J
11
R
V. 111
appf
Jan 4 - Feb 25

Appendix

President Johnson and His Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States and Democratic National chairman, delivered a prophetic address before the Rotary Club of Atlanta, Ga. The essence of his prophesy can best be described as a sincere and absolute conviction in the imminent greatness and success of the great society, the era which is about to begin.

If Jim Farley's appraisal of the present scene and his prediction of things to come prove to be as accurate as those of the past—and I personally believe that they will—this Nation, its citizens and the entire world can look forward to a period of unparalleled advancement, prosperity and peace.

In 1936 against what was then considered heavy odds, General Farley predicted that in his bid for reelection, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt would carry 46 of the 48 States. The election of that year sustained his prediction.

Nearly a year ago he made a similar prediction in which he forecast a victory by President Johnson in all but six States. Once again, his political judgment was vindicated by the results.

Some will disagree with Mr. Farley's views of the past, particularly where they concern the administrations of previous Presidents. Others will object that his preview of the great society is too optimistic.

Those who know Jim Farley and know of his command of knowledge concerning both the United States and the world will hesitate to discount his views concerning the years that are immediately ahead, for such views are not those of an idle dreamer, but the thinking of a political realist.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is highly appropriate on this, the first day of the Johnson administration, that the wisdom of this great American should be offered to my colleagues in the House and to the American people. I ask that the full text of his speech be printed herein:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND HIS GREAT SOCIETY

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., before the Rotary Club of Atlanta, Atlanta, Ga., November 16, 1964)

Along about last February, I predicted that President Johnson would carry all but six States of the Union. I should have stood by that prediction. But truth to tell, the campaign of his opposition appeared to be so dismal and President Johnson's own presentation of the issues was so lucid that I extended my prediction to include 48 States. It was a sweeping declaration, to be sure, but I felt quite justified.

I have been reminded a great deal about this. But I answer that this is not the first time a man's enthusiasm has overextended his judgment.

More particularly, I am reminded of a story of a marvelous Negro major-domo on a Virginia plantation, a century and a half ago, whose uncanny weather predictions reaped great fortunes for the planters. They were so grateful—and amazed—at an unusually successful forecast that a huge garden party was given in his honor.

It was a beautiful May day, and no one enjoyed the punch more than Abraham, the major-domo. As the evening shadows fell, all insisted that he take the rostrum and predict the weather for the Fourth of July. Flushed with the acclaim and the punch, Abraham loudly proclaimed that on the Fourth of July Virginia would have 6 inches of snow.

In the silence which followed the squire of the plantation whispered to him, "Abraham, why did you predict snow on the Fourth of July? You know that's almost impossible."

"Snow on the Fourth of July is almost impossible," agreed Abraham happily, "but I sure am going to have a national reputation if it comes true."

Actually, the odds were heavily against it but it reminded me of an occurrence when I made the correct estimation of the 1936 election, that Mr. Roosevelt would carry 46 out of the 48 States.

Actually, I was urged not to make the prediction—the odds, it was said, were too heavily against it. But here, Charley Michelson, my close adviser, broke in with a story which convinced me of the wisdom of venturing the forecast.

According to Charley, two policemen were down on a Chicago pier one stormy January night, when they heard running footsteps on the dock and before they could stop him a man took a huge jump into the wild lake. When they fished him out, the man was perfectly sober and perfectly rational.

"What were you trying to do, drown yourself?" asked one of the policemen.

"Of course not," said the man, "they just bet me 5,000 to 1 back there that I couldn't jump across Lake Michigan."

"Let me tell you something," said the policeman. "Lake Michigan at this point is 9 miles wide."

The man looked at him with contempt. "Let me tell you something," he said. "5,000 to 1 is very attractive odds."

Which brings me to the reason I am grateful to my very good friend, George Woodruff, for asking me to speak here today. I want to make a very serious prediction—and to give you my reasons for it. I predict that with cooperation, the Great Society proposed by President Johnson will go down as among the greatest and most prosperous times in American history. I predict that the Johnson administration will be known as the "Second Era of Good Feeling"—the first such era since President Monroe—and I further state that no President in American history is so uniquely equipped to accomplish this result as President Johnson.

This is too a sweeping statement, but I believe I can sustain it.

In the first place, President Johnson has returned to the interpretation of the Constitution given to it by President Jefferson. President Jefferson insisted that the Executive should offer its leadership to the country through the Congress. President Jefferson, accordingly, always consulted Congress before offering legislation. Indeed, he himself frequently even attended party caucuses, and when he could not, sent Albert Gallatin, his Secretary of the Treasury. The result was a smoothly flowing cooperation instead of unnecessary conflict and misunderstanding. President Johnson has already demonstrated the soundness of the Jeffersonian concept—and his own mastery of it. Witness his tremendous effectiveness with the Congress—but do not take it for granted. It represents the most dynamic return to a working Constitution that the country has witnessed in a century and a half.

I need not tell you what stability and regularity at Washington means to us business people. President Johnson, it has been said, is a professional politician. Let us thank heaven that he is, because as Mark Twain said, the trouble with amateurs is that no one knows what they are going to do next.

Already President Johnson has eliminated half the cause of domestic uncertainty.

One need merely look at the history books to sustain this. Thus, President Andrew Jackson completely discarded the Jefferson theory. President Jackson declared that since the President was the only official elected by the entire American people he, the President, was the sole spokesman for the Nation, and indeed the American people themselves. He called the President the Chief Steward of the Republic—and proceeded to defy Congress, the Supreme Court, and all and sundry who dared even challenge him. Cooperation was lost. I, personally, think that it is no accident that the great panic of 1837 followed later.

President Abraham Lincoln fully embraced the "stewardship theory." He sidetracked the Congress, relying on the clause of the Constitution which charged him to take care that the laws be enforced; and he enlarged the war powers of the Commander in Chief to proportions unheard of before he took office. Indeed, it was said of President Lincoln that he regarded his Cabinet as an unnecessary nuisance, and Congress merely as a necessary nuisance. The Congress, naturally, could be expected to resist—and the near-impeachment of his successor ushered in the tragic era of Reconstruction—really the Dark Ages of this Republic.

President Theodore Roosevelt flouted the Congress even, at one time, declaring that the beauty of being President was that nine-tenths of his illegal acts were never even questioned. Further, he enlarged the scope to an attack on business, calling business leaders malefactors of great wealth.

President Woodrow Wilson followed the Jacksonian theory. He attacked both Congress and business, declaring, after he was elected but before he was inaugurated, that he promised the financial markets a gallows higher than Haman's. Subsequently, President Wilson's administration met catastrophe at the hands of the Congress.

Now, this brings me to focus of President Johnson's administration in the light of the experience of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

President Franklin Roosevelt received as great a mandate from the American people

in 1936 as President Johnson received in 1964. But President Roosevelt, in my opinion, completely misinterpreted this mandate. He plunged the country into the unnecessary Supreme Court fight without even consulting the Congress. The result is history. The Congress rebelled against President Roosevelt as it had rebelled against President Wilson and President Lincoln—and the Nation sustained the Congress on this issue. And I cannot refrain from noting the recession of 1937 and 1938 followed.

President Johnson, in my opinion, has abandoned the Jackson theory, and has returned to the original and far more sound concept of President Jefferson. The result—to be frank—has been magical. Holding office only 11 months, his method has produced both the harmony and the result which already identify it as the soundest approach in a century and a half.

Here, I must confess that the pitiful lack of appreciation of the tremendous change in method adopted by President Johnson is a matter of some irritation to me because I went through the fight with Congress in 1937. President Johnson has already demonstrated—and to the country's great gain—the invaluable know-how that more than 25 years on Capitol Hill as Congressman, Senator, majority leader and Vice President have given him. He has already bestowed on the Congress the respect and consideration it has not received since President Jefferson—and the Congress has fully responded in terms of the great respect it holds for the Presidency. We shall have no paralyzing crises such as we experienced in the Court fight of 1937 or the Purge of 1938, which I did not approve nor support.

Yet the press—and, indeed, some of its most honored columnists—proceed to describe this historical constitutional change of procedure as if it were at the level of ward politics, and the President a mere, cunning manipulator of personalities.

Nothing could be further from the truth. President Lyndon B. Johnson has, in my opinion, already accomplished the greatest constitutional effect, certainly in my time or memory. And as a result of this new constitutional order on Capitol Hill I predict the greatest era of harmony since President Monroe, an era when the country will not be paralyzed by the gigantic and unnecessary struggles between the three great branches of our Government.

Hence, if I am correct, you will understand why I am irritated by having a great statesman called a mere political manipulator. It is, considering President Johnson's accomplishments already, little less than shameful to have this tremendous constitutional change unrecognized and unappreciated.

I have made important claims for President Johnson in saying, in effect, that he has already settled a constitutional crisis of 138 years standing. But my hope and my prediction go much further. Our country and all of us have had some hard experiences in the last six decades. We have had raucous days, from the Pullman strike down through the sitdowns and the steel strikes. Our country has been torn from Main Street to Wall Street, from village meetings to Capitol Hill.

But the Nation has been learning something, and learning it the hard way and it is now ready for its realization.

That is what I believe—and I have reason to believe President Johnson has in mind in his great society. He does not consider business leaders as malefactors of great wealth, or economic royalists. Indeed, I do not know how anyone could, after looking at the income taxes they and their great corporations pay. On the contrary, he regards them as people whose high management skills are absolutely necessary to the welfare of this Nation. In this, he is supported by the new type of labor leaders—men who are even more aware of the necessity of successful management than the ordinary citizen. Many of the labor unions, indeed, cooperate night and day with the industrial leaders, especially for foreign markets, for a good and simple reason; if there are no profits, there is no work, and where there is no work there is no payroll check. All American business leaders and all American labor leaders are proceeding on the basis of preserving a system which has brought wealth and honor to both of them.

Bluntly, there's no free enterprise under communism, and where there is no free enterprise there are no free labor unions either. What President Johnson is saying is the absolute truth—when he states that our country is a vast and successful partnership. Free labor, free enterprise and a free government are as indivisible partners as the legs of a three-legged stool; one can't go without the other two falling. No other President since the industrial revolution has so approached the body politic. Coupling this realistic and optimistic approach to the economic system with the constitutional reform of President Johnson already in effect, I am of the opinion that the President has put in place the cornerstone upon which he through the Congress will lead us across the threshold into the great society.

Now, we are all businessmen here and we like to think we get down to facts. Assuming that the new constitutional approach and the labor, industry, government partnership is recognized, the natural question is—if we are in business together, where do we begin?

Well, it is my view that we will begin by expanding our greatest asset and our greatest market—the American people themselves.

That, I believe, is what stirs the soul of our President. Certainly he is familiar with how great our country has become; but even our present greatness is but as a dwarf compared to the giant we are about to become.

The President is on soundest financial and economic ground. This is no wild pie-in-the-sky dream. The great society is merely a forecast of the national expansion of our country. The proof is as close and as clear as a glance out of the window. Do you think Colonel Oglethorpe and his first settlers of Georgia could have conceived of the wonderful city of Atlanta—even in their wildest dreams? But it's here and it's growing and it is going to grow twice as fast. Why?

Suppose I should tell you that right at Atlanta's doorstep a new country has been discovered, containing nearly every known resource of man, untouched minerals, great forests, and rushing streams. Suppose I should add that Atlanta would be the gateway to the new country. Surely, you would say such a prospect is bright for Atlanta, Georgia, the South and the Nation.

Well, President Johnson has proclaimed such new country, right in the heart of our own and he calls it Appalachia.

I cannot help but feel that here again the analogy between the administration of President Johnson and President Jefferson holds true. President Jefferson bought the whole Mississippi Valley from Louisiana to Montana for $15 million in 1803. Fifteen million is not enough to buy one square block in any one of the dozens of cities in the Mississippi Basin now. But people who could not see the vision of President Jefferson called $15 million a waste of money. Similarly when Alaska was purchased for $7,200,000 it was called Seward's Ice Box and Seward's Folly. Why the salmon catch alone now nets tens of millions annually. History has answered the absurd shortsightedness of those who fear the future. And, so will history answer those who cannot see the reality of the vision of the great society of President Johnson. Hence, I predict President Johnson's Appalachia will pay out as magnificently as the Louisiana and Alaska purchases.

Ah; as businessmen, many will say—what about the national debt? My answer is for the Nation what is for private business, namely, does anyone know how you can get into production without paying for a plant. If so, the eve of financial miracles is upon us.

Louisiana alone produced $7 billion in oil and gas last year, but a century and a half ago Jefferson suffered much abuse because of his investment. President Johnson is currently being subjected to close scrutiny on the national debt limit. Well, let's look at the figures. The U.S. Government had an average national income of $13 million a year—13 million, not billion—in President Jefferson's time. Suppose he had heeded the fearful who said don't buy the Mississippi Basin because you will double the public debt. Why, we would have lost nearly half of the States of the Union. My point is, can anyone imagine a more wasteful policy than not investing in the future of the American people? In short, I believe that the President will have to expand the public debt—but like President Jefferson for every million he spends the country's future—the American people—and you and I, and our children's children, are going to be enriched by a billion—and on a soundest financial basis.

Now, someone will naturally say, "Come on Farley, when and how?"

My answer is now as soon as the Congress convenes—and this is how. Let me first define sound financing. First, millions of Americans own their own homes, paying out over 20 to 30 years. These loans are the prime securities of our country, perform the greatest public service and at a profit—indeed the profit system at its best. Now, the homeowner's house won't grow, but his children will.

This is what President Johnson is literally going to bank on. I do not mean this as idle talk—based in the obvious that if we don't have children our country will die. I mean, literally and financially, that the President knows that the education of these children is not only bankable but the best investment in the Nation. Let me give you the figures. A child which has up to a grammar school education will earn during lifetime an average of $152,000; a child which goes through high school $272,000; a child which will go through college and beyond a lifetime average of $452,000. In plain, hard figures, it means that a college-trained man will earn about $300,000 more than one who has not had such education. I submit that to increase the earnings of every American child it is not only bankable but a prime investment. Thus, if private financing will loan a man $20,000 over 25 years to build a house, which doesn't grow and make a profit, it is President Johnson's position that the same homeowner can be loaned the money to build his son into an educated man—whose income will grow $300,000 on a mere $20,000 loan.

I am both glad and proud that the great financial institutions of our country—a considerable number of savings banks and insurance companies—are already exploring this as a field for private investment. The outlook is most promising. The foundations and the colleges indicate, for example, that such loans have a nearly 100 percent record of repayment.

Now, suppose that this vast new field turns out to be a field rich for private investment. It would open up a vast new vista for private enterprise and in my opinion no one would be more overjoyed than the President.

Indeed, that is what I think he meant when he said, "I need your help." It is my personal opinion that if private capital could assume a major part of the tremendous job of educating a population which will total between 335 and 450 million by the year 2000, President Johnson would see to it that the Government undertook part of the risk. Is

this new and radical? Of course it isn't. The Government already insures small deposits up to $10,000 in banks and it wouldn't be more than a mere innovation to insure loans for the education of a child up to an equal amount. The security? The same we bank on now—future earnings.

Well, you will ask, what is the constitutional authority for this. My answer is that President Johnson has at least as much authority under the general welfare clause in this 20th century as his predecessors had under the interstate commerce clause in the 19th.

Put yourself in his place. He must do more, because he cannot do less. He intends to create his great society on the same basic principles that prompted Jefferson to purchase Louisiana. There is this innovation. President Johnson proceeds on the theory that, economically, an American family is as valuable as the real estate upon which it lives. This idealism, too, is on a sound business basis.

Sir Winston Churchill, certainly no radical, in his later years declared that the best investment a nation can make is a bottle of milk for a baby. President Johnson goes a step further. The President declares that the best investment a nation can make is in a book on the arms of boys and girls in schools and in the colleges.

That, frankly, is why I thought the President might even carry 50 States; because deep in its soul, our Nation knows that when St. John promised that "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall set ye free," that God himself ordained the American public school system.

I should be less than frank if I did not say that the President has reignited my faith in the American ideal with a fire which has not burned in me since I, as a campaigner in 1912, carried the banner of idealism and integrity for Woodrow Wilson, who also believed America's destiny was based on public education.

While President Wilson fought for the rights of education as president of Princeton, President Johnson saw it from a view far closer to the people.

President Johnson, like myself, had to work for his education. I never got beyond high school and business school. My father died when I was 10. President Johnson knows what a poor boy must do to go through college. He did it himself—and then he taught the underprivileged children. That is where I think his crusade was born. Having suffered himself he understood the privations of those who suffered even more. He became the champion of those who sought to better themselves and their children. And he fought for them, not only as children, but for the men and women they had the right to be. This, I think, is the fire that burns most clearly and fiercely in his heart.

The President's efforts in this field remind me of a story of the sculptor Michelangelo. He was in a great fury of energy, as is President Johnson and when he was inspired with his vision nothing could stop him. One day, when he was nearly 80, the chips were flying as he battered away at a block of marble. "What are you doing, Master?" called out one of his pupils up in the gallery. Without stopping, Michelangelo called back, "I am freeing the man in this rock."

With the same relentless energy, President Johnson is freeing the man and the woman to be in every American child. And I firmly believe, as I believe in St. John, that great American men and women as yet unborn, in the magnificent cities yet to be built, will bless and revere the name of President Johnson, as we now pay homage to his nearest prototype among the American Presidents, President Thomas Jefferson. Because, if President Johnson succeeds, he will write the bill of rights for American children no less than Thomas Jefferson wrote them for the Constitution.

Thomas Jefferson, very significantly, omitted in his epitaph that he was President of the United States. He did, however, wish to be remembered as the author of the Declaration of Independence and the Founder of the University of Virginia. In the same vein, I believe that history will record that President Lyndon Johnson wrote the declaration of independence for American childhood, and that the cornerstones of scores of new universities, as the University of Virginia now carries the name of Thomas Jefferson—will carry the name of President Lyndon Johnson.

Now, I cannot refrain from noting that though I was originally correct in my prediction of 44 States—I was only off 8 percent in my final tally. And if I am only 8 percent off in my prediction for the Johnson administration—this country is on the threshold of the great society—its greatest financial and industrial prosperity and its greatest spiritual advance since they rang the Liberty Bell in 1776.

Three Hundred Aged To Go to Capital To Back Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an article from the Philadelphia Inquirer on January 3, 1965, entitled "Three-Hundred Aged Going to Capital To Back Medicare."

The article follows:

THREE HUNDRED AGED GOING TO CAPITAL TO BACK MEDICARE

More than 300 elderly Philadelphians will board a special train Tuesday morning for Washington, where they will join elderly persons from all over the country, gathered to lobby for passage of a medicare bill.

The demonstration, under the auspices of the National Council of Senior Citizens, is being organized locally by the Philadelphia branch of the Committee on Political Education (AFL-CIO), headquartered at Broad and Vine Streets.

TO CONTEST OFFICIALS

According to Norman Blumberg, COPE president, the train will pick up passengers at North Philadelphia and 30th Street Station and continue to Union Station, Washington, where buses will carry them to Capitol Hill.

There, said Blumberg, the oldsters will spend the day contacting the offices of their Senators and Representatives to stress the importance of medicare legislation—a medical assistance program for the aged.

"Too long has medicare been a political stepchild, and the overwhelming majority given to the Democratic Party from all sections indicates clearly that medicare should be considered 'must' legislation at this time," said Edward F. Toohey, executive secretary of COPE.

CONCENTRATED EFFORT

Toohey said the demonstration would be a concentrated effort to offset the activities of the multimillion-dollar American Medical Association lobby that will be simultaneously conducting its own drive against medicare.

Blumberg estimated the average age of persons making the trip would be 65. He said a drive for participants had been conducted through 200 AFL-CIO unions in the city, as well as numerous clubs and organizations for the elderly.

Thirty-one To Be Honored at Academy Interview Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Saturday noon, January 16, 1965, 31 outstanding young men of the 20th Congressional District, Illinois, will be honored at a luncheon at Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.

They are the candidates for appointment to the military academies, class to begin in June 1965. Qualifying for final consideration by passing civil service examinations, each will receive recognition at the luncheon, which is part of a daylong program of interview and evaluation. During the morning, each will be interviewed by a civilian board. Members of the boards were selected because of their deep interest in the military affairs of our country.

Serving on the interview boards will be: Gene Terry, Quincy; Russell D. Shambrook, Springfield; Ralph Knotts, Pittsfield; Ray Samples, Jacksonville; Donald W. Marshall, Macomb; Jack Huff, Quincy; Philip L. Robinson, Springfield; Harper C. Allan, Springfield; Lee Ensel, Springfield; E. C. Bone, Jacksonville; J. E. Fetter, Quincy; Frank Strieby, Quincy; Carl T. Meyer, Springfield; Patrick Noonan, Springfield.

From the young men now entering the military academies must come tomorrow's military leadership for the United States. Therefore, I am most anxious to select the best available talent. I appreciate the fine cooperation of the members of the interview boards in making possible this mode of selection. Here are the candidates:

Donald L. Goff, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Donald E. Goff.

Richard Johnson, Riverton, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Troy L. Johnson.

Joseph D. McCausland, Jr., Beardstown, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph D. McCausland, Sr.

Howard E. McNier, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. George E. McNier.

Michael J. Schussele, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Halbert A. Schussele.

Randall C. Moore, Roodhouse, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Harold Moore.

Stanley L. Flynn, Colchester, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. James L. Flynn.

Steven K. Goodman, Pleasant Hill, Ill., son of Dr. and Mrs. James E. Goodman.

David Pfeiffer, Pittsfield, Ill., son of Mr. Roy F. Pfeiffer.

John F. Timko, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Michael J. Timko.

Dale D. Turvey, Pawnee, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Dale C. Turvey.

David B. Wilson, Auburn, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Edwin B. Wilson.

George J. Young, Auburn, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Young.

David Lee Hallenbeck, Macomb, Ill., son of Maj. and Mrs. Howard E. Hallenbeck.

James M. Harnly, Virden, Ill., son of Lt. Col. and Mrs. Merlin W. Harnly.

Kenneth C. Harper, Chandlerville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles B. Harper.

John R. Hinton, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Hinton, Jr.

Scott D. Ingram, Fieldon, Ill., son of Col. and Mrs. James W. Ingram.

James D. Ivers, Eldred, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. James Ivers.

David H. Jennings, Pleasant Hill, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Avery L. Jennings.

Garland R. Johnson, Jr., Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Garland R. Johnson, Sr.

Kevin D. Johnston, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Dean Johnston.

Roger L. Keithley, Blandinsville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert L. Keithley.

Richard A. Kolaz, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph A. Kolaz.

John L. Komnick, Athens, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin J. Komnick.

Larry C. Louden, U.S. Air Force Academy, Colo., grandson of Mr. Ben F. Louden, La Harpe, Ill.

Ronald D. Mansfield, Carlinville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Delbert Mansfield.

Albert W. Scott III, Carrollton, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Albert W. Scott II.

Carl Shulman, Pittsfield, Ill., son of Dr. and Mrs. Myer Shulman.

Charles Alan Smith, Macomb, Ill., son of Col. and Mrs. Gilbert G. Smith, Jr.

William F. Young, Jacksonville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. William B. Young.

Despotic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a resolution which would accomplish the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Washington Post editorial of January 4 entitled "Despotic Power" cogently illustrates the necessity of favorable action on this resolution.

The editorial follows:

DESPOTIC POWER

With extraordinary celerity, the U.S. attorney has persuaded a grand jury to indict two highly reputable and respected Washington women for contempt of Congress. Nothing more sinister has been imputed to them than an open, forthright visit to the Department of State to request the granting of an entry permit to a noted Japanese professor of law invited to lecture in this country on peace. Subpenaed by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the two women appeared respectfully, expressed a willingness to answer any questions put to them at an open hearing, but declined to submit to an inquisition in secret. For this, they have been indicted for contempt of Congress.

It may well be that a court will decide that the House of Representatives has power to punish this conduct as a contempt. But the exercise of the power in this case will be, nevertheless, wrong, shameful, and despotic. It is not unreasonable for persons who have nothing to hide to be unwilling to testify before the Un-American Activities Committee in secret. That committee has so often been guilty of warped, selective, and self-serving disclosure of testimony taken by it in closed hearings that no one can prudently repose confidence in its good faith.

The Un-American Activities Committee appears to make its hearings closed or open at the whim or caprice of its subcommittees. Whether witnesses called by the subcommittees must submit to these whims is a question of law which the courts have not yet definitely decided. But the capricious holding of secret sessions is contrary to sound public policy and contrary, as well, to the expressed will of the House of Representatives. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 provided that "all hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee, by a majority vote, orders an executive session." Since the Congress was not in session at the time of this hearing, it seems unlikely that a majority of the full committee ordered an executive session.

Whatever the courts may say about it, the House of Representatives ought to be revolted by this exhibition of despotism in its name.

Back to Waikiki

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith an article by Joseph Alsop entitled, "Back to Waikiki," for the benefit of my colleagues who may have missed reading it.

I know that many Members of the House have been thinking of the serious situation in Vietnam. No newspaper columnist or writer has interpreted the situation more clearly or succinctly than Mr. Alsop in the following article:

BACK TO WAIKIKI

(By Joseph Alsop)

Unless President Johnson takes rather prompt preventive action, 1965 is pretty likely to be remembered as the year when the proud, ever-rising curve of American power and greatness at length turned sharply downward.

This would have happened in 1962 if President Kennedy had ducked the challenge of the Soviet missiles in Cuba. Barring a miracle, this is due to happen in 1965 if President Johnson ducks the challenge in South Vietnam, as he seems to be getting ready to do.

To be sure, the White House has been passing the word that we can safely go on as we are going in Vietnam. To be sure, others have suggested that we can safely forget about the Vietnamese war and negotiate larger diplomatic arrangements which will guarantee a bearable future for Asia.

But it is ludicrous to talk about negotiating, when you are on the naked verge of total, final defeat—unless you merely wish the negotiations to register the defeat. And in this same situation, it is also self-deceiving to say you can safely go on as you are going—unless your concealed intention is to accept the coming defeat, and then to try to throw the blame on all sorts of other people.

The truth, if it is faced, is meanwhile quite simple. The United States is very near to defeat in Vietnam. It may come militarily, or it may come politically; but either way, there is not much time left to avert it. Furthermore, the United States has the power to avert this defeat—unless it is argued we are too weak to win a war against the North Vietnamese aggressors. Hence it is well, now, to count what this defeat can be expected to cost.

"The question is whether you want to go right back to "Waikiki." In these words, the first part of the cost of defeat in Vietnam was summarized by one of the leading participants in the White House conference with Gen. Maxwell Taylor early in December, when the challenge ought to have been met but was instead ducked for the second or third time during 1964.

Going back to Waikiki of course means losing the American position as a great power in the Pacific. Gaining and holding that position in the Second World War and the Korean war, cost the United States hundreds of thousands of dead and wounded and hundreds of billions of dollars. Its loss after a defeat in Vietnam is foreseen by all qualified judges, including the Presidents' own policymakers.

The Hong Kong analysts, the best in Asia, say that Formosa will hardly last 6 months after the United States concedes victory to the Communists in southeast Asia. It will take longer than that for the Philippines to reach the stage of Indonesia, and longer still for all that we fought for in South Korea to go down the drain. Japan's movement to a neutralist position, and the consequent loss of Okinawa, may even require a good many years.

But as nothing fails like failure, especially in Asia, the whole grim chain reaction is easily predictable. In southeast Asia, meanwhile, U.S. defeat in Vietnam may perhaps briefly install an allegedly neutralist government in Saigon. But such a government will represent no more than a brief transition.

In very short order, the Laotian and South Vietnamese peoples, who have relied upon the United States, will be subjected to the bleak tyranny now prevailing in Communist North Vietnam because the United States has proven unreliable. But that will be no more than the first phase; for the American defeat will be far more a Chinese triumph than a North Vietnamese triumph.

All of southeast Asia, emphatically including Vietnam, will be China's to deal with as the Chinese Communist leaders may please, just as soon as we are defeated and our forces withdraw. In southeast Asia, China will gain the margin of resources to achieve what China cannot possibly achieve today—the status of a military-industrial giant power. And this third giant power will be led, remember, by the bloody-minded men who now rule in Peiping.

As for Europe, there are good reasons for believing that the intelligence reports from Saigon are the real source of General de Gaulle's vastly more aggressive recent policy. U.S. humiliation in the Pacific will certainly not increase U.S. influence in the Atlantic, as De Gaulle well knows. And to this dreadful bill that will have to be paid if we accept defeat, one must add the inevitable feedback into Latin America and the Middle East.

It may seem rediculous that so much should depend upon the obscure conflict in Vietnam. But this conflict, for good or ill, has now become a decisive test of U.S. power and resoluteness. That is the basic reason why Mr. Johnson's choice in Vietnam in 1965 so closely resembles President's Kennedy's choice in Cuba in 1962. One must pray he does not fail where his predecessor succeeded.

Tribute to an Educator: Charles Williams Armstrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, recently I had an opportunity to spend a nostalgic half-hour with the former principal of the first school which I attended, Babylon Free School District No. 1, and I am pleased to recite the background of a great educator as a tribute to him:

TRIBUTE TO AN EDUCATOR: CHARLES WILLIAMS ARMSTRONG

An outstanding example of dedication to the teaching profession is personified in Charles W. Armstrong who, still living and attaining his 95th year, has continued to be interested in young people and their educational future.

Charles W. Armstrong was born in Port Byron, N.Y., to a devout business and farming family on February 15, 1870. He was one of six children, four of whom turned to education; in fact, one of his sisters became a doctor and a medical missionary to further the interests of mankind. As a boy he lived in rural New York State attending elementary and secondary schools there. Upon his graduation from high school in Port Byron, N.Y., he attended Albany State Teachers College and received a bachelor of education degree as a member of a class of 125. It might be noted here that during his high school days, Mr. Armstrong walked approximately 5 miles daily to attend classes.

Several teaching assignments followed his graduation from college, one of which was at Sag Harbor, N.Y. There he met and married Nell Merritt whose family were coopers in the whaling trade, at that time a big industry in Sag Harbor. Their first son, Francis, was born in this town. While teaching in Sag Harbor, he organized the first tennis team of Pierson High School of that town and, to this day, has remained an avid tennis fan.

In 1908 he obtained an additional degree in education at Columbia University. Then, after teaching for a time at Pierson, he joined the school system of Cobbleskill, N.Y. where his second son, Donald, was born. After teaching there for a short time, he returned to Long Island in 1913 to become the supervising principal of the Babylon high school system. He remained in Babylon in that capacity until 1932 when he retired. During his tenure many changes in the educational system at Babylon took place.

Back in those days, a principal was a jack of all trades. "Pop" as he was affectionately known ruled the school system with an iron hand. His beliefs were in the three R's. He could substitute and did substitute in any class or subject should a teacher be ailing or absent. His particular love was American history which was then, as is now, a senior high school subject. This he taught for many, many years in addition to his business duties as administrator. For a time, he also coached the Babylon High School baseball team and in the final year of its league participation, the team became county champions. This same team, after graduation from high school, continued as a unit and became a semipro team of which he was made an honorary member.

Charles Armstrong was devoted to his students, be they at the top of class or the bottom. Although he was a firm administrator and teacher, he would always lend a sympathetic ear and compassionate understanding to problems of his students and his staff alike. His home extended his working day often as frequently visitors gathered there to discuss some project or seek advice. It was not unusual of an evening to find him at home joining with his students and teachers in a songfest. During this period, Mr. Armstrong was also an active member of the Suffolk County Council of Boy Scouts of America striving with the council for about 15 years.

After many years of service, Charles W. Armstrong retired from the Babylon school system. This did not mean, however, that he retired from active participation in local and civic affairs. He became a member of the Babylon Village Board and the OPA during World War II. He was trustee and treasurer of the First Baptist Church in in Babylon and a member of the Masonic Lodge both in Cobbleskill ALd Babylon. His elder son is following in his footsteps and for many years has enjoyed the teaching profession. This son was graduated, Phi Beta Kappa, from Colgate University in 1923 with a bachelor of science degree and took his masters in languages at Columbia.

Mr. Armstrong's interest in his former students and teachers continued and he was constantly following their progress as they matured in both professional and business circles. To this day, some of his former pupils and teachers drop by to say "hello" to "Pop." His wife, now in her 88th year, is his constant companion. His later life has been brightened by the event of two grandchildren. Despite his age, Charles W. Armstrong is alert and most interested in educational developments.

A New Motto on Budgets?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "A New Motto on Budgets?" which appeared in the Phoenix Gazette on December 19, 1964:

A NEW MOTTO ON BUDGETS?

It has become a custom for the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to keep in his Washington office a framed motto that reflects the spending attitude of the administration he serves. This Bureau sifts through requests for funds and helps the President prepare a budget to submit to Congress, so it has a big say in Federal spending.

Maurice Stans, last Budget Director of the Eisenhower administration, adopted the motto, "Why?" This was to remind him that he was to ask agencies why a program had to cost so much or why it should be a Federal program at all. This attitude was described as the negative approach.

During the Kennedy administration, David Bell and his successor, Kermit Kordon, still in office, preferred the motto, "How?" This supposedly typified a more positive approach; instead of merely questioning requests, they would suggest alternatives.

Both of these mottoes seem adequate enough, and President Johnson, as he begins his administration of the great society, may prefer that the Budget Director keep the present motto, "How?" If Mr. Johnson, concerned with frugality, wants a new motto, however, there is one that seems quite appropriate:

"Who?"

That might remind the Bureau of the Budget to inquire about who is going to pay for a program, no matter how large or small. The answer, of course, always will be the taxpayer, but since so many Federal spenders don't seem to recognize that fact, a reminder appears entirely in order.

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Lithuanian Hall Association in Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, Baltimore is a city which includes among its citizens almost every nationality group in existence up to World War II. Each group, while becoming Americanized and part of the everyday life of the city, retained many of the customs and cultures of its homeland.

The people of Lithuanian extraction were among the early settlers in Baltimore. As far back as 1902 they recognized the need for a central gathering place and their early activities were held in a church building which they purchased and converted to a hall the following year. Shortly thereafter an association was formed to supervise the operations and maintenance of the hall. With a large increase in the number of Lithuanians coming to the city their activities grew to such an extent that a much larger place was necessary, and in 1921 a newly constructed building was dedicated which has been used ever since. Many dramatic, musical, and social affairs have been held there, attended by many notable personages, including two former presidents of the Republic of Lithuania. After World War I and during and after World War II, a tremendous amount of relief work and charitable activities were carried on there. On November 21, 1964, the 50th anniversary of the Lithuanian Hall Association was observed at a banquet which it was my privilege to attend. On that occasion tribute was paid to the early founders, and to their foresight, which made possible this meeting place for the thousands of Lithuanians and the many activities of all kinds which have been held there.

The officers of the association are to be congratulated for continuing the fine work which was begun 50 years ago, and for arranging the commemorative banquet. Mr. John M. Stefura, chairman of

the association, also served as chairman of the anniversary committee. He was ably assisted by Valys Brasauskas, Marcrit Matelis, Kazimieras Dulys, Julijus Silgalis, Albert J. Juskus, Ben Karius, P. Buda, M. Simkus, and F. Lisowski.

It's Time for Firmness Toward Nasser and Company

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in light of current controversies regarding foreign aid and its effect on our relations with Nasser, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Lansing State Journal, Monday, December 28, 1964, entitled "It's Time for Firmness Toward Nasser and Company."

It expresses well a feeling of many in Michigan's Sixth District and, I am sure, elsewhere, that it is time to display some firmness in our relations with those who aid our enemy and who allow attacks on U.S. property. Therefore, I am especially anxious that this editorial be called to the attention of all Members of Congress:

IT'S TIME FOR FIRMNESS TOWARD NASSER AND COMPANY

Three of the U.S. Senate's most powerful Democrats want next year's foreign aid legislation to have a new look.

Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, and Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, have joined with Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, in support of what they regard as a reform on the multibillion-dollar aid package.

FULBRIGHT and SPARKMAN want the bill divided into separate parts for military, economic and other forms of assistance to other countries.

FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said that unless there is a reform he will refuse to lead the fight for the aid program legislation.

He expressed opposition to having the bill turned into a garbage can for all kinds of amendments "which have nothing whatever to do with foreign aid."

MANSFIELD called the usual single-package bill a conglomerate mass which tempts Senators to "throw in everything but the kitchen sink."

FULBRIGHT emphasized his continuing support for foreign aid, now running at the rate of $3.25 billion a year, but said, "I have served my time on this kind of a bill."

As we see it, the bill should be restricted solely to foreign aid and not allowed to become a vehicle for wholly unrelated legislation.

It also would seem to be sound practice to separate military and economic assistance to the end that each category would receive the careful consideration it deserves.

One urgently needed reform is action based on a painstaking search by Congress for the kind of spending that represents large-scale waste of the taxpayers' money. There has been a lot of talk about weeding out waste but little or no evidence of effective action in that direction.

One good way to reduce the foreign aid burden would be to cut off aid to those who portray Uncle Sam as a villain on the world scene whom they accuse of sending them millions of dollars to achieve his own selfish purposes, among them the support of imperialism.

One charge along that line was made last week by President Gamal Abdel Nasser, of the United Arab Republic. Shortly after an Egyptian attack on an unarmed American plane, Nasser accused the United States of bullying and said Egypt would not accept that or pressure and silly talk as the price of continued American aid.

His attack on the United States was the bitterest since 1957 when the United States virtually cut off aid to Egypt following the Suez debacle.

Nasser lashed America for not meeting Egypt's request for $35 million in emergency aid to alleviate a serious food shortage. He apparently was referring to a United States demand for payment in hard currencies instead of Egyptian pounds.

He said if America doesn't like Egypt's terms of payment it "can go drink sea water.

"We will not sell our independence for 30, 40, or 50 millions. We are not prepared to accept a bad word from anyone. We shall cut out the tongue of anyone who speaks bad words to us."

Nasser defiantly admitted he was supplying arms to the Communist-backed Congo rebels.

"We will continue to send arms," he said.

Perhaps he would need less aid from the United States to relieve Egypt's food shortage if he spent less on supplying arms to the rebels in the Congo. If he chooses to subsidize the torture and murder of innocent persons, the United States obviously should withhold aid that would, in effect, subsidize Nasser's support of the rebels.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk warned, that U.S. relations with nations that do not protect American diplomatic installations may be adversely affected. He named no countries but apparently referred to recent attacks on U.S. libraries in Indonesia and Egypt.

It is doubtful that Rusk's vague statement will have the desired effect with foreign regimes which act as though they were doing America a favor by accepting the millions flowing from Washington.

In our opinion, it's high time Uncle Sam dispelled that notion by calling a spade a spade and displaying proper firmness toward those who attack him, instead of merely wincing when they pull his whiskers, kick his shin, and tell him to go jump in the lake.

The Congress and America's Future: The Final Report of the 26th Annual American Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress the final report of the 26th American Assembly of Columbia University, entitled "The Congress and America's Future."

The American assembly conducted discussions throughout the United States prior to writing its final report. I had the honor of participating in one regional discussion conducted in California.

Many outstanding business, academic, civic, and governmental leaders have taken of their time, talents, and energy to look with an interested eye at Congress. I feel we should take note of the report, especially since it concerns the vital institution to which we all belong. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I, under unanimous consent, insert the American assembly's report in the RECORD:

FINAL REPORT OF THE 26TH AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

(NOTE.—At the close of their discussions the participants in the 26th American Assembly reviewed as a group the following statement. Although there was general agreement on the final report, it is not the practice of the American assembly for participants to affix their signatures, and it should not be assumed that every participant necessarily subscribes to every recommendation.)

We have discussed what steps might be taken to assure the continued vitality and effectiveness of the Congress of the United States. We feel a respect for the values underlying the American system of representative government, in which the legislature is crucial. We desire to see those values perpetuated and reflected in institutions that will protect free men and provide the capacity for effective government.

Many of the problems of the Congress, and many of the criticisms and complaints directed at it, have roots in conditions affecting not only the United States but all representative governments. As these governments have been obliged to meet the problems created by industrialization and urbanization, complicated almost beyond measure by persistent and critical issues of foreign policy, representative bodies have confronted a troublesome situation. The matters that they consider are far more significant, numerous, and complex than those of their predecessors half a century ago. Little can be done to alter these conditions, but something can be done to improve the capacity of the institutions that must deal with them.

These problems that the Congress shares with other parliamentary bodies are paralleled by others that arise from distinctively American arrangements: the constitutional separation of President and Congress, the decentralizing effects of federalism, and the structure and practices of the House and Senate that frequently reflect long tradition and distinctive styles in our political life. One need not assume fundamental changes of a constitutional character in order to conclude that changes are both desirable and possible of achievement. In meeting these problems we may help to assure a Congress whose role in America's future is vigorous and worthy of the respect of free and intelligent men.

Three specific sets of convictions have guided our deliberations:

1. The distinctive functions of the Congress must be maintained. Congress must retain and strengthen its capacity to bring critical political judgment to bear on the major issues of the day. Congress thus can function more effectively in relation to the increasingly active role of the President and his Executive associates in the initiation of legislative proposals. In consequence it will better reflect the broad wisdom available in our total political system.

If the Legislature is to perform this basic function, the Members of Congress must also continue to handle problems of their individual constituents. Such activities, far from being a handicap to the Congress, provide a sympathetic link between citizens and the bureaucracy. The Congress must also maintain its oversight of the decisions and actions of executive officials. Both service to constituents and oversight of the executive agencies are subject to abuse, but their

67 354 A A 30

proper exercise is necessary to the American system.

2. The vigor of the Congress as a legislative body and the effectiveness of our constitutional arrangements require that the Congress warrant and command the confidence and respect of the electorate. A Congress able and equipped to discharge its central functions rationally, expeditiously, and with integrity is essential to the survival of representative government in this country.

3. If the Congress is to perform these functions well, ways must be found to strengthen the elected leadership in the House and Senate—chiefly the Speaker and the floor leaders—and through that leadership to assure that the majority sentiment of the Congress is effectively expressed. Individuals or minorities in the Legislature must not be permitted to frustrate the will of a majority, whether in a standing committee or in one or both of the Houses.

This conviction is not inconsistent with a due regard to the rights of a minority or in conflict with the continuation and encouragement of expertness in the standing committees. Such competence is essential to the effectiveness of the Congress. But no single committee in either House can be assigned a jurisdiction broad enough to achieve coordinated action in such complex areas as national security policy and national economic policy. If such action is to be achieved in the Congress, it should be accomplished through the central leadership.

In support of these general convictions we recommend:

1. The system of designating chairmen and ranking minority members of the standing committees on the basis of seniority must be modified. There is merit in the seniority principle, provided some choice is offered to the majority and minority parties in each House. We suggest that the choice be made either by the elected leaders in each House or by secret ballot in the caucuses of each party, in either case from among the three senior party members of each committee.

2. No Senator or Representative should be permitted to become or to remain a committee chairman, Speaker, or floor leader after reaching the age of 70. This provision should not apply to incumbents.

3. Any Representative or Senator should be permitted to retire on full pay after reaching the age of 70, provided that he has had at least 10 years of service in the Congress.

4. The rules of the House should be amended to provide that signature of a discharge petition by 218 Members or by 150 Members and the Speaker be sufficient to bring any bill out of committee and before the House.

5. In the Senate the majority leader should be authorized to offer a motion designating any bill a major item of legislation Adoption of this motion would require the committee to which that bill had been assigned to report it to the Senate within 30 calendar days.

6. The Rules Committee of the House must be at all times an instrument of the leadership of the House. To this end the Speaker might be restored to his position as chairman of the committee. Alternatively, he might be given authority in each Congress to appoint its majority members, including the chairman. At minimum, the Speaker of the House should be empowered to call up a special rule for the consideration of any bill which the Committee on Rules has failed to act for 21 calendar days.

7. The Committee on Rules should have no part in determining whether a bill passed by the House should be sent to conference with the Senate. Agreement to conference and on instructions to conferees should be by majority vote on a privileged motion by the majority leader.

8. Freedom of debate in a legislative body has value, even at the cost of delay, but its abuse in the form of a filibuster exposes the Senate and the Government of the United States to ridicule and may dangerously delay action. Such tactics should be restrained so that a majority can act after a dissenting minority has had adequate opportunity to be heard.

The present cloture rule is inadequate for this purpose. At the least the Senate should amend its present rule to provide for the adoption of a cloture petition by three-fifths of those present and voting.

9. At the start of each Congress a simple majority of the Senate should have the power to adopt and amend its rules without prejudice to the concept of the Senate as a continuing body for other purposes.

10. Further to assure majority control of legislation, a majority of the Members from each House designated to serve on a conference committee should have indicated by their votes general agreement with the bill as passed by that House.

11. Each Chamber should adopt and enforce effective procedures to protect the constitutional and other traditional rights of citizens called before its committees.

12. The growing practice of requiring that administrative agencies obtain permission from or "come into agreement" with committees or subcommittees of the Congress, or their chairmen, before taking action, exceeds the proper bounds of congressional oversight of administration and subverts Presidential responsibility. It grants arbitrary power to chairmen of committees or subcommittees that is not subject to account. The practice should be abandoned.

13. Campaign costs are excessive; requirements for reporting on contributions are ineffective; and existing ceilings on expenditures are unrealistic. The consequences too frequently are waste, deception, and corruption. To correct these evils:

(a) Time on television and radio stations should be made available by law to candidates for Congress.

(b) Ceilings should be raised to realistic levels, but legislation governing campaign contributions and expenditures should provide for full and prompt reporting to an agency designated by Congress responsible for complete disclosure. These reports should be public property, should be locally available, and should cover all receipts and expenditures on behalf of any candidate for the House or Senate in a primary or general election.

(c) The income tax laws should be amended to encourage campaign contributions by a larger number of persons, thus reducing candidates' dependence on a small number of large donations.

14. Respect for the Government requires respect for its individual officials. Each Senator and Representative and all Presidential appointees should be required to report annually their financial interests and the sources of their income.

Furthermore, the number of Members of the House and the Senate holding Reserve commissions in the military forces while serving in the Congress is a cause for concern. We regard this practice as undesirable and of doubtful constitutionality.

15. The standing committees in their specialized jurisdiction serve the Congress well, but no adequate overview in Congress is taken of such large areas as national security policy and national economic policy. Responsibility for dealing with this difficult problem should lie with the elected leadership, and these leaders should be adequately staffed for this purpose. The executive performance in this area needs to be improved, but much more needs to be done on the legislative side.

16. The Congress should divest itself of direct responsibility for the government of the District of Columbia.

17. We agree with the recent decision of the Congress to increase salaries of Senators and Representatives, and we recommend that salaries, allowances, and staff services be kept at a level commensurate with the dignity and responsibilities of these offices.

18. A majority of participants who considered this report favor a 4-year term for the Members of the House of Representatives, with elections in the presidential years.

Oceanography Offers Much

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which proposes that we set up a Federal agency to help give America world leadership in a most important science—oceanography.

It is imperative for our national welfare that we move ahead in the many fields which make up the broad science of oceanography. The bill that I am introducing simply sets up a coordinating agency that would help give direction and force to the many experiments and studies already underway, and would establish goals and make assignments toward them.

The National Academy of Science Committee on Oceanography recently issued a 50-page report in which they pointed out that our Nation could, by investment of $165 million a year, reap benefits of $6 billion per year in the fields of recreation, long-range weather forecasting, ocean-bottom mining, and increased fish catches.

To derive these benefits we must exert a national effort with a unified program. Oceanography today is vital to defense. Tomorrow it may well be vital to our economy, to feeding our people and supplying our needs for raw materials, and even water supply itself.

The seas comprise three-fourths of the earth's surface, yet it has been said that we know more about the surface of the moon than about the floor of the ocean. It is time we devote attention to getting the maximum benefits from the seas around us. For example, scientists predict that within a decade the manganese nodules in the deep sea, the phosphate deposits on oceanic banks, and the placer deposits of various minerals on the inner shelves can all be profitably recovered. Mining men believe that within 10 years ocean mining may become a $50 million per year industry.

This is but a small example of the vast vistas of future benefits our Nation can expect if we plan ahead today and begin a systematic program of understanding and exploitation of oceanic resources.

Our immediate need is to harness all the research being done by private institutions, commercial interests, and Government agencies into a coordinated program. It has been done in the space program. The need is as great in the oceanographic program if we are to avoid an oceanography gap. We know the Soviets have grasped the significance of this pro-

gram, and are driving ahead on many fronts, notably the military aspects of utilizing undersea knowledge.

The agency I propose would function much as the National Astronautics and Space Agency, or the Federal Aviation Agency. We are today, in oceanography, where we were perhaps 15 years ago in commercial aviation and 10 years ago in space exploration. Much work was being done, but the program did not realize its full potential until a coordinating agency was set up to unite the various elements into a meaningful program of research and development.

Oceanography offers us much for the future. It is our military frontier. It is a cornucopia of mineral wealth, a prodigious producer of food, and an unending supply of water. The taxpayers could have no better investment than establishment of a good, sound, active, progressive oceanographic program. I urge that early hearings be held, and that action be taken this session on this bill.

GOP's Voice Only Muffled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, a recent column by Roscoe Drummond in the Lansing State Journal of December 12, 1964, pointed out the challenges and the opportunities facing Republicans in Congress in the years ahead. Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It is interesting indeed to note the large constituency for which the Republican voice on Capitol Hill should speak. The figures Mr. Drummond cites are encouraging—and also challenging. I commend his column as being of interest and concern to all Members of the House:

GOP'S VOICE ONLY MUFFLED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Despite the lopsided Democratic majorities, there is no reason the Republican Party should roll over and play dead in the upcoming Congress.

It has been generally overlooked that, while two-party Government has been greatly weakened in Congress, there remains a very evenly balanced two-party division among the voters.

This means that while the Republican voice has been muted on Capitol Hill, it still speaks for a very large constituency in the Nation.

The party imbalance in Congress is a little frightening, but the party balance in the electorate is most reassuring.

The evidence in support of this fact is impressive.

In the past five national elections from 1948 through 1964 there have been 306,315,000 Democratic and Republican votes cast for the presidential nominees.

In light of President Johnson's getting 15,600,000 more votes than Senator Goldwater last month, what would be your guess as to the total Democratic margin over this period?

DEM EDGE SLIGHT

The answer is that out of these 306,315,000 votes cast for the Presidency during the past 16 years (including the Republican disaster of 1964) there have been just 1,677,000 more Democratic votes than Republican votes.

This shows that we have a balanced two-party electorate even if, at the moment, there is a one-party imbalance in Congress.

It means that the Republicans in Congress have a large constituency to speak for—if they can summon the kind of voice which these past Republican voters will listen to.

There is further evidence. It comes from the recent Gallup poll which shows that even the Johnson landslide did not greatly alter the two-party balance among voters, even if it did in Congress. This poll had to do with whether the public wants the President to pursue a leftward, a rightward, or a middle-road policy, and the results were:

Voter's viewpoint: Policy would like to have Johnson follow?

	Percent
Keep to middle	44
Go more to left	23
Go more to right	19
No opinion	14

This Gallup survey showed that as many rank-and-file Republicans want the President to keep to the middle road as want him to move toward the right, while 12 percent of the Republicans prefer to see Johnson move toward a more liberal position.

The problem the Republicans face is how they can mobilize their weakened ranks in Congress in order to speak for this large middle-road national constituency.

They are going to have to decide whether their dominant voice is to be that which lost the 1964 election or whether it is to be the voice of the political center.

They are going to have to develop new party positions to respond intelligently and constructively to the President's legislative program. A helter-skelter of Republican congressional voices would serve no purpose at all.

As never before, the Republican minority will need competent professional staff to match to some extent the expert advocacy of the executive branch. If the Democratic majority won't authorize adequate minority staff, there couldn't be a better way to spend that million-dollar surplus of the Republican National Committee.

Ask End of House Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an article taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer dated January 3, 1965, entitled "Groups Ask End of House Unit":

GROUPS ASK END OF HOUSE UNIT

Termination of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is being sought by three groups in Philadelphia who have written area Congressmen to vote in favor of the committee's abolition.

Two of the groups, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 2006 Walnut Street, and the Greater Philadelphia Branch of the American Civil Liberties Union, 260 South 15th Street, want Congress to change House rules so that the committee would become a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. Such a move would, in effect, take away the UnAmerican Committee's independent investigatory powers.

URGE ABOLITION

Another group, the Southeastern Pennsylvania Chapter of Americans for Democratic Action, urges abolishment of the committee.

The ADA has advised area Congressmen, in a letter, that:

"We condemn the perversion of that (power of legislative investigation) to obtain political advantage through exposure of unpopular individuals and ideas.

"We urge that congressional investigations be limited to obtaining information leading toward legislative action."

CALLED UNFAIR

The first two groups, in a petition, state:

"The House Un-American Activities Committee has wrought much harm. It's methods have often been unfair. The committee * * * serves no useful purpose."

West Virginian of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 3, 1965, the Sunday Gazette-Mail of Charleston, W. Va., printed the following statement on its front page:

Since Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH went to the Halls of Congress, such world shaking events as the great depression, two wars, the minority cry for equal rights have arisen—and on all of these issues his eyes have been firmly fixed on solutions, rather than the status quo. It is this quality in him that makes him the Sunday Gazette-Mail's West Virginian of the year for 1964.

Many honors have been heaped on this man whose statesmanship has made all West Virginians proud. In truth, he also honors us by his great service to the Nation and to freedom which he performs in the Senate of the United States. There follows an article from the January 3, 1965, Gazette-Mail magazine section, and also an editorial column concerning Senator RANDOLPH's service:

SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH—THE SUNDAY GAZETTE-MAIL'S WEST VIRGINIAN FOR 1964

(By Thomas F. Stafford)

On a warm summer afternoon in 1963, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH said in one of his infrequent formal statements before the U.S. Senate, "My personal philosophy is guided by the axiom that the only changeless fact in life is change itself."

The occasion was a historical one. On that particular day the Senate was debating the test ban treaty, an issue on which the membership was sharply divided as to what America's ideological destiny should be in the still developing nuclear age.

On one side were the neoisolationists, who would have the country pursue the madness of building constantly bigger bombs for an arsenal already large enough to devastate the world. And on the other were those who would have it take the lead in advocating a

course of reason as the only alternative to ultimate destruction.

RANDOLPH was a member of this latter group. His position was an uneasy one. On his desk in the Senate Office Building across the street were piles of letters opposing the treaty. Some were frantic, some were calm, but all were from the precincts back home.

For even an oldtimer like RANDOLPH this issue smacked of trouble. But he was not one to take the coward's way out with a grandstanding speech about Valley Forge, San Juan Hill, Corregidor, and Heartbreak Ridge.

He had been waiting for this great moment since that tragic morning 19 years before, when Hiroshima was turned into smoldering rubble with the triggering of a single bomb. As he had done when legislation dealing with that first noble experiment in peaceful coexistence came before Congress in the middle 1940's, the United Nations compact, he voted for the test ban treaty.

"The art of government," he told his colleagues, "is to help channel the forces of change in the direction that will best fulfill the aspirations of our society. Today, the overwhelming aspirations of the American people, of the Soviet people, and of most humanity, is for world peace."

It is this willingness to push out into new directions and explore the unknown that sets RANDOLPH apart from the usual political figure, and makes him a scarce commodity in this State which breeds second-rate politicians with the monotonous regularity of the changing moons.

RANDOLPH'S willingness to test the political unknown is not a quality of recent vintage. When he first went to Washington as a fledging Congressman in those dismal hours of early 1933, he chose the role of an experimentalist and he has never deviated from it.

Such world-shaking events as the great depression, two wars, and the rising cry of minority groups for equal rights have pushed their way into the congressional halls since he went there, and on every occasion he has been on the side of those whose eyes were on solutions rather than the status quo.

It is this quality in him—as was typified in his work on civil rights, antipoverty, Appalachian redevelopment and medicare—which makes him the Sunday Gazette-Mail's West Virginian of the Year for 1964. It is his trademark, his creed, his political gospel.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, at 62, has been in public life a long time. His name has appeared so often in the headlines of the State's newspapers that he is as familiar to the average voter as bacon and eggs or donuts and coffee. After 32 years in the forefront of politics, he has reached that enviable position as senior member of the West Virginia delegation in Congress and elder statesman to the Democratic Party.

His road to political seniority was not an easy one. He first felt the sting of defeat when he traveled with his father at the age of 14 and made impromptu stump speeches in his behalf along the back roads of his native Harrison County. The elder Randolph was doomed before he even filed. He was a Democrat running in the then heavily Republican Third Congressional District.

RANDOLPH came to Charleston in 1925 after his graduation from Salem College, and worked for a year as associate editor of the West Virginia Review. The next year he moved to Elkins, as athletic director at Davis & Elkins College.

While at D. & E. he taught speech and journalism, but in those years sports were his chief interest. With the colorful Cam Henderson coaching the team, he built a reputation for the little Presbyterian school as a football power, using such now unorthodox devices as Saturday heroes and professionals in amateur dress to win games.

At 28 he made his first venture into politics as a candidate for Congress from the Second District. Like his father, he lost, and in the spirit-shattering early hours of defeat he gave serious thought to giving up politics forever.

But discovering, as so many other political careerists have before and since, that even the chase has its exhilarating moments, he decided that win or lose he would try again when conditions seemed right. Meanwhile, he brushed up on his speechmaking technique at church suppers and before civic clubs, and between times worked at making friends throughout the district.

He tried again in 1930, but the district was not yet ready for a Democrat. Although he won the primary, he lost in the general election to Republican Frank L. Bowman—a situation that was reversed 2 years later when, in the aftermath of the stock market crash, the voters turned out the Republicans.

His victory was a brilliant one. Almost everywhere the writers of political history credit the triumph of West Virginia Democrats that year to the Roosevelt landslide, but RANDOLPH was not coattail rider. He ran 5,000 votes ahead of the President, and built so much momentum that he remained in Congress for seven consecutive terms.

During his early years in Congress he built a reputation as a campaigner of tireless energy. Everywhere he went his stock-in-trade was a cheery smile, a warm handshake and a kind word. He was always the first to arrive at a public gathering and the last to leave.

One such occasion at Arthurdale illustrates this trait in RANDOLPH. While waiting on the station platform for a trainload of Washington dignitaries to arrive at the little experimental community, a group of prominent West Virginians began making book he would be the first off the train.

Among those in the crowd were Gov. H. G. Kump and R. Carl Andrews, later a candidate for Governor and mayor of Charleston. RANDOLPH, it turned out, surprised them all. When the train pulled in, he was leaning out of the baggage car, shaking hands with everybody he could reach.

This young man, whose first earned quarter came from stuffing newspapers, was part of that great mass which huddled in the mist and wind before the Nation's Capitol on March 4, 1933, and heard Roosevelt say, "This Nation asks for action, and action now."

From that moment on he was a steadfast supporter of the New Deal, voting with the majority on such experiments in economic recovery as the NRA, the Triple A, the CCC and the WPA. But he had ideas of his own about what should be done for the helpless and oppressed.

By building his political fences in Washington as he had back in the district, he found the support he needed for one of the most humanitarian pieces of legislation ever to be sponsored by a West Virginia. It was the Randolph-Sheppard Act of 1936, which authorizes the operation of news and soft drink stands in Federal buildings by blind people.

Thousands of blind persons all over America found jobs after the passage of this legislation, and its value as a medium for rehabilitation has since been demonstrated by the acceptance of its framework for State and county governments as well.

Among other laws which RANDOLPH sponsored as a Congressman was one aimed at reducing illiteracy among aliens seeking citizenship, an aviation bill authorizing the Government to subsidize the production of synthetic gasoline from coal, the civil aeronautics act, airmail pickup and the Federal aid airport program. One of his most noteworthy accomplishments as a Senator was approval of the Highland Scenic Highway, a Skyline Drive-type road which is being built from Richwood to Gormania.

He was so wedded to the belief that coal to gasoline was a course Government research should follow that he demonstrated his conviction by joining in the flight from Morgantown to Washington of the first airplane ever powered by gasoline produced synthetically. The year was 1943, and he had few companions on the flight.

In 1946 his House colleagues, in a Pageant magazine poll, voted him the Representative doing the most for his district. But the folks back home didn't get the message. They voted him out of office that same year in a rebellion against holdover wartime restrictions.

In that election President Truman tried in his characteristic free-swinging style to justify the continuation of price controls, but the voters weren't convinced. RANDOLPH sensed what was happening in talking with an elderly woman back in the district about campaign issues. "I an't got no soap," she said bitterly.

He wasn't long out of work. His interest in aviation had gained him a national reputation, and Capital Airlines grabbed him up as assistant to the president. In this capacity he worked on bettering community and company relations in the 16 States where Capital operated, as well as on problems the company had on Capitol Hill.

But busy though he was as an airline executive, he kept a weather eye on West Virginia politics. Public service had become so much a part of his life that he never gave up the vision of someday going to the Senate.

His talent as a platfrom personality served this vision well. In the years that followed his moving downtown to Capital's executive suite, he was badgered with invitations from back home to speak on everything from the Wright Brothers flight at Kitty Hawk to the malevolent tendencies of the black widow spider.

Along with accepting as many of these invitations as time would permit, he kept active in politics by running for delegate to the Democratic National Convention. In this way he was able to gage his popularity. which was on the rise. He was elected delegate-at large in 1948, 1952, and 1956, running fourth, third, and second respectively. (Of interest in the context of these races is the fact that last spring he ran first for delegate-at-large to the 1964 convention.)

The death of the old warrior, Matthew Mansfield Neely, finally opened the door for RANDOLPH in 1958. He ran for Neely's unexpired term against interim Senator John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., the appointee of Republican Gov. Cecil Underwood, and won by the crushing margin of 118,000 votes. Two years later he ran for a full 6-year term and defeated Underwood by 88,000 votes. He is serving this term now.

Although Underwood ran better than the late Jack Hoblitzell, there was never any question about who would win. The races for President and Governor remained in doubt right down to the last week, but every poll and straw vote gave the edge to RANDOLPH by a comfortable margin.

Old campaigner that he was, he understood the signs, yet he never indicated publicly that the battle was over. It was only in the quiet of a hotel room, or while traveling from town to town, that he relaxed by reminiscing about past campaigns.

On one such occasion he and his companions turned to the lack of novelty that goes into menu-planning for public dinners. Looking back across more than a quarter century of playing the banquet circuit, he chuckled and said, "The standard menu is either creamed chicken and peas or baked ham and sweet potatoes."

"What will it be tonight?" one of his friends asked, thinking ahead to his scheduled appearance in a little Southern town. "Well," he mused, "we've had creamed chicken three times this week and ham once. The law of averages favors ham."

"What about steak?" somebody else asked.

"No, we won't have steak," the Senator chuckled. "That's for $100-a-plate affairs, and this tonight is strictly a blue plate special."

When, later, T-bones of generous sizes were served all around, RANDOLPH looked at his traveling companions, winked, and got up and gave one of the most stirring speeches of his career. The audience was small, but William Jennings Bryan, after whom he is named, couldn't have done better.

One of RANDOLPH's favorite subjects as he travels around West Virginia is highways. The interest is understandable. He serves as chairman of the Senate subcommittee on roads, one of the most powerful bodies in the Federal establishment.

Just before a public address in Parkersburg last fall, where he was to speak on the importance of highways as an economic vehicle, he became nostalgic on the subject. He talked meditatively of driving cattle along the dusty roads of Harrison County, and of having experienced the heady thrill of riding in the first car in his native Salem.

As a product of that uncertain middle period between farming as a way of life and embryonic industrialization, when motor cars were a luxury to be enjoyed only on sunny Sunday afternoons, he has a perception of the importance of modern highways not possessed by the average citizen. As a consequence, when he was called upon last fall to help pass the $200 million road bond issue, he responded with all the vigor and enthusiasm of a college sophomore.

No West Virginian contributed more to the success of that victory than he did. He could have remained in Washington on the pretense of minding the store on Capitol Hill, but he went from platform to platform urging and pleading with the voters to support the amendment.

For a man who had spent 6 weeks in the hospital last spring on the threshold of blindness, this was service above and beyond the call of duty. Incidentally, it is a classic irony—much like that of Matt Neely—for RANDOLPH to have been hospitalized by a condition he had fought against for so long. But where Neely died of the cancer he tried to find a cure for as a Senator, RANDOLPH recovered and again has full use of his eyes.

RANDOLPH has contributed mightily to the well-being of his fellow citizens during his years in Washington, as is illustrated by the Randolph-Sheppard Act, which opened up employment opportunities for the blind and is now pumping more than $24 million annually into the economy from people who otherwise would be on relief.

This tireless worker for the underprivileged and oppressed has enjoyed many victories since going to Congress, but never were there so many of importance to the community of man than in 1964. Look at the record.

Against the great hue and cry from the white man's South—and from those noisy white West Virginians who regard themselves as a super race—RANDOLPH stood strong and tall during the classic debates on civil rights.

He was a defender of only 5 percent of the West Virginia population, but he said, "The history of the American ideal has been always to advance the fundamental doctrine that man—as man—is a creature of worth and dignity, and that all men—as men—partake of these qualities.

"The essential characteristics which we cherish are in all men and women, and we can no more create an aristocracy of human dignity than we can create an aristocracy of human love or human imagination or any of the other essential human characteristics."

He also was in the vanguard of the war on poverty, as floor manager with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and Senator PAT MCNAMARA for the Economic Opportunities Act. Again he was on the side of a minority, but with the same conviction he demonstrated on civil rights, he said:

"The Economic Opportunities Act will provide a vital and progressive tool to upgrade both our human and material resources. It can be a constructive way to bring together otherwise idle manpower and jobs going undone."

It was the same story on Appalachian redevelopment. Poverty stalks the hills and valleys of 11 States which lie along the backbone of the great Appalachian mountain. Millions grow to manhood and die without ever experiencing even a thimbleful of the prosperity which lies in the valleys of the tidewater or in the rolling, teeming Middle West, just beyond their mountain homes.

They are a national phenomenon—the impoverished few surrounded by a nation of plenty. RANDOLPH became familiar with their plight in the 1930's during the floor fights on TVA, the Arthurdale and Red House experiments, and WPA. They were an obsession with him then, and they remained an obsession when he squared off as floor manager on the Appalachian redevelopment bill last summer.

His colleagues first said it wouldn't pass. It was too regional in its appeal, they reasoned, and would therefore engender opposition from the farm belt and Western States. Later, they said, it would pass as a squeaker. When it rolled through by a big margin, they shrugged their shoulders, smiled and said, "RANDOLPH's done it again."

West Virginia's senior Senator has a reputation in the Senate of being an accomplished behind-the-scenes negotiator, and his fellow Senators have come to respect his judgment. For example, 2 years ago the administration wanted to bring a youth opportunities bill to a vote, but he balked.

"We're not ready yet," he advised. "We'll lose." A few days later he urged immediate action, saying he had the votes he needed. A rollcall was taken that day, and the bill slid through with only three votes to spare.

It comes as a tragic capstone to his other triumphs of 1964 that the greatest of the lot—on Appalachian redevelopment—was a futile gesture. The House refused to act and the bill died. So many of its supporters were back home campaigning for reelection that not enough votes could be mustered to hazard a final rollcall.

Another tragic throwaway last year was his vote on medicare, which passed the Senate only to die in the House. On this, as on all the other major issues of 1964, the fight was for a minority group—16 million elderly citizens.

RANDOLPH demonstrated his deep concern for the 165,000 senior citizens in West Virginia 5 years ago when he came to Charleston and urged the legislature at a special session to implement a recently passed Federal act that would provide the elderly with limited hospital and medical care. It was not the ideal but it was a start, he said.

The legislature hesitated because of the heavy burden such action would impose on the budget, but RANDOLPH persisted, saying that if a better plan known as medicare should come before Congress, he would do everything in his power to see that it passed.

When his opportunity came in 1962 to cast a vote for medicare, he shocked even his closest friends by voting against it. He had good reason for doing what he did. A vote for the bill would have been a hollow gesture, since it was hopelessly tied down in the House, and he is not one to engage in such dramatics for expediency's sake.

He chose the opposite course to save another program equally as important as medicare. This was the aid-to-dependent-children program of the unemployed, which would have died if he hadn't voted as he did, and would have meant a return to virtual starvation for 50,000 West Virginians.

RANDOLPH was plagued by the pangs of inner torment during the 48 hours or so before medicare came to a vote. He was besieged on all sides to support it—from the administration's floor managers in the Senate, from the elderly and from the White House itself. This was the banner unfurled for the Kennedy administration. Medicare was to be the major weapon of the forthcoming congressional election campaign.

He kept his own counsel on how he would vote. Even his office staff had no inkling of what he would do right up to the hour of the rollcall. It was indeed an electrifying time. And when he voted "No," a deep and ominous silence spread through the Senate Chamber. The great liberal from West Virginia had deserted the cause.

But had RANDOLPH in truth deserted a philosophy which had been his creed and his gospel for 30 years? Back in his office an hour or so later, with newsmen badgering him for statements and interviews, he said wearily to a friend, "I was right. Time will prove I was right."

Time and events have proved the wisdom of his action. Medicare has never yet passed the House but the aid-to-dependent-children program has outgrown its pilot status and today is a nationally accepted medium for lifting the unemployed off the dole and giving them jobs.

In spite of his vote last September, when he fulfilled his 5-year-old pledge on medicare, there is yet some question whether the West Virginia electorate will forgive him for what he did 2 years ago.

The national spotlight was on him then. He had the center of the stage. And, as readers' forum letters have implied for so long, the feeling was that he had deserted to the enemy.

Casting reason and logic aside, the casual observer of the Washington scene fails to realize that that was RANDOLPH's finest hour. He put his political career on the block, and he was fully aware of the possible consequences of his action.

He chose the unpopular course when the popular course would have been so much easier. He struck a blow for a secondary cause only vaguely at issue when the primary cause became clouded in uncertainty. He was every inch a statesman.

The drama he played out on that lovely afternoon may never find its way into the history books, but it was another chapter in "Profiles in Courage." Like the others in public life John F. Kennedy told about so wonderfully in his Pulitzer Prize winning book, RANDOLPH put conviction and justice above the grubby expediencies of the times.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Jan. 3, 1965]

SENATOR RANDOLPH STANDOUT CHOICE

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia's happy warrior of the political hustings, takes a well-earned place among distinguished company today in his selection as the Sunday Gazette-Mail's West Virginian of the Year for 1964.

Somewhat ironically, the smiling and warm-hearted man from Elkins could have been a logical choice for the honor in any of the 14 years it has been bestowed. But for one reason or another, in the years since 1951 there always has been another State personality to catch the eye—perhaps because the workings of a U.S. Senator often is behind the scenes and not of a nature to capture the news headlines.

In 1964, however, JENNINGS RANDOLPH was not to be denied. His leadership on the

floor of the Senate in winning passage of President Johnson's antipoverty bill and in managing the Appalachian redevelopment bill, as well as his influential activity on behalf of such monumental legislation as the nuclear test ban treaty, made him a standout choice.

Who are the others in this distinguished group which the senior Senator from West Virginia now joins? They include 13 men and 1 woman—all West Virginians who distinguished themselves, some at home and some abroad, in varied fields.

The first man to win the honor, when it was started for the year 1951, was Okey L. Patteson, who at the time was serving as West Virginia's 23d Governor. The primary reason for his selection was his willingness to accept responsibility for choosing the site for the West Virginia Medical School, thereby breaking a ruinous sectional stalemate.

The late Walter S. Hallanan, of Charleston, West Virginia's longtime Republican national committeeman, was named for the year 1952 because of the honor he did his State in the manner in which he served as temporary chairman of the Republican National Convention that year.

The third winner of the award was Maj. Charles (Chuck) Yeager of Hamlin, a pioneer in the field of modern-day aviation who became the first man to break the sound barrier. He is still in the Air Force, now a colonel.

Another military man drew the honor for 1954, Adm. Felix Stump, of Clarksburg, who distinguished himself during World War II and also in critical postwar days off the China coast.

Next came an educator, Dr. Leonard Riggleman—the West Virginian for 1955—who almost singlehandedly brought Morris Harvey College from infancy to an honored place in the field of higher education.

A wiry little man named John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., a Parkersburg resident who long had been active in civic affairs of the whole State, moved into the field of politics and did such an outstanding job as Republican State chairman that Cecil H. Underwood became the first Republican elected Governor since 1928—and Hoblitzell became the West Virginian of the Year for 1956.

The West Virginian for 1957 was M. L. (Mike) Benedum, who came out of the rolling hills of Harrison County to build a fortune as a worldwide wildcatter for oil, and whose generosity in supporting worthwhile West Virginia institutions still continues through a foundation he established before his death.

Judge William J. Thompson of Kanawha County intermediate court won the award for 1958, largely because of civic activities that extend far beyond his judicial duties.

For the year 1959, the newspaper ventured into the field of sports and for the first time made a dual selection—Jerry West in basketball and Sam Huff in football both of whom made national reputations for themselves and the State.

Fred A. Otto, the now retired manager of the Du Pont plant at Belle, was chosen the West Virginian for 1960 because of his quiet service to civic affairs.

The honor for 1961 went to Charles Hodel, the Beckley newspaper publisher, because of his efforts as a prime mover in organizing the West Virginia centennial celebration.

The following year marked the only time a woman has been chosen West Virginian of the Year. Pearl S. Buck, born in the little town of Hillsboro in Pocahontas County, won world renown in the literary field and in the process did honor to her native State.

The West Virginian for 1963 was Cyrus Robert Vance, a native of Clarksburg, who was chosen because of his service as Secretary of the Army and who shortly after winning the honor was advanced to No. 1 aid to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

And now comes Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH. We salute him as the West Virginian for 1964.

THE EDITOR.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont* — 217 Slade Run Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* — Alban Towers
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1026 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6815 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*
Grider, George W., *Tenn*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa*
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Hollfield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*

Appendix

Betts Supports Federal Anti-Communist Program—Hoover Warns Americans of Communist Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, it is a continuing responsibility of the Congress to be constantly on guard against those who would subvert and destroy our Republic. The Communist Party of the United States of America is an organized conspiracy whose members are ever hard at work through propaganda campaigns, social agitation, and actual espionage, striving to stir fears and hatreds among our citizens, and generally make America more vulnerable to Khrushchev's famous threat to bury us.

Outstanding among the efforts of the Federal Government to challenge internal threats to our security have been those of J. Edgar Hoover and the agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Accompanying the work of the FBI, in the legislative arena, are the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Committee on Internal Security. Once again this year, the House Committee on Un-American Activities is being subjected to attack. Every Member of Congress has received not one, but a well-planned and organized series of letters designed to gain his vote for the abolition of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that I have always supported the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and I will support the continued existence of the committee. The people of the Eighth District of Ohio, through their letters, calls, and discussions with me, overwhelmingly affirm my position.

Both the FBI and the House Committee on Un-American Activities have done invaluable work in exposing the efforts of the Communists among our young people. As an outstanding example of this phase of their subversive plot, what Member of the 88th Congress can forget the House committee hearings on the so-called Cuban students. We were eyewitnesses to the most ill-mannered, contemptuous disrespect of law and authority ever seen on Capitol Hill. These young people, only a handful of whom were genuine students, shouted their defiance of the committee, and indeed, of the basic principles of our Constitution. If any Member of Congress had any doubts about the need for the committee's investigation, they were completely dispelled by the actions of these rowdies.

During the adjournment of Congress, in delivering an address entitled "Our Heritage of Greatness," FBI Director Hoover emphasized the programs and activities of the Communists directed against our young people. Referring to the tactics of these agents, Hoover said:

> Today, these rabid emissaries of Red fascism are engaged in an intensive campaign to subvert the minds and win the support of American youth.

I believe Director Hoover's message is an expression of vital significance to all Americans. In order that this address might receive wider attention, Mr. Speaker, I included it in its entirety with these remarks.

The address follows:

OUR HERITAGE OF GREATNESS

(Remarks of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the Pennsylvania Society and the Society of Pennsylvania Women, New York, N.Y., December 12, 1964)

I am deeply honored to have been selected for this outstanding award. To receive the gold medal of the Pennsylvania Society is a distinction which I shall cherish always.

The members of this society are bound together by common loyalty to a State which has played a vital role in our Nation's history. Valley Forge, Brandywine, Germantown, Washington Crossing—these are permanent shrines to the faith, spirit, and determination of that elite corps of early patriots who set the pattern for America's heritage of greatness and freedom.

The indelible footprints of our Founding Fathers—men like Jefferson, Hamilton, Adams, and Franklin—mark the walkways of Independence Hall and Washington Square. These were the architects of our Nation's freedom who shared a mutual faith and mutual vision. They believed in that form of government described by William Penn: "where the laws rule and the people are a party to those laws."

This concept of government by law rather than by man is the bulwark of American freedom. Today, it is under relentless attack by avowed enemies of our Republic—deadly forces of moral, legal, and spiritual corruption.

Crime and subversion are formidable problems in the United States today because, and only because, there is a dangerous flaw in the Nation's moral armor. Self-indulgence—the principle of pleasure before duty—is undermining those attributes of personal responsibility and self-discipline which are essential to our national survival.

Disrespect for authority and specifically for the law-enforcement officer who is performing his official functions can be measured to a great extent by the number of assaults on police acting in line of duty. The rate of these assaults continues to climb yearly with about 11 of every 100 police officers having been the victims of assault during the past year. All of this contributes to moral decay, a tragic national malady.

Included among the carriers of this disease are the crime syndicates, labor racketeers, dishonest businessmen, unscrupulous politicians and those lawyers-criminal whose ethics are lower than the lawless deeds of the clients they serve.

Included also are the Communists and other agents of foreign ideologies who would destroy this country's democratic institutions and betray our birthright of liberty and justice under God.

And I include the false liberals of the extreme left, such as the Communist Party, as well as the counterfeit patriots at the fanatic limits of the far right, such as the Ku Klux Klan, who not only take the law into their own hands on occasion but who would use the Constitution and laws of the United States to defeat the very purpose for which they were drafted—liberty and justice for all.

These dangerous elements are at work in America today, subverting our traditional democratic processes and undermining respect for law and order. In all too many instances, they have been aided by a body politic incredibly indifferent to the demands of civic responsibility.

Witness, for example, the sickening spectacle of 37 persons closing their ears to the urgent pleas of a young woman who was ruthlessly murdered by a sadistic terrorist in New York City a few months ago.

Search the moral conscience of another group of adults who complacently stood by while two hoodlums beat, kicked, and robbed a defenseless teenager in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Rationalize, if you can, the actions of a stream of citizens who turned their backs on a college student after he had been stabbed and left bleeding by a gang of teenaged thugs in Brooklyn, N.Y.

Spineless indifference, apathy, and neglect of civic duty such as this are a national disgrace. What has happened to the civic pride and the sense of decency of these citizens? Has the last ounce been drained from the chalice of courage and moral indignation within their communities?

Today, there are too many signs that Americans, as individuals, are pursuing the deadly course of irresponsibility which has led to the downfall of other nations and other cultures throughout the history of mankind.

I refer particularly to those halfway Americans who eagerly avail themselves of every right and privilege which our country guarantees its inhabitants while blatantly refusing to accept the duties that life in a free society necessarily entails. I refer also to those modern-day Rip Van Winkles who tolerate abuses of our democratic institutions and corrosive downgrading of America's high ideals by dangerous enemies of freedom.

When this great Nation was founded and when its guidelines were being established for future generations of Americans, George Washington proclaimed, "The administration of justice is the firmest pillar of government." What has happened to that "firm pillar" in the intervening 175 years?

Far too often, it has become weakened by impractical theorists, emotion-blinded pressure groups, warped idealists, and self-serving politicians. Misguided leniencies, including pardons, paroles, and probation for unrepentant and unreformed offenders, continue to prevail in many jurisdictions—as does the use of loopholes, technicalities and delays in the law which benefit rogues at the expense of decent members of society.

Judges, in particular, must remain alert to the reprehensible tactics of those members of the bar who would play the venal game of legal charades in our courts of justice. This point was emphasized most clearly by a distinguished member of the Pennsylvania Su-

preme Court, Chief Justice John C. Bell, Jr., when he declared: "law abiding citizens and communities * * * possess certain fundamental inalienable rights. One of these rights is that their life and property shall be protected * * *. Justice is not a one-way street—law-abiding citizens are entitled to the protection of the law and to justice just as much as (if not more so than) criminals."

The need for that protection today is greater than ever, because a surging tide of lawlessness is sweeping the United States—one of unparalleled size and intensity.

Last year, 2¼ million serious offenses were reported to police departments throughout the Nation. This is the largest number ever recorded. But preliminary statistics already available indicate that the crime total in 1964 will far surpass 2½ million.

What does this mean to the American people? It means an annual crime bill of $27 billion—the equivalent of $574 for every family, or $143 for every man, woman, and child, across the United States.

It means that crime is increasing five times as fast as our expanding population. It means that vast sections of many American towns and cities have become virtual jungles of terror and lawlessness. And it means that growing numbers of children are living in an atmosphere rife with defiance, violence, and cynicism.

This polluted atmosphere is exacting a heavy toll among the youth of our Nation:

One that can be measured in terms of the zip guns, steel chains, switchblade knives, and Molotov cocktails seized from arrogant bands of teen-aged hoodlums.

One that can be measured in terms of police reports which show that nearly two-thirds of the arrests for automobile thefts, one-half of the burglaries and larcenies, and one-fourth of the robberies throughout the country involve persons under 18 years old.

Cold, deliberate defiance of the law must be met with realistic action, whether the offender is a juvenile or an adult. But, too frequently, realism has given way to false sentiment where teenagers are involved. Under the pretext of rehabilitation, far too many young thugs have been released prematurely to continue preying upon society.

Pampering, overprotection, fawning indulgence—these set a pattern of weakness which breeds contempt for the law and for those charged with the administration of justice.

Too many young people are developing neither the self-discipline nor the moral restraint to get along in a free society. Their world is a narrow island of irreverence, intolerance, and irresponsibility too often encouraged by parental delinquency.

A dangerous void exists in the lives of youth such as these. They must be taught the true meaning of citizenship. They must learn respect for the laws of God and the laws of society. And they must learn to realistically face the challenges and responsibilities which are inseparably a part of adulthood and which must assure America's heritage of greatness.

It is time to stop slapping young hoodlums on the wrist and begin clapping them into jails and reform schools. Justice is not served when the innocent victim and society suffer while the vicious young criminal goes free.

Challenge, not compromise; bravery, not cowardice; strength, not mediocrity—these noble qualities illuminate the pages of our Nation's history.

I subscribe to the words of our 26th President, Theodore Roosevelt, when he defined Americanism as "the virtues of courage, honor, justice, truth, sincerity, and hardihood." There is an urgent need for these strong virtues in our Nation today as we face the threats and provocations of a godless conspiracy which is bent upon enslaving the entire world.

Communism—mortal enemy of liberty and justice and of God—continues its relentless war against humanity. While the Kremlin and its corps of false propagandists incessantly speak of peaceful coexistence, the roar of Communist cannon and the rattle of Red sabers continue around the world.

Week after week, gunfire of East German border guards heralds the continuing effort of persons behind the Iron Curtain to scale the wall of Berlin.

In Laos, in Vietnam and other countries bordering slave China, guerrilla fires set to homes and villages—and guerrilla bayonets cutting down defenseless men, women, and children—have colored the earth and skies a sickening red.

And in Communist Cuba, less than 100 miles from our shores, a bearded disciple of the Kremlin shakes a bloodstained fist at the United States while belligerently conspiring to spread violence and subversion throughout the Americas.

Do actions such as these have the ring of peace? It is one of the hard-taught lessons of this century that Communist actions speak with far greater authority than Communist words.

Throughout the tense international crises of our modern age, the Communists in this country have made their position undeniably clear—for the party has never deviated in any respect from the line proscribed by the Soviet Union.

The reason is clear: The Communist Party is not simply un-American; it is anti-American in every conflict of issues between Washington and Moscow. Its members are not simply pro-Soviet; they are deliberately and intentionally an active part of the inflexible Soviet empire.

Today, these rabid emissaries of Red fascism are engaged in an intensive campaign to subvert the minds and win the support of American youth.

Foremost among the programs and activities currently being directed against our Nation's young people are: A new Communist-oriented youth organization, the Du-Bois Clubs of America, which was founded last June at a special meeting in California, dominated and controlled by the Communists; and a continuation of the campus speech program which has contributed so successfully to the party's efforts to reach the student bodies of American colleges and universities.

Why are Communist spokesmen so anxious to appear on college campuses, yet so tightlipped before grand juries, committees of Congress, and in our coutrs of law? Why do glib-tongued party members suddenly lose their voices when placed under oath?

The answer is: They are afraid of the truth—just as they fear decency and justice and God. Let me repeat what I have said before: We are at war with the Communists and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this the safer we will be.

The Communists speak a different language from true Americans. They speak in glowing terms of academic freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, while advocating a system dedicated to destroying the rights and privileges we Americans enjoy. What the party actually wants is license, not freedom—license to defy, exploit, and destroy.

Nowhere have the devious tactics of the Communist Party been more forcefully demonstrated than in the party's efforts to drive a wide breach of racial misunderstanding in this country and to capitalize upon areas of dissension and unrest.

Let me emphasize that the American civil rights movement is not, and has never been, dominated by the Communists—because the overwhelming majority of civil rights leaders in this country, both Negro and white, have recognized and rejected communism as a menace to the freedoms of all. But there are notable exceptions—dangerous opportunists and morally corrupt charlatans who would form an alliance with an organization, regardless of its nature, to advance their own power and prestige.

We must maintain a constant vigil against these imposters, as well as against other zealots who would shortcut the orderly processes of government and demand a mantle of special privilege under the law.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has been the target of both extremes in the civil rights issue and I believe this shows the FBI has followed the proper course in its handling of this most delicate issue.

Let me reaffirm that so long as I remain its Director, the FBI will never be intimidated by the illogical cvriticisms and pressures of those detractors who would have us exceed some areas of our authority and grossly neglect others. We will continue to carry out every assigned duty thoroughly, promptly, impartially and without apology to anyone.

Self-serving individuals such as these are not a genuine part of the civil rights movement. Nor are the brick-throwing rabble, or the raucous hoodlums who have attacked the forces of law and order and have turned orderly protests into nightmares of violence and bloodshed. Theirs is a doctrine of hatred—defiance and anarchy—which cannot and must not be tolerated. Their acts are of the greatest disservice to the civil rights cause.

We must be ever alert to the activities of the Ku Klux Klan and other racist groups that would trample upon the rights of their fellow man. These cowardly jackals, who attack only the weak and the outnumbered, have earned the contempt of every genuine American. But here again, too often justice is not only blind, but deaf and dumb. We saw this recently in an area of Mississippi where nine men were brought to trial in State court following a series of racial bombings. None of the defendants offered a pretext of a defense against the charges; yet, all were given suspended sentences and released on probation. Such blindness and indifference to outrageous acts of violence encourage others to defy the law.

We cannot have full citizenship for some and part citizenship for others. Nor can we apply different standards of justice to our people according to the color of their skin.

Concerted effort, understanding, logic and reason must prevail over hate, bigotry, and intolerance.

The Founding Fathers of our Republic were stanch patriots who put the common good and the righteous cause above all other considerations. They were men of deep religious conviction—men who knew that it is the divine order in man which enables him to be free. William Penn recognized this vital truth nearly 300 years ago when he proclaimed: "Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants."

Herbert Hoover 13 years ago succinctly stated the situation:

"Our greatest danger is not from invasion by foreign armies. Our dangers are that we may commit suicide from within by complaisance with evil. Or by public tolerance of scandalous behavior. Or by cynical acceptance of dishonor. These evils have defeated nations many times in human history.

"The redemption of mankind by America will depend upon our ability to cope with these evils right here at home."

As America was born out of faith in God, so it will continue in freedom only as that faith remains forthright and strong.

We must revitalize the miracle of faith that keeps men free. Therein lies our heritage of greatness.

Independence Day of Western Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, Western Samoa celebrated the third anniversary of her independence. The House was not in session on this date, so we are taking this opportunity, belatedly, to extend warm felicitations to congratulate the Head of State Chief Malietoa Tanumafili II, Prime Minister Fiame Mata'afa Faumina, and the people of Western Samoa.

West Samoans were the first of the Polynesian islanders in South Pacific to attain their freedom and establish their own sovereign state. This was done only 3 years ago, but these dauntless islanders had to struggle long before they could attain their cherished goal.

Western Samoa, comprising the two large islands of Saval'i and Opolu with a galaxy of other small islands, have a combined area about 1,200 square miles and their population totals no more than 150,000. These islands were seized by Germany in 1900, and the islanders endured Germany's stern protectorate for some 18 years. At the end of the First World War Western Samoa was assigned to New Zealand under a League of Nations mandate, and at the end of the last war the New Zealand's administration was confirmed by a United Nations trusteeship agreement. In May 1961 a plebiscite was held under the supervision of the United Nations which resulted, by an overwhelming majority, for independence as from January 1, 1962. In October 1961, the General Assembly terminated the trusteeship agreement by a resolution, and since January 1, 1962, Western Samoa has become an independent sovereign state.

The Government of Western Samoa is essentially republican in form, with some qualifications. The constitution provides for a head of state in whom is vested all executive power. He appoints the Prime Minister, and in consultation with him, also appoints eight other ministers who form the Cabinet. There is a legislative assembly of 47 members, elected for 3-year terms. In April of 1963 when the incumbent head of state died, he was succeeded by Malietoa Tanumafili as head of state for life. Future heads of state will be elected by the legislative assembly for 5-year terms.

West Samoans have had considerable tutelage in government and had developed a certain amount of sense of public service. Partly because of this, and partly due to the benevolent attitude of its former mandatory power, the Government of New Zealand, Western Samoa possesses a stable and effective government. Today the government of that Commonwealth country is providing about $250,000 annually toward educational development in the islands, and has been equally generous in providing $125,000 annually toward strengthening the administrative machinery of the government there. Western Samoans are working hard to make themselves worthy of such aid, as they are striving for effective membership in the world community. In the third anniversary of their independence day we wish them full success in all their endeavors.

The Living Legend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, with the retirement this month of Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, the United States loses the active service of a great military statesman. General LeMay has had a distinguished military career, and his many contributions to the defense of his country and the free world leave a record to inspire all of those who will come after him.

The Air Reservist, official magazine of the Air Reserve Forces, has an article in its most recent issue entitled "The Living Legend." Gen. Curtis E. LeMay has become a legend in his lifetime and the article is a fine portrait of this great American. Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE LIVING LEGEND

One of the few remaining living legends in the Armed Forces, Air Force Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay, is scheduled to retire January 31, after 35 years' service. He has been Air Force Chief of Staff since 1961.

A proponent of strong ready now Air Reserve forces, he has stated: "Behind our regular operational forces are dedicated and capable Ready Reserves. Though in reserve in one sense, they are in another sense very much an internal part of the active duty force." In keeping with this philosophy, General LeMay directed that the Air Staff take a greater interest in the Air Reserve forces, supporting them as they do the active duty forces.

His faith in the Air Reserve forces was vindicated as a result of their fantastic performance during the Berlin and Cuba crises.

In addition to implementing the integrated staff concept, he instituted the philosophy of mobilizing the Air Reserve forces only when needed and releasing them when, the need was gone (Cuba was an example).

As Chief of Staff, General LeMay gained international fame for his firm control of the free world's mightiest tool of deterrence during extremely tense periods of crisis. Lesser publicized are his humanitarian efforts on behalf of the officers and airmen and their families.

This personal interest was strongly exhibited in 1963 when General LeMay proposed his eight-point program, promising a more stable and rewarding Air Force life. His revolutionary program for people concentrated attention in the following areas: improved housing; fewer family separations; preservation of the present system of military retirement; improving in-service education opportunities; increasing retired medical and dependent dental care; and preserving military fringe benefits such as commissaries and base exchanges.

A native of Columbus, Ohio, the general was graduated from Ohio State University and entered the armed services as a flying cadet in 1928. He completed pilot training at Kelly Field, Tex., and was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Air Corps Reserve in October 1929. He received his regular commission in 1930.

General LeMay participated in the first mass flight of B-17 Flying Fortresses to South American in 1938 and prior to World War II, he pioneered air routes over the South Atlantic to Africa and over the North Atlantic to England.

The general organized and trained the 305th Bombardment Group in 1942 and led that organization to combat in the European Theater. As commanding general of the 3d Bombardment Division (England), he led the famed Regensberg raid, a B-17 shuttle mission that originated in England, struck in Germany, and terminated in Africa. In July 1944 he was transferred to the Pacific to direct the B-29 bombardment activities of the 20th Bomber Command in the China-Burma-India Theater. He later commanded the 21st Bomber Command with headquarters on Guam, and still later became chief of staff of the Strategic Air Forces in the Pacific. At the conclusion of World War II, he returned to the United States piloting a B-29 on a nonstop record flight from Hokkaido, Japan, to Chicago.

General LeMay's postwar assignments have included duty with the Air Materiel Command; as first deputy chief of air staff for research and development in Washington; command of U.S. Air Forces in Europe where he organized air operations for the famous Berlin Airlift; and command of Strategic Air Command for nearly 10 years, during which time he built an all jet bomber force and supervised plans for the development and integration of an intercontinental ballistic missile capability.

In July 1957, the general was appointed vice chief of staff of the U.S. Air Force and served in that capacity until July 1961, at which time he was appointed chief of staff.

The combination of his extraordinary ability as a leader of military forces in times of war and peace, and his dedication to the cause of the individual, truly categorizes Gen. Curtis E. LeMay as a living legend. Every airman and officer, active duty and Reserve, will remember his strong hand on the reins of command.

Here Is Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial written by Hon. Ellie Hopkins, which appeared January 1, 1965, in the 30th east Texas industrial progress edition of the Longview Daily News, Longview, Tex., along with a reproduction of a letter written to Publisher Carl Estes by President Johnson. The editorial is most timely and the letter written by President Johnson is one which is fully deserved by Publisher Carl Estes:

HERE IS OPPORTUNITY

Industrialists, investors, and businessmen looking for opportunity in 1965 are invited to research the 538 pages of this industrial

progress edition. It is an illustrated record of progress that depicts the great potential of the Nation's most inviting new industrial region, the ideally located and weather-conditioned Sabine-Cypress inland empire.

A careful check through the sections of this newspaper will reveal the picture of a well-watered and resources-rich region in which more than a hundred cities and towns are working individually and cooperatively to expand their public facilities, improve their advantages for happy living, and display their readiness for new industrial and commercial development.

The emergence of the Sabine-Cypress region as a new industral center of national note has come about in two distinct but related stages—both of which have been widely publicized through this annual industrial edition, itself a unique venture in journalism.

The first stage of major development started several years ago in the upper watershed of the Sabine, accompanying and following the building of Lake Cherokee at Longview, Lake Tawakoni at Iron Bridge, and several other reservoirs; and the beautiful Lake O' The Pines and earlier reservoirs on the Cypress watershed north of Longview.

The second stage of development has just begun with construction about completed on the large Sam Rayburn Reservoir on the Angelina River and now underway on the gigantic Toledo Bend Reservoir and hydroelectric project on the middle Sabine River southeast of Longview in southern east Texas and southwest Louisiana.

Just as the northern part of east Texas already has experienced an infusion of new industry and continues to record expansion and growth due to earlier major water conservation projects and community improvement programs, so is southern east Texas and southwest Louisiana now assured of a new era of industrial and commercial expansion with nearing completion of large water conservation projects and community improvement programs.

Longview, centrally located and the chief industrial and commercial city in this vast Sabine-Cypress inland empire, has made truly remarkable progress from an early start. Today, Longview's several large industrial districts are graced by plants of some of the best known blue chip industries in the world, many of which have major expansions underway.

Indicative of this city's industrial and commercial progress in 1964 is the fact that in the first 10 months Longview was first in Texas in rate of increase in total construction permits with a gain of 385 percent over the like 1963 period; first in Texas in rate of increase in nonresidential permits with a gain of 1,216 percent; and third among Texas cities in dollar volume of nonresidential permits, being exceeded only by Houston and Dallas.

Industrial and commercial progress in east Texas by no means has been confined to Longview. It is most encouraging to note what is happening all over east Texas. The list of new industries carried elsewhere in this edition includes plants in such perimeter cities as Texarkana, Paris, Greenville, Corsicana, Lufkin, Keltys, Center, and Marshall—with new plants or expansion projects in dozens of east Texas communities from the Red River to the Gulf of Mexico.

The rapidly developing east Texas region centering around Longview is one of the principal reasons why Texas ranks right at the top among the States in industrial growth as measured by numbers of new plants. Industry is learning that here we have an unusual concentration of the major factors of first importance to manufacturing and marketing.

Probably nowhere else in America today is found such a concentration of industrial advantages and materials—central location with reference to population, especially as projected in upcoming growth patterns; all major methods of transportation, so important in rapid and economical distribution; plenty of trained and adaptable manpower, noted for giving a day's work for a day's pay; ample electric power now and for the future at favorable rates; unlimited fuel supplies of oil, natural gas, and liquid petroleum products; the greatest available and unpledged supply of fresh water left in America; rich commercial deposits of iron ore, salt, sulphur, and other minerals; small cities and attractive communities were citizen pride and purpose assure the best in educational, cultural, religious, and recreational facilities of good living.

Industry looking for opportunity here will find ready help from banks and chambers of commerce throughout east Texas, industrial departments of utility firms and railroads, industrial districts in Longview and several other cities, or from such well organized groups as the Northeast Texas Industrial Development Council, Greater Cypress River Industrial Commission, Sabine River Authorities of Texas and Louisiana and local development councils in the Toledo Bend Reservoir and Sam Rayburn areas.

Major development projects now under way or projected for this east Texas region—such as Interstate 20 and Interstate 30, Toledo Bend, new dam on Caddo Lake, new reservoirs on the upper Sulphur River and other streams, airport improvements, and community industrial projects—now assure the present and future industrialization and progress of the Sabine-Cypress empire. Here is opportunity, ready and waiting. We invite all who may be interested to come and see for themselves.

ELLIE HOPKINS,
Editor in Chief.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 24, 1964.

Mr. CARL L. ESTES,
Publisher, The Longview News & Journal, Longview, Tex.

DEAR CARL: I am delighted to join your many friends as they pay tribute to you on your 30th anniversary as owner-publisher of Longview News & Journal and to extend to you my warmest greetings and good wishes on this happy occasion.

Under your responsible guidance the Longview News Co has provided the people of your area with most effective and reliable news reporting and interpretation. You have brought honor and distinction to American journalism and your fine record of achievement stands as an inspiring example to your staff as well as to all the members of our Nation's press.

I wish you abundant happiness and continued success in the years ahead, as you endeavor to sustain the high traditions of your past.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Independence Day of the Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Republic of the Sudan celebrated the ninth anniversary of her independence. Since the 89th Congress had not yet convened, I am taking this opportunity, belatedly, to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Sir al-Khatim al-Khalifa, the Prime Minister; and to Togeldin Mohamed Eltahir, the Chargé ad Interim of the Sudanese Ambassador to the United States.

In 1956 the Sudanese people proclaimed their independence, became masters of their own fate, and constituted a new sovereign state. Since then these some 10 million vigorous Sudanese have proved themselves worthy of the freedom they acquired, and today they are struggling hard to hold an enviable place for themselves in the family of free and independent nations.

Sudan, with its nearly 1 million square miles of territory, is one of the important and commercially strategic places in the whole African Continent. It is the natural bridge between the Middle East and Africa. Situated to the south of the United Arab Republic and separated from the Arabian Peninsula by the Red Sea, the northern part of the country is peopled by seminomadic negroid tribes. This part of the country is joined to the south by the lifegiving Nile, whose waters cultivate Sudan's most staple crop, cotton. Financially and economically Sudan has done well since its independence; actually startling gains have been made in the economic sphere, mostly because of the increase in the production of cotton. The country's irrigation system has been improved. A good indication of the soundness of the economy is indicated by the fact that the country has been able to meet its important needs through export earnings and regularly return a surplus to the national budget with which to finance a large portion of its development plans. The 10-year development plan which went into effect in 1961 envisions an annual growth rate of more than 5 percent.

On the political front the Sudanese have done well to keep clear of the troubles involving many other developing nations in Africa. Relatively speaking their Government has been fairly stable, and their leaders have been on the alert to maintain a degree of stability.

On the ninth anniversary of their independence day one can only hope that this involvement will not endanger Sudanese independence, and that they will continue to work for their salvation in peace and prosperity.

Uruguay: A Wel-Fairy Tale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the trend in this country, it occurred to me that we might well take a page from the history book of Uruguay to see what has happened in that unfortunate country by pursuing policies which seem so popular at the present time in this country.

The following article is from Time, of November 27, 1964:

URUGUAY: A WEL-FAIRY TALE

Once upon a time in 1952 the 3 million people of Uruguay voted to have a nine-man council instead of a President, and everyone cried hooray. Even though they didn't always agree, the council members tried hard to get along, and the land, which was already very welfare minded, became even more so. One-fourth of all the workers got jobs with the Government at which they worked only half a day; and for every 2½ people working, there was one who had retired at 45, sometimes with full pay. It was wonderful. The people didn't worry because they had all those benefits. The Government didn't worry about how much it was all costing because the people were not worrying. And statesmen in other lands didn't worry much about that nice, prosperous, Swiss-style country because there were other things to worry about.

Last week in Uruguay:

The stock market was reeling from the effect of an unprecedented 3-week strike by brokers. They went out when the Government announced plans for imposing impossibly stiff regulations on market trade and landholding companies, who must sell off all their property within a year as part of the land-reform program.

The hugh Government work force was threatening to strike unless salaries were increased 35 percent, and the Government was expected to bow to the demands, grant its employees their fourth substantial raise in 5 years.

Disheartened economists were sadly contemplating a batch of disastrous financial figures. The value of the peso has crash dived from 9 cents to 5 cents in 20 months. The cost of living went up 45 percent last year, has climbed 30 percent more this year. The Government's proposed $258 million budget for 1965 includes a planned deficit of $29 million; others say it will be more like $83 million. The gross national product over the last 6 measured years (1955–61) expanded only a paltry $8 million, though projected figures at the start of the period assumed a $70 million gain.

Most people in Uruguay really could not accept that they had had too much of a good thing, and were faced with shattering economic colapse. They reminded each other proudly that beef export is up, chose to forget that wool export, the country's other major product, is generally down. Despite the fact that as much as 50 percent of a man's salary may be withheld against social benefits, and that much of this withholding is illegally used by capital-starved companies, politicans anxious to please the people called for more benefits.

Drury College Inaugural

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the board of trustees of Drury College in Springfield, Mo., I had the great fortune last November 6 to witness an inspiring program in connection with the inauguration of the college's ninth president since its founding in 1873.

The major address was delivered at a noon luncheon attended by members of the faculty, trustees, alumni, and visiting academicians from throughout the Nation. It was given by the distinguished publisher of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Mr. Richard H. Amberg. I have been advised by Drury College President Earnest Brandenburg that it was selected for inclusion in the December 1 issue of Vital Speeches, so less prejudiced observers than myself agree on its merits.

Though Drury College is a privately endowed college, Dick Amberg's remarks at the inauguration luncheon deserve the audience of all who are interested in education, and especially Members of the Congress and the House Committee on Education and Labor who have specific responsibilities in this field:

ADDRESS AT DRURY COLLEGE, NOVEMBER 6, 1964, BY RICHARD H. AMBERG, A TRUSTEE OF THE COLLEGE AND PUBLISHER OF THE ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT

Inaugurals and anniversaries have always been a time for rededication. Anyone witnessing the stirring scene here this morning cannot fail but he moved to a rededication to the ideals of this great institution.

At the same time he may want to reexamine why there is a Drury College, what our purposes are—our hopes and dreams and aspirations for the future. He may want to inquire why we have endured so long in a fiercely competitive world. He may question those of us who believe in small liberal arts church-related colleges as to the reasons for our beginning, for our continuance and for our growing strength in the complex society of the America of the latter part of the 20th century.

What, truly, is our function? Why is it better to come to a college such as Drury, involving as it does far greater financial sacrifice for many parents, than to go to the large public colleges? Are there advantages to our type of education?

If we did not believe there were, none of us would be here today. But what are these advantages and what is the dedication of Drury and of colleges like us?

The obvious, but not by any means the only answer, is to get an education. But an education is only the beginning. The old proverb that knowledge comes but wisdom lingers certainly never had more meaning than it does today. If our need is great for knowledge, it is greater far still for wisdom.

Talking for myself from the vantage point of 31 years since my own graduation from college, I can remember few of the details of my classes. I think it is important to remember the details of the Peloponnesian Wars, or of chemical formulas, or Martin Luther's 95 Theses. But, today I recall little of them and even my French, in which I had some proficiency, now is inadequate either for Paris taxi drivers of Quebec fishing guides.

While I do not want to dissuade our student body from attention in class and doing well on the examinations, that which is really important and that which must endure if we are to be successful is the essence, the idealism, the spirit of education, far more than the specific of substance. This, of course, must come from education, just as there can be no sizzle without a steak.

The real function of Drury is the improvement of human character which our young men and women receive in their 4 years here. This I truly believe is the basic function of a liberal arts church-related college—to instill a love of learning, to enlarge the spirit of inquiry, to deepen Christian character and Christian witness, and to implant beyond all possible retraction a love of country and a dedication to our true idealism which alone is the hope of the world.

Almost 20 years ago, when Gen. Douglas MacArthur was accepting the surrender of the Japanese on the battleship *Missouri*, speaking at the end of the most terrible war the world has ever seen, and looking for the path of the future, he summed up the situation in these words:

"Military alliance, balances of power, League of Nations all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative. We have had our last chance. If we do not now devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door. The problem, basically, is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advance in science, art, literature and all material and cultural developments of the past 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

This, I think, not only states the dedication of the Nation toward the future, but I believe really explains why there is a Drury and other like-minded colleges. This lights the way toward our even better future. Our consecration is to a spiritual recrudescence. It is to improve human character. It is to ennoble the spirit if the world as we know it is to survive.

If these are our ideals, how do we go about implementing them during the 4 years that the future leaders of America dwell with us on this lovely campus?

There are many virtues which go into the making of the complete person. If I had to list just four qualities of heart and mind which I think should be instilled into our charges during their 4 years here, it would be these: Religion, discipline, compassion, courage.

Students can learn little more than the rudiments of these in the classroom, but the classroom contributes to them all. Our job is to lay the foundations, to plant the seeds which nuture and grow long after our young men and women leave Drury.

The basis of any education, transcending knowledge and learning, is the Christian religion. This is our great Judeo-Christian heritage, based on the 10 Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, and the Golden Rule.

We have courses in religion, but this is but the beginning. Religion, I have always believed, flourishes more through exemplification than exhortation. Drury teaches religion more by the exemplification of the faculty than through classroom exercises. Of course, we must have the courses in religion and history, but in the broadest sense, religion is faith and belief which comes cumulatively from many sources.

Ours is a society based on the belief in God. Without it, nothing avails us. At Drury our young men and women, by some processes of osmosis or absorption over their college careers, declare this as the bedrock of their faith. Whatever else they forget, they cannot, and I believe do not, forget this precept.

This is what makes a college founded on Christian education and adhering to Christian principles of character and virtue absolutely indispensible in building the spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character of which MacArthur spoke. In short, religion and religious beliefs are important, meaningful, and enduring at Drury.

The second virtue is discipline. Discipline is too often tagged as conformity. Webster defines it as teaching and instruction, but it is far more than this. Discipline, in the broadest sense, is the training of the mind, the willingness to take the hard right instead of the easy wrong—to resist the blandishments of cheapness in favor of goodness for the sake of goodness.

Discipline in college comes from a variety of directions—sometimes from mathematics or from philosophy, both of which show the perfect working form, or sometimes from the physical or chemical sciences which show the wonderful orderliness of nature.

The synthesis of all these combined is the discipline of thought and mind which evolves into character or basic goodness or virtue. The distillation of all the precise sciences leads to an orderliness of mind and habit which in the end becomes the mental discipline which is the stuff of character. Thus, it seems to me, these rigid sciences—and I was always very bad in them—run together eventually into the second great virtue of discipline. Here at Drury our graduates have disciplined minds.

The third virtue of which I speak is compassion. I once asked a very great churchman what he considered the greatest virtue, and he replied, "Humility * * * and if you ask me for the second, third and fourth, I should say for each 'humility, humility, humility'."

Translated into every day action, humility becomes, it seems to me, a fellowship of feeling, a compassionate love of mankind. I do not see how we can be truly great citizens unless we have compassion, which is the opposite of intolerance.

General MacArthur had compassion toward the Japanese or else he could not have converted a vicious foe into a loyal and faithful friend. In a later day, I detest the Russians and all forms of dictatorships with all my heart and soul and mind, yet I recognize that somewhere, without accommodation or appeasement, we must work out a way of living with them for a better world. My own view is that this comes from strength, righteousness and justice, not from appeasement, but the broad virtue must be, it seems to me, compassion.

We learn compassion from the lessons of history. We see the rise and fall of empires and of nations and of peoples. The lessons of the past teach us the strengths and weaknesses of the present and light the way toward a better future if we are but wise enough to appreciate them.

We learn compassion in the priceless writings of literature. Who can read the closing lines of one of Elizabeth Barrett Browning's great sonnets and not feel the essence of compassion when she said: "And when I sue God for myself, He hears that name of thine and sees within my eyes the tears of two." She was talking of one, but it is this same feeling which the truly compassionate person translates into a love of the best of mankind.

Who cannot feel a broadening of the spirit when he remembers Tennyson's beautiful song: "Now folds the lily all her sweetness up and slips into the bosom of the lake. So fold thyself, my dearest, thou, into my bosom and be lost in me." Literature, truly great literature, is the beginning of compassion.

Lines such as these give a feeling not only for a person, but for people. A love of people—a desire to be of service to God and man—the realization that man does not live by bread alone—is one of the great attributes which we must and do instill in our students.

St. Francis said, "It is in giving that we receive. It is in forgiving that we are pardoned." These are among the elements of the educated man and woman of this day. The person who lives for himself and selfishly, no matter how successful, leads a cold and narrow life. The man of compassion, of humility and action, of unselfish virtue, of sharing God's blessings with those less fortunate and well-endowed is the complete man. This compassion for mankind and desire for service must be an indispensable end product of a Drury education.

Finally there is courage. Any other virtue is unvailing without courage for it is the implementation of every good deed and every good desire. Courage, in part, is a knowledge of virtue and a willingness to implement it. Courage is knowing right from wrong and following the course of right. Courage is taking the part of the underdog when the underdog is right. Courage is also not being deterred from speaking for the majority when the minority wrongly assails it—a virtue too frequently forgotten in these days.

Henry van Dyke defined courage in a definition which has special meaning to college people when he said, "Courage is virtue which the young cannot spare. To lose it is to grow old before your time. It is better to make a thousand mistakes and to suffer a thousand defeats than to run away from a battle."

Theodore Roosevelt said that battling for the right is the ultimate good. Courage is a neglected virtue in the present age when so many of our leaders test the wind of public opinion before they take a stand, completely forgetting the basic correctness of an issue. They are too much like the would-be patriot of the French Revolution who said, "I must see where the mob has gone and find them for I am their leader."

Without courage, whether it is an individual's or a nation's, there can be no success, whatever the other virtues one possesses. I like to think that here at Drury, courage is a distillate of our educational process and is the active ingredient of religion, discipline, and compassion.

In man's struggle to free himself from savagery he developed institutions which placed restraints upon his conduct. These include such institutions as the church, the family, social pressures, due regard for the opinions of others, the rules of conduct derived from natural law, adherence to manners to avoid private frictions, and the epics of truthfulness so that man's word is his bond.

These are a few of the institutions and traditions which man has adopted and culminantly established in his own interest. These are the rungs in the ladder of civilization.

At the basis of all this are religion, discipline, compassion, and courage. When these standards of conduct have been neglected, great civilizations have failed. You need read no further than Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" to see how the greatest civilization in the history of the world up to that time fell—not because it was overwhelmed from without but because it was rotten from within.

If we are to succeed as a nation in these days it will not be through force of arms, though we must maintain such strength that no one will dare to attack us.

We shall not succeed through wars, for the horror of another war would drown out life on this planet as we know it today.

We must succeed, and I am quoting again: "Through a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character."

A nation is no stronger than its component parts—the individual, the family, the community, the State. It all must start with the individual. Our job at Drury is to produce worthy individuals who, singly and collectively, will produce the better State.

This, in the last analysis, is why we educate our young men and women. This is why parents save and sacrifice to send them to fine church-related institutions like Drury when, for far less expense, they could send them to other institutions, but perhaps without the advantages we have here.

Because these parents charge us with producing young men and women who can be the leaders of tomorrow, we must equip these fine young people to take a meaningful place by instilling in them wisdom and understanding based on the virtues of religion, discipline, compassion, and courage.

I think Drury has done well in instilling these virtues in the past. I look forward with confidence to the administration of Dr. Earnest Brandenburg to continue to grow in a great tradition.

Independence Day of Cameroon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Federal Republic of Cameroon celebrated the fifth anniversary of her independence. Since the 89th Congress had not yet convened, I am taking this opportunity, belatedly, to extend warm felicitations on this occasion to His Excellency Ahmadou Ahidjo, the President of Cameroon; and to His Excellency Jacques Kuoh Moukouri, the Cameroon Ambassador to the United States.

Cameroonian Independence Day falls on January 1, for on that day 5 years ago most of the 4 million Cameroonians proclaimed their independence and established the Cameroon Republic. But the birth of the Federal Republic of Cameroon and the complete independence for all Cameroonians did not take place until the union of Southern Cameroon with the Cameroon Republic on October 1, 1961. Since the earlier date, that is, since January 1, 1960, however, Cameroonians have been masters of their fate in their fertile, sunny land, and enjoying the blessings of freedom.

From the time of its birth the Federal Republic of Cameroon has had its problems and difficulties, but happily we can say that at least some of these have been solved and others are being dealt with in a peaceful and orderly manner among contending groups. Some of these seemingly difficult problems were solved because Cameroonians were fortunate in having intelligent, educated, and dedicated leaders. In the difficult and delicate task of bringing about the union of British Southern Cameroons with the Cameroon Republic the part played by Ahmadou Ahidjo, the patient and skillful President of the Federal Republic, proved of supreme importance. Nor was his role in establishing a federal government based on democratic principles is less praiseworthy. The draft Constitution of the country, providing for a strong president and a National Federal Assembly was probably his brain child, though he did not give the appearance that his views on such important matters should prevail. However, his sound and practical advice was taken, and fortunately proved both workable and wise.

As the result of such a well-suited constitution, and also because of their willingness to seek counsels among their experienced and matured leaders, the Federated Republic of Cameroon has become one of the most stable of the new African countries. Its economic recovery has been steady and quite rapid. The Government has constantly pursued a policy of assisting the development of agriculture. The production of cocoa,

Cameroon's chief cash-earning crop, has been increased while the expansion of coffee plantations has been encouraged. On the international political scene Cameroon's status is high. It holds a central position in the French-speaking Union of African and Malagasy States, and with the formation of the Organization of African Unity, Cameroon has become a stanch supporter of continent-wide cooperation. Cameroon's relations with the United States have been on the best of terms. We have extended bilateral assistance, as well as multilateral aid through the United Nations and the European Economic Community. In all this the sole aim of this great Republic has been to help in the growth and strengthening of the Federated Republic of Cameroon as a steadying force in the turbulent African Continent.

On the fifth anniversary of their independence day I wish Cameroonians peace and prosperity.

When Ends Justify Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State, seems to have come up with a very sound criticism of our present foreign policy as reviewed in the Wall Street Journal of December 11, 1964.

The article follows:

WHEN ENDS JUSTIFY MEANS

It's a rare day when anyone cuts through the delusions surrounding foreign policy so cleanly as did Dean Acheson in his speech at Amherst this week. The former Secretary of State's dissection deserves the thoughtful attention of the present occupant of that post, his superior in the White House and all others concerned about America's direction in the world.

All the more so because the election campaign, which promised an airing of foreign-policy fundamentals, bogged down on this along with other issues. Since then about the only notable attempt at analysis has been an address by former Ambassador to India John Kenneth Galbraith, in which he preached far-reaching accommodation of the Communists for the sake of peace, the preservation "not of our way of life but of life itself."

Mr. Acheson's discussion lacks the reckless overtones many found in Senator Goldwater, but it is far tougher than the Galbraithian mushiness. As though in answer to Galbraith, Acheson roundly asserts a duty "to preserve values outside the contour of our skins, and at the expense of forgoing much that is desired and pleasant, including—it may be—our own fortunes and lives."

Such forthrightness rings refreshingly, in these "better Red than dead" days, of the Declaration of Independence. It is close to the essence of Mr. Acheson's message: What he calls his strategic approach means that the object of foreign policy is not peace at any price, not accommodation of the Communists merely in the hope of peace; rather, it is to preserve and foster an environment in which free societies may exist and flourish. That is the overriding criterion by which our foreign policies and actions must be tested.

Mr. Acheson recognizes that there appears to be a moral question here, and he meets it head on. If his strategic approach sounds like saying the end justifies the means, his answer is that in foreign affairs only the end can justify the means. Not just any ends or any means; but if the purpose is the preservation and strengthening of freedom, then it can require national action beyond what is accepted as ethical conduct among individuals.

Nations, the Secretary reminds us, are not individuals, and a good part of our foreign-policy grief stems from an attempt to translate individual moral standards into national policy; the result is usually not morality but moralizing and sloganeering. In fact, a government's foreign decisions "are not helped by considering them in terms of sharing, brotherly love, the Golden Rule, or inducing our citizens into the kingdom of heaven." The determining factor should be how the decisions bear upon major objectives.

Consider, then, the use and threat of force, not normally condoned among individuals and condemned for governments by the United Nations Charter. Yet the Communists have used force or the threat of force whenever they thought they could get away with it. They would neatly tie our hands, proclaiming their right to supoprt wars of liberation like the ghastly rebellion the Congo while we are obligingly of refrain from any action in the defense of freedom.

"Is it moral," Mr. Acheson asks, "to deny ourselves the use of force in all circumstances when our adversaries employ it, under handy excuses, whenever it seems useful to tip the scales of power against every value we think of as moral and as making life worth living?" To him, and to us, it seems a bad and stupid bargain, and very likely immoral as well.

The great virtue of the Acheson approach, we think, is exactly this somewhat old-fashioned emphasis on values that are worth fighting for and if need be dying for. In the campaign any such suggestion was scorned as too "simplistic" for a complicated and nuclear-armed world; to a Professor Galbraith it evidently is unrealistic.

We suspect that the truth is more nearly the other way around: Foreign-policy thinking in this country has become so infected with fear and doubt and irrevelant moralizing that it has confused and even paralyzed decisions and obscured the essentially simple purpose of policy. If the purpose is continued freedom for ourselves and help for others wanting freedom, it cannot be well served by putting peace above all.

A firmer adherence to the fundamental purpose is unlikely to entail any more risk of war than we now face. It may be we have already risked too much for illusions of peace—that hope of preserving not our way of life but life itself. If so, Mr. Acheson in the wisdom of years has sharply called us all back to first principles.

Representative Philip J. Philbin Nominates Speaker John W. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, January 2, 1965, in the House Democratic caucus held here, it was the privilege of the Members on this side to hear the distinguished gentleman from the Third Massachusetts Congressional District [Mr. PHILBIN] deliver one of the most eloquent addresses and tributes ever uttered on such occasion when he nominated for the continuing speakership of this House, our beloved and revered colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. Of course, the nomination was unanimously approved and yesterday we wisely and formally reelected Speaker MCCORMACK.

All of us agree with and share in the sentiments so ably expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman PHILBIN, as he summarized the tremendous public service record of our great Speaker and reviewed the remarkable talents of his brilliant mind and courageous heart, which have endeared him to all who have ever served with him and which assuer that the name of Speaker MCCORMACK will be forever an inspiring byword in the legislative history of this Nation.

A great many Members, on both sides of the aisle here asked me to intercede with my very dear and esteemed friend and colleague from the Third Massachusetts District for the purpose of having his eloquent address included in the permanent RECORD. He graciously consented to permit me to introduce it into the RECORD and Congressman PHILBIN's nomination speech follows:

CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN'S SPEECH NOMINATING SPEAKER MCCORMACK

Mr. Chairman and members of the caucus, the great man, whom I have the honor, privilege, and pleasure of nominating today surely needs no encomium. The gleaming record of brilliant, outstanding service and achievement, which he has made in a lifetime of devoted, distinguished contributions to the well-being and advancement of the Nation and the world, is too well known and too widely acknowledged to require either comment or elucidation.

This man is indeed cast in an heroic mold, blessed by the Creator with great abilities and talents, tested in the crucible of long experience, deeply dedicated to mankind, to justice and the rule of law, rich in all those attributes of humaneness and sympathetic understanding that make for lofty service to the people.

The greatness, the goodness, the lovable qualities, the zeal for great accomplishment, the work and achievements of this man are manifest to all Members of the House, to the Nation, to the world.

A man of humble beginnings and humble spirit, and profound religious faith, this illustrious son of Massachusetts is hailed on every side and every quarter of this country and the world. His impressive dignity, impartiality, fairness, sagacity, loyalty, and the outstanding distinction with which he has conducted the affairs of this House are widely recognized and appreciated.

He will go down in history as one of our greatest Speakers. His keen insight into every facet of the work of Congress and the Government, his superb knowledge of the great public questions with which the Congress is required to deal, his tact, his diplomacy, his skill, his invariable cooperation, his innate humaneness, his high aspirations, his progressive political philosophy, and his strong, vibrant, inspiring leadership have left a permanent imprint upon this body and upon the course of history.

The notable success which he has achieved in leading the House in these critical times has won for him the greatest respect, highest

admiration, widest acclaim and deepest gratitude.

How fortunate we are in these uneasy days to have such a richly experienced, warm-hearted, forward-looking and effective leader at the helm, guiding the affairs of this great, deliberative body with wisdom and sound judgments toward the cherished goals, which the American people and this Nation have set, to bring our ship of state through uncertainties and challenges of the hour into the calmer waters of peace, human betterment, and progress for our land and for the nations and peoples of the earth.

This dear colleague truly touches our hearts. He inspires our confidence.

And together with his gracious, charming wife, an inspiration and partner in his life and career, he holds our deepest affection.

For my esteemed colleagues of the Massachusetts delegation, and for myself, I am very proud and greatly pleased and honored to place in nomination in the Democratic caucus for Speaker of the House, the name of a very great American, a courageous leader, our beloved, distinguished Speaker and friend, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Social Security

SPEECH

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, even as we face what must be a momentous future on this first day of the 89th Congress, our first responsibility is to remedy what many of us believe was the gravest deficiency of the 88th Congress—the failure to complete action on legislation to improve the Social Security Act.

Accordingly, I have today introduced a bill which is identical to the bill passed by the House last July 29. I would hope that the Ways and Means Committee, which has already considered and recommended this legislation, will report it favorably as soon as possible and thereby expedite the process of doing justice to the millions of Americans who are dependent, in whole or in part, on the income from social security.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, should be a matter of the first priority for this Congress. The need for the modest 5-percent benefit increases—which would be the first since 1958—and the other important changes which the bill would make has been thoroughly established. By virtue of the wide bipartisan majority by which the bill was first approved and the endorsement of the liberalization of the social security program by both major political parties, we have made in effect a moral commitment to enact this legislation without further delay.

Additional justification for immediate passage of the legislation has just been provided by the report and recommendations of the Advisory Council on Social Security. This report establishes both that the social security program is soundly financed and that benefit increases should be provided. Indeed, the report makes a number of important recommendations for further benefit improvements, changes in the contribution rates, extension of coverage, and a possible new method of financing the proposed hospital insurance for the elderly program which deserve careful consideration by the Ways and Means Committee.

I would hope, however, that while the newer proposals are being studied, the committee and the Congress could proceed immediately to the business of enacting the bill we already have. The people who need and would benefit from this bill have lost 3 months of benefits to which they are entitled. Justice, it seems to me, requires that we delay no longer.

Four of the provisions in this social security bill, Mr. Speaker, are especially important. The 5 percent across-the-board increase in cash benefits will help to meet the increase in the cost of living since the last such adjustment was made in 1958. The liberalization of eligibility requirements will qualify for limited benefits approximately 600,000 persons age 72 or older whose covered employment under social security has been insufficient under present law. The continuation of benefits for dependent children from the present cutoff age of 18 to 22 for those who stay in school or college will provide significant encouragement for about 275,000 boys and girls to obtain better educations. Finally, the optional provision of benefits to widows at age 60 will introduce an element of flexibility which can help relieve much hardship.

Enactment of this bill will not reduce the need for consideration of further improvements in the social security system. But it will represent a major step forward in the continuing work of making social security more fair and humane and more responsive to the special needs of older people, widows, and dependent children.

I have also reintroduced, Mr. Speaker, a bill to revise the present retirement test for social security purposes, which would permit beneficiaries to earn up to $2,400 a year—or $3,600 in the case of widows with minor children—without losing social security benefits. This is a bill I have sponsored ever since 1957 and as each year passes the need for raising the present completely inadequate limit of $1,200 a year becomes more evident. I hope that with the soundness of the social security system having been demonstrated again we can move to correct this frequently painful inequity.

Independence Day of Burma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Burma celebrated the 17th anniversary of her independence, and I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Gen. Ne Win and the Burmese Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency On Sein.

The Union of Burma came into existence on January 4, 1948, and from that day on the Burmese have enjoyed their own sovereign and independent state. Thus they have been in the community of free and sovereign states for 16 years, and during that relatively short time they have given a creditable account of themselves on many fronts. In the difficult art of government their leaders have been very careful and cautious, and they have jealously guarded, until very recently, the republican form of government set up by a liberal constitution. That constitution provided for a president, a cabinet and a parliament. For more than a decade the constitution served the purpose of the state well. Since 1958, however, there have been disturbances which have upset the uneasy balance maintained by rival factions. From that year on one person has dominated the politics of the country. On October 29 of that year Gen. Ne Win took over the government. In the subsequent elections he lost out, but then he managed to come to the top again, and since 1962 he has governed Burma through his own revolutionary council under his personal chairmanship.

Gen. Ne Win's aim of establishing a socialist state is being realized by the nationalization of numerous industrial establishments, banking, rice trade, mining, and some manufacturing industries.

Agricultural yields of rice, millet and cotton have been on the increase. Exports of milled rice and raw rubber, as well as raw cotton have also increased, thus easing financial strains on Burma's supply of hard currency. With its strategic geographic postion, and with its 22 million population, Burma is destined to play an important role in the affairs of southeast Asia. On the 17th anniversary of their independence day we wish them peace and prosperity in this important role.

President Johnson's State of the Union Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's state of the Union address last night was a very constructive and forward-looking program as befits our Nation in the tasks facing it in the years ahead. It is a blueprint for action to maintain America strong and secure, to promote peace in the world and economic prosperity at home.

I believe that the 89th Congress will enact most, if not all, of the President's program outlined in his state of the Union address. His observation that

the state of the Union is "free and restless, growing and full of hope" is so very true of present-day America and should serve as a source of inspiration and encouragement to our people.

The President's address marks the beginning of what we all hope will prove to be a highly successful program in the interests of our Nation and the world. I was deeply impressed with his presentation. He has again shown that he is a most capable leader and a man who has a profound understanding of the Nation's problems. His confident mood, his determination, and his leadership ability should prove most reassuring to the American people in these crucial times.

Main Points of State of the Commonwealth Message by Gov. William W. Scranton Before the Joint Opening Session of the Pennsylvania Legislature, Tuesday, January 5, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, before the joint session of the Pennsylvania Legislature, January 5, 1965:

Two winters ago a new beginning was made in Pennsylvania.

The issue before us then was the issue of achieving greatness. Greatness for Pennsylvania.

Greatness. An echo from the past? Or a whisper of the future?

Does it belong only in the past, with William Penn writing on the cold stone tablets of history? Or is it here and now, in the effort required by John Doe, an average citizen of modern Pennsylvania, to find a job or to get his children through school?

And for politicians, what does greatness mean? An easy word or a hard promise? Something to talk about, or something to do?

Is it worth a vote for education, for mental health, for law enforcement, for all those things about which everybody seems to care—until somebody mentions taxes?

What is greatness? What is it worth? Where do you find it? How do you make it happen?

Those were unanswered questions for us two winters ago when Pennsylvania made a new beginning.

Almost 10 out of every 100 Pennsylvania workers could not find jobs. And, in percentage terms, for every two people in the Nation as a whole who could not find work, there were three in Pennsylvania.

And now, two winters later, after civil service, after unemployment compensation, after our programs for education, and human services, and conservation, and industrial development.

Now, two winters later, I stand here to report to you on the state of the Commonwealth.

Ladies and gentlemen of the general assembly, it is a pleasure to report that Pennsylvania has turned the corner.

The greatness of our past has become a promise for our future. Now we need not dream of greatness. Now we may grasp it.

To be specific, the condition of the economic health of our Commonwealth today is good.

Pennsylvania's rate of unemployment has been cut almost in half from what it was when we began two winters ago.

To put it another way: Right now, nearly 220,000 more Pennsylvanians have jobs than had jobs in January of 1963.

Announcement was made in 1964 alone of 765 new or expanded industrial plants, up 12 percent from the year before we began.

Travel within Pennsylvania by tourists during 1964 increased 20 percent over the previous years.

Bank deposits, a traditional economic yardstick, are $1 billion higher than they were a year ago.

Best of all, during the past 2 years the economy in Pennsylvania has been growing faster than the total national economy. Industrial production in Pennsylvania for October of 1964 showed a 12-percent increase over the previous year, while national production during the same period increased only a bit more than 4 percent.

And Pennsylvanians have been going back to work in proportionately greater numbers than have other Americans.

By October of this past year, Pennsylvania's unemployment rate, which had been 9.6 percent when we began, had tumbled to the amazingly low figure of 4.3 percent. And listen to this: That was lower than the national rate of unemployment. This was the first year in the history of modern recordkeeping that Pennsylvania's unemployment rate figured lower than the rest of the Nation.

Truly, then, Pennsylvania is on the way back to the top, to days of greatness, to her rightful place as leader of this Nation.

It is with considerable satisfaction that I report to you further that the condition of the State government of the Commonwealth is also good.

Our financial picture is strong and healthy.

Within 3 weeks, I will present for your consideration the general fund budget for the coming fiscal year.

If current trends continue, we will produce a substantial surplus for the second straight year.

I would remind you that this will mark the first time since the Korean war period that any administration has been able to show a surplus for two consecutive budgets. This achievement has been made possible through the application of sound business methods to the operation of State government and careful pruning of departmental expenditures, as well as through the health of our economy.

This budget document will be significant, not only because it will be balanced fiscally, but because it will provide for more balanced progress for Pennsylvania.

It will provide for greater levels of service to the people of Pennsylvania in every major area of governmental activity. I am convinced that such a balanced approach is what our State most needs. Our needs are great in so many areas that we cannot afford to overemphasize any one field to the detriment of the others.

The budget, as submitted to you, will provide for this progress without any increase in taxes.

But it is my responsibility to warn that if expenditures requested by the administration are increased by the legislature, or new expenditures added, new taxes must be enacted to pay for such added costs.

Reform of some outmoded features in our tax laws is now under study within the administration. If this study reaches fruition, I will send a special message on tax reform to you at a later date.

Successful efforts at efficiency and economy have made it possible for us to increase and improve State government services, so that the people are getting a fair return on their tax dollars. These services are as diverse as the nature of our State.

First are those services that relate directly to the land itself.

The department of agriculture during the past 2 years has established important new services for our farmers, to increase their production and therefore their profits in commodities as different as apples, eggs, and frozen foods.

The new bituminous strip mine law is nationally regarded as landmark legislation. It is being enforced strictly and fairly, and has won the admiration of conservationists at home and abroad.

The anthracite strip mine law has brought protection to the anthracite region after years of neglect. Under its provisions, no fewer than 252 of the 255 pits now in operation will be completely backfilled with all overburden.

Our State parks continue to attract millions of visitors to Pennsylvania each year, and to provide needed physical and spiritual renewal for our own citizens. In 1964 alone, attendance at the State parks increased by more than 1 million. This year we will open three entirely new parks in Bedford, Lancaster, and Cambria Counties.

Project 70 has been advanced on every front.

Probably the most important of all the areas of service in which the State is active is that of education. In this field, a new era was begun in 1963.

William Penn once wrote: "If we would amend the world, we should first mend ourselves, and teach our children to be, not what we are, but what they should be."

This is the true ideal of education. We have moved closer to its fulfillment during the past 2 years.

The State contribution to local school districts and toward teachers' salaries have been substantially increased. Faculty salaries at the State colleges have been raised. The Commonwealth has increased its aid to institutions of higher learning by 30 percent. And the largest-in-history building program at the State colleges has moved forward as the general State authority set a new record during 1964 of $116 million in construction contract awards.

Pennsylvania's first community college has been opened and three more are on the way this year.

A new system of area technical high schools has been launched. Twelve of these schools are now operating, and eight more are almost ready to open.

Five educational television stations are either operating or under construction.

Special education to our handicapped boys and girls was extended in 1964 to an additional 17,000 students.

Pennsylvania's first program for deserving students seeking higher education was put in motion. In the first year more than 3,000 students have received loans.

Perhaps most important of all, a new State board of education has been established to develop overall policy in both basic and higher education for our State.

Protection of the public safety was the first and remains among the most important duties of the State.

The Pennsylvania State Police by December had conducted during 1964 more than 950 raids on vice and gambling racketeers, with more than 1,700 arrests. That was almost five times as many raids and more

than three times as many arrests than in the year before this administration took office. I can promise you there shall be no letup in our war against organized crime, which bleeds our economy and corrupts our young people.

In the field of human services, decisive progress has been made since 1963's new beginning:

We have put into operation the best and most liberal medical care for the aged program in the entire Nation.

Public assistance rolls have been reduced by almost 80,000 in 2 years. Our unique Project Independence has found employment for 3,500 heads of families who had been on relief. Chiselers have been knocked off the relief rolls in record numbers. At the same time, for the truly needy we have been able to offer more help, including the first increase in 14 years for shelter allowances.

The population of our mental hospitals has gradually declined as more patients are treated in local clinics. And it is a tremendous satisfaction to report that the heart-rending waiting list at institutions for the mentally retarded has been cut in half as 1,500 additional beds have been made available.

These, then, are some of the signposts of progress which have marked Pennsylvania's march along the road toward greatness since the new beginning.

But now the time has come once again to look to the future, to offer a blueprint for further progress, for further greatness for Pennsylvania.

First of all, I wish to state clearly the point of view from which this administration views the 2 years before us.

The history of our State, as we all know, is replete with instances in which the second half of an administration became a poaching ground for unscrupulous politicians, who seemed to think that though the first 2 years might be for the people, the second 2 years were for them.

That is not going to happen this time.

This administration will become a lame-duck administration at high noon on January 15, 1967, and not 10 seconds sooner.

As we also all know, the control of the government of Pennsylvania will be divided during the next 2 years between two political parties. The results of such a situation in the past have sometimes been most unfortunate for the progress of our people. Let us not minimize the difficulties that lie ahead. The temptations to place partisan advantage above the common good will be manifold. If we do not all exercise responsible judgment, the next 2 years may be simply a sparring period with no real progress achieved.

Pennsylvania cannot afford that sort of waste today. Our problems are too serious; our opportunities, too pressing. We must progress every year. Of course, we will sometimes disagree. But where compromise and reasonable understanding among men of good will are possible, we dare not permit party interest to stand in the way of the higher interest of the Commonwealth.

This administration will do all in its power to work toward those goals of social and economic progress that surely we hold in common.

The first challenge that faces you in this new year is the matter of court directed reapportionment.

In 1962 the general assembly reapportioned the State's congressional districts in keeping with State and Federal laws as they were understood at that time. In 1963 the assembly acted in the same way to reapportion both houses of the legislature.

Since that time the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that the doctrine of one man, one vote must be rigidly applied to apportionment of both congressional and legislative districts. In general, these decisions seem fair. A vote should be worth just as much, whether it is cast in Philadelphia or in our most rural county. Such has always been the case for statewide offices, and should be the case in elections for Congress and for at least one house of the legislature.

It is my belief that there is room for consideration of factors other than population in apportionment of the second house, if the people of any given State should so desire. The Federal Government operates under such a plan.

A proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution along these lines will be submitted to you.

But the Supreme Court decision stands as the law of the land. We must move speedily to enact new apportionment laws for the State legislature and for our congressional districts. I have suggested that a bipartisan committee be set up to produce fair reapportionment laws.

If you agree that this is the way to proceed, fine. If not, that certainly is your right. But I caution you that any attempt to proceed in less than a bipartisan way forebodes possible legislative failure to grasp an opportunity for statesmanship that is rare. If it becomes necessary for the court to assume the task of reapportioning the State, the luster of the general assembly cannot fail to be damaged.

Contempt for the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today 149 Members of the House recorded their opposition to seating the 5 Members-elect from Mississippi. On January 1, 1965, the Washington Post in an editorial stated:

It is high time for Mississippi to learn that the country is not altogether indifferent to its contempt for the Constitution.

After today's vote I am sure that the country knows that a substantial number of Congressmen are deeply concerned over the continuation of the unconstitutional laws and actions of Mississippi. I call the attention of all my colleagues to the Washington Post editorial. The complete text follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 1, 1965]

PRETENDERS IN CONGRESS

The State of Mississippi will send to the 89th Congress when it convenes on January 4 a delegation elected by only a fraction of its inhabitants and representing only one of the races comprised in its population. There is overwhelming evidence to show that Negroes indubitably qualified to vote in Mississippi were kept from doing so by a systematic denial of their qualification, by intimidation, and by outright terror. The State is therefore clearly not entitled to the five Members it seeks to have seated in the House of Representatives. And the election of every one of these Representatives was clearly tainted.

It seems to us entirely right and reasonable, in this situation, that the seating of the Mississippi delegation to the House of Representatives should be challenged on January 4. Representative WILLIAM F. RYAN, of New York, with the support of 16 other Democrats, will make the challenge. We applaud it whether it succeeds or fails. It is high time for Mississippi to learn that the country is not altogether indifferent to its contempt for the Constitution. And it is high time for the House of Representatives to give some thought to the integrity of its own membership.

The 14th amendment declares that "Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed." That amendment then goes on to provide a specific remedy for infringement of this rule: "When the right to vote * * * is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State."

Congress has never seen fit to enforce this provision of the Constitution, despite long and flagrant denials of the right to vote in several States. Perhaps, during the period when Mississippi's delegation has been challenged and required to stand aside pending assessment of its credentials, the House could give this constitutional clause due consideration.

It is worth noting, in this connection, that a suit has been filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia by Negro and white citizens from all over the United States to compel the Census Bureau to take this clause of the 14th amendment into account when it apportions House membership. The suit is based on the same principle that lay behind the recent apportionment decision of the Supreme Court. It seems almost self-evident that disregard of the 14th amendment in regard to Mississippi operates to dilute and, in relative terms, to diminish the representation of voters in States which do not abridge the right to vote.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Senator Jennings Randolph, West Virginian for 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Sunday Gazette-Mail of Charleston, W. Va., following its annual custom, selected as West Virginian for 1964, our colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

We who serve with Senator RANDOLPH are not surprised that he has been so honored, for we know that he works unceasingly and effectively for the people of West Virginia. We know of his interests in and understanding of the serious national and international problems which our country must face, and we also know of his participation in the Senate in the formulation of legislation and debate concerning these problems.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH is an able and effective Senator for West Virginia, and for our country. His qualities of heart and mind, his integrity and character, give us inspiration and leadership. We are not surprised that these qualities are well recognized in his own State of West Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Sunday Gazette-Mail, written by Thomas E. Stafford, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Jan. 3, 1965]

THE EDITOR REPORTS—SENATOR RANDOLPH STANDOUT CHOICE

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia's happy warrior of the political hustings, takes a well-earned place among distinguished company today in his selection as the Sunday Gazette-Mail's West Virginian of the Year for 1964.

Somewhat ironically, the smiling and warm-hearted man from Elkins could have been a logical choice for the honor in any of the 14 years it has been bestowed. But for one reason or another, in the years since 1951 there always has been another State personality to catch the eye—perhaps because the workings of a U.S. Senator often is behind the scenes and not of a nature to capture the news headlines.

In 1964, however, JENNINGS RANDOLPH was not to be denied. His leadership on the floor of the Senate in winning passage of President Johnson's antipoverty bill and in managing the Appalachian redevelopment bill, as well as his influential activity on behalf of such monumental legislation as the nuclear test ban treaty and aid to education made him a standout choice.

The West Virginian for 1963 was Cyrus Robert Vance, a native of Clarksburg, who was chosen because of his service as Secretary of the Army, and who shortly after winning the honor was advanced to No. 1 aid to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

And now comes Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH. We salute him as the West Virginian for 1964.

SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH—THE SUNDAY GAZETTE-MAIL'S WEST VIRGINIAN FOR 1964

(By Thomas F. Stafford)

On a warm summer afternoon in 1963 Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH said in one of his infrequent formal statements before the U.S. Senate, "My personal philosophy is guided by the axiom that the only changeless fact in life is change itself."

The occasion was a historical one. On that particular day the Senate was debating the test ban treaty, an issue on which the membership was sharply divided as to what America's ideological destiny should be in the still developing nuclear age.

On one side were the neoisolationists, who would have the country pursue the madness of building constantly bigger bombs for an arsenal already large enough to devastate the world. And on the other were those who would have it take the lead in advocating a course of reason as the only alternative to ultimate destruction.

RANDOLPH was a member of this latter group. His position was an uneasy one. On his desk in the Senate Office Building across the street were piles of letters opposing the treaty. Some were frantic, some were calm, but all were from the precincts back home.

For even an oldtimer like RANDOLPH this issue smacked of trouble. But he was not one to take the coward's way out with a grandstanding speech about Valley Forge, San Juan Hill, Corregidor, and Heartbreak Ridge.

He had been waiting for this great moment since that tragic morning 19 years before when Hiroshima was turned into smoldering rubble with the triggering of a single bomb. As he had done when legislation dealing with that first noble experiment in peaceful coexistence came before Congress in the middle 1940's—the United Nations compact—he voted for the test ban treaty.

"The art of government," he told his colleagues, "is to help channel the forces of change in the direction that will best fulfill the aspirations of our society. Today, the overwhelming aspirations of the American people, of the Soviet people, and of most humanity, is for world peace."

It is this willingness to push out into new directions and explore the unknown that sets RANDOLPH apart from the usual political figure, and makes him a scarce commodity in this State which breeds second-rate politicians with the monotonous regularity of the changing moons.

RANDOLPH's willingness to test the political unknown is not a quality of recent vintage. When he first went to Washington as a fledgling Congressman in those dismal hours of early 1933, he chose the role of an experimentalist and he has never deviated from it.

Such world shaking events as the great depression, two wars, and the rising cry of minority groups for equal rights have pushed their way into the congressional halls since he went there, and on every occasion he has been on the side of those whose eyes were on solutions rather than the status quo.

It is this quality in him—as was typified in his work on civil rights, antipoverty, Appalachian redevelopment and medicare—which makes him the Sunday Gazette-Mail's West Virginian of the Year for 1964. It is his trademark, his creed, his political gospel.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, at 62, has been in public life a long time. His name has appeared so often in the headlines of the State's newspapers that he is as familiar to the average voter as bacon and eggs or donuts and coffee. After 32 years in the forefront of politics, he has reached that enviable position as senior Member of the West Virginia delegation in Congress and elder statesman to the Democratic Party.

His road to political seniority was not an easy one. He first felt the sting of defeat when he traveled with his father at the age of 14 and made impromptu stump speeches in his behalf along the backroads of his native Harrison County. The elder Randolph was doomed before he even filed. He was a Democrat running in the then heavily Republican Third Congressional District.

RANDOLPH came to Charleston in 1925 after his graduation from Salem College, and worked for a year as associate editor of the West Virginia Review. The next year he moved to Elkins, as athletic director at Davis and Elkins College.

While at D. & E. he taught speech and journalism, but in those years sports were his chief interest. With the colorful Cam Henderson coaching the team, he built a reputation for the little Presbyterian school as a football power, using such now unorthodox devices as Saturday heroes and professionals in amateur dress to win games.

At 28 he made his first venture into politics in 1930, as a candidate for Congress from the Second District.

Although he won the primary, he lost in the general election to Republican Frank L. Bowman—a situation that was reversed 2 years later when, in the aftermath of the stock market crash, the voters turned out the Republicans.

His victory was a brilliant one. Almost everywhere, the writers of political history credit the triumph of West Virginia Democrats that year to the Roosevelt landslide, but RANDOLPH was no coattail rider. He ran 5,000 votes ahead of the President, and built so much momentum that he remained in Congress for seven consecutive terms.

During his early years in Congress he built a reputation as a campaigner of tireless energy. Everywhere he went his stock-in-trade was a cheery smile, a warm handshake, and a kind word. He was always the first to arrive at a public gathering and the last to leave.

One such occasion at Arthurdale illustrates this trait in RANDOLPH. While waiting on the station platform for a trainload of Washington dignitaries to arrive at the little experimental community, a group of prominent West Virginians began making book he would be the first off the train.

Among those in the crowd were Gov. H. G. Kump and R. Carl Andrews, later a candidate for governor and mayor of Charleston. RANDOLPH, it turned out, surprised them all. When the train pulled in, he was leaning out of the baggage car, shaking hands with everybody he could reach.

This young man, whose first earned quarter came from stuffing newspapers, was part of that great mass which huddled in the mist and wind before the Nation's Capitol on March 4, 1933, and heard Roosevelt say, "This Nation asks for action, and action now."

From that moment on he was a steadfast supporter of the New Deal, voting with the majority on such experiments in economic recovery as the NRA, the Triple A, the CCC, and the WPA. But he had ideas of his own about what should be done for the helpless and oppressed.

By building his political fences in Washington as he had back in the district, he found the support he needed for one of the most humanitarian pieces of legislation ever to be sponsored by a West Virginian. It was the Randolph-Sheppard Act of 1936, which authorizes the operation of news and soft drink stands in Federal buildings by blind people.

Thousands of blind persons all over America found jobs after the passage of this legislation, and its value as a medium for rehabilitation has since been demonstrated by the acceptance of its framework for State and county governments as well.

Among other laws which RANDOLPH sponsored as a Congressman were one aimed at reducing illiteracy among aliens seeking citizenship, an aviation bill authorizing the Government to subsidize the production of synthetic gasoline from coal, the Civil Aeronautics Act, airmail pickup, and the Federal aid airport program. One of his most noteworthy accomplishments as a Senator was approval of the Highland Scenic Highway, a Skyline Drive-type road which is being built from Richwood to Gormania. The 88th Congress has an extraordinary record in regard to advancing the cause of education and Senator RANDOLPH was in the forefront as a cosponsor and comanager of these measures.

He was so wedded to the belief that coal-to-gasoline was a course Government research should follow that he demonstrated his conviction by joining in the flight from Morgantown to Washington of the first airplane ever powered by gasoline produced synthetically. The year was 1943, and he had few companions on the flight.

In 1946 his House colleagues, in a Pageant magazine poll, voted him the Representative doing the most for his district. But the folks back home didn't get the message. They voted him out of office that same year in a rebellion against holdover wartime restrictions and price controls.

In that election President Truman tried in his characteristic free-swinging style to justify the continuation of price controls, but the voters weren't convinced. RANDOLPH sensed what was happening in talking with an elderly woman back in the district about campaign issues. "I ain't got no soap," she said bitterly.

He wasn't long out of work. His interest in aviation had gained him a national reputation, and Capital Airlines grabbed him up as assistant to the president. In this capacity he worked on bettering community and company relations in the 16 States where Capital operated, as well as on problems the company had on Capitol Hill.

But, busy though he was as an airline executive, he kept a weather eye on West Virginia politics. Public service had become so much a part of his life that he never gave up the vision of someday going to the Senate.

His talent as a platform personality served this vision well. In the years that followed his moving downtown to Capital's executive suite, he was badgered with invitations from back home to speak on everything from the Wright Brothers flight at Kitty Hawk to the malevolent tendencies of the black widow spider.

Along with accepting as many of these invitations as time would permit, he kept active in politics by running for delegate to the Democratic National Convention. In this way he was able to gage his popularity, which was on the rise. He was elected delegate-at-large in 1948, 1952, and 1956, running fourth, third, and second, respectively. (Of interest in the context of these races is the fact that last spring he ran first for delegate-at-large to the 1964 convention.)

The death of the old warrior, Matthew Mansfield Neely, finally opened the door for RANDOLPH in 1958. He ran for Neely's unexpired term against interim Senator John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., the appointee of Republican Gov. Cecil Underwood, and won by the crushing margin of 118,000 votes. Two years later he ran for a full 6-year term and defeated Underwood by 88,000 votes. He is serving this term now.

Although Underwood ran better than the late Jack Hoblitzell, there was never any question about who would win. The races for President and Governor remained in doubt right down to the last week, but every poll and straw vote gave the edge to RANDOLPH by a comfortable margin.

Old campaigner that he was, he understood the signs, yet he never indicated publicly that the battle was over. It was only in the quiet of a hotel room, or while traveling from town to town, that he relaxed by reminiscing about past campaigns.

On one such occasion he and his companions turned to the lack of novelty that goes into menu planning for public dinners. Looking back across more than a quarter century of playing the banquet circuit, he chuckled and said, "The standard menu is either creamed chicken and peas or baked ham and sweet potatoes."

"What will it be tonight?" one of his friends asked, thinking ahead to his scheduled appearance in a little Southern town. "Well," he mused, "we've had creamed chicken three times this week and ham once. The law of averages favors ham."

"What about steak?" somebody else asked.

"No, we won't have steak," the Senator chuckled. "That's for $100-a-plate affairs, and this tonight is strictly a blue plate special."

When, later, T-bones of generous sizes were served all around, RANDOLPH looked at his traveling companions, winked, and got up and gave one of the most stirring speeches of his career. The audience was small, but William Jennings Bryan, after whom he is named, couldn't have done better.

One of RANDOLPH's favorite subjects as he travels around West Virginia is highways. The interest is understandable. He serves as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Roads, one of the most powerful bodies in the Federal Establishment.

Just before a public address in Parkersburg last fall, where he was to speak on the importance of highways as an economic vehicle, he became nostalgic on the subject. He talked meditatively of driving cattle along the dusty roads of Harrison County, and of having experienced the heady thrill of riding in the first car in his native Salem.

As a product of that uncertain middle period between farming as a way of life and embryonic industrialization, when motorcars were a luxury to be enjoyed only on sunny Sunday afternoons, he has a perception of the importance of modern highways not possessed by the average citizen. As a consequence, when he was called upon last fall to help pass the $200 million road bond issue, he responded with all the vigor and enthusiasm of a college sophomore.

No West Virginian contributed more to the success of that victory than he did. He could have remained in Washington on the pretense of minding the store on Capitol Hill, but he went from platform to platform urging and pleading with the voters to support the amendment.

For a man who had spent 6 weeks in the hospital last spring on the threshold of blindness, this was service above and beyond the call of duty. Incidentally, it is a classic irony—much like that of Matt Neely—for RANDOLPH to have been hospitalized by a condition he had fought against for so long. But where Neely died of the cancer he had tried to find a cure for as a Senator, RANDOLPH recovered and again has full use of his eyes.

RANDOLPH has contributed mightily to the well-being of his fellow citizens during his years in Washington, as is illustrated by the Randolph-Shepperd Act, which opened up employment opportunities for the blind and is now producing more than $50 million annually in gross sales.

This tireless worker for the underprivileged and oppressed, has enjoyed many victories since going to Congress, but never were there so many of importance to the community of man than in 1964. Look at the record.

Against the great hue and cry from the white man's South—and from those noisy white West Virginians who regard themselves as a super race—RANDOLPH stood strong and tall during the classic debates on civil rights.

He was a defender of only 5 percent of the West Virginia population, but he said, "The history of the American ideal has been always to advance the fundamental doctrine that man—as man—is a creature of worth and dignity, and that all men—as men—partake of these qualities.

"The essential characteristics which we cherish are in all men and women, and we can no more create an aristocracy of human dignity than we can create an aristocracy of human love or human imagination or any of the other essential human characteristics."

He also was in the vanguard of the war on poverty, as floor manager with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and Senator PATRICK MCNAMARA for the Economic Opportunities Act. Again he was on the side of a minority, but with the same conviction he demonstrated on civil rights, he said:

"The Economic Opportunities Act will provide a vital and progressive tool to upgrade both our human and material resources. It can be a constructive way to bring together otherwise idle manpower and jobs going undone."

It was the same story on Appalachian redevelopment. Poverty stalks the hills and valleys of 11 States which lie along the backbone of the great Appalachian Mountains. Millions grow to manhood and die without ever experiencing even a thimbleful of the prosperity which lies in the valleys of the tidewater or in the rolling, teeming Middle West, just beyond their mountain homes.

They are a national phenomenon—the impoverished few surrounded by a nation of plenty. RANDOLPH became familiar with their plight in the 1930's during the floor fights on TVA, the Arthurdale and Red House experiments, and WPA. They were an obsession with him then, and they remained an obsession when he squared off as floor manager on the Appalachian redevelopment bill last summer.

His colleagues first said it wouldn't pass. It was too regional in its appeal, they reasoned, and would therefore engender opposition from the farm belt and Western States. Later, they said, it would pass as a squeaker. When it rolled through by a big margin, they shrugged their shoulders, smiled and said, "RANDOLPH's done it again."

West Virginia's senior Senator has a reputation in the Senate of being an accomplished behind-the-scenes negotiator, and his fellow Senators have come to respect his judgment. For example, 2 years ago the administration wanted to bring a youth opportunities bill to a vote, but he balked.

"We're not ready yet," he advised. "We'll lose." A few days later he urged immediate action, saying he had the votes he needed. A roll call was taken that day, and the bill slid through with only three votes to spare.

It comes as a tragic capstone to his other triumphs of 1964 that the greatest of the lot —on Appalachian redevelopment—was a futile gesture. The House refused to act and

the bill died. So many of its supporters were back home campaigning for reelection that not enough votes could be mustered to hazard a final rollcall.

Another tragic throwaway last year was his vote on medicare, which passed the Senate only to die in the House. On this, as on all the other major issues of 1964, the fight was for a minority group—16 million elderly citizens.

RANDOLPH demonstrated his deep concern for the 165,000 senior citizens in West Virginia 5 years ago when he came to Charleston and urged the legislature at a special session to implement a recently passed Federal act that would provide the elderly with limited hospital and medical care. It was not the ideal but it was a start, he said.

The legislature hesitated because of the heavy burden such action would impose on the budget, but RANDOLPH persisted, saying that if a better plan known as medicare should come before Congress, he would do everything in his power to see that it passed.

When his opportunity came in 1962 to cast a vote for medicare, he shocked even his closest friends by voting against it. He had good reason for doing what he did. A vote for the bill would have been a hollow gesture, since it was hopelessly tied down in the House, and he is not one to engage in such dramatics for expediency's sake.

He chose the opposite course to save another program equally as important as medicare. This was the aid-to-dependent-children program of the unemployed, which would have died if he hadn't voted as he did, and would have meant a return to virtual starvation for 50,000 West Virginians.

RANDOLPH was plagued by the pangs of inner torment during the 48 hours or so before medicare came to a vote. He was besieged on all sides to support it—from the administration's floor managers in the Senate, from the elderly, and from the White House itself. This was the banner unfurled for the Kennedy administration. Medicare was to be the major weapon of the forthcoming congressional election campaign.

He kept his own counsel on how he would vote. Even his office staff had no inkling of what he would do right up to the hour of the rollcall. It was indeed an electrifying time. And when he voted "no," a deep and ominous silence spread through the Senate Chamber. The great liberal from West Virginia had deserted the cause.

But had RANDOLPH in truth deserted a philosophy which had been his creed and his gospel for 30 years? Back in this office an hour or so later, with newsmen badgering him for statements and interviews, he said wearily to a friend, "I was right. Time will prove I was right."

Time and events have proved the wisdom of his action. Medicare has never yet passed the House, but the aid-to-dependent-children program has outgrown its pilot status and today is a nationally accepted medium for lifting the unemployed off the dole and giving them jobs.

In spite of his vote last September, when he fulfilled his 5-year-old pledge on medicare, there is yet some question whether the West Virginia electorate will forgive him for what he did 2 years ago.

The national spotlight was on him then. He had the center of the stage. And, as readers' forum letters have implied for so long, the feeling was that he had deserted to the enemy.

Casting reason and logic aside, the casual observer of the Washington scene fails to realize that that was RANDOLPH's finest hour. He put his political career on the block, and he was fully aware of the possible consequences of his action.

He chose the unpopular course when the popular course would have been so much easier. He struck a blow for a secondary cause only vaguely at issue when the primary cause became clouded in uncertainty. He was every inch a statesman.

The drama he played out on that lovely afternoon may never find its way into the history books, but it was another chapter in "Profiles in Courage." Like the others in public life John F. Kennedy told about so wonderfully in his Pulitzer Prize-winning book, RANDOLPH put conviction and justice above the grubby expediences of the times.

Curbing Fuel Oil Imports Would Speed Economic Revival of Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, time after time I have spoken out on the floor of this body against the importation of great and rising amounts of residual oil, which have undermined the markets for coal and deprived coal miners of jobs in this country. The president of the United Mine Workers of America, W. A. Boyle, has written a guest editorial for the leading newspaper of my hometown, the Huntington, W. Va., Adviser. This editorial was printed on December 28, 1964, and I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues since it sets forts so graphically the relation between curbing imports of foreign residual fuel oil, and the future prosperity of the Appalachian region:

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser, Dec. 28, 1964]

CURBING FUEL OIL IMPORTS WOULD SPEED ECONOMIC REVIVAL OF APPALACHIA

(By W. A. Boyle, president, United Mine Workers of America)

For many years the United Mine Workers of America has fought against the excessive importation of residual fuel oil. We have done so for one very simple reason.

The importation of residual fuel oil is a threat to the jobs and income of American coal miners. It is so because it deprives the coal industry of markets and precludes it from the normal growth that it should rightfully have.

The marketing pattern of coal must be understood before the damage that is done by residual oil imports can be realized. The impact that residual has and will have upon the social and economic life of Appalachia must also be understood if its detrimental and injurious effect upon the Nation as a whole is to be truly appreciated.

Coal must compete in the most intensely competitive market in the world, the energy market of the United States. In order to survive coal must match, on the bases of quality and price, fuel oil, natural gas, water power, and now the atom. The fact that coal is sold largely on the basis of price per million B.t.u. and not because of any inherent advantages, further intensifies the problem of the coal industry in seeking survival.

UNFAIR COMPETITION

The market convulsions that coal has undergone are well known and need no further elaboration. Fortunately, the industry was able to reorder itself in time to meet the challenge posed by the market and to gain some confidence for the future. Unfortunately, however, the transformation which coal underwent made it vulnerable to price competition and to unscrupulous and unfair tactics by competitors.

Perhaps the most notorious example of such tactics is in the area of residual oil importation.

Residual oil is essentially a waste product. It is what is left over after the refining process. It is transportable only with difficulty and can be burned only in special equipment expressly suited for the job.

For many years coal faced the problem of competition from residual fuel oil produced in domestic refineries. It was successful in meeting such competition largely because of its production efficiency and also because the domestic refiners produced as little residual oil as possible, due to residual's extremely low price.

This is not to say that domestic residual oil was not a good competitor for coal. It was and is. However, competition was carried on largely within the framework of the domestic energy industry, an industry which seeks to maximize return from each unit of energy produced.

A WASTE PRODUCT

Foreign residual fuel oil in the United States comes mainly from Venezuela and the Netherland East Indies. It is also a byproduct of the refining process and is essentially a waste material.

There is, however, one important difference. In the nations producing foreign residual oil, conservation and resource utilization is not quite so important. They are willing to produce many more barrels of residual oil than the U.S. refineries. In fact, in many cases, the production of residual oil in foreign nations reaches 60 percent of the total refinery run.

Thus, huge quantities of a useless product are produced, unless some area can be found in which it can be sold. Since it will go to waste and pose a disposal problem unless sold, price is no object. It is in fact a dump product, since it can move only if the price is lower than other energy fuels.

The only area in the world that can absorb this much residual oil is the east coast of the United States. We have seen for several years a cocerted attack upon the fuel market of the east coast by the producers of foreign residual fuel oil.

DISRUPTION OF MARKETING PATTERNS

The result of this methodical assault has been to create a shambles of the energy market in the United States. It has disrupted the traditional patterns of marketing and caused the gravest harm possible to the coal industry, as well as to the domestic oil industry in the United States. This damage is particularly harmful to the coal industry in Appalachia, since it is most directly involved in supplying the east coast. However, the ripple effects of residual oil competition reach far beyond the area directly involved and touch almost every aspect of coal mining.

From a strict industrial point of view the most immediate impact of residual fuel oil imports has been to shut off coal from the growth of the east coast energy market. This is immediately apparent in the following statistics.

Between 1957 and 1963 the consumption of coal in the east coast declined from 157,064,000 tons to 153,325,000 tons. At the same time the importation of residual fuel oil in the same region increased from 30,613,000 tons of coal equivalent to 49,166,000 tons of coal equivalent, or 60.6 percent. In other words, the importation of residual oil increased extremely rapidly at a time when the consumption of coal was declining by 2.4 percent.

Look at this picture in another way. The total demand for energy in the east coast, exclusive of energy sources not competitive

with coal, increased from 350,106,000 tons in 1957 to 407,660,000 tons in 1963.

From this it is evident that coal did not share in the energy growth of the area. It is also evident that imported residual fuel oil gained to a much greater degree than the other energy fuels.

IMPORTANT NATIONAL POLICY

There is a question of national policy involved here that must soon be resolved. We as a nation must determine whether or not our own industry is going to meet our national needs. We must decide to whom we shall look for the satisfaction of the needs of the Nation for energy. In so doing we shall have to determine to what extent we shall protect our own industry from the ravages of foreign competition and the unfair tactics of foreign competitors.

In this case the time is past due for such a decision. For, to continue long upon our present course will doom the coal industry to death by submerging it in an ever-expanding sea of foreign residual fuel oil. Our present policies will suffocate the coal industry and render it unable to meet the needs of the Nation, especially in the event of a crisis of a national or international nature.

But this is not the gravest danger of residual fuel oil importation.

There are men today who are out of work because of the excessive importation of residual fuel oil. There are men currently working who will be thrown out of jobs if the quotas on residual oil are increased any further. There are families in Appalachia and elsewhere who know the total despair of poverty because of residual oil importation.

This is also waste of a natural resource. For, if we as a nation choose to write off the coal industry, if we are content to allow the importation of foreign residual oil to continue on its present level and even to expand—then we must be ready to face the hard and cold reality of unemployment in the coal areas.

RELATION TO APPALACHIAN PROGRAM

It is the announced policy of the Johnson administration to alleviate the poverty of Appalachia. To this end the President has introduced legislation in Congress. He has formed study groups and turned out reports.

But all of the activity that has been carried on thus far will amount to little if residual oil continues to erode coal markets. Any contemplated action will be futile unless something is done to restore some sort of sane balance between the coal and residual oil industries in the energy market.

If the President is content to allow the importation of residual fuel oil to increase, if he is willing to further depress the coal industry of Appalachia, while at the same time promising programs to help that region—then he is either economically naive, or guilty of a cruel hoax.

Coal underlies the economic superstructure of Appalachia. Coal dollars permit the region to function and grow, if growth is possible. Coal is the basic natural resource of the region and must form the foundation for regional growth.

This is amply illustrated in the survey on the impact of coal production recently completed by the United Mine Workers of America, the National Coal Association, and the National Coal Policy Conference. This survey pointed to the $271,547,420 going into the economy of West Virginia each year because of the production of coal. It pointed to the employment that it brought about because of the coal industry and its associated industries. It showed how the trickle of coal dollars permeates the entire economic structure of Appalachia, giving it strength and vitality and the substance that it needs to grow.

INCOME AND JOBS OF MINERS

Residual fuel oil threatens all of that. Residual oil importation strikes at the income and the jobs and the future of coal miners and their families.

We estimated that the job loss due to current quota levels approximates 55,000 jobs. This does not include the ancillary services, the storeowners, the service people, and all the rest. Nor does it account for the desperation that comes to a coal mining community when a layoff occurs or a mine is shut down.

Even this figure, staggering as it is, does not tell the whole story of the damage done by residual oil imports.

Each time the U.S. Government allows more residual oil to come into the nation it in effect discounts the importance of the coal industry. The price competition becomes more severe and the legitimate profit margins of the industry become depressed.

In this environment the industry pattern tends to degenerate. Investment in the industry is driven away and mines closed because they can no longer meet the competitive threat.

We have seen many mines close in the Appalachian region in the years since the increase in residual oil imports has taken place. Many of these mines would not have closed if imported residual oil was not present. For, under a fairer marketing arrangement the mine that has become marginal would not be so and would be able to operate.

Instead, under the constant pressure of residual competition, a ruthless, vicious, brutal competition, the industry no longer can sustain itself.

It might be said that we do not have a stake in what happens to the industry in this regard. But we feel differently.

EFFECT ON INVESTMENTS

A mine can close and investment be lost. But investment can often be transferred elsewhere. In fact, one of the peculiar phenomena of our modern industry age is the flight of capital from coal to other industries. Many of the leading coal companies have taken part in this flight. At least one of the major coal companies is involved in the importation of residual fuel oil.

But what happens to the men when the money goes? What happens to the wives and children when the mines close and the breadwinner is out of work?

The answer is easy to find. It shows up in the face of Appalachia, in the poverty and the want. For a coal miner who is out of work is usually tied to an area. He cannot easily move or transfer his skills to another job. His investment is his own ability, his courage and his experience. It is a valuable investment, a priceless commodity. But it cannot with ease be changed to other pursuits.

So it is that the real loser is the coal miner, the people of the area involved. So it is that when a mine closes people are the expendable commodity.

This human wastage is the real tragedy of residual oil. It is a tragedy that is repeated often in the Appalachian region each year as the quantity of imported residual oil goes up and as the pressure on coal increases apace.

The present quota, which continues to rise beyond reason and good judgment, adds to the loss of job opportunities and a waste of human resources and makes added burden on our Government to feed those who suffer forced unemployment.

There can be no doubt that a reasonable policy on the importation of residual oil would help to induce investment in the coal industry of Appalachia. Indeed, the coal operators of the area and the railroads serving it have made a dramatic proposal to President Johnson on this very subject.

They propose to invest $1.5 billion in the Appalachian region. However, this proposal is contingent upon the adoption of a reasonable oil import policy.

This is dramatic proof of the harm that has come to coal areas because of the importation of residual fuel oil. For here we see American industry willing and able to make an investment in a depressed area. Here is a great part of the answer to the problems besetting the Appalachian area, problems which must finally come to the question of jobs.

But the one contingency, the one drawback that prevents this boon to the area is the fear of residual fuel oil importation.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

We need no further evidence. Usually, if a company or group of companies offered to spend $1.5 billion in the Appalachian region, a great cry of relief would go up from all of the populace. If the Federal Government succeeds in passing its Appalachian program and spends millions of dollars of Federal money in this area, we shall count ourselves lucky. Yet, we have a concrete proposal from leading businessmen in the area to spend $1.5 billion of their own money in our region. We have the promise of jobs and income security. We have a proposal that will use a natural resource of the region and which will employ the labor force at a job for which they are uniquely suited.

All that we ask in protection from the flood of a cheap foreign product which threatens to engulf us. We ask: Is this not a reasonable request?

As we have said, in essence we do not ask for favored treatment. We do not ask for subsidy or for market guarantee.

We are a proud people, we coal miners. We are used to looking out for our own and taking care of the problems that arise in our own way. We have made a contribution to the Nation, a contribution that cannot be measured solely in terms of dollars and cents. We believe in our system of government and in the free enterprise economy. We feel that our record in the past substantiates this belief.

THE RIGHT TO COMPETE

However, we do believe that we can request help and protection. We do feel that we can ask, yes, demand the right to compete on a fair basis for the energy market of our Nation.

It is beyond our comprehension to see the energy market of the east coast, a market where we traditionally were strong, being given to a foreign fuel, to a waste fuel, while coal miners go hungry and in want. It is a tragedy to see the abandoned tipples and the squalid homes in Appalachia, when we know that our soil holds millions and millions of tons of the finest fuel in the world.

So it is that we seek fairness and equity. The time is long overdue that such should be granted to us. The Nation must decide once and for all whether or not it will protect its own industry against the inroads of foreign products. The Nation and the Government must determine if the Appalachian program is a sham or whether or not the promises for the great society do in fact hold hope to those who now live without hope.

Our struggle will continue until we can once again see the coalfields as centers of prosperity and the future bright for coal miners and their families.

John Amos, West Virginia Transportation Expert, Business Leader, Public Servant, Named President of American Trucking Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, more than ever before America is a nation on wheels. Our economy is geared to rapid transportation of both passengers and commodities within our borders and to other nations of the world. Without the vast capabilities of the transport industries we could not hope to build increased prosperity, reduce unemployment levels, or raise living standards for those who live on the fringes of deprivation.

Transportation has been a key to our growth. In 1963, we expanded a total of $116.5 billion to buy the tires, haul the cargo, move the passengers, and do the myriad other jobs involved in overall transportation in the United States. And we continue to grow. The 1963 figure represented an increase of 5.4 percent over the outlay for the previous 12 months.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege to forge firm friendships with a number of the men who have exercised meaningful leadership in strengthening America and its transportation system. They are citizens of conscience and purpose who are dedicated to the best interests of the public. Among the most respected and effective of these is a West Virginian, John Amos, who has long been influential in the growth of the trucking industry. As a lawyer, public servant, business executive, and gentleman farmer, John Amos has been a credit to the very finest traditions of the Mountain State.

In 1946, after meeting success in the legal profession and in the political arena, our friend bought an interest in a small West Virginia trucking firm. Today, Bell Lines, Inc., is a vital and expanding element in our transportation network. The success of the company has been due in considerable measure to the energy and astuteness of Mr. Amos, who is the president of the firm.

During his career, John Amos served 12 years in the West Virginia House of Delegates, with three terms as speaker of the house. Later, he was elected to the West Virginia State Senate for 8 years, and served as majority leader. On two occasions he has been elected Democratic National Committeeman for West Virginia.

Latest in the honors which have come to John Amos is his selection as president of the American Trucking Association, a post which will demand most of his time and toil for the coming 12 months. He will travel throughout the Nation speaking to thousands of our citizens on the importance of maintaining and improving our transportation system. A.T.A. members could not have selected a more able representative or a more effective spokesman.

Mr. President, in the Business on Wheels magazine, volume 13, No. 3, published by the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., there appeared a concisely written article on John Amos and his fine family. The author, Bob Sievers, has woven a wealth of information into a brief and yet interesting story entitled: "Top Hand on the A.T.A. Range." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed.

[From the magazine Business on Wheels, vol. 13, No. 3]

TOP HAND ON THE A.T.A. RANGE

(By Bob Sievers)

Whenever he can spare the time from his wide-range businesses, John Amos likes nothing better than to head for his farm and help care for his saddle horses and cattle. During the next year, however, he'll be riding a range of a different sort. For as president of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., he'll be off at a gallop across the trucking industry's border-to-border coast-to-coast rangeland.

Holding such leadership reins will be no new experience for Amos. He's been in the driver's seat of so many businesses and organizations that one colleague was prompted to observe that "John must have been born with a Wall Street Journal in one hand and a mahogany gavel in the other."

Even so, he has recently been devoting the major portion of his time and talents to the operation of Bell Lines, Inc., where he works behind a door marked "President." Headquartered in Charleston, W. Va., this general commodities common carrier operates in West Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Tennessee, and the Carolinas.

Trucking, however, is only one of the latest in a succession of careers successfully pursued by Amos in the last three decades. He started out in the distant field of law. Shortly after receiving his degree from the Law School of West Virginia University in 1929, he began practicing law. His present partner is W. T. Brotherton, Jr., in the firm of Amos and Brotherton.

As his general law practice prospered, Amos frequently handled cases dealing with the Interstate Commerce Commission and appearances before the West Virginia Public Service Commission. It was through such cases that he was introduced to the realm of trucking.

"One day while I was appearing before the West Virginia Public Service Commission," says Amos, "I heard a rumor that Bell Lines was for sale." For sale it was, and on June 1, 1946, John Amos met with four others—Fred Sclavi, Betty Winterholler, A. J. Stifel, and E. J. Flaccus—to sign the papers making them trucking company owners.

With Amos and his associates tugging at the Bell rope, the company has undergone a resounding transformation. During his first year at its helm, the company fielded 25 to 30 pieces of equipment and grossed about $350,000. Presently, Bell Lines boasts more than 900 pieces of equipment, and Amos estimates this year's gross will be close to a rafter-ringing $12½ million.

The still-growing carrier was actually born in the late twenties as the "Mountain Truckers," hauling finished tobacco products from Virginia and North Carolina, and general commodities on the return trips south. The company name was changed to Bell Lines shortly before Amos and associates made their big purchase. But even then, tobacco was almost the line's most important means of support.

"As a result of an ICC ruling in the 1950's, increasing truck rates for the hauling of tobacco and tobacco products," says Amos, "trucklines lost about 95 percent of their tobacco hauling contracts."

Today, a quick look into a few of Bell Lines big yellow trailers yields convincing proof that the company's hauling policies have undergone a complete metamorphosis. "Now we carry everything from light bulbs to lawnmowers," says Amos. "Tobacco products are still a major cargo, of course, but we are no longer dependent on them for survival."

Of the original Bell Lines purchasers, three are still with the company. Amos, Sclavi, and Miss Winterholler signed on as equal partners in 1952 after buying the Stifel and Flaccus interests. Sclavi is vice president and general manager, and Miss Winterholler is company secretary and comptroller.

Even a partial enumeration of Amos' extracurricular careers reads like a stock exchange listing. He is president of two real estate holding companies—West Virginia Terminals, Inc., and North Carolina Terminals, Inc. He is partner of the Conner and Amos Nursery, located about 20 miles east of Parkersburg, W. Va. He is a director of the Vulcan Materials Co., of Birmingham, Ala., a leading supplier of gravel, slag, and aggregates in 12 Southern and Midwestern States. And he is a director of the American Electric Power Co.

Like so many successful lawyers, John Amos has had a distinguished career in politics. He served six 2-year terms in the West Virginia House of Delegates representing Charleston's Kanawha County between 1935 and 1949. During his last three terms, his inherent leadership qualities won him the responsibility of serving as speaker of the house.

From the house of delegates, Amos moved up to the State senate for two 4-year terms. While there, as senator from the eighth district, he was named chairman of the senate committee on the judiciary and later became the senate majority leader.

The next natural step upward in Amos' political career came some 5 years ago when he was elected Democratic National Committeeman. He was again named to that post in 1960, this time for a 4-year term. Earlier this year he attended his third National Democratic Convention.

"After this term as committeeman," says Amos, "I think I'm going to call it quits as far as politics is concerned. I just don't seem to have enough time to do the things I want to do any more."

Foremost on this list of "most-wanted-things-to-do" is spending more time on his farm in Monroe County some 20 miles south of White Sulphur Springs. "My wife, Edie, and I both think the world of the place," says Amos. "And our two children, Mary and John, share our love for it."

Amos has about 100 head of registered Black Angus cattle on this 250 acres of crop and rangeland, and just recently began raising thoroughbred horses. But the real pride and joy of the Amos stables is a huge black Percheron stallion. "There aren't many of them in the country any more," says Amos. "We like him because he's such a magnificent animal."

In addition to being a gentleman farmer, cattleman, and horse raiser, Amos is also an avid sportsman. He rates tromping through the fields of West Virginia hunting for grouse and quail high on his list of hobbies.

As Amos knew last year when he accepted the ATA's first vice presidency, all such pursuits and business endeavors will have to put aside for the next 12 months while he de-

votes most of every working and waking hour to performing the duties of president.

In this role, his long record of service in both State and National trucking association work will serve him well. In 1946 he became fourth vice president of the West Virginia Motor Truck Association and chairman of its size and weight committee. He subsequently served as ATA vice president for West Virginia during two periods—1948 through 1950 and 1955 through 1961. The big step toward the ATA presidency was made in 1962 with his election as second vice president.

Now the that the time has come, John Amos is ready. "I know I'm going to see a lot of this country before the year is out," he says. "And why so many people are going to want to sit and listen to me speak, I'll never know. But I'm going to do it, and I'm going to try and do as good a job as has been done by the men who preceded me as president."

Looking at the way Amos has handled things in the past, there's not much doubt that it will be an exceptionally good job. For as they say in politics, "the record speaks for itself."

The 1965 Legislative Program—National Postal Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the National Postal Union, representing many thousands of Federal workers, is among the leading postal employee groups responsible for bringing to the attention of Congress the need for corrective and/or beneficial legislation relating to postal operations, and so forth. Recently I had an opportunity to discuss this union's legislative program for 1965 with its president, Mr. Sidney A. Goodman, and the secretary-treasurer, Mr. David Silvergleid.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include below the provisions of this program so that all Members of the House may have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with it:

THE 1965 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—NATIONAL POSTAL UNION

SALARY

The current administration introduced the principle of "comparability" between salaries of Post Office and "outside" employees in "comparable" jobs. (Public Law 87-793, effective October 13, 1962.) In addition, it is committed to increases for employees whenever the cost of living (COL) rises by 3 percent.

No increase has yet been granted under this provision, although "outside" wages have continued to move up based on figures issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. These showed an increase of 2.8 percent in the COL as of February 19, 1964, 2.9 percent as of September 1964, and this will undoubtedly have reached 3 percent by the time the 89th Congress convenes. This makes no allowance for the fact that the rise in the COL for postal employees is substantially larger in fact, because of the type of index utilized by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Bureau of Labor Statistics reports invariably lag considerably behind the actual COL. Further, all past experience indicates that some time must elapse in a new Congress before salary legislation can be enacted. Thus, there is little doubt but that postal employees will be at least 4 percent behind the COL before any relief can be obtained.

We ask at least a 4-percent upward adjustment of all salaries under the current Postal Field Schedule (Public Law 88-426) as a minimum of economic justice.

DULSKI ADMENDMENTS

In addition, we ask that a major inequity of Public Law 87-793, the failure to credit all past service in setting salary steps, be corrected.

RETIREMENT

Thirty years ago, annuities received by postal employees constituted a major factor in attracting and retaining desirable personnel. Today, with the advent of social security and the development of numerous and comparable "outside" retirement plans, paid for entirely by employers, existing postal annuities can no longer be considered the positive factor it once was. Government, if it is to compete in the labor market, must again restore the retirement system to the favorable position it once held.

We urge that the retirement system be liberalized to provide:

1. Optional, full retirement based on 25 years of service, regardless of age.
2. Elimination of all deductions required to provide for widows and dependents.
3. Revision of current retirement formula to provide a formula based on 2½ percent of the highest 1 year of service multiplied by the number of years of service, not to exceed 100 percent of salary.
4. Tax exemption of all annuities.
5. We oppose any attempt to merge our present retirement system with social security, or any increase in the present 6½-percent deduction from an employee's basic salary.
6. Extension of benefits to all annuitants.

ELIMINATION OF SUBSTITUTE CATEGORY

There are approximately 85,000 career substitutes who are truly the most exploited of employees. They are frequently required to work in excess of 8 hours per day and/or 40 hours per week, all at straight time. The Walsh-Healey Act, passed almost 30 years ago, made it illegal for "outside" employers to engage in such practices, and the Davis-Bacon Act specifically prohibits this cheap labor device for any employers involved in a Government contract.

The Government's continued use of this sweatshop practice in 1964 is a national disgrace. It is an indefensible practice which demeans employees, denies them simple economic justice, and is unworthy of the U.S. Government.

We ask legislation to assure payment of overtime rates for all postal employees for work in excess of 8 hours a day, and/or 40 hours per week.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION SOUGHT

Hospital plan premiums

Government contributions under the Health Benefit Act of 1959 were relatively small in the first place and have never been increased, despite an average 5-percent annual increase in hospital costs. This has meant sharply increased costs to employees in order to retain essential coverage.

We ask that the Government, just as in the case of comparable outside employers, cover the entire cost of hospitalization.

Shorter workweek

A 35-hour workweek has become commonplace, and we urge this as overdue for all postal employees and as an aid to reduce unemployment.

Premium pay for Saturday, Sunday, and/or holidays

Regular postal employees are frequently forced to work Saturday, Sunday, and holidays, receiving "compensatory" time back in lieu of overtime. We ask payment of time and one-half for Saturdays, and double time for Sundays or holidays, long since standard practice "outside."

Work measurement system

Much has already been spoken and written on this subject. We ask complete elimination of this odious speedup which has created its own gigantic, wasteful paper bureaucracy.

Whitten amendment

This limits the number of career postal employees to 110 percent of the number in 1950. It is hopelessly outmoded, and has led to the appointment of approximately 55,000 additional "temporary" substitute employees and caused confusion, instability, injustice, and waste. We ask repeal of the Whitten amendment in its entirety.

Merit promotion

Present promotion procedures are wholly inadequate and completely subject to administrative whims. We ask open, competitive examinations, published lists of eligibles, and full credit for seniority, all by law.

Hatch Act

Government employees should be protected against being compelled to support any particular candidate or party. The time has come, however, to relieve them of second-class citizenship and hypocrisy with respect to normal political activity, and we seek appropriate amendments.

Executive Order 10988

The right of agencies to retain their "mission" is being used to buttress age-old "prerogatives" and to prevent the development of proper personnel-management relations.

We urge that postal and Federal employees be given full collective bargaining rights to cover all working conditions other than those specifically fixed by law, such as salary, leave, retirement, etc.

Uniform Allowance Act

Mail handlers are the only major category of postal employees without any clothing allowance whatsoever. We urge amendments to the Uniform Allowance Act to assure them an allowance for "shoes with built-in safety toes," as is provided for other categories of postal employees. We also urge a work clothing allowance for them and certain maintenance and motor vehicle employees, as a matter of safety, morale, and equity.

Curtailment of service

In April 1964, delivery of parcel post was reduced from 6 to 5 days per week. Simultaneously, window service on Saturdays was set at a maximum of 4 hours. This was in addition to closing all windows at 6 p.m. weekdays, including offices which had previously provided 24-hour service. There has been only some restoration of previous service, and we request that all previous service be restored.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

NATIONAL POSTAL UNION—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—HEALTH BENEFITS ACT

May I take the liberty of addressing you as a distinguished Member of Congress, with respect to urgently needed amendments to Public Law 86-382, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act, enacted in 1959.

This is the largest voluntary health benefits program in existence, covering 6 million employees and their dependents. There are approximately 40 plans participating in the program. National Postal Union's Health Benefit Plan, with 44,000 members, is the third largest among the employee organization plans, and the fifth largest participant in the program.

As administered by the Civil Service Commission, the Government's contribution is

based on 50 percent of the lowest rates charged by a Government-wide carrier (Blue Cross or Aetna) for their low option plan. A further stipulation, however, is that such contributions are not to be less than $1.25 or more than $1.75 biweekly for an employee or annuitant who is enrolled for self-only coverage, and not less than $3 or more than $4.25 biweekly for an employee or annuitant who is enrolled for self and family. Since the inception of the act, and currently, the Government has been contributing $1.30 biweekly for self-only enrollments and $3.12 biweekly for self and family enrollments.

The average annual cost per person for health care services has been increasing steadily for many years, both because of increases in the cost of individual services and because an increasing volume of such services is being used. Since the act came into being, increases in hospital costs have averaged 5 percent per year, and as of this date, every single carrier has been compelled to increase premiums for essentially the same benefits at least once, and in some cases, two and three times. Thus, the net practical effect has been to increase costs sharply for our enrollees in order for them to maintain essential coverage.

We believe the Government has an obligation to set an example as an employer, rather than to lag behind "outside" employers who, in general, have been assuming the entire cost of comparable hospitalization for their employees, more and more. We believe that the Government should contribute the entire cost of basic hospital benefits; such as, a reasonable number of days in the hospital, reasonable medical and surgical fees, and the same for outpatient services, such as, laboratory, X-ray, and first aid benefits, with the individual subscriber being covered for supplementary benefits by a plan of his choice. An informed estimate of the required Government contribution for this purpose would be $2.50 biweekly for self-only enrollment, and $5 biweekly for self and family enrollment.

With reference to the increasing cost of hospitalization, I would respect fully and strongly suggest that an educational program for carriers and subscribers might well be initiated by the Government in the intests of all concerned, as a first step in combating the trend of rising medical costs. In this connection, it is impossible for any carrier to attempt to initiate such a program, since it could be considered in violation of Civil Service Commission regulations prohibiting "solicitation." These regulations are so stringent that any carrier can find itself in serious difficulty if it even so much as mentions its hospital plans in writing with respect to premium and rate structure, rising costs, etc., which could be interpreted as "touting" a particular plan. Because of this, in our opinion, Federal employees are being denied, in practice, their right to essential information to enable them to make the free and informed choice that the Civil Service Commission presumably espouses.

Accordingly, I request your aid in obtaining passage of legislation to increase Government contributions, lessening the burden on enrollees in particular as well as easing unreasonable restrictions on advertising, presently in effect. We would be more than happy to submit an outline for a suitable bill.

I realize that this is only a brief outline of a vast and involved subject. Nevertheless, I hope it has provided a frame of reference for your favorable consideration of a vital issue of grave concern to millions of enrollees. May I assure you of our desire and willingness to provide all necessary statistical data, factual information, and pertinent background, concerning all aspects of the subject we have raised. In this connection, we would appreciate an opportunity to discuss this matter with you, at your earliest convenience, prior to the opening of the 89th Congress.

NATIONAL POSTAL UNION POSITION ON WORK MEASUREMENT SYSTEM

Beginning in 1958, postal employees—distribution clerks in partcicular—had a so-called "work performance standard" summarily imposed on them. Although the Department repeatedly contended that this was not an individual work measurement system, it blossomed forth, full grown, into what is known now as the "Work Measurement System," which measures production on an individual basis rather than on the earlier group basis. From a union point of view, never have so few imposed so much on so many with so little regard for those affected. The net effect has been a speed-up which imposes a severe strain on employees who are forced to meet individual production quotas unilaterally established by management. The entire system attempts to mechanically ape the assembly line technique which, however applicable to mass production outside, is totally unsuited to the irregular volume and rate of receipt of mail. The increased production, taken out of the hides of the employees, is completely dissipated in the redtape and paper work which mushroomed as a part of WMS, and whose retention now constitutes a vested interest. There is no net gain to the public. We fully agree with the goal of attaining the highest possible rate of efficiency, but any efficiency under WMS is wholly at the disproportionate expense of the health and morale of employees.

We wish to urge the complete elimination of the Work Measurement System, as an unfair, odious speed-up, unworthy of the U.S. Government as an employer, and totally inappropriate as regards true efficiency.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Wyoming's Diamond Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on the 10th day of July in the year 1890, Wyoming became the 44th member of the United States. Since that day, Wyoming has risen to prominence, not only as a great hunting, fishing, and tourist State, but as a State with the courage to pioneer women's suffrage and to maintain balanced budgets and fiscal integrity, even in this age of calculated governmental deficits.

Throughout 1965, the Equality State will celebrate its 75th anniversary. Wyomingites and guests from every State will observe the Diamond Jubilee at literally hundreds of events throughout Wyoming.

Many of the events of Wyoming's Diamond Jubilee are outlined in a comprehensive feature story from the January 3 issue of the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article, together with my remarks, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YEARLONG CELEBRATION WILL MARK STATE 75TH ANNIVERSARY

Visitors to big Wyoming in 1965 will find a big bonus as the State will be the scene of a yearlong celebration. Wyoming is celebrating its 75th anniversary of statehood. Residents and visitors alike will observe the Diamond Jubilee at literally hundreds of events throughout the State.

The theme of the celebration—Historical Wyoming—will be carried out in five major pageants and scores of smaller events across the State. The major programs which call attention to particular segments of Wyoming history and legend are: the Green River Rendezvous, the Legend of the Rawhide, the All American Indian Days, the Gift of the Waters Pageant, and a special historical pageant at the Wyoming State Fair.

The Green River Rendezvous is a commemoration and a living memorial to the mountain men and the fur trade which played an important role in Wyoming history. The rendezvous is presented outdoors at a special arena with hundreds of items; people, horses, mules, wagons, pack strings, and tepees. A fast-moving program brings to life the epoch of the rendezvous. It is presented annually on the second Sunday in July by the Sublette County Historical Society in Pinedale, Wyo.

Thermopolis, Wyo., located at the southern end of the Big Horn Basin on U.S. Highway 20 and Wyoming State Highway 789, is known internationally as the home of the world's largest hot springs. These warm water springs produce 18,600,000 gallons of mineral water at 135° every 24 hours. The springs are visited the year round by thousands of people from all over the world. The State park where the springs are located is the scene of the annual Gift of the Waters Pageant.

Each summer Indians from the nearby Wind River Indian Reservation and citizens from the town of Thermopolis present a pageant depicting the actual gift of the waters to the people by the famed leader of the Shoshone Indians, Chief Washakie. The pageant is held in a natural amphitheater at the State park in Thermopolis. This year the unique and colorful ceremony will be held on Sunday, August 1.

A unique blending of Indian heritage with modern-day activities is shown each year at the All-American Indian Days celebration in Sheridan, Wyo. As many as 70 Indian tribes are represented when they gather to present age-old ceremonies, dances, arts and crafts expositions, and authentic Indian games.

The annual Miss Indian American contest is the highlight of All-American Indian Days. Indian girls from some 70 tribes compete for the title. Judging is based not only on beauty, but poise, Indian characteristics, scholastic ability, and dedication to the advancement of their own people. This year's Miss Indian America is Michelle Ann Portwood, of Riverton, Wyo., an Arapahoe Indian girl, who also serves as queen of Wyoming's Diamond Jubilee. All-American Indian Days will be held on July 30, 31, and August 1, in Sheridan, Wyo.

The Legend of the Rawhide is presented in a gigantic pageant by the residents of Lusk, Wyo. The pageant depicts an episode involving a small band of "Forty-Niners" in a wagon train who have wrongly killed an Indian girl. The subsequent fight and method of Indian justice gives an unique and authentic insight to life on Wyoming's historic trail country. There are 150 members in the cast; 12 to 15 covered wagons; a representation of a detachment of U.S. Cavalry in full uniform; 150 head of horses; an ox team; and a band of Indians dressed as they lived on the plains over a hundred years ago. The Legend of the Rawhide will be held in Lusk on August 14 and 15.

The Wyoming State Fair will be officially opened on August 23, in Douglas, Wyo., with the arrival of a wagon train from Newcastle, Wyo. The wagon train will leave Newcastle 4 or 5 days before the fair and will schedule overnight stops at designated campsites where tourists and residents from adjacent communities will be invited to attend square dancing, basket dinners and old fashioned western fun each evening.

The Wyoming State Fair will be held on August 23 through 29, and will feature many extra activities of the 75th anniversary. A colorful historical pageant—in which all 23 Wyoming counties will participate—is scheduled for Sunday, August 29. The counties will stage separate skits showing outstanding historical events of their areas. In addition, several rodeo performances, parades, exhibits, stage shows, and fine arts concerts will be held in conjunction with the 75th celebration during the State fair.

Perhaps the most ambitious events of the Diamond Jubilee year is the "Pack Train Race Over the Top of the World." This race will be between two teams of "Mountain Men" of Fremont and Sublette Counties in Wyoming. The race will see picked teams of buckskin-clad, fur-capped, bewhiskered men from the "Wind River Mountain Men" of Fremont County start from Lander, Wyo., at the exact time a similar team from the "Trappers Corp" of the Green River Rendezvous in Pinedale, Wyo., starts for a 50-mile trek over the Continental Divide.

The two teams will ride over the divide, cross it at approximately 11,000 feet, and proceed toward each other's town. Both teams will be required to stop by sundown and make 1 night's camp in Wyoming's most rugged wilderness, the Wind River Mountain Range. The first team to cross the other's starting line in either Lander or Pinedale will be declared winner. Both teams will be guests of honor at a grand "Trapper's Rendezvous Ball" which will be held in Lander and Pinedale. The race will start July 24 in Pinedale and Lander.

Visitors to Wyoming will find a rodeo every day during the summer months in Wyoming. Indian dances will be held nightly during the summer in Cody and Lander.

The national intercollegiate rodeo will be held in Laramie on July 6–10, 1965. World famous "Cheyenne Frontier Days" will be held July 24 through August 1.

Organized as a territory in 1868, Wyoming became the 44th State to join the Union, on July 10, 1890. Special commemorative services will be held in Cheyenne at the State capitol on July 10, calling attention to Wyoming's frontier past.

Visitors to Wyoming this year will find that history is only a handshake away. Complete information about Wyoming's 75th anniversary events and activities and other vacation possibilities in the State may be obtained by writing the Wyoming Travel Commission, 2320 Capitol Avenue, Cheyenne, Wyo., 82001.

The State of the Union—Soviet, That Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, when Stalin, the tyrant, died the Russians wept. But no one shed a tear and many smirked when Khrushchev, the "liberal," was tossed on to the "dunghill of history." It is also interesting to note that the Chinese are insisting upon the rehabilitation of the image of Stalin. They have even demanded that Stalin's remains should be restored to the Lenin mausoleum.

Brezhnev and Kosygin are, to all appearances, still balancing precariously on a tightrope. The climax of their act, when it comes, may not call for applause from the West. There are indications that the trend will be toward a restoration of Stalinism without its domestic excesses.

It is obvious, at present, there is no leader or supreme ruler of the Soviet Union. An excellent editorial in the December 6, 1964, Peoria Journal Star points out there is a form of collective leadership balancing insecurely on a razor's edge. The editorial quotes Dr. Nicholas Nyaradi, director of international studies at Bradley University, who is personally acquainted with Kosygin and Brezhnev and obviously well informed.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial at this point:

NYARADI: UNITED STATES MUST BE REALISTIC

Will the real Russian leaders please stand up?

No, not you Brezhnev and Kosygin. Over there, Shelepin and Semichasnov, it may be you—you have secret police credentials, and that organization seems to be in the Russian saddle now.

We asked an expert on Russian affairs to assess the meaning of the Soviet changeover, and he said, "To tell the truth, the real Russian leaders haven't come out in the open yet."

Dr. Nicholas Nyaradi, director of the school of international studies at Bradley and former Hungarian finance minister, said it isn't Kosygin and Brezhnev, both of whom he knows personally.

"Kosygin is a very fine banker and finance man, but a political leader he is not. He and Brezhnev are just front men till the fight is over.

"The Soviet struggle for power is like six men fighting under the rug. Not only can't you tell who is going to win, you don't even know who is fighting," he points out.

The two new figureheads were installed quickly. Dr. Nyaradi says, because of the "king sized inferiority complex the Soviets have about the machinery of succession of leaders." They don't have any succession without a fight, as illustrated by Lenin and Stalin's succession struggles.

The KGB, the Soviet secret police, are the most significant factor in the change in the Russian power structure, the former Hungarian leader says.

"Khrushchev managed to push the secret police back. He had Beria liquidated and he managed to play the army against the secret police. The army was on the upward move.

"But today not a single army officer holds a high position, and two secret police officers are very high in power. Shelepin, who is in his late forties, the former KGB chief, was elected to the powerful 14-man Soviet Presidium. Semichasnov, his KGB successor, is a member of the party's Central Committee.

"It looks to me as if a crisis has developed in Soviet affairs. A change in Red policy is obvious, although their diplomats say their leaders will follow the existing philosophy. But we don't even known who the real Soviet leaders are.

"The Russian dictatorship is in trouble, and there is nothing more dangerous than a dictatorship that is in trouble. Then the leader starts trying to divert his own people by pointing to international dangers.

"We don't know who the real Russian leaders are—but we can bet the secret police will play an important role in 'electing' the new dictator," he says.

Our policy toward Russia, in Dr. Nyaradi's opinion, should be more realistic.

"We should look at Russia as she is, not envisioning her as the way we wish she was. We should be realistic.

"We should recognize the fact that Russia does not change her goals, only her methods. This is shown once again in the Khrushchev liquidation.

"They say Khrushchev is living nicely with a thousand a month to spend and a chauffer-driven car, but nobody has seen him.

"Delegations of the two most powerful Communist parties in Europe went to Russia to see Khrushchev to find out if he was all right. But they had to return home without seeing him. They had to be satisfied with a Russian leader assuring them that Khrushchev was all right," he says.

He wants the Johnson administration to let Americans know that we can't have peaceful coexistence.

The matter of promoting the rift between Russia and China he looks on with a skeptical eye.

"Certainly our sending wheat to Russia was a step in the direction of driving a wedge between the two Communist powers.

"But if they patch up their differences, then Khrushchev was sacrificed on the altar of Communist unity. And if they have patched it up, there'll be a Communist bloc 1 billion strong breathing down our neck."

He doesn't see how we can win with a rift policy either way.

"If we help Russia and take her side against China, then we become involved in a nuclear war in Asia. Is that any better than any other kind of nuclear war?" And if Russia won, we'd just have Soviet communism in China instead of the present brand.

A solution Nyaradi favors is for the United States to withdraw to the sidelines and watch with great interest how the Russian Bear and the Chinese Dragon tear each other apart.

He worries about the nuclear test ban.

"When I traveled in Europe recently, diplomats there told me they suspected that the Chinese atomic bomb was really more sophisticated than that nation could produce. They believe Russian scientists, Russian financial aid, and Russian know-how must have been involved. So if Russia is circumventing the test ban by tests in China, we're in for trouble."

In short, he says, we must adopt the old Roman adage, "Videant Consules," always watchful—and always be realistic in our watching.

Improved Management Practices for Small Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it is common knowledge that the stumbling block more small businessmen trip over than any other is poor management. While it is true that all business concerns, regardless of size, can exercise poor management judgment, most large corporations have the resources to overcome occasional mistakes. But the small firm, often in a shaky condition to begin with,

simply cannot afford even one serious management miscue.

That is why any effort made to help small businessmen improve the quality of their management practices should be supported and encouraged. In this connection, the Small Business Administration has done yeoman's service. Thousands of owners and managers of small firms have benefited from management conferences, courses, and seminars cosponsored by the agency and various educational institutions throughout the country.

The most recent effort of the SBA to help small businesmen become better managers is known as SCORE, or the Service Corps of Retired Executives. Briefly, this is a program whereby retired business executives volunteer to make available to small businesmen with management problems the wisdom they have acquired in a lifetime of business experience.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published on page 1 of the Wall Street Journal of January 4, 1965, describing the success of the SCORE program, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETIRED EXECUTIVES ADVISE SMALL FIRMS IN NEW U.S. PROGRAM—FORMER BANK VICE PRESIDENT ASSISTS PLUMBER; SOME 2,000 OFFER HELP THROUGH SCORE

(By Elliot Carlson)

PHILADELPHIA.—Herbert B. Morrone is an industrious and aggressive businesman. Still, he was having trouble finding enough customers for the one-man tool and die business he started here about a year ago.

Clearly, Mr. Morrone needed help. And a few months ago he got some, from Lawrence Katz, a semiretired Philadelphia executive. The 51-year-old Mr. Katz, former president of a textile machine company, suggested possible new customers for Mr. Morrone's highly specialized service and recommended a few minor changes in equipment so he could supply parts for producers of electrical and hosiery goods.

Mr. Katz' advice, which already is bringing some benefits to Mr. Morrone's business, was made possible by a novel program sponsored by the Small Business Administration. Called SCORE, for Service Corps of Retired Executives, the program was launched last October in 68 cities following 3-month pilot efforts in Boston and Washington. It's designed to make available to small businesses managerial skills and experience they couldn't otherwise afford.

"The program will have the effect of channeling a vast untapped reservoir of unused talent to points where it will be most effective," says Edward N. Rosa, SBA director for the Philadelphia region.

FREE AT FIRST

The Federal agency itself spends almost nothing on the program, except the time required to recruit retired executives and match them up with small businessmen. A retired adviser receives no pay for 90 days. After that, he and the small businessman may work out their own agreement for pay, if they wish to maintain their arrangement. SCORE advisers pledge not to accept commissions for recommending supplies or services and cannot simultaneously assist competing clients.

Recruiting through newspapers and other sources, the SBA has lined up more than 2,000 volunteers and is looking for more. Their caliber, says T. Stanley Gallagher, chief of the management assistance division for the agency's Philadelphia region is "quite high."

In Philadelphia, for example, the SBA has lined up a retired international banker to advise the owner of a small men's wear store on expansion plans; a retired bank vice president to counsel a plumber, and the retired president of a consumer products company to suggest ways a baker can boost his sales volume.

There are many reasons why retired executives volunteer for such service, but boredom and a desire to do something constructive are the most common. "Horseback in New Jersey in summer and bridge in Arizona aren't sufficient," says the retired founder of a chemical concern. A retired Washington, D.C., executive says: "I have plenty of time to offer and I just wanted to help the next fellow."

Most of the companies participating in the program so far have 25 or fewer employees and have obtained loans, either from the SBA itself or under the new antipoverty program. Participation in the program is voluntary; the SBA simply informs companies they are eligible to participate. In addition, some firms without Government loans have asked to be included in the program. "They are eligible as long as they have no more than 25 employees," says Mr. Gallagher of the management assistance division.

TOO EARLY TO TELL

It's still too early to tell, of course, how well the SCORE program will work out. Don Latella, vice president of the Association of Management Consultants cautions: "Just because a man was a good executive doesn't mean he will be a good consultant."

Nevertheless, Mr. Latella concedes, "there's a need" for such a program. Small businessmen, an SBA official points out, "take their businesses seriously but are unsophisticated in certain areas. They cannot be experts in bookkeeping, sales and inventory all at the same time."

SCORE is "necessary for people like myself whose business experience is limited in certain phases," says Edward L. Strickler, owner of Prudence and Strickler Originals, a custom maker of bathing suits, gowns, and other garments for women. Mr. Strickler, a self-taught craftsman who started his business 4 years ago, has lacked the necessary cash to build up an inventory broad enough to attract more customers.

He's been getting advice, thanks to SCORE, from Joel B. Davis, Jr., for 25 years a wholesale distributor of women's hosiery, Mr. Davis has been counseling Mr. Strickler on such matters as how much to spend for labor.

SCORE volunteers also can help small businessmen by putting them in touch with larger firms which can become important customers or suppliers. "Big businesses often are reluctant to deal with a small guy," says Mr. Morrone. "That's where the SCORE program could be helpful. The counselors have good connections and can open doors for you. It's hard for a guy like me to open those doors."

A Bill To Designate Agate Springs Fossil Quarries as a National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this 1st session of the 89th Congress, I introduced a bill (H.R. 500) to preserve and designate the Agate Springs fossil quarries—located in Sioux County, Nebr.—as a national monument in the National Park Service System.

In brief, the Agate Springs fossil beds are unique. The general sandhills area in which these fossil beds lie are of exceptional geological interest, scenic beauty, and solitude. Scientists feel that comparable fossil deposits have yet to be found that equal those at Agate Springs. This area may well contain the world's largest deposit of prehistoric animal remains, as estimates indicate that only about 25 percent of the beds have been explored after some 60 years of digging by scientists.

It was a fortunate accident of history that these fossil beds were first discovered by a man who had the imagination and understanding to see the tremendous importance of preserving them and investigating their scientific importance—Capt. James H. Cook, Indian scout, frontiersman, and later a well-known author. He soon acquired the property on which this discovery was made and brought it to the attention of leading paleontologists. His son, the late Dr. Harold J. Cook, not only maintained this family tradition but was himself a noted paleontologist and authority on fossils.

Since 1891, these deposits have been the object of repeated scientific explorations by a dozen leading institutions: Carnegie Institute, the American Museum of Natural History, the Chicago Natural History Museum, the Smithsonian Institution, the Colorado Museum of Natural History, Amherst College, the Universities of Nebraska, Chicago, Kansas, Michigan, Princeton, Yale, and many others. In other words, since their discovery, the quarries have been carefully preserved and safeguarded so as to be of maximum value from a scientific standpoint. Now, following Dr. Cook's death, it is proposed that the Nation take over the duty of preserving these deposits, making them available for the instruction of the public and for further scientific study.

The site of these fossil beds could conceivably attract some 50,000 visitors per year if the proposed project is carried out. The project would include almost 3,000 acres of land, construction of a visitor's center, an Indian artifacts museum, and development of a museum at the fossil quarries. Three stories could be told at the site: First, paleontology of the area dating back some 21 million years; second, pioneer ranching; and third, the Indian experiences of Capt. James Cook—Government Indian Scout, cattleman, author, and amateur bone collector, who purchased Agate Springs in 1887.

The National Park Service feels that these fossil beds should be preserved for research and future generations. The area could be developed into a prime tourist attraction in addition to neighboring Scottsbluff National Monument, Chimney Rock, the Black Hills, and so forth.

As presently proposed, the cost of the project is estimated to be $1,750,000, including the acquisition of the land, construction of a visitors' center, an Indian artifacts museum, development of a

museum at the quarries, and the paving of roads to the fossil sites.

I believe that this is a worthwhile project, as it is our duty to protect these fossil deposits for additional research and posterity. This is the major purpose of my bill.

Editorial Tributes to Brig. Gen. William S. Rader and Maj. Huly E. Bray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I call attention to the departure from Fort Warren Air Force Base, in Wyoming, of two Air Force officers whose service with the Nation's biggest missile complex has been exemplary from a military viewpoint, as well as in public relations with the people of my State.

Being transferred from Fort Warren, this month, are Brig. Gen. William S. Rader, ranking officer and commander of the 13th Strategic Missile Division, and Maj. Huly E. Bray, Fort Warren's director of information.

The extremely friendly and mutually profitable relationships between Wyoming's capital city, Cheyenne, and the Air Force base are very much the result of General Rader's efforts and those of Major Bray.

These two officers were the subjects of tributes paid by the capital city's leading newspaper, the Wyoming State Tribune. These editorials, under dates of December 13 and 23, express the esteem in which General Rader and Major Bray are held by the community; and I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wyoming State Tribune of Dec. 13, 1964]

SUBJECT: "COMMENDATION"

For most communities where military establishments are located, post commanders and other ranking personnel come and go with astonishing frequency. Some of them make impressive marks on the places where they live and work; for others, it is pure routine.

As the site of one of the oldest such establishments in the Nation, now nearing its 100th year first as a frontier Army post to fight off Indians and more recently as the hub of the country's biggest missle complex, Warren Air Force Base here in Cheyenne has seen many military people come and go. In the early days things were a little too raw for such a policy as community relations; people like Gen. J. J. Reynolds and Gen. George Crook were too occupied with campaigning against the Sioux and Cheyennes to bother much with the local people.

But for a good many years the post personnel and the townspeople have lived and worked well together and much of it, particularly since the turn of the century, has been due to excellent relations fostered through the ranking commander at Fort Russell and later Warren AFB.

In the opinion of many people, however, there probably has been none the equal, or anyway the superior, of the individual who currently occupies this role, and who shortly shall leave here after 5½ years of duty at Warren.

If we may proceed out of channels, Brig. Gen. William S. Rader deserves a civilian commendation from the citizen of Cheyenne among whom he has lived for—as military assignments go—a considerable period of time.

During his residence among us, General Rader has made a multitude of friends and has come to be universally admired by the residents of this community. Much of this stems from the fact that he has demonstrated a unique and superior capacity for maintenance of excellent relations between the base people and the civilian populace of the city. But a great deal of it stems also from his own great character and outstanding personality.

A man who has been around our town for a good many years and has seen many a commander come and go from first Fort Reynolds, then Warren AFB, described General Rader as the greatest such individual ever seen there by either the Army or the Air Force.

Aside from his own fine record as a member of the community and in the development of a strong rapport between the civilian and the military, General Rader has fulfilled admirably his basic mission as an Air Force commander. He now has completed his job that began in mid-1959: That of developing a great missile complex, thus the purpose of his assignment is complete. It is enough to say that we shall all regret to see him go.

At age 50, however, General Rader still has years before him in the service. While he has many opportunities in the future, so does this country, in the full and complete utilization of the abilities of such dedicated career military men. It is our fond hope that the fullest advantage will be made of this outstanding potential.

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, Dec. 23, 1964]

MAJOR BRAY'S GOOD WORK

This newspaper already has paid its respects to Brig. Gen. William S. Rader who will depart Warren Air Force Base next month after 5½ years as its ranking officer and commander of the 13th Strategic Missile Division.

In so doing, we noted that among his outstanding achievements was the maintenance during his tour of duty here of excellent relationships between the base personnel and the civilian community.

A military command that exists side by side with a civilian community and in the very close fashion that prevails in this particular instance, does only as well as the abilities of its key officers may dictate.

One of the principal of these, if not the most important, is the director of information. He is the chief contact with all of the sources of information in the community to say nothing of the world at large, plus the local service organizations and all manner of groups through which the military command maintains its connections with the remainder of the particular civilian area concerned.

Rapid and adequate communications that establish a good liaison between the military unit and the immediate civilian populace in an area, such communication being consistent with the most reasonable of security, should be one of the most desirable goals of a commander in the fulfillment of his many-faceted role.

One of General Rader's key aides insofar as his role is concerned with community and public relations during his stay here, has been Maj. Huly E. Bray, who within a few days also will be leaving as Warren Air Force Base's director of information.

As the direct result of both of these officers, the military-civilian relationship here has been a very good one; and we would be remiss in not paying tribute to Major Bray in this role along with General Rader.

Proposed Closing of Olmsted Air Force Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, on January 5, members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation met to discuss the proposed closing of the Olmsted Air Force Base and the Middletown Air Materiel Area. Governor Scranton gave a splendid statement on the devastating effect which this move would have on the economy of the entire State, particularly the south central Pennsylvania area, but reaching up into Schuylkill County and even as far as Lackawanna and Luzerne Counties.

The Honorable John Taber, secretary of commerce of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, pointed out how this move would more than destroy all the accrued benefits of the efforts by the State and the Federal Government to improve the economy of Pennsylvania during the past few years.

Edward C. First, Jr., Esq., president of the Harrisburg Chamber of Commerce, gave statistics showing the exact impact on this particular section of the country. Gen. E. J. Stackpole, chairman of the Keystone Committee, filed a statement along similar lines. The Keystone Committee is a comprehensive committee covering most of the State of Pennsylvania in the efforts to retain the vital Olmsted Air Force Base at Middletown.

Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, dean of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation and chairman of the Pennsylvania congressional steering committee, presided. The meeting was closed with stirring statements by representatives of the labor organizations on behalf of the employees at Olmsted. These statements particularly emphasized the tragic personal problems that would arise as a result of the transfer of thousands of people from their present positions to distant points and different environments.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the fine statement made by Nathan T. Wolkomir, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees. At a later date, I plan to extend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement by Mr. John F. Friner, president of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO.

The statement follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY NATHAN T. WOLKOMIR, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, JANUARY 5, 1965, TO THE PENNSYLVANIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION ON OLMSTEAD AIR FORCE CLOSURE

Last night we heard the President of the United States deliver his state of the Union message to Congress. We heard him make such statements and proposals as the following:

1. "I will welcome recommendations and constructive efforts";

2. "A great society asks not 'How much?' but 'How good?'"

3. "I intend to remove regions of our country suffering from distress";

4. "There will be an all-out campaign against waste and to promote efficiency";

5. "I recommend full employment for every American citizen and will provide dignity for their later years";

6. "I recommend a Government 'modern in structure,' 'efficient in action,' and 'ready for any emergency.'"

The National Federation of Federal Employees sincerely hopes that these statements were not mere platitudes and aphorisms. We are all for uplifting the character of American life and in line with "constructive efforts" would like to discuss the nut and bolt effect of base closures by an analysis of a shopping list prepared by people concerned with the human element and not mere CPA figures and data. In order to be top-lofty in our concepts we should not forget that we are dealing with people. It is the honest man who reviews facts that he himself has established in the light of a consideration of those who disagree with the facts. "People" at Olmstead were not invited for comments in the consideration of base closure of Olmstead Air Force Base. This is apparent when the receivers of "functional moves" know more than the losers in a "functional move." The personnel affected mostly, the human beings involved, are not informed while pinball processing proceeds with results told only to our hierarchy. An informed man is an understanding man and the people involved in the base closure at Olmsted have not been informed nor have they been asked to contribute in the overall actions taken by the Department of Defense.

Our purpose is to augment the Keystone Committee report and present facts demonstrating that information available to date is neither specific nor does it logically support the closure of MAAMA. The best information available to us points up the need for its continuance, possible enlargement, and merger with the Army overhaul activity at New Cumberland by transferring New Cumberland to Olmsted Air Force Base.

You have been furnished with detailed explanations of the fine facilities, equipment, and advantages of geographical location. We, as the representatives of labor, wish to point out the human aspect of this grave action and its effect on people employed at MAAMA.

1. First, the Secretary of Defense has stated that employees will be offered a job opportunity. What does this mean to the employee? The opportunity is for relocation at a point no less than 1,000 miles away, no assurance of preservation of attained skills, a strong possibility of reduction in force at the new location, a possible lower wage rate area, and family dislocations occasioned by long distance moves—moves of personnel into areas, incidentally, where their acceptance in community living may well be difficult.

2. There are several other facts and value judgments incorporated in the November 19, 1964, letter to Congressman KUNKEL from the Secretary of the Air Force. This gives the rationale for the closures which bears careful examination. It states therein, "From the point of view of personnel, skills of all of the AMA's rate well and there was no ground for choosing one over the other." Review of the AMA relative standing for the past several years indicates, however, that MAAMA constantly ranks as first or second in terms of effectiveness and economy, even under adverse conditions. Yet the report finds this high rating of efficiency insignificant. This indicates to us a failure to recognize the most important element of any efficient operation—people. (The attitude and performance of the people who must do the work.)

3. In addition, although complete statistics are unavailable, our information indicates that if the beginning phase-out date was advanced to July 1, 1956, as many as 1,000 additional employees would fall into the 25-year group who could avail themselves of special retirement provisions.

4. Although we urge the continuance of MAAMA, should the base be closed, we feel that the more efficient method to accomplish this planned action is to first reduce the work force over a period of years consistent with workload reduction, and let the normal rate of attrition accommodate most of the reductions. Movement of people will then be minimized in the consolidation deemed necessary by the Secretary of Defense.

5. The Air Force recognizes that MAAMA has missions that are important and of expected long duration and yet it elects to denude the entire northeast of the country from employment and facilities and from participation in these phases of the Defense program. Its qualitative analysis of available square footage, equipment inventory, invested costs, etc., appears to be premised on the concept of making the largest installations bigger and that such large installations by virtue of their bigness are "hard core" and more flexible. This may be regarded as a CPA analysis and not in consonance with the DOD dispersion philosophy. MAAMA, has through the years, received changes in missions and has converted its skills to accommodate changes with a minimum of disruption. In short, it has been tried and found true as demonstrated by its consistently high standing in relation to all of the AMA's.

6. A few years ago MAAMA was relieved of its vital status and relegated to the role of a nonvital AMA. This status requires considerable contracting-out which experience shows reduces the effectiveness and efficiency of the AMA especially where the AMA has efficient inhouse facilities and capabilities. Inhouse repair and overhaul costs are typically less than one-half of the contractual costs based on a comparative study attached in the enclosure and one conducted by AFLC. Notwithstanding these costs and loss of efficiency factors, MAAMA has maintained its high standing.

7. There is every indication that the Department of the Army through its ARADMAC, Army overhaul facility at New Cumberland, is going to perform overhaul services on aircraft similar to overhaul activities now being performed or capable of performance at MAAMA. It is urged that plans for future enlargement of the ARADMAC be made available in order that skilled technicians at MAAMA be given the opportunity to be placed in their own community at comparable skill levels or ARADMAC be absorbed within MAAMA.

In sum, we believe the closing of MAAMA is uneconomical, inefficient and will result in a tragic waste of skilled manpower and the reluctant relocation of thousands of people who look upon their future with great apprehension. We urge careful review of these facilities with the full expectation that this committee can make plain to the Secretary of Defense that the best interests of our Defense posture can be reinforced by the continuance of MAAMA substantially as it exists or through consolidation of the new Army overhaul functions with the MAAMA activity at Olmstead.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before the committee and of making this presentation on behalf of what we believe is a very important objective in the national interest. We speak as the labor representative for Olmstead personnel and the largest of the employee organizations represented at the base.

I and my staff should be glad to answer any questions on which we have information and in which the committee has an interest.

Tribute to Roy Howard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, written by Mr. Henry J. Taylor, in tribute to the late Roy Howard, who was very distinguished in the newspaper world, and for whom I had the highest regard.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MAN TO RIDE THE RIVER WITH

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Roy Howard called me up last week and asked my wife and me to Thanksgiving dinner. I told him we would be in Charlottesville, Va.; we could not come. And this is the last time I will ever hear from Roy Howard, God bless him.

The newspaper business can never seem the same to me again, for he was my helper, my sponsor, critic, companion and friend throughout my working life.

Other writers can doubtless do it better, but it is very hard for this writer to say goodby.

Readers may not know too much about Roy Howard, but all editors of newspapers all over the world know him. And why not? Newspaper publishing covers the entire civilized world, and when he died November 20 at the age of 81 he was the last of the great legendary figures in it.

His life spanned the lives of Northcliffe, Rothermere, Camrose, Beaverbrook (his great friend), Scripps, Munsey, Hearst, Pulitzer—all dead. Thus in his death we seem to hear the tolling of a bell whose old tower is lost from sight. But you never thought of him quite that way because Roy Howard lived every day in the future and not in the past.

He always thought his most rewarding adventure, of course, was his building of the United Press abroad and his breakup of the European news cartel that faced it like a stone wall.

The chief members were Reuters in England, Havas in France, Stefani in Italy, Woolf's in Germany, Fabre in Spain, and Rosta in Russia, along with the Japanese Government news agency in Tokyo. Reuters dominated the interlocked group—until Roy Howard came along.

In attacking the whole cozy, self-serving system of world news distribution he said: "News controlled by government officials is never objective news. It is usually international bunk."

He fought the setup with the courage of youth and hope and placed American news-

men—beholden to no one—in the news capitals of the entire world. He had a news sense—and sensitivity—like Paderewski had a sense of the keys on a piano, and he saw developments coming like a bush pilot feels the terrain with his eyes. Great editors are made by their news sense and their character, and it is commonly agreed that this is the force that distinguishes them.

He abhorred the journalist who covers everything—and feels nothing.

He felt that all good writing is the overflow of powerful feelings. But he had no interest at all in mere words—as such.

He froze down to zero if behind the eloquent, erudite language there was little significance. "It's fluff" he scoffed. His own writing had content, and he demanded it as the readers' due.

It never embarrassed him to change his mind, which often comes from thinking. For his mind never shrank. He had an instinct for large affairs and a contempt for humbug. He kept going as his conscience told him to go, and when principles were at stake nobody ever captured his battleflag or silenced the war drums of Roy Howard. "A man to ride the river with," as the Westerns used to say.

He knew at first hand the problems of the breadwinner and insisted there is much we can do to make this land better and richer for all people. But he profoundly distrusted big power from whatever direction it came. He believed that if we do not intend to create free and independent citizens we have gone to a great deal of trouble and expense for nothing.

Life? He underwent a severe operation some time ago but he never dwelt on the fact he was growing older. He felt that if a man is too afraid to die he is too afraid to live, so there is nothing to do but forget about it. It is true that he could never relax in terms of "eight bells and all's well," and his illness must have been silently preparing itself for years. But to me it was incredibly sudden.

Roy Howard rests now beneath great accomplishments.

A Day of Memory, Remembrance, and Reevaluation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the Erie County Board of Supervisors at Buffalo, N.Y., memorializing the U.S. Congress to set aside the 22d day of November as a day of memory, remembrance, and reevaluation, dedicated to the spirit of brotherhood and freedom throughout our great country.

I concur most heartily with the sense of this resolution, which follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY,
Buffalo, N.Y., December 10, 1964.

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify, that at a session of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, held in the county hall, in the city of Buffalo, on the first day of December A.D., 1964, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

One year ago I introduced a memorial resolution to this board of supervisors and received unanimous support for same, and I am deeply appreciative of that fact.

That resolution memorialized the Congress to set aside a national holiday, and although it was presented in the House of Representatives by the Honorable THADDEUS J. DULSKI, of New York, on December 10, 1963, and appears in volume 109, No. 202 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, no action was apparently taken on this matter.

That is most unfortunate.

The language of our resolution, yours and mine, was not to achieve another day devoid of business or school or political and commercial enterprise.

By its clear language the intent was to set aside a day—1 day a year as one of memory and remembrance and reevaluation and dedicated to the spirit of love and freedom throughout this great Nation and among our peoples.

The resolution fell on deaf ears and it is my impression that we continue to move in the opposite direction. From the untimely death of our young leader we have learned little if anything, and it seems his life and talents were wasted among us.

We cannot allow this to be so.

It is for us to redouble our efforts for the sake of humanity and the ultimate goal of man.

Millions of dollars and man-hours are spent to combat dread disease but only a token offering is made to eliminate bigotry, deceit, hate, fear, and misunderstanding.

Men deserve better treatment at the hands of men.

Forget the man if you will, strike his name from your minds if it suits you, but remember always what he represented.

A small ray of light to penetrate the darkness and evil which surrounds us, a voice of hope in a world filled with despair, a firm hand to guide us through troubled times are part of his legacy.

Eternity has claimed him but his presence is everywhere asking us and pleading with us to reevaluate our sense of relative values—and our sense of humor.

Although there is wide room for disagreement among us let it be honest disagreement.

Let us join together in the fight for humanity not because of the force of law but because of a deep rooted respect for it and for our fellow man.

Wherefore, it behooves us to set aside a day annually for each man to meditate in his own way, to examine our individual consciences, to remove bigotry, bitterness, and hate from our hearts and minds and instill therein an understanding for our neighbor so that all peoples everywhere can truly learn by our example and we can secure for our posterity a world for all mankind that will meet not only the challenge of the 60's but thereafter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this, the Erie County Board of Supervisors memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to set aside the 22d day of November, as one of memory, remembrance, and reevaluation, and dedicated to the spirit of brotherhood and freedom throughout this great Nation and among our people.

FRANK E. WENDLING,
Supervisor 11th Ward.

Attest:

WALTER A. HOLZ,
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.

Hollies Linked With Christmas Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine article which appeared on Christmas Day in the Greenville, S.C., News, written by Mr. Charles E. Thomas.

This article clearly and interestingly shows that there is considerable traditional and historic religious symbolism in some of the Christmas plants and flowers which appeared on the four Christmas postage stamps.

Senators may recall that when these colorful stamps appeared, they were criticized in some quarters for an alleged lack of religious significance.

Mr. Thomas' very informative article shows that many plants and flowers, some of them native to my home State of South Carolina, have ancient associations with the beautiful story of Christmas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA HAS HOLLIES LINKED WITH CHRISTMAS FESTIVAL

(By Charles E. Thomas)

When Thomas Walter published his famous "Flora Caroliniana" in London in 1788, he identified two native hollies of the Santee River country of South Carolina. These are the *Ilex decidua* and the *Ilex myrtifolia*, two of the State's most diffuse and popular hollies. The latter is an evergreen and bears bright red berries.

When John Lawson wrote his "History of the Carolinas" early in the 18th century, he mentioned "Holly of two sorts" without specifying whether they were the same two that Walter later named in the State. Brookgreen Garden is famous today for its varieties and splendid specimens of native hollies.

Two of the State's most popular and best known hollies today are the *Ilex cassine* or Dahoon holly and the *Ilex vomitoria* or Yaupon. The Indians used the latter as an emetic, hence its strange name, "*Ilex vomitoria*."

BERRIES ATTRACT BIRDS

Garden clubs have long urged the planting of hollies in South Carolina for they grow well and with minimum care in the State. Many of the varieties are evergreens and some hold their red or yellow berries throughout the year. They provide popular winter feed for robins and other songbirds, attracting them to your garden.

Holly is surrounded by hundreds of legends for it is a universally popular Christmas symbol. The burning bush from which God spoke to Moses was said to be holly. In some European countries, it is believed that Christ's crown of thorns was made of holly and that this is recalled in the Christmas wreath.

Mistletoe which grows abundantly throughout South Carolina is perhaps the oldest of the Christmas flowers. Its symbolic origin dates back to the Druids and

other pre-Christian peoples and their pagan rites. Early man was amazed by the fact that mistletoe grew not out of the ground like other plants but grew only firmly rooted in the branches of trees. It was known to grow in apple, pear, maple, elm, basswood, willow, thorn, almond, ash, popular and oak. That tree so varied and different should produce mistletoe puzzled early men. The strange parasite was reverred, and 3,000 years ago in Gaul and Britain, the cutting of mistletoe was a solemn and mystical holiday ceremony. Early Latin writers describe a drink made from mistletoe as a remedy against poisons.

The pagan rite of cutting mistletoe has been brought into modern Christian Christmas and New Year's traditions as the harbinger of good luck, if hung over the doorway. The young lady who is caught under the mistle may be kissed by the first young man who reaches her. In South Carolina mistletoe grows most generally on oak, hickory and poplar.

BROUGHT BY POINSETT

The most colorful of our Christmas flowers, the poinsettia bears the name of the native son of South Carolina, Dr. Joel Roberts Poinsett, who brought the bright red plant to the United States.

An oriental plant, Poinsett discovered it in Mexico, and brought it to his native South Carolina only 100 years ago. It now grows wild in parts of the South, especially in Florida, and is the most extensively cultivated Christmas plant we have today. White and pink varieties have been developed but the bright red poinsettia remains the most popular and Christmaslike.

Dr. Poinsett, a native of Charleston, S.C., with a summer home in Greenville County, and a plantation near Stateburg, S.C., was a physician, lawyer, Member of Congress from South Carolina, Secretary of War, and Ambassador to Mexico, who also served his country on missions to Russia. He brought the brilliant plant from Mexico in 1840, and developed it in South Carolina soil through seed, offshoots and cuttings. It is sensitive to cold and has to be protected even in the local climate of the State.

PINE AND COUSINS

The pine and its numerous coniferous cousins, the cedar, the spruce, the hemlock, and so many other popular cone-bearing plants of the pine family, generally provide Christmas trees, and another the most popular and widely used Christmas decorations.

The pine has long been South Carolina's most universal tree, and in recent years it has become the State's most valuable. The pine abounds in Christmas story and legend.

The story of the spider that helped trim the Christmas tree is one of the most beloved. On the night before Christmas, after a family tree had been decorated for the great day, the little spiders came out to see the tree. They could not get a good view from the floor, so they climbed and crawled from branch to branch until they had covered the entire tree from floor to ceiling. However, everywhere over the trimmed tree they left cobwebs. When the Christ Child came to bless the tree, he touched the cobwebs and they turned to silver. And the story is that Christmas glittering tinsel has been used to decorate our pine Christmas trees ever since. And this reminds us that spiders helped the Christ Child make the tree honoring his birth more beautiful and glistening.

Icicles on Christmas trees also came from a visit of Jesus Christ to the sheltering branches of a pine tree in a cold, wet forest on a wintry night. He took shelter under the pine tree's low-hanging branches for the other trees had lost their leaves. When the pine tree realized it was caring for the Christ Child, tears of joy and happiness poured from its branches, and as they fell on the cold, wintry night, they froze into icicles. The next morning, with the bright rays of the Christmas sun, the pine tree was transformed into a vision of dazzling brilliance. Christ is said to have blessed the pine tree above all other trees of the forest. If you cut a small pine cone lengthwise you can still see the imprint of His hand, the story says.

And may God and His Son, Jesus Christ, bless us all on this joyous Christmastide, made more beautiful and meaningful by the wonderful Christmas flowers that we have so abundantly.

The Insurance Industry's Vital Role in the Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, at a recent Free Enterprise Day conducted by the Greater Cincinnati Junior Chamber of Commerce, a report was submitted by Mr. Chester T. Cruze, director of public affairs and civic improvement, which portrays the true values of the free enterprise system in an excellent manner. I would like to insert this report in the RECORD.

The report follows:

THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY'S VITAL ROLE IN THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

(By Chester T. Cruze, director of public affairs and civic improvement of the Greater Cincinnati Junior Chamber of Commerce)

Since man is different from other animals in that his existence depends upon his controlling his environs rather than merely adapting to them, his primary purpose is the ultimate control of the natural world around him. Observing this goal, the anthropologists tell us that the growth of civilization is directly related to man's fulfillment of his urge for security. This desire for security has been recognized by behavioral scientists as one of the basic motives affecting human conduct and has been termed by the psychologists as "one of the preponderant tendencies in man." It is part of self-preservation and in the words of Burke, "the passions conversant about the preservation of the individual, turning chiefly on pain and danger, are the most powerful of all the passions." But paradoxically, it is the taking of risks that is an inherent part of a dynamic and progressive people bent upon achieving that security for security comes only as a result of a willingness to take risks. Every advance in man's progress has involved chances for failure as well as promises for success. Resolving that paradox results in man's happiness and that is the goal of insurance. The harmony of the venturous instincts essential to success coupled with the goal of that success: security.

Dr. Solomon S. Huebner, of the University of Pennsylvania, has observed in this regard that, "Worry and fear retard human initiative and efficiency probably more than do any other factors. To the thoughtful man, personal contentment and vocational efficiency are impossible when the curse of worry and fear is constantly exerting its dampening influence. On the contrary, the absence of this curse produces a state of mental feeling which increases man's efficiency and enables him to venture more willingly. Here we reach the heart of all insurance, irrespective of the type under consideration; namely the creation of certainty out of the uncertainties that permeate our economic life."

The metamorphosis from uncertainty to certainty is achieved by the technique of the group budgeting of risks. Whatever the contractural and economic forms insurance may take, this feature is common to all varieties: the losses of those exposed to hazard are pooled or averaged, and average loss cost is substituted for individual loss incidence.

Looked upon in this fashion, insurance may be likened to a contract by one party, the insurer, to take over from the other for a consideration some part of the latter's chance of loss.

The type of protection can be dichotomized as human life values and property values. The former includes life, accident, health, compensation, and liability, and the latter embraces fire, marine, corporate, bonding, title, credit, insolvency or bad debt, reinsurance, engineering, riot, and civil commotion, and tornado and windstorm, as well as many others.

Closely akin to the desire for security is the desire to be free from restraints that affect the individual in his family and business life. It was formerly thought that security necessarily involved a loss of freedom. This notion of security and freedom as mutually exclusive alternatives arose because security was thought of as something derived from the state. But the advent of private insurance companies working in the free enterprise system destroyed this notion and that in itself is a major contribution to the free enterprise system.

It is the insurance industry that manifests an independent people providing through business enterprise, for their economic security. It has coupled the aspiration for freedom with the goal of high and improving standards of living. It has respected the freedom of the individual person, anchored in our constitutional guaranties and sustained by our system of private enterprise by placing primary responsibility on the individual for the provision of his own necessities and acceptance of his initiative for his own improvement.

It is a tribute to the industry that the more complex society has become—the farther it has moved away from the simple social organization where the family on the land was insured by the land—the more people have looked to insurance to help them accept the responsibilities of a technological age.

Thus misfortune, the clarion call of the opponents of a free society has been met by private insurance companies, who have underwritten misfortune more providently and efficiently than any bureaucracy could imitate with no loss to the freedom of the individual.

This has been so because the insurance industry has refused to take as doctrainaire the premise that everyone must have every kind of insurance imaginable as a social necessity. Instead, the industry has recognized the right of each individual to determine just what exigencies he must protect himself against. Since protection and security are two of the many "commodities" contributing to the mental and physical satisfaction and happiness of the individual, the gratification of those wants must displace others. When a man makes a decision to purchase protection and security, he must give up the resources needed to purchase other wants or even more immediate needs.

Cognizance has been given to the fact that whether a given type or amount of insurance or any at all will best serve any one particular person's enlightened self-interest depends upon the other needs and wants of that particular individual measured against his need for protection and security.

One person may prefer to use the money for the education of his children; another may have a chronic illness and prefer to spend the money on his own health prior to retirement; or he may have a sick wife or a sick child on whom he would prefer to spend the money; or he may prefer to eat better of have more vacations while he is young; or he may prefer any of innumerable alternative uses of his money that he has the right to prefer. The insurance industry has shown it is aware of the multiplicity of these choices as well as the fact that no one has a right to force another to make a particular choice in matters of this kind regardless of what is thought best for him. The industry has proven the value of insurance precisely by eschewing coercion and relying on individual foresight and judgment to make the proper allotment to insurance.

This foresight involves the self-discipline of doing things from which no immediate benefits are derived in order to secure the means to future satisfaction and protection against adversity. This is the basic tenet of insurance. Its origins probably occurred when Joseph warned the Pharoahs that the 7 fat years were going to be succeeded by 7 lean ones. They heeded his advice and stored the surplus grain harvested from the fat years in advance of the time when it would be needed and thus protected his kingdom against starvation.

But since we live in a free society instead of a monarchy, one's preoccupation with the means for future ends can only be regulated by the individual concerned; for it is he who must select the ends brought about by those means. One has no incentive to provide means for ends not sought A case in point is a boy who will toil uphill with a toboggan for the sake of a few brief moments of bliss during the descent. No one has to urge him to be industrious, and however he may puff and pant he is still happy. He has selected the ends, and he knows the means are worth it. But if he were promised an old-age pension at 70 instead of the immediate reward, his energy would probably very quickly flag.

Germane to this selection of ends, is the fact that the more complex our economy and society becomes the more futile it becomes for a bureaucratic planner to attempt to consider the vast number of choices and decisions open to the populace that must be made to achieve their desired ends, let alone select those ends. In this regard the industry has weighed carefully the issue of voluntary versus compulsory insurance and refusing to substitute its judgment for the independent judgment of citizenry, has chosen the former. It has done so because the people of the insurance industry possessed a sense of reality gained from their own personal experiences and used it. They can recall the troubles involved in managing their own life; they have observed that their friends and families have worked out problems contrary to the way they would have worked them out in what they considered the best way. They have observed how difficult it is to attempt to manage the lives of those intimately familiar to them and have empirically deduced how absurd it would be to attempt to manage the lives of millions of people whose lives, personalities, interests, desires, hopes, conditions, and situations are wholly beyond the scope of mortal man's imagination and mind.

In reaching their decision the industry has asked, "Why resort to compulsion at all?" In a free society every reasonable presumption should be in favor of freedom. It has observed that compulsion is not conducive to individual initiative and self-reliance, which are the essential characteristics of a democratic government. It has seen that people, when regimented, get used to having things done for them and not by them. When this happens they are kept in a state of tutelage and the habit of caring for themselves is weakened. This is anathema for a democratic nation, for it must depend upon the ability of its citizens to manage themselves, since it is they who must also manage the state. It has been observed that compulsory insurance, especially through bureaucratic methods, is likely to weaken that quality and substitute an intuitive diffidence with respect to creating their own destinies. Experience and knowledge of human nature alike teach that when people undertake to reduce the hazards of life by placing responsibility on external forces, it will only result in the kind of meretricious security possessed by Macbeth, and in the end it will be insecurity and not security which will be increased. And when something as unforeseen and unprepared for as Birnam Woods' advance to Dunsinane disrupts that complacency, it will become obvious that nothing less than an omnicomprehensive and omniscient security can replace individual prudence and good judgment; and not even then without a loss of freedom.

The insurance industry has, however, had to face up to the ultimate question, "What about those who will not exercise prudence, good judgment, and foresight?" The response, however, has not been the urged answer that "compulsory insurance must be made mandatory for all, because if it's not those who are allowed not to make provisions to protect themselves against the consequences of negligent acts, the hazards of economic and property loss and the loss resulting from accidents, sickness, and death will become a public charge on those who do." Instead it has entered the demurrer, "What has this to do with insurance?"

The industry has refused to amalgamate the aim of insurance with the aims of relief and alms. Its concern has been with the legitimate area of insurance and its participants, i.e., those who like Aesop's ant, use their own foresight to forgo a strictly carpe diem way of life. The industry has chosen to deal only with those citizens who, by insuring their own lives and property, have recognized their personal responsibility in taking care of their families and business obligations, come what may, and have done something about them rather than allow the welfare state to assume those obligations for them, or ask for a handout when adversity strikes.

The industry has refused to be an instrument in an involuntary redistribution of society's wealth. It has even refused to sanction compulsory savings and self-insurance, i.e., using the Government's police power to compel one to look out for oneself, let alone coerce the individual and others to look out for him. Thus it has refused to undertake compelling those who are productive and prudent to care for those unfortunates who were too improvident or unable to care for themselves. It has rather allowed those productive individuals the choice of exercising true charity to those whom they wish to help, recognizing the fact that any person who defends man's freedom to determine his own needs in life must defend with equal diligence the freedom of every man to determine in his own way how he will help others. But more important, it has realized that these actions are totally divorced from the principles of insurance and should likewise be divorced from the nomenclature, and when a contributor receives a disproportionately smaller material return from his input and the recipient accrues large benefits that have no actuarial relation to any contribution, it is not insurance, but relief or alms.

It is not within the scope of this report to opine on the relief and welfare activities of the state, but it is obvious that the commingling of an insurance program with a relief or welfare program deserves opprobrium for when the programs are treated as one and the same, that treatment not only attacks the integrity of those who participate in the former but it also lends a pseudo dignity to the beneficiaries of the latter by encouraging the idea that he is asserting a right which his payments entitle him to assert. The truth, however, according to a leading social security case, *Nestor* v. *Flemming*, is that this is not the beneficiary end of an insurance program but the relief end of a tax in which the individual has no more equity in the tax he pays than anyone else.

This comingling is doubly unwise in the indefinite area of job insurance and health insurance, which because of their nature are particularly prone to the abuses of bureaucratic management. It should be mentioned here that one important criterion for insurance is that the insured person have a definite interest in seeing that the contingency against which he is insured does not occur. The insured should always prefer not to collect. Insurance companies must guard against writing policies which protect the insured against an eventuality which for one reason or another, consciously or unconsciously he may desire or help bring about. (This is the reason for policies wherein the insured pays the first portion of the claim himself as in the deductible portion of automobile insurance.) Since health and ability to be gainfully employed are more subjective and less absolutely measurable than life and death, or property loss it is doubtful whether a real insurable interest exists in many cases because hypochondriacs, malingerers, and what John Kenneth Galbraith calls "insular poverty cases" would actually prefer to collect the benefits in many instances. And it would be far more difficult to guard against these cases than it is to guard against suicide and arson cases by of some sort of exculpatory clause. To work at all, proximity between the insured and the insurer would be an absolute necessity to prevent abuses. The likelihood of the insured's aiding the occurrence of the insured incident would be almost impossible to guard against by the remote handling of a central authority. The only way this type of insurance could be feasible at all would be by the close watch of those who would suffer a fraudulent payoff i.e., the insuring company, and not a disinterested bureaucrat.

It is also obvious that the Government's usurpation of the strictly proprietary function of insurance which has proven it is better suited to the free enterprise system than the bureaucratic system for the reasons stated above has no constitutional sanction and runs counter to the ninth amendment of the U.S. Constitution (as well as the third tenet of the Junior Chamber of Commerce creed: "We believe * * * that economic justice can best be won by freemen through free enterprise.")

This usurpation is unfortunate as well as unnecessary for the insurance industry has proven by the most undisputable evidence that it has served the free enterprise system and the American way of life as well as the free enterprise system and American way of life has served it.

A free society is always preferable to a despotic one even if it is less efficient from an economic standpoint. However, when it is more efficient as well as free, the argument for its preference becomes a fortiori. Thus, when this proof of the industry's service in the achievement of American's economic goals can be looked upon in just as glowing economic terms as it can in philosophical terms, it becomes evident that there is a nexus between them. These three economic goals, of course, are a vigorous but steady rate of growth in per capita production and living standards; a reliable dollar made possible by steady prices and curbed inflation; and as a concomitant to

our philosophical goal, an economic structure with maximum individual freedom of action based upon private enterprise and competition in open markets.

The insurance industry has stimulated the first goal, the economic growth of our country, by inducing millions of Americans of modest means to save through insurance for that proverbial rainy day. And when one considers that it takes more than $15,000 in savings to create one additional productive job, it becomes obvious that the sine qua non of economic growth is the investment of capital. By investing their policyholder's savings, the industry has promoted this growth and at the same time guaranteed the policyholder's future payments and dividends with the tangential bonus of alleviating unemployment.

The industry has fought for the second goal of restoring the integrity of the dollar since its reliability is as crucial to it as it is to the whole economy. This is essential, for the industry's basic function is to provide dollars for future delivery. Hence, it is important that these dollars delivered in the future have a purchasing power comparable to that of the dollars used to pay premiums and not be devalued by the ravages of inflation. If not, insurance for any reasonable duration would be of uncertain protection.

Finally, the insurance industry has reinforced the third goal and basic totem of the free enterprise system: Open competition among freemen in a free market. In this regard, the insurance industry has held fast to the firm belief in words and deeds that the market economy, which allocates resources by the undiscriminating mechanism of supply and demand is the only economic system that is not only the most judicial distributor of the goods of our society, but also the only system whereby productivity is maximized by the unhampered abilities of freemen.

Responses by Hadassah Myrtle Wreath Awards Recipients

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on December 3, 1964, Myrtle Wreath Awards were made by Hadassah at its annual brunch in New York City. Because I feel that the remarks of the very fortunate awardees would be of interest to the Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that they be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HADASSAH MYRTLE WREATH AWARDS BRUNCH, RESPONSES BY AWARD RECIPIENTS—DR. SOLOMON GRAYZEL, MISS DOROTHY HEIGHT, DR. MARGARET MEAD, MR. RICHARD RODGERS, DR. HOWARD A. RUSK, SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH—HOTEL ASTOR, NEW YORK, DECEMBER 3, 1964

Dr. SOLOMON GRAYZEL. Madam Chairman and ladies of Hadassah, I have no intention of deprecating your choice of me to represent literature. [Laughter.] On the contrary, I heartily approve of your choice and am grateful for it. I am especially pleased that you did so knowing that my chief occupation for a quarter of a century has been to revive, restore Jewish literary activity and encourage the reading of Jewish books.

I'm glad to assume that through me you have just expressed your approval of the work being done by the Jewish Publication Society of America. [Applause.]

In all candor, however, it seems to me desirable for your protection and for mine to make clear the sense in which I understand the term literature so that no man of letters will argue that I am here under false pretenses.

It seems to me that literature has served two purposes. It has served as a mirror of life. The writer of today holds up this mirror to his contemporaries and asks them to recognize themselves. The image may be ugly, revolting, even terrifying. This is no fault of the author, that is, of the one who holds up the mirror. Even if he has exaggerated for effect, the fault is not his but that of the mass whose character he chooses to reflect.

There is also literature of another kind. It serves not as a mirror but as a guide in a quest. It assumes that as obnoxious as human nature may be, it is redeemable if not perfected. This side of literature too may be accused of exaggerating since it posits a willingness on the part of the people to improve. This also is forgiveable since not to make that assumption is to admit defeat from the start. This is literature in the tradition of the Bible and of all that has been written in the course of the centuries in the hope of building a utopia.

This latter is currently not the popular type of literature. It has been abused by becoming identified too closely with religiosity just as mirror literature is being blurred by being identified too closely with ephemeral entertainment.

In the one, or the latter, the hero used to be the conqueror and he is now nothing more than the schelemiel. [Laughter.] In the other, the hero used to be the incredible saint and he is now he who no matter how vainly seeks the meaning of life.

This questing literature is the kind with which I have identified myself. In doing me honor, make no mistake about it, you are honoring the type of literature which believes in God and in human dignity, which sympathizes with human failings, which frankly hopes that man, weak, benighted, blundering man can and should look for ways to better days.

For encouraging me in my work and in my dreams, you have earned my profound thanks. [Applause.]

DOROTHY HEIGHT. Thank you, Hadassah, from the depths of my heart. In accepting your distinguished Myrtle Wreath Award, I am deeply honored. I accept this high honor with full realization that in fact, no one individual can achieve human rights alone, nor can human rights become a reality except as individuals take responsibility. I am my brothers keeper, long has been Hadassah's answer to a key life question. And this award reminds one that each of us must be ready to answer.

My acceptance of this award is but a symbol of appreciation of all that has made this moment possible: the early teachings in home, and school and church where the biblical concept of man as a child of God and the political guarantees of the Constitution of the United States were deeply embedded; the opportunities to work to translate problems of brotherhood into experiences of fellowship through the YWCA with its clear commitment to full equality; the creative hours with many groups and individuals especially concerned with the status of women; the challenge of great personalities like Mary McLeod Bethune who founded the NCNW because she could not rest in the face of the unharnessed womanpower and the thousands of women who now work continuously to fulfill her dream; the thousands who have given leadership in the Negro revolution in search of full civil and human rights, those who have gone to jail singing and those who challenge their elders lest they too quickly rest on their laurels; the little people around the world whose rising expectations make clear that freedom is indivisible.

Women in minority groups in the United States have a very special contribution to make to the Great Society. As women and as members of minority groups we know through a life of double jeopardy that its realization depends upon what happens in human relations in every community.

Eleanor Roosevelt said it quite clearly: "Where, after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home—so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any map of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person: The neighborhood he lives in; the school or college he attends; the factory, farm, or office where he works. Such are the places where every man, woman, and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere. Without concerted citizen action to uphold them close to home, we shall look in vain for progress in the larger world."—March 27, 1958.

Hadassah's recognition of the significance of human rights must send us forth this day with new dedication to the unfinished tasks of our democracy. For you this is no new struggle. What is new is that with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the conditions for making equality a working principle in every part of our land have been given a clear base of legal support. It is up to us now to live the values of a free society from this foundation of law.

Today's women of valor, in the tradition of Henrietta Szold, deep in a family life enriched by the concept of peoplehood, can identify the struggle of the Negro woman whose family roots were destroyed even as they left the shores of Africa. It is disturbing when the civil rights movement calls for special effort to help the long deprived catch up, to hear people of good will join the detractors and say the call is for special treatment. Hadassah has demonstrated at home and especially in Israel that a policy of special effort and special treatment is essential to achieve true equality of opportunity.

Hadassah's award is a constant reminder that women must give direct support to the movement for civil and human rights. "We need allies," the nonviolent civil rights movement is saying in many ways. We need others to take initiative to help achieve quality education in integrated classrooms for all. We need jobs and the training for jobs. We need role models to lend vision and to bring inspiration to youth who have lost their way. There are those who ask—"will there be more civil rights demonstrations, will we have peace in our town?"

As you know, in the Hebrew the word for peace itself is "wholeness." When better than Hadassah can make clear that until the whole community has equality of opportunity and equality of responsibility there can be no real peace for any part of it.

So then, the task of teaching and healing must go on so long as a Michael Schwerner, the young civil rights worker in Mississippi, can become the target for death because of what was called his Jewishness makes him different.

The task of opening communications must go on so long as there are millions with a sense of powerlessness in the black ghetto and there are those with a feeling of separation and of having no problem in the lily-white suburbs. The task of communication and of building bridges without which there can be no reconciliation must

continue until in every section of our country people of different backgrounds live together, in respect and harmony.

Dr. MARGARET MEAD. Hadassah: I am 5 feet 2, so I have to climb up again.

I think all of us who are here today and honored by your awards think of perhaps one of the most important aspects of the award, the chance to talk to this group, a chance to meet face to face this large group of women from so many regions representing such a large membership, whom one knows are responsible and compassionate people.

There are all kinds of audiences in the world, but an audience where you are so certain of whom you're speaking to is something very valuable to those of us who are given an opportunity to speak.

But perhaps in line with this quotation from Mrs. Roosevelt as Dorothy Height read, I thought also of a lot of little things as well as big ones in attempting to prepare what I would say.

I remember when I was an undergraduate at Barnard how my roommate and I used to buy one large piece of white cardboard and cut it in half. She made the poster for the Jewish student society and I made the poster for the Sunday night club. And I put in my first lessons on how to be a well behaved goy. [Laughter.] I've had a lot more lessons through the years and I don't claim any proficiency, just an attempt to learn.

And I thought also of the visit I made to Israel in 1956 which started out with people paying quite a little attention to me and taking—starting early in the morning and going on late at night to be sure I didn't miss anything, especially anything of all the things that Hadassah was doing there. At the same time, each person told me not to let other people overwork me. [Laughter.] Which is characteristic of the Israeli position where everyone is so enthusiastic that even a visitor can hardly appreciate all that's going on.

This is the—the way I went to Israel—I left Israel an almost total eclipse because my young daughter had decided to stay there which everybody felt was much more interesting. So the last 3 or 4 days were devoted to my daughter and the fact that she had fallen in love with Israel and decided to stay and learn Hebrew and finish high school in Hebrew.

And I think it was very appropriate that they were more interested in what she had to say than in what I had to say or what she was going to say later once she had learned Hebrew, because Israel does so much belong to the future and so much to the very young people that we have an opportunity to send there.

Now, each one of us has thought in many ways of what we would like to say today and what we would like to say to this group of people where we're certain that anything one says that matters will have an echo not only in your hearts but in your actions.

And what I would like to say is a little about the contribution that movements like Hadassah make to the building of a world in which nationhood replaces nationalism, because one of the necessary parts of nationhood is that one does not love one's country less because one loves other countries also. [Applause.]

Hadassah has demonstrated over and over again that being compassionate, responsible American citizens is compatible with also loving and caring for children of the world and the particular children in particular other countries dear to them. And I think that what you've done, what you're doing and what you will do is going to be a tremendous contribution to the world of the future in which people will not only have a country of their birth, a country of their citizenship, but many other countries, countries of their minds, countries of their hearts, countries of their hopes, and in which we will realize that each nation grows in stature because it is able to care about other nations also. [Applause.]

Dr. HOWARD RUSK. Thank you very much, Mrs. Salpeter.

Members of Hadassah, I think the reason that you gave me this award is the fact that subconsciously you recognize my long and secret love affairs for Hadassah. [Laughter.]

I first got to know about Hadassah when Dr. Yassky and his staff spent a month with me at Bellevue in the late summer of 1951. I visited Israel for the first time 3 weeks after Dr. Yassky and his nurses and workers were ambushed and killed on their way up Mount Scopus. I spoke the second night I was there to a group of nurses that graduated from your nursing school. There were 17 of them. The graduation exercises were held on the patio of an old French convent. Every graduate was a [inaudible]. Everyone carried one flower, a dark red rose. Everyone was going to take a vacation before they went to work. The vacation was the rest of the afternoon. Every girl went to work in the hospitals and the health services the next morning.

Because of groups like this and dedicated people and opportunity that you made possible, the planes that were coming in from Yemen, DC-3's, normally made to seat 36 were bringing in a hundred, a hundred and twenty individuals from Yemen, and it wasn't uncommon to open the door and find a half a dozen children dead and hospitals were set up on the airstrip manned by girls like this. Water was carried for a quarter of a mile in certain instances.

I remember going into one and seeing two transfusions and five intravenous infusions going at the same time with young children and one nurse looking after 200 patients alone with no help except those that she had [inaudible].

I came back and reported the things that I had seen to you. Now I have had the privilege in these years of continuing romance to see the development of your magnificent hospital. You have trained a number of physicians. You have participated in the new research programs in Israel, made possible by our Congress and about 5 years ago, our International Health Act in which Senator SMITH was one of our staunch supporters which made counterpart funds available in the currencies of the countries that was frozen and we'd agreed not to take out for research purposes.

There are now projects going in nine different countries, but by far the largest and the best are the nine projects that are now going on in Israel. [Applause.]

It is a wonderful opportunity to study the problems of disease as far as ethnic origin is concerned, the essence, the course, the problems.

I revisited Israel 7 years after my first visit and again saw what has been described to you, this magnificent transformation. I saw Israel already sharing her doctrine with the new countries in Africa and I saw doctors from other countries now coming to learn.

So it's been an evolution not only in development but sharing. It has some little idea about the part that you have played.

In many of these projects, you've not only been the yeast in the loaf but you have furnished the loaf itself. I think all of us in medicine owe you a great debt of gratitude, but I think I speak for my colleagues when I say thank you.

I am grateful for his honor. I will put it by one of my most treasured ones, the Henrietta Szold Award, but I don't need them to remember you because I remember the people and the country that you have helped off their knees and I know what you do in this country to make it the kind of a place that we all want to live in.

I'd like to close with six lines written by a man who had a stroke in his forties, who lived to his late seventies, who did his greatest scientific work after he was paralyzed and he left this philosophy as his heritage in addition to the knowledge he left. I think it's your philosophy, too:

"Not to destroy but to construct; I hold the unconquerable belief that science and peace will triumph over ignorance and war.

"That nations will come together not to destroy but to construct; and that the future belongs to those who accomplish the most for humanity."

And the author was Louis Pasteur. [Applause.]

May I wish for you in the future the joy of accomplishment that you have here today. Thanks to your strong heart and great spirit. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Mrs. RICHARD RODGERS. Thank you very much, Mrs. Salpeter. Honored guests, ladies, my husband is so sorry he cannot be here today to accept this great honor. But he has something we all know about, a bad back. He hurt himself yesterday morning and it's very painful when he moves and that's why I'm here. Perhaps you'll accept me as a poor substitute and forgive us both. [Applause.]

Well, Mrs. Salpeter suggested that I tell you a little bit—very little I assure you—about my experience in Israel. I went to Palestine in 1928 on a trip with my parents and I didn't go back again until about a year and a half ago when Dick and I went and you just cannot imagine—or perhaps this audience particularly can imagine—the change that took place in those years.

It was transformed from a desert, really just a sandy, arid desert where nothing green grew and it looked to me a year and a half ago very much like the land of milk and honey. It was green once again and I know that that's due in a large part to the efforts of Hadassah. I saw all those trees that were planted throughout the length of Israel. We were fortunate enough to be there on Independence Day and the parade was held a year ago in Haifa and that was perhaps the most beautiful setting in which to see it because you had the Mediterranean Sea and Mount Carmel in back of you and it was a marvelously sunny day and it was a thrilling, thrilling experience.

Our 12-day visit was all too short. We were so excited about this wonderful country and what is being accomplished and I know the tremendously important part that Hadassah has played in what has happened in Israel in the last 16 years—is it, since it was established? Yes, 17 now.

Well, I will now read the few words that Dick expected to say to you today.

As a partitioner in the musical theater, it is an important part of my job to deal with stories and I am convinced that the most inspirational stories are those that depict courage and imagination and energy, stories that relate the triumph of the human spirit over all kinds of obstacles in the face of adversity.

The history of Hadassah is that kind of story. But it's even more exciting and heartwarming because it is based on fact rather than fiction.

When the late Henrietta Szold founded your organization in 1912 in the old Temple Emanuel here in New York, it consisted of 12 members. Today there are more than 300,000 members located in all 50 States and Puerto Rico. Hadassah's initial project consisted of two lone nurses sent by you to struggle against the squalor, the disease and the malnutrition that beset the children of Palestine 50 years ago.

Having recently seen for myself the Hadassah Hebrew University Medical Center on the outskirts of Jerusalem with its magnificent hospital, its clinics and its medical, dental, and nursing schools, I am convinced that this accomplishment is among the most outstanding in the whole noble history of philanthropy. But you haven't stopped

there. Through the World Youth Aliyah movement, you have helped to resettle over 100,000 children in Israel and there you have trained and rehabilitated them.

You have been the largest single contributor to the Jewish National Fund which has converted thousands of square miles of arid wasteland into productive fields. Through your efforts, hundreds of medical research projects are contributing to the world's store of medical knowledge and these activities constitute only a few of Hadassah's major accomplishments during the past half century.

Furthermore, you have achieved this proud record with dignity, with efficiency, and with a selfless dedication that has won the admiration of every one to whom compassion is more than just a word.

The American women of Hadassah, past and present, have faithfully practiced the credo of the ancient Jewish physician Maimonides. "In the sufferer, let me see only the human being."

In the face of Hadassah's magnificent history, I am deeply moved that you have been gracious enough to include me in this most distinguished group of Myrtle Wreath recipients. I accept your award with pride, with gratitude, and with the recognition that it symbolizes all that is best in American and Jewish traditions.

Thank you from the bottom of my heart. [Applause.]

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH. I deeply appreciate the great honor you have accorded me with your Myrtle Wreath Award. In all humility I do hope that I am worthy of it.

For I have the greatest respect and admiration for Hadassah in its wonderful record of service to humanity. I mean specificaly your efforts to help safeguard the democratic—spelled with a small "d"—way of life here in the United States: your countrywide medical and public health system in Israel; and your work toward peace and security throughout the world.

You have answered with a most impressive "Yes" that very crucial question of "Am I my brother's keeper?" and at a time when too many Americans are giving a timid and almost silent "No."

Because I feel so very strongly on this matter I do want to repeat observations and cite cases as I have before done both in informal and private discussions and in formal and public statements.

Each of us has the responsibility to meet our obligations to ourselves and society and the reason for that responsibility is set forth in the statement many of you will recall—that "The only thing necessary to insure the triumph of evil is for enough good men to do nothing."

Let me recall your memory to some specific examples. The court trial of one of the American prisoners in Korea—the trial and conviction of an American who threw two other American prisoners out of a hut in snow because they were two miserable, human specimens suffering from diarrhea. There were 40 Americans in that hut. The two were thrown out of the hut to freeze to death.

The man who threw them out was put on trial. But of even greater concern should be the fact that 37 other men in that hut didn't lift a finger to do anything about it.

This is a forceful and frightening example of the saying that "The only thing necessary to insure the triumph of evil is for enough good men to do nothing."

Within the past year we have read in our newspapers of a 28-year-old woman stabbed to death while 38 of her neighbors admitted hearing her cries for help, but—did nothing. Yes, "Evil triumphs when good men do nothing."

An 18-year-old girl, in broad daylight, was assaulted, beaten, stripped. When she broke away from her 38-year-old assailant and pleaded for help, some 40 onlookers were attracted by her cries, but they—did nothing. Yes, "Evil triumphs when good men do nothing."

On a beach in our country, 12 adults stood passively by ignoring the pleas of a man who was trying without success to rescue a drowning boy. There is a frightening development of a behavior pattern on the part of too many of our citizens who, when asked about their doing nothing in the face of crime or unpleasantness, give the shocking answer of "I didn't want to become involved"—who callously refused to be their brother's keeper.

The sophistry of "not getting involved" and refusing to be "my brother's keeper" is pervasive. We see it even in semantics. In recent years, there has been a growing awe and admiration for pragmatists whose philosophy is that the end justifies the means. There has been too much glorification of the angle players, the corner cutters, the sharp shooters and the "goof offs."

Many years ago, the word "square" was one of the most honored and respected words in our vocabulary. A square deal was an honest deal. A square meal a good and full meal. It was the square shooter rather than the sharp shooter who was admired. When you were financially square, you had paid all your debts.

What is a "square" today? He's the fellow who never learned to get away with it—the one who volunteers when he doesn't have to—who tries to do better than others—who has to be reminded to go home because he's so lost in his work—whose heart beats faster and who gets choked up when the band plays the Star-Spangled Banner and the flag unfurls.

Yes, he's the fellow who says, "I am my brother's keeper" and means it.

We used to respect character as real power instead of admiring pragmatism—to recognize that mind without heart, intelligence without ethics, cleverness without goodness—all have dangerous flaws.

A man of character was a person universally acclaimed and respected for integrity, honor, responsibility, and determination—who was willing to be "his brother's keeper."

Now the word "character" has been prostituted for when someone is referred to as being a character, he is considered a square, an eccentric, an odd-ball—as being abnormal.

Yes, one of America's greatest needs today is for more people who are square and who have character and who are willing to be their brother's keeper—who dedicate themselves to the welfare of humanity as does your Hadassah.

I say, "Thank God for you"—and God bless all of you.

Term of Office for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to make the term of office 4 years instead of 2 for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Under my resolution, one-half of the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives would be elected every 2 years for a 4-year term.

This resolution would offer several advantages over the present 2-year terms:

First. Members would be able to devote more time and energy to their committee work and legislative duties and less time working toward reelection.

Second. The resolution would provide greater continuity in the membership of the House since only one-half of the total membership would be up for reelection every 2 years.

Third. In view of the fact that the average Member now represents slightly over 400,000 people, in contrast to the First Congress where the average Member represented approximately 45,000 people, this tremendous increase in the workload justifies a 4-year term instead of the original 2-year term.

Fourth. Many able young men with family responsibilities are hesitant to run for election to the House of Representatives because of the 2-year term and the constant job of campaigning. By making this a 4-year term, more young men would be attracted to seeking election to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Fifth. Costs of campaigning have increased tremendously within the last few years and many qualified people decide against running because of the combination of a 2-year term and the excessive cost of a campaign.

Sixth. The physical burden of a campaign every 2 years is most exhausting and is no doubt a contributing factor to the number of deaths of Members from each Congress.

I have discussed the merits of this proposal wth many people in my district, both Republicans and Democrats, and have their unanimous approval of a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives. I hope early favorable consideration is given to this resolution.

Wyoming Tightens Up on "Happy-Time" Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the January issue of Reader's Digest includes a condensation of an article by Earl and Anne Selby, reprinted from the National Civic Review. The article is entitled "Wyoming Tightens Up on 'Happy-Time' Money." This well-written article is a study of unemployment-compensation abuse—and its cure—in Wyoming. It points out not only the pitfalls inherent in overly liberal employment compensation, but also the difficulties which accrue when a legislature attempts to "retire Santa Claus" before the something-for-nothing fever bankrupts the State.

To those of my colleagues and readers of the RECORD whose States may also be

beset by abuses of unemployment compensation, I recommend reading of the Selby article, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the condensation of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYOMING TIGHTENS UP ON "HAPPY-TIME" MONEY: A CASE STUDY OF UNEMPLOYMENT-COMPENSATION ABUSE—AND ITS CURE

We turned our tape recorder off. We had been interviewing a Wyoming labor-union official on the effects of that State's new, tightened-up unemployment-compensation law, and he had criticized it as harsh and restrictive, an insult to people thrown out of work.

"Now that we're off the record," he said, smiling wryly, "I'll admit that the old law was too soft—it went so far that some people got to thinking of compensation as a way of life. They figured they could work a while, then just rest and draw benefits. It happens everywhere. Don't quote me by name, but frankly we needed something like this new law."

He was recognizing a painful fact: in many of our States, the unemployment compensation laws, originally designed to tide workers over periods of enforced inactivity while they hunted for new jobs, have been riddled with loopholes which encourage all who want something for nothing.

Wyoming, although it is one of our least populous States, had long been afflicted with all the abuses and distortions of the compensation systems prevalent in larger, more industrial States. And when, in 1957, the State legislature liberalized the already liberal unemployment benefits, the door was opened wide to the twin human weaknesses of laziness and cupidity. The next 6 years saw a public binge at the trough of unemployment compensation—a happy time for everybody who wanted a prolonged vacation at public expense.

The following cases and practices were typical:

A girl was brought to trial and found guilty of embezzling her employer's funds. Since more than 4 weeks had elapsed between the date of her dismissal from the job and the day she filed her claim, the State promptly granted her unemployment compensation. When the outraged employer registered an official objection, the State's only response was a letter stating that the girl's unemployment compensation would not be charged against the employer's account.

A fieldhand was asked to help out with barn chores during the winter months when outdoor work was slack. He refused, quit—and after a month was granted unemployment benefits.

A man gave up his job in another State because he decided that the climate did not agree with him. He filed for compensation in Wyoming, where he had previously worked. He stated lamely that he had consulted a doctor—several years earlier. In spite of an official ruling stating that self-diagnosis of an ailment may not be accepted as good cause for quitting work, the applicant was not denied benefits. He merely had to wait 4 weeks—the maximum penalty under the law at that time—for his first check instead of starting to draw compensation at once.

Benefits to casual workers who had no intention of becoming year-round employees were handed out lavishly. It was necessary only to earn $250 in one 3-month period and $125 in another to qualify. This rule was an obvious temptation: pick up a temporary job, hold it for a few weeks, then push up to the trough and share in the largess. Many a small farmer planted in the spring, took a job for wages in early summer, then reaped a double harvest during the late summer and early fall—one from the land, the other from the State.

Residents of neighboring South Dakota noted Wyoming's bonanza and came across the border in considerable numbers for summer work. Returning home in the autumn, they drew from Wyoming more liberal unemployment benefits than if they had worked in their own State.

In many cases, the same person received unemployment benefits and social security simultaneously.

A highway contractor offered some of his men, who had been laid off during severe weather, $2 an hour for winter repair work in his shops. They declined. They were drawing $53 a week in nontaxable compensation. If they worked 40 hours a week in the repair shops, they would have to pay income tax and would end up with only about $16 more take-home pay than they were already getting for doing nothing. It wasn't worth it.

Wyoming's scale of benefits was top bracket—right up with the industrial States, which have a higher cost of living. In the first half of 1960, Wyoming tied for first place in highest average weekly benefits. Only three States had higher maximum weekly benefits. A claimant could collect up to 55 percent of the State's average wage for 26 weeks—a total of $1,222—and also pick up an extra $6 a week as a dependency allowance for two children. He could also earn any amount up to 50 percent of his benefits without any reduction in his State checks.

Unemployment compensation, of course, is financed by a tax on employers, and in Wyoming, as in other States, employers with a record of solid employment through the years pay less than firms where employment fluctuates. Some with perfect records pay nothing. Wyoming's law, however, established a whole series of complicated gimmicks whereby some employers could escape compensation taxes more easily than others. As a result, within 2 years after the 1957 law went into effect, 30 percent of the State's employers were paying no compensation taxes at all.

The inevitable penalty for such profligacy became evident. Soon the State was paying out 39 percent more in benefits than it was collecting from employers. The reserve fund began shrinking drastically. From $16 million in 1953, it was to melt to $3 million before action was taken in 1963. To check the downhill flow, in 1959 the State's Employment Security Commission proposed that the employer be taxed on the first $4,200 of an employee's earnings instead of the first $3,000.

At this point trouble began for the bureaucrats. It was started by a young man named Jack Knott, newly appointed manager of the Associated General Contractors of Wyoming and a management appointee on the advisory council of the employment commission. Knott started digging diligently into the States compensation practices. He was joined in his investigations by Russell W. Beamer, executive secretary of the Wyoming Mining Association.

The commission had hoped to push through the tax hike in the legislative session of 1959. One morning Knott and Beamer had breakfast with two members of the legislature. That same afternoon the house took up the compensation tax bill—which presumably was all set to go through with a whoop and a holler. But when the two legislators who had conferred with Knott and Beamer had finished talking about all the abuses and loopholes that had been unearthed, the house turned down the commission's bill by a vote of 26 to 23.

The struggle was by no means over. The State still had it old spendthrift unemployment-compensation law. The reserve fund was still sinking. And a lot of folks who shouldn't have been were still relaxing at public expense on happy-time money. But Knott and Beamer had succeeded in raising the warning flag.

About a year later, the efforts of the two men were reinforced by the arrival of Charles DeFoe, energetic new manager of the Wyoming Retail Merchants Association. DeFoe came from Oregon, where he had made a study of unemployment compensation. In his new position he saw immediately that Wyoming's jobless-pay system was headed for disaster.

In 1961, the employment security commission renewed its demand for increased taxes on employers, and a new legislative battle erupted. Knott, Beamer, and DeFoe prepared their own bill and got it sponsored by interested legislators. The commission's bill died, and their measure landed on the Governor's desk. But the Governor vetoed it.

By this time, however, the State was aroused. The reserve fund was approaching the danger point; soon there would be nothing left to pay even the deserving jobless workers. It was obvious that before long all employers, even those with perfect employment records, would be paying the maximum tax. Suddenly, compensation reform was everyone's busines. In the 1962 State election campaign, Clifford P. Hansen, Republican candidate for Governor, made it one of his principal issues, and was elected.

DeFoe, Knott, and Beamer finally won their long battle in 1963. Their bill, tough but fair, was signed into law. The chief changes are:

1. Under the old law, a worker who quit or was fired for cause could collect benefits. Now he gets none.

2. The casual worker who under the old law regarded compensation as a post-job bonus is now excluded. No one is eligible for benefits unles he has worked 26 weeks in a year, putting in at least 24 hours a week and earning a minimum of 75 cents an hour.

3. Full unemployment compensation and social security can no longer be collected simultaneously by the jobless worker.

4. Maximum weekly benefits have been cut about 5 percent.

5. The out-of-Stater who comes to Wyoming to work and later collects Wyoming compensation checks in his home State is now subject to a 25-percent reduction in benefits.

6. Any amount over $10 a week earned through temporary employment is now subtracted from unemployment benefits.

7. Until the unemployment-benefit fund is built up to a safe level, all employers have to pay an extra one-half of 1 percent on their taxable payroll.

This was drastic medicine for a State where many people had come to regard easy access to public funds as a vested right. Opponents predicted that business would suffer because a lot of people would have less spending money. This hasn't happened. The State's economy—as reliably measured by volume of the sales tax—has not been hurt. And the compensation reserve fund doubled in the first year of the new law. When the legislature meets in January 1965, some refinements may be made in the law, but the chances are that in basic outline it will remain unchanged.

"When a man is out of work through no fault of his own, after having been an honest-to-goodness member of the labor force, he is entitled to benefits," says Jack Knott. "Here in Wyoming most of us are all for that established principal. But when the system gets out of hand, something must be done if it is to survive and serve its purpose."

Boost Our Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are rightfully proud not only of the overall history of our country but of the regional and local historic developments that collectively give us our great national heritage.

The Des Plaines Valley News, independent publication serving south Cook County, Ill., in its issue of Thursday, November 19, 1964, discussed in a most effective and proper fashion the great historic activities of the past that took place specifically in the State, county, and local areas served by that newspaper.

Recognizing the historic value of these comments, I place the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

BOOST OUR HERITAGE

Countless trails of various Indian tribes converged on one spot in the Midwest for centuries.

For this was the high ground between the rivers of the West and South between the swamps linking the west branch of the Chicago River to the Great Lakes region.

It was a spot where the tribe traders rested before portaging their canoes and merchandise from one waterway system to another, where the shortest route was found the fastest.

They paused for they had battled the downhill current and needed rest before beginning another waterway journey.

Indians on the warpath from the north used the region as a spot to launch raids on other native tribes.

Through this spot, the Indians held, a canal could be dug to link the two mighty waterway trade routes.

When the Jesuit missionaries, Marquette and Joliet, explored the region and were teaching the natives, they were told of the Indians' dream of linking the waterways.

The French fur traders followed the steps of the missionaries and linked their empire with one outpost on the banks of the Des Plaines at the bend of the river and another at the mouth of the Chicago River which, incidently, was staffed by a Negro.

Later the Pilgrims launched their first colony on the eastern shores of the unknown land. Powerful France lost its western trade empire to England in the wars.

Then the Thirteen Original Colonies revolved, forming a new nation. As part of the victory, they won control of the trading rights. The Northwest Territory was established.

The new Nation saw the advantage of protecting the trade route to the Southwest and built a fort known as Fort Dearborn. This protection gave settlers the courage to establish homes in the wilderness.

Indians then went on the warpath after losing faith in the newcomers' promise of digging a waterway to link the mighty trade routes. Historians call the battle then fought the "Fort Dearborn Massacre."

An Indian fighter known as "Mad Anthony" Wayne was sent and the tribes lost their outpost. However, a treaty was signed in 1816 giving a strip of land 10 miles wide on both sides of the proposed canal to the Federal Government.

When Illinois became a State, its boundaries were shifted so that new canal would be constructed entirely within the new State.

The convergence of the high land routes became the route of stagecoaches from Chicago to the west and north. The first tollway plank road linked to Summit Ridge.

When railroads replaced the canoe and stagecoach, they chose the ridge to lay their route. Many know of the Santa Fe rail line linking the West, but few know that rail laying began along the banks of the Summit Ridge. The Gulf, Mobile & Ohio line followed soon after, using the same high ridge.

At the convergence of the Indian trade routes, that of the first stagecoaches and where roadbuilder Colonel Archer turned to follow the ridge to dig the canal, today is a beautiful grassy knoll, laid by the southwest expressway builders.

Mighty Chicago leaders, who today by reason of population and political strength have named various routes for presidential figures or noted men, should look to Summit.

May it be known that Summit, the ridge from which the suburb took its name, gave birth to both Chicago and Ottawa, for Chicago would be still a swamp today were it not for the water dam at the bend of the Des Plaines within the village.

All dwelling sites within Chicago and Ottawa were laid out by the canal commission in its survey.

Many claim that the new expressway route should be known after Marquette. Perhaps they are correct. But let's carry out the name that existed before Marquette ever trod the land; namely, "Portage Road."

Let us move the monument which now marks Marquette's stopover in his journey of exploration to that grassy knoll so it could not remain weed grown and hidden at the foot of a block where the routes converged.

Let us be proud of our heritage. Let our new generation of students be aware that because Summit stands on top of the Continental Divide, Chicago exists, waters of the canal flow backward and a nation helped to grow mighty.

Let the mighty Lawndale-Expressway complex be known as Portage Bridge and our little grassy knoll as the corner where history marched since the coming of man to this land as Portage Point.

Many communities in our area have marked their golden jubilee, but Summit marks its 75th or diamond jubilee in 1965, and may this writer be the first to ask that the grassy knoll at the junction of Lawndale and Archer be hereafter known as Portage Point.

Strom Thurmond—Women Strike for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on December 8, 1964, Gerda Pugell, United Nations correspondent for the Mutual Broadcasting System, made a very interesting and significant broadcast concerning the organization "Women Strike For Peace." Much has been in the news concerning this organization and its officers, some of whom have recently been indicted for contempt of Congress. The brief remarks of Miss Pugell put the organization in proper perspective. I ask unanimous consent that this broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM A BROADCAST BY GERDA PUGELL, UNITED NATIONS CORRESPONDENT, MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, DECEMBER 8, 1964

While welcoming speeches for three new member states of the United Nations were in progress inside the U.N. Building, outside, on the United Nations Plaza, the "Women Strike For Peace" was holding a demonstration, urging the admission of still another state, Red China. About 100 demonstrators, all women of course, carried signs reading "China must be included in all disarmament negotiations as a necessary step to lasting peace"—"China must be seated in the United Nations immediately." Women Strike For Peace is a non-Government organization duly accredited to the U.N. and, as you know, its members are thousands of women—mostly mothers from all over the United States. They have been active in calling for test bans and disarmament before, but now, they say they are newly aroused by the dangers of Chinese nuclear testing, wherefore—as one lady told me, "in an unprecedented action," they have even written a letter to the President of Red China, protesting nuclear tests. One member of the group told me that Woman Strike For Peace hopes to attract more and more women all over the world, so that at the end, they'll be powerful enough to successfully pressure the men of the world to stop contamination of the world's atmosphere with atomic tests and to keep the peace.

The idea, and especially the name of the organization made me think of the old Lisistrata story and so I would have jokingly renamed them "Lisistrata Inc.," or "Lisistrata Ltd."—except that there is nothing funny about Women Strike for Peace, because I consider Women Strike for Peace a dangerous organization.

Dangerous, because obviously there are thousands of sincere and well-meaning mothers, who don't know—don't realize what they are saying. I am sure that most of them are unaware that "phrases," "slogans," words they have been taught smell to high heaven of communism. They are nothing but reiterations of all those typical expressions used in Communist propaganda. What I find so dangerous about it, is precisely the fact that an unsuspecting person cannot detect it. It all seems so normal and innocent and the "cause" is such a sensible one. Of course, we all want to stop wars and nuclear testings; of course, we all want to live in a peaceful world, so why then would anyone find grounds to object to a dedicated organization called Women Strike for Peace? It's the choice of words, that tips you off. It makes you think, if of all the possibilities of selecting words to express something, the words they choose are the ones used in Communist propaganda, and that this goes completely undetected by thousands of American women, to what else, it makes you think, can these unsuspecting mothers be made a tool of next.

This is why I said before that Women Strike for Peace is a dangerous organization. Nothing is more dangerous than unawareness of the extremely clever ways of Communist propaganda.

After reading petitions and press releases by this group and after having talked to two of its members, I have a hunch, and this is shared by many of our friends in the United Nations, that most members of Women Strike for Peace don't know what they are doing but that the few who run the show know exactly what they are doing.

Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn, Educator, Philosopher, and Civil Libertarian, Dies Unexpectedly at 92

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, December 17, 1964, the Washington Post carried the following obituary upon the passing of Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn:

Alexander Meiklejohn, who championed the unfettered interchange of ideas as the very essence of education, died unexpectedly yesterday at his home in Berkeley, Calif. He was 92.

What is most noteworthy about this opening paragraph is not that an eminent philosopher, educator, and civil libertarian passed away at the age of 92—actually, he was approaching 93—but what is noteworthy is that he died "unexpectedly." And the fact is that his passing was altogether unexpected, particularly by a group of proud and admiring alumni of the Meiklejohn Experimental College conducted on the University of Wisconsin campus in the early 1930's, who were at this very time planning a college reunion in Athens this April with Dr. Meiklejohn, as a fitting and proper setting for reviving the Socratic dialog on a number and variety of questions which are still perplexing mankind.

I would like to include here a group of articles and editorials which were published in the wake of Dr. Meiklejohn's unexpected demise which pay in small measure tribute and homage to this great perceptive, noble, and courageous man of our time.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 17, 1964]

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN, FORMER AMHERST HEAD

Alexander Meiklejohn, who championed the unfettered interchange of ideas as the very essence of education, died unexpectedly yesterday at his home in Berkeley, Calif. He was 92.

A former president of Amherst College, Mr. Meiklejohn resigned the post in 1923 in a storm of educational controversy that swirled around the center of his contention that the country's intellectual heritage was being sacrificed on the altar of professional rote.

A few years later he founded the short-lived (1927–32) School of Experimental Education at the University of Wisconsin, which featured teaching methods that have since been standardized in many progressive institutions.

The late President Kennedy presented him with the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1963 in recognition of his profound influence on American education.

His wife, three sons and a daughter survive him. They are Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, of 1209 Ripon Road, Alexandria, vice chairman of the Fairfax County Democratic Committee; Donald Meiklejohn, a professor at Syracuse University; Dr. Gordon Meiklejohn, who heads the school of medicine at the University of Colorado; and Ann Stout, of Berkeley. He also leaves 12 grandchildren.

A native of Rochdale, England, Mr. Meiklejohn came to this country at the age of eight. He was educated at Brown and Cornell Universities and in 1897 joined the Brown faculty as an instructor in philosophy. He became professor of logic and metaphysics there in 1906 and it was from that post that he moved in 1912 to the presidency of Amherst.

From the start at the New England institution, Mr. Meiklejohn showed he was not in consonance with the educational status quo. He reshaped the curriculum with new emphasis on the social sciences and he placed the control of student activities in the hands of the students themselves through a student board.

Amherst flourished but internecine strife smoldered under his innovations and in 1923 the storm broke. By unanimous vote of the board, backed by a majority of the faculty, Mr. Meiklejohn was asked to resign. Eight members of the faculty quit in sympathy with him and 12 seniors and one post-graduate student refused the diplomas they had earned.

In later years he was the recipient of honorary degrees from Amherst among half a dozen other recognized seats of learning. Among his books on the subject of liberal education are "The Liberal College" and "Freedom of the College."

Washington alumni of Amherst joined him here last December at a reception in the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies after President Johnson had presented him with the Freedom Medal President Kennedy had awarded him.

"Do you remember the first lecture you gave us?" one of the old grads began in the course of just such a conversational exchange as Mr. Meiklejohn had made famous.

"Lecture?" he interjected, smiling, and his questioner corrected himself immediately. "I mean the first time you talked to us," he amended.

Formal lectures were anathema in the Meiklejohn scheme of things. He sought to make students think for themselves, building their thoughts on a minute survey of Greek civilization in one concentrated dose and of American civilization in another.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 18, 1964]

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

The death of Alexander Meiklejohn at the age of 92 robs the country of a national resource—a figure almost uniquely symbolic of its libertarian tradition. This ramrod-straight, sparse, spectacled philosopher was at once scholar and polemicist, a man of learning and a champion of freedom. An implacable foe of every restraint on expression, an inveterate champion of underdogs and lost causes, he was, nevertheless, a man of extraordinary sweetness, gentleness, and tolerance.

Alec Meiklejohn was forever in the vanguard. As dean of Brown University, as president of Amherst College, as head of the experimental college at the University of Wisconsin, as chairman of the School for Social Studies in San Francisco, he pressed incessantly for educational ideas and practices which were not to win general acceptance for nearly half a century. All of higher education in the United States is today indebted to him for his theories and innovations.

He was, above all other things, a gifted, inspired, and devoted teacher—a lover of learning and an inspirer of youth. He believed that mental capacity is developed by exercise; and so he sought always to make students think and challenge and question. He abhorred monologue and delighted in discourse. He relished argument from youngsters, eliciting responsibility from them by treating them as responsible. Although he deplored reverence, he won it from innumerable young men and women who worked under him.

In the area of political controversy, Professor Meiklejohn always espoused the view that the first amendment was intended as an absolute barrier to any governmentally imposed limitation on the expression of political opinion. He made a distinction between political expression and the discussion of private interests, asserting that "under the Constitution, the freedom of advocacy or incitement to action by the Government may never be abridged. It is only advocacy or incitement to action by individuals or nonpolitical groups which is open to regulation."

Thus, he argued persistently and eloquently against Justice Holmes' clear and present danger limitation of free speech. "No belief or advocacy may be denied freedom," he insisted, "if, in the same situation, opposing beliefs or advocacies are granted that freedom." He held a utilitarian view of freedom, believing that it "is always expedient"—that it affords the best assurance of wisdom in national affairs and the surest safeguard to national security.

For all the passion of his opinions, Alec Meiklejohn never doubted the right of others to dispute them—never doubted the desirability of having them disputed. He represented a great heritage. And he left a rich inheritance.

[From the Nation, Dec. 28, 1964]

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

His influence was even greater than his achievements. The achievements—as educator, as social philosopher, as theorist of freedom and democracy—were deeply impressive, but his influence was incalculable. Through students and colleagues whose lives and outlook had been transformed by their association with him, his influence radiated outward in ever-widening circles. His intelligence—his capacity to illuminate—was incandescent. Well before the domestic witch hunt that accompanied the cold war got underway, he had foreseen that it would strike us and why. "What Does America Mean?" published in 1935 by W. W. Norton, is one of the great testaments of American freedom.

Our frontier experience, he argued, had blinded us to the distinction between freedom and independence—Senator Goldwater please note—and this confusion kept us from acknowledging that we love freedom more than anything else. Our commitment is to freedom, not to independence; freedom implies an obligation to respect the freedom of others; independence is self-assertion. Because of this failure of insight, "there has come upon us, in recent years, a vivid sense of having been disloyal to our own purposes. In many ways we are obsessed by the fear of having betrayed ourselves."

The capacity to make distinctions of this sort was typical of his way of examining what appeared to be the insoluble dilemmas of democracy. The teacher's responsibility, he once wrote, had two aspects: "responsible for" and "responsible to." The teacher is responsible for the students, not to them. He is responsible on behalf of parents, but not to them. No teacher worth his salt would ever agree that the success or failure of his teaching was to be judged by what parents thought of it. Nor was the teacher responsible to the public. "More than anything else," he wrote, "the public interest of a democracy demands that its learning and teaching shall be free, shall not be subject to popular pressure or review * * *. No democracy can afford to have either its courts or its learning subject to its own whims, its caprices, its ignorance, or even its commonsense." To whom, then, is the teacher responsible? "As

against the truth which scholars have there is the truth for which they strive." It is rarely achieved but "somehow in the very nature of the world itself there is a meaning which we seek, a meaning which is there whether we find it or not. That meaning is the final standard of our work, the measure of all we do or hope to do or fail to do. To it we are responsible.

Alexander Meiklejohn was an American idealist in whose presence "realists" and "pragmatists" seemed shortsighted and naive. His courage was intellectually and morally exhilarating. At a time when other philosophers were cashing in on the cold war by hedging their commitments to freedom, he proudly reaffirmed his commitment and thereby gave courage to the legion of the faint-of-heart. At 92, frail but indomitable, he was active in the campaign to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Last December, President Johnson awarded him the Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian honor; for once the right honor was given to the right man.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 25, 1964]

LETTER TO THE EDITOR—MEIKLEJOHN'S INFLUENCE

The late Alexander Meiklejohn was the conscience of all those who had once sat at his feet and learned from him what it means to apply the Socratic precept about the unexamined life. While his name is indelibly associated with Brown University, with Amherst College, and with the Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin, it should not be forgotten that Mr. Meiklejohn had a profound influence in the shaping of what has, since 1937, been called the new program at St. John's College in Annapolis.

One of the cofounders of this new program, Scott Buchanan, had been a student of Meiklejohn's at Amherst and the freshman or "Greek" year at St. John's can trace its descent from the Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin.

Those who were at St. John's in the early days of the New Program remember the annual spring visit of Mr. Meiklejohn to Annapolis when he would give a series of formal lectures, play a bit of tennis in the afternoon (he was only 70 then), and sit in the coffee shop "corrupting the youth of Athens" by asking the students to wrestle with the hard, ultimate questions. To have known Mr. Meiklejohn at all was an honor, but to have had him as a teacher when young was truly a rare privilege.

HARRISON SASSCER.

CHEVY CHASE.

The Republican Challenge for 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Chairman of the Republican National Committee, the Honorable Dean Burch, addressed the District of Columbia League of Republican Women on the subject "The Republican Challenge for 1965."

Mr. Burch addressed himself to the challenge facing his party this year, but I believe his remarks also present a succinct statement of the challenge facing the American two-party system at this juncture in our history.

I commend a study of Mr. Burch's address to all those interested in the future of one of our great American political parties and of our two-party political system. With unanimous consent, I include the text of Mr. Burch's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE REPUBLICAN CHALLENGE FOR 1965

(Address by the Honorable Dean Burch, Chairman, Republican National Committee, before the District of Columbia League of Republican Women, January 4, 1965)

The start of a new year is traditionally a time for assessment and resolution. As Americans, we are concerned about the state of the Union—and as Republicans, about the state of our party.

Today I would like to discuss with you the state of our party.

Where do we stand and where we are headed?

There are those who would direct all our energies to reassessing our party's effort in 1964. Still others are looking ahead solely to the election challenge of 1966 and 1968.

I agree that we must consider the lessons of past defeats so as to create the conditions for future victories. But as chairman of your national committee I submit that to do this we must first meet the challenge of this year, 1965.

Unity and purpose are the primary needs of our party if we are to meet the Republican challenge for 1965. This doesn't mean that all Republicans must agree on all matters. It does mean that we must recognize and stand by the fundamental principles which make us Republicans—and which distinguish us from our Democrat opposition.

There are ideological ties which bind us to our Republican home. Party unity can be achieved only by strengthening these ties for all Republicans—whether eastern or western, liberal or conservative.

Unity cannot be achieved by seeking to cut that tie from other Republicans—that is, by closing the doors of our party to all those with whom we sometimes disagree.

If we succeed in our efforts to meet the challenge of 1965, this can be a year of Republican Party unity and opportunity. But if we fail—if 1965 becomes a year spent in division and recrimination—the year of the scapegoat—then we will also fail our larger duty to the Nation as the party of responsible opposition.

The postelection criticism we have all heard reminds me of the comment of Marshal Joffre, the French commander, when asked whether he could be credited with having won the Battle of the Marne.

"I do not know," replied the Marshall, "who is responsible for winning the battle. But if we had not won, I know who would have lost it." Or to put it another way, success has many parents but failure is an orphan.

Perhaps the search for scapegoats is an inevitable consequence of defeat, military or political. But as I have said many times in recent weeks, the real challenge for Republicans in 1965 is not what to do about Dean Burch. It is what to do in order to strengthen our party's role as the historic spokesman for responsible government and those principles which have made our country great.

The question we should be asking if our party is to achieve unity is not: Who lost the election? It is: Why are we Republicans?

Let's seek out and emphasize those vital principles which brought us together as a party and have held us together as a party for over a century—through years of victory and years of defeat.

Why are we Republicans?

Fundamentally, we are Republicans because we believe that while government must serve in the creation of an orderly society, it must never replace individual responsibility in forming that society.

The Republican Party believes in the individual. And we are Republicans because we believe that government is the servant of the individual citizen—and that the true greatness of our society rests not in government power but in individual rights and responsibilities.

In terms of the specific domestic issues facing the American people today, this means:

We are Republicans because we are committed to those programs and policies which truly advance the principle of equality of opportunity for all Americans. We are Republicans because we support these programs and policies not as a matter of political expediency, but as a matter of political principle.

We are Republicans because in 1965, as in 1865, ours is the party of Lincoln.

We are Republicans because we regard the well-being of citizens in human rather than political terms.

We are Republicans because we consider the needs of our senior citizens in the light of individual requirements rather than bureaucratic powers. And we consider the needs of our younger citizens in terms of their opportunity, not ours.

In brief, we are Republicans because we believe in strengthening programs—not in fattening the bureaus and the agencies assigned to carry out programs.

We are Republicans then because we are interested in our fellow Americans as human beings—not simply as potential votes.

Why are we Republicans? Let me tell you:

We are Republicans because we believe in an America in which government is an ally of business, agriculture, and labor—but not the ultimate arbiter, intruding into every aspect of the country's economic life.

We are Republicans because we know that before the great society came the free society. And because we understand that what the Democrats really aim for is not a great society at all—merely greater government control over all segments of American society. This necessarily results in the diminution of the free society.

We are Republicans because we strongly support economic policies to create a national prosperity based not on artificial Government stimuli but on sound economic grounds.

Now, when I say "we" believe in these principles, I mean all Republicans. For despite any differences among us, the domestic positions I have briefly outlined here are fundamental to our existence as one of the two major American political parties.

And regardless of other differences—geographic or ideological—these are the ties which bind us to our Republican home in this year of 1965.

But there are also other reasons, common reasons, why we are Republicans:

We hold dear the freedom and security of our country and we are realists in assessing outside threats to that freedom and security in the modern thermonuclear age.

In terms of specific foreign policy problems facing our country today, this means:

We are Republicans because we recognize that a true and lasting peace in today's world depends on maintaining American strength—material and moral.

We are Republicans because we remember and understand the lessons of recent history—and we don't believe a sound foreign policy can be built on wishful thinking and gambling on our Communist adveraries' intentions and conduct.

We are Republicans because we believe that world respect for our country can only be based on firmness in the face of aggression, whether petty or great.

We are opposed to such fallacies as trying to halt an aggressor with what President Johnson recently described as a policy of "creative inaction."

We are Republicans because we believe that the American people are entitled to know the truth concerning the worldwide dangers which beset our country and our allies. Government paternalism in domestic affairs is bad enough. But the "Father Knows Best" information policy of the administration today poses a serious threat to our country's basic institutions.

A significant example of the differing philosophies of the two parties is that Republicans have faith in the American people.

We are Republicans because we have faith in the American people's good sense and ability to understand the facts regarding our national security—and we believe they should have the full facts on which to base their judgments.

The Johnson administration—lacking such faith—prefers that its information policy on foreign affairs operate in a semidarkness in which the American people have less than the full truth.

So here again we find an issue upon which all Republicans stand together. For the central theme of Republican history is faith in the American people and opposition to government paternalism in all forms.

Why are we Republicans? I repeat: If we are to be a responsible and effective party of opposition—if we are to regain executive and legislative power nationally—we must keep this question uppermost in our minds.

The answers point up those principles which unify us as a party. And we must never forget that our primary argument must be with those administration programs and policies which run counter to our own philosophy of government.

Now should there be any doubt about the unanimity of Republican adherence to these basic postures of our party, let me assure you that these are positions which have been spelled out clearly and repeatedly in our national platforms and by our national candidates over the years. As recently as a month ago, in a speech in New York, General Eisenhower eloquently restated these fundamental precepts concerning the relationship between government and the individual American.

I personally have a strong conviction that the needs of the Nation—and the overriding necessity of maintaining an effective two-party system—come above all else. Our country will not be served if we as a party retreat from any of the principles or philosophies which spell out the differences between Republicans and Democrats.

History has told us that when any one party enjoys a political monopoly such as the one that now exists, this excessive power leads to corruption, erosion of freedom for all of us, and to a weakening of our leadership in world affairs.

As your national chariman, my goal is to create in the Republican Party a party of the majority strong enough to carry any candidate, rather than placing our dependence upon any candidate who can carry the party.

Our elections of the future must not be popularity contests—bouts between personalities—but a decisionmaking process where traditional American ideals and positive programs to implement them hold the limelight of public attention. The issues must be debated fully, and hates and prejudices must be discarded for the common good.

I think this can be accomplished only if we as Republicans tell our story between now and the next election in terms of a unanimity of thought and action which will transcend all other considerations. We must redouble our efforts to seek and achieve fair play in the public media which is so influential in national affairs today. This can be done only if we demonstrate a united faith in what we believe to be best for America, rather than merely concentrating on the mistakes of the opposition.

If past performance is any guide—and if Lyndon Johnson really meant some of the things he said during the recent campaign—then let me assure you that we'll have a full-time argument on our hands during the next 4 years.

This isn't to say that Republican equate opposition simply with obstruction. In the midsixties, responsible opposition and a concern for the public good demand a positive approach to our country's problems.

For such an approach we can look to our party's representation in Congress for leadership and guidance. Our leadership in the House and Senate is capable of providing such guidance. These are the men who are writing the record on a day-to-day basis and they are all men of high goodwill and ability who have the best interests of our party and Nation at heart.

No less a challenge for 1965 lies outside of Washington, however, on the State and local levels of government. The Republican Party is uniquely qualified to meet this challenge, for ours is the party that believes in greater State and local responsibility in government affairs.

Make no mistake, if America's State and local governments are to survive the onslaught of Federal centralization, the country must look to Republican leadership.

It remains with Republican Governors, mayors, and other State and local officials to shape our party's record in legislatures and city halls throughout the 50 States.

Like General Eisenhower, I am hopeful that 1965 will see an end to prefix Republicanism. For when it comes down to meeting the challenges posed by our Democrat opposition, we cannot afford to divide ourselves as eastern or western Republicans, conservative or liberal Republicans, Goldwater, or Scranton, or Rockefeller Republicans.

This is our paramount challenge. Are we going into the field to join issue with Democrats and to uphold our historic responsibility as a party of unity—or as a party of division, weakened and rent by internal conflict?

The principle of party unity—of reaching for that which binds us together rather than that which separates us—is indispensible to our party's future. It cannot be accomplished by any one man or group of men dedicated above all else to their own political successes. Nor can we achieve unity by listening to the siren songs of those people outside our party who tell us gratuitously what is wrong with Republicanism and how to correct it. Unity can be accomplished only by the full party itself working together with single purpose: Victory at the polls for every Republican, based on our common dedication to Republican principles.

It is this conviction that sustains me in our effort to meet the Republican challenge for 1965. It was Winston Churchill who pointed out: "If we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future."

That was good advice for Englishmen in the 1940's. I submit that it is excellent advice for Republicans in this country as we ready ourselves for the challenge of the year ahead.

Repayment in Insults

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the continued deterioration in the conduct of foreign affairs is seen in an especially clear light in the relations of the United States with the United Arab Republic.

The fact that the United Arab Republic, by its support of so-called Congo rebels, is violating international law and working against the interests of its own people is clear. In addition, it sees fit to publicly abuse the United States to whom it should be forever indebted.

The Chicago Daily News, in a timely editorial on Saturday, December 26, 1964, discussed this area of foreign relations.

The editorial follows:

REPAYMENT IN INSULTS

Americans learned long ago that helping a foreign government brings small returns in friendship or gratitude. But seldom has foreign aid returned such ingratitude and insults as have flowed from Gamal Abel Nasser of the United Arab Republic.

In repid succession, Nasser's followers burned the American-built library in Cairo and shot down a private American plane, and Nasser himself told our Ambassador to go drink from the sea—the Egyptian equivalent of "jump in the lake." He boasts of helping the savage rebels in the Congo, and says if we do not like it we can take our gifts of food elsewhere.

This is the best suggestion Nasser has come up with in a long time. Egypt has been getting about $140 million worth of grain and other food from the United States each year on what amounts to a gift basis. Payment is made in Egyptian currency, virtually worthless outside the country. It is standard procedure for such currencies to be used only for projects within the country that in the long run help the beneficiary country far more than the United States.

What sparked Nasser's particular anger was an implied U.S. demand for real money—dollars—for the food we sell, rather than Egyptian currency. In short, the gift supply might dry up if the Egyptian dictator does not call off his vicious anti-American attacks.

"We do not sell our dignity, not even for a billion pounds," Nasser said. Just what dignity he had in mind is not readily apparent. Perhaps he meant the show of dignity last month when his mobs burned the John F. Kennedy Library in Cairo. Or the dignity expressed by his Russian-built fighter planes in shooting down a slow, unarmed American cargo plane. Or the dignity he derives from contributing to a state of savage anarchy in the Congo.

It is true that things have not been going too well for Nasser of late. His dreams of setting up a pan-Arab federation with himself in the driver's seat have not worked out. Egypt itself has made little headway under his leadership. His desperate bid for power and prestige elsewhere in Africa brings him into conflict with other dictators in the new nations, as ambitious and unscrupulous as he is.

But there is no reason why the United States has to accept a role as target of his temper tantrums born of frustration. Nearly $1 billion in U.S. aid has poured into Egypt since 1946, in one form or another, but there is no law that says the flow must continue.

Let the charred wreckage of the U.S. library stand as a reminder to the mobs in Cairo that they destroyed a thing of value and beauty intended for their benefit. Let all aid be cut until Nasser regains some civility.

Address by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE, TO THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF GREATER PITTSBURGH, PITTSBURGH, PA., NOVEMBER 10, 1964

I

Governor Lawrence, President Schulten, Mayor Barr, Congressman Fulton, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, members and guests of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh, it is always a pleasure to visit the "New" Pittsburgh, the ever newer Pittsburgh, with all of its vitality and its progressiveness in so many fields. What you have done here in physical renovation and beautification, in controlling smoke and floods, in expanding your educational and health facilities, and your cultural activities, is justly famed. You have set an inspiring example in constructive cooperation among public authorities and enlightened private citizens.

It is a privilege to take part in this great fair and forum—and particularly to attend this session devoted to the theme: "Pittsburgh, a Supplier of Products and Know-How to the World Market." I must confess that I should have preferred to attend without making a speech. During recent weeks, in the quadrennial period ordained for debate and choice by the American people, I made a Secretary of State's normal quota of speeches. For, it seemed to me that when the foreign policies of the United States were being publicly discussed, the Secretary of State should not be the only one to remain silent. However, all of my speeches, except one, were made to nonpartisan audiences. And all, without exception, were devoted to the exposition of policies which were not, and are not, partisan, but which have been developed and supported by leaders of both major parties with experience in international affairs—policies which bear the hallmarks of such Republicans as Arthur H. Vandenberg, John Foster Dulles, and Christian Herter, as well as of such Democrats as Cordell Hull and Dean Acheson, and that extraordinary man who stood above partisan politics, George C. Marshall—the hallmarks of President Eisenhower as well as of Presidents Truman, Kennedy, and Johnson.

That bipartisan consensus on our basic foreign policies is the powerful gyroscope which holds the ship of state steady and on course even when the winds blow hard. And, I have no doubt it will continue to keep the ship steady as we pursue our course toward a more secure peace in a world of expanding freedom.

The basic foreign policies of the United States today are what they were a month ago, a year ago, a decade ago. As new situations arise, we shall try to deal with them. If new methods or greater efforts seem necessary to achieve our objectives, we shall try to find and apply them. But our goals are constant. And so are the major policies through which we worked toward those goals.

Tonight I shall discuss some of our major policies in the economic field. It goes almost without saying that a central objective of our foreign policy, as of our domestic policy, is the prosperity of the American people. We must have a strong economy, high levels of employment, a high and regular rate of growth, a high level of investment, injecting into our capital stock all that modern technology can provide—an economy capable of paving our way in the world, with a surplus to support our vital global commitments.

From the viewpoint of a Secretary of State, all these elements are indispensable to our success in the world arena. Without a strong economy we could not sustain the physical efforts necessary to preserve the security and build the strength of the free world—our vast Military Establishment, our relatively modest foreign aid programs, our oversea information program, our diplomacy. And, beyond that the ability of the American system to provide a good—and ever better—standard of living for the American people is a critical asset in the contest between freedom and tyranny.

Promotion of the economic growth of the United States is one of the oldest and most constant objectives of our foreign policy. We endeavor to enlarge foreign markets for American products and to insure access to the goods from abroad which our economy needs. In line with those fundamental economic objectives we pursue several closely related policies: the lowering of trade barriers, the strengthening of the international financial system, achievement of a balance-of-payments equilibrium, aid to the developing nations in modernizing their economic and social and political institutions.

Nowhere are the continuity of our goals and the bipartisan character of our actions more strongly demonstrated than in this field of policy—in foreign trade, foreign aid, and foreign investment. For three decades, we have used our resources and exerted our influence on the world scene to rebuild and expand the international economic order. We have sought an international environment that would encourage and expand the interchange of goods, capital, technology, and ideas among nations, and we can all take pride in the results.

I need not dwell on what has been accomplished because we see the results all around us. Trade among free world countries almost doubled in a decade, with exports and imports now more than $300 billion a year. The countries of Western Europe and Japan have long since recovered from the damage of war. As economically strong and prospering nations, they can now concert with us in the great enterprise of ensuring freedom, security, and peace in the world. Capital is moving in greater volume among nations and thereby making its contribution to the more effective use of the world's resources and to higher world income. In all these respects, ties among nations have greatly expanded—to the advantage of all.

We must continue in this direction—not simply to achieve further economic benefits but to build the kind of world that will enhance our national security and well-being. These are large stakes and they highlight the role of economic affairs in foreign policy.

I would like to stress that the results we achieve will depend more heavily upon private enterprise than upon Government. The Government can set guidelines, improve the ground rules, and provide information, but, for the most part, private actions are the instruments of change and progress in the economic world.

I propose, therefore, to discuss the respective roles of Government and private enterprise in two major areas of our foreign economic relations—our relations with other industrial countries, and our relations with the developing or emerging nations of the world. As a nation we have vital interests in both groupings. And this is mirrored in the trade of the Pittsburgh area. In examining the list of your best customers overseas, I find that they are almost equally divided among the industrial and the developing nations of the world.

It is a striking fact of our contemporary world that we trade and invest more with other industrial countries than we do with developing countries. Roughly two-thirds of our foreign trade and almost as much of our direct investments abroad are concentrated in Canada, Japan, Australia, and the countries of Western Europe. It is in these countries, moreover, that our trade and investment have risen most rapidly throughout the postwar period. They are the dynamic sector of our private economic activities abroad.

This is a far cry from Marxist tenets. Indeed, these trends make a mockery of the traditional Marxist view that foreign trade is primarily a battle for markets prosecuted by colonial powers, and that foreign investment is exploitation.

Instead the figures demonstrate what is axiomatic to American business—higher incomes make for greater trade and investment. We gain more from trading with our competitors because markets are larger and more specialized and because the exchange gives us both the opportunity to concentrate somewhat more on producing and selling the things we do best. And, as investors, we are attracted to these countries because the rules governing such investments are similar to our own and because market prospects there are growing most rapidly.

Moreover, we have been able to maintain, if not to improve, our competitive position in these markets despite our higher wages. Wages in our export industries average $3.50 per hour—or much more than the average in our more highly protected industries which do not sell abroad. Essentially these figures show that the most progressive of our industries at home are also the most competitive abroad. Or, put another way, our export industries tend to be our growth industries.

That is one reason why we must continue to work with other industrial countries to free the channels of world trade. It always seems easier to avoid competition by resorting to one or another protective device. But such actions encourage retaliation, close off opportunities, raise costs, and, in the end, hurt us all. Neither we nor other industrial countries can afford to view our own markets as special economic preserves removed from world market competition.

Together with other free world countries we share the prospect of participating in a world market growing by more than $10 billion a year. But our policies must be consistent with such opportunities. We must remember that those who cannot sell to us cannot buy from us.

Government has three specific functions in this endeavor.

First, we are engaged in major negotiations with other world trading countries to reduce tariffs on a reciprocal basis. These negotiations, popularly known as the Kennedy round, have been undertaken under the authority conferred by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. They are, of course, at the heart of our trade policy.

Second, where our products are subject to unwarranted restrictions, we negotiate bilaterally to remove such restrictions. This is a continuing and difficult process, but it is a responsibility that goes back to the beginnings of our diplomacy. We view it in that serious tradition.

Third, we have greatly expanded our program to assist U.S. businessmen in exporting abroad. This program is directed primarily to our markets in other industrial countries where the prospects are greatest, but it goes on elsewhere in the world as well. I thought some of the details would be of particular interest to your chamber.

Abroad, the Department of State has made commercial activities a responsibility of every Foreign Service officer, with the Ambassador setting the pace. Approximately 150 officers now spend all or most of their time on trade promotion work. Some 350 other staff members of the Foreign Service are closely associated with this program.

Over the past year, our missions abroad reported on almost 18,000 business opportunities relating to specific foreign companies. They also made available to American business information on approximately 4,000 foreign government tenders or planned government construction projects. We now have five trade centers operating in major foreign cities. And we have greatly expanded our participation in important trade fairs throughout the world.

A parallel effort has been made by the Department of Commerce in the United States. Through its 42 field offices, the Department of Commerce has greatly expanded its program to interest American firms in the export trade and to disseminate the business information collected by our posts abroad. There are now 1,200 members participating in regional export expansion councils in the United States. Seminars have been organized around the country to give businessmen the best available information on how to do business abroad.

These efforts—abroad and at home—clearly have had results. In the past 3 years, the number of our manufacturers engaged in exporting abroad has increased by one-third—from 12,000 to 16,000 firms.

This trade fair and forum is a demonstration of the new interest in foreign trade. It shows both the immense stake western Pennsylvania already has in world markets and your intention to enlarge them. I shall not carry coals to New Castle—I mean New Castle, Pa.—by reciting figures you already knew about western Pennsylvania's exports and your activity in establishing new foreign business units. But I must say that the statistics are impressive. And, as Secretary of State, I would add: keep up the good work.

But I would also add that much more remains to be done. We can do our best to provide American business with helpful information on market prospects and we can carry on the diplomatic negotiations necessary to open up markets. But only business can do the job itself, and this will depend on your continuing interest in these markets and on your ability to remain competitive abroad.

I turn now to some of the issues, the responsibilities, and the opportunities we confront in our economic relations with the developing countries. Here again, is a field where public and private actions must complement each other. There is not only room for both: there is an overriding need for both.

We must first remind ourselves that these countries contain three-fourths of the people in the free world; that their average per capita income is only $140 a year; that only 35 percent of them are literate. But these people are determined to achieve a better life for themselves and their children. And they are urgently pressing their leaders for economic and social progress.

We have a deep commitment to help these people realize their aspirations and make the progress they so desperately need. As President Johnson said: "These things are rooted in devotion to our democratic birthright and dedication to our spiritual values. They are * * * the only objectives possible to men that seek to retain freedom and protect moral values while pursuing progress in a world that is on the march."

We must help in the first instance, through our aid programs. These programs provide capital and technology that both supplement and stimulate the mobilization of local investment resources. Foreign aid frequently is crucial in determining whether a nation begins to move on the road to self-sustaining growth.

The cost of our foreign aid is small in relation to the contribution it makes to our national interests. It is about 3 or 4 cents out of the tax dollar, about 8 or 9 percent of the cost of our Military Establishment. And even this cost is somewhat overstated because more than 90 percent is in the form of American goods and services. Our aid programs help our agriculture, our metallurgical, chemical, and machinery and machine tool industries. You may be interested to know that Pennsylvania now is first among all the States as a source of our nonagricultural aid shipments commodity.

Nor is the United States alone in the business of extending aid. The countries which we helped to their feet through the Marshall plan have joined us to help others. So have Japan, and, on a smaller scale, other nations in the Pacific.

We must also help through our trade policies. This requires that we and other industrial countries assist in working out ways to stabilize the prices of a few key tropical products that can greatly affect the export earnings and hence the development prospects of many of these poorer nations. It also requires that all the industrial countries push forward together toward lower tariffs, the elimination of quotas, and a more open trading system. This would benefit the developing countries now and help them the more as they build their industries. In turn, our trade would also benefit. As their incomes and export earnings rise, the developing countries will be a better market for capital equipment and other advanced products from the United States and other industrial countries.

But Government actions in relation to the developing countries—even the combined actions of all the industrial countries—will not be enough unless they are accompanied by private actions. Economic development results from the growing application of capital, the will to change, and technological and managerial skills, to the productive process. Private investment and the private sector are the surest and the quickest means of bringing these factors into play.

It is this prospect that should challenge American business. There are growing signs that American firms are becoming more alert to the great differences in conditions and outlook among the newly independent countries and are adjusting to these individual situations. Nevertheless we have not been doing enough. We must learn more effective ways of investing in these countries, and how to manage these investments in ways appropriate to our times. We must experiment more with new forms of investment—with joint ventures, licensing agreements, and a variety of shared-equity arrangements. In one way or another, American private enterprise must become more extensively and more heavily engaged in the development business.

A hopeful sign is that attitudes in the developing countries are also changing—for the better. Outmoded theories and old fears are gradually being put aside. In their place is a greater recognition of what private foreign investment can accomplish and, more generally, an understanding of the dynamic role that the private sector as a whole can play in promoting economic growth.

Taken together, these changing attitudes around the world enable private foreign investment to make a much larger contribution to economic development—and in ways consistent with the interests, customs, and laws of the developing nations.

Here again I would like to outline some recent measures our Government has been taking to assist U.S. firms interested in making investments in the developing countries.

First, we have greatly expanded the investment guaranty arrangements. It is now possible for the U.S. Government to insure private investors against a variety of political risks in 61 friendly countries and areas. During this year alone, AID has written contracts under these agreements covering more than $500 million of new U.S. private investment—a record sum for the program.

Second, a great deal has been done to put more and better information at the disposal of American firms interested in making investments in the developing countries. For example, AID has recently established a Businessmen's Information Center and has brought together all available investment surveys for the ready convenience of potential U.S. investors.

Third, there is the unfinished business of the tax credit bill which President Johnson recommended and sent to Congress on March 10, 1964. This measure could greatly increase U.S. private investment in the developing countries. I have every hope it will receive the early attention it deserves in the Congress.

There is a larger issue running through these foreign economic policies that I would like particularly to bring into focus.

For too long, the critical business of economic development has been hampered by a sterile debate in the emerging nations of the world. This debate centered on the relative role of business and private enterprise. It was argued in terms of theory and ideology—not experience and performance.

In many countries, that phase seems to have run its course. There is a growing recognition that giving more scope to the private sector can be an important way of serving the public interest. There is also greater awareness that the free market is a wonderfully efficient instrument for allocating a nation's resources and organizing its human energies. There is no better teacher than success. Even some of the Communist countries are beginning to learn the lesson and to move haltingly in this direction.

The trends, therefore, point strongly toward an enlarged role for private investment and the private sector in the less developed countries. This is happening under a set of ground rules based on the proposition that public and private action need not be a substitute for each other, but must complement each other. In this environment, American private investment will have greater opportunities to participate and to help in promoting economic development. I have every confidence that you will meet the challenge.

George Washington Carver: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, January 5, was George Washington Carver Day, a day which commemorated

the passing 22 years ago of one of America's greatest scientists, most unusual teachers, and most unselfish contributors to the welfare of our people. It is with pride in an eminent fellow American and with gratefulness for his inspiring example that I rise to pay him tribute.

By the time of his death George Washington Carver, the son of Negro slaves, had gained international renown for his work in the field of agricultural research. He was unexcelled as an agricultural chemist, and he, probably more than any other single human being, had enabled the South to lift itself from despair and poverty by overcoming the destructive tyranny of a one-crop policy.

Born in Missouri about 1864, he was kidnaped as a baby and redeemed by a master in exchange for a $300 racehorse. By the age of 10 his master, recognizing the boy's intelligence, permitted him to leave in search of schooling and the youth set out penniless to acquire an education.

He worked his way through grade school in four nearby towns, through high school in Minneapolis, Kans., and for 3 years attended Simpson College in Iowa. Then, at the age of 32, in 1896, his years of struggle and patience won him a master of science degree from Iowa State College at Ames.

It is to the great credit of these schools that they did not make race or color the basis for entrance, for in extending education to young Carver they helped to mold one of America's most remarkable figures.

Dr. Carver was a modest man. I suggest that he would want us to use his life as an example of what this world might be like if there were equality of education for all citizens.

He became more than a good agricultural chemist. He became a superlative botanist, a teacher of great stature, an extraordinary inventor, a profound scientist, an unexcelled pioneer in the application of chemistry to industry, and an unselfish, devoted humanitarian. When he said these words, he genuinely and humbly felt them:

> There is goodness in everything * * *. I am only a trailblazer for those who come after me.

This trail that Dr. Carver was to blaze led him first to become director of the department of agricultural research for the Tuskegee Institute at the request of Booker T. Washington. It was here in a poorly equipped laboratory that he began the astonishing series of creative experiments that brought him fame.

Recognizing the soil-exhausting effects of cotton, Dr. Carver began preaching crop rotation to the depressed Alabama farmers. In his soft, shy manner, he urged them to alternate with soil-enriching crops such as peanuts and sweetpotatoes. As the South slowly heeded his advice, he worked endlessly in search of new uses for the products that were soon to become surplus foodstuffs.

In his laboratory he developed some 300 synethic products from peanuts, including milk, butter, cheese, coffee, flour, breakfast food, ink, dyes, soap, wood stains, and insulating board. His efforts lifted the peanut industry from a lowly state to a multimillion dollar yearly business.

From the sweetpotato he developed 118 products, such as tapioca, starch, vinegar, molasses, library paste, and rubber. He used pecan nuts, soybeans, cotton, cowpeas, and wild plums to produce valuable new products. He made synthetic marble from wood shavings; dye pigments from Alabama clays; mats and carpets from okra fiber, and fertilizers from the muck of swamps.

His output was phenomenal and he might easily have become a millionaire. But Dr. Carver steadfastly refused to exploit his discoveries, gifts he felt to be from God. His discoveries became the world's property, and to him, as to all great teachers, the reward lay in the thrill of expanding man's horizon. He put it very simply:

> Whatever helps the southern farmer helps the entire South. And what helps the South helps everybody.

Dr. Carver's was a natural humility. He considered his abundant talents to be a sacred trust. The harshness of his early life did not embitter him nor did the honors of his later life make him arrogant or proud.

In 1953, his birthplace in Missouri became a national monument. A bronze bust immortalizes the man who, born a slave, became a scientist, a pioneer, and a benefactor of his country. It is proper that we remember him, and we do so in gratitude.

Short Sight in Washington: Men of Vision Created Imperial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as a native of the great Imperial Valley of California, I have always followed with interest its tremendous progress as one of the most important agricultural regions of the country. For this reason, I include in the Appendix the following editorial:

[From the San Diego Union, Jan. 2, 1965]

SHORT SIGHT IN WASHINGTON: MEN OF VISION CREATED IMPERIAL

It took big men with courage, vision, and fortitude to make an agricultural mecca out of the United States last frontier in Imperial Valley.

They came to the valley when it was bone dry. They suffered privation, hardship and want in a vast, sprawling desert region hostile to man. With their imagination, initiative, and calloused hands they conquered the region and made it a showcase for farming.

Now men of Washington would undo all of this with strokes of a bureaucratic pen.

Meddling bureaucrats told Imperial Valley farmers and ranchers they cannot have water unless individuals own only 160 irrigated acres each.

In Imperial Valley, water is life itself. The sudden Department of Interior dictum on land ownership overlooks water rights dating back to first settlement of the valley, a superior court decision, and a ruling of then Interior Secretary Ray L. Wilbur in 1933.

The decisions held that the 1902 Reclamation Act did not only apply to lands with water rights already under cultivation, such as those in Imperial Valley. To have held otherwise would have been an ex post facto decision.

A solid foundation and the 1902 decisions gave Imperial Valley the impetus to prosper and make full use of the All American Canal for irrigation. For 31 years no official voice was raised in protest.

Now the Secretary of Interior has ruled that the 160-acre limitation must apply, whether or not the area is large enough to form an economic farming unit.

It must be assumed that regardless of who owns how much land the total water use in the 430,000-acre irrigation district is the same. What then are the underlying motives of the Secretary of Interior to make his move at the present time?

Isn't it strange that the Department of Interior decision on Imperial Valley came at a crucial time in California's negotiations to keep its rightful share of 4.4 million acre-feet of water annually in perpetuity from the Colorado River?

California claims this right is inherent in any discussion of a Pacific Southwest regional water plan, which is a significant fact. Secretary of the Interior Udall only wants the right to exist 25 years.

This is the second body blow the Federal Government has dealt Imperial Valley farmers this year. The first was a decision not to renew the bracero migrant labor program which is so important in harvesting valley crops. These are strange acts from a government which says it is trying to help agriculture.

Mr. Udall's decision for Imperial Valley is blatantly political leverage and an insult to all Californians. The full force of official, legal, and public opinion must be brought to bear to make him back down.

Wheat and Our Hopes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, within the past few days the head of the United Arab Republic in strong language denounced the United States which has provided food and economic assistance to his country. This was another in a series of incidents which point up the urgent need for a complete reappraisal and reevaluation of the United States foreign aid program.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Eagle which appropriately places the arrogance of Nassar in a proper light, while at the same time focusing attention on a general misgiving of the American public regarding our whole policy of foreign aid. The editorial follows:

WHEAT AND OUR HOPES

Only days ago Egypt's Nasser was telling Washington to go to hell, or the Arabic equivalent of that. Now the newspaper, Al Ahram, the organ of his regime, says Egypt is "by no means a party to an inexorable

enmity either with the American people or their Government."

Why the abrupt change? The only reason anyone has thought of up to now is our decision to ship $17-million worth of surplus wheat to the hungry United Arab Republic. This, said Al Ahram, was "an initiative worthy * * * of being pondered upon and encouraged."

All of which probably doesn't mean much, although American diplomats in Cairo are reported to be "encouraged" by the softening of the official line toward the United States.

If the diplomats are pleased, there is some evidence that the American public, or much of it, is not. A sampling of opinion in Wichita showed opinion running heavily against sending wheat to Nasser in light of his outburst. And there exists among many of us a deeper misgiving about our whole policy of foreign aid, which often seems to benefit most the people who like us least.

The policy is based upon the conviction that communism and disorder feed on hunger and deprivation, and that if we can contribute enough of our bounty to the world's underdeveloped nations we can create an economic stability and a sense of individual well-being that will diminish enmities and bring more concord into international affairs.

It is an approach that is both hopeful and humane, but it would be easier to support it if there was more evidence that it is working. It has been in effect for 20 years, and its proponents can say only that perhaps it has helped to keep our differences from flaming into war.

Everyone has conceded that it will require a great deal of time and patience to establish anything approaching world peace. It may be that if a shipment of wheat will ease a Nasser's anger for the moment that is the best we can hope for on a short-term basis.

Death Quiets Critic of Wierd Viet War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, several months ago, prior to the October 3, 1964, adjournment of the 88th Congress, I received a disturbing report on the lack of adequate ammunition and weapons for American fighting men in South Vietnam.

As the report came from a military man with firsthand experience in South Vietnam, and a fine service record, I regarded the information as accurate and factual.

American servicemen bartering for ammunition and using second-rate equipment seems incongruous with a $50 billion annual defense budget.

The Secretary of Defense immediately issued a denial, maintaining ample ammunition is available and the latest equipment is being used.

Since that time there have been other reports of lack of ammunition and obsolete weapons, including the discovery that some World War II first-aid kits had been issued in South Vietnam, with rusted safety pins, mildewed gauze bandages, mildewed first-aid dressings, waterstained and unusable adhesive tape, iodine swabs banned by the Army Surgeon General and tourniquets ordered destroyed in 1951.

The latest story of obsolete weapons appeared in the Thursday, December 24, 1964, edition of the Indianapolis Star.

It was a report from an Army captain who had been killed in action on December 12, 1964. The captains' letters told of obsolete weapons highly dangerous to fire that could explode in a man's face.

It is a shocking report by a career soldier with no ax to grind with the Defense Department.

Every Member of Congress will want to read this Associated Press dispatch, which, under unanimous consent, I publish in the RECORD in its entirety.

The story follows:

DEATH QUIETS CRITIC OF WEIRD VIET WAR—YANK FOUGHT REDS, BUREAUCRACY

(By Charles Stafford)

BRADENTON, FLA.—Capt. John King's war was "long periods of boredom interrupted by short periods of intense hell."

His was wornout weapons, loneliness, an enemy that melted away, waste, leaders who he said sought advice but didn't heed it, a superior who he said refused to forward his critical report.

Capt. John King died December 12 in South Vietnam, a bullet through his head.

He was a Bradenton man, the son of Mrs. Thomas J. Brooks and John H. King. He enlisted at 17, fought in Korea, rose from private to captain in 15 years. He had a wife and five children in Sebring. Mrs. King is expecting a sixth child next month.

At 32, John King was a career soldier.

His war came to life in the letters that arrived at the home of his mother and stepfather following his arrival in Saigon in late September. It ended with a telegram.

October 3: "Indications are that we are going to win here, but not overnight.

"It will take some time. If we lose this country, which is the entry into southeast Asia, there will be no telling what else will go to the Reds."

October 10: "On your question of Christmas, there is nothing I can think of that I need. I would appreciate your just adding whatever you planned spending on me to the children's Christmas.

"It certainly is lonesome here for some reason. I guess it's because everybody is so intense and continually looking over their shoulder."

October 28: "The area that I am in is way down in the delta. Because of the size of our force, we are fairly secure inside the bounds of the Kien Long district. However, we are completely surrounded for miles by the Vietcong. So the only way into this area and out is by helicopter * * *.

"We go in battalion-sized search and clear operations daily. So far we have encountered very few enemy as they keep moving away from us. They will not fight unless everything is in their favor."

November 5: "I received the hunting knife you sent me. The knife is just exactly what I needed and certainly will come in handy for many things, primarily to eat with and find water on the trails. When we run out of water, we need a sharp knife to cut through heavy vines and bamboo to steal the potable water stored in these fellows."

About mid-November, King wrote his sister, Mrs. Roy Howell, of Bradenton. There was nothing unusual about it, except that it included a page from another letter, which presumably had been meant for a friend in service.

It read, in part—

"These weapons are completely worn out * * *. I can take an unexpended 30-caliber round of ammunition and drop it through the muzzle end of the barrels of our M-1 rifles and it will fall out the breech end of the barrel with little or no resistance. The same holds true for the carbines, Thompson submachine guns, 30-caliber machineguns. Many parts essential to the functioning of our weapons are missing * * *. I have written my superiors on two different occasions explaining the condition of the equipment that we must fight with and have attempted to solicit help to rectify this, as these weapons are highly dangerous to fire and could easily explode in a man's face * * * so far nothing has been done."

November 19: "There has been very little going on here in the way of a war. * * * They [the Vietcong] seem to have evaporated from this area. That doesn't make me unhappy mind you but our intelligence, such as it is, keeps telling us that they're here, but we haven't made a contact in better than a week.

"I guess this is just like, or similar to, Korea in that we are plagued with long periods of boredom interrupted by short periods of intense hell * * *.

"The United States is wasting millions of dollars a year having advisers here. These people don't know—they don't know, and are either too proud or too stupid to admit it * * * they listen to our advice and agree that we are right, and go right ahead and execute operations that violate every basic principle of tactics * * * the only way this war will ever be won is the United States to step in and say our advisers are going to plan every tactical operation at every level of command * * *.

"Please do not publish anything I've said here, at least not now. Ha Ha."

November 26: "We arrived here in Viet Hank after 4 days of traveling * * * the third day was by far the most hectic for us. We covered 14 miles of jungle, rice paddys, and canals completely dominated by Vietcong. Every trail and road was saturated with mines, boobytraps, and sniper fire; * * * during this move we had 1 man killed and 11 wounded, all due to mines and boobytraps."

December 1: "I'm in what appears to be hot water at the present time. I'm not sure how serious it is, but I believe I have the right people behind me * * * you see, at the end of each month, I must prepare a written statistical and command valuation of the battalion I'm advising. That I did for the month of November, based on factual, recorded observation maintained by myself and Sergeant Jones in each day's operation.

"For the report to be of any value, it must be truthful and accurate and this is the manner in which I prepared my report * * * all the essential and important parts of the report had to be rated unsatisfactory, showing the battalion commander and his unit to be ineffective * * *.

"Well, my immediate superior * * * will not forward my report to division. He obviously does not want the truth to be known as my report goes all the way to Washington, D.C. I have refused so far to lie, so as to make him and his counterpart look good, for if I do this there is no reason for any of us being here trying to advise and risking our lives each day. Colonel Preston * * * is behind me so far. We are having a big meeting on this subject tomorrow. If I don't win tomorrow, then I guess I'm in for trouble."

December 12: "The Secretary of the Army has asked me to express his deep regret that your son, Capt. John E. King, died in Vietnam on December 12, 1964, as the result of hostile action * * * he was accompanying Vietnamese army when they were ambushed and attacked."

The Divine Ascent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the poet laureate of Polk County, Bolivar, Mo., Mr. T. H. B. Dunnegan, composed a poem for the inauguration of Dr. Brandenburg as the ninth president of Drury College which was founded in Springfield, Mo., in 1873. I believe the poem entitled "The Divine Ascent," and another poem previously written by Mr. Dunnegan entitled "To Those Who Guard the Waters," will aptly reflect the still deep waters of the Missouri Ozarks. He is also president of the Polk County bank in his hometown.

Under unanimous consent, I include them in the RECORD at this point:

THE DIVINE ASCENT

From the primordial marshlands of the mind,
With slow persistence was the ascent begun;
As by a heliotropic impetus to find
The Light through ages, upwards towards the Sun.

Man still with labored steps ascends the stair,
The prize mysterious, his goal a dream;
Lured on, as was Sir Galahad by a Gleam
Across the weary days of contest where
His bright hopes led. (Nor let it e'er be said,
At this late hour, there are no jousts to win,
The golden days of chivalry are dead,
No wrong to right, no virtue or no sin.)

Tenaciously we climb the upward way.
To test, to learn, to ponder, and to teach,
We set our task; pursue it day by day;
As Faith lends added measure to our reach.

This then the stint, too often marred by strife,
To see the Truth by which all ills are healed;
To crest the tallest rise of mortal life,
The summit from which nothing is concealed;
To mount the topmost landing of the stair,
To recompense for all that one has strived;
Full height, deep breathed, with feet set firmly there
To shout triumphant: See. We have arrived.

—T. H. B. DUNNEGAN

(This poem written also for the inauguration of Dr. Earnest Brandenburg as president of Drury College.)

TO THOSE WHO GUARD THE WATERS THE KEEPERS OF THE SOURCE

High in the mountains springs a living stream,
Sweet water from the timeless glacier's snow,
Pure as the concept of man's noblest dream,
Refreshing all who drink the crystal flow.

With hardy purpose on and on it goes,
Potent to make the arid desert green
And gardens blossom with the tender rose;
To spur the mind to visions yet unseen.

Through broadening meadows burgeoning with flowers,
Or laving edge of forest and of fen,
With slower impulse through the passing hours,
It winds its way past the abodes of men.

Here soon the river reaps a turgid stain
From teeming cities, smoke begrimed, where toil
Of hapless millions bound by labor's chain
Add still their wastage to the factory's soil.

The earnest guardians of the common weal
Must render good account for this supply,
Else how in their dependence shall men feel
Their lives secure, their faith to justify.

For all the seeking can we hope to find
For man's unsated thirst the grateful cure,
Or healing waters for the troubled mind,
Except the keepers keep the prime source pure.

—T. H. B. DUNNEGAN.

OCTOBER 1964.

Cardinal Cushing and Dr. Billy Graham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein very impressive remarks appearing in the Boston papers which were made by the great spiritual leader, His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston, concerning Dr. Billy Graham and his work.

Since Cardinal Cushing's words are in the best Ecumenical spirit they demonstrate the progress that is being made in bringing together the constructive forces of belief in God in this country and the world.

The remarks follow:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Record-American, Oct. 8, 1964]

CARDINAL LIKENS DR. BILLY GRAHAM TO ST. FRANCIS

(By Jack Wharton and Jack Kendall)

World-renowned Evangelist Billy Graham met Wednesday with Richard Cardinal Cushing in a 45-minute demonstration of Christian unity between two giants of different religious faiths.

The session took place at the cardinal's Brighton residence where the popular evangelist had gone to express his thanks to the prince of the Roman Catholic Church for "kind words of support" on the current Greater Boston Crusade.

It was Graham's first meeting with Cardinal Cushing and his first with any cardinal.

Their discussion, before some 35 newsmen, ranged from friendly chit-chat to opinions on the effects of the Ecumenical Council now underway in Rome.

The cardinal opined that Graham "was extremely gifted," and he urged Catholic youngsters and students at Catholic universities to go to Boston Garden and listen to Dr. Graham.

He likened the evangelist to "St. Francis of Assisi for sowing seeds that blossom into faith in the future," and said "the hand of God must be somewhere upon you."

The cardinal was standing in the doorway of his home when Graham appeared escorted by Boston police.

"I am glad to see you," the cardinal said in greeting.

"It's nice of you to have me," Graham replied.

When Cardinal Cushing remarked, "I must say you look healthy," and asked, "What's your secret?"

Graham answered, "I trust in the Lord and take vitamins."

Each offered praise for the efforts of the other in bring religion to their people.

Graham said he felt there was "a great need in the world for the proclamation of the Gospel. We defended it so long, it is time to proclaim it.

"And I feel that the new spirit in the world was the result of what happened in Rome."

"Well, it comes a few hundred years late," rejoined the cardinal. "It will take a long time before they feel the full impact of it."

The cardinal expressed the opinion, "There should be more agreement between faiths and I believe there will be now."

Graham responded, "This started with you long before we heard of Pope John."

"Well, I'm a Catholic, but I'm for you," the cardinal said. "No Catholic can listen to you without becoming a better Catholic. You preach Catholic as well as Protestant doctrine."

When the Protestant preacher said he had never met the Pope, Cardinal Cushing offered, "if you ever go to Rome, I'll arrange a private audience."

The cardinal asked Graham what his plans were for the future and when the latter said he planned to go to Hawaii in February, Cardinal Cushing said, "That's a good time to go to Hawaii."

Graham said his preaching was much closer to the theology of the Catholic Church than it was to some of the farther-out Protestants.

They shook hands at the conclusion of the meeting, and when Graham said he was en route to Boston College to address the students, the cardinal stated: "I'm glad to hear that. That's my alma mater."

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, Oct. 8, 1964]

DR. GRAHAM ASKS "COMMITMENT TO CHRIST"; YOUTH ACCEPTS EVANGELIST'S CHALLENGE

(By Michael Bennett)

A crewcut student, dressed in button-down blue shirt, chino pants, and buckskin shoes, was the first.

He strode across the open arena, under the eyes of 12,500 in Boston Garden to stand before Evangelist Billy Graham and declare himself for Christ. Two elderly men in front row seats crossed their hands before their eyes and wept.

Then there were 725 persons, two-thirds of them students, standing before the platform in silent declaration of their decision.

Billy Graham had spoken to them in the rich, clear voice and they had heard as thousands have in the past few days and weeks.

He had quoted Jean Paul Sartre, the French philosopher, "In order to find fulfillment in life one must be committed to something or someone," and then asked, "Why shouldn't that commitment be to Christ?"

The 725 had heard and answered.

Earlier, Cardinal Cushing had "encouraged all Catholic people to attend his meetings. They have everything to gain. The hand of God must be upon him. I'm 100 percent for him.

"His message is one of Christ Crucified," the cardinal had observed, "and no Catholic can do anything but become a better Catholic from hearing him. I have never known of a religious crusade that was more effective than Dr. Graham's. I have never heard the slightest criticism of anything he ever said from any Catholic source."

Dr. Graham acknowledged "the kind and generous words of the Cardinal" at Boston Garden last night and spoke with warmth and feeling of the reception he had been accorded in the afternoon at Boston College.

"I have spoken at many, many colleges and universities," he said, "and never had a warmer, more hospitable welcome. Seventy-five or eighty percent of the students must have come out, and it was entirely voluntary.

"I have never felt the presence of God more at a service."

Dr. Graham addressed himself to students again last night although the meeting was not one scheduled for young people. But there were thousands of them in the cavernous Garden.

He held the Bible open in his right hand and declared, "Jesus was the absolutely perfect man; He was the man God wanted everyone to be.

"You cannot prove what I've said in a scientific laboratory. But can you prove your mother's love, the love of your girl friend, in a scientific laboratory? There are many things in this world you cannot prove in a test tube."

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Oct. 8, 1964]

"I TRUST IN LORD, TAKE VITAMINS"

(By George M. Collins)

Evangelist Billy Graham and Cardinal Cushing toppled another of the imaginary walls separating Christians Wednesday.

Their meeting in the cardinal's study—with the cardinal urging all Catholics to attend the Graham meetings at the Boston Garden—was just as natural as if they had been lifelong friends.

Cardinal Cushing met the evangelist and asked him how he managed to look so healthy.

"I trust in the Lord—and take vitamins," answered Dr. Graham and the wall started to crack.

Moving into the study, they sat down, Cardinal Cushing in a red chair and Dr. Graham in one of green, beneath the gold-framed masterpieces which adorn the walls.

Their conversation for 20 minutes ranged over many facets of their lives and stressed in particular the rapid changes taking place in the world and in the Christian church.

Dr. Graham told the prelate how he had heard of Cardinal Cushing's statement in the Boston Pilot preceding the opening of the crusade.

"I was in a New York hotel room with a few friends and we heard of your kind words of support. I was overwhelmed by it. We knelt together in the room and gave thanks to God for your help."

The cardinal told his guest that he had listened to him many times over the radio and said he was astounded by the fact that he never repeated his sermons.

"You certainly are gifted by God for this work," said the prelate.

"I'm just a farm boy whom the Lord called," answered his guest.

"You've had a very large impact on the world, thank God," the cardinal continued. "You've had a good impact on Boston."

Evangelist Graham settled back and told the cardinal that he had wanted to meet him for many years.

"I feel that I have known you for a long time. While here in Boston I have spoken about you with the police that have helped me. They think you're the greatest."

"Now you can see why I've never come within the arm of the law," quipped the cardinal.

The cardinal asked Dr. Graham where his next crusade would be and Dr. Graham commented on his proposed swing around New England cities and then said he would be in Hawaii for a crusade in February.

"That's where the sinners go in February. There and Florida. And I'm after the sinners," Dr. Graham joked.

The cardinal complimented the Baptist clergyman for his contribution to the ecumenical spirit "because your talks always emphasize the similarities among Christians, rather than the differences."

The pair had been sitting with their hands in their laps for the first 10 minutes, but now they were completely relaxed and began to use their arms and hands to emphasize their remarks.

"I feel a lot closer to many Roman Catholic traditions than I do with some of the most liberal Protestants," said Dr. Graham.

The cardinal told his guest of his visits to 60 Protestant churches in Greater Boston. "I tell them that I'm not there to make Catholics out of Protestants, and you're not here to make a Protestant out of me."

They discussed the many strides toward spiritual Christian unity. Then the cardinal told Dr. Graham that "no Catholic can listen to you and not become a better Catholic."

"I've never known of a religious crusade that was more effective than yours," the cardinal stressed.

"I've never heard the slightest criticism of anything Dr. Graham has ever said from any Catholic source.

"I only wish that we had a half dozen men of his character to go forth and preach Christ crucified as he does," he told the newsmen.

"I hope that Catholic youth and students will go to the Boston Garden and listen to Billy Graham.

"I'm 100 percent for Dr. Graham and if I were to rewrite the article in the Pilot now I would go right out and encourage all Catholic people to attend the meetings.

"They have everything to gain by going. The hand of God must be upon him."

The two chatted together and answered newsmen's queries for 45 minutes and then parted.

The evangelist traveled across Commonwealth Avenue an hour later to address a standing-room-only crowd of 5,000 Boston College students in Roberts Center.

The message was short—not more than 25 minutes—and they brought Dr. Graham back for a second "curtain call" with prolonged applause.

Later Wednesday, speaking at his third renewed Boston crusade at the Boston Garden, the evangelist said, "It was a unique privilege for me—a Baptist—to be with the cardinal."

Dr. Graham said that Cardinal Cushing "said generous things to me and told me that he appreciated emphasizing Christ and the Crucifixion in my addresses."

Turning to his afternoon visit to Boston College he said "It was a great thrill for me to have close to 80 percent of the student body come to hear me."

Dr. Graham urged the many college students in the Garden audience to "examine evidence of the existence of religion closely before rejecting it."

WHY CARDINAL CAME BACK

Why did Cardinal Cushing return prematurely from the Ecumenical Council last week?

"No mystery to it," he said, Wednesday. "The climate in Rome is bad for me because of my asthma, the food in Rome is bad for me because of my ulcer."

Bribing States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the interim between the close of the 88th Congress and the commencement of the 89th Congress, a most fascinating editorial appeared in the Lansing, Ill., Journal emphasizing the relationship of the Federal Government to the respective States.

This editorial, in a frank, forthright, and concise fashion, delivers a message which we all should ponder.

The editorial follows:

BRIBING STATES

Federal grants have become a way of life to many State and local governments, at a huge cost, not just in money, but in the coin of State and local rights, responsibilities, obligations, and freedom of action and decision.

Occasionally, however, a State does refuse a handout—and when that happens it is worthy of general notice.

It happened the other day in Oregon. The Department of Agriculture offered the State $25,000 a year to pay for milk served children in four State institutions.

As it happens, this milk is produced on a farm operated by the State prison and the children are getting it now.

The secretary of state of Oregon said: "This is a prime example of the idiocy of the Federal Government. They want to give us some of our own money back for doing what we already do."

Oregon's Governor said: "I don't know if one small State can stop this foolishness. It takes courage to show that the States can't be bought off by a Federal bribe. This is an attempt by the Federal Government to tranquilize the States. I vote 'no'."

The amount of money involved in this is trivial, by Federal handout standards. What is important is the question of principle it raises.

The word "bribe" as used by the Governor is a strong one—but it seems to fit the occasion.

Senator Williams of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the American people have reason to be thankful that the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, has been returned to the Senate of the United States.

In a recent editorial, the Washington Evening Star paid a well-deserved tribute to this dedicated public servant. The editorial follows:

Republican Senator WILLIAMS has come to the parting of the ways with the Senate Rules Committee which is controlled by the Democrats. This is hardly surprising, for he dragged the committee leadership, kicking and screaming, into an investigation of the Bobby Baker case, only to be insulted for his pains.

Last week the Delaware Republican was called a liar on at least two occasions by Lennox P. McLendon, counsel for the committee and a North Carolina friend of Chairman JORDAN. After demanding and failing to get an apology, Senator WILLIAMS left the committee room, where he had been present as a guest. He announced that henceforth he would go his own way in developing evidence in the Baker case, and that he would

make it public if the committee failed to do so. We hope he does precisely that.

Senator WILLIAMS is a rare bird—he actually seems to care about morality in public life. As a result, he suffers a certain ostracism among his congressional colleagues. The pressures on him to lay off this embarrassing business have been very great. He has stuck to his lonely guns. What is more, while fighting to bring out the truth he has resolutely resisted the temptation to sully the record with irresponsible charges.

This investigation has been farcical enough; had it not been for Senator WILLIAMS and the evidence he dug up, it would not have amounted to a hill of Carolina beans. Now it has been reported that the committee, in secret session, has heard charges directed to prominent people, including at least one member of the committee. The Democrats who are in control seem bent upon concluding the investigation, or, more accurately, the whitewash, this week. If they do so it is our hope that Senator WILLIAMS, if he can assemble the evidence, will blow the lid off. There is no excuse or justification for a coverup of this shoddy affair. And certainly Senator WILLIAMS is under no obligation to anyone to play it cozy. In the face of a Democratic sweep in Delaware last month he was reelected in spite of a personal appeal from President Johnson for his defeat. His constituents quite obviously have faith in him. So do we.

Further Points of State of the Commonwealth Message by Gov. William W. Scranton Before the Joint Opening Session of the Pennsylvania Legislature, Tuesday, January 5, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, before the joint session of the Pennsylvania Legislature, January 5, 1965:

Two areas of government are of such importance this year that I will shortly request the opportunity to appear before you with special messages.

The first of these is our highway system.

Although this administration has established new records of achievement in many aspects of highway construction, maintenance, and repair, our own high goals and the full modern needs of our Commonwealth have not been fully met. Some of the fiscal and the administrative problems that have hampered the highway programs of this and previous administrations have not yet been overcome. Consequently, in a special message I will outline to you what is needed to do the job, not only now but for the next several years.

In a second special message I will present to you a far-reaching plan for reorganizing and streamlining the entire State government. The time has come for an all-out effort to modernize government if it is to meet the needs of Pennsylvania with full efficiency and full economy.

The plan we will present to you has been 2 years in the making. It will upset some traditions I am sure, but it will provide the mechanism that is necessary if we are to render adequate service to all segments of life in our Commonwealth.

A host of other proposals will be brought before you to move Pennsylvania forward to achieve greatness.

First, we will seek the advancement of Pennsylvania in the operations of the State government itself.

I can think of no single imperative in Pennsylvania today more important than the need for constitutional revision. State government simply cannot effectively discharge its heavy responsibilities under the antiquated rules contained in our present constitution. Both the administration of justice and the welfare of our people suffer daily from the burdens and restrictions that were placed on our government during the 19th century.

The 12 amendments recommended last year by the Governor's Commission on Constitutional Revision provide the substance for sorely needed reform. I strongly urge the adoption of these needed constitutional amendments.

In the meantime, State government can in many ways be brought up to date.

We will ask for a new electronic data processing law to make possible real savings and efficiency through the use of computers and other modern devices.

Further, no government can be any better than the employees who man it. Pennsylvania today faces a serious problem of competition with the Federal Government, other State governments, and with private industry in attracting and keeping the best of them.

Our inadequate pay scales encourage our best employees to seek jobs elsewhere and this means the waste of millions of dollars annually in the cost of training new personnel.

I will request, therefore, that you provide across-the-board pay raises for State employees, ranging up from 5 percent. This is no extravagance, but rather, in the long-run, will return itself manifold to the benefit of the Commonwealth.

Fundamental, of course, to the operation of our Government is the conduct of our elections. Last years' primary election and several still-undecided contests from the general election make it abundantly clear that we need election reform, especially in the use of absentee ballots. You will soon receive recommendations for such reforms upon which I urge your speedy action.

The second great imperative that faces us is the unfinished work that remains in the field of education.

We will ask you to increase the State's effort for higher and basic education by no less than $42 million in the new fiscal year.

This means that the amount spent on education will be raised an enormous 32 percent over the amount that was included in the budget 3 years ago.

To make the fruits of education available to more of our young people, the administration will recommend that you make participation in our new student loan program available to freshmen.

We will recommend changes in the Community College Act that will enable the State to join with the Federal Government in assisting in the cost of construction of community college facilities, and we will ask that the colleges be reimbursed on a quarterly rather than an annual basis to ease their financial burden.

We will seek an increased minimum pension for our retired schoolteachers and other public school employees.

We will propose a substantial increase in the salary of the State's superintendent of public instruction, so that Pennsylvania can compete for the best in the field.

We will propose a new formula for fair and reasonable distribution of the State's aid to local school districts. This will have an important impact on the financial capabilities of our city school districts as well as in other areas.

While you are at work on all of these items of major importance to education, the State board of education will containue its dedicated efforts to remove chaos from an educational system that for too long has "grown like Topsy" without enough real planning or thinking. We attach particular importance to the master plan for higher education which is due 1 year from now. When this plan is before us, we will be able to chart rational expansion of the State's effort for higher education.

The third great area in which the administration will ask you to act during this session concerns the very land of Pennsylvania.

We will seek almost $6 million in additional appropriations for the departments of mines, forests, and waters, and agriculture. These are the State agencies most involved in the preservation, reclamation and cultivation of our great land resources.

This will represent an increase of more than 40 percent on these items over what was included in the budget in 1962.

These appropriation requests will make possible, among other things, multimillion dollar participation by Pennsylvania in the proposed Appalachia program to reclaim abandoned strip mine areas, clean polluted streams, and prevent surface subsidence and caving.

We will ask you to improve the beauty of the land by prohibiting commercial advertising along all limited access highways in Pennsylvania. In addition, we will recommend a program for beautification of the rights-of-way of interstate highways.

I further recommend that the general assembly, through appropriate committees, conduct on-the-spot investigations into the workings of last year's anthracite strip mine control law. As I reported, all but 3 of the presently active 255 hard coal strip mine operations are being completely backfilled with all overburden. We can leave no effort unmade, however, in assuring completely adequate legislation in this field.

Next, there is the field of human services.

The first responsibility of government in human services is the guarantee of human rights, and important new legislation will be set before you this year. The administration, for instance, will recommend that the provisions of the Fair Employment Practices Act be extended to all Pennsylvania employers.

No employer ought to be forced to hire anyone, but no employee should be refused a job on grounds of his race, his creed, or his national origin. Discrimination is wrong. It is wrong for small employers as well as for large, for charitable organizations as well as for profitmaking concerns, for trade unions as well as for businessmen.

The effects of discrimination are particularly cruel on the very young. We will recommend in the budget that you supply funds to make possible community education programs directed toward very young children who have not yet been forced into the mold of deprivation that is the direct result of discrimination.

In another area of fair treatment for all, we will ask you to pass legislation to remove the economic burden that now rests on members of those religious faiths that keep the Sabbath on a day other than Sunday. The courts have upheld the State's right to limit commercialism of the Sabbath, but surely these laws should not fall with special force on any particular group of citizens because of their faith.

Another important area within the field of human services deals with the health of our people.

We will ask that you very substantially increase the appropriation for the care of our citizens afflicted with mental illness.

In 1961 Pennsylvania ranked only 35th among all the States in effort for mental health. Our position has now risen to 31st. This is improvement, but we must do much more.

Other health measures that will be set before you include these:

Legislation to establish district health departments.

Legislation to create two centers for the treatment of the ills of old age.

Legislation to liberalize the Commonwealth's program of assistance to those suffering from so-called miner's asthma.

And, to protect the health and safety of Pennsylvania children attending nonpublic schools, the administration will again recommend legislation to provide bus transportation for such children along existing public school routes.

Without flinching, this administration will uphold the principle in our constitution that the State should in no way participate in direct support of education in religious or other private schools, but I am convinced that there is no constitutional or moral barrier against providing a bus ride for the health and safety of any child. Just as we extend services of dental hygiene to all school-children, including those who attend religious and private schools, so, too, we can provide transportation.

In the welfare area of human services you will also be asked to do much.

On the one hand, we will seek a large increase in the State appropriation for public assistance, so that Pennsylvania can more nearly meet the humane objective of providing for the truly destitute according to minimum standards of health and decency.

On the other hand, we shall seek ways to distribute more equitably the cost of welfare programs. The Federal Government, which commands so huge a portion of the tax resources of the Nation, should do more. It is long past time also for local communities in Pennsylvania to assume part of the burden, as is done in almost every other major State.

We will ask you to increase the appropriation for our child welfare program as preventive action against juvenile delinquency.

And, next, we will put before you important programs of State aid to our cities and other communities.

We will ask you to appropriate a 25-percent increase in what the State was spending on urban renewal in the year before this administration took office.

We will request—as part of our plan for reorganization of State government—that you establish a separate department of community development.

We will request legislation to assist in solution of such problems as mass transit that now afflict our cities and our suburbs.

And, we will request that you authorize the State to become a full partner with the city of Philadelphia in providing for the better operation and expansion of the great port of that city.

Next, we will set before you important matters regarding law enforcement and protection of the public.

The administration will ask that you increase the complement of the Pennsylvania State Police by 300 men so that they can continue and expand the wars on crime and highway death.

You will be asked to provide for improved penal institutions and modernized penal laws, so that Pennsylvania can better protect her citizens from the repetition of vicious crimes.

Our present penal institutions are actually far too costly and in many cases are not the best means for doing the job for which they are intended.

At the same time, you will be called upon to provide more adequate supervision of prisoners on probation and parole.

And, a new banking code will be put before you to protect the public and to more adequately allow our banks to assist in the continued growth of the Commonwealth.

Finally, I direct your attention to our needs in the field of industrial development.

In a very real sense, of course, everything we have talked about so far will benefit industrial development. Progress in education, in human services, in government reform in all the rest, means progress in the creation of jobs, of prosperity, of a full and booming Pennsylvania economy.

To further help us along the road to these goals, however, I have further specific proposals.

Our return to prosperity has been so striking that it is necessary for the administration to ask you this year to amend the Pennsylvania industrial development authority law to permit continued participation of PIDA in the development of counties below the presently specified unemployment rate of 6 percent.

Several counties have already become ineligible for further PIDA loans under current law. If present economic conditions continue many more will soon follow. Indeed there is a real possibility that at our present rate of progress, even areas of long-term unemployment, such as Lackawanna, Luzerne, Schuylkill, and Fayette Counties, will, in the near future, be ineligible for further PIDA loans under the present law.

PIDA has proven an invaluable tool in our fight for industrial growth in Pennsylvania. We do not wish it be phased out of existence by our economic progress.

We will further recommend to you that the county of Philadelphia for the first time be made eligible for PIDA loans.

To help give unemployed workers the skills they need to find jobs in a swiftly changing economy, we will request an appropriation of $6.5 million for manpower retraining.

And, it is with considerable satisfaction that for the second time in as many years we can ask you to increase the maximum benefits paid under Pennsylvania's unemployment compensation law.

The condition of the unemployment compensation fund itself is now sound and vigorous, able to provide protection for the unemployed in good times or bad.

Its new strength enables me to recommend that maximum weekly benefits be increased to $50—a figure that is matched by only three other States. And, I also recommend an accompanying increase in maximum benefits paid under our workman's compensation law.

So, there you have it. The highlights of what can surely be another year of outstanding progress in Pennsylvania.

The issue before us is still the issue of achieving greatness.

Greatness for a Pennsylvania where young people are well educated, the needy well provided for, the sick well cared for, the people of whatever circumstances given a chance at a full share of a better life.

The program I have outlined for you today is ambitious, but it is realistic. Our eyes are on the stars, but our feet are on the ground.

And now we need to help each other to make it possible. Democrats, Republicans; whites, Negroes; city dwellers, suburbanites, residents of rural areas and small towns; Protestants, Catholics, Jews—we are all those things. And each of us can, if he chooses, during the next year pursue only his own interest, and the interests of those most like himself.

But all of us are one thing more. We are Pennsylvanians. And we can, if we choose, be guided in the months ahead by the standard: "What is best for Pennsylvania?"

If that is our course, the work will go well, the rewards will be good. Prosperity will flourish in our land, and the coming years will be remembered by our children and our descendants yet unborn as a new time of greatness for Pennsylvania.

Cortland's Story of Success in Attracting New Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the October 1964 issue of the Industrial Bulletin of New York State written by Mr. Joseph Albino, of Syracuse, N.Y., on the remarkable success of the city of Cortland, N.Y., in my district, in promoting a vigorous and expanding economy.

The article follows:

CORTLAND'S SUCCESS STORY—COMMUNITY EFFORTS TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY PAY DIVIDENDS IN JOBS

(By Joseph Albino)

"Success breeds success," says Morris Noss, president of the Cortland Chamber of Commerce and the Cortland County Development Co., Inc. Mr. Noss, not minding the cliche, points out that Cortland, after breaking a variety of smalltown records during the late 1950's, at the same time planted the seeds for future industrial development; now the community is reaping a rich harvest as new and vigorous industry continues to knock at her door.

In 1956, the Cortland Chamber of Commerce enlisted 225 new members; this was the trigger for subsequent moves which ultimately spelled success for the Cortland area.

The chamber of commerce membership agreed that most citizens of the community did not realize:

Present industries were housed in obsolete buildings, and were using outdated methods of production;

Twenty percent of the working population of 6,000 (20,000 total population) were leaving the city each day to work outside the community; and

Young people upon graduation from either high school or college were seeking job opportunities elsewhere.

Success manifested itself in attraction of several new industries, and retention of at least one firm which had plans to leave the Cortland area. In each instance every problem—from negotiations over land purchases to installation of sewer lines—was ironed out; cooperation in solving the problems was forthcoming from the town and city government, civic groups, and representatives of State government.

At the end of 1956, Cortland got its first break. The New York State Commerce Department informed them that the Trinity Equipment Corp. of Roselle Park, N.J., was considering the establishment of a plant in New York State. The Trinity Co. invited Mr. Noss and three others from the chamber to "sell" Cortland to them as an industrial site; only then did the chamber officials realize they were not chartered to buy, sell, or rent real estate, supply or loan money. An emergency board meeting was held and the Cortland County Development Co., Inc., was formed and chartered within 24 hours.

The Cortland County Development Co. pledged to the Trinity Equipment Corp., now known as the Pall Trinity Micro Corp., to raise $200,000 and to build a 40,000-square-foot factory to Trinity's specifications. Trinity was to add $100,000 and take the factory on a lease-option basis. A site of 15 acres, on a railroad, just outside the city, was selected.

To obtain the capital needed to keep their promise, the development group sold stock. Everyone in the community pitched in. The citizens, including many union members, the local industries, and even the churches bought stock. All told, 550 stockholders acquired from 1 to 100 shares at $50 each.

The New York Gas & Electric Co. ran a high pressure gas line to the site. Cortland County constructed a water line from the city line to the site. Ground was broken in May 1957. Trinity presently employs 145, all working in jobs created since 1957.

Recalling the activities of the late 1950's, F. S. Lehlbach, secretary of Pall Trinity Micro Corp., notes: "In 1956 George R. Feeley, founder and president of Trinity, and now vice president in charge of marketing for the Pall Co., spent a weekend in Cortland and was favorably impressed.

"In September of that same year, a team of eight, including myself, spent a week on a comprehensive survey of the Cortland area. We had people look into the "living" part of the community, including schools, housing, and recreation facilities. Others investigated the business side of the community—labor supply, availability of materials and services, and transportation. Each member of the survey team submitted a rating report to Mr. Feeley.

"As a result of composite thinking on the part of the team, the decision was made to consider Cortland as a new location where we would manufacture dehumidifiers, thermawells, thermacouples, and dry air and gas systems."

Next: the Cortland Carey Co. Cortland Carey, now employing 300, was going to move to a community in South Carolina because "nothing had been done for them." They were "caught" the day they were leaving. The development agency helped them construct a new 30,000-square-foot factory right across from Trinity.

Officials of the development company learned early that they not only had to introduce new industry to the community but also had to satisfy the needs of industry already in the Cortland area. They've handled both tasks well.

Chester Wickwire, president of Wickwire Bros., Inc., says: "We unofficially received help from the development company in obtaining a loan needed to purchase a new steel-making machine * * *. My personal viewpoint about keeping industry in a community is that industry needs help and should be represented by local, as well as State groups."

The year 1960 was a big one for Cortland. "In 1960 we learned through a real estate agent that the Smith-Corona-Marchant Corp. was going to move their Syracuse operation," recalls Mr. Noss. It's important to realize that the Smith-Corona people had been in the Cortland area for the past 50 years. They had a plant on Huntington Street where they employed 750 people. They also had a plant at Groton which, for all practical purposes, has always been considered part of Cortland even though it's 12 miles west. Fifteen hundred were employed at Groton. And, of course, their biggest operation, including offices and engineering, was located in Syracuse.

The Syracuse plant was considered obsolete. And the company was to lose part of its land when the Interstate Highway, Route 81, went through Syracuse. Moreover, Smith-Corona had a good record of employment in the Cortland area. They liked the airport site and queried the Cortland officials about buying this for a factory site. The common council elected not to sell the municipal airport site, but turned the inquiry over to the development corporation.

Albert Haskell, Jr., first president of the development agency, recalls: "SCM handed us a big order. They wanted a 100-acre site at a reasonable price and in a place where their buildings could be seen for advertising purposes. They also wanted water for processing, heavy electric power lines, gas, and sewer lines.

"It was a difficult order to fill, but we worked hard at this and got for them a 600-acre site (a dairy farm) on Route 13, just beyond the Trinity and Carey factories, with land on both sides of the major highway. Half of the land was flat gravel which is highly satisfactory for industrial purposes."

The development company offered to obtain the site for Smith-Corona-Marchant at a price not to exceed $250,000. The agency also committed itself to water, sewer, gas, and electricity according to SCM's specifications.

In committing itself to water, the development company assumed that a water line could be continued from the line which brought water to the Trinity Co. This was true. However, it was later learned that because the site was outside the established water district, the agency would have to pay for extending the water line to the site. This they did at a cost of $9,000. It was little enough to spend to get Smith-Corona.

While SCM and the development agency were working on that project, the State Teacher's College at Cortland was experiencing a phase of rapid development; and, the residential or west end of the city was growing rapidly. Because the present line was not adequate to handle the needs of the expanded college, the burgeoning residential suburban areas, and the SCM plant as well, a proposition was brought before the common council to construct a new, and fully adequate, sewer line.

To do this, the city ran, at a cost of $200,000, 2 miles of 24-inch sewer line from the sewerage disposal plant at the east end of the city, right down the center of Main Street, to the western boundary of Cortland. Here, the town of Cortlandville established a sewer district and contracted with the city to process the sewerage developed in the SCM area. The town then, at its own cost, ran a 1-mile sewer line from the city boundary to the factory site. Cooperation, to say the least, was not lacking.

The SMC Corp. built a 170,000-square-foot factory on the factory site. Three hundred acres of the site were turned over for further industrial development. Prior to 1960, SCM employed 2,200 in the Cortland-Groton area. They now employ 3,500–4,000 in their three plants.

In 1962, Cortland scored again.

One of the best established industries in Cortland for the past 25 years was the Thompson Boat Co. Chris Craft, a leading national boat manufacturer, purchased Thompson in 1961. This set the stage for developments which led to securing an expanding industry, and jobs for Cortland residents.

Shortly afterward, the president of Thompson, who remained as a top executive with Chris Craft, told the Cortland developers that Chris Craft was planning to establish a fiber glass boat division. Chris Craft had 12 other plants in the East, in addition to Thompson, and each plant wanted the fiber glass division as part of its overall operation.

The Cortland agency also learned that Chris Craft had received an offer from a Pennsylvania community, which offered a good plant as well as a large pool of skilled labor.

But Chris Craft stayed with Cortland. The firm was impressed by the record of stability of employment in the Thompson plant, and considered Cortland ideally located from the viewpoint of transportation. After all, Cortland was located near a future interstate highway. It was service by two railroads; and was in relatively close proximity to the Great Lakes, the Finger Lakes, and the eastern seaboard.

According to Jim Yaman, who served for 2 years on the development company's board, "We thoroughly investigated 20 sites in and around Cortland to find land that met their requirements.

"The site we finally decided upon comprised 46 acres in close proximity to Interstate Highway Route 81 and only a quarter mile from the big highway interchange which provided the highway access needed."

Mr. Noss says, "In the meantime, Chris Craft said they would take the site if we could get it at a reasonable price. They quoted a price of $1,000 per acre.

"Negotiation was difficult. The farmer whose land we needed was hesitant about selling because he expected the new Route 81 to take a big chunk of his land, and he wasn't sure how much he would have left for farming. Our time was limited. Chris Craft felt they had to be in operation by the first of the year to meet 1963 demands for boats."

Finally, the development agency put through an urgent call to the New York State Commerce Department asking assistance to expedite plans by the State public works department and a monetary settlement with the farmer whose land was needed.

Within 3 days public works department representatives were in Cortland. When they left, the farmer was agreeable to talking price with the development corporation, and the land was optioned and sold to Chris Craft. Again, cooperation—this time by State officials—was the major ingredient in the plan to retain Chris Craft.

Deadlines for construction of Chris Craft's facilities were met with time to spare.

What has been the effect upon employment as a result of the development company's efforts to bring new industry into the Cortland area?

According to the State labor department's employment service, "As of July 1, 1964, 1,415 persons were employed in the three plants which were located in Cortland due to the efforts of the agency. Obviously, the impact these firms have had on our manufacturing work force has been great.

"During the 1950–1960 period several major firms were gradually reducing their work forces. Losses were noted at Wickwire Brothers and the Brewer-Tichner Corp. to name two significant firms. Cortland also was hit by the loss of a few industrial concerns during the past several years. Some of these losses were offset by increases in the work forces of other firms but the net loss was about 700 jobs in manufacturing during the period. Fortunately, with the addition of nearly 1,500 jobs, at the present time there is a net increase of approximately 800 jobs rather than a loss of 700 jobs."

And, says Frank Lorenzo, president of Local 2371, United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO, "There's no question about it. The development agency has immensely improved the employment situation. For many year's we've had a low labor rate. All this is changing. In recent years, we've made great strides."

In the view of Geno Patriarco, president of Local 68, United Auto Workers, AFL–CIO, "More money is being made and more money is being spent. Jobs have become more competitive and, as a result, wages and benefits have increased."

Mr. Haskell attributes Cortland's growth to a stability of labor, an abundance of natural rsources, and transportation; he also believes industry must be offered a well balanced community with pleasant living

conditions and good recreational facilities, plus excellent schools at all levels.

Mr. Yaman adds, "Industry also wants the feeling it is wanted. If the slightest amount of 'cold-shoulderness' is shown, the industrial representative will quickly lose interest. The industry of today, as was the case in the past, wants to become part of the community. It wants to be accepted 100 percent."

In Cortland they are; and this, combined with everything else the community and its leaders offer, explains Cortland's growth.

Abbott Laboratories Awarded 200,000th Design Patent for Sucaryl Dispenser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is with real pride that I report to you and to the Members of the House, the distinct honor which has come to Abbott Laboratories, of North Chicago, Ill., one of our great pharmaceutical manufacturers, and to two of its brilliant inventors, Howard Richards and Jack Williams, of Waukegan, Ill.

Abbott Laboratories and these two inventors received the 200,000th design patent from the Commissioner of Patents, Edward J. Brenner, at ceremonies held in Commissioner Brenner's office on Tuesday, January 5, 1965.

The patented article consists of a dispensing container for Sucaryl, a low-calorie sweetening tablet, one of the many useful products of Abbott Laboratories.

In addition to the prestige and honor which accompanies the awarding of this milestone design patent to Abbott Laboratories, the occasion was particularly significant because it falls in the year when the Patent Office is celebrating the 175th anniversary of the patent system.

Mr. Speaker, I am arranging to send one of these dispensing containers to each of my colleagues in the Congress, containing, of course, a supply of Sucaryl tablets.

This example of the ingenuity and skill of Abbott Laboratories and two of its inventors, Howard Richards and Jack Williams, identifies in some measure the great private enterprise system which has developed in this Nation and which contributes so much to the good things of life for citizens of this Nation and to mankind around the world.

Let me also take this occasion to compliment Commissioner Brenner and the Patent Office on the occasion of this 175th anniversary and to extend to George R. Cain, chairman of the board and president of Abbott Laboratories; Robert L. Niblack, manager of the company's patent and trademark department, as well as to the distinguished inventors, Howard Richards and Jack Williams and the other officers and employees of Abbott Laboratories, the Nation's congratulations on this award of the 200,000th design patent for the dispensing container for Sucaryl.

South Bend Tribute Praises Indiana's Governor, Matthew E. Welsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an editorial published by the South Bend, Ind., Tribune paying tribute to the record of the distinguished Governor of the State of Indiana, the Honorable Matthew E. Welsh.

The editorial, which appears in the January 3, 1965, issue of the Tribune, follows:

FAREWELL TO A GOOD GOVERNOR

In a few more days, Indiana's 41st Governor will step aside for a new chief executive and a new State administration.

It may be rather early to do a completely objective analysis of the last 4 years of Indiana government, but from this vantage point Matthew E. Welsh seems to us to be the strongest argument in many years for tearing up the constitutional ban on Governors seeking reelection.

Governor Welsh, to put it another way, has been the best all-round Governor Indiana has been blessed with in a long, long time, in our view. He has worked tirelessly for the good of our State, and with the kind of leadership that puts the public weal ahead of personal popularity.

Perhaps Governor Welsh's greatest single achievement came early in his tenure. He nudged into existence a long-overdue reorganization of the State highway department, putting that division of government on a professional plane which was badly needed after the sad disrepute the department had fallen into during the preceding administration. Long-range planning for highways, a spurt of activity in the interstate program, and even some action at last on South Bend's bypass were among the fruits of the reorganization.

In highway matters and in other ways, Governor Welsh became the first Governor in memory to ignore what used to be called "the spending line"—a mental boundary at U.S. 40 north of which it was difficult to see much evidence of State spending.

The outgoing Governor was a stanch friend of minorities. He insisted that the legislature put teeth in a State civil rights law, and the insistence brought results.

Considering the economic handicaps under which he had to work during his tenure, Governor Welsh did a commendable job of continuing the emphasis on mental health which earlier Governors had started. That the emphasis today appears insufficient does not mean it did not exist.

Governor Welsh did what he could to nourish and expand Indiana's economy. He worked with a passion for a Lake Michigan seaport, and the fact that the port is still unbuilt is no fault of the outgoing Governor's.

Matthew Welsh's greatest single lapse came during the 1963 general assembly when he abdicated the leadership that many Hoosiers felt he should have exercised in that tortured winter when far-reaching decisions were being made. Ultimately, he showed courage by backing a sales tax that was personally distasteful to him in order to keep the State from financial chaos and to give local schools much-needed help from the State.

In the waning days of his administration when he must have felt the temptation to relax and let things slide, Governor Welsh unhesitatingly answered a call to the barricades, where he prevented Alabama's racist Gov. George Wallace from making a mockery of an Indiana primary election.

Matthew E. Welsh was a good Governor in a trying and historic 4 years of Indiana history. We wish him well in whatever he moves on to.

Perhaps the best tribute that can be paid to him is to acknowledge his administration as honest and scandal free. May all his successors in the Governor's office merit the same salute.

Address by Charles H. Silver, Chairman, at the Annual Dinner of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend to all Americans the address of the Honorable Charles H. Silver delivered at the annual Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation dinner.

Mr. Silver, executive assistant to the mayor of New York City, and a former president of the New York City Board of Education, has made an eloquent plea for the cause of education for all schoolchildren. I heartily concur in his remarks.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, CHAIRMAN, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE ALFRED E. SMITH MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

We have come together to refresh the cherished memory of a great American who walked proudly with his fellow men and humbly with his God.

Time has sharpened our vision of the bigotry he fought. The perspective of history magnifies the victories he won—even in defeat—and we know today that the "Happy Warrior" waged his crusades against ignorance and hate for the sake of all humanity.

I greet you on behalf of this foundation named for that noble symbol of all that our Nation can mean—Alfred E. Smith.

If the 21 years that we have gathered as members of this devoted fellowship brought their share of shock and surprise in world affairs, they have also carried some portion of comfort.

We have seen human genius reach its most diabolic expression in the development of instruments for mass destruction. We have watched the rise of unimagined evil in many corners of the earth. We witnessed the ravages of a war that wiped out hundreds of thousands. We saw the slaughter of 6 million innocents in the concentration camps of the Nazi nightmare.

And right here at home, not many days ago—not many miles away—not across a shrinking sea or even just outside our doorstep, but in the heart of a so-called civilized community, we gazed in horror at the bullet-scarred and mangled bodies of three young men whose only crime was their hopeless, heroic defense of the rights of other men.

The world has, indeed, rolled through blood and blackness, bitterness and shame.

And yet—and yet those same years have brought the most amazing blessings of sci-

ence. Wonder drugs have lengthened our span of life by almost two decades. New sources of energy have shortened the working day, expanding man's hours for leisure and recreation.

We have won more time and opportunity to cultivate our gardens—and it would be tragic if nothing could grow there because they must be dug up for bomb shelters.

Only a few days ago, the front pages bristled with rumors of an even bigger superweapon. Now, it began to appear that the individual in Moscow was not going to bury us after all. This newest doomsday device would be so definitely thorough that nothing would remain to bury—and no place left to dig a grave. This was the weapon to end all wars—indeed to end everything that we hold dear.

But they forget one thing. We, too, are rapidly developing an enormously effective weapon of our own. And I do not refer to our leadership in armaments. Thank God, we have that, too—and despite the whine of the appeaser and the din of the extremist—America—in her millions—in her hope and strength and faith in democracy—stands ready and keeps her guard up against any emergency and any enemy.

Yet our courage and our military preparedness are not the greatest weapon we are fashioning.

The fortress which will turn back the tides of hate and fear to safeguard our future is being forged in our schools. That is where our intellectual muscles are being made ready for the test that may come tomorrow.

Perhaps we were caught napping yesterday or the day before. We still remember the shock of that first alien satellite to sail into outer space. To some it seemed the end of America's supremacy. It was only the beginning.

We saw a new light and challenge in the sky, and it rocked us to our heels. But it gave us a firm sense of direction, a fresh grip on reality.

We realized that nothing less than the survival of mankind was truly now at stake; that the destruction of civilization was not just a glib phrase in a speech, but a real, perhaps even a near, possibility. And it became evident that the chief function of foreign policy, of world unity, of national conscience and, primarily of education, is to save humanity from self-destruction.

On every hand, we embarked upon an intensive reevaluation of our educational system. We gained a new awareness of the meaning of instruction, as opposed to destruction. We learned to respect our educators and to recognize the need of more and better teachers, more and better schools.

Nowhere were these facts more apparent than they were to me in our own New York City public school system. The alarm was heard in every State of the Union, in every town and village.

And I know that it grew into a dedicated cause for a man in Congress who had himself been a teacher of history and was now in a position of immense influence in the Senate from which he was to rise to become Vice President; always an advocate of the American way, and today, bearing the responsibilities of crucial events, still a crusader for the common man and a champion of education—Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States.

Our perennial and honored host is likewise a leader whose inspiration and untiring efforts have advanced the cause of education in our city and throughout America. A lover of learning for its own sake, he looks upon knowledge as one of man's richest gifts from his Creator.

The children of our community have always been uppermost in the mind and heart of our cherished friend, that prince among the guardians of faith, his eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman.

The record by which Al Smith urged us to measure progress speaks eloquently of the educational contribution of His Eminence.

Under the sponsorship of Cardinal Spellman, 99 new elementary schools and 30 new high schools have been opened. Many existing schools have been replaced by new structures, and others have been modernized and expanded. These are all in addition to the many hospitals, homes, nursing schools, and institutions of higher learning dedicated by His Eminence.

This year, the Catholic parochial school system in the archdiocese of New York provides instruction for more than a quarter million students in 431 structures.

The greatest benefit to the community, of course, comes from the added emphasis that these schools give to moral and spiritual values. In our Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish schools there is still complete freedom to speak God's name, to pray to Him, and to walk in His way.

These Catholic schools alone represent a savings to the taxpayers of more than $175 million in operating expenses. The value of this vast educational plant is over $600 million.

In my decade as president and member of the board of education, and during my many years of friendship with His Eminence, my respect for the parochial schools has constantly increased.

I believe that the choice of whether his child will attend a public, parochial or other private institution is the inherent right of every parent.

That is why, some 3 years ago, I testified before the Congress in behalf of Federal aid to all schools.

And for these reasons, I will continue to urge men of good faith to devise every possible unhampered way for our Government to advance the education of children wherever they may study.

It is not the label on the school that matters. The only thing that counts is what our Nation can do for the child—and, in our democracy, that must come to mean every child.

Among our honored guests are many men of good will, with sincere love for the young, with the fullest appreciation of the value of education in our efforts to sustain a free nation and a free world. Let us trust that from such men as these will come the inspiration and the action that will build ever stronger bridges of understanding and knowledge among men and nations.

We must brighten the way toward peace and brotherhood with the small but steady candles of wisdom that our Maker has lighted in the heart of every man.

They can become a beacon that will banish the darkness and confusion that surrounds us and blaze the path to a better day.

God willing, firm in our love of freedom, we shall find the strength and the way to accomplish our great tasks.

Let this be our watchword: The nation that builds its schools, builds its future.

Open Letter on Poverty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an unusual commentary on the President's antipoverty program was included in an open letter, intended for the White House, published by the Prairie Farmer on November 7. Here it is:

FULTON COUNTY, IND.

I don't want to be a millionaire. I don't want to earn $10,000 a year; or even $5,000. I just want to be allowed to be me. I want a yardful of dogs, cats, and kids, the human kind. I want a black and white cow, some sows and pigs, a vegetable garden, and a posy patch. I want a sketchbook, drawing pencils, bare feet, faded sweatshirt, and a braided ponytail. I am rich in spirit. God takes care of me, not any Government agency. You will find that the poor, the little fellows, will always be with us. You can't legislate us out of existence. We're here to stay.

P.S.

Calendar of Events at the National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events at the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, JANUARY 1965

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Collections: Paintings and sculpture from the Andrew Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are on the main floor. The Garbisch American primitive paintings, Kress Renaissance bronzes, and Widener decorative arts are on the ground floor.

New exhibition: The American watercolor drawings of John White (1577–90). Central gallery, January 30 through February 22.

New publication: Catalog. "The Watercolor Drawings of John White," from the British Museum; 54 pages, 10 by 7½ inches; introduction by Paul H. Hulton, assistant keeper of prints and drawings, the British Museum; with 1 color plate and 40 halftone illustrations; $2 postpaid.

New reproductions: Color collotype reproductions. Joos van Cleve, "Joris W. Vezeler," 23⅞ by 16¾ inches, $12; "Margaretha Boghe, Wife of Joris W. Vezeler," 23½ by 17 inches, $12; Botticelli, "Madonna and Child With Angels," 30½ by 20½ inches, $18; postpaid.

Radio picture of the week: Color reproductions by subscription allow you to follow the picture of the week discussion on the radio each Sunday night. Reproduction 11 by 14 inches, together with short texts, will be mailed monthly. Series for January and February, $2.25 postpaid.

Holidays: On New Year's Day the gallery will be closed.

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday, 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday, 4 to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 28, THROUGH SUNDAY JANUARY 3

Painting of the week: Cézanne. "House of Pere Lacroix," (Chester Dale Collection) gallery 68. Tuesday through Thursday, and Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Patrons and their tastes: Italy, rotunda. Tuesday through Thursday, and Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda. Monday through Thursday, and Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Significance of Seurat's Art." Guest speaker: William Homer, professor of art history, Princeton University, Princeton. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Armenta Adams, pianist. East garden court, 8.

MONDAY, JANUARY 4, THROUGH SUNDAY, JANUARY 10

Painting of the week: Botticelli. "Portrait of a Youth" (Andrew Mellon collection), gallery 8, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Patrons and Their Tastes: France." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Mysticism in the Arts of the Middle Ages." Guest speaker: James Snyder, professor of art history, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Donald Hefner, oboe; Robert Parris, harpsichord. East garden court, 8.

All concerts are broadcast by station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5). The Radio Picture of the Week is discussed during the intermission (about 8:40 p.m.) followed by comments on the music by Richard Bales, conductor of the National Gallery Orchestra.

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, THROUGH SUNDAY, JANUARY 17

Painting of the week: Masolino. "The Annunciation" (Andrew Mellon colection), gallery 7, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Patrons and their Tastes: The Low Countries." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Woodcuts of Albrecht Dürer." Guest speaker: Wolfgang Stechow, professor of art history, Oberlin College, Oberlin. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor. Church of the Reformation Cantata Choir and soloists. (A concert in honor of the inauguration of the President and Vice President of the United States.) East garden court, 8.

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, THROUGH SUNDAY, JANUARY 24

On Wednesday, January 20, Inauguration Day, the gallery will be open to visitors but no educational services will be offered.

Painting of the week: Stuart. "George Washington" (Andrew Mellon collection), gallery G-7 Tuesday, Thursday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Patrons and Their Tastes: England." Rotunda. Tuesday, Thursday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Rise of Neo-Classicism." Guest speaker: Robert Rosenblum, professor of art history, Princeton University, Princeton. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Philip Lorenz, pianist. East garden court 8.

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, THROUGH SUNDAY, JANUARY 31

Painting of the week: Fragonard. "A Young Girl Reading." (Gift of Mrs. Mellon Bruce in memory of her father, Andrew Mellon) gallery 55. Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Patrons and Their Tastes: Spain." Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda. Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: John White, artist, guest speaker: P. H. Hulton, assistant keeper of prints and drawings, the British Museum, London. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Fredell Lack, violinist; Albert Hirsh, pianist. East garden court, 8.

Cole Porter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the entire musical world and popular music lovers everywhere were deeply saddened by the recent passing of one of America's greatest musicmakers—the illustrious Cole Porter.

In the twenties and thirties, creative musical genius seemed to be at its peak. It was a time when the lovely music of Victor Herbert, Jerome Kern, Sigmund Romberg, Rudolph Friml, Vincent Youmans, Franz Lehar, Oscar Strauss, Emmeric Kalman, Richard Rodgers, Cole Porter, and other colorful writers, was heard in Broadway musicals and throughout the country and the world.

There were countless writers and lyricists in this period producing large numbers of popular songs as well as many fine operettas and musical comedies. The whole country was singing. Music was in the air and in the hearts of the people. Grand opera had the great Caruso and a host of other gifted singers who sang with such eclat and impetuosity that their golden voices literally made the rafters ring and tinkle the Waterford glass crystals in the ceilings of the Nation's opera houses, concert halls, and theaters.

From and of this great, talented, dynamic, music-producing, music-loving generation came Cole Porter. His was not a Horatio Alger career. He was born with a silver spoon in his mouth. He was one of Yale's and Harvard's most famous sons, the writer of some of the Eli's most rousing football songs.

But he had a musical lyre in his brain, an irrepresible song in his heart, and Park Avenue lyrics in his head. Someone said he was the master of sophisticated melody and urbane lyrics which was another way of saying that he wrote love songs for society and the smart set, but woke up to find that he was writing them for all the people, thus giving support to Kipling's premise that "the colonel's lady and Rosie O'Grady are sisters under the skin."

Cole Porter more than held his own among his gifted fellows, who were the greatest musical, creative artists of the New York and Hollywood studios. To use the words of the inimitable Swede Nelson, peerless raconteur and musical savant, Porter's songs were "suave, sportive and gay, often profound and always emotional." It could be said that his words were definitely on the emancipated side as measured by the tear jerkers of the gay nineties and the prewar teens. They had a hint of abashed and penitent naughtiness, as a boy calling a name and running, but their piquant flavor caught the country and made Porter one of the truly top men in American and continental popular music.

The sentimentalized lyrics of his "An Old Fashioned Garden" yielded to "You're So Nice To Come Home To" and the world was gay, everybody happy.

Cole Porter went up the ladder fast even though he sufffered quite a few disappointments on the way up. But his struggles with the musical entrepreneurs and jealous competitors are for another time. In the song writing business of his day, unlike today when aspiring artists are merely playing a form of Russian roulette against the "establishment," and most of them fall by the wayside, he won his spurs, because he got the chance to show his wares, and they proved fabulously marketable. The public gobbled them up and shouted for more.

I wish I could more fully sketch the life and works of this great man, because I think the American people, whom he served so well, whom he entertained, pleased and at times thrilled and inspired, should pause to recall and pay fitting tribute to this gifted man who wrote some of the greatest popular music of this century. I am sure that others will take the time to portray this appealing story in its completeness and its glory. It is a vital part of our popular musical history and heritage during the past half century.

Porter might well be said to have been a prolific writer. Many of his works never came into real production. But many of them did, and these are the ones that cheered young America and young Europe and brought a sparkling effervescence to the social life of our period.

Of course, a man of this degree of genius had to have some connection with Massachusetts and New England. Born in Peru, Ind., he was educated at famous Worcester Academy in Worcester, Mass., the heart of the Commonwealth, so-called, near my beloved Third District and famous hometown, Clinton, and then at Yale where no doubt the Wiffenphoofs and the Wiffletrees rocked him into a sort of insensitivity to anything weaker than spiritus frumenti. In this climate no doubt his psyche found solid nourishment, and his wits and his tastes were hammered into a bon vivante diadem shedding sparkling musical thoughts in all directions.

And then the frosting on the cake—Harvard Law School and the Harvard School of Music where Cole rounded out his musical appreciation and techniques, and where he caught a vivid understanding of indifference as practiced on Beacon Hill, the Commonwealth Avenue of his day, and the dedicated salons of Fifth and Park Avenues, where a distracted hauteur prevailed, nor somewhat

shaded by the advent of the nouveau riche.

One thing is certain: Cole learned counterpoint at Harvard and harmony too, for his music exudes the exhilerating sensation of motion and soul-stirring quality of depth.

The Yale "Bull Dog Song" and "Bingo Eli Yale" adorn Porter's composer's repertoire—his first offerings—now standard college songs.

Porter was a war hero in World War I and went to the front as a French officer and then studied music in Paris, where he enriched his knowledge of life and absorbed European culture.

Soon thereafter his career started to move. "Kitchy Koo of 1919," "Greenwich Village Follies," "Paris," "Wake Up and Dream," "Fifty Million Frenchmen," "The New Yorkers," "Gay Divorcee," "Anything Goes," "Jubilee," "Red, Hot and Blue," "You Never Know," "Leave It To Me," "DuBarry Was a Lady," "Panama Hattie," "Let's Face It," "Something for the Boys," "Mexican Hayride," "The Seven Lively Arts," "Kiss Me Kate," "Out of This World," "Born To Dance," "Rosalie," "Something To Shout About," "Broadway Melody," "You'll Never Get Rich," followed.

His musicals contained many songs everybody came away humming and singing "Let's Do It," "Your'e the Top," "I Get A Kick Out of You," "What Is This Thing Called Love," "Blow, Gabriel, Blow," "You Do Something To Me," "Begin the Beguine," "You've Got That Thing," "Just One of Those Things," "Love for Sale," "It's DeLovely," "Night and Day," "I've Got You Under My Skin," "Easy To Love," "Anything Goes," "In the Still of the Night," "Rosalie," "My Heart Belongs to Daddy," "Do I Love You, Do I," "You'd Be So Nice to Come Home To," "I Love You," "Don't Fence Me In," "Old Fashioned Garden," "So In Love," "Wunderbar," "Always True to You in My Fashion," "True Love," and many others.

The loss of such a man leaves a great void in the world. For he brought something to the American people and to mankind—something that brought them surcease and joy, that brought them lift and new heart, that made them sing and dance and live with verve and spirit.

Surely this is a great contribution. The world urgently needs more of it, but there will be no more Cole Porters. Such genius is not welcome in the music marts of this modern age. It cannot live. It never gets a chance. It is swept under the mat of the modern music bund operators. Popular taste and preference no longer select America's songs. That function is now performed by the "establishment" which keeps a tight rein on the kind of music America sings. How long will the American people remain supine in the face of this condition? Will we ever have music like Cole Porter's again? Only the American people can answer this question.

One of the best services that the people and the Congress can render to the memory of Cole Porter would be to put an end to the present shocking perversion of American musical tastes.

It will take the determined action of the people and the courageous efforts of the Congress to do it right. But it should and must be done in the interests of our youth and to redeem the labor and contributions of Cole Porter and other composers who shaped our traditional popular music and the great masters who created the world's classical music which we love so much.

Hail and salute to Cole Porter. He had a great life. He did a gread deal for the country and the world, because he made life better and brighter for millions of people.

His good deeds and great works will long remain after him. His melodies and words will be sung and repeated for years to come wherever there is youth, as long as stirred memories can bring back the golden days of yesteryear, the smiling faces of dear ones at play, and the soft, insinuating strains of magical music wafted on the gentle breeze of a moonlit night.

Long live the music and the memory of the great Cole Porter. May the angelic choirs welcome and cherish him. And may he find eternal peace in his heavenly home.

To his dear ones, I extend my most sincere and deeply heartfelt sympathy for the truly irreparable loss they have suffered. And I express condolences as as well to his close friends, his esteemed brethren, his fellow composers of ASCAP, and the American public, for they too have suffered a great loss in the passing of this great, gifted man of song, Cole Porter.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent, fine, moving editorial on Cole Porter from the columns of the widely famed Boston Herald, which is timely, heartfelt and extremely well done, and also an exceptionally well documented, ably and feelingly written piece from the celebrated Boston Record-American by Boston's outstanding dramatic and music critic and columnist, the brilliant Elliott Norton, who captures precisely the lofty, courageous spirit of Cole Porter and his buoyant personality:

COLE PORTER

A Warner Bros., script writer assigned to the task of preparing a screen biography of Cole Porter in 1946 complained to his superiors after combing the studio's file on the songwriter: "There's no struggle—all along the line."

In both the economic and the artistic sense the script man was very nearly right. Cole Porter's parents were well-to-do and his grandfather eventually left him a million dollars. He published his first song at the age of 13 and remained a prolific, facile composer until late in life.

Lucius Beebe once said of Porter: "It is really the simple things of life which give pleasure to Mr. Porter—half-million-dollar strings of pearls, Isotta motorcars, cases of double bottles of Grand Chambertin '87, suites at Claridge's, brief trips aboard the *Bremen*, a little grouse shooting."

Yet Porter's songs reflected no dilettantism. They were the work of a superlative craftsman distinguished by their melodic originality and the wittiness and worldliness of their lyrics.

True Porter fans will remember him not only for such great standards as "Begin the Beguine," "Wunderbar" and "Don't Fence Me In," but also for literally scores of less famous but no less elegant gems, including "All Through the Night," "Miss Otis Regrets" and "Ace in the Hole."

Cole Porter, now dead at 71, was a giant of American popular music. He leaves a bountiful musical legacy to his countrymen.

BEST OF PORTER WRITTEN IN ILLNESS

The best of Cole Porter was joyous, jubilant music, reflecting in melody and in rhythm the spirit and essence of the 1920's and 1930's and, in the best of all his Broadway shows, "Kiss Me, Kate," the cocky, jaunty optimism of an American generation.

Porter wrote as he felt. Most of the time, despite many years of a brutal and debilitating illness, he felt good. He lived joyously, celebrating life continuously in the words and music he created for many musical comedies and movies and in a great series of songs.

As a young man, he was wealthy. During his adult years he was rich. He lived exuberantly as the son of a man of means, as the million-heir of an opulent uncle and as one of the most successful and highly paid song writers of the world. He had sumptuous homes here and abroad, servants, cars, yachts when needed, and enough rich and witty friends to make his life seem, at times, one long celebration.

At first nights in Boston, he was the only carefree one among the creative artists. The others, librettists like Howard Lindsay and Russell Crouse, who collaborated with him on such shows as "Anything Goes" and "Red, Hot and Blue" might be nervous or jittery, or, at the best, tense. Porter was not.

Even after the accident that crippled him and which was ultimately to make him a recluse, he attended a premiere in the highest of high spirits.

Having written his songs, he was ready to enjoy the show. He hobbled down the aisle painfully, with aluminum crutches clamped to his arms. Once in his seat, with the curtain up and the orchestra playing, he forgot his pain, forgot conventional modesty, too, and even forgot that he, as the most sophisticated showman of them all, wouldn't be expected to laugh at jokes he had heard many times before.

He laughed at every funny line, applauded the entrances and exits of the stars he admired, and his own music, too, including the overture. He obviously loved the theater, its excitement and his part in it.

In the years between 1937 and 1956, Cole Porter wrote the scores of shows like "Leave It to Me," "Kiss Me, Kate," and "Can Can," and such songs as "My Heart Belongs to Daddy," which made a star of Mary Martin, and "I love Paris in the Springtime." This despite a riding accident which had smashed almost every bone in his body, which left him a victim of osteomyelitis, and necessitated more than 50 separate operations, in the last of which his right leg was amputated.

The accident occurred in 1937, when he was thrown by a horse, which then fell on him. Although he seems to have been in constant pain night and day, and would be for most of the rest of his life, he wrote "Leave It to Me" within a year.

To make it possible for him to compose, his wife had his piano jacked up on blocks; in that way, they could get his wheelchair under it.

The late Moss Hart, who went around the world with Porter the year before the accident to gather material for "Jubilee," reported afterward that for all his seeming lightheartedness, Cole Porter worked hard at his music. His smiling public personality did not reflect his serious interest in his work.

He was modest in private conversation, insisting that he could never tell which of his songs would become favorites. What he liked

most and what the public most enjoyed were not necessarily the same songs. For the popularity of some numbers, he gave credit to others. "Begin the Beguine," which he introduced into "Jubilee" in Boston after the opening night, attracted little attention at the time. He credited Artie Shaw with making an arrangement and a recording which converted the then forgotten song into a universal favorite.

His last show, "Silk Stockings" in 1955, was not his best. There was in his music for that musical comedy little of the magic that had made so many others memorable. After that, he lost interest and lost heart.

In death, he left behind a great many wonderful songs and one musical play, "Kiss Me, Kate," which ranks with the best ever written.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

The Gettysburg Address 101 Years After

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, William A. Coblenz, the public affairs specialist in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, delivered the annual Gettysburg Address, November 19, 1964, at Gettysburg, Pa., commemorating Abraham Lincoln's famous oration 101 years before. The occasion, known as Dedication Day, is a profoundly dignified event at the National Cemetery and takes place yearly. It is sponsored jointly by the Lincoln Fellowship of Pennsylvania and Camp 112, Sons of Union Veterans, with participation by the Lincoln Group of Washington, D.C.

In an hour so close to the Nation's commemoration of the birth of Abraham Lincoln I think it altogether fitting to have this moving and brilliant commemorative speech inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Coblenz as the principal speaker in 1964 succeeded such notables in other years as Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Carl Sandburg, and Governors Scranton, of Pennsylvania, Stevenson of Illinois, now Ambassador to the United Nations; and McKeldin, of Maryland.

The tribute the Lincoln address elicited from Mr. Coblenz and others in these ceremonies, through the years, is, in a sense, a reflection of its enormous impact on the civilization of the West, and its unexcelled eminence in the political literature of all time. Mr. Coblenz makes the point thoughtfully that however great Lincoln's influence has been in the past, the potential for the future is even greater.

The program and the Coblenz speech follows:

PROGRAM: 101ST ANNIVERSARY, LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS—"FOUR SCORE AND SEVEN YEARS AGO"—1863–1964

(Observance of Dedication Day, November 19, 1964, 2:30 p.m., National Cemetery, sponsored jointly by the Lincoln Fellowship of Pennsylvania and Camp 112, Sons of Union Veterans)

LINCOLN FELLOWSHIP LUNCHEON, HOTEL GETTYSBURG, 12 O'CLOCK

Master of ceremonies: Hon. William G. Weaver, mayor of Gettysburg, president of Lincoln Fellowship of Pennsylvania.

Speaker: Dr. J. Walter Coleman, National Park Service; former superintendent, Gettysburg National Park.

Fellowship hour.

Dinner music.

Short concert by U.S. Army Field Band.

DEDICATION DAY SERVICE—SOLDIERS' NATIONAL CEMETERY

Introduction of master of ceremonies, Maj. Chester S. Shriver, Brigadier Staff, Sons of Veterans Reserves.

Master of ceremonies, Hon. William G. Weaver, president of Lincoln Fellowship of Pennsylvania.

The National Anthem, U.S. Army Field Band, Lt. Col. Robert Bierly, director.

Color guard, Camp 112, Sons of Union Veterans.

Invocation, Rev. Fr. Joseph Kealy, St. Francis Xavier Church.

Laying of memorial wreaths, Lincoln Fellowship of Pennsylvania, Dr. J. Walter Coleman, past president, Lincoln Fellowship of Pennsylvania; Sons of Union Veterans, Dr. Joseph Riley, commander, Camp 112, Sons of Union Veterans.

Dedication day address, Hon. William A. Coblenz, Library of Congress.

Music of the Lincoln era, U.S. Army Field Band.

Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Prof. Joseph Wolfinger, English department, Gettysburg College.

"Battle Hymn of the Republic," U.S. Army Field Band.

Benediction, Dr. Harry F. Baughman, past president, Lutheran Theological Seminary.

LINCOLN FELLOWSHIP OF PENNSYLVANIA

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS, 1964–65

William G. Weaver, president; Joseph Feagley, vice president; C. A. Lediard, secretary; John A. MacPhail, treasurer; Dr. Frederick S. Klein, historian; Miles H. Keiffer, archivist; and Lawrence Welker, Chester S. Shriver, Kittridge Wing, and Dr. Charles Glatfelter.

THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS 101 YEARS AFTER

It is my message to you today that there was established here on American soil the living application of the greatest moral values in the life of man since the dawn of time.

It is my message to you today that the physical personification of these moral values was embodied in the life of one American, more than in any other.

This American was Abraham Lincoln.

It is, more especially, my message this afternoon that the noblest expression of these moral values took place 101 years ago on about this spot where we are now gathered, and is known to us and to mankind as the Gettysburg Address.

Moreover, it is my conviction that these aspirations of the human soul, to which Lincoln gave this exquisite restatement, and which our Founding Fathers brought to pass on this soil four score and 7 years before Gettysburg, constitute man's greatest contribution to man.

Since then and right up to the present hour we, the American people, have further implemented and amplified this extraordinary legacy.

As it inspired Lincoln so it continues to inspire us.

What Lincoln said here in 2 minutes on November 9, 1863, put this massive achievement in words of eternal flame, slow burning, to be loved and spoken, engraved and dreamed about, commented upon and sacrificed for, to the end of time.

In it is all the meaning of the history of our country.

The title-deeds of our American freedom: the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Gettysburg Address, outclass in their value to our everyday life, all the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome.

Of course, what we did here is not all of our own creation.

We were influenced mightly, and derive our freedoms, from Judaeo-Christian and Greco-Roman culture.

The loftiest concepts of this composite civilization flowered nowhere in the concrete as they flowered on this continent.

Our Founding Fathers reached into the poetry of Holy Writ and reduced it to forthright law by which men govern men.

We have come to call it the dignity of the individual, and we protect it by blunt statute.

Here on this continent we put an end to the lettre de cachet. No sovereign can put you in prison at his own caprice, without trial.

Here was an end to the ominous knock on the door in the middle of the night.

We have no ex post facto law.

We have no bills of attainder.

We have trial by jury.

We have habeas corpus.

We have freedom of the press.

Freedom of speech.

Freedom of worship.

Freedom of assembly.

Our Founding Fathers put to practice, not merely as a literary but as a living fact of life, the eternal truths known to mankind since Leviticus and Isaiah and Jesus. They made the thunder of the moral will of man the basic commandments of the law of the land. They made it into a grammar of decency we call the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights.

All this that I am saying now, and about which whole libraries have been written, Abraham Lincoln said on this spot in 2 minutes and said them as no words in any language were put together since the days of the ancient Hebrew prophets.

"Conceived in liberty."

"Dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." These are words that in their sublime context ring like an echo from Mount Sinai and the mountain in Judea from which the greatest of all sermons was delivered.

We have in our own times lived through pages of magnificent oratory.

"Never in the course of human conflict have so many owed so much to so few."

"We will fight from the landing fields, we will fight from the beaches, we will fight in the streets, we will fight from the dominions beyond the seas if need be, but we will never surrender."

"I have nothing to offer you but sweat and blood and tears."

You remember that other voice, the one in the White House.

You remember the four freedoms.

When Winston Churchill spoke it helped him to become, in my humble judgment, one of the 10 greatest Englishmen who ever lived. And that from Hastings in 1066 to the thin line of Spitfires in World War II is, I am aware, a considerable but a deserved tribute.

Yet this language of fight and inspiration, of combat and defiance, had only the immortality of immediacy, words keyed to the moment and the crisis, and memorable as such.

The language that Lincoln spoke on this spot—its calmness, its depthful profundity, its simple evocation of the deepest recesses in the human heart, are for all crises, for all travail, an answer, like a prayer, to the tragedy of the human condition.

It is like Holy Writ itself.

We live right now in an age of the most monumental decisions.

We have done things and seen things done that have shaken mankind to its roots.

There are steps taken by men in the hours of the last several generations that the human race will be proud of until the day of judgment.

Yet we have testifying to these deeds of immortal greatness no language of grandeur to match the deeds, no language that goes beyond the moment of action.

We can, and we do, dedicate ourselves to commitments and decisions that may be said to have everlasting value.

But we are as human beings, as decision-makers, as heroes of the hour, bereft of the words that will echo and reecho down through the corridors of time.

We seem unable to put the enduring words in our election speeches although world-shaking stakes are involved.

We have proved ourselves unable to give to our noblest deeds and our mightiest achievements the comparable brilliance and the moral glitter of the printed and the spoken word.

We are, for instance, in the death-throes of a struggle with communism.

The back of the world may be broken in that fight.

The Gettysburg Address has nothing to do with communism and yet it has everything to do with it. Certainly Lincoln did not contemplate communism in his funeral oration that day. But the address has to do with the dignity of man. In that sense it is the greatest single weapon against communism in the vast literature of this strange dialog between the open and the closed societies. It is the deadliest, the most devastating, the most complete answer to communism and totalitarianism that has emerged since the Communist Manifesto of 1848. Communism, in my judgment, will, in the evolution of history, perish from the earth. In time it will be noted that it suffered the mightiest blows of extinction from the words spoken here by Lincoln a century ago. They are the seeds from which, to the last freemen on this earth, spring endless dedications to liberty.

Thus to answer communism adequately we have to go back to Lincoln.

What words are there to remember from the great Court decision on civil rights?

Has anything yet been said about nuclear fission equal to the incredible might of this unbelievable scientific breakthrough?

What prose to remember, as the greatest prose is remembered, has come to us out of either World War I or World War II and these unprecedented sacrifices?

Just as the ancients, I believe, often lacked the deeds to match the words, so we today lack the words to match the deeds.

Man waited 2,000 years before the dream of the dignity of the individual emerged in the reality of the Constitution of the United States.

We, here, shaped into concrete conditions to live by, the poetic aspirations of the prophets.

When we want to exult in joy, rejoice in victory, or sing out the inner depths of human travail and tragedy, or, when we wish to speak of hope and the flight of the human spirit into majestic prayer and fortitude, we are all but stricken dumb.

We must, perforce, turn instead, thankfully and gratefully, to the Bible.

We reach for the Sermon on the Mount. We seek out the 23d Psalm:

"The Lord is My Shepherd I shall not want"—or Isaiah, or Leviticus, or Job, or Paul.

We, ourselves, in this civilization and in our generations, lack the luster, cannot achieve the depth, although often our approach is indeed close.

Except—I repeat with all the emphasis I can muster—except for the immortal 2 minutes on this spot 101 years ago.

We are magnificent in the words that have the impact of immediate inspiration. The words that make men leap to arms. The words to give the strength of the instant to endure great sacrifice.

Words of exhortation and electric persuasion, words like: "What is it that the gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Sometimes it seems to me I'd have given my right arm to have heard Patrick Henry utter those words.

It is the ultimate in eloquence.

Or this from John Adams in 1776:

"Sir, I know the uncertainty of human affairs, but I see, I see clearly, through this day's business. You and I, indeed, may rue it. We may not live to the time when this declaration shall be made good. We may die; die colonist; die slaves, die, it may be ignominiously and on the scaffold. Be it so.

"Sir, before God, I believe the hour is come. My judgment approves this measure, and my whole heart is in it. All I have, and all that I am, and all that I hope, in this life, I am now ready to stake upon it; and I leave off as I began, that live or die, survive or perish, I am for the declaration."

And there is, of course, the declaration itself upon which Lincoln drew so heavily, for his imperishable 2 minutes:

"And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

There are approaches to Biblical eminence, as you see, throughout our literature of combat and aspiration, everywhere in our title deeds of freedom, superb approaches that will ring down through the ages. For instance F.D.R.'s: "I see one-third of a nation ill housed, ill clad, ill nourished."

But none is so perfect in form, so right in the depth of human feeling, so true, so lacking in malice in the very midst of a savage and brutal civil war, so divinely mellowed in compassion, as this Gettysburg Address, which alone for its style and its nobility might indeed have been an integral part of Holy Writ itself.

It is for this reason that it is so unique.

Just as the Lord's Prayer is the most compact expression of the moral ideals of life in a mere handful of words, so the address represents a compression, in words of surcease, without any seeming effort at concentration, of the whole meaning of the ideology and the history of our country.

And, speaking with the utmost reverence, I find an extraordinary parallel in the tone, the firmness, the gentleness, the childlike faith, in these two divine pieces of the literature of mankind: the Lord's Prayer and the Gettysburg Address.

Those soul-satisfying phrases are the very balm of Gilead.

The appeal to "Our Father who art in heaven," the utter humility of the words: "Give us this day our daily bread."

The compassion: "forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us."

The plea, pitiful and stirring, and almost hopeless—"lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil."

And from one of ours, Lincoln's God-soaring reminder to us all: "Conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

"Those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live."

"A final resting place."

"The unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced."

"These honored dead."

"The last full measure of devotion."

"Shall not have died in vain."

"This Nation, under God, shall not perish from the earth."

The principal reason, in my judgment, why utterances like these because they are so infrequent, create a gap of mediocrity all the way from Leviticus to Gettysburg, is that we are dealing with the highest of all the art forms, and the rarity is due to the excellence. No matter what, it is unlikely that we shall ever again have in the sonata form another Fifth Symphony, or in paintings another "Descent from the Cross," in which Michelangelo recreated so much of the infinite bereavement, the unlimited compassion, the divine fortitude of the story of the Crucifixion.

Like Michelangelo, Lincoln did not obtrude his own person on the event. He was not concerned with how great a speech he would deliver, for "the world will little note nor long remember what we say here," but he was concerned with the boundless tragedy of this awful battle. The remarkable Edward Everett, in an excellent two-hour speech, was more concerned with delivering the greatest of all the Everett creations, than he was concerned with the meaning of the bloody battle itself. The great Everett, most notable orator of his day, wanted his speech to ring down through the centuries, and seemed less moved by the occasion which gave rise to his being there.

But Lincoln was absorbed down to his very marrow, only in—"the brave men, living and dead, who struggled here,"—and in a cause that tested whether a government of the people, by the people, for the people can long endure. This business of divorcing one's own ego from one's work of art and being wholly involved with the subject itself, is the quality which gives an expression of genius its overplus of appeal.

This is powerfully manifest in the Gettysburg speech.

Then apart from the speech there is Lincoln himself, whose every utterance, not only this one, is supercharged with a moral tone and a kinship to Holy Writ. The "house divided," the irrefutable logic of the Cooper Union address; the literary vignettes: "as I would not be a slave so I would not be a master;" "We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies"; "with malice toward none, with charity for all." There is the personality of the man, the frontier humor, the non-European, utterly American speech and presence; the citizen-President the most native of us all, the everlasting imprint of the absolute American, gaunt, brooding, humane, physically strong, intellectually a master of relevance and logic.

The Gettysburg Address, I charge, is not simple in any accepted sense; it is the most complicated thinking rendered lucid. Sublime simplicity is arrived at through the complex, because it is the divine fruit of 40 years of brooding thought and meditation. It is as much a breakthrough in human thought, from the standpoint of a restatement of the American ideal, as Christianity itself is a restatement of the great principles that flowed through the intellectually active society of Judea in the days of Christ.

If Einstein's basic formula for atomic energy is simple: E equals MC squared, and

that, of itself, is simple enough, then the Lincoln Gettysburg Address, too, is simple. The Einstein formula, told in a simple equation, altered everything we know about the universe. It constitutes the greatest scientific enlightenment since man first contemplated the stars, for it has changed the lives of all of us forever. Lincoln's words, on the moral and soul-searching level, have that kind of simplicity and that kind of momentum. It is the sort of simplicity that looks through the sum of man's knowledge of himself and gives us the ultimate in human wisdom. It is the word of God speaking through man.

This total Lincoln story, the acute and devastating crisis of the hour, the explanation of it in eternal terms, the personality of the speaker, and the story of his life, together, make the Gettysburg Address the greatest utterance ever delivered on this soil, and the most Godly single piece of rhetoric in the English language—I repeat—since the days of Holy Writ.

Up to this hour, it seems to me, the proof of all that I have said is overwhelming. But up to this hour is only a fraction of the history of Gettysburg. I deeply plead with you to consider the real burden of my thesis today. This is that the impact of the Gettysburg Address has a future greater even than its past. Wherever there is human communication, in any language, in Japanese, in the Romance languages, in Urdu, in Swahili, in any of the Chinese tongues, in India, in the heart of the Gobi Desert, in the swamps of Africa, everywhere, there will be heard this noblest expression of the human spirit, this absolutely American utterance. This is because there is in it not the confining limits, the parochial orthodoxy of a theology, but the breadth and scope of a universal religion, under which all men everywhere can find their liberation and the release of the finest motives that electrify the human soul. Indeed, what Lincoln said on this spot, will have for the future an immensely greater influence than it has had in the past, massive as that is, and will raise the level of man's thinking and his action until the end of time.

Geneva, Switzerland, Home of International Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in view of the anticipated message on health that is to come from the President, and in which we are all much interested, I have come across an article written by Bob Considine, released by King Features Syndicate under date of November 19, 1964, which sets forth some of the problems of world health. Because the article is of interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the King Features Syndicate Nov. 19, 1964]

ON THE LINE WITH BOB CONSIDINE

GENEVA.—If man ever learns how to live in peace with his neighbor, this spotless city might well become the first capital of the world, many of the agencies which work in fields calculated to persuade the peoples to stop killing and eating one another already are located here. Their work is often breathtaking in scope and effectiveness, yet all the agencies combined attracted less attention in recent months than Cassius Clay drew with one incarcerated hernia.

Last year more than 3,000 meetings having to do with international cooperation were held here at the Palais des Nations, once condemned to be razed as an upsetting reminder of the collapse of the League of Nations. The Palais is now too small to hold all those groups of many colors and ideological graduations which look to Geneva, a city of scarcely 280,000, as the world's best common meeting ground.

Roger V. Tubby, our Ambassador to the European Office of the United Nations and to other international organizations, calls Geneva on "international smorgasbord of activity." That's virtually an understatement.

It has been the home of the International Red Cross for a century. Your radio, television, telegrams, telephones, and a lot of the communicating with satellites passing overhead would not work nearly as effectively if it were not for the International Telecommunication Union, the oldest (99 years) of all the United Nations family.

Here are a few samples of what some of the other working bodies of U.N. are doing, on direction from their offices in Geneva:

In September of this year, 3,000 scientists from 70 nations attended the Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. They agreed that the world will run out of coal and oil in 75 years at the present and projected rates of use. Incredible new developments in atomic energy have produced the forerunners of reactors which one day will simultaneously desalt all the water a city needs, provide all the electric power the city needs, and in the course of "burning" its uranium fuel will breed more plutonium than the original pile of uranium, and has found a way to make the cinders more valuable than the exhausted coal.

Out of conferences such as this one the deserts will bloom, ships will sail endlessly without fuel stops, the seas will be mined for precious ore and other treasures, and harvested for food. Food preserved by a bolt of radiation remains fresh, wholesome, tasty for inconceivably long periods, without refrigeration. In the bursting enthusiasm of the session, Russia pledged to build a fleet of atomic propelled icebreakers to make the arctic navigable for world shipping the year around.

Even hear of bilharziasis? More than 20 million inhabitants of the valleys of the Nile, the Tigris, and the Euphrates who suffer from it look to the World Health Organization for help—which is always ready and willing. It is caused by tiny worms in human veins. It was described on papyrus 5,000 years ago. Autopsies of mummies have disclosed that the mummified died of bilharziasis thousands of years before there was a western culture.

You seldom hear of yaws either. About 100 million human beings live under the threat of this crippling disease. Since 1950, some 300 million have been examined in internationally aided campaigns. An astonishing 40 million have been treated with penicillin. In some areas the proportion of active cases has dropped from a whopping 20 percent of the population to half of 1 percent.

The greatest killer in the world today is malaria. Trachoma claims about 400 million victims, filariasis another 200 million. All these aches, pains, all the compounded ignorance and suspicion of mankind is being worked on 24 hours a day by the 116 international organizations in Geneva, including the International Organization for Standardization, which standardizes the nuts, screws, and bolts without which man can no longer engage in the industrial rebellion.

Who said U.N. doesn't work?

The Farm Bureau's Charlie Shuman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, some people think the term of service in the House is too short. They don't believe Congressmen should have to run for reelection every 2 years. They want a constitutional amendment to increase our term to 4 years.

Without venturing an opinion at this time, I have a suggestion for any of my colleagues who might feel sorry for themselves. They might find solace in the plight of one of my most distinguished constituents who comes up for election every year in a district that extends from coast to coast and far out into the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

He is Charles B. Shuman of Sullivan, Ill., president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the biggest farm organization in the world.

Apparently, Charlie has satisfied his 1,647,455 constituents—spread over 49 States, including Hawaii, and Puerto Rico—only Alaska has no Farm Bureau—because they have been reelecting him every year for the past decade.

In the following interview with Ralph W. Sanders, farm editor of the Decatur, Ill., Herald and Review, Charlie makes some interesting observations that shed light on the problems we will face in considering farm legislation later this year.

SHUMAN VIEWS HIS AFBF DECADE—LOOKS BACK AND FORWARD

(By Ralph W. Sanders)

Improving the marketing of farm products looms as the largest and most important project for farm organizations in the decade ahead.

That is the belief of Charles B. Shuman, the Sullivan farmer who heads the Nations' largest farm organization, the 1,647,455 member American Farm Bureau Federation.

Shuman made that observation during a recent interview with the Herald and Review as he reviewed his first 10 years as president of the mammoth federation which has members in 49 States and Puerto Rico. Only Alaska has no farm bureau organization.

In his farm home south and east of Sullivan, Shuman spent a brief Christmas vacation weekend before returning to his duties in the Chicago office of the AFBF.

Shuman relaxed on a couch in his living room in front of a newly cut and erected Christmas tree as he answered questions.

In December 1954, Shuman, who had just been elected to his 10th 1-year term as president of the Illinois Agricultural Association (IAA), succeeded Allan B. Kline, as president of the AFBF.

CHANGE IN THINKING

Since then, Shuman said, most farmers have quit telling themselves that Govern-

ment farm programs would work with the proper administration.

"At least 75 percent of the farmers then believed there was a way for the Government to regulate production and get fair prices for the farmer," Shuman said.

That is now reversed, he said, with about 75 percent of the farmers now believing in a minimum of Government farm regulation.

The change in direction of thinking was gradual, Shuman said, but the May 1963 defeat by farmer referendum of a mandatory wheat program was a dramatic demonstration of the change in farmer thinking.

He said the Agricultural Act of 1958 was the first major Act by Congress to reduce price supports.

It was the first time many persons realized the balance of thinking was swinging away from high supports, he said.

Minimum price supports were lowered from 75 percent of parity to 65 percent of parity by the measure on corn and cotton. It was passed during Ezra Taft Benson's term as Secretary of Agriculture under the Eisenhower administration.

Changes in the support prices on cotton would have become effective in 1962.

Had the present administration not reversed that position, Shuman said, cotton "would have been in as good a shape as is corn and price adjustment to a market price could have continued."

HARD WORK

"It has been nothing but really hard work," the graying Shuman said of the decade of leadership of the AFBF.

Expressing a preference for operation of his Moultrie County farm over his Farm Bureau position, he conceded he has derived some personal satisfaction from serving as president.

That comes, he said, from knowing that "most of the folks think you are doing a fairly good job."

The absence of any large "purge Charles Shuman movement," he said, would indicate general satisfaction with his leadership. There has also been general membership growth in the period.

Another compensation, he said, "is the shift in thinking of farmers (toward less Government agricultural controls) which I think is sound and in time will put them on a better income basis."

He said, "If we continued down the control route we would have had limits placed on income."

His only regrets are that his job took him away from his family and farm.

Traveling some 50,000 miles a year and averaging two major speeches a week plus short radio and television appearances and press interviews, Shuman spends over half of his working time away from his Chicago offices.

The work itself is interesting, he said, but the travel associated with it is not as glamorous as it might appear.

The 57-year-old graduate of the University of Illinois has a master's degree in agronomy.

He likes working with people, he said, and finds appealing the challenge of "winning some of these political battles."

The major triumph in the decade for Farm Bureau, he believes, was the defeat of the wheat referendum in May 1963. Farm Bureau made it an issue, he said. "Otherwise it would have gone by the way."

The start Farm Bureau has in "cracking the marketing problem" also is a big step forward, he thinks.

The problem, he said, is getting into a well enough organized position so as to negotiate for sale terms prior to production.

He called the National Farmers Organization (NFO) holding actions a symptom of the need for more orgnization on the part of farmers where marketing is concerned.

But, he said, their problem is impatience. "You don't make progress that way. You have to earn the right to bargain. We have not either, but we're working on it."

Looking to the future, Shuman predicted that the present trends toward contract marketing, increasing efficiency and increasing size of average units will continue.

Farms will continue to be operated as family units, Shuman believes, as there has been very little increase in the number of large-scale factory farms.

One of the biggest changes coming, Shuman thinks, is contract marketing with the producer and processor coming to terms on quality, quantity and price prior to production.

When it comes it could come real fast, Shuman said, as processors get in line to assure themselves of supplies.

"It is inevitable that we get to a market priced agriculture," Shuman said. He thinks the next 10 years will see an end to Government attempts to control production as well as price supports.

But the nearer future is still in doubt. What is in store farm legislation wise for 1965? Shuman said the situation is unclear.

Shuman is to meet soon, perhaps this week, with Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, to discuss farm legislation and Farm Bureau positions on it.

The framework for that meeting seems somewhat muddled. Shuman knows where his organization stands. Generally speaking it maintained or toughened its stand on reducing Government controls in agriculture at its annual meeting in Philadelphia, Pa., Dec. 6–10.

And although Shuman says "there is reason to believe the administration may soften its stand on more controls" there has been no such demonstration to date.

Further complicating hopes for the meeting is the possibility that Freeman may not call the shots in the Department during the Johnson administration.

Calling it a "peculiar situation," Shuman said rumors indicate that Vice President-elect Hubert H. Humphrey may have more to say about agriculture than the Secretary.

Admitting that the situation puts him in a spot, Shuman reasoned that perhaps the best thing for him to do is ask Freeman where he stands.

CAMPAIGN STATEMENTS

Shuman interprets campaign statements made by Humphrey as indicative that the next Vice-President wants to see the market price system work without compulsory programs.

As for Government farm payments, Shuman thinks they are going toward direct payments for farmers not to produce rather than commodity payments.

Without saying he approves or does not approve of direct payments, Shuman said such payments would start a distinct differentation between commercial farmers and part time farmers, especially if payment approvals were handled by the local office.

"I'd like to see some of the persons now getting Government farm program payments going to the welfare office to get approval," he mused.

Shuman does not participate in Government farm programs on his 270-acre Moultrie County farm and hasn't for many years.

His three oldest sons, Charles W., and twins John and Paul, operate about 1,000 acres including their father's farm which includes a livestock partnership of about 70 head of commercial beef cows and the start of a swine operation.

A daughter, Mrs. Roger (Janet) Roney, is the wife of a farmer and a teacher at Lovington High School.

Shuman's youngest son, George 5, and Mrs. Shuman, keep the home fires burning between week ends when the busy AFBF president makes it home for a few hours of concentrated leisure.

Aid for the Wool Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, because of continued imports and competition from abroad, the wool textile industry in the United States is undergoing severe hardship and is fighting desperately to survive. Employment in this industry has dropped to about a third of what it was in 1947. In 1964 at least 17 plants closed down, 12 of them in New England. The number of jobs disappearing in this industry in recent years is as follows: 1962, 1,700; 1963, 3,150; 1964, 4,600. The erosion is growing greater with each year; the hope for survival is diminishing correspondingly with each passing year.

The massive influx of imports has particularly hurt the woolen-worsted mills in New England, and most especially the remaining mills in Connecticut. Recently the advisory council of the Wyandotte Worsted local unions, affiliated with the Textile Workers Union of America, adopted a resolution in which President Johnson is urged to use his good offices "to prevail upon the wool textile and apparel producing nations to work out effective arrangements to regulate international trade in wool products in a reasonable and orderly manner."

In an effort to call attention to the plight and the difficulties encountered by this industry, I am inserting the text of that resolution into the RECORD. I trust that the means will be found to provide the necessary relief to this industry before it is too late.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION—RELIEF FROM WOOL PRODUCTS IMPORTS

In 1961, President Kennedy announced a program of assistance to the textile industry which was designed to meet the wide range of problems it faced. One of the points of this program was the calling of "an early conference of the principal textile exporting and importing countries * * * to seek an international understanding which will provide the basis for trade that will avoid undue disruption of established industries."

International conferences were held and resulted in an agreement among 22 nations regarding international trade in cotton textiles. This agreement established procedures to regulate the development of trade in cotton textiles in a reasonable and orderly manner so as to avoid disruptive effects in individual markets.

The international cotton textile arrangement has contributed substantially to the improvement of the well-being of the domestic textile industry. The sharp rise in imports of cotton products has been halted and the domestic markets for cotton goods have been stabilized. However, no provisions have been made to regulate international trade in textile products other than cotton.

In Portland, Maine, and Providence, R.I., last September 28, President Johnson reaffirmed his support of the Kennedy seven-point program for textiles and publicly

recognized the plight of the wool division of our industry.

"The wool industry," President Johnson said, "continues to be faced with problems, particularly in New England. In the past 10 years, imports have soared from less than 5 percent to 20 percent of American consumption, with particular concentration in worsteds.

"The administration has made and will continue to make vigorous efforts to solve this problem. I share with our late, beloved President Kennedy the view that wool textile and apparel imports must be kept at reasonable levels.

"We have been trying to work out effective arrangements with other wool textile-producing countries. Two missions have been sent abroad for this purpose in recent months. Thus far, a multination meeting has not been convened, but we intend to continue our efforts vigorously.

"I can assure you that we shall work hard at this problem. I consider it essential that the wool textile industry be restored to good health," President Johnson pledged.

This division of textiles is in particular need of safeguards similar to those established under the cotton agreement. The problems of the wool division have been seriously aggravated by a massive influx of imports. Between 1958 and 1963 imports of wool woven cloth increased from 16.5 to 28 million pounds, a rise of 69 percent. Imports of all wool products, including tops, yarn and wearing apparel, increased from 27 to 74.3 million pounds, a jump of 175 percent.

Despite the general increase in textile consumption so far this year, the wool sector has continued to decline. Total fiber consumption in the wool textile industry fell by 9 percent in the first 7 months of this year and production of woolen and worsted fabrics declined by 10 percent in the first half.

Imports of wool apparel fabric have not fallen by anywhere near the proportion of domestic production. Consequently, the share of the U.S. market accounted for by imports has risen sharply. Imports from Japan, the largest supplier of foreign apparel fabrics, actually increased in the first 7 months of this year.

The erosion of the domestic industry has caused severe hardship to woolen and worsted workers. From 167,000 production jobs in 1947, employment has dropped to less than 60,000. Most of the displaced woolen workers were employed in small towns where alternative employment opportunities were not available. Many of them had devoted most of their lives to work in textiles and are faced with the hopeless prospect of finding new jobs at an advanced age.

In the past few months the plight of many mills has become desperate. A rash of liquidations has occurred. So far this year no fewer than 17 plants—12 of them in New England—have closed their doors, wiping out 4,600 jobs. This exceeds the 3,150 jobs which were lost in all of 1963 and 1,700 which disappeared in 1962.

Immediate action is imperative. President Johnson has stated that "wool textile and apparel imports must be kept at reasonable levels." He has pledged the best efforts of the administration to solve this problem: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Advisory Council of TWUA's Wyandotte Worsted locals, That we urge President Johnson to use the prestige and influence of his office to prevail upon the wool textile and apparel producing nations to work out effective arrangements to regulate international trade in wool products in a reasonable and orderly manner; and be it further

Resolved, That committees from each of the Wyandotte Worsted locals call upon their respective Congressmen and Senators for the purpose of soliciting their support of President Johnson's program to restore the wool textile industry to good health; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Haydon Burns Becomes Florida's 35th Governor—Excellence in Education State's Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 5, 1965, Haydon Burns, the dynamic and resourceful mayor of Jacksonville, Fla., for 15 years, was inaugurated as the 35th Governor of the State of Florida. Governor Burns succeeded Farris Bryant, who has led Florida to its greatest heights in his 4 years as the chief executive of Florida, and who now moves to Jacksonville to become our city's leading new citizen.

Governor Burns, in his inaugural speech in the State Capitol of Tallahassee, outlined his goals for his administration. Chief among the goals for the ninth largest State of the Union was the achievement of excellence in education. Education is the keynote to the future of any great State, and in Florida we seek to achieve the very best.

I take this opportunity to wish Governor Burns, his charming wife, Mildred, and the Burns family the best of everything during his administration. Under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the inaugural speech of Governor Burns:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF HAYDON BURNS, 35TH GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Following is the full text of Gov. Haydon Burns' inaugural address today in Tallahassee:

"Governor Bryant, members of the cabinet, members of the court, members of the legislature, other distinguished platforms guests, families, friends—my fellow citizens—

"It is with a sense of deep humility, as well as eternal gratitude that I stand before you, the people of Florida, today. As we pass the moment of my inauguration, I am truly cognizant that you have bestowed upon me, not only the highest honor in your power to confer upon a fellow Floridian, but also a task of great magnitude—the task to keep aglow that sacred flame on which rely future hope, progress, and prosperity. In return for your confidence, my purpose will be an unrelenting determination to so serve that in the years to come you will look with pride upon the activities of this State under my stewardship.

"But before we look further to the future, I would like to look to the past for a moment.

"During all of my public service I have been blessed with many friends who have assisted me. And to the hundreds of loyal supporters who are here today and to the thousands throughout Florida who have given so unselfishly of their time, energy, and resources in my behalf, I am grateful and there is reserved a place for you in the innermost recesses of my heart.

"But, of all who have assisted and encouraged me, I would like to pay tribute to that group which blessed my life—leading always onward and upward—and that is my family—especially my wife, Mildred, who, along with our son, Bill—our daughter, Eleanor, her husband, Lloyd—and my mother—have consistently provided the kind of warm, sympathetic understanding and devoted family relationships that make it possible for a man to enter and to remain a part of public life. They have truly been my beacon of light—my haven of stability and serenity.

"To Governor Bryant I express my best wishes, and to his first lady, Julia, the warm wishes from myself and Mildred. To the members of the Florida cabinet and department heads, I would like to express my appreciation for their very fine cooperation in shaping the orderly transition of the State government. They have all accorded me every courtesy—and have taken every step necessary to insure a smooth path for our new administration. I am sure that as citizens of Florida you appreciate this orderly transfer as much as I do, for it is such continuity that makes for stability, orderly progress, and moreover a safe and sound system.

"To the men and women who have worked so diligently to prepare and carry out this wonderful inaugural program with all of its formalities and festivities, I want to say thank you and well done. The beauty, the pageantry, and the dignity which are a part of this ceremony will long be remembered by all who are here today.

"I want to express my profound appreciation for the presence today of some of Florida's most distinguished citizens of our day, former Governors Doyle Carlton, Sr., Spessard L. Holland, Millard F. Caldwell, Fuller Warren, and Charley Johns. Every citizen of this day and the future owe to these gentlemen a lasting debt of gratitude to their great personal contributions and leadership which have brought us as a State to this great hour.

"An inaugural has many meanings. This ceremony today, of course, has a deep personal meaning for me. But, more important, it has a broad meaning for all of us as beneficiaries of the past and trustees of the future. It marks a beginning—a beginning of new hopes—new dreams—new plans—new projects—the beginning of a new era in our State government. An inaugural highlights our aspirations for the future, that will be even more golden as we translate our goals into realities.

"This is a majestic and magnificent country, and I am glad to say Florida is a prosperous State—a pleasant place in which to live—to study—to work—to play—to worship.

"With its continual growth our State also has its problems—but let us not fear—for here the people have vision and talent—energy and imagination—and sound moral values. We are a people who have a rightful place in the space age to which we are making real contributions. We are a people who—while keeping our feet firmly planted on the ground—focus our eyes on the broad horizon—on the stars and the moon. We are a people who are ready to move forward—joined daily by others from throughout the Nation and the world—by newcomers who want to have a part in our future, in which there are priceless opportunities.

"But prosperous as we are, we realize that some of our people are not sharing as fully as they should in our general prosperity. We must exert every effort to not only bolster what we have, but to bring a soaring boost to our economy, by expanding business and industry, and attracting new enterprise, which will provide additional employment for our fast-growing population. The only limit to our realizations of tomorrow will be our doubts of today.

"We are a natural location for the administrative offices of America's large corporations.

Already the insurance industry has found Florida and many are moving their headquarters here in order that their employees and executives may enjoy the blessings we have. Likewise, one interstate railroad has moved its general headquarters here, and several others have regional offices.

"No State in this vast Union is better suited for the manufacture and distribution of light metals and materials—chemicals—and pharmaceuticals—for furniture making and boat building—to name a few. These are industries that depend upon brainpower—industries light and clean and wholesome, which will provide substantial payrolls and not conflict with our important tourist industry.

"We do not lack the brainpower here that these industries need, and we have the climate to make them flourish. We have attractive land, water and utilities for their operation, and we have the kind of communities in which they want to settle. Ours is the opportunity to pursue vigorously a program of selling Florida, through a unity of spirit that cannot fail.

"And let us be reminded that, in the manufacturing field, there will never be a machine made that cannot be substantially improved. There will never be developed a technique that cannot be made better. Therefore, so long as research is encouraged, we will never come to the end of the road of progress.

"At one time we were almost totally dependent upon tourism and agriculture for our prosperity. Both of these still play a vital role in our economy, but no longer is this just a winter playground—it is a year-round mecca from Pensacola to Key West, for those who seek relaxation and relief from their daily labors.

"Our agricultural industry continues to expand and we expect to keep it so, as we are still the winter vegetable basket of this Nation.

"Our citrus industry in central and south Florida grows by leaps and bounds. We must strive to improve the markets until these products are available everywhere on earth.

"Too long neglected and too little advertised is our beef cattle industry, which is becoming the envy of our sister States to the west. Florida beef is not just good beef—it is superior beef.

"Our sugar industry in south Florida is enjoying an unparalleled development.

"Our timber industry, including particularly pulp and paper, is bringing about an improved economy throughout north Florida.

"One vital area of our economy to which we have devoted far too little attention is trade with the Caribbean and with all of Central and South America. Actually, we in Florida can be the keystone in an arch of peaceful relations with our sister Americans to the south of us. We can develop fruitful cultural as well as trade ties. We can help to advance the cause of peace within a free-enterprise economy.

"Interama—located strategically in Dade County—is an excellent beginning in the construction of this magnificent arch. And let me point out here that although Interama is directly important to the economy of Dade County, it is important to all of Florida. It deserves the support and interest of all Floridians.

"Another bright development is the growth of transportation facilities. We now have 13 deepwater ports. We are extending business and industrial growth with waterborne commerce. The real potential in this activity awaits the completion of the cross State barge canal. I pledge my every effort to the earliest possible realization of this great project. Florida today is served by a fine network of railroads and airlines. No person—no business—today is located more than 50 miles from a commercial airport.

"At the same time that we are making progress with respect to water and air transportation, we must move forward with improved highways—with roads designed to move our people safely and efficiently from place to place—to move our agricultural and manufactured products—roads designed to serve the needs of our tourists. Our expressways and limited access highways now under construction must be completed without delay. I shall direct the State road board to give immediate attention and complete cooperation to the establishment of an expressway authority for Dade County to the end that we shall design and build an east-west expressway and complete the other road systems designed for Miami and other parts of Dade County. Of paramount importance is the fulfillment and completion of Florida's entire Interstate Highway System. The new administration will put special emphasis on the completion of Interstate 95 with major projects immediately in Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties, as well as the continuation of this vital highway southward from Jacksonville. Of equal importance will be the expediting of the completion of Interstate Highway 75 from Wildwood into the downtown area of the city of Tampa, and a pronounced program for Interstate Highway 10 beginning from the Alabama line at the western boundary of our State and continuing the construction program from the east. These roads are all indispensable to our growth and prosperity, and while working toward these completions, we must and will be planning ahead to construct new highways where they are needed.

"Related to highway construction, there are two other significant opportunities. We must continue to improve traffic safety and reduce the slaughter of people on our highways—and, while the municipal parking problem is not a direct responsibility of the State, we shall cooperate with the cities in planning their solutions.

"We will be a prosperous State only so long as we have a well-trained labor supply. For this we look to our public schools—our junior colleges—our technical and vocational schools. They must be improved to the point that they are second to none.

"We will be a prosperous State only so long as we have leadership. For this we look once again to our schools—and more especially to the kind of young men and women who are the products of our universities. We look to these higher institutions of learning also for the research they are doing—research that opens new frontiers of knowledge—that contributes to our economy in a variety of ways. And, although we want to graduate young people as quickly and as economically as possible we must make certain that what we are doing is educationally sound—that we take the time and effort to produce quality as well as quantity.

"In the near future I shall call for the appointment of a group of distinguished educators and laymen to study our present trimester plan and to report on their observations and recommendations. We must move forward rapidly to preserve what is good and desirable, and to eliminate that which is undesirable, in our system. Our young people are our most important resource. They must be taught by superior men and women. Their education—whether they be retarded, average, or brilliant—is our most important undertaking, for our future depends on them, and our present is dedicated to them. If in the annals of history our administration can only be remembered for one contribution, then let it be said that we devoted our maximum experience, courage, and labor toward helping Florida reach a peak of excellence in its entire educational system.

"We want to continue our attack on diseases, so this will always be one of the healthiest States in the Nation. We are committed to a program of excellent public health, both physical and mental in Florida. We shall not forget them.

"We know that our senior citizens have provided us with a wealth of experience and wisdom in shaping the fortunes of our State in the past. As they reach the era of their golden years, we shall not forget them. Proper care, within our ability, for our aged and infirm, our blind and our dependent children—is not only a duty but a privilege and a source of joy and satisfaction.

"We shall strive to keep a watchful eye over our sources of fresh water and prevent as far as possible all contamination.

"With the climate, labor supply, recreational facilities, and geographical location being brought to the attention of the proper officials in Washington throughout the past years by our strong congressional delegation, we are now the host State to many defense plants and military installations. It was a source of gratification to learn that the current plan in Washington to curtail such operations, left almost untouched the ones in Florida. For a nation to maintain leadership it must remain strong, and I pledge full cooperation with the National Government in the continued operation and expansion of these facilities.

"As we view our challenges, and our opportunities—we must seek the advice and assistance of all who have something to offer. We must develop constructive relationships among the branches of our Government, and between all levels—local, county, State and national. Business leaders, educational leaders, governmental leaders, civic leaders, and labor, working together, must develop new trust and respect for each other, must join hands in finding solutions to our problems, and thus will they be mastered.

"In forming an administration of department heads under the Governor's office, oftentimes referred to as the Little Cabinet, we have been able to attract some of Florida's most outstanding citizens to accept these posts of responsibility. These distinguished citizens are dedicated to our great State, and its purposes, and I know they will serve with distinction and honor to themselves and our State.

"This being a ceremonial occasion, I shall not detail the blueprint for our administration, but a more comprehensive plan, with recommendations, will form a part of my executive message to the State legislature when it convenes this year.

"In conclusion, let me say that I do not have all the answers to all our problems, but I do have the will and determination to pursue with vigor every responsible avenue of solution, to seek advice from citizens both in and out of government who share my concern and devotion to this State, and I shall daily need and seek guidance from that Supreme Being from Whom all power and wisdom flow, I pledge you the full range of whatever talents I may possess.

"As mayor of the Gateway City for 15 years, I have had the opportunity from that vantage point to observe the growth of every part of our State. In the performance of my executive duties, I shall see no east, no west, no north, no south, but one great State of Florida. My head, my heart, my hands are hereby dedicated to your service."

CCC Wheat Dumping Drives Farmers to Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD the December 10,

1964, release of the GTA Daily Radio Roundup, St. Paul, Minn. This focuses attention on the practice of the Commodity Credit Corporation of dumping Government grain, which has resulted in disastrous economic hardship to the American farmer.

This release deals with wheat, but the practice that is under attack in this article has also been employed in the feed grain commodities. This has driven the price of feed grains down and has done much to stimulate the glut in livestock production. As a result, many farmers have been driven to the wall in competing with the biggest farm market monopoly in the world, the Government of the United States.

This article which I insert hits the nail right on the head, and I compliment GTA for its willingness to bring to the attention of the American farmer these policies which are detrimental to his best interests.

The article follows:

GTA has a primary responsibility only to the farm people who own it. That comes first. This primary responsibility is not to the Government, not to the buyers of grain, not to the consumers, the politicians or anybody else—just to the farmers. And we feel now that an explanation is owed to the grain farmers for the miserably low wheat prices that were bid to them generally during harvest this year.

These wheat prices could have been about 20 cents per bushel higher, and there is a very simple explanation why they were not.

Beginning in July the U.S. Government, through its Commodity Credit Corporation, began the most massive dumping operation in history. The CCC was originally formed to help farmers, not to put a ceiling on their prices. But here is what actually happened and unfortunately continues to happen.

During the first month of the 1964 harvest the huge Government corporation dumped 50 million bushels of wheat with the expressed and vocal intention of preventing farmers from getting higher prices for their wheat.

CCC sold this wheat to buyers who otherwise would have been ready customers for your wheat from your cooperatives and other handlers. But you didn't sell this wheat; the Government did. Incredibly, during the harvest period of approximately 90 days more than 150 million bushels of Government wheat was dumped on the market. Buyers got some of the most unbelievable bargains in history because the CCC wheat flooded the market and put a low ceiling on farm wheat prices.

This is immensely disturbing. GTA has looked into the history of Government operations all over the world, and we have found no precedent for this behavior. No other country does it. GTA General Manager M. W. Thatcher had this to say about it:

"CCC price support activities when conducted to help farm producers have no stronger advocate than GTA. But," Mr. Thatcher said, "we oppose CCC's misuse of the farm program."

GTA's grain experts estimate that without this CCC dumping during this harvest wheat would have gone on the market about 20 cents a bushel higher than it actually sold for. Twenty cents a bushel on a crop of 1,200 million bushels is $240 million. That is what was taken out of the wheat producers' pocket by the dumping action by CCC.

We are sorry to have to expose this behavior. We do not believe that the President of the United States, or the Vice President, or the Congress had any intention that the farm law would be administered in this manner. We believe that these decisions were made by a small handful of persons, perhaps very inexperienced, in charge of CCC who were determined to use its power to punish those farmers whom they refer to as noncompliers.

We also believe that the purpose of the present wheat legislation is very clear, and it is that those who comply with the program receive certificates worth on the average about 50 cents a bushel. That is their payment for complying. Punitive action by the Government to hurt them, as well as the noncompliers, was never intended by Congress. The punishing ceiling that CCC operations impose on wheat prices in the markets, a deliberate thing that punishes all growers without reason, is plainly obnoxious.

Moreover, the dumping operation that we described did not actually rid the Government of one single bushel of surplus. And why not? Because by dumping 150 million bushels CCC drove market prices so low that farmers were sealed within a narrow price range and had no choice but to put their new grain under loan. The Government just took the grain right back into its warehouses. It took different kernels, true, but ultimately as much or more grain than was dumped came back into CCC's bins. It need not have been thus if enough price leeway had been allowed so producers could sell instead of going in to the loan program. That wheat might have been sold through your farmer cooperatives and regular market channels instead of to the Government which ultimately will probably dump it again and keep the vicious circle going.

If this is the policy of the Federal Government, then there never will be any "muscle in the marketplace" for farmers. Instead, in time there will not be any cooperative marketing system at all. It is that serious and that dangerous to producers.

That is why we at GTA believe that we would be derelict in our duty to farmers if we did not call this maladministration to the attention of the voters.

And that, we should add, is in concurrence with resolutions adopted by GTA delegates at their recent annual meeting and expressed in resolutions by other regional cooperatives, just like GTA, of which there are more than two dozen in the Nation.

If the Government continues this process of nationalization, it should openly advocate it. Then the voters would have a chance to make a decision.

J. Edgar Hoover Commended by City of Lakewood Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the city of Lakewood which, incidentally, recently was awarded first honors in the 1965 Pasadena Rose Tournament, by action of its city council on December 22, last, has commended the fine work of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. The council's Resolution 1575 reads as follows:

RESOLUTION 1575

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Lakewood commending J. Edgard Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation

Whereas, J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have recently been under attack for alleged dereliction of duty; and

Whereas, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover, has an exemplary record in efficient and just police work; and

Whereas, by reason of the successful operation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, law enforcement in each city, county and State is benefited and strengthened; and

Whereas, said J. Edgar Hoover and the men in his Bureau should be commended for their contribution to maintenance of law and order in the United States, rather than being condemned: Now, therefore, the City Council of the City of Lakewood does hereby commend J. Edgar Hoover and the men of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for their successful and unshirking performance of duty in the maintenance of law and order in the United States.

The city clerk is directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to our Congressman and Senators as well as to said J. Edgar Hoover.

Adopted and approved this 22d day of December 1964.

ROBERT W. BAKER,
Mayor.

Attest:

JO BENNITT,
City Clerk.

Autumn in Full Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the enclosed article entitled "Autumn in Full Glory" by Woodroe Wylie, Carthage, Tex., Route 1.

The article follows:

AUTUMN IN FULL GLORY

(By Woodroe Wylie)

Ever since I was a boy, I have wanted to write a discourse on autumn. The changes and scenes that take place are most spectacular. Everywhere one looks or listens there are distinct admissions or omissions of multivarious events.

On November 5, 1929, at Carthage Tex., a flock of wild geese became lost at night in low clouds and blinding lights. The bewildered geese honked all night long. Some people were amused at their musical sounds while others were annoyed because the geese kept them awake. The flight of the geese is timed with the falling of the leaves.

The most glorious show that nature has to display is the changing colors of the leaves in October and November. Perhaps the most beautiful colors are pink, yellow, burgundy, orange, and red. For those who have a poet's soul, their eyes can feast upon the beauteous glory until their starved souls are content.

In the valley of the many colored leaves, a mazy, meandering stream flows toward the rivulet. Its progress comes almost to a standstill when it brushes against some clogged leaves and brush. But then it bursts forth with its freedom, and it seems to make musical laughter in its progress. Here, before in the lustrum of spring when beauty reigned supreme, the songbirds would gather in this hallowed grove to take a bath in the stream, consequently displaying their winsome plumage. The ones that sang the loudest laid claim to that strip of domain.

Nearby is a variety of trees—blackgum, sweetgum, maple, hickory, and others—that are dotted upward to the top of the hill slope. It is perhaps here that God's creation of beauty is at its best, for each specie of tree and every leaf seems to be vying for splendor's prizes. Amid the glory of the beautiful trees is a unique one. It is the pine tree, and it knows no changing season, for its foliage is green the year round. The winds pierce the giant pine trees' needles, and most beautiful musical sounds issue forth. A million produce music, but none is too audible nor any out of key. The soft, mournful sounds summarize the events of a lifetime.

Over the flood of years, methinks that I can see a little bright, blue-eyed boy, in a shy, concealed way, grab his long-visored cap, gather up some sacks, and set forth for autumn's rich fruits. He encounters a strange, frightening bird called the screech owl. This unique bird has a mysterious talented voice; in the black hours of night he haunts people who have departed from the straight and narrow way. Some guilty, superstitious ones will get up and turn over an old shoe. Now barefooted and on tiptoe, the boy reaches the desired woodlands, scales the persimmon tree, and feasts upon the rich, luscious fruit. Then he fills his sacks with chinquapins, walnuts, and hickory nuts. He looks about him and sees the squirrels gathering nuts and taking them up large trees to deposit them in hidden holes for winter food. Their thoughts are so much like his own.

Then falls the cruel, telling frost. Each leaf seems to cling to its accustomed place tenaciously, but volleys of wind smite it again and again, and like a human gasping for his last earthly breath, at last it gives way to eternity. The fallen leaves scurry over one another like little children playing leapfrog. Then at last the leaves come to rest, and I lament that in all their beauteous glory they must, like common earth, rot. The gayer hours of life were ours; the worst is mine.

With the passing of the leaves go many songbirds, which were heavenly sweet and earthly present. Then the ones left are deleted of their gay songs. Their pleasures seem to have terminated during the flight of their earthly companions of the air and the falling of the leaves. Even the persistent musical voice of the pretty bluejay is no longer heard, "Ching, chang, ching." The multitude of mockingbirds has departed and taken their multivarious songs with them. The most abundant birds left are the crows and blackbirds which, at their best, only produce a cacophony of sounds.

The wise old owl perches himself on the top spray of the loftiest tree in the forest. He has seen many seasons come and go, and from his vantage point he appears to be taking inventory. Beyond the woods, out in the open meadows, a wilderness of wild flowers in their gay sisterhood was mutilated by Jack Frost's wintry breath. Upon surveying the scene in the woodlands, the owl still has left with him hawks, doves, quail, larks, redbirds, snowbirds, sparrows, robins, killdees, and the four-footed animals: wolf, coon, skunk, mink, squirrel, opossum, and hare. The owl mops the brow of his sad countenance and seems to say, "The birds have taken a leave of absence and will return with the arrival of spring. The flowers and the leaves will appear in the resurrection next May."

When death comes to a bird, it usually is preceded by a brief illness. Birds do not feel any responsibility for whatever happens to them after death. Their plight is not so complex as the departure of us humans.

Another Dienbienphu?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith another article by Joseph Alsop entitled, "Another Dienbienphu?" Mr. Alsop has been on the scene in Saigon and, apparently, understands better than any other correspondent the situation there. He has been giving forthright reports in simple language about South Vietnam.

The article follows:

MATTER OF FACT—ANOTHER DIENBIENPHU?

(By Joseph Alsop)

Everyone in Washington is hard at work worrying about the political situation in Vietnam. They should also begin worrying about the military situation which is the prime cause of the recurrent political difficulty.

Just 11 years ago, this reporter left Saigon to fly halfway around the world for an earlier family Christmas. Doing exactly the same thing this time, with exactly the same cold dread of disaster-soon-to-come lying clammy on one's stomach, was not an agreeable experience.

Yet facts must be faced, however disagreeable they may be. And the central fact that now needs facing is the grim similarity of the present military situation in South Vietnam to the Vietnamese military situation at the end of 1953, on the very eve of Dienbienphu.

By December, 1953, the Communists had managed to stretch the defense to the utmost, leaving the French high command with almost no reserves in hand. This year, once again, the defenders' resources are badly overstretched. The central reserve amounts to hardly a division and a half; and a good part of this slender reserve is actually pinned down in the Saigon area, because of the strength of the Communist underground in the city.

In December 1953, the Communists also had large reserves outside the war zone, in the form of the newly trained division in China whose commitment in Vietnam then caused the French disaster at Dienbienphu. This year, once again, the Communist reserves outside the war zone are extremely important, theoretically comprising the entire North Vietnamese Army. And units of this reserve have almost certainly begun to be infiltrated southward, over the Ho Chi Minh trail.

This startling fact must be deduced from recent captures of very young North Vietnamese draftees in South Vietnam. No general in his senses would send youthful conscript soldiers to serve as hard-core cadres in guerrilla fighting. Hence it is as certain as anything can be that the draftees were sent to the southern front with their battalions.

The appearance of organized units of the North Vietnamese army in the southern fighting is a new and startling fact, which might well divert the State Department's wrath from Gen. Nguyen Khanh to Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap. To be sure, this movement southward is not large by normal standards. It cannot as yet amount to more than a couple of battalions a month.

But the war in South Vietnam is fought province by province. In province after province, the balance of the fighting is already close. And in too many provinces, a local catastrophe can too easily result from the injection of no more than one or two additional main force enemy battalions.

In Quang Nai, for example, the anti-Communist forces have already been pushed back so far that the enemy controls just about the entire province, except for the main town and two or three other strong points. In main force battalions, moreover, the balance in Quang is probably already about 7 to 5 in favor of the Communists.

Obviously, therefore, there is grave risk in Quang Nai of some such local catastrophe as the capture of the provincial capital and destruction or capture of all the defense forces by a Communist surprise attack. This is not the only province, either, where risks are being run. In Darlac, to name another, the odds are now better than even on a second Communist-inspired rising of the Rhade tribespeople.

Logically, of course, a mere local catastrophe in Quang Nai or some other province ought not to achieve decisive results for the Communists. This kind of logic is very popular, nowadays, with the U.S. staff officers in Saigon. They seem to forget that it was also quite illogical for France to be decisively defeated at Dienbienphu, which was a very small scale fight by normal standards.

The Vietnamese people have been at war for too many years, with no end in sight. On their resistance, as on the French, a mere local catastrophe can all too easily produce decisive effects. The raw materials for another Dienbienphu are plainly present.

To be sure, there is one vast, potentially saving difference between 1964 and 1953. This is not just Vietnam's war. It is also our war; and the United States has gigantic uncommitted reserves. But unless we soon begin to bring American power to bear in deadly earnest, we must get ready for the greatest American defeat in the history of the United States.

That is what now looms ahead, as a clear possibility if not a probability. And using Laotian pilots, in training planes converted into bombers, to attack the Ho Chi Minh trail cannot be described as bringing American power to bear in deadly earnest.

Chains Open Fire on Family Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the questions farmers are increasingly asking, no matter what farm organization they belong to, are brought out in an article, "Chains Open Fire on Family Farms," by Gene Cervi of the Rocky Mountain Journal.

This alarming article was brought to my attention by Mrs. Kenneth Tellers, of Cologne, Minn., and I hope that my colleagues will give it their careful consideration as the National Commission on Food Marketing gets down to business in Washington this week.

The article follows:

CHAINS OPEN FIRE ON FAMILY FARMS

(By Gene Cervi)

Abolition of the family farm was called for at the annual meeting of the National Association of Food Chains in Chicago in October by the organization's principal spokesman.

Never before has such open warfare been declared on a traditional segment of American society.

It is known, however, that since the end of World War II, the supermarkets have been in the steady process of vertically integrating small farmers and ranchers out of existence as farms got bigger and the farm folk sold the furniture and moved to town to work in mill and factory.

Clarence G. Adamy, executive vice president of the national chainstore group, said flatly, in his October speech, "I do not believe this (the idea that agriculture is the province of family farmers) to be a sensible goal for midtwentieth century American farm policy.

"Not only that, but I am opposed to the maintenance of the family farm," Adamy said in calling for a counterattack on farm organizations fighting to get a fair share of the food dollar for the man who produces it.

A large part of the October meeting of chainstores was taken up with means and methods of countering, if not subverting, the investigations soon to be launched by the joint presidential-congressional National Commission on Food Marketing.

Speaker after speaker raised warning signals of unconscionable evidence that could come to light if the National Commission is diligent in examining supermarket buying practices that by their nature and trend bring charges of illegal price-fixing and restraint of competition.

Inescapable facts and questions in the national food economy confronting the Commission are:

1. The cattle producers of America lost more than $2,500 million in 1963. The question: Who got that money, since it didn't go to the consumer in the form of lower prices and it didn't go to labor in view of growing automation?

2. Since the end of World War II, beef prices at retail have increased 26 percent, according to the Department of Agriculture, and prices paid to beef producers declined a minimum of 16 percent.

3. Why was it possible for chains to make a profit 7 years ago when there was a shortage and no imports of beef, when prices at retail were lower than they are today, and beef producers were getting 25 percent more than they are today?

4. If there is a surplus of beef, as the chains contend and the producers deny, why doesn't the natural law of supply and demand operate to bring down the prices at retail?

5. Why did credit for small farm and ranch operations dry up progressively in the last 20 months until today only the largest commercial feed lots and the largest ranchers are conditioned to stay in business?

These are but a few of the matters that will be brought before the Commission. The chainstores are worried because they'll not look good when their practices and methods of squeezing producers come to light.

It is the strategy of the supermarkets to appeal to Congress through the customers they [they chains], currently are brainwashing.

The chains and the largest food processors are engaged in a gigantic saturation advertising campaign to convince the consumer that she never had it so good, and every possible effort is being exerted to hide the fact that thousands of farmers and ranchers are going broke.

Meanwhile, farm organizations are not idle in the face of Adamy's determination to wipe out their members.

Tipoff to the fact that the chains control food prices and have repealed the law of supply and demand was seen last month in the Ohio Farm Bureau demand that its parent organization, the American Farm Bureau, undertaken to buy one of the largest chainstores. It is believed the organization has its eye on the management-plagued Atlantic & Pacific organization.

In St. Paul recently, the Minnesota Farmers Union passed resolutions barring food chains, packers, and processors from operating farms, feedlots, egg factories, or cowpools.

Chainstores spokesmen are so frightened that some of them see price controls in some form coming. They also hint at revolutionary measures to make all large chains utilities and have their rates of return fixed as in the current manner of private power utilities.

This type of hysteria among chainstore spokesmen can be attributed to severe cases of bad conscience.

After all, the 1963 question won't go away: Who did get that $2.5 billion that the beef producers lost in 1 year?

A Bill To Prevent the Mailing, Importing, or Transportation of Obscene Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to prevent the mailing, importing or transporting of obscene matter by strengthening the penalties presently provided in the United States Code.

The bill is in response to frequent complaints received by me from parents, educators, ministers and others against the steadily increasing use of the mails and other forms of transportation by filth peddlers. I am sure many of my colleagues are receiving similar complaints.

A particularly infuriating aspect of this situation is that much of this obscene material is unsought by those who receive it. Their names are obtained by a variety of tricks, and unfortunately, many of them are young children.

Unhappily, even when convicted, these smut peddlers often are only lightly penalized. In instances where the penalties are more severe, the effect has been demonstrably to discourage the peddling of smut.

As a constituent has written me, If we are to maintain a strong nation, we must start with strong moral principals, especially in the upbringing of our children. For these reasons I am hopeful of success for the bill, the text of which follows:

H.R. —

A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the eighth paragraph of section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to the mailing of obscene matter) is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever knowingly uses the mails for the mailing, carriage in the mails, or delivery of any obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile article, matter, thing, device, or substance, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail according to the direction thereon, or at the place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, or knowingly takes any such thing from the mails for the purpose of circulating or disposing thereof, or of aiding in the circulation or the disposition thereof, shall be fined not less than $1,000 nor more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than one year nor more than five years for the first such offense, and shall be fined not less than $3,000 nor more than $20,000 and imprisoned not less than three years nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter.

"Whoever knowingly uses the mails for the mailing, carriage in the mails, or delivery of anything (other than anything within the purview of the immediately preceding paragraph) declared by this section to be nonmailable, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail according to the direction thereon, or at the place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, or knowingly takes any such thing from the mails for the purpose of circulating or disposing thereof, or of aiding in the circulation or disposition thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for the first such offense, and shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both, for each such offense thereafter."

SEC. 2. The next to the last and the last paragraphs of section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to the importation or transportation of obscene matter) are amended to read as follows:

"Whoever knowingly takes from such express company or other common carrier any matter, article, or thing within the purview of paragraph (a) or (b) of this section shall be fined not less than $1,000 nor more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than one year nor more than five years for the first such offense, and shall be fined not less than $3,000 nor more than $20,000 and imprisoned not less than three years nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter.

"Whoever knowingly takes from such express company or other common carrier any matter or thing within the purview of paragraph (c) of this section, the depositing of which for carriage is herein made unlawful, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

SEC. 3. The second paragraph of section 1463 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to the mailing of obscene or indecent matter on envelopes, wrappers, or cards) is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever knowingly deposits for mailing or delivery anything declared by this section to be nonmailable matter, or knowingly takes the same from the mails for the purpose of circulating or disposing of, or aiding in the circulation or disposition of, the same, shall be fined not less than $1,000 nor more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than one year nor more than five years for the first such offense, and shall be fined not less than $3,000 nor more than $20,000 and imprisoned not less than three years nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter."

SEC. 4. The first paragraph of section 1465 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to the transportation of obscene matter for sale or distribution) is amended by striking out "shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years or both" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall be fined not less than $1,000 nor more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than one year nor more than five years for the first such

offense, and shall be fined not less than $3,000 nor more than $20,000 and imprisoned not less than three years nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter".

Dedication of the John F. Kennedy Apartments, Lakewood, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on December 17, 1964, an address was given by Miss Marie C. McGuire, Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, at the dedication ceremonies of the John F. Kennedy Apartments in Lakewood, N.J.

In her address she gave deserved praise to Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR. and Mr. David Fried, of Lakewood, for their efforts to bring dignity and comfort to our senior citizens through the establishment of decent housing provided with Federal assistance. The John F. Kennedy Apartments are a symbol of hope for the millions of our elderly citizens whose housing is inadequate. Let us hope that future years will see more accomplishments such as this.

The text of Miss McGuire's address follows:

REMARKS OF MARIE C. MCGUIRE, COMMISSIONER, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION, AT DEDICATION CEREMONY, JOHN F. KENNEDY APARTMENTS, LAKEWOOD, N.J., DECEMBER 17, 1964

A dedication of housing is an especially fitting act at this time of year since it was the shortage of appropriate lodging in Bethlehem that led to the birth of Christ in a cave where donkeys and small animals were kept.

And, while thinking of Christmas, who can forget the poignant story of Hans Christian Andersen's "The Little Match Girl"? The locale was New York City, you may recall, and the little match girl did not dare go home because she had not sold any matches that day. Even if she were home, however, she would have had little protection from the elements. The story points out that she had little more than a roof over her head—that although the biggest cracks were stuffed with rags and straw, the wind whistled through, and little comfort could be had from a small stove that sat in the middle of this bleak room that served as a home.

The inadequate shelter of the little match girl is not dissimilar to many of the hovels that were occupied—and in many instances are still occupied—by low-income families and individuals. Today the little match girl may be a grandmother seeking shelter in a housing development such as you dedicate.

Nothing is more inspiring to me than to share with you this instant in time which exemplifies our national aspirations to create in this land of ours the opportunity for all men to live in dignity.

This is a moment, too, of reflection of the past * * * of the history of how these and other low-rent homes were made possible.

In a sense we are dedicating here today a great domestic housing effort which began 27 years ago in the administration of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Some of you may remember him saying then, "One-third of the Nation is ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed."

Those words gave spirit and form to the Housing Act of 1937, and 12 years later inspired our Congress to develop a national policy calling for "a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family."

There are more words to this declaration of the national housing policy but this is its essence and this goal is based on a conviction that all Americans are less than fully able to realize the benefits of our democracy and our American way of life as long as any of us—oldsters or youngsters—are not able to live in a home and a neighborhood which safeguards our health, our privacy and our dignity.

It is a particular pleasure to share the platform today with your distinguished Senator, HARRISON WILLIAMS. Those of us who work in Washington are keenly and daily aware of the strength of his convictions, the depth of his knowledge and his hard work in behalf of legislation to help our cities and towns and the people who live in them. Could we have a Senate composed of people like HARRISON WILLIAMS, our human settlements, cities, and towns would more nearly reflect both our capability of improvement and the underriding human concern our efforts represent. May I here, Senator, in your home State, once again bespeak my gratitude and that of the voiceless millions of low-income people for your mind, your heart, and your actions in our behalf. "A decent home for every American family" is not a bit of beautiful phrasing for you, but a positive goal to be achieved, and achieved promptly.

So long as America remains rich and strong, the forward-looking Members in Congress feel that a family's lack of financial resources is one of the poorest of reasons that it should be relegated to a decaying shack on the outskirts of our affluence or in the blighted slums of our cities.

What you have done here in memory of our late President shows that Lakewood has concern for its citizens and steadfastness of purpose. In brick and mortar and on this warm inspiring homesite you commemorate John Fitzgerald Kennedy's heartfelt hopes. In a very real sense also you denote the compassion for humanity which the American people have shown since this Nation sprang up out of the wilderness in a new world.

Such community programs take courage.

This is true here at home just as it is true on the far-flung battlefields of the cold war. The President had an identical observation 2 weeks ago when he presented the first Medal of Honor of the war in Vietnam. Courage comes easy to us when trouble is an ocean away. It comes dear when the fight is close at hand.

Our homes are the nurseries of the Great Society to which the President beckons us. For we go into the world with the story of our environment upon us.

Today, therefore, marks one more triumph in a long crusade. Here families can live with dignity and real day-to-day enjoyment of wholesome, attractive surroundings. Here the older people can look forward to living, not existing, their golden years and share the wealth of their wisdom and experience and skills with younger people all about them.

Here, as in 53 other communities in New Jersey, is portrayed for all to see the spirit which undergirds our democracy and assures its strength and continuity.

While we congratulate ourselves on this step forward, let us not forget the one-third of a million families living in substandard dwellings in New Jersey and more than 30,000 here in Monmouth and Ocean Counties. Seventeen percent of your State's population—or nearly one in five—subsist on incomes of less than $2,000 a year.

And for the Nation as a whole there are still 35 million people who do not share the fruits of our prosperity.

They, too, must be brought into full-fledged participation as we harvest the crops of our labor.

Poverty represents needless waste. With help the potentials of our impoverished can be developed, dependency can be removed, and gainful employment be obtained.

The President has aimed his war against poverty at the community front where Federal, State, and local agencies, individuals, and private groups can join in a concerted attack. It will be fought on many battlefields, in the slums and in migrant labor camps, in roominghouses that shelter the aged and the sick, in shacks and shanties, and on Indian reservations.

Success in those efforts will bring 35 million people to schools, skills, health, homes, jobs, and equal economic opportunity.

Although no single weapon, no single strategy can win this war, the work already begun by local housing authorities to bring community services to meet the needs of low-income families is an important step in the attack.

All of us engaged in the low-rent program, here in Lakewood Township, in the Nation's Capital, and in the more than 2,100 other communities across the Nation are in this struggle upward to greater heights.

These homes here are a fine example of Federal, State, and local teamwork in arresting one symptom of poverty—poor housing, which is the common ailment of all those suffering from privation.

Happily—in spite of our critics—public support for our housing program for lower income people is growing.

Happily—in spite of our critics—the low-rent program is fulfilling its basic purpose.

Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson characterizes public housing as "one of the great social advances of the 20th century.

"It has done more," he said, "than removing people physically from the horror of the slums. It has provided more than decent homes; it has created new neighborhoods and the opportunity for new lives."

This, then, is the gift you give the families who will reside here in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Apartments, the gift of opportunity.

All of you who gave of your hearts and minds to bring these homes to life—Senator WILLIAMS who is a leader of those who champion public housing legislation in the Halls of Congress, your board of commissioners, your Executive Director Howard Goldberg, his staff, and many, many others—deserve the tributes we offer today.

These homes are a living symbol which unite us in the brotherhood of man. They reflect the compassion for the less fortunate of One who trod the earth 2,000 years ago and whose birth we shortly celebrate.

What greater deed, what more noble expression that we have good will to men than these homes we dedicate here today.

Mass Transportation—European Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. O. T. Banton, staff writer for the Lindsay-Schaub newspapers of Illinois, recently

accompanied a group of 19 Chicago area men on a study tour of public transportation systems in the large cities of 10 European countries.

The tour was made under the direction of Stanley Berge, nationally known professor of transportation at Northwestern University, and an ardent advocate of through, platform-type railroad stations as contrasted to the deadend depots in use in most big cities.

I know that my colleagues, particularly those concerned with the effort to solve our mass transportation problems, will find much of interest in the following article from the Decatur Sunday Herald and Review of January 3.

WHY EUROPEANS PREFER "THROUGH" RAIL STATIONS TO DEADEND DEPOTS

(By O. T. Banton)

This capital city of the most scenic country in Europe is building a new multipurpose railway station that will be one of the finest in the world. Since it is costing $50 million its design was given much study, and embodies a principle that is gaining slow acceptance in American cities.

Berne's new depot will be a through, platform-type station, in contrast to the deadend railroad stations in Chicago, New York and a number of other large cities in the United States. Paris, London and a few other important European cities also have deadend stations, but both London and Paris are taking expensive steps to obtain some relief from the handicaps this type of station imposes.

Dr. Hugo Gschwind, president of the Swiss Federal Railways, who has converted them from a losing venture when he took over their operation in 1949 to a profitable business, is a strong advocate of through stations which, he points out, "keep the trains running," rather than standing idle part of the time at stations.

INTO FOCUS

The issue of whether U.S. cities should incur the heavy cost of replacing their dead-end stations with through stations was brought sharply to the attention of a Chicago area group of 19 men who visited here and in a dozen other European cities recently studying mass transportation as it is being handled in this part of the world. Their tour director, Stanley Berge, professor of transportation at Northwestern University in Evanston, is a vigorous advocate of through stations.

The tour group, which included three officials of the city of Chicago and its rapid-transit system, were guests of Dr. Gschwind at a luncheon here after a viewing trip through the partly completed station, and a conference with city and national transportation officials.

While the purpose of the European tour was much broader than studying the merits of through stations versus dead-end stations, Professor Berge passed up no opportunities to point out examples of how mass-transportation officials in cities over here are moving in the direction of replacing dead end stations with through stations.

In Copenhagen there are four downtown platform-type through stations, which serve both the city and suburban transit system trains and trains of the national railways. Movement of Copenhagen's city and suburban electric trains is described by Professor Berge as a "pendulum swing" back and forth through, rather than to, the business district, with more frequent operation of trains during the rush hours.

Copenhagen is a city of about a half million, and while multiple use of downtown tracks is working well there, Professor Berge believes that in very large cities there should be separate systems of tracks for the local rapid transit trains and for the intercity railway trains—this is provided in the larger European cities.

The Danish capital's growing population is finding homesites along the radial suburban railroad lines and clustering in finger developments at various points along those lines, rather than sprawling into acres of bungalows as is so often the pattern in American cities. While they operate at a loss, Denmark's state-owned railways serve all parts of the country without having a single highway crossing at grade.

In Stockholm Professor Berge was able to show another prime example of a smooth-functioning through railroad station. Two lines of the Swedish State Railways cross in the heart of the capital city, with a central station located immediately above one of the main downtown stations of the city's "Tunnelbana," or 40-mile electric train subway system. Escalators provide for easy exchange of passengers.

Oslo, the tour group found, is planning a tunnel to connect its two main dead-end railway stations into a through route which will greatly facilitate movement of freight as well as passengers through the capital to and from territories on either side of the city.

Brussels tunneled through in 1952 to connect what had been two dead-end stations. This, according to Professor Berge, "has had a highly beneficial economic impact not only on the Belgian capital city, but on the entire country." A spur line diesel-electric train shuttles between a downtown Brussels air center and the city's airport, but since it handles little traffic other than persons going to and from the air terminal, it is operating at a loss.

The Netherlands Government is hoping to provide fast train service from its new Schiphol Airport near Amsterdam to Amsterdam and The Hague by building a through railway line that will run under the airport. Such a line, it is believed, will generate enough traffic in addition to airport passengers to pay its way.

TRANSPORTATION DYNAMOS

At a conference between the Chicago visitors and mass transport experts in Delft, Holland, Professor Berge received strong moral support from his old friend, Dr. F. Q. den Hollander, former president of the Netherlands Railways and former chairman of the board of Delft Technical University. Dr. Geschwind and Dr. den Hollander are recognized as outstanding leaders in European railway circles and had top roles in developing the Trans-Europe Express, a new rail system which went into service in 1957 and is jointly owned by several West European railways. In reference to through railroad stations, Dr. den Hollander said:

"To use trains the best way, you have to have them running, not having them standing idle. And in order to have them in the stations and very quickly out of the stations, we have everywhere (in the Netherlands) through stations. We come before the platform, stop a few minutes, and we are off again. All the other systems take a lot of time from the trains which means a lot of money."

The Berlin railway station was a through station, but train operation has been blocked by the Berlin wall. The "S-bahn," or mainline railroad in Berlin, is controlled by Communist East Berlin, and the West Berliners generally boycott it.

West Berlin controls the "U-bahn," or electric subway system, and that is used little by East Berliners. A section of it loops through East Berlin, which has closed four of the five underground stations on this loop and has armed guards with tommy guns on duty day and night at closed stations. The Chicago visitors were taken on a trip through this East Berlin loop of the U-bahn.

These subway trains operate very quietly and are well patronized by the West Berlin residents, as the line comes out of and reenters West Berlin. A fifth station on the loop is open, for strictly controlled use of West Berliners. No East Berlin people are allowed to board the U-bahn trains there, and few West Berliners enter the east part of the city by that route.

TUNNELS UNDER PARIS

In Paris the Chicagoans saw construction work on an electrified commuter railway tunnel being bored east and west under the city, to relieve the congestion on the city's 100 miles of "metro," or subway rapid transit lines. Later, it was explained, a similar tunnel will be built north and south under the city.

The tunnels, which will be 30 feet in diameter and whose lower level will be 90 feet beneath street surface, will accommodate double tracks for standard gage railway equipment. The east-west tunnel of the Regional Express network, as the new transverse lines are called, is under the Champs Elysee, Paris' most famous street, and will have only three or four stops in crossing the city. Its trains will have an average speed of 40 to 50 miles an hour and a top speed of 62 miles, compared with the 20 miles per hour operation of the metro trains.

Near the fringe of the Paris suburbs the trains of the Paris Regional Express network will connect with long-distance lines, thereby relieving congestion at such dead-end stations as St. Lazare, Nord, and Lyon. Under Paris, trains in the deeper tunnels will exchange passengers with the metro via escalators at the stations, which are being developed directly under stations of the metro.

LONDON ACTS

While London has no plans for abandonment of its dead end rail stations, it is developing new subway lines that will extensively relieve congestion on its 100-year-old underground system. The new 10.5-mile Victoria tube is well underway, and trains on it are expected to be completely automated by 1970. This will cut down congestion at the stub-end stations and the overloading of existing subway lines.

The Chicago group was taken to London's Liverpool Station, one of its 16 suburban stub-end stations, during an evening rush hour. Trains arrive at and leave this station 2 minutes apart in the rush period, and handle some 200,000 passengers a day. Since they have no locomotive and can run either direction without turning around, their entry and exit from a deadend station is attended with little delay, but is less than half as rapid, as a through train stopping at platform stations.

London's transit system provides 8 million passenger rides a day; of these, 450,000 commuters are brought in by British railways from outside the city to the 16 suburban stations, which are in a 3-mile radius of the central city.

Lisbon, Portugal's beautiful capital city, has one-dead-end and one through railway station. It has 12 miles of electric subway lines and plans to add to these, and cut down the number of streetcars. Lisbon is doing a good job of coordinating its highway, railway, tramway, and subway services, and officials of the Portuguese Ministry of Communications emphasized this in a conference with the Chicago group.

A ring of outlying stations is being developed, they reported, where shoppers, business or other personnel working downtown can drive their autos, park them, and ride a rapid-transit train or bus to the central city.

Trips into the main part of Lisbon will be greatly speeded up for many of its residents after completion 2 years hence of a $50 million combination highway and railway bridge being built over the wide Tagus River to an industrial and residential area south of the river. Traffic from south of the river long has had to make the crossing by ferryboat.

BACK HOME

Chicago has made a good start in developing a "park 'n ride" system such as Lisbon is operating, and George L. De Ment, chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority and a member of the tour delegation, is enthusiastic about its success. At the end of a 6-mile line, operating from Skokie, a North Side suburb where they park their cars, passengers ride to the Howard Street Station in Chicago. There they transfer to elevated and subway trains that run downtown.

Vienna was not visited on the Chicagoans' tour, but the group was told it has an efficient and quiet-operating underground railway, and that the Austrian Government has started to help the city in financing its subway system.

In most of the tour group's conferences with European transit authorities, mention was made of extensive electrification of railway lines. Dr. Gschwind completed electrifying the Swiss Federal Railway system in 1960, and Dr. den Hollander reported most of the Netherlands railways are electrified; the rest are diesel, mainly diesel-electric.

England, it was reported, since World War II, has electrified 220 miles of its railways routes, mainly those running radially out of London, at a cost of $150 million. Several of them run to satellite cities, 50 to 60 miles out and beyond the "greenbelt" that was developed around London under a concept which was popularized in 1944.

COST QUESTION

Although economical to operate after the systems have been converted, rail electrification is very expensive, and experts seem generally agreed that it is not feasible except for lines that are assured of heavy traffic.

Use of monorail trains as an adjunct to rapid transit facilities has not looked attractive to traffic engineers in Europe. The question was asked several times by members of the Chicago group, but the answer was always the same. After its flurry of public interest at the 1962 World's Fair in Seattle, Wash., the monorail was given careful study by European railway engineers, the Chicagoans were told.

Transportation: Year 2000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding specialists in the field of transportation is Morris Forgash, of New York City, president of the United States Freight Co. His views and opinions are worthy of deep study and consideration. I have a profound respect for the views of Mr. Forgash.

On October 30, 1964, Mr. Forgash delivered an address entitled, "Transportation—Year 2000" at the Second Annual European Regional Conference of the National Defense Transportation Association, in Frankfurt, Germany.

In my remarks, I am pleased to include the address made on that occasion by Mr. Forgash.

"TRANSPORTATION—YEAR 2000," ADDRESS BY MORRIS FORGASH, PRESIDENT, UNITED STATES FREIGHT CO., BEFORE THE SECOND ANNUAL EUROPEAN REGIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION, HOTEL INTERCONTINENTAL, FRANKFURT, GERMANY, OCTOBER 30, 1964

I deeply appreciate the opportunity to meet with you and to participate in your interesting and challenging program. To all those responsible for the staging of this Second Annual European Regional Confererence of NDTA, I extend congratulations upon an excellent idea splendidly executed.

No oracle, prophet, or seer was ever called upon to deal with a more elusive or demanding subject than the one assigned to me. I have no occult powers but I speak with utmost assurance, for if time proves me wrong I will very likely be out of the jurisdiction when the verdict is brought in.

Transportation in the year 2000. Why should any of us have any concern today about mobility in a world that by the year 2000 may be only a tiny way station in a universe of worlds—or, by accident or design, a cloud of dust in the galaxy of limitless space? Because we have faith. Faith that we can shape the course of future events and write on the scrolls of time the terms of our own legacy for ourselves and our posterity.

Essayist William Hazlitt said man is the only animal that laughs and weeps for he is the only animal that is struck by the difference between what things are and what they ought to be. This awareness of imperfection is responsible for the fact that man is the only animal that has acquired the ability to modify his own environment. And in straining at the leash of his environment man has achieved a measure of his manifest and only laudable destiny—civilization.

Kipling wrote that transportation is civilization. He was not quite right. Transportation certainly has paced civilization from the time when man first came to inhabit the earth. But transportation is an instrumentality which produces nothing in itself. Transportation is the mobility of human resources but humanity charts its own course. Transportation can carry us over any horizon but what we find there we bring in our own hearts.

How will we go in the year 2000? By what media, responsive to what energy, with what degree of dispatch will people and the people's resources then be moved from one place to another? The intelligence accumulated through all the milleniums of recorded and derivative history sheds only a flickering light on the mists that shroud the path of transport during the next 35 years. But we must nevertheless scan the pages of history if we expect to sit in the jury box of time.

Where will we go in the year 2000? Over what horizons, to what destinations will the restless race of man then be traveling to make another rendezvous with destiny?

If we are to find any answers to the questions I have posed, we must realize that the caliper of history is our only tool of measurement and our only certainty is that there will be change. The fact of change is immutable. It is only the acceleration or rate of change with which we must be concerned as we try to illuminate the road to the future with the torchlight of the past.

THE DAWN OF TRANSPORTATION

Why should it be difficult to anticipate developments that may reasonably be expected to transpire in transportation in the next 35 years? Can we not make a simple projection based on the rate of progress in the past? The calendar measures time as the earth turns and 35 years is an imperceptible speck in the spectrum of history. The beginnings of civilization can be traced back at least a million years, and in that perspective we are dealing with a period of time that would transpire many times over during the next tick of the clock.

The problem is not so simple. Progress is not measured by the calendar but by human accomplishment. And if it be taken that man has lived on earth for a million years it follows that for the first 990,000 years his progress in transportation was absolutely nil. During all of that time he walked on the legs he was born with and what he transported he carried in his arms. For it was only about 10,000 years ago, give or take a few hundred, that man first conceived the idea of employing animals as a media of transport. This oldest form of transportation has survived to this day—the ox, the camel, the elephant, the reindeer, the dog, and the horse are still important carriers.

A historic breakthrough in transportation occurred when man discovered the secret of propulsion by animal, giving us the standard of measurement called "horsepower." During the next three or four thousand years such marvelous inventions as the sled, the raft, the dugout, and the canoe made their appearance and added immeasurably to the mobility of humanity. Then came the sail—first instrument of transport to harness the forces of nature to man's bidding. Wonders were unceasing.

The wheel—there is an invention to remember. It still is a nominee for the greatest discovery of the human race. The wheel evolved only about five or six thousand years ago. It will stand forever for the first revolution in transportation. But giddy as the pace of progress in transportation had become, wheel and sail were destined to continue to be powered by wind and muscle for another 5,000 years or more. This does not detract from the significance of those fabulous instrumentalities. They made it possible for man to explore, to colonize, and in a degree to civilize the globe on which he lived. Of course they also made it possible for him to annihilate peoples, to destroy civilizations, and to topple the world into dark ages. But in the slow and painful process of recovery from the consequences of his own folly man added to the sum of human intelligence, and as he marched forward the chapters of transportation history covered less time and embraced ever greater accomplishment.

TRANSPORTATION FINDS MECHANICAL POWER

The 35 years that lie immediately ahead cannot reasonably be focused against the million years of man's sojourn on earth, or against the 10,000 years since the discovery of horsepower, or even against the 5,000 years since the advent of wheel and sail. Change has compounded the rate of change with such astonishing rapidity that such comparisons are no longer valid. Actually, all we are talking about is simply what remains of two centuries of transportation progress.

For it was not until after the beginning of the last century, less than 165 years ago, that the era of transportation in the accepted sense began. The age of mechanical power—the goal toward which man had been struggling since he was first invested with the power of rational thought—had its birth in the last century. When steam power was first successfully employed as a propellant of the instrumentalities of transport man crashed through a barrier which had defied the ages and eluded countless generations of highly intelligent and ingenious men.

The year 2000 seems a more distant target of speculation when it is realized that in point of time 35 years is 20 percent of the

entire era of transportation. It seems more distant still when it is appreciated that as time has marched on progress in transportation has compressed centuries into decades, decades into years, and years into days, so that what we and those who come after us may expect to witness in 35 years may make everything that has been developed heretofore as rudimentary as the canoe.

How has transportation gone since the paddle wheels of "Fulton's Folly" churned dreams into realities 157 years ago? Well, steamship and iron horse served the 19th century very well, but during all that time dreamers who knew that this was not the outer periphery of man's environment were at work on other things. Self-propelled land vehicles were sputtering about on the streets and roads causing amusement and some consternation before the end of the last century. When, a few years later, the internal combustion engine made these monsters of the road practical, a new dimension in mobility was created.

But as the world spun into the present century man had not yet realized his oldest dream—he had not found his wings—he was still confined to the surface of the globe. Then at Kitty Hawk, in North Carolina, on December 17, 1903, when some of us in this room had already been born, the Wright brothers inaugurated the age of flight.

What secrets of mobility then remained to be wrested from nature? With great efficiency and dispatch people and things could be transported anywhere on the surface of the earth or in the earth's atmosphere. For half a century the prevalent view was that transportation had crossed its last horizon and that the future was for improvement of existing media. Improvement there certainly was.

The diesel engine vastly increased the economy and efficiency of railroading. World War I speeded the inauguration of the truck as a carrier of freight. Improved roads and better automobiles put the world on rubber tires. The 1940's ushered in the jet age in air transport. In 1954 the atom was harnessed to transportation with the launching of the *Nautilus*, first atomic-powered submarine. Nuclear-powered merchant shipping was inaugurated in 1959 when the NS *Savannah* was launched. Then the hydrofoil, a ship on stilts, made its appearance.

But 50 years of tinkering with the same media of transport was all that the modern mind could take. New frontiers were beckoning genius and enterprise. A sort of in-between machine—an air-cushion vehicle which rolls on a cushion of air over land, sea, swamp, sand, or snow made its appearance in the sixth decade of this century and soon may be cutting across all lines of existing transportation, revolutionizing all modes.

The air-cushion phenomenon did not, however, take us across an unkown border—it simply created a new dimension of transport. The latest barrier of mobility was crashed in 1957, with the orbiting of the space vehicle Sputnik I. Four years later, in 1961, the first earth man made the first trip to outer space and returned. He was not yet an explorer of the universe—he had only invaded the majesty of space. That is something which may be corrected very soon. On July 31, 1964, the spacecraft Ranger VII zeroed in for a crash landing on the moon, sending back to earth more than 4,000 pictures of that inscrutable globe.

OF PROGRESS, DREAMS, AND PERSEVERANCE

That, in brief compass, is a panoramic view of where we stand in transportation today. How and where do we go from here? We go however and wherever we have the vision and determination to go. For all the progress which we have made to this point in time has been the slow and tardy consequence of long-held dreams. Let history speak to that point for just a moment.

When the steam engine gave birth to the mechanical age in transport just over a century and a half ago it simply represented the practical application of a principle that had been known for hundreds of years. Hero of Alexandria, Greek scientist of the second century before Christ, developed a toylike machine for deriving power from thermal energy. A man named Savery developed a steam engine for pumping water from mines in 1698. When James Watt patented his very practical steam engine in 1769 he was only improving on an engine developed by Thomas Newcomen in 1705. In 1707, a hundred years before Robert Fulton's *Clermont* made its maiden run, Denis Papin of France built and launched the steam-powered *Cassel* in Germany. Angry boatmen, fearing for their livelihood, destroyed Papin's boat and nearly killed its inventor. Where would we stand now if modern transportation had been inaugurated just 100 years earlier, as it would have been except for an accident of history?

The idea of human flight has fascinated all peoples throughout the ages. The famous legend of Daedalus and Icarus, related by Ovid, is only one of a multitude of tales of human flight that date back more than 6,000 years. Magic carpets, flying chariots, flying horses, characterize all mythologies. By the 13th century, A.D., man had begun seriously to try to make his dreams of flight come true. Roger Bacon anticipated the balloon and suggested heavier-than-air craft propelled by flapping wings.

Leonardo da Vinci discovered the helicopter principle of vertical lift from rotating wings, and his model helicopters actually flew. About 1490 he designed a man-carrying flying machine, but his craft was never built because Da Vinci undoubtedly realized that there was then no source of power capable of lifting it. Around the turn of the 19th century Sir George Cayley began investigations of flight which formed the basis of modern aerodynamics. One of his gliders carried a man a distance of 900 feet. It was 500 years after human flight was theoretically demonstrated to be possible before the Wright Brothers made flight a reality.

Jet propulsion, which began to revolutionize air transport less than a quarter of a century ago, is founded on laws formulated by Sir Isaac Newton in the 17th century. But the theory was not then new. At least 100 years B.C. the Alexandrian philosopher, Hero, designed and demonstrated a jet engine. All those things which may transpire between now and the year 2000 might have happened long ago if man had mobilized the resources to capitalize on his own inventiveness several hundred years sooner than he did.

Rocket propulsion is even older than the jet. The Chinese are said to have employed the principle of the rocket several centuries B.C. Rockets were used in the War of 1812. The bazooka of World War II was only one of a number of types of rockets used in that conflict. Developed as implements of war, rockets now have become symbols of the conquest of outer space. Perhaps it is as well for mankind that the destructive potential of the rocket was not recognized sooner, but the inertia of the human mind is responsible for failure to have recognized its peaceful uses sooner.

Incidentally, Ranger VII was not the first projectile to land on the moon—at least in the imagination of man. Jules Verne's projectile carried three men to the moon in 1863. The journey required approximately four days, or 96 hours. Ranger VII made the trip in 68 hours and 35 minutes. Who is to fault Jules Verne for a miscalculation of 30 hours? After all, his ship got stuck for a while in the "weightless" band which, perhaps out of sheer perversity, he pictured as only a narrow strip between earth and moon. And he brought his men back to earth because his capsule was equipped with rockets to kick it out of the moon's orbit and back into earth's gravity.

The most awesome secret which man has extracted from nature is the release of energy from the atom. This knowledge, which is no longer a secret, can incalculably advance the cause of civilized man, or it can render him completely obsolete. This most potent of all sources of energy was not a sudden discovery. The Greek philosophers, Epicurus and Democritus, postulated the atomic concept at least 300 years before the Christian era. Beginning as early as A.D. 1500, a long succession of professional people contributed to the accumulated knowledge which led to the operational use of the atom—Boyle, Newton, Dalton, the Curies, Rutherford, Bacquerel, the enigmatic Albert Einstein, and a host of others.

The instinct for staying alive provided the ultimate incentive which led to the discovery of the means for extinguishing all life. In the dark days of World War II the United States and her allies, impressed with the knowledge that the enemy was as well aware as they of the potential of the atom, simply decided to apply the old axiom of getting there "fustest with the mostest." Mobilizing the scientific intelligence of the allied nations into the greatest scientific and engineering project of all time—the Manhattan project—the atomic bomb was developed in a period of about 4 years. The dropping of the first atomic bomb on the city of Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, is fixed as the dawn of the atomic age. That is not quite accurate. A test bomb was exploded at Alamogordo, N. Mex., on July 16, 1945, and it was on that date that a handful of men assumed the fearful responsibility of releasing a force which even they could not be sure would not obliterate the world.

So it has happened that man has dreamed, then theorized about his dreams, then studied the scientific basis of his theories, and centuries later other generations have made his dreams come true. And the important consideration always has been not what man has discovered but the uses which he makes of his discoveries. The greatest challenge facing the peoples of the world today is how they shall use the sources of energy represented by the atom. Depending on how that challenge is met we will have a better world or no world at all.

THE WORLD AND THE PEOPLE, A.D. 2000

On this philosophic note I think I should turn from the pages of history on which the accomplishments of man in his search for mobility have already been written and, with the temerity if not the foresight of a Jules Verne, undertake to project history a short distance into the future.

The ingredients or "mix" with which we have to work as we stir the brew of transport in the cauldron of tomorrow are railroads, highway carriers, water-borne vessels, aircraft, pipelines, and those exotic developments still standing on the horizon—air-cushioned vehicles, hovercraft, monorails, pneumatic tubes, rockets, continuous belts, and others not yet categorized.

Will all of these existing and embryonic media of transport still be in use in the year 2000? My answer is: Yes, and more. But some of them will not look the same. If, perchance, any agency of transport that we know today joins the pony express and other museum pieces of transport history it will be because it failed to accept the inevitability of change.

Standing clear among the unknown quantities which cloud the horizon of the year 2000 are certain things which we can postulate as fact. The people will determine for themselves the kind and quantity of transportation they want—and what they demand they will get. The engineering has been done, the horizons are unlimited and the choice is the people's choice. We know this too: There will be a great many more

people in the world of 2000 A.D., than there are today, and they will have a great deal more leisure time to dispose of, en masse and per capita. They will know more about their world and themselves than the people of today. They will be able to communicate, face to face through space, with other people everywhere. They will be able to read the news media of the world on screens in the comfort of their own homes. These people will have different tastes, a different outlook, a different philosophy of life, leisure, civilization, and the dignity of man.

We will be wise to put on some brakes on the exploding population, but we will have no choice except to support and transport what the world produces and requires. The world population of 3.2 billion is increasing at a rate that will cause it to very nearly double in 35 years. That means 5 to 6 billion people in the year 2000. There will be neither the need nor the opportunity for that many people to work a 5-day, 40-hour week. A 3- or 4-day, 20-hour work week will be standard. Six billion people with 4 days of leisure each week adds up to a great deal of leisure.

The time was not far back when anybody who was not a member of the "leisure classes" would turn aside from his daily pursuits only on special holidays of which there were few. This was by design as well as necessity. The old saying, "The Devil finds work for idle hands to do" sprang from a popular belief that too much leisure would expose the average man to the temptations of evil. Leisure was for the rich. In the middle ages the creators of the world, the artists, writers, sculptors, architects, were not expected to earn their livelihood by toil and trade. They were patronized by those who were born to blood and wealth. Whatever the fault of such a system it is a fact that it spawned the great renaissance of the 15th and 16th centuries which changed the course of history and immeasurably enriched the lives of men everywhere.

But in the next 35 years we will experience a new renaissance, kindled not by patronage but by opportunity—the opening of new vistas to a new leisure class which will embrace the whole population, not just the upper crust. Leisure and the economic freedom to enjoy it will come to the common man. In the United States the average family income will be at least $20,000 a year, which will be commensurate with the gross national product of $2 trillion per year which will maintain in the year A.D. 2000. In Europe and other places in the world comparable advances will be made.

These factors, plus freedom from want in old age which will be the lot of almost everyone everywhere by the end of this century, will free the resources of the human mind and rekindle the instincts of the human spirit so as to bring about not only a renaissance of culture and civilization but a closer unity of governments and peoples. The curiosity and desire for enrichment which leads the people of one nation to travel to far lands will cause the people of those lands to reciprocate. The barriers to world travel will be eliminated. The complicated visa systems will disappear and a single document, issued by a world organization, will be acceptable.

Ideologies and concepts which offer the people utopia in the distant future in return for sacrifice and the loss of personal identity in the present will have little appeal in a world where the people have already created their own utopia without the sacrifice of human dignity.

Trade and tariff barriers will crumble before the needs and desires of peoples drawn closer together by the common bonds of understanding and the ability to communicate and move swiftly across international boundaries. Geographic affinity will breed political, sociological, and moral affinity among nations and populations. The relationship among nations will improve, and the emphasis on sovereign rights will diminish as the common goals of humanity become visible to more people. Common control of the instrumentalities of destruction, cherished by all men of good will, will cease to be a mirage and will become a reality when we achieve that unity of purpose without which we know that none will survive.

Confederations of nations will develop in direct ratio to the infusion of understanding and the dissipation of fear of aggression. Neighbors quarrel and insulate themselves from each other because of lack of understanding and as transportation and communication shrink the physical world the bonds of understanding will be strengthened.

In undertaking to project the course of transportation to the year 2000 we must take these political, social, economic, and moral factors into account. For as the people shape a better world they will create the demand which will insure the ultimate in mobility.

What will the people demand—and demanding get—in the way of personal transport in the year 2000? Curiously enough there may be less demand for commutation and business travel than there is today. The reason—communication. People come together to promote enterprise because they have a need to communicate. But when everybody is equipped with a Dick Tracy wrist radio and wide-screen closed-circuit TV is a commonplace fixture of every business organization there will be very little need to commute in order to communicate. The board chairman will call his meeting to order in his own living room. The secretary will dictate the minutes into an automatic machine which will file them for all future reference and reproduce copies instantly on demand. Surely there will be less need for people to congregate together in cities when instantaneous and universal communication is perfected.

THE AGE OF HYPERSONIC FLIGHT

But business is one thing and leisure is another and man will always want to go places to see an art treasure or an opera—to sun, surf, and chase golf balls. Knowing that distance is no longer a matter of miles but of time he will demand the ultimate in speed and the airlines will oblige. When the "man on the street"—any street—in the year 2000 decides to take his lady for a night "on the town" he will offer her a choice of Paris, Rome, or Reno. A weekend at the beach for the Sioux City set may mean Catalina or the Riviera, Miami Beach, or Travemunde.

The supersonic airliner will not serve the day we are talking about. Of course the supersonic flying machine will still be with us. In fact it will be standard among the transports that ply the earth's atmosphere, and mach 3 speed will be at the minimum not the maximum end of the scale.

The man in a hurry will take a rocket in the year 2000. In our preoccupation with space travel and exploration of the universe we have given too little attention to the very practical potentials of the rocket for transport on earth. In the interest of security we have developed rockets that can hit any target on earth. All that remains is to adapt the craft to carry a different cargo.

Without hesitation I predict that in the year 2000 people and things will be transported between all the more distant points on earth by rocket-powered craft. Instead of the 2,000 miles an hour already known to be a practicable speed, we will achieve a speed of perhaps 20,000 miles per hour. I will not presume to go into the engineering details, such as how the booster will be disposed of, how the craft will be landed without devastating impact, and what the cost of fuel will be. We expect to have the answers to many of those questions before the end of this decade when the moon project comes to fruition.

THE IRON HORSE IN THE ATOMIC ERA

Rockets to railroads is quite a jump, but let's consider the future of the mode of transport that on the land mass of the earth has the most illustrious past. In most places in the world the railroad has occupied the center of the stage of land transport during almost the entire history of the era of modern transportation. Why? Because it creates less propulsive resistance over a wider range of speeds than any other mode of transport. In other words, a railroad uses less horsepower in relation to load carried than any other form of land transportation. Ironically, this colossus of mobility, conqueror of time, terrain, and distance, has run a troubled course for a long time. Everywhere except in the United States and a few other countries it has become necessary or expedient for Government to manage and maintain the railroads in order to save for the people the only mode of transport capable of fully serving their needs. For my purposes today I need not explore the reasons for this enigma. There is nothing in the picture that modernization of thinking and method, and aggressive exploitation of inherent advantages, will not cure. And the railroads will survive, because we cannot afford to let them die.

But the railroad that greets the 21st century will have only vestigial resemblance to the industry of today. Today's railroad is the most efficient instrumentality yet invented for moving goods between given terminals, but things that are shipped do not originate or find their destination at rail terminals. They move from the suburbs of St. Louis to the outskirts of Baltimore or Bremerhaven. Railroad transport has to be harmonized with all forms of transportation, land, sea, and air, so that when goods are put into one end of the transit pipeline they will come out of the other and not get stuck in the joints.

Traditional methods established during a century and a quarter of proud history are not easily broken, but the railroads are slowly yet surely making their equipment compatible, interchangeable, and versatile. Long before the year 2000 the boxcar will have completely disappeared. Everything except commodities requiring specialized equipment—grain, ore, lumber—will move in containers that will hardly interrupt their journey as they are transferred swiftly from highway to rail or ship or air for continuous movement from the door of the shipper to the platform of the consignee. One bill of lading and one rate will apply to the movement of anything from anywhere to anywhere else.

More dramatic will be the breakthroughs in power, speed, efficiency, and the pattern of rail operations. All locomotives will be nuclear powered. For this and other reasons locomotives will be wider and tracks will be widened. Tracks also will be straighter and grades will be reduced to a minimum. With today's techniques of earthmoving there is no need to run over a mountain. Speeds of several hundred miles per hour will be attained and consistently maintained, if not on rails, then on air cushions or monorails.

Cars will be cut out, switched (sideways), and loaded and unloaded automatically by radio-controlled devices. Yards and humps, for which there will be only minimal necessity, will be completely automated and computer controlled. Somebody may ride the locomotive in token to tradition but he will have little to do. Arrivals and departures will be scanned on closed-circuit TV. Radar will measure distance to obstacles and signal automatic retarders on the tracks which will prevent collisions.

Passenger and freight trains will effectuate a compatible marriage long before A.D. 2000. People pods will be whisked from convenient locations in the major cities and deposited by helicopter on special flatcars to ride in streamlined comfort with the less distinguished freight. Those who wish to insure their continuous mobility will be able to drive their own automobiles onto a special rail car and go up to the passenger lounge above. Double-decked buses will be piggybacked on flatcars, insuring that nobody has to wait for a taxi to take him to or from the railroad. The speed, comfort, and convenience of this combined form of travel will make it attractive to a wider range of patrons than simply the people who have an antipathy for those "flying contraptions."

In the United States, at least, there will be fewer railroads—perhaps three or four systems at the most. There will be a greater number of mainline tracks and practically no feeder lines. Archaic regulations which have prevented the acquisition of other media of transportation will have been swept aside to make way for progress. Rail movements will be confined to the area where rail transport is most efficient and feeder service will be performed by truck, helicopter, or air-cushion machine, whether these supplemental services are performed by the railroad, the shipper, or by a carrier of different ownership.

The iron horse, fascinator of the youth of yesterday, is not about to ride into the sunset like the heroes of old. With renewed vigor this trusty steed is about to charge the dawn.

HIGHWAY TRANSPORT—ON, UNDER, AND ABOVE GROUND

First to succesfully challenge the supremacy of the railroad in almost half a century was the motor carrier—automobile and truck. The private automobile, later joined by the bus and the airline, made the once profitable rail passenger business a deficit operation. Then, beginning about 35 years ago, the motor truck began to eat into the rail freight business with an ever increasing appetite. We have been content to try to referee the fight between the modes by regulation in the United States whereas most governments have found it necessary to take stronger measures.

There is a place in the future for both road and rail transport and by one means or another each will find its ecomonic sphere. My concern now is to highlight some of the dramatic developments in highway transport which I think the next three and a half decades will unveil.

Versatility is the lever which hoisted motor transport into its position of eminence. The truck brought transportation to the door of the patron. The automobile made every man his own charioteer. The maneuverability of each was limited only by the availability of a street or way upon which to run. That, it turns out, has come to be quite a problem. We have built vehicles at a faster rate than we have built highways to accommodate them. City streets are not elastic. In the United States we are at the midpoint of the greatest public works project ever undertaken in the annals of time—a 16-year project to construct 41,000 miles of interstate and defense highways. We are on schedule, but already we are making plans to feed new mileage into the system.

So swiftly does the magic wand of time now alter the face of transportation that motor transport, circa 2000, will bear as little resemblance to that of today as Cinderella's coach and six to a pumpkin and six white mice. Mammoth truck and midget auto will no longer vie for position on the highways, for private and commercial vehicles will move on separate ways. These thoroughfares will be laid out side by side or double or triple decked with one deck above and one below the surface. The arteries for trucks will be freed of obstructions which now limit the size of rig and load.

Highway travel will still frequently be bumper-to-bumper but traffic will move at high speeds with complete safety because of the built-in control devices of radar and electronics to regulate speed and prevent collisions. Trucks and autos will stop themselves before they collide with another object.

We will have advanced highways equipped with radio beams so that drivers can put their vehicles on automatic pilot. Between certain important centers there may be conveyer networks. Vehicles will be automatically whisked onto the system at terminals and will ride a belt or electrified rail to an exit point where they will automatically be discharged.

The truck train will be as common in the year 2000 as the rail freight train is today. Five, six, or even more bottoms will be moved as a unit, pulled by one huge tractor or by a tractor and one or more automatically controlled booster units. Some highway trains will be made up of self-propelled units, all controlled by the driver of the leading vehicle. Self-propelled units will add great maneuverability. The consist of the train can be changed by adding and dropping units at interchange points along the superhighway.

Nuclear propulsion for trucks, to say nothing of automobiles, seems a rather remote possibility today, but nuclear energy certainly will be harnessed to the larger units of A.D. 2000, and even more exotic forms of power will be in vogue. We have already unlocked the secret of taking energy from the sun, and I confidently believe that private automobiles will, in time be powered by solar energy, which will constantly restore itself from the rays of the sun.

Metropolitan area transit has reached a saturation point and there is no place for it to go now except up, or down, or both. First of all, trucks will be banned from city streets. From terminals in the outskirts goods will be transported to and from points in the city through pneumatic tubes, by helicopter, or in some other fashion. Monorails high in the air, or "people pipelines" running underground will relieve the congestion which is choking our cities to death. We will not, like the author of Dick Tracy, wait for the people on the moon to show us how to construct individual air cars for personal transport. The town car of tomorrow will look more like a flying saucer than like a pullman car on a rubber tires, and it will be able to park on the roof or the balcony, or simply remain suspended in the air.

OF PIPELINES AND THINGS

The pipeline or underground conduit, already a major instrumentality of transport, will be in much wider use and will have a much wider range of usefulness in the year 2000. Not only will the pipeline be used to relieve the traffic of city streets—it will be employed to move all types of commodities over long distances. Coal slurry has been transported by pipeline. In Canada plans are underway to build a pipeline to carry wood chips. Britain's Transport Minister has announced that a tunnel under the English Channel will join England and France within 10 years. As land becomes more valuable for other purposes transit pipelines will become more prevalent.

Incidentally, coal petroleum and gas will be too valuable to use as fuel by the year 2000, As a source for the manufacture of snythetics and a wide range of things which come from other sources today, these products will be precious gems of science. When land becomes too valuable for the grazing of sheep, wool will cease to be the staple commodity of cloth and synthetic fibers made from the storehouses of nature will take its place.

And while I am out of context let me point out that farmland to produce the food necessary to feed the teeming population in the year 2000 will be in short supply but we will solve that problem by tapping the inexhaustible protein resources of the measureless oceans.

MIRACLES OF THE SEA

Now, let us turn the long-range binoculars on that ancient, fabled, challenging pathway of transport, the "bounding main" with its fingers of water reaching into all the land areas of the earth. Tradition and custom have kept a tight grip on water transport, but change is about to break over the fleets of the world like a storm.

Exciting, almost incredible, developments in the area of water transport crowd across the pages of the daily press. Automation, nuclear power, hydrofoils, hydroskimmers, containerization. But wait. Look a little closer and you will see just beneath the surface an industry encrusted with the barnacles of time and obsolescence of thought. During the past quarter of a century and more, when newer forms of transport were breaking barrier after barrier, the improvements in ship design, speed, and efficiency have been relatively insignificant.

Water covers three-fourths of the earth's surface, and world geography plus vital statistics will force us to make better use of water transport in the future. There is a limit to the highways of concrete and steel that we can build, and to the space available for their building, but the pathways of the seas are almost limitless.

It is now just a decade since nuclear energy was first successfully employed to power the submarine *Nautilus*, launched in 1954. During that decade we have invaded outer space, put new stars in the heavens, landed a rocket on the moon, and established worldwide communications through relay stations in the sky. But we have been slow to exploit the greatest breakthrough in water and land transport since the inauguration of mechanical power. It was not until 1959, with the launching of the SS *Savannah*, that this fantastic new source of energy was employed to propel a cargo-passenger ship.

In an age where miracles abound the miracle of nuclear propulsion is just breaking free. The *Savannah* can operate 3½ years on a single core of fuel. She can cruise at 21 knots for 336,000 nautical miles on a single fuel load. But like Robert Fulton's *Clermont*, the *Savannah* is only the beginning. Last month a large U.S. manufacturer announced that it is developing a reactor plant that will require refueling only once during the entire life of a ship. When history writes the saga of ocean transport from the vantage point of the year 2000, the chapter headed "*Nautilus*, 1954" will be longer than the chapter headed "Christopher Columbus, 1492."

The ship of the future will be mass produced—certainly production methods will be revolutionized—from one of the strong, light metals or even plastic. All will be nuclear powered. The size will be suited to the environment and the type of cargo to be handled. The bottleneck of shipping is the port operation. That handicap will be overcome in a number of ways. All cargo that is susceptible of being boxed will be containerized and will move between ship and land vehicles without breaking bulk—by crane, conveyer, monorail, or some other device. Bulk cargoes will be loaded and discharged automatically by remotely controlled mechanical devices.

What will happen to the containers when they are emptied at destination? The answer is a "world bank" of containers under

the control and direction of an international organization. This could be a branch of the United Nations or some specially constituted world organization. The establishment of such a worldwide pool of standard, interchangeable, multiple-use containers will require diplomacy and the cooperation of all governments, but in the face of necessity and in the interest of humanity it can and will be worked out.

The only limitation on the size of ships is the facility for docking at ports, and it will be possible for the ship to take on and discharge cargo at almost any place, so that vessels of mountainous size will ply the seas. The screw propeller probably will be supplanted by jet-type propulsion using either air or water to provide the thrust. Ocean-going barges, with capacity almost unlimited, will move anything that needs to be moved.

The subsurface ship, or submarine, may carry a substantial part of the heavy or bulk cargo of the world in 2000 A.D. It has many advantages. The submarine is capable of much higher speeds with less resistance than surface ships. There is no wave or wind resistance. Storms which slow down and sometimes imperal surface craft have no effect on the submerged vessel.

As the giant submarine torpedoes its way through the oceans under the surface of the water, a greyhound of the seas, the fleet hydrofoil, will be skimming over the waves, adding a dimension of mobility the uses of which will be infinite. The ship on "stilts" or hydrofoil, like many other departures from the normal has been known and employed for a long time, but its potentials are just beginning to be realized. Jet propelled, these ships which rise on their foils like a water skier, are capable of tremendous speeds. Consequently, they reduce the time differential between air and water travel to a minimum. Carrying their hulls above all except the highest waves they are not subject to pounding. Their power-to-speed curve, contrary to that of surface vessels, climbs steadily as speed increases.

By the year 2000 the hydrofoils will be the buslines of the oceans. Millions will commute between home and office by this fast and economical form of taxi service. But hydrofoils will have even more vital roles in transportation. Since they can operate in very shallow water they will be used as a supplemental carrier, making it possible for the giant ocean liners to transfer their cargo to hydrofoil or hydroskimmer and discharge it on any beach. These shallow-draft vessels also can act as ferries to carry ocean-going freight between a shipside and interior river ports. This should prove especially beneficial in the emerging nations of the world which are deficient in road and rail transport but which are traversed by many natural waterways.

Transportation always has developed in response to the will and the needs of the people. The 5 or 6 billion people who will live in the year 2000, having more time to travel, a keener appreciation of the cultural aspects of life, an unquenchable desire to see and explore the far reaches of the world, will create a demand for more, better, and cheaper ocean transport. The largest passenger liners today accommodate only about 2,000 passengers. Nuclear powered superliners can be built to accommodate 10,000 or more passengers—a complete city on water—a traveling resort or cultural center.

The cost of such mass-produced transportation can be reduced to a maximum of $100 between the United States and Europe—a world cruise for $500. No need for hotels for those who wish to make their traveling city a home. By helicopter and hydroskimmer the vacationer will explore the interior of all countries from the ports of call. These floating cities will provide ideal convention facilities and places to "get away from it all" or facilities from which to "see the world," depending upon the whim of the passenger.

I have mentioned before the one phenomenal, newly emerging, mode of transport which, because it cuts across all known media seems destined to have a more profound effect on the pattern of transportation in the year 2000 than anything else on the horizon today. That is the vehicle that rides on a cushion of air. These strange craft are called, variously, hydroskimmers, aircushion vehicles, and ground-effect machines (GEM). In England one of these types of air-cushion vehicles is called the Hovercraft on which considerable progress is now being made. The principle on which these vessels operate has been known and explored for more than 20 years but it is only in recent times that serious efforts were begun to make practical application of the idea.

The feasibility of the air-cushion vehicle has been established. It can hover inches above the surface of land or water or rise to a considerable height. It can be pushed by hand, since the air on which it rides is almost frictionless, or it can be powered by propellers, by jet engines, or by air jet. Fantastic speeds will be possible. Since it can go where no other surface craft can go, it will be an indispensable adjunct to rail, motor, water, and air transport. It can take frozen foods and medical suplies to peoples in heretofore inaccessible places, over swamps, marshes, rocky cliffs, or frozen wastes. This machine can and will immeasurably advance the cause of civilization.

In the year 2000 the "flying saucer" myth or mystery will be no more—there will be flying saucers everywhere, and if some of them are from Mars, no one will worry except the man responsible for selling license plates. There will be no need for bumpers on the machines because radar will prevent crashes and computers will direct traffic.

CONCLUSION

What a confluence of centuries—what a juncture of history—when the sun sets on the 20th century and rises on the 21st. If all the dreams I have spun come true in the next 35 years, the bells will ring loudly and the people will cheer wildy and there wil be peace on earth when the clock ticks in the first syllable of the next century. But have I dealt with dreams? Is anything that I have predicted more improbable than that a man-made satellite known as Syncom III is standing out in space right now through the instrumentality of which these very proceedings could be made to come alive in the living rooms of people everywhere?

Were da Vinci, Marconi, and Watt, or Stevenson, Fulton, and the Wright Brothers dreaming dreams or paving the way for the future when they postulated things that had never theretofore been achieved? If that is what dreams are then put me down as a dreamer.

Before you mark off anything that I have predicted for the next three and a half decades look back on the startling developments of the recent past. The breaking of the sound barrier. Space travel. Substitution of a cushion of air for the ageless wheel. The broadcasting of a message of good will to the world by a President of the United States not by cable, phone, or radio, but from a satellite circling around the globe in outer space—then the erasure of the message and substitution of another while the satellite was in orbit. The Olympic games in Tokyo brought into the homes of people on the far side of the earth through the medium of a relay station in space. Multiply these miracles of science by the rate of change which is being constantly compounded and see if my predictions do not come out on the modest side even to the point of reticence.

I believe the most important fact for us to understand is that transportation, though it opens new worlds and changes old concepts of time and distance, will not shape the world of 2000 A.D. Transportation is the servant of the people—the genie which makes their dreams come true—the magic carpet of their future—the mobility of their desires, their aspirations, and their resources.

A long time ago one of those great men who are born with a mission to change the environment of their time, Benjamin Franklin, wrote to his friend Joseph Priestly, that he sometimes regretted he was born too soon, because he found it impossible to imagine the height to which might be carried, in a thousand years, the power of man over matter. And after speculating for a while about a great many things that might come to pass, much as I have speculated here today, Franklin ended his letter with a sentence which I should like to leave with you:

"O, that moral science were in as fair a way of improvement that men would cease to be wolves to one another and that human beings would at length learn what they now improperly call humanity."

Increase the Minimum Wage to $2 Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 1022, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage to $2 an hour. This increase in the minimum wage is vitally necessary if we are to establish the Great Society envisioned by President Johnson, and if we are to win the fight against poverty in our country. The workingman, the bulwark of our economy and our Nation's strength, must have an adequate living wage in order to meet ever-increasing living costs, high taxes, and skyrocketing medical costs. His children must be given the security and assistance which increased wages will provide; nourishing food, good medical and dental care, and educational advantages, are all essential to the well-being and progress of our children.

An enduring myth in our country is that the poor are generally unemployed, and by innuendo, shiftless and lazy. We have many employed workers with incomes of $3,000 and less who are underemployed or working for substandard wages. Our minimum wage laws were enacted to enable workers to live at least at a minimum standard of decency.

The average workingman cannot meet all these obligations on his present income, and children often suffer neglect which is unavoidable under present wage conditions. The laboring man is entitled to all possible help so that he can maintain a decent standard of living, a home he can be proud of, and have the satisfaction that his family can enjoy at least the minimum comforts and advantages of life.

Mr. Speaker, the Fair Labor Standards Act was originally a product of the depression in the thirties. Congress declared it to be the policy of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 "to correct and as rapidly as practicable to eliminate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living

necessary for health, efficiency and general well-being of workers." Mass poverty at that time was greatly reduced by Federal minimum wage and hour protection. Today, mass poverty stemming from substandard wages is one of our society's greatest problems, affecting every racial and ethnic group. In my own State of New York, it is clear that Negro and Spanish-speaking persons constitute an increasingly large segment of the lowest income groups. It is a fact, and a tragic one, that more than 1 million workers in New York State receive wages of less than $1.50 an hour.

As our President has pointed out, now in the 1960's we have one-fifth of our American families with incomes too small to meet their basic needs. To be truly meaningful, this new war on poverty also must include an attack on low wages and long hours. Our effort to combat poverty would certainly be advanced by the minimum wage increase proposed in my bill. It would be an important step in breaking the present-day cycle of poverty which plagues millions of our citizens. It is to our advantage to pursue every reasonable means in fighting the battle against the evils of poverty.

The passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act 25 years ago has proved an important stabilizing factor in maintaining the purchasing power of workers. Today, the act needs further amendment, as provided in my bill, to maintain this safeguard by narrowing the gap between the average wages and the minimum wage. We must adjust the minimum wage upward to reflect current conditions.

The civil rights movement has adopted the $2 an hour Federal minimum wage as one of its major goals. Without adequate income to patronize stores, theaters, and hotels, the public accommodations law cannot be meaningful. The $2 an hour Federal minimum proposed in my bill is only a minimum standard, in view of the $3 an hour which Labor Department studies show as necessary for a family of four to attain an adequate and decent standard of living.

Those who oppose such a minimum wage increase will argue that industries covered by the minimum wage will find it difficult or impossible to adjust to wage increases. Surveys of the U.S. Department of Labor and various State agencies have shown this has not been the case after previous minimum increases.

The increase to $2 an hour I propose is reasonable and practicable. I am hopeful that the House Education and Labor Committee will take action on my bill early in this new Congress.

No Irresponsible Defense Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution of the Reserve Officers Association of the Department of Massachusetts on the subject of cuts, restrictions, and curtailments of the National Reserve program.

As soon as I received this resolution, I assured representatives of the association that I would continue to do everything that I possibly could to preserve our vital Reserve Forces which are such an important, integral part of the national defense.

Obviously, these matters are of such great import to the security and defense of the country that they must be very carefully considered and acted upon by the Congress and its appropriate committees, so that nothing will be done by way of reducing or weakening our Reserve programs, no action taken that would be injurious to, or would impair, the efficiency of the vital strength of Reserve components or of our great defense system in its entirety.

There is nothing inconsistent between a powerful defense and efficiency, economy, prudence, and accountability in the armed services. But in these days of peril, it would be a plain, foolhardy risk to cut back any part of our military setup that is essential to the national defense. This would not be economy; it would be criminal negligence and gross recklessness.

In my judgment the proper resolution of the question of our defense is one of the most important problems confronting this Congress and it is my intention to move in every way that I can to resolve it in the interest of maintaining, preserving, and strengthening our defense until a viable peace comes to the world.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Whereas the Reserve Officers Association, Department of Massachusetts has been informed that there then is action pending in the Defense Department to transfer Air Force Reserve and Army Reserve Units into corresponding Air and Army National Guard Units; and

Whereas such action would greatly jeopardize the defense of the United States; and

Whereas any potential cost savings would be nullified by the confusion and demoralization caused by the forced integration of senior Reserve officers, long service noncoms and experienced civilian technicians into the existing National Guard structure; and

Whereas such action will constitute a breach of contract on the part of the U.S. Government with regard to those reservists who accepted their obligations only after careful consideration of the responsibilities and benefits which adhered to such contract, believed to be inviolate, with the U.S. Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That each member of the Reserve Officers Association, Department of Massachusetts, be informed of the facts as stated in this resolution and that each member be requested to communicate with his Federal congressional Representative and U.S. Senators regarding this most serious matter; and be it further

Resolved, That it be recommended that each member take vigorous and immediate action in his respective community to request any and all possible assistance to prevent this most serious plan from being implemented; and be it further

Resolved, That the president and secretary of the Reserve Officers Association, Department of Massachusetts, shall be and are hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each duly elected Federal Senator and Representative of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PAUL F. POMEROY,
Lieutenant Colonel, USAFR, President.

ROGER WEEDE,
Lieutenant, USAFR, Secretary.

Cannibalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the savage butchery of whites and blacks alike in the Congo has so outraged one American, Mr. A. N. Spanel, founder and chairman of the International Latex Corp., that he has expressed his views in a paid advertisement in some of the newspapers.

Mr. Spanel says among other things: "We dare not, if we value our souls, let mealy-mouthed diplomats around the globe and in the United Nations blur the horror of the Congo events. The issue is not political or military. It is primarily moral."

The American people must be made aware of the failures of those to whom our policymaking has been entrusted, and it is toward this end that I offer for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full article as published by Mr. Spanel:

Whatever remains of conscience and decency in a morally numbed world recoils with horror from the naked savagery in the Congo. In Stanleyville, in Paulis and wherever the Communist-inspired "people's democracy" is in control, over a hundred white men, women and children, and many thousands of the relatively more educated blacks, have been massacred with calculated cruelty.

And the end is not yet. More than 900 whites are still in the clutches of frenzied Simbas chanting the new magic taught by Chinese Communists. The sudden and complete pullback of the Belgian-American rescue forces is utterly distressing. Can it be that Western man, with all his culture and codes of ethics, has again withdrawn for fear of "world opinion" ballooned by the Communist propaganda system?

We dare not, if we value our souls, let mealy-mouthed diplomats around the globe and in the United Nations blur the horror of the Congo events. The issue is not political or military. It is primarily moral. Let there be no doubletalk on torture and murder of innocents—nor on the depravity of those who, while pretending to be civilized, condone the horrors and pledge "firm support" to the perpetrators.

Words cannot quite convey the fiendishness of the Congo bloodlust, marked by sadism and cannibalism. A few telltale episodes need to be spelled out. In Paulis, for instance, some 20 innocents, among them the American missionary, Mr. Joseph Tucker, were murdered slowly, piecemeal, in 45 minutes of systematic beatings—"from the neck downward," as escaped eyewitnesses described it. Natives earmarked for murder were forced to drink gasoline, then cut open and set afire. Rescued nuns related seeing four Catholic priests butchered and eaten.

Nuns were marched naked through the streets.

THE HOWLS OF BIPEDS

No less shocking than the savage bloodlust has been the response of governments and leaders who side with the killers and vilify the Belgian-American rescue operation, limited and unfinished though it has been. Howls of fury have come from Moscow, Peiping, Cairo, Dakarta, the stooge regimes in Eastern Europe, Algeria, and the black African "republics"—not against the cannibals but against those who have snatched some of the victims from their grasp. These protests, as an editorial in the New York World-Telegram put it, "exceed the bounds of cynical brutality which might be expected even from Communists."

As for the African nations, they seem determined to prove their callous inhumanity. At an emergency meeting in Nairobi on the day after the massacres, the seven countries represented professed to speak for all Africans. The opening address by the Mau Mau terrorist, Jomo Kenyatta, was a slashing attack—not on the torturers and cannibals but on those who saved about 1,500 of the innocents earmarked for death. Egyptian, Ethiopian, and other delegates followed the Kenyatta lead.

The ugly record will stand for all time: that African leaders found not a word of reproof for the hopped-up slaughterers of whites and blacks alike. They had all swallowed the poisoned bait of Red propaganda. Implicity in their call for "collective reprisals" against the United States and Belgium was the idea that the right to kill and torture was part of their new independence. Only these three African states had the grace to express approval of the humanitarian airlift of hostages: Nigeria, Senegal, and the Malagasy Republic.

Fervid support of the murder-bund from influential quarters, along with the pledges of more arms, amounts to a death sentence for the whites still in Simba hands, and for thousands of relatively better educated blacks. The Communist bloc and its vassals are saying in effect, "Kill in the name of Lumumba and Karl Marx."

INCITING MASSACRES

One wishes there were an institution today that could formally indict for the crimes of genocide and cannibalism not only the Congolese leaders directly responsible but the Mao Tse-tungs and Brezhnevs, the Nassers, the Ben Bellas and Sukarnos, who arm savages with murder weapons and murder slogans.

Where has the United Nations been during the Congolese outbreaks of blood madness? Unfortunately Secretary U Thant hasn't considered the Congo massacres worthy of sharpest condemnation.

The assaults on American, Belgian, British and Congolese embassies in Communist and pro-Communist capitals were palpably staged by the authorities. In Cairo the fire brigade, only a couple of blocks from the hallowed John F. Kennedy Library, did not show up until it had been completely burned.

In the Soviet capital, the New York Times dispatch from the scene made it quite clear that the wild demonstrations were officially organized. An African student leader was seen yelling his instructions to the vandals over a police car loudspeaker. A demonstrator was heard to complain, when the police finally began to curb the frenzy, "First you tell us to demonstrate, now you stop it."

The emotional state of some of the rioters, it is important to underline, reflected the falsification of news in places like Moscow, Prague, Cairo. The Soviet people, for example, have not yet been told of the wanton massacres. Would African students in Russia and Czechoslovakia, in Egypt and Ghana, have had second thoughts had they been aware that not only whites but thousands of blacks were being slaughtered?

PEACEFUL, HARD PROTEST

Do we really have no peaceable and effective response to attacks on American embassies, properties, and nationals beyond routine notes of protest? Much greater would a Great Society be if it took instant steps to prevent the humiliation of physical abuse from those who enjoy American aid and seek American trade. Shouldn't we cut off such aid and trade in peaceful protest now?

The tragic developments in the Congo should induce some soul searching at policymaking levels in Washington. Americans should recall that the source of the long Congo agony is in its premature abandonment by Belgium. But our Government joined in the pressure on Brussels to yield to that instant disengagement.

The one element of stability after that, was Katanga Province under Moise Tshombe, who refused to submit to know-nothing anti-white racism and threatened secession. The United States not only joined the pack in the U.N. determined to crush Tshombe, but financed that blindness to the bitter end. The pervasive chaos thereupon swallowed Katanga too. Today, in one of the great ironies of history, Tshombe has become the one hope for a viable authority in the Congo and enjoys American backing.

Who in our policymaking centers pulled such monumental blunders? It is not a matter of crying over spilt milk but of identifying the people and the forces responsible. Are the same blundering elements behind the present attempt to make an "accommodation" with Soviet Russia and its satellites with trade, concessions, and credits? At the very least, against the background of the savagery in the Congo, we should take notice of the fact that the Kremlin has made common cause with the cannibals and their Red Chinese mentors.

The nations of the free world, divided and in disarray, have once again experienced the high cost of weakness on this Communist-menaced planet. There should be an end to the euphoria being deliberately spread that the cold war, if not quite over, is in cold storage. There should be an end to the delusion that there are "good" Communists and "bad" Communists, so that we may face up to communism in all its obscene dimensions.

Whatever the disputes between Moscow and Peiping, they have a familiar way of evaporating where communism confronts the world of freedom. Red Russia backs up the Chinese in southeast Asia, just as Red China supports the Soviets in Cuba. The Congo tragedy again demonstrates that "peaceful coexistence" is a slogan to a trap. The killers and cannibals led by the Communist-trained Gbenye and Muelele make no distinction between "good" and "bad" capitalists.

The unspeakable horrors in the Congo, we repeat, leave no room for moral choice or for free world divisiveness. Any nation that fails to condemn the savagery must share the stigma of its depravity.

The Late Honorable George Arthur Paddock

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable George Arthur Paddock served with honor and distinction as the Representative of the 10th Congressional District of Illinois in the 77th Congress. I was grieved to learn of his passing and join with my colleagues in tribute to his memory and deep sympathy to his family.

Mr. Paddock was born in Winnetka, Ill., March 24, 1885, was graduated from Chicago Manual Training School in 1902 and later from the University of Virginia. He was admitted to the bar in 1907 and commenced practice in Chicago.

In 1916 he attended the Plattsburg Training Camp and in 1917 the Officers Training Camp at Fort Sheridian, serving during World War I as captain and later as major of the 342d Infantry, 86th Division.

A lawyer and investment banker, he was a prominent leader in the Republican Party, a delegate to the Republican State Convention in 1936, and treasurer of the Cook County Republican Central Committee in 1938–42. He was elected as a Republican to the 77th Congress. He was a man of high principle and was held in warm esteem by his friends and associates and by the community and the broad circles of his interests.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 22 years this month since Congressman Paddock completed his service in this Chamber, but he is still remembered with affection and appreciation.

Campaign Costs Threaten Representative Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the high cost of political campaigns is a matter of increasing concern to thoughtful students of government. Earlier this week I discussed some aspects of this matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 39 through 43, in connection with the recent election in the 25th District of New York. It is my understanding that you, our distinguished Speaker, touched on this same general subject in addressing the new Members of the 89th Congress earlier this week and expressed the hope that some way would be found to diminish excessive campaign expenditures and the unfair burden placed on political candidates of modest means.

On December 10, 1964, the Littleton Courier, a distinguished weekly newspaper in my congressional district, commented editorially on this subject. Because of increasing interest in this important matter, I ask leave to enclose this editorial at this time.

[From the Littleton (N.H.) Courier, Dec. 10, 1964]

THE HIGH COST OF PUBLIC OFFICE

ROBERT F. KENNEDY, with the support of his family and several hundred contributors, spent nearly $2 million to defeat Senator Kenneth B. Keating in the November election. Keating, with aid from the Rockefellers and more than a thousand other back-

ers, spent almost as much in trying to ward off defeat.

Is the office of U.S. Senator worth $2 million to obtain? The answer must be "Yes," otherwise why would such sums be spent in gaining it. If it requires such fortunes to be a successful candidate for high office, the great majority of Americans are automatically excluded from serving their country.

The New York case is of course an exceptional one, but it can be assumed that proportionately large amounts of money are being spent in most political campaigns these days. Isn't it time that regulations already on the lawbooks to limit political expenditures be rigidly enforced and new ones created if these are inadequate to do the job?

Otherwise, the dollar sign looms as the badge of a man's qualification to hold office—not his ability, dedication, and personal attributes.

Joseph N. Gill, Connecticut's Man of the Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wsh to insert into the RECORD the text of an article about Joseph N. Gill, Connecticut State commissioner of agriculture and natural resources. Commissioner Gill is not only a close friend and constituent of mine, but he is also a very able administrator in our State government. Connecticut is very proud of this man who came from the West to the East and has made good.

The article referred to above was published in the Hartford Times on January 5, 1965, and reads as follows:

PROFILE OF A MAN OF THE SOIL—JOE GILL AIMS TO SAVE STATE'S CHARM

(By Bill Ryan)

Joseph N. Gill is one man who decided to forsake the city for life on the farm.

A native of New Mexico, he studied law in Washington, D.C. Then he suffered through 5 years of work in a New York bank. Then he went into the Army and he made his decision there. He would come to Connecticut as a farmer.

"I told my wife I'd rather bring up a family on a farm in Connecticut than in a city. She came from Connecticut and her family was in chicken farming. I decided to come up here and be a chicken farmer. I haven't regretted a minute of it since."

Mr. Gill is no longer a chicken farmer, but he is still in agriculture.

He's the State commissioner of agriculture and natural resources. In his way he is the big farmer of the State, or at least the man who worries most about the farmer and the diminishing number of farms in an industrialized State.

If the farms would remain, his life would be serene. But they don't. More and more of them are sold. Connecticut had 3,500 farms 10 years ago. Today there are 1,700. The remaining farms produce more food than the 3,500 of 15 years ago but the beauty—the open spaces—of the land is lost and this distresses Mr. Gill. It is part of his job to retain the natural beauty of the State and the best way would be to retain the farms.

"The cheapest way to maintain open spaces is to keep somebody on the land who can make a living from it, and that's the farmer," he says.

He knows, of course, that it's a losing fight to keep farms in operation, at least in the numbers of even today. He knows more of them will go into home subdivisions or be allowed to lie idle. So he attacks the problem in a different way: If you can't keep all the farms, keep as much open space as you can. If Connecticut is really to become part of a great eastern seaboard megalopolis, fight to keep the State green and pretty.

This is, actually, a big part of his job. It was a much more simple job back in 1955 when Joe Gill was named State agriculture commissioner by Gov. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.

The job of agriculture commissioner was one of many political appointments that would change hands according to the fortunes of the political parties.

Mr. Gill was a chicken farmer in Mansfield. He had been president of the Connecticut Poultry Association. He was also a Democrat, and chairman of the Democratic town committee of Mansfield. The job of agriculture commissioner hadn't gone to a poultryman in some time. There was agitation from poultry farmers. Mr. Gill got the job.

He didn't regard the job, however, as a plum to be savored. Among capitol observers he became known as a long-hours, what's-your-problem working commissioner. And then, in 1959, the job got much bigger.

Governor RIBICOFF merged several departments, to create some "superdepartments" in State government, and the biggest of these moves concerned agriculture.

The department of agriculture would henceforth be an agency in which all boards, commissions, and departments concerning conservation would be lumped.

These included the park and forest commission, the fish and game commission, the water resources commission, the shellfish commission, the geological and natural history survey, the veterinarian board, and the marketing authority.

Gill was selected to head the new "superdepartment" and he admits that some of the previously autonomous agencies weren't exactly in ecstasy about the shift.

It has worked out, however. "These directors run their own show," he says. "We act as a clearinghouse for the agencies, and make sure they don't overlap."

Joe Gill is a heavy-set man, in his early fifties, who speaks deliberately and believes in cooperation. He attacks his job with the spirit of the farmer who is plowing a field. You stay with it until the field is plowed. If you hit a rock, though, you do something about it.

The first, and thus far only, rock he has hit in his relationships with the various agencies he supervises was over land acquisition practices among the agencies. This was back in 1961 and he charged, at a public hearing, that waste and inefficiency resulted from the system of each agency doing its own land acquisition work. He wanted a centralized land acquisition agency.

Some of the agencies leaped on Mr. Gill, in public. There was no waste and inefficiency, they said. Mr. Gill kept plowing. The centralized land agency isn't a reality yet, but the word is that it will come this year. The mill of government grinds slowly.

Land acquisition is especially important to Gill because it is so important in the open spaces program, which occupies a great deal of his time.

Three years ago, Governor Dempsey called for almost a crash program to "save our dwindling open spaces and our great heritage of natural resources for the use and enjoyment of future generations."

Mr. Gill responded with a study by a consultant with the Rockefeller Foundation, William M. Whyte, which called for an outlay of $50 million. The legislature came through with an initial $3 million last session.

Gill is a fluent speaker when it comes to the value of the land, the need to save it for recreation and just for its beauty.

"This is the most exciting program I've ever been in, trying to preserve some of the natural resources of the State. The rural sociologists are telling us that the eastern seaboard is going to be one big megalopolis and this is a small State and an industrial State. We're right on the runway. The big question is, How are we going to maintain the edge of quality of the State? That's what we're working on."

He thought for a moment. "This is a beautiful State," he said. "I drive 32 miles to work each day and I've been doing it for the past 10 years and I'm not tired of looking at it yet.

"I think that's why I love this State so much, because of the scenery. It has trees and rolling hills and water close by. When I was a boy in New Mexico, I'd walk 7 miles to go swimming in a creek and it might be dry. I'd travel a hundred miles to get into timber country. But here we've got all this. The question is, How can we keep it?"

The fact that he only received $3 million, against a proposed $50 million, does not dismay him. He makes it plain that he works with what he has.

That's sort of old hat anyway. When he and his wife and their young daughter first came to Connecticut after World War II to start their chicken farm, they lived in a house designed as a chicken coop.

"We built it so it could be converted into a chicken coop," he said. "It was 40 by 60 and we lived in it 5 years." After the 5 years they built another house and the first building underwent its conversion into a coop.

There are advantages in living in a building that is designed as a coop, says Mr. Gill. "We had a living room that was 26 by 50. That was some room."

Mr. and Mrs. Gill live in their more conventional home in Mansfield Center now. Their 21-year-old daughter is married and lives in Brattleboro, Vt.

The State commissioner of agriculture and conservation puts in a long day at his first-floor office in the State office building. He's in each morning by 8:30 or 9, after his hour-long trip from Mansfield. He's not usually home until 6 or 7.

Two or three nights a week, he's out at meetings. He keeps a close liaison with various farm groups and often the meetings are with these groups. But they may be completely different. On this night he was scheduled to meet with some people who were thinking of establishing a State fair. They wanted his opinion.

Opinions he has, and ideas. One of these is for a State nursery—to supply landscaping for State roads and institutions—and which might be operated in connection with a centralized State jail.

"I think this would be a good thing. It would supply the State's needs for trees and give jail inmates something to do. It could be a factor in rehabilitation and help some of them find jobs in agriculture. The fastest growing industry in agriculture today is nursery stock."

When it comes to agriculture, he knows his facts and figures. He can snap them out. When it comes to talking about conservation, he sounds almost like an evangelist for the beauty of unspoiled hill ridges and woodland and unpolluted water. This is his biggest job, and the one he seems to enjoy most at present.

"This is a beautiful State," he said. "We just want to keep it beautiful."

Chicago's Dead-End Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, several European cities are replacing their dead-end depots with platform-type through stations. Their aim is to keep trains running instead of standing idle so much of the time in stations.

Mr. O. T. Banton of the Lindsay-Schaub newspapers of Illinois, in an article reprinted elsewhere in this section, described this development and other things Europeans are doing to improve rail passenger service. The following article from the Decatur Sunday Herald and Review of January 3 tells some of the difficulties that would be involved in converting to a consolidated through station in Chicago, hub of the Nation's rail network.

The article follows:

AMERICAN RAILROADERS STAND BY STUB-END STATIONS

Dead-end railway stations in large cities were defended by railway experts here, when asked if there is likelihood of replacing them with through stations as seems to be the trend in western Europe.

Consolidation of their stations has been considered by the railroads running into Chicago, according to H. A. Lenske, director of commuter and passenger services for the North Western Railroad, "but it involved stations south of the Loop and our railroad was not included."

In addition to bringing passengers into the city from many parts of the country, all of the railroads here operate suburban commuter trains into Chicago. Service on only two of these lines—the Illinois Central and the Chicago, South Shore and South Bend—is electrified. The I.C.'s suburban electrification was completed in 1926.

"Effecting direct physical connections between the present stations would be costly and difficult," Lenske said. "In addition, the through-station operation that has been advocated under such a changeover would be faced with other obstacles. There is much variation in equipment on the commuter lines; our trains and those of the Burlington Road have double-decker coaches, and the Rock Island is starting to use double-deck cars. The Illinois Central and South Shore have single-deck coaches.

DOUBTS PRACTICALITY

"Equipment generally would have to be standardized—it couldn't be partly electric with overhead wires, and partly diesel-electric. The other roads have not electrified their suburban lines because we regard diesel-electric as more versatile and flexible. In addition, the proposal to replace the present stations with a series of platform-type through stations assumes dual use of the stations by local transit and intercity operation, and I do not believe that would be practical."

George L. De Ment, chairman of the board of the Chicago Transit Authority which operates this city's underground, surface, and elevated transit lines and buses, avoids being drawn into the debate over dead-end versus through-type railway stations in the cities. He points out, however, that the CTA has through stations on its two subway lines that operate under State and Dearborn Streets. These north-south routes connect Wilmette in the North Shore suburbs with 63d Street on Chicago's South Side.

Possibly the country's most ardent advocate of through stations is Stanley Berge, professor of transportation at Northwestern University. Berge recently directed a tour made by 19 Chicago men, to study public transportation systems in the large cities of 10 European countries. De Ment was among the group.

In an article in the Atlantic Monthly, Berge predicted that the big American cities will some day abandon use of dead end rail stations.

FINDS IT LOGICAL

"The principle of continuous flow," Professor Berge said, "should be applied in metropolitan networks just as it has been applied in the development of express highways and rapid transit lines. It is no more logical to stop all New York Central and New Haven passenger trains at a brick wall in Times Square, or bottle up all motor vehicles using the Lincoln Tunnel in a giant downtown parking lot.

"Through-station tracks can handle at least four times as many trains and passengers per hour as can stub-end station tracks. In Chicago 45 multiple-unit trains can be operated by the electrified Illinois Central suburban line to and from its stub-end terminal at Randolph Street in a single rush hour. Since the station contains six stub-end tracks, this means an average of about seven trains per track per hour. By comparison, the State Street subway line of the CTA averages 30 trains per track during a single hour, and in addition offers the passengers a number of convenient platform stops. This indicates a fourfold efficiency from through-station operation."

Among the larger cities in this country that have through stations are Milwaukee, Kansas City and Philadelphia. Philadelphia's 30th Street Station and North Philadelphia Station on the Pennsylvania Road's mainline are through stations. The suburban stations of the Pennsylvania and Reading Railroads are stub end, but it recently has been proposed to make them through stations by building a tunnel track connection through the downtown area.

OFF THE RECORD

Top officials of most of the railroads operating into and out of Chicago are loath to voice their views publicly on the subject of stub-end stations. But an official of one of the biggest systems, speaking off the record, said:

"Of course through stations are more efficient and economical and would serve the public better. If control of all the rail lines were merged into one system, through-station operation without doubt would be developed."

Haym Salomon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an editorial written by the late Mr. Harry H. Schlacht, a well-known writer and journalist from my own district on the Lower East Side of New York City, for the East Side News, which is widely circulated within my district:

HAYM SALOMON

(By the late Harry H. Schlacht)

(NOTE.—January 6, Wednesday, all Americans should honor the memory of the famous (East Side-New Yorker) Revolutionary War patriot and Son of Liberty, Haym Salomon, on the 180th anniversary of his death. The late Harry H. Schlacht, East Side's famed son, city official, noted writer, and journalist, penned the editorial "Haym Salomon." He was honored by the National Haym Salomon Committee for "his outstanding interest in all communal endeavors and his many brilliant written contributions toward keeping alive the spirit of Haym Salomon."—ABE E. EISENSTEIN.)

Haym Salomon, one of our early American patriots, is still remembered for his contributions to the causes of American freedom. He loved our land. He served it well. We salute his memory, his example, his inspiration, and his achievements to the cause of American independence.

The American Revolutionary period was a time that tried men's souls. It was also a time that tried men's purses. We remember with great gratitude this great Jewish patriot whose qualities of mind and heart endeared him to our Founding Fathers.

The life story of this noble man is both fascinating and tragic. Haym Salomon came to our blessed shores from Lissa, Poland, seeking religious freedom. He came to help a nation which gives to bigotry no sanction; to persecution no assistance. He gave all he had and all he could borrow that this nation might be conceived in liberty. It was Haym Salomon who helped raise the money to equip the Continental Army, contributed his personal fortune, gave his all to enable George Washington to keep his tattered forces on the march until victory was won. It was he who advanced $640,000 in freedom's holy cause. And he died penniless.

Haym Salomon was a man of great character, of noble self-sacrifice, of wholehearted patriotism, of martyrlike devotion to high ideals. He toiled, sacrificed, lived, and died in the very shadow of anonymity. He was a simple man—the badge of great soul. Pride and vain glory where alien to his nature. He would have shrunk from worldly acclaim. He loved America with deeds and devotion. He was an institution to himself. He became part of our glorious inheritance.

Let all Americans remember and acclaim the great benefactor and patriot. Let Haym Salomon cease to be the forgotten man in American history. His contributions to the cause of American independence should be deeply engraved in our hearts and indelibly inscribed in our historic annals. He belongs to us. He is ours by more than patriotic self-devotion with which he came to the aid of our Nation in the crisis of our fate. He is ours by that unshakable gratitude for his services which is the precious portion of our inheritance. He is ours by the tie of love stronger than death which will link his name for the endless ages with the names of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Morris, and the other immortals of our history.

Little Lobbyists Resume Shasta Daisy Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend

my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article entitled, "Little Lobbyists Resume Shasta Daisy Campaign," from the October 14, 1964, issue of the San Juan Star.

This article was sent to me by some friends and constituents of mine who read it in the San Juan paper.

I am greatly pleased to read the favorable reactions that came to the proposal of my bill and the one introduced by my esteemed colleague, Congressman J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, to name the shasta daisy the national flower.

The shasta daisy is one of the famous Luther Burbank's creations and is a flower of great beauty. The genius of the great Burbank, native of Lancaster in my district never produced a more lovely flower.

I strongly urge its favorable consideration, and I hope that all Members of the House who are impressed with the beauty and fitness of the shasta daisy will record their views with the committee considering the bill.

We need a national flower. We need it now, not years from now, and we need the shasta daisy.

Every other nation has its flower, and the shasta daisy would be the ideal national flower for our own great country.

The article follows:

LITTLE LOBBYISTS RESUME SHASTA DAISY CAMPAIGN

(By Ron Bergman)

SAN FRANCISCO.—Thousands of little lobbyists dedicated to a single cause have resumed their massive letter writing campaign to get Congress to give them an answer true.

Over the past 5 years each and every Senator and Representative has heard at least three times from the primary school pressure group.

From a modest and accidental beginning in 1959 among 31 relentless third-graders at San Mateo's Baywood elementary school to its present nationwide stature, the kiddie crusdae has retained its sole purposes:

To get Congress to name the shasta daisy the national flower.

The campaign naturally has inspired unique congressional correspondence.

"The shasta daisy would really look swell in our Uncle Sam's lapel," wrote Mark Eisenberg from Baywood on the San Francisco peninsula.

To which Representative FRANK THOMPSON JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, replied:

"Roses are red,
Violets are blue,
I thought your poem was cute,
And I bet you are, too."

Included among those who regard the playground persuaders with something less than partial amusement is the registered Washington lobbyist for the marigold, 1 of 6 survivors from the original 60 varieties nominated for the national flower.

Louise Lytken unwittingly led her third-grade class into this campaign in the winter of 1959.

It started during the preparation of an Arbor Day class project when the pupils simultaneously discovered that Luther Burbank was relatively unhonored, that he developed the shasta daisy, that there was no national flower and that a congressional hearing to recommend one was coming up shortly.

California celebrates Arbor Day on March 7, birthday of Burbank, the horticultural wizard from Santa Rosa.

The class project sucked in principal Ira G. Barker and his daughter, now Margaret Taylor, a petite 21-year-old mother who devotes much of her time to evangelizing the shasta daisy.

The mayor of San Mateo and the city council gave their endorsement and the movement spread to other schools in the county and then to schools and governmental bodies throughout California.

Representative J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, the Republican who represents the San Mateo area, introduced House Joint Resolution 409 in Congress to name the shasta daisy the national flower.

The youngsters wrote all Congressmen—then 437 in the House and 100 in the Senate.

The most favorable reaction came from Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, a Massachusetts Democrat, who introduced his own resolution favoring the shasta daisy.

His district includes Lancaster, where Burbank was born in 1849.

Even though the first hearings were inconclusive, the letter writing continued. Most of the answers were politely noncommittal.

"I will give your recommendations every consideration," replied Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona.

The then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, Democrat, of Texas, said he would submit a youngster's letter to the proper subcommittee.

"As fond as I am of the Burbank shasta daisy," replied Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, "I am at present committed to the corn tassel."

New England Association of Chiefs of Police Voice Faith and Continued Support of the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last month, while Congress was not in session, a rash of stories were circulated that reflected little credit on the distinguished Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover. The record of this outstanding public servant speaks for itself and has won the unshakeable support and admiration of millions of Americans. Echoing the high esteem which Mr. Hoover enjoys by thoughtful citizens throughout this Nation is a resolution unanimously passed on December 9, 1964, by the executive board of New England Association of Chiefs of Police. Because the resolution speaks sincerely and well in tribute to a man who has made a great contribution to the preservation of law and order in our Nation, I wish to share it with my colleagues and insert it at this time in the RECORD.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON MR. HOOVER

Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has spearheaded the fight against crime and subversion in the United States for over 40 years; and

Whereas he has given unselfishly of his time and effort to raise law enforcement to a professional status; and

Whereas he has constantly maintained the highest standards of integrity within his organization and has carried out his duties fairly and impartially; and

Whereas he has recently been vilified in public but nevertheless has reiterated that this Nation does not need a national police force and that no individual or faction will receive special favor over the general interest or rights of all citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, members of the New England Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., voice our faith and continued support in the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover and express our deep appreciation to him for his years of dedicated public service and hope that he will continue to lead the fight against the subversive agent and the predatory criminal; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution, passed this 9th day of December 1964, at Framingham, Mass., be made available to President Lyndon B. Johnson, Acting Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, with copies sent to news media and to members of the congressional delegations in Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION
OF CHIEFS OF POLICE,
ARTHUR P. HAYWARD,
Secretary.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont* — 217 Slade Run Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Bogg., Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* — Alban Towers
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6815 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*
Grider, George W., *Tenn*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa*
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*

Appendix

Dr. Bennette Eugene Geer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 8, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on December 30 of last year, the city of Greenville, the State of South Carolina, and, indeed, the world, lost one of its most distinguished and outstanding citizens. Dr. Bennette Eugene Geer, outstanding civic leader of the city of Greenville, S.C., passed away at the age of 91. Dr. Geer's contributions in many fields will benefit future generations for years to come. He was a noted scholar and educator and was one of the original trustees of the Duke endowment. In the later capacity, his advice and counsel has benefited many educational institutions throughout the Nation. He will be long remembered by a wide circle of friends as a man of integrity and principle.

I ask unanimous consent that a news article from the Greenville, S.C., News of December 31, 1964, and an editorial from the January 1, 1965, edition of the Greenville News be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Dec. 31, 1964]

DR. B. E. GEER, 91, LEADER HERE, DIES

Dr. Bennette Eugene Geer died yesterday at 8 p.m., ending a life closely identified with the educational, industrial, and philanthropic endeavors of Greenville. He was 91.

In failing health for several years, he took a turn for the worse several weeks ago. The past several days he had been near death at General Hospital.

Death was attributed to the infirmities of old age.

Private funeral services for family and relatives will be conducted at the home, 112 Broadus Avenue, Friday at 11 a.m. by Rev. Herbert A. Sargent and Rev. John G. Wilson. Burial will be in Springwood Cemetery.

Dr. Geer's death leaves only Norman A. Cocke, honorary chairman of the Duke Power Co., of the original trustees of the Duke endowment appointed December 11, 1954.

Regularly until very recent years, Dr. Geer made the trip to New York five times a year and five times a year to other places, principally Charlotte, to carry out his responsibilities as a trustee of one of America's great endowments (its assets now amount to $535 million, making it third only to the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation).

Significantly in recent years, three meetings of the trustees have been held at Furman University—Dr. Geer's "little college down in Greenville" (so the story always went), which was substantially remembered by James D. Duke in setting up the endowment.

Furman to date has received close to $8 million from the Duke endowment. In a typical recent year, it received $302,000 in unrestricted funds for current operations and $250,000 restricted for use primarily on the building program.

THE 11TH OF 12 CHILDREN

Dr. Geer was born June 9, 1873, in Anderson County, S.C., the 11th of 12 children of Solomon M. Geer and Mary Melvina Holmes Geer. His birthplace was the ancestral home near old Neal's Creek Baptist Church, located midway between Anderson and Belton.

Dr. Geer's early education was in the "old field schools" of Anderson County, but he also attended schools in Belton, where his mother moved after his father's death.

Young Geer had given up hopes of continuing his education, and was working in a grocery store at Darlington in 1890, when Dr. Charles Manly, president of Furman University, called on him and strongly urged him to attend Furman. This was the beginning of a lifetime association with Furman, and the beginning of an affection for Dr. Manly that amounted almost to idolatry.

He was a former president of Furman University, 1933–38; a onetime life trustee of Clemson College; a trustee of the Greenville city schools—these among a score of other positions of honor and trust to which he devoted his lifetime, both during and after his retirement as head of several large textile companies in the Greenville region.

One of the founders of the Cotton Textile Institute, Dr. Geer served as president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Association, 1930–31; was one time president of the American Bank & Trust Co. of Greenville; a former director of the First National Bank, Peoples National Bank, Liberty Life Insurance Co., and Union Bleachery, all of Greenville, and a director for 48 years of the Piedmont & Northern Railway.

STATE FUEL OFFICIAL

In World War I, he was fuel administrator for the State of South Carolina. In World War II he was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as a member of the National Labor Relations Board, for the textile industry, and also was a member of the Code Committee of the Textile Industry under NRA (National Recovery Act).

Dr. Geer held honary degrees from the following universities and college; doctor of literature, Furman, 1916; doctor of laws, Wofford, 1934; doctor of laws, University of South Carolina, 1937, and doctor of laws, John B. Stetson University, DeLand, Fla., 1938.

He held the unusual distinction of having been, without his solicitation or knowledge, elected president of the University of South Carolina. He declined because of other interests with which he was so closely identified and concerned. The story was not even told—and then not by Dr. Geer—until several years later.

When Dr. Geer was elected, July 15, 1933, as the sixth president of Furman University, he had been closely connected with the institution since the 1890's. He had received his A.B. degree in 1896. The next year he was awarded his M.A. degree; by then he was already assistant in the preparatory department. A little later he became proctor and assistant treasurer.

In 1897 he was made assistant professor of Latin, and in 1901 he became professor of English. After the death of Dr. Charles H. Judson in 1907, he became dean of the faculty.

A GIFTED TEACHER

Professor Geer's students remembered him as a "gifted teacher, a man of keen intelligence and unusual capacity for the appreciation and interpretation of literature."

Dean R. N. Daniel, in his definitive history of Furman, summarized the mayor achievements of Dr. Geer's administration, as follows:

First, the coordination of the Woman's College and Furman was completed.

Second, the university was made "definitely serviceable" to the community.

Third, "and," says Dr. Daniel, "this is perhaps the most important of the achievements," Dr. Geer "did much to steer the university into the main channel of the stream of modern education. The study of objectives of the curriculum and of ways of improving teaching, together with provision for further study by members of the faculty, constituted the principal means of this accomplishment."

The Greenville County Council for Community Development was an example of Dr. Geer's belief that the university should contribute in a special way to the community. Dr. Geer saw the project as a program of development for the entire county and at the same time a "social science laboratory" for Furman students, among them prospective teachers and other community leaders.

M.A. DEGREE ADDED

During his tenure the university restored the master of arts degree—with principal emphasis in the fields of education and sociology. The results were such that the superintendents and principals of county schools who did work in the graduate department carried into their respective communities the benefits of the community council development program.

In an effort to improve instruction, Dr. Geer obtained grants from the General Education Board to carry out visitations to 20 or more colleges and universities in the South and East, with the findings having a helpful effect on administrative matters and curriculum and teaching situations.

Some additional land was purchased for the former men's campus, and, through an arrangement with the city of Greenville, Sirrine Stadium was built with Federal funds on land owned by Furman University.

On May 27, 1938, Dr. Geer submitted his resignation, and it was accepted "with regret."

Even while engaged in his many-faceted business career, Dr. Geer's interests were never far removed from Furman. In the early 1920s he had obtained from the General Education Board a grant of $175,000 on condition the alumni and other friends of Furman conrtibute a minimum of $325,000. In 1923, the campaign was launched—and the heirs of the estate of Dr. Geer's brother, John M. Geer, were the first to contribute, $50,000, a magnificent gift for that day. The drive came at a time when Dr. Geer himself was too weighted down with duties in connection with the operation of textile mills and other business enterprises for him to actually help on the solicitation.

But, hearing that the campaign was far short with the deadline only a few days away, Dr. Geer assumed personal command. Twenty-five thousand dollars was still need-

ed, or the entire general board amount would be lost to Furman.

Dr. Geer had the entire campaign headquarters, including personnel, moved into his offices at Judson Mills. Laying aside all other business and taking almost no calls except those involved in the campaign, he began his one-man effort to raise the needed amount.

Within a few hours, he was successful.

TOOK A PRECAUTION

It is interesting to note—from L. Mell Glenn's biography of Dr. Geer written in 1956—that Dr. Geer took the precautionary step to wire his friend, Mr. Duke, explaining the situation, and asking him if he would underwrite the $25,000 for the campaign. Mr. Duke wired back that he would be happy to contribute the $25,000 if needed.

Mr. Glenn notes also that except for the small steering committee and the campaign office staff, no one ever knew what Dr. Geer had done.

Years later, when Dr. Geer was asked to describe how Furman came to share so munificently in the Duke endowment, he said this in substance:

"Mrs. Geer and I had made plans for a trip north when we received an invitation from Mr. Duke to join him on his private railway car at Charlotte for the trip to New York. We changed our plans and accepted Mr. Duke's invitation. In our conversation following dinner Mr. Duke told me that he and his brother, B. N. Duke, were about to give Trinity College (present Duke University) $5 million for the establishment of a law school. Upon Mr. Duke telling me about this I said to him that I hoped he would do something for a little college, Furman University, down in Greenville, in which I was deeply interested. Mr. Duke promptly replied: 'Well, I will.'

"After hearing Mr. Duke make the statement I did not say another word about the matter. Soon after that we retired. When Mrs. Geer and I had retired to our drawing room she asked me why I did not say something further to Mr. Duke about his helping Furman. I said to Mrs. Geer that that would have been the wrong thing to do, and that Mr. Duke had already said all that I needed to know.

LEARNED DUKE'S PLANS

"It was some time after this that I received an invitation from Mr. Duke to spend the weekend with him at his Charlotte home. I accepted the invitation. Mr. Duke's family was away at the time, so he and I were alone. That night Mr. Duke gave me details for the first time of his plan to create the Duke endowment into which he would put $40 million at the outset, with more later. He then recalled the promise he had made to me on the train trip that he would do something for Furman University. Mr. Duke then asked me how much of the $40 million I thought he should designate for Furman. My reply was that I could not name an amount, but would leave that matter entirely with him, with the assurance that whatever he did for Furman would be agreeable with me and deeply appreciated. Mr. Duke then asked me: 'Well, what about 5 percent of the income?' I figured immediately in my mind that this would represent $2 million. I promptly assured Mr. Duke of my entire satisfaction with what he had suggested.

"After a valet had shown me to my room and I had retired I still felt dazed. I could not go to sleep for thinking of what Mr. Duke had done for Furman. I was afraid to go to sleep because I feared I might awake to find it was all a dream.

"At the breakfast table next morning Mr. Duke again brought up the subject of the endowment, saying to me: 'Now, Ben, are you entirely satisfied with what I told you last night that I would do for Furman?' I assured him that I was entirely satisfied and was most grateful to him. Within a short while after that the trustees were asked to come to New York for the signing of the indenture."

In 1911, Dr. Geer had given up his professorial role as head of the English department to go to the assistance of his brother, John M. Geer, then head of the Easley and Alice Mills at Easley, who was stricken ill.

A ROUGH ROAD TRAVELED

The role was not one inviting success—a young college professor with almost no acquaintance with industry and business going into the rough and tumble world of cotton manufacturing. But any doubts about Dr. Geer's ability to make the change, or, indeed, to make a great success of the undertaking, were dispelled in a business career lasting until 1931.

Upon the death of his brother in 1919, he became president of the Easley and Alice Mills, serving in this capacity until 1921. In the meantime he had been elected president of Westervelt Mills—in the process giving it the name of Dr. Judson—and serving as head of this then-unique type of textile plant in the South, engaged in the manufacturing of fine and fancy goods, using combed cotton, rayon and silk.

James B. Duke was the largest stockholder of Judson Mills, and Dr. Geer became his close and trusted friend in this period of great expansion of the southern textile industry following World War I.

Dr. Geer, encouraged and supported by Mr. Duke, played a leading role—probably the leading role—in the organization of Southern Bleachery and Print Works at Taylors, Southern Worsted Mills at Paris, which he served as chairman, and Southern Weaving Co., of which he was chairman of the board until this year.

Also, in close association with Mr. Duke, he located Pacific Mills' Lyman plant in Spartanburg County.

ALL ON P. & N.

More than coincidentally, all these plants were located on the Piedmont & Northern Railway, a line promoted and largely owned by Mr. Duke. Dr. Geer has only recently stepped down after 48 years of continuous service as a member of the board of the P. & N.

Soon after he became active in the textile industry, Dr. Geer began advocating an organization to be sponsored by both the northern and southern mills for their mutual interests and protection with respect to legislation, tariffs and other matters. One leading industrialist frequently referred to him as "Institute Geer" because of his advocacy of such an organization, which eventually was created as the "Cotton Textile Institute."

He served as president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Association in 1930–31 (this is the predecessor organization to the present American Textile Manufacturers Institute).

It was Dr. Geer's association with Mr. Duke in so many endeavors, and his membership on the Duke Endowment Board, that caused Dr. Geer to resign his life membership on the Clemson College Board.

There were frequent conflicts between the meetings of the two boards, with the Duke trustees meeting 10 times annually, and Dr. Geer realized that it "was my duty to resign from one of these honored positions." Because of his close association with Mr. Duke, it was a foregone conclusion which it would be.

His community activities at one time or another included supervisor of Furman investments for endowment; a trustee of Hollins College in Virginia; and a prime mover in the formation of the Greenville community chest and in forming the Parker school district, whose modern school buildings became a showplace for the State and National educational world.

MANY OTHER ACTIVITIES

He was mainly responsible for W. W. Burgiss making a gift of $350,000 for erection of the Shriners' hospital for crippled children at Greenville; he figured so importantly in the location of the highway between Greenville and Brevard that the South Carolina Legislature formally named it the Geer Highway; he helped to establish the Phyllis Wheatley center and Camp Greenville.

In all of his community efforts, he gave not only of his time, but was a material financial contributor.

Dr. Geer was a member of the board of deacons of his church, the First Baptist, for several years and also taught Sunday school there for a long period of time. He was a member of the Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity.

Dr. Geer and Rena McGee Rice, of Belton, were married in the First Baptist Church of Belton, December 20, 1900, by Rev. W. T. Tate, pastor, assisted by Rev. C. S. Gardner, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Greenville. She was a daughter of Joel Towers and Sarah A. (nee McGee) Rice and was born at Belton on August 24, 1875, and died January 27, 1953, in Greenville.

Surviving are two daughters, Mrs. Robert Finley Gale, Jr. (Sarah), of Richmond, Va., and Mrs. J. C. Keys, Jr. (Rachel), of Greenville; three sons, John M. Geer, of Leaksville, N.C.; Robert A. Geer, of Bucksport, S.C.; and Bennette E. Geer, Jr., of Spartanburg; 13 grandchildren, and 13 great grandchildren. Another son, Sidney Ernest Bradshaw Geer, died early this year at Marietta, Ga.

The family respectfully requested that flowers be omitted.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Jan. 1, 1965]

B. E. GEER: TRUE FRIEND OF MAN

With the death at 91 of Dr. Bennette Eugene Geer, Greenville and the entire South lost a great and noble citizen whose highest ambition and greatest achievement, in a widely varied career marked by many noteworthy accomplishments, was to be a friend of man.

And a friend of man and a tremendous benefactor of mankind of every race and creed he continued to be even after advancing age and declining health a few years ago largely confined him to his home. Until only a few months ago he remained active in two or three directorships which meant the most to him and which he had held for upward of half a century.

Long after he had retired from all but these few affairs, Dr. Geer's mind continued to operate at peak speed and efficiency. He never thrust his thoughts upon others, for he was personally a retiring sort of man, but he delighted in sharing his ideas and marvelous philosophy with his younger contemporaries by telephone, letter or brief personal visit.

At about the time of his 90th birthday in June of 1963 we did a little research to add to and refresh our memory of the man, whom we had admired as President of Furman University, and write an anniversary salute. We made some interesting discoveries.

One was that what we didn't know about "Ben" Geer we had to find out from others and they had to depend largely on their own memories. For Dr. Geer talked and wrote little of himself, although his scholarly mind was a rich storehouse of information about the many people with whom he had dealt and had admired.

That mind, too, was a rich storehouse of scholarly lore, a strong and livable philosophy and fresh ideas.

Another thing was that Ben Geer didn't seem to go into any of the various facets

or phases of his long career in education, business, and philanthropy entirely of his own volition. He either was urged to move into some deteriorating situation and improve it, or he happened to be in the right place at the right time for the right person to call on him for assistance.

For instance, he received an advanced formal education because the late Dr. Charles Manly persuaded him to enter Furman when the institution needed students. He became a schoolteacher and college professor. Circumstances caused him to step into the leadership of a series of textile plants, ill prepared as he thought he was, and guide them through difficult times.

He served several years as president of Furman at a time of great crisis for the school, and instigated and blueprinted the merger of Furman and the old Woman's College. His friendship for the late James B. Duke had much to do with the establishment of the Duke Foundation and was almost solely responsible for the Foundation's large and continuing contributions to Furman and other institutions in this area.

In his latter years, Dr. Geer's active public interests narrowed to the Duke Foundation and to the Piedmont & Northern Railway, which he served as a director for 48 years.

But these interests represented the distilled essence of a long career which left a lasting impression for the better on education, the textile industry, general business and, most important of all, philanthropy.

Bennette Eugene Geer was, indeed, a true friend of man.

Keep the Faith With Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the proposed merger of the Army Reserves with the National Guard should be given the closest scrutiny by the Congress. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I intend to study very carefully the methods being employed by the Secretary of Defense to promote the proposed merger. Our committee should also look very closely at the many ramifications of such a merger and the many hardships it will necessarily work on large numbers of our men in uniform.

The Wausau Daily Record-Herald, an outstanding newspaper published in my district, discussed one of the results of such a merger in an editorial which appeared on Tuesday, December 15, 1964. So that all of my colleagues may have the benefit of reading this editorial, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The editorial referred to follows:

KEEP THE FAITH WITH RESERVISTS

There have been many reasons why Army reservists have chosen to serve their country on a part-time basis. Certainly one has been a sense of duty to country. But just as certainly most reservists also have welcomed the pay they received as active reservists.

Part of that pay has been the credit earned toward retirement pensions. And anyone who has ever discussed this matter with reservists knows that retirement pay has been a major consideration for many. Yet those men who have served 10 or 15 years or more—anything short of the required minimum of 20 years—now stand to lose all of their credits.

Commenting on this the other day, Secretary of Defense McNamara said that men will not be kept on the rolls just to build retirement credit. He added, however, that he believes many will stay in the program.

Unfortunately, many apparently will not. And many of these are going to feel that their country did not keep an agreement with them. Those who have served many years and who considered retirement pay as one of the chief benefits of that service certainly are going to think so.

What will this do to the morale of those who remain on part-time duty? And how about promises to new reservists and guardsmen of the future?

We haven't seen any details on what will be done, but it would seem that men who have served 10 years or more should be given the opportunity to continue to serve in some capacity which will permit them to retain the retirement credits already earned.

The Muzzle on the Military Should Be Removed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 8, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the January, 1965, issue of the Journal of the Armed Forces, there appears an editorial written jointly by the retiring editor, Mr. LeRoy Whitman, and his successor, Mr. Daniel Z. Henkin. The editorial is entitled "Congress Can Remove the Muzzle." It points out that Congress has a constitutional responsibility to hear and make available to the public both sides of arguments on serious military questions, but that presently military personnel, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are not permitted to present views which are contrary to ultimate policy decisions by the Secretary of Defense.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS CAN REMOVE THE MUZZLE

(EDITORS' NOTE.—The authors of the following editorial comment are longtime colleagues on the Journal. This is their first and only joint bylined report. With this issue, Mr. Whitman retires as editor. He will be succeeded by Mr. Henkin.)

(By LeRoy Whitman and Daniel Z. Henkin)

Unless Congress takes effective action in fulfillment of its constitutional responsibility "to raise and equip armies" and demands the forthright testimony and counsel of Armed Forces leaders, there is a danger that professional military thought and expression will be further curtailed. Top civilian officials at the Pentagon undoubtedly will assail any contention that military men are being muzzled, but the prospect of this denial will not deter a discussion of the problem.

Let's take a look at the record. Whether the problem at hand is organic Army aviation, Navy nuclear ship construction, Air Force long-range objectives, or reorganization of the Reserve Forces, the order of the day repeatedly has been to maintain silence until the Secretary of Defense has made his decision. The same is true for military pay. What service Secretary or service chief last year or this has dared to speak out publicly with a detailed discusison of the military pay problem and what he thinks should be done about it? Instead of clear-cut professional expression, there has been a succession of flabby assertions.

The Howze report on Army mobility, created at the order of the Secretary of Defense, was withheld from public discussion, also at his order. So was the companion Disosway report in the Air Force. Efforts of naval leaders to bring the problem of nuclear propulsion and future ship construction into full public view were scuttled. The Pentagon leadership forbade the Air Force to release details of its once-heralded Project Forecast, looking to changes in the seventies. Nothing could be said about the Reserve Forces reorganization until the plan was signed, sealed, and delivered by the Secretary of Defense. The same procedure is being followed with regard to the study on the draft.

In a country where free discussion is a birthright, the option that has been chosen is to present to Congress and to the American public actions which are a fait accompli. It is true that the courageous and tireless Secretary of Defense, by these tactics, has been successful in accomplishing what he wants accomplished. No question about that. It is also true that this procedure has squelched military thought and expression. No question about that either.

There will be instances during forthcoming congressional hearings when House and Senate committees will have the opportunity, if they press the point, to learn from the service chiefs details about actions in which they, individually or unanimously, have given advice contrary to the actions ordered by the Secretary of Defense. Hopefully, Congress will meet its obligations to seek, within the bounds of security, full public discussion of urgent matters of national defense.

One would suspect that outside the Halls of Congress, military thought and expression would be fostered by activities at the top service schools or colleges. It is pertinent to note that the Secretary of Defense, whatever his great interest in the civilian academic world, has not deemed it worth his time to visit and speak at service schools. What aggravates the situation is that the Secretary of State, who has made numerous visits to service schools and colleges, quietly has reduced his participation in these activities, presumably because he does not wish to embarrass the Secretary of Defense.

If military men during recent months and years have been confronted with mounting problems of policy clearance in speeches, statements, articles, books, and interviews—quite distinct from security clearance which obviously is essential—there is a new potential peril worthy of congressional interest. The Secretary of Defense has established in his office an independent investigative unit, which many observers have deemed necessary since the late Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson first talked about it a decade ago. The official word is that this investigative unit will be concerned primarily with administrative reviews, audits, and similar work. This reflects the fact that it was established after alleged fiscal irregularities were revealed in the Secretary of Defense's office.

The new office, headed by an Assistant Secretary of Defense, is needed. Perhaps it will help take the General Accounting Office out of the business of assessing combat effectiveness and telling the Pentagon how to employ military discipline.

But it also is a fact that the Secretary of Defense's powerful investigative unit has

been given a broad charter, which permits probes of virtually any activity or any individual in the Armed Forces. This includes responsibility for conducting investigations of news stories which are displeasing to the Pentagon leadership.

The separate services, in conducting inspector general investigations, have been bound by long-established rules of procedure, which seek to safeguard the interests of the Government and those of the individuals concerned. Whether this will be true of the new DOD sleuth organization remains to be seen.

Where there are violations of security, the Department of Defense has the obligation—and no one questions it—to investigate in order to safeguard the Nation. The question is, however, to what extent such investigations could be used, in an environment such as now exists, to silence military men in their professional expression.

The services must look to Congress to explore this crucial problem, and the place to start is with the chiefs.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Governor Barron, of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the 4-year term of West Virginia's 26th Governor, the Honorable William Wallace Barron, will come to a close on January 18, with the inauguration of Hulett C. Smith. Under the terms of the State constitution, the Governor of West Virginia cannot succeed himself.

Elected in 1960, Governor Barron has compiled a remarkable record of progress in the Mountain State. From the very first day that the late President John F. Kennedy was inaugurated on January 20, 1961, Governor Barron developed a woking partnership which has continued with President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The following article by Thomas F. Stafford in the January 10, 1965, issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette and Daily Mail outlines many features of Governor Barron's remarkable record on behalf of West Virginia. The article does have one important item, however, which should be added. The greatest asset in Governor Barron's success as chief executive is the First Lady of West Virginia, Mrs. Opal Barron. She will long be honored for the dedicated manner in which she carried the banner of West Virginia in support of Governor Barron's efforts.

The article follows:

BARRON'S ABILITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS AS CHIEF EXECUTIVE SURPRISE FRIEND, FOE

(By Thomas F. Stafford)

One of Governor Barron's closest friends said last week, "Even I was surprised. I didn't think he would be as good a Governor as he has been."

This remark by a tough-minded political realist typifies a feeling that prevails around the statehouse as the term of West Virginia's 26th Governor draws to a close.

Five years ago, when William Wallace Barron announced that he was a candidate, his friends and foes alike seemed in agreement that he would be another in a long string of chief executives who spent more time enjoying the honors than working at the problems of the office.

He has enjoyed the honors. Like his predecessor, he has traveled extensively at home and abroad. And like a recent President, he has been a golf buff.

UNEMPLOYMENT

But he hasn't ignored the problems. When he entered office on a cold, blustery day in January 1961, unemployment was at a shocking 106,000, children were starving, and job opportunities were almost nonexistent. West Virginia was tragically depressed.

He struck his first blow for the better life by asking the legislature even before taking office to create a public works program which would provide jobs for the jobless. And when outgoing Gov. Cecil Underwood refused to sign legislation into law which would have financed the program, he was inaugurated in a dramatic midnight ceremony.

These two actions by Barron demonstrated how determined he was to reverse conditions which had made West Virginia into one of the most economically distressed States in the Union.

NEW PROGRAMS

During the next 60 days he worked with the legislature on programs which are still paying dividends. Among other things he was successful in getting a workable job retraining act, a departmen of commerce, improved support for the schools and colleges, and increased public welfare.

Probably he will be best remembered for what he did in the area of fiscal affairs. Where Governor after Governor before him had been unsuccessful, he was able to get adoption of a State income tax and an increased consumers sales tax, both at one legislative session.

Last week in the comfort of his office he looked back on those turbulent early days of his administration and said cooperative effort lay behind his accomplishments. He succeeded where others failed by getting lobbying groups to work with him.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

He did this with a labor-management conference, where he outlined the problems and suggested solutions. The conferees talked and debated, but when the conference closed they were in accord on what should and could be done.

He looks back on that conference as one of the great moments of his administration. "I don't take credit for what has happened," he says. "I happened to come along at the right time, and I provided leadership."

The 1961 legislative session was indeed a remarkable exercise in government at work. Lobbying elements which had resisted change for decades joined forces behind Barron. And the brawling in the committee rooms ceased. Almost everybody wanted action, and they worked at it.

In tallying up the score, Barron finds that this single period in his 4 gubernatorial years was the most productive. It provided the momentum for what followed, and has helped turn West Virginia from a depressed State into a reasonably prosperous one. Look at the record:

MILESTONES

The economy has climbed to successively higher alltime levels each year since 1961.

Unemployment has slumped to approximately 40,000.

Outmigration has been arrested.

Barron's 4 years in office haven't been without their lumps. Where he has had the confidence of the legislature (he never was defeated on a major piece of legislation), he hasn't always had the confidence of the people. .

Rumors of hanky-panky and administrative indiscretion have been so widespread that 2 years ago the chambers of commerce of Huntington and Charleston issued a white paper in which they charged that steps should be taken to improve the moral tone of Government.

They made no specific charges, and when Barron invited their officers to meet with him and discuss the indictment in detail, they retreated to neutral ground and said no more.

He looks on this incident as proof of nonguilt. But he recognizes that the suspicion have never abated, and he attributes them to some bad judgments of the early months of his administration.

He points especially to the purchase of luxury-type cars by some of his most trusted officials. Also, the use of employees as chauffeurs, indiscretion in buying office furniture, and expense account padding.

NEW DIRECTIONS

Yet he believes that his record will withstand the test of time and history will be kind to him. He has good reason for this viewpoint.

His trademark has been that of an experimentalist. He has never been one to cling to the status quo for security's sake. He has been willing to try new things and explore the unknown.

Indicative of his willingness to push out into new directions was his decision in early 1961 to examine the merits of Operation Plowshare, a little known area of nuclear research.

Through the explosion of nuclear devices underground he hoped to find new uses for coal, develop vast deposits of oil which geologists believe lie deep within West Virginia, and transform limestone into chemicals.

He put a team of experts to work on the project, first advanced by the noted scientist, Dr. Edward Teller, and they spent a year seeking answers.

They were only partially successful. They failed in their primary efforts, but they opened up new vistas of research which are expected to lead ultimately to an enlarged base for the chemical industry.

WORK TRAINING PROGRAM

Also, Barron joined in sponsorship of a unique jobmaking plan which has since been adopted nationally.

This, too, was a memorable event of his first year in office. He went quietly to Morgantown one morning, where he met with the secretary of health, education, and welfare and worked out a method of turning the State public works program into a Federal-State operation.

In so doing, he and those who worked with him were able to create 10,000 jobs for the chronically unemployed, and start hundreds of projects which led to everything from streambank reclamation to roadside parks.

CLEANUP PROGRAM

The always impeccably dressed Barron has such a penchant for neatness that he organized a statewide cleanup program. Every roadside in the State has been policed, hundreds of shacks have been demolished, and other unsightly structures have been refurbished.

He looks on cleanup as one of the most satisfying accomplishments of his administration.

His roadside improvement efforts have been turned into another channel. He formed a commission to restore the historical

markers which have deteriorated or disappeared since they were first put up more than a quarter century ago. And he has asked the commission to assume the leadership in restoring sites of historical significance.

The first step in this latter direction was taken when he went to Wheeling at the height of the centennial year and called for restoration of the building where West Virginia became a State. A further step toward salvaging this famous landmark for posterity was his recommendation to the legislature that it appropriate funds to buy it.

PARKS AND RECREATION

A similar area which has had Barron's untiring support has been parks and recreation. He was successful in getting $24 million in Federal funds for park improvement, and today work is beginning in four counties which will lead to some of the most elaborate playspots in the East.

Barron hasn't been one to dodge delicate and explosive issues. Throughout his time in office civil rights has been a burning question, and on two occasions he demonstrated his ability to put down possible trouble before it got started.

One was when civil rightists organized a march from downtown Charleston to the statehouse, and he greeted them at the door with a handshake and a friendly smile.

The other was during the southern Governors' conference at White Sulphur Springs 2 years ago when another group of civil rights sympathizers went there to demonstrate against two southern Governors—Alabama's George Wallace and Mississippi's Ross Barnett—and Barron met them at the gate.

They asked for a conference with him, and out of it grew further gains for the Negro race.

He has been particularly active in improving job opportunities for the Negroes, and he fathered the Human Rights Commission, an agency of Government now 3 years old.

* * * * *

SETTLEMENT OF STRIKES

Another dramatic event was that of last summer when he settled the strike at the FMC Corp. plant in South Charleston. After many bitter days of idleness, when a settlement seemed hopeless, he joined with Representative JOHN M. SLACK, Jr., in bringing management and labor together and finding a common ground for agreement.

His patience and persuasive powers turned the trick. He used them again a short time later to settle the Sterling Faucet Co. strike in Monongalia and Preston Counties.

The Barron administration record likewise is notable in such little known fields as vocational education and retraining. Procedures developed here have been adopted nationally, and in retraining West Virginia has the best placement record in the Nation.

Barron emphasizes that he is not singularly responsible for the many accomplishments of his years in office. "I offered leadership," he says, "and there was a great public response."

Dead Hand of the Past Strikes Imperial Valley Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Interior Secretary Stewart Udall has ghoulishly reached into the grave and resurrected a dead hand of the past to strike blows against the farmers of California's Imperial Valley. This follows a recent arbitrary cutback by the Secretary's Bureau of Reclamation of Colorado River water to which, by law and contract, these farming participants in the free enterprise system, unsupported by crop props, are entitled. Also it follows action by the Federal Government seeking to deny them the bracero labor needed to harvest their crops. Udall goes back over half a century, to 1902, to revive a provision of the Federal reclamation law limiting delivery of water to farms not exceeding 160 acres in size. If, in 1902, the law made any sense, it is highly questionable that it does now. The mere fact that it has never during the past half century been enforced in the Imperial Valley leads one to believe that the consistent consensus of history is that it is unwise. Nonetheless the Secretary by executive fiat has peremptorily ordered compliance on the high sounding excuse that Interior's failure for decades to enforce the limitation "cannot legitimize a violation of public policy contrary to the spirit and letter of the law." One wonders about the substance of the sanctimony involved here since Mr. Udall has occupied his high office for 4 years now without the matter troubling his conscience sufficiently to make a move. What is behind the sudden zeal now, at this late date? On January 2 an editorial in the San Diego Union newspaper hinted that calumny may be involved. The editorial is as follows:

MEN OF VISION CREATED IMPERIAL

It took big men with courage, vision and fortitude to make an agricultural mecca out of the United States last frontier in Imperial Valley.

They came to the valley when it was bone dry. They suffered privation, hardship and want in a vast sprawling desert region hostile to man. With their imagination, initiative and calloused hands they conquered the region and made it a showcase for farming.

Now men of Washington would undo all of this with strokes of a bureaucratic pen.

Meddling bureaucrats told Imperial Valley farmers and ranchers they cannot have water unless individuals own only 160 irrigated acres each.

In Imperial Valley, water is life itself. The sudden Department of the Interior dictum on land ownership overlooks water rights dating back to first settlement of the valley, a superior court decision and a ruling of then Interior Secretary Ray L. Wilbur in 1933.

The decisions held that the 1902 Reclamation Act did not only apply to lands with water rights already under cultivation, such as those in Imperial Valley. To have held otherwise would have been an ex post facto decision.

A solid foundation and the 1902 decisions gave Imperial Valley the impetus to prosper and make full use of the All-American Canal for irrigation. For 31 years no official voice was raised in protest.

Now the Secretary of Interior has ruled that the 160-acre limitation must apply, whether or not the area is large enough to form an economic farming unit.

It must be assumed that regardless of who owns how much land the total water use in the 430,000-acre irrigation district is the same. What then are the underlying motives of the Secretary of Interior to make his move at the present time?

Isn't it strange that the Department of Interior decision on Imperial Valley came at a crucial time in California's negotiations to keep its rightful share of 4.4 million acre-feet of water annually in perpetuity from the Colorado River?

California claims this right is inherent in any discussion of a Pacific Southwest regional water plan, which is a significant fact. Secretary of Interior Udall only wants the right to exist 25 years.

This is the second body blow the Federal Government has dealt Imperial Valley farmers this year. The first was a decision not to renew the bracero migrant labor program which is so important in harvesting valley crops. These are strange acts from a government which says it is trying to help agriculture.

Mr. Udall's decision for Imperial Valley is blatantly political leverage and an insult to all Californians. The full force of official, legal and public opinion must be brought to bear to make him back down.

The New Era of Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the following article was written by Ed C. Leach, president of Jack Tar Hotels in America. As one of this country's enlightened and outstanding businessmen, Mr. Leach candidly discusses the new era of labor relations which has been occasioned by the passage of the 1964 civil rights law, and suggests that business will continue to prosper if management takes a positive approach to implementing the requirements of fair employment throughout this country. I commend Mr. Leach for his business statesmanship in this very critical area of human relations.

The article follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S POINT OF VIEW

We are all about to enter a new era of labor relations, an era motivated by the new civil rights law. While the Federal fair employment practices section of the law does not go into effect until July 1965, it is not too early to make our position clear.

May I say now, Jack Tar management is 100 percent committed to compliance with the fair employment law and will devote concentrated effort to identifying and eliminating discriminatory practices in our hotels.

Resistance to change is a common and well-known human reaction based on fear of the unknown. A new way is always strange, threatening, and laden with uncertainly, even if it is an improvement over the old.

But we have time. Time to explain, to answer questions, to dispel fears. Communication is the key, and it must be a two-way road. We cannot pass down desired information if we do not hear the questions. We can't dissipate fear if we are unaware of the form it has taken.

Above all, let our approach be positive. The old order changes. The hospitality industry will continue—and prosper. But only if we keep up with the times.

Let's face it, for many years it has been the practice in our company to evaluate the individual on his or her ability, integrity, willingness to cooperate with fellow em-

ployees, relations with guests, and years of service. To the best of our ability, we have assigned jobs to the employee we felt most acceptable to the guest for that particular responsibility.

Now there is a law to that effect. If there are those still with us who have not carried out the basic intent of our company in their employee relations, conformity to this new law will necessitate a change in their ways. But I would like to feel that the majority of our supervisors need simply to continue our basic practice and policy of fair dealings with all employees—changing in a few areas where lack of public acceptance has sometimes in the past prohibited the normal advancement of competent people.

As has often been pointed out in this column, one man alone can accomplish only that which can be done by his own two hands and his brain—a limited area of achievement. But a team of men sharing the problems and successes of a business without bias or petty jealousy can whip any competition under practically any situation.

Farley Lauds Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, Atlanta has always welcomed distinguished visitors. On November 16, 1964, Mr. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., addressed the Rotary Club of Atlanta.

Paul Valentine, of the Atlanta Journal, has summarized Mr. Farley's speech in his usual succinct manner:

FARLEY HERE, LAUDS GREAT SOCIETY

(By Paul Valentine)

James Farley, former Postmaster General under President Roosevelt, predicted Monday President Johnson's proposed Great Society will go down "among the greatest and most prosperous times in American history."

He told a luncheon gathering of Atlanta Rotarians at the Dinkler Plaza Hotel, "the Johnson administration will be known as the second era of good feeling—the first such era since President Monroe."

In a brief review of American history, Mr. Farley took several past Presidents to task, compared President Johnson to President Jefferson and pooh-poohed the Republican criticism that the Johnson administration is trying to usurp congressional and judicial authority.

"President Johnson has returned to the interpretation of the Constitution given to it by President Jefferson," he said. "President Jefferson insisted that the Executive should offer its leadership to the country through the Congress. President Jefferson accordingly always consulted Congress before offering legislation.

"Indeed, he, himself, frequently even attended party caucuses and when he could not, sent Albert Gallatin, his Secretary of the Treasury. The result was a smoothly flowing cooperation instead of unnecessary conflict and misunderstanding."

Mr. Farley observed, "President Johnson has already demonstrated the soundness of the Jeffersonian concept—and his own mastry of it."

President Johnson's actions "reprent the most dynamic return to a working Constitution that the country has witnessed in a century and a half," he said.

A former Democratic National Committee chairman during the 1930's and now board chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., Mr. Farley criticized five past Presidents—including Franklin Delano Roosevelt—for failing to follow the Jeffersonian technique of working through and with Congress to accomplish administration goals.

President Jackson, he said, was the first offender by presuming that since he was the only official in the Nation elected by all of the people, "he was the sole spokesman for the Nation."

President Lincoln sidetracked Congress, he said, regarding his Cabinet as "an unnecessary nuisance and Congress merely as a necessary nuisance."

President Theodore Roosevelt "flouted the Congress even, at one time, declaring that the beauty of being President was that nine-tenths of his illegal acts were never even questioned," Mr. Farley said.

President Wilson "attacked both Congress and business, declaring * * * that he promised the financial markets a gallows higher than Haman's."

During the great depression, President Franklin Roosevelt received an enormous popular mandate but "completely misinterpretend" it, Mr. Farley said. He plunged the country into the unnecessary Supreme Court fight without even consulting the Congress. The result is history. The Congress rebelled against President Roosevelt * * * and the Nation sustained the Congress on this issue."

Because of President Johnson's return to Jeffersonian practices, Mr. Farley said, "I predict the greatest era of harmony since President Monroe, an era when the country will not be paralyzed by the gigantic and unnecessary struggles between the three great branches (legislative, judicial, and executive) of our Government."

Address by the Very Reverend Edward J. Burke, C.M., President of St. John's University, Brooklyn, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Very Reverend Edward J. Burke, C.M., president of St. John's University, Brooklyn, N.Y., at the third annual journalistic achievement awards luncheon sponsored by the Equitable Savings & Loan Association and held at the Towers Hotel, Brooklyn, N.Y., on October 28, 1964:

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to be here this afternoon, and I want to thank our host, Mr. Andrew Roscoe, for his kindness in giving me this opportunity to talk to you for a few minutes. First of all, I would like to extend my heartiest congratulations to the representatives of those newspapers which have been granted recognition for the splendid work they did in publicizing the happenings of the borough of Brooklyn.

I feel very much at home here today among the members of the fourth estate whom we are honoring, because I feel that your work and mine are very much alike. There are many obvious similarities between a newspaper and a university. Both are dedicated to community service. Both have as their objective the informing or the teaching of the public. Arthur Brisbane, one of the most famous newspapermen of all times, believed that an editor's job can be fourfold: he can teach, attack, defend, or praise. But teaching, he insisted, is the most important and the most difficult. His words apply with equal force to a professor's role in a university. A university communicates knowledge, which is yesterday's news; a newspaper disseminates today's happenings which will become future knowledge. Both a university and a newspaper exercise vigilance against intellectual impoverishment: a university conducts research to create new knowledge; a newspaper makes investigations to produce news. Both require an available fund of accumulated knowledge to function: the university has its library; the newspaper, its morgue. A university lives by exposing students to truth; a newspaper, by disclosing facts to readers. Both must be independent, fair, honest, responsible, and accurate. Joseph Pulitzer emphasized in his creed: What a newspaper needs in its news, in its headlines, and on its editorial page is terseness, humor, descriptive power, satire, originality, good literary style, clever condensation, and accuracy, accuracy, accuracy. Both the newspaper and the university would be sorely missed, if through some reason or other, they were to terminate their respective role in a community.

It is about this role in the community—that is, the role of the press—that I would now like to say a few words. The newspaper strives for community improvement or enhancement. It does much more than reflect the life of the community: it helps to make the life of the community. A newspaper performs this commendable function to the degree that it exercises a sense of responsibility in molding a right community life. This responsibility is evidenced by the manner in which a newspaper serves, watches over, and helps to develop a community.

A newspaper serves the public by the variety and volume of news it prints. This news is either local, State, National, or international in content. Because of the inevitable volume of daily news, judicious editing is required, so that only the most interesting and pertinent items are selected for publication. In the matter of local news, proper attention and adequate coverage must be given to those issues, events, and personalities directly related to the community. A community reader's interest is naturally drawn to information dealing with local school integration, politics, clubs, athletics, human interest, and so forth. The local reader is also interested in announcements of social and educational events, and a host of other items that reveal unmistakably the newspaper's aim to render not only informative but also practical service. To the degree that the newspaper offers a variety and a volume of local news, it is demonstrating its desire, its willingness, indeed its commitment, to serve the community.

A newspaper watches over a community through the role it plays in combating the evils of slums and moral decay. Because a newspaper is intimately involved in the life of a community, it naturally wants to safeguard that community against physical and moral deterioration. A newspaper is, in a sense, the eyes and voice of a community and would be remiss if it did not show a conscience articulated by a pointing of the finger as it exposes filth in any form. In performing this task, a newspaper gives evidence of its independence. This role requires courage and patience, persistence and calmness, for the attempt to extirpate any

evil must be deliberate. It involves a well-planned campaign geared to achieve practical results and not merely to arouse local excitement. We have been indeed blessed in America with courageous newspapermen who did not flinch when a nasty job had to be done and whose names have been immortalized in the history of American journalism.

A newspaper helps to develop a community by its efforts to create a sound moral climate and firm social, economic, and political foundations in the community. From its earliest days journalism has sought to influence mankind. This may be regarded as the educational function of a newspaper and is reflected most effectively in its editorials, that have been defined as short essays steeped in the sense of timeliness. This function is evidenced especially around election time when newspaper editorials are devoted to pointing up and clarifying campaign issues, to comparing or contrasting the qualifications of political candidates, and even to making recommendations among the various aspirants for office whose election will most benefit the community. At other times, editorials are devoted to a consideration of the moral, social, and economic problems that concern the community. It is for this reason that individual editors and newspapers have won great community regard, because its citizens appreciate the character and the efforts of those who are working in behalf of the community's interest and welfare.

We in Brooklyn have been blessed in the attention and the concern which our metropolitan papers have given to us in the past few years. We have been particularly gratified with the Brooklyn sections which many of the papers have included in their daily coverage. We would, however, today like to urge all of you and especially the managing editors and city editors, to go one step further and help the Borough of Brooklyn to assume its rightful place in the metropolitan community by including our activities in your citywide editions.

To fulfill your responsibility to us in serving, watching over, and helping to develop the community of Brooklyn, it is essential that you cause the people of the entire metropolitan area to become aware of the life and the aspirations of the people in Brooklyn.

You are our newspapers; the newspapers of the city of New York. We are a large part of the city of New York. May I ask you to consider seriously the question of whether you are doing everything that we have the right to expect from our newspapers and whether you are serving the entire community as fully as you can. Thank you.

No Major Changes for Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a respected newspaper columnist, Mr. Richard Wilson, has written about "The Great Society" in a column appearing in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of January 8, 1965. I request that it be reprinted here:

NO MAJOR CHANGES FOR GREAT SOCIETY

(By Richard Wilson)

When the President's program is studied carefully in the context of what he has said both publicly and privately, the Great Society idea gets into better perspective. It is a slogan for the continuation and expansion of welfare programs.

Of the 30-odd specific proposals in the state of the Union message, at least three-fourths are extensions or improvements of existing welfare programs which are virtually self-initiating or were implicit expansions of programs begun in the Kennedy or Eisenhower administrations.

Another fraction includes Kennedy proposals which Congress would not adopt, or such measures as the proposed excise tax cut which was part of the deal on last year's income tax cut, and the repeal of section 14B of the Taft-Hartley Act pledged in the Democratic platforms of 1960 and 1964.

The Great Society aspects boil down to increasing the antipoverty program; pushing for medicare; Federal, State, and local cooperation on highway and street beautification; the Appalachia plan; a new attempt to get more funds for education by skirting the church-state issue; more money for parks and recreation areas; heavier concentration on urban problems.

There is nothing unique or earth shaking about any of this. A new dawn has not yet illuminated the sky.

But there is a central theme which is of interest and possibly of long-range importance. President Johnson is trying to cut back on defense and agriculture outlays, along with economies in other Government operations, so as to be freer to increase outlays on welfare programs which have their chief impact in urban areas. The urban theme is predominant, as it undoubtedly should be in a Nation which has changed so since World War II.

The Johnson program is an attempt to adjust Government operations to these changes. Among the major aspects of these changes are the greater concentration of people in metropolitan areas, the revolution in agricultural technology, the improvement in industrial processes called automation, the alteration in defense requirements caused by the perfection of nuclear missiles, and the social revolution for racial equality.

President Johnson speaks of seeking the unity of man with the world he has built, with the knowledge that can save or destroy him, with the cities which can stimulate or stifle him, with the wealth and machines which can enrich or menace his spirit.

It should be obvious that no slogan like the Great Society and no program like that now being outlined can be equal to adjusting man readily to the changes he has wrought. It is of the essence of the changes—save in the defense and space fields—that they have been wrought by man and not by his government.

Free men created these great cities and metropolitan areas and their mixed beauty and ugliness; free men have changed beyond recognition the face of agriculture; free men have built great new industries and enterprises and expanded old ones.

The Government has found itself in the grip of an onrush of progress which has created new social problems—unemployment and poverty in the midst of unparalleled plenty, the uprooting of millions of farmers, the intolerable aspects of metropolitan life, pockets of despair and decay left behind in man's march of progress.

The Johnson program is more a response to the problems created by an already great society because it was built so great and so fast that it is a program to build such a society. The society is well along in its own construction. It is growing bigger and bigger and the Government is hard put to keep up with it.

This is essentially the problem Mr. Johnson has now: just how far it is prudent to go in proposing the almost limitless measures which might be undertaken if man were to be adjusted to the world he has built.

In spite of what seems a bewildering array of proposals, Mr. Johnson has chosen the path of restraint. He compromises the education issue and seeks by wile to get a start on helping both private and public schools. He looks warily at the problem caused by the fact that 1 million of the 3 million farmers can produce all the food we need domestically and for export, and they do not need, very much, the farm benefits they are receiving. He is capitalizing on the fact that defense expenditures can be cut.

So he emerges with an elaborate program of small starts on big projects, boosts or economies in old projects to try to cope with problems which a great society has already created.

Local Public Works Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill, the Local Public Works Act of 1965, to provide Federal grants-in-aid for towns and cities of all sizes to help them finance virtually the whole range of needed local public works—water and sewer systems, hospitals, public buildings, community centers, parks and playgrounds, and the like. This will help to meet one of the most urgent needs now facing us, the need for increased public investment.

No one can deny that public facilities are essential to community life. They are a prerequisite to public investment and economic growth. They are also necessary to the livability of our towns and cities and the achievement of President Johnson's "Great Society."

It is equally undeniable that State and local governments today face a financial crisis. The rapid urbanization of our people and the rising standards of services and facilities demanded by our citizens have placed impossible burdens on the limited tax bases of State and local governments. No local government can continue to raise its taxes indefinitely without the danger of driving industry and employment elsewhere. No local tax base enjoys the diversity or the strength of the Federal Government which rightly or wrongly has largely preempted the most fruitful source of revenues through the Federal income tax. By far the largest part of these Federal revenues comes from the people and business firms in our towns and cities and it is only right that we should reinvest those funds to help meet urgent local needs.

State and local governments have struggled valiantly to meet their responsibilities. Their taxes have risen more rapidly than Federal taxes and their debt has risen more rapidly than Federal debt. In spite of this, a backlog of needed improvements and additions to our inventory of community facilities has built up running into billions of dollars. Even in our most prosperous years public investment has been an economic stepchild and

had to sept aside for the satisfaction of other wants. Given the tremendous annual increase in our needs in this field to serve our rapidly growing urban population, we cannot expect to eliminate this backlog overnight. It will require a continuing effort and one which will grow larger and more costly every year that we delay. Meanwhile, the quality of life in our cities suffers in ways ranging from threats to health from polluted water to threats to economic growth from overcrowded traffic and other facilities.

There is also a growing recognition among economists that expanded public investment is essential to continued prosperity. The current uptrend has lasted far longer than most analysts had expected and now there is almost a chorus of prediction that the economy ever-expanding labor force, even a level-second half of this year. Given our ever expanding labor force, even a leveling off is a critical problem which can add heavily to the millions of American men and women now out of work.

Just yesterday I read in the Washington Post of an interview with Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, in which he expressed concern for the latter part of 1965. He stated, and I quote: "on balance I would expect a somewhat faster expansion in the first part of the year and some slowing down in the latter half." He went on to say that "if there is cause for disappointment about the 1965 outlook it is that the foreseeable gains in output are not sufficiently large to sustain our recent progress in reducing unemployment." Many economists express even deeper concern over the outlook and a recent analysis in the U.S. News & World Report suggested that unemployment by the end of 1965 might be one million higher than our present intolerable level. I believe this clearly indicates that now is the time to launch a program to step up local public construction activity.

There is growing recognition of the fact that only a Federal grant program has the power to stimulate local public works investment to the extent needed. Such a program was strongly endorsed by the AFL–CIO last November and it has the warmest endorsement of the mayors of our towns and cities. It is also endorsed by the National Association of Home Builders who know from first-hand experience how the shortage of community facilities inflates land prices by creating an artificial shortage of land available for development and adds to the burden of local real estate taxes. These factors have the effect of pricing many middle income families out of the market for new homes.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would authorize $2 billion annually to cover up to two-thirds of the cost of nearly the whole range of local public works—schools, which will be treated under separate legislation, would not be covered by my bill. These grants would be available to every town and city without regard to size and there would be the further provision that economically depressed areas would receive grants up to 75 percent. I believe that this bill is urgently needed and I anticipate that the Committee on Public Works will place it high on its agenda and begin action on it in the near future.

Independence Day of Chad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the fifth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Chad. On this memorable occasion, we wish to extend farm felicitations to His Excellency Francois Tombalbay, President of Chad; and to His Excellency Boukar Abdoul, the Chad Ambassador to the United States.

The Republic of Chad came into being very early in 1960. Thus as an independent and sovereign entity it is less than 5 years old. It has an area of some 450,000 square miles with a population just under 3 million. For a long time part of French Equatorial Africa, it became a member of the French community as a state late in 1958, and a few months later it formed an economic union with the three other territories of French Equatorial Africa. All these successive steps represented carefully planned preliminaries to the proclamation of Chad's independence on January 11, 1960, and the founding of the Chad Republic.

The people of the Republic of Chad have done well in keeping the vast expense of their country in relative peace and quiet. It is one of the few countries in Africa, and certainly one of the few among the newly created independent states on that continent, in which there is little internal disturbance, and in which the republican form of government has had fair success. The people of Chad, who are hard workers and quite jealous of the freedom they have acquired, seem determined to maintain it at any cost. In many ways the people of the Republic of Chad, with their democratic institutions and their zeal to improve their economy through sheer hard work, have set a fine example to their immediate neighbors and other states in Africa.

The country is not abundantly rich with resources. Cotton cultivation and animal husbandry are the most important activities in the country. There are certain potential possibilities for some extractive industries, and in the developmental budget, with French financial aid, some definite improvements are envisaged. The Republic of Chad is part of the French community of states, and it is also a member of the United Nations. On the fifth anniversary of their Independence Day we wish success to the people of the Republic of Chad in all their worthwhile endeavors.

Free Dope Clinics Won't Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the October 1964 issue of Catholic Layman carried an article so significant in relation to the issue of free narcotics clinics for dope addicts that the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics is interested in its wide dissemination. William L. Roper, the author of the article, believes we must not relax law enforcement procedure. He calls for support for antinarcotics legislation and cure of addicts. He believes free narcotics clinics would only compound our problem. He feels they would be most dangerous, since they would tend to increase the possibility of more youngsters becoming slaves of the deadly habit-forming drugs.

Mr. Roper's excellent article follows:

FREE DOPE CLINICS WON'T HELP

(By William L. Roper)

It has become fashionable in certain circles to advocate the establishment of government clinics, where drug addicts will be given drugs free or for a nominal fee.

Considerable propaganda has been used to promote this idea and sell it to the American public. In fact, the New York Academy of Medicine has worked out an elaborate plan for the proposed operation of such clinics on a 24-hour-day basis throughout the Nation. While proponents of the free clinics are still not agreed on all details for operating them, the experiment does have strong support.

Those favoring the free clinic argue that it will reduce the illicit narcotics traffic, which is now a major source of revenue for organized crime in the United States. A second benefit, according to sponsors of the experiment, is that the plan will tend to remove from narcotic addiction the stigma of criminality, and therefore make the problem of cure and rehabilitation easier.

"So you see," one advocate of the free clinic theory explained enthusiastically, "we would be helping a lot of poor, unfortunate people who are almost incurably addicted, and would at the same time strike a death blow at organized crime."

But is this line of reasoning valid? What assurances do we have that it would not increase drug addiction, especially among the young, and create an even greater national drug problem?

These are but a few of the serious questions suggested by the proposal for free drug clinics. Persons who know the soul-deadening effects of addictive drugs are appalled by the dangers of this experiment. Some feel that all taxpayers would become accessories in a scheme designed to make an addict more comfortable while he or she commits suicide by degrees.

Aside from any moral issue, many thoughtful citizens oppose creation of another privileged class—"the free dopers"—in a welfare state. Recent senatorial investigations have disclosed that we now have thousands of persons living idle, debauched lives on welfare funds. The average, hard-working taxpayer does not wish to be compelled to support more irresponsible persons in vicious habits.

"But these free shots and free pills would keep the addicts from committing criminal acts to get the stuff," argues the advocate of the clinics. "It would reduce jail and court costs, and actually be cheaper for the taxpayer in the long run."

This argument, like others favoring the proposal, is open to question.

The very real and dangerous possibility is that if such clinics were established they might encourage many youngsters to experiment with addictive drugs. As in many known cases, such experiments could lead to life-time addiction.

This is one of the threats that exists in removing the aura of criminality and giving drug addiction the stamp of respectability.

Wouldn't it be possible for an impressionable, adventurous teenager to get the mistaken notion that society approved or at least condoned drug addiction when he sees that the Government has provided free dosage clinics? And wouldn't it be equally natural for him to assume that drug addiction was not too bad, since he could get free drugs if he became hooked?

With the juveniles' fear of becoming an addict lessened, his tempters would find it easier to get him to try a shot "just once."

When one weighs these possibilities, it becomes clear that free clinics, instead of helping to solve America's drug problem, might contrarily magnify it and increase its danger, especially among the young.

These are the possibilities that the public must keep in mind when considering the free clinic experiment. It is always much easier to stop a program before it gets started than after it becomes a routine, an accepted project.

So far, those advocating the free drug clinics have not agreed on any one plan, although the proposal of the New York Academy of Medicine is the most publicized one. The academy proposes the establishment throughout the country of narcotic clinics in connection with general hospitals. These proposed clinics would be open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Addicts would be issued registration or identity cards, which they would be required to present in obtaining their drugs. In theory, these identity cards would prevent them from obtaining more than their quota, and from getting drugs at more than one dispensary.

According to the New York plan, addicts would first have to undergo initial hospitalization that would establish the existence of addiction and allow for medical and psychiatric diagnosis. Such examinations would determine the patient's "minimum needs for narcotics."

But will any minimum quantity satisfy a real addict?

Many students of addiction are convinced that it will not; they believe that the whole idea of the free clinic will not work, because of this fact. They contend that receiving a minimum quantity of narcotics will not satisfy the addict, unless it is enough to blot out his withdrawal symptoms and at the same time give him the stimulation he craves. They explain that while it is comparatively simple to determine the minimum quantity necessary to keep the addict from discomfort, this dosage will not satisfy the average addict. He will always crave more than the prescribed dosage.

There are additional loopholes in the plan. For instance, it will be most difficult to guard aganist card forgery and multiple registration, to prevent addicts from making the rounds of free dispensaries. For no matter how often an addict gets a free shot, he will always want more; he may even turn to illicit sources for the additional booster shot.

Consequently, the argument that free dispensaries will virtually eliminate the illicit drug traffic appears excessively optimistic.

After carefully studying the proposal for free government drug clinics, the American Medical Association Council on Mental Health went on record as opposing the experiment. In a 1957 report, the council expressed the opinion that such clinics should not be established.

Proponents of the new venture in narcotics control refused to accept the AMA verdict. They continue their activity, frequently citing British practices and urging their adoption in this country. The British, they contend, do provide free drugs for addicts

But what these advocates fail to point out is that there is a vast difference between British policies and those in the United States because Britain does not have the acute addiction problem that prevails in America. One of the major differences in the two countries' control methods is that in Great Britain, responsibility for the treatment of addiction cases rests with the medical profession and the individual, while in the United States (addiction has never been a Federal crime in the United States, although it has been a criminal offense under some State laws) the Government exercises a moral obligation to see that the addict is cured if possible, instead of being pampered in his addiction. The Supreme Court has ruled that it is professionally improper for a physician to prescribe narcotics for an addict without trying to cure him.

In England, however, only a committee of doctors determines the proper professional conduct in dealing with addiction problems.

The British committee of physicians establishes three conditions under which narcotics or other addictive drugs may be given addicts:

Where the patient is being treated by the gradual withdrawal method in the hope of effecting a cure.

Where, following an attempted cure, it is found that the patient has severe withdrawal symptoms which make discontinuance of drugs dangerous or inadvisable.

Where there is evidence that the patient can only lead a relatively normal life with the aid of drugs.

Since the system has worked with fair success in England, there has been a growing clamor in America to try the same approach to the problem in this country. The idea would be to place more emphasis on addiction as a medical problem, and thereby deemphasize its criminal aspect. This, of course, means downgrading the rigid enforcement and punishment policies which we have relied upon in the past, and substituting hospitals for jails.

Such thinking has led to an experiment, sponsored by the National Association for the Prevention of Addiction to Narcotics (NAPAN), a private, nonprofit group of doctors and others interested in addiction. On September 12, 1963, NAPAN announced that it was sponsoring the establishment of two clinic projects to determine whether narcotic addicts can be treated successfully on an outpatient basis. The two clinics to be established will be located in New York and in the Los Angeles area.

The initial projects would be carried out by established medical centers; the aim would be to cure addicts by administering decreasing doses of narcotics while also giving the patients intensive psychiatric treatment. (There is a danger in permitting private organizations to undertake the treatment of narcotic addiction by using narcotics as proposed by NAPAN.)

The purpose of these experimental clinics is to settle a fierce controversy among medical and law enforcement officials about whether addicts can be cured while living outside a hospital or institution. Dr. S. Bernard Wortis, chairman of psychiatry and neurology at New York University's School of Medicine, as head of NAPAN's medical advisory board, believes addiction can be cured on an outpatient basis. A drive to raise $1 million for the experiment is now underway.

This new approach is revolutionary; both the American Medical Association and the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics have in recent years vigorously opposed projects to treat addicts through outpatient clinics. Now those favoring the British system, which would make addiction a medical rather than a criminal problem, have gained an opening wedge.

There are good reasons for doubting that such a project will succeed. One is that there is no clear and convincing evidence that addicts can be cured without hospital treatment in a drug-free environment. Similar outpatient treatments in New York several years ago resulted in a scandal. At that time, an investigation disclosed that several unscrupulous physicians had been getting rich by the indiscriminate prescription of drugs to addicts. They were maintaining addiction, not curing it.

Yet it is New York physicians who are now spearheading the new experimental approach. The New York County Medical Society has strongly endorsed the outpatient treatment project.

Meanwhile, both New York State and California, where most of the Nation's narcotic addicts reside, are working on plans for new institutions to be built and operated for the exclusive treatment of addicts. So far, institutionalized treatment, such as that provided by hospitals in Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex., offers the best hope for cures.

The Public Health Service Hospitals at Lexington and Fort Worth were opened in the 1930's for the treatment of Federal prisoners who were narcotic drug addicts; 1929 legislation also authorized these two hospitals to accept voluntary patients if beds were available; at present, 75 percent of the addicts being treated at Lexington alone are voluntary patients.

Treatment of a convicted or voluntary patient at the Kentucky hospital, for example, begins with a complete physical examination and recording of his medical history. Next comes the withdrawal period in which prescribed drugs are given in regulated, dwindling quantities. The patient experiences minimal discomfort for a week or so, after which treatment becomes mainly psychiatric.

Through individual and group psychotherapy, an effort is made to increase the addict's ability to cope with the problems and discomforts of living. Most narcotic addicts, like alcoholics, have acquired their habit in trying to escape the tensions and distressing realities of life. Many persons, after overcoming the habit, can be taught to adjust to life. Religion has been found to be a tremendous help in some cases that appeared beyond human assistance.

The two Public Health Service hospitals are Federal hospitals, however, not State institutions such as California's Rehabilitation Center at Norco. When a patient is committed to a Federal institution, he stays until he is believed to be cured; I have never heard of Federal patients being released prematurely on writs of habeas corpus. Therein lies the difference: not in treatment techniques so much as in commitment and disciplinary patterns.

Despite available facilities, the sad fact remains that permanent narcotic cures are extremely difficult to achieve. There are far too few of them. Statistics show that addicts should be confined for at least a year and often considerably longer, with a 5-year period of probation following discharge.

Those attracted by the rosy promises of experimental approaches now being proposed should also remember that the best statistical information available shows that relapses frequently occur, that permanent cures are rare. The idea that free drug clin-

ics or outpatient clinics will reduce the problem is purely conjectural.

The basic conflict goes much deeper than the controversy over how best to handle the narcotic problem. One school of thought, psychiatry, believes that most of those regarded as criminals are just mentally ill and that psychiatry, not jail, is the answer to most of our criminal problems. Law enforcement advocates are convinced that society needs discipline and that the individual is moraly responsible for his social behavior; they believe we must have law and order, or anarchy; and that jails are necessary.

Too many criminals, they say, escape punishment for their crimes today by claiming to be drug addicts; which would make practices such as California's new commitment procedures seem almost an inducement to the would-be criminal to combine drug taking with his other antisocial acts.

The best defense against drug addiction know at this time is the prevention of addiction. Education and law enforcement that makes access to drugs difficult have proved their value. Any letdown in enforcement increases the danger for American youngsters. In placing the emphasis on curing addicts and ignoring the addiction dangers created by relaxed enforcement procedures and the nonjailing of the illicit pill pushers, we would appear to be taking a dangerous road and one that will magnify, rather than reduce our national narcotics problem. Free dope clinics do not appear to be the answer when this problem is examined in the light of the possibility of increased addiction.

Many longtime students of the problem are convinced that experimental approaches which involve the discarding of our time-tried, rigid enforcement policies are fraught with new dangers. And once the lid is off the Pandora's box, I believe we can expect to reap a whirlwind of narcotic addiction.

The Legal Role of the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was passed by the Los Angeles County Federation of Republican Women on December 2, 1964, and I have been requested to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

Whereas the present role of the FBI is an objective one, limited by law to investigation of criminal acts in violation of Federal law and the collection of police and crime reports for the Nation; and

Whereas in the past few years the Justice Department has misused the FBI as a police arm in the steel crisis and in other cases; and suggestions are now being made that the FBI should change its role to become a national police force; and

Whereas history shows deep-seated abuses where police systems have operated under political control of central governments; and

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, has stated that "the FBI will continue to be objective in its investigations and will stay within the bounds of its authorized jurisdiction regardless of pressure groups which seek to use the FBI to attain their own selfish aims"; and

Whereas because of his courageous refusal to permit the FBI to be misused, Mr. Hoover has recently been subjected to intemperate and unwarranted attacks by the ADA and other groups: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles County Federation of Republican Women commend Mr. Hoover for his stand, and express our confidence in him and his organization; and be it further

Resolved, That we ask our Representatives in Congress to use every means within their power to prevent misuse of the FBI by the executive branch, and to resist any attempt to change the present legal role of the FBI as a Federal agency.

Self-Help for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, at the age of 13, it was necessary for me to begin work to help finance my education. After school, on Saturdays, and through the summer vacations, I worked as a store clerk, a laborer, farm hand, truck driver, and carpenter's helper. When I enrolled in college, I continued to earn my way until I entered the military service in World War II, and when I returned and married, both my young wife and I worked so that I might complete my education.

It was apparent to me then that one of the best forms of aid to education would have been a tax deduction for at least part of the income I earned from extracurricular work and applied toward educational expenses. Yet, then and now, when a boy and girl has to work full time during the summer and part time during the school year to pay for his or her books and tuition, the Federal Government taxes their meager income without consideration that most of it is being used for an educational purpose. On the other hand, the affluent philanthropist who makes a financial contribution to an educational institution is allowed a tax deduction.

Feeling that the Federal Government has an obligation to encourage our young people to secure an education, and recognizing that many other approaches to Federal financial aid involve the inherent danger of Federal control, I have introduced a package of three education bills, one of which would allow students who are working to pay their way through college to deduct for tax purposes certain expenses incurred in obtaining a higher education. The deduction to be allowed is only for books, tuition, fees, and supplies and does not apply to such things as expense of room and board. My bill would allow an undergraduate student to deduct up to $1,500 per taxable year. To be eligible the student must be enrolled in an accredited institution pursuing a baccalaureate or graduate degree.

I sincerely hope the committee which has jurisdiction over this field will act favorably early in this session of Congress. One who has worked hard to pay for his or her education appreciates it all the more, and the Nation's policy should be to foster self-help in this endeavor.

Address by Hon. Alan S. Boyd, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Before the Eastern Air Lines' Management Banquet, Houston, Tex., December 10, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include a very fine speech by the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, at the Eastern Air Lines' management banquet in Houston, Tex., on December 10, 1964. This banquet was hosted by the very able and distinguished president of Eastern Air Lines, Mr. Floyd D. Hall:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ALAN S. BOYD, CHAIRMAN, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, BEFORE THE EASTER AIR LINES' MANAGEMENT BANQUET, HOUSTON, TEX., DECEMBER 10, 1964

It is an inspiration to a speaker when he finds a proper occasion for a fitting subject. I hope you will find this to be the case tonight.

Here, in Houston, one of the most dynamic cities of the United States—diversified in industry and commerce and air-minded like few other cities I know—are gathered the management of one of our major air carriers and many civic officials keenly aware of the importance of air transportation.

President Johnson has issued his call for the development of the Great Society. We must all share unreservedly with him the belief that our resources, our ideals, and our system of government provide the potential for a life of dignity and honor to all Americans. The Great Society can be achieved only to the extent that we citizens are willing to work, to sacrifice, if necessary, and most of all to give strong support to those who must take the actions to make a reality of an ideal.

Houston has shown its foresight by its willingness to return to Congress again and again ALBERT THOMAS and BOB CASEY. It has been my pleasure to work closely with Congressman THOMAS. His representation is important to you; his support is essential to me and to the Civil Aeronautics Board. There is no more able, conscientious and knowledgeable Congressman in Washington. I praise him freely and with full knowledge that he will not appropriate a nickel to the Civil Aeronautics Board solely out of friendship. We must convince him and I can guarantee you that it has to be done with facts.

These men and their colleagues will build the Great Society with your support. But the Great Society or any society rests upon more than good will and fine ideals. Our modern society is oriented to a very large extent upon transportation. In the United States transportation represents about one-fifth of our gross national product.

A small but very important part is attributed to air transportation, the common carriage of persons, mail, and property by air. The scheduled airlines comprise the

greatest portion of air transportation. Today they operate more than 2,000 aircraft with 172,000 employees. There are 51 U.S. scheduled air carriers operating in the domestic and international markets. Their responsibility is to provide service to the communities to which they are authorized to operate by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Service should be defined as providing sufficient seats at the right time to transport passengers where they want to go. Service means operating on time without flight cancellations. Service means courteous attention to the needs of the passenger. Service means accurate information on delays and protection on flights of the same or competitive airlines when necessary delays do occur. Service means fulfilling the spirit as well as the letter of the contract, which is the ticket. A Chinese proverb states that a picture is worth a thousand words. How much more must a smile be worth to a harassed, tired, or nervous passenger?

An airline should seek to understand and meet the needs of the cities it serves. It should not play games with the community. By this I mean there is no point in saying the x number of passengers per day between two points are well provided for by several hundred seats, when it turns out these seats move through the city between midnight and 6 a.m. The communities appreciate, as I do, that it is impossible to provide 9 a.m. departures with 5 p.m. returns to and from every community served. They expect, however, as I do, that an airline will provide a reasonable amount of service at the desirable hours commensurate with the traffic flow and within the airline's ability.

Furthermore, the airline should consider requests for additional service to be reasonable. The airline attitude should be one of fulfilling the request if it seems to make sense and if it can be done. Sometimes the airline attitude in the past has been that the community did not know what was good for it, and the airline was doing a favor by providing service at all. This attitude is fortunately rare; it is 180 degrees off course. There may be times when the community does not know what its own best interests are, but the airline should try constantly to develop service in the true best interests of the community. The airline lives for the city; the reverse is not true.

One other point here is that nobody really knows what will generate more traffic in a specific instance. Sometimes the community does a better job than airline management in projecting traffic growth. Management should never adopt the attitude that it is the source of all knowledge. Traffic growth is a guessing game we are all entitled to play up to a point.

Too often airline schedules are adapted to fit the needs of the large traffic generating points that are terminal cities. I believe that there is a large untapped potential of traffic at the intermediate points on most carriers' systems. Improvement of equipment, scheduling, and quantity of service to these intermediate points may prove rewarding to carrier and communities.

One of my pet beliefs is that each airline should set up an annual fund in its budget for experimentation and use that fund for traffic development. It seems to me this has several advantages. Local and district sales managers will know they can get some additional service if they make a persuasive case. Management knows how much is available for experimentation. The communities on the route system know that the airline is making a reasonable effort, even if not in the particular community at that moment.

Moving to a more fundamental proposition, the airlines must never be a leech on the community. It is a member of each community it serves and should so conduct its affairs. There is more involved than merely draining funds into its cash box from the sale of tickets. The airline should identify with the community—advertise its benefits and participate in civic life. Here again, attitude is a matter of extreme importance.

Last but not least, the airline should never sell pie in the sky (not meant to be a pun). It should promise only those things it is willing and able to provide. Glowing promises made with tongue in cheek turn to ashes that cause subsequent indigestion.

I have been discussing only responsibilities of air carriers to the communities they serve. There is also an obligation running from the community to the airline.

Cities should demand reasonable service from airlines; they should not expect the impossible. The airline management is responsible to its owners and to other communities served by the same route system. It cannot provide additional frequencies merely because the leading newspaper feels more service means a more important city. An airline cannot operate for long without passengers. Cities must be reasonable in their requests. If the airline loses money providing a service after a fair trial, the city involved should be first to say, "Eliminate the service."

Cities should provide adequate yet not extravagant facilities at airports. Charges ought to be based on amortization of debt and maintenance expense. An airline airport with airline service is a major asset to the community; there is no valid reason to get a further profit from excess charges on the airlines.

New or additional service requirements to existing carriers should be developed through studies in cooperation with the carriers. The Civil Aeronautics Board is always willing to lend a hand in settling questions on approach or method and procedures.

Noise is a nuisance; the city officials must take the lead in assisting aviation spokesmen explain the problem and the value of air transportation to the community. Noise is the kind of knotty problem we would all like to avoid. It cannot be eliminated so it must be explained. It is unfair to demand airline service without supporting the carriers.

Zoning is extremely important for safety of landing approaches and for noise abatement. Local politics tend to become entangled in any zoning matter, but support of air service means adequate zoning and there is no substitute.

Acknowledgment of contributions made and benefits rendered is a particularly appropriate way to support the air carriers serving a community. Too often, the really magnificent efforts to provide safe, reliable air service are merely taken for granted. A pat on the back is inexpensive and welcome, indeed.

To discuss the community obligations it was necessary to conjure up the ideal city—the one that does all the right things in the right way. My task was simple. I thought of Houston and its air transportation relations. This is the ideal city.

It is aggressive, responsible, and conservative. Houston seeks all that can be fairly obtained; it asks for service but not for charity from the airlines. It appreciates that private investors own the airlines and are entitled to a return on their investments. It plans ahead; it coordinates with the carriers; its fees are reasonable.

Houston citizens are airminded and fairminded. They know that reason leads to far better results than does regulation. Responsible carriers and reasonable cities are the products of dedicated individuals. There are many here tonight who set fine examples.

A Neighborly Incident in Gary, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Reuben E. Olson, administrative assistant of the Anselm Forum, Inc., in Gary, Ind., has called my attention to the following article by Elma K. Lobaugh in a recent issue of the Gary Post Tribune, Gary, Ind.:

DOCTOR IN MEXICO REMEMBERS "GARY TAUGHT ME TO LOVE"

(EDITORS NOTE.—It was 4 or 5 years ago that Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Lobaugh, 131 East Fifth Avenue, first met Isidoro De Orta in Mexico City. They were on vacation, staying at the Hotel De Cortes where Mr. De Orta was working as the night clerk. The Lobaughs suddenly found themselves in the midst of a happy reunion since Mr. De Orta had lived in Gary as a boy and was homesick. There have been reunions almost every year since that first meeting, and Mr. De Orta now has completed medical school and is a physician. Mrs. Lobaugh writes of their last meeting and the warm remembrances of Gary by Dr. De Orta. She is the author of many books.)

(By Elma K. Labaugh)

We were sitting in an elegant dining room in a hotel on the Paseo de la Reforma in Mexico City. The crystal chandelier sparkled in the sunlight coming through the high windows, and we sat very quietly listening to the young man who sat opposite us. He was talking about Gary, a Gary which was not the Gary of the shadowed reputation—nor of the monumental steel mills—nor the one known for its widely divergent ethnic groups, but a Gary which had been kind once to a young Mexican boy—now Dr. Isidoro De Orta of Mexico City who sat opposite us.

"Surely," he was saying, his dark eyes alight, "there never was such a group of wonderful teachers as we had at Froebel in those years. There was Miss Bernstein (Mrs. Harry Cohen) who taught me the quality of perfection, that one must do everything as close to perfect as possible. There were Miss Bopp, Miss Stewart, Miss Mailath, and numerous others who gave to me and the rest of the students something which cannot be described—they were not only teaching us, they were giving us the great desire to learn.

"Some of my own people were not as helpful. I had to pass a pool hall on my way to school. The Mexicans standing outside would laugh at me. 'You're wasting your time, boy.' they would say, 'the only job for a Mexican is laboring in the steel mills.' I'd not pay any attention, and when they threw my new biology book in the dirt, I picked it up and brushed it off and walked on. My mother always sent me to school in a white shirt and tie. They liked to grab the tie and twist it, but I would pull myself free and straighten it. I could have gone another way, but I made myself walk the same street every day and soon they came to respect me and stopped their tormenting.

"I had a paper route for the Gary Post-Tribune—part of it was on Broadway where the merchants were kind to me * * * the Muscats and the Jack of the Department Store, and there was Mrs. Silverman who would have a glass of lemonade waiting for

me on hot days and liked to have me sit with her while she talked about her son who was a doctor. I built up the circulation and was promoted to branch manager. What a group I had to manage. I distributed the papers to a tough bunch of big boys whom I met in a shack near the settlement house. I learned to be strict with them, to see that they did their job properly, and I found out then how to deal with people, how to supervise, how to be stern and still be respected.

"There was the Anselm Forum youth group. We met—let me see—there was a Jewish church somewhere east of Broadway, I believe—we met there and we were a club of all faiths, of all nationalities. There were Protestant boys, Jewish boys, and Catholics like myself—and we were Mexican and Polish, and Serbian and Negro, and we discussed our problems and our hopes and our ambitions. There were the older men in the Anselm Forum who gave us of their time and their knowledge."

He talked on and on. The sun was going down, it had left the chandelier which soon would be sparking with its own brilliance, and as he talked, we tried to match his words with other words about Gary—but they didn't come out the same at all.

Finally, his quick words stopped. He hesitated—"Yes," he said, "Gary was wonderful to me. It gave me those years of fine education * * * it gave me friendliness * * * it gave me inspiration, but most of all," a small silence again * * * "Most of all Gary taught me to love."

Sometime later we walked out of the hotel. The soft blue light of late afternoon was coming down over the boulevard and we walked silently and slowly. I turned to Ken and there were tears in my eyes as I repeated Dr. De Orta's words, "Gary taught me to love." And Ken, his eyes thoughtful to my tears, said, "Yes, we come to Mexico City and talk to a Mexican and discover something about our home * * * something good and fine and beautiful."

Polk Bros. Outline a Bold Program for American Retailing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 1965 marks the 30th anniversary since the founding of Polk Bros., one of the largest retail merchandising chains in Chicago and one of the pace setters in retailing in the United States.

Mr. Sol Polk, president of this very successful retailing business, has suggested a daring program for the future of American retailing which he calls a moral rearmament program for retailing.

It is my firm conviction that Sol Polk and the other members of his family who have made such an impressive contribution to keep the wheels of industry rolling in America by providing impressive outlets for name brand consumer goods, have performed a most worthy public service in outlining this bold program for the future.

In the letter which Mr. Polk has prepared marking the 30th anniversary of his establishment, he reviews in a most enlightening way the growing meaning of American retailing and the changes that have occurred in recent years.

I believe this letter deserves the attention of the entire American business community.

Mr. Polk is one of Chicago's most outstanding and highly respected civic leaders. He and his family have written an exciting chapter in Chicago's retailing history. But above all, the fact which stands out indelible is that by creating a mass outlet for moving name brand durable consumer goods, Polk Bros. has provided the much needed demand to keep our wheels of industry turning and provide steady employment in factories throughout our land for hundreds of thousands of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Polk's very penetrating letter follows:

POLK BROS.,
Melrose Park, Ill.

This letter is all about time * * * 1965 marks Polk Bros. 30th anniversary. It seems little more than a few years ago when we opened our first store. However, in retrospect, 30 years ago the automatic washer hadn't even been thought about—television was purely a dream. For a matter of fact, in 1935 we sold 6-cubic-foot refrigerators for the same price we're selling beautiful giant, self-defrosting models today. We sold wringer washers for as much as we sell automatics, and radios were priced then comparable to TV today.

We had a store that measured 40 feet by 80 feet, and when we were able to buy our first carload, we thought that we were real good merchants. Now, 19,428 carloads later, we've learned so much and yet, despite our growth, there is still so much for us to learn.

In 1935, with our little store, time was a great deal cheaper than it is today—our business, like yours, wasn't nearly as complex. The enclosed time reminder is something that I wanted to send to you as a symbol, and I'll tell you why a little later in this letter.

In 1935 there were more manufacturers than today. Time and attrition has changed the picture completely. Now only you that are strong and creative are left, yet the market has quadrupled.

In 1935 when we became a retailer, there were over 40,000 stores selling appliances in the United States. Today I understand there are not more than 20,000 outlets selling brand names—yet our population has doubled. Many retailers left the business because they didn't really believe in the future. You do, and so do we. You've pioneered, and in our small way, we have tried to seek new customer services as well as motivational ideas to build traffic, so that more people could be exposed to your creativity in product. Many criticized us when we decided to stay open every night because we knew it was a whole family decision to make a major purchase. Some laughed when we gave oranges, apples, and Christmas trees to our customers free with a purchase. We did it because we knew it would build talk, and good talk creates traffic. Some were critical of our trade-in programs, or our rental plans. But despite the burns of pioneering, we're still growing, and we are absolutely dedicated to continue growing.

However, only more efficient use of our time will help us to continue. Now that there are fewer manufacturers and fewer retailers, we must spend more time working together. We both have strong competition. You have other brands, and we have other retailers. Mutually we have a giant retailer competitor who, by virtue of price products, and our weaknesses, has grown to as much as 40 percent of the business in certain markets. Therefore, we must constantly analyze our marketing and merchandising strategy as a team, if we are to move ahead in the marketplace.

I read recently that over half of the world population is under 21. This seems incredible; however, it endorses the future potential of our business even more than any economic prognosticators could project.

What we need—today, and for the future—is a "moral rearmament program for retailing," a dedicated belief that the future has obviously made a transition from a manufacturing economy to a retailing economy. Your facilities can produce everything we at retail can sell. Our moral rearmament for future retailing needs:

(1) More education in high schools and colleges keyed to retailing.

(2) A determined program to upgrade retail sales personnel to the professional rank they need to achieve.

(3) Better coordination between retailer and manufacturer in merchandising and marketing strategy.

(4) A "right to know" law that would force all manufacturers to spell out, on the product, the manufacturer's name, address, country of origin, and warranty, to protect customers from being misled.

(5) Better communications to the customers on product advantages and limits.

(6) A more strenuous effort by manufacturers to develop a new posture for their franchised retailers, to potential customers.

(7) Further awareness that our products are, and always will be, sold one by one, person to person.

(8) Continued research for new, time-saving products and processes.

I hasten to add that, with the development of the Peace and Poverty Corps, those of us in manufacturing and retailing must now become economic patriots—and keep building not accidentally, but on purpose.

Now, to get back to the time reminder. You will note that it was designed to use with your telephone. It ticks off minutes with a twofold purpose. One, to help remind you of the person that only wants 5 minutes of your time, and who wastes 30—and secondly, that we would like you to give us some of your time and skills in helping us plan our next 30 years.

Cordially,

SOL POLK,
President.

Pacific Southwest Water Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation to implement what has become known as the Pacific Southwest water plan. It seeks to handle the water deficit situation in the Upper and Lower Colorado River Basins on a regional basis with fairness and equity to all concerned. The plan calls for importing at least 2.5 million acre-feet of water in the Colorado River system. This is the quantity which must be added to the Lee Ferry deliveries required by article III (d) of the Colorado River compact—75 million acre-feet per decade, if 7.5 million acre-feet is to be made available for consumptive use from the main stream. Put another way, 2.5 million of imports will offset the sum of the treaty requirement at the Mexican boundary,

1.5 million, and net losses between Lee Ferry and the boundary, 1 million. It is the portion of the Lee Ferry flow which is not available presently for use in the lower basin. The proposal I have introduced includes authorization of the central Arizona project in accordance with the recommendations contained in the following resolution of the Colorado River Board of California adopted on January 6:

RESOLUTION OF THE COLORADO RIVER BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

The Colorado River Board recommends that if the central Arizona project is to be authorized, that authorization should be contained in a Pacific Southwest plan, as one of the following three interrelated provisions:

1. Authorization for the construction, operation and maintenance of works to import not less than 2.5 million acre-feet annually into the main stream of the Colorado River below Lee Ferry, as the first stage of a regional importation plan adequate to protect existing economies and provide water for filling upper basin reservoirs and refilling Lake Mead, as well as providing water for the central Arizona project. The congressional authorization may be made conditional, as has been done in several other statutes, on the promulgation by the President or Secretary of the Interior of findings of feasibility. A portion of the cost, fairly related to the relief of shortages occasioned by the Mexican Treaty burden, should be nonreimbursable. To the extent that importation of water into the Colorado River system is necessary in order to make sufficient water available for release, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to article II(B)(1) of the decree of the U.S. Supreme court in *Arizona* v. *California, et al.*, to satisfy annual consumptive use of 2,800,000 acre-feet in Arizona, 4,400,00 acre-feet in California and 300,000 acre-feet in Nevada, respectively, the Secretary shall make such imported water available to the holders of contracts with the United States for the storage and delivery of main stream water in those States at the same cost, and on the same terms, as would be applicable if main stream water were available for release in the quantities required to supply such consumptive use.

2. Authorization for construction of the central Arizona project, with a diversion capacity of 1.2 million acre-feet annually as planned, subject to the following condition.

3. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer article II(B)(3) of the Supreme Court's decree (which relates to the insufficiency of water to supply 7.5 million acre-feet in consumptive use), as follows: diversions for the central Arizona project shall be limited to the extent necessary to assure the availability of water to satisfy 4.4 million acre-feet of consumptive use in California, plus the satisfaction of present perfected right in Arizona and Nevada and the satisfaction of the Government's contracts with water users in those two States made before passage of the Act, until the President proclaims that works have been completed and are in operation, which are (i) capable of continuously delivering water in aggregate annual quantities of not less than 2.5 million acre-feet into the main stream below Lee Ferry, (ii) from sources outside the natural drainage area of the Colorado River system which are adequate, in the President's judgment, to permanently supply such quantities, (iii) without adverse effect upon the satisfaction of the foreseeable water requirements of the States from which such water is imported into the Colorado.

The Dollar and International Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as we start a new year and a new session of Congress we again face the happy prospect of an economically favorable climate. In spite of the unhappy burdens of pockets of poverty and of high unemployment the overall level of our economic activity is expected to be increased by about 5 percent in 1965. There are those who see as the greatest threat to this bright picture the possibility of inflation. I do not agree. My own view is that the greatest threat to our domestic economic well-being is the burden we bear in the international market from the reserve status of the dollar as the exchange base for world trade. Now I grant you it may be a fine and prestigious thing that the currency of our country is thought so highly of—that it be used as the basis for an international currency system. However, Mr. Speaker, I suggest we look critically at the increasingly burdensome cost of this dubious honor.

I suggest that the very fact that our dollar is so involved in international credit and balance of payments means we are restricted in our choice of actions on interest rates, reserves, and discounts at home. Also, our domestic economy is highly exposed to critical conditions in world trade. Actions completely outside the realm of our control seriously impinge upon our domestic decisions. In a sense, we lose a portion of our sovereign will to act in our internal best interest because we are so deeply involved in external finance.

What is the alternative? you may ask. There are those of us who believe that the U.S. position relative to the International Monetary Fund should be much more aggressively and actively pointed toward the creation of some international credit- machinery in the IMF, such system to be supported on at least a pro rata basis by the gold and local currencies of all the nations in the IMF. We cannot expect a sudden or dramatic release nor can we foresee sudden, revolutionary acceptance of such a change; but there should be intelligent, step-by-step moves already in action to remove from the shoulders of Britain and America the burden now carried by the pound sterling and by the dollar. The help we have already had to request in the innumerable "swap" arrangements is a "back door" method to spread this load. It is dangerous in that it relies upon the chances of cooperation in the stress of the crisis. Let us face both reality and the future and call for immediate action toward the creation of international machinery for international financial matters and safeguard our domestic decisionmaking in domestic economic policy.

Television Programing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it certainly is refreshing to see a newspaper like the Herald Tribune of New York City publish an article on television programing such as they did in their issue of December 20, 1964. If more recognition were given to such presentations of documentary and special programs, the public probably would not be burdened with such a film as was presented by another network under the title "Carol for Another Christmas." It appeared that the purpose of this film was to write a new religion.

The article from the Herald Tribune on the exceptional documentary and special programs of NBC follows:

CAROL FOR ANOTHER CHRISTMAS

In a medium ordinarily not devoted to higher aspiration than tickling the moment's fancy of multimillions by "giving 'em what they want," it's unusual to come across a television program of durable appeal and of such superior quality that it can bear rebroadcast many times without diminution of interest and delight.

Not one but two such programs are being telecast today and tomorrow in Yuletide celebration.

At 4 p.m. this afternoon, Gian Carlo Menotti's luminous Christmas miracle play, the hour-long colorcast, "Amahl and the Night Visitors," will for the 15th television time obey the injunction of the Psalms: "Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all ye lands."

Commissioned by the NBC Opera Co., "Amahl" made its debut on Christmas Eve 1951 in a production by the late Samuel Chotzinoff, the opera company's top executive, who doubled in brass as a charming writer of musical and youthful memoirs.

Since its premiere, when it was lauded by critic and general viewer alike as a most felicitous musical variation on the Nativity theme, the opera of the poor crippled boy who offers his crutch as a gift to the "Child about to be born" has been NBC–TV's annual Christmas card to America. Off screen, little opera companies, churches and schools have performed the work hundreds of times all over the world.

The other holiday special, "The Coming of Christ," will be telecast at 8:30 p.m. tomorrow. It is a reverent and stirring recounting of the early life and ministry of Jesus, told mainly in the words of the Bible and gloriously illustrated in color by paintings of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance and by Holy Land film.

This program, too, is an NBC–TV presentation. Produced and directed by Donald B. Hyatt, written by Richard Hanser, narrated by Alexander Scourby and the music composed and conducted by Robert Russell Bennett, the half-hour film will have its third repeat tomorrow. A recent screening reinforced a memory of the program as both beautiful and powerful.

Two superb programs such as these outstanding examples of television's Hall of Fame entries are not the total of NBC programs of lasting achievement. Still another rebroadcast classic is writer-producer Lou Hazam's "Way of the Cross," the solemn

pageant of the Crucifixion shown the past five Easter Sundays.

Since masterpieces are seldom ad libbed on the wing, it should be mentioned that NBC does not, any more than the other networks, have an undeviating policy of producing programs of permanent value (just look at the full schedule). But it does create a climate, apparently more salubrious than its rivals, in which they can come into being.

Its record, which can't be touched by the competition, began with "Amahl" 13 years ago.

A year later it burgeoned into the magnificent, 26-part, Richard Rodgers-scored "Victory at Sea," today still the best TV documentary series ever made. The unit, started by the late Henry Salomon, who conceived, produced and coauthored the series, is now being carried on by the "Project 20" group headed by Messrs. Hyatt and Hanser, who were Mr. Salomon's associate producer and coauthor, respectively. "Victory," by the way, was created under the aegis of Robert W. Sarnoff, now NBC chairman of the board, but then head of the Film Division.

A 90-minute version has been telecast twice on the network.

In addition to these four richly realized and often repeated efforts, Mr. Hazam's other outstanding but less exposed work (only two broadcasts each) must be noted: "Vincent Van Gogh: A Self Portrait," "The River Nile," "Japan: East Is West," "U.S. No. 1: American Profile," and "Shakespeare: Soul of an Age." Mr. Hazam is a TV creative gusher.

It may not be immediately obvious to an appreciative viewer, but these programs have to be paid for. All the Hazam shows just mentioned, it's good to report, were sponsored, both originals and repeats. However, his "Way of the Cross," which had a sponsor in first showing, was carried sustaining through four rebroadcasts. "Amahl" was sponsored through 1959, but four subsequent revivals, including the cost of a new production last year, have been on NBC's tab. And although the two hour-and-a-half dories scrimshawed from the "Victory at Sea" dreadnaught had commercials, the original 26 half hours were telecast without sponsor.

In other words, NBC, by footing the bills itself, has been putting its money where its convictions are, adding corporate guts to the corporate enlightenment of granting producers creative freedom.

Now that's a pretty, if sticky, picture, and the only trouble with it is that it's not the whole story of "Victory at Sea." The truth is that a business could go broke backing quality without return. And the whole truth about "Victory" has an unexpected ending that should hearten shy do-gooders and those broadcasters who say they'd like to air worthwhile programs but can't afford not to make a buck.

"Victory at Sea" is not a case of a worthy destitute that copped 16 major awards, including the Peabody, but never earned a copper. On the contrary, this pioneer blockbuster of a documentary, produced with hope for no quick-cash gain but for prestige and long-range potential, has become one of NBC's enduring and profitable television properties.

After its prize-winning run on the network, "Victory" went into syndication.

As of this month, the series has been sold to 186 domestic and 40 overseas markets, with many ordering repeats. For instance, the 90-minute edition was network-shown in Japan in 1961. The 26-week masterwork followed in 1962, and this year two local Japanese stations bought the full series again. Other countries telecasting the documentary: Canada, England, Australia, Mexico, Cuba, Belgium and Finland.

A 2-hour version has played the motion-picture theater circuit. There were three LP recordings of the orchestral score and a book version.

To date, NBC admits, the series has earned a return equal to double its original production cost. The revenue from a popular record, "No Other Love," adapted from the Rodgers score, alone more than repaid NBC's investment.

According to George A. Graham, Jr., vice president of NBC Enterprises, sales contracted this year for syndicated showings in 1965 (20th anniversary of victory over Japan) assure the network of a financial gain equal to the entire production cost of the series—13 years after its premiere.

There's a moral here somewhere. Like: A Fast Buck Is Not the Only Buck in TV. Or: Virtue Is Rewarded. Or: Television Need Not Stoop to Conquer. Or (NBC hopes): It Should Happen to "Amahl and the Night Visitors" and "The Coming of Christ."

A moral reminds us of Dickens' "A Chirstmas Carol," which brings us back to the season to be jolly. It's not likely that NBC, at this late hour, will find in its stocking a pair of sponsors for today's and tomorrow's deeply moving entertainment classics. They will just have to remain NBC's gifts to us viewers.

Remarks by the Honorable Robert T. Murphy, Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, at Special Observance Commemorating Fifth Anniversary of Inauguration of Jet Service at Houston, Tex., December 4, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include a fine speech by the Honorable Robert T. Murphy, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of inauguration of jet service at Houston, Tex., on December 4, 1964. All of the top airlines were represented by their highest officials. The occasion was an outstanding one for all of Houston and south Texas. Aviation has played a great part throughout the United States in the field of transportation and has been most helpful to Houston and all of Texas.

The speech follows:

I deem it a special privilege to participate, at the invitation of Claud B. Barrett, president of your vigorous chamber of commerce, in this special triduum of aviation thanksgiving. My response to your invitation was quickened by the anticipation that, at long last, I could have the opportunity to visit the city named for one of my longtime heroes of American history, Sam Houston, a man of vision, of great dreams and of heroic accomplishments. We meet in a place, so I am told, not far removed from the original location of the rude structure which served as the first capitol building of the Republic of Texas and where, as President of the Republic, Sam Houston established, with a firm but able hand under trying and adverse circumstances, the solid foundation of a frontier nation and future State. I note with particular interest that the Houston Chamber of Commerce was chartered by the Republic of Texas in 1840. There is every evidence from what I have seen of your industrial program—including your new facilities for the probing of outer space—that the same tradition of drive and enthusiasm persists here in the city of Sam Houston that moved your forebears to impressive achievements more than a century ago. If "what is past is prologue," then we can say with the assurance of history that the true destiny of the city of Houston is still in the making and that even greater vistas lie ahead.

As I understand the nature of our convocation, these few days have been set aside as a time of special observance of the outstanding record of performance on the part of those airlines which serve your city. It is a time for gathering laurels for the furrowed and wrinkled brows of the airline operators and for the pronouncement of a benediction on them as a token of Houston's appreciation of what they have done for the community during the past 5 years. You are to be complimented for initiating this gracious and wholesome observance. Too infrequently, in the accelerated and sometimes mad pace of present-day life, do we pause for the recitation of blessings and the expression of compliments and appreciation to others who make our lives more bearable and, in many respects, more fulsome.

Perhaps, from this type of observance, all of us affiliated with the aviation industry in one way or another, will derive a renewed and refreshed sense of dedication to the ultimate objective which should motivate our concerted actions—namely, improved public service in the national interest.

I cannot refrain from mentioning in this, my first visit to Houston, the great personal satisfaction which I derive at the beginning of each year in reviewing with one of your distinguished senior Members of Congress, ALBERT THOMAS, the annual record of the Civil Aeronautics Board as it affects our fiscal needs for efficiently coping with the multitudinous problems of the aviation industry. His constructive criticisms, strong assistance and prudent budgetary control have proven him to be one of aviation's, and the taxpayer's best friends in the Congress of the United States.

It is well to remember that behind the saga of achievement on the part of our air carriers which now provide more than 100 flights a day in and out of your airport here, there lies the significant contribution of our aircraft manufacturing industry, both engine and airframe, that gave us the instrument that has made all of this possible.

Their product has been of such proven excellence as to warrant its use under the flags of all the free world over air routes in every corner of the globe. I think their contribution to the prosperity of our general economy resulting from the sale and distribution of jet aircraft, both domestically and in our foreign trade, deserves special mention and commendation on an occasion of this character and I am certain that all of our airline operators would concur. The manufacturers' search for an even better product still continues, as I have noted from my own visits during the past 2 years to some of their principal plants on the west coast. All of this is in accord with the constant evolution in our free enterprise system which has brought so many of the material benefits to mankind in our lifetime.

However, it was the airlines of the United States, many of whose distinguished leaders are with us here today, who were the essential partners with the manufacturers in making the jet age a reality and in harnessing the machine for peaceful civilian progress. They perceived the great public advantages accruing from the civilian adaptation of the jet aircraft—advantages which inure to our benefit in both the international and domestic spheres. They made the bold decisions requiring a $3½ billion investment to transition from piston to turbopowered equip-

ment in the face of rather critical financial burdens at a time when the airline industry, as a class, was far from the position of economic strength that it enjoys today.

The 5 years which have elapsed since the jet age was introduced in Houston with the departure of a New York-bound Delta DC-8 have seen the wisdom of those courageous decisions verified in every respect. We are now well past the jet phase-in stage in the air carrier industry.

The doubts, the fears, the anxieties which attended that transition period are now, gratefully, behind us. Crews have been trained, special maintenance and overhaul techniques established and improved, and the special items of nonrecurring integration costs have been absorbed.

Management ingenuity has built around the jets improved techniques reflected in their operations, including reservation and baggage handling practices, terminal facilities, etc., and the introduction of reduced fares helping to expand the air travel market. Now—and only now—are we experiencing the full effect of the decreased operating costs of the jet aircraft—unit costs which are much more favorable than anticipated by even the most optimistic forecaster. In short, the machine itself has proven to be the most economic and flexible.

The data filed with the Board does not permit a quotation of a precise break-even load factor for the jet. However, the consistency with which domestic trunkline and international U.S. flag carrier break-even load factors have been dropping since the introduction of jet aircrafe demonstrates the great economies in unit operating costs effected by the new turbo-powered fleets. The most recent industry figures show do-introduction of jet aircraft demonstrates mestic trunkline break-even load factors hovering around 50 percent and the international and territorial break-even load factor in the lower 1940's. The excellent profit picture developing over the last year and a half is a direct result of this most favorable trend.

To pursue cost trends a bit further, these greater efficiencies reflect such items, for example, as overhaul times on the jet engines. Some operations are now up to 6,000 hours as compared with 3,000 hours or less on reciprocating engines with the turboprop overhaul times ranging midway between these figures.

Carrier reports filed with the Board also indicate a tremendous improvement in daily utilization available through the employment of jets as compared to the pistons, ranging from 9 to almost 12 hours average daily utilization. This impressive experience of utility reflects the scheduling potential of the higher speed aircraft as well as its greater reliability.

Thanks to the foresight of the designers, the jet permits easy replacement of black boxes so that difficulties which could have taken an aircraft off the line for substantial periods of time in the past are minimized through the ability to quickly replace a particular component and, thus, avoid excessive loss of time for on-ground repairs.

Although the initial investment in the jets is high in comparison with their piston predecessors, I suspect that the total investment per unit produced would be found to be lower than in the case of piston aircraft. Consequently, we happily find the carriers in a position with this modern equipment to provide service at a reduced cost.

Obviously, the service available to the traveling public on the jets is of a greater value than that previously offered for sale. It offers a more comfortable and swift mode of transportation and, hence, constitutes a more attractive sales product. In all recent cases the Board has specifically recognized the stimulus to traffic growth resulting directly from the provision of service by the jet aircraft. The enthusiastic response of the public wherever jet service has been initiated is indicative of favorable consumer reaction to an improved quality of service.

The upgrading of service to the traveling public, coupled with substantial operating economies which have restored financial strength to our Nation's airline industry has been one of the most remarkable economic developments in the last 5 years.

Recognition of the ingenuity, the diligence and dynamic efforts of the operators and the manufacturers is certainly merited and deserving.

It would be fitting, at this point, to briefly review the chief concerns of the Civil Aeronautics Board at this stage of the jet age. We are mindful, of course, that the jet evolution is still continuing in that an estimated $1 billion is currently on order covering principally twin- and three-engine jet aircraft designed for short to medium-range operation. It is my hope that utilization of these smaller jets will permit the extension of turbo-powered service to more of the intermediate city airports in the United States. In any event, the regulatory actions of the Board have not impeded or burdened the utilization of the jets for their widest public advantage in accord with sound managerial direction. We would like to keep that record going and there is every reason to believe we can.

As you know, with the decision in the Southern Transcontinental Service case a few years ago, the board concluded a series of major trunkline route cases so that the basic trunkline system is reasonably well established. I need not tell this audience that the pattern of jet service available here at Houston was significantly and favorably affected by the awards in that case, including the establishment of National's southern transcontinental route to California via Houston, and the extension of Continental into the Houston gateway. It would appear reasonable, with certain exceptions, that the future domestic trunkline cases will be limited to spot adjustments in the route pattern as required by the public convenience and necessity. One exception is the recently instituted Pacific Northwest-Southwest Service case, which will consider, among other things, the need for new single-carrier services between Houston and Seattle and the major cities in between.

Our decision in the Southwestern Area Local Service case of a few years ago was one of the last of the series of the major proceedings to consider local service issues. We are continuing our use it or lose it review program, in local service cases, and in the trunkline area, further route refinements which our growing and developing economy requires.

Major attention is being devoted to our international and territorial services. Cases involving the route pattern between the Pacific Northwest and Alaska, and the entire transatlantic route structure to Europe and beyond to Asia and Africa, are presently pending decision before the board. And, as you well know, the United States-Caribbean-South America route structure is before the board presently awaiting trial.

We have devoted considerable attention to the question of further delineating the roles of the various classes of carriers. We have recently approved blocked-space services for the domestic all-cargo operators with the expectation that this action may provide an attractively priced service to volume shippers and also redound to the financial benefit of this important category of certificated carriers who, unlike our trunks and local service carriers, have never received any subsidy support for their valiant efforts.

At this very moment, also, we are in the midst of a formal proceeding to carry out the congressional mandate to define and develop a role for the supplemental air carriers and will soon institute a general review of the role to be played by the air taxi operators who perform a most useful and necessary function with small aircraft.

In the rate field, where our functions are perhaps less precise and specific as in the case of licensing, I think it is fair to say that we have attempted to give the carriers an opportunity to test their proposals in the marketplace which, in my personal view, is the ultimate forum for such determinations. We have permitted experimentation with one-class service, three-class service, various fares intended to stimulate specific traffic flows, and so forth. I am sure the carriers, recognizing the vast capacity of the jet aircraft, are ever conscious of the proper price to be charged for their services and its effect upon traffic generation.

In the international arena, where our rate powers are strictly limited, we can, I believe, take credit at the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the lowering of prices in the large, attractive transatlantic markets. As you know, the power to fix international fares is vested in a private organization of the international carriers, known as IATA. It is an arrangement violative of our antitrust laws but for specific Board approval of that machinery. Such a system obviously calls for the exercise of a high degree of statesmanship on the part of our carriers and the other members of IATA to insure that the tremendous social and business processes served by international transportation are not frustrated by narrow, individual corporate interests to a degree requiring any refocus on the need to change the system. As a gateway city to Central and South America and an international port of continuing, great promise for the future, Houston, I am sure, is vitally concerned with all developments within IATA. Let me assure you that, pursuant to the responsibility placed on us by the Congress, we shall keep a watchful eye on IATA and all its works and pomps.

Continuous efforts are devoted, in conjunction with the Department of State, to negotiating operating authority for our U.S.-flag carriers abroad and in coping with the extremely intricate and difficult problems which arise in maintaining our international operations in face of increasing foreign-flag carrier activity. A very high total of foreign movement, of course, is made up of U.S. citizens and our own carriers must be in a position to provide them with U.S.-flag services throughout the world.

The complicated systems, the size, speed, and operational environment of the swept-wing jet aircraft have had a substantial impact on our air safety function, making it necessary that our technical staff be fully qualified with respect to all facets of the new machines. We have met these problems successfully. We have, moreover, made great strides in facilitating our internal procedures for investigating and determining the probable cause of civilian aircraft accidents. Once we know the cause of an accident, we are generally able to initiate prompt action to prevent any recurrence attributable to a similar cause. Thus, we are continually reviewing our safety obligations and our performance with the view to a constant improvement of the very excellent safety record of the air carrier industry.

This, then, is a cursory summary of some of the highlights of the special problems confronting the Board at this moment. Through it all we have the support of a prosperous and growing economy with all economic indicators pointing toward fair weather ahead.

An enthusiastic outlook for the future of the airline industry is not unjustified. Its record of achievement during the past 5 years, which we are marking here today, bespeaks a continuing ability to surmount and overcome the problems of the future.

With the established efficiency of the jet aircraft, continuing growth in passenger and cargo movements and no major reequipment program on the horizon until the forepart

of the 1970's at the earliest, optimism is justified.

The next 5 years should be an improvement upon the past 5 years in every respect, but I shall leave the job of forecasting to much better qualified observers than myself, noting, as I do, that the airline presidents who are with us today, will discuss the future of commercial aviation during a forum this afternoon entitled "Looking Ahead—The Next 5 Years."

I would like to think, however, that Houston, grateful and pleased as it is with the last 5 years, can look forward to moving ahead in even a grander manner with the continued support and good will of its airline carriers. Your intercontinental airport, which I am told will be operational in 1966, is destined to be one of the greatest airports in the world. You have designed and created, not only for the next 5 years, but for the supersonic age, 10 years down the road. Your able and conscientious counsel, Cecil Beasley, has furnished me with a number of large, impressive volumes containing the development plan of the Houston Intercontinental Airport and the data underscoring it. I keenly anticipate our visit there tomorrow, as you have planned. But, from my perusal of the material furnished me, I can only say that while you have entered the jet age in a big way, you are certainly ready to push forward in the next phase of air transportation history in even a bigger way. It can be truly said that you are preparing to meet tomorrow's needs today.

I would not wish to conclude this discussion, conducted in this atmosphere of thanksgiving to the airlines, with anything suggestive of a discordant note. Today is the day for hallelujahs to ring from this assembly, but I would like to leave this thought as an appropriate last chord to our chorus of praise. Air transportation is a public service enterprise. Air carriers are expected to serve the public needs of all cities on their certificated routes to the very maximum degree of their abilities. What has been wrought here in Houston can be done elsewhere. Perhaps we can look forward, with air carrier cooperation in effectively meeting all certificate responsibilities, to a repetition of this type of special observance, so thoughtfully created by the Houston Chamber of Commerce, at many other cities in the United States, as "We Look Ahead—The Next 5 Years."

Martin-Decker Corp. Receives Presidential Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Presidential "E" award for excellence in developing export markets represents the highest award the U.S. Government can bestow upon a business firm. Recently this award was bestowed upon Martin-Decker Corp. of Long Beach, Calif. Martin-Decker has turned out products so superior that they have earned a truly phenomenal share of the world market. The firm manufactures a variety of devices used by the oil drilling industry and others. President Elmer H. Decker of the firm developed a weight indicator which now is standard on 90 percent of the oil rigs in the world. He also invented the Telemtric Driloger, an electronic technique by which drilling data can be transmitted instantaneously and continuously from an offshore oil drilling rig floor to a supervisory office many miles away. President Decker and the skilled and enthusiastic employees of the corporation have taken an outstanding products list and covered not only the U.S. market, but the world market as well. In doing so they have helped mitigate our balance-of-payments problem and, bolstered worldwide the U.S. reputation for superior products. They fully deserve, the appreciation of their fellow citizens and the congratulations of the Congress, as symbolized by the award of the Presidential "E."

The award was commented upon editorially by the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram newspaper, as follows:

AN "E" FOR EXCELLENCE

The Martin-Decker Corp., 3431 Cherry Avenue, Tuesday was awarded the Presidential "E" for excellence in developing export markets. It was the first ever awarded in Long Beach.

Richard H. Holton, Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, U.S. Department of Commerce, cited some specifics of the excellence in his presentation talk to the corporation's periority of manufacturers like Decker.

He said U.S. exports exceeded imports by $5 billion in 1963 and by $6 billion this year despite higher prices of U.S. exports. This successful assault on the balance-of-payments situation, he said, is due to the reputation for excellence and technological superiority of manufatcurers like Decker.

Speakers used the better mousetrap analogy to explain the fact that 90 percent of the world's oil rigs use a drilling instrument developed by Decker. Holton used the firm's humorous motto to explain its pursuit of international business, a 37-year preoccupation with Martin-Decker: "There isn't hardly anything that's got that wasn't went out for."

Harbor department spokesmen added their "well done" at the Cherry Avenue ceremonies, stressing the significance to local port business and our international image of Martin-Decker's export trade to almost every country of the world.

We join in the salute to founder Decker and his dedicated organization for extraordinary achievement.

A New Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the January 6, 1965, issue of the Albert Lea Tribune. The editorial is of timely importance in view of President Johnson's announcement of plans to renegotiate the 1903 Panama Canal Treaty. There is no question but that a new canal is needed. The present canal is already economically outdated and is duck soup for Red agents to sabotage. However, the significance of this editorial is the suggestion that the building of the canal ought to be an internation activity. I think this proposal merits our close study and approval:

NEW CANAL NEEDS BROAD FINANCING

President Johnson is reported to have raised the issue of digging a new canal across the Isthmus of Panama at this time in order to take the wind out of the sails of a rumored demonstration being planned by liberals in Panama. Back of it all, of course, are the hard-core Marxists whose mission it is to embarrass the United States whenever and wherever it is possible to do so.

Threat of digging a new canal, of course, is well calculated to cause any Panamanian to have second thoughts. The Panama Canal provides employment and sales outlets for a great many local people—as well as some pretty plush assignments for deserving politicians from the United States. As noted in an article elsewhere on this page [not printed in RECORD] by Ram Cromley, the present canal would be outmoded by one that would require only a minimum of labor. A canal automated, as it were.

And as Cromley points out, the present canal is obsolete in terms of larger craft, including airplane carriers. It is too cramped to accommodate all the shipping that wants to use it and the trip through the locks takes too long. All of these conditions could be remedied in planning of a new sea level canal.

The President appears to believe that the billions needed to finance the new canal would be easily raised, especially if they were taken from docile American taxpayers. Which brings us to the point of the commentary. We suggest that the building of the canal ought to be an internation activity—planned, financed, built, and operated by several nations acting in concert. Possibly even the United Nations.

Now the reason for suggesting this is quite simple. If the United States makes agreements with a single nation—say Nicaragua—that agreement becomes an inviting political issue for any politician at any future date. The treaty can be denounced—just as the present treaties and agreements with Panama are being denounced—without reference to historical good faith.

Besides, we see no particular virtue in using American dollars to accomplish a task that will net us nothing but ill will at some uncertain future date. We think it would be wise to invite a coalition of nations to plan the canal, arrange for its financing, and provide for its supervision.

And it might be necessary to make some such gesture anyhow. When the United States got mousetrapped into signing the "test ban treaty," it arranged for its own criticism if atomic energy were to be employed in digging of the canal. A committee of nations, including several nonsignatories, would aid our diplomats in getting out of this cul de sac.

Mother Sends Chicago Her Thanks for Christmas Eve Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues

to an article which appeared in this morning's Chicago Tribune and which relates the depth of gratitude that a New York mother has for the wonderful help she received from the people of Chicago when she found herself in extreme distress while changing buses in Chicago on Christmas Eve. This letter of appreciation from Mrs. Virginia Hartman, of Bath, N.Y., in behalf of herself and her two small sons, tells the depth of kindness that the people of Chicago have for their fellow man.

I am including this article in the RECORD today to show that the steady stream of vulgar stories preying upon Chicago's prohibition-era past do not reflect the real spirit of Chicago. It is indeed lamentable that modern day authors of press and magazine articles and those sadly misguided producers of television shows who see Chicago only as it was during prohibition days, are incapable of catching the real dynamics of today's Chicago.

I should like to congratulate the Chicago Tribune for giving such prominent display to Mrs. Hartman's letter. For here is the real Chicago of today, a city whose greatest asset is its people—people deeply steeped in the tradition of pride, morality, civic virtue, and the spirit of "I will."

I will leave to the cynics their distorted descriptions of Chicago. For my part, and I am sure I speak for 3½ million other Chicagoans, the kind and tender letter by Mrs. Hartman, based on her own personal experience, describes the real Chicago—a city of warmth and heart and deep concern for, yes, even a stranger in distress such as Mrs. Hartman and her two children were on Christmas eve.

Mr. Speaker, this is the spirit that, as Mayor Richard J. Daley has repeatedly stated, really represents the true image of Chicago.

The Chicago Tribune story follows:

MOTHER SENDS CITY THANKS FOR CHRISTMAS EVE HELP

A woman who was stranded with her two sons and in distress in Chicago the day before Christmas has asked the Chicago Tribune to "thank the people of Chicago who displayed the true spirit of Christmas by coming to the aid of strangers."

She is Mrs. Virginia Hartman, of Bath, N.Y., who became ill and was stranded in the Greyhound bus terminal at Clark and Randolph Streets early December 24 with her sons, David, 6 and Peter, 9.

CAN'T FIND WORDS

"There are no words in my heart that can say thanks to the people of Chicago because words haven't yet been able to express the inside of one's heart," Mrs. Hartman wrote the Tribune.

"Most of the people who helped us were themselves poor, working people but they shared what little they had with us."

Mrs. Hartman and her sons were waiting to catch a bus for Bath after arriving here from Rochester, Minn. She had sold the family's furniture to obtain money to take David, suffering from a serious brain ailment, to the Mayo Clinic, where physicians had examined the boy. When, however, Mrs. Hartman became short of funds for lodging and food, she and the boys left for home before surgeons could operate on David.

SUFFERS CHOKING ATTACK

At the terminal, Mrs. Hartman developed serious breathing difficulties and began choking. A policeman summoned firemen, who took her to Henrotin Hospital. A doctor restored her breathing to normal, but ordered her to stay in Chicago overnight before returning home for a Christmas reunion with her husband, Philip.

"I want to thank Patrolman Edward Holden who called the fire department to remove me to the hospital and sent my boys after in a squad car. Also, the doctor who was so efficient and gentle in helping me," Mrs. Hartman said.

"The story of our incident appeared in the Tribune before we left for home. As a result, wonderful things happened to us. Strangers who had read the story gave me and the boys money and toys. The restaurant where we ate refused to give us a bill.

"The cab driver refused to charge me the fare, saying, 'This is the time for giving and please let me give this.'

"A woman clerk at the bus terminal repaired David's hearing aid and gave him extra batteries and would not accept money. The hostess on the bus gave us pillows."

BIG LITTLE PEOPLE

"My heart goes out to all of these little, everyday people. They all stand 10 feet tall in my book. They helped me and my sons through a few hours of utter horror and fear."

Doctors at Mayo Clinic on Thursday informed Dr. Irwin Ginsburg of Buffalo of David's condition and recommended him to Mrs. Hartman for performing the surgery the boy requires to save his life.

Dr. Ginsburg said he will operate on the boy this week, she told the Tribune Mrs. Hartman said by telephone yesterday. The boy's condition is an aftermath of meningitis which he suffered as an infant.

Mr. and Mrs. Hartman lost two other sons through the disease. Mr. Hartman has been unable to obtain work since he suffered a heart attack last summer.

The Partners of Alliance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I deem it timely and significant to inform my colleagues that a distinguished team from my State has arrived today in the state of Parana, Brazil, to develop a partnership program between the private sectors of the two States. The team, headed by Dr. Paul L. Noble, dean of the College of Business Administration at Ohio University, represents the Ohio Partners of the Alliance Committee.

Now operating in 22 American States, this partners program, under the Alliance for Progress and the Agency for International Development, serves to establish contact between private groups and organizations in the United States and Latin America. It is fulfilling a need for establishing closer bonds between all the peoples of the American Republics. The basic objective of the partners effort is to help Latin groups who measure up to the self-help principle. It seeks to improve health, education and general living conditions by helping provide basic items for the completion of small projects in Latin rural and slum areas.

Other members of the Ohio team are Mr. Lynn A. Brua, private housing expert; Mr. Don Newkirk, of the Ohio Hospital Association; and Dr. Mervin Smith, agriculturalist at Ohio University. Also accompanying the team is Mr. James H. Boren, director of the partners of the Alliance programs in Washington, D.C. Mr. Boren will be meeting with U.S. AID mission officials in Brazil and private sector leaders for the purpose of discussing the development of specific activities in regard to the partners program. He will be meeting with leaders in both south and northeast Brazil. He is also scheduled to visit with a number of State Governors and leaders of local committees to discuss the partners program.

I know that the people of Ohio are participating in the partners of the Alliance program with an eagerness to accept the responsibility for a fruitful citizens' program in concert with their counterparts in Brazil. I am pleased to associate myself with these timely and worthy objectives of my constituents.

Pittsburgh Quickens Economic Stride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the increasing attention this Congress is expected to give to the problems of big cities, I thought Members of this House would be particularly interested in the tremendous strides my own city of Pittsburgh has made in dealing with air pollution and downtown decay. Mr. David K. Willis, of the nationally circulated Christian Science Monitor has written an excellent report on the Pittsburgh solution of such problems. I include it here as part of my remarks.

The article follows:

PITTSBURGH QUICKENS ECONOMIC STRIDE

(NOTE.—Over the past 20 years Pennsylvania's second largest city has dramatically solved two major problems: choking air pollution and a decayed downtown. Now Pittsburgh faces another crucial challenge: over the long run it must find jobs for an increasing stream of citizens made jobless by technical advances in heavy industry. How well the Steel City copes with this problem will determine the shape of its future.)

(By David K. Willis)

PITTSBURGH.—Standing where two rivers form a third, halfway between New York and Chicago, Pittsburgh today sparkles like a great ship with a new coat of paint. The city looks transformed.

For years, the city was more like a dirty old tramp steamer, half hidden by the smoke belching from the stacks of iron and steel works.

Now, Pittsburgh is a refurbished ocean-liner, gleaming from stem to stern with bright fittings, decks humming with activity.

But no reconversion, naval or otherwise, would be complete without a hard look at the engineroom—and it is down in Pitts-

burgh's engineroom that the new story of the city lies.

From the bridge—the depths of big leather chairs on the deep, red carpets of the Duquesne Club where the city's leaders gather, the beflagged office of Mayor Joseph M. Barr, the office suites of corporation executives high in their aluminum and glass towers downtown, the academic halls in suburban Oakland—word is going out:

Pittsburgh's economic boilers must be stoked up with tough new slabs of industry, or the city is headed for trouble. Many a city faces the same problem: finding new industry to employ its residents.

A concerted drive has begun here to bring in the industry. The men involved are optimistic. Some new industry has already arrived.

But in a dozen interviews ranging from cab drivers to the president of United States Steel Corp., this correspondent found few people who did not, at some point in the conversation, strike a somber note—who were not aware that the voyage ahead could be a rough one.

PRIVATE-INTEREST PARTNERSHIP

Still, the dominant mood was one of hope. As one leader put it: "What we've done to scrub the city's face we can do to spark its economy."

Essentially, the scrubbing was done by a partnership between private interests—symbolized by banker Richard King Mellon—and City Hall.

The same partnership now is at work in the engine room. Their shirt sleeves are up and their heads are down.

Back in 1946, Pittsburgh was fighting for its life. Its air was so black with soot that street lights still burned at 11 a.m.

It was the city of the blue shirt—businessmen found white ones became soiled in a few hours. "You could literally feel the soot raining down on your face," long-time residents tell you.

But then Mayor David L. Lawrence, with the cooperation of private interests, clamped air-pollution controls on the iron and steel stacks and set about persuading homeowners to stop burning soft coal in their furnaces.

It worked. Clean air came to Pittsburgh.

Then, in the early 1950's, new building began downtown at the tip of the Golden Triangle, where the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers converge to form the broad Ohio.

Thus far 55 glistening buildings have been built in the Triangle. Most are office buildings. One-quarter of the old ones have been torn down to make room for the new. And much construction is still going on.

"Right now, some $450 million is committed for new projects all over town," says Robert B. Pease, who, as executive director of the Pittsburgh Urban Redevelopment Authority, is one of the architects of the Pittsburgh renaissance.

NEW INDUSTRIES NEEDED

Now that the city has its clean air and dazzling office buildings, its big problem is finding new industries that can support payrolls. In particular, Pittsburgh is actively competing with other cities to attract research and development laboratories of all kinds.

Pittsburgh's heavy industries—especially steel—historically have been its economic bellwether. But over the past few years they have been employing fewer and fewer men. Technical improvements have made it possible to produce much more steel, for example, with far fewer workers.

One of the most important community leaders working to attract new industry is a self-assured former Bostonian named Robert H. Ryan. His name crops up again and again wherever top people gather in the steel city.

Mr. Ryan is president of a group which symbolizes the cooperation between public and private sectors—the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania. It seeks to improve the economies of Pittsburgh and nearby communities.

A nonprofit enterprise, it has on its board the leading industrialists in the city, as well as Mayor Barr. It draws on the academic community through a scientific and research advisory group.

The development corporation covers nine counties an an area of some 6,000 square miles where 3 million people live.

In his office the other day, Mr. Ryan picked up a black marker pencil and drew a triangle on a large piece of artists' paper.

"Our economy is like this triangle," he said crisply. "Here"—he shaded in an area at the bottom—"is the heavy base: coal, steel, railroads. It's the classic 19th-century structure."

CORPORATE CENTERS ABOUND

"Here"—the black pencil drew a line parallel with the base, then sketched in a series of boxes hanging from it—"we have what looks like Christmas ornaments, but which are meant to represent corporate headquarters.

"We have more here than any other city outside New York and Chicago—Gulf Oil, Alcoa, Pittsburgh Plate Glass, Heinz Foods, Westinghouse, and so on."

He paused, and held up the marker pencil dramatically.

"In the center of the triangle"—he jabbed at it—"is a gaping hole. A traditional hole, you might say. It is a lack of three things: of diversity, of small manufacturers in many fields, of service industries."

He strode back to his desk. "What we are trying to do now is to fill the hole. We want many more small, growth industries. We're going at it, but it's a long, hard job."

The development corporation has set up a $10 million development fund to help. Since it began in the fall of 1962, it has committed more than $4.5 million in loans.

Currently it has helped or is helping such varied activities as powered metallurgy, electronics, hospital supplies, metal fabrication, machineshops, sportswear, plastics, scientific instrumentation, printing and packaging, lasers, chemicals, and trucking.

The development corporation has set up an industrial park; the first industry is already operating in it.

EMPLOYMENT PICTURE SKETCHED

On the surface, the city's economy looks healthy. Mayor Barr has just brought down his latest budget, a $65 million document which raised no new taxes and actually lowered a mercantile wholesale tax.

Three years ago, unemployment was 13 percent. Today it is below the national average at about 3.7 percent. But the total work force has been shrinking as well.

The city—population about 800,000—is losing people each year, particularly in the 20 to 29 age group. Prof. Edward M. Hoover, an economist at the University of Pittsburgh, says that 12,000 more people left than arrived each year during the 1950's, and that the rate has been "much higher" so far in the 1960's.

One way to stem the tide, Mr. Ryan believes, is to exploit not just the city's natural resources and plants and equipment, but its human resources as well.

Specifically, he and many others want to see Pittsburgh become a major research and development center.

After all, they say, the city has a tradition of research excellence. The main laboratories of the Nation's big steel companies are here.

Today some 150 research laboratories are working in the nine-county Greater Pittsburgh area, with 7,600 professional scientists and engineers helped by 6,500 assistants and technicians.

Research is Pittsburgh's third leading industry, behind primary metals and electrical machinery.

But Mr. Ryan's dream is of a complex like the Route 128-MIT-Harvard setup in the Boston area. "How did Route 128 develop?" he asks.

"It had three things: scientists who were also entrepreneurs; new technology; money. Pittsburgh must have all three."

RESEARCH COMPLEX PLANNED

Plans to make Pittsburgh a national center of research also are going forward in the city's cultural hub, the Oakland section. Here the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, and the Mellon Institute form a nucleus around which city leaders hope to attract research industry and laboratories. The three institutions are within walking distance of each other.

In March 1962, the enthusiasm of Dr. Edward H. Litchfield, chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, resulted in several institutions banding together to form the Oakland Corporation. Its aim is to develop Oakland, revitalize Pittsburgh's economy, and make money in the process.

Members are the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, the Carnegie Institute (a separate organization), the Mellon Institute, the Catholic Institute of Pittsburgh, Mount Mercy College, and the United Jewish Federation.

Its major project is an adventuresome plan to fill a 150-foot-deep ravine which straggles untidily between the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Institute campuses with a gigantic research park called Panther Hollow.

The corporation hopes to announce plans for the first section of the park soon. There have been several delays in the timetable.

To imagine the park, think of a 150-story building suspended on its side in the ravine. All the research labs will be under one landscaped roof, which will bridge the two campuses. Light and ventilation will come from sunken courtyards several levels deep.

CHALLENGES FORESEEN

"The point about Panther Hollow," said the University of Pittsburgh's vice chancellor for planning, Edison Montgomery, "is that it is in the heart of the academic community here. * * *

"The city hasn't been attracting the light industry, in the form of 'spinoff' from research, that it needs. We started late, don't forget. We have something to offer. But we have yet to prove ourselves."

Across the ravine in a sunny office at Carnegie Institute of Technology, Vice Chancellor McCabe was cautious in forecasting another Route 128 complex in Pittsburgh.

"We have a way to go yet," he said. "We do have a lot of strength to build on. The best materials research in the country—on iron, steel, and so on—goes on here. And the city could become a center for such industries as mass transit cars and information processing."

The Mellon Institute, University of Pittsburgh, and Carnegie Institute have jointly formed the MPC corporation, which has suggested a materials research center to the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Pentagon. The center is still being evaluated.

Almost everyone this reporter spoke with agreed that regional cooperation was essential for progress. Genial, white-haired Mayor Barr was emphatic: "We have to work closer together with the counties to solve our problems, from transit to refuse disposal," he said. "The city can't do it alone."

Since 1960 United States Steel has installed a wide variety of new plants in and near the city, including the huge "Dorothy" blast furnace at the Duquesne works. Plans have been announced for the world's largest coke and chemical plant at nearby Clairton.

And Robert Ryan, gesturing with his black marker pencil, says: "Do we have a golden triangle or a steel trap? We have this: a basically 19th-century economy in the process of making friends with the future."

He Comes of a Good Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Clarence Poe, senior editor and board chairman of that outstanding journal, the Progressive Farmer, died October 8, 1964. He had been editor of the Progressive Farmer for 67 years. No one stood higher in the esteem of the people of the rural South and his great worth to southern agriculture is recognized throughout the Nation. His last work appeared in the November issue of that publication.

I submit this work for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD together with a résumé on his life's work:

[From the Progressive Farmer]

"HE COMES OF A GOOD FAMILY"

(By Clarence Poe, senior editor and board chairman)

Most of us cannot leave our children much material wealth. The land, stocks, houses, farm equipment, and other such valuables we possess may not amount to much. Nevertheless all of us, when our sons and daughters move into new neighborhoods, may well wish to have it said of them, "They come of a good family."

In probably all ages mothers and fathers, sons and daughters have appreciated the worth of an honorable name. One of the most quoted of all Bible proverbs is Solomon's saying, "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches." And in all the intervening years many people not worthy of the title as they grow older may well wish that for themselves and their children they had tried harder to deserve a good name.

For a hundred years our Southern people have placed an unusually high value on the family's reputation. In old days when families did not move so much as now but stayed put in one area, the good name of a family was more easily established. Nowadays, however, when sons and daughters of one family are frequently dispersed abroad all over America, probably hundreds of miles apart, the situation is different.

But in old days a family's reputation was too often based on a false foundation—all too often the ownership of slaves. And the slaves themselves encouraged this false appraisal. In the days of my great-grandfather when a marriageable young man came home with one of his daughters, the slaves immediately whispered from one to the other, "How many Negroes does his daddy own?" If a large number, the Negroes saw to it that the young man's horse was well groomed and well looked after, but they had to be prodded into giving proper attention to the poorer boy's horse.

It may, indeed, be true that the reputation of "a good family" may now be more soundly based than when ownership of slaves and lands figured so largely in appraisal of a family's standing. But in spite of the present wider dispersal of family units there are still certain soundly based qualities and characteristics that will give any rural family a reputation worth more than fine gold. Hence I have thought it worth while to list 12 things which I believe will give worthwhile prestige to a young man who moves into a community or a young woman who marries into a new community:

1. Honesty and truthfulness are of course the foundation stones of a family reputation. Without these qualities, all other qualities have little worth.

2. Obedience to law is perhaps the next indispensable qualification—along with sobriety, moral excellence, and wholesome family relationships.

3. An interest in schools and churches is nearly always one of the marks of a good citizen.

4. Progressiveness, as shown by the use of modern methods of cultivating, grading, and marketing farm products, will help any family's reputation.

5. Neighborliness and readiness to help in all good causes—especially a readiness to help other people in times of sickness or other misfortune or disaster—must have a high place in any listing of good citizenship.

6. A good citizen also means a well read or well informed citizen. A good citizen will not only try to give his children the best possible school advantages, but he and they will read the best books needed to be well informed about the problems and issues affecting the peace, prosperity, and happiness of their country, State, and Nation.

7. Walter Page's definition of a southern gentleman will always be remembered: "The weaker the man with whom he has to do, the more scrupulous is his justice; the weaker the woman with whom he has to do, the more scrupulous is his honor."

8. The duty of laughter and good humor should never be forgotten. People who can laugh at amusing incidents—and especially people who can laugh at a good joke on themselves—help provide a continuing bit of sunshine and tolerance in a world otherwise gray and intolerant.

9. To pay all debts promptly will always make it easier to have a happy family. And wherever credit is needed, a bank or PCA will better meet the need than any reliance on usurious time prices credit. To pay bills by bank check is one of the first evidences of sound financial standing.

10. Neatness in everything helps any family. This means keeping everything in good repair—never letting the home, barn, and other buildings look neglected, ramshackle, and rundown may be more important than you may realize.

11. A readiness to join in the games, sports, and recreations of one's neighbors is an important asset.

12. Finally, whether you, your son or your daughter stay at home or locate elsewhere, all will be helped if they preserve the old southern virtues of hospitality, courtesy, and kinship ties.

[From the Progressive Farmer]

CLARENCE POE: JANUARY 10, 1881–OCTOBER 8, 1964

Dr. Clarence Poe's name and that of the Progressive Farmer were inseparable for 67 years. His last article, on this page, typifies his dedication to improving the rural South and to helping farm people live happier lives.

When Dr. Clarence Poe died at age 83, October 8, he had been editor of the Progressive Farmer for 67 years. He was active in the company's business until October 1, when he entered the hospital in Raleigh, N.C., suffering from a slight stroke.

During the early days of October, his condition had been satisfactory and he had even called for the manuscript of a book on which he had been working the past few months so that he could do some editing from his hospital room. His condition worsened October 7, and he passed away the afternoon of October 8.

Dr. Poe was born on a Chatham County, N.C., farm in 1881. He joined the staff of the Progressive Farmer at 16, and became editor of the magazine 2 years later.

Through his 67 years of editorial work, Dr. Poe led crusade after crusade—two-armed farming for the South (crops and livestock), improved marketing, better schools, credit systems adapted to farm needs, more beautiful homes and grounds, better health programs for rural people, good roads, and cultural and artistic advances. He received honorary degrees from five colleges and universities. A leader in many fields, he was called by D. W. Colvard, president, Mississippi State University, "one of the most distinguished and industrious leaders the South has ever produced."

Virginius Dabney, editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch, stated, "If a list were drawn up of the half-dozen men who have done the most for the South since 1900, it would have to include Dr. Clarence Poe."

In addition to his magazine work, Dr. Poe wrote numerous books, among them: "A Southerner in Europe," "Where Half the World is Waking Up," "How Farmers Cooperate and Double Profits," "True Tales of the South at War," and "My First 80 Years." He was working on two other books at the time of his death.

He had personal friendships with and served in responsible appointive positions under Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Herbert Hoover, Dwight Eisenhower, and Harry Truman.

Dr. Poe's most recent award was the first annual North Carolina Award bestowed by Gov. Terry Sanford in 1964. Among other organizations which heaped honors on him are Southern Agricultural Workers; citation, National 4-H Conference; Honorary American Farmer Degree, National FFA; North Carolina Farm Bureau; American Association of Agricultural College Editors; and National Vocational Agricultural Teachers' Association. He received the World Peace Award for 1962 from American Freedom Association, Inc. At Atlanta on October 14, the National Convocation on the Church in Town and Country was to have presented to Dr. Poe one of its first three awards ever made for exceptional service to the rural church and to the betterment of rural life.

In 1912, Dr. Poe married the late Alice Aycock Poe, daughter of one of North Carolina's most prominent Governors. The Poes celebrated their 50 wedding anniversary in 1962. Mrs. Poe passed away in 1963. One son, William Poe, also a Progressive Farmer editor, died in 1958. Other children are Charles, a Raleigh, N.C., attorney, and a daughter, Mrs. Jean Poe Smith.

Agriculture Loses a Great Pioneer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have long been involved in the field of agriculture have suffered the loss of one of the men responsible for the abundant capabilities of the American farmer. Prof. Lloyd W. Hurlbut died after serving many years as a leader in agricultural engineering.

Professor Hurlbut served as president of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers from 1960 to 1961, and was an international authority on tractor testing. He was chairman of the University of Nebraska Department of Agricultural Engineering.

Dean E. F. Frolik, of the University of Nebraska College of Agriculture and Home Economics, said:

Professor Hurlbut's untimely death comes as a shock to thousands of friends in Nebraska, the Nation, and numerous foreign countries. He made outstanding contributions professionally and was a dynamic leader.

Dean Frolik termed Professor Hurlbut "one of the most forward looking persons I have ever known." Nebraska's agriculture—in fact the agriculture of the world—has suffered a great loss in the death of Lloyd Hurlbut.

Professor Hurlbut was a pioneer in development of pneumatic tires for farm tractors in the 1930's. More recently, he was a moving force behind the development and widespread use of the combine for harvesting corn, artificial drying of corn, and the minimum tillage system for raising corn and other row crops. He was granted patents on several devices, including a pneumatic seeder which uses air to meter and deposit seed in a seedbed.

At the time of his death, Professor Hurlbut was chairman of the Nebraska Tractor Test Board, which supervises operation of the tractor testing laboratory, established in 1921 under law of the State of Nebraska.

Professor Hurlbut was the leader of a research project which showed that unheated, forced air could be used effectively for drying high-moisture grain in bulk storage.

In cooperation with other engineers, Professor Hurlbut developed the V-type tillage blades now widely used to work soil and leave crop residues on the surface.

In the early 1950's Professor Hurlbut was instrumental in construction and testing of the first mechanical harvester of castor bean seeds. A patent was issued on the harvester and assigned to the University of Nebraska.

Professor Hurlbut was a native of Kansas, received his B.S. degree in engineering from Kansas State College in 1932. He received his M.S. from the University of Nebraska in 1934.

He joined the University of Nebraska staff as an assistant in agricultural engineering in 1934, was appointed an instructor in 1936, and promoted to assistant professor in 1938.

He served with the U.S. Navy on active duty from 1943 to 1945 in the Pacific theater, becoming a lieutenant commander in the U.S. Naval Reserve in 1946. In the same year he joined the staff of Purdue University at Lafayette, Ind. In 1947, he returned to the University of Nebraska as professor and chairman of the department of agricultural engineering.

John Mackie Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Christmas Day edition of the Detroit Free Press carried an editorial commending one of our new colleagues for the great job he has done as highway commissioner for the State of Michigan. I am referring to the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN C. MACKIE, who last Monday took the oath of office as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

As the editorial pointed out, JOHN MACKIE became Michigan's highway commissioner when the State stood 35th in roadbuilding. Michigan today leads the Nation, and a great deal of the credit goes to our colleague.

I know he will continue to build upon his distinguished and effective record of public service as a Member of Congress. I share the confidence of the Detroit Free Press and the people of Michigan's Seventh Congressional District who have elected JOHN MACKIE as their Representative in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the Free Press editorial to which I have referred in the Appendix of the RECORD:

OFF TO WASHINGTON

JOHN C. MACKIE is so intimately identified with Michigan's good roads, he will appear for awhile like a lanky, ill-at-ease Mr. Smith as he strides the Halls of Congress.

But before he packs his tweeds and handball and goes off to Washington, he deserves the thanks of people of Michigan for a job well done.

When MACKIE was elected State highway commissioner in 1957 he was a little known Flint surveyor. At 37, he was the youngest person chosen for the post. The Michigan Society of Professional Engineers was so upset it asked the State supreme court to disqualify him as not competent.

MACKIE made the society eat its words.

Michigan, 35th in its roadbuilding efforts when he took office, is now leading the Nation.

MACKIE has stumped for good roads whenever he could find an audience, has defended highway funds like a tiger—and has been lucky. The Federal interstate highway program and the State's pay-as-you-drive financing program gave him the money to construct his master plans.

Under MACKIE, Michigan's freeway system has grown from 100 to more than 1,200 miles; more than 6,000 miles of State highways have been modernized, and his department, unlike those of many States, is remarkably free of scandal. Last year, he earned the title, "Road Builder of the Year."

It was typical that he used his closing days in office to argue for even more good roads and the tax increases needed to pay for them.

In Washington, it will take more than roadbuilding savvy. The answer in the Congo isn't a freeway system with 90–10 financing.

But MACKIE has evidenced the drive and integrity sought in a Congressman. He also has been a shrewd judge of talent, surrounding himself with highly competent men.

This was evident in his selection of Howard Hill, managing director of the department since 1959. They worked as a team. MACKIE was the outside man, the spokesman for the department; Hill the inside man, the administrator.

With MACKIE, the Nation's last elected highway commissioner, leaving, Hill has been named acting director of the department by the State highway commission.

The appointment doesn't prevent Hill from becoming permanent director but the search has not been called off. It should be. Hill has shown he can do the job soundly and efficiently.

Space: Where We Stand and Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, delivered an address to the Commercial Club of Chicago on December 21, 1964, entitled "Space Exploration: The Challenge and the Promise," which very clearly sets forth the current status of America's space program, its objectives and its future. I commend this excellent address to the attention of my colleagues:

SPACE EXPLORATION: THE CHALLENGE AND THE PROMISE

(Address by James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Commercial Club of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., December 21, 1964)

This evening I want to talk to you about our national space program. Perhaps I can set the scene by giving you this information: As we meet here tonight—this very moment—the NASA Mariner IV spacecraft is some 4,023,450 miles from Earth, speeding toward Mars at about 6,987 miles per hour. The 575-pound spacecraft must travel 325 million miles on an extremely accurate course to pass within 5,600 miles of Mars and photograph this distant planet next July 14. Mariner will then be so far from the Earth that its radio signals, flashing through space at the speed of light, will require nearly 12 minutes to reach our antennas here on Earth.

These signals will be transmitted from Mariner by a power source of 10 watts—a fraction of the power needed for any one of the light bulbs in this room.

Already Mariner IV has solved successfully extremely difficult problems. On December 5, a week after the flight began, NASA ground stations sent radio commands to correct Mariner's flight path so that the spacecraft would pass near Mars. Without correction, the spacecraft would have missed its goal by some 150,000 miles.

A week ago, Mariner went through the tail of a comet and through heavy showers of micrometeoroids. Nevertheless, this evening, all but one of the eight experiments the spacecraft carriers are still intact.

As Mariner nears Mars next July, assuming that its instruments and their 138,000 components continue to work as they should, special cameras will be turned on to photograph features on the surface below. The cameras will record some 22 pictures on magnetic tape, at distances ranging from 9,000 to 6,000 miles.

The TV signals must be transmitted 135 million miles to Earth—or nearly three times farther than Mariner II's record after it passed Venus in late 1962. Because of the tremendous distances involved, signals will have to be transmitted slowly, in digital form, for clarity and strength. As a result, each recorded photo will take 8⅓ hours to relay to Earth. If the transmissions are good, Martian mountains, hills, plains, and valleys should be plainly visible. Perhaps the photos will even show the mysterious features that some astronomers have thought to be canals. The pictures are expected to be as good as those earth-based telescopes can take of the Moon.

The Mariner is managed by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory of the California Institute of Technology, under contract to NASA.

Some 61 subcontractors provided the parts and equipment.

The experiments aboard the spacecraft are the work of investigators from such universities and other research organizations as the California Institute of Technology, Stanford Electronics Laboratory, Cornell University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the State University of Iowa, the University of California at Los Angeles, Brigham Young University, the University of Chicago, Goddard Space Flight Center, Temple University, and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

Thus, Mariner IV epitomizes the combination of industry, universities and government that is bringing the vastness of space within the reach of this Nation.

This most complex scientific undertaking of the space age is successfully on its way less than 7 years after the United States placed its first satellite in orbit. In that brief period of time this Nation has accumulated the knowledge, established the skills and built the facilities to extend human boundaries beyond this planet for the first time.

These new resources have implications for each person in this room, for all Americans and for every man, woman and child on Earth.

I would like to examine with you how and why this national effort has taken place.

The reasons for the national decision to explore and use space were first set forth during the framing of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.

They were valid then; they are valid now. Let me state them briefly:

1. Our security is involved.

2. Our international leadership is at stake, and our American system is on trial.

3. We are making a long-term investment in acquiring new scientific knowledge and technical skills.

4. We are developing practical uses of space and space technology for the benefit of ourselves and of all mankind.

5. Our pioneering heritage inspires us to respond to this challenge. The American people have given their mandate to those who represent them in the Congress, indicating their determination that this Nation take the leading role in the challenging endeavor of space exploration.

We are now at the point where our efforts and investments are producing tangible results. The foundations have been laid. The promise that once could be seen only by the most farsighted is now becoming increasingly apparent: space exploration and utilization will serve mankind, directly, and indirectly.

The national space program has now moved 3 months into its 7th year. We have reached the halfway point in a broad based, accelerated program for the present decade, a program that was planned and has been carried forward by three administrations. Let us review some of the major achievements:

In Projects Gemini and Apollo we are developing manned spacecraft for carrying crews in near-Earth orbits of long duration, for investigating space outward a quarter of a million miles from the Earth, and for taking astronauts to explore the Moon and returning them safely home.

The United States is launching advanced, highly instrumented, unmanned spacecraft—automatically programed or remotely controlled by radio from Earth—for scientific missions millions of miles deep in space. These include craft which will examine the planets electronically and photograph surface features, then transmit the information to Earth stations.

One of these is our Mariner IV Mars spacecraft. You will recall that 2 years ago, an earlier version, Mariner II, flew near Venus and radioed back from a distance of 36 million miles more information about Earth's nearest neighbor planet than generations of astronomers had learned from observations with telescopes on Earth.

Last July 31, scientists spectacularly increased their knowledge of the Moon when NASA's Ranger VII sent 4,316 photographs of the lunar surface from distances ranging from 1,300 miles down to 1,000 feet. The pictures were so clear that astronomers can distinguish very small details with an accuracy 2,000 times better than pictures taken from earth with conventional telescopes. Other unmanned, instrumented spacecraft will be crashed or landed softly on the Moon before the makeup of its surface can be ascertained beyond doubt. The Ranger VII pictures were not only scientific accomplishments of the highest order but also a crucial step toward landing Project Apollo astronaut-explorers on the Moon.

It was accomplishments such as these that caused one of the world's most conservative and accurate aerospace publications—the British annual Jane's All The World's Aircraft—to state last week that "In terms of quality and quantity of scientific data acquired in space, America has probably been in the lead (in the space contest with Russia) for some years." But we must make no mistake. Jane's spoke of scientific data—not manned flight. We are still in a period of catching up with the Soviet Union in manned flight.

We have had success with a series of weather satellites which have photographed, from high above, thousands of cloud patterns indicating prevailing weather front movements. These satellites include eight of the Tiros series and one of the Nimbus series. In addition to photos from the sunward side of the Earth, some of the weather satellites, notably Nimbus, have employed infrared sensors to map weather patterns at night.

In experiments shared with several other nations, we have reflected off the giant, aluminized Echo balloon-satellites thousands of radio, radiotelephone, photofacsimile, and other electronic signals—clear messages between points thousands of miles apart on the Earth's surface. Echo is a passive satellite, an orbiting mirror in the sky for electronic signals.

Telstar, Relay, and Syncom are America's active communications satellites. That is, they pick up from Earth stations, signals of the radio or television types, record them on magnetic tapes, then retransmit to distant points on the globe. In the Syncoms we have the first so-called stationary satellites which, since they orbit at 22,300 miles above the Earth, hover above the same spot. You saw Syncom's transmissions from Tokyo during the recent Olympic games.

Our orbiting observatories of several types not only study the Earth from above its atmosphere, as well as the Sun and the stars, but also measure solar and cosmic radiation and the forces of gravitation and magnetism near the Earth and to vast distances out in space.

We are building reliable and versatile rocket engines that will develop tremendous thrusts, ranging from 1.5 million pounds for Saturn I to 7.5 million pounds when clustered for the Saturn V. These giant engines will be capable of carrying out any missions in space required by the national interest during the present decade and perhaps for a longer period.

The space program has established a worldwide tracking and data acquisition network.

We have built and are building other large ground facilities for fabricating, testing, launching, and controlling the new rockets and spacecraft—facilities that will be basic national assets for many years to come.

NASA research and development centers, staffed with skilled and experienced personnel, are studying what the United States requires in space and what it can accomplish. At the same time these personnel work with industry, where more than 90 percent of the NASA funds are spent, in the production of the rockets, spacecraft, and other equipment.

We have augmented the Nation's research capabilities in our universities by means of training grants, facilities grants, and research grants and contracts.

The space program has founded an industrial base that can fulfill the space requirements of this country as well as many requirements on earth.

It is important to note that NASA works very closely with the Air Force in manned space flight. The Gemini two-man spacecraft will serve the Air Force as a key element in its manned orbiting laboratory program. The total NASA effort contributes technology, scientific description of its space environment, and operational experience to a wide variety of defense projects. The Department of Defense, in turn, shares applicable knowledge from its military projects with NASA. This exchange is an integral part of the concept of a national space program.

These, then, are the national goals and the resources and facilities which the space program is creating and proving out. They are of key importance to the present and future strength of the United States.

Because of the many innovative aspects of space exploration, for which we have only the most limited experience at the very forefront of science and technology, program management has itself taken on a new dimension. The largest peacetime research and development endeavor in history requires not only the best possible engineering and scientific methods—it depends, as much on sound management. The space program is taking advantage of every management tool or device that will help insure that the right problems are being solved at the right time.

Many segments must be meshed together. For example, we must maintain close cooperative relationsips between the Government and industry. But there is also the important factor of the contribution of the university community, which plays a larger part in the space program by far than in any previous research endeavor. Thus, management must guide and control all elements of this NASA-industry-university triad.

We are concerned with three things: achieving the program objectives, achieving them on time, and achieving them while keeping within a lean budget.

In the past 6 years we have learned much about improving management techniques. We are still learning. Technical success alone can no longer satisfy the mature space program. We are moving forward with greater confidence in our ability not simply to achieve end results, but to achieve them with maximum efficiency. And the management techniques that have been developed in the space program are fast becoming useful tools in the entire American economic system.

This evening I wolud also like to mention some other aspects of space exploration which hold significance for our national progress and character.

There is an analogy between our national space program and our national history. The exciting adventures of the settlement of North America captured popular fancy. But it was the quiet development of the free spirit of Americans and the growth of our form of self-government that were to weigh heavier in the scales of history than Indian raids and campaigns of the colonial wars.

Another analogy closer to us has been the change in public attitudes that has led Americans to adopt new scientific ideas and concepts that may have been rejected only a few years ago.

Today we live in a period of unprecedented scientific and technological explosion. You—and you young men especially—are receptive to new ideas, new methods, new perspectives. To be visionary is no longer to be labeled

as impractical. It is increasingly evident that today's innovations and inventions require the kind of educated minds that can understand the workings of large interrelated groups of natural forces—minds grasping far more than the fundamental facts in a single field.

In the past, the situation was often quite different. Thomas Edison scoffed at the airplane, just after Kitty Hawk, when he said that it could never have any practical value and would, at best, be "nothing more than the toy of wealthy sportsmen."

Pioneers in the field of rocketry during the first half of this century encountered skepticism and indifference. Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the American father of this new science, obtained little support for his work, which was to prove that the rocket engine can deliver power efficiently in a vacuum.

Such attitudes have been altered by lessons learned during two world wars and in the competition with Communist science and technology. They have also yielded to repeated demonstrations that science has political, social, and international economic impact as well as military potency.

As paradoxical as it may seem, our space program may bring a new kind of stability to the shifting world of the future. This stability can come from international confidence that America will attain and use preeminence in space "for the benefit of all mankind" instead of for military or economic threats or aggression.

Already we are sharing experimental weather and communications satellites with many nations and have made the scientific and technical knowledge we have gained in space available to the world scientific community. Today, more than 70 nations are cooperating with us in scientific space projects, each paying the full cost of its own experiments.

The pace of space exploration is steadily increasing. Remember that while it took almost 50 years to move from the Wright brothers' primitive airplane to those that could fly faster than sound, little more than a decade was required to increase aircraft speeds from 70 miles per hour to more than 4,000 miles per hour. Meanwhile, manmade objects were hurled beyond the atmosphere into orbit around the earth at 17,000 miles per hour and today far out into the solar system at 25,000 miles per hour.

Along with public willingness to accept change, and recognition of science and technology as keystones of a new era of history, there has also come an awareness that the rate of progress which our Nation requires demands the marshaling of resources in large-scale efforts. The facilities, skills, resources, and funds needed are not within the capacity of any single firm or group of firms. The sole workable solution lies in coordinating the work of Federal agencies with that of industry, educational institutions, and public and private foundations.

From the new spirit of welcoming fresh ideas is coming another dividend that—although it cannot be measured in dollars and cents—is providing a creativeness of outlook which will inevitably reward us.

For instance, none of us here this evening has difficulty in understanding that we are aboard a manned, orbiting satellite—a very large satellite, spinning on its axis while, at the same time, moving through space at nearly 67,000 miles per hour.

This spacecraft called Earth, carrying some 4 billion human beings, is one of a family of 9 planets orbiting the Sun. Together with the Sun, they make up our solar system which is itself rushing, as a unit, through space. The solar system is orbiting the center of our 100-billion-sun Milky Way galaxy at the rate of 600,000 miles per hour. Our galaxy, one of a billion whirlpools of sun-stars in the universe, is also speeding through space—at some millions of miles per hour.

Such facts about our solar system and the universe of which it is part are not new discoveries. They were known to astronomers before the space age began. But now the power of the modern rocket has enabled man to send artificial satellites spiraling around the Earth beyond the atmosphere in order to gain knowledge that is new and often startling. Deep space probes, packed with sensitive instruments, are propelled millions of miles into the solar system to radio back to Earth heretofore unknown data.

That is how science is learning a host of new facts about the Earth, its immediate environment, and the apparently limitless expanse beyond. It has been discovered that intense activity goes on in space where nuclear bombardments from the Sun, radiation from sources deep in the cosmos, and magnetic and gravitational fields are interacting constantly. Not many years ago space was believed to be a featureless expanse of absolutely nothing, a vacuum penetrated only by sunlight and starlight and occasionally by a few meteors.

Our very first American Explorer I satellite, orbited January 31, 1958, detected the unsuspected Van Allen belt in which tides of radioactive particles are attracted by the Earth's gravity into a thick mantle about our planet. We build shielding into spacecraft that transport men and delicate equipment out into space. The Earth's magnetic field and atmosphere are built-in natural shielding against this deadly radiation. Otherwise, it would blast all life on Earth or would have prevented life, as we know it, from developing.

Signals from our tiny Vanguard I, another early satellite, disclosed that the Earth is not a perfect sphere but is slightly pearshaped, with a bulge at the equator.

Thus NASA's space science programs are not only laying the foundations for manned space flight and weather, communications, and other practical satellite systems under development but are also extending the entire spectrum of activities open to the human mind.

Increasing the outward reach and scope of men's understanding so quickly will have tremendous effects on education, on human aspirations, and on the intellectual progress of all men.

Space exploration is raising mankind's vision. It is stimulating and releasing creative energy in many vital areas of human endeavor, much as the Renaissance swept open the horizons of Western man and set off an intellectual ferment that led on to the scientific and technological revolution the world is experiencing today.

Until 1957 it had occurred to few people that man could go beyond the atmosphere of the Earth. It was widely believed that space would forever confine man to the planet of his origin. But during the past few years we have learned that the space barrier can be crossed, as Columbus and Magellan sailed over oceans believed to be impassable.

From our space successes men everywhere can draw courage to attack other so-called impossible problems. If man is ingenious enough to go to the Moon, he may be inspired to find the way to lasting world peace and the means to eliminate disease, hunger, poverty, and ignorance.

Turning again to manned space flight, we have successfully completed Project Mercury. This program carried Americans into the shallows of space. It was a beginning.

As I have indicated, Projects Gemini, and Apollo, the successors to Project Mercury, are well underway.

In Project Gemini, our astronauts will stay in space for 2 weeks or more. They will practice rendezvous maneuvers; that is, bringing two space vehicles together in space and then docking or linking them together.

The first manned Gemini spacecraft, with two astronauts aboard, will be orbited by a Titan II booster in early 1965. On later flights, the Gemini astronauts will join their craft in space with an unmanned Agena rocket, launched by an Atlas booster. They may also go outside the Gemini spacecraft to learn how pilots can manually aid in docking vehicles.

Gemini's 2-week stay in space and the drill it will provide in rendezvous and docking techniques are essential first steps for both military and civilian manned space missions. Gemini astronauts are scheduled to clock some 5,000 man-hours of flight time.

Project Apollo will follow Gemini. It will serve as the focal activity for achieving the national goal of pre-eminence in manned space flight by 1970. The Apollo spacecraft will be able to stay for 3 weeks or more in Earth orbit and will take three astronauts on the round-trip lunar exploration voyage.

If in our minds we reduce the quarter of a million miles between the Earth and the Moon to half a mile, then men have gone 1 foot into space. On this scale, it is still a hundred miles to Mars. Remember, though, that progress in manned flight will not be arithmetical but will be geometrical. In other words, the technology developed in near-Earth flights within the next few years will enable us to make a great outward leap in manned space flight and land explorers on the Moon.

In manned flight and other main areas of space activities, the United States is determined not to lose the momentum it has built up. Space symbolizes and spearheads major developments in the science and technology which have become a part of the substance of our times. The danger of falling behind should be apparent to all thoughtful Americans.

I am confident we shall press on to master every important phase of space exploration, in the sure knowledge that, as Dr. J. Allen Hynek of the Dearborn Observatory has said, "In the last analysis, the mind which encompasses the universe is more marvelous than the universe which encompasses the mind."

Hospitalization Care of the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I see on today's UPI news ticker that the American Medical Association is calling its house of delegates together to approve a new alternative plan to medicare. Much as many of us know and respect members of the medical profession, I must say I anticipate that any such action by the American Medical Association is going to be a case of too little or too late. Only a few days ago, we read that the American Medical Association would not compromise; it was against any plan. Now, I gather there has been a change of mind. All of this gives the public more of the same old negative, regressive image that unfortunately has become associated with membership in the great medical profession.

Let us face it, Mr. Speaker; the doctors have been fearful—and rightly so—of steps that would eventually lead to government medicine. There are so-called liberal organizations, like the Americans For Democratic Action, that honestly be-

lieve—I am sure—that socialization of the medical profession would benefit suffering humanity. However, I think the American people and most Members of Congress want free choice of hospital and doctor. At the same time, a great many persons, recognizing the need of a plan to underwrite the high cost of multiservice health and medical needs of older citizens, favor a nationwide program along the lines of medicare. They feel the need and importance of the program transcends any danger of socialization.

Like other Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, I admire and respect the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means—our colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. We know how conscientiously he has guarded the financial health of the social security system. In this connection, after I read last fall that Chairman MILLS had said he would support a payroll tax to finance health benefits for the aged, I immediately wrote him a letter saying I was anxious to learn the details of his proposal—that I wanted and was seeking a plan that was fiscally sound and would provide protection for the elderly, with guarantees against unwarranted medical control in the lives of private citizens, because I think it could be provided by permitting an individual the choice of cash benefits or medical care.

Mr. Speaker, I go along with our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], when he suggests a payroll tax calculated separately from old age, survivors, and disability insurance. Also, I reserve the right to support any other suggestion which may be made by the American Medical Association to improve existing proposals. But, meanwhile, I want to make my position clear; namely, that I believe there is a real need for such legislation. The time has come, it seems to me, to act, and with an open mind I intend to examine the administration's proposal and others similar to the suggestions of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. As I understand, one of these latter suggestions would be to gear Government health-care benefits to the income levels of recipients, which makes sense to me, because the wealthy can afford hospital care where the modest-income person cannot.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I intend to testify in person when committee hearings are held, because I want the record of medicare hearings to show that in States like my own State of Washington, the Kerr-Mills Act has not filled the need.

Eastern Connecticut Invites Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that eastern Connecticut is becoming a major area of industrial growth and expansion. The process of such growth has increased considerably over the past few years. By way of proof, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD a very fine article by Charles La Freniere, which appeared in the December 31, 1964, issue of the Hartford Times, entitled "Immigrating Industry Polishes Economy Lamp for 10-Town Area."

In this article Mr. La Freniere briefly reviews the industrial growth of the area during the year 1964, listing some of the major industries that have been established in eastern Connecticut over the past year. He reaches the conclusion that "1965 should be one of the most prosperous years this region has experienced in some time." There is an abundance of space in the area, skilled labor, excellent transportation, plenty of natural resources, and good markets. I invite business executives, industrialists, manufacturers and others to look into the possibility of locating their industrial establishments or branches in eastern Connecticut.

The article by Mr. La Freniere reads as follows:

IMMIGRATING INDUSTRY POLISHES ECONOMY LAMP FOR 10-TOWN AREA

(By Charles La Freniere)

DANIELSON—A review of the economic picture of the 10-town northeastern Connecticut region shows two bright spots that developed during 1964.

First, unemployment in the region which was classified as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment dropped so that the area was declassified.

Secondly, several new industries began operations in the 10-town area and others already there embarked on or announced plans for expanding production facilities.

Some of the expansion plans will result in additional employment opportunities and thus a further decrease in the rolls of the unemployed.

Figures compiled by John J. Morrison, manager of the Danielson office of the Connecticut State Employment Service, indicate that nonagricultural employment climbed from 14,400 in the first quarter of 1964 to 15,030 in the third quarter of the year.

Mr. Morrison points out that while fourth quarter figures will not be available until mid-January, "they are not expected to change substantially from the previous quarter."

Unemployment in January equaled 8.2 percent of the area's work force. By June the figure was down to 5.6 and after hitting a low point of 4.7 in September, it climbed slightly to an even 5 percent in November.

NO LONGER SUBSTANTIAL

It was in September that the Labor Department in Washington removed the area from the classification "substantial and persistent unemployment."

Hardly a month passed during the year without the economic picture getting brighter.

During the first quarter, Moore-Kirk Laboratories, manufacturers of pharmaceuticals, began operations in a former textile plant in East Woodstock after moving there from Worcester, Mass.

Also during that quarter, Johnson Corrugated Products, producers of corrugated boxes, moved into the firm's new plant in Thompson. The concern's production facilities were formerly in Webster, Mass.

During the second quarter the Two Rivers Dyeing Corp., of New Jersey, took over the former Danielson Finishing Co. plant and began setting up production facilities.

PUTNAM CENTER

Ground for the recently opened shopping center in Putnam's redevelopment area was broken and the Pall Co., of Glen Cove, Long Island, purchased the former Hindle Transformer plant in Putnam. The firm is now producing pumps and filters.

Two other major happenings took place during the second quarter. One was the ground breaking for the $5 million expansion program at the Knox Glass plant in Dayville. The second was the dedication of a new addition to the Rogers Corp. plant in Rogers which is being used for the production of Mektron printed circuits.

Gov. John Dempsey presided at both these events as he did at the ground breaking and opening of the Putnam Shopping Center.

In the third quarter which saw nonagricultural employment climb over the 15,000 mark for the first time, the Hartford National Bank & Trust Co. initiated a merger with the Cargill Trust Co. giving the Hartford banking institution its first branch in northeastern Connecticut.

Another Putnam Bank, the Citizens National, began construction of a new building in the redevelopment area.

PLASTICS FIRM

The economy got a further boost during the third quarter when Pervel Industries (formerly plastic film) announced a $3 million expansion program involving construction of two new buildings at the firm's Plainfield plant. The new buildings will add 100,000 square feet of manufacturing space.

The construction contract for the project went to the Norwich firm of Alexander Schnip & Sons.

Also during this quarter, Hale Manufacturing Co. began construction of a new warehouse facility at its Ballouville facility.

As the fourth quarter opened, Acme Cotton Products Co., Inc. of East Killingly announced plans for construction of a two-story building adjacent to the present plant. The new construction adds 20,000 square feet to the company's present facilities.

Later in the quarter, ground was broken for a 75,000-square-foot building in Putnam which will house the Lamphere Sail Co., a new firm moving here from the New York area.

LABOR SHORTAGE

One of the difficulties that industry and business in the region will have to face as the economy expands will be a shortage of labor. Several hundred new job opportunities are expected to open up during the coming year and many of them will require skilled labor.

This, in turn, is expected to result in an influx of new residents whose earnings will contribute even more to the growing economy.

The consensus is that 1965 should be one of the most prosperous years this region has experienced in some time.

Where There's a Will, There's a Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, 1964, it was my pleasure to participate in the dedication of a community water system at Destin, Fla. It was built with the cooperation and assistance of the Farmers Home Administration which has done so much for rural America. On that day a very fine message was delivered by Hon. Howard

Bertsch, Administrator of that fine organization. I am very pleased to submit this speech for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The speech follows:

WHERE THERE'S A WILL, THERE'S A WAY

(Speech given by Howard Bertsch, Administrator, Farmers Home Administration, at dedication of Destin Water System, Destin, Fla., October 23, 1964.)

I have a simple remedy I am going to offer to all those who are frustrated by the complexities of modern-day living, to all those who see only the gloomy side of life and who find their solace in dreaming of days gone by.

I say to these people visit the community of Destin on the strip of sunshine and salt air between Choctawhatchee Bay and the Gulf of Mexico in Okaloosa County, Fla.

This is a bit of the America of tomorrow.

Progress is in the air. You can feel it.

Here is a community that when it needs a community center, builds it.

Here is a community that when it needs an airport, builds it.

Here is a community that when it needs a water system, builds it.

A community that knows how to take the initiative, marshal the resources that it has available, couple these resources with those provided by its government, and move ahead.

Gone are the days when Destin housewives struggle with unfit and inadequate water supplies. Gone are the red strained pots and pans.

Gone are the days when water was haulted and water was rationed.

Now water will be your servant, good water, as much as you want, at the turn of a tap.

Ahead lies better fire protection, lower insurance rates, higher land values.

Who knows but what some light industry of the type that has sprung up around Fort Walton will pick Destin for a construction site.

And for sure the thousands of tourists that pour into this area from Alabama, Tennessee, and the Mid-West will come in larger numbers and stay longer, build more vacation homes, provide customers for more motels, restaurants, and fishing boats.

Destin now has a basic community service to offer all those who seek to patronize this nationally known center for sportsmen who seek the sail fish and the red snapper.

I understand that the Destin water system will serve not only the homes that line your attractive streets, but the business enterprises, the motels, the churches, and the school. Some 2,400 people will benefit at the outset. Five years from now who knows what the number will be. Destin is ready. Destin is moving ahead.

Credit for this kind of progress belongs to many.

Let me mention a few who have spent long hours around conference tables to make the new water system possible.

Edward F. Pearce, president of Destin Water Users, Inc., Jack T. Owens, vice president, John R. Cox, secretary-treasurer, all deserve special mention.

As do Paul Burnett and W. L. Marler, board members.

All of these local leaders I have been told have given freely of their time.

Irwin Fleet, in his capacity as attorney for the corporation has also given the community invaluable service.

For our part, in the Farmers Home Administration, we take a great deal of pleasure in being able to work with men like the men that constitute the leadership of Destin.

I know I can speak for the chairman of our county committee, Grady G. Baggett; our county supervisor, Jack Drasko; our Florida State director, William T. Shaddick, and all the other members of our organization, when I say that nothing gives a greater pleasure than being able to provide service to forward-looking members of a small community.

I am delighted that Congressman BOB SIKES is here today.

He has had a hand in this enterprise too. Without men like BOB SIKES, in Washington, men responsive to the needs of the people, the voice of the people would not be heard, and laws that make such facilities as community water systems possible, would not be on the books.

BOB SIKES is also responsible in a large measure for the existence of our rural housing program, our rural renewal program, and the support we are able to give the family farmers.

Congressman SIKES will be glad to know that the dynamic force of community leadership so visable here today in Destin is also at work in surrounding communities.

I checked the records before I left Washington and found that local leaders with our help are developing or have already completed rural water systems in the communities of Gonzalez and Walnut Hill in Escambia County, at Pace in Santa Rosa County, at Esto in Holmes County and across the Alabama State line at Grand Bay in Mobile County, and Spanish Fort and Stapleton in Baldwin County. All told these 7 systems are using $1.7 million to develop systems that will serve 10,000 people.

The spirit of Destin spreads throughout the land.

We take some pride in being part of an administration that responds when people, like the people of Destin, make known their needs.

The leadership in Washington is concerned with the welfare of people. Led by President Johnson it chooses to follow the path of foresightedness, of creativity.

This administration in response to the wishes of the people passed a tax reduction bill to provide the necessary stimulus to continuing prosperity.

This administration brought forth new programs to break the vicious cycle of poverty which still ensnarls too many of our people.

This administration developed and improved farm loan, rural electrification and telephone, agriculture export, food for peace, school lunch, agriculture price and income protection and other programs to preserve and strengthen the family farm and help family farmers cope with the revolution in farm technology.

This administration sponsored area development programs to help rural communities grow as strong, viable contributors to our Nation's progress.

This administration firmly opposed the view held by many that the family farm and rural communities of which they are a part should be allowed to die gracefully.

I could go on and list many other accomplishments—progress in preserving natural resources, strengthening public power and public works, foreign aid, national defense.

The list is long, the record impressive. And best of all, the direction is forward looking and rural oriented.

We believe that rural America faces a great future.

This administration favors strengthening and encouraging and insuring the survival of the family farm and the rural communities of which they are a part.

There are those who hold a different point of view, those who would discontinue programs that bring comfort and hope to farmers and rural families.

Fortunately the will of the people prevails.

Let me give you an example.

Take the rural housing loan program administered by the Farmers Home Administration. Initiated and developed in 1949 by the Democratic leadership in the Congress, the program made available to farmers for the first time long-term reasonable-interest loans to finance better housing and farm improvements. Designed so as not to compete but rather to supplement credit available from private lenders, this worthwhile new program filled a housing financing gap too long existing in rural America. The promise of a better home brought new hope to families living in termite-ridden shacks and dilipidated houses.

Negative thinkers tried to stymie the bill, firmly convinced that the Government of the people should have no part in seeking to help the people regardless of how bad conditions might be.

But the voice of the people was heard and the bill was passed.

Today, after 15 years and major improvements in 1961 and 1962, the housing loan program as administered by the Farmers Home Administration, contains all the necessary tools to bring better housing to all people in rural areas who are unable to finance good housing through other means.

Farm families, other rural families, senior citizens, farm laborers, all can now have a decent place to live. And rural communities sparkle with these new homes.

Since the program was started more than 91,000 families have borrowed some $737,500,000 in housing funds from the Farmers Home Administration. Their repayments on loans are far ahead of schedule. Losses amount to less than two one-hundredths of 1 percent of the principal advanced.

What a record.

And best of all, the success of this program has served as a guiding light to other lenders. Many are now financing rural housing improvements for the first time.

The issue is just as clear and dramatic regarding another measure that means so much to rural communities—the rural community water system program of the Farmers Home Administration—the program that has been used to such good advantage by Destin.

Negative thinking kept this program under wraps during the fifties.

Last year we advanced $34 million to finance water systems throughout the country.

And this is only the beginning.

We estimate that during the coming year the Farmers Home Administration will advance $65 million for water loans, up 91 percent over last year. This program must move forward. Despite the progress made so far some 15,000 rural communities still lack decent, safe, and adequate water systems. Families in these communities still have to haul water, use impure water, ration water and, yes, even do without water.

Some 1,197,000 man-days of employment have been or will be provided through the construction of water systems financed since 1961. And when all are in operation, these systems will supply 264 million gallons of water a month, providing fire protection, enabling schools to remain open, attracting new businesses and new industries to rural areas.

The positive approach, the forward-looking approach must and will prevail.

There is a great day dawning.

Destin is a signboard pointing the pathway to the future.

The drive, the ingenuity, the independence, the ability that rural people possess to capitalize upon the tools that the people working through their Government have made available has been demonstrated nowhere more vividly than here in the community of Destin.

You have shown the way. Others have joined with you.

We have a great world to live in, we are beginning to realize how much we can attain if we but work, and will to do so.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held Tuesday, January 12, at noon.

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations: Committee on Armed Services and Defense Subcommittee of Committee on Appropriations met jointly in executive session to receive testimony from John A. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 99 public bills, H.R. 2168–2266; 94 private bills, H.R. 2267–2360; and 27 resolutions, H.J. Res. 163–178, H. Con. Res. 86–91, and H. Res. 96–100, were introduced. Pages 473, 494–498

Minority Employees: Adopted H. Res. 96, providing for the selection of, and fixing the salaries of, the following minority employees: Harry L. Brookshire, William B. Pendergast, William R. Bonsell, Tommy Lee Winebrenner, and Walter Patrick Kennedy. Page 473

Program for Tuesday: Adjourned at 12:45 p.m. until Tuesday, January 12, at 12 o'clock noon.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 12

(*All meetings are open unless otherwise designated*)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, open followed by executive, on the nomination of John T. Connor, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Commerce, 10 a.m., 5110 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Relations, executive, on committee business, and to hear Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Thomas Mann, 10 a.m., room S–116, Capitol.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on the nomination of John A. Carver, Jr., of Idaho, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, 10 a.m., 3110 New Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Foreign Affairs, executive, briefing with Llewellyn E. Thompson, U.S. Ambassador at Large, State Department, 10 a.m., H–322 U.S. Capitol Building.

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶ The Congressional Record will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $1.50 per month, payable in advance. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402. For subscription purposes, 20 daily issues constitute a month. The charge for individual copies varies in proportion to the size of the issue. ¶ Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and is sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶ With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

Appendix

Little Rock Women's Panel Wages War on Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, some time ago a group of dedicated housewives in Little Rock, Ark., decided to do something about improving the climate for living in their community and their State. An article in the December 27 issue of the Arkansas Gazette describes their unusual approach and the results they have achieved.

I think that Members of the Senate and other readers of the RECORD will be interested in this story, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE ROCK WOMEN'S PANEL WAGES WAR ON PREJUDICE

(By Matilda Tuohey)

Much has been written and said in the abstract about America's pluralistic—or diverse—society. But it is not often, especially in a State that brags to out-of-State industrialists about the superiority of its white native-born labor force, that one is made deliberately aware of it.

There's no avoiding the consciousness of this pluralism, though, when you're at a table seated side by side with a member of the dominant culture, a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant (or WASP as the ethnic experts call it) an oriental, a Jew, a Catholic, and a Negro.

It is not, however, as members of a race or religion that these people who deliberately go into such a project wish to be visualized. They wish to be seen—and this is the reason they are together—as citizens of the United States or, as they call themselves, a panel of Americans.

Twenty-two Little Rock women, more socially (in the broad sense of the word) scrupulous than most, share appearances on this panel, 6 each time with the moderator, and in the last 14 or so months they have spoken to 120 groups and before an estimated 28,00 persons.

Each time, the "WASP," the Negro, the Catholic and the Jew tell of their personal experiences with prejudice, they do it with deep feeling, yet balanced with a saving sense of humor, all with the hope that this mental cleansing of themselves will touch the responsive cord of understanding of someone in the audience.

They make no pretense of being sociological or psychological experts and the jargon the professional in social problems is not theirs. They are housewives and that is how they are introduced (although this pat introduction is inopportune when the nun who has joined the panel appears). They are women who are concerned about intolerance and misunderstanding and who are doing what they can to spare their children, and the children of others, the hurts they have felt.

Oddly, the main point of the panel sometimes is missed. The Catholic member is told by a man who has just heard her talk that "It's all right to be Catholic because my secretary is one and is a very nice woman." The Japanese hears from persons who worked in relocation camps during World War II that they "learned to love the Japanese there." The Negro hears from the woman who "just loves her maid and we have lunch together in the kitchen."

It is these "some of my best friends are Negroes—Jews—Catholics" attitudes that the panel members want to dispel but these statements, though patronizing, are accepted graciously because they are generally well meant and, the members feel, a step closer to their goal of understanding.

The idea for the panel was brought back to Little Rock by Mrs. Patrick C. Murphy, the wife of a lawyer at a meeting of the National Committee for the Support of Public Schools where she had asked the president of the Kansas City School Board what had been done in his city to promote better relationships between races and religions. The best thing, he told her, was a volunteer group of women who had been able to reach untouched groups. Through him Mrs. Murphy reached Mrs. Paul Brown who started the Kansas City panel, now in its ninth year, and others in six or seven cities.

Mrs. Murphy collected some others she thought might be interested in hearing Mrs. Brown. They liked the idea and then came the task of finding fitting panelists. There was not too much difficulty with the white Protestants and the Catholics, considerably more with the Negroes and even more still with orientals, an uncommon sight in a State in which many were relocated in a camp during the Second World War.

Mrs. Murphy first recruited Mrs. Negail Riley, the wife of a minister, and through her, found other members of the Philander Smith College faculty as the Negro members. She found one oriental by trailing a child, apparently of oriental descent, out of a beauty shop and into a nearby washateria where her mother was deep in the family wash.

There were speeches written, revised, revised again, consultations with each other, a brushing up on creeds, a public address system purchased by cooperative husbands, a trial run before some ministers and finally a premiere at the Westover Hills Presbyterian Church.

Since then, the panel has appeared before many church groups, PTAs, colleges, civic clubs, summer camps, youth fellowships and even a few conventions. It has had 24 out-of-town appearances and 4 out-of-State ones. It will have 50 to 60 engagements next spring.

A similar panel has been formed in Fort Smith and inquiries have come from other Arkansas cities.

The panel has yet to appear before a thoroughly hostile audience although it braved one appearance in a Little Rock area where they definitely thought they, or certainly the ideas, they brought with them, would be unwelcome.

Insults and hostile questions usually come from only one or two persons in an audience and generally the reaction from other listeners is a defense of the panel. They got some of their most antagonistic questions recently when they did their show on television and the questions were protected by the anonymity of the telephone. They received some racist literature after an appearance in Pine Bluff but the incidents have been few.

"One reason we're accepted so well is because we aren't asking anyone to do anything. We're just telling them how we, as mothers and housewives, feel about barriers which keep us apart," Mrs. Murphy said.

The program follows a set pattern, a moderator who gives a brief introduction and then short talks by the women followed by an invitation for questions from the audience.

At a recent session before a group of mostly middle-aged professional men. Mrs. Murphy introduced the theme—"women who are amateurs in the field of human relations selected because they are typical Americans."

A petite, animated blond came first. She was the Jew—Barbara Phillips (Mrs. Dan) whose husband is executive vice president of M. M. Cohn Co.

She grew up, she said, in a home "filled with love and centered in trust" and her first blow came when she received a bid from the best sorority in her high school and then found she would not be accepted because she was a Jew. Her mother had to tell her that prejudice against the Jew was a fact of life and then she began to wonder how an Italo-American might feel when he saw "wop salad" on the menu.

Carol Taylor has a delicate face that certainly would have inspired innumerable haikai had her grandparents chosen to remain in Japan, but as a third-generation American she admitted she does not have the proverbial Japanese traits—neatness and a green thumb.

She is able to smile about a national magazine article written after the attack on Pearl Harbor and called "How to Tell Your Chinese Friends from the Japanese" but the smile faded when she told about her family in the wartime hysteria—her father destroying a valuable library because of rumors that anyone with Japanese books was suspect and her family torn from San Francisco, her own immediate one sent to a relocation camp in Wyoming.

The relocation camps were a shame to America, she said, and unreconcilable with the ideals of democracy that are taught in American schools.

Mrs. Jon Griffin, the widow of an Air Force officer, mother of five children and, of course, she laughed, the Catholic, projected a serenity as she said that her "faith teaches that all men are brothers and it is up to me to see that they are treated as such."

She told of trying to explain Catholic customs and traditions—the sign of the cross, meatless Fridays—to non-Catholic children visiting in her home and how she had to combat indications of a growing intolerance in one of her children toward one of her Baptist friends. She explained to the child that her friend "chose to worship God in another church."

Faustenia Bomar (Mrs. Howard) was the Negro member, a poised woman under what at times must be difficult circumstances. In the small town where she was born, she said, she walked 3 miles to elementary school. The family had to move to Little Rock for

further education, her mother going to high school while she and her brother were in junior high.

Determined to go to college, she worked for 2 years as a domestic at $1 a day, saved for 2 years, accumulated $15, lived in a small rented room eating cornbread and molasses with her mother, and then with a degree in hand found she could only get a menial job. In her first white collar job she was passed by in pay raises and promotions and "I knew that regardless of sacrifice here again was the dreary cycle of discrimination."

Mrs. Bomar now has a master's degree, has worked on a doctorate and is a registrar at Philander Smith. Her husband is a chemical firm salesman.

One has an odd sympathy for Jean Gordon (Mrs. Frank), whose husband is vice president of the First Pyramid Life Insurance Co. After all, she is the "WASP" and the closest experience she had to personal intolerance, and prejudice was a bit of snobbery from an easterner. Yet, one has admiration for her nerve in bucking the usually accepted mores of her class.

"God does not love only WASP's," she said. So she looks for ways through her church, civic, and social groups to promote understanding, to see that there is no hint of anti-Semitism or anti-Catholicism in Sunday school literature, for example, and to have "my children wish for others the same privileges they enjoy."

Other members of the group are Mrs. Cal Ledbetter, Jr., wife of a college professor; Mrs. Warren Bass, wife of an accountant, and Mrs. J. W. Littleton, wife of a civil engineer, moderators and WASP's; Mrs. Jim Gallman, wife of a lawyer; Mrs. Larry Obsitnik, wife of a Gazette news photographer; Mrs. John R. Snider, wife of a contractor; Mrs. W. T. Gilmore, Jr., wife of a businessman, and Sister Thomas deSales, administrator of St. Vincent Infirmary, Catholics; Mrs. Alvin L. Terry, wife of a postal supervisor, and Mrs. Jim Cone, wife of a college professor, Negro; Mrs. Raymond Jang, wife of a research pharmacist, Oriental; Mrs. Louis Snyderman, wife of a businessman, and Mrs. Joe Kaufman, wife of a contractor, Jewish; Mrs. Frank Lambright, wife of an insurance man, and Mrs. Robert Chowning, wife of a lawyer, WASP.

After each appearance, the women get together for coffee and a critique of themselves. Mrs. Murphy, Mrs. Phillips, Mrs. Bomar, Mrs. Griffin, Mrs. Taylor, and Mrs. Gordon were somewhat dissatisfied with their appearance at one meeting, but put the blame on themselves.

The self-examination went on, a continuing brushing and polishing to clarify their feelings and thoughts to put across their purpose. If nothing else has been accomplished, and it has, at least they have gotten to know one another.

In addition to this self-satisfaction and the knowledge that they are trying their best in a difficult field that has stumped the experts, there are such consolations as this note from a PTA member:

"I want to thank each of you for giving so much of your time and yourselves in a way that represents all of us who care and desire better understanding, love, and respect among all our people."

Federal Truck Taxes—They're High Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following remarks made at the annual meeting of the board of directors, American Trucking Associations, on October 29, 1964, by Mr. William A. Bresnahan, managing director, entitled "Federal Truck Taxes—They're High Enough":

FEDERAL TRUCK TAXES

The halfway point has now been reached in construction of the great 41,000-mile interstate and defense superhighway system.

As of last June 30, almost 17,000 miles were open to traffic and another 6,100 miles were in an advanced stage of construction. Work had begun on an additional 12,000 miles—leaving about 6,000 miles yet to be started.

This trucking industry has reason to be proud of the role it played in the launching of this massive road program, which we recognized as vital to the economic growth and military posture of the entire Nation.

Our support of this program entailed acceptance of a pay-before-you-go-plan which involved imposition of stiff special Federal truck taxes on top of all the other Federal, State, and local levies a trucking company must bear.

We bargained in 1956 for a 41,000-mile interstate and defense system to cost a total of $27 billion—all to come from special taxes on road users.

By 1961 the cost figure had jumped to $41 billion and we were called upon to take additional substantial tax increases, and we did.

Today, trucks of all types are paying 38.6 percent of all the special road taxes going into the Federal highway trust fund.

The larger trucks are bearing a particularly heavy burden. For a typical 5-axle tractor-trailer unit the Federal road tax alone amounts to an average of $1,308 a year.

When you add the average annual State road tax of $2,090 paid by the same unit, the total is $3,398 in fuel taxes and other special levies just for use of the roads.

NO REASON FOR INCREASE

This special tax burden already has had a serious impact on the cost-competitive position of the trucking industry, and now we hear rumblings around Washington of further increases in the Federal road taxes.

I submit that the time has come to take a strong stand and vigorously oppose any further increases.

The order of the day is tax reduction, and there is no valid reason why there should be any serious consideration given to suggestions that the trucking industry be singled out for increases.

Some of the speculation about a possible increase in Federal road taxes is founded upon an expectation that next year there will be another upward revision in the estimated final cost of completing the interstate highway system.

We won't know the detailed picture until it is laid before Congress early in the next session, but its outlines can be pretty well pieced together now.

One factor in the rising cost is the new requirement that the roads be built not just for 1975 traffic, as originally planned, but for traffic 20 years after completion. In addition, many urban sections of the system which were curtailed in 1959 now have been reinstated. Combined, these two factors are expected to add $1.2 billion to the final cost.

Another factor is an estimated 6 percent rise in the basic construction cost index which would add another $1 billion to the tab.

Finally, the Bureau of Public Roads, for reasons of safety and better design, is recommending that all sections of the interstate system be at least four-lane divided highways. Some sections, under the old cost estimate, were planned as two-lane roads. Conversion of these sections to four-lane roads would add another $800 million.

In the aggregate, these several factors would add a total of $3 billion to the ultimate cost of the program.

TAX YIELD IS GROWING

On the other hand, there is sound reason to believe that the ultimate total of tax receipts for the highway trust fund also will increase.

Current receipts are running ahead of estimates. If the extent to which collections have exceeded estimates for 1964 were to continue for the life of the program, the trust fund would receive $1.5 billion more than anticipated.

Assuming, however, that tax receipts will exceed estimates by only $1 billion—and this is generally conceded to be a realistic assumption—the projected deficit would be reduced from $3 to $2 billion.

Such a deficit, or even more, can be easily handled without another round of oppressive tax increases.

Although the States are optimistic about completing the interstate system on schedule by 1972, many of them actually are running behind and sources close to the program are confident that it will be 1973 before the program is finished.

EXTENSION WOULD SOLVE DEFICIT

If the highway trust fund tax program simply were continued through the complete fiscal year of 1973, and not terminated in October of 1972, as currently provided by law, an additional $3 billion in highway taxes would be collected. This would be more than adequate to cover any deficit that might be indicated by the new cost estimates.

Meanwhile, there have been a rash of proposals to add new mileage to the system. It is estimated that the Bureau of Public Roads has a backlog of proposed additions to the system which would total another 10,000 miles.

Undoubtedly, many of these proposed additions have merit and, in time perhaps, they can be achieved. However, any further additions to the Interstate System should not be made until the present program is fully completed.

I have never talked to a single person, in or out of Government, who has the slightest idea that the Federal road building program and the Federal road taxes will come to an abrubt half when the present Interstate System is completed. Almost everyone concerned is proceeding on the assumption that both will continue.

It makes no sense, then, to assume that either the present system or the proposed additions must be completed by some arbitrary date. Only so much roadbuilding, and only so much road taxation can be reasonably crammed within a specified period of time. We already are concentrating within a 16-year period a backbreaking tax program for a huge network to serve generations not yet born.

We must make it clear, here and now, that we have reached the end of the rope. We can't stand any more taxes.

TAXES AT BREAKING POINT

There is a point of diminishing return. That we had passed that point with respect to income taxation is now being clearly demonstrated by results of the tax-cut program recently adopted, and now there is talk of additional reductions in the area of general taxes.

The same law of diminishing return operates with equal inevitability in the field of special taxation. We have reached the breaking point in special road taxation, and any further increases not only could badly cripple the trucking industry, but easily could result in less rather than more tax revenues for the highway trust fund.

We applaud the vision and enthusiasm of those who planned and are carrying out the present highway program, and we have no quarrel with them for thinking in terms of an even bigger and better program.

At the same time, they must not completely lose sight of basic economic facts. We can only run so far so fast and, from a road tax standpoint, the trucking industry already is gasping for air.

We must disagree vigorously with those who are sugegsting that a liberalization of the Federal limits on motor vehicle sizes and weights might justify increasing Federal truck taxes.

This is another one of those suggestions which has the superficial ring of logic, but won't stand up under examination.

In the first place, the new size and weight limits which have been proposed by the Department of Commerce are completely in line with the structural and geometric capabilities of the highway system as it is being built, and for which we already are paying.

For example, the Department of Commerce report recommends a width limit of 102 inches. As long ago as 1946, the American Association of State Highway Officials recognized a width of 102 inches as proper and desirable for roads having 12-foot lanes, and 12 feet is the minimum lane width on the Interstate System.

PROPOSALS VERY CONSERVATIVE

The new gross weights recommended in the report are very conservative in terms of the true load carrying capabilities of the bridges being constructed on the Interstate System.

With respect to single axle weight, the report recommends an increase from 18,000 to 20,000 pounds. This is still below the single axle limits already permitted in 18 States which already had such higher limits on the grandfather date of the 1956 Highway Act.

A similar situation prevails with respect to tandem axles. The report proposes an increase from 32,000 pounds to a modest 34,000 pounds. Twenty States already allow tandem axle weights in excess of 34,000 pounds.

LUDICROUS INJUSTICES FORESEEN

A tax increase founded upon approval of the proposed weights and sizes not only would constitute double payment for capacities already being built into the system, but such a tax increase also would bring about ludicrous injustices.

Are we going to increase the taxes on trucks operating in States already permitting weights greater than those recommended in the report?

Or to turn it around, are we going to make special additions in the case of trucks in those States where the limits have been frozen since 1956—tax increases for slightly improved levels which still would be below the levels which have been permitted right along in many other States?

It doesn't make any sense. It makes even less sense when you remember that there is nothing permissive about the Federal limits.

In other words, even if the Federal statute is liberalized, truck operators actually can obtain such improvements only in the State legislatures. In a sense, then, the tax advocates are suggesting a special tax penalty merely for the opportunity to appeal to the States, with no assurance at all that such appeals will be fruitful.

WOULDN'T ADD TO COSTS

There can be no valid claim that proposed increases in the Federal size and weight limits would add to the initial construction cost of the roads and bridges on the new road system.

The construction standards were established long ago. They are fully adequate to handle proposed weight increases and, in fact, are handling weights now, in a third of the States, which exceed the proposed increases.

I have heard it suggested that the increased weights might increase the cost of maintaining the roads, and that this would be a justification for tax increases.

Well, unless the law was changed while we weren't looking, responsibility for maintaining the roads will rest entirely with the States, not the Federal Government.

STATES WOULD RAISE TAXES

And unless the States have undergone a complete change while we weren't looking, the States will be sure to tax us to recover any increased maintenance costs they might have to bear as a result of higher weights. The States were pastmasters of the tender art of truck taxation long before the Federal Government even dreamed of the Interstate Highway System.

Suppose we assume, without granting, that the proposed weight increases actually would make a measurable difference in maintenance cost. The dullest kid in a junior high school logic class wouldn't suggest that we should pay increased taxes to the States, for maintaining the roads and, at the same time, pay increased taxes to the Federal Government for not maintaining the roads.

The validity of this point was conceded by a Government official in a recent discussion.

"However," he said, "suppose the law is changed and the Federal Government takes over responsibility for the cost of maintaining the interstate system?" He added, with a twinkle: "There's been some little talk of that, you know."

I countered with a suppose of my own: "OK, suppose the Federal Government takes over maintenance costs, increases truck taxes on that ground, and then a State refuses to amend its law to permit increased weights. Then we'd be paying the Federal Government for something denied us by the State."

"True," he admitted, "but suppose the law also were changed so that the increased Federal weight limits were mandatory as well as permissive—so that the States had to allow them?"

In other words, there might be a modicum of merit in a weight-related tax increase if the weight limits in the Federal law are increased, and if the Federal Government forces the States to permit such increased weights, and if the Federal Government assumes the cost of maintenance. Until such time as these unlikely ifs become reality, there is no merit at all in current tax suggestions.

The 24th National Bellamy Award Flag to Wausau, Wis., High School—Statement by James Blakely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on October 9, 1964, the 24th National Bellamy Award flag was presented to the Wausau Senior High School of Wausau, Wis.

The Topeka High School of Topeka, Kans., was the 20th annual winner of the National Bellamy Award. Jim Blakely, of the Topeka High School, represented the Topeka High School at the ceremony at Wausau, Wis.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement he made on that occasion be made a part of these remarks and be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. BLAKELY

Located in Topeka, the capital of Kansas, the breadbasket of the Nation, Topeka High School lacks just 5 years of being 100 years old. Influential and highly respected through nine decades, it has been joined by two other high schools as our city has expanded.

In 1961, the year of the Kansas centennial when Topeka High School became the 20th Bellamy Award school, the late President Kennedy presented our own Mrs. Marjorie French with the National Teacher of the Year Award, and Mrs. William J. Greer, a member of the Bellamy Advisory Board, was recognized by the Wall Street Journal as Journalism Teacher of the Year. Our flagpole is the foreyard arm of the SS *Constitution, "Old Ironsides,"* brought to Topeka in 1932 through the efforts of the then vice president, Charles Curtis, a former student.

Our graduates have won thousands of scholarships including more than 70 merit finalist and scholar ratings. In the 8 years of the Betty Crocker program, Topeka High School girls have won four State and two runner-up positions and in 1960 the National Homemaker of Tomorrow Scholarship.

The Drs. Karl and William Menninger graduated from Topeka High School and our city is known the world over for its famous Menninger hospital and research center.

From looking through the Wausau yearbook, I noticed several differences in our sports. You offer bowling and baseball in school, and we have this only on a community basis. Also, you have one sport here of which I have never heard: Curling. Before I leave Wisconsin I would like to try my hand at it.

I want to extend sincere congratulations from my principal, Mr. Glenn Burnette, and our entire student body and to present this framed portrait of our school, whose gothic tower was recently displayed on the cover of the Southwestern Bell Telephone directory.

A Christmas Message Appropriate for All the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, all too often the thoughts of good will which surround us at Christmastime are soon forgotten. Perhaps our world would be a better one if they were not. One particularly inspiring message last Christmas was written by Virginia Weldon Kelly and appeared in a number of newspapers throughout the land. Its appropriateness as a guide for our public and private actions warrants republication here.

A CHRISTMAS WISH

(By Virginia Weldon Kelly)

Serene in the loving presence of God, millions feel joyful gratitude for the birth of Jesus. There are others who regard life as a desert of despair.

The French writer, Jean-Paul Sartre believes that life is without divine plan and that every person is alone, the possessor and victim of freedom.

In His life and crucifixion, Jesus knew all of the agony of man but He said, "Happy are the pure in heart for they shall see God."

Happy is the word Jesus is believed to have used for it appears in early Greek manu-

scripts of the New Testament. Two recent English translations use the word. King James version scholars knew that happy, is the highest sense, and blessed are synonymous.

Jesus preached often about happiness. He said, "These things have I spoken to you that My joy may be in you and that your joy may be made full."

The great Quaker, Dr. Jones, said, "Radiance is the mark of the Christian."

St. Paul said, "The Kingdom of God * * * is peace and joy in the Holy Spirit."

Some may say that only a saint can be habitually joyful. This is what St. Paul meant. In the early Christian church any person who dedicated his life to God was counted a saint.

In the noblest concept, the American missionary, Dr. Carlson, martyred in the Congo, was a saint. Before his murder, he endured daily torture. He remained serene and ministered to other sufferers.

Most of us say we are not brave, we are too young, old, busy, important, sick, rich, poor, and much too wicked for sainthood. But we can aspire to dedication.

If we believe in Jesus' Sermon on the Mount in His promises of forgiveness and rebirth, we know Jesus and have Him with us on His birthday.

Our Christmas wish is that you will be of good courage, happy in living your life to the glory of God, and to the peace and good cheer of all men.

John Artichoker, Jr., Superintendent of the Northern Cheyenne Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the welfare of the American Indian has long been a subject of vital interest to me. I have been anxious to see the American Indian take his place as a first-class citizen of the United States, working side by side with all other Americans for the Great Society.

Therefore, it is with great pride that I direct attention to the Junior Chamber of Commerce selection of this country's outstanding 10 young men of 1964. One of them is John Artichoker, Jr., a member of the famous Sioux tribe, and now superintendent of the Northern Cheyenne Agency, in Lame Deer, Mont.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the part of the article about Mr. Artichoker, from the January 26, 1965, issue of Look magazine.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S 10 OUTSTANDING YOUNG MEN OF 1964

In 1876, Sioux Indians rode out of Dakota Territory to Montana, joined the Cheyenne and warred on Gen. George A. Custer in the Battle of Little Big Horn. Today, another warlike Sioux, John Artichoker, Jr., fights in Cheyenne territory against poverty, disease and unemployment.

Artichoker grew up in a shingled farm cabin on a Sioux reservation in South Dakota. He earned an M.A. degree at the University of South Dakota. Now, he is the youngest man ever appointed head of an Indian reservation in the United States, and the first Indian to be superintendent of the Northern Cheyenne Agency in Lame Deer, Mont. More than 2,000 Cheyennes look to him for care.

Among other things, Artichoker oversees their road, forestry, welfare and credit programs, police force, and school system.

The tribe needs him. Many homes in Lame Deer lack indoor plumbing, electricity, insulation. Sometimes, five families share a single outdoor water pump. John Artichoker wants to change this. Already, he has lured in a small factory, increasing employment. Tourism is growing. It's all uphill, but this Sioux and the Cheyennes are winning their battle in Lame Deer.

Remarks by Gov. J. Millard Tawes, Maryland Partners of the Alliance Dinner, Friday, December 11, 1964, Baltimore, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, Gov. J. Millard Tawes, of Maryland, recently delivered an address at a dinner honoring the Brazilian Ambassador, His Excellency Juracy Magalhaes.

The occasion marked the inauguration of Maryland's participation in the partners of the Alliance program, which is jointly sponsored by the Department of State and the Agency for International Development.

Maryland, which is cooperating with the State of Rio de Janeiro in Brazil, has joined 16 other States working with our neighbors in Latin America in a mutual assistance program on a self-help basis.

This program will have far-reaching importance in furthering our good relations with Latin American countries, and we are proud that Maryland has undertaken this effort.

The text of the Governor's remarks follows:

Ambassador Megalhaes, Mr. Berney, Mr. Lanahan, Mr. Stein, Dr. Vavrina, members of the Maryland Partners Committee, Mr. Boren, ladies and gentlemen, it is an especially great pleasure for me to be able to welcome to our State, His Excellency the Brazilian Ambassador, Mr. Megalhaes.

Let me say at the outset that Maryland is proud and pleased to have been chosen as one of the States to play a pioneering role in the partners of the Alliance program. We are especially pleased that a State of the great nation of Brazil has become our partner in this new venture in international understanding.

As a State containing one of the leading Atlantic ports of this Nation, Maryland has long been closely associated with Brazil and other countries of Latin America in trade and commerce. We are delighted to have this association emphasized by the establishment of a special bond between Maryland and the State of Rio de Janiero.

In talking with our Maryland group upon their return from the State of Rio, I was surprised to find how many things our two States have in common. Both of us boast long stretches of fabulous Atlantic beaches; both of us possess extensive harbor facilities; both of us claim the possession of a mammoth steel mill; both of us have attractive mountain resort areas; both of us have a large urban population, and both of us are adjacent to a large independent Federal Government center.

Just as we share many of the same benefits, I understand that we also have many of the same problems. Like the State of Rio we are still searching for the best way to develop part of our seashore. Like Rio, we are trying to absorb increasing numbers of people who come in from rural areas to settle in our large cities and—like the people of the State of Rio, and people all over the world for that matter—we are trying to do all we can to see that our children get a good education, that our sick get adequate medical care and our poor are provided with a chance for a better life.

As a State Governor, I find it especially gratifying to be able to play a role—no matter how small—in international affairs. To my mind one of the chief advantages of the partners of the Alliance program is the way in which it enables private citizens to take a useful and active part in a program of vital importance to the free world.

Just as I have had the privilege, as Governor, to exchange messages with Governor Torres of the State of Rio, so many other Marylanders will now be able to establish lines of communication with their counterparts in the State of Rio. The partners program, by bringing international affairs down to the state level, can thus add a new dimension to the lives of all of us.

I am sure that eventually this program, as it develops, will reflect itself in producing wider horizons for the school and college students of both our States; and in exchanges of assistance and talents in all fields from manufacturing to farming.

And so, in closing, I want to say especially to you, Mr. Ambassador, how delighted I am that you now have a special reason for visiting Maryland—a reason that will bring you back here to visit us frequently in the future.

I hope also that you will convey my personal thanks to Governor Torres for the wonderfully warm reception which the State of Rio gave to our Maryland visitors. And I hope that it will not be too long before we have the opportunity to receive a group from his State. It will be a real pleasure to be able to show them a little of our own Maryland hospitality.

Finally, as a token of the relationship that now exists between our two States, I wish to present to you, Mr. Ambassador, these certificates of honorary Maryland citizenship, in addition to the one for yourself, I have included one for Governor Torres and one for each of the members of the State of Rio Partners Committee. I hope that you will transmit these with my warm regards and best wishes.

Thank you.

"Free Enterprise, America's Heritage"—Speech by John I. Kotake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, it is not very often that we are privileged to hear

speeches of the quality of the one delivered by Eagle Scout John I. Kotake. Therefore, it gives me great pleasure to request permission to have his speech printed in the RECORD. I believe it is most worthwhile, and should be read not only by those in the Scouting movement, but also by Americans in general.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE ENTERPRISE—AMERICA'S HERITAGE

(A speech presented by Eagle Scout John I. Kotake, of Honpa Hongwanji Mission Troop 49, at 11th annual Eagle Scout recognition dinner on November 5, 1964, at the Royal Hawaiian Hotel honoring the "Honorable John A. Burns Class" of Eagle Scouts. Eagle Scout Kotake is 14 years old and a ninth grader at Kawananakoa Intermediate School.)

We, who live in America, are better fed, better clothed, and enjoy more luxuries than the people of any other country. How has this come about? What makes America the prosperous and progressive nation that she is today?

If we look at our economic picture closely, we find that we are blessed with the inheritance of freedom—freedom to engage in any enterprise. Webster defines enterprise as "an attempt or project, especially one which involves activity, courage, and energy." We live and make our living under this free enterprising system. In this system, one can make his own decisions and follow his own interest in the economic life. His income depends upon how much his labor and resources produce. Our economic progress has been great under this free enterprising system.

We must realize, however that we have not always enjoyed this freedom in the United States. It came into existence when the Colonies rebelled against Great Britain and reacted against government control of economic life. As the pioneers pushed westward and found fertile lands, they became independent farmers and traders. Gradually they expanded their activities to greater and diversified enterprises.

As we look upon the American scene, we find the entire country alive with individuals with indomitable courage, will, and faith in our priceless American heritage of free enterprise. They all thrive under the principle of free and open competition. Today, we remember and hear of great men in American industries. They symbolize the free-enterprising system. These men had the foresight and initiative to take advantage and utilize the opportunities offered under this system. To mention a few individuals, we have Henry Ford, who originated Ford Motors; John D. Rockefeller, who built Standard Oil Co.; Conrad Hilton, who started the Hilton chain of hotels; and Walt Disney, creator of Disney Productions and Disneyland.

America does not disclaim any individual's rights because of differences in race, religion, or creed. As long as an individual can prove that he has the ability, the integrity, and the will to move forward, she will welcome him with open arms. As a result, many sons and daughters of immigrants are now holding key positions in the economic and political world today. For example, here in Hawaii we have such men as Chinn Ho, who started Capital Investment Co. and the Ilikai. We also have Senator HIRAM L. FONG, who began Finance Factors and has gained prominence as being one of the first Senators to Congress from Hawaii; and Henry J. Kaiser, who is known nationally and locally as a construction expert. He is also responsible for the new subdivision called Hawaii-Kai.

Our economic progress has been great under this free enterprise system but we must realize that we owe it to the tireless efforts and courage of these men, who believed in and engaged in free enterprising. In other words, we are enjoying the fruits of their ingenuity and hard work. Therefore, as citizens of our democratic society, let us, Scouters and friends, understand and appreciate this invaluable gift of freedom. Let us strive to make it our responsibility to strengthen this system by showing leadership and initiative and by working diligently in anything we undertake. Let us help to pass it on to those who follow us so that we may perpetuate free enterprise. For truly, free enterprise is our great American heritage.

The Family Farm: A Blueprint for Its Doom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have read with dismay and shock a recent magazine article by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Kermit Gordon, embracing a blueprint for doom of the family farm system in America.

Since the Bureau of the Budget is the policy arm of the White House, many people are asking if this blueprint, this prescription, this pattern for the destruction of the farm system that has become the envy of the world, soon may be presented to the Congress.

There are now 3,500,000 farms in the United States. As recently as 1940 there were 6,350,000 farms.

This rural attrition already has changed the face of our Nation, and we now are struggling in the Congress and in the executive department to deal with poverty, crime, and other pressing emergencies among the impacted populations in our cities.

Now, Mr. Gordon tells us, "One million farmers could produce all the Nation's farm needs, including large commercial exports," and he says the other 2,500,000 farmers "require assistance in the painful transition to nonfarm jobs, to which most of them or their children will certainly have to move."

Mr. Speaker, such a transition for 2,500,000 farmers and their families would move perhaps 7,500,000 farm people out of rural America. Where would they go, except into the poverty program in the cities?

Thousands of Main Street towns would become ghost towns. What would become of all the businesses and all the people who populate our rural towns?

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the President of these United States has greater wisdom than to follow such a course.

Moreover, Budget Director Gordon is an honorable man; he is an able man of very substantial accomplishments. Most of his experience has been in Government employment. I cannot find that he ever has had any direct association with agriculture. I can explain his position with respect to farmers, as stated in the magazine article, only by surmising that he has been listening to the wrong people. I am certain that when he broadens his knowledge his fine mind will impel him to become a foremost advocate of the family farm system that has blessed this country with the greatest abundance any people on earth ever has enjoyed.

Mr. Speaker, there has been, in recent days, a great deal of newspaper comment, along with the magazine article I have mentioned, which has treated in a very cavalier fashion the share of the national budget that goes for commodity programs in agriculture.

Considering the value of these programs to America's free agriculture, and the importance of new legislation in the present session, I think it is essential that we set in order some of the misstatements and misunderstandings that are reflected in these articles. Most of them, I might add, are authored by people without connection with farming and with little or no background in the subject.

It is always a fair and worthy enterprise—in any legislative year—to examine critically the ongoing programs of the Government as well as those proposed. It is essential—in fairness to taxpayers—that we examine the worth to the Nation and to the economy of every part of every program that is budgeted with public funds. So I welcome this examination of the farm programs—which are, after all, reckoned in a great many dollars.

I am troubled, however, by a number of quick assumptions which find ready acceptance among the unknowing, and eager credence among people who are looking for easy ways to cut Federal costs. And all of us are eager to find budget savings—to ease the burden on the taxpayer. So it is only too easy to fall into the trap of easy budget cutting—particularly when we cannot readily see a direct loss to our own families and our own security.

I am troubled.

I am troubled by the tendency to see the farm programs as welfare programs—programs that can only be justified as a handout to a submerged and needy peasantry. The price support and acreage adjustment programs are not welfare programs—and they never have been. They are not means of distributing funds to the needy—and they never have been. The real purpose is to enable U.S. agriculture to attain and maintain a level of income and family living that is fair in terms of the remainder of America's free society. And that was the basic idea, back in the 1930's, when we first began to develop effective commodity programs.

I am troubled—by repeated references to the so-called top million of America's farmers. These are the farmers who gross cash sales above $10,000 or more in the average year—and as a result are supposedly ready to set sail in a sea of laissez faire which does not prevail for any other segment of our economy. What is overlooked is this: The average farmer in this top million class is able

to keep, as operator's earnings, only 20 percent of the dollars he gets for products sold. After allowing 5 percent interest on capital and hired hand wages for himself and family, he still is not earning a return on his capital, labor, and management comparable with returns earned by nonfarmers.

Remember, too, that in order to produce $2,500 in earnings the farmer enterprise needs on the average an investment in the $50,000 range. Also that in order to earn even the $2,500, some farmers may have cash sales well over $20,000. These are, of course, subject to wide variation.

But most important: If some of these top million farmers have climbed near to income parity—they have climbed there, and are remaining there, in a farm economy stabilized by farm programs. Many, many farmers would drop out of this top group in a hurry, if they had to face the kind of price declines they would be up against in the absence of farm programs.

I am talking about a drop in wheat prices of almost half—a drop in feed grain prices of more than a fifth—severe drops in other commodities, including a 20-percent decline in the price of cattle, which are not even price supported. Indicated price declines in this magnitude are so well established by numerous nongovernmental studies that they cannot be doubted or ignored.

I am troubled because to suggest that the top million farmers no longer need income protection is like saying that the top 27 percent of industrial workers can now be deprived of union protection, because they are so well off. It is like saying that the top 27 percent of bank depositors should be deprived of deposit insurance. It is like saying that investors in the top 27 percent of U.S. corporations should all be deprived of the protection provided by limited liability under the law—by antitrust legislation, and countless other legal protections.

What some writers have been doing is to take the top 27 percent of America's farmers, compare their incomes with the average of industrial workers, and declare that their incomes are almost up to parity. And then say: These 1 million farmers are no longer peasants—so let them eat cake.

I am troubled by all this misunderstanding because I know that the support of income is only part of the tremendous job that commodity programs perform. The commodity programs are important in putting land to the uses that are best suited for it and in avoiding the waste and expense of excessive production that cannot be put to use here or abroad even with the best in salesmanship and the ultimate in generosity.

It is simply a matter of too many resources available to agriculture. For every 2 acres we harvested in 1964, there stood on the sidelines an additional acre that could easily have come into the game. With only two out of every three acres needed to produce abundantly for us all—it made more sense to conserve this extra acre. About half of this extra acre was in fallow, in temporary pasture, perhaps idle for one reason or another—but the other half was kept out of surplus production by a public program designed to do that very thing.

This is the resource situation as it exists in agriculture, and it is not well understood. For every 2 acres harvested, we have another acre in unneeded cropland, as I have said. But we also have between four and five acres in grassland and another four to five acres in woodland. In a real pinch, many of these acres could come into cropland use.

Without acreage adjustment programs, certainly much of the extra cropland would come into production. And this condition of excessive resources will continue into the future because rising technology is increasing the productive power of each acre. Meanwhile the individual farmer, acting alone, can do very little about this—and this would be true even if you sent 2½ million of him to town and kept only a million farmers in food and fiber production.

I am troubled because if that happened I fear for the traditional structure of our rural communities, town and farm alike. If a million farmers can produce food for all of us—why not a half million, a quarter of a million, a hundred thousand?

Then, where will these few thousand large individual or corporate operated farms get their supplies? From the local machinery dealers? The feed dealer? The seed dealer? Not on your life. You would see direct buying from wholesaler and manufacturer that would leave little room for the local farm supply dealer and little need for the other local retailers who would be depending on a dwindling hinterland.

You would create poverty in rural America faster than you could lick it—even with the best intentions.

It has been suggested that food production might eventually be concentrated in a few strong hands—which by that time might be able to exert sufficient control to manage their production as auto builders manage theirs. And this would avoid surpluses and get the Government out of agriculture. But would this be a happy solution?

Would the American public then be at the mercy of a few giant producers who would control their very sustenance? Or would the American people take it upon themselves to regulate food production publicly as they regulate any other public utility controlling the Nation's lifeline? Both of these have been suggested as serious possibilities.

Am I overdramatizing? I do not believe so. We have already gone a long way down a road marked by abandoned farms and dying towns. And this is no time to run out on agriculture. A famous farm economist said prophetically, just a few days ago, that agriculture is heading along a collision course—toward a point where the welfare and existence of family farm agriculture will clash with concern for the Federal budget.

I am truly concerned about the future of our traditional American freeholding agriculture. The agriculture that has done so much to sustain our democratic traditions. The agriculture that has made possible the great industrial society that is now America. The agriculture that stands, more than any other element of our society, as an example to the world.

A Japanese farmer once said:

> A farmer without land is like a man without a soul.

And, wherever in this world, the peasant and the sharecropper and the agrarian oppressed look for a better life on the land, they look for their model to the free agriculture of America.

In the world, America's farmers have not only exported food, they have exported hope. In America, they have not only sent their sons to become industrial and business and professional leaders, they have made food the biggest bargain in history. Indeed, American farmers for the last 10 years have not been subsidized by the public—farmers have instead subsidized the American consumer.

They have done this by providing food at a constantly declining real cost. The average family buys food for less than 19 percent of its take-home pay—compared with about 23 percent in the early 1950's. As an example, if the 23 percent had continued to this day, Americans would now be spending each year—for every man, woman, and child—better than $95 more for food than we are now spending. For a family of five, almost $500.

Even at subparity prices agriculture now contributes about $42 billion a year in new wealth, which jangles local cash registers and feeds a giant sector of the total economy. All this for 1½ cents of the Federal tax dollar. Let us search for budget savings, Mr. Speaker, but let us keep things in proportion.

May I say again that the farm commodity programs are not welfare. They are programs that help to strengthen and stabilize our entire economy—just as other economic groups have their protections. But let us not forget that U.S. agriculture is the way it is, and the success it is, because we have made it that way. As public policy, the encouragement of agrarian settlement goes back to the very beginnings—to colonial times and the early days of the Republic. The early grants of kings' lands. The grants of extensive rights-of-way to encourage railroad building and settlement. The Homestead Act.

The American public has, almost from the start, subsidized research and the improvement of crops and livestock. The extension idea developed as a natural sequence—and one that was unique in the world. The credit programs were developed, because we could see that wherever farmers have been oppressed and submerged, it was partly because they had no means of obtaining control of the land they farmed.

Our freeholding system of agriculture, widely held, is our own creature—developed in a free society, by a free society, because we thought it the best system and encouraged its growth along these lines through public policy. It is important that we not cast away lightly—in the name of economy—a farming system that has been 300 years in the making. Mr. Speaker, this is why I am troubled.

West Virginia Weekly Editor Expresses New Year Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Spirit of Jefferson-Advocate, a weekly published in Charles Town, is one of West Virginia's highly respected and widely read newspapers. General Manager Max Brown and news editor, Don Rentch are to be commended for their excellence in the field of journalism and their dedication to their community and to the Mountain State.

On December 31, 1964, an editorial appeared that is both thought provoking and inspirational. Most of us at this time take stock of ourselves and our accomplishments and failures of the 12 months past and of the beginnings of another year. The associate editor of this publication, Henry W. Morrow, went further than most, by placing his reflections in print. Mr. Morrow's words are realistic, but hopeful; and I think they are worth reading.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Spirit of Jefferson-Advocate be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE YEAR JUST ENDED

Today, the 31st day of December in the year 1964, marks a dividing line in the measurement of time. More so than we do with personal and individual birthdays, we tend to divide our lives by the markings of calendar years. No man, be he 20 or three score and ten, will allow this day to go past without looking back. The young will cast only a passing glance backward, consoling themselves with the thought that if there have been wasted years there is yet time to redeem their hopes and aspirations. But the older of us, the great majority of us, will tend to panic, however slight. For the older of us realize that time is running out, and the thought frightens us. We, the older, will realize that the hopes and dreams we set in our youth as polar stars are far from fruition and we will wonder just where it was we allowed our selves to be sidetracked, however slightly.

We never accomplish in any year what we set out to do on its eve. But this is not necessarily bad, and we need not necessarily condemn ourselves for it. Falling short is better than complete success over a small goal. We would like to think that in any judgment that is made of us for our performance in 1964 we will be weighed in this light. Let it be said of us that we did not succeed completely in all we set out to accomplish, but we tried. And we hope posterity will be able to say of us for the year just passed; the world is a little better off, a little better place, for our having been here during the past year.

AND THE YEAR AHEAD

So we begin a new year with full knowledge of the fact that there have been failures and disappointments in the year just ended. And it is realism and not cynicism that prompts us to the inevitable observation that there will be failures and disappointments in the year to come. In every endeavor we undertake this will be largely true. But the task is not to allow the sure knowledge of this to deter us from our course. We may fail and fail. But if deep against the failure something wars, something gets up from the ground and fights back, the gains will yet outbalance the losses in the final account.

There is much to be done in the days and years ahead. In years gone by man has accomplished much. It is not necessary to recount it. But after 5,000 years man has not yet accomplished the one goal for the failure of which all his other accomplishments seem puny. He has not yet learned the secret of living with his brother in peace. And the lack of this accomplishment makes all his other accomplishments tarnished, even in some cases dangerous.

So let us then in 1965 nibble and bite again at the goal, the goal of the brotherhood of man. Let us be done with hate and bigotry and selfishness. Let us be intolerant of only one thing; our own shortcomings. The ultimate goal is still out of sight, still far down the road. But let 1965 be a milestone in that road, a milestone that we may look back upon a year hence, even as we look back on 1964, and say, "We have traveled a little part of the way and in so doing brought the goal a little closer."

Georgia Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the people of South Carolina admire, respect, and love the Honorable Carl Vinson, and they are grateful to him for his incomparable service to our country and to the free world. The following editorial tribute to Mr. Vinson recently appeared in the Anderson Daily Mail, Anderson, S.C. I commend this excellent editorial to the attention of my colleagues and to the people of this Nation:

CARL VINSON—GREAT GEORGIA STATESMAN

Every so often, a public man redeems the American democratic system by his private action.

The last to do so is Carl Vinson, who has just put into effect his vow to "wear out, not rust out" by retiring at the age of 81 after 50 years of service as the Representative from the Sixth Congressional District of Georgia.

Vinson has gone back to Milledgeville, in our neighboring State, where he will live alone on his 601-acre farm from whence he began the longest continuous service in the history of the Congress of the United States.

In those 50 years, Vinson had become one of the most powerful men in Congress. For 30 years, he had been chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee and its predecessor Naval Affairs Committee. His was a key role in launching the two-ocean Navy which was ready for its great part in winning the last world war. More recently, he fought for expanded air power. In all, he helped develop the Nation's military forces into the most powerful in the world.

Yet, when he felt he had given his all to his country, he simply announced he would not run again, though he could have had his seat in the House for life so far as his Georgia neighbors were concerned.

He took with him his rocking chair. In it he plans to snooze a little between time when he rests from raising beef cattle and the grains to feed them.

Vinson will join another great veteran of the political wars in retirement, though they will be separated by more than a half a continent. Jack Garner, 91, who could have capped Vinson's record of service in the House had he not listened to the political siren song and run for Vice President with Franklin D. Roosevelt, has been rocking away the years in Uvalde, Tex., since 1941.

What tales these two old fighters of the political wars could tell were they to wear out together. They fought the good fight. They earned their rocking chairs.

A Clash in Basic Assumptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, we all know that a great deal of what is said during a national political campaign is intended only for the moment. Much of it takes on a peculiarly hollow ring when read or repeated several weeks after an election.

No such disadvantage attaches to the remarks of a colleague which I have obtained permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD. During the campaign, the Honorable RICHARD HANNA, who represents a portion of my neighboring Orange County, Calif., was asked to discuss a foreign policy conflict which had emerged in positions taken by the two major candidates for President.

With many of us, I am afraid such an opportunity would have become the occasion for intensely partisan remarks. But DICK HANNA, displaying the breadth and charity that have marked his outlook, as a Member of this House, chose instead the clinical approach. He analyzed the dialogs developing on foreign policy. And he found that there existed a clash in basic assumptions which seemed to bar any sort of consensus. His assessment of the radical right—with which Mr. HANNA disagrees as strongly as with the radical left—is based on considerations of cause and effect, rather than what he sees as good or evil.

I commend this address to the attention of other Members.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—A CLASH OF BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

(By Hon. Richard T. Hanna)

We have had, in this campaign, a real conflict between the two presidential candidates over questions of foreign policy. To a marked degree that conflict has highlighted the obvious sharp division which the subject of foreign policy occasions in our country today. We surely ought to look at some of the differing assumptions about it, and try for a more basic understanding of these differences.

Maybe one of the reasons we are so badly split as a national right now, on basic questions affecting our very survival, is that we have done very little examining of our assumptions. I mean both sides here, the assumptions of those, including myself, who for almost two decades since the end of World War II have supported an essentially

bipartisan, internationalist, pro-United Nations, proforeign aid, pro-nuclear-test-ban foreign policy, and advocated the containment of communism, perhaps with some emphasis on the liberation of peoples under Communist rule. For want of a better term, let us call this group the Mainstream in America, it being understood that we do not mean the mainstream of one party alone, but the mainstream, until recently, of the dominant elements of both. This broad mainstream or center position—center at least until the major challenge to it grew up on the right—would contain the foreign policies of the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations. The mainstream position also generally received the support during these administrations of a powerful bipartisan majority in both the House and the Senate.

I also want to look at the assumptions of the conservative group on the political right which is now so strongly challenging and cutting into this formerly bipartisan policy of the Mainstream. This broad sector, which I will call the Right Branch, has grown to the point where it took over the leadership of the Republican Party at the GOP convention in San Francisco in July. The Right Branchers include those of both parties who are to a greater or lesser degree against the United Nations, against foreign aid, and against agreements with Communist countries. The Right Brancher expounds not the containment of communism or containment with some emphasis on liberation, but rather, complete victory over communism.

To complete a very rough division of the political spectrum in regard to foreign policy, I should mention three other categories. On the far right we have the familiar rightwing extremists, such as the John Birchers, the Klu Kluxers, the Minutemen and other groups which exaggerate the positions of the Right Branchers to the point where they fall wholly outside the democratic framework. Corresponding to them, but on the extreme political left, are the leftwing extremists, the American Communist Party and other revolutionaries seeking the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. Our fifth group, within the democratic consensus but to the left of the American mainstream, is what I'll call the Left Branch. For one reason or another, members of this group do not support the mainstream of American policy, often objecting to our system of alliances or our military power buildup or our possession of nuclear weapons. They may disagree fundamentally with our policy in particular areas, such as Vietnam, usually from the standpoint that it is too interventionist or belligerent. In this group are the pacifists, those who would disarm unilaterally, and those members of so-called peace groups who differ basically with the Mainstream's foreign policy.

When you're looking at basic assumptions that shape your views on foreign policy, where do you begin? I suppose with your views about the nature of man. I'll ignore at this point the assumption built into the question, the question of whether a man's philosophical assumptions do indeed shape his politics. At least it is clear that some syndromes of political views tend to go along with certain basic ideas about the nature of man. And perhaps the first thing on which our Mainstreamers and Right Branchers would split has to do with people's similarities and differences. The Right Brancher tends to stress the uniqueness of each individual as well as the individual's natural rights, particularly his freedom from restraint by government. This is fine, by itself. But the idea that individuals are all different from each other somehow gets mixed up with the view that, across international boundaries, whole peoples too are very different from each other. Moreover, within countries, the Right Brancher often sees great and scarcely bridgeable differences between racial groups, religious groups, and social classes. Somehow the foreign groups, and the other groups within his own society, usually turn out to be inferior, if not actually subversive. If we shift our lens from the Right Brancher to the right wing extremist, we note that just about anyone who dares to disagree with him is so different that he is considered mildly or wholly traitorous.

Point 1 then about the nature of man, from Right Brancher's standpoint, is the differences he has with others of his kind. Point 2 follows closely behind: Since men have little in common with each other, particularly across different economic, social, religious, racial or national groupings, there is accordingly little basis for real agreement in a world that consists essentially of conflict rather than cooperation.

Point 3 has to do with how much free will a man has. He has a great deal of free will, in Right Brancher's view, with very little of his life or thinking determined by outside forces. Moreover, Right Brancher considers his politics to be primarily the product of his own mind, through right reasoning. This contrasts rather sharply with the various forms of determinism which may be encountered in the thinking of Left Brancher. Those on the left incline to the view that a man's politics is wholly determined by his economic interest, or perhaps by his relationships with his parents before the age of 7, or by his sense of social justice, or by his total environment.

As a middle-of-the-roader on this issue, I would myself guess that there are rather greater limitations on free will than Right Brancher assumes, but more than the various determinists of the Left Branch would allow. Right Brancher's assumption finds little or no support in psychology or other behavioral sciences. Still, Right Brancher would be merely a harmless, though negative and pessimistic, sort of fellow were it not for some other basic assumptions and characteristics. These transform him into an active threat to all that man has laboriously constructed over the centuries.

A primary factor in human events, in Right Brancher's view, is the dominance of physical force over the realm of ideas. Force rules the world in almost unchallenged rein, the sword is mightier than the pen; power is worthy of respect for its own sake; and respect for her power is what America must demand from the disorderly nations of the world. The American military man is to be glorified and trusted, while civilian authority is at least somewhat suspect, if indeed it is not actually selling America down the mainstream.

We have then men who are very different from each other, their thoughts very little influenced by the social conditions under which they live, and among whom there is very little basis for agreement or cooperations. It is a world of conflict, in which force dominates. Moreover, (and this will be highly significant when we consider the ability of the Right Brancher to understand the appeals of the Communist enemy) it is a world in which social justice will pretty well take care of itself. Social welfare should not of course be any major concern of government, particularly at the national level. It should be left basically to the individual's own efforts and the operation of the economic laws of the marketplace. Government should not, above all, employ such devices as the graduated income tax, in a misguided effort to create an artificial, unnatural equality. If wealth tends to concentrate in the hands of a small class, this is only a fitting reward for those of superior ability and effort.

The Right Branch's assumptions about the nature of communism are also significant. Communism is an unmitigated, unchanging evil, uniformly so, everywhere. The fact that it seeks world rule and the downfall of the United States is a hidden truth which must somehow be made known, and which the leaders of the Government of the United States have stubbornly refused to believe. Any U.S. official who may have known this and who still supports U.S. policies toward Communist countries is at least soft on communism, and perhaps even infected with treason.

Like most of the other assumptions of the Right Branch, this one overlaps with and becomes stronger and more exaggerated among rightwing extremists. Its high point is the published view of Robert Welch that President Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.

In addition to its assumptions, we should mention certain characteristic tendencies of the Right Branch approach: They can be summarized as the tendency to oversimplify, to be highly impatient, to be intolerant, and to be extremely suspicious. International politics is viewed in terms similar to those of a very short western, in which the good cowboys face down or shoot up the bandits. The plot is thickened only to the extent that meanwhile, back at the ranch, some dirty work is usually being plotted.

Another characteristic of the Right Brancher, and a particularly strong characteristic of the rightwing extremist, is a tendency to stress the menace, peril or threat of communism, and to play down or ignore any nonthreatening accomplishments in Communist countries. This is in part a natural inference from basic Right Branch assumptions. However, in some cases it is no doubt a consciously used technique in the Right Branch's bid for political support. The political strength of the Right tends to increase with increases in the strength of the Communists and fears of them. This political phenomenon has been observed in many countries, and was particularly clear in the Nazi and Communist election returns under the Weimar Republic of Germany during Hitler's rise to power.

Our analytical groupings within the American foreign policy spectrum may not of course describe the views of any one man at all times. A man's views may be in one category one day and slip into another the next. Still, for those who at any given time are basing their thinking on the Right Branch assumptions we have outlined, a number of specific conclusions about American foreign policy logically follow.

The Right Brancher's basic aim for America is characteristically simple, negative, and forceful: complete victory over communism. This does not mean anything so mild as the evolution of communism in the direction of greater economic and political freedom. Such changes would be at least partly contrary to his assumption about the nature of communism. In any case, they would be complex, would take a lot of time, and would be wholly unsatisfying. Communism must be overthrown or, if war comes, defeated in war.

All American policies should be judged, according to the Right Brancher, according to whether they contribute to the defeat of communism. Anything which contributes to our victory is good, anything which hinders it is evil.

To the Right Brancher, most contacts with Communist countries fall into the category of helping communism and impeding victory. Trade, aid and cultural exchange should be cut off; diplomatic relations of any kind are at best of dubious value, and might well be severed. Communist countries should in general be cut off from the free world and denied membership in international organizations.

The United Nations, owing to the very nature of the conflict in the world, can at best be a sort of debating society. It is useful only to the extent that it can serve as an instrument of U.S. policy. It is dangerous

to the extent that the United States alters its policies to accommodate the U.N., which is increasingly made up of immature, nonwhite, new members.

Disarmament is, of course, a complete mirage as well as undesirable in itself, Right Brancher maintains. It can only be a screen under which the Communists seek to gain a decisive military advantage. The partial nuclear test ban is a dangerous indication of our willingness to be lulled to sleep. The Communists can be counted upon to break the ban whenever they believe this is in their interests.

Foreign aid is a drain on the U.S. taxpayer and a frightful example of waste and inefficiency. It is founded on the falacious notion that if we fill people's stomachs, we can turn their minds from communism. On the contrary, Right Brancher holds, if they would merely straighten out their thinking, they could liberate the energies to improve their own economies. In short they have no one to blame but themselves. Certain types of aid might be extended to countries which are already our proven friends. None should go to Communist or neutralist countries.

Our alliances have limited value. Their worst feature is that they are essentially defensive. They do not adequately protect the free world against either internal subversion or overt aggression, and our main reliance must continue to be on our own power, particularly the capacity to wage limited nuclear wars. Our allies are socialistic and politically unreliable in many cases, and refuse to bring themselves into line with strong anti-Communist policy. We must be prepared on occasion to go it alone.

In general, negotiations with the Communist world are to be avoided, because they always seem to involve some right or territory of the free world which the Communists want. If what's theirs is theirs, and what's ours is negotiable, we can never hope to gain, we can at best hold even, according to Right Brancher. Since world tensions are created by the Communists, they can be relaxed by the Communists also, unilaterally, without negotiation. Since any agreement worth making with the Communists must be in the interests of the Communists to keep, there is no need to negotiate a treaty about it in the first place. The Communists will go ahead and do what's in their interest in any case.

As is evident, the foreign policy of the Right Branch would repeal much of existing U.S. foreign policy. But what would it put in its place? It is strong on what it is, and what it is, is strength. This means military strength, economic strength, strength to promote revolt in Communist countries and strength to participate ourselves in operations against vulnerable Communist regimes. Characteristically, it does not seem strong on other ideas, and appears to have little or no economic or social content. These things would presumably take care of themselves largely without interference by national governments or international organizations, once world communism were overthrown.

These are, in summary form, the main assumptions, characteristics, and policy recommendations of the Right Branch in this country. In general, I would have to take strong exception to most of the assumptions made in the Right Branch's challenge to American foreign policy. I also believe the characteristics associated with this approach are harmful in the conduct of foreign relations, and that the specific recommendations which the Right Branch offers would be disastrous. Far from achieving victory over communism, I believe they would result in the loss of America's position in the world to the point where we would indeed be forced to choose between allout war and surrender. Either one would be a catastrophe beyond measure.

I am proud to belong to what has until recently been the bipartisan mainstream of American policy. I disagree with those of the opposite Left Branch who hold that we can disarm unilaterally before our potential adversaries do likewise, in the hope that they will follow suit. Military power is an undeniable reality in the anarchic world from which we are slowly emerging, and during this process our country must be able to deal from a position of military strength.

And I recognize, as have successive American Presidents and Secretaries of State from the time of the Truman Doctrine in 1947, that this country must use its power effectively to thwart the attempted expansion of the Communist empire. But I must confess that just assembling the main assumptions and proposals of the Right Branch is itself an indication of their almost pathetically distorted, shallow and inadequate nature.

Of the major assumptions we have reviewed, one to which I have already entered a vigorous dissent, is the view that we have little in common with other peoples. I would concede that, in the absence of an effective rule of law in the world, force has dominated the relations of states. Potential agreements among nations in developing a more secure, prosperous world are everywhere impeded by the requirements of military preparedness. But this in no way denies that the potential is there. Even in the case of the deepest gulf, that between the Communists and ourselves, I would argue that we have certain strong interests in common.

I believe that everybody likes to be able to get his family enough to eat and enough of the other things they need, and would welcome the end of the financial burden he pays for military security; I think that everybody has an interest in seeing that his family and friends can live in a world without the threat of war. It seems to me every Russian, Communist or not, and every American, too, has a common interest in seeing that nuclear weapons do not spread all over the world. I believe we all have an interest in the health and perfection of coming generations of children.

With such common interests as these, there is, I believe, a basis on which to work for the achievement of arms control and disarmament. Our country should, with all awareness of the difficulties and risks involved, keep everlastingly at it.

I believe in the importance of looking at things from the longrun as well as the shortrun standpoint. When you do this, a number of assumptions of the Right Branch collapse in a heap. Ideas, which may be secondary in importance to military power in any given crisis, take on added importance as the time span increases. Over the decades and the centuries, the power of ideas is determining, while the power of armies fades. The ability of any social system to satisfy the yearning of most men for social justice will be crucial to its longrun survival. In these vital areas, the Right Branch would leave us defenseless.

A recent United Nations report has found that while considerable wealth was concentrated in the hands of 5 percent of the population, more than half the people of all of Latin America made a per capita income of only $120 a year. This is probably far less than many members of the wealthier group might spend on entertainment alone in a short period of time. This is a situation inviting Communist revolution. It breeds revolution not so much because people with empty stomachs tend to go Communist, but because it appalls any who may have a sense of social justice, whatever their income level.

The Right Branch's suggestion that whatever helps victory over communism is good is not a useful standard for American foreign policy. It ignores all the myriad problems of this world with which a great country such as ours must be concerned, and which exist wholly independently of the Communist movement: hunger, poverty, disease, ignorance, exploding population, to name but a few.

This suggested standard has no power to command the allegiance of men, being wholly negative. And most ludicrous of all, those who propose it are obviously unqualified to judge when we are, and when we are not, making progress in the basic battle for men's minds, both inside the Communist orbit and in the contested areas. About all the Right Branch can do is see where the red is on the map, and then seek to combat it with ultimatums or force. It proposes, in fact, that we surrender the main part of the battle, because it doesn't understand it.

The American foreign policy which has developed over the years since 1945 is essentially sound. It will be improved, adjusted to changing conditions, and made more effective as we proceed. But above all, we must face the future with our minds open and with respect for our fellow man in our hearts.

On Being Nice to the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the public is necessarily growing increasingly concerned with the vacillating, weak foreign policy of this administration. The public's concern was increased by that portion of President Johnson's state of the Union message that dealt with foreign affairs. The Chicago Tribune of January 7, 1965, pinpoints the worrisome features of the President's dissertation on foreign affairs:

ON BEING NICE TO THE RUSSIANS

One aspect of the Great Society, as depicted in Mr. Johnson's state of the Union message, is a sort of top-level cultural exchange program in which Soviet and American leaders would exchange visits, appear on television in each other's country, and come to know each other better.

To start the ball rolling, the President suggeseed that the new Soviet leaders pay us a visit.

It's tempting to think of Messrs. Brezhnev and Kosygen, or whoever the Soviet leaders really are, reposing on the porch of the L.B.J. ranch with their feet on the railing, wearing 10-gallon hats, and drinking bourbon and branch water. But we doubt that this would do any more for world peace than Mr. Khrushchev's stroll through an Iowa cornfield or his 2 days with Mr. Eisenhower in the sylvan quiet of Camp David.

Great things were predicted of Mr. Khrushchev's 11 days in this country in September 1959. They were filled with talk about a thawing of the cold war, about disarmament, and about weapons inspection systems. Mr. Eisenhower was to reciprocate with a visit to the Soviet Union, and the meeting at Camp David yielded an assurance that the problems of Berlin were about to be solved.

But within a few months Khrushchev had wrecked a summit meeting at Paris, and Eisenhower's proposed visit had been called off. Within a year, Khrushchev was pounding his desk at the United Nations with a shoe and denouncing us as monopolists, colonialists, and provocation mongers. And within 3 years the Communists had bisected Berlin with a wall and were surreptitiously

building up an offensive missile system in Cuba.

Mr. Khrushchev not only came to this country twice; he also gave a television interview which was broadcast here in 1957, and he sent his deputy, Anastas Mikoyan, to this country in January 1959. None of these gestures was any more fruitful, in the advancement of world peace, than the others.

Mr. Johnson may think that the Russians will be susceptible to the persuasive hospitality dispensed on the banks of the Pedernales River, or to gestures such as offering to reopen the discussion of a direct Moscow-New York air route [although in 1963 only 92 ordinary Soviet tourists visited this country]. But to the Russians, personal contacts are like conferences and treaties; all are looked upon as steps toward eventual Communist domination of the world. Neither treaties nor friendships will last any longer than their usefulness in advancing this cause.

Aid to the United Arab Republic Should Be Terminated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I expressed to the House my conviction that massive Public Law 480 food shipments to the United Arab Republic should be terminated, and pointed out that the failure of the State Department to follow congressional directives forbidding U.S. assistance to aggressor nations has resulted in the United States subsidizing of Nasser's aggressive activities in the Congo; in Yemen; in south Arabia; and in Libya.

For the further consideration of this body and the administration, I ask unanimous consent that the following UPI report taken from this morning's Chicago Tribune and the January 2, 1965, editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times be included in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 12, 1965]

CHARGES NASSER DIVERTS U.S. AID TO CONGO REBELS

TEHERAN, IRAN.—A high Egyptian security official who defected to Iran charged today that President Gamal Abdel Nasser, of the United Arab Republic (Egypt), is using American aid to finance rebel uprisings in the Congo and Yemen.

The official is Abdel Ghader Owdeh. He was identified by the Iranian Government as the top secret service official for the United Arab Republic. He told a press conference today that the Egyptians were starving because they were denied American food and wheat aid.

PROPPED BY UNITED STATES

He reported that the United Arab Republic is selling food received from the U.S. aid program and using the money to pay for the Congo and Yemeni uprisings.

Owdeh said that Nasser stayed in power only because of the $1.5 billion in American assistance he received. He said Nasser recently started attacking the United States in speeches to pacify anti-American feelings reflected in the burning of the Kennedy Memorial Library in Cairo.

Owdeh said he defected to Iran 8 days ago, because life in the United Arab Republic has become unbearable under "this modern pharaoh who has destroyed democracy in my homeland and has the temerity to shed crocodile tears over its corpse now."

Owdeh asserted that Henry C. Byroade and Jefferson Caffery, former American Ambassadors, had supported Nasser and helped keep him in office but that the United States had received only hatred for its $1.5 billion in aid in the last 10 years.

MAKES LIVING IMPOSSIBLE

Owdeh accused Nasser of spending $1.5 million daily on secret police operations in which 100,000 officials are making "the lives of our people impossible and subhuman."

He said his ailing mother and seven brothers in the United Arab Republic were tortured by agents.

The Iran Government identified Owdeh as a member of the United Arab Republic secret police since 1956, who rose to become its head. Owdeh was said to have made secret missions to such places as Syria, Lebanon, Kuwait, and the Persian Gulf, and that he defected while making such a trip.

Owdeh's father was executed in 1954 on Nasser's orders on charges of sabotage and arson, an Iranian spokesman said. At the time of his execution the father was head of the Moslem brotherhood.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Jan. 2, 1965]

THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW

The purpose of the economic aid programs provided other nations by the United States is to better the lot of the peoples in those nations and, in so doing, bring about a condition in which peace can thrive. The purpose of the military aid programs provided other nations by the United States is to enable them to assure that peace against both internal and external foes.

This, at least, is what the American people have been told in one form or another ever since the World War II lend-lease programs were followed by U.S. grants totaling $3.4 billion to UNRRA to bring aid to the war stricken peoples of the world. Next in sequence was the aid, both economic and military, provided Greece and Turkey by President Truman to fortify them against both internal and external Communist pressures. That effort was successful as was also the succeeding Marshall plan (1948–52) which stabilized the then rapidly collapsing economies of postwar European nations.

From this succession of war and immediate postwar emergency measures emerged the concept of the economic, technical assistance, and military aid programs which have been with us ever since.

More than $100 billion has been spent by the United States on its postwar foreign aid programs alone.

The generosity of the American people in contributing of their substance for the declared purposes of the aid programs is without precedent. Those purposes have been achieved in part. They have also been thwarted or prostituted in part. In more recent years the latter has become commonplace.

The increasing number of tyrants such as Nasser, Sukarno, and Sihanouk who, along with the left-leaning heads of various emergent nations in Africa, act on the theory that the road to success is paved with anti-American epithets is largely chargeable to Washington bureaucrats.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic provides the best current illustration of that which is amiss. The United States has provided Egypt, over which this synthetic Napoleon struts, with more than $1 billion in various forms of assistance, primarily foodstuffs which he requires to keep his people's diet at mere subsistence. It has done so despite his long continued threats to wipe neighboring Israel off the Middle East map; despite his aggression in Yemen.

Nasser has gotten and continues to get American aid despite the almost constant turmoil in which he keeps the Middle East. It has been necessary, so Washington bureaucrats have said, to keep the lines of communication open, to offset the inroads of Soviet Russia in Nasserland. Do so, they have contended, and maybe someday Nasser will see the light.

That day hasn't come. It hasn't come because the United States has largely lost sight of the objectives of foreign aid. It is now being used—not only in Nasser's case but in a number of others—in vain attempts to placate petty tyrants who continually menace the peace and, as in the case of Nasser and Indonesia's Sukarno—who violate that peace by acts of aggression.

How does it better the lot of the Egyptians—a lot that is about as woeful as any people on earth—to provide Nasser with the means to threaten war and to make war? The foodstuffs we send him enables him to maintain a subsistence level for his people. That provided for, he then uses other funds thereby freed to maintain an army with which to carry on his ventures and threaten more of them.

His tactics have now reached the point that no self-respecting nation—no nation aware of what it is doing—can longer afford to support this desert jackal, even indirectly.

On December 23 he said:

"We have sent arms to the Congolese people and we will still send them. * * * We do not recognize Tshombe. We do recognize him as the agent of imperialism."

He now boasts that he is allied with Soviet Russia and Red China in their efforts to upset the first Congolese Government which has had a half-way chance to restore law and order in that turbulent African nation. He now boasts that he is acting in concert with nations openly opposing American efforts to pacify the Congo.

And then, with direct reference to the United States, he said:

"I would like him (the American Ambassador to Egypt) to know that whoever does not like our conduct can go drink up the sea. If the Mediterranean is not sufficient, there is the Red Sea, too. We can give him that as well."

Nasser, the friend and ally of Congolese rebels who have slaughtered hundreds of white people in a dastardly exhibition of racism, should be called to account and quickly. The usual mumbo jumbo of Washington bureaucrats who believe they can tame dictators of this stripe by providing them with more and more aid every time they get rambunctuous should be disregarded. Their theory hasn't worked. It will not work.

The time has come to make an example of Nasser, an example which Sukarno in Indonesia, Ben Bella in Algeria, and others of the same ilk can and will understand.

The way to begin is to cut off every bit and every type of aid to Nasser.

Such statements cause the bureaucrats to warn that Soviet Russia will then move in. Soviet Russia has already moved in. Nasser is the Kremlin's ally. He certainly isn't that of the United States.

If Nasser, Ben Bella, and other petty tyrants can underwrite revolution wherever it breaks out, as Russia and Red China seek to do, they are allies of the Communist bloc, not allies of the West.

WNYC–TV, the World's First Noncommercial Municipal Television Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Federal Communications Com-

missioner Robert E. Lee, who represented the Federal Communications Commission in the inception and development of WNYC–TV has furnished me with a copy of a very significant report on UHF television in New York City.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include this report issued by the Morse Communication Research Center on WNYC–TV, the world's first noncommercial municipal television station:

WNYC–TV: THE WORLD'S FIRST NONCOMMERCIAL MUNICIPAL TELEVISION STATION

INTRODUCTION

(By Louis G. Cowan, Director, the Morse Communication Research Center, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.)

It is possible that of all the so-called crime broadcasts on television, the best is on WNYC–TV, but can be viewed only by a select audience. For specifically stated reasons, it cannot be watched by home viewers.

Perhaps the most highly motivated audience in New York tunes in WNYC–TV for its broadcasts of medical programs: its own brand, in this era of "medical" features.

The report that follows gives detailed explanation of both of the above statements.

Necessarily, the WNYC–TV schedule has an essential difference in policy, purpose, and approach that clearly separates its role from that of other New York television outlets.

It may be interesting to keep these points in mind while reading this publication, which contains certain high points of a study made by the Morse Communication Research Center at Brandeis University. It was decided at the center that this communication innovation—the use of television as an instrument of municipal administration—should be observed and reported as one aspect of the Morse Center's program of studies in the use of the mass media for information and education.

This is primarily a brief history and deliberately limited study offered in response to requests from municipal administration students, leaders in other municipalities, and those concerned with certain aspects of political science, educational processes, and communication studies.

It is believed that its observations and comments—with the statement by FCC Commissioner Robert E. Lee, who represented the FCC in the WNYC–TV inception and development—may provide a starting point for further study by other communication authorities, and students and practitioners of municipal administration.

Thanks are due to many whose time, study, and effort have made this publication possible: Those Commissioners of the city of New York and their staffs who were so generous with their help and information while the original study was being made; Robert Newman, Harris Dienstfrey, Lewis Gillenson, and perhaps most importantly, Seymour N. Siegel, Director of the Municipal Broadcasting System whose papers, files, and constant availability for inquiry proved invaluable.

Final responsibility, of course, rests with the staff of the Morse Communication Research Center.

FOREWORD

(By Robert E. Lee, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.)

The UHF tests which the Federal Communications Commission conducted resulted in the termination of all arguments on the suitability of this portion of the spectrum for television operation. A most fortunate byproduct of our tests is that New York City has its own truly magnificent television station which fills a large void which had existed. It is a station which other large cities can hardly afford not to duplicate and the UHF spectrum is the place where such operations can readily be conducted.

A few years ago I decided that the best solution to the critical problems that beset television broadcasting was to move it all into UHF. I was impersuasive. One of the arguments that I couldn't answer authoritatively was: How will it work in big cities?

I was authorized to approach the three television networks to ascertain their willingness to conduct tests in New York City. Their engineers told me that the costs would be virtually prohibitive if the tests were to be conducted with the thoroughness that was warranted. Our engineers sharpened their pencils and figured that a fully reliable test could be conducted for $2 million.

We approached Congress and convinced them that the public interest required the performance of a full-scale test and that the FCC was capable of contracting the work and of gathering and evaluating the data.

There are many unsung heroes who, enthused with the prospect of confirming their faith in UHF, spent long and arduous hours in planning and executing these tests, the significance of which is inestimable. Not only have the results indicated what can be done in UHF but, as a result of this knowledge, prospective broadcasters are showing a keen interest in UHF operations in large cities.

The public is to be the direct beneficiary in New York and other cities when larger choices of programs, transmitted with excellent picture quality, will be an actuality. I have yet to hear the opinion expressed contrary to the view that it was money well spent, with dividends to follow.

REPORT

MTV, municipal television in the United States, came about through the juxtaposition of a federally supported communications experiment and an American city's effort to perform its functions more efficiently via visual broadcast communications.

On October 23, 1961, at 3:30 p.m., a television picture, transmitted from the 80th floor of the Empire State Building in midtown New York, was clearly received 29 miles north in suburban Connecticut.

At first glance, such a transmission does not seem extraordinary. New York City with its seven television stations operating on full schedules has long been an important communication center. Nonetheless, something unique had occurred that clear autumn afternoon. The pictures being transmitted were in the ultra-high-frequency range. And to receive them, the sets in the metropolitan regional area of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut had to be equipped with converters—special tuning devices that enable a set to receive broadcasts in both the standard very-high-frequency range (channels 2 to 13) and the yet largely unused ultra-high-frequency range (channels 14 to 83). The channel being tested in this case bore the number and call letters 31, WUHF.

These test broadcasts took place some 2 weeks before the official opening of the station. They marked the beginning of an experiment that helped to increase the New York City television spectrum with great range and ultimately resulted in several decisive new developments in communications.[1] The transmission experiment, financed by the Federal Communications Commission and carried out with the cooperation of New York City's Municipal Broadcasting System, tested not only the feasibility of television broadcasting in the ultra-high-frequency range but, as importantly, its use for municipal administrative purposes.[2]

The tests indicated that the modern tool of television could serve to ease the problems of a modern city by helping to raise the speed and efficiency of its administration.

As municipalities grow their services increase as do the demands on the agencies that perform them. These widening areas of effort inevitably beget increasing problems in communication, beginning with the city's chief executive and moving downward through departments, and subdepartments to supervisors and every person employed in municipal service. Ideally, direct contacts between executive staff and line personnel produce an atmosphere in which objectives may be achieved with the least possibility of misunderstanding. But such direct and constant personal confrontation is beyond hope within the complex modern city.

The original UHF experimental program in New York City demonstrated that strategically employed television could help cut across barriers of distance and time, quickening communication between supervisor and employee, between administration and citizen. Extended to its logical potential, this electronic device hints that it could bring important changes in the conduct of municipal life; helping to increase the quality of its services, better educate its civil servants as to their duties, save money, obviate confusion, draw together the ever-spreading segments of the city and therefore help to make it a more cohesive unit. (Eventually, what might work for the city could apply to the State and to the Federal Government in equal proportion.)

Some 9 months after the tests were performed, on July 10, 1962, President John F. Kennedy signed a bill requiring that all television sets be capable of receiving the total spectrum of channels in both the very high and ultra-high-frequency ranges.

One year after the beginning of the tests, on November 1, 1962, the city of New York took control of WUHF, changed its call letters to WNYC–TV, and has operated it ever since—making WNYC–TV the first municipally operated noncommercial television station in the world.[3]

Many inquiries concerning WNYC–TV have been received, not only from municipalities interested in establishing similar stations within the United States, but from abroad as well. This report is an attempt to give some background and to answer some of the questions most frequently asked about this unique station.

The history of ultra-high-frequency broadcasting in the United States

Though the first licenses for commercial television broadcasting were issued in 1941, the medium did not have the opportunity to develop its mass communication power until after the war.[4]

The Federal Communications Commission initially had reserved 13 channels—channels 1 through 13—for commercial television.[5] These channels are in the VHF (very-high-frequency) band, which are within bands between 44 and 216 megacycles per second. Additional spectrum space in the higher frequencies of the UHF (ultra-high-frequency) band, between 480 and 920 megacycles per second, was reserved for experimental stations.[6]

As early as 1945, however, it became apparent to the FCC that the 13 available channels in the VHF range would hardly be sufficient to supply all the future needs of the country. On September 30, 1948, the Commission stopped assigning frequencies in the VHF range while it developed guidelines to determine its future dispensation of television channels. This period, known as the freeze, lasted until April 14, 1952, when the FCC then made available 70 new channels for regular operation, all of which are in the UHF range between 470 and 890 megacycles per second. Two of these channels were assigned to New York City.[7]

The Commission hoped that the television industry would begin broadcasting in the

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

UHF range, and so satisfy the needs of a growing population for more stations than those available in the limited VHF range. These hopes were not fulfilled.

With the advent of commercial television broadcasting, sets were manufactured to receive only the 12 channels in the VHF range, the only channels in general use. These sets could not receive UHF telecasts without adding a converter, which then cost between $15 and $35 each. Also, VHF signals had a greater range than those of UHF. For these and other reasons, except in areas that could not receive satisfactory VHF signals, there seemed to be little incentive to build and operate UHF stations.

It was suggested by many that competitive television services could and should be developed. Various plans were advanced and studied by the Federal Communications Commission, the broadcasting industry, and technical engineers. After about a decade of study, discussion and debate, it was generally agreed that the development of UHF could be an important service, particularly if educational television is to flourish.[8]

The FCC appealed to Congress for legislation requiring that all television sets shipped in interstate commerce be equipped to receive channels in both the VHF and UHF ranges. Such a bill was introduced in the Senate in June 1961, by Senator WARREN MAGNUSON (S. 2109) and in the House of Representatives a month later by Representative OREN HARRIS (H.R. 8031).

In order to document its case solidly and demonstrate the practicality of UHF broadcasting in metropolitan areas, the FCC decided to underwrite an extended period of testing. It sought and obtained a congressional appropriation of some $2 million for the purpose. The location selected for the test was New York City.

The reason for the choice was the fact that the city had a greater concentration of high buildings of concrete and steel than any other area in the world: if UHF reception proved satisfactory there, it could presumably be used anywhere.

Another factor which made New York City an ideal choice was that all of the city's stations operate with facilities in the Empire State Building. This made possible a direct comparison of UHF and VHF transmissions by the simple expedient of alternatively duplicating the programs of channels 2, 4, and 7. Duplication of channel 4 offered the opportunity to compare color transmissions, which were almost exclusively confined to that channel. The proximity of these transmitters permitted duplication with a minimum of interconnecting program feeder lines. Duplication of these programs required clearance by the owners and suppliers of the programs and the assent of labor unions.

City officials, because of their experience with radio stations WNYC AM and FM, were eager to explore the use of this medium and furnished the staff and management of WUHF under contract with the FCC. When not being programed to afford comparative data for the test, the facilities of WUHF were used to duplicate educational programs, then carried on channel 11, for approximately 10 hours each week, and to broadcast programs of special interest to the municipality for which purpose the city provided additional funds to establish studios in the Municipal Building.

The history of radio station WNYC

In June, 1922, New York's Board of Estimate appropriated $50,000 for the establishment of a municipal radio station. It began broadcasting on July 8, 1924 with the call letters WNYC. Though the Board's resolution had declared that the station was "to be an adjunct to the police and fire departments and such other departments as may use or require such service,"[9] it transcended these limits from its beginning.

In the next dozen years, the station faced many problems, including charges of political abuse. However, when Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia came into office in 1934, he recognized the possibilities of WNYC—not only as a cultural medium, but as an aid to city government—and constantly improved and expanded its operations. (Seymour N. Siegel, director of the Municipal Broadcasting System and one of the principal architects for WNYC–TV, has been with MBS for 30 years—having been appointed assistant program director in the year that Mayor La Guardia first brought emphasis to its radio role.)

WNYC, which in 1943 added an FM outlet, has consistently broadcast a wide variety of programs. These ranged from regular live broadcasts of fine music, sessions at the United Nations, public health and consumer information programs, public hearings, board of estimate and city council meetings; to broadcasts on special municipal matters involving transit, power and water supply emergencies. Since the station has also covered all official city receptions, there is almost no visiting foreign head of state who has not appeared before WNYC's microphones. Also it has won a large loyal following in the highly competitive communications area of New York,[10] and its programing has earned it innumerable citations and awards.[11]

WYNC and television

The management of WYNC was quick to recognize the potential of television. As far back as 1953, it had applied for and received a permit to construct a UHF television station to broadcast over channel 31.[12] On December 24, 1958, Mr. Siegel wrote a memorandum analyzing the television situation in New York, in which he detailed the values that would derive from a UHF station both for educational purposes, such as in-school instruction, and for specialized uses in connection with such groups as the city hospitals and the police and fire departments.[13]

When the FCC decided to undertake its large-scale tests to determine the effectiveness of UHF operations under the difficult conditions imposed by a canyon city such as New York, Commissioner Robert E. Lee, who had long been a dedicated partisan of UHF expansion and under whose urgence the tests were undertaken, suggested that the tests be conducted on channel 31. The suggestion was accepted by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, funds for the city's share of the costs of operation were approved on December 6, 1961 by the board of estimate, and an agreement was entered into whereby the Municipal Broadcasting System of New York would operate the transmitter for the FCC, the city to be reimbursed by the Federal Government. The contract for the lease of a transmitter was signed between the FCC and the Radio Corp. of America; a transmitter was installed on the 80th floor of the Empire State Building.

The installation of the antenna required unique considerations in view of the fact that all of the space available on the tower is occupied by antennas of existing television and FM stations. The FCC conducted a feasibility study and later awarded a contract to Melpar, Inc., to fabricate, install and test a four-unit array in close proximity to the WCBS–TV antenna which, in itself, required elaborate precautions to prevent an adverse effect on either signal. The antenna employs electrical-beam tilt which places a large signal in the built-up portions of the city and thus prevents its energy from being dissipated toward the horizon. A constant theoretical signal, disregarding perturbations caused by buildings and terrain, is delivered 6 miles from the Empire State Building. On November 29, 1961, after the initial test period, channel 31 officially began its broadcasts with FCC Chairman Newton Minow throwing the switch.[14]

The city's appropriation of $175,000 for studio equipment included the following: 4 TK 60 RCA cameras and their synchronizers and speech input assemblies and one videotape recorder. Most of the sound equipment came charge-free from WNYC radio. RCA loaned three additional cameras, Teleglobe Inc., the scrambling equipment required for the police department telecasts. Property, scenery and studio lighting came from the 10-year-old WNYC film unit.

While the FCC was concerned with the WUHF experiment primarily because of its engineering aspects and New York primarily because it extended the city's public service capabilities. The Morse Communication Research Center of Brandeis University saw it as an opportunity to study its use as an administrative tool.

After exploring the subject with Mr. Siegel, Mr. Louis G. Cowan, director of the Morse Communication Research Center, proposed that the center undertake a functional study of WUHF as a counterpart to the engineering tests then taking place. In a letter to Mr. Siegel, dated November 27, 1961, Mr. Cowan outlined the center's area of interest as follows:

"As we understand it, the primary focus [of the tests] is to gather additional technical data concerning UHF efficiency and broadcast potentials in a large city. Our interest relates to quite another subject—the possible employment of UHF–TV as one of the electronic instruments available for the improved functioning of urban administration. Can municipal government operate more efficiently, clearly, quickly, economically (with consequent potential savings in manpower and money) through proper utilization of this instrument? Business and education have found a role for television. Is there one in municipal government?"

Mr. Cowan went on to list some of the authorities at Brandeis University and elsewhere with whom he had already discussed the form of such a study and who would serve as its consultants.[15]

After thorough discussion, it was agreed by city officers that such a study would provide useful and needed information. Arrangements were made for the center to interview police, fire, stanitation, health, and hospital department heads to learn the following:

(a) Communication objectives of each department.

(b) Data on present communication procedures.

(c) Departmental policies and staff structure.

(d) Existing evaluative information on the effectiveness of current communication methods.

The operation of WUHF

Through the year of its operation from November 1961 to 1962, station WUHF can be divided generally into two categories:

1. Internal communication: the disseminating of information, instruction, and direction within the city administration.

2. External communication: direct communication to the residents of New York City and its environs.

A chief problem was the fact that few sets in the metropolitan area (approximately 30,000), were equipped with converters.[16] It was therefore difficult at first for the station to obtain periodical program listings. Shortly after the start of the tests, however, the New York Times and the magazine Cue began to list some of the broadcasts for the benefit of city employees who could receive them in hospitals, police stations, and fire houses on sets furnished by the city.

Then on March 15, 1962, Comeback, Inc., a private organization established to aid

Footnotes at end of speech.

the rehabilitation of ill and handicapped persons, presented 12 programs over WUHF. Response to the series was so favorable, and the press coverage so extensive, that from then on more and more newspapers listed the channel's programs.

On June 5, 1962, the Morse Communication Research Center submitted its preliminary findings and observations on WUHF operations to Mr. Charles Tenney, city administrator. The report set forth its purpose as follows:

"This study of MTV (municipal television) is based on the premise that effective communications is a command responsibility. It concentrates on the major UHF-TV efforts that are now being applied to internal communication—disseminating information, instruction, direction to those within the city adminstration."

The report proceeded to outline the ways in which the UHF facilities were being used by various city departments:

(a) The police department: Besides presenting refresher and other unit-training courses during tour changes—enabling police personnel to observe the programs at precinct houses which were equipped with all-channel receivers—the department also began transmitting the morning lineup prior to the regular broadcast operation. These broadcasts, sent out on a scrambled basis so that only the police could receive them, required special FCC permission. They proved to be extremely valuable in many ways; they not only saved hours in traveling time and the expense of transporting police officers from all parts of the city to police headquarters, but they also aided law enforcement by making the lineups visible to an infinitely greater number of observers, and facilitated speed of followup action.

During 1963, the police commissioner utilized the facilities of WNYC-TV in issuing instructions to all commanding officers and their men in such areas as election day procedures and holiday traffic safety measures. He was joined by the parks commissioner in briefing departmental personnel in safety measures to be adopted in city parks and beaches during the summer months.

(b) The fire department: The department broadcast on-the-job training programs coinciding with drill time for the city's 280 fire houses. The broadcasts thus enabled the television instructor to reach all the fire houses simultaneously with obvious savings in time and effort.

(c) The department of hospitals: Hospitals employed UHF facilities to offer nurse training. With 21 institutions, widely separated geographically, the use of MTV and its tremendous potential was early recognized and utilized by Dr. Ray Trussel, hospitals commissioner. The first series of programs was concerned with the legal aspects of nursing. Another series of programs on the evaluation of nursing personnel was directed to head nurses and supervisors. More than 370 nursing students and 75 graduate nurses watched the programs. Such ambitious plans as the televising of surgical techniques were abandoned for the lack of technical equipment and skilled personnel. The programing was limited to lecture-type presentations buttressed by posters and charts.

To make the learning response more viable, subject syllabuses were prepared and distributed in advance. Subject matter warmups in each viewing area were held prior to the programs. Videotape recordings of each broadcast were given for those who missed the original telecast or for repeat learning reinforcement purposes.

Teachers received extra hours relief of their duties to prepare their lessons. Discussion manuals, including bibliography and similar reference material, were distributed to heighten the impact of the telecast and to overcome the mechanical disadvantage of the absent person-to-person contact between teacher and student. The department of hospitals now presents several series of programs which have resulted in several changes in nursing practice, directed toward improvement in patient care.[17]

(d) The department of health: The department developed UHF programs for food handlers and provided information on nutrition.

(e) The board of education: The board devised a UHF in-service course for junior high school teachers in English. These 26 presentations were received in 24 junior high schools by more than 400 teachers.[18]

The report went on to denote the response of the various city departments to their television broadcasts. Almost without exception, the response was favorable.

For example, the May 1962 issue of Spring 3100, the official magazine of the New York City Police Department carried an editorial which said:

"For the first time, direct communication has been established between the police administration and the members of the force and, as this new line of transmission is improved and expanded, so will the police service be improved. No longer will written orders and directions alone provide the guidelines. From now on, face-to-face instructions on a citywide basis will bring to every member of the force the very latest information on up-to-date enforcement techniques."

A comparable reaction by the fire department is found in an editorial in the February 1962 issue of the Fire Engineering magazine:

"Television may prove to be the answer to the long leap forward which some educators believe is necessary if the fire service is to reach a comparable plane of training now found in areas of business and industry. * * * Most of all, however, it may prove to be the missing link necessary to acquaint the public in general with the true picture of the work of firefighters. It may then provide the public with additional insight into the problems that face the fire service and the methods employed to safeguard the general welfare."[19]

Summing up its findings. The Morse Communication Research Center quoted a statement on the potential of municipal television by Col. Harold Riegelman, whose remarks reflected the view of the citizens budget commission:

"We think that the city is engaged in an enterprise here that offers great promise in the future for the people of the city. We hope that ways can be found at least to meet minimal financial requirements of the program. Chiefly, it seems desirable to hold on to the equipment and materials assembled in New York City for the experimental UHF television broadcasts."

The report itself, which was circulated among city officials and other parties interested in the city's finances concluded:

"The information and views assembled thus far indicate that New York City should engage in the fullest UHF program tests for at least 2 years."

The all-channel television receiver bill

Before the report was completed, much of the material contained in it was made available to Newton N. Minow, then Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. Minow referred to the New York UHF experiment in detail in his speech to the annual conference of mayors on May 16, 1962,[20] and also urged passage of the all-channel television receiver bill, which though already passed by the House of Representatives, was then being considered by the Senate. On July 10, 1962, it was signed by President Kennedy and became law.

One of the chief technical problems of UHF—the inability of regular sets to receive telecasts in the 70 channels of the higher frequencies—had evidently been resolved. On the estimate that set replacement averages a little more than 10 percent a year, it was anticipated that within 5 years, more than 50 percent of all sets in the country would be capable of receiving UHF.[21]

The FCC field test report

On July 19, 1962, the FCC issued a preliminary report on the engineering tests it had been conducting.[22] The report analyzed reception of WUHF at 800 locations throughout the metropolitan area and its environs. Mr. Seymour Siegel summarized the results in a speech at Fordham University: "Within the 25-mile radius from the Empire State Building there is no significant difference between UHF and VHF television." He also noted that "based on our own mail response and the reaction of our public (to the broadcasting over channel 31), UHF works." Final reports were issued by the FCC on November 14, 1962, February 12, 1963, and March 27, 1963.[23]

During its comparatively short existence, WUHF had won an unusually high amount of praise. In discussing the station's full coverage of the United Nations proceedings, the New York Times wrote: "A better example of the usefulness of UHF television in filling a specialized need would seem hard to find." A month later, an editorial commented: "The broadcasts of WUHF could have an important influence on the future of TV." The New York Herald Tribune also commented editorially on the station's operations: "The prospect (of broadcasts over channel 31) excites and, while the audience is now limited, the day for easy UHF availability for all is coming soon. Meanwhile, congratulations to WNYC-TV." And Ben Gross of the Daily News wrote that the broadcasts were "a useful addition to the telecasting lineup of the country's greatest city."

The Municipal Broadcasting System had also received many queries from municipalities about various aspects of its operations. The station in effect had become a case study for those interested in this new development in broadcasting.

On September 28, 1962, New York's board of estimate approved $450,000 to purchase that station's transmitter from the Radio Corp. of America.[24] The antenna was declared surplus by the Federal Government and donated to the city, thereby saving the Government the removal cost of approximately $50,000 and affording the city a going operation.[25] On November 1, 1962, a year after the experiment began, WUHF became WNYC-TV, a part of the Municipal Broadcasting System, the world's first such owned and operated noncommercial station.

Present status and future plans of WNYC-TV

All broadcasting stations produce public service programs. Though often excellent, they represent a small portion of the total broadcast schedule. During its almost four decades of operation, WNYC has followed a strict policy of public service in all its broadcasts.[26]

WNYC-TV—described as civics plus culture—intends to provide public service through municipal television. In addition to its use in internal communications—as a disseminator of information, instruction, and direction within the city administration—the station plans to fulfill needs not satisfied by either commercial or educational stations. As of September 1963, WNYC-TV was broadcasting between 56 and 60 hours a week, more than half of the total being original programing. The balance consisted of documentary films and programs produced elsewhere by educational and commercial television stations, and by diverse government and private public service agencies. The station hopes, in time, to increase its total programing to 120 hours a week.

Since its early WUHF days, WNYC-TV had added an additional videotape recorder and fixed studiod lighting. Budgetary provisions have been made for another camera chain,

Footnotes at end of speech.

a four-camera mobile unit, a solid state videotape recorder, studio-link equipment, and an additional film chain. Original studios were inadequate, having been built for radio; plans exist for new studios to be constructed. At least half of all live programs are telecast without camera rehearsal. For police, nurse, and fire department training programs, two rehearsal hours have been provided, three for the medical programs. The station operates without budget for programing, receives a modest allowance for such essentials as slides and art materials.

During the two 17-week periods of 1962 and 1963, channel 31 provided live coverage of the United Nations General Assembly from opening gavel to 6 p.m. daily. The magazine Saturday Review has said that "WNYC-TV devoted more time to the United Nations than any other TV station in the Nation." This generally follows the policy of WNYC radio which (since 1948) has provided gavel-to-gavel coverage of the United Nations and its various organs.

During 1963, WNYC-TV's cameras covered such public hearings as city planning, zoning problems, and the budget. When the hearings on fluoridation occurred, WNYC-TV covered it from 10 a.m. one day to 6:15 a.m. the next. The president of New York's City Council, Hon. Paul Screvane, presented a series of interviews with council committee chairmen to keep New Yorkers abreast of city business before the council. These presentations also emphasized the role changes of city officials under the municipality's new charter. The democratic functioning of local government requires a continuous flow of information to citizens. Neither commercial nor educational stations have allocated time for such telecasts; a municipal station such as WNYC-TV functions in part to fill those needs.

The prime function of MTV is the service of municipal departments and agencies. However, the program schedule is supplemented by a considerable number of cultural, informational, and educational offerings as is WNYC radio. In this tradition WNYC-TV, during its first year, presented a variety of programs from institutions of higher learning,[27] museums and galleries, civic organizations, labor, and business groups, and social, health, and welfare agencies. Community needs, according to MTV, stimulate the creation of programs of interest to senior citizens, consumers, children, and other specialized groups.

Adult education—especially relating to active citizenship, local news telecasts, discussions and interviews concerning the theater, art, music, and literature—is a mainstay of WNYC-TV's programing. Grassroots community programing and reviews of the world press are considered to be within the range of WNYC-TV programing interests.

In a program series entitled "City Close-up," the heads of 50 different city departments and agencies were presented during a 12-month period. In the main, these were in-depth interviews on the plans and progress of their operations.

WNYC-TV's presentations in behalf of the New York Public Library and the New York Academy of Medicine, indicate the diverse community uses to which the station management believes municipal television may be put.

The New York Public Library has equipped a dozen branches with all-channel receivers and presents a weekly program entitled "Teen Age Book Talk." It features young adults and noted authors in a lively panel discussion. This is in addition to "Your Lion's Share," a weekly program that the library has been presenting for 2 years on channel 31.

The New York Academy of Medicine has presented a weekly "Clinical Science Seminar" for general practitioners, interns, residents, and staffs of city, private, and voluntary hospitals in the New York area. During 1963 this series was deemed of such unusual value that the audiovisual facility of the National Institutes of Health now videotapes each program for distribution here and abroad.

The New York City Community Health Board presents a continuing program series entitled "Viewpoint on Mental Health" which is video taped for reuse by television stations in 20 other U.S. cities.

With the New York World's Fair opening in 1964, WNYC-TV has presented a yearlong weekly series on developments in the planning and construction, foreign participation and industrial exhibitors in the exposition.[28] The station has constructed studios in the City Building at the Fair and is preparing to originate a large portion of its program schedule from the fairgrounds during 1964-65.

Although New York City contains 750,000 Spanish-speaking citizens, none of the seven existing VHF stations provided any programs specifically directed toward them. After several experiments, WNYC-TV began—in July 1963—a weekly Spanish hour; including news reports, in cooperation with Puerto Rico's educational station, WIPR; an example of what WNYC-TV believes to be its especially staked-out role.

Aware that Spanish will be one of New York's major languages for the foreseeable future, WNYC-TV also plans to expand its cultural and educational programing in this area. A Puerto Rican advisory board is now studying the needs and resources of New York's Spanish-speaking citizens. WNYC-TV's open door of communication to Spanish-speaking citizens may serve to obviate or ease many of the problems they face as strangers in the city.

Summary and conclusions

In the speech delivered at Fordham University on July 19, 1962, Mr. Seymour Siegel, Director of the Municipal Broadcasting System, said: "Communication between the city departments and the public brings about a better understanding of how local government functions; and to make known the services available to our people is our prime responsibility * * *. We know that for the purposes of directionalized communication and to serve minority audiences, UHF works."

In a later speech in Columbus, Ohio[29] he offered a view of what the future held for certain heretofore undeveloped areas of television: "The cities of America are, in their relationship to television, what the educational institutions of the country were 10 years ago when educational television was on a tenuous springboard. In my view, the thrust and surge of all-channel television, which is the communications revolution of the 1960's, will carry along with it a wave of opportunity which we may not again witness in our generation. On the basis of our limited experience over the past 2 years * * * we have determined that MTV (municipal television) can achieve great efficiency, effect economies, and thus improve municipal management * * * nobody can foresee the tremendous potentialities that lie ahead."

The many requests for information about WNYC-TV from cities here and abroad reveal the degree of interest in municipal broadcasting as developed by this station. It is exemplified by Los Angeles' petition to the FCC (on July 16, 1963) for a UHF channel which would operate as a municipal television station patterned after the New York station.

The difficulties of establishing a municipal television station like WNYC-TV are many. Besides a capital expenditure of about $750,000 for facilities and about $600,000 a year for operating expenses, such a station requires a trained staff of about 60 for its operations and programing. More than that, it requires both a desire to fulfill needs that are in the public interest and an ability to determine what those needs are.

But in this country it has never been impossible to secure the funds for any project of proven merit. Nor has human talent ever remained unobtainable for long. From comment received, it seems possible that within the next decade, we may see a dramatic proliferation of municipal television stations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The following Federal Communications Commission personnel contributed to the UHF project described in this report: Commissioner Robert E. Lee,[30] Edward W. Allen,[31] George V. Waldo,[31] Sydney R. Lines,[31] Daniel B. Hutton,[31] Jules Deitz,[31] Margaret B. Fox, Edward W. Chapin,[30] Willmar K. Roberts,[30] Milton C. Mobley, Lawrence C. Middlecamp, Everett N. Shinn, Paul H. Sheehy,[30] Walter W. White,[30] Joseph Hanyok, Braxton L. Peele, Robert G. Weston,[30] Rose Marie Borda, John Cushman, Ralph J. Renton,[30] Donald Eddins, Phillip Tremper, Nancy Roach, Arnold G. Skrivseth,[32] William C. Boese,[30] Harry Fine,[30] William Caretta, Thomas Durston, Charles Sheets, William Daniel, Roger B. Carey, Elton D. Davis, Louis Manning, Julian T. Dixon,[30] Frank L. Rose, Thomas J. Dougherty,[30] Arthur A. Gladstone,[30] Max Paglin,[30] Charles R. Escola,[30] Eugene W. Lederer.[30]

In addition John De Prospo, executive officer, and Bernard R. Buck, television program manager of the Municipal Broadcasting System, must be mentioned for their tireless efforts toward making WNYC a successful operation.

---

[1] See article by Jack Gould, The New York Times, Oct. 24, 1961, p. 1.

[2] See article by Charles G. Bennett, The New York Times, July 12, 1961, p. 63.

[3] The city of St. Petersburg, Fla., has operated a commercial television station since 1953.

[4] The first grant for American commercial TV operation was issued to the NBC station WNBT (now WRCA-TV), New York, on June 17, 1941, to become effective on July 1. A week later the CBS station WCBW (now WCBS-TV) was authorized to begin program tests on that same day. By May 1942 10 commercial television stations were on the air. Six of these continued to provide service during the war, but it was not until 1945 that wartime manufacturing restrictions were lifted and television sets became generally available.

[5] Channel 1 was withdrawn from television use in May 1948.

[6] The range of UHF frequencies available for experimental operation was narrowed to the range 470 to 890 megacycles per second prior to 1948.

[7] One of them, channel 25, was reserved for educational purposes and the construction permit is held by the Regents of the State of New York. The other, channel 31, was held by the Municipal Broadcasting System and is the channel over which WNYC-TV now broadcasts.

[8] Roughly 300 channel assignments were reserved for noncommercial educational use; about two-thirds of these reservations are in UHF bands.

[9] Milton Nobel, "The Municipal Broadcasting System: Its history, organization and activities." Thesis for the College of the City of New York, January 1953. On file at the Reference Library, Municipal Building, New York City.

[10] WNYC's basic audience is estimated at 350,000. In situations where specific infor-

mation is wanted on a matter of municipal concern, the audience becomes much larger. The 1961 Annual Report (p. 5) notes that an FM listener survey shows that WNYC-FM ranks among the first FM stations in the city in terms of total audience.

[11] Milton Nobel, op. cit., and WNYC and WNYC-FM Annual Reports, 1957 through 1962.

[12] Speech of Seymour N. Siegel, Director of the Municipal Broadcasting System, to the Fordham University Conference on Educational Television, July 19, 1962, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 30, 1962.

[13] Memorandum on Non-Commercial Television in New York City," on file in the Municipal Reference Library.

[14] 1961 annual report, Municipal Broadcasting System, city of New York. 1962 and 1963 annual reports of the Federal Communications Commission.

[15] These included: Prof. Herbert Kaufman of Yale, coauthor with Wallace S. Sayre of "Governing New York City"; Dr. Lyle Fitch, president of the Institute of Public Administration and former city administrator of New York; Dr. Charlton Chute of the Graduate School of Public Administration of New York University; and Dean Clarence Q. Berger and Profs. Max Lerner, John Roche, and I. Milton Sacks of Brandeis University.

[16] Informal surveys by Pulse, Inc., in 1961.

[17] Journal of Nursing, January 1964. Cynthia Kinsella, assistant director of nursing, Bronx Municipal Hospital Center, says, "For us in the department of hospitals, television offers much. It can bring all the teaching resources of the system to bear on the problems of each of our units."

[18] An example of experimentation in visual communication was the 9-week film distribution experiment under the auspices of the New York City Board of Education and the State education department. Limited film prints make it difficult for New York City schools to present enrichment material precisely at the time the subject matter is being discussed. Because films are bicycled from school to school, some schools will be presenting material a month or two in advance of the classroom presentation and others months afterward. WNYC-TV demonstrated that a film distribution system could be economical.

[19] In January 1964 the fire departments of almost 70 communities in the metropolitan area were tuning in regularly to the New York Fire Department's telecasts on channel 31. Many of these were volunteer companies and this was their first opportunity for continuous authoritative and updated training activity.

[20] "Public Service Responsibility of Radio and Television," at the annual conference of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, Miami Beach, Fla. Made before the Board of Estimate on Apr. 2, 1962, during the 1962-63 budget hearings.

[21] This estimate based on figures supplied by the television information office of the National Association of Broadcasters.

[22] Office of the Chief Engineer of the FCC, No. 23153.

[23] Report on Receiver Installations, FCC Rept. No. R-6201, Nov. 14, 1962. Report on Mobile Field Strength Measurements, FCC Rept. No. R-6302, Feb. 12, 1963. Report on the Analysis of Measurements and Observations, FCC Rept. No. R-6303, Mar. 27, 1963.

[24] Actually only $384,000 of this sum was paid to RCA. The balance was used for the purchase of other equipment from other sources.

[25] This and other savings permitted the FCC to turn back $310,000 to the U.S. Treasury.

[26] Milton Nobel, "The Municipal Broadcasting System," op. cit., and also award citations in the station's annual reports, 1953 through 1961.

[27] Queens College, Cooper Union, New York University, City College of New York, Northwestern University, and Purdue University have all presented television program series on WNYC-TV.

[28] "World's Fair Report" is another program distributed to other stations throughout the Nation.

[29] Delivered to the Institute for Education by Radio and Television, June 13, 1963.

[30] Worked in a supervisory or semisupervisory capacity.

[31] Committee chairmen.

[32] Project chief.

A 4-Year Term?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 1st day of the 89th Congress the House adopted rules changes which the majority believes better enable the House to cope with the problems of the 1960's. In an article in the New York Times magazine of January 10, 1965, William V. Shannon, one of the Nation's most able journalists, presents another reform to improve the ability of the House to meet the pressing needs of our time. In his discussion of a 4-year term in the House instead of the present 2-year term Mr. Shannon advances persuasive arguments which should be of great interest to all of us.

The article follows:

REFORMING THE HOUSE: A 4-YEAR TERM?

(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON.—As the 89th Congress gets underway, congressional reform is more a subject of controversy than it has been for nearly 20 years.

One reform proposal which has received relatively little attention but which could have far-reaching consequences has been put forward by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Pennsylvania Democrat. He intends to offer a constitutional amendment increasing the length of the term for House Members from 2 years to 4.

He will offer his amendment later this month, as soon as he has arranged for its sponsorship by a Member of the House. Senator CLARK could act alone, but since the amendment concerns "the other body," he deems it wiser to let the House act first. The amendment is likely to be referred for hearings to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees. No action is probable this year because it takes time to develop support, but this proposal has already stirred wide interest. If approved by two-thirds of both Houses, it would become effective if ratified by three-quarters of the States.

"Two years is too short a term in which to represent effectively a congressional district," Senator CLARK says. "A newly elected Congressman has hardly warmed his seat before he must leave it to campaign for renomination and reelection. And if he comes from a noncompetitive district, he will remain a Representative for the rest of his political life. So what does it matter if he goes through the motions of getting reelected once every 4 years instead of once every 2?".

Representative FLORENCE DWYER, New Jersey Republican, offers support for the 4-year term from a slightly different angle: "Eight years in the House have convinced me that a longer term for Congressmen could greatly improve the quality of representation. Under the present 2-year system, most House Members must spend an excessive amount of time politicking and campaigning—simply to survive. A term of 3 or 4 years would give us time to think and plan and produce a more consistent and constructive legislative program."

Mrs. DWYER, who unseated Democrat HARRISON WILLIAMS, now New Jersey's junior Senator, in 1956, and has won reelection by increasing margins every 2 years, notes that her State has an April primary, which means that every other year she has to do at least some campaigning from April through November.

The proposal for a 4-year term is part of the larger struggle for reform of the House. At issue are two divergent views of how the House ideally should function. The traditional view is that the first duty of a Representative is to represent the particular interests of his constituents and pay the closest attention to their opinions.

The late Estes Kefauver, a congressional reformer himself, liked to tell of the advice he received on his first day in Congress in 1939 from Speaker William B. Bankhead when he asked for the secret of how Members get reelected term after term. Bankhead replied without hesitation: "It is a simple secret. Give close and prompt attention to your mail. Your votes and speeches may make you well known and give you a reputation, but it's the way you handle your mail that determines your reelection."

Most pragmatic observers of the congressional scene would not dissent from this well-worn wisdom. Fast, efficient service on requests from constituents builds a body of loyal supporters and has helped keep many otherwise mediocre Members in Congress for decades. "Listen to the home folks and answer your mail," is part of the conventional wisdom every Member of Congress knows, along with such hoary adages as, "The way to get along is to go along," and "Vote your district," and "Freshman Members should be seen and not heard."

These attitudes grow out of the present power arrangements of the House, in which most of the important work is done in committees; control of committees is governed by the automatic working of the seniority system, and favor trading among committee and subcommittee chairmen is one important way things get done.

Those observers who share Senator CLARK's dissenting view of how the congressional system should work, put forward a somewhat different view of reality. They point out that most of the work of servicing constituent requests is done by a Member's staff. Every Member has at least two or three employees devoting full time to what is known as "casework." Contrary to the Bankhead dictum, answering the mail is a task for a clerk, not a Congressman. Moreover, they note that there is no evidence that the dozens of Republican Congressmen swept out of office in last November's anti-Goldwater landslide had been dilatory or delinquent in answering their mail, sending out free "baby books" and other Government manuals, or processing requests for help in obtaining a veteran's pension or a social security benefit. Those Republicans lost simply because they were riding the wrong tide of public opinion.

In the view of Senator CLARK and his adherents, this is as it should be. The Members of the House, they argue, should not represent a network of petty political fiefdoms, each owing a nonideological loyalty to its Congressman for personal services rendered and for devotion to particular local interests. Members should instead represent—as the Presidency does—the changing national consensus on major issues. They see the ideal of what ought to be merging with the reality of what is, as major shifts in population in the last 30 years and the development of rapid transportation and communications destroy old parochialisms and make the Nation into a single great constituency.

How would a 4-year term for the House fit into this picture? Since Members would

always run in presidential years, it would accentuate the coattail effect that the top of the national ticket usually exerts. Individual Congressmen and congressional candidates would become more dependent on the national party. In the same year as a presidential campaign, the voters would be more likely to cross-examine congressional candidates about their views on the national party platform and their agreement or disagreement with their party's national ticket. (Republican candidates in many districts last fall discovered only too clearly that extolling their own records was not sufficient to shake off the incubus of Mr. Goldwater's candidacy.) A 4-year term would eliminate the midterm election for the House, in which the party in power almost invariably loses seats. Since Presidents have enough trouble getting their programs through as it is, avoiding this drop in their political prestige at the midway point would represent clear gain for the White House.

In his recently published book, "Congress: The Sapless Branch," Senator CLARK puts the argument this way: "If [a Member] comes from a competitive district, he will be more of a statesman and less of an errand boy if he runs always at the same time and on the same ticket as the presidential candidate of his party. The strengthening of the national interest in terms of the effective dialogue on issues which such a procedural change would bring about is substantial. The strengthening of the national parties is even more so. The strengthening of the hand of the President, who alone speaks for all Americans, is the most substantial of all."

It is an ironic footnote to this argument that Mr. CLARK was able to win his place in the Senate by unseating an Eisenhower Republican incumbent in 1956, although General Eisenhower swept the Presidential election by 9,500,000 votes. That year, for the first time in a century, the party that won the White House failed to carry either House of Congress. Presumably even in the best reformed and well-ordered political system such anomalies would continue to occur occasionally.

When the framers of the Constitution provided that Members of the House should be popularly elected for 2 years and the Senators indirectly elected for 6, they anticipated that the Representatives would be immediately responsive to popular sentiment as the price of reelection. This was true until the Civil War. But over the past 100 years, the development of one-party strongholds across the country has meant that ordinarily fewer than 100 of the 435 Members need worry about reelection.

Democrats from Boston, New York, Chicago and Los Angeles, as well as from many rural districts of the South, have safe seats which they regularly win by upwards of 65 percent of the vote. A sizable number of Republicans in rural and small-town districts of the Middle West from Ohio to Kansas are equally well-entrenched. Meanwhile, the Senators, now elected by direct popular vote and running statewide, are more subject to volatile shifts in public sentiment.

"The framers thought that the Senate would consist of a conservative body of senior statesmen who would restrain the speed and radicalism of the House," Representative RICHARD BOLLING, Missouri Democrat and a leader in the long struggle for congressional reform, recently observed. "But history has taken the two houses in the reverse directions. At present the Senate is often the more liberal body because it is more responsive to the social pressures of the big cities and the suburbs. The House, organized under the seniority principle, is the restraining influence."

Under these circumstances the historical argument for sharply differentiating between House and Senate has lost much of its validity.

If Members of the House were elected for 4 years, this might subtly undermine the gerontocracy in the House. Newly elected Members who know they may be swept out at the midterm election have neither the time nor the incentive to mount an attack on the House establishment, since if they were to fight and win a larger share of committee contral they would have only 2 years in which to enjoy it—and most of the second year is necessarily spent back home campaigning for reelection. But with the security of a 4-year term the newcomers would feel more nearly on an equal footing with the oldtimers and could look forward to more than 3 years of uninterrupted service.

As matters now stand, the 71 newly elected Democrats in the House become junior members of committees, every one of which is chaired by a member who has been there a minimum of 20 years. These newcomers won election as partners and supporters of Lyndon Johnson, but the fresh wave of 1965 has to yield to the men elected in the time of Franklin D. Roosevelt and, in a few instances, to those first elected in the days of Harding and Hoover.

Those who favor congressional reform are convinced that the only hope for improving the quality of House membership and the level of House performance is to speed up the rotation of those in positions of control by finding ways to bring junior Members to positions of power. The security of a 4-year term would be one step in this direction.

The elimination of midterm elections for the House would not necessarily weaken Congress as against the Presidency under our constitutional system of checks and balances. When the House is more liberal than the President, as it was in 1931–32 during the last half of the Hoover administration and again in 1959–60 at the end of the Eisenhower administration, the President can with relative ease frustrate the legislative plans of his liberal opponents.

When the House is more conservative than the President, as it was in 1947–48 during the Truman administration, the conservatives fare only slightly better. The Taft-Hartley Labor Relations Act was the one major exception to 2 years of Republican frustration in the 80th Congress.

Leaving the political struggle aside and looking at the House in purely institutional terms, one can see that a 4-year term would conform with the growing trend toward the professionalization of government. As big government has developed over the last 30 years, the tendency in State capitals and in Washington has been steadily toward longer legislative sessions, higher salaries, more expert staff assistance, and—in the States—toward longer terms of office.

So many States have lengthened the terms of office for their Governors, for example, that there are now only 16 which provide only a 2-year term; of these, Michigan and Massachusetts will switch next year to 4 years. Similarly, a 1-year term for State legislators was still common before World War I. Now all States elect them for at least 2 years. New York is currently considering extending the terms of its State senators from 2 years to 4.

Two arguments have proved persuasive in advancing this trend toward longer tenure. The first is that most people now regard frequent elections not as a democratic safeguard but as a waste of time, energy, and money for both the candidates and the electorate. Shorter campaigns and less frequent elections are now the vogue.

Secondly, government at all levels has obviously grown so much more complex than it was in 1787, or even in grandfather's day, that the public has concluded that its officeholders, both legislative and executive, need more time if they are to learn their jobs thoroughly and do them properly, free from campaigning and other extraneous pressures.

For these reasons many people who do not approve of Senator CLARK's broader program for more tightly structured political parties and a Congress more on the model of the British House of Commons do favor his proposal for a 4-year term for Members of the House. A recent meeting of the American Assembly endorsed it, which suggests that although the idea has not been widely discussed, it does have public support.

More important is the absence of any strong opposition. This makes it difficult to estimate the proposal's chances of practical success. It is not likely to be adopted this year, but if the study commission on congressional reform that Senator MONRONEY of Oklahoma, has proposed is established, and were to make the 4-year term part of its package of recommendations, it might sail through with little controversy.

The chief arguments against a 4-year term are the force of tradition and the belief that the necesity of running every 2 years is desirable in keeping a Representative close to his constituency.

Dr. Charles Clapp of the Brookings Institution reports in his book "The Congressman" that when he discussed briefly the possibility of a 4-year term wtih Republican and Democratic House Members in 1959, they were overwhelmingly of the opinion that, although longer tenure would be delightful from their vantage point, it would never be adopted. Senators, they observed, were not likely to adopt a constitutional amendment which would enable House Members to run for the Senate in midterm elections without risking their own seats.

The advocacy of this reform by Senator CLARK, who has never served in the House, suggests that these Congressmen may have judged their colleagues in the other chamber too harshly. Notwithstanding the risks, ambitious House Members who want to enter the smaller and more prestigious Senate are usually willing to surrender their seats and make the attempt. The 4-year term would, in fact, not noticeably increase the number of Representatives running for the Senate. On the contrary, by lessening the difference between the two Chambers, it would encourage Members of the House to stay there.

In any event, Senator CLARK has one more reform to take care of this contingency as well. A second clause in his proposed constitutional amendment would reduce senatorial terms from 6 years to 4, thus eliminating midterm elections altogether. No one expects the Senate to adopt this self-denying innovation. Only a man of Senator CLARK's imperturbale spirit would propose it to his colleagues.

We Must Say to Them That They Cannot Win "Elections" From a System Based on Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, the opening day of this 89th Congress, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, made a speech in the House of Representatives of great significance on the subject of the seating of the Mississippi delegation. I commend him for his depth of thought and courage of expression, and recommend to all the reading of his poignant remarks, which begin on page 49 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Appendix

The Philippines and Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in the field of foreign affairs, America faces one of its most critical challenges in southeast Asia and the Far East.

Surely, no one knows all of the answers; few of us understand all of the complexities involved in the technicalities of foreign relations; but all of us have the same desire—that is, to project the best interests of our Nation and our people and, in doing that, to promote the interest of freedom and free men throughout the world.

Our heritage has been a rich one, Mr. Speaker, but it is incumbent upon us all to review and reflect upon our attitudes and our outlook to insure that our judgments always reflect our best interests. Undoubtedly, some of our ablest experts are dedicating their efforts to the difficult questions in the Far East and southeast Asia. In trying to resolve these intricate problems between our people and the peoples of the East, we can all welcome intelligent and enlightened discussion of our policies and practices.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD at this point the speech of Ambassador William E. Stevenson—our Ambassador to the Philippines from 1961 to the middle of last year. This thought-provoking address was presented before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations on November 5, 1964:

THE PHILIPPINES AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Talk by William E. Stevenson before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Nov. 5, 1964)

I appreciate your kind invitation to be the speaker here today. In these crucial times a knowledge of international affairs is essential for enlightened citizenship. So I congratulate this council for its efforts to bring its members and friends together from time to time to listen, to question, and to discuss the great world issues confronting us as Americans.

There is a story about three baseball umpires. They were talking shop together in the locker room after a game. One volunteered, "There are balls and there are strikes. I calls 'em as I see 'em." The second umpire replied, "Sure—but I calls 'em as they are." After a pause, the third and most senior umpire observed, "They're balls and strikes all right, but until I calls 'em they ain't nuthin."

Here today I shall try to emulate the first umpire. I shall talk frankly about things as I see them. And may I stress that I am no longer connected with the Government so do not speak officially. I talk as an individual and the sole responsibility for any views expressed is my own.

At the outset, let's remind ourselves very briefly of some facts concerning the Philippines:

A republic since 1946, it numbers today about 30 million people. Most of them live on the dozen largest of the more than 7,000 islands governed by the Philippines. The archipelago extends for 1,200 miles, from 5° north of the Equator to within a hundred miles or so of Formosa at the north. From the southernmost islands British Borneo—now included in Malaysia—is clearly visible.

The land area of the Philippines approximates that of Great Britain. In more local terms it is about twice the area of Illinois.

It is believed that the earliest settlers reached the Philippines from the south, over land bridges, about 250,000 years ago. Since then there have been many infiltrations by different ethnic stocks from Asian points and again from the south when large numbers of Malays arrived and settled.

Scholars can identify 55 ethnic groups in the Philippines using about 70 dialects. However, more than 80 percent of the population speaks in eight principal native languages. By law "tagalog," the language of the greater Manila area, is designated as the national language. It has much overlap with Malayan as does Indonesian.

Starting with the arrival of Magellan in the Philipines in 1521, and by subsequent conquests, the islands came under Spanish rule until our war with Spain terminated it in 1898. Through the efforts of Spanish missionaries and other influences during its 350 years of control, not only Catholic Christianization but a strong Spanish culture and veneer became, and still is, a significant part of Philippine life and custom.

Today, as we all know, the United States finds itself involved in many parts of the world, not because of any imperialistic objectives, or any need or desire for additional territory, but rather, to stem the tide of Communist aggression. We are doing what we can to make it possible for the rapidly increasing numbers of new nations to establish themselves as viable, independent entities of free men and women.

It was somewhat comparable rationale that led to our involvement in the Philippines. We didn't seek the islands for ourselves, but after the conquest of the Spanish there, we feared to withdraw because of the risk that the Philippines might be globbled up again by Spain, or by Japan, or by one of the European powers which were so dominant in Asia at that time.

From the Treaty of Paris until the Philippines became an independent Republic on July 4, 1946, the United States occupied the Philippines. It was our one great adventure in colonialism. To our credit we brought to the Philippines universal education, the concepts of a democratic form of government and practices, the rule of law, and health and sanitation measures, as well as other benefits. Through some of our missionaries, Protestantism was introduced and today, about 10 percent of the population is Protestant. Of the balance, 80 percent is Catholic and the rest are Moslems or belong to other sects.

It has been said facetiously that "it's a miracle that Filipinos are not confused. They are Asians who spent 350 years in a Spanish convent and then 50 years in Hollywood." In actuality Filipinos, from their more than 400-year contact with the West, are quite familiar with Western ideas and values. They have accepted many of them. Since its independence, the Philippine Republic has consistently demonstrated practical and effective democracy. Without exception the people have selected and changed their political leaders through regular democratic elections and processes—a shining example for all of Asia, if not the whole world.

In this situation why do we not hear and know more about the Philippines here in the United States? Why are the infrequent items about the Philippines in our press mostly of the superficial, sensational variety, disregarding truly significant items such as the adoption and implementation of the Land Reform Code? Why do only a few of the leading American newspapers maintain a correspondent there? Why don't we work more closely with the Philippines in coping with Asian problems? Why do we give so much more attention and emphasis to other less democratic, or even undemocratic nations around the world, or to our enemies in the last war? These are the kinds of questions Filipinos are constantly asking. Answers are not always easy to make.

As our first and only colony and our protege and friend for so many years, Filipinos naturally are sensitive about the attention and solicitude we have been showing recently to other countries in Asia, some of which are lukewarm friends of the United States, if not anti-American. Philippine sensitivity was aggravated by the action of our Congress in 1962 in tentatively voting down final payments to Filipinos for war damages which we had promised. In contrast, we were spending far greater sums elsewhere in Asia. It must not be overlooked that the Filipinos, alone in Asia, fought as our ally against the Japanese and in doing so lost nearly a million soldiers and civilians and suffered devastating property damage, a substantial part of it caused by our own forces as the country was liberated. Next to Warsaw, Manila was the worst damaged capital in the war. Although much of the city has been rebuilt, it still bears war scars as do many of the principal provincial cities.

It does seem ironic that in keeping our fingers in so many dykes to prevent the Communist tide from breaking through, we tend to neigect those countries and allies whose dykes, for the moment at least, have no holes or cracks. As is so often true in everyday human life, it is the squeaky wheel that gets the grease.

In the case of the Philippines, are we neglecting a nation that could be even more useful than it is in contending with the many complex problems of Asia? Are we running the risk that, without more help and understanding from us—its adviser and logical protector—the Philippines may be unable to withstand outside pressures and possibly be lost someday to the free world? Alhtough more urgent and compelling pressures elsewhere may make it comprehensible, I believe we are not giving the Philippines as close attention and cooperation as we should.

Apart from the interest we should naturally show in the Philippines because, as the so-called "showcase of democracy," its success or failure will be ideologically related to our country, there are very practical rea-

sons why we should maintain our relationship on a very close and cooperative basis.

In these troublous times I would mention first our 1947 agreement with the Philippines permitting us to maintain and operate military bases there. These bases are of the greatest importance and utility to our Armed Forces and to our defense posture in the Far East. They are on the direct route between our country and South Vietnam. Not only is Clark Air Base vital to our 13th Air Force, and Subic, Cubi, and Sangley Naval Bases to our 7th Fleet, but we deprive special advantage in their use and operation because of the close relationship and association which our two countries—and our peoples—have enjoyed in the past. Filipinos know us, our language, and our customs. Thousands of Filipinos fought in American military units. The Philippine Armed Forces are patterned after ours and are advised by American military personnel. Selected Filipinos regularly attend our service academies. Ten thousand Filipinos are serving at this very moment in our Navy. Thousands of Filipino civilians and technicians are employed at our military bases.

Another very practical reason for maintaining closest ties with the Philippines is for economic and trade purposes. Here again we can deal with those who speak our language, are experienced in free enterprise, know our trade customs and requirements, and welcome American investment interest. The country is rich in resources and development potential. And, until the Laurel-Langley Treaty, unless renewed or extended, expires in 1974, Americans have equal opportunities with Philippine citizens.

Because of our American determination to resist Communist aggression and to defend freedom at all costs, throughout the world, we obviously need all the support and assistance we can get. In southeast Asia we have a longstanding ally in the Philippines. A charter member of the United Nations, it has stood with us there. It has strongly backed SEATO. While its financial and economic resources are presently limited, it has manpower, experience and willingness to cooperate with us in our tremendous task. In fact the Philippines is even more opposed to communism than we are. Communism is barred by law in the Philippines. President Macapagal is so passionately opposed to it that he would not even permit entry to a Yugoslav basketball team to compet in a league match in Manila.

In the past months our Government has indicated that we will cut off our aid program to the Philippines in the near future. Political pressures, especially in our Congress, probably account for this. Yet, our nonmilitary aid to the Philippines has been running at the paltry rate of about $3 million per annum. Most of that amount has been expended to supply American technicians in such fields as education, public administration, agriculture, flood control and public health. Having invested so much in effort, funds and manpower in the Philippines since 1898 to help it attain democratic independence, does it make sense to abandon this needed technical assistance just now? I believe the proposed action is premature, and shortsighted. If carried out it will be a great mistake. Because of the long, special relationship between our two countries, to stop this comparatively minor aid program will be construed most unfavorably against us in the Philippines.

During my recent 2½ years in the Far East, I took pains to visit and study most of the countries there. It became plain to me that while there may be superficial similarities between Asians and Westerners, basic personal and sociological differences exist between us. These must be taken into account in our dealings with each other if we are to expect mutually satisfactory accords and understandings. For example, Asians prefer easygoing friendliness to our habit of directness and blunt speaking. They abhor unpleasant situations, especially in personal relations.

This is illustrated by the story of an Asian farmer who promptly gave an affirmative answer to a request for help from a neighbor, knowing he could not possibly fulfill it because of a prior conflicting commitment. The farmer reasoned that it was better not to disappoint the petitioner twice: once, when the original request was made, and the second time, on the occasion when the help was needed. Any American who has lived in the Philippines has been puzzled by acceptances by Filipino friends of social invitations which afterward were not kept. The story of the farmer may throw light on how the problem arises.

Face is of the utmost importance in Asia. You can say things privately that should never be said in public. Americans prefer and are used to fast action. We want to achieve quick and decisive results. Asians are far more patient, philosophical and if necessary, long suffering. They are accustomed to waiting for desired objectives and consequences, even for centuries, if necessary.

The Asian relishes playing out each situation to its maximum. This characteristic has been compared to Spanish bull fighting. Like the matador, the cynosure of his thousands of afficionados, the Asian—and perhaps especially the Filipino—tends to prolong a discussion, a negotiation, or the conclusion of a contract, in order to get the most out of the personal encounters involved. He greatly enjoys bargaining—the ebb and flow of negotiation strategy—always carried on in an atmosphere of friendliness. In contrast, an American usually is restless to secure the quickest possible attainment of the goal, and, too frequently, he makes the mistake of showing it. Unlike the matador, who deliberately takes his time in order to obtain maximum attention to the drama and its climax, the American tries to kill the bull as quickly as he can.

I stress here these differences in approach, attitude and modus operandi, for two reasons:

1. In dealings with Asians, I do not believe that we Americans take such differences into account enough—very much to our disadvantage. Decisions are made, especially here at home, on the basis of our own background and culture with too little knowledge, practical experience and understanding of Asian attitudes, methods of negotiation, and customary procedure. Even in the field, where Asian reactions can best be learned from firsthand observation and in day-to-day experience in dealing with Asians, we rotate our diplomatic and top policy level governmental personnel far too rapidly—usually before meaningful comprehension of local mores, customs, and ways of doing things has been achieved to full advantage.

In theory it is recognized that 3 or 4 years at an oversea post is desirable. In practice, 2 years is nearer the average. Except in unusual circumstances, that is too short a time. It takes a new man a year or more to learn his job in a foreign land, to become acquainted with his counterpart officials on a personal working basis, and to begin to achieve his maximum performance level. In Manila, for example, the average tenure of the nine ambassadors who have served there since 1946 has been only 22 months. I know from many conversations with Filipino officials that they resent the disruptive, frequent changes in our American personnel. It defeats continuity of policy and administration.

Treaties, agreements, and documents are important, but in the end—in my view and experience—personal relations is vital in foreign affairs. Each situation around the world is different because in each we are dealing with different groups of complex personalities. The better our representatives learn to know them, gain their confidence, and acquire experience in dealing with them the more successful will be the outcome from our standpoint. Obviously that takes time.

In March of 1962, the 15 American ambassadors and 2 consuls general in the Far East met for a conference in the Philippines. Today only 2 of those 17 are still posted there.

My second point, with respect to differences between Asians and ourselves, has to do with a regrettable vestige of colonialism:

Just before World War II, General MacArthur, in command in the Philippines, sent his staff associate, the now so well known and distinguished Carlos P. Romulo, on a tour of southeast Asia to ascertain the attitudes of the various countries toward the expected Japanese invasion. General Romulo reported back that in country after country he found concern and apprehension about the Japanese but many then said they would prefer the Japanese to their colonial masters whom they resented and distrusted far more.

Although the American colonial record was comparatively good in the Philippines, we must reluctantly recognize that even though illogical and unjust, prejudice and resentment against one particular colonial power has tended to be turned against all former colonial powers, i.e., white men. This is certainly one of the factors in the enigmatic policies being followed at present by Indonesia. It may well be a factor minimizing or affecting our American effectiveness elsewhere in Asia.

In such a situation the Philippines, sharing our ideals and political objectives and not holding any serious resentment against us for our 48 years of colonial rule, could play a more significant and helpful role in Asia than we are asking of it. As Asians, the Filipinos could bring about rapport, understanding, and cooperation with their fellow Asians that we Americans could never achieve. Of course, they will follow Asian patterns, and their approaches and techniques will differ from those we would customarily use. But if we mean it when we endorse the solution of Asian problems by Asians, then we must place special confidence in such Asians as our Filipino friends. We lose all the benefit that an Asian partner can gain for us if we continue to call most of the shots ourselves, and make decisions at home or with others without close collaboration with our Asian ally.

The Filipinos evolved and applied most effective techniques in the defeat of the Huk Communist movement in their country just after the war. You will recall that under the leadership of Ramon Magsaysay—who because of his success later became President—a new military concept was conceived, a combination of force and persuasion. By virtue of its excellent public relations practices the army gained recognition by the people as their genuine protector. In the end the seriously threatening Huk rebellion was defeated as a movement of any significance by (1) a succession of Huk military defeats; (2) loss of support to the Huks by farmers as the latter learned to trust the government; and (3) the arrest of the Huk leaders. An important factor in winning back the dissident farmers was the creation of an Economic Development Corps (Edcor) through which landless—especially repentent Huk adherents—were resettled on land of their own. Although there are a few Philippine technicians in South Vietnam, it would seem that more Filipinos with experience in the successful campaign against the Huks would be most useful and effective. I am sure that they are available.

In the dispute between Indonesia and Malaysia, the Philippines has sought to be a conciliator. Despite its historic claim to

land which became part of the new state of Malaysia a year or so ago, and the validity of which claim it has indicated it is most ready to resolve through peaceful and legal procedures, the Philippines regards itself as the friend of both Malaysia and Indonesia. The Philippines is also conscious of the far reaching implications should Indonesia become Communist. As President Macapagal recently stated it: "Firstly, if Indonesia turns Communist, the Philippines will be among the first to be adversely affected. Secondly, if it is costing the free world considerable effort, expense and manpower to retrieve small countries like Laos and South Vietnam from the Communist orbit, it is staggering to contemplate how much more effort, expense and manpower the free world will have to expend to retrieve a large country with 103 million people, like Indonesia."

It is with such thoughts in mind that the Philippines, even in the face of criticism and misunderstanding in certain quarters, has persisted in trying to keep doors open between Indonesia and the free world.

There are some who have been disturbed by independent attitudes shown by the Philippines or by particular Filipinos in recent years. There was criticism of our policy in Laos, the Presiednt canceled a trip to the United States when our Congress voted down the final war damage payments, there was talk about a 90° turn in Philippine foreign policy—to mention some items. To my mind it is natural for the Philippines, in seeking its true identity as an Asian nation, while at the same time maintaining its status as our friend and ally, to think in terms of nationalism and to demonstrate its bona fide independence. We can't have it both ways. Either we want the Philippines to continue its reliance upon us indefinitely, or we prefer them to achieve true self-sufficiency and national stature both economically, politically, and most important, in the eyes of its neighbors. From the latter vantage point—as I have argued already—the Philippines is serving as an outstanding example of what democracy means, and it can also render very special assistance in Asia to the causes of the free world to which it is also committed.

The ambivalent position some Filipinos find themselves in with respect to this question of nationalism and Americanism was expressed this past August in a thoughtful editorial in the Philippines Free Press by the editor, Teodoro M. Locsin. He wrote: "Heaven knows what will be the ultimate relationship between the Philippines and the United States, what will be the final Philippine response to communism, Chinese or domestic. Communism * * * offers one world, a Communist one, while noncommunism offers fragmentation. There is the urge to independence, on the one hand, and the urge to be part of a greater whole. Meanwhile Filipinos are being Americanized—by the books and papers they read * * * the movies and television programs they see, the music they hear, by the whole educational system * * *. They are taught to be like Americans, to be pro-American—it always shocks Americans here to come across anti-Americanism in opinion or action; but by what necessity should Filipinos be pro-American? The process of Americanization goes on—only to end in the Philippine product being made to realize that he is not, after all, an American. Indoctrination is followed by rejection. The sense of dislocation is complete. Resentment is a natural reaction."

One great denominator common to all the countries of southeast Asia is fear of the Chinese in general and of Red China in particular. Looming over all of Asia is the spectre of China, with its huge burgeoning population which, whatever its political ideology may then be, must almost inevitably burst its bounds and pour its people like a lava flow into adjacent areas. Each southeast Asian country has had experience with its own hard working, competitive, successful Chinese middleman, tradesmen, and money lenders. Rather than a policy of assimilation, or at least some approach to accommodation, a variety of restrictive or segregative measures have been adopted against the respective "overseas" Chinese minorities. Obviously such measures are only makeshift and beg the basic question.

Indonesia tried to cope with this special problem by segregating its Chinese and their business activities into the larger cities. In the Philippines legislation became effective last June seeking to limit all retail trade to Philippine nationals. Unfortunately thus far retail trade has been so broadly construed that a number of American firms, particularly the oil companies, would be caught in the net ostensibly thrown out to catch the industrious, ubiquitous Chinese. This matter is now being litigated, but it may be worked out on the political level.

Without doubt an important factor in the formation of the new State of Malaysia a year ago (amalgamating Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak, and North Borneo) was to counterbalance the high percentage of Chinese in Singapore and Malaya by the high percentage of non-Chinese in the other states located in Borneo several hundred miles across the South China Sea. This very objective, on the part of the British and Malay organizers of Malaysia, made the Philippines unhappy about the new state in its belief that the mainland Singapore Chinese (so large in number) would, as citizens of Malaysia, have ready access to the North Borneo island territories, some of the north eastern boundaries of which are within sight of the Philippines. Thus Chinese Communists from Singapore could secure a bridge from the mainland to the islands to the east, perhaps even to the Philippines.

It was partly to unite in order to contain the Chinese tide that ASA (Association of Southeast Asia), consisting of Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines, was formed in 1961. In the summer of 1963, one element in the formation of Maphilindo (Malaya, the Philippines, and Indonesia) was the Chinese problem the three had in common and the spectre of the huge giant to the north that someday may move southward down the Malay Peninsula, or eastward across the South China Sea. Of vital importance to all of us will be the reaction of the Asian countries now that Red China has become an atomic power. Will this expedite confederation or new regional security arrangements by the anti-Communist nations of the area, or will it work some other way?

Probably because the Philippines was our ward for nearly half a century and because we have had such close contacts, I think we have each, perhaps inevitably, taken each other too much for granted. Perhaps it can be said that the Filipinos expect us to be what we've told them that we are. We, in turn, expect them to be what we like to think that we are.

At this particular time of troubles and problems in Asia, any taking for granted or veering away from each other would seem most unfortunate. As I have tried to develop in what I have said, I believe relations of a very close order and with better mutual cooperation, attention and understanding is very much in the American and I would hope the Philippine interest.

Fortunately we have in many able Philippine leaders men who know us well, understand us and are most anxious to contain and defeat communism everywhere. That President Macapagal is the true friend of the United States seems clear from his utterances and his actions on many occasions. Recently he referred to Philippine-American relations as "such a profound affinity between two peoples, cherishing freedom and democracy, that the close ties of mutual collaboration and respect between them are virtually impregnable."

Gov. Harold E. Hughes, of Iowa, Addresses Joint Session at Iowa State House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent state of the State message of Gov. Harold E. Hughes, of Iowa, delivered at a joint session of the Iowa Legislature on January 12, 1965. It records some of the excellent progress made by the State of Iowa over the past 2 years. This will make this information available to those institutions and individuals who otherwise would not have access to it.

The message follows:

STATE OF THE STATE MESSAGE TO THE 61ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY BY HON. HAROLD E. HUGHES, GOVERNOR OF IOWA, JOINT SESSION, JANUARY 12, 1965

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, honorable senators and representatives of the 61st general assembly, article IV, section 12 of the constitution of the State of Iowa sets forth as one of the duties of the chief executive that "he shall communicate, by message, to the general assembly, at every regular session, the condition of the State, and recommend such matters as he shall deem expedient."

I welcome this opportunity to meet with you on the first day after your convening and I wish you individually and collectively every success in the important endeavors before you.

Inasmuch as I have been invited to appear here again on Thursday to deliver my second inaugural address, I shall try to make my remarks today somewhat shorter than the Code of Iowa. I don't want to wear out my welcome at this early stage of the session.

From any way you approach it, the state of the State is a vast subject and I could not conceivably cover every phase of it in these remarks. By communicating a few significant facts and observations, I can only attempt to convey a reasonably objective interpretation of the position of our State today and the distance we have traveled in the past 2 years. In the inaugural message, the emphasis will be on my concept of where we should go from here.

A state of the State message should, as I see it, be something of a balance sheet, taking note of liabilities as well as assets and viewing the State as a whole—its economy, its culture, its aspirations and its far-flung system of local governments as well as the State government itself.

Exactly what determines the state of a State? How can we define it or measure it? The treasury balance does not constitute it, although this is a relevant factor. Nor does the value of our industrial production, the rate of employment, or the number of pupils in our schools—although these facts are extremely important and pertinent.

The truth is that the state of the State is a qualitative as well as a quantitative matter. The success or failure of a State is gauged in the final analysis by the opportunity it affords its people for the good life in the highest sense of this concept.

The state of the State involves spiritual as well as material considerations. The state of our minds has a great deal to do with the state of our State.

The state of the State involves attitudes, social trends, prides, prejudices, and ideals,

the courage to venture and the willingness to adapt to changing conditions. From another approach, we may define the state of the State in terms of movement—Is our State dynamic or is it static? Above all the state of our minds and the state of our State are conditioned by our degree of faith in the future.

Ladies and gentlemen, Iowa in its present hour checks out favorably by all of these standards. I do not mean, of course, that we have achieved the goals that all of us who love Iowa want her to achieve. I do mean that we have made historic breakthroughs and that we are moving in the right direction. The fact of the matter is that Iowa is on the move and on the map and I sincerely believe that the points I am about to make will bear this out.

IOWA'S EXPANDING ECONOMY

It seems to me fitting to begin with the meat and potato course—by which I refer to our economy: the fiscal posture of your State government, general economic conditions throughout the State, and the measure of our economic development during the past 2 years.

First, I would say that the financial position of your State government is strong, healthy, and full of promise for the years ahead. I look at this not so much as a credit to this administration as a tribute to the character of our people who demand and have received sound, pay-as-you-go, virtually debt-free State government operation.

At the end of the present biennium, on June 30, 1965, the comptroller estimates that there will be an unencumbered balance in the State treasury of approximately $30 million. At least half of this will be available to meet the revenue needs of the next biennium. Revenue from current taxes is expected to increase during this biennium by more than 12 percent over the previous 2-year period. Further details on the State's finances will, of course, be set forth in my budget message early next month.

Every citizen of this State has a right to be proud of the unprecedented record of economic growth this State has registered in the past 2 years. This year the value of Iowa's industrial production exceeded $8 billion for the first time in our history. The total value of our industrial and agricultural production was more than $10 billion—a gain of $1.2 billion from 1963. It is generally conceded that personal income will surpass the record figure of $6.4 billion set in 1963. Total employment set a new record in each of the past 2 years and earnings are at a record level.

Iowa Development Commission figures show that one new mark after another was set in industrial growth over the past 2 years.

New industries, branch plants and expansions hit new peaks—168 such industrial developments in 1963 and a leap to 278 last year. Employment opportunities created on the production line numbered 6,093 in 1963; then mounted to 6,876 in 1964. Capital investment in plants and equipment—the basis for a major source of State and local revenue—was reported at more than $134 million last year, nearly double the 1963 record total of over $70 million.

More than 100 branch plants were established in Iowa during the 2-year period, indicating an increasing awareness of Iowa's potential on the part of out-of-State manufacturers. However, it is particularly reassuring to note that our existing industries affirmed their confidence in the future of our State by announcing more than 180 expansions of their Iowa plants.

These figures do not include the additional job opportunities created in the trades and services as the direct result of industrial expansion; neither do they reflect the increased personal income nor the growth in tax revenue to State and local governments which results from such economic growth.

The total value of manufactured goods for 1964, at $8.1 billion, represents a 17-percent increase over the 1963 record figure. Contrasted with the nearly steady level of farm marketings, which maintained Iowa's leading position in agriculture, this total serves to point up the need for increased efforts toward greater diversification in our economy.

One of the major efforts in the direction of such diversification took place over the past 2 years in the field of tourist promotion. It is regrettable that all Americans—and all Iowans—are not yet fully aware of our State's vacation and recreational assets. But we can pride ourselves on participation in development of the four-State Hiawatha Pioneer Trail, the first major promotion of its kind ever undertaken in Iowa; we can reflect with confidence on the average increase in attendance of more than 20 percent at Iowa's major travel attractions, and we can readily measure the rising tourist interest in Iowa by the ever-increasing volume of requests and inquiries about the State's attractions.

While Iowa's economic progress has in some measure reflected the general prosperity of the Nation, there is no question but that we have made significant gains in our own right as a State. Total personal income in the State last year rose by 5.3 percent, compared to a 4.9 increase over the Nation as a whole; per capita income was up 5.1 percent, compared to a national increase of only 3.4 percent. Department store sales have shown about a 4-percent growth in the past year; time deposits in banks, together with checking transaction volume, are higher, and general retail sales reports are favorable. Nonagricultural employment increased by 2.6 percent over 1963, tending to offset the continuing drop in farm employment.

In addition, the latest employment figures show Iowa with the lowest rate of unemployment in the Nation, although there is still a more-than-adequate supply of efficient and productive workers to attract new industry, and there are areas of underemployment which cry out for assistance in helping themselves through area development programs and other cooperative governmental aids.

This record industrial growth in Iowa in the past 2 years did not take place without the concerted effort of individual citizens, community groups, and governmental bodies. Credit should be given to the Iowa Development Commission and some 250 local development groups in the State. Credit should be given to the last session of this general assembly which adopted a significant legislation to spur industrial development and to attain wider utilization of our agricultural products. Credit should be given to industrial and financial leaders who gave impetus to our industrial promotion by participating in the "sell Iowa" trips to Chicago, the Twin Cities, and New York, and who are presently serving on my State economic advisory council. Credit should go to our universities, to labor, and to farm organizations, all of whom have lent their enthusiasm and their effort to this common cause. Credit should be given to local citizens, both rural and urban, who have participated in area development committees that have organized and begun functioning in the past 2 years.

In other words, we are seeing for the first time what can be done to advance the common good when we have a truly cooperative effort behind the endeavor.

ADMINISTRATION

In the State administration we have instituted a regular series of interdepartmental meeting and a weekly get-together of department heads in order to eliminate duplication of effort and to achieve greater coordination between the departments of State government. We have presented the first public hearing on the State budget in history. We have expanded the use of data processing and other modern business methods in State departments. By the creation of a Governor's commission on State and local government, we have broken ground in what we hope will be a new era of cooperation between State and local government and between the various units of local government. Efficiency of tax collections has been sharpened by further implementation of the agreement with the Federal Government for cross-checking of State and Federal returns and by the exchange of information between State agencies. We have been able to operate the State government during the past 2 years from current revenues and at the same time to increase the State treasury surplus.

BREAKTHROUGHS TOWARD PROGRESS

In the past 2 years, more important breakthroughs toward progress have been made in Iowa than in any similar period in the current century. I would like at this time to express my appreciation to the last session of the general assembly for their extraordinary contributions—and I convey this now personally to those members in this chamber today who served in the 60th session of our legislature. I would like also to express my appreciation to the dedicated people in the departments of State government who have given outstanding service during the past biennium in carrying out new laws and in working administratively to reach new levels of efficiency and economy in government. The State of Iowa is a better place in which to live because of the effort of these people.

It is no secret to anyone familiar with the recent history of this State that for a considerable period we were trapped in a treadmill of negative thinking. This consisted on the one hand of a passionate devotion to the status quo with the related idea that anyone who was willing to discuss the State's problems realistically was "downgrading" the State. On the other hand, we heard, far too often, the statement "It can't be done in Iowa."

In the past 2 years we have seen that many things which people said couldn't be done have been done.

In the special session of the legislature in 1964, a temporary reapportionment plan was adopted that gave all of our people reasonable equality of voting rights for the first time in this century. In my opinion, this enactment has had a tremendously beneficial effect on the morale and self-respect of the majority of citizens of Iowa and has contributed to the fresh outlook we find in our State today.

The 60th general assembly made history by enacting a liquor control law providing for liquor by the drink with strict enforcement provisions. As you all know, this marked the end of the era of the wide-open illegal bars and key clubs in Iowa where anyone, adult or minor, could buy illegal liquor by the drink in open contempt of the State law.

Many other legislative milestones were registered by the last regular session of the general assembly.

Public utility regulation, providing protection to the consumer was enacted after 50 years of fruitless effort in this area. Regulation of public utilities under the Iowa State Commerce Commission in the past 2 years has resulted in reduction of utility rates by $5 million annually—without a formal rate case.

The first significant legislation in this century to provide home rule for Iowa's cities and towns was adopted, and while the constitutionality of this particular measure is

in doubt, there is no question in my mind that the way has now been cleared for whatever action may be required to confer upon local communities the long-needed power of self-determination in local affairs.

A new law was enacted to provide citizens of Iowa undiluted property tax relief in the form of interest on current operating funds of local governments. Fair employment practices legislation was adopted for the first time in our history. This was followed by an executive order from this administration to eliminate discrimination for reasons of race, creed or color in State government. An effective law for brucellosis control was enacted. Pensions for government employees were increased. Workmen's compensation laws were improved. Medical aid to the aged under the Kerr-Mills Act was implemented.

EDUCATION

In the past 2 years, progress has been made in the service areas of State government that must be sustained if the bright promise of our economic growth is not to wither on the vine.

There is no more important service of government than the education of our youth. In Iowa we have over 600,000 pupils enrolled in our elementary and secondary schools. The education of these pupils costs the citizens of Iowa approximately $300 million annually. While the total cost seems large, the average investment of approximately $500 per pupil is small when you consider the task of preparing a person for a lifetime of occupational and civic competency.

In the past biennium and in the past decade, Iowa has made substantial improvements in its public elementary and secondary schools. In 1953–54, there were 4,492 school districts in Iowa. For this school year, there are 1,097 school districts in the State. Four hundred and fifty-nine of these are high school districts. It should be acknowledged, however, that school district reorganization is not complete. Clearly Iowa does not need 1,100 districts to educate 600,000 elementary and secondary pupils.

The quality of instruction that Iowa children have available to them has also improved in recent years. With respect to academic qualifications, 46 percent of our high school teachers and 10.8 percent of our elementary school teachers now hold master's degrees. Almost 100 percent of our high school teachers and 50.5 percent of our elementary school teachers hold B.A. degrees and this percentage is increasing yearly.

Time does not permit the listing of other advances that have been made in public school education. Obviously, school reorganization and teachers' qualifications are only two phases of a vast complex of problems. Our objective, as I see it, is to provide first-class educational opportunity for all of the children and youth of this State—and adults as well where retraining is required—wherever they reside or whatever their individual capacities may be. It is a big order, I know. And new answers to curriculum, structure, and support patterns will be required to meet this all-important objective.

The importance of higher education to our economic development, as well as to our cultural development, has never been so widely appreciated as at the present time. The period between this legislative session and the last has seen many changes and improvements at our three public institutions of higher learning. The retirement of Dr. Hilton and Dr. Hancher after long periods of distinguished service to the State presented the board of regents with a formidable problem of finding qualified successors. The board, in my opinion, met this problem with the utmost wisdom. As a result, I would say to you that in Dr. Bowen, Dr. Parks, and Dr. Maucker we have three of the top educational leaders in the Nation to head our institutions of higher learning.

For the record, our three large State-supported institutions have nearly a 25-percent larger enrollment this year than in the school year of 1960–61. In the last 10 years, the number of students at these same 3 schools has grown from 21,000 to 32,000. This massive increase in enrollment will continue in the years ahead and presents problems which must be met and I am sure they will be met.

During the 1964 special session, a higher education facilities commission was established to develop a State plan in order that public junior colleges and Iowa's public and private institutions of higher learning might receive Federal funds for the construction of school buildings.

Iowa subsequently became one of the first 18 States to obtain Federal approval of its State plan. Applications totaling nearly $2.5 million from nine public and private institutions were approved by the commission in December and forwarded to the U.S. Office of Education. Applications for the remaining $1.4 million available to Iowa during the current fiscal year will be received by the Iowa commission during the next few months.

PUBLIC SAFETY

In the area of public safety, our prime concern in Iowa, as in all the other States, is with traffic safety. With the explosive increase of traffic on our highways, the tragic rise of traffic accidents and fatalities has become epidemic in Iowa as in other parts of the Nation. To cope with this shocking situation, the department of public safety and county and municipal traffic officers throughout the State have joined in an all-out program.

To coordinate these efforts, we organized the Governor's Traffic Safety Coordinating Committee, composed of top leaders in the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of State, county and municipal government and initiated the following programs in enforcement, education, and engineering:

Revitalization of the division of safety education, issuance of temporary driving permits to every first-year operator, establishment of the community conference for better driving and the driver improvement clinic, implementation of the implied consent law, installation of electronic data processing and use of social security numbers to keep closer tab on the records of nearly 1,600,000 licensed drivers in Iowa, the calling of the first traffic court conference in Iowa since 1945, and various other measures.

No stone has been left unturned within the authority the State now has to deal with this overriding problem. This is an area in which several measures of important legislation will be requested of the present session of the general assembly.

In other areas of public safety during this biennium, the Bureau of Criminal Investigation has initiated a program of assigning resident agents to the field in order to work more effectively with local law enforcement officials. The fire marshal's office, for the first time in recent history, has brought up to date its inspection program of schools and nursing homes and has inaugurated a broad, new program of fire prevention.

HIGHWAYS

In this age of spectacular progress in transportation, one of the most important responsibilities of your State government is in the construction and maintenance of highways. Last fall, the highway commission completed its 324th mile of four-lane divided interstate highway—the final link between Des Moines and the east coast. In terms of interstate highways completed and scheduled for construction in the 5-year period ahead, Iowa holds a position at the forefront among the States.

In the meantime, the State's primary system has not been neglected. Reconstruction of several of our important cross-State primary routes has been underway to bring these heavily traveled highways up to present-day standards. While the ultimate goal has been to modernize the entire highway system, a program of curb removal on existing narrow highways and of widening of narrow bridges has been conducted in the interests of highway safety. Curb filling or the placing of an asphalt mat between the "lip curbs" on 407 miles of narrow highways has been completed and contracts have been let for the widening of 29 narrow bridges in the primary system in the past 2 years.

Actual highway construction accomplished in the past 2 years includes the following: 77 miles of four-lane interstate paving; 303 miles of primary pavement including 32 miles of rural highway four-laning; 352 miles of grading, which includes 106 miles of four-lane interstate grading; 47 miles of widening narrow highways; 228 miles of resurfacing; and 2,668 highway bridges, culverts, and roadway pipe culvert.

CONSERVATION

No area of the State government is closer to my heart than the conservation of our natural resources and the administration of our outdoor recreation facilities. Perhaps the most salient contribution of the conservation commission in the past 2 years has been the development of long-range plans for conservation and recreation in Iowa that kindle the imagination to the potentials that exist in these important areas.

In addition, I would report that 9 million visitors used our State parks in 1964; that we have the longest pheasant season and the highest small-game population in history; that we substantially increased the forest acreage under the State's jurisdiction; that we completed construction of a fish hatchery, aquaria, and laboratory at Clear Lake; and that we reorganized our fish and game administration and made major improvements in several parks.

HUMAN RESOURCE PROGRAMS

In the human resource areas of mental health and mental retardation, programs for the physically handicapped, public health, social welfare, and corrections, the pattern was generally one of continuing progress with some exceptions.

In mental health, perhaps the most encouraging index of progress has been the increased interest and effort on the local level in providing community mental health services. While the State can provide modern hospitals and hospital schools and can provide effective leadership in mental health programs, in the final analysis a large share of the responsibility must devolve upon the local community. Large State institutions and unwieldly, costly State programs are not the answer to an effective State program in mental health.

Although our overall effort in social welfare in Iowa is substantial, there are phases in the financing and administration of the program that need shoring up. In my opinion, the present schedule of paying 75 percent of basic living needs to ADC families is inadequate. So also is the handling of the 1,231 seriously handicapped adults in the aid to disabled assistance group who are not provided any medical care under the present program. Administratively, I believe that greater emphasis should be placed on existing programs for rehabilitation of recipients, such as training ADC mothers to become self-supporting.

To those who look with jaundiced eye on all welfare programs, I would say, as I have in the past, that adequate, efficiently administered welfare programs are a sound public investment, while inadequate, halfhearted programs are a waste of the taxpayers' money. Antiwelfare people point out to us that

there are sometimes second and third generation welfare recipients. I would point out to them that inadequate programs that demean, rather than efficiently build on the self-reliance of the recipients, are the breeding grounds of family patterns requiring public assistance from generation to generation.

The State department of public health has operated well within the stringently inadequate limitations of its budget. With the death of Dr. Zimmerer in 1963, the State lost one of its most devoted public servants. It is a credit to our State's potential that we have been able to attract a man of the caliber of Dr. Long to the position of acting commissioner of public health.

The State's modern and progressive program in corrections has moved ahead steadily in the past biennium, although it was marred, as you know, by some costly and regrettable disturbances among inmates at the penal institutions. The situations from which these incidents arose have been remedied and every precaution has been taken to prevent future recurrence. The board of control and I have been united in our support of the modern program of treatment, training, and rehabilitation which represents the best thinking in modern penology. Although the post of director of corrections is presently vacant, the board is in the process of interviewing qualified prospects for the position and we are confident it will be filled in the near future.

Through the diligent effort of a highly competent parole board, probation and parole have been increased in the last few years with a resultant decline in prison populations since 1962. It is significant that there has been no marked increase in violation of paroles during this period.

Advancements made in the institutions under the board in the current biennium include the development of a new program at the State Training School for Boys at Eldora that has attracted national attention and the establishment of new vocational programs for rehabilitation at the men's reformatory at Anamosa.

The functioning of government is never perfect, and even today there are many human needs that are not being adequately met in Iowa. Yet as I reflect on the vast and farflung operations of government in Iowa, I can think of many distinguished services being performed day in and day out in which every Iowan can take pride. In downtown Des Moines on any day, you will see many persons moving about the streets with white canes—and you will know that this is part of the great work that is being done by the commission for the blind in teaching the newly blinded to make their way in life. In our wards for retarded children at our State hospitals, in the university laboratories where instruments are devised to record the mysteries of outer space, in the vocational rehabilitation of human beings with shattered bodies * * * in these and countless other areas you may find reason for pride in this State. I only regret that time does not permit me to touch on more of these vital services that attest to our humanity and civilization as a people.

AGRICULTURE

A year ago, as you all know, Iowa harvested its first billion-dollar corn crop. We have long been known as the State where the tall corn grows. God willing, we will always bear this proud title.

While the value of manufactured goods produced in Iowa now exceeds the value of agricultural products by more than three times, farming is still our basic industry. This is an economic fact and not a sentimental cliche.

In discussing the state of our State, I think we must face the fact that in this period when our State and National economies are surging to new levels of prosperity in other sectors, many Iowa farmers are facing economic crisis. This should be a matter of intense concern to every urban citizen of the State as well as our farm people, for nothing has a more profound effect upon the overall well-being of Iowa than the state of our farm economy.

It is my personal conviction that we are entering in Iowa a new era of cooperation and mutual understanding—and this may well be the most important single development bearing upon the state of our State.

The lines that once separated rural and urban Iowa are fading fast. I believe nonfarm people in Iowa are developing a more enlightened understanding of farmers and their problems. This is of the utmost importance, since for the good of all, we need to present, as a State, a united front to the Nation and to the world on behalf of Iowa agriculture.

Along the same lines, I think that Iowans as a whole are developing a fairer and more mature understanding of the problems and legitimate aspirations of the working men and women of the State. They are beginning to realize that the factory worker or mechanic who is their neighbor and fellow church member is still the same person as part of a labor organization.

It is generally acknowledged that Iowa's labor force is of the highest quality that may be found. It goes without saying that much of the credit for recent advancements in our State's economy must go to labor.

I hope and believe that the old age of stubborn prejudice and dark distrust toward working people and labor organizations is drawing to a close in Iowa.

In this hour of unlimited promise for our State, no Iowan can afford to be antibusiness, antilabor, antifarmer, antigovernment or antiprogress. No Iowan can afford to look with suspicion at his neighbor because of the occupation he follows, the church he attends or because of the color of his skin.

At long last, ladies and gentlemen, I believe we have begun to free ourselves from the bullheaded prejudices that have cramped our spirit and retarded our growth in years gone by.

Our future depends upon our ability to act as a united people. In a very real sense for Iowans, the state of our State is dependent on the State of our Union, one with another.

Through a conscious effort to achieve higher levels of cooperation and mutual understanding, we can all become better Iowans.

Kenneth H. Burns, Maritime Administration, Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn recently that a native of my home State of Texas has been awarded a high honor for superior performance in connection with his duties in the Maritime Commission. I am inserting below a letter addressed to Mr. Burns signed by Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., December 24, 1964.

Mr. KENNETH H. BURNS,
Office of the General Counsel,
Maritime Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR KEN: Recently I personally approved a cash award for your markedly superior performance of duties in connection with the NS *Savannah* program.

This award is a token of my appreciation for the remarkable degree of initiative and personal drive that you have shown in your assignment since I designated you as my Special Assistant for Public Affairs in May of 1964. Your achievements in this regard reflect creditably not only upon yourself but upon the Maritime Administration as a whole.

May I extend my sincere personal congratulations to you, and assure you of my best wishes for your continued success.

Sincerely yours,

NICHOLAS JOHNSON,
Maritime Administrator.

The International Road Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading organizations in the development of highways throughout the entire world is the International Road Federation. As a member of the Committee on Public Works, I am familiar with the fine work now being done by this organization to bring about the best highway systems in all parts of the world.

One of the leading figures in the International Road Federation is an old friend and a distinguished administrator, its president, Mr. Robert O. Swain. On January 12, 1965, Mr. Swain delivered a most important and instructive talk on the question of road problems before the Highway Research Board in Washington. Mr. Swain's statement has so much merit that I offer it for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The text of Mr. Swain's address follows:

ROAD AND ROAD TRANSPORT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, WORLDWIDE

(Presented at the Highway Research Board, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., January 12, 1965, by Robert O. Swain, president, International Road Federation)

Due to the widespread usage of the English language and the large circulation of American publications, road researchers and roadbuilders abroad have easy access to U.S. research results. But this is a one-way information flow, and it puts Americans in an unfavorable position: U.S. roadbuilders are definitely a "have not" group when it comes to access to research and development information from other parts of the world.

Over the 5-year period 1958–63, the free nations of the world increased their expenditures for highways by almost half—from $16.7 billion in 1958 to more than $23.82 billion in 1963. In the same period, the number of motor vehicles in these countries rose by more than a third—from 106.6 to 144.6 million..

Sometime in this year of 1965, highway expenditures in the free countries of the world, outside of the United States, will equal those in the United States. In view of this tremendous growth, it becomes evident that initiative, ingenuity, and professional qualifications must exist in many parts of the world.

The new and realistic highway facilities that are now being planned and constructed

abroad are the product of trained engineers and economists scattered throughout the world. Many such works are being undertaken by the almost 400 graduates of the International Road Federation fellowship program, which has given graduate engineers from some 80 countries an academic year of advanced study in the United States. Skilled engineering talent is now global. No one country holds a monopoly on either problems or approaches to their solutions. The United States must give greater acknowledgement to the work being done abroad.

If a needed highway job is to be done economically, speedily, and in accordance with the best standards, the builders and planners must have access to the results of research and development on an international scale. Enormous amounts of time and money can be and have been wasted, simply because engineers are not aware of the experience and findings of their peers in other parts of the world.

The problem is not that there has not been important research and development work done globally. Rather, it is that information already obtained has not been coordinated and is not available here in the United States and elsewhere when and where it may be needed.

The problem of coordination is a vast one and it is compounded by differences in language, economics, and objectives. But perhaps the most important reason for failure of previous attempts has been the inability to utilize qualified professional personnel for direct observation and interview purposes. Questionnaires have long been obsolete for real scientific purposes, having proved particularly annoying (and thus gone unanswered) to men devoting full time to a scientific or technical operation.

The answer must be found in the creation of methods and channels through which research and development data covering roads and road transport internationally can be collected, codified, and made readily accessible. We emphsaize that such a system for information storage and retrieval must be predicated on the practical accessibility of the information which will be of direct use and value to highway planners, designers, economists, researchers, equipment manufacturers, and others allied in the transport field.

International Road Federation, recognizing, as do so many other groups, the importance of research and edveolpment and the need for closer liaison among all interested in highways and highway transport, last year suggested a three-point program that would include (1) an inventory of current R. & D. work in the general field of highways and highway transport worldwide; (2) a detailed analysis of the individual current programs, for classification as to intent, and particularly to discover any parallel efforts that could or should be coordinated; and (3) designation or establishment of some agency, either public or private, to maintain current information on R. & D. progress and programs, and distirbute this information to interested agencies or individuals most probably combining the use of computer technology in this respect.

The Bureau of Public Roads offered both financial and technical support so that the first phase of the proposal could proceed.

Obviously the degree of success or any inventory is dependent largely upon the development and careful application of an effective methodology for the collection of the information. A methodology appropriate to the proposed preliminary inventory was developed in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads and the School of Engineering of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Four European countries were selected for the field studies and two engineers from the Virginia Department of Highways, long experienced in highway research, were borrowed to carry out the initial field work.

During the course of the past summer these engineers visited Denmark, Sweden, Germany, and Italy. Their schedules were arranged through the national road associations affiliated with the International Road Federation in each of the four countries. They were accomapnied on many of these visits by graduates of IRF fellowship program who, of course, were entirely conversant with both the language utilized in the interviews and the subject matter.

The work this summer brought further information on a total of 278 current research projects.

The results of these interviews add to our conviction that a system for improved international intercommunications on highway research and development would more than pay for its cost. In the countries visited, for example, research and development programs parallel both in nature and in the stage of advancement those recently completed, now underway or planned in the United States. This fact alone should alert us to the potential benefits that may be possible through closer coordination and more complete exchange of information.

Many examples could be cited of specific benefits where there has been such an international exchange. Some of the early road construction in the United States, for instance, was guided by the research findings of Thomas Loudon MacAdam in England who pioneered the macadam road. More recently, the tellurometer, developed in South Africa, received almost overnight acceptance and use in this country because of its proven advantages. The automatic scanning correlator (Auscor) developed in Canada, greatly expedited the remarkable advancements in data collection, processing and presentation in the United States.

For some years now, German cities have had in operation their green wave system of staggered timing of traffic signals combined with supplementary warnings to indicate how fast a motorist must travel to make the next light. Research in Germany was the basis for these systems. It also stimulated the development of the traffic pacer system in this country as well as other research on traffic signal timing.

Today, because of the close parallel between highway research and development programs in this country, in the four countries visited last summer and probably in many more, the opportunity for mutual benefits through improved international exchange of knowledge is tremendous. A great deal of emphasis is currently being placed upon urban transportation planning all over the world. At Gothenburg, Sweden, for example, where the population of 500,000 may be doubled in 10 years, a team of engineers and statisticians in the city planning office is preparing a comprehensive plan for a mass transport system embracing a number of different modes of travel. In the United States, no program of highway projects in urban areas of more than 50,000 population can be approved after July 1, 1965, for Federal-aid participation unless the projects are based upon a continuing comprehensive planning process, embracing various modes of transportation and carried on cooperatively by State and local communities. This need for better urban transportation is felt in almost every country. Coordination of this global effort would be a tremendous forward step toward providing the urban communities of the world with a sound basis for the development of efficient and effective transportation systems.

Many countries are now using orthotropic plate highway bridges. These bridges are still in the experimental stage in the United States where design details, fabrication, erection and other factors are being studied. It might be beneficial if the research and experience of other countries were available. For instance, in Germany, zigzag, transverse ribs are welded to the deck plate to keep the bituminous concrete surface from displacing under traffic.

There are many other instances where the findings of research and development in just the four countries visited would be well worth study by highway engineers in the United States and in other countries. In Italy, for example, a very highly developed technique for employing models in the design of bridges was noted. A noted pavement expert has proposed, on the basis of his studies, to make final thickness designs from plate bearing tests upon the completed subgrade. This technique should be compatible with current practices in the United States where grading and paving contracts often are let separately.

Vibratory pile driving using ultra sonic equipment is often used in other countries but only experimentally in the United States. A project was noted on a German program for the evaluation of infrared radiation for the removal of ice and snow. A special bituminous concrete is being developed to withstand conditions at bus stops. A test road is being constructed for the purpose of evaluating diagonal finishing equipment for stabilized base course and concrete surface construction.

Probably becaues accident rates in most European countries are even higher than ours, a major effort is being directed toward improving the safety of road designs. The method of development and refinement of devices for measuring slipperiness is given high priority in Germany at Stuttgart and Berlin; in Denmark at Copenhagen; and in Sweden, most particularly at Stockholm's National Road Research Institute. We have already learned much from some of these programs.

A fuller exchange could increase these benefits. As one example, a special skid trailer designed to measure the effectiveness of steel-studded tires on icy roads has shown that the use of studs in the tires can improve skid resistance at least as much as the use of abrasives on the pavement. U.S. tire manufacturers are now beginning to make these tires. Only recently the District of Columbia authorized the use of them but only for this winter. Damage to street surfaces, hazards to other vehicles, effectiveness, and other factors will be studied before use will be authorized permanently. Here again knowledge of experience in other countries would be helpful.

Other traffic safety projects include full scale tests, in Denmark and Italy, of a variety of types of median barriers and guardrails. The need for effective guardrails is obvious when one travels the no-speed-limit autobahnen and autostrade and notices the narrow medians separating opposing traffic lanes. Mutual benefit to all would accrue from improved communication.

This brief review would not be complete without mention of the spectacular model studies of bridges and other structures at the Institute of Experimental Studies of Models and Structures (Isames) at Bergamo, Italy; of the annual full scale tests in the mountains of northern Italy of various types of snow removal equipment conducted by the Technical University of Turin, and of the full sale tests, in the backyard of the Technical University of Aachen, of many types of construction equipment being developed in the very progressive Federal Republic of Germany.

This information has now been inventoried, analyzed, and submitted to the Bureau of Public Roads for inclusion in a storage and retrieval system now being developed by BPR and the Highway Research Board.

As a result of this pilot fieldwork, IRF now recommends a continuation of the program to include 30 additional countries. The interview sheets and other items of methodology for use in future studies have been revised and refined in accordance with the experience of the past summer.

As an adjunct to this work, and with the cooperation of Prof. Nicolas E. Manasseh, of the Department of Engineering, American University of Beirut, the IRF simultaneously looked into the broad activities in the field of information storage for road and road transport research and development which are underway outside of the four countries in which the pilot field survey was conducted. Coverage of course was restrictive and based only on materials available here in Washington.

The salient factor which emerged was the commanding importance of on-going research and development activities throughout Europe. Our conclusion is that their diversity and depth are of such consequence that the American road engineer can no longer afford to ignore this work.

Research organizations exist in strength in many parts of the world. Among the outstanding, according to the data we were able to collect, are the Committee for Scientific Research of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the Central Laboratory of Bridges and Roads of the French Ministry of Public Works, the Canadian Good Roads Association, and the British Road Research Laboratory.

The Committee for Scientific Research of the OECD is conducting an investigation which includes three phases: (1) the study of a multilanguage thesaurus and its adaptability to coding and analytical summaries; (2) determining the probable extent of cooperation between laboratories and services already publishing abstracts; and (3) examining the practical means of publishing analytical summaries. The Central Laboratory of the French Ministry of Public Works is doing a remarkable job of translating into French some 80 foreign publications. In 1963 it acquired more than 745 books and brochures and 540 microfilms, photocopies, and translations.

The Canadian Good Roads Association has in effect been the central research organization for Canada and in cooperation with agencies here in the United States, has done a most creditable job. A recent publication entitled "Road Research in Canada in 1963" is probably one of the best catalogs of its type in the field.

Because of a common language, the Highway Research Board and other agencies in the United States are well versed in the activities of the Road Research Laboratory in Great Britain.

In a modest manner, IRF itself has initiated a document center in Bern, Switzerland, where we are abstracting articles, some covering research and development. In 1964 we published two volumes of abstracts, the last one of which contains over 120 projects, each abstract running from 60 to 600 words.

In closing, let me again stress that research and development is not an end in itself. Neither is a system for storage and retrieval. The real value of information obtained and the accessibility of that information must be measured only in its end use and value to those working in the field of land transport improvement. Accordingly, it is logical to suggest that any international center devoted to the distribution of research and development material should be able to make that material available in any of the several basic languages which command the greatest use throughout the world. Translation of technical articles in the road and road transport field in the area of research and development must be made by qualified personnel proficient in both the language at hand and in general technical background. Here in the United States we are guilty of a major omission, since there are few facilities for ready translation of the wide source of multilanguage technical articles. These facilities should be made available to the road profession without delay.

It is interesting to note that recognition of an allied omission was made recently by the Ford Foundation with a $750,000 grant to the University of Texas to help improve and expand the translation of foreign literary works.

There is an urgent need for close liaison and worldwide coordination in this important field of highway research. We would foresee, in the not too distant future, the establishment of an international center through which the results of worldwide research could be made available to any group, country, or interested organization, in a basic language utilized within the requesting country and for inclusion in its own storage and retrieval system, if desired.

Admittedly considerable expense would be involved to bring this research utopia about. However, in relation to the great economic and social advantages which would accrue worldwide, the price would be small indeed.

Uncle Billy Frost Marks His 102d

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, everyone in my home city of Pampa, Tex., loves Mr. William B. Frost—or "Uncle Billy," as we all call him. Last Saturday, Uncle Billy Frost celebrated his 102d birthday. At the Pampa Senior Citizens' Center, of which Uncle Billy is a charter member, he told a friend that what he wanted most for his birthday was for all his friends to visit—not to bring gifts, but to bring themselves and big smiles.

Uncle Billy Frost is truly a pioneer in the now-great U.S. petroleum industry. His father drilled a well in Drake, Pa., generally credited with originating the petroleum industry and at age 14 Uncle Billy himself went to work pumping oil wells.

A staff writer for the Pampa Daily News, the newspaper's women's editor Peggy Jo Ormson, marked the occasion of Uncle Billy's 102d birthday with an excellent article about this wonderful man of great faith, confidence, and dignity. Her article about Uncle Billy follows:

"UNCLE BILLY" MARKS BIRTHDAY 102 SATURDAY

(By Peggy Jo Ormson)

Pampa's centenarian, William B. Frost (affectionately known as Uncle Billy), will mark his 102d birthday tomorrow. To celebrate the birthday anniversary, he was an honored guest at yesterday's meeting of Senior Citizens' Center of which he is a charter member.

A brief resumé of Uncle Billy's life as prepared by E. J. Dunigan, Jr., tells of his birth at Tinesty, Pa., January 10, 1863, on the banks of the Allegheny River.

It was Uncle Billy's father who drilled the second well at Drake, Pa. His first well there was generally credited with being the original in the U.S. petroleum industry.

Mr. Frost started pumping oil wells at the age of 14 in Pennsylvania and worked in Kansas, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Texas.

He was married to Miss Effie Jane Thompson, daughter of a minister. There were two sons and two daughters born to the couple. Only one son survives, Charles O. Frost of Caney, Kans.

Uncle Billy is a member of the First Christian Church of Pampa and has been a lifetime elder of the church. He is a firm believer in God and often, when he sees a troubled friend, he counsels with him and advises him not to worry, but to have faith in God.

The 102-year-old Pampan moved here in 1927 at the start of Pampa's oil growth. He was a superintendent for Dungian Bros.

He now lives by himself at 1105 Charles Street. Mrs. Frost died December 22, 1949. Until last year Uncle Billy did all his own housework and took care of his lawn and trees. He has now decided to take things a little easier and has a housekeeper in once a week and has most of his yard work done. However, Uncle Billy still does his own cooking and raked the leaves from his lawn this fall.

Mr. Frost believes the kindnesses and considerations shown him by his many Pampa friends and business people have made his life much richer and added years to his life.

Uncle Billy has four constant companions, his cats, which he says are the finest cats in the country although they eat more than he does. Frequent visits to Twilight Acres are greatly enjoyed by Uncle Billy where he visits with many new and old friends.

Mr. Frost was the eldest of seven sons and only the youngest brother, Burt Frost, still survives. He has a large number of grandchildren and great-grandchildren, and two great-great-grandchildren. A great-grandson, Terry Maderia, who lives at 914 North Somerville, is his only Pampa relative.

Uncle Billy has a host of friends, some of whom visit or telephone him daily. Friends drop in just to chat for a while, read his mail, or write letters to his daughter-in-law Genta, wife of Charles, in Kansas.

Hon. Matthew E. Welsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an editorial published in the Indianapolis Times praising the distinguished 4-year administration of the Honorable Matthew E. Welsh, Governor of the State of Indiana. In addition, I insert, under unanimous consent, the text of an article which appeared in the Indianapolis Times reviewing the just-completed administration of Governor Welsh on the same day he was named that paper's 1964 Man of the Year.

The editorial, which appeared January 10, and the article, which appeared January 1, follow:

A GOVERNOR DEPARTS

Matthew E. Welsh has been one of Indiana's best Governors.

He has improved the tone and raised the standard of State government.

He did this through 4 years of many frustrations. His problems ranged from the

final reckoning on his predecessors using up the wartime treasury surplus to the unforeseen coliseum disaster to the rising cost of educating our young.

He faced two legislatures which did not want him to look too good, and he managed cooperation and compromise through trying sessions when he could not get what he wanted.

How much could have been accomplished had the voters given him the comfortable legislative majorities they granted his successor, no one will ever know.

Even so, he brought greater businesslike efficiency to State administration, reformed the toll road, brought Indiana clearly in on the civil rights side of the civil rights issue, fit Hoosier traditions to 20th century realities, pushed progress on many fronts, and faced honestly the State's responsibilities even when he couldn't solve every problem.

It is a record of accomplishment against the odds.

Governor Welsh has had the grace and balance given to too few in public life to perform well as both a politician and a public servant.

He was far from perfect, but far less imperfect than most who brave the partisan brawls for high office.

Matt brought stature to the office and dignity to our town. He was good to have around.

We will miss him, and wish him the best in the years ahead.

THE TIMES NAMES MATT WELSH MAN OF THE YEAR

(By Walter Spencer)

Matthew Empson Welsh, 41st Governor of Indiana, today was named 1964 Man of the Year by the Indianapolis Times.

The Vincennes attorney and longtime public official was cited for elevating the standard of government in the State and for his personal example of integrity in Hoosier politics—for demonstrating that government service can be a dignified, honorable profession.

More than any specific accomplishments during his 4 years in the Governor's office, Welsh himself is proudest of drawing skilled, professional people into State government. This, Welsh believes, remains the major job in State administration. "We must raise the level, the tone of State service to be attractive as a career for young people," he said.

Welsh is the 10th winner of the Man of the Year award.

The 52-year-old Jackson County native has been admirably suited to run a State noted as an example of typical rural America, yet caught up in the economic progress and technical complexities of 20th century industry and technology.

His education has included small town elementary school (Brownstown), high school in a typical medium-sized Hoosier community (Vincennes' Lincoln High School), State university (2 years at Indiana University Law School) and specialized institutions (University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School of Commerce and Finance, from which he received a bachelor of science degree in economics in 1934).

Welsh obtained his law degree from the prestigious University of Chicago, yet before becoming Governor he referred to himself as having "a general small-town law practice."

Welsh grew up in the shadow of community government and a tradition of political service. The family home in Vincennes—to which the Welshes moved from Brownstown when he was 14—is directly across the square from the Knox County Courthouse.

His father was a longtime Democratic precinct committeeman.

Welsh's education, Ivy League appearance and decorum are not to be misread. The State's top administrator is not necessarily an ivory tower intellectual. He has the infighting experience of one who's grown up in the arena of Hoosier politics.

In 1937, Welsh received his law degree, hung out the shingle for his law office in Vincennes and married Virginia Homann of Washington, Ind.

Within 3 years, he was running for office (a seat in the State house of representatives) and won, despite the GOP sweep that year behind Indiana's favorite son, presidential candidate Wendell Willkie.

He resigned from the legislature in 1943 to take a commission in the Navy, where he served 3 years as a legal officer renegotiating war contracts.

His grassroots political experience included Democratic caucus chairman in the house during his second term in the legislature (1943), city chairman of Vincennes (1947), Seventh District chairman (1948–49), and Democratic floor leader in the State senate in both the 1957 and 1959 sessions.

In 1950, President Truman appointed Welsh U.S. district attorney here, a post he held for 2 years.

In his political career, Welsh has lost only two bids for office: He was defeated in the race for State Appellate Court judge in 1946 ("rationing killed us," he said of the Republican sweep) and he lost his party's nomination for the gubernatorial candidacy in 1956 to Terre Haute Mayor Ralph Tucker, who was defeated in the general election.

Governor Welsh put his political reputation on the line, standing in for President Johnson, in the Democratic presidential primary last May, and turned back the determined challenge of Alabama's segregationist Gov. George Wallace.

A team player, Welsh tallies the accomplishments of his term in the Governor's office in "we's":

"We've made major progress in the Interstate Highway System. The highway department has the entire interstate program in design. Four years from now it should be 80 percent complete, if the money continues to be available.

"We've launched a flood control program which will provide one new major reservoir per year for the next 10 years. It's just been put into the pipeline. Like so many other programs, the results won't be visible for a few years.

"The corrections department has greatly enlarged rehabilitation and vocational training programs, has built an intermediate institution and established work camps for first offenders.

"The State tax board has done a very fine job of improving property tax administration which has gone practically unnoticed, but which has been, in fact, a revolution, particularly with the problems of reassessment and the preparation of new tax manuals.

"The revenue department has instituted a new system of collection without confusion.

"The National Guard was selected as one of the top-priority divisions in the Nation. The civil rights commission has made strides to put the theory of equal opportunity into effect, and yet there has not been one incident of the social upheaval that they've had in other Northern States. We've carried out school reorganization programs, which now have 89 percent of the public school pupils in the State in school corporations of adequate size. Mental health has seen an expansion of service both on the State and local level."

But, again Walsh says he is proudest that: "A few years ago, no civil engineering professor at Purdue would recommend his students go to work for the State highway department because of the politics in it. Last spring, in competition with private industry, we got 25 percent of the graduating civil engineers."

Welsh has attempted a balance of practical politics and good government. He puts heavy store in the ability of his lieutenants.

"You can only do as well as the departments will let you," he said. "You can't personally run all the individuals working for the State." He maintains competence in administering State agencies has been of greater importance to him than political beliefs of the official.

As examples, he cites the fact that he carried over from the administration of Republican Governor Handley, "without knowing their party affiliations the heads of the State's largest departments in terms of manpower and money."

Welsh's tenure has not been without incident. There is the present controversy over one of his key men—State Highway Chairman David Cohen, who has been under fire for preparing legal work for a firm doing business with the highway department.

Welsh has stuck by Cohen, pointing out that as a part-time employee of the State, he is not legally disabled from such activity, but at the same time he chastised Cohen for being "indiscreet."

In the main, for a political officeholder, Welsh has kept close to the goals he outlined before taking office, in a full page interview in the Times November 20, 1960. At the top of his list was "Restore honesty and integrity to Government. Demand the highest standards of conduct."

At the same time, perhaps his biggest flop—and a haunting echo—was his promise of "no new taxes."

It, of course, was the product of the last legislature, which, in its prolonged wrangling, provided Welsh the greatest frustration of his administration.

The continuing problem of educating—and paying for the education—of young people is the greatest problem facing the State, the Governor believes. The second greatest problem is finding jobs for young people, he said.

Welsh said he will "urge strongly" that the next session of the legislature greatly expand facilities for post-high-school training "for the 80 percent of our youngsters who will not be college graduates. In this highly technical age, we have to increase the training and not confine our efforts to the 20 percent who go to college," he said.

There have been other, lesser frustrations, too. Principal among them the failure to obtain legalization for a deepwater port on Lake Michigan. But this and other unfinished efforts will be matured under future administrations, the Governor believes.

Another thorn left in the side of the Governor is the still-unresolved struggle to allow the Indiana Civil Liberties Union to meet in the World War Memorial Auditorium here—a matter of principle. "It is, in effect, a denial of the right of free speech," Welsh said.

Despite the criticism he has received from some conservative and veterans groups over his ICLU stand, Welsh has stuck by his principles. In this area and in his advocacy of civil rights, Welsh said, "There has been some stray disagreement, but I felt the general reaction was favorable in both cases."

Overall Welsh said, "I don't know that I would have changed anything I had control over during the 4 years."

He and a brother have purchased a restaurant in Vincennes, and there is his law practice to be picked up again.

One of his 22-year-old twin daughters, Kay, is going to Washington to work in the office of 11th District Congressman-elect ANDY JACOBS, Jr. Janet is in St. Louis studying nursing.

At this point, looking back on his 4 years in office, Welsh concluded, "I thoroughly enjoyed being Governor. Despite some trying periods I felt it was rewarding.

"You hear so much talk about States rights and the Federal Government taking over. But for States to make a good case for asserting that they can discharge their own responsibilities, it's important that we continue to raise the level of effectiveness and efficiency of our State agencies. We also must not fear to meet new responsibilities.

"Those who 'view with alarm' every increase in State agencies and budgets had better rethink their position because in almost every case they are asking for Federal intervention, because the needs of the public must be met."

Sugar Quotas in Central America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity, following the election, to visit in one of our neighboring countries in Central America. Among the many new friends and acquaintances I made in that very hospitable country was Senor Jose Luis Bouscayrol, president of the Sugar Producers Association. As a member of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, it had been my duty, together with the other Members of that body, to investigate the dramatic rise in sugar prices in 1963. It was understandable, then, that I found discussions on the world sugar market of some special interest.

The United States has attempted, with the cooperation of other forward-thinking elements of the sugar business, to stabilize the sugar market, making it sound for both the sugar producer and the sugar user. As the largest single purchaser of sugar the United States faced and passed a crisis when Cuban sugar was removed from our purchasing power. We met this crisis by a new allocation system throughout the tropical regions of the world and particularly by expanding purchases in South and Central America. When we were in sugar shortage we asked for a future commitment from the Central American countries which Mr. Bouscayrol's organization represents. Even in the face of higher world prices the Central American countries made good on their promise to us and delivered, at our prearranged price, sugar which at that time in the world market would have brought about $5 million more.

Now, these countries, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica are asking that we continue their participation in our allocation system so that their production is not harmed in the new season of less world market pressure. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we must adopt such domestic production patterns which will treat our friends as kindly in times of good market as they have treated us when the market was moving against our consumer interest. We cannot have it all our way. We owe an obligation to protect and encourage those who have shown that they will protect our interest even at personal loss.

I hope that the Agriculture Department, in setting sugar quotas, at home and abroad, will take note of the position of our friends in Central America and give them the consideration that our mutual concerns for the future so richly deserve. I ask for unanimous consent that the freely translated text of a letter received from Mr. Bouscayrol may appear at the end of these remarks:

NOVEMBER 13, 1964.

Hon. RICHARD T. HANNA,
U.S. Embassy,
Guatemala City.

In behalf of the Sugar Producers Association, I thank you for your kind visit of yesterday. In accordance with our conversation, by this letter I would like to express the following:

The sugar producers of Guatemala as well as the sister Republics of El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica, considered from all points of view appropriate and stable prices for the sugar we sell to the friendly country, the United States. Furthermore, we consider that one of the principal bases for price stabilization would be a sugar act of long term in which preference should be given to Latin American countries.

The Alliance for Progress, to reach its noble purposes, requires that commercial relationship be wider each time for the undeveloped countries be more productive and consequently, a larger capacity for investments and better salaries which may benefit the people. When the United States required sugar from us, the Guatemalan producers made efforts to cover the requirements from you and when the sugar prices in the world market were at superior levels compared with the prices that the United States paid for sugar, Guatemala continued delivering that product and conservatively we estimate a loss of about $5 million.

We sincerely believe that, since we complied with our sugar deliveries to you, it will be taken in consideration by the Congress and Senate of the United States when they review the structure of the new sugar legislation.

Repeating once again our thanks for your visit, we remain cordially yours with our consideration and appreciation.

JOSÉ LUIS BOUSCAYROL,
President, Sugar Producers Association.

Hansen Election Top News Story in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, many persons have selected the election victory of President Johnson as the top news story of 1964.

In view of this, I believe it is interesting and extremely noteworthy that the Associated Press, in a poll of newsmen in the State of Idaho, has selected the election of Republican GEORGE V. HANSEN to the House of Representatives as the top Idaho newsstory of the year.

As John White, Associated Press writer points out in an article appearing in the edition of December 31, 1964, of the Idaho Statesman, Boise, Idaho, Mr. HANSEN's victory over an incumbent Democrat was achieved in the face of a Democratic landslide. In fact, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HANSEN], was the only Republican to defeat an incumbent Democrat outside of the Deep South.

I commend my colleague, Mr. HANSEN, for his outstanding victory. I am confident that his energy, his dedication, and his courage will keep him in the House of Representatives for many years to come.

The Associated Press article follows:

ELECTION OF HANSEN TOPS EDITORS' BALLOTS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—What were Idaho's top stories of 1964? The Associated Press asked newsmen to express their views and 26 stories won mention. Here is a story on the balloting.)

(By John White)

Election of a Republican to Idaho's Second Congressional District seat in the face of a national Democratic landslide made Idaho's top newsstory of 1964, winning over Gov. Robert E. Smylie's effort to broaden the GOP's leadership.

Missing from the top stories, however, were the damaging Christmas week floods. They occurred too late in the year to figure in balloting by the newsmen who covered the year's news for newspapers and television and radio stations.

Ten of the 19 newsmen taking part in an Associated Press poll picked the November 3 general election as the top story of the year. Youthful GEORGE HANSEN of Pocatello, the Republican nominee, defeated Democratic Representative Ralph Harding, who was seeking reelection to a third term.

MISSED ONE BALLOT

The story was mentioned on all but 1 of the 19 ballots and garnered 169 points, on the basis of 10 points for first place votes, 9 for second, and so on.

Smylie's drive to oust Republican National Chairman Dean Burch and broaden the party's leadership after the November 3 general election picked up two first place votes and 120 points for second place. It was also mentioned on 18 of the 19 ballots cast.

Also picking up two first place votes was action by the U.S. Supreme Court and district courts in the legislative reapportionment argument. That story rated third with 109 points.

A Tribute to Taras Shevchenko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on December 20, 1964, the Ukrainian community in Buffalo, N.Y., held a dinner-banquet and paid tribute to a great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter—Taras Shevchenko. Three Buffalo men were also honored at this banquet, and I am very proud that I was chosen to be one of these.

The principal address, delivered by Dr. Nestor Procyk, who is an outstanding citizen in our great City of Good Neighbors, together with my speech, follows:

ADDRESS OF DR. NESTOR PROCYK, DELIVERED AT THE DINNER-BANQUET GIVEN BY THE UKRAINIAN COMMUNITY OF BUFFALO TO PAY TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN T. J. DULSKI, MAYOR CHESTER KOWAL, AND COUNCIL PRESIDENT CHESTER C. GORSKI, BUFFALO, DECEMBER 20, 1964, UKRAINIAN HOME "DNIPRO"

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I do feel certain that all of you, gathered here tonight—in this modest but our own home "Dnipro"—the Ukrainian headquarters of Buffalo, will share my views and feelings, when I'll say that this is an especially joyous night for us Ukranians of the Buffalo area, in this year's Christmas season, as it is a night of a historical significance to our community. For, we have assembled here tonight to honor—and again should I say, in our modest but from the depths of our hearts and in our most sincere way—three distinguished men of our Buffalo community: the Honorable T. J. Dulski, Hon. Chester Kowal, and Hon. Chester C. Gorski; to honor them and to pay tribute to their dedication to their people, to the duties of their office, but most of all, to their living up to good American citizenship.

We are gathered here to pay tribute to them for their human approach to life's human problems in a most humane way. We look at these three honored men as representing the symbols of good public servants, who work with understanding and dedication, who serve their community and all parts of it to the best of their ability and—of course—to the extent the community itself, as a whole, or as part of it, deserves, by and through its own initiative, understanding, and efforts, toward its own life and progress and the life and progress of the Nation.

We, the Ukrainian community of Buffalo and everywhere do honor these men and men like them because—in the days of our turbulent and often discouraging time we need individuals with initiative, faith, courage, and desire to work for people's cause, serving both—the people and the cause. We need men of character and stature to show the others, the proper way of life to follow. We need people with firm patriotic ideas and principles which would not break nor weaken under pressure of the temptations of the day or the easy way out of public duty which we too often see. We need men of vision and imagination to sow and nurture the seeds of truth and justice in our democracy, of freedom and order, of duties to one's country, of faith in the high values of our personal and community life and of courage to stand firm for these values, principles, and truths.

We do need such men and many such people now and we will need them in the days to come, because, ladies and gentlemen, America is in a grave danger. It would be childish on our part if we should fail to understand this gravity and seriousness of the present situation.

Abroad, thanks to our chief adversary—Russia and communism melted into one—we Americans are being presented as ugly and imperialistic, as inhuman exploiters and killers of mankind. Unfortunately, the number of those who do believe in this skillfully manufactured and spread propaganda rapidly increases. Instead, the number of our genuine friends and people who have had faith in us and who believed in our principles of freedom and human liberties, in our high standards of justice and truth, decreases as rapidly. The nations enslaved and oppressed by Russia and communism begin to shake their heads hopelessly and to offer us a disappointed grin, disguising their deep pain and sorrow. Our people are being told—and many, including those of high rank in our administrative branch of Government, seem to delude themselves or, maybe, to pretend—that we are in a state of cold war while the clear logic and down-to-earth reality proves that we are now in the hottest type of war because we are in the midst of a total war with an enemy who aims at our total destruction.

For, I venture to say, the so-called hot war is not now limited to South Vietnam, Congo and other areas marked by more pronounced restlessness, like political hoodloomism by attacking U.S. institutions in foreign countries. As another example, I would see a tragic mistake if anyone would consider the Russian so-called oceanographic studies of the Carribean waters only a peaceful maneuvering of the Russian submarine fleet. No, ladies and gentlemen, we are in a state of very hot and total guerillatype war launched against us and the rest of the free or good world by the most unscrupulous, cunning, inhuman, and cruel enemy the world has ever known. And this type of total guerilla-type war is being launched by our enemy in all aspects and dimensions: physical, moral, spiritual, and cultural as well. We are in a total war with an enemy who, in his wild drive to conquer for the sake of conquering, will never stop, give up or give in, unless he is forced down to his knees and kept so for the time necessary to make him understand his wrongdoings. The sooner all of us in these United States of America do realize that, have courage and are ready to face it and to do the necessary things about it, the less sacrifice we are going to pay in the long run. We must provide hope, we must nurture faith in our ability to win this total struggle.

Therefore, we need more men and women of the stature of our honored guests tonight, because they know what situation we are in, they are facing it and are doing all they can about it.

We may discuss, of course, the situation inside the United States, too. But I do not feel that tonight is either the place or the time for doing it. I would like to mention only, that this aspect of the matter—the aspect of the internal situation—is not too rosy either. For, there are too many signs and symptoms of the enemy introjected within the realm of this very country, guerillatype warfare, that are tending to destroy our culture, spiritual, and moral values of our traditions, our ideals, our system and way of life. We are doing fine—or even wonderfully—where material values of life are concerned, but, are we doing as fine in the social, interpersonal and community life aspects? I leave this question open with you, ladies and gentlemen, as I am sure that you are as much concerned with it as I am and, as I know, are the gentlemen we are honoring tonight as well as all the distinguished guests at the dias. As for myself I am most concerned with the problems of our youth—the new generation.

Thomas Paine once said that "The duty of man is plain and simple and consists but of two points; his duty to God, which every man must feel; and his duty to his neighbor, to do as he would be done by." In full agreement with that, I would like only to add that into our duties to our neighbors I would include the duties to our country and Nation and our duties to all nations and all men. And in that respect, I again, am happy to say that the men honored by us tonight have proven their understanding of these duties. Here again is the reason why we render them this tribute.

But we, Ukrainians, have another good reason for paying tribute to these gentlemen and to their alikes.

We are relatively new in America, this country blessed with freedom, liberties, and abundance. Few of us, only, came in the previous century, some of us came before and between two wars and most of us came only after World War II. All of us were driven from our beloved Ukraine by political and economic tyranny enforced upon our land by Ukraine's enemies. We came here in poor financial condition with empty pockets and, some of us, with just the clothes on our backs.

However, we didn't come quite empty handed, as a matter of fact, not empty handed at all. We brought in our hearts a piece of our dear country, and a score of great and noble Ukrainian traditions, Ukrainian historical and cultural heritage; we brought in our minds the knowledge, experience and the ability to think and to act; and we brought in our souls a strong faith in God's justice and in freedom for all nations and men, including Ukrainian nation and the Ukrainian people. But, above all, we brought with us—in our minds and our souls and our hearts—an extreme love to our country and to all that is good, the love which we were and are willing to and anxious to offer to America and her people. We are not extremists, as a matter of fact we are against any bad extremism, but we cherish extreme love in our hearts to Ukraine and to America alike. With this love and with other assets mentioned above we came to this country and we were received with warmth and friendliness by many, but, with understanding, sincerity, and equal love by few. Among these few we found the distinguished guests we are honoring tonight. For, they were the ones among the first few, who seem to have recognized that we didn't come here to just eat and digest America's food, but, to work, contribute with our assets whatever we can to the development and further cultural, social, and economic progress of this great country. In other words "to honor, love, and cherish, for better or worse, till death or fate do us part."

That is why we chose these gentlemen for our tribute tonight as representatives of those who showed us this sincerity, understanding and love. It goes without saying, may I add here, ladies and gentlemen, that all our guests at this dais, as well as at the main tables, have distinguished themselves, one way or another, by being our sincere and understanding friends which we have cherished, are delighted with and very very proud of them.

As you see, in our choice we were not motivated by party affiliation, and the fact that Mayor Kowal is not among us is due only to his ailment that temporarily ties him to the hospital bed. We like and subscribe to a two party system and hope and pray that they both get equally on the ball and united within themselves. We chose those who in addition to their political parties, and above them, recognize America first.

Finally we chose them for tribute tonight because all three of them, each in his own way, did not only show their sincerity, understanding and warm feeling in words, but they proved it by their acts and actions.

The Ukrainians are the kind of people that, while reserving themselves the right to constructively criticize whatever they feel is necessary, they also and first of all like to exercise their right to pay tribute and offer recognition and public acknowledgement whenever and to whomever they feel it is due.

It seems to us that few public officials escape criticism but still less are given adequate recognition for a work well done. Our Ukrainian community of Buffalo feels that it is fitting to give public acknowledgement to men in office. It seems especially fitting to do this, apart from free election periods and noisy election confusion, but just this Christmas season—the season of brotherly understanding.

Our committee felt therefore that it is essential to render this tribute to our three

deserving men, as this is the only way unselfish devotion to duty is properly recognized.

Our mayor, the Honorable Chester Kowal, deserves the gratitude and thanks of the Ukranian community of Buffalo metropolitan area and we acknowledge it publicly. For he was among the first ones who, as a public official, had the understanding of our needs and desires and who first gave us a helping hand as far back as in the early fifties when he served as the city's comptroller. To him we are indebted, that we are in possession of this home which represents to us—as I mentioned earlier—the headquarters of Ukranian mainstream in Buffalo. In the period of his tenure of the office of the mayor he never refused to give us his full official and personal cooperation and support in any endeavor of ours that required his attention, help, or approval. Besides, Mayor Kowal has always been a stanch supporter of the Ukrainian freedom's cause as he is for freedom of all captive nations. He is also known to us for his motto that "Freedom is everybody's business" and he has always lived up to this motto.

We certainly regret very much that our mayor's ailment prevents him from being among us and from enhancing our joy by his personal participation at our gathering tonight, but this will not prevent us from paying tribute to him and to express our feelings of appreciation and acknowledgement for all his endeavors in our behalf, along with our wishes for a speedy recovery and a very merry Christmas and a happy New Year. The committee has made arrangements to visit Mayor Kowal in his hospital room tonight, following our dinner, and to present to him our token of esteem, gratitude, and appreciation.

Hon. Chester C. Gorski, president of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, is another stanch supporter of the cause of captive nations and among them the Ukrainian nation, of course. The Ukrainian community of Buffalo became acquainted with council's President Gorski through the UCCA representative in the latter fifties and this contact has remained uninterrupted. It was thanks to Mr. Gorski's understanding that our request for permission to observe the anniversary of Ukrainian independence in the common council chambers of the city hall, in January 1960, was granted and such observances took place for the first time, which was and will remain of great historical significance for the Ukrainians of Buffalo as well as America. It is to be hoped that such observances will continue in the years to come. He never refused the chambers for any other solemn observance of the Ukrainian community which we always have greatly appreciated. When called upon, he was kind to give his personal time to render addresses or to otherwise personally participate in our community observance. This year, the year of 150th anniversay of birth of the poet-laureate of Ukraine Taras Shevchenko, Mr. Gorski presented us with a special encouragement: he promised to introduce the bill to common council that one of the main streets in the waterfront area to be developed, be named Taras Shevchenko Boulevard. This, by the way, was in full consent with ideas of Mayor Kowal as it was with former Mayor Frank A. Sedit's and his legal counsel H. Buswell Roberts, whom we are honored to have present with us tonight, as well as his charming wife. Should this naming of the street after the greatest Ukrainian take place and we strongly hope it will, our Ukrainian community would receive a spiritual booster and the city of Buffalo and name of Mr. Gorski and all those, who contributed to it would enter the golden pages of the history of Ukrainian immigration and the Ukrainian people. The city of Buffalo, too, would have reason to pride herself with Shevchenko's name as is our Nation's capital Washington, D.C., with his monument.

Thus, Mr. Council President, Hon. Chester C. Gorski deserves fully the respect, appreciation, and public acknowledgment by the Ukrainian community of Buffalo. The committee, therefore, presents to him tonight a token of our appreciation, with it go our thanks an warm wishes for the best of success in his days to come and in all his noble endeavors. Our best wishes go also to Mrs. Gorski, of course.

Our third honored man tonight, but far from the last and still further from being the least, is the Honorable THADDEUS J. DULSKI, U.S. Congressman of the 40th District. We do know our dear Congressman for several years and he has always been of great help to the Ukrainian community on the local level but still greater on the national scene. Congressman DULSKI is known as a firm opponent of communism and Russian imperialism and a stanch defender and promoter of the freedom to all nations and men in the world. In him we have one of the greatest and best informed supporters of captive nations' cause, including Ukrainian cause and we know that from his multiple speeches in Congress and at civic affairs. And as I understand Congressman has been nominated and will soon receive a well-deserved Captive Nation Award from New York City. What the Ukrainian community in particular is concerned, Congressman DULSKI has rendered innumerable services to us and here again both on the national and local level. His work in Congress and spreading upon the official record of the Congress all those events, observances, and special occasions concerning the cause of submerged Ukraine are well known to us. He has been in the forefront in our successful endeavors regarding the erection of the T. Shevchenko monument which now stands in our nation's capital as a national shrine to freedom; His endeavors to secure a national Shevchenko memorial stamp and a special section in the Library of Congress for the works of T. Shevchenko have been inspiring and most encouraging to our people all over the nation. Knowing our Congressman as we do we are confident all his efforts will be crowned with victory.

Congressman DULSKI nominated one of our young men, Mr. Bohdan Sahan, as his candidate to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Mr. Sahan is present with us tonight and we will give him the opportunity to express his appreciation to our Congressman.

There are many more things that Congressman DULSKI has done or is doing for the Ukrainians as part of his constituency, which time would not permit us to review. I summarize it shortly only by saying that in Congressman T. J. DULSKI the Ukrainian community in Buffalo have found truly a people's Congressman. And for all these reasons which I have stated we do feel that Congressman DULSKI fully merits our heartfelt appreciation, our grateful thanks and the assurance of our unwavering support in all his dedicated endeavors.

Only a few weeks ago our Congressman and his wife celebrated their 25th wedding anniversary, and the birthday of Mrs. Dulski only last week. Our congratulations to them, joined by our fervent hope that God will bless them and their family with many more happy anniversaries.

Now, since this is Taras Shevchenko year for Ukranians the world over, we present to each of our honored guests a token of our esteem in a form which symbolizes the highest meaning of gratitude to Ukrainians the world over—an oil painting duplicating the self-portrait of Taras Shevchenko—the poet-patriot of Ukraine.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you for that eloquent and generous introduction.

I am deeply honored to have been asked to join your fine group here this evening. When Ukrainians get together, you can be sure it is a joyous occasion—but more than that, it is usually for a purpose—a purpose for uniting behind a cause that serves the good of the community, the Nation, or their homeland.

Ukrainian Americans are known the country over for their devotion to the principles of liberty and national independence. I had occasion to witness this myself when they came to Washington last year and again this year for the groundbreaking and dedication of the Shevchenko statute.

They are a great people, and America has been blessed with their many fine contributions in every field of endeavor.

Taras Shevchenko is proclaimed as the champion of liberty for all mankind. He rose from serfdom and once his own freedom was won, he dared losing it in his fight for the freedom of all Ukrainians and of all peoples. So, too, Ukrainians today—in the United States and all parts of the world—continue the fight to liberate their homeland from the modern Russian Communist oppressors.

Some of you here attended the Shevchenko ceremonies in Washington. The 86th Congress performed an invaluable service to our national interest when it legislated the act permitting all Americans to honor the works and achievements of Shevchenko. This name is a historic symbol of freedom throughout Eastern Europe. The spirit of his fight lives forcefully and brightly in the hearts of all the freedom-loving peoples, who are under the yoke of the Soviet Russian imperiocolonists. It was little wonder that in 1960–61 Moscow and its puppets reacted vehemently and viciously against our congressional action.

I am proud that, as a Member of Congress, I had the opportunity to make American soil available for the erection of the Shevchenko memorial.

It has also been my privilege to introduce legislation which would provide a Shevchenko memorial section in the U.S. Library of Congress. Considerable support for such a memorial section has been indicated, and I intend to reintroduce my bill in the next session, and to continue to solicit support among my colleagues in an endeavor to bring this proposal to the House floor at an early date.

The encouragement and assistance I have received from the Ukrainian Congress Committee, your own Buffalo group, and from Ukrainian organizations throughout the country has been most gratifying.

One of the most important issues before the American people today is the captive nations. I have sponsored legislation calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. No public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively, all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself. Such a committee could serve as a beacon throughout the world to show the solidarity and determination of the American people that these captive nations are not forgotten in their struggle for liberation and true independence.

This year we celebrated the sixth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. This most important observance has a meaning for both the imprisoned peoples of the world and our own citizens. The deprivation of liberty does not remove the desire for it. We must show the citizens of the Soviet, and Red Chinese, satellites that we care and that their appeals for help are heard and understood.

The Ukrainians have been among the most unfortunate peoples in modern history. Reviewing events endured by your brave people over the years bids us to pause and reflect on their sufferings in their thirst for freedom. It is a thirst for freedom that has never once wavered, and is as strong today as it ever was.

We are on the threshold of great events. In our power is the ability to carry forward the great struggle for the national independence of Ukraine and of every other enslaved and subjugated nation of the world.

It is an undertaking in which we must not fail. It is an undertaking in which we must succeed and be victorious. Thank you.

Thomas Dugan: Crusading New York Sheriff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Thomas M. Dugan, New York's crusading sheriff, is dead and we mourn his passing. The sudden and untimely death of this great American presents an irreplaceable loss to our community, State, and Nation.

I first met Tom during the recent campaign. He was tireless and without equal in his efforts and dedication to the task before him. One could not help being overwhelmed by his vigor and his devotion to duty. Tom had a wonderful way with people that made you feel he was destined for a brilliant and long career of public service. Tom Dugan will be missed. I join with the multitudes in expressing deepest sympathy to his attractive wife, Constance, and their three small children.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Washington Post of January 13, 1965:

THOMAS DUGAN DEAD—CRUSADING NEW YORK SHERIFF

Thomas M. Dugan, sheriff of Nassau County, N.Y., and Inspector General of the Peace Corps until last April, died Monday apparently after a heart attack at his home in Greenvale, Long Island.

Mr. Dugan, 38, had been in office only 10 days. A Democrat, he was elected in November after a campaign in which he promised to work to abolish his $19,775-a-year job.

The Washington Post, in an editorial January 8, noted that he was taking steps to repudiate Ambrose Bierce's harsh comment that politics are "the conduct of public affairs for private advantage."

During the short time he was in office, Mr. Dugan had fired several deputies and had drafted legislation with the county attorney that would eliminate the sheriff's job and make the plush sheriff's offices available for the use of inmates under a new department of correction.

Mr. Dugan's law enforcement career began after his education in his native Brooklyn and at American University here.

From 1951 to 1959, he worked as a Federal narcotics agent. He was the agent in charge of nationwide arrests in 1959, which netted 21 delegates to the 1957 gangland convention in Apalachin, N.Y. For his direction of that operation and other raids, he won four Treasury Department awards.

For a year, between 1959 and 1960, Mr. Dugan served as assistant chief investigator for the Little Hoover Commission of New York State which uncovered the Dominican Republic rock salt scandal.

He then served as deputy chief investigator for the Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor. In 1961, he was appointed U.S. marshal for the eastern district of New York by President Kennedy.

Mr. Dugan worked as a marshal until his appointment to the Peace Corps in January 1963.

He was a member of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. An award from the National Police Officers Association, which he won in 1961, has been placed in the Police Hall of Fame.

Just Right for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 1965, a fine editorial—pointing to the need for action by the 89th Congress on the question of Presidential succession—appeared in the South Bend Tribune. The distinguished junior Senator from Indiana, the Honorable BIRCH BAYH, is giving particular leadership in this field.

I know that this is a matter to which all Members of Congress wish to give their most serious consideration and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of this very useful commentary:

JUST RIGHT FOR ACTION

At no time since serious talk began of reform to assure practical continuity in the Presidency of the United States has everything been more right for action than for the 89th Congress.

The matter, of obvious importance to the Nation, has Presidential endorsement. President Johnson has twice spoken of the need, most recently in his state of the Union message.

The assassination of John Kennedy, which left the new President without a Vice President for more than a year, is still fresh enough in mind to spur lawmakers and stir public agitation for action.

Sound proposals have been made to deal with the dual problem of Presidential disability and filling the Vice Presidency in case of vacancy. (The Senate took affirmative action last year but the House let the matter die with adjournment.)

Members of the new Congress need have no pangs of fear of treading on the toes of the Speaker of the House, who is next in line under the present succession law, and incurring his wrath. Now we have a Vice President, or will have one in a few days.

There has been ample time to consider the need and ponder the remedy. The 89th Congress shouldn't squander the opportunity to repair a serious deficiency in the machinery for assuring continuity of the Presidency. And Indiana Senator BIRCH BAYH's resolution which was passed by the Senate only to die by default in the House still stands as an inviting solution.

It not only provides for procedure to permit the Vice President to become Acting President if the President were unable to perform his duties, but also provides for filling the office of Vice President. If a vacancy should occur, the President would nominate a Vice President subject to confirmation by House and Senate.

Tax on Telephone Service

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Chicago Sun-Times:

TAX ON TELEPHONE SERVICE

The Johnson administration intends to ask Congress to eliminate the excise taxes on retail sales of toilet articles, cosmetics, jewelry, furs, and leather goods. No change is contemplated in the taxes on tobacco, alcoholic beverages, gasoline, autos, and telephone bills.

We cannot quarrel with the decision to keep taxes on alcoholic beverages and tobacco since, to some extent, these have a sumptuary purpose. Taxes on gasoline and autos help build Federal highways used by motorists. But there appears to be no justification for continuing the wartime tax on telephone service. If a tax on a luxury such as jewelry is to be lifted why should not a tax on a necessity such as telephone service be abolished?

Hale Nelson, vice president of the Illinois Bell Telephone Co., points out that the 10-percent temporary wartime tax on telephone service has now been in effect for more than 20 years and costs the average telephone user about $22 a year.

Originally the tax was imposed, along with taxes on transportation and electric power, as a wartime measure primarily to discourage use. All such taxes, except the one on telephone service and telegrams, have been repealed.

The telephone tax is a tax on customers, not on the telephone companies. It is a tax on the low-income worker as well as on the firms which pass it along as a cost of doing business. The telephone industry says that repeal of the tax would mean a 10-percent reduction in phone bills and this in turn would stimulate telephone usage and bring about as much as $500 million worth of additional telephone construction. New jobs would be created. Additional tax revenues would offset in part the revenues lost from repeal.

Treasury Secretary Dillon, in discussing his plan to ask elimination of taxes on jewelry, furs, et cetera, said that the administration wants to revise the excise tax structure not only as a stimulus to the economy but because many of the taxes involved have outlived their usefulness, having been enacted to discourage consumer consumption rather than to produce revenue. Telephone service certainly fits in this category but the Treasury Department probably is reluctant to give it up because it is so easy to collect.

Legion of Merit Presented to Col. James M. McHugh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, long overdue recognition of exceptionally meritorious conduct during his World War II service in China came to a Frederick County resident last week. In ceremonies at the Naval Annex, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Wallace M. Greene, presented Col. James M. McHugh, USMC, retired, with the Legion of Merit.

The long delay in this recognition of the colonel's service as personal representative of the late Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek resulted from his detached service assignment.

Last year Vice Adm. Paul S. Foster, USN, retired, heard of the oversight and wrote to Gen. Thomas Holcomb, who had served as Marine Commandant during World War II. Recalling the facts in the case, General Holcomb recommended to General Greene that Colonel McHugh be decorated. At the January 5 ceremony Colonel McHugh received the Legion of Merit and was presented with the following citation:

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Legion of Merit to Col. James M. McHugh, U.S. Marine Corps (retired), for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service as the Assistant Naval Attaché and Assistant Naval Attaché for Air and later Naval Attaché and Naval Attaché for Air to the Republic of China during the period December 1940 to November 1942. After four previous tours of duty in China, Colonel (then Major) McHugh was reordered to that country in 1940 as the personal representative of the Secretary of the Navy to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's headquarters, wherever located. Exercising marked professional competence, sound judgment and skilled diplomacy and because of his close personal relationship with the Generalissimo, he served with distinction throughout this period. Tirelessly carrying out his duties, often under the most difficult and hazardous conditions, he rendered valuable assistance to the Secretary of the Navy, the American Ambassador to China, the Department of State, and to American and British Commands serving in the Far East. His exceptional performance of duty, extreme loyalty, willingness to work long and arduous hours, and unswerving devotion to the fulfillment of a vital task reflect great credit upon himself and the U.S. naval service."

For the President:

PAUL H. NITZE,
Secretary of the Navy.

Humanity Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest editorial supporters of my proposal for a National Humanities Foundation is the Pittsburgh Catholic, America's oldest Catholic newspaper in continuous publication. This newspaper in a recent editorial pointed up one of the basic reasons for such a foundation—to redress the imbalance now existing between the sciences and the humanities.

The editorial follows:

HUMANITY HUMANITIES

In line with our long-standing position on medicare we would like to direct attention to a well-documented article on same in the December 24 issue of the New Republic. The author, Dr. Michael H. Alderman, of Bethesda, Md., takes carefully itemized issue with the American Medical Association's contention that existing legislation (Kerr-Mills) is sufficient to the needs of the aged.

He cites three great weaknesses of Kerr-Mills: "Arbitrary definitions, such as allowable duration of hospital stay * * *"; "eligibility tests bearing no relation to medical need * * *"; and the fact that "the program (as implemented with varying degrees of enthusiasm by 39 States) does not provide total medical care."

Dr. Alderman quotes, with some irony, a statement of the AMA to the effect that "it is of the utmost importance that physicians abandon the attitude of unreasoning opposition which has characterized professional discussions on social insurance." The statement was made in 1919.

The point is, of course, that something must be done for the 15-million elderly Americans who are caught in the vise of rising medical costs. Kerr-Mills is demonstrably inadequate; the King-Anderson bill (medicare) comes considerably closer to the ideal.

Passage of medicare is a task for Government, but it would seem also to require a positive, creative, helpful contribution from the world of medicine, especially since it is medical science which has, as the New Republic provocatively puts it, "endowed many elderly couples with more life than they can now afford."

We repeat the wish (first voiced in August when Congressman MOORHEAD introduced his bill) that Congress will see fit to endorse the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation.

Such a foundation, dedicated to official national promotion and support of the humanities and the arts, would go a long way towards restoring the perspective of science and spirit which many feel has been knocked a-kilter by the current multibillion-dollar Federal involvement with science.

"A National Humanities Foundation," Congressman MOORHEAD suggests, "can well be the cornerstone of the Great Society."

We would like to see his pertinent prediction put to the test.

The President's Message on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson rang the bell with me in his message to Congress on education, when he stated unequivocally that the education of our youth is the No. 1 business of the American people.

On the other hand, the President's bill is complex and requires more study than I have given it—especially the part that includes benefits for parochial schools. I understand that the administration estimates that 15 percent of the funds could go to private schools, mostly indirectly rather than directly, although they could share in some direct programs.

Personally, I am going to refrain from any comment on such details at this time, pending a thorough airing in the House Education Committee. In general, however, I agree with the President that our national goal should be full educational opportunity for all, and I likewise agree with President Johnson—and this should be emphasized—that education is primarily a State function.

In this latter connection, Mr. Speaker, there is a potential danger that I foresee. It could be that the $1.5 billion asked by the President in his message could give the various States the idea that the Federal Government, by this new bill, would be assuming their traditional responsibility. On the contrary, this program—large as it may seem—is not intended to relieve the States of their financial responsibility. Under this program, State legislatures—and this is true of my own State of Washington—are not intended to reduce their expenditures for schools; and, speaking of Washington State, as an example, its established pattern of taxation has resulted in serious inequities. The burden on taxpayers has been inequitable. Our per capita expenditure is high compared with most States, but responsible school leaders admit there is a dangerous emergency facing Washington State in financing its schools adequately. In our State, we should revise our system of raising funds for education, and to properly carry out the State's own constitutional responsibility, the State legislature must increase and equalize school support. Getting back, however, I must point out that the headlines and news reports on the President's message could falsely indicate that new Federal aid is on the way to ease the cost of education in the States. But, as I see it, the reverse is true. The Federal Government, under the President's proposal, will actually require more in the way of State matching funds.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would comment that President Johnson has given Congress and the American people a most persuasive argument for more Federal encouragement and support of our schools at all levels. If the proposed

program is free of Federal domination and control, I would certainly expect to vote for it, because I believe that the answer to America's problems such as poverty and full employment lies in upgrading our youth and adequately financing our educational system at the secondary as well as the higher levels.

In conclusion, let me repeat, the President's program does not meet all the Nation's educational needs; it does not afford anything like the resources needed for new school construction, teacher recruitment, or the improvement of teachers' salaries.

I sincerely hope that State and local governments will take care of these aspects of the problem.

Congress and the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina and the new chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, came into the Congress at the same time I did, in 1941. He has not only been my colleague but also my close personal friend.

I anticipate serving under his leadership on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RIVERS has the ability, diligence, and desire to make an outstanding chairman. The challenge is great when it is realized that he follows the great Carl Vinson, at whose feet both Mr. RIVERS and I sat for 25 years.

I believe Mr. RIVERS admirably stated his philosophy on "Congress and the Military" in the interview which appeared in the January edition of Air Force and Space Digest magazine.

It is a pleasure to include this definitive article into the RECORD, and I suggest that each Member, especially each new Member, read it closely:

CONGRESS AND THE MILITARY

(An exclusive interview with the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, U.S. Representative from South Carolina)

(Everything that affects members of the Armed Forces—food, pay, clothing, shelter, medical care, promotions, equipment, bases, and missions—is the concern of the House Committee on Armed Services. In the 89th Cong., for the first time in 10 years, a new chairman takes over that committee. To find out how he looks at his job and current military problems, the editors of Air Force/Space Digest interviewed him recently in his Washington office. Here is a transcript of that exclusive interview.—THE EDITORS.)

(L. (for LUCIUS) MENDEL RIVERS has represented the First Congressional District of South Carolina, embracing nine counties in the southeastern section of the State, since 1940. Born in 1905 in Gumville, Berkeley County, part of his district just upriver from Charleston, he attended the College of Charleston and the University of South Carolina, earning a law degree in 1931. After serving in the South Carolina Legislature from 1933 to 1936 and 4 years as a special U.S. attorney, he was elected to the 77th Cong. in 1940 and has been there ever since. Coming from a seacoast district which includes the Charleston Navy Yard, he requested and got an appointment to the House Naval Affairs Committee, then led by Representative Carl Vinson of Georgia. In 1948, when the House Military and Naval Affairs Committees were merged to form the Armed Services Committee, Mr. Vinson became its chairman and headed it for all but 2 years (1952–54, when the Republicans controlled the House), until his retirement this year. "I have been in Mr. Vinson's university ever since I got here," says Mr. RIVERS. "If anyone has ever had on-the-job training, that fellow is RIVERS.")

Question. Congressman RIVERS, how do you see the role of the legislative in dealing with the executive branch on defense matters?

Answer. I am on a committee whose members are quite sensitive about that section of the Constitution which deals with the role that Congress plays in governing the military.

To explain how I feel about it, I want to read you what the Constitution says. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution sets forth the powers of the legislative branch of the Government. It says the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, to declare war, and so on.

In that same article, it says this: "To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use be for a longer term than 2 years." This is so that we can reappraise what we have done. "To provide and maintain a Navy. To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces. To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia."

I take this to mean that, of all the branches of the Government, there is vested in the Congress the exclusive right to deal with the military. I don't mean a quasi-right. I mean the exclusive right.

That is the base from which I proceed. I think that the proper committee—which is ours—should have access to all information dealing with the military. It is as simple as that. I don't know why we should always wait for proposals to emanate from the Executive. I am not implying that I don't plan to cooperate fully with the President and Secretary of Defense, but there should be a mutuality.

I am going to head my own committee, and I am going to get along with my committee and the Pentagon, but I have my ideas and I will insist on them.

Question. We understand it is unlikely that the administration will propose a military pay bill, other than possibly another cost-of-living adjustment. What are your views on military pay?

Answer. We should very definitely consider a new pay bill for the military this year, because they have not been treated fairly. The bill passed last year was little more than a gesture. It was not exactly an insult, but it certainly was no compliment.

Question. The Air Force, after long study, is supposed to have come up with a pay package for all services which totals between $800 and $900 million to bring the military up to some parity with the civilian economy. Do you envision that the Congress might act favorably on a bill of that scope in this session?

Answer. I haven't seen the Air Force study, but I have already drafted a pay bill.

Question. Of this magnitude?

Answer. It would be about that size. With a $630 billion gross national product, I say we can afford to give the military a pay raise of this size.

Question. Mr. Chairman do you think there will be any chance of writing into this law a provision for annual review such as is in the law for civil service employees?

Answer. I think a review, possibly annually, should be provided by law.

Question. What about housing?

Answer. We have a great shortage of housing. Mind you, I used to handle housing. I think it is one of the most vital areas. Let me answer your question like this: Housing, pay, food, commissaries, oversea expenses in highly inflated cost areas—all of these things will be reviewed very carefully.

Wherever we can, we are going to write these benefits into law rather than leave it to the discretion of some transitory Secretary. This is no reflection on Mr. McNamara. He has done a lot of things I approve of, and he and I, I am sure, will get along very well.

I have always favored appropriated housing but when you have to pay the money on the barrelhead to build houses, you don't get as many as you did under the Capehart Act. We cut off Capehart just about the time it was beginning to do a pretty good job.

Question. Can we assume you intend also to look into hospitalization—medical care and dental care?

Answer. Of course. I have a report on medical care. This is one area we are really going to watch. Hospitalization is a vested right. I don't like the term benefits. Hospitalization is as much a right for the serviceman and his dependents as a pair of shoes. Our report gives my view on hospitals.

Over the years the recruiters have told those whom they recruited: "Your dependents and you will have hospitalization and when you retire you will get it." I think that is a contract, and I think it is an obligation.

Unless we change the law, that is still my view—that they are entitled to it. The Congress has passed a medicare bill and all of these things, and they have only scratched the surface because these things have never been fully implemented. I don't know why we can't do something about it.

Question. Do you see any chance to add dental care along with medicare?

Answer. It all gets down to morale. I wrote the Navy dental bill, you know. Are you asking me if dependents should have dental care?

Question. Yes.

Answer. Why not? Have you ever tried to do a job with a toothache or gone home and held your wife's hand when she has a toothache? What I am trying to get over is that we are going to try to do everything we can to give the serviceman a well-rounded set of rights—benefits, prerogatives, privileges, and emoluments, so whenever he is called to fight or go on long patrols he won't have to be worried about his folks back home. We want to do something about whatever affects his morale. If denticare is one of them, we want to do something about that.

Question. And the same for retirees?

Answer. My report speaks about that. Let me quote it: "The subcommittee is convinced * * * that the traditional benefit of hospital care to military retirees and their dependents must be continued." It goes back to what I said. Congress has let somebody else handle these decisions so long that they wait for the decisions to come up from downtown. I think that is a mistake.

Question. We have been talking about money and its relationship to morale. There's also another side to it, isn't there—the regard in which the military is held by the public and by the people in the Pentagon?

Answer. Absolutely. When I was a boy, people used to join the Navy and the Army just to get the pay. That day is gone.

We've got to pay them adequately, yes—but we've got to do more.

I don't believe for a minute that, as some say, our young people are delinquents. I don't assume that any of them are. Neither do I agree that they're unpatriotic. The people I talk to don't think the man in uniform alone should be saddled with all the patriotism. Why shouldn't others be patriotic, too?

These men are putting in long, tedious hours away from their families, often in remote, isolated areas. If they don't get paid enough money to pay their bills, if they aren't confident their families are being looked after while they're away, they're not going to stay.

There is only one way to keep them—to make them know that their country wants them, to pay them what we pay our civil servants; to help them in looking after their families. We are not doing these things, because we try to cut corners. So we lose them, but we spend time and money to train replacements. It doesn't make sense.

Question. What do you think has been the effect of the new DOD directive on standards of conduct—the one that says military personnel cannot eat lunch at someone else's expense, or if they do, they have to report it within 48 hours?

Answer. I think it is too strict. I am sure it will be modified. Either a fellow is honest or he is not honest. If suspicion has to surround everybody who is in the military, this, too, will cause a lot to leave.

Question. Do you anticipate any changes in the existing retirement system—since the money involved has now reached a billion dollars a year for military retirement pay?

Answer. I think we should look into the subject. We might have a lot of people we want to keep longer. I don't know why we should give the military the privilege to retire after 20 years. I have always felt that way.

Question? You have been very much interested in the Reserve and Guard programs over the years. What is your view toward DOD plans to transfer Reserve units to the National Guard?

Answer. I don't know why things like this should not be thoroughly reviewed by the proper committee. I hate to see these drastic changes being proposed when the Congress is out of session. Such proposals should be made when we are in session so that we can go into them.

Question. Another subject DOD is studying is the draft. How does that look to you?

Answer. I won't know until we go into it. At this point I can only give you a curbstone opinion. As of this date (December 9), I don't favor terminating the draft.

Question. Congressman, you have had extensive experience with sealift and airlift. How do you evaluate the relative merits of rapid deployment of forces by sea versus air?

Answer. One should complement the other, and implement the other. One service can't do the whole business. I saw that on Steelpike in Spain in November. Exercise Big Lift (in 1963) demonstrated a capability of reinforcing our European allies fast. In that one, the ground forces used prepositioned equipment. In Steelpike the Navy demonstrated it can deliver the equipment as well as the manpower. We need both sealift and airlift.

Question. Do you feel we have enough airlift now to meet the requirements of the military, particularly the Army?

Answer. No, sir, not to meet our commitments. We have more commitments than we have airlift. New equipment is coming in, but it is not inclusive enough. We should immediately go ahead with the CX-HLS (cargo experimental, heavy logistic system) transport plane.

Question. What do you think of the C-141A?

Answer. It's a wonderful plane. When we created that—I headed the subcommittee—the Air Staff put out the guidelines, and the C-141 has met every requirement they asked for. But it is not big enough.

Question. Are you satisfied generally with the structuring of our forces? Are we pressing technology hard enough or translating technology into new weapons quickly enough?

Answer. No. I am positive we are not.

Question. In what specific areas are we standing short?

Answer. I think we have made a mistake in the Defense Department by not pressing to get enough performance out of conventional systems and by jumping headlong into the unmanned systems. We have become overbalanced in unmanned systems and have not achieved the ultimate in what conventional systems can do. To add to our problem, we may be saddled with only conventional war for the foreseeable future, as in Vietnam and some other places.

You know and I know we don't have a follow on for the B-52. We don't have, in my opinion, a modern interceptor. In these areas we have not done what I would like to see done.

Question. Do you include the YF-12A in that?

Answer. Is that an interceptor?

Question. The Pentagon said it is an interceptor.

Answer. Is that an interceptor? I stand on what I say. I don't think we have an all-purpose plane yet. The nearest thing we have to a versatile plane is the McDonnell F-4 series. But I just don't believe we have an all-purpose plane.

Question. There is some talk that a version of the YF-12A is also being considered for a bomber role. Do you think this kind of approach is going to meet the needs for a follow-on to the B-52?

Answer. That aircraft has been developed in secret. We will have to go into that and question the people who are in the business of strategic bombing. The only people who can advise us on that are people like Generals LeMay and Power, the authorities on what these planes can do. I don't think it is big enough to do the B-52's job. But we will go into it and see.

Question. Is there any way of getting at this problem of Congress and the executive branch, particularly with hardware systems?

Answer. In what respect?

Question. We have been through it with the B-70 and so on, where the Congress asserts its will and interest through making money available, and in one case even directing that it be spent. But when it comes right down to it, the Executive can spend it or not as it sees fit. Isn't this a pretty severe limiting factor on any kind of coequal arrangement?

Answer. You can't make the man spend the money. But I believe that with my friendship with the President, we won't have any impasse.

I have had a lot of service with President Johnson, an awful lot. I think where we have problems, he will want to get along with us. I wouldn't have any hesitancy at all urging that he listen to the congressional viewpoint.

Question. All in all, it looks as though you're heading into a very eventful session.

Answer. The point I want to get over to you—this is my own viewpoint—is that I know good and well this country can afford the best military on earth. We have the best, but we cannot rest and still keep the best. The best thing we have going for us is 190 million people behind us. If there is anything the American people want, it is a first-class military man, well dressed, well housed, well fed, well paid, with the best equipment. If the Congress does not provide these things, we are out of step with the grassroots and the city roots. It is as simple as that. That is my position.

Los Angeles Neighborhood Music Settlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in marking the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Neighborhood Music Settlement in Los Angeles.

This nonprofit settlement, located at 358 South Boyle Avenue, has compiled a most enviable record of achievement and of service to the Los Angeles community. In particular, I want to cite the excellent work the settlement has done in bringing music lessons to the underprivileged children as a cultural development, and also as a deterrent to juvenile delinquency.

Over the years children of 14 different nationalities have been students at the Neighborhood Music Settlement, receiving lessons at less than cost from a staff of outstanding music teachers.

At present, some 270 students are enrolled, including 25 adults. A brief listing of some of the major contributions made by the Neighborhood Music Settlement would include: Providing cultural education in music, enriching the lives of thousands of students, building better citizenship through the advancement of general culture, strengthening family life in the community, lessening juvenile delinquency, supplying capable teachers, giving some 750 lessons each month at less than cost, presenting bimonthly and annual recitals, and establishing scholarships for worthy pupils.

The many men and women who have played a part in the fine work of the Neighborhood Music Settlement deserve our heartfelt thanks and congratulations. And personally, I want to thank Mr. Bernard W. Shafer, president of the settlement, for bringing this anniversary to my attention.

For additional information, I would like to take this opportunity to include at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors in recognition of the achievements of the Neighborhood Music Settlement:

RESOLUTION ON THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES NEIGHBORHOOD MUSIC SETTLEMENT

Whereas the Neighborhood Music Settlement, founded in 1914, is marking its 50th anniversary of service to those in the Boyle Heights area; and

Whereas this nonprofit settlement is maintained to bring music lessons to the underprivileged children as a cultural development and also as a deterrent to juvenile delinquency; and

Whereas over the years, children of 14 different nationalities have been students at the Neighborhood Music Settlement, acquiring lessons at less than cost from the staff of outstanding music teachers; and

Whereas at the present time the settlement has 270 students enrolled, including 25 adults, and is a major factor in strengthening family life in the comunity; and

Whereas the settlement is operated under the supervision of its civic-minded board of directors and its executive director: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, That the Neighborhood Music Settlement be congratulated on its 50th anniversary of service, and that all members of its board of directors be commended for their dedicated efforts on behalf of others in helping to bring cultural advancement to our county; and be it further

Resolved, That an engrossed copy of this resloution be given to Bernard W. Shafer, president of the settlement, at the March 24, 1964, meeting of the board of supervisors.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont* — 217 Slade Run Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* — Alban Towers
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6815 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*
Grider, George W., *Tenn*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*

Appendix

The Quest for Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Valley National Bank in Arizona recently published an excellent article on this Nation's mounting water problem in its monthly news digest, Agriculture and Livestock. In this article the bank points out that, as a result of gains in our population, we will need a doubling of our fresh water supplies by 1975.

In the Southwest today we are working on plans for regional solutions to our already dire water problems. But the Southwest is not the only area that must increase its supplies of fresh water; this is, in fact, a national problem requiring the best technology we can find to arrive at adequate answers. Surely the development of economical means of converting salt water to fresh, a program given new impetus recently by President Johnson, offers our greatest prospect of long-range help.

The Valley Bank article is an excellent summary of our modern-day search for water, and I believe it will be of interest to my colleagues. The article follows:

The passage of each day finds 8,000 more American stomachs to be fed. By 1975, our U.S. population will require 25 percent more milk, 35 percent more fruit, 36 percent more beef, and 45 percent more pork than now is being produced. And equally important as food, about 100 percent more fresh water will be required to sustain the American civilization of 1975. "Water is the essence of life, as necessary as air," one commentator lyrically wrote recently "Without it, nations wither and die. With it, they flourish. It is among the most precious of all mankind's treasures—yet it is wasted, neglected, and despoiled more than any other."

We agree. And add, prosaically, that our water needs already are enromous. The average American consumes about 1 ton of water a year in his food and drink. Plants need about 1,000 pounds of water to produce 1 pound of food. Industry and transportation require tremendous amounts.

Moreover, the problem of obtaining adequate water is hardly confined to our Nation. The truth is that the world is running out of fresh water at an alarming rate. Explosively expanding populations the world over—plus the constant advent of new manufacturing technique using more and more water—are compounding the problem to a point where many global leaders are gravely noting that mankind's very survival may depend upon its solution before today's newly born babies reach adulthood.

Despite the fact water covers three-fourths of our planet, less than 3 percent of the world's supply is fresh—and an estimated 80 percent of that is locked up in the ice and snow masses of Antarctica, Greenland, and the Arctic. Because water doesn't actually disappear and because it can forever be reused, most of the proposed solutions to the problem to date have been couched within a framework of reclamation and reuse.

"But water does disappear," the average layman will insist. "How about its evaporation by the sun?" True, the sun's rays act like magnets in drawing an incredible amount of water into our planet's cloud-layer atmosphere. But, over a given period of time, a virtually equivalent amount of water descends upon the earth in the form of rain and snow.

Rarely, of course, do the "up and down" ratios ever agree, if we select specific areas. Here, in the Southwest, we lose far more water by evaporation than we gain by rain. But, globally speaking, the total ratios are felt to be approximately equal—if we can make allowances for water that drains into underground reservoirs, or changes in its forms from liquid to steam or solid—and so forth.

"Well, then," continues our typical layman, "why don't we make reuse of our available water supply?" The answer is that we're learning how to do just that—even to the point of purifying sewage water—just as we're learning how to recharge depleted underground reservoirs, and just as we're learning more about the controversial technique known as "cloud seeding," which finds us turning clouds into rain (sometimes) by "salting" the former with chemicals.

"What about redistributing our available supply?" asks the layman. "Isn't it true that millions of gallons of fresh water daily run into the ocean in the Northwest while here in the Southwest we virtually measure every drop?" This is a perfectly valid comment—at least most of it is. Unfortunately, all of us don't measure water by the drop here in the Southwest. Too many of us waste vast amounts via dripping faucets, excessive lawn watering, careless irrigation practices, and like acts.

But it is quite true that a more equitable distribution of water resources would help greatly to solve current and approaching water shortage problems. And this is the thinking behind Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall's proposed Pacific-Southwest regional water plan, of which our own central Arizona project is now an integral part. So far as the CAP is concerned, even if it—by magic—were to become a reality tomorrow by diverting more water from the Colorado River, we'd still be confronted with the problem of rapidly diminishing ground water resources. Arizona now is using around 7 million acre-feet of water annually, of which about one-third is surface flow and the balance pumped from an ever-decreasing supply of groundwater. (In central Arizona, ground water is being used up almost twice as rapidly as nature replenishes it.)

Our paramount objective, of course, must be the securing of congressional approval of the central Arizona project if our growing population and economy are to be maintained. But as Rich Johnson, CAP president, points out: "There can be no CAP separate from or without relationship to a regional water plan. It just isn't politically feasible." (Others might even add the word "economically" to Johnson's second sentence.)

Assuming that CAP approval comes about during the next session of Congress—and eventually a Pacific-Southwestern regional plan (with the CAP an integral part of it) is agreed upon by the various States, Federal agencies and Congress—will the Southwest's water problems be permanently solved? Far-sighted authorities say "No." They point out that the Southwest is the Nation's fastest growing and most arid area. In the next 40 to 50 years, its population will triple, they predict. Population pressures, plus those arising from our increasing industrialization, will demand a supplementary source of fresh water.

"Out of sheer necessity, man must veer into long-range water planning to meet the demands of the next 50 to 100 years," declares Gov. George Clyde of Utah. "Just as our forefathers were men of vision and imagination, so too must we use vision and imagination to begin work now on plans that will ultimately take care of our water needs in the year 2020 and beyond," observes H. S. Raymond, manager of the Maricopa Municipal Water Conservation District.

Where, then, should man look for a supplemental source of fresh water—if he is to plan today for his needs a half century hence? The answer, according to a host of distinguished experts, is "the ocean." Sooner or later, water from the sea is going to have to make up for the fresh water shortages in various areas of this and other nations of the world, they insist. But—and this is highly significant—virtually all these authorities agree the most practical and most economical type of desalinization will come about by using nuclear energy to remove salt from sea water and generate electricity at the same time.

Last April, a special governmental interagency task force, after a year of intensive study, told the White House that by 1975—if need be—huge nuclear plants could simultaneously by producing vast amounts of inexpensive power and inexpensive fresh water. In this last connection, it expressed confidence that the water would cost no more than 20 to 25 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Desalinization plants are nothing new, of course. Up to now, the only barrier to more widespread development has been the cost of the product. The Government, for example, today is operating five experimental plants—using various conventional methods—in as many different areas of the Nation—with the three largest having a capacity of a million gallons a day. But, and this is the rub, none of the five can produce fresh water for less than $1 per 1,000 gallons. This is true, by and large, of most privately owned experimental desalinization plants, although, from time to time, they have hinted they are on the verge of a "cost breakthrough."

Roger Revelle, at present dean of research at the University of California, headed the Government task force. "Nuclear energy is a solution in search of a problem—and desalting of sea water is a problem it can solve," he confidently declares. A number of illustrious industrial scientists are in complete agreement with him.

Take Dr. Robert E. Wilson, former chairman of the board of Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, and, until recently, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. Shortly after the task force's report to the White House, Dr. Wilson was vacationing in Scottsdale. In an interview with Tom Kelland, business and financial editor of the Arizona Republic, he flatly declared "the secret of inexpensive fresh water production is combining its production with that of electricity."

As Dr. Wilson explains it: A nuclear reactor produces steam at relatively high pressures. This steam is best adapted for the creation of electricity. But, after it is used, low pressure steam can be tapped off the turbines at a point where it is fit for the distillation of sea water. In 10 or 15 years when both water and electricity can be produced and sold on a large scale by the same plant, Wilson continued, it will make electrical production competitive (when produced in high cost coal areas) and will make water at a cost of about 20 cents a 1,000 gallons—which is sufficiently cheap for household and most industrial uses. Both Wilson and the task force agree that the larger the nuclear plant, the greater its efficiency and the lower the unit costs of power and water produced.

The task force's findings were presented to Dr. Donald F. Hornig, Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology. Then, on June 10, President Johnson made a speech in which he stated an "economic breakthrough" had brought "the long promised day of economical nuclear power." Great reductions could now be made in the cost of building giant atomic powerplants—and these plants could be used for desalinization purposes, thus raising a "dramatic prospect of economically transforming sea water into water suitable for human consumption and industrial use."

(Curiously, the dual purpose approach was originated not by an engineer or a scientist but by a politician—Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico. Several years ago, ANDERSON attended an Interior Committee meeting and heard about the steam temperature required for an effective desalinization plant. Shortly afterward, he went to a congressional Atomic Energy Committee meeting where reactors were being discussed—and learned that the steam, as it came off an electrical turbine, was about the same temperature as that used in the desalinization process.

(ANDERSON then wrote to Dr. R. P. Hammond, then at the Los Alamos Scentific Laboratory and now at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, inquiring why it would not be possible to combine desalinization and the generation of relatively inexpensive electricity. Hammond, it developed, had been thinking along the same lines—and out of Senator ANDERSON's suggestion grew a 1962 report by Hammond concluding very large reactors could distill sea water economically. Direct result of his report was the appointment of the interagency task group to examine his conclusions. Its April 1964 report to the White House confirmed them in all important respects.)

Things moved fast after the President's speech. Gov. Grant Sawyer, of Nevada, promptly urged a crash Federal program to use nuclear energy to convert ocean water into fresh water for thirty inland States. "Ultimately, with cheap power, water will be transported to States within reasonable distances of coastal areas," he said. Nevada and Arizona both could be considered within "reasonable distance," he added, along with the observation: "Atomic energy is the key to unlock the ocean depth."

At the same time, the huge Metropolitan Water District of Southern California requested the Interior Department to launch a study regarding the feasibility of a 50-million-gallon-a-day nuclear-fuel desalting plant. On August 20, 1964, the Interior Depatrment, in conjunction with the Atomic Energy Commission, signed an agreement with the MWD to study construction of a plant producing up to 150 million gallons of fresh water daily, plus 150,000 to 750,000 electrical kilowatts. The three agencies expressed confidence the plant would meet the water needs of as many as 750,000 residents of southern California and the electrical needs of as many as 200,000 homes.

(Realistically, the MWD announced on December 5 that some 750,000 southern Californians soon may drink water from the Pacific Ocean but the rest of its more than 9 million patrons will still have to rely on the Colorado River and northern California. The study is expected to take a year and the plant, if constructed, would be the largest of its kind in the world. The world's largest non-nuclear-fueled plant is located in the tiny Arabian kingdom of Kuwait at the head of the Persian Gulf, incidentally. It turns out 2.4 million gallons of water a day.)

On August 26, President Johnson ordered three Federal agencies to join in accelerating the Government's program for desalinization of sea water. (The agencies are the Interior Department, the AEC, and the Office of Science and Technology.) He called upon them to develop an "aggressive and imaginative program" and reminded them the OST has already indicated large-scale dual purpose plants could be in operation by 1975 "in many water-short areas."

That same day the President announced a three-man U.S. team from the Interior Department was conferring in Tel Aviv with Israeli officials regarding the feasibility of constructing a nuclear-powered desalinization plant there. (Since then, it has been announced that the two governments will combine their know-how to build a $190 million plant capable of producing up to 125 million gallons of fresh water daily.)

Earlier this summer, the President had announced that the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to explore the possibility of cooperative development of methods for desalting sea water. The Milwaukee Journal commented at the time: "The joint endeavor takes on new significance in light of the President's decision to speed up desalinization research. And the joint Soviet-American effort might lead to other cooperative endeavors—such as further ventures into outer space that now appear to be too forbiddingly expensive for a single nation to undertake." (Note: On December 9, Secretary Udall reported a dual purpose plant "already is under construction in the Soviet Union. Similar installations are being discussed seriously in the United States, but we have yet to break ground.")

On August 31, President Johnson invited all nations of the world to join the U.S. dual purpose nuclear program. In a filmed message to a United Nations conference on nonmilitary uses of atomic energy, the President noted that the Soviet Union, Mexico, and Israel already had been invited to join the project. Money spent in harnessing atomic energy for peaceful uses is an investment in the future of all mankind, he said.

Then, on November 20, came the climax. The President summoned Secretary Udall to his Texas home and ordered a crash research program which, by 1969, will result in an economically feasible method of claiming fresh water from the sea. By "economically feasible," the President indicated he wanted fresh water produced for no more than 25 to 35 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Udall told the press the President said he wants "no penny-pinching in the program because he seeks a cost-cutting breakthrough during his 4-year administration." At the President's request, Udall reported, he will ask Congress in January for a $16 million appropriation to speed up desalting research now being conducted by his Department. Asked by newsmen if he expects to remain in the Cabinet, Udall responded: "Yes, I do. And after my visit today (to the LBJ Ranch), I'll stay with a real sense of excitement."

The question now arises: What does the future hold in store for Arizona, so far as its water needs are concerned? First and foremost, of course, comes the need of persuading Congress to approve the long-dreamed of central Arizona project. So far as most Arizonans are concerned, the cheapest and quickest way of adding more water to our present inadequate supply is to tap the Colorado River for the annual million-plus acre-feet of water the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled this State is entitled to.

Political observers express belief there is "a reasonably good chance" of congressional approval of Arizona's CAP request this coming session—provided Arizona guarantees California no less than 4.4 million acre-feet of water annually from the Colorado. And provided the CAP is part of a regional water plan resembling Udall's Pacific Southwest redistribution proposal. But these same sources also add, "It's difficult, however, to predict with any certainty what course Congress will take when confronted with a project of the financial magnitude the Pacific Southwest proposal encompasses." (Cost of the CAP alone has been pegged at $1.1 billion, it should be noted.)

And on that note we'll conclude with this prediction: Both a regional water redistribution plan and large-scale dual purpose nuclear desalinization plants are inevitable. Too much is at stake to assume otherwise. Neither alone can provide sufficient fresh water to meet our needs two generations from now. Both approaches are required if we are to sustain the 600 million U.S. population estimated by A.D. 2000 and the highly technological civilization we are approaching with such amazing speed.

Dr. Daniel E. Fountain of Homer, N.Y., 1 of the 10 Outstanding Young Men of 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was recently delighted to learn that one of my constituents, Dr. Daniel E. Fountain, of Homer, N.Y., was selected by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce as 1 of the 10 outstanding young men of 1964.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Cortland Standard of January 12, 1965, outlining Dr. Fountain's brilliant achievements in his chosen field.

The article follows:

DR. FOUNTAIN BRINGING NEW DISTINCTION

The selection of Dr. Daniel E. Fountain, missionary-surgeon, as 1 of the 10 outstanding young men of 1964 by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce is an honor deserved by the candidate and brings new distinction to Dr. Dan's native Homer and Cortland County.

Dr. Fountain will be 1 of the 10 men honored at the U.S. Jaycees award congress January 15–16 at Santa Monica, Calif. The presentations will be covered in national news media. It is appropirate that representatives of the Cortland County Junior Chamber of Commerce, which had the foresight to nominate Dr. Dan, will attend the awards congress and bring the story home.

This story will be a highlight of the program at the annual Distinguished Service Award (DSA) banquet to be held February 27 by the local Jaycees. Dr. Fountain is to be the speaker on the evening that the win-

ner of the Cortland County DSA for 1964 will be revealed.

Among the distinguished guests will be Dr. Fountain's wife, Miriam, and his parents, the Reverend and Mrs. Egbert P. Fountain, of Homer. Others attending the DSA banquet here will have the opportuity to share with the Fountains the pride they must feel in the selection of Dr. Dan for national recognition among the United States 10 outstanding young men of 1964.

In its announcement of the selection, the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce cited "Dr. Daniel E. Fountain, 34, of Kwilu Province, Republic of the Congo, a medical missionary from Homer, N.Y., who faces constant danger as doctor and teacher to 265,000 Congolese in the strife-torn province."

Local residents who know Dr. Dan and his family and others who have read the results of interviews with him published from time to time in the Cortland Standard are aware of the significant contributions made by Dr. and Mrs. Fountain during 3 years service in the Congo.

At the time the local Jaycee were preparing their nomination of Dr. Dan, he was in the Congo and unavailable to be interviewed. This newspaper takes pride that articles published previously supplied some information used in the nomination of Dr. Dan to be considered among hundreds of candidates 35 years of age or under.

Among winners over the past 27 years are the late Dr. Thomas Dooley in 1956, Howard Hughes in 1938, Nelson Rockefeller in 1941, William Saroyan in 1940, the late John F. Kennedy in 1956, Richard M. Nixon in 1947, Virgil "Gus" Grissom in 1961, and in 1964, Dr. Daniel Fountain.

Retirement of Prof. John L. Bonn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1965, the Waterbury Republican carried the news of the retirement from active esrvice of Prof. John L. Bonn, organist in St. Margaret's Church for 51 years. At the age of 93, Professor Bonn was dean of Connecticut organists when he relinquished his active duties.

When a man has devoted a long life to making his fellow men aware of the beauty that lies in the world; in lifting their minds above the mundane things of everyday life and, particularly, when he has labored with such outstanding success as has Professor Bonn, I believe that his retirement is worth more than passing notice. Professor Bonn came to Waterbury in 1899 and he has given piano, organ, and voice lessons to thousands of Waterburians during his years of service. This, in itself, is a record of achievement that is worthy of commendation, but it is rather the style and method of John Bonn's teaching that I wish to note.

He was never one to suffer fools gladly, nor would he satisfy himself or his pupil by teaching the banal or the superficial, "I don't teach that tinkle, tinkle, stuff; I teach real music," he said once. John Bonn created for himself and for his students a standard of excellence to which he always conformed himself and to which he required them to conform. He was a sound technician with an excellent education, both in this country and in Europe, and he knew the music of the world's masters in detail.

It is unfortunate in today's world that more educators do not have the high standards of Professor Bonn so that the youth of this country would be challenged to attain the excellence which we must maintain if we are to keep our place as a great Nation. John Bonn can retire secure in the knowledge that he has done his part to maintain that greatness.

The biographical article, which appeared in the Waterbury Republican, follows:

VETERAN CITY ORGANIST RELINQUISHING DUTIES

Prof. John L. Bonn, 93 dean of Connecticut organists, has finally decided to relinquish some of his musical activities. Professor Bonn today admitted that he has resigned as organist and choir director of St. Margaret's Church where he has served for 51 of the parish's 53 years of existence.

In his usual jovial mood, the venerable musician said: "I resigned some time ago, but I promised the monsignor (Rt. Rev. Edward L. Morrison) that I would stay on until Christmas."

Asked if he would still play occasionally at the church organ, he smiled: "I'll pitch in whenever they want me."

Professor Bonn, who gave his first public accompaniment in New York's St. Dominic's Church 82 years ago when he was only 11 years, will continue to teach piano at his studio and home, 175 Willow Street.

He still enjoys walking, even though he must use a cane and his pace is slower than it was 50 years ago. He hopes to continue to patronize the musical and concert events in Waterbury as he has done since he came to the city May 1, 1889.

THOUSANDS OF MASSES

Although he has no record of the thousands of masses at which he has accompanied at the organ, Professor Bonn has probably played at more masses than any other Connecticut resident.

He is firm on his appreciation of good church and secular music. He told an interviewer recently: "I don't teach that tinkle tinkle stuff; I teach real music. Many who claim to be music and piano instructors teach the mechanics only. Some are more qualified to teach typing than music."

"Real music elevates your mind and heart," he said. "Music is a language with its own syntax, rhetoric, and prosody."

Professor Bonn, who comes from a family of musicians, learned the basic organ techniques from his father who was choirmaster and organist at St. Vincent Ferrer Church, New York. Later he graduated from a Catholic liberal arts college in New York, after which he was organist at All Saints and St. Ignatius Churches, both in New York.

He came to Waterbury to accept the position of organist and choirmaster at the Church of the Immaculate Conception. After 15 years in Waterbury, he went to Vienna, Austria, to study piano and composition for 2 years. He came back to Waterbury in 1907 to resume teaching in the Willow Street music studio where he still teaches and practices—sometimes up to 10 hours a day.

His "Mass in Honor of St. Margaret" was played by the Waterbury Philharmonic Society during the 1963 season in tribute to Professor Bonn's 50th anniversary as organist at St. Margaret's Parish.

He has also composed "Ave Maria," "Divine Praises," "Vidi Aquam," "Puer Natus," "Introit for Christmas," and other compositions. He wrote the church music because he wasn't satisfied with some scores that he had seen for church purposes.

A traditionalist in church music, Professor Bonn has asserted: "The purpose of church music is to enhance and to make an atmosphere more conducive to public worship."

For the past two generations or more, Professor Bonn has given many concerts in Waterbury nad has had the pleasure of seeing many of his pupils become teachers and musicians, bringing much joy and satisfaction to themselves and to others.

The Late President Kennedy's Role as Chief Magistrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, volumes have been written on the administration of our late, beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Recently, however, I chanced to read an article in the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat which examined a seldom discussed facet of his administration: the President's role as Chief Magistrate.

The article was written by Edward J. McBride, assistant professor of political science at St. Francis College, Loretto, Pa.

Professor McBride studied in my district and received his bachelor's degree from one of our finer institutions of higher learning, Le Moyne College.

Herewith his analysis:

As the first anniversary of the assassination of President Kennedy approaches, the recollection of his public service understandably evokes thoughts on both the nature of the man and the nature of the high office he held—elements which, like form and substance, combined to make the Kennedy Presidency what it was.

In my mind, John F. Kennedy always will be associated with a particular dimension of the Presidency, and it is to this facet of the post that I shall address myself first.

In an acutely perceptive work entitled "The American Presidency," Prof. Clinton Rossiter of Cornell set a pattern for students of the office by casting the occupant of the White House in a number of different, though interlocking roles: Chief of State, Chief Executive, Chief Diplomat, Commander in Chief, and so forth.

Although this type of analysis has much to recommend it, I feel that a less obvious presidential task, albeit a transcendently important one, warrants more notice than it usually receives. I refer to the President's role of Chief Magistrate, that is, quite literally, chief teacher.

The man who holds our supreme governing position commands not only the authority, but also the attention, of the American political community. Thus, the President of the United States, as both national cynosure and national spokesman, has the capacity and, correlatively, the duty, to become the country's foremost political educator, or, if

one prefers (and, as a political scientist, I do), its leading teacher of political science. Our Chief Magistrate, no less than the British Prime Minister of Walter Bagehot's "The English Constitution," is, at least in potency, "the greatest teacher of all, the headmaster of the nation."

It is, therefore, under the aspect of his Chief Magistracy that I should like to consider, however cursorily, the presidential stewardship of John F. Kennedy.

First, I submit that Kennedy was singularly well favored for fulfillment of the function of Chief Magistrate. It only requires brief reflection to illustrate the point: He was at once erudite and articulate, qualities always—hopefully—to be associated with teaching success.

Second, for all his skill at workaday politics, his temperament appeared, at times, to border on the professorial—one occasionally encounters, for example, the term "donnish" as a description of the Kennedy perspective.

Furthermore, John Kennedy seemed disposed, from the beginning, to discharge the magisterial responsibility of the Presidency to the full reach of his ability. At the very outset of the 1960 presidential race, in a speech at the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., on January 14, 1960, the young candidate sounded the note of presidential initiative in the shaping of public opinion: "We will need in the 1960's a President who is willing and able to summon his national constituency to its finest hour—to alert the people to our dangers and our opportunities—to demand of them the sacrifices that will be necessary."

This theme, it will be recalled, remained fairly constant throughout Kennedy's campaign and, in fact, he made explicit reference to it on election eve, in the Boston Garden: "I run for the Presidency of the United States because it is the center of action and, in a free society, the chief responsibility of the President is to set before the American people the unfinished business of our country."

Although it will be for presidential scholars of the future to gage the measure of Kennedy's success as Chief Magistrate, certain well-remembered magisterial exertions by him afford some present indication of his performance in this regard.

In submiting the Civil Rights Act to Congress, on June 19, 1963, Kennedy called for its passage upon, inter alia, moral grounds: "In this year of the Emancipation Centennial, justice requires us to insure the blessings of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy and domestic tranquillity—but above all, because it is right."

It is in the field of foreign affairs, however, that our political society stands most in need of presidential instruction. As Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has written, "The President is * * * the prime mover in shaping a national consensus on foreign policy * * *. Public opinion must be educated and led if it is to bolster a wise and effective foreign policy. Only the President can provide the guidance that is necessary."

John Kennedy's magisterial labors with respect to international relations began, eloquently and perceptively, with his inaugural address. In rejection of the perspective which views the cold war in terms of blacks and whites, disjunctive propositions, polarized alternatives, and decisive solutions, he admonished his constituents "to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out."

Similarly, Kennedy's call to make the world "safe for diversity," issued at American University's commencement exercises on June 10, 1963, constituted an attempt to purge the "twilight struggle" of our age of its ideological rigidity. How accurate Kennedy's lessons were, and how well they were absorbed—and to what purpose—are only matters of conjecture as of now.

One thing is certain, however. Kennedy's approach to affairs of state was (like that of a good teacher to his discipline) imaginative openminded, appreciative of subtlety and nuance and, above all, thoughtful.

Incontestably, Kennedy was "a man of gallantry and of action, of motion, and of the trumpet," as Theodore H. White has said, but, what is more, he was a man of thought—"much thought, deep reflection, a sagacious, powerful, and combining mind," the attributes Edmund Burke regarded as crucial to the sustenance of free government.

If, in fact, our Government is to remain free and orderly, and just, vigorous and thoughtful magisterial leadership of the kind exemplified by President John F. Kennedy must continue to grace the highest councils of American statecraft.

American Initiative Can Still Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, as a reminder and inspiration that American initiative, energy, and sweat can still accomplish in this competitive society, I am pleased to include at this point a very pertinent article on this subject which appeared in the September 21 edition of the Boston Globe, as follows:

(By Donald White)

It has been 4 years since the Blake boys—John and Gary—stumbled upon industrial gas. They stepped on it and have been accelerating ever since.

The Blake brothers, both in their thirties, are sons of Harry J. Blake, a former president of Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce and president of his own wool company until 1960.

The Blake boys worked for their father as salesmen and worked for the new owners after he sold the business and retired.

But after years in a family business they wanted to run their own show again. The burning question, recalls Gary, was just what could two ex-wool peddlers do?

During their wool importing days the Blakes deal with the First National Bank. They decided to ask a friend at the First just what was open to a couple of hard-working fellows with relatively small capital.

The friendly First man had the answer. Union Carbide Corp. was seeking prospects to form a distributing company to serve Boston and southeastern Massachusetts.

Products for distribution included all forms of industrial gases, oxygen, nitrogen, argon, acetylene, and so on—as well as apparatus, supplies and equipment used in welding and allied industries.

Best of all, the required capital was only approximately $25,000.

"That's for us," decided Gary, and brother John was quick to see the wisdom of the idea. So, in the early part of 1961, they set up shop in Quincy with one other man on the payroll and a secondhand truck.

Their sales the first month were $300 and for the first year were $100,000.

They lost money, just as they, Union Carbide Corp. and the bank expected they would.

Second year, 1962, sales were $300,000. They broke even—strictly according to predictions.

Third year sales totaled $600,000. "We had begun to show a profit," says John, the treasurer.

Fourth year sales (estimated): $1 million plus. Everybody was surprised at such steady progress. Among Union Carbide's 30 eastern distributors, Colony Welding Supply, Inc. was fourth. Among the 300 distributors throughout the Nation, the company ranked 15th.

"We named the firm Colony because with so many established firms of this type already in the Boston area, we felt like a new colony striking out on our own," Gary recalls.

Gary is now the president. There are 27 employees and 12 new trucks. Better yet, their father is coming out of semiretirement to lend his acumen to his sons' company as chairman of the board.

Why did things go so well?

"Aggressive selling," says Gary.

They sold a revolutionary system to United States Steel's American Bridge Division at the Prudential Center. Instead of cylinders of gas being lugged to the top of the building, they stored liquid oxygen in the basement and piped it to the top.

They sold a semiautomatic welding unit—on condition that it was installed by midnight the same day. They found it had to go into a steel tower, 100 feet up. It also had to be cut in half, and then rejoined, because of a small manhole. But they made it.

They sold all the industrial gas requirements for the largest single road construction contract in the history of the United States—the Massachusetts Turnpike Extension.

So now they have a brand new office building on Center Street, Quincy and their sights set on a sales mark of $2 million in 3 to 5 years.

Minnesota ASC Resolution Disturbing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vernon Runholt, secretary-treasurer of the Minnesota Association of Farmer-Elected Committeemen has provided me with a list of resolutions recently adopted by the association. Mr. Runholt reports the association represents about two-thirds of Minnesota ASC committeemen.

While some of the ASC resolutions unquestionably have merit, one of them is greatly disturbing to me. According to Mr. Runholt, 98.2 percent of the association's membership subscribes to the following resolution:

> We endorse the present role of CCC in the handling and disposition of surplus farm commodities. We warn against permitting the grain trade to take over this function.

Mr. Speaker, most farmers are aware that injudicious Commodity Credit Corporation feed grain dumping has resulted in disastrous consequences for millions of farmers—cheap feed and cheap livestock. And most, I am convinced, believe deeply in a free enterprise system which leaves the production, marketing, and selling of goods to the people, and not to the Government.

Having made this observation, I insert these resolutions in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF FARMER-ELECTED COMMITTEES

The Minnesota Association of Farmer-Elected Committees endorses existing supply management programs and such additional programs as needed. We recommend improvements in present programs as indicated by the following resolutions.

We also wish to call attention to certain proposals in the farm area which we regard as dangerous, excessively costly or otherwise too impractical to be considered by the Nation or our farm community.

	Percent of approval
1. We recommend that present commodity programs be improved by modest increases in support prices, wherever practical, and substantial increases in incentive payments. Present programs have proven their effectiveness in reducing burdensome surpluses and should be continued	100.0
2. We support the food-for-peace (Public Law 480) program and recommend that it be expanded	100.0
3. We endorse the present role of CCC in the handling and disposition of surplus farm commodities. We warn against permitting the grain trade to take over this function	98.2
4. We recommend gradually increasing production goals on farm products as new and expanded markets develop	99.1
5. We reaffirm our strong support for the elected committee system for the administration of farm programs	100.0
6. We are opposed to the establishment of civil service in local ASCS offices. We believe civil service, if initiated, would weaken the committee system and result in loss of local control in the operation of farm programs	93.9
7. We strongly oppose the proposal of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission to retire 40,000,000 acres of marginal land from agricultural production over a period of the next 5 years. This proposal appears to be ill conceived, poorly planned, and would be very costly. We favor instead, planned use of our agricultural resources rather than the abandonment of the land that is implied in this crash program. We favor pilot programs to explore methods of aiding severely depressed rural areas before any long term or large scale program is initiated	69.1
8. We believe base and land diversion requirements could be relaxed for farmers with small farm bases to permit within base compliance and no land diversion requirement on very small farms. We favor similar relaxing on wheat allotments in areas designated as major wheat areas by the Secretary of Agriculture	85.6
9. We are opposed to the planting of substitute crops on land diverted from feed grains, wheat and cotton production	95.6
10. We recommend a restriction in all supply management programs requiring that the same land area may not be designated as diverted for more than 2 consecutive years without prior approval of the county committee	84.3
11. We recommend the establishment of a supply management program for the dairy farmer patterned after the feed grain program and with special provisions protecting the smaller dairyman	95.4
12. We endorse recent proposals for a national food reserve to protect the Nation in case of war or natural disaster. We would warn, however, for the Nation's protection that this food reserve be well dispersed throughout the Nation rather than in large vulnerable terminal warehouses. Grains and oilseeds should be stored on the farm wherever practical, and additional stocks should be stored in rural warehouses and CCC binsites	100.0
13. We pledge our continued support to Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman. Secretary Freeman has given outstanding leadership to American agriculture. We look forward to his continuing service as Secretary	98.2

The following two resolutions were presented from the floor and passed:

1. That the incentive payment on corn be raised from 15 to 40 cents per bushel on the first 50 acres on a farm and that the prevailing rate per bushel be paid on all corn over 50 acres.

2. That the maturity date on corn loans be set back 1 month from July to June.

Resolutions recommending changes in the Soil Conservation Service, the election of State committeemen and a price-support resolution were defeated.

Does Good Architecture Pay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I am not alone when I wonder what future generations will think of the decisions we are making today and every day in the Congress and in our Government. As we look back on past generations and past eras we can readily see their mistakes, and I am sure many of us wonder what glaring mistakes are escaping us here and now.

Surely one of the most apparent records of the quality of an age is its architecture. How will ours be measured by critics of the future? In the constant battle between quality and economy how far can we ignore the one to attain the other?

On Monday, January 11, the New York Times published an excellent article that explores these questions. Entitled "Does Good Architecture Pay?" it was written by Ada Louise Huxtable. Because we in the Congress play such an important part in determining what kind of investment this Nation makes in its public buildings I want to call this article to the attention of my colleagues. Without objection, the article follows:

DOES GOOD ARCHITECTURE PAY?

(By Ada Louise Huxtable)

"Does good architecture pay?" is a simple, clear, loaded question. There are as many answers as there are kinds of builders—speculative, public, private and corporate, and the figures given, or more generally, not given, are as loaded as the question. And they are loaded with skill, to prove any point, pro or con. The one reliable consistency, in fact, is the refusal of most clients and architects to give comparative costs on a good building versus a routine building. Construction costs are as carefully guarded or, if released, as calculatedly ambiguous as the secret of the Sphinx.

In terms of the New York City tax system, the answer to the question is, no; good architecture does not pay. Whatever the legal rights or wrongs of the recent discriminatory tax for excellence levied on the Seagram Building may be, the result is unarguable. Good architecture is penalized.

If the question is put another way, "Does good architecture cost more?" the answers are still evasive but more constructive. It does not always cost more. There are extravagant bad buildings as well as expensive good ones. It is also possible to put up a good building, as well as a bad one, on a tight budget.

A case in point is the Girl Scouts headquarters at 830 Third Avenue, by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, one of the country's most notable firms of prestigious office building architects. Skidmore, Owings & Merrill is also responsible for New York's Lever House, Union Carbide, Pepsi-Cola and Chase Manhattan buildings, the last on a far-from-tight budget of $135 million. The modest but impeccable Girl Scouts building was erected at a total cost of $3,875,000, or approximately $3.50 a square foot, by the thoughtful and tasteful utilization of carefully selected standard components. Even allowing for some loading of figures through tax exemptions, this is remarkably cheap.

But by and large, good building does cost more. It goes beyond standard components to deal in improved solutions, technical advances and quality materials. This makes a higher initial bill in design charges, testing costs and luxury choices, although all may result in substantial savings later. It is largely a matter of values.

As long as a building is treated exclusively as a commodity to be bought and sold for maximum profit in the shortest time, no other values—the contributions of such buildings to the community, for example—enter. A Harvard Business School survey a few years ago found a majority of businessmen to be keenly conscious of social responsibilities and highly critical of business practices that failed to weigh them in the profit picture.

This ethic has been conspicuously lacking in the real estate and building business, whose entrepreneurs seem sincerely innocent of any awareness of responsibility for the effect of their blockbusters on the urban scene, in terms of design, quality and function.

The answer to the question "Does good architecture cost more?" could be another question, "Does good anything cost more?" Generally, yes. Cut rate is frequently second rate. This holds in any competitive market.

Carl A. Morse, head of the immense Diesel Construction Co., which puts up a formidable number of New York's new buildings, was quoted in a recent Fortune article as saying "the difference in cost between an esthetically pleasing building and an ordi-

nary one is nominal." In a $15 million building, he added, 1 to 2 percent additional is all that is needed to give a feeling of quality."

This, of course, is a loaded statement, like our loaded question, and like everything else in the field of building economics. The reality of quality is quite different from the feeling of quality, and the substitution of one for the other is a sympton of what's wrong with the values that dominate the investment building business.

Lou Crandall, chairman of the Fuller Construction Co., another of the giants of the building industry, believes that quality pays, but that it is a big world and there is room for everything. Builders are practical men.

Mr. Crandall has lived intimately with the remarkable series of experiments that make up the story of the building art in our time, from the Flatiron Building of 1902—it was the Fuller Building—through the glass curtain wall that leaked and had to be fixed at the United Nations Secretariat and was perfected at Lever House, to the present movable forms and reinforced concrete construction techniques that permit the erection of a skyscraper floor every 4 days. He speaks of advances in design and construction, quality by any definition, with the warmth that most men would reserve for discussing the fascinations of a beautiful woman.

Everything that has become standard, efficient, and profitable practice in commercial construction came from a quality building, where someone paid for something a little bit different and a little bit better.

What is the client getting when he buys better architecture? Basic structural and mechanical services are generally standard. The difference is in the skin of the structure and the quality of the details, as in Seagram's bronze and glass curtain wall and special fixtures and accessories, or the granite sheathing of the new CBS Building by the late Eero Saarinen, reaching completion at 53d Street and the Avenue of the Americas.

It can also be in the interiors, as in the elegantly functional modular partition systems of the Union Carbine Building at 46th and Park. It may be in a radically different concept, in which a structure is "rethought" to achieve increased efficiency reflected to a distinctive appearance. An example is Paul Rudolph's striking Endo Labs in Garden City, Long Island.

To whom is this kind of design worth more? Or, to rephrase the question again, "For whom does good architecture pay?"

It pays for the client who is going to own and operate his building. This client is usually a corporation. Most of the ways it pays can be measured in good hard cash. Union Carbide rearranges about 25 percent of its space each year, at great savings as well as with superior good looks, through its custom partition system. Higher in initial design cost, it achieves substantial long-term savings through flexibility, standardization and lower maintenance.

Lever House was a daring excursion into good design 12 years ago. Its proven long-range benefits in maintenance, operation and advertising show the investment to have been a shrewd one, although it was originally estimated as high as double the cost for a standard building at that time.

Lever's fixed sash of tinted, heat-absorbing plate glass set in stainless steel frames, radical in 1952, cost about $28,000 more for its 1,404 windows than for ordinary sash. Stainless steel frames were roughly 20 percent higher than aluminum, and double glazing added $135,000 more. The special window washing machinery cost $50,000.

Savings were $90,000 on the first cost of the air conditioning, with an operational cut of $3,600 a year. In addition, $1,000 was saved on reduction of hot and cold air leakage. The 30 percent lower cost to install fixed, rather than movable, sash paid for the window washing setup, which saved $2,000 a year on conventional washing bills and reduced maintenance costs by cleaning the entire surface of the building.

In operational costs, the more attractive building has given Lever the pick of personnel, with 37 percent less turnover in 1958, to take a recorded year, than other large companies in the New York area. (The day after the opening, 782 applicants queued up.) The advertising and promotional value of the building has been incalculable for an industry that invests heavily in the creation of a "corporate image." Professional estimates have put the figure at from $7 to $25 million, equaling the cost of the building itself. The most conservative guess allows a benefit of at least $1 million a year.

If the advantages of good architecture are so clear, for whom does it not pay?

It does not pay for the speculative investment builder. And the investment builder is responsible for most of the construction in this country. In 1961 B. H. Friedman, a former executive of Uris Bros., the firm that has probably put up more of New York's standard commercial construction than any other, wrote in the Architectural Forum: "A building is a machine to make money with," and there is no indication that the situation has changed in any way.

This attitude has been intensified by some interesting features of the tax laws, which favor quick killings and bad buildings. Obviously someone up there in Internal Revenue loves the real estate man.

In a fairy-tale package of benefits, for an investment requiring at most only one-third in the investor's own cash, with the rest supplied in mortgages, he has income-tax deductions for the rental of the land (building on leased land is much more profitable than the old sport of speculating in land itself) plus full depreciation of building costs, with accelerated depreciation deductions taken in the early years of the lease.

When he's gotten a good return on his investment, usually in 6 or 7 years at a 14- to 17-percent profit before tax deductions, he sells the building and collapses his corporation, paying a capital gains tax of only 25 percent instead of the normal corporate 52 percent. There are fringe benefits like special stock market advantages and increased profits from the artful separation of the building into independent corporate identities.

Because the whole cycle can be repeated by a new buyer, basing his depreciation on the difference between the original cost and the price he pays, properties are sold and resold at inflated and reinflated prices. The real estate syndicate, which has further tax advantages, flourishes for the purpose of playing musical buildings in this fashion. And the game is played by putting the least in and taking the most out in every case.

Naturally the investor has no interest in the future of a building and he couldn't care less if it fell apart. He has no reason to be concerned about the eventual benefits of quality or good design. Structure after structure goes up that is patently cheap, ordinary and routine, aimed at "maximized profits." Without restrictions such as zoning laws, they would be even worse. Blame the tax gimmicks, urban economics, and the society that permits this to happen, as well as the man who takes advantage of the situation.

But looking at the percentages of those short-term profits, it is perfectly clear that the investor could afford to put up better buildings. The bitter truth is that bad architecture pays too well. Looking at our cities, it is obvious that society is paying the bill.

Foreign Aid: The Price Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer frequently asks: "Why foreign aid when there is so much to be done here at home?" The answer is not easy to see but it is my view that the price is right. To paraphrase President Kennedy, surely the Nation that cannot help the many who are poor cannot save the few who are rich.

The actual expenditure President Johnson is asking for the foreign aid program this year is less than one-half of 1 percent of our national income—and this amount is primarily for a loan program. As the President has pointed out this is the smallest assistance burden on the American people since the Marshall plan. It is a minimum request—but one which will get the job done.

Sixty-nine percent of our economic aid is in the form of loans which must be repaid by American dollars. Moreover, U.S. foreign loans have an excellent credit record. Of the $25.7 billion lent since World War II, we have received back over $10 billion on the principal and $4 billion in interest. Generally, collections have been received on time and in some cases ahead of schedule. As an example of this, in 1963 the United States lent $2.1 billion and in the same year more than $1.4 billion was returned on payment of interest and principal on old loans.

Along with the satisfaction of seeing progress in the cause of freedom, foreign aid has yielded unexpected financial returns. Beside contributing to the economic strength of developing countries it directly benefits the U.S. economy through creating new purchasing power for U.S. exports and by financing development projects requiring the importation of U.S. goods and services.

More than 80 percent of our foreign aid money is spent within the United States for goods and services. In fact, a recent study by the House Foreign Affairs Committee showed that U.S. military aid in 1963 resulted in U.S. procurement amounting to more than 100 percent of total expenditures. AID was responsible for more than $855 million worth of U.S. exports in the year 1963 alone. In 1962 for example, AID-financed purchases were responsible for one-third of U.S. exports in locomotives, one-third of U.S. fertilizer exports, and one-fourth of the U.S. iron and steel exports.

Actually, the foreign aid program has been a catalyst in creating new markets for American exports and increasing old ones for U.S. products. One study of 32 countries receiving foreign aid shows that over a 5-year period, U.S. exports increased 4 times the amount of aid. Since the Marshall plan and the beginning of European recovery, our West-

ern European exports have doubled and our exports to Japan have tripled. Our European markets have made possible a favorable balance of trade of over $3 billion. U.S. wheat and milk donated to Japan in earlier years has contributed to making Japan today the single largest consumer of American agricultural products today.

U.S. aid is so familiarizing the world with American products and techniques that it is creating a market which is potentially four times that of the Marshall plan countries. As these countries achieve economic growth and stability so will demand and purchasing power for buying U.S. goods.

The President has stated that the role and responsibilities of the U.S. private sector in the aid program is growing. More opportunities will result from the enactment of the President's request to expand the existing investment guarantee programs and the enactment of the investment tax credit program. At the same time, the foreign assistance program affords many chances for advancement for the private sector in the developing countries. The program loans to small business and development and agricultural credit banks as well as technical asistance will encourage private enterprise and provide a favorable climate for investors from abroad.

These aspects—the expansion of U.S. exports, earnings from U.S. foreign investments and acquainting nations with U.S. goods and services—mean that the foreign assistance program, contrary to some popular beliefs, actually contributes to the long-range improvements in our balance of payments.

Aside from the benefits to U.S. business and export, American products have added new dimensions to the living standards of developing countries. U.S. wheat and milk which went to Japan during assistance days created a market for additional quantities of milk, wheat, and corn products now important nutritional ingredients to the Japanese diet. U.S. technology and business enterprise have appealed to the inventiveness of the developing countries and by their example have importantly contributed to better living standards, future industrialization, with accompanying job opportunities.

The foreign aid record is particularly encouraging in light of these facts. It certifies the prudence of our loan record and responsibility with which recipient countries have carried out their agreements. It proves itself a sound investment for the U.S. business community. It represents an investment which will increase U.S. exports and further reduce the U.S. balance-of-payment deficit. Most important, it is a sound investment in creating a world of modern and secure nations.

Lest We Fail To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, probably too many American citizens and leaders fail to remember daily that we are at war—a dirty, dying, deteriorating war—in Vietnam.

Some of America's best manhood is dying each day in Vietnam. We need to remember. They need to know why.

More than 18 graduates of the Defense Language Institute, Monterey branch, have been killed in Vietnam. This is an enormous number.

I recently read the following requiem from the U.S. Air Force Academy student magazine, the Talon, of December 1964.

The first Academy cadet to take the oath of allegiance was killed in Vietnam. We should remember this outstanding young man.

On Saturday, October 24, 1964, the U.S. Air Force Academy lost its first graduate in combat. Not only was he the first Academy graduate to be killed under enemy fire, but he was also the first cadet to take the oath of allegiance in the first entering class.

Lt. Valmore Bourque took the oath with the class of 1959, but he graduated with the class of 1960. His mission while in Vietnam was combat support in C-123's. His specific mission on the 24th of October was a resupply drop of high explosive and ammunition to Special Forces. He was flying lead in a flight of three C-123's when his ship was hit by ground fire. Although the other two planes were hit, they managed to limp home. Lieutenant Bourque was posthumously promoted to captain and awarded the two highest Vietnamese Air Force citations. The Academy can look with pride on Captain Bourque's record as an officer. He was an aircraft commander and was recently made a mission commander, a great distinction for so junior an officer.

Captain Bourque's death marked the first Academy graduate to die in combat. He is not the first graduate to die, nor will he be the last to do so under enemy fire. But his sacrifice epitomizes the sacrifice each and every cadet voluntarily swears to make upon entrance into the Academy. Moreover, the death of Captain Bourque illustrates more vividly the true mission of the Academy. This does not include excellence in academics, physical education, or military training alone, but rather in a willingness and responsiveness to give up whatever is necessary, including the life itself, for one's country.

While at the Academy we are still a long step from participation in the mission of the Air Force. In effect we are training ourselves—mentally through academics, physically through athletic programs, and professionally through military training. However, often our vision as to where we are going, or why, is clouded by problems of immediate concern with regard to academics, physical education, or military training. To us, Captain Bourque is not only a symbol of why we exist, but he represents these characteristics each one of us should try to emulate. He realized his responsibility; he undertook the mission in full realization that he might not return, and he prepared for the untimely conclusion. In preparation for this assignment to Vietnam, he requested that should he not return, he would like to be buried in the Academy cemetery. Our vantage point of Captain Bourque and what he contributed to our further development can best be summarized by the somewhat unrenowned philosopher John Berrill:

"I am like a man journeying through a forest, aware of occasional glints of light overhead, with recollections of the long trail I have already traveled, and conscious of wider spaces ahead. I want to see more clearly where I have been and where I am going, and above all, I want to know why I am where I am and why I am traveling at all."

Can anyone in a position of leadership or authority tell the family of Captain Bourque "why he was there" or what the sacrifice of his young life contributed to the betterment of society. These valiant young men may be willing to die for their country, but should they not have a purpose?

Long Campaign Breeds Venom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members the enclosed article which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner, November 6, 1964, on the subject of long campaigns. This presents the views of two outstanding leaders in the Democratic and Republican Parties—James A. Farley, a former Democratic national chairman, now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., and Leonard Hall, a former Republican national chairman—who agree that the length of a campaign should be given serious consideration.

The article follows:

LONG CAMPAIGN BREEDS VENOM

Two of the Nation's most respected politicians, James A. Farley and Leonard Hall, were as far apart as the poles in their election positions. Farley is a former Democratic Party national chairman, Hall a former Republican chairman.

But they stood together in advocating shorter election campaigns. Farley contends that a majority of the people had made final decisions in the first few days—or weeks at most—after the national conventions. Hall attributed the campaign excesses of bad temper and bad taste to prolongation of the effort to influence the voters.

Long election campaigns stem from the days of slow communications and travel.

Those days are long gone. Now communications are virtually instantaneous. Physically, San Francisco is less than 5 hours from New York.

Most of the venom, hate and calumny of the 1964 campaign built up through the unnecessary weeks and months of the contest. Politicians and candidates said all that needed saying and then kept on saying it over and over again, with embellishments. The more a story is told the farther it gets from the truth. The inventions, contrivings, exaggerations and misrepresentations of a political campaign amount to wearing and wearying boredom for voters. They change few voters, if any.

The British concentrate their major election campaigns into a little more than 2 weeks. These are tense weeks, with controversy, personalities and vilification to spare. But candidates and voters alike get in and out of a campaing fast without injury to the democratic process, without risk of an uninformed electorate and without any damper on free expression.

We do not propose a 2-week national election campaign in the United States. We do propose as do Messrs. Farley and Hall, that shorter campaigns would take much of the bad temper and bad taste and much of the cost in wasted time and money out of our elections.

The Dedication of the John F. Kennedy Elementary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to be the principle speaker on Sunday, November 22, 1964, at the dedication ceremonies of the John F. Kennedy Elementary in Holbrook, Mass. I presented a flag which had been flown over the Capitol as well as Senate Document No. 59, Memorial Addresses in the Congress of the United States.

Following are my remarks:

Mr. Chairman, on Friday, November 22, 1963, the assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy brought shock and grief to both great and humble people throughout the world. The inspiration of President Kennedy's courageous, stirring leadership will live through the years to strengthen and sustain our great Nation and time will enrich the greatness of this outstanding American, who shall always be remembered for his courage and his dedication to freedom, peace, and the cause of humanity.

How impressive was his magnetic personality, how appealing his alert mind. How appreciated the lightning of his ready wit. How admired his lofty ideals, his intrepid courage, his concern for those unable to speak for themselves, his inspired battle for social justice, for equality of right and opportunity for the cause of the oppressed. His determined struggle for peace and order and a world organized on the rule of law, his firm resolve to preserve the integrity and security of our Nation and the free world, to uphold the basic moral and ethical principles of the American way of life.

The name of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will go down the long unbroken annals of history like a great gleaming beacon light casting its warming glow of toleration and justice over the Nation and the world and showing us, and generations to come, the way to prosperity and peace.

My friends, rarely in the history of America has one man blazed his path of glory across the horizons of this Nation in so short a time and with such momentous impact as did John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He was fashioned of the heroic stuff of which great Americans are made. Yet we who knew him best can testify before all the world that here was a man of gracious charm, broad intellect, and rare wisdom, a man with all the courage, faith, and compassion which real manhood forever requires.

And as if aware of the tragic limitations which destiny was to impose upon him, he swept with power and purpose out of the mists of relative political obscurity to burst upon the consciousness of the American people as few men before him have ever done, symbolizing in his vigor, his leadership, and his vision a new generation of Americans. In all of his formative years, it is difficult to find a time when John Kennedy was not testing himself, when he was not sharpening and perfecting his moral and intellectual capacities for that fateful moment when he would keep his long appointed rendezvous with destiny as President of the United States. His entire life became a hymn of preparation for the brief but critical months of service he would undergo as leader of the country he loved so dearly and for which he finally gave every last ounce of devotion that there was in him to give.

Though he wrote three books, he considered himself no author. Though he was a decorated war hero, he was no militarist. Though he served with honor as a distinguished political figure, he was no politician. But, first and foremost, he was a great patriot. Above personal ambition, above party affiliation, above petty conceits, John F. Kennedy will forever be a challenge and an inspiration to all those patriots, present and future, who would take their place among History's honor roll of the brave and the good. Though many men are called to serve their God and their country, a very few men in any generation are chosen to walk the solitary path to glory which he walked. His entire life was a noble overture to his sudden and tragic death.

No man so captured the imagination of his age as did John F. Kennedy. No man so mirrored the ideals and aspirations of the American people as did he. When John Kennedy died, people the world over felt hope within them die. When John Kennedy was struck down, men everywhere saw reason and sanity and understanding being struck down with the same brutal senselessness and violence.

But the ideals which were so much the immortal part of John F. Kennedy shall endure beyond the grave. The assassin's gun and the assassin's bullet has not been made which can destroy freedom's dream—a dream that is indelibly impressed upon the minds and hearts of men. The dream of freedom shall endure so long as man himself endures. On January 20, 1961—nearly 4 years ago—John F. Kennedy said:

"Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans. * * * Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival of liberty."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy has borne his burden. Now let us take up ours. With God as our shield, with freedom as our cause, let us labor to create a new and even greater America so that historians, in the years to come, will not find us unworthy of the sacrifice made by one of the noblest men of this or any other age.

A list of the members and programs is as follows:

BUILDING COMMITTEE

Thomas F. Hoell, chairman; Henry L. Dye, secretary; Thomas Ahern, Andrew H. Card,[1] Stanley R. Christianson,[1] secretary; Walter W. Donovan,[1] Peter George, Francis Hoban, Edward Huntington, George T. Jameson, Jr., Gerard Lane, Frances MacWilliams, James F. Magrath, Donald J. Martin,[1] chairman; Miss Grace G. McCarthy,[1] Irene A. Moran, Roger F. Poole, Ralph A. Samuels, John C. Sarhans.

Superintendent of schools, I. D. Reade; assistant superintendent of schools, John E. Zoino; principal, Irving Waitz; architect, Korslund, LeNormand & Quann, Inc.; contractor, Marshall Contractors, Inc.; clerk of the works, Irving Winslow.

Hosts: Holbrook Parent-Teacher Association.

DEDICATION PROGRAM

Presentation of the flag, main entrance: John J. Kelly.

Invocation: Rev. Charles B. Murphy, pastor, St. Joseph Church.

Welcome: Thomas F. Hoell, chairman, school building committee.

Introduction of platform guests

Music: Kennedy School Glee Club, director, Marcia Galway.

Presentation of keys

Contractor to architect.

Architect to building committee.

Building committee to school committee.

School committee to superintendent of schools.

Music: Kennedy School Glee Club, director, Marcia Galway.

Presentation of John F. Kennedy portrait

Council No. 5046 Knights of Columbus, William Godfrey.

"God Bless America": Audience.

Benediction: Rev. Roy Bruce, pastor, Brookville Baptist Church.

Open house: 3 to 5 p.m.

[1] School committee.

Who Says What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Mankato, Minn., Free Press raises an interesting question about who should make agricultural policy. I would like the editorial, by Franklin Rogers, included in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

L.B.J.'S REMARKS

Comments on President Johnson's state of the Union message included one from the Department of Agriculture that he did not say what that Department had told him to say about the farm problem. The President informed the Nation that he had instructed Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman "to lead a major effort to find new approaches to reduce the heavy cost of our farm programs and to direct more of our effort to the small farmer who needs help most." This apparently surprised the Secretary and his advisers.

A legitimate question arises here, however. It revolves around who is the boss, as far as the executive department is concerned. Is it the President? Or some of his underlings?

This move on the part of the Agriculture Department to dispute, even anonymously, what the President had to say points up one of the great problems that confronts any President, no matter what his party affiliation or his personal philosophy. It is the difficulty he has in the expansive bureaucracy trying to put his own policies into effect. He has literally thousands of career employees in all executive departments who are determined that they, and not the President, will set policy.

There is considerable doubt that either the President or his Secretary actually directs the policy of the Department of Agriculture. This is one of the problems which continues to plague that Department. And it also may be one of the problems that makes it extremely difficult to come up with an effective farm program.

This resistance on the part of bureaucrats is bad enough. But when they publicly say the President was wrong because he didn't say what they told him to, the situation becomes almost alarming.

Wright Patman's Policies Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note in a letter in one of Arizona's leading newspapers recently praising the work of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

What struck me as most significant about this letter was that it was written by an investment banker and president of a small business investment company. It is testimony to the respect our colleague enjoys among bankers and financial executives. The letter, by Mr. William Howard O'Brien, of Phoenix, appeared in the Arizona Republic on January 3.

The letter follows:

PATMAN'S POLICIES IN FINANCE PRAISED

EDITOR, THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC:

I want to aline myself in defense of Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN as quoted in Tom Kelland's article in the Republic December 20. I would like to say that Congressman PATMAN, who is chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, does not make charges against the Federal Reserve System for political reasons, particularly since he already was recently reelected from his congressional district very handily. It must be appreciated that Mr. PATMAN, although not particularly popular with banks, is respected there and is respected and liked by such financial institutions as the savings and loan institutions, the small business investment companies, and the insurance companies.

Speaking strictly from the viewpoint of a financier in small businesses, I have been able to watch Congressman PATMAN'S fiscal and financial policies for the past 4 years. I know, for example, that WRIGHT PATMAN as a matter of principle, opposes any use of Government money as a guarantee. I've seen him take some hard looks at plans projected by the Budget Bureau, the Treasury, and the Small Business Administration and make objective and unbiased comments, especially in the interest of setting up safeguards against incurring liabilities for the U.S. Government. We are in the throes of setting up a capital bank for small business investment companies, which will have the effect of taking the Federal Government out of the lending business, a move favored by PATMAN and by Senator SPARKMAN. In short, Mr. PATMAN has some astute, progressive fiscal policies and is not the liberal, easy money man you might think.

WILLIAM HOWARD O'BRIEN.

No Sugar Coating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, over the past year I have become concerned over what might be described as the Secretary of Agriculture's one-sided approach to the sugar program. The Secretary has gone to extremes in order to protect the interests of the Nation's beet sugar and mainland cane sugar industries.

At the same time, the Secretary has ignored his obligation to the other segments of the domestic sugar industry and, more importantly, his obligation to the American sugar consumer.

The Secretary's preoccupation with this handful of farmers has led him to commit a number of unfortunate blunders. These blunders contributed to the sugar crisis of 1963 and to the impasse that developed over sugar legislation in 1964.

Recently the Secretary started tampering with the sugar program again. His objective is to get the price of sugar up for the benefit of 23,000 beet farmers and 2,400 mainland cane farmers. He placed stringent restrictions on the imports of sugar into the United States during the first half of 1965. The price of sugar went up to almost a cent a pound within a matter of days.

This one-sided nonsense is the subject of an editorial that appeared in the January 8 issue of the Journal of Commerce. With permission, I place the editorial in the RECORD.

The Secretary desperately attempts to associate himself with the interest of the consumer. No one will deny that his Department performs important services for the consumer. These services are, however, of equal import to the farmer.

We must remember that when the interest of the farmer and consumer conflict, the Secretary decides in favor of the farmer.

The Secretary's approach to the sugar program leads me to believe that it might be necessary for some other department to share in the administration of the sugar program in order to protect the interest of the consumer.

The editorial follows:

NO SUGAR COATING

At the risk of belaboring a subject on which we have previously commented, we feel it essential to point once again to the curious manner in which the administration (like some other administrations before it) is pursuing one policy toward business pricing in one sector of the economy and a wholly different policy in another.

It is hardly a secret that when selective steel price increases are posted, the Government looks at the situation with stern severity. For awhile it may keep hands off, but ultimately the President's Council of Economic Advisers is directed rather publicly to examine the situation and determine whether remedial action is necessary. This may not force a rollback, as was the case during President Kennedy's row with United States Steel, but it is apt to discourage further price increases, even though the industry itself knows full well that the forces prompting the move toward higher prices were unleashed in good part when the administration failed to criticize the very expensive settlements automobile producers reached with Walter Reuther's UAW last year.

This provides one example of the administration's tendency to apply its noninflationary guidelines to industrial pricing but not to labor. But what has been happening lately in the sugar market provides another that is, if anything, even more uncomfortable to contemplate.

The plain fact is that the administration, through the Department of Agriculture, is striving as manfully to boost prices in sugar as it is to hold them down in steel. And it is doing so without giving any convincing reason why what is sauce for the goose in one case is not sauce for the gander in the other.

Eastern sugar refiners have every right to be angry over the Agriculture Department's decision to place the most restrictive kind of quotas on raw sugar during the first half of this year. The consumer, given such tender consideration in Washington when steel prices are involved, is given very shortshrift by the Agriculture Department, if he has the misfortune to live in the Northeast, in the Southeast or along the gulf.

The inevitable result of this policy of creating an artificial scarcity by onerous curbs on imports, is a forced increase in refiners' prices. The increase to industrial users in the Northeast, as pointed out by Charles Fuchs & Co., Inc., amounts to 11 percent—a jump that would galvanize Washington's entire bureaucratic apparatus into outraged action if applied to any basic industrial product. Why was this action taken? Why to protect domestic producers, and in particular the Louisiana cane growers who were hard hit last October by Hurricane Hilda.

We do not at all wish to place ourselves in the position of opposing aid to areas suffering the consequences of natural disasters. We certainly don't oppose assistance to the Louisiana growing areas which suffered a production loss on the order of 20 percent as a result of Hilda.

What we do oppose is the Agriculture Department's bland assumption that this aid should be supplied at the expense of consumers—and not all consumers at that, but of those in the Northeast and Southeast. Nor do we see why the consumer interests, rated so high when price increases in major industries are proposed, should rate so low when even sharper price increases are attached to agricultural products.

But it is not only between industrial and agricultural pricing that the Government's policies show serious conflict. Nor is the Agriculture Department the only departmental culprit. The Northeast, which is forced to bear the brunt of the sugar import quotas, is also the victim of a similarly restrictive policy on crude oil.

The oil policy is similar because it utilizes mandatory import quotas to create an artificial scarcity which, in turn, encourages more production in the Texas-Oklahoma and

other domestic producing areas. It also forces up the price consumers must pay, and specifically it forces them up in the Northeast, especially New England.

To us this just doesn't make sense. Nor does it add up to anything approaching a meaningful, or even coherent policy toward pricing on the part of the Administration. Washington might be right in pursuing one policy toward steel prices. It might be equally right in trying to force up prices of sugar, residual oil and other goods, and in looking intently the other way when its wage-price guidelines are cracked wide open by some of the largest unions. But it cannot be right in all these respects simultaneously.

Acknowledging Paul Heinecek—Article Printed in SESAC Music Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of SESAC Music magazine there is an article which I am sure will be of interest far beyond the music industry. It tells the story of a man, born in Germany in 1885, who came to America and through his own work and initiative rose to become one of the leaders of the music industry. Paul Heinecke widely recognized for his early encouragement of radio, for his work as head of the Association of Music Publishers, Inc., for founding SESAC and being its able president for 34 years. This year we observe Mr. Heinecke's 80th birthday, and it is a fitting occasion to pay tribute to his life and work. Under unanimous consent, I include the article entitled "Acknowledging Paul Heinecke," in the RECORD at this point:

ACKNOWLEDGING PAUL HEINECKE

(Written by Willis F. Myers, SESAC's director of station relations)

This is Paul Heinecke's 80th birthday year—a milestone doubly significant not only because it is a physical achievement, but also because 34 of these years were lived vigorously and effectively as the president of one of the world's foremost performance licensing organizations. To be president of anything today is a backbreaking job. To be president of a performance licensing organization is also a challenge and a crusade.

As a longtime employee and friend, I write this salute to a man whose way of life, character, integrity and personal warmth are too little known to an industry—broadcasting—he has served constantly and ably. His light has been too long under a bushel and I would like to bring it into the open for all to see. I'd like the broadcasters of America and music users throughout the world to know that personal dignity is not passé, that wholesome humor is still the best laugh getter of them all and that the worth of a man is measured in terms of honesty, directness, humility, heart, and the company he keeps.

Now then, this is the president of SESAC—this is Paul Heinecke.

To make America conscious of the many values of cultural and classical music was Paul Heinecke's dedicated goal when he organized SESAC in 1930. To say that he foresaw the new era of radio as the key to greater music appreciation of the masters as well as contemporary artists and composers would be only remotely approaching the heart of the dream. Music was and is now to Paul Heinecke the common denominator—the instrument for promoting better international understanding.

"To underscore the Heinecke credo and foresight, we cite the July 13, 1929, issue of the Musical Courier. In an article titled "Exploiting Strauss" (Richard), the editors draw a sharp stinging line. Said they, "The president of Associated Music Publishers, which had been assigned the American copyright on Strauss' 'Gesange des Orients' ('Songs of the East'), Mr. Paul Heinecke, was approached with a view to learning his intentions in the matter of exploitation in America of this important and valuable contribution to contemporary music. Mr. Heinecke's amazing—astounding—reply was that he proposed to make these highly classic, modern, and difficult songs known to the American public by way of the radio and the movietone.

"To attempt to sell the songs of Strauss to such an audience would seem as futile as to attempt to dispose of a delicate cameo of incalculable artistic worth on the Lower East Side.

"One cannot help wondering what Richard Strauss would think of the proposal to make these masterworks of his mature years known to the intelligentsia of America by way of channels that appeal chiefly to the least cultured of tastes. Music of this class is so far beyond the comprehension of radio-movietone patrons that it is omitted from the programs.

"Can Mr. Paul Heinecke possibly imagine that such people would sit for hours, glued to earphones or loudspeakers, in the vague expectation of getting some information as to the latest European publications of this type?

"Does Mr. Heinecke actually imagine that people of this sort will patronize the moving picture theaters, except perhaps on rare occasions by way of a lark?

"If Mr. Paul Heinecke holds these views, he is offering a gratuitous insult to Mr. Strauss and his work and to American culture.

"The radio and the movietone are great inventions. At some future time these inventions may be used in such a manner as to appeal to the highly cultured intellect. At the present time it would be ridiculous to make any such claim. * * *" To the above we would only say: "* * * Which have eyes and see not; which have ears and hear not. * * *"

Mr. Heinecke has a record of achievement few men of music can ever hope to attain. In 1926, Paul Heinecke became president of Associated Music Publishers, Inc. and continued as the company's No. 1 executive for 3 years. With Mr. Heinecke was Arthur Dean, as first vice president, until recently Director of U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Radio was then in its infancy and Mr. Heinecke was already one of the first broadcast pioneers and ardent advocates of this electrifying industry; he envisioned the growing role that radio would play in bringing good music to people everywhere. His ideas and plans for a wired music service smoothed the way for the background music so familiar to us all now.

Pertinent and vital to the broadcasting industry was the founding of SESAC in 1930.

Still young, Paul Heinecke decided on an early retirement in 1929. First step was to see the world, but retirement was nowhere along the way, for wherever he went, composers and publishers besought him to represent their copyrights. In no time at all, Mr. Heinecke realized that the protection of performing rights was essential, democratic and pressing. The Society of European Stage Authors and Composers came into being. Since then the organization has grown by leaps and bounds and today represents a wide variety of many different music publishers' catalogs. The SESAC repertory is not limited to any one category of music, but is all-inclusive. The catalogs are predominantly American (no longer the Society of European Stage Authors and Composers—simply SESAC), even though SESAC does have agreements with practically every performance licensing organization throughout the world. In addition, SESAC produces SESAC recordings, drummers, repertory recordings, special program packages and the popular "Just a Minute" series.

Paul Heinecke's background is as colorful as the musical compositions he has introduced. Born in Halle, Germany, in 1885, he enjoyed a boyhood peppered with international flavor. After very early years in his native land, he came by sailing ship to America at the age of 11 and journeyed to his uncle's cattle ranch in the Black Hills of South Dakota. Horseback riding and the other rigors of the still-wild West began to fulfill his boyhood dreams. Then on to Sibley, Ill., where he was 1 of 20 pupils in a little country school. Returning to Germany at the age of 14, he began a 4-year apprenticeship with the Carl Ruhle Music Co. Simultaneously, he furthered his education at the famous Handelshochschule in Leipzig, where he studied philosophy and business science. This was followed by 2 years with Forberg Music Publishers where he was placed under the guidance of his employer for instruction in the art of the music trade. This behind him, he became manager of the music department in the K. F. Koehler firm.

In 1910, Paul Heinecke, then 25 years old, entered the house of Breitkopf and Hartel, Leipzig, Germany, one of the world's major music publishing firms, in preparation for his taking over the management of their New York office. World War I forced the separation of the New York branch and the formation of an independent company which Mr. Heinecke headed until 1926. During all these years, Mr. Heinecke was growing close to the goal of a new musical culture in America. He paved the way fo Sibelius "Finlandia" and "Valse Triste," Ponce's "Estrellita," and Provost's "Intermezzo" as well as the music of such modern composers as Arnold Schoenberg, Ferruccio Busoni, Frederick Delius, and many others. Although a top promoter of good music from Europe in America, Paul Heinecke also became a leading champion of fresh new talent on the growing American scene. He was among the first contacts for pianist Rachmaninoff when he came to America and was the first to recognize and publish the works of Henry Cowell. Among those he has befriended in the world of music are: Mrs. Edward MacDowell, Villa-Lobos, Victor Herbert, George Gershwin, Maurice Ravel, Enrico Caruso, Erno Rapee, Ethel Leginska, Leopold Auer, Franz Drdla, Percy Grainger, Leo Ornstein, Edward Poldini, Nat Shilkret, and Richard Maltby.

Just a year ago, in January 1964, SESAC opened an office in Nashville, Tenn., the country music capital of the world. From this headquarters, manned by a highly capable staff headed by Mercury recording artist Roy Drusky, the firm will further expand its activities in country music during the months and years ahead. It may well be said that every outstanding personality in the music field crossed the Heinecke path professionally and once having done so, became a fast friend, for the Heinecke charm, then as now, captivates all with whom it comes in contact.

He believes in youth as well as the wisdom of age; in music as the international language, and in broadactsing as the instrument of world peace and understanding. He has built the house of SESEC well, not on sand but on solid rock.

L.B.J.'s School Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Congress to an editorial and a letter to the editor in the January 13 issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. The editorial points up the direct relationship of the President's program of aid to education and the school needs of big urban areas like Pittsburgh. The letter, from Mr. John F. Soboslay, of West Mifflin, Pa., has some very sound advice for all of us who may tend sometimes to be overwhelmed by the enormity of the task of achieving the goals represented in the phrase "Great Society." I commend the editorial and letter to your attention and suggest that another major link in the program of building the Great Society would be a National Humanities Foundation, as proposed in my bill H.R. 334. As I told the House on January 4 we must inspire the education of Americans who can understand and articulate the critical values that give compelling meaning and a sense of direction to human life—Americans who are as skilled in devising a general program of peace and progress as are the specialists in creating engines of destruction.

The editorial and letter follow:

L.B.J.'s SCHOOL PROGRAM

President Johnson's appeal to Congress for $1.5 in new obligational authority to finance Federal programs of aid to education emphasizes the needs of urban communities like Pittsburgh, where the public school board is now seeking an additional $12 million through 1968.

The local school board is looking primarily to Pennsylvania's General Assembly for financial assistance but some help could come through the Federal Government if Congress responds favorably to the President's message.

"The burden on the Nation's schools is not evenly distributed," the President said, "Low-income families are heavily concentrated in particular urban neighborhoods or rural areas. Faced with the largest educational needs, many of these school districts have inadequate financial resources. This imbalance has been increased by the movement of high-income families from the center of cities to the suburbs—and their replacement by low-income families from rural areas."

That's exactly what has been happening in the Pittsburgh district. Proof is found in an analysis made of the Pittsburgh and Philadelphia school districts by the Fels Institute. Its study, published last weekend, shows that below a median family income range of $4,800 to $5,700, the predicted average achievement test scores for urban school populations "were always lower than comparable scores for any of the classes of suburban or rural school districts representing the entire State."

More specifically, the per capita disposable income for Pittsburghers is $2,221 as compared with a State average of $2,363. About 40 percent of this city's families have incomes under $4,000, which sociologists define as poverty level. A third of those families are destitute, with annual incomes of less than $2,000. The children of the lowest 40 percent of the city's families are the ones most desperately in need of greater educational opportunity, starting with preschool training and continuing for as long as the child is capable of learning.

President Johnson's proposals tie in with his antipoverty program. They embrace education at every level, starting with preschool, for which he would make available $150 million, and continuing through the universities, which he would call upon to exert their influence throughout the fabric of our society.

This is a very ambitious program extending help in a great many directions, including the private schools. There may be a question here as to whether the President, in an attempt to get his program through Congress by including help to the private schools, is not breaching the historic separation of church and state. Some of his proposals, if enacted, will almost surely bring constitutional challenges.

For the most part, however, his proposals, particularly as they seek to elevate the Nation's socioeconomically deprived children, are well conceived. The topheavy majorities of the President's party in both Houses of Congress suggest that at long last the Nation stands at the threshold of a major breakthrough on the controversial old issue of Federal aid to the elementary and secondary schools.

GREAT SOCIETY DREAM? DREAMS COME TRUE

After the flood of progressive legislation in the last session of Congress, it is easy to understand why many people might be amazed at the lengthy agenda of priority programs President Johnson has presented to the recently convened 89th Congress.

It is easy also to joke about a term such as the Great Society. All realistic human beings are aware that problems and sorrows are the constant companion of mankind. Yet, it is likewise realistic to recognize that the hopes and dreams envisioned for the Great Society are part of man's never ending search for paradise lost.

It is true that all problems will never be solved, but there is an inner voice which tells us that many situations can be improved if we stop ignoring them, and if we have the courage to challenge deplorable conditions wherever they exist with a firm resolve to make better that which is.

The program of President Johnson is the unfinished work of our day. It is worthy of our time, energy, and tax dollars to be deeply concerned about the education, the health, and the culture of our people, as well as trying for a compassionate immigration policy which recognizes that we are a nation of immigrants.

The journey to the Great Society has been long and troubled. Not all those whose ideas and ideals helped shape this dream are with us today. One rests in Hyde Park and another in Arlington. We look now for leadership to the tall figure from the New South.

If anyone doubts that this country is on the move, let him look at the record of the last few years. We put a Catholic in the White House and let the Negro into the schools and restaurants. We survived. We prospered. And as a nation we felt better for having faced up to situations that far too long nipped at our conscience.

Today we are blessed to have skilled engineers who can construct a towering skyscraper in a metropolis, and we are equally blessed to have idealistic youngsters from Oberlin College in Ohio who spent their Christmas vacation helping to rebuild a bombed-out church in Ripley, Miss.

The Great Society is a mighty dream, but many dreams once thought impossible have already become reality in the United States within our own lifetime.

JOHN F. SOBOSLAY.

WEST MIFFLIN, PA.

Forecast for Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, both in a letter to my fellow colleagues, and in a statement here on the floor of the House, I pointed out the need for drastic changes in our silver and coinage policies.

Another view on this issue is offered in an editorial published in the Mining and Natural Resources Record, of Denver, Colo., on January 7, 1965.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the following remarks of Editor M. E. Fry, under the title, "Let's Once Be Honest":

Tonight we listened to a radio commentator explaining reasons for the shortage of silver. Not so long ago we heard the same comment on the gold crisis.

It reminded us of the time, not so very long ago, when some of our official eggheads in Washington were talking about this being a "have not" nation. They said we had no fissionable minerals for making the atom bombs. We had no tungsten for military and industrial purposes. We had not this or that mineral or metal, and so on. And then, one of the exceptions in Washington, somebody with a sense of reality, proposed that the Government offer a price for tungsten and a price for uranium which would be in keeping with the current cost of mining and refining these metals. Lo and behold, it was discovered that this Nation had not only plenty of both, but we had an overabundance of these metals.

Now we talk about the shortages of gold and silver. As we mentioned above, the coinage price of silver was fixed in 1792 substantially as it is now, and the price of gold hasn't been changed since 1934. Just how does Washington expect the American metal miner to provide gold and silver when the prices the Government allows for these metals are deliberately kept so low that no miner now can afford to mine them?

The shortage of silver may be due in part to hoarding, which is understandable in view of the uncertainty of our paper money. It is also due to the increased uses of silver for commercial and industrial purposes. Coin operated machines and our expanding population require more silver. We think one of the chief reasons why silver is so scarce is because it has more value overseas than it has in this country. Once a silver coin is beyond the borders of this Nation it may be safely melted and sold at a profit because the silver in that coin will bring more in foreign countries than the face value of the coin. We have many gold and silver mines in this country that are capable of producing for years to come. We've only scratched the surface of the known mineralized area of this country. Less than a sixteenth of it has ever been developed; less than a fourth has ever been prospected. But there is something about gold and silver mining that arouses the hackles of the officials in Washington. Gold and silver mining are

prime examples of individual initiative and private enterprise which now are only tolerated in some Government quarters. Hundreds of thousands of jobs await the reopening of our gold and silver mines. And reopen they will in spite of all the restrictions that have been placed upon them by our Federal Government because the law of supply and demand is commencing to overturn all bureaucratic rules and regulations and all the silly laws that have been enacted to hinder and retard the mining of metals in this country in the last 30 years.

When we are talking about these jobs we mean not only the actual miners. We are thinking about all the professional jobs: assayers, engineers, lawyers, doctors, and all the rest. We mean, too, the communications and the transportation jobs that will come from the opening of the metal mines. We are thinking, too, of the retail establishments, the banks, and all the other occupations and professions of every day American life which must again come into being to serve those engaged in this basic industry.

Our Present Morality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the astute publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, Ralph McGill, has given the lie to the charges of immorality lodged against American society by the losing side in the November election. If we would but stop and look around us we would see that he has put his finger on the truth: we are a more moral nation today than ever before. Mr. McGill's column appeared in the November 29, 1964, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

OUR PRESENT MORALITY

With the election now well behind us, and the Goldwater revolution busily devouring its own litter in the manner of all revolutions, it may be possible to discuss rationally the campaign charges of national moral decline. Unhappily, this indictment was never defined, save in already weary charges chiefly about Billie Sol Estes and Bobby Baker. Senator Goldwater said early in the campaign that there was something wrong. "I haven't put my finger on it yet," he said. He promised eventually he would place his finger firmly on the sickness, but, alas, he never could locate it, except, as aforesaid, in finger pointings at the Bobby Baker case.

Neither Billie Sol nor Bobby Baker makes us proud. They are a product of our society in which the shrewd and clever entrepreneur with influence and connections can pyramid borrowings, sales, transfers and profits into great riches and be admired. These charming fellows always involve a number of innocent persons who are soft touches for charm, especially that charm that seems "accepted." It is only when the precariously balanced pyramid comes crashing down, exposing all the elements that go to make up "'connections" that we become affronted. So long as those charmers balance their deeds successfully, we rather admire them. They very often are accepted as religious leaders, as was Billie Sol, or held up as examples for our young.

The deeds of the so-called U.S. robber barons attained stature with the incredible corruption, sales of influence and brazen graft in the Grant administration. We did not even match it with the corrupt practices and uses of influence in the Harding administration, though we came close. Bobby Baker was a peanut vender compared with them, but still he was brought to an early halt. Even Billie Sol, whose pyramid came toppling down, was not in a class with the robber baron operators in the late 1880's.

The inescapable truth is that we are, in 1964, in general a more moral people than ever before. There is less dishonesty in government, local and national. Our cities contain a disturbing amount of violence for which the answer is by no means more policemen and laws. But even so, our cities are much healthier and less violent than they were in the 1880's. We do not now have areas in our cities into which police are afraid to go. That such areas flourished long after the Civil War is a part of our history. Nor do we have vast acreages given over to prostitution and associated vices.

We are at a higher peak of morality than ever before. We are trying to do what is moral and right in race relations. We are beginning to look coldly at the slum landlord. We are admitting that, while we have had public housing for more than 30 years, we have done almost nothing at all about housing for the really poor person. We also are aware of our failures in education and the ugly discriminations in our society. We have instituted a social security system that includes pensions for the old and aid to the blind and crippled. No reasonable person can deny that the Nation is more moral and compassionate than ever in its history.

But there is a feeling of unease and fretting. It may, quite seriously, be due to the fact that we were created as a nomadic people who "invented" agriculture and took up village life. We are not yet psychologically adapted to cities and the sameness of suburbs.

Alfred Kazin, writing in "Contemporaries" about American literature, concluded: "American society is remarkable for the degree of loneliness (not solitude) in which the individual can find himself. In our mass age, the individual's lack of privacy, his unlimited demands for self-satisfaction, his primary concern with his own health and well-being, have actually thrown him back on himself more than before. Our culture is stupefyingly without support with tradition, and has become both secular and progressive in its articulation of discontent and ambition; the individual now questions himself constantly because his own progress—measured in terms of the social norms—is his fundamental interest."

We can chew on that for a while.

Dr. Albert Schweitzer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today is Dr. Albert Schweitzer's 90th birthday. He is one of the greatest humanitarians in all the history of the world. It will be interesting to my colleagues who are often visited with ingratitude for doing good that Dr. Schweitzer upon one occasion said, "Anyone who proposes to do good must not expect people to roll stones out of his way, but must accept his lot calmly if they even roll a few more stones upon it."

Dr. Schweitzer's magnificent philosophy can be summed up in this statement he made early in life, "It is an uncomfortable doctrine which the true ethic whispers in your ear. You are happy, it says; therefore you are called upon to give much. Whatever more than others you have received in health, natural gifts, working capacity, success, a beautiful childhood, harmonious family circumstances, you must not accept them as a matter of course. You must pay a price for them. You must show more than an average devotion to life."

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Schweitzer has devoted his life to others and his "reverence for life" has inspired countless millions throughout the world. I wish Dr. Schweitzer a happy birthday and the greatest New Year of all.

Help for Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Membership, the very fine editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on Monday, January 11, 1965, concerning the bill to create a National Humanities Foundation which was sponsored by my good friend, Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD. I believe the editorial to be most timely and should be read by all.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Jan. 11, 1965]

HELP FOR HUMANITIES

Three recent events should have a profound effect on liberal arts studies: the reintroduction of Representative WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD'S bill to create a National Humanities Foundation; a $750,000 Ford Foundation grant to the University of Texas for a national language translation center; and plans of the American Historical Association for a $40 million research center for historians.

The Moorhead bill would promote a broad support of the humanities as a counterweight to the emphasis generated by the National Science Foundation. The bill is based on recommendations of the Commission on Humanities, made up of many erudite groups. Mr. MOORHEAD has keyed the Foundation to the needs of the Great Society, which should help the bill on its way through Congress. Yet the appropriation sought for the first year is $150,000. Compare that with the Science Foundation's 1964 appropriation of more than $350 million.

At the center in Austin, Tex., to improve and expand the translation of literature, the Ford Foundation grant will provide for a 5-year program, with annual expenditures of $150,000. Fellowships will be given to writer-translators for research, younger writers will be trained, and commissions will

be given in an effort to make more foreign works available.

America publishes far fewer translations than other leading countries; and some of the world's major writers are either completely or largely missing in English translation. The emphasis at Austin will be on literary values, not only to fill the gap but to end the secondary status of the translating art.

The extensive project of the American Historical Association will raise funds for a center to include individual living quarters, a library, conference rooms, and dining hall. Facilities would be available "to all serious scholars of whatever place or station. Its development as a national research clearinghouse will further add to its value.

The practical value of the humanities is the way in which they can help Americans meet challenges. These three projects support that thesis. At the same time they should improve the national climate for the humanities themselves.

Humanities: Proposals To Set Up National Foundation Are Gathering Support in the House and Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of the best summaries I have read on the National Humanities Foundation, which I have proposed in my bill H.R. 334, appears in the latest issue, January 15, 1965, of Science, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House this excellent report by Mr. Daniel S. Greenberg, of the Science editorial staff:

A good deal of support has developed in the new Congress for proposals to provide the arts and humanities with some of the institutional and financial recognition the Federal Government long ago gave to the sciences.

Basically, the proposals call for establishing one, or possibly two, foundations, modeled in large part after the National Science Foundation, to provide money for humanistic studies and the performing and visual arts. At this point, the prospects look bright. The backers differ on a few points, principally whether the arts and humanities should be housed in one foundation, and how broadly the performing and visual arts should be defined. But the differences appear to arise from uncertainty, rather than any strongly held conviction that might turn allies to destructive feuding.

Contributing to the general optimism is the fact that no public word of opposition has been raised to the principle of the Federal Government's assuming some financial responsibility for the arts and the humanities. The most likely opponents, fiscal conservatives, have of course been well occupied in these first weeks of the 89th Congress with liberal-versus-conservative organizational battles. When the legislative deliberations on the foundation proposals reach the serious stage, some Members of Congress can be expected to ask whether it is necessary or prudent for the Federal Government to establish a new agency to promote finger painting and Chaucer studies. But, for better or worse, things have evolved in this country to the point where very few legislators dare make fun of what is considered to be intellectual activity. Now and then a Member will have some harsh things to say about the Federal Government's financing studies of, say, how turtles navigate, but the physical sciences seem to have won the fight to convince Congress that the quest for knowledge may lead anyplace, and there has been a beneficial, though far from complete, spillover to the social sciences and, to a lesser extent, the humanities. This is evidenced by last year's expansion of the National Defense Education Act to provide greater support for nonscientific disciplines. Whether this relaxation extends to the performing and visual arts remains to be seen. There may be a problem there. The basic sciences both suffer and benefit from the fact that they are generally incomprehensible to the public that supports them. Taxpayers and Congressmen have yet to declare, "I don't know anything about chemical bonding, but I know what I like." However, that sort of judgment is easily and often applied by laymen to what they see on the stage and on canvas, and any Federal agency that must operate in this area of strong tastes and changing values may encounter some difficult problems.

In the House, the proposal to provide Government support for the arts and the humanities is contained in H.R. 334, introduced by WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, a Pittsburgh, Pa., Democrat. MOORHEAD'S bill, which has been endorsed by some 70 Members of both parties, is derived from a version that he introduced at the end of the last session, not with any expectation of passage, but simply to elicit interest and critical evaluation. The Moorhead bill calls for the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation to promote the study of "languages, literature, history, and philosophy; the history, criticism, and theory of the arts; the history of law, religion, and science; the creative and performing arts; and those aspects of the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods."

To accomplish this, the Foundation would have authority to "develop and promote a broadly conceived policy of support for the humanities and the arts" and to provide "grants, loans, and other forms of assistance" for "educating and developing scholars, teachers, and artists at any stage of their growth." It would provide institutional grants and other support for "public and other nonprofit institutions" that are "concerned with encouraging and developing scholars, teachers, and artists"; it could award "scholarships and graduate fellowships, including postdoctoral fellowships, and grants for research and for creative work and performance in the humanities and the arts." And, it could provide funds for "the improvement of library resources and services for research and for teaching at all levels in the humanities and the arts. * * *"

The first appropriation would be $5 million. The Foundation would be headed by a full-time Director, who would receive the same salary as the Librarian of Congress—$27,000. (Why this position was chosen to set the salary scale is not clear. The Director of the National Science Foundation, which is the institutional parallel for the proposed Humanities Foundation, receives $28,500.) Like NSF, the NHF would have a 25-member board, but there are some possibly significant differences in the makeup of this body. The NSF Board consists of 24 persons drawn from nongovernmental sources, plus the NSF Director as an ex officio member. The NHF Board, in the Moorhead bill, would consist of 20 members drawn from nongovernmental sources, plus five ex officio members from the Federal Government; the Director, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Chairman of the National Council on the Arts (which was all that Congress accepted last year from a proposal to establish a National Arts Foundation). The inclusion of the ex officio members reflects an intention to have the Foundation work closely with the various Government institutions that are already supporting the arts and the humanities to some extent.

In the Senate there are now three bills proposing Government support for the arts and the humanities—S. 111, introduced by ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska and endorsed by 29 other Senators, closely follows MOORHEAD'S House version. However, two bills introduced by CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, take a somewhat different approach, although the differences would seem to be easily reconcilable. PELL, who last year sought to establish a National Arts Foundation, has again introduced a bill to accomplish that goal, S. 315. But he has also introduced a bill, S. 316, to establish a National Humanities Foundation that would wholly encompass the functions prescribed for the Arts Foundation.

The humanities parts of the combined bill are essentially the same as corresponding provisions in the Moorhead and Gruening versions, but the Pell bill spells out the arts activities in greater detail, specifying, for example, that the arts are to be defined as including "music (instrumental and vocal), drama, dance, folk art, creative, writing, architecture and allied fields, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, industrial design, costume and fashion design, motion pictures, television, radio, tape and sound recording * * * plays (with or without music), ballet, dance and choral performances, concerts, recitals operas, exhibitions, readings. * * *"

Under the Pell bill, the foundation would provide no more than 50 percent of the cost of any production, and groups would be ineligible for assistance if any of their net earnings went to private parties. PELL would start the foundation off with $10 million and raise the appropriation to $20 million in the second fiscal year.

As far as the internal workings of Congress are concerned, the proposals have good fortune on their side. In the House, the Moorhead proposal will go before an Education and Labor Select Subcommittee headed by FRANK THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey, who is known to be sympathetic. In the Senate, it will be handled by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee's special subcommittee on the arts. PELL was chairman of this subcommittee in the last Congress and will probably continue in that post, although there is a slight possibility that this may be affected by his appointment last week to the Appropriations Committee.

In any case, the prospects are bright, but the proposal is not yet in the category of a sure thing. It has a clear endorsement from President Johnson, who said at Brown University last September, "I look with the greatest favor upon the proposal * * * for a National Foundation for the Humanities." But out of caution, rather than hostility, the Congress may decide to take a long and careful look at what is in many respects a revolutionary proposal. Support for the sciences evolved initially from science's utility in exploration and later in military, agricultural, and medical matters. The needs were clear, and so were the dividends. The needs are also clear in the areas that come under the headings of arts and the humanities, but the early and easy outpouring of congressional support should not obscure the fact that some Members, fully sympathetic to the arts and the humanities, harbor real concerns about the wisdom of meeting these needs through setting up a new Federal agency. One of these Members, with

close ties to a major university in his district, commented that he endorsed MOORHEAD's bill but, before the matter comes to a vote, is going to have to be persuaded that the proposed NHF is the right way to meet what he readily agrees is an important need. Furthermore, while the scientists have had long experience in dealing with Congress and have formed useful alliances there, some of the humanists who have been lobbying through the corridors strike the Members and their staffs as annoyingly amateurish. One staff member, who is heavily relied upon by one of the House's leading supporters of Federal aid to education, remarked, after a long talk with one of the backers of the NHF, "I didn't have any idea of what he was talking about and I don't think he did either." The comment may be unfair, but it was made.

D. S. GREENBERG.

The U.S. Coast Guard in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article on the U.S. Coast Guard and its various activities, with particular emphasis on New England, is published in the January 1965 issue of the New Englander, a very fine monthly magazine published by the New England Council. I am especially proud that the U.S. Coast Guard Academy is located in New London, Conn., in my district, as are also other Coast Guard installations.

While many of us in Congress are aware of the fine work of the U.S. Coast Guard, I believe that the general public should learn more of its activities in port security, navigation, oceanographic research, search and rescue, international ice patrol, and others. I am therefore pleased to insert into the RECORD the text of the article referred to above.

THE U.S. COAST GUARD: DEEP ROOTS IN NEW ENGLAND

New England and its gigantic front yard, the Atlantic Ocean, are at times integral forces, at other times stern opposites facing each other in battle, but always a complement of each other. Serving as a go-between, or helpful mediator between man and ocean, is the U.S. Coast Guard.

PART OF NEW ENGLAND

To live in New England and remain unaware of the importance of the Coast Guard to the life and economy of the region is almost impossible, for the present-day mission and the history of the Nation's oldest continuous seagoing service is as much a part of New England as the proverbial cod. It is, in truth, a force whose very roots and origins lie buried deep in the revolutionary past of New England.

New England of the Revolutionary War era—textbook history put aside for the moment—was a rough, frontier-type culture where many times unscrupulous means justified questionable ends. One such activity was the disregard of shipping interests toward tariff regulations. To a young government beset with financial problems warranting national emergency designation, it became imperative that this financial drain be stopped. To raise the revenue needed to help the fledgling government survive, Alexander Hamilton, first Secretary of the Treasury, asked Congress for funds to establish a Revenue Cutter Service. The service was charged with enforcing tariff regulations and bringing to justice the culprits who tried to bypass these payments.

NEW ENGLAND BEGINNING

The first of the 10 ships commissioned, the *Massachusetts*, was built in Newburyport, Mass., in 1790, and the first Coast Guard officer, Hopley Yeaton, was a native of New Hampshire.

The fortunes of this small force and the tiny rockbound corner of America, which depended so much on the sea for its livelihood, have been from that moment tied up in one another.

FAR-REACHING FORCE

As New England transformed itself from a simple, agrarian, fishing, textile economy to an industrial giant of great complexity and technological orientation, the Revenue Cutter Service has also grown from a law enforcement agency into a far-reaching and multipurposed force which at one time encompassed the duties and responsibilities of an aid to navigation, a lifesaving service, and a branch of America's Armed Forces. Despite its name, the activities of the Coast Guard are not confined in any way to the coastline of the United States. It operates, in fact, in all parts of the world, including both polar regions and the Pacific islands.

Attempts to define the purpose and obligations of the Coast Guard are a constant source of humor to coast guardsmen. The latitude of operational purpose is sometimes so wide that the Coast Guard motto, "Always Ready," can be stretched to cover almost any emergency situation. In 1961, Secretary of the Treasury Douglass Dillon instituted a comprehensive study of the Coast Guard's role and mission. The study, conducted by experts from the Bureau of Budget, Department of Defense, and Department of the Treasury, required 8 months to fully investigate the scope of the Coast Guard's 10 major missions.

Among the foremost points made in the survey was the conclusion that New England and/or the 1st Coast Guard District remains the Coast Guard's most important operational region.

NEW ENGLAND TRAINED

Coast Guard officers, or at least the majority of the career officers, are trained at the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Conn. The greater part of the Coast Guard petty officer force (a rank roughly equivalent to the Army's noncommissioned officer) receives its training at the Coast Guard Training Station in Groton, Conn. Those Coast Guardsmen who learn through the Coast Guard's extensive correspondence course system send their completed lessons to the Coast Guard Institute also located in Groton. The Coast Guard installation at Woods Hole, on Cape Cod, is world renowned as a center for oceanic study.

HOME PORT

But beyond its importance as a training center, New England or rather the New England ports of Portland, New Bedford, and Boston, is the home port of 11 major Coast Guard cutters, including the icebreaker, *Eastwind*.

The Coast Guard's First District covers all of New England except Connecticut and the western part of Vermont. From the District Office in Boston, 418 officers, 3,567 enlisted men, and 322 civilian employees are assigned to ships and shore units throughout the New England area. This represents 15 percent of the service's manned strength.

WHAT IT DOES

Under the Treasury Department, the Coast Guard is responsible for port security, aids to navigation, oceanographic research, law enforcement, search and rescue, ocean stations (weather and navigational information), merchant marine safety and inspection, reserve training, icebreaking, International Ice Patrol.

Under the Navy Department (when the President directs) the Coast Guard is responsible for carrying out the duties of Armed Forces.

In terms of dollars and cents the 1st Coast Guard District pumps approximately $22 million into New England's economy each year. About $11,180,000 of this is paid out in salaries to Coast Guard personnel, while operating expenses make up the remaining $10½ million or so. In addition to this sum, considerable expenditures are made by the Coast Guard in Connecticut also.

It is understandable that New England, bordering on the rough waters of the North Atlantic, is an area where the Coast Guard functions most frequently as a search and rescue agency. Here again the concept of a governmental agency serving as a lifesaving service was fostered in New England. Forerunner of the Coast Guard's search and rescue branch was the U.S. Lifesaving Service which was, in turn, inspired by the Massachusetts Humane Society.

Approximately half of the Coast Guard operation in New England is devoted to search and rescue. Each year the first district averages about 4,000 assistance cases. Although many such calls involve the towing of fishing boats and pleasure craft which are not in immediate danger, the district is credited each year with saving 350 to 400 lives and saving property valued at $200 million.

Search and rescue facilities for the first district include coastal stations equipped with one or more utility boats, motor lifeboats, and amphibious LARC's; 36 cutters and patrol craft; three helicopters and four amphibious planes located at the Salem, Mass., Air Station; one amphibious plane at Quonset Point, R.I.; and two long-range search and rescue planes at Argentia, Newfoundland.

In some cases these rescue operations, even when they involve New Englanders and Coast Guard units from this area, take place many hundreds of miles out to sea. One such case last February was a rescue operation 1,000 miles east of Boston when 11 seamen from the British freighter *Ambassador* were rescued by the Portland-based cutter *Coos Bay*.

Coast Guard lifesaving efforts, however, are not restricted to thrilling, drama-packed rescue. Many lives are saved or protected by the service's aids to navigation program.

Aids to navigation in the first district include the smallest of nun-buoys, which mark the channels of Boston harbor, to the three Loran stations in Greenland, Baffin Island, and Nantucket Island. The coast line of the first district, 1,299 miles long, also includes 68 manned and 180 unmanned light stations. These range in power from the 9 million candlepower of the Buzzards Bay light tower to beacons of a few hundred candlepower.

This complex system and its maintenance is the primary duty of more than 20 percent of the entire regular Coast Guard strength of 31,000. Another 30 percent spend a substantial part of their time carrying out this mission also.

Historically, and by contrast, the First Congress accepted title to 12 lighthouses then in existence in the newly formed United States of America. Nine of these, including Boston Light on Little Brewster Island, the oldest, were in New England and are still in operation.

But to gage the scope of Coast Guard operations in New England, only a focus on one of its major missions will explain the length, breadth, and involvement of this unique

service and New England. A good example of the Coast Guard in action is the International Ice Patrol.

The impetus for founding the International Ice Patrol was the *Titanic* tragedy in 1912. This is standard procedure for Coast Guard growth, a maritime emergency triggers off the need for a new service and/or function and the Coast Guard is assigned a new duty.

This 'round-the-clock watch on potentially dangerous icebergs, paid for proportionately by many nations, begins in December with aerial reconnaisance of Baffin Strait and the Labrador coast. The area eventually patrolled is 45,000 square miles in size.

In late February, International Ice Patrol headquarters moves from Woods Hole to Argentia, Newfoundland. There patrols begin, led by the veteran oceanographic vessel, *Evergreen*. The aircraft and surface vessel surveillance continues each day until the ice danger is past, sometime in late summer.

The patrol sends out twice-daily reports, representing compilation of all sightings, via code and facsimile. These sightings amount to approximately 5,000 each season. In the 50 years the Coast Guard has performed this duty, no ship has been lost through collision with an iceberg.

Equally as important as the precautionary nature of the patrol, is the oceanographic studies made while the Coast Guard mans its ocean station.

Data on ice drift, currents, and water temperature are gathered each day. This past season the patrol added several refinements to its oceanographic studies of the area. Three specially designed buoys were placed in the Labrador current to provide information on intensity, salinity, direction, volume of the current, wind velocities, and even heat output. It is expected that these new devices will help forecast with considerable accuracy the severity of coming ice seasons.

Still another duty of the International Ice Patrol is search and rescue operations in the area they are assigned.

This is the way of the Coast Guard, multiple duties which combine humanitarian purpose with scientific research. It can be lonely, many times dangerous, but always worthwhile. It is an organization where no list of duties or organizational charts spell out with any justice the value of its assignment.

Prosecution of the Nazi Mass Murderers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, more and more people the world over are urging the extension of the German Government's statute of limitations for the prosecution of the Nazi mass murderers.

Many Americans, in and out of Government, have expressed themselves vigorously on the subject, urging our own State Department to file an appropriate expression of opinion with the German Parliment. Still others have made their views known directly to high German Government officials, as well as to the German Parliament. Among those who have been most active in this connection is my longtime good friend, Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, U.S. Army, retired.

It is good to note that because of the number and efficacy of these remonstrances it appears likely that the German Parliament will take action to extend the statute of limitations so that those who are still in hiding and who have thus far gone untried and unpunished will not escape their just deserts.

It is good to note that many Germans have reacted in the same manner as we have.

I am pleased to call to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by the German Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Heinrich Knappstein. He is to be congratulated for the forthright position he has taken. The article is as follows:

PROSECUTION OF NAZI MASS MURDER MUST NOT AND WILL NOT END NEXT MAY

(NOTE.—Recently an article on this subject written by German Ambassador Heinrich Knappstein appeared in the German-language newspaper Aufbau in New York. A translation of the article follows.)

In the past few weeks and months all of us, and particularly we in Germany's Embassy in Washington, have been greatly concerned with a problem that has evoked violent discussions, grave accusations and deplorable misunderstandings—the problem of the application of the statute of limitations to Nazi crimes in Germany. I am therefore particularly grateful to the editors of the Aufbau for giving me space in the pages of their courageous and truth-seeking paper to say something on the subject. In doing so I do not set out to justify the position of the German Government, but to present the facts without whose knowledge this complicated problem cannot possibly be judged.

The starting point of the debate was a provision in the German criminal code whereby a murder falls under the statute of limitations 20 years after it has been committed, i.e., after such a period has elapsed no trial proceedings can any longer be opened. That would imply that any murder committed before the end of the Hitler regime, i.e., before May 8, 1945, would be subject to this statute after May 8, 1965. The practical implication of this legal situation, unfortunately, has been so thoroughly misunderstood in the United States—and elsewhere—that some clarification is called for.

GERMAN "LIMITATIONS" STATUTE MISCONSTRUED

On one point there is undisputed agreement between the Federal Government, the German Parliament, all leading personalities in Germany and the many organizations and individuals here in the United States who have sent me worried and even dramatic petitions: that the horrible mass murders of the days of the Hitler regime must not fall under this statute; that the Nazi criminals who have committed these deeds must have their proper punishment meted out to them, for the sake of justice. This goes for the petty sadists who strutted through concentration camps with bludgeon or pistol, and beat their victims to death or "finished them off" with a shot in the neck, as much as for those big bureaucrats of murder who organized the whole pandemonium. The German people know very well, and their leaders know it even better, that guilt can only be atoned for and that justice with regard to such criminals must take its course, regardless of legal technicalities. After all, thousands of Germans too—and certainly not the worst—became the tyrant's victims in their resistance against him.

During the past weeks, we have received a great number of petitions, letters and telegrams from well-meaning and truly concerned persons and groups, particularly from Jewish circles and organizations in the United States. It pained us to see that most of them, but also many newspaper articles on this subject, were based on assumptions about the effects of this statute which are not in keeping with the facts, but profoundly mistaken. There seems to be a widespread impression that in Germany after May 8, 1965, all Nazi criminals not legally adjudicated by that time would go scot-free; that hundreds or even thousands (one publication spoke of ten thousand) of Nazi criminals who had tortured and murdered human beings could promenade freely in Germany's streets and jeer at all legal authorities: "You can't do a thing against us, our deeds are subject to the statute of limitations." All one can say with regard to this notion is that it is false.

Regretably, we have also often been confronted with another, no less erroneous notion, namely: that the German courts did practically nothing to clean up the German house "except for a few show trials designed to throw dust in the eyes of the world" as someone said to me in a recent conversation. This notion, too, is false, as I shall demonstrate.

JUSTICE HAS BEEN AT WORK FOR YEARS NOW

To begin with the latter problems: What has actually become of the criminals of those evil years; what have the courts, particularly the German courts, done so far to bring them to justice?

Let me first delinate the five most important groups:

(1) It is known that a large number of Nazi criminals escaped the consequences of their crimes by biting the cyanide capsule or shooting themselves with their own service pistol. This not only includes Hitler, Himmler, Goering, Goebbels, Ley and others, but also a long list of Gauleiters, leaders of "Special Groups" (Einsatz- und Sonderkommandos) and others. So to speak, they have, by their suicide, eradicated themselves from the list of Nazi criminals and escaped worldly justice. Their number is hard to ascertain but is very high according to present investigations.

(2) A great number of the perpetrators were sentenced or otherwise brought to justice in east European countries, for example in Poland where many concentration camps were located, or in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and the Soviet Union. We may be sure that none of the Nazi criminals caught there escaped justice, all the more as the Western Allies extradited suspects they had caught to those countries where these men had done their bloody work.

(3) In west European countries, too, numerous trials took place against those who had "administered" and oppressed Nazi-occupied countries, or been commanders of concentration camps located there. In this connection, mention should be made of verdicts pronounced in France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Italy and Greece. So far, no figures have been assembled on this score, but we may be sure that justice was done there, too.

(4) The military tribunals set up by the three western Allies in Germany after the war for the trial of Nazi criminals, as we now know, pronounced sentence on 5,025 persons, 806 of whom were sentenced to death. In turn, 486 of these, i.e., more than half, were executed, including the Nuremberg war criminals.

(5) As I know from my own activity in the denazification process, German courts during the early postwar years were not able—or only to a very limited degree—to try Nazi criminals, because the Allies reserved these cases almost entirely for themselves. Only with the establishment of the Federal Republic and the conclusion of the Bonn Conventions of 1954 was German judicature

able to take on fully the prosecution of Nazi criminals. This was particularly difficult in the beginning as the most important documents were still in Allied hands, and because it was especially difficult, during those first turbulent years, to reach surviving witnesses who were essential for such trials.

Still German judicature pronounced the high number of 5,445 legal verdicts between May 8, 1945 and January 1964 with 12 death sentences among them (that could not however be carried out because the 1949 Constitution abolished the death penalty). I therefore believe that the charge that German judicature did nothing to clean up the German scene, can really not be maintained.

THOUSANDS INVESTIGATED BY LUDWIGSBURG OFFICE

Did these convictions in East and West, by Allied military tribunals and German courts, bring all or nearly all Nazi criminals to justice? This question may well be answered negatively, even though everyone must admit that a great deal of justice was done in this fashion. In the course of a trial in Ulm in 1958, it emerged that many of the crimes committed in the concentration camps and by the "special groups" had not yet been prosecuted or adjudicated.

The German judiciary therefore established a center in the town of Ludwigsburg, exclusively charged with examining and uncovering crimes committed in concentration camps and so-called "special actions" outside the Federal Republic. With "German thoroughness," this center during the past 6 years reconstructed, on paper, all those places of horror where human beings were tortured and killed, and also the organizations set up to commit such mass murder; and it attempted to find the names of all those involved in these cirmes, so that subsequently the regular courts could prosecute.

So far, the Ludwigsburg center has pieced together no fewer than 540 such "complexes" (of which, incidentally, the Auschwitz trial now taking place in Frankfurt is one). All these "complexes" encompass one or more participants who are known by name, and a criminal dossier was prepared in the case of every one of them. Involved in these 540 "complexes," are certainly several thousand suspects with whom the German courts will have to deal in the years to come.

"LIMITATIONS" PROVISION IN GERMAN CRIMINAL CODE

With this I return to the frequently so thoroughly misunderstood effects of the statute of limitations. German law provides—this is generally not known—that every statutory limitation can be interrupted by a simple action on the part of a judge; the statutory period then begins anew. What does that mean in practice? If the Ludwigsburg center forwards the dossier of a suspect to a regular court, and the judge merely makes a notation in the papers, such as: "The investigation is to be continued. Mueller, district judge"; the statutory limit is automatically set aside and the case runs for another 20 years. Therefore the statutory limitation is interrupted as regards those under suspicion by the Ludwigsburg center, regardless of whether it is known they are still alive, where they live, or whether they live somewhere under an assumed name, and the statute of limitations will not apply to them as of next May, but only 20 years after its interruption. Thus, this large number of persons will be excluded from the statute, so that justice can proceed unhampered in their cases.

GERMANY CALLS UPON WORLD FOR EVIDENCE

Finally, the German Federal Republic went to extra lengths on November 20, 1964, when it launched an appeal to the entire world asking everyone—individuals, organizations, or governments—to make available to the Ludwigsburg center (Zentralstelle der Landesjustizverwaltung zur Aufklaerung nationalsozialistischer Gewalttaten, Ludwigsburg, Schorndorfer Strasse 28) any documents, photostats, microfilms, or other information containing names of Nazi criminals so far not known to legal authorities of the Federal Republic. There are still 4 months to go before the statute takes effect, unless the statute is previously stayed by juridical action. This is further guarantee that no one will escape justice.

If we sum up objectively all measures so far taken against the Nazi criminals, such as the trials in the East European countries, the trials in Western Europe, the sentences by the Allied military tribunals, the convictions by German courts, the investigation efforts by the Ludwigsburg center that lead to an interruption of the statutory limitation in thousands of cases, and finally the appeal by the Federal Republic to the world to provide information on any Nazi criminals who have so far remained unknown—then one may confidently conclude that after May 8, 1965, there will by no means be hundreds or thousands of war criminals who will roam the streets of Germany and jeeringly point to the statute as protection against punishment.

CAN A FEW STILL ESCAPE JUSTICE?

In spite of all this, the theoretical possibility still remains, that one or the other of the culprits, if he was never named in any context nor pointed out by an accusing witness, might, under the shelter of the statute, dare to show himself again. Theoretically, I say; for in practice such a case is very improbable after all the lists of names of the concentration camp guards and the "special groups" have been combed, and so many convictions obtained.

But it must be admitted that, theoretically, the possibility remains and therefore—in my personal opinion—this possibility should also be blocked. It is not impossible, for example, that the authorities in the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany have some such cases in their files, in order to bring them out only after May 8, 1965. They most certainly would not do that to help justice triumph, but to capitalize on it politically to the detriment of the Federal Republic. Should the zonal authorities fail—now, after the appeal by the Federal Republic—to release such information, they would thereby protect Nazi criminals.

GERMANS CONTINUE STUDY ON EXTENSION OF LIMIT

What can be done to prevent abuse of the statute in the few theoretically possible cases—if there should be such cases at all? It is surely understandable that people in Germany are reluctant to change the Constitution because of these few possible cases, a change which in the opinion of some jurists, would be necessary in order to extend the time limits of the statute. Other jurists, however, are of the opinion that no constitutional change would be required, but merely a normal legislative act. In any event, the debate over the closing of this last small gap is not yet ended. A few days ago the German Parliament charged the Federal Government with the task of presenting a full report before March 1, 1965, on the extent to which National-Socialist crimes of violence have been solved, prosecuted, and punished. Parliament will then draw its conclusions from that report and take measures to close the last gap through which a Nazi criminal might slip. For, as I said in the beginning, it is the firm intention of Germany's political leadership to prevent this and to assure that particularly in cases of National-Socialist acts of violence, justice will take its course unhampered.

In that connection it is also well to call attention to the official requests made by the German Government for further information which would aid in the prosecution of these Nazi criminals, as follows:

BUNDESTAG ASKS FOR REPORT ON PROSECUTION OF NAZI CRIMES

(NOTE.—On December 9, 1964, the German Bundestag adopted a resolution which requested the German Government to submit to it a report on the prosecution of Nazi crimes. The resolution was supported by both the CDU/CSU and SUD parliamentary groups. The text of the resolution follows:)

In full recognition of the work of the state prosecutors and the courts in investigating and prosecuting the Nazi mass murders and with special recognition for the investigations carried out by the central office in Ludwigsburg with the goal of seeking atonement for these acts of murder and to mete out just punishment for the responsible and guilty, the German Bundestag calls for intensified and speedier efforts in order that the statute of limitations may be interrupted in every case where this is possible. It stresses its support for the call of the Federal Government of November 20, 1964, and expresses the hope that all who have evidence which sheds light on such acts of murder will place it at the disposal of the German authorities.

Therefore the Federal Government is called upon to deal directly with the governments of the Laender in reaching agreement on the following:

(1) To be included in this review is all material insofar as (a) it is available within the Federal Republic but has not yet been thoroughly checked; (b) it is available from the archives of the Soviet-occupied zone; (c) it can be obtained from abroad, especially from the countries of Eastern Europe.

(3) The systematic review is to be undertaken by a central office of the Land Judicial Administrations. Irrespective of the place of the crimes, it should be made competent to investigate all acts of murder including instigation and abetment within the area which was under the control of the authorities and offices of the former German Reich and central Nazi organizations.

(4) The Federal Minister of Justice is requested to report to the Bundestag by March 1, 1965, whether charges have been initiated in pertinent cases of murder and the interruption of the statute of limitations has been assured, if necessary whether the Federal Government is prepared to review together with the German Bundestag the question of an extension of the statute of limitations in case it should conclude that there is no other way to assure the prosecution of such acts of murder.

GERMAN GOVERNMENT APPEALS TO WORLD PUBLIC

(NOTE.—On November 20, 1964, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany issued an appeal for information regarding National Socialist crimes as follows:)

Allied and German courts have already passed final judgment on the great majority of National Socialist crimes, and penal proceedings have been instituted regarding a number of other crimes.

Determined to punish National Socialist crimes and to restore violated justice, but considering, on the other hand, that the period of limitation in respect to crimes committed prior to May 9, 1945, cannot, for constitutional reasons, be extended, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany requests all governments, organizations, and individual persons, both in Germany and abroad, to make available without delay to the "Zentralstelle der Landesjustizverwaltungen zur Aufklaerung nationalsozialistischer Gewalttaten" (Central Office of the Land Judicial Administrations for the Investiga-

tion of National Socialist Crimes), Ludwigsburg, Schorndorfer Strasse 28, either original documents or photostat or microfilm copies of material in their possession relating to offenses and their perpetrators still unknown in the Federal Republic.

All diplomatic or consular missions abroad of the Federal Republic of Germany will accept and forward any documentation intended for the above-mentioned office.

Address of Dr. S. P. Marland, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the critical problem of financial resources for education was the subject of a penetrating address recently by Dr. S. P. Marland, Jr., president of the Pittsburgh Board of Public Education.

His address follows:

ADDRESS BY S. P. MARLAND, JR., TO PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION, PITTSBURGH, PA., NOVEMBER 5, 1964

You pay me a large compliment by inviting me to offer the keynote message for this very important gathering. This is especially true since the Pittsburgh Board of Education, confronted by extreme austerity 2 years ago, ceased to be a dues-paying member of the Pennsylvania School Boards Association. I hope the time will come when this will be corrected, and I won't have to make a speech in order to come to your meetings.

I have been a fellow Pennsylvanian a little over a year. My predecessor was Cal Gross, now superintendent of schools in New York City. Throughout the year whenever I found myself in a group of new acquaintances, I could count on being asked two questions: "How do you like Pittsburgh?" The answer is "Fine." The other question was: "Do you think Cal Gross wishes he were back here." I never quite know what to say to that one—because I can't help wondering where that leaves me. So far no one on our Pittsburgh Board of Education has asked me that question.

There are two very large problems confronting boards of education in the United States today, and they are closely related: One is the increasingly critical issue of finding the financial resources within the established governmental systems for the support of education. The other is the evolving role of the teacher in relation to the board of education, as teachers seek a larger place in the decision making processes affecting their personal and professional effectiveness. All other board of education issues, in my judgment, are overshadowed by these two very large questions: school finance and teacher relations are the keynote I offer you. Since we in Pittsburgh must solve the first one before we can constructively confront the second one, I have chosen to speak of money as a problem in the big cities.

You may say to me, "Why should we be concerned about such a dull subject as Pittsburgh's finances?" There are many reasons, but let me cite one. Two years ago our costs for unemployment compensation and relief in Pittsburgh totaled $54 million. Our costs for education totaled $34 million. The cost of welfare were dollars down the drain. They were your dollars and mine—public dollars, State dollars, Federal dollars, that did not buy 1 ounce of productivity. How many of you are in school districts where your welfare costs are more than 1½ times your school budget? And are these children of the inner city going to stay there forever? Or are they the responsibility of all freemen? And what about the very swift and able of our city? Are they only to serve Pittsburgh as they increase in scholarship? Citizenship? They too, are the responsibility of all freemen. And so it is with all the children in between. And all freemen are most magnificently represented in the corporate body of boards of education in this land—whether from big cities or from rural crossroads. Yours is the monstrous responsibility for America's next generation in a time when all men look to the schools as the solution to society's ills. That is why I presume to speak to you of Pittsburgh's problems.

It has been noted that before coming to Pittsburgh I was a smalltown superintendent, first in the neighborhood of New York City, most recently in the neighborhood of Chicago. I was so busy, and my board members were so busy with serving our schools that the extraordinary educational and financial problems of New York and Chicago were in another world. As I look back now, I wish someone had told me of these other worlds. I hope in these few minutes to give you some insights into the problems of our big cities in Pennsylvania—especially Pittsburgh.

It is my purpose to try to help you look at the educational problems of Pennsylvania as Pennsylvania's problems, not those of 2,055 separate school districts with high walls around them. The schools in the big cities of this land, not only in Pennsylvania, are in serious trouble. Much of the trouble is financial. We need the understanding and support of men and women who are, like yourselves, deeply concerned with boys and girls, not just those on your street, or in your neighborhood or your school district. Education has, historically, been declared a responsibility of the State. I invite you as citizens of a State to hear my story. In minor degrees of variation this story is true of the 15 or 20 large urban centers throughout the country.

John Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corp., and currently chairman of the Education Task Force appointed by President Johnson last summer, has written as follows:

"The foremost challenge facing American education today is to equalize educational opportunity for the disadvantaged segments of our population. The individuals involved may be disadvantaged because they live in economically depressed rural areas, because they are victims of race prejudice, because they are handicapped, or because they live in socially disorganized parts of our great cities. Although the problem must be pursued wherever such conditions exist, it is primarily an urban problem."

Archibald Shaw, associate secretary of AASA, and, like me a former suburban school superintendent in highly favored Scarsdale, N.Y., has this to say: "It is not only people who are poor, it is school districts. And the very districts which are the most impoverished are carrying the greatest burdens. Most of them are the big cities, and we are only beginning to notice the astonishing shift."

Many of you who have been close to education for a good number of years will remember easily the days when the big cities had the advantages. When I started teaching we looked wistfully at New York, Detroit, Chicago, and their relatively high salaries. We can recall the days when all the good things in education started in the cities, for that was where the money was, and others tried to follow. This condition has changed. All of the significant things that have happened to the instructional program in Pittsburgh in the past few years have been the product of private philanthropy, through local and national foundations. Without this money, amounting to about a million dollars a year, we would be without hope, without progress, without any innovation or forward movement. Philanthropy is never enduring, nor should it be. Honest acceptance of foundation support for research and development calls for a readiness to pick up the tab when the case has been validated. We are desperately trying to pick up tabs now, as our budget for 1965 goes into its final stages. As we look down the road to 1967 or 1968, we see a very bleak picture.

One may ask what has brought on this change in the circumstances of our large cities. We could list a number of reasons, such as the removal of many favored families to the suburbs, the deployment of industry and merchandising properties to the countryside beyond the city limits, the influence of rural power in State legislatures, the increasing burden of municipal services to the swiftly growing population of deprived families and so on. But whatever the reason, the fact remains that we can no longer speak proudly in America of equal educational opportunity for children in the big cities as compared with those children beyond the city who really need much less, and for whom there is so much more.

The big cities are everybody's business. I did not know this two years ago, as I wrestled separately with the school problems of Winnetka, just outside Chicago. Chicago was Winnetka's reason for being. There would have been no Winnetka if Chicago were not there. The big cities of Pennsylvania are your reason for being. They are the industrial, cultural, governmental, economic, medical, commercial, and educational centers of their surrounding areas. The cities can live without the surrounding areas, but most of the surrounding areas in today's world cannot live without the big cities. The health of the big cities is a State problem, and the cities are financially ill.

Let us look at the facts in Pittsburgh: The per capita disposable income for our people in the city is $2,221, compared with $2,363 in the Commonwealth. About 40 percent of our families have incomes under $4,000, which sociologists define as poverty level. A third of these families are destitute, with incomes under $2,000. Yet these children of the lowest 40 percent of our families are those most desperately needing the services of education if we are to remove them from this repetitive cycle of hopelessness and despair.

Let us continue to examine other problems of school finance in Pittsburgh.

Most of you who make up the statistics of the State are in communities where the schools properly claim about two-thirds of the local tax dollar. Baldwin Township, for example, to use a friendly neighbor for an illustration, uses 77 cents of its local tax dollar for schools; Gateway Union, 75 cents; Mount Lebanon, 77 cents. Municipal costs claim the balance.

Urban centers have different problems. The costs of operating large cities place far greater demands on the tax dollar. In Pittsburgh our municipal costs require 65 cents, our schools receive 35 cents. In other words, the ratio of municipal to school costs almost exactly reverses itself in urban centers, Pittsburgh being only typical of all the large cities.

One may quickly say, why not increase the city taxes, then, to afford more money for schools, and claim a larger proportion of the whole. Perhaps this would help, but very large risks are involved. We are walking a narrow path between essential taxation for the schools, in order to preserve a sound and healthy city on the one hand, and on the other hand, observing the effect of higher taxes on industry, mercantile establishments, and home owners. We know that one of the reasons for the flight to the suburbs is taxes.

How far can we go in taxing ourselves further without destroying the very things we are trying to preserve.

A $20,000 home in Pittsburgh costs the taxpayer $708.30 in local taxes. The same priced house, in terms of current market value, setting aside the variable and elusive factors of tax rate and assessment policy, located in our neighboring communities costs the taxpayer $100 to $200 less per year. I am sure that the same arithmetic applies to the tax costs of a new shopping center, or a research center, or a cottage. The tax costs of living in the city are already 20 percent higher than the surrounding area, hence, how far can we press industry and residents without losing them?

One may say that the city possesses many high-priced real estate properties that provide a strong tax base, and that this justifies the present formula for the State support program. Perhaps. Perhaps not—especially if the big stores are closed—or the fabricating plant is about to close, or if a prospective new industry looks, and then looks elsewhere for lower municipal and school taxes.

In all of our comparisons we are paying all we can scrape together, and we are still 25 percent lower in our pupil cost than our neighbors.

Even though we are paying more taxes in the city, how much are we affording for the costs of our schools. Again, drawing upon the evidence from neighbors, we find nearby communities paying between $525 and $625 per child. We currently are paying $442, or 25 percent less than many, and I hold in all respect to our neighbors that the needs of many of our children are far more grave and demanding of educational service than the children of our neighbors. That is, if we speak seriously of equal educational opportunity.

The only solution I see to our problems short of massive Federal aid lies in the State support formula (I try to avoid the term State subsidy, which implies some kind of remote benevolence as distinct from a basic responsibility), and I am sure some of you know the problems of the big cities of Pennsylvania on this subject. Let me illustrate again from the facts of life in Pittsburgh:

You will recall that our per capita disposable income is $2,221. Our State support provides Pittsburgh with about 20 percent of its school costs for operating expenses. Returning to our illustration in Baldwin-Whitehall where average income is, of course, considerably higher, the State pays 31 percent; in Gateway Union 34 percent; in Mt. Lebanon, with a family income more than twice that of Pittsburgh, the State pays 24 percent, against the 20 percent in Pittsburgh. Penn Hills, 42 percent; Upper St. Clair, 37 percent. I speak of these good neighbors, not to make unhappy claims that they should not receive this support; I think they should, consistent with the pattern of State-local partnership throughout the United States. But I hold that we in the cities desperately need more funds from State or Federal sources if we are to survive.

Where does the State money come from. It is yours and mine, derived in large measure from the sales tax. Pittsburgh citizens paid about $22 million last year in sales taxes—and I am speaking of Pittsburgh alone—not the county or the general buying area—$22 million. This is the education tax. According to the present formula we received about $8 million in State support. I do not propose that the big commercial centers like Pittsburgh should get back all they pay out in taxes, but I hold that the drain on us to support education in other parts of the State is very heavy. We need to get back about half of that $22 million instead of a third.

I could go on listing some of our problems, which compound our picture. For example, we are negotiating for a desperately needed school site in our city, where existing dwellings must be razed. We need 7 acres. The price?, $2,200,000, for 7 acres. This is junior high school where we ought to have 20 acres for these boys and girls who need more blue sky than they now have. I'll settle for seven. How many of you are paying $300,000 an acre for land? We haven't bought it yet. We're still shopping, hopefully.

And what about State support for school construction? We get 10 percent on the formula. We look at new schools going up in some of the outlying towns and marvel at the 90-percent State support that some get. We have before us a desperately needed $40 million building program. We have exhausted our debt limit. If we proceed with building we will probably go to the school building authority method—yet we have no funds with which to pay the annual obligations of the authority. And three high schools go on staggered shifts with more to follow, and elementary classes shockingly exceed 40 pupils in some cases.

Sections of our city, as in all big cities, have decayed, and we are trying to keep the people in those sections from decaying, too. Our Negro boys and girls have increased 40 percent in the past 10 years, now comprising about a third of our enrollment. Many of them need "more than equal education."

Compensatory education is our term for the larger investment in our deprived neighborhoods. We are struggling for smaller classes, counseling services to children and families, mental health services, preschool programs for the 3- and 4-year-olds, decent buildings, as a place of beauty and hope in the heart of the ghetto. Some of these things may be realized under the Economic Opportunity Act—but that act like all supplemental funds must be for new or additional services and programs. It is the mainstream of financing that concerns us.

Occupational-vocational-technical education, really the heart of our long-term problem, is heavily on our minds now, as we seek to provide a clear path to the world of work as it will be in 1970 and beyond.

I have poured out to you just a few of our financial problems, hoping to give you some insights into the conditions faced by your colleagues in our Pittsburgh Board of Education. I have asked you to share for a few minutes the reality of big city school problems. I have asked you to rise above the political and parochial biases that often preoccupy us in our own communities, and view the urgency of education down at this end of the turnpike.

This is a city with a proud and distinguished school system. It is a body of great teachers, a devoted and selfless board of education, and 80,000 boys and girls. If I have talked of our problems, it has not been in despair or discouragement. It is in the hope that as men and women who believe in the infinite worth of educational investment you will know that some means will be found to keep our great cities strong. Their most valuable resource, just as in your community, is the children.

In summary, as we think of the tremendous responsibilities faced by boards of education in Pennsylvania, and throughout the United States, the big cities need your help, your understanding and your concern, for they are the central structure on which the fabric of our States exist. If you, for the moment, place your community and your school system statistically at the median of the State, how do you compare with us in Pittsburgh:

(1) Your per capita income is higher than ours.

(2) Your educational problems, though grave, are not likely to include the extremes of need found in the cities, especially in our decaying inner cities.

(3) Your costs of relief and unemployment are not likely to be 1½ times your school budget.

(4) You get two-thirds of your local tax dollar: we get one-third.

(5) Even though our tax base is high because of business and industry, the one-third we get is far lower than the two-thirds you get.

(6) Our cost per pupil is much lower than yours even though you are levying lower local taxes. We are spending all we can get, and still are not providing reasonable pupil services.

(7) You get 49 percent of your school costs from State support; we get 20 percent. Some of you get 90 percent.

(8) We send $22 million to Harrisburg in sales tax from the city alone. We receive $8 million in State aid. This effort at equalization is more equalizing than we feel is sound.

In short, we in Pittsburgh are in trouble. Our only solution lies in legislation that will recognize the big city problems without damaging the present support to all school districts. We need your help in the legislature. It will not be provincial help for Pittsburgh. It will be help for boys and girls in Pennsylvania who happen to have been born in a big city.

Summary, Legislative Program of Communications Workers of America Adopted by 26th Annual Convention, June 1964

SPEECH

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the legislative program of the Communications Workers of America which was adopted by their annual convention:

SUMMARY, LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA ADOPTED BY 26TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, JUNE 1964

Congressional reforms: Called on the 89th Congress to make its first order of business the revamping of its antiquated rules and procedures in such fashion that will guarantee a smooth flow of legislation to the floor where the will of the majority might readily be expressed.

Labor-management relations: Urged Congress to enact legislation (1) amending the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts to restore the principles of the Wagner Act; (2) repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley so unions will be able to represent and protect workers from unwarranted restrictions imposed by a few conservative-minded State authorities; and (3) redefining, fairly and reasonably, the "free speech" provisions of Taft-Hartley.

Appalachia: Convention agreed that the continued poverty of the Appalachia region in a time of great national prosperity is intolerable. Urged the early enactment of legislation to provide the basic facilities needed to foster economic development in the region; strongly support the administration's inclusion of human resources program of the Appalachian Commission in the President's poverty program.

Hospital Insurance Act of 1964: Reaffirmed support of amending the Social Security Act to extend practical, and fair method of social security to provide payment of

hospital and related bills for the elderly and thus to permit them to live out the years of their lives free from the haunting fear of disastrous medical bills.

Consumer protection: Supported struggle for enactment of truth-in-lending and packaging legislation and drug industry reforms, all of which will protect the health and earning of our members and of consumers in general. Also called on Congress to defeat the deceptively named quality stabilization bill that is really nothing more than a discredited price-raising, price-fixing "fair trade" legislation.

Conservation: Endorsed programs for the conservation of our national resources.

Public works: Endorsed continuation of the accelerated public works program, and urged Congress to authorize an additional maximum amount of money to carry on the fight against unemployment, recognizing that the needed public facilities that would be provided, would benefit distressed areas in which one-third of the Nation's population lives and which accounts for one-half of the unemployment in this country.

Area redevelopment: Cognizant of the fact that ARA represents an investment in the future of America which will pay sound human and economic dividends to all of its people, the 1964 convention of the Communications Workers of America wholeheartedly supoprted the ARA program and urged immediate passage by the House of the Senate-approved $455 million appropriation bill.

Minimum wage extension: Urged Congress to enact legislation providing for the extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act coverage to include under its protection the millions of workers in industry engaged in interstate commerce who are now protected by the act, and establishing a $2 an hour minimum wage.

Double time for overtime: The Convention supported an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act to raise the present overtime provision from time and one-half to double time. Further, it opposes any provisions to make application of double time contingent on approval by special industry committees.

SUMMARY

Housing and urban renewal: Convention reaffirmed its support for a Cabinet-level Federal Department of Housing and Urban Renewal. Called for a minimum of 200,000 public housing units a year. Urged a stepped-up urban renewal program to create beautiful and livable communities within these United States and to provide employment for our growing labor force. Also, urges encouragement of middle-income housing within our cities. Supported goal of equal opportunity in housing for all Americans. Called for provisions in all Federal, State and local housing programs of the requirement that the prevailing wage must be paid to all employees engaged in such projects.

Education: Convention urged a comprehensive program of Federal aid to our public schools to eliminate classroom shortage and improve educational opportunity for all children. Called for assistance to higher education which will provide adequate facilities so that no qualified child will be denied admission to an institution of higher learning. We favor extension of free public education through the 14th year or 2 years of junior college. Also, Congress should immediately enact the Hartke bill as a step toward universal higher educational opportunity. Urge the creation of a new congressional commission on higher education to report to the Nation the costs of a universal GI-type bill designed to meet the financial needs of all qualified youths who seek higher education.

Unemployment compensation: Convention urged Congress to establish an adequate unemployment compensation system that would provide uniform minimum standards to be applicable to the entire country. It would include raising the weekly benefits, extend the period for which benefits are payable, extend the system to many now denied any and all protection, and improve the financial structure of the system by providing some measure of equalization of cost.

Robert Southard: A Life of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in every district across this land of ours, there are men and women who every day quietly and unobtrusively wage a battle against almost insuperable odds. Many of these men and women of courage are handicapped by a physical defect or ailment that others would find impossible to bear. Such a man was Robert Southard, who, until his death on January 3, was very active in his community despite the fact that he was almost completely paralyzed for 11 years.

Despite his almost complete paralysis, Bob Southard was the successful owner of the Southard Insurance Agency, vice president of the Automemories Speedway and president of a sheltered workshop for the handicapped in Eau Claire, Wis.

Although his work with the shelter in Eau Claire was a full-time job, there being nearly 80 employees, Bob Southard spent a great deal of time attempting to help other communities establish similar workshops for the handicapped. At the time of his death, he was busy planning a similar shelter for Wisconsin Rapids and Marshfield, where his twin brother, James Southard lives.

Mr. Speaker, the story of Bob Southard and his courage will inspire the handicapped all over this country of ours. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial that appeared in the Daily Telegram of Eau Claire, Wis., on January 5, 1965, and one that appeared in the Marshfield News Herald on January 8, 1965, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in my hometown of Marshfield, Wis., the sheltered workshop that Bob Southard helped establish will be called the Robert Southard Foundation for Handicapped, a fitting tribute to a man whose life and work will inspire all who come in contact with the foundation or with the story of his life.

The editorials referred to above follow:

[From the Eau Claire (Wis.) Daily Telegram, Jan. 5, 1965]

ROBERT SOUTHARD: A LIFE OF COURAGE

When fathers tell their sons about courage they should not forget the story of the life of Robert Southard.

If a doctor needs a golden thread of hope for a patient with some new handicap he should know the story too. There's surely faith in it or it would never have been told. Compassion too, for any human afflicted in mind or body.

And always a bright touch of humor to season it properly.

Bitterness he shunned completely although a summer outing plunge into the Eau Claire River pinched his spinal cord and left nine-tenths of his body lifeless. He sought for weeks to bring feeling back to his fingers and toes through sheer willpower.

When a tiny flicker of life trickled down one arm and gave it slight motion he thrilled at that success instead of succumbing to remorse over the larger void of feeling.

Eventually with the devoted help of his twin and other family members he completed college, established himself in the insurance business and found fulfillment in active leadership of Shelter for Handicapped activities here.

So successful was he in meeting the challenge of his handicap that few people knew how extensive it really was. His hope was that Wisconsin should have many shelters to provide places for handicapped persons to bridge the gap between unemployment and a gainful job in regular business and industry. Failing that he sought for them at least a place to work on worthwhile projects with others also seeking dignity.

Bob Southard believed in the hard sell when it came to helping the handicapped find a productive place in society. All he asked was that they get a chance to show what they can do instead of being asked to describe what they can't.

A memorial foundation in his name will help the handicapped.

And those who know him will speak the name respectfully as befits a man from whom much was taken but who gave his all in the service of others.

[From the Marshfield (Wis.) News Herald, Jan. 8, 1965]

ROBERT SOUTHARD

Few Marshfield people were personally acquainted with Robert R. Southard, who died last Sunday in Eau Claire at the age of 30. Perhaps he was best known here through his twin brother, Jim. But he left a memorial in Marshfield, and we hope the people of this city will perpetuate it, because in its way it personifies him better than any other sort of memorial could do.

Bob Southard had been something like 90 percent physically paralyzed during the past 11 years as a result of an accident, yet he achieved more during that period than is accomplished in the lifetimes of many able-bodied men who attain their eighties.

He completed his college education, operated a highly successful insurance business, and still found time to be the guiding spirit and executive genius of Eau Claire's Shelter for the Handicapped.

Only a matter of weeks ago he came to Marshfield to tell an audience here what a sheltered workshop can mean to many who have been denied the right to a place in the workaday world. He fought indomitably and successfully for his place in it, and his productive life has been an inspiration to thousands who were spurred on by his courage. No one can think of Bob Southard and let Marshfield's Sheltered Workshop down.

Compulsory Voting Law Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in Australia that country's government imposes a fine on those who cannot justify

their failure to vote. I believe that we should give serious consideration to enacting such a law in this country. Participation in elections in the United States is deplorably low. Voters rarely equal 65 percent of those eligible to vote. To even achieve that total there must be a really hotly contested election.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial on this matter broadcast over WMAL here in Washington during the week of November 1, 1964:

THE VOTE

Although the metropolitan area can proudly claim a record high vote, steps must be taken to combat public apathy in future elections here and throughout the Nation.

Australia has a compulsory voting law. If a person does not vote, he receives a "please explain" notice. If the explanation is satisfactory, the matter is dropped. If an unsatisfactory answer is given, the nonvoter is subject to a $5 fine. This results in a high voter turnout—usually 97 percent.

Greater participation in our elections is essential and voter apathy must be overcome. We endorse the Australian compulsory voting law and believe steps should be taken to adopt a similar law in the United States.

Lorraine Hansberry: Too Brief a Career—Obituary, New York Herald Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Lorraine Hansberry died in New York Tuesday at the age of 34—a short life, but one that few people with lives twice as long could match. She won the Drama Critics Circle Award for the best play of the 1958–59 season at the age of 29 with her first play, "A Raisin in the Sun," and went on to write "A Sign in Sidney Brustein's Window." Though superficially very different, both these plays were merely facets of her deep concern for justice. But it was her personal example as much as plays which earned her an outstanding place in the history of the civil rights movement. Under unanimous consent, I include an editorial and an article from the New York Herald Tribune in the Appendix of the RECORD to familiarize my colleagues with her work:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 13, 1965]

LORRAINE HANSBERRY: TOO BRIEF A CAREER

(By Robert W. White)

Lorraine Hansberry's dream was not deferred. It did not, in the words of Langston Hughes' poem, dry up like a raisin in the sun. Miss Hansberry reached the pinnacle of theatrical fame in a short life that was ended, at 34, by cancer yesterday.

Miss Hansberry, author fo the plays, "A Raisin in the Sun," and "The Sign in Sidney Brustein's Window," died at 8:45 a.m. in University Hospital after a long illness. She had been permitted to leave the hospital to attend the openipg of "The Sign" on October 15 but was readmitted 3 days later and placed on the critical list soon after.

Last night's performance of the play at the Longacre Theater was canceled out of respect for the playwright. A spokesman for the theater said the play may not reopen.

The play has had 100 performances partly because of an unusual effort by the theatrical world. The production was scheduled to end soon after it opened but various theatrical personalities, writers, and clergymen formed a committee to support and promote the play. The reason given was to keep alive a production of high quality so that it could find its audience; affection for Miss Hansberry was not mentioned but it was an obvious factor in the effort.

After becoming bedridden, Miss Hansberry continued work on a new play, "Les Blancs," which was to have been directed by Tony Richardson. She also had begun work on a musical and on a play about the Haitian liberator, Toussaint L'Ouverture.

Miss Hansberry was married in 1953 to Robert Nemiroff, a theatrical producer who produced her current play. They had an apartment in Greenwich Village and a house in Croton-on-Hudson, N.Y.

Surviving, besides her husband, are her mother, Mrs. Carl Hansberry, Sr.; a sister, Mrs. Mamie Tubbs, and two brothers, Perry and Carl Hansberry, Jr. Funeral plans were not complete last night.

Tributes from the theatrical world flowed in last night for the young Negro playwight who had created one of Broadway's modern legends.

ADDED LUSTER

How often is a first play a hit? Her "Raisin in the Sun" was not only a hit with the audiences, who kept it on the boards for 530 performances, but with the critics, as well. They topped their opening night salvos by naming the play the best of the 1958–59 season, giving it the Drama Critics Circle Award.

That award was given in competition with such major names in American playwriting as Tennessee Williams, Archibald MacLeish, and Eugene O'Neill.

The accomplishment acquired added luster from the fact that Miss Hansberry was only the fourth Negro to have a play produced on Broadway in a quarter of a century. Her predecessors were Langston Hughes, Richard Wright, and Louis Peterson.

As if all this were not enough to establish "Raisin in the Sun" as a unique occasion in the annals of Broadway, it was to be noted that it was produced by two men, Philip Rose and David J. Cogan, one a music publisher, the other an accountant, who had never produced a play before; its director, Lloyd Richards, was the first Negro ever to direct a Broadway play, and it was the first starring role on Broadway for Negro actor Sidney Poitier.

TOTAL DIFFERENCE

And though she eventually succumbed to insistence from Hollywood and sold the play for a movie along with her services as script writer—the movie rights went for $300,000 and she drew Hollywood prices for her work—Miss Hansberry did not try to capitalize on her Broadway success by charging in with another offer.

Not until 1964 did another Hansberry play come to Broadway, "The Sign in Sidney Brustein's Window."

Critics and audiences alike were intrigued by the total difference between "Raisin," with its all-Negro cast exploring the doomed struggle of a Chicago Negro family for a better life, and "The Sign," the story of a Jewish intellectual in Greenwich Village and his involvement in a political cause that proves to be a fraud.

What surprise there might have been in Miss Hansberry's ability to deal with the problems and behavior of a white family with such accuracy and insight was discounted by the playwright, who explained to an interviewer that it is much easier for a Negro to write about the whites than for a white person to interpret Negroes realistically.

SHE HAD A BALL

White writers, she explained, "even good ones, like Faulkner," can never observe Negroes as they really are. "The very fact that a white man is observing them constrains Negroes, and they do not talk or act as they would with their own people.

On the other hand, Negroes—especially servants and intellectuals—can enter into the lives of whites and see them as they really are."

An attractive, lively young woman, Miss Hansberry accepted her sudden fame with a combination of equanimity and good humor, displaying a detachment not too often found in one of her profession. She freely confided to an interviewer that the kid sister, Beneatha, in "Raisin" was modeled after herself.

"She's a mess," Miss Hansberry said. "She's me 8 years ago. I had a ball poking fun at myself through her."

Because the prosperous family is not so remote from the poor one in the Negro community as is the case among whites, the playwright had no difficulty in portraying the lives of Negroes of the "Raisin" slum family.

Her own surroundings had been most comfortable. Her father was a Chicago real estate man who had been at one time a U.S. marshal. He was a founder of one of Chicago's first Negro banks, and he had successfully fought a legal battle all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court on the question of restricted covenants in real estate deeds.

TIRED OF SCHOOL

He died when Miss Hansberry was 14 while he was in Mexico, hoping to find a new home for his family away from what he regarded as a hopeless situation for Negroes in this country.

Her family didn't believe in private schools, and so she went to Jim Crow public schools, and then attended the University of Wisconsin for 2 years before she "just got tired of going to school and came to New York," in the summer of 1950.

Already enamored of the theater by brief glimpses of it, she began hanging around little acting groups in New York. In 1953, she was married to Robert Barron Nemiroff, a songwriter and publisher who later was to become a producer. His first venture was a musical, "Kicks & Co.," in 1961, and he produced "The Sign in Sidney Brustein's Window."

After the success of "Raisin," Miss Hansberry said she had started writing at the insistence of her husband. The result was four plays, and the last one, "Raisin," almost went the way of the others when she became impatient with the finished product and hurled it at the ceiling. Mr. Nemiroff picked up the sheets of manuscript and put her back to work.

That was in the four-room walkup they occupied in Greenwich Village, and they continued to occupy a four-room Village walkup after the money came rolling in—but this one was on Waverly Place instead of Bleecker Street, and they owned the whole four-story building.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 13, 1965]

MISS HANSBERRY

The strength of Lorraine Hansberry was not so much in her anger, which fired many writers, but in her ability to dramatize the plight of the Negro in such a way that those who came to the theater and watched her drama were converted to the cause she preached—the cause of justice, too often forgotten.

Miss Hansberry made us less forgetful, and that was her great contribution to the stage and to current history.

Gen. Raymond G. Davis of the Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the story of Marine Brig. Gen. Raymond Gilbert Davis, a Medal of Honor winner, is an exciting and gallant one. I am very pleased to submit for the RECORD a chronology of his great career in the Marines. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Raymond R. Davis, live in Tallahassee, Fla.

GEN. RAYMOND G. DAVIS OF THE MARINES

Brig. Gen. Raymond Gilbert Davis, who earned the Medal of Honor during the Korean conflict, assumed his current assignment as assistant division commander, 3d Marine Division, Fleet Marine Force, on Okinawa, in October 1963.

As a lieutenant colonel in Korea, General Davis was awarded the Nation's highest decoration for heroism during the 1st Marine Division's historic fight to break out of the Chosin Reservoir area. There, against overwhelming odds, he led his battalion in a terrific 4-day battle which saved a rifle company from annihilation and opened a mountain pass for the escape of two trapped Marine regiments. The award was presented him by President Truman in a White House ceremony on November 24, 1952. The accompanying citation reads:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as commanding officer of the 1st Battalion, 7th Marines, 1st Marine Division (reinforced), in action against enemy aggressor forces in Korea from December 1-4, 1950.

"Although keenly aware that the operation involved breaking through a surrounding enemy and advancing 8 miles along primitive icy trails in the bitter cold with every passage disputed by a savage and determined foe, Lieutenant Colonel Davis boldly led his battalion into the attack in a daring attempt to relieve a beleaguered rifle company and to seize, hold and defend a vital mounatin pass controlling the only route available for two Marine regiments in danger of being cut off by numerically superior hostile forces during their redeployment to the port of Hungnam.

"When the battalion immediately encountered strong opposition from entrenched enemy forces commanding high ground in the path of the advance, he promptly spearheaded his unit in a fierce attack up the steep, ice-covered slopes in the face of withering fire and, personally leading the assault groups in a hand-to-hand encounter, drove the hostile troops from their positions, rested his men and reconnoitered the area under enemy fire to determine the best route for continuing the mission.

"Always in the thick of the fighting, Lieutenant Colonel Davis led his battalion over three successive ridges in the deep snow in continuous attacks against the enemy and, constantly inspiring and encouraging his men throughout the night, brought his unit to a point within 1,500 yards of the surrounded rifle company by daybreak. Although knocked to the ground when a shell fragment struck his helmet and two bullets pierced his clothing, he arose and fought his way forward at the head of his men until he reached the isloated Marines.

"On the following morning, he bravely led his battalion in securing the vital mountain pass from a strongly entrenched and numerically superior hostile force, carrying all his wounded with him, including 22 litter cases and numerous ambulatory patients. Despite repeated savage and heavy assaults by the enemy, he stubbornly held the vital terrain until the two regiments of the division had deployed through the pass and, on the morning of December 4, led his battalion into Hagaru-ri intact.

"By his superb leadership, outstanding courage and brilliant tactical ability, Lieutenant Colonel Davis was directly instrumental in saving the beleaguered rifle company from complete annihilation and enabled the two Marine regiments to escape possible destruction. His valiant devotion to duty and unyielding fighting spirit in the face of almost insurmountable odds enhance and sustain the highest traditions of the U.S. naval service."

General Davis was born on January 13, 1915, at Fitzgerald, Ga., and graduated in 1933 from Atlanta Technical High School, Atlanta, Ga. He then entered the Georgia School of Technology, graduating in 1938 with a bachelor of science degree in chemical engineering. While in college he was a member of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit. After graduation, he resigned his commission in the U.S. Army Infantry Reserve to accept appointment as a Marine second lieutenant on June 27, 1938.

In May 1939, Lieutenant Davis completed the Marine Officers' Basic School at the Philadelphia Navy Yard, and began a year of service with the Marine detachment on board the U.S.S. *Portland* in the Pacific. He returned to shore duty in July 1940 for weapons and artillery instruction at Quantico, Va., and Aberdeen, Md.

Completing the training in February 1941, Lieutenant Davis was assigned to the 1st Antiaircraft Machine Gun Battery of the 1st Marine Division at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. He returned to the United States with the unit in April, and the following month was appointed battery executive officer, serving in that capacity at Parris Island, S.C. and Quantico. He was promoted to first lieutenant in August 1941.

In September 1941, Lieutenant Davis moved with the battery to the Marine Barracks, New River (later Camp Lejeune), N.C. Upon his promotion to captain in February 1942, he was named battery commander.

During World War II, he participated in the Guadalcanal-Tulagi landings, the capture and defense of Guadalcanal, the eastern New Guinea and Cape Gloucester campaigns, and the Peleliu operation. Embarking for the Pacific area with his unit in June 1942, he took part in combat on Guadalcanal from August 1942 to February 1943. Following that campaign, he was appointed executive officer of the 1st Special Weapons Battalion, 1st Marine Division. He was promoted to major in March 1943.

In October 1943, Major Davis became commander of the 1st Special Weapons Battalion, and served in that capacity at New Guinea and Cape Gloucester. In April 1944, while on Cape Gloucester, he was named commanding officer, 1st Battalion, 1st Marines, 1st Marine Division.

Major Davis' action while commanding the 1st Battalion at Peleliu in September 1944 earned him the Navy Cross and the Purple Heart. Although wounded during the first hour of the Peleliu landing, he refused evacuation to remain with his men; and, on one occasion, when heavy Marine casualties and the enemy's pointblank cannon fire had enabled the Japanese to break through, he personally rallied and led his men in fighting to reestablish defensive positions. In October 1944, he returned to Pavuvu and was promoted to lieutenant colonel.

Returning to the United States in November 1944, Lieutenant Colonel Davis was assigned to Quantico, as tactical inspector, Marine Corps Schools. He was named chief of the infantry section, Marine Air-Infantry School, Quantico, in May 1945, and served in that post for 2 years before returning to the Pacific area in July 1947 to serve with the 1st Provisional Marine Brigade on Guam.

Lieutenant Colonel Davis was the 1st Brigade's assistant chief of staff, G-3 (operations and training), until August 1948, and from then until May 1949 was assistant chief of staff, G-4 (supply). Upon his return from Guam in May 1949, he was named inspector-instructor of the 9th Marine Corps Reserve Infantry Battalion at Chicago, Ill. He served there until August 1950 when he embarked for Korea.

In Korea, Lieutenant Colonel Davis commanded the 1st Battalion, 7th Marines, from August to December 1950. Besides receiving the Medal of Honor for action during that period, he twice earned the Silver Star Medal by exposing himself to heavy enemy fire while leading and encouraging his men in the face of strong enemy opposition. He also received the Legion of Merit with Combat "V" for exceptionally meritorious conduct and professional skill in welding the 1st Battalion into a highly effective combat team.

Later, as executive officer of the 7th Marines, from December 1950 to June 1951, Lieutenant Colonel Davis earned the Bronze Star Medal with Combat "V" for his part in rebuilding the regiment after the Chosin Reservoir campaign. He returned from Korea in June 1951.

Ordered to Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., Lieutenant Colonel Davis served as assistant officer in charge of the operations subsection, G-3, division of plans and policies, until February 1952, when he took charge of the subsection. In April 1953, he became head of the operations and training branch, G-3 Division. While serving in this capacity, he was promoted to colonel in October 1953.

The following July, Colonel Davis entered the special weapons employment course, Fleet Training Center, Norfolk, under instruction. In September 1954, he entered the senior course, Marine Corps Schools, Quantico. On completing the course in June 1955, he served consecutively as assistant director and, later, director, of the senior school.

In October 1957, Colonel Davis was again transferred to Washington, D.C., and served there as assistant G-2, Headquarters Marine Corps, until August 1959. The following June, he completed the course at the National War College in Washington. Assigned next to Headquarters, U.S. European Command, in Paris, France, he served from July 1960 through June 1963 as chief, analysis branch, J-2, staff of the commander in chief, Europe. On July 1, 1963, he was promoted to brigadier general. That October, General Davis assumed duty on Okinawa as assistant division commander, 3d Marine Division.

A complete list of the general's medals and decorations includes: the Medal of Honor, the Navy Cross, the Silver Star Medal with Gold Star in lieu of a second, the Legion of Merit with Combat "V", the Bronze Star Medal with Combat "V", the Purple Heart, the Presidential Unit Citation with four bronze stars indicative of second through fifth awards, the Navy Unit Commendation, the American Defense Service Medal with Fleet Clasp, the Asiastic-Pacific Campaign Medal with one silver star in lieu of five bronze stars, the American Campaign Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the Korean Service Medal with four bronze stars, the United Nations Service Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, and two Korean Presidential Unit Citations.

General Davis and his wife, the former Willa Heafner of Lincolnton, N.C., have three children, Raymond G., Jr., born March 6, 1943; Gordon B., born January 26, 1946; and Willa Kay, born November 20, 1950. The general's parents are Mr. and Mrs. Raymond R. Davis, formerly of Goggins, Ga., now living at 1500 North Monroe, Tallahassee, Fla.

Legislative Program of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees

SPEECH

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the legislative program of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees. It was my pleasure to discuss the program with their officers and it is my hope the Congress will give it careful consideration. The legislative program follows:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, 1965

We seek improvements in the civil service retirement system, not only for the benefit of our members and of other retirees and their dependents and survivors, but also for the benefit of all of the people of the United States. Our Federal Government, which is so important in preserving our basic freedoms and security, cannot function without a capable efficient civil service. The retirement system helps in two ways to assure the necessary standards of excellence in our civilian employees. First, the promise of retirement benefits enables the Government to attract and retain the best qualified persons for its various activities. Second, the opportunity for employees to withdraw from active service after they have passed the prime of life, permits more frequent injection of new blood into important Government agencies. Furthermore, by providing the necessities of life to previous employees and their dependents, the retirement system permits savings in welfare services and expenditures at Federal, State, and local government levels. During the past 44 years, a continuing series of improvements has made the retirement system even more responsive to the needs of the people as well as to the needs of the beneficiaries.

In its dedicated effort to achieve additional improvements in this retirement system, for the benefit of all our members, all beneficiaries of the system, and all of the people, the National Association of Retired Civil Employees presents its legislative program for 1965, as follows:

PARAMOUNT OBJECTIVE: ANNUITY INCREASE

1. Ability to acquire the necessities of life is the most important problem to everyone, and this problem is most acute to those who have suffered a reduction in their living standard and must get by on low fixed incomes. The only general increase in civil service annuities since 1955 was in 1962, and was limited to 5 percent. The actual increase in the cost of living since 1955, as reflected in the official Consumer Price Index, is now more than 15 percent, leaving retiree and survivor annuitants 10 percent behind in the onward march of inflation. Civil Service Commission records show more than 500,000 retirees and survivors with annuities under $3,000 per annum, considered as poverty in current programs before the Congress. In order to restore this loss of purchasing power to those who need it most, and to give some measure of relief to all, we seek an immediate annuity increase of 10 percent in each annuity up to $3,000 per annum and 5 percent in that portion of each annuity above $3,000. At the same time, we demand the retention of the automatic cost-of-living increase approved in 1962, in order that future increases in the cost of living may be made without additional action by Congress.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES

2. End discrimination in survivor benefits: Many persons who retired before 1956 are still suffering annuity reductions up to 25 percent in order to provide survivor benefits for their spouses, while persons retiring more recently may provide similar benefits by deductions of only 2½ percent. Survivors of former employees who retired before October 11, 1962, cannot receive more than half of the annuities paid to their spouses, but in the cases of those who retired on or after that date, survivor annuities are 10 percent higher. We seek legislation (a) requiring the recomputation of annuities of all persons who retired before October 11, 1962, and who elected to provide survivor annuities, to give them the benefit of the more liberal formula authorized since that date, of 2½ percent on up to $3,600 of annuity, and 10 percent on the remainder; and (b) recomputation of all survivor annuities of spouses of former employees who retired before October 11, 1962, to increase them to 55 percent of the annuities of such retirees at the time of death.

3. Reinforcing the retirement fund: Although the retirement fund still shows a steady increase each year, we recognize the fact that prospective demands on it are increasing at a more rapid rate, and that it needs new reinforcements in order to maintain its solvency in the future. We declare our earnest support for additional Government contributions to the fund to safeguard all annuities now and hereafter.

ADDITIONAL OBJECTIVES

4. There are many inequities under the retirement laws for which we advocate corrections, particularly in cases as follows:

(a) Benefits under the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act are denied to retirees from the Tennessee Valley Authority, some agencies of the Farm Credit Administration, deferred annuitants, and forgotten widows who were first granted annuities in 1958. We favor legislation to extend health benefits to all of these annuitants.

(b) There are a few forgotten widows of retirees who died before 1948 who are still denied annuities because they were not married 5 years before the death of their husbands. There are also a number of widows of employees who died in service before 1948 who do not receive annuities. We favor legislation to grant annuities and health benefits to these unfortunate widows.

(c) There is no provision under existing law for a retiree to marry after retirement and provide a survivor annuity for his spouse. We favor legislation authorizing a retiree married after retirement, after such marriage has continued 3 years, to elect a reduced annuity in order to provide a survivor annuity for such spouse.

(d) Under present law, a retiree who elects a reduced annuity in order to provide a survivor annuity for his spouse, in the event of such spouse's death and his remarriage, cannot designate such second spouse for a survivor annuity, although he till suffers the reduction in his own annuity. We favor legislation permitting a retiree in such cases to designate his second spouse to receive the survivor annuity.

(e) A survivor annuitant, under present law, loses the survivor annuity in the event of remarriage, and cannot reclaim it even if again widowed. We favor legislation to permit a survivor annuitant to remarry without loss of annuity, or at least if the annuity is lost by remarriage, to permit it to be reinstated upon the death of the second spouse.

(f) A retiree who has elected a reduction in annuity in order to provide an annuity for his spouse continues to suffer such reduction even if predeceased by the spouse. We favor legislation providing for a recomputation of the retiree's annuity in such cases to restore him to a full annuity.

(g) Persons who retired before 1956 with 30 years of service who had reached 55 years of age are suffering annuity reductions up to 15 percent while persons who retired under similar circumstances since 1956 lost only 1 percent of their annuities per year under age 60. We favor legislation to equalize the reductions for all persons who retired under age 60 under the more liberal 1956 formula.

(h) Persons who retired on or after July 12, 1960, who had rendered service and made contributions to the retirement fund after they had accumulated enough service to earn a maximum annuity, have received credit for such contributions in purchasing additional annuity, but those who retired before that date with excess service have received no equivalent adjustment. We favor legislation providing for the recomputation of the annuities of persons who retired before July 12, 1960, who had rendered service and made contributions to the fund after completing the service on which their annuities were based, to bring about annuity increases under a formula of one-half the ratio of such excess service to the service on which their present annuities are based.

(i) Since October 1, 1956, persons retired on account of disability have the benefit of an annuity floor equal to the annuity they would earn by service to age 60, or 40 percent of the average salary, whichever is less, but this benefit has been denied to persons who retired before October 1, 1956. We favor legislation to extend the benefit of this annuity floor to persons retired on disability prior to October 1, 1956.

5. Free survivor benefits: Survivor benefits are granted to spouses under the social security and railroad retirement systems without any reductions in the annuities of the persons retired. Also, spouses married after retirement can receive survivor annuities under these other retirement systems, but no comparable benefits are authorized under the civil service retirement system. We favor legislation providing an annuity to the surviving spouse of each retiree under the civil service retirement system, in the amount of 55 percent of the annuity of such retiree at date of death, without charge to the original annuity, provided such spouse was married prior to retirement, or, if after retirement, the marriage had continued at least 3 years; and restoring full annuities to all retirees who are now receiving reduced annuities in order to provide survivor annuities; provided further that no existing annuity or right to receive an annuity is reduced or impaired.

6. Government group life insurance: We favor legislaton to modify the reduction in Government group life insurance at age 65 (or at time of retirement, whichever is later) from 2 percent per month to 1 percent per month, and to limit the total reduction to 50 percent.

7. Other retirement systems: Since persons retired under other civilian retirement systems of the Federal Government (and the District of Columbia) are eligible for NARCE membership, we will support liberalization in such other systems, including but not limited to those for foreign service, CIA employees, lighthouse service, teachers, policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia, construction workers on the Panama Canal, and beneficiaries under compensation laws.

8. Matching salary increases: Since annuities under the civil service retirement system are definitely linked to salaries, we favor legislation to require annuity increases to match all general salary increases for civilian employees.

9. Early retirement without penalty: We will support legislation to authorize retire-

ment for employees with 30 years of service upon attaining 55 years of age, providing such legislation contains a provision restoring full annuities to all persons retired previously with 30 years of service at age 55 or later, whose annuities were reduced because they retired before reaching age 60.

10. Postal rate advantages: All labor unions, employee associations, and many other nonprofit associations are enjoying preferential bulk mailing rates under Federal postal laws, while our association headquarters and many of our chapters have been denied this privilege. We will continue efforts to obtain postal rate privileges equal to those granted labor unions and employee associations.

11. Income tax laws: We favor reductions in Federal and State income tax laws to ease tax burdens on our members and we will be alert to protest any proposals that would discriminate against civil service annuitants.

12. Merger of health benefit systems: The retired Federal employees health benefits system, limited to persons who retired prior to July 1, 1960, is certain to dwindle in future years, and the costs of benefits may become prohibitive. We favor legislation to combine this plan with the Federal employees health benefits system which now serves all persons retired since July 1, 1960, in order to preserve equitable health services at reasonable costs for all of our members.

13. Veterans benefits: Many of our members are eligible for veteran or widow pensions in addition to their civil service retirement annuities, and we will continue to support amendments to veteran pension laws which would be beneficial to such members.

14. Opposing harmful legislation: While supporting legislation that would be of benefit to our members, we must also be constantly alert to oppose measures that would be objectionable, particularly—

(a) Price fixing: There is a determined campaign to get Congress to approve a law authorizing price fixing by manufacturers and distributors of branded items that all of us must use, including food and medicine. Sometimes, this is proposed under the guise of quality stabilization and sometimes as fair trade. Whatever the label, it is simply a scheme to force us to pay more for things we need than we do now. We will continue our opposition to all of these proposals.

(b) Merger with social security: Numerous NARCE conventions have declared opposition to any plan which would merge civil service retirement with social security, and we will be alert to follow this mandate.

(c) Preserve present benefits: We enjoy a number of current retirement benefits that might be attacked as, for example, the provision for annuity increases to match increases in the cost of living when the consumer price index advances 3 percent or more. We will scrutinize all proposals which might be adverse to us and oppose them.

(d) Income tax laws: In the revision of Federal income tax laws, there is always a chance for attacks on some of our present advantages, such as double exemptions at age 65, the retirement income credit, etc., which would increase the tax burdens of our members. We will be on guard against such threats.

(e) Liberty amendment: Our recent convention declared its opposition to the so-called liberty amendment, which would seriously curtail many governmental activities, and might endanger our civil service retirement system, veteran and social security benefits, etc. We will support the convention action in opposing this proposal.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4615 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont* — 217 Slade Run Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* — Alban Towers
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6815 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*
Grider, George W., *Tenn*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*

Appendix

Senator McNamara Proposes Economic Assistance Act of 1965 as Part 2 of War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 15, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, S. 3, will be the subject of hearings before the Public Works Committee next week on Tuesday, January 19, and Thursday, January 21. It is my hope that the committee will report the measure the following week and that the Senate will act on it during the last week of January or the first week of February.

I am informed that the leadership of the House of Representatives plans also to act quickly on similar legislation.

The priority which President Johnson has assigned to this proposed program is well recognized, and it is noted again in an article in today's Washington Post by Columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak. The writers also point out, however, the growing concern on the part of the Members of the Congress from other regions for Federal assistance in solving the problems of economic lag and chronic unemployment in those areas. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GILDING THE JOHNSON LILY

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Two weeks ago, in his first serious talk with Democratic congressional leaders, President Johnson laid down the following as rule No. 1:

Get moving fast on medicare and the Appalachia development program.

Rule No. 2 followed:

Vote down any and all amendments to the 11-State Appalachia program, for which the President will ask $1.077 billion—no matter how hard the new liberals elected in the Johnson sweep last November press for special projects of their own.

"The President is hipped on controlling the budget," one of the participants in the late December White House meeting told us, "but he knows he can't control the budget if he can't control his own liberals in the House."

The first great test of Mr. Johnson's ability to prevent the House liberals from enlarging the Johnson legislative program ("gilding the Johnson lily," as one Democrat puts it) may well be the Appalachia bill.

Not only the new liberals, but such well entrenched and prestigious liberal leaders as Representative JOHN BLATNIK, from Minnesota's poverty-stricken iron region, are already fretting about voting for massive aid for the Appalachia States when parts of their own districts are no less in need.

As a leader of House liberals, BLATNIK could be the deciding factor in any liberal move to load the bill with all manner of expensive amendments. As of today, he is inclined to go along with the President. But this could change.

The 11 States of Appalachia stretch diagonally from Pennsylvania down to the Deep South States of Alabama and Georgia. The new Democratic liberals from Iowa (to pick one conspicuous example), who have no regional aid plan of their own, don't like the idea of voting millions in special Federal aid to Republican Alabama. Alabama elected five new Republican Congressmen last November and gave its electoral votes to Barry Goldwater.

In general, northern liberals are not panting in anticipation of helping southern Democratic Congressmen, most of whom deserted the party position last week when the House voted to liberalize its rules.

What the Democratic liberals want is a pledge from the White House that after the Appalachia bill passes, the administration will back spending programs for their own chronically depressed regions.

At this stage in the session, there is no certainty that this pledge will be given. This is true despite the President's well-known plan to handle most if not all future Federal aid to depressed areas through regional plans similar to Appalachia.

One way to surmount political trouble from his own Democrats in Congress would be the traditional pork-barrel route. For example, another dose of accelerated public works, operating with a kitty of around a billion dollars or so, could satisfy some of the political needs of the new northern liberals who want to make a quick impression on their constituencies.

But Mr. Johnson told his legislative leaders that day in the White House that he was and will remain totally against accelerated public works. In the first place, it would dent his budget. In the second place, it conflicts with his principle of orderly and systematic planning.

By the time Appalachia reaches the floor of the House, the administration may have a spending package of some kind to satisfy the demands of non-Appalachian Democrats.

If so, the President has not told his congressional leaders. Instead, he is putting all his eggs in the Appalachia basket. At any rate, other regional plans won't be ready in time to affect the vote on Appalachia.

The President's leaders in Congress aren't complaining about any of this. They simply hope the White House doesn't underestimate the problem. Not since Mr. Johnson first came to Washington 30 years ago has the Democratic Party had a potential runaway majority in the House.

Beyond the question of Federal subsidies, whether the President can prevent this massive majority from greatly expanding his definition of the Great Society will be a major political test in the 89th Congress.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the issue of other regional development programs arose during the Senate debate last year on S. 2782, which was enacted by the Senate by a vote of 45 to 13. At that time I indicated that I would support such an approach for other regions when their programs are formulated, but that such considerations should not delay enactment of the Appalachian bill. This measure is the product of 4 years of planning at the local, State, and Federal levels.

Mr. President, the problem of regional economic lag in areas of the United States other than Appalachia was addressed earlier this week by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan and chairman of the Public Works Committee [Mr. MCNAMARA]. In a thoughtful and well-reasoned address before the national legislative conference of the AFL–CIO on January 12, Senator MCNAMARA proposed as part 2 of the war on poverty the enactment of an Economic Assistance Act of 1965 which would concentrate on regional development of natural and physical resources. The McNamara plan would provide for first, establishment of Federal-State commissions similar to the Appalachian Commission; second, technical assistance to development districts; third, grants-in-aid for construction of public facilities; fourth, loans to industry; and, fifth, a coordinated manpower retraining program.

Mr. President, the proposal advanced by the senior Senator from Michigan merits the most serious consideration by the Congress and the administration. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the address by Senator MCNAMARA printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS DELIVERED BY SENATOR PAT MCNAMARA, OF MICHIGAN, AT THE AFL–CIO NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 12, 1965

It's a pleasure to be here with you today. I know that you are interested in what the Senate Committee on Public Works may do this year.

That interest, I'm sure, results from the ever-increasing recognition that public works activities affect employment and long-range economic growth.

This has not always been the case. Too long, the mention of public works has been coupled with the derisive term "pork barrel."

For many years, the projects in the so-called rivers and harbors bills have been considered political chips to obtain support in other areas.

I do not share that view. Even historically, whether it was recognized or not, the use of navigation improvement on our Nation's rivers 100 years ago was as important to the development of commerce and our economy as our highway program is today.

Development of water resources not only saves lives and property from the ravages of floods, but provides a base for further economic improvement.

Economic improvement is becoming more and more a standard of measurement for public works.

And there has been an increasing demand upon the Public Works Committee to concern itself in this field.

The Federal-aid highway system plays an important role in developing the national economy. The present program came into

being through enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

As of April 1, 1964, some form of work has been completed or is under way on 34,474 miles—or 84 percent of the 41,000-mile Interstate System—and expenditures have totaled more than $19 billion.

This program has provided a substantial immediate employment boost, and as lanes of commerce and transportation network it has increased the ease with which the flow of goods has moved, thus becoming an important cog in improving our total economy.

The first program which took the committee directly into the unemployment problems of the Nation was the Accelerated Public Works Act.

President Kennedy recognized that public works provided a useful tool to combat recession before it might become fully developed. At the same time, useful and needed works for long-term development would be speeded up.

In May 1962, the Congress passed an APW bill authorizing the President to spend $900 million for immediate acceleration of public works projects in areas of heavy unemployment.

Within 4 months after the President signed into law the APW program in 1962, the volume of applications for Federal assistance to State and local projects had exceeded the $900 million authorization.

By the end of October 1963, on-site employment generated by APW projects had reached almost 50,000 man-months.

The estimated total man-months of employment for all APW grant-in-aid projects was, by December 1963, 1,099,000.

Last year, I introduced legislation which would have increased by $1½ billion the authorization for the APW program. This fund would have allowed a continuation of the attack on those areas in the Nation which have lagged behind economically.

At the same time, with our growing involvement in economic improvement, the principle of accelerating public works and using public works for improving the physical conditions of an area so that its economy will benefit began to take on a different form.

This was the Appalachia regional development measure, which was introduced late last year by Senator RANDOLPH.

What is the value of improving, on a sectional basis, an economic picture such as Appalachia by pumping in Federal aid money?

Studies have demonstrated that if Appalachia's economy merely equaled the national average, $4 billion would be added to our gross national product through retail sales.

Our annual rate of personal income could be increased by $5 billion, and, to mention just one area of need, another billion dollars could be added in new housing construction.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act has been introduced again by Senator RANDOLPH as an administration measure, and hearings will be held on the bill next week.

But this mountain region in eastern and southeastern United States, although long-suffering economically, is not the only such area in the Nation.

Little touched by the general economic improvement in the last 4 years, for example, is the upper Great Lakes region, including a portion of my own State of Michigan.

Similar conditions of economic depression exist in the upper New England area and the Ozarks.

In the western part of the United States there exists an area in the Rockies falling behind the Nation economically.

The failure of these regions to share equally with the rest of the Nation in economic growth is like the weakest link in a chain. Our total growth potential is retarded while we pull at the lagging areas.

We are enjoying the longest sustained period of economic improvement since the depression of the 1930's.

Unemployment this month dropped below 5 percent. All the economic indicators demonstrate a high level of activity and suggest that this will continue for some time.

It is just at this time, when the economy is growing, that we should be best able to eliminate pockets of unemployment and resistance to economic improvement.

The tools we have used, including the area redevelopment program, have demonstrated that improvements can be made.

Our approach has been good; our criticism is that we have done too little, too late, and too piecemeal.

The outlook for a continued APW program is poor. The future of ARA, stymied in the last session, is doubtful.

Yet, without the principle of these programs available for depressed areas, even the success of an Appalachia regional program is questionable.

I believe that President Johnson recognizes this.

I believe that his reference to economic recovery in the state of the Union address was notice that he intends not to let economic assistance to disadvantaged areas evaporate, or even continue at the low-keyed or one-region level.

We have tried in the Kennedy-Johnson administration to combat three economic problems through:

First, assistance to areas that have suffered a long decline in economic activity.

Second, assistance to areas which, in this century at least, have never shared in economic prosperity.

Third, assistance to areas suddenly faced with economic upheaval as a result of automation, conversion from war to peace or cyclical unemployment.

By themselves, the four weapons employed to fight these problems are good weapons: Technical assistance, grant-in-aid for public works improvement and acceleration, loans to industry and manpower retraining.

Our weaknesses have been applying the remedy to areas too limited in size, and in poor coordination of the programs.

President Johnson has suggested he will correct these deficiencies.

He called for "a regional recovery program to assist development of stricken areas left behind by our national progress" and "special funds for job-creating public programs * * * made available for immediate use if recession threatens."

I propose these words be translated into an action program.

Such a program could and should be combined in one coordinated effort to aid improvement on all three geographic levels—regions, groups of counties, and labor markets.

It should be able to retard recession, as well as speed up economic growth.

This program should allow the President to make the same aid available to areas which are threatened with economic upheaval.

And it should allow the President to coordinate planning, public works grants, loans, and manpower training so that maximum benefit is received from all this aid.

This can be done by creating a National Regional Development Council composed of the Secretaries of the Departments most concerned with economic development, and chaired by a full-time Chairman appointed by the President.

Those Federal agencies now administering the economic aid program could continue to administer the program.

The funds for public works acceleration and improvement would be appropriated to the Council by the Congress, then allocated by the Council to the agencies to be granted in accordance with plans approved by the regions and local redevelopment districts.

The formation of other regional commissions, such as Appalachia, would be encouraged and aided.

Such public works spending is necessary if the physical resources of a depressed area are to be developed so as to attract new industry or new economic activity.

Our policy for aiding private industry through depressed area loans—should be broadened to induce the Nation's financial industry to be more active in supporting new efforts to increase economic activity in these areas.

Such a move would increase the amount of dollars available for loans, without increasing Federal expenditures.

This can be done through guaranteeing loans, such as we do in our housing program. It also can be done by establishing a mortgage loan association, as we have done in our housing program.

A manpower retraining program, geared to the needs of industry expanding or entering depressed areas with the aid of this loan program, is a must to complete the entire arsenal of weapons to fight economic depression and prevent recession.

Last year, the President proposed and achieved the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964: That was the war on poverty—part 1—for the development of human resources.

This year I hope he will propose and achieve the Economic Assistance Act of 1965: The war on poverty—part 2—for the development of physical resources.

Together, these programs can effectively carry on the battle to eliminate and prevent poverty.

The Foreign Assistance Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today the President has submitted to us the outlines of his proposal on one of the most important issues facing this session of the Congress—the foreign assistance program. I should like to take this opportunity to express my strong support for the foreign aid program. The President has presented a sound and realistic program to the American people He has asked the Congress to accept—for the American people—the lightest burden for foreign assistance in the history of the program.

Less than a year ago, the President requested what was called a barebones minimum for foreign aid. The Congress responded to his request because it was a sensible one. His request this year continues the same tight and careful planning that characterized last year's program. Indeed, the present request is even smaller than last year's.

This minimum request is based on a simple, realistic approach—we are not asked to do all that we could do with our abundant material and human resources. Neither are we asked to do all that the recipient nations have requested. Rather, we are asked to support only that assistance which can be effectively utilized. I know of no sounder approach to our foreign aid program.

The President's request for a minimum foreign aid program does not mean that the challenge before us has in any way diminished or that we are less dedicated to the pursuit of our objectives. On the contrary—the task before us is as difficult as ever. The past year has witnessed ominous developments as well as marked successes. If some countries have moved closer to self-sustaining growth, others are still in a situation in which population growth outstrips economic growth. If our Communist antagonists have appeared to be divided among themselves, they are still united in their goal of subverting our effort to develop a world of free and progressive nations. To our friends and enemies alike, it should be clear that the President in his message rededicates our determination to pursue, firmly and wisely, the objectives of our foreign aid program.

He has pledged anew our commitment to safeguard our national interest by strengthening the free world economically and militarily.

He has pledged anew our commitment to work toward a stable world order in which all nations can enjoy political independence and freedom.

He has pledged anew our commitment to that fight which he mentioned in his first address to Congress in a joint session—our fight against poverty and misery, ignorance, and disease.

Perhaps—we do not need to be reminded so much about why we have a foreign aid program as much as we need to be reminded of how these purposes are to be accomplished.

First, we realize no long-range effort of economic and social development can succeed unless the nations involved have political and military security. Therefore, we have our program of military and supporting assistance. I know we all understand the need for this program, and I need not dwell on it. But I do want to underline the President's statement that this type of assistance is highly concentrated in a few countries and that most of it goes to those peoples facing the gravest threat of Communist subversion. I know we all would like to wish away problems in southeast Asia and elsewhere, but we must face the world as it is—not as we wish it to be. If these countries cause us frustration today, we should remember that in other countries at other times our assistance has not been in vain. And, given a firm resolve, we need not fail in these critical areas today.

Second, we should realize that our economic aid is concentrated in a few countries that are making a considerable self-help effort. If our aid program is to succeed, it must be joined by an eager receptiveness on the part of those countries we are aiding. We seek to help those who demonstrate the willingness and capacity to help themselves.

For this reason we have chosen to make a major effort in seven countries. The President's message reveals that, in next year's program, over two-thirds of our development assistance will go to these countries. They all provide leadership in their areas of the world. They contain a sizable portion of all the people reached by our aid program. These are certainly important considerations but the fundamental reason for our assistance is the strong self-help effort which they have all demonstrated.

Furthermore, we not only seek to assist those countries helping themselves, but we seek to assist them to reach the level of a self-sustaining economy as soon as possible. The American people cannot be expected to provide aid endlessly. Fortunately the number of countries where our aid is necessary should continue to decline. Although Taiwan is the shining example today of countries reaching a self-sustaining level, Greece, the Philippines, and Israel—to mention several—will soon reach that stage. Many other countries are approaching the stage of development when they will no longer require soft loans or grant assistance from us. Taiwan's emergence marks an important landmark in our aid program. Until now, our successes have been related to Europe and Japan. Now we begin to see the fruits of our efforts in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

A third aspect of our aid program is the effort to increase assistance on a multilateral basis. We all realize that our aid efforts will be successful in large measure only if the free world unites in the great challenge before us. We must step up our efforts to encourage other free world donors and international organizations to increase their participation. As the total commitment increases, the need for better multilateral coordination will become greater. It is satisfying to know that steady progress is being made in this direction, but much remains to be done. The President has indicated he intends to continue to seek improved multilateral coordination. I am certain that we all encourage his efforts.

Finally, the objectives of our aid program can be accomplished only when the wholehearted support of the American people is enlisted and the vast reservoir of talent which they possess is utilized. The President's message clearly emphasizes the important role which private citizens and institutions must play in our aid program. To me there is no more encouraging development than the increasing numbers of private citizens and institutions that are taking part in this great adventure. The list continues to grow—not only our great universities, but labor unions, cooperatives, business executives—to mention but a few—are among representatives of the private sphere that are participating in oversea projects. Another outstanding development is the success of the partners for the Alliance program. One-half of our States have joined in partnership with various regional sections of Latin America so that the Alliance can draw closer to a people-to-people level. Our aid program must continue to emphasize this human dimension, for in essence, the program is a people-to-people effort.

I have stressed the primary means by which the objectives of our aid program must be pursued—securing internal security and freedom; helping those who help themselves; increasing multilateral aid efforts; and utilizing the resources of the private citizenry. None of these, or other means which I have not mentioned today, can be effective alone. They all must be employed with considerable effort if we are to achieve our purposes. The President's message has placed proper emphasis on all of them and—I trust—so will the Congress.

President Johnson has been honest with the Congress. He has presented a minimum request. His message assures us that next year's aid program will be sound and realistic. I am sure that the Congress will justify the faith the President has shown in us. I urge you to give full support to his foreign aid program.

A Theology of Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 15, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I continue to be most favorably impressed with the editorial content of the outstanding magazine, National Review, edited by the eminent writer and speaker, Mr. William Buckley. In its January 12, 1965, issue, National Review presents a most provocative and interesting article written by Frederick D. Wilhelmsen. The article is entitled "Toward a Theology of Survival." It contains many points of irrefutable truth which need to be pondered at length by all Members of the Senate. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have this excellent article printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD A THEOLOGY OF SURVIVAL

(By Frederick D. Wilhelmsen)

Our aging civilization, hurried on by the angel of death, seems bent upon holocaust and oblivion. The full meaning of November 3, 1964, may never be known to us on this side of history but one ominous truth, a fixed and awful face, is glaring down upon the West and we would be fools were we to fail to look and see what is written there for us to read. The West, sickened in comfort and diseased in doubt, has unleashed its sword and is about to hand it over to the enemy, blade in palm and hilt outstretched. We have lost faith in the power of justice to conquer evil and we are thus disposed to make our peace with barbarism. I can see no other meaning to the politics of coexistence and to the banner of cowardice upon which are written the words, "peace and prosperity."

I gravely doubt that many of the apostles of coexistence are convinced of any supposed superiority of Marxist civilization over our own. But despite their adherence to some of the broad principles which have made our world to be what it is, these men have despaired of victory because they think the price is too high to pay. This heresy which has today become the new orthodoxy within the free world is akin to pacifism but cannot be reduced to the simplicity of its tenets. Principled pacifism opposes armed resistance

to the enemy under all forms and therefore refuses to fight even when victory is assured. The philosophers of coexistence will fight, but only provided that there is an overwhelming chance of winning and of winning without appreciable damage to oneself. These men pronounce, effectively, in favor of any kind of battle except that waged with risk. Today they are convinced that the West has passed the point where it could possibly have won its war with communism without paying a price which would cancel out the fruits of victory. They believe that any war would involve the destruction of both parties. Thinking, as they do, that this consideration might not deter the enemy under certain circumstances which might emerge at any moment, they appeal to the West to surrender whenever its sovereignty is seriously challenged. The Communist enemy is insane, according to this doctrine, and we must simply accept this fact as a dictate of history. We enter into a pact with insanity. We retreat whenever and wherever the enmy forces us to do so. We run down the flags that hitherto governed the political behavior of civilized men.

COEXISTENCE IS DESPAIR

I suggest that underlying the politics of coexistence is a kind of despair: we cannot win our war, hot or cold, with the Marxist world and therefore we must cease trying to win. Buttressing this despair is a philosophical prejudice which I believe to be false; i.e., success is the ultimate end of politics and if the supposed superiority and virtue incarnated in Western civilization are not sufficient to conquer in and of themselves then we must realistically accept the consequences. This is the meaning of the slogan: "peaceful competition with the Communist bloc." But if the enemy still advances despite all of our peaceful competition (and the enemy is advancing) then the enemy must be permitted the fruits of his victory in the war we refused to wage. Duty ceases to be a mandate of the conscience at the moment when its exercise no longer carries with it a high probability of success at a minimum of risk. Let me hasten to add that I am by no means as pessimistic as the disciples of coexistence. But even assuming that victory would be bought only at a great price or that victory would be impossible, would we thereby be absolved of our duty to defend our civilization?

It is this question which divides a purely classical or pagan conception of politics from a Christian vision of existence. To the Greeks and Romans, political victory belonged to the power of human virtue or to the irrational goddesses of fate and fortune. To St. Augustine, political victory belonged to the will of God. The classical concept of virtue, along with the civilization which virtue was supposed to incarnate, was handled roughly by Augustine in "The City of God." Virtue, simply one among all the other gifts that God's mercy has given to men, does not guarantee political success any more than vice guarantees failure.

Once one accepts the Christian conception of a providence that cuts through the conventional opposition between a natural intelligibility (i.e., the victory of virtue) and the unintelligibility of evil (i.e., the victory of political barbarism), then a philosophy of history becomes possible. Ex post facto, we can see the hand of God moving through the action of the virtuous but we can also see His hand moving through the powers of darkness because they too work, in their own way, toward God's ultimate plan for history. They also are under the divine government. The God of St. Augustine is truly the Lord of history.

In an orthodox context, God is neither the same as the world and its causes nor is He totally other than the world in its coming and going. God falls outside of—better yet, He cuts through the entire dialectic between "the same" and "the other" which are themselves finite terms. God does not destroy the mystery of political decency frustrated nor does He dissolve its tragedy and bitterness. What was meaningless for the pagan remains so for the Christian who knows, however, that there is here a sign wrapped within a providence he cannot see or know perfectly in this life. The Greek and Roman complaint against evil rampant in the world, against the success that is often attendant upon the forces of barbarism that forever encircle civilization, was a complaint against what is truly a surd in reality. This surd, when seen in the framework of a created universe utterly penetrated by its Creator, becomes part of the inscrutability of divine providence. And God Himself subjected His Son to this terrible meaninglessness when Christ was crucified upon the cross.

THE AUGUSTINIAN THEOLOGY

The political consequences are inevitable. Should some polity come to ruin because swamped under a barbarian sea despite the good found within the polity in question, this failure, will have been decreed by the will of God for purposes known fully only to Himself. Such a polity is under the curse of sin and the scandal of the cross. The final resolution of this awful mystery belongs to God. The Augustinian theology gives comfort to the good man with his back to the wall, to the Quixotes of our tradition. Let them take comfort in the face of the scandal of their enemies enjoying the fruits of this world, even amidst all the contradictions of life itself.

This theology of St. Augustine is also a theology of history. Whereas the commonweal of a society annealed in virtue might very well be frustrated by the forces of darkness and irrationality, this frustration actually would serve an end which is infinitely higher, according to Christianity. The civilization, therefore, that does its duty by the heritage of justice that it enshrines must harden itself in hope, in the words of St. John. The civilized polity must do all that it can to secure success and the perpetuation of its legacy in the future. But should civility go down, it must not despair in the hour of its defeat. Such a failure would have been written into creation for ends known only to the god of history, a failure made bearable because the cross teaches men that even God Himself took upon His back the contradictions of human existence. Does not Chesterton teach us that only Christianity has seen fit to invest God with the attribute of courage?

It follows that the ultimate ends of politics must not be measured by a success supposedly guaranteed by the power of a virtuous life exercised corporately by the many. A virtuous life and a good polity are demanded as imperatives that issue forth from human nature itself. This has nothing to do with failure or success in any worldly sense of the term. There was a valid excuse for our pagan forefathers of Rome to balk at the scandal of barbarism on the march—of civilization at bay. This absurdity troubled their spirit because they knew nothing higher than human virtue and they had supposed, in all the arrogance that a purely human virtue breeds, that their own excellence ought to have been sufficient unto itself in the battle against evil. But our world has behind it the experience of 2,000 years of Christianity. We ought to know that the victory of our arms belongs to the god of battles.

This principle must be understood with all the delicacy involved in political speculation and action. The principle does not urge us to abandon astuteness when we treat with the enemies of civilization, be they the Turks before Vienna in the 16th century or the Russians in Berlin in the 20th. The principle does not insist that we hurl all our troops and all of our resources into the breach in a desperate cavalry charge against barbarism, although the principle does not discount this possibility. The principle does not goad us into a politics of international suicide. The principle does not countermand the subtlety and even the deviousness demanded in the actual practice of the arts of diplomacy. It rather commends all of these things and presses them upon us in the name of political prudence. But the principle does insist that these arts be seen for what they are, techniques in the service of something deeper than themselves: the preservation and the enhancement of civilization and therefore the ultimate destruction of civilization's enemy. Should the arts of diplomacy convert themselves into a general foreign policy whose very end is the perpetuation of the enemy in existence, then politics would have renounced its own proper finality, a common good shared by all of us and not simply by those who have thus far escaped falling under the heel of slavery. Foreign policy in the West today has settled upon coexistence as an end to be achieved, as a good to be gained. This is certainly the meaning of November 3, 1964. Coexistence has thus ceased to be a temporary stratagem to be tolerated and exploited (assuming that it ever could have been exploited by the West). The entire Western World, with some honorable exceptions, rejoiced when President Johnson returned to the White House. The world rejoiced because the powers of irrationality have proven too strong for us. Foreign policy is thus entering into a pact with the enemy just as many Roman emperors in the centuries of decline, despairing of ultimate victory over barbarism, threw themselves into the arms of oriental superstitions in the hope of saving some shadow of civility from the surrounding doom.

SEDUCTIVE MYTHS

Political irrationality is always symbolized in terms which appeal to the imagination and thus soothe the outrages suffered by reason itself. In late Roman times, the irrational was often symbolized by the stars. Let the stars save us because we cannot save ourselves. In our times the symbolization of the irrational takes form under the cloak of gnostic dreaming about a total elimination of poverty from the face of the earth. It seduces by its myths of historical determinism and inevitablity. It confuses means with ends and thus proposes anticolonialism and anti-imperialism and democracy and similar nostrums as though these political instruments were in truth ends worthy of rational consideration. The West has seized upon this rosary beaded by the hands of secular humanism because the West today has lost the courage to face up to the only political end which can really interest any decent man in the second half of the 20th century: the business of beating communism or getting beaten at the try.

We began this brief meditation because the heresy of coexistence is becoming a new orthodoxy. These heretics believe that unless we keep on surrendering whenever we are challenged, an atomic conflict is inevitable. This conflict, they say, will bring with it a destruction of our whole civilization as well as that of our enemies. Since such a condition would render human life intolerable, since it would reduce a debased remnant of the race to the status of cavemen grubbing for a living on the crust of a ravaged planet, we men of the West must give up our hopes of reconquest, not only in Poland and Hungary but even in Cuba. We give up reconquest as a goal although we know that communism will never give up conquest as its goal. This doctrine is preached openly by Lord Russell and his hysterical followers in a decayed England and elsewhere; but Russell's call to an open

and candid surrender only masks a more profound and subtle despair circling throughout the entire occidental world today, working carefully and quietly, always moderately, toward the same end. Conscious in the minds of some men who do not as yet tip their hand openly, the doctrine is the preconscious conviction of millions who have despaired of victory.

ARGUMENTS FOR SURRENDER

This teaching urges itself upon us in a dozen ways: it insists that we always retire, whether it be in Hungary yesterday or in Vietnam today; it demands that we concede to them, whether it be in Korea yesterday or in Cuba today. It always advances speciously convincing arguments for every concession and it can always demonstrate, to the satisfaction of its own followers and even of others as well, that such and such a retreat is demanded by world opinion and counseled by moderation. It points to the reluctance of the Kremlin to engage us in a world conflict as an instance of an easing of old tensions and of the birth of a new world in which the concepts of cold as well as hot war will have no place. It brushes aside China's brandnew bomb with the pious hope that political responsibility can be urged upon the dragon of the East. In Europe, the heresy of coexistence dominates the mind and the nerve of England and of the whole Continent as well, excepting only some pockets of resistance. Today its apostle in the United States is Senator FULBRIGHT.

LITTLE BY LITTLE

Against every stiffening of opposition, the heresy raises the specter of atomic war. Against every spontaneous reaction to Communist brutality and tyranny, it raises the cry of chauvinism. Coexistentialism would never dream of surrendering the West all at once to the enemy: it does so little by little, hoping thereby to soften the harshness of the New World being prepared for us and for our children. The doctrine is thus spared the embarrassment of preaching surrender openly and crudely to a world still penetrated heavily by Christian morality. The heresy dominates the press wherein it finds some of its loftiest oracles. It occupies government. It is the new orthodoxy of an intellectuality purged of hope and altogether without chivalry. It is the yellow banner of the academy and the arts.

SURVIVAL AND DISHONOR

Were we to unfold the presuppositions lying behind this flag of defeat, we would find the same fears that worked toward the weakening of the Roman Empire. They—the Communist enemies—will never lay down their arms nor give up their dreams of world conquest because they are crazy with conviction—a very unhealthy state of mind. We live in a better world and enjoy a more humane society than they do, but we know that there is no ultimate meaning to life, that our centuries of blood spent in the name of religion and liberty have yielded nothing dearer to us than the comfort and ease that we enjoy today. We like this comfort and ask only that it be expanded and shared by the rest of the world. If we yield constantly to the enemy and even surrender to him completely when he demands that we do so, we may well be permitted the continuous exercise of our pleasures and our complacency. At the very least we will not die—right away, that is—and thus cease to be. Possibly we might even teach our barbarian conquerors the manners of civilization if not the morals in which we do not believe anyhow. In any event, we survive.

St. Augustine and the Christian tradition say something else. This tradition, formed as it is of swords which flash down the ages touching one another in comradeship, tells us that ultimate survival of this our beloved civilization is hidden in the wisdom and the will of God. He has not entrusted us with the destiny of history, but only with the duty of making it. Our fathers wrought the city of man out of the catalyst of time. They fenced this city all around and they set up sentinels and to each they gave a sword. They ordered us to defend the city, and it were better for the whole cosmos to go up in flames, unto the very last star and the most remote moon, burnt out—the whole of existence scorched and reduced to a cinder blown away into the awful wastes of the void—than that dishonor should unfold the banner of hell within our walls.

Feinschreiber With Kenyatta When News Came of Congo Airlift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following news article from the New York World-Telegram:

HE HAS A ROYAL TIME IN AFRICA

(By Lawrence Farrant)

Selven F. Feinschrieber, 52, of 1076A Union Street, Crown Heights, breakfasted at home today after 6 weeks in Africa, swimming in the Red Sea with an Ethiopian princess, drinking tea with Jomo Kenyatta, Prime Minister of Kenya, and going on safari with Apollo Milton Uganda.

Prince Asrate Kassa, governor general of Eritrea, now a province of Ethiopia, under Emperor Haile Selassie, "Lion of Judah," appointed Feinschrieber his personal legal adviser. In the past 10 years, Feinschreiber has often been Selassie's guest in the palace at Addis Ababa.

Feinschreiber takes his wife, Maxine, on most of his trips to east Africa. He's practically a commuter, two or three times a year. For 2 years, he has been legal adviser to King George III of Uganda, who rules Toro, in the western region of the Republic.

Feinschreiber was drinking tea at the home of Prime Minister Kenyatta, in Nairobi, Kenya, the day that American planes dropped Belgian paratroopers over Stanleyville, in the Congo, to rescue whites being held hostage by Congelese rebels.

"Kenyatta had intervened to save the life of Paul Carlson, American missionary, threatened with execution," Feinschreiber said. "But Kenyatta hadn't been told about the airdrop and he felt put out."

Kenyatta indicated that he might have saved Carlson's life if the Americans had trusted him.

Feinschreiber helped write the Constitution for Uganda.

"I put the Bill of Rights—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, and so on—into the Constitution," Feinschreiber said. "After that, the other emerging nations copied Uganda."

There's a touch of the wirepuller about Feinschreiber, that also delights the Africans. For instance, take the case of Long Island University awarding an honorary degree of doctor of laws to Prime Minister Obote of Uganda in June 1963.

Obote had won election a year earlier. But he had relatively little schooling, starting at 12 in a Protestant mission and ending with 2 years at Makerere University College. Yet, as a son of a Lango tribal headsman, he was one of the most educated Africans.

Feinschreiber talks little about Obote's degree. But "Who's Who in the East" reports that he is a past president of LIU's alumni association. Feinschreiber stood at Obote's right when the degree was awarded.

Way back in 1931, Feinschreiber earned his own bachelor of science degree from LIU, followed by a bachelor of laws from Brooklyn Law School in 1935. He married in 1940 and has two children. His interests shifted from the general practice of law to African affairs in 1956 when he first visited there. In 1957, he became a registered agent for the newborn Republic of Ghana, and in 1961 for the Ugandan king.

This winter he expanded his interests to Ethiopia. With a granddaughter of Haile Selassie, he attended many functions where he was the only American among hundreds of guests. For example, a royal wedding. The royal party swam in the Red Sea at Massawa, in Eritrea.

"It was like Miami but I didn't get a tan," Feinschreiber recalled. "Ethiopians think you're mad if you go out in the noonday sun."

Organization of Wyoming "Partners of the Alliance" Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 15, 1965

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last December 2, a conference called by Gov. Clifford P. Hansen, of Wyoming, was held in the house chamber of the State Capitol Building, in Cheyenne. Leaders of business, labor, civic, fraternal, and veterans' organizations from throughout the State attended. The purpose of the conference was to hear a presentation explaining the workings of the Partners of the Alliance program and to learn the details of how Wyoming could organize to become a part of the program. Governor Hansen welcomed the conferees and praised the overall objectives of the Alliance for Progress. He also expressed his hope that Wyoming would join a growing list of States participating in the Partners of the Alliance program.

Mr. Wade B. Fleetwood, special assistant in the partners programs in Washington, D.C., under the Agency for International Development, addressed the group. He discussed the achievements of the Alliance in the Western Hemisphere and gave background material on the development of the partners' concept, which joins the private sector in American States with the groups and organizations in Latin America.

Mr. Clyde W. Gaymon, of Cheyenne, was elected chairman of the Wyoming Partners of the Alliance Committee. A 10-man steering committee was appointed. Wyoming is thus in the process of getting its citizens' program underway, in an attempt to help groups and organizations in the State of Goias, Brazil.

I am informed that Mr. James H. Boren, director of the Partners of the Alliance programs in Washington, D.C., is now in Brazil. He is discussing with private-sector leaders the tie between the

State of Goias and Wyoming. On his return to Washington, he will present the details necessary in order to move forward the Wyoming-Goias partnership, and will relate other specific information in regard to the organizational procedure necessary in order to activate the partnership.

An article published in the Cheyenne Wyoming Eagle of December 15, 1964, sets out a summation of the meeting. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYOMING "PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE" PROGRAM ORGANIZED

Wyoming support of the "Partners of the Alliance" program, being sponsored by the U.S. Depatrment of State, was announced by Gov. Clifford P. Hansen, at a meeting held recently at the State Capitol Building attended by approximately 35 leaders of business, labor, civic, fraternal, and veterans' organizations.

Wade Fleetwood, Assistant Director of the Partners of the Alliance, under the supervision of the Agency of International Development, arm of the Department of State, told the group last week that the program has been in existence for slightly more than a year and that to date 18 States have entered into some form of alliance with a country or State in Latin America, and seven other States including Wyoming, are in the process of formulating a plan for participating.

Fleetwood added that the program is essentially one through which civic clubs, unions, business and professional groups, schools, and even private individuals may work directly with people in Latin America who are striving to improve their way of life. From the other side of the coin, Fleetwood said, the program presents a challenge to those who are concerned about the dangers of communism.

More specifically, a team of Wyoming experts in various fields such as business, medicine, public health, etc., would be sent to the State of Goias, Brazil, to ascertain what is required there and which people, business, organizations, etc., in Wyoming could supply and furnish assistance.

These projects cover a wide range of self-help activities. Providing some educational materials and equipment, medical supplies, equipment, books, etc. The program does not contemplate the sending of old clothes or old books in the English language. Rather it is a program which responds to specific needs and efforts of villages or slum organizations in the Latin American country in meeting a productive need when there has been a demonstration of self-help interest.

Most of the items required are available in the country (and about 90 percent are U.S. produced items). In the interests of speedy response and simplified administrative handling, funds are generally sent directly to a man designated in each American Embassy to be the program representative for the Partners of the Alliance. He sees that purchased and delivered to the partnership village or association. He also arranges for pictures of the program being completed with the help received from the U.S. organization.

This program is a channel through which people can help people help themselves through small impact type projects. This type of partnership has a tremendous effect in Latin America and assures people there of our concern for them in their struggle to rise above abject poverty and despair. It gives a true sense of movement of the Alliance in the slums and the rural areas where help is most needed. And, most importantly, it is a high priority program that seems to buy a little time until the institution building economic development programs of the Alliance make themselves felt at the grassroots level.

The conference then proceeded to form an interim steering committee which elected Clyde W. Gaymon of Cheyenne as chairman, Leo I. Herman of the Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce as secretary and the following members of the steering committee: Harmon Watt, president; Riverton Chamber of Commerce; Dean Clair Mundell of the College of Commerce and Industry, Laramie; Melt Bryan, president, Wyoming Trucking Association, Casper; Dean Prosser, secretary, Wyoming Stock Growers Association, Cheyenne; Vic Bauer, chairman, Wyoming Industrial Development Advisory Committee, Casper; Harry L. Palmer, Lions International of Guernsey; Lloyd Taggart, president of Cody Club, Cody; and J. L. Erickson, Cheyenne Kiwanis Club, Cheyenne.

The steering committee met for a short time to discuss organization, funds, and ways and means to select a team of qualified Wyomingites to fly early next year to Brazil and visit the State of Goias, one of 14 States in Brazil, which is located inland and which contains the nation's new capital, Brasília, to ascertain its needs. Goias was selected as it is somewhat like Wyoming in land structure. Goias economy is basically agriculture, almost 50 percent in crops productions and 25 percent livestock raising. Its 6 percent mining ratio is concentrated in quartz, crystal diamonds, titanium, and chromium.

Goias and Wyoming became States in their respective countries 10 years before the turn of the century. Goias occupies the "planalto central" or vast level surface just as Wyoming occupies much of the area "upon the Great Plain" was its name signifies. The high points in Goias serve as the divide for Brazil's great river system, while the peaks in Wyoming are part of the great Continental Divide. Both States are characterized by generally moderate temperatures, great plains, valleys and tall peaks. Wyoming's seven national forests are comparable to the woodland area of Goias known as "campo cerradeo."

When the team of qualified Wyoming people returns from a 3-week tour of Goias, it will report to the entire organization as to the needs and requirements of the people of Goias, and it will be the purpose of the organization, through its steering committee to determine how best these needs can be fulfilled with, through, and by the assistance of Wyoming's people, organizations, groups, and communities.

A Time To Be Wary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 15, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed with an outstanding editorial analysis of the President's state of the Union message as printed in the Savannah, Ga., Evening Press, of January 5, 1965. I commend these penetrating and incisive comments to all Members of the Senate and, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "A Time To Be Wary," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TIME TO BE WARY

The very manner in which Lyndon Baines Johnson mounted his glowing blueprint for paradise in the state of the Union message last night should put the American people on notice to expect a shifty, crafty administration in the years ahead. Members of the Congress as well as the public became the victims of a legislative T-formation. In delivering the 177th state of the Union message to Congress assembled, President Johnson, to use gridiron parlance, played a fake wing and then charged off in an entirely different direction.

Congress had had every reason to believe that the 1st session of the 89th Congress would be a relatively calm one, with adjournment coming by July. The boat was rocked violently last night by the President. His legislative shopping list will keep them busy night and day.

Suitcase diplomacy will be the rule for conduct of foreign affairs and policy, if one can accept the President's words at face value.

In our relations with the Soviet Union and its satellites we have moved from peaceful coexistence to peaceful understanding. The man from Texas, like his idol, the second Roosevelt, is encouraging the American people to become "buddy-buddy" with the Russians. He suggests that the leaders of the Kremlin appear on our television channels and he, in turn, appear on the Russian screens.

Although the State Department still has doubts as to who the real rulers of Russia are at the moment, President Johnson has invited them to visit the United States. The Russians, of course, heard nothing of the invitation because Tass, the official news agency, was silent on this point.

The love potion which the President would brew envisions increased peaceful trade with Russia and its satellites. It is readily apparent that the White House and the State Department are out to prove that there are really good guys behind the Kremlin wall and that the Communists we must fear are those under Mao Tse-tung's banner.

Although only the modus operandi differs between the goals of world conquest by the Kremlin Communists and the Peiping Communists, the White Houes tends to aline us with the Kremlin in its intraparty scrap with the Chinese Communists. The Chinese are aggressive says Mr. Johnson and that seems to make the big difference.

The President holds the belief that no new Communist nations have come to the fore in the last 4 years and that, indeed, the Communist empire has begun to crumble. Even a quick look at the continent of Africa would subject that view to some question.

In addition to planning jaunts to Europe and Latin America, the President pledged enlarged commitments to Latin America through the Alliance for Progress. He, of course, was strangely silent about the Communist cancer which remains 90 miles off our shores—Cuba. Since it was not mentioned as an exception, could one conclude that we intend to trade with Castro as one of the Russian satellite nations?

The underlying theme of the Great Society, to use the President's words, is "not how much, but how good."

The man from Texas sought to reassure America that its dollar was sound and the balance-of-payments problem was at a low point. He shunned any reference to the Federal Reserve gold ratio. Just before Christmas, the ratio dropped to a new low—27.6 percent. This ratio is that of gold to the combined Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities. The legal minimum rate set by Congress is 25 percent. A year ago the ratio stood at about 30.6 percent. In 1958 it was at 47.4 percent.

Because the ratio is so close to the minimum, the 12 Federal Reserve banks have had to swap assets to keep their gold hold-

ings above the legal floor. At the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, for instance, the gold reserve dropped to 25.6 percent. The recent shift from $1 silver certificates, backed 100 percent in silver, to $1 Federal Reserve notes has added to the drain on the gold reserve.

Against this ominous background, President Johnson has thrown a bone to the people in the form of a promised reduction in excise taxes. In April of this year the public will discover that last year's income tax cut is not the bonanza that everyone thought it was. Instead of refunds of about $100 million, taxpayers will have to send an additional $1.5 billion into Washington.

Offsetting the tax cut talk is the President's domestic proposals covering education, medicare, urban renewal, mass transportation, poverty, etc. These plans are all expensive ones and Washington bureaucracy being what it is he'll never shrink it enough to get the money for the new programs. This, of course, spells deficit financing.

It was perhaps in a backhand fashion that the President took cognizance of the economic peril point. He wants standby authority to cut income taxes temporarily and authorization for vast public works projects—to prime the pump, when needed.

The President's message last night theoretically contained something for everyone. The semantical wizardry shown by the man from Texas merely opens the door on a new maze, the center court of which is pure and simple socialism. At the rate at which the President would have us proceed, the offsprings of the next generation will not have to trouble themselves to think—the Government will do everything for them.

The President first mentioned the Great Society in remarks at Gainesville, Ga., on May 8, 1964, during a poverty tour. But neither he nor his ghost writers can claim credit for origination of the phrase.

The term was a coined a half century ago by a British Socialist, Graham Wallas, one of the earliest members of the Fabian Society, which is keyed to socialism in Britain as the Americans for Democratic Action is working for socialism in the United States.

A professor of the London School of Economics, Wallas, a predecessor of the late Harold Laski, the Fabian apostle in the same school of economics, wrote a book entitled "The Great Society," which outlined a socialist state on an economic and social pattern at which the incumbent President is aiming his program.

On balance, there were few departures from the ADA program, revealed last week, when the President came before the American people last night.

Republicans, alone, cannot apply the brakes to Johnson's headlong drive toward Utopia. They will need the aid of responsible Democrats in Congress who will put the Nation above party platform and party leadership. The legislative steamroller must not be permitted to mount its head of steam.

Now is the time to be wary—not wait until there is only remorse at having been flattened by the juggernaut of socialism.

The Gold Backing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 15, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in connection with the President's recommendation of foreign aid in the sum of $3,380 million for the fiscal year 1966, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from a valued friend and monetary expert, Hon. Richard Wagner, who offers pertinent suggestions concerning the current problems of balance of payments.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, *January 12, 1965.*

Hon. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Recalling our pleasant discussion when you and I both attended a GATT meeting at Geneva, Switzerland, I am taking the liberty of writing you about a matter which I believe to be of most vital importance to the citizens of this country.

The nonchalance with which consideration is being given to proposals to remove the gold backing of U.S. currency is most distressing to an oldtimer like me who cut his eyeteeth on banking and currency problems prior to the inauguration of the Federal Reserve System in 1913.

For over 8 years, I have been constantly urging administration officials in Washington to take realistic and proper measures to halt the mounting imbalance in our foreign obligations. To remove the gold cover from our currency is not a proper corrective measure; indeed, it will not strengthen the standing of the dollar around the world—it will weaken it.

I realize and understand the propriety from a purely technical standpoint of the arguments advanced by economists and some bankers that the gold cover on our currency is no longer essential. But from a practical standpoint, you cannot with the stroke of a pen irradicate the belief which has existed for thousands of years that a gold-backed currency is sound, and one that is not so backed is printing press money. Furthermore, if the 25-percent reserve requirement is removed, all restraint on turning the presses to create money is also removed and a profligate administration could really play havoc with the destiny of the Nation. The only way to cure concern abroad about the stability of the dollar is to immediately take steps to put a moratorium on the export of dollars in connection with our military adventures abroad, our military assistance to other nations, and our economic aid. If we confine our actual dollar export by our Government for its foreign objectives to an amount not in excess of our available favorable balances from international trade and service, we would swiftly stop all fears abroad about the stability of the dollar. This would not mean that we would have to cut our overall foreign aid to any great extent because instead of paying out dollars, we could give that aid in goods, material, equipment and services which would not impair further our international position.

One of the large drains on our position is caused by payments in dollars to servicemen stationed abroad. These payments to the extent the servicemen want to spend money abroad, should be made in the local currency of the host nation. If sufficient amounts of such currency were not available through the world bank or perhaps the monetary fund or AID, this could be arranged by borrowing local currency in the host countries against 25-year U.S. Treasury notes issued for the purpose and repayable after 5 years in equal annual installments. To the extent servicemen did not want to spend abroad, dollar credits could be held here for their account, or the money paid to their designees.

In my humble judgment, Senator, if we followed some such program, we would stabilize the dollar and the demands upon us for withdrawals of gold would lessen. If we do not stop the erosion caused by increases in our balance-of-payments deficit each year, the liberation of the gold now behind our currency will not stop the ultimate devaluation of the dollar.

You have always been sound on monetary affairs and I hope that you will see the validity of my suggestions and proceed with utmost caution before changing the time-tested soundness of gold-backed currency issuance.

With personal best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD WAGNER.

Right-To-Work Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 15, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in a front-page editorial in its January 10, 1965, issue, the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., has set forth very eloquently its opposition to the President's proposal to amend the Taft-Hartley law and do away with the power of the States to have right-to-work laws.

In South Carolina labor-management difficulties have been at a minimum, and the overwhelming majority of the people in our State support our right-to-work law because its guarantees to each individual the right to work without being forced to join a union. This is a basic American right, Mr. President, which we must preserve if we are truly interested in preserving individual freedom for all Americans.

I am, therefore, pleased to commend to the attention of the Senate this outstanding editorial and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BITTER PILL: MOVE TO END RIGHT TO WORK

Workers in 30 States in the Union are now already working in industrial bondage—bondage that in principle is just as true as it was during the days of slavery before the War Between the States. For they are working under State and Federal laws which require, as a prerequisite to holding their jobs, their compulsory membership in a union, their compulsory payment, deducted from their salary by their employers, of union dues which could better go to the support of their families and the education of their children.

Now, President Johnson, as outlined in his state-of-the-Union address last Monday night, has promised as part of his program for his coming administration changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, including section 14(B).

Section 14–B reads as follows:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or territorial law."

It is regretable that the legislatures in those 30 States have seen fit to bow to the demands of organized labor in forcing membership in a union as a condition of employ-

ment. They have lost sight of the fact that when a man works for a stated salary or wage, the control of the money he receives is inherently his to do with as he wishes (with the exception of withholding for government taxes which, inherently too, must be paid).

Without right-to-work laws, an employee is not only contrained to give a day's work for his daily wage, but is also required to pay tribute to a labor union. * * *

The AFL–CIO has announced that the repeal of section 14–B is its prime target in Congress this year. President Johnson has indicated that it is also one of his. If it is repealed, it will mean that workers in the remaining 20 States, including South Carolina, will themselves become enslaved, enslaved to unionism and to a socialistic governmental ideology. Is this Americanism?

The Times and Democrat believes that a man should have the right to work as a member of a union or free of union encumbrances. That he should have a free choice as to his religion, his preferences, his likes, and his dislikes—and his right to free speech as long as those choices are within the bounds of commonsense and decency.

It also abhors the thought of force or compulsion in man's dealings with his fellow man except in the enforcement of laws which do not abridge his constitutional inheritance.

George Washington Carver Award

SPEECH

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I know the Members of the House share in congratulating the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] on receiving the first George Washington Carver Award. This award for Congressman CORBETT's efforts in introducing legislation in the 79th Congress to honor a great scientist is certainly merited. I take particular pleasure in joining in the tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania because the George Washington Carver Monument is located at Diamond, Mo., in the district I am privileged to represent. Thousands of visitors come annually to pay tribute to his memory.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Local Public Works Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, two of the most urgent problems with which this Congress must come to grips are the need to help our towns and cities to grow and prosper and the need to maintain our economic expansion and thereby reduce the present intolerably high level of unemployment. An important step in achieving these aims is Federal aid for local public works. The success of this approach was most recently proven by the accelerated public works program. Because of this I was greatly pleased that our distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, introduced the Local Public Works Act of 1965 (H.R. 2170) which I have the honor of cosponsoring (H.R. 2425). I hope that we can act on this legislation promptly because the need for it is urgent. This need was clearly spelled out by Congressman BLATNIK in his speech last week to a luncheon meeting of the AFL–CIO legislative conference. I hope that all of my colleagues will read his speech carefully and I request that it be reprinted here:

FEDERAL AID TO LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS: THE NEED FOR A CONTINUING PROGRAM

(An address by Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, to the AFL–CIO Legislative Conference)

The 89th Congress is scarcely 1 week old but it is already evident that this will be a hard-working and productive session. The House has made highly important changes in its rules to overcome obstacles which in the past have repeatedly thwarted the will of the majority. The benefits of these changes will be reflected in the sound and constructive record which I am confident that this Congress will achieve.

President Johnson's state of the Union message, one of the most notable ever given, has set the tone. Those who expected cautious generalizations must have been very much surprised. It was hard hitting, specific, and showed the President's determination to move ahead rapidly toward the realization of his Great Society. I was particularly pleased with the several references in the President's speech which recognized the importance of public works and the need for prompt action in this field. While details of administration proposals have to await specific messages, I believe that they will recognize the urgent need for increased public investment and the fact that only Federal grants have the power to provide the stimulation required.

At no time in the past 20 years has the setting been as favorable for the enactment of legislation designed to give a substantial and continuing boost to public works construction. The critical need for the many benefits of increased public works investment has created broad-based support for vigorous Federal action. The AFL–CIO has long been in the forefront of those who recognize that this aid is needed and are willing to fight for it. The resolution adopted by your executive committee in November is a strong reaffirmation of your traditional support and will carry tremendous weight with all of us in public office. This kind of Federal aid also carries the all-out support of the mayors of our towns and cities who know firsthand the extent of the need and the problems of State and local government in meeting it. Just last month the National Association of Home Builders, I believe for the first time, endorsed Federal grant assistance for local public works because they know from their own experience that the lack of adequate community facilities has resulted in inflated land prices and excessive real estate taxes which in effect have priced middle-income families out of the market for new housing in many areas. Undoubtedly other groups will add their support to proposals for stronger Federal aid to meet this problem.

In his message, President Johnson said, "I propose we launch a national effort to make the American city a better and more stimulating place to live." I am sure that all of us here share the President's desire and determination, and inevitably a vital element in that effort will be greater investment in all of the many public facilities essential to modern urban living. Perhaps many of these things seem unexciting and are too often taken for granted, but a city cannot exist and cannot be prosperous or satisfying without substantial investment in water and sewer facilities, public buildings, parks and playgrounds, streets, hospitals, community centers, and so forth. When these facilities are antiquated or inadequate, the quality of life in the community suffers and its ability to expand and attract new job-producing investment is severely limited.

We have a bold and vigorous program of urban renewal which is clearing the worst of our cities' slums and blighted areas and to which the Federal Government has already committed $4 billion in grants, and undoubtedly this Congress will be called upon to provide additional billions for this vital program which is doing so much to revitalize our cities. We have provided billions of dollars in grants for our long-term highway program much of which will be built within urban areas, and last year we took the first step toward providing grants for local mass transit systems. Meanwhile, there has been a growing need to supplement these efforts by providing grant assistance for a broad range of local public works which the city or other local government unit must build to meet the requirements of its citizens.

The fact is that we have not kept pace with the growing needs of our people for local public works. Today the backlog of needed improvements and additions to our supply of community facilities runs into billions of dollars. Our inventory of local public works is less adequate today than it was in 1940 when we had the benefit of the intensive building programs of the 1930's. This is reflected in the growing problem of water pollution, in traffic congestion, overcrowded public facilities, and in many other problems of daily life ranging from nuisances to outright threats to health and safety.

State and local governments are making heroic efforts to meet their responsibilities, but the fact is that their limited revenue resources simply cannot carry the whole burden. Rightly or wrongly, the Federal Government has preempted the most important and the strongest source of revenues through its corporate and personal income taxes. Where a State or city is limited by the prosperity and diversity of industries within its jurisdiction and the danger of driving investment elsewhere, the Federal tax structure is based on the entire American economy, the strongest and richest the world has ever known.

I believe that Federal assistance for local problems is not only justified but is an obligation on those of us who have the honor to serve in the Congress. The taxes which support the Federal Government come largely from the people who live in our towns and cities, our urban population, and it is only right that the Federal Government reinvest that money at the local level where it is most needed.

Increased investment in public works is not only needed for the growth and livability of our towns and cities but also for its broad economic benefits. We must not forget for one minute the plight of those millions of American men and women who are out of work today, who will be displaced by automation and other economic changes, or who will be entering the labor force in the coming year. No one knows better than you in this room what an awesome task it will be to provide employment opportunities for these millions. This would be true under the best of circumstances, but as we enter 1965 there is growing concern about the economic outlook. Most economists seem baffled that our present expansion has lasted as long as it has, for over 40 months. I believe that the reason is clear—the expansionist policies of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations have been making up for the preceding 8 years of restriction. I believe, however, that the economists are correct in their concern for the coming year. I cannot help but be perturbed when these doubts are expressed in some of the stanchest business quarters. For example, Fortune Magazine, hardly a foe of business confidence, felt compelled to open the economic analysis in its January report with this statement, "A new period of subnormal growth is now in prospect for the U.S. economy after this quarter. Following 4 years of rapid gains in output * * * this means a real change in trend. As Roundup remarked 6 months ago, 'The really difficult task for the economy lies not behind us but ahead, i.e., after the spring of 1965.' This outlook is now more definite."

In the same vein, U.S. News & World Report began its recent economic summary with this statement, "Almost a chorus of prediction now is heard that the business upturn can slow or end in second half, 1965, that today's good times may face trouble."

I do not need to tell you that an actual downtown is not our only danger. With our growing labor force, even a leveling off of the economy poses a major menace. Again in the U.S. News & World Report had this to say, "The pattern of business activity that seems to be indicated promises little improvement in the problem of unemployment. It appears likely that total employment will expand by some 850,000 by this time next year. But that expansion will not be enough to absorb the indicated increase in the labor force. The result may be that by fourth

quarter, 1965, unemployment may be nearly 1 million higher than now."

A phrase being used with increasing frequency by economists is "fiscal drag." This refers to the fact that Federal revenues under any given tax structure rise as the economy expands. In fact, because of the progressive nature of income taxes, these revenues rise faster than total national income. On the other hand, the rate of increase in Federal spending has slackened off over the past year or year and a half and although it is still going up, it is not rising as fast as the Government is taking money out of the economy. Whether or not this would be made up by an accelerated expansion in the private sector of the economy is debatable. We hear contradictory estimates of the outlook for business spending on new plant and equipment, but the best estimates at this time do not indicate enough of a rise to stimulate the economy to the extent needed. In the case of consumer spending there seems to be general agreement that people have spent the higher take-home pay from last year's tax cut somewhat more quickly than anticipated and the further rise from this source will not be great enough to give the economy the lift it needs. We all know the critical impact that follows the closing of a defense base or the cancellation of a defense contract. Though the effects are more subtle and harder to pin down, the same thing happens throughout the economy from a relative reduction in Federal spending—relative to tax revenues and to our economic needs.

We have made great gains in economic sophistication in the past few years. The Kennedy-Johnson tax cuts at a time when the Government was running a substantial deficit is clear evidence of this. We have also launched a long-term effort to get at the roots of unemployment, of low income, through the poverty and retraining programs. However, we cannot say to the unemployed worker and his family that he should be patient and wait for general overall improvement. He needs a job now and it is our responsibility to do whatever we can to provide full employment. Recognition of this fact was recently given by the National Planning Association, an organization of some of America's leading businessmen as well as labor leaders. In their latest report they state, "We endorse both tax reduction and training and retraining as useful and desirable first steps toward modernizing our economy. But we do not believe that they will create the very large number of additional job opportunities which will be needed to absorb present open and hidden unemployment and the large influx to the urban labor market from schools and farms in the years ahead, during which we obviously cannot forever resort to one large-scale tax reduction after another." I concur wholeheartedly with those views.

In these circumstances it is particularly timely that you should make public works the theme of your luncheon. Increased public works construction has proved its value both in improving our cities and in meeting the problem of unemployment through its direct impact in on-site jobs, materials consumption and transportation, and through its multiplier effect as this money is spent and respent for the whole range of consumer and business, goods and services. The academicians are fond of saying that they appreciate the impact which stepped up public works activity can have on the economy but that the leadtime required to get projects underway limits their usefulness. I hope that this time the economists will get behind us and support the effort to inaugurate a major public works program now, without waiting until the last minute. I would also say to them that they should study the experience under the accelerated public works program which proved to me that the money can be put to work promptly creating jobs and creating needed community facilities. The truth is that there is a substantial "shelf" of plans already completed or well advanced for local public works which can be started in a very short time. There are hundreds of millions of dollars worth of projects in applications pending under the APW program for which no Federal assistance is available, and undoubtedly an even larger amount of planning exists outside that limited program.

To meet the twin problems of needed local public works and increased employment opportunities, I have introduced H.R. 2170, the Local Public Works Act of 1965. This bill is designed to provide a large and continuing program of Federal grants for virtually the whole range of local public works. It would authorize $2 billion annually in Federal grants to cover two-thirds of the cost of sewer and water facilities, public buildings, streets, and road improvement, and other kinds of local facilities. These grants could be made to local public bodies without limitations on population size. Also there would be no employment criteria for eligibility but it includes the further provision that depressed areas, in view of their special needs and limited resources, could receive grants up to 75 percent of cost. I believe that this legislation could spark a sharp increase in public works construction, one which is particularly needed since the exhaustion of APW funds and the end of the boost which that gave to such construction might otherwise actually lead to a slackening in this vital part of our economy.

I am confident that the basic support for this kind of a proposal is there if only those who believe in the need for it will give it their determined support. Major legislation must have grassroots backing to make its way through the complex route it must follow here in Washington. I hope that all of you, while you are here in Washington and when you return to your homes, will keep this in mind. Certainly this bill is among my highest legislative priorities this year and I hope it will be among yours.

Bill Avery Becomes 37th Governor of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 11, William H. Avery, who served as a Representative in Congress from 1955 through 1964, was inaugurated as the 37th Governor of the State of Kansas. On his inauguration day, it was not possible for me to be in Topeka to witness the inaugural ceremony, so I took occasion to call attention to it on the House floor so that many of the Members who served with Bill would know about the start of his service as Governor.

Because I know that many of my colleagues will be interested in what took place at the inauguration in Kansas and what Bill Avery said on the occasion, I am presenting a newspaper account of the day's events which appeared in the Topeka, Kans., Daily Capital, and the full text of Avery's inaugural address. I find it an inspiring message, typical of Bill Avery and his dedication to the virtues which have served Kansas in the past and which will be cornerstones of progress in the future—religious faith, pursuit of knowledge, and hard work. I commend his remarks to all who read them:

WILLIAM AVERY BECOMES 37TH HEAD OF STATE

With an inaugural day, crammed to the brim with activities, behind him, Gov. William H. Avery began his first full day at the State's helm this morning.

The gala inaugural day included a parade through downtown, a speedy but full inauguration ceremony at municipal auditorium, reception at Cedar Crest, and the swirl of the inaugural ball Monday night.

Governor and Mrs. Avery spent much of the afternoon entertaining State officials and members of the legislature at a luncheon reception at the Governor's mansion.

PROBLEMS AHEAD

Earlier in the day the Averys rode in a parade from the statehouse to the auditorium where, with his hand on the family Bible, Avery was sworn in as Governor at 12:20 p.m.

In his address to over 3,000, Avery pledged to keep the State on an even financial keel but warned of weighty problems yet to be solved.

The inaugural may have set a record for brevity. It started at noon and ended at 12:30 p.m.

Following the noon ceremonies, Avery was sworn in as head of the Kansas National Guard on the Statehouse grounds where he was given a 19-gun salute. Avery was escorted on an inspection of the honor guard by Maj. Gen. Joseph Nickell, adjutant general. The Army honor guard was furnished by the 891st Engineer Battalion from Manhattan with the air honor guard from the 190th Tactical Reconnaissance Group in Hutchinson.

FAMILY PRESENT

Avery was surrounded by members of his family throughout the day. Sitting on the stage at the inaugural and accompanying him throughout the day were the Avery children, Bradley, Martha Sue, along with William, Jr., and his wife, Alice, from Washington, D.C., and Barbara Lanahan and her husband, Lauck, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Avery's mother, Mrs. Hattie Avery, of Wakefield, and his mother-in-law, Mrs. Ada M. Bowles, of Manhattan, also attended celebrations.

OTHERS SWORN

In addition to Avery, many other elected officials, all Republicans, took the oath of office Monday. They were Lt. Gov. John W. Crutcher, Supreme Court Justice Harold Fatzer, Secretary of State Paul R. Shanahan, State Auditor Clay Hedrick, State Treasurer Walter H. Peery, Attorney General Robert C. Londerholm, Adel F. Throckmorton, superintendent of public instruction, Frank Sullivan, commissioner of insurance, and State Printer Robert R. Sanders.

Although Avery's day was full, he planned to begin his first full day in office early. He scheduled a press conference for 9:30 a.m. today. Aids said he would probably work on his address to the legislature scheduled for early next week.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS, HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY, JANUARY 11, 1965, TOPEKA, KANS.

As no doubt has been the case for 36 other men before me, this is the proudest moment of my life. It is a privilege to be inaugurated as Governor of any State, but I consider it the highest possible honor to be sworn in as chief executive of your State and mine, Kansas.

It has been my privilege during the past years to observe firsthand, a cross-section from each of the 50 States. The impressions I have gained have not only made me extremely proud to be a Kansan, but have placed in clear perspective the reasons for this pride. This is not the time, nor appropriate occasion, to set these reasons out in detail, but permit me to recite a few general observations.

One of our greatest heritages is the dominant role that religion has played in the formative years of history. This was evident even in the turbulent society before statehood, and to a greater degree in the more than a century that has followed. History is replete with evidence that nations have remained strong only so long as they have had belief in God and recognized the dignity of man. When this has been lost, the nationality and culture have disappeared. Whereas Kansas cannot completely separate its traditions from that of this great Nation, we must make certain that this religious heritage is not lost, but is perpetuated.

Hand in hand with the religious fiber of Kansas has been that of educational opportunity. The results of this opportunity are evident. The literacy rate in Kansas is one of the highest in the Nation, and one of the highest for any comparable area in the world. The percentage of high school graduates attending college is considerably above the national average. Further, information from military statistics reveals that in 1963 Kansas had a lower preinduction disqualification rate for draftees than any of the 50 States.

Another impressive observation from Kansas history is the impact of education and religion. Prior to, and during the Civil War, settlement of the prairies had gone westward on a line roughly extending south and east from Manhattan. After the hostilities ended, central and western Kansas was open for development and was settled very quickly. If you will examine the location of virtually all of the private and denominational colleges, you will find them located in this central Kansas area and founded in the post-Civil War years. The point I want to establish is that not only were Kansas settlers a devout people, but they were equally determined that their children should enjoy the advantage of a college education. These same schools are serving Kansas youth today in increasing numbers.

May I mention one more heritage? This is the capacity of Kansas people to work. We may have an equal, but we are not surpassed. Typical of many Kansas pioneers, my grandparents gave up a secure and stable environment in New England to move west. No doubt, adventure was an element in this motivation, but more, I think, was the acceptance of a calculated risk to find a more abundant life, made possible by the fertile Kansas plains. Their life was not easy, but I think they felt rewarded by the unlimited opportunities this land could yield to them and their children. Of the thousands of settlers who came to Kansas, only the resourceful and stouthearted remained. The ones with less courage returned to the security and safety from which they had come. Here, again, is a heritage of courage and a will to succeed of which we can all be proud. We should employ it as we plan the future.

Tradition has always been a great influence on any society. A tradition, as a heritage, is a community legacy. It can be dissipated, simply preserved, or considerably enhanced with prudent management. We have these same three choices with the legacy we have inherited for Kansas.

Any change or any adjustment is usually inconvenient, sometimes even painful. It always presents some problems. Some of these problems beg a most difficult solution. We must never accept the status-quo for our society unless we also accept being relegated to the status of a people who have lost their will to win and to progress.

As we meet a gradual transition from a basically agricultural State to one that is quasi-industrial, we must recognize the inherent economic problems. As our population expands in urban areas, schools, churches, highways and community facilities must adjust. State government must also give and take to accommodate accepted functions within its jurisdiction.

May I submit an observation from personal experience as a farmer and in public life. Whereas a change from any familiar status or circumstance presents some problems, this change also usually creates new opportunities.

It is in this perspective that I view Kansas on this day in January in 1965. The necessity for some changes are self-evident. Some State functions are nearly obsolete. Others are inadequate. We have, by tradition, recognized as rightful responsibilities the needs of our citizens that can only be done by, or done better, by the State. It is not my view that we should reach for functions and resources that logically belong to local government. Further it is not my view that we should ignore voids that have evolved in our social system which invite unwarranted Federal intervention. On these matters I will report to the legislature later.

Finally, let me state, that I do not propose to know all the solutions to all of our problems. For the great honor that has this day been bestowed upon me, I shall devote all of my energy and what talent I possess to help mold for the generations to follow, a State that is fiscally strong; a society enriched by educational opportunities; a work force gainfully employed through an accelerated program of industrial development; and the maximum development and conservation of our natural resources. These objectives I consider to be the obligation of my office. To these goals I am totally committed.

In the Cause of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, in my efforts to help enlighten the American people as to what is happening to their Nation, I have found the greatest obstacles to be apathy and doubt, or the idea that if the situation is ignored, it will go away. Therefore, it is most encouraging to me to see the fine progress of our country's fastest growing youth organization, which is dedicated to preserving this great Republic. The members of this energetic group are not apathetic, nor do they have any doubts, and they certainly do not feel the problem will resolve itself if it is ignored. They are completely aware of the danger our country is facing, and are working hard in their communities throughout this Nation to bring this knowledge to everyone who has its interest at heart, and wishes to see the principles of our Founding Fathers prevail. I am speaking of the Young Americans for Freedom. They want this country left for them to live in with their freedom guaranteed, and, also, to be able to leave it for the generations that follow, as it was left to us.

It is with pleasure that I submit the text of a speech by one of these noble freedom fighters, Mr. Thomas J. Dahl, field director of the Colorado Young Americans for Freedom, which was delivered at their constitutional convention held this month, and request unanimous consent that it be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

IN THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM

As we gather here this afternoon, the situations of our world have not become any less tense, nor have the futures of those situations become any brighter.

We are still at war with the Communists in Vietnam, we still have done nothing about Cuba or Berlin, and in the Congo, a pro-Western government was slapped in the face while we sat idly by twiddling our thumbs while many were dying and many others were wounded, and finally the "Johnny-come-lately" foreign policymakers of the United States decided that it was time to act. And yet, ladies and gentlemen, our great President is still turning out the lights in the White House. These are the lights of leadership; the lights of strength; the lights of responsibility; the lights of respect, and the lights of honesty.

In addition to all of the other problems which hover over our Nation, both domestic and foreign, one of the first acts of the Great Society was to close 95 more military bases, another serious drawback in our system of defense; not the first, but I am sure, not the last.

Where to now, Mr. President? How many more bases are to be closed; how many more governments and nations do we let the Communists have; how many more Americans must be killed needlessly before we surrender everything, including our Nation?

Ladies and gentlemen, the time is getting shorter—the days are getting fewer before that day of infamy falls upon us—and the days are getting darker with every minute we do nothing.

We have gathered here in this dark hour, because we have a cause—a cause which could save the world from taking that final and fatal step into the bottomless pit of eternal tyranny; a step which would bring down that iron curtain between all men and freedom, at least, for centuries to come.

However, something is happening in America, that has great promise for the future. I have actually heard the augury of its approaching thunder.

Our future will be as we will have it, it cannot be, nor will it be any other way. That future can be ours to look to with respect and dignity if we choose, however, there is much work to be done. We can begin that work as we leave this convention; in our homes, in our churches, in our schools, and in our communities.

Countless numbers of Americans have gone before us in the everlasting fight to preserve freedom in this restless and chaotic world of the space age. Yes, we are young people, who at times tend to be optimistic and idealistic, but we are old enough to realize and to understand the mistakes which have been made by preceding generations, and we have the will and the desire to do something about them.

Freedom cannot nor will it be preserved by the so-called economists who tell us that we owe the national debt to ourselves and to our posterity, and it will not be preserved by those fabian-socialists who are bestowing upon this Nation a type of system that is contrary to every principle that our Founding Fathers held in the formation of the United States, and indeed the greatest bulwark of freedom the world has ever known.

When those great so-called civil libertarians of today stand before the people of this Nation and condone the crime of news-management by the Government, when the Supreme Court cares more about the welfare and fairplay for the Communists in this Nation, than it does for the honest, freedom-loving citizens, and the encroachments of big government, then it is time for all citizens, especially young Americans, to redouble their efforts in the cause of freedom.

Let us continue with our energy and our hearts, forever rededicating our lives to those principles of freedom and to that cause.

Let us continue, never becoming discouraged in our fight, for that road which we must take, is a difficult path to travel.

Let us continue remembering always, that there is no substitute for victory, and that the opposite of victory is defeat.

Let us continue assuring all nations and all men that the United States of America shall never again tolerate humiliation or disrespect, as that we so cowardly tolerated in Panama, a nation and a people which owes its very existence to the United States.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, let us continue.

The answer lies with the youth of America. It is the youth who must bear the burdens imposed by the mistakes of the past, and it is the youth who must be responsible for the future. Let each and every one of us here dedicate ourselves to the unfinished task which remains before us, meeting every new challenge with confidence and determination, and let us bear with pride, the banner—Young Americans for Freedom.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us continue, in the cause of freedom, and let us adopt the motto of another great American, "I have not yet begun to fight." Thank you.

Security Measures of the House Strengthened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about security measures of the House and I am pleased to announce that security measures have been and are being improved and strengthened since the convening of the 89th Congress.

The House personnel and patronage committee, in cooperation with the House leadership, has acted to take every reasonable precaution against repetition of such untoward incidents as occurred in the Chamber of the House on the opening day of the present session.

This problem has been reviewed thoroughly at a conference with Speaker McCormack and, as a result, a decision has been reached to add additional security officers for the House. These men have been recruited on the basis of their experience, training, ability, and demonstrated dependability in police work—without regard to patronage considerations.

Members of this enlarged security force have been stationed at the five entrances of the Chamber of the House of Representatives.

They are there to assist and reinforce the watch maintained by the doormen of the House, who are on duty at all times.

In addition, as you know, our Capitol Police and doormen are supported by a detail of uniformed Metropolitan Police and plainclothesmen.

We believe that proper and effective steps have been taken to protect the House against invasions by troublemakers or disturbances on the floor and in the gallery.

I was present on the floor of the House on March 1, 1954, and a witness of the violent attack staged by a band of Puerto Rican nationalists. The lesson of that experience is lasting.

I fully share the conviction of my colleagues that maximum security can and must be provided for the orderly and safe transaction of the business of this House without isolating this body from the American citizens who desire to come here and observe the proceedings of their Representatives.

The 20th Anniversary of Art Linkletter's "House Party"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, 1965, Art Linkletter's award-winning show "House Party" celebrated its 20th anniversary of broadcasting on radio and television.

Art is a good friend of mine and I know that I can speak for the many thousands of his friends and fans in congratulating him for the outstanding contribution he has made not only to entertainment but also to humanitarian endeavors he has actively supported during his remarkable career.

I am therefore asking unanimous consent that the text of a joint resolution I introduced today be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 212

Joint resolution honoring Art Linkletter for unique services rendered to his country and to the world

Whereas on January 15, 1965, Art Linkletter celebrated his twentieth anniversary of broadcasting "House Party" on radio and television; and

Whereas "House Party" has for twenty years contributed to the wholesome entertainment and education of millions of listeners and viewers and has maintained a high standard of excellence; and

Whereas Art Linkletter has given unstintingly of time, talent, and energy to the welfare of children and to a rich variety of humanitarian causes throughout the world; and

Whereas Art Linkletter has been honored by a host of American organizations for his selfless devotion to charitable causes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to present in the name of the people of America a parchment of appropriate design to Art Linkletter in recognition of the aforesaid services to his country and to the world, such parchment to include a suitably engrossed copy of this joint resolution.

The Way to the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, for those of my colleagues who may have missed the editorial in yesterday's Washington Sunday Star, I am extending my remarks to include the comments of our Senate Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris. Dr. Harris combines some highly inspirational precepts with a salting of commonsense. We would do well to keep his thoughts in mind for the months to come. The article follows:

THE WAY TO THE GREAT SOCIETY

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

America on its privileged pedestal is being summoned by the demands of the world revolution not only to see visions and dream dreams, but to lead the way to a fairer earth. The blueprints are not dated to be realized in some far sweet-bye-and-bye but in a desperately needy here and now where uncounted millions wallow in the lowlands of misery. With all the necessary implements in their hands those who are citizens of the coveted privileged portions of this spinning globe are solemnly called to be willing partners in the task of changing dreary deserts into rose gardens of life more abundant. It is the time to fulfill the ancient prophecy that the crooked things which spoil life's music must be made straight. The valleys of despair must be exalted.

The vistas of a Promised Land have been lifted up long 'ere this by millions of worshipers in 10,000 churches as they have prayed Thy Kingdom Come with hymns upon their lips such as:

"O shame to use who rest content
While lust and greed for gain
In street and shop and tenement
Wring gold from human pain.
Give us, O God, the strength to build
The city that hath stood
Too long a dream, whose laws are love,
Whose ways are brotherhood,
And where the sun that shineth is
God's grace for human good."

The answer to that prayer is all involved in the universal petition voiced constantly by millions that the kingdom of human good may indeed come.

But the desperate immediate need of these days of violence and revolutionary change is that those who have in their hands the power to help God answer the prayer, Thy kingdom come, shall with a new dedication and determination, face the realization that the way to any society that can really be called great is not simply by the manipulation of legislative levers by social engineers. The Great Society can only be built by those who, in there own attitudes and actions, join the ranks of those whose ruling passion was so well expressed by John F. Kennedy, when, 4 years ago, he took the oath of the presidential office—"Ask not

what your country can do for you but rather what you can do for your country." That distinction divides Americans into two classes—those who lift and those who lean.

A fatal fallacy of so many rose-tinted social schemes is to regard Government as a sort of escalator upon which even the indolent may be carried up to desired levels whether they personally exert themselves or not. Where such social panaceas have been tried there have been alarming indications that far too many people are perfectly willing just to recline on the moving stairway while they, themselves, do little but enjoy the sensation and the scenery.

One of England's most famous preachers broadcast his estimate of the escalator philosophy as in his country it has been carried out in the "welfare state." He said: "What is so often forgotten is that if you give amenities endlessly to people who are at heart grabbing and selfish you will bring the life of the community to chaos. In this serious hour human motives are being poisoned with a drug that is sapping the moral grandeur and stamina of our whole land. We might label the drug thus—'How can I do less and gain more?'"

In America it is certainly no exaggeration to say that the raging passion with half of our people is to build barns and bigger barns, or corporations or bigger corporations. And, the raging passion of the other half of our people is to get more and more wages for less and less work. So, millions of Americans make wealth and security the goals of their personal living and of our national existence.

Life which is geared as an escalator, while conceivably it might get many material things for people, would at the same time do terrible things to them by robbing them of self-respect and a sturdy independence which fosters personal initiative and develops character. The only hope for the coming of what we are thinking of as a Great Society is a tremendous increase in the number of those who stand and toil, not with those who learn but with those who lift. A modern sage declares that a gentleman is one who puts a little more into the general pool of human welfare than he takes out.

Personal responsibility is the central theme of Christianity. One of the fundamental principles of the Master of men is—"If a man shall save his life he shall lose it." That puts the attainment of life abundant for individuals and for nations at the disposal of those whose ruling passion is not how much can I take out but how much can I put in. The symbol of all that has made our democracy great and mighty enough now, in this desperate day, to be the chief factor in saving the world from the horror of regimented communism is not the automatic escalator on which people are lifted, but the stairway up which people climb.

The signboard to the Great Society was put up by the One who spake as never man spake when He declared—"Let him who would be great among you be the servant of all."

Congressman Anderson, Former Skipper of the "Nautilus," Speaks for Nuclear Power Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in an address delivered on January 13 at the "Salute to the Nuclear Navy" program in Washington, our new colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, discusses our country's nuclear power development policy with particular reference to the part played by the Congress.

Congressman ANDERSON, is, as you know, the former captain of the nuclear-powered submarine *Nautilus* and was its commander on the historic first journey under the polar ice. He comes to this House from the Sixth Congressional District of Tennessee following his election last November.

As we welcome our distinguished new colleague from Tennessee, we have occasion to congratulate both him and the House leadership on his assignment to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, a congressional specialty closely related to his specialty as a famous Navy officer.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include Congressman ANDERSON'S remarks on the subject of nuclear propulsion's development in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The address follows:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, OF TENNESSEE, AT "SALUTE TO THE NUCLEAR NAVY," WILLARD HOTEL, WASHINGTON, JANUARY 13, 1965

I am very glad to be here and I appreciate the forbearance of all of you who must realize that I am a bit late to be a qualified Navy spokesman and considerably early to be a congressional expert.

My problem doesn't stop here. Despite all my efforts to acquire the image of lawmaker and statesman, I find I'm still more closely identified with the North Pole than with Capitol Hill. I assure you, it is twice as hard and much more dangerous to reach Congress.

I want to express my warm appreciation to the Washington Naval Reserve Public Relations Co. for conceiving and arranging this event. Having spent my last 3 years of Navy duty here in Washington, I am well aware of your versatility, your fine traditions and the great contributions your unit has made toward a more effective and better understood Navy.

The last 10 years of our nuclear Navy have been eventful and bright with performance and potential. It is certain that the next 10 years can be years of progress, achievement and consolidation.

The joint Navy-Atomic Energy Commission program has always been blessed with champions to serve the cause of nuclear propulsion.

Its number one champion originally stood almost alone. Tomorrow, that man, small in physical stature but gigantic in the breadth and depth of his character, intellect, and devotion, will leave his austere office to go to the White House to receive the Enrico Fermi Award from President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The Navy and the Nation are indeed fortunate that Adm. H. G. Rickover is willing to continue in his demanding assignment in the second decade of nuclear power.

There are also many champions of the nuclear Navy on both sides of Capitol Hill. I do not intend to diminish the credit due the Navy, but history will record that Congress, particularly during the early days, gave nuclear propulsion better attention, better service, and greater push than did the Navy itself.

We are most fortunate that two Capitol Hill champions of nuclear power have now moved to powerful positions. I refer to Congressman MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The outlook for the next 10 years is brighter because of the judgment, vision, and leadership of these statesmen.

With the support and leadership of men of this type, the Navy now stands on the threshold of a historic changeover. The *Nautilus* and her successors and the dramatically powerful Polaris-firing submarines are a tremendous force in being. Nuclear task force 1, after its circumnavigation of the globe appears to be the prototype for the ships that will make our Navy the most powerful and adaptable the world has ever seen.

With more and more efficient nuclear propulsion systems being developed, the key question to a policy for the second decade of the nuclear Navy would seem to be how best to proceed with construction of nuclear surface ships.

The reason for our past timidity in this matter has, of course, been costs. In opening a discussion on nuclear surface ships, I want to make it clear that my purpose is not to criticize the decisions of the past but to make some suggestions bearing on future policy.

First of all, I think that in deciding whether to adopt an aggressive program of nuclear ship construction we should make sure all factors are considered.

It's important, first of all, that the figures on which we base decisions be true, complete costs of ship construction and operation, amortized over the useful life of the ship—development, construction, outfitting, operation, repairs, refueling.

Viewed on this basis, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has estimated that a nuclear carrier is just 3 percent more expensive in the long run than a conventional carrier. It is also, of course, much more effective than a conventional carrier. There are few Americans who would not be willing to invest this additional 3 percent in order to avoid dependence on obsolete, second-best ships for the defense of this country and the security of the free world.

Let us also remember the spin-offs, the side benefits and returned dividends that have and will come from the development of nuclear propulsion.

Take the Shippingport reactor, this country's first full-sized commercial atomic generating plant. Shippingport is really a larger version of the *Nautilus* powerplant. Eventually, I believe we will realize that if the only result of the *Nautilus* development program had been a safe, satisfactory situation at Shippingport the money would have been well spent.

While our needs for commercial atomic power may not press us today, we must prepare for the time when they press in on us rapidly—as, indeed, they are pressing in already on many nations hard up for conventional energy sources.

Let us not forget, either, that the Stars and Stripes, flying from modern, swift, far-ranging nuclear ships comprises one of our most dramatic symbols of the success of the United States in harnessing the atom for practical, peaceful purposes—dramatic proof of this Nation's firm determination that the atom shall be used for mankind's good, rather than his destruction.

These considerations are difficult, I think, to place on the scale of cost accounting. But they must be included in our thinking. We cannot afford to deprive ourselves of our full potential power merely because it appears today to be a little more expensive, because what slide rule can measure the value of life and liberty?

So, as a new administration, with a sparkling mandate from the people, prepares to open new and ambitious vistas toward the fulfillment of the American dream, I think we must visualize ourselves as at a new departure, beyond which a wise nation will not only build fleets powered by the atom, but

will embrace every opportunity to harness this elemental force for the benefit of all men, everywhere.

Address by the Honorable Robert T. Murphy, Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, on the Occasion of Air Transportation Day of Lehigh-Northhampton Airport Authority, Allentown, Bethlehem, Easton, Pa., November 12, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on November 12, 1964, a group of civic-minded citizens in the Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton area, popularly known as the Lehigh Valley, invited officials of the Civil Aeronautice Board to come and inspect the facilities of the Allentown, Bethlehem, and Easton Airport.

The remarks of Mr. Robert T. Murphy, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, at a dinner reception that evening contain some cogent observations on some of the work done by CAB. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT T. MURPHY, VICE CHAIRMAN, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, ON THE OCCASION OF AIR TRANSPORTATION DAY OF LEHIGH-NORTHAMPTON AIRPORT AUTHORITY, ALLENTOWN, BETHLEHEM, EASTON, PA., NOVEMBER 12, 1964

This has been a great day for me and my associates as representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Board who have been privileged to inspect your impressive area airport and to survey some of your industrial facilities which constitute a great seedbed for our national economy.

I wish to express our thanks for the reception which you have accorded us and, in particular, to John Leh, chairman of the Lehigh-Northampton Airport Authority, and Wiley Post, your airport manager, for their invitation to come and meet with you here. We have always realized that this is an area of great natural and physical resources but, with the advent of Allentown's own Jack Yohe at the Civil Aeronautics Board, our appreciation and awareness of the Lehigh Valley's importance to the United States has somehow grown. All of us associated with the air transport industry are particularly appreciative of your designation of this day as a special air transportation day and we are grateful to the city, county, State, and National officials who have taken the time to join with us in making it a memorable occasion.

It is noteworthy, also, that a great many of you are consistent air transportation users, depending on the efficacy of the operations of some of our Nation's leading air carriers now serving the Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton Airport for keeping your own companies operating at full efficiency and, hence, responsive to the growing needs of our domestic and foreign commerce.

Today we have viewed, across the Lehigh River at the foot of South Mountain, one of the world's greatest steel plants and have journeyed to the summit of the mountain to inspect its magnificent, new research laboratory. We have likewise visited the hangar facilities maintained by Bethlehem Steel at your airport where its fleet of modern business aircraft is maintained in continuing safe and reliable condition, earning for it a safety record second to none in the Nation. All in all, this has been a pleasant and rewarding experience for those of us in aviation and I believe a proper atmosphere has been generated for a discussion of transportation services which, in this jet age, we cannot discuss without reference to air transportation—the beginning and end of which must always be at an adequate airport facility.

You have one here of which you may, indeed, be proud, operating as it does with great efficiency under the management of Mr. Post and through the cooperative efforts of the Lehigh-Northampton Airport Authority, composed of your three cities and two counties that long ago voluntarily united their efforts to bring about a single adequate airport. This is an example of civic cooperation initiated long before any pronouncement in Washington of the need for exploration and development of the regional, or area, airport concept.

This demonstrates beyond peradventure of doubt that all progressive thinking of a governmental nature does not necessarily originate on the banks of the Potomac; that State, county and local governments can, in many instances, be relied upon to resolve economic and social problems on their own initiative through joint cooperative efforts. After all, it is well to remember that our Declaration of Independence, our Articles of Confederation and our Constitution were all devised by city, State, and local leaders and we haven't produced any better mutual aid pacts since.

You are to be congratulated for setting a singular example for communities in other parts of our country through the establishment of this conveniently located airport complex dedicated to serve the needs of each of your separate civic entities. As men of business affairs you apparently early perceived the needless economic waste resulting from the duplication of airport facilities in nearby locations leading, in many instances, to a dilution of the quality and quantity of airline services for an entire area.

As you probably know, since early 1961, following a joint policy statement of the Board and the Federal Aviation Agency, we have been endeavoring in appropirate cases, not only to conserve Federal tax funds for airport construction and air transportation subsidies, but also to upgrade the character and quality of service through the encouragement of the area airport concept in those instances where no great disservice would be wrought upon the communities involved and where demonstrable savings would redound to the State and Federal taxpayer and to the corporations responsible for furnishing our airline services.

With the vast expenditures invested in the improvement of our national highway system in recent years, thereby knitting many communities even closer together, I think you will agree that such a policy has much to commend it. But what you, here in the Lehigh Valley, acting on your own initiative recognized years ago and voluntarily moved to correct, still constitutes a continuing problem for a number of other municipalities in other parts of the country.

Perhaps, if we keep at our task on the Federal level with patience and restraint and with the help of men of good will on the local level, we shall be able to make a worthwhile contribution to improved airline services in the years ahead through the area airport concept.

Since we appear before you in our role as Federal public servants, I thought perhaps you might be interested in knowing a few pertinent facts about your Civil Aeronautics Board. Created in 1938 so as to bring some order out of the chaotic condition in which the infant air transportation industry was then enmeshed, ours is yet one of the smallest of the Federal agencies and—I like to think—one of the most efficient and dynamic.

The Board consists of five members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 6 years and, by law, not more than a majority of the members may be of the same political party. With a staff of less than 850 employees, we are responsible for the economic regulation of the far-flung, burgeoning air transport industry—an industry now employing more than 180,000 persons, operating a fleet of more than 2,000 aircraft over routes extending to every part of the 50 States of the United States and throughout the world except for the Iron Curtain countries and Red China, and generating revenues approaching $4 billion a year.

The Board is likewise charged with the responsibility for the investigation and determination of the probable cause of civil aircraft accidents as well as the submission of recommendations to the Federal Aviation Agency which will tend to prevent similar accidents in the future and for the conduct of special studies and investigations on matters pertaining to air saefty. In matters of air safety our functions are directly related to the maintenance of a safe and sound air transportation system. Perhaps the greatest public notice of the Board's activities is derived from the impressive work of the experienced corps of accident investigators representing the top technicians in the aviation business whose work on a number of occasions has merited tremendous public acclaim. Additionally, the Board in an advisory capacity participates in the negotiation of agreements with foreign governments for the establishment of international air routes or the exchange of air rights.

As an independent regulatory agency, the quasi-judicial functions of the Board are governed by the Administrative Procedure Act requiring the conduct of open hearings before examiners and the determination of cases upon a public record developed in such hearings. We actively cooperate with the Department of Commerce with respect to many transportation problems and with our sister transportation agencies, the Federal Maritime Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission, through joint committees or special boards in an effort to integrate our various transportation modes so as to facilitate their use by our Nation's commerce.

In the economic sphere and subject to the powers granted to us by the Congress, we are responsible for the licensing of air carriers and determining the routes over which they operate and exercising a review authority over the charges which they exact from the passengers and shippers. The Board administers a Federal program of subsidy payments which presently provides over $85 million of Federal funds primarily to support and sustain local services including those carriers serving our remote, but important, new States of Alaska and Hawaii where air transportation constitutes the only effective means of communication.

Our primary injunction from the Congress is the development and maintenance of a sound, safe air transportation system capable of meeting the present and future needs of our foreign and domestic commerce, of our postal system and our national defense. With relative permanence and stability having been evolved in the route structures of certificated carriers in the last few years, we have in the recent past devoted considerable attention to further refinements and delineation of the roles of the various classes of air carriers. Some

fairly recent cases have raised important questions of the relationships between trunkline and local service carriers.

Major cases are presently in process involving the route patterns between the Pacific Northwest area and the State of Alaska; the transatlantic routes to Europe and beyond, including the continents of Africa and Asia and, equally important, the entire Caribbean and South American route systems.

Not long ago, the Board certificated several new carriers to engage in charter operations on the Atlantic in recognition of the existing and future potential of low-cost group travel in this rich, popular market.

We have taken steps to afford the domestic all-cargo carriers a reasonable opportunity to develop a new concept in the sale of blocked space to large shippers which promises to stimulate and develop new markets for the carriage of air cargo.

Within the past few years, also, Congress has directed our attention to the need to formulate a permanent role for the supplemental carriers. There is considerable effort now being devoted to carrying out a proper niche in the aviation spectrum in which this category of carriers may find some economic stability and in which they may continue a safe and valuable contribution to the Nation's commerce and defense.

Before long, we will institute a proceeding to reexamine the role to be assigned to the commercial operators of smaller aircraft, sometimes designated as air taxi operators.

In short, we are doing our best to keep abreast of technological developments in the industry and, through a process of enlightened regulation, to develop a full complex of transportation services as required by our Nation's commerce—services which can be offered with a reasonable expectation of profit; services which can be purchased with a like expectation that they will be adequate and that the charges will be reasonable and nondiscriminatory.

A matter which is always of vital interest and concern to every community is the service which you can properly expect to be provided by the carriers operating in and out of your airport pursuant to certificates of public convenience and necessity. As a preliminary, let me briefly review the current posture of the trunkline industry. Our reports for September indicate domestic trunk traffic for the month was running at a rate in excess of 41 billion revenue passenger-miles a year—a record never achieved until now. Coach traffic increased to a new high of over 70 percent of the total. These very favorable traffic trends have been translated into an excellent profit picture for the carriers thus far in 1964. Comparing the year ending June 30, 1964, with the year ending June 30, 1963, we find that international passenger traffic was up 19 percent and freight traffic up 16 percent. Domestic passenger traffic was up to 18 percent and freight up 20 percent. Airline profits were up 115 percent from $66 to $141 million with a 38-percent increase in return on investment from 6.2 to 8.5 percent. Figures for the later summer months were equally impressive. There is every reason to believe that these favorable trends can continue. Having weathered the temporary fiscal difficulties attendant upon the acquisition of a large jet fleet, the trunkline operators have fortunately found the jet aircraft, not only a highly efficient unit of production, but a very profitable one.

I think it is fair to say that one of the first consequences of the transition to jets by the trunks, of a negative nature, was a distraction on their part from the service needs of the smaller, intermediate city markets which were not among those points initially selected to receive jet service from the large four-engine aircraft. Within recent days this situation has been the subject of critical comment by Senator MONRONEY, chairman of the Senate Aviation Subcommittee, with particular reference to some of our larger inland cities. But, as of today, it is reasonable to expect that trunk managements will voluntarily attend to their service responsibilities in these smaller markets.

In my opinion, two factors combine to support the necessity of a conscious improvement of trunkline services in these areas. First, the excellent growth in traffic, both passenger and cargo and the consequent trunkline profits of record proportions, afford no valid reason for these public service entities not furnishing a product of excellence to their smaller traffic cities, most of which have been on their route systems for several decades and, in that sense, are not Johnny-come-latelys. Secondly, the acquisition of two- and three-engine jet aircraft adapted for the volume of traffic and shorter hauls involved at the so-called intermediate city markets should make for desirable, efficient and highly profitable jet service.

The obligation of the trunk carriers to provide adequate air transport services at intermediate cities is no less than their obligation to provide the finest service in the denser transcontinental markets where we now find almost hourly schedules offering a wide choice of service class and prices and assurances to entertain you through astrovision, television, wide screen movies, stereophonic music or, at no extra charge, just plain peace and solitude. This is all to the good at the moment, but it certainly must raise a question in the minds of a large segment of Americans who live in the nonhub cities as to why they cannot expect from the same carriers just a little more in the way of attention to their basic transportation needs. I am sure that most of these folks would be content to buy their own movie tickets at the neighborhood theater if they could only get a good service at a decent price in their less glamorous travel markets.

It seems to me that if the trunkline industry is to continue this encouraging growth and expansion, it cannot concentrate its exclusive attention on the traffic base available in the top 100 pairs of points. These markets already have been highly stimulated by the provision of excellent jet service at attractive prices. It seems reasonable to expect that the expansion of the present traffic base would be most dramatic in the smaller traffic markets which have, as I indicated, not received the attention which I believe that they should receive in the future.

I am confident that the trunk carriers will receive enthusiastic support from the residents of intermediate cities if they provide them with an improved service adapted to their true needs.

I believe experience in the trunklines has shown that many of them have made money on their medium-size markets when they have conscientiously devoted appropriate attention to their service requirements. A growing trunkline industry must attract new categories of traffic which do not now move by air and merely noting that 80 percent of our population has, as yet, never flown indicates that there is a vast reservoir of potential business awaiting development.

One fact which adds support to the expectation of an improved trunkline service at intermediate cities is the industrial dispersal evidenced throughout the country for various sociological and business reasons. More and more manufacturing and industrial plants are being located in the country. Urban population figures no longer represent a true index of a metrolopitan area. For example, the Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton urban population figures do not include almost 200,000 of the over one-half million persons in the metropolitan area. This industrial and manufacturing dispersal must be tied together by good transportation services and the location of new plants and facilities relies in important part upon the availability of good transport services. All of these factors call for and will result, in my opinion, in the development of a heavy flow of commerce in twin- and three-engine aircraft to and from the medium-size cities which have long supported our trunkline industry.

These thoughts are personal ones—and perhaps, rambling. But one central fact I would like to leave with you: with all our faults and all our delays, this country has developed the greatest and the best air transportation system in the world. Our aviation industry has met every challenge of the past. I am sure the industry can successfully conquer the problems yet remaining and those appearing on the horizon ahead. Let us, on this Air Transportation Day here in this important corner of Pennsylvania, pledge our continuing, energetic support to them in this task. We dare not—we must not—fail.

Eroding the Gold Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, by authority previously obtained, I submit a thoughtful analysis bearing on our Nation's gold standard problem, which appeared as an editorial in the Oregon Statesman, January 11, 1965, and which I believe, will be a valuable reference for Members of Congress:

ERODING THE GOLD STANDARD

While currency is not exchangeable for monetary gold and possession of gold is illegal, gold remains the base for our monetary system as it is the basis of exchange in international settlements. The trouble is, that trade expands at a far faster rate than the gold base increases. This raises doubts as to the adequacy of gold and encourages those who advocate going to a system of managed international currency.

Last week the gold issue got new agitation. France announced it would convert $150 million of its American credits into gold, withdrawing same from the United States. The U.S. Treasury announced it would honor the French demand and would honor other claims on gold which foreign holders of U.S. exchange might demand. At the same time it said it would ask Congress to change the law which calls for the backing of domestic currency with 25 percent in gold. The timing and terms of the request were not announced. This would increase the amount of gold to use in foreign settlements.

The effect is, if the requirement of a percentage of gold is wiped out, to put our currency afloat. Its value would depend on how the U.S. dollar rated in foreign exchange. The ultimate measure would still be gold because it is the common denominator which all nations respect. The danger lies in the lack of any restraining norm. The temptation is strong for managers of currency to produce it in ample quantity. They can always find an excuse in the need to sustain business and support buying power. When the purchasing power of the currency deteriorates, the temptation is to increase the output of currency. Such a course of inflation usually ends in a deflationary smash.

There is no ground for predicting inflation is in prospect because we may drop the gold

reserve requirement. But if that action is taken, the only restraint on the credit balloon will be the intelligence and the courage of those who manage our financial affairs. This means that attention should be given toward achieving a balance in the national budget and to ending the continuing drain because of deficits in our international settlements. On the wisdom and skill employed in dealing with these matters our future economic health depends.

San Diego: The Place To Stay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with great pride, I wish to direct the attention of my colleagues to the exceptional and brilliant development exhibited by San Diego, Calif. I am proud of the example that wonderful city holds forth to the Nation and world, not only because it is my home, but because it illustrates how successful in developing itself a close-knit community can be.

The following succinct comments about San Diego appeared in the January 22, 1965, issue of Time magazine and I insert it here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for each to review:

THE CITY: A PLACE TO STAY

It had taken 4 years' work and $21.5 million, but San Diegans were convinced that the evening had been worth it. For with the opening night of San Diego's impressive new Civic Theater last week, the community could look back with pride on an urban renewal program without parallel in the United States. It could also look forward to growth and progress that of late have eluded what was becoming California's problem city.

San Diego (population 655,000) has every natural asset a city could ask. Set between rolling mountains and the sea, it boasts a magnificent natural harbor, a paradise for yachtsmen and a major port for the U.S. Navy. No smog sullies its air, no wastes pollute its waters. The climate is kindly (67° to 70°) all year. It is a place that people dream of coming back to, and they do; the phone book is a virtual who was who of retired Navy and Marine Corps brass. To keep San Diego unspoiled, the city fathers long ago adopted rigid zoning laws. For decades, all attempts to attract new industry bogged down in the perennial controversy known locally as "geraniums versus smokestacks," and geraniums were practically growing in the streets.

As a result, San Diego over the years became a land of lotus eaters, so immersed in its happy, old-fashioned ways that the future seemed irrelevant. By failing to diversify its industrial base, the city by 1961 had saddled itself with a 7.5 percent unemployment rate, far higher than in nearby Los Angeles. Worse, for the long term, was the loss of skilled workers as a result of cutbacks in the aerospace industry, their biggest employer. In 1960, when a group of businessmen got the results of an exhaustive study of the city's economic prospects, the outlook was so gloomy that, as one economist put it, "you could have cut the pessimism with a knife."

Not a single office building had gone up in the center of the city since 1928, and the downtown area was a sleazy jungle of honky-tonks and arcades. Suburban shopping centers had relentlessly whittled downtown retail volume; the city faced a 30-percent decline in sales revenue by 1962. A successful bond issue was as rare as snow. Despite 35 separate attempts to build one, San Diego remained a city without a convention hall. In virtually every other sector of the economy from transit to schools, San Diego was lagging far behind lesser and less-blessed cities.

FACING FACTS

The man who first suspected how far was Joseph E. Jessop, president of a chain of jewelry stores and the patriarch of a family that has been in San Diego since 1890. In 1959, Jessop, who had already begun to move his own stores out to the suburbs, called together a group of 60 leading businessmen to start facing the hard facts. "Up to this point," Jessop recalls, "San Diego was only penny ante. If you asked them for a contribution, they wrote you a check for $200." Jessop demanded—and got—$100,000 "for a start." With it, on May 1, 1959, they formed San Diegans, Inc.

The group's first project was an attempt to revitalize the downtown area by building an ambitious complex to serve as a center for the city's cultural, financial, and administrative activities. Financing was a problem. Government-aided urban renewal was considered too controversial for ultraconservative San Diego, one of the only two counties in California carried by Goldwater. A bond issue, which by State law requires a two-thirds majority to carry, was certain to be beaten. So San Diegans, Inc., made an outright gift of $1.5 million to the city, which agreed to borrow the rest of the project's $21.5 million cost from its own employees' pension fund.

Functional L: Finally after 2 years of tearing down and building up, San Diego's functional, L-shaped concourse is now complete. The complex includes an 11-story parking garage and flanked by a pleasant terrace, a capacious convention and exhibit hall, a 14-story city administrative building, and the elegant, 3,000-seat civic theater, which will also house the city's symphony orchestra and a brandnew opera company.

Since San Diegans, Inc., began its work, nearly $90 million has been invested in the downtown area in building and restoration. The city's success has inspired other groups to deal similarly with problem neighborhoods. High-powered citizens' committees have also been formed to attract industry, rehabilitate the transit system, overhaul city finances. San Diegans, Inc., which has spent a total of $73,500 in surveys, has just completed a building-by-building blueprint for redevelopment of 74 more downtown blocks.

Thus San Diego has worked its way out of lotusland on its own terms. The city has yet to seek a single cent of redevelopment money from the Federal Government. Without going soft on smokestacks, San Diego in 2 years has more than doubled the number of research and development plants in the area. Investment in new industry rose from $440,000 in 1963 to $4 million last year, while 3 big junior colleges and a University of California campus with a projected enrollment of 27,000 in 20 years have just been completed.

Perhaps the most important gain of all is intangible. San Diego, as banker Ewart Goodwin pointed out last week, has learned under pressure to harness "the mutual power of the community." Said he: "Business needs the authority of government and government needs business as a salesman." As a result, San Diego today is not only a nice place to come back to; it is a place to stay.

Gov. Mark O. Hatfield's Legislative Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I present to you herewith the preamble of the message of our great Governor, Mark O. Hatfield, to the opening session of the Legislature of the State of Oregon.

Despite the great damages suffered by the citizenry of the State of Oregon in the recent storm and flood disaster, our farsighted, capable, and realistic Governor has set forth in his message worthy goals capable of achievement by State government. These he proposes with no raise in taxes and no new taxes.

I am proud that my State continues on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The preamble follows:

THE GREATER PROGRESS

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the 53d legislative assembly, 40 days ago when I presented the biennial budget, no one could foresee the havoc that was beyond the horizon. Many parts of our State have been torn asunder with the loss of lives, millions of dollars in land and building damage, and inconvenience in travel, communications, heat, shelter, lights and water, as well as disruptions of commerce and industry.

The impact on the budget, both in terms of unexpected expenditures and in unrealized revenue, is not yet clearly known. Not enough facts are in; nor will they be, in terms of individuals, for some time and probably not before this legislature must make hard decisions.

But even in view of the temporary setback which the forces of nature dealt us, it does not appear that we need an increase in the income tax. Our generally high level of prosperity during the past 6 years has been such that not only can we live within our income but, in so doing, we may reach out for worthwhile goals to provide our citizens with the greater progress.

It would be tempting, meeting as we are with the echo of disaster still ringing in our ears, to do only that which can be demonstrably connected to the immediate needs. But we would be untrue to our heritage if we did not apply ourselves to the long view, to chart a course for those who are to follow.

This is the eighth regular session of the biennial assembly with which I have enjoyed some association. When you convene 2 years hence my connection will be but momentary. My experience confirms what observers of the political scene have long known: that an idea implanted in one session or one decade may not take root for years. It has been in this spirit that each of my messages to you has contained recommendations blending factors of immediacy and ultimacy. Some you have enacted; some you have deferred; some you have rejected; some you have improved. Such is the responsibility of each of us in our coequal, coordinate branches of Government; mine to recommend, yours to act, react, reject, modify or initiate on your own.

You have had my budget recommendations for over a month. Your Joint Ways and Means Committee has been meeting for 2

weeks. You have access to the nearly 20,000 words of my previous messages and there has been placed at your desk a list of specific recommendations for your consideration at this legislative session. I trust you will give these recommendations the same attention they would have received had they been presented orally. My remarks today provide a perspective for these recommendations as we take a look at the Oregon that is and the Oregon we hope may be.

It will soon be 20 years since the end of hostilities in World War II. Some of the scientific leaps forward were undreamed of when the first atomic bomb was detonated. These advances in technology have far outpaced our social maturation. Thirteen Asian and thirty-three African nations have become independent since 1945. Yet, inadequate preparedness for this new independence is the heart of some of today's international frictions. We know how to produce more and more foodstuff from less and less earth with fewer and fewer hands but we have yet to learn how to handle its distribution without jeopardizing the market. We have raised our standards of living to new heights for the majority of our citizens, yet poverty prevails to such an extent we are watching a rebirth of a type of Civilian Conservation Corps of depression days. The ability of man to design and construct machines to do man's work has been so successful that what might be a blessing fosters numerous dislocations of distressing personal impact.

Oregon has thus far been spared some of the headaches and heartaches of other areas of our Nation. Because more people sought gold, or sunshine, or oranges, or Hollywood, we have not experienced the population explosion of our southern neighbor or of many other States. Our freeways are relatively effective, the air we breathe is relatively clean, our scenery relatively unspoiled, our colleges and universities are not yet of multiversity magintude. We took enlightened and humanitarian civil rights action long ago. Should our population ratios change perceptibly in the years ahead, the laws are on the books. In only one locality is there even the potential for sharp racial tensions and there a study in depth has charted a course for calm, deliberate, and effective action, preventive rather than corrective.

At this particular juncture in our history, we dare not be content with the status quo. Whether we like it or not, Oregon is in a competitive age, State with State, in many fields of endeavor. It behooves us to make the most of our assets, to correct our liabilities to the extent possible, to discover ways of taking full advantage of the opportunities as they appear.

There are those among us, and there may be a considerable number, who yearn for the good old days—the days of the boardwalk, the horse and buggy, and the kerosene lamp. Some would prefer that the population shrink back to what used to be. They want lights but not the dams to disturb the fish, inside plumbing but not the sewage charge, cars to get from here to there but not so many that traffic slows them down.

Today, Oregon is the geographical center of the United States. An astronaut climbed our lava beds because it is thought they approximate the moon; off our seacoast, the depths of the ocean are plumbed to uncover their mysteries and oil is sought with new zest; at Boardman a space age enterprise prepares to make new testings and at Tongue Point the war on poverty becomes the activity of a facility built for another kind of war; the skylines of our cities change daily with new structures and the economic pulse of our largest metropolitan center is reflected throughout the State.

Now, let us look at competitive factors that place barriers on the road to the greater progress. In some of these, courtesy, commonsense, and putting the public interest ahead of personal motives will meld competition into cooperation. In other situations the barriers are such you will have to make decisions of momentous magnitude, and significant consequence, requiring courage and statesmanship.

We face competition with the 15,000 public and private agencies in other States spending a quarter of a billion dollars annually to attract industry. There are those who would lure away our university graduates after our taxes have educated them. There are those who look with envy upon the abundance of our water, as they contrast ours with their own lands. There are the elements themselves which we are still learning to control and use for human good, not human harm. There is competition within the structure of government which, if misdirected, can bleed taxpayers in needless duplication. There is competition for tourist dollars which can be won and retained by hospitality and coordinated effort. There is competition with the educational traditions that defy the cry for the changes necessary if we are to meet the gigantic enrollment challenge. There is competition for foreign markets.

There is competition that arises from the fact that ballooning population has increased our numbers at both ends of the age scale—more and more young not yet contributing to the economic sphere and more and more senior citizens with only nominal income, if any * * * both supported by the relatively smaller group in the income-earning age categories. This is the simplified economic root of the revenue problem of most State and local governments.

And there will be competition within this legislature as you face decisions together. There is competition for your ear and for the State's purse string. To put this particular competition in context let us ever remember that the farmer's problem, so real to legislators from a rural district, is a problem for us all by the time his produce arrives at the marketplace. The traffic congestion of Portland, in which a legislator from that area finds himself every workday of the week, merits the attention of each of us, just as those who live along a completed freeway have a moral obligation to those who traverse substandard roads.

Vocational training and rehabilitation measures and graduate research programs are all needed, not only in striking at poverty but adjusting to automation and attracting new industry. The backward and the gifted who compete for the teacher's time are equally worthy of your time and action.

And the competition does not end with these listings. There is competition between party and party and within party itself. There may even be competition between house and senate.

The greater progress can be attained only if we resolve these potentials for stalemate and stagnation.

Oregon's fertile fields can feed far more Americans than now benefit from our toil. Oregon's water statesmanship can lead the way toward a morally justifiable, politically practical solution to the extremes of abundance and want. Oregon's educational aspirations can make better use of all our resources while pushing ever higher our standard of excellence. Oregon can pioneer in county-city cooperation, in county consolidation, and in pacing the Nation to more efficiently serve the overburdened taxpayer. Oregon's State government can be reshaped to meet the needs of the day rather than carrying over the antiquated ways of yesteryear. Oregon can be known as a State that thinks so much of each individual that it extends a helping hand when one is down and out, but always with an eye toward restoring his self-esteem by showing him how to stand again on his own two feet. Tomorrow's Oregon, not dependent upon huge Federal contracts or on a single industry, must constantly strive to diversify its economic life, seasonally and geographically. Oregon, not long from now, will be discovered by new millions as a great vacationland. It can be an Oregon whose planning for decades of development kept the air free, the water pure, the scenery visible, the traffic moving, the school graduates staying, the labor force working, the whole population enjoying a distinctive way of life in an ideal setting and under conditions which would be the envy of the Nation.

In this year of 1965 you have an opportunity to write an epochal chapter in the history of the greater progress of Oregon. It will require skill, determination, courage, and the cordiality of men and women who are of good will. Not only will the Oregonians who have entrusted their destiny to you be appraising your efforts, but we will be visited this year by the 14 Governors of the other Western States, who have honored me with their chairmanship, and by your legislative counterparts from throughout the Nation.

The reputation of the State of Oregon has been built from our earliest days on a foundation of enlightenment, of humanitarianism, and of conservation. Let us from this session, with the guidance of Almighty God, provide for our Oregon the dynamic policies which will achieve the greater progress. Toward this goal I invite your dedication—and pledge you mine.

Mrs. Polly Firestone, an Outstanding American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, Los Angeles mourns the death of Mrs. Polly Firestone, who passed away on January 10. Mrs. Bell and I join with thousands of friends and admirers in extending heartfelt sympathy to her husband and family.

Polly Firestone was one of the most outstanding and well-liked women in the Los Angeles area. Intelligent, attractive, highly capable, personable, cultured, and creative, she was an unselfish civic worker, a talented artist, and, perhaps most important, a devoted and loving wife and mother.

Those of us who knew Polly admired her for the many qualities which gained for her the respect she so well deserved. She was able to see solutions and effect them quickly, yet she was able to work well with others. She had a natural dignity, tact, and modesty, yet she was warm and charming.

The tribute which appeared in the January 11 edition of the Los Angeles Times details Mrs. Firestone's many achievements. Under unanimous consent, I reprint portions of it here. It is but a small indication of the loss suffered by the many people who felt the benefits of her selfless contributions:

Mrs. Polly Curtis Firestone, 55, socially prominent wife of Industrialist Leonard K. Firestone, died Sunday of cancer at her Beverly Hills home.

She had been in ill health for several years.

Mrs. Firestone moved to Los Angeles in 1943 with her husband, president of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. of California, and had been active in community affairs and charitable work prior to her illness.

She and Firestone * * * were founding members of the Music Center and founding benefactors of the new Los Angeles County Museum of Art, where they established the Polly Firestone Gallery.

Mrs. Firestone was a noted amateur artist and had painted award-winning canvases for the last 10 years.

In 1951 she was named a director of Las Madrinas and in 1953 was appointed a vice president of the organization.

Mrs. Firestone also served as a member of the Women's Committee for the Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra and was a founding member of the Auxiliary of Good Samaritan Hospital.

She was married to Firestone, third son of Harvey S. Firestone, founder of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., in September 1932.

They lived in Akron, Ohio, for a number of years where Mrs. Firestone also was active in charitable work before coming to Los Angeles.

Mrs. Firestone was a native of South Orange, N.J., where she was a member of a widely known family.

The House Small Business Committee Reports to the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the hearings, studies, and reports of the House Small Business Committee during the 88th Congress are summarized in the current issue of my weekly newsletter, Capitol Comments.

The reports contain many recommendations directed to the attention of the 89th Congress, in consonance with the declared policy of the Congress that our Federal Government should protect and promote the interests of American small business.

The newsletter summarizing the activities and recommendations of the House Select Committee on Small Business during the 88th Congress, on which I had the honor of serving as chairman, are included in the Appendix of the RECORD under unanimous consent.

The newsletter article follows:

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE CALLS FOR ACTION ON WIDE RANGE OF PROBLEMS

Approximately 80 specific recommendations for actions dealing constructively with major problems of American small business are set forth in the House Small Business Committee's final report on its work during the 88th Congress.

The House Small Business Committee, on which your Representative serves as chairman, summarized in this report the comprehensive studies and investigations of the full committee and its subcommittees during the last Congress. This report (H. Rept. No. 1944) has been made public and is available in printed form upon request, along with five other new reports of the committee.

The other reports, which discuss in detail some of the matters summarized in the final report, include:

Small Business Administration, its organization and operation: Seventeen recommended steps to make this important Federal agency more helpful and effective are outlined in House Report No. 1935. Included is the recommendation that Congress promptly consider supplementary appropriations to the revolving fund in order that the SBA's financial assistance program not be curtailed.

The SBA has a revolving fund of $1.6 billion through which more than $2.5 billion in loans has been made available to small business firms since this program was established in 1953 by Congress. There are today more than 4.6 million small businesses in the United States representing better than 90 percent of American business.

Small business investment program: House Report No. 1934 makes numerous recommendations designed to strengthen this financial assistance program, under which privately owned, organized, and operated investment corporations make equity capital and long-term loans available to small business firms. More than 10,000 concerns have received over one-half billion dollars in such assistance since this program was established by Congress.

Dual distribution: House Report No. 1943 covers testimony received from small businessmen in 46 industries concerning the impact upon small business of dual distribution and vertical integration. This is one of the most comprehensive studies ever made of small business distributional problems.

Government procurement: House Report No. 1937 outlines 15 administrative actions which should be taken by various Government departments and agencies to insure that small business obtains a fair share of the Federal Government's procurement dollars.

Lumber standards: House Report No. 1936 is based on the subcommittee hearings that were held in response to complaints of small businessmen in the U.S. softwood lumber industry that new size standards would have harmful effects on their business. The subcommittee recommended that the Department of Commerce reconstitute the American Lumber Standards Committee so as to provide broader representation on this advisory panel.

Our committee's final report includes chapters on each of the subjects covered in the five separate reports, together with informative chapters on taxation, tax-exempt foundations, small business problems in urban areas, the economy and small business, corporate mergers, and the monopoly problem.

A chapter on small business and foreign trade, based on extensive hearings conducted in 1963, is another of the significant sections of our committee's final report. A chapter is devoted also to the Federal Trade Commission's advisory opinion on joint ads. This relates to our committee's work which resulted in the reversal of an adverse FTC decision on joint advertising by retailers—a reversal beneficial to druggists, hardwaremen, merchants, and other small business retailers.

In sum, the committee's reports for the 88th Congress make available a vast store of vital information to all who are concerned with the problems and the welfare of American small business. Copies of each of these reports are available without charge upon request to your Congressman or the House Small Business Committee, Washington 25, D.C.

How Chicago District Changed From Republican to Democratic Stronghold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, few, if any, of the States of the Union are more equitably divided into congressional districts than is Illinois. There are 24 congressional districts in Illinois, and the population of each of 12 districts, according to the 1960 census, was between 350,000 and 400,000.

How closely population compares in districts both in Chicago and downstate is shown by the census figures from the downstate 21st District, represented by Congressman GRAY, with a population of 263,196, a bare 2,300 under the 365,525 population of the Chicago-based 2d District, which I have the honor to represent, and about 10,600 over the population of the downstate 22d District, represented by Congressman SPRINGER, and 24,000 over the population of the downstate 17th District, which is represented by the distinguished, and I might add the ageless and fadeless minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Four only of the Illinois districts have populations exceeding 500,000—the 10th District, represented by Congressman COLLIER topping the list with 552,582.

CHICAGO A DEMOCRATIC STRONGHOLD

Chicago is strongly a Democratic city because the regular Democratic organization, headed by Mayor Richard J. Daley, functions on the principle that good and honest, efficient, and courteous service to the people is good politics. In the Second District, which I have represented in the administrations of four Presidents of the United States, and to the electors of which I am forever indebted and deeply and humbly grateful, are the University of Chicago, the Headquarters of the 5th U.S. Army, the great Museum of Science, Art, and Industry, the steel mills, and I have been told more churches and synagogues than any similar area in the world. Every ethnic segment of the American population is well and numerously represented in the Second District.

I know of no district in the United States that offers a more exciting and rewarding challenge to the student of American politics and the tides and trends that determine the fate of parties and the course of the Nation.

DISTRICT ONCE A GOP STRONGHOLD

In my young manhood the Second District of Illinois was one of the strongest Republican districts in the Nation, and in some elections topped them all in the size of its Republican majority. It is true that the district has been changed several times since then, but Hyde Park and most of Kenwood always have been in the Second District; and in the old days, Hyde Park and Kenwood were so

Republican that it was hard to spot a Democrat. I think there were only two other Democrats in the precinct where I voted when I was Lieutenant Governor of Illinois and living on Everett Avenue in Hyde Park, near the present home of Democratic Ward Committeeman Korshak.

Hyde Park is in the present fifth ward; Kenwood is largely in the 28 precincts in the fourth ward that remain in the Second Congressional District. In 1964, the fifth ward voted 24,806 to 4,231 to retain a Democratic Congressman and the 28 Kenwood precincts in the fourth ward voted 10,972 to 1,546. Fifty years ago it might have been the other way around.

Here are the official figures of the 28 precincts in the fourth ward, the alderman and ward committeeman of which is the Honorable Claude W. B. Holman:

	Precinct	Barratt O'Hara	William F. Scannell
Ward 4	16	400	15
	17	651	15
	20	414	7
	21	223	12
	22	306	32
	24	450	20
	25	496	10
	26	390	14
	29	244	196
	30	252	114
	31	424	85
	32	412	56
	33	330	73
	34	483	45
	35	442	34
	36	365	34
	37	345	16
	38	371	30
	39	400	42
	40	466	31
	43	342	41
	44	366	109
	48	307	120
	53	323	101
	55	288	2
	56	430	13
	59	503	15
	63	549	264
Total		10,972	1,546

Please note that in the 55th precinct the vote was 288 to 2, which I would call almost a perfect score. How the two dissenters got away from that Democratic precinct captain, I have no explanation. Please note, too, that in the 20th precinct, with 414 voting the way that brought gladness to my heart, only 7 voted the other way. And 496 to 10 in the 25th precinct, 503 to 15 in the 59th precinct, 651 to 15 in the 17th precinct, 430 to 13 in the 56th precinct, and on and on and on in the march of democracy under Committeeman Holman and his 4th ward stalwarts.

The best Republican precincts were the 29th and 63d. The former gave me 244 votes and by Republican opponent 196. The latter gave me 549, my opponent 264.

FIFTH-WARD RETURNS

Committeeman of the fifth ward is Hon. Marshall Korshak, former State senator with an outstanding record, present trustee of the santitary district and a topflight member of the Chicago bar. Here are the 1964 returns by precincts in the congressional election:

	Precinct	Barratt O'Hara	William F. Scannell
Ward 5	1	362	10
	2	286	167
	3	469	30
	4	482	25
	5	424	15
	6	472	33
	7	407	51
	8	371	125
	9	418	121
	10	266	183
	11	319	144
	12	340	124
	13	228	101
	14	340	181
	15	359	138
	16	266	79
	17	348	53
	18	468	18
	19	361	12
	20	364	89
	21	360	14
	22	404	53
	23	541	22
	24	348	158
	25	283	35
	26	372	78
	27	365	102
	28	375	16
	29	296	10
	30	413	137
	31	405	16
	32	333	25
	33	376	115
	34	512	24
	35	183	125
	36	568	21
	37	302	131
	38	312	157
	39	121	235
	40	233	113
	41	255	117
	42	375	110
	43	318	136
	44	497	17
	45	530	52
	46	394	9
	47	360	66
	48	417	28
	49	427	16
	50	441	14
	51	416	42
	52	390	55
	53	425	16
	54	527	21
	55	543	25
	56	484	10
	57	531	17
	58	497	13
	59	349	104
	60	473	10
	61	456	15
	62	420	14
	63	342	29
	64	487	9
Total		24,806	4,231

Please note, as I have with pride and appreciation, that 487 to 9 in the 64th precinct, that 484 to 10 in the 56th precinct, that 362 to 10 in the 1st precinct, 424 to 15 in the 5th precinct, 441 to 14 in the 50th precinct, 568 to 21 in the 36th precinct, and on and on and on in the march of democracy under Committeeman Korshak and the precinct stalwarts of the 5th ward.

There are 64 precincts in the 5th ward. One of the 64, the 39th precinct, went for my Republican opponent by a vote of 121 to 235. The next best Republican precinct was the 10th precinct, in which the Republican nominee received 183 to my 266.

SEVENTH-WARD RETURNS

Democratic committeeman of the seventh ward is the Honorable James A. Ronan, Democartic State chairman, member of Governor Kerner's cabinet, and one of the Democratic leaders in Illinois. This has been the ward of my residence for close to half a century. When I started running for Congress, the seventh ward was concededly Republican territory, but more and more came over to the Democratic side, the Democratic vote in 1964 setting the Democratic high water mark. Here are the returns by precincts in the 1964 congressional election:

	Precinct	Barratt O'Hara	William F. Scannell
Ward 7	1	462	28
	2	420	18
	3	629	33
	4	276	81
	5	231	131
	6	225	157
	7	305	114
	8	401	56
	9	397	96
	10	263	120
	11	246	133
	12	229	222
	13	264	284
	14	177	151
	15	157	154
	16	237	166
	17	340	159
	18	341	106
	19	210	194
	20	206	161
	21	401	78
	22	483	33
	23	180	190
	24	139	175
	25	479	110
	26	380	97
	27	250	112
	28	359	141
	29	248	164
	30	233	159
	31	274	261
	32	276	119
	33	187	365
	34	226	233
	35	211	277
	36	176	191
	37	226	232
	38	296	201
	39	204	185
	40	298	172
	41	255	154
	42	263	173
	43	418	116
	44	260	222
	45	296	113
	46	212	157
	47	315	188
	48	256	143
	49	202	181
	50	183	189
	51	312	180
	52	172	192
	53	274	235
	54	246	295
	55	258	243
	56	218	337
	57	153	204
	58	140	176
	59	163	198
	60	365	155
	61	310	123
	62	298	123
	63	243	108
	64	244	170
	65	339	88
	66	207	206
	67	351	151
	68	225	119
	69	191	209
	70	368	133
	71	213	274
	72	272	157
	73	185	127
	74	342	143
	75	248	180
	76	305	209
	77	297	140
	78	299	89
	79	288	93
	80	204	125
	81	226	207
	82	269	167
	83	306	87
	84	276	313
	85	190	213
	86	263	187
	87	295	321
	88	175	218
	89	161	215
	90	352	85
	91	257	145
	92	482	89
	93	382	27
Total		25,468	15,151

Please note with me the 420 to 18 in the 2d precinct, the 462 to 28 in the 1st precinct, the 529 to 33 in the 3d precinct, the 392 to 27 in the 93d precinct, and on and on and on in the march of democracy under Committeeman Ronan and the precinct stalwarts of the 7th ward.

Best Republican precinct was the home precinct of the Republican nominee, the 33d, which gave him 365 votes to my 187. There are 93 precincts in the fifth ward. They divide 73 Democratic, 20 Republican.

EIGHTH-WARD RETURNS

Until the last reapportionment, all the eighth ward was in the Second Congressional District and when I was first elected to the Congress, it was the strongest Republican ward of the district. Later, it became Democratic. The 31 precincts that remained in the Second District after the 1960 reapportionment, however, were inclined to go Republican. In 1962, I carried them by about 25 votes, 1 of 2 Democratic nominees who cleared the hurdle. In 1964, I was thankful to carry 24 of the precincts and to come close in the remaining 7. Here are the official figures:

	Precinct	Barratt O'Hara	William F. Scannell
Ward 8	2	207	144
	3	178	247
	4	187	165
	7	236	226
	13	198	173
	14	183	242
	19	152	240
	20	342	112
	21	276	207
	22	362	103
	23	249	233
	24	220	175
	25	186	139
	26	326	140
	27	369	89
	30	223	243
	33	201	155
	46	302	254
	48	141	180
	49	233	266
	50	301	212
	51	258	278
	57	285	160
	67	207	265
	68	202	143
	70	261	191
	72	236	194
	73	252	206
	77	256	226
	85	179	296
	98	217	155
Total		7,425	6,059

Please note the 369 to 89 in the 27th precinct, the 362 to 103 in the 22d precinct, the 342 to 112 in the 20th precinct. Best Republican precinct was the 85th, which gave my opponent 296 to my 179.

Russell O'Brien is the Democratic committeeman of the eighth ward, one of my longtime friends, as is his predecessor, James Sullivan, who as one of the then governing group sponsored my congressional candidacy in 1948 and earlier, in 1912, had rung doorbells for me as a candidate for Lieutenant Governor.

Hon. James Condon, former associate of mine in the office of the corporation counsel of Chicago, is the alderman of the eighth ward. Russell DeBow, formerly associated with me in the representation of the Second District, and now on the staff of Mayor Daley, is an important member of the eighth-ward team.

NINTH-WARD RETURNS

Ward committeeman of the ninth ward is the Honorable Leslie V. Beck, clerk of the appellate court. He is one of my oldest and dearest friends. Alderman of the ward is the Honorable Dominic J. Lupo, who has established an enduring record by his hard work and his willingness to give a tireless and helping hand on all worthy occasions. The Honorable Michael Hinko, onetime Democratic nominee for Congress and presently my personal representative, is a resident of the ninth ward.

Here are the returns by precincts from the ninth ward:

	Precinct	Barratt O'Hara	William F. Scannell
Ward 9	1	273	116
	2	173	254
	3	212	278
	4	189	217
	5	233	95
	6	268	153
	7	284	96
	8	295	168
	9	123	302
	10	259	139
	11	277	190
	12	162	297
	13	194	262
	14	216	238
	15	244	221
	16	286	153
	17	199	238
	18	194	268
	19	255	200
	20	179	272
	21	290	214
	22	251	207
	23	222	186
	24	463	15
	25	269	151
	26	169	179
	27	345	7
	28	406	11
	29	179	183
	30	251	218
	31	200	118
	32	217	261
	33	350	10
	34	187	176
	35	171	230
	36	205	219
	37	291	138
	38	222	204
	39	180	260
	40	196	219
	41	235	225
	42	493	12
	43	220	289
	44	234	198
	45	210	173
	46	193	169
	47	275	170
	48	250	120
	49	258	130
	50	331	63
	51	329	9
	52	210	261
	53	214	217
	54	208	218
	55	288	166
	56	238	172
	57	240	135
	58	174	188
	59	260	305
	60	218	290
	61	262	189
	62	225	261
	63	267	291
	64	183	287
	65	293	150
	66	262	192
	67	231	182
	68	177	200
	69	260	228
	70	351	94
	71	243	218
	72	227	159
	73	170	263
	74	279	165
	75	141	240
Total		18,187	13,982

Please note, as certainly have I, the 463 to 15 in the 24th precinct, the 345 to 7 in the 27th precinct, the 406 to 11 in the 28th precinct, the 350 to 10 in the 33d precinct, the 493 to 12 in the 42d precinct, the 329 to 9 in the 51st precinct, and on and on and on in the march of democracy under Committeeman Beck and the precinct stalwarts of the 9th ward.

TENTH-WARD RETURNS

Stanley Zima is the new ward committeeman of the 10th ward, succeeding the late Emil Pacini. It is no exaggeration to say that no party leader ever made a better showing in his first major campaign. He mapped and sparked the campaign that carried the 10th ward by a close 2-to-1 majority. There are 70 precincts in the 10th ward and all but 6 went Democratic. Here are the figures of the congressional election by precincts:

	Precinct	Barratt O'Hara	William F. Scannell
Ward 10	1	369	183
	2	224	124
	3	280	103
	4	307	206
	5	254	144
	6	228	118
	7	237	186
	8	283	89
	9	314	185
	10	315	203
	11	400	166
	12	293	258
	13	339	212
	14	350	180
	15	295	159
	16	291	81
	17	275	68
	18	309	92
	19	286	219
	20	432	31
	21	334	170
	22	261	70
	23	246	106
	24	241	118
	25	327	148
	26	297	160
	27	282	147
	28	373	165
	29	287	211
	30	248	104
	31	414	139
	32	161	215
	33	183	180
	34	251	224
	35	202	201
	36	180	279
	37	238	219
	38	226	267
	39	300	196
	40	370	101
	41	283	201
	42	296	218
	43	433	28
	44	242	65
	45	304	130
	46	225	117
	47	236	84
	48	329	142
	49	341	184
	50	181	161
	51	307	172
	52	314	144
	53	369	9
	54	378	170
	55	337	184
	56	301	131
	57	236	293
	58	234	201
	59	455	168
	60	356	161
	61	459	158
	62	398	140
	63	238	320
	64	366	121
	65	312	255
	66	268	281
	67	206	52
	68	345	188
	69	373	267
	70	315	276
Total		20,939	11,447

Please note the 369 to 9 in the 53d precinct, the 433 to 28 in the 43d precinct, the 432 to 31 in the 20th precinct, and on and on and on in the march of

democracy under Committeeman Zima and the precinct stalwarts of the 10th ward, not forgetting the great and invincible State legislative team of Daniel Dougherty, Nick Svalina, and Henry Leonard, and the steamworkers who have never been found wanting. My deepest thanks again to them, one and all, and to Joe LaMotte and Al Towers, who worked day and night with tireless dedication, and all the others this expression of a gratitude that will never fade.

TIDES AND TRENDS IN POLITICS

Mr. Speaker, in our high schools and colleges there is a healthy growth in political interest. The civic studies in our high schools and the courses in political science in our colleges have an ever-widening appeal to our youth. What makes our democracy click? What are the forces that bring changes to the status quo, how are they aroused, and concentrated into voter action? What is the how, when, and where of politics? I sincerely hope that the story of the Second District in Illinois, a district that in the span of my lifetime has changed from a Republican to a Democratic stronghold will make some contribution to better understanding of American politics and the tides and trends that determine the fate of parties and the course of the Ship of State.

The 10th Anniversary of the U.S. Nuclear Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on January 14 the President awarded the Enrico Fermi Award to Admiral Rickover. It is most appropriate that this award was made as we are observing the 10th anniversary of the U.S. Nuclear Navy.

When the Atomic Energy Commission announced the selection of Adm. H. G. Rickover as the recipient of the Enrico Fermi Award on November 21, 1964, in a public statement, I indicated my great pleasure at the receipt of this news. I said:

> In my opinion, Admiral Rickover has done more to further the development and uses of atomic energy than most of the prior recipients of this award. I believe his selection for the highest honor in the atomic energy field has been long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the President's remarks when he presented the award to Admiral Rickover and Admiral Rickover's response.

I would also like to include the Atomic Energy Commission's November 21, 1964, announcement of the selection of Admiral Rickover for this award. This announcement also contains a biographical sketch of Admiral Rickover which lists some of his outstanding accomplishments and a list of some of the honors which Admiral Rickover had earned and received previously:

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON UPON PRESENTATION OF ENRICO FERMI AWARD FOR 1964 TO VICE ADM. H. G. RICKOVER, U.S. NAVY, THE WHITE HOUSE, JANUARY 14, 1965

Admiral Rickover, it is a gratifying pleasure to participate in this ceremony recognizing your contributions to our Nation's security—and to our peaceful economic growth in the future.

The citation of this eighth Enrico Fermi Award states:

"For engineering and administrative leadership in the development of safe and reliable nuclear power and its successful application to our national security and economic needs."

In just 3 days, we shall be celebrating the 10th anniversary of the first sea voyage of a nuclear-powered submarine—the *Nautilus*. The Nation is grateful for your courageous and dedicated role in that historic development.

Over the 10 years since, the *Nautilus* has been joined by more than 50 other nuclear-powered naval vessels. Today our nuclear fleet numbers 22 attack submarines, 29 Polaris submarines, and 3 surface ships. Together these nuclear-powered vessels have traveled a total of more than 4,300,000 miles on patrol for peace and freedom.

Your personal leadership has made an invaluable contribution to our national security—and to our capacity for keeping the peace.

Your personal dedication to excellence—your personal faith in the future—offer examples which this Nation must emulate if we are to fulfill the potential that is ours.

In no field is the promise—and the challenge—more exciting that the peaceful potential of nuclear power.

Beyond the present naval applications, perhaps there may be much broader horizons for nuclear power on the high seas. I hope the day will come when nuclear power will be so economical for our merchant ships that the American Maritime Fleet will once again become preeminent—with a new generation of swift longrange nuclear-powered vessels.

You were instrumental in the construction of the world's first large nuclear generating station at Shippingport, Pa., in 1957. From that beginning, we are now able to foresee the day—only 15 years away—when we shall have some 70 million kilowatts of installed capacity from nuclear power generation stations.

I look forward to the day when this great energy resource can be applied to desalting the sea, assuring us the additional fresh water needed for our growing population and expanding industries. In these important years you have played a role of first importance in helping us to understand and use more rationally the great force of nuclear energy. It is often overlooked that your many accomplishments and contributions have been made while in the service of your Government. Your achievements and your career should stand as an example to the many present and future Government personnel that there is a large job that can be done—and that a job well done is recognized.

For these significant contributions to our national security and growth, I am privileged to present to you—on behalf of the Atomic Energy Commission and the people of the United States—the Enrico Fermi Award for 1964.

REMARKS BY VICE ADM. H. G. RICKOVER, U.S. NAVY, THE ENRICO FERMI AWARD CEREMONY, THE WHITE HOUSE, JANUARY 14, 1965

Thank you, Mr. President. I had the privilege of knowing Enrico Fermi. I admired him greatly for his scientific achievements and because he was a singularly warmhearted human being. To be a recipient of the award established in his name moves me deeply.

I have always felt that in honoring a person we must remember that all human achievement flows not only from individual effort but from associative effort as well. We, the living, are heirs to all the ideas and accomplishments of every human being who has ever lived. Nowhere is this more true than in the never-ending quest for new knowledge and for new ways to put this knowledge to practical use.

The developer of a new technology starts at the current technical level and seeks to raise it so as to profit from new scientific discoveries. By its very nature, this is a cooperative endeavor. Had our nuclear ship program not received the firm and constant support of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and of the Atomic Energy Commission, we would not today have a fleet of nuclear submarines and surface ships.

The naval reactors group which I am privileged to head designs the powerplants of these ships and supervises their construction and operation. This task is shared by all members of the group. The actual building of these plants is carried out by private industry working under close supervision and to the exacting standards necessitated by the nature of the atom.

In gratefully accepting this award I do so on behalf of the dedicated men and women in the laboratories, the factories, and the shipyards who build our ships, as well as the brave men who serve in them. All work long and hard to make it possible for the United States to have an effective and ready nuclear navy.

VICE ADM. H. G. RICKOVER TO RECEIVE AEC'S ENRICO FERMI AWARD FOR 1964

The Atomic Energy Commission has selected Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover as recipient of the Enrico Fermi Award for 1964 in recognition of his outstanding engineering and administrative leadership in the development of safe and reliable nuclear power and its successful application to our national security and economic needs. The award consists of a gold medal, a citation, and $25,000.

Admiral Rickover is the first engineer-administrator and the eighth person to receive the award, named for the late Enrico Fermi, leader of the group of scientists who achieved the first sustained, controlled nuclear chain reaction on December 2, 1942, at Stagg Field, Chicago.

The selection of Admiral Rickover for the award was made by the Commission after consideration of recommendations from its statutory General Advisory Committee. The award will be presented at a ceremony in January 1965.

Admiral Rickover first achieved national recognition for his leadership in the design, development, construction, and operation of nuclear propulsion systems for submarines and other naval ships. As early as 1946, before the Atomic Energy Commission was established, Admiral Rickover was assigned responsibility for investigating the use of nuclear reactors for this purpose. He assembled a team of naval officers and civilians at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and early in 1948 he headed the joint AEC-Navy program to develop the first naval nuclear propulsion system.

Utilizing the fundamental research on reactor materials and conceptual systems developed by the Oak Ridge and the Argonne National Laboratories, Admiral Rickover's group made steady progress in compiling the information and perfecting the techniques necessary to build the first nuclear submarine. He made American industry a partner in this effort at the Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory near Pittsburgh, the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory near Schenectady,

and at the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho. At these places the development of naval nuclear propulsion systems was carried out. A landmark in this effort was the initial operation on March 31, 1953, of the submarine thermal reactor, Mark I, the land-based prototype of the first nuclear submarine propulsion plant. This prototype plant performed a continuous full power run of 66 days duration. This was enough time to have carried a ship twice around the world without refueling and contrasts with the 4-hour full power run which is required for acceptance of new naval ships. This run served to highlight the virtually unlimited cruising range of the *Nautilus*, even at high speed. On June 14, 1952, the keel of the *Nautilus*, the world's first nuclear submarine, was laid by President Truman at Groton, Conn. She was launched by Mrs. Eisenhower on January 21, 1954, and went to sea on January 17, 1955.

This event was the beginning of a revolution in naval strategy and tactics. For the first time a true submarine was possible—one that could steam long distances almost indefinitely at high speeds. In February 1957, the *Nautilus* completed operation on its first nuclear core, having traveled 62,500 miles in more than 2 years without refueling. The arctic region was accessible to the nuclear submarine, as demonstrated by the voyages of the *Nautilus* and the *Skate* under the North Pole icecap. A new record was established in naval history by the *Triton*, the first submarine to circumnavigate the world underwater, completely independent of the earth's atmosphere. The impact of the development of nuclear power on the Navy's surface fleet was recently demonstrated by the round-the-world cruise of the nuclear ships *Enterprise*, *Long Beach*, and *Bainbridge* without replenishment of supplies or fuel.

In addition to his contributions to the development of the Nuclear Navy, Admiral Rickover also led the scientific, technical, and industrial team which developed and constructed the Shippingport Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) at Shippingport, Pa. This project has served as the basic laboratory for much of the reactor technology which has gone into the Nation's atomic powerplants. The Shippingport power station has supplied more than 1.7 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity to users in the Pittsburgh area since its initial startup in late 1957.

Two of the most important contributions of the Shippingport (PWR) project have been in the fields of reactor physics and reactor fuel technology. The PWR, with its "seed and blanket" design, demonstrated that it is feasible to obtain large amounts of power from a blanket of natural uranium surrounding a "seed" of highly enriched uranium core which serves as the driving element in a reactor which is cooled and moderated with ordinary water. While producing power and the seed-and-blanket design has the additional advantage of making possible the breeding of fissionable material from the very abundant element thorium in the blanket. As a result of Admiral Rickover's achievements in this program, the State of California has submitted a proposal for cooperative construction of a large thorium seed-blanket reactor which the Commission now has under consideration.

In the field of fuel metallurgy the Shippingport PWR project team, led by Admiral Rickover, has been responsible for the development of uranium oxide as a fuel material for large power reactors. Engineering studies of the PWR also produced many design improvements which have extended the life of reactor fuel elements and thus have contributed to the reduction in nuclear power costs. The first PWR core, placed in the reactor in late 1957, operated until February 1964, more than three times its original design life.

To extend the knowledge of basic reactor technology both in the United States and abroad, Admiral Rickover was also instrumental in establishing a school for reactor operators at Shippingport in which personnel from the United States and foreign utility companies are training as atomic powerplant operators. Admiral Rickover also established and maintains the Navy's program for the nuclear training of all officers and enlisted personnel involved in the operation of the Navy's nuclear powerplants.

In developing components and materials for naval propulsion and civilian power reactor systems, Admiral Rickover and those working with him soon discovered that the standards of reliability and safety established for conventional power systems were by no means sufficient for nuclear powerplants. The result has been the development of technical standards and specifications in the nuclear industry which would have been inconceivable a few years ago, and the formulation of realistic and comprehensive safety standards for propulsion and power reactors. So rigorous have been the standards for fabrication and operation of nuclear systems that they have surpassed conventional equipment in safety and reliability.

For his many achievements, Admiral Rickover has been awarded, among others, the following honors and awards:

American Legion of Merit for performance of duties as head of the electrical section, Bureau of Ships, 1946.

Made commander, Order of the British Empire, 1946.

Awarded Gold Star in lieu of Second Legion of Merit for performance of duty in development of nuclear ship propulsion program, 1952.

Awarded the Christopher Columbus Prize at the Fifth International Meeting of Communications in Genoa, Italy, October 1957.

Awarded Congressional Gold Medal for his accomplishments in successfully directing the development and construction of the world's first nuclear-powered ships and the first large scale nuclear power plant devoted exclusively to the production of electricity, 1959.

Presented the Distinguished Service Medal, for exceptionally meritorious service from January 17, 1955, to January 17, 1961, while in charge of the naval nuclear propulsion program in the Department of the Navy and in the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, January 1961.

Awarded Gold Star in lieu of the Second Distinguished Service Medal, for exceptionally meritorious service from January 1961 to January 1964 as manager, naval reactors, Division of Reactor Development, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and as assistant chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion, February 1964.

He has also been awarded numerous degrees by universities.

In addition to numerous articles, he has written three books and made two reports to the House Appropriations Committee (issued as separate publications):

"Education and Freedom (1959)," E. P. Dutton & Co.

"Swiss Schools and Ours: Why Theirs Are Better (1962)," Little, Brown & Co. (under auspices Council for Basic Education).

"American Education—A National Failure (1963)," E. P. Dutton & Co.

"Report on Russia (1959)," Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

"Education for All Children: What We Can Learn From England (1962)," Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

The first recipient of an award under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was the late Dr. Enrico Fermi, who was granted a $25,000 award on November 16, 1954.

The Commission decided that subsequent awards should bear his name. The seven previous Fermi Award winners are:

Year 1956: The late Dr. John von Neumann, noted scientist and mathematician and member of the Atomic Energy Commission, "for his contributions to the theory, design, and construction of fast computers and to the role of computers in the control and use of atomic energy."

Year 1957: The late Dr. Ernest O. Lawrence, director of the Radiation Laboratory, University of California, which bears his name, "for his invention and development of the cyclotron and for his many contributions in nuclear physics and atomic energy."

Year 1958: Dr. Eugene Wigner, professor of mathematical physics, Princeton University, for "contributions to nuclear and theoretical physics, to nuclear reactor development and to practical applications of atomic energy."

Year 1959: Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, who was chancellor of the University of California when he received the award "for discoveries of plutonium and several additional elements and for leadership in development of nuclear chemistry and atomic energy."

Year 1961: Dr. Hans A. Bethe, professor of physics at Cornell University "for contributions to nuclear and theoretical physics, to peaceful uses of atomic energy and to the security of the United States."

Year 1962: Dr. Edward Teller, associate director of the E. O. Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley, Calif., "for contributions to chemical and nuclear physics, for his leadership in thermonuclear research, and for efforts to strengthen national security."

Year 1963: Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, "for contributions to theoretical physics as a teacher and originator of ideas, and for leadership of the Los Alamos Laboratory and the Atomic Energy program during critical years."

The award citation for Admiral Rickover is as follows:

"For engineering and administrative leadership in the development of safe and reliable nuclear power and its successful application to our national security and economic needs."

The Enrico Fermi Award, authorized in section 157(b)(3) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, is international in scope, and may not be granted more often than once annually. Section 157(b)(3) reads in part:

"The Commission may also, upon recommendation of the General Advisory Committee, and with the approval of the President, grant an award for any especially meritorious contribution to the development, use, or control of atomic energy."

In 1964, the Commission reviewed the history of the Fermi Award and decided it would be desirable to extend the award criteria to recognize not only scientific achievement but also contributions to engineering and technical management in the development of atomic energy. The Commission also decided it would be consistent with the intent of the award if the monetary amount were returned to the level of $25,000 as awarded Dr. Fermi in 1954.

H. G. RICKOVER: BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover was born in 1900. After graduating from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1922 he served in various seagoing duties and became a qualified submariner in 1930. He then requested and was assigned to engineering duty in 1937. He studied electrical engineering at the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School and completed the course at Columbia University, New York, N.Y., from which he received the degree of master of science in electrical engineering. During World War II he directed the electrical sec-

tion of the Bureau of Ships and served briefly with the Manhattan district atom bomb project. After the war, he turned his attention to nuclear ship propulsion.

In 1946, he was assigned to the atomic submarine project, then under the Manhattan district, as assistant director of operations. Since 1947 he has worked in a dual capacity as manager, Naval Reactors, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and as assistant chief for nuclear propulsion, Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy.

Admiral Rickover first achieved national recognition for his leadership in the design, development, construction, and operation of nuclear propulsion systems for submarines and other naval ships. As early as 1946, before the Atomic Energy Commission was established, Admiral Rickover was assigned responsibility for investigating the use of nuclear reactors for this purpose. He assembled a team of naval officers and civilians at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and early in 1948 was made head of the joint AEC-Navy program to develop the first naval propulsion system.

Later, in collaboration with the outstanding scientists and engineers of the Oak Ridge and the Argonne National Laboratories, basic data on the nuclear properties of reactor materials were compiled and conceptual design systems for nuclear propulsion of ships were developed.

Admiral Rickover also brought industry into an active role, and at the Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory near Pittsburgh, Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory near Schenectady, and at the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho the development of naval nuclear propulsion systems was carried out. A landmark in this effort was the initial operation on March 31, 1953, of the submarine thermal reactor, Mark I, the land-based prototype of the first nuclear submarine propulsion plant.

On June 14, 1952, the keel of the *Nautilus*, the world's first nuclear submarine, was laid by President Truman at Groton, Conn. The event marked the beginning of a revolution in the concepts of naval propulsion. In February 1957, the *Nautilus* completed operation on its first nuclear core, having traveled 62,500 nautical miles in more than 2 years. For the first time a true submarine has become possible. Nuclear submarines such as the *Nautilus* and the *Skate* voyaged under the North Pole icecap, demonstrating that the polar regions were no longer inaccessible to ships. The *Triton* became the first submarine to circumnavigate the world completely submerged, independent of the earth's atmosphere. A graphic demonstration of the scope of Admiral Rickover's efforts and the value of nuclear propulsion to the surface fleet was recently provided when the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the guided missile cruiser *Long Beach* and the destroyer *Bainbridge* cruised around the world without refueling. From operating experience at sea, and from land prototypes, the effort to further develop nuclear propulsion has continued with great success.

Comparably important, but not so well known, is his direction and leadership of the Shippingport pressurized water reactor (PWR) project near Pittsburgh, Pa., from which came not only most of the basic technology for submarine and surface ship reactors but also a large part of the reactor technology used in our present day water-cooled and water-moderated nuclear power plants.

The Shippingport project was established in 1953 as an important national goal. It was the first large-scale central station atomic powerplant in the world and has served as the technical foundation for other reactor plants both private and Government owned. This plant has supplied more than 1.7 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity to users in the Pittsburgh area since its initial startup in late 1957 and has clearly demonstrated that nuclear fission can reliably and safely supply electricity to a utility network on a useful scale.

Notwithstanding its success and the production of electricity, the primary goal of the Shippingport project, under Admiral Rickover's direction, was advancement of the basic technology of water reactors. Some of the specific gains in reactor technology resulting from the Shippingport operation are in the fields of fuel and nuclear poison and technology; reactor physics; reactor control; reactor thermal, hydraulic, and mechanical design; basic heat transfer studies; fuel element failure detection systems; refueling procedures; primary coolant water radio-chemistry; and disposal of radio active wastes.

Two of the most important contributions resulting from Admiral Rickover's direction of the Shippingport (PWR) project have been in the fields of reactor physics and reactor fuel technology. The PWR, with its "seed and blanket" design, demonstrated that it is feasible to obtain large amounts of power from a "blanket" of natural uranium surrounding a "seed" of highly enriched uranium which serves as the driving element in a reactor which is cooled and moderated with ordinary water. While producing power the seed-and-blanket design has the additional advantage of making possible the breeding of fissionable material from the very abundant element thorium in the blanket. As a result of Admiral Rickover's achievements in this program, the State of California has submitted a proposal for cooperative construction of a large thorium seed-blanket reactor which the Commission now has under consideration.

In the field of fuel metallurgy the Shippingport PWR project team, led by Admiral Rickover, has been responsible for the development of uranium oxide as a fuel material for large power reactors. Engineering studies of the PWR also produced many design improvements which have extended the life of reactor fuel elements and thus have contributed to the reduction in nuclear power costs. The first PWR core, placed in the reactor in late 1957, operated until February 1964, more than three times its original design life.

For his many achievements, Admiral Rickover has been awarded, among others, the following honors and awards:

Awarded Legion of Merit for performance of duties as head of the Electrical Section, Bureau of Ships, 1946.

Made commander, Order of British Empire, 1946.

Awarded Gold Star in lieu of second Legion of Merit for performance of duty in development of nuclear ship propulsion program, 1952.

Awarded the Christopher Columbus Prize at the Fifth International Meeting of Communications in Genoa, Italy, October 1957.

Awarded Congressional Gold Medal for his accomplishments in successfully directing the development and construction of the world's first nuclear-powered ships and the first large scale nuclear powerplant devoted exclusively to the production of electricity, 1959.

Presented the Distinguished Service Medal, for exceptionally meritorious service from January 17, 1955, to January 17, 1961, while in charge of the naval nuclear propulsion program in the Department of the Navy and in the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, January 1961.

Awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the second Distinguished Service Medal, for exceptionally meritorious service from January 1961, to January 1964, as manager, naval reactors, Division of Reactor Development, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion, February 1964.

He has also been awarded numerous degrees by universities.

Admiral Rickover is married to the former Ruth D. Masters and they have one son, Robert. The Rickovers reside at 4801 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

In addition to numerous articles, he has written three books and made two reports to the House Appropriations Committee (issued as separate publications):

"Education and Freedom (1959)," E. P. Dutton Co.

"Swiss Schools and Ours: Why Theirs are Better (1962)," Little, Brown & Co. (under auspices Council for Basic Education).

"American Education—A National Failure (1963)," E. P. Dutton & Co.

"Report on Russia (1959)," Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

"Education for All Children: What we can Learn From England (1962)," Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

Washington Observance of 10th Anniversary of U.S. Nuclear Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago this past Sunday, January 17, these words signaled the successful launching of nuclear seapower by the U.S. Navy: "Underway on nuclear power."

In recognition of this important anniversary of the U.S. nuclear Navy, when the now Rear Adm. Eugene P. Wilkinson sent that message from the submarine *Nautilus*, ceremonies are taking place in various parts of the country. As a member of both the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Armed Services Committee, I was privileged to attend the principal public event in Washington last Wednesday night, under the sponsorship of Naval Reserve Public Relations Company 5-4 at the Hotel Willard.

Today, the U.S. Navy is the world's largest operator of nuclear reactors, and the uses to which these phenomenal powerplants are being put, and will be in the future, were extremely well recorded at the Washington salute to the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy.

The addresses were delivered by Admiral Wilkinson, first skipper of the *Nautilus;* newly seated Congressman WILLIAM R. ANDERSON of Tennessee, who was commanding officer of the *Nautilus* on her historic voyage under the North Pole, and Rear Adm. Bernard M. Stream, commander of the famed Nuclear Task Force 1 which recently completed Operation Sea Orbit by circumnavigating the world.

A similar message was delivered by Admiral Wilkinson in Boston today at a 10th anniversary luncheon cosponsored by the 1st Naval District and the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, which also is observing its 50th year of service to my home State. This is doubly appropriate in view of the fact that two of Admiral Stream's nuclear task force ships, the cruiser *Long Beach* and frigate *Bainbridge*, were built and commissioned in Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, our maritime nation has been underway on nuclear power for 10 years. The cause of freedom and security in the world demands that we continue on course into the future—at flank speed. It is with pleasure, therefore, that I join at this time with my colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], in recognizing this great anniversary in our nuclear history. In that connection, I desire to enter into the RECORD at this point the informative Washington dinner messages of the three aforementioned distinguished pioneers of our nuclear Navy—with which it has also been my privilege to be closely affiliated since its inception, along with the stalwart father of nuclear seapower, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover.

SIGNIFICANCE OF "UNDERWAY ON NUCLEAR POWER"

(Remarks of Rear Adm. Eugene P. Wilkinson, U.S. Navy, at the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy dinner, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., January 13, 1965)

Tonight we are saluting the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy, with zero time being 1100 hours, January 17, 1955, when Q.M.1c. Rayl, *Nautilus* quartermaster, sent a signal by flashing light to the U.S.S. *Sunbird* for furthter relay to commander submarine force, Atlantic Fleet—"underway on nuclear power."

Actually, 1100, January 17, 1955, wasn't the beginning at all. Just the opposite. That instant of time when *Nautilus* took in her No. 1 line and backed into the stream at Groton, Conn., marked the end of a job. A long, hard job that started with then Capt. H. G. Rickover and a select group of engineering duty officers at Oak Ridge National Laboratory in 1946. A job that, before it was through, involved a cross section of America, including Congress, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Navy, national laboratories, Federal bureaus, various colleges and universities, and a great segment of American industry. A job that included conception, controversy, congressional support, design, development, superior technical management, significant technological breakthroughs, construction and test. A pioneering program that saw many frustrations and setbacks, redesign and retest, years of never ending pressure, dedication, persistence, and at last consummation—*Nautilus* was ready to go to sea.

The dramatic end of this phase occurred only 17 days off a schedule made more than 6 years before; in 1948. A remarkable accomplishment for such a revolutionary development—and what a success. The ship worked perfectly from the first day. And then continued to do so, time after time, and every time thereafter.

The objective of the naval nuclear propulsion program is the design, development, production and operation of nuclear propulsion plants having high reliability, maximum simplicity and maximum fuel life for installation in ships ranging from small submarines to large combatant surface ships. This objective is being achieved. The tangible evidence of this is 92 nuclear-powered submarines and 4 nuclear-powered surface ships authorized to date. When completed this will be roughly 11 percent of our entire fleet numerically and about the same percent of the total tonnage. We should expect to see a similar, if not a greater, percentage increase in the next decade. The objective back in 1955 was simpler—just to get that one ship to sea. An inanimate mass of steel one day, the next a living ship that, those of us who were in her, will love all our lives.

Of the 96 nuclear ships authorized through fiscal year 1965, the surface ships: *Enterprise, Long Beach*, and *Bainbridge*—22 attack submarines, and 29 Polaris submarines have assumed their duties in the fleet. Others are operational, soon to report. In the more than 4½ million miles these ships have steamed, their accomplishments are legend. The Arctic explorations of Captain Anderson in *Nautilus*, followed by those of *Skate, Sargo*, and *Seadragon*; the submerged endurance runs of *Seawolf* and *Patrick Henry*; the speed and maneuverability of *Skipjack*; the first test firings of Polaris by *George Washington*; the increasing strength of the ever vigilant Polaris submarines on deterrent patrol; circumnavigation of the globe; first, submerged, by *Triton*, then, by Admiral Strean's Nuclear Task Force 1 in Operation Sea Orbit—all these exploits add in increasing tempo to naval history.

Nautilus' sailing marked the beginning of a new era in naval history—the age of nuclear naval power. The significance looms ever larger as our visions become realities in submersibles and ships with virtually unlimited range, endurance, and speed—making them some of the deadliest military weapons systems ever devised. The revolution in our Navy started by nuclear power has come a long way in the first 10 years, with greater possibilities ahead.

All of the combatant submarines being built or authorized will be nuclear powered. The advantages of nuclear propulsion are being carefully examined for their application to some of our future surface combatant ships. The Secretary of Defense has announced that a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, using only two reactors instead of eight, is now practicable. This will stimulate further studies of the economics of surface ship nuclear propulsion. As reactor technology continues to advance, we in the Navy look to a future in which many of the new major combatant ships will be nuclear powered and these nuclear-powered ships will help keep our Navy modern and strong so that it can continue to fulfill its traditional role of assuring the freedom of the seas effectively.

NUCLEAR NAVY—ONE OF NATION'S GREATEST ASSETS

(Remarks by Congressman WILLIAM R. ANDERSON at the dinner celebrating the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., January 13, 1965)

I am very glad to be here and I appreciate the forbearance of all of you who must realize that I am a bit late to be a qualified Navy spokesman and considerably early to be a congressional expert.

My problem doesn't stop here. Despite all my efforts to acquire the image of lawmaker and statesman, I find I'm still more closely identified with the North Pole than with Capitol Hill. I assure you, it is twice as hard and much more dangerous to reach Congress.

I want to express my warm appreciation to the Washington Naval Reserve Public Relations Company for conceiving and arranging this event. Having spent my last 3 years of Navy duty here in Washington, I am well aware of your versatility, your fine traditions, and the great contributions your unit has made toward a more effective and better understood Navy.

The last 10 years of our nuclear Navy have been eventful and bright with performance and potential. It is certain that the next 10 years can be years of progress, achievement, and consolidation.

The joint Navy-Atomic Energy Commission program has always been blessed with champions to serve the cause of nuclear propulsion.

Its number one champion originally stood almost alone. Tomorrow, that man, small in physical stature but gigantic in the breadth and depth of his character, intellect, and devotion, will leave his austere office to go to the White House to receive the Enrico Fermi Award from President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The Navy and the Nation are indeed fortunate that Adm. H. G. Rickover is willing to continue in his demanding assignment in the second decade of nuclear power.

There are also many champions of the nuclear Navy on both sides of Capitol Hill. I do not intend to diminish the credit due the Navy, but history will record that Congress, particularly during the early days, gave nuclear propulsion better attention, better service, and greater push than did the Navy itself.

We are most forunate that two Capitol Hill champions of nuclear power have now moved to powerful positions. I refer to Congressman MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The outlook for the next 10 years is brighter because of the judgment, vision, and leadership of these statesmen.

With the support and leadership of men of this type, the Navy now stands on the threshold of a historic changeover. The *Nautilus* and her successors and the dramatically powerful Polaris-firing submarines are a tremendous force in being. Nuclear Task Force 1, after its circumnavigation of the globe appears to be the prototype for the ships that will make our Navy the most powerful and adaptable the world has ever seen.

ENTER, THE SECOND DECADE

With more and more efficient nuclear propulsion systems being developed, the key question to a policy for the second decade of the nuclear Navy would seem to be how best to proceed with construction of nuclear surface ships.

The reason for our past timidity in this matter has, of course, been costs. In opening a discussion on nuclear surface ships, I want to make it clear that my purpose is not to criticize the decisions of the past but to make some suggestions bearing on future policy.

First of all, I think that in deciding whether to adopt an aggressive program of nuclear ship construction we should make sure all factors are considered.

It's important, first of all, that the figures on which we base decisions be true, complete costs of ship construction and operation, amortized over the useful life of the ship—development, construction, outfitting, operation, repairs, refueling.

Viewed on this basis, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has estimated that a nuclear carrier is just 3 percent more expensive in the long run than a conventional carrier. It is also, of course, much more effective than a conventional carrier. There are few Americans who would not be willing to invest this additional 3 percent in order to avoid dependence on obsolete, second-best ships for the defense of this country and the security of the free world.

Let us also remember the "spinoffs," the side benefits and returned dividends that have and will come from the development of nuclear propulsion.

Take the Shippingport reactor, this country's first full-sized commercial atomic generating plant. Shippingport is really a larger version of the *Nautilus* powerplant. Eventually, I believe we will realize that if the only result of the *Nautilus* development program had been a safe, satisfactory situation at Shippingport the money would have been well spent.

While our needs for commercial atomic power may not press us today, we must prepare for the time when they press in on us

rapidly—as, indeed, they are pressing in already on many nations hard up for conventional energy sources.

FOR GOOD OF MANKIND

Let us not forget, either, that the Stars and Stripes, flying from modern, swift, far-ranging nuclear ships comprises one of our most dramatic symbols of the success of the United States in harnessing the atom for practical, peaceful purposes—dramatic proof of this Nation's firm determination that the atom shall be used for mankind's good, rather than his destruction.

These considerations are difficult, I think, to place on the scale of cost accounting. But they must be included in our thinking. We cannot afford to deprive ourselves of our full potential power merely because it appears today to be a little more expensive, because what slide rule can measure the value of life and liberty?

So, as a new administration, with a sparkling mandate from the people, prepares to open new and ambitious vistas toward the fulfillment of the American dream, I think we must visualize ourselves as at a new departure, beyond which a wise nation will not only build fleets powered by the atom, but will embrace every opportunity to harness this elemental force for the benefit of all men, everywhere.

TASK FORCE 1—AND LOOKING AHEAD

(Remarks of Rear Adm. B. M. Strean, U.S. Navy, in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., January 13, 1965)

I am most happy to participate in this observance of that day in 1955 when Admiral Wilkinson signalled "Underway on nuclear power." I think it becomes increasingly clear that when the *Nautilus* got underway on the atom, the Navy got underway on the atom. In the intervening 10 years, much has been accomplished, and it was a great honor for me, this past year, to lead the surface manifestation of the progress we celebrate on a round-the-world cruise. I refer, of course, to all-nuclear Task Force One—the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the cruiser *Long Beach*, and the frigate *Bainbridge*, and Operation Sea Orbit. It is this voyage and its implications for all of us that draws me here tonight.

As you know, Task Force One left Gibraltar at the end of July on a west to east track, rounded Africa, crossed the Indian Ocean, turned south to Australia, crossed the southern Pacific and rounded Cape Horn to proceed up the east coast of South America and thence to Norfolk, arriving on October 3. This nuclear circumnavigation of the globe took 57 steaming days plus 7 days in port on good-will visits, transiting approximately 31,000 miles. It was made on the absolute ground rule that there would be no stops for refueling or replenishment of any kind. The three ports visited were for goodwill and crew morale purposes.

To begin at the beginning, Sea Orbit probably would not have come about had it not been for the tireless insistence of the late Adm. Claude Vernon Ricketts. Word came from him to study such a round-the-world voyage of our three nuclear surface ships. When the completed study pointed out the many obstacles in the way, the answer from Vice Commander of Nuclear Operations Ricketts was typical: "Take out the obstacles and study the project again." Such was the man. His determination and foresight will prove to be correctly placed, I think, again and again.

The objectives of Sea Orbit were several. Among them:

We wanted to test the capability of nuclear powered ships to maintain high speeds for indefinite periods of time and distance in all possible weather and sea states without refueling or replenishment of any kind.

We wanted to show these powerful modern ships and their potent airpower to peoples in distant areas of the world and thus enhance the political and military image of the United States.

We wanted to demonstrate the strategic mobility and the strategic utility of this new element of U.S. power.

And we wanted to demonstrate our ability to quickly reinforce U.S. power in remote areas of the world.

I think we accomplished these things and more. Time does not permit a full discussion here, but there are salient points which inevitably will leave a lasting and deep imprint upon the already illustrious nuclear progress we observe here tonight.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

On the technological side, Sea Orbit erased any lingering doubts about the reliability of these ships and their ability to take it. In all the voyage, the engineering plants suffered no casualties nor incidents of any kind. I seriously doubt that conventionally powered ships could have given such trouble-free performance.

All the advantages of nuclear power had not been apparent to us when operating in conjunction with conventionally powered ships. It's the old story that the complexion of your force may be set by the slowest ship in it or those which need refueling most often. Sea Orbit gave us the opportunity to test the nuclear ships by themselves. I can tell you that the ships of Task Force 1 exceeded all expectations.

A thing brought into focus for me was the complete independence of seaborne or short logistic support. This will be an enormous advantage in any future conflict because logistic support will be far more difficult and hazardous to provide than in World War II. Oddly enough, there is an analogy in the old sailing ships as related to the nuclear force; using the winds for movement, they, too, were limited in operations only by the provisioning and endurance of the crew.

When we left Gibraltar, we knew we would buy no supplies or use any facilities along the way. There was no need of any. All the ships carry 4 months' food supply, they carry a 6 months' supply of ship and aircraft spare parts, and they have onboard a full load of ammunition and aviation fuel together with a virtually unlimited supply of ship's fuel in the reactors. An all-nuclear force can go anywhere on the seas of the globe, remain on station with 100 percent readiness for all operations, deliver their combat load and return—all without logistic support.

The other side of the coin is speed and instant readiness. The nuclear force is underway minutes after the word "go," not hours or days. As a matter of fact, there was no special preparation for Sea Orbit at all as far as the ships were concerned. We could have shoved off on the world cruise with little or no advance notice. The tactical and strategic advantages of such instant readiness needs no belaboring here. Our speed of advance around the world was set at a modest 22 knots. This to allow for into-the-wind flight operations and the severe weather near the Antarctic. I only wish I were at liberty to tell you how much faster that rate could have been had we really wanted to press these ships.

What I have been saying here adds up to this: In addition to the many advantages of nuclear power, I know of no disadvantages except the much publicized one of somewhat higher initial cost. In this, I understand, there may be relief in sight through advances in reactor resign and construction. I, for one, most fervently hope it is true. For as I mentioned earlier, a mixture of the conventional and the nuclear only inhibits the performance of the nuclear. I agree with those who say that any firstline warship in the future which does not have nuclear power is doomed to an early obsolescence where global combat operations are concerned.

As I stated, both a mission and an accomplishment of Sea Orbit was to show our nuclear wares to nations which were both friendly and remote—remote in the sense that the U.S. Navy does not normally frequent these areas. Along our track, top-ranking foreign government and military people were flown out to the *Enterprise* for an operational show. The demonstrations included the launching of aircraft, the firing of live ordnance, the recovery of planes, and extensive tours of the ship. This only reached a chosen few. For populaces on the beach at larger cities, our pilots did their stuff in aerobatics and flyovers. These were underway visits exclusive of a few port calls, and thousands of people and hundreds of influential leaders were exposed to modern nuclear seapower for peace, courtesy of the U.S. Navy.

"ON THE SIDE OF PEACE"

It will take me many a day to understand and appreciate completely the many and varied reactions of these people to Task Force One. For one thing, I perceived three distinct comments on the broad plans from three different parts of the world. The gist if not the exact words of what the Africans said to us was "Thank God all this power is on the side of peace." Our English speaking friends said, "Thank God you are on our side." And our South American allies said, "Thank God this tremendous power is on the side of the free world." I must leave to the ethnologists and the demographers the unraveling of subtelties in these shadings of meaning.

All were impressed, if not dumbfounded, at the modernity of the ships and aircraft. They were amazed at the split-second timing of operations and they appreciated the teamwork of the crews. Invariably, they expressed wonder at the youth of our men, and that a 24-year-old could be the master of the Phantom II fighter aircraft. A ranking official from an African country probably spoke for all the underdeveloped countries when he said:

"My personal responsibility in my government is the training of our youth. I only wish that they all could have been here to see young Americans, to see what work really is and to see the faith and responsibility invested in 24-year-old pilots. It would have erased from their minds certain ideologies which are alien to economic development."

One of the most important dignitaries we met from "down under" was straight and to the point: "This is fantastic. I had to see it to believe it—but I can only comprehend what I have seen in retrospect."

On one of the thoughts that has come to me because of Sea Orbit, I, too, will need some time for contemplation. It is that other peoples in other lands just may have a sharper appreciation of mobile nuclear seapower than do we here at home.

I was amused at a question asked during one of our large press conferences, but I quickly sensed that the man's fellow correspondents saw no humor nor naivete in the question. It was: "Admiral, would you ever be ordered to destroy a whole continent?" Of course I put the nuclear fleet in perspective. But the point is that here was a pretty good understanding of the capabilities in the presence of powerful, modern, nuclear naval forces. Not only that, but I felt almost everywhere a good understanding of the uses of potent and flexible forces on the high seas to express or enforce the national intent. I also felt an appreciation that the intent of the United States was in the cause of free men. I refer again to the voices heard round the world saying, "Thank God all this power is on the side of peace."

I feel most privileged to have been invited here for this occasion. I think we can say that Sea Orbit actually began 10 years ago at Groton, Conn., with Admiral Wilkinson, and was helped further along the way by Congressman ANDERSON. Certainly it would not have been possible at all without the fine and astute hand of Admiral Rickover. In this sense, tonight is a time to pay tribute to the countless numbers of dedicated people within both Government and American industry who took the nuclear age to sea.

THE KEEL IS LAID

But tonight also is a time to look forward. Although nuclear submarines and surface ships hold a high degree of modernity, these might be considered as the laying of the keel for the true nuclear Navy to come.

The facts of life in the world of international politics and the peculiar relationship between the oceans and the affairs of men will combine to make the Navy of tomorrow an even greater contributor to the well-being of our country and our allies. May the spirit and the determination which brought forth the *Nautilus*, 10 years ago again prevail. I think we should face the days of our future with the most modern seagoing forces our technology can provide—nuclear ships. Thank you.

Nuclear Navy Message by Representative Holifield at U.S.S. "Truxtun" Launching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an important talk made by my esteemed colleague, Mr. CHET HOLIFIELD, at the launching of the Navy's newest nuclear-powered warship, the frigate, U.S.S. *Truxtun*. The *Truxtun* was launched on December 19, 1964. This is the only nuclear-propelled naval surface warship now under construction.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which CHET HOLIFIELD is chairman and BILL BATES and I are members, delved into the question of nuclear propulsion for surface vessels of the Navy in hearings in October and November of 1963 and found that the military advantages of nuclear power is acknowledged by all. But still the Department of Defense is only building conventionally powered warships. Cost effectiveness comparisons are always cited by the Department of Defense to support the contention that the military advantages of nuclear power are not important. The erroneous assumptions in such comparisons were brought out in the Joint Committee report—Report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, "Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels," December 1963.

Only 4 days after the launching of the nuclear-powered *Truxtun*, the newspapers reported that the Secretary of Defense had turned down the Navy's request to build a nuclear-powered destroyer leader in the fiscal year 1966 program. The news reports cited relative costs of nuclear and conventional destroyers that were substantially different from the relative costs given to the committee in our hearings. According to the news reports there are to be no surface warships, conventional or nuclear, in the fiscal year 1966 shipbuilding program—as was the case in the fiscal year 1964 and 1965 programs.

We will surely want to review any new studies of nuclear power for surface warships completed since our hearings in 1963 including the basis for the latest comparative cost estimates.

We in Congress are all aware of the part Congress played in overcoming the initial reluctance in the Department of Defense to building nuclear-powered submarines. It is evident that if we are to complete the transition from sail to coal to oil to nuclear power in our surface fleet, the Congress will have to play a similar active role to lead the way. I urge all of you to consider CHET HOLIFIELD's remarks carefully:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN CHET HOLIFIELD AT THE LAUNCHING OF U.S.S. "TRUXTON" (DLG(N)35), NEW YORK SHIPBUILDING CORP., CAMDEN, N.J., DECEMBER 19, 1964

It is a great honor to take part in this memorable ceremony. The launching of the *Truxton* marks another major step in the building of the new nuclear Navy for the defense of the United States.

Almost two centuries ago, Thomas Jefferson said in his first message to Congress:

"We should at every session of Congress continue to amend the defects * * * in the laws for regulating the militia * * * " and "* * * until we can say we have done everything for the militia which we could do were an enemy at our door."

Referring to this passage, President Johnson recently added these words:

"We need and we want our most able men—of all grades—to make the military a profession. We want them to be able to know their service to Amercia's defense will not be a disservice to their families' dignity. We cannot promise—they do not ask—assurance of comfort. None can know what tomorrow may require of any of us or all of us. But we can promise—and our citizens in uniform may expect that we shall provide them with—the best and most modern arms in the world."

It was this same philosophy that led the Congress 3 years ago to take the initiative to authorize and appropriate the extra funds to change the U.S.S. *Truxton* from an oil-fired frigate to be our fourth nuclear powered surface warship.

JOINT COMMITTEE SUPPORT

I have been privileged to be a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy since its inception. The Joint Committee is charged, by law, with the responsibility for making continuing studies of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy. The committee has historically played a creative role in fulfilling the declared statutory policy of the United States that the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to make the "* * * maximum contribution to the common defense and security."

In furtherance of this responsibility, the Joint Committee, from its inception, has been interested in and vigorously supported research and development in the field of naval nuclear propulsion; first, for submarines and then for surface ships. The history of the early years was marked by a reluctance within the Defense Department to use nuclear power for the propulsion of submarines.

Now that we have over 50 nuclear submarines at sea—now that our Polaris armed nuclear submarines stand their watchful guard hidden under the oceans of the world—few remember that it was the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that arranged to buy the nuclear powerplants for our first two nuclear submarines, the *Nautilus* and *Seawolf*, with Atomic Energy Commission funds, because the then Capt. H. G. Rickover was not able to get the necessary support in the Department of Defense for his project in the early 1950's.

Let us beware that history does not repeat itself. The military advantages of nuclear propulsion for naval surface ships have been acknowledged by all. We must be alert to assure that our future capital naval surface ships incorporate the proven advantages of nuclear propulsion.

The operations of our first three nuclear surface warships, the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the cruiser *Long Beach*, and the frigate *Bainbridge*, have been an outstanding success. However, only one more nuclear-powered surface warship, the *Truxtun*, we are here to launch today, is currently under construction. In the interval between starting the nuclear frigates *Bainbridge* and *Truxtun*, nine conventional frigates have been laid down.

HEARINGS ABOARD "ENTERPRISE"

Three years ago the Joint Committee flew to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to hold hearings abroad the aircraft carrier *Enterprise* during her shakedown trials. Our report of that hearing emphasized:

"The United States must prosecute vigorously the conversion of the Navy to nuclear propulsion in the surface fleet as well as in the submarine fleet."

Just as in the last century when the issue was between sail and coal, and early in this century when the issue was between coal and oil, so today is the issue between oil and nuclear power—and today's issue is no less vital.

Nuclear propulsion has the fundamental advantage of permitting our warships to go anywhere in the world, to deliver their combat load, and to return, all without logistic support. Nuclear propulsion in combatant ships will free the striking forces of our Navy from the obvious restrictions of reliance on a worldwide propulsion fuel distribution system.

As the number of foreign nuclear submarines increases and as the air striking capabilities of our potential enemies increase, the difficulty of providing logistic support will surely increase. After only a few days steaming at high speed, oil-fired warships must use fuel from their combat reserves unless a tanker is immediately available at the scene. The basic reason for developing nuclear power for surface warships is to reduce this logistic support, support which will be most difficult, if not impossible, to provide in wartime.

Last year, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy made an exhaustive study of the subject of nuclear propulsion for surface warships. Our committee concluded that each new warship the United States decides to build for our first-line naval striking force should be the best that our technology will allow and should, therefore, have nuclear propulsion, even if a somewhat higher cost is incurred to pay for the increase in military capability.

The committee was told by the Department of Defense that the choice we face is between a given number of conventional ships and a smaller number of nuclear ships for the same total cost. In other words, to improve a weapon system, we must reduce the number of weapons to pay for it. I do not share this view.

DEFECTS IN ANALYSIS

Cost effectiveness comparisons were cited by the Defense Department to support the contention that the advantages of nuclear propulsion are not particularly significant.

These studies, however, contain a fundamental weakness that negates their validity. The comparisons were based on the assumption that in wartime logistic support forces operate unhampered and without losses. The defect in this analysis is immediately apparent. We must plan for times of crisis. It is precisely in such situations that the superior mobility, maneuverability, and reliability of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled naval striking force.

Our potential enemies may not use the same cost effectiveness criteria and thus oppose us with the best weapons technology can provide them. This could create an intolerable peril to our national security.

Our committee printed for the public record a report of these hearings in December 1963. In releasing this report, our chairman, Senator PASTORE, said that "* * * the Joint Committee believes that cost cutting is important but it must eliminate the fat and not cut to the marrow. * * *

"It is my earnest hope that we will never again be forced to go to war, but if we do, I want our equipment to be second to none."

Just as men of vision in the past faced heavy opposition to bring about the change from sail to coal and the change from coal to oil, we who understand the great advantage of nuclear propulsion face an uphill struggle in obtaining support for its use in the surface fleet.

But we don't tire easily. We will undoubtedly look in on the studies which have been carried out in the past year since our hearing. I sincerely hope that the new studies will be more realistic in evaluating the advantages of nuclear power.

NUCLEAR MERCHANT SHIPS

In addition to the propulsion of flirstline surface warships of the Navy, I believe it is time to consider nuclear propulsion for our firstline merchant ships. Nuclear propulsion could provide the revolutionary factor we need to strengthen our merchant fleet for peacetime and also provide vital military logistic support in times of emergency.

The views I have expressed are, of course, not in conflict with the advanced thinking of the new Navy. I know that the worth of nuclear propulsion under wartime conditions is known to many of you here. As you know, the advantages of nuclear power are most evident under wartime conditions and that is the basis under which systems of war should be evaluated.

There are encouraging signs that the true significance of the increased capability of nuclear propulsion is beginning to achieve recognition. The 30,000-mile cruise around the world of the first nuclear-powered task force was completed only 2 months ago. This cruise proved conclusively the feasibility of operating nuclear surface ships in the oceans of the world on a self-sustaining basis. It gave world leaders the opportunity to witness firsthand the capability of the U.S. Navy to operate nuclear-powered warships anywhere independent of support ships—a feat out of the question for conventionally powered ships. In the last 3 years, the *Enterprise, Long Beach,* and *Bainbridge* have proved their outstanding reliability during almost 500,000 miles of operation.

Further and even more encouraging is the recent decision announced by President Johnson to proceed with the development of a very high-powered, long-fuel-life nuclear reactor for application to a two-reactor nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier. This carrier will require refueling only once during her life. The development of this reactor will be completed in time for it to be installed in the next carrier planned by the Navy.

In summary, if capital ships of the Navy are deemed necessary for the security of the Nation—and I believe they are—they should be nuclear propelled.

NUCLEAR POWER A "MUST"

The future is clear. Any capital ship in the future which does not have nuclear propulsion is doomed to obsolescence early in its expected life. The additional costs for nuclear propulsion are minor and, in fact, insignificant, when one considers how vitally important it is to the effectiveness of the ship as a weapons system.

As we celebrate today the launching of our latest nuclear warship, the *Truxtun,* I hope this event will mark the point in the history of the U.S. Navy where our Nation will accept the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy "that the United States adopt a policy of using nuclear propulsion in all future major surface warships" thus adding another link to the inevitable chain from sail to coal, from coal to oil, and from oil to nuclear power.

Godspeed to all who will sail in *Truxtun.* Our freedom depends on the brave men who man such ships as this. The least we can do is provide them with the best that our technical resources will allow.

If Nasser's a Moderate Then So Were Hitler and Mussolini

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we have lately seen a propaganda campaign carried on in certain parts of the press to change the image of President Nasser of the United Arab Republic.

Many of us have tried to point out through the years just how dangerous this man is to the future of the Middle East generally and to Israel in particular. Dr. William Korey, director of the New York Bureau of the B'nai B'rith International Council, has written an article which appeared in the December, 1964, edition of the National Jewish Monthly, using Nasser's own words to describe the miscreant that he is.

The article follows:

IF NASSER'S A MODERATE THEN SO WERE HITLER, MUSSOLINI, AND OTHER DICTATORS WHO FRANKLY SHOUTED THEIR SINISTER AIMS, BUT NOBODY TOOK THEM AT THEIR WORD

(By Dr. William Korey)

In a variety of circles a studied attempt is being made to cast Gamal Abdel Nasser, President of the United Arab Republic, in the role of a moderate anti-Communist statesman who merits the sympathy of the West for aims allegedly progressive in character. An example of this buildup was an article in a mass circulation magazine last year. The author, after calling upon Americans to look with sympathy upon Nasser's objectives, concluded: "For if Nasser fails to unite the Arabs on terms of independent neutrality and a desire for progress, someone more violent may offer to finish the task that Nasser has begun."

The parallel between this effort and the one made in the mid-thirties by certain circles to portray other dictators as moderate anti-Communist rulers who required the sympathy of the West for their national objectives is disturbing. Just as few then bothered to read the actual works of these dictators, and their many explicit statements on hate as well as aggression, so too today insufficient attention is being given to the numerous assertions of the Egyptian ruler and the organs that he commands, which set out in detail his destructive, hate-filled, and expansionist purposes.

QUOTES "PROTOCOLS OF ZION"

The most recent disclosure of President Nasser's views came in a startling interview published on May 1 in the shrill neo-Nazi German journal, Deutsche National Zeitung und Soldaten Zeitung. Almost as extraordinary as the interview itself is the fact that it has received virtually no attention in the West.

To the interviewer, Dr. Gerhard Frey, Nasser betrayed a set of preconceptions characteristic of the stereotypic thinking of those who forged the notorious "Protocols of the Elders of Zion." He contended that "World Zionism exercised control over the Western powers." Later, he told Dr. Frey that "where we do not have to face direct Zionist influence, we find an American, an Englishman, or a Frenchman acting as agents for the Zionists." Such assertions would not have surprised anyone who is familiar with another interview he granted in 1958 to R. K. Karanjia, editor of the Indian journal, Blitz, Nasser told Karanjia: "I wonder if you have read a book called 'Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion.' It is very important that you should read it. I will give you an English copy. It proves clearly, to quote from the Protocol, that 'Three hundred Zionists each of whom knows all the others, govern the fate of the European Continent * * *'."

But Nasser went even further in his talk with Dr. Frey. He revealed that his "sympathies" were with Nazi Germany "during the Second World War," and added: "Surely no one still accepts the lie of the 6 million murdered Jews? Not even the simplest man in the street here believes it." He went on to denounce the war crimes trials now being held in West Germany. The real war criminals were to be found in Tel Aviv, he charged. Only Israel could benefit from these trials by extracting more money from the Germans, he added.

The violent impulses which govern Nasser's thoughts about Israel can be found in this exchange:

FREY. "Your Excellency, may I be quite brutal? Do you propose to crush Israel?

NASSER. "I hope so."

This comment by Nasser is hardly unusual. Here are three assertions made by him during the past few years:

"We do not deny that we want war. We want war; this is our right. The return of Palestine is impossible without war." (Oct. 13, 1960.)

"We will act to realize Arab solidarity and the closing of the ranks that will eventually put an end to Israel * * *. We will liquidate her and imperialism in our land * * *." (Aug. 17, 1961.)

War against Israel is inevitable. I will begin the war when I am certain that all factors for success are on our side." (In an interview published February 1962.)

YEMEN IS TRAINING GROUND

As late as last July 2, he told the graduates of the Egyptian Air Force Academy that "the war between ourselves and Israel cannot be avoided because Israel is the aggressor."

That Nasser regarded his military intervention in Yemen as a training ground for the forthcoming war is suggested by the comments made last year (May 9, 1963) by the commander of the United Arab Republic forces in Yemen, Major General Saadi Nagib: "We gained good training in Yemen, and we are ready to fight the big battle against Israel."

In preparing itself for its military objectives, the United Arab Republic will have purchased from June of 1955 through 1964 almost three-quarters of a billion dollars in weapons from Soviet bloc countries, according to available estimates. Such estimates indicate that expenditures for weapons have

risen sharply from $70 million in 1961 to approximately $130 million in 1962.

Further, some 500 West German scientists and technicians, many of whom worked for the Hitler war machine, have been engaged by the Nasser Government to equip it with advanced instruments of warfare, including planes, missiles, and rockets. Nasser has himself made clear how the new weaponry will be utilized. On December 23, 1962 he said: "Yesterday I visited our atomic reactor and I was filled with confidence in our future. Israel may well be a little nervous. Now she has reason to be, for the future belongs to the Arabs and not to Israel. We possess missiles."

That the planned destruction of the Israeli state is powered ideologically by a violent philosophy of hate is made apparent by numerous assertions broadcast by Egyptian officials on radio, newspapers and other media. Indeed, Nasser has not been adverse to using former Nazi ideologists, supporters, and war criminals to assist him in his endeavors. One example is Dr. Johannes von Leers. A writer of numerous anti-Semitic works, who had been associated with Joseph Goebbels' Propaganda Ministry, von Leers was hired by Egypt in 1956 and has authorized inflammatory anti-Israel broadcasts for Cairo Radio. A second example is the former camp physician at Buchenwald, Dr. Hans Eisele. Charged with responsibility for the deaths of numerous inmates of that infamous camp, he fled West Germany and today holds a position in a Messerschmitt airplane factory in Cairo. A third example is Dr. Wilhelm Voss, formerly head of the Hermann Goering Works of Nazi Germany and later, of the Skoda Works in Nazi-occupied Czechoslovakia. In the fifties he developed a number of munitions plants for the Nasser Government.

The aspirations of Gamal Abdel Nasser extend far beyond Israel. The distinguished British historian, Professor H. R. Trevor-Roper, a close student of Fascist policies, last November categorized Nasser's aims as "the nearest approach (today) to a genuine Fascist movement" in its "imperialist and expansive" objectives. Like Mussolini, Trevor-Roper noted, Nasser "dreams of a revived Arab empire in the Middle East."

Arab countries have been the first to express concern about Nasser's imperial policies. In 1957 Sudan complained to the U.N. Security Council about Egypt's military occupation of part of its territory; on May 22, 1958, the representative of Lebanon addressed to the President of the Security Council a letter concerning Egypt's intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon; and on July 17, 1958, the representative of Jordan forwarded a letter to the Security Council concerning Egypt's intervention in its affairs. More recently, the office of the Secretary General was compelled to deal with the matter of intervention by this same government in the affairs of Yemen.

Such interventions, as well as numerous incitements to violence, like the appeal for the liquidation of Israel, stand in sharp contrast to the attempt to project an image of Nasser as one who stands for moderation and sweet reasonableness. Documentation of the utterances of Nasser and of his propaganda organs, indeed, makes the projected image wholly fraudulent.

The danger is that political machinery is presently being established that could channel Nasser's threats into eventual military conflict. Among the decisions taken at the recent Alexandria conference of Arab League powers was the creation of a Palestine Liberation Army. Its formal existence, together with the sizable allocation of funds made by the League to equip it and other Arab armies with military hardware, constitutes a real, if not immediate, threat to the peace.

Mining Views on American Monetary Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, many persons and pressure groups are making proposals to solve the precarious problems of the U.S. monetary policy.

Mr. Jack Fraser, staffwriter for the San Jose Mercury-News, presents the view of a mining expert with outstanding credentials. Prof. Evan Just's views should be considered thoroughly as we undertake to make some hard decisions on these important, even vital, subjects relating to our money and our monetary system.

General De Gaulle, in another neat little knifing thrust at the Nation which freed France from the Nazis and rebuilt it, last week demanded to buy $150 million in U.S. gold.

The Gaullist move was the latest threat to the integrity of the U.S. dollar.

It caused widespread concern, helped propel a rush of hot money to West Germany, sent the price of gold up to $35.17 in the London market, and stirred to new fever those who heard gold.

A tall man who wears lumberjack coats and has traversed the globe in search of treasure was not surprised. He has been warning for years of a possible loss of confidence in America's money.

Evan Just is professor of mining and executive head of the department of mineral engineering at Stanford University.

He is considered one of the world's authorities on mining and for 10 years was editor in chief of the Engineering and Mining Journal.

He can tell you about the possibilities for a revival in silver (good prospects) and gold (poor) mining in the West. He can discourse on emeralds, oil, zinc and lead, bauxite, titanium, bureaucrats in Russia (he worked there for a year), the intricacies of the Federal Government, and teaching compared to a business life.

But what he most likes to talk about is the case for valuable money.

Just charges the U.S. Government has "defrauded" its citizens since 1934 and is getting ready to effect new schemes which will further weaken the value of U.S. money and the earnings and savings of Americans.

The French may have decided to topple the U.S. currency by demanding more gold for dollars than the United States has in reserve. France has undermined the money of other so-called allies before (England in 1931).

But Just says Americans cannot blame what he terms the precarious position of the U.S. currency on General de Gaulle or anyone else.

And he predicts, "the money managers" soon will take new steps to stop the outflow of gold which will make U.S. money worth even less. The Treasury may ask that less than 25 percent gold reserves be required by the Government or it may devalue the dollar, he said.

"Congress will have to go along with this," Just claims, "as Congress has been a full participant in the policies which have caused national insolvency."

Just sees gold or any precious metal as the natural enemy of what he terms the welfare state.

"Gold in the monetary system, domestic or international, plays the role of a policeman, placing curbs on financial" spending beyond income, he says. "Neither a monstrous bureaucracy nor a citizenry bribed with its own money will accept any curbs on spending appetites" and therefore must seek ways to minimize requirements that hard money back currency, he claims.

Just thinks it is "outrageous" that since 1934 U.S. citizens haven't been allowed to hold gold or to redeem dollars with it. He thinks hiking the debt ceiling, Federal budgets which are not balanced, and heavy spending at home and overseas are symptoms of "the untrustworthy character" of Government leaders and the erosion of the power of gold.

"I do not think it is a proper role of Government to swindle anybody," he says.

"Money is for the public, or it should be, but if the public is indifferent, it sooner or later will be degraded." Just makes it clear he thinks Americans have shown far too little interest in demanding an accounting from the Federal Government.

He would like to see U.S. currency backed 100 percent by gold. Now backing is 25 percent and this figure may go lower, he said.

Just says "The Government is now studying" putting less silver in coins and he says there are some monetary managers who would like to get silver out of the system entirely."

He thinks this could arouse the long silent public. Americans might accept less silver in small coins, he said, but could howl about a cheaper value dollar. (The dollar now actually contains about 90 cents worth of silver, he said. No coin could be worth exactly its face value or it would disappear from circulation, snapped up by hoarders.)

"Several countries have gone to aluminum and alloys in their coins. There is a public reaction to these cheap feeling coins. I think coins should have heft and beauty. France in recent years has returned to silver in the franc," he noted.

Ninety-cent silver for years was a good enough price to keep most U.S. production going to the Treasury. "But in recent years industry has taken it all. There is a great demand for silver in desalination of water, as a conductor in electronics, and as a shield against radiation.

Therefore Just says "a great search for silver is underway," and the industry is booming in Nevada and in places like Colorado, Utah, and Idaho where silver is a byproduct of zinc and lead mining.

The price could go to $1.50 an ounce; some think $2, he said.

Gold is different. The Government in 1934 set the price at $35 an ounce. Industrial and private demand is not enough, he said, to push it higher.

Gold producers should get at least three times $35 considering inflation and rising costs since 1934, he said. But the goldminer, in California's mother load and elsewhere, has been limping. The United States produces now only 3 percent of the world production (South Africa mines 52 percent, and Soviet Russia is a big producer.)

California produces less than 10 percent of the U.S. output, and Just sees a gloomy future. Mines would have to go deeper at great cost, he said, and the men who could run them have moved away to urban centers.

"I have a lot of friends in the mother lode who think a revival is coming. They think it will come when gold goes to $75 an ounce. I hate to say it, but it would take around $100, and it's hard for me to believe that will happen."

Justice on Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, the Catholic Herald in Sacramento, Calif., published an excellent editorial, entitled, "Justice on Farm."

I believe this editorial is noteworthy because it indicates that this church group has faced reality and admits a farmer's problem with respect to agricultural labor which many groups have long ignored.

I commend this article to my colleagues as an objective and fairminded treatment of a difficult subject.

The article follows:

JUSTICE ON FARM

Many crises are destined to beset the agricultural front in 1965 if the problems of all concerned are not weighed in the scales of justice.

The basic issue is a perennial one, the plight of America's farm laborer. Now that the bracero program has been terminated, the issue must be faced: How to make work on the farm attractive enough to obtain the services of a sufficient home labor force to harvest the Nation's crops?

This goal can be accomplished only if the wage provided is a living one and only if employment conditions reflect a human concern for those who work.

It will not be realized unless the plight of the farmer is considered as an integral part of the total problem. In truth, that plight may be called the heart of the problem.

In an era of an expanding national prosperity, the U.S. farmer has been caught in a cost-price squeeze which is ruthless.

During the past 20 years, the farmer has seen the cost of production increase at a staggering rate, following the pattern common to all sectors of the economy. But unlike other economic fields, the price for farm products received by the farmer has not begun to keep pace.

Statistics bear out this observation. In 1947, the gross farm income was $34 billion. By 1963, it had increased to $41 billion. However, in that same period of time, the net farm income had decreased from $17 to $12 billion. The diminishing return is explained by production expenses soaring from $17 to $29 billion.

To keep pace with a modernized agriculture, the farmer has had to pay increasing amounts for new equipment and its maintenance, for products to enrich the soil and for electricity to provide water.

The farmer has not been able to control the amount paid for these factors of production. He has paid the inflationary amounts or gone out of business.

The only production factor which has been kept stationary like the farmer's gross income has been the wage paid farm laborers.

In 1963, farm people received $1,480 of personal annual income per capita, of which $510 was from nonfarm sources. Per capita income of nonfarm people was $2,515. The average hourly return for farm work was $1.01, while 1 hour's work in a factory averaged $2.46.

There can be no question on moral grounds that the farm laborer's wage must be increased, drastically increased. Neither should there be any question that the farmer who is expected to pay this increase must himself be given a vastly greater share in economic affluence through increased payments for his products. This, too, is a matter of elemental justice.

The average consumer paid 15 percent more, but farmers received 15 percent less in 1963 for the same kinds of food purchased in 1949. Purchasers of bakery products saw the price tag soar 42 percent in that period. Farmers saw their income in this area decline 12 percent.

Users of dairy products had to pay 18 percent more in 1963 than in 1949. The farm value of these same products dropped 5 percent in that time.

In terms of practical reality, these statistics mean that if the farm laborer's plight is to be improved—and improved it must be—the farmer must be given the means whereby it becomes possible for him to assume that increased production cost. He must be given more for his produce, a lot more.

If we really want to solve the problems which beset American agriculture, there should be in this year 1965 an across-the-board increase of 10 percent in the price farmers obtain for their produce. This should be followed in the 2 succeeding years by an annual increase of 5 percent.

Moral dictates impel us to improve the lot of the farm worker. The same justice demands that the farmer himself cannot be ignored. It is one whole picture. You cannot provide justice for one and not for the other.

The Alarming Farm Exodus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the "GTA Daily Radio Roundup" for Friday, January 15, which calls attention to the alarming exodus from the farm, spelling doom for many fine communities all over the country. If this trend continues, it is easy to see what will happen to the small towns, their churches and schools, which provide the pulse of America.

Unless something is done soon, the family farm of America will no longer exist. The roundup presentation sums up the trend very clearly:

You have to go way back to 1875 to find a time when the number of farms in this country was as low as it is today. The United States then was in the gangling adolescent stage of just recovering from the Civil War, fighting Indians on the Western Plains, and beginning to find out that there were other ways of farming besides hand labor and the walking plow.

Each year now the number of farms goes down. It dropped an estimated 3 percent in 1964, according to the Department of Agriculture. Today there are somewhere around 3.4 million farms, give or take a few tens of thousands one way or another. There is no way of knowing the precise number from month to month.

Seventy-five to one hundred thousand farms are expected to go out of existence in 1965 this year.

You might be interested to know that the United States had the most farms in 1935 which was right in the middle of the depression. There were 6.8 million farms then. That number has been cut in half in the 30 years since 1935.

As the number of farms goes down, the average size goes up. The average size of 1964 farms was 333 acres. It is expected to go up to 341 acres this year.

By the end of this year North Dakota is expected to have 49,000 farms, down 1,500 in 1 year. Minnesota will end this year with about 144,000 farms, down 2,000. South Dakota will have 52,000, down 1,500 from 1964.

Hobby farms, sideline farms, and big commercial farms grow in number. The big decline comes in ordinary operating farms where people live and try to make a living.

All the learned talk we hear from the sociologists and economists and all the others deals with the problem of some economic ocrner into which to stick the exfarmers. Too few are bending their efforts to making the ordinary farms pay off so that families can live and work and make a decent living on them. These States of our are good farming areas among the best in the Nation. There is something wrong when farms here are forced out by the thousands every year.

Yet, each year consumers spend a smaller and smaller percent of their incomes for food—only 18 percent this year. The farm price recession is feeding the biggest boom in autos, houses, boats, clothing, automatic washers, refrigerators, and all the other consumer goods that this Nation has ever experienced.

The small towns and country businessmen are not sharing in this boom because their trade is farm trade and that is not booming.

The farms must have price and they must have production to share in the Great Society. They do not have enough of either today. That's why they are in trouble.

Justice Goldberg Explodes Some Myths About the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the November 8, 1964, edition of the New York Times Magazine.

Justice Goldberg, while defending rational and reasonable criticism of the Court and its decisions, rightly objects to those attacks based upon what he calls myths. People frequently base their comments on the Court on notions having no basis in fact. Both the Court's friends and its enemies do this and Justice Goldberg's article explodes these myths.

The article follows:

THE COURT SITS—IN THE CENTER OF THE STORM

(By Arthur J. Goldberg)

WASHINGTON.—It is not my purpose in writing about the work of the Supreme Court of the United States to enter into debates about the Court's recent decisions or justify and defend them. The tradition long held and seldom departed from is that the Court's Justices speak on current cases only by and through their decisions. This tradition I respect.

But it is also a part of that tradition for Justices from time to time to write and speak about the Court as an institution, of its role in American life, and of the nature of its judicial process. And even the Olympian

Yankee, Justice Holmes, did not regard it to be a departure from tradition to express anguish that the Court's opinions are misunderstood and its motives wrongfully impugned. Justice Holmes, in a speech delivered more than 50 years ago, said:

"We are very quiet there, but it is the quiet of a storm center, as we all know. Science has taught the world skepticism and has made it legitimate to put everything to the test of proof. Many beautiful and noble reverences are impaired, but in these days no one can complain if any institution, system, or belief is called on to justify its continuance in life. Of course we are not excepted and have not escaped. Doubts are expressed that go to our very being. Not only are we told that when Marshall pronounced an act of Congress unconstitutional he usurped a power that the Constitution did not give, but we are told that we are the representatives of a class—a tool of the money power. I get letters, not always anonymous, intimating that we are corrupt.

"Well, gentlemen, I admit that it makes my heart ache. It is very painful, when one spends all the energies of one's soul in trying to do good work, with no thought but that of solving a problem according to the rules by which one is bound, to know that many see sinster motives and would be glad of evidence that one was consciously bad. But we must take such things philosophically."

I hasten to add, as Justice Holmes undoubtedly would have, that our Court, along with every institution of democracy, is not immune to criticism of its actions. I agree with a New York Times editorial comment on this subject: "Unlimited public discussion is a primary safeguard of our democracy. The decisions of the Supreme Court are written by men on paper, not by gods in letters of fire across the sky. Critics may distort them. But the Court will have to trust the good sense of the people, just as the people trust the good sense of the Court." I trust the good sense of the people to recognize that although the Court is a proper subject of public comment and criticism, what should not be called into question is our allegiance as a nation and a people to government under law—for on this we have truly staked our all.

Because of our allegiance to the rule of law, it is of the utmost importance in appraising the role of the Supreme Court in vindicating this noble concept that we recognize what is myth and what is reality about the Court.

The very first myth which apparently must be laid to rest in every generation is that the Court has usurped the function of passing upon the constitutionality of State and Federal laws and action. This myth, always revived during times of storm over the Court, has no solid basis in history. Chief Justice Marshall did not write on a clean slate in asserting in *Marbury v. Madison* the right and duty of the Court to declare void an act of Congress contravening the Constitution. His action was forecast in the debates in the Constitutional Convention and urged by proponents as one of the solid reasons for the Constitution's adoption. Prof. Charles T. Black, Jr., in his excellent book "The People and the Court," has summarized the historical evidence. It supports his conclusion that: "It seems very clear that the preponderance of the evidence lies on the side of judicial review." And the very first Congress, composed of men whose memories of the making of the Constitution were fresh, enacted the Judiciary Act of 1789 which, from that date to this, has expressly authorized the Court to review the constitutionality of State legislation. This enactment was shortly followed by a succession of laws providing for ultimate review by the Court of judgments of the lower Federal courts.

Thus the reality rather than the myth about the Court is that it exercises judicial review as a consequence of intent as well as tradition. Judicial review is not a usurped power but a part of the grand design to insure the supremacy of the Constitution as law—supreme law to which all branches of government, executive, legislative and judicial, State and Federal, are subject. This is what the Constitution clearly imports.

The next great myth is that, even though judicial review was intended and is sanctioned, it is, nevertheless, undemocratic and, therefore, to be regarded with alert suspicion and its exercise to be dimly viewed. The argument has an obvious, albeit superficial, appeal. The Justices are appointed for life and not elected by the people for limited terms, as the President and Congress are. The latter, so the argument goes, being representative of the popular will, should have their way—otherwise democracy will be forsaken; a guardianship, however benevolent, negates popular government.

This reasoning, however, overlooks the first facts about our Constitution—that its source is the people and that, as Dean Roscoe Pound once said, it is meant to restrain "not individuals alone, but whole people." It is they who mandated that the individual be protected and safeguarded in his constitutional rights even against the popular will of the moment as voiced by the legislature or the executive. Our courts were entrusted with the responsibility of judicial review, in large part, to protect individuals and minorities in their fundamental rights against abridgement by both government and majorities.

It is not a denial, therefore, but rather a supreme manifestation of democracy that the fundamental rights of the least among us are protected from government by the Constitution and safeguarded by an independent judiciary. History teaches that democracy and an independent judiciary are one and inseparable. A country where judges are faithful to the popular will rather than to the rule of law, will not be a democratic country worthy of the name.

Another myth is that the Court reaches out and determines troublesome cases that would be best avoided. It enters, so it has been said at times, into thickets of controversy. The reality is that the cases which the Court decides are pressed upon it. It does not seek out cases or invite their filing. Under our Constitution, it issues no advisory opinions—it decides only actual cases and controversies. These must be genuine and current; otherwise jurisdiction will be summarily declined.

But what of cases seeking protection of political rights, should not the Court shun them? The answer to this is that most of the cases before the Court deal with public issues of the first moment in our society—issues like reapportionment—commonly called political. As Tocqueville said, "scarcely any political question arises in the United States that is not resolved, sooner or later, into a judicial question."

Solicitor General Archibald Cox has accurately described the nature of the cases coming before the Court:

"The central qualities of Supreme Court litigation arise * * * out of the peculiarly American principle of constitutional adjudication. The real contest is not so much between individuals and business corporations as between institutions and ways of life; and in reaching decisions this fact is consciously recognized. Throughout American history the prime examples have been the contests between State and Federal authority and the definitions of the powers of the executive and legislative branches, but familiarity does not lessen the intensity of the contest and new aspects are always arising.

"Through constitutional adjudication we have developed the extraordinary but very useful habit of casting social, economic, philosophical and political questions in the form of actions at law and suits in equity and in this way important aspects of a large proportion of the most fundamental issues of our times ultimately go before the Supreme Court for judicial determination. They are the issues upon which the community, consciously or unconsciously, is most deeply divided. They arouse the deepest emotions. Their resolution—one way or the other—often writes our future history."

My colleague, Justice Brennan, accurately observed in Baker versus Carr, the germinal decision of the reapportionment cases, that "the mere fact that the suit seeks protection of a political right does not mean it presents a political question. Such an objection is little more than a play upon words." If a claim is justiciable there is no escaping the responsibility of decision just because the constitutional right asserted is a political one.

Whatever the justification in another age or time for seeking out ways of avoiding decisions on the merits of a case, the temper of the modern world demands that judges, like men in all walks of public and private life, avoid escapism and squarely and frankly confront even the most controversial and troublesome justiciable problems.

And surely, it should be agreed by all—supporters or critics of the Court alike—that the least possible justification for the Court to avoid adjudicating a claim of constitutional right is that the Court may injure itself if it decides the case. Is this not another way of saying that the Court should avoid unpopular decisions? I have always conceived it to be the first duty of any judge worthy of the name and office to abjure popularity in decisionmaking.

Lord Mansfield long ago stated the creed of any worthy judge: "I will not do that which my conscience tells me is wrong to gain the huzzahs of thousands, or the daily praise of all the papers which come from the press; I will not avoid doing what I think is right, though it should draw on me the whole artillery of libels, all that falsehood and malice can invent, or the credulity of a deluded populace can swallow. * * * Once for all let it be understood, that no endeavors of this kind will influence any man who at present sits here."

The Court should—the Court must—decide the cases and controversies properly coming before it, however difficult and controversial they may be, by doing what the Justices are appointed and sworn to do: "Faithfully and impartially [to] discharge and perform all the duties" of their office and to "administer justice * * * according to the best of [their] * * * abilities and understanding agreeably to the Constitution and laws of the United States." Judicial cowardice is far more likely to be the undoing of the Court as an institution than the faithful exercise of judicial responsibility.

There is a myth that the Court is against States' rights, oblivious of the great interests of federalism—interests, which not only reflect our history and traditions, but which require constant and vigilant attention if we are to avoid overcentralism of our National Government and if we are to preserve viable local government.

There was considerable substance to this myth during three decades early in this century when the Court, in the name of due process, invalidated social and economic legislation of the States as well as the Nation. But, as our recent decisions demonstrate, the present Court does not strike down State or Federal legislation because it deems laws of this type unwise or unsound. The Nation and the States are free to experiment, and never have their interests in federalism been better safeguarded than they are now.

But it is asserted that the present Court intervenes far more frequently than in the past to protect individuals in their consti-

tutional rights against State action. Particularly is this true, so the argument goes, in connection with criminal prosecutions. The Court, critics charge, is following a double standard—it denies the application of the due-process clause to economic cases; it applies the clause energetically to cases involving impairment of personal liberties.

There is a simple answer to this charge. There is no evidence that the framers intended the 5th and 14th amendments to deny to the Nation and the States their right of economic experimentation. There is every evidence that they intended the Bill of Rights and the 14th amendment to safeguard the fundamental personal rights and liberties of all persons against governmental impairment or denial.

There is a myth, very popular these days, that the Court is divided into liberal and conservative wings, or, as some would put it, into activists and those who practice judicial restraint. Labels of this kind are convenient but not accurate. Members of the Court, applying general constitutional provisions, understandably differ on occasion as to their meaning and application. This is inevitable in the interpretation of a document that is both brief and general by a human institution composed of strong-minded and independent members charged with a grave and difficult responsibility. But the inappropriateness of these labels became apparent upon even the most perfunctory analysis.

A judge may believe that under the Constitution a court without a jury may not adjudge guilty a defendant charged with serious criminal contempt. Is he a liberal or a conservative? Is he an activist or a believer in judicial restraint? Or a judge may refuse to hold a litigant or newspaper in contempt for biting commenting on the guilt or innocence of a criminal defendant. Is he an activist or a follower of judicial restraint? Is he a liberal or a conservative? May not the denial of a claim of constitutional right be more activist in its effects upon our constitutional structure than the allowance of the claim?

Examples could be multiplied, but inevitably the classification of the justices as liberal or conservative, or activist or believer in judicial restraint, will depend upon the outlook of or the criteria employed by the classifier.

Finally, the fact is that the Court is not as divided as is commonly assumed. Last year the Court, by denied of certiorari or decision on their merits, disposed of more than 2,500 cases. In the overwhelming majority of these cases the Court was unanimous in its orders. But more importantly the Court is united in a common dedication to constitutional principles and to the rule of law. The members of the Court may differ as to a particular case, but all members of the Court attempt to emulate Chief Justice Marshall in "never [seeking] to enlarge the judicial power beyond its proper bounds, nor [fearing] to carry it to the fullest extent that duty requires."

The Justices of the Court pursue a common method and aim, simply but eliquently described by Justice Frankfurter:

"What is essential in judging is * * * first and foremost, humility and an understanding of the range of the problems and one's own inadequacy in dealing with them; disinterestedness, allegiance to nothing except the search, amid tangled words, amid limited insights; loyalty and allegiance to nothing except the effort to find that path through precedent, through policy, through history, through one's own gifts of insight to the best judgment that a poor fallible creature can arrive at in the most difficult of all tasks, the adjudication between man and man, between man and State, through reason called law."

I could continue this recital of myths about our Court, but I shall conclude with one that emanates from those who seek to support rather than condemn the Court. It is the myth that the Court is infallible. A simple and correct answer to this myth is the oftquoted bon mot of Justice Jackson: "We are not final because we are infallible; we are infallible because we are final."

The reality is that as a human institution the Court is bound to err. It is a tribute to its awareness of human frailty, and the extent to which the Court seeks to avoid mistakes, that so few really serious ones have been made in the Court's history. And, of course, it is only proper to note that reserved to the people is the right to change the course of the Court's opinions—right or wrong—through the process of constitutional amendment.

There are more sophisticated mythologists who would seek to preserve the illusion of infallibility by banning dissenting opinions. The Court, by their lights, would then speak with a single authoritative voice not to be gainsaid. Some courts in other lands function in this fashion, burying their differences in a single opinion and judgment. But I, for one, would not have it this way, for I profoundly believe that in the long run the Court benefits, and certainly the people do, by the free expression of dissenting views. They educate and sometimes eventually prevail, and they always demonstrate that our judicial air, like all of the air of American life, is, and, God willing, will remain, free.

So long as the Court sits myths about it will exist. Myths are not necessarily all or entirely bad, as the literature of mythology proves. But since we must live in this world and not in a make-believe world, myths about the Court or any other human institution must yield to reality. Otherwise our society will be the victim of our fantasies rather than the servant of our purposes.

Mississippi Serves as the Whipping Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I felt compelled upon reading the following article to bring it to the attention of the American people and my colleagues in the Congress. This article is an example of the growing awareness that Mississippi is truly a State of God-fearing hospitable people. The image that some pseudointellectual misfits are trying to portray is quickly being suppressed by thinking Americans, who take the time to inform themselves about actual conditions in our great State.

Surely we make mistakes, but no mortal on this earth can claim to be completly free from error, and other States cannot boast as we of having the lowest crime rate per 1,000 people—a great accomplishment in itself.

I would like to take this opportunity to invite every American to visit Mississippi, and I wish that the 149 Members of Congress who voted against seating our delegation would come and witness for themselves what great achievements we are making.

James J. Kilpatrick has my most humble thanks and appreciation for his perceptive portrayal of the state of affairs in our great State. I hope that everyone will take the time to read his article which appeared in both the Shreveport Times and the Ohio Blade as follows:

MISSISSIPPI SERVES AS THE WHIPPING BOY

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

It is about time that someone wrote a piece entitled, "Stop Pickin' on Mississippi," and I have just nominated me.

For the past 10 years, and more especially for the past several weeks, the drums have been beating tatoo for Ole Miss. There are those who would read her out of the regiment altogether, a disgrace to the Union, a blot on the whole human race. Dr. Martin Luther King, in one of his more humane moments, urged a boycott of all products manufactured in Mississippi. Roy Wilkins, that great apostle of the advancement of colored people, sought to block the sale of Mississippi bonds for the building of public schools. Some emissaries from Oberlin College in Ohio, finding no meritorious good works closer home, chose to spend some highly publicized holidays as "carpenters for Christmas." And in a particularly presumptuous piece of arrogance, Dick Gregory, Sammy Davis, Jr., and Drew Pearson met in Chicago, of all places, to round up 20,000 turkeys to be sent to the oppressed Negroes of darkest Mississippi.

It is high time, I suggest, for a national rereading of Leviticus 16. This whole republic is deeply involved in prejudice, discrimination, and crimes of racially motivated violence. How convenient it is to have a Mississippi. We will pile all our sins on the head of the scapegoat, and drive her into a Dixie wilderness. We will scourge her erring congressmen and drive up her bond rates. All this may not make the world safe for southern Negroes, but it is making things marvelously safe for northern hypocrites.

Consider some of the events of recent weeks. If Mississippi ever is to lick her frightful problems of poverty—and poverty lies at the very root of the sickness—it can only be by bringing into the State the new industry that will provide the jobs that bring the income that contribute to self-respect. But with "Saint Martin" blowing the bulge for boycott, what industry would elect to settle in Mississippi now? Very well, he has "dramatized the evils." Is this truly what Mississippi needs above all else?

That was what Mr. Wilkins had in mind, too. He would dramatize the bleeding wounds. So he grautitously injected himself and his influential organization into the sale of certain Mississippi bonds. In so many words, he warned the country's top security dealers that he would equate them with murder, arson, and racist oppression if they dared to bid on bonds for sewers, water supplies, and public schools. The nervous dealers at last bid in the bonds, but at a rate that, will punish the affected people of Mississippi, white, and black alike, for many years to come.

Several months ago, some of the decent and generous people of Mississippi established an interracial, interfaith group known as the Mississippi Committee of Concern, whose sole purpose is to rebuild burned or damaged churches. In a publicity blackout that has been almost total, it has gone about its quiet work. It has contributed already to the rebuilding of four churches at Brandon, Clinton, Gluckstadt, and Philadelphia. Just before Christmas, the committee announced additional allocations for 10 more churches at Canton, North Jackson, Aberdeen, Itta Bena, Carthage, Collinsville, Hattiesburg, and Flowood. More than $36,000

has been raised toward these several projects; architectural firms in Jackson have contributed their services free of charge; scores of white persons have worked through the Committee of Concern, side by side with Negro friends, in an effort to put matters right. Dr. William P. Davis is chairman of the group; the address is Post Office Box 530, Jackson.

How many persons are familiar with the good work of this Mississippi committee? Very few, I should judge. But the Oberlin contingent, working in the glare of national publicity on a church of highly doubtful justification, reaped a harvest of newspaper space. Truly was it said that there are those who love to pray standing in the synagogues and on the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men.

The blunt truth is that, there are more crimes or interracial violence in Washington, D.C., on any weekend, than there are in Mississippi in a month. Compared to the jungles of Harlem and Central Park, Jackson is an oasis of pure tranquility. Yes, the murders of Emmett Till, of Medgar Evers, of the three civil rights workers, were terrible events. Philadelphia, New York, and Chicago have known equal violence, identically motivated, but this has been the violence of Negroes wrought upon whites.

My point is simply that much good exists in Mississippi also, and much kindness, and much commonsense. Perhaps these forces could go to work, if the rest of the country would stop crying about the mote in its brother's eye, and probe for a while at the beam in its own.

Rabbi Glasner Recalls Nazi and Red Oppression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, few among us have experienced at firsthand the conditions of life imposed by communism. One who understands the evils of atheistic communism better than most American is Rabbi Juda Glasner, because he has lived directly under the Red hand of communism. Rabbi Glasner is one of the great spiritual and civic leaders of California's 27th Congressional District. The president of Congregation Mishdan Yicheskel of Tujunga, Calif., Mr. Israel I. Farber, has called my attention to the following article about Rabbi Glasner, which appeared in the Valley Times of North Hollywood on December 23, 1964. Rabbi Glasner's story and the unpleasantness which he endured before he came to this country should cause all Americans to pause and reflect on their blessings, and to vow to do all within their power to make certain that someday soon no one in the world will need suffer what so many now suffer. "We must," as Rabbi Glasner says and as Americans of all faiths must agree, "add sustenance and life to our strength and fortitude bolstered by the spiritual faith that is the foundation of America's future." Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that those who are privileged to read the following article will gain a little more perspective on the enemy which surounds us:

RABBI GLASNER RECALLS NAZI AND RED OPPRESSION

(By Gene Cowles)

Rabbi Juda Glasner, whose steadfast spiritual faith triumphed over Nazi oppression in Czechoslovakian concentration camp during World War II, is the inspired and beloved leader of Congregation Mishkan Yicheskel, Tujunga.

As a man of courage and vision, Dr. Glasner does not hesitate to defy those who are playing into the hands of communism in America by turning a deaf ear to the causes of patriotism and application of the teachings of the Deity.

"We must," he implored his followers today, "add sustenance and life to our strength and fortitude bolstered by the spiritual faith that is the foundation of America's future."

Rabbi Glasner, who vows that "I would never have left Rumania except for the conditions brought about in that country by communistic domination," is a fourth generation rabbi and proud of his lineage.

He gained his freedom in 1944 before the end of World War II; left Bucharest in August 1945 for Switzerland where he had a reunion with his family.

The cleric gives an intriguing account of his contact in Bucharest with the father of Anna Pauker, Communist leader of Rumania, before she became Minister of the Interior.

"The father," he related, "was a pious Jew with deep religious convictions. His appearance reflected the characteristics of a devout Jew.

"In a choking voice the father of Anna told me he made a number of attempts to see his daughter after her return from Russia. She refused either to see him or to acknowledge him."

Thus the rabbi illustrated how some young people who joined the Communist Party became completely alienated from their parents and other members of their families, adding:

"Sometimes parents were afraid to discuss or talk about anything in the presence of their own children.

"I had the opportunity," Rabbi Glasner said, "to speak to people who were participating on November 8, 1945, in the great manifestation for King Michael in Bucharest.

"While they organized a big demonstration for the king, Communist shock detachments arrived in trucks heavily armed. The trucks entered with great speed to break up the meeting. Many were killed. The casualties were enormous. The crowds were dispersed.

"It is well known that criminals all were freed, such as murderers, and placed in important Communist positions to terrorize innocent people. Former Nazis became the most articulate Communists.

"Many who belonged to the Hungarian Nazi Party and to the Rumanian Nazi Party were embraced as fine Communists.

"While I was staying in Bucharest in one of the hotels, we were all awakened in the middle of the night by Russian soldiers and subjected to interrogation. This was prior to the coup d'etat in Rumania.

"There is one trecherous incident that should not be forgotten. It should be remembered by the free world. It occurred during the Hungarian revolution.

"When the Hungarians under Premier Nagy tried to free themselves from Russian occupation and the Russian Army was forced out of Hungary, the Hungarian chief of staff was called by the Russian Army leaders to negotiate a 'peaceful' settlement.

"Instead of negotiations the chief of staff and his associates were arrested and the Russian march into Budapest began."

Here the rabbi cautioned the need to be wary of similar deceptive Russian tactics today.

Then he told the story of a visitor to the Russian zoo in Moscow where a wolf and lamb were in a cage together. Day after day the visitor witnessed this spectacle, expressed wonderment.

"We replace the lamb every day," the zookeeper told him.

Uihlein Family Gives Generously to Culture in Milwaukee and New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, for many years the Uihlein family of Milwaukee has made outstanding contributions to the development and enjoyment of American culture in their home city and elsewhere in the country.

Recently, the Uihleins and the Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co., of which Robert A. Uihlein, Jr., is president, have made two particularly noteworthy gifts to enhance music and the theater in Milwaukee and in New York City.

On January 10, it was announced that the Uihlein family and the Schlitz Co., had jointly given $1 million to the drive to raise $6 million for Milwaukee's new music hall-theater. This public-spirited action gave the drive for a long sought after cultural facility a tremendous boost and brought it near its goal.

Just a little more than a month before, the Schlitz Co. had joined with the city of New York and the New York Philharmonic to provide 3 weeks of free outdoor concerts by the Philharmonic in New York City parks next summer. The company's support of these concerts is a logical outgrowth of similar concerts sponsored by the company in Milwaukee. The outdoor concerts will bring the Philharmonic to thousands who would not otherwise hear it.

I include three news stories describing the gifts by the Uihlein family and the Schlitz Brewing Co.:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Jan. 10, 1965]

UIHLEINS GIVE MUSIC HALL $1 MILLION

The Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co. and the Uihleins family jointly have contributed $1 million to the drive to raise $6 million for Milwaukee's new music hall-theater.

The gift will pay for the main concert hall of the Center for the Performing Arts. It will be named "Uihlein Hall" as a family memorial.

"This is the largest gift we have received," said Irwin Maier, cochairman of the fund drive. "We are extremely grateful to Schlitz and the Uihlein family for their very generous support."

Maier, president of the Journal Co. and Edmond Fitzgerald, retired president and chairman of the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., jointly head the civic campaign for the music hall funds.

The Schlitz-Uihlein gift raised the total of contributions to $5,114,000, which is 85 percent of the goal.

Earlier totals disclosed included the Schlitz gift and some of the family donations. Announcement of the combined gift was withheld until all members of the Uihlein family had made their contributions.

Maier said:

"I think it is very fitting that the big hall will bear the Uihlein name. The Uihlein family long has been an outstanding source of community leadership, and this is not the first civic project which has been the beneficiary of their good will and generosity."

Fitzgerald said about 30 other donors of substantial gifts would have areas of the center named for the family, individual, or company making the donation.

ONE OF THE LARGEST GIFTS

He said the Uihlein gift was one of the largest ever made to a single agency during the donor's lifetime. The Uihlein family has been noted for widespread, anonymous philanthropies, he said.

The music hall is to be built on the east bank of the Milwaukee River on a site bounded by the river, East Kilbourn Avenue, North Water Street, and East State Street. The main concert hall will seat more than 2,300. There will be two other smaller halls and other facilities for the performing arts. The target date for completion is June 1967.

Schlitz President Robert A. Uihlein, Jr., said, "the family was grateful for the opportunity to join in a great civic project.

"We look forward to the time in the near future when the Center for the Performing Arts stands as a symbol of Milwaukee's dedication to excellence and as a tribute to the uncommon vision and effort which is bringing it into being," he said.

"It would be impossible to list all the benefits which this structure has brought and will bring to Milwaukee. From its inception, it rekindled Milwaukee's spirit of cooperation in achieving a goal. Its construction will bring jobs to those who build it. It will be an attraction to tourists and a positive factor in attracting people to live and work here.

"Its function as a home for the many events which will take place there will be visible evidence of the city's stature. And, finally, it will bring to all Milwaukeeans and to their children and to generations to come, the inspiration which comes from contact with man's achievements in the arts.

CAMPAIGN AIDS LAUDED

"Our company and our family are proud to be a part of this outstanding effort which will be of immense value to our community. It is our hope that the campaign will substantially exceed its minimum goals.

"This tremendous undertaking would not have been possible without the dedicated service of all those serving in this campaign. Noteworthy is the work done by Mrs. John E. Schroeder, a member of our family and a campaign associate. She personally contacted each member of our family, even those no longer living in Milwaukee, and coordinated this gift to the center."

Other members of the Uihlein family who have been involved in the fund drive include Joseph E. Uihlein, Jr., and Alfred U. Eiser, both members of the board of directors of the brewery and campaign associates in the fund drive.

Irwin C. Uihlein, chairman of the board of Jos. Schlitz Brewery Co.; William G. Brumder, chairman of the board of First Wisconsin National Bank, and Mrs. Robert B. Trainer, of River Hills, are members of the Milwaukee County War Memorial Development Committee, which organized the project.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Dec. 1, 1964]

SCHLITZ WILL SPONSOR NEW YORK CONCERTS

Because of the success of a New York Philharmonic concert in Milwaukee, the Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co. will put on 12 free concerts in New York City next August.

The city, the orchestra and Robert A. Uihlein, Jr., president of Schlitz, announced the plans in New York Tuesday. Said Amyas Ames, president of the philharmonic:

"Giving impetus to the entire idea of giving the concerts * * * was the outstanding success of a concert given in Washington Park in Milwaukee when Schlitz presented the philharmonic conducted by Leornard Bernstein."

Ames said that that concert, presented September 6, 1963, attracted the largest audience ever to see the philharmonic. The crowd was estimated at 23,000 to 27,000.

"After that, the philharmonic came to Schlitz and asked if Schlitz would participate," a spokesman for the brewery said.

The concerts in New York next August will follow this plan: There will be a different program each week, presented in parks in each of four boroughs, including Central Park in Manhattan. The other boroughs are Queens, Brooklyn, and Staten Island.

The concerts will be in the evening, and all will be free.

They will be played in a mobile stage and accoustical shell being built by the city of New York.

The shell, large enough to hold an orchestra of 100 members and a chorus, will be moved overnight from park to park. Dates and conductors have not been scheduled.

Mayor Robert F. Wagner said the regularly scheduled philharmonic concerts were always sold out. He said the free concerts would "make the city's artistic resources more available to the people."

Last summer, Schlitz sponsored a concert by the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra, conducted by Eugene Ormandy, in Washington Park. The brewery plans to sponsor another concert next summer, but has not decided on the performing group.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 2, 1964]

PHILHARMONIC TO GIVE FREE PARK CONCERTS—SERIES IN TRAVELING SHELL AND STAGE TO BE CLASSICAL

(By Theodore Strongin)

The New York Philharmonic will give 3 weeks of free outdoor concerts in city parks next August, Mayor Wagner announced yesterday at city hall.

He said that the city would provide $175,000 for physical facilities, including a portable stage and acoustical shell. The shell will travel to the four boroughs in which the concerts will be held.

The shell, with stage and all other facilities built into it, is being designed by Christopher Jaffe, the acoustical engineer, of Norwalk, Conn.

The Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co. will contribute $50,000 and the Philharmonic an equal amount toward expenses.

Classical music, not pops will be offered, according to Amyas Ames, Philharmonic president. Beethoven's Ninth Symphony is being considered for the opening program.

Four concerts a week will be given, one each in Sheep Meadow, in the center of Central Park just north of the 66th Street crosstown road; in Crocheron Park, at 35th Avenue and Cross Island Parkway in Bayside, Queens; in Music Grove of Prospect Park, and in a lakeside site in Clove Lake Park, near Clove Road and Victory Boulevard in Staten Island. Mr. Ames said that no suitable site convenient to public transportation was available in the Bronx.

The Philharmonic's regular concerts are usually sold out the mayor said. The parks series allows those who cannot afford tickets, or otherwise cannot get them, to hear the orchestra free.

A successful Philharmonic concert in a Milwaukee park 2 summers ago provided the impetus to the Schlitz Co. to support the new parks series, according to Robert A. Uihlein Jr., president of Schlitz. He said that 27,000 people turned out to hear the Philharmonic in Milwaukee.

Mr. Ames expects the 125-year-old Philharmonic to play to the largest audiences in its history in the parks. Newbold Morris, city parks commissioner, estimated that an audience of at least 100,000 will attend on opening night.

Other summer music will continue in the parks as in the past, though the parks department will plan carefully to avoid conflicts in the same neighborhood, an official said. Among other summer series in the parks are the Guggenheim Memorial Concerts given by the Goldman Band; the Naumburg Concerts, given by a symphony orchestra; the Seuffert Band concerts; an extensive and varied series sponsored by local 802, American Federation of Musicians; the Con Edison name band dances; and concerts of Latin-American music.

By adding the parks concerts, the Philharmonic fills out the first season of its new contract with its musicians that calls for a full year's employment.

Resolution by the City Council of North Miami Beach, Fla., Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Declare November 11 of Each Year To Be Veterans' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to submit for the Appendix of the RECORD the following resolution which comes from one of the distinguished municipalities of my district, and I am pleased to commend it to the Congress:

RESOLUTION R64-125

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to declare November 11 of each year to be Veterans Day and make same a national holiday in honor of veterans of all wars

Whereas November 11 of each year has, since 1918, been celebrated as a day dedicated to peace and to those men living and dead who served their country in achieving such peace; and

Whereas in 1955 the Legislature of the State of Florida dedicated such date to veterans and made the same a State holiday; and

Whereas such date is a holiday which is national in its scope and origin and should, in honor of the veterans of all wars in which the United States was a participant, be by the Congress of the United States so dedicated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of North Miami Beach:

SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact suitable legislation to declare the 11th day of November of each year to be Veterans Day and a legal holiday and calling upon the President of the United States to issue his proclamation requesting that the citizens of the United States set aside all business and rejoice with the free peoples of the earth on Veterans Day.

SEC. 2. The city clerk is directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each of the U.S. Senators from Florida and a copy to each

Member of Congress elected from the several congressional districts of the State.

Approved and adopted in regular meeting assembled this 1st day of December 1964.

ARTHUR I. SNYDER,
Mayor.

Attest:

VIRGINIA H. MOORE,
City Clerk.

A Churchill Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, the thoughts of many citizens of the United States, in all walks of life, have turned toward the personality and career of Sir Winston Churchill, whose many distinctions include the award of honorary U.S. citizenship.

Among those who had the high privilege of personal meeting with Sir Winston is State Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., of Virginia, who recently wrote for the Winchester, Va., Evening Star an illuminating commentary, which I include, as it appeared on January 16, 1965, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix:

It was in 1929 at the Governor's mansion in Richmond that this writer first met Mr. Churchill; I saw him last in 1951 when Mrs. Byrd and I were his guests at the British Parliament in London.

Between those dates Winston Churchill, British politician and writer, became Prime Minister of England and the man most responsible for the downfall of Hitler and the preservation of England as a free nation.

It was 35 years ago that Mr. Churchill, as author, lecturer and historian, came to Virginia to study the Civil War battlefields around Richmond. His host was Governor Byrd; his battlefield guide was Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, editor of the Richmond News Leader and perhaps America's foremost authority on Robert E. Lee and Confederate military strategy. Years later Sir Winston was to write that the American Civil War was the "noblest and least avoidable of all the great mass conflicts."

Mr. Churchill, then 54 years of age, spent 10 days in Richmond. He told his host that he regarded his political career behind him.

He had at that time been a member of Parliament for 28 years. He had served in the Cabinets of three Prime Ministers, H. H. Asquith, Lloyd George and Stanley Baldwin. As such he had served as President of the Board of Trade, Home Secretary, First Lord of the Admiralty, Minister of Munitions, Secretary of State for War and Air, Secretary of the Colonies, and Chancellor of the Exchequer.

But more than a decade was to pass before Winston Churchill was to obtain the political position for which he has now become famous.

Perhaps more than any single factor it was his bulldog tenacity, along with his ability to rally his war-weary people, that saved England during those dark days between 1940 and 1945.

Following the evacuation of the British armies from Dunkirk, Winston Churchill's strong, clear voice hurled a challenge—both to Hitler and to his own people: "We will fight on the beaches, we will fight on the streets, we will fight in the hills."

His tenacity was apparent during his Virginia visit. On the night of his arrival, Governor and Mrs. Byrd entertained at a formal State dinner for the British statesman. During the course of the meal Mr. Churchill asked for mustard. His hostess sent his request to the kitchen only to be informed, to her dismay, that there was none in the house.

Trying to pass it off lightly, Mrs. Byrd told Mr. Churchill of her predicament, but added she would be glad to send someone to the store. He said, yes, that was what he would like. So Mrs. Byrd slowed the dinner down to a snail's pace while this writer was dispatched to the grocery.

Mr. Churchill knew what he wanted and when he wanted it, a characteristic which served him well in war and politics.

As a guest, however, it was a quality that some hostesses did not relish too highly.

During his visit, Mr. Churchill made a habit of specifying the time he would like his meals. And then he began to supervise the menu. My mother would have been happy had the Britisher received an emergency call to return to Parliament.

Winston Churchill was born to statecraft. His father, Lord Randolph Churchill, held posts of importance in the English Government, with the exception of Prime Minister. Winston Churchill was elected to Parliament at the age of 26 and, except for a 2-year period (1922 to 1924), he was reelected until his retirement 64 years later.

Serving for 6 years as a conservative M.P., he shifted to the Liberal Party for the next 16 years. In 1924 he returned to the Conservative Party, where he remained for the rest of his career.

His abilities shone most brilliantly in periods of crisis. He was the first to recognize the potential danger of Adolf Hitler. His was the clearest and most persistent voice against the appeasement policies of the Chamberlain government in the mid-1930's. For years he stood virtually alone—and unheeded.

And then came September 1, 1939. The German armies were on the march, just as Churchill had warned.

It was then that a frightened nation turned to the one amongst them who, for 6 lonely years, had sought without avail to stiffen the policy of his Government toward the German menace.

Winston Churchill overnight became First Lord of the Admiralty in the Chamberlain government. But within a few months Neville Chamberlain was out and Winston Spencer Churchill became in 1940 Prime Minister of England, First Lord of the Treasury, and Minister of National Defense, positions he held until victory was achieved in 1945.

It is perhaps too much to say that Winston Churchill saved England and the British Empire. It is not too much to say, however, that Winston Churchill did more to that end than any single individual. Mr. Churchill was England's foremost son during "Their Finest Hour."

Having sat at the summit with President Roosevelt and Joseph Stalin, having shared the triumvirate leadership in ridding the world of Nazism, having brought his nation from the bitter ignominy of Dunkirk in 1940 to total victory 5 years later, Winston Churchill tuned his thoughts to the rebuilding of England.

The world leaders gathered at Potsdam in the early summer of 1945: An American President who only weeks before had assumed the responsibilities of office, without essential background; the Soviet's determined, crafty Joseph Stalin; and England's resolute, highly experienced Winston Churchill. It was those three, Harry Truman, Stalin, and Churchill, who began the task of reshaping the peacetime world.

And then a bombshell struck.

A supremely confident Churchill had left the German conference site for England, saying he would be back as soon as the election votes were counted.

But the England which turned to Winston Churchill in the darkest period of that Nation's history deserted him while still drinking the heady wines of victory.

When the votes were counted that July Winston Churchill no longer was Prime Minister, and his place at the world conference table was taken by Clement Attlee, the leader of the Socialist forces.

In 1940 Churchill had told his people bluntly that if victory were to be achieved he could offer them nothing but "blood, toil, tears, and sweat." The people responded. But in the elections of 1945 they wanted something more comfortable. The war-weary English listened to the siren song of the Socialist. England embraced what Mr. Churchill described as "the philosophy of failure and the gospel of envy."

And Churchill left the role of world leader and went back to his painting, to his bricklaying, to his writing, and to his leadership of the minority party in the House of Commons.

It was in this role that I found Mr. Churchill in the summer of 1951—with the elections only a few months away. I met him in his private office at Westminster. We talked for a long time—or rather, Mr. Churchill talked for a long time.

He was interested in Virginia, in the Shenandoah Valley. He told me he had seen most of the Confederate battlefields, but hoped before he died to see firsthand the valley terrain which was the scene of so many of Stonewall Jackson's campaigns.

He told me of some of his great wartime decisions, and then we fell to discussing governmental philosophy.

He spoke of the bombing of the House of Commons; it having been destroyed during the early years of the war (the Commons then met in the House of Lords).

Mr. Churchill said he had had the old Commons restored in exactly its original form. He met much opposition in this, he said, by those who wanted to enlarge and modernize. He opposed this with, to use his own words, "resolution and vigor." One could see that this old chamber where he had spent more than 50 years as the peoples' representative, was dear to Mr. Churchill's heart.

He gave two pieces of advice on the building of a legislative hall:

One: "Do not make it semicircular like you have in the United States, but rather make it oblong—and put one party on one side and one on the other side, and make them stay there. (He did not mention that he twice had changed parties.)

Two: "Keep it small and compact and do not have enough seats for all the members." (The British House of Commons can seat only 400 of its 600 members.) "It is much better to have a small, compact chamber and make the members sit on the floor and on each other's lap. This is more democratic. And besides, it is much easier to speak to a crowded House than to a sparsely filled one."

In the last assertion was it Churchill the architect speaking, or was it Churchill the orator?

On that interesting occasion we discussed the relative merits of America's constitutional form of government and the British parliamentary system. At one point I mentioned that in some respects the British system had advantage over the American.

Never shall I forget Mr. Churchill's reply:

"Ah, yes, Mr. BYRD, but don't forget this. The basic strength of America, in my judgment, lies in the fact that the 48 States, acting through their own legislative bodies, can to a very considerable degree determine their own local problems. You are not centralized in America like we are in England."

A few months later the British electorate returned Winston Churchill to his wartime position as Prime Minister.

Winston Churchill's leadership was that of an elected leader of a democracy.

He joined battle against, to use his own words, "totalitarian compulsion and the regimentation of our national life." Mr. Churchill had the wisdom, the experience, the character, and the determination to pursue resolutely this goal.

In my judgment, he was without a peer among his contemporaries in three spheres: As a statesman, as orator, and as writer of prose.

He once summed in five words a noble creed for nation or individual:

In war: Resolution.

In defeat: Defiance.

In victory: Magnanimity.

In peace: Good will.

To this may I add, in reference to Mr. Churchill:

In history: Indelible impression.

Closing of Veterans' Administration Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have been sorely troubled over the recent announcement of the Veterans' Administration concerning the closing of 17 Veterans' Administration regional offices, 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals, and 3 domiciliary facilities.

As many of my colleagues know, I have been closely associated with the veterans of this Nation since my discharge from World War II service. It is my pleasure at this time to be closely acquainted with the distinguished national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, John A. Jenkins, of Birmingham, Ala., as well as the legislative director of that organization, Francis Stover, and the distinguished chairman of the legislative committee of that same group, and former colleague in this House, James Van Zandt, of Pennsylvania.

Just today I had the opportunity to confer at length with VFW officials concerning this announced closing of these VA facilities. I cannot help but recall that in the recent state of the Union message of our President, he spoke in sympathetic terms of care for the elderly, the war against poverty, and the establishing of experimental centers designed to overcome diseases which have plagued mankind throughout our history.

It would seem to me that the closing of certain of these facilities is directly contradictory to this announced plan and policy by the President. It is felt that these huge veterans' hospitals and domiciliaries, whose closing have been announced, have gone a long way toward reaching the exact objectives of the President in his message. For example, the closing forever of 3,000 domiciliary beds. For the most part, domiciliary homes are occupied by veterans of our several wars without funds, of advanced age, and suffering from diseases which prevent and preclude them from reentering the labor field.

Several years ago, this Government authorized 125,000 VA hospital beds. Despite long waiting lists of veterans in many areas, these have never been fully utilized to this day. The average patient load has been well under this number.

Of course, the closing of 11 hospitals will further decrease the operating bed capacity.

I must protest most strongly, in behalf of our American veteran, this reduction in facilities.

Mr. Speaker, during my conference with VFW officials, I was given permission and authorized to incorporate in this RECORD a letter dated January 15 addressed to the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE. This letter is over the signature of the commander in chief of the VFW. Likewise, I include a letter dated January 18 from Francis W. Stover, director of the national legislative service of the VFW, and a special bulletin dated January 14 from the VFW national rehabilitation office in Washington. In order that all my colleagues of this House may be informed of their contents, I include these three documents with my remarks:

JANUARY 15, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: This is to register the vehement protests of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States with respect to the announced closing of 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 3 domiciliaries, operated by the Veterans' Administration.

The President has been officially notified of our shock and dismay concerning these closings as contained in my letter of January 15, a copy of which is enclosed. A similar letter has also been forwarded to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

In his state of the Union message to the Congress, the President emphasized care for the elderly, fighting against poverty, and establishing health and community centers for better health of citizens struck down by mental and crippling diseases. It seems to the Veterans of Foreign Wars that the closing of many of these facilities collides head on with this announced policy, for the Federal Government is already operating in a most successful manner hospitals and domiciliaries scheduled to be eliminated within the next several months, which are already doing what the President has proposed.

Most acute and distressing to our membership will be the closing forever of over 3,200 domiciliary beds. A quick look at these veterans shows that they are, in the main, without any funds except their monetary payments from the Veterans' Administration, are poorly educated, have little or no work experience, and are suffering from crippling diseases such as arthritis, heart, and mental and personality problems. To literally turn these veterans onto the streets will mean that many will have to look to local relief agencies to exist and will further aggravate and contribute to the national problem of poverty.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has always been deeply disturbed that the 125,000 authorized VA beds have never been fully utilized. Likewise, the number of operating beds have never been fully implemented. The average daily patient load is perhaps the best indicator which is that about 112,000 Veterans' Administration beds are occupied with patients on an average daily basis.

The decision to close 11 VA hospitals will further decrease the operating bed capacity of the Veterans' Administration and there seems little possibility that starting with the new fiscal year, July 1, that these beds will be replaced in other areas by that time.

The membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars wants to be reassured that the closing of these hospitals and domiciliaries does not constitute a change in administration policy, to provide fewer beds for war veterans in need of medical care and treatment. Many of our members are equally distressed by the closing of the regional offices.

This is to request, therefore, that your committee hold hearings and take whatever action you may deem appropriate to look into these and other matters which will adversely affect services to veterans and their families. Your favorable consideration of these views and this request will be deeply appreciated by the 1,300,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. JENKINS,
Commander in Chief.

JANUARY 18, 1965.

From: Francis W. Stover, Director, National Legislative Service.

To: National officers and department commanders.

Subject: Closing of Veterans' Administration facilities.

The announced closing of 31 VA hospitals, domiciliaries, and regional offices has sparked the Congress like no other action for many, many years. Friday, January 15, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, the majority leader of the Senate, spoke on the Senate floor for almost an hour on the closing of a VA hospital in his State at Miles City. Nine other Senators expressed similar dissatisfaction about closings in their States.

The Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee headed by RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, has scheduled hearings for Friday, January 22, at which time Administrator Bill Driver will be called upon to explain and justify any and all of these closings. Other Members of the Senate and House will be heard at that time. The VFW position will also be presented. OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, has also agreed to hold hearings, probably at a later date.

The issue which goes to the heart of the matter is that the closing of these hospitals is a policy matter decided at the highest level of government. While the Veterans' Administrator will explain these actions, the policy being carried out was decided at the White House level. As MANSFIELD stated, "I do not believe we ought to blame Mr. Driver for what has happened. He is new in his position. I assume he has been acting under orders of the Bureau of the Budget."

For veterans needing domiciliary care, the policy inherent in closing 3,200 domiciliary beds means that this type of care will be gone forever. Since these veterans are at the bottom of the pile in our society, it means they will be forced to get in line with all other citizens to seek assistance and relief at the local level. For these veterans it may be called the great deception rather than the Great Society.

All Americans are for economy in Government, but, as Senator MANSFIELD stated, "Whose economy? Not the veterans of the region, who have every right under the law and simple justice to claim first-class service. Not the veterans who need prompt medical attention. Not their families who will have to travel great additional distances * * * to provide the essential therapy * * * involved in visits to patients." We agree.

A copy of Commander in Chief Jenkins' letter to OLIN E. TEAGUE is attached.

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

[From special bulletin, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Jan. 14, 1965]

CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs recently announced the closing of 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries.

Regional offices

State	Offices closed	Functions transferred to—
New York [1]	Albany	New York.
	Syracuse	Buffalo.
Pennsylvania	Wilkes-Barre	Philadelphia.
Ohio	Cincinnati	Cleveland.
Missouri	Kansas City	St. Louis.
Louisiana	Shreveport	New Orleans.
Texas	Lubbock	Waco.
	San Antonio	Houston.
Alaska	Juneau	Seattle, Wash.
Delaware	Wilmington	Philadelphia, Pa.
Nevada	Reno	Los Angeles, Calif.
Vermont	White River Junction.	Boston, Mass.
New Hampshire	Manchester	Boston, Mass.
North Dakota	Fargo	St. Paul, Minn.
South Dakota	Sioux Falls	Do.
Wyoming	Cheyenne	Denver, Colo.

[1] Brooklyn and New York functions will be consolidated under 1 manager, but remain in the same physical locations.

Reasons cited for closing numerous regional offices include reduced participation in and actual termination of some readjustment programs, the improvement and simplification of operational procedures, conversion to automatic data processing, and changes in the management of various programs. Considerations cited for the selection of offices to be closed include workload, operating costs, veteran population, volume of communications, number of employees, and the fact that the unit production cost reduces in proportion to the increase in size of the office.

Hospitals

State	Location	Operating beds	Nov. 30, 1964, average daily patient load
New York	Bath	273	226
Ohio	Broadview Heights division (TB) (Brecksville).	177	98
New York	Castle Point	258	227
Illinois	Dwight	215	183
New Mexico	Fort Byard	215	156
Colorado	Grand Junction	152	99
Montana	Miles City	96	76
Nebraska	Lincoln	280	177
Texas	McKinney	312	254
Massachusetts	Rutland Heights.	420	363
New York	Sunmount	511	324
Total		2,909	2,183

The VA explanation for closing hospitals refers to significant breakthroughs in medical science which have altered the type and nature of medical care and facilities therefor, reduction in need of facilities for treatment of tuberculosis, obsolescence of some facilities, and disproportionate geographical locations. Considerations cited for the selection of the specific hospitals to be closed include the need for extensive modernization, staffing problems, excessive operating costs, and low or decreasing patient demand for hospitalization at these particular facilities. The VA claims that the beds closed will be numerically placed elsewhere in areas of greater need as soon as facilities therefor are available.

Domiciliaries

State	Location	Number of beds
New York	Bath	830
Iowa	Clinton	565
Georgia	Thomasville	800
Oregon	White City	1,025
Total		3,220

The explanation for closing the domiciliaries refers to gradual but profound changes from the date of inception of the domiciliary programs, the necessity of integrating domiciliary activities with hospitals, and the impossibility of providing all modern diagnostic and therapeutic tools in domiciliaries not affiliated with hospitals. Included were references to the effect of the vast social security program, increased veterans pensions, and other Federal and local programs which provide care facilities. Apparently the primary specific reason for closing the Clinton, Iowa, Thomasville, Ga., and White City, Oreg., domiciliaries is the fact that they are separate domiciliaries not located adjacent to VA hospitals. This, of course, would also apply to the Bath domiciliary if it were to be maintained after closing the VA hospital at the same location.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Is is estimated that closing of the listed VA facilities will save $23,500,000 in administrative or overhead costs in fiscal year 1966. All closings are to be completed by June 30, 1965, with many to be completed by April 1, 1965. A definite schedule for each station will apparently be available in the near future.

Admissions to the affected hospitals and domiciliaries will be discontinued.

It is estimated that approximately 50 percent of the 2,183 patients now in the hospitals to be closed will be transferred to another hospital because of the need for continued care. The domiciliary members will be transferred to another domiciliary if they so desire.

Necessary personnel, including contact representatives, loan guarantee personnel, and members of the chief attorney's staff will be maintained as needed at the closed locations. Clinics for outpatient treatment and compensation and pension examinations now operated at Lubbock, Tex., San Antonio, Tex., Syracuse, N.Y., and Juneau, Alaska, will be continued.

Employees not retained at the present locations wil be given an opportunity to follow their functions to another field station where applicable, or accept the offer of a position at another field station. In order to provide maximum opportunity for placement of employees affected by these changes the VA is placing restrictions on hiring at its installations throughout the country. Cost of moving will be paid by the Government.

COMMENTS OF THE VFW NATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICE DIRECTOR

While the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs announced the closing of the facilities listed in this bulletin, it is no secret that the idea for extensive closing is the product of the minds of officials of the Bureau of the Budget who believe that, except for consideration of the adverse effect of service-connected disabilities, veterans should receive no special consideration and should receive whatever public assistance they need from the Health and Welfare programs authorized for the general public. It is no secret in Washington that some proposals considered would have resulted in the closing of a much greater number of VA facilities.

The retention of personnel for personal service to veterans at the locations of closed regional offices will be of some benefit. The pattern of the past in this regard, however, causes one to doubt that these limited offices will be continued for any great length of time. VA officials state only that they will be maintained "as long as needed."

The adverse attitude of VA officials with respect to separate domiciliaries not affiliated with VA hospitals has been known for some time. It is strange that this has rather suddenly been considered to be such a tremendous handicap in view of the relatively good record of these facilities in caring for veterans in need of such care since the date of the inception of this program in the 19th century.

Although the VA may honor its pledge to numerically place the closed operating beds in other facilities in areas of greater need, it is obvious that this cannot be fully accomplished prior to or immediately after the closing date of June 30, 1965. There will, therefore, be a reduction in the number of operating hospital beds of approximately 1,000 in the 1966 fiscal year. The VA has consistently supported and has urged an increase in the 125,000 authorized hospital-bed ceiling, on the basis that while it is a limitation, it is also a stabilizing factor. It is rapidly becoming a numerical myth in view of the reduction in the number of operating beds.

Many Members of Congress and perhaps others were trusted with the list of facilities to be closed Tuesday, January 12, 1965. The VFW Washington office was advised that under no circumstances would such list be available prior to 3 p.m. Wednesday, January 13, 1965. One or more of those who were trusted with the list January 12, 1965, apparently made it available to the press. While members of the staff of the VFW Washington office were aware of the probable identity of some facilities to be closed, they maintained good faith with the VA and released no information concerning individual facilities prior to the date the information was officially received from the VA, Wednesday, January 13, 1965. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should recognize the interest of national veterans organizations and their demonstrated policy of not prematurely releasing information by providing appropriate officials of such organizations with the same detailed information at the same time it is furnished to others even though prior to the official date and time for public release.

The VFW has requested the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct hearings to determine when and by whom this decision to close VA facilities was made, and to explore and evaluate the reasons therefor.

LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS, JANUARY 14, 1965

DEAR MR. DRIVER: The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has long recognized the occasional need and justification for limited changes in the structure of the Veterans' Administration. This includes general support of the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to close hospital beds in areas of greatly reduced need, and to reestablish such beds in areas of demonstrated significantly greater need. The number of facilities, however, selected for almost immediate closing is staggering. For numerous reasons the decision to close many of these facilities does not merit the support of this organization.

The number of operating beds and actual patients or members at some of the hospitals and domiciliaries which are scheduled to be closed indicates a substantial need for con-

tinued operation of such facilities. The physical condition of some of these facilities may well be unsatisfactory but this should not be a controlling factor. You have completely modernized facilities at other locations and have even constructed complete replacements for obsolete hospitals. This also could and should be done at a number of the facilities included in the list to be closed.

The closing of the hospital and domiciliary facilities will eliminate convenient availability of VA care for eligible veterans in the affected areas, and will impose on these fully eligible veterans the requirement of extensive travel for required care. This is impossible in emergency cases and undesirable for several reasons. It will make it difficult, if not impossible, for family members to visit veterans in the distant treatment facilities contrary to the proclaimed VA policy urging such visits and recognizing the importance thereof in the total treatment program for individual veterans and in plans for release and restoration to home or community facilities.

The contention that the closed hospital beds will all be reestablished in areas of greater need would be considerably more persuasive if suitable facilities for such beds were available in the appropriate areas in order to permit complete implementation of this transfer plan July 1, 1965. The impossibility to do so on that date or for sometime thereafter is clearly demonstrated by the estimated loss of approximately 1,000 hospital beds operating in fiscal year 1966.

The decision to close the separate domiciliaries not affiliated with VA hospitals is ostensibly arbitrary and apparently based on nothing more than the presumption that separate domiciliaries cannot afford proper treatment and care for domiciliary members. This is wholly disproved by the history of service of these facilities and the exceptionally excellent care in some domiciliaries, staffed and managed by officials and physicians of compassion and initiative. Some State veterans homes provide excellent home care, including intensive nursing care in many cases, without hospitals as defined in the VA system.

The projected saving of $23,500,000 for the 1966 fiscal year is obviously inconsequential in view of the greatly reduced service, reduction in care facilities, and increased distances required for some categories of service, including personal appearances before rating agencies, and hospital treatment and domiciliary care. The need for conservation of Federal funds in order to finance expanded and new programs is recognized. The amount preserved for these purposes by the VA economies in question will be more than offset by the detrimental effect of reduced care facilities for veterans and Federal employment opportunities in the affected localities, contrary to the desire of the current administration to promote programs for treatment and care, and employment opportunities for all.

I want to emphasize our distress concerning the manner of release of the information concerning these proposed closings, conveyed to you previously by the executive director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Washington office, and the director of the VFW national rehabilitation service. It is respectfully requested that in the future appropriate VFW national officers be advised of proposed VA changes of this type at the same time Members of Congress and any others so privileged are furnished such information.

I most strongly urge that you thoroughly review this decision in total and as it applies to each individual location, with a view toward substantial modification thereof, thus minimizing its adverse effect on the health and welfare of hundreds of thousands of veterans who served this Nation with honor in time of war.

JOHN A. JENKINS,
Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Hanson Baldwin Comments on Reserve Cutbacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the Congress have expressed apprehension because of the revolutionary changes in our national military Reserve posture which are being planned by the Pentagon. In effect it is proposed to abolish the active Reserves and to merge Reserve units with the National Guard.

This proposal has very broad implications.

It is the responsibility of the Congress under the Constitution "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

In meeting that obligation, the Congress has from time to time adopted laws establishing the basic structure of our military forces. In 1952, the Congress adopted the Armed Forces Reserve Act, and since has strengthened this basic law with various amendments. Today it represents the law of the land on Reserves.

The proposal of the Secretary of Defense would arbitrarily change this law without legislative concurrence by the Congress. The decision to do so was made on December 12 while Congress was in recess. It is my understanding that only three or four Members in the legislative branch of Government were consulted. Most of the others had no inkling that such a move was on the way.

It is proposed that this radical change will be accomplished by the simple expediency in the reduction of appropriations. The matter is not being submitted to Congress for consideration by properly constituted legislative committees. Nevertheless, I am confident that the legislative committees as well as the Appropriations Committees of Congress will carefully and objectively weigh the merits and demerits of the Pentagon's proposal.

In the New York Times of Sunday, January 17, Mr. Hanson Baldwin wrote an enlightening article on this Pentagon plan. He made it clear that under the law the Congress has a responsibility to pass on several major issues which are raised. Mr. Baldwin is one of the Nation's outstanding military writers and analysts. I include this article in the RECORD:

CONGRESS IS PREPARING STUDIES OF PENTAGON PLAN FOR RESERVES

(By Hanson Baldwin)

WASHINGTON, January 14.—Senate and House committees were preparing this week to conduct intensive studies of the Pentagon's plan to merge and realine the Army and Air Force Reserves and National Guard.

The studies have been spurred by letters to newspapers, television appearances, and the strong opposition of the Reserve Officers Association to the projected elimination or integration into the National Guard of all organized Reserve units.

The association, which has 60,000 members, is bitterly opposing the plan, which would, in effect, substitute a single Army and Air Force Reserve under one management, for the present system of two separate reserves.

The officers' group says, and the Army agrees, that the Army Reserve units contain a higher proportion of personnel with prior active duty than do the National Guard units. According to the association, 25 percent of the personnel in Army Reserve units have had 2 years of active-duty training in the Army and only 3 percent of the personnel in the Guard have served 2 years or more.

The Guard says that men who have finished their tours of active duty can be assigned, whether they wish it or not, to Reserve units, whereas the Guard, by law, must accept only volunteers. This requirement may be changed if the merger is approved by Congress.

DIFFERENCE IN FIGURES

The figures of the officers' association and the National Guard differ markedly on the experience, training and degree of readiness of Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard units. The association states that the Air Force Reserve has a higher percentage of volunteers with active-duty experience than do National Guard squadrons. The Guard denies this.

In a detailed bill of particulars circulated throughout the country, the officers' group has disputed virtually all of the Defense Department's cost-effectiveness claims for the plan.

The association says that deployment capability and combat readiness will be impaired, not improved, by any system that gives the National Guard management and control of all Reserve units.

"National Guard divisions manned predominantly by superficially trained personnel, with no prior active duty, will be substituted for Army Reserve divisions that are presently manned by a hard core of officers and men with extensive active-duty experience, the association states.

And it states further that the contemplated reduction of the combined troop list of the Army Reserve and Army National Guard from the present 29 divisions to a projected 8 eliminates the possibility of an "orderly phase-in of trained personnel and support forces to man (new) equipment produced after D-Day Mobilization Day."

HUGE SAVINGS DOUBTED

The officers' group also says that the plan will not save the $150 million annually that the Pentagon says (the Army's estimate is $130 million). The elimination of the corps system, which now administers the Army Reserve around the country, will save several thousand management and staff personnel, but the National Guard, at various State headquarters, will have to add some personnel to take over the administrative duties of the entire Reserve, the officer's association charges.

It is planned that 700,000 who are now authorized to receive drill pay annually will be reduced to a projected 550,000. However, if 8 divisions and 16 brigades (a brigade is approximately one-third of a division) are to be provided with 100 percent of their equipment needs and maintained in a high state of readiness, new equipment will be needed for about 3⅔ divisions in addition to that now on hand, according to Army statistics.

It costs from $115 to $130 million to equip an Infantry division, so that even if the anticipated savings of the merger should be realized—which the association disputes—it would require about 4 years before all of the ready divisions would actually be equipped and any savings would show, unless the defense budget for the Reserves is sharply increased.

These and other issues will be aired at length before congressional committees.

SEVERAL ISSUES INVOLVED

But it is already clear that there are three major, as well as many minor, issues involved in the realinement and merger of the Army and Air Force Reserve forces.

The first issue, officers are agreed, raises the question whether a paid drill strength of 550,000, instead of the present 700,000, for Army components and a force structure of 8 divisions and 16 brigades, instead of the present 29 divisions and 11 brigades, constitute an adequate reserve for an emergency? Or do the reductions imply a dangerous calculated risk?

Congressmen and officers agree that paper strengths have little meaning but that the real strength and readiness of the Reserve force depends upon the funds, equipment, training and encouragement provided by the Federal Government. The Reserve, no matter who manages it, is going to be as good or as bad as the Pentagon and Congress make it.

The second big issue concerns the dual State-Federal nature of the National Guard, which will become the only organized Reserve under the new concept.

National Guard officers are appointed by Governors; the Federal Government has a negative power over these appointments because it can withhold Federal recognition if the officer does not measure up to stipulated requirements. But it cannot choose an officer's successor; it cannot appoint and reshuffle officers, except when the Guard is on active duty.

GOVERNORS MUST APPROVE

Moreover, Governors must agree—as they have routinely done in the past—to changes in Guard units and they must accept for integration into the Guard the Reserve units now planned for elimination. The question is whether the Guard system can inherently provide the flexibility and effectiveness needed.

Many observers and commentators, including the Journal of the Armed Forces, believe the projected changes to be, in a military sense, "painful but progressive," or as President Johnson characterized them "prudent and wise."

But some are worried by the third issue, which is essentially political and philosophical and not military. The Army and Air Force Reserve components and the Army and Air Force National Guard have acted in their areas, as these officers see it, as one of the many military checks and balances in the democratic system.

They helped to prevent, by their very rivalries, the concentration of too much power in too few hands in the Pentagon. The individualism and traditions of Reserve units will be lost, it is suggested, in the proposed realinement, and the trend toward amonolithic defense, structure, already so pronounced in the Pentagon, will be accelerated.

One Man, One Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress there was much discussion, on and off the record, concerning the Supreme Court's decisions in Baker against Carr and Reynolds against Sims. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New York Times magazine of November 8, 1964, which examines the issues and discusses the problems involved in reapportionment. As Prof. Andrew Hacker, of Cornell University, points out:

The goal of equal votes for equal citizens, far from being a radical departure in our political tradition, is consistent with this Nation's efforts to extend a full franchise to all citizens.

The article follows:

ONE MAN, ONE VOTE—YES OR NO?

(By Andrew Hacker)

The closing days of the 88th Congress, contrary to all plans and expectations, were consumed by a prolonged debate that was never on the official agenda and which put an effective end to normal legislative business for the session. Its subject was the abstract principle of "one man, one vote."

Since the earliest days of the Republic, the districts of most State legislatures have been so constructed as to give disproportionate representation to rural voters. While this practice was struck down by the Supreme Court in its 1962 *Baker* v. *Carr* decision, at that time the Justices gave no precise indication of the reform they would require.

Because *Baker* v. *Carr* was silent on the subject of second chambers, the hope was held out that the upper houses in each State might still be permitted to remain attuned to the interests of the countryside. Then, last June, came *Reynolds* v. *Sims*. In that case the Court held that both legislative chambers had to be based on population alone, that there could be no exceptions to the rule that all districts had to be substantially equal.

This time the reactions were profound and came from several directions. The Republicans, meeting in San Francisco, added to their platform a plank calling for a constitutional amendment that would allow one legislative house to be formed on criteria other than population. The House of Representatives rushed through a bill stripping the Federal courts of all jurisdiction over State apportionment cases. The Senate was less precipitous, but there was strong sentiment for at least delaying the impact of the Court's decision.

The argument for "one man, one vote" is simply an application of the principle of political equality. All votes should carry the same weight, it is said, because no justification can be found for singling out certain citizens for preferred treatment. If minorities are worried about the possibility of majority oppression, the remedy lies not in giving them added electoral weight but rather in settled constitutional procedures.

Moreover, the 14th amendment stricture that all citizens are entitled to "equal protection of the laws" would seem to require that everyone be permitted to participate in the process whereby those laws are made. Experience has shown that those who are excluded from the polls or who are underrepresented in legislative councils will find themselves having to obey laws that are highly discriminatory. Urban voters, to use the customary example, are taxed to support rural services while city problems are all but ignored. If the majority is not allowed to rule, then power reverts to some accidental or consciously designated minority.

"One man, one vote" may appear to be unexceptionable as a matter of logic. But logic alone is not the only guide in political life. When a national party and a national legislative chamber both propound the argument that some votes ought to be more equal than others, it is time to examine this position with consideration and care:

1. What is good for the Congress in Washington, it has been suggested, ought also to apply at the State level. The Senate has given equal representation to each State regardless of size, and by the same token one legislative chamber in each State should be allowed to represent established political units within its own boundaries. As a minimum, the State house might give each county at least a single representative, thus insuring that its interests will have a spokesman.

A legislature must insure, by one means or another, that small units have an effective voice in its proceedings. This is especially necessary when metropolitan areas elect large blocks of legislators who might easily ignore or drown out rural opinion. The founders agreed that Delaware and Rhode Island should always be able to defend themselves in the Senate. Ought not similar guarantees to be given to Schuyler County in New York (population: 15,044) and to Sierra County in California (2,247)?

2. Rural areas, which benefit most from arrangements as they now stand, actually need additional representation for their well-being—if not their survival. Ours is an urban age, with wealth increasingly concentrated in the cities and suburbs. Small towns and agricultural areas are losing population, which is one reason why they are overrepresented, and industry is by no means reinvigorating rural America to the extent that is necessary. If the logic of equal votes is applied, then back-country legislative seats would in most cases be transferred to the growing suburbs. Yet this would take from the have-nots and give to those who are already doing quite well.

In Illinois, for example, the median family income in Gallatin County (population: 7,638) is $2,711 per year, whereas the Chicago suburbs of Du Page County, which have doubled in numbers in the last decade, have a median annual income of $8,570 per family. Gallatin may be overrepresented in Springfield but it is underequipped with schools, roads, hospitals, and other amenities. Were the prosperous and populous to be given their arithmetical due, the odds are great that the flow of public funds to rural sections would come to a halt.

No one will deny that cities and suburbs have problems of their own; but metropolitan areas have the resources to help themselves if only they would set their minds to it. In contrast, the last remaining hope for the countryside lies in its political power at the State capitals.

3. "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God * * *." Thomas Jefferson once wrote, adding, "the mobs of great cities add just so much strength to the support of pure government as sores do to the strength of the human body." Under this theory—which still prevails in many sections of the country—the America of the provinces is composed of superior stock: independent, self-reliant, and embodying the values which impart integrity to society. The rural and small-town citizen is an individual, uncorrupted by the mass mentality of the city. While such a characterization can verge on caricature, it explains why we hear so much about "bloc voting" in the cities but not about such behavior out where the pavements end. At all events, if rural areas need added representation because of their economic plight they also deserve such a magnified voice due to their enhanced moral character.

4. There is no technical difficulty in dividing a State into a series of geometric quadrilaterals, each one having almost precisely the same population as its neighbor. Michigan, in reapportioning its senate last year, created 38 districts no one of which had less than 205,000 people nor more than 207,000. But to do this is to break up the natural communities of interest and outlook within a State, imposing an artificial political mold on what are really areas having

historic identities and social complexions of their own.

Thus, in the cause of arithmetical consistency, a dairying region may be forced into a shotgun marriage with an industrial suburb, resulting in a district that is difficult for one man to represent and lacking a personality of its own. By the same token there is much to be gained in psychic satisfactions, if nothing else, in having Polish and Czech and Jewish districts where voters can be represented by someone of their own ethnic background who understands their particular interests and needs.

5. There are indications that the voters—and not simply rural voters—are content with arrangements as they now stand; that they see nothing particularly malapropos in malapportionment. In Colorado, for example, a statewide referendum rejected by a 2 to 1 vote a proposal calling for districting reforms in the direction of greater equality.

Moreover, every county in the State, urban as well as rural, registered a majority for retaining the status quo. Thus it would appear, at least in the States that have had such referendums, that the majority is sensitive to minority needs and is willing to dilute its own votes so as to augment those of their fellow citizens who need them more.

Some of these arguments are clearly more persuasive than others. It is hard to prove that while 1,000 city dwellers automatically make up a mob, 1,000 farmers are all independent yeomen. Even if the innate superiority of rural Americans were demonstrated, it would not necessarily follow that a weightier ballot should be given to those blessed with greater virtue. Among other difficulties there would be the problem of finding virtuous souls, admittedly few and far between, who happen to reside in the cities and suburbs, in order to give them additional votes at election time. For uprightness of character is a condition of spirit and not dependent on where one stakes one's tent.

More to the point is the fact that rural America is indeed poorer, that it needs political leverage more than its metropolitan cousin. The reply here, quite simply, is that if one disadvantaged minority is to have preferential treatment in the chambers where laws are made, then other such minorities should be given similar consideration. Surely Negroes, Mexican-Americans, the indigent aged, mothers supporting fatherless children, and the blind also stand in need of greater-than-average governmental help and protection. If a downstate Illinois farmer with an annual income of $2,711 deserves to be heard so does a Negro laundress in Chicago who also ends the year with $2,711. The rural areas hardly have a monopoly on those suffering from majority indifference.

The creation of districts of equal population would undoubtedly destroy what are now homogeneous enclaves. Yet one of the troubles with State legislatures is that too many of their members do in fact represent special-interest constituencies, preoccupied with a particular crop or industry or natural resource. Experience has usually shown that the best lawmakers emerger from districts that are diverse in their social characteristics and competitive in their party politics. Such legislators must be able to talk the language of more than a single electoral group and have the skills to win an open fight against more-than-token opposition. Underpopulated districts, whether rural or urban, tend to be one-party domains, with the same seat going to an organization regular. Enlarging these fiefdoms would breathe some fresh air into more than a few musty political corners.

Should each State have a miniature Federal system, with one house based on population and the other on some other criterion? There may be good reason for arguing that a bicameral legislature serves some useful purpose (although unicameral Nebraska has not been notable for rushing through hasty or ill-advised statutes). However, the two chambers, as Chief Justice Warren pointed out last June, can both be population-based and still display quite different characteristics.

"One body could be composed of single-member districts while the other could have at least some multi-member districts," he wrote in *Reynolds* v. *Sims*. "The length of term of the legislators in the separate bodies could differ. The numerical size of the two bodies could be made to differ, even significantly, and the geographical size of districts from which legislators are elected could also be made to differ. And apportionment in one House could be arranged so as to balance off minor inequities in the representation of certain areas in the other House."

What does stand out is the fact that the role of counties, townships and other subdivisions within the States, simply is not constitutionally analagous to the status of the States themselves vis-a-vis the Union. Alaska and Utah are sovereign entities and hence entitled to as much representation in the Senate as are New York and California. Counties, far from being sovereign, are convenient governmental agencies which can be created, consolidated, or abolished by the States. The States came together to create a more perfect union; that is why they have sovereign status and that is why the Senate exists. Counties and cities are creatures of the States; it is too late to endow them with an immortality they never had.

Most compelling, perhaps, is that the people of a State have on occasion agreed to permitting one of their legislative chambers to give an amplified voice to underpopulated areas. Here the Supreme Court has chosen to stand on slippery political ground, for it has had to justify a judicial veto of arrangements approved by popular referendum. Even if majorities in Colorado and Michigan and California acted mistakenly, it may be argued that it is part of democracy that the people should be allowed to commit their own errors—and then learn by experience and mend their ways in their own time.

The Court's reply, or at least the reply of six of the nine Justices last June, was that "an individual's constitutionally protected right to cast an equally weighted ballot cannot be denied even by a vote of a majority of a State's electorate."

The issue is the old one of majority rule versus individual rights, but with a new twist. The Court seems to be saying that even if a majority of the citizens are willing to dilute the value of their legislative vote they must be prevented from doing so. For citizens may not trade, barter, or give away their basic political freedoms. These rights are the end products of a historical evolution, too often imperfectly understood by those who now possess them. And the continuance of democratic government itself requires that such rights be protected and guaranteed. Jean-Jacques Rousseau once said that there are times when citizens must be "forced to be free." Equal votes for equal citizens seems to be just that sort of occasion.

Logic, theory, and history can be brought to bear in defense of one man, one vote. Such a position, moreover, is difficult to compromise. For if a minority can rule in one House of a bicameral legislature, then it could veto the acts of its sister chamber and exact concessions on behalf of the special interests its represents.

The problem, not surprisingly, is one of political power. Those who feel that current arrangements safeguard their interests are understandably disinclined to see changes brought about. While the general public has not become involved in the reapportionment issue, it is plain that many elected officials are deeply concerned. There are more than 7,000 State legislators, more of whom have something to lose than to gain by redistricting, and these local politicians can expect to find fellow feeling among Members of Congress and party leaders at all levels.

But it would be idle to mask the fact that State legislatures are not simply rural but conservative citadels. Those who are calling for reapportionment might well ask just how disinterested their own position is. If it were proposed that the U.S. Senate be abolished—after all, it is a far cry from one man, one vote—and that all national legislation be left to the House of Representatives the suspicion arises that such a move would arouse little enthusiasm in liberal circles. Much of the rhetoric on both sides tends simply to rationalize a struggle for that oldest of all political commodities; the power of some to make policy for all.

If apportionment dominated the closing days of the 88th Congress, notice has been given that the debate will resume when our lawmakers convene in January. Leaders in both Chambers have promised to introduce resolutions for amending the Constitution that would permit one house in each State to be based on nonpopulation factors.

Whether such a resolution will be able to muster the required two-thirds vote, especially in the Senate, remains to be seen. Yet if this is accomplished and an amendment is sent to the States, for ratification in 1965, then there will be the curious spectacle of malapportioned State legislatures voting for their own continuation. In the words of Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, this will allow "the rotten boroughs to decide whether they should continue to be rotten."

The goal of equal votes for equal citizens, far from being a radical departure in our political tradition, is consistent with this Nation's efforts to extend a full franchise to all citizens. Reapportionment, insuring ballots of the same weight for all voters, is not only long overdue but will also lay the groundwork for updating of our 50 State legislatures.

As matters now stand, those bodies have lost effective contact with all too many of the voters they supposedly represent, and they are unwilling or unable to deal with the most pressing problems within their jurisdictions. One consequence of malapportionment has been public cynicism about State government; the reverse side of the coin is mounting popular approval for the extension of Federal authority to provide services the States have neglected Representative legislatures, representing people rather than cows or acres or trees, will actually serve to strengthen the States and give new life to the practice as well as the theory of federalism.

The City: A Place To Stay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, when an economic recession hits a major city, in far too many cases that city as a whole and its citizens as individuals complain bitterly about the buffets of fate, but do little to recover from such buffets. It is pleasing, therefore, to call attention

to one city that refuses to bow before adverse economic developments without fighting back.

San Diego, Calif., which I have the honor to represent, is such a city.

Three years ago, Time magazine brought national attention to San Diego but not the sort of attention a city seeks. Ours was labeled a "bust town."

The current issue of Time tells a different story. It details at length the efforts made by civic leaders to counteract the adverse effects of an economic recession, caused in major part by the phasing out of Government defense contracts. A highlight of the efforts of these dedicated men and women was the construction—at a cost of $90 million in local money—of the community concourse, a downtown building project that now enables San Diego to rank with the most modern cities in the world.

So inspiring is the article in Time magazine, and so indicative of what can be done by other cities in the same situation, that I insert it in the RECORD:

THE CITY: A PLACE TO STAY

It had taken 4 years' work and $21.5 million, but San Diegans were convinced that the evening had been worth it. For with the opening night of San Diego's impressive new Civic Theater last week, the community could look back with pride on an urban renewal program without parallel in the United States. It could also look forward to growth and progress that of late have eluded what was becoming California's problem city.

San Diego (population 655,000) has every natural asset a city could ask. Set between rolling mountains and the sea, it boasts a magnificent natural harbor, a paradise for yachtsmen and a major port for the U.S. Navy. No smog sullies its air, no wastes pollute its waters. The climate is kindly (67° to 70°) all year. It is a place that people dream of coming back to, and they do; the phone book is a virtual who was who of retired Navy and Marine Corps brass. To keep San Diego unspoiled, the city fathers long ago adopted rigid zoning laws. For decades, all attempts to attract new industry bogged down in the perennial controversy known locally as "geraniums versus smokestacks," and geraniums were practically growing in the streets.

As a result, San Diego over the years became a land of lotus eaters, so immersed in its happy, old-fashioned ways that the future seemed irrelevant. By failing to diversify its industrial base, the city by 1961 had saddled itself with a 7.5-percent unemployment rate, far higher than in nearby Los Angeles. Worse, for the long term, was the loss of skilled workers as a result of cutbacks in the aerospace industry, their biggest employer. In 1960, when a group of businessmen got the results of an exhaustive study of the city's economic prospects, the outlook was so gloomy that, as one economist put it, "you could have cut the pessimism with a knife."

Not a single office building had gone up in the center of the city since 1928, and the downtown area was a sleazy jungle of honky-tonks and arcades. Suburban shopping centers had relentlessly whittled downtown retail volume; the city faced a 30-percent decline in sales revenue by 1962. A successful bond issue was as rare as snow. Despite 35 separate attempts to build one, San Diego remained a city without a convention hall. In virtually every other sector of the economy from transit to schools, San Diego was lagging far behind lesser and less-blessed cities.

FACING FACTS

The man who first suspected how far was Joseph E. Jessop, president of a chain of jewelry stores and the patriarch of a family that has been in San Diego since 1890. In 1959, Jessop, who had already begun to move his own stores out to the suburbs, called together a group of 60 leading businessmen to start facing the hard facts. "Up to this point," Jessop recalls, "San Diego was only penny ante. If you asked them for a contribution, they wrote you a check for $200." Jessop demanded—and got—$100,000 "for a start." With it, on May 1, 1959, they formed San Diegans, Inc.

The group's first project was an attempt to revitalize the downtown area by building an ambitious complex to serve as a center for the city's cultural, financial and administrative activities. Financing was a problem. Government-aided urban renewal was considered too controversial for ultraconservative San Diego, one of the only two counties in California carried by Goldwater. A bond issue, which by State law requires a two-thirds majority to carry, was certain to be beaten. So San Diegans, Inc., made an outright gift of $1.5 million to the city, which agreed to borrow the rest of the project's $21.5 million cost from its own employees' pension fund.

Functional L. Finally after 2 years of tearing down and building up, San Diego's functional, L-shaped concourse is now complete. The complex includes an 11-story parking garage and, flanked by a pleasant terrace, a capacious convention and exhibit hall, a 14-story city administrative building, and the elegant 3,000-seat Civic Theater, which will also house the city's symphony orchestra and a brandnew opera company.

Since San Diegans, Inc., began its work, nearly $90 million has been invested in the downtown area in building and restoration. The city's success has inspired other groups to deal similarly with problem neighborhoods. High-powered citizens' committees have also been formed to attract industry, rehabilitate the transit system, overhaul city finances. San Diegans, Inc., which has spent a total of $73,500 in surveys, has just completed a building-by-building blueprint for redevelopment of 74 more downtown blocks.

Thus San Diego has worked its way out of lotusland on its own terms. The city has yet to seek a single cent of redevelopment money from the Federal Government. Without going soft on smokestacks, San Diego in 2 years has more than doubled the number of research and development plants in the area. Investment in new industry rose from $440,000 in 1963 to $4 million last year, while three big junior colleges and a University of California compus with a projected enrollment of 27,000 in 20 years have just been completed.

Perhaps the most important gain of all is intangible. San Diego, as Banker Ewart Goodwin pointed out last week, has learned under pressure to harness "the mutual power of the community." Said he: "Business needs the authority of government and government needs business as a salesman." As a result, San Diego today is not only a nice place to come back to; it is a place to stay.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Debate on U.S. Policy on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, a continuing and in my judgment, very constructive debate, on U.S. policy on Vietnam is underway. Right now, I believe, there exists what amounts to a deadlock between the state of South Vietnam, aided to an increasing extent by the United States, and the Vietcong guerrillas, aided to an increasing extent by North Vietnam. It would be difficult, and probably impossible, for South Vietnamese forces to win a final military victory, since there appears to be a grass roots cooperation with the Vietcong throughout much of the countryside. On the other hand, it would be equally difficult for the Communist forces to achieve a final victory over the South Vietnamese, with their strong U.S. military backing. The U.S. forces are undoubtedly able to remain there indefinitely and to prevent a Communist takeover in that manner; yet there is raised with increasing frequency the question of whether we might achieve basically the same results, over the long run, by a negotiated settlement which would spare the Vietnamese people the long suffering and economic devastation of continued warfare. It would also avoid the continued financial drain and loss of life now being suffered by the United States.

Few Americans favor an immediate and unqualified pullout. I believe the commitment we have given the leaders of South Vietnam and the concern we have for the people there would make it impossible for the United States to withdraw immediately. Yet it is not too soon to discuss the terms on which a withdrawal might ultimately be possible, and to assess the long-term requirements for the settlement of an issue which is basically political, not military. During the present struggle, we should not remain silent, with bated breath, as it were, waiting for a sudden resolution of the problem, which is most unlikely. Rather, we should use, here in Congress and throughout the country, the existing deadlock to discuss alternative policies and forms of settlement, so that the American people, as well as the administration, will be better equipped to take further action at an opportune time. Prolonging the conflict indefinitely could only mean continued painful losses for both sides.

In this connection, Mr. President, a debate over U.S. policy on Vietnam was published in the New York Times magazine of January 17. The debate was between the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and Henry Cabot Lodge, former Ambassador to South Vietnam. Both points of view—"withdraw now" or "fight on to victory"—were presented clearly and cogently. I ask unanimous consent that this presentation be printed in the Appendix following my remarks, in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST LEAVE VIETNAM

(By WAYNE MORSE)

Ten years ago the United States embarked upon an adventure in South Vietnam that was just about 100 years out of date. While Britain, France, and the Netherlands were terminating their rule over their Asiatic colonies, the United States began trying to establish its own beachhead on the Asiatic mainland.

Although present at the Geneva conference of 1954, which drew up the accord whereby France withdrew from its old colony of Indochina, the United States refused to sign the final agreement. So did one of the subdivisions of Indochina, South Vietnam. The United States began a heavy program of financial and military aid to a new Premier in South Vietnam who, we believed, was most likely to preserve a Western orientation. When it came time for the 1956 election throughout both North and South Vietnam required by the Geneva accord, we and our client in Saigon, Ngo Dinh Diem, realized it would be won by Ho Chi Minh's followers not only in his own North Vietnam but in the South as well. South Vietnam refused to proceed with the election.

In the last decade we have explained our policy as one of helping a free government resist Communist subversion. But South Vietnam never has had a free government. In its 10 years of existence its governments have been picked for it by the United States and maintained by our heavy doses of economic and military aid.

The fraudulence of our claim has been starkly exposed by the successve coups in Saigon and by the piecing together of one government after another by the American Embassy. Leaders suspected of favoring neutralism or any form of negotiation for settlement of the civil war are firmly excluded from Government ranks. The major tools we have used in manipulating political and military leaders have been various threats and promises regarding our aid, which now hovers around the level of $600 million a year in a country of 14 million people. This sum of exclusive of the cost of keeping 23,000 American "advisers" and large contingents of aircraft in the country.

In fact, our official explanations of why we are there now play down the "helping a free government" line and play up American security and American prestige as the stakes in Vietnam. At least, the explanations are getting closer to the truth, which is that the United States took over this quarter of Indochina in 1954 when the French pulled out. Having intruded ourselves into Southeast Asia, where we never were before, it was this country and not the Communists who made our prestige in Asia the issue.

Our Secretary of State often says that "China must leave her neighbors alone." Under this premise, our officials have vaguely threatened to expand the war to North Vietnam and possibly China if we cannot win in South Vietnam. But there are no Chinese forces in South Vietnam nor Chinese equipment in appreciable amount. Americans are still the only foreign troops in South Vietnam.

Nonetheless, China has the same interest in what goes on in the subcontinent of Southeast Asia as we have in Mexico, Cuba and other countries of Latin America. She will increasingly resist having hostile governments on her borders, as do Russia and the United States. We recognize and accept this principle as regards Russia, but we refused to recognize it as regards China.

This has been true even though we have watched other Western nations ousted from Asia and Africa by rising nationalism. It was inevitable that once China became part of this tide she would reassert her interest in the governments on her borders. A reawakened China would assert this interest whether she were Communist or not. The more we escalate the Vietnam conflict, the more likely China is to intervene directly.

In South Vietnam we invite China's apprehension, but more than that, in trying to surround China with American bases and pro-Western states, we have to buck not only communism but anticolonialism. One of our many mistakes is to equate the two, especially when antiwhite feeling is directed against the United States. Advocates of a "containment" policy for China, similar to that applied to Russia with some success in the late 1940's and 1950's, overlook the impossibility of maintaining Western strongholds in Asia, no matter what their purpose. What we could do in white Europe and even the Middle East is not to be imposed upon an Asia that is united in at least one respect—its determination to see the white man sent back to his own shores.

With our great wealth we can sustain the current war effort in Vietnam indefinitely, even if it is escalated. But it will never end, because our presence and our selection of Saigon's rulers will always inspire rebellion.

Far from maintaining our prestige in Asia, our present policy in Vietnam is eroding it. The fact that we are losing despite the steady increase in our aid, the addition of 23,000 American advisers, and complete American air domination, has already led several Asian nations to throw out an anchor on the Chinese side. Of the famous dominoes that were all supposed to fall to China if we failed to take up the French burden in southeast Asia, Burma, and Cambodia have already neutralized themselves. Pakistan has made it clear that the aid she gets from us is directed against India and not against China. Japan and India, the largest non-Communist nations of Asia, who might be expected to be the most helpful to us in Vietnam, have not associated themselves with what we are doing there. A few days ago India's Premier Shastri urged a new international conference to negotiate a settlement. He asked the United States not to press for a military decision and urged that we avoid a major military conflict.

Of all the nations touted as potential Chinese victims, only Australia and the Philippines have offered tangible help in South Vietnam. The Australian contribution amounts to some 66 "advisers" and three

air-cargo planes. The Philippine offer of a force of volunteer veterans was turned down.

That is the extent of the local interest and support for the American view that we are saving all of Asia from communism by our policy in Vietnam. Surely if one of these so-called dominoes believed it, they would be fighting side by side with us in Vietnam. They are not, because they see us having to run faster and faster just to stay in the same place in Vietnam. They see that the bulk of its people are too indifferent to American objectives to resist the Vietcong. They know that sooner or later we will have to leave and they do not want to jeopardize their own standing in Asia by supporting a last-minute white intervention.

There are many ways this country could crawl back from the limb we crawled out on 10 years ago. Through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the United Nations or a reconvened Geneva Conference we could seek to establish an international presence in Vietnam to stabilize and pacify the country while it develops political institutions. Our refusal to sign the accord of 1954 has always made suspect our claim that we were enforcing it.

In truth, our "enforcement" has taken the form of violations far more massive than any violations by North Vietnam. Our jet air forces and bases, our helicopter fleet, the 23,000 U.S. military advisers are all violations of the 1954 accord. So are they violations of section after section of the United Nations Charter, under which we are pledged to seek peaceful solutions to disputes and to lay before the U.N. those disputes we are unable to solve peacefully through means of our own choosing. We have done neither in Vietnam.

A negotiated settlement in South Vietnam is the first solution we are obliged to seek. Of course, it would mean some guaranteed neutralization of the country. That would give its war-torn people the best chance they have yet had to construct a country of their own, something the French, the Japanese, the French again and now the Americans have not given them.

If we fail to reach a negotiated settlement, then the U.N. Charter requires the dispute to be laid before a regional organization, such as SEATO, or one of the U.N. bodies. Both groups have the capacity to police the country; both are more likely to bring it some degree of cohesion than is the United States with its unilateral intervention in pursuit of our own interests.

Some Americans have busily erected an enormous pyramid of disasters they contend would result even from this limited American retrenchment. They see America as a power in the Pacific only if we and our friends control all its shores instead of just its northern, eastern, and southern shores, plus the island fringe off its western shore. Most important, they ignore the impossibility of creating an American foothold on that shore in mid-20th century, communism or no communism.

Many countries, East and West, have accommodated themselves to the end of the old order in Asia. We will, too, eventually. The only question is how much blood and money we will waste first trying to turn the clock back.

We Can Win in Vietnam

(By Henry Cabot Lodge)

"Pulling out of Vietnam" is exactly the same as "turning Vietnam over to the Communists." Such a course would be not merely imprudent, but actually extremely dangerous.

Geographically, Vietnam stands at the hub of a vast area of the world—southeast Asia—an area with a population of 240 million people extending 2,300 miles from north to south, and 3,000 miles from east to west. The Mekong River, one of the 10 largest rivers in the world, reaches the sea in South Vietnam. He who holds or has influence in Vietnam can affect the future of the Philippines and Taiwan to the east, Thailand and Burma with their huge rice surpluses to the west, and Malaysia and Indonesia with their rubber, oil, and tin to the south. Japan, Australia, and New Zealand would in turn be deeply concerned by the communization of South Vietnam.

Historically, Vietnam has long played a part in the political development of the Far East. For many centuries it was under the occupation or influence of the Chinese and was used by the Chinese as a means of enforcing their hegemony over the whole of southeast Asia. The Vietnamese did not enjoy this experience and have traditionally done what they could to throw off Chinese overlordship. In a very real sense, therefore, the present struggle is one of self-determination.

But today Vietnam should be seen as one more instance in a long series of events which began in Iran, Turkey, and Greece after World War II; which include the seizure of Czechoslovakia; which led to the Marshall plan in Europe; which caused the Korean war, the Malayan emergency, the Huk rebellion in the Philippines and the Berlin crisis. In all these widely separated places the Communist bloc has tried to subvert and to undermine the free world in order to spread its control and its suppression of freedom.

In opposing this Communist onslaught, the free world has stood together for nearly two decades. One manifestation of our common determination to frustrate the Communist design to conquer Europe was the creation of NATO. Elsewhere in the world we have formed other alliances. The United States alone has suffered 160,000 casualties since the end of World War II in this effort to contain the spread of communism.

This worldwide effort by nations of the free world has not been undertaken out of a simple quixotic delight in engaging in battles in distant places. Nor does it signify a desire to establish a new colonialism or any kind of special position. The war in Vietnam is not only the struggle of a small nation to exist, but it is also an open encounter between the doctrine that "wars of revolution," as the Communists call them, are the wave of the future, and our belief that in the future nations should be allowed to develop their own destinies free from outside interference.

Although the North Vietnamese have their own motives for their aggression in South Vietnam and have played the leading role, they have always been backed by the Chinese Communists. Should their aggression be successful, the Chinese Communists will have seen positive proof that their approach to international relations is correct.

Such an outcome might well lead the Soviets, in their desire to retain the leadership of the Communist bloc, to adopt a more belligerent stance in their relations with the outside world. This would surely affect the West.

It would also be regarded everywhere as a reflection of the inability or lack of will of the free world to prevent aggression. What, for example, would be the reaction in Europe if the United States were to withdraw from southeast Asia in the face of its commitment to assist the nations there?

The state of public opinion in the United States itself would also be affected. Should Vietnam be lost, many voices would be heard urging us in effect to resign from the world, fall back onto our Fortress America and gird up our loins for a contest with guided missiles. This too would be something which neither Europe nor the rest of the free world could ignore.

Because of all these considerations, the United States has undertaken to support the Vietnamese both politically and militarily, in an effort which has cost us lives and treasure. The effort has not been in vain.

Although we are not yet victorious, we have achieved a stalemate, which is surely much better than defeat. On the economic and social front the United States has contributed to the building of schools, clinics and better farms, all of which are essential to gaining and holding the political support that must be had to win the war. And we try to help in every way in training civil administrators and in creating political energy in the country.

Some have said that despite this effort the war in Vietnam cannot be won. Yet recent history shows that we have been fighting wars of this sort for the past 20 years and that the record is creditable. We of the free world won in Greece, we thwarted the Communist aggression in Korea, we won in Malaya, we won in the Philippines, and we can win in Vietnam. We must persist and we must not play into the enemy's hands by counting on a quick, sensational and easy way out and then being disappointed when it does not occur.

Persistent execution of the political and military plans which have been agreed to will bring victory—provided outside pressures do not become too great. These outside pressures occur in many forms such as the problem of sanctuaries from which Vietnam can be attacked and the Vietcong helped with impunity. Infiltration from such sanctuaries cannot be allowed to defeat the efforts the Vietnamese are making. We will not shrink from taking such measures as seem necessary to cope with it.

Another form of "outside pressure" is the desire in some quarters for an international conference here and now. We do not oppose the idea of holding international conferences as an abstract proposition—if they are held at the proper time and under the proper circumstances—but we think that to hold a conference now would serve no good purpose and would seriously undermine morale in South Vietnam. Consider the reasons:

1. There have already been two conferences on southeast Asia (one on Vietnam and another on Laos), the terms of which were satisfactory but which the Communists violated before the ink was dry. Before holding another conference there must be some sign that the Communists of Hanoi and Peiping are prepared to let their southern neighbors alone.

2. For the South Vietnamese to go to a conference now with a large and aggressive fifth column on their soil would amount to a surrender. A conference not preceded by a verifiable Communist decision to cease attacking and subverting South Vietnam would be nothing more than a capitulation.

3. There is clearly no agreement between us and the Communists on the simple proposition to let South Vietnam alone. A conference held in an atmosphere of bitter disagreement could only make matters more dangerous than they already are.

So-called neutralism is another outside pressure standing in the way of the successful prosecution of the war in South Vietnam. Neutralism that does not include some means of enforcement, that does not include North Vietnam, that means South Vietnam will be alone and disarmed, is nothing more than surrender. It should be opposed for Vietnam just as it is opposed for Berlin or for Germany. It takes strength to be neutral. South Vietnam is not strong enough today to be neutral.

In truth both Vietnams are "neutralized" now by article 10 of the Geneva accord of July 21, 1954, which said: "* * * the two parties shall insure that the zones assigned to them do not adhere to any military alliance and are not used for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy."

This provision was formally approved by article 5 of the final declaration of the Geneva Conference of 1954, which the U.S.S.R., Red China, France, the United Kingdom, United States, Cambodia, Laos, North and South Vietnam attended.

We must therefore insist before there is any discussion of a conference or of neutralism, that the Communists stop their aggression and live up to the agreements which already exist. The minute the onslaught ceases, there can be peace. At present, the North Vietnamese seem only to understand force, and, of course, when they use force they must be met with force, as they were in the Gulf of Tonkin. They should also be met with the strong and united opposition of the free world.

It seems that conflicts in far-off places are precisely those which have often brought war and calamity to all of us. Manchuria seemed far away in 1931; the subversion of Czechoslovakia by Hitler seemed remote to the United States in 1938. Persistence, and unity in the face of Communist pressure have succeeded in Europe and in southeast Asia, and can succeed again.

Mao Tse-tung said: "Politics is war without bloodshed; war is politics with bloodshed."

The struggle in Vietnam is not a "war" in the sense that World War II—or Korea—was a "war," because total military success in Vietnam, unaccompanied by success in other fields, will not bring victory. A many-sided effort is needed; no single effort will solve the problem; the problem is thus the despair of the headline writer and the political stump speaker employing black-and-white phraseology.

Therefore, those who say that there is a quick solution or a simple solution or an exclusively military solution are doing as much of a disservice as are those who say that there is no hope, that we must pull out and that another southeast Asian conference (added to the two which have been already held—and dishonored) will do other than turn South Vietnam over to the Communists.

They also do a disservice who deny that much has been achieved, that the military program, the economic program, the social program, the informational program and the various technical programs have all accomplished much—have indeed built the springboard of victory—and that it is the political, counter-subversive, counter-terrorist program which still needs special attention.

It is accurate to say that a glass is half-full of water and it is also accurate to say that the glass is half-empty. To dwell on the fact that we have not achieved victory does not negate the other fact that we have prevented defeat—and that a stalemate is much better than a defeat.

It is not the American tradition to get panicky whenever there is a little rough weather. If we decide only to interest ourselves in the nice, quiet, neat countries (which do not need our help) and abandon all the rough, tough, difficult places to the Communists, we will soon find ourselves surrounded by a rough, tough world which is aimed straight at the destruction of the United States and which will make our present effort in Vietnam seem like the mildest of pink teas.

Law Duty To Criticize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the December 1964 edition of the Tennessee Lawyer, a wholesome professional journal, an excellent article by Mr. Olin White, president of the Tennessee Bar Association.

In his timely remarks,, Mr. White points out that the judiciary is suffering from an uncontrolled movement toward concentration of power in the Central Government and it is not only a right but a duty of the bar to criticize judicial abuses. Believing this article to be of interest to all my colleagues in Congress and particularly those on the Judiciary Committee having jurisdiction over legislation in this field, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE PRESIDENT REPORTS

(By Olin White)

It has always been the view, if not a rule, of our profession that lawyers should refrain from criticizing the Supreme Court of the United States, and other courts.

Surely this is restricted only as to the degree of differences in the opinion of the bar and in the holdings of the Supreme Court of the United States and of other courts. In other words, is this an absolute protection from criticism? I think not, and although I believe that lawyers should in the ordinary administration of justice refrain from public criticism—I feel equally sure that when the courts have gone very far afield and when their decisions are extreme, then it is not only the privilege of the bar but the duty of the bar as leaders to speak out—to criticize—and to seek legislative correction of such judicial abuses, if there is no other remedy at hand.

It is my opinion that it is not only high time, but that we are somewhat late in such criticism and action for the correction of such matters.

We have been faced in the last few years with Federal decisions which not only permit but require the release of prisoners guilty of the most heinous crimes, on so-called technical grounds which to some, at least, appear to be not a ground but an excuse and not a technicality but a triviality.

A great many, if not all, the prisons of this country have a law library (or law books) where prisoners may work upon their petitions for habeas corpus so that a man convicted, sentenced, and whose sentence has been confirmed through the highest courts, may open and indeed reopen from time to time the door to release, thereby requiring the attorney general and other officials to appear and testify about matters and procedure which occurred years before.

The holding that the failure to take before a committing judge promptly, and in some instances 7½ hours, entitled a prisoner to release, and to renew his claims is more than startling.

The number of Federal courts will have to be doubled in a relatively short time to take care of the hundreds of habeas corpus petitions that are filed, as well as appeals or petitions interfering with the administration of the State courts—unless some laws are passed to govern and restrict this subject. Not only do the prisoners file these but the courts construe the law as requiring lawyers to appear and even to make long journeys to appellate courts to represent this man, without expense to the criminal and without expense to the government, hence, at the expense of the lawyer.

Local State courts are becoming more and more familiar with the fact that under Supreme Court of the United States rulings, a prisoner or indeed any litigant may, and many do, remove themselves from the trial court of a State to the trial court of the Federal court. In other words, we once had trial in State trial court, and appeal to State supreme court, and thence to the U.S. Supreme Court. Now we have a Federal trial court, superseding the State supreme court, as well as a State trial court. This is only one of the many indications of the rapid, and so far uncontrolled, movement toward absolute concentration of power in the Federal Government.

I am also familiar with the unwritten rule among lawyers not to criticize judges for fear that when the criticizing lawyer appears, in some other case, punishment will be inflicted upon him. This will not happen with any good judge no matter what the difference of opinion may be, and whatever happens, lawyers should quit whispering among themselves about these matters and now speak out boldly on the subject.

I have refrained from such direct comments prior to the recent national elections for fear that some person might think my comments were politically inspired.

Space does not permit me further comments, but I assure you that I shall have further comments on the subject in future issues.

Bank Loans to Overseas Borrowers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in connection with the vital subject of our balance of payments, which is such an important element in our gold reserve problems, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have just received from Mr. Walter B. Wriston, executive vice president of the First National City Bank of New York, together with an excerpt from the December 1964, Economic Letter of that bank, on the subject of commercial bank term loans abroad.

I believe Mr. Wriston's letter and the discussion of commercial bank term loans will be helpful to members of the Senate and the public in their consideration in the near future of these important matters.

There being no objection, the letter and the excerpts were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST NATIONAL CITY BANK,
New York, N.Y., January 14, 1965.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There has recently been a good deal of talk about the rise in commercial bank term loans to overseas borrowers and the effect of these loans on the country's balance of payments. There has not, however, been enough understanding of the fact that these loans finance our exports. It is no coincidence that those parts of the world which have the highest volume of American commercial bank term loans also are the largest buyers of American exports. These exports produce the Nation's trade surplus of nearly $7 billion which is so essential to the soundness of the dollar.

I am writing to ask that you take some time from your busy schedule to consider what the imposition of the interest equalization tax on commercial bank term loans would do to American exports and other sources of revenue from abroad. We firmly believe that the result of such a move would be no gain for our balance of payments and

a great deal of lost international business for our country. A detailed discussion of this subject is set out in the December issue of this bank's Monthly Economic Letter at pages 141–143 under the heading "Commercial Bank Term Loans Abroad." I enclose a copy and would be glad to send you additional copies if you wish.

Very truly yours,

WALTER B. WRISTON.

COMMERCIAL BANK TERM LOANS ABROAD

In the world today, nations are exchanging goods in rapidly growing volumes. Our own exports have expanded from $15 to $25 billion in the past 10 years. Understandably, the remarkable expansion of world trade has required growing supplies of credit.

Commercial banks in the United States and other principal trading nations extend credits to their foreign correspondents and customers. Indeed, the resources of commercial banks constitute a pool of private international liquidity that is drawn upon by creditworthy borrowers in creditworthy countries throughout the world.

Along with direct investment in bricks and mortar, commercial bank credit abroad has greatly expanded over the past 15 years as private U.S. capital has replaced U.S. Government aid to Western Europe and Japan—aid that had been an essential ingredient during the earlier postwar period in reinvigorating world commerce. In recent years, private financing has received further impetus from the restoration of meaningful currency convertibility among the principal nations. These trends and developments have in turn strengthened international competition in the field of money and banking; they have also created new opportunities.

Within a relatively short span of time, U.S. banks have girded themselves to play a prominent role in world finance. With the dollar the leading international currency, the United States the world's largest exporter and importer, and U.S. money and capital markets the single most important source of financial resources, this has been a natural evolution.

PATTERNS OF BANK LENDING

American commercial banks engaging in international business extend both short- and long-term credits. According to definitions used by official statisticians, short-term credits are those with a maturity up to 1 year; they are frequently renewed from year to year. Loans beyond 1 year are called term loans. These term loans have been customary in domestic financing in the United States for a quarter of a century and have, since World War II, spread to the field of international financing.

U.S. banks have outstanding short- and long-term credits abroad of $9.5 billion. U.S. exporters, importers, and industrial and commercial firms also grant credits to their foreign clients; these amount to $2.3 billion at this time.

Of the short-term bank credits, about $1 billion are short term, and $3.5 billion are largely on behalf of customers. An additional $2.5 billion of the short-term bank credits represent bankers acceptances. After a long period of inactivity, these have grown remarkably since 1950, with the encouragement of the Federal Reserve System; most acceptances are made under arrangements that involve exports from the United States. Loans to foreign banks and customers today amount to about $5.7 billion, of which $2.2 billion are short term, and $3.5 billion are term loans.

THE ANATOMY OF TERM LOANS

There is general agreement that short-term loans by U.S. banks are indispensable as a means of financing U.S. trade and other international business that directly benefits the U.S. balance of payments. Sometimes, however, the question is raised—particularly by those who tend to blame the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit on private capital investments abroad—whether loans in excess of 1 year serve purposes beneficial to the U.S. balance of payments. To assure export financing and "normal recurring international business," the administration's proposal and the House-approved bill for an interest equalization tax [1] exempted bank loans made in the ordinary course of business as well as all obligations maturing within 3 years. Before the tax was enacted last September, however, a provision was added in the Senate giving the President standby authority to extend the tax to bank loans with a maturity of 1 year or more.

---

[1] The tax and its implications have been reviewed in the April and November 1964 issues of this letter.

Changes in U.S. banking credits abroad

[In millions of dollars]

	Short term					Long term
	Collections	Acceptances [1]	Loans to— Banks [2]	Loans to— Others	Total [3]	
1955	82	24	40	94	200	230
1956	87	137	93	94	411	168
1957	−17	255	45	−27	256	335
1958	−2	−43	213	125	292	188
1959	95	−74	8	32	62	183
1960	89	651	−35	22	729	153
1961	95	641	224	140	1,099	336
1962	−14	93	274	20	372	126
1963	146	596	−171	132	703	[4] 576
1963:						
January to March	22	90	−207	29	−65	−36
April to June	25	341	−94	24	297	[4] 178
July to September	24	−42	6	27	15	121
October to December	74	207	124	52	456	[4] 313
1964:						
January to March	100	136	103	29	369	231
April to June	1	242	67	84	393	64
July to August	23	−101	15	32	−30	130
Outstanding: August 1964	956	2,840	1,326	919	6,041	3,440

[1] Acceptances made for account of foreigners, including varying amounts of other financing.
[2] Including central banks and other official institutions.
[3] Excluding credits in foreign currencies, which amounted to $689 million in August 1964.
[4] Excluding items reported by banks for the 1st time but representing certain credits extended previously. Such items amounted to $86 million in the 2d and $193 million in the 4th quarter of 1963. Of the latter amount, $150 million represented trade credits sold to banks by a U.S. corporation.

Source: Derived from data published in the U.S. Treasury Department Bulletin and the Federal Reserve Bulletin.

Changes in U.S. long-term banking credits abroad

[In millions of dollars]

	Extended to—				
	Europe	Latin America	Japan	Canada	Others
1955	−21	240	−44	3	52
1956	95	67	−27	22	11
1957	164	116	6	33	16
1958	20	65	4	28	71
1959	−28	131	3	5	72
1960	−1	125	3	−28	54
1961	126	17	5	198	−10
1962	86	−45	50	30	6
1963 [1]	518	−5	129	−29	49
1963:					
January to March	27	−16	2	−19	−30
April to June	150	30	35	−28	77
July to September	82	−1	30	10	--------
October to December [1]	259	−18	62	8	2
1964:					
January to March	155	9	62	−6	11
April to June	80	−15	14	−13	−2
July to August	49	28	8	14	31
Outstanding: August 1964	1,385	1,037	333	270	415

[1] Excluding the $193 million item described in footnote 4 to the preceding table. Its geographical distribution is as follows: Europe $5 million; Latin America $134 million; Japan $46 million; and others $8 million. The distribution of the $86 million item has not been published.

The author of this amendment, Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, stated that it seemed a foregone conclusion that the exemption of commercial bank term loans would be used to avoid the tax and characterized it as an important loophole. In his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee last June, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon pointed out that the rise in long-term bank loans had started before there was any thought of the tax and that, in the light of detailed information made available to the Treasury, any possible evasion of the tax through use of bank loans could not be more than 5 percent of the total bank loans."

Changes in direction of the flow of loans to less-developed and developed countries have been remarkably similar to the changes in patterns of direct investment. Until 2 or 3 years ago, the direction of the flows had been mainly to Latin America and Canada. In recent years, most of the term loans have gone to Europe, particularly to Italy during late 1963 and early 1964, and to Japan. The shifts in the geographic distribution are summed up in the second table.

Over the past year, changes in bank credits abroad, short as well as long-term, have been particularly influenced by borrowings by Japan. These have grown substantially to support the expanding volume of Japanese trade and business activity. In recent months, the rate of bank lending to Japan has slowed down. As noted in these pages last month, Japan has floated sizable amounts of bonds in European markets.

A HELPFUL INNOVATION

The use of term loans in foreign operations is an adaptation of techniques developed in the United States for domestic lending. As is well known, term loans in the

United States are generally made to finance acquisitions of plants, machinery and equipment, with repayment out of the cash flow—earnings and depreciation—expected to be generated by their use. The lender must satisfy himself that the borrower will have funds forthcoming to meet his obligations. The borrower can obtain terms that gixe flexibility in repayment schedules and permit efficient use of loan funds. Over half of the total dollar volume of business loans made by major New York City banks consist of term loans.

Banks extending term loans abroad must, however, satisfy themselves that the borrower will not only generate adequate cash flows but also will be able to convert his local currency earnings into U.S. dollars. Exchange risks—including the possibility, however remote, that exchange controls may prohibit remittances to the United States—and political risks are as much part and parcel of considerations bearing on the extension of a term loan as the general credit standing of the borrower. Other essential considerations are the balance-of-payments position of the brorower's country, the level of its gold and foreign exchange reserves and its short-term international indebtedness. Under certain circumstances, a country may appear to be borrowed up.

Many of the term loans extended by U.S. commercial banks to borrowers in less-developed countries have been arranged in conjunction with operations of the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, the Agency for International Development, and such private lenders as insurance companies. As part of policies to encourage U.S. exports, the Export-Import Bank has recently developed comprehensive insurance coverage for banks against political, military and commercial risks on development loans. This can be expected, as was the intention, to increase the volume of term lending, particularly to some of the less-developed countries.

On a number of occasions, U.S. commercial banks also have granted loans to foreign governments or central banks as part of packages of financial assistance extended by the International Monetary Fund, sometimes in conjunction with credits from the U.S. Treasury or the Export-Import Bank. Such arrangements have often been negotiated with Latin American nations.

Loans to Europe and Canada have been extended primarily to foreign subsidiaries of American businesses. Sometimes, U.S. firms operating abroad have also been instrumental in helping arrange U.S. bank financing for many of the foreign customers and suppliers with whom they do business. Credits have thus been granted to finance purchases of oil tankers, freighters, airplanes, machinery, electrical equipment, etc. Because of their rapid rate of obsolescence, airplanes have been particularly well suited to financing through bank term loans, with maturities adjusted to the funds generated through earnings and depreciation allowances. Shipping firms have received substantial amounts of term credit by obtaining long-term charters from major shippers of such raw materials as oil, iron ore and bauxite and assigning the charter income to the lenders.

Technical innovations in industry have thus been matched by innovations in banking techniques. Like advances in technology, the bank term loan is spreading to meet the needs of corporate enterprise here as well as abroad. The growth of international trade and multinational business organizations naturally creates demands for flexible financing on an international scale.

TERM LOANS AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Term loans help promote U.S. exports in the period following the year when they are granted; this minimizes their impact on the balance of payments. Subsequent repayments of the loans with interest increase U.S. balance-of-payments receipts.

Foreigners not only borrow in the United States but also keep deposits in U.S. banks and hold bankers acceptances and other short-term investments. Some of these deposits are normally connected with the loans granted them by U.S. banks. In fact, most nations hold short-term assets in U.S. banks in excess of the sums they borrow from them. The relevant data for selected countries are summed up in the table, which also shows the value of U.S. trade with the nations concerned.

U.S. banking credits to foreigners set against the background of foreigners' short-term assets in the United States and U.S. foreign trade, August 1964

[In millions of dollars]

	U.S. bank credits abroad		Foreign short term assets in U.S.[1]	U.S. exports[2]	U.S. imports[2]
	Short term	Long term			
Canada	694	270	3,065	4,572	4,060
Italy	94	260	1,057	[3] 825	[3] 508
United Kingdom	277	72	1,951	1,384	1,115
Germany	133	133	2,361	1,217	1,100
Argentina	175	78	307	215	145
Venezuela	137	36	707	575	940
France	72	42	1,525	774	480
Switzerland	88	25	1,102	341	256
Belgium	31	71	424	[4] 606	[4] 418
Sweden	31	69	509	278	197
Netherlands	40	13	316	905	217
Japan	2,471	333	2,514	1,868	1,625
Mexico	572	415	674	967	649
Brazil	153	209	221	343	562
Colombia	250	56	149	249	255
Philippines	179	120	216	360	366
Norway	35	249	171	104	117
Chile	187	23	172	164	193

[1] Official and private.
[2] Year ended August 1964.
[3] Including Trieste.
[4] Including Luxembourg.

NOTE.—The countries are arranged in 2 groups: Those where U.S. bank credits, both short and long term, are smaller than short-term dollar assets held by them in U.S. banks and vice versa. Within each group, the countries are arranged according to the size of U.S. bank credits to them.

Among the leading net debtors is Japan; its assets in the United States are, however, large. Japan is the second largest customer of the United States. This group of countries also includes several Latin American countries and Norway (because of shipping loans).

Bank lending also appears as a complicating factor in our balance of payments because of the way in which Government statisticians present their accounts. When an American citizen makes a deposit in a foreign bank or a loan to a foreigner, the transaction is recorded as a capital outflow; but when a foreigner makes a deposit in a U.S. bank or buys U.S. short-term paper, the transaction is considered as one of the means of financing the U.S. payments deficit rather than a capital inflow that helps reduce the deficit. A committee of Government-appointed experts, which, under the chairmanship of Edward M. Bernstein, has since April 1963 been examining the asymmetries and anomalies in U.S. balance-of-payments bookkeeping, is to report its findings this month.

One thing is certain. Bank loans abroad to finance U.S. exports and other international business do not result in a loss of U.S. international wealth. They help expand U.S. exports and job opportunities and incomes at home. They speed up economic development abroad. The law providing for the interest equalization tax, with its implied threat of removing the exemption for bank term loans, should be allowed to expire on its scheduled date at the end of 1965. Even if some immediate advantage were to be gained for our balance of payments by controls over bank lending, it would be more than offset by the damage such controls would do to the standing of the dollar as a reliable and freely usable currency.

The Select Committee on Government Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great privilege to serve under Mr. Elliott's chairmanship of the Select Committee on Government Research. Despite the herculean proportions of the task assigned to the committee to cover the entire spectrum of research and development as it has been carried out within the Federal Government, we feel that we have been able to make some contribution that will be of permanent and lasting value.

Indeed, we are hopeful that as a result of the work of the Select Committee on Government Research and its recommendations that Members of Congress may be materially assisted in carrying out their manifold responsibilities with respect to the funding and the oversight of the innumerable research programs which are under the aegis of the Federal Establishment.

Apparently, the editors of Science magazine, although extremely pessimistic about the actual implementation of some of the committee's recommendations, do recognize that the select committee did leave an impressive legacy.

Obviously, I do not agree with all of the arguments contained in their commentary which follows my remarks, and I would particularly take issue with the statement that this committee was created merely to enhance the political career of its chairman, the Honorable Carl Elliott. Quite to the contrary, I think it resulted from a sincere and deep-seated realization on the part of many Members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, that this huge and amorphous field of Government research and development was in need of sharper definition and clearer guidelines.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express the hope that even though this committee has suffered its demise that its work will be digested not only by the Members of Congress but by members of the general public and that its recommendations and conclusions will receive thoughtful consideration. I am particularly interested personally in the value of the select committee's recommendation for the creation of a Joint Committee on Research Policy. I think that with appropriate support from Members of Congress, such a recommendation could lead to the establishment of an extremely useful device to oversea a more rational development of Federal policy in the all-important area of research and development.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to include extraneous material, I wish to include herewith the article to which I referred earlier; namely, the comment from the January 8, 1965, issue of Science magazine. The article follows:

NEWS AND COMMENT: ELLIOTT COMMITTEE—FINAL REPORTS ISSUED AS 15-MONTH INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL RESEARCH COMES TO END

With the expiration of the 88th Congress, Representative Carl Elliott's Select Committee on Government Research went out of existence, openly confessing, in its final study, to a tinge of frustration at not having had time to do more than raise some of the substantive questions of policy." The frustration can be widely shared, for Elliott's committee, despite many obstacles and pessimistic expectations, was developing into the sort of organization that has often been prescribed for the Congress; a well staffed, influential entity that could serve as a center for legislative examination of the Federal Government's involvement in science, technology, and education.

The committee's demise, just as it was emerging from infancy, can in part be attributed to no more than a turn of political history—Elliott's defeat in last fall's Alabama primary; but interwoven with the personal element is the fact that Congress is yet to demonstrate any more than a low-keyed concern about its ability to handle the problems that Elliott took under surveillance.

The committee was established in September 1963 (Science, Sept. 23, 1963) as a gesture of support for Elliott, who was seeking an escape from the rightwing deluge that eventually overwhelmed him in Alabama. The House leadership, mindful of widespread unease over the annually rising costs of research and development, felt that it would be desirable to conduct a comprehensive survey—and simultaneously give Elliott a vehicle for obtaining publicity. Elliott thus got his committee, but not before the chairmen of the major standing committees with scientific and technical jurisdictions were given membership, a price they exacted to guard against the possibility that their own territory might be subjected to unsympathetic appraisal. Finally, the Elliott committee was constituted as a select committee, which meant that it had to be reestablished with each new Congress. When Elliott was defeated, none of his colleagues showed interest in succeeding him as chairman or in pushing to extend the life of the committee, and, as a result, the Select Committee on Government Research automatically went out of business at the end of the year. Elliott, who received little publicity from the committee's 15 months of work—basically because he insisted on a careful, nonsensational approach to the subject matter—is now back in Alabama, practicing law and possibly working for another try at public office.

The legacy of his committee is a set of hearings containing the testimony and statements of 75 witnesses, plus 10 separate studies containing an accumulation of statistics—many of which were previously unavailable—and analyses and recommendations. In general, the recommendations called for what many observers of the Nation's scientific, technical, and educational scene have been calling for: better coordination of Federal support for research, improved techniques for collecting and disseminating information, broader distribution of Federal funds for research and education, and the development of techniques for relating scientific and engineering training to long-term national needs.

But the committee also poked into some other matters, quite possibly to the annoyance of some of Elliott's colleagues, one of whom, GEORGE P. MILLER, chairman of the House space committee, filed a letter stating that he felt "some reservations." These were, in most cases, related to conclusions that the space program, for which Miller's committee bears responsibility in the House, may not be as comprehensive a national blessing as space agency publicity men make it out to be.

The Elliott committee's report stated, for example, that "in the world of our probable future, our ability as a nation to compete will depend to a great extent on the efficacy of today's research into our grave social and economic problems * * *. In the sense of mission-oriented programs, we are spending greatly on defense, space, and nuclear missions and virtually nothing on the mission of securing our probable competitive future * * *. Apart from strictly economic problems, many of our social problems have become very costly * * *. In comparison to the dollars spent on the space program, we can well afford some additional pennies for research into these and many other areas."

The committee also took up another theme that supporters of space, military, and defense research programs find particularly grating—that their use of manpower is detrimental to other national needs: "It is critical," the committee stated, "that the Government avoid policies or procedures which lead to inefficient deployment or stockpiling of trained personnel. Manpower cost is as important as fiscal cost in consideration of major programs. But this has not been a significant criterion in major program choices to date. The huge technical programs of NASA, DOD, and AEC have absorbed large numbers of engineers and scientists. Yet no one at the time of decision has reckoned their worth on these programs as opposed to their alternative use in teaching, private industry, or other Government programs."

It was in response to these and similar assertions that Representative MILLER appended his letter of reservation to the final report, offering the explanation that he disagreed with certain points and, in addition, had not had time to study some of the later reports in detail. MILLER wrote that he would provide a fuller explanation of his objections when the new session of Congress was underway.

MILLER's reservations, and the failure of Elliott's colleagues to keep the committee alive, suggest an unpromising future for Elliott's most far reaching and significant recommendation: that Congress establish a Joint Committee on Research Policy, which would be the legislative counterpart of the White House science advisory apparatus, in much the same fashion that the Congressional Joint Economic Committee is the counterpart of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. The Joint Economic Committee doesn't write laws or pass on appropriations, but with a first-rate professional staff and an industrious membership it has come to radiate a good deal of influence simply by being very competent.

As Elliott's committee sees it, the Joint Committee on Research Policy would not supersede the committees that now have scientific and technical jurisdictions: rather, it would attempt to obtain the sort of overall view that now has little or no place in the thinking of committees responsible for specific programs or agencies. It would have no weapons to employ outside of reports and studies, but, hopefully, these could go a long way if they were well done.

It is far too early in the session to tell whether any influential support can be obtained for this proposal. But at this stage there is a great deal working against it. In response to the creation of Elliott's committee, subcommittees on research was set up by MILLER's own space committee and by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Armed Services Committee. Thus, the way is far from clear for a new standing committee to step into the field of science and technology.

Furthermore, Congress seems to be tending toward less agitation about Federal support for research and development. A few years ago it found that funds in this area were growing by a couple of billion dollars a year, and it became quite excited. But it now seems to be accustomed to R. & D. as a 15-percent slice of the budget, and rather than gaping at this figure, the Members are concentrating on getting fair slices for their districts. Finally, the hearings held by Elliott and other committees have reinforced the sense of mystery that many laymen feel about science. One witness after another told these committees that you never knew what might come out of the most nonsensical-sounding research project, and, in the absense of any solid argument to the contrary, the general congressional attitude seems to be that we do not understand it too well, or at all, but it is good for the country. If the new and large Democratic majority starts a wave of general congressional reform, it is possible that a Joint Committee on Research Policy might win approval, but in the absence of any large-scale revision of the committee structure, it seems unlikely that the Elliott committee will leave behind anything but an impressive pile of reports.—D. S. Greenberg.

ELLIOTT REPORTS AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION

The following publications have been issued by the House Select Committee on Government Research. Copies may be ordered from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Study No. 1: "The Administration of Research and Development Grants," is out of print.

Study No. 2: "Manpower for Research and Development," 25 cents.

Study No. 3: "Federal Facilities for Research and Development," 60 cents.

Study No. 4: "Documentation and Dissemination of Research and Development Results," 60 cents.

Study No. 5: "Federal Student Assistance in Higher Education," 30 cents.

Study No. 6: "Impact of Federal Research and Development Programs," 65 cents.

Study No. 7: "Contract Policies and Procedures for Research and Development," 45 cents.

Study No. 8: "Interagency Coordination in Research and Development," 25 cents.

Study No. 9: "Statistical Review of Research and Development," 60 cents.

Study No. 10: "National Goals and Policies," 25 cents.

Hearings: "Federal Research and Development Programs": part 1, $2.50; part 2, $1; part 3, 60 cents. Committee print: "Federal Research and Development Programs," 15 cents.

"The Future That Nobody Knows?"—Editorial by David Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by David Lawrence, the distinguished editor of U.S. News & World Report. The editorial is entitled "The Future That Nobody Knows?" This is a most outstanding editorial, and it deserves the attention and consideration of every Member of this body. The

editorial was printed in the January 11, 1965, issue of U.S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE THAT NOBODY KNOWS?

(By David Lawrence)

This is the season of prophecy, when we ask ourselves: What will the new year bring?

The past is recollection. The present is actual experience. But of the future we say: Who really knows?

Certain truths, however, can guide us. For human nature does react always with characteristic self-interest, whether as individuals striving to obtain material rewards, or as nations endeavoring to unite in the face of a common peril.

We know all too well the ingredients of manmade friction in both the world at large and in the narrower confines of our home communities. We know the factors that bring discord. We are also aware of an instinctive duty to find ways of accommodation—a heroic means of adjustment which shall remove the influences that keep us in conflict with one another.

We are, therefore, not lacking in knowledge of things to do to make a better world. What we lack is the willpower to do them.

For war is not a phenomenon merely of nations. War is also the battle of men against men, in every walk of life. Eventually, the strident voices of individuals make up the babel of a distraught world.

Whatever the vicissitudes of the times, the human struggle continues with more periods of fear than of repose. The contest for supremacy over other peoples is unceasing. The age-old passion for superiority does not subside—mere equality does not seem to satisfy.

The common fallacy is that there is something new in the offing—a magic remedy for all this. The perennial friction of class, of race, of creed, of political or economic factionalism is regarded as just a malady of the times. We assume that what has happened before is obsolete, and hence not worth reexamining. Too often we disregard the lessons of the past as meaningless, because, as we rationalize it, they supposedly apply to a different set of circumstances than we observe today. Yet history repeats itself.

We look admiringly at our new inventions. But some of the "improvements" of our day are illusory. We have developed many mechanical devices to get more enjoyment out of life, but we have never invented a better formula for human behavior than the Sermon on the Mount.

We are perfecting now the most effective means of "organized murder"—as Lloyd George once called war—that the world has ever known. But the weapons of organized peace are still in the laboratory stage.

The foundations, however, of understanding between men were long ago established. Man has accumulated enough knowledge of the necessary principles of law and order to build a free society. Our moral philosophy is now, as always, a combination of faith and conviction based on daily experience in the busy thoroughfares of life. We know full well what really constitutes fundamental truth, no matter how much we discount it in our everyday living.

For whether we pay homage to the doctrines of Mohammed or Confucius or Moses, or whether we worship at the shrines of the Christian world, we know that there is a force stronger than ourselves which moves among us everywhere, every day. Acknowledgment of the existence of a Supreme Being is the starting point of human progress.

What we have not yet been ready to utilize effectively, however, is the knowledge that God's infinite power does invest the earth in countless places, and does govern the behavior of men, even as they seemingly submit to leaders who oppress and enslave.

The transgressions of men—or their passive acquiescence in sinful deeds—are not the result of any dearth of knowledge of what is right or what is required of us. These errors come because many of us deviate from basic principles, though in our hearts we know that these principles are inflexible and cannot be bent to suit the expediences or whims of the hour. Evil survives in the world primarily because good men fear to make the sacrifices that must be made to win and retain freedom.

We do not know the future? Of course we do. The real question is whether we are willing to meet its tests—whether we will let greed and selfishness reign where we know there must be generosity and unselfishness, whether we will be craven and cowardly where we know we must be brave and resolute, and whether we will extend the hand of friendship and with love open our hearts to other human beings, or whether we will shirk the obligations which inner conscience and the pages of history tell us to fulfill.

We do know the future—because we know the past.

Human knowledge does not perish. It lives on under the inspiration of divine providence, whose reminders of what truth really is come to us every moment of our lives. With faith in His wisdom we can face the challenges of the future, courageous, and unafraid.

The Way to the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in the January 17 issue of the Washington Star an article entitled, "The Way to the Great Society," written by the Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, was carried.

As we approach the inauguration ceremonies, I hope that the Johnson administration will not be so enticed by their own public relations that they fail to consider the future consequences to the Nation. This article is well worth reading by every citizen, and I commend it to the attention of this House:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—THE WAY TO THE GREAT SOCIETY

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

America on its privileged pedestal is being summoned by the demands of the world revolution not only to see visions and dream dreams, but to lead the way to a fairer earth. The blueprints are not dated to be realized in some far sweet-bye-and-bye but in a desperately needy here and now where uncounted millions wallow in the lowlands of misery. With all the necessary implements in their hands those who are citizens of the coveted privileged portions of this spinning globe are solemnly called to be willing partners in the task of changing dreary deserts into rose gardens of life more abundant. It is the time to fulfill the ancient prophecy that the crooked things which spoil life's music must be made straight. The valleys of despair must be exalted.

The vistas of a Promised Land have been lifted up long 'ere this by millions of worshipers in 10,000 churches as they have prayed "Thy Kingdom Come" with hymns upon their lips such as—

"O shame to us who rest content
While lust and greed for gain
In street and shop and tenement
Wring gold from human pain.

"Give us, O God, the strength to build
The city that hath stood
Too long a dream, whose laws are love,
Whose ways are brotherhood,
And where the sun that shineth is
God's grace for human good."

The answer to that prayer is all involved in the universal petition voiced constantly by millions that the kingdom of human good may indeed come.

But the desperate immediate need of these days of violence and revolutionary change is that those who have in their hands the power to help God answer the prayer, "Thy Kingdom Come," shall with a new dedication and determination, face the realization that the way to any society that can really be called great is not simply by the manipulation of legislative levers by social engineers. The Great Society can only be built by those who, in their own attitudes and actions, join the ranks of those whose ruling passion was so well expressed by John F. Kennedy when, 4 years ago, he took the oath of the presidential office—"Ask not what your country can do for you but rather what you can do for your country." That distinction divides Americans into two classes—those who lift and those who lean.

A fatal fallacy of so many rose-tinted social schemes is to regard government as a sort of escalartor upon which even the indolent may be carried up to desired levels whether they personally exert themselves or not. Where such social panaceas have been tried there have been alarming indications that far too many people are perfectly willing just to recline on the moving stairway while they, themselves, do little but enjoy the sensation and the scenery.

One of England's most famous preachers broadcast his estimate of the escalator philosophy as in his country it has been carried out in the "welfare state." He said: "What is so often forgotten is that if you give amenities endlessly to people who are at heart grabbing and selfish you will bring the life of the community to chaos. In this serious hour human motives are being poisoned with a drug that is sapping the moral grandeur and stamina of our whole land. We might label the drug thus—'How can I do less and gain more?' "

In America it is certainly no exaggeration to say that the raging passion with half of our people is to build barns and bigger barns, or corporations or bigger corporations. And, the raging passion of the other half of our people is to get more and more wages for less and less work. So, millions of Americans make wealth and security the goals of their personal living and of our national existence.

Life which is geared as an escalator, while conceivably it might get many mateiral things for people, would at the same time do terrible things to them by robbing them of self-respect and a sturdy independence which fosters personal initiative and develops character. The only hope for the coming of what we are thinking of as a Great Society is a tremendous increase in the number of those who stand and toil, not with those who lean but with those who lift. A modern sage declares that a gentleman is one who puts a little more into the general pool of human welfare than he takes out.

Personal responsibility is the central theme of Christianity. One of the fundamental principles of the Master of Men is—"If a man shall save his life he shall lose it." That puts the attainment of life abundant for individuals and for nations at the disposal of

those whose ruling passion is not how much can I take out but how much can I put in. The symbol of all that has made our democracy great and mighty enough now, in this desperate day, to be the chief factor in saving the world from the horror of regimented communism is not the automatic escalator on which people are lifted, but the stairway up which people climb.

The signboard to the Great Society was put up by that One who spake as never man spake when He declared—"Let him who would be great among you be the servant of all."

Support of State Right-To-Work Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the President's comments, in his state of the Union address, indicating that he would press for repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act have caused much concern in my State and throughout the country.

I have already placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some editorials on this subject; and I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three excellent editorials supporting State right-to-work laws. They are: "The Case for Section 14(b)", from the January 16, 1965, issue of the Greenville, S.C., News; "Section 14(b) is a Guarantee of the Right To Work," from the January 16, 1965, issue of the Greenville, S.C., Piedmont; and "The Right To Work," from the January 14, 1965, issue of the Journal of Williamston, S.C.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville News, Jan. 16, 1965]

THE CASE FOR SECTION 14(b)

The many other points made in President Johnson's state of the Union message, and the special requests he has sent to Congress since, naturally have attracted the most local and national public attention.

But his implied threat to the right-to-work laws in force in 20 States under authorization of the Taft-Hartley Act is much more serious than his rather vague references to certain other matters.

The implication is that the administration will recommend and work for congressional enactment of legislation which will drastically change or repeal outright section 14(b). This 1947 amendment to the labor-management relations law authorizes the States to enact statutes outlawing the "union shop" contracts so dear to the hearts of union bosses.

The President merely said he would propose changes in the union-management statutes, "including section 14(b)," without specifying what these proposals might be. Union leaders promptly took this to mean repeal of the section.

It is obvious that they have received assurances to that effect from the President himself. President George Meany of the AFL–CIO, and other top unioneers, have had one or more long conferences with the President since last November and they have emerged beaming each time.

The right-to-work laws have been much misunderstood and maligned. It has been charged that the term "right to work" is a misnomer, and perhaps it is. It would be more correct to refer to the laws as "freedom from unionism" statutes, for that is what they should be. In fact, to fairly accomplish their purpose they should go further than they do.

Simply stated, the laws say that no person shall be compelled to join a union as a condition of employment. He does not have to be a member of the union having a contract with an employer to get a job. He cannot legally be required to join after he gets it. Hence, the term "right to work" which means the right not to join a union as well as freedom to join voluntarily.

The directors of the South Carolina State Chamber of Commerce recently adopted a resolution opposing "the repeal or amendment in any respect of section 14(b) of the Labor Management Relations Act as amended." In the "whereas" of the resolution the 50 or so business and industry spokesmen representing over 3,000 firms, stated a good case for the right-to-work law of South Carolina and against repeal of the permissive Federal statute.

A few excerpts:

"Employees should be free to decide for themselves whether to join or not to join a labor organization and their right to work should never be dependent upon membership in, affiliation with, or financial support of a labor organization, or any other organization.

"The right to work is jeopardized by compulsory unionism.

"A labor organization should recruit and hold its members on its merits and not by making membership in or compulsory payment to any organization a condition of employment.

"The right to work and right of association including both the right to join and the right not to join are basic liberties, and Federal and State Governments should take effective action to protect them.

"A public opinion poll taken in 1964 by a respected and reliable opinion research corporation of Princeton, N.J., shows the majority of the American public believes that no citizen should be forced to join a union to obtain or to hold a job.

"Chapter 3 of title 40 of the Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1962, which sets forth right-to-work law in this State, is both necessary and desirable in that it expresses the will of the people of the State of South Carolina.

"Recent statistics compiled and published by the U.S. Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics show States with right-to-work laws continuing to lead the Nation in the rate of improvement of industrial wages and the creation of new industrial jobs."

President Johnson's statement that he would recommend the change in order to put an end to "strife in so many of our States" was laughable but for its deadly seriousness. There has been relatively little "strife" in the right-to-work States, except for the desperate efforts of the union leaders to oppose passage of the laws or to get them repealed.

The President's proposal might ultimately put an end to union strife—after every worker had been compelled by union tactics and Federal bureaucratic coercion to join a union and follow the dictates of its leaders without opening his mouth. But the real strife would only then begin.

Not all that is said in favor of the statutes is literally true, but, then, practically nothing that is said against them is. With NLRB decisions favoring anything the unions do, while muzzling management, the State statutes are about all the protection the worker has against compulsory unionism.

And if all that is said in favor of unions were true, still nothing can be said for forcing a worker to join.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, Jan. 16, 1965]

SECTION 14(b) IS A GUARANTEE OF THE RIGHT TO WORK

Fourteen (b) sounds like an odd shoe size, but in fact this identifies a section of the Taft-Hartley law designed to keep union members from being completely subject to the whims of union officials. The administration, having been elected with the lavish support of union officers, now proposes to change the section at their request.

Fourteen (b) allows any State whose citizens so desire to adopt a right-to-work law which merely prohibits making union membership necessary to get or hold a job. Twenty States, including South Carolina, have such laws. Unions thrive in all of them.

But where right-to-work laws are in force, a man can make up his own mind about whether he wants to belong to a particular union. In the United States are unions which are honestly run and responsive to the members' wishes, and there are others which are dictatorial, violent, and corrupt. A National Labor Relations Board examiner recently commented that he had no power to treat a corrupt union any differently than a legitimate one.

Where right-to-work laws do not exist, a union, once it signs a contract with an employer, can obtain dismissal of any covered employee who does not join and stay in good standing with the union. It can call wildcat strikes that put him out of work, curtail his earnings through work quotas, and do other things that hurt rather than help the individual employee, and still he must render his dues as if he truly were being represented.

It is probable that the mere existence of 14(b) has had a beneficial effect on unions, even in States which have passed no right-to-work laws. Unions are always mindful that one could be passed, and inclined to behave a bit less arrogantly to keep from getting the voters worked up.

If 14(b) is repealed, this restraint will be gone. Unions will not need to consider the feelings or opinions of either their members or the people of the States in which they operate.

Fourteen (b) injures no one. Its repeal would benefit only labor union officials. It is the only guarantee against captive union membership. It would best be kept.

[From the Williamston (S.C.) Journal, Jan. 14, 1965]

THE RIGHT TO WORK

Although organized labor professes to be dedicated to the winning of new privileges for its members, it has adamantly refused to grant them one of the most fundamental of all rights—the freedom from being forced to join a union in order to hold a job.

In furtherance of this blind policy of compulsion, officials of the AFL–CIO have launched a campaign to get the Congress to kill the laws in 20 States that now protect their residents from compulsory unionism.

The target of the drive is the provision in the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to enact and administer right-to-work statutes which guarantee the rights of workers to refuse to join a union, without sacrificing their jobs.

Union leaders are resorting to congressional help because, despite heavyhanded campaigns in the 20 right-to-work States, they have failed to win repeal of the individual laws.

It is obvious that the residents of the States in question greatly cherish the free-

choice privilege and do not want to relinquish it. Just as obvious is the motivation of union leaders. They want employers to be required to enroll their employees in unions with no effort on the union's part.

It seems to us that if the Congress takes any action in the matter at all, it should be to strengthen the rights of States to shield their residents from involuntary union membership rather than to remove the last vestige of free choice from all the Nation's workers.

One Response on Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, few pieces of legislation have received greater publicly than the so-called medicare bill. It is interesting to note that few pieces of legislation have received less actual public interest in proportion to the amount of publicity about it.

This fact—the general public apathy toward such a measure—was amply demonstrated recently in one of the cities of my district, Red Wing, Minn. The editor of the Red Wing Republican-Eagle, a daily newspaper, wrote an editorial on November 25, 1964, in which he bluntly asked if there was one single elderly person in his area that does not receive adequate medical care because he cannot afford it. He asked with equally direct candor whether any such person could say that the Kerr-Mills law, which has been doing such a good job in Minnesota, has failed him while "medicare" would help him?

Following is the full editorial from the Red Wing Republican-Eagle:

WHAT CASE FOR MEDICARE?

Reelected Congressman AL QUIE spoke at length against social security medicare when he appeared in Red Wing last week, and we are glad he did.

So many GOP Congressmen were buried under the anti-Goldwater avalanche November 3 that medicare appears almost certain to pass next year. Some believe the new Congress will rush it through shortly after convening in January. But nothing is preordained in politics or legislation, and minority Congressmen ought to keep pressing the case for not overburdening our social security system.

The Kerr-Mills approach to medical care for the elderly is well started in Minnesota. Goodhue County's welfare department has the program in full swing. And because Kerr-Mills offers so much broader protection than the social security plan—while limiting its coverage to those who can't afford to pay their own way—we agree with QUIE that Kerr-Mills in infinitely to be preferred.

But are we wrong? Is there an elderly person living in this area who is not getting the medical treatment he ought to have because he can't afford it? Can such a person say that Kerr-Mills has failed to help him while social security medicare would?

If such a person exists, we wish he would step forward by writing us a letter or visiting the DRE's editorial offices. If his case is valid, it would make a wounderful case study in refuting the views that we have expressed here and QUIE has so ably championed. If none such exists, on the other hand, it's hard to see much reason for Congress to impose social security medicare on an unwilling country.

Mr. Speaker, upon reading this fine editorial with its thought-provoking questions, I wrote Mr. Phil Duff, editor of the Red Wing Republican-Eagle, complimenting him, asking for a report on how many elderly people actually came forward to declare Kerr-Mills of no value, and asking his permission to share his views and information with my colleagues.

This is my letter:

DECEMBER 4, 1964.

Mr. PHIL DUFF,
Red Wing Republican-Eagle,
Red Wing, Minn.

DEAR PHIL: Your editorial "What Case for Medicare?" on November 25 was a dandy, and I appreciate greatly your reference to my views on this issue.

It will be interesting to see how many elderly persons come forward to declare that the Kerr-Mills program is of no value, or that they are not getting proper medical treatment because of lack of funds. I wish that you would give me a report on the results of this appeal as I may want to include it with your editorial as an extension in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With very good wish, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on December 30, 1964, I received a reply to my letter from Mr. Duff. He stated that only one person had come forward with a response. Mr. Duff also kindly included two clippings from his newspaper. The first is a letter to the editor—the only response he received. The second is a followup editorial which Mr. Duff wrote. Following are his letter to me, the letter to the editor which I just mentioned, and the followup editorial:

DAILY REPUBLICAN-EAGLE,
RED WING, MINN., *December 30, 1964.*

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: To answer your request of a little bit back, I received only one response to my suggestion that old people come forward with actual cases to show how Kerr-Mills didn't fill the bill but medicare would.

This one response—obviously not very clear—is marked on enclosed tearsheet. Another tearsheet shows my followup editorial. Nothing since.

Sincerely,

PHILIP S. DUFF, Jr.,
Editor-Publisher.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR—OTHER NATIONS FIND MEDICARE SUCCESS

To the EDITOR:

In as much that Representative ALBERT QUIE thanked you for your editorial and you had no word from older folks I will try to put in one little bit for as much as it might be worth.

It is real nice for older people that might have $200 or $300 stached away so dad could get a new suit as his old one is 10 or 15 years old, or mother would like a new coat. But one of them needed medical attention and according to Kerr-Mills they had to go and bow down to the welfare board and were told: spend your money first so AMA can survive.

I would ask QUIE as a good Norseman to take a trip to anyone of the Scandinavian countries which all have medicare from the cradle to the grave and they would not part with it.

England started about 25 years ago and there if today you would speak against it you would be hung. QUIE and the Farm Bureau are against everything the Government does. But their members are the first to take advantage of it. QUIE and the Goodhue and Wabasha Counties newly elected representatives don't want reapportionment.

They, plus the Farm Bureau, think that 10,000 rural people should have the same voice in the legislature as 200,000 urban dwellers.

If QUIE and these representatives would only consider that it is not only farmers they represent but about 50–50 labor which they are against, let them consider who buys their products.

AN OLDSTER.

LAKE CITY.

ONE RESPONSE ON MEDICARE

The DRE several weeks ago invited readers to come forward with specific illustrations of the need for a social security medicare program. We asked for actual examples of elderly people who need and deserve the taxpaid care that the President's medicare bill would provide but who can't get this needed care through the local-State-Federal Kerr-Mills program.

Congressman AL QUIE noted this editorial and wrote to express his interest. He would like to have the results, QUIE said, in anticipation of the congressional medicare debate early next year.

So far only one response. A Lake City oldster wrote that Kerr-Mills may be "real nice for older people that might have $200 or $300 stashed away" to pay for a needed new suit or new coat. But if husband and wife needed medical care, "they had to go and bow down to the welfare board" under the Kerr-Mills program. And then they were told to go and spend their money first.

This writer provided no more information on his personal situation, but the above suggests he hasn't realized the full benefits of Minnesota's program under the Kerr-Mills law. This program—officially "medical aid to the aged"—would allow him to get the needed suit and coat and still get all the medical attention he or his wife should have.

A welfare worker must first take some confidential information to determine his eligibility. But then this couple can have as much as $200 in monthly income, $15,000 clear in a home, $1,000 in cash savings, and $1,000 each in cash value life insurance and still have the welfare office pay all their doctor, medicine, hospital, and nursing home bills after they have first paid $200 per year themselves. Nor is any lien attached to their home.

This splendid medical coverage is available to all Minnesotans 65 and older right now. Why should we want a medicare bill that will impose new taxes on family incomes $5,200 and under in order to pay hospital bills for elderly couples who have more than $200 monthly income, or more than $15,000 value in a house, or more than $1,000 in the bank, and $2,000 in cash value life insurance?

Mr. Speaker, taking into account the published circulation of the Red Wing Republican-Eagle and the National Editorial Association's estimate of how many individuals read each newspaper circulated, it is reasonable to assume that about 30,000 people read the Red Wing Republican-Eagle each day.

Yet, it would be reasonable to cut that 30,000 figure in half, or in fourths, or even smaller, and it would still be obvious that just one response hardly shows any great public support for medicare.

Moreover, Mr. Duff, in his followup editorial, met the argument of the letter with logical facts and statistics which must cause any reasonable person to conclude that the letterwriter, if possessed of the information contained in the editorial, might have earlier reconsidered his view.

Mr. Speaker, it would appear that if the response to such an editorial question were not greater in all the communities of America than it was in Red Wing, Minn., that medicare would not be considered of major importance.

It is interesting to note that, until now, there has been very little evidence to indicate that the response in any given city would be any greater than that which I have just shown.

Federal Savings Should Consider Welfare of Smaller Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which was published in the Great Falls, Mont., Tribune on January 14, 1965. The article relates to the proposed emasculation of veterans facilities in the less populated States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SAVINGS SHOULD CONSIDER WELFARE OF SMALLER COMMUNITIES

We are highly in favor of saving tax money and expenses at all government levels, because it is our own money.

So we can't complain unduly when military installations which are no longer vital to national defense are folded. No more can we be too doleful when Veterans' Administration hospitals and regional offices are similarly affected.

But we do raise one point on these various savings on which administrative decisions are made in Washington. More consideration ought to be given to the impact on local economies in smaller communities. For example, moving the veterans office from White River Junction, Vt., to Boston, doesn't cause the slightest riffle in Boston, but it pulls the rug out from under an important segment of the Vermont village's economic bloodstream.

By something of the same token, there is understandable and justifiable despair in Glasgow over the possible loss of that fine new airbase. This hurts Glasgow, and we in Great Falls are thankful on our sinning knees that Malmstrom didn't get the ax. Nor is there any joy in Miles City over losing its excellent new hospital.

So we say to Washington, "Go ahead with your savings, but close installations in metropolitan areas first. Closures in or near large cities are negligible factors in those areas, whereas shutting down the Glasgow's and White River Junction's leave scars from which such smaller communities may take years to recover.

Russian Reforms Not Impressive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is growing evidence of the White House directed propaganda barrage which hopes to soften the American public to permit further accommodation with communism.

Part of the line emphasizes reforms behind the Iron Curtain and the so-called easing of Communist pressures.

This dangerous and misguided propaganda barrage is, however, being effectively answered by thinking Americans across the country. One of the most practical articles I have seen appeared in the Polish American, an independent weekly publication in Chicago, Ill. It was written by Columnist John Switalski.

With consent, I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

RUSSIAN REFORMS NOT IMPRESSIVE

In a letter to one of the Chicago morning newspapers a Latvian American called attention to the speech of Soviet President Mikoyan on the 47th anniversary of the Communist revolution, in which Mikoyan assured the world that the Soviet Union wants an end to colonialism so that all nations can be free. This Latvian American also reminded us that although more than 60 Senators and Representatives introduced resolutions during the recent session of Congress calling on President Lyndon B. Johnson to bring the question of the freedom of the Baltic nations before the United Nations the President has not done so. He expressed the hope that Mr. Johnson would demand freedom for all the captive nations and warned that otherwise the day will come when this Nation will also become a captive nation.

Why this silence on the part of our Government and its representatives in the State Department and the U.N.? It would demand freedom for all the captive nations and, warned, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson could raise the question of the captive nations without creating a war crisis. One would think that Stevenson, a past master at well-worded irony could brilliantly expose the cynical hypocrisy of Mikoyan's statement. And by failing to speak out the Johnson administration makes the captive nations plank in the Democratic platform also look like a hypocritical statement.

Meanwhile the forbearance of the U.S. Government on Russian colonialism does not stop the Kremlin from continuing to attack what it regards as U.S. colonialism and imperialism in Vietnam, Laos, Congo, Korea, and even Cuba.

What are we to think? Is it conceivable that our Government—despite periodic expressions of sympathy for the people behind the Iron Curtain—really recognizes a Russian "sphere of influence" that forever consigns Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and other satellites, the Baltic States, and other occupied nations (Ukraine White Ruthenia, Georgia, Armenia, etc.) to Russ enslavement? Or is our Government so completely taken in by the "reforms" of Soviet communism that impress our liberal intellectuals?

That very same evening a Chicago newspaper columnist expressed some indignation about American anti-Communists who refuse to see Soviet "reforms." The Daily News' Sydney Harris compared these anti-Communists with the liberal of 30 years ago who refused to believe the evidence of the Moscow trials.

The comparison is not a good one. For one thing many of the liberals of the thirties are the same liberals who today never lift their voices against Soviet colonialism. They apparently see nothing wrong in the denial of self-determination to a 25-century-old nation such as Armenia even after dozens of new nations have been artificially created out of primitive tribes that formerly inhabited French and British African colonies. These new nations, moreover, are not homogeneous. Mutually hostile tribes, speaking different languages, have been grouped together often only to be oppressed by the more advanced or dominant tribe.

Historians of the future will surely scratch their heads in puzzlement. How, they will say, could the West so readily free these primitive peoples and at the same time show such crass indifference to the fate of an illustrious nation such as Poland that was the first in Europe to stand up and fight the Nazi monster and then continued to fight him in the air over Britain, on the sands of the Sahara, in bleakest Norway, and at Monte Cassino? And why the indifference to the rights of such ancient nations as Armenia and Georgia? Or to the Ukrainian nation as populous as France?

Communist Harris cites as evidence that "Russia has changed enormously" the fact that the Chinese leftists accuse Russia of having betrayed Marxism. He forgets similar accusations by Trotsky against Stalin in the 1930's and that even the great Lenin once allowed a resurgence of capitalism in Russia during his new economic policy period of the 1920's.

Nor does the decline of the Third International and the disagreement among the Communist bloc offer much of an argument for ending anticommunism. Even if we ignore the now friendlier relations between Moscow and Peiping, there is little to be happy about when we compare the map of the world before Yalta with that of today. Or when one reflects on the enormous task it is for the United States to keep one small country in southeast Asia from being engulfed by the Communist tyranny. Or to recall how very close our great sister republic to the South—Brazil—came to suffering the fate of Cuba.

Sidney Harris has attained an enviable prestige with his pithy comments on human frailty but he should be reminded that even Einstein blundered on the field of politics. As a kremlinologist Sidney is strictly bush.

Retirement of Frank Fuller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me concerning Frank H. Fuller, of the Associated Press.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

Along with many other Virginians, I am going to miss Frank H. Fuller, who is retiring from the Associated Press, after 38 years as chief of its Richmond bureau.

As head of Virginia operations for the Associated Press, he has directed with effi-

ciency and speed the distribution of news to many newspapers and radio and television stations throughout the State. Newspaper readers seldom get to know the desk men of a news-gathering organization, who work quietly behind the scenes. But these are the men who see to it that we find out without delay what happened a few minutes or a few hours ago.

Mr. Fuller began his career with the Associated Press in the Atlanta Bureau in 1923, shortly after his graduation from the University of Georgia. Before coming to Richmond, 4 years later, he served the Associated Press in Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

In addition to having many contacts with Frank during my 32 years of service in Congress, we had another interest in common—the love of the out-of-doors and an inborn fondness for duck hunting. One of the crosses that Frank bore with patience and fortitude was a broken leg which interfered with his hunting and fishing.

I join his many friends in wishing him many years of happiness in his well-earned retirement.

Need for Comprehensive Legislation on Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on January 18, I introduced legislation to renovate our legal and treatment procedures in dealing with the scourge of narcotics addiction.

In my explanatory remarks, I referred to a letter from Commissioner Henry Giordano of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. Mr. Giordano, at my request, commented upon certain phases of the narcotics legislation I introduced during the 88th Congress which in some areas is similar to my current bills.

For the RECORD, Mr. Giordano's letter is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NARCOTICS,
Washington, November 16, 1964.

Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALPERN: This refers to Acting Commissioner George H. Gaffney's letter to you dated October 22, 1964, concerning your request for comments on bills introduced by you in the 88th Congress and the Bureau's views on the adequacy of the existing law enforcement capabilities in the handling of the illicit narcotic traffic.

H.R. 1630 is designed "to enable the courts more effectively to deal with the problem of narcotic addiction." The proposed legislation would permit a victim of narcotic addiction who is charged with a narcotic drug offense to be afforded an opportunity for treatment and rehabilitation instead of being criminally prosecuted. The features of the proposed legislation would not be available if it appears that the offense involved sale or transfer of narcotics; there is pending against the person a prior criminal charge; the person has been previously convicted of a felony; the person previously has been civilly committed because of narcotic use; suitable facilities are not available; or if such action is not in the interest of justice.

I agree in principle with the purpose of proposals to treat addicts, who are not engaged in commercial selling of narcotics, as medical rehabilitation cases and not as criminals. Moreover, I believe that punishment should fit the gravity of the offense for persons engaging in the business of exploiting human misery. Accordingly, I have favored legislation of the type set forth in H.R. 1630. I pose this question, however: Would it not be more appropriate to have a compulsory civil commitment treatment and rehabilitation program to be applied without waiting for the person to commit a criminal offense? This is the course we have urged upon the States for many years.

H.R. 1639 is designed "To provide for the general welfare by assisting the States, through a program of grants-in-aid, to establish and operate special hospital facilities for the treatment and cure of narcotic addicts." The proposed legislation would appropriate specific funds for the purpose of permitting the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to make grants-in-aid to States for the construction of special hospital facilities, to assist States in the operation of special hospital facilities, and to furnish technical assistance to the States in constructing and operating such special hospital facilities.

Although the Bureau of Narcotics does not have any administrative responsibility in the area of treatment and rehabilitation, I believe that much good could come from a program of grants-in-aid and technical assistance furnished by the Federal Government to States. I have advocated Federal assistance to State and local governments where serious narcotic addiction problems exist. While I do not believe it is necesasry or desirable to spend large sums of Federal money for the construction of specialized, single-purpose hospitals for the treatment of addicts, I do believe there is a definite need to develop programs for research, posthospital care, treatment and rehabilitation. There is already quite a lot being done by the Federal Government in this respect. However, if new legislation is deemed necessary to implement an adequate program, I would be in favor of it.

H.R. 11910 is designed "To establish in the Bureau of Customs the U.S. Narcotic Division in order to improve the enforcement of the narcotics and other antismuggling laws." The proposed legislation would provide for a new enforcement body in the Bureau of Customs to be called the U.S. Narcotic Division, with not less than 500 officers, charged with the duty of enforcing the Narcotic Drug Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 171–185) and other laws of the United States relating to the smuggling of narcotic drugs.

The job of policing the borders of the United States to eliminate the smuggling of narcotics is a tremendous responsibility. The Bureau of Customs has to do many jobs, and the Treasury Department has noted that their investigative force is undermanned. I am informed that the Department has supported an increase in Customs manpower, and within the limits of the budget as approved by the President, will do everything possible to obtain the appropriation of necessary funds by Congress.

In Report No. 1031 accompanying the act of June 14, 1930, which created the Bureau of Narcotics, the 71st Congress stated that the major enforcement and permissive features of the Federal narcotic laws will be administered by the proposed new Bureau of Narcotics and centralized responsibility in narcotic law enforcement will be imposed upon the Commisioner of Narcotics. Additionally, in conformance with this country's obligations under international narcotic treaties, for 34 years the Bureau of Narcotics has been the Government's central agency responsible for administration of the narcotic laws. On the other hand, the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Customs over narcotic drugs is simply one of suppressing smuggling. From an effective and realistic enforcement standpoint, responsibility for investigation of the illicit traffic and regulating the legitimate trade in narcotics under 21 U.S.C. 171 et seq., should be in the hands of a single authority. Accordingly, I oppose establishing a "narcotic division" in the Bureau of Customs with functions similar to those now being discharged by the Bureau of Narcotics. I believe the purpose of H.R. 11910 to provide the Bureau of Customs with additional manpower can be accomplished within the framework of existing regimen instead of causing an overlapping of functions by creating a separate narcotic enforcement agency.

H.R. 12066 is a bill "To authorize the establishing by the Surgeon General of an aftercare posthospital treatment program for drug addiction." The proposed legislation would authorize the Surgeon General to establish outpatient units of the Public Health Service to provide medical, sociological and psychiatrical help and supervision over persons released from the Lexington and Fort Worth hospitals after treatment for addiction.

I think there is a great need in areas where serious narcotic addiction problems exist for nonhospital treatment centers where addicts may obtain necessary followup rehabilitation treatment. However, I believe that followup care and supervision should continue to be the responsibility of the person's community. Accordingly, I am inclined to the view that the Federal Government should assist State and local governments by providing grants-in-aid for the operation of posthospital rehabilitative care. Such assistance could be included within the provisions of H.R. 1639.

Regarding your request to be informed of the Bureau's views on the sufficiency of present-day law enforcement capabilities and suggestions as to what needs to be done, I have continued to advocate a program centered around the following principles:

1. A strong vigorous law enforcement policy aimed at exacting certain and stringent punishment for illicit traffickers in narcotics.

2. Proper treatment and effective rehabilitation of addicts with a view of curing addiction.

3. International and national cooperation with enforcement agencies to help eliminate the local violators and the foreign sources of supply.

The most significant legislation in more than 40 years to help check the spread of addiction was the Narcotic Control Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 567). The important feature of the act is that all peddlers of narcotic drugs are on notice that they will not be dealt with lightly when convicted in Federal Court of selling narcotic drugs. The act provided certainty of imprisonment for convicted sellers and smugglers. There is also a discretionary measure in the act which does not preclude probation where circumstances warrant leniency for persons convicted of offenses other than sales or smuggling.

I believe that criminal sanctions against all narcotic sellers, be they addicts or nonaddicts, including long terms of imprisonment, are essential to effective enforcement of the narcotic laws and the eradication of the illicit traffic. In many areas of the country where there are mandatory sentencing provisions under the laws of the States, accompanied by vigorous and continuous law enforcement, there has been a substantial reduction in the traffic, and in some cities addiction is at a virtual minimum. Our agents have received underworld reports that because of the narcotic laws enforced by Federal and State officers and the penalties facing the smuggler and peddler some of the topflight traffickers have announced that

they are no longer willing to assume the risks involved in such activities. Our intelligence discloses that it is becoming more difficult for narcotic offenders to secure financial backing from the underworld moneylenders.

We have had significant success in seizing large quantities of heroin smuggled into this country, and we have presented for prosecution during the past several years 20 major conspiracy cases resulting in the conviction of 206 important gangsters, including such notorious violators as Vito Genovese, John Ormento, Carmine Galente, and Joseph Valachi.

In addition to working closely with the Bureau of Customs, which has the primary responsibility for the prevention of smuggling, we have extensive liaison and cooperation with State and local law-enforcement officers. We maintain a narcotics training school which offers to State and local officers a 2-week course in narcotic law enforcement procedures. As a result of our liaison and training program, there has been very gratifying response on the part of State and local authorities who have recognized their responsibilities to the community and have made major contributions to the overall enforcement effort.

Another approach to the solution has been our oversea program of engaging the international violators firsthand at the source. In our expanded foreign operations, the work of agents of the Bureau of Narcotics has repeatedly led to the location and destruction of laboratories and seizures of large quantities of narcotic drugs destined for the illicit traffic in the United States. We seek the close cooperation of other countries in the fulfillment of treaty obligations to restrict the production of narcotic drugs to the world's legitimate needs. In this manner, there should be insignificant overproduction and far less opportunity for diversion of narcotics into illicit channels. As a result of our enforcement activities, the efforts of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the continual cooperation with the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol), and an awareness of narcotic problems by officials of other countries, there is an increasingly effective enforcement program covering nearly all of the free world.

However, I believe we still have a considerable way to go in the formation of legalized weapons to rectify our investigation disadvantages. In my opinion, legislation permitting limited wiretapping under strict controls would be of great assistance in bringing the large-scale violator to justice. An effective wiretap provision is the best way to cope with the secret communication facilities employed by organized narcotic traffickers who know they can conspire from all points in the United States by telephone with virtual immunity. Another measure which I think deserves favorable consideration is an appropriate statute providing severe penalties for anyone who terrorizes any person to prevent him from giving information or furnishing testimony or who otherwise obstructs a criminal investigation being conducted by an agency of the United States. At the present time, the law only prohibits the intimidation of witnesses who are under judicial process. No protection is afforded to prospective witnesses prior to the formal initiation of judicial proceedings.

As of December 31, 1963, there were 48,535 active reported addicts listed in the files of the Bureau of Narcotics. Although this represents a decrease from 1 in 400 of the population in 1914 to about 1 in 4,000 at this time, it is quite clear that narcotic addiction in this country is still a problem. However, I believe that with intensified enforcement of the laws now provided by the Federal and State Governments; with continual success in our foreign program; with an emphasized program by the States for compulsory civil commitment of narcotic addicts for treatment; with increased Federal assistance to States to develop programs for research, posthospital care, treatment and rehabilitation where the problem is acute; and with further exploration into the causes and cures of addiction, we will see an even more impressive improvement in the future.

I appreciate the opportunity of commenting on the bills introduced by you. I have no reason to believe that any of the points covered in my remarks are counter to any policy statement of the Treasury Department; however, I should like to point out that my comments and suggestions represent my own observations of the various aspects. Accordingly, please do not consider this letter as an official position paper of the Department.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. GIORDANO,
Commissioner of Narcotics.

Eastern Air Lines Publishes Inaugural "Words That Live"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Eastern Air Lines recently published a booklet entitled "Words That Live." In it are excerpts from inaugural addresses of the past. This major air carrier compiled the pamphlet as a memento of the event which will occur in this National Capital City on January 20, 1965, when Lyndon B. Johnson is sworn in as President of the United States. Tomorrow our Chief Executive will be heard and seen by tens of millions of people in this country and throughout the world.

Seldom do we find such ideas and goals in so condensed a form as are set forth in "Words That Live." I heartily commend Eastern's management for the thought-provoking and well-chosen phrases from these historical speeches.

In scanning the words of our great leaders it is interesting to note the similarity of problems then and now, as well as the parallelism of purposes and aims in their addresses.

Today, education is foremost in our legislative programs. Yet it was in 1817 that James Monroe said:

> Let us by all wise and constitutional measure promote intelligence among the people as the best means of preserving our liberties.

James A. Garfield could have been speaking on the recent civil rights issue when in 1881 he declared:

> The will of the Nation, speaking with the voice of battle and through the amended Constitution, has fulfilled the great promise of 1776 by proclaiming "liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof."

In 1905 when the world was becoming smaller, Theodore Roosevelt spoke softly and carried a big stick. He might have spelled out the same policy before the United Nations Security Council in this decade when he stated:

> We wish peace, but we wish the peace of justice, the peace of righteousness. We wish it because we think it is right and not because we are afraid. No weak nation that acts manfully and justly should ever have cause to fear us, and no strong power should ever be able to single us out as a subject for insolent aggression.

One hundred years ago, President Abraham Lincoln faced his domestic crisis with these famous words:

> With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

I could continue, Mr. President, condensing even more, the excerpts from Presidential pronouncements. However, I think the printed matter in "Words That Live" is well worth reading and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE WASHINGTON, FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS, APRIL 30, 1789

> No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men more than those of the United States.
>
> Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency; and in the important revolution just accomplished in the system of their united government the tranquil deliberations and voluntary consent of so many distinct communities from which the event has resulted cannot be compared with the means by which most governments have been established without some return of pious gratitude along with an humble anticipation of the future blessings which the past seems to presage.
>
> These reflections, arising out of the present crisis, have forced themselves too strongly on my mind to be suppressed. You will join with me, I trust, in thinking that there are none under the influence of which the proceedings of a new and free government can more auspiciously commence.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS, MARCH 4, 1801

> But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.
>
> I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong, that this Government is not strong enough; but would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not.
>
> I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest Government on earth. I believe it the only one where every man, at the call of the law, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted

with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the forms of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

JAMES MONROE, FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS, MARCH 4, 1817

The Government has been in the hands of the people. To the people, therefore, and to the faithful and able depositaries of their trust is the credit due. Had the people of the United States been educated in different principles, had they been less intelligent, less independent, or less virtuous, can it be believed that we should have maintained the same steady and consistent career or been blessed with the same success?

While, then, the constituent body retains its present sound and healthful state everything will be safe. They will choose competent and faithful representatives for every department. It is only when the people become ignorant and corrupt, when they degenerate into a populace, that they are incapable of exercising the sovereignty. Usurpation is then an easy attainment, and an usurper soon found. The people themselves become the willing instruments of their own debasement and ruin. Let us, then, look to the great cause, and endeavor to preserve it in full force.

Let us by all wise and constitutional measures promote intelligence among the people as the best means of preserving our liberties.

FRANKLIN PIERCE, INAUGURAL ADDRESS, MARCH 4, 1853

Preeminently, the power of our advocacy reposes in our example; but no example, be it remembered, can be powerful for lasting good, whatever apparent advantages may be gained, which is not based upon eternal principles of right and justice. Our fathers decided for themselves, both upon the hour to declare and the hour to strike. They were their own judges of the circumstances under which it became them to pledge to each other "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" for the acquisition of the priceless inheritance transmitted to us. The energy with which that great conflict was opened and, under the guidance of a manifest and beneficient Providence, the uncomplaining endurance with which it was prosecuted to its consummation were only surpassed by the wisdom and patriotic spirit of concession which characterized all the counsels of the early fathers.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS, MARCH 4, 1865

If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him?

Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mightly scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether." With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

JAMES A. GARFIELD, INAUGURAL ADDRESS, MARCH 4, 1881

The supremacy of the Nation and its laws should be no longer a subject of debate. That discussion, which for half a century threatened the existence of the Union, was closed at last in the high court of war by a decree from which there is no appeal—that the Constitution and the laws made in pursuance thereof are and shall continue to be the supreme law of the land, binding alike upon the States and the people. This decree does not disturb the autonomy of the States nor interfere with any of their necessary rights of local self-government, but it does fix and establish the permanent supremacy of the Union.

The will of the Nation, speaking with the voice of battle and through the amended Constitution, has fulfilled the great promise of 1776 by proclaiming "liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof."

GROVER CLEVELAND INAUGURAL ADDRESS MARCH 4, 1885

But he who takes the oath today to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States only assumes the solemn obligation which every patriotic citizen—on the farm, in the workshop, in the busy marts of trade, and everywhere—should share with him.

The Constitution which prescribes his oath, my countrymen, is yours; the Government you have chosen him to administer for a time is yours; the suffrage which executes the will of freemen is yours; the laws and the entire scheme of our civil rule, from the town meeting to the State capitals and the National Capital, is yours. Your every voter, as surely as your chief magistrate, under the same high sanction, though in a different sphere, exercises a public trust. Nor is this all. Every citizen owes to the country a vigilant watch and close scrutiny of its public servants and a fair and reasonable estimate of their fidelity and usefulness.

Thus is the people's will impressed upon the whole framework of our civil policy—municipal, State, and Federal; and this is the price of our liberty and the inspiration of our faith in the Republic.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT INAUGURAL ADDRESS MARCH 4, 1905

Much has been given us, and much will rightfully be expected from us. We have duties to others and duties to ourselves; and we can shirk neither.

We have become a great Nation, forced by the fact of its greatness into relations with the other nations of the earth, and we must behave as beseems a people with such responsibilities. Toward all other nations, large and small, our attitude must be one of cordial and sincere friendship. We must show not only in our words, but in our deeds, that we are earnestly desirous of securing their good will by acting toward them in a spirit of just and generous recognition of all their rights.

But justice and generosity in a nation, as in an individual, count most when shown not by the weak but by the strong. While ever careful to refrain from wronging others, we must be no less insistent that we are not wronged ourselves. We wish peace, but we wish the peace of justice, the peace of righteousness. We wish it because we think it is right and not because we are afraid. No weak nation that acts manfully and justly should ever have cause to fear us, and no strong power should ever be able to single us out as a subject for insolent agression.

WOODROW WILSON, SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS, MARCH 5, 1917

We shall be the more American if we but remain true to the principles in which we have been bred. They are not the principles of a province or of a single continent. We have known and boasted all along that they were the principles of a liberated mankind. These, therefore, are the things we shall stand for, whether in war or in peace:

That all nations are equally interested in the peace of the world and in the political stability of free peoples, and equally responsible for their maintenance; that the essential principle of peace is the actual equality of nations in all matters of right or privilege; that peace cannot securely or justly rest upon an armed balance of power; that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed and that no other powers should be supported by the common thought, purpose or power of the family of nations; that the seas should be equally free and safe for the use of all peoples, under rules set up by common agreement and consent, and that, so far as practicable, they should be accessible to all upon equal terms; that national armaments shall be limited to the necessities of national order and domestic safety; that the community of interest and of power upon which peace must henceforth depend imposes upon each nation the duty of seeing to it that all influences proceeding from its own citizens meant to encourage or assist revolution in other states should be sternly and effectually suppressed and prevented.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, FOURTH INAUGURAL ADDRESS, JANUARY 20, 1945

We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations far away. We have learned that we must live as men, not as ostriches, nor as dogs in the manger.

We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community.

We have learned the simple truth, as Emerson said, that "The only way to have a friend is to be one."

We can gain no lasting peace if we approach it with suspicion and mistrust or with fear. We can gain it only if we proceed with the understanding, the confidence, and the courage which flow from conviction.

The Almighty God has blessed our land in many ways. He has given our people stout hearts and strong arms with which to strike mighty blows for freedom and truth. He has given to our country a faith which has become the hope of all peoples in an anguished world.

So we pray to Him now for the vision to see our way clearly—to see the way that leads to a better life for ourselves and for all our fellow men—to the achievement of His will, to peace on earth.

HARRY S. TRUMAN, INAUGURAL ADDRESS, JANUARY 20, 1949

The American people stand firm in the faith which has inspired this Nation from the beginning. We believe that all men have a right to equal justice under law and equal opportunity to share in the common good. We believe that all men have the right to fredom of thought and expression. We believe that all men are created equal because they are created in the image of God.

From this faith we will not be moved.

The American people desire, and are determined to work for, a world in which all nations and all peoples are free to govern themselves as they see fit and to achieve a decent and satisfying life. Above all else, our people desire, and are determined to work for, peace on earth—a just and lasting peace—

based on genuine agreement freely arrived at by equals.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS, JANUARY 20, 1953

No person, no home, no community can be beyond the reach of this call. We are summoned to act in wisdom and in conscience, to work with industry, to teach with persuasion, to preach with conviction, to weigh our every deed with care and with compassion. For this truth must be clear before us: whatever America hopes to bring to pass in the world must first come to pass in the heart of America.

More than an escape from death, it is a way of life.

More than a haven for the weary, it is a hope for the brave.

This is the hope that beckons us onward in this century of trial. This is the work that awaits us all, to be done with bravery, with charity—and with prayer to Almighty God.

JOHN F. KENNEDY, INAUGURAL ADDRESS, JANUARY 20, 1961

In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility; I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it, and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country.

My fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America wil do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His Help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

Less Foreign Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a large segment of the responsible press of our country has apparently been misled by the following very carefully worded paragraph of the President's message on foreign aid presented to this House on January 14.

Referring to the appropriation request for fiscal year 1966 of $3,380 million, the President said:

This is a minimum request, the smallest in the history of the foreign aid program. It is $136 million less than requested last year, and will impose the smallest assistance burden on the American people since the beginning of the Marshall plan in 1948.

Apparently the technical accuracy of this statement did not prevent it from being misinterpreted, even by knowledgable and responsible newsmen.

For instance, the lead editorial of the Milwaukee Journal for Saturday, January 16, carried the headline "Less Foreign Aid" and referred to the President's proposal as "the smallest foreign aid program of recent history."

The record shows that the President's requested amount of $3,380 million, if appropriated in full, would represent a greater burden upon the taxpayers of the United States for foreign assistance than they bore through appropriations for this program in six of the last 10 fiscal years.

In order to clarify the record, it should be pointed out that the President's minimum request does not include funding of the President's proposal of a three-quarter billion dollar contribution over 3 years, to the Inter-American Development Bank.

I find much that is encouraging, and much that I can approve in the President's message on foreign aid. But I do not like to have any of my constituents misled; including the editorial writers of Wisconsin's largest newspaper.

I believe that David Lawrence's editorial in the January 18 issue of the Washington Star is illuminating, and I include it herewith in amplification of the above remarks:

BRAINWASHING AND FOREIGN AID

Brainwashing—the political technique of playing on the ignorance or indifference of the public—seems to have been effectively utilized in the message on foreign aid which President Johnson has just sent to Congress.

Many a headline in the press emphasized the President's comment that his request for $3,380 million is the smallest in the history of the foreign aid program since it was started in 1948. But a request for an appropriation is far different from an actual authorization by Congress, and what was glossed over is the fact that the President's request this year is higher than what was actually appropriated for foreign aid for fiscal year 1965 as well as for 1964, 1960, 1958, 1956, and 1955.

So a request for a sum which is slightly lower than what was requested last year is not in itself of any real significance, particularly when it is $130 million more than last year's appropriation and $380 million more than was appropriated the year before that.

What is more important is that, while the President used the figure of $3,380 million as his request, he inserted at the same time in his message a separate request for another $750 million for aid to Latin America. In the first part of his message, he says:

"Specifically, for fiscal year 1966, I recommend no additional authorizations for development lending or the Alliance for Progress; existing authorizations for those purposes are adequate."

But further on in the same message, Mr. Johnson says:

"To strengthen multinational aid, and further to strengthen the Alliance for Progress, I urge the Congress promptly to approve the 3-year authorization of $750 million which constitutes the U.S. contribution to the fund for special operations of the Inter-American Development Bank."

Yet the public is being told, in effect, that the total amount the administration is asking from Congress for foreign aid is only $3,380 million. Actually, by adding one-third of the $750 million of multinational aid for Latin America, the total request becomes $3,630 million. This is higher than the total of last year's request as well as the request in several of the preceding years.

A third request by the President in his message is not spelled out. He says the amount asked for the Vietnam operation may not be enough and that he is requesting an additional standby authorization for military or supporting assistance which would be used only in Vietnam. He also warns that he will ask Congress for more funds if situations should arise which require additional amounts of U.S. assistance to advance U.S. vital interests.

There is also an accumulation of unexpended funds from previous years which can at any time be used for the original purpose as long as it comes within the scope of the language of the laws authorizing such expenditures. It is estimated that $6.5 billion appropriated by Congress in past years has not yet been spent. But each year Congress is nevertheless asked to keep on appropriating more money without regard to these previously authorized but unspent sums.

The President's message, therefore, does not tell just how much will be taken out of the U.S. Treasury for foreign aid this fiscal year or next year. The impression is being given that spending for foreign aid is to be at a record low, when this is not the case at all.

The President is, of course, trying to convince Congress that the estimates this year are much more of a rockbottom nature than they have been in the past. The attitude of Congress in cutting down on Presidential requests for foreign aid in recent years has brought about a much more careful study of the requests before they are submitted to Congress. Last year, when the President asked for $3,516 million, Congress appropriated all but $266 million, and Johnson explained then that he was giving a much more realistic estimate of the performance which could be expected among the recipient countries.

In the past, officials had apparently based their requests on what they hoped could be spent effectively, but they were unable to judge just how much of the funds authorized could be expended within a given period. It is the attempt to end such guesswork which has brought the new requests down to a far more accurate projection of the foreign aid program this year. In a broad sense, however, the expenditures are just about as high as they have been before. Indeed, in the coming year they will be higher than in many of the preceding years.

The objectives of foreign aid have raised quite a controversy. But, on the whole, the record of achievement has been, despite some weaknesses, a creditable one. The fact remains nevertheless that this country has established a prestige throughout the world of having generously shared its wealth with less fortunate nations.

"Freedom Is Slipping"—Editorial by R. L. DeYoung

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Spartanburg Guide and the Textile Tribune, of Spartanburg, S.C., is an outstanding weekly newspaper which speaks out very strongly and eloquently in the interest of the cause of freedom. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent

editorial entitled "Freedom Is Slipping," as printed in the Spartanburg Guide and the Textile Tribune of January 14, 1965. The editorial was written by Mr. R. L. DeYoung, editor and publisher of this newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM IS SLIPPING

Many men of knowledge have said that if the people of this country ever lose their freedom it will be by the process of losing just a little freedom at one time. Our freedom will never be taken away in one bold stroke by some man who would proclaim himself a dictator. But "the constant dropping water will wear away the hardest stone."

Now you do not have to be an old person to remember when things were quite different in this country from what they are today.

Just a few years ago a man could say * * * I will buy a home in a certain neighborhood where the people will always be of the caucasian race. A man cannot do that today. He has lost that freedom.

A few years ago you could say you would select a school for your children to attend where only the caucasian race of children attend. You can't do that now. That freedom is gone.

A few years ago you could plan and open a business establishment and you could say that you would carefully select your employees and you would hire only the kind of employees which you believed would best serve your interest. You can't do that now. That freedom is gone.

Then if you are a farmer, time was when you could walk out across your acres and decide you would plant this field to cotton this year; this field you would plant to corn, and this was the year to put this acreage to wheat. You can't do that now. That freedom is gone. Farm life was one time considered the one place where a man had freedom to operate his business and to live his life as he wished, so long as he did not trespass on another's freedom. Gone. It's all gone. In exchange for the loss of that freedom the farmer gets some handouts, but today he's forced to produce cotton that returns him the lowest income of perhaps any working people in this Nation.

And yes, other people are getting handouts too, and for these handouts their freedom is slowly but most surely being taken away. And the end is not yet.

And we predict that the next 4 years will see more freedoms lost than we have experienced in the last 30 years. These freedoms will be exchanged for the handouts—called the Great Society. And the people will swallow it.

And let us remind you of another lost freedom. It is that of electing a President of the United States. You will not have a choice again. No. You'll take what is offered, that's what you'll take.

Just think for a moment—if you can imagine such an absurd thing—of a man running for the presidency in 1968 on a platform of liberty, freedom, living within our income, working and saving to pay off the national debt that is weighting down the people of this Nation; to encourage frugal living until we got out of debt. And to proclaim a love and devotion to the United States above any other country in the whole wide world. And to guarantee freedom and independence to every citizen so long as his freedom did not oppress another citizen.

Such a candidate would stand no chance of being elected. The only kind of platform, and candidate that will win the election in 1968 is a platform and a man that will promise more than the present occupant of the White House can promise. We are getting well into a socialist form of government, and the only other form of government that can promise more than that is the Communist form of government. Communism can outpromise socialism. In the end both will wreck a free nation of men and women.

Just thought we'd remind you of these things.

No society is as grand and glorious as the society of free men and women. Our freedom is slipping, slipping, and slipping. Is the handout worth it?

How the Handicapped Are Overcoming Barriers to Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include four essays authored by young people in the 23d district of California. These high school students competed in a contest sponsored by a number of individuals and groups all of whom have a deep interest in the solution of the employment problems of the physically handicapped. The contest is held annually under the sponsorship of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. The essays follow:

HOW THE HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY

(Lyle Eugene Hill, 17, Compton, Calif., Dominguez High School, Compton, Calif.; D. Taylor, English department)

Simply because one of the faculties of a person doesn't operate correctly, this person usually has to look forward to much difficulty in finding a job. Many employers won't hire the handicapped because they believe the person will not be as efficient as others or will require special training. I will attempt to show in this essay how this person can adapt to the requirements of a job and become an efficient worker.

It is unfortunate that many employers view the handicapped as they do, since they are entirely wrong. Although the person is at first at a disadvantage on a new job, once he becomes situated his other highly developed senses help him to become just as good or even better than the other workers in his line. Since a handicapped person has so much difficulty in finding a job, he will not be apt to move from one job to another; consequently, any special training required will not be wasted. I have a personal interest in the handicapped since my own father lost the vision of his right eye in an industrial accident. Before the accident occurred he worked only on regular production jobs in a furniture factory. The loss on one eye denied him his depth of vision. As a result of the extreme competition in the furniture industry, speedy operation of the machinery is a necessity. Since woodworking machinery is basically dangerous, it was no longer possible for my father to continue in the production type of work. He then began to specialize in the building of custom-made furniture. In this type of work quality is more important than speed. He now builds furniture for many of the well-known interior decorators on the west coast. My father has recently made furniture for the ex-President of Mexico. He also made many of the furnishings for Desi Arnaz's apartment in the new Desi Arnaz Indian Wells Hotel in Palm Springs.

Mr. Karl Faulhaber, of Compton, is another example of one who has overcome the difficulties of the handicapped. Several years ago his right arm, from the elbow down to and including his hand, was badly mangled when it became caught between the rollers of a glue-spreading machine in a plywood factory. During the many months of convalescence, he became interested in the study of photography. The injury left his hand and fingers stiff making it difficult for him to continue in his occupation. Because of his great interest in photography he decided that this might be a profitable line of endeavor. Mr. Faulhaber made a tour of the western United States, taking pictures as he traveled. When he returned home he was able to get several engagements to show his pictures and tell of his travels. This convinced him that photography could be a profitable business for him and also one that he could handle although handicapped. Mr. Faulhaber has now become a world traveler and a very successful man, showing travel films and lecturing throughout the United States.

These are only two of many examples that one could tell of to demonstrate that a handicapped person can be successful if he will take advantage of his undeveloped capabilities. In today's complex society with its multitude of job classifications, there should be more job opportunities than ever before for the handicapped if they will develop their dormant abilities and if the employers will recognize their potential.

HOW THE HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY

(Kenneth East, 17, Compton, Calif., Dominguez Senior High School, Compton, Calif., Mrs. Delia Taylor, English department)

Since time began there has been a constant struggle for survival. This struggle emerged long before even civilization evolved. In fact, this struggle was almost inherent in any conditions where life existed. Animals of all orders have been involved in this struggle, and traditionally a doctrine of the survival of the fittest has been preached and accepted as fair. With animals this reasoning can hardly be argued, but with man it is not the same. How can man, with such diverse capacities and knowledge, be categorized by a mode of thinking that sets normal people apart stating that they are fit and thus should survive, and that others are unfit, and thus should not survive.

Just how is such a surmisal reached? Fit for what, and unfit for what? Man is not a mere animal whose future must follow a narrow line of action. He is not limited completely and utterly if he lacks 1 or 2 or even 10 or 20 of the capabilities which others retain. Yet for ages such persons who lacked all their capacities were locked away, or turned out, to rot in solitude or to exist in constant mockery. Why should this be? It is not what a person lacks that is important. It is what abilities a person retains and how he uses them that counts.

The idea that handicapped persons have any right for life in its fullest sense has been a long time in coming. The handicapped person for ages was degraded and mocked, or feared and avoided, but somewhere this ended. It would be impossible to tell who was the first handicapped person who didn't accept the fate he had forced upon him by society. But someone didn't. Someone didn't just sit back and accept the corner he was pushed into, or the position he was allowed. He decided that he was not doomed from the day he was born. God saw fit to deprive him of his full capacities, but in doing so did not prohibit him from utilizing the capacities he still possessed. So he worked and he showed the world, no

matter how small it was to him, that he could succeed; that he could survive. Complete fitness was not required. And the world looked on, and thus a revolution was born.

It is the same frame of mind that is being utilized by today's handicapped in overcoming barriers First of all desire is absolutely necessary. Without this how can any progress be made? Increased presence of this can be seen by the fact that more and more handicapped are seeking employment and trying to make something of themselves.

If a person has desire, he can find a type of employment a great majority of the time. If you examine different jobs, none requires the use of your complete capacities. Thus the handicapped person must evaluate himself. Just what can he do? How could he use his abilities? He must choose a position that he can at least adequately fill. If he tries the impossible, the chances are he is aggravating a prejudice against handicapped persons that will cause people after him to be turned down. Thus he must choose wisely the road he will follow. Proof that this has been done can be seen in the increasing number of handicapped gaining employment and often in groups in different establishments.

Next, when he selects his goal in life, the handicapped must demonstrate to employers that it is the ability, not the disability that counts. This will not always be an easy task to fulfill. But diligence in achieving success has been maintained as can be seen again by the increasing number of employed handicapped.

Last of all, when a position finally has been attained, the handicapped person must fulfill his responsibility. He must show the world, as the first inspired of his kind did, that he can be a faithful, conscientious worker, an asset to any establishment. He must do this not only for himself, but so the path for the millions of handicapped after him will not be so steep, so that maybe the wall of prejudice will crumble just a little more. Again, the fact that many firms are hiring handicapped in groups proves the impression the initial employee made was good.

Yes, man is better than animal and always will be. For one major reason: He can adapt, and let us hope that we continue to use this power. When people in our community, now at a time when community can mean anything from the people on your street, to the entire world, begin to stop adapting, that is when the real danger sets in. When change is inevitable—so let us draw a lesson from the handicapped we know and will come to know. For their spirit is the type of spirit that is essential to our way of life. Their desire and utilized abilities, continuated by lasting performance is the attitude that all should have. The day we no longer see these things in the obvious places such as the handicapped, is the day we can begin worrying if these essential attitudes would be there in the rest of the citizens if it were ever necessary to use then. Let us hope this never happens.

OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT FOR HANDICAPPED

(Judy Spann, Compton, Calif.; Elva S. Riggins, teacher; Centennial Senior High School, Compton, Calif.)

Despite the great emphasis which is placed on physical and mental fitness, it is gratifying to realize that the great number of blind, deaf, deafmutes and cripples, along with the mentally retarded, are given assurance of leading productive and rewarding lives through organizations, schools, and agencies.

Perhaps, the awareness, in each community of the need to so provide for employment of the handicapped, is the greatest indication of our being our brother's keeper.

The vast number of cripples is attributed to war injuries, accidents, and diseases. Yet those unfortunate persons who have one, two, or even four members afflicted, can look forward to their becoming rehabilitated and adjusting to productive lives. Such institutions as the Long Beach Veterans' Administration Hospital are engaged in such a program. Following corrective surgery, therapy, the fitting of artificial limbs to the patient, many such war casualties are employed in highly skilled jobs in the local aircraft industry.

Those who through birth defects, or, as the result of accidents, are forced to face a lifetime of blindness may also look toward a life of productivity through such institutions as the Blind Industries of California, Inc. In these institutions, training is given in various skills, and an employment service seeks out such employment for them as is best fitted for their training.

Another agency dedicated to rehabilitating and correcting the barriers to employement for the handicapped is the Rancho Los Amigos hospital where polio victims are taught to walk, talk, and develop such manual skills as will enable them to return to their place in society and lead gainful lives in competition with the employed.

The areas of training and rehabilitation to which I have previously referred are less familiar to me than that of the special education program for the mentally retarded. This State sponsored project exists in many schools in my community. The basic principle upon which this program is founded certainly is aimed at the overcoming of barriers to employment.

According to statistics, 3 out of every 100 children are born with mental deficiencies. Some such persons sustain a permanent brain damage which limits their mental development. Therefore the burden of preparation for these young people rests upon the local community school.

Along with training these students in the fundamental academic studies, close attention is given to their test results in order to best screen their aptitudes and develop their skills to enable such students to compete for jobs.

Classes in typing, arts and crafts, civil service training, printing, and distributive education are among the courses offered for overcoming these barriers. Special education classes also give the girls helpful guidance in home economics training, and the boys work in the school cafeteria in order to gain training for such positions as busboys, waitresses, or food handlers in later life.

Another institution that is best known for its service to the handicaped is the Goodwill Industries. This nonprofit organization employs thousands of handicapped persons who salvage usable clothing and household goods, repair these materials, and make them available to the public for purchase and use.

Through these and other mediums, my community proves its integrity, belief, and feeling of brotherly responsibility in those who are handicapped and who must overcome their limitations in an effort to secure employment.

HOW THE HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY

(By Rolland Gale Coburn, 17, Lynwood, Calif., Lynwood High School, Lynwood, Calif.)

There are just too many bright things to see and do to let a handicap cloud them. I think of my handicap as only technical, and don't allow it to get in the way of living a happy life,[1] says Miss Olivia Moore, receptionist for Goodwill Industries of Southern California. She is one of the handy handicapped. Undeterred by 14 operations, 8 years in cumbersome leg braces, and years of orthopedic therapy to correct the crippling effects of polio, Miss Moore has taken her place in society helping others either handicapped physically like herself, or physically whole but spiritually handicapped.

A man earns a living in the Los Angeles area proofreading Bibles. An ordinary enough occupation, but the man is blind and the Bibles are printed in braille.

These are but two of the many handicapped people who are not judged by their disability but by their ability. Scores more exist not only in the Los Angeles area, but also in communities throughout the State and across the Nation. These, the physically impaired, serve their community as radio announcers, musicians, chauffeurs, accountants, electronic engineers, elevator operators, lawyers, doctors, machinists and hundreds of other occupations, big and little but all serving the same purpose; to put to use the often wasted know-how of the physically handicapped.

In my community there are four major barriers to employment of the handicapped: social, psychological, legal, and architectural. I have already touched upon surmounting the social barrier. Because Miss Olivia Moore, as a receptionist, is constantly dealing with the public, her job is largely social. She has proved herself most capable in her duties. In relation to the social contribution of the handicapped, I might mention that Los Angeles has a wheelchair basketball team, the Flying Wheels.

Psychological barriers are perhaps the hardest for the handicapped to overcome. The employer is persuaded that the handicapped worker will be a hindrance to production, that the handicapped are more likely to be injured while working, that insurance rates will go up if he hires a handicapped person. The handicapped have, however, dispelled the fears and exposed the truth by their own effort. Statistics show that rather than suffer more disabling injuries, the handicapped suffer less; rather than pose insurance problems, the physically impaired are now readily accepted by most insurance agencies.

Because of their superb employment records, the handicapped are now accepted in industry. Lockheed Aircraft, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., the Firestone Rubber Co., the Ford Motor Co., and others have found the physically impaired, including the deaf and the hard of hearing, outstanding workers. Two biarm amputees drove vehicles in Los Angeles City traffic for 4 years without an accident. The men were part of a Northrop Aircraft, Inc., experiment. The only mechanical change needed on the vehicles was the addition of a ring device to the steering wheel so that the amputees could use their hooks to steer.

The refusal of the handicapped to accept employment offer purely on a charity basis but willing to compete on the basis of ability has enabled him to overcome employment barriers. A leg amputee is an accountant. He also keeps in good health by playing tennis and bowling. Another man is almost totally blind; yet, he is a topnotch electrician. A prominent lawyer in the community has only one arm. In addition to his law office, he is a judge.

Employers who have hired the handicapped report increased morale among employees, high efficiency for disabled persons, low tardiness record compared to the normal, less absenteeism, and general satisfaction with the handicapped worker. I personally know of a crippled man who ran an elevator for years and is now doing custodial work. There is another who often has heart trouble but serves the community as a crossing guard for schoolchildren. Then there are the door-to-door salesmen—some blind, some lame—but doing their job well. Perhaps one of

---

[1] "Cherry Smile Greets Visitors," Goodwill News (fall, 1964), p. 3.

the reasons for the success of the handicapped is their willingness to develop their talents through rehabilitation programs.

The legal barriers to employment of the handicapped are connected with efficiency on the job. Since the handicapped worker has proved so sufficient and therefore safe, the legal barriers have been reduced or removed.

As the other barriers have been surmounted, the problem of architectual barriers has become the problem of today. Inaccessibility to many buildings has in time past been a neglected problem. Not only handicapped people are blocked by architectural barriers, but also elderly people. Now, though, more facilities are being provided for use by the handicapped in public buildings, old and new.

So far I have dealt with how the handicapped are overcoming barriers to employment through working for a company or a corporation. There are also those who have overcome similar employment barriers through self-employment, and some of these people are doing exceptionally fine. One man, for example, confined to a wheelchair, gives piano lessons in his home. He always has a full schedule. Some blind have their vending stands, and one severely crippled man sells magazine subscriptions. A victim of multiple sclerosis has learned to type and embroider even though she has only limited use of her hands. A friend has so developed his upper body that although he has little use of his legs, he can mow lawns with a handmower by supporting himself on his crutches and pushing the mower in front of himself. One paraplegic owns a shaver shop. There he repairs electric shavers, old and new, truly an expert at manipulating the tiny parts.

"Today * * * it is not essential that you possess all * * * (limbs and senses) to meet the prime requisites for doing most of the work that is done and needs doing in the country today."[2] Each individual must make the most of his individual capabilities, for it is a crime to waste ability. We should never note a person for his disabilities but for his abilities, because ability counts.

[2] W. P. Gullander, "Toward Wider Job Vistas for the Physically Impaired," New York 17, N.Y., National Association of Manufactures, 1963.

Proposed Abolition of Army Reserve Program—Editorial by the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., has reprinted an excellent editorial from the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., on the subject of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's proposal to abolish the Army Reserve program. The editorial, entitled "The Method Is Wrong," was originally broadcast on January 5 over WBT, in Charlotte, N.C., and was reprinted in the January 12, 1965, issue of Times and Democrat.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE METHOD IS WRONG

There has been much argument, pro and con, about Secretary McNamara's stand on merging the Army Reserves and the National Guard. While some accede that the merger would effect economies in operation of the defense structure, many believe that the Secretary has gone about achieving his results in the wrong manner.

The Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., of Charlotte, N.C., has definite ideas on the subject. In an editorial broadcast January 5, its beliefs on the subject were aired. Here they are:

Secretary of Defense McNamara barely got off the ground with his flight of fancy about merging the Army Reserves and the National Guard before prominent political and military people started shooting him down.

It is a very complicated question for most of us, and there are no authorities to whom we can refer on either side who are not already strongly partisan in their opinion on the matter. But out of the welter of words emerges the fact that even if his plan were basically a good one for giving more efficiency at less money, Mr. McNamara has overstepped his authority in issuing his orders as he did.

To find out where that authority lies, flip the pages of the Constitution to article 1, section 8: Under "Powers of Congress" the Constitution states: "To raise and support armies * * * to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces. To provide for calling for the militia, execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia."

These are powers that belong to Congress, and the most current law of that body states that the Army consists of the "Regular Army, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Army National Guard while in the service of the United States, and the Army Reserve."

Until the Constitution and law is changed by proper means, it would seem that the Secretary of Defense is technically a lawbreaker in attempting to carry through a reorganization which so clearly violates a statute that is just as much a part of the law of the land as is any other part of our laws passed by Congress.

Representative EDWARD HÉBERT, who is chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Reserve and National Guard Affairs complained in a strong statement that Secretary McNamara issued these orders without consulting Congress or the keymen in and out of uniform who would be responsible for and affected by such changes.

There is a lot of waste motion and a lot of wasted money in the military and its reserves, we have no doubt. We would like to se more genuine efficiency and conscientious expenditure of money and men held up as a prime objective at all times. We can applaud any efforts that are made toward the proper reduction of waste or duplicate effort in the vital job of keeping up our military defenses.

But we feel equally sure that these efforts could be directed toward every element in the existing structure. And we feel even more sure that if the structure is going to be changed for the better, it should be changed through the proper channels, with as unanimous a vote as possible among those who do know and are concerned and are responsible for the Nation's defense.

The evidence so far indicates that Mr. McNamara is out of bounds.

The Transportation Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is always encouraging when you find someone who agrees with your governmental philosophy but far more encouraging when you find a newspaper like the Washington Star, which publishes an editorial in general agreement with legislation which you have introduced. The editorial was published on Sunday, January 17, calling for a Department of Transportation.

For a number of years I have introduced legislation calling for a Department of Transportation and Communications. I believe these two functions, from a governmental standpoint, can well be placed in one department, and I am delighted to find at least partial concurrence with my suggested legislation by an editorial which follows:

THE TRANSPORTATION PICTURE

The vision, conjured up in President Johnson's state of the Union message, of trainloads of contented passengers whooshing between Washington and Boston at top speeds of 150 miles an hour, is appealing and dramatic. But it is only a promising first step along a long road.

The ills of the Nation's transportation system are too deep seated and too complex to be cured by a single move, however dramatic. As pointed out in a recent Star survey of national transportation, the system is dangerously out of balance. Profits in some areas of transportation are excessive. Losses in other areas are unbearable. Duplication, inefficiency, and lack of foresight have filtered down to the consumer in the form of increased prices, needless delays, and overburdened facilities.

The President has already demonstrated his awareness of the complex problems involved and his determination to take action. Special task force reports and scientific studies have been made at his behest. A glimpse of the goal he will pursue can be found in his state of the Union message: He will, he said, "recommend heavier reliance on competition in transportation."

All well and good. A removal of the artificial restrictions and props that are slowly strangling the system in a tangle of redtape would certainly be another big step along the way. The same goal was envisioned by both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, but earlier attempts to reach it were crushed by trucking and shipping interests who feared a revitalized railroad industry.

It is to be hoped, therefore, that Johnson's proven powers of persuasion will be used to bolster congressional courage against the pressures of the lobbies, so that the national interest can assert itself effectively.

Other steps must follow.

Action must be taken to disentangle the overlapping and conflicting governmental bodies charged with Federal direction of the transportation system. The intelligence, energy, and money now expended in needless duplication and bloodletting must be aimed at more productive goals. The fabulous technology of our era must be made available to all segments of the system. And never again must the Nation's transportation be permitted to drift toward chaos.

All this will, of course, require time, money and—above all—planning. But the Nation can no longer afford to put off the payments necessary to bring order to this most vital and most overlooked area of our development.

We applaud the beginning that has been made; we shall follow with interest the administration's future moves. And we are much attracted to the idea that the most efficient, least costly way out of our present maze of problems would be the creation of a Cabinet level Department of Transportation.

Tribute to Governor Smylie of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Robert E. Smylie has served as Governor of my State of Idaho for 10 years, during which time great progress has been made in the State. This progress is a tribute to Idaho and its leaders.

Governor Smylie's recent state of the State message to the Idaho Legislature, in which he spelled out Idaho's progress during the past decade—and submitted plans for Idaho's future—has elicited many favorable comments from responsible journalists in the State.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and to include extraneous material, I include an editorial from the Times-News of Twin Falls, Idaho, dated January 6, 1965, and an editorial and a commentary from the Eastern Idaho Farmer of Idaho Falls, Idaho, dated January 14, 1965.

The editorials and commentary follow:

[From the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News, Jan. 6, 1965]

CHALLENGE

Gov. Robert E. Smylie has decided to be the bold, decisive leader that many Idahoans have been urging him to be for several years. The change is evident in his state of the State message Tuesday to the Idaho Legislature. Two years ago, Governor Smylie's tone was more one of marking time, of pointing to possibilities without endorsing them. Now he emerges as the leader, no longer pointing out possible courses of action but outlining what must be done and challenging the legislature to find the courage to break with tradition and take giant strides into new territory of Idaho legislation.

Some Idahoans will question the motives behind the change in Governor Smylie's image. There will be efforts to interpret his talk, attempts to relate the talk to future politics and political moves. Some will believe Mr. Smylie's increasing importance on the national scene contributed a good deal to his plain emergence as a leader.

But perhaps the change in Mr. Smylie merely reflects a normal development, an evolution of thought that has been taking place gradually all along. His message of 2 years ago was the most decisive and the closest approach to clear leadership up to that point. The 1963 talk was widely acclaimed because Mr. Smylie started to emerge as a leader. In view of the praise accorded Mr. Smylie 2 years ago, the current address should evoke cheers.

The Governor's changing attitude is clear in many portions of his talk, but those sections in which he refers to a sales tax are quite interesting. Two years ago, Mr. Smylie said, "If there be those who think that this session can achieve a tax structure more adequate to their concept of our needs and which is acceptable to our people, let them be assured that I for one do not lack political courage to make that departure and travel new roads. This I will do, if, but only if, such action can be achieved with bipartisan support and without partisan recrimination * * *."

Tuesday, Governor Smylie declared, "The budget when it reaches you will be based upon, and will recommend, the enactment of a retail sales and use tax designed to produce revenue adequate to the needs of these expanded services, and keyed to realistic tax reform designed to ease the burden of the new tax on those least able to pay, and act as an incentive for economic expansion."

There it is—plain, simple, and to the point. The Governor has boldly taken the step avoided by all Idaho politicians since the 1930's when Idaho had a sales tax which was repealed by a referendum vote in a few months. From now on, the sales tax will be known as Smylie's tax. But perhaps the politicians could have misjudged the attitude of Idaho's changing population. Instead of "Smylie's tax" being a political liability, there's a strong possibility the label could be an asset. Regardless of what develops along this line, it took courage to base the budget recommendations on enactment of a sales and use tax.

Another issue that has attracted considerable attention also serves to illustrate the change in the Governor's thinking. Two years ago, the Governor said, "Once again I urge that you act to reduce the majority by which a bond election must pass in order to carry. The rule of two-thirds is too great a barrier, and in effect reduces the ability of local citizens to meet their own needs themselves * * *." But in 1965, Mr. Smylie doesn't talk about merely reducing the two-thirds requirement. He declares, "We have no need for arbitrary rules which permit the minority on these issues to have their way. I therefore recommend to you most strongly once again that you take steps to reduce to 50 percent the number of votes necessary to carry a bond issue for school building purposes."

Mr. Smylie could have been even more inclusive inasmuch as the two-thirds majority is still required in more elections than just those raising funds for school buildings. No election should require more than just a bare majority.

These are only examples of the changes in the Governor's thinking during the last 2 years. When the Governor gets around to his budget message and spells out his recommendations in terms of dollars, he will have completed the most clear-cut challenge presented to any session of the Idaho Legislature in recent years. Whether legislators are capable of rising to the challenge remains to be seen. Certainly no session of the Idaho Legislature has faced so many crises as those confronting the 38th session. Voters and taxpayers are not without obligation and responsibility in the current situation. They should make their opinions and desires known in no uncertain terms.

[From the Eastern Idaho Farmer, Idaho Falls, Idaho, Jan. 14, 1965]

THE GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE

For once in his tenure as Governor of Idaho, Bob Smylie last week stood up before the Idaho Legislature and said his say. Where, only a week ago we said in these columns that Governor Smylie was rarely, if ever, incisive, this time he was decisive, emphatic, and positive. He didn't mince words. He spelled out precisely what he thought and what he'd like to have the legislature do. There was, overall, a declaration of intent at leadership far too long lacking in his approach to legislative programs.

Orval Hansen, Bonneville County representative, said it was Governor Smylie's "finest hour" and probably it was. We doubt that anyone was more surprised than the legislators whom he addressed. That they liked it was obvious. Governor Smylie was roundly applauded when he advocated the enactment of a sales tax. But when he concluded, he received a near ovation and the applause came from Democrats and Republicans alike. Within the limits of political probity, there was near unanimous approval of the Governor's message. Only exception: Democrat William Dee who promptly classed Governor Smylie and Republicans generally—if they follow the Governor's recommendations—as "free spenders." That had a political background: Senator Dee has aspirations to become Idaho's Governor on an economy platform, 2 years from now. We suspect that Senator Dee has parsimony instead of constructive and reasonable conservatism in mind as a possible political ladder to the Governor's office. A great many of his Democratic associates see nothing but political oblivion in such a course. After all, Idaho has children to educate—and children have parents who vote.

Not everything which Governor Smylie advocated will get an attentive legislative ear and affirmative action. He urged the reestablishment of a direct primary voting system in Idaho, displacing the present election law. That one won't get far. He wants to repeal the parimutuel law. The 37th Idaho Legislature overrode his veto on that one; there is currently no indication of an intention of wiping out that law without giving it a fair trial.

Governor Smylie, with the blessing of the League of Women Voters, called again for constitutional revision. This is the third time Governor Smylie has sought this objective. We suppose that public inertia has something to do with the inaction in former years. Whether the League of Women Voters can arouse sufficient enthusiasm to get constitutional reconstitution underway is not yet apparent.

There were other things, too: everything from water legislation to the expansion of the system of State parks and recreation facilities. With most of them there can be no quarrel if Idaho is to move forward.

Governor Smylie knows how to use the English language. Here are a few quotable quotes emphasizing the point:

"It is cliche to say that the world will never be the same. But it is probably truer today than on any of the hundreds of occasions when it has been said before."

"Quality education is the rock upon which this State will be built. Because we are small, we must be better. Idaho's new day in the main current of America will require nothing less."

"This is, I think, the year Idaho is ready to move. Penny pinching will have no political virtue, especially when our people have time to reflect that it was parsimony practiced against the educational opportunities of their children and the welfare of the aged and infirm."

"If there had been a willingness to spend more on education in the decade before this one, we would not be so far behind now, nor would we have so much catching up to do."

"I invite you to decision at the branching of two vastly different roads. There are hazards in either course, but I am confident that the hazard of doing nothing far exceeds the hazard of doing what must be done, and paying the bill."

"Let it never be said, if we can help it, that we had not the 'vision to see,' or seeing,

had not 'the will to try.' We must go forward, and we must somehow succeed. These are years in which great decision can no longer be passed on to the next generation."

"We have a State to build—a nation to love—a God to serve; and this we will do."

Remembering that politics is, after all, the art of the possible and that a conservative is one who insists upon getting a dollar's worth of goods or services for the dollar spent, we are impressed that a brighter day may be ahead for Idaho. But we're going to have to pay for it. We suspect that pay for it we will.

[From the Eastern Idaho Farmer, Idaho Falls, Idaho, Jan. 14, 1965]

VIEWS AND NEWS ON SUBJECTS HERE AND THERE

(By Aden Hyde, editor, Eastern Idaho Farmer)

We live day by day. What happened day before yesterday is already forgotten. But what happened that day, yesterday, today and tomorrow and through a succession of such days adds up to something which we should not forget.

Gov. Bob Smylie did some remembering for all of us when, in his "state of the State" address to the Idaho legislators convened at Boise, he outlined what had happened to Idaho in the years he has served Idaho as its chief executive. Most of us have nursed the notion that Idaho hasn't been doing well; that we are a sluggard among States. What Governor Smylie told the legislators certainly tells a different story.

Here is the story, going back 10 years for Governor Symlie's first appearance as Governor before the legislature, and bringing Idaho's progress up to date:

"January 1, 1955, our population was estimated to be 598,000. Ten years later the figure stands above 700,000.

"Average per capita income in 1954 was $1,440. In 1964 the average Idahoan had an income of $2,050.

"Average family income in 1954 was $4,709. By 1964 that figure had risen to an estimated $6,075.

"Total personal income in the State in 1954 amounted to $861 million. Estimates place total personal income for 1964 at $1,435 million.

"In 1954 bank deposits totaled $484 million. By 1964 they had rise to a total of $665 million.

"Savings deposits had risen even more precipitously. In 1954 the total was $156 million. By 1964 total savings had reached $380 million.

"During the decade total employment rose from 216,300 in 1954 to 252,600 in 1964, and total labor force had jumped from 228,600 in 1954 to 266,300 by 1964.

"In 1955 we organized the State's first effort to attract tourists on a year-round sustained basis. The effort has shown startling results. In 1954 we enjoyed an income from tourist business of $50 million. In 1964 that figure is estimated to reach $160 million.

"But these are bare economic statistics. How did we deal with the welfare of our people? What did we contribute to capital construction in the State?

"In those 10 years we increased maximum weekly compensation benefits from $25 in 1954 to $45 in 1964; and we now meet the original objectives of that 30-year-old legislation for the first time.

"Total workmen's compensation benefits paid to injured working people increased by 36.4 percent during the decade.

"Financial support of higher education rose from $11.4 million in the 1953–55 biennium to $28 million in the 1963–65 period.

"In the same period of time State support of public schools increased from $14.7 million to $43.2 million.

"We have constructed 73 new buildings at our State institutions costing a total investment of $22 million.

"And we have built or rebuilt 2,925 miles of State highways."

Let's go back to the beginning. Had you forgotten about day before yesterday? Did you remember what Idaho was like only 10 short years ago; how far we have come?

Somehow, we'd missed most of that. But certainly it is a record of progress which needs to be pinpointed—as Governor Smylies did it—lest all of us miss it.

That progress hasn't been all sweetness and honey. We've had problems—new ones and big ones because of that growth. Somehow, we have an abiding conviction that Idaho has moved forward rapidly enough; more speed might have dumped the whole State into the borrow pit. Let's stay on the road, moving forward steadily and soundly. It's safer and better.

The Dying Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most noted spokesmen for the cause of conservation today is the junior Senator from Wisconsin, GAYLORD NELSON. He has distinguished himself both as Governor of his State and now as a U.S. Senator, as a man who is concerned over our dwindling natural resources.

I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of Tuesday, January 19:

THE DYING RIVERS

The St. Croix River is, as Senator NELSON of Wisconsin, rightly points out, the last large clean river near a major metropolitan area in all of the Midwest. It won't be for long, if the Northern States Power Co. has its way. The company wants to build a coal-burning electric generating plant at Stillwater, Minn. Besides inflicting a huge coal-pile on the river, the plant would also pour warm chlorinated water into the stream, changing the natural habitat for the worse.

Senator NELSON appeared on Thursday before a hearing in Minnesota to appeal to State authorities to reconsider consequences of approving the project. There is no doubt, as the Senator acknowledged, that there would be some local economic benefits for the area if the plant were built. But that is precisely the problem, because, he added, "the fight has been unequal—eloquent spokesmen preaching lofty conservation generalities on the one hand, determined people seeking their bread and butter on the other."

As the Senator pungently put it:

"Call the roll of the great American rivers of the past, and you will have a list of the pollution problems of today—the Androscoggin in Maine; the Connecticut, that boundary water between the Green Mountain and the Granite States; the mighty Hudson; the thermally polluted Delaware; the Ohio; the Mississippi; and even your Minnesota, covered from time to time by flotillas of sugar beet chips.

"The story in each case is the same: they died for their country. They died in the name of economic development."

By disapproving or at least delaying the Stillwater generating plant, Minnesota authorities could spare one river from the same fate until Congress has time to consider Mr. NELSON's proposal for a St. Croix National Scenic Waterway. We urge them to do so.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, one could scarcely ask for a better concensus on the President's foreign aid proposals than the comment offered by both of Cleveland's two daily newspapers last Friday.

Both of these outstanding papers indicate a strong desire that the Congress take a long, hard look at where American aid is going.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I now insert editorials from the Cleveland Plain Dealer and the Cleveland Press in the RECORD:

[From the Plain Dealer, Jan. 15, 1965]

AID BID SETS UP ASIAN DEBATE

President Johnson's request for $3.38 billion in foreign aid sets the stage for full-scale congressional debate on U.S. involvement in southeast Asian conflicts, political and military.

The President has earmarked more than a half billion dollars for weapons and economic help in Vietnam and Laos. He suggests that this amount may not be enough. He could have been more specific. It will not be enough.

Before escalation of the war sent combat planes into Laos, American costs in Vietnam alone were $1.5 million a day. Since that estimate was made, the number of U.S. advisers in the Vietnam war has been doubled and the amount of equipment vastly increased.

Cost of the two fighter planes shot down in Laos is in excess of $2 million. If attacks on the Communist supply lines are to continue these will not be the last planes to be destroyed.

Continuing economic aid to a country that has been unable to stabilize its government in 14 months is going to be challenged in Congress. The lawmakers will also weigh the cost that would result from abandoning the U.S. effort.

There is much that is commendable in the aid message.

The amount sought is the smallest in the history of the program.

The $580 million for the Alliance for Progress is reasonable in view of the great strides the Latin project has made and its value as a buffer against Communist inroads.

Streamlining of the program is apparent in the $136 million that has been cut from last year's request. Economies in administration are pinpointed.

Congress undoubtedly will make further cuts. This may help keep the Federal budget under $100 billion while still providing more funds for education, job training, and other goals of the Great Society.

A welcome note is the President's disclosure that over 80 percent of the U.S. aid is now in American goods and services, thus cutting the dollar drain on the U.S. balance of payments.

President Johnson can make a strong case for practically all of the items in his aid pro-

gram. If Congress objects to the price put on aid for South Vietnam and Laos, then it will have challenged the heart of U.S. foreign policy, the blocking of Communist expansion.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Jan. 15, 1965]

L.B.J. ON FOREIGN AID

President Johnson's foreign aid message to Congress suggests that at last the Government is beginning to take seriously public and congressional demands for streamlining this costly program.

Johnson asked authority to allocate $3,380 million for foreign aid in the next fiscal year. This, he boasted, is the smallest "request" since foreign aid began right after World War II. However, it is slightly more than the $3,250 million Congress permitted for the previous year.

The President talked all through his message about making foreign aid selective, leaving more development in undeveloped countries to private enterprise, improving the efficiency of the foreign aid administration, putting new stress on self-help.

But just because L.B.J. says his new request is a minimum—meaning Congress must not cut it—is no reason for Congress to avoid its own responsibility to examine the program in detail, and to whack wherever the results do not justify the spending.

"We cannot afford to do less," the President said, because Red China and the Soviet Union have tripled their promises in the last year.

This is not a justification for our program. Never mind what Red China and the Soviet Union promise—our program should be tailored to places where it will be of real help to the countries aided, and in our self-interest. Not merely an attempt to offset Communist forays.

The Melody Lingers On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Allan A. Seiler, editor of the Pike County Republican, Pittsfield, detected a puzzling background musical theme while listening to the President's state of the Union message. As recounted in the newspaper's January 13 issue:

A FAMILIAR MELODY

As we listened to President Johnson's state of the Union speech we seemed to detect a faint bit of background music. It seemed strange, coming from the hallowed Halls of Congress, and—true enough—it was only our imagination. Still the melody lingered on as we continued to listen.

We heard the President outline the blueprint of the Great Society where the arts will flourish, poverty is banished, the air is sweet, the water is pure, everyone has a job and is well educated, sickness and crime are no more, taxes are cut, waste in Government is eliminated, the deficit disappears, inflation is curbed.

Still the musical refrain continued to haunt us. Then it came to us. It was the folk song Burl Ives used to sing about the big rock candy mountain where grew the lemonade tree and where the hens laid soft boiled eggs.

Farm Labor and the Welfare Recipient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will be interested in the following statement from J. M. Wedemeyer, director of Social Welfare of the State of California and the attached testimony before the California State Senate Fact Finding Committee on Labor and Welfare.

The testimony indicates how arbitrary local welfare administrations can sometimes become due to local pressures and how national interests can be eroded in the process.

It is high time, in my opinion, for some local public officials not already involved to join our war on poverty by practicing sound public welfare administration.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF THE SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE SENATE FACTFINDING COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND WELFARE IN SAN DIEGO ON DECEMBER 11, 1964—GIVEN BY SUPERVISOR CLIFFORD C. WISDOM

The San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors is deeply concerned regarding the implication of the following; it is being presented to the factfinding committee today in the earnest hope that the committee will seriously consider this area of public welfare administration in California in formulating a welfare legislative program for the 1965 session of legislature:

A family (name being withheld to comply with confidentiality law) applied to our county welfare department for aid to families with dependent children—unemployed parent program on January 14, 1964. The county granted aid effective February 1 on the basis of the father's unemployment.

The welfare department sent the family a letter reading as follows, under date of May 14:

"DEAR ———: You are receiving aid from the county welfare department because you are unemployed. This letter is being sent to you to inform you that you no longer need to be unemployed. There is work waiting for you that you are able to do. The farm labor division of the California State Employment Service will offer you work as:

"Tractor driver, $1.15 per hour; strawberry picker, 75 cents per crate; short handle hoe worker, $1–$1.15 per hour; or cherrypickers, $1.15 per bucket.

"Please consider this letter as official notice to you that you have been offered a specific job at the above stated wage and that you will not after May 31, 1964, be receiving assistance from the county welfare department because of your unemployment. The check you receive on May 16, 1964, will be your final payment from this department.

"If you have any questions about this letter, please contact your social worker by telephone, 466–5231, or writing 621 East Market Street, Stockton.

"Very truly yours,

"——— ———,

"Social Worker."

On the basis of the availability of work as indicated in the above letter, AFDC–UP aid was discontinued as of May 31. The family filed a request for an appeal hearing with the State department of social welfare on May 28. The claimants stated that although work was available, it was not steady and did not constitute full-time employment.

On October 27, the State welfare department adopted a decision in the matter that concluded as follows:

"Evidence in this case established that the claimant did not refuse to accept a bona fide offer of employment for a specific job. The county merely presented evidence that there were jobs available.

"Under manual section C–172(3) there is no disqualification or basis for discontinuance of aid without refusal of a 'verified bona fide offer of employment at a specific job and stated wage.'

"The fact that employment is generally available is not in itself a basis for discontinuance without a bona fide offer of employment.

"Discontinuance, therefore, was improper, but did not prejudice the claimant since the discontinuance was effective May 31, 1964, and the husband had been working full time since May 15, 1964."

On the basis of the appeal decision, only the fact that the husband actually started working full time on May 15 prevented the State ordering the county to pay aid retroactive for the period in question. This would have been so in spite of testimony presented at the appeal hearing that at the time there were between 99 and 746 jobs available every day for farm labor, according to reports from the farm labor office; the county also presented testimony which indicated that there would be employment available in one type of farmwork or another steadily through, at least, August 15.

Section 1523.7 of the State welfare and institutions code reads in part as follows: "Aid shall be denied to an unemployed parent and his family if it is determined by the county welfare department in accordance with regulations of the State department of social welfare that he refuses without good cause to accept part time, temporary, or permanent employment without reference to his customary occupation or skill."

The administrative interpretation of the law by the State welfare department seems to make unnecessarily cumbersome the responsibilities of the county welfare department when it is common knowledge in a locality that there is an abundance of work available. Due to the nature and hiring practices in agricultural work, it might be necessary for a welfare department representative to actually accompany a reluctant father to the work fields in order to document the refusal of a "verified bona fide offer of employment at a specific job and stated wage." Obviously, this is not practical in each instance when agricultural work opens up in the spring because of the large number of AFDC cases the county has at that time of the year. The burden of proof is placed completely with the welfare department. It would seem reasonable that some burden of proof of the unavailability of work for a specific individual, when it is known to be generally available, should reasonably rest with the welfare recipient.

State department of social welfare circular letter 1546 (AFDC) dated November 12, 1964, subject, "Condition of employment and AFDC" pertains to the same general area of welfare administration. The circular letter, in the first paragraph, states, "The following interpretations will be helpful pending preparation and release of appropriate handbook sections. These interpretations illustrate the department's expectations as to how this program is to be carried out. Evaluations of operations will be made against these expectations." Although State welfare

department circular letters are not strictly regulatory, the quoted statement gives the directives in this communication virtually the same effect as regulatory material. We question the reasonableness and/or consistency with law of the following instructions in the circular letter.

1. Section 1(c), "A person should not be expected to report to CSES (California State Employment Service) more frequently than CSES requires in order to keep his registration current." In the city of Stockton, we are advised by the CSES that a person can keep his registration current by reporting to that office once every 2 months. We do not think that it was the intent of the legislature in enacting AB-59 in 1963 to bring about a situation whereby an unemployed parent could maintain his registration for employment with CSES in such a superficial and perfunctory manner.

2. Section 1(d), "Referrals 'for employment' on a mass basis may not be considered as individual referrals and such referrals do not affect eligibility." We see nothing wrong with mass referrals to employment provided that there is, in fact, a mass of work available, and there is an individual determination as to whether a person is capable of performing the work to which he is referred. There was such individual screening prior to the sending out by our welfare department of the above quoted letter of May 14. The letter advised the recipient to contact his social worker if there were any questions concerning the communication; this automatically resulted in further individual screening. In all instances where there was an indication of physical inability to do agricultural work, further evaluation ensued; welfare aid was not discontinued in any instance in which it was determined the parent was not reasonably physically able to do agricultural work.

The ban on mass referrals adds to the blizzard of paperwork which is currently of a magnitude that threatens to completely engulf our welfare department. Furthermore, the required complete individualization of each employment referral necessarily substantially adds to the already staggering personnel requirements of our welfare department.

3. Section 1(f), "When a person is working part time, a referral to a full-time job should be made only if he can be expected to earn more on the full-time job than he is earning on a part-time job." This appears to be inconsistent with welfare and institutions code, section 1500(C). This section, paraphrased, includes the provision that aid shall be granted to families with related children under the age of 18 because they have been deprived of parental support or care due to the unemployment of the parent or parents. Admittedly, this problem will occur only infrequently as with few exceptions full-time work pays more than part-time work. However, there are such exceptional cases and we are of the opinion that the intent of the legislature was that this type of assistance would not be available to families when there was reasonable full time work available to the breadwinner, irrespectively whether or not the individual chooses to take such employment, and without consideration being given to relative wage levels.

4. Section 2, "Aid will be continued when employment is obtained and may not be terminated until all of the following have occurred:

"(a) There has been a specific offer of a specified job at a stated wage.

"(b) The offered job has been accepted.

"(c) The pay for the first full week's employment has been received.

"(d) The job is not less than 40 hours per week."

(a) Our reaction to item (a) above is covered in some detail in our previous discussion of a State welfare department appeal decision.

(b) Similarly, point (b) is dealt with in some detail in the preceding material.

(c) In many agricultural jobs the employee is paid in cash on a day to day basis and it is therefore extremely difficult to verify the receipt of a full week's pay. The matter is further complicated by the fact that the individual may have several employers during a given week. The policy may encourage a parent to work for less than a full week over an extended period of time, particularly when the aid grant exceeds the earning potential. Furthermore, this policy is a new departure in administration of the program; for example, in the past if an unemployed parent secured regular full-time work on the 27th day of a month, then assistance would be discontinued effective the last day of that month; this new policy means that assistance would usually be continued for an additional calendar month.

(d) Frequently, specific individual job offers by an individual employer at 40 hours or more a week on a continuing basis are not available in agriculture; rather the employment is on a day-to-day basis. Furthermore, pay is often on a piecework basis, not by the hour, so there is no record kept of actual hours worked. The directives contained in section 2 may be appropriate in respect to some types of employment, but certainly are not realistic or generally applicable to agricultural work because of the nature of the employment and the hiring and payment practices followed. The problem is further aggravated by the impending termination of the bracero program which hopefully will provide additional work opportunities for members of families receiving welfare assistance.

5. Section 3, "When persons who are not accustomed to farm labor are referred to farm labor jobs, they should be considered as being referred to part-time employment until they are conditioned to the job." We want the members of your legislative committee to know that we agree with the spirit and philosophy of this directive. In fact, this is the approach that our welfare department took this past spring without any such order and which it will follow in the future.

This highlights one of the principal points we wish to make in this presentation: That our welfare department can and should administer the various welfare programs in the light of existing laws and with minimum necessary regulatory guidance from the State welfare department, and appropriate policy direction by our board of supervisors, without having to conform to a mass of detailed instructions from the State. At the best they thwart the essence of local administration and limit imaginative approaches to difficult unsolved problems, and at the worst are impractical and sometimes, in our opinion, seem to go beyond legislative intent. It is fully realized that welfare recipients must be afforded reasonable safeguards and protection from possible arbitrary actions by public welfare officials. However, we feel that the above discussed directives and policies of the State welfare department go far beyond this to the point of usurping the intent of the legislature.

General Farley Divulges His "Rule" for Making Political Predictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of his predictions concerning recent national elections, the Honorable James A. Farley, a former Postmaster General of the United States and Democratic national chairman, has acquired a renown unparalleled by any other political forecaster.

The Farley rule which is founded on political experience second to none, contends that elections are won or lost in the aftermath of the national conventions and not during the campaigns as is generally assumed.

Based on this principle, Mr. Farley predicted several months before the recent election that President Lyndon B. Johnson would be returned by a landslide rivaling that of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936. The results of November 3 attest to the reliability of General Farley's rule.

Mr. Speaker, on this, the day of President Lyndon B. Johnson's inauguration I feel that it is highly appropriate to include at this point two articles concerning General Farley's predictions regarding President Johnson's election.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Journal-American, Oct. 30, 1964]

CAMPAIGN CORNER: JIM FARLEY HAS A RULE

(By Milton L. Kaplan)

WASHINGTON.—We've reached that stage of a political campaign where candidates divide their time just about equally between warning against false charges by their opponents and accusing those opponents of all manner of evil.

In the light of what has come to be known as Farley's rule, last-minute stunts and surprises are not going to win elections, although they might titilate or enrage large numbers of people. The rule would seem to apply to the situation comedy the other night in New York when Senator Kenneth Keating debated an empty chair which, he said ROBERT F. KENNEDY had refused to fill.

The rule propounded by James A. Farley on the basis of political experience unmatched by any living American is worth keeping in mind in the twilight of this murky campaign. The former Democratic national chairman and architect of the 1932 and 1936 Franklin D. Roosevelt victories explains it this way: "I've always contended that people make up their minds after both conventions have named their presidential candidates. All the charges and countercharges that may come after that don't affect the net result. One washes out the other."

There is, Farley believes, "very little variation" in the election outlook after the conventions have named their candidates except in years of a lopsided contest. The prospect of an overwhelming victory by one party can help swing votes to that party.

Last February the master Democratic strategist said that he did not think Lyndon B. Johnson would lose more than six States on November 3—maybe four in the South and possibly a couple of Republican regulars, Kansas and Nebraska. After the Atlantic City Democratic Convention, he took back Kansas and Nebraska. Now he is prepared to concede only Alabama and Mississippi to Senator Goldwater.

Farley cites Louisiana as an example of the swing effect of an apparently approaching landslide victory. That State until recently was considered in the Goldwater column. Enough Louisianians who see the shape of the coming victory, he says, will not want to waste a vote and will help swing the State to the Johnson-Humphrey ticket.

The Farley rule is respected by many political professionals. While no one, including its author, would want to turn the rule into law providing for a national election the day the conventions are over, it's a big part

of the argument that U.S. presidential election campaigns go on far too long. It's reasonable to assume that if we survive the current one, there will be some attempt to legislate a campaign time limit—as the British do. And just as reasonable to assume the attempt will fail.

The campaign is like nothing so much as a party where all the guests are drunk but continue drinking because the time has not yet arrived to go home. We're all going to be pretty bilious by next Tuesday.

[From the Albany (N.Y.) Times Union, Nov. 8, 1964]

FARLEY CALLED THE TURN ON JOHNSON LANDSLIDE

(By Bob Keating)

Veteran Campaigner James A. Farley called the shot on Tuesday's election.

Way back in May, before either party had nominated a candidate, the political strategist predicted President Johnson would carry more States than his former boss, the late President Roosevelt, did in 1932.

In the year, Franklin D. Roosevelt had 42 States in his column. In Tuesday's election, Johnson carried 44 States.

EXCLUSIVE IN T-U

Maybe he [Johnson] has an even better chance to carry more States, Mr. Farley forecast in an exclusive interview with the Times-Union on the occasion of his 76th birthday. "He's surely going to carry Hawaii and Alaska."

Mr. Farley, Postmaster General in the Roosevelt administration, managed the 1932 and 1936 presidential campaigns of Roosevelt.

Mr. Farley's early predictions on election results are well known and respected. He did it in 1936, when the polls were showing Alf Landon as the winner, by handing newsmen the written prediction the Roosevelt-Garner ticket would carry all States but Maine and Vermont—and that is precisely how the voting turned out.

Last May, the board chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. said "President Johnson has created a fine image in himself all over the country and developed in the electorate a confidence in him."

PREDICTION BORNE OUT

He said that if Mr. Johnson lost any States "it'll be by a very small vote. He could very well be the recipient of a landslide victory," Mr. Farley predicted.

Tuesday's election of Johnson bore out his prediction.

In 1932 Roosevelt polled 22,821,857 popular and 472 electoral votes to Hoover's 15,761,841 popular and 59 electoral. In 1936 F.D.R. polled 27,751,597 popular and 523 electoral votes to Landon's 16,679,583 popular and 8 electoral votes.

On Tuesday, Johnson polled 42,187,722 popular and 486 electoral votes to Goldwater's 26,607,815 popular and 52 electoral votes.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

The Congress and America's Future: Report of the 26th American Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, last fall a group of distinguished Americans gathered at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y., for the 26th American Assembly. Since 1950 Columbia University has sponsored symposiums where a group can spend a few days in the seclusion of this beautiful setting and discuss the issues of concern to our Nation. My personal participation in these discussions causes me to believe they have great value in lending direction to policymaking agencies of our Government. The American Assembly recommendations are always the result of careful and thoughtful consideration on the part of the participants.

The 26th study, conducted last October 29 to November 1, was convened to review the functions and procedures of the Congress. The final report, which follows, makes recommendations which would, in the words of the report, "assure the continued vitality and effectiveness of the Congress of the United States."

Two of these recommendations this body has already acted upon: we have given the Speaker the power to call up for consideration any bill on which the Committee on Rules has failed to act for 21 days. We have also provided that agreement to go to conference with the other body should be by majority vote of the House, without reference to the Committee on Rules.

Other recommendations include two that I have urged for many years: the first is home rule for the District of Columbia. I have introduced legislation for many years to accomplish this purpose. Currently pending before the House Committee on the District of Columbia are four bills of mine providing four approaches to divesting the Congress of this unnecessary and undemocratic responsibility. These bills are H.R. 628, H.R. 629, H.R. 630, and H.R. 640.

The second proposal which I have urged that we enact is a constitutional amendment providing 4-year terms for the Members of this House. I have introduced this legislation in each Congress since the 81st Congress and hope that we will see it adopted in the near future. In the 89th Congress it is House Joint Resolution 78, which has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I commend the report of the 26th American assembly to our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, and urge them to study its recommendations carefully:

THE CONGRESS AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

PREFACE

These pages contain the recommendations of a group of Americans of diverse pursuits and interests who met at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y., October 29–November 1, 1964, to review the functions and procedures of the Congress of the United States. The meeting was convened by The American Assembly of Columbia University which conducts policy studies. "The Congress and America's Future" was the 26th study initiated by the Assembly.

The recommendations were adopted by the Assembly in plenary session after 3 days of meetings in small discussion groups. As a nonpartisan, educational institution, the American Assembly takes no stand on the subjects it presents for public discussion. The same may be said of the Ford Foundation whose generosity made the entire 26th American Assembly possible.

FINAL REPORT OF THE 26TH AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

(NOTE.—At the close of their discussions the participants in the 26th American Assembly reviewed as a group the following statement. Although there was general agreement on the final report, it is not the practice of The American Assembly for participants to affix their signatures, and it should not be assumed that every participant necessarily subscribes to every recommendation.)

We have discussed what steps might be taken to assure the continued vitality and effectiveness of the Congress of the United States. We feel a respect for the values underlying the American system of representative government, in which the legislature is crucial. We desire to see those values perpetuated and reflected in institutions that will protect free men and provide the capacity for effective government.

Many of the problems of the Congress, and many of the criticisms and complaints directed at it, have roots in conditions affecting not only the United States but all representative governments. As these governments have been obliged to meet the problems created by industrialization and urbanization, complicated almost beyond measure by persistent and critical issues of foreign policy, representative bodies have confronted a troublesome situation. The matters that they consider are far more significant, numerous, and complex than those of their predecessors half a century ago. Little can be done to alter these conditions, but something can be done to improve the capacity of the institutions that must deal with them.

These problems that the Congress shares with other parliamentary bodies are paralleled by others that arise from distinctively American arrangements: the constitutional separation of President and Congress, the decentralizing effects of federalism, and the structure and practices of the House and Senate that frequently reflect long tradition and distinctive styles in our political life. One need not assume fundamental changes of a constitutional character in order to conclude that changes are both desirable and possible of achievement. In meeting these problems we may help to assure a Congress whose role in America's future is vigorous and worthy of the respect of free and intelligent men.

Three specific sets of convictions have guided our deliberations:

1. The distinctive functions of the Congress must be maintained. Congress must retain and strengthen its capacity to bring critical political judgment to bear on the major issues of the day. Congress thus can function more effectively in relation to the increasingly active role of the President and his executive associates in the initiation of legislative proposals. In consequence it will better reflect the broad wisdom available in our total political system.

If the legislature is to perform this basic function, the Members of Congress must also continue to handle problems of their individual constituents. Such activities, far from being a handicap to the Congress, provide a sympathetic link between citizens and the bureaucracy. The Congress must also maintain its oversight of the decisions and actions of executive officials. Both service to constituents and oversight of the executive agencies are subject to abuse, but their proper exercise is necessary to the American system.

2. The vigor of the Congress as a legislative body and the effectiveness of our constitutional arrangements require that the Congress warrant and command the confidence and respect of the electorate. A Congress able and equipped to discharge its central functions rationally, expeditiously, and with integrity is essential to the survival of representative government in this country.

3. If the Congress is to perform these functions well, ways must be found to strengthen the elected leadership in the House and Senate—chiefly the Speaker and the floor leaders—and through that leadership to assure that the majority sentiment of the Congress is effectively expressed. Individuals or minorities in the legislature must not be permitted to frustrate the will of a majority, whether in a standing committee or in one or both of the Houses.

This conviction is not inconsistent with a due regard to the rights of a minority or in conflict with the continuation and encouragement of expertness in the standing committees. Such competence is essential to the effectiveness of the Congress. But no single committee in either House can be assigned a jurisdiction broad enough to achieve coordinated action in such complex areas as national security policy and national economic policy. If such action is to be achieved in the Congress, it should be accomplished through the central leadership.

In support of these general convictions we recommend:

1. The system of designating chairmen and ranking minority members of the standing committees on the basis of seniority must be modified. There is merit in the seniority principle, provided some choice is offered to the majority and minority parties in each House. We suggest that the choice be made either by the elected leaders in each House or by secret ballot in the caucuses of each party, in either case from among the three senior party members of each committee.

2. No Senator or Representative should be permitted to become or to remain a commit-

tee chairman, Speaker, or floor leader after reaching the age of 70. This provision should not apply to incumbents.

3. Any Representative or Senator should be permitted to retire on full pay after reaching the age of 70, provided that he has had at least 10 years of service in the Congress.

4. The rules of the House should be amended to provide that signature of a discharge petition by 218 Members or by 150 Members and the Speaker be sufficient to bring any bill out of committee and before the House.

5. In the Senate the majority leader should be authorized to offer a motion designating any bill a major item of legislation. Adoption of this motion would require the committee to which that bill had been assigned to report it to the Senate within 30 calendar days.

6. The Rules Committee of the House must be at all times an instrument of the leadership of the House. To this end the Speaker might be restored to his position as chairman of the Committee. Alternatively, he might be given authority in each Congress to appoint its majority members, including the chairman. At minimum, the Speaker of the House should be empowered to call up a special rule for the consideration of any bill which the Committee on Rules has failed to act for 21 calendar days.

7. The Committee on Rules should have no part in determining whether a bill passed by the House should be sent to conference with the Senate. Agreement to conference and on instructions to conferees should be by majority vote on a privileged motion by the majority leader.

8. Freedom of debate in a legislative body has value, even at the cost of delay, but its abuse in the form of a filibuster exposes the Senate and the Government of the United States to ridicule and may dangerously delay action. Such tactics should be restrained so that a majority can act after a dissenting minority has had adequate opportunity to be heard.

The present cloture rule is inadequate for this purpose. At the least the Senate should amend its present rule to provide for the adoption of a cloture petition by three-fifths of those present and voting.

9. At the start of each Congress a simple majority of the Senate should have the power to adopt and amend its rules without prejudice to the concept of the Senate as a continuing body for other purposes.

10. Further to assure majority control of legislation, a majority of the Members from each House designated to serve on a conference committee should have indicated by their votes general agreement with the bill as passed by that House.

11. Each Chamber should adopt and enforce effective procedures to protect the constitutional and other traditional rights of citizens called before its committees.

12. The growing practice of requiring that administrative agencies obtain permission from or "come into agreement" with committees or subcommittees of the Congress, or their chairmen, before taking action, exceeds the proper bounds of congressional oversight of administration and subverts Presidential responsibility. It grants arbitrary power to chairman of committees or subcommittees that is not subject to account. The practice should be abandoned.

13. Campaign costs are excessive; requirements for reporting on contributions are ineffective; and existing ceilings on expenditures are unrealistic. The consequences too frequently are waste, deception, and corruption. To correct these evils:

(a) Time on television and radio stations should be made available by law to candidates for Congress.

(b) Ceilings should be raised to realistic levels, but legislation governing campaign contributions and expenditures should provide for full and prompt reporting to an agency designated by Congress responsible for complete disclosure. These reports should be public property, should be locally available, and should cover all receipts and expenditures on behalf of any candidate for the House or Senate in a primary or general election.

(c) The income tax laws should be amended to encourage compaign contributions by a larger number of persons, thus reducing candidates' dependence on a small number of large donations.

14. Respect for the Government requires respect for its individual officials. Each Senator and Representative and all presidential appointees should be required to report annually their financial interests and the sources of their income.

Furthermore, the number of Members of the House and Senate holding Reserve commissions in the military forces while serving in the Congress is a cause for concern. We regard this practice as undesirable and of doubtful constitutionality.

15. The standing committees in their specialized jurisdiction serve the Congress well, but no adequate overview in Congress is taken of such large areas as national security policy and national economic policy. Responsibility for dealing with this difficult problem should lie with the elected leadership, and these leaders should be adequately staffed for this purpose. The executive performance in this area needs to be improved, but much more needs to be done on the legislative side.

16. The Congress should divest itself of direct responsibility for the government of the District of Columbia.

17. We agree with the recent decision of the Congress to increase salaries of Senators and Representatives, and we recommend that salaries, allowances, and staff services be kept at a level commensurate with the dignity and responsibilities of these offices.

18. A majority of participants who considered this report favor a 4-year term for the Members of the House of Representatives, with elections in the presidential years.

PARTICIPANTS—THE 26TH AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

Arthur G. Altschul, partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co., New York.

Stephen K. Bailey, dean, Maxwell School, Syracuse University.

Margaret M. Ball, dean, Woman's College, Duke University.

Richard J. Barnet, codirector, Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, D.C.

Joseph W. Barr, chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, D.C.

Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr., president, Lincoln Liberty Life Insurance Co., Houston.

Philip Broughton, Pittsburgh.

John Anthony Brown, Jr., vice president, George Washington University.

Frank Caizzi, Harriman scholar, Columbia University.

Holbert N. Carroll, chairman, Department of Political Science, University of Pittsburgh.

Clifford P. Case, U.S. Senator, New Jersey.

Joseph S. Clark, U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania.

Benjamin V. Cohen, Washington, D.C.

Earl Coke, vice president, Bank of America, San Francisco.

William T. Coleman, Jr., Dilworth, Paxson, Kalish, Kohn & Dilks, Philadelphia.

Arthur G. Coons, president, Occidental College.

John J. Corson, professor of public and international affairs, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University.

Ovid R. Davis, vice president, the Coca-Cola Co., Atlanta.

Philip Donham, Arthur D. Little Co., Cambridge, Mass.

Eleanor Lansing Dulles, research associate center for strategic studies, Georgetown University.

Frederick G. Dutton, assistant secretary of State for congressional relations, Washington, D.C.

Richard F. Fenno, Jr., professor of political science, University of Rochester.

Robert H. Finch, Finch, Bell Duitsman & Margulis, Los Angeles.

Roger Fleming, secretary-treasurer, American Farm Bureau Federation, Washington, D.C.

George B. Galloway, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Bernard L. Gladieux, vice president, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc., New York.

James A. Gorrell, Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease, Columbus, Ohio.

Edward H. Harte, president, the Corpus Christi Caller Times, Texas.

H. Field Haviland, Jr., director, foreign policy studies, the Brookings Instiution, Washington, D.C.

Frank Hawkins, editor, editorial page, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Pennsyvlania.

Thomas A. Henderson, Harriman scholar, Columbia University.

Donald G. Herzberg, executive director, the Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University.

Merritt D. Hill, president, J. I. Case Co., Racine.

Allen C. Holmes, Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, Cleveland.

Ralph K. Huitt, professor of political science, University of Wisconsin.

Samuel P. Huntington, professor of government, Harvard University.

Evron M. Kirkpatrick, executive director, the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

Allan B. Kline, Western Springs, Ill.

John D. Lane, Hedrick & Lane, Washington, D.C.

Sol M. Linowitz, chairman, Xerox Corp., Rochester, N.Y.

William P. McClure, McClure & Trotter, Washington, D.C.

David McDonald, Harriman scholar, Columbia University.

Carl McGowan, judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, Washington, D.C.

Marshall McNeil, Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, Washington, D.C.

Arthur Maass, professor of government, Harvard University.

David W. MacEachron, director of program, Council on Foreign Relations, Inc., New York.

Harvey C. Mansfield, professor of political science, Ohio State University.

Carl Marcy, chief of staff, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Washington, D.C.

Roger G. Mastrude, vice president, Foreign Policy Association, New York.

Robert Molyneux, Newspaper Enterprise Association, Cleveland.

Frederic A. Mosher, executive associate, Carnegie Corp. of New York, New York.

Emil Narick, assistant general counsel, United Steel Workers of America, Pittsburgh.

Richard E. Neustadt, professor of government, Columbia University.

N. B. Obbard, executive vice president, United States Steel Corp., Pittsburgh.

Michael O'Leary, assistant director, public affairs center, Dartmouth College.

Albert J. Rosenthal, professor of law, Columbia University.

John S. Saloma III, professor of political science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Howard D. Samuel, assistant president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, New York.

Wallace S. Sayre, professor of public law and government, Columbia University.

William V. Shannon, editorial board, the New York Times.

Robert F. Steadman, director, Committee for Improvement of Management in Government CED, Washington, D.C.

Theodore Tannenwald, Jr., Weil, Gotshal & Manges, New York.

A. W. Tarkington, president, Continental Oil Co., Houston.

David B. Truman, dean, Columbia College, Columbia University.

David A. Valenti, president, Allied Stores of Michigan, Grand Rapids.

Franklin Wallick, United Auto Workers, Washington, D.C.

Francis O. Wilcox, dean, School of Advanced International Studies, the Johns Hopkins University.

ABOUT THE AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

The American Assembly was established by Dwight D. Eisenhower at Columbia University in 1950. It holds nonpartisan assemblies of American leaders and publishes authoritative books to illuminate issues of U.S. policy.

An affiliate of Columbia, with offices in the graduate school of business, the Assembly is a national, educational institution incorporated under the State of New York.

The Assembly seeks to provide information, stimulate discussion and evoke independent conclusions in matters of vital public interest.

AMERICAN ASSEMBLY SESSIONS

Currently two national programs are initiated each year. Authorities are retained to write background papers presenting essential data and defining the main issues in each subject.

About 60 men and women representing a broad range of experience, competence, and American leadership meet for several days to discuss the Assembly topic and consider alterantives for national policy.

All assemblies follow the same procedure. The background papers are sent to participants in advance of the assembly. The Assembly meets in small groups for four or five lengthy periods. All groups use the same agenda. At the close of these informal sessions participants adopt in plenary session a final report of findings and recommendations.

Regional, State, and local assemblies are held in every major area of the United States. A number have already been scheduled, following the national session at Arden House, on "The Congress and America's Future"—with Occidental College, Tulane University, George Washington University, the University of Oregon, and the U.S. Air Force Academy.

Assemblies have also been held in Canada, Europe, Asia, Latin America. Over 70 institutions have cosponsored one or more assemblies.

AMERICAN ASSEMBLY BOOKS

The background papers for each Assembly program are published in paper and hard cover editions for use by individuals, libraries, businesses, public agencies, nongovernmental organizations, educational institutions, discussion, and service groups. In this way the deliberations of Assembly sessions are continued and extended.

The background papers for the 26th American Assembly will be published under the title, "The Congress and America's Future," by Prentice-Hall, Inc.

ARDEN HOUSE

Home of the American Assembly and scene of the national sessions is Arden House, which was given to Columbia University in 1950 by W. Averell Harriman. E. Roland Harriman joined his brother in contributing toward adaptation of the property for conference purposes. The buildings and surrounding land, known as the Harriman Campus of Columbia University, are 50 miles north of New York City.

Arden House is a distinguished conference center. It is self-supporting and operates throughout the year for use by organizations with educational objectives. The American Assembly is a tenant of this Columbia University facility only during assembly sessions.

THE AMERICAN ASSEMBLY: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Trustees: Dwight D. Eisenhower, honorary chairman, Pennsylvania; Arthur G. Altschul,[1] New York; William Benton, Connecticut; Courtney C. Brown, ex-officio, New York; William P. Bundy, Washington, D.C.; John Cowles, Minnesota; George S. Craft,[1] Georgia; Marriner S. Eccles, Utah; Thomas K. Finletter, New York; Alfred M. Gruenther, Nebraska; W. Averell Harriman, New York; H. J. Heinz II, Pennsylvania; Oveta Culp Hobby, Texas; Grayson Kirk, ex-officio, New York; Allan B. Kline, Illinois; Leonard F. McCollum, Texas; Don G. Mitchell, New Jersey; Clifford C. Nelson, ex-officio, New Jersey; Robert W. Woodruff, Georgia; Henry M. Wriston, ex-officio, Rhode Island.

Officers: Henry M. Wriston, chairman; Clifford C. Nelson, president; Paul M. Eisele, secretary; Olive B. Haycox, treasurer; Mary M. McLeod, assistant to the president.

[1] Trustees elect.

Salute to Jefferson County Mounted Sheriff's Posse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my appreciation and that of the Congress to the Jefferson County Mounted Sheriff's Posse for the splendid manner in which they represented my home State of Colorado in the inaugural parade.

I should like to point out that this is not just a ceremonial group, but an active working posse, which has performed with great valor and selflessness for many years in search and rescue operations. It is composed of business and professional men, all of whom are expert horsemen and dedicated public servants. One condition of their membership in this organization is that they hold themselves available on 1 hour's notice for whatever service they may be called upon to render.

A hearty "Well done" to the following posse members who rode in the parade: Sheriff Harold Bray, Capt. John P. Chumbley, Lt. William Dillon, Lt. James Wildman, Lt. Robert Clark, WO Lester Longbrook, WO C. M. Pike, Jr., Ernest Benzie, William Brantley, Robert Burdick, Don Burleson, Richard Cox, Leland Good, Jack Gregg, John Humphreys, Dr. John Makris, Wayne McConnell, John Nelson, Dean O'Brien, Walter O'Hara, Dick Perkins, Kermit Reasoner, Richard Ritchie, Art Schrieber, Darrell J. Skelton, Charles Strong, Frank Strong, Enos Wilson, Fletcher Wood, and John Wood, Jr.

Conflicts of Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as one Member of this great representative body and one who joins his many colleagues in their dedication and service to democratic representation as a form of government, I am singularly concerned in our time with the need to protect a high level of confidence in the American system. One tact which has been pursued by those not so devoted to our democratic Republic has been to play heavily on recent publicity regarding conflicts of interest in the Congress. We need to soon earnestly and effectively turn our considerations to adopting sensible procedures which will allay public concern and remove from the arsenal of extremists this weapon with which they have so successfully assaulted the democratic processes and injured public confidence.

No article has been spoken with more erudition or wisdom on this subject than the one by Lewis L. Strauss, which appeared in a recent issue of the California Management Review. I commend it to the membership and, with unanimous consent, the discourse appears herein below:

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

(By Lewis L. Strauss)

Diagonally across Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House stands Blair House—a dignified, antebellum residence, now used to lodge emperors, kings, and the very important persons who are guests of the President of the United States. On the morning of April 18, 1861, it was still a private home and its elderly owner, Francis Preston Blair, Sr., waited in his living room to receive a visitor from the southern shore of the Potomac. Mr. Blair was a friend of the new President, Mr. Lincoln, who had just entrusted him with a task of such importance that he had sent an urgent message across the river, to Arlington, to a colonel of the 1st U.S. Cavalry. That officer, Robert E. Lee, after service in Texas, was enjoying a reunion with his family.

Responding to the summons, Colonel Lee arrived on horseback and, giving his bridle to the waiting stable boy, mounted the high steps to the vestibule. Amenities disposed of, the two men were soon seated behind closed doors and Mr. Blair came to the point. A large army, he said, was to be raised immediately to enforce Federal law and preserve the Union. President Lincoln, acquainted with Colonel Lee's outstanding record, had authorized Mr. Blair to inquire if the Colonel would accept the command of that army.

Lee was taken completely by surprise—so much so that when Blair finished speaking, he may well have pictured himself in command of the largest army the United States had ever put into the field. Certainly, that opportunity would consummate the ambition of a professional soldier. Moreover, he was opposed to secession. He deplored the institution of slavery and much earlier had freed his own slaves. He believed in the Nation to which he had given 25 years of service and which his father, as one of General Washing-

ton's most brilliant officers, had helped to establish. All of his personal interests clearly lay in prompt acceptance of the historic offer.

But as Lee saw his personal interests, they were in conflict with the interests of Virginia. Long before, in conversation with a friend, he had said, "If the Union is dissolved and the Government disrupted, I shall return to Virginia and share the miseries of her people." He thus decided—"instinctively" (wrote Douglas Freeman)—what duty required of him. The allurement of supreme command and all that went with it did not tempt him to equivocate. Without requesting time to consider or even yielding to Blair's persuasion and entreaty that he do so, Lee declined, "as candidly and courteously" as he could.

Immediately he crossed Pennsylvania Avenue to visit his aging commander, Gen. Winfield Scott whom he revered and, in due course, would have succeeded. General Scott, knowing Lee to be the ablest officer in the service, exerted his enormous influence to change Lee's mind. At the end of the interview, the old soldier, deeply moved, said, "Lee, you have made the greatest mistake of your life, but I feared it would be so."

Lee's sword was put at the service of his beloved State. Instead of supreme command of the Armies of the Union, he accepted a post which was third in seniority in the Confederacy. Instead of financial security, he knew full well that confiscation of Arlington and his other property was inevitable. His own interests of every kind—of every kind, that is, except principle, as he saw principle—were subordinated without hesitation. He solved the conflict between his interests and his duty by a code so noble that even in the passions of war, his foes admired him for it.

I begin with this incident because the words "conflict of interest" have acquired an unsavory overtone due to the misapprehension that such conflicts are too often resolved against the public interest. Conflicts of interest are, of course, an inescapable part of life and almost any interest of any man may collide with another of his interests. As I use the expression in this article, it is focused to mean the interest of the public official in the discharge of his duty on the one hand, and on the other hand, his interest in his private affairs.

That type of conflict of interest is peculiarly an affliction of democracy. In autocratic societies the interest of the ruler involved no conflict whatever. He made the laws naturally to further his own ends. It became clearer with the growth of the idea of the commonwealth that the public interest and the interest of the governing individuals were frequently adverse.

Conflict of interest was chosen for the lecture upon which this article is based before the dealings of the secretary to the Senate majority had come to attention in Washington and later been sealed away from public view in a maneuver which the New York Times editorially characterized as "the Senate itself taking the fifth." Accordingly, the general observations on conflict of interest are not generated by the Baker case and, since there has not been a judicial exploration of it, any connection between my observations and the persons who have been mentioned is, as the familiar literary disavowal expresses it, "purely coincidental."

A HISTORICAL PROBLEM

Conflict of interest is not a modern phenomenon. There was the warning two millennia ago in the Sermon on the Mount against serving two masters. Early in our own history, the first Congress took official notice of the possibility of a conflict and endeavored to remove one temptation to it. Thus, despite the eminence and the reputation for probity of Alexander Hamilton, it was written into our laws that the Secretary of the Treasury might not own directly, or hold in trust through others, any securities of the United States or of any State or be engaged in trade or commerce or own any part of any seagoing vessels. I can find no record that Hamilton or any Secretary of the Treasury after him objected that this was a reflection upon his judgment or his trustworthiness.

In the days when this became part of our Federal code, our economy was very simple. Today, by contrast, the Secretaries of several of the executive departments and the heads of independent executive agencies such as AEC and NASA each deal with many times the annual fiscal responsibility of the early Secretaries of the Treasury. Congress has gone further than the Treasury Department, however, in solicitude to see that temptation is removed from the path of the executive branch of Government. For some executive posts, the business or professional men who respond to a Presidential call to duty have found it expected of them to expose the list of their investments and the nature and sources of their income. Many doubtless dislike intensely the invasion of privacy, though it is doubtful that any man refuses high public office for that reason alone. In recent years, men accepting a call to several executive positions have been required to dispose of certain of their holdings and at large financial sacrifice. There have been some who, to avoid any presumption of conflict of interest, have simply sold or given away equity holdings representing a lifetime of work. More recently, it has become the custom to offer to place such holdings with a trustee who makes the decisions associated with ownership without consulting the owner. The Congress has evidenced some disposition in a few cases to accept this in lieu of actual divestment, although the first Congress barred this method of holding Federal securities to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the law is still on the books.

Judges observe a rigid code of their own devising. An incident in that area dramatically demonstrates a judicial resolution of conflict of interest. In 1929, President Hoover asked me to inquire whether a prominent lawyer, with whom he was unacquainted but who enjoyed a distinguished reputation, would accept a Federal district judgeship if it were offered. I called the man and asked the question. He was silent for a few moments and then said: "Of course, that would be the culmination of my ambition, but if I do it, I'll need to sell all my investments. They are mainly in the shares of companies in this area and those companies are the plaintiffs or defendants in most of the cases that ordinarily come before that court. Also, I would have to pay a large gains tax. But I suppose I can't let those personal things interfere. Tell the President I will be greatly honored if he should select me."

The President did select him and the man sold his portfolio. That was about 60 days before the great panic of 1929 and he liquidated his portfolio at what turned out to be the top of the market. Virtue, of course, is its own reward, though the delivery is not always so prompt as in this instance.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SEC

In the early months of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, the Government concerned itself with conflicts of interest in the business community, and the Securities and Exchange Commission was established. One of its functions was to protect stockholders in private companies from officers and directors who were assumed to be vulnerable to temptation because they normally possessed knowledge of the affairs of a company sooner than the great body of shareholders. Thus, depending upon whether their knowledge was of favorable or unfavorable factors, these men, by buying or selling stock, could—if so minded—profit at the expense of the shareholders they were representing. The law met this situation by providing for full public disclosure. Prompt reporting of purchases or sales of company securities was required of all officers and directors. Profits, if they were improperly realized, were for the benefit of the company—not the individual. At the time many men felt it an invasion of privacy to have to report transactions in securities of companies which they directed; but over the years it has become routine, and today few would be found to criticize it as unfair or fail to agree that it has operated to deter conflicts of interest.

Congress has also gone to considerable lengths to protect retired officers of the military services from the temptation of conflict of interest. This has been effected by barring them from certain kinds of employment. (For some reason not explained to me, strictures are more severe on retired Navy and Marine officers than on other branches of the service. Naturally, I feel sad about this discrimination.)

CONGRESSIONAL PRACTICES

During the years that Congress has been occupied in eliminating conflict of interest, insofar as possible, from business, from the retired Military Establishment, and from the executive and judiciary branches of the Government, it has neglected its own defense against criticism. Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER says that Congress has been "winking at the questionable practices of its own Members." This is a choice of words that only a Member of Congress may feel privileged to use. I only quote Senator NEUBERGER.

It is a fact that a few Members of Congress have voluntarily filed statements of their holdings and income, and others have spoken approvingly on the subject. One has written that "a Senator might sit on the Agriculture Committee, which writes farm legislation involving billions in crop subsidies, but the public would be completely unaware of whether or not he is speculating in commodity futures." Or a Congressman or Senator might sit on the Interstate Commerce Commtitee, which is concerned with the licensing of radio and television stations. The Congressman or Senator, unknown to the public, might have a large ownership in such a facility and be anxious to maintain a monopoly position for it. And it has not been long since two former Congressmen were convicted of trying to influence the Department of Justice to drop mail-fraud charges against a man with whom they were associated in business. Such isolated instances do not give a true picture of conditions in the legislative branch, but they exist or existed. They are not more isolated events, however—weight given to numbers—than the instances of clandestine profit-making in the business world at the expense of shareholders, which gave birth to the SEC.

As a people, we are not very much exercised about conflict of interest. It temporarily outrages us when exposed, but it has never aroused us for long. Our major preoccupation with the dangers of communism overshadows other concerns—especially since we have awakened to the fact that it is Soviet policy to export Marxism to the world and that the Soviet neoplasm has established metastases in our own hemisphere. Our preoccupation with such alien threats has befogged awareness of dangers from domestic adversaries. The loss of public confidence in the integrity of the democratic process arising from conflict of interest is a great and imminent danger.

Democracy has not existed long enough to warrant the assumption that it is permanent. In order to survive, democracy depends upon continuous confidence of the people. Conditions which undermine con-

fidence can be just as fatal to the structure of democracy as frontal attack from some other political system. Threats from beyond our borders are more readily perceived and enlist a more prompt and unified resistance. By contrast, internal erosion and decay can be so impalpable, so covert and ingratiating, and so seemingly compatible with our institutions, that the damage is done before we become aware of it.

Democracy is just not foolproof. While it is the best system men have devised, it is not safe from human frailty. That often-quoted observer of the 1840's, Alexis de Tocqueville, whose predictions about our future have a much better batting average for accuracy than those of most latter-day prognosticators, surveyed the virtues and vices of our new order with an unpartisan eye. He saw the specter of future conflicts of interests as the greatest single threat to the permanence of the noble structure.

DE TOCQUEVILLE'S PREDICTION

First among these conflicts he placed the eligibility of the President himself for unlimited self-succession. At the time that he wrote, there had been but seven Presidents, only three of whom, besides the great Washington, had served a second term. The two-term limitation had barely received the sanction of the "unbreakable tradition" which was to be its status for the next hundred years. De Tocqueville feared the particular conflict of interest which would ensue when a President, bent upon the retention of authority for his own ends or, persuaded by his courtiers that he alone was unique and indispensable to the nation, might use the vast powers of his office to perpetuate his tenure. He wrote: "It may be asked whether the legislators of the United States did right or wrong in allowing the reelection of the President. It seems at first sight contrary to all reason to prevent the head of the executive power from being reelected * * *. A law preventing the reelection of the chief magistrate would deprive the citizens of the services of a man at the very time when he has shown his ability in conducting its affairs * * *. But if these arguments are strong, perhaps still more powerful reasons may be advanced against them. Intrigue and corruption are the natural defects of elective government; but when the head of the state can be reelected, these evils rise to a great height and compromise the very existence of the country * * * a simple candidate * * * must necessarily be limited to a narrow sphere; but when the chief magistrate enters the lists, he borrows the strength of the government for his own purposes * * *. The success of his election is his first concern. All laws and all the negotiations he undertakes are to him nothing more than electioneering schemes; places become the reward of services rendered, not to the nation but to its chief."

This was a preview of a conflict of interest which did not surface for a century. Then after a President's fourth election, the Nation solemnly decided that the conflict had best never occur again. Within 2 years of Mr. Roosevelt's death, both Houses of the Congress had approved a resolution which, ratified by the States, became the 22d amendment to the Constitution. Thus, an attempt was made by the highest law to prevent conflict of interest at an echelon in which, by employing a program to "spend and spend and elect and elect," a presidential dynasty might perpetuate itself.

UNCHALLENGED CONFLICT

But the elective office of the presidency is nearly unique in the executive branch. Most of the elective offices are in the legislative branch. Incumbents to elective office may be returned with no limitation save mortality and no criteria as to fitness (other than age) beyond popularity with constituents. On the other hand, the attitude of the legislative branch toward the executive branch in respect to conflicts of interest is one of stern probation. The possibility that appointed servants of the people are morally weaker vessels than those who are elected to office is treated as a fact of life. Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY is quoted on the subject:

"It is within the executive departments and in the independent regulatory agencies that the most serious problems arise, and it is in these offices that conflict between public duty and private interest is most likely to occur and most likely to go undiscovered or unchallenged."

This is a startling observation. Consider the fact that the executive agencies are subject to surveillance by the legislative branch. They are continuously called upon by the legislative branch for testimony; they are occasionally and vigorously investigated; and they are frequently and thoroughly audited. The large and competent staff of the General Accounting Office is an arm of the Congress to look into every aspect of executive performance, and it does a complete and impartial job. From time to time in the vast executive bureaucracy, the GAO turns up evidence of incompetence, waste, and stupidity, but rarely of wrongdoing. I say "rarely" since, in view of the large number of persons involved, the occurrence of wrong resolutions of conflicts of interest are astonishingly few. Considering that there are over 2.5 million Government employees (excluding the military) and nearly 2,000 departments, bureaus, commissions, and agencies, the record hardly supports the Senator's charge.

The legislative branch, on the other hand, is also subject to conflict between public duty and private interest. It properly insists on knowing whatever is done or planned to be done by the executive departments and agencies well before such matters become public knowledge. This advance information is potentially just as fraught with temptation for the legislative as the executive branch. If conflicts between the private interest of a Member of the Congress and the public good are resolved by the individual in his own favor, they are far more likely to go undiscovered or unchallenged, since there is no watchdog or auditor for the legislative branch.

To balance this, it is widely believed that improper conduct by elected officials is corrected at the polls. But this seldom occurs. Preelection charges that an incumbent is untrustworthy are usually attributed to the exaggeration and hyperbole of political campaigning. There are, of course, instances where censure or condemnation of a fellow Member has been voted in one or the other Houses of Congress itself, but such occasions are excessively rare. Somewhat less rare are the instances where men have been returned to Congress in spite of a criminal record. An instance not very long ago was a reelection while the candidate was actually in prison serving a sentence for income-tax evasion—that is to say, for evading the taxes which he himself helped to impose upon his fellow citizens.

In short, moral indignation expressed through the ballot is not a dependable means of eliminating elected officials whose standards have proved unequal to the temptations they encounter This loss of critical capacity becomes conspicuous during elections. James McGregor Burns, writing about former Mayor Curley of Boston, noted that: "His brushes with the law never seemed to hurt his standing among his large personal following; perhaps they strengthened his standing. One of his most enthusiastic receptions * * * came on his return from prison * * *. I have never known a voter to turn against a man he personally knows and likes because of his known violation of norms of conduct. The capacity to rationalize is a mighty thing."

A further rationalization runs to the effect that untrustworthiness in the legislative branch is just a result of the fact that the voters get the kind of representation they deserve. This is perhaps true enough viewed from the point of elections for local office. But a Senator or Congressman, elected to office by the local vote of a State or a congressional district, becomes part of a national legislative body which deals with the welfare of people in States which had no responsibility for their selection.

Congress exercises part of its responsibility by legislating the moral climate in which the executive branch resolves its conflicts of interest. After months of hearings and debate, the Congress enacted Public Law 585 in 1946. This was a revolutionary piece of legislation since, for the first time in history, it dealt with atomic energy. The law established the commission of five men to carry out the purposes of the act. Their appointments were to be made by the President, with Senate advice and consent as usual, but the law goes on to stipulate that "no member of the Commission shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as a member of the Commission." In effect, the Congress said to these men: "You will be dealing with the expenditure of billions of Federal funds; you will be buying uranium, which is a Government monopoly and the producers will have no voice as to price but must take what you pay; you will have control by condemnation of vast areas of land; and you will be hiring scores of thousands of men and women; building factories, reactors, and laboratories; and establishing living conditions in large communities We want to remove temptation from you. We want to be sure that no business, vocation, or other employment you have ever had will present you with a conflict between your private interests and the public weal."

Some excellent men invited by Presidents of the United States to join the Atomic Energy Commission have declined, but I never knew of anyone who refused because of this part of the law. I thought it was a good provision in 1946, and nothing has changed my view in that regard.

AEC CODE

To carry this principle into the work of the Commission personnel, we prepared and published during my chairmanship a manual on conflict of interest for the guidance of employees and consultants. It laid down precise ground rules. A committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, in a study of conflict of interest and the Federal service, stated that "the AEC has been notably sensitive to the problem of preventing conflicts of interest from arising." Incidentally, the code which we prescribed never made it difficult for us to find good men willing to abide by it in order to serve their country.

This study by the bar association was limited, however, to the executive branch of Government. It briefly noted the special sensitivity of the judicial branch (its practice of self-disqualification setting it apart from the other two branches) and its deservedly high reputation. But excluded from the bar association study, except by reference, was the legislative branch. The study cited a rule of the House which calls for Congressmen to disquality themselves from voting in certain limited situations of personal interest but noted that the disqualification is seldom invoked and is unenforceable. The Senate has no corresponding formal rule, though some Senators have disqualified themselves in committee. The study concluded with a recommendation that an independent survey of conflict-of-interest problems as affecting the Congress should be undertaken at some future time.

In what degree should the ethical problems of Congress differ from those of ordinary private citizens in the conduct of their busi-

ness, or from the problems of executives of the Government in the fulfillment of their duties? Is there justification for a different, a double standard? A legislator, replying to such a question, recently expressed the view that a requirement for relevant disclosures by Members of Congress would make them second-class citizens. It seems odd that the Senate demands second-class citizens, in this sense, to conduct the Nation's business. The bar association report concludes: "The Congressman's representative status lies at the heart of the matter * * *. As a Representative, he is often supposed to represent a particular economic group and in many instances, his own economic self-interest is closely tied to that group * * *. It is common to talk of the farm bloc or the silver Senator. We would think odd a fishing-State Congressman who was not mindful of the interest of the fishing industry—though he may be in the fishing business himself * * *. Sterile application of an abstract rule against acting in situations involving self-interest would prevent the farmer-Senator from voting on farm legislation or the Negro Congressman from speaking on civil rights bills."

Commenting on this part of the report, Arthur Krock, the distinguished dean of Washington correspondents, concluded that: "Accordingly, the men on Capitol Hill have to be taken largely on trust, and this, of course, is precisely what has been hurt the most in the Baker case."

Lindsay Warren, who for many years was Comptroller General of the United States, testified before a congressional committee on the subject of taking men on trust. He represents the extreme of disillusionment, and he makes no distinction in this statement between legislators and administrators:

"For a long time I thought that no code of ethics or morals would insure a high standard of conduct of the Government's business. I felt that moral integrity is something innate, the result of a person's conscience, upbringing, and education, and not something controllable by legislation, no matter how rigid * * *. However, the things I have seen in my 25 years in Washington, especially the shocking disclosures of the war and postwar period, have made me more receptive to an official moral code. In the first place, I no longer feel that we can rely on the moral training of all those who come into or deal with the Government."

A country as rich as ours can probably afford the intrinsic losses that occur when conflicts of interest are wrongly resolved. They are minuscule compared to our resources. But the question is whether any government can afford the contagion of moral lapses in high places. De Tocqueville also foresaw our future as involving this consideration:

"A state may survive the influence of a host of bad laws and the mischief they cause is frequently exaggerated * * * but a canker within must prove fatal in the end, although its bad consequences may not be immediately perceived * * *. In a democracy, private citizens see a man of their own rank in life, who rises from that obscure position, and who becomes possessed of riches and of power in a few years; the spectacle excites their surprise and their envy, and they are led to inquire how the person who was yesterday their equal is today their ruler. To attribute his rise to his talents or his virtues is unpleasant; for it is tacitly to acknowledge that they themselves are less virtuous and less talented than he was. They are therefore led (and not infrequently their conjecture is a correct one) to impute his success mainly to some of his defects; and an odious mixture is thus formed of the ideas of turpitude and power, unworthiness and success."

In sum, he is saying that a bad example is likely to be followed by other men when they see evidences of great financial gain by venal men in high station.

Following an investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation some years ago, Senator FULBRIGHT commented: "As our study of the RFC progressed, we were confronted more and more with problems of ethical conduct * * *. How do we deal with those who under the guise of friendship accept favors which offend the spirit of the law, but do not violate the letter? * * * One of the most disturbing aspects of this problem of moral conduct is the revelation that, among so many influential people, morality has become identical with legality."

Alexander Hamilton had an answer. Writing in the Federalist, he said: "The aim of every political constitution is, or ought to be, first to obtain for rulers men who possess most wisdom to discern, and most virtue to pursue, the common good of society; and in the next place, to take the most effectual precautions for keeping them virtuous."

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE NECESSARY

The most effectual precautions for keeping men virtuous in business or government are laws, regulations, and codes of conduct requiring full public disclosure. These at first impression seem distasteful; yet men who aspire to careers where the property, welfare, and even the lives of their fellow citizens are to be governed by them (and where great honor and recognition are the expected and deserved meed for duty well performed) ought not be reluctant to bear the scrutiny of those who have delegated authority to them.

Disclosures are painful if only because they are an invasion of privacy, and privacy is a precious thing. Yet every one of us stripe to the buff for the Internal Revenue collector. We know that it costs money to run a great government and we pay those costs not only with part of our income but with part of our privacy as well. The man who has nothing he feels compelled to hide ought not be embarrassed by disclosure.

In 1958, President Johnson, then leader of the Senate majority, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a concurrent resolution designed "as a guide to all who are privileged to be part of the Government service." It was to apply to "every servant of the public whether he be the President, a Member of Congress, a lifelong career employee, or an employee engaged only on a temporary basis." It related to a code of principles that was to apply to all—not just to some and not to others. "There is no room in a great democracy such as ours for any set of double standards," he concluded.

KENNEDY'S MESSAGE

Three years later, in 1961, President Kennedy, in a message to the Congress, stated that "high ethical standards can be maintained only if the leaders of Government provide a personal example of dedication to the public service * * *. Their own conduct must be above reproach * * *. It will often be difficult to assess the propriety of particular actions."

He then added these words: "Honest disclosure will often be the surest solution, for the public will understand good-faith efforts to avoid improper use of public office when they are kept informed."

Honest disclosure makes it unnecessary to draft a code which would have to cover every conceivable contingency. Disclosure can only come about, however, through action by the legislative branch itself. The parliamentary system is under attack today in many parts of the world. As citizens, we have a vital interest in defending it. It should also defend itself.

In a world facing the trilemma of exhaustion of natural resources, overpopulation, and nuclear war, the evils of conflict of interest appear de minimis. Yet protection against these three calamities will depend upon the maintenance of government supported by citizens with respect for the men they have put in authority. A people who grow cynical of the good faith of their leaders will be in a bad way to take the bold and intelligent actions essential to survival.

REFERENCES

This article is based on the Bley Stein Memorial Lecture, given at the University of California, Los Angeles, on May 6, 1964.

A Topsy-Turvy World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Frank McCallister, director, labor education division, Roosevelt University in Chicago, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking article written by Rabbi David Polish, Beth Emet Temple, Evanston, Ill.

The article follows:

A TOPSY-TURVY WORLD

There is a world out in space which is an exact duplicate of our own. It is populated with men and women like ourselves. They live in countries like our own. They conduct business and raise families. They live under various economies and governments, and are divided into different national, religious, and racial groups. They differ in only one respect. In each country there is a pathological obsession with human welfare. As a result, over 60 percent of the national budgets are devoted to a compulsive and hysterical desire toward sheltering life from the normal ravages of human existence which we accept more stoically. Billions of dollars are spent by governments on the conquest of disease. Over the years, nations have poured their resources into medical research, and today no cancer, no vascular disease, no kidney ailments, no degenerative disease exists. Unheard of sums are spent by governments on housing. They have so tortured their fiscal policies that slums and blight are unheard of. They are so overprotective of their children that they overpay their teachers, and training schools for teachers have to turn candidates away. The perverseness of these conditions reaches its greatest height in their legislation against all private charities in behalf of human welfare. The outlawing of private charity has, of course, stifled the philanthropic instincts of the people.

There is only one exception to this restriction against private benevolence. Since the national budgets are so swollen with welfare appropriations, there is little left for national defense. It therefore becomes necessary for private citizens to raise money for armaments. Thousands of organizations exist for this purpose alone. There are clubs to buy guns through raffles. People stand with tin cups on street corners to collect coins for the purchase of hand grenades. Drives are conducted to acquire tanks. There are tag days for military aircraft. Cousin clubs sponsor dances to buy uniforms. The national governments simply neglect the problem of defense and let the burden fall on private agencies. But the inadequacy of this system is apparent to all. People are grumbling that under such a policy there will never be a war.

In the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times of Thursday, November 19, 1964:

IN THE NATION: THE PRESIDENT IN A NEW PERSPECTIVE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, November 18.—Perhaps the most cogent exposition of the conservative political philosophy duirng the campaign of 1964 was made by a professional actor, Ronald Reagan. At least this was indicated by the fact that his speech on television drew almost $1 million in small contributions from the video audience to Senator Goldwater's campaign fund. Now a professional politician, James A. Farley, has matched Reagan in a performance outside his lifelong zone of activity.

In a speech delivered this week to the Rotary Club of Atlanta, Farley, the past master of organizing a party for victory at the polls, appeared in the role of historian. His central thesis was that "President Johnson has returned to the interpretation of the Constitution given to it by President Jefferson." In supporting this interesting concept, of which the proof as yet is in the oven with the pudding, the chief strategist of Franklin D. Roosevelt's two successful presidential campaigns prophesied that "the Great Society" would be built according to the Jeffersonian philosophy of the strict separation of powers.

The founding father of the Democratic Party, said Farley, "insisted that the executive should offer its leadership to the country through the Congress * * *. The result was a smoothly flowing cooperation instead of unnecessary conflict and misunderstanding. President Johnson already has demonstrated the soundness of the Jeffersonian concept—and his own mastery of it * * * in the most dynamic return to a working Constitution that the country has witnessed in a century and a half.

This suggests a deference to the untrammeled function of Congress that is not wholly borne out in the history of executive legislative relations in Jefferson's time. It also challenges evidence, which many observers have found conclusive of pressures on Congress by President Johnson that are derived from his vast powers to reward and punish the many in that body who are always candidates for reelection. Also, there will be considerable dissent to Farley's general conclusion that "no other President since the industrial revolution has approached the body politic" from the position that "free labor, free enterprise, and a free government are as indivisible partners as the legs of the three-legged stool."

FARLEY AS POLITICAL HISTORIAN

Surely, other Presidents since the industrial revolution have "approached the body politic" with this undeniable platitude. The criteron of difference is the act, not the word. But Farley said other things which are tenable as history and bold as prophecy. Such as:

President Jackson "completely disregarded the Jefferson theory by defying Congress, the Supreme Court, and all and sundry who dared even challenge him * * *. I think it is no accident that the great panic of 1837 followed."

President Lincoln "sidetracked Congress," in emulation of Jackson's "stewardship theory." President Theodore Roosevelt "flouted" Congress, boasting that "nine-tenths of his illegal acts were never even questioned," and attacked business leaders as "malefactors of great wealth." President Wilson also adopted the Jacksonian theory, assailing "both Congress and business" and just after he was elected promised "the financial markets a gallows higher than Haman's."

President F. D. Roosevelt "misinterpreted" as great a popular mandate in 1936 as Mr. Johnson received in 1964. The results were a congressional rebellion against the Supreme Court packing bill, a party rebellion against the "great purge of 1938," "and—I cannot refrain from noting—the recession of 1937–38."

Under President Johnson, "we shall have no paralyzing crises * * *." On his precept of dealing with all groups equitably will be "built the Great Society * * *. He will have to expand the public debt; but [like Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase] for every million he spends for the country's future [it will be] enriched by a billion on the soundest financial basis * * *. The President knows that the education of * * * children is not only bankable, but the best investment in the Nation." Expenditure for this will be the keystone of the structure of the Great Society.

Thus Farley, venturing with Reagan into "fresh woods and pastures new."

United States-Israel Economic Ties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the November 1964 edition of American-Israel Economic Horizons.

The article, written by the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, reports the wide range of economic assistance made available to Israel under the provisions of Public Law 480. This excellent program has redounded to the benefit of both nations.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ECONOMIC TIES: PUBLIC LAW 480, FOOD AND FUNDS

(By Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture)

Since 1964, total agricultural imports by Israel have accounted for one-fifth to one-sixth of the country's total imports, averaging about $100 million annually. Over the decade the United States has supplied approximately one half of them—nearly one-half billion dollars of agricultural products.

In recent years the share supplied by the United States has moved upward to about 55 percent of the total as compared to about 33 percent prior to the implementation of the Public Law 480 program in 1954. Agricultural products also have been accounting for a larger share of total imports from the United States—from less than 30 percent during the period 1949–52 to approximately 40 percent since 1960.

Wheat and feed grains have accounted for more than half of the agricultural commodities supplied under the Public Law 480 title I and mutual security programs. Although wheat has been the major commodity supplied to Israel under these programs, feed grains, which have played a major role in the development of livestock enterprises, have accounted for about one-fourth of U.S. exports under concessional sales programs.

Dairy products are the third most important category of imports under the Public Law 480 program, followed by fats and oils, cotton, meat, rice, and tobacco. Considerable quantities of dairy products have been made available under Public Law 480 title III for use in school lunch programs and for donations to the needy.

Soybeans have been the principal commodity provided in the fats and oils category. The title I program can be credited with the successful commercial introduction of soybeans into Israel. Since the early title I imports, Israel has become the world's largest importer of soybeans on a per capita basis. Less than 14,000 tons annually were imported by Israel prior to Public Law 480. By 1963 Israel imported 207,000 tons of soybeans, the equivalent of 35,000 tons of oil or $20 million of cash purchases from the United States. Israel also is importing large quantities of oilseeds from other countries. Oilseeds imports along with feed grains are also an important factor in the nation's growing livestock industry.

Israel has also increased its commercial purchases of rice and tobacco. For rice, commercial purchases in 1963 amounted to some 9,000 tons, nearly double the total rice imports of approximately 4,000 tons annually prior to Public Law 480. The United States as well as other countries are sharing in this growing market. Commercial purchases of tobacco have also risen, benefiting such neighboring countries such as Turkey, Greece, and Yugoslavia. The country also has become a substantial market for American cigarettes.

PART OF A BROAD PROGRAM OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Aid in the form of agricultural commodities became a major part of the overall U.S. economic assistance program to Israel beginning in 1954.

Total net economic assistance from 1950 through 1963 amounted to approximately $750 million. Of this amount, agricultural commodities under the Public Law 480 program and the Mutual Security Act accounted for approximately $345 million or 46 percent of the total Public Law 480 assistance which included title I sales for local currency, title II grants, and title III donations, amounted to $268 million from 1954 to 1963 while net mutual security food shipments amounted to approximately $77 million.

A study made by the Bank of Israel on "The Analysis and Assessments of the Economic Effect of the Public Law 480 Title I Program in Israel," published in 1963, concluded that the availability of title I commodities had numerous favorable effects on the Nation's economy. It was stated that "title I imports constituted part of the capital imports which served as the main source of the large-scale capital formation during this period, facilitating the country's rapid development."

The study also pointed out that supplies made available under the title I program made possible a continuous flow of raw material imports and the maintenance of adequate inventories resulting in fuller utilization of the Nation's productive capacity. The study concluded that, on balance, the title I program had no adverse effect on the Nation's agricultural development. In fact, the availability of title I wheat, feed grains, and oilseeds—commodities not well suited to Israel farms—actually contributed to long-range desirable structural development of the Nation's agriculture.

Therefore, the Public Law 480 title I program proved to be a very effective instrument in the overall U.S. economic assistance effort in Israel. Its impact has been felt in two important ways—the actual importing of commodities needed by the Israel economy

and the investment financed with the title I local currency proceeds. It has been said that the need for agricultural imports during the early years of Israel's development and growth was sufficiently great—that aid in the form of needed agricultural imports was just as important as if such aid had been in the form of cash.

PUBLIC LAW 480 CONTRIBUTED TO LONG-RANGE EXPANSION OF COMMERCIAL TRADE

The Bank of Israel study also pointed out that the title I program contributed to the general expansion of efficient export industries with a high import component, which contributes to the country's long-range ability to increase commercial imports. Title I local currency loans also facilitated the development of these export industries so vital to the country's objective of reducing its trade deficit.

Israel has taken full advantage of a provision in Public Law 480 which provides for making loans to private enterprises from title I local currency proceeds.

These loans are known as Cooley amendment loans. Through June 30, 1963, some 50 loans, amounting to over $23 million, were made to private United States or Israel firms for business development, market expansion, and development of markets for U.S. farm products. Approximately 16 percent of local currency proceeds from title I sales have been set aside to be used for this purpose in Israel as compared to 6 percent for all other countries.

The first Cooley amendment loan of local currency proceeds in Israel was made in 1958 to Dagon Batey Mamguroth le-Israel, Ltd. Similar loans have been made to industrial enterprises in the fields of textiles, rubber, plastics, chemicals, paper, metals, and machinery. The Bank of Israel's analysis of the experience of 12 firms receiving such loans indicates that the local currency Cooley loans not only provided for additional investment needed to expand facilities in capital intensive industries but also contributed to increased employment, labor productivity, and net national product.

In addition to local currency loans in the private and public sectors of the economy, millions of dollars have been used for international educational exchange projects, for agricultural research, and for the translation of scientific papers. All of these projects serve as an example of progressive economic and technical cooperation.

The food-for-peace program embodying the technique of providing for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for local currencies has been a success story in Israel—such a success that it serves as a model for the operation of food-for-peace programs in other developing countries.

The title I concept which permits trade to take place between countries when foreign exchange resources are inadequate to finance needed imports has been one of the most useful vehicles for extending foreign aid. The title I technique also has worked smoothly in Israel as it permits distribution and sale of agricultural commodities through the existing marketing system.

Jingle of U.S. Dollars Is Muffled at Las Vegas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues a very timely and interesting article that appeared in one of our Indiana newspapers recently. The article which was written by the syndicated columnist, Alice Widener, sets forth some worth while observations as far as the U.S. dollar problem is concerned.

The article follows:

JINGLE OF U.S. DOLLAR IS MUFFLED AT LAS VEGAS

(By Alice Widener)

LAS VEGAS, NEV.—On the gambling tables here, plastic chips have replaced silver dollars.

There is no more metallic clink of payoffs in sterling coin, there is no longer the pleasant sensation of walking around with a pocketbook or coat pocket sagging from the weight of a few silver dollars. The Las Vegas Review-Journal recently carried the lead story, "New Dollars May Contain Less Silver," and reported, "The Treasury has canceled plans to start January production of the $45 million in silver dollars authorized by Congress." The news item continued with the statement that there probably will be "at least a general lowering of the silver ratio in half dollars, quarters, and dimes which are all 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper."

The reasons cited by the Treasury Department for all this bad news are that the world's use of silver outruns production, that the Treasury's reserve of silver fell to about 1.2 billion ounces from 1.5 billion in 1964, and that "the Government has little hope that mining will increase fast enough to stave off further depletion."

BLUNT TRUTH: DEVALUATION

What would reduction in silver content of dimes, quarters, and half dollars amount to? Their devaluation. This is the blunt truth.

Yet on the very day that this probable devaluation was announced, the president of a big New York City bank was reported to have ordered all executives and employees to refrain from any discussion of possible devaluation of the U.S. dollar. Such discussion, he said, "is unpatriotic."

On hearing this, I myself was profoundly troubled and went through some deep soul searching. With all my heart, I would not wish to be unpatriotic. But I decided it would be not only unpatriotic but also dishonest of me to be anything less than wholly frank with my readers. Therefore, permit me to warn you that if present Government spending policies and Federal Reserve easy-money policies are continued, there will almost certainly take place a devaluation of the U.S. dollar, and we Americans will suffer all the horrors of inflation, at first limited and then probably not so limited.

Without wanting to be too personal, permit me to tell you that I have a special reason for speaking out on this subject. All during World War II, at the request of the Treasury Department, I lectured to Americans, as an unpaid volunteer, on the horrors of inflation. The Treasury Department believed me to be especially well qualified for this task.

MIDDLE CLASS IN PERIL

As a student and later a young housewife, I had lived in Western Europe between two wars, and did the household marketing and shopping for necessities in several countries where there was limited or unlimited inflation. I knew at first hand what happens to a nation when its currency is debased. The extremely poor lose nothing because they have nothing to lose. The very rich reap unwarranted benefits because they are able to profit by others' misfortunes. The life savings of the hardworking middle classes and professional persons are wiped out.

So in my soul searching before writing this column, I asked myself:

"If it was patriotic for me to talk and write against inflation during 1941–45, how can it be unpatriotic for me to do so in 1964–65? How could a government that urged me to speak out against inflation 20 years ago now criticize me for speaking out against it in these critical times?"

TWO AGENCIES HOLD POWER

My fellow Americans, there still may be time enough for you to act to rescue our failing currency from deliberate debasement. Since only Congress and the Federal Reserve have power to halt profligate U.S. spending and to tighten our money policies, your protests at wanton dissipation of our tax-money assets and the piling up of national debt and deficits must be directed at Congress and the Federal Reserve. I beg of you—for the sake of our freedom, solvency, and morality—to beseech Congress and the Federal Reserve to take immediate action and put into effect those drastic economy measures urgently needed for rescue of our U.S. dollar.

We Americans are a hard-working, productive, creative people. Our Nation is rich in natural resources. There is no valid reason for our money troubles. These are directly the result of wrong foreign policy, wrong domestic policy, and of politicians' utterly cynical purchase of votes through the false, demagogic government promise of giving the people something for nothing.

Something for nothing costs billions.

Pollution of San Francisco Bay by the San Luis Interceptor Drain Should Be Prevented Before It Occurs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which was published in the Antioch Ledger, Antioch, Calif., on January 6, 1965, reflects the overwhelming view of the citizens of the San Francisco Bay area in opposition to the proposal of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to construct an interceptor drain from the service area of the San Luis Reclamation project and terminate it at the Antioch Bridge. The editorial points out that this proposed drain clearly violates the position taken by the President in his state of the Union message that pollution of our water should be prevented "before it happens." Unfortunately, the Bureau of Reclamation wants to go ahead and pollute the river and then after the pollution is proved, will consider moving the drain to a new terminal point. In the meantime, pollution may continue for several years before the terminal point of the drain can be moved. The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation should comply with the President's state of the Union message. The construction of the drain should be deferred until a study is made by the U.S. Public Health Service to determine whether the drain will pollute the waters of the San Francisco Bay and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

The editorial follows:

NO DUMPING HERE? L.B.J. JOINS POLLUTION WAR

"We will seek legal power to prevent pollution of our air and water before it happens. We will step up our effort to control harm-

ful wastes, giving first priority to the clean-up of our most contaminated rivers. We will increase research to learn more about control of pollution."—President Lyndon B. Johnson in his state of the Union address, January 4, 1965.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Antioch, Contra Costa County and the San Francisco Bay area are heartened by your statement that you favor dealing with pollution before it occurs.

We hope it means that the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, under your leadership, will suspend its plan to terminate the San Luis interceptor drain at the Antioch Bridge.

You can't be expected to know of every water project in the country, but let us tell you that that one paragraph in your compelling address hit our problem right on the nose.

The Bureau of Reclamation last year announced its plan to build the superdrain to Antioch and deposit the San Joaquin Valley's waste water in the river at our front door.

Fearful that salts and pesticides would contaminate this region's domestic and industrial water supply, U.S. Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Congressman JOHN BALDWIN, and others urged that the Antioch outfall be delayed until a study was made of the pollution threat.

Like you, Mr. President, they prescribed preventive medicine.

However, the Bureau of Reclamation took the position that the drain should be built to Antioch and if subsequent experience proved there was pollution, the outfall could be relocated.

Time enough to hunt for a cure once the patient gets the disease, the Bureau was saying.

As soon as Congress reconvened last Monday, Congressman BALDWIN and four other bay area representatives introduced a bill barring discharge of the waste water drain in the bay area until the pollution potential is analyzed.

Everyone out here hopes, Mr. President, that you will exert your powerful influence in behalf of that bill.

And we trust that officials of the Bureau of Reclamation listened as carefully as we did to your outline of the Great Society, particularly the statement quoted here.

Forgive us for concentrating so intently on one small part of your historic address to Congress, but this is a facet of the Great Society with which Antioch readily, eagerly identifies itself.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, throughout the world we cry for peace and freedom, yet at times we tend to be unaware of the gross injustices committed by totalitarianism, the archenemy of democracy. We tend to overlook the vast numbers of peoples who are forced to live in captivity.

Ukraine is one of the many nations held in bondage. It is easy to forget that this proud country was not always a prisoner of despotism, so long has it suffered under the yoke of cruel alien oppressors. Today it has been so thoroughly incorporated into that vast imerialist Russia that we in the free world tend to regard it as an integrated part of the Soviet Union. The Ukraine is vital to the well-being of its despot; its rich and fertile food belt nourishes Russia while it languishes from lack of freedom and independence that it once knew.

The Ukrainian people have witnessed all types of foreign domination in their long and varied history, and it was not until January 22, 1918, that their dream of freedom was realized. For these stout hearted and courageous patriots, this day symoblizes their century-long struggle to be free and enjoy the basic rights we hold so dear. Yet they were destined to lose this hard-fought liberty at the hands of their most formidable foe, Russia, after only 2 years of enjoying political sovereignty. In 1920 the Red army, upon orders from Moscow, overran the eastern regions of the Ukraine and slowly set out to stifle their political freedom. Many brave and noble patriots died under the tyranny of Communist Russia; millions have been deported to the desolate wasteland of Siberia. Yet neither the forcible Russification or genocides could weaken the determination of the Ukrainian people to regain their freedom and independence. Despite the countless crimes committed by Russia against these courageous patriots, the Ukrainian people have resisted when possible and have maintained their sense of national integrity.

On this occasion of commemorating the 47th anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence Day, we must express once again our compassion and concern for the oppressed in the world. To those gallant Ukrainian people we extend a hand of friendship, and with them go our hopes for a future national life of dignity and happiness.

The National Freight Car Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1965, I introduced a bill, H.R. 425, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply. In effect the bill would allow the Interstate Commerce Commission to provide just and reasonable compensation to freight car owners and thereby encourage the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense.

The shortage of freight cars in the United States and especially in the Midwest is of national concern. One of the reasons for this shortage is the fact that ownership of freight cars has become an unattractive investment. The answer lies in providing a proper incentive for investment in such equipment.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives excerpts from an address by Mr. Eldon Martin, legal vice president of the Burlington Railroad, before the St. Louis-East Side Traffic Conference, September 30, 1964. I believe Mr. Martin's remarks summarize the national freight car situation:

THE NATIONAL FREIGHT CAR SITUATION

From a peak boxcar ownership of about 1 million cars, and an ownership of about 750,000 boxcars following World War II, the serviceable boxcar fleet was down to 564,988 on August 1, 1964, and the trend since 1958 has been steadily and consistently downward. Despite resurgence of the new car orders, particularly for so-called special purpose cars, the trend is still downward. During the 12 months ended July 1, 1964, 16,912 new boxcars were installed, but 38,321, or more than twice as many, were retired.

The long-range explanation for this dismal and discouraging record—at least in my view—lies in the fact that, during all this period of recurring shortages, ownership of freight cars have been an unattractive investment. Until January 1 of this year, a railroad could use for its business, a freight car owned by another railroad at a rental of $2.88 per day. It was obviously cheaper to rent than to own.

The viciousness of the past low-rental policy has not only created recurring freight car shortages, but has also created major inequity between car owners and car users. A recent study by my own company, the Burlington, shows that when we build a new $12,000 or $15,000 car, we can expect to enjoy its use on our own railroad only about 1 day out of 10. Ninety percent of the time it will be on other railroads which rent rather than own such equipment. The same study shows that our older freight cars are at home, that is, on our own railroad, about 4 days out of 10. We not only get an inadequate rental when our freight cars are off-line, but when our colleagues are gracious enough to return some of our equipment, we get the old and they retain the new.

To some extent, the sound economic principles stated above were recognized January 1 of this year when a new schedule of car rentals charges became effective. This new schedule provides for five different daily rentals based roughly on the age and value of the equipment. Although this new scale is an important step in the right direction, the daily rentals are still too low, in the middle and upper brackets, to create a proper incentive for investment in such equipment. Litigation is now pending before the ICC in which that tribunal must prescribe reasonable and proper car rentals for the future. A group of major car-owning railroads have urged Congress to give the Commission some guidelines for this important task. A bill is pending (S. 1063) which would tell the Commission to fix compensation to be paid for the use of freight cars, upon a basis which in its judgment will provide just and reasonable compensation to freight car owners, contribute a sound car service practices, and encourage the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and national defense.

On 47th Anniversary of the Independence of Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago this month the Ukrainian Na-

tional Republic declared her independence after centuries of subjugation. The independence and liberty of the freedom-loving Ukrainians was almost immediately stamped out by the Soviet Communist dictatorship, but the indomitable spirit of the Ukrainian people survives and the flame of liberty still burns brightly in their hearts and minds.

Ukraine represents one of the most powerful forces of patriotic nationalism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Its invincible fight for national independence and freedom has forced Moscow to resort to a masquerade of Ukraine as an independent and free nation within the federal framework of the U.S.S.R.

Tomorrow, residents of Ukrainian extraction in the city of Yonkers, N.Y., are joining in the celebration of the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. The mayor of Yonkers, the Honorable John E. Flynn, has designated tomorrow as Ukrainian Day and has given permission to raise the blue-gold flag of the free Ukraine on the city hall flagpole to commemorate the proclamation of January 22, 1918. The Very Reverend Basil Klos, pastor of St. Michael's Ukrainian Catholic Church of Yonkers has been designated as the honorary mayor for this occasion.

I am honored to pay tribute to this freedom-loving nation for her inspiring example in continuing the unabated struggle for recovery of the liberty which is rightfully hers. It is the sincere hope of America and the entire free world that soon the Ukraine will join them in the family of free nations.

The Man in the Rock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chattanooga Times of Monday, November 23, 1964:

THE MAN IN THE ROCK

Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., made an interesting talk the other day before the Atlanta Rotary Club. He spoke rather glowingly of Lyndon B. Johnson, but no one expected anything else at this season from the grand old super-Democrat.

Mr. Farley's thesis was that Mr. Johnson is best compared to Jefferson because like the Virginian, he is a strong President who, nevertheless, values the national consensus and works with the close approval of Congress.

Presidents who did not so work, Jim Farley said, were Franklin Roosevelt with his court-packing plan; Jackson "who completely discarded the Jeffersonian theory"; Lincoln who sidetracked Congress; Theodore Roosevelt who flouted it, and Wilson who threatened it and was damaged in the process.

Mr. Farley made these controversial appraisals as a base for his point that Lyndon Johnson will accord business and other segments of society the respect and consideration they must have to maintain natural unity.

Hoisting himself then onto one of several limbs he predicted that the Johnson administration will become the second era of good feelings; the first such era since that under James Monroe.

He declared that the Appalachian program would "pay out as magnificently as the Louisiana and Alaska purchases."

He compared the national efforts for education and improved opportunity to Michelangelo. When the incomparable sculptor was nearly 80, one of his pupils in the gallery asked what he was doing, as he battered away at a block of marble, with the chips flying. "I am freeing the man in this rock," he said. "With the same relentless energy, President Johnson is freeing the man and the woman to be in every American child," said Jim Farley.

Some, of course, will see this analogy as overgallant. In any case, there is truth as well as affection in the following Farley characterization of Johnson:

"He does not consider business leaders as malefactors of great wealth, or economic royalists. Indeed, I do not know how anyone could, after looking at the income taxes they and their great corporations pay. On the contrary, he regards them as people whose high management skills are absolutely necessary to the welfare of this Nation. In this, he is supported by the new type of labor leaders—men who are even more aware of the necessity of successful management than the ordinary citizen. Many of the labor unions, indeed, cooperate night and day with the industrial leaders, especially for foreign markets, for a good and simple reason; if there are no profits, there is no work, and where there is no work there is no payroll check."

Lyndon Johnson is a worker, who understands work; as does Jim Farley.

What's So Terrible About Germ Warfare?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there was contained in the January 30 issue of the Saturday Evening Post a most interesting article entitled, "What's So Terrible About Germ Warfare?" which was written by Dr. Clifford F. Rassweiler. It is well worth reading. More than that it deserves a lot of careful thought and free discussion. For years it has been impossible to obtain free discussion of biological and chemical warfare in the press. The leftist groups have maintained a constant chorus of denunciation of the very thought of the use of such weapons. This has had its impact in our defense structure, and I think there is little doubt but that we are well behind the Russians in capabilities in this field. That, too, is something to think about.

Dr. Rassweiler has been president of the American Chemical Society and the Industrial Research Institute, vice president of Johns-Manville Corp. and adviser to several Government agencies, including the Pentagon. He is now a management consultant. He is qualified to speak authoritatively.

The article follows:

WHAT'S SO TERRIBLE ABOUT GERM WARFARE?

(By Dr. Clifford F. Rassweiler)

We Americans put too much confidence in our nuclear missiles too much confidence in the knowledge that by pressing a button we can destroy cities and even civilizations. We are victims of complacency. We have fallen far behind the Russians in the kind of warfare that many top military scientists predict will be the next step in the evolution of war—chemical and biological weapons. Because of our ignorant and emotional opposition to these weapons, we have prevented our military men from exploiting the enormous offensive opportunities of chemical and biological warfare and from providing us the defenses we need against a growing Russian threat.

We think of poison gas and germ warfare and call these weapons "horrible." Why? Because they provide the most effective way known to kill masses of people. But that is the objective of all other weapons of warfare. Many modern poison gas weapons are not at all horrible in the way they kill. They kill almost instantaneously. They do not mangle men's bodies as conventional weapons do, and they do not leave men lying in agony for hours before death ends their suffering.

What's more, there is the clear possibility that, if we give this new kind of war the attention and support it deserves, we can make war more humane, even benign.

There is no question that our nuclear power protects us from atomic destruction by Russia, and prevents Russia from blackmailing us with threats of such destruction. But has it any other usefulness? The answer is negative.

We did drop the first atomic bomb. It was a wonderful exercise of personal courage, necessary under extreme circumstances. But in Korea our men died by the thousands, and we suffered one of our most humiliating defeats. Our nuclear weapons stayed in their vaults. In Vietnam we are now fighting a war whose loss may lead to Communist domination of southeast Asia. Our nuclear weapons stay in their vaults. We must face the fact that in the struggle now going on for world supremacy we do not have the kind of military power we need. We get into small wars we cannot win. More important, we may not have the weapons to give us the power to prevent or win another big war.

For this situation the citizens of this country are to blame. We eagerly seek new scientific inventions in every area except warfare. Here the thought of developing new ways to kill people horrifies us. In the field of warfare we are afraid of science.

Chemical-warfare agents first became important during the First World War, when they caused 1.3 million casualties and were considered five times as effective as shrapnel or high-explosive shells. At the beginning of World War II both the Allied and German forces had major capabilities in the chemical field, but the opposing forces were balanced and so, other than smoke and flame, chemical agents were not used.

Toward the end of the war the Germans discovered a new type of chemical agent, called nerve gas. Two of these, Tabun and Sarin, cause casualties before they can be detected by the human senses and cause death in less than a minute of exposure. They can be absorbed either through inhalation or through the skin. They can be transported easily and can be stored indefinitely in ordinary steel drums or other innocent-looking containers. They can be spread over wide areas—a whole city—by a variety of means ranging from missiles to simple vaporizers concealed in ordinary delivery trucks.

The Germans were actually producing Tabun at the end of the war. The Russians captured the Tabun plant and research laboratories and moved them and their scientists to a secret site in Russia. Production and research have continued. It has been reported that Russia's stockpile of Tabun is measured in thousands of tons, adequate to wipe out the population of hundreds of cities the size of San Francisco. It is considered sufficient to support three or four major offensives on a wide front. No one here knows how many other deadly agents the Russians have developed in the past 20 years.

Russian military forces are well organized to use chemical agents. Every unit down to battalion level has specialized chemical troops. They can deliver chemical agents by a variety of means—rockets, guided missiles, airplanes, mines, explosive projectiles and transportable vaporizers. Their protective equipment against chemical agents is simple and effective.

Biological warfare is a newer development than chemical warfare, and potentially even more dangerous. Plagues were the mass killers of the past. Man-induced plagues may be the mass killers of future wars. On the other hand, biological warfare may produce illnesses that debilitate temporarily and reduce the ability to resist without doing any permanent harm.

Biological agents may be delivered by rockets or bombs. However, the most effective way is to disperse them into mild wind currents from a vehicle, ship or airplane. Under favorable circumstances, usually to be found at night, a 50-gallon drum of material could spread infectious particles over 50 or more square miles. The inhalation of one-millionth of an ounce of these infective particles could start a debilitating or infectious disease.

These are not Jules Verne fantasies. All the facts presented here have already been made available to the public in reliable, specialized publications. There is evidence that Russia has been aggressively adding biological warfare potential to its chemical arsenal. Five years ago Col. Adam Milkovich stated before the Moscow Institute: "From results of comparative studies of the losses of life from conventional weapons, war poisons and atomic energy on one side, and losses from biological weapons on the other, it is believed today that a biological war would have the greatest effect of all."

In contrast to Russia's accomplishments, consider our own situation. To make sure that chemical and biological war will never be used against us, we must do two things. First, we must learn how to use these weapons more effectively than our potential enemies. Second, we must provide adequate protection for our population. We have the capability to do both these things. We are doing neither adequately.

Our Army experts at the chemical-biological warfare center at Edgewood Arsenal, Md., and the germ-warfare center at Frederick, Md., are kept on an inadequate budget by legislators who fear that major support for chemical and biological war would bring a wave of emotional public disapproval. Moreover, the experts must work in fear of public opinion. As the New York Times recently reported, one chemical-warfare official conceded that "we can't educate the public, and we are regarded as monsters." Another official has been quoted as saying, "Every time we open our mouths, we get clobbered."

Biological weapons lend themselves easily to undeclared wars of attrition. Russia and China have little chance of surpassing us in industrial development, but one of them might try to achieve supremacy by secretly cutting down our strength. Biological agents might be spread into our drinking water, or to damage our crops and attack our domestic animals. Epidemics might be started in our own cities or those of our allies. We might blame Russia. She might claim that it was the Chinese trying to start a war between Russia and the United States. We might never know who was guilty.

But consider the opportunities that biological and chemical warfare—the art of war we neglect so disastrously—would offer us. To expose the enemy supply lines in Vietnam, we have tried defoliation, without success. But suppose we could destroy all vegetation and prevent regrowth for the crop year in the areas which form the hard core of Vietcong strength. The Vietcong installations and activity would be exposed. The Vietcong could no longer live on local crops. We would, of course, shower the devastated area with notices that food for loyal Vietnam citizens would be available in areas controlled by loyal Vietnam troops.

Suppose these agents "by accident" should drift across the Cambodian border to the Vietcong supply dumps and staging areas there. No one would be killed. But the operations in these areas would be exposed to aerial photography. There would no longer be any question about Cambodian involvement in the Vietcong war. The refugee problem would be great, but the cost of relieving it would be small compared to that of direct military attack. The United States is expert at rushing relief to disaster and famine areas. Why not create a few such areas where they will provide a deterrent to our enemies?

Many people feel that the only way to win in South Vietnam is to make a direct bombing attack on North Vietnam. The objection is that this would start retaliatory bombing. But suppose we provided ourselves with the chemical and biological agents that reduce crop yields and cause debilitating but nonfatal diseases. Suppose we started using these agents against North Vietnam. The price that North Vietnam would start paying for her interference in South Vietnam would become unbearable. But for her to retaliate by bombing South Vietnam would be foolish. It would only invite complete destruction by retaliatory bombing.

We are a humane nation. We need methods for hurting our enemies without killing them. We must hurt them badly enough to deter them from interfering with us or our allies, but not as badly as they know we would hurt them if they retaliated with actual warfare. The damage should be of the type for which we could provide relief and restoration—once the country concerned changed its attitude.

These are interesting opportunities, but science is offering us even more exciting developments. These are rather new additions to our arsenal—the chemical and biological agents that incapacitate temporarily. The oldest such agent, of course, is alcohol. Getting a man into a drunken stupor, in order to steal his belongings, is an old technique.

What is new is the discovery of chemicals which will produce similar mental confusion with a very minute dosage. Scientists now are sure that a multitude of psychochemicals will be developed to produce sleep, paralysis, loss of sight, hearing or balance, persistent crying, diarrhea, vomiting, hallucinations, or senseless elation. None would be fatal; none would have any permanent effect.

These agents can be delivered as gases or dusts to be inhaled, or they can be introduced into the bloodstream by darts that puncture the skin. If wars must be fought, these are the weapons a humane nation should develop. If battles were fought with these weapons, we might even say that war was benign.

One can do some interesting speculation on how these agents could be used in the kind of struggles now shaping the world of the future. For example, a group of armed revolutionaries might charge the guard of a government palace. If the guards had only conventional weapons, they might have to kill their attackers. The deaths could spark a wave of emotional resentment that would topple the government.

But darts tipped with chemicals could reduce the attackers to uncoordinated elation. Instead of becoming martyred heroes, the attackers would appear to be disgusting drunks. The police could then sort out the ringleaders and take them off to prison. In a few hours everybody would be as chipper as ever, but not eager for another dose.

In the Vietnam fighting it is hard to tell a friend from a foe. Bombing would kill large numbers of innocent Vietnamese. Why not develop incapacittaing agents that would put everyone in the area to sleep? With protective clothing our own people could move about safely, even during an attack. Friends and foes could then be sorted out.

If really effective nonlethal weapons were available, it might even be possible to achieve agreement to ban the use of more horrible weapons.

None of these things can come to pass, however, without a mammoth expenditure of money and scientific effort. Our military men are aware of these possibilities. They are working desperately to get maximum progress from the money made available for work in this field. But the effort is small in comparison with the all-out drive we made to learn how to destroy civilization with atomic bombs.

Our program for developing chemical and biological weapons is woefully inadequate. Our legislators and military men fear the unreasoning emotional reaction of the public. Our emotional antagonism to the possibilities of modern science is threatening our future security and ruining the possibility of making war more humane.

We must stop being ignorant and emotional about war. We must become informed and tough minded. We must ask ourselves some difficult questions:

Why are we afraid or ashamed to match Russia in chemical and biological warfare capability? We have not hesitated to spend billions to acquire dominance in nuclear weapons, the most horrible mass killers of all. Why should we be afraid to move with equal boldness to acquire dominance with other mass killers that can determine national superiority in the future? What would happen if Russia and the rest of the world now agreed to total nuclear disarmament under adequate safeguards? As a humanitarian nation, could we refuse? Of course not. If this caught us in our present situation, which of the remaining military weapons would dominate? Chemical and biological weapons. Which would be the world's greatest power? Russia.

A Tribute to the Kiwanis International on the Occasion of Its 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call attention to the 50th anniversary of an organization beloved and revered by hundreds of thousands of Americans—the Kiwanis International.

Founded January 21, 1915, as a federation of business and professional men's

civic service clubs, the Kiwanis has stood forth over the years as a major contributor in the overall campaign for a better America.

The work of the Kiwanis in the interest of civic improvement includes activities in vital areas such as agriculture and conservation, boys' and girls' work, public and business affairs, support of churches in their spiritual aims, and vocational guidance.

A burgeoning membership of 262,000 is evidence enough that the Kiwanis International appeals to Americans in every walk of life. And the growth of two subsidiaries—the Key Club International and Circle K International, open respectively to high school boys and college men—reveals that youth, as well, is equally concerned for and dedicated to the grand, illustrious Kiwanis ideal.

On this occasion—the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Kiwanis International—I join with millions of Americans in a vote of confidence, a heartfelt salute, to a noble organization. Long may it flourish on this earth.

Lt. William H. Jessie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, early in January Detective Lt. William H. Jessie, a resident of Silver Spring, Md., and commanding officer of the Detective Bureau of the Rockville substation, lost his life in an attempt to apprehend the driver of a stolen car. The tragedy occurred when Lieutenant Jessie's patrol car crashed while in pursuit of a juvenile driver. The 17-year-old boy responsible for the loss of this good public servant was not a first-time offender. An editorial in the January 7 edition of the Maryland Monitor is a tribute to Lieutenant Jessie and a public appeal that steps be taken to better a situation which is spreading so much tragedy throughout the country.

Because of grave concern within the Congress over the nationwide problems of juvenile delinquency, I include the editorial here in the RECORD and call it to the attention of my colleagues:

LT. WILLIAM H. JESSIE

Detective Lt. William H. Jessie, a fine dedicated police officer and a good, all-around guy, last week gave his life in behalf of law and order in Montgomery County.

This newspaper regrets the tribute it now pays was not paid during his lifetime. He deserved it and more.

Lieutenant Jessie, 43, was a Silver Spring resident, and commanding officer of the detective bureau of the Rockville substation. In 1963, he was the county's "Policeman of the Year." Solution of an arson case, through which a public school suffered some $250,000 damage, brought him that coveted annual award by the Knights of Columbus.

He had served on the county police force only 10 years. Before his police career, he was a good Capital Transit busdriver. His rise to a top spot on the county force was spectacular in many respects. His promotion to lieutenant came only 2 years after making sergeant, one of the fastest jumps in detective bureau records. He was competent, able, and applauded by his superiors.

To newspaper people who cover the county police beat, Lieutenant Jessie was a bit more than these things. He was one of the good guys. He met you straight on and dealt from the shoulder. You didn't have to be told of his personal and professional dedication to his job nor of his impeccable integrity. It was there. You trusted him. "Trust" is a big word in newspapering lexicons.

He was a personable, friendly, courteous fellow—quietly generous to fellow officers in a spot. He recognized that newspaper people have a job to do and he helped them do it. He never beefed if the stories failed to glorify the police department when the facts were right. He never asked you to go easy unless the public welfare or fast solution of a case were involved.

His personality and reputation for fair dealing were important factors in his success as a police detective. They brought him information he needed to do his job. High, low, good, bad, law abiding, or offender, everyone had a good word—everyone liked the lieutenant.

Lieutenant Jessie, as head of the detective bureau, wasn't required to start that 20-mile, 90-miles-an-hour pursuit of a stolen car he spotted on Hungerford Drive at the county seat. There were other cruisers that could have taken up the chase. But he did. He was that kind of officer.

The fact that the pursuit ended by his car going out of control up near Hyattstown, crashing, and burning is nightmarish to contemplate. The further dramatic fact that following police officers were able to pull him from the wreck before the flames reached him is heroic. The further sad fact that he died some 4 hours later leaves Montgomery County without his services He was slated to go places. More important, it leaves his wife and daughter without a good and devoted husband and father.

It also leaves an important question to be answered. The 17-year-old youth who allegedly had stolen the car which Lieutenant Jessie pursued and who is being held, by order of the juvenile court, at the Wexter detention center in Laurel until decision is made on disposition of his case, is not a first-time juvenile offender.

A few hours before Jessie's death, he had appeared before Judge Noyes in connection with a speeding charge and was ordered to attend driving school, beginning January 9. Nor was the speeding charge a first offense. His record includes involvement in an accident while driving without a license. At that time, the court sent him to the Maryland Children's Center for Diagnostic Study where it was recommended that he be placed on probation and receive counseling.

Last September, in connection with another speeding charge, his driving privileges were restricted.

At the request of the boy's father, he now will undergo psychiatric study during temporary detention at Laurel. Fine.

The question that needs to be answered here and now, however, is how long the people of this county will tolerate the go soft approach of the juvenile court in dealing with second and more offenders who appear before it. Records of disposition of second and more offense cases are public property and speak outrageously loud of the failure of the policy to deal with, correct, or lower the appalling and increasing rate of serious crimes by those in juvenile court age bracket.

Remarks of Gov. Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho, Before National Press Club, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the voice of Idaho Gov. Robert E. Smylie has been an important one in the Republican Party during the days following the 1964 general election. As chairman of the Republican Governors' Conference, he has had much to say on the direction the Republican Party should take in the future.

The recent controversy over the Republican Party chairmanship served to bring Mr. Smylie to the forefront of the national scene. Although the controversy has now been resolved by the announced change in the position of national chairman, an upcoming party leadership conference has kept interest high. Thus, Governor Smylie's stop in Washington, D.C., this week to attend the inauguration on his way to the Chicago meeting, has attracted much interest.

Among his activities in the Nation's Capitol was an invitation to speak to the National Press Club on January 18, giving his views on the course of action the Republican Party should adopt to assure its success in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the text of Governor Smylie's remarks to the National Press Club:

REMARKS OF GOVERNOR ROBERT E. SMYLIE, OF IDAHO, AT A LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I confidently believe that the Republican Party is now locked in on a consolidation course which will be good for the party, good for everybody in it and good for the United States as well.

Instead of a costly and fraticidal bloodletting in Chicago there will be a transfusion, and this transfusion will start us on the road again.

With patience, with moderation and with restraint on all sides, the Republican Party can begin to move out of these weeks of political uncertainty and despair back toward its historic role as a major force in the political life of American society.

And it is vastly important to the future of freedom and individual human dignity in America that we do just that.

For the two-party system to exist, there must be two parties, broad enough in both philosophy and numbers to be capable of governing America.

In order to govern in America you have to win elections, and when a political party makes it impossible for large numbers of its candidates to win elections then the party has failed in its duty to the candidates, to itself and to the Nation. It may be all right for an individual candidates to decide that he would rather be right than win. As a matter of fact there is sometimes no other choice.

But the party does not have the luxury of that choice. If the party begins to be philosophically narrow and provincial then it will become peevish, petulant, and parochial—lose its appeal to the electorate and condemn itself to a perpetual minority status.

When that cycle has been completed it will soon lose even the capacity to be a minority and drift away toward the dustbin of history.

This is why simple commonsense dictates that we must now broaden our appeal as a party and attract all possible support. This is the only way in which that famous figure—26 million—can be turned into the still more famous figure of 36 million which is enough to win.

We have to talk to the Nation and not to ourselves—and the only way we can do this is to keep the windows and doors of this historic political home of ours open—open to the winds of change, open to everyone who agrees with the great broad principles of Republicanism that have served the party and the Nation well in campaigns from the courthouse to the White House for over a century now.

People on both sides of the recent controversy have to remember that there is no excuse for a political party that can't be of service to the people of the Republic.

We have to be able to contest successfully because the two-party system will not work in any other way.

There is no future for the party as a white supremacy party. We are dedicated as a nation, as a party, and as a people, to full participation by all citizens in the voting right.

As full voting rights are established throughout the Nation, and they will be, a party tinged with that label simply invites disaster.

The Republican Party must stand for decent provision for our aged and infirm citizens under a solvent and self-respecting system of social security.

The party must support legislation at all levels of government which provides opportunity for all citizens to realize their fullest potential and their aspirations regardless of race, creed, or color, in a manner consistent with the rights of others.

We must stand for decent legislation for the protection of the working people of the United States.

We must be strong at home and we must be leaders abroad. We must do our duty by Western civilization for the simple reason that history has made us, as a nation, the custodian of all the values that 2,000 years of history have distilled from civilization.

We must stand against the expansion of communism, and we must be committed to expansion of the opportunity for all the world's people to achieve freedom and dignity in a world without fear.

We must stand for the concept of responsible States as strong and working partners in a Federal Union because we believe that what must be done can best be done closest to home. We must make it clear that we do not reject Federal action when it is required, but that we do reject the notion that only the Federal Government is capable of solving America's problems.

We must promote the development of modern responsive State and local government techniques which are fundamental to the preservation and extension of individual liberty. The Democratic drive toward a cruishing national centralism will not be arrested by solely negative response. Republicans are, and must continue to be in the forefront in removing archaic restrictions which prevent effective local and State action.

We must be against monopoly in any form whether it be big government, big business, or big labor, and against the threatening combination of all three; we must stand with the forces of individual freedom and individual dignity and fight their battles for them.

These are but some of the guidelines that will lead us into the middle of the American road where the consensus that will create electoral majorities will be found.

This is a creed as old as the party, the bright historic thread that runs through the fabric of all of our victories—this is a creed that is essentially conservative, a creed that is prudently progressive, a creed that can continually evolve to meet the dynamism of an America that won't stand still—but that moves and perseveres and prospers.

But now to the mechanics of consolidation for victory in 1966 and in 1968.

The very fruitful suggestion put forward some days ago by Senator DIRKSEN and Congressman FORD should have the fullest study and examination by the national committee. It is entirely consistent with the proposals of the Governors and could well be the first real step toward implementation of some of those forward looking proposals.

We are implementing the Denver declaration.

By springtime the Washington office of the Republican Governors' Association will be open for business and we shall be giving attention to how to win State elections in 1965 and 1966.

We propose that our policy committee confer with the congressional and senatorial leadership with a view to implementing their suggestion and inviting their cooperation in working out an organizational structure that would provide for annual conferences of the party, including elected officials from all levels of government, leaders from the working party machinery and members of the academic and business community. Such conferences could very well provide a continuing review and revision of party policy in detail, and would provide room for one innovation that is now sadly lacking—a strong and viable avenue of communication and responsibility between the party and the leadership which the people have elected to represent the party in the conduct of the Government of the United States, at Federal, State, county and local levels.

We should try the first leadership conference. If it works it should become an annual affair.

These conferences would sharpen and restate our party policies and principles on a continuing and contempraneous basis and would develop positive Republican proposals for solving the problems of our States and of the Nation.

The consolidated consultations could then evolve the necessary procedures for strengthening the organizational structure of the party. For instance the national committee might well be enlarged to include representation from every level of elective office, and all of the organizations that represent the basic strengths of the party organizationally.

Such a procedure, if approved by the committee, and adopted for action, would create a body at the core of Republican activity nationally that was broadly enough based geographically to proclaim the consensus of party policy. This innovation could well be a historic breakthrough in the wall of anonymity that tends to surround a party out of power, and provide the framework on which a positive image could be placed before the people.

It is to be hoped that no one, nor any group, will attempt to dictate his own version of how all this should be done. The first conference could be deemed a success if it reached a broad consensus on basic ideas and then proclaimed the right of all Republicans to hold to varying points of view within that broad frame of reference.

The leadership conference should make it clear beyond doubt that ours is an all-inclusive party and that we not only tolerate, but encourage diversity of views, and that we have the statesmanship to accomplish unity out of diversity.

And we might proclaim too that new ideas are intellectual attempts to answer new problems. They are not suspect simply because they are new. Our honest conservatism is valid because it is relevant and worthwhile to the times in which we live. Our time-tested principles are not antiques. They are useful foundations upon which we can build real answers to the real problems of an America on the move.

These suggestions for implementing our new consolidation for victory can be achieved. As we have built a Federal Union out of the diverse economic, sociologic, and geographic facts of life in these United States, we can build once again a unity of Republican purpose and principle out of the diversity of viewpoints within the broad framework of our first principles.

Then we can stop using labels and start electing Republicans. We can act like a party which has valid hopes of becoming a majority party, and quit acting like a perpetual minority.

We can create a consolidated framework of party faith and machinery that will win elections and can govern America.

Working together—with patience, with moderation, and with restrain on all sides—we can keep alive the two-party system that has served America so well, and in doing so we will have kept faith with the Republican Party's historic commitment to individual freedom and dignity.

Talk About a Dollar Crisis Is Poppycock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Leslie Gould, financial editor of the New York Journal-American, which appeared in that paper on January 8, 1965.

Mr. Gould sees the dollar future in realistic terms.

One of the more positive steps that we can take to demonstrate our strength is to enact my bill H.R. 625, which would remove the 25-percent gold reserve requirement. This move, recommended by all responsible financial authorities, would forestall much of the talk about our not being willing or able to meet our obligations—a contention that, on the face of it, is in any case ridiculous.

Mr. Gould's article follows:

THAT U.S. DOLLAR CRISIS CAN BE "POPPYCOCK"

Talk about a dollar crisis to follow the British pound sterling crisis is poppycock.

That is the conclusion of Louis Stone of Hayden Stone, Inc., in this continuing discussion by him of the new "Battle of Britain."

Before going into this, Mr. Stone notes the drastic penalty involved in devaluation for a country, like Britain, that lives on foreign trade. A 15-percent cut in the foreign value of sterling means an automatic 15-percent increase in the cost of everything that Britain buys abroad. Additionally Britain loses, because what she sells will be at cut prices.

While it is too early to tell whether the pound sterling will hold or can be held at $2.79, Mr. Stone feels the uncertainty alone will continue to be an upsetting factor in world markets.

A $2.40 POUND?

No matter how strong the reasons for England's trade competitors to contribute to the support of the pound, Mr. Stone doubts that these will be forthcoming again if a real flight of capital develops. If and when it does, he thinks the Bank of England will be forced to stop supporting the pound, with the pound

gradually finding its own level in the free or "black market" until an official revaluation is set at the new market level—say $2.40.

If this chain of events develops, "as it may," Mr. Stone feels, then attention will shift to the U.S. dollar.

THE POUND VERSUS THE DOLLAR

There is a big difference in the relative positions of the dollar and the pound. The United States is running a $5½ billion trade surplus in contrast to Britain's $3 billion current deficit rate. Contending the U.S. gold stock of $15.6 billion is still high enough in relation to the $2 billion a year estimated current annual payments deficit, Mr. Stone says:

"The U.S. difficulties do not reflect an unhealthy trade position or an overpriced foreign value for the dollar in relation to domestic prices, as is the case with sterling. The difficulties arise from the burden of foreign aid and military spending on top of a $5½ billion annual outflow of capital for investment abroad.

"It seems clear that the $2 billion deficit rate is created by our strength rather than our weakness, contrary to the British position."

There is another difference—the nature of the claims against the dollar. England's immediate reserves of $2.3 billion equal only about one-fifth of estimated current liabilities to foreigners. Our $15.6 billion of gold compares with total short-term bank liabilities to foreigners of $27.4 billion, of which $17.3 billion is held by foreign central banks and the International Monetary Fund.

Out of the $27.4 billion total, according to Mr. Stone, only $7.7 billion is represented by demand deposits, of which $6.2 billion is in banking and institutional hands. The balance of $19.7 billion is in time deposits and short-term paper.

DOUBTS "RUN" ON U.S. GOLD

He is convinced that while there may be further gold losses, "there is no likelihood—one can almost say no possibility—of a 'run' on U.S. gold, because the claims are in responsible official hands that do not want a U.S. gold embargo, or a forced devaluation of the dollar. They want stability."

As a further point of strength in the U.S. picture, Mr. Stone notes the tremendous total of claims by the United States on foreign assets. The banking system alone holds $6.8 billion of short-term claims on foreigners liquid and callable at least to the extent of 50 percent. On top of this are short-term claims of $2.4 billion of nonfinancial concerns outside the banking system against short-term liabilities of only $624 million.

In addition there is the direct investment abroad by U.S. private capital estimated by the Federal Reserve at $66 billion. While not liquid or callable, it provides a flow of interest and profit that exceeds the $2 billion payments deficit rate.

UNITED STATES DEALING FROM STRENGTH

Mr. Stone sums up:

"In theory, one might say that if all our gold were called from us tomorrow we could turn around and call it right back the next day. In practice, any serious threat to the U.S. gold position can be countered as it develops by more restrictive measures on the U.S. private capital outflow, on military spending, and on foreign aid.

"Because of our immensely favorable balance of trade and services, we are dealing from strength in the international game, not from weakness; it seems to us that most of the thought about a dollar crisis to follow the sterling crisis is poppycock."

Waldemar Alfred Paul John

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, while we often honor the giants of industry whose technical brilliance made possible mass production, the great men with the vision to create the markets for the mechanical marvels are too often overlooked.

Last October, shortly after the 88th Congress became history, one of these great men, Waldemar Alfred Paul John—better known as W.A.P. John—died at the age of 69.

As did many others, I counted him as a friend and adviser whose uncommonly perceptive commonsense will be long remembered.

The son of a minister, Mr. John was born in New Albany, Ind. He graduated from the University of Michigan with a bachelor of arts degree in 1916, married Hildegarde Hagerman, and in 1917 left his first job in the advertising department of the Dodge Motor Co. to serve with the AEF in France.

After the war, he wrote for advertising firms in Cleveland and Detroit. In the midst of the depression in 1934, he and another young copywriter, the late Jim Adams, founded John-Adams, Inc., which shortly thereafter merged with MacManus, Inc., the company of another pioneer in the automotive advertising field, T. F. MacManus.

Legend has it that when the general manager of Pontiac Motors asked Mr. John what would be the first thing he would do if he received that firm's account, his reply was, "Well, sir, I think I'd go get a drink."

Mr. John received the account, and today MacManus, John & Adams does $70 million worth of business yearly for 90 firms.

In 1936, Mr. John became president of the young agency. A few years later, he suffered a massive heart attack, conquered it and told how in a Saturday Evening Post article entitled, "I Have a Scar on My Heart." Magazine executives have said it has been reprinted more than any other Post article.

In 1955, Mr. John retired as chairman of the board, but maintained his office in the agency's Bloomfield Hills headquarters.

The present president of MacManus, John & Adams, Mr. Ernest A. Jones, who first met Mr. John while a student at the University of Michigan, said:

Over the years, his affection and the depth and warmth of his wisdom was an unfailing source of encouragement not only to me but to the many other young men to whom he opened both his heart and the doors of his business. I am afraid we shall not soon see his like again.

Professionally, he was a living legend in the advertising world, particularly in the automotive area of the business. He was known, respected, and even loved by company presidents and dealers alike not only for his intensely human qualities but for his unique skills which helped the industry attain its present position.

It will be a long time, indeed, before the world sees another man with the qualities of courage, ambition, compassion, and talent which W.A.P. John carried so well through life.

Why Columbus Day Should Be a National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill H.R. 1754 making Columbus Day a legal holiday. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an essay written by Dianne Prost of the eighth grade of St. Cornelius School, Chicago. The contest was sponsored by the Knights of Columbus, Holy Cross Council No. 3980.

The essay follows:

WHY COLUMBUS DAY SHOULD BE A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Considering Christopher Columbus' great accomplishments, we should honor his memory by dedicating a national holiday to him.

From a humble beginning in Genoa, Italy, around 1446, Columbus became one of history's heroes. We know little about his childhood except that his good Catholic parents brought him up in the faith. Ships docking at Genoa fascinated young Columbus, and he was often found talking to the sailors. Though his father was a woolweaver, Columbus preferred a more adventurous life. He learned chartmaking and became an expert navigator. Because his study of the sea convinced Columbus that the world was round, his ambition was to be the first man to reach the Orient by sailing west.

After seeking assistance from Genoa, England, Portugal, and France, Columbus finally obtained it from Spain. His problems continued, however. Most sailors were afraid to go far from the coastline. But eventually Columbus gathered a crew of about 100. On August 3, 1492, after hearing mass and receiving communion, Columbus began the historic voyage.

For months Columbus' three small vessels sailed. The men begged to turn back, but Columbus never despaired. On October 12, 1492, land was sighted. Named San Salvador by Columbus, it was an island in the group now called the West Indies.

Columbus never knew he had discovered America. He believed he had reached India, though puzzled by the lack of riches.

After being falsely accused of brutality, Columbus was brought back in chains from his third voyage. Although acquitted, to the day of his death in 1506, he was deprived of recognition of his greatness.

Columbus possessed courage and determination. He was devout, and undoubtedly

prayer played a large part in his undertakings. He named his discovery in honor of Christ and landed with a crucifix in his hands.

We owe a great debt to Columbus. He braved the dangers of unknown seas to reach the Orient, but discovered a new world instead. The Spanish people did not appreciate Columbus; they rejected him because he failed to bring them power and glory.

Heroic Americans such as Lincoln and Washington are honored with national holidays. It is only just that the United States should so honor Christopher Columbus, America's earliest hero.

A Tribute to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, although Veterans Day 1964 occurred last November, the words spoken in commemoration of the occasion in Brunswick, Md., by Wilbur L. Vansant, Jr., commander, Department of Maryland, the American Legion, were so meaningful to all Americans, I include them here in the RECORD. If every American would put into practice the four resolutions Commander Vansant proposed in this speech our American heritage would certainly be greatly enhanced for future generations.

Veterans Day has an added significance in 1964 for not only veterans but for all Americans. This year marks the 50th anniversary of the beginning of World War I and the 25th anniversary of the start of World War II.

Not only did these two wars give us cause for the special day we now observe, but anniversaries are milestones in man's relentless march through time and history. And milestones—whether for tragic or happy events—seen always to merit some special attention.

Such milestones in any other situation probably would merit references to them as golden and silver anniversaries. But words so suggestive of lightness and gaiety are not in line with the horror—the carnage—and the destruction—that marked the two worst wars to scourge mankind.

Let us note one fact significantly in relation to Veterans Day in the United States. In the finest American tradition, the observance is not associated with the beginning of a war or wars. It is—and this is noteworthy—a day associated with the ending of war.

It is also a day filled with the expression of hope that some day man will learn to solve his differences without resorting to war.

War which is so terrible in our time that even the winner becomes a loser.

Veterans Day, we agree, is a day noble in purpose. But it is a national holiday of fairly recent duration. It holds this status largely through the efforts of the American Legion.

Legionnaires honored the memory of their World War I comrades each anniversary of that armistice signed on the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month. But it was not until 20 years after World War I, in 1938, that they succeeded in having Congress declare Armistice Day a national holiday. Then after World War II and the Korean war, Congress redesignated the date Veterans Day to honor not only the new heroes but those of all the Nation's wars.

As we look back on this Veterans Day over history's long path to 25 and 50 years ago, we are aware that the two world conflicts were events that set the stage for our Nation's emergence as the greatest world power. Our rise came as other nations tumbled from former greatness.

Our world role carries greater responsibility than that ever before passed to a nation and to a people. Our responsibility comes at a time in history of the greatest peril to ourselves and our freedom.

Never has so much been at stake for men—for freedom. The exercise of our power is a demanding role. In fact, it is awesome. No nation ever before has been required to be so judicious in its actions at home and abroad.

We entered both World Wars with great reluctance and without ambition for personal gain. Our only objectives were to preserve the ideals that we hold sacred as a nation and to maintain justice in our world.

While the wars vanquished despots, others—feeding on war's misery—rose to that end after World War II, we found the each case dangerously powerful to us as a nation and to us as a part of the free world. To the peace and liberty of man everywhere.

Even after two terrible world conflicts, history's chapters devoted to war did not halt. Much as we wished and worked toward that end after World War II, we found the bloody chapters were still with us.

New despotism, cloaked in a false ideology and in conflict with peace and freedom, was met in Korea. And that land whose history is so filled with tragedy became a bloody battleground between the forces of freedom and those who would enslave all men's minds, hearts, and souls. With South Korea, United States forces bore the brunt of this war against the Communists.

Now in the twilight zone between a troubled peace and an undeclared war, we again encounter this despotism of strange ideology in the jungles of Vietnam.

Even at this moment our servicemen fight in these outposts of freedom. And they die lonely deaths in these outposts so barren of all things that have the happy, familiar air of home and native land.

But our servicemen fight there backing up this Nation's belief that the destruction or threatened destruction of freedom anywhere endangers our own.

They fight in this distant land because we also believe that there must some day be peace and justice among men. But that peace, however, must be peace with honor—with justice—with liberty for all men.

Above all, it must be a peace in which men everywhere will live—as God intended them to live—in freedom and dignity. Not in slavery of either mind or body. It must be a peace that will not compromise the spirit of freedom.

So on this Veterans Day the two anniversaries of so seemingly distant conflicts become poignant reminders that the battle for freedom is long and hard fought. Those who would live in freedom must be prepared to pay a hard price in the sacrifices of human and material treasures.

This is the credo that our veterans have established and maintained in eight major wars, from the Revolution onward, which tested our Nation and her fighting men.

Veterans Day is a grateful Nation's tribute to the qualities that come to the forefront in our people when the survival of our Nation or her ideals are at stake.

Courage, loyalty, and personal sacrifice—all strengthened by a devotion to freedom—are these qualities. And they have been a part of the spirit of our American service men and women—from every walk of life—who have marched to our Nation's defense in time of national peril.

Veterans Day honors this spirit. It honors those who died in their Nation's wars and the others who served in them—all the Nation's wars.

But let our tribute to them on this Veterans Day, 1964, be not empty of meaning. Let it instead ring with full meaning. Let it be meaningful for those who sacrificed—meaningful to the country they loved and served so well—meaningful to our country now and in the future.

Together, let us make these resolves:

First, that the quality of our citizenship and patriotism shall not be called the product of a materialistic and selfish age in which our responses were only second best toward our Nation's greatness.

Second, that in our daily lives and actions—and by example as citizens—that we shall inspire our youth to ask what there is great that they can do for their country to keep it great.

As always, there will be much that needs to be done. The challenge for greatness is with every generation.

Third, that we be ever alert that our Nation and ourselves be prepared for all potential enemies within and without this great Nation. For it cannot be disputed that the best assurance of peace and liberty is to be strong and well prepared. Despots do not pick on strength, but on weakness.

Fourth, that we be ever vigilent and alert as citizens so our leaders will be of the highest quality devoted to the spirit and principles of America—that they will have the imagination and spirit to guide America to further greatness—that they will stand up for the rights of America and the free world, that they will work for peace, in the best tradition of America, that the peace they seek will be one with honor, that it will be peace with strength.

By these resolutions, by these actions, we will on this and Veterans Days to come be able to say that we kept the faith, that our heros did not die in vain—that we guarded, that we preserved, our great heritage for generations yet unborn.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Gen. Thomas J. "Stonewall" Jackson Was Born 141 Years Ago in Clarksburg, W. Va., a Community Which Continues To Thrive and Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 22, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a century ago this country had just endured a bloody conflict. We had proven, not the prowess of an army, but had tested our Nation's ability to withstand sectional strife and to continue as a republic and a democracy.

For the past 5 years we have been paying tribute to the men and battles of the War Between the States. We are not proud that our land was once divided, but we can recognize and honor with distinction those men and events which helped shape the history of the United States.

One such man was born in Clarksburg, W. Va., 141 years ago, January 21, 1824. An inspiration to me since my youth, Thomas Jonathan Jackson was destined to become world renowned as a military strategist. Nicknamed "Stonewall," his personality and character have been subjected to much diversity of opinion by historians and writers.

Lenoir Chambers, a biographer of Jackson, said of him:

> He could make a political speech. He had been elected to the board of directors of the oldest bank in Rockbridge County, and there he sat with half a dozen of the town's best known and most respected businessmen. Obviously some people thought the major was more than "Fool Tom Jackson" * * * was at home with politicians, knew their values and their ways, and understood with them the fine art of the possible.
>
> It would never do to try to write General Jackson down as a bench philosopher only—not this man of action, not this personification of the aggressive spirit, not this general on the move who made time his ally and surprise and deception his aids, not this creator—rather than follower—of precedent.

When the Lee-Jackson memorial window of the National Cathedral in Washington, D.C., was dedicated, the Reverend Thomas V. Barrett described General Jackson thusly:

> Ungainly * * * down one side all military regulations. A man made fun of by cadets, stiff, graceless, and disreputably clothed, a twice-a-Sunday churchgoer without humor or wit. An unpopular teacher at Virginia Military Institute, showing no sign of greatness to a peacetime people. Once called in to see the superintendent of the institute, Jackson was told to sit down and wait for a few moments while the superintendent went outside to attend to some matter. Jackson sat. The superintendent became engrossed and forgot the officer waiting in his office until very late that night. The next morning Jackson was still sitting in the office where the superintendent had left him. He had received no orders to change position.

Allen Tate said of Jackson:

> Short of conflict, Jackson well might have lived his life a thorough, uninspired, eccentric teacher of philosophy and artillery tactics. Yet in the surge and thrust of battle his eccentricities turn into virtues. His stubborn, literal thoroughness becomes the foundation of a disciplined army; his narrow goals still narrower, and, for the occasion, right—the pursuit of victory. In peace socially uncommunicative—in war a man who kept his counsel and the secret of his military plan. And all his ambitious devotion to his profession, his stern desire to do the will of God, grown with the start of conflict into a fanatic and hardfisted energy which spares neither friend, nor foe, nor self, and issues in the order "Press on * * * press on * * * close up the ranks."

"Stonewall" Jackson was held in such high esteem as a master of warfare that on his untimely death at Chancellorsville, May 1, 1863, he was eulogized editorially in the Daily Chronicle of Washington, D.C., by John Forney:

> He has one great and overmastering trait of character—a fanatical enthusiasm which overleaped all obstacles and sharpened prematurely the other qualities of his mind. "Stonewall" Jackson was a great general, a brave soldier, a noble Christian, and a pure man.

Less than 2 months after his death, West Virginia was admitted to the Union as the 35th State. We can only speculate as to the role Jackson might have played in forming the early policies and decisions of the Mountain State. But from his own maxims we can draw guidance for creative living in the troubled world of today: "You may be whatever you resolve to be," and "never take counsel of your fears."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a chronology of events in the life of Gen. T. J. "Stonewall" Jackson and a sketch of his birthplace, Clarksburg, W. Va., be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the chronology was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LT. GEN. THOMAS JONATHAN "STONEWALL" JACKSON, CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA

In the First Battle of Manassas (Bull Run), on July 21, 1861, General Jackson first attracted the attention of the world. His first brigade gallantly held off the enemy against repeated charges, and Gen. Barnard E. Bee in rallying his men exclaimed: "See, there stands Jackson like a stone wall." He thus applied the name better known around the world than the Christian name given at birth.

An impressive equestrian statue of "Stonewall" Jackson dedicated May 10, 1953, is located on the plaza of the Harrison County Court House directly across the street from the Stonewall Jackson Hotel.

A bronze plaque appears on the site of his birthplace, at 324-328 West Main Street, here in Clarksburg, W. Va.

January 21, 1824, Thomas Jonathan "Stonewall" Jackson, lieutenant general, Confederate States of America, born in Clarksburg, W. Va.

June 18, 1842, appointed to the West Point Military Academy. Admitted July 1, 1842.

July 1, 1846, graduated from West Point with brevet rank of second lieutenant of artillery. During the Mexican War, he rose to the brevet rank of major for heroic conduct at Chapultepec.

August 13, 1851, reported as professor of artillery tactics and natural philosophy at Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va.

February 22, 1852, formally resigned from U.S. Army.

August 4, 1853, married Eleanor Junkin, daughter of Rev. Dr. George Junkin, president of Washington College in Virginia.

In 1856 "Stonewall" toured Europe.

July 16, 1857, married Mary Anna Morrison, daughter of Rev. Dr. Robert H. Morrison, president of Davidson College in North Carolina.

In 1859 took company of cadets from V.M.I. to Harpers Ferry and to the execution of John Brown at Charles Town, W. Va.

April 27, 1861, appointed colonel of Virginia Volunteers.

July 3, 1861, commissioned brigadier general. October 7, advanced to rank of major general.

October 11, 1862, advanced to rank of lieutenant general.

Between April 29, 1861, and May 1, 1863, "Stonewall" distinguished himself as one of the greatest military strategists that ever lived. No force was too great for his abilities. Two of his most famous maxims substantiate this: "You may be whatever you resolve to be" and "never take counsel of your fears." General Jackson was a complete master of the art of war. He used his two great elements, initiative and surprise, in unsurpassed applications. Swift and sure of attack, dogged and determined in defense, undismayed by adverse odds, he was the ideal battlefield commander.

One of the finest tributes to "Stonewall" Jackson was sent in a telegram by the great general of World War II, Douglas MacArthur at the unveiling of the bronze bust of "Stonewall" in the Hall of Fame at New York University, May 19, 1957: "Perhaps the most prized message I ever received came from the famous historian, Douglas Southall Freeman, who wrote me at the close of my campaigns in the Southwest Pacific area of World War II: 'The mantle of Robert E. Lee and "Stonewall" Jackson has now fallen on your shoulders.' "

May 1, 1863, "Stonewall" led the Army corps around Hooker's flank at the battle of Chancellorsville, routing the right wing of the Federal Army. He was wounded and died at Chandler's, near Guinea Station, on May 10, and is buried at Lexington, Va.

(Selected and compiled by S. J. "Stonewall Jackson" Birshtein, Clarksburg, W. Va.)

IN THE GREAT STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Clarksburg, W. Va., is one of the oldest cities west of the Alleghenies, being settled in 1765 and incorporated by the Virginia General Assembly in 1785.

Historically, Clarksburg enjoys a rich heritage which began with the movement of

early American frontiersmen to the West in 1764. The settlement was named in honor of George Rogers Clark, a noted general of the Indian and Revolutionary Wars.

Gen. Thomas Jonathan ("Stonewall") Jackson, one of the greatest military geniuses that America has ever produced, was born in Clarksburg, January 21, 1824, in a three-room brick cottage on the north side of Main Street, between Third and Fourth Streets. In 1856 the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad built into Clarksburg and extended westward. This railroad played an important part in the War Between the States and Clarksburg became a depot center for Union troops. Old trenches are still to be found within the city limits.

The Honorable John W. Davis, Ambassador to Great Britain and nominee for President of the United States in 1924, and other numerous notables who have made and are making history for the Nation were born and reared in Clarksburg.

Today, Clarksburg has a council-city manager form of government established under a model charter which was adopted by the people in 1957. For this action and other citizen activities, Clarksburg was named an "All-America City" by Look magazine and the National Municipal League.

Clarksburg is indeed rich in historical heritage. It is richer still in potentialities for growth, expansion, and progress. In a manner of speaking, the city stands today on the threshold of greatness.

Clarksburg is located on the main line of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad 275 miles west of Washington and 276 miles east of Cincinnati. It is at the junction of U.S. Highway 50 which extends from Washington to San Francisco and the north-south U.S. Highway 19 from Erie to St. Petersburg. Clarksburg is served by the growing Benedum Airport located 6½ miles east of the city.

Because of its unlimited quantities of coal, oil, natural gas, and electric power, Harrison County, of which Clarksburg is the hub and county seat, has become the most important manufacturing and natural resource center in central West Virginia. Its principal products are: Graphitized carbon electrodes, zinc, caskets, evaporated milk, women's lingerie, window glass, signal lenses, glass balls and marbles, glass tumbers and other glassware, bent and convex glass, heavy chinaware, brick and tile, bituminous coal and natural gas.

Clarksburg is the center of one of the State's large coal-, oil-, and gas-producing fields. At the present time Harrison County has 15 natural gas-and oil-producing companies employing more than 2,300 people and furnishing enormous quantities of natural gas, petroleum, and gasoline to industries.

Clarksburg's trading area comprises 13 counties in central West Virginia, covering a total of 6,153 square miles. The population of this area, according to the last census was over 343,000. As a result, the city has over 800 retail, wholesale, and service establishments with sales amounting to $400 million.

The water supply of Clarksburg is taken from the West Fork of the Monongahela River. The catchment area above the city, including the tributary of Elk Creek, is 507 square miles. The Clarksburg water supply is not excelled by any system in any other city of comparable size in the country.

The schools of Clarksburg are a part of the Harrison County school system. In the county there are 11 high schools, 10 junior high schools, and more than 60 elementary schools, with 620 teachers comprising the teaching staff. Most of these teachers hold bachelor degrees from approved colleges and more than a third of them have master's degrees. Every high school in the county is approved by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Clarksburg can justly boast of being an outstanding medical center, not only in West Virginia, but in any city of comparable size in the Nation. At present there are three hospitals in the city with 530 beds. St. Mary's, Union Protestant, and Veterans' Administration.

Clarksburg has 5 parks and 12 playgrounds, totaling over 160 acres. River Bend Park has a new pavillion, amphitheater, pitch and putt 6 hole golf course, charcoal, and wood ovens, picnic areas, and ball diamonds. Norwood Park contains ball diamonds, lighted multipurpose court, picnic area, playground, and horseshoe pits. There is a magnificient view of the city from the Civil War trenches in Lowndes Hill Park.

It can be readily seen that this city has much to offer and with such an array of essential assets, there can be little doubt that there is a glowing future in store for the community.

Dirksen Promotes New GOP Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 22, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News on Saturday, January 16, entitled "DIRKSEN Promotes New GOP Unity," may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This editorial concerns the great service that our minority leader has rendered to our country, and the responsibility that he has borne.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIRKSEN PROMOTES NEW GOP UNITY

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—Almost against its will, the Republican Party is being slowly reunited by a congressional wing that is willing to let others have the joy of imagemaking while it holds all the reins and actually runs all the show.

Senate Republican Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois bestrides the old GOP elephant with an elegant skill that can be fully appreciated only by his admiring opposite numbers among the Democratic pros.

In a bit of wheeling and dealing of rare acuteness, DIRKSEN, in association with House Party Leader GERALD FORD and certain backroom types, has largely closed the great crevices of division that had been left by the spectacular November defeat of the ticket headed by Barry Goldwater.

To be sure, Goldwaterites and anti-Goldwaterites have not yet been brought into what could be called real palship. But DIRKSEN has got them talking to each other through a wonderfully grave new device to be called the Republican coordinating committee on which shortly they are all to be serving together.

This instrumentality is handed to the party by DIRKSEN with a solemnity that is both a triumph of dead-pan humor and a striking instance of the subtlety of Senate-type politics at its best. For the coordinating committee is to be important-sounding enough to please everybody, big enough to embrace every view—and diffuse enough so that no part of it will ever be able to encroach one inch upon the real power center of the party. This, of course, is to be occupied exclusively by the congressional leadership.

The coordinating committee is to have 11 congressional members, plus 5 Republican Governors, plus all 5 of the living former Republican presidential nominees: Alf Landon, of Kansas, Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, and Barry M. Goldwater.

DIRKSEN thus finesses Goldwater into this organization in such a way that his detractors can hardly object to his presence without seeming vindictive beyond words. At the same time, scope is given to the anti-Goldwater people by the provision for the five governors; the Conference of Republican Governors has been the principal avenue of attack upon Goldwater's continued titular leadership of the party.

DIRKSEN's plan, therefore, makes certain the maintenance of a power balance within the committee so precisely weighted and poised that no faction can do any great harm to any other. This will take most of the heat out of the Goldwater issue. Everybody on the committee will be free to make statements on every possible occasion; nobody will have anything to do with writing the real Republican record. That will be done in Congress.

So it is that DIRKSEN and FORD and unsung allies—Senator THRUSTON MORTON, of Kentucky, Representatives MEL LAIRD, of Wisconsin, and BOB WILSON, of California, and the deposed GOP House leader CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana—have thrown some handsomely packaged tranquilizers to the angry Republican troops outside Congress. By the time these fellows find out what is not inside the package, tempers will have cooled and there will be less inclination to dwell on the horrid past.

Moon Country: Bend, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 22, 1965

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Bend, located in Oregon's beautiful Cascade Mountains, is playing a major role in our Nation's exploration of space and plans for a moon landing.

The magnificent and strange volcanic lava beds near Bend duplicate conditions believed to exist on the moon. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been conducting extensive tests with our Nation's astronauts in Oregon's moon country.

The nationally circulated Family Week magazine for November 29 contained an excellent article on America's moon country. The article, entitled "America's Little-Known Lunar Lab," was written by Hal Higdon.

I am hopeful that Oregon's role in lunar testing will continue to grow. More tests will certainly be run near Bend.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, which appeared in the Family Weekly magazine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard]

AMERICA'S LITTLE KNOWN LUNAR LAB

(By Hal Higdon)

Less than a month after America's Ranger 7 had broadcast the most detailed pictures ever recorded, Astronaut Walter Cunningham donned a bulky, white space suit and, with scientists monitoring his every step, strode across what perhaps is the earth's closest approximation of the face of the moon.

Cunningham's simulated moon journey late last August didn't occur behind guarded fences in Houston's new manned space center. Nor was it in some inaccessible wilderness.

He "walked on the moon" near the town of Bend, Oreg., in the heart of what is known as the moon country. There, strange volcanic formations, grotesque lava beds, and ankle-deep volcanic ash are comparable to what scientists expect to find someday on the moon.

"No one can stand up and swear what the moon will be like," Cunningham admitted shortly after he and scientists from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) finished a week's tests in three different areas of the moon country of central Oregon. "The surfaces here just represent three possible surfaces we might encounter on the moon."

The primary purpose of the Oregon tests, Cunningham said, was "to determine capabilities to perform on lunar-related terrain." Under security guard, NASA geologists laid out trails over the lava fields, then stood by with stopwatches to see how long Cunningham took to cover the distance. While his time didn't break any Olympic records, he performed well—especially for a man weighted down with an 80-pound air-conditioned moon suit.

Before Cunningham's trek across the lava fields, most lunar tests were made at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston. There a special indoor "moon room" provided lighting conditions similar to those in space. NASA also built what it calls a "lunar surface simulation area." In an outdoor area approximately the size of a football field, it tried to duplicate the moon surface, using volcanic material and slag to simulate moon craters.

Other research was done at Langley Field in Virginia, where NASA erected a harness device that supports five-sixths of a person's weight. Strapped into the harness, potential moon explorers leaped, jumped, and walked sideways on walls, experiencing only one-sixth gravity—which is the gravity pull on the moon.

Despite laboratory attempts to copy the moon surface, the best moon-testing area may still prove to be the volcanic fields of central Oregon. For example, there is Crater Lake National Park, which was formed eons ago after a cataclysmic explosion splattered the area with a layer of coarse and sand-colored pumice dust. Many scientists expect the moon to be covered with a similar layer of dust, maybe so deep that a spaceship would sink into it. If so, Oregon's pumice fields, which are often 15 to 20 feet deep, may show NASA exactly what to expect on the moon.

NASA also is conducting lunar surface tests in this area to explore an astronaut's ability to hike in a heavy space suit across the rough, spiny basaltic lava and sharp obsidian lava, or volcanic glass. The tests have been encouraging. Although Cunningham scrambled over loose lava and steep rock inclines with 31° pitches, he fell only once during his week of tests.

"More than likely we won't find conditions as rough on the moon," explained geologist Curt Mason. "If we did, the astronaut probably could avoid them."

Although NASA scientists decline to comment on future lunar surface tests, they probably will need to return to central Oregon. Future tests may explore these problems:

Lava tubes, or caves, exist in the Oregon moon country. One is a full-mile long. If similar caves exist on the moon—and many scientists believe they do—they could provide shelter for future moon colonies.

Water will be expensive to transport to the moon. Volcanic rock, at least here on earth, contains up to 2 percent water. Although it will not be easy, moon rock might be made to yield some liquid content.

Apart from testing man's lunar mobility, future lava-field tests may involve vehicles capable of traversing the moon's surface, instruments capable of measuring it, and perhaps even a prototype lunar spaceship.

But before the first spaceship touches down on the moon's surface, perhaps in 1969 or 1970, much more information must be gathered. NASA scientists already have selected a general region for the first moon landing. They are now making more detailed studies of specific areas within that region.

In 1966 space scientists expect to land a vehicle on the moon that will transmit signals after arrival. A television camera peering in all directions may then tell scientists whether the surface of the moon resembles central Oregon's moon country—or, instead, is unlike anything on earth.

The Spiritual Dimensions of Leadership

SPEECH

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the truth shines forth to us as a light in a world of darkness—giving us the courage and faith to travel through the perilous pathways of life.

In his sermon to the President on Inauguration Day at National City Christian Church, Dr. Billy Graham spelled out clearly the spiritual dimensions of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Graham brings home the overwhelming truth that only with the help of God can our Nation find peace, purpose and courage and continue to endure as a free nation.

Dr. Graham's sermon was inspiring, and I believe it only proper that Americans everywhere—as well as everyone else—be given an opportunity to hear his words.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include his sermon:

THE SPIRITUAL DIMENSIONS OF LEADERSHIP

(By Billy Graham)

On that day more than a year ago when the torch of leadership was transferred, I happened to be with a long-time friend of President Johnson's, and we went immediately to a quiet place to ask God to sustain him for the immense responsibilities which were thrust so suddenly upon him. That afternoon, when he was placing his hand on the Bible and being sworn in to the high office of President of the United States, we read together a passage of Holy Scripture. It was the prayer of King Solomon upon his ascension to the throne of Israel after the death of his father, King David.

Today, at high noon, as he takes that oath again and become President in his own right, I can still think of no finer prayer to begin with than that one (2 Chronicles 1: 7–12): "In that night did God appear to Solomon, and said unto him, ask what I shall give thee."

And King Solomon prayed, "Give me now wisdom and knowledge, that I may come in and go out before this people."

"And God said to Solomon, Because this was in thine heart, and thou hast not asked riches, wealth, or honor, nor the life of thine enemies * * * but hast asked wisdom and knowledge for thyself, that thou mayest judge my people, over whom I have made thee king:

"Wisdom and knowledge is granted unto thee; and I will give thee riches, and wealth, and honor, such as none of the kings have had that have been before thee."

Last February President Johnson said, "No man can live where I live now, nor work at the desk where I work now, without needing and without seeking the strength and support of earnest and frequent prayer." Humbled by the magnitude of the responsibilities of a high office, a man begins to probe the erratic swirl of events for a prophetic understanding of history; and when he is a spiritually sensitive man he will feel as Lincoln did—that he is a "humble instrument in the hands of Almighty God."

During the next 4 years many of you here today will have to make decisions of state, perhaps greater than those of any of your predecessors. You will hold in your hands the destiny not only of America, but of the world. You will lead the richest and the most powerful nation the world has ever known. It is a nation which has been abundantly endowed with material blessings, but it is also a nation in danger of losing its moral moorings and its spiritual perspective. Christ, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom, once said, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul" (Mark 8: 36). This applies to nations as well as to individuals, for a nation that loses its spiritual courage will grow old before its time. Even if we gain all our material and social objectives, and lose our souls, it would be disastrous. Winston Churchill once said, "Man's destiny is not measured in material computations."

There is a spiritual dimension to leadership which this administration has already recognized. Theodore Roosevelt once said, "The White House is a bully pulpit." So it is. From this city you are already leading the Nation to new heights of social justice and economic prosperity. You have also the opportunity to lead the Nation to its greatest moral and spiritual heights. Jesus Christ said, "Unto whom much is given, of him shall much be required." Those who have the greatest power always need the greatest guidance.

No government rules except by the will of God. You are leaders, not only as a result of the greatest mandate the American people have ever given, but there is a mandate higher than the ballot box. You have responsibilities not only to all the people of America and to the peoples of the world, but you have also a great responsibility to the God of our fathers.

Even to the most casual observer, it is apparent that there is a growing spiritual vacuum in our Nation. Our wealth and our prosperity are in danger of making us complacent and careless in the matters of the spirit. Jesus said, "Man shall not live by bread alone." Many nations have tried it, and failed. Germany declared a neutrality in matters of religion during the thirties. That neutrality created a spiritual vacuum, and the first robust philosophy to come along filled that vacuum with a vengeance. And that, in my judgment, is how we got nazism, and the hell of World War II. The Bible says, "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

In foreign affairs, we are faced with overwhelming problems, from southeast Asia to the Congo. In domestic affairs, we are faced with an alarming crime rate, a moral crisis, and many individual psychological problems which fill our hospitals. These problems will become more intense and more demanding during the next 4 years.

There seems to be no permanent solution to our problems. We try this scheme and that, but we find that each one is only a stopgap measure. Could it be that we have failed to diagnose properly the ills of the world? Could General MacArthur have been right when he said, 20 years ago, "The problem, basically, is theological * * * there must be a revival of the spirit, if we are to save the flesh?"

I know the leaders of this administration, especially the President and Vice President, well enough to know that they believe he was right—and that our problems are basically spiritual and that they require a spiritual solution. That spiritual solution was outlined by God to King Solomon long ago, when he said,

"If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land" (2 Chronicles 7: 14).

To approach the problems of the next 4 years in a spirit of prayer and humble dependence upon God would bring a freshness of vision and purpose that could capture the imagination of the world.

During the next 4 years, there will be moments of discouragement, despondency, and even disillusionment. There may come times when some of you will feel like Woodrow Wilson did when the Senate voted against the ratification of Wilson's proposal for the League of Nations. The news was telephoned to the White House. "I feel like going to bed and staying there," Wilson said. He could not sleep that night, and he turned to Dr. Grayson about 3 o'clock in the morning, and said, "doctor, the devil is a busy man."

Later in the morning, he had Grayson read St. Paul's consoling words from Second Corinthians, "We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed." Turning to Grayson, President Wilson said, "Doctor, if I were not a Christian, I think I should go mad, but my faith in God holds me to the belief that He is, in some way, working out His own plans, in spite of human mistakes."

Centuries ago Moses stood before the people of Israel and said, "When thou art in tribulation, and all these things are come upon thee * * * if thou turn to the Lord, thy God, and shall be obedient unto His voice. * * * He will not forsake thee * * * nor forget the covenants of thy father, which He sware unto them."

In the midst of the bloody Civil War, Abraham Lincoln read his Bible regularly. He memorized passages from its pages. He used the Word of God to help him make decisions and solve problems. In matters of right and wrong, the God of the Bible was Lincoln's final court of appeals. The overwhelming problems of his day drove him to the Scriptures and to his knees in prayer. Out of this humble dependence on God came the preservation of the Union.

History throbs with crisis, but the Gospel is that God is for man, and that, in the greatest crisis this world has ever known—when Jesus Christ went to the cross—God transformed that tragedy into triumph and wrought redemption for those who trust in Him.

Mr. President, on the wall of your office at the White House, I have seen a framed yellowed letter. It was written to your great-grandfather Baines more than 100 years ago, and it bears the bold—almost defiant—signature of Sam Houston.

Your great-grandfather led Gen. Sam Houston to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ. This conversion transformed that troubled, rough hero of San Jacinto into a man of peace, happiness, and purpose. As Marquis James put it in his book "The Raven":

"The long quest for spiritual repose ended when Houston knelt before the altar and asked to be received into the church, and on the 19th of November 1858, the convert waded into the chilly waters of Rocky Creek, and was baptized. A church publication at that time said, 'The announcement of General Houston's conversion has excited wonder and surprise of many who have supposed that he was past praying for.' "

At the time, somebody said to Sam Houston, "Well, general, I hear all your sins were washed away." "I hope so," Sam Houston replied, "but if they were all washed away, the Lord help the fish down below."

On the day Sam Houston was baptized, he offered to pay half the minister's salary in the church. When someone asked him about it, he said, "My pocketbook was baptized, too."

This newness of spiritual life that the President's great-grandfather Baines helped introduce to Gen. Sam Houston is the same transforming faith we need in our Nation today if we are to meet successfully our rendezvous with destiny. That letter, written by a heroic Texan, to the great-grandfather of our President, is heartening evidence of a sense of moral direction. The letter itself is important, but the fact that the President chose to hang it in his office is also important. It is a shining symbol that from the very apex of Government, there is a spiritual emphasis in our national affairs.

Symbolically, it says that Lyndon Baines Johnson has respect for the "old faith" that has guided his family, his State, and his nation, through generations.

On this solemn occasion, as a great nation goes forward under its newly chosen leaders, I find great comfort for the future, symbolized by a yellowed scrap of paper on a White House wall.

Nearly 12,000 Children Aided by Portland Shriners Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 22, 1965

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding acts of mercy and human kindness is that performed by the Shriners, the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, in building and operating hospitals for crippled children. The Portland Shriners Hospital for Crippled Children was opened in 1924 and some 12,000 children have received help and loving care in Portland alone. The Shriners have also operated hospitals for crippled children throughout the country. Now the Shriners are turning to an additional medical problem, treatment and research in the field of burns, especially for children.

A notable address was delivered in Portland by George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N.J., past imperial potentate of the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, before the members of the Al Kader Temple, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Portland Shriners Hospital for Crippled Children. Mr. Stringfellow has had a notable career in the business world, and has performed many effective endeavors. He was an associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, and retired in 1959 as vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries. He has been active in the American Cancer Society and many other outstanding humanitarian endeavors.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Stringfellow's remarks of November 16, 1964, delivered in Portland, Oreg., together with an article entitled "Nearly 12,000 Children Aided by 40-Year-Old Portland Shriners Hospital," from the Portland Oregonian of November 17, 1964.

There being no objection, the address and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUL OF THE SHRINE

(Address by George E. Stringfellow, past imperial potentate, AAONMS, and former business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, before the members of Al Kader Temple, Portland, Oreg., on the occasion of the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Portland unit of the Shriners Hospital for Crippled Children, on November 16, 1964)

I am delighted to join with you in the observance of the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Portland unit of the Shriners Hospital for Crippled Children and am complimented by your invitation to address myself to Freemasonry, the Shrine, the Shriners Hospital for Crippled Children, and the Burns project.

FREEMASONRY

The importance of Freemasonry to the world, and to the Anglo-Saxon nations in particular, is manifest in part by the space allotted to it in major encyclopedias. These chronicles, however, tend to be more concerned with our history than with the principles of Freemasonry, in which we believe, and which in a measure guide our lives.

Freemasons played an important part in establishing our way of life. For example, a majority of those who signed the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States were Freemasons. The men who dumped the tea in Boston Harbor were mostly Freemasons.

In referring to Freemasonry, Gen. George Washington said, "The lessons I learned on my admission to Freemasonry were of encouragement in later years when I encountered * * * severe trials, especially those of the commencement and during the Revolution. There is no doubt in my mind," continued the Father of our Country, "that Freemasonry and its lessons were helpful throughout the Revolution, both on the battlefield and in the legislative assembly."

The lessons Washington and his associates learned in our fraternity doubtless helped to hold together that little band of patriots at Valley Forge, which made us a free people.

HERITAGE

Our Masonic forefathers built on this continent a civilization which for prestige, wealth, and power has no equal in the annals of history. It was divine guidance that gave them faith and courage to push forward the frontiers of world commerce and thus increase the living standards of all peoples. On the 100th anniversary of the founding of our Government, someone asked James Russell Lowell, "How long will our form of

government endure?" The great poet, statesman, and philosopher replied, "Only so long as the spirit and the philosophy of those who conceived and built it continues to be dominant in each succeeding generation."

It is our duty, therefore, as Freemasons, as Shriners, and as citizens to promote that spirit and that philosophy and thus be worthy of our great heritage.

HIRAM ABIF

We Freemasons are inspired by the example of the intellectual integrity and earnestness of purpose of our exemplar, one of the world's greatest leaders, whose father died when he was a boy and whose mother remarried.

His stepfather a highly skilled workman, gave him his vocational training. His mother, who came from one of the best families of her time, gave him his religious training and his moral and ethical code of life.

Historians tell us his contemporaries considered him an exemplary citizen. He possessed great vision, he dreamed of castles in the air and had the ability to make them realities on the surface. His mastery of mathematics and engineering enabled him to handle the technical problems of his profession with great skill.

History reveals that he employed, effectively, over 200,000 workmen on the world's greatest construction job. While we Freemasons respect his brilliance, executive ability, and his leadership, it is his integrity and his perseverance that we admire most.

There is little to be found about this wise man in the pages of secular history. It is in the Bible and the annals of Freemasonry that his name is prominently recorded. I quote from Scripture: "This inspired master was, without question, the most skilled * * * workman who ever lived, whose qualities were not confined to building. They extended to all kinds of work."

We Freemasons have walked in his footsteps. We are impressed by his steadfastness, unto death. We have gone with him, to the grave.

He was the renowned architect of King Solomon's Temple—he was Hiram Abif—"The Widow's Son."

THE SHRINE

Almost 100 years ago, a distinguished American actor and an eminent American physician presented to 11 other Freemasons a proposal for the formation of a new fraternal order. It was enthusiastically received and unanimously approved. Thus was born the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine.

As most of you know, membership in Freemasonry is a prerequisite for membership in the Shrine and that, more than any other one thing has, in my opinion, helped to make the Shrine a great organization.

Starting with 13 members and 1 temple, our membership has grown to more than three-quarters of a million. Today we have 167 temples located in Canada, Canal Zone, Mexico, and the United States.

Oregon was admitted to statehood in 1859. Thirty years later, your own Al Kader Temple was 48th of the 167 temples to be chartered. It is currently 29th in membership.

No other temple, in my opinion, commands greater respect of the citizens of its community of wields greater influence in molding the policies of our fraternity, than Al Kader. Your temple has enjoyed top-flight leadership over a long period of years and that is especially true this year.

Our fraternity has, since its inception, been a humanizing force. It adds years to our lives and life to our living.

The Shrine is sometimes referred to (in jest) as an old man's organization. However, I submit that youth is not a time of life—it is a state of mind. One is as old as his despair and as young as his faith. Men grow old by deserting their ideals. Years wrinkle the skin by compromising principles wrinkles the brain and sours the soul. Shriners strive to emulate St. Paul who, crying that the days were evil, labored to improve them.

Shriners, therefore, cherish no jealousies and entertain no hatred for their fellow man. Shriners' code of conduct is "Pleasure without intemperance, hospitality without rudeness, and jollity without coarseness."

SHRINERS HOSPITALS

To Freemasons in general, and Shriners in particular, charity is a desirable trait. Ever since the advent of Freemasonry into the New World, the lodges have practiced charity without ostentation and, more often than not, in complete secrecy.

Almost from its beginning, Shriners have practiced charity of some kind. From the example of the first Christmas basket, delivered by members of Mecca Temple to some unnamed and now unknown family in New York, back in the eighties, the idea spread. Eventually every temple of the Srhine had helped, wherever, whenever, and however it could.

Therefore the idea of Shrine charity was not unknown in 1919 when Freeland Kendrick became imperial potentate. However, many unsuccessful attempts had been made to develop a goal for the Shrine beyond the "pursuit of pleasure."

It was Freeland Kendrick who, 44 years ago, brought the project of the Shriners hospitals for crippled children to the floor of the imperial council here in your beautiful city. Like any new idea, it was kicked around until Forest Adair, of Atlanta, Ga., made his moving "Bubbles" speech, from which I quote excerpts: "I was lying in bed yesterday morning, about 4 o'clock, in the Mutnomah Hotel, and some good fellow had strayed away from the rest of the band and, a magnificient performer on his baritone horn, stood under the window for 25 minutes, playing 'I'm Forever Blowing Bubbles,' and after a while * * * when I dropped back into peaceful sleep, I dreamed of a crippled children's hospital—a hospital run by the Scottish Rite in Atlanta, Ga., and I thought of the wandering Shrine minstrel of the early morning and I wondered if there was not a significance, for Shriners, in the tune he was playing, 'I'm Forever Blowing Bubbles'."

The hush in the auditorium deepened. There could be no doubt, that Adair was delivering an inspiring message; a message that was to become known wherever Shriners gather, as the "Bubbles" speech.

Following that speech, Kendrick's resolution creating the Shriners hospitals was passed. The following year Shriners agreed to build one or more hospitals.

Subsequent to the 1921 meeting, 17 Shriners hospitals have been built, equipped and staffed. They are located in Canada, Mexico, and the United States.

There has been spent more than $103 million to operate these hospitals—140,000 inpatient children and 10,000 outpatient children have been helped.

Capital expenditures for these hospitals and committeed to be spent on the burns project is in excess of $39,500,000.

On January 15, 1924, the Portland unit was opened. The capital expenditures to date for this unit is $1,797,000. The operating cost to September 30, 1964, is $6,945,000—11,790 crippled children have either been completely cured or materially helped in your unit, without cost to their parents or guardians. Yours is an enviable record and I hasten to extend to you my sincere congratulations.

BURNS PROJECT

With Allah's blessing, Shriners are now embarked on a new course of treatment and research in the field of burns. We appropriated $10 million in 1962 to get the program underway.

Medical science knows little about burns or how to treat them. We have been told by medical doctors from the Army, Navy, and Air Force that there is no field of medicine in such dire need of help.

Our objective is to determine the best methods of treating burns in three burn centers. The first center is now under construction in connection with the University of Texas Medical Center. But even before our new building is erected, we are operating beds in the Seeley Hospital, adjacent to our new structure.

Ground has been broken for the second burns center adjacent to the University of Cincinnati Medical Center.

Ground will be broken in the spring for the third Burns Center, adjacent to Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School.

As in our hospitals for crippled children we will treat burn cases without cost. We will do full-scale research on the burns problem. We will develop medical and nursing teams to carry the knowledge we have gained to the other centers of medical learning.

Love of little children turned Shriners into ministers of healing. The red fez thus takes its place, with the Red Cross, as an emblem of mercy and of loving kindness. Our hospitals have been identified as "temples of mercy." In the words of one of our leading citizens, crippled children's work gave the Shrine its soul.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Nov. 17, 1964]

NEARLY 12,000 CHILDREN AIDED BY 40-YEAR-OLD PORTLAND SHRINERS HOSPITAL

"Crippled children's work gave the Shrine its soul," George E. Stringfellow, East Orange, N.J., told members of the Masonic order Monday night at a meeting observing the 40th anniversary of the Shriners Hospital for Crippled Children, in Portland.

"Love of little children turns Shriners into ministers of healing," he said.

"Thus, the red fez takes its place as an emblem of mercy and of loving kindness."

It was in 1920 when the Ancient Arabic of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine met in convention in Portland. Before the delegates, the Imperial Potentate Freeland Kendrick proposed the hospital idea as a goal for the shrine beyond the "pursuit of pleasure."

SEVENTEEN HOSPITALS BUILT

Later, at the same convention, Forest Adair provided the inspirational kickoff which has since sent thousands of football players throughout the land into action to provide the wherewithal so that these crippled children could become normal.

Through all these efforts, 17 Shriners hospitals have been built, equipped, and staffed. More than $103 million has been raised in their support. More than 140,000 children have been completely cured or materially helped.

On January 15, 1924, the Portland unit was opened. Operating costs have totaled $6,945,000 and 11,790 crippled children have occupied its 80 beds. A waiting list of more than 200 exists.

Stringfellow, who is a past imperial potentate, said a new aim of Shriners is a project passed on by Army, Navy, and Air Force doctors.

TOP PEOPLE ATTRACTED

"Our new venture, costing initially $10 million, is a program of treatment and research in the field of burns, especially burned children. The ballcarrying for crippled children is being picked up by others, although we will not diminish our efforts in that area.

"We hope to do for burned children what we have done for crippled youngsters," he added.

R. Earl Riley, former Portland mayor and now chairman of the Shriners hospital board, said in an interview Monday that one of the major reasons for the success of Shriners hospitals is the $500,000 record and communication system whereby the record of every child ever treated in any Shriners hospital is instantly available through IBM equipment to any doctor in any other hospital.

"Formal research programs are carried out in orthopedic surgery and the spirit and will for a good cause," said Stringfellow, make the solutions obvious. "Such programs attract the top people in the healing profession."

Miss S. Dorothy Andrew, hospital administrator, said each child's "will to be normal is a great help to the staff in getting them well. And each sees the progress of others."

Railroads May Be Our Salvation When Autos Strangle Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Nashua Telegraph has written a perceptive editorial on the railroad passenger crisis in the Northeast, which I offer here for the RECORD. There is no doubt that it would be disastrous to allow railroad passenger service to wither away. One point comes to mind, not touched on by the Telegraph and that is the vital importance of railroads to the national defense. No other means of transportation can do the job of moving troops and supplies so well as railroads. Thus, for both economic and military reasons, it is important that we, at all levels of government, do everything to insure preservation and improvement of adequate rail service in all parts of the Nation.

The editorial follows:

RAILROADS MAY BE OUR SALVATION WHEN AUTOS STRANGLE HIGHWAYS

After reading the story of New Hampshire railroad history in the Telegraph the other day, it is hard to believe tha the Nashua area is now almost bereft of passenger train service.

Only one train a day clickety-clacks its way from Boston to Concord and return, leaving the matter of public transportation to buses and airlines.

The personal automobile has helped put the skids under a mode of transportation that 25 years ago was the backbone of our transportation system. The same automobile, increasing by a couple of millions annually, may be a victim of its own growth in another 25 years. With traffic flow being strangled by decreasing highway space and congestion in the cities the use of automobiles may have to be regulated.

In such event railroad passenger service, if we have the wisdom now to preserve it, will be able to speed commuter trips in safe, comfortable equipment, over existing roadbeds that take up only one quarter of the width of a modern highway. This could be the answer to the problem of getting around between urban areas in the future.

Can we in New Hampshire see that far ahead? Washington is starting to see the light. The President has revealed a plan which would set up high-speed railroad runs between urban centers with early attention being given to the Boston to Washington run.

New Hampshire's loss is magnified a hundredfold by the mess confronting the commuters to the south of us, but the MBTA, with a subsidy, at least is keeping numerous railroad commuter trains running north to Wilmington, Mass., with Lowell now deliberating whether or not it will make the move to come under the same arrangement.

Plans have also been discussed to run high-speed transit authority trains over existing railroad roadbeds in Massachusetts, and this may be the answer when the subsidies to the railroads run out. Have we considered this sort of service for New Hampshire?

Curtailment or loss of passenger service will prove to be a great handicap to this State, and the realization ought to concern our chambers of commerce and our political leaders to the extent that a thorough study of transportation be made, to deal with the problem on a regional basis, for the problem is a regional one.

New Hampshire certainly can't afford to be known among summer visitors and the business world as the State where the trains don't run, or hardly run at all. The profitable freight business will continue to take trains over the trackage, but that doesn't help the commuter, the shopper, the student, and the tourist who will ride the trains in increasing numbers as congestion grows on the highways and in the cities.

This newspaper isn't quite ready to admit that the days of railroad passenger service are through for New Hampshire. Washington seems now to realize that the railroads provide an indispensable transportation need, some leaders there being perceptive enough to see that we are strangling ourselves with our rocketing production of automobiles and demands on a highway system that some day will be hard pressed to give them all room to safely operate.

Nashuans should be able to foresee the day when they can take a short ride from home to a spacious parking lot near a bright, new station on the outskirts of the city and board a high-speed regional commuter train for Boston, free of the care of driving into that congested metropolis.

We will see this, if the New Hampshire Legislature, heeding the voices of those who see the problem in the light of the growing future, will make a study of transportation that will tie us in with the rest of New England.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

"South Bend: 1 Year After Studebaker Closed"—An Article by Jerry Dale in UAW Solidarity, January 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago last month the Studebaker Corp. in South Bend, Ind., closed its gates and more than 7,000 workers were suddenly jobless. In number, this group represented about 8 percent of the area's total work force. In age, they averaged 54 years.

The initial shock to the community was intense but was quietly and quickly replaced by the positive and cooperative actions of many individuals and groups. An Interdepartmental Committee was set up immediately at the direction of President Johnson in response to a request from the Indiana congressional delegation. Labor and industry joined with local, State, and Federal officials to begin effective and corrective efforts.

Although there are still too many unemployed workers in South Bend, remarkable progress has been made during the past 13 months.

Both the United Automobile Workers, AFL–CIO, international union and Studebaker Local No. 5, UAW–AFL–CIO, contributed significantly to the South Bend comeback. An excellent account of their efforts and of other events that occurred since the shutdown is contained in an article by Jerry Dale entitled "South Bend: 1 Year After Studebaker Closed," which appeared in the January 1965 issue of UAW Solidarity.

The article follows:

SOUTH BEND: 1 YEAR AFTER STUDEBAKER CLOSED

(By Jerry Dale of the Solidarity staff)

December is not the most pleasant time of year in South Bend, Ind., and this December day was typical: cold, the sky gray, the streets lined by white banks put there by the snowplows.

The stores downtown were decorated for Christmas. Holiday shoppers scurried in and out of the stores. Here and there a store advertised a "going out of business" sale.

Suburban shopping centers were doing a brisk business. Two of the city's fancier restaurants were crowded with diners and "office Christmas parties."

The city's only daily paper, the South Bend Tribune, carried front page headlines about NATO and Dean Burch, but nowhere in that publication was there even a hint that this day was different from any other day in the life of the city.

But it was.

This was the first anniversary of the announcement by the Studebaker Corp. that it was ending car and truck production in South Bend.

One man who remembered the date only too well was Woodrow A. Frick, president of UAW local 5 and a Studebaker worker with 23 years of seniority. His local, which at one time represented more than 16,000 workers in the days when Studebaker was a major auto producer, still had more than 7,000 dues-paying members when the ax fell, a year ago.

He lives with other people's problems every day.

What progress has been made in South Bend's year in crisis Frick credits to cooperation between labor, industry, the Federal Government, and the city.

The U.S. Department of Labor, for example, has poured thousands of dollars into the city in an effort to get people retrained in new skills and placed in new jobs.

The Government's Manpower Development and Training Center here, located in an empty Studebaker plant, is one of the largest in the country and is currently training 560 unemployed workers, most of them ex-Studebaker employees. They take such diverse courses as auto body repair, operating a screw machine, mechanical drafting, shoe repair, machine shop inspection, refrigeration mechanics, upholstering, furnace repair, typewriter repair, and nursing, to mention just a few.

The Manpower Development Training Act trainees receive $42 a week while in training, provided they have a family to support.

About 130 of the 560 trainees are getting a basic education course from the Manpower Development Training Act to qualify them for the trade courses. These are people with little or no formal education who need to be trained in reading, writing, and arithmetic.

When the current class "graduates," the Manpower Development Training Act center will train another class of 600.

The most encouraging statistic to come out of the South Bend Manpower Development Training Act Center is that 70 percent of those who have completed training so far have found jobs.

Another local project sponsored by the Federal Government which has worked wonders is Project Able—for ability based on long experience. This project is designed for workers 50 years of age and older and provides counseling and job development and procurement.

"Project Able is a local Torch Drive agency financed by the U.S. Labor Department," explained Lester Fox, associate director of the project and a former vice president of local No. 5.

"We have trained counselors who will classify applicants by skills, background, health, and other factors. They will help them write job résumés and aid them in finding jobs.

"They also help applicants, with their personal problems, such as unemployment compensation and pension benefits and social security, getting surplus food for them, helping them with insurance matters, or problems with loan companies.

"Since last April, we have counseled almost 4,000 unemployed older workers," Fox said.

A blackboard in Fox's office tells the story of Project Able: of 3,974 workers counseled, 703 have retired, 57 have died, 98 have moved out of town, 264 are still working for Studebaker, 117 are in Manpower Development Training Act training to learn new skills, 1,689 have been placed in new jobs, 109 are temporarily ill or disabled, 126 are planning to retire, and only 811 are in the current active file and still need to be placed.

"Our biggest problem is with the totally unskilled and the 'functional illiterates'," Fox explained, "but our motto is: 'We accept no limitations.'

"I resent those who take political potshots at what they call 'big government.' This project demonstrates that the Federal Government cares about people. It has given our older workers the only hope they have."

Aside from the Manpower Development and Training Act, Project Able, and on-the-job training, the Federal Government has tried to help South Bend and its people in many other ways, including the placement of defense contracts with local firms, encouragement for companies to locate in South Bend, and the temporary lifting of restrictions on the distribution of Government surplus food.

Fox praised the "real interest" demonstrated by Indiana's two Democratic U.S. Senators, VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH, and South Bend's Democratic Congressman, Representative JOHN BRADEMAS.

Perhaps the first to act after the shutdown was announced was the UAW Region 3 Director Ray Berndt, himself a former president of local 5, contacted Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz and asked for a special Federal task force "to come to the immediate assistance of this stricken community."

And the Government did just that.

Another group which pitched in to bring the city back on its feet was the special mayor's committee, formed a year ago, with representatives from industry, labor and business.

This committee is headed by Franklin Schurz, editor of the South Bend Tribune, and Paul D. Gilbert, head of Gilbert's, a large men's clothing store here.

Members of this committee made numerous trips to Washington for talks with U.S. Commerce Department officials and the Indiana Senators. They also talked to heads of companies about locating in South Bend. Some did.

"I think South Bend will be all right now," Gilbert said the other day. "I think we're close to being over the hump. Now if we could only get one more large plant that would employ 2,000 to 4,000 people * * *."

It takes a special kind of courage to smile in the face of adversity. You can find it in abundance in South Bend, Ind.

This industrial city of 135,000 is full of people who have refused to give up. Hit hard by the loss of Studebaker car production exactly a year ago, it is trying to make an economic comeback.

With substantial help from the Federal Government, labor and industry, South Bend has made more progress than anyone thought possible a year ago—but a great deal remains to be done.

What has been happennig here during the past 12 months can best be told through the people most deeply involved—people like Jerry Taelman, who found another job although he is 59 years old. And people like Louis Kenna, a skilled 48-year-old Studebaker worker who is still looking for work.

Kenna and his family live in a well-kept, mortgage-free eight-room frame home in a nice neighborhood. He went to work at Studebaker in 1938 and was working as a

mechanic on the repair line when his layoff notice came on January 10, 1964, a month after the corporation had announced it would cease making cars and trucks in South Bend.

Aside from some odd jobs lasting a few hours or a few days, Louis Kenna has not worked since.

At Studebaker, he received about $85 a week in take-home pay for a 40-hour week. For the past year, he has had to support his family on $36 a week unemployment compensation benefits. What savings he had were used up during this period.

Now he is faced with an even starker reality: his unemployment compensation benefits are about to run out.

His family-at-home includes his wife, Mary, and two daughters, Kathy, 14, and Marlene, 9. (Two older sons are married and away from home.)

How does one take care of a family of four on $36 a week?

"It hasn't been easy for us," says Mrs. Kenna. "It takes about $25 a week just to take care of the house—fuel, utilities, maintenance, taxes, insurance, things like that. You have to keep a roof over your head.

"That leaves us $11 a week for food and everything else. We skimp on everything. We buy only the cheapest foods. If it weren't for the surplus food we get from the Federal Government once a month, we wouldn't be able to get by.

I've had to learn to cook differently, too. I cook the way they used to during the depression, to make the most of the surplus food we get—and we eat all the leftovers, too."

"I still have the car," says Kenna, "but I use it mainly for job hunting. I can't afford to run it for anything else.

"We turn off all the lights except for the room we're sitting in. There's no money to buy clothes; we haven't bought any in a year. There's no money for recreation or entertainment.

His voice trails off, then:

"We keep our fingers crossed that nobody gets sick because we've had to give up our Blue Cross a long time ago.

"Fortunately, I have some shotgun shells left. I can go hunting for rabbit and quail. That way, we get a little meat on the table besides the rolled beef and canned meats we get from the Government."

Kenna has been everywhere looking for work.

"I have job applications in all over the place," he says, "In town and out. I've applied at Ford in Chicago, at Allis-Chalmers in LaPorte, at Wheelabrator, Oliver and Cummins Engine here, just to mention a few. I've talked to new car dealers and service stations and just about everyone else. But the reply is always the same: 'You're too old,' they say.

"They insist on physical exams, too, and they expect somebody my age to look and feel like a kid 20.

"I realize it isn't just me, of course. My brother's in the same boat, and so are a lot of other laid-off Studebaker workers."

By his own admission, his prospects for a job in the near future are not bright. Nor does he know what will happen when his unemployment benefits run out, as they will shortly.

Yet he and his family remain cheerful.

"It doesn't help to cry, does it?" asks Mrs. Kenna, philosophically.

Fortunately, other ex-Studebaker workers—even older ones—have had better luck than Louis Kenna.

Jerry Taelman was very depressed a year ago when Solidarity talked to him. He had just found out that (1) he was laid off from Studebaker where he had worked for 23 years; and (2) he would not be eligible for a pension because there wasn't enough in the fund to take care of all the older workers.

At age 58, life looked bleak indeed.

"Who'll hire a man my age?" he kept asking.

Well, somebody did. After being without work for about 3 months, he was hired by the Kaiser Jeep Corp., which came into town and took over the former Studebaker aviation plant, one of the newer buildings in the old Studebaker complex.

Kaiser Jeep, a Toledo, Ohio, firm, assembles army trucks here.

Taelman, who had been a press operator at Studebaker, now operates a forklift truck for Kaiser. He's been doing it since last March and likes it.

"I don't make as much money as I did when I worked at Studebaker," he says, "but I'm not complaining. At my age, I was lucky to find any kind of job. Besides, the fringe benefits are good and this is a good company to work for."

He should know. He's the shop chairman of the Kaiser unit of local No. 5.

"We negotiated a pretty good contract here," says Taelman, who used to be a member of the bargaining committee at Studebaker, "and we don't have too many grievances."

Taelman is by no means the oldest Studebaker workers," says Charles Wolfram, manager of industrial relations for the Kaiser plant and himself an ex-Studebaker man. "We hired quite a few of the older ones, too, and they worked out fine."

Taelman is by no means the oldest Studebaker worker to be reemployed. There's the case of Joe Szucsits, age 62, who had worked for 31 years as an inspector in the Studebaker stamping plant until he was laid off in April 1964.

He started drawing his social security pension and unemployment insurance, and never expected to go back to work. Yet he did, last month, doing the same job in the same plant, now being run by Allied Products, which stamps parts for American Motors, Studebaker of Canada, the Big Three and other firms.

Allied has also negotiated a contract with local No. 5 and has hired mostly former Studebaker workers. The pay scale is lower than Studebaker's, but neither the local nor the workers are complaining.

In fact, Local No. 5 President Woodrow A. Frick has high praise for firms like Allied Products and Kaiser Jeep.

"They have hired as many of our Studebaker people as they could, and will hire more if their business expands," he says. "They do not disqualify a man simply because he is over 40. And they negotiated contracts with us that our people can live with. They have cooperated with the union all the way. We can't ask for more than that."

That age need not be a barrier is also proved by the work force at the Studebaker parts warehouse here, one of the few operations of that corporation which remained in South Bend.

According to E. J. Challinor, Studebaker vice president and general manager of the depot, 50 percent of his employees are 60 years old or older, and "they're as fine a group of workers as you could find anywhere," he says.

Somewhere between the unlucky Kennas and the lucky Taelmans are those who are now Manpower Development Training Act trainees, learning a new skill while getting a Federal Government subsidy of $42 a week (for a family man).

These men and women feel they are doing something useful, though they have no absolute guarantee they will have a job waiting for them when they finish training.

How earnest are the trainees?

"I'm real proud of my students. They really want to learn, and they're doing good work," says 60-year-old Russell Humphrey, one of the Manpower Development Training Act instructors who is himself a former Studebaker tool and die welder with 32 years of seniority.

Humphrey teaches a welding class. He feels a special responsibility toward his students, most of whom are his union brothers.

"I was laid off a year ago but had no trouble finding another job," he told Solidarity. "I went to work at Fisher Body No. 21 in Detroit and liked it very much. But when I was offered a job as an instructor here, I decided to come back to South Bend. I can do more good here."

Peter Radanovich, age 44, with 17 years' seniority at Studebaker, is one of the more than 500 Manpower Development Training Act trainees. He's learning auto body repair work and glad of it. He's hip, politically also.

"If it weren't for President Kennedy and President Johnson, I wouldn't be here today," he said. "We would never have had this Manpower Development Training Act program if they hadn't pushed it. And I wouldn't be getting this chance to learn a trade."

An unskilled worker at Studebaker, he was laid off a year ago and was unable to find work. He supports an aged mother.

Trainee C. J. Bellakobich had 28 years' seniority at Studebaker when he was laid off last March. He is 55.

"I applied all over for a job—but no luck," he said. "So I started this Manpower Development Training Act training last June, learning the upholstery trade. I hope it leads to something."

That's what everybody here says. They hope all these efforts by the Government, by the UAW, by the city, by industry and business will lead to a better South Bend.

A South Bend in which you will again see workers carrying lunchpails, hear plants whistling shift changes and get caught in early morning and late afternoon traffic jams—all the symbols of men and women going to and from work.

Closing of Veterans' Administration Hospitals and Regional Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe all Members of Congress are well aware of the unwarranted and arbitrary closing of 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries as announced recently by the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

As a Representative from the State of New York which includes 2¼ million veterans and their dependents, I have urged that present plans for closing and consolidating these facilities be delayed until a thorough study can be made by the proper congressional committees to determine the advisability of curtailing these needed services. I believe the closing of these veteran hospitals and regional offices cannot help but impose an undue hardship on those who can least afford any further hardship or distress.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement

by Lincoln S. Tamraz, national commander of the AMVETS, concerning the closing of these veteran facilities. While there appears to be some difficulty in placing the real responsibility for the decision behind the announced closings, the President must assume full responsibility for the actions of his administration; and he is one person who can reverse this decision.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY LINCOLN S. TAMRAZ, CHICAGO, ILL., NATIONAL COMMANDER AMVETS, ON CLOSINGS OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS AND REGIONAL OFFICES, JANUARY 19, 1965

WASHINGTON, D.C.—AMVETS strongly recommends that the order closing 11 hospitals, 16 regional offices, and 4 domiciliaries issued by the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration on January 13, 1965, be held in abeyance until the President and other responsible officials have the opportunity to review and appraise their relationship, place, and contribution to the objectives of the President's program for the Great Society.

It has always been the conviction of Amvets that the Veterans' Administration should be the one-stop agency for all matters relating to veterans and their care.

The statement by President Johnson on January 16, 1965, from Texas confirms Amvets position; when asked with regards to these closings, "Do you see any reassessment of these closings coming up or do you have any plans along that line?" The President replied, "That decision has been made by the Veterans' Administrator. That is a matter for him. He is a career employee. That is not something that I am passing on from day to day. On these individual locations."

It is very apparent that in the present situation, considerable difficulty exists in placing the real responsibility for the decision behind the announced closings.

Interested Members of Congress have placed the responsibility upon the President. He has stated that the responsibility rests with the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. In one of his last appearances, the former Administrator, Mr. John S. Gleason, Jr., before a House Finance Committee hearing fiscal year 1966 budget, there was every indication that the authority of the Administrator to make VA policies were being usurped by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and his staff, who are neither specially experienced in veterans needs or programs and are not primarily answerable for their administration to America's veterans.

If there is an overriding responsibility for the closings, the authority that dictated them should be brought out in the open.

We believe that only shortsighted considerations of possible immediate savings dictated the orders to close. The many other conditions of service to veterans and the short- and long-range additional costs to other State and Federal agencies were apparently ignored.

It appears that the only purpose really being served by the order to close is to allow the Bureau of the Budget to centralize, automate, and depersonalize control at the expense of the agency bearing the responsibility given to it by the law and the will of Congress and the vast majority of Americans—the Veterans' Administration.

We listened to the President's state of the Union message for some word of the role of the veteran in the Great Society—we listened in vain.

If the aims and purposes of the great ideals are to be realized, it cannot be done without the support of veterans, nor should it be in any way accomplished at their expense.

Our veterans and their dependents comprise over 50 million Americans. It is unfortunately true that many of them, particularly the survivors of earlier wars and their dependents are on the bottom rung of the ladder, financially, socially, and physically.

The announced and possibly yet to be announced closings, and the elimination of services and facilities to the veterans and their dependents can only be to the detriment of the aims and projections stated by the President "to raise our people into the Great Society" in his message to Congress.

The relatively insignificant so-called savings of $23,500,000 in the fiscal year 1966 at the expense of the many services in so many widely separated places will make no real contribution to the President's social programs which are projected in billions of dollars annually.

The loss to the States, communities, and to the veterans will be immediate and irreparable. The creation and establishment of many of these facilities were years in the making. They will not be easily replaced.

The great evil of our present day is the depersonalization of almost every human activity. Some of this is unavoidable. It is no less deplorable for this reason. The removal of consolidation of existing facilities which will force our veterans to rely upon mail-order service can only be a step backward.

Computers and machine programers simply cannot replace the warm, human, and sympathetic service given by experienced dedicated people who have served the Veterans' Administration and the veteran.

There is no substitute for face to face relationship in the kind of human problems faced by our veterans and dependents in the vast accumulation of laws and regulations, instructions and forms confronting those seeking benefits to which they are entitled.

We are particularly concerned to see veterans programs in any aspect, equated with social, welfare or charity programs, administrated by any other agency than the Veterans' Administration.

Coordination of Federal Policy and Economic Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harvey H. Segal, financial writer for the Washington Post, has written a most penetrating and incisive analysis of the economy as it performed in 1964. In this article he raises the question of whether or not the impressive performance of 1964 can be sustained in 1965.

Mr. Segal states that if there were proper coordination of Federal policies and programs it would be possible to lay the all-important groundwork needed to achieve sustaining economic growth in our economy.

The article indicates, as I have pointed out many times, that Federal Reserve policies must be geared to the economic objectives of the administration or else a most vital element in the economic picture will be lacking.

I commend these comments to all Members of the House of Representatives, and, therefore, under unanimous consent, I submit this analysis to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

ECONOMIC FRONT: GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT'S 1964 RISE IMPRESSIVE

(By Harvey H. Segal)

With the latest releases of information on employment and production, the statistical history of 1964 is all but written. The important question is whether the lesson that it holds for economic policy has been properly understood and assimilated.

In the fourth quarter, the gross national product—estimated at a seasonally adjusted annual rate—reached the level of $633.5 billion. For the year as a whole the gross national product was $622.3 billion. The increase over 1963 amounts to nearly 6.6 percent in current prices.

The Office of Business Economics has not yet released an estimate of the 1964 gross national product in constant prices. But if it is assumed that the gross national product price deflator rose by 1.7 percent in 1964—a figure in which the increase in Federal salaries has a heavy weight—the gross national product, measured in 1963 prices, would be nearly $612 billion. And the increase in real rate of growth would be slightly more than 4.8 percent.

By Japanese or even Western European standards, a 4.8 percent of real gross national product growth is not very impressive. But bear in mind the recent American experience. For the postwar period as a whole, from 1947 through 1963, the real gross national product grew at an average annual rate of a little more than 3.6 percent. And between 1957 and 1962, when the economic policies of the Federal Government wavered between passivity and measures that inhibited growth, the rate was about 3 percent.

A 4.8 percent of real gross national product growth was exceeded in only 6 years since 1947, but there were abnormal circumstances in every year except 1964. In the recovery from the 1948–49 recession, the gross national product increased by 8.7 percent in 1950. And in the following year the outbreak of the Korean conflict boosted the rate to over 7.4 percent. The gains of 8.2 percent in 1955, 6.8 percent in 1959 and 5.4 percent in 1962, all were made when the economy rebounded from the troughs of recessions.

If one excludes recession years, initial years of cyclical recovery and 1951 as a war year, 8 of the 16 years from 1947 through 1963 remain. And the average rate of real gross national product growth in those normal years was less than 2.8 percent. By this standard the 4.8 percent growth rate achieved in 1964 represents a striking improvement, a tribute to the expansionist policies of the Federal Government.

What was accomplished by the higher growth rate? The answer lies in the summary figures on employment and unemployment for 1964.

The overall rate of unemployment, measured as a percentage of the civilian labor force, fell from 5.7 percent in 1963 to 5.2 percent in 1964. When these barebone rates are clothed with arithmetic flesh, the following picture emerges. The labor force increased by 1,258,000 in 1964, but because of the stimulus of the tax cut and moderately expansive monetary policy, the number of jobs increased by 1,598,000. As a result, unemployment declined from 4,166,000 to 3,876,000, a gain of 290,000.

These summary figures, it should be noted, understate the improvement. In December the overall unemployment rate was down to 4.9 percent, the third time since 1957 that the monthly rate fell below 5 percent. And 2 of those months were in 1964. The 3.5 percent December unemployment rate for men over 20 is the lowest since 1957. And even

teenage unemployment was reduced under the impact of higher economic growth.

This record makes a shambles of the gloomy, structural unemployment hypothesis. The structuralists, a rather diverse group that share only a common pessimism about the effectiveness of fiscal and monetary policies, argued that unemployment could not be reduced because of the obsolescence of vocational skills and the disparity between actual levels of educational attainment and those required for employment in industries that utilize advanced technology.

Can the momentum of 1964 be sustained? The answer is "Yes," but not unless there are actively expansionist Government policies.

President Johnson will probably ask the House of Representatives to devise speedier procedures in responding to Executive requests for temporary reductions of income tax withholding rates. If the President can extract an agreement on that point, the economy will gain a new and very powerful instrument of fiscal policy.

But a willingness on the part of Congress to change tax rates quickly is not enough. Federal economic policies should be coordinated to achieve predetermined rates of economic growth, rates that are calculated to reduce unemployment to desired levels. If explicit growth and employment goals were formulated by the White House in the same manner that it now formulates the grotesquely outmoded administrative budget, it would be possible to assign specific fiscal and monetary policy tasks.

The great danger ahead lies in underestimating the potential of the American economy. Underestimation is inherent in the wish-fulfilling prophecy of the standard business forecast, predicated on the assumption that the rate of economic growth must decline in the latter part of this year. Forecasters project current trends, but it is the business of Government to change them.

Foreign Lands Need Peace Corps Men From Factories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, an important new dimension has been added to the Peace Corps. Now skilled workingmen are being recruited by the Peace Corps and sent to nations in need of their specific talents and experience.

Already the United Auto Workers and the major auto companies have written clauses in their contracts to guarantee leaves of absence for these workers. Other industries are expected to follow this example.

The inspiring story of how our factory and construction workers are now joining our younger Peace Corps volunteers in assignments abroad is told in the following article by Victor Riesel:

FOREIGN LANDS NEED PEACE CORPS MEN FROM FACTORIES

(By Victor Riesel)

PITTSBURGH, PA.—Downtown in this city seems a long way off from the tiny hamlet at the edge of monkey territory in Senegal, Africa, where I stopped this summer. Three crewcut young men came over to us from the well they had been digging in the 100° heat.

Why were they going 100 feet down in the noonday heat? The answer was simple and swift. They were U.S. Peace Corps men. They were there to help a people who had never had running water. The Peace Corps men said: We want them to know the Americans are their friends.

What now ties Pittsburgh to the Senegal hamlet north of the French city of Thies? The link is a relatively new blue-collar recruiting drive—a program to bring America's skilled factory and construction workers to the underdevelop nations.

In the past, the Peace Corps cadres had been made up of young college men. Now the Corps wants workingmen. There is no age limit, no educational minimum, no college degree as a requirement, just the skills of men who man America's big mills and construction projects.

This drive has the cooperation of such men as Walter Reuther, head of the United Auto Workers Union, and the chief executives of such corporations as General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, American Motors, Caterpillar, and soon the aircraft and steel industry.

Within a few days, Dave Burgess, a veteran Foreign Service officer who is an old Asian hand, will drop in to see Dave McDonald, president of the United Steel Workers of America, at its national headquarters here. Burgess, who already has conferred with Conrad Cooper, vice president of United States Steel and chief of the steel industry's joint bargaining team, wants the industry to insert the new skilled workers Peace Corps clause in the new steel industry contract when it is signed next year.

With the mutual agreement of Reuther and the industrial relations vice presidents of the major auto companies, the clause was written into the contract recently negotiated in that industry.

The clause guarantees leaves of absence for those workingmen who want to go to South America, Africa, or Asia to work and even teach. The clause guarantees reemployment, seniority, and pension rights and credit even to those who are going through apprentice training if they volunteer for Peace Corps service.

The Corps needs such practical men. Out of the 10,000 now serving in 46 countries, only 200 have been men with professional skills in their hands.

Now the Latin lands are asking for some 400 out of our factories and building and construction trades. They want men who can put roofs on houses, build schools, wire a community center, fix a truck, handle a garage, pour concrete, and make things out of lumber.

Guinea, on the west coast of Africa, needs some 40 garage mechanics, Tunisia wants men who can repair buses and trucks and maintain all types of machines and agricultural implements. The Malaysian Government is asking for 50 men who can teach vocational skills.

Ethiopia needs machinists. Nigeria, which the Sino-Soviet bloc drools over because of its 55 million people, and whose big city traffic jams prove its modernity, wants all the mechanics it can get.

So the Peace Corps has talked to management and labor. It has set up a series of teams which go right onto the factory floor, or cafeteria, or some big office and talk to shop stewards and middle management people.

The drive started at Mack Truck in Hagerstown, Md. In Peoria recently, Burgess and some of his colleagues made 38 speeches in some 24 hours at the Caterpillar plant and report they came away with 84 applicants.

Married couples with no dependents under 18 are welcomed. The husband will handle the machinery. The wife will teach home economics or help villagers. The couples are first trained for several months in the language and methods of adaptation to the new, far-off home.

At the end of the 2 year stint, the couple will have $3,600—before taxes—since all expenses are paid. And they will have gained experience needed by many American firms now beginning to move into the new lands.

The President's Emphasis on Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to assist in the employment of handicapped workers, the President maintains a permanent Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Mr. Harold Russell is the Chairman of this Committee and Mr. William P. McCahill is the executive secretary. Recently Mr. McCahill made a speech on the employment of handicapped workers which I believe will be of interest to the Members.

The speech follows:

"THE PRESIDENT'S EMPHASIS"—REMARKS OF WILLIAM P. MCCAHILL, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

The Presidents of this country since 1945 have consistently and personally placed particular emphasis upon employment of the handicapped.

This emphasis of four Presidents has been expressed in numerous ways and on many occasions. From the 1st Presidential proclamation of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week in 1945 to the 20th in 1964, the Federal Register has carried the proclamation and it has been duly recorded in the Archives of our land in response to congressional resolution.

Since 1947, Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Jonhson have lent their names and their office to the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. In addition, each year in budget messages and in many personal ways, our Presidents have placed special emphasis on jobs for qualified handicapped men and women.

In reviewing records and rereading proclamations through the years, it has been interesting how the times shaped the thoughts and words of our Presidents and help guide the activities of their Committee. The early postwar proclamations emphasized the needs of the war disabled for jobs. During the Korean conflict emphasis was placed on finding jobs for the handicapped to backstop the men at the front. Then came the recognition of the fact that not enough was being done for the civilian handicapped, followed, incidentally, by passage of Public Law 565 in 1954 and subsequent references to that act in the next year's proclamation. Coming up to the present, we have the continued emphasis upon jobs for both the physically and the mentally handicapped.

Suppose we review a few of the highlights of past proclamations and pick out key words and phrases which pointed up the emphasis of the President.

In 1947, President Truman stated that "the people of this Nation are profoundly conscious of the limitless debt they owe their fellow citizens who count the costs of wars in terms of physical handicaps." The following year he cited "war production records and recent industrial surveys" as showing the

selectively placed handicapped workers "perform their tasks as well as or better than those without handicaps." He also referred for the first time to the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week which, he said, "I have established."

The 1948 proclamation thus reflected the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Survey done for the Veterans' Administration which is still the landmark survey for statistical comparisons and released prior to the proclamation and the establishment of the President's Committee in 1947. Again, in 1949, Mr. Truman referred to the Nation's "responsibilities * * * for citizens who have been physically handicapped by war or disabled in civilian pursuits." In 1951, however, the opening whereas clause stated that the Nation "needs the services of every person capable of productive work in its gigantic task of mobilizing to meet the requirements of defense and to maintain the civilian economy." In his last NEPH Week Proclamation, Mr. Truman in 1952 referred to the "need for greater public participation in educational and promotional activities." Pointing up the year-round activity, that proclamation reflected Mr. Truman's action previously in shortening the committee name, dropping the reference to the "Week."

In 1954, President Eisenhower marked the 10th anniversary of the observance of "a week dedicated to publicizing the urgent need for employing the physically handicapped" and referred to "recent legislation enacted by the Congress" which he said "will tend to increase greatly the number of citizens who will be rehabilitated and prepared for gainful occupation annually, thus requiring redoubled activity in the field of employment."

The proclamation of 1955 was issued from Lowry Air Force Base where the President was recovering from his own disability and mentioned for the first time the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare along with the President's Committee as "cooperating with Governors' committees in the States and Territories in a joint public education program to rehabilitate and hire the handicapped." This was related to language in the 1954 vocational rehabilitation amendments.

In 1957, Mr. Eisenhower related our "expanding economy" which required more workers to the "expanded rehabilitation and training programs." Again, in 1959 he referred to the "expanding national program to develop maximum employment opportunities for the physically handicapped," saying that it was "continuing to attract the interest of additional thousands of dedicated volunteers in national, State, and community committees."

Three years later, Mr. Kennedy's second proclamation mentioned the mentally handicapped for the first time and referred to the President's Committee by its present title. This reflected his Valentine's Day action in 1962 in dropping the word "physically" from the Committee title; not to give any less emphasis to the physically handicapped, but to begin to give emphasis where it was so badly needed, to the retarded and the mentally restored.

The following year, Mr. Kennedy called upon "all volunteers to rededicate themselves during that week to continuing their year-round interest and activities in behalf of the handicapped."

This year, for the first time, the unwieldy "whereas" clauses were dropped, making the proclamation read smoother and actually summarizing the last 19 years in four purposeful paragraphs. President Johnson thus told the NEPH Week story as follows:

"During the last year of World War II the Congress called for the first observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. It is a mark of our esteem for all humanity, and a testimonial of our faith in individual worth, that we have continued this purposeful observance in each succeeding year.

"The intervening years have seen our Nation enjoying an ever-expanding economy as we have moved swiftly toward the promise of an ever greater society. During this era the natural barriers of sound and space have been breached. Now, a host of new visions brighten our horizons, and a profusion of new forces are abroad in our midst. But there still remain for some of our people—the physically and mentally handicapped—employment barriers that have not yet been breached, horizons limited by prejudice, and discriminatory attitudes that have not yet been swept away.

"To set a satisfactory pace for our Nation's growth, we must commit ourselves to the challenge of full participation by all—the handicapped and able bodied alike. It has been said that men differ less in capacity than in zeal and determination to utilize the powers they have. Time and again the handicapped have demonstrated determination in their struggle to overcome their limitations; their capacity to work being strengthened by their zeal to succeed.

"For nearly two decades we have encouraged our Nation's employers to give equal consideration to job-qualified handicapped persons. During the same period we have fostered a model policy with respect to the employment of the handicapped within the Federal Government. The quarter-million handicapped placements made yearly by public employment services is evidence that the message has been heard. But despite that notable achievement, real progress can be claimed only when the number of persons with physical or mental handicaps awaiting rehabilitation, vocational restoration, and return to a fully productive life is cut to an irreducible minimum. Accomplishment of that objective calls for concerted action by all our rehabilitation and placement agencies and by all other groups working for the vocational betterment of the handicapped."

And, then before the usual and decisive finale, President Johnson pointed directly at the ultimate target, saying: "Our hopes for the handicapped can be realized if the employers of this Nation will but consider all job applicants, regardless of handicaps, solely on the basis of their qualifications to do the job."

Of course, the proclamations are the formal and legal statements of purpose of a President and of a people, but, of themselves, they aren't effective unless somebody does something about the problem. This has been the mission of the President's Committee through the years in partnership with the operating agencies of government (Federal, State, and local) and with the full cooperation of the private agencies and the various groups whose help is necessary.

Another source of history of a movement such as this is the public statements of the Presidents before various groups. In our case, we have been fortunate in having the Presidents appear personally at our meetings an average of 2 out of 3 times during the past 17 years, beginning with an informal gathering in the White House Rose Garden on November 7, 1947, when President Truman said: "One of the most important things I can think of is rehabilitating handicapped Americans and placing them in gainful occupations."

It was to be 16 years later that another President welcomed our group in the Rose Garden. In 1947, all those attending the meeting that year could be accommodated. In 1963, less than 2 weeks before his assassination, President Kennedy welcomed a group of State chairmen and secretaries in town for a 2-day conference or training session. The actual Committee meeting that year had filled Washington's largest Government auditorium to overflowing as more than 1,800 crowded the departmental auditorium to hear President Kennedy in late April.

In 1949, Mr. Truman did not attend but sent a message in which he said that he had watched with interest the increase and growth of public attention each year. He said, "please be assured of the continued personal interest of your President and your government in your year-round efforts."

In August the following year, he appeared in person and spoke at some length. He thanked the State Governors and asked the State chairmen present to take his thanks back to their Governors. He also emphasized the momentum the program had already gathered when he stated: "While our public appeal will be concentrated in that one week, the job of securing employment for the handicapped has now become a year-round effort." Mr. Truman also reminded the visitors that their work "is important to our civilization because it reflects the high value which we place on individual human lives."

A year later, and I well remember that we again asked the Secretary of Labor to dismiss his employees so that the auditorium would be full for the President, Mr. Truman took note of the seventh observance of NEPH Week coming up and said, "we have made a lot of progress." He then said that many of the old prejudices against handicapped workers were disappearing and said: "It is now well recognized that employment of the physically handicapped is a natural and very valuable part of our economic life."

That was also the year which saw the presentation of the first President's Trophy to the first 'Handicapped American of the Year," George Barr, of Chicago, who went on to be chairman of the Illinois Governor's Committee for many years. Mr. Truman mentioned the fighting going on in Korea and pointed to the poster which told the world that "America Needs All of Us."

Then, a year later, Mr. Truman told his Committee that he and Admiral McIntire had decided to honor an outstanding physician each year, in addition to the Handicapped American. Thus was instituted the first Physician's Award, personally signed by President Truman for Dr. Henry H. Kessler, of New Jersey, who went on to be President of the International Society for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled and today is among the top men in his chosen profession.

Mr. Truman, in his last appearance before his Committee, spoke at length and from the heart for more than 11 pages. I know, for it was my high privilege to go over his speech with him and his speech staff as he put the finishing touches on the official version. As he would read each page, he would call for comment or correction and then would hand that page on to Charles Murphy with the comment, "that page goes as is."

Speaking not of NEPH Week which began in 1945, but of the Committee itself, Mr. Truman said: "We have started something fine and good in these 5 years and I am proud of it and heartened by it. But we are still only working around the edges of the problem which we face here in this great country."

He then went on to relate some of the things undone, many of which have since been done upon the groundwork laid in the Truman years. He also proved prophetic when he said that this "is a real crusade that we must undertake, not only here at home but throughout the world." For today, hardly a day goes by but some foreign country, individual, or problem does not come to our attention or present us with an opportunity of being a helpful world neighbor.

In Mr. Eisenhower's first message to the Committee in August of 1954, he wrote that the Congress had "reaffirmed its confidence in the potential abilities of our handicapped

men and women" in passing the new vocational rehabilitation amendments. He countered this thought with the challenge that "there must also be an increase in the dedicated volunteer work of many citizens now serving on State and local committees on employment of the handicapped."

In May of 1955, the Committee moved to the spring of the year and concentrated on an annual meeting instead of holding two each year. President Eisenhower appeared personally and the principle that opportunity belonged to all, including the handicapped, was emphasized. Here, again, the President's emphasis.

Two years later, President Eisenhower, by now fully familiar with the working of his Committee through visits from General Maas and through correspondence, publicly expressed his personal interest in and emphasis upon the work of the volunteer committee. In his opening remarks, he said:

"There are numerous bodies working in the United States under the name of a President's Committee for this or that—the President's Commission for this or some other function. There is none in whose work I take greater satisfaction and follow with keener interest than I do this one."

That year, President Eisenhower gave the President's Trophy to the late Hugo Deffner for his one-man crusade against steps and other architectural barriers, a crusade the Committee and the entire country was to take up under President Kennedy's administration and which is continuing today.

Mr. Eisenhower returned the following year, in 1958, and said: "I know of no group that so inspires me to go back home and go to work without feeling sorry for myself so much as does this one."

Now, I am sure this audience is aware that it has been said of Washington that it is a place where nobody ever writes the speeches he makes or signs the letters he writes. I'll admit to having been a ghost occasionally along the way in the performance of my duties, but no ghost could have written some of the things which our Presidents said, both because they were so personal and because the remarks were many times extemporaneous and ad lib.

It wasn't until the third spring of the Kennedy administration that it was possible for the President to appear personally at his Committee meeting. But, when he did in 1963, Mr. Kennedy placed his emphasis upon the retarded and called for more citizen cooperation and participation in the problems of the Nation. And, then he said something which many of us have subsequently related to him: "There are a lot of acts of courage which are done in the flash of the moment, but the most commendable and admirable acts of courage are those which go on day in, day out, month in, month out, year in and year out. He (David Hall, Handicapped American of that year) has shown it, many of you have shown it, the General has shown it, and I am glad to be among those who live it."

Mr. Kennedy had but followed Mr. Truman and General Eisenhower in mentioning General Maas and his own dedicated volunteer labors as Chairman of the Committee.

And, so we come to the 1964 annual meeting when both General Maas and President Kennedy had concluded their lives of courage. And, President Johnson on the same platform the three previous Presidents had used, spoke for the first time to his "President's Committee." He, too, spoke of courage, saying: "Emerson once said that courage consists in equality to the problem before us." He said that the 1964 Handicapped American, arthritic Jerry Walsh, and the young writing contest winners "stand in the tradition of Mel Maas, who before his death 2 weeks ago had taught us all that personal courage and individual fortitude can turn defeat into victory."

He then went on to castigate men of little faith in their country and held up Mel Maas and Harold Russell and Mr. Walsh as examples to be followed. He also announced the new Federal policy for hiring the retarded and called upon all agencies to "make fuller use of the abilities of handicapped Americans."

His words have been and are being heeded, just as have been the words of Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy before him. Just as will be the words of the Presidents who follow him. For, try as we might, it does not appear that this President's Committee will ever be able to work itself out of a job. But, believe it or not, that's what we've been trying to do since 1947.

Vice Adm. Vernon L. Lowrance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in reading the January 1965 edition of Navy magazine I was very pleased to note an article on Vice Adm. Vernon L. Lowrance, a constituent of mine who is a distinguished naval officer.

Admiral Lowrance is a 1930 graduate of the Naval Academy and is serving at the present time as commander, Submarine Force, Atlantic. I know my colleagues will be interested in learning of this outstanding naval officer, and I request that the article from Navy magazine be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

VICE ADM. VERNON L. LOWRANCE

(By Ray N. Ivey)

"I relearned my most memorable lesson with my first command—you can't do a job alone, it takes teamwork."

This thought has permeated Vice Adm. Vernon L. Lowrance's philosophy through more than 30 years of naval service, from his first command in the submarine R-16, through a tour as Director of Naval Intelligence, to his new post as commander, Submarine Force, Atlantic.

His new position as ComSubLant is ideally suited to a man of Admiral Lowrance's temperament and experience, particularly temperament.

A quiet, soft-spoken man, but steely firm when the situation demands, he looks upon his position of responsibility for training and maintaining one of the Nation's major defense forces as a challenge rather than a burden.

REMEMBERS HIS TEACHER

Admiral Lowrance received his appointment to the Naval Academy in 1926 from Senator Simmons of North Carolina through a competitive examination. He credits much of his success to his high school mathematics teacher in his home town of Catawba, N.C. It was he who taught him the value of application in studies.

A 1930 graduate of the Academy, the majority of the admiral's service has been in the submarine force.

His first tour of duty was not in a submarine, however. In the practice of the day, he was assigned to a battleship, the U.S.S. *California*, immediately after receiving his commission.

"You had to qualify as a top watch-stander in a battleship, cruiser or other surface ship before you could request duty in submarines in those days," he recalled.

When asked if he thought a similar program for junior officers might not be effective today, he replied:

"Yes, but we had more time to train in those days, the junior officer of today has a much tougher job—he assumes responsibility a lot faster."

After attending submarine school, Admiral Lowrance served in various R-boats before assuming command of the R-16.

WON NAVY CROSS

In World War II, he commanded three different submarines and a submarine division. For his outstanding efforts in the war in the Pacific, he was awarded the Navy Cross, three Silver Stars and the Bronze Star.

During the war and in the years following it, "teamwork" has been the key to the Lowrance method. The concept of working with a team was initially impressed on him through participation in sports at the Naval Academy where he won varsity letters in basketball and baseball.

He feels that every man must be made aware of the importance of his contribution to the effort of the team, from the officer in command to the newest seaman.

"The Navy stands or falls on the effort of the individual working for the overall goal," the Admiral said, "and tolerance and appreciation of the other person's view is the way to get that effort."

He admits that molding a crew into a team is easier to achieve on a submarine because of the closeness and interdependence of the crew, but disagrees heartily with the idea that it is next to impossible to achieve on a large ship.

"In my career I've had command of the cruiser U.S.S. *Macon* and the attack transport U.S.S. *Rockbridge* and, while it took a little longer because of the greater number of men involved, the same teamwork resulted," he asserted.

While teamwork is a vitally important part of the Lowrance concept of a successful naval force, it is not the only one. "Motivation, dedication, training—these are all extremely important elements in building and maintaining an effective force," he said.

MUST WORK HARDER

The admiral went on to say that the advance of technology had placed many new responsibilities on personnel in the Navy.

"A junior officer has to be willing to work and study outside of the normal working hours if he is to be successful—he's got to learn a lot more a lot faster," he explained.

The march of technology does not, in itself, create a lack of qualified personnel to serve in submarines according to the admiral:

"Almost any young man with a good high school education who can meet the necessary aptitude requirements can be trained to perform admirably in the submarine service—providing, of course, he has the proper motivation and desire."

Asked about the possibility of radical changes in submarine construction in the next few years, Admiral Lowrance replied, "Not that I can foresee; of course, the submarine service, as always, will be alert to any scientific developments and will take advantage of them." He went on to say that the next 10 years will bring faster, deeper diving, and quieter submarines.

The problem of retaining personnel is one of his vital concerns. The vast amount of training a young man receives today makes his loss felt that much more if he decides to return to civilian life rather than make a career of the Navy. In the admiral's mind, the personnel problem is one of the major issues facing the Navy today.

The problems to be solved in the area of personnel retention are vast, but not entirely insurmountable, he said, adding: "Housing,

separation from families, pay—these are all difficult and perplexing problems now, but we are doing better on these matters and we will continue until we have them licked."

But, according to Admiral Lowrance, the problem goes deeper than the material aspects. Motivation and pride are equally, if not more, important.

Asked to sum up his own feelings about a career in the Navy, he replied:

"The late Admiral Ricketts put it much more eloquently than I ever could when he said, 'The naval profession has no superior in honor and service to its country. It has played a major role in the establishment and maintenance of many powerful nations and particularly our own. It could not have reached its present stature if it had not yielded actions commensurate with the country's faith and investment in it. It is a profession respected, trusted, and depended upon by the civilian population.' "

Polish Insurrection of 1863

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the unhappy Poles have suffered under numerous alien regimes, but they suffered longer and more cruelly under the oppressive and decrepit regime of Russian czars than any of the others. Since the third partition of Poland late in the 18th century, most of Poland became part of imperial Russia and the majority of the Polish nation restive subjects of the czars. More than once, the Polish people tried to free themselves through uprisings and open revolts. Such an event took place in 1863.

This uprising was proclaimed on January 22 of that year, but actually it had been in the making since mid-1861. A secret conspiracy was planned, with adherents in all parts of Poland, in August of 1861. On October 15, there was a demonstration protest. Demonstrators took possession of the churches, and the clergy was forced to close them down. This was followed by reconciliation overtures by Russian authorities, and for a while things seemed quiet. Then in the summer of 1862 more uprisings took place; there was an attempt to asassinate the Russian Grand Duke. This was followed by severe repressive measures, which in their turn brought a revolutionary group into the open, proclaiming itself the "true government of Poland." Then Polish leaders made categorical demands on Russian authorities adding that they would accept nothing short of the establishment of a Polish national government. Unfortunately, these demands left the Poles to their own meager resources, for though they could and did expect moral support of their friends abroad, these friends were in no position to aid them in any effective way. Nevertheless, they meant to carry on their resolve.

On January 16, they called the nation to arms, and many Poles serving in the Russian Army responded to this call. Then on the fateful January 22 they announced the emancipation and "complete enfranchisement of every person in the Polish realm without regard to race, religion, or previous condition of bondage."

The response to this announcement was heartening; simultaneous uprisings occurred in many parts of the country, even though the Poles could organize no more than 10,000 men against Russia's 100,000. Therein lay the tragedy of the Polish uprising of 1863. As long as brute force was the arbiter of a righteous and sacred cause, the uprising was doomed to failure. In mid-1864 when the stout-hearted and youthful Polish leader Traugett was hanged by Russian authorities in Warsaw, the daring Polish uprising against Russia was officially brought to an end. Today, noting the 102d anniversary of the uprising against czarist tyranny, we pay tribute to the memory of those gallant Poles.

Protecting Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the editorial of January 25 in the Washington Post. This editorial points to some valid reasons why the problems of agriculture merit serious and detailed evaluation before any programs are advanced which would damage price stability on agricultural income.

PROTECTING AGRICULTURE

With the growth of Federal expenditures politically constrained many a cold eye in the executive branch is cast on the older programs. And since the expenditures of the Agriculture Department rank second only to Defense in size, they are attracting their share of attention. There are few Federal programs that cannot be trenched upon without courting disaster, but before subjecting the agricultural programs to indiscriminate cutting, an effort should be made to weigh their costs and benefits.

By the end of the current fiscal year about $3.5 billion will be spent in supporting agricultural commodity prices. The price support programs have been criticized on the grounds that they neglect the welfare of the small "dirt farmer" and result in higher prices to consumers. It is, indeed, tempting to add to the direct Federal outlays a much larger figure representing the difference between current prices for food and what it would cost consumers in an absolutely free market.

But calculations of that type tacitly assume that farm prices can somehow be permitted to find their natural levels without serious economic dislocations. In a highly interrelated economy, such an assumption is highly dubious. According to the new input-output study recently completed by the Office of Business Economics, every dollar of agricultural products that is delivered for final demand requires about 78 cents in the products and services of nonagricultural industries. So any disruption in the agricultural sector would be transmitted immediately to all other sectors of the economy and would be magnified.

If the United States faced the predicament of France where farms absorb 25 percent of the labor force, the protection of agriculture would have the untoward effect of retarding the growth of the industrial labor force, raising wages, and boosting costs. But with only 7 percent of the labor force on farms and an uncomfortably high level of unemployment in urban areas, the social costs of protecting agriculture are considerably reduced. In fact, a good case can be made for retarding the migration of poorly educated young people from farms to cities.

None of the foregoing considerations vitiate the need to reexamine the agricultural programs and to broaden them in such a way as to improve all aspects of rural life. Government programs are increasingly geared to the 75 percent of the population that lives in urban areas. But a Great Society cannot ignore the welfare of the other 25 percent.

Business Likes L.B.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I request that an article by Roscoe Drummond, distinguished Washington correspondent, on President Johnson's relations with the American business community be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan 4, 1965]

BUSINESS LIKES L.B.J.—UNIQUE HONEYMOON TO CONTINUE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

President Johnson is having a perfectly glorious honeymoon with big business.

The business community liked Lyndon Johnson before the election and it apparently likes him more than ever since.

Many businessmen were repelled by Senator Goldwater and it is increasingly evident that they are being drawn to Lyndon Johnson by his personality, his policies, and his ability to get things done.

The latest proof of this fact comes from the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Walter F. Carey, who recently remarked that he had expressed confidence in Mr. Johnson last April and added, "I feel even more so now. Many other businessmen feel the same."

It may seem strange that so many of the Nation's business and financial leaders should be giving their backing to a moderate-reformist, socialminded Democratic President.

No other Democratic President in this century has experienced anything like it.

The business and professional groups have overwhelmingly supported every Republican presidential nominee at election time and have opposed Democratic Presidents most of the time.

Last November the business and professional voters overwhelmingly supported Mr. Johnson and are apparently now convinced they made no mistake.

How is it that this protege and admirer of Franklin D. Roosevelt has achieved such rapport with the businessmen? And, more important, will it last?

The usual explanations are that the President, himself a successful businessman, talks the language, appeals to businessmen as a practical fellow, and is willing to listen.

It seems to me that the explanation goes much deeper, that the business support for Mr. Johnson comes more from the conditions in which the President is functioning than from personality or background. If it didn't, this rapport would not last.

In the first place, a national climate sympathetic to business and economic growth is as vital to the success of the Johnson administration as it is to business.

If the President is going to make any headway at all toward his still undefined goals of the Great Society, he needs an expanding Federal revenue, in order to get the necessary money from Congress and to achieve or come near to balanced budgets. He needs thriving business activity to get this revenue, and accordingly, he aims to keep the climate favorable to business.

The President does not intend to be dominated either by business or by labor. To avoid being overinfluenced by his labor allies, he needs the open support and balance that comes from his business allies.

I expect that the rapport between the business community and Mr. Johnson will continue largely since there is no objective reason for them to fall into serious conflict. The economic conditions the President faces are far different from those F.D.R. faced.

President Johnson's overriding domestic problem is how to manage and nourish a high level of prosperity, not how to lick a depression. His problem is not how to create prosperity, but how to extend it and use it to create jobs for the unemployed 5 percent of the Nation's labor force.

Undoubtedly the President is going to expand his war on poverty program and seek substantial Federal aid to education. This will not frighten away business as long as he maintains the cordial national climate. He intends to do so.

Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of the acts of the 88th Congress was to confer honorary citizenship on Sir Winston S. Churchill. We did so in recognition of the vast and heroic part that he played in the prosecution of the allied war effort which gave us victory over our common foes, the Axis Powers. We did it also because he exemplified more than any other living mortal of foreign nationality those essential traits of devotion to liberty on which the whole American experiment was initially founded. The fact that this experiment, begun 189 years ago, has not only endured but flourished and prospered beyond measure is due in large part to the fact that these ideals of liberty, respect for truth, and love of justice, have been fought for by courageous men of purpose and vision.

Sir Winston Churchill will surely live forever in the annals of history. We mourn today his passing; yet, we rejoice in the imperishable heritage which he has not only helped to preserve but which his shining deeds and magnificent words of courageous counsel in times of adversity have helped to strengthen. For in the course of human events there will surely come other times of decision; yes, even times when once again our whole democratic system will come under the siege guns of those who would overcome us. Yet, we can remain confident that in times like these the inspiration of Sir Winston Churchill's life and writings will continue to strengthen other men in the purpose and resolve to resist tyranny and remain free. The world has truly lost a great man, but as freedom's champion he lives on in the immortal garb of historic greatness. He will forever remain joined in the effections of the American people with the great patriots of our Republic.

Is Our Viet Policy of Letting Bad Enough Alone Good Enough?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, Roscoe Drummond's column of January 9, 1965, has an especially interesting analysis of our Vietnam policies which illustrates that the situation cannot be solved by "simple solutions" like pulling out or going all out in global conflict. Mr. Drummond asks the interesting question as to whether Vietnam can be saved by merely setting up the alternatives of "avoiding expansion of the war" or "avoiding contracting the war."

I am especially concerned that continued confusion and uncertainty in southeast Asia will ultimately lead to the exposure of 200 million people to Communist invasion. The American people have not been given an understanding of our stake in southeast Asia and Mr. Drummond's column is an expert analysis which should be read by Americans everywhere. Therefore, with unanimous consent, I include his column, "Is Our Viet Policy of Letting Bad Enough Alone Good Enough?" in the Appendix of the RECORD.

IS OUR VIET POLICY OF LETTING BAD ENOUGH ALONE GOOD ENOUGH?

WASHINGTON.—The war in Vietnam is not going to be won by the Senate Armed Services Committee. But Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, its chairman, is doing a good thing in deciding to take a fresh look at how things are going.

Things are not going well.

During the past 2 years Secretary of Defense McNamara has taken frequent "fresh looks." It has looked worse in recent months. We have helped change governments in Saigon. We have changed U.S. generals and U.S. ambassadors. And right after the election, President Johnson called all the brass home for a thorough go-around. Afterward, everything was back where it was before—unsatisfactory.

A HARD LOSER

It was the President's decision—or so it appeared—to let bad enough alone.

I doubt that Mr. Johnson, by instinct a hard loser, can live with this kind of decision very long.

The value of Senator RUSSELL's hearings will be that they will force the administration to define and defend what it proposes to do.

The state of the war is evident. We are losing. Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor has said so bluntly as a soldier-diplomat can bring himself to speak in public. He was asked: "Is the war being lost?" His answer: "The issue is very much in doubt."

On this basis the questions to which the Russell inquiry will be seeking answers are these:

Is a policy of letting bad enough alone good enough for the United States?

Are the two alternatives suggested by Secretary of State Rusk the only ones: (1) avoid expanding the war; (2) avoid contracting the war?

Finally, the most important question of all: Having gone to the defense of South Vietnam, can the United States afford to lose the war in defense of South Vietnam?

CRUCIAL QUESTIONS

These are the crucial questions. The Senate Armed Services Committee will be rendering a service by searching for the best possible answers.

One thing for sure: this is no time for the administration to complain that there is not enough support at home to do what is needed to win in Vietnam.

We have spent too much time wringing our hands over whether the Vietnamese people understand their stake in the war and whether they have the will to win it, not enough time giving the American people an understanding of our stake in the war and nourishing our will to win it.

The stake is not whether the Communist noose is going to be put around 14 million South Vienamese, but whether this gateway to all southeast Asia is to be unhinged.

The stake is whether the 200 million people within a radius of 1,000 miles from South Vietnam are to be exposed to being taken over by the Asian Communists.

The stake is whether the rice bowl of southeast Asia is to be added to Red China's aggressive arsenal and India and Japan immobilized.

The stake is whether the United States is to be withered as a Pacific power and its defenses pushed pack to Hawaii.

We need to understand that we are fighting not only to defend South Vietnam but simultaneously to defend the position of the United States.

President Johnson told Congress this week: "Our own security is tied to the peace of Asia."

Ambassador Taylor's word from Saigon is: "Above all, now is not the time to sell our side short."

This is why the question the administration must answer—to and for the American people—is not whether we are now winning the war in Vietnam, but whether we can afford to lose it.

Ukrainian Independence: Nationalism at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the last decade has witnessed the emergence of

many new nations, some of them barely meeting any valid criteria of nationhood. In fact, many people would argue that these new countries are meddlesome and unstable, and that the world would be a lot better off if the nationalism which spawned them, and which animates their policy, could be forgotten.

Whatever the merits of this contention, there is no doubt that nationalism has played, and can play, a constructive role on the world stage. When genuine national feeling, and a genuine basis for nationhood exists, its suppression is a measureless tragedy. Such has been the unhappy, and yet inspiring fate of the Ukraine, whose brief taste of independence and freedom was crushed by the Soviet Union 47 years ago.

Unhappy—because with all the requisites of nationhood the Ukraine was destroyed. The country possessed a broad and fertile territory, a hardy and intelligent population, and a tradition of independence and democracy going back to medieval times. Its leaders set up a humane and democratic state, with the support of the great majority of their people. Yet the Red Army snuffed out the life of the Ukrainian Republic, and the Soviets, professing to support self-determination, set up their own regime in the Ukraine.

Inspiring—because Ukrainians have never lost hope. They cannot celebrate January 22 as their national day. Only their brethren living abroad can do so. But oppressed as they are, the people of the Ukraine know, with a sure faith, that a day of freedom will eventually come.

The fate of the Ukraine should also serve as an object lesson to those new countries tempted to play ball with communism, whether of Soviet or Chinese stripe. For communism cannot accept truly valid national aspirations. It can only give them lip service. For the Communists the only nationalism they can support is one which serves their interests. They have proved this in the Ukraine.

The destruction of the Ukrainian Republic can serve as an object lesson for this country as well. It demonstrates that we can never relax our vigilance, never take Soviet professions of cultural or national freedom at face value. But more than this, the example of the Ukrainian people should inspire us all. For if we can only show the same steadfastness, freedom—true freedom—is bound to triumph in the end.

Ukrainian Independence Day, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to join my colleagues in rising today to salute and remember January 22, 1918—the date the Ukrainian peoples proclaimed the now-destroyed Ukrainian National Republic. That was 47 years ago. A lot has happened to the world order in this period of time, but we are concerned here today with just two events that have touched the lives of the Ukrainian people. Just 3 years after independence was proclaimed the country was occupied by Soviet troops, and 12 years after that, in 1933, the once-free peoples of the Ukraine were incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Now, Mr. Speaker, being a political pragmatist and not a historical fatalist, I realize, as do many of my colleagues in both Houses, that all the speeches, all the salutes, and all the remembrances will not change the policies of the Soviet leaders, or undo this tragedy of modern history. There are, however, valid reasons for our words today:

First of all, it permits us the opportunity to search our own souls and political consciences, by taking just a few moments each year to recall the history of these noble peoples. In what better forum can this be done than in the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress? Secondly, it affords the American people the opportunity to collectively recall there still exists in the world national and religious persecution. Thirdly, it gives us the chance to tell the world that we Americans do not take our freedoms lightly or for granted. Despite impressions to the contrary, the American people are not complacent, are not preoccupied with themselves. Instead, our hearts and our minds and our spirit will always be with those less fortunate than ourselves—especially with those whose freedom has been forcibly taken from them.

Let us tell Ukrainians all over the world today that we heartily agree with President Johnson who said in his inaugural address:

> How incredible it is that in this fragile existence we should hate and destroy one another. There are possibilities enough for all who will abandon mastery over others to pursue mastery over nature. There is world enough for all to seek their happiness in their own way.

The Pause of Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, no editorial writer on the current scene more effectively and more responsibly pinpoints the moral weakness of our fiscal irresponsibility than does David Lawrence of U.S. News & World Report.

Mr. Lawrence has again hit the bull's-eye with the editorial in the most recent issue of that publication, entitled "The Pause of Conscience."

I commend its reading to my colleagues and especially to those in Government who do not share my concern with our repeated deficits. The budget message which we received today boldly accepts the certainty of another deficit. The pause of conscience was missing.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I include Mr. Lawrence's editorial:

THE PAUSE OF CONSCIENCE

(By David Lawrence)

We hear much talk nowadays about the importance of "consensus." Government is supposed to "follow the tide." The President sets forth a legislative program of unprecedented cost, and Members of Congress are expected to perceive a majority sentiment and to abide by it.

The late President Kennedy, in his inaugural address 4 years ago, said:

"Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

The mood, however, of the political establishment in Washington today is perhaps best expressed by the following sentiment:

"Ask not where the money is coming from as we keep on borrowing and spending—and if there's a business recession, we'll reduce taxes and borrow more money to increase the deficit."

We now have had 4 years of big deficits. When the prospective deficits for the current fiscal year and next year are added, the result is a total of $27 billion in the red for 6 consecutive years.

Contrasting this with the previous 6-year period, we find that there were 3 years of surpluses and 3 years of deficits, making a total deficit of $10 billion on a cash basis.

How long can the Government keep on borrowing to meet continuing deficits? How long before that intangible but all-powerful bulwark of business progress—public confidence—becomes shaky and begins to collapse? Where is the responsibility today for the making of constructive policy in the Government? Is it vested in top officials and political leaders of the majority party who apparently feel that, as long as there is no protest from the public, they have a consensus and are on the right track? Or is the responsibility vested, after all, in the American people themselves, who sooner or later must recognize the fallacies of a spending spree and the possible consequences?

Many of the men in high office, to be sure, sincerely but mistakenly accept the doctrine that prosperity can be maintained by an artifical stimulus to the national economy—by "pump-priming," as in the 1930's. But many economist disagree.

President Johnson said in his address at the opening session of Congress on January 4: "A President's hardest task is not to do what is right, but to know what is right."

But why should there be difficulty in distinguishing between what is right and what is wrong? Morality is not a complex puzzle or a code of fuzzy ambiguity. The truth is that public men do know in their hearts what is right or wrong. What they find difficult to do is to reconcile what is right with what is politically expedient. This is where the pressures of conscience should give them pause.

Many persons in public life are victims of an illusory philosophy. They believe that it is the people who cannot distinguish between right and wrong in the use of public funds, and that what seems popular at the moment justifies national policy.

This points up a serious weakness nowadays in the operations of the American Republic. There is so much preoccupation with the material comforts of life that most people seem to have little time to study and examine the basic issues and questions which can make a big difference in their economic future. Instead, evils are glossed over, and criticisms are not crystallized in time to apply restraints. Hence we are confronted periodically with recessions or depressions.

Why, for example, is there such complacency about the Government's finances? Each year, more and more billions are being spent in excess of what is collected. Is it assumed that there will be no day of reckoning? Must we wait until the monetary unit is substantially diminished in purchasing power before words of warning are heeded?

Inflation, in its incipient stages, is something that is not readily discerned by the masses of the people. But history tells us that when inflation reaches a climax, it is widely felt. For it is related, of course, to a decline in purchasing power. Indeed, when debts begin to be paid in dollars of less and less value, public confidence is broken down and the upward rise in prices gets beyond control.

The results of fiscal irresponsibility are well known. How long will it be before the conscience of the Nation's leaders is awakened?

The spending orgy of today can hardly be continued indefinitely. The time has come to face the issues and apply correctives in national policy with prudence and foresight and courage. We cannot pay our bills with bluprints of utopia.

There are grave dangers inherent in the policies that dominate our fiscal affairs today. Our elected representatives know what is right. Why do they hesitate to do what is right? When will they begin to be guided not by temporary expediency but by conscience?

Maurice Pate, UNICEF Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, last week the United Nations and the world lost Maurice Pate, a man U Thant described as a "distinguished and tireless servant of international cooperation." His name is not widely known, but millions of children who owe their health to UNICEF know the quality of his work. They are in his debt, as are we all, and in tribute to him I place a copy of an article and an editorial in the New York Times last week in the RECORD.

MAURICE PATE, UNICEF CHIEF, DIES—HELPED WORLD'S NEEDY CHILDREN—DIRECTED U.N. RELIEF AGENCY SINCE ITS FOUNDING IN 1964—STARTED AS HOOVER AID

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., January 19.—Maurice Pate, who made the name UNICEF synonymous with help for the world's needy children, died of a heart attack today.

Mr. Pate, who was 70 years old, collapsed last night while talking with his wife and was taken to Bellevue Hospital. He did not regain consciousness.

The Secretary General U Thant, announced Mr. Pate's death to the General Assembly and then led the delegates in observing a minute of silence in tribute to "this distinguished and tireless servant of international cooperation."

UNICEF—the United Nations Children's Fund—is a name known, respected and loved throughout the world, Mr. Thant told the assembly. The credit for its unique achievement in promoting the health of children and mothers belongs to Mr. Pate, who was "truly a great humanitarian," he said.

ONLY HEAD OF FUND

It was as Executive Director of the Children's Fund—its first and only Director—that Mr. Pate achieved worldwide recognition, although his career in international relief work spanned 48 years, two World Wars and many lesser conflicts.

His reputation was so solidly based that he was able to move across political barriers that blocked others.

In 1956, in the midst of the Hungarian uprising against Soviet control, Mr. Pate flew into Budapest and spent days walking freely around the battle-scarred streets at a time when the Hungarian Government resolutely refused a proposed visit by Dag Hammarskjold, the late Secretary General, or any other United Nations official. Mr. Pate returned with a report that the Hungarians' needs were "desperate." UNICEF aid followed.

More recently, when disorders broke out in the newly independent African state of the Congo in July 1960, Mr. Pate was one of the first United Nations officials summoned by the Secretary General. One day after the call, he was on his way to Leopoldville to begin the distribution of emergency foodstuffs.

The swift response was a reflection of long experience with crisis situations. "In an emergency operation," Mr. Pate said at the time, "speed and flexibility are essential."

Typically, he was quick to add that he had learned these pointers from Herbert Hoover in his World War I era relief operations. Mr. Pate's association with Mr. Hoover was a lifelong influence.

WORKED WITH HOOVER

It began when Mr. Pate, fresh from Princeton University, went to work for Mr. Hoover's Belgian Relief Commission. At the end of World War I, Mr. Hoover assigned him to head the child-feeding operation the American relief administration was undertaking in Poland.

In 1939, only a few hours after Hitler's army entered Poland, Mr. Pate was on his way to Washington to volunteer for relief work. With Mr. Hoover's backing, he organized the privately operated Commission for Polish Relief, which shipped supplies to the Poles. Later, he joined the American Red Cross as director of relief to prisoners of war. In the next 5 years this organization shipped $170 million worth of supplies to American captives.

In 1946, Mr. Hoover summoned him again, this time to accompany him on a survey for President Harry S. Truman of the war-devastated countries. They visited 27 countries and out of this trip and the recommendations by Mr. Hoover came the U.S. sponsorship for the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. The words "emergency" and "international" were dropped several years ago, but the name UNICEF was retained.

UNICEF was set up by the U.N. General Assembly on December 11, 1946. Mr. Pate was named its Director by the Secretary General in consultation with the new agency's policymaking board. The post carries the rank of an Under Secretary.

From the outset, Mr. Pate attempted to win the government support and financial backing that would enable UNICEF to meet its goals. Initially, he set out to try to care for 20 million children by supplying milk, clothing and cod liver oil. Since its start, the United States has been the main contributor to the operation.

Under his direction, UNICEF projects have become a worldwide operation, supplying aid in 116 countries and territories. With the end of the immediate postwar period, the emphasis has shifted from feeding to health, nutrition and child-care programs of long-range benefit, although drums of powdered milk with the identifying stencil "UNICEF" still go where they are needed.

In 1960, Mr. Pate was suggested for the Nobel Peace Prize by the Norwegian Committee for UNICEF. But he told the Norwegians that he could not accept the honor for himself and suggested that UNICEF be nominated instead.

GAVE FEW SPEECHES

Mr. Pate, a 6-footer with a shock of white hair, was self-effacing in his approach to his post. He made few speeches to large audiences. A Republican, he found political support for his program from both parties in the United States and retained financial backing through changes in administration in Washington.

Without children of his own, he managed to organize help for tens of millions of children, all given without regard to race, color or nationality.

Mr. Pate was born in Pender, Nebr., on October 14, 1894. After attending Princeton, where he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, he served briefly in a small country bank in Iowa. This career ended when he volunteered for relief work with Mr. Hoover in Belgium and entered public service.

In 1927, he married Jadwiga Monkowski in Poland. They were divorced 10 years later. She died in 1960.

He is survived by his widow, Martha Lucas Pate, former president of Sweetbriar College, whom he married in 1961; a sister, Mrs. Ann Lefevre of Denver, and two brothers, Richard E. Pate, Jr., and Theodore Pate, both of Denver.

Funeral arrangements were incomplete last night.

MAURICE PATE

Relatively few people have heard of Maurice Pate, but scores of millions of children in well over 100 countries have been fed and clothed because he lived. His measure of greatness was not fame, from which he shrank, although he was famous among those connected with relief work anywhere in the world.

Maurice Pate created something great and kept it going. This, of course, was and is UNICEF—the United Nations Children's Fund. As Secretary General Thant said, the credit for UNICEF's creation and unique achievement in promoting the health of children and mothers everywhere belongs to Mr. Pate, who was "truly a great humanitarian."

No monument could be more imposing than UNICEF, which will carry on because needy children are not going to disappear. As Mr. Thant said, UNICEF is a name known, respected and loved throughout the world. It will continue to be so, and this is the greatest honor that could be paid to Maurice Pate.

Devoted KU Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Kansas and the Nation have lost an ardent friend and spokesman for higher education. Mr. Fred Ellsworth, who served as secretary to the University of Kansas Alumni Association for 39 years, died on January 11, 1965. Mr. Ellsworth was the father of our distinguished colleague, ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH of Kansas.

Fred Ellsworth's devotion and service to the University of Kansas earned for him the deserved title of "Mr. KU." During my service in the Kansas Senate and House of Representatives, I came to know Fred Ellsworth and respected him for his effective work in behalf of KU and higher education in Kansas. We are saddened

by his passing, and we convey our heartfelt sympathy to his widow, Lucille, and to his sons.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Topeka, Kans., Daily Capital:

DEVOTED KU SERVANT

The death of Fred Ellsworth—"Mr. KU" to thousands of University of Kansas alumni—is a personal loss to all Jayhawkers. To them Fred Ellsworth represented pride in their alma mater, and Fred was fiercely proud of everything about the university.

As KU Chancellor W. Clarke Wescoe once observed: "More than faculty or chancellors, to thousands of alumni and friends Fred Ellsworth is the University of Kansas."

This devoted man was, as usual, humble on learning in 1962 that KU's largest men's dormitory would be known as Fred Ellsworth Hall. Yet this recognition which he so richly deserved only served to emphasize his innate modesty.

For 39 years, as KU alumni secretary, Fred Ellsworth traveled up and down Kansas and across the Nation, cementing firmly the ties of Jayhawker graduates and their alma mater. He had taken the job in 1924 when the KU student body numbered only 4,000. Through the years he watched the numbers on Mount Oread and the KU School of Medicine grow to 13,000.

Fred managed to build up the alumni association from 2,700 members in 1924 to 16,500 before he retired. He was known in college circles as an outstanding man in alumni relations.

Shortly before his death he was awarded a medal for distinguished service to education by the Alumni Federation of Columbia University. He was one of 23 men and women so honored for their "eminent leadership in the field of alumni relations."

Thus the farm boy from Pleasanton, whose student days at KU were interrupted while he served in the 35th Division in World War I, was to find his life's work at the institution from which he graduated in 1922. His indefatigable quest for the betterment of KU can be seen today in many places. Besides the fine dormitory that bears his name, the World War II Campanile and Drive are other monuments to Fred Ellsworth's love for the university, for it was a project that was achieved largely through his efforts. He played an important role, too, in the completion of the Kansas Union and Memorial Stadium, both World War I memorials.

Undergraduates on the Campus knew Fred Ellsworth as a friend and counselor, as did the graduates whose careers took them far from Lawrence. For those coming back to the campus to plan for class reunions, meeting with Fred was a stimulating experience.

Some may have wondered how, year after year, he could so enthusiastically go through the same routine with different classes, but he steered them toward an enjoyable program that earned him many thanks from the returning grads.

At football games, Fred sometimes appeared wearing a Texas hat, gift of KU alumni living in Houston. He prized the hat highly and responded good naturedly to friends who called him "Sheriff" when he wore it.

When KU celebrates its centennial in 1966, it will be regretted by all Jayhawkers that Fred Ellsworth will not be on the campus to aid the project for which he had been counsel since his retirement.

But the pages of Jayhawk history are the richer for Fred Ellsworth's loyalty and devotion.

The name of Mr. KU will live on in the memories of those who knew him and in the accomplishments of the young Jayhawkers of the future.

How To Deal With Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, recently the famed writer, Mr. William S. White, wrote an article regarding the current situation in Asia and dealt with our problems connected with Red China which appealed to me as being far above the average writing that has developed in this general field of late. I trust the article, which I am attaching herewith, will find interest with my colleagues, and the public generally.

The article follows:

SATO'S PROBLEM: HOW TO DEAL WITH RED CHINA

(By William S. White)

A looming problem over how to deal with Communist China without weakening or embittering the American-Japanese alliance is the skeleton at the feast in the meetings here between President Johnson and Prime Minister Eisaku Sato of Japan.

The thing has not yet come to a sharp issue, but it has ugly possibilities for trouble between Washington and Tokyo. As high Japanese informants put the case, Prime Minister Sato is finding it increasingly difficult to resist popular pressure—including a good deal of pressure from within his own party—for accepting Red China into the United Nations.

Japanese recognition of Red China would, of course, torpedo the long American effort, thus far successful, to keep her out of, and Nationalist China in, the U.N. Moreover, it would set the most civilized power in all Asia—Japan—looking in precisely the opposite direction from its biggest friend, the United States.

On the U.S. side of the question, popular opinion—and administration and congressional opinion, too—is profoundly against any concession whatever to the Red Chinese so long as they remain what they now clearly are: The most poisonous agents for war and aggression, the most noxiously infectious core of trouble for the West, in all the world.

Here is a regime that fought us—and the United Nations—in Korea, and a decade and a half later remains unpurged and unrepentant of its crime while it now simultaneously foments Communist assaults upon South Vietnam and Communist intrigues to destroy free governments in Africa.

Here also is a regime that in the contest with the Soviet Union for the ultimate headship of world communism is openly contemptuous of Russian proposals for coexistence with the West and instead openly recommends intercontinental war with the West.

Here, in short, is a regime that in American eyes embodies a very great part of the whole aggregate of evil and horror that now afflicts the earth. But this estimate, however sound it is in fact, is not the estimate of the Japanese people. Where we see Russia as far the more tolerable, at least in a relative sense, of the two monolithic Communist states, the Japanese see matters exactly in reverse.

They prefer the Chinese to the Russians. It is an incredible choice to us and an incredible choice in logic, considering present Chinese attitudes, but it is the Japanese choice all the same. Perhaps it is because the Chinese Communists are not bothering the Japanese as they are bothering us. Perhaps it is because Japan and Russia were mortal enemies long ago.

Perhaps it is simply because the Chinese are, after all, Asians, too, with a culture and language pattern not in every way really alien to the Japanese. At any rate, there it is: the Red Chinese demon in American eyes is not that demon in Japanese eyes, and is not likely to be in any foreseeable state of affairs.

This being the bottom reality, Japanese leadership is clearly moving, if moving very cautiously, toward loosening if not actually in time breaking the solidity of the old American-Japanese front against giving any kind of international countenance to what we see as the bandit regime in Pieping.

There is little doubt that Prime Minister Sato will hold on to our essential line as long as he can, for the maintenance of good Japanese-American relations is even more vital to Japan than to us. But there is no doubt at all that he has here a major domestic political problem and that in the end he is most likely to solve it the way the people want it solved.

This being the predictable end of it all, the indicated present course for this country would seem to be to give Sato all the help it can to enable him at least to hold on as long as he can. He is in the moderate's classically painful position—squarely in the middle. And while this position is far from satisfactory to us, it is at all events infinitely preferable to a situation in which Sato had been pushed all the way to the left by unsympathetic American treatment.

Two, Thirteen, or Twenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a poem which has been sent to me by my good friend, David Gimbel of Brooklyn, N.Y. This poem, entitled "Two, Thirteen, or Twenty" has been written by Mr. Gimbel for the 16th birthday celebration of the Association for the Help of Retarded Children, the organization to which Dave Gimbel has contributed so much.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a prayer which Mr. Gimbel has written for the same occasion:

TWO, THIRTEEN, OR TWENTY

(By David Gimbel)

At the tender age of two they sparkle like champagne,
It could be your boy or girl, yes, little Joey or Jane,
Their every word a symphony or like flowers that are in bloom,
While a lingering sense of joy fills each and every room.

The tender years just melt away and soon they put on jeens,
They try so hard to act grown up although they're in their teens,
The girls put on some lipstick or fix their hair in style,
While the boys may steal a puff of smoke and follow them a mile.

Now twenty summers just slip by and most
are now in love,
And like each and every parent you beg the
Lord above,
That they be blessed in every way to bring
you lasting joy,
Those eyes that sparkle like champagne, your
precious girl or boy.

But when children are retarded their age
just stands at two,
Each day is filled with sadness and their
parents feel so blue,
And although these children are so sweet
'tis really not the same,
For each and every moment is filled with so
much pain.

So if your child is normal how blessed can be
your day,
By helping retarded children in each and
every way,
'Tis then your darling children may never
have to fear,
What the parents of retarded children face
each and every year.

LET US PRAY

(By David Gimbel)

Almighty and Eternal God, we implore Thee with Thy council of angels to listen to the plea of these parents whose hearts are so heavy and whose eyes are wet with the endless tears of time itself.

Oh Master of the Universe, these children of Thy creation, the mentally retarded, are the most precious and the most innocent, and yet they remain the most rejected of all of Thy creatures.

These flowers that Thou has created blossom ever so beautifully, and yet they are so unwanted and forgotten by some members of our society.

Oh, dear Lord, we implore Thee to send Thy angels from heaven to lead these creatures out of their secluded little world and into the realm of beauty and understanding. Although their lips cannot convey the words that are in their hearts, their eyes always sparkle with the message of love. Bring unto these unacceptables the warmth of acceptance in the circles of brotherhood.

Bless them, dear God, by brightening their paths as their parents seek to escape with them over the high wall of ignorance that separates them from their rightful place beside all of their brothers and sisters.

Let not our hope perish, dear God, that Thou will enrich the wisdom of men of science so that they will be able to see the light in the darkness of mental retardation.

Bless those, dear Lord, who have given so much of themselves and to this great cause, so that with Thy guidance the day of days that we so desperately seek will yet dawn upon these troubled parents and their beloved children. Amen.

Curb of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a column written by David Lawrence that appeared in the Evening Star, January 7, 1965, Washington, D.C. The column was entitled "Johnson Seeks To Curb a Freedom" and I insert it herewith:

Each individual is supposed to have the right under the Constitution to freedom of expression and freedom of thought. Countless demonstrations have been witnessed in recent months as citizens have engaged in sit-ins and various other dramatic manuevers in order to emphasize their civil rights.

But when it comes to the right of a citizen to work without being coerced into surrendering his beliefs, all the pious rhetoric about "human freedom" goes by the boards. The tragic truth is that, if a person wants to get a job to support his family, he is about to be told he must give up his "freedom of association" and "freedom of belief."

How many of the millions of persons who listened and watched President Johnson deliver his address to Congress last Monday night really understood the paragraph in which he recommended what amounts to a form of human bondage? For Johnson informed both Houses of Congress they would be asked to pass a law taking away from the 50 States their right to prohibit compulsory unionization. The President didn't explain the point to his audience, and it may well be wondered how many people could possibly learn what a fundamental change in American life was being recommended when all they heard was the following brief reference in Johnson's message:

"And as pledged in our 1960 and 1964 Democratic platforms, I will propose to Congress changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, including section 14–B. I will do so hoping to reduce conflicts that for several years have divided Americans in various States of our Union."

How many listeners recognize what was meant by the reference to section 14–B? It is the provision of the National Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 that permits each State to prohibit by law agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment within that State.

Twenty States now have "right to work" laws. They are Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Wyoming. But the labor-union monopoly objects to such laws and wants to extend its power over the entire country so that compulsory unionization will be "the law of the land."

Technically, an employer in any State can refuse to sign a contract with a union that stipulates a worker cannot be retained on his job unless he joins a union. But an employer who tries this is confronted by threats of strikes, picket lines, and other hazards to his business. He naturally feels that if employees generally don't care to preserve their rights, it isn't up to the management to do so.

Labor-union leaders are not so much concerned about the "right to work" laws in the 20 States as they are anxious to see compulsory unionization retained and extended in all the 30 other States where it is legally permissible, but where it has sometimes been fought by workers and employers by advocating the enactment of State "right to work laws.

Even if section 14–B is repealed, it will be technically possible for each State to have a right to work law to cover employment in businesses that are supposed to be conducted wholly within the State and are known as intrastate operations. But now that the Supreme Court has interpreted interstate commerce so broadly in connection with the Civil Rights Act, nearly every business that uses some article or ingredient or equipment coming from another State can be considered to to be engaged in interstate commerce and cannot be covered by the State "right to work" laws. These would thus become meaningless.

If Congress, however, passes legislation repealing section 14–B of the Taft-Hartley Act, it will be tantamount to endorsement of the idea of compulsory unionization everywhere and in all businesses. Those employee and employer groups that have held out against this step will be told that Congress and the President of the United States have formally endorsed the whole concept.

It seems ironic that, with all the many references in the President's message to "freedom" and the constant reiteration that the American people are enjoying unexampled freedom, a worker in many areas cannot keep a job unless he agrees to join a union within 30 or 60 days after he is employed.

The idea that a human being can be compelled to work against his will has long been denounced as slavery. It is easy enough to say that a worker doesn't have to become a member of a union—that he can just not apply for a job requiring union membership. But survival for himself and family may be at stake, and he has no alternative to accepting this form of coercion. Yet Johnson said in his message last Monday, "We have achieved a unity of interest among our people that is unmatched in the history of freedom."

American Indian Among Nation's Top 10 Young Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with real pride that I call attention to the fact that an American Indian and native South Dakotan is among the Nation's 10 outstanding young men for 1964, as selected by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce.

He is John H. Artichoker, Jr., born on the Pine Ridge Sioux Indian Reservation and currently superintendent of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Agency at Lame Deer, Mont.

The Jaycees could have made no finer choice. It has been my pleasure to follow the outstanding achievements of this young man since he was a child. He is a real credit not only to his parents and to his race but also to the American people as a whole.

But of deeper significance is the fact that this award—first of its kind for an American Indian, I believe—indicates the Indian can compete successfully in our society if he is given the opportunity to do so. It demonstrates once more that, slowly but surely, the Indian is adjusting and that our investments as a Nation in Indian programs are beginning to bear fruit.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I ask that a news article appearing in the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader of January 11, 1965, giving detailed information on Mr. Artichoker's background, be reprinted as a part of my remarks as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA GRAD IS NAMED ONE OF NATION'S TOP 10 YOUNG MEN

VERMILLION, S. DAK.—John H. Artichoker, Jr., Monday named one of the Nation's 10 outstanding young men for 1964, is a University of South Dakota graduate from

Mission who has devoted his young life to helping his people.

His father is a Winnebago Indian and his mother of Sioux Indian descent.

Artichoker, 34, is the first Indian to hold the position of superintendent of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Agency. He resides at Lame Deer, Mont.

Born on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota, Artichoker entered the University of South Dakota with no financial support except that given by his parents. At that time they were earning $180 a month.

Upon graduation with a bachelor's degree from the University of South Dakota in 1951, he was appointed director of Indian Education for the State of South Dakota. In this post he pioneered the integration of Indian and non-Indian students on a community basis.

He returned to the University of South Dakota and earned his M.A. degree in 1957.

Artichoker left the department of education in 1962 to accept a position with the Department of Interior in the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Billings, Mont., serving as technical adviser of tribal operations.

Artichoker later handled the grievances for the Indian people in seven States, serving for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Division of Indian Health.

In 1959 he was invited to attend the White House Conference on Children and Youth. He was also chairman of the Governors' Interstate Indian Affairs Conference and was for several years an adviser at South Dakota Boys State.

At the University of South Dakota Artichoker was active in campus affairs and a member of the varsity football squad as a reserve back.

He and wife June, who is of Kiowa Indian descent, live in Lame Deer with their one child, John Hobart III, 3.

Artichoker is the third University of South Dakota graduate who has been chosen for the select TOYM award, the others having been Robert Liebenow, president of the Chicago Board of Trade, and Joe Foss, commissioner of the American Football League.

As superintendent of the Montana reservation, Artichoker is responsible for improving the economic self-sufficiency, full participation in American life, and equal citizenship responsibilities for the 3,000 Indian people associated with the reservation.

In addition to supervising the development of the 444,000 acres of natural resources on the reservation, he is charged with the responsibility for the administration and disposition of the $4 million claim awarded the tribe by the United States.

Sacrifice in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, there is hardly a day passes now that the headlines or bylines of our daily newspapers do not carry a story of or from South Vietnam, and yet a large part of our adult population are unaware of the extent of our human involvement there. More than 22,000 uniformed Americans are serving in South Vietnam, the hottest spot of the cold war, and it is sad to be aware that a recent poll showed that more than 27 percent of American adults did not know that American troops were stationed in that country.

The sacrifices these men and women are making are not small ones; indeed, approximately 250 Americans and 140 in 1964 have been asked to make the ultimate sacrifice of all—their lives. One of these was Cpl. Richard D. Slack, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, of 11 Bunker Hill Lane, Quincy, Mass. Corporal Slack joined the Marine Corps after his graduation from Weymouth, Mass., High School in 1961 and was scheduled to be discharged in June 1965. He had only been transferred to the aircraft carrier *Princeton* in October 1964 and had received his wings as helicopter crew chief, having flown over 50 missions since arriving in Vietnam in May 1964. He was flying relief missions for flood victims in South Vietnam on Saturday, November 21, 1964, when the helicopter lost power and crashed into the sea.

Corporal Slack joined a long list of heroes and martyrs who have given their lives for their fellow citizens, and the most fitting eulogy we can make is to hope with Abraham Lincoln that they have not died in vain and that future generations of Americans shall not have to make the same sacrifices.

Almost all American servicemen in South Vietnam live in some kind of danger—danger to a greater or lesser extent depending on day-to-day circumstances. These men and women, all of them, are making a great sacrifice; namely, they are placing their lives in jeopardy in a situation which we cannot officially call war.

There is the sacrifice of inconvenience, of leaving family and home and what certainly must be called "the better way of life" for a country and people who may see the American uniform every day, and wonder why so many Americans are in their country.

And there is finally frustration with a war—where terror is always a weapon; where the unusual and the unknown weapons and tactics become the known and usual, only to be replaced by other unknowns; where a typical training bivouac becomes an atypical nightmare; where the enemy is never known, and the battle never won; where the villagers are concerned with survival, not with ideology, and where they know hunger but cannot recognize communism; and where Americans can give a full measure of dedication and work not knowing whether their efforts will ever be successful or bear fruit.

In South Vietnam there is a different kind of enemy in a new kind of war, and American sacrifices are of no small measure.

Following are texts of articles which appeared in the Boston Globe and Quincy Patriot Ledger:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe]

DEATHS

Slack—Of West Quincy, in South Vietnam, November 21, Richard D., Jr., corporal, USMC, beloved son of Richard D., Sr. and Elizabeth M. (Meenan) Slack, of 11 Bunker Hill Lane and brother of Kevin W., Bryan F., Stephen M., Merlyn T., Lisa M. and Mary Ann Slack, all of the home address. Funeral from the Grimwood & Coletta Funeral Home, 603 Adams Street, Quincy (Route 135), Thursday, December 3, at 9:15 a.m. Solemn High Funeral Mass at St. John's Church at 10 a.m. Visiting hours Tuesday, 7 to 10, Wednesday, 2 to 4 and 7 to 10. Relatives and friends are kindly invited. Interment Blue Hills Cemetery.

QUINCY MARINE KILLED IN VIET COPTER CRASH

QUINCY.—Cpl. Richard D. Slack, Jr., 21, of 11 Bunker Hill Lane, was killed Saturday in the crash of a Marine helicopter flying relief missions for flood victims in South Vietnam.

The helicopter, operating from the aircraft carrier *Princeton*, lost power and crashed into the sea about 2 miles from the carrier and near the town of Qui Mhon.

Corporal Slack was transferred to the *Princeton* 6 weeks ago. He recently received his wings as helicopter crew chief, having flown over 50 missions since arriving in Vietnam last May.

He was decorated for his service during the Cuban missile crisis and in Vietnam.

Born in Medford, he lived in Weymouth most of his life and was a 1961 graduate of Weymouth High School. He joined the Marines shortly after graduation and was scheduled to be discharged next June.

He had attended East Carolina State College while undergoing training at Camp Lejeune, N.C., and was planning to study to be a commercial pilot after his discharge.

He was engaged to marry Miss Judith Costello, 20, of 72 Upland Road, a senior at Boston University.

Corporal Slack is survived by his parents, Richard D. Slack, Sr., and Mrs. Elizabeth (Meenan) Slack; three brothers, Kevin Slack, 18, Bryan Slack, 16, and Stephen Slack, 13, three sisters, Merlyn Slack, 11, Lisa Slack, 6, and Maryann Slack, 2, all of Quincy, and his grandfather, Ernest W. Slack, of Medford.

Funeral arrangements are being made by the Grimwood-Coletta Funeral Home, 603 Adams Street.

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot Ledger, Dec. 4, 1964]

OVER 300 AT MASS FOR RICHARD SLACK, VIET WAR VICTIM

QUINCY.—More than 300 attended a solemn high mass of requiem yesterday in St. John's Church for Cpl. Richard D. Slack Jr., 21, of West Quincy, victim of a Vietnam helicopter crash November 21.

Rev. John J. McMahon of St. Mary's Church celebrated the Mass. Rev. D. Domenic Menna was deacon and Rev. Leo X. Lynch, subdeacon.

In his eulogy, Reverend Father McMahon said:

"He gave his life for his country; it was voluntary service. He laid down his life that you and I, and all of us, might live safely in our United States * * *.

"And so Corporal Richard joins a long line of heroes and martyrs who have given their lives for their fellow citizens. He joins the great and the small. He is with Abraham Lincoln and our late President and with the hundreds of unknown soldiers who died for their country * * *.

"The priests and the parishioners of St. Mary's and St. John's offer their deep sympathy to his good mother and father and family. May God be good to him and may we never forget what he has done for us all."

Marine bodybearers were from the Marine Corps Recruiting Stations of Quincy and Greater Boston. Firing detail and the bugler were Marines stationed at the Boston Naval Shipyard.

Gunnery Sgt. Leo Tierney presented a flag to the family.

Reverend Father Menna and Reverend Father Lynch read committal prayers at Blue Hill Cemetery, Braintree.

Famed Tennessee Banker Suggests Ways To Increase U.S. Gold Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished Tennessee banker, thoroughly versed in monetary problems, has written a statement in which he brings his experience and insights to bear on our country's gold reserve problem. In this paper, a way is suggested to solve the crisis growing out of our country's international exchange deficit.

The author of this statement is Mr. Thomas Motlow, president of the Farmers Bank of Lynchburg, Tenn. Mr. Motlow has been the active head of an old and important smalltown bank for more than 60 years. His knowledge of finance and banking is widely recognized.

As Mr. Motlow is eminently qualified to make the recommendations contained in his proposal, under unanimous consent, I include his statement in the Appendix of the RECORD.

His statement follows:

A REMEDY FOR OUR GOLD RESERVE PROBLEM

(By Thomas Motlow, president, the Farmers Bank, Lynchburg, Tenn.)

There is no greater problem in world commerce and finance today than the problem of liquidity, that is, having a currency or other financial media recognized and accepted anywhere in the world, thus bringing the world into a condition similar to one country in a financial way. As gold is recognized universally as the most desirable metal in the world for use as money, being recognized for its value in proportion to its volume, easily moved from one location to another, there is no greater accomplishment than to obtain an increase of this metal to be used as money or security for money.

This problem has been pressing for solution since William J. Bryan opposed Grover Cleveland for the Presidency of the country and made his famous speech about crucifying America upon a cross of gold.

At that time the writer was attending the Webb School at Bell Buckle, Tenn., and the principal, Mr. W. R. Webb, had the debating societies use that subject in their weekly debates.

There is no doubt that the commerce of the world from nation to nation would be promoted should the liquidity mentioned above be brought about, and (in the writer's opinion) an increase in monetary gold would be the answer to the problem.

The population of the world is increasing faster than the production of gold and all values are determined ultimately, directly or indirectly by their value in gold.

At this time this Nation has about $15 billion in gold. About three-fourths of that is pledged as a 25-percent reserve for currency and member bank deposits in the Federal Reserve.

This comparatively small stock of gold is being depleted by our unfavorable balance of international exchange; which includes travel in foreign countries, support of our military forces abroad for aid and many other expenditures. This is brought about by the fact that any national bank in any foreign country can demand gold for any deficit caused by any of these expenditures. These demands have been causing the decrease in the value of the dollar as the leading monetary unit of the world.

This situation is brought about by the existence of a law that the U.S. Treasury pay $35 an ounce for gold or sell gold at the price of $35 an ounce. No company, or individual in this country, can acquire or hold gold except for the few rare coins.

After 70 years of study of this gold problem, I suggest a remedy that might be brought about without too much trouble. That is to discourage the use of gold as ornaments, in the arts and in other respects, and use a greater proportion for currency reserve.

It is reported that only 29 percent of the annual world production is used as money and monetary reserve.

Now, if this percentage of use could be enhanced and our gold reserve increased, worldwide esteem for the dollar would be increased, international trade increased and world prosperity promoted with resultant advantage to all.

Now let us take the following as an example:

Suppose there is dug from the earth an ounce of gold; that ounce is worth $35 and our Treasury will pay that price to anyone. The Treasury could use this ounce as a reserve for four times the price, or $140.

Then suppose this $140 should be deposited in an American bank. With a reserve of say 16⅔ percent the $140 could produce five times the $140, or $700 good bank money.

Now, if this $35 had been used to buy something made of gold, say a watch for $35, the gold would be worth only the $35 and it might be lost, burned, or destroyed. Thus the commerce of the world and welfare of our economy would be lowered by the misuse of this metal that could have been used for twenty times the original price as a currency reserve and bank deposit. Now, just multiply the world's annual production of gold, which I estimated at $1½ billion, by 20 and you can imagine the result that would be startling.

Would this not be better than permitting the use of the metal as bracelets for the Abysinnians, anklets for the Senegambians and for gold images of worship in the African nations?

Where is the gold of Captain Kidd?

Would that not also apply to this country, whose inhabitants use so much gold for ornaments of every kind for gadgets and instruments that could be made with other metals and gold plating for utensils?

I have suggested this to a wise man who has traveled much, who has a good idea not only of this country but of the world, and he said that this idea if carried out could change the habit and standard of living of the entire world. But he added that in his opinion millions would have to adopt it before its effects would be greatly helpful.

Every panic since 1893 has been caused or accelerated by the export of gold.

The current loss is causing the Nation's financiers to walk the floor in nervous fear of another depression.

It has been suggested by one prominent authority that gold no longer be used as money or monetary reserve.

That might be harmful and cause a loss in lowering the value of the metal.

The remedy suggested above is less drastic, more progressive, with no hardship involved with advantages to be realized.

Perhaps in the future the production of gold might be increased.

That increase, concurrent with the program under consideration, would bring about an improvement in the world that is almost unimaginable.

The question, however, arises: Is this program practical? Can it be carried out without trouble or resentment? These same questions were asked when the price of gold, about 30 years ago, was raised about 75 percent, and the insurance of bank deposits was accomplished by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

These measures brought more relaxation and freedom from fear in business and financial circles than anything else in my 70 years study and 63 years of actual experience in banking.

Since then banking failures have become almost unknown.

Suppose we give up, for a period, more impractical projects and concentrate on this for the prosperity and happiness of the world?

As an example of the power and influence of gold and its value as a reserve for currency let us take the figures shown by reports of the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States of America:

On December 31, 1951, the total of all currency and coins in all the banks of the United States of America was $2,890,421,000. On that date all deposits of all the banks in the Nation amounted to $186,603,665,000.

On December 31, 1961, all the currency and coins in all the banks of the Nation amounted to $3,865 million and the total of all deposits in all the banks of the Nation was $287,991 million. In 1951 the ratio of deposits to actual cash in all banks was 64 to 1. In 1961 the ratio of deposits to actual cash in all banks was 74 to 1. These figures speak for themselves.

Thus an increase in gold as money and reserve for money would bring from 64 to 74 times that much bank money represented by deposits in all the Nation's banks.

Thus would not just a small addition to gold solve the problem mentioned above as to liquidity in world commerce which becomes more urgent with increase of population?

An Inch of Culture to a Mile of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to a recent column written by Mr. Holmes Alexander and distributed nationally by the McNaught Syndicate. In his column, Mr. Alexander provides a perceptive argument for establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, as proposed in my bill H.R. 334.

The article follows:

AN INCH OF CULTURE TO A MILE OF SCIENCE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—"Man is astonishingly good at dealing with the physical world, but he is just as astonishingly bad at dealing with human nature; therefore, an inch gained in the understanding of and command over human nature is worth a mile in the understanding and command over physical nature."—Arnold Toynbee, "A Study of History."

Flying back and forth between Washington and his home, Congressman WILLIAM MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, had been reading and pondering on the one-sidedness of the American society. Ever since the Russian sputniks flew—and before that—the weight of erudition and ambition has fallen to the side of the physical sciences.

The Federal Government has encouraged this bias through the establishment of the National Science Foundation, and later in

the Space Act. Money has poured into education from the Defense Department, NASA, and the National Institutes of Health. It was a good thing, thought the quiet-spoken, silver-haired solon, Yale 1944, Harvard Law School 1949. Not too much of a good thing, for the country needs its scientific competence, but a good thing out of balance.

He was thinking that Johnny can't read, think or articulate; that automation is pushing the labor force into an "abyss of leisure"; that the profound philosophic expertise which permitted the Founding Fathers to express immortal ideas in unforgettable prose is no longer at our general command. Then one day MOORHEAD, a reader of Toynbee, came across the foregoing passage and exclaimed, as he tells me, "That's just what I was trying to say."

MOORHEAD soon said it again in the legislative language of his bill to establish a National Humanities Foundation. The bill got lost at the last session but is now being introduced with numerous cosponsors from both House and Senate. It proposes, in general, that the Government do for the studies in English literature, foreign languages, history, philosophy, ethics, and economics what has already been done for the natural sciences. Section 6 of MOORHEAD's bill contains a specific prohibition against Federal interference in the proliferation of scholarships, fellowships, libraries, and museums.

Since launching his idea into orbit, MOORHEAD has been getting invitations to address learned and academic groups around the Nation, and he has collected more than 1,000 letters from 40 of our States. More than a few of the letters come from men and women who write in effect: "I have been teaching or practicing science all my life, but you are right and I'm for the bill."

Whether President Johnson is for it—the Moorhead measure isn't part of the Great Society package—becomes the crucial question. L.B.J. has come out several times for "culture," but his temperament tends toward the hard-knowledge subjects in education. Three of our late Presidents, however, have set the precedent for promotion of studies in the humanities. Jefferson, in 1809, pushed for the establishment of free circulating libraries in every American county. Fifty years ago Hoover began to build the research collection at Stanford University which bears his name. Kennedy set the example of nonscientific writing in his own works, and his family is carrying on with the Kennedy Library on the Harvard campus.

Thus far, the Moorhead effort is stronger in good intentions than it is in political propulsion. It needs behind it the driving power of men who would be aghast to know that, while the Federal Government provides school lunches, there are 10,600,000 students in American public schools without a central library of any kind.

A Toy Safe and an I O U

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial column from the Auburndale Star, of January 7, 1965, entitled "A Toy Safe and an I O U."

Editor John Lopp expresses deep concern over what will happen when the day of reckoning comes—that day when our Federal Government's income does not equal its outgo. Each of us in the Congress should give thought to this inevitable problem.

The editorial follows:

A TOY SAFE AND AN I O U

(By John D. Lopp)

Although it occurred almost a half century ago you will remember your first brush with high finance and and how you learned a lesson that is as applicable today as it was way back in 1915 or some such year.

You had received a miniature safe, made of cast iron and with a real key and lock as part of your Christmas loot, and for weeks afterward you had hoarded every Indianhead penny along with the occasional nickel that had come your way.

Ever so often you'd get the tiny key off of the shelf in your bedroom, unlock the strongbox and miserlike count your savings.

One day along about spring you recall you unlocked the bank, but instead of coins out poured a slip of paper, with writing on it.

You set up a howl and your mother hurried to explain that she had borrowed your coins to meet some urgent need, like paying the carrier for the old St. Louis Republic, which was a daily visitor at your home.

"But that piece of paper is really a note, saying I owe you your 30 cents," she assured you. "It's just the same as money."

And you believed her, although even at that early age it was difficult for you to understand how a piece of blue lined paper with pen marks on it was "just the same as money."

Next trip downtown you decided to find out if it really was.

You took the slip out of the make-believe safe and headed for the corner grocery, where you ordered a penny's worth of redhots, 2 cents worth of candy corn, and two chocolate-covered marshmallow teddybears.

You handed the grocer the slip.

"I'll take the change in money," you told him adding as you saw him frown over the paper slip, "Mom says it's just the same as money."

The grocer inspected the "I O U" and handed it back to you.

"Your mother's partly right, Johnny," he said. "It's just the same as money as long as you don't try to spend it."

And you remember he let you keep the candy, probably putting the nickel onto the family's bill.

That was 50 years ago, yet today that "just the same as money" philosophy has become a national, instead of a family, policy.

For instance, you take a look at the social security program.

There is no money in the Treasury to pay off accounts as the older workers retire.

Instead there are Government bonds, purchased by the Social Security Administration, and make no mistake about them they are just the same as money until you try to spend them.

Then, since they represent only a promise of the Government to pay, they must be converted into cash to meet the pension demands.

The Government has no source of income except taxes and borrowing. And borrowing in the final analysis must be repaid from future taxes.

Which means that social security payments now due and those which will become payable in the future must be met from new taxes, not from the "just the same as money" I O U's, which are all that the bonds really amount to.

You ponder that situation as you listen to the President's state of the Union address and as you contemplate the new drain on your paycheck when medicare becomes a reality, and you feel pretty much as you did a half a century ago when you suddenly realized that a promise to pay isn't exactly the same as money in the bank, unless you choose not to spend it.

So today as you sit at your desk writing these words you wonder just what is really going to happen come the day that the demand for retirement payments and medicare bills exceed the monthly withholding take.

And you decide there are only two answers and both are painful to contemplate.

Of course, instead of lending money to other agencies, the social security system can begin borrowing—but that will only postpone the day of reckoning.

The other course is to increase the withholding tax on each individual to where income will balance the outgo, but with the Government already taking a prohibitive bite out of each paycheck in direct and indirect taxation, there's a limit to what the wage-earner can and will stand.

There is one other alternative—and that's printing press money, which means the wildest inflation imaginable, unless—and here's the gimmick—the money is issued by a totalitarian government, which freezes all prices and all wages and turns the nation into the socialistic state where every action and every price is controlled.

And that—fantastic as it may seem to many who embrace the philosophy of the Great Society—is exactly the collision course upon which this Nation is embarked.

A Champion Describes His Home State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Metropolitan Golf Writers Association assembled for their annual awards dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York. At this dinner, a brief address was delivered by one of West Virginia's alltime greats—the national amateur golf champion, Bill Campbell, of my hometown of Huntington, W. Va.

Bill Campbell was on hand to receive the Gold Tee Award, presented to the individual who has contributed the most to golf over the years. This prince among men who once captained America's Walker Cup team, who has won wide renown in the golfing world for his excellent sportsmanship, who was so often close to but never quite a champion until now, delivered a remarkable address—not about golf, but about his home State of West Virginia. Here is what he told his New York audience:

I wonder how much you know about West Virginia—except perhaps that it has been exploited politically and journalistically as the poverty capital of America? This is too big and important an audience for a proud West Virginian not to set the record straight about our part of Appalachia.

I attended the Gold Tee dinner 9 years ago when Senator SMATHERS took the opportunity to talk about his nature State of Florida, which had not even been maligned, so I should be allowed equal time now, for just 1 minute.

Like Switzerland, mountainous West Virginia is surrounded by States that are more populous and supposedly also more prosperous and progressive. We are centrally

located yet denied a personality of our own, and now without reason.

On the map, West Virginia is north of Pittsburgh and south of Richmond, east of Rochester and west of Cleveland, stretching on both sides of the Alleghenies; and despite its birth by secession from the Confederacy, it lies mostly south of the Mason and Dixon line. Even West Virginia's detractors should agree that it is in pretty good condition for the shape it is in.

Actually, our economic indices have constantly improved, 1964 being our best year ever for West Virginia business. Would you believe that our urban retail sales per capita exceed those of any of the neighboring States of Ohio, Virginia, Kentucky and Pennsylvania? And that our per capita income exceeds that of all Southern States except Florida and Texas. Not bad, for a so-called depressed area, is it? So fear not to send us your factories and your teeming multitudes.

Meanwhile, why not come and visit West Virginia? See for yourself, fish our trout streams, and ventilate your lungs with our pure mountain air. And remember to bring your golf clubs when you come to The Greenbrier for a change, and a rest, but bring your handicap card too, and plan to play well, or the hotel will get the change and Sam Snead will get the rest.

Mr. Speaker, West Virginia is doubly proud of Bill Campbell. We have rooted for him and followed along with him in the ups and downs of his brilliant tournament play. For 21 years, this tall Princeton graduate battled away, year after year, in the National Amateur, twice reaching the semifinals, and twice reaching the semifinals in the British Amateur. Twice he was a finalist in the Canadian Amateur, and once finalist in the British Amateur. Some thought he had the bad luck to run up against Ed Tutwiler, who has frequently beaten Campbell in the West Virginia Amateur, in the National Amateur finals last September. But Bill came through and did it.

Now the champion has made his mark in another way. He is in the vanguard of another noble effort—to build the image of his home State of West Virginia, so maligned by the slick writers seeking a sensational story after a quick peek at the fringes.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Campbell is a modest man. He does not gild the lily. He tells the simple truth about West Virginia. To help understand Bill Campbell, and why we are so proud of him in West Virginia, I include the following article by Ernie Salvatore, sports editor of the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser:

DOWN IN FRONT—THE GENTLEMAN DID IT HIMSELF

(By Ernie Salvatore)

The hardest man remaining to be convinced that Bill Campbell is really the new U.S. amateur golf champion is Bill Campbell himself.

But, as the messages of congratulation continue to pour in 4 days after his breakthrough, he's beginning to weaken.

Pointing to a fresh stack on his office desk early today, he shook his head in amazement and said, "Each one that comes is a fresh reminder that it did happen. And, do you know, I'm beginning to believe it."

If Bill has been slow to accept the reality of his triumph, it's understandable. His past amateur career, though most satisfying, was no stranger to frustration. Major national championships somehow always managed to elude him—often at the last possible moment.

"I was putting together the greatest runnerup record in the history of amateur golf," he said, ticking off two such finishes in the Canadian Amateur, another in the British, plus a pair of semifinal efforts in both the United States and the British.

But, last week, on his 21st try, he finally changed the pattern, and against Ed Tutwiler, his old West Virginia rival and friend. They went the full 36 holes in a typical Campbell-Tutwiler dogfight to reach a decision, too.

As far as Bill is concerned, and contrary to what many might have believed, he couldn't have drawn a more comfortable opponent.

"Instead of playing a stranger whose game was unfamiliar, there I was going against an old friend from back home. Tut's presence was a great pacifier for me. I went into our match enveloped in a massive calm."

Campbell realizes many inaccuracies have innocently been read into his rivalry with Tut, that bitterness is suspected mainly because of Tut's 7 to 1 edge in their State amateur series, a bitterness steeped in unspecified personal differences, also.

FRIENDS MOST OF ALL

"But, it's simply not true," Bill said. "Certainly, we're rivals on the golf course. But, most of all we're friends. Why, we've roomed together at other tournaments, and we've also tried to help each other with our games. In 1957, when I won my last North-South at Pinehurst, it was Ed who helped me correct some putting faults."

Much of the misunderstanding about the Campbell-Tut rivalry is also logically based on the sharp contrasts in their games and conduct. Campbell is the steady, calm, quiet man. Tut is the reckless, colorful, garrulous scrambler—the man of a million golfing miracles.

These held no fears for Campbell last week—never have, for that matter. Actually, Bill wouldn't have been hesitant about playing Arnold Palmer in the finals, if Arnie was still eligible. A series of little tell-tale signs had been pointing to a championship for several weeks.

He felt physically stronger than he had in years, for one thing. His hay fever was under control, for another.

PLAYED WITH CLEAR HEAD

"Thanks to some new juice my doctor prescribed, I went to an amateur with a clear head for a change," he said. "I even told my wife and my parents that I had a feeling this might be my year to win."

"Their reactions weren't overwhelming," he chuckled.

Then, there was that miracle shot on the 19th hole of his first match. The ball flew off his club soaring toward disaster—but, it took a strange bounce, ricocheted off a tree and onto the green.

Another was the decision of a sportswriter to "stay with me after the second day, because I was going to win it," Bill said. "I didn't know this fellow—I'd never heard of him. Yet, for some reason he picked me, and I'm thankful he made the right pick."

There was the weather.

"We had only 1 hot day all week," Bill said, "and, at my age (41) that helped. Early in the tournament it was cool. Later it was wet.

"That also explains the presence of so many older players in the late rounds. Canterbury's character was another factor. Its trees and doglegs put a premium on experience."

There was his set of accidentally heavy clubs.

"I had won a set of irons for being the low amateur in the State open last year. So, I pulled a refinished driver out of my locker and sent it in to the factory with orders to match the irons and a spoon with it. The driver was heavier than I thought. So, when the new set came back, they were much heavier than what I was used to."

The heavier clubs, plus hard work on correcting flaws in his backswing, came together to give Bill greater control over his shots—and this, too, helped produce last week's victory.

These explanations are typical of Bill Campbell, who always tends to minimize himself.

But, it seems to me someone had to hit the shots at Canterbury, someone had to face the pressure, and battle doggedly to the title.

That someone, regardless of all the signs of predestiny, was the gentleman himself—the gentleman from Huntington that is, Bill Campbell. As they say, it couldn't have happened to a nicer, more deserving man.

The Honorable L. Mendel Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware of the competence and effectiveness of the new chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina. He is providing leadership in developing our national policy which is based on long and sound experience. His qualifications stand this Nation in good stead.

Through the bills which he has sponsored, Congressman RIVERS already has had a major impact upon the policies which guide our national defense program. In a real sense, he has contributed to the security which the United States through its military strength, is privileged to enjoy in these threatening times.

All of those who know MENDEL RIVERS will be proud he has been selected by the Reserve Officers Association to receive this year's ROA award as "the citizen who has contributed most to national security." As it has done in the past, this association reflects credit upon itself and upon its record of service to national security in choosing its 1965 recipient of this Minute Man Award.

The February issue of the ROA magazine, the Officer, carries an article which outlines many other aspects of the great service rendered by MENDEL RIVERS to his constituents in South Carolina, and to the entire Nation. This article, written by John J. Ford, is most interesting and enlightening. I am pleased to call it to the attention of the Members of this body:

WRITER VIEWS A RESTLESS RIVERS AND HIS FABULOUS CAREER

(By John J. Ford, congressional editor, Army Times; contributing editor, the Officer)

Ask a dozen artists to draw their conception of a Congressman and combine the 12 into a single drawing and the composite is likely to look very much like LUCIUS MENDEL

RIVERS, the Representative from Charleston, S.C., the new chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and ROA's Minuteman of the Year. More than almost any other Member of Congress (with the possible exception of Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, and the now-departed Kenneth Keating, of New York), MENDEL RIVERS looks like a solon. His long flowing white hair is famous at the Capitol. With a frock coat and string tie he would appear to have just stepped out of the 19th century.

The tall South Carolinian is what he looks like: a man absorbed in the job of being a legislator. At 59, after 24 years in the House, he comes to the chairmanship of the powerful House Armed Services Committee with an extraordinarily wide range of legislative achievement. He has been deeply involved in virtually all aspects of the military program; pay and other personnel benefits legislation, the Reserve, airlift, hospital construction policy, shipyard, weapons procurement—the whole gamut. He has an impressive list of battles won and, quite obviously, a lot of fight left in him.

In recent years he has taken an especial interest in seeing that the men and women of the Armed Forces share in the benefits of the Nation's prosperity and he has made it clear this is going to be one of his important goals as chairman. A man with an unusual gift for the right words, he put it this way: "The members of the Armed Forces are entitled to a standard of living equal to the standard of living they are defending."

RIVERS is known at the Capitol as the earliest of the early risers, getting out of bed every morning when many people in Washington are just getting in. He usually rises between 4:30 and 5 a.m. It is not too uncommon for him to be up as early as 4 a.m. He is always at the Capitol by 7 in the morning.

"When you get up early in the morning your mind is pretty clear," he says.

He once casually remarked to this reporter that he likes to schedule appointments "between 6 and 10 in the morning." It didn't seem to have occurred to him that there weren't many people around for a 6 a.m. conference.

HABIT FORMED EARLY

Necessity was the mother of habit as far as the early rising is concerned. It was ingrained in a hard childhood. RIVERS was born on a farm in Gumville, S.C. (on September 28, 1905), and shortly after his family moved to a farm near St. Stephens, S.C. On a farm, of course, everyone gets up early. When MENDEL was in the second grade, his father died, which meant hard times for the family. As soon as he could, MENDEL had to take on odd jobs to help out.

He had a paper route and after delivering the papers in the morning he still had to milk the cows before going to school. When he went to high school in Charleston, the school was 10 miles away and he had to catch the trolley for Charleston at 7:45 in the morning. In order to get his papers delivered, get his cows milked and still get the trolley on time he used to get up at 4 a.m.

He worked all during the time he went to school and also at the College of Charleston, where he took undergraduate work, and the University of South Carolina, where he got his law degree.

One of his earliest jobs was in the summer of 1918 when the Charleston Transportation Depot was being built in connection with the war effort. MENDEL, 13 at the time, was the waterboy for the laboring gang. When he was older he got more pleasant summer work with companies that sponsored semiprofessional baseball teams around Charleston. He was proud of his hitting ability. In later years, when he played in the annual congressional games held in Washington for charity, he used to tell his colleagues that he had "the highest batting average in disorganized baseball."

RIVERS received his law degree in 1932. From 1933 to 1936 he served in the South Carolina Legislature and from 1936 to 1940 served as a special attorney with the U.S. Department of Justice. At Justice he served under the late Brian McMahon who later, as a Senator, achieved fame for his work on atomic energy legislation.

RIVERS says he always knew he was going to go to Congress and that it was only a matter of when to run. But the time he chose, the election of 1940, seemed something less than propitious. The organization backed his opponent and MENDEL had very little money for a campaign. But he had energy and he left no stone unturned and no hand unshook in his quest for office. The present mayor of Charleston, J. Palmer Gaillard, who as a boy at the time went around tacking RIVERS' signs on trees, tells a delightful story of election night in MENDEL's campaign headquarters. It was a small, sparsely furnished office and early in the evening there were only MENDEL, a very few friends, and a battered radio on which to hear the returns. As the returns grew the crowd grew and by the end of the evening, when it was clear MENDEL had won by a big margin and scored a major upset, the office was mobbed with people who said they knew all the time MENDEL was going to win. In 12 elections since then, no one has come close to beating RIVERS.

Three months after he arrived in Congress, RIVERS began matriculating at "Vinson University"—which is what the alumni call committees run by Carl Vinson, George's famed lawmaker who retired in December after 50 consecutive years in the House. Among fellow students at "Vinson University" at the time was Lyndon B. Johnson, who also graduated with honors. As committee chairman, RIVERS is expected to work well with the President.

RIVERS moved with Vinson from the Naval Affairs Committee to the Armed Services Committee following the Unification Act in 1947.

"The greatest thing that ever happened to me is that I worked under Mr. Vinson," RIVERS said recently.

"OLEO" RIVERS

Not all of RIVERS triumphs were in the military field. One of his earliest and longest battles was his fight in the early forties to get the tax off margarine. He made so many speeches on the subject his colleagues used to call him "OLEO" RIVERS.

Margarine at that time was made from cottonseed oil, which of course was a product of RIVERS' area of the country, although none was produced in his congressional district. The midwestern dairy farmers led the lobbying against margarine, fearing it would cut into their butter business. RIVERS didn't think it was fair to tax one product to keep it from competing with another. The needs of wartime helped him win the battle. Curiously enough, most margarine is now made from soybean oil and midwestern farms benefit from its sale as much as southern farmers.

Another early victory from which RIVERS derived great satisfaction was helping to push through legislation creating the Navy Dental Corps. He has always taken a special interest in medical and dental corps personnel. Last year he headed a special subcommittee that made an exhaustive study of hospital construction policy and the worrisome problem of providing medical care long promised military retirees and their dependents.

He says that one of his most satisfying achievements was his work in improving military airlift. He chaired lengthy hearings on the subject and was remarkably successful in getting the airlift program off dead center.

RIVERS also served a stint as chairman of the Reserve Subcommittee of the House Armed Services unit and authored the Reserve readjustment pay bill.

The 88th Congress was unique in passing two pay bills and RIVERS was chairman of the subcommittee that handled both measures. On the 1963 bill he reluctantly, but successfully, opposed his chairman, Carl Vinson, to lead the floor fight in the House to provide retired pay recomputation for those retired before 1958. He had consistently been one of the stanchest supporters of the principle of recomputation. The 1963 bill, with a $1.2 billion price tag, was the largest pay bill ever passed. Still, RIVERS says that one of his keenest disappointments is that the bill was not passed as written by his subcommittee. The measure was caught in an economy drive and scaled down before passage.

DEFENDER OF BENEFITS

RIVERS has stated his feeling on the need for adequate service pay very clearly.

"I know one thing," he said. "Unless we provide adequate increases for members of our armed services, we are going to develop a generation of mediocre officers and noncommissioned officers which may be one of the most dangerous trends ever faced by any nation * * *. I intend to do a great deal more for the members of our armed services who are watching their privileges, their rights, their benefits being attacked from every side."

One military benefit he has defended with great vigor is the commissary stores—particularly after the attack on same by the Comptroller General. "If Congress wants to authorize a million commissaries that's none of the Comptroller's business," RIVERS said. "If any commissary is closed it will be over my battered body."

The latter remark illustrates both his penchant for strong statements and his fine sense of word choice. He did not say my "dead" body, as the familiar phrase goes because, as he told an aid, "even if I'm defeated I won't be dead."

While giving most of his attention to military affairs, RIVERS has not exactly neglected his home district of Charleston. In the past 10 years Charleston has grown into a great naval base highlighted by repair and homeporting facilities for Polaris submarines. Charlestonians frankly give RIVERS the credit for much of the buildup.

On the surface a quick, outgoing, sometimes seemingly impetuous man, RIVERS is actually one of the hardest workers in Congress, with a high sense of responsibility and a sure sense of how to carry it out. Even some of his casual, witty remarks in hearings are more studied than witnesses ever realize.

John R. Blandford, the chief counsel for the Armed Services Committee, put it this way: "Mr. RIVERS always knows what he is doing. To some he may give the impression of acting impulsively but those who think about it realize immediately, or certainly in retrospect, that he must have given much prior consideration to his words.

"He has a remarkably analytical mind. He can cross-examine with rapier effect but at the same time can be as courteous and courtly as any man in Congress."

To one who has watched him run subcommittees over the years RIVERS' special gift has always seemed to be an unerring sense of when to follow his own instincts and when to take advice from other members, from counsel, from witnesses. He has the considerable advantage of knowing what he doesn't know. He is a man of such deep

convictions that he is often quick to express but he is not afraid to change course.

Someone once said of him that the five most important things in his life are his family, his country, the Congress, the Armed Forces, and time. Time is something he can't stand to see wasted. And his rising schedule makes for a long working day. He has two times for leaving his office in the evening, just before or just after the rush—but it is usually after. He breaks up his day with a 10-minute nap in the cloakroom at noon. He loves golf, hunting, and other sports, all of which he seldom gets time for, is an enthusiastic gardener, and likes to cook many of his own meals. He never uses tobacco, abhors cocktail parties, and limits his social activities to military functions.

POETRY QUOTER

Ask those who work with him or for him about MENDEL RIVERS and sooner or later most of them will mention his marvelous retentive memory. It is a very valuable attribute for one working with the many intricacies of complex military legislation. But in RIVERS it also manifests itself in the ability to quote great swatches of poetry from memory. He sprinkles lines from the great poets in hearings and floor speeches and it often serves to ease a tense moment. Once he arrived on the House floor to find his colleagues were eulogizing a retiring Member. After expressing irritation that he hadn't been notified in advance of the program, RIVERS broke into a moving tribute to the departing solon that included three selections of poetry ranging up to 24 lines each, all of which fitted the occasion.

RIVERS is proud of his ability to remember poetry, as I discovered some years back when, after a hearing, I started to question the version of some lines from Thomas Gray he had used. His eyes showed at once he didn't appreciate having his knowledge of Gray questioned and he quickly quoted the lines correctly before I could.

RIVERS kids that one of the reasons he knows so much poetry is that he was associated for so long with Dewey Short, the highly educated Ozark Republican. "He could quote poetry till Hell won't have it," RIVERS said. But the love of poetry and the reading of it has been a lifelong habit.

Besides the poetry RIVERS often eases tension in committee hearings with his own brand of humor.

Last year a witness who had gotten himself trapped in a hopeless position before the committee asked if he could rephrase his answers to some questions.

"You go ahead and clear your conscience as much as you can," RIVERS said.

For the future, the restless RIVERS is certain to keep the Armed Services Committee, which has always been a busy group, moving in high gear. Those who know him best say he is not likely to accept the Pentagon's word on things as quickly as his predecessor. He is a strong believer in Vinson's position against a single chief of staff system. Last year he introduced a bill to prevent any Defense organizational changes without prior notice to Congress and at the time he told the Congress "must take back its constitutional responsibilities." He wants to make sure that Congress has its share of authority and carries its share of responsibility for running the Armed Forces. For MENDEL RIVERS, article I, section 8 of the Constitution ("Congress shall have the power to raise and support armies * * * to provide and maintain a navy.") is living literature. The Pentagon will find it's his favorite quotation. For him, it's poetry.

Taxes on Antitrust Treble Damage Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement submitted to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, January 21, 1965, in opposition to the tax ruling allowing deduction of treble damage antitrust penalties. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER

I welcome the decision of the distinguished chairman and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to consider the recent ruling of the Internal Revenue Service, announced in TIR-615, permitting Federal income tax deductions, as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses, of payments made in satisfaction of, and for unsuccessful defense against, private treble damage claims under the antitrust laws. I am grateful for this opportunity to express my concern at the impact of this ruling upon effective antitrust enforcement.

The antitrust laws embody policies essential to our political and economic strength, and their enforcement is a matter of primary importance. The Sherman Act of 1890, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1–17, is the keystone, so to speak, of the antitrust arch. As the Supreme Court recently stated in *Northern Pacific Ry.* v. *United States*, 356 U.S. 1, 4:

"The Sherman Act was designed to be a comprehensive charter of economic liberty aimed at preserving free and unfettered competition as the rule of trade. It rests on the premise that the unrestrained interaction of competitive forces will yield the best allocation of our economic resources, the lowest prices, the highest quality and the greatest material progress, while at the same time providing an environment conducive to the preservation of our democratic political and social institutions."

In sweeping language "comparable to that found to be desirable in constitutional provisions" (*Appalachian Coals, Inc.* v. *United States*, 288 U.S. 344, 359), the Sherman Act condemns contracts, conspiracies and trusts in restraint of trade, and monopolies or conspiracies to monopolize. Violations may be punished both by criminal prosecution and by private actions for treble damages, and either the Government or private parties may sue to restrain violations.

The Clayton Act of 1914, 15 U.S.C. 12–27, supplements the broad provisions of the Sherman Act by prohibiting specified transactions or conduct such as tie-in sales, exclusive dealing, interlocking directorates, mergers and the like where their effect "may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly." Violations may be restrained by injunction at the suit of the Government or a private party, the Government can recover its actual damages incurred as a result of antitrust violations, and private parties are again accorded a right of action for treble damages.

The Internal Revenue Service ruling in TIR-615 must be measured against the public policy embodied in these statutes. I believe that TIR-615 is bad law, bad public policy, and bad public administration. It permits an antitrust offender, already convicted of a criminal antitrust violation, to deduct treble damages paid to its victims after guilt has been established, and consequent damage to the victims proved in a private action.

The legal question before this committee, in my view, is whether conduct which constitutes a criminal antitrust violation is conduct that is "ordinary and necessary * * * in carrying on any trade or business" within the meaning of the statute, 26 U.S.C. 162, so that the treble damages which Congress has prescribed to punish violators and deter others from violating the antitrust laws, would give rise to an income tax deduction.

From this standpoint of public policy, the question before this committee, as I see it, is whether the "sting" of treble damages which Congress has prescribed to penalize antitrust violators should be lessened by shifting from the shoulders of criminal antitrust offenders to the taxpayers generally approximately one-half of treble damage awards.

From the standpoint of public administration, the question is whether the Internal Revenue Service by an administrative ruling, not subject to judicial review, should, in effect, amend the antitrust laws by mitigating the treble damages which Congress has expressly prescribed as a "penalty."

To me, the answer to each of these questions is clear from repeated decisions of the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts and from the legislative history of the treble damage provisions of the antitrust laws.

I. THE EXPENSE OF ILLEGAL BUSINESS ACTIVITY IS NOT DEDUCTIBLE AS AN "ORDINARY AND NECESSARY" BUSINESS EXPENSE

When it was first suggested that a Federal income tax deduction should be allowed for the expense of carrying on illegal business activities, Mr. Justice Holmes rejoined, "it will be time enough to consider the question when a taxpayer has the temerity to raise it." *United States* v. *Sullivan*, 274 U.S. 259, 264.

Accordingly, it is now well settled that fines or penalties paid for violations of State or Federal laws are not deductible under section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code. In *Tank Truck Rentals* v. *Commissioner*, 356 U.S. 30, and *Hoover Motor Express Co.* v. *U.S.*, 356 U.S. 38, the Supreme Court held that fines paid for violations of State laws, whether willful or inadvertent, were not deductible as "ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred * * * in carrying on any trade or business." By contrast, TIR-615 confers a Federal income tax deduction on penal damages flowing out of a hard core criminal price-fixing conspiracy in flagrant violation of the Federal antitrust laws.

In Tank Truck Rentals, the Supreme Court said (356 U.S. 33–34), 35, 35–6:

"A finding of 'necessity' cannot be made, however, if allowance of the deduction would frustrate sharply defined national or State policies proscribing particular types of conduct, evidenced by some governmental declaration thereof.

* * * * *

"We will not presume that the Congress, in allowing deductions for income tax purposes, intended to encourage a business enterprise to violate the declared policy of a State. To allow the deduction sought here would be to encourage continued violations of State law by increasing the odds in favor of noncompliance. * * *

"Although each case must turn on its own facts, *Jerry Rossman Corp.* v. *Commissioner*, 175 F. 2d 711, 713, the test of nondeductibility always is the severity and immediacy

of the frustration resulting from allowance of the deduction. The flexibility of such a standard is necessary if we are to accommodate both the congressional intent to tax only net income, and the presumption against congressional intent to encourage violation of declared public policy.

"Deduction of fines and penalties uniformly has been held to frustrate State policy in severe and direct fashion by reducing the 'sting' of the penalty prescribed by the State legislature."

Here, as in *Tank Truck Rentals*, supra, this Committee faces the necessity "to accommodate both the congressional intent to tax only net income, and the presumption against congressional intent to encourage violation of declared pulic policy." Here, as there, "allowance of the deduction would frustrate sharply defined national * * * policies proscribing particular types of conduct." Here, as there, it would be inappropriate in the absence of a scintilla of evidence to "presume that the Congress, in allowing deductions for income tax purposes intended to encourage a business enterprise to violate the declared policy" embodied in the Federal antitrust laws.

Earlier, in *Textile Mills Corp.* v. *Commissioner*, 314 U.S. 3266, the Supreme Court upheld a Treasury Regulation denying a deduction for lobbying and propaganda expenses. The Court pointed out that "Contracts to spread such insidious influences through legislative halls have long been condemned" and concluded, "There is no reason why, in the absence of clear congressional action to the contrary, the rulemaking authority cannot employ that general policy in drawing a line between legitimate business expenses and those arising from that family of contracts to which the law has given no sanction."

By contrast here, it is difficult to see why the same "rulemaking authority" failed to "employ that general policy [of fostering effective antitrust enforcement] in drawing a line between legitimate business expenses and those arising from that family of contracts to which the law has given no sanction" and indeed roundly condemns.

II. THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY CLEARLY SHOWS THAT CONGRESS REGARDED TREBLE DAMAGES AS PENAL

The legislative history of the treble damage provisions of the antitrust laws clearly shows that the Congress regarded them as penal in nature.[1] *Haskell* v. *Perkins*, 28 F. 2d 222 (D.N.J., 1928) squarely so holds.

The treble damage provision of the antitrust laws was originally embodied in section 7 of the Sherman Act of July 2, 1890 (26 Stat. 210) which provided: "Any person who shall be injured in his business or property by any other person or corporation by reason of anything forbidden or declared to be unlawful by this act, may sue therefor in any circuit court of the United States in the district in which the defendant resides or is found, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the costs of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee."

In the Clayton Act of October 15, 1914, Congress enacted section 4 in its present form (38 Stat. 731), providing for treble damage recoveries for injuries sustained "by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws."

In 1955, Public Law 137 repealed section 7 of the Sherman Act because, as stated in Senate Report No. 619, 84th Congress, 1st session: "Section 7 is almost identical with section 4 of the Clayton Act, but relates only to violations of the Sherman Act. * * * Since the Clayton Act's section 4 is more comprehensive, section 7 of the Sherman Act is considered to be no longer necessary."

Accordingly, in determining the congressional intent in prescribing treble damages for antitrust violations, the legislative history of original section 7 of the Sherman Act is crucial.

In *Haskell* v. *Perkins, supra*, 28 F. 2d 222, the Court squarely held that the legislative history of section 7 shows that treble damages are penal in nature. There, after the plaintiff had recovered a verdict under the Sherman Act, the defendant died. Accordingly, on the plaintiff's motion to treble the damages and for a counsel fee, the Court confronted the question whether the statutory right to treble damages and counsel fees survived the defendant's death. With eminent counsel on both sides, the Court noted (28 F. 2d 222-3) that "there was, apparently, virtual agreement between counsel in the proposition that, if the matters in dispute were in truth of a punitory nature they could not be considered as having survived [the defendant's] lifetime." In language so apposite that I quote it here at length, the Court concluded (28 F. 2d 223):

"The trebling of the damages and the addition of an attorney's fee can be regarded in no other way than as a burden laid upon an alleged wrongdoer by way of penalty or punishment.

"The records of the introduction and passage of this act have been made available, and it is interesting, in connection with this dispute, to pursue the account of proceedings in the Senate and House at the time the Sherman Act, so called, was made law. Apparently an argument was precipitated through an effort made by a Senator from Texas, who offered an amendment to provide that under this section suit might be brought, not only in the Federal courts, but alternatively in any State court, and during the course of the debate which ensued Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, who was in charge of the bill, and who probably was in large measure the author of the same in its final form, spoke as follows, regarding this very section 7:

" 'What I wish to point out to the Senate and to the Senator from Texas is this: This section, which is proposed to be amended, is a section establishing a penalty, threefold damages. Now, you cannot clothe a State court with the authority to enforce a penalty. If we create a legal right like a debt by a U.S. statute, then undoubtedly a State court of general jurisdiction, which has authority to enforce and aid in the collection of debts, without express enactment by the Congress of the United States, would sustain an action to recover that debt.

" 'But, when you come to penalties, no court enforces penalties except those created by the authority which creates the court, and no statute of any foreign or other authority but that can clothe the court with that power. * * * We might perhaps say that a person who owed to another a sum of money under an obligation solely the creature of a statute of the United States might recover in any State court; and if the obligation were created he could recover it equally, whether he said so or not; but we cannot say that a State court shall be clothed with jurisdiction to enforce a claim for threefold damages suffered, which is purely penal and punitive.'

"And at that point Mr. Morgan, Senator from Alabama, asked the following question: 'And the attorney's fee?' To which Mr. Hoar replied: 'Yes; and the attorney's fee. So I submit to my honorable friend from Texas that his amendment, though intended in the same direction as the bill is intended, will not bear examination.'

"There is much of the same nature in the further consideration of this law as set forth in the congressional proceedings, and from it there is no other conclusion to be drawn than that Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, Senator Morgan, of Alabama, and Senator Edmunds, of Vermont, all of them eminent lawyers, regarded the trebling of damages and the attorney's fee as constituting a penalty."

Accordingly, the legislative history seems crystal clear that the Congress conceived of treble damages for violation of the antitrust laws as penal in nature.

The final judgment in *Haskell* v. *Perkins* was later reversed on other grounds, id., 2d Cir., 31 F. 2d 53, cert. den. 279 U.S. 827, but the holding that treble damages are penal in nature has been widely cited and followed.

Thus in *Sun Theatre Corp.* v. *RKO Radio Pictures* (7th Cir., 213 F. 2d 284), the court referred to the legislative history I have just canvassed and concluded (p. 287): "the only permissible interpretation is that the remedy afforded is treble damages, penal in nature."

Again, in *Rogers* v. *Douglas Tobacco Board of Trade*, 5th Cir., 244 F. 2d 471, the court cited *Haskell* v. *Perkins*, supra, and held (p. 483): "Trebling of the damages seems to us to be in the nature of a penalty for the public wrong."

Finally, in *Leh* v. *General Petroleum Corp.*, 9th Cir., 330 F. 2d 288, the court in a recent exhaustive opinion written by Judges Barnes, formerly the Assistant Attorney General in Charge of the Antitrust Division, referred to the holding in *Haskell* v. *Perkins* as "correct."

III. TREBLE DAMAGES UNDER THE ANTITRUST LAWS ARE PENALTIES TO PUNISH THE OFFENDER AND TO DETER OTHERS

In the cases where the proper tax treatment of treble damages under the antitrust laws was directly at issue, the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts consistently have characterized them as "payments * * * extracted from the wrongdoers as punishment for unlawful conduct," *Commissioner* v. *Glenshaw Glass Co.*, 348 U.S. 426 at p. 431.

Similarly, in *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* v. *Obear-Nester Glass Co.*, 7th Cir., 217 F. 2d, the court distinguished sharply between compensatory and "punitive" damages stating (at pp. 61-62): "The principal purpose of treble damages seems to be punishment which will deter the violator and others from future illegal acts."

Indeed, the courts have generally stressed the public purpose in prescribing treble damages under the antitrust laws to punish offenders and to deter others from violating the antitrust laws.

Thus, in *Karseal Corp.* v. *Richfield Oil Corp.*, 9th Cir., 221 F. 2d 358, the court noted p. 365): "The treble damage action was intended not merely to redress injury to an individual through the prohibited practices, but to aid in achieving the broad social object of the statute."

Again, in *Kinnear-Weed Corp.* v. *Humble Oil & Refining Co.*, 5th Cir., 214 F. 2d 891, the court held (p. 893): "The main purpose of those laws was to protect the public from monopolies and restraint of trade, and the private right of action for treble damages

[1] Congress has rarely authorized private treble damage actions. Section 4 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 15, is one of but three statutes which provide for mandatory treble damages. The others are the Antidumping Act, 15 U.S.C. 72, and the statute relating to Government-aided railroads which renders the Union Pacific Railroad liable for treble damages to victims of discrimination practiced by the railroad, 45 U.S.C. 83.

The patent and copyright laws permit, but do not require, recoveries up to three times actual damages in cases of infringement, 35 U.S.C. 284, 17 U.S.C. 1, 101, while under 38 U.S.C. 1822, a veteran can recover three times the excess of the purchase price over the reasonable value of property sold under a loan guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration, underscores the importance attached by the the Veterans Administration.

The rarity of mandatory treble damages underscores the importance attached by the Congress to effective antitrust enforcement.

was incidental and subordinate to the main purpose. *Glenn Coal Co.* v. *Dickinson Fuel Co.*, 4th Cir., 72 F. 2d 885, 889. The grant of a claim for treble damages to persons injured was for the purpose of multiplying the agencies which would help enforce the antitrust laws and therefore make them more effective. *Malts* v. *Sax*, 7th Cir., 134 F. 2d 2, 4. The very foundation of the right of a private suitor to recover 'threefold the damages by him sustained, and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee' is the violation of public rights prohibited by the act, and, indeed, made criminal offenses. 15 U.S.C.A. secs. 1, 2."

Finally, in *Lyons* v. *Westinghouse Electric Corp.*, 2d Cir., 222 F. 2d 184, cert. den. 350 U.S. 825, Judge Learned Hand described a private treble damage action under the antitrust laws thus: "The remedy provided is not solely civil; two-thirds of the recovery is not remedial and inevitably presupposes a punitive purpose. It is like a qui tam action except that the plaintiff keeps all the penalty, instead of sharing it with the sovereign."

IV. PAYMENT OF FINES AND PENALTIES AND FOR THE UNSUCCESSFUL DEFENSE OF CASES UNDER THE ANTITRUST LAWS ARE NOT DEDUCTIBLE

Accordingly, the courts have generally denied Federal income tax deductions for payments of statutory penalties to the State and Federal Governments and for counsel fees incurred in the unsuccessful defense of antitrust proceedings brought by the State and Federal Governments.

In *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* v. *Longhorn Portland Cement Co.*, 5 Cir., 148 F. 2d 276, the Court denied a deduction for payments made to the State of Texas in compromise of a suit under the State antitrust laws to recover statutory penalties. In so doing, the Court reversed the tax court which had found that the defendants "didn't admit their guilt and were not proven guilty, and that the compromise settlement was made by them because they believed a defense of the suit would be more expensive than the settlement even if the verdict was favorable." (148 F. 2d 277). Overturning the tax court's decision that such compromise payments were not penal in nature and hence were deductible, the court said (148 F. 2d 277–278):

"The sense of the rule that statutory penalties are not deductible from gross income is that the penalty is a punishment inflicted by the State upon those who commit acts violative of the fixed public policy of the sovereign, wherefore to permit the violator to gain a tax advantage through deducting the amount of the penalty as a business expense, and thus to mitigate the degree of his punishment, would frustrate the purpose and effectiveness of that public policy.

"The test universally employed to determine the applicability of the doctrine to any such claimed deduction is whether the sums claimed were paid as penalties * * * if deduction for such expense is to be denied, it must be because allowance would frustrate sharply defined public policies.

"Though the solution of such issues usually turns upon the taxpayer's guilt or innocence of a crime, the ultimate determinative inquiry upon this appeal is whether the deduction claimed was paid as a penalty. This is illustrated by cases where due to a compromise settlement, the question of guilt or innocence was not established, yet the deduction claimed was disallowed to the extent that it represented a payment made to extinguish a cause of action to impose a penalty."

Such also was the holding in *Burroughs Building Material Co.* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 2 Cir., 47 F. 2d 178, where the court disallowed a deduction for fines, costs and counsel fees incurred in an unsuccessful defense of a suit against a corporation and its president under the New York State antitrust law. Again, in *Gould Paper Co.* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 2 Cir., 72 F. 2d 698, 699, 702, the Court denied an income tax deduction for counsel fees paid in connection with the unsuccessful defense of a criminal action and a suit in equity under the antitrust laws. Moreover, in *National Outdoor Advertising Bureau* v. *Helvering*, 2 Cir., 89 F. 2d 878, the Court held that the taxpayer could not deduct his legal expenses incident to the defense of an antitrust action brought by the Federal Government which was settled in the course of trial by a consent decree declaring unlawful a contract to which the taxpayer was a party although the decree did not find that the taxpayer had committed the offense forbidden by the consent decree. The Court concluded (89 F. 2d at p. 881):

"If it is never necessary to violate the law in managing a business, it cannot be necessary to resist a decree in equity forbidding violations, except in cases where an injunction is unjustified. There is indeed less to be said for spending money in that way than in defending a criminal prosecution, for the decree by hypothesis will do no more than forbid what the taxpayer ought not to do anyway."

V. CONGRESS HAS RECENTLY AGAIN MANIFESTED ITS INTENT TO PUNISH ANTITRUST VIOLATORS BY INCREASING THE MAXIMUM FINES FOR CRIMINAL VIOLATION OF THE SHERMAN ACT

Congress has recently again manifested its intent to deal severely with criminal antitrust offenders, particularly giant business corporations which engage in restraints of trade.

As enacted in 1890 the Sherman Act provided criminal penalties not to exceed $5,000 or 1 year in prison or both. Since corporations could not be sentenced to imprisonment and prison sentences for corporate officers were rare, criminal sanctions for huge nationwide corporations amounted to a mere slap on the wrist.

The inadequacy of the financial sanctions against large corporations, such as those involved in the notorious electrical equipment conspiracies, was a matter of continuing congressional and legislative concern. Accordingly, in 1955, the Congress amend the Sherman Act to increase the penalties for each violation from $5,000 to $50,000 (Public Law 135, 84th Cong., 1st sess., 69 Stat. 282).

As the Senate report on that bill noted, "As early as 1900 a House committee reported that the penalty provisions were deemed insufficient,"[2] and a similar position was taken in the minority views of Representatives Nelson and Volstead in connection with the House bill which ultimately became the Clayton Act.[3]

In *U.S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Ass'n.*, 322 U.S. 533, 591 at note 11, Mr. Justice Jackson observed:

"The antitrust law sanctions are little better than absurd when applied to huge corporations engaged in great enterprise. In the two related Madison Oil cases (see *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.*, 310 U.S. 150) 15 of the 17 corporations convicted had combined capital and surplus reported to be $2,833,516,247. The total corporate fines on them were $255,000 making a ratio of fines to corporate capital and surplus of less than one-hundredth of 1 percent. In addition, fines of $180,000 were assessed against individuals. In the automobile financing case (see *United States* v. *General Motors Corp.*, 121 F. 2d 376, cert. denied, 314 U.S. 618) General Motors Corp., three wholly owned subsidiaries and no individuals were convicted. The fines were $20,000. Capital and surplus were then reported at $1,047,840,321, the fine being somewhat less than one five-hundredths of 1 percent thereof."

The very reason which moved the Congress to increase the penalties for each violation of the Sherman Act from $5,000 to $50,000 was stated in the Senate report to be: "so small a fine may indicate that the offense for which it was levied is not very serious, with the result that some businessmen may consider the possibility of violation a good business risk."

This attitude—that a violation of our antitrust laws, even a flagrant criminal price fixing conspiracy, is no worse than a traffic ticket—is the major premise of TIR–615. Such an attitude is indefensible. It conflicts with the intent of Congress expressed in the antitrust laws. It is also at war with the more recent recognition of Congress that increased criminal penalties were needed if the sanctions of the antitrust laws are to be truly effective.

VI. TIR–615 MISTAKENLY RESTS ON A MINORITY VIEW IN CONTENDING THAT TREBLE DAMAGES ARE "REMEDIAL" RATHER THAN PENAL

I understand that the Internal Revenue Service relies on a line of cases following *City of Atlanta* v. *Chattanooga Foundry and Pipe Works*, 203 U.S. 390, for the proposition that private treble damage actions under the antitrust laws are "remedial" rather than "penal" in nature. The Chattanooga case and those which have followed it involve the question of the appropriate State statute of limitations governing such actions.

To the extent that those cases, which arose before the amendment of the Clayton Act in 1955 to provide a uniform statute of limitations for actions arising under the antitrust laws, 15 U.S.C. 15b, applied a State statute of limitations other than the statute applicable to actions to recover on a penalty, they recognize the public policy embodied in section 4 of the Clayton Act which favors private enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Moreover, even if the statute of limitations cases were relevant here, they are inconclusive. As the court noted in *Englander Motors, Inc.* v. *Ford Motor Co.*, 6 Cir., 293 F. 2d 802, 804, the Federal courts have been divided on the question whether private treble damage actions under the antitrust laws are "penal" or "remedial" for purposes of the statute of limitations.

However, the most recent decision on this issue holds that a private treble damage action is penal in nature. *Leh* v. *General Petroleum Corp., supra*, 330 F. 2d 288. The comprehensive opinion in the Leh case, as I have already noted, was written by Judge Barnes, a former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division.

Citing the report of the Attorney General's Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws (p. 379) to the effect that the treble damage provision penalizes antitrust violators by "imposing the harsh penalty of mutiple damages," Judge Barnes concluded (330 F. 2d 298–299): "What is recovered under section 7 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 15 note) is no less a penalty on the wrongdoer than is the fine or imprisonment with which the sovereign can threaten the violator under sections 1 and 2, or the forfeiture of articles transported in commerce, as provided for in section 6 (15 U.S.C. 6)."

The same "policy of the Federal statute," namely, to encourage effective private antitrust enforcement, applies with equal force to cases such as *Rogers* v. *Douglas Tobacco Board of Trade, supra*, 244 F. 2d 471, 483,

---

[2] Senate Report No. 618, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

[3] Minority views of Representatives John M. Nelson and A. J. Volstead, House Report 627, 63d Cong., 2d sess., pt. 3, p. 7: "Attention must be directed, also, to the fact that the maximum fine which is provided * * * is $5,000. To fine a great trust a maximum of $5,000 when the loot it gained may have been many hundred times that sum, is most ridiculous. The maximum should be much greater in amount."

which deal with the nature of the treble damage remedy in connection with questions of abatement and survival. *Cinnamon* v. *Abner A. Wolf, Inc.*, 215 F. Supp. 833 (D. Mich., 1963).

In view of this paramount public policy, the answer to the proper tax treatment of treble damages, it seems to me, is suggested by these words of Judge Cardozo in *Cox* v. *Lykes Bros.*, 237 N.Y. 376; 143 N.E. 226 at pp. 227–228: "We are to remember that the same provision may be penal as to the offender and remedial as to the sufferer. * * * The nature of the problem will determine whether we are to take one viewpoint or the other."

Applying this test to the proper tax treatment of treble damages, treble damages are properly taxable as income to a successful antitrust plaintiff. So the courts have held in *Commissioner* v. *Glenshaw Glass Co.* (348 U.S. 426), and *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* v. *Obear-Nester Glass Co.* (7 Cir., 217 F. 2d 56). By the same reasoning a deduction should be denied to the unsuccessful defendant in a private treble damage action under the antitrust laws.

VII. THE ERROR OF TIR–615 IS DEMONSTRATED BY THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE FLAGRANT CRIMINAL ANTITRUST CONSPIRACY WHICH IT PREDICATES AND THE LEADING CASES ALLOWING "BUSINESS EXPENSE" DEDUCTIONS

(1) In support of TIR–615, the Internal Revenue Service may also be expected to cite *Commissioner* v. *Heininger* (320 U.S. 462), where the Supreme Court upheld deduction of legal expenses incurred in connection with an unsuccessful attack upon a mail fraud order. The decisive difference is to be found in the fact, as the Supreme Court noted, that it is not the policy of the statutes which authorize the Postmaster General to issue fraud orders "to impose personal punishment upon violators," 320 U.S. 474. By contrast, as we have seen, it is the purpose of the treble damage provision of the antitrust laws to impose a penalty upon offenders.

In *Jerry Rossman Corporation* v. *Commissioner, supra* (195 F. 2d 711, 713), Judge Learned Hand had this to say of the Heininger case: "It is possible to read it as distinguishing between the legal expenses of an unsuccessful defense and the payment of fines or forfeitures. On the other hand, it is also possible to read it as meaning that, whether the claimed deduction be of legal expenses or of fines or forfeitures, its allowance depends upon the place of sanctions in the scheme of enforcement of the underlying act. We think that the second is the right reading."

I fully concur in this view, and I submit that the difference between the statute authorizing a prophylactic administrative stop order designed to prevent fraudulent advertising through the mails in the Heininger case, and the criminal and penal treble damage sanctions in the antitrust laws demonstrates that by no stretch of imagination does the Heininger case support deduction of penal treble damage payments.

(2) Again, the Internal Revenue Service may be expected to cite *Commissioner* v. *Sullivan* (356 U.S. 87), where the Supreme Court held deductible payments for rent and salaries in the conduct of illegal gambling enterprises. In sustaining the deduction, the Supreme Court stressed that Congress had recognized the existence of the gambling business by imposing a Federal excise tax on wages and that the regulations of the Internal Revenue Service made this tax deductible as an ordinary and necessary business expense. The Court stated (356 U.S. 28–29): "This seems to us to be recognition of a gambling enterprise as a business for Federal tax purposes. The policy that allows as a deduction the tax paid to conduct the business seems sufficiently hospitable to allow the normal deductions of the rent and wages necessary to operate it."

By contrast here, the Congress has never countenanced illegal conspiracies in violation of the antitrust laws.

(3) TIR–615 cites *Jerry Rossman* v. *Commissioner, supra*, 175 F. 2d 711. That case is wholly inapplicable here. There, the defendant voluntarily paid to the Office of Price Administration inadvertent overcharges to his customers; in that case, (a) there was no criminal conviction, (b) the offense was inadvertent, and not deliberate, and (c) the defendant had voluntarily disclosed the offense and done his best to make restitution. This is toto coelo different from the criminal conspiracies concealed by the defendants, and punished by conviction when uncovered, which TIR–615 predicates.

(4) Finally, the Internal Revenue Service may cite *Foss* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 1 Cir., 75 F. 2d, 326, where the Court sustained the deduction of payments for counsel fees incurred by the president of a corporation in the unsuccessful defense of a stockholder's derivative suit to enjoin violations of the Sherman Act. The contention may be that the Foss case sustains a deduction in private actions under the antitrust laws, whereas payments of fines and penalties on account of antitrust violations to the sovereign are not deductible. This contention was rejected by Judge Learned Hand in *National Outdoor Advertising Bureau* v. *Helvering, supra*, where he acknowledged the conflict of that decision with the Foss case, stating "we cannot see any distinction between the unsuccessful defense of a suit by a minority shareholder to enjoin the unlawful conduct of the taxpayer and a suit brought by the sovereign."

Similarly, in *International Shoe Co.*, 38 BTA 81, 95–97, the Board of Tax Appeals sustained a deduction for attorney's fees and the amounts paid in settlement of a private action under the antitrust laws. The Board reasoned that "There is no evidence that the petitioner and its officers had entered into any conspiracy or committed any illegal act. The petitioner was, however, receiving unfavorable publicity from the suit and its officers considered that it might be advisable to pay a reasonable amount to settle the controversy." However, whatever authority the International Shoe case may once have possessed, its rationale was later flatly rejected in *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* v. *Longhorn Portland Cement Co., supra*, 148 F. 2d 276–277.

VIII. ANALOGOUS DECISIONS UNDER OTHER STATUTES LIKEWISE HIGHLIGHT THE ERROR EMBODIED IN TIR–615

Since treble damages under the antitrust laws are penal in nature, the decisions of the courts and of the Internal Revenue Service itself under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (50 U.S.C.A. app. 925 (e)) afford no support for TIR–615. Instead, they serve to highlight the error of this ruling, and the same is true of the Tax Court rulings under section 16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. 78p(b), and cases the Walsh-Healey Act, 41 U.S.C. 35 et seq.

(1) As to the OPA cases, as Judge Learned Hand noted in *Jerry Rossman Corporation* v. *Commissioner, supra*, 175 F. 2d at p. 714, Congress amended the statute to mitigate the treble damage penalty in the case of innocent violations.

Accordingly, it became the rule that a taxpayer could deduct payments to the Office of Price Administration in settlement of charges of price ceiling violations if the taxpayer could establish that the overcharge had been innocently and unintentionally made and not through an unreasonable lack of care, *National Brass Works* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 9 Cir., 182 F. 2d 526. If, on the other hand, the taxpayer acted purposely, deliberately and knowingly, payments to the Administrator in settlement of such charges were not deductible, *National Brass Works* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 16 T.C. 1051, affirmed 9 Cir., 205 F. 2d 104; *American Brewery* v. *U.S.*, 126 F. 2d 477 (D.Md. 1954); *Nemrow Bros., Inc.* v. *U.S.* 125 F. 2d 604.

By the same token here, since TIR–615 predicates a criminal conspiracy in restraint of trade, these OPA rulings would suggest denial of any deductions.

In support of TIR–615, the Internal Revenue Service cites its own ruling in 1943 C.B. 111, 112–3 to the effect that amounts paid pursuant to judgments in favor of consumers or tenants (other than the United States) in consumer actions under section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and amounts paid in compromise of pending or contemplated litigation in such cases, were deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses. This attempted distinction between actions brought by the sovereign and by private parties is at odds with the holding of Judge Learned Hand in *National Outdoor Advertising Bureau* v. *Helvering, supra*, 89 F. 2d at p. 881, that there is no such distinction.

In any event the Internal Revenue Service ruling permitting a deduction of payments in satisfaction of private suits under the OPA statutes is inapplicable here, for Congress has never relaxed the treble damage penalties—indeed, it has increased the criminal sanctions—for violations of the antitrust laws, whereas, at the behest of the Administrator, Congress mitigated the penalties for violation of the Emergency Price Control Act, *Jerry Rossman Corp.* v. *Commissioner, supra*, 175 F. 2d at p. 714.

(2) In sharp contrast with TIR–615 are the decisions of the Tax Court and the ruling of the Internal Revenue Service denying deduction for payments by corporate insiders, made by way of restitution for short-swing profits gained in violation of section 16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Unlike the antitrust laws, violations of section 16(b) are not punishable either criminally or by a private treble damage action. Instead, section 16(b) merely requires the corporate insider to restore profits gained from short-swing trading in his corporation's stock. Nevertheless, the Tax Court and the Internal Revenue Service have consistently ruled that such payments by way of restitution are "in the nature of a penalty" and deduction of such payments have been disallowed because a deduction "would mitigate the deterrent effect of the statute and subvert a sharply defined public policy." *William F. Davis, Jr.*, 17 T.C. 549; *Robert Lehman*, T.C. 629, 635; 1952 C.B. 28.[4]

(3) A further relevant analogy is furnished by *McGraw-Edison Co.* v. *U.S.*, 300 F. 2d 453 (ct. cls., 1962), a decision written by Mr. Justice Reed, now retired from the Supreme Court. There the Court held that a taxpayer could not deduct as a business expense sums paid in compromise of amounts claimed by the United States under provisions of a Government contract prohibiting the use of child labor in its performance. In language directly applicable here, Mr. Justice Reed said (p. 455): "Deduction of amounts assessed as penalties pursuant to specific legislation virtually always must be treated as frustrating 'sharply defined National or State policies' unless those charged with the administration or interpretation of the statute have indicated that deductibility will not undercut the governmental punitive purpose."

By the same token here, I submit, deduction of treble damages should not be allowed unless "those charged with the administration and interpretation of the statute"—to wit, the Antitrust Division of the Department

[4] In Lawrence M. Marks, 27 T.C. 464, the decision permitted such a deduction only where it was doubtful whether there was any violation at all.

of Justice—"have indicated that deductibility will not undercut the governmental punitive purpose." TIR-615 cites no such indication from the Department of Justice. Indeed, I am informed that the Antitrust Division has taken a contrary position.

IX. TIR-615 IS INTERNALLY INCONSISTENT AND IT IS INCONSISTENT WITH EFFECTIVE ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

TIR-615 is internally inconsistent, as previous rulings of the Internal Revenue Service have been inconsistent, with respect to the deductibility of fines, damages and counsel fees incurred in the unsuccessful defense of antitrust actions.

In 1944 C.B. 93, in the wake of the Heininger case, supra, the ruling was that legal expenses incurred by a corporation in defending itself and its officers and directors for violation of the Sherman Act were deductible.

However, in 1962—2 C.B. 50, that broad ruling was modified to render nondeductible attorneys' fees and related legal expenses paid or incurred in unsuccessfully defending a prosecution for criminal violation of the Sherman Act.

Now, TIR-615 would deny a deduction for payment of compensatory damages to the Federal Government on account of antitrust violations but would permit a deduction for treble damages which, as we have seen, are penal in nature. This ruling is flatly inconsistent with the announced principle on which it purports to proceed, namely, that if the statutory right is "remedial" a deduction should be allowed, whereas if the statutory remedy is "penal," no deduction should be allowed.

The obvious unstated reason for denying a deduction for damages paid to the Federal Government in an action to recover "actual" damages under section 4A of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 15a, is that the Government would never be fully compensated if the defendant were allowed to deduct from its income tax roughly one-half of the amount of the payment.

However, there is not a scintilla of evidence to suggest that Congress intended by allowing the deduction of "ordinary and necessary business expenses" to reduce the "sting" of the treble damage penalties previously prescribed in the antitrust laws. On the contrary, as we have seen, Congress has recently evidenced its concern that the penalties for antitrust violations may be inadequate rather than the reverse.

Accordingly, and in flat violation of the "cardinal principle" that repeals by implication of the antitrust laws are not favored (*U.S.* v. *Borden Co.*, 308 U.S. 188, 198; *Georgia* v. *Pennsylvania R. Co.*, 324 U.S. 439, 456–7; *California* v. *Federal Power Commission*, 369 U.S. 482, 485; *Silver* v. *New York Stock Exchange*, 373 U.S. 341, 357), TIR-615 would in effect amend the treble damage provision in section 4 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 15, by reducing the penalties which Congress has prescribed to approximately double damages. I respectfully submit that to work such a de facto amendment of the antitrust laws by an administrative ruling, not subject to judicial review, in the teeth of the clearly expressed intent of Congress, and in the face of a long line of judicial decisions to the contrary, is bad law, bad public policy, and bad public administration.

I trust and believe that this distinguished committee will take whatever action may be necessary to correct this serious mistake.

Capt. Anthony Meldahl—Riverman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, when the Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam on the Ohio River are dedicated this year, it will recall the fabulous river career of a native West Virginian who grew up near Parkersburg, W. Va. It would take a Mark Twain to describe with all the river flavor the many experiences and exploits of this river captain, who has so many relatives and admirers in the Huntington, W. Va., area. I would like to share with my colleagues the following account by Jim Wallen, which appeared in the Huntington, W. Va., Herald-Advertiser of January 24. This article accurately captures the spirit of the man after whom the great new locks and dam are named, 130 miles below Huntington on the beautiful Ohio River:

CAPT. ANTHONY MELDAHL—RIVERMAN

(By Jim Wallen)

The Ohio River produced some mighty interesting and colorful steamboatmen during the latter part of the past century and the early part of the present one, but few have been so notable in as many different ways as was Capt. Anthony (Tony) Meldahl, for whom the new, high-lift dam 130 miles below Huntington is being named. The new structure with its twin locks, to be the only lock and dam structure between the Greenup Dam and Cincinnati, is now in the final stage of construction. The pool above it is being raised, and dedication will take place early in 1965.

Since the modern structure is close to Captain Meldahl's later Ohio home, it is quite logical the locks and dam should bear the name of this notable captain and pilot who was, however, a native West Virginian who had some close ties to Huntington.

There were several outstanding things about Captain Meldahl that are remembered on the river today. He was a man of highest character, an excellent and dependable pilot of some of the finest packet steamers that ran between Cincinnati and Pittsburgh, he kept a complete and accurate journal of his observations on river events for many years, and was an able photographer in a day when the camera was rarely used by any but the few professional photographers who operated photograph galleries.

One of Captain Tony's best known photographs among many that are still viewed with interest, is that of the handsome, sternwheel packet steamer *Queen City* passing up the Ohio River at the head of Newberry Island. This view from the West Virginia shore was doubtless made from his earlier home at Maldahl's Landing, W. Va., at Washington Bottom, below Parkersburg, in Wood County.

His later home was the attractive Maple Lane Farm, just above Neville, Ohio, where the new lock and dam structure has been built. It was at Maple Lane that he spent his later life, raised his family, welcomed his many friends, and now lies buried. Maple Lane Farm is just across the highway, U.S. Route 52, from the new dam.

The *Queen City*, which Captain Meldahl photographed so strikingly, became widely known as one of the greatest packets that ever ran in the Pittsburgh-Cincinnati trade, and it was on this steamer that Captain Meldahl did much to achieve his lasting reputation as a pilot.

Captain Meldahl stood watch in the pilothouse of the *Queen City* for every one of that steamer's trips during the first 10 years of its operation, from 1897 to 1907. Those were the days when a week's round trip between Cincinnati and Pittsburgh cost $12, including meals and stateroom.

There never were any serious accidents with the *Queen City* under Captain Meldahl's hand, but in the early spring of 1899 he was involved in a terrifying incident aboard her, which caused much concern at the time.

Early on the morning of March 6 the *Queen* was upbound below Kenova, carrying her usual heavy trip of freight and a considerable number of passengers. A cold, blustery wind was blowing and the river had been rising rapidly as the *Queen* neared the N. & W. Railroad bridge. The river had been rising so rapidly, in fact, that it was up to a stage of 48 feet, something that Capt. Robert R. Agnew and Pilot Meldahl may not have realized in the darkness.

The big steamer was only a couple of hundred feet below the Kenova Bridge when Captain Agnew climbed to the top of the pilothouse to check the amount of clearance beneath the railroad bridge. As it turned out, there wasn't any clearance. There was a splintering crash and Captain Agnew was tumbled from his perch, to be mashed down into the wreckage by the impact.

Inside what had been the pilothouse, Pilot Meldahl, who had been at the wheel, was caught between the big wheel and the front of the pilothouse, and at the same time a wire line whipped across his neck and held him fast. As the pressure increased, however, the line snapped freeing the pilot.

The *Queen City* proceeded on to Huntington, but it was a cold, breezy trip for the pilot, for there was little left of the pilothouse.

The kind of man that Tony Meldahl was may be indicated to some extent by the decisive action he took during the great flood of 1913. The steamer on which he was pilot had to be tied up at Ashland, Ky., as the river went beyond floodstage. Concerned for the welfare of his family down at Maple Lane Farm, and knowing there was only one way of getting there, Captain Tony borrowed the steamer's yawl and set forth, rowing alone down the wide and swift Ohio as it swept along, carrying barns, fences, houses, huge logs, trees, and driftwood of all kinds. He made the 116-mile trip successfully, and after the flood had subsided, returned to the steamboat with its yawl.

A niece of Captain Meldahl, Mrs. Harry Damron, of Huntington, whose husband is a member of the Huntington City Council, has the notebook in which her Uncle Tony kept his daily journal for the year 1882, when he was standing watch on the popular, sternwheel steamer, *Emma Graham*, running between Pittsburgh and Cincinnati.

The captain noted, among the many daily items, that on Thursday, November 16, 1882, he had left the boat at Parkersburg "to attend Julian's wedding." The previous morning, he had recorded, was "beautifully clear"

as the steamer passed the village of Reedsville, Ohio, at dawn.

His river career must have spanned almost a half-century, for by 1878 he had been issued a license by the Government inspectors and was on the sizable steamer *W. P. Thompson*, running between Pittsburgh and Cincinnati, the trade in which he made so many hundreds of trips over the years. However, he was not always in this trade; for in 1887 he was on the *Harry D. Knox*, running between Parkersburg and Ravenswood, W. Va.

In 1890 he was pilot and part owner of the stately packet steamer *Fashion*, again in the familiar Pittsburgh-Cincinnati trade. Others of the noted steamboats on which he served were the packet *Hudson*, and the well-known, Point Pleasant excursion steamer, *Homer Smith*.

In 1916 he went aboard the towboat *Cayuga* as captain and remained on that steamer until his final illness in 1923. The *Cayuga* towed for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the Cincinnati and Louisville districts and occasionally in the Huntington district. It was late in 1922 while this boat was landed at Huntington taking on coal that Captain Tony came uptown for his last visit to his niece, Mrs. Damron, and to have a look at the Damrons' new daughter.

Captain Meldahl died in a Cincinnati hospital on January 26, 1923, and from there his body was returned to Neville, Ohio, for burial near his beloved Maple Lane Farm, with its large shade trees and comfortable, white frame house.

At the Damron home, 2627 Third Avenue, there are a number of clear photographs of the two Meldahl homes at Washington Bottom in Wood County, W. Va., 114 miles above Huntington. The newer one, the one in which young Tony Meldahl grew up, continues in use. The older one, built by Tony's father, Emil Meldahl, was torn down many decades ago.

There are other photographs of family groups and scenes of the surrounding countryside which, in all probability, were made by Tony.

In telling of the earlier home at Meldahl's Landing, W. Va., Mrs. Damron relates that there were extensive grape arbors on the farm, and that in a steep hillside back of the house a large wine cellar had held not only casks of wine, but at one time sheltered a whole company of Confederate cavalry. The stories that are still told about this company of southern horsemen suggest that they might have been a part of Morgan's raiders, from Kentucky, or possibly Albert Gallatin Jenkins' troop of Confederate horsemen from southern West Virginia. Morgan's raiders crossed the river at Buffington's Island, a short distance below there in 1863.

It is interesting to trace the Meldahl family history as it leads to this part of the Ohio Valley. Emil Meldahl came to the Ohio Valley from Denmark, where he was a member of a distinguished family engaged in shipbuilding and construction. At the settlement in Washington Bottom, then a part of Virginia, Emil Meldahl married a young lady who had come from Lubeck, Germany, and settled in Lubeck, W. Va., with her family, whose name was Munchmeyer. The Munchmeyers were part of a sizable group that had emigrated to this spot in the Ohio Valley, bringing the name of their hometown with them.

Another nearby town is named Vienna, indicating that groups of both Austrians and Germans were influential in the early settlement of the area.

Besides Anthony, Mr. and Mrs. Meldahl had another son, Alex, who became a prosperous riverside farmer on the banks of the Ohio 4½ miles below Vanceburg, Ky., and thus established a second Meldahl's Landing, this one 70 miles, by river, below Huntington. Mrs. Harry Damron (Margaret) grew up there, along with her sisters, Mrs. George (Carrie) Pancake, also of Huntington; Mrs. Tom (Mildred) Burns, Ironton, Ohio; and Mrs. E. M. (Katherine) Lunsford, now of Hemet, Calif. The beautiful home of Alex Meldahl is marked from the riverside by a pair of cedar trees. "The old home place is still beautiful," says Mrs. Damron, "and I always enjoy looking at it every time I pass that way."

Mrs. Damron and her sisters will doubtless be present at the dedication ceremonies for the Capt. Anthony Meldahl Dam in 1965. And with them will be the two daughters of Capt. Tony Meldahl, who are Mrs. Clinton (Vera) Wile, of Felicity, Ohio, and Mrs. John (Louise) Carley of Memphis, Tenn.

HUNTINGTONIANS INTERESTED

Other Huntingtonians having more than a passing interest in the naming of the Meldahl Dam are Wallace S. King, Jr., of 1022 West Second Street, and Mrs. Edwin J. Humphrey of 2115 Wiltshire Boulevard. Their grandfather, Capt. Edmund B. Cooper, had his home on a 60-acre farm adjoining the upper side of the original Meldahl homestead at Washington Bottom, in Wood County, W. Va. Another grandson of Capt. Edmund Cooper is James Edward Wallace, a former Huntingtonian who now lives in Logan.

Not only were Captain Cooper and Captain Meldahl next door neighbors for a time, but they were also close friends and later partners in the ownership of some large and popular packet steamers.

The two captains not only held joint ownership in the *Fashion*, which was lost at Manchester Island in June of 1890, but also stood watch together as pilot and captain on others of the well-known upper Ohio steamboats of the eighties and nineties, including the *W. P. Thompson* and *Emma Graham*.

Mr. King has an 1879 freight book of the steamer *Sallie Cooper*, which Captain Cooper owned and operated in the local trades below Parkersburg. In 1881 Captain Cooper had the steamer *Sonoma* in the Parkersburg-Belville, W. Va., trade, but graduated to master of the big *General Pike* in 1886, and was master and part owner of the *Andes*, running between Wheeling and Cincinnati, in the late eighties and early nineties.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont* — 217 Slade Run Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* — Alban Towers
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6815 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*
Grider, George W., *Tenn*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

Senator A. S. Mike Monroney Presents Important Address "The SST—A Bird for All Nations," to Aero Club Members and Guests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a friend and colleague, Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, has been hospitalized at Walter Reed Hospital with a virus infection and a bad case of laryngitis. He was to have delivered a speech today at the Aero Club of Washington. The address was given in excellent fashion by Mr. John Burzio, staff attorney on the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee.

I was privileged to be present as a guest of the officers of Lake Central Airlines, one of the local service carriers providing scheduled flights to several West Virginia cities. It is of interest to the constituency I represent to note that Lloyd Hartman, president of Lake Central, has just been elected chairman of the Association of Local Transport Airlines. ALTA is composed of 21 local airlines operating throughout the United States and our territories.

Mr. President, Senator MONRONEY has been involved in so much legislation affecting aviation he is known as "Mr. Aviation." He serves as chairman of the Commerce Aviation Subcommittee and in 1958 was author of the Federal Aviation Act, which established the FAA and provided unified and independent control of air traffic and airspace for both civil and military aviation. In 1961 Senator MONRONEY received the Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy given by the Aero Club and in 1964 his contribution to the scheduled airline industry earned him the Tony Jannus Award.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that Senator MONRONEY'S remarks "The SST—A Bird for all Nations" be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SST—A BIRD FOR ALL NATIONS

I have always been an advocate of building airplanes—the more the better. And the aircraft manufacturers in the United States have always built the finest aircraft in the skies. Whenever the military or the airlines said we needed a new type of plane, American ingenuity and technology provided it.

But I must confess that at the conclusion of hearings before the Senate Aviation Subcommittee on the development of a U.S. SST in October of 1963, I thought perhaps we were expecting too much too soon from our manufacturers. After 6 months of sonic boom testing in my hometown during 1964, I was even more pessimistic. The booms bombarded my constituents and my constituents sonic boomed me.

I am happy to report, however, that after an extensive review of developments and improvements in the state of the art during the last year, my gloom has been dispelled. I am now more enthusiastic and optimistic about the SST than ever before.

I talked to the engineers and scientists who designed and built supersonic aircraft now being tested and flown. Ten days ago, I talked to the test pilots who have been flying these planes. I saw the colored movies on sound film of takeoffs and landings. And I talked to the executives of the companies who make the decision whether to risk many millions of dollars of their stockholders' funds in the development of a commercial SST.

These highly competent teams of engineers, scientists and management have solved virtually every technical difficulty which concerned me only a year and half ago. Working with titanium is no longer a black art. Recent announcements by scientists give us every reason to hope there may be an alleviation to the sonic boom problem within reach.

I am convinced that it is now time to get our SST off paper and off the drawing board. We now have available our own supersonic test bed—the XB-70. We will probably see it fly at mach 3 no later than April 1. The XB-70 will be able to give us invaluable information on the characteristics and effects of mach 3 flight.

The pilots who have flown the XB-70 so far are enthusiastic. Of course, this is not the SST and it was never designed as a transport. The XB-70's old nickname, "Savior,"—and I am sure you have heard the irreverent story behind that nickname—is no longer cogent. This bird now is more like John the Baptist; it can lead the way into a new era of flight.

I am convinced that the use of the XB-70 for a test bed can result in savings on both development and construction costs for the commercial SST. One model of the XB-70 is already flying and a second is nearly completed. We perhaps will need a third to complete the research that is required. What the XB-70 can tell us about titanium already has added a great deal and can add much more to our fund of aeronatical knowledge.

Based on economic studies recently made, the SST's being designed in this country will not only break the sound barrier, but will also break alltime earnings records for the airlines. I am convinced we can build an aircraft that will land and lift off as easily as our present subsonic transports and with sound levels as low as our present 707's, DC-8's, etc. We can produce a bird that will land as gently as a dove—both on the balance sheets and on the runways.

We cannot ignore the race that exists between our aeronautical industry and the combined forces of Britain and France now working on the Concorde, but we can be confident that if we proceed in good order, the race will be comparable to matching a plowhorse against Kelso. With the XB-70 as a test bed, we can have at least 2 years' experience flying mach 3 before the British and French begin flight testing the Concorde, an airplane that may be obsolete before it is born.

There is only one obstacle remaining—the lack of a firm commitment by the U.S. Government. The decision last year to make moré studies, do more research and improve designs was right. The progress made during the last year is the best evidence of that. It would have been a grave error to have gone ahead at that time on the course that had been charted.

Those in Government participating in this project have not been inactive. The Commerce Department has been making intensive studies on the economics of this plane and studying financing plans which would be workable and acceptable to Government and industry. The McNamara Committee, composed of the able Secretary of Defense, other Cabinet members and other very competent Government officials, is giving its concentrated attention to the SST. Those of us in Congress interested in aviation have been constantly seeking new approaches and ways to resolve the impasse between Government and industry on financing arrangements.

I have spent a lot of time worrying and thinking about this plane. I have known all along that it should and must be built. The United States must maintain its leadership in aviation. We must continue to build the best, the safest, and the fastest aircraft in the world—and it must have growth capability. It is important to us as a nation—important to our domestic economy and important to our position in foreign affairs as the mightiest nation on the earth.

We in Government have been slow to recognize the full significance of this. We did recognize it in the field of communications when we launched the Communications Satellite Corp. We recognized it in the field of space when we launched our vast space program and devoted it to peaceful purposes. But we have partially defaulted in the field of transportation. In our changing world of rapidly advancing technology and soaring costs we are just coming to realize that some tasks are of such enormity that the Nation through its Government must share the responsibilities in advancing the state of the art. It is the cost of progress. In the long run the cost of abdicating such responsibilities greatly outweighs the costs of meeting them. The overall impact on our economy, our balance of trade, our employment and our prestige with other nations because of these defaults, is beyond estimation.

The most modern ocean-going fleets do not fly the U.S. flag. The best commercial fishing vessels are not built in this country. The fastest, smoothest trains in the world do not run on U.S. roadbeds.

Other technological contests exist. You can get into an argument almost any time, anywhere, in this country over the relative merits of U.S. versus foreign-built small automobiles. The arguments are almost always started by the owners of Volkswagons, Fiats, or Renaults. Small automobile enthusiasm seems to be the mania of the Americans who own the foreign-made models. We can't afford to be smug or complacent in any field of endeavor.

I have traveled some 35,000 miles since Thanksgiving, mostly abroad. I have flown on many airlines of the world. It has given me the greatest sense of pride and security

to fly into Saigon on a 707, Tokyo to Honolulu on a DC-8, to see DC-3's flying into the deepest parts of Latin America, to see 727's running shuttle service in Japan.

These shining, silver-winger machines are often our best ambassadors and the most graphic symbols of our might, our wealth, and above all our record of always advancing the frontiers of aeronautical science.

The latest available estimates show that if the United States does not build an SST, our balance of trade would be adversely affected to the tune of almost $10 billion. A default by the United States at this stage would fit in perfectly with General De Gaulle's dream of transferring our gold hoard at Fort Knox wholesale to the Paris mint. The number of jobs available in the U.S. aircraft industry would be reduced by at least 25,000, and employment in related areas of the U.S. economy would compound this problem. Considering the indirect effects on related industries, failure to go ahead with an SST would probably chokeoff 375,000 job opportunities a year over a period of years, and our airline profits would suffer, probably to the tune of a billion dollars a year less by the year 1980.

In broader terms we could lose our technological superiority and invaluable skills. If history repeats itself, we would lose the spill-out which past advances in science have given to the U.S. economy. We would have a second-class air transportation system, just as we now have a second-class merchant marine and second-class railroads. And we would be well on our way, in the opinion of other countries, to being a second-class nation as the other countries of the world surpassed us in industrial technology, scientific and productive capabilities.

What we must do now—you in industry and we in Government—is decide on a mutually acceptable approach and get on with the business of building our SST. We must talk with each other and discuss frankly our ideas to discover those which are alike and those which are divergent. I have concluded in my own mind that we must build an SST—the best one the state of the art will permit. I want to tell you my own personal ideas on what I think the proper approach should be. I reiterate, I speak only for myself, one Senator. And there are some 99 other prima donnas—I said other—in the U.S. Senate.

The development of an SST is a national program. When I speak of development, I mean the design, engineering, construction and testing of experimental prototypes—soft tooled and hand-knit. For until we fly and test our peaper theories in the air, we will not have the knowledge upon which to make an intelligent decision with respect to production—neither the Government, which will be investing taxpayers' dollars, nor the manufacturers or the airlines, who will risk stockholders' equities.

We must proceed without delay—prudently, but deliberately—to test our ideas, to refine them, to improve them so that we will arrive at a safe and economical aircraft. We no longer face the spur of earlier deliveries by foreign competition, which added a sense of urgency to the program in 1963. I believe the best way to do this is to build both of the competing prototypes and two copies of each. We have two existing concepts to be tested. One airframe prototype would be complex, but offers the advantages of flexibility. This is the variable sweep-wing design proposed by the Boeing Co. The other prototype would perhaps not be as flexible, but would offer the advantages of simplicity and time-tested design. This is the swept back fixed-wing on double Delta design proposed by the Lockheed Co.

Seldom in the development of new aircraft have such diverse designs been proposed. Both designs offer great promise. But until they are built and flown, we cannot know whether the promises will come true. In a project as complicated as the SST where the tinest refinement can mean the difference in economic success or failure—where the addition of 1,000 pounds of payload or an extra 300 miles spells profit or loss—we cannot afford now to make a 1 billion dollar decision on insufficient information. Although the development costs are enormous and competing prototypes would add to the cost, this is one situation where the old adage "penny wise and pound foolish" applies.

Speaking of decisions based on insufficient information, we have already noted regretfully one or two goofs during the process of geting ready for the big decision to go ahead. For instance, sonic boom tests were scheduled last year over a metropolitan area in Oklahoma to obtain the reaction of citizens to these noises. Then the cart was placed squarely before the horse by scheduling sonic boom studies in the desert of New Mexico to obtain more precise data on what happened structurally to the homes of Oklahoma citizens. It may be that the human eardrum will tolerate more boom than ordinary window glass. The FAA should have had better data on sonic boom structural effects before it launched its Oklahoma experiment to obtain data on human effects.

Actually, the competing prototype approach could result in only minor added program costs, plus a much more economical aircraft, which in the long run would be more profitable to the airlines and which would assure a quicker and surer recoupment of Government investment.

A computer analysis of added cost for competing airframe prototypes shows that added cost through 100 hours of testing would be about 98 percent greater. But through certification, this would raise costs only 49 percent. The added cost for production of 200 units would be not quite 10 percent greater. The increase in airplane total operating costs over a 15-year period would only be 1.4 percent greater. When you stack the possibilities of obtaining a much safer and a more profitable plane against only 1.4 percent added cost spread over 15 years, I believe we would save money in the long run by spending a little extra now and letting competition do the rest.

The figures I have seen lead me to believe we can build and test four airframe prototypes—two of each design, including engines—for about $1.2 billion. The engine, if one estimate prevails, costs $400 million of this amount. The outlay on appropriations would be spread over a 5-year period, so that we would not need to fund the total cost in any one year. Thus, the funding requirements would be about $250 million a year. The willingness and ability of the manufacturers to share this cost with the Government should be a consideration. I think it would be in their interest to do so. But prudent management could not allow, and the Government should not expect, them to bear the proportion envisaged a year and a half ago. If need be, the Government should pay for all development costs through the stage at which an intelligent decision can be made with the help of the airlines (the final buyer) on production.

The idea of Government funding for developing of technological improvement with commercial benefits for private companies should not frighten anyone or even come as a surprise. There are many past precedents. Back in 1844, the Treasury Department subsidized the building of trial lines for the Morse telegraph. The State Department funded the building of a transoceanic cable between Newfoundland and Ireland in 1857. We gave millions of acres of public land to the transcontinental railroads after the Civil War. In more recent times the Maritime Administration has funded the development and operation of the nuclear ship *Savannah*. Since the early days of aviation, the Government has funded the airlines through mail payments and direct subsidy.

Only yesterday the President, in his budget message, asked for funds to study the development of a high-speed express train from Boston to New York. This could be a $2 billion project in itself. The Congress has appropriated funds for mass transit systems. All these projects provide commercial benefits to private companies, but are also in the national interest and for the benefit of the public.

Some provision must be made for the recoupment of the Government's investment. I do not think it is necessary at this time to work out a detailed plan, because again we do not have sufficient knowledge about what the end product will be.

But the economics of the plane must be designed so that there will be eventual recoupment over a period of years. Of course, if the decision is made not to go into production, the question is moot anyway. I am confident this will not happen.

Therefore, discussion should continue during the development period as to the most practical way to repay the Government.

I believe that some means can be devised where the Government—the taxpayers at large—would bear the loss if production fell short and where the taxpayers would share in profits or revenues if sales exceed a yet undetermined break-even factor. In any event, taxpayers would benefit in the long run. The program should not flounder now, though, simply because a proper formula has not been agreed upon.

Since the Government will bear virtually all the development cost and be responsible for the procurement of the prototypes, it must have a voice in the crucial decisions to be made. Because this is a national program of immense proportion, these decisions must be made by the highest officials of the Government.

And since the program cuts across many segments of our national interest, the decisions must be made by a representative group of Government leaders. The President's appointment of the Cabinet level committee, headed up by Secretary McNamara, was a wise move. Much of the progress made in the past year is directly attributable to the fine efforts of this committee. With a cross section of our top leaders working on the program, the proper decisions are assured. A committee of this type is necessary to make the broad decisions inherent in a national program. Such a committee serves essentially the same functions as a board of directors for a corporation.

There must, of course, be other Government officials to execute the broad decisions and supervise the details of the program. I personally (again) feel that some way must be worked out to insure the fullest active participation of the other aircraft manufacturers and the airlines, who will be the purchasers. The most tragic mistake we could make would be to establish a Government procurement officer as czar of the program and come up with a plane he likes, but one the airlines will not buy, or long distance travelers will not use.

It is at this stage—the detail design of the plane—that Government should fade into the shadows and private enterprise assume responsibility. Adequate provision must necessarily be made to insure against waste and exorbitant cost. But with competing prototypes, we need have no fear about inefficiency or poor effort on the part of manufacturers or airlines.

I understand that the Commerce Department is working on a plan which would permit the full engagement of private management working in cooperation with Government project supervisors. This is a vital essential to the success of this program.

The manufacturers and the airlines must design the plane—not Government officials. The Government agency which certifies the plane cannot become deeply involved in its detailed design or designate the selection.

As we must avoid arbitrary decisions by a government czar, we must also avoid detailed decisions by a committee of too many cooks. This is an area where Government and industry must sit down together and find a workable approach—and I might add one with sufficient flexibility to permit change as the program progresses. This may require full- or part-time assignment of airline officials to work directly with Government officials responsible for the execution of the program. I am sure the details of delegation of authority and responsibility can be agreed upon once the funding impasse is resolved.

In addition to being a national program, the development of SST prototypes must be an all-industry project. Just as the financing is beyond the capacity of any one company, so are the solutions of technological problems. The best research and design teams from all the major aircraft manufacturers interested in the program must be used. This could be achieved through prime contracts awarded to developers of the two competing designs with substantial subcontracts being let by them to other major manufacturers. I have talked with representatives of the companies involved and feel they would welcome this type of approach. Not only would we be assured of the best knowledge and skill available, but we would also temper opposition to the program by those who oppose what they call monopolies at Federal expense.

In this connection the most recent studies on market potential are much more optimistic than in 1963. Then, we talked about a market for 200 of our SST's. One of the manufacturers now conservatively estimates the market at 400. Other studies being made indicate the market through 1980 to be as large as 600, with an additional 400 needed by 1985 and another 500 by 1990. This is a total market through 1990 of 1,500 airplanes. This bird, if it is as good as I think it will be, will rival the venerable DC-3.

With a market potential this large, we don't need to worry about monopolies. There would be plenty of room for production of two or even three competing U.S. SST designs. The projections on revenue passenger-miles by 1980 and 1990 are fantastic.

I believe the airline managements, who plan ahead for only 2 to 5 years, must take a longer look at the future and get some of the optimism and enthusiasm which we senior citizens, I mean senior Senators, on Capitol Hill have. Often we spend so much time looking backward we don't realize we have made progress until it knocks us down.

Aviation progress has been remarkable. Sixty-one years ago the Wright brothers made the first powered flight. This momentous flight covered 120 feet. The fuselage on the domestic version of the Lockheed SST is over twice that distance. I think we are just now beginning to build airplanes. There will be a continual need for short-haul, intercity aircraft.

The SST will satisfy for 20 years to come our long-haul and intercontinental flights needs. We are just now building the stable of different types of airplanes we need—designed for specific missions.

Some of our military people are beginning to take off their blinders and recognize the urgent need for a new manned supersonic bomber. When they see what the new engine for the SST is capable of, they will be crying for a new bomber. We must, I repeat must, build a supersonic bomber. As a cornfield engineer, I believe the new bomber and our commercial SST can utilize a common engine, even though the boys in blue shout their opposition to any such mundane thing as a powerplant designed for civilian use. But when the engine for the SST is ready for production, I will wager that the idea of building it into an Air Force supersonic bomber will suddenly become an example of Air Force wisdom—as was the Lockheed C-141.

These comments I have made today and the approach I have suggested are necessarily broad and unspecific. Many of the specifics must be filled in later on.

I would welcome your comments on it and any potshots you care to take. Now is the time for us to get together across the table, maybe pound on it a bit, and discuss our problems and our dreams.

As in the song from "Damn Yankee," "You gotta have heart," and let's make the start.

Capitol Physician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, my former colleague, Representative Walt Horan, called to my attention a very fine tribute to a man who has been both friend and physician to many former and present Members of Congress. I am speaking of Dr. George W. Calver.

As Walt Horan said when he autographed a picture for Dr. Calver:

Since 1928 Dr. Calver has lengthened the lives and increased the effectiveness of Members of the Congress. No greater service exists to the legislative branch.

Both Walt and I thought that this long-overdue tribute to an outstanding public servant deserved being placed in the RECORD:

[From the Courier of George Washington University Hospital, fall 1964]

CAPITOL PHYSICIAN

In most cases, if you want an appointment with Dr. George W. Calver, you must first get elected to Congress. The reason for this is simple. Dr. Calver is the physician to Congress.

Congress didn't always have a physician, but when it did get one it was Dr. Calver, a 1912 graduate of the GWU Medical School. He has been "Doc" to Congressman for 36 years.

In 1928 three Congressman collapsed in a single month. One died in his office after being without medical attention for 2 hours because there was no physician in the House or Senate. Soon after this incident, Nicholas Longworth, then the Speaker of the House, asked the Navy to assign its 41-year-old lieutenant commander at the naval dispensary in Washington to be in attendance for the sessions of Congress. Three years later, in 1931, Congress passed special legislation prohibiting Dr. Calver's transfer until otherwise provided by law. In this way Dr. Calver became the first—and only—Capitol physician.

As the physician to the Nation's lawmakers, his working environment is different from other doctors. Usually his day at Congress begins at noon when Congress convenes and ends at five when it adjourns—6 days a week. With rounds at Bethesda Naval Hospital and the supervision of two laboratories at the hospital, Dr. Calver's day often starts at 9 in the morning and finishes 10 at night. However, during filibusters, Dr. Calver maintains a vigil around the clock. On a moment's notice appointments are broken because of rollcalls and other urgent matters concerning his congressional patients.

"By and large I deal with the major occupational hazard of Congress," says Dr. Calver. "I deal with nervous tension."

"Senators and Representatives are exposed to too much eating, too much talking, too much writing, and too many pressures from their constituents.

"As I meet new Members of Congress I give them all the same advice. Give 5 percent of your time to keeping well, and you won't have to spend 100 percent of your time getting over being sick."

The 77-year-old physician takes his own advice. Each day he does 10 minutes of sitting-up exercises and goes for walks with his dog. As often as possible he works in his large garden and in his hobby shop. The gym in the New House Office Building was opened in 1935 largely through the efforts of Dr. Calver and a Representative from New York.

Many years ago, Dr. Calver prescribed long walks before breakfast for a freshman Senator who needed relief from the tensions of his hectic life. The advice was well taken because the Senator, Harry S. Truman, has made early morning walks a lifelong habit.

Dr. Calver performs various scientific tests on all new Congressmen, which he feels are useful and necessary, but his real goal is to make friends.

"A newly elected Congressman comes to Washington from his district or State on the heels of victory and a sense of importance, only to learn that he is on the bottom of the pile in Congress. Very often the best prescription for this letdown is a friend."

Dr. Calver is just such a friend. As a native of Washington, D.C., he is free of sectional interests, and as a District of Columbia resident he has never voted until this year or belonged to a political party. Because of this he has been able to give dispassionate solace to all Members of Congress. As he points out, "to me there's no difference between a Republican bellyache and Democratic bellyache."

So many have taken Dr. Calver into their confidence that a saying exists on Capitol Hill, "If Doc Calver ever opened up, there wouldn't be anything sacred left in Washington." Getting him to discuss the frustrations, complaints, or confessions of his illustrious patients, living or dead, is impossible. Anyone who persists gets walked over to a sign on his office wall which reads, "No talkee, no tellee, no catchee hellee."

Dr. Calver's office, unlike most physicians' offices, is an organized clutter of printed proverbs, stuffed fish, autographed pictures of Presidents and Congressmen, statues, awards, certificates, and cartoons. Among the memorabilia on the mantel of his cavernous office is a Japanese god of health, a miniature rocking chair made from the wood of a Washington elm, and two signed photographs—one from the late President Kennedy and another from President Johnson, both former patients during their Senate and House days. On a nearby wall is an editorial cartoon from the Washington Star commenting on the time Dr. Calver caused the Senate to be recessed for 10 days. During censorship proceedings against the late Senator McCarthy, Dr. Calver pointed out to Vice President Nixon that the Senator could not be tried in absentia. Dr. Calver had placed the Senator in the hospital from an illness just prior to the proceedings.

Aside from the gallery of signed pictures from prominent public figures, a visitor to Dr. Calver's office notices an unusual desk and an unusual chair. The massive wooden desk that Dr. Calver sits at was issued to Congressmen at the turn of the century. There are very few to be seen today. The

chair beyond his desk is an old dentist chair that Dr. Calver uses for eye examinations.

Not all the people that Dr. Calver treats are Members of Congress. He gives annual physicals and first-aid care to the members of the Supreme Court and the officials of the Library of Congress. He oversees first-aid stations in nine buildings. Dr. Calver and his staff of nine nurses—one at each first-aid station—and two naval doctors assigned to his office also meet the emergency medical needs of tourists in the Capitol Hill buildings. Last year he and his staff had 45,000 patient visits. "This is higher than past years," Dr. Calver points out. "Many more tourists visited the Capitol on the way to and from the New York World's Fair, so of course the number of people becoming ill was higher. Dr. Calver saw about 80 patients a day.

The Capitol physician has no immediate plans for retiring and certainly shows no signs of slowing down. Dr. Calver graduated from the George Washington University, completed his medical education at GWU and after his residency at Providence Hospital in Washington in 1913, entered the Navy. His Navy medical career took him to many places in the Far East and several Navy medical centers in the United States. Dr. Calver was the senior medical officer of the U.S.S. *Henderson* sailing through the West Indies, Panama Canal, the Philippines and to China prior to his assignment at the Naval Dispensary in Washington in 1927. In 1928 he was assigned to the Capitol. By 1945 he had been promoted to the rank of rear admiral. In 1947 he was placed on the retired list after 33 years of service but continued on active duty status to make his place on the active list available for another officer.

Dr. Calver has had a long and distinguished medical career. As he suggests, "I've been concerned with keeping men healthy and working at their important responsibilities. This has been very satisfying to me."

"Religious Heritage of America"—Address by Hon. Brooks Hays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, shortly before Hon. Brooks Hays left the White House, where he distinguished himself as a special assistant to the President, he presented a memorable address to the Awards Dinner of the 14th Annual Pilgrimage of the Religious Heritage of America.

As a former colleague in the House of Representatives and as director of the food-for-peace program, I came to know and admire Brooks Hays.

Following some of the sparkling Hays humor, he delivered an inspiring statement of our spiritual heritage. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of his address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE BROOKS HAYS AT THE AWARDS DINNER OF THE 14TH ANNUAL WASHINGTON PILGRIMAGE OF RELIGIOUS HERITAGE OF AMERICA, INC., JUNE 27, 1964, MAYFLOWER HOTEL

President Johnson has asked me to say to you that, first, he is greatly pleased that his suggestion that was made at the Presidential prayer breakfast—the annual meeting sponsored by the International Christian Leadership—has the approval of Dr. Sizoo and the other distinguished leaders in this great movement, the Religious Heritage of America, Inc. Further, that he would be gratified if churchmen of all faiths throughout the country acting exclusively through private organizations would support the idea of a religious freedom center in Washington. It would symbolize our faith in God and our determination to maintain the Nation's spiritual and religious foundations. The President believes that a building of this kind, constructed in this way, would not only stand as a symbol of religious freedom but would also provide a practical facility for prayer and a place of voluntary assembly for those who were concerned that our religious traditions be maintained and utilized in the struggle for righteousness and peace.

I know that I am speaking to the saints and not the sinners, that I should not exhort the saints. As a matter of fact, I suppose that even sinners shouldn't suffer exhortations from me, but I do have some thoughts to leave with you on this very important occasion because of this announcement by the President and with the things that have happened already in this pilgrimage it is apparent that we are ready to do something that has never been done before in the long history of the Republic. We are involved in the life of the Nation—in the affairs of the Commonwealth which is an important part of our parish. We have derived as individuals, great benefactions and great blessings from the State, and a sense of obligation alone should inspire us to make exertions in the political realm that we might have a righteous State and that the elements of justice and decency in political affairs be strengthened. Now the truce that Edmund Burke asked the church to maintain, I think should be maintained today and his injunction perhaps was a wise one for those in our times. It is not too much to expect that we find in the shelter of the church the solace and the comfort that all men and women seek, and since my life has been spent in politics, I can say that in the buffetings that are inevitable, in the political career, one requires this solace. It has nothing to do with moral issues and is not the exclusive function of the church for the church has a contribution to make in the reconciling of issues on a moral basis. The shelter and the truce can be maintained without abandoning our prophetic service. We have never believed that the concept of a wall of separation should imply that politics and religion are to be unrelated. In the American scene they are interdependent. To be impregnable the wall need not be impenetrable. There must be a commerce in ideas between these two great areas of life—religion and politics—and Burke I am sure, were he with us today, would agree with what I have said. Surely we agree that Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, may find in church life a congeniality and rich fellowship in the church while they differ in the political pursuits and find themselves on opposing sides.

This is the birthday of a saintly woman named Helen Keller, and I recall that one time she said that one would have to live in a dark and silent world to understand fully the precious comfort of religion. This is doubtless true, and yet as I recall the words of Pascal, I think that there is in the injunction that the 17th century theologian and scientist, gave us out of his meditation 300 years ago, was something that would apply today. He gave us a wonderful definition of religion; perhaps you are familiar with it. He said "It is a higher life. It is a calm and deep enthusiasm. It is a love which radiates. It is a force which acts. It is a happiness which overflows." I recited that inventory to a friend one day and I said, "Do you think of anything he omitted?" He said, "Yes, it is a conscience which prods." "Well," I said, "if Pascal were here I think he would insist that as he spoke of a force which acts he was thinking of the conscience within a man that moves him into the conflicts of life with the determination to see these religious and spiritual values in the life of society. So religion is more than a love that radiates or a happiness that overflows; it is a force that acts and sometimes it moves us into difficult and dangerous situations. "Though love repine and reason chafe, there comes a voice beyond reply, 'tis man's perdition to be safe when for the truth he ought to die'." So we cannot expect the comfort of religion to provide a cloister, making us secure from life's conflicts. Still there is joy and happiness in the struggle, though our times present some of the severest that mankind has ever known.

I am indebted to a preacher friend for this theological concept. I believe he was quoting Karl Barth who, asked about it, said, in substance, indeed God is at our side in this struggle, whether it is in the institutional life of the church we love, or in the conflicts of government where we have firm convictions that thrust us into the battle. God is on our side "without diluting any of his divine essence." The very existence of tension in an individual life troubled by injustice around him or tensions in the life of a group because adjustment, perfect adjustment to the total society, has not been accomplished may be God's gift to His children. This may be the force that acts to thrust us into the conflicts that call for the contribution of religious men and women—men and women who believe in God and who believe that we are His partners in this enterprise of building a just and righteous nation and world.

Isaiah had something to say about it a long time ago. He said, "God will not rest until He establishes justice in the world." So if God will not tire, we must not.

What are the issues? I shall not enumerate them. I think I might be forgiven for mentioning one of them, the dramatic issue of our times. I have lived very close to it. We cannot wish the racial issue away from our doorstep, nor the Negroes' doorstep, but his greatest hope is in the friendliness of the more powerful white group, and while sometimes representatives of the minority find themselves embarrassed in their own racial group by the suggestion that they are betrayers of their own, by maintaining this friendliness and this faith in the white man. But we believe that his trust is well-founded, and we are going to continue to struggle with him, and for him.

My heart is singing because the Congress of the United States is about to send to the President's desk an important civil rights bill. Men equally conscientious and equally compassionate may differ about some of the mechanisms that are embraced in this law, and yet we can all rejoice that here is a symbol of the Nation's conscience, its desire to bring into alinement with our avowals. The governmental policies and the conduct of

our Nation. These words have been unpleasant for some of my beloved friends in the South to hear, and yet I have counseled with them in this direction. You see I am talking now about the Commonwealth as our workshop, as a place where we may find an opportunity to apply the principles of our faith. I have counseled with them to recall that in other issues we had to recognize the interdependence of the States and the regions—and no region any longer lives unto itself. The Supreme Court said one time when a certain State undertook to prohibit the impoverished people of Arkansas for example from moving into their State, that the State had no such power. It is the right then of any American to go into another State if his purposes are good. I counseled with them to remember that when Congress was legislating on labor relations some Representatives—those both on labor's and management's side—said to those of us from rural districts in the South, that we should have nothing to say about industrial relations, we replied that we had a stake in the policies of the factories of the North for the trucks produced in the automobile factories there were to be sold to our farmers and any mishandling of labor relations would be reflected in the problems of the whole Nation. We claimed a right to contribute to the new design and I point out parenthetically that the great labor movement did not suffer by reason of what we did, but it was the national judgment that some changes should be made. So in this difficult and delicate issue where moral principles are involved, can we not lovingly say to those who have been reluctant to change patterns that our religious convictions require the change and that the North and West has a stake in the progress of the South. I am happy to point out that one very unprominent feature of the civil rights legislation has to do with conciliation, and I doubt that much has been said about it, and here we will have an opportunity at the local level to live out our religion—the Judeo-Christian concept of justice and brotherhood. I predict that we will find perhaps that the little-known and undramatized paragraphs in that law to set up procedures for conciliation in which there shall be communication and voluntary action at the local level, may prove to be one of the most effective provisions in a law that is designed to make America more Christian, in the broadest sense of the word. You are hearing me patiently.

The finest compliment I ever heard paid my own faith, when I think of its expression in political life, was from the lips of a rabbi. He was asked by a young Christian if he had any message for Christian youth in a world assembly. He said, "To be sure I have. Tell them to go home from Oslo—from the meeting—to work hard to build a Christian world." "If the world in which Hitler came to power had been indeed and in fact a Christian world, 6 million of my people would not have been done to death." What a marvelous symbol of religious unity there is in this assembly—Christian and Jew, Protestant and Catholic. When I was going through Talbotton, Ga., recently, I said to the driver, "Please stop." He said, "Why do you want to stop in Talbotton? Do you know anyone here?" I said, "No, but in 1858 something happened here and I want to see if there is a marker to preserve the memory of a good man—a man named Straus who brought his three lads here, aged 13, 11, and 8, Isadore, Oscar, and Nathan. Because there was no synagogue, the father sent them to the Baptist Sunday school. Something must have happened. They remained true to their Hebrew faith. When they moved to New York, the three men grew up and became, as you know all three of them, distinguished Americans in business, in government, in philanthropy. When a great biography of Roger Williams, the Baptist hero, was written, it was written by Oscar Straus, a Jew who named his son Roger Williams Straus. When he and his wife went down on the *Titanic*, she had lived by his side and she refused to leave him in death—the whole world mourned. Baptists recall with pride that they contributed something in understanding from our own traditions to a member of the Jewish faith, and we have not said enough in gratitude ourselves for what the Jews have contributed to us. But America, unlike other nations, and, here perhaps, we can be forgiven, is something that might appear to be chauvinistic. As Ogden Nash said, 'I don't pretend to be an oracle; I make no statements categorical; I just say thanks for what I've found while I have been traveling around.

" 'Humility is a wholesome vittle, but why shouldn't the eagle scream a little. If we differ on Truman or vivisection, we can always wait till the next election.' " We have in the remarkable mechanisms of government an opportunity to demonstrate our faith in government by consent of the governed which rests in this religious concept, the dignity of man, his capacity for self-government. Without the religious concepts, the Republic's life as we have known it, as we have seen it flower, would have been impossible.

I lived as a boy in a quadrangle in the little town of Russellville, Ark. You could describe it by drawing a line from the courthouse, to the public school, to the little home for which my father paid a thousand dollars in 1903, to the Baptist Church. There was a struggle for my talents. The question in Russellville was, "Will Brooks be a minister or a politician, will the church or the state command his talents?" That's all right but I don't much like what one friend said, "The church won that contest, didn't it?" But I like to recall this, and I must bring this quickly to a close. I told you I would reminisce in spite of everything. Five hundred thousand young men come out of rural counties like mine every year and move into the cities. Many are in trouble and where are they looking hopefully? Just as in my despair in trouble, I look to the points on that quadrangle. I looked to the home, of course. Then to the public school—Miss Lucy Hill who taught me to memorize the favorite psalms, and she violated no law. I think when this wholesome dialog about the prayer decision is completed, we will find that what Miss Lucy did contribute can still be done without violating the law. We'll find a way out this difficulty. We must think and talk our way through it, prayerfully and lovingly though. I look to the schools and to the courthouse which was the symbol of government and finally to the little church. I tried to relate the life of the church to the government and I am hoping that young people, farm youth, Negro youth, whether from the farms or the city, unemployed and others will find hope and strength in our institutions. Government must recognize its responsibility, and we are the government. We seek just and righteous solutions of the problems. But—whether we are Republicans or Democrats—we know that the resources of the churches and the synagogues are available, and that's the reason we're all heartened tonight.

Victor Hugo said of George Peabody, "There are men of hate and men of love, and because Peabody was a man of love, he traced through the sky a trail of light to brighten a somber world." Victor Hugo would agree with me that there are also men of indifference; men insensitive to the problem that I have mentioned tonight, believing that the Religious Heritage Foundation in a powerful way has a magnificent opportunity now that we can all rejoice and be a part of it. Let's help make sensitive the conscience of the indifferent, those who have been guilty of moral lethargy through these years of tension, and let's find hope in what the churches are now supplying through their professionalized service that is no longer limited to this idea of individual conversion. We glory in the releasing by Pope John XXIII of a remarkable humanizing and redemptive force that has touched the lives of Protestants as well as Catholics. Let us rejoice. And when I find a great cardinal saying that "surely Catholics around the world can see that in countries like the United States where there is separation of church and state Catholics have a greater moral strength and spiritual power than in countries—he did not name them—than in countries where they rely upon a political prop." We rely upon no political prop in America, neither Catholic nor Jew nor Protestant, but as fellow religionists loving God the Father of all, we seek to serve Him faithfully regardless of the cost.

I bring this talk to a conclusion by referring in a rather intimate fashion to my last conversation with John F. Kennedy. I knew him well and loved him dearly. I had a paternal feeling toward him; you see I was 19 years of age when he was born. I reached the House of Representatives 4 years ahead of him, but we became good friends. I called him Jack; he called me Brooks. Well, I called him Jack until he took his oath of office and then he was always Mr. President. Sometimes, and I hope it was not inappropriate, I referred to him as "my beloved young President." The burden of grief I carry tonight will never be any lighter than it is, but I wanted to share with you the last conversation I had with him because, whichever party you are a member of, you would agree that no President ever tried harder to be President of all the people or to interpret more faithfully our constitutional requirements regarding church and state. I think he was peculiarly aware of the hopes of the American people. When I called him from Arkansas one day to tell him of something I wanted to do, a project that had to do with bridgebuilding, dealing with the conflicts of life that have plagued us, I said, "Mrs. Lincoln, I need to find if what I want to do is agreeable with the President," and she said, "Mr. Hays, you ask him yourself. He is in a Cabinet meeting; but there is a phone right by him, and when I hand him a note saying you are on the phone long distance, I'll bet he will want to talk to you." This inflated my vanity for he interrupted that Cabinet meeting, and in a moment I heard him say, "Brooks, where are you?" I told him "in Arkansas" and then described what I wanted. He said, "That's wonderful," and if I had known that I would never hear his voice again I would, of course, have recorded indelibly the words he said, for they were words of commendation, and I feel that in work like this trying to accomplish something with Paul Griffith and others, in work of this kind I have his mandate and his blessing. I never heard his voice again, but his spirit lives with me; and now that I am able to thank you for this wonderful hearing, I would like to conclude with the words that I think represent the spirit of America, voiced by one we all did come to admire and love. He said, "With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessings and His help, but knowing that here on earth, God's work must truly be our own."

Thank you.

A Sick American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, all of us are troubled by the fear that in our various international involvements we may wind up buried—either economically because of unwisely subsidizing our enemies—or physically, in the fulfillment of Mr. Khrushchev's threat. This feeling of fear and frustration is fully underscored by an article reprinted in a leading daily in my district, the Daily Local News of West Chester, Pa. The reprint is that of a letter appearing in the house organ of the American Institute of Banking and is included with these remarks as a simple reminder of where we are being led by some misguided people who seem to think that we are required to coddle our avowed enemies and be nice to those who hate us.

The article follows:

A SICK AMERICAN

I am one of the Americans who heard Mr. Khrushchev tell our Nation that my great-grandchildren will grow up in a Communist world.

For some time now, this has bothered me. I am not a brave man—not even a big one * * * I am now 50. I paint my own house, repair my own car, grub my own devil grass, and nurse a modest savings account * * * I am a lawabiding man on the quiet side, and dissension makes me terribly nervous. Frankly, I am the kind who simply doesn't have it in him to fight anyone ever.

My wife had me cleaning out an old trunk in the storage room the other day, and I ran across the huge old family Bible that I hadn't thought about for years. My great-grandmother had kept a journal of the trip across the Great Plains with a wagon and oxen when she and great-grandpa, were youngsters coming out to settle in California in the great migration.

On the trail she wrote of sickness, dust and thirst, and the deaths and hunger, and heat and cold, and births like beads strung together on a thread of hope—hope of freedom and a land of plenty for their children yet unborn.

As I read, I began to think about America and what it all stands for; and I thought about our enemies and what they intend to do to America, to its freedom and its hope.

And, suddenly, I realized that I am a sick American, I mean really sick. I am sick of bureaucrats who tell me that my enemy is not really my enemy and that I should live together with murderers and tyrants. I am sick of government that hasn't the guts to clean traitors out of its own offices. And I am sick of being a nice pleasant guy about it. I am sick of my country being ridiculed all over the world. I am sick of pink-fingered diplomats and lily-livered politicians who place personal career above the fate of the flag.

I am sick of 40 years of relentless, creeping, cancerous, Communist Godlessness that never once has wavered from its avowed purpose of conquering that flag and seeing it trampled into the mud under Russian boots. I am sick of my genteel desire to stand pat and pray while the enemy advances. I am sick of educators who teach tolerance of subversion and of clergymen who would have me quail at the specter of battle and turn my cheek in fear of what our enemies might do.

In all honesty, the thing of which I am sick is the man who let these things come to me—myself. And by the living God who made, sir, I am a sick American who intends to get well.

Douglas MacArthur and Winston Churchill—Article by Vermont Royster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely article entitled "Two Incredible Men." The article was written by Mr. Vermont Royster, and was published in the Wall Street Journal of January 25.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THINKING THINGS OVER: TWO INCREDIBLE MEN

(By Vermont Royster)

The year was 1935—it doesn't seem like 30 years ago—and everybody thought that the soldier's course was run. In Washington that autumn day they paraded a guard of honor for him, and the hero who had commanded armies went off in retirement as adviser to a provincial constabulary.

It was the same year, so a date on the book's flyleaf reminds us, that we read the autobiography of another man who had also completed a full life. In his time he too had been a soldier, and also a journalist of renown, a historian, a novelist, twice minister to a king, key figure in a great war, and a politician to be reckoned with. Now the old man, as old men will, was rounding it off with the tale of how it all happened.

The first man, of course, was Douglas MacArthur, and the second was Winston Churchill.

What they had done before taxes credulity. Only a hackwriter turning out boys' adventure yarns would spin such derring-do of the handsome young man, first in his class at West Point, mixing with guerrillas in the Philippines, slipping behind enemy lines in Mexico, winning five Silver Stars and the two stars of a general in the trenches of France, all within 15 years of being a schoolboy. Becoming a full general and U.S. Chief of Staff, as MacArthur did in 1930, seemed dreadfully anticlimactic.

Not even a pulpwriter would have dared put Winston Churchill's story in a movie script for Errol Flynn. It would have to come out like a Henty series—"Fighting Afridis in Khyber Pass," "With Kitchener at Khartoum," and "the Escape From the Boers." But G. A. Henty wouldn't dream of casting the same character as First Lord of the Admiralty and—of all things—Chancellor of the Exchequer.

What happened to them afterward was patently impossible. You dare recount it only because it happened. The retired general was twice recalled to life, at Bataan and Korea, and twice gained victories for his country; it was left to others to lose them. The discarded minister saved his country from ashes; it was left to others to let its glory fade.

Yet for all the astonishment at such adventures, the most incredible thing is that in the era of common man such men could be.

Each was the son of a father who was himself an uncommon man and in turn the son of an uncommon father. The first Arthur MacArthur was briefly Governor of his State and for years a respected Federal judge. The second one, colonel of a battle regiment as a boy of 20, became a general whose name was as much a household word in his time as the son's in our own. Lord Randolph Churchill, the son of a Duke of Marlborough (name famed by the Battle of Benheim), was himself a queen's minister and a mover of a nation's affairs.

So both Churchill and MacArthur were born with a heritage, and not the least of which came from their remarkabel mothers. Jennie Jerome Churchill and Mary Hardy MacArthur were proud of the men they married, and in a way less now in fashion bequeathed their sons pride in family and a desire to honor it.

A part of their inheritance was an uncommon mind. Churchill won no scholastic prizes as a schoolboy, but to a delight in history he brough incessant curiosity for its meanings and he mastered, as few men do, the structure of the simple English sentence.

MacArthur, as anyone can testify who ever heard him speak, also had the gift to articulate an ordered mind. His rhetoric, as sometimes Churchill's, might be a little overblown but whatever the subject the words went to the heart of the matter and, listening, you knew their clarity came from unmuddied thought.

Not the least of their inheritance were the gems of longevity, without which the rest would have been impossible. Both in youth were vigorous in body; in age they kept vigor of mind.

As striking as any of it is that each of these men inherited a 19th century view of man and his destiny and with such a view made themselves towering figures of the 20th.

For each of these men, plainly, was an aristocrat—in birth, breeding, mind, and manner. Toward their fellow man theirs was the attitude of the noblest oblige; believing themselves superior men, and never deigning to hide their belief, they took it their duty to lead, their destiny to play great roles.

As men conscious of the past as well as the future, they saw the world not as if it were morn yesterday but against the sweep of history. Thus Winston Churchill, surrounded by disasters at home, could spend an hour thinking about the Balkans. Thus MacArthur, fleeing Corregidor, was already reflecting on the world after victory.

This way of looking far ahead because they could look far back was noticeably absent in the other leaders, good or bad. Hitler dreamed of a great Reich but had not seriously thought of what he would do with victory if he won it. And much of our present trouble is due to the fact that Roosevelt's postwar planning dealt too much with the immediate, too little with past or future.

For much the same reasons, both MacArthur and Churchill unashamedly used words that today make many people wince—patriotism, duty, honor, loyalty, sacrifice, courage, and self-respect.

You're struck with this reading MacArthur's memoirs recently published in Life magazine; the sentiments sound as old fashioned as McGuffey's Reader. Yet reading them you know why MacArthur would rather be dismissed than fail to urge what he thought Korea required. Churchill sacrificed his political career, or so he and everyone thought, because he believed honor and duty to country required him to speak his mind on Hitler, alone if need be.

Men so endowed are likely to have a touch of arrogance. MacArthur, for all his admirers, could probably not have been elected to anything; Churchill would never have been chosen Prime Minister in ordinary days. Yet in each man's case, and several times, when a nation at war had need of uncommon men it turned to them. And every time the people found themselves well served.

Now their story is in the past and other men can only marvel at it.

Flint's Antipoverty Program Should Be Model for Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, having been privileged to represent Flint, Mich., in Congress for the past 8 years, I know personally of the good works of the Mott Foundation. It is for this reason that I am particularly delighted that the Jackson Citizen Patriot, Jackson, Mich., editorialized on January 12, 1965, with reference to the support given by the foundation and by local enterprise to the Flint school system.

This editorial, entitled "Flint's Antipoverty Program Should be Model for Nation," points up a comparison between prudent local administration and our spending national antipoverty program. Because of the current controversy over administration of antipoverty programs and proposals for Federal aid to education, I commend this editorial to all my colleagues, and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FLINT'S ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM SHOULD BE MODEL FOR NATION

The good works of the Flint school system and of the Mott Foundation again are in the national spotlight as they are offered as an example of what can be done when an antipoverty program begins at home.

Specifically, the director of the Mott Foundation and the schools' associate superintendent for the Mott program proposed that the Michigan city be made a national center for the training of community action leaders for the Office of Economic Opportunity which administers what is known as the antipoverty program. Federal officials have expressed an interest in Flint's offer and will send staff members to the city to see the program in action.

That is good because Flint already is doing with local money and initiative exactly what the Federal Government proposes to do on a national scale.

Whenever a new Federal program is set up to achieve a given goal, and especially where the betterment of the lot of human beings is involved, there is a tendency toward grandiose or idealistic thinking and the belief that the mere spending of money will cure all the human race's ills.

Flint has pretty well proved that the problems of the culturally deprived and the untrained can be solved at home if the community will do so.

It is true that having a Mott Foundation to put up funds when they are needed is very helpful.

At the same time, it has to be said that the people of Flint have seen the benefits of the "lighted schoolhouse" plan and support it generously. At the Washington meeting in which Flint's offer was made to the antipoverty directors, Dr. Peter L. Clancy, the associate superintendent in charge of the Mott program quoted some significant figures.

He said that the people of Flint have increased their tax dollar contributions to the schools from $2.5 million in 1935 to $25 million today. He added that the community has voted extra school taxes five times since 1950.

This record perhaps is not unique. Many other communities, including Jackson, also have been generous with their schools.

The difference seems to be one of enthusiasm. Many school districts—again this includes Jackson—have to cope with a great deal of resistance to supporting schools. Tax and bond issues frequently are lost.

The broad program offered in Flint, with its emphasis on adult education and an effective method of saving persons who might be lost as useful members of society through a lack of education, makes public support of the schools almost automatic.

Dr. Clancy, for example, touched on the dropout problem. He said that a personalized curriculum has kept nearly 80 percent of some 600 problem students off the dropout list. Many of these have graduated and now are gainfully employed. The program for culturally deprived persons reaches children at the age of 4 in schools where this seems to be needed.

In the personalized high school curriculum program the ratio of students to teachers is 15 to 1.

Flint can point proudly to the results of its methods. It also can say that the cost is modest.

Counting the support from the Mott Foundation, the Flint schools spend considerably more than districts of comparable size. Yet the expenses do not run wild as they might under a Federal program.

The great danger in the national antipoverty program is that it will not be administered on a practical basis and will soak up vast sums of tax money without producing results.

Given the opportunity, Flint can show the way. It can demonstrate results obtained by wise local administration and spending. It proves that an antipoverty program which begins at home can be highly successful.

Excerpts From Reviews of the Book "Congressman From Mississippi," by Frank E. Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, our former colleague in the House of Representatives, Frank E. Smith, has recently published one of the most significant books of recent years on the subject of the American Congress and the influence of racial politics. Entitled "Congressman From Mississippi," it is published by Pantheon Books. Mr. Smith now serves as a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a number of reviews of Frank E. Smith's book be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The New Yorker: "Mr. Smith served in the House of Representatives from 1950 to 1962, when he lost his seat because he could not utter enthusiastic anti-Negro noises—noises that are now almost the entire substance of Mississippi campaigning. Up to the moment of Mr. Smith's arrival in Washington, his book is an amiable, entertaining, sketchy autobiography. From that point on, it gets better and better. His account of being a Member of Congress is written with professional skill (he used to be a newspaperman) and with reminiscent, though not regretful, gusto. The experience has never been better explained, and Mr. Smith's report sharply contradicts those political scientists who tell of the impotence of the lower House and of the nullity of individual Members. Mr. Smith doesn't pretend to have wielded great power, but he was by no means ineffectual; he originated and helped shape a considerable number of good laws, and he supported and was supported by such influential figures as Speaker Rayburn and President Kennedy. Much of the book, especially its description of the State of Mississippi, is depressing, but the core of the story—the doings of a useful, likeable legislator—is as heartening as it is engaging."

The Washington Post (Robert E. Baker): "Smith's autobiography is a valuable study of how Congress really works—his personal contact with, and assessment of, lobbies, colleagues and Presidents.

"But most of all, it is an invaluable realistic study of race and politics in the South and should join the definitive works of Wilbur J. Cash, V. O. Key, Jr., and C. Vann Woodward."

The Virginian-Pilot, Norfolk, Va. (Staige D. Blackford): "The Mississippi Delta is a land of brooding beauty. Avenues of Spanish moss trail across the trees in strange and solemn splendor, and the moody, muddy yet majestic 'Father of Waters' moves slowly past the endless fields of cotton.

"It is a land of rich soil and poor people, a land whose fierce summer heat is matched only by the fierce pride and even fiercer prejudice of its people. It is a land where Jim Crow still reigns supreme, and the Negro's cry for equality is answered by a brutality that epitomizes man's inhumanity to man.

"Despite its terrible and tragic history, the Delta country has produced men whose love for their land was, in the words of Stephen Vincent Benet, 'something so dear it must be holy.'

"Many of these men have represented all that is bad about the South—its racial prejudice and narrow provincialism, its intolerance of dissent and appalling ignorance of the outside world. But a few have stood for all that is good about the South—its courage and honor, its deep patriotism and high idealism, its willingness to work for men.

"One such man was a Delta planter, poet and philosopher named William Alexander Percy. Another is a former Member of the U.S. House of Representtaives named Frank E. Smith. They lived in different eras, but they share something in common besides a common birthplace.

"Smith, like Percy, has now written an autobiography. It tells how one Mississippi Representative sought to be a statesman rather than a white supremist, how he tried to stand for all the people he represented and not just for the white people.

"The wonder is not that he failed; the wonder is that he lasted so long in the first place, considering the authoritarian climate of the closed society. But last he did until,

in 1960–62, he committed the worst of all possible heresies in the eyes of Ross Barnett & Co.: Frank Smith supported John F. Kennedy for the Presidency and continued to support the program of the New Frontier after Kennedy's election. As Smith himself writes:

" 'The buildup of the forces that took me out of the Congress in 1962 had been underway since I was first elected in 1950, and, in retrospect, they would probably have been successful no matter who was President in 1962. Since "the Kennedys" were the chief issue in my campaign, however, my defeat made me the only Member of Congress turned out of office because he supported Jack Kennedy during * * * his administration. It is not a bad distinction.'

"Unlike Percy, Smith was not to the manor—and manner of the southern aristocrat—born. Unlike Percy, he was not educated at Sewanee, Harvard, and in Europe. Unlike Percy, he is a self-made man, one of those common men who rise to achievements that are anything but common.

"Still if there were many differences between these two Mississippians, if they shared neither a common background nor a common breeding, if one was the son of a poor delta sheriff senselessly murdered by a Negro and the other the son of a distinguished senator, they both fought for the same thing: A Mississippi freed from the shackles of poverty and prejudice.

"At the outset of his autobiography, Smith describes his father's murder in 1926; and then in a brief but eloquent statement, he clearly shows why Mississippi is an accursed land:

" 'Sylvester Mackey (the Negro who killed Smith's father), like Frank Smith (Sr.), was a victim of the nameless terror, the fear and suspicion between white and black that always has walked in the shadows with the people of Mississippi.'

"Elected to Congress in 1950 as Representative from Mississippi's Third District (which includes Greenwood, the home of Byron De La Beckwith, and Greenville, the home of Hodding, Carter, and Percy), Smith went to Capitol Hill firm in his belief that 'large-scale economic progress was the only avenue likely to lead to solution of the race problem in Mississippi.'

"Today he feels that economic progress alone is not enough:

" 'The elimination of economic discrimination should probably be the first step in a patterned process to end segregation and racial injustice, but the essence of the present situation is that all discrimination has been maintained too long, and the white people of Mississippi are not likely to be granted the luxury of gradual adjustment to the changing order.'

"Smith, who is now a Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, underscores the tragedy and the travesty of the poorest State in the Union when he notes that 'no State's 20th-century insurrection has been as militant as Mississippi's, and no other State has poured so much of its wealth and talent and energy into the effort.'

"The rest of the South is now moving ahead as never before in its history, but Mississippi isn't. The rest of the South is hot in pursuit of the American dream, but Mississippi has yet to awaken from the nightmare of racism. The rest of the South is writing a new chapter of American triumph, but Mississippi remains the American tragedy. For there, despite men like Frank Smith and Will Percy, the bottom rail is still sitting on top."

New York Herald Tribune (Maurice Dolbier): "Mr. Smith was an intelligent, troubled, but fundamentally optimistic man, who realized the burden of contradictions he took into office, but thought he might bear it and still be able to do some useful work.

"The closing chapter of his book is as strong a statement for the granting of full civil rights, and immediately, as has ever been heard from a white southerner.

" 'The Negro Revolution,' he writes, 'must prevail if the visions of 1776 and the American system of government are to survive. * * * The white people of Mississippi are eating away their own freedoms in their attempt to deny freedoms to others. The national body cannot and will not tolerate so insidious a self-destruction. If the South will not save itself, the Nation will have to redeem it.' "

McComb (Miss.) Enterprise-Journal (John Emmerich): "Ex-Representative Frank Smith is a calm-voiced, courageous native son of Mississippi who, in this book, tells without bitterness the truth about the bigotry which has pervaded Mississippi politics.

"He says here the things which he could not say—for obvious political reasons—during the 12 years he served as a Congressman from the Mississippi Delta.

" 'This book is largely about race,' Smith writes, 'because race has been the overriding element in Mississippi politics for more than a century. In a larger sense, it is an apology for hypocrisy.'

"But it is more than that. This autobiography is a commentary on the whole state of political affairs which exists in Mississippi by one who intimately knows what he is talking about.

"It's the written experience of a keen student of southern politics, of an astute observer of the workings of Congress, and—above all—of a southerner who deplores what racism and demagoguery has done to Mississippi.

"No matter how much some Mississippians may dispute Smith's contentions, nobody can attack his Mississippi credentials.

"This is strong medicine, surely coming from a man who only yesterday represented Mississippi in Congress. * * * It strikes this reviewer as being the dead truth, no matter how hard it may be to take."

Clarksdale (Miss.) Press-Register (B. J. Skelton): "Frank Smith hewed a unique place for himself as a Mississippi congressman, and it took a lot of mental and moral muscle.

"Smith considers the last 10 years of immutable resistance to integration by 'the entire structure of political, economic, religious, and social life' in the State as immeasurably costly—in industry lost, money spent, man-hours wasted, all for a delay of 2 or 3 or 4 years in the coming of integration.

"A last chance remains, he thinks, to avoid destructive turmoil. It is, in essence, for the State to grant Negroes their rights voluntarily. 'It would be worthwhile to work out a system of accommodation with these people rather than to continue a conflict that they will wage from an increasingly greater base of power to inevitable victory,' he says."

Chicago Tribune (James W. Silver): "It is more difficult to explain Smith than Medgar Evers or Aaron Henry. His father, a deputy sheriff, was senselessly shot down by a Negro when the son was 8 years old, yet Smith developed no trace of racism. The prevailing view of his rural environment assumed the black man to be 'an inferior being, beyond the pale of religious and political doctrines of brotherhood and equality' nevertheless, Smith's record was such that he garnered what Negro vote there was * * *.

"Smith quickly learned of the 'enormous dissipation of talent perverted into fomenting hate and justifying injustice,' and that the whites were 'eating away their own freedom in their attempt to deny freedom to others.' He also came to feel that 'too many people for too many generations have lived in relative comfort at the expense of exploited Negro labor.'

"This eloquently simple autobiography concerns much more than the race problem. It includes the story of a poor farm boy grasping eagerly for an education and a political career, distinguished essays on the working life of a Congressman (including a bit of 'cloud riding'), the history of a burgeoning friendship and political alliance with John F. Kennedy, and an account of his increasing concern with international problems, to the extent that more than half of Smith's congressional newsletters were devoted to foreign affairs. His real specialty was flood control and the conservation of natural resources.

"This is the most instructive book available about Mississippi. Its message is not of the author's success but of Mississippi's failure. The dedicated young Congressman was a little ahead of his time. There will be other Smiths in Washington from Mississippi and they will stay there."

Chicago Sun-Times (Hoke Norris): "Such, in brief, is the story of one moderate. It should have wide circulation, not alone among the white supremacists of our Nation, but also among liberals who grow impatient with the South and its people. Such liberals should ask themselves if they under similar circumstances would behave as well. All they are asking is for men and women to turn their backs on their way of life and on their own people. Not many people of any persuasion and place could do as well as did former Representative Smith."

Saturday Review (Edwin M. Yoder, Jr.): "Of course, in this book Mr. Smith has much to say about Mississippi's sense of race, and with more reason than most. When he was 8 his father, while on duty as a deputy sheriff in Leflore County, died at the hands of a Negro prison escapee, pleading that his assailant not be lynched. Thus Frank Smith's intimacy with race is grounded in bitter memory. But just as racist rituals did not dominate his congressional career, they do not conceal or mar, in this clearly written autobiography, a refreshing appreciation of the Federal legislative process. Frank Smith is more than a regional congressman; he was and is an articulate defender of the legislative branch whose critics, with some reason, regard it as 'sapless,' corrupt, or worse.

"Neither prig nor spoilsman, Mr. Smith makes the legislative process sound as it should—a workable arm of coordinate government. When he lost his seat troubled Mississippi lost a responsible representative, and the country lost a legislator who understands and husbands the dignity of popular legislative government. Such losses cannot be afforded in our time."

The New Republic (Gerald W. Johnson): "The people who should read this book are, in order, first, all members of the Democratic caucus, House and Senate; second, all non-southern members of the Democratic National Committee; third, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson. After that, the rest of us might not need to read it."

The New York Times (Ralph McGill): "* * * an excellent, painfully honest book * * * with touches of glory, courage, and purpose."

Baltimore Afro-American (Saunders Redding): " 'Congressman From Mississippi,' is a revealing and vital book * * * readers will admire the courage that it took to tell the truth."

St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Rufus Terral): "Mr. Smith is at his best in a chapter telling what in his opinion makes the House tick."

Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News (Rosemary Yardley): "Unlike the customary political biography which is either authored by a ghostwriter or else should have been, Mr. Smith's memos are well written brisk journalistic fashion. (He is a former newspaperman.) Wit and modesty make their contributions too.

" 'Congressman From Mississippi,' was written for national consumption. It is es-

pecially to be recommended for a southern audience."

The Nashville Tennessean (John Seigenthaler): "Frank Smith's autobiography is a story about Mississippi by a man who knows and loves his native State and its people. And because of his knowledge and love his story is a mixture of pathos and pain and regret—and hope.

"But Frank Smith's story is more than exposure of one Congressman's problems. It is more an exposure of the conflicts and torments which must afflict every Member of Congress when he is caught in the struggle between conscience and constituency.

"And beyond that it is his personal appeal to his people and their leaders to wake up to the realities of life; to reject the hates and bitterness of the past and to plan for the future.

" 'The time has come,' he says 'when Mississippi must look away from Dixie and forward to America.'

"In the person of the Congressman from Mississippi the rest of the Nation has clear evidence that there is hope for Mississippi—even a potential for greatness.

The Nashville Banner (Dick Battle): "This is an honest book. It is evident that there is anguish in it, soul searching and confession. It will not win ex-Congressman Smith many new friends in the Delta State. It should win him respect. He states a case for moderation, for understanding and for the dignity of man without regard to his race or color which is impressive in its directness and as believable as sunlight."

Memphis Press-Scimitar (Charles H. Roper): "Smith is a man deeply concerned about what he calls his State's obsession with the race issue. He believes that because race is the beginning and end of every issue in Mississippi and other parts of the South, 'the people of the South have disfranchised themselves. They make decisions on national and international issues on no other basis, and they are the only segment of the national electorate so irrationally circumscribed.'

"Most Mississippians probably will not like Smith's book, but it is one they should take the time to read and ponder."

The Knoxville News-Sentinel (Edward B. Smith): "His objectivity is particularly remarkable because he has every right to be bitter.

"A good deal of this autobiography deals with Mississippi and National politics. But this reviewer, who lived in south Mississippi for nearly 3 years, admired and relished his neat dissection of the average white Missippian's mental processes. It explains the massive, unreasonable rejection of the Negro as an American citizen."

The Chattanooga Times (Norman Bradley): "The former Congressman views his native State and its people with a great deal of affection, as well as despair over their intransigence in racial matters.

"This was the bridge of reality Frank Smith was never able to build as a Congressman; as a humane individual, he still hopes for its spanning strength."

The Mississippi Methodist Advocate: " 'Congressman From Mississippi' is a gripping and factual story. * * * It is the outspoken autobiography of Frank E. Smith, a native Mississippian who served 12 years as a Congressman from Mississippi.

"The book should challenge all of us to reevaluate our politics and our religion."

Dallas (Tex.) Morning News (Harry McCormick): "But in 1962 Mississippians used their bulldozers to oust Frank Smith from Congress where he had served for 12 years.

"As he left the Congress, Smith was referred to as 'a breath of fresh air out of a political swamp.'

"This autobiography is outspoken, politically and otherwise; it is the story of a man of courage who tried to make a political career in Mississippi without pandering to racism."

Lake Charles (La.) American Press (Stacy): "Most of all, however, he concerns himself with the way that his native State has removed itself from the common society of Americans, and has, for most purposes, declared war against the National Government—although at the same time holding out an itchy palm for any Federal funds that may be had."

Austin (Tex.) American-Statesman (James T. Bratcher): "The heart of the book is its chapters on race politics. Mr. Smith argues that the South, by reason of its solid segregationist bloc, has disenfranchised itself."

Ford's Strong Convictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Joplin, Mo., Globe of January 21 carried an excellent article by Mr. Holmes Alexander, setting forth the challenge that faces our two-party system. The article takes a close look at our distinguished minority leader and the heavy responsibility he bears. I commend it to the attention of all:

FORD'S STRONG CONVICTIONS

WASHINGTON.—There was something bravely defiant in the way GERALD FORD said it. The newly chosen leader of the minority House Members was making his first appearance with his Senate colleague EVERETT DIRKSEN, and he had a crowded press conference where a good beginning was important.

The Republicans had picked him for his good looks, his good brain, his fine projection of sincerity and vigor, and his promised ability to give the GOP a pickup after its debacle in the November elections. The key passage of JERRY FORD'S first formal utterance was this:

"We are convinced that the Republican Party is not only a great force in the American way of life, but is the only living political instrument which can make the American dream a reality, not a mere collection of words and promises."

CLOUDY OUTLOOK

From a man given to mere rhetoric and bombast, the words would have seemed weightless and banal. From FORD they expressed the political equivalent of what Washingon must have felt at Valley Forge and Lincoln must have felt when the Union Army was routed at the first battle of Manassas.

What hope is there, in FORD'S case, of stopping the Democrat juggernaut, which is now so numerically and psychologically superior? How can FORD, who is today the Republicans' de facto standard bearer, plan to halt the stampede of defeatism into which the party has been plunged?

He does not have the troops. His 140 House Members look very sparse in a membership of 435, and he cannot count on their solid support. The liberals will leave him on many a Great Society rollcall. He does not have the esprit de corps. The defeats last November which cost the Republicans 40 of their House seats were demoralizing. FORD does not have a program.

The downfall of Barry Goldwater, and the savage fighting to destroy National Chairman Dean Burch and all other vestiges of the Goldwater crusade have left the Republicans in Washington with a roster but not with a charter.

All that FORD has left to fight with is a set of convictions which have to be summoned out of the void of party disaster. It is manifest that he wouldn't have gone after the leadership post if he didn't believe it worth having. It is a position which gives him a chance to ask the country whether or not the pretentious Democratic blueprint is, as he said, "a mere collection of words and promises."

HIS FORUM

The leadership post offers FORD a forum where he can try to juxtapose reality against Democratic utopia, and where he can warn the Nation against the follies of sloganized schemes to legislate a heaven-on-earth.

FORD is up against the task of producing something in the future out of nothing in the present. That "something" may be no more in the next 2 years than the semblance of an opposition to the dominant Democrats. But he, more than the triumphant Democrats, has the preservation of the two-party system in his keeping. It will take a while for the country to swing back to an understanding that no party, however overwhelmingly placed in power and however brilliantly led from the White House, should have the whole responsibility for shaping domestic and foreign decisions.

The hammer of the majority must have the anvil of the minority on which to beat out its plowshares and swords. At the moment there is no anvil, no Republican opposition that is fit to be called by that name. FORD stood there, a man who is beginning his fight with empty hands but strong convictions.

Latin Hopes Are High for Good Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Alliance for Progress is a program of great importance and great promise. As it enters its fourth year, there are many encouraging signs of its effectiveness. I ask unanimous consent that the report of Juan de Onis about the Alliance, published on January 22 in the New York Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN HOPES ARE HIGH FOR GOOD YEAR

(By Juan de Onis)

RIO DE JANEIRO.—Latin America is not likely to find answers to all of its economic problems this year, but, some realistic programs in key countries may set a bright example.

Politically stablizing developments and some improvements in exports last year set the stage for what some experts predict will be the best economic year of the decade.

In Mexico, Venezuela, Ecuador, Peru, and Argentina, the task will be to sustain the impetus of last year. These countries have cashed in on higher exports and show a good potential for absorbing investment.

THREE PROBLEM NATIONS

Brazil, Chile, and Colombia, which represent 42 percent of Latin America's production, had inflation, political distress, and serious problems in their balances-of-pay-

ments last year. Their growth rates were weak, as were those of Santo Domingo, Haiti, and the Central American Common Market countries—Guatemala, Honduras, Salvador, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica.

The military revolution that ousted President João Goulart in Brazil and the election victory in Chile of Eduardo Frei Montalva at the head of a strongly reformist Christian Democratic Party have raised hopes in those two countries.

More is involved than just cranking up the existing economic machinery. Brazil and Chile are among the most industrialized countries in Latin America, but their steel mills and manufacturing plants exist alongside archaic, high-cost forms of agriculture.

Mr. Frei's elected government in Chile and the military regime of President Humberto Castelo Branco in Brazil are both committed to modernization, including agrarian reform.

Substantial reforms in taxation and public administration are also called for to increase Government revenues, reduce deficit spending, and focus public investment on roads, power, education, and public health.

The U.S. Government has shown its confidence in the new Brazilian and Chilean regimes by pledging about $600 million in aid to them.

Under the Alliance for Progress, a 10-year program for inter-American economic cooperation, the U.S. Government, international financial institutions, and foreign private investors are expected to support Latin America's efforts with a total of $20 billion.

Now in its fourth year, the alliance is still essentially a concern of governments. It has not yet acquired broad political or popular support.

The alliance has been harassed by the radical left, including supporters of former President Goulart and Mr. Frei's defeated opponent, Salvador Allende.

In Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala, small revolutionary guerrilla groups denounce the alliance as neoimperialist.

At the same time, vested interests oppose alliance reforms. As described by the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America, these forces use their influence to make reforms "weak and innocuous instruments."

Each Latin American nation presents a distinct economic situation, yet all face the same problems of how to produce rates of development proper to the needs of fast-growing populations. There are now 200 million people in the area.

Cuba, under a revolutionary government, established a centrally planned Socialist economy dependent on the Soviet Union. After 4 years, the results are largely negative.

LOOK TO THE WEST

Other Latin American countries have mixed economics, with relatively high levels of Government ownership and public investment, but private ownership of manufacturing, commerce, and agriculture. They look to the West for trade and aid.

Latin American economics are heavily influenced by foreign markets. The area generates 75 percent of its exchange income through exports of oil, coffee, meat, cotton, copper, sugar, wool, iron ore, and bananas.

Exports, excluding Cuba's were estimated at $9.8 billion last year, or nearly 23 percent more than in 1960. But Latin America's need to import production goods and the heavy drain of foreign-debt payments require even faster expansion. The level of imports was $8.1 billion last year, but it is expected to exceed $9 billion this year.

Latin Americans have made trade a major issue of the Alliance for Progress. They insist that the United States make good on promises to help stabilize prices of exports such as coffee, through international marketing agreements. They ask the United States and Europe to take steps to open markets to new Latin American exports.

Latin Americans feel more strongly now about trade expansion than about increased aid, although some development plans are handicapped by crushing short-term debts abroad. A large part of the Brazilian and Chilean aid programs this year involved postponement of debts.

CREDIT BOTTLENECKS

United States and international public credit, which has been coming forward at $1 billion a year, has begun to run into bottlenecks. One is incomplete projects. Technical help has been asked to complete suitable projects. Another problem is insufficient local currency to match foreign credits.

Efforts by Latin American countries to increase trade among themselves have come to a crossroads. The major attempt at regional economic integration is the Latin American Free Trade Area, formed by Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay.

After 4 years, this has brought only modest progress toward tariff reductions to create a preferential, but internally competitive, market. The trade within the area totals more than $400 million a year, and arrangements have increased commerce in some manufactured and chemical raw materials, but no real integration.

Chile has proposed a high-level political conference this year to discuss a bolder line toward an eventual common market.

False Assurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, when President Kennedy confronted Khrushchev in the 1962 missile crisis, and the Russians backed away, the American people were led to believe all danger of Communist attack from Cuba had been removed. During the Johnson administration, there has been a silence about the Cuban situation. Nothing is said about the Soviet strength on that island. The Castro government is ignored. Disquieting events there are being played down. A recent report of the completion of Soviet submarine bases there has triggered no general alarm. The general attitude of the Johnson administration seems to be that Russian communism is maturing, becoming more amenable to true concepts of freedom, even turning to ways of private enterprise; that the Communists are becoming people we can trust.

Vigilance is still the price of liberty. And evidence that our people are not being lulled asleep by this kind of propaganda is illustrated in an excellent editorial recently appearing in the Niles (Mich.) Daily Star, which I include under leave to extend my remarks.

FALSE ASSURANCE

Those Americans who want to believe that the Comunists are steadily becoming the kind of people we can trust, must have been jolted last week on reading that four Red submarine bases have been completed in Cuba for use of Soviet undersea craft.

Russian submarines, operating from a base just a few miles off U.S. shores, can lob medium-range or even short-range missiles into the center of cities and military bases well back from the Gulf and Atlantic seacoasts.

The facts about the submarine bases in Cuba were dug up by John Ennis, military affairs editor of a television station in Norfolk, Va. Mr. Ennis reports that he checked his facts with Federal intelligence officials and they indicated that his information was correct, but had no comment.

It is not surprising that the Russians are working in every devious way possible to get us into a spot where they can deliver ultimatums based on the capability of destroying us.

The surprising thing about the whole situation is that the Federal administration in Washington still seems unwilling to tell Americans the facts about Communist operations. There are three possible reasons for the Federal silence:

The administration could have wanted to keep bad news suppressed until its candidates, favoring accommodation with the Reds, were safely elected.

The State Department people, who for years have been slow to recognize the danger of the Communists, were doing their utmost to convince the administration that their course was successful, and felt that the full truth about the submarine bases would discredit them.

The administration was simply following the pattern of the Kennedy years when Americans were frankly told that "managed news was a desirable policy.

Whatever the reason, the Government failed to take the American people into its confidence. This is along lines of Socialist and collectivist theories that the people are to take orders, not give them. But the American Republic was not founded on this theory, and many millions of Americans are not ready to relinquish the idea that an informed public is essential to democracy.

The administration's attitude with regard to the Russo-Cuban threat has created a feeling of false assurance in this country. Why should administration spokesmen have led Americans to feel the threat was diminishing when they knew the bases were being completed for possible nuclear assaults on the United States.

If Americans know the facts, bad as well as good, then public sentiment will build up into support of those things that must be done to maintain national safety. If on the other hand, Americans are not told the facts, the Great Society could let international situations get past the point of no return.

Outstanding Georgia Agricultural Leader Named "Man of the Year" by Progressive Farmer Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, L. W. "Hoop" Eberhardt, Jr., a distinguished Georgian, and one of the State's most outstanding agricultural leaders, has been named "man of the year" in service to agriculture by the Progressive Farmer magazine.

Mr. Eberhardt—whose many friends call him "Hoop," and I am proud to be counted among them—is director of the Georgia Agricultural Extension Service. Because of the great contributions he has made to the progress of farming in Georgia and to the economy of the State, "Hoop" Eberhardt is most deserving of the high honor accorded him by the Progresive Farmer.

I join all his friends and associates in extending him warmest personal congratulations and best wishes for every future success in his work.

Mr. President, I ask that the Progressive Farmer citation to Mr. Eberhardt, on the announcement of this award, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN OF THE YEAR IN SERVICE TO AGRICULTURE

When L. W. "Hoop" Eberhardt, Jr., was appointed director of Georgia Extension Service in 1963, he brought to the position a wealth of experience in all areas of extension work.

From his former position as associate director, he also brought with him credit for two major jobs recently done—development of program to increase Georgia's farm income by $400 million a year and reorganization of extension service to carry out the program more effectively and efficiently.

After growing up on his parents' farm in Jackson County, "Hoop" Eberhardt was graduated from Maysville High School and University of Georgia.

He began his career with extension service in 1936 as assistant county agent, Berrien County. A few years later he developed Treutlen County's first livestock outlet, a cooperative auction market.

Since 1940 he has been on the State staff in the fields of forestry and 4-H and later as district agent.

Throughout his career he has been a leader in programs giving greater educational opportunities to youth.

The area corn program he started has helped increase per acre yields by 4-H Club members and adult farmers.

He started the 4-H forestry and naval stores camps and got financial support for them from the forest industry.

He gave dynamic leadership to the campaign to raise more than $3 million for developing, and was instrumental in getting, State support for building Rock Eagle 4-H Center.

In 1962 he conducted a people-to-people tour of Europe, including Russia, for Georgia agricultural leaders.

Because of him there is a tremendous effect upon the economy of the entire State as a more prosperous, efficient agriculture develops under the leadership of the extension service.

L.B.J.'s School Objectives Are Good but States Can Do Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the message of the President on education to this body has aroused considerable comment throughout the Nation. The editorial, "L.B.J.'s School Objectives Are Good but States Can Do Job," as it appeared in the Jackson, Mich., Citizen Patriot of January 13, 1965, takes one side of the controversy and asks questions that deserve the attention of Members of Congress as we seek correct answers in the area of Federal aid to education.

For that reason, I am pleased to include, with unanimous consent, this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD in the hope that it will stimulate debate and discussion on this vital issue in the months ahead.

L.B.J.'S SCHOOL OBJECTIVES ARE GOOD BUT STATES CAN DO JOB

Most of the objectives set forth in President Johnson's message to Congress on education are excellent.

Professional educators, school board members, and enlightened laymen see the need for improving the educational processes, and particularly in the areas where economics tend to deprive children of opportunities.

"Poverty has many roots," the President said, "but the taproot is ignorance." He is right.

Take just one point from his program—that of eradicating the handicaps with which slum children start kindergarten or the first grade:

Educators have known for years that teachers in the first two or three grades have been able to put their fingers on the potential dropouts. Their forecasts have been so accurate as to be terribly disturbing.

Preschool programs now are in use in many school systems and there are high hopes for making it possible for the culturally deprived children to take advantage of their opportunity. Such a project is underway in the Union School District on a small, experimental scale, with funds supplied by the Kiwanis Club.

This is only one of many areas in which the schools can do more and can offer a better opportunity for children who must have education.

The question we raise does not involve the fitness of the President's recommendations. Rather it is whether the Federal Government can afford to do the job, and whether the best interests of the people are being served by letting Uncle Sam do it.

Figures tend to be boring, but they are all important here.

The U.S. Government owes around $310 billion. It is operating in the red every year and no balanced budget is in sight.

President Johnson's education program is expected to cost around $1.6 billion—the first year. Where the cost goes in subsequent years no one knows, but it undoubtedly will move up.

The Federal Government's debt figures out to something like $1,600 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Now, to bring this thing close to home so that it may be understood, let's assume that the Union School District of Jackson owed a similar amount per capita. It would be in debt to the tune of more than $110 million.

The Union District's debt actually is less than $7 million and is being paid off handily. No one knows when or if even any payments will be made on the Federal debt.

Now if we apply that same $1,600 factor to the State of Michigan it would owe around $13 billion.

So we ask the question: Who should be helping whom?

We are certain that the State of Michigan and every other State, and all local school districts everywhere given proper tax structures and assistance from their States can do everything for education recommended by the President and without swelling the national debt and deficit spending which is eating away at the integrity of the dollar.

Yet we expect the President's education plan to be gleefully hailed in the Congress and in school districts and in States which have failed or refused to do what they should for education.

It's "easy money" that can be obtained without going through the painful process of telling the people they must pay for what they get. If Uncle Sam doesn't have the cash on hand, he merely borrows it and thus puts a heavier mortgage on the future of the younger generations—the ones that the education program is supposed to help.

There is an old saying: Those who fail to govern lose the right to govern.

If the Federal Government moves heavily into the field of education and thus piles deficit upon deficit, it is because the people of the communities and the States have failed to do what they should for themselves.

There is absolutely no reason why the State of Michigan and every school district within it cannot do everything the President suggests and more, if necessary without a nickel's worth of "Federal money."

The resources are here. It is a matter of mobilizing them. But it is easier to ignore the problem, let Uncle Sam do it on borrowed money and bring the Nation one step nearer to fiscal disaster.

Certainly we are for improved education for all. We want the kids from the slums or the wornout farms to have their chance at the great American dream.

But we also would like to see them inherit an economic system that is a going concern, instead of one wrecked by inflation, and a government based on the morality involved in paying your own way instead of borrowing against nothing to avoid facing facts.

Federal Domination a Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 19, the Redwood City Tribune of Redwood City, Calif., published an editorial in regard to the President's message on Federal aid to education, which clearly sets forth the direction in which this administration is continuing to go and the ultimate goal of such policies.

The editorial follows:

FEDERAL DOMINATION A WAY OF LIFE

That there has been barely a ripple of dissent since President Johnson submitted his Federal aid to education program is indication of how the people are beginning to accept Federal domination as a way of life.

There has been such a clamor for Federal Government (taxpayer) assistance for education that last week's "tots to teens" proposals, calling for additional expenditures of $1.5 billion in the first year, barely stirred anyone out of his complacency.

Regardless of what we would like to think about local control, the Federal Government is becoming the dominant voice in education.

The President would use Federal funds to build gymnasiums and laboratories for students from public, private and parochial schools * * * something which local tax dollars and private contributions have managed to provide until now.

He would give cash to public school districts serving students from extremely poor families, and maybe this is the humane thing, even though it would mean that such areas as the Peninsula would be paying twice, or even three times, for educating our youngsters.

He would pump $150 million into a program to provide preschool indoctrination for slum kids who now suffer some of the social drawbacks attached to being poor. Maybe this explains why some pupils lag behind, although we have never been aware of the connection between brains and affluence.

If the Federal Government is going to build schools, buy books, subsidize training and grant scholarships we can be certain that it also will exert pressure * * * a pressure not to the liking of most American adults, including the presently apathetic educators and parents.

When this comes to pass it won't really matter whether we've unified our school districts, we'll all be taking orders from the bureaucracy bordering on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Proposed Closing of Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1965, I included some excellent remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Nathan T. Wolkomir, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees, concerning the proposed closing of the Olmsted Air Force Base at Middletown, Pa. At that time, I stated my plan to place an extension in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the excellent presentation made by John F. Griner, president of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO.

I trust the membership will read carefully both this one of Mr. Griner, and also the presentation of Mr. Wolkomir in the January 6 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The proposed closing of Olmsted, in my judgment, may have an extremely bad effect upon our national defense capabilities. It will destroy available skills which can only be replaced over a long period of time. It has strategic implications affecting our whole defense setup. It is a matter in which every Member of Congress should be vitally interested. Above all, we must consider the people involved, as Mr. Griner so ably points out and stresses.

Mr. Griner's presentation follows. Also contained in it are some answers to questions propounded to him:

STATEMENT OF J. F. GRINER, NATIONAL PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. GRINER. Gentlemen, I have a prepared statement that I am going to pass around, and do just a little ad libbing.

You will notice from this statement that I want to call your attention to the real rights of (interest in the) human being as being expressed here. I have heard spaces and spaces this morning, and I have never heard the words "personnel" or "employee."

So we are beginning to think of the human being as a machine, and it is clearly indicated here this morning by these representatives from the Department of Defense as to how they think about the human being.

I want to say that we agree, all of us do, that these people cannot be absorbed in the area around Olmsted Air Force Base. They are going to have to be moved, and the impression has been left with you that they are going to be made whole. That is wrong.

Do you know that they only pay for 7,000 pounds of moving of household goods to any new place? We have had thousands of protests from people in Rome, New York, and other places that had to move, and they have had to dig into their pockets for hundreds of dollars to cover additional moving costs.

And what about the loss in their housing? It is my understanding that the value of real estate around this area has dropped almost 50 percent. Are these people going to be made whole? I don't think so.

Then I was surprised to learn that there were only 2,400 slots to be dropped. Understand, I am using their Department of Defense figures. That means 2,400 people. So it is going to leave about 10,000 to 12,000 to be scattered throughout the world; not only the United States, but throughout the world, wherever they can find jobs for them. They are going to have to pick up their roots and move.

Where is all this saving? I heard two figures this morning, one $68 million and the other $34 million. Which is correct?

I don't think either one of them is correct. I don't have the figures to support my thinking, and I will dare say that they don't have them.

I was in a hearing not too long ago over in the House Subcommittee on Manpower. When the three arms of the Department of Defense appeared with respect to the cost of contracting out, not one of them could tell you what a single contract cost this Government. These officials who appeared were the Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of these different Departments.

Now, did any of the Department of Defense representatives mention the fact that we have at Olmsted somewhere in the neighborhood of 292,000 square feet of clean room space, and that they were building 20,000 additional square feet of clean room space? That contract has to be closed out. The contractor has to be paid his profit.

And that is not all of it. Part of this work is now going to be moved to Oklahoma City. You have 44 people in Oklahoma City that are now employed in clean rooms. There are 1,800 people now employed at Olmsted, and yet they need 20,000 additional feet of space up there. It is only logical that additional space must be provided.

It is my understanding that General McNichols made the statement, and then somebody clammed him up, that it was going to be necessary to spend an additional $31 million in Texas and $21 million in Oklahoma City, or vice versa, for additional clean room space.

There must be additional hangars constructed in these places. And all of these are additional costs. I am wondering if that is taken into consideration with either the $34 million or $68 million which we have been shown here today. I wonder if the human element has been taken into consideration. Spaces have. But where is the human element?

Has the additional expense that will be incurred by retraining the civilians been taken into account? We recognize also that many civilians will not be able to accompany the function for personal reasons, and that it will be necessary to hire and train new employees in certain areas. Surely these two factors are significant and added to other factors raised in our statement cause us to wonder whether any economy figure will result.

Yes, I agree with what Governor Scranton of Pennsylvania said this morning. I agree with what you gentlemen say. It is a problem.

It looks like to me that we are beginning to put all of our eggs in one basket, in one section of the country, west of the Mississippi.

We do not pretend to know all the answers. We have been told that the defense posture of this country will not be adversely affected by the closing of Olmstead Air Force Base. However, after closing this base there will not be a similar facility in the entire Northeastern United States. Air Force claims that this presents no problem since they utilize airlift rather than ground transportation. Certainly, weather conditions such as rain, fog, and snow will limit the effectiveness of supplying air bases in the Northeastern United States. This entire section of the country will not have a facility closer than Georgia or Oklahoma City, and yet almost half of the population of this country is located in the Northeastern United States.

All of us are familiar with the dispersal plans proposed over the years by the Department of Defense. Now we are seeing a concentration of military facilities. Have the dispersal plans been abandoned or are we so concerned with cutting down numbers that we are ignoring the defense of this country? Surely in the event of enemy attack it is easier to hit 5 targets than 10 targets spread across the country.

I am not only president of the AFGE. I am a taxpayer. And my tax is pretty high, like your taxes are. I am interested in where our money is being spent, and I don't want it thrown away, and I want you to know that this federation feels this way.

But we think there should be some logic in these considerations, and we would appreciate any consideration that the Department of Defense might give toward having additional figures and facts. I mean substantive facts and figures, given not only to the committee but these organizations represented here today, and others.

Since it is apparent that this action will result in the loss of thousands of civilian positions in the Department of the Air Force, I wonder who will continue to do the work. There is a very dangerous practice in the military which replaces civilian personnel with military. Will this action result n military personnel performing the functions normally performed by the career civilians? This is of vital concern to all Americans. The civil servant represents a highly skilled trained work force that also provides continuity which cannot be replaced by military personnel. The military transfer every 2 to 4 years. The civil servant usually spends his career in the same location.

There has been very little liaison between the Department of Defense and our organization regarding these places that are going to be phased out. We, like you, are told about it after it is over.

We would like to help you. We would like to be a means of communication between the employees. We think we have some ideas, and would like to be given a chance to express them.

Thank you, gentlemen. I appreciate your hearing me.

Mr. MORGAN. Do any members of the steering committee wish to direct questions to Mr. Tabor or members of organized labor?

Senator SCOTT. I have just one question, and I will ask Mr. Griner.

We are in northern Appalachia. Do you agree that this move could be described as a formula for instant recession in this part of northern Appalachia?

Mr. GRINER. Yes, sir. Absolutely. While Middletown, itself is not in Appalachia,

nevertheless, a great many of its employees live in that area.

As I understand it now, if you take away the base there would be a recession, because you don't have the industries or other back-up work for people that work outside the base.

If you take away the base, then the related work which the payroll of this base keeps going will also disappear. Certainly you will have a depression, not a recession.

In my statement, Senator. I said how can our Goverment create an unemployment in an already depressed area, only then to ask Congress for funds to raise employment in the same area? This is an inconsistency which must be repugnant to all.

As national president of the American Federation of Government Employees, I have been informed of the Department of Defense's plans to close certain defense agencies. There was no consultation with this union or to my knowledge with any union prior to the announcement that the Olmsted employees would be affected by the base closures.

The Secretary has assured the civilian employees that every effort will be made to find new positions, both within the Government and private industry. I have no quarrel with this statement, but as you gentlemen from Pennsylvania know, people do not just pick up roots and move without hardship. The employees from Olmsted must move unless the Department of Defense is able to relocate other defense activities at Olmsted Air Force Base which would utilize the skills of these employees. I say that they must move because the labor market area cannot absorb these people. Some of the other gentlemen here today from the State of Pennsylvania will undoubtedly give you more details concerning the impact that this action will have on the Middletown area. The Department has given public assurances that every effort will be made to retrain employees. To date our union has not been consulted on this vital problem.

We must not forget that Middletown affects the northern Appalachian area and this region is receiving considerable attention by the administration and hopefully the U.S. Congress will act to relieve poverty in this area.

Soviets Take Over Cuban Ocean Studies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call my colleagues' attention to the shocking story which appeared in Hydrogram Intelligence Briefings on October 16, 1964. The article is entitled "Soviets Take Over Cuban Ocean Studies," and reads as follows:

The Navy is concerned over the Soviet mission which has come to Cuba to take over its oceanographic studies. These studies can have two directly connected effects on the United States-Soviet balance of power.

Charting the islands, reefs, keys, and underwater canyons in the Caribbean may locate nondetected submarine routes for Soviet submarines. Our detection devices would find it difficult to track submarines moving near the ocean buttom and shielded by a line of islands with connecting underwater reefs.

The Soviets also could be locating detection-proof passages where its subs could lay secret mines to be fired by remote control. Soviet mining of terminal area sealanes and harbor approaches in the Caribbean and Gulf of Mexico would put the free Americas at a considerable disadvantage in facing a conventional war.

Dream Comes True

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, as Representative of the 12th Illinois Congressional District in the heartland of the Midwest, I am always proud to recount new instances of the qualities of my constituents.

From the Waukegan News-Sun, the largest daily newspaper published in this district—Lake, McHenry, and Boone Counties—I have just clipped an article which I wish to share with my colleagues. I commend for your reading pleasure a people-to-people project in which a columnist, an ex-serviceman and his family, and a little Japanese girl are the principals. We are grateful to the columnist, Mrs. Bernice Just, for calling this item of human interest to our attention.

The article follows:

DREAMS COME TRUE

To a petite Japanese girl, the Waukegan News-Sun is not just a newspaper but a fairy godmother, also.

How the News-Sun became a godmother to the girl has a beginning.

Once upon a time, almost a year ago, the girl, whose name is Shigeyo Chiba, wrote to "The Waukegan Newspaper in Waukegan, Ill."

"Would you ask in your column if some family in your area would keep me next school year so I could go to classes there and learn more about your wonderful country?" wrote Shigeyo, of Hokkaido.

At the time, the News-Sun never thought of itself as a godmother, and besides was fresh out of wands. Fortunately we had plenty of sticks of type.

In this column we told about Shigeyo.

Two families immediately volunteered to adopt Shigeyo for the year.

We asked former News-Sun proofreader, Mrs. G. B. Hanna, and Miss Eleanor Moore, both American Field Service advisers with experience in selecting families for foreign students, to decide which of the two families should be chosen for Shigeyo.

The AFS committee liked both families so much and found both so qualified as foster parents that the women, we think, flipped a coin.

They chose the Curt Rosemann family of 1524 West Derring Lane, Lake Villa. The sons are Bruce, 15, and Craig, 13. The rest of the family are rabbits, cats, geese, dogs, and parakeets.

Rosemann, an engineer for Jan-Air, Inc., Richmond, was in Japan when he was in service. All year long the family has been corresponding with Shigeyo and reading about Japan.

Shigeyo, in the meantime, has been continuing her study of English and trying to learn as much as possible about the United States.

"Tell me," she wrote to Mrs. Rosemann, "everything your family does in 1 day, from time you get up to when you go to bed."

Shigeyo kept writing the News-Sun.

"I want my American family to know well about me. I want to become like their true daughter."

The year of planning, correspondence with the American Embassy and the Japanese Government and other paperwork finally came to fruition: Shigeyo has been granted permission from her Government to come to Lake County.

So now we come to the beginning of another beginning.

Shigeyo will fly from Tokyo to O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, on March 30 or 31.

The fact that she will fly here has the sound of a fairy tale with godmothers and wands and wishes come true.

So maybe Shigeyo is right after all.

Maybe the News-Sun is not just a newspaper but a fairy godmother, also.

Harvest of Shame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the following excellent article entitled "Harvest of Shame." This editorial appeared in the Daily News, Camarillo, Calif.

The editorial follows:

HARVEST OF SHAME

During 1964, the last year of the bracero farm labor program, western do-gooders and eastern know-nothings sowed the seeds of folly when they managed to beat down legislative attempts to have this workable system continued. This year, California is reaping a harvest of shame. While furtive attemtps are made to fill the farm labor gap with unqualified domestics, the agricultural economy of the Nation's No. 1 farming State teeters on the brink of disaster.

Newly elected Senator GEORGE MURPHY, who vigorously opposed cancellation of the bracero program during his campaign, stated last week that farmers are letting fields lie fallow rather than plant crops only to have them rot on the vine.

With the domestic worker system only a few weeks old, the problems brought about by the change are already exceeding forecasts of the bracero proponents. And the troubles go beyond the basic difficulty of farmers dealing with this uncertain labor market.

County and city law enforcement officials report a sharp rise in incidents involving farmworkers notably fights and drunkenness. Oxnard Police Chief Al Jewell had so many drunks the first weekend after the farmworkers were paid that the city drunk tank was filled and some had to be sent to the county jail.

A sheriff's office spokesman said the department has received many calls on fights, both at the labor camps and in the fields. He said this was in marked contrast to the almost complete lack of this type of incident among the braceros.

Drinking and fighting are just openers—the rapes, burglaries, assaults and other crimes of violence are yet to come. Sheriff's officials, knowing the type of individuals that are being brought into the county to work

in the fields, are certain they will come. A long, hot summer of violence may be in store for Ventura County and other agricultural areas.

The Government played a dirty trick on the farmers and rural area residents when it decided to trade braceros for America's unemployed. Farmers and ranchers were handed the job of rehabilitating the chronic unemployed. In an effort to secure enough farm hands and thereby prove that there are sufficient domestic workers to fill the need, labor recruiters dragged the slums of Los Angeles and other large cities.

Among the herds of field recruits rounded up is an ample sprinkling of winos, derelicts and skidrow bums. These individuals, unfortunate though they may be, need more than a job to set their lives aright, they require a carefully supervised rehabilitation program.

Of course, the majority of the domestics are good, honest workers, interested in making a decent living. But the supply of this type is limited and they usually have an eye open for better employment.

The bracero program was a sound program all around. It provided farmers with a stable supply of good adept, willing farmhands. Braceros were noted for their good behavior. They had to behave if they wanted to remain in this country.

They were a far cry from the slave laborers as many of the dogooders tagged them. The Mexican workers were paid far beyond what they could expect in their homeland. They were well fed, clothed, sheltered and supervised. The fact that they were happy with their lot was reflected in their regretful departure last month.

The most baffling aspect about the whole situation is that by putting the ax to the bracero program, Uncle Sam canceled an important part of our foreign aid that didn't cost the taxpayers a red cent. The United States annually pours millions of dollars into Latin America with few thanks and little promise of being paid back.—Yet in this instance, millions of dollars were going into Mexico in pockets of grateful braceros who left behind the most valuable harvest in the world.

But maybe this is why the "experts" in Washington killed the bracero program—it just made too much commonsense.

Car Sales Hold Key to 1965 Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent budget message indicates that the depressing effects of our excise tax system are finally to have attention. I sincerely hope that this is the year that something will be done about reduction or repeal of the automobile excise tax. The importance of such a step is clearly pointed out by J. A. Livingston, Washington Post economist, in his article included in the Post's economic review section of January 10, 1965.

This article, "Car Sales Hold Key to 1965 Prosperity," illustrates that "as autos go, so will 1965, and vice versa." Since we in the House may soon be faced with a decision on auto excise taxes I take this opportunity to commend this penetrating article to the careful attention of my colleagues in the House and under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CAR SALES HOLD KEY TO 1965 PROSPERITY

(By J. A. Livingston)

What's to keep prosperity rolling?

That is the question, as we enter 1965.

This has been a 20-year boom.

It began right after World War II and has persisted with only four minor interruptions—1949–50, 1953–54, 1957–58, and 1960–61. The setbacks were so mild we introduced a new term: Recession instead of depression.

The latest advance has been a gallop. It started in February 1961—the month after President Kennedy's inauguration—and has hardly stopped for breath since.

It is now the second longest peacetime upcycle on record, exceeded only by the unprosperous recovery from the great depression.

But this raises a critical question: Is it petering out?

The majority of economists who responded to my yearend questionnaire think so. Their predicted pattern for the year is: First half up, second half up also, but not so fast. This leads to the inference: Recession in 1966.

TROUBLE SPOTS

Here are seven reasons for apprehension:

1. The automotive industry has had 3 superlative years in a row. Adding on a fourth would be like filling an inside straight in poker. It can be done, but the experts advise: "Don't bet your all on it."

2. Housing continues to dip. The continued rise in foreclosures and the persistent vacancy rate of more than 7 percent hardly foreshadow any immediate reversal.

3. The United States has not yet solved its balance-of-payments difficulties, and even more emphatically, neither has Great Britain. A sterling crisis could upset international money markets and perhaps put pressure on the dollar.

4. As a corollary, the Federal Reserve System is inhibited. Modern economic thought—a la Keynes—dictates that central banks should make money and credit cheap and plentiful when business is not expanding rapidly enough to take up slack in employment. But if interest rates were to fall in the United States, foreign banks, business firms, and investors would pull out funds—hot money—from this country. This would put pressure on America's gold supply and perhaps cause a dollar crisis.

5. Closing of military bases, if not carefully planned and spaced, can cause pockets of unemployment and a fear psychology. Indeed, retrenchment in defense spending—highly desirable, in itself—is a source of uncertainty.

6. Labor unrest is possible. The rivalry between David J. McDonald, president, and I. W. Abel, secretary-treasurer, for the presidency of the United Steelworkers increases the chance of a strike. Whoever is elected will want to prove he deserved it—by winning a signal wage boost.

7. Moreover, in anticipation of trouble in steel, many manufacturers and retailers are building up inventories. Not only are they ordering steel but also products made of steel. This could lead to an up-down inventory cycle.

RETURN GROWS

So much for the question: What's to cause a slowdown? Now to: What's to keep prosperity rolling?

Recoveries are often propelled along by unexpected strengths generated by recovery, itself. This is possible in 1965.

Corporate profits have made the great leap upward: From $22 billion after taxes in 1961, to $25 billion in 1962, to $27 billion in 1963, and in 1964 to well above $30 billion. This is a major breakthrough.

The return on invested capital has been increasing. This courses through the economy in unexpected ways and places. It induces corporate boards of directors and entrepreneurs to put more money into new capacity and development projects.

This flow-through is discernible in the railroads. For years they were the economy's stepchildren. Now, profits are up, and this year's capital expenditures will be three times those of 1960.

Furthermore, the social needs of modern living—highways, schools, parking facilities, hospitals, sewage disposal systems—require continuing expansion in capital improvements by State and local governments. These will be a powerful force again this year.

And the increase in employment—at rising income levels—widens the base of consumer demand. Affluence always lifts families into higher spending brackets.

This widened demand will be reinforced by an upsurge in marriages. The big crop of babies born just before and after the end of the war is reaching the age of nubility.

PRESIDENT AWARE

Finally—and this is what keeps me optimistic—Preisdent Johnson and his economic advisers are fully aware of the standard forecast: Up in the first half, second half up also, but not so fast. Such retarded economic growth would mean a shortage of jobs for the bumper crop of 18-to-21 year olds.

The second stage of the tax cut voted last year will take effect. This will add somewhat to incomes. And elimination or reduction of excise taxes is probable. This will reduce price tags on higher priced items, such as autos, furs, etc. Finally, if necessary, President Johnson can have ready a shelf of public works—just in case.

The greatest danger this year is external—events beyond the mastery of the President and his aids, such as an international monetary crisis, deeper involvement militarily in the Far East, disputes with the Soviet Union. But these are the unpredictables. And in business and investment planning, it's not easy to do much about them.

The domestic economic test will come in the spring. If automobile sales keep pace with the optimistic forecasts of Detroit executives, then a good second half will hatch.

Conclusion: As autos go, so will 1965, and vice versa.

Americans Are Eyeball to Eyeball With Communism in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the presses are running overtime today producing evaluations of the present situation in South Vietnam. Foreign policy experts are blossoming forth every Monday morning in the tradition of the "Monday morning quarterbacks."

Some of the articles appearing are indeed enlightening and are based on factual information of responsible reporters and journalists in the field. Others are obviously written by those who merely want to jump on the bandwagon of the critics.

Without doubt, the military and political situation in South Vietnam grows more ominous from day to day. The

controversy and debate will continue and it is important that the American people have factual information upon which to base their opinions and decisions.

It is for this reason that I commend the article appearing in the Washington Post of Sunday, January 24, 1965, by Eugene Patterson, entitled "Vietnam Can Make Kneecaps Shake," to my colleagues.

The article follows:

VIETNAM CAN MAKE KNEECAPS SHAKE—WE'RE EYEBALL TO EYEBALL WITH REDS BUT ONLY BLINKING IS STATESIDE

(By Eugene Patterson)

(NOTE.—Editor of the Atlanta Constitution, Patterson recently visited Vietnam and accompanied American troops into battle. Upon his return, he wrote this story for United Press International.)

American men are eyeball to eyeball with communism in Vietnam, but if there's any blinking by Americans, it's those at home who are doing it.

Our men in Vietnam go out every day and try to do a job. They hear from Peiping, China, and Podunk, U.S.A., alike that the job isn't being done.

Maybe. The crews of the armed helicopters and the advisers in paddy-stained fatigues keep going on out to see about that.

Quite generally, their knowledge of the difficulties in Vietnam seems to be higher, and their frustration levels lower, than the American public's at large.

Most of the ones I saw weren't "gee whiz" about the situation but they hadn't joined the "aw nuts" crowd either.

They were taking it a day at a time, trying to build a country up while helping shoot its enemies down, and understanding better than most Americans that the two items go together in a civil war like this. To win the war, you win the people plus the battles.

A lot of them were wondering why the folks back home couldn't get a better grasp on what they're trying to do instead of groaning about things they haven't done.

THE LITTLE PICTURE

A colonel at the Saigon headquaters of the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, had quit writing home to his wife about the war because she couldn't comprehend it and finally he couldn't take it any more. Now they write about "the house and the kids and stuff like that," he said.

Jack Donohue, a big pistol-packing USOM (U.S. operations mission) civilian, had just been home on leave to Newark. What did he think of the attitudes he found back in the States?

He slammed a freckled fist on the table and sat in silence for a moment. He looked out beyond the barbed wire fences around the muddy hamlet where we sat and brooded on the water flatlands of the delta. He had spent a little U.S. aid money out there that morning to help the people of Mo Cay finish digging a well so they wouldn't have to catch rainwater.

"I was glad to get back to this," Donohue said softly.

To Capt. Jack Sanford of Columbus, Ga., a Regular Army professional, Vietnam is duty. "I'm a little-picture guy," he said. "When I go out there and do my part of the job, I have the satisfaction of seeing results. I can see things move."

Twice wounded in Korea, Captain Sanford volunteered for Vietnam. He's a helicopter pilot. He joined the Army's 62d Aviation Company on a dirt strip at Vinh Long and volunteered to fly gunships. He leads the company's all-volunteer platoon of six gunships, each of which mounts six machineguns. Each also fires 16 rockets, except for Sanford's. He modified his pods to fire 20. When a rocket caught fire in flight recently, he didn't jettison the pod. He dropped his whole jet turbine helicopter into a paddy and let the water put out the fire.

BULLETS IN STREAMS

The gunships strafe, patrol, and place covering fire for the "slick" helicopters, which mount only two machineguns, while the slicks are landing troops in airborne assaults. Sanford's own gunship had been hit four times in the 2 months before I visited Vinh Long. He showed me one steel-jacketed slug they had picked out of his altimeter. It came up between his copilot's feet. Yet Sanford said: "You have to stretch your imagination to call this a war."

I went along the night Sanford's platoon beat up a Vietcong battalion on a canal. It was a sight you wouldn't forget.

By the blue-white light of parchute flares, the helicopters circle in a daisy chain, with one behind opening fire as the one ahead breaks off and banks out. They fire from 300 feet and lower with their red beacons rotating. The spurt of all-tracer bullets from the six machineguns flows down like a cherry-red stream from a garden hose in the night sky. The rockets go two at a time in a streak of smoke and then a ball of white fire.

Inside the open helicopter, where the wind whips through and the instrument panel glows red and spent cartridges thump against your ankles and pile up on the floor, the muzzle blast of the machineguns is almost unbearable to the ear. You find yourself opening your mouth wide against the helmet chinstrap for fear your eardrums are going to burst. The rockets kick like great hammer blows—"sscchhoomp"—and draw a smoky V ahead.

The gunships sound very good up there also when you get out of a slick to accompany South Vietnamese soldiers on a ground assault.

My kneecaps were jumping a little as they did in World War II when the troop-loaded helicopter began its eagle pounce into a broad valley northwest of Hue. Once on the ground, the little steel-helmeted Vietnamese squirted out the doors and within seconds the helicopter was gone.

There we squatted, a company of us, in golden sunshine and silence. Then the gunships spotted the Vietcong we had come for on high ground to the right front. Their machineguns and rockets clattered and swished across the sky.

Our company of infantry spread out in a skirmish line and we walked on down the valley toward the firing. We had not gone very far through knee-high brush and hedgerows before the burred, authoritative baritone of incoming bullets put us down flat in the bushes to inspect some grains of sand and think it over.

Lt. J. R. Schwartz of Columbus, Ohio, the U.S. Marine adviser to the Vietnamese company, listened intently as the bullets sang and richocheted up and down our line. Then he radioed the gunships overhead. Lying prone, he estimated where the enemy automatic weapons were firing from: the high ground to the right and a fence row straight ahead. He marked our company's position with a violet smoke grenade and then held the Vietnamese soldiers in check until the gunships had come in over us on their firing runs. The fence line smoked with white phosphorus hits. Then—

"Dai uy," Lieutenant Schwartz yelled to the Vietnamese captain. "Charge." The company of little men was up and going toward the fence line.

Abruptly a little man stood up facing us just a hundred yards ahead, and this side of the fence. If he hadn't stood up, we might have stepped on him in the bushes. He had on a wide-brimmed hat with a plastic rain cover, a loose black shirt, gray shorts and sandals. Chinese grenades with short wooden handles hung on his cartridge belt. In his hands he held a Czech submachinegun (more often the Vietcong use U.S. weapons they've captured) and he was not standing up to surrender.

Alone, he came up shooting that submachinegun at an entire advancing company of infantry and he fired every bullet in his clip before the infantry shot him down. They took his gun, covered his ruined head with his hat and his poncho and left him there, with his thin bare legs drawn up in death, and went on down the valley to get the rest.

When you go thundering in on a firing run with Captain Sanford, or stand on a plot of ground you hold with a company of good infantry, or watch Jack Donohue, trailed by kids, make freedom mean something personal to the peasants by meeting their needs, you could almost delude yourself into thinking we can win that war easily over a ragtag bunch of sketchily armed rebels who have neither the money nor the guns to match us. That is, of course, a gee-whiz delusion, it doesn't work that way.

The Communist guerrillas obviously have been persuaded they have a cause worth dying for, whereas the South Vietnamese can't even put together a government to stand for a cause. The Communists also have the robber's advantage over the cop, of knowing what they're going to hit. Like defense-minded coaches in football, they also count on using our mistakes to gain their victory.

They plan steadily for the big break—the break in their enemy's will.

"They're counting on us to tire in Washington," a dispassionate U.S. colonel said in Saigon. "Our people want an easy victory. You can't do it with mirrors out here. The long hard effort is the only way, with variations and improvements, of course. The Communists don't think we'll make it."

You come away sobered when you think that this is the kind of war that can take some other continents if it can wear us out in southeast Asia.

You wonder if American advocates of withdrawal have been so preoccupied with the discouraging political farces in Saigon that they have underrated one central factor: That a South Vietnamese Army is still in being, and is fighting the Vietcong. As long as these people have the will to fight and lose several hundred dead each month to resist takeover of their country, and as long as they can shell their own villages and kill their own South Vietnamese kinsmen (for that's who nearly all the Vietcong are), can this country honorably abandon them?

Farley Chairs Electoral Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James A. Farley, of my State of New York and long a resident of the 27th Congressional District which I represent, is serving, still, the public in his State. This time he was chairman of the meeting in Albany of the New York State electors for President and Vice President, and I should like to include in my remarks the newspaper account of his distinguished performance as leader of that group.

The article follows:

FARLEY FEATURES VOTE LIKE OLD PRO SHOULD

ALBANY.—The will of more than 4 million New York voters was formally carried out Monday when President Lyndon B. Johnson and his running mate Hubert H. Humphrey received the State's 43 electoral votes in a tradition-steeped ceremony.

The pomp and ornate procedure of the 1964 electoral college gathering was presided over by the towering figure of James A. Farley, who had been elected its permanent president at the afternoon session.

Still alert, erect and ruddy at 76, the former national Democratic chairman lent to the nostalgia of the occasion as he reminisced from the podium about "the good old days" when he served as an assemblyman and later worked for the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt on the campaign trail and in Government.

The business at hand was a formality. After a leisurely morning organization session, the delegates returned to the oak and mahogany paneled red-carpeted Senate chamber in the State capitol to file past the ballot boxes and vote for the Democratic national ticket.

The electors were executing the wishes of the 4,913,156 New Yorkers who had elected them in a recordbreaking Democratic presidential plurality last month.

During Monday, electors from the other 49 States carried out the mandate of their voters and registered a record Democratic majority for the electoral college count to match the landslide generated by their constituents.

An elector can theoretically defect from his party, but his preelection pledge to a presidential candidate has traditionally bound him and has rarely been broken throughout American history.

Perhaps the real story lay, however, in the atmosphere surrounding the gathering. There stood the debonair Farley, once a power behind President Roosevelt, delivering his impeccable phrases in the same fashion that won campaigns a score of years ago.

Below him on the plush Senate chamber floor sat many of the State's Democratic leaders, there to pay tribute to the memories of the past and promise of the future.

The nine female electors, a number of them wives of prominent New York Democrats, sported pink camelias as corsages, while the male delegates displayed white carnations on their lapels. All seemed to glow at the frequent mention of the recent Democratic success throughout most of the country.

Throughout the day, the rhetoric was flowery—as dictated by custom—with all participants addressed as "the honorable" and motions dutifully advanced according to an elaborate electoral college format.

Congressman Schmidhauser Urges Strengthening of Agricultural Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, after spending the weekend carefully analyzing the budget, I made the following strong recommendations:

It is fortunate to me that the American system of government provides for final congressional modification of effective budget recommendations. After a careful analysis of the general statements which Budget Director Kermit Gordon has made concerning the position of agriculture in our economic system, I can only conclude that he does not understand the nature of our efficient agriculture economy. I should like to strongly urge the President and the Secretary of Agriculture in their current preparation of agriculture recommendations that they include the following proposals:

First. That our total agriculture program shall strive to encourage the family farm as a measure of recognition of the great contributions that this way of life has made to our society as a whole.

Second. That our agricultural program strengthen and improve our successful feed grains program. It is worthy to note that our feed grains program has now indicated the greatest promise of success in eliminating surpluses and their attendant costs. I would also recommend that improvement of the feed grains program include a program of sufficient duration to enable agriculture producers stability in long-range planning in the use of their land. Specifically, a program of 4 years' duration will be exceedingly helpful.

Third. I strongly recommend the adoption of a sound national defense food reserve program.

Fourth. I recommend that we strengthen rather than weaken our agricultural conservation program and our rural electric cooperative movement.

Fifth. In designing a program for agriculture, let us recognize clearly that many budgetary items charged to agriculture actually should be categorized under some other appropriate heading.

And finally, let us recognize that any ill-conceived cutback in our agricultural economy will not only have a serious direct effect upon agricultural producers but will set the stage for a weakening of our total national economy similar to the setback suffered during the 1920's.

It is noteworthy that an editorial of January 25, 1965, in a fine urban newspaper, the Washington Post, pointed out that "according to the new input-output study recently completed by the Office of Business Economics, every dollar of agricultural products that is delivered for final demand requires about 78 cents in the products and services of nonagricultural industries. So any disruption in the agricultural sector would be transmitted immediately to all other sectors of the economy and would be magnified."

Surely our economy is diverse enough to continue recognition that our family-farm economy must be preserved in continuing its vital productive role in American world leadership in the production of the food essential to promoting well-being domestically and peace in our time abroad.

West Coast Flood Damage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works conducted a personal, on-the-spot inspection of the severe damages which were inflicted upon a wide section of the west coast by the recent floods.

The subcommittee was headed by the Honorable ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, as chairman. Other Members included Hon. HAROLD T. JOHNSON, of California, Hon. DON H. CLAUSEN, of California, Hon. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, of Ohio, and myself.

Under the extremely able direction of Chairman JONES this subcommittee held numerous hearings and traveled by helicopter and light plane over the regions of the most severe flooding, witnessing the stark spectacle of entire communities washed into the river.

The total damages caused by the floods easily will exceed $1 billion, particularly when the residual effects of lost jobs and employment opportunities are taken into account. We were heartened by the evidence of great and calculable damages prevented through the existence of flood control works already in place. Many of these structures paid for themselves in this one flood. Had it not been for the extensive work done on the rivers of California, Oregon, and Washington, the damages would have been easily twice of what was suffered.

Typical of the local response to the trip of this subcommittee of the Congress is a story which appeared on Thursday, January 14, 1965, in the Oregonian of Portland, Oreg.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting the following article for inclusion in the RECORD:

GOVERNOR TOTALS UP FLOOD TOLL

(By Peter Tugman)

SALEM.—The State of Oregon suffered a total loss of $244,446,242 in public and private property and facilities during the Christmastime flood, according to figures released Wednesday by Gov. Mark O. Hatfield.

Hatfield disclosed the latest and most detailed damage estimate in a command center briefing for five members of the House Subcommittee on Public Works. The committee, led by Representative ROBERT E. JONES, Democrat, of Alabama, finished a flying 4-day tour of flood-torn California and Oregon in Portland Wednesday night.

The Congressmen had to be content mostly with reports and pictures of the Oregon damage. Wretched weather, first curtailed visibility from the air on the flight north, and then forced a flyby of Salem, with the solons busing back to the capital from Portland Wednesday noon and then back to the city for a dinner Wednesday night.

But the Governor was encouraged and impressed by the committee's grasp of the situation and the prospects for Federal help in solving some of the disaster problems.

Hatfield said he made two main points in a private meeting with the Congressmen: The capacity of Oregon and Oregonians to help themselves out of a good many of the flood-spawned difficulties; the responsibilities of the Federal Government as the State's biggest landowner to rush rehabilitation of its disaster areas.

He stressed that forest roads under Federal jurisdiction took a pasting during the flood. And unless these are back in service when the logging season begins in the spring the State will suffer untold losses to its major industry.

OREGONIANS IMPRESSED

Chairman JONES, a courtly southerner with an engaging drawl, proved a close questioner during the briefing and displayed a

remarkable knowledge of Oregon geography, climate, water problems and agriculture.

At one point during the briefing he brought out that the Willamette at its flood crest near Oregon City was twice the normal flow of the Mississippi at Memphis. Later he came up with the average wheat yield of ranches near Pendleton and asked if torrential rains in the area had washed away much topsoil. He was assured they had by F. F. Price, State university agriculture dean.

JONES later met alone with leaders of the Oregon House and Senate. Senator Anthony Ytturi, Republican, of Ontario, remarked, "His knowledge of the State was very impressive. He had a good grasp of most of Oregon except the southeastern part. This could play an important part in the report this committee will submit later."

STATE FLOOD DAMAGE PEGGED AT $244,446,242

SALEM.—Oregon industry suffered more dollar damage in the Christmastime flood than all the Federal holdings in the State. The State's agriculture was not far behind in damage losses.

These surprising figures were developed at a briefing Wednesday in the State capital for members of the House Subcommittee on Public Works. Five of the committee members wound up a 4-day tour of northern California and Oregon flood damage Wednesday with a briefing session in Gov. Mark O. Hatfield's disaster command center.

The detailed damage estimates were prepared by a special team of the public utilities commission staff, headed by Thomas R. Baker. The 21 team members devoted 586 man-hours to the task.

The results:

Total damage: $244,446,242 throughout the State for public and private ownership together. The figure does not take into account loss of payrolls or revenues.

The breakdown showed private ownership totaled $153,615,000 in losses; total public ownership, $90,830,337.

Industrial losses led the private ownership totals with $60,963,889; followed by agriculture, $50,634,243; residential and personal property, $19,025,040; commercial business, $12,014,608; transportation industry, $7,350,100, and utilities, $3,628,025.

FIGURE DISPUTED

The loss figure for agriculture quoted by Hatfield was disputed by F. E. Price, Dean of Agriculture at Oregon State University. He told the visiting Congressmen the agriculture loss was more like $55 million than $50,634,243. He based his reckoning on loss of farm buildings and residences which were figured by the public utilities commission team under residential and personal property. Price said this item amounted to around $4.4 million.

Public ownership losses were topped by the Federal total of $56,988,100. The segment hardest hit was transportation—highways and bridges—according to figures developed by the public utilities commission. Governor Hatfield called attention to the total loss of $21,800,000 by the Bureau of Land Management, which includes a good portion of Oregon's secondary and logging roads.

Hatfield said that unless these roads were rehabilitated before the logging season, Oregon's principal industry would suffer more losses.

Still in the Federal category, the interstate and primary road system was reckoned to have suffered $12,978,000 in damage and the city-county road net $3,156,300.

LOSSES LISTED

The rest of the public ownership breakdown showed a State property loss of $12,583,313; county, $13,374,200; cities and towns, $6,642,000; districts, $878,064 and cooperatives, mutuals and associations, $364,660. These last figures do not exclude the road and bridge losses given before.

State Engineer Chris L. Wheeler told the committee this was a "Thousand Year Flood," one which, under the laws of probability would not occur for 1,000 years.

Wheeler said "for the first time in our history" we had flooding on both sides of the "climatic divide"—the Cascade Mountains. Heavy water content snows—springlike rise in temperatures and a very heavy rainfall contributed. Some areas, Wheeler said, had a year's average of rain fall in 5 to 6 days.

To a great extent flooding on the lower Willamette and Columbia Rivers was produced by creeks and rivers never before considered flood producers, Wheeler said. "Literally," said Wheeler, "our whole State was experiencing a major, if not record, flood in every stream and minor tributary."

The Columbia, "with its tremendous capabilities for flood damage," was being held in check to some extent, Wheeler noted. "It had for the first time a major flood on the lower river created by discharge from lower tributaries. With 500,000 cubic feet per second measured at Bonneville Dam and an estimated 400,000 cubic feet per second from the Willamette system, the Columbia River exceeded 900,000 cubic feet per second. In the well-known flood of 1948, only 30,000 cubic feet per second was contributed by the Willamette system to a peak flow of 1,010,000 cubic feet per second.

Wheeler concluded that flood control and other water projects which have the capacity if not the purpose of water control "are our best investment." Other speakers noted those already built paid for themselves many times over in the Thousand Year Flood.

Wheeler did call attention to the need for metering devices on minor streams. These automatic metering devices, he said might warn of similar freakish conditions which might reproduce the 1964 deluge.

What purpose was served by the field trip of the subcommittee to Oregon?

One State Department head noted that it brought together heads of State and Federal agencies and members of a commitee whose final report on needed projects in the Oregon-California region will carry much weight.

Other members making the trip with Chairman JONES were Representatives JIM WRIGHT, Democrat, of Texas; HAROLD T. JOHNSON, Democrat, of California; DON H. CLAUSEN, Republican, of California, and WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Democrat, of Ohio. They were accompanied by their staffs, and representatives of: Bureau of Public Roads, Corps of Engineers, Agriculture Department; Interior; Office of Emergency Planning and the Small Business Administration.

Requiem—J.F.K.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Catherine Hanson Thomas, an editor of weeklies within my district and a great admirer of President John F. Kennedy, has written a poem in his memory. This poem will appear in a collection of her poetry to be published shortly.

REQUIEM—J.F.K. (NOVEMBER 22, 1963)

(By Catherine Hanson Thomas)

For him no evening star, no sunset glow.
He sleeps the long sleep now upon the hill.
His comrades rest beside him, row on row,
The muffled drums have ceased, the world is still.

When all the words are spoken, have been said,
And tears have dried upon the widow's cheek,
The burning flame that rests above his head
Will be a torch for those who freedom seek.

Close to the earth, within her bosom, warm,
Let lightening strike, he does not hear the blast.
The thunder clouds around him do no harm,
For he who sought for peace, finds peace at last!

Military Pay Inadequacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to endorse the U.S. Navy League's recently issued message protesting our current military pay inadequacies. I ask that each of my colleagues scrutinize its contents as it has a direct bearing on this Nation's defense.

HEAR THIS—OUR NATIONAL PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE FOR 1965

It is a shocking tragedy that the military services have not been able to get their story of second-class pay across to the Department of Defense. It is not because the services haven't tried—it's just that no one appears to be listening.

The story the services can't get across is that they are losing good men daily—by quits, by resignations, by low reenlistment rates—because of low pay, poor housing, separation of families. There seems to be little doubt, however, by those well informed that not less than 40 percent of our personnel loss would be avoided, if they received adequate pay.

In fact, in the nuclear submarine program the Navy has the highest percent of retention of its trained people—66 percent. Why? Because sufficient pay, allowances, proficiency pay, submarine pay, etc., have been made available to encourage people to stay in this vital program. A second-class petty officer in this service can earn up to $560 per month, compared with $241 per month elsewhere in the Navy, and he has decent housing besides.

The Navy loses 130,000 trained enlisted people per year. About 20 percent of its force. With procurement costs, training costs, pay and allowance costs over a 4-year enlistment, the country—that's you as a taxpayer—and the Navy, has an investment of $20,000 in each of these young men, who get in, get it over with, and get out as soon as possible. Loss of investment? Two billion six hundred million dollars per year.

About 19 percent of our Navy is tied up in schooling or training—the 130,000 new, untrained recruits signed up each year, most of whom are motivated by the draft law—and obligated military service. This 20 percent of the Navy that gets processed through and

quits, plus the 19 percent involved in training, adds up to 39 percent of the entire Navy.

Sure a lot of other trained people stay in for longer periods but the very simplest analysis of the annual loss of investment of taxpayer's money is $2 billion, $600 million per year on Navy enlisted personnel alone. Adequate pay would reduce this loss by 40 percent. The $1.04 billion which can be saved each year, plus a substantial reduction in training facility costs.

On the commissioned officer side of the picture, the Navy commissions—according to the latest figures—about 11,000 new ensigns each year, and the Department of Defense pays them less than a New York City fireman or probationary patrolman requiring only a high school education. It's understandable that the Navy loses about 10,000 officers each year. This means an attrition of 90 percent sooner or later of all officers commissioned.

This doesn't look like an efficient personnel policy. Ten thousand officers leaving the naval service annually—trained officers—some of them among the best we have—some of them we can ill afford to lose.

The cost of this—it's complicated, and hard to compute accurately, but with commissioning costs running from Officers Candidate School at $1,077, Reserve Officers Training Corps (contract) $3,300, Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps (regular) $8,900, U.S. Naval Academy $31,000, naval aviation cadets and aviation officer course $153,000, you can see the mounting up of commissioning costs.

However, let us average the commissioning cost at $14,300 each, which can be reasonably demonstrated. Then add for a minimum of 3 years pay and allowances also invested per officer, $3,469 unmarried, or $10,400. This plus commissioning costs equals, $24,707 as a low figure of investment of taxpayers' and the Navy's money.

It's conservative, because many officers serve 6, 8, 10, or more years before they quit in desperation. Ten thousand officers at $24,707 investment each, totals $247,070,000 or about a quarter of a billion dollars investment loss each year.

If, by adequate pay, we could save 40 percent of the best of these, and reduce input and training proportionately this would mean a minimum saving annually of $98.8 million, and a better naval service. There will be many who will state this is a low estimate.

However, we now have developed a potential, possible saving of over $1.04 billion annually in our enlisted service costs, and $98.8 million in officer costs—and this totals, to be exact $1,040,000 plus $98,828,000 or $1,138,828,000 per year in the Navy alone. Who knows what the loss is in the Army and in the Air Force—probably the same or more because they are both larger than the Navy. That would total $3,416,484,000 for the three.

The Air Force made a fine study on the imbalance of military pay compared to civil service. They estimate it would require an increase in military pay of $811 million a year to bring military compensation up to civil service levels.

Few people in the military are trying to equate military compensation with industry. They are making every effort to have it equated with civil service—the people who work side by side with the military, in the same offices, and working for the same man—Uncle Sam. Comparability—equality with civil service pay would materially ease service personnel problems.

The important, significant part of all this is something few people realize. There is a loss within the Department of Defense of the taxpayer's investment in military people, of over $3,416,484,000 annually. According to the Air Force study, it can be solved by an additional $811 million in pay, or by spending 25 cents the taxpayer can save $1. Even by Congressman MENDEL RIVERS' estimate $1 billion additional in decent pay would save over 3.4 times as much.

What an opportunity for forward civilian leadership in Congress this coming session.

Nuclear Seapower Vital—Our Defense Must Be the Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union entitled "Nuclear Seapower Vital: Our Defense Must Be the Best":

NUCLEAR SEAPOWER VITAL: OUR DEFENSE MUST BE THE BEST

When columns of statistics are totaled in the Defense Department, the greatest weight must be given to those dealing with efficiency and lives.

American servicemen who are ready to give their lives for their country deserve the best defense tools we can give them.

The need for emphasis on lives and efficient equipment rather than cost accounting was recently emphasized in a talk by Representative WILLIAM B. ANDERSON, of Tennessee. Representative ANDERSON, a former Navy officer, was commander of the atomic submarine *Nautilus* on its history trip under the North Pole.

"We cannot afford to deprive ourselves of our full potential power merely because it appears today to be a little more expensive. What slide rule can measure the value of life and liberty?" Representative ANDERSON asked.

Bids by the Navy for additional nuclear carriers have been blocked by the Defense Department because of the higher cost. Representative ANDERSON points out the cost differential is really not great if total useful lives of conventional and nuclear-powered ships are considered. On this basis, the Joint Commission on Atomic Energy estimates the nuclear carriers cost only 3 percent more.

"There are few Americans who would not be willing to invest this additional 3 percent to avoid dependence on obsolete, second-best ships for the defense of this country and the security of the free world," Representative ANDERSON correctly said.

In these troubled world times especially, we cannot afford to let the efficiency and operational ability of our fleet slip. No one questions that the nuclear-powered ships are the most efficient. Nuclear power is no longer an experiment.

At the end of one decade of nuclear power, the Navy had 54 atomic-powered submarines and surface vessels. Altogether, 96 have been built or authorized. The 54 operational ships have logged 4.5 million miles. They include 29 Polaris submarines, 22 attack submarines, the carrier *Enterprise*, the cruiser *Long Beach* and the frigate *Bainbridge*—a good cross section of operational capability.

Rear Adm. Bernard M. Strean, who commanded three nuclear surface ships on a nonstop, 57-day trip around the world last year, said their atomic plants gave no trouble during the 31,000 miles.

"I seriously doubt that conventionally powered ships could have given such trouble-free performance," Admiral Strean said.

The 96 ships built or authorized since 1955 represent progress. However, the pace must be stepped up if America is to retain command of the seas.

Transportation: Year 2000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to present a revealing statement on transportation by Morris Forgash:

"TRANSPORTATION: YEAR 2000"—ADDRESS BY MORRIS FORGASH, OCTOBER 30, 1964, BEFORE THE SECOND ANNUAL EUROPEAN REGIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION, HOTEL INTERCONTINENTAL, FRANKFURT, GERMANY

I deeply appreciate the opportunity to meet with you and to participate in your interesting and challenging program. To all those responsible for the staging of this Second Annual European Regional Conference of NDTA, I extend congratulations upon an excellent idea splendidly executed.

No oracle, prophet, or seer was ever called upon to deal with a more elusive or demanding subject than the one assigned to me. I have no occult powers but I speak with utmost assurance, for if time proves me wrong I will very likely be out of the jurisdiction when the verdict is brought in.

Transportation in the year 2000. Why should any of us have any concern today about mobility in a world that by the year 2000 may be only a tiny way-station in a universe of worlds—or, by accident or design, a cloud of dust in the galaxy of limitless space? Because we have faith. Faith that we can shape the course of future events and write on the scrolls of time the terms of our own legacy for ourselves and our posterity.

Essayist William Hazlitt said man is the only animal that laughs and weeps for he is the only animal that is struck by the difference between what things are and what they ought to be. This awareness of imperfection is responsible for the fact that man is the only animal that has acquired the ability to modify his own environment. And in straining at the leash of his environment, man has achieved a measure of his manifest and only laudable destiny—civilization.

Kipling wrote that transportation is civilization. He was not quite right. Transportation certainly has paced civilization from the time when man first came to inhabit the earth. But transportation is an instrumentality which produces nothing in itself. Transportation is the mobility of human resources but humanity charts its own course. Transportation can carry us over any horizon but what we find there we bring in our own hearts.

How will we go in the year 2000? By what media, responsive to what energy, with what degree of dispatch will people and the people's resources then be moved from one place to another? The intelligence accumulated through all the milleniums of recorded and derivative history sheds only a flickering light on the mists that shroud the path of transport during the next 35 years. But we must nevertheless scan the pages of history if we expect to sit in the jury box of time.

Where will we go in the year 2000? Over what horizons, to what destinations will the restless race of man then be traveling to make another rendezvous with destiny?

If we are to find any answers to the questions I have posed, we must realize that the caliper of history is our only tool of measurement and our only certainty is that there will be change. The fact of change is immutable. It is only the acceleration or rate of change with which we must be concerned as we try to illuminate the road to the future with the torchlight of the past.

THE DAWN OF TRANSPORTATION

Progress is not measured by the calendar but by human accomplishment. And if it be taken that man has lived on earth for a million years it follows that for the first 990,000 years his progress in transportation was absolutely nil. During all of that time he walked on the legs he was born with and what he transported he carried in his arms. For it was only about 10,000 years ago, give or take a few hundred, that man first conceived the idea of employing animals as a media of transport. This oldest form of transportation has survived to this day—the ox, the camel, the elephant, the reindeer, the dog, and the horse are still important carriers.

A historic breakthrough in transportation occurred when man discovered the secret of propulsion by animal, giving us the standard of measurement called "horsepower." During the next 3,000 or 4,000 years such marvelous inventions as the sled, the raft, the dugout, and the canoe made their appearance and added immeasurably to the mobility of humanity. Then came the sail—first instrument of transport to harness the forces of nature to man's bidding. Wonders were unceasing.

The wheel—there is an invention to remember. It still is a nominee for the greatest discovery of the human race. The wheel evolved only about 5,000 to 6,000 years ago. It will stand forever for the first revolution in transportation. But giddy as the pace of progress in transportation had become, wheel and sail were destined to continue to be powered by wind and muscle for another 5,000 years or more. This does not detract from the significance of those fabulous instrumentalities. They made it possible for man to explore, to colonize, and in a degree to civilize the globe on which he lived. Of course they also made it possible for him to annihilate people, to destroy civilizations, and to topple the world into Dark Ages. But in the slow and painful process of recovery from the consequences of his own folly man added to the sum of human intelligence, and as he marched forward the chapters of transportation history covered less time and embraced even greater accomplishment.

TRANSPORTATION FINDS MECHANICAL POWER

It was not until after the beginning of the last century, less than 165 years ago, that the era of transportation in the accepted sense began. The age of mechanical power—the goals toward which man had been struggling since he was first invested with the power of rational thought—had its birth in the last century. When steampower was first successfully employed as a propellant of the instrumentalities of transport, man crashed a barrier which had defied the ages and eluded countless generations of highly intelligent and ingenious men.

The year 2000 seems a more distant target of speculation when it is realized that in point of time 35 years is 20 percent of the entire era of transportation. It seems more distant still when it is appreciated that as time has marched on progress in transportation has compressed centuries into decades, decades into years, and years into days, so that what we and those who come after us may expect to witness in 35 years may make everything that has been developed heretofore as rudimentary as the canoe.

How has transportation gone since the paddle wheels of "Fulton's Folly" churned dreams into realities 157 years ago? Well, steamship and iron horse served the 19th century very well, but during all that time dreamers who knew that this was not the outer periphery of man's environment were at work on other things. Self-propelled land vehicles were sputtering about on the streets and roads causing amusement and some consternation before the end of the last century. When, a few years later, the internal combustion engine made these monsters of the road practical a new dimension in mobility was created.

But as the world spun into the present century man had not yet realized his oldest dream—he had not found his wings—he was still confined to the surface of the globe. Then at Kitty Hawk, in North Carolina, on December 17, 1903, the Wright brothers inaugurated the age of flight.

What secrets of mobility then remained to be wrested from nature? With great efficiency and dispatch people and things could be transported anywhere on the surface of the earth or in the earth's atmosphere. For half a century the prevalent view was that transportation had crossed its last horizon and that the future was for improvement of existing media. Improvement there certainly was.

The diesel engine vastly increased the economy and efficiency of railroading. World War I speeded the inauguration of the trucks as a carrier of freight. Improved roads and better automobiles put the world on rubber tires. The 1940's ushered in the jet age in air transport. In 1954 the atom was harnessed to transportation with the launching of the *Nautilus*, first atomic-powered submarine. Nuclear-powered merchant shipping was inaugurated in 1959 when the NS *Savannah* was launched. Then the hydrofoil, a ship on stilts, made its appearance.

But 50 years of tinkering with the same media of transport was all that the modern mind could take. New frontiers were beckoning genius and enterprise. A sort of in-between machine—an air-cushion vehicle which rolls on a cushion of air over land, sea, swamp, sand, or snow made its appearance in the sixth decade of this century and soon may be cutting across all lines of existing transportation, revolutionizing all modes.

The air-cushion phenomenon did not, however, take us across an unkown border—it simply created a new dimension of transport. The latest barrier of mobility was crashed in 1957, with the orbiting of the space vehicle Sputnik I. Four years later, in 1961, the first earthman made the first trip to outer space and returned. He was not yet an explorer of the universe—he had only invaded the majesty of space. That is something which may be corrected very soon. On July 31, 1964, the spacecraft Ranger VII zeroed in for a crash landing on the moon, sending back to earth more than 4,000 pictures of that inscrutable globe.

OF PROGRESS, DREAMS, AND PERSEVERANCE

That, in brief compass, is a panoramic view of where we stand in transportation today. How and where do we go from here? We go however and wherever we have the vision and determination to go. For all the progress which we have made to this point in time has been the slow and tardy consequence of long-held dreams. Let history speak to that point for just a moment.

When the steam engine gave birth to the mechanical age in transport just over a century and a half ago it simply represented the practical application of a principle that had been known for hundreds of years. Hero of Alexandria, Greek scientist of the second century before Christ, developed a toylike machine for deriving power from thermal energy. A man named Savery developed a steam engine for pumping water from mines in 1698. When James Watt patented his very practical steam engine in 1769 he was only improving on an engine developed by Thomas Newcomen in 1705. In 1707, a hundred years before Robert Fulton's *Clermont* made its maiden run, Denis Papin of France built and launched the steam-powered *Cassel* in Germany. Angry boatmen, fearing for their livelihood, destroyed Papin's boat and nearly killed its inventor.

The idea of human flight has fascinated all peoples throughout the ages. The famous legend of Daedalus and Icarus, related by Ovid, is only one of a multitude of tales of human flight that date back more than 6,000 years. Magic carpets, flying chariots, flying horses, characterize all mythologies. By the 13th century, A.D., man had begun seriously to try to make his dreams of flight come true. Roger Bacon anticipated the balloon and suggested heavier-than-air craft propelled by flapping wings.

Leonardo da Vinci discovered the helicopter principle of vertical lift from rotating wings, and his model helicopters actually flew. About 1490 he designed a man-carrying flying machine, but his craft was never built because Da Vinci undoubtedly realized that there was then no source of power capable of lifting it. Around the turn of the 19th century Sir George Cayley began investigations of flight which formed the basis of modern aerodynamics. One of his gliders carried a man a distance of 900 feet. It was 500 years after human flight was theoretically demonstrated to be possible before the Wright Brothers made flight a reality.

Jet propulsion, which began to revolutionize air transport less than a quarter of a century ago, is founded on laws formulated by Sir Isaac Newton in the 17th century. But the theory was not then new. At least 100 years before Christ the Alexandrian philosopher, Hero, designed and demonstrated a jet engine. All those things which may transpire between now and the year 2000 might have happened long ago if man had mobilized the resources to capitalize on his own inventiveness several hundred years sooner than he did.

Rocket propulsion is even older than the jet. The Chinese are said to have employed the principle of the rocket several centuries before Christ. Rockets were used in the War of 1812. The "Bazooka" of World War II was only one of a number of types of rocket used in that conflict. Developed as implements of war, rockets now have become symbols of the conquest of outer space. Perhaps it is as well for mankind that the destructive potential of the rocket was not recognized sooner, but the inertia of the human mind is responsible for failure to have recognized its peaceful uses long ago.

The most awesome secret which man has extracted from nature is the release of energy from the atom. This knowledge, which is no longer a secret, can incalculably advance the cause of civilized man, or it can render him completely obsolete. This most potent of all sources of energy was not a sudden discovery. The Greek philosophers Epicurus and Democritus postulated the atomic concept at least 300 years before the Christian Era. Beginning as early as A.D. 1500, a long succession of professional people contributed to the accumulated knowledge which led to the operational use of the atom—Boyle, Newton, Dalton, the Curies, Rutherford, Becquerel, the enigmatic Albert Einstein, and a host of others.

The dropping of the first atomic bomb on the city of Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, is fixed as the dawn of the atomic age. That is not quite accurate. A test bomb was exploded at Alamogordo, N. Mex., on July 16,

1945, and it was on that date that a handful of men assumed the fearful responsibility of releasing a force which even they could not be sure would not obliterate the world.

So it has happened that man has dreamed, then theorized about his dreams, then studied the scientific basis of his theories, and centuries later other generations have made his dreams come true. And the important consideration always has been not what man has discovered but the uses which he makes of his discoveries. The greatest challenge facing the peoples of the world today is how they shall use the sources of energy represented by the atom. Depending on how that challenge is met we will have a better world or no world at all.

THE WORLD AND THE PEOPLE, A.D. 2000

On this philosophic note I think I should turn from the pages of history on which the accomplishments of man in his search for mobility have already been written and, with the temerity if not the foresight of a Jules Verne, undertake to project history a short distance into the future.

The ingredients or "mix" with which we have to work as we stir the brew of transport in the cauldron of tomorrow are railroads, highway carriers, waterborne vessels, aircraft, pipelines, and those exotic developments still standing on the horizon—air-cushion vehicles, hovercraft, monorails, pneumatic tubes, rockets, continuous belts, and others not yet categorized.

Will all of these existing and embryonic media of transport still be in use in the year 2000? My answer is: Yes, and more. But some of them will not look the same. If, perchance, any agency of transport that we know today joins the pony express and other museum pieces of transport history it will be because it failed to accept the inevitability of change.

Standing clear among the unknown quantities which cloud the horizon of the year 2000 are certain things which we can postulate as fact. The people will determine for themselves the kind and quantity of transportation they want—and what they demand they will get. The engineering has been done, the horizons are unlimited and the choice is the people's choice. We know this too: There will be a great many more people in the world of A.D. 2000 than there are today, and they will have a great deal more leisure time to dispose of, en masse and per capita. They will know more about their world and themselves than the people of today. They will be able to communicate, face to face through space, with other people everywhere. They will be able to read the news media of the world on screens in the comfort of their own homes. These people will have different tastes, a different outlook, a different philosophy of life, leisure, civilization and the dignity of man.

There is an increasing awareness of the necessity to check the exploding population. The world population of 3.2 billion is increasing at a rate that would cause it to almost double in 35 years. That would mean 5 to 6 billion people in the year 2000. Even if we manage to severely curtail that rate of growth we must plan to meet the essential requirements and demands of a vastly increased population. And the demands of the people will be greater because the standard of living will be higher and there will be a great deal more leisure time involved. In the United States a 3- or 4-day, 24-hour workweek will be standard. Advances in this respect will also be made in other parts of the world.

The time was not far back when anybody who was not a member of the "leisure classes" would turn aside from his daily pursuits only on special holidays of which there were few. This was by design as well as necessity. The old saying, "The Devil finds work for idle hands to do" sprang from a popular belief that too much leisure would expose the average man to the temptations of evil. Leisure was for the rich. In the middle ages the creators of the world, the artists, writers, sculptors, architects, were not expected to earn their livelihood by toil and trade. They were patronized by those who were born to blood and wealth. Whatever the fault of such a system it is a fact that it helped spawn the great renaissance of the 15th and 16th centuries which changed the course of history and immeasurably enriched the lives of men everywhere.

But in the next 35 years we will experience a new renaissance, kindled not by patronage, but by opportunity—the opening of new vistas to a new leisure class which will embrace the whole population not just the uppercrust. Leisure and the economic freedom to enjoy it will come to the "common man." In the United States the average family income will be at least $15,000 a year, which will be commensurate with the gross national product upward of $2 trillion per year which will maintain in the year A.D. 2000. In Europe and other places in the world comparable advances will be made.

Not only will the average citizen living in the United States in the year 2000 have more leisure during his working years, he will retire at an earlier age with guaranteed minimum income that will permit him to live in comfort and enjoy the finer things of life. I foresee, for that time, a voluntary retirement age of 55 and a retirement income of $500 per month. With an estimated population of 350 million in the United States, there will be upward of 45 million persons of age 55 years and over receiving retirement payments in excess of $130 billion annually. Not only will this add an entirely new layer of consumer spending to our economy, but of particular significance is the fact that the availability of these pension dollars will have been insured by prior funding. Therefore, we are contemplating in excess of $130 billion of additional consumer spending that will not be dependent upon the year to year prosperity of our economy, but instead will act as a stabilizer and a deterrent against business depressions.

All of these factors will free the resources of the human mind and rekindle the instincts of the human spirit so as to bring about not only a renaissance of culture and civilization but a closer unity of governments and peoples. The curiosity and desire for enrichment which leads the people of one nation to travel to far lands will cause the people of those lands to reciprocate. The barriers to world travel will be eliminated. The complicated visa systems will disappear and a single document, issued by a world organization, will be acceptable.

Ideologies and concepts which offer the people utopia in the distant future in return for sacrifice and the loss of personal identity in the present will have little appeal in a world where the people have already created their own utopia without the sacrifice of human dignity.

Trade and tariff barriers will crumble before the needs and desires of peoples drawn closer together by the common bonds of understanding and the ability to communicate and move swiftly across international boundaries. Geographic affinity will breed political, sociological, and moral affinity among nations and populations. The relationships among nations will improve, and the emphasis on sovereign rights will diminish as the common goals of humanity become visible to more people. Common control of the instrumentalities of destruction, cherished by all men of goodwill, will cease to be a mirage and will become a reality when we achieve that unity of purpose without which we know that none will survive.

Confederations of nations will develop in direct ratio to the infusion of understanding and the dissipation of fear of aggression. Neighbors quarrel and insulate themselves from each other because of lack of understanding and as transportation and communication shrink the physical world the bonds of understanding will be strengthened.

In undertaking to project the course of transportation to the year 2000 we must take these political, social, economic, and moral factors into account. For as the people shape a better world they will create the demand which will insure the ultimate in mobility.

What will the people demand—and demanding get—in the way of personal transport in the year 2000? Curiously enough there may be less demand for commutation and business travel than there is today. The reason—communication. People come together to promote enterprise because they have a need to communicate. But when everybody is equipped with a Dick Tracy wrist radio and wide-screen closed circuit TV is a commonplace fixture of every business organization there will be very little need to commute in order to communicate. The board chairman will call his meeting to order in his own living room. The secretary will dictate the minutes into an automatic machine which will file them for all future reference and reproduce copies instantly on demand. Surely there will be less need for people to congregate together in cities when instantaneous and universal communication is perfected.

THE AGE OF HYPERSONIC FLIGHT

But business is one thing and leisure is another and man will always want to go places to see an art treasure or an opera—to sun, surf, and chase golf balls. Knowing that distance is no longer a matter of miles but of time he will demand the ultimate in speed and the airlines will oblige. When the man on the street—any street—in the year 2000 decides to take his lady for a night on the town he will offer her a choice of Paris, Rome, or Reno. A weekend at the beach for the Sioux City set may mean Catalina or the Riveria, Miami Beach, or Travemunde.

The supersonic airliner will not serve the day we are talking about. Of course the supersonic flying machine will still be with us. In fact it will be standard among the transports that ply the earth's atmosphere, and mach 3 speed will be at the minimum not the maximum end of the scale.

The man in a hurry will take a rocket in the year 2000. In our preoccupation with space travel and exploration of the universe we have given too little attention to the very practical potentials of the rocket for transport on earth. In the interest of security we have developed rockets that can hit any target on earth. All that remains is to adapt the craft to carry a different cargo.

Without hesitation I predict that in the year 2000 people and things will be transported between all the more distant points on earth by rocket-powered craft. Instead of the 2,000 miles an hour already known to be a practicable speed we will achieve a speed of perhaps 20,000 miles per hour.

THE IRON HORSE IN THE ATOMIC ERA

Rockets to railroads is quite a jump, but let's consider the future of the mode of transport that on the land mass of the earth has the most illustrious past. In most places in the world the railroad has occupied the center of the stage of land transport during almost the entire history of the era of modern transportation. Why? Because it creates less propulsive resistance over a wider range of speeds than any other mode of transport. In other words a railroad uses less horsepower in relation to load carried than any other form of land transportation. Ironically, this colossus of mobility, conqueror of time, terrain, and distance, has run a troubled course for a long time. Everywhere except in the United States and

a few other countries it has become necessary or expedient for government to manage and maintain the railroads in order to save for the people the only mode of transport capable of fully serving their needs. For my purposes today I need not explore the reasons for this enigma. There is nothing in the picture that modernization of thinking and method, and aggressive exploitation of inherent advantages, will not cure. And the railroads will survive because we cannot afford to let them die.

But the railroad that greets the 21st century will have only vestigal resemblance to the industry of today. Today's railroad is the most efficient instrumentality yet invented for moving goods between given terminals, but things that are shipped do not all originate or find their destination at rail terminals. Traffic moves between the suburbs of St. Louis and the outskirts of Baltimore or Bremerhaven. Railroad transport has to be harmonized with all forms of transportation, land, sea, and air, so that when goods are put into one end of the transit pipeline they will come out of the other and not get stuck in the joints.

Traditional methods established during a century and a quarter of proud history are not easily broken, but the railroads are slowly yet surely making their equipment compatible, interchangeable, and versatile. Long before the year 2000 the boxcar will cease to be the predominant vehicle of carriage. Everything except commodities requiring specialized equipment—grain, ore, lumber—will move in containers that will hardly interrupt their journey as they are transferred swiftly from highway to rail or ship or air for continuous movement from the door of the shipper to the platform of the consignee. One bill of lading and one rate will apply to the movement of anything from anywhere to anywhere else. It is in these areas that the freight forwarder, both foreign and domestic, will play an indispensable role in coordinating the services of the underlying modes of transport.

More dramatic will be the breakthroughs in power, speed, efficiency, and the pattern of rail operations. All locomotives will be nuclear powered. For this and other reasons locomotives will be wider and tracks will be widened. Tracks also will be straighter and grades will be reduced to a minimum. With today's techniques of earthmoving there is no need to run over a mountain. Speeds of as high as several hundred miles per hour may be attained and consistently maintained, if not on rails than on air cushions or monorails.

Cars will be cut out, switched (sideways), and loaded and unloaded automatically by radio-controlled devices. Yards and humps, for which there will be only minimal necessity, will be completely automated and computer controlled. Somebody may ride the locomotive in token to tradition but he will have little to do. Arrivals and departures will be scanned on closed-circuit TV. Radar will measure distance to obstacles and signal automatic retarders on the tracks which will prevent collisions.

Passenger and freight trains will effectuate a compatible marriage long before A.D. 2000. People-pods will be whisked from convenient locations in the major cities and deposited by helicopter on special flatcars to ride in streamlined comfort with the less distinguished freight. Those who wish to insure their continuous mobility will be able to drive their own automobiles onto a special rail car and go up to the passenger lounge above. The speed, comfort, and convenience of this combined form of travel will make it attractive to a wider range of patrons than simply the people who have an antipathy for those "flying contraptions."

In the United States, at least, there will be fewer railroads—perhaps three or four systems at the most. There will be a greater number of mainline tracks and practically no feeder lines. Archaic regulations which have prevented the acquisition of other media of transportation will have been swept aside to make way for progress. Rail movements will be confined to the area where rail transport is most efficient and feeder service will be performed by truck, helicopter, or air-cushion machine, whether these supplemental services are performed by the railroad, the shipper, or by a carrier of different ownership.

The iron horse, fascinator of the youth of yesterday, is not about to ride into the sunset like the heroes of old. With renewed vigor this trusty steed is about to charge the dawn.

HIGHWAY TRANSPORT—ON, UNDER, AND ABOVE GROUND

First to successfully challenge the supremacy of the railroad in almost half a century was the motor carrier—automobile and truck. The private automobile, later joined by the bus and the airline, made the once profitable rail passenger business a deficit operation. Then, beginning about 35 years ago, the motor truck began to eat into the rail freight business with an ever increasing appetite. We have been content to try to referee the fight between the modes by regulation in the United States whereas most governments have found it necessary to take stronger measures.

There is a place in the future for both road and rail transport and by one means or another each will find its economic sphere. My concern now is to highlight some of the dramatic developments in highway transport which I think the next three and a half decades will unveil.

Versatility is the lever which hoisted motor transport into its position of eminence. The truck brought transportation to the door of the patron. The automobile made every man his own charioteer. The maneuverability of each was limited only by the availability of a street or way upon which to run. That, it turns out, has come to be quite a problem. We have built vehicles at a faster rate than we have built highways to accommodate them. City streets are not elastic. In the United States we are at the midpoint of the greatest public works project ever undertaken in the annals of time—a 16-year project to construct 41,000 miles of interstate and defense highways. We are on schedule, but already we are making plans to feed new mileage into the system.

So swiftly does the magic wand of time now alter the face of transportation that motor transport, circa 2000, will bear as little resemblance to that of today as Cinderella's coach-and-six to a pumpkin and six white mice. Mammoth truck and midget auto will no longer vie for position on the highways, for private and commercial vehicles will move on separate ways. These thoroughfares will be laid out side by side or double or triple decked with one deck above and one below the surface. The arteries for trucks will be freed of obstructions which now limit the size of rig and load.

Highway travel will still frequently be bumper to bumper but traffic will move at high speeds with complete safety because of the built-in control devices of radar and electronics to regulate speed and prevent collisions. Trucks and autos will stop themselves before they collide with another object.

We will have advanced highways equipped with radio beams so that drivers can put their vehicles on automatic pilot. Between certain important centers there may be conveyor networks. Vehicles will be automatically whisked onto the system at terminals and will ride a belt or electrified rail to an exit point where they will automatically be discharged.

The truck train will be as common in the year 2000 as the rail freight train is today. Five, six, or even more bottoms will be moved as a unit, pulled by one huge tractor or by a tractor and one or more automatically controlled booster units. Some highway trains will be made up of self-propelled units, all controlled by the driver of the leading vehicle. Self-propelled units will add great maneuverability. The consist of the train can be changed by adding and dropping units at interchange points along the superhighway.

Nuclear propulsion for trucks, to say nothing of automobiles, seems a rather remote possibility today, but nuclear energy certainly will be harnessed to the larger units of A.D. 2000, and even more exotic forms of power will be in vogue. We have already unlocked the secret of taking energy from the sun, and I confidently believe that private automobiles will, in time, be powered by solar energy, which will constantly restore itself from the rays of the sun.

Metropolitan area transit has reached a saturation point and there is no place for it to go now except up, or down, or both. First of all, trucks will be banned from city streets. From terminals in the outskirts goods will be transported to and from points in the city through pneumatic tubes, by helicopter, or in some other fashion. Monorails high in the air, or "people pipelines" running underground will relieve the congestion which is choking our cities to death. We will not, like the author of Dick Tracy, wait for the people on the moon to show us how to construct individual air cars for personal transport. The town car of tomorrow will look more like a flying saucer than like a pullman car on rubber tires, and it will be able to park on the roof or the balcony, or simply remain suspended in the air.

OF PIPELINES AND THINGS

The pipelines or underground conduit, already a major instrumentality of transport, will be in much wider use and will have a much wider range of usefulness in the year 2000. Not only will the pipeline be used to relieve the traffic of city streets—it will be employed to move all types of commodities over long distances. Coal slurry has been transported by pipeline. In Canada plans are underway to build a pipeline to carry wood chips. Britain's Transport Minister has announced that a tunnel under the English Channel will join England and France within 10 years. As land becomes more valuable for other purposes transit pipelines will become more prevalent.

Incidentally, coal and petroleum may be too valuable to use as fuel by the year 2000. As a source for the manufacture of synthetics and a wide range of things which come from other sources today, these products will be precious gems of science. Moreover, long before the year 2000, nuclear power may rival in cost that of traditional fuels in the production of power for industrial use and other purposes. When land becomes too valuable for the grazing of sheep, wool will cease to be the staple commodity of cloth, and synthetic fibers made from the storehouses of nature will take its place.

And, while I am out of context, let me point out that farmland to produce the food necessary to feed the teeming population in the year 2000 will be in short supply, but we will solve that problem by tapping the inexhaustible protein resources of the measureless oceans.

MIRACLES OF THE SEA

Now, let us turn the long-range binoculars on that ancient, fabled, challenging pathway of transport, the "bounding main," with its fingers of water reaching into all the land areas of the earth. Tradition and custom have kept a tight grip on water transport, but change is about to break over the fleets of the world like a storm.

Exciting, almost incredible, developments in the area of water transport crowd across

the pages of the daily press. Automation, nuclear power, hydrofoils, hydroskimmers, containerization. But wait. Look a little closer and you will see just beneath the surface an industry encrusted with the barnacles of time and obsolescence of thought. During the past quarter of a century and more, when newer forms of transport were breaking barrier after barrier, the improvements in ship design, speed, and efficiency have been relatively insignificant.

Water covers three-fourths of the earth's surface, and world geography plus vital statistics will force us to make better use of water transport in the future. There is a limit to the highways of concrete and steel that we can build, and to the space available for their building, but the pathways of the seas are almost limitless.

It is now just a decade since nuclear energy was first successfully employed to power the submarine *Nautilus*, launched in 1954. During that decade we have invaded outer space, put new stars in the heavens, landed a rocket on the moon, and established worldwide communications through relay stations in the sky. But we have been slow to exploit the greatest breakthrough in water and land transport since the inauguration of mechanical power. It was not until 1959, with the launching of the NS *Savannah*, that this fantastic new source of energy was employed to propel a cargo-passenger ship.

In an age where miracles abound the miracle of nuclear propulsion is just breaking free. The *Savannah* can operate for 3½ years on a single core of fuel. She can cruise at 21 knots for 336,000 nautical miles on a single fuel load. But like Robert Fulton's *Clermont*, the *Savannah* is only the beginning. Last month a large U.S. manufacturer announced that it is developing a reactor plant that will require refueling only once during the entire life of a ship. When history writes the saga of ocean transport from the vantage point of the year 2000, the chapter headed "*Nautilus* 1954" will be no longer than the chapter headed "Christopher Columbus, 1492."

The ship of the future will be mass produced—certainly production methods will be revolutionized—from one of the strong, light metals or even plastic. All will be nuclear powered and propelled at speeds of at least 30 knots per hour. The size will be suited to the environment and the type of cargo to be handled. The bottleneck of shipping is the port operation. That handicap will be overcome in a number of ways. All cargo that is susceptible of being boxed will be containerized and will move between ship and land vehicles without breaking bulk—by crane, conveyor, monorail, or some other device. Bulk cargoes will be loaded and discharged automatically by remotely controlled mechanical devices.

What will happen to the containers when they are emptied at destination? The answer is a "world bank" of containers under the control and direction of an international organization. This could be a branch of the United Nations or some specially constituted world organization. The establishment of such a worldwide pool of standard, interchangeable, multiple-use containers will require diplomacy and the cooperation of all governments, but in the face of necessity and in the interest of humanity it can and will be worked out.

The only limitation on the size of ships is the facility for docking at ports, and it will be possible for the ship of tomorrow to take on and discharge cargo at almost any place, so that vessels of mountainous size will ply the seas. The screw propeller probably will be supplanted by jet-type propulsion using either air or water to provide the thrust. Oceangoing barges, with capacity almost unlimited, will move anything that needs to be moved.

The subsurface ship, or submarine, may carry a substantial part of the heavy or bulk cargo of the world in A.D. 2000. It has many advantages. The submarine is capable of much higher speeds with less resistance than surface ships. There is no wave or wind resistance. Storms which slow down and sometimes imperil surface craft have no effect on the submerged vessel.

As the giant submarine torpedoes its way through the oceans under the surface of the water, a greyhound of the seas, the fleet hydrofoil, will be skimming over the waves, adding a dimension of mobility the uses of which will be infinite. The ship on "stilts" or hydrofoil, like many other departures from the normal, has been known and employed for a long time, but its potentials are just beginning to be realized. Jet propelled, these ships, which rise on their foils like a water skier, are capable of tremendous speeds. Consequently, they reduce the time differential between air and water travel to a minimum. Carrying their hulls above all except the highest waves, they are not subject to pounding. Their power-to-speed curve, contrary to that of surface vessels, climbs steadily as speed increases.

By the year 2000 the hydrofoils will be the buslines of the oceans. Millions will commute between home and office by this fast and economical form of taxi service. But hydrofoils will have even more vital roles in transportation. Since they can operate in very shallow water they will be used as a supplemental carrier, making it possible for the giant ocean liners to transfer their cargo to hydrofoil or hydroskimmer and discharge it on any beach. These shallow-draft vessels also can act as ferries to carry oceangoing freight between a shipside and interior river ports. This should prove especially beneficial in the emerging nations of the world which are deficient in road and rail transport but which are traversed by many natural waterways.

Transportation always has developed in response to the will and the needs of the people. The 5 or 6 billion people who will live in the year 2000, having more time to travel, a keener appreciation of the cultural aspects of life, an unquenchable desire to see and to explore the far reaches of the world, will create a demand for more, better, and cheaper ocean transport. The largest passenger lines today accommodate only about 2,000 passengers. Nuclear-powered superlines can be built to accommodate 10,000 or more passengers—a complete city on water—a traveling resort or cultural center.

The cost of such mass-produced transportation can be reduced to as low as $100 between the United States and Europe—a world cruise for as low as $500. No need for hotels for those who wish to make their traveling city a home. By helicopter and hydroskimmer the vacationeer will explore the interior of all countries from the ports of call. These floating cities will provide ideal convention facilities and places to "get away from it all" or facilities from which to "see the world," depending upon the whim of the passenger.

I have mentioned before the one phenomenal, newly emerging, mode of transport which, because it cuts across all known media seems destined to have a more profound effect on the pattern of transportation in the year 2000 than anything else on the horizon today. That is the vehicle that rides on a cushion of air. These strange craft are called, variously, hydroskimmers, air-cushion vehicles, and ground-effect machines (GEM). In England one of these types of air-cushion vehicles is called the Hovercraft on which considerable progress is now being made. The principle on which these vessels operate has been known and explored for more than 20 years but it is only in recent times that serious efforts were begun to make practical application of the idea.

The feasibility of the air-cushion vehicle has been established. It can hover inches above the surface of land or water or rise to a considerable height. It can be powered by propellers, by jet engines, or by air jet. Fantastic speeds will be possible. Since it can go where no other surface craft can go it will be an indispensable adjunct to rail, motor, water, and air transport. It can take frozen foods and medical supplies to peoples in heretofore inaccessible places, over swamps, marshes, rocky cliffs, or frozen wastes. This machine can and will immeasurably advance the cause of civilization.

In the year 2000 the "flying saucer" myth or mystery will be no more—there will be flying saucers everywhere, and if some of them are from Mars no one will worry except the man responsible for selling license plates. There will be no need for bumpers on the machines because radar will prevent crashes and computers will direct traffic.

CONCLUSION

What a confluence of centuries—what a juncture of history—when the sun sets on the 20th century and rises on the 21st. If all the dreams I have spun come true in the next 35 years, the bells will ring loudly and the people will cheer wildly and there will be peace on earth when the clock ticks in the first syllable of the next century. But have I dealt with dreams? Is anything that I have predicted more improbable than that a manmade satellite known as Syncom III is standing out in space right now through the instrumentality of which these very proceedings could be made to come alive in the living rooms of people everywhere?

Were Da Vinci, Marconi, and Watt, or Stevenson, Fulton, and the Wright brothers dreaming dreams or paving the way for the future when they postulated things that had never theretofore been achieved?

Before you mark off anything that I have predicted for the next three and a half decades look back on the startling developments of the recent past: The breaking of the sound barrier; space travel; substitution of a cushion of air for the ageless wheel; the broadcasting of a message of good will to the world by a President of the United States not by cable, phone, or radio, but from a satellite circling around the globe in outer space—then the erasure of the message and substitution of another while the satellite was in orbit; the Olympic games in Tokyo brought into the homes of people on the far side of the earth through the medium of a relay station in space. Multiply these miracles of science by the rate of change which is being constantly compounded and see if my predictions do not come out on the modest side even to the point of reticence.

I believe the most important fact for us to understand is that transportation, though it opens new worlds and changes old concepts of time and distance, will not shape the world of A.D. 2000. Transportation is the servant of the people—the genie which makes their dreams come true, the magic carpet of their future, the mobility of their desires, their aspirations, and their resources.

A long time ago one of those great men who are born with a mission to change the environment of their time, Benjamin Franklin, wrote to his friend Joseph Priestly, that he sometimes regretted he was born too soon, because he found it impossible to imagine the height to which might be carried, in a thousand years, the power of man over matter. And after speculating for awhile about a great many things that might come to pass, much as I have speculated here today, Franklin ended his letter with a sentence which I should like to leave with you:

"O, that moral science were in as fair a way of improvement that men would cease to be wolves to one another and that human beings would at length learn what they now improperly call humanity."

Cheshire, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Cheshire, Conn., is one of the most attractive towns in our lovely State. This town has an enviable history which has just been placed in compact form by the Cheshire Historical Society. So attractive is this brochure and so interesting is the history which it details that I am appending its contents to my remarks. As I do, I wish to compliment the Cheshire Historical Society for its efforts to preserve the records of the past of this historic town.

The brochure follows:

CHESHIRE, CONN.—AN OLD NEW ENGLAND TOWN

THE EARLIEST TIMES

Cheshire was the granddaughter of New Haven, and Wallingford was its mother town. As the latter was founded by sons of New Haveners who, becoming dissatisfied with the narrow limits of the hometown, fared forth to conquer the wilderness, so Cheshire grew from the urge of Wallingford's sons and daughters to create new homes in turn in new country. First known as Quinnipiac, New Haven was founded in 1638, Wallingford by the next generation, in 1669.

West of Wallingford and beyond the stream Quinnipiac was a low range of "Blew (Blue) Hills," and at their base a fine stretch of land known as early as 1680–90 as "Ye Fresh Meadows." The region was one of promise to the farmer and soon the more venturesome of the colonists' sons were going over there to clear the land and plant crops. By 1694 there was an organized settlement here, the beginning of our present town of Cheshire. Names we know today are to be found in the list of early settlers in this region: Hall and Ives, Doolittle, Hitchcock, others. In 1705 the name of Thomas Brooks appears, and soon the name Cheshire, which he gave to the settlement, from the county of his birth in England. The Brooks name itself is preserved in Brooksvale, the southern part of Cheshire today.

Slowly Cheshire broke from the mother town, a separate school being established first, and then a church. As early as in 1719 the "west farmers," as the Cheshire pioneers were called, won the right to hold school for 2 months of the year "in a convenient place." In 1724 a church followed, with the erection of a Congregational Church on the site which is now Main Street and Lanyon Drive. The present Congregational Church building, third in time, of Federal Colonial design and still standing on the central green, was built in 1826–27. Well, before this, St. Peter's Episcopal Church had been organized, in 1760, at the bend of Main Street. An Episcopal Academy of Connecticut had been established in 1794 through the efforts of Samuel Seabury, first bishop of Connecticut, locating in Cheshire in 1796.

DEVELOPMENT AND GROWTH

In 1780 the State legislature made Cheshire a separate town. Its population was at this time 2,015, and despite its new standing the figure did not rise very rapidly because of poor communications. In 1801, however, communications began to improve, as the main street became a turnpike, with a stagecoach running via Farmington between Hartford and New Haven, and making stops in Cheshire 3 days a week around 5 o'clock in the afternoon. There was further improvement in 1827, with the opening of the Farmington Canal, first link in a system of waterways designed to link the Connecticut River at Northampton with the sound, and thus the whole producing area of western New England with the world of trade. Beachport, as the Cheshire stop was called, was an important point on the canal, traffic both east-west and north-south meeting here. Farmers and tradesmen and manufacturers would drive their oxen from Naugatuck to Beachport in order to ship their products by water, as being cheaper than by land. In 1848 the canal was superseded by the railroad, which because it was built mostly along the old towpath of the canal was called the canal line.

All around Cheshire small industries were now springing up, James Mix for example, had a gimlet and hardware factory upstream from the present fine town bathing beach. In Cheshire Street, to the east, there were any number of small but flourishing enterprises. From Cheshire grew the town of Prospect, known at first as the West Rocks. Farming was of course the greatest of Cheshire's industries from the beginning, one generation after another often carrying along on the same site, as the Bishop family has done, five generations farming the same land.

Cheshire had its first boom not from the outside, thanks to railroad or canal, but from resources deep within its own soil. As early as in 1712 we hear of a John Parker finding copper on his farm, and the records show that copper was, in fact, mined here for a number of years, the Copper Valley name given to one section of town deriving from this. But the big exploitation of what lies beneath the soil in Cheshire came later, when some time before 1840 a Negro woman known as Jinny discovered some unusual stones on the hillside near her cabin. Scientists had known since 1813, when the word was published by Benjamin Silliman of Yale, that there were deposits of barium sulphate, popularly known as barytes, in Cheshire, but it took the Negro woman's chance discovery to dramatize the treasure. Following her happy find, for nearly 40 years barytes mining operations were carried on in Cheshire, first at the Jinny Hill site, later on the Peck place in the northwestern end of town. The mineral found a ready market with manufacturers of glass, paint, cloth, and certain rubber products, while the industry it fostered was responsible for bringing to Cheshire a totally new population, principally from the mining district of Cornwall, England. A byproduct of this influx was a notable expansion of the Methodist Church, which had been founded in 1834.

In the period of growth due to improved communications, and to the barytes flurry, Cheshire got its first manufactory. This was the Cheshire Manufacturing Co., founded in 1850 to produce, as it announced at that time, "ivory combs, and buttons of all kinds." The company is still in full operation today as the Ball & Socket Co., its principal products being metal buttons and stampings.

With the increase in population and the diversification of national strains attendant upon it, there was a need for new churches, and in 1856 we find Roman Catholic services being held in the upstairs ballroom of Beach Tavern, which today is the fine old home at 137 South Main Street. Today St. Bridget's Church has not only a handsome edifice for worship, but a junior high school as well, opened in the autumn of 1964. In 1888 we find a Baptist Church coming into being, on land given by Josiah Hull. Finally, in 1956 we note the beginnings of an Evangelical Lutheran parish, and in January 1961, the dedication of a church building in a style new to Cheshire, and pleasingly modern.

Returning to Cheshire's underground treasure, there was a third moment of interest in this in 1919, when a company from Virginia began drilling operations on the Peck farm in the northwestern part of town. Interest ran high, and there was a rumor that, besides oil, coal had also been found there. Nothing came of the project, though hope was great for some time, and eventually all search was abandoned.

CHESHIRE TODAY

For many years Cheshire was linked with New Haven by a trolley line, which at first ran only as far as Mount Carmel. Cheshire people would drive to Hamden and leave their horses in a livery stable while they went on by trolley. Eventually the line was extended to Waterbury, thus linking Cheshire with the whole New England hinterland. This was important as a great deal of freight was carried by trolley. Today the old trolley line has been superseded by a system of buses.

The town today has a population of more than 14,400, drawn from every corner of the earth. The Cheshire Academy alone, with its 800 students, is a world in microcosm, adding color and vitality and universality to the town. The Waverly Inn also, founded in 1894 by Walter Scott (hence the name), is likewise a cosmopolitan institution, acting as host to the world. Oldtimers sometimes look back with nostalgia to the days when band concerts were a feature of the Waverly, some recalling the days when there was a one horse shay on display there that was said to have been used by George Washington himself.

Greatly expanded educational facilities have become imperative in Cheshire, what with the doubling of the population within the last 10 years. Now, in addition to Humiston School in the center of town, so long the only school, there are five elementary schools, a junior high, and a high school.

CHESHIRE AND THE WORLD

Cheshire has supplied the world with its quota of notables, an early one being the eccentric, pioneering educator, Bronson Alcott. Alcott was in Cheshire for a short time as a boy, with his uncle, who was a headmaster of the Cheshire Academy, and later, as a teacher in a school of his own from 1825–26.

A name in the news not long ago, when it was invoked by Yale students seeking to make the university coeducational, was that of Lucinda Foot, who in 1784, at the age of 12, passed the Yale entrance examination. Although not admitted, because of her sex, Lucinda saw her brother Sam graduate before he was 17. Sam later became a Congressman, a Senator, and finally Governor of Connecticut. His father and maternal grandfather had been the second and first pastors, respectively, of the Cheshire Congregational Church. His son, Adm. Andrew Hull Foote of Mississippi River fame in the Civil War, lived here as a boy and attended the Cheshire Academy, along with the Union Secretary of the Navy, Gideon Welles, and the Confederate general, Joseph Wheeler. Foote's name may be seen on the north side of the soldiers' monument (erected in 1866) on the green.

Lambert Hitchcock, famous for his Hitchcock chair, was born in Cheshire. So also was John Frederick Kensett, a painter of the Hudson Valley School, known for his landscapes and marines. In 1859 Kensett was appointed a member of the National Arts Commission and engaged to superintend the ornamentation of the National Capitol in Washington. His painting of Niagara Falls was one of the canvasses chosen by Mrs. John F. Kennedy for the White House collection.

Still others from Cheshire who have left their imprint on the world are Amos Doolittle, an 18th century engraver; Abraham Jarvis, second bishop of Connecticut and eighth bishop of the Episcopal Church in

America; and George Capewell, who made a fortune from his inventions, among these horseshoe nails. Many notables have attended Cheshire Academy, perhaps the most spectacular having been the great financier and art collector, J. Pierpont Morgan, a native of Hartford.

CONCLUSION

The town of Cheshire covers a surprisingly large expanse of territory. Its main street, almost straight, runs 7½ miles, from Hamden to Milldale, while at its greatest width the town extends 6¾ miles, from Waterbury to Wallingford. With a total of 31.4 square miles, Cheshire is 68th in size among the 169 towns of the State. It has some 90 miles of highway.

Right now plans are being drawn, looking toward a proper and harmonious development of Cheshire in the future. As to these, and on Cheshire's past, the historical society, like the public library, is always happy to assist in finding information.

Civil Liberties Aspects of Police Membership in John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the American Civil Liberties Union has been a peculiarly American institution, supported over the years by private individuals who gave their time, their professional training, and their money, to protect the constitutional liberties of all of us by seeking legal redress for those whose fundamental rights have been encroached upon or denied. The union has not hesitated to intervene on behalf of the most unpopular causes where the Constitution was in jeopardy. It has done this with a single mindedness of purpose and a single standard, As President Johnson said last June in his greeting to the ACLU at the occasion of its biennial conference, "The American Civil Liberties Union has an essential role at this critical time. It defends the rights of even the most despised to speak, to assemble, and to petition for redress of grievances. It protects the individual's constitutional guarantees of the right to counsel, to confrontation, and to due process of law. It has come to symbolize racial justice and religious freedom."

I believe it is fair to say that the members of the John Birch Society have little sympathy for the work of the ACLU. It is appropriate, therefore, for the record to show yet another example of the unbiased concern the ACLU brings to any infringement of liberty, whether it affects those of the left, right, or center of political persuasion. The following statement, recently adopted by the board of directors of the ACLU makes their position clear on the matter of the right of a member of the John Birch Society to be a police officer:

STATEMENT ON CIVIL LIBERTIES ASPECTS OF POLICE MEMBERSHIP IN JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY—ADOPTED BY ACLU BOARD OF DIRECTORS, DECEMBER 21, 1964

The judgment of people on the basis of their individual ability and competence, not their political beliefs and associations, is a cardinal civil liberties principle. This position, long upheld by the ACLU, supports the first amendment guarantee of freedom of expression.

In recent weeks this principle has been challenged because of the disclosure that in many local communities members of the police force are also members of the John Birch Society. There has been considerable demand for the dismissal of such police officers, on the ground that the openly avowed program of the society is incompatible with this service as public employees, that such membership makes them incapable of dealing calmly and rationally, for example, with violence and racial tension, and to respect the constitutional rights of citizens.

This is not the first time this question has arisen. From time to time membership in other organizations whose philosophy and program are regarded as opposed to democratic values was suggested as a disqualification for public employment—most notably members of the Communist Party and Catholic nuns who belong to religious orders should not be allowed to teach in public schools.

The ACLU reaffirms now in the John Birch Society case the same civil liberties standard it applied to cases involving members of the Communist Party and Catholic religious orders—mere membership in any organization is not sufficient grounds for disqualification from employment. The right to associate for lawful purposes is a constitutionally protected right and no public servant should be barred from exercising it. To do otherwise would not only deny individuals their constitutionally guaranteed freedoms, but also create a climate of fear and suspicion which can only limit public employees from expressing their personal opinions—to the detriment of society as a whole which needs the freest exchange of views by citizens.

Certainly public authorities should have discretion to inquire into the suitability of any member of the police force at any time, and especially when he receives any information which he thinks may reflect on the member's capability to perform his duties. Such information might include personal activity as a member of the John Birch Society which is shown to have interfered with the impartial conduct we expect law enforcement officers to demonstrate in the exercise of their authority. But the guiding standard for such inquiry should be conduct, not mere membership in any organization.

Poll Shows Strong Support Among Iowa Farmers for Continuation of Feed Grain Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important agricultural issues facing Congress this session is the feed grain program. If farmers are to continue receiving the benefits of this program, Congress must vote to keep it in force. From my personal experience, I know that the overwhelming sentiment among farmers in Iowa is for continuation of the feed grain program and this is confirmed by the results of a poll published in the January 16 issue of Wallaces Farmer.

The poll indicates that nearly three-fourths of Iowa's farmers approve of the feed grain program and believe it should be continued. I think it is important to note that, as indicated by this and two earlier Wallaces Farmer polls, support for the program has increased steadily in Iowa since it was begun in 1961. A poll taken in 1961 showed 53 percent in favor of the program. In 1962, the majority favoring it rose to 66 percent. And the latest poll shows an even higher majority of 74 percent.

There has been much discussion about the feed grain program. But the sentiment of Iowa farmers, who are personally affected by the program, is clearly in favor of continuing it. I hope that, when considering arguments pro and con on the feed grain program, my fellow Members will keep in mind the views of farmers, both in Iowa and other States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the article from Wallaces Farmer describing the results of its latest poll on the feed grain program:

WALLACES FARMER POLL—STRONG APPROVAL GIVEN FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

About three-fourths of Iowa's farmers at least partially approve of the current feed grain program. This is the highest vote of confidence given the program in Wallaces Farmer polls to date. And indications are that acceptance of the program has been increasing since it went into effect in the spring of 1961.

Farm men were asked: "What do you think of the present feed grain program?"

They could choose one of these four answers: (1) It's a good program and should be continued as is; (2) it has some value, and should be improved and continued; (3) it has little or no value, and should be dropped; and (4) undecided.

Here's how men answered:

	Percent
1. Good program	29
2. Some value	45
3. Should drop	12
4. Undecided	14

Thus, 74 percent of those polled think the program should be continued. Similar, though not exactly the same questions were asked in October of 1961 and October of 1962.

Only 53 percent voted to continue the program in 1961; 66 percent favored continuance in 1962. In the 1961 poll, 21 favored dropping the program, compared with 13 percent in 1962, and 12 percent last year.

Strongest opposition came from the smaller farmers. "I am in favor of something," commented a Muscatine County farmer, "but the way it is everything is in favor of the big operator. I am against pushing the little farmer out."

A number of those polled voiced objections to the present feed grain program, but feel it's better than nothing. "The farm program isn't just right, but I don't see how we can drop it," said a Woodbury County farmer.

"While I don't think the present program is the best it could be," said a Black Hawk County farm owner, "things are lots better than they were in the good old days. I can remember when we had so much corn and it was so cheap we burned it in our furnaces and tank heaters. We better not drop it."

Age made litle difference on farmers' attitudes toward the feed grain program. Nor did size of farm—except for those with small farms who are growing less than 245 acres of corn.

Farm Bureau members' thinking was fairly well in line with IFBF's 1964 resolution on the feed grain program. Half voted for choice No. 2—it has some value, and should be improved and continued. Here's the total vote by Farm Bureau members and nonmembers:

[In percent]

	FB members	*Nonmembers*
Good program	24	37
Some value	50	39
Should drop	11	12
Undecided	15	12

Responses under individual choices don't average out to total scores listed above because four of the Farm Bureau members polled also belonged to other farm organizations. So their votes are counted again under "nonmembers."

Controversial Aspects of Ordinary and Necessary Business Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with interest that the Internal Revenue Service is being criticized for a ruling published August 17, 1964 (Rev. Rul. 64–224), which permits the deduction from gross income as "ordinary and necessary" business expense payments made in satisfaction of private treble damage claims under the antitrust laws. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has instructed its staff to prepare a report of the varying views with respect to this Internal Revenue ruling; and I am informed that the joint committee staff is presently engaged in assembling and analyzing a variety of views on this matter. The only published views which seem to have received widespread attention are statements criticizing the Internal Revenue Service for issuing this ruling last August.

A scholarly article entitled "Controversial Aspects of Ordinary and Necessary Business Expense" by Donald I. Lamont, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, was published in the December 1964 issue of the Tax magazine. Mr. Lamont was previously employed in the Internal Revenue Service. While his article is labeled as "not necessarily representing the official position of the Internal Revenue Service or the Treasury Department," one can readily assume that Mr. Lamont's expressions on this subject are not at variance with the views of the IRS or the Treasury.

In his article Mr. Lamont states that the Internal Revenue Service ruling has "understandably, been criticized by those who view the antitrust treble damage provision of the Clayton Act as punitive in nature." Mr. Lamont also indicates that the ruling was criticized as depriving the Government of millions of dollars of tax revenue, as being contrary to existing law as declared by the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts, and as being "most unfortunate both as a matter of law and from the viewpoint of tax and antitrust policy."

Mr. Lamont then comments:

The IRS gave all of these issues thorough consideration before issuing the ruling. It may, in fact, be appropriate in this connection, to paraphrase the words of Lord Justice Scrutton. When the Service initially considered the question of whether treble damages under section 4 of the Clayton Act were deductible, the offhand reaction by most Service officials appeared to be "of course, they are not." However, the more thorough the study of the question became, the more difficult it was to find the legal justification for that answer.

Mr. Lamont subsequently states:

The weight of legal precedent would appear to support the deductibility of statutory treble damage payments to redress private injury, and the IRS so found.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the Internal Revenue Service is not infallible, and I have no hesitation in criticizing the Service if I think it is wrong. On the other hand, I think its decisions are entitled to carefully considered analysis when subjected to challenge. Mr. Lamont's article makes it clear that the revenue ruling of last August concerning the deductibility of payments in settlement of treble damage actions under the antitrust laws was carefully considered, and in the judgment of the Service properly issued.

I am inserting the text of Mr. Lamont's article in the RECORD in order to be sure that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and its staff take cognizance of Mr. Lamont's scholarly work in considering this highly involved and important tax question.

The article follows:

CONTROVERSIAL ASPECTS OF ORDINARY AND NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENSE

(By Donald I. Lamont; Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, Washington)

A familiar provision of the Federal income tax law is that in computing net income subject to tax there shall be allowed a deduction for all "ordinary and necessary" expenses incurred in carrying on a trade or business.[1] This fundamental concept has been an integral part of the tax law since its beginning.

Also familiar, is the closely similar provision that, in the case of an individual, there shall be allowed a deduction for all "ordinary and necessary" expenses incurred for the production or collection of income or for the management conservation, or maintenance of property held for the production of income.[2] The "ordinary and necessary" expense provisions have received excellent and thorough comment over the years, and little purpose would be served by retracing their history or by discussing their full scope at length, already well presented elsewhere.[3]

It should suffice to say, by way of introductory summary, that it is today well established:

(1) An expense is "ordinary," within the meaning of these statutory provisions, where the expense is common and accepted in the general industry or type of activity in which the taxpayer is engaged; and

(2) An expense is "necessary" where it is appropriate and helpful in furthering the taxpayer's business or income-producing activity.[4]

So far as the "ordinary and necessary" standard is concerned, the tests of deductibility under both sections 162 and 212 are identical.[5]

These general principles are, of course, very helpful as guidelines to the Internal Revenue Service and to taxpayers for determining whether a given expense is or is not allowable as a deduction. But they have not eliminated all controversy. Largely, this is because each case turns on its own peculiar facts. Most frequently the debate is not over legal principle, but over its application to specific facts. Thus, as Justice Cardozo, in the leading case of *Welch* v. *Helvering*,[6] recognized some 20 years ago:

"Here, indeed, as so often in other branches of the law, the decisive distinctions are those of degree and not of kind. One struggles in vain for any verbal formula that will supply a ready touchstone. The standard set up by the statute is not a rule of law; it is rather a way of life. Life in all its fullness must supply the answer to the riddle."

Thus viewed, the provision will and must provoke continuing disputes between the IRS and taxpayers. According to IRS records, 534 cases involving application of the term "ordinary and necessary" were pending in the courts on September 30 of this year; 218 additional cases involving the same issue were under consideration at the appellate level in regional offices.

Most controversy involving the "ordinary and necessary" provisions, however, can be readily cataloged under three separable headings:

(1) Controversy on the question whether a given expense is an "ordinary and necessary" expense deductible under sections 162 or 212, or a nondeductible personal expense.

(2) Controversy whether a given expense is deductible in full as an "ordinary and necessary" expense, or whether it is a capital expenditure for which deduction must be taken by way of depreciation, amortization, or depletion.

(3) Controversy whether an expense is allowable if it is illegal or improper per se, or incurred in connection with illegal or improper activity.

There have been noteworthy current developments in all three categories, and each will be discussed below. Of the three, however, the third—involving the public policy limitation on deductions for "ordinary and necessary" expenses—presents one of the cloudiest principles of Federal income taxation. It is not difficult for the skilled advocate to cite legal precedent for a jumble of opposing propositions. The "public policy" limitation merits more extended analysis than is necessary for the other two categories.

SEPARATING "ORDINARY AND NECESSARY" FROM "PERSONAL"

In general

Section 262 of the code provides that "except as otherwise expressly provided * * *, no deduction shall be allowed for personal, living, or family expenses."

One of the controversial aspects of the "ordinary and necessary" provisions, then, is

Footnotes at end of speech.

separating the expense that properly is deductible under section 162 or section 212 from expenses which are essentially personal, living or family costs, not deductible under section 262.

The overlapping effect of these statutory provisions raises difficult questions. Expenses for travel, and expenses for food, clothing, lodging and residence, entertaining, moving, and expenses relating to one's family, are common personal and living expenses for all of us. At the same time, it is by no means uncommon for certain taxpayers to incur these very expenses legitimately for business purposes. It is not surprising that the books on tax law contain a host of cases in which the deductibility of these expenses has been at issue. No less surprising, decisions on the issue have gone both ways, over the years, depending on particular facts and circumstances.

At the heart of most controversy involving the "ordinary and necessary" provisions is a nebulous, but always present, human factor. Certain persons tend naturally to view the "ordinary and necessary" expense provisions liberally. Others look at these provisions more strictly. The conceptual dichotomy appears to prevail equally among judges, Treasury Department and IRS officials, and tax practitioners. It has contributed to much of the contradictory and perplexing decisions in this area of the law. What one judge holds to be "ordinary and necessary," another would have held to be "personal." What one IRS official considers to be "personal" another IRS official would consider "ordinary and necessary." We see again Justice Cardozo's insight in his statement that "the standard set up by the statute is not a rule of law; it is rather a way of life." [7]

Direct and proximate relation

In an effort to cut into this hard-core problem of separating the deductible from the nondeductible in the case of expenses which commonly are personal in nature, subsidiary doctrines have developed. One such doctrine is that to be deductible, the expense must be "directly connected with" [8] or have a "proximate relationship with" [9] the taxpayer's business or income-producing activity.

Cases on closely similar facts, however, continue to arise and produce contrary decisions. For example, in Louis Boehm,[10] an attorney was not allowed to deduct amounts spent on dues and expenses for membership in certain social clubs on the ground that he had not shown that the expenses had "a direct relation to the conduct of * * * [his] business." In contrast, in Norman M. Hussey [11] the Tax Court allowed an attorney to deduct essentially similar costs on a finding that the expenses "had a direct relation to * * * [his] law practice." Conflicting decisions involving generically identical expenses such as these obviously complicate the law. They introduce an abrasive element into day-to-day administration of the law.

Travel and entertainment expenses: In 1962, on the ground that the "ordinary and necessary" standard had proved inadequate in itself to delineate true business expenses from personal expenses, Congress enacted a new statutory provision—section 274—specifically limiting deductions for travel and entertainment expenses.[12] The Internal Revenue Service concluded that, in the travel and entertainment expense area at least, the indefiniteness of the "ordinary and necessary" expense deduction seriously threatened to undermine the voluntary compliance concept upon which our tax law is structured.[13]

New section 274 generally requires that entertainment expenses, to be deductible, must have a closer relationship to actual business discussion or negotiation than was required under prior law. Section 274 also imposes limitations on deductions of travel and gift expenses. By statute, this new provision comes into play only in the case where these expenses are otherwise deductible as "ordinary and necessary" expenses under sections 162 and 212. In no sense was section 274 intended to liberalize prior law in this respect.

On the other hand, in view of the extremely cloudy and controversial nature of the "ordinary and necessary" provisions, it may well develop that the administration of section 274 by the IRS, as well as judicial application of the section, will largely answer a substantial number of questions that have heretofore been the subject of controversy under the "ordinary and necessary" provisions. Although only time will tell whether section 274 has eliminated controversy or has merely substituted new issues, there is very solid reason to be optimistic that it will go a long way in reducing dispute.

Early contention over indicated Revenue Service interpretation of new section 274 has subsided. It was, in large measure, the result of initial misunderstanding and overreaction. In the interim, the Service met with a large number of attorneys, accountants, businessmen and trade associations throughout the country in an effort both to develop sound guidelines for reasonable administration of the new statute and to permit widespread understanding of the rules. This joint effort was, I believe, very successful. Moreover, many knotty issues, which had been particularly troublesome in past years, received close scrutiny. Specific, but far-reaching, policy understandings were reached. In view of this, it is important for tax practitioners who have not already familiarized themselves with the new rules, to do so.[14]

Some of the rules—following enactment of section 274—governing deductions for travel and entertainment are strict. They fairly clearly deny deductions for many types of inherently personal expenses, for which the "ordinary and necessary" provisions had been most abused. The new statute is aimed at abuse, and it applies corrective brakes on the overly liberal aspects of the "ordinary and necessary" provisions.

The section 274 "T. & E." rules do not, however, evidence a new philosophy against deductions for legitimate business expenditures. The IRS has clearly indicated that it intends to apply a rule of reason in administering section 274, and the implementing regulations.

Proxy fight expenses: The IRS recently announced [15] that it will generally follow decisions of the Court of Appeals for the Fourth and Fifth Circuits allowing deductions for expenses incurred in proxy fight contests. This may prove to be a significant development affecting the construction of the "proximate relationship" test. It may have widespread implications beyond the issue of deductibility of proxy fight expenses.

In *Surasky* v. *United States* [16] the taxpayer purchased 4,000 shares of Montgomery Ward & Co. stock for the stated purpose of making a profit. According to the record of the case, the taxpayer purchased the stock on the understanding that a progressive new program for the company was planned that would enhance the value of the stock and increase dividends. In carrying out this program, the taxpayer and other Montgomery Ward stockholders formed a proxy soliciting committee to rebuild Montgomery Ward. The committee sought its objective through a vigorous stock proxy solicitation. It sought to displace a majority of the board of directors and the existing management, and replace them with its own candidates. The proxy committee spent substantial sums in its campaign for mail, telephone, and advertising costs. Three of the committee's candidates were in fact elected to the board. The taxpayer's share of the proxy campaign costs totaled $17,000.

In R. Walter Graham, Jr.,[17] the facts were very similar, although the taxpayer in Graham was both a stockholder and a director of the corporation involved in the proxy fight. The taxpayer joined with others in a group called the Alleghany-Young-Kirby ownership board for the purpose of soliciting proxies to unseat existing management of the New York Central Railroad. At the end of the proxy campaign the candidates of the group were elected as directors of the railroad. The net out of pocket cost to the taxpayer for proxy solicitation expenses was $9,453.[18]

Both Surasky and Graham claimed deductions for Federal income tax purposes under section 212, on the ground that their proxy fight costs were ordinary and necessary expenses incurred (1) for the production or collection of income, or (2) for the management, conservation or maintenance of property held for the production of income.[19]

The Commissioner disallowed the deductions, and the disallowance was upheld by the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida in the Surasky case and by the Tax Court in the Graham case. However, on appeal, the action was reversed in both cases. The IRS, in TIR 613 announced that it would generally follow the decisions of the courts of appeals. Its only qualification was that it would not follow the decision of the fifth circuit in Surasky to the extent that that court in its opinion may be thought to have indicated that expenses need not be proximately related to either the production of income or to the management, conservation, or maintenance of property held for the production of income to be deductible.

It is, thus, now established that proxy fight expenses, as a class of expense, are generally deductible for Federal income tax purposes. In this respect alone, it is a significant development which should sharply deduce what otherwise would have continued to be a substantial point for controversy between the IRS and taxpayers.

More significant, perhaps, are the implications of the IRS ruling for future application of the proximate relationship test.

In initially disallowing the deduction for the proxy fight costs incurred in Surasky and Graham, the IRS clearly adopted a strict and conservative view of the proximate relationship standard.

Under such a view, it could be questioned whether expenses incurred by stockholders in waging a proxy fight to influence corporate activity—with only a secondary, and speculative, effect on the value of corporate stock and dividends—would meet the proximate relationship test. The term proximate has been defined as "very near or close * * * often nearest; next; immediately preceding or following, as in a chain of causes or effects." [20] Enhancement in value of stock, or an increase in dividends, would not—it can logically be argued—flow immediately from a change of corporate management.

Under a more liberal construction of the "proximate relationship" test, on the other hand, it could well be argued that the profit motive of the taxpayers in both the Surasky and Graham cases was clear; there was a direct casual connection between the proxy fight and the realization of financial gain.

In the abstract, it was a difficult question to answer. However, court decisions, the Service believed, lent support to the conservative view, and disallowance. Expenses which had to date been allowed as proximately related to production of income were, as a general proposition, more directly related to a taxpayer's property holdings.[21] Thus in Jacob M. Kaplan,[22] the Tax Court had disallowed certain travel and entertainment expenses of a stockholder which he claimed

Footnotes at end of speech.

had been made for the corporate benefit. The Tax Court said:

"Only those expenses proximately and immediately relating to (the taxpayer's) own income or property are deductible. * * * [I]n the case of a stockholder, there may be deducted as 'ordinary' only that which can be placed in the category of expenses which a substantial stockholder engaged in conserving or enhancing his estate would ordinarily incur. Typical of such ordinary expenses are the rental of safe-deposit boxes, costs of investment counsel or investment services, salaries of secretaries, and the like."

Also in *Forbes* v. *Commissioner*,[23] the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit had held that dues paid to a nonprofit organization, by its founder and president, formed for the purpose of advancing the interests of investors, small businessmen and property owners did not have a sufficient "proximate relation" to production of income or to management, conservation or maintenance of property held for production of income.

In addition, in Revenue Ruling 56–511,[24] the Service had ruled that transportation and incidental expenses incurred by a stockholder in attending stockholder's meetings, to secure information which might be useful in making future investments, were not "sufficiently related to the taxpayer's investment activities to warrant their deduction under the provisions of section 212."

Moreover, and more directly in point, prior to Surasky and Graham it had been held that proxy fight expenses incurred by an individual stockholder were not deductible. In J. Raymond Dyer[25] a lawyer and his daughter both holding a relatively small amount of stock in a widely held public utility company, waged their own campaign to delete references to atomic energy from the company's advertising. In furtherance of this campaign, they incurred substantial costs in opposing granting of proxies to company management. The Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's disallowance of a deduction for the proxy fight costs on the ground that they were not "sufficiently related" to the taxpayer's "investment" activities as a stockholder.

There was, of course, a point of distinction between the facts of Dyer and those of Surasky and Graham. In Dyer the taxpayer's proxy fight costs were apparently not motivated primarily for a profit purpose. Rather, they were prompted to effect certain changes in the company's advertising program.

Nevertheless, in view of this precedent, the Service understandably concluded that if proxy fight costs incurred in Surasky and Graham were to be deductible it was for the courts and not the Service to make the decision. And, as earlier indicated, the trial courts in both Surasky and Graham upheld the action of the Commissioner in disallowing expenses as a deduction. The lower courts agreed that there was not a sufficient proximate relationship between the proxy fight costs incurred by the taxpayers—as stockholders—and the production of income—in the form of increased dividends and stock value—to support a deduction.

There remained, however, a respectable argument for deduction. The taxpayers cited cases construing section 162 for the proposition that the "ordinary and necessary" standard is not to be construed "in a narrow, technical sense but, on the contrary, that Congress intended the statute to be broadly construed to facilitate business generally."[26]

In addition, the taxpayers cited a line of cases holding that it was "ordinary and necessary" for stockholders, in connection with their stockholdings, to incur expenses to influence corporate action by way of proxy solicitation and derivative suit. In Alleghany Corporation[27] a corporate stockholder—a closed-end investment company—spent substantial sums in proxy solicitation in support of a reorganization plan which would allot a value to the stock held by it. The Tax Court held that this proxy expense and related costs were deductible as "ordinary and necessary" expenses under section 23(a)(1)(A), of the 1939 code, now section 162. The Commissioner acquiesced.[28] In *Straub* v. *Granger*,[29] a stockholder sought legal advice on how to protect his stock interest in a closely held corporation against adverse action by the corporate management. The court held the expenses had a reasonable and proximate relation to income producing property.[30]

In issuing TIR–613, announcing that it would generally follow the court of appeals decision in Surasky and Graham, the Service thus evidenced accord with a more liberal construction of the "proximate relationship" test than it had admitted previously.

The Service, as indicated earlier, qualified its ruling in one respect. The circuit court in Surasky had said in its opinion that nothing in the statute expressly requires a showing of a "proximate relation to the production of income." The Service made it clear in TIR–613 that it will not follow the opinion of the fifth circuit to the extent it may be taken to mean that expenses need not be "proximately related" to trade or business or to the production or collection of income to qualify for deduction.

In taking this position, the Service appears to be on very solid ground. In *Trust of Bingham* v. *Commissioner*[31] the Supreme Court said that "the requirement * * * that deductible expenses be 'ordinary and necessary' implies that they must * * * bear a reasonable and proximate relation to the * * * [activity covered]." More recently, the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed the "proximate relationship" test as a valid condition of deductibility for "ordinary and necessary" expenses.[32] See also the legislative congressional committee reports accompanying enactment of the counterpart provision to section 212 under the 1939 code.[33]

Reasonable in amount

An interesting point that continues to be debated is whether an expense, to be deductible under section 162, must be reasonable in amount.

It has been argued strongly that section 162 expenses, aside from compensation, are not subject to such a limitation. In support, it is stressed that section 162(a)(1) expressly provides that a "reasonable" allowance for salaries or other compensation for personal services actually rendered is deductible, but no similar standard is imposed by section 162 on the allowance of deductions for expenses other than compensation. Moreover, it is pointed out that whereas the Treasury Regulations under section 212 explicitly provide that an expense deductible under section 212 must be "reasonable in amount," the Treasury Regulations under section 162 contain no similar limitation.[34]

The development of section 162 has, however, passed the stage where such arguments are persuasive.

The concept that the "ordinary and necessary" standard embodies a requirement that an expense be "reasonable in amount" is supported by court decision. In *Commissioner* v. *Lincoln Electric Co.*,[35] the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, referred broadly to items not compensatory in nature, "such as rent, advertising, transportation and communication charges, repairs and other such operating expenses," and said:

"Such payments are made proper deductions by the statute, but with respect to them there is no express statutory provision limiting them to a reasonable amount, as is the case in payments of compensation for personal services. However, the element of reasonableness is inherent in the phrase 'ordinary and necessary.' Clearly it was not the intention of Congress to automatically allow as deductions operating expenses incurred or paid by the taxpayer in an unlimited amount."

Similarly, in *Limericks, Inc.* v. *Commissioner*,[36] the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit held that "rentals or other payments for the use of property which are excessive in amount, taking into consideration all the facts of the particular case, do not constitute 'ordinary and necessary' business expenses * * *." In *Trust of Bingham* v. *Commissioner*,[37] the Supreme Court stated that "the requirement * * * that deductible expenses be 'ordinary and necessary' implies that they must be reasonable in amount * * *." Although the Supreme Court made this comment with respect to the 1939 code predecessor provision of section 212, it is now fairly well settled that the tests of deductibility for expenses under section 162 are in pari materia with those under section 212, so far as the "ordinary and necessary" limitation is concerned.[38]

Accordingly, the position of the IRS seems to be fairly firm that, to be deductible under section 162, an expense must be reasonable in amount.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

In general

Expenditures which are capital in nature are not currently deductible as ordinary and necessary expenses under sections 162 or 212.[39] Capital expenditures, speaking generally, are those paid or incurred for the acquisition of property, or for permanent improvements to property with a value extending beyond the taxable year.[40] Such expenditures are to be included in, or added to the basis of the property, and may be deducted only by way of depreciation, amortization, or depletion under sections 167 or 611, or by other specific provisions of the code.[41]

These broad rules have been construed and applied in innumerable cases, and are, of course, basic principles, familiar to all tax practitioners.

Over the years application of the capital expenditure limitation to specific types of expenses has been highlighted at one time or another. Court decisions or revenue rulings have eliminated debate as to tax treatment for some types of expenses. But taking character from the complexities of life of the business Nation, the capital expenditure limitation will continue to provoke disputes as it is applied to different expenses under varying circumstances.

Expenses relating to corporate reorganization

One of the more interesting current questions in connection with capital items is whether expenses relating to the issuance of stock dividends should be treated as capital in nature or as ordinary and necessary expenses.

Notwithstanding that the controlling provisions have been in the tax law since its inception, the Service ruled formally on the question for the first time in 1960.[42] The stock dividend expense issue thus illustrates the uncertain application of the law to very common types of expenses. It is indeed surprising that an issue of this sort could have gone unanswered throughout the years.

By way of background, it has for some time been fairly well settled that expenses paid or incurred in organizing[43] or reorganizing a corporation are capital in nature, and thus not deductible as ordinary and necessary expenses.[44] Moreover, it was also fairly clearly established in a long line of early court decisions that corporate expenses in issuing its stock are not deductible as ordinary and necessary expenses.[45] The basis for these holdings is that expenses relating to corporate organizations, or alterations of structure through reorganizations or recapi-

Footnotes at end of speech.

talizations, primarily benefit the corporation for its indefinite future.

In the opinion of the IRS the effect of a stock dividend is similar. It alters the corporate structure for the future benefit of the corporation by increasing the amount of permanent capital through transfer from earned surplus account to capital account. The IRS so ruled in 1960, holding that expenses relating to the issuance of a stock dividend are capital in nature, and not deductible as "ordinary and necessary" expenses.[46] The ruling was immediately protested. Several taxpayers, after receiving notices of deficiencies, filed petitions in the tax court. The tax court, however, upheld the Commissioner.[47] And, on appeal the Fifth, Sixth, and Eighth Circuits affirmed.[48] Hence, this particular issue would now appear to be put to rest, but it stands as an excellent example of the uncertain and controversial nature of the "ordinary and necessary" provision.

EXPENSES CONNECTED WITH ILLEGAL OR IMPROPER ACTIVITY

Certain court decisions stand for the flat proposition that it is not ordinary, or at least not necessary, to violate the law or commit an improper act while carrying on a trade or business. In National Outdoor Advertising,[49] the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit stated that the law will not recognize the necessity of engaging in illegal activity in the conduct of a business. Similarly, in Sarah Backer,[50] the Board of Tax Appeals stated:

"We are not willing to concede that the carrying on of business in the ordinary manner * * * under the Government of the United States, is necessarily accompanied by the commission of illegal acts or by the accusation of the commission of such acts whereby business men are subjected at least to the charge of the commission of crimes. We doubt if businessmen generally would concede that bribery and lying are ordinary and necessary business acts. If they are not, then the cost of bribes and lies are not ordinary and necessary business costs.

This philosophy, if applied rigidly, would mean that expenses which arise out of illegal or improper activity are not deductible. Indeed, to many persons, as a question of first impression, this is a reasonable and correct result. However, no matter what one might conclude as a matter of first impression, it appears too late to argue today that an expense cannot under any circumstances be ordinary and necessary in the generally accepted sense simply for the reason that it is improper in itself or is incurred in connection with illegal or improper activity. The clear weight of judicial opinion has not supported this line of thinking.

In *Commissioner* v. *Heininger*,[51] the taxpayer was engaged in a mail order business. He sold false teeth which were ordered, delivered, and paid for by mail. The Postmaster General found that the taxpayer's advertisements were misleading, and issued a civil fraud order directing that all letters addressed to the taxpayer be marked "fraudulent" and returned to the senders. The Supreme Court held that legal fees incurred by the taxpayer resisting the mail fraud order were deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses. In so holding, the Court said:

"[The Government's] argument is that dentists in the mail order business do not ordinarily and necessarily attempt to sell false teeth by fraudulent representations as to their quality; that respondent was found by the Postmaster General to have attempted to sell his products in this manner; and that therefore the litigation expenses, which he would not have incurred but for this attempt, cannot themselves be deemed ordinary and necessary. We think that this reasoning, though plausible, is unsound in that it fails to take into account the circumstances under which respondent incurred the litigation expenses. * * * Upon being served with notice of the proposed fraud order respondent was confronted with a new business problem which involved far more than the right to continue using his old advertisements. He was placed in a position in which not only his selling methods but also the continued existence of his lawful business were threatened with complete destruction. So far as appears from the record respondent did not believe, nor under our system of jurisprudence was he bound to believe, that a fraud order destroying his business was justified by the facts or the law. Therefore he did not voluntarily abandon the business but defended it by all available legal means. To say that this course of conduct and the expenses which it involved were extraordinary or unnecessary would be to ignore the ways of conduct and the forms of speech prevailing in the business world."[52]

In *Commissioner* v. *Sullivan*,[53] a taxpayer claimed a deduction for wages and rent paid in carrying on a gambling enterprise which was illegal under State law. The Commissioner disallowed a deduction for these expenses. The Supreme Court, however, held that these expenses, even though incurred in carrying on an illegal business, were deductible. The Court expressly stated that "the amounts paid as wages to employees and to the landlord as rent are 'ordinary and necessary' expenses in the accepted meaning of the words."[54]

The IRS and the lower courts, similarly, have allowed deductions for legal expenses in defending against malpractice, fraud, and breach of fiduciary duty as ordinary and necessary business expenses.[55]

This does not mean that a tax deduction will in all cases be allowed for illegal or improper expenses, or for expenses arising out of illegal or improper activity. But it does mean that the test of deductibility is not a flat rule of disallowance merely because the expense is not ethically or morally proper.

Rather, in determining whether an expense is "ordinary and necessary" in the generally accepted sense, the same test applies to illegal and improper expenses as applies to lawful and proper expenses. If the expense is a common and accepted cost of doing business in the taxpayer's general line of business or income producing activity, it is "ordinary" in the general accepted sense of the statutory term without regard to whether or not the expense is lawful or unlawful, moral or immoral. Similarly, if the expense is appropriate or helpful to the taxpayer in carrying on his business, it is "necessary" in the generally accepted sense of the term without regard to whether or not the expense is lawful or unlawful, moral or immoral.

As a practical matter, however, there is an understandable disposition on the part of courts and the IRS to apply these general standards strictly against the taxpayer in the case of expenses which are illegal or immoral. Thus, in Nicholas D. Wusich,[56] the Tax Court upheld the Commissioner's disallowance of a deduction for payments by a bank manager to a bonding company in satisfaction of liability arising out of his fraudulent use of bank funds. The Tax Court said that "it does not seem to us ordinary for a bank manager to defraud his employer." And in Sanford Reffett,[57] the Tax Court upheld the Commissioner in disallowing a deduction for payments made by a taxpayer to witnesses for testifying on his behalf in a judicial action. The Tax Court said:

"Payment of contingent witness fees such as those that Reffett paid to Slaughter and Toney is not in our experience the common and accepted means used by a coal operator or any other person in prosecuting an action for damages to his business. * * * Regardless of the propriety of such an agreement or the public policy involved, we do not think such payments can be considered ordinary in any sense of the word * * *. Payment of such fees would, in our opinion, be not only unique to Reffett but would also 'be unique in the life of the group, the community, of which he is a part.'"

The same viewpoint was expressed in R. W. Lashels Est.[58] when the Tax Court disallowed a deduction for certain so-called commissions secretly paid to a purchasing agent with whom the taxpayer did business. The Tax Court found that:

"These payments were made secretly and their existence was not known to (the purchasing agent's) employers. The payments were made in cash and no receipts were executed. Such payments were not ordinary; they were not normal, usual, or customary in the business world, or in the type of business in which the company was engaged."

THE PUBLIC POLICY LIMITATION

Introduction

Expenses which are illegal or improper in themselves, or are connected with illegal or improper activity have also been disallowed on the ground that it would frustrate public policy to allow the deduction. Indeed, in general, the courts have tended to base the justification for disallowance of expenses which are connected with illegal or improper activity on public policy grounds rather than on straightforward construction of the phrase "ordinary and necessary" in the generally accepted sense.

For example, in *Tank Truck Rentals* v. *Commissioner*,[59] the Supreme Court held that fines paid by a trucking company for violations of State maximum highway weight laws were not deductible. However, the Court did not disallow the deduction on the ground that it is never ordinary nor necessary to violate the law. In fact, the Court recognized that violations of the maximum weight laws were a widespread and common practice in the trucking industry and that the taxpayer trucking company would have been at a serious competitive disadvantage if it did not deliberately violate the highway weight law in the normal operation of its business. The Supreme Court rested its decision that the fines paid by the trucking company were nevertheless not deductible on the ground that it would frustrate public policy to allow a deduction for such penalties.

For similar decisions by the lower courts, see *Burroughs Building Material Company* v. *Commissioner*,[60] holding penalties and legal expenses arising out of violations of law not deductible, Frank A. Maddas,[61] holding bribes to corrupt public officials to avoid interference with illegal business not deductible, and Israel Silberman,[62] holding rent and wages incurred in carrying on an illegal business not deductible, all on grounds of public policy.

The public policy limitation is by no means, however, a fixed and certain rule. On the contrary, as indicated earlier in this article, it is one of the cloudiest principles of Federal income taxation. Before delving into the problem in depth, it is appropriate to give credit to the English Bench, which gave the United States fair warning of what it would be up against if it attempted to articulate a rule of law based on public policy.

In *Inland Revenue Commissioners* v. *Von Glehn*,[63] in 1920 Lord Justice Scrutton, when asked whether a taxpayer could deduct penalties under the British Income Tax Acts, said:

"It seems to me that the obvious answer is 'Of course he cannot.' But * * * when one comes to state the reasons why that obvious answer should be given perhaps it is not so easy as saying 'Of course he cannot.'"

In a similar vein, Justice Burrough[64] 100 years earlier had said:

Footnotes at end of speech.

"I, for one, protest as my Lord has done, against arguing too strongly upon public policy—it is a very unruly horse, and when once you get astride it you never know where it will carry you."

General maxims

No matter what other uncertainties may be present so far as the public policy limitation is concerned, however, two maxims appear firmly established. One is the general principle itself that an expense, even though ordinary and necessary in the generally accepted sense, is not deductible "if allowance of the deduction would frustrate sharply defined national or State policies proscribing particular types of conduct, evidenced by some government declaration thereof." [66] The Supreme Court clearly adopted and applied this general principle in 1958 in the case of *Tank Truck Rentals* v. *Commissioner* [66] and, in so doing, rejected what until then had been a point of view held by many that there is no basis, under existing statutory law, for the disallowance of "ordinary and necessary" business expenses on the ground of public policy.[67]

A second precept, which has been expressed and applied by the Supreme Court, is that the Federal income tax is a tax on "net income," not gross income or gross receipts.[68]

These two principles are necessarily at the center of any current analysis of the public policy limitation.

The Supreme Court held that the first principle governed in the case of *Tank Truck Rentals* v. *Commissioner*. This was the case, mentioned above in which the Supreme Court held that fines paid by a trucking company for violating highway maximum weight laws were not deductible. The Court said:

"We will not presume that the Congress, in allowing deductions for income tax purposes, intended to encourage a business enterprise to violate the declared policy of a State. To allow the deduction sought here would but encourage continued violations of State law by increasing the odds in favor of noncompliance. This could only tend to destroy the effectiveness of the State's maximum weight laws.

"Certainly the frustration of State policy is most complete and direct when the expenditure for which deduction is sought is itself prohibited by statute * * * If the expenditure is not itself an illegal act, but rather the payment of a penalty imposed by the State because of such an act, as in the present case, the frustration attendant upon deduction would be only slightly less remote, and would clearly fall within the line of disallowance. Deduction of fines and penalties uniformly has been held to frustrate State policy in severe and direct fashion by reducing the 'sting' of the penalty prescribed by the State legislature." [69]

On the same day, the Supreme Court in *Sullival* v. *Commissioner* considered the question whether payments for rent and employee salaries in the conduct of a gambling enterprise in violation of State law were deductible. In sharp contrast to its decision in *Tank Truck Rentals* the Court held these latter payments were deductible, saying:

"If we enforce as Federal policy the rule espoused by the Commissioner in this case, we would come close to making this type of business taxable on the basis of its gross receipts, while all other business would be taxable on the basis of net income. If that choice is to be made, Congress should do it." [70]

Here, then, we see the clash of two competing doctrines. If it would frustrate State law to allow a Federal tax deduction for fines or penalties paid for violation of State law, why would it not also frustrate State law to allow deductions for major operating expenses incurred for the purpose of violating State law?

There are certain disturbing inconsistencies—perhaps irreconcilable—in these two decisions by the Supreme Court, although attempts at reconciliation have been drawn.[71] Reconcilable or not, it is clear under these two decision of the Supreme Court that the public policy standard of deductibility must strike a balance.

The Supreme Court in tank truck rentals said:

"This is not to say that the rule as to frustration of sharply defined National or State policies is to be viewed or applied in any absolute sense. 'It has never been thought * * * that the mere fact that an expenditure bears a remote relation to an illegal act makes it nondeductible.' * * * Although each case must turn on its own facts * * * the test of nondeductibility always is the severity and immediacy of the frustration resulting from allowance of the deduction. The flexibility of such a standard is necessary if we are to accommodate both the congressional intent to tax only net income, and the presumption against congressional intent to encourage violation of declared public policy." [72]

To accommodate both of these objectives is a tall order. Many cases obviously will be decided on an ad hoc basis on the basis of specific facts, and will not always be reconcilable with other decisions. The decisions of the courts nevertheless give us certain criteria for applying the standard of accommodation, that should prove helpful in reaching a somewhat orderly, general result.

Principles accommodating net income doctrine

There are three broad principles which accommodate the concept that the Federal income tax is a tax on net income, not gross income or gross receipts, and thus that expenses which are ordinary and necessary in the generally accepted sense cannot be disallowed merely because they appear morally improper:

(1) The mere fact that an expenditure arises out of, or is incurred in connection with, an illegal or undesirable activity, or is incurred for an illegal purpose, does not make it nondeductible. This is true even though allowance of the deduction may arguably frustrate public policy.

(2) The public policy alleged to be frustrated must be "sharply defined—evidenced by some Government declaration thereof," and

(3) The frustration of a sharply defined public policy through allowance of a tax deduction must be severe and immediate.

These three principles in themselves make the frustration doctrine a limited one in application, and thus accommodate the net income doctrine.

The principle that an expense will not be disallowed on grounds of public policy merely because it is connected with illegal or improper activity follows a fortiorari from the holding of the Supreme Court in Sullivan that normal operating expenses of an illegal business are deductible.

This conclusion is, of course, consistent with that drawn above that expenses will not be disallowed under the ordinary and necessary standard in the generally accepted sense, simply for the reason that they are illegal or improper or arise out of illegal or improper activities.[73]

A similar concept enunciated by the Supreme Court in *Heininger*,[74] and referred to by the Court in both *Tank Truck Rentals* and *Sullivan*, is that the mere fact that an expenditure bears a "remote relation" to an illegal act does not make it nondeductible. The decision in *Sullivan*, however, would appear to indicate that the "remote relation" concept is of little practical value today. It is not sufficiently flexible to accommodate the "net income" principle. It is difficult to characterize everyday operating expenses of an illegal business as bearing merely a "remote relation" to illegal activity. In view of the *Sullivan* decision, the standard which will accommodate the "net income" principle must be more liberal than the so-called remote relation test.

Supreme Court decisions limit frustration doctrine

The Supreme Court has considered seven cases involving deductions for expenses, arguably "ordinary and necessary" in the generally accepted sense, but questioned on grounds of public policy.

These seven decisions are *Sullivan* v. *Commissioner*,[75] *Textile Mills Corp.* v. *Commissioner*,[76] *Cammarano* v. *United States*,[77] *Tank Truck Rentals, Inc.* v. *Commissioner*,[78] *Hoover Express Co.* v. *United States*,[79] *Lilly* v. *Commissioner*,[80] and *Commissioner* v. *Heininger*.[81] Some of these decisions have been mentioned earlier in this article. It is important that they also be read together. These decisions, when read together, would appear to severely limit application of the frustration doctrine. The Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, indeed, has concluded that "absent an express ruling by the Supreme Court on this issue, we are of the opinion that the tendency of that Court is to limit the effect of the frustration doctrine." [82]

In *Sullivan* v. *Commissioner*, already discussed above, the Court in effect held that the "net income" doctrine overrides the "frustration" doctrine in the case of everyday operating expenses (such as wages and rent) of an illegal business. The Court held such expenses were deductible when "ordinary and necessary" in the generally accepted sense. In this decision the Supreme Court rejected a line of lower court holdings that the allowance of a deduction for operating expenses of an illegal business would violate public policy.[83] It rejected the rationale of the Tax Court for broader use of the "frustration" doctrine:

"The fact that an expenditure is directly related to the production of income does not automatically qualify it as deductible * * *. The record in this case establishes that the payments in question constituted the illegitimate expenses of an illegitimate business * * * [t[he criminal code of the State of Illinois * * * not only makes the conduct of a bookmaking establishment illegal but also provides that employees who assist in the conduct of such business by recording bets are equally guilty of the commission of an illegal act * * * [t[he payment of the wages in question in and of itself constituted an illegal act.

"The wages paid by petitioner were paid to procure the direct aid of others in the perpetration of an illegal act; namely, the operation of a bookmaking establishment. Certainly, it would be a clear violation of public policy to permit the deduction of an expenditure, the making of which constitutes an illegal act.

"We recognize that the disallowance of the instant expenditure may be almost tantamount to taxing petitioner on his gross rather than his net income. But it is axiomatic that deductions are a matter of legislative grace. *New Colonial Company* v. *Helvering* (4 USTC, sec. 1292) 292 U.S. 435 (1934); *Deputy* v. *du Pont* (40–1 USTC, sec. 9161) 308 U.S. 488 (1940); *Detroit Edison Co.* v. *Commissioner* (42–2 USTC, sec. 9778) 131 F. 2d 619 (C.A. 6, 1942), aff'd (43–1 USTC, sec. 9418) 319 U.S. 98. Whether a taxpayer's business is a legal or an illegal one, it is inconceivable that he should be permitted a deduction for amounts spent to procure the commission of an act outlawed by a State statute." [84]

In Textile Mills and Cammarano the Supreme Court held that expenses incurred for lobbying purposes or to influence legislation were not deductible. However, it is difficult to conclude that these decisions add any strength to the "frustration" doctrine. Since

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

1915, Treasury regulations have contained provisions denying deductions for expenses incurred for lobbying purposes. In both Textile Mills and Cammarano the Court based its opinion on these Treasury regulations. In Cammarano, the Court stated explicitly that the regulatory language, then of more than 40 years' duration, had been repeatedly reenacted by Congress without the slightest suggestion that they did not conform to congressional intent. The doctrine of legislative reenactment is of course a familiar concept making Treasury regulations a rule of law. Against the background of these circumstances, the Court in Cammarano said that the Regulations themselves constituted an expression of sharply defined national policy.

In the companion cases of Tank Truck Rentals and Hoover Express the Court held that fines paid for violating State laws prescribing maximum trucking weights on highways were not deductible, without regard to whether the violation was willful or innocent. Prior to these decisions, the lower courts [85] had articulated and applied a public policy limitation on deductions for "ordinary and necessary" expenses, but the Supreme Court had not clearly done so.[86] Thus the Tank Truck Rentals and Hoover Express decisions constitute the cornerstone of the "frustration" doctrine.

Nevertheless, it is debatable whether these two decisions give the "frustration" doctrine much strength for application beyond the precise holding of the decisions themselves that penalties for violation of statutory law are not deductible. Fines or penalties are unique. They are a punitive measure imposed by National, State, or local declaration for violations of governmental policy. It is obvious that the immediate effect of allowing a tax deduction for the fine or penalty imposed by statute is to reduce the direct punitive cost to the violator.

As the Supreme Court stated in Tank Truck Rentals, "deduction of fines and penalties uniformly has been held to frustrate State policy in severe and direct fashion by reducing the 'sting' of the penalty prescribed by the State legislature." Accordingly, even though some may criticize [87] the rule, the rationale behind the disallowance concept is easy to grasp, and readily understandable.

It is not, however, very easy to (1) draw out from the rule that fines and penalties are not deductible a logical principle for disallowance of other types of expenses and at the same time (2) accommodate the rule of the Sullivan decision that the income tax is a tax on net income, and not a tax on gross income or gross receipts.

In the remaining two of these seven decisions, the Supreme Court rejected the position of the IRS—and indeed that also of the Tax Court—that the expenses involved were not deductible on the ground that it would contravene public policy to allow deductions. In the first of these two decisions, *Lilly* v. *Commissioner*, the Court allowed a deduction for so-called kickback payments made by opticians to doctors who referred patients to them. The "kickback" payments were not illegel under applicable State law. The policy alleged to be frustrated by allowance of a tax deduction was not as sharply defined as it was in the cases involving lobbying expenses and the fines and penalties.

In the second of these two last cases out of the seven, *Commissioner* v. *Heininger*, although the policy was sharply defined, the immediacy of the frustration was not as obvious as in the cases involving lobbying expenses and the fines and penalties. In Heininger, as mentioned earlier in this article, the Postmaster General had found that the taxpayer, who was engaged in a mail order business, was using the mails for misleading advertising purposes. The Court allowed a deduction for legal fees incurred by the taxpayer in an unsuccessful effort to enjoin the Postmaster General from issuing a civil mail fraud order, saying:

"The single policy of [the sections of the statute under which the Postmaster General issued the fraud order] is to protect the public from fraudulent practices committed through the use of the mails. It is not their policy to impose personal punishment on violators; such punishment is provided by separate statute, and can be imposed only in a judicial proceeding in which the accused has the benefit of constitutional and statutory safeguards appropriate to trial for a crime. Nor is it their policy to deter persons accused of violating their terms from employing counsel to assist in presenting a bona fide defense to a proposed fraud order. It follows that to allow the deduction of respondent's litigation expenses would not frustrate the policy of these statutes; and to deny the deduction would attach a serious punitive consequence to the Postmaster General's finding which Congress has not expressly or impliedly indicated should result from such a finding." [88]

Principles accommodating "frustration" doctrine

Three categories of expenses are frequently described as not allowable on public policy grounds. These are (1) expenses which are in themselves illegal or improper, (2) penalties and similar punitive sanctions imposed for violations of law, and (3) attorneys' fees and similar costs incurred in unsuccessful defense against charges of violations of law. These three categories are useful guideposts for applying the "frustration" doctrine.

Expenses Illegal or Malum in Se

It is necessary to distinguish expenses which are themselves illegal under statutory provision from expenses which are not prohibited by statute but are generally regarded as immoral or improper in themselves.

Expenses prohibited by statute: It apparently is now established that expenses [89]—other than normal, everyday expenses such as rent and wages [90]—which are themselves prohibited by statute are not deductible under the frustration doctrine. The Supreme Court in Tank Truck Rentals said that frustration of State or National policy is "most complete and direct when the expenditure for which deduction is sought is itself prohibited by statute." [91] As an example of this type of expense, the Court cited, and would appear to have approved, the holding of the Tax Court in Boyle, Flagg & Seaman, Inc.,[92] that an insurance agency could not deduct "kick-back" type payments to automobile dealers which referred persons to the agency when state law prohibited such payments to anyone other than a licensed insurance agent.

Other lower courts, subsequent to the Tank Truck Rentals decision, have recognized the principle that expenses which are in themselves prohibited by law are not deductible. In *Dixie Machine Welding & Metal Works, Inc.* v. *United States*,[93] the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit found that "kick back" type payments made by a ship repair company to ship officers on ships—made without the knowledge and consent of the shipowners—violated State commercial bribery laws. The Court held the payments were not deductible. It rested its decision on Tank Truck Rentals, and distinguished Sullivan. See also Basil Christodoulou [94] and McGraw Edison Co.[95]

It is not a wholly satisfying result that the major operating of expenses of an illegal business incurred for an illegal purpose are deductible (under the "net income" doctrine of Sullivan) but incidental costs of doing business in illegal manner, such as bribes to secure protection from corrupt public officials and commercial kick-backs, are not deductible if prohibited specifically by law (under the "frustration" doctrine). This will likely remain a point for dispute until the courts speak more specifically on the issue, or definitive legislation is enacted.

Pending a decision by the Supreme Court or specific legislation, the rationale for distinguishing tax treatment for these expenses has been described as a test of "integrality." The Seventh Circuit in *Commissioner* v. *Doyle* [96] put it this way:

"We construe the statutory words 'ordinary and necessary expenses' to mean those expenses which economically are an integral part of a business, whether it be lawful or unlawful. Integrality is the test. Disbursements which fail to meet this test, although they may be concomitants to the business as operated by some persons, are not ordinary and necessary expenses thereof within the meaning of section 23(a). We exclude and, therefore, hold as nondeductible, expenses which are not an integral part of a business. In this class fall bribes paid to public officers, fines and penalties imposed for violations of Federal or State statute, expenses for certain types of lobbying and political pressure activities, payments to an influential party precinct captain, in order to obtain a State printing contract and other similar disbursement." [97]

Expenses malum in se: There is an obvious analogy between expenses specifically prohibited by statute and expenses which, although not prohibited by statute, are in themselves generally regarded as contrary to the best public interest. If it severely and immediately frustrates public policy to allow a deduction for the former, it is difficult to see why it would not equally frustrate public policy to allow a deduction for the latter.

There is, however, one significant distinguishing factor. In the case of expenses which are prohibited by statute, the State or National policy is clearly evidenced by statute provision. In the case of expenses not prohibited by statute but "generally regarded" as against the public interest, it is not as clear that a particular expense is in fact contrary to State or National policy. It is necessary to ask whether the policy alleged to be frustrated is "sharply defined," evidenced by governmental declaration.

Over the years, a number of lower court decisions have held expenses which, even though not declared illegal by statute, are incurred to secure political or other special influence affecting governmental activity are not deductible on the ground that such expenses are in themselves contrary to public policy.

For example, it has been held that so-called commissions paid by a taxpayer to close personal friends of State officials who used personal influence to secure State contracts for the taxpayer were not deductible.[98] Similarly, it has been held that payments by a taxpayer engaged in illegal activity for "protection" against raids and arrests by law enforcement officials [99] and that expenses of entertaining public officials [1] are not deductible. It has also been held that payments in the nature of bribes to avoid labor disputes [2] and payments to an employee of a contracting party, with whom taxpayer was doing business, for furnishing special information which enabled taxpayer to secure a contract,[3] are not deductible.

In view of the "frustration doctrine," as defined by the Supreme Court in Heininger, Lilly, and Tank Truck Rentals, the validity of this line of lower court decisions presents an intriguing and very debatable question.

Was a "sharply defined public policy evidenced by government declaration" involved in the case of the so-called commissions paid to obtain influence with government officials or in the case of the bribes to avoid labor disputes? There may well have been, of course; but the courts did not mention any

Footnotes at end of speech.

statute, ordinance or other government declaration as being involved. Do these lower court opinions represent sound law today? When is public policy sharply defined? When is public policy evidenced by governmental declaration?

These questions pose a dilemma for the IRS. The Service is, of course, charged with enforcing the tax laws, and with protecting the revenue. It does not want to, nor can it, ignore these lower court decisions. But may the Service properly deny deductions for expenses simply on the basis of these decisions in the face of the "net income" doctrine and the limited construction of the frustration doctrine as applied by the Supreme Court?

In addition, arguably, the Sullivan decision raises the question of whether governmental declarations proscribing types of conduct may be in any form other than legislation or formal regulations.[4] However, until that issue is clearly resolved by the courts, it seems proper, from the administrative point of view, to assume that governmental declarations of policy may include directives or statements not having the full official dignity of legislation or a regulation. In this connection, see Revenue Ruling 62-133,[5] holding a Federal Trade Commission news release to be a governmental declaration of sharply defined public policy.

Entertainment of public officials: The decisions involving entertainment of public officials probably put the issue in clearest focus.

The courts have apparently denied a deduction for expenses for entertaining public officials in every case in which the specific exemption has been considered.

In Raymond F. Flanagan,[6] the taxpayer's business included selling slag and similar products to counties and towns in the State of New York. The taxpayer entertained county and town officials, primarily at parties in hotels and nightclubs. The Board found as fact that it was customary for salesmen in the taxpayer's line of business to entertain county and town officials, that the taxpayer did not personally entertain these public officials to influence them, but that the taxpayer believed he would suffer competitive disadvantage if he defied this long-established practice. The Board held nevertheless that the taxpayer was not entitled to deduct his costs of entertaining ($3,000 to $4,000 a year) the county and town officials, saying:

"Such entertainment of public officials who necessarily have a direct or indirect relation to the contracts which petitioner seeks, is, speaking generally, commonly regarded as contrary to the public interest. It is as much against public policy as expenditures to influence legislation; and such expenditures have been consistently denied deductibility, irrespective of the absence in the concrete case of a venal motive."

In Cecil I. Haas[7] the taxpayers (husband and wife) engaged in the manufacture and sale of solidified alcohol. Their customers included the U.S. Government, and during the taxable year 1944 they entertained Government representatives at lunch (the cost averaged $3 per lunch) and at dinner (the cost averaged $5 per dinner). The Tax Court, citing the Flanagan decision as authority, disallowed a deduction for these lunch and dinner expenses, saying merely:

"[O]n petitioners' own statement some part of the claimed expenditures was for entertainment of Government employees and hence nondeductible as being contrary to sound public policy."

In James A. Gleason[8] and Riss & Co., Inc.[9] the Tax Court also denied deductions for expenses incurred for entertainment of public officials.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Do Supreme Court decisions require a more flexible result? The decisions of the Supreme Court indicate that the legal test governing deductions in this area may be something different from the flat rule of the Flanagan line of cases. It should be kept in mind, however, that none of these Supreme Court decisions involve the precise question of deductibility of expenses incurred in "entertainment" of public officials, and are perhaps distinguishable on that ground alone.[10]

In *Lilly* v. *Commissioner*, as mentioned earlier in this article, the taxpayers (engaged in the optical business) claimed income tax deductions for so-called kick-back payments made to doctors who had referred patients to them. When the issue of deductibility of these "kick-back" payments was presented to the Tax Court the court disallowed a deduction in an opinion reviewed by the court. The Tax Court apparently viewed the public policy test as one of broad application for tax purposes. The Tax Court said:

"Public policy is defined as the public good. Everything that tends clearly to undermine that sense of security of individual rights, whether of personal liberty or private property, which any citizen ought to feel, is against public policy.

"Petitioners argue that, since there is no constitutional or statutory provision, State, or Federal, and no canon of ethics of a medical association specifically condemning this 'kick-back' practice by opticians to oculists, no public policy exists proscribing such practice and therefore none is violated * * *. The absence of constitutional or statutory law or rules of professional conduct condemning this particular practice is not enough to support petitioner's position. Decisions of the courts can and do evidence public policy.

"It must be remembered that the fundamental principle with which we are dealing here is not that of the relationship between the parties to an ordinary commercial transaction. We are concerned in this case with the relationship between physicians and their patients. There can be no doubt of the exceedingly high degree of confidence and trust inherent in that relationship." [11]

This line of thinking—which emphasizes the fundamental element of high trust inherent in situations which involve the public good and which holds expenses which might tend to undermine that trust to be nondeductible for Federal income tax purposes—would seem equally applicable to the tax treatment of expenses for entertaining public officials. Or, to put it another way, the direction of thinking of the Tax Court in Lilly may be considered identical to the thinking of the Board of Tax Appeals in Flanagan.

The Court of Appeals for Fourth Circuit affirmed the Tax Court in Lilly. However, on writ of certiorari, the Supreme Court held that the "kickback" payments were deductible, reversing both lower court decisions. The Supreme Court stated:

"Assuming for the sake of argument that, under some circumstances, business expenditures which are ordinary and necessary in the generally accepted meanings of those words may not be deductible as 'ordinary and necessary' expenses under § 23(a)(1)(A) when they 'frustrate sharply defined national or State policies proscribing particular types of conduct,' supra, nevertheless the expenditures now before us do not fall in that class. The policies frustrated must be national or State policies evidenced by some governmental declaration of them. In 1943 and 1944 [the taxable years involved in Lilly] there were no such declared public policies proscribing the payments which were made by petitioners to the doctors." [12]

It may be argued that the Supreme Court in Lilly restricted the rule of the Flanagan case, and permits a deduction for expenses in the public policy area which on the reading alone of earlier decisions of the Supreme Court, such as Textile Mills and Heininger,[13] might have been assumed nondeductible, and in line with Flanagan. In *Tank Truck Rentals* v. *Commissioner*, the Supreme Court confirmed the principle that the policies frustrated must be evidenced by some governmental declaration of them.[14]

Penalties

Punitive payments: It now appears well established that punitive fines or penalties paid to local, State, or Federal Governments after conviction for violation of regulatory statutes (whether criminal or civil) are not deductible. This principle accommodates the "frustration" doctrine, and is based on the theory that it would immediately and severely frustrate clearly defined public policy to allow a deduction which would reduce the "sting" of the punishment.[15] And this is true, whether or not the violation of the law giving rise to the penalty was willful or inadvertent.[16]

It has also been held that payments in satisfaction of punitive penalties, under settlement agreement or consent judgment, are not deductible.[17] This result seems correct since otherwise it would be an easy matter to make form control over substance.

Damage payments are not clearly punitive: Controversial and difficult questions remain, however, in determining the deductibility of payments which are in the nature of penalties, but are not clearly punitive in nature. Questions arise whether statutory damages, imposed for violation of law, are punitive in nature (nondeductible under the "frustration" doctrine) or are intended for nonpunitive purposes and, if the latter, to what extent such costs may fall nevertheless within the reach of the "frustration" doctrine.

Costs arising out of violations of the law may be essentially remedial measures for the benefit of injured parties rather than punitive measures directed against the violator. If remedial in nature, it is very questionable whether it would "immediately and severely" frustrate statutory policy to allow the violator a tax deduction for the remedial payment.

Damage payments arising out of violations of the antitrust laws illustrate the difficult questions involved.

Treble damages for private injury: As most tax practitioners will be aware, the IRS in July of this year ruled that amounts paid or incurred in satisfaction of treble damage claims under section 4 of the Clayton Act[18] are deductible as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses.[19]

The ruling has, understandably, been criticized by those who view the antitrust treble damage provision of the Clayton Act as punitive in nature. For example, in a joint statement, Senator HART, chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, and Representative CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and of its Antitrust Subcommittee, criticized the ruling:

"This ruling would lessen the treble damage penalty Congress has established by law in private antitrust suits. By allowing tax relief for the damages, IRS seems to have lowered the penalty to double damages, at most, instead of the treble damages which Congress has provided to punish the violators and to deter others from antitrust violations. The ruling is likely to hamper effective antitrust enforcement both by mitigating the penalties which Congress has prescribed and by its tacit assumption that a hard-core criminal price-fixing conspiracy is 'ordinary and necessary business.'

"Moreover—and of greater concern to all American taxpayers—this ruling would constitute a tax giveaway to corporations which are found guilty of criminal antitrust violations at the expense of the taxpaying public.

"The ruling would mean the loss of millions of tax dollars to the Government. For example, in private suits for treble damages growing out of the electrical equipment price-fixing conspiracies, judgments may be expected to total more than a quarter of a billion dollars, not including attorney's fees and court costs which also would be deductible under this new ruling—or $350 to $400 million all told by conservation estimate. Under the ruling, half of this amount would be lost to the public treasury through income tax deductions against current earnings of the corporations involved.

"Finally, the new ruling appears flatly contrary to existing law as declared by the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts. Accordingly, this ruling seems most unfortunate both as a matter of law and from the viewpoint of tax and antitrust policy." [20]

The IRS gave all of these issues thorough consideration before issuing the ruling. It may, in fact, be appropriate in this connection, to paraphrase the words of Lord Justice Scrutton.[21] When the Service initially considered the question of whether treble damages under section 4 of the Clayton Act were deductible, the offhand reaction by most Service officials appeared to be "of course, they are not." However the more thorough the study of the question became, the more difficult it was to find the legal justification for that answer.

The central question is whether treble damages payable under section 4 of the Clayton Act are punitive in nature. A punitive measure has been described, in this context, as punishment inflicted by Government upon those who commit acts which violate the fixed public policy of the sovereign,[22] intended to deter the acts proscribed.[23]

The legislative history indicates that a purpose of the treble damage provision was to encourage private parties that had been injured, through violations of the antitrust laws, to bring actions which—even though private—would "serve the public interest in the enforcement of the antitrust laws." [24]

Similarly, the courts have characterized the treble damage provision as an incentive to injured parties to aid the Government in enforcing the antitrust laws.[25]

If one of the purposes of the treble damage provision is to aid the Government in enforcement of the antitrust law, it could well, of course, be concluded that the treble damage provision is essentially a measure to deter persons from violating the antitrust laws. If intended as a deterrent, it would then follow that the purpose of the law would be frustrated by reducing the force and effect of the deterrent if tax deductions were permitted for damage payments. This, it could well be argued, should logically follow whether or not the treble damage provisions were a penalty in the strict sense of the word. Cutting sharply across that rationale, however, was evidence that the recognized purpose of the treble damages provision was remedial in nature; that it was intended to facilitate redress of private wrongs rather than to deter public wrong.

The Supreme Court has described the treble damage provision of the antitrust laws as a "remedial provision * * * for redress of injuries," [26] and as "a right of action * * * granted to redress private injury." [27] Also, the Supreme Court has referred to the treble damage provisions as a measure to redress private injury while referring to the statutory criminal provisions as the measure to "vindicate the public interest." [28] One of the sponsors of the Clayton Act, Congressman Webb, stated that the treble damage provision "opens the door of justice to every man, whomever may be injured by those who violate the antitrust laws, and gives the injured party ample damages for the wrong suffered." [29]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Moreover, the courts and the IRS over the years have drawn a clear distinction between (1) damage payments, even though in the nature of penalties in the broad sense, which constitute reparation of private injury and (2) payments which are penalties, in the strict sense, for punishment of an offense against the public.[30] In this respect, the courts have distinguished damage payments resulting from wrongdoing against private parties, which are generally deductible if incurred in the course of business,[31] and payments to a Government entity for offenses against the public, which are not deductible.[32]

In addition, the Service itself had ruled in 1943—an established precedent of some 20 years' standing—that treble damage payments to a private party resulting from violation of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 [33] were deductible.[34]

In many respects the treble damage provision of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and the treble damage provision of the antitrust laws are closely analogous. In both cases, in the public interest the Congress had enacted statutory restrictions on commercial pricing practices, and in both cases Congress had provided a two-pronged sanction for violations of the statutory restrictions; it provided both for governmental proceedings against the violator and for private actions by injured parties for treble damages. In both cases there is legislative history that the treble damage provisions were intended to be partially remedial and partially a means of aid to the Government for enforcement of the statute. In 1943, the service had concluded that where Congress provides both for actions by injured private parties and for actions by the Government, the private actions are primarily remedial in nature. During the intervening years, there were no significant developments in the law indicating that the ruling under the Price Control Act was erroneous or that the Congress did not approve the result.

The weight of legal precedent would appear to support the deductibility of statutory treble damage payments to redress private injury, and the IRS so found.

Damages to the Government: In contrast there is authority that amounts paid as damages to the United States under section 4A of the Clayton Act or under the Federal False Claims Act are not deductible.

In *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Commissioner*,[35] a taxpayer had claimed a deduction for a payment to the United States in settlement of an action by the United States against the taxpayer for damages for oil unlawfully converted in the Teapot Dome oil and gas lease cases. The court conceded that the settlement amount represented a tort recovery by the Government, but held, nevertheless, that public policy required disallowance. Similarly, in David R. Faulk,[36] it was held that no part of the double damage payment recovered by the United States in a successful False Claims Act prosecution was allowable as a deduction to the defendant taxpayer.

Legal expenses

In general: It is well settled that expenses connected with legal proceedings may, depending upon facts and circumstances, qualify as deductible "ordinary and necessary" expenses under section 162 or 212.[37] The general tests apply. A taxpayer must show a connection between expenses of litigation and the carrying on of his trade or business or a connection between his expenses of litigation and the production of income or the conservation or maintenance of income-producing property. He must also establish that these expenses are not personal,[38] not capital,[39] and not subject to disallowance on ground of public policy.[40]

Relating to violations of law: Deductions for legal expenses connected with violations of law presents a controversial question.

Early decisions: The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in the early leading decisions of *Burroughs Building Material Co.* v. *Commissioner* and *National Outdoor Advertising Bureau* v. *Helvering* [41] had held that legal expenses incurred in defense against actions brought by a Government authority for violations of law were not deductible if the taxpayer was not successful in the litigation. This position was followed by the Eighth Circuit.[42]

In contrast, however, in *Foss* v. *Commissioner* [43] the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit had held legal fees paid or incurred in defense of actions brought by private parties were deductible, even though the defense was unsuccessful and even though the private action was based on violation of statutory law.

As a matter of first impression it might well be asked whether it should make any difference whether litigation, arising out of violations of law, is brought by governmental authority or by private party. In either case, a violtaion of law is involved. Hence, arguably, it would frustrate public policy in one instance just as much as in the other to allow deductions for legal expenses arising out of a statutory violation.

The second circuit apparently did not think it should make any difference whether the action was governmental or private. The second circuit stated flatly in its opinion in National Outdoor Advertising that its decision was in conflict with the first circuit's decision in Foss.

Heininger case reexamined: The leading court decision in this connection today is the Supreme Court opinion in *Commissioner* v. *Heininger*. In Heininger the taxpayer was engaged in mail order business. The Postmaster General determined that the taxpayer's advertisements were misleading, and issued a fraud order directing that all mail addressed to the taxpayer be marked fraudulent and returned to the senders. The taxpayer brought suit to enjoin enforcement of the mail fraud order, but was unsuccessful.

The Commissioner disallowed a claimed deduction for legal fees and related expenses incurred in connection with that unsuccessful litigation. The Board of Tax Appeals upheld the Commissioner, citing the second circuit as authority.[44]

The Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, however, reversed, indicating that, on legal principle, it was not inclined to follow the second circuit decision in National Outdoor Advertising.[45] The seventh circuit said that the allowance of a deduction for the legal fees was supported rather by the decision of the first circuit in Foss.[46] The seventh circuit, in Heininger appears to have assumed that the decisions of the first and second circuits were in conflict, and chose to follow the view of the first circuit. The Supreme Court in Heininger affirmed the seventh circuit.

It was considered by many at the time of the Supreme Court's decision in Heininger that the Supreme Court—in allowing a deduction for unsuccessful litigation costs in defense against the mail fraud order issued by the Postmaster General—had overruled the positions taken by the second and eighth circuits. It might have been said that although statutory law might forbid certain acts in themselves, public policy does not discourage persons from defending themselves against criminal prosecution or other charges based on illegal acts.

Longhorn Portland Cement case and G.C.M. 24377: A year after the Heininger decision, the Tax Court in Longhorn Portland Cement Co.[47] held that a taxpayer could deduct legal expenses incurred in connection with an unsuccessful defense of a suit brought against the taxpayer by the State of Texas for penalties on the ground that the tax-

payer had violated the Texas antitrust law. The IRS acquiesced.[48]

In the same year, the Service issued G.C.M. 24377,[49] holding that, on the basis of Heininger and Longhorn Portland Cement, legal expenses incurred by a corporation in unsuccessfully defending against criminal antitrust proceedings brought by Federal or State authority against the corporation were deductible.[50] In the same vien, the Service ruled in 1946 that legal expenses incurred in connection with the defense of a suit brought by the Price Administrator for violation of the OPA regulations were deductible.[51] Presumably in view of these IRS rulings that legal expenses incurred in defending against alleged violations of law may be deductible, whether or not the taxpayer was successful in his defense and whether or not the action was brought by governmental authority or private party, there was only limited controversy on this general point for the following several years.

Criminal versus civil actions: Notwithstanding the Heininger decision, the Longhorn Portland Cement decision, and the Service's position in G. C. M. 24377 (with respect to the deductibility of legal expenses arising out of antitrust violations), the Service and the courts tended to resist allowing deductions for legal expenses incurred in connection with violations of law. Deductions were subsequently disallowed for legal expenses arising from unsuccessful defense against criminal charges.

In 1956 the Tax Court in Thomas A. Joseph[52] held that a taxpayer could not deduct legal expenses incurred in an unsuccessful defense against criminal prosecution for subornation or perjury. In the same case the Tax Court held that the taxpayer could not deduct legal expenses in defending himself in disbarment proceedings resulting from the criminal conviction. The Tax Court drew a distinction between criminal violations and noncriminal statutory violations. The Court said it believed "that had the Supreme Court [in Heininger] been confronted with a deduction claimed for expenses incurred in defending against conviction for a crime which conviction eventuated, it would have reached a different conclusion in Heininger."

Similarly, it has been held in a line of cases that legal expenses for unsuccessful defense against criminal conviction for willful failure to file tax returns or for willful evasion of the income tax laws are not deductible.[53]

Other governmental action: In David R. Faulk[54] it was held that legal fees incurred in connection with unsuccessful defense in a civil action by the Government for penalties under the False Claims Act were not deductible.

Rev. Rul. 62-175: In view of these developments, in the IRS reviewed its position in G. C. M. 24377. It issued Rev. Rul. 62-175[55] in 1962, modifying G. C. M. 24377, and holding that legal fees and related expenses incurred in the unsuccessful defense of a criminal prosecution under the Sherman Antitrust Act were not deductible on grounds of public policy. The Service distinguished both the Heininger and the Longhorn Portland Cement cases on the ground that neither Heininger nor Longhorn Portland Cement involved criminal prosecution.[56]

Rev. Rul. 64-224: More recently in Rev. Rul. 64-224[57] the Service essentially confirmed its position that a distinction is to be drawn between legal expenses arising from civil actions and legal expenses arising from criminal actions. The Service in Rev. Rul. 64-224 went further, however, and on the basis of the David R. Faulk decision ruled that legal fees and related costs paid or incurred "in cases in which the United States is the injured party as a buyer of goods are not deductible." At the same time, the Service ruled that legal fees and related costs paid or incurred "in connection with private civil actions under Sec. 4 of the Clayton Act would not appear to frustrate any sharply defined public policy."[58]

Hence, the wheel of the law might be said to have turned full circle, notwithstanding Heininger. The rules concerning deductibility of legal fees arising out of violations of law may not be fully logical, but certain general principles appear firmly established. A distinction has been drawn between litigation involving government action and litigation involving action by private parties even though the latter may be based on violations of statutory law. If I were to draw a conclusion as to the state of the law in this area today, it would be that: legal expenses in unsuccessful defense against criminal prosecution are not deductible notwithstanding that they may be ordinary and necessary in the general sense; legal expenses in unsuccessful defense against any other actions brought by governmental authority for violation of law, are not deductible notwithstanding that they may be "ordinary and necessary" in the general sense unless taxpayer can establish that the statutory authority upon which the government action is based was not intended to impose personal punishment; and legal expenses in unsuccessful defense against actions based on violation of law, brought by private parties are deductible if taxpayers can establish that they are "ordinary and necessary" in the general accepted sense.

The "ordinary and necessary" deduction is not a simple or orderly rule of law. It involves an intricate package of court holdings, Treasury Regulations and Internal Revenue Service rulings that frequently lead to perplexing contradictions. Overlapping legislation must also be considered. Notwithstanding the host of court decisions construing the "ordinary and necessary" provisions over the years, they remain controversial. They will continue to provoke dispute over whether particular expenses are "ordinary and necessary," personal or capital in nature, or are against public policy.

For these reasons, the "ordinary and necessary" provisions may be criticized perhaps as not satisfactory. Moreover, the principle that an expense is "ordinary" if it is common and accepted in the industry in which the taxpayer is engaged may, from one viewpoint, be considered fairly liberal. Thus, an expense is "ordinary" even though it is incurred for the first and only time in the lifetime of a particular taxpayer.

On the other hand, it is worthwhile noting that, although the courts have indicated a reluctance to superimpose their judgment over that of a taxpayer on the appropriateness of a given expense, the rule that an expense to be deductible must also be "ordinary" could, and indeed has, been applied to produce restrictive results.[59] Strict application of the rule that expenses to be deductible should be commonly incurred by others in the same business could well prohibit business initiative and innovations. From the policy viewpoint, a broadsweeping provision that might discourage business and economic initiative is subject to question. In this connection, the American Law Institute has recommended that the "ordinary and necessary" provision in section 162 be eliminated for corporations, and that instead a deduction be permitted corporations for "all expenses incurred and losses sustained" subject only to limitations for capital items, dividend distributions, gifts, and public policy.[60]

Broadsweeping revisions of this order may provide a partial solution in the quest of reducing controversy, that otherwise will be unending. The alternative, presumably, is patchwork legislation, superimposed on the "ordinary and necessary" provisions.[61]

Apart from broad liberalizing revisions such as the American Law Institute proposed, however, it is difficult to conclude that, on balance, the "ordinary and necessary" provisions are not as workable as any other general rule would be in covering the vast grey area of cases which cannot be reasonably isolated and provided for by specific legislation.

---

[1] I.R.C. sec. 162(a).

[2] I.R.C. sec. 212(1) and (2).

[3] 4 Mertens, "Federal Income Taxation," ch. 25; 1 Rabkin and Johnson, "Federal Income Gift and Estate Taxation," ch. 3; 3 Research Institute of America, "Tax Coordinator," ch. L; Surrey and Warren, "Federal Income Taxation," ch. 3; 642 CCH—Standard Federal Tax Reports sec. 1300 et seq.

[4] *Welch* v. *Helvering*, 3 USTC sec. 1164, 290 U.S. 111 (1933); *Deputy* v. *DuPont*, 40-1 USTC sec. 9161, 308 U.S. 488; *Commissioner* v. *Heininger*, 44-1 USTC sec. 9109, 320 U.S. 467; *Lilly* v. *Commissioner*, 52-1 USTC sec. 9231, 343 U.S. 90. See Rev. Rul. 60-261, 1960-2 CB 42-43.

[5] See H. Rept. No. 2333, 77th Cong., 2d sess. p. 75; S. Rept. No. 1631, 77th Cong., 2d sess. p. 88; *Trust of Bingham* v. *Commissioner*, 45-2 USTC sec. 9327, 325 U.S. 365, 374; *United States* v. *Gillmore*, 63-1 USTC sec. 9285, 372 U.S. 39, 45; *Ditmars* v. *Commissioner*, 62-1 USTC sec. 9421, 302 F. 2d 481, 486 (CA-2).

[6] Cited at footnote 4.

[7] Cited at footnote 4, at p. 115.

[8] Treas. Regs. Sec. 1.162-1(a).

[9] Treas. Regs. Sec. 1.212-1(d); Trust of Bingham v. Commissioner, cited at footnote 5.

[10] CCH Dec. 9652, BTA 1106, 1110 (1937).

[11] CCH Dec. 18,790(M), 11 TCM 141, 142 (1952).

[12] Revenue Act of 1962, sec. 4, amended by Revenue Act of 1964, sec. 217.

[13] See Mortimer M. Caplin, "The Travel and Entertainment Expense Problem," 39 Taxes "The Tax Magazine" 947 (December 1961).

[14] Treas. Regs. secs. 1.274-1 through 1.274-8 set out in detail the rules which will be applied by examining agents. They are essential reading for determining the deductibility of travel, entertainment and gift expenses for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1963. See also Rev. Rul. 63-13, 1963-1 CB 69; Rev. Rul. 63-145, 1963-2 CB 86. The Service also published a series of questions and answers relating to the deductibility of travel, entertainment and gift expenses, which should prove helpful for ready general understanding of the rules. Rev. Proc. 63-4, 1963-1 CB 474; Rev. Rul. 63-144, 1963-2 CB 129.

[15] TIR 613 (July 23, 1964).

[16] 62-2 USTC sec. 9836 (DC Fla.) rev'd 63-2 USTC sec. 9841, 325 F. 2d 191 (CA-5).

[17] CCH Dec. 26,059, TC 14 (1963), rev'd 64-1 USTC sec. 9192, 326 F. 2d 878 (CA-4).

[18] The group members, including the taxpayer, were authorized to be reimbursed for their proxy solicitation costs by the New York Central stockholders. However, certain derivative suits, claiming the reimbursement to be improper, were filed and settled. The expense of $9,453 constitutes the net out-of-pocket cost to taxpayer as his share of the settlement payment.

[19] In Graham, the taxpayer claimed his deduction also under sec. 162, as an ordinary and necessary expense incurred in a trade or business, and under sec. 165, as a loss. The tax court held that the taxpayer was not entitled to a deduction under sec. 162 for the reason that the taxpayer was not engaged in a "trade or business" so far as the proxy fight was concerned. Whether or not a taxpayer is engaged in a "trade or business" is of course critical to the allowance of a deduction under sec. 162, but it is not relevant within the scope of this article. The Tax Court also held that Graham was not entitled to a loss deduction. In Surasky, the taxpayer claimed alternatively that the proxy costs were capital in nature, to be added to the basis of his stock.

[20] Webster's New International Dictionary" (2d ed.).

[21] *Daniel S. W. Kelly*, CCH Dec. 20,822, 23 TC 682 (1955) aff'd 56-1 USTC sec. 9170, 228 F. 2d 512 (CA-7) (safe deposit fees for stock certificates); *Nancy Reynolds Bagley*, CCH Dec. 15,561, 8 TC 130 (1947) (investment counsel fees).

[22] CCH Dec. 19,957, 21 TC 134 (1953), acq. 1954-1 CB 5.

[23] 53-1 USTC sec. 9420, 204 F. 2d 777 (CA-2) aff'g CCH Dec. 18,971, 18 TC 321 (1952), cert. denied 346 U.S. 872 (1953).

[24] 1956-2 CB 170.

[25] CCH Dec. 24,869, 36 TC 456 (1961).

[26] For example, *Lutz* v. *Commissioner*, 60-2 USTC sec. 9687, 282 F. 2d 614, 617 (CA-5) (Taxpayer paid debts of three controlled corporations to protect his own credit standing in the industry).

[27] CCH Dec. 22,356, 28 TC 298 (1957).

[28] 1957-2 CB 3.

[29] 56-1 USTC sec. 9551, 143 F. Supp. 250 (DC Pa.).

[30] See also, *Shoe Corp. of America*, CCH Dec. 22,665, 29 TC 297 (1957), acq. 1958-1 CB 6.

[31] *Bingham*, cited at footnote 5.

[32] *Forbes* v. *Commissioner*, 53-1 USTC sec. 9420, 204 F. 2d 777 (CA-2), cert. denied, 346 U.S. 872 (1953).

[33] H. Rept. No. 2333, 77th Cong., 2d sess. p. 75; S. Rept. No. 1631, 77th Cong., 2d sess. p. 88.

[34] Compare Reg. sec. 1.162-1(a) with Reg. sec. 1.212-1(d).

[35] 49-2 USTC sec. 9388, 176 F. 2d 815 (CA-6).

[36] 48-1 USTC sec. 9146, 165 F. 2d 483 (CA-5).

[37] *Bingham*, cited at footnote 5.

[38] See footnote 5.

[39] Treas. Regs. secs. 1.162-1(b)(2), 1.212-1(n), 1.263(a)-1.

[40] Reg. sec. 1.263(a)-1 and 2.

[41] For example, sec. 173 (newspaper circulation expenditures), sec. 174 (research and development expenditures), sec. 175 (soil and water conservation expenditures), sec. 248 (corporate organizational expenditures).

[42] Rev. Rul. 60-254, 1960-2 CB 42.

[43] I.R.C. sec. 248 permits certain expenses in organizing a corporation to be amortized over a 5-year period.

[44] For example, *Missouri-Kansas Pipe Line Co.* v. *Commissioner*, 45-1 USTC sec. 9210, 148 F. 2d 460, 462 (CA-3); *Skenandoa Rayon Corp.* v. *Commissioner*, 41-2 USTC sec. 9631, 122 F. 2d 268, 271 (CA-2), cert. denied 314 U.S. 696. See *Gravois Planing Mill Co.* v. *Commissioner*, 62-1 USTC sec. 9271, 299 F. 2d 199, 206 (CA-8).

[45] For example, *Baltimore & Ohio R. Co.* v. *Commissioner*, 35-2 USTC sec. 9479, 78 F. 2d 460 (CA-4) aff'g CCH Dec. 8506-A, 29 BTA 368 (1933). See cases cited 29 BTA at 372.

[46] Rev. Rul. 60-254, 1960-2 CB 42.

[47] *General Bancshares Corporation*, CCH Dec. 25,771, 39 TC 423 (1962); *United Industrial Corp.*, CCH Dec. 25,778(M), 21 TCM 1482 (1962); *Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co.*, CCH Dec. 26,008(M), 22 TCM 331 (1963).

[48] *General Bancshares Corporation* v. *Commissioner*, 64-1 USTC sec. 9220, 326 F. 2d 712 (CA-8); *United Industrial Corp.* v. *Commissioner*, 64-1 USTC sec 9462, 331 F. 2d 605 (CA-6); *Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co.* v. *Commissioner*, 64-1 USTC sec. 9483, 331 F. 2d 850 (CA-5).

[49] 37-1 USTC sec. 9289, 89 F. 2d 878 (CA-2).

[50] CCH Dec. 88, 1 BTA 214 (1924).

[51] 44-1 USTC sec. 9109, 320 U.S. 467.

[52] Case cited at footnote 51 at pp. 471-472.

[53] 58-1 USTC sec. 9368, 356 U.S. 27.

[54] Case cited at footnote 53 at p. 29.

[55] S.M. 4078, V-1 CB 226 (1926) (malpractice); *Helvering* v. *Hampton*, 35-2 USTC sec. 9562, 79 F. 2d 358 (CA-9) (fraud); *Isaac P. Keeler*, CCH Dec. 6999, 23 BTA 467 (1931) (breach of fiduciary duty).

[56] CCH Dec. 24,452, 35 TC 279 (1960).

[57] CCH Dec. 26,002, 39 TC 869 (1963).

[58] CCH Dec. 18,872(M), 11 TCM 274 (1952).

[59] 58-1 USTC sec. 9366, 356 U.S. 30.

[60] 2 USTC sec. 641, 47 F. 2d 178 (CA-2). But see *Jerry Rossman Corp.* v. *Commissioner*, 49-2 USTC sec. 9333, 175 F. 2d 711 (CA-2).

[61] CCH Dec. 10,820, 40 BTA 572 (1939).

[62] CCH Dec. 11,832, 44 BTA 600 (1941).

[63] 2 K. B. 553, 571 (1920), quoted in *Burroughs Building Material Co.* v. *Commissioner*, cited at footnote 60, at pp. 178, 179.

[64] *Richardson* v. *Mellish*, 2 Bing. 229, 252, 130 ER 294, 303 (1824), quoted in *Dixie Machine Welding & Metal Works* v. *United States*, 63-1 USTC sec. 9355, 315 F. 2d 439, 441 (CA-5).

[65] *Tank Truck Rentals, Inc.* v. *Commissioner*, cited at footnote 59, at pp. 30, 33-34.

[66] Case cited at footnote 59.

[67] For example, Randolph Paul, "The Use of Public Policy by the Commissioner in Disallowing Deductions," 1954 Southern California Tax Institute, 715.

[68] *Commissioner* v. *Sullivan*, cited at footnote 53. See also *Tank Truck Rentals, Inc.* v. *Commissioner*, cited at footnote 59, where the Court, although disallowing a deduction for penalties, referred to "congressional intent to tax only net income." The view, however, has been advanced that the Sullivan decision rests simply on a principle that there is no basis in the tax laws for discriminating between legal and illegal businesses, and does not support the broader "net income" principle.

[69] Cited at footnote 59, at pp. 35-36.

[70] Cited at footnote 53.

[71] For example, *Dixie Machine Welding & Metal Works* v. *United States*, 63-1 USTC sec. 9355, 315 F. 2d 447 (CA-5).

[72] Cited at footnote 59, at p. 35.

[73] See text at footnote 53.

[74] *Commissioner* v. *Heininger*, cited at footnote 51.

[75] Case cited at footnote 53.

[76] 41-2 USTC sec. 9784, 314 U.S. 326.

[77] 59-1 USTC sec. 9262, 358 U.S. 498.

[78] Case cited at footnote 59.

[79] 58-1 USTC sec. 9367, 356 U.S. 38.

[80] 52-1 USTC sec. 9231, 343 U.S. 90.

[81] Case cited at footnote 51.

[82] *Farnsworth* v. *Commissioner*, 59-2 USTC sec. 9705, 270 F. 2d 660, 664 (CA-3).

[83] *Sam Mesi*, CCH Dec. 21,385, 25 TC 513 (1955); *Albert D. McGrath*, CCH Dec. 21,988, 27 TC 117 (1956); *Anthony Cornero Stralla*, CCH Dec. 16,110, 9 TC 801 (1947); *Est. of Joseph Karger*, CCH Dec. 20,458(M), 13 TCM 661 (1954); *Israel Silberman*, cited at footnote 62.

[84] *Sam Mesi*, cited at footnote 83, at pp. 521-23.

[85] See for example, bribes and payments to secure political influence, *Harden Mortgage Loan Co.* v. *Commissioner*, 43-2 USTC sec. 9552, 137 F. 2d 282 (CA-10); *Rugel* v. *Commissioner*, 42-1 USTC sec. 9429, 127 F. 2d 393 (CA-8); *Excelsior Baking Co.* v. *United States*, 49-1 USTC sec. 9132, 82 F. Supp. 423 (DC Minn.); *Wm. T. Stover Co.*, CCH Dec. 22,049, 27 TC 434 (1956); entertainment of public officials, *Raymond F. Flanagan*, CCH Dec. 12,833, 47 BTA 782 (1942); *Kelley-Dempsey*, CCH Dec. 8735, 31 BTA 351 (1934); fines and penalties, *Burroughs Bldg. Material Co.* v. *Commissioner*, 2 USTC sec. 641, 47 F. 2d 178 (CA-2 1931); damages, *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Commissioner*, 42-2 USTC sec. 9528, 129 F. 2d 363 (CA-7); legal expenses in connection with unsuccessful defense against criminal charges, *Acker* v. *Commissioner*, 58-2 USTC sec. 9804, 258 F. 2d 568 (CA-6); *Commissioner* v. *Schwartz*, 56-1 USTC sec. 9370, 232 F. 2d 94 (CA-5); *Helvering* v. *Superior Wines & Liquors*, 43-1 USTC sec. 9354, 134 F. 2d 373 (CA-8); *Burroughs Bldg. Material Co.*, cited at footnote 60.

[86] The Supreme Court in *Commissioner* v. *Heininger*, appeared to have recognized the doctrine. However, it held that expenses there involved were deductible, and thereafter in *Lilly* v. *Commissioner* the Supreme Court indicated certain reservations about the validity of the doctrine, and assumed the point only arguendo.

[87] Some commentators have criticized disallowing deductions for fines and penalties on the ground that the disallowance is in effect an "additional" penalty. See Note, "Business Expenses, Disallowance, and Public Policy: Some Problems of Sanctioning with the Internal Revenue Code," 72 Yale Law Journal 108, 117 (1962).

[88] Case cited at footnote 51 at pp. 474-75.

[89] This does not, however, apply to "costs of goods sold," which have been held deductible from gross receipts in determining gross income *Lela Sullenger*, CCH Dec. 16,735, 11 TC 1076 (1948); I.T. 4104, 1952-2 CB 71.

[90] Rent and wages are, of course, deductible under the rule of Sullivan. See text at footnote 70. See also, discussion of "integrality" test below.

[91] Case cited at footnote 59 at p. 35.

[92] CCH Dec. 21,280, 25 TC 43 (1955).

[93] 63-1 USTC sec. 9355, 315 F. 2d 447 (CA-5).

[94] CCH Dec. 25,309(M), 21 TCM 10 (1962).

[95] 62-1 USTC sec. 9310, 300 F. 2d 453 (Ct. Cls.).

[96] 56-1 USTC sec. 9441, 231 F. 2d 635 (CA-7).

[97] Case cited at footnote 96 at p. 637. Footnote authorities omitted from quoted material.

[98] *Rugel* v. *Commissioner*, 42-1 USTC sec. 9429, 127 F. 2d 393 (CA-8); *Easton Tractor & Equipment Co.*, CCH Dec. 9536, 35 BTA 189 (1936). See also *T. G. Nicholson*, CCH Dec. 10,103, 38 BTA 190 (1938); *Messenger Publishing Co.*, CCH Dec. 15,993(M), 6 TCM 988 (1947).

[99] *G. A. Comeaux*, CCH Dec. 16,238, 10 TC 201 (1948).

[1] *Raymond F. Flannagan*, CCH Dec. 12,833, 47 BTA 782 (1942); *Cecil I. Haas*, CCH Dec. 19,919(M), 12 TCM 1117 (1953); *James A. Gleason*, CCH Dec. 25,190(M), 20 TCM 1799 (1961); *Riss & Company, Inc.*, CCH Dec. 26,881(M), 23 TCM 1113 (1964).

[2] *Kerrigan Iron Works, Inc.*, CCH Dec. 18,552, 17 TC 566 (1951); *Excelsior Baking Co.* v. *United States*, 49-1 USTC sec. 9132, 82 F. Supp. 423 (DC Minn.).

[3] *Mary Lucile Lewis*, CCH Dec. 11,779-D, BTA Memo. (1941).

[4] In the *Sullivan* opinion, the Supreme Court, after finding that the wages and rent expenses were "ordinary and necessary" in the generally accepted meaning of those words, said: "That is enough to permit the deduction, unless it is clear that the allowance is a device to avoid the consequence of violations of a law, as in *Hoover Motor Express Co.* * * * and *Tank Truck Rentals* * * * *or otherwise contravenes the Federal policy expressed in a statute or regulation*, as in *Textile Mills* * * *" (Italic added.) Case cited at footnote 53 at p. 29.

[5] 1962-2 CB 45.

[6] *Flanagan*, cited at footnote 1.

[7] *Haas*, cited at footnote 1.

[8] *Gleason*, cited at footnote 1.

[9] *Riss*, cited at footnote 1.

[10] Furthermore, in *Wm. T. Stover Co.*, CCH Dec. 22,049, 27 TC 434 (1956), the Tax Court cited the *Flanagan* decision with apparent approval while deciding that *Lilly* did not prevent denial of a deduction for costs of private "employment" of a public official.

[11] CCH Dec. 17,669, 14 TC at pp. 1079-85.

[12] Case cited at footnote 80 at pp. 96-97.

[13] Extended analysis of *Textile Mills Corp.* v. *Commissioner*, cited at footnote 76; *Commissioner* v. *Heininger*, cited at footnote 51; and *Cammarano* v. *United States*, cited at footnote 77 does not appear practical for purposes of this immediate issue. None of these decisions clearly support Flanagan; none is necessarily inconsistent with Flan-

agan. In addition, even if it be argued that Heininger restricts Flanagan, the subsequent Lilly decision more sharply focuses the issue.

[14] Case cited at footnote 59 at pp. 33–34.

[15] See discussion of Tank Truck Rentals, above.

[16] *Hoover Express Co.* v. *United States*, cited at footnote 79.

[17] *Universal Atlas Cement Co.* v. *Commissioner*, 49–1 USTC ¶ 9110, 171 F. 2d 294 (CA–2), cert. denied 336 U.S. 962; *Commissioner* v. *Longhorn Portland Cement Co.*, 45–1 USTC ¶ 9242, 148 F. 2d 276 (CA–5).

[18] 15 U.S.C. Sec. 15.

[19] T.I.R. No. 615 (July 24, 1964), Rev. Rul. 64–224, 1964–33 I.R.B. 13 (Aug. 17, 1964). This ruling also held, however, that amounts paid or incurred in satisfaction of damage claims by the United States under sec. 4A of the Clayton Act. 31 U.S.C. 231, are not deductible.

[20] Release dated Aug. 21, 1964.

[21] See text at footnote 63.

[22] *Commissioner* v. *Longhorn Portland Cement Co.*, cited at footnote 115, at pp. 276, 277.

[23] *Jerry Rossman* v. *Commissioner*, 49–2 U.S.T.C., sec. 9333, 175 F. 2d 117 (C.A.–2).

[24] See S. Rept. No. 619, 84th Cong., p. 3.

[25] *Flintkote Co.* v. *Lynsfjord*, 1957 Trade Cases sec. 68,674, 246 F. 2d 368 (C.A.–9 1957); *Maltz* v. *Sax*, 1940–43 Trade Cases sec. 56,-259, 134 F. 2d 2 (C.A.–7 1943); *Weinberg* v. *Sinclair Refining Co.*, 48 Supp. 203 (D.C. N. Y. 1942).

[26] *Eastman Kodak Co.* v. *Southern Photo Materials Co.*, 273 U.S. 359, 373 (1927).

[27] *United States* v. *Cooper Corp.*, 1940–43 Trade Cases sec. 56,111, 312 U.S. 600, 608 (1941).

[28] *Bruce's Juices* v. *American Can Co.*, 1946–47 Trade Cases sec. 57,553, 335 U.S. 743, 750 (1947).

[29] 63 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9073 (1914).

[30] See *Huntington* v. *Attrill*, 146 U.S. 657 (1892); *Chattanooga Foundry and Pipe Works* v. *Atlanta*, 203 U.S. 390 (1960); *Overnight Motor Co.* v. *Missel*, 316 U.S. 572 (1942); see also, *United States* v. *Cooper Corp.*, cited at footnote 126.

[31] For example, *Helvering* v. *Hampton*, 35–2 USTC sec. 9562, 79 F. 2d 358 (CA–9); *Anderson* v. *Commissioner*, 36–1 USTC sec. 9085, 81 F. 2d 457 (CA–10).

[32] *Commissioner* v. *Longhorn Portland Cement Co.*, cited at footnote 116; *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Commissioner*, cited at footnote 85.

[33] 56 Stat. 23.

[34] I.T. 3627, 1943 CB 111.

[35] Case cited at footnote 85.

[36] CCH Dec. 21894 26 TC 948 (1956).

[37] For example, *Kornhauser* v. *United States*, 1 U.S.T.C. sec. 284, 276 U.S. 145 (1928); *Commissioner* v. *Heininger*, cited at footnote 51. See also *Welch* v. *Helvering*, cited at footnote 4.

[38] See discussion at p. 809 et seq.

[39] See discussion at p. 815 et seq.

[40] See discussion at pp. 817 and 819 et seq.

[41] *Burroughs Building Material Co.* v. *Commissioner*, cited at footnote 85; *National Outdoor Advertising Bureau* v. *Helvering*, 37–1 U.S.T.C. sec. 9289, 89 F. 2d 878 (CA–2).

[42] *Helvering* v. *Superior Wines & Liquors*, 43–1 U.S.T.C. sec. 9354, 134 F. 2d 373 (CA–8).

[43] 35–1 U.S.T.C. sec. 9091, 75 F. 2d 326 (CA–1).

[44] CCH Dec. 12,554, 47 BTA at p. 101.

[45] 43–1 U.S.T.C. § 9287, 133 F. 2d at p. 570.

[46] 43–1 U.S.T.C. § 9287, 133 F. 2d at p. 569.

[47] CCH Dec. 13,747, 3 TC 310 (1944), rev'd on other grounds, 45–1 U.S.T.C. § 9242, 148 F. 2d 276 (CA–5).

[48] 194 CB 18.

[49] 1944 CB 93.

[50] G. C. M. 24377 held, however, that such expenses were not deductible to the extent that they constituted payments on behalf of individual defendants.

[51] G. C. M. 24810, 1946–1 CB 55.

[52] CCH Dec. 21,791, 26 TC 562 (1956).

[53] *Acker* v. *Commissioner*, 58–2 USTC sec. 9804, 258 F. 2d 568 (CA–6); *Port* v. *United States*, 58–2 USTC sec. 9702, 163 F. Supp. 645 (Ct. Cls.); *Richard F. Smith*, CCH Dec. 23,197, 31 TC 1 (1958).

[54] CCH Dec. 21,894, 26 TC 948 (1956).

[55] 1962–2 CB 50.

[56] In Rev. Rul. 62–175, the Service also referred to the fact that in both Heininger and Longhorn Portland Cement the taxpayers were threatened with a "severe if not complete diminishment of their businesses." The significance of this point is not clear.

[57] 1964 I.R.B. No. 33, p. 13.

[58] 1964 I.R.B. No. 33, at p. 15.

[59] See *Deputy* v. *DuPont*, 40–1 USTC sec. 9161, 308 U.S. 488, 495. In *Walter J. Dannemiller*, CCH Dec. 23,025(M), 17 TCM 547 (1958), it was held that travel expenses of a commodity trader to consult with commodity specialists were not deductible on the ground that most grain and commodity traders do not travel to consult experts.

[60] A.L.I., Federal Income Tax Statute, February 1954 draft and comments, pp. 268–269.

[61] Subsec. (b) through (e) of sec. 162.

Way To Solve the Boxcar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Interstate Commerce Commission, in its 78th annual report to the Congress, renews its recommendation that the Commission be authorized to determine the proper basis for per diem rental rates for the use of railroad freight cars. This recommendation has been carried in the Commission's report since 1955, and congressional hearings on such legislation have been held during the 84th, 85th, and 87th Congresses.

Legislation to implement the Commission recommendations was passed on favorably by the Senate Commerce Committee in the last Congress—S. 1063—but no further action was taken.

In the 88th Congress, I introduced H.R. 2903, a bill to implement the ICC recommendation, and again in this Congress I have introduced the same proposal. It is my hope that my bill, H.R. 3397, will be given early consideration in this session.

I include the ICC recommendation in the Appendix of the RECORD:

We recommend that section 1(14) be amended to authorize the Commission to determine whether per diem charges for the use of railroad freight cars shall be computed on the basis of cost of ownership and maintenance, value of use, or upon such other basis or combination of bases as will, in its judgment, provide reasonable compensation to the owner, contribute to sound car service practices, and encourage the acquisition of an adequate national fleet of freight cars.

The Commission has for a number of years been greatly concerned with the diminishing supply of railroad freight cars and the critical shortages that have occurred during periods of peak loadings. Foremost among the factors contributing to these recurring shortages are an inadequate car ownership, a relatively high percentage of unserviceable or bad order cars, and the inefficient utilization of existing equipment.

There is no uncertainty as to the reason for these shortages—the national car supply has dwindled to a new low for this century, despite the fact that carriers are making a determined effort to repair and rebuild cars. Purchases are confined primarily to equipment of a specialized nature, which obviously will not tend to reduce the existing shortages, as only a few big shippers are afforded relief by the new cars acquired. In 1963 a total of 36,468 new cars came on line but 74,822 were scrapped. In the first 6 months of 1964 the loss continued at the rate of over 2,400 units per month.

The assistance that can be expected from the institution of the new multilevel per diem system established by the carriers which became effective last year, is questionable. This system is based generally on the concept of adequate compensation to owners of cars purchased, on the basis of cost, condition, or age, but compliance with the plan is voluntary and some carriers have not accepted it.

Enactment of the proposed legislation will substantially assist in alleviating the crippling economic effects of freight car shortages by enabling the Commission to prescribe and promulgate per diem charges which will encourage the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense.

Does Alabama Really Want Voters?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, past debates on civil rights legislation have too little emphasized some of the problems which are the basis for demanding corrective action. The attached articles from the January 24 editions of the Washington Post and the Detroit News, graphically illustrate the obstacle course through which prospective registrants must pass in order to qualify to vote in the State of Alabama.

There is ample evidence that double standards based on race have been unofficially established in order to minimize the participation of Negroes in the election process. It dramatically demonstrates the need for vastly simplifying these procedures by Federal statute. In order to assure protection of our fundamental right to exercise the franchise, the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, informed me a few weeks ago that he plans to hold early hearings on his constitutional proposal to eliminate poll taxes in local elections.

I fervently hope that many of my colleagues will join me in trying to persuade him to expand his efforts, and once and for all eliminate all unnecessary voting qualifications. An important adjunct to such a concept would be a provision for the use of Federal registrars, where local administrators proved obviously recalcitrant.

The articles in question follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 24, 1965]

DOES ALABAMA REALLY WANT VOTERS?—SOME PEOPLE MIGHT THINK CERTAIN PARTS OF THE REGISTRATION TESTING ARE JUST A TEENY BIT DIFFICULT

(By James E. Clayton)

In some places in the United States, registering to vote is a simple matter. In some other places, it isn't.

In the District of Columbia, a citizen fills in three blanks on a punch card and swears that he is qualified to vote.

In most areas of Virginia, you fill in 16 or so blanks and sign a similar oath.

In Maryland, applicants fill out a small card answering a handful of personal history questions and swear they are telling the truth.

Then there is Alabama. A would-be voter signs such an oath, fills in 48 blanks, writes from dictation a portion of the Constitution, answers four questions on government, reads four excerpts from the Constitution and answers four questions about the excerpts and then signs a loyalty oath.

Perhaps this explains why long lines form outside registration places in Alabama, as they did in Selma, where 67 Negroes were arrested last week for illegal assembly as they waited to try to register. It takes a long time to fill out the Alabama application and the State's voting registrars are not noted for their speed in processing applicants.

The burden, of course, falls more heavily now on Negroes than on whites. About 20 percent of the adult Negroes in the State are registered, as compared with almost 70 percent of the adult whites. In some of the State's black belt counties, where Negroes often outnumber whites in population, almost no Negroes are registered.

Even to provide the personal history statement demanded by the State is not easy. I found that I could not answer all the questions when I tried to fill out a sample form. I couldn't remember my Army serial number and I wasn't sure of the exact street numbers of two persons who could vouch that I have lived in my precinct long enough to be eligible to vote.

Having recently registered to vote in Virginia, I was struck by the amount of additional information Alabama requires.

In Virginia, the registrars want to know your name; your address; how long you've lived in the State, county, and precinct; when and where you were born or naturalized; your occupation; whether you have voted before; whether you have paid your poll taxes; whether you are a member of the Armed Forces, and when you were discharged if you ever were, and whether you have been convicted of a crime disqualifying you from voting.

Alabama wants to know all that—and it also wants to know each place you have worked and lived in the past 5 years; how much education you have received and where; whether you are married (and to whom) or divorced; your sex and race; the dates of military service as well as your serial number; whether you have ever been rejected as a voter, and so on.

After you get past this personal history quiz (which ends the registration procedure in Virginia, Maryland, the District of Columbia and most States), Alabama has three tests you must pass.

It is these tests that the Justice Department attacked in a suit filed in an Alabama Federal court this month. The Justice Department says the tests remove the meaning from a part of the Civil Rights Act that Congress passed last summer.

One part of the act says that when a State prescribes a literacy test as a requirement to vote, anyone who has completed the sixth grade is presumed literate. Keep that sixth grade factor in mind as we see what happens when a would-be voter takes Alabama's tests.

First, a member of the board of registrars hands him a paper on which he must write one or more dictated excerpts from the Constitution of the United States. They may be as short as "The 18th article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed."

Or, they may be as long as: "Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representative in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State."

These excerpts cannot be copied. The Alabama registration form says explicitly that a board member is to read them and the applicant is to write them from dictation.

After the applicant finishes writing out the selected excerpt, he must answer four questions to test his general knowledge about government. There are roughly 400 prepared questions in 100 sets, and the applicant must answer one complete set.

The questions are generally simple—"Name the President of the United States"—but a few are quite ambiguous—"Congressional districting is required to be done by: legislature, State courts, Congress, U.S. Supreme Court."

According to the Constitution and Congress, Representatives can be elected from districts or at large. Alabama's constitution says the State legislature must draw new district lines every 10 years. But after the legislature failed to do so for 60 years, a Federal court ordered an election at large in 1962. The legislature has since drawn new districts. In that situation, who is requiring election by districts in Alabama?

After this quiz is finished, the applicant reads four excerpts from the Constitution and answers four questions about them. These are to test comprehension and reasoning ability.

For example, the applicant reads: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." The question, "Is there any constitutional barrier to Alabama passing a law forbidding women to vote?"

When this is finished, the applicant signs a statement saying that he received no help in completing this "citizenship and literacy" test, that he had all the time he wished to complete it and that he waives any right to demand a copy of the test. If the applicant does not want to sign the statement, he "must discuss the matter with the board of registrars."

Oh yes, he must also sign an oath that all answers are true and that he swears to support and defend the Constitution of the United States and of Alabama, and that he does not believe in or is affiliated with any group which advocates or has advocated the overthrow of the State or Federal Governments by unlawful means.

Anyone need a refresher on the sixth grade?

SOME SAMPLE QUESTIONS FROM THE ALABAMA TEST

In the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Congress said that anyone who had completed six grades of school was presumed to be able to read and write sufficiently well to vote in Federal elections.

To register to vote in Alabama, however, one must pass a "citizenship and literacy" test which includes questions about government. Reproduced below is a sampling of the questions used by Alabama in its testing procedure. A prospective voter is asked four. The Department of Justice says the test requires a level of comprehensive and literacy higher than the sixth grade. Try them; particularly the last.

1. A proposed change in the State constitution is called a proposed ———.

2. Which of the following is a right guaranteed by the Bill of Rights? public education, voting, employment, trial by jury.

3. Name one person now a member of the governing body of this county.

4. The Federal census of population is taken each 5 years. (True or false.)

5. To what county official are poll taxes paid?

6. To serve as President of the United States, a person must have attained —25, —35, —40, —45 years.

7. What words are required by law to be on all coins and paper currency of the United States?

8. The supreme court is the chief lawmaking body of the State. (True or false.)

9. Can a municipal governing body levy taxes?

10. To veto a bill passed by Congress means that: the Senate defeats it, the President rejects it, the court declares it unconstitutional.

11. Cases tried before a court are of two types, criminal and ———.

12. A member of the State house of representatives cannot succeed himself. (True or false.)

13. Name two levels of government which can levy taxes.

14. Communism is the type of government in: United States, Russia, England.

15. By a majority of the Members of Congress, Congress can change provisions of the Constitution of the United States. (True or false.)

16. How long must a person live in Alabama to be eligible for registration as a voter?

17. Check the applicable definition for presidential electors: persons chosen from each State to cast votes for President; persons qualified to vote in the general election; members of the Cabinet; persons qualified to vote for President although they have not paid poll tax.

18. Name one board or commission with countywide authority which is appointed instead of elected.

19. Capital punishment is unconstitutional in Alabama. (True or false.)

20. In what document or writing is the "Bill of Rights" found?

21. If no person receives a majority of the electoral votes, the Vice President is chosen by the Senate. (True or false.)

22. All bills for raising revenue must originate in the U.S. House of Representatives to be considered by Congress. (True or false.)

23. Is to "insure domestic tranquility" mentioned as one of the reasons for establishing the Constitution for the United States of America?

24. A person seeking public office in an election is called a ———.

25. In Alabama, a person may lawfully carry a pistol concealed on his person, on land not his own and not in his own abode or fixed place of business, without a license. (True or false.)

26. Name one of the U.S. Senators from Alabama.

27. The Congress decides in what manner States elect presidential electors. (True or false.)

28. Name one of the Members from Alabama serving in the U.S. House of Representatives.

29. Are members of jury commissions in Alabama elected or appointed?

30. Name one kind of property on which a tax must be paid each year.

31. Under the U.S. Constitution, no State can lawfully collect a poll tax as a pre-requisite for voting in any election. (True or false.)

32. Name the President of the United States.

33. The President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. (True or false.)

34. Does the Board of Equalization deal with property taxes or civil rights?

35. Name one kind of drink referred to as an alcoholic beverage.

36. Where do presidential electors cast ballots for President: home State, Washington, home county.

37. Name the State senator representing this county.

38. The following statement is a part of the Constitution of the United States: "The trial of all crimes, except in case of impeachment, shall be by jury." (True or false.)

39. What official presides over the State senate?

40. Name three counties in Alabama in addition to the one in which you reside.

41. All poll taxes collected in the State must be used for education. (True or false.)

42. The right to free public education is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. (True or false.)

43. Name a member of the legislature from this county.

44. Congressional districting is required to be done by: legislature, State courts, Congress, U.S. Supreme Court.

[From the Detroit News]

ALABAMA VOTER TEST—COULD YOU PASS?

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Alabama voter test questions were put to many persons by Detroit News staff reporters. The results were assembled by Stoddard White, staff writer.)

None of the eight Federal judges in Detroit could answer all three of typical questions demanded of an Alabaman seeking to vote.

Of eight circuit judges, only one got all three right, but the rest presumably would be denied the vote if they lived in Alabama.

A Detroit News sampling shows that plenty of highly educated people in the Detroit area, regardless of their race, could not pass the new Alabama voter registration test. Following are the three questions:

"If no person receives a majority of the electoral vote, the Vice President is chosen by the Senate. True or false?

"Ambassadors may be named by the President without approval of the Senate. True or false?

"Where do presidential electors cast ballots for President? — home State; — Washington, D.C.; — home county."

The News put these questions before a sampling of local citizens, including judges, officeholders, election officials, and professors of constitutional law.

None of the eight Federal judges here answered question 1 correctly. Three failed all the questions. Three got only one right. Two scored two out of three, saying this was because of a unique experience in their legal careers or an educated guess.

Chief Justice Theodore Levin laughed when he scored zero.

"I'm glad the News is pointing out the ridiculousness of this type of question as a prerequisite to the fundamental right to vote in this great country," he said.

Prosecutor Samuel H. Olsen, who also scored zero, said it another way:

"These are absurd questions, as far as voting is concerned."

One of the Federal judges pointed out that he and his colleagues should not be expected, just because of their Federal office, to know all about constitutional law."

He suggested that the News ask professors who teach that subject at the city's three law schools.

"The questions are specialized and out of the reach of the layman," declared Thomas C. Mayer, an attorney who lectures on constitutional law at the University of Detroit. He did not say how he fared with the questions.

Prof. Charles W. Quick, who has been teaching the subject for 15 years at Wayne State University, got one right.

"This type of question obviously is the kind that allows the examiner to do just as he pleases," Quick commented.

Prof. Harold Norris, of Detroit College of Law, correctly answered two of the three and attacked them as "just another effort to discriminate."

"If this type of question is being used," he said, "Congress should amend the Civil Rights Act and make a sixth-grade education a conclusive presumption and not a rebuttable one."

CHECKS CONSTITUTION

Judge Wade H. McCree, Jr., first Negro on the Federal bench here, graduated in the top 12 percent of his Harvard Law School class.

He got only one answer right, and agreed with Professor Quick that "they give the examiner the power to eliminate just about anybody he cares to."

He missed the question about Senate election of the Vice President, and pulled down the Constitution from his bookshelf for the right answer. It says that if the electors fail to reach a majority for Vice President the election is thrown into the Senate.

History shows this has been done only once. The Senate elected Richard Mentor Johnson in 1837.

(If the electors cannot reach a majority for President, the House of Representatives conducts that election. Thus the House elected Thomas Jefferson in 1801 and John Quincy Adams in 1825. The Alabama test, however, does not touch on the Presidency in this connection.)

LABELED AMBIGUOUS

Judge McCree and his Federal colleagues, Judges Stephen J. Roth and Ralph M. Freeman, not only called the questions ridiculous and hopeless for the layman but said they are "ambiguous and misleading."

Circuit Judge Charles Kaufman answered all three questions correctly. Five other circuit judges missed one, and one judge missed two.

County Auditor Charles F. Edgecomb scored two out of three, saying:

"If a guy in England playing the soccer pool could hit three straight like this, he would get $1,000 to $1.

Edgecomb missed only question 1, about the Senate choosing the Vice President.

"A guy has as much chance of being eligible to vote by answering these questions as he would hitting the numbers," said the auditor, referring to gambling in the numbers racket.

State Representative John J. Fitzpatrick, Detroit Democrat, said he was not surprised at missing all three.

"Only an election expert would know for sure," he said.

COUNCILMAN ASTOUNDED

John A. Smith, city elections director, missed the first question but got the others right. His Wayne County counterpart, Leonard F. Howe, got the first one right but missed the others.

One city councilman was so sure the vice-presidential argument is settled in the House that he looked it up after he missed the question.

"That's pretty tricky," he said, asking that his name not be used. He got the others right.

"Fantastic" and "holy smoke" were the words of an Oakland County judge and another law officer when told the questions were a prerequisite to voting.

ROTTEN AND DIRTY

But Mrs. Mabel Childs, that county's elections director, scored 100 percent and then cried, "Rotten and dirty."

"I can't imagine these being a part of a voting test," she said.

"This kind of thing makes you fighting mad," echoed Detroit's Chief of Detectives Vincent W. Piersante. "Why should a set of questions like this decide whether a man can vote?"

He, too, criticized question 1 as ambiguous, saying, "The way it was worded, it could almost be answered either way."

Thirteen policemen, lawyers, stenographers, and assistant prosecutors were given the questions at police headquarters.

Six of them did best—two right. Four got one right. The other three scored zero.

CALLED UNIMPORTANT

Many who missed question 3—the one about where the electors vote—indicated that the question was unfair because it was unimportant.

"Wherever they vote, it really doesn't count until it gets to Washington," one man pointed out.

Fire commissioners, chiefs, and firemen were varying inaccurate on the three questions. The only person at fire headquarters who answered all three correctly was Mrs. Dorothy King, 2130 Annabelle, a Negro clerk.

Mrs. King said she made a study of presidential succession and the electoral college after the assassination of President Kennedy.

Two educators had no trouble answering correctly, but both found fault with the test.

Prof. Alfred H. Kelly, chairman of the Wayne State University history department, found question 1 "sloppily worded" and "rather severe for an average voter in Alabama."

Elmer Pflieger, director of social studies for the Detroit public schools, said "Adults normally have no use for such odd bits of information."

"I think 75 percent of our high school seniors could answer correctly," Pflieger said, "but they would have just completed a course in civics."

Lincoln Park's city clerk, William G. Suzore, acknowledged that "I am certainly more familiar with election laws" when he passed the test. But he said he doubted that 19 percent of the voters could answer correctly.

One Wyandotte official commented:

MANY ARE MISLED

"I got one right. I certainly should have known better, and it must be really rough to have to take such a test."

Seven Macomb County municipal and school officials gave the wrong answer about the Senate election of the Vice President. Three were wrong on the President's power to appoint ambassadors without Senate confirmation.

Only two missed the one about electors convening in their home State—but some of these responses came after considerable thought and a few said they were just guesses.

Many who understood that someone is chosen by the House when the electors fail to reach a majority were misled into thinking the House chooses the Vice President as well as President. Both, of course, are

bracketed together on the ballot in a presidential election.

George T. Eddington, administrative assistant to the Grosse Pointe's school superintendent, said the questions were much harder thn those asked of him when he became a naturalized American citizen in 1954.

SUED BY UNITED STATES

The U.S. Department of Justice has sued the State of Alabama, charging that the new test is too difficult and illegally discriminates against some, chiefly Negroes.

Additionally, the Department charges, many more whites than Negroes were registered under a previous, easier test. Thus, it says, the racial imbalance of the Alabama voting structure remains frozen.

The test, the Department complained, removes the meaning from that part of the new Civil Rights Act which says that when a State prescribes a literacy test, anyone who has completed the sixth grade is presumed to be literate.

For those who need the answers to the questions, here they are: (1) true; (2) false, and (3) home State.

Keep the Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a splendid editorial written by the Honorable Carl Estes, publisher of the Longview Daily News, Longview, Tex. This editorial was in the January 21, 1965 issue of the Longview Daily News.

The editorial follows:

KEEP THE FAITH

In a warmly solemn and moving inaugural address, President Lyndon Baines Johnson Wednesday issued this simple but stirring challenge: "Keep the faith."

Calm and deliberate in tone and with all the dignity that befits the high office, President Johnson reminded this Nation of its great heritage of freedom and opportunity and called for a return to the old virtues that have made America great.

"Look within your own hearts," the President said, "to the old promises and the old dream. They will lead you best of all."

What our President was saying is that strength and hope come from within, from the heart, rising from the wellspring of faith in our God.

Standing at his side and holding the family heirloom Bible was the alternately smiling and tearful Mrs. Johnson. Mr. Johnson related that his mother, who had given them the Bible, taught him when a boy at her knees: Keep faith in God, in your fellow man, and believe in yourself.

That philosophy of faith and confidence was in strong evidence as President Johnson called upon God in his opening sentence, as America's great leaders have done since colonial times, and closed his address with Solomon's prayer when he became king.

In a most significant linking of past with present to form a base for the future, President Johnson repeated the pledge he had made to the American people 14 months ago on that "sorrowful day in November," 1963, when he promised "to do the best I can" to lead the Nation.

The inaugural address—Mr. Johnson's first, although he twice has taken the oath as President—was a revealing statement of his philosophy of the Nation's heritage and the challenge it faces in these times of rapid internal and world change.

As for the Great Society he envisions for America, he said it is not "the ordered, changeless and sterile battalion of the ants"; rather, "It is the excitement of becoming—always becoming, trying, probing, falling, resting, and trying again—but always trying and always gaining."

"In each generation—with toil and tears—we have had to earn our heritage again. If we fail now, then we will have forgotten in abundance what we learned in hardship; that democracy rests on faith, freedom asks more than it gives, and the judgment of God is harshest on those who are most favored. If we succeed, it will not be because of what we have, it will be because of what we are; not because of what we own, but because of what we believe."

Then President Johnson, with characteristic faith and courage, spoke of the future: "Is our world gone? We say farewell. Is a new world coming? We welcome it—and we will bend it to the hopes of man."

It was here that he sounded a firm call for justice, liberty, and union: "Let us now join reason to faith, and action to experience, to transform our new unity of interest into a new unity of purpose. For the hour and the day and time have come to achieve progress without strife, to achieve change without hatred; not without difference of opinion, but without the deep and abiding divisions which scar the Union for generations."

This Nation, the President said, "must work now to provide the knowledge and the surroundings which can enlarge the possibilities of every citizen," to "increase the share of all" in the "bounty" of America, to enhance justice and liberty and to help "show the way for the liberation of man."

This is the Bible-based philosophy of our President. This is his inspired challenge to a free people. This is a solemn call, in the great American tradition, to "Keep the faith."—CARL L. ESTES.

Postmaster General Gronouski Praised for Christmas Delivery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in 1900 the U.S. Post Office handled approximately 7 billion pieces of mail a year. That same amount of mail was processed in just the 25 days between December 1 and Christmas Day, December 25, 1964.

The ability of the Post Office Department to keep pace with the tremendous increase in mail—particularly the glut which occurs it Christmas—is a tribute to our postal workers and to the administration of the Department itself.

Heading this huge operation is the Postmaster General. It is he who must direct the myriad activities necessary for the successful dispatch and delivery of letters and packages. While he is seldom applauded when things go well, he is often criticized when they do not.

For that reason I was particularly pleased to see an article in the New York Daily News by Mr. Ted Lewis citing Postmaster General Gronouski for a good job well done during the Christmas mail rush of last month.

Because these tributes are well deserved, I proudly request permission to insert the article at this point and respectfully urge the attention of my colleagues to it.

The article follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, December 24.—We have been talking with Postmaster General Gronouski, who on this Christmas Eve is taking pride in a holiday delivery exploit never equaled except by Santa Claus.

More than 7 billion pieces of mail, letters, and packages have been delivered since December 1. Two-thirds of the volume is Christmas-type mail, and as Gronouski figures it, this breaks down to 25 letters or packages received by the average man, woman, and child in the country.

It is because the mail generally got through on time for Christmas that the Postmaster General decreed a 3-day holiday this weekend for the Nation's mailmen and other postal employees. This means, of course, that the postman won't ring even once until next Monday.

Perhaps it is our saccharine reaction to the Christmas spirit, but we think Gronouski—next to Santa Claus of course—deserves a big hand.

So too does the job 590,000 year-round postal workers did, and which Gronouski says has him "bursting with pride."

Gronouski really needed, for his personal morale, a smooth Christmas mail delivery job this year. No Postmaster General ever found himself in the mess that Gronouski did a year ago. The jam at key distributing points was in some cases not straightened out until weeks after Christmas.

The breakdown in 1963 Christmas delivery service began less than 3 months after Gronouski was sworn in as John F. Kennedy's last Cabinet appointee, succeeding Postmaster General J. Edward Day.

The jam up was entirely due to the impact on the Nation of Kennedy's assassination on November 22, 1963. Until the shock of the President's death lifted, there was little thought of Christmas cards or gifts. The result was that the holiday mail deluge was delayed, then came with a last-minute rush which jammed the delivery system with almost 7 billion letters, cards, and packages.

WHEN STATISTICS CAN BE INTRIGUING

In view of the mail problem during Gronouski's first Christmas in office, it is easy to understand why he is willing to go a little overboard in expressing his satisfaction about this year's handling of the holiday load. He doesn't say it has been 100 percent perfect, only 99 percent, but he claims the Christmas mail, despite its record volume "has moved earlier, faster, and more smoothly than ever before."

Statistics can be more than a little boring but as they pertain to what Gronouski calls the "mail explosion," they are intriguing.

For example, more mail was handled between December 1 and December 25 this year than was handled in one year not so very long ago. In 1900 the volume was 7 billion pieces for the entire year, about the same as during this present Christmas period.

Today the postal service is handling 72 billion pieces annually, and the volume is increasing at the rate of 2 to 3 billion a year.

There has been a population explosion, of course, but this does not explain the mail explosion. In 1900 there were 76 million Americans. Now there are 192 million. But they are writing far more letters per individual. If they were only writing as often as their 1900 ancestors did, the annual mail

volume would be 20 billion pieces a year, not 70 billion.

IN 1900 IT WAS EASIER TO PEN A LETTER

Sure there has been a lot of "junk mail" contributing to the mail explosion. Despite this factor, people are generally writing to each other more. The Post Office Department has no simple explanation for this positive trend which runs counter to an age in which life is more hectic than in the thumb-twiddling homey days of the Gay Nineties.

It certainly was easier to sit right down and write someone a letter back in 1900, when only the logs in the fireplace were crackling, not the TV commercials.

It also helped in those days to know that it took only a 2-cent stamp to send a letter by first-class mail, and a penny to mail a chatty postcard.

Neither did someone 64 years ago have to worry about some infernal ZIP code number. It made little difference whether a letter from Braintree, Mass., reached brother Joe in Chicago in 1 week or 10 days. It probably still doesn't, except to the Post Office Department, which insists on expediting mail the ZIP code way.

HEAR PROTESTS ABOUT THE CHRISTMAS STAMP

While this is a most happy Christmas for Gronouski, it does not mean that he is not having the usual troubles that go with his Cabinet post.

He is in hot water with some members of Congress and a segment of the public because of the Christmas stamps issued by his department. They display only floral decorations of the Christmas red and green type.

One of his chief critics in this respect is Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, Republican, of Wisconsin, who thinks a Christmas nativity scene stamp would be more appropriate, for "Christmas has been set aside as a national holiday to honor the birthday of Jesus Christ."

The Post Office Department's answer is that since stamps were first issued the policy has been not to commemorate specific religious events and subjects. Moreover, it was decided before this year's Christmas stamp design was chosen, that a stamp depicting Christ at the Nativity scene would arouse too much controversy, both among those who would object to use of the religious idea and those who might think that a cancellation imprint on the stamp was a sacrilege.

The controversies over new postage stamps are one of the perpetual headaches of the Postmaster General's job. But today at least Gronouski deserves a merry Christmas happy New Year greeting for getting the mail there on time.

Sir Winston Churchill

SPEECH

OF

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, my good constituents from the Fifth District of Texas will think me remiss in my duty if I do not express in their behalf that we of Dallas County join with those in this august body and those of the world who have expressed their deepest sorrow at the passing of one of the century's ablest leaders and statesmen, Sir Winston Churchill. Particularly, representing Dallas do I feel motivated to speak out in praise of this man's life and in sorrow at this man's death, for we in Dallas owe him a debt. Three years ago, while I was the mayor of the fine city of Dallas, Sir Winston was made an honorary citizen of Dallas. In responding to this city's tribute to him, Sir Winston paid Dallas one of its most revered compliments. We will never forget this great man or his warm remarks about our city.

Danger in Visit by Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the obvious attempts by the Johnson administration to embrace the Soviet Union with a policy of coexistence are clear to us. The danger of such a policy is recognized by many Americans.

Columnist Marguerite Higgins wrote an article which appeared in the Thursday, January 21 edition of the Washington Star and discussed the specific danger of the invitation President Johnson issued to Russian leaders to visit this country. I believe that this article is extremely timely and worthy of thorough review by State Department and White House policymakers.

The article follows:

POINT OF VIEW: DANGER IN VISIT BY RUSSIANS

(By Marguerite Higgins)

Questioned about President Johnson's recent invitation to Russian leaders, a White House wag replied, "We are operating around here under the theory that familiarity breeds consensus."

But Johnson's "getting to know you" gambit in the state of the Union message is no laughing matter, for it already has unleashed tremendous pressures from certain business circles who have been restive under trade restrictions imposed in part by national security consideration and in part by the Soviet Union's outrageous refusal to make any reasonable settlement of its enormous lend-lease debt to us.

It has been U.S. policy to withhold granting credits to the Soviet Union until the debt question has been satisfactorily solved. But according to Department of Commerce officials, some eager businessmen with visions of massive trade dancing in their heads have been arguing that some way ought to be found of getting around these inhibitions.

SUSPICIOUS SOUND

Indeed some of the businessmen who have returned from a trade conference in Moscow sound suspiciously as if they have talked themselves into believing that Russian exposure to the American capitalists way of trading is going to reform the Kremlin and soften their hard Communist hearts toward things Western.

But this is not all. There are even some administration officials who are arguing that visits of high-level Russians contribute to the prospects of peace by showing them how peace loving the American people are. According to this school, the visit of Nikita Khruschev here in 1959 had precisely this effect on that colorful old Bolshevik.

Now it may be that certain cultural and trade exchanges have their uses. But it would be idiotic if we were to make any concessions in this matter to the Soviet Union under the illusion that these exchanges in themselves are going to change policies and official attitudes.

For there is plenty of history in this matter of such exchanges with the Soviet Union and there is not the slightest evidence to support the contention that exposure to Americans and American goods necessarily sweetens in any enduring way the normally harsh course of Russian-American relations or softens the Kremlin's dictatorship.

In 1932 it was in great part pressure from American businessmen that determined President Roosevelt to recognize the Soviet Union. In the 1930's American businessmen and engineers made enormous contributions to the rapid—and ruthless—industrialization of the Soviet Union under Stalin. Then in World War II billions and billions of dollars worth of American machines and machine tools were poured into the Soviet Union.

Even today, a tourist lucky enough, for example, to have a close look at a Soviet auto factory will be astonished at the amount of heavy machinery "made in Detroit."

And it is worth remembering that neither American know-how nor American machines prevented Stalin from making a pact with Hitler when it suited him, or from waging the bitter cold war in the period immediately after 1945.

And in the case of Khrushchev, his visit to the United States, which from beginning to end was a kind of Russian spectacular on American soil, did not inhibit him one whit from placing his offensive missiles in Cuba precisely 3 years later.

About all that came out of the "spirit of Camp David" was a slightly more polite tone in Pravda and Izvestia that lasted a few months. And by the summer of 1961, Khrushchev was again pushing the Berlin crisis to the brink of war.

As to convincing the Russians that the United States is peace loving, there is something to be said for those authorities on the Soviet Union who warn that this portrait of a pacific American can be overdone.

WOULD BE NAIVE

In the words of one Kremlin watchers:

"In these days when the most aggressive Communist power—Red China—is trying to convince the world that America is a paper tiger, it would be naive not to realize that this propaganda can have its effect. It had its effect, for example, on Khrushchev.

"Khrushchev came to visit and saw that we were peace loving. But he dared to put his nuclear missiles 90 miles off our shores, convinced that the American paper tiger would do absolutely nothing.

"And in the future, too, the American people are going to be played for fools if they allow themselves to think that visits of Soviet leaders—or any Communist leaders—are going to turn them into friends. They are here to case the joint, which is well and good if we are hardheaded enough to extract the same in return, and meantime, everybody keep their hands on their wallets."

A Giant Is Gone From Our Midst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill—the imbodiment of Western civilization's struggle toward peace in

the 20th century—has departed from us. The uniqueness of the man is best summed up in the following editorial which appeared in the New York Journal-American of January 25, 1965:

CHURCHILL

The great man is dead. With him has died a part of the 20th century.

Sir Winston Churchill was a towering figure of our age, a unique man who grasped and molded history as few before him.

Those fortunate enough to have lived during his day can treasure this knowledge: they are contemporaries of one who ranks with such titans of history as Caesar, Napoleon, George Washington, and Lincoln.

Who of us will ever forget how he rumbled defiance when Britain stood alone during World War II? Who of us has not thrilled to the rolling resonance of his words?

His brandy, his cigars, and famed V-sign became his unmistakable hallmarks and he relished them as one who loved life and his fellow man.

We are proud that his mother was an American and that he accepted honorary American citizenship, the sole individual so honored in this century.

Soldier, journalist, statesman, and historian—he was all of these in a manner seldom equaled. Yet he was more than any of them.

He was the embodiment of a stubborn determination to preserve honor, decency, and dignity in the affairs of men. For him, civilization and all it implied, built up over the centuries, was sacred.

A giant is gone from our midst.

Ukrainian Americans Contribute to the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, for 2 short years, from 1918 to 1920, the Ukrainian people had independence.

Since that time they have been swallowed up as part of the Soviet Union. Americans who have long held high the principle of self-determination of peoples pay special tribute to these wonderful people of Eastern Europe during this month, the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic.

All of us here in Congress are well aware of the great contribution to American life made by the Ukrainian American immigrants, be they from the 19th century or among the 60,000 Ukrainian displaced persons who came to our shores and became a part of our national life after World War II. One of the best statements I have read about Americans of Ukrainian background was written by Joseph L. Dichten in "One America," edited by Brown & Roucek. I have unanimous consent to place part of that statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at this point:

CONTRIBUTIONS TO AMERICAN LIFE

The Ukrainian American immigrant has done more than his share in the building of the Nation. He has worked in great numbers in factories and farms, railroads and mines, and his unremitting labors have helped to strengthen the vast and crucially important industrial power of the United States. He has strongly identified himself with the cause of organized labor, and has zealously participated in the founding and growth of the American labor movement. The Ukrainian immigrant brought with him from the old country a love of his own home and his own piece of land; thus, the Ukrainian American family unit has always been a sturdy, stable entity.

Many areas of American culture have profited from the contributions of the Ukrainian immigrant. His music, songs, and folk dances have greatly influenced American composers and choreographers. George Gershwin used an old Ukrainian theme as a base for his "Don't Forget Me" from the operetta "Song of the Flame." The Ukrainian National and the United Ukrainian Folk choruses, composed mainly of young Ukrainian Americans born in the United States, have been acclaimed by critics as among the best ever heard in the United States. One reviewer described the Ukrainian National Chorus as "a human organ, an instrument of incomparable precision and incomparable expressiveness. It can rustle like leaves in the forest; it can be lyrical as a lark at dawn; it can be sonorous as thunder over mountains." These choral groups were created by Prof. Alexander Koshetz, a Ukrainian immigrant who lived in New York until his death in 1944. Professor Koshetz left behind him several notable compositions and arrangements of Ukrainian songs for American choruses.

Ukrainian dances are often considered among the most vivid and colorful of all folk dances by virtue of charm and expressiveness, and many of their basic steps have found their way into the American dance. The world-renowned sculptor, Alexander Archipenko, has made his contribution to modern American art. His sculptures, created in New York and California, can be found in many American museums. Movie stars John Hodiak and Anna Sten are of Ukrainian descent. Volodymyr Timoshenko, a recognized authority on the economy of the Ukraine and Russia, was a professor at Stanford University in California.

Many other individual contributions to American life by Ukrainians can be cited. Ukrainian American scientists, composers, singers, cartoonists, and athletes have gained positions of prominence and have contributed to the mainstream of American culture.

However, the greatest contribution to American life has been made by the Ukrainian group as a whole—by the hundreds and thousands of Ukrainian immigrants and their families. The Ukrainian churches, organizations, and press have become integral parts of the American culture, and are concrete examples of the best that can be attained through the realization of the concept of "cultural pluralism."

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. FRASER.

The Soul of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, the distinguished editor of the Tulsa Tribune, should be read by every citizen in the United States. I commend it to the attention of the Congress and to the people of the country.

WHO IS TAMPERING WITH THE SOUL OF AMERICA?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor the Tulsa Tribune)

I am about ot inflict upon you a jeremiad.

Long before the prophet, Jeremiah, uttered his lamentations about the evil behavior of the Children of Israel, the world had seen many calamity howlers. We have cuneiform tablets describing the moral decay of Babylon and Chaldea. We have hieroglyphic inscriptions predicting that Osiris and Ra will smite the Egyptians for their wickedness. And so today when I make some comments about the moral climate of America, and about our responsibilities therefore as temporary custodians of America's press, I speak in a very old tradition.

The calamity howler. It is customary to dismiss such fogeyism as I am about to display with a tolerant laugh. For while it was freely predicted all through the ages that the world was going to hell, it hasn't gone to hell yet. Who can deny that in practically all the crafts and certainly all of the sciences we are further advanced than we ever have been? Why not be cheerfully optimistic?

I think I can tell you why. Human progress has never been steady. It has washed back and forth like waves upon a beach. Happily, there has also been an incoming tide, so the waves have washed higher and higher as each great civilization came on.

But the pathway of history is littered with the bones of dead states and fallen empires. And they were not, in most cases, promptly replaced by something better. Nearly a thousand years elapsed between the fall of western Rome and the rise of the Renaissance, and in between we had the Dark Ages in which nearly all of man's institutions were inferior to those which had gone before. I don't want my children's children to go through a couple of centuries of dialectic materialism before the sun comes up again.

So the Jeremiahs haven't been so wrong, after all. It is sad to watch the beginnings of decay. It is sad to see an age of Pericles replaced by the drunken riots of Alcibiades. There was, indeed, just cause for gloom when into the palaces of the Caesars went Nero and Caligula, and when the once-noble Praetorian guard became a gang of assassins willing to sell the throne to the top bidder.

Alaric's Goths finally poured over the walls of Rome. But it was not that the walls were low. It was that Rome, itself, was low. The sensual life of Pompeii, the orgies on Lake Trasimene, the gradually weakened fiber of a once self-disciplined people that reduced them at last to seeking safety in mercenaries and the payment of tribute—all these brought Rome down. She went down too early.

And so I look upon our own country and much that I see disturbs me. But we are a great people. We have a noble tradition. We have much to teach the world, and if America should go down soon it would be too early.

One thing is certain. We shall be given no centuries for a leisurely and comfortable decay. We have an enemy now—remorseless, crude, brutal, and cocky. However much the leaders of the Communist conspiracy may lie to their subjects about our motives, about our conditions of prosperity, about our policies and aims, one thing they believe themselves implicitly—and that is that we are in an advanced state of moral decline.

When Nikita Khrushchev visited Hollywood he was shown only one movie set, that of a wild dance scene in Can-Can. He said it represented decadence and I am sure he

really thought so. It is a dogma of current Communist faith that America is Sodom and Gomorrah, ripening for the kill.

Do you know what scares me about the Communists? It is not their political system, which is primitive and savage. It is not their economic system which works so badly that progress in a few directions is purchased at the price of progress in all the rest. It is their puritanism. It is their dedication and self-sacrifice.

It does no good to comfort ourselves with the reflection that these are products of endless brainwashings, of incessant propaganda, of deprivation by censorship and jamming of counterinformation and contrary arguments. The dedication is there. The confidence that they are morally superior is there.

The naive questions of your Intourist reveal only too quickly that she thinks she is talking to a self-indulgent fop from the court of some latter day Louis XIV. In the schoolyard the children rush up to show you, not their yo-yos, but their scholarship medals. And when you offer them new Lincoln pennies as souvenirs they rip off their little Young Pioneer buttons and hand them to you, proud that they are not taking gifts, but are making a fair exchange.

The Russian stage is as austere as the Victorian stage. Russian literature may be corny but it is clean, and it glorifies the Russian people and exudes optimism and promise. Russian art is stiffly representational, but the paintings and the sculpture strive to depict beauty and heroism—Russian beauty, of course, and Russian heroism.

And what of us?

We are now at the end of the third decade of the national insanity known as progressive education. This was the education where everybody passes, where the report cards were noncommittal lest the failure be faced with the fact of his failure, where all moved at a snail pace like a transatlantic convoy so that the slowest need not be left behind, and all proceeded toward adulthood in the lockstep of togetherness. Thus the competition that breeds excellence was to be sacrificed for the benefit of something called life adjustment.

With what results? We have watched juvenile delinquency climb steadily. We have produced tens of thousands of high school graduates who move their lips as they read and cannot write a coherent paragraph. While our Russian contemporaries, who were supposed to be dedicated to the mass man, hav been busy constructing an elite we have been engaged in the wholesale production of mediocrity. What a switch.

When was the last time you, as editors and publishers, examined the curriculums of your local schools? How did your schools rank on the standardized Iowa tests? When have you looked at your schools' report cards and the philosophy behind their grading system? Have you asked to examine any senior English themes? Have you offered any recognition to your schools' best scholars to compare to the recognition you accord your schools' best football players?

For the funny thing about progressive educators is that theory vanishes when the referee's whistle blows for the kickoff. In the classroom they pretend to grade subjectively, against the student's supposed capacity, lest he be humiliated by natural inadequacy. But on the football field they never put in a one-legged halfback on the theory that, considering his disability, he's a great halfback. They put in the best halfback they've got, period. The ungifted sit on the bench or back in the stands even though they, too, might thirst for glory. If our schools were as anxious to turn out brains as they are to turn out winning football teams this strange contradiction wouldn't exist.

Having neglected disciplines in education, it was quite logical that we should reject disciplines in art. The great painters and sculptors of the past studied anatomy so diligently that they often indulged in their own body snatching. And today, after many centuries, we stare at the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel or at the walls of the Reichsmusee and marvel at their works.

But this self-discipline is of little concern to the modern nonobjective painter. All he needs is pigment and press agent. He can throw colors at a canvas and the art world will discover him. He can stick bits of glass, old rags, and quids of used chewing tobacco on a board and he is a social critic. He can drive a car back and forth in pools of paint and Life magazine will write him up.

Talent is for squares. What you need is vast effrontery. If you undertake to paint a cow, it must look something like a cow. That takes at least a sign painter's ability. But you can claim to paint a picture of your psyche and, no matter what the result, who is to say what your psyche looks like? So our museums are filled with daubs being stared at by confused citizens who haven't the guts to admit they are confused.

But the age of fakery in art is a mild cross that American civilization bears. Much more serious is our collapse of moral standards and the blunting of our capacity for righteous indignation.

Our Puritan ancestors were preoccupied with sin. They were too preoccupied with it. They were hag-ridden and guilt-ridden and theirs was a repressed and neurotic society. But they had horsepower. They wrested livings from rocky land, built our earliest colleges, started our literature, caused our industrial revolution, and found time in between to fight the Indians, the French, and the British, to bawl for abolition, women's suffrage and prison reform, and to experiment with graham crackers and bloomers. They were a tremendous people.

And for all their exaggerated attention to sin, their philosophy rested on a great granite rock. Man was the master of his soul. You didn't have to be bad. You could and should be better. And if you wanted to escape the eternal fires you'd damned well better be.

In recent years all this has changed in America. We have decided that sin is largely imaginary. We have become enamored with "behavioristic psychology." This holds that a man is a product of his heredity and his environment, and his behavior to a large degree is foreordained by both. He is either a product of a happy combination of genes and chromosomes or an unhappy combination. He moves in an environment that will tend to make him good or that will tend to make him evil. He is just a chip tossed helplessly by forces beyond his control and, therefore, not responsible.

Well, the theory that misbehavior can be cured by pulling down tenements and erecting in their places elaborate public housing is not holding water.

The crime rates continue to rise along with our outlays for social services.

We speak of undeprivilege. Yet the young men who swagger up and down the streets, boldly flaunting their gang symbols on their black jackets, are far more blessed in creature comforts, opportunities for advancement, and freedom from drudgery than 90 percent of the children of the world.

We have sown the dragon's teeth of pseudoscientific sentimentality, and out of the ground has sprung the legion bearing switchblade knives and bicycle chains.

Clearly something is missing. Could it be what the rest of the world's children have been given—the doctrine of individual responsibility?

Relief is gradually becoming an honorable career in America. It is a pretty fair life, if you have neither conscience nor pride. The politicians will weep over you. The State will give a mother a bonus for her illegitimate children, and if she neglects them sufficiently she can save enough out of her ADC (Aid to Dependent Children) payments to keep herself and her boyfriend in wine and gin. Nothing is your fault. And when the city fathers of a harrassed community like Newburgh suggest that able bodied welfare clients might sweep the streets for "liberal" editorialists arise as one man and denounce them for their medieval cruelty.

I don't know how long Americans can stand this erosion of principle. But I believe that some of my starry-eyed friends are kidding themselves when they pretend that every planeload of Puerto Ricans that puts down at Idlewild is equivalent in potential to every shipload of Pilgrims that put into old Plymouth. Nations are built by people capable of great energy and self-discipline. I never heard of one put together by cha-cha-cha.

The welfare state that taxes away the rewards for responsible behavior so that it can remove the age-old penalties for irresponsible behavior is building on a foundation of jelly. It is time we stopped this elaborate pretense that there is no difference between the genuinely unfortunate and the mobs of reliefers who start throwing bottles every time the cops try to make a legitimate arrest.

Finally, there is the status of our entertainment and our literature.

Can anyone deny that movies are dirtier than ever? But they don't call it dirt. They call it "realism." Why do we let them fool us? Why do we nod owlishly when they tell us that filth is merely a daring art form, that licentiousness is really social comment? Isn't it time we recognized Hollywood's quest for the fast buck for what it is? Isn't it plain that the financially harassed movie industry is putting gobs of sex in the darkened drive-ins in an effort to lure curious teenagers away from their TV sets? Recently the screen industry solemnly announced that henceforth perversion and homosexuality would no longer be barred from the screen provided the subjects were handled with "delicacy and taste." Good Lord.

And we of the press are a party to the crime. Last year the movie ads in our newspaper got so salacious and suggestive that the advertising manager and I decided to throw out the worst and set up some standards. We thought that due to our ukase there might be some interruption in advertising some shows. But no. Within a couple of hours the exhibitors were down with much milder ads. How was this miracle accomplished?

Well, it seems that the exhibitors are supplied with several different ads for each movie. If the publishers are dumb enough to accept the most suggestive ones those are what they get. But if publishers squawk the cleaner ads are sent down. Isn't it time we all squawked?

I think it's time we quit giving page 1 play to the extramarital junkets of crooners. I think it is time we stopped treating as glamorous and exciting the brazen shack-ups of screen tramps. I think it is time we asked our Broadway and Hollywood columnists if they can't find something decent and inspiring going on along their beats.

And the stage: They raided Minsky's so Minsky's has spread all over town. Bawdiness has put on a dinner jacket, and seats in the orchestra that used to go for six-bits at the Old Howard and Nichols' Gayety are now scaled at $8.80. Oh, yes. And we have lots of "realism." Incestuous Americans. Perverted Americans. Degenerate Americans. Murderous Americans.

How many of these "realistic" Americans do you know?

Several months ago an American touring company, sponsored by the State Department and paid for by your tax dollars, presented one of Tennessee Williams' more depraved offerings to an audience in Rio de Janeiro. The audience hooted in disgust and walked out. And where did it walk to? Right across the street where a Russian ballet company was putting on a beautiful performance for the glory of Russia. How dumb can we get?

We are drowning our youngsters in violence, cynicism, and sadism piped into the living room and even the nursery. The grandchildren of the kids who used to weep because the little match girl froze to death now feel cheated if she isn't slugged, raped, and thrown into a bessemer converter.

And there's our literature. The old eye-poppers of the past, which tourists used to smuggle back from Paris under their dirty shirts, are now tame stuff. Compared to some of our modern slush, "Ulysses" reads like the minutes of the Epworth League. "Lady Chatterley's Lover" has been draped with the mantle of art, and it is now on sale in the corner drugstore to your high-school-age son or daughter for 50 cents. Henry Miller's "Tropic of Cancer," which resembles a collection of inscriptions taken from privy walls, is about to join Lady Chatterley. The quick-buck boys have apparently convinced our bumfuzzled judges that there is no difference between a peep show and a moral lecture.

And, of course, we have our latter-day historical novels in which the romance of man's upward movement from savagery is lost in a confused welter of bundlings and tumblings. The foreign reader of one of these epics on the development of the American West must marvel that our forefathers found time to quell the Comanches, plow up Kansas, and build the transcontinental railroad, while spending practically all their time in the hay.

Don Maxwell of the Chicago Tribune has recently asked his book department to quit advertising scatological literature by including it in the list of best sellers. The critics and the book publishers have denounced him for tampering with the facts. I would like to raise a somewhat larger question: "Who is tampering with the soul of America?"

For nations do have souls. They have collective personalities.

People who think well of themselves collectively exhibit elan and enthusiasm and morale.

DECLINE OF GREATNESS

When nations cease believing in themselves, when they regard their institutions with cynicism and their traditions with flippancy, they will not long remain great nations. When they seek learning without effort and wages without work, they are beginning to stagger. Where they become hedonistic and pleasure oriented, when their Boy Scouts on their 14-mile hikes start to hitch, there's trouble ahead. Where payola becomes a way of life, expense-account cheating common, and union goonery a fiercely defended "right," that nation is in danger. And where police departments attempt to control burglary by the novel method of making it a department monopoly, then the chasm yawns.

Do not let me overdraw the picture. This is still a great, powerful, vibrant, able, optimistic nation. Americans—our readers—do believe in themselves and in their country.

But there is rot and there is blight and there is cutting out and filling to be done if we, as the leader of free men, are to survive the hammer blows which quite plainly are in store for us all.

We have reached the stomach-turning point.

We have reached the point where we should reexamine the debilitating philosophy of permissiveness. Let this not be confused with the philosophy of liberty.

The school system that permits our children to develop a quarter of their natural talents is not a champion of our liberties.

The healthy man who chooses to loaf on unemployment compensation is not a defender of human freedom.

The playwright who would degrade us and the author who would profit from pandering to the worst that's in us are no friends of ours.

It is time we hit the sawdust trail. It is time we revived the idea that there is such a thing as sin—just plain old willful sin. It is time we brought self-discipline back into style. And who has a greater responsibility at this hour than we, the gentlemen of the press?

So I suggest:

Let's look to our educational institutions at the local level, and, if Johnny can't read by the time he's ready to get married, let's find out why.

Let's look at the distribution of public largesse and if, far from alleviating human misery, it is producing the sloth and irresponsibility that intensifies it, let's get it fixed.

Let's quit being bulldozed and bedazzled by self-appointed longhairs. Let's have the guts to say that a book is dirt if that's what we think of it, or that a painting may well be a daub if you can't figure out which way to hang it. And if some beatnik welds together a collection of rusty cogwheels and old corset stays and claims it's a greater sculpture than Michelangelo's "David" let's have the courage to say that it looks like junk and probably is.

Let's blow the whistle on plays that would bring blushes to an American Legion stag party. Let's not be awed by movie characters with barnyard morals even if some of them have been photographed climbing aboard the presidential yacht. Let us pay more attention in our news columns to the decent people everywhere who are trying to do something for the good of others.

In short, let's cover up the cesspool and start planting some flowers.

Well, that's the jeremiad. I never thought I'd deliver one of these. I never dreamed I'd go around sounding like an advance man for the watch-and-ward society. I used to consider myself quite a liberal young man. I still think that on some people bikinis look fine.

But I am fed up to here with the educationalists and pseudosocial scientists who have underrated our potential as a people. I am fed up to here with the medicine men who try to pass off pretense for art and prurience for literature. I am tired of seeing America debased and low rated in the eyes of foreigners. And I am genuinely disturbed that to idealistic youth in many countries the fraud of communism appears synonymous with morality, while we, the chief repository of real freedom, are regarded as being in the last stages of decay.

Unless I misread the signs a great number of our people are ready for a fresh breeze, a breeze of new honesty, new idealism, new integrity.

And there is where you come in. You have typewriters, presses, and a huge audience.

How about raising hell?

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago peoples subjected to Russian autocracy cast off the heavy yoke of that oppressive regime and proclaimed their independence. To tens of millions the Russian revolution of 1917 seemed to usher in a new day; they all then sought and hoped to find their freedom in the overthrow of the czarist regime. At first their most sanguine expectations seemed justified, and by the end of the First World War nearly all ethnic groups in the continental empire had attained, or were about to attain, their national independence. The Ukrainians, as the most numerous and also as the most important of these nationality groups, had done this.

Since mid-17th century Ukraine had been part of the Russian Empire, and during all that time the Russians had tried to Russianize them by eradicating Ukrainian nationalism and national ideals, but their attempts were not successful. Liberty-loving and stout-hearted Ukrainians clung firmly to their traditional national ideals, and in 1918 they had their reward in freedom and independence. On January 22 of that year they proclaimed the Ukrainian Republic, set up their own democratic government and began to rebuild their war-ravaged country. Unfortunately, the independent state thus created did not last long. Ukrainians enjoyed their hard-earned independence for only 2 years; they then lost it to their inveterate foe, the Russian Communists. Early in the 1920's the country was attacked by the Red army; Ukrainians could not by themselves stave off this deadly threat. Soon the country was overrun, and their independent existence came to an end. Before long Ukraine was annexed to the Soviet Union. Since then, for more than 44 years, some 44 million Ukrainians have been captives of the Kremlin's Communist totalitarianism.

On the 47th anniversary of their independence day it is appropriate that we join them in its observance. We do this gladly in the fond hope of seeing them regain their freedom and independence once more and live in peace in their historic homeland, in their fair and fertile Ukraine.

The Titan of Our Time

SPEECH

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, most of us, in this body of Members truly representative of our Nation, are of that generation which President Kennedy in his inaugural address referred to as "tempered by war." We had, from the tragic years from 1938 to the triumphant year of 1945, our own great leader in the person of Franklin D. Roosevelt, but we and all people who fought tyranny during that dark convulsion which shook the earth had another leader in the person of Sir Winston Churchill.

England has the honor to call him her own, but we have the honor to call him

ours, too, by adoption and by affection. From the beginning of that conflict there was tragedy, and there was fear, and a new language was imposed upon the minds and hearts of the American people. As the German armies overran Poland, the first nation proud enough to fight rather than surrender, the words "blitzkreig," "panzer," "stuka," and "gestapo" became household words, and brought a foreboding of a terrible and irresistible force which could menace us even across the Atlantic, and as those armies overran France this fear increased.

And then that doughty, cocky, magnificent voice was raised, and a more familiar language went to work, and phrase after eloquent phrase rolled across England, and across America, and put heart in her people and our own.

"Give us the tools," he said, and America produced the tools.

"Look west, the land is also bright," he quoted, and the conscience and honor of America were awakened.

"We shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender," he said, and courage and resolve flowed from this one man into all who enlisted in the cause of freedom.

For that generation which was tempered by war, he provided both the fire and the steel; he articulated courage and honor; he brought out the best in all of us, and made that generation greater than it had been.

For all those, in all lands, who have ever engaged in public service, he did something more. He demonstrated the value of standing hard by one's beliefs. Sir Winston Churchill did not always leap mightily from triumph to triumph. He had his political defeats, his public repudiations, and must at times have despaired for the future of all those principles in which he most deeply believed, but he held to those principles and in the fullness of time they were recognized, needed, and used to save his nation and our own.

Not many men live to be recognized as great in their own time. None will be recognized as greater in our own. Warrior, statesman, author, artist—this was a man. This was the titan of our time. From his life each of us has gained greatly; with his death we join gratefully to do him honor.

Persecution of Jews Within Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, last November 22 in Pittsburgh, 1,000 persons from 54 Jewish organizations in the community met to register their concern over the persecution of Jews within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I should like to call the attention of the House to the attached resolution passed by acclamation at that meeting.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON SOVIET JEWRY, 1964

This assembly of representatives of virtually all of the Jewish organizations and religious institutions in the city of Pittsburgh declares its deep concern over and condemnation of the treatment of our Jewish brethren in the Soviet Union.

Soviet Jews have been singled out for cultural and spiritual genocide. They have suffered the confiscation of synagogues, the closing of Jewish cemeteries, the arrest of rabbis and lay religious leaders, the severe curtailment of religious observance and the ban on import or fabrication of the materials needed for such observance. They suffer discrimination in cultural activities and access to higher education, and are subject to special restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands.

Soviet Jews have been denied any sort of national or provincial organization, secular or religious, such as other nationality groups and other religious sects have. While Soviet Jews are designated as a nationality, regardless of religious practice, they are barred from activities or institutions permitted to other nationality groups.

Soviet Jews, past and present, are daily vilified and maligned in the controlled press and other official publications. Judaism and Jewish history are falsified; anti-Semitic stereotypes are exploited to portray the synagogues as a breeding ground of economic and social crimes.

Soviet Jews, charged with alleged economic crimes, face discriminatory application of maximum penalties including the death sentence, and the controlled press deliberately reports such news in a manner calculated to exacerbate public anti-Semitism.

World opinion must be brought to bear upon the Soviet Union to end these inhumanities. We call upon the new leaders of the Soviet Government, as they discard those policies of the previous administration which were harmful to the well-being of their citizens, to abandon and turn away from this heritage of the Stalin-Khrushchev era, with its violation of their own constitutional guarantees of equality for all citizens of the Soviet Union.

We ask no special privilege for our brethren; we do demand an end to the massive and systematic liquidation of the religious and cultural heritage of an entire community. We ask only justice and equality, with all other cultural and religious minorities, for the Jewish community.

Rabbi MORDECAI S. CHERTOFF.

Unanimously passed by meeting of 1,000 persons, representing 54 Jewish organizations, in Pittsburgh, Pa., Sunday, November 22, 1964.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, all peoples struggle to attain their national goals, their freedom and independence, and after attaining these goals, they do their utmost to retain them. In this task some have succeeded well, while others have not been so fortunate, and through some freakish turn and twist in international affairs over which they had no control, have witnessed their own tragic failure in this supreme task. The Ukrainians have been among these unfortunate people. By the inexorable forces of nature their fair land has been surrounded by powerful and aggressive neighbors, and these have shown no mercy in their dealings with the Ukrainians. Among the cruelest of these neighbors have been, and still are, the Russians. In the past, before World War I, they had held the Ukrainian people in bondage under their czarist autocracy. When that autocracy was shattered in 1917, Ukrainians asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence on January 22, 1918.

That historic event seemed for a time to have turned a new page in Ukrainian history, but within 2 years, before the Ukrainian people barely had time to taste the sweetness and joy of their freedom, they were robbed of their richly deserved prize by the Red army of Communist Russia. That was in 1920, and during the last 44 years these ceaseless fighters for their freedom have known no freedom in their historic homeland. They have been held down under the unrelenting rule imposed upon them by the Kremlin. During all these years they have struggled hard to free themselves from the Kremlin's tyranny, but they have not been successful. On the 47th anniversay of their independence day we wish them success in future years.

Dedication Address—Victor Valley Lutheran Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD the dedicatory address of the Honorable Joseph Campbell, mayor of Victorville, Calif., on the occasion of the dedication of the Victor Valley Lutheran Hospital on November 22, 1964—a badly needed institution of healing for the great Mojave Desert.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the board, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the most rewarding facet of the office of mayor is being granted the privilege of participating in ceremonies held to recognize the achievement of a goal.

Mayors are called upon to represent their cities at every conceivable public function from the opening of commercial enterprises to the dedication of houses of worship.

All mayors look forward to such occasions because it allows us to feel that in some small measure we have participated in the economic or spiritual growth of our respective communities.

The dedication of this beautiful hospital is doubly gratifying because it represents, not only a tremendous boon to our economy, but it is also an overwhelming monument to the awareness which the people have of their obligation to their brothers.

In my opinion, it would be impossible to find a community project which could more forcefully demonstrate the spiritual health and moral fiber of the population than the creation of a facility for the sole and express purpose of providing care for all who are ill without regard to their economic or social standing, without regard to the color of their skin or their native tongue or without regard to how or with whom they worship.

I am sure that none of you can help but be impressed by the beauty of the buildings, the excellence of design, the skill of construction and the other physical attributes of these structures which we are privileged to inspect in detail today, but I would like to direct your heart's gaze to something which is on display today which is of far greater importance than an engineer's slide rule, an architect's plans, a builder's tools or the steel, glass, and concrete which are blended here.

These things, important as they may be, could not have been combined to create anything without one other ingredient. That ingredient was faith.

Over 4 years ago, a small group of men came to my office and told me that this community was going to build a hospital and I told them that I knew the community and that, in my opinion, their dream was just that; a dream, and that like other dreams it would fade and disappear. But, they had a device at their disposal which I didn't recognize and didn't understand. They had faith and faith isn't something that comes in limited quantities. They had enough so that they were able to share it with others, and, they in turn, with still others until eventually they had enough people infected with faith to transform a dream into a substance.

The transformation was not without problems and travail: but no obstacle, no disagreement was of sufficient magnitude to diminish their faith nor dim their vision. There were many times when I felt that the obstacle was insurmountable, but these dedicated people never considered abandoning their dream.

Tomorrow morning the doors will be opened and those who have dedicated their lives to the healing arts will have another place to bring comfort and the restoration of health to those who are ill.

I am keenly aware that I lack the power of rhetoric to adequately express to the small band of 25 or less, who were the instrument by which this house of healing was created, the depth of our gratitude to them or the magnitude of the debt we owe them. They have sought no temporal reward and there is none within our power to bestow upon them, but I speak for all who are present and all of the residents of our valley and all of those who in the future will have received comfort and care and health within these walls, when I say we will remember you in our hearts and in our prayers.

Visit to a Dead Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Gustave Siskoff, of New Prague, Minn., is just one of many thousands of farmers in the Second Congressional District of Minnesota greatly concerned and disheartened by the sick state of agriculture. Along with his letter, Mr. Siskoff provided me with a column written by Frawley Hynes which appeared in the January issue of Columbia magazine.

I include it in today's Appendix as a forceful statement of our case for the family farm:

VISIT TO A DEAD FARM

Within a radius of 2 or 3 miles of the family farmland, we can count eight deserted farmsteads This is sad and a little frightening. Analyzed, it means that about a fourth of the rural people in our neighborhood have left the land. Multiply this by thousands of similar sections of the country and you have a very disheartening result, indeed. These people have been forced, by the downscale prices of the last 10 years, to sell their land to neighbors or lease it to corporations; or have lost it to banks and insurance companies. Or, perhaps, have left it idle because they are weary of trying to continue the uphill climb toward a fair and just reward for their labors. Or, are financially unable to do so. The saddest part of the dilemma is that 9 out of 10 persons, thus inhibited, do not want to leave their homes and their land which may have been in their family for generations.

Statistics bluntly affirm that the cost of starting even a modest farming operation, is, at the least, $50,000. This is a staggering sum confronting, say, a young man just out of university or agricultural college or the Armed Forces, who wises to make of farming a way of life common to his forebears. Either, if he is able, he must borrow to buy land and equipment with no assets but his youth, his strength and his enthusiasm; or he must rent at a high rate per acre; or, if he is fortunate, be backed by father or friend already established on productive acres that have managed to hold their own in the sliding agricultural economy. Alternately, he is forced to seek job and home elsewhere, in a distant State or in the already ballooning urban areas, even though farming is bred in his bones.

All this is galling and frustrating * * * there is no more independent individual in the world than the farmer and, perhaps, this is his nemesis. If all concerned would join together with one voice and proclaim unanimity of price and purpose, the financial status of agriculture would unquestionably rise and stabilize. Judging by the strides ahead made by other aspirants in other fields of endeavor, so, at least, it seems to us.,

Rural life, with its attendant labors, is the oldest of all ways of life. Our first parents tilled the soil in the sweat of their brow and were nourished and clothed thereby. So it is an ancient, a prideful as well as a humbling way of life; for the farmer deals with and cooperates with nature for the welfare of mankind, as the Creator designated. From spring through autumn, he often works in all weathers from 12 to 16 hours daily. He toils with his hands, his head, and his heart; physically, mentally, yes, and spiritually, if he is a true son of the soil. His needs must be, by the very nature of his calling, a specialist in husbandry, a sower, a reaper, a mechanic, a mathematician, an architect, an engineer. He is also, no matter how astute and diligent, how resolute and farseeing, and knowledgeable, a mouse in the paws of economic progress; a pawn of the weather which can bless him with goodly harvests or ravage, in an hour, the fruits of months of hard and conscientious labor.

It's an honorable profession, farming. We are loath to see it lose dignity; to be forced to become big business, thus making the modest family farm expendable.

Farming has always been, and should be for those who choose it, a dedicated and distinct way of living. There seems to be something culpable and malfeasant in this unhappy draining away from the land those who love it; as though the world turns its back on the indomitable spirit of our pioneers and the heritage they bequeathed us. We fear and resent that something, whatever its font, whatever its purpose.

Sometimes we drive into one of the deserted places that disfigure the countryside. Havoc is rampant. The woods have become a labyrinth of tangle creepers and tumbled trees. Weeds flourish head high, the habitat of sly, shy, woodland creatures. Fences shamble and creep about like huge distorted insects and the silo tilts like a miniature Pisa. Gaunt and gray, the barn spraddles on its stony knees; and the granary, once guardian of the harvest, leans in the wind, raddled and empty as a vacant mind.

What once, were lawn and garden run riot with thistles, nettles and the unquenchable quack. A quick eye may discover a pinch of beauty there: a bit of Queen Ann's lace, a shoot of lilac, a yellow marigold, a purple petunia, coaxing a way up through the dock and the wild dill.

As for the house, it huddles forlornly amid the scraggling bushes with its roof sunken and its walls awry. Wind, rain and snow have climbed through the broken panes and left their footprints on the warping floor. Tatterdemalion wisps of curtain still dangle at the windows. A raggety doll stands on its head in a dusty corner; and, in a tattered story book on the hearth, Cinderella goes to the ball in a cobwebby gown.

Empty are the rooms now, disconsolate, echoing, dusty, and doomed to complete dissolution. There is nothing more sad or more sobering than this: a house, once a home that roofed love and laughter, life and death; and now forever deserted by all save the uncaring ghost of time.

In Remembrance of President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following letter honoring the death of President John F. Kennedy, which was written by Miss Jackie Kelley, a senior at Argentine High School in Kansas City, Kans.

The letter follows:

IN MEMORIAM

November 22 will mark the beginning of the 4 most memorable days of history in our generation. On these days of that bleak November last year, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, answered the call of God under the guidance of an assassin's bullet. The loss of this great chief upset many different walks of life. Perhaps the most important and most meaningful was the President's family and close friends. Not only did they lose their chief, but their brother, son, husband, and father. The gap left in their hearts remain solemn and memorable of happier days when his laugh and crinkled eyes shown brightly.

One of the most difficult tasks, ordered by President Johnson, was designated to Chief Justice Earl Warren. On September 27, 10 months and 5 days after the death of John Kennedy, the Warren Commission released its extensive report to President Johnson. The facts stated in the report astonished

people in America who were grateful to learn the absolute truth of the happenings on November 22, 1963.

In August 1964, the National Democratic Convention opened and closed with the nomination of Lyndon B. Johnson as candidate for the Presidency in November 1964. The Kennedy clan supported Mr. Johnson, as would be the wish of their fallen leader. Mrs. John F. Kennedy, still, in the hearts of Americans, the first lady, again proved her ability to hold composure and graciousness under the great strain of memory of another convention 4 years previous.

Was it only 4 years ago John Kennedy ran for and achieved the position of President? And was it only 1 year ago he was slain and now remains only in memory? The answers to all of these questions is the affirmative "yes." A fallen executive chief; answers to big questions; and a new chief beginning, ends a year of anxiety and mourning. The world will forever mourn John Fitzgerald Kennedy, but he will stay in the hearts and minds of men. May God watch over him forever.

Moscow Warms up to Peiping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we watch closely the interchanges, and interactions, between Moscow and Peiping, in order that we not be deluded into the belief that a major and permanent division has occurred, harmful to the essential objectves of Communist aggression and favorable to the free world.

In this connection, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a commentary by John Chamberlain which appeared in the Washington Post on January 23, 1965, as follows:

THESE DAYS: MOSCOW WARMS UP TO PEIPING

(By John Chamberlain)

In common with most other commentators who listen to professional Kremlinologists, I have been heartened by the difficulties that the Soviet Union has been having with Red China. But Vladimir Petrov, a teacher of Russian studies at Yale University who reads Moscow's Pravda and Izvestia with his morning coffee, takes a disturbing minority exception to the general rejoicing over the reported Sino-Soviet troubles.

Contrary to general belief in Washington, where President Johnson is hoping for a bid to visit Moscow, Petrov finds "the evidence of the Sino-Soviet rapprochement following Khrushchev's demise overwhelming." I had asked him to check through Soviet publications for the last 3 months, and he comes up with a disenchanting pattern.

"Whatever the Sino-Soviet differences are," he says, "they are subordinated to the needs of reestablishment of the united front against the United States, which in their book takes precedence over everything else. Moreover, I am convinced that in the last 3 months certain far-reaching decisions have been made both in Moscow and Peiping related to the buildup of pressure against us at all the fronts where we have a good chance to lose. Only fools can ignore the gathering storm."

This is a sweeping conclusion, and it is not what any of us want to hear. Petrov justifies it because—

After months of vituperation, sometimes most violent, all Soviet publications have cut off unfavorable comment about Communist China. The change in tone, says Petrov, is startling.

Chou En-lai's visit to Moscow for the celebration of the October Revolution was reported with some reserve, but Petrov sees significance in the fact that it was reported as fully as it was.

On December 12, Pravda printed an article by Comrade Sardesai of the Indian Communist Party that was somewhat critical of his fellow Communists who favored China (the so-called Indian "splitters"). A few days later Pravda did penance for this by printing a long report from Bombay on the proceedings of the seventh congress of the Indian Communist Party. It did not contain a single reference to Red China's intrigues or to the bad split within the Indian Communist movement.

After Khrushchev's departure, the Soviet papers stepped up their attacks on the U.S. position in South Vietnam. The attacks slavishly followed Mao Tse-tung's line.

Moscow has been hailing the leaders and rebels who are most closely associated with Peiping: Ben Bella in Algeria, the Simbas in the Congo, Sukarno in Indonesia, Castro in Cuba. This could be interpreted as competition with Red China for influence, but it is nonetheless curious that all the Peiping-blessed Red regimes began to get a larger share of promises and praise from Moscow after Khrushchev's removal.

Petrov notes that visiting Soviet citizens—actors, writers, and so on—have stopped taking small gifts from Americans. They are keeping a correct distance.

All of this could, of course, be interpreted as the desire of Brezhnev and Kosygin, the two new men in charge of Soviet destinies, to find space for maneuver vis-a-vis the Chinese, which Khrushchev had denied himself. Some observers report the emergence of a pro-Soviet clique in Peiping, which complicates the issue.

In any event, the view of this column is that the internal difficulties in the Red world from Poland and Czechoslovakia east to Siberia are so great that a firm group of Western nations can face the Russians no matter what Soviet relations with the Chinese may be.

But my worry, as always, is that the West, in its pursuit of la dolce vita, will try to build bridges to Soviet Europe without gaining any economic or political advantage from them. There are still World War II lend-lease debts to be settled. There are still those "hate America" riots and the Embassy and library vandalism to be called off.

So it goes as we talk about bridge building. We still have advantages to press even though we may not be able to count on that hoped-for Sino-Soviet split.

Cheating on Exams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the January 25 issue of the Washington Daily News expresses my feelings on the recent events at the Air Force Academy which have resulted in the resignation of a number of cadets. While those who have cheated certainly deserve their fate, I feel that the public recognition of the problem and the action that was taken speak well for the Academy and its honor code.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the above-mentioned editorial entitled "Cheating on Exams":

CHEATING ON EXAMS

Unfortunately, the current scandal at the Air Force Academy marks neither the first nór the last episode involving classroom cheating in American schools.

Only occasionally does it break out into the open, however, as in this case and in the famous West Point disclosures of 1951. More often, the problem is handled without publicity by university officials or—even worse—the cheating goes undetected.

The very fact that the cheating was exposed indicates that the great majority of Air Force cadets abhor the practice and intend to live up to the words of their honor code: "We will not lie, steal, or cheat or tolerate among us those who do."

And the fact that Air Force officials have moved promptly and openly against the cheaters also is a good omen for the Academy's future. It says, clearly and firmly, to future cadets: "Don't try this here."

Abandoned Railroad Rights-of-Way Can Be Made National Recreational Assets by Converting Them Into Hiking-Cycling Paths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the United States now has an unprecedented opportunity to create easily and inexpensively an extensive network of safe and scenic hiking and bicycle trails.

This excellent opportunity is the result of the abandonment fo railway service on more than 1,000 miles of right-of-way each year, combined with the passage of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and the Economic Opportunity Act, and the renewed national emphasis on physical fitness.

The January 1965 issue of Recreation magazine, published by the National Recreation Association, includes an article describing possible development of hiking-cycling trails on old railroad rights-of-way. The article also describes the campaign of private and local government groups in the Midwest to establish an Illinois Prairie Path along the right-of-way of the former Chicago, Aurora & Elgin Railway. In this scheme hiking and cycling would be one of a number of valuable uses for the right-of-way.

Another promising opportunity, not described in detail in Recreation, is for a recreational trail along the old Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad. I commend this project to my colleagues from Maryland and Pennsylvania.

The text of the article from Recreation follows:

NEW COURSES FOR OLD PATHS

Hikers, cyclists, and horseback riders whose trails, paths, and byways have been steadily dwindling before the steady encroachment of housing developments and highways, finally have some hope that urbanization will not totally engulf them. Communities are eying abandoned railroad rights-of-way, dry riverbeds, old towpaths, and similar obsolescent properties with a determination to convert these areas into new trails. Park and recreation administrators should examine the new Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (recreation, November 1964) for assistance in this regard and also note the progress made in various communities across the country.

TRIPLE COINCIDENCE

Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, an outdoorsman and member of the board of the American Youth Hostels, recently presented a plan for using abandoned railroad rights-of-way to develop an extensive network of hiking and bicycling trails throughout the country. "A happy triple coincidence—the physical fitness program, abandonment of railroad rights-of-way, and two measures passed by Congress this year—has given the United States an opportunity we must not miss to improve our grossly inadequate facilities for hiking and cycling," says Representative REUSS. "For years, Americans traveling in Europe have enjoyed the marvelous hiking and cycling facilities there and wished we had something to match them. The heavy use of the few hiking and cycling trails we have—such as the C. & O. towpath from Washington, D.C., to Cumberland, Md., or the cycling roads on Nantucket—show that Americans like to go places under their own power.

"Establishment of networks of hiking and cycling trails like those in the Netherlands, Germany, and Great Britain would give us a great new recreation asset," declares Representative REUSS. "Three circumstances have converged to make this the time to catch up with Europe. There is renewed interest in the physical fitness of our people and a sharper realization that too many Americans have become soft as a result of spectator sports and the lack of good opportunities for vigorous outdoor recreation. Long stretches of railroad rights-of-way, which are ideally suited for development as biking and hiking trails, are being abandoned every year. Since the heyday of railroading in 1918, an estimated 40,000 miles of railroad rights-of-way have been abandoned. and quite a bit of it never used for any other purposes. In the last 6 years alone, railroads have ended service on 8,200 miles of rights-of-way. If the trend toward railroad mergers continues, the abandonment of parallel lines may well make land available at an even faster rate. Acts passed by the 88th Congress provide the means for buying and developing the rights-of-way. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act provides as much as $90 million a year for States and localities for acquisition and development of land for recreation purposes. Edward F. Crafts, Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation which administers the act, told me that 'projects to increase bicycling opportunity are among the kinds of projects which will be eligible to receive assistance.' The Economic Opportunity Act provides, in the Job Corps and in the work-training program, manpower that could be used to develop railroad rights-of-way for recreation."

Since railroads usually remove the tracks and ties, the roadbed could be prepared for cycling merely by smoothing it out, Representative REUSS points out. Wayside shelters and paving would be optional. In some cases, old bridges might have to be strengthened or replaced by light suspension structures.

There are already several pilot efforts to use abandoned railroad rights-of-way for recreation—on a 30-mile stretch near Sparta, Wis., and on old ways between Chicago and Elgin, Ill., and between Baltimore and the Pennsylvania State line.

"There are many other opportunities to turn relatively useless long, narrow strips of land into real community assets with Federal help, if citizens and State and local governments will take the initiative," Representative REUSS stresses. At his suggestion, an exploration of bicycling paths and of railroad rights-of-way suitable for recreation use is being included in the Department of Commerce's scenic roads and parkways study, scheduled for completion late next year.

ILLINOIS PRAIRIE PATH

Many groups in the Midwest are putting on an active campaign to establish an Illinois Prairie Path system along the right-of-way of the defunct Chicago-Aurora & Elgin Railway. The proposed path has received the enthusiastic endorsement of many groups and individuals who see the project as one which they can utilize for their own programs, which can provide a good community service, which can establish a green ribbon of beauty from Cook and Kane Counties through Du Page County.

The prairie path is one of the proposals of the open lands project of the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago. The open lands project, a Chicago-foundation-supported program, has as its objective the acquisition, preservation and conservation of open land in the total metropolitan area. The welfare council is a federation of 268 health, recreation, and social service agencies in Cook, Lake, and DuPage Counties, combining their strength to create a better environment for living. The council includes not only the youth-serving, recreation, public parks, and forest preserve agencies, but also the health and family welfare groups that are equally aware of the importance of open playlands for a balanced life. The proposed prairie path has many ramifications:

BACKGROUND

About 5 years ago, the Chicago Aurora & Elgin Railway ceased operation after many years of providing commuter service to Chicago from its western suburbs. Since then the right-of-way has been abandoned, the tracks and ties have been sold and removed, the stations have been sold or rented.

PRESENT USES

In addition to ownership by the railroad, Commonwealth Edison maintains power lines over the major portion of the right-of-way. This company purchased many of the railroad rights over the years and has acquired fee title to a portion of the right-of-way. It also has perpetual easements over the entire system for its powerlines. In some areas the original landowners have cultivated portions of the right-of-way. The remainder of the property is standing idle. There is some usage of the roadbed as an alley and a dumping ground.

SOME PROPOSED USES

Consideration has been given by the State highway department to an inter-community highway on the right-of-way. This has encountered opposition in the suburban towns (like Lombard, Glen Ellyn, Wheaton) because it would mean added traffic through the centers of these communities. Suburban officials would much prefer the establishment of parking lots to provide easier shopping in the towns. Some communities are pursuing this use.

With the anticipated need for water from Lake Michigan to supply the growing communities in Du Page County and with a need to make provision for sewage collection and disposal, the Du Page County Board of Supervisors would like to acquire the right-of-way for these purposes. It would need the continuity of the entire right-of-way. A future monorail development is another use.

PROPOSED OWNERSHIP

In order to retain the continuity of the right-of-way for multiple use, the Du Page County Board of Supervisors is being urged to acquire the entire rights of the railroad in Du Page County. Similar bodies in Cook and Kane Counties should acquire the sections in their counties.

FINANCING

The proposed purchase of access rights to the entire right-of-way would have to be done by the county. The transportation fund is a source for purchase—in order to hold the right-of-way for possible highway or monorail development in the future and for the Prairie Path now. Provision will need to be made for supervision and maintenance of the path. This may come from forest preserve funds or from some, as yet to be determined, body. The acquisition of rights to the property should take place as quickly as possible.

POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT

Separate paths for hikers, cyclists, and riders would give to all an encouraging opportunity for exercise and education. The path varies in width from 45 to 150 feet and would lend itself well to development. Some development ideas:

Garden clubs may wish to plan certain areas.

Men's clubs might install picnic benches.

Civic groups could drill wells and build privies.

Youth groups may engage in cleanup projects.

Audubon groups might set out plants to attract birds.

Sports clubs may clean streams.

Scout groups may develop trail markers.

Naturalists may set out simple identification markers.

Property owners could consider renting youth hostel stopovers and camping facilities.

Simple supply stores may be established.

Village stores and restaurants could find new customers.

Rental of bicycles and horses would be possible.

COMMUNITY PROJECTS

A wide variety of possibilities exist for communities to beautify the areas through which the path runs and to make the path a beauty spot through all of the communities. Parking lots will undoubtedly be necessary in some locations, but it is hoped that a section of the right-of-way might be reserved for hikers, riders, and cyclists passing through the villages. Some provision will need to be made in communities for parking bicycles and tying up horses, in order to permit access to the shopping areas through which the path will undoubtedly travel. There may be places in the future for group campsites off the prairie path on private property but accessible to it. There may be connecting paths along the prairie path to extend hiking, riding, and cycling opportunities to an even more extensive route. Consideration is being given to possible links between Elgin and Aurora along the Fox River, perhaps even a water route.

STRIP FILM

A 10-minute film strip with recorded commentary has been produced by the open lands project, to call attention to the possibilities of the Illinois Prairie Path. Arrangements are being made to have the film shown at meetings and affairs throughout the area.

Drama Critic Says "Wire Your Congressman"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, drama critic Harold V. Cohen who writes a very perceptive column for the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette pointed up in a recent article the plight of the actor in this day of a few hit plays with small casts. Under the heading "Wire Your Congressman," he suggested that this was a cultural poverty pocket that needs immediate attention.

I should like to suggest that a National Humanities Foundation, as proposed in my bill, H.R. 334, and cosponsored by more than 80 other Members of this House and some 40 Members of the Senate, would offer some remedy for this problem.

The goal of a National Humanities Foundation is twofold in nature.

It is to promote excellence in the creation and the understanding of art or as President Johnson called it, "the love of learning and the capacity for creation."

Great creativity in the arts alone is not enough, the Great Society must have a great audience.

What do I mean by that phrase?

I mean that a great civilization, at least in modern times, must have not only great creativity, but great receptivity.

The humanities not only give us what is beautiful to see or to hear, but they also teach us what to look for and what to listen for. And it is important that an audience know these things. The National Humanities Foundation would recognize that great drama critics are as important to great theater playrights, directors, and actors.

I conceive it to be a central function of a National Humanities Foundation to promote excellence in the creation and the understanding of art in America—to develop a great audience for great creative artists.

I have in mind two different varieties of ventures in the performing arts which the National Humanities Foundation could support.

The first type of program would have as its primary focus the development and cultivation of "the great audience." As Walt Whitman said of poetry:

> Poetry like a grand personality is a growth of many generations * * *. To have great poets, there must be great audiences, too.

In this task, one has to begin somewhere, and I propose that a good beginning point is with traditional theater productions. I am not suggesting that the National Humanities Foundation mount a full-scale Broadway production, but it would support efforts to bring established classics to broader and more diverse audiences.

Last summer, on the street corners of New York, for example, a troupe of young and enthusiastic players brought Shakespeare to a Harlem audience. Most of those in that audience had never seen a play before. Their initial bewilderment changed rapidly to approval and delight. Such an undertaking offers the theater a splendid opportunity to fulfill its traditional function of illuminating for its spectators unfamiliar corners of life; it also begins to develop the potential of a vast and as yet untried audience.

However, there would also be byproducts beneficial to the theatrical profession. In addition to the opportunities it would offer to the underemployed acting profession, such a program might well bring into the open an acting genius whose talents might otherwise never have been discovered. We would hope that the immediate benefits of such a program in terms of jobs for members of the theatrical profession would be dramatic. But our primary focus in this type of venture, that of educating broad audiences to be willing theatergoers, will have the long-range product of developing the very large audience which is necessary if the theater arts and its practitioners are to flourish in this country.

I mentioned another type of program, which the National Humanities Foundation might appropriately support. I think the National Humanities Foundation could and on occasion would, subsidize a theatrical production thought to be of unusual merit without reference to the audience it would attract. The young performer, the experimental production, the untried director, would be the primary object of such a program. They would be offered a stage on which to develop their craft, a way to obtain recognition of their talents, and also, of course, a way to earn a living in their chosen profession.

The primary aim, of course, of subsidizing experimental works of unusual merit would be providing outlets for underemployed professional talents. The primary aim of sponsoring the more conventional efforts, such as the traveling Shakespearean troupes, is the development of a responsive supporting audience. And it is hoped that in the more experimental productions, we would be developing a great audience, as a secondary aim, while the support of the conventional theater, albeit in unconventional ways, would open up many new jobs for actors and directors.

Thus, the two forks of National Humanities Foundation aid to the theater arts are supplementary. Each is necessary, if we are to achieve the twin goals of excellence in creativity and understanding of the arts. I stress both sides of this coin because it is so clear to me that the National Humanities Foundation must aid in the development not only of a great American theater, but also of a receptive and educated audience which will be able to support that theater. And this, a National Humanities Foundation, working with educators and humanists, would be uniquely prepared to do.

I include Mr. Cohen's excellent article at this point in my remarks:

WIRE YOUR CONGRESSMAN

Pity the poor actor these days. The theater is all but threatening him with extinction. Not quite total extinction perhaps, although perilously close. Look at the casts of characters in the current Broadway playbills, the print expended on them barely nudges a linotype machine. In one case, in fact, "Any Wednesday," the producers (five) take up more space than the company (four).

Actors Equity Association needs a lobby in Washington at once lest the Appalachia program consider listing it as a disaster area. An act of Congress declaring the Playwrights Guild un-American might help some, a minimum employment law, even more. Under it, any author guilty of writing something for the stage which requires the services of less than at least a dozen players would be subject to heavy fine and long imprisonment.

Other theatrical alliances sitting down at the bargaining table specify exactly how many of their dues-paying members must be on the payroll of every production. Unfortunately nothing in the constitution of either Actors Equity Association or the United States of America extends equal representation to the Max Factor clientele. An impresario can lift a curtain on an absolutely empty platform or a couple of wax dummies if he wishes provided a sufficient number of stagehands and musicians have been contracted for.

First things first. Let the drama schools, if they wish to survive, begin by turning their greasepaint into gunpowder and aiming it at the offices of the playwrights guild. There the chief conspirators in a diabolical plot to overthrow the actor may be found. Once the drama schools have declared war, espionage agents from the Stanislavsky cell, secreting a brainwashing potion, should go around to the taverns where the enemy gathers and spike their drinks with it.

The situation calls for such stringent measures. Otherwise, there will soon be more Tony awards available annually than there are people to give them to. This season in a good example. "Any Wednesday," it has already been noted, Muriel Resnik has written for only a quartet. Frank Gilroy's "The Subject Was Roses" gets along with just a threesome, so do Murray Schlisgal's "Luv" and William Hanley's "Slow Dance on a Killing Ground."

A boy and a girl comprise the entire acting ensemble of Bill Manhoff's "The Owl and the Pussycat"; the census also comes to exactly two in Enid Rudd's "Peterpat" and the late Eugene O'Neill's "Hughie."

Time was in the theater when straight plays had to put up pup tents backstage to supplement the dressing rooms. Now most of the Broadway playhouses, unless they are tenanting musicals, can rent out their dressing room surplus for bingo parlors and floating crap games. A lot of them are probably even listed with the New York Convention Bureau as possible lodging places when the hotels are full up.

Something's simply got to be done about this. Immediately; wire your Congressman before the drama schools shutter their doors, the greasepaint manufacturers go bankrupt and Actors Equity Association turns its headquarters into a soup kitchen.

Statue to "Mr. Sam" Unveiled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, our distinguished and able colleague, delivered a timely,

brief, but masterful and eloquent address when the statue to our late beloved Speaker was unveiled in the Rayburn Building on January 10. I commend this superb address to the attention of the Congress and to the Nation:

REMARKS OF WRIGHT PATMAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AS MASTER OF CEREMONIES AT UNVEILING OF SAM RAYBURN STATUE AT RAYBURN BUILDING, CAPITOL HILL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

President Hutchinson, Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered here today to accept reverently and with gratitude a superbly sculptured image in bronze of Sam Rayburn from the Texas State Society of Washington to the American people and their Government. This is the statue of the greatest legislative personality in the history of our country. It is to adorn this massive and distinguished new congressional office building, which is to bear Sam Rayburn's name. The building itself, as you see, in size and scope and capacity to serve, in accommodation, and in its structural soundness and architectural eminence, is a high monument made for the centuries. It is ideally suited to help preserve the name of the great Texan who, by his leadership in the Congress of the United States, has done so much to change for the better the face of our country and the posture of the world.

I knew Sam Rayburn for a half century or more, and I say this building is the ideal monument to his memory, and this statue is a remarkable rendering of the dynamic, the patriotic, the humanely concerned American whom we are here to honor. A building with this immense space and footage is, of course, not a minor undertaking. Much has been said about its cost that, I find, conflicts with the simple truths of arithmetic. In terms of cost—$86,400,000 in relation to its 33,600,000 cubic feet—this new Rayburn House Office Building may be said to be, not an extravagance, but a sound buy and a solid success from every aspect of fiduciary commonsense.

In truth and in fact, it may be described as a bargain of the first magnitude, except by those who think in the dismal financial language of the 1930's and in the depressed labor market of the same period, the economic evils Sam Rayburn did so much to redress. For example, the Supreme Court at current prices would cost $4.46 a cubic foot. The Old Senate Office Building would come to $3.50 at today's prices. Yet this magnificently imposing, ably engineered, brilliantly architectured monument in stone and marble cost $2.46. On the square foot basis, the Supreme Court would cost $90.94, the Old Senate Office Building $59.00, and this new Rayburn Building $36.56. This is arithmetic, not rhetoric. It is the sort of Government deal that would have pleased the heart of "Mr. Sam."

The new Rayburn House Office Building, like the grand old man after whom it is named, looks not only to the present but even more notably to the future. In an age of quick absolescence, this edifice is made, like Rayburn's toughly achieved reputation, to last for the next thousand years and more. I hope you will forgive my emotion, but Sam Rayburn was my friend, and I revered and loved him as one respects and admires a legendary figure in his lifetime and after.

This statue moves my heart because the Texas State Society of Washington has done a noble thing. For this statue is the ideal tribute in perfect taste and I salute you for it. I know it does all of us good—those who worked so closely and so loyally with the master legislator who has been Speaker of the House longer than any Speaker in history and those who were for years his intimate friends: Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts; the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the House; the sculptor, Felix de Weldon, who so perfectly caught the essence of Mr. Sam's personality; President Everett Hutchinson; and the judges and representatives of the Texas State Society Committee who were commissioned to decide on a fitting memorial. There is, of course, a special and a very particular place in all this for Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson. For it must be said it was nothing less than a stroke of genius that named her to make the dedication. And now it must be said that, more than ever before, from here on out with the unveiling of this statue, Speaker Sam Rayburn belongs not only to Texas, but to all our people, indeed, to mankind and to history.

Senator Pell Outlines the Need for an Eight-State Transportation Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the plight of our rail commuter transportation was at last recognized by Congress in passing the Mass Transportation Act of 1964, which I cosponsored. While this problem is by no means solved, the need to provide for high-speed passenger rail transportation between cities is also being noted. A pioneer in this approach has been the junior Senator from Rhode Island, CLAIBORNE PELL, who has proposed an eight-State compact to create a new authority to provide for new and improved passenger transportation between Boston and Washington, D.C. For the past two Congresses, I have joined in cosponsoring this approach.

In the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star of January 17, 1965, Senator PELL provides an excellent analysis of the need for this new transportation authority. His position as an observer of the present problems in this area has been uniquely shaped by the fact that his own travels between his home State of Rhode Island and the Nation's Capital have provided him with personal experience.

The use of the interstate compact device, specifically provided for in the Constitution, has too often been overlooked. It provides a means, other than the creation of a new Federal program, for the development of a governmental authority large enough to handle the problem, yet still responsible to the States themselves. And as Senator PELL points out, in the case of an interstate transportation authority, its costs could be financed without Federal subsidy, short of a Federal guarantee of a portion of the authority's bonded indebtedness. I believe the problem and the proposal merit the serious attention of Congress.

The article follows:

PELL SAYS OWN EXPERIENCES LED TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA-BOSTON RAIL PLAN

(By CLAIBORNE PELL)

A brief 38-word passage in President Johnson's state of the Union message may presage new developments in public transportation as significant as the flight of the Wright brothers or the invention of the automobile.

The President's statement, succinct and to the point, said:

"I will ask for funds to study high-speed rail transportation between urban centers. We will begin with test projects between Boston and Washington. On high-speed trains, passengers could travel this distance in less than 4 hours."

PROPOSED IN 1962

Behind those deceptively terse words lies a bright vision of innovation in transportation that ultimately could involve the construction of new intercity ground transit systems operating at speeds of 200 miles per hour or more, perhaps in the form of rocket-shaped trains operating in enclosed rights-of-way.

Until these futuristic concepts can be perfected, the administration's program hopefully will involve maximum improvement and utilization of our existing conventional rail equipment.

For myself, the President's statement meant the coming to fruition of 2½ years of persistent and often discouraging argument of the idea that Americans should have more adequate and dependable public transportation facilities for medium-range intercity travel.

I first spelled out my proposal in June of 1962, when I introduced a bill in the Senate to create an eight-State public authority to operate high-speed rail passenger service between Boston and Washington.

LIKE A SUPERCITY

I did not specify the Boston-Washington corridor out of idle sectional political interest. The fact is that this coastal strip, comprising the oldest and most crowded section of our Nation, is in many respects the prototype of our complex urban society of the future, and the manner in which we solve the problems of the area thus is important to the whole Nation.

The corridor already has the aspects of a supercity, and scholars have dubbed it the megalopolis. It already has over 20 percent of the Nation's population and nearly 30 percent of the Nation's business crowded on only 1.4 percent of the Nation's land.

There is no other comparable area in our country at present where so many people are in competition for channels of communication, although demographers have identified 21 other urban clusters which soon will be megalopolitan in their own right. Together they will contain almost 100 million people on less than 6 percent of the Nation's land. Some of the centers of these urbanized belts are Chicago-Green Bay-South Bend; Los Angeles-San Francisco; Pittsburgh-Cleveland; Portland-Seattle; St. Louis-Kansas City (Mo.) and Dallas-Fort Worth-San Antonio, to name a few.

In our northeast megalopolis we are already being faced with some hard decisions about the future. By 1980 we are told that intercity travel will increase by about 170 percent and that public facilities will have to be expanded to meet the increased traffic. For example, up to $1 billion will have to be spent on expanding our airport facilities in the corridor unless other alternatives are presented.

It was against this background that I put forward my proposal in 1962 for development of high-speed intercity rail service in the Northeast.

KNOWS THE PROBLEMS

A number of factors have convinced me that such a development was badly needed. As a former Foreign Service officer who has lived and worked in Europe, I have often marveled at the speed and efficiency of European railroad systems. To my mind, there is no reason why we should not do as well.

Moreover, as a U.S. Senator from Rhode Island, I so often have occasion to travel the 400-mile trip between Washington and Providence that I know painfully, at first hand, the problems confronting the intercity traveler today.

TOO FAR FOR AUTOS

The Washington-Boston trip is too long for automobile travel when one has a tight schedule—and yet it is too short, by modern 20th century standards, for the maximum utilization of our splendid developments in air transportation. So often, the weather or air traffic congestion renders flight plans uncertain, and so often planes are missed because of mammoth traffic jams on the way to the airports. Yet the railroads in their present state of decline offer only marginal relief. The overnight rail service between Boston and Washington is so rough that I refer to the cars as "wakers" rather than "sleepers."

But it is the railroads, with their splendid exclusive rights-of-way, and with their inherent efficiency—one estimate is that one set of tracks can do the job of up to 18 highway lanes—which I believe hold the greatest hope for the future over the intermediate distances separating our megalopolitan centers.

HIGH SPEED PLANNED

The type of development I envision would involve purchase of new rail cars and improvement of right-of-way to allow service at a minimum average speed of 100 miles per hour—or up to 200 miles per hour as we develop new types of equipment. The service should be very frequent—at 15 to 30 minute intervals at the busy times of the day—and it should be directly integrated with local urban transit systems. It should also be clean, comfortable, and reliable.

This type of service would assure a Washington businessman, for example, that in any kind of weather, he could travel in one integrated system from downtown Washington to downtown New York City or Boston and back in a timespan virtually equal to if not less than the lapsed door-to-door time by air carrier. And, with fully modernized equipment he could use his time en route to get a haircut in the train's barbershop, or to dictate correspondence or hold a conference in a special business compartment, or to place phone calls on the train's long-distance telephone system.

To do the job right, even with conventional rail equipment and with no technological breakthroughs, would require an investment of about $1 billion for the entire Boston-Washington line. But I am convinced that the development would be so promising that it might be accomplished without Government subsidy, short of a Federal guarantee of a portion of the bonded indebtedness.

Where direct Federal assistance is needed is in the preliminary planning stage because no railroad today is in a position to risk money on new techniques and equipment capable of greatly improved, high-speed service. It is for this reason that President Johnson has proposed a federally financed research and development program designed to stimulate technological breakthroughs that could revolutionize ground transportation and stimulate the entire economy. In addition, he proposes demonstration programs to show how existing service can be improved in the meantime.

Winston Churchill

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my deepest sorrow on the passing of a great statesman and great citizen, Winston Churchill. When Congress made this noble Englishman an honorary citizen of the United States, it was showing this country's deep affection for him, its abiding admiration. In effect, Congress said, "We are presenting you with the finest gift in our power to give, because of your outstanding foresight, your invincibable courage, your inspired leadership to the free world in some of its darkest hours."

We are today honoring him in death, but fortunately he did not have to wait for the many honors and the respect his colleagues in Great Britain and Americans everywhere accorded him during his life. Respected and long recognized for his distinguished leadership and for upholding the highest standards of public office, he was equally esteemed for his personal graces and his exceptional concern for all mankind.

Winston Churchill has left a distinguished imprint upon the decisions and policies of our time. We shall all miss his greatness, his wisdom, his counsel and the courage with which he held steadfastly to his convictions.

Clara Barton House Designated a Registered National Historic Landmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, Clara Barton, one of this Nation's great humanitarians and founder of the American Red Cross organization, spent the final 20 years of her long and fruitful life in a unique house at the end of Oxford Road in Glen Echo, Md.

From 1897 until 1904 the Barton house was also the national headquarters for the American Red Cross. Following Miss Barton's death in 1912, the house was bought by the Franks sisters who occupied it until physically unable to care for it any longer. In May 1963, learning that the house was to be sold and possibly destroyed, a group of civic-minded Montgomery County citizens formed "The Friends of Clara Barton, Inc.," raised funds to purchase this historic house, and have preserved it for future generations.

I was very pleased to note that the National Park Service has now designated this famous home as a registered national historic landmark. Because of its great interest to all Americans, I include here in the RECORD the description published by the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings in recognizing the historical importance of the Clara Barton House.

The statement follows:

CLARA BARTON HOUSE, MARYLAND

This unique frame structure in Glen Echo, Md., was the final home of Clara Barton, the major figure in the founding of the American Red Cross. Due almost entirely to her efforts and example, the American Red Cross was able to render widespread relief during the 19th century, to persuade the United States to confirm the International Geneva Convention of 1864 which proclaimed Red Cross principles, and to gain the official recognition and cooperation of the Federal Government at the beginning of the 20th century.

With Civil War battlefields as her training ground, and her European experiences during the Franco-Prussian War as her specific impetus, Clara Barton strove to bring the United States into the international Red Cross movement. In 1881, she founded the National Society of the Red Cross. From that time until 1904 she served as its president. The present American National Red Cross is a direct descendant of that society. Moreover, Miss Barton even influenced the international Red Cross movement by securing the adoption of the "American amendment" in 1884, which contained the principle of helping victims of peacetime disasters as well as victims of war.

The house in which Clara Barton spent the last 20 years of her life, and which housed the national headquarters of the American Red Cross organization from 1897 until 1904, reflected perfectly its famous owner. Built in the early 1890's, partly of materials salvaged from emergency housing, the structure was designed to store relief supplies and to accommodate Red Cross workers.

A remarkably utilitarian house for a very efficient woman, it has, nevertheless, warmth and amenities that make it comfortable and personal. Although it has served as a residence without interruption since Miss Barton's death in 1912, the Clara Barton House will eventually be opened to the public as a historic house museum by the Friends of Clara Barton, Inc.

The Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, all too often it seems that the true worth of a man is recognized only after his death. This was not true of our beloved Winston Churchill.

This man became a legend in his own time. He became the symbol of a proud people and a proud nation and an enduring, prideful relationship between our great Nation and his own. The extent of his personal contribution to the world is simply awe inspiring—virtually impossible to measure in any mortal terms. His passing takes Winston Churchill into the realm of the immortal, but to so many of us he has seemed immortal while he was among us.

Winston Churchill has always seemed to me to be a man who defies description in any reasonably human terms. His contributions have been so extensive, so valuable, so fulfilling that he demands description in language that is too poetic because despite the immortal character of the man, he was a warm, sincere, and genuine human. He enjoyed his life and he obviously enjoyed

life's pleasures, even though he had dedicated his life to service to his fellow man. And, there is no man in public life in any time who has so richly deserved the deference he received during his lifetime and now. His greatness found its origins in his own character and he was one of the few men on this earth who has been able, by the great force of his magnetic ability, to influence people and nations and the world.

He has seemed, in recent years, to gain in stature and in the admiration of his colleagues, friends, and admirers and in human warmth. It has become evident to every citizen of every nation that Winston Churchill had given his every thought, his every action, and his life to the best interests of Britain and the world. The affection that has been showered on him in recent years seemed to please him and I am very deeply grateful that this man who gave so much was able to know—as one of our great leaders was never able to know—that the people loved him.

It has become commonplace in recent times for men in public life to talk about their place in history. Winston Churchill who himself has gained a hallmark reputation as an historian will be recorded in history as the man who perhaps best represents the Western World's image of leadership in modern times. The symbol of leadership that he is leaving behind may never again be matched on this earth. His mastery of men and events and issues was not only uncommon—it was gigantic. His own people have recognized him as a superb author, orator, patriot. Here in the United States we have known him for all these things and as a friend.

I am personally very deeply sorry that he is no longer with us, and yet I know that he will live forever in the hearts of his own people, on the pages of history, and in our hearts.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, all true Ukrainian patriots marked the anniversary of the independence of their country, 47 years ago. Although the Ukrainian Republic lasted but a few short years from its inception in 1918, the memory of freedom from over 300 years of Russian rule is still fresh today.

The Ukraine is the largest constituent republic of the Soviet Union, with over 40 million inhabitants and a rich, fruitful land it is. Yet its people were cruelly subjected to the tyranny of communism through the force of arms, not by choice. Economic exploitation, and an attempt to crush Ukrainian national spirit and traditions by their Red rulers has failed to diminish the burning hope of the Ukrainian people for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in this century the United States restated its belief in the principle of self-determination. The hope that this principle would be honored in Eastern Europe and on the steppes of Asia has been dimmed by the actions of the Communist empire. This does not mean, however, that we should blandly sit back and accept the status quo. It is our moral duty to speak out against injustice wherever it may be found. And the recognition of the right of the Ukrainian nation to self-determination can be a symbol of hope to all people behind the Iron Curtain.

Nor is this the only reason for remembering the bitter struggle for freedom by the Ukraine. There is a pragmatic reason as well. Until the day comes that all men may taste again of freedom, we should work in every way possible for the relaxation of their bonds. The very encouragement of a nationalistic yearning for freedom and independence forces the Russian bear to accommodate to the pressures in order to keep up its influence among non-Russian peoples. Within the Soviet eastern European empire, this spirit of national independence has already made itself felt and it may eventually be true within Russia itself.

It is not my purpose to raise false hopes of easy, quick victories in the cause of freedom. The struggle for that priceless commodity has been going on for centuries within the Ukraine. Surrounded by hostile nations, subjected by foreign rulers, the Ukrainian nation knows full well that the struggle will be long and costly. It is a tribute to the indomitable spirit of the Ukraine that the heritage of its people has not been lost, and their faith has not been diminished.

I join with Americans of Ukrainian descent, and with all those who cherish freedom in saluting the Ukrainian nation, and adding my hopes that the day will come when that nation will again be free to celebrate a new independence day.

Let's Have More, Not Less "Politics in the Pantry"—and All Through the House—by Closing Gaps in Consumer Protection Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly honored in the last Congress by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, when he named me to the chairmanship of a newly created standing subcommittee known as the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, a field to which I have devoted so much of my efforts in the Congress during the past 12 years. And you, Mr. Speaker, further honored me for my work on consumer issues by appointing me as 1 of 5 Members of the House of Representatives serving on the 15-member bipartisan National Commission on Food Marketing, created by Public Law 88–354.

I am therefore always interested in the views of responsible leaders of our food industry and in any discussion of legislation affecting the consumer and the businesses which serve consumers. Consequently, I read with great interest an article in the current issue of Look magazine—the one dated today, January 26—written by the chairman of the board of one of our greatest food processing corporations about the fine job the American food industry is performing in making this the best-fed Nation in the world, and at the most reasonable cost.

POLITICS AND THE PANTRY

The article is entitled "Let's Keep Politics Out of the Pantry." In it, Mr. Charles G. Mortimer of General Foods points out that whereas only 19 cents of the American family's take-home dollar goes for food, the average family in Great Britain spends 29 cents, in France 31 cents, in Japan 47 cents, and in the Soviet Union, 50 cents. Furthermore, he tells us, there is a much greater variety of foods here, more convenience foods, and—thanks to Government safeguards and the competitive pressures of America's free enterprise system—Mr. Mortimer says the American housewife is fully protected not only against dangerous and unwholesome foods but also against trickery and deceit in the marketplace.

Nevertheless, this food executive warns, there is an ominous cloud on the horizon, threatening our best-of-all-possible food worlds. Mr. Mortimer declares:

> The machinery of free competition which has made ours the best-fed Nation on earth is in danger of being tampered with. It is being attacked by certain people in Government who have the perverse notion that the Mary Joneses of America need more Government protection than the ample safeguards they already have.

The fears of the General Foods Corp. board chairman grow out of the activities of what he describes as "vote-conscious politicians" who are, as he puts it, "playing politics in the pantry" by "pitching emotion-charged appeals" to consumers. He says that the politicians are indulging in "headlinemaking innuendos" implying that America's food marketing system "needs to be watched and regulated even more closely than it is."

The General Foods executive was directing his fire primarily at Senator HART's so-called truth in packaging bill, which is aimed at the jungle of confusing sizes making intelligent price comparisons so extremely difficult for the average shopper in the supermarket; at Mrs. Esther Peterson, the President's dynamic and effective Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs; and at the possible recommendations of the National Commission on Food Marketing.

IF THE SHOE FITS—

But although he does not mention me by name, I cannot help but feel that I, too, must be one of his targets in that article. The evils Senator HART seeks to eliminate in his bill proposing readily comparable sizes of bottles and cans and boxes in easily computed multiples or fractions of pints, quarts, pounds, and so on, are also attached in the labeling provisions of one of my bills, although from a much different approach, and in a less controversial manner. But essentially, Senator HART and I seek similar goals of better information to the consumer in making price and quantity computations in the stores.

For a second thing, I think Esther Peterson is doing a wonderful job, and I am all for what she is trying to accomplish. I have worked very closely with her through my subcommittee, and I hope to continue to do so. And, for a third thing, I am, as I said, a member of the National Commission on Food Marketing, which Mr. Mortimer of General Foods hopes may do a good job in explaining the necessary roles played by the different levels of our food distribution system, but he fears we may, instead, do a very bad job by merely trying to expose the so-called middlemen as profiteers.

Personally, I have no idea in the world what we will end up doing in that Commission, for we have only just begun our work, and the first job has been to pick capable and unbiased staff experts to do the basic research which will eventually guide us in making our recommendations to Congress.

WE NEED MORE CONSUMER POLITICS, NOT LESS

But beyond all that, I am certainly the food executive's target because I must admit that I am a politician—and undoubtedly a vote-conscious one, too. Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States must win reelection every 2 years in order to retain and enhance their seniority and thus accomplish their objectives. To win elections, you have to get more votes than your opponents, and I have taken my chances in the ballot boxes of my district seven times, so I am certainly aware of the importance of consumers as voters.

Thus, I suppose I must plead guilty to at least some of the counts in the General Foods Corp. board chairman's indictment in today's Look magazine against "vote-conscious politicians" promoting what he calls the "perverse notion" that the supermarket customers of this country need more Government protections than the ample safeguards Mr. Mortimer believes we already possess.

If I didn't have such notions—perverse or not, depending upon one's viewpoint—I would undoubtedly feel a bit silly about putting so many bills into the congressional hopper to tighten the safeguards which already exist, or to create new safeguards where none exist.

It is not my purpose here to debate with the General Foods chairman the quality and wholesomeness and comparatively reasonable costs of American food. However, I certainly challenge his theory that there is something ominous or reprehensible about "playing politics" on these issues, or that we should, as he puts it "Keep Politics Out of the Pantry." Instead, I would say: "Let's Have More Politics in the Pantry, and All Through the House."

POLITICS IS SCIENCE OF GOVERNMENT

Perhaps the whole argument rests on what we mean by the word "politics." As used in the Look article urging us to "Keep Politics Out of the Pantry," it is a somewhat mild and gentle word, implying—in a not too angry fashion—hints of self-seeking, of personal aggrandizement, demagoguery, voter deception, and perhaps a tiny touch of corruption. In this connotation, "politicians" are not necessarily evil, not bad all through, but rather forced by their professions to "play politics" by deceiving the public into wanting things that are not good for them, so that the politicians can stir up enough turmoil in giving these undesirable things to the public to make a lot of headlines and thus get the politicians' names in the paper, the better to gain attention and win votes.

To me, politics is a good many cuts above that level. To me, politics is the science and art of government in which every citizen has not only the right but the solemn obligation to participate to the utmost of his abilities and opportunities. Without politics American-style, the free enterprise system which has made this country great in so many ways could not possibly have grown and developed, for our economy is an outgrowth, and a correlary, of our form of government and of the politics which make democracy function.

POLITICS AND WHOLESOME FOOD

Even the acknowledged greatness of the American food industry is a direct reflection of American politics at work. For the very safeguards the General Foods chairman referred to in his article as now adequately protecting the American consumer against unwholesome foods and deceptive sales devices were the hard-won—but never completely won—fruits of political effort and political achievement—by Teddy Roosevelt as well as by Franklin D. Roosevelt, and by other Presidents and Cabinet officers and bureaucrats and Congressmen and Senators doing what the General Foods executive calls "playing politics"—putting politics in the pantry, as it were.

There is a long history of legal enactments—which were all bitterly contested, highly controversial, touch-and-go political issues—when first introduced in the form of proposed legislation in the Congress—but which resulted in todays' high food quality and wholesomeness. Each was proclaimed in its time as the forerunner of doom for the American free enterprise system. Opponents charged in each instance that the "vote-conscious politicians" were "playing politics" with free enterprise.

MEAT AND POULTRY INSPECTION

We have had compulsory Federal inspection of meat for wholesomeness in interstate commerce for 59 years. Upton Sinclair and other writers known in their day as "muckrakers" presented such a sickening picture of the conditions in our packing plants that the people demanded that Government take action, and it did. But it was not until 1957—41 years later—that we had the same protections written into law for interstate shipments of poultry. When I first introduced the poultry inspection bill, the poultry industry was alarmed. Today, federally inspected poultry is accepted within the industry as one of its best sales tools, and American poultry has won tremendous export markets around the world, based on the reliability and acceptability of the little seal or tag which says "U.S. Inspected for Wholesomeness." Nevertheless, much meat in intrastate commerce is still not inspected for wholesomeness.

PURE FOOD AND DRUG LAW OF 1906

The Food and Drug Act of 1906 was our first foray into protecting the American consumer against adulterated or unsafe American products in the two fields of foods and drugs. It took a scandal involving the sale to the Army of meat treated with formaldehyde, and revelations about tonics and medicines (supposedly for women but consisting mostly of alcohol or opium or other ingredients no lady would have knowingly used), to spur the public into demanding remedial legislation and Congress to pass it.

COSMETICS REGULATION BEGAN ONLY 27 YEARS AGO

But cosmetics did not come under Federal supervision until only 27 years ago, in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, after numerous women had been blinded by unsafe eye preparations. If you read the old congressional debates on that bill—a milestone piece of legislation then, but terribly outmoded today—you will come across speeches predicting that the measure would bankrupt every business in the field, discourage research in medicines, and make every woman get permission from some bureaucrat in Washington before she could powder her nose or use lipstick.

LOOPHOLES IN THE FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT OF 1938

The 1938 act, as I said, was a good law for its time, but time quickly eroded holes in it, through court decisions and changes in technology. Not all of those holes have been repaired. Other loopholes still in the act were deliberately put there when it was originally passed, in order to assure neutrality on the bill on the part of some business interests, like the soap manufacturers, for instance, who otherwise would have joined in the bitter battle to defeat the controversial legislation in 1938. I will mention later a few of those special exemptions dating back to 1938.

But what about the loopholes Congress did not anticipate, and had no intention of creating? One of the first bills I introduced in my first term in the Congress was directed at closing such a gap created by court decisions. The courts had ruled that the Government's food and drug inspectors could not inspect the operations of a plant if the owner or manager did not want to admit them. Well, this was not the intent of Congress at all, so we had to amend the law to make it explicit.

In 1954 we first took notice of the great danger to our food supply which was

developing from unregulated use of pesticides on raw agricultural commodities—that was only 11 years ago.

UNTESTED CHEMICALS IN FOOD

It was only 15 years ago that the Delaney committee in the House, a special committee headed by Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY of New York, first spotlighted the dangers to consumers from a proliferation of new chemical additives being used in food processing without prior testing and certification as to their safety. It took Congress 8 years thereafter to act on the Delaney committee revelations in the Food Additives Act of 1958, which I cosponsored. By then, responsible leaders of the food industry were acknowledging the need for corrective legislation, but the battle over the details of the bill were often bitter ones. The 1958 act was a great forward step. Under it, the manufacturer now has to prove an additive is safe before he can use it in foods. Previously, the burden of proof had been on the Government; if the Government could not provide legal proof that the additive was harmful, the manufacturer could continue to use it, even if the weight of scientific evidence indicated the safety of the product was seriously in doubt.

BURDEN OF PROOF ON COSMETICS SAFETY IS ON GOVERNMENT

The burden of proof, however, is still on the Government in the law's sections on cosmetics. There is no requirement that cosmetic manufacturers must pretest their products for safety. The consumer thus can easily be a guinea pig on a new cosmetic item. If enough consumers get hurt—burned or scalped or disfigured or scarred or infected from a new and untested cosmetic—the Government eventually hears about it and moves against the product andf takes it off the market. But, oh, the agony in the meantime. Remember the false fingernails which caused such anguish several years ago, when it was discovered that removing them could also remove the nails? Or the hair dyes which made women bald? These things can happen under our present law on cosmetics.

So I say to women in this country: "This is an area in which every woman—every woman—had better begin to play politics in every way she knows how, because your skin and your hair and your nails and your eyebrows and your lips and even your lives may be at stake some day."

COSMETIC COLORS MUST BE SAFE—BUT NOT IN HAIR DYES

The only significant improvement made in the cosmetic sections of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in the last 27 years had to do with the coloring matter used in cosmetics. How it came about is a long story, and a somewhat ironic one, but color additives must now be proved safe in the manner used before incorporation in a food, drug or cosmetic. Even if considered safe in the manner used, a color additive can still not be approved if it could cause cancer in man or animal. That is the so-called Delaney clause, which we also wrote into the law on food additives in 1958.

But outside of the coloring matter, no other ingredients of cosmetics have to be pretested for safety or subjected to any preclearance by the Government before use. Only when the Government can produce legal proof that a cosmetic is unsafe or contains unsafe ingredients can it act against it. Legal proof, as you can guess, must go far beyond reasonable doubt as to safety—it must be proof of harm. And often that is impossible to ascertain without years of laboratory research.

In the case of hair dyes, it does not matter how dangerous they are—they can be sold anyway, as long as the label clearly warns the purchaser that the product may be dangerous to use. That is all the law requires. In a beauty shop, how many women ever get to see the labels on the bottles or drums in which hair dyes are shipped?

GAPS IN OUR FOOD LAWS

So to go back to the thesis in the food executive's article in today's issue of Look magazine—that the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act already fully protects the consumer of foodstuffs, and that those who would further tighten consumer protections are cynical politicians "playing politics in the pantry," I would say that legislative history of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in the 12 years in which I have served, and for long before that, shows that is overoptimistic, and usually premature, to make sweeping defenses of the status quo in consumer protection legislation. Even if we concede the accuracy of Mr. Mortimer's claim that the provisions of the act dealing with foodstuffs are generally adequate—and on the whole they are very good—it is clear that other sections of the law are terribly inadequate—dangerously so—and that some of the food sections need modernization, too.

For instance, the law we passed in 1960 on cautionary labeling of hazardous household products such as bleaches, paints, insecticides and so on, does not apply to foods, drugs and cosmetics; including those packaged in pressurized containers, which can be dangerous when carelessly handled. Furthermore, the section of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act dealing with informative labeling of foods—giving the consumer information she is legally entitled to have—has been held by the courts to be too vague to prevent some processors from hiding the information in tiny type in a cluttered panel, or in pastel inks on noncontrasting backgrounds, defying the housewife's efforts to find the information on weights, ingredients, and so on.

I am not a lawyer, so I cannot argue with the judges on whether the present language on labeling is too vague. It sounds clear enough to me. It says the required information on a food label must be "prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness—as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling—and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use."

READ THE LABEL—IF YOU CAN

As I said, that sounds pretty clear and straightforward to me. But the courts have nevertheless blocked Food and Drug Administration efforts to crack down on some flagrant violators. The law therefore needs a simple amendment authorizing the Government to issue regulations specifying—as is done now in the prescription drug sections of the law—how the required label information must be presented on the label—the location of the data on weights and on ingredients, the comparative type sizes to be used, and so on.

Otherwise, the housewife will continue to find it difficult, if not impossible, to find the net weight on some bags or boxes, or cans or bottles, if only to try to figure out the better buy between different sizes of the same brand. And she will continue to find it a real challenge to find the listing of ingredients to make sure the contents do not include anything to which some member of the family is allergic.

There is not widespread enough violation of the spirit of the labeling law to an extent that it is a serious national crisis, but violations are common enough to constitute an unpardonable nuisance to the careful, label-reading shopper—who must take extra hours to do her marketing. These violations also victimize the casual shopper who is quickly discouraged from making the complex price computations to determine the more economical among competing products or among different size packages of the same product. So she buys the "large economy size" on faith that it is the better buy—and often it is not as good a buy as a smaller size—believe it or not.

LOOPHOLES ENDANGERING HEALTH

Much more serious, however, are the gaps in the food, drug, and cosmetic law which affect not your pocketbook and disposition so much as your life and safety. I have described the free and easy manner in which cosmetics can be manufactured and put on sale without pretesting or clearance for safety and the fact that coal tar hair dyes are subject to no regulation, no matter how dangerous, as long as the label warns you of the possible consequences of using them. The cosmetic and hair dye manufacturers won these special exemptions for their products during the battle over passage of the original act in 1938.

They have been successful ever since in fighting off attempts to make them prove the safety of their products before marketing. They apparently want us vote-conscious politicians to keep politics out of the beauty parlor. I hope you agree with me that more politics, not less, is needed in coping with this problem.

THERAPEUTIC DEVICES

Let us look at another loophole in the law. Therapeutic devices—medical devices of all kinds—can also be marketed, as cosmetics are, without safety clearance, and can be removed from the market only if proved dangerous or fraudulent. In this case, we should require not only proof of safety but also proof of effectiveness, too—particularly when someone with a serious illness or disability delays seeking medical attention in the hope some useless machine

or device can cure him. But the problem is serious also in the devices and materials used in good faith by physicians and dentists. What a tragedy it has been for some patients who underwent surgery involving the use of artificial bone material only to have the material deteriorate in the body; then they have had to go through the ordeal all over again—merely because the material used had not been sufficiently tested for safety and effectiveness before being put on the market.

H.R. 1235, AN OMNIBUS BILL TO REWRITE THE FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT OF 1938

Rather than catalog all of the possible dangers of living in today's fast-changing world with its amazing new technology, I would like to list what my omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 would actually do. Its number is H.R. 1235. I introduced it originally on the opening day of the 87th Congress, in January, 1961, 4 years ago. Brief hearings were held in June 1962 on the whole range of issues covered in the omnibus bill, after President Kennedy's consumer message that year endorsed most of its provisions. As originally introduced, the bill provided the procedures later adopted by Congress to safeguard prescription drugs, in the historic Drug Control Act of 1962 which was enacted after the thalidomide tragedy came to public attention.

IT HAS EVERYTHING IN IT, INCLUDING THE KITCHEN SINK

I revised and reintroduced the bill in the 88th Congress, 2 years ago, but no action occurred in the House on any of its features. I have now reintroduced it in this Congress, bringing it up to date once again. It is 45 pages long and covers everything you eat, all the medicines you use, anything rubbed, poured, sprinkled, or sprayed on, introduced into, or otherwise applied to the human body for the purpose of cleansing, beautifying, promoting attractiveness, or altering the appearance, to give you the official definition of a cosmetic; it applies also to therapeutic devices, fake cancer cures, worthless ingredients in special dietary foods; over-the-counter drugs, animal feeds, sleeping pills, pep pills, and other habit-forming stimulant drugs.

In other words, it has everything in it, including the kitchen sink, along with the refrigerator, the bathroom medicine cabinet, the dressing table, and the nursery. I am going to spell out some of the provisions, Mr. Speaker, so that the Members can decide whether the loopholes which this bill would close are serious enough to warrant action. I also hope that through publication of this material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, many citizens, particularly women, are able—through newspapers, radio, and television programs, magazine articles, and through their churches and clubs and organizations—to learn more about the need for this legislation, for I am convinced that they then will insist and demand that Congress act.

As I told the women attending the convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, along those lines, if enough women are made aware of the deficiencies in our basic consumer law and are encouraged to write to their congressional delegation about these deficiencies and the need for corrective legislation, such legislation will be enacted promptly. As I explained, "Congress is like the accelerator of your car—that is, very sensitive to pressure. You make it go."

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION OF H.R. 1235

Now here, in the order in which they are covered by H.R. 1235, are some of the things on which all of us, and particularly the women of this country, must put their foot down hard.

Section 1 is the title of the bill.

MAKING THE LABEL SERVE ITS FULL PURPOSE

Section 2 deals with amendments to the required labeling provisions of the present law—to make sure the consumer can readily find the net weight and ingredients and other information she is entitled to have on food, drug, and cosmetic labels; also to require cautionary labeling on pressurized food or cosmetic containers so as to prevent accidents, and on medicines and drugs to prevent unsafe use by children or by adults with pathological conditions. Labels would have to carry instructions for first aid treatment, when necessary.

For instance, in the case of cosmetics which are frequently swallowed by children, the doctors just have to guess as to what is in the products. This section would also apply to hair sprays, which are usually dangerously flammable—but you see women using them while smoking, and in the beauty shops you see clouds of the spray with no one apparently aware of the fact that they can be dangerous to inhale.

Section 2 also removes a 27-year-old loophole put in by the dairy industry, exempting butter, cheese, and ice cream from having to reveal on the package or label the presence of artificial color. Every other food label must show the presence of artificial color; why not butter, cheese, and ice cream? Of all of the provisions of my bill, I guess this one on artificial color in dairy products is probably the least urgent from the standpoint of health and safety, but I included it because this exemption is typical of how every industry wants to hide from the consumer facts which are perhaps a little embarrassing—such as the fact that the beautiful yellow color which butter claims as its own is often put there with a chemical.

Some consumers, for reasons of their own—and sometimes they are good reasons—want to avoid artificial coloring matter in food whenever possible. The color additives in use in food are proven to be safe in the manner in which they are used, but it should be remembered that the law had to be changed several years ago to repeal a previous requirement that these colors must be absolutely and completely harmless under any and all circumstances. The Government discovered that many of the coal tar colors were no longer able to pass this requirement of the 1938 act because the testing devices, like those used to find pesticide residues in milk, were so much improved and so extremely sensitive.

SPECIAL DIETARY FOODS

Section 3 of my bill deals with worthless ingredients in special dietary foods. This is a very controversial issue among health food manufacturers. It prohibits the use in a product represented as a special dietary food of exotic-sounding ingredients which have never been shown to have the least nutritive value, or any dietary usefulness whatsoever. Sale of the ingredients themselves would not be touched; the bill would apply only when the products are represented as having special dietary value.

PRETESTING OF MEDICAL DEVICES FOR SAFETY AND EFFICACY

Section 4 applies to the pretesting of therapeutic devices for safety and proof of effectiveness before they can be sold. I covered that earlier.

CERTIFICATION OF ALL ANTIBIOTICS

Section 5 requires the certification by the Food and Drug Administration of the purity and potency of veterinary antibiotics, similar to the requirement we wrote into the law in 1962 applying to antibiotics intended for use by man. When these powerful, and often unstable, drugs are used on meat animals, we should be certain they are from certified batches, tested and approved by Uncle Sam.

THE MIND-AFFECTING DANGEROUS DRUGS

Section 6 deals with the barbiturates, amphetamines, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulants—the sleeping pills, and the pep pills, the "goof balls" and "bennies," and other drugs now so widely bootlegged as to constitute a national menace. How many deaths on the highways that can be attributed to the use of these pills we can never know. They are dangerous, and docors who prescribe them treat them with respect.

H.R. 1235 would not interfere in any way with proper medical dispensing of any of these drugs; the targets of the bill are the fly-by-night outfits which obtain and distribute them in the same way that narcotics are sold and whisky used to be sold during prohibition. My bill uses weapons similar to those we use in fighting narcotics; possession itself would be a crime for any except those having a legitimate reason for having the drugs on hand.

We are dealing here with a vast illicit traffic in death-dealing drugs which are major intsruments of suicide, and major causes of highway deaths, and major causes of mental injury to youth. A Presidential Advisory Committee called them psychotoxic, or mind-affecting drugs. There is now such widespread awareness of the dangers from these drugs that the Senate last year passed a bill containing most of the features of this section of my bill.

I oppose the piecemeal approach, however; there are so many deficiencies in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, of which this is only a part, that I decided in 1961 to seek a single overall solution to all of them at one time, in one bill. That is how my omnibus bill was developed. I got tired of the snail's pace at which we were correcting faults in the old act, like putting blowout patches on an old

automobile tube long after it needed replacement for safety. I am sure we could quickly pass a bill dealing with the bootlegging of these so-called psychotoxic drugs, but I am afraid it might be at the expense of early action on other necessary reforms in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, such as on cosmetics safety and so on. Of course it all depends on the Congress and on the public. If enough Americans insist upon a complete overhaul of the entire act, it can be done. But if Members of Congress are not made more aware of the problems, then the piecemeal approach will undoubtedly continue to be followed.

FAKE CANCER REMEDIES

Section 7 of H.R. 1235 deals with fake cancer remedies, and drugs or devices intended for the prevention or cure of cancer. This is an area of widespread trickery and fraud, and it is tragic. On the other hand, we do not want to discourage the search for any really effective treatment for this disease, on which so much research money and time and effort are now being spent.

This is a section of my original bill of 1961 which I have retained in succeeding versions of the measure, even after the passage of the 1962 Drug Control Act which covered the testing of new prescription drugs in comprehensive fashion. I left this section in, however, because I think that in evaluating drugs or devices intended to prevent or cure cancer, the Government must have every possible assistance—the complete facts—everything about the treatment—without any holdback of information, so a determination can be made of the circumstances under which it can be tested and used. This section, by the way, would apply primarily to racketeers in health, not legitimate researchers.

PRETESTING COSMETICS INCLUDING A DELANEY ANTI-CANCER CLAUSE

Section 8 is the basic foundation on which the rest of the omnibus bill was originally built 4 years ago: the pretesting of cosmetics for safety. It contains an anticancer clause such as we have in the food additives and color additives acts—under it no ingredient could be used in a cosmetic if it could cause cancer in man or animal. The law on cosmetics does not now say that. Under the present law, the Government, as I noted, must prove a cosmetic harmful in order to block its sale; under H.R. 1235, the manufacturer would have to prove the product is safe to use, and, in addition, that it does not contain any carcinogens, whether used in a safe fashion or not.

THE SOAP AND HAIR DYE EXEMPTIONS

This section would also repeal the old special interest exemption for soap, which, since 1938, has been held by the law not to be a cosmetic. Soap manufacturers are therefore subject to nothing more than their own consciences and the risk of possible damage suits for what they might include among ingredients of a soap, and they do not even have to tell you the net weight of a bar of soap.

More importantly, this section of H.R. 1235 also repeals the hair dye exemption now in the law. Hair dyes, too, would have to be proved safe for use before being placed on sale.

FULL DISCLOSURE OF COSMETIC INGREDIENTS

All of the significant ingredients of a cosmetic item would have to be revealed on the label under H.R. 1235. Actually, there are few secrets in the cosmetic industry; most competing products use similar basic ingredients. But for the woman who is allergic, there is no way but painful trial and error—and sometimes it is very painful—in finding suitable cosmetics. When a formula is suddenly changed in a product she has been using, she is back in the dark, and perhaps also back in the doctor's office. Even the Food and Drug Administration sometimes has to guess what is in a particular cosmetic. The Government should be informed about ingredients, and so should the buyer.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPENAS

Section 9 provides for administrative subpena powers, particularly in developing information for the establishment of food standards. Food standards issued by the Government, in cooperation with the processors, spell out exactly what ingredients must be included in a processed food once it is covered by a particular standard. Subpena power may be needed, too, in pesticides hearings.

CARRIER'S EXEMPTION IS TOO BROAD

Section 10 repeals an exemption enjoyed for many years by the railroads, trucking firms, and other common carriers, which are now relieved of responsibility under the act for transporting adulterated foods, drugs, or cosmetics even when the adulteration occurred as a result of their own actions or omissions. Under my bill, the carriers would continue to be exempt only in those cases where they did not cause the adulteration.

A TOUGH FACTORY INSPECTION PROVISION

Section 11 is a tough factory inspection amendment, giving to the Food and Drug Administration stronger powers in inspecting facilities used and methods used in the manufacture, processing, warehousing, packaging, and distribution of foods, cosmetics, and nonprescription drugs. The Food and Drug Administration already has these stronger factory inspection powers in checking on prescription drugs, under the 1962 act. These powers include the right to see all relevant files, including complaint files, and to check on the professional qualifications of personnel responsible for performing certain technical functions in the plant. Factory inspection is a vital area of consumer protection, even though food and drug inspectors can still touch only a tiny fraction of the existing plants in the country each year. But when they do go in to inspect, the inspectors must have sufficient powers to determine whether the products are made in a sanitary, wholesome or safe manner and if the production controls are adequate to maintain the necessary standards.

CANCER-CAUSING COLORING MATTER IN MEAT ANIMAL FEEDS

Section 12 repeals a special interest exemption in the law for cancer-causing coloring matter used in animal feeds. I have never been able to get an understandable story from anyone on why this exemption was written into the law or what purpose it is to serve. If the Government finds any residue of a cancer-causing feed ingredient in the carcass of meat animals he can order a halt to the use of the animal feed responsible; and it is on this basis that the growth stimulant hormone stilbestrol is now widely permitted to be used in animal feeds. But why should we permit the use of cancer-inducing coloring of animal feeds? The coloring matter serves no nutritive purpose, and no economic purpose. It is certainly not intended to make the feed more appetizing to the steer. It merely helps the farmer to identify different feeds by color. But permitting the use of carcinogenic coloring matter for this purpose is a completely unnecessary and unjustifiable additional hazard. H.R. 1235 repeals this glaring exemption.

U.S. INSPECTION OF FOREIGN FACTORIES

Section 13 would require foreign manufacturers of foods, drugs, or cosmetics who export substantial quantities of their products to the United States to permit on-the-scene inspection by U.S. officials of their plants overseas. At present, only a small percentage of the food, drug, and cosmetic imports into this country are inspected on arrival—on a sampling basis, but not necessarily a random one—to make sure they are safe, wholesome, uncontaminated, and otherwise eligible for admission under our laws. This spot-check at the docks is often concentrated on the exports of firms whose products have frequently reflected a high percentage of violations. Under H.R. 1235, the United States could send inspectors to inspect the plants of foreign firms it has reason to believe are not observing proper sanitary or production control practices on foods, drugs, or cosmetics sold here. We would inspect on the same basis as we now inspect American plants. If the foreign plant cannot pass our domestic inspection requirements, or if it refuses to permit our inspectors to enter on request, its products would be denied admission to this country. I think this is a useful reform.

A BAN ON FLAVORED ASPIRIN FOR CHILDREN

Section 14 of H.R. 1235 prohibits the sale in interstate commerce of flavored or sweetened aspirin. This is a new provision, just put into the bill this year for the first time. It grew out of a letter from a St. Louis resident on a completely different matter, but in checking into some facts on household accidents in connection with inquiries made in that letter, I discovered to my amazement and horror that candy aspirin, the special baby aspirin, is far and away the leading cause of accidental poisoning of children under 5.

Aspirin poisoning is the most frequent cause of death among young children from accidental ingestions. The children learn to regard flavored aspirin as candy, and thousands of them each year risk death by eating an entire bottle of flavored aspirin in the belief it is candy. If the mother or the babysitter discovers

the empty bottle in time, the child's life is saved, but in 125 to 150 instances a year, the child dies.

There is no reason in the world why a parent cannot crush half of a regular aspirin tablet on a spoon, using the bottom of the bowl of another spoon to do the crushing, and then add sugar and water, or jelly or some other sweetner to the crushed aspirin to help push the medicine down, if the child needs aspirin. The child would at least know this was medicine, not candy.

Since adding this aspirin provision to H.R. 1235, I have heard from mothers from different parts of the country telling me of hair-raising experiences in their homes when children or grandchildren found the flavored aspirin bottle, pried off the so-called safety cap, and ate the contents.

If there were no chance whatsoever of the product being misused by preschoolers—who after all, cannot read warnings on labels—my bill would permit certain exemptions and waivers under this provision, but otherwise flavored aspirin could not be sold in interstate commerce, except for stocks manufactured prior to 1965.

CONSUMERS MUST MAKE THEIR VOICES HEARD

I do not think the aspirinmakers will like section 14 of H.R. 1235, just as the cosmetic manufacturers do not like section 2 or section 8 and other affected interests do not like other sections of H.R. 1235. The big question to me, however, is whether the people of this country like this bill—enough to join me in fighting for it.

Consumer battles can be won in the Congress only when consumers make it clear they want them won, and will work at it, and, yes, "play politics" at it. That is why I say—in contrast to the General Foods executive I quoted—let us have more politics in the pantry, and also in the bathroom medicine cabinet, and all through the house, as H.R. 1235 would require—more politics in the sense of more active citizen interest in more effective safety laws affecting consumers and consumer products.

There are other consumer issues in Congress besides those involving the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, of course, and I hope the people of this country will "play politics" on those, too.

TIRE SAFETY

In addition to more politics in the pantry, and all through the house, as exemplified by H.R. 1235, we need more politics on the highways, too. Passage of the provisions of H.R. 1235 applying to the mind-affecting drugs which are such frequent causes of highway accidents will certainly save lives, but so also will another bill of mine on highway safety—H.R. 688, to provide for Federal standards for automobile tires, to and the mass murder on the highways from shoddy tires which the consumer purchases in a jungle of price and performance claims, but with no way of knowing for sure what the quality of that tire really is. H.R. 688 was originally drafted and introduced in the last Congress by former Congressman Kenneth Roberts, of Alabama, who, as we all know, Mr. Speaker, was our leading expert in Congress on automobile safety legislation. Unfortunately, he was defeated in the Goldwater sweep of Alabama last November. I cosponsored his bill on tires last session, and since he cannot reintroduce it this year, I introduced it on my own and will work for its adoption. The Federal Trade Commission hearings on tire advertising earlier this month certainly proved the need for reliable grades and standards for tires.

SAFE HANDLING OF INDUSTRIAL MATERIALS

In still another area of consumer safety, let's have more politics in job safety, too. One of my bills this year, H.R. 1179, never before introduced, provides for the establishment by the Secretary of Labor of Federal regulations for the safe handling of hazardous materials in industry and commerce. At present, the Secretary of Labor issues guides and suggestions for worker protection, but he has no powers to enforce safety standards. State laws vary widely in this respect, and few, if any States have the resources to keep abreast of all of the new solvents and chemicals and bleaches and dyes and other dangerous materials coming into use each year, sometimes with very limited application. The Federal Government can do this job, and should be given it to do.

FULL DISCLOSURE OF CREDIT TERMS

What about more politics at the loan company, or department store credit window, or the automobile agency's finance department? As chairman of the Subcommittee on Committee Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I introduced on our side of the Capitol in the 88th Congress the truth-in-lending bill drafted by Senator DOUGLAS to require disclosure of actual interest rates and the full costs of credit, and I have reintroduced it in the 89th Congress as H.R. 155.

UNINSPECTED MEAT GOING INTO OUR CITIES

Citizens of urban areas must become more aware of the danger to their health from meat coming into their city from uninspected slaughtering houses located within the same State. If this meat does not cross State lines, it is not subject to Federal inspection. Since President Kennedy first suggested in his 1962 consumer message an expansion of Federal inspection to cover much of this 20 percent of our meat supply which is not now subject to such controls, I have sponsored bills to accomplish this purpose. In this Congress, my bill on Federal inspection of intrastate shipments of meat in certain designated "major consuming areas" is H.R. 149. It follows the same principle in the designation of major consuming areas as we established originally in the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957 for poultry moving only in intrastate commerce but burdening or affecting interstate commerce in wholesome poultry.

PRICE GYRATIONS IN SUGAR AND COFFEE FUTURES

In 1954 an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission revealed the part played by unregulated speculation, and abuses in trading in coffee futures contracts in bringing about and accelerating the tremendous leap in retail prices of gress into sugar price gyrations consistently proposed placing trading in coffee futures under the Commodity Exchange Act, as the FTC recommended 11 years ago. Investigation in the last Congress into sugar price gyrations convinced me that sugar futures trading should also be regulated under that act. Consequently, I have amended my previous bill on coffee futures trading to include sugar also, and have introduced it in this Congress as H.R. 8. Excessive speculation in futures contracts, usually at very low margin—thus, largely on borrowed money—can send prices of any commodity skyrocketing, if the futures trading is not properly regulated.

THE NEED FOR POLITICAL ACTION TO ACHIEVE CONSUMER GOALS

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined many of the great glaring gaps in our consumer legislation, and the kind of legislation which is necessary to close those gaps. This legislation can be passed only if a great many more citizens actively "play politics," as the chairman of General Foods calls it, on these important issues. But this is no game. Politics is a serious business, because the stakes of political action—or inaction—are high.

The battles are not won overnight. Sometimes it takes years. But often results are won even before the legislation is passed. For instance, the food processors do not like Senator HART's bill on packaging—not one bit; but his introduction of the bill and the hearings he conducted in support of it, did a great deal to bring about voluntary reforms in food packaging by the processors themselves.

Many consumers have now begun to do the same thing I do: that is, try to favor those grocery store products which are packaged in pounds or half pounds or quarts or similar standard sizes in prefence to competing products which come in sizes such as $7\frac{5}{16}$ ounces, or $19\frac{31}{32}$ ounces. I just think it gives the consumer a better basis for judging comparative values, particularly on the two-for-so-much deals, and I show my appreciation to the manufacturer accordingly. So far as this one consumer is concerned, and I think there are now many like me, it is good business for a firm to package its wares in containers using easily understood net weights.

Senator HART's hearings have made many consumers aware of this method of fighting back, and increasing numbers of manufacturers are therefore paying heed—getting the message—changing their packaging practices accordingly.

But in many of the situations I have described today—involving the safety of the consumer rather than pennies or nickels on a grocery item—we cannot depend merely upon the manufacturer's sense of intelligent self-interest to provide us with the protections we should have. We have had consumer protection laws for many years, but the laws always need updating, because the products they regulate are constantly changing in composition and in manufacturing technology.

As consumers we are far from helpless in solving these problems if—if, that is—we put more, not less, politics into the pantry and into our strategy for achieving consumer protection.

Aid to Dictators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it comes as no surprise to those of us who have followed the career of President Nasser of Egypt that he has again attacked the United States. President Sukarno of Indonesia has had a good teacher; Nasser has been attacking us ever since he came to power.

Robert G. Spivack has placed the whole matter of our assistance to these dictators in proper perspective in the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 24, 1965:

AID TO DICTATORS

WASHINGTON.—Abdel Gamal Nasser, the little Caesar on the Nile, deserves credit along with Sukarno, Il Duce of Indonesia, for persuading the administration and the Congress to take a new look at our foreign aid program.

There has been some speculation as to why Nasser, in an apparent fit of ill temper, said we could "jump in the lake" with our foreign aid after protests by the American Ambassador, Lucius Battle, at the destruction of the John F. Kennedy Library and the mutilation of some 20,000 books.

Was it just a tantrum? Or was it a tactic designed to prove to the Arab world that he was not subservient to America? The informative Near East report notes that his outburst coincided with the visit of a Soviet delegation to Cairo. Maybe that was it.

Whatever the reasons, a little group of "Let's not be nasty to Nasser" apologists first whispered that Ambassador Battle had "overreacted" to the incident and then began to conjure up visions of what damage Nasser could do to U.S. oil and other interests if he were further alienated.

I doubt that any of these arguments impressed the President, who has on several occasions made it clear that there is a new attitude on the part of the U.S. Government toward those who abuse us, on one hand, while holding out the other hand for foreign aid goodies. This message had been conveyed in several ways; I suppose the clearest demonstration was to the Panamanian politicians who like American dollars but feel a demagogic urge to stir up occasional anti-American demonstrations.

There is no tendency in the administration to deny American errors made during the days of dollar diplomacy. But these are new times, and we have no intention of negotiating with a pistol at our head. The President made this clear when he let the Panamanians know that we are considering construction of a new canal, possibly in some other country.

In other words, we are not at the mercy of the Panamanian politicians. In the case of Egypt this is even less so. The politicos in Panama seem to have gotten the point quickly; there were fewer than 100 demonstrators memorializing the 1964 riots, incidentally one of the first and touchiest issues that fell into L.B.J.'s lap shortly after President Kennedy's assassination.

Whether Nasser also gets the point remains to be seen.

Nasser has been playing fast and loose for some time, mostly at the expense of his own people, as is the case in Indonesia.

However, there is reason to believe that Nasser was a little startled at U.S. reaction to his comments about our assistance to his country. He has offered to rebuild the destroyed library and contribute 1,000 books. It will be interesting to see how soon this is done, how it is paid for, and what books are donated.

His Government also withdrew a publication attacking U.S. policy in the Middle East, and one of his newspapers expressed gratification that we would continue to ship wheat to Egypt. None of this constitutes an overwhelming expression of gratitude for American generosity, but we do not need any such fulsome or phony responses.

All we ask in return for American assistance is that the money reach the people for whom it is intended, that it be used to put the country on its feet, and that the nation's freedom and independence be maintained.

That is at the heart of our foreign aid program. We are not contributing U.S. funds to keep dictators in power, even if they profess to be anti-Communist, and we are not without long-range objectives that are in our self-interest. We believe that if these nations can be made to use their full potential and are relatively prosperous, that they will not go Communist or threaten the peace. But Nasser and Sukarno are forcing us to watch more closely how the funds are being used.

Serious Farm Situation Widespread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have submitted for the RECORD letters and publications which call attention to the serious economic situation that exists in rural America, the parity ratio of farm income now being the lowest since depression years. Most of the material that I have placed in the RECORD deals with the situation that exists in Minnesota and in my district.

However, I find the situation to be quite widespread and on a recent trip to North Dakota my attention was called to a resolution introduced in the house of representatives at Bismarck, which vividly sets forth the attitude and conditions that exist in North Dakota.

I respectfully submit for the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of this resolution:

NORTH DAKOTA HOUSE RESOLUTION 3

Resolution concurring in the viewpoints of the president of the North Dakota Farmers Union

Whereas the president of the North Dakota Farmers Union has expressed criticism over the remarks made in regard to agriculture by President Lyndon B. Johnson in his recent message to the U.S. Congress; and

Whereas the members of the House of Representatives of the 39th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota are in agreement with President Ed Smith of the North Dakota Farmers Union when he states: "Johnson had little to say about implementing this promise which won him an unprecedented mandate in every farm State"; and

Whereas there is also agreement with President Ed Smith when he states in regard to the Great Society: "We are not going to have one long if we go on losing farm income and farm families. North Dakota families made $26 million less in 1964 than in 1963, and wheat farmers made $11 million less while harvesting 20 percent more"; and

Whereas there is further agreement with President Ed Smith when he says that it is as important to prevent poverty as it is to cure it and also says: "North Dakota farmers need not be reduced to abject want before they have a right to expect fairplay from the administration they so overwhelmingly endorsed on election day": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, That the administration of President Johnson is urgently requested to heed the remarks of President Ed Smith on behalf of the people of North Dakota; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of North Dakota is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the North Dakota Farmers Union; President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

The 47th Observance of Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for many, this past Friday, January 22 had no special significance; yet for Ukrainians and people of Ukrainian descent throughout the world this day was one of solemnity and reverence. Forty-seven years ago the Ukraine proclaimed independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic, amidst greedy powerful neighbors. This day marked the end of almost 300 years of foreign domination and oppression. However, the realization of their long-nourished dream for freedom was doomed to perish before 2 years were finished.

Soviet imperialists eagerly eyed this rich and fertile land and the skilled and vigorous people of its soil. Hardly had the Ukrainians had a chance to enjoy their independence than the Red Army attacked the country and crushed all Ukrainian opposition. The Ukraine thus became a mere satellite of Soviet Russia, and within a few years was forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R.

Now the Kremlin boasts that the Ukraine is free and independent in the attempt of the new Russian ruling class to discredit the growing charges in the free world that the Ukrainian nation is a captive people of Soviet imperialism. But we in the West are acutely aware of the Communist calculated transformation of the words "freedom" and "national independence." For them, the definition of Ukrainian independence is "national in form and Socialist in substance," which simply means that the Ukraine is allegedly "free" to develop within the structure of Ukrainian national values but only according to the "substance" or ideology of communism. Here is a serious contradiction of terms, for in reality freedom for the Ukrainians means that they are free only to obey

Moscow's dictates, not to assert their own will. Nevertheless, it is clear that the Soviet Union has failed to destroy the Ukrainian spirit of freedom and self-determination.

We, as the leader of the free world, must never discourage the aspirations of captive nations. We must never allow the cause of freedom to suffer from any failure on our part. Indeed, we act in the highest American tradition when we raise our voices in behalf of those who aspire to be free and who wish to live a life of dignity and peace.

Americans of Ukrainian descent have made great and lasting contributions to the success of our political and economic system. They have defended our democratic institutions in time of war against totalitarian and imperialist foes. To these Ukrainian-Americans our Nation is ever grateful.

On this solemn occasion I, therefore, join hands with all freedom-loving peoples in commemoration of Ukrainian independence day. Let us all rededicate ourselves to the principle that has made our Nation great, the principle of self-determination, and let us pray that this principle will one day bring freedom to those who desire it.

World Calendar Reform—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, world calendar reform is a subject which has deeply concerned some of the finest minds of our time and the ages which have gone before. Despite the intensive study which has been done on this subject, there has been little progress in unifying, clarifying and perfecting the present multiple systems of tabulating days, weeks, and months.

Today I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the work of the Reverend Evarist Kleszcz, O.F.M. Conv., who has devoted the last 8 years of his life to perfecting a calendar system which he believes is a fair and practical solution to calendar problems. He calls his system the "Equitable Calendar for the World."

Father Evarist, an accountant before entering the priesthood, has attempted to simplify our calendar from an economic, social, and civil standpoint. For about 34 years Father Evarist pursued calendar reform as a hobby, doing research in this field in a number of libraries.

When it became evident in the early part of 1956 that the proposed "World Calendar" plan of simplification, which had been repeatedly proposed to first the League of Nations and then the United Nations for international consideration, could not gain sufficient support for adoption, he began to devote himself almost full time to study and research on the calendar reform problem.

He found that although the world calendar plan was fundamentally good in its overall structure, it was not internationally acceptable principally because of a "blank day" device to make the calendar fixed and permanent.

Father Evarist, who lives at Our Lady of Fatima Friary, Kenosha, Wis., then developed his "equitable calendar" plan, being careful to avoid objectionable features of past such calendars. He believes that his plan is in accord with the demands of mathematics and astronomy, and is one which would be most convenient, simple, fixed and perpetual, and of such a nature as to be acceptable to all people and nations.

Believing that Father Evarist's ideas deserve serious consideration and discussion, I am inserting at this point an article by this Franciscan priest in which he explores the problem of calendar reform. A second article explaining in detail the equitable calendar plan will follow in a succeeding issue of the RECORD. I earnestly urge the attention of my colleagues to them.

The article follows:

LET US SIMPLIFY OUR CALENDAR

(By Father Evarist Kleszcz, O.F.M. Conv.)

(Pt. 1: A call to simplify our calendar accurately, conveniently and equitably for all people, in all places and for all times)

During the first half of this century, various commercial, labor, governmental, scientific, educational and religious organizations have repeatedly, and sometimes urgently, expressed their desire to simplify our calendar.

The call "Let us simplify our calendar," came loudly from every part of the world. It was so persistent, that the League of Nations made an effort to respond to it. The League had repeatedly conducted international studies, research and inquiries, between the years 1923 and 1937 concerning the problem of simplifying our calendar in its attempt to solve the problem rightly. The United Nations also made international inquiry concerning the problem between the years 1947 and 1956.

Although the League of Nations and the United Nations did not succeed in obtaining the international adoption of any one specific and concrete simplified calendar plan, nevertheless their studies and inquiries provided us with valuable information that is very helpful in solving the problem of calendar simplification.

From their published official documents and records, we may learn what kind of modification of our calendar would be objectionable and unacceptable to certain social, economic, religious, and cultural groups of people and to various governments.

On the other hand, from a careful study and evaluation of these official documents and records, we are enabled to determine just what kind of simplified calendar plan would be most convenient and acceptable to people, groups, and nations.

The call "Let us simplify our calendar" is not as frequent now, nor as clamorous, as it was a few decades ago. Nevertheless, a widespread desire and a social, economic, religious and cultural need to simplify our calendar still remain.

BUT WHY SHOULD WE SIMPLIFY OUR CALENDAR?

We should simplify our calendar, because the simplification will bring better calendarial order and convenience to society. A most important reason is that such a simplification, if it is done rightly and considerately of the needs of all, will help bring about calendar unity in the world.

While it is true that the Gregorian Calendar is solidly established internationally and is the most commonly used official calendar in the world, nevertheless fewer than half of the world's people actually use the Gregorian Calendar in their daily life. Numerous other diverse calendars of various cultures are still in actual use among a large portion of the world's 3 billion people.

AT LEAST 30 CALENDARS IN INDIA

In India calendarial disunity is especially great. In India alone among the people of various provinces and cultures at least 30 diverse and sometimes conflicting calendars are in actual use. In a voluminous report of the Calendar Reform Committee published by the Government of India in 1955, the author states: "In India there is at present a terrible calendar confusion." More recent reports indicate that the calendarial situation in India remains the same. Such a great diversity of calendars is a fertile source of iniquities, discord, and confusion. According to one estimate, a needless duplication in the observance of just one civil holiday, due to diverse national and local calendars used, would produce an economic loss of $1 billion in that country.

The complexity of our calendar hinders its acceptance among innumerable millions of people of various lands and cultures, who prefer to use their own local calendars rather than the Gregorian Calendar.

The complexity of our calendar is due to two major defects, which have come down to us from the Caesars and are now part of the Julian and Gregorian Calendars. These defects are: the nonfixity of our calendar and the illogical inequality of months.

The first defect: Our calendar is not fixed, but changes every year. The year, in fact, consists of 365 days in every ordinary year and 366 days in every leap year. The calendar year thus contains 52 weeks plus 1 or 2 days. It is this excess of 1 or 2 days over and above the 52 complete weeks which causes each new calendar year to begin on a different day of the week than the preceding year did.

Thus, if January 1, New Year's Day, is a Sunday, in the following year it is a Monday (or even a Tuesday, if it follows a leap year). As a result, each and every date of the new year falls on a different day of the week than it did in the previous year. Thus, for example, if July 4, Independence Day, should fall on Wednesday in one year, it will fall in the next year on Thursday or Friday. If Christmas Day, December 25, should fall on Monday in one year, it will fall on Tuesday or Wednesday in the next year.

Consequently, each year civil, religious, and educational authorities have to prepare special programs. Schedules for one year are not valid for the next year. Thus our life is needlessly complicated.

As a result, also, periodic comparisons of statistics and accounts become difficult and confusing.

These difficulties are intensified even more by the illogical inequality of months.

The second defect: The months are illogically unequal. The months contain 28, 29, 30, and 31 days. There is a difference of 10 percent between the number of days in January and in February in ordinary years. The difference is even greater percentagewise, if we compare the number of business or working days of these 2 months.

Such an illogical inequality of month lengths make periodic comparability of statistics and accounts difficult, confusing, and inaccurate. It is an occasion of confusion and uncertainty in management-labor relations. It can be an occasion of hidden inequities in contracts that involve labor, salaries, wages, interest, leases, rents, and the

like, when they are fixed on a monthly basis. An official or worker is paid the same salary or wage for working 23 days in January as he is for working 20 days in February. When an apartment is leased, a person pays the same rent in January which has 31 days, as he does in February which has 28 days.

SIMPLIFIED CALENDAR DESIRABLE FOR MODERN TIMES

We have somehow tolerated these defects for more than 2,000 years. The Julian Calendar was established on January 1, 45 B.C. Pope Gregory XIII has somewhat modified this calendar on October 15, 1582, but without removing these defects. If these defects are removed accurately and equitably, our calendar will be immeasurably simplified and made perpetual.

Our calendar is basically convenient and substantially good and serviceable. But its faults are especially harmful in modern times to our social, economic and religious institutions.

It is indeed desirable that we keep and preserve substantially intact the basic calendarial forms, that is, the calendar day, the 7-day week, the month of about 30 days and the 12-month year, which make up the Gregorian Calendar. But we need to perfect these forms.

This need and desirability of simplifying our calendar was recognized at the international conference on calendar reform in October 1931, although the time and circumstances were not favorable to the accomplishment of the task.

At this conference, held under the auspices of the League of Nations, a resolution was adopted on October 19, 1931, titled "Resolution concerning the economic aspects of the simplification of the Gregorian Calendar," in which the following statements were made:

"The conference was almost unanimous in coming to the conclusion that the present is not a favorable time, taking into account the state of opinion, for proceeding with a modification of the Gregorian Calendar.

"Most of the delegations to the conference have clearly recognized that the present calendar has certain disadvantages, as explained in the report of the preparatory committee and have expressed an opinion that it would certainly be desirable, in principle, to secure a simpler measure of time more accurately appropriate to the needs of modern economic and social life * * *" (p. 15, official No.: C.785.M.380.1931. VIII, dated at Geneva, October 24, 1931. League of Nations, 4th General Conference on Communications and Transit, Official Instruments Approved by the Conference.)

Besides the foregoing two defects, there is the special disadvantage and further complications by virtue of the annual changing of the date of Easter Sunday. The date of Easter now can occur on any one of 35 different dates.

The annual changing of our civil calendar, together with the annual changing of the Easter Sunday date, give us 70 different kinds of calendar years, no two of which are exactly alike. If we should wish to obtain a complete set of these calendars, which would give us the right calendar for each and every year, we would need 70 different calendars of 12 months each, or a complete set of 840 pages. This is our complete calendar. This is the tool we now use in measuring time and in scheduling of our social, economic, and religious life.

Fortunately, these complexities can be eliminated at once, easily and permanently, by making only a few relatively minor changes in our present calendar.

HOW SHOULD WE SIMPLIFY OUR CALENDAR?

We should simplify our calendar accurately from a mathematical and astronomic standpoint, conveniently, and acceptably. Above all, we need to simplify our calendar equitably, that is, in a spirit of fairness and friendly consideratenesss of the calendarial needs and problems of all and in a spirit of brotherly understanding and love. We need to do it in a way which would help everyone, without hurting anyone.

We should simplify our calendar in a manner which would fit best the common calendar needs, convenience, and requirements of all people, of every social, economic, cultural, and religious group of all nations.

Our plan will fit the common calendar needs and convenience of all people, if we keep and preserve substantially intact the most generally and most commonly used calendarial forms. And it will fit best, if we would perfect these customary forms in the best possible manner.

Let us consider first, what in our judgment we cannot change and then consider what we can and should change.

At this time a very appropriate prayer for Divine Guidance and assistance comes to mind: "God, grant us the serenity to accept what we cannot change, the courage to change what we can, and the wisdom to know the difference."

WHAT IS IT THAT WE CANNOT CHANGE?

We cannot make any radical changes in, nor completely abandon any one of the four basic time units of the Gergorian Calendar, that is, the calendar day, the 7-day week, the month of about 30 days, and the 12-month year.

Why? Simply because a radical change in any of these time units would require a corresponding change in the regulation of time in the social, economic, cultural, and religious life, customs and practices of a very large portion of the world's people. A calendar reformer must seek to improve a calendar in a way that would better fit established customs and not revolutionize them.

CORNERSTONES OF OUR CALENDAR

These four time units are the cornerstones of our calendar. They are very ancient and are used also almost universally in other diverse and important solar, lunar, and luni-solar calendars of the world, although in a diverse manner. They are fundamentally and substantially convenient and generally acceptable divisions of time. They need, however, to be simplified, by the correction of their defects.

All past national and international efforts to make radical changes in one or another of these time units have failed. For example: An official adoption of a 10-day week in one country has failed decisively nearly two centuries ago. An official adoption of a 5-day week in 1929 by another country has likewise failed. An organized international effort to obtain the worldwide adoption of a 13-month calendar in the twenties and thirties has failed. Another highly organized and prolonged international effort between the years 1930 and 1956 to obtain the adoption by governments of a basically good simplified calendar plan, but with the objectionable "blank day" device of stabilizing our calendar by means of an annual interruption of the regular sequence of days of the week, has also failed repeatedly and decisively.

WHAT CAN WE CHANGE?

We can by a few minor adjustments of our calendar correct the two defects of our calendar; namely, first, the lack of fixity of our calendar, and second, the illogically unequal number of days in our months.

First. We can make our calendar fixed and perpetual:

The Gregorian Calendar changes every year simply because the calendar year contains 1 or 2 days over and above 52 complete weeks.

In order to make our calendar fixed and perpetual, we need to make the basic calendar year contain exactly 52 weeks, or 364 days. This will make every year identical in structure with every other year. Every year will then always begins on Sunday and end on Saturday.

There are two mathematical ways of making our calendar fixed and perpetual, without destroying its effectiveness as an accurate indicator of seasons. They are: the "blank day" method and the "leap week" method.

Of the two, the "leap week" method is the simplest, most convenient way and best suited to meet the common calendarial needs of all in an acceptable manner.

(a) The "blank day" methods: A "blank day" is a day not belonging to the week at all, which some reformers advocate as a means to make our calendar fixed and perpetual.

Reformers wish to stabilize the Gregorian Calendar by stabilizing the basic calendar year of 52 weeks, or 364 days, in such a way that each date would be permanently attached to its own day of the week. Then, in order to prevent the new year from beginning on a different day of the week, they would consider the remaining 1 day as a "blank day" and place it at the end of December. This day would not belong to the week at all, but would be removed altogether from the regular order of weekdays. The "blank day" would be neither a Sunday, nor a Monday nor any other day of the week, but simply a holiday, altogether removed from the regular sequence of the 7-day week. In a leap year they would insert a second "blank day" at the end of June. In promoting this device, the reformers refer to this blank day as a world day, or world holiday, or yearend day, or midyear holiday.

"BLANK DAY" INTERRUPTS ORDER OF WEEK

Because the "blank day" of a world calendar would interrupt the regular order of the 7-day week, once in every ordinary year and twice every leap year, it would create chaos among countless people of the world.

The blank day would be confusing, especially to children and to illiterate adults. And because the lunar year and the luni-solar year of Moslems, Jews, Chinese and of many of the people of India does not coincide exactly with the proposed world calendar which would use the blank day device, the blank day would occur on a different date of these lunar and luni-solar calendars with the advent of every new year. If we remember that about half of the world's population is illiterate, we will more easily understand the constant difficulties the blank day would create in the use of their calendars.

The blank day was found seriously objectionable to a number of civil and religious groups, and in itself it is apt to create serious confusion. It is not surprising therefore, that in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, promulgated on December 4, 1963, the Second Vatican Council made a declaration (in the appendix) that: "the church has no objection only in the case of those systems which retain and safeguard a 7-day week with Sunday, without the introduction of any days outside the week, so that the succession of weeks may be left intact, unless there is question of the most serious reasons."

Although the Vatican Council did not use the expression "blank day" in its objection, nevertheless different words express their objection to the blank day.

EVIDENCE AGAINST BLANK DAY

There is abundant evidence to indicate that the blank day principle cannot succeed internationally.

On October 7, 1954, the Secretary General of the United Nations sent a questionnaire to governments, together with the world calendar proposal, which uses the blank day principle in stablizing the calendar. Only 5 governments of the 41 who had replied to the questionnaire have ex-

pressed themselves in favor of the plan. (The replies of the 41 governments who had responded to the questionnaire were published in a series of United Nations documents numbered E/270, E/2701 Add.1, E/2701/Add.2, E/2701/Add.3, E/2812, E/2812/Rev.1.Add.1 and E/2812/Add.2.)

(b) The leap-week method: The new calendar would contain 364 days, or 52 weeks exactly. This would at once make the calendar fixed and perpetual.

A leap-week would then be added to the calendar once in every 5 or 6 years for the purpose of keeping the date of the March equinox within a narrow range. A leap year would thus have 371 days or 53 weeks exactly.

This method would always preserve the regular 7-day sequence within the week without any interruption or exception. Such a calendar could truly be called a calendar of weeks.

LEAP WEEK METHOD PERFECTS 7-DAY WEEK

The leap week method not only preserves but perfects the 7-day week. The 7-day week is the most universally used and the most convenient compound division of calendarial time there is. A calendar of complete weeks simplifies the entire calendar.

This perfection of the seven-day week, in a carefully worked out plan in which the solar and seasonal character of our calendar would be preserved with sufficient and reasonable accuracy, would make the calendar more acceptable to followers of widely divergent calendars whether they be lunar, solar, or luni-solar. The reason is that the regular 7-day week is the common point of reconciliation between the diverse calendars of the world.

A calendar of complete weeks in every year is the only simple method of stabilizing our calendar there is.

Secondly: We can equalize the number of days in the months as nearly as possible.

Because our calendar is solar and seasonal, and needs to keep in step with the solar year, which on the average has 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes and 46 seconds, it is obviously impossible to divide our calendar into 12 exactly equal months.

Some have sought to overcome this difficulty partially by seeking to provide a calendar of 364 days in ordinary years, or 52 weeks, and then dividing the year into 13 equal month of 4 weeks each, and then would add an extra week once every 5 or 6 years to keep the year of the seasons in closer alinement with the calendar year.

The 13-month calendar, although mathematically more perfect in some respects than the 12-month calendar, has not obtained sufficient support for adoption. When a questionnaire was sent out by the League of Nations to governments on the subject, and the replies came in, not one government has expressed itself in favor of the 13-month plan of reform.

In the League of Nations report on the reform of the calendar, published at Geneva on August 17, 1926, which was submitted by the Special Committee of Enquiry, the following statement was made: "Generally speaking, and considering only the intrinsic value of the last two groups, the 13-month system would seem to be of greater utility from the point of view of statistics and commerce, if the month, rather than the quarter, is to be taken as the unit of economic life. The 12-month system would be preferable in the other contingency. As regards the possibility of their practical application, the preliminary enquiry shows that the various governments are more favorable to the 12-month system, which would cause less disturbance to established customs. Most commercial organizations seem to take the same view" (p. 19 A. 33. 1926. VIII).

ACCORDING TO CALENDAR REFORM HISTORY

Calendar reform history tells us very plainly how tenaciously people cling to their customs and to their ancient calendars with which their customs are interwoven. The 12-month division of time goes back many centuries into the ancient past. The 12-month calendar of the Egyptians, for example, probably dates back to July 19, 4,236 B.C. The Julian calendar is now more than 2,000 years old. The national reformed calendar of India, the lunar calendars of China, of the Moslems, and of the Jews are 12-month calendars. A 13-month calendar would be a poor radical departure from the most firmly established customs and practices of the world's people.

A 13-month calendar would go counter to the Koran which the Moslems (who number 400 million in the world) use as their sacred book. Mohammed proclaimed through a verse in the Koran: "12 months is the number of months ordained by God, according to God's book."

Clearly, the 12-month calendar needs to be retained, and perfected. Abundant evidence indicates that the 13-month calendar has very little or no chance of being successfully adopted by the governments of the world.

KEEP THE 12-MONTH DIVISION

The best we can do then is to keep the 12-month division of the year, and then modify the month lengths as accurately and as conveniently as possible in accord with the demands of convention and of astronomy.

The best we can do then is to assign 30 days to some months and 31 days to other months, in accord with the duration of the seasons of the year. The distribution of the 30 and 31 days in the calendar must be made in such a way that the calendar would become a convenient indicator of the seasons.

We respectfully present the foregoing principles for your consideration. And we believe that a careful adherence to these principles will give us a simplified, fixed and perpetual calendar, which will be equitable, accurate, convenient and acceptable to all.

In part two we will present the equitable calendar plan to you. We believe that the equitable calendar plan is a realistic answer to the call: "Let us simplify our calendar."

This Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention a very stirring sermon entitled "This Nation Under God," recently delivered by my good friend and former pastor, Dr. Ray H. Kiely, of Westminster Church, Buffalo, N.Y.

We in Government are mindful of the need for divine guidance if our Nation is to survive and continue to serve the proper goals of freemen. This recognition finds expression in our State papers and opening prayer, our motto, and our pledge of allegiance. We wish our Nation to travel the road of justice and freedom and to be acceptable in His sight, but sometimes we neglect to carry out these convictions in our daily lives. Dr. Kiely makes it clear that faith without deeds is not enough. He calls upon the living church to inspire, and for the people to respond. I commend his sermon to my colleagues, believing that it has spiritual significance in our time.

The inspiring sermon follows:

THIS NATION UNDER GOD

(A sermon preached by Dr. Ray H. Kiely on October 25, 1964, at Westminster Church, Buffalo, N.Y.)

Psalm 33: 12: "Blessed is that nation whose God is the Lord."

Revelation 21: 1, 5: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth, he that sat upon the throne said, 'behold I make all things new.' "

The decisive battle in the War Between the States took place at Gettysburg, Pa., on July 3, 1863. There 70,000 Confederate and 93,000 Union soldiers took part in that fierce struggle. By the time Lee withdrew his troops a total of 51,000 men had fallen.

On November 19 of that year ceremonies were held on that site to set apart a portion of the battlefield as a national cemetery, honoring both men of the blue and of the gray who had given their lives in the bloody Battle of Gettysburg. On the train trip President Lincoln penned a brief speech for that historic occasion. Newspapers reporting the event in some instances severely criticized Lincoln for what they thought was a totally inadequate attempt at speechmaking for such an event. Yet history has honored Abraham Lincoln for his Gettysburg Address. Only 10 sentences or 267 words in length his address is generally considered the finest speech ever delivered by an American. Picture the war still raging, the situation of a nation divided against itself, the battlefield where so many sons, husbands, and fathers had fallen, and hear again his words:

"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure.

"We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that this government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

These time-honored words are not merely stirring rhetoric. Here are well-stated principles which point us back to that concept of government to which Americans have pledged themselves. In order that we might always remember a phrase was taken from the Gettysburg Address and, through act of Congress in 1954 incorporated in our pledge of allegiance to the flag. Since that time, in saluting the flag, we have said, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands. One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." In the last 10 years many of us have stumbled over the inclusion of those two words—and perchance still do. After all, is it quite that

important? Is it necessary that it be stressed for us that this is "a nation under God?"

I

Without any hesitation at all I would reply, "Yes, it is important, that important."

To coin high-sounding phrases is one thing—to be able to clearly understand what they imply may be quite another. But our forefathers knew what they were doing and why they were doing it—when they founded this Nation "under God."

Here was a dream which God had attempted to give over and over again to the children of Israel. They were called to become "a holy nation" whose God was the Lord because their law was His. Through Moses and the prophets God tried to lead Israel into truly becoming a nation under God. But repeatedly Israel rejected God and flouted His laws.

But that dream which the early Jews rejected became the dream of our forebears while they were still on the other side of the Atlantic. You may recall the inspired painting by Weir entitled "The Embarkation of the Pilgrims" which hangs in the rotunda of our Nation's Capitol. There the Pilgrims are shown assembled on the deck of the *Speedwell*, the sister ship of the *Mayflower*, at the moment of their departure from Southampton. They are not cheering and shouting farewells. They are not demonstrating with confetti and firecrackers. Rather they are gathered for the reading of the Bible and the benediction of prayer. At the very center of the painting is William Brewster with a great open Bible on his lap. To the right center is one of the Pilgrim Fathers lifting up his heart in petition to the only wise God into whose hands they are all committing the destiny of their lives.

It was not alone the chart and compass for the journey which came from God—the chart and compass for the life they were to live as a new nation was likewise from Him.

In the hold of the *Mayflower* some months later the torchbearers of freedom bound themselves through what has become known as the Mayflower Compact. "In the name of God, Amen. We whose names are written, having undertaken for the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith—do solemnly and mutually in the presence of God and one another covenant and combine ourselves into a civil body politic." This document established no executive, judicial, or legislative bodies—but it did go on to state clearly that this was to be a "nation under God."

Later came the New England Confederation which contained this statement of purpose, "all came to this part of America with one and the same purpose: to advance the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ and to enjoy the gospel of purity and peace."

My friends, this is the rock from which we have all been hewn. By countless other references it would be easy further to establish that which was obvious from the beginning: i.e. that this was a nation established to stand "under the rule of God."

II

What has happened to this concept as the years have advanced?

In all honesty we must admit that though we have talked a good case—though we have officially put God over this country in our allegiance to the flag, though our prayers have been regular and fervent in legislative halls, we have all largely forgotten that that which took place on these shores was to be an experiment in government under God. We intended to discover for ourselves just how fortunate would be that nation which had made the God its Lord.

Prof. Arnold Toynbee in his "Study of History" has noted the rise and fall of 14 different civilizations and hints that ours shows some signs of decay. Recently the reasons for the fall of the Roman Empire were reanalyzed. The three findings were these:

1. The undermining of the dignity and sanctity of the home, which is the basis of human society.

2. The mad craze for pleasure, sports becoming each year more exciting, more brutal, more immoral.

3. The decay of religion: Faith fading into mere form, losing touch with life, losing power to guide the people.

And then the author goes on to make this comment: "In the light of the above the oft-heard warning that 'history repeats itself' has an ominous meaning. The average age of the world's civilizations has been 200 years. In 12 years the United States will be 200 years old."

All this by way of saying that in spite of our fond beginning, our spiritually centered national anthem and hymns, in spite of the slogan against which we press our finger every day of our life "In God we trust" the evidence is against us when it comes to proving that we take very seriously the sovereign rule of God over our lives and over our Nation.

When 43 percent of our major crimes are committed by youth under 18 years of age, when we spend $67 million a day for crime, how glibbly can we repeat the words "One nation under God"? When there is so much inhumanity to man—so much inequality of opportunity—what do we mean when we say "one nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all"? (And neither of these faults can be blamed on one or other of the political parties. All of us are indicted by these conditions. We must bear a part of the social guilt.) Now is it reassuring or disquieting to recall that "blessed (only) is that nation whose God is the Lord."

III

Clearly "a nation under God" is something to be strived for—not something already achieved.

I am so convinced that only that nation which takes seriously the sovereignty of God will be blessed, that I fear for our Nation.

This is something to keep seriously and thoughtfully before us as we prepare to vote in the next few days. It is possible to so vote that increasingly less this is a nation "under God."

But the polls is only one place, and one of the less important of the places where this must come alive, if we are yet to be true to the dream of our forefathers.

If it doesn't happen in the homes, it will not happen anywhere, that we become a people of God, and thus a nation under God. Where there are attitudes and acts of hatred on the part of the children this only reflects hatred copied from parents. It has been said that there is and has been for some time anarchy in the home—as children have defied their parents—but the anarchy suggests that there was a prior anarchy as the parents turned on God. "If the foundations be destroyed, the righteous, what has he been doing?" The law, the law of love as well as the law of the Ten Commandments, must be written upon the hearts of the children by the parents. Reverence, submission, obedience to God must be taught and caught in the home, else it will never come by any means. Here is at least part of the way that a nation becomes "a nation under God."

But there is another half to this picture. If and when this becomes a nation under God, it will be because of government which accepts God as its judge.

There was a few years ago some surprise expressed concerning the Presbyterian Church not fighting to maintain prayers in the school system. The reason was to be found in that the church was involved in re-thinking what consistency demanded if we were to adhere to the age-old stand of separation of church and state. And that became of great importance when it was recognized that if the church were to be free to be the conscience of the Nation it had to remain separate and unentangled. The church of Jesus Christ must ever be free—free to carry on its prophetic role of calling the Nation to righteousness, to truth, and to justice under God.

Do you recall those splendid words of insight about our land which highlight the role the church has in helping bring this dream to realization?

"I sought the greatness of America. I sought the greatness of America in her ample rivers and great harbors. It was not there. I sought the greatness of America in her fertile fields and boundless forests. It was not there. I sought the greatness of America in her matchless Constitution and her dedicated Congress. It was not there. It was not until I entered the churches of America and found her pulpits aflame with righteousness that I understood the greatness of America."

Let the pulpits of the land be still—in all save personal matters of faith and morality? But some would have it so. Our great national moments have been those in which the pulpits of our land have faithfully and fervently spoken out—calling for righteousness, truth, and justice—and the people of the pew have faithfully and fervently responded.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it affords me great pleasure to advise this body that a number of Democratic organizations in my district have adopted the town of Starksville, Miss., and are seeking to raise funds, food, and clothing for this Negro community. In this connection I issued a statement lauding these organizations for their efforts as an "inspiring demonstration of that unity of Negro and white which will insure full civil rights for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color."

Following is my full statement:

I was very pleased to learn of the action of a number of Democratic clubs in the upper end of my district in adopting the town of Starksville, Miss., and their current campaign to raise funds, food, and clothing for this community. It is an inspiring demonstration of that unity of Negro and white which will insure full civil rights for all Americans regardless of race, color, or creed.

The complete support of full civil rights for all, by the National Convention of the Democratic Party and the total and unequivocal campaign of President Lyndon B. Johnson and Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey for civil rights, made this issue the overriding one of the 1964 campaign.

The overwhelming victory of President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey was in every real sense a true consensus of the desire and the determination of the American people to wipe out and end discrimination now and in this day.

Now all Americans must, as good citizens, work together and on every level to implement and assist in carrying out the clear mandate of the Nation.

I hope that this striking example of cooperation will stimulate other communities to similar action. I do not think it is too much to ask the remaining pockets of resist-

ance to the will of the Nation to accept the inevitable. I trust that from here on all our people will move forward to a better and a stronger America.

Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the year 1964 marked the 50th anniversary of the amalgamation of several veteran's organizations which met in Pittsburgh, Pa., at the Schenley Hotel, September 14–16, 1914, and formally organized the present national organization, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. The Allegheny County Council and district 29 of the VFW held commemorative services on the anniversary date of this fine, patriotic organization—an organization which plays such a vital role in our daily life in preserving and promulgating American ideals.

In the commemorative services September 13 tribute was paid to Mrs. Margaret Armstrong, first president of the Ladies Auxiliary to the VFW, who is buried in Allegheny Cemetery, Pittsburgh. Services were held last September 14 honoring the founders of VFW at the county courthouse, Pittsburgh, with the following taking part: Joseph A. Borkowski, Allegheny County commander; Ed Evans, commander of district 29; Mrs. Edna Sheriff, president of ladies auxiliary; Mrs. Florence Marion, president of 29th district auxiliary; Castle Shannon Post 5012th Firing Squad under command of Alex Stefko; Chaplains Leslie Carlyle; John C. Waters Post No. 46 and A. C. Smith; Oscar Schmidt, bugler; Edna Tepsic, past president of ladies auxiliary, Department of Pennsylvania; past department of Pennsylvania commanders William P. Tepsic and George Hartman; and John H. Boehmer, past county council commander.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in my remarks at this point a "Brief History of the VFW" by Commander Borkowski.

The article follows:

BRIEF HISTORY OF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

(Joseph A. Borkowski, chairman, Americanism Committee, Allegheny County Council VFW)

The month of September marked the 50th anniversary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, a national veterans' organization which came into existence through amalgamation of several veterans' organizations at a Pittsburgh meeting held on September 14–17, 1914, at Schenley Hotel, Oakland.

Prior to the national amalgamation meeting, there were several sizable veterans' organizations, such as the Army of Philippines, Cuba, and Puerto Rico, and Boxer Rebellion. All of these sincerely believed in their right to organize and to seek hospital care for the returned disabled and needy veterans and compensation for veteran's widow and orphans. With time, it became evident that unless there was one veteran organization on national basis, the possibility of securing favorable veterans' legislation was remote.

A special convention in 1909 was called to the city of Pittsburgh for the purpose of consolidation of existing veterans' organizations, viz, the Army of Philippines, American Veterans of Foreign Service, and others, but no definite results were obtained.

The groups met again in Denver, Colo., in 1913 at the invitation of Gus Hartung, of Stewart Post, No. 1. Again consolidation was stalemated over selection of a name. The matter was referred for referendum, and the groups were tentatively combined under leadership of Rive W. Means, Denver attorney, who later was to become U.S. Senator from Colorado.

Dissatisfaction followed. It took men like General Hale founder of Foreign Service to point out the advantages to all the veterans concerned. The dissenters even went to the extent of electing their own commander in chief.

However, when the referendum was taken, 31 posts with 493 votes favored amalgamation and against it were only 7 posts with 85 votes. With this sustaining assurance, another meeting at Philadelphia and the way was cleared for amalgamation of western and eastern groups under a new name of "Veterans of Foreign Wars." This was done by creating a new society and also empowering the new group to unite "with a similar body at a future time." The western groups and others still remained aloof until on April 15, 1914, when favorable reaction started to snowball for consolidation.

VFW HISTORICAL DATA—SYNOPSIS OF ENCAMPMENT ELECTIONS AND COMMANDERS IN CHIEF

1. American Veterans of Foreign Service, organized as a national body in Columbus, Ohio, September 23, 1899. Chartered by the State of Ohio, October 11, 1899. Elected J. C. Putnam as commander in chief.

2. Colorado Society Army of the Philippines, organized at Denver, Colo., November 1899. Gen. Irving Hale, organizer. Became national society Army of the Philippines on August 13, 1900.

3. Philippine War Veterans, organized at Altoona, Pa., July 7, 1901. H. O. Kelley, organizer. In July 1902, reorganized with C. O. Knoghton as president.

4. Philippine War Veterans, organized at Pittsburgh, Pa., October 13, 1901, G. H. Smith being elected commander. On April 27, 1902, reorganized as Foreign Service Veterans with Jacques La Belle as commander. William A. Wein, commander, May 26, 1903.

5. American Veterans of the Philippine and China Wars, organized at Philadelphia, Pa., June 24, 1902, by Capt. Robert S. Hansbury.

Numbers 3, 4, and 5 above met together September 10–12, 1903, at Altoona, Pa., and formed the American Veterans of Foreign Service. In September 1905 the original American Veterans of Foreign Service, formed September 23, 1899, and this later one, formed September 1903, united and formed a society of the same name which in August 1913 at Denver, united with the Army of the Philippines under the temporary name of Army of the Philippines, Cuba, and Puerto Rico, the name being changed during the year to Veterans of Foreign Wars.

In November 1913 several posts in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, refusing to recognize the amalgamation in Denver during September preceding, met as American Veterans of Foreign Service and elected George F. Lumb as commander. Other nonaffiliated posts, but which were ready to affiliate, elected Ben Nowell as commander and he held the posts in line until amalgamation could be effected.

In March 1914 a few posts from New Jersey and Pennsylvania met in Philadelphia under the guidance of Capt. Robert G. Woodside and formed a group called Veterans of Foreign Wars with the specific understanding that they would unite with the amalgamated bodies at the earliest opportunity possible. This was accomplished in September at the Pittsburgh encampment. Capt. Robert G. Woodside was elected commander of this temporary society.

To formalize all prior activities which were directed toward consolidation of all contemporary veterans organizations an encampment was called for at Schenley Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Attorney Rice W. Means of Denver and commander in chief of American Veterans of Foreign Service issued the call in February 1914 and asked all veterans groups to join stating in part: "There must arise an organization which will embody the true patriotic sentiments of this Nation. It must be so broad in its provisions for eligibility to include every man who has served or who in the future will serve in the United States is engaged."

THE ENCAMPMENT COMMITTEE

The Pittsburgh encampment committee of 1914 which was Maj. Robert G. Woodside, Dr. George Metzger, H. O. Kelley, former commanders of American Veterans of Foreign Service, and William E. Ralston, and Col. Thomas S. Crago.

It was the first encampment of veterans of then who participated in foreign wars of the United States and also included delegations from territories and possessions of the United States.

Among those was noted Engineer Col. George W. Goethals, the builder of the Panama Canal, representing the Panama Canal post.

There were 250 registered delegates. Delegates from every State in the Union besides Cuba, Puerto Rico, Panama, and Philippines will be in Pittsburgh for the encampment representing over 100 posts and representing some 30,000 members.

Allegheny County had four posts, three being in Pittsburgh and one in McKeesport, viz: William McKinley, Sergeant Carney, Malate, Ward.

THE NATIONAL LADIES AUXILIARY

A very interesting and significant item appeared in the local newspaper which in part stated that the Allegheny County posts, viz: William McKinley, Sergeant Carney, Malate, and Ward are now forming auxiliaries and that the headquarters are at Schenley Hotel. It also added under dateline of September 15, 1914, that "There are about 50 women present at the opening session. The organization of a woman's auxiliary is being discussed." The ladies yesterday took the initial steps in the organization of a national Ladies' Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars which they expect to have accomplished before the adjournment of the convention. Mrs. Rice W. Means was elected temporary chairman and Mrs. George Armstrong, of Pittsburgh, temporary secretary of the ladies' organization, at a meeting attended by about 50 ladies at the Schenley Hotel during the afternoon.

Reports will be made this afternoon by the committee on credentials, composed of Mrs. George Geis and Mrs. Fred Oglesby, of Pittsburgh, and Mrs. J. H. Kolber, of Albany, N.Y.; the committee on constitution and bylaws, composed of Mrs. Joseph Brice, Mrs. William Ralson, of Pittsburgh, and Mrs. John Jepson and Mrs. Gus E. Hartung, both of Denver. It is expected that permanent officers will be elected and the organization completed this afternoon. There are already many local auxiliaries, one of which, known as the Ida McKinley Auxiliary, was formed in Pittsburgh 4 months ago, but not an attempt has heretofore been made to band them together.

THE FIRST ELECTED OFFICERS OF THE NATIONAL LADIES' AUXILIARY

The National Ladies Auxiliary to the VFW met in the Hotel Schenley and elected the following officers: Mrs. George Armstrong, Pittsburgh, national president; Mrs. William F. Hern, Sr., St. Paul, national vice president; Mrs. Jacob H. Kobler, Albany, N.Y. junior national vice president; Mrs. George H. Geis, Pittsburgh, national treasurer.

Mrs. George Armstrong, the first president of national auxiliary died in 1947 and is buried in Allegheny Cemetery, section 43, lot 95, Pittsburgh, Pa.

THE HISTORICAL PREAMBLE OF VFW CONSTITUTION

If there is any doubt as to the place and time of the formal founding of the VFW there is not better evidence than that of the word content in the preamble of the VFW constitution:

"CONSTITUTION

"Adopted at Pittsburgh, Pa., September 15–16, 1914.

"Preamble

"We, officers, and enlisted men, and honorably discharged officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy and Marine Corps of the United States of America, do unite to establish a permanent organization which shall be known as Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States."

This, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, was organized by the amalgamation of the Army of the Philippines, American Veterans of Foreign Service and the Army of the Philippines, Cuba, and Puerto Rico, on September 14–17, 1914, at Pittsburgh, Pa.

Therefore the first national officers of amalgamated Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States were:

Thomas S. Crago of Waynesburg, Pa., national commander; William K. Harvey of San Francisco, senior vice commander; Alfred V. Kennedy of Albany, N.Y., junior vice commander; Rev. Samuel J. Smith, national chaplain; Frank H. Husted, Philadelphia, Pa., surgeon general; Chester O. Dunlap, Pittsburgh, quartermaster general; William E. Ralson, Pittsburgh, judge advocate.

A national insignia was adopted and the pendant, a Maltese cross used at the Pittsburgh encampment became part of the decorations.

Sir Winston Churchill

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, freedom-loving people the world over today mourn the death of Sir Winston Churchill. The great warrior is stilled. The final battle is over.

But the tears in our eyes and the grief in our hearts are not so much for Sir Winston, himself, who lived a rich, full life and tasted the fruits of honor and glory and the respect and admiration of his fellow man.

No, I think we mourn for ourselves, for we have lost a valiant and farsighted man. We have lost a statesman and a patriot who rallied an entire country to the cause of liberty, giving it the fortitude and courage to withstand the forces of oppression and tyranny which besieged it. We have witnessed the passing of a leader who helped inspire an alliance of nations to turn back the enemy so that freedom might prevail. We have lost a great orator and writer who gave the English language new eloquence. Indeed, we mourn for ourselves because we have lost one of the great men of our time.

Yet, we cannot really mourn for our children who will never know him as we did. We cannot grieve for them because they are the richer because Sir Winston lived. They are the heirs of the liberty into which he breathed new life and the heirs of the freedom he fought so steadfastly to perpetuate.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Excise Tax Repeal Bill Introduced First Day of Congress, January 4, 1965—The Number Is H.R. 7—Vigorous Efforts Will Be Made for Its Passage as Disclosed in the Speech Made in San Francisco Last Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a report of the speech made by me before the National Association of Retail Druggists in October of 1964. The subject discussed has been delayed so long that I have personally promised to do everything that can be done under parliamentary rules to get the bill enacted into law.

The statement made at San Francisco is as follows:

EXCISE TAXES MUST GO—CONGRESSMAN TO INTRODUCE EXCISE TAX REPEAL BILL WHEN CONGRESS CONVENES

(By WRIGHT PATMAN, Representative in Congress from Texas)

The time has come for repeal of the retailers excise taxes on a number of items widely used by consumers. There has been talk about it for a long time, but the present opportunity and occasion calls for action. There is no reason for further delay.

With that in mind, I am introducing a bill to repeal these retailers excise taxes. Specifically, the bill will exempt toilet preparations, jewelry and related items, ladies' handbags, luggage and furs and fur trimmed coats.

The present ad valorem tax rate on these items is 10 percent; they have been subjected to this "luxury" tax for over 20 years. It was first imposed in 1943 as an emergency wartime measure. After the war, the tax was retained as a restraint against inflationary pressures warranted by the tremendous buildup of consumer purchasing power during the war. During this time, and in fact up until 1954, all of these items included in my bill were taxed at a 20-percent rate. Finally, in 1954, the Congress reduced the rate on these items to 10 percent.

There was no justification, in my opinion, for continuing these taxes after 1949. The fact is that a wartime emergency tax measure gained enough momentum to stay on and on long after its reason for being had ceased. And the result has been an unequitable burden for consumers—particularly the ladies. I don't see how anyone can argue that ladies' handbags are a luxury, or for that matter cosmetics, in this day and age. My bill would abolish the Federal excise tax on these items entirely and it would do it effective January 1. There is no reason for deferring the effective date. As a matter of fact, to do so would merely result in postponement of purchases, with resulting problems for retailers.

But it must be stressed that prompt action is needed not only by the Congress but by the voters throughout the country who are so much in favor of this tax repeal. Since the measure is long overdue, there is no reason, as I see it, why it cannot be put through in the first 90 days of the Congress. That is why I have prepared this bill for introduction at the very beginning of the Congress.

But the bill will not breeze through without support from the people who favor it, and that is why retail druggists who are so vitally concerned, as well as the other retailers, and the consumer groups, too, of course, who are affected, must make their views known early and see how important it is that this legislation is brought to the attention of the public.

Removing these Federal taxes will save consumers about $550 million a year. This will, of course, stimulate consumer purchasing power and will contribute to higher business activity and employment.

At this point, a word is in order about the general economic situation. We hear a lot of talk these days about inflation, and in some banking circles it has been suggested that a general increase in interest rates will be needed. To my mind, this would be a terrible mistake. Raising interest rates slows down the entire economy and could bring on a recession. That is what happened three times during the last Republican administration. To raise interest rates because of the fear that some prices may rise (I might add a fear that hasn't really shown itself to be warranted by the evidence) is like trying to kill a mosquito with a sledge hammer.

Our present high level of economic activity, which we all want to continue, will require some additional stimulus in 1965, according to many competent economic analysts. The reduction occasioned by this excise removal will help to provide some stimulus. By itself, it will not produce a major spurt in consumption, but it will definitely provide a lift in demand for these items that will be removed from the tax, and it will reverberate down through the retailer, the wholesaler, and the producer, with a healthy effect on the economy.

ADMINISTRATION STUDYING REPEAL

It well may be that removal of other excises is warranted, and I am happy that the administration is studying the question at the moment. But there is absolutely no doubt that the excises removed by my bill are long overdue. They have been 15 years overdue, and the time for action is January and February of 1965. To delay would be to run the risk of getting caught up in the whole range of legislative activity and lose momentum.

Taxes are necessary for national defense, for the maintenance of law and order, for provision of the many services to business, agricultural, labor, and consumer groups required by this complex society in which we live. But taxes in a democracy should be fair and based on the ability to pay. Taxes on consumers, particularly when they fall heavily on one group such as the American women and where they are levied on items that are widely necessary for comfort and convenience, are in violation of both of these principles. This fact makes the case for immediate action a very strong one.

A humorist once defined the retail drugstore as the "poor man's country club." Like most jokes this is somewhat exaggerated but there is no doubt that the retail druggist is as close to the American consumer as anyone is. You provide him with some of his fundamental needs and you see him often. It is your members who understand thoroughly the stagnating effect of excise taxes. You are in a position to bring home these facts to the consumer and to enlist his sympathy and enthusiasm in what is really a common objective. As a sponsor of the excise tax removal I look to your organization for the kind of support that you have always given me.

(In his address to National Association of Retail Druggist members attending the October annual convention in San Francisco, Mr. PATMAN reviewed the efforts that had been made in various sessions of Congress to effect repeal of the excise taxes which were assessed during World War II, and continued in effect after the war emergencies were ended.

(He suggested that a maximum effort by consumers and retailers would be helpful in repealing such taxes. Contacting Representatives in Congress before the opening of Congress in January 1965 is needed to assure passage of repeal measures, he said. Also, in his convention address, Representative PATMAN warned that other tax measures were being considered in top level business quarters. He cited several of these proposals.)

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is on record for a general sales tax at either the retail or manufacturing level. The members, of course, are split on it, but in the Washington office they are working for it.

The National Association of Manufacturers are for it. They prefer to call it a broad-based excise tax instead of a sales tax, which, of course, is the same thing.

Then the American Retail Federation is interested, debating it internally trying to decide whether to change from a previous policy of allout opposition. They seem to be on the fence about it, and very likely will come over on the side of the sales tax. I hope they don't, but it looks like they are trying to get them, and they are considering it.

The National Retail Merchants Association is sounding out department store members about whether or not they should have a general sales tax and whether it should be at the retail or manufacturers' level, and many other trade groups are doing the same thing.

The No. 1 objective of the National Association of Retail Druggists for 1955, as stated by the NARD executive committee was, "To renew our vigorous efforts to successfully eliminate the retail excise tax on toiletries, cosmetics, leather goods, and jewelry." The repeal of these Federal taxes on toilet preparations, jewelry and related items, ladies' handbags, luggage, and furs and fur trimmed coats will save consumers about $550 million a year.

Any Members who would like to join this effort will be privileged to do so.

Closing of Military Installations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last November the Defense Department's announcement to close down 95 military installations set off a repercussion among Congressmen, industry and others that today is still vibrating. This reverberation continues despite the fact that every effort is being made to protect the individual employees affected by these moves. Secretary McNamara guaranteed "a job opportunity for every career employee affected by a closure." He also assured the Government would retrain these individuals and continue their salaries during the retraining period.

In the December 5, 1964, issue of Saturday Review, Norman Cousins writes about the needless attempts to continue military installations once the Government decides to shut them down. He suggests that "instead of lamenting the shutdowns, we ought to be hailing them—both for the improved peace prospects they symbolize and for the economic opportunities they offer."

In the past former military bases have been successfully put to civilian uses, including schools, civilian airports, industrial parks and recreation areas. Some locations have been converted into urban job training centers under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Many antiquated and useless installations are not discontinued solely because of congressional pressure. What is suggested in this enlightened article is that efforts to prevent closure of military installations could be much better directed at enacting legislation to convert outdated bases into useful nonmilitary projects that will "sustain and possibly even expand the area economy."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Counsin's article entitled "Planning for Prosperity," published in the Saturday Review.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLANNING FOR PROSPERITY

The owner of a small delicatessen in Brooklyn, N.Y., received prominent newspaper attention last week when he told his Congressman and the press of the severe hardships that would be imposed as a result of the Government's decision to shut down the Brooklyn Navy Yard. His cry of pain was only one of many thousands throughout the country in response to the order suspending operations at obsolete or marginal military installations. Meanwhile, Congressmen and other officials of the affected areas registered their protests with the Department of Defense. It might be noted in passing that in the recent election campaign many Senators and Representatives sought to make political capital out of their ability to obtain, save, or prolong defense spending in their areas. Even Senators who have a reputation for opposing large military budgets have made strenuous efforts, often successfully, to retain or restore defense plants in their States.

The plight of the Brooklyn delicatessen owner, and others like him, was real enough. But that is beside the point. The point is that the most powerful lobby in American history is now at work in behalf of what is in many respects a multibillion-dollar boondoggle. It makes little difference if a defense plant is manufacturing equipment for which there is no longer practical use, or if the march of military technology has outmoded particular weapons and their integral parts. All that matters, apparently, is that arms spending means jobs or improved business.

After the First World War, writers like Philip Noel-Baker and Frank C. Hanighen [1] attracted widespread attention and provoked popular indignation with their contention that the war was brought on, at least in part, because of private concerns that lobbied for and profiteered in arms. The principal lobby today behind the arms race comes not just from the military or from manufacturers but from everyday people, labor unions, small shopowners, and congressional and local officials who are supremely vulnerable to economic and political pressure.

It is important to identify this lobby not just for historical purposes but as a matter of accurate contemporary labeling. No local storm is as great as the one that is stirred up by a report that defense spending in that area is about to be reduced. And those who recognize a specific danger in the mounting arms race will be misdirecting their energies if they address themselves solely to the Military Establishment. Indeed, for efficiency purposes alone, the military would like to discontinue many outmoded and cumbersome installations but are virtually forced to keep them going because of congressional pressure.

We are not arguing here that the hardships imposed by military shutdowns are not real. The laborer or the shopkeeper whose income is cut off cannot be expected to exult or do a victory dance, whatever the nature of his work. It is natural to expect that a man who has been wedded to a job for 20 years will fight to keep that job. But at least let us correctly identify this situation, if only to be in a better position to address ourselves to the human side of the problem.

Over the past 20 years, the occupants of the White House, whether Democratic or Republican, have frequently spoken of the opportuntiy offered by a cutback in military expenditures. For example, it would be pointed out that the cost of a single bomber, if saved, could build a school or a hospital or a community center or so many miles of new road. Also, experts like Seymour Melman of Columbia University have demonstrated how armament plants can be converted into essential nonmilitary production. And public officials like Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, have developed detailed plans for reconversion.

The time has come to put these reconversion plans into operation. We assume that the concept of peacetime equivalents was seriously advanced; very well, let it now be applied. When factory orders are discontinued or sharply reduced, new products can be adopted, in line with the detailed recommendations advanced by reconversion task forces. When the Government decides to shut down a military installation, let it also make available the resultant savings for new prospects in the area affected.

It may be argued that the Government lacks authority for applying economic equivalents—despite all the oratory about the need to apply military savings for peacetime purposes. True enough. But this would seem to make it imperative that proper authority be provided. We should suppose that many of the Senators and Congressmen who are doing their utmost to protect their areas against economic dislocation would recognize the need for legislation to empower the Government to undertake reconversion or assist communities in such useful projects as will sustain and possibly even expand the area economy.

What we are trying to suggest is that a situation the Nation has been hoping for these past two decades may be eventuating sooner than most people think. Increasingly, the Nation may be in a position to take energies and resources now going into armaments and put them into the making of a better America. Instead of lamenting the shutdowns, we ought to be hailing them—both for the improved peace prospects they symbolize and for the economic opportunities they offer. In any case, we ought to be able to find something better to do with empty hands than to turn them to the manufacture of mass murder weapons.

[1] Philip Noel-Baker, M.P., "The Private Manufacturer of Armaments," Oxford University Press, 1937, $3.75; H. C. Engelbrecht and F. E. Hanighen, "Merchants of Death," Dodd, Mead, 1934, $2.50.

New Hampshire, the Cradle of Skiing, Proclaims Ski Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of the State of New Hampshire has proclaimed the week of January 22–31 as Ski Week. I am delighted to bring the Governor's proclamation to the attention of the House because the principal skiing areas of New Hampshire are in my district and I can give the House personal testimony as to their beauty and excellence. Throughout the year, of course, you will find a welcome in New Hampshire amid surroundings of unsurpassed splendor. At no time is this truer than in the winter. A wealth of comfortable lodges and inns await you among our broad slopes and exhilarating trails, where you will find the finest skiing and the warmest welcome. This helps explain why so many people and industries chose the Granite State for their homes. I submit our Governor's proclamation herewith with my own endorsement:

A PROCLAMATION: SKI WEEK—JANUARY 22–31, 1965

"Whereas for many reasons New Hampshire may with justice lay claim to being the cradle of skiing since it is the home of the first ski club in America, first to teach European techniques, first to host a snow train in the United States, first to have an overhead cablelift, first to have an aerial tramway, skimobiles and a gondola tramway, and

"Whereas we have the longest skiing season in the East because we have the highest mountains in the northeastern ski country, and

"Whereas many of New Hampshire's sons and daughters have brought glory to their State and their Nation in the field of competitive skiing, and

"Whereas it is proper that we should carry on the crusade for physical fitness launched

by our late beloved President John F. Kennedy, and continued in the Great Society program of President Lyndon B. Johnson,

"Now, therefore, I, John W. King, Governor of the State of New Hampshire, hereby heartily endorse the ski industry's promotion of National Ski Week from January 22–31, 1965, and most cordially invite residents and visitors alike to enjoy New Hampshire's superior ski areas, relax at our comfortable ski country resorts, and sample our special brand of hospitality during the aforesaid period."

Given at the executive chambers in Concord this 15th day of January in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-five and of the Independence of the United States of America, the one hundred and eighty-ninth.

JOHN W. KING,
Governor.

By His Excellency,
The Governor
Attest:

_____ _____,
Secretary of State.

Johnson Uses "Brainwashing" Well in Foreign Aid Request

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Mr. David Lawrence, which recently appeared in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, points out a fact which is frequently overlooked. This is that we spend far more for foreign aid in all its various forms than the total set forth in the annual assistance bill. Thus, simply to assume that the dollar cost of the Foreign Assistance Act is our total aid expenditure is obviously erroneous:

JOHNSON USES "BRAINWASHING" WELL IN FOREIGN AID REQUEST

WASHINGTON.—"Brainwashing"—the political technique of playing on the ignorance or indifference of the public—seems to have been effectively utilized in the message on foreign aid which President Johnson has just sent to Congress.

Many a headline in the press emphasized the President's comment that his request for $3,380 million "is the smallest in the history of the foreign-aid program" since it was started in 1948. But a request for an appropriation is far different from an actual authorization by Congress, and what was glossed over is the fact the President's request this year is higher than what was actually appropriated for foreign aid for fiscal year 1965 as well as for 1964, 1960, 1958, 1956, and 1955.

So a request for a sum which is slightly lower than what was requested last year is not in itself of any real significance, particularly when it is $130 million more than last year's appropriation and $380 million more than was appropriated the year before that.

What is more important is that, while the President used the figure of $3,380 million as his request, he inserted at the same time in his message a separate request for another $750 million for aid to Latin America. In the first part of his message, he says:

"Specifically, for fiscal year 1966 I recommend no additional authorizations for development lending or the Alliance for Progress; existing authorizations for those purposes are adequate."

But further on in the same message, Johnson said:

"To strengthen multinational aid, and further to strengthen the Alliance for Progress, I urge the Congress promptly to approve the 3-year authorization of $750 million which constitutes the U.S. contribution to the fund for special operations of the Inter-American Development Bank."

Yet the public is being told, in effect, that the total amount the administration is asking from Congress for foreign aid is only $3,380 million. Actually, by adding one-third of the $750 million of multinational aid for Latin America, the total request becomes $3,630 million. This is higher than the total of last year's request as well as the request in several of the preceding years.

A third request by the President in his message is not spelled out. He says the amount asked for the Vietnam operation may not be enough and that he is requesting "an additional standby authorization for military or supporting assistance which would be used only in Vietnam." He also warns he will ask Congress for more funds if "situations should arise which require additional amounts of U.S. assistance to advance U.S. vital interests."

There is also an accumulation of unexpended funds from previous years which can at any time be used for the original purpose as long as it comes within the scope of the language of the laws authorizing such expenditures. It is estimated $6.5 billion appropriated by Congress in past years has not been spent. But each year Congress is nevertheless asked to keep on appropriating more money without regard to these previously authorized but unspent sums.

The President's message, therefore, does not tell just how much will be taken out of the U.S. Treasury for foreign aid this fiscal year or next year. The impression is being given that spending for foreign aid is to be at a record low, when this is not the case at all.

The President is, of course, trying to convince Congress the estimates this year are much more of a rock bottom nature than they have been in the past. The attitude of Congress in cutting down on Presidential requests for foreign aid in recent years has brought about a much more careful study of the requests before they are submitted to Congress. Last year, when the President asked for $3,516 million, Congress appropriated all but $266 million.

In the past, officials had apparently based their requests on what they hoped could be spent effectively, but they were unable to judge just how much of the funds authorized could be expended within a given period. It is the attempt to end such guesswork which has brought the new requests down to a far more accurate projection of the foreign aid program this year.

The objectives of foreign aid have raised quite a controversy. But, on the whole, the record of achievement has been, despite some weaknesses, a creditable one. The fact remains nevertheless that this country has established a prestige throughout the world of having generously shared its wealth with less fortunate nations.

Senator Mansfield Unfairly Criticized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed by a recent editorial criticizing the distinguished majority leader of the U.S. Senate for expressing his opposition to the closing of veterans hospitals throughout the country. The editorial stated that the current practice of caring for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities is a "fantastic distortion" of the main purpose of caring for sick and disabled veterans of this Nation. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the editorial writer is in error. The system of caring for non-service-connected veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals on a bed-available basis is one which was authorized approximately 40 years ago. It should be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, that these individuals suffering from non-service-connected illnesses are in many instnaces veterans having chronic disabilities, many suffering from neuropsychiatric disorders, others with tuberculosis, and by far the greatest percentage of admissions of this type of patient are receiving a pension and that in itself indicates that they cannot afford to pay for medical care.

These sick individuals must be cared for, and I am not aware that any city, county, or State has come forth with any offer to assume the responsibility for caring for these individuals. I for one feel that they deserve to be treated better than as charity cases.

The editorial writers too conveniently overlooked the contribution which the Veterans' Administration medical system has made to the training of physicians. I cite the recent statement of Dr. John L. Parks, dean of the School of Medicine of George Washington University, and a member of the Executive Council of the Association of American Medical Colleges, when he stated:

> A total of 3,885 out of 7,321 registered senior medical students have a part of their fourth year clinical training in VA hospitals. Approximately 10 percent of all residencies are in VA hospitals. Many of America's best specialty training programs have developed through combined university and affiliated VA hospital programs; 15 percent of all practicing physicians have received part or all of their specialty training in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Anyone who takes the trouble to ascertain the facts will learn that excellent medical care is being given in small communities throughout the United States. If this is not the case, why are medical associations, public health groups, and hospital association encouraging the use of Hill-Burton funds to construct, man and maintain hospitals in small communities? This fact in no way detracts from the outstanding research or the quality of medical care which is being performed in hospitals affiliated with medical schools or in medical facilities devoted to research.

Rather than criticize Senator MANSFIELD, the editorial writers should be appreciative of his efforts to bring out one of the facts involved in this complicated situation, and particularly for coming to the defense of a medical system which has made a unique and distinct contribution to medical care in the United States.

I am of the opinion that the editorial criticizing Senator MANSFIELD, which appeared in a local Washington newspaper yesterday, was particularly unfair and, in fact, missed the entire point of Sen-

ator MANSFIELD's position. The editorial accepted the Veterans' Administration hospital closing as a justified economy move and inferred that Senator MANSFIELD's opposition is based on his own local interests. I think this is most unfair. Senator MANSFIELD's question of the Veterans' Administration hospital curtailment has not been on the narrow issue of a hospital in his own State, but rather he has questioned the policies of the Veterans' Administration in closing hospitals in smaller towns and concentrating its medical facilities in the big cities, in many instances hundreds of miles away from the veteran beneficiary.

This editorial characterized the facilities being closed as "old, expensive to maintain, and not needed." This characterization is in direct conflict with the Veterans' Administration's own description of the facility at Miles City, Mont., which is as follows:

The reservation consists of approximately 14 acres and the hospital includes nine brick buildings. It is equipped with the most modern facilities and services for the treatment of medical and surgical patients. There is a new, modern medical library. The staff includes consultants who are outstanding in their specialties. There are approximately 130 full-time employees, comprising a complete team of physicians, dentists, nurses, and a full range of auxiliary staff.

It is a fact that the Miles City Hospital is operated more economically than the local Washington, D.C., Veterans' Administration hospital. In December 1964, the per diem cost per patient at Miles City was $37.62 as compared with a per diem cost per patient at the Washington hospital of $49.65.

Economy is not the essential issue involved in these closings. Actually, this decision will save only about $20 million and in fiscal year 1966 the Veterans' Administration will spend for veterans' medical care $60 million more than it did in the previous year. Their recently announced budget includes $50 million for new medical facilities. These are mainly located in large population centers. We heard no criticism or cries of economy several years ago when Congress appropriated funds to expand the Washington VA hospital from 335 beds to 760 beds at a cost of $18,500,000. As I recall, this move was applauded by the local newspapers. The New York City newspaper which has chosen to criticize Senator MANSFIELD's position has failed to note that this year's Federal budget provides $15,109,000 to build a new hospital at Northport, N.Y., and another million dollars to obtain the site for a hospital to be located on Long Island with a total cost of approximately $20 million. In other words, the new construction designated for the New York City area will require considerably more funds that will be saved by closing facilities in other parts of the country. I do not criticize the plans of the Veterans' Administration to expand facilities in the New York City area and, in fact, I think they are needed but, again, I must question the excessive emphasis on facilities in large metropolitan areas at the expense of other sections of the country.

At a time when we are being told that the Nation is woefully short of hospital beds and is doing an inadequate job of caring for our older citizens, we are also closing 6,000 VA hospital and domiciliary beds which would cost in excess of $125 million to replace. This is being done on the basis of economy. At the same time, VA facilities are being expanded in the larger cities, apparently at the expense of veterans located in small towns and rural areas. This is the policy being questioned by Senator MANSFIELD.

It is most unfortunate that newspapers should level criticism at Senator MANSFIELD when he calls for further inquiry into this complicated situation. There are many of us who share his concern about the overemphasis on facilities in large cities at the expense of rural areas. Along with others, I worked hard to secure the authorization of the new Washington VA hospital. I did this because I believed it was needed and justified. But I regret to see the local Washington press criticizing Senator MANSFIELD because he seeks to preserve medical facilities which exist in some less populated areas in order that the veterans in those areas may participate to some degree in the programs our Nation maintains for their benefit.

The Amish and the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following letter to the editor appearing in the January 2, 1965, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

AMISH ARE MISTREATED BECAUSE THEY ARE FEW

Isn't it too bad, now that the whole world is watching to see how the United States treats minority groups that our Government keeps trying to club the Amish into conformity?

The Amish are a quiet people, peace loving, hard working, and God fearing. The latter quality explains their trouble with Uncle Sam. The Amish religion forbids any form of insurance as evidence of a lack of faith in God and in man. Hence they steadfastly refuse to pay social security.

Putting their faith into practice still further, the Amish look well after their own. And they're also very generous with free-will offerings to the needy of all races and creeds. Judged by any standards, they must surely be among the finest of all citizens. They work hard, save money, and pay their bills, are not on relief, and are conscientious and law abiding. Yet when manmade law conflicts with God's law as they see it, they follow the latter. They believe, as did our fathers before us, that might does not make right, and that moral law based on the Ten Commandments should govern man's conduct.

So the Amish are in trouble with social security. Wouldn't it be just as accurate to say they're in trouble because of their religion? Their property has been confiscated, they've been beaten by Government agents and dragged into courts like common criminals when, in fact, their only offense has been to stand by their religious convictions.

Why are they being so persecuted? More to the point: Why do we consistently ignore their plight, when we make such a big fuss over the rights of other groups?

The two main reasons are political: (1) the Amish are few in number, making up only a tiny fraction of the voting population; and (2) they think for themselves. They know that difference between civil law and moral law. They are a frugal, hardy people who refuse to be nourished by government pap and therefore they are not a fertile field for the bureaucrats.

In short, what happens to the Amish is of little concern to Washington, where vote-hungry big Government wants a vast horde of new voters who approve the handouts, so as to increase its influence in our daily lives.

Pretty said, isn't it, especially when compared with the high-sounding promises of the Great Society?

MORRIS H. BANNER.

NORMAL, ILL.

Moving Misery Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to consider the appropriations for those programs vital to our agricultural economy, I was most gratified to see that a large, urban newspaper, the Washington Post, on Wednesday, January 27, 1965, printed an editorial concerning the problem of low incomes in the agricultural sector of our economy, which I feel is a very perceptive analysis of this whole problem. At this time, I would like to submit this editorial for the RECORD:

MOVING MISERY AROUND

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, in his address to the American Institute of Planners which met here Monday, made some points that ought to figure in any planning of agricultural policy. It is to be hoped that his ideas will be reflected in the agricultural message soon to go to Congress.

The Secretary told the planners that half the poverty of the country is concentrated in rural areas where 30 percent of the people live—a proportion of poverty twice as high as is found in cities and suburbs; that there are more substandard, dilapidated and deteriorating homes in rural America than in all the cities of the Nation put together.

And yet, the Federal budget message proposes a half billion dollar reduction in agricultural appropriations, most of it in price support funds. The budget message, moreover, declares that "in view of the market outlook for farm commodities at home and abroad, farming alone cannot be expected to provide a decent living in the future for more than 1 million farm families, even with continued Government assistance." The message asserts that "many low income farm families will have to find other means of earning a living, or other sources of income to supplement their modest farm earnings, if they are to share in our national prosperity."

This is an unexceptionable statement, so far as it implies increasing farm incomes where the farmers are, but it does not hold out much hope to low-income farm families

if they have no future in rural communities. Most of them are not equipped by training or provided with resources necessary to make a socially acceptable readjustment to urban life. We now have some 3½ million farm families of which 1 million are large commercial operators with gross income of $10,000 a year or more; 1½ million low-income commercial farmers and 1 million part time farmers. It is the 1½ million farmers who earn less than $10,000 whose fate seems to be mostly involved. Of this group, some 821,000 have incomes less than $5,000 and the rest average between $5,000 and $10,000. Given the fact that many of these farmers lack any preparation for urban employment, migration may not be the best solution either for them or for society as a whole. Little is to be gained by moving them out of agriculture, which at least provides a subsistence, and onto urban welfare rolls.

Farm population declined 4 percent a year in the sixties. In the 25-year period after 1929 more than 18 million farm people moved out of agriculture. This is a staggering rate of depletion. As Secretary Freeman told the planners, "rural poverty has been moved en masse to the cities to become urban poverty—and the inherent evils of poverty have been compounded by congestion and the family disorganization that takes place when people are uprooted."

The Secretary declared himself in favor of an orderly migration of the well prepared and opposed to a disorderly, forced migration of the ill prepared. He rightly said there has been too much of the latter. And he rightly supported, as an alternative, "the creation of economic opportunity in rural America that will enable people who want to stay in their home communities to make a decent living there."

Secretary Freeman is calling for a "rural renaissance" and that is exactly what is going to be required. That renaissance might give the 2½ million farmers outside the highest income commercial group a decent standard of living in the rural areas where they now live. If the means are provided in rural areas to produce educated, capable, and self-dependent people, they will move into urban industry as rapidly as positions are available to them. No enlightened government could contemplate a policy of inducing the disadvantaged and ill prepared, by the naked coercion of want and poverty, to move into great urban centers which cannot provide the jobs for employable people already there and which cannot cope with the social problems of the unemployables already on their welfare rolls.

Nothing is to be gained by just moving human misery around from one sink of degradation to another. And that is what we are going to be doing if we simply cut agricultural appropriations in the expectation that the market system will cut the farm population down to the number that can find profitable employment in high-income commercial agriculture.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the 22d of January is a significant day for every man who loves freedom. It was on this day, 47 years ago, that the Ukrainians, one of the great peoples of Eastern Europe, achieved their freedom. After centuries of being overrun by invaders, the Ukrainian people on this day in 1918 proclaimed their independence.

It was a freedom they fought hard for, and yet it was short lived. For in 1920 the budding union of all the Ukrainian lands was no more. It was swallowed up in the vast orbit of the Soviet Union. It was a bitter pill for the Ukrainians, who for centuries have been trying to repel invaders from their lands.

Though their liberty has been snuffed out, we here in the United States, whether of Ukrainian descent or just ordinary freedom-loving Americans, will never forget the 45 million Ukrainians now under Communist domination. We have memorialized in statuary, here in our Nation's Capital, Taras Shevchenko, that legendary Ukrainian poet who spoke loudly for freedom, and paid heavily with years of exile.

It is only fitting on this occasion that we pledge that their cause will not be forgotten as long as they are not free—free to worship their own God, free to speak their own tongue, free to enjoy their own culture, and free to live their own lives in dignity.

An Editorial: "Tic"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave, previously granted, to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to quote in its entirety the editorial tribute paid to my friend and former colleague, the Honorable E. L. Forrester. This editorial appeared in the Stewart-Webster Journal, Lumpkin, Ga. In having it reproduced here, it becomes a part of the permanent record of the many tributes he will receive.

"TIC"

Once in a while—a great while—a giant goes to Congress.

Fourteen years ago the Third Congressional District had the good judgment to send such a man to Washington.

A great believer in the dignity of man, and himself, a wise and prudent person, he was elected as our Representative in 1950, and reelected six consecutive times. He was well qualified to fill this important place, being a lawyer, a solicitor general, a Christian, a patriot, a hard worker, and a considerate husband.

A conscientious conservative and often in the minority our lawmaker was well aware of his congressional future when he asked for and gained a seat on the Committee of the Judiciary. Chaired by a liberal New Yorker, the committee was already considering special legislation our representative believed shadowed the U.S. Constitution but which was eventually enacted over his opposition. Nevertheless, his strength and ability were recognized and he was named chairman of one of judiciary's most powerful subcommittees where he directed some of the Nation's most important legislation.

Oratorically, our diminutive solon stands tall on his feet. He holds his listeners with forthright, clear, persuasive, and factual statements. He is one of the few Congressmen to address the House of Representatives and receive prolonged thunderous applause and a 100 percent standing ovation (his civil rights speech, 88th Cong.). It was heartwarming to see Members who disagreed with him completely, pay their respects to his tenets and ideals.

A new and respected interpretation of the timeworn cliche, peanut politician, has been established because of the consistent and rewarding work our Representative has done for the peanut program. Regularly when the agricultural appropriation is being considered there are strong efforts to remove this important crop from price supports, but the Congressman always led the fight for peanuts to get full consideration. He succeeded.

And about that peanut laboratory for Dawson. Again he succeeded. It should bear his name. The story of the blood, sweat, and tears of your Congressman to make this plant a reality is one of the crowning glories of his career. Even during late hours and from his hospital bed he spared no effort or personal care in pursuing the project. Yes, he had help, but he was the torchbearer.

No man ever had a greater devotion to his country, to his job, to his family, and to the people who believe in him and sent him to Congress year after year. His beliefs and principles are foremost among his concerns. Convinced a position is right and honest, he will never abandon it. Whatever he considers worth fighting for he supports with vim and vigor.

Where the interests of his constituents are concerned his toil knows no bounds. His days begin early and end late. There is no undertaking too large nor request too small to receive his personal attention. He never said no, he always tried. As time passes, the people of the Third District will realize, more and more, his incomparable worth as a public servant.

When the 88th Congress adjourned, a group of southern conservative colleagues of the Third District's champion of constitutional government and States rights presented their beloved associate a farewell gift suitably inscribed and autographed. It proclaimed him the big man of the little alliance.

As the Congressman's final term of office draws to a close, there is no adequate way to say farewell. The lengthening shadows of his fruitful labors will be seen for generations to come.

This tribute only approaches an evaluation of the character and accomplishments of an eminent statesman, the Honorable Elijah "Tic" Forrester, our retiring Congressman. A man just over 5 feet tall and barely weighing 135 pounds, who is truly a giant among men.

THE END?

Well, we don't know. Mr. Forrester continues to be very active. In every way, he is better equipped through experience, wisdom, and achievement to be of service now than ever before. During the past year he did have a health problem, something he was not accustomed to, and which momentarily fazed him. However, he is fine now and, who knows, maybe all he needs is a good rest.

On the other hand, he has done a magnificent job, he has fought a good fight, he has served well. He has earned, in the best tradition of the thoroughbred, his time to pasture. If retirement is his uncompromising choice, we can only respect—and regret—his decision.

At any rate, and whatever * * * God speed, Tic.

Sir Winston Churchill

SPEECH

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we have received the tragic though not unexpected news of the passing of the truly remarkable Sir Winston. His great works will live forever in the history of our planet as shining guideposts for those who follow.

Mere words fail as we seek to eulogize Winston Spencer Churchill. The greatest of the great falls far short of the mark in describing the impact of this man upon our century. It is clear to all that he was the greatest of our era—and one of only a few of the truly outstanding mortals in all of recorded history.

Mr. Speaker, we are aware that Sir Winston was a man of many rare qualities. He leaves a rich personal heritage which we may study to our very great benefit.

His statesmanship is legendary. By the force of his own personality and will, Prime Minister Churchill crystallized the determination of his own nation and of the entire free world during times of extreme danger to repel and overcome the most serious threat to civilized society in the history of the world to that point. It seems probable that this "uncommon commoner" affected the course of human affairs more profoundly than has any other single individual since Jesus of Nazareth.

Mr. Churchill was an early and implacable foe of communism, recognizing it as a most dangerous form of tyranny.

As a member of the House of Commons for 62 of his 90 years, Mr. Churchill was a parliamentarian without equal—a politician in the most honorable sense of the word.

Mr. Churchill was perhaps the foremost craftsman of the English language of all time—written and oral, formal and extemporaneous—a towering figure in the area of human expression.

Mr. Churchill was a renowned painter throughout most of his life—one of the outstanding artists of his time. His place in history would have been secure with his contributions in this field alone.

As the son of an American mother, and an honorary citizen of the United States—a distinction of which he was enormously proud—we cherish Mr. Churchill as one of our own.

It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that we might honor the great Sir Winston best—and simultaneously benefit all of mankind—by studying his life, emulating his works as best we can, heeding his admonitions, pursuing his dreams, and keeping alive his ideas.

May God grant us a small portion of his indomitable courage, his profound foresight, his selfless, sustained dedication to the preservation of freedom for all men.

Tribute to Mr. J. Edwin Larson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday Florida was shocked by the passing of one of the State's most distinguished and dedicated leaders, J. Edwin Larson.

He held the post of State treasurer, a post second only to that of Governor of the State of Florida. He worked his way up to this merited prominence, being a dedicated public servant of Florida for over 40 years.

He came to Florida from Pennsylvania to study law at the University of Florida in 1923. Soon active in Florida affairs, he was principal of the Keystone Heights High School, and later mayor of Keystone Heights. After becoming a commissioner of Clay County, he was a State representative and later a State senator.

A stanch Democrat, he was an early supporter of Franklin Roosevelt. Appointed collector of internal revenue in 1933, he held that post until he ran for treasurer in 1940. He became the 16th treasurer of Florida, a post he held until his death.

An honorable man, he received many honors. An exemplary Mason, he served as grand master of the Masons in Florida, and grant patron of the Order of the Eastern Star. The Masons honored him by conferring upon him the 33d degree, the highest Masonic tribute.

Besides being a Mason and a Shriner, he was also active in the Methodist Church, Kiwanis, Odd Fellows, Moose, and Elk.

The newly arrived Floridian married Clara Bussard in 1927 in Keystone Heights. Today they have three lovely daughters, all raising families of their own.

Always active in his life, it was appropriate that he was active until the moment of his death. Indeed, the stroke came as he was delivering a speech opening a clinic for which he had raised funds.

Ed Larson had been my devoted friend ever since we served in the House of Representatives of Florida Legislature in 1929. My wife and I have cherished his friendship and that of his lovely wife and we shall ever hold that friendship with him warm in our memories.

Mrs. Pepper and I spent some happy times with Mr. and Mrs. Larson when they were here during inauguration.

In the passing of Ed Larson America has lost a dedicated patriot; Florida has lost a devoted and distinguished public servant; good causes have lost a notable and faithful champion; and a host of friends have lost a friend they shall never forget.

Mrs. Pepper and I join all Floridians and his fellow Americans in mourning the passing of this dedicated man who gave inspiration to all in the public service of Florida and who contributed so much to making Florida the threshold of space.

Farley Keeps His Magic Touch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have always considered it one of the pleasures of my life to be acquainted with and to count as a friend one of the great men of the Democratic Party and of this Nation—the Honorable James A. Farley.

The New York World-Telegram and Sun of November 13, 1964, contained an article entitled "Farley Keeps His Touch of Magic," which I enjoyed reading and which I wish to share with my colleagues. The article, by William Longgood, follows:

FARLEY KEEPS HIS TOUCH OF MAGIC

(By William Longgood)

Jim Farley has lost none of the old magic. He did it again in the recent election. He called the shot right on the nose, and he has already made his prediction for 1968.

The amazing James A. Farley, former Democratic national chairman, former Postmaster General, predicted a 1964 Democratic landslide as early as February and last August 27 he forcast President Johnson would carry all but six States.

Farley wasn't quite right on all of the six States the President lost (in addition to Alabama and Mississippi, he predicted the loss of Kansas and Nebraska and two other States, and he didn't figure on Goldwater getting Arizona). But he successfully picked ROBERT F. KENNEDY to beat Senator Kenneth Keating, and he predicted that all the incumbent Democratic Congressmen in New York State would be reelected.

UNEASY FEELING

I went to see Jim the other day to ask how he did it. About 20 years ago, while I was still in the Army, I rode up three floors in an elevator with him, and I figure this gives me the right to call him Jim. I'd heard about his fabulous memory for names and faces, and I thought he might remember me from that elevator ride, but I guess I have changed; he just gave me the blank eye.

Anyway, we talked about his predictions. I asked if he had inside information—maybe a secret spy system, truck with the supernatural, perhaps a Ouija board. But he denied all. He was very modest. Just political know-how from years of experience, he said. "You get the feel of things."

But all the time he sat there looking at me. Or maybe peering is the word. Jim has a wonderfully expressionless face with the piercing eyes of an old riverboat gambler. All the time you sit across from him you have an uneasy feeling that he is reading your mind.

I kept remembering how in 1932 he predicted the Roosevelt landslide. And in 1936 he hit it right on the button when he said F.D.R. would win every State except Maine and Vermont. It gives you the willies to sit talking to a guy who can do this sort of thing. And then last February—

Jim is an executive for the Coca-Cola Co., with offices at 515 Madison Avenue. His office is so perfect that it ought to be reproduced for the ages, with a figure of him in wax, presiding behind that big desk, peering impassively at visitors, talking in that flat voice, and the whole thing set up in a museum.

The walls are ablaze with autographed pictures of Presidents, political leaders,

friends, foreign statesmen, souvenirs of old campaigns, plaques, pennants, posters, and scrapbooks piled on the floor. In a corner is an old radio, a present to Jim when he joined the company in 1940. But the most impressive thing is Jim himself, behind that desk talking politics with the calm detachment and bold confidence of a surgeon discussing the removal of some favorite patient's innards.

He said he was sure last February the President had mastered his job and the people had confidence in him, and the result would have been the same no matter whom the Republicans nominated. Further, he said, if it hadn't been for the thorny civil rights issue, "there's no doubt the President would have carried every State in the Union." He added that he considers Johnson the best qualified man ever elected to the Presidency.

This was all well and good, I said, but in truth I had another reason for coming. I wasn't really getting rich in newspapers, and how could I go about making it big in politics—short of having him manage me? The answer was discouraging:

"Hard work!" he snapped back.

"Nothing else?" I must have sounded disappointed.

"You've also got to get the breaks," he added. "Be in the right place at the right time, when the notch above you opens, and work hard to justify the confidence of the people who put you in the job."

Anything else?

Yes, he said. One more thing—the most important of all: "Keep your word. That's the only thing a politician has on the shelf to sell. Once you lose that reputation you're in trouble."

LIKES PEOPLE

What about this business of his remembering the first name of everyone he ever met? Was it true?

The eyes seemed to send out little sparks, and he said, "I know thousands of people by their first name. I like people."

What will happen to the Republicans now?

"They're bound to make some progress in the elections 2 years from now," he said. "Political parties never stand still; they go up or down. The Republicans are now at the bottom of the barrel; there's only one way to go—up."

And how about 1968? I waited breathlessly, waited for a flash of lightning or a crack of thunder. But Jim just sat there, impassive as always, and replied in that flat voice that he was sure President Johnson would be reelected if he chooses to run, no matter whom the Republicans nominate.

By how many States? I asked.

He closed his eyes, thought, and finally replied, "I'm not yet ready to say."

Sir Winston Churchill

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, belief in evil equals fear. Belief in good equals courage. Sir Winston Churchill's death reminds us of these truths. He was in fact the world's greatest living person and his passing over to the realm of spirit makes us look again at his predominant tool for leadership and victory—namely courage. Even the most humble are important in the eyes of God; and we Christians believe that all become great with the acquisition and practice of courage for right things. Churchill's life will always be a symbol of the value of courage for proper objectives. I am glad I lived in his age, met him, and have his memory to strengthen me. As to his life we all respond "Well done."

No U.N. Aid for Sukarno

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the major threats to world peace is the increasing saber rattling of Indonesian Ruler Sukarno. A very specific and precise analysis of the situation was contained in the January 24 edition of the Chicago Sun-Times which I place in the RECORD at this point and urge Members to give their fullest consideration:

NO U.N. AID FOR SUKARNO

President Sukarno has completed his move to withdraw Indonesia from the United Nations. He thus becomes the first to leave the U.N. since it was formed two decades ago.

In the formal letter of resignation Sukarno offered the U.N. a gratuitous insult. He expressed the hope that "our decision may become the catalyst to reform and retool the United Nations in spirit and in deed lest the present atmosphere of complacency shown by the neocolonial powers may determine the lofty spirit of the United Nations."

Sukarno has shown precious little inclination to honor the lofty spirit of the U.N. to which he refers. Ever since the Federation of Malaysia was formed on August 31, 1963, Sukarno has been threatening to crush Malaysia. He launched a series of armed attacks against Malaysia and continues to do so. When representatives of other nations, including the United States, reasoned with him and attempted to resolve his differences with Malaysia, Sukarno made extravagant promises of peace and enduring good will and then laughed as he broke his promises.

However, in breaking with the U.N. Sukarno did not completely divorce his nation from all U.N. benefits. He announced he would no longer take aid or assistance from the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), its Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, (UNESCO) or its Children's Fund (UNICEF). Sukarno will decide later which, if any, of the other U.N. technical aid agencies he will dismiss from Indonesia and which he will allow to continue servicing his nation.

He should not be allowed that privilege. If he chooses to spurn membership in the U.N. and continue his course of international banditry he should be stripped of all aid and assistance offered by the various U.N. agencies as well as the assistance give him by the United States, Austrialia, Japan, West Germany, and France.

Only Red China cheered Sukarno's decision to bolt the United Nations. He has cast his lot with the Chinese Communists. Let him get what help he can from them.

Senior Citizens Ignored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Melvin M. Hurwitz, past county commander, Jewish War Veterans, and presently service officer of the Kings County Council, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, has issued a very interesting and noteworthy statement entitled "Senior Citizens Ignored."

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include Mr. Hurwitz' statement herewith:

SENIOR CITIZENS IGNORED

A citizen, let us say, has made wise investments during his working years, and has built up a sizable backlog of stocks and bonds. When he retires at a specified age, his income from these stocks and bonds may be in any amount, but he will not lose any income from social security because of it.

Another citizen, on the other hand, has been unable to lay up any appreciable amount of money on which to live during his retirement. Furthermore, what stock investment that he has been able to make has turned out bad, and he has nothing but his income from social security to meet his living expenses. Even the maximum amount of social security will hardly be adequate to meet ordinary demands. What should he do? Suppose he secures employment. Suppose further he earns $2,500 per year from this work. This amount, less income tax, added to his income from social security, provided that he was permitted to receive all of it, would provide a modest living. However, for every dollar he earned above $1,200, up to and including $1,700, he would, in effect, have to pay to the Federal Government 50 cents; for every dollar earned above $1,700, he would, in effect, have to pay to the Federal Government $1, until the total amount of income to which he is entitled from social security is exhausted. Therefore, of the $1,300 above the $1,200 which he is allowed without penalty, he would pay to the Federal Government, in the form of deductions from social security income, $1,050. This amount, added to income tax of $260, makes a total of $1,310. Of the earnings of $2,500 he would be permitted to keep $1,190 net.

Where is the incentive?

Some men, a small minority, will do creative work without thought of compensation, but the vast majority will not work without incentive. When we rob a man of an incentive to do things, he is likely to lose interest in life itself.

Now the original purpose of social security was to take old men out of the labor force, to make places for the younger men. If the older men could earn money without taking the places of the younger men, then they should be permitted to do so without sacrificing any of their income from social security to which they have made contributions over the years.

There are many things that the retiree could do to augment his income from social security which would not only help provide for a decent living, but, also an interest in life; he could also make a direct contribution to the welfare of his country. Other-

wise, he is so much deadwood and that isn't good for him or his country.

When a man reaches the age of 72 years, he is permitted to earn an unlimited amount of money without sacrificing any of his income from social security. Why 72 instead of 65 or 66? A man retired at 65 years of age can certainly be termed an unemployable. Think how much incentive a man would have if he were able to retain earnings of any type after age 65, and receive the total of his contributions to social security. It is just to consider social security as a form of insurance annuity with no restrictions as to payment upon reaching the named age in the program.

As long as men are alive, they have to give some thought to income, and income created by their own thoughts or hands adds something to life; they feel that they have not lost their importance in the general scheme of things. Let them lose that feeling of importance, and we have lost an asset. Can we afford it?

While on the one hand social security is of some help, on the other hand it is casting into oblivion many of our senior citizens; depriving our country of their contributions to its welfare, simply because it kills an incentive to do anything.

The remedy? Permit our senior citizens to earn anything that they can, without financial penalty; let them keep their dignity, self-respect, and independence, and a zest of life. The Nation will be the richer for it.

We must consider that protection against the kind of risks covered by the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program in the United States, is enjoyed by people in 78 nations the world over. Sixty-two countries (including all 27 countries of Europe) have family-allowance programs, a comparatively new type of coverage that is undergoing tremendous growth. Maternity benefits are accorded to mothers in 18 countries, and in 64 others they are incorporated within a combined sickness and benefit program.

Our Government and our people should consider the importance of our social security program, and urge our leaders to review the program, and revise its benefits in accordance with the needs of the public.

Supplemental Appropriation for Certain Activities of the Department of Agriculture

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Chairman, I voted yesterday against a motion to recommit House Joint Resolution 234 to the Committee on Appropriations. I hold no brief for Colonel Nasser; I do not believe that the United Arab Republic is entitled to agricultural assistance from the United States at this time. But my conviction is even stronger that Congress should take no action to embarrass the President of the United States or to tie his hands in the conduct of foreign policy. The grave responsibility for charting our foreign policy is entrusted to the President by the Constitution. I, for one, will not tinker with the Constitution or gratuitously make the President's task more difficult than it already is in this delicate field. Let me say to our Republican friends that I never supported any effort to hobble President Eisenhower in his conduct of foreign affairs, and in my judgment, President Johnson deserves equal consideration.

Concord's New Post Office—A Commentary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Concord is getting a new post office, an event attended by mixed reactions. The following editorial from the Concord Shopper's News on the subject—and the subject of postal service generally—sums them up, somewhat humorously, to be sure, but with perception. I am glad to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

A NEW POST OFFICE

We have watched the homes of the Sawyers, Matthews, Quints, and others turned into rubble to make way for progress—and we sincerely hope it will be.

There isn't much point in arguing at this late date whether Concord needed a new post office or bemoaning the tax loss to the city by another Federal takeover. Call it necessity or political payoff, Concord will have a beautiful new building and we'll all be boasting about it not long from now.

This city has always been fortunate to have a well-managed post office and employees who have taken their jobs seriously. Orders from Washington have sometimes complicated service but as a rule—and there are many of them in a post office—we haven't suffered the mail delays and bureaucratic bungling that have plagued other cities.

Of course, most of us balk at using zip codes. We can't see why, despite postal rate hikes, residential deliveries cannot return to the old two a day. We don't understand why some stamps don't stick. We wonder why what used to be a penny postcard now costs 4 cents and you can't write on it with a fountain pen without having your message look like a psychiatrist's ink-blot test. We are curious as to why school supplies had to be marked library rate while rock-and-roll records to a disc jockey were mailed at a so-called educational rate. Now they must be stamped special fourth-class mail to add further confusion to the function of special handling and special delivery.

Yes, we'll be thrilled over the new post office but we do hope Washington will clear up some of those small problems that irk the average patron. And please, Mr. Postmaster General, sir, don't turn around and tell us that now that you have been nice enough to use our tax money for a spanking new building, you'll have to slap another rate increase on mailing a box of divinity fudge to Aunt Letitia.

Invasion of Congress Shows Perilous Laxity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who sat in this Chamber during opening-day ceremonies know of the effect on us of the invasion of an unwanted guest who danced and shouted in the well of the House Chamber.

The Lansing State Journal for January 9, 1965, contained an editorial which indicates that those back home are concerned too. As we complete the organization of this Congress and turn to the problems at hand, I feel that it is appropriate that some thought be given to suggestions for improved security precautions.

With unanimous consent, I insert the editorial, "Invasion of Congress Shows Perilous Laxity," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, Jan. 9, 1965]

INVASION OF CONGRESS SHOWS PERILOUS LAXITY

An amazing spectacle in the National Capitol this week evidenced what we regard as a serious weakness in security measures.

Congressmen sat stunned when an uninvited guest interrupted opening-day ceremonies of the House of Representatives by crashing the gates and dancing and shouting in the well of the House Chamber.

Dressed in a bizarre costume, with blackface makeup, a top hat, red bandana, black tights, and tennis shoes, the intruder could hardly be mistaken by Capitol policemen for a Member of Congress or a congressional aid.

Policemen, taken by surprise by the invasion, dragged the intruder away. Later charged with two counts of disorderly conduct, he was released after forfeiting a $20 bond, which, incidentally, indicated a shockingly casual attitude on the part of authorities toward his offense.

Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, of the House Judiciary Committee, said he was irked at the relative lightness of the fine.

The incident, which came only a few hours before President Johnson delivered his state of the Union message to a joint session of Congress in the same Chamber, understandably stirred thoughts among the lawmakers about the need for tightening up security measures.

There had been similar warnings in the past. In 1954, a band of Puerto Rican fanatics shot up the House Chamber from the galleries and wounded five members of the House.

And only last September an American Nazi got through police lines and began throttling a witness testifying before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the House Office Building.

Police speculated that Monday's intruder may have been wearing ordinary street clothing when he entered the Capitol and then donned his bizarre costume in an employee's locker room or a restroom.

Even so, the fact that he made his way to the well of the House directly below the desk from which the President later spoke

doesn't say much for current security precautions.

One House Member said, "I'm shocked. Imagine what he could have done in there if he had had a gun."

The ability of the man, who said he was a follower of George Lincoln Rockwell, leader of the American Nazi party, to get past the attendants and onto the House floor proves two things—that "kooks" are loose in the country and that stronger safeguards are needed against those who might commit acts more dangerous than merely making fools of themselves.

Following Monday's incident, embarrassed Capitol Police officials promised "improvements" in the security system. It's a promise that clearly should be implemented without delay.

South Bend Tribune Praises Local Federal Program for Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was a strong supporter of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 because I felt that it would serve a vital need in our national interest. I am proud that my own hometown of South Bend, Ind., has been a pioneer among communities in the Nation in developing programs under the provisions of this act. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act we have been able to bring new skills and new hopes and, most important, new jobs to a great many unemployed workers who were laid off when the Studebaker Corp. closed its gates in December 1963.

One of these programs, Project Able, is specifically aimed at helping unemployed workers over the age of 50 to find jobs. The success of this program in human and economic terms is well documented in an editorial that appeared in the South Bend, Ind., Tribune of January 18, 1965.

The editorial follows:

FEDERAL AID—NOT SO BAD

To an unreasoning few Americans, "Federal aid" are dirty words. They conjure up visions of an all-powerful, centralized government crushing individuals and promoting economic waste.

Quite a different picture of at least one sort of Federal aid emerged from a recent interim report on Project Able, the United Community Services program for helping unemployed workers over 50 to find jobs.

Project Able is underwritten by $331,000 in Federal money. In the 6 months since it started after Studebaker shut down production here, it has helped 1,689 men and women to find work.

The average age of these men and women is 55. To say that most of them would have found jobs without Project Able's help is to ignore the staggering difficulties that older workers face when they go job hunting.

Very Rev. Robert F. Royster, chairman of the Project Able coordinating committee, has done some pertinent figuring on the economic benefits of Project Able to date. We think they are eye opening.

If the 1,689 had not found work, they would have had to accept public assistance for an average of 7 years, until they reached the earliest retirement age of 62. Public assistance costs for the group over a 7-year period, Father Royster estimated, would have come to more than $16 million in tax money. Project Able, by comparison, cost $331,000.

Considering that the 1,689 have jobs with an average wage of $80 per week, Father Royster continues, they will pay an estimated $5.2 million in Federal and local taxes between now and retirement.

If you look at that tax return as payment of a Government loan, it involves an interest rate of 1,500 percent—"a pretty good return on an investment," in Father Royster's words.

And so it is, as even the ruggedest individualist must admit.

Testimony of Dr. Paul W. Briggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland public school system is fortunate to have one of the foremost educators in public education today as its superintendent, Dr. Paul W. Briggs.

Dr. Briggs provided one of the most illuminating examples of creative education in his testimony before the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor which is currently considering the President's massive aid to education legislation before the Congress.

Dr. Briggs dealt specifically with title III of this bill which is related to the development of supplementary educational centers to help upgrade all education programs for public school students.

His testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF PAUL W. BRIGGS, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, CLEVELAND, OHIO, TO THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE, JANUARY 26, 1965

I am Paul W. Briggs, superintendent of the Cleveland public schools. I welcome the opportunity to testify before the House Education Labor Committee and to present our ideas as they relate to title III governing supplementary educational centers and services as proposed in House bill 2362.

I am sorry I cannot be present tomorrow when my colleagues from the great cities program for school improvement make their presentation respecting all aspects of House bill 2362. However, today I will confine my observations and remarks to title III.

Cleveland is Ohio's largest city. It is the eighth largest school district in the United States. The problems facing Cleveland public schools are similar to those problems found in other large urban centers.

Between the 1950 and 1960 census, the population of the city of Cleveland decreased by approximately 40,000; yet during this same period the enrollment in our schools increased by approximately 30,000.

Today in Cleveland 10 percent of the unemployed work force is comprised of out-of-school, high school age youth, for the most part unemployable. Unemployment in Cleveland in general is running high while at the same time jobs requiring skill and training are going unfilled. It is estimated that during this present fiscal year, relief expenditures in the city of Cleveland will total $35 million while for the same period we will spend $70 million for public education.

As I move about the city of Cleveland, visiting its many schools and neighborhoods, I am increasingly impressed with the need for better educational opportunities throughout the city and especially in areas of great poverty and cultural deprivation.

The severity of our problem in Cleveland is compounded by the fact that American education must move into the space age: an age that requires progressively higher levels of competence and skill, supported and reinforced by the best scientific know-how available. This is an age that demands superior education for all our citizens.

Cleveland schools are confronted with inadequate housing for children at a time when the population is expanding. Thirty-nine of the 180 school buildings were constructed before 1895, and in only 4 of the 135 elementary schools are libraries to be found. Our vocational and scientific equipment is antiquated.

I am thoroughly convinced that Cleveland cannot bridge the gap between its problems and the demands of this age without new, dynamic programs in education.

Establishment of supplementary educational centers and services, as provided in title III, is a bold, innovative and educationally sound approach which will greatly assist in bridging this gap for Cleveland and other large cities with similar problems.

Basic to good education is a sound program of community schools sensitive to and efficiently serving an ever-expanding list of neighborhood needs. Inherent in this space age, though, is a demand for new educational and cultural experiences not now or likely soon to be available at the neighborhood level.

For several weeks a task force of the Cleveland public schools augmented by key community leaders has been meeting in emergency sessions attempting to structure a program of supplementary educational opportunities for the children of Cleveland elementary public and private schools. Preliminary studies of this task force indicate that certain cultural and instructional services above and beyond those readily available in our neighborhood elementary schools should be provided as soon as possible.

The supplementary educational center will enable us to offer a wide range of such services to our children throughout the city with a minimum of delay.

It is our belief that supplementary educational centers can do two important things:

1. Dramatically improve the quality of education.

2. Bring into meaningful relationship children from all sections of the city.

I am thinking of programs in the humanities, foreign languages, music, the arts, and sciences that will in some way involve every elementary school child and broaden cultural horizons, sharpen academic appetites, and bring understanding of new social and scientific concepts not usually or economically achieved through traditional classroom channels.

I would envision a center containing a space age planetarium capable of seating 500 students where students could be given their introduction to universal concepts of age. Adjacent to the planetarium would be located specialized laboratories and demonstration centers where our children could be given experiences not possible in the neighborhood school and where they would have the opportunity for face-to-face contact with other children having similar interests and with master teachers.

Our facilities within the complex of the center would include auditorium space; areas for language laboratories; special centers for

vocational conferences, consultations, and testing; the most modern facilities for expanded dental and medical clinics; as well as the headquarters for certain psychological and psychiatric services; and for reading and other instructional improvement clinics. There would be additional galleries and display areas where the best works of the children throughout the city can be displayed, representing excellence in art, science, and the humanities.

Special attention would be given to making the facilities of the center usable for adult educational activities in order to promote the widest possible community participation in the center.

The supplementary educational center will also provide for us in the Cleveland schools and our cooperating universities and colleges an excellent teacher-training laboratory through which it will be possible to reinforce educational theory with masterful demonstrations and other rich practical experiences.

In Cleveland, so richly endowed with a world-famous orchestra and choir, a great art museum and institute, an excellent museum of natural history, a superior health museum, and with scientific societies and research centers, governmental space age laboratories, a great public library, and many old, new, and expanding centers of higher education is to be found a wealth of talent, ready and willing to serve. We propose to utilize fully this reservoir of talent. Through the supplementary educational center, the children of Cleveland will have the opportunity of associating and working with these distinguished scholars and these outstanding performers.

The proper location of these centers and the careful scheduling of programs will bring the children of all parts of Cleveland into meaningful association with each other.

This association among children will deepen their understanding and appreciation of the rich contributions of the many diverse racial and cultural groups in Cleveland.

These enriching and motivating educational experiences which will be available to children enrolled in all Cleveland schools—public and private—will enable us to discover, develop, refine, and encourage the productive talents of Cleveland children in a way which the national interest demands but which no school system in any large city is today prepared to do.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Friday, January 22, 1965, marked the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukraine from domination by Soviet Russia.

In commemorating that occasion, free people all over the world once again raise their voices in encouragement and sympathy to the valiant Ukrainian people.

Despite years of domination by the Kremlin, the spirit of a free Ukraine still is enshrined in the hearts of her sons and daughters, both within the homeland and outside.

Despite the fact that the Ukraine has been suppressed by totalitarian powers, incorporated forcibly into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, deprived of their individual political, economic, and religious freedoms, the people of that land look forward to the day when the Ukraine will once again resume its rightful place in the family of free nations.

It is my earnest hope that the people of the Ukraine will draw encouragement from the warm regard of the people of the United States for them. On this auspicious date, we extend our best wishes to the Ukrainian people and Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, and we pray that the oppression of their native land may soon be ended.

My Vote—Freedom's Privilege

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to bring to the attention of my colleagues an award-winning essay on the theme, "My Vote—Freedom's Privilege," prepared by Lt. Col. Arnold F. W. Frank, U.S. Army, commanding officer of Camp San Luis Obispo, a U.S. Army installation located in my district—the 12th of California.

Colonel Frank recently received the George Washington Honor Medal in the annual national awards program competition sponsored by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa., for submitting the outstanding entry from among all of the many received from Army personnel. As the Members of this House are well aware, the Freedoms Foundation was established to inspire a greater love and appreciation of our free way of life and to build a better understanding of the spirit of our Constitution—the great bulwark of our free society—and the political and economic freedoms it guarantees.

Mr. Speaker, in reading the brief but profound letter-to-my-son essay by Colonel Frank, we note that he writes of voting as a sacred privilege of freedom and emphasizes that tyranny can result either from failing to vote or voting unwisely. He understands freedom—and the loss of freedom—better than most because he lived in Germany as a youth and witnessed the destruction of a struggling free republic by the votes of a discouraged and desperate people.

We are reminded of the absolute necessity of being alert to all threats to our birthright of freedom—whether by force from without, or subversion from within, or even through the ballot box itself—our most valuable instrument of freedom. Constant vigilance by an informed citizenry is our minimum responsibility if we are to retain our priceless heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks, "My Vote—Freedom's Privilege," by Lt. Col. Arnold F. W. Frank:

DEAR SON: Once upon a time in a distant, foreign land, that was striving hard to become a successful democratic republic, lived a young boy. He was barely aware that his country had recently fought and lost the most devastating of all wars, and was even then in the throes of a paralyzing depression. He was not nearly old enough to vote, as dramatic historic and personal events were racing toward a climax which would leave lasting impressions upon his mind.

His parents were serious-minded citizens, who believed that democracy could be made to work, and that the way to accomplish this was for every citizen to vote intelligently for responsible leaders. The boy listened to discussions concerning the politicians and platforms of the many parties. He learned early in life that it was not easy to exercise freedom's privilege effectively. There were liberals, conservatives, extremists of the left, and extremists of the right. One of the parties was led by a would-be dictator, who, nevertheless, was determined to gain power exclusively through constitutional means; through the votes of the electorate. He preached race superiority. He promised to repudiate unfavorable foreign treaties, stamp out corruption, and make the nation strong again. At first he was not taken seriously, but those were troubled times. During that fateful last year of freedom, there were four national elections. All were without decisive results. The voters were tired, frustrated, confused, and angry. Was this the democracy they had been striving for? Through all this turmoil rose the din of the extremists, they alone claimed to have the solutions to all the problems confronting the nation. Finally, even though he did not receive an absolute majority, the would-be dictator won out and was appointed chancellor. He had achieved his goal of obtaining power legally, but that was the last time the voters were to have a choice, those tired and confused voters, who that year had voted away their freedom. That loss of freedom and the war that followed are history. However, before that happened the parents of the boy, seeing the inevitable, left their native land and migrated into a foreign country where freedom reigned.

The story I have just told was not a fairy tale, and the end was really a beginning. For you see, I was that boy, and now the time is at hand for me to impress upon you, just as my parents taught me, that it can happen here. It can happen anywhere, where the electorate relinquishes its right to preserve freedom by failing to vote, or by voting unwisely for extremist causes, for the extremists are always poised to rush in and assume control.

To vote is freedom's privilege, but remember that you can also vote away your freedom by voting injudiciously. Remember that well, my son, so that you, or your son will never have to live in chains or flee this Nation to seek freedom elsewhere.

Affectionately,

YOUR FATHER.

Dr. John Mirich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with President Johnson's recent announcement and the Nation's concern relating to police training and crime prevention, I am pleased to announce a significant step forward in the field of criminology.

The Second District of Oregon is honored to have one of the few qualified

centers of police science and criminology in the western part of the Nation. Dr. John J. Mirich, chairman of the department of law enforcement at Treasure Valley Community College in Ontario, Oreg., has been referred to as a national authority in his field by the eminent criminologist, Dr. A. C. Germann, author of a recent text in the field of law enforcement.

The following press release was issued by Treasure Valley Community College in recognition of Dr. Mirich's achievements:

TEXTBOOK CLASSIFIES DR. JOHN MIRICH AS A NATIONAL AUTHORITY IN POLICE SCIENCE AND CRIMINOLOGY

Dr. John J. Mirich, chairman of the department of law enforcement at Treasure Valley Community College in Ontario, Oreg., is referred to as a national authority in police science education and an eminent scholar in criminology in the second edition of a police science textbook entitled "Introduction to Law Enforcement," published by the Charles C. Thomas Publishers. The author of the book, Dr. A. C. Germann, professor of police science at Long Beach State College, has written several textbooks on the subject, and is considered to be one of the Nation's foremost scholars in the area.

The book quotes Dr. Mirich's studies in police stereotypes. Mirich has found that through disinterest and neglect by the public, local law enforcement has been forced to recruit its manpower from the ranks of the unqualified. Furthermore, the public, he states, has naively believed that although it takes 8 or more years of education to be a district attorney to interpret complex laws and ordinances, anyone with or without education, is qualified to be an officer of the law in too many States. This is one of the basic reasons that police are underpaid, he finds. In addition, Mirich states that the typical citizen feels that policemen should by physical Samson's to be effective, while actually, a very small percentage of the police officer's time is spent subduing criminals and if the officer is uneducated and untrained, his physical size will not guarantee that he will be a competent officer. While Mirich calls for more assistance from the public if local law enforcement is to become a profession, he also blames many police officials for the present condition of the police vocation nationally. He feels that although the enforcement officer is responsible for protecting the rights of the innocent, and the deterrence of criminal behavior as well as the detection and repression of crime, the typical police leader has interpreted the duty of the police officer as only crime repression. Catching criminals, states Dr. Mirich, is only one part of the policeman's duty.

Dr. Mirich has had a wide background in criminology and social problems. He has been a counselor of delinquents in California schools and has taught human growth and development at Idaho State University, and child and adolescent psychology at Colorado State University. His background also includes city police work, county probation service, as well as deputy sheriff investigation. His research in the area of criminal behavior leads him to believe that the city, county, and State police nationally, must become professionally trained, and this training must come soon. Police science education has become so complex that it is almost impossible to receive it by experience alone. He feels that when local law enforcement arrives at that position of professional development that it requires high academic, emotional, mental, and other standards which encompass most of the knowledge available today for the police science area, it will be considered a profession by the public. When this hoped-for day arrives, crime will be better detected, citizens will be more adequately protected, the delinquent more easily deterred from antisocial behavior, and the local officer will enjoy the social and economic fruits of a professional person. In addition, he will develop the esprit de corps so evident in the highly qualified and most effective FBI.

Mirich has been writing nationally for professional criminology journals for several years. At the present, he is at work rewriting his research on social problems for raido syndication as a public service.

Closing of VA Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed by the recent announcement of the Veterans' Administration that it is closing down 11 VA hospitals, 4 domiciliaries and 17 regional offices in various parts of the country.

While I can understand that this is being done for reasons of economy, termination of readjustment programs in some instances, and changes in management of certain programs, I am wondering whether this may in the long run prove to be a case of false economy. We must not forget that our veterans of World War I are now advanced in years, and even our veterans of World War II are now middle aged and beyond. This means that in the years ahead there will undoubtedly be a greater need for facilities to care for these people, rather than a lesser need.

I would strongly urge the Veterans' Administration to reconsider its decision and to place greater emphasis on providing these facilities to all veterans who may be in need of them. We are dealing here with human beings, with men who have rendered selfless services to their Nation in times of great crisis, and we should therefore extend to them every possibility to obtain the care they need in the area they live.

In recent days I have received several letters and telegrams on this subject from veterans organizations in Connecticut, as well as nationally. I want to associate myself with the views expressed in these communications. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert these letters and telegrams into the RECORD:

HARTFORD, CONN.,
January 18, 1965.

The Honorable WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The American Legion, Department of Connecticut, strongly opposes the Veterans' Administration closing down of hospitals and regional offices throughout the several States and ask your support in keeping them open for service to the veterans.

HUGH C. GRAHAM,
Department Commander.

WATERBURY, CONN.,
January 18, 1965.

Representative WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Emphatically protest announced closing of VA installations. Confident that you will agree. Please do all you can to prevent this action. Advise if I can help.

EDWARD H. LYNCH, JR.,
National Vice Commander, the American Legion.

HARTFORD, CONN.,
January 19, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Connecticut, joins with Connecticut Legionaires in strongly opposing the closing down of veterans hospitals and regional offices in the several States and we ask your support in keeping them open for service to the veteran.

BARBARA L. WALLET,
Department President, American Legion Auxiliary.

JANUARY 25, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As representative of 3,000 veterans in the American Legion, fourth district, State of Connecticut, and for myself, I wish to urge your assistance in protesting the closing of 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliary homes, and 16 regional offices of the VA.

With the increasing age of our World War II and Korean veterans, I am sure you realize, as we do, the growing need of facilities to take care of our veterans' needs.

Surely the added burden will fall on the offices and hospitals of our State and others to take on this extra load, and a still greater burden will fall on the needy veteran and his family by having to travel greater distances to reach these proposed consolidated VA offices. For example, the merging of the Juneau office in Alaska with the Seattle, (Wash.) office will add 500 miles for the veteran to reach his nearest VA office.

Therefore, I respectfully urge you to do your utmost to prevent the closing of these facilities.

Respectfully yours,

WILFRIED H. DUROCHER,
Fourth District Commander, The American Legion, State of Connecticut.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
January 25, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ST. ONGE: The American Legion is deeply disturbed over the announced intention of the Veterans' Administration to close 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and 16 regional offices. While 23 States are affected by this order, we are convinced that additional closings are contemplated.

It is our considered opinion that these closings are indefensible other than to those who place dollar savings above compassionate considerations. The resulting decrease in services to sick and needy veterans far outweighs the purported savings.

The American Legion respectfully urges that you use every influence at your command to cause the VA to rescind the decision to close these needed facilities.

Sincerely,

C. C. HORTON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 18, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You are well aware of the drastic closing of 17 regional offices, 11

hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries as announced by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on January 13, 1965.

We are attaching herewith a special bulletin, dated January 14, 1965, and we specifically request you to refer to my letter to the Administrator, dated January 14, 1965, on page 4 of the special bulletin. A similar letter was forwarded to the President of the United States on the same date. We have also registered a strong protest to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Kermit Gordon.

The explanation of the Veterans' Administration for closing hospitals was due to the fact that some hospitals required extensive modernization and that staffing was a problem. However, they have failed to explain where the veterans, who are presently hospitalized in these hospitals, can be transferred to a hospital, which would be close to their home in order to permit members of the family of the hospitalized veterans to visit the veterans, which is part and parcel of the total treatment program of the individual patient.

If this drastic reduction of Veterans' Administration facilities will save only $23,500,000 in fiscal year 1966, certainly this amount of money can be absorbed by a cut in the foreign aid program, especially the portion that ultimately will be given to countries not friendly with the free world, instead of usurping the services that the veterans of this country fought through four wars to preserve.

On behalf of the 1,300,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, we ask your wholehearted support in curtailing the closing of these facilities, and we request that you appear personally and voice your objection when hearings are conducted on this subject before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee headed by Mr. OLIN TEAGUE of Texas and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, headed by Mr. R. W. YARBOROUGH.

Very sincerely,

JOHN A. JENKINS,
Commander in Chief.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Judicial Reformer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Bernard G. Segal, former chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association, and present president of the American College of Trial Lawyers, recently wrote what I consider to be an outstanding article on the need for modernization of the Pennsylvania courts. Mr. Segal, who served for 3 years as chairman of the board of the American Judicature Society, is uniquely qualified in this field. I ask unanimous consent to have a brief biography of Mr. Segal, his very excellent article, and an editorial concerning the article, all of which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 24, 1965, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the biography, article, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDICIAL REFORMER

Bernard G. Segal, former chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association and now serving as president of the American College of Trial Lawyers, has long been a proponent of far-reaching reforms in Pennsylvania's judicial system.

He is cochairman of the Pennsylvania Bar Association's committee on the judiciary of "Project Constitution," the committee which drafted the proposed judiciary article providing for modernization of Pennsylvania's courts.

In addition, he served for 3 years as chairman of the board of the American Judicature Society, originator and prime sponsor of much of the judicial reform in the United States. He is also a member of the joint committee for the effective administration of justice, organization in charge of court reform nationally which is a composite of many professional groups.

Now only 57, Segal, a graduate of Central High School and the University of Pennsylvania and its law school, was the youngest man ever to head the Philadelphia Bar Association. He held that post for 2 terms.

A lawyer's lawyer and a partner in the firm of Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis, he has never served on the bench (preferring private practice to proffers of appointment) but has been known as a judgemaker, a term he deplores. Appointments to the Federal bench from 1956 to 1962 were channeled through him in his capacity as chairman of the standing committee on Federal judiciary of the American Bar Association.

COURT SYSTEM IN PHILADELPHIA AND PENNSYLVANIA IN NEED OF MODERNIZATION—JUDICIARY ARTICLE PROPOSED AS SOLUTION

(By. Bernard G. Segal, former chancellor, Philadelphia Bar Association)

Pennsylvania has no more pressing need today than the modernization of its antiquated judicial system.

Within recent months, the citizens of Philadelphia were first incredulous, then shocked and disgusted, by the disclosures of corruption and wrongdoing in the magistrates' courts of this city which appeared in a series of articles in the Inquirer.

The public criticism, the general condemnation, the investigation ordered by Attorney General Walter E. Alessandroni and currently being conducted by Special Deputy Attorney General Arlen Specter, and the remedial measures proposed by Gov. William W. Scranton and District Attorney James C. Crumlish, Jr., are all necessary and desirable, but at best they are palliatives, stopgap treatments for a cancerous condition.

The simple fact is that in a modern court system, there is no room for individuals to preside in courts of justice who are selected solely on a political basis and have neither training nor experience to enable them to read and understand, let alone interpret and enforce, the laws involved in the cases which come before them.

NO STATEWIDE SYSTEM

Philadelphia magistrates are part of a system which was outworn before this century began. Unless the entire system is changed, no amount of housecleaning will have any lasting effect.

While the magistrate system is the worst element in our present court setup in Pennsylvania, it is by no means the most outworn, or the most out of step with modern court reforms.

At the trial level, incredible as it seems and anachronistic as it is, Pennsylvania has no statewide judicial system. Instead, we have courts in 59 different judicial districts, each entirely independent of the other and practically unsupervised insofar as the administration of their work is concerned. The supreme court is virtually without administrative jurisdiction over them, and each district operates as a separate principality.

In Philadelphia alone, we have 10 separate courts and 10 president judges.

The 28 Philadelphia magistrates and the approximately 4,000 aldermen and justices of the peace in the rest of the State similarly operate essentially on their own.

In short, Pennsylvania has been curiously immume from the wave of judicial reform which has swept the country since the end of the Second World War, and has brought vast and immensely beneficial changes in the judicial systems of numerous States all over the country.

NINETEENTH CENTURY PACE

Pennsylvania courts are operating today under constitutional provisions designed to meet the leisurely pace of the mid-19th century.

Our present judiciary exists under a constitution adopted in 1873, more than 90 years ago. The automobile, the airplane, the radio, television, even electricity, were unknown. The population of Pennsylvania was 3½ million; today, it is 3 times that, over 11,300,000. The number of motor vehicles registered in Pennsylvania today—over 5 million—exceeds by more than 50 percent the total number of people in Pennsylvania when our present constitution was adopted.

This population explosion, the growing complexity of our industrial and commercial life, the advent of the automobile with the resulting litigation arising out of the ever-mounting number of accidents on the highways, have combined to create immensely increased volume and wholly different kinds of litigation from those known in 1873. The judicial setup approved then simply cannot cope with the situation today.

Last year, Chief Justice John C. Bell of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania stated that there was a backlog of nearly 12,000 untried civil jury cases and over 16,000 untried bills of indictment in the Philadelphia courts. Not long before that, a study disclosed that the average time required to obtain a jury trial in a personal injury case in Philadelphia, after the case is fully at issue, is over 2½ years, and hundreds of cases have been in the Philadelphia courts, undetermined for 4 and 5 years and more.

These conditions exist despite the substantial procedural measures instituted over the years by the board of judges of the court of common pleas to relieve calendar congestion and expedite the disposition of cases.

In the fall of 1961, a day after he assumed office, Chief Justice Bell convened a special conference of all Pennsylvania judges and outlined a broad program of over 30 recommendations for changes and reform (some requiring constitutional amendments), designed to streamline and modernize court practices and procedures and make justice speedier and more certain.

PROJECT CONSTITUTION

After 14 of the 21 judges of the courts of common pleas of Philadelphia had indicated their willingness voluntarily to relinquish some of their power and accept an administrative judge, the chief justice appointed Judge Vincent A. Carroll, of court of common pleas No. 2, to that post.

The present chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association, Marvin Comisky, has issued a plea for the creation of additional judgeships in Philadelphia, which undoubtedly is justified.

The inexorable fact, however, is that none of these measures can do the job, no real cure of the Pennsylvania judicial situation can be effected until our archaic judicial arrangement is completely overhauled to bring it in line with the modern ideas of judicial organization which characterize the reforms sponsored by legal authorities, adopted in many parts of the country, and embodied in a proposed judiciary article.

Under these conditions, the Pennsylvania Bar Association included the preparation of a completely new judiciary article as part of its dynamic "Project Constitution," conceived a little over 3 years ago by former Attorney General William A. Schnader, then vice president of the Pennsylvania Bar Association, and readily embraced by that group's president, Thomas W. Pomeroy, Jr., of Pittsburgh.

They appointed a committee from 23 different counties, representing the broadest cross-section of Pennsylvania lawyers. The cochairmen were J. Wesley McWilliams and the writer, and the membership included the then attorney general, David Stahl; the present attorney general, Walter E. Alessandroni, and the former attorney general, later supreme court justice, Thomas D. McBride.

The resulting proposal was overwhelmingly approved in a statewide referendum vote of the total membership of the association in February 1963.

Later, the same year, Governor Scranton appointed a commission on constitutional revision, with Schnader as chairman, and 31 distinguished judges, lawyers and laymen, including former Chief Justice Jones of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, as members. This commission recommended to the Gov-

ernor the adoption of the new judiciary article as drafted.

In January 1964, a citizens' conference on the modernization of Pennsylvania's judicial system was held in Philadelphia to consider this proposed new judiciary article for the Pennsylvania constitution. The conference consisted of 121 recognized Pennsylvania leaders in industry, labor, agriculture, and education, and included representatives of newspapers, radio, and television stations and the important civic organizations of the State. The conference unanimously endorsed the new judiciary article.

What does this judiciary article provide? In general, it creates a modern, integrated, unified judicial system, in which the judges are free of political involvement and enabled to conduct their judicial duties with a maximum of efficiency.

Here we shall discuss in some detail only three of the principal objectives of the proposed constitutional amendment: (1) provision for a businesslike administration of the courts of Pennsylvania by establishing a unified court system with the supreme court at its head; (2) removal of judges from politics by establishing a nonpartisan system for their appointment and election, and (3) abolition of our present minor judiciary and the substitution of courts manned by judges trained in the law.

BUSINESSLIKE COURT ADMINISTRATION

It is difficult to imagine a more antiquated court arrangement than we now have in Pennsylvania. There is no statewide administrative supervision or control of any kind over the courts in the 59 judicial districts. Each operates completely independently of the others and virtually independently of the supreme court as well, insofar as administration is concerned.

There are 88 president judges for our 207 trial and orphans' court judges in our 59 districts—10 president judges in Philadelphia alone. Each president judge is a law unto himself, free, and in many cases, insistent, as former Chief Justice William Howard Taft once complained in a similar situation, "to paddle his own canoe."

Could a less efficient or less businesslike arrangement be conceived for the conduct of a critical branch of our government? That is precisely the kind of loose organization which was abolished in England by the great Judicature Act of 1873, adopted in the very year that our present judiciary article was written into the constitution of 1873.

Just think of a statewide business with 88 branches, which tried to operate without a president or a board of directors, but with 88 branch heads, each with completely autonomous authority. No one would suggest that each department head or the chairman of each board or commission of the State government should be autonomous, free of any supervision or direction by the Governor.

Similarly, the more than 4,000 (no one knows just how many) magistrates, aldermen and justices of the peace operate free of any supervision or control by anyone. Each is a freelance, all on his own.

The proposed amendment to the constitution provides that the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania shall exercise general supervisory and administrative authority over all the courts of the Commonwealth, including the temporary assignment of judges from one court or district to another.

This latter provision would insure maximum use of the judicial manpower of the State, a major reform in itself.

The amendment provides that the powers of administration vested in the supreme court shall be exercised by the chief justice, in accordance with rules prescribed by the supreme court.

LIKE MODEL ARTICLE

Within recent days, 2½ years after approval of the proposed judiciary article by the Pennsylvania Bar Association, and almost 2 years after its overwhelming endorsement in a statewide referendum of all the members, the bar associations of two counties have for the first time declared their opposition to this portion of the proposed constitutional amendment. They contend that it places too much power in the supreme court and the chief justice, that it provides far more power than exists under the judiciary plan in any other State, and that it is a radical and as yet untried plan which it is dangerous to adopt as a constitutional amendment.

The writer has the greatest affection and respect for the members of these two local bar associations. However, they are mistaken in their belief that the general supervisory and administrative power over the courts of Pennsylvania given to the supreme court by this article is greater than that afforded in any State.

In the first place, this provision is virtually the same as that contained in the American Bar Association's model Judicial Article for State Constitutions, except that that article vests somewhat more power in the chief justice directly rather than through the supreme court. That model Judicial Article was unanimously approved by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association in February 1962, at a meeting attended by delegates from every State and from every large city in the United States, as well as from many smaller communities, representing a constituency of more than 80 percent of the practicing lawyers in the United States.

Supervision over and administration of the affairs of the courts of the State by the supreme court, similar to the system provided in the proposed Judiciary Article for Pennsylvania, have been in effect in other States in various parts of the country for years.

Another argument advanced by the two local bar associations is that the unified judicial system is not needed in their respective counties, since they do not have any case backlog and their courts operate efficiently locally. The answers to these contentions, too, are clear.

In the first place, it is a fallacy to consider the courts of common pleas and the orphans' courts as local or county courts. They are State courts; their judges are paid their salaries out of the State treasury and, like all other State employees, they are members of the State employee's retirement system.

Further, the reason for a modern, unified statewide court system is not solely to eliminate court congestion.

But the solid basis for change is so that the citizens of the Commonwealth may secure the best possible statewide system of courts. Judges are public servants, as are the executive and legislative officials of our government, and the citizens are entitled to have them operate under the most efficient system which will produce the most effective justice.

This will never be attained in Pennsylvania; it has never been achieved anywhere, without a unified court system operating in cooperation and not as 59 segregated, disconnected, unrelated units having no administrative relation to each other.

ABOLITION OF MAGISTRATES, ALDERMEN, AND JUSTICES OF PEACE

Philadelphia has 28 magistrates. Elsewhere in the State there are approximately 4,000 aldermen and justices of the peace. They receive no salaries, but derive their remuneration from costs in civil cases and commissions on fines collected in criminal cases, so that in effect, they have a pecuniary interest in the outcome of every case which comes before them.

According to the answers to questionnaires sent to justices of the peace in a survey conducted in 1962 by a committee of the Pennsylvania Bar Association, of the 1213 justices of the peace who replied, only 422 had completed high school, 183 had attended but never completed their high school work, 121 had gone to grade school only and 7 had not even completed grade school; only 7 were lawyers, the highest number were skilled laborers, and next in order came real estate or insurance agents and housewives. Approximately 80 percent of the justices of the peace held court in their homes.

As far as the Philadelphia magistrates are concerned, little need be added to the revelations in the Inquirer during recent months, and what has been said earlier in this article.

Experts who have studied our magistrates' system have labeled it the worst in the country, and the most political. Revent disclosures have described the abysmal conditions in most of the magistrates' courts.

Yet these are the peoples' courts. In them, magistrates pass on critical questions involving the liberty and property of parties appearing before them, and the safety and interests of the citizens of our community. For most Philadelphians, this is their only contact with any "judges" or "court"; from the magistrates' courts they receive their sole impression of our system of justice at work.

Is it any wonder that citizens' respect for law and our courts, so essential to the survival of our kind of society, is at such a low level in Philadelphia?

Regrettably, it must be said that similar conditions may be found elsewhere in our State.

COMMUNITY COURTS

Under the proposed judiciary article, magistrates' courts in Philadelphia, and aldermen's and justices of the peace courts in Allegheny County, would be abolished, and new courts, called community courts, would be created in their place.

Justices of the peace and aldermen's courts in counties other than Philadelphia and Allegheny could be abolished by the voters at any election after adoption of the new constitutional amendment. The community courts would be part of Pennsylvania's statewide judicial system and would be conducted by judges selected in the same way and required to have the same qualifications as judges in other trial courts.

NONPARTISAN SELECTION OF JUDGES

Pennsylvania is one of 12 States which still elect all of their judges and require them to run for office on a partisan political ballot. Only seven others have this system for any of their judges. The overwhelming majority of States have abandoned partisan, political election of judges entirely.

It is an arresting fact that, with one minor exception, the only other places in the world where judges are elected are Russia and its satellite nations. In no democratic nation, other than our own, is the elective system for judges still in general use.

Who really elects the judges in States still clinging to a political elective system? Can anyone doubt that the average voter who goes to the polls knows nothing about the candidates for judge, and when he leaves the polls, cannot even remember the names of the persons for whom he voted for this high office?

It is obviously an absurdity to suggest that in the case of judges, it is the voters, who make the selection under an elective system on a partisan ballot. It is usually the political party chairman, at best a few political leaders, who choose the judge who sits on the bench.

Before Missouri, in 1940, adopted the present plan for the nonpartisan selection of judges, Justice Fred L. Williams, speaking of his own election, said:

"I was elected in 1916 because Woodrow Wilson kept us out of war. I was defeated in 1920 because Woodrow Wilson did not keep us out of war. In both of the elections, not more than 5 percent of the others knew I was on the ticket."

The fact is that even under our elective system, the great majority of our judges reach the bench initially through appointment by the Governor. As each judge ascends the bench after appointment, he must look back over his shoulder to be sure to retain the good will of the political leaders who soon will decide whether he will remain on the bench. And he must know that for his lifetime thereafter, he cannot lose this good will unless he is willing to risk failure of nomination, and therefore of election.

It is time for Pennsylvania to follow the lead of most of the States of the country, and abolish the political election of judges. For more than half a century after the beginning of our government, Pennsylvania did not have popular election of judges. We have had enough of it now. It is time for a change.

The plan for nonpartisan selection of judges embodied in the proposed Judiciary Article for Pennsylvania was originally advanced by the American Judicature Society a half century ago, and it has been approved and sponsored by the American Bar Association since 1939.

LOCAL OPTION

This new system of selection and tenure of judges would apply mandatorily to the supreme and the superior courts, the two appellate courts of Pennsylvania, and to all courts in Philadelphia and Allegheny Counties. Under "local option" it may be adopted at an election by the voters in other judicial districts in Pennsylvania.

Under this plan, the Governor would fill judicial vacancies by appointment from a panel submitted to him by a judicial nominating commission.

For the supreme and the superior courts, there would be a single judicial nominating commission, consisting of three citizens appointed by the Governor, three lawyers selected by the lawyers of the State under rules esablished by the supreme court, and one judge chosen in the manner prescribed by the supreme court.

In Philadelphia County and Allegheny County, and in any other judicial district whose citizens vote to adopt the plan, there would be a similar, but separate, commission for each such county or district, the members other than the judge to be resident in such county or district.

The judicial nominating commission would submit a panel of three names to the Governor for each vacancy to be filled. If the Governor did not act within 60 days, the commission would submit a panel of three additional names. If the Governor did not act within an additional 60-day period, the chief justice would have the duty of making the appointment from among the six names which were submitted to the Governor.

Under the proposed amendment, any judge appointed by the Governor, upon nomination by the judicial nominating commission, would serve for approximately 2 years before his name appeared on the ballot. Then, at an appropriate election, he would come before the voters on a nonpartisan ballot, on which there would be no other candidate. The single question to the voters would be whether the judge should be retained in office.

If a majority of electors should vote negatively, a vacancy would exist, which would again be filled by the Governor from panels submitted to him by the judicial nominating commission.

Whenever a judge should come up for reelection, the same procedure would be followed.

The proposed judiciary article contains numerous other provisions to promote the effective administration of justice in our courts.

These include prohibitions upon the making of political contributions or engaging in political activities by judges; provisions for the compulsory retirement of judges so mentally or physically incapacitated as substantially to prevent them from performing their duty, and for the removal, suspension and discipline of judges for misconduct in office, and other provisions implementing the purposes of the article. All of these have been tried and proved effective elsewhere, and they are supported by the leading professional organizations in the country sponsoring judicial reform.

NEED FOR SUPPORT

The need for the reforms provided by the proposed judiciary article is clear. How can they be achieved?

Experience elsewhere has demonstrated conclusively that this result will be accomplished only through an aroused citizenry.

Last month, Governor Scranton, after pledging his unqualified support of the proposed judicial article as "essential for the future of our judicial system and for the people of Pennsylvania" and pledging that he would do everything within his power to achieve its passage at the coming session of the legislature—and hopefully for its subsequent approval by the people—obtained the approval of Richard C. Bond, of Philadelphia, to serve as chairman, and Gustave G. Amsterdam, of Philadelphia; John S. Rice, of Gettysburg, and J. C. Warner, of Pittsburgh, as vice chairman, of a statewide bipartisan organization to work for adoption of the amendment.

If the judiciary article is to be adopted, everyone will have to join forces with Bond's organization to prevail over strongly entrenched political powers who consider their interests to be involved; magistrates, aldermen, and justices of the peace, whose positions will be eliminated; in some cases sincere but misguided citizens who oppose any change; and perhaps most deadly of all, the inertia which so often results in inaction on worthy bills in the legislature.

TO ACHIEVE JUDICIAL REFORM

Long delayed reforms in the court systems of Pennsylvania may become a reality, at last, if the people of this State—public and private citizens alike, irrespective of political party—will join in a massive effort to persuade the legislature to take affirmative action this year.

The immense need for judicial reform—and how the proposed changes would help to eliminate existing inefficiences and injustices—were told in authoritative and illuminating detail by Bernard G. Segal, former chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association, in an article in the Today's World section of Sunday's Inquirer. The clear case made by this distinguished attorney in support of judicial reform should be instrumental in arousing civic minded individuals and organizations to participate actively in a drive to enact the reforms.

As Mr. Segal noted, the State investigation of the magistrate system in Philadelphia has served to focus public attention on one area of the judiciary where need for reform is especially acute.

"In a modern court system," Mr. Segal said, "there is no room for individuals to preside in courts of justice who are selected solely on a political basis and have neither training nor experience to enable them to read and understand, let alone interpret and enforce, the laws."

Better court administration, on a Statewide basis, and nonpartisan selection of judges under the "Pennsylvania plan" are among other reforms that are overdue.

Governor Scranton has urged that judicial reform be a top priority item at this session of the legislature. It should be. Energetic public support is essential, however, and the time for it is now.

Alaska Disaster Highlighted Civil Defense and Military Support Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the catastrophic earthquake of last March which wrought havoc in Anchorage and other communities of south-central Alaska furnished the setting and a preview of how the civil defense and military team might function in a national disaster. Experts have commented that only a nuclear attack might exceed the quake for disruptive effect over a wide area, for variety and magnitude of disaster conditions produced. Noteworthy in the high degree of teamwork achieved between the military and civil defense people during the emergency period following the quake in Alaska was adherence to the basic policy that military assistance in connection with disasters will complement, not supplant civil defense. Planning now underway to strengthen this teamwork relationship in all our States for the purpose of meeting future disasters is ably and interestingly recounted by Mr. William P. Durkee, Director of Civil Defense, in an article in the November 1964 edition of the Army Information Digest, which reads as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE—THE MILITARY SUPPORT ROLE

(By William P. Durkee, Director of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army)

Although the Office of Civil Defense has been a member of the Department of the Army team only since March 31, 1964, this civilian agency now under the direct control of Secretary of the Army Stephen Ailes actually has a long history of cooperation with the Army in fighting peacetime disasters. When a hurricane lashes a coastal area, a tornado rips through a community, an earthquake shakes a State, we find Army troops and civil defense personnel working side by side to contain damage, save lives and restore normal conditions. This is the concept of military support for civil authority in emergencies. Military support for civil government—not military control in emergencies—is a manifestation of our democratic process and is a tradition deeply rooted in national life.

A good example of the military support concept is still fresh in the minds of many Americans. On Good Friday 1964, the State of Alaska was rocked by the mightiest earthquake ever recorded on this continent. The catastrophe put to the test not only established civil defense-military plans for emergencies but the ingenuity of both in the face of the disaster.

The quake struck at 5:35 p.m., Alaska standard time. Within minutes after the tremors subsided, the State civil defense permanent staff was in action and military communications specialists were among the

first persons to augment it. Within a short time, military assistance of every kind, requested by civilian authorities, was on the way to hard-hit communities under orders from the commander in chief, Alaska, Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, USAF.

When civil officials in Anchorage called together the group that was to coordinate and control the fight against the disaster, General Reeves and members of his staff attended. Subsequently, General Reeves commented that he had quickly found it necessary to funnel military assistance which he controlled through civil defense to prevent duplication and maintain efficient operations.

The major military assistance effort was mounted from Fort Richardson and Elmendorf Air Force Base. These installations provided the 4th Battalion, 23d Infantry, and units of the 60th Infantry and the 56th Military Police detachment, as well as Air Force personnel and planes for airlift operations. The Alaska Scouts (National Guard), encamped at Fort Richardson, were pressed into service. At Kodiak, personnel of the Navy station provided military help to local authorities.

Assistance by the military ranged over a broad field. Military units policed stricken areas, set up search and rescue parties, fed and sheltered the homeless, established water points and installed emergency power units.

The airlift provided by the Air Force, at the request of Alaska civil defense, exceeded in magnitude that of any previous peacetime disaster. In one feat, the Air Force lifted a 330,000 pound Bailey bridge into the State.

In short, the military in Alaska wrote a new and often heroic chapter in the history of service to the civilian community in time of need.

By coincidence, the Alaska quake struck as studies and plans in the Defense Department by the Army staff and OCD were already well underway, aimed at improving the effectiveness of military support of civilian authorities in national emergency.

To some extent, Alaska furnished a preview of how the military and civil defense team might function in a nationwide disaster. Experts have commented that only a nuclear attack might exceed the quake for disruptive effect over a wide area, for variety and magnitude of disaster conditions produced, and for responses evoked from civilian agencies and military units on the scene. In the harder hit areas, only the element of radioactive fallout was lacking to produce conditions similar to a post-nuclear-attack situation.

The Alaskan experience has lent added weight to studies of the Army's role before and after a nuclear attack. These studies are pointing to new missions for active and Reserve personnel and National Guard units in support of civil authority. Nothing in this planning process, however, is intended to detract from the Army's primary mission of offensive and defensive combat against an attacker. Civil defense fully recognizes that the Army's major role in a war is to fight.

The civil defense effort today is centered on fallout protection. The objective is to establish a national shelter system, equipped and provisioned, to enable the population to survive a critical period of fallout following a nuclear attack.

To produce shelter space quickly and economically, OCD, with the assistance of the Corps of Engineers, first assessed the Nation's existing shelter resources in a national survey in 1962.

The survey has located potential shelter for more than 121 million persons in large, heavily constructed buildings and installations. Some of it is located on military posts and installations, and offers protection for military dependents and noncombatants. Public shelters are currently being stocked with food, water, medical, and sanitation supplies, and equipped with radiation detection instruments, furnished by the Federal Government to local community governments through OCD.

More than 80,000 buildings are marked today with the distinctive black and yellow signs indicating that they could be used in an emergency. More than 47,000 of these structures, with space for 25 million people, are stocked and ready for use.

The main thrust of other OCD programs provides support for the national shelter system. These programs are essentially designed to create organizations and train people at every level of government to establish plans and carry out emergency operations during and after attack.

Under a matching funds program, the Office of Civil Defense shares with the States and cities the costs of maintaining local and State organizations, training people, and building hardened local emergency operating systems and command and control communications for civilian authorities. OCD provides funds to selected radio broadcasting stations to harden their facilities against fallout to permit continuous radio broadcasting to the public in emergencies.

Civil defense planners anticipate that increased military support for many of these operations will be forthcoming in the months ahead. In June, the Secretary of the Army approved a plan to use the headquarters of State adjutants general and National Guard for planning and controlling military support of civil defense. Secretary Ailes has outlined the plan in a letter to State Governors and has asked for their acceptance.

The plan, developed by a Continental Army Command Planning Group under direction of Maj. Gen. Hugh M. Exton, reinforces the basic policy of the Department of Defense that military assistance will complement but not be a substitute for civil participation in civil defense.

The essential element of the plan is the establishment of a military headquarters in each State for planning the use of the State's military resources in support of civil defense in emergencies. The State adjutant general would have this planning responsibility.

Continental Army commanders would designate Army Active and Reserve units as well as those units of the other services which have been made available to zone of interior armies to support civil defense operations and planning. In a national emergency, it is contemplated that the adjutant general and his staff would be ordered into active military service and become the State military commander with the mission of providing military support to civil authorities in accordance with prepared plans.

Today, the adjutants general and civil defense directors in each State are studying this plan and preparing comments. The outlook is favorable. In 1963, at its convention in San Juan, Puerto Rico, the Adjutants General Association adopted a unanimous resolution expressing support and approval of the concept.

Various branches of the Army have participated in the new civil defense program since its transfer to the Defense Department in August 1961.

At the direction of the Office of Civil Defense, the Corps of Engineers (with the Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks) has supervised the monumental task of surveying every structure in the Nation capable of serving as a public fallout shelter.

Some additional Army contributions to civil defense:

Army posts and installations throughout the country are under orders to cooperate with local civil defense authorities on shelter use plans, and are establishing shelters on installations for civilian dependents and employees.

Army personnel, under CONARC directives, are helping to train civilians in the use of radiological monitoring instruments.

Army communications systems are carrying civil defense messages and providing other support.

An Army unit is touring the country with a mobile civil defense exhibit to demonstrate protection methods against radioactive fallout.

National Guard units have assisted local civil defense agencies with personnel and transport to move fallout shelter supplies from warehouses to local shelters.

Civil defense and the Army have long been partners in fighting disaster in peacetime. Today, we are seeing the inauguration of a closely integrated effort, with support and direction from the highest defense officials, to place the vast resources, manpower, skills, and equipment of the military in a better position to aid civil government under conditions of nuclear attack.

A well-coordinated military and civilian effort is basic to a strong structure of national defense—a structure which serves the cause of peace in this nuclear age.

Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most eloquent, timely, and fitting editorial on the late Winston Churchill. The editorial is from the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 25, 1965]

WINSTON CHURCHILL

Churchill is dead, gone from the world he saved. And the world he saved, distracted still by the flow and eddy of the aftermath, has not yet reckoned its debt to him.

Perhaps that sum cannot be reckoned up, so great it is. Our very troubles of this time derive from that more nearly mortal evil that Churchill fought and ended.

Are the emerging nations irritated and frustated at what they take to be survivals of the British Raj? Had it not been for Churchill, they would have been spared their hurt feelings, for they would never have emerged at all.

Does Charles de Gaulle grow restive at the failure of the nations to see his glory? The question would not have arisen without Churchill to fight for a France that had been captured.

Are we ourselves troubled with the problems of the alliance? We'd have been spared our troubles had not Churchill stood when all else fell. Is it hard and endless to achieve the unity of Europe? There was a European unity of slavery and depravity designed to last a thousand years. Because of Churchill it is no more.

The Russians themselves may count their debt to that great man. Had England made its peace with evil, the Soviet state would have dropped into the dark of history or have become, in the extension of the Stalin-Hitler pact, the complete political expression of the worst shadows in Stalin's mind.

But Churchill did not fail. He lived and spoke and fought, and so all of us live as we do.

In and age of progressive thought, he seemed an odd man to become a hero. He liked cigars and brandy and high cuisine. He believed deeply in the virtue of royalty. He believed in the British empire, in gallantry, in chivalry. He believed in language and in the golden deeds of the English past. In an age that wrote history in terms of social movements and philosophical evolution, Churchill read history as a glorious record of brave men and the things they did for our country.

He was old fashioned and out of date. But when the hour struck it was his alone. For the evil that rose in Germany was a timeless evil. To meet it required a cast of mind that Churchill had, a dedicated innocence, a belief in battles and in courage. The monstrous German war gods came up from under mountains and brandished again their hammers and axes. Their shadow of death spread through the heart of Europe, north to the polar ice, south to the Sahara, over all of France and paused for a moment at the little strip of water before England.

In that moment Churchill spoke and his voice was like Roland's horn of Roncesvalles. He broke the spell of the evil magician and roused the world to fight for its freedom. Against the Wehrmacht's mechanical might, he had, for a while, only the gallantry, the courage, the spirit, of his people. These old-fashioned virtues held the battle.

He saved the world and his world at home replied by turning him out of office, for a new time had come. He said that he would not preside over the dissolution of the British empire, but it is dissolved and it had to be dissolved. Yet whatever hope of freedom and dignity all men have today, they owe in part to the last glorious flight of that empire and to the ability of the empire to bring forth, as its last gift, the man, Winston Churchill.

May angels attend him.

A Guest Editorial: Look Who's Favored in Poverty War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial from the Martinsburg, W. Va., Journal, sheds some very interesting light on the administration of the antipoverty program. I am sure that all of us would benefit from reading it, and request unanimous consent to include it at the end of my remarks. The editorial follows:

A GUEST EDITORIAL: LOOK WHO'S FAVORED IN POVERTY WAR

West Virginians received some pre-Christmas news which should be counted among the "good" variety. After all of these years of the politicians telling us how poverty-striken we are here in West Virginia, we note that on the first tentative allocation of funds for President Johnson's war on poverty, our State ranks 26th down the line in money to be spent.

We are to be alloted the grand sum of $423,811. This averages out to almost 25 cents per person. That really ought to wipe out our poverty in a hurry.

While West Virginia is to get $423,811 for the war on poverty, guess how much is assigned to the fabulously wealthy State of Texas which just happens to be the home of President Johnson? $9,776,483. Admittedly, the population of Texas is almost 5 times that of West Virginia but it is going to get 23 times as much as West Virginia for the war on poverty.

Minnesota, which is the home Vice-President-elect HUBERT HUMPHREY, has just about twice West Virginia's population but it is assigned $1,449,407, or more than three times as much as West Virginia.

New Jersey, which has always been regarded as one of our wealthier States, is being allocated the top amount of war on poverty money, $12,456,361. Kentucky, where a determined effort is being made to get rid of the two Republican Senators, is to be the recipient of the second highest amount, $10,416,242.

President Johnson's own proud State of Texas ranks third with Oregon in fourth spot at $8,219,670. Oregon's population is just about the same as West Virginia's but they must be really hard up there financially to qualify for 20 times the amount set up for us.

We are not quarreling about the amount but we are quarreling about West Virginia always being labeled among the poverty-striken. The next time President Johnson or Vice President HUMPHREY or even David and Chet come carpetbagging around West Virginia and expressing their sympathy over our sad plight, West Virginians can hold their heads high and tell these do-gooders to clean up their own back yards.

Their home-State poverty is obviously worse than ours because we are sure these politicians who were so solicitous in the pre-election days would not let us down after the election, particularly since the great majority of West Virginians dutifully voted the straight Democratic ticket.

Festival for Israel Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Hon. Charles H. Silver, the distinguished executive assistant to the mayor of New York City, early this month addressed the annual Channukah Festival for Israel Bonds, at Madison Square Garden. His address is worthy of attention; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, CHAIRMAN, CHANNUKAH FESTIVAL FOR ISRAEL, MADISON SQUARE GARDEN, JANUARY 4, 1965

We are privileged to greet many honored guests tonight—but our one guest of honor is the State of Israel.

We have gathered to celebrate the survival of our blessed infant commonwealth—as we bid you "Shalom"—and welcome to a glorious festival of celebration and rejoicing.

We rejoice that Israel endures as a light among the nations—a living symbol of the triumph of freedom.

Little more than a decade ago there was only a hope and a prayer—but Israel has grown from strength to strength above her bloodstained stones and barren desert.

History records no more inspiring victory than this. Out of heartbreak and hardship, our people have carved this proud young nation that declares the glory of God and the brotherhood of man. In an age that has known horror enough to shatter the very meaning of the word "civilization"—this one miracle has emerged as the foremost humanitarian achievement of our century.

Here, in our ancient homeland, we are healing the scars of centuries of human tragedy.

From the ovens of Buchenwald * * * from the dust of the Warsaw ghetto, from the heaped-up bones, the mass graves, the smoldering embers of the Nazi nightmare * * * has come this one light against the darkness.

Six million Jewish dead are listening as we say: "You live again as long as Israel lives."

It is the answer * * * the survival of this land of hope and salvation is an inspiration to every man who struggles against oppression or persecution in any form, in any part of the world.

Israel is a living reminder of a few glorious pages of history that the world must never forget, for they echo an ancient prayer and the promise of the Almighty that our dwelling place would be redeemed * * * that the dream of our people would—at last—come true.

From this land, every Jew, wherever he makes his own home, takes new spirit and courage.

This is the promised land, and the land of promise * * * a haven for the homeless, the helpless and the wanderer on all the desolate and forsaken roads of a tormented world.

Israel, today, justifies the courage that, yesterday, fought against impossible odds to bring about its birth. And, like our own God-loved land of America, she heralds the coming of an even greater tomorrow.

Her future is the special responsibility of everyone who loves liberty—but ours most of all because we are Jews and because our blood and heritage is linked to Israel.

And it is our problem now—as never before—because we cannot begin to guess what tragedy may be in store if we delay.

We all do our share in many worthwhile charities. This is not a charity. There was a time when we emptied our pockets for Israel believing that the bonds we bought would probably prove to be an outright gift. We know better now. Israel bonds are a sound, gilt-edged investment—but that isn't why we buy them.

Our duty to Israel is one we inherit from the centuries. It is an obligation we owe by our birthright—and one we should be proud to pay. The return is substantial, but monetary gain is surely not our greatest interest.

This is a time in the destiny of Israel that calls for action rather than words. A nation's future is in your hands * * * and time is running out. For Israel, for the world and for each one of us, this is the hour of decision.

There is little to be said that has not been said before, but there is more to do than we have ever done before.

Israel, defending herself on every hand, needs help desperately and immediately. Much of her resources that should go into projects of peace and industry must continue to be poured into her armed defenses and the military equipment on which she relies to protect her very existence.

Today, after years of treachery and terror, her flag flies proudly among the banners of freedom. Her harvest is bountiful. But her borders still bristle with guns, and her people enjoy only a perilous independence.

Thank God that blood is thicker than water * * * even 3,000 miles of water * * * and your presence tonight signifies that even the vast oceans between America and Israel are not as deep or as strong as the identical blood that runs in our veins.

And this blood has a voice. It cries out for Israel's honor. It shouts that self-defense must not be labeled aggression. It proclaims that human decency must not be

abandoned—that human lives must not be lost—that provocation must not be met with appeasement.

By keeping the candle of Israel lighted on the menorah of civilization, we are helping to win—for all men and all nations—the blessings of liberty.

May God grant us the will, the strength, and the means—to achieve this great purpose.

May God grant that here * * * in our time and for all time * * * Israel may continue to declare to all mankind * * *.

This is a land of peace and purpose pure—
Where honor dwells, where justice rules supreme;
This is a land of freedom, strong and sure—
Where men may build—and speak—and pray—and dream.

Progress in Chile—Effectiveness of Thomas Mann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in a recent article, John Chamberlain expressed the view that Chile is going to solve its problems without making a turn to Castroism. He also commented favorably on the influence of Thomas Mann, President Johnson's special assistant for Latin America, on United States-Latin American relations. I ask unanimous consent that John Chamberlain's syndicated column entitled "A Logjam Breaks in Latin America," published on January 16, 1965, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[King Features Syndicate, Jan. 16, 1965]

THESE DAYS: A LOGJAM BREAKS IN LATIN AMERICA

(By John Chamberlain)

Cuba's Che Guevara is still calling for subversion in Chile, but it begins to look as if that country were going to solve its problems without making any desperate turn to Castroism.

The biggest obstacle that the new Chilean Christian Democratic government of President Eduardo Frei has had to surmount can be summed up in one word: copper. The local mines that produce this metal, which accounts for at least two-thirds of Chile's foreign exchange, have been nominally owed by great foreign companies such as Anaconda and Kennecott. Paralyzed for years by the threats of expropriation and nationalization of their properties, the Anaconda and Kennecott companies had done practically nothing to expand their Chilean production. The Braden property belonging to Kennecott in Chile is one of the richest sources of copper in the world, but with a local tax rate running to some 85 percent of profits Kennecott had actually diverted investment funds that might have gone to Chile into a renovation of western U.S. mines with much poorer quality ore.

Now, suddenly, the logjam is broken: Anaconda, Cerro, and Kennecott have all worked out patterns that give Chile equal—and even better—partnership in the mines.

Each side, in the negotiations leading up to the new agreements, has given up a big token of false pride to get the realities of more profit for everybody concerned. Kennecott has agreed to transfer the business of its Braden subsidiary to a new Chilean corporation, the Sociedad Minera El Teniente, S.A. The Chilean Government gets a 51-percent interest in this new corporation, with Kennecott retaining 49 percent.

The company is to get $80 million for the surrendered 51 percent. But the Chileans will be able to fund the payment out of their share of the copper profits quite easily, for Kennecott has agreed to expand Braden production from 180,000 tons a year to 280,000 tons. It will take 5 years to complete the expansion. Meanwhile the total tax rate on Kennecott's Chilean earnings will be 44 percent—or about half of what it is at present.

This points up the calming influence that President Johnson's Latin American policy coordinator, Thomas Mann, has had on the course of recent United States-Latin relations.

Thomas Mann works behind the scenes. He has gotten tremendous results everywhere he has had the opportunity to work. He was an adviser to the Eisenhower government at the time of the Guatemalan takeover by the Communists—and it wasn't very long before the Communists were ousted.

He was Ambassador to Mexico—and Mexico is today the only Latin American country that can sell its bonds abroad. He let it be known that the United States would look with complaisance on the overthrow of the leftist Goulart regime in Brazil—and the ouster of Goulart came off on the Brazilians' own schedule. He worked out the new canal approach that did so much to defuse the Panama crisis.

Thomas Mann hasn't been able to solve the problem of Cuba, but as thousands of U.S. citizens continue to bypass Havana to spend winter vacation money in Jamaica, the Virgin Islands, Barbados, and the Bahamas, more and more Cubans must be thinking that Castro is tops as an economic idiot.

If Dean Rusk has any retirement plans, Thomas Mann is one of two obvious choices to succeed him as Secretary of State. The other choice is Dean Acheson, who has learned much since Korea.

Let's Shorten Those Political Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, my proposal to limit presidential election campaigns to 60 days continues to receive strong support. The Danbury, Conn., News-Times, in its edition of January 21, 1965, published the following editorial entitled "Let's Shorten Those Too-Long Political Campaigns," and with your permission, I include the editorial herewith:

LET'S SHORTEN THOSE TOO LONG POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, who represents the new fifth district, stretching from Danbury to Meriden, in the 89th Congress, has a good idea.

He proposes to limit presidential election campaigns to 60 days.

The Waterbury Congressman, returning to the House for his fourth term, has already introduced bills to give the force of law to this proposal.

His House Joint Resolution 16 proposes an amendment to the Constitution providing that no candidate be nominated more than 60 days before election day.

This would require adoption by Congress and ratification by at least 38 States within 7 years after its submission to the States.

Representative MONAGAN'S House Resolution 96 would provide the same 60-day limit, but as a Federal law, rather than as an amendment to the Constitution.

The Congressman has termed long presidential campaigns "expensive, boring, unnecessary and provoking imposition on the public."

He told the House: "I am convinced that excessive exposure soon lends to boredom and lack of interest on the part of the electorate and thus frustrates the main objective of the candidates—discussion of issues with the people."

Vice President HUMPHREY has told Representative MONAGAN that "your interest in this problem will be of substantial importance in pursuing the kind of solution which is acceptable to our political parties and to the people of the United States."

Representative MONAGAN'S efforts in the 88th and earlier Congresses to limit presidential campaigns attracted some interest but no action resulted.

Now, with the 1964 campaign fresh in mind, there is considerable interest in the proposal.

Political conventions and campaign schedules were first adopted in days of slow communications. Candidates traveled by train and spoke to only a few hundred or a few thousand people at a time.

Today a presidential candidate travels by jet plane back and forth and up and down the country in matter of hours.

His voice and his views are widely circulated in newspapers and heard by millions on radio or television.

While we stick to the old fashioned schedule, a relic of the days of horse and buggy and steam locomotives, other countries manage to conduct national elections in a much shorter time.

England named a new government in October with less than one-quarter of the campaign time spent in the United States.

By the time England held its election, the U.S. campaign had become anticlimatic and there were still more weeks to go.

Representative MONAGAN has been pushing his shorter campaign idea for more than 4 years.

This is the year it should be made into law by the Congress.

Hydrographic and Oceanographic Surveys in the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, of the U.S. Department of Commerce, that an oceanographic venture will be conducted by the ocean survey ship *Explorer*, of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, during a 4-month period commencing February 2, 1965.

The scheduled activities of the *Explorer* and the description of its mission, I think, will be of interest to all the Members and to the public in general, tend to dispel any fears that the United States is not alert to the great rewards which will flow from a knowledge of the sea. The *Explorer* is an example of our efforts to forge ahead in this important field of science.

An abbreviated form of the information I have received follows:

The ocean survey ship *Explorer*, of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, U.S. Department of Commerce, will sail next week from Norfolk, Va., to conduct extensive hydrographic and oceanographic surveys in the Caribbean on a voyage which is expected to last for 4 months.

The *Explorer* will weigh anchor on February 2 for its 3,000-mile round trip from the Coast and Geodetic Survey's Atlantic ships base. Five to ten days later it will arrive in San Juan and will work in the vicinity of Cape San Juan on the east coast of Puerto Rico, Vieques Sound, San Juan Harbor, and possibly Charlotte Amalie Harbor in St. Thomas, V.I.

It is a 1,900-ton, 220-foot vessel, commanded by Comdr. Marvin T. Paulson, of Hatton, N. Dak. It will be carrying a complement of 15 officers and 73 crew.

The surveys to be undertaken by the *Explorer* are a part of a program commenced in 1962 to revise nautical charts for the Puerto Rico-Virgin Islands area. Present charts are based on surveys in the early part of the century. Since then, currents, waves, and storms have shifted shallow areas, eroded the coastline, built up coral reefs, and altered the configuration of the ocean bottom.

The ship will conduct hydrographic surveys and will map the ocean bottom in offshore areas where the water is deep enough to permit safe navigation. In the shallow, inshore areas, launches will be employed to locate coral reefs and shipwrecks, and to determine the configuration of the ocean bottom.

The area to be surveyed is approximately 50 square miles.

Water depth will be measured with a fathometer, a device which transmits sound impulses to the ocean floor and converts the time it take the impulse to return to the ship into a water depth. To locate the horizontal position of the *Explorer* relative to land, the ship will employ electronic and visual control. An electronic positioning system will be used in offshore areas. In shallow, inshore areas, markers will be established on land as reference points with the aid of triangulation and aerial photography. Aerial photographs will also be used to determine the position of charted features, such as emerging rocks, prominent landmarks, and the shoreline.

A 29-day survey will be made by the *Explorer* at the entrance to San Juan Harbor. In this period, the moon will make a full orbit around the earth, thereby causing a full cycle of spring and neap tides.

Four-day surveys of the current will be made, first, southeast of Ramos Island; second, San Juan Harbor; and third, Vieques Sound between Point Saldado and Point Este.

Many different forms of tides characterize the ocean waters in the Caribbean. To study these tidal characteristics, portable tide gages will be placed at different localities, including Playa de Fajardo, Ensenada Honda, Iota Mulas, and Punta Este on the Island of Vieques. These gages measure rise and fall of the tides.

On its way to Puerto Rico, the *Explorer* will study the profile of the ocean bottom to determine the location of undersea mountains, valleys, depressions, and other features.

After completing its work in the Puerto Rico-Virgin Islands area, the *Explorer*, en route home, will make samples at 14 separate locations to determine at various depths the temperature, salinity and oxygen content of the sea water. To oceanographers, these are the "fingerprints" of the various water masses that comprise the sea. Knowledge of the temperature and salinity makes it possible to determine the origin of the water. The dissolved oxygen content tells researchers the biological life to be found in that part of the ocean.

En route home to Norfolk, the *Explorer* will parallel Puerto Rico's northern shoreline, turn north at Tortuga Island, continue through Caico Passage between Mayaguana Island and the Caico Islands, and then north to Norfolk, which it should reach in late May or early June.

American Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I should like to bring to the attention of the House at this time a thought-provoking article by Mr. Clay B. Carr, of Boyce, Va., a respected journalist whose writings appear in a number of publications.

AMERICAN FAITH—IT'S TIME TO STAND UP AND BE COUNTED

(By Clay B. Carr)

In the writing of "American Faith" we have largely followed a time pattern, but on occasions have deviated from the early growth of this Nation to factors which are present now, some akin and some foreign to the founding faith of the early settlers.

The title of this week's article, "It's Time To Stand Up and Be Counted" is taken from an ad run in the Washington Evening Star by the Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co. regarding the following prayer which was written as a voluntary form of grace to be said at one of the schools in Fairfax County, Va.:

"Come Lord God and be our guest, let these, Thy gifts to us be blessed. For health and strength and daily food, We praise Thy name, O Lord. Amen."

It seems that the reason for the ad being run is that a group is trying to see that the grace is abolished at this school. The insurance company which ran the ad urged parents "To stand up and be counted" for the prayer mentioned. The writer of "American Faith" agrees with this action.

Think what a General Washington praying for divine help in the winter at Valley Forge would have in his mind if he knew the children whose country he helped establish were to be denied the word of God. Also consider what Gen. Robert E. Lee would think after having prayed the night before Appomattox when he surrendered the Confederate Army of Northern Virginia and urged his soldiers to return home and help build a better nation under God.

There is entirely too much talk nowadays about abolishing God from everything and leaving it up to the churches and homes. Although the Supreme Court in 1962 ruled out prayers in schools, do you know that chapel exercises continue as usual at the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy No one has tried to stop them. Why? One of their superintendents is reported to have said that religion is necessary in building a well-rounded citizen. How much more is this necessary in the formative years of a child's life.

In the early beginning of our Nation, we often spoke of the triangle—the church, school, and home. Every church that I know of—and I have attended services in many of the faiths—have never failed to do good to the community. We speak of "juvenile delinquency." Perhaps it is "adult delinquency" for the great majority of homes that I am informed of, do not go to the trouble of teaching religion—even in some, the home has simply become a place to hang your hat, sometimes eat and sleep.

Take away American faith and you breed disrespect for God. When you breed a godless nation, the National Government might take into account that instead of passing billions for foreign aid, it might be necessary to pass millions for houses of correction. Our forefathers would have looked up the lack of respect for God this way—and people just do not change.

Carlos Almeida Honored in San Leandro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, we are about to resume a national dialog over modernization of our immigration laws. In this connection, I am always pleased to read or hear accounts of constructive achievements on behalf of our country by those who have decided to adopt our great land as their home.

One such story of accomplishment by a new citizen from another land is the one of Carlos Almeida of San Leandro, Calif. Mr. Almeida came to this country in 1959 from San Miguel, Azores, where he was born. In the short time he has been here, he has made some remarkable contributions to the well being of his community and its people.

Because of this, the Junior Chamber of Commerce of San Leandro recently named him as the Outstanding Young Man of that city for 1964.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an account of Mr. Al-

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

meida's activities as contained in the January 22, 1965, edition of the San Leandro Morning News.

The account follows:

OUTSTANDING YOUNG MAN: CARLOS ALMEIDA HONORED IN SAN LEANDRO

Carlos Almeida, a resident of San Leandro since 1959 and a citizen of the United States since 1962 last night was named the Outstanding Young Man of the Year by the San Leandro Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The distinguished service award, presented as a highlight of National Junior Chamber of Commerce week was given to Almeida by last year's winner, Father Joe Ferreira, at the annual Jaycee award banquet.

Both the 1964 and 1963 winners are natives of the Azores Islands, who came to San Leandro and made a lasting impression and contribution to the community.

Special commendations were given to Ed Chovanes as "Boss of the Year" and to John K. Chapel and Zella Simonet in recognition of their contributions to Jaycee programs.

Almeida is secretary-treasurer of the UPEC, the Portuguese Union of the State of California, which has its headquarters on East 14th Street in San Leandro. He has held that position for the last 6 years.

He was born in San Miguel, Azores, on February 15, 1933, and came to San Leandro early in 1959, becoming an American citizen 3 years later in what Almeida describes as "one of the proudest moments of my life."

Married 7 years ago to Maria Fernanda Almeida at Riverbank, Calif., he is the father of two daughters, Patty, 5, and Debbie, 4.

Almeida has been active in various civic projects in the city of San Leandro and played a key role in bringing the monument of the Portuguese immigrant to Root Park. Almeida worked 3 years to make the dream of a statue become a reality.

In March of 1962, Almeida coordinated the Carpet of Friendship clothing drive which aided earthquake victims in Sao Jorge, Azores.

This clothing drive was sponsored by the League of Portuguese Fraternal Societies in conjunction with the U.S. Air Force. Over 70 tons of clothing was sent from California with Almeida coordinating the entire operation.

He has served as secretary of the League of Portuguese Fraternal Societies of California, a group representing all Portuguese fraternal groups in the area.

In April 1964, he led a group of UPEC members to the Azores and to Portugal. Messages and greetings of good will from citizens and officials of San Leandro were carried to the residents there.

In September 1964, Almeida was invited by President Lyndon B. Johnson to attend a meeting of fraternal society leaders in the White House to determine the role these groups might play in strengthening the United States.

The honoree is currently secretary of the San Leandro-Ribeirao Preto Town Affiliation Committee and does translations for the group. He helped escort Brazilian delegates Antonio Machado Sant Anna and Dr. Valente during a visit to the bay area, including San Leandro, following the Congress of Municipalities meeting in Louisville, a session to which Almeida had been a delegate.

He is now building a library of Portuguese works which are being housed in the library of the new home office of the UPEC. It is planned that the library may be used as a research source for Portuguese speaking people and other scholars.

Chairman of the State auditing committee of Cabrillo Civil Clubs, Inc., a well-known organization dedicated to civic work, Almeida has also found time to be instrumental in establishing a scholarship fund in the UPEC.

Almeida and his family reside at 1884 Lanier Avenue, San Leandro, and are members of St. Felicitas Parish.

Other nominees for the Distinguished Service Award present for the occasion were Dave Davini, Robert Taylor, Roger Grund, and Pete Seymon.

Featured speaker for the evening was Steve Santangelo, State junior chamber president. Dave Tyler served as master of ceremonies, and Clint Lee presided.

Paul H. Rutherford—American as Business and Baseball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to join his many friends and colleagues in paying well-deserved tribute to my constituent, Paul Rutherford, as he retires from his present job on the last day of this month. But knowing Paul Rutherford as well as I do, I am confident that retirement for Paul really means commencement—commencement to start doing some of the many things he has always wanted to do and at last has time to do.

For truly Paul Rutherford has been a busy man all his life. He has earned every step on the long road to the position of one of America's leading industrial managers by dint of hard work, persistence and dedication to duty.

Already as a boy he had to help his mother, who was widowed when he was only 6, in making ends meet. He sold newspapers at a downtown street corner in Pomona, Calif., and had a paper route in the evening besides. While in high school, he struggled through a summer job with a plumbing company, working from 2 in the afternoon till midnight, 7 days a week for $30 a month. All the time Paul was looking ahead. He went on to college, working his way through the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, from which he graduated in 1922 as an electrical engineer.

Four years later he joined General Motors, the company to which he has devoted his working days for nearly 40 years. He started out in GM's Dayton Engineering Laboratories Division. By 1936 he was chief engineer and in 1940 he became plant manager in Dayton. Two years later, in 1942, he was in Detroit on General Motors personnel staff. While there, he handled GM wage dispute cases which went before the War Labor Board and other work on job and wage classifications. After the end of the war, in 1946, he spent about a year as special assistant to the vice president in charge of the Dayton household appliance group. The following year he came to Rochester, where he has been associated with GM's Delco Appliance Division ever since, for a year as assistant general manager and beginning on August 1, 1948, as general manager. He has held this position for 17 years and thus has served as a general manager in the General Motors organization longer than any other GM general manager at the present time. This is a record of which he may be justly proud and for which I join in saluting him.

Perhaps as much as any man, Paul Rutherford brought about home air conditioning as an accepted goal for the American family. He persuaded builders and developers throughout our Nation that cooling a home was no longer a rich man's luxury.

Most men would be more than content to have just this career to look back upon. But Paul Rutherford has been far more than a successful American businessman. He has a deep social conscience. He has concerned himself with parolees in industry. He has been a leader in the movement to bring about greater acceptance of ex-convicts as workers in American factories. As he has said:

> At Delco we have hired a goodly number of parolees. Most of them have done a good job for us. * * * When a man has paid his debt he deserves an opportunity to show that he really is rehabilitated.

He has worked for the victims of multiple sclerosis.

He is vitally concerned with sound community growth and development.

He has a keen interest in the education of young Americans.

Perhaps most of all he has been a lifelong fan of that most American of all sports—baseball. At one time his interest in this and other sports was so strong that he wanted to become a sportswriter. He has a knowledge of big league baseball as few if any do who are not players on the diamond. He has never lost his devotion to the game. I trust that now he will be able to really enjoy the sport season after season as he has not been able to do fully for many a busy year.

So I congratulate Paul Rutherford on his outstanding service to American industry and to the healthier and more comfortable American home. At the same time, I want to wish him well in the years that lie ahead, years that will continue to be rewarding to a man who has always had a broad sweep of interests and sympathies, a man who is characteristic of the best that is American today.

Our Ship of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. B. Culbertson of Laurens, S.C., has simply and succinctly expressed in verse the present condition of our Ship of State. I would like to share his handiwork with my colleagues and, therefore, beg leave to include his poem at the end of my remarks. The poem follows:

We ponder thy fate, O Ship of State
As the lights go out and the hour is late.
Our souls grow sick as we abide
Our fathers' dreams, now sorely tried,
As vagabonds thrive throughout thy realm
And avarice bungles at thy helm.

—A. B. CULBERTSON.

LAURENS, S.C.

Address of Dr. Max M. Kampelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, at a Seminar for Freshmen Congressmen, Dr. Max M. Kampelman gave advice to the new Members of Congress. Dr. Kampelman, former legislative counsel to our Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY during his distinguished service as U.S. Senator from Minnesota, and a continuing close adviser of the Vice President's, is a brilliant attorney and political scientists. His profound and moving address was extremely helpful to our freshman group, and, I am convinced, will be of wide general interest.

I would like to take this opportunity to insert Dr. Kampelman's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for everyone to read.

The remarks follow:

ADDRESS OF DR. MAX M. KAMPELMAN AS DELIVERED JANUARY 8 TO THE SEMINAR FOR FRESHMAN CONGRESSMEN

Coming to Washington for the first time is an abrupt experience. Adlai Stevenson tells the story of the little girl who said in her prayers: "God bless mother and father, and sisters and brothers and now this is goodbye, God. We're moving to Washington."

To a large extent I think it is somewhat presumptuous for somebody who has never been elected to public office to give advice to those of you who have gone through the crucible of campaign fire, which somebody called the Dance of Democracy. I say that because, in my judgment, one of the most important set of values which must guide you in your behavior as Members of Congress should be the recognition that you must survive—and by that I mean that you must always keep your eye on the next election.

Some of you may be fortunate enough to come from geographical areas where you can afford to be more carefree and act like the candidate who, when a heckler said: "I wouldn't vote for you if you were the angel Gabriel," quickly replied: "If I were the angel Gabriel, you wouldn't be in my precinct." For most of you, however, you recognize that modern American politics is today increasingly heavy combat politics, whether it is in the primary or in the general election.

Political survival is, therefore, quite understandably a matter of constant concern to Members of Congress.

The point I desire to make in that connection is not merely to point out the obvious. It is rather to assert that this concern with survival—which many might consider selfish—is, in fact, an essential prerequisite of democratic government. It is a concern that must be recognized as a legitimate one in our society and not one to be lamented as a necessary evil. Our democratic society is not based on a search for philosopher-kings whose only concern is with achieving excellence in public service. Noble and essential as the pursuit of excellence may be, it must be tempered by a concern for survival if we are to avoid the totalitarianism of a philosopher-king society and strengthen our democratic life.

It is this concern with survival which permits the Congress to serve as a decided link between those who are governed and our Government in Washington. Certainly, the tremendous volume of mail and requests that will pour into your offices is a reflection of the vital role that a Member of Congress plays in translating the meaning of government to his constituency and in acting as the point of reference between the citizen and his government.

The pupil's typographical error in a geography class to the effect that Washington, D.C., is bounded on all sides by the United States of America will fast become a harsh reality to you. In all likelihood, you will not reply to the constituent that our Government is one of separation of powers, that the problem he is raising with you refers to the executive branch of the Government and not the legislative branch, and that, therefore, he ought to write to somebody else—that is, you will not write such a letter if you are concerned with survival.

Those who are concerned with democratic government are concerned about the growing disassociation that takes place between people and the government. The extent to which the institutions of the Congress, through its mail and errand boy functions, helps to provide some method of association—to that extent is democratic government strengthened.

There is one other related point that I consider to be relevant here. It refers to survival as it relates to the word "compromise." T. V. Smith once said that "Politics is the art of compromising an issue without comprising yourself." Senator FULBRIGHT stated the same problem in yet another way when he said "To be prematurely right is to court what, to the politician, at least, is a premature retirement."

The give and take of legislative debate is the essence of preserving Congress as an institution. I suppose one of the most profound lessons that I learned after arriving in Washington in 1949 to serve as a staff member of the Senate was the overpowering presence of te color gray within these Halls. There are black and white issues, but they are not as evident as they once were to me. The variations of background, experience, and problems of geography among your colleagues is an impressive fact of life which cannot be ignored.

There are forces on the outside—and I am included among them—who will be urging this or that solution to the many problems of the day that face our country and the Congress. I choose to think that I am probably right about my solutions, but I am fully aware of the fact that it is I who vote. Somebody once said that a reformer is a person who wants his conscience to be your guide. But you must always remember that there are no "maybe" votes in the Congress—no "yes but" or "no and" votes that you will be permitted to cast. This sense of finality and responsibility knowing that you in the end are held accountable for those votes, of necessity injects a distinguishing characteristic which can be experienced by nobody else not in your shoes.

Now, for one final word about the Congress as an institution: I speak to you not only as a lawyer and an observer, but as a political scientist.

I started my talk by referring to those of us who give you free advice. It took 62 double-column pages last summer for the Congressional Quarterly to summarize the criticisms and proposed reforms of Congress. We can tell what is wrong with Congress as an institution, why its rules ought to be modernized, why it is failing as an institution.

I stand here in a dissenting role. I urge you not to feel inferior about this institution of which you are now a part. I know of no parliamentary institution in the history of man which has fulfilled its responsibilities as conscientiously and as seriously as the Congress of the United States. It is fair game to attack the Congress. The 89th Congress will soon be under heavy attack before it is very old, despite the remarkable performance of the 88th Congress.

In one sense this is so because you are politically a representative body. Unlike the President and members of the Supreme Court, you do not walk separated from your fellow man by the Secret Service or by black robes. You are a part of ordinary man—people just like us with our strengths and our weaknesses. You are fair game for attack.

Congress is also attacked, however because of some strange drive within our society toward easy solutions which takes the form of a drive for greater centralized power in the hands of the President—a drive which unfortunately in recent years has been as much a characteristic of my fellow liberals as it has traditionally been considered an illiberal doctrine. Certainly the Congress debates, considers, and may even have the temerity to alter legislative proposals submitted by the President. This is as it should be. I remind you that the Congress, almost alone among the world's legislatures, has withstood the absolutism of the Executive and has remained the coordinate branch which our democratic philosophy means it to be.

Yours is a great privilege. Be proud of your role and your Congress. May you fulfill your trust with dignity and honor.

Thank you.

Sir Winston Churchill

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, Sir Winston Churchill is dead. And it is right and proper for all who love freedom and admire man to do him honor.

But is must be done in the correct way. It is not enough merely to recite lists of deeds done, or name battles won, or chant a string of adjectives with his name. Nor should it be maudlin or idolatrous.

He would not have liked it.

More important, it would have missed the point. For Churchill was a man, and a very human one. He made mistakes, sometimes enormous. He was hard to get along with, and sometimes pettish. He was always stubborn, and he could be tyrannical.

But it was precisely that humanity—set in a grand scale and raised to a high power—that made him what he was: One of the giants of our times. Churchill the man was bigger than lifesize, and it was partly through this that he led men as he did. But he led men from a position

in their midst, rather than trying to lead from above. He went out into the streets during the agony of London, to be with his people. As a man, then, we must see him and do praise to his measure.

Merely to have lived in the same century with Sir Winston was an honor and an inspiration and, unquestionably, fun. For Churchill had that lashing sense of humor and quick flash of wit which importantly complemented his iron will and fierce resolve. He was big enough and strong enough to direct it against himself, as well as others.

His wit, coupled with his impatience, helped him lead. "Pray submit to me, by 4 p.m. today, on one-half sheet of paper, the preparations undertaken by His Majesty's Navy to pursue the coming war," he supposedly wrote the First Sea Lord after becoming the First Lord of the Admiralty.

He led with words, written sometimes but more effectively spoken. To an extraordinary degree, his language had always expressed his unusual character. It came, in time, to express not only what Great Britain must be, but what the Western World must do. It was good, tough language and it had a majesty that made the important things seem vitally alive and immediate. He could never say, as had his predecessor, Neville Chamberlain, that England would not fight "for a small, faraway country, between people of whom we know nothing."

Instead, Churchill rallied his people and the world to the struggle at hand and to the problems to come. He did so by combining to a degree unmatched since President Lincoln, the qualities of a great man and a towering writer in a setting of dark peril. The result was the true criterion of leadership; he made people feel directly, personally, and passionately involved in the great events of their time. Not only people in Great Britain, but also in France, America, and around the world.

Winston Churchill did this himself, through the force of his personality and the power of his words. The setting did not make the man, though it called him forth. Once emerged, he changed it entirely. His life was one of the rarest of all historical events; in living, he did not make a difference. He made the difference.

His death was right and proper. It was expected and dignified, quiet and fitting, after such a life. His going leaves us all the poorer, as his living left us all the richer.

Winston Churchill will always be with us, for in large measure he molded our world. He will particularly be in our hearts during moments of crisis and fear, his words and his example giving fiery thrust to our hopes:

In war, resolution.
In defeat, defiance.
In victory, magnanimity.
In peace, good will.

Testimony on H.R. 2362

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the very able superintendent of schools of my home city of Pittsburgh, Dr. S. P. Marland, Jr., testified on Thursday, January 27, before the General Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, now under study by that subcommittee. I commend to Members of the House Dr. Marland's excellent summary of the educational and economic needs of education in a large city. His testimony follows:

TESTIMONY ON H.R. 2362 TO THE HONORABLE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

My name is S. P. Marland, Jr., superintendent of schools, Pittsburgh. I have been asked to present testimony in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. My assignment is to comprehend briefly the several titles of the act, in general, and to give brief, specific attention to title II, libraries and instructional materials.

As a superintendent of schools in a large city I can report, with a fair knowledge of the facts, that a very grave problem exists in the financing of urban education. A phenomenon of social and economic shift has evolved over the past few years which critically threatens the education of children in the cities, especially the children of poverty.

The cities, historically, have been the centers of wealth, as wealth is normally measured in property value. Industry, commerce, and valuable residential properties have served as a strong and stable tax base for the support of good schools, and for the attraction of favored, high taxpaying families in fair share to urban schools. This condition is no longer true. The attractions of suburban locations for industry, shopping centers, homes, have measurably sapped the cities' economic strength. We must restore the balance of families and encourage the retention of those now present in the cities. As a measure of this condition, the Pittsburgh schools were, not long ago, favored by a solid tax base, a balanced distribution of families by socioeconomic character, and a reasonable budget for the support of good school services. These conditions no longer prevail. We will in 1966 be critically in arrears financially, in spite of local taxes that range from 10 to 25 percent higher than our surrounding areas. In other words, the effort of the city remains high, but the income is insufficient to meet the needs. Increased local tax action will inevitably compound the problem, as more enterprises and more homeowners relocate outside the city limits. This condition feeds unhappily upon itself as those who choose to remain are pressed to pay more to survive, and as they look about them at an ever-increasing proportion of the poor and deprived who have no choice but to stay. Whatever improved support for Pittsburgh may derive from this bill, it is clear that continued high effort and sacrifice in local taxation will be needed to meet the costs of education for those not eligible under the poverty implications of the program.

As an illustration of a big city scale of need, we in Pittsburgh must increase our income by 10 percent ($4 million) in 1966, 20 percent by 1967, and 30 percent by 1968 merely to preserve present standards, and meet the demands of growth and plant. Realistic and justifiable improvements in our program would double those percentages.

Fresh and objective evidence has been published in the past month to give further urgency to these facts. The Fels Institute of local and State government of the University of Pennsylvania has produced a timely study of the crisis in urban education in Pennsylvania. The evidence compiled in this study is very likely pertinent to all large cities. In our case Philadelphia and Pittsburgh were the chief objects of inquiry. The study documents two facts:

(a) The children of impacted poverty in the cities are unable to learn as effectively as poor children in rural or suburban areas. Low academic achievement is a direct product of urban poverty, calling for larger investment in compensatory education.

(b) Cities are able to allocate only 30 percent of local revenues to education, while nonurban areas are able to allocate 50 to 70 percent of local revenues to education. This condition has been described as municipal overburden.

A brief abstract of the Fels study has been appended, and is offered to the Members of Congress for review as a document, not only descriptive of Pennsylvania, but probably pertinent to large cities throughout the Nation.

The total impact of H.R. 2362 is immediately and acutely applicable to urban education. The intent of title I would be translated in Pittsburgh into several critical needs:

Expansion of preprimary education for 3- and 4-year-old children beyond the start being made under the Economic Opportunity Act; the provision of massive reduction in ratio of pupils to teachers through ungraded and highly individualized instructional organization; the provision of critically needed counseling and guidance services in elementary and middle schools for the deprived neighborhoods; the provision of mental health services, including more social workers for the children and families of poverty. The provision of highly specialized centers for the correction of reading deficiencies, deployed in convenient areas throughout the city, but aimed specifically at the removal of the illiterate or the semi-illiterate from our society. Beyond the operating programs implied above, the resources of the bill would permit our board of education to replace long obsolete buildings in the heart of our poverty-ridden neighborhoods. By the nature of poverty, its people live in the oldest and most decayed parts of the city. The schools in these neighborhoods are no exceptions in the ugliness, bleakness, and barrenness of decay. Fifty percent of our buildings are over 50 years old, many 60 or 80 years old. The majority are located in our deprived neighborhoods. Our board of education deplores this bitter fact, but is absolutely unable to meet the costs of any new building construction under present arrangements of local and State revenue. Probably the most immediately productive and uplifting effect of the proposed Federal investment in poverty would be the creation of attractive and well-equipped buildings as places of beauty, optimism and aspiration for children who know little but ugliness and despair in their present lives. The opportunity for new and dramatic school buildings would include small structures deployed throughout the neigh-

borhood to accommodate the preprimary program, for 3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds. These buildings would serve not only the little ones, but the parents and the community as oases of new hope. These would be centers for health instruction to parents, channels for the work of public and private social agencies, and places for articulation of other governmental services to share with the schools the early interruption of the cycle of despair.

Titles III, IV, and V of the bill are warmly supported as pertinent not only to the poor, but to the education of all urban children. It is essential that educational innovation and change be validated and promptly disseminated. These titles all support a long overdue evolution in teaching and learning. In total, the opportunities implied in this bill suggest a need for about $5 million a year for our city. This is about 12 percent of our budget, as we continue to carry the costs of the mainstream in local resources.

Finally, as to title II, Libraries and Instructional Materials: There is probably no single investment in public education that promises such efficient and effective productivity as a massive increase in school libraries, librarians, and coordinated instructional materials at all levels, kindergarten through grade 12 or 14. Yet there is probably no element of public education that is more neglected, more underestimated as to its worth, and more susceptible to budgetary slashes than the school library. Earmarked funds for this purpose would constructively motivate local boards of education to correct the present scandalous condition, in which we find less than one-third of the Nation's elementary schools with any libraries at all, and less than 20 precent staffed with qualified librarians. The libraries of elementary and secondary schools should be centers not only for books, in greatly increased quantity both as to titles and multiple copies; they should be centers for instructional materials and equipment of all sorts. They should be places for the slow to have access to the individualized instructional tools for recovery. They should be places for the able and ambitious to find their way to move swiftly ahead, with good counsel. And they should, of course, serve all the children in between.

The library is the place where all man's knowledge is stored. It is there for the asking. In the spirit of individual self-teaching and independent inquiry which must characterize our evolving educational design, the library, well stocked and well staffed, is essential.

All of the implications of H.R. 2362 have direct or indirect relevance to the relationships between the public schools and the nonpublic schools, especially the church-related schools of the city. We have, in Pittsburgh, enjoyed many years of constructive partnership between the parochial schools of the Catholic Church, and the public schools, especially in what is now called shared time. Many thousands of parochial school children have received certain types of instruction in the public schools of Pittsburgh since 1911.

We see in this bill opportunities for extending this partnership, especially in the neighborhoods of deprivation, to accommodate all children, including those customarily enrolled in parochial schools. The relevant aspects of the bill suggest shared resources under which the public schools would welcome parochial school children in the following facilities: the preprimary program for the very impoverished; the centers for massive reading improvement; the joint use of libraries; the joint participation in the processes and products of research and innovation; the new dimensions of occupational, vocational and technical education. These categories of universal need appear to be consistent and compatible with the spirit of the bill.

Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Power Commission has concluded hearings on the application of the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York to build a power plant on the Hudson River at Storm King Mountain. Indications are that the proceedings will not be reopened despite the protests of many associations and individuals who fear the destruction of scenic values and the destruction of spawning grounds of striped bass and other fish, major assets of Long Island and adjoining seacoast areas.

President Johnson has asked the Congress to protect natural resources and to conserve the beauty of our Nation. The area in question is one of the most majestic and beautiful rivers in our country and its preservation is directed related to many needs of surrounding counties.

The following excerpts from the petition of the Hempstead Town Land Resources Council, by its chairman, Mr. Rod Vandivert, before the Federal Power Commission sets forth the possible threat to Long Island's economy and recreational fishing from the proposed electric power plant.

The Hempstead Town Land Resources Council is an organization of fishermen, conservationists, sportsmen, and civic and business leaders to protect and perpetuate the natural and recreational resources of western Long Island.

I believe that the Hempstead Council's position reflects the concern of Long Island residents with the proposed hydroelectric plant and explains why a majority of the residents support legislation designed to meet the "conservation challenge" and to protect our natural resources without obstructing effective land development.

The excerpts follow:

At the instruction of its membership, the Hempstead Town Lands Resources Council is now concerned specifically with the proposed Consolidated Edison pumped storage hydroelectric plant at Storm King Mountain (project 2338) and the effect that this plant would have on the total ecology of the Hudson River, with particular emphasis on the Hudson River striped bass.

It is particularly important to this organization that no testimony has been heard regarding the effects of this plant on salinity, temperature change and siltation. Each of these factors is vitally important to the existence of eggs, fry and juvenile fish and to the food that they need for sustenance. This represents an extremely delicate natural balance which must not be upset. The cycle of marine life is a form of an ecological chain in which organisms and microorganisms are interdependent one upon the other and as a whole are totally dependent upon the stability of their environment. This balance is so delicate that even without the intrusion of a massive manmade change, the natural changes resulting from this year's drought have already effected significant alteration in river ecology and resulted in some changes in the species and numbers of fish found at various upriver locations.

We submit that there has been no evidence of valid research to determine changes in salinity, temperature, and other vital factors that would result when billions of gallons of water are drawn into the Cornwall Upper Reservoir and returned to the river with force at different tidal stages. Changes effected by the introduction of water, the salinity, and other vital factors which are radically different and the turbulence caused by rapid interchange of this water could certainly change significantly and perhaps remove entirely an environmental factors required by fish as a necessary condition of life at one stage or another.

Of further concern to the Hempstead Town Lands Resources Council is the lack of testimony regarding temperature change potential in the removal of water at one temperature, the storage of that water at a different altitude, and ultimately the return of the water to the river. It is highly probable that a temperature change could be sufficient to again totally alter the habits and/or habitat of types of life necessary to maintain proper ecological balance.

A third major factor which concerns marine life was, again, not in evidence. The movement of, and turbulence created by, billions of gallons of water must necessarily cause a degree of siltation. Research is necessary to determine whether siltation produced would be sufficient to follow tidal patterns and render sterile a productive portion of the river bottom. It has been found in silt research on Long Island and other places that in any massive movement of water, the fine silt settling out of a current or tidal pattern can, and has, completely killed vegetation, shellfish life, and other forms of marine life in any area of concentration.

This organization is further concerned over the inadequacy of testimony as respects striper protection and the spawning habits of stripers. There are at least two authoritative papers, one "Migratory Pattern and Racial Structure of Atlantic Coast Striped Bass" from Transacrions of the 19th North American Wildlife Conference, March 8-10, 1954, by Edward Raney and associates, and "Aspects of the Early Life History of the Striped Bass (*Roccus saxatilis*) in the Hudson River" from the New York State Fish and Game Service, January 1957, by Messrs. Warren F. Rathjen and Lewis C. Miller, marine biologists of the New York State Conservation Department, which supersede the evidence presented to the Commission to date by Dr. Alfred Perlmutter, whom we understand and believe to be the only witness before the FPC to date dealing with the impact of Project 2338 on fisheries and fish life.

In summation, the Hempstead Town Lands Resources Council submits that the evidence and testimony now before the Federal Power Commission does not include some of the most basic and vital factors in the evaluation of marine environment. We further submit that destruction, miscalculation, or poor judgment in any one of these areas would constitute a permanent and irreparable loss to commercial fisheries and sports fisheries in the Hudson River, on Long Island and other areas affected by the migration of the Hudson River striper bass.

Kathryn Cooley Stubblefield Olsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, in my congressional district a dedicated

public servant, Mrs. Kathryn Cooley Stubblefield Olsen, was honored for her long years of unselfish assistance to the handicapped people of Alameda, Calif.

The honor given Mrs. Olsen was directed by her former students. Mrs. Olsen devoted the period from 1928 to 1945 to teaching children who were handicapped and not able to fit into the regular curriculum of the public schools of Alameda. In doing this work, Mrs. Olsen was actually a pioneer because in 1927 the idea of having classes especially directed to handicapped children was very new and unheard of in many school districts.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report on the reunion luncheon sponsored by the students as a tribute to this great lady:

REUNION LUNCHEON FOR KATHRYN COOLEY STUBBLEFIELD OLSEN, ALAMEDA, CALIF., NOVEMBER 14, 1964

PROGRAM

Radio announcement by station KABL: "A measure of greatness in San Francisco and the Bay Area can best be seen in the outstanding citizens of its business, industrial and science worlds. One such person is honored each day as KABL's Citizen of the Day.

"Today's nominee, Mrs. Kathryn Cooley Stubblefield Olsen, is honored today by the Handicapped Association for her years of unselfish work with the handicapped."

Opening remarks of welcome by Talmadge Rice, former member of the class and master of ceremonies.

Introduction of head table: Former Mayor and Mrs. Wm. F. Murray, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Olsen (son of Mrs. Olsen), Marie Rynberg Courneen, class member and her husband, Ford Courneen, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Olsen, brother-in-law of honoree, and Mr. and Mrs. Talmadge Rice.

Luncheon served.

Introduction of each person attending by standing and identifying themselves and brief account of association with Mrs. Olsen. Other than class members, some of those attending included: Mrs. Irene Paden, wife of former Superintendent of Schools Wm. G. Paden, director of education, Dr. Marvin Hockabout and Mrs. Hockabout, Dr. Alice Burke, former school board member, Mrs. Ray Shafer, Mrs. Margit McLean, Mrs. Vivian Lyndell, formerly with bureau of special education, Sacramento, Miss Helen Norton, Mrs. Vena Shaw, Mrs. Orval Healy, Mrs. Eric Crone, Mrs. George Millerick, Miss Edith Mobley, Miss Musa Snyder, Mrs. Wyman, former Mayor and Mrs. Ray Kranelly, Mrs. Hendrickson, and Mrs. Thayer Hall, Business and Professional Women's Club.

Vocal and accordion selections by Val Ballarini.

Talmadge Rice called upon Marie Rynberg Courneen to introduce committee members: Talmadge Rice, master of ceremonies; Betty Curtis and Mrs. Betty Burgess, memory book; Miss Pat Kranelly and Mrs. Betty Ballarini, decorating committee; Mrs. Josephine Bixler, gift committee; Leonel Jones, treasurer; Bob Christy and all committee members, telephone and tracing committee; Marie Courneen, secretary.

Presentation of memory book.

Letters of congratulations read:

From Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER.

From former radio personality Rod Hendrickson, New York: "Will be unable to attend due to ill health, however feel honored to be invited to pay tribute to well remembered Mrs. Olsen and shall never forget the wonderful work this fine person did."

From Dr. Donald D. Lum, former school board president expressing regret at absence and congratulations for years of service and devotion.

Former Mayor Wm. F. Murray called upon to say a few words—excerpt:

"Dr. Paden got together with Mrs. Olsen in approximately 1927 and together they visited Oakland and the various places to get an idea of their programs in teaching the handicapped and between them they set up the classes as Mrs. Olsen taught them so successfully. Today everyone sees the results of this marvelous work which was initiated at the time and I would like to certainly commend you, Mrs. Olsen, for the very fine work you did and it was indeed an honor to be here."

Remarks of congratulations given by: Mrs. Vena Shaw; Mrs. Irene Paden; Dr. Alice Burke; Mrs. Thayer Hall; Dr. Marvin Hockabout, director of education, Alameda; and former Mayor Ray Kranelly.

Thanks given to Dr. Hockabout for his great help in assisting in going through the old school records to locate as many former students as possible.

Presentation of gift, a plaque, inscribed: "In appreciation, Mrs. Kathryn Cooley Olsen, from your former students whom you devotedly taught, 1928–1945. Presented at class reunion, November 14, 1964.

Talmadge Rice: "This is for you to put in your home to express to you our gratitude and appreciation for what you have done for all of us and I think you will find we have all turned out all right so far. A few words from you now, Mrs. Olsen—"

Mrs. Olsen: "Thank you very much, Talmade, and it is lovely and made to fit in my home and the book is beautiful too. To all the committee, if I were to tell you all how grateful I am you wouldn't believe I was sincere. It has just meant everything for me to be here and see all of you again and I am so appreciative of all the planning and work you have done. Thank you again, all of you."

Social hour followed.

West Virginia Loses Outstanding Citizen

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, last week saw the passing of a very prominent and dedicated public official, the Honorable Everett F. Moore, of Moundsville, W. Va. As former majority elader of the West Virginia House of Delegates, the late Mr. Moore served as chairman of the judiciary committee of the house and held a position of leadership for 20 years in serving the State of West Virginia. Among the members of his family mourning his death is our colleague, ARCH A. MOORE, JR., Representative of the First District of West Virginia. I know I speak for many Members of the House of Representatives in extending condolences to his family. Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of including in this extension notice of his obituary which appeared in the Wheeling Intelligencer on Monday, January 25.

EVERETT F. MOORE DIES IN GLEN DALE

Everett F. Moore, prominent Moundsville attorney and former majority leader of the West Virginia House of Delegates, died at 2:30 p.m. yesterday in the Reynolds Memorial Hospital.

Born April 29, 1885, at Beelers Station in Marshall County, he was graduated from Moundsville High School in 1903 and from the West Virginia University Law School in 1905.

The deceased entered the practice of law in Wheeling and opened his Moundsville law office in 1910.

During his legislative career he served as majority leader, chairman of the house judiciary committee, and as minority leader during 20 years of service in the house of delegates.

He often had served as special judge in the circuit court of Marshall Couty and had been a member of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States since 1912.

Surviving are two brothers, Arch A. Moore, Sr., of Moundsville, and Harry W. Moore, of Sylacauga, Ala.; two sisters, Mrs. Rose Derrow and Mrs. Harry Bryson, both of Moundsville; and a number of nieces and nephews, including Congressman ARCH A. MOORE, JR., of Glen Dale.

World Calendar Reform—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in the January 26 issue of the RECORD, I inserted an article by the Rev. Evarist Kleszcz, O.F.M. Conv., on world calendar reform. Father Kleszcz, of Our Lady of Fatima Friary, Kenosha, Wis., explored some problems in simplifying our present multiple calendar systems.

Today I would like to insert another article by Father Kleszcz in which he explains his equitable calendar plan, developed after 8 years of almost full-time study and research. He hopes to see it gain world acceptance because he believes that it holds the greatest possibility of being a calendar that is one of peace, reconciliation, and unity for everyone.

Once again I urge the attention of my colleagues to this contemporary solution to an age-old problem.

The article follows:

THE EQUITABLE CALENDAR PLAN

(By Father Evarist Kleszcz, O.F.M. Conv.)

(The answer to the call to simplify our calendar equitably, accurately and conveniently. This plan was prepared with special care to fit the common calendar needs of all people and nations.)

We respectfully present the equitable calendar plan to you for your thoughtful consideration and approval.

The equitable calendar plan is a practical and realistic response to a widespread desire and need to simplify our calendar.

Any modification of our calendar will in some way touch upon the habits, customs and practices of a large part of the world's population. For this reason, very radical changes in our calendar are inconceivable. Nevertheless, a few minor changes in our otherwise good calendar can and should be made.

The equitable calendar plan was not prepared with haste, but only after prolonged study and research concerning the nature and history of our modern calendar reform problem. With reliance above all upon divine providence, we have tried to construct a plan, which in our judgment would fit best the common and universal calendar needs

and convenience of all people and nations, under existing modern conditions, without creating conflict or confusion with any of the various specialized particular calendars which are still being widely used among the people of the world.

We believe that the equitable calendar will fit the common calendar needs and convenience of all people, simply because it keeps and preserves substantially intact the four most universally and most commonly used and firmly established calendarial forms, i.e., the calendar day, the 7-day week, the month of about 30 days and the 12-month year. It fits because it keeps and preserves the cornerstones of our common calendar, with a minimum of change and disturbance in established custom.

We believe that the equitable calendar will fit best because it perfects these customary established forms in the best possible manner.

National and international efforts of this century to make radical changes in one or another of these four calendarial forms have ended in failure. Thus, for example, national and international efforts to institute a 5-day week, and a 13-month year have failed to gain sufficient support.

We hope that the equitable calendar plan will be given careful consideration and that its simplicity and stability will help to bring about greater calendarial unity and better understanding among the people of the world.

WHY IS THE CALENDAR CALLED EQUITABLE?

The calendar is called equitable because it is designed to help promote this most important social virtue: Justice tempered with merciful love, that is equity.

It is called equitable, because it is designed to help provide, in a spirit of fairness and of brotherly undertanding and love, for the calendar needs and convenience of all people and nations, of every social, economic, cultural and religious group, and not merely for the restricted benefit of one or a few groups.

It is called equitable, because it was prepared with great care to provide an accurate and an equitable division of time, in a manner which would be helpful to all, without creating, conflict, confusion or injury to anyone.

It is called equitable, because it respects and preserves substantially intact the basic customary calendarial forms, the calendar day, the 7-day week, the month of about 30 days and the 12-month year, which are most solidly established and most universally used (however diversely in widely diverse calendars) among the countless millions of people of various cultures, without disturbing their customs and practices which are intimately connected with their calendar, but rather by seeking to perfect these forms for the common and universal benefit.

It is called equitable, because it permits other important calendars of the world to be used side by side therewith without conflict or confusion, while it seeks to accomplish unity in the universal use of one common simple and perpetual calendar, amid a diversity of specialized calendars for auxiliary use.

It is called equitable, because it would make secure the regularity and sanctity of days of worship, by retaining and safeguarding the 7-day week with Sunday, without introducing any days outside the week, so that the regular succession of weeks is left intact.

WHAT CHANGES IN THE GREGORIAN CALENDAR ARE NEEDED TO TRANSFORM IT INTO THE EQUITABLE CALENDAR?

The equitable calendar is substantially the same as the Gregorian calendar. But its defects are removed.

The four fundamental units of time, that is, the calendar day, the 7-day week, the month of about 30 days and the 12-month year of the Gregorian calendar are kept and preserved substantially intact in the new calendar. The fact that these four time units of time are used most universally in other important calendars of the world, although diversely of course in the widely diverse calendars, is a most important reason for preserving these four time units.

Our present calendar can be simplified, fixed and perpetual and transformed into the equitable calendar simply and solely by removing the two generally recognized defects of the Gregorian calendar, namely the nonfixity of our calendar, and the illogical inequality of month lengths.

The two well-known defects of our calendar may be removed:

(a) By stabilizing our calendar in the simplest and most convenient way; i.e., by simply making each calendar year a year of complete weeks—52 weeks in ordinary years and 53 weeks in leap years; by stabilizing our calendar in this manner, our calendar becomes at once well adapted for fixing the date of Easter Sunday on one unchanging date; and

(b) By making the number of days in each month as nearly equal in length as it is practically possible, in accord with the demands of science and convention.

The foregoing two easy changes in our present calendar would greatly and conveniently transform our entire calendar into a simplified, fixed and perpetual—equitable calendar.

The benefits to be derived from such a simplification and stabilization would far exceed any momentary inconvenience which might result from the actual changeover of calendars.

THE EQUITABLE CALENDAR MAKES OUR CALENDAR PERPETUAL IN THE BEST WAY

Because our present calendar changes every year, simply because the year has an uneven number of weeks, i.e., 52 weeks plus 1 or 2 days, and the fractional part of the week is the cause of the nonfixity of the calendar, the equitable calendar plan makes our calendar fixed and perpetual simply by making it a calendar of integral weeks, 52 weeks in each ordinary year and 53 weeks in each leap year.

But because the mean solar year has 365 days 5 hours 48 minutes and 46 seconds, while the equitable calendar year would have 364 days, the difference of almost 1¼ days would cause the date of the March equinox to advance each year on the calendar by 1¼ days. So in order to prevent the date of the equinox from advancing too far into the month of March or even April on the calendar, an extra week would be added to the calendar every 5 or 6 years at the proper time.

The leap year rule of the equitable calendar will thus keep the date of the equinox on the calendar always within the week between March 18 and March 24. The mean or central date of all March equinoxes according to the equitable calendar would therefore be March 21.

Only a calendar of integral weeks, containing 52 weeks in every common year and 53 weeks in every leap year, can fix the calendar acceptably in such a way that the regular sequence of weekdays would always be maintained without interruption. It is clear, that this practically unavoidable variation of 1 week between one year and another in a calendar of integral weeks must necessarily also produce a variation of at least 1 week in the equinox dates on the calendar in the course of years.

It is true that the "blank day" (or "supplementary day") method of fixing the calendar would produce a smaller variation than a week in the equinox dates, but because the "blank day" interrupts the regular sequence of weeks once in every ordinary year and twice in every leap year, it would inevitably create serious conflict and confusion in society, and would therefore be unacceptable.

The leap-week method remains the only other practically possible method of stabilizing our calendar, while it preserves the solar and seasonal character of our calendar with sufficient practical accuracy.

The equitable calendar plan with its leap-year rule will never permit the date of the equinox to occur sooner than March 18 nor later than March 24. It is mathematically impossible to obtain any calendar formula for a calendar of integral weeks which would keep the date of the March equinox within a narrower range than this 1 week. The equitable calendar formula is mathematically perfect.

Should anyone object to the equitable calendar because of the difference of 1 week between 1 calendar year and another (52- and 53-week year), let us remind him that there are many commercial organizations in the United States which use a fiscal year of 52 and 53 weeks. For example, the Eastman Kodak Co., has used a fiscal year of 52 and 53 weeks since January 1, 1928. Numerous chain food stores, with an aggregate of thousands of branches all over the country have been using the 52- and 53-week year for many years. Moreover, the U.S. Government in its income tax code officially permits the use of a 52- and 53-week fiscal year in the filing of income tax reports by citizens. The Catholic Church has used the 52- and 53-week year in its liturgical calendar for over 1,000 years.

There is no better way of making our calendar perpetual than the equitable calendar way.

THE EQUITABLE CALENDAR IS MOST SUITABLE FOR THE STABILIZATION OF CIVIL HOLIDAYS, AND RELIGIOUS HOLY DAYS AND ESPECIALLY FOR THE FIXING OF EASTER SUNDAY ON ONE UNCHANGING DATE

Because the equitable calendar is fixed and perpetual, so that January 1 would always fall on Sunday, and the end of the year always on Sunday, the same dates of one year would always fall on the same day of the week in every year. For example, Independence Day, July 4 would always fall on Wednesday; Christmas, December 25, would always occur on Monday.

The equitable calendar would be excellent for the stabilization of Easter Sunday by religious authorities on one unchanging date. The average date of the March equinox being March 21 according to the equitable calendar, the average date of Easter Sunday would be April 9 u.t.[1] Sunday, April 9, is most commonly accepted as the most probable date of the Resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Because April 9 would always fall on Sunday according to the equitable calendar, the equitable calendar would be most convenient for the establishment of a fixed date.

THE LEAP YEAR RULE OF THE EQUITABLE CALENDAR

The following is the leap year rule of the equitable calendar: "Add a leap week to the calendar year whenever the addition is necessary to keep the date of the March equinox always within the week from March 18 to March 24 at the Greenwich meridian."

This rule would provide a leap year once every 5 or 6 years. An extra week would be added to the calendar at the end of December whenever the addition would be needed to prevent the date of the March equinox from appearing on the calendar sooner than March 18 or later than March 24, u.t.

The mean or central date of all March equinoxes according to the calendar would

[1] U.t.—universal time—time used at the Greenwich meridian.

therefore be March 21, and at noon, at the Greenwich meridian.

It is mathematically impossible to obtain a narrower range of equinox dates than 1 week on any fixed and perpetual calendar of integral weeks.

The most accurate and practical way of assigning leap years would be for authorized Government astronomers to calculate for a century or two in advance, which of the years should be leap years and which common years. Leap years so predetermined could then be publicized by governments.

In order to ascertain leap years in advance, however, astronomers would first need to precalculate the estimated time of the March equinox for each year for a century or two in advance. After this more difficult task, it would then be an easy arithmetical matter to predetermine leap years in such a way that the date of the March equinox would always remain within the week between March 18 and March 24.

How conveniently and how efficiently the leap year rule of the equitable calendar would operate in practice has been tested and demonstrated by and through the courtesy of the Computer Division of the Ford Motor Co. on IBM computers for a projected period of 35,000 years ahead. The results of this electronic computer test are printed in a massive volume of 604 pages. Tabular data contained in this volume provides visual proof that the leap year rule of the equitable calendar would keep the date of the March equinox on the calendar between March 18 and March 24 permanently by means of a precalculated addition of an extra week approximately every 5 or 6 years.

The equitable calendar plan would remain valid without change even far beyond this period of 35,000 years. The equitable calendar plan is versatile enough to last for even a million years.

These calculations indicate that the following years would be leap years, according to the equitable calendar plan, during the remainder of this century: 1970, 1976, 1982, 1987, 1993, and 1998. These years would contain 53 weeks. All other years of the remainder of the 20th century would be common years of 52 weeks.

The common year of the equitable calendar could be engraved on stone or on steel and remain valid for countless thousands of years in the future, without the need of making any change in it, except that we would need to add a leap week at the end of December at the proper time once every 5 or 6 years.

We respectfully recommend that for the years beyond the year A.D. 2000, Government astronomers predetermine by calculation for a century or two in advance which of the years should be leap years containing 53 weeks each, so as to keep the March equinox within the week between March 18 and March 24.

On September 18, 1962, four professors of Marquette University, after they had made a "careful study of the mathematical and other related aspects of the problem of making the Gregorian calendar fixed and perpetual" presented a signed statement of four pages, in which the following assertion is made: "The leap week method remains as the only practically possible way of converting the Gregorian calendar into a perpetual calendar, while maintaining its seasonal character with sufficient accuracy. To be more specific, the perfected leap week method of the equitable calendar is the simplest, most accurate, most acceptable, and mose permanent way of making the Gregorian calendar fixed and perpetual."

These professors of Marquette University then made the following recommendations:

"We humbly and respectfully recommend that civil and religious authorities examine the problem carefully and, if it meets with their approval make a positive declaration approving the following vital principle of calendar reform:

" 'That, in any effort toward making the Gregorian calendar fixed and perpetual, the regular 7-day sequence of weekdays be perpetually preserved, without any interruption whatsoever at any time of the historic, solidly established and universally observed order of weekdays.'

"It seems prudent, moreover, to encourage and promote a scientific study of the leap week method and for this reason, we make a second recommendation:

" 'That the leap week method in general and the finally perfected leap week method of the equitable calendar in particular, whereby our calendar would be made conveniently and acceptably fixed and perpetual, be submitted to careful scientific study and consideration under the encouragement and direction of both civil and religious authorities.'

"Such a study should expedite a beneficial and lasting improvement of our common calendar, through which we may reasonably expect the ultimate attainment of universal calendarial unity. It would be a simple but firm step forward toward acquiring that urgently needed and greatly important universal brotherly unity in justice and charity among people and nations under the loving fatherhood of God.

"We the following professors of Marquette University have examined the reasonableness of the above recommendations and attest to their mathematical validity."

HARVEY E. HOHL,
Director of Research.
NORMAN J. KAYE,
Ph. D. in Accounting and Control.
MIRIAM E. CONNELLAN,
Ed. D. in Mathematics.
EARL W. SWOKOWSKI,
Ph. D. in Mathematics.

THE EQUITABLE CALENDAR EQUALIZES THE NUMBER OF DAYS IN THE MONTHS AS NEARLY AS POSSIBLE AND IN THE BEST WAY

Each month of the common year of the equitable calendar contains either 30 or 31 days.

In a leap year, however, an extra week is added at the end of December. This extra week is called leap week. The leap week may be considered for record and statistical purposes either as a part of the month of December, in which case December would contain 37 days in a leap year; or the leap week may be considered as a separate time unit independent of the month of December, in which case the month of December would contain 30 days as it does in every year, and the leap week would be added as a separate unit at the end of the calendar year.

In the equitable calendar each of the first 4 months and of the last 4 months has 30 days. But each of the central 4 months, that is, May, June, July, and August, has 31 days.

The 4 months of the middle of the calendar year are longer, because in the astronomic year of the seasons the interval from the March equinox to the September equinox is about 7½ days longer than the interval from the September equinox to the March equinox of the following year. Authoritative astronomers tell us that in the northern hemisphere the combined time of spring and summer is approximately 7½ days longer than the combined time of autumn and winter.

In the March 1945 issue of Popular Astronomy, Dr. Edgar W. Woolard, who later became director of the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac, U.S. Naval Observatory, tells us about this variation in the length of the seasons in his article titled, "The Variation in the Calendar Time of the Equinox," on page 107:

"The interval from the March to the September equinox is approximately 186 days 10 hours,[2] but varies irregularly over a range of nearly half an hour because of perturbations in the motion of the earth; the interval to the following March equinox is shorter, because the earth is in the neighborhood of perihelion over this arc of the orbit and is moving more rapidly."

The calendar year then needs to be in accord with the astronomic year of the seasons as nearly and as conveniently as it can be. By assigning 31 days to May, June, July, and August of the equitable calendar, we would provide for a more orderly, more harmonious and more convenient dating of equinoxes and solstices on the calendar.

In the solar calendars of India, Iran, and Afghanistan those months which approximately correspond to our months of May, June, July, and August are longer. The mathematical and astronomic necessity of making these months longer to make the calendar year keep in step with the year of the seasons has been recognized in these countries for many centuries.

By keeping the 31-day months in the central portion of the equitable calendar year, the following calculated estimate was made of the average dates of equinoxes and solstices: March equinox—March 21; June solstice—June 23; September equinox—September 23; December solstice—December 23.

The equitable calendar plan equalizes the number of days in the months as nearly as possible and in the best way.

CONCLUSION

May that day be not too distant when one simple common calendar will be adopted by all the people of the world and that it will serve as a symbol and constant reminder of the brotherhood of man and the unity of the human family under the loving fatherhood of God.

[2] The interval from the September equinox to the following March equinox would be approximately 178 days 20 hours. The difference between these two periods would be approximately 7½ days.

Born of Change—The Story of Local 23–25, International Ladies Garment Workers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in this day of rapid industrial change it is most important to note the successful adaptation to change by one union, local 23–25 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. The story of local 23–25 is told in the December 1964 Industrial Bulletin issued by the New York State Department of Labor. This article describes the dynamic leadership provided by Shelley Appleton, manager of local 23–25; Jay Mazur, assistant manager; and Jerry Grossman, supervisor of the blouse department.

The article follows:

BORN OF CHANGE: A UNION MEETS THE CHALLENGE POSED BY NEW BUYING HABITS

What does a union do when confronted by change?

It's a vital question for unions in the age of automation, a rapidly changing technology

and highly mobile markets. The wrong answer can mean a loss in membership and prestige; the right answer can mean a renewed vigor for both the union and its industry. In any event, change frequently brings on a kind of truth or consequences crisis for union leadership.

Two key New York City locals of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union recently had to face up to the challenge posed by deep-running changes within the garment industry. One local, Skirtmakers' Local 23, actually was in fairly good health.

Under the management of Shelley Appleton, the local had grown in membership from about 7,000 in 1959 to about 10,000 in 1963. Nonetheless, changes in production and marketing threatened the ability of the local to enforce its contracts effectively and uniformly. Blouse manufacturers were spilling over into the sportswear field, creating jurisdictional difficulties with the ILGWU's Skirt and Sportswear Local 23.

These difficulties, given the tradition of ILGWU solidarity, were not insurmountable. But they were complicated by the declining member of local 25, down to 4,000 in 1963.

Charles Kreindler, manager of local 25, was retiring. The loss of his leadership and the fall off in membership brought into question the ability of the small local to continue its former high level of service to its members. In addition, the skirt and sportswear industries were edging into the blouse industry. All in all, the immediate prospects for the two locals seemed to demand the refilling of the aspirin bottles tucked away in office desks.

To the outsider, merger must seem the obvious answer to the headaches running through the two local unions. But on the inside this solution was neither so obvious nor so easy.

Each local had its own proud past. Local 23, for example, played a crucial role in the establishment of the ILGWU's first health center; local 25 had founded the union's famed resort for union members, Unity House. Both locals had a full complement of elected union officials, business agents and office staff.

Against the all too human failing of empire building must be set loyalties to the brotherhood of the ILGWU and the hard-headed recognition by union activists of the industrial facts of life. To understand the merger of locals 23 and 25 one must understand the changing conditions of the industry as well as the traditions of the ILGWU.

"The union evolves as the industry evolves," says Mr. Appleton, the youthful manager of local 23–25. Along with the garment industry in general, the blouse, skirt and sportswear segments have developed a greater diversity of product. (More and more ILGWU locals are now mixed locals replacing the traditionally highly separate craft locals that formerly dominated the union.) Actually, this development may be much further along in sportswear than in any other branch of the ladies' garment industry. With the suburban explosion and its more relaxed form of dressing, sportswear really came into its own after World War II.

Originally sportswear did not include skirts and blouses but today it is difficult to separate the three. As one manufacturer points out: "When a woman goes into a department store to buy a skirt or a blouse, she'll find it in the sportswear department." Following the item back to the point of manufacture, one finds blousemakers manufacturing slacks, skirts, and sportswear and vice versa.

"The consumers forced the change," explains Mr. Appleton. "They wanted to buy everything in one place instead of traveling from showroom to showroom to buy item by item."

Manufacturers were quick to see the advantages of becoming multiproduct firms. Machines idled by a drop in one line can be kept busy on another.

But even more important is the competitive spirit in the industry. A rapidly expanding firm is scarcely content with achieving mere success. To do well in one line is to remain static. One firm, for example, started out making ski pants and did very well indeed. But the owner wasn't entirely satisfied so he went into ski jackets. Today, he makes nearly everything in the sportswear line.

"You've got to keep working to catch the market," says one oldtime manufacturer.

One result was the melding of the skirt and sportswear industries and the encroachments of blousemaking. "We still have a separate blouse industry," notes Mr. Appleton, "but the pressures are there, too."

The same pressures were behind the union.

"With the two industries growing together," Mr. Appleton explains, "the union felt that it would make good sense to merge local 23 and local 25. Changes in the industry, in effect, wiped out the two locals and our members have been producing much the same kind of garments.

"Under these circumstances," Mr. Appleton adds, "it wouldn't make sense to continue the two locals as separate organizations. Uniting them will enable the union to do a better and more consistent job of organizing and contract enforcement."

The sensibility of the proposition carried the day for merger with the members of the two locals. And, a year ago, the two became one. Local 23–25, though hyphenated, is today the third largest ILGWU affiliate in New York City with 15,000 members.

Although the merger went smoothly enough, it was not without its difficulties. A certain awareness in structure still exists a year later. The dues, for example, are not as yet uniform; the so-called lesser crafts in skirts and sportswear pay $4 a month dues, and operators, $4.50, while blouse workers pay $4. This means a sewing machine operator who moves from blouses to sportswear will have her dues jumped, or dropped, if the move goes the other way. It's a small irritant, however. Somewhat more inconvenient is the doubling up of the local's executive board—47 members now—and the existence of 2 chairmen instead of 1.

Instead of recasting the structure of the two local unions as a result of merger, the ILGWU simply cemented the two together. So, Rose Renzuola, former chairman of local 23, and Carrie Franco, former chairman of local 25, simply carried on and are now serving the new local as cochairmen.

Mr. Appleton, with a typical imaginative flair, has made a virtue out of what for others might be a troubling necessity. He believes that by adding together the leadership of the formerly separate locals, more people instead of less, become involved in the life of the union. For example, now that the blouse contract is about to expire and new demands must be worked out, he has called together all the chairladies of the individual shops, not just those from blouse shops.

"He wants everyone to be familiar with all our contracts," explains Jay Mazur, assistant manager of the local, "not just blousemakers with the blouse agreement and sportswear people with theirs. If everyone gets in on the discussion it becomes part of the educational process that is going on here all the time."

Local 23–25's jurisdiction is limited to Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx with the largest concentration of its membership—about 20 percent—located between 40th and 14th Streets on Manhattan's west side. The membership of the local, however, is exceedingly cosmopolitan. (Local 23–25 is one of the few labor organizations that puts out leaflets, reports, etc. in Chinese as well as English and Spanish.) It wasn't always so. In the old days, the skirt industry work force was largely Jewish while that of the blouse industry was largely Italian.

The industry remains largely on piecework. A quality operator is guaranteed a minimum of $1.90 on hour. The average hourly wage for operators runs $2.25 to $2.50 an hour.

As befits any new local, local 23–25 has young leadership. Both Mr. Mazur and the supervisor of the blouse department, Jerry Grossman, are young men with college backgrounds. Mr. Grossman, a former captain in the field artillery, served local 25 some 16 years as a business agent and assistant manager before heading the blouse department of the merged local. Mr. Mazur is a graduate of the ILGWU Training Institute and was the director of organization and education activities for local 23 before the merger.

At 45 years of age, Mr. Appleton, Local 23–25 manager, is the youngest ILGWU executive board member. As ILGWU's president David Dubinsky's son-in-law, Mr. Appleton is sometimes mentioned as a possible successor to the ebullient union leader. However, as his associates make abundantly clear, being a son-in-law is more of a hindrance than a help.

"If anything," says another ILGWU vice president, "Shelley must work harder than the rest of us to succeed." His natural capabilities—plus a talent for hard work—have brought him to his present position in the union.

Mr. Appleton came to the ILGWU in 1941 fresh from New York University Law School. He was one of the first group of "outsiders" that the union recruited for its leadership. As a youngster he had served as a volunteer organizer for various union organizing drives in the New York area in the late 1930's, so his first assignment for the ILGWU was a natural—as an organizer in upper New York State and in Vermont. In 1942, he left the ILGWU for the Air Corps where he served in the statistical control section of a fighter wing stationed in England. After the war, he returned to the union where he was assigned to local 99 as a business agent. He became assistant manager of the local in 1951 and manager in 1954. Five years later he shifted to local 23, a larger local. He is also the administrator of two of the ILGWU's national agreements, one with Bobbie Brooks, the other with Majestic. Both are giant multiplant, multiproduct garment firms.

As head of local 23 and, subsequently, of local 23–25, Mr. Appleton is a great believer in modernization. He has, for example, abolished all the wire cages that make so many older union offices look like tax collection offices. Huge photo murals, pastel tints, and stylized modernistic furniture make the headquarters of the local—on the 10th floor of the ILGWU health center at 275 Seventh Avenue—a match for the executive suite of any corporation executive. A library and an auditorium, with sound motion-picture equipment, round out the headquarters.

But what makes the headquarters impressive is not the furnishings but the people. The young girls who come in on their lunch hour for a handful of leaflets to distribute at the shop; the older women in to talk over their problems with a union counselor; and the fiery youngster in to file a complaint—these give the union headquarters its life.

Mr. Appleton believes in keeping his staff "as flexible as possible." No one is frozen into the same petty round of duties. And, while each of the 12 business agents, as well as the 5 education-organization staff members, are responsible for certain areas of activity, all are expected to pitch in whenever a major problem develops. Each business agent, for example, covers about 55 shops with an average of 30 employees. He is re-

sponsible for servicing the people in his district, but he and his people are expected to join the rest when broader issues demand a total effort. Local 23–25 does not rely on specialists to achieve its impact on the daily life of New York City.

And, by any test, though only a year old, local 23–25 is an efficient organization. It was born of change and seems likely to survive.

The Role of the Community College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of an excellent article on the subject of community college development in the United States, Thomas E. O'Connell refers to the need for community colleges to be flexible, imaginative and zestful in order to meet the challenges of the future.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas E. O'Connell, the president of the Berkshire community in my home city of Pittsfield, Mass., is personally a most imaginative, zestful and flexible individual. He is becoming one of the Nation's leading spokesmen on the role of the community college. No one I know could better fill this function.

As one who has often called attention in Congress to the need for community college support, I know that all of my colleagues will be grateful to Mr. O'Connell for his views on this increasingly important subject of what happens to youth "after high school."

His most recent article appeared in the January 30 edition of the New Republic. It deserves the wide reading which I am sure it will receive, and I am gratified to make it available for that purpose.

The article follows:

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE AFTER HIGH SCHOOL

(By Thomas E. O'Connell)

Community colleges are spreading like wildfire and are every year educating a larger and larger percentage of each freshman class across the country. Alvin E. Eurich, formerly of the Fund for the Advancement of Education in the Ford Foundation, thinks maybe by 2000 there won't be any 4-year colleges; maybe there will be only community colleges and universities.

Let me tell you what a community college is. First off, it is a junior college—2 years. Usually it is a public college, financed by the municipality or the State or both. Usually it is coeducational. Usually it is only for commuting students—no dormitories. It serves a wide variety of students; indeed that is a part of its charm as well as a limitation. But there are essentially two groups of students: Those who plan to transfer as juniors to 4-year institutions and those who plan to take jobs after just 2 years of college.

It is this multipurposeness which accounts in large measure for the community college's surging popularity. Typically a community college has a transfer or liberal arts program which contains the same balance among the social sciences, the sciences, and the humanities that one would find in the first 2 years of a liberal arts college or university. It also has a variety of specialized programs, often called occupational, or technical, or terminal programs. These occupational programs, in addition to offering a core of compulsory liberal arts courses, include courses to prepare students for jobs in local businesses or industries. Pittsfield's largest employer is the General Electric Co., so Berkshire Community College numbers among its occupational programs one in electrical technology. Obviously, the more of these occupational programs the community college can offer, the more opportunity there is for each qualified high school graduate to find the one which suits his particular aptitudes and aspirations. Some colleges have up to 20 of these occupational programs, in fields such as dental technology, nursing, data processing, or in the technology of petroleum.

Another reason community colleges are burgeoning is that they're inexpensive. The first 2 years of college are cheaper to operate than the last 2 because larger lecture classes are suitable for many introductory courses (psychology, for example) and because less specialized equipment is required. A nonresidential college costs only about half as much per student to build and to run as a dormitory college. The cost to students of attending a community college is a fraction of the cost of a residential college. Many community colleges are tuition free. At Berkshire and at the other seven Massachusetts community colleges the tuition is $200 a year and the total college cost for a student living at home is often under $400 a year. This economy makes all the difference to many students from large families or from families of limited income—it often means they attend college when they otherwise could not even consider doing so.

The community college is easier to get into, too. It may have an open door for any high school graduate. It is sometimes described as a uniquely American or democratic institution which recognizes the importance of the average person having the opportunity to go beyond high school. The description is justified, I think. At Berkshire we don't have an open door, but we do admit any high school graduate who looks to us to be a reasonably good bet to do the job in college. I say to our freshmen each year, "This is a relatively easy institution to get into, but it is not an easy institution to stay in." We wash them out pretty quickly if it turns out we guessed wrong at admission—about one-third flunk or quit the first year—but at least they've had the chance, and that's important. And we'll probably have lower attrition as we initiate more occupational programs suited to a wider variety of student motivations and aptitudes.

What about the quality of education offered in a community college? The fact that our attrition at Berkshire is high indicates we're not soft. But a community college has definite handicaps as it strives to keep the right kind of "institutional press" on its students. In the first place, we don't have the students for as long as we could wish. They are gone at the close of each day and they are gone after 2 years. They don't have the benefit of more mature upperclassmen to set a tone for them in the informal, out-of-class education which a residential institution offers.

The community colleges have other shortcomings. Our students tend to come from the same socioeconomic group as well as from the same geographic area, so most of the usual college stimulation of rubbing up against "strange" people is lacking. Nor do they get another kind of stimulation often associated with going to college, that of going away from home, of being "on their own." And, of course, 2 years of college is not really enough of college for most able youngsters, but that is all most of our occupational students get.

Also, the fact that community colleges are not selective in admissions means that there are students in the colleges who are not as well prepared to do what is usually considered to be "college-level" work as would be the case in most 4-year institutions. There is a greater disparity in the aptitudes of the students and in the amount of information they have than one usually finds in a college. Some students who come to us are very bright and the community college must not hold them back while attending to the problems of their slower classmates. The problem is akin to that faced by public high schools and we use some of the same devices they do to solve it. Homogeneous grouping in classes is one device. Many of these colleges have several distinctly separate "tracks" for occupational students, depending on their abilities and the jobs for which the programs are pointing them. Honors programs, developmental reading programs, special attention to the very quick student and the slower but especially persevering one are other devices we use to deal with a disparate student body. But obviously the 130 IQ student who comes to Berkshire (and each entering class has several) is going to find fewer intellectually challenging classmates than would be the case at Stanford or Smith.

TEACHERS WHO LIKE TO TEACH

On the plus side of community colleges the very least that must be said is: Better to attend a community college for 2 years than not to have any college experience at all. And I think that much more than this can be said.

In the first place, community college teachers concentrate on their work in the classrooms and on counseling with students. They are not required to "publish or perish." The strongest teachers we can find are given the introductory courses where sparks of interest are most likely to be generated in students. Indeed, we often are able to attract first-class teachers who are interested in just this kind of situation. Many of our best teachers are non-Ph. D.'s who were blocked from promotion in the 4-year institutions because they wished to concentrate on teaching rather than scholarship. They are pleased to find a college teaching assignment which does not demand that they continue to divide their energies between teaching and working at the frontiers of knowledge in their disciplines. This is not, of course, to derogate the dual-purpose role of the university and its faculty of teacher-scholars. Nor is it to say that we discourage scholarship on the part of our faculties; we want them to keep up in their fields and there is no better way to do this than by research. It is simply to say that our special emphasis is on teaching and not on scholarship.

Thus Berkshire is strongest where Harvard or Columbia are weakest. The great universities, it is generally acknowledged, especially by students who have attended them, are strongest as the student goes up the academic ladder. Introductory courses, taught by young graduate students, sometimes in large sections, are apt to be less than exciting. The graduate student may have little interest in teaching and less in students only slightly younger than himself (isn't it a phenomenon of growing up that we tend to view the age group immediately younger than our own as a pretty sorry lot?). Only when the student begins to major in the department of his choice is he apt to get the "name" faculty people who made the university glitter for him when he applied for admission. And he may not have many exposures to them until he begins graduate work.

Many of the community colleges are small. Berkshire has 500 full-time day students in this its fifth year of operation, and we won't go above 1,000 for several years. This means we are quickly able to single out for extra attention the really able student or the one with special problems. Our being small means that many students are able to take on

leadership functions they might otherwise not have. Extracurricular activities do play a part in community college education, though there is relatively more emphasis on the curricular work and perhaps less danger of a marginal student being dazzled by the appeal of a variety of subsidized activities to the detriment of his studies.

For many students, attending the first 2 years of college while living at home is just right. For one reason or another, 17 is not the right age for everyone to try his wings away from home. I recall the late Dr. Alan Gregg, of the Rockefeller Foundation, chiding educators for our pride in the slow-maturing nature of humans, and for our paradoxical insistence that maturity be assumed at the arbitrary cutoff age of 17 or 18. The so-called late bloomer often finds the community college the best garden. At Berkshire we have helped a number of students who left home to go to a residential college, found it a bewildering or overwhelming experience, especially at a large university, and as a result quickly flunked out. They have come to us, done well, and returned more confidently to the university as juniors. Some community college people refer to this as our "salvage function" and that strikes me as an accurate, if inelegant, phrase.

OPPOSITE OF IVORY TOWERS

The lack of juniors and seniors to set a tone—a lack which has always struck me as a very real one in residential junior colleges, especially those which are geographically isolated—is in some measure offset in community colleges by the liberal sprinkling of more mature people in our classrooms. We have a number of housewives, for example, women in their twenties and thirties who come in to take one or two courses during the day while their husbands are at work and their children are in school. They lend a serious and purposeful tone. So do the older married veterans who find us the most feasible college to attend. These mature people, many of whom were caught in the "tender trap" and found themselves with families before they realized what they had missed in education, are almost wistfully grateful for the chance to pick up their lost opportunity. Their zest and energy in taking advantage of it make them a delight for their teachers and catalysts for their classmates.

This perhaps brings us to the "community" nature of the community college. Our colleges are assumed to be the opposite of the "ivory tower" institutions. One of our missions is to serve the community, to be the educational and cultural focal points in our regions. Hence the name "community college." We have adult education programs, lecture series, musical programs and plays, short noncredit courses for special groups to upgrade themselves, and a range of other educational activities for which there is a need in our communities. While these functions are performed by lots of other colleges and universities, they are perhaps more central to the purposes of the community college. Last year Berkshire served over 1,000 students in the day, evening and summer programs; we held lectures by Norman Rockwell, Alistair Cooke, and C. Northcote Parkinson; we served as the "home" for a local symphony orchestra; we ran a series of seminars for businessmen in the area. But with all that we don't feel we are yet having nearly the impact on our community that many community colleges have on theirs.

One of the exciting things about this community college business is that many communities are having colleges established for the first time. Most of these communities are taking the colleges to their hearts as they would no other kind of institution. They sense what a college can mean to them, much as the upper Connecticut Valley communities did when they vied for Eleazar Wheelock's attention as he made plans for starting Dartmouth College two centuries ago. So municipalities and States are building flossy new campuses for their community colleges. They are planning to expand them to meet the crush of high school graduates during the next few years. That crush is enormous and it is even now upon us. For example, the number of high school graduates here in Berkshire County jumps 40 percent in just 2 years between the class finishing in 1963 and the class finishing this June. Figures for New York and many other States are comparable. As for the community college's role in handling this avalanche of students, by 1970 three out of four high school graduates in the Nation who go on to higher education will enroll in 2-year institutions, according to a study by the Prudential Insurance Co.

The community colleges, in turn, must do their best to be sure that coping with this quantity doesn't preclude quality education. One measure of their quality is how well their graduates do in good 4-year institutions when they transfer as juniors. The record is impressive. A number of studies have shown that community college student transfers do as well as or better than their classmates who matriculated in the 4-year institutions in the first place. At Berkshire we were pleased (no, overjoyed) to find that our first group of 111 graduates who went on to 40 different 4-year institutions with credit for their community college work (there has been surprisingly little difficulty in transferring credits) achieved on an average a 2.45 cumulative index on a 4.0=straight "A" scale their first semester. This would be slightly better than their junior-year classmates. Their successors have done equally as well.

How do the 4-year institutions feel about the new community colleges? The State universities are by and large delighted to delegate the task of screening large numbers of freshmen and sophomores so that they can concentrate most of their energies on upper-division and graduate education. On the campuses of the University of California, for example, there are twice as many juniors and seniors as freshmen and sophomores. In Florida, new State universities are not admitting any freshmen or sophomores. Their students will all be community college transfers. In the Northeast, too, the 4-year institutions are beginning to demonstrate an awareness of the community colleges. Dean of Admissions Eugene S. Wilson of Amherst College has announced that Amherst will actively seek applications from 50 transfers from junior and community colleges each year. Students from Berkshire have already transferred to Middlebury, Brandeis, Simmons and several other "prestige" institutions. (After all, it was a shorter time ago than most of us keep in mind that the "prestige" institutions were admitting many "average" students who now find most doors closed to them except those of the community college.)

It may well be, though, that over the long pull the community colleges' greatest contribution will come not in this transfer function, but in helping to meet what Walter Lippmann has called the most pressing unfinished business facing our Nation: "the gigantic work of adjusting our way of life to the scientific revolution of this age and to the stupendous growth of the population." By providing the communities across the Nation with flexible post-high school educational institutions committed to offering some form of higher education to everyone willing to prepare for it, the community college may be a decisive factor in our adjustment to this scientific revolution. Soon a high school education will be insufficient as preparation for any but the most menial job. Even now there are not enough menial jobs for those prepared to do no others. At the same time, our society's need for technicians or preprofessionals is greater even than our need for professionally trained people. The occupational programs of the community colleges may prove the best way to meet this challenge, both by educating young people coming out of high schools and by retraining their elders to adjust to automation.

WIRTZ WAS OFF THE MARK

We can't, though, do everything; we can't solve the problem of too large a labor force for example. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz is way off the mark when he assumes that compulsory education to age 18 is a reasonable solution to unemployment. Anyone who has dealt with truculent youngsters of 15 who want "out" of school know that keeping them 3 more years is not the answer to anything. Compulsion in education is effective in inverse proportion to the pupil's age. In some measure a 10-year-old can be forced to learn; it is harder to "make" a 15-year-old learn. Having tried to "make" 18-year-olds learn in an academic situation, I report that it is impossible. At 18 there are too many attractions competing for their attention. They are nearly at their maximum power physically. They are old enough to have achieved a large measure of independence, at least under our present society's rules. They are usually social animals at that age, and friendships—with both sexes—are absorbing. You can't make them do anything as lonely as studying unless they really want to.

So compulsory education won't work. But universal opportunity for post-high school education is another matter. Especially if the opportunity includes sufficient variety to appeal to a wide spectrum of high school graduates. The variety must include clusters of occupational programs which are diverse not only in kinds of courses but in levels of courses. Norman C. Harris of the University of Michigan in his recent book, "Technical Education in the Junior College-New Programs for New Jobs," talks about the "middle 50 percent" of high school graduates which community colleges ought to serve through programs characterized by diversity rather than by sheer intellectuality. For example, Harris says community colleges should have a cluster of programs in the engineering and technical fields, ranging from the first 2 years of a transfer engineering program at the top end of the scale of intellectuality and abstraction, all the way to courses for highly skilled technicians at the other end of the scale, where practicality is essential and where the students are not intellectually equipped to handle very abstract work.

It is important to expose students to different occupational possibilities. Grant Venn in his "Man, Education, and Work" points out that today's child, unlike his grandparents, grows up in a world where he never sees people doing the jobs which he might be most intrigued with and best qualified to do. He never sees the electrical technician, say, or the low temperature specialist at work. As a result, "job selection in the technological work world has become a desperate affair, often subject to wildest chance and equally often unrelated to the young jobseeker's aptitudes and abilities." Exposure in a community college combined with both opportunity and occupational guidance would make the transition into the world of work more rational.

So far, the community colleges have talked much better than they have performed in occupational education. We have not really yet begun to educate technicians in anything like the numbers needed. We'd better start soon; and I think we will. The trick will be for our community colleges to remain flexible enough and zestful enough and imaginative enough to meet the special new educational needs of the United States which community colleges appear uniquely well suited to handle.

Science and Public Policy in Aerospace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, for a better understanding of the philosophy behind our national space program and the issues concerning it, I am sure that the following address by Dr. Edward C. Welsh will prove beneficial to all Members. Dr. Welsh, of course, is Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. He has a most perceptive gift for seeing things as they are and putting them into sharp focus. His remarks, which follow, were made before the New York Academy of Science in New York City on January 11, 1965:

"SCIENCE AND PUBLIC POLICY IN AEROSPACE"—BY DR. EDWARD C. WELSH, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL, NEW YORK ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, JANUARY 11, 1965

The entirety of aerospace activity is indelibly impressed upon and in most respects directed by public policy. The national interest is the guideline generally used in determining what can be done, what should be done, and what pace should be followed along the pioneering path of aerospace.

In our efforts to use aerospace, we find that complexities are commonplace. Many of the concepts are involved and much of the language itself is esoteric. Consequently, he who speaks from a scientific background is likely to have an attentive audience and wield a significant influence. In some respects, this is fortunate.

It contributes to clear thinking, however, to recognize that the vision of the scientist does not and should not be expected to encompass the whole spectrum of the competences necessary to fruitful use of aerospace. The point is made primarily to emphasize the wide range of skills and background required rather than to minimize the role of the scientist who, in individual cases, does have capabilities in addition to those obtained through exposure to the disciplines of the physical and life sciences.

It would seem to be obvious, but nevertheless it is sometimes overlooked, that science is only one element among the considerations which should shape policy goals in the field of aerospace, just as has been true in past improvements in the evolution of transportation and in the exploration of new lands. Among the other considerations are national defense as well as national prestige, economic growth, advances in technology, and the vigor of the general intellectual climate of the times.

Scientists should be consulted, of course. Their views on space policy are particularly important in better understanding what is possible and what is not, and what the hazards are in specific missions in space. An intelligent selection of missions should include those which would obtain scientific knowledge not to be gained in any other way and perhaps of a value which cannot be measured in ordinary dollar terms. Who can say what will be the intellectual or economic consequences or the philosophical changes which may flow from new scientific discoveries? But, by the same token, scientists should not set themselves up to judge the overall value of aerospace missions or aerospace hardware construction by narrowly comparing the dollars spent for space with what those same dollars might accomplish if devoted to other endeavors, scientific or otherwise. First of all, such dollars are often not directly transferable. Second, space dollars may actually change the general climate to one favoring broader aid to the whole spectrum of science. Third, since space expenditures seek broader goals than those of science, the comparison may well be invalid on the face of it.

It is indeed appropriate for scientists to view with some pride their many contributions in the field of aerospace. But it should be noted that organized science has not always been outstanding for its courage, its vision, or its optimism regarding goals for human efforts. Elements of conservatism, parochialism, and even reactionary thinking do appear among scientists just as they do among many other groups in our society. Many important projects, later proved to be entirely feasible, have been reviewed earlier by distinguished panels of scientists and found wanting. Numerous examples in the airplane, the rocket, the ICBM, and manned space flight come to mind. This is not to say that it is axiomatic that advice from scientists will be wrong, but it does suggest that such men may be as fallible as the rest of us.

The visionaries, whether primarily scientists or policymakers, must be given the opportunity to point out the many benefits which can flow from the manned and unmanned uses of aerospace. But, given such opportunity, they should use it effectively and affirmatively. Regardless of their motivations, the pessimists who cry out against aerospace research and technological endeavors have clearly set themselves against progress. The United States can no longer relax and rest on its past industrial laurels. The race for survival, literally and philosophically, is on. Of course, we all would like to believe in the solely nonaggressive uses of aerospace by all countries which have the needed technology. However, the realities of life dictate adequate preparation to preserve our national and free world security. We should follow the axiom that a pound of prevention is worth megatons of cure.

Initially, and to some extent still, the weak link in the planning of many expensive aerospace systems and programs is the prediction of human behavior. We know too little about the healthy human to predict his behavior with assurance, and without useful prediction, policy and program planning is difficult. However, the new science of cybernetics is becoming one of the most promising forces for understanding the control mechanisms in the living cell, in the human, and in that collection of humans known as society. I don't intend to discuss such a vast and virgin field as cybernetics. Rather, I simply want to mention at this point that the byproducts of aerospace research and technology, i.e., biomedicine, mathematics, electronics, and computer research are making the required tools available, for the first time, to study the intricacies of the human body and society as a whole.

There are many examples of the value of aerospace research and technology such as the development of biomedical instrumentation for better diagnosis and patient care, new materials, advanced electronic devices, and communications. However, the one use of aerospace that strikes closest and most directly to the heart of the general public is transportation. We are a nation on the move. We have more commercial aircraft than any nation in the world. We will continue to expand our transportation uses of the aerospace medium. The supersonic and hypersonic transports will be followed eventually by routine flights in space.

One would be deeply challenged to find another activity—if aerospace may be so singularly labeled—which brings together so many competences and welds them to so many valued objectives. This may indeed be one of the outstanding contributions of aerospace. There is, however, another benefit which is not frequently highlighted, but which merits special mention. I refer to the very useful role which our space effort has played in closing rapidly the artificial gap between science and engineering practice.

Historically, there has been a time gap, usually of decades, sometimes of a century, between the discovery of new scientific principles and the effective engineering application of these principles. In recent times, particularly in space research, this gap has all but disappeared.

New scientific discoveries have found almost immediate applications. Shortening of this time gap had tended to blur the distinction between science and engineering and to lower any barrier which might have arisen between the two. Our space program has helped to place many engineering practices on a much sounder scientific footing. At the same time, it has given science some new tools. Space research has advanced the engineering art, making possible the accomplishment of many tasks not previously possible, but it has also been able to advance our storehouse of scientific knowledge.

High vacuum technology offers an excellent example of this development. Only a decade ago, the scientist wishing to work on ultrapure metals or crystal mechanics had to fabricate his own vacuum furnace. If he was quite skillful, he could build one in a few months capable of containing a small laboratory specimen with a fair vacuum, measuring this vacuum to an accuracy of possibly one order of magnitude, and controlling temperature in an approximate fashion. Today, not so much by design as by necessity, high vacuum technology has spurted far ahead. The need for environmental testing of spacecraft provided the impetus for this progress.

Another example is that of electrical power storage. Until recently, the chemistry of the storage battery was pretty mysterious. Now, due largely to technical efforts in the space field, knowledge of energy conversion in batteries has been put on a much firmer footing. This has resulted in better power equipment. More importantly, we are now beginning to design space batteries from scientific principles. Both the chemistry and the chemical engineering have improved. While it may be incidental, it is certainly not insignificant that the development of space batteries has contributed to better hearing aids and lifesaving equipment.

Space projects have a tendency to pose engineering problems for which there is no handbook solution. Solving these problems requires new data, new methods, and new concepts. Frequently, when the solution is finally in hand, we find we have not only the answer to a specific application, but a bonus of new scientific knowledge as well.

Alars have been sounded regarding the risks which purportedly stem from the Federal Government's sponsorship of research and development. In fact, some of these alarms stem even from Government sponsorship in training people so that more and better research and development can be conducted. Such alarmists, though stridently critical, generally fail to stipulate just what the risks are except that somehow or other our "type of society" is being endangered. I do not share this worry for a moment. However, if I did think that some element of our society were in jeopardy because of the stimulation of research and development in the public interest, I would chance it. We can always improve the mode of such Federal assistance without destroying its beneficial substance. Even though our type of society is undoubtedly the best in existence, it surely is not unpatriotic to believe that it is not perfect. There is always room for improvement, and research and development is a productive source of new insights. It will yield positive benefits

in the long run in spite of any short-run inconvenience it might cause.

We are in fact talking about shortages. Who can doubt that there are and always will be shortages of the best skills and the greatest abilities. Who can believe that we should rely entirely on the profit motive to encourage better schools and better laboratories and better libraries and better experiments? I hasten to add that the profit motive, property distilled, would also suggest such improvements. But isn't the role of the Federal Government, if not to be the sole provider, at least to help stimulate the provision of such assets and to fill in the gaps of leadership and funds?

Innumerable benefits are harvested from the fertile fields of aerospace. These benefits alone are sufficient to make it a matter of public policy to pursue research and development and the application of aerospace capabilities. There are some aerospace applications which, after initial Government sponsorship, can be exploited by private enterprise. Examples are the airplane and the communication satellite. Other applications have little adaptability to commercialization but rather further the objectives of defense, broad educational research, public service, and foreign relations.

One could, without great strain, visualize a relationship between aerospace and public policy which touches importantly upon a wide range of basic activities. We have referred briefly to some of these, such as improved transportation, increased national defense, better education, and added knowledge—both scientific and technological. The impact upon man's standard of living is tremendous. The impact upon his way of living in peace and freedom is even greater. The benefits from aerospace run the gamut from new productive processes to new approaches to world peace. Science and technology have a great role to play, not so much in influencing public policy, although they do, but in making intelligent policy decisions possible. Scence and technology can indeed be a major force in our efforts to attain the Great Society.

N. V. (Swede) Nelson Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain appropriate pertinent newspaper excerpts concerning the N. V. Nelson Football Award to Columbia's great quarterback, Archie Roberts.

The Nelson Award is football's most distinctive recognition of high character, ability, and sportsmanship. It was founded to honor the career, life's work, superb character, exemplary sportsmanship and all-round qualities as an individual and a great American of my dear friend and former teammate, Mr. N. V. (Swede) Nelson, former outstanding Harvard football star and coach, whose contributions to the cause of Americanism, football, sportsmanship, charity, and the cause of the underdog have so indelibly marked him as unique and preeminent in the athletic and sports world of our times.

The selection of Archie Roberts for the Nelson Award was singularly appropriate because this young man embodies the finest attributes and best characteristics of a college athelete and young American.

The Nelson Award is also unique in that it is not confined to football ability alone, but is based upon the overall performance of the individual as well as superlative character traits, lofty concepts and demonstrated consideration for the rights and welfare of others, particularly those who need a helping hand.

This great award is designed to extend fitting recognition to young college gridiron stars who best demonstrate on the playing field and in the classroom, their college life, and personal activities, the skills, standards, practices, and ideals of sportsmanship combined with those concerns for human beings, for the community, the State, the Nation, for humanity itself, which "Swede" Nelson so unselfishly and magnificently reflects.

Archie Roberts reflects an exceptionally fine choice since his gridiron career was filled with brilliant performances, physical and mental fitness and alertness, poise, judgment and the display of that warm spirit of dedication and thoughtfulness for others and for the values we like to believe animate the finest young men in the country.

This young man made an enviable record for himself on the football field and in his accomplishments as a student and scholar. It is no accident that he is a great athlete. His father was an outstanding football player a generation ago at New York University where he stood out among other brilliant performers on some of the greatest teams ever to grace an American gridiron.

Success and fame have not gone to Archie Roberts' head. He is modest, humble, yet fired by high aims and the determination to achieve his goals. He aspires to a career in medicine and his career, bright and promising as it is, will undoubtedly be characterized by the same sterling performance and social concern that have so brilliantly illumined his performances on the football field.

So great is the appeal of the personality, the spirit, the strong will, the poise, grace and humane qualities of this young man that, following the Columbia-Princeton game last fall, in which his team was the loser, the huge crowd gathered to watch this thrilling contest rose to its feet with one accord to render young Roberts perhaps the most unusual personal tribute that has ever been paid to a young American college athlete.

I want to congratulate the proud parents and the family of this inspiring young American boy. Their son is a great credit to them and to every American, because he has adhered to those rules of fairness and high standards which all of us admire.

I want to congratulate his coach, Buff Donelli, and the president of Columbia and the dean of Columbia College, the intellectual community from which he has come, and all those who played a part in this young man's educational and athletic activities.

And I congratulate and thank the Gridiron Club of Boston whose generosity and wisdom established this award.

I also want to congratulate Swede Nelson, a sterling figure, who on his own account and in his own inimitable way, has been the inspiration of this coveted award, now the greatest and most distinctive in American football.

I may say that we will hear much more in the time to come from Archie Roberts, whether it be in professional football, or in the field of medicine and surgery, which is his goal. In my judgment, many honors and brilliant success remain ahead of this young man. He is destined to be a standout in his chosen career, not alone because he is a football player, but because he combines with that talent to a rare and perhaps, an unsurpassed degree, a deep interest in other people, a realistic humility, and an avowed purpose to exemplify in his daily life the tenets of true sportsmanship and to strive his best in every way be can for equality of opportunity and treatment and human betterment.

Swede Nelson's introduction to Archie Roberts, the winner of this year's award was particularly noteworthy and combines the inspirational qualities, the eloquence, the wisdom, wit and humor of the great American sports figure, in whose honor the Swede Nelson Award is made. I ask unanimous consent that his introductory remarks be printed in the RECORD.

The ceremonies, as usual, were very interesting and held the rapt attention of the audience. There was general recognition of the fact that athletic history was being made, that those present were participating in the simple but dignified ceremonies attending the award of what has become the greatest award in American football.

It would not be possible for the N. V. Nelson Award committee to have selected a finer boy and I commend them for their devoted work and their excellent judgment which is universally approved.

I also would like to include as part of my remarks two very fine newspaper articles with reference to the Nelson Award by the outstanding sports writers, Tim Horgan of the Boston Traveler and Joe Looney of the Boston Herald, each of whom have contributed a splendid analysis and account of the award and the occasion.

Young Americans like Archie Roberts and the illustrious Swede Nelson go together. They are our best.

The material follows:

REMARKS IN PART OF N. V. "SWEDE" NELSON

We now come to the purpose of this happy evening. Nineteen fine young athletes have been honored by our Gridiron Club at this annual dinner.

Tonight we honor Archie Roberts and in honoring him, we honor his family, his wife, his university, his coaches, and his fellow students.

Archie is the product of many contributions—but his contributions have been many. A tremendous athlete—baseball, basketball, and football. He had inspirational help in his early youth from his dear mother, from two wonderful men, his dad, a great athlete, and his headmaster, famous Frank Boyden, at Deerfield, a molder of men—who can

still make the double play. His intercollegiate ability was developed to perfection by his brilliant coach, Buff Donnelli. Arthur's constant contribution to young folks at Morningside Park and all through New York City did not go unnoticed. He received the B'nai B'rith Award—and also was awarded the Earl Blake Fellowship—and his scholarship ability is outstanding.

Archie Roberts has learned to plan his life and plan his day—he always had time to help some worthy cause.

Archie, you have always been a gentleman as well as a scholar—your premedical course confirms this—your life has been dedicated on many occasions to the cause and betterment of youth and will be dedicated in the future to the cause of humanity.

You are one of America's greatest forward passes—and you passed so well, you could hit a Republican in the head in Charlestown.

On several gridiron occasions, you were severely burdened with overpowering oppositions, yet, few have been so blessed with ability, character, and courage to march right on down the field to victory.

At Princeton, when you left the playing fields—although defeated—the sons of Nassau rose en masse in triumphant acclaim—the only time they do this is when they sing Old Nassau.

The only other time those Princeton Tigers stood up was for Bridgit Bardot.

This is the finest country in all the world and it is men like you who help to keep it great.

Archie, you have the progressive realization of worthy ideal, and athletics is the only area that combines physical courage with the will to win. Your flaming spirit of competition, together with your dedication to help all mankind, has the respect and affection of everyone of us.

In behalf of our Gridiron Club I am proud to present to you the Gridiron Club trophy indicating that you are the outstanding sportsman in America in intercollegiate football of 1964—ladies and gentlemen, Archie Roberts.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Herald, Jan. 10, 1965]

SURGERY, QUARTERBACKING COMPARED BY ROBERTS—NELSON AWARD WINNER LIKES CHALLENGE

(By Joe Looney)

Surgery is like quarterbacking, claims Archie Roberts who operated on a few defenses during his 3-year varsity career at Columbia University.

The 21-year-old premedical student from Holyoke made this comparison last night before he went to the main ballroom of the Sheraton-Plaza Hotel to receive the Swede Nelson Award for Sportsmanship.

PERFECT CHOICE

"I've always liked to work with my hands," Roberts explained. "That's why I'm interested in medicine. To me surgery is a lot like football. There's tension, drama and preparation in both."

"A surgeon's role is similar to a quarterback's. Situations don't always fall into the same pattern. There's a constantly changing challenge. And in both cases there are occasions when there isn't much time to determine the course of action to be taken."

Nelson told the gathering of 500 at this 19th annual dinner that Roberts was the perfect choice for the award because of the manner he portrays the role of gentleman, scholar and athlete.

"He plans his day and his life so he can help people who are less fortunate," said Swede. "His premedical studies and athletic career are time consuming, but not enough to prevent him from doing volunteer social work in New York City.

Columbia coach Buff Donelli declared, "I have never seen a better passer than Archie Roberts. He just has an unusual knack of being able to throw a football with extreme judgment. He accepts the punishment he receives as a good play on the part of the opposition."

PRO DISCUSSIONS

Turning to Roberts, Donelli remarked. "The Gridiron Club of Boston has done honor to you in the name of an honorable man, Swede Nelson. Think of the significance of this sportsmanship award from time to time and it will serve you well."

Roberts, who has been drafted by the New York Jets, revealed he has had pro football discussions with representatives of the Baltimore Colts and Cleveland Browns. He was bypassed in the National Football League draft because the clubs felt a medical career was his primary choice. The Jets would like to have Roberts remain out of school for a year to concentrate on football.

"I would like to combine medical school and pro football," Roberts said. "But it would have to be medicine first and football second. This could be done in Cleveland where Western Reserve University is located." He said he would reach a decision in this matter after the midterm examinations at Columbia.

Nelson presented the trophy and an inscribed watch to Roberts. LeRoy Kelley served as toastmaster and kept the program moving at a lively tempo.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler, Dec. 23, 1964]

ALL-AROUND CLASS EARNS NELSON AWARD

(By Tim Horgan)

The Gridiron Club's choice of Archie Roberts for this year's Swede Nelson Sportsmanship Award meets special favor with the man for whom the prize is named.

"I understand," explained Swede, the noted speaker, "that the boy runs the radio station at Columbia and has never once mentioned his own name on the air. That's worth a medal any day."

Nils V. also terms these award winners, of which Roberts is the 19th, "All-Americas with halos." Like a great deal of Swede's afterdinner stuff, this sacrifices accuracy for yocks.

A player needs neither a drawer full of press clippings nor a chestful of merit badges to qualify for what, to my mind, is the most meaningful honor in college football. All-Americas are born but gentlemen have to work at it. And anybody who remains gentleman with an elbow sticking in his brisket and a cleat in his ear has gotten the idea of the game.

Precisely what does qualify a player for this award isn't clear to many people, however, particularly this year. Roberts is one of the few winners who didn't perform any single act of sportsmanship that offers a clue to his character.

He got the vote, explained Arthur Barry, head of the selection committee, "because he demonstrated a high esteem for the football code and exemplified sportsmanship to an outstanding degree."

This is pretty high-faluting for the average fan and also contains too many syllables for Swede, "Even though I took speech 46 at Harvard. Anybody can get a Harvard accent by riding the Cambridge subway, but I paid good money for mine," he insists.

So here's Swede's own inimitable version of what this award is all about, and why the Lions ace quarteback will receive it January 9 at the Sheraton Plaza.

"He's a kindly guy," Swede said, "and he teaches the poor kids in Harlem and he's married. He's also a very, very good student, an Earl Blaik Scholarship winner, in fact, and that's always important.

"Then, too, at the Princeton game this year the whole Princeton crowd stood up and gave him an ovation when he left the field. Of course, that's easy to do when you're ahead, but it still says something about the boy.

"Let me put it this way," Swede added. "I always say that when a kid adopts an athlete for his idol, you don't have to measure his height on the wall any more. He's grown up.

"I mean, if a kid imitates a pretty regular guy, like this Roberts fellow, then the kid is going to be a regular guy himself. That's the type of boy we want for this award, a player the youngsters will look up to and imitate because I always say that goodness is catching, like the measles.

"You know, you see all these photos of our missile bases and warships, and rockets but they've never yet taken a picture of the spirit of our kids on the athletic field. And that's won more wars than all the guns combined.

"Archie Roberts has that kind of spirit. You know, he never lost a minute of play and he gave it everything he had when he was in there. Maybe he didn't play for the best team in the world, but he never quit trying and that's what really counts."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Changing Communities—Upper Great Lakes Region: Jobs and Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 29, 1965

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting article entitled "Changing Communities—Upper Great Lakes Region: Jobs and Resources." The article was written by James I. Black and Frederic Marx, and was published in the December 1964 issue of the Employment Service Review.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGING COMMUNITIES—UPPER GREAT LAKES REGION: JOBS AND RESOURCES

(By James I. Black and Frederic Marx)

Federal, State, and local agencies charged with economic development responsibilities have been concerned with longstanding problems of unemployment and underemployment in the upper Great Lakes region, which spans the northern portions of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. Bordering Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, and Lake Huron, the region includes 50 counties with a land area of some 64,000 square miles. Nineteen of the counties are in Wisconsin, 16 are in Minnesota, and 15 are in Michigan. Wisconsin contains two-fifths of the region's population, Michigan a third, and Minnesota a fourth.

For the most part, this region has not been participating in the Nation's economic advance of the early 1960's. An evaluation of the region's manpower and material resources in the light of changing economic trends may assist in diagnosing the problems and in finding means to stimulate economic activities leading to greater employment opportunities.

The upper Great Lakes region is primarily known for its mineral, forest, and water resources, and agriculture. Forests, lakes, and streams cover much of the region and its terrain varies from Minnesota's open pit iron mining areas to Wisconsin's rolling meadowlands. In the winter, temperatures may dip to 35° below zero, but summer temperatures in the sixties make the region climate pleasant. Annual precipitation is about 30 inches.

Iron and copper ore dominate the mineral segment of the region's economy. Iron ore mining which amounts to about $500 million annually, is centered in the Mesabi Range (Itasca and St. Louis Counties, Minn.), and in Marquette, Iron, and Gogebic Counties in Michigan. Most of the region's copper mining is centered around Houghton County, Mich., which produced almost $50 million worth of minerals in 1962. Salt, cement, petroleum, natural gas, lumber, and wood are also important natural resources. About 7 percent of all commercial forest lands in the United States are located here and water for both industrial and recreational projects is plentiful.

Close to 1.1 million people lived in the upper Great Lakes region according to the 1960 census. During the 1950–60 decade, the region's population increased by less than 1.5 percent, in contrast to a total tristate rise of 18.8 percent and a national gain of 18.5 percent. The slow rate of population growth during the 1950's resulted largely from a heavy outmigration of workers because of a lack of local job opportunities.

The region is generally rural, with a density of 180 persons per square mile, compared with an average of 910 persons per square mile for the 3 States. While over a third of the land area of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin is in the upper Great Lakes region, only about 7 percent of their inhabitants reside in the region. The region has only one major labor area—Duluth-Superior. Smaller areas (a work force of at least 15,000) include Hibbing-Virginia, Minn.; Brainerd, Minn.; Marinette-Menominee, Wis.-Mich.; Grand Rapids and Marquette, Mich.

UNEMPLOYMENT HIGH

An average of some 29,000 of the region's 312,000 workers were unemployed in 1963, according to estimates of the U.S. Employment Service and the employment security agencies of the 3 States. The region's 9.3-percent rate of unemployment was nearly twice the 1963 rate for the three States as a whole, and substantially higher than the 5.7-percent national rate. Further, with only 5 percent of the tristate work force, the region had 10 percent of the unemployed.

Although the region's rural counties are three times larger, geographically, than the area covered by urban centers, the work force—employment and unemployment—is almost equally distributed between rural and urbanized areas. While the urbanized area generally experienced less unemployment, their relatively high rate of 8.9 percent in 1963 was somewhat under the 9.6-percent rate in the rural counties. The rate in the Duluth-Superior major area—the region's largest employment and population center—was 7.2 percent in 1963. (See "Duluth-Superior—A Redevelopment Area," Employment Service Review, May 1964, p. 37.)

The 1963 unemployment in the region reflected a 5.2-percent decline from 1960. However, employment also declined over the period by 8.6 percent, while the region's work force was 8.3 percent smaller. It would therefore appear that most of the unemployment drop between these years was caused primarily by the outmigration of workers to areas with more favorable job opportunities, as well as by other work force withdrawals, such as early retirement, rather than by any real economic improvement.

In addition to continuing high unemployment, the region's workers also experience substantial underemployment, mainly because of a lack of year-round job opportunities. This is substantiated by the low level of family income. In 1959, about one in four of the region's families earned less than $3,000. During the same year, one of every five families in the Nation earned below this amount.

Nearly 60 percent, or about 166,000, of the region's workers are employed in the dominant nonmanufacturing activities. Wholesale and retail trade, accounting for 15 percent of the total (42,000), is the region's leading employment sector. Government accounted for 37,000 workers and the service division, 30,000 workers. Mining industries employ about 20,000 workers, transportation-communication-public utilities, about 18,000, and construction, about 14,000. Agriculture accounts for about 10 percent of the area's total employment.

Whereas about one out of every three workers in the United States was employed in factory work, in recent years less than one out of five workers in the region was employed in manufacturing. Most important of the area's manufacturing industries are furniture, and lumber and wood products which alone account for one-fourth (11,000) of the region's 44,000 factory jobs. Paper products, food processing, primary and fabricated metals, nonelectric machinery, printing, and textile products are other major factory employment sources.

CAUSES OF EMPLOYMENT DECLINE

During recent years, almost every resource-based activity in the region underwent changes which resulted in a steady decline in area employment. Between 1952 and 1962, iron ore production decreased by about 30 percent. In addition, a substantial number of miners in the region lost jobs due to mine closures. A case in point is the closure of the Montreal Mine in Iron County, Mich., in 1962, resulting in the layoff of about 600 miners. In Houghton County, Mich., however, where copper production increased substantially between 1952 and 1962, there was no commensurate increase in mining employment.

The overall effects of the introduction of laborsaving devices to mining operations has reportedly had an inconsequential effect on mining employment, since few mining machine innovations were adopted during the past 10 years.

Forests are important to the upper Great Lakes economy as a source of employment and income. However, timber production in the area has been declining for almost half a century, primarily as a result of poor conservation practices and competition from other timber-producing areas in the United States. Also, the introduction of such mechanical aids as portable debarkers, self-loading trucks, clam and finger lifts, and larger and faster chain saws increased output per man-hour and reduced forest employment. Almost every wood-producing county in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan experienced employment decline during the past decade as a result of at least one of these factors.

The changes which revolutionized America's farming structure likewise have significantly affected agricultural employment in the upper Great Lakes region. With the introduction of new farm technology and fertilizers, fewer workers are producing more. Also, the trend toward fewer but larger farms continued unabated in the early 1960's. With improvements in farm technology and automation expected to continue, the need for farmworkers will probably decrease correspondingly.

Livestock and dairy farming dominate the agricultural economy of the region, accounting for over half of total farm income in many counties. Most of the region's other agricultural activities are highly seasonal. With transportation geared, for the most part, to operations in the mining and forest industries, employment in these industries has a direct bearing on employment in railroading, shipping, and trucking. Transportation employment in the region has also declined as a result of such technological improvements as mechanized loading devices and larger and more efficient equipment. In the winter, when oreboats

are tied up in the frozen lakes, shipping employment is reduced. Concomitantly, railroad employment is also affected by a dip in shipments of ore to lake ports. In the 1963 off season, about a fifth of the transportation workers in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan were idle.

With limited year-round employment opportunities in such activities as manufacturing and other stable industries, regional unemployment usually peaks during periods of inactivity which occur in industries dependent on the area's natural resources. For example, in 1963, employment in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan's lumber and wood segment ranged from a low of 4,000 to a high of 4,700 while mining employment in the Mesabi Range went from a low of 7,900 in January to over 12,000 during the summer months. Thus, the combination of high seasonality in area economic activities and a narrow economic base resulting from a lack of industrial diversification not only aggravates unemployment, but also results in substantial underemployment.

The lack of nearby markets and, conversely, distance from sources of supplies of many materials, are other regional disadvantages. These geographic hindrances also deter industrial and employment development because higher shipping costs affect product prices. Costs for transporting lumber, for example, often exceed payments to timber producers for stumpage. Construction of new and better highways would not be of much help since mineral and timber products are usually categorized as low-class freight and therefore can be shipped more cheaply by rail or water.

THE REGION'S FUTURE

Perhaps imbalance in the upper Great Lakes region economy can best be corrected by a more extensive use of its available raw materials in the expansion of manufacturing activities. The establishment of an office in Duluth by the Forest Service in 1962 to carry on market research in the timber industry may be a step in the right direction. This facility's objective is to explore more efficient use of timber resources and provide information to timber producers in the area.

More investment would stimulate industrial growth. Toward this end, area bankers and other representatives of business could form business development corporations which would make loans to foster promising new industries. An example is the Northeastern Minnesota Development Association Corp., which raised $1.25 million in private capital to help stimulate and expand present business and encourage the location of new businesses in their area of operation.

New industry would not only increase employment, but also reduce seasonal fluctuations in jobs. However, the area must be made more attractive to potential industries. A prime inducement to an industry to locate in an area is the availability of those skills which are necessary for its effective operation. Although the region has ample available manpower, most of the unemployed and underemployed workers in the region have skills which are geared to mining, forestry, or agriculture, rather than to manufacturing. To help provide the necessary skills, an extensive program of training and retraining is now underway in many areas of the region.

SMALLER COMMUNITIES PROGRAM

The smaller communities program of the U.S. Employment Service and affiliated State employment services has had an impact on employment in several communities in the upper Great Lake region. This program is designed to develop methods for providing more effective employment services to rural areas and to assist in the implementation of programs for their economic adjustment. Activity has been focused on six counties in Wisconsin, where a mobile team of interviewers, counselors, and test administrators developed manpower resource information and made it available to the community and prospective employers, several newly located in the counties. Area Redevelopment Act and Manpower Development and Training Act training courses have also been initiated to upgrade skills of workers to meet employer needs. As a result of these activities, several hundred of the unemployed have either been placed in jobs or selected for training. Similar smaller communities programs are presently beginning in Michigan and Minnesota.

For some time, efforts have been made to attract plants to utilize the region's low-grade iron ore to produce taconite in the manufacture of ore-bearing pellets. After recent approval by Minnesota voters of a proposed amendment to guarantee taxes on taconite will not be raised above general corporate levels for at least 25 years, two large steel producers announced plans for building plants in that State costing $150 million. An estimated $500 million will be invested in new taconite plants in Minnesota by 1970, with expectations that thousands of direct and indirect jobs will eventually be created.

The region's vast potential for tourism probably offers the best prospects for near-term economic stimulation to employment despite the seasonality of these activities. If developed to useful levels, the area's abundant resources, including the thousands of lakes and streams, could serve as important attractions.

A number of recreational development projects are underway in the region. In northeastern Minnesota, for example, the ARA and the State department of business development have allocated funds for building up the State's tourist industry.

Since almost all tourists and vacationists travel by automobile, perhaps the building of up-to-date highways would promote such travel to and within the region. Upwards of $20 billion are spent annually in the United States on recreation and tourism, and the upper Great Lakes region should strive for its share and thus generate employment in the service industries and in wholesale and retail trade.

The region's employment problems can probably be solved more readily and effectively by instituting a single, comprehensive program based on a regional approach. This is essential if the region's economic rehabilitation and potential are to be fully realized and new jobs created for its unemployed.

Work force, employment, unemployment, and unemployment rate, upper Great Lakes region, 1960–63

Item	Annual average (thousands)		Percent change, 1960–63
	1963	1960	
Work force:			
Labor areas [1]	147.5	156.7	−5.9
Very small areas [1]	164.9	183.9	−10.3
Total, region	312.4	340.6	−8.3
Employment:			
Labor areas	134.3	142.9	−6.0
Very small areas	149.1	167.1	−10.8
Total, region	283.4	310.0	−8.6
Unemployment:			
Labor areas	13.1	13.7	−4.4
Very small areas	15.9	16.9	−5.9
Total, region	29.0	30.6	−5.2
Unemployment rate:			
Labor areas	8.9	8.7	
Very small areas	9.6	9.2	
Total, region	9.3	9.0	

[1] Labor areas are those with 15,000 or more work force. Very small areas have fewer than 15,000 work force.

Source: U.S. Employment Service, based on data from the Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin State Employment Security Agencies.

The Promise and Challenge of the Computer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment of Congress Gen. David Sarnoff, the chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America, gave a most interesting address on the impact on our society of the computer. In order that we meet the challenge presented by our constantly changing environment a knowledge of exactly how we can make the computer work for us is necessary. I ask that General Sarnoff's speech be reprinted in the RECORD at this point:

THE PROMISE AND CHALLENGE OF THE COMPUTER

(Address by David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corp. of America, to the Fall Joint Computer Conference, San Francisco, Calif., October 27, 1964)

California has always been synonymous in my mind with innovation and progress, and the past year has given me fresh reason to think so.

Seven months ago, at the NBC studios in Burbank, I had the pleasure of presiding at the inauguration of a new dimension in business communications. By means of two-way closed-circuit color television two large assemblies of RCA's shareholders—one in California and the other in New York—were brought into instant visual and verbal communication at our 45th annual meeting. Despite their continentwide separation, the two groups were as effectively unified as though they were meeting under one roof.

Three months later, the sense of participation was almost as direct and immediate with the successful performance of Ranger VII. Again, this was an accomplishment that spanned the continent. RCA cameras and transmitters built in New Jersey, aboard a spacecraft built in California, completed their historic mission at a third point—the moon.

Today, I am glad to be in California and to experience again this sense of participation in progress. It is expressed this time in a gathering of more than 4,000 scientists and engineers from a new and dynamic industry that traces its line of descent directly to the beginning of the art and science of electronics. The modern electronic computer is the precocious offspring of wireless telegraphy and radio telephony, and it is creating a new dimension of progress through the high-speed handling of electronic signals.

Since the birth of RCA in 1919, our principal efforts have been concentrated on transmitting, receiving, and recording information by electronic means. It was natural, therefore, that our scientists and engineers were among the first to begin the study of electronic computing techniques, and I believe their contributions to this new art have been significant.

Six years ago, when we entered the computer field commercially, it was the logical extension of everything we had been doing up to that point. We are making good progress—in technology, programing, service, sales, and revenue—and we will soon announce some significant new product developments which we believe will contribute to the industry's future growth. Last month, we crossed over into the promised land of computer profits. While the trip was rugged, we found the new terrain to our liking, and

we expect to stake out a permanent profit claim.

THE LESSON OF STANDARDS IN ELECTRONICS

During my 58 years in electronics, I have seen several dynamic industries emerge from conceptual beginnings in the laboratory. The most memorable were radio communications, radio broadcasting, sound movies, black-and-white television, and color television. While their origins differed in detail, all shared a common experience that has a distinct parallel today in the rise of computers as another major member of the electronics family.

All were intensely competitive from the beginning and have remained so. But they began fulfilling their potential only after agreement had been achieved for technical standards prescribing the kind and quality of service to the public. A pattern for progress was thus fashioned without sacrificing the vital stimulus of competition in developing newer, better, and more economical equipment, and in furnishing more efficient service to the user.

I am convinced that this same process must occur in the computer industry. Even now, the computer is stirring a revolution of the brain just as steampower stirred a revolution of the muscle. The potential effects are almost incalculable—but their full realization calls for the same definition of ground rules that permitted the growth of the older electronics industries.

When sight was added to sound with black-and-white television, the need for technical standards as the basis for orderly growth was clearly recognized. The receiver in the home and the transmitter in the studio had to be built to operate on the same standards. A committee representing all major elements of the industry obtained practical unanimity on such standards as a precondition to the establishment of a public television service. It was on this foundation that black-and-white television grew so phenomenally in the postwar era.

Again, in the early 1950's, the industry underwent the long and difficult process of reaching agreement on a workable service to the public. This time the issue was color television, and two sharply different systems and standards were in dispute. One was based on a mechanical color wheel which could produce color images but whose transmissions could not be received by the black-and-white receivers in the Nation's homes. It was therefore incompatible with existing equipment. The other was an all-electronic compatible system which could be seen in black and white on any TV set in the home.

It was evident that, if the incompatible mechanical standards were to be adopted, the industry would be saddled with an inferior system and the public with an inferior, more costly product. To adapt the 10 million sets then in existence in order to receive a degraded picture in black and white would have cost the public approximately $500 million. Without an adaptor, the TV screen would simply go blank.

Clearly, there were many inherent advantages in adopting an electronic rather than a mechanical system of color television. For the industry, the basic issue came to this: should the millions of dollars already invested by television set owners be jeopardized by an incompatible color television system?

Once more, an industry group was formed to draft signal specifications and standards. The result, after 32 months of work, was a complete set of compatible color signal specifications closely following those that had been developed through long years of laboratory research and engineering. These ultimately became the basis for color television in the United States—a business that now stands with data processing in the forefront of the Nation's industrial growth.

The industry committee did its work so thoroughly that every subsequent advance in the color television art has been put into service with no change whatever in the original standards.

THE NEED FOR STANDARDS IN COMPUTERS

The phenomenal rise of data processing bears certain resemblances to that of color television. It is confronted in similar fashion by a question of compatibility. The investment of the user is again a primary consideration. The issue becomes more acute as the growing computer industry intensifies its competitive drive for new and more ingenious ways to accommodate the user.

From the two score or so machines in existence barely a dozen years ago, there are now some 17,000 general-purpose computers in the United States alone, and the number is increasing at a rate of more than 500 a month. Within the coming decade, the computer population can increase enormously.

Whether it realizes its full growth potential depends in very large degree, however, on the measures we undertake now to establish the basis for orderly development. The interests of the industry and the needs of the user demand a far greater measure of compatibility and standardization among the competing makes of computers and means by which they receive and transmit information.

Neither the operators nor the machines we have built for the processing and transmission of information can yet speak to each other in a commonly understood and accepted language. The means of preparing data, of forwarding and entering data in the machine, and of instructing the machine in its use differ sufficiently from one make of equipmnet to the next so that none can readily accept the product of another.

We function today in a technological Tower of Babel. There are, by conservative count, more than 1,000 programing languages. And there are languages within languages—in one instance, 26 dialects, and in another, 35 dialects. There are eight computer word lengths in use. There are hundreds of character codes in being, at a ratio of one code for every two machines marketed. Four magnetic tape sizes are employed with at least 50 different tape tracks and codes.

Standards have not been accepted even for commonly used symbols, instruction vocabulary, or program development procedures. Words which have currency throughout the industry assume different meanings, depending on whether a man has trained in Pasadena, Poughkeepsie, or Camden. We have yet to produce a universally accepted computer glossary.

No means have yet been perfected for a program in one basic language to be run efficiently into computers of different makes. The result has been needless duplication, delay, and waste—both to the manufacturer and to the user—in cost, in equipment, in operating efficiency, and in manpower and skills.

Incompatibility has compelled the manufacturer to build optional choices into peripheral equipment for the input and output of data. It has required him to maintain various types of the same equipment, or to build to a customer's specifications on each order. It has diverted needed engineering and programing talent from the vital work of new product and systems development.

The burden of incompatibility has been even more onerous to the user. It has meant the extra cost of providing hardware and programs to handle the differences between incompatible systems, the cost of extra machine time to process data set for another computer, the cost of training people to do things differently, the cost of not being able to do the job immediately.

Last year, an estimated $2 billion was spent by American business and Government for privately developed computer programs, representing thousands of man-years of effort. Yet, when a change to new equipment is made, portions of this effort must be thrown away because they have no validity to another make of machine, or they are retrievable only at further cost.

I have heard it said that even a degree of standardization and compatibility might inhibit the progress of the art. In my judgment, this argument is without substance. The nature of a computer is such that its operation is governed far less by its internal construction than by the program that is given to it.

The effort to bring order to the flow of computer intelligence need not affect competition either in creating programs or in seeking new generations of increasingly efficient machines. On the contrary, the result could be a greater concentration of effort toward this primary goal.

PRELIMINARY STEPS TOWARD INDUSTRY STANDARDS

During the past 4 years, certain essential preliminary steps have been taken toward industry standards and compatibility, largely under the aegis of the American Standards Association and the Business Equipment Manufacturers Association. Representatives of the industry, of users, and of technical groups have proposed industrywide standards in such areas at data transmission, information exchange, and character recognition.

Working with a committee of the International Standards Organization representing the computer interests of 13 foreign countries, they have recommended worldwide standards which would make it possible for a credit card or invoice produced in any country to be read by equipment anywhere in the world. Another recommendation, for information interchange, would make it possible for computers in all countries to talk to each other in a common language, when it is adopted and implemented by the manufacturers.

FURTHER ACTION ON STANDARDS IS ESSENTIAL

That phrase—when adopted and implemented by manufacturers—is central to the resolution of the problem. For in our country, at least, the action is voluntary, and until these and other standards are put into general use they remain little more than statements of hope.

Today, Western Europe is energetically seeking to close the computer gap and is moving toward the establishment of standards. During the next 5 years, the use of computers in European industry and government is expected to develop at an accelerating rate. Ten years from now, the foreign market might well equal that of the United States.

Unless we achieve some coherence in our own ranks, we may find ourselves following instead of initiating standards.

All of us, in computer manufacturing, in communications, and among the user groups—at the technical as well as the managerial level—share a common interest in the free interchange of information, and the media and equipment through which it flows.

This demands that we give compatibility the urgent consideration which it merits but which it has not yet received. It requires the wholehearted support by all of us of the standardization work that is now going forward, and implementation of the results with all deliberate speed. It will require that we submerge our differences, through fair and equitable compromise, to achieve greater ends.

I do not suggest that existing systems be discarded. That would be unrealistic as well as costly. Even today's computer has reached maturity in one basic respect: its average time between failures, measured in minutes only a decade ago, is now measured in

months. This is a level of operating reliability far beyond that of either the automobile or the airplane.

But new generations of systems are coming, and the time to bring order into progress is now, before they have fully arrived. Standards can be established which, if planned with thought and foresight, can guide us in the future, linking our separate efforts and facilitating the common evolution of our industry. Such standards are indispensable to continued progress.

THE COMPUTER'S IMPACT ON THE FUTURE

As the shape of tomorrow's technology takes form, the volume and accessibility of data stored in the computer will play a decisive role. All information as to what to do, how to do it, and what data to do it with, resides in the memory of the machine. With larger and faster memories there are few limits to the tasks that can be solved or the speed with which they are completed.

The time is soon coming when these memories will be capable of storing up to 100 million bits of information, retrievable in fractional millionths of a second.

For external memories, the goal is a trillion bits, possibly advancing later to capacities that are many times greater.

By these means we can hope to store all of the information that is presently contained in all the world's libraries.

Tomorrow's standard computers and their peripheral equipment will instantly recognize a handwritten note, a design or drawing which they will store and instantly retrieve in original form.

The computer of the future will respond to commands from human voices in different languages and with different vocal inflections.

Its vocabulary will extend to thousands of basic words in the language of its country of residence, and machines will automatically translate the speech of one country into the spoken words of another.

The computer itself will become the hub of a vast network of remote data stations and information banks feeding into the machines at transmission rates of a billion or more bits of information a second.

Laser channels will vastly increase both data capacity and the speeds with which it is transmitted.

Eventually, a global communications network handling voice, data, and facsimile will instantly link man to machine—or machine to machine—by land, air, underwater, and space circuits.

We will see computer switchboards in space, similar to those presently in operation on the ground, routing in milliseconds any communication to and from virtually any point in the world.

The interlocking world of information toward which our technology leads us is now coming closer to realization. It will be possible eventually for any individual sitting in his office, laboratory, or home to query a computer on any available subject and within seconds to receive an answer—by voice response, in hard copy, or photographic reproduction, or on a large display screen.

We will see the emergence of national and global information processing utilities, serving tens of thousands of subscribers on a time-sharing basis. These utilities will accommodate the specialized needs of researchers and engineers, lawyers, medical men, sociologists, or the general needs of the public.

The ordinary citizen may well carry an individual credit card for use anywhere to charge his bank account electronically over a worldwide data communications network that would link up with the telephone systems of all nations.

Such an arrangement could employ simple input units located in all retail establishments—service stations, restaurants, hotels, and other public facilities. These would be in direct and instantaneous communication with a system of banking computers to permit the transfer of funds without the many duplicate bookkeeping and mailing steps that characterize the present credit card system.

A scientist will be able to discuss a problem by two-way television with a colleague anywhere on the globe, and both of them will be able to query a computer at another terminal point for assistance in finding the solution.

Private corporations, many of which will be international in ownership and operation, will have instant access to production and market information from data stations positioned around the globe.

Similar systems will operate on a vastly larger scale for Government agencies—military, diplomatic, and economic.

The computer will evaluate and offer alternate courses of action, taking into account all the known and probable variables of a given situation.

This emerging pattern inevitably will set in motion forces of change within the social order, extending far beyond the present or presently predictable applications of the computer. It will affect man's ways of thinking, his means of education, his relationships to his physical and social environment, and it will alter his ways of living.

I believe, for example, that television in a vastly expanded form will become our major instrument for communicating general or specialized information. The same broadband channels that accommodate the TV picture signal can also transmit masses of computer data at ultrahigh speed for instant display.

One day, we will receive our newspapers and technical publications, photocomposed by a computer, by direct display on a wall screen in the home or office. If we wish to retain any part of them for future reading or reference, it can instantly be produced in electrophotographic copy.

As computers become amenable to simple commands, they will become as indispensable to education as the reference library. Indeed, they will become tomorrow's reference library, used by every student from the upper elementary levels through university.

Far from eliminating the need for intense intellectual effort, they will permit young people to undertake mental explorations far beyond the boundaries of the present classroom world.

The computer already is opening areas of knowledge long denied us by the sheer magnitude of the mathematics involved. The implications are no less fundamental for the social and life sciences than for the physical disciplines. By correlating vast quantities of data and uncovering new relationships we can for the first time obtain significant information on social and human behavior—from the destructive tendencies of some to the learning power of all.

THE ULTIMATE CHALLENGE POSED BY THE COMPUTER

The ultimate implication of the computer is that it provides a means of releasing the productive powers of the human brain to an almost limitless degree. Yet the computer imposes as a precondition the sternest discipline to which the mind has yet been subjected.

Even to use the machine, we must apply clear and precise logic to situations which heretofore were assumed to be beyond analysis. We must state precisely what we know or do not know, and what we wish to know.

If we are to develop the computer to its full potential as a reference storehouse of human knowledge, we face the immense intellectual challenge of researching every major field of human activity, of assembling, analyzing, and identifying its documents, and reducing the information to acceptable machine form.

Before the end of the century, I believe that these codification efforts will coalesce into what unquestionably will become the greatest adventure of the human mind. We shall achieve a far more comprehensive understanding than we have today of man and his environment. We shall do so through the orderly compilation of accumulated knowledge and wisdom, beginning with the days of clay tables and papyrus scrolls. The human horizon will then encompass all that man has ever known, and all that his science will enable him to know.

But how swiftly we scale these heights depends upon the steps we take today to bring order and compatibility to our art. It is an urgent task to which all of us who bear the responsibility for leading this industry into the future must turn our efforts.

It was Socrates who said: "Let him who would move the world move himself." His words have particular pertinence at this time and in this place. For we of the computer industry must surmount today's challenge before we can advance to tomorrow's promise.

Let me conclude on a personal note.

Whether your individual role is large or small, the significance and scope of this new science and industry are such that in a genuine sense you are making history. The impact of your knowledge and talents will echo down the corridors of time. The quality and content of life on this planet will be profoundly affected—indeed are already being affected—by your labors.

I am grateful for the opportunity to have shared a few thoughts with you.

Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 29, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Setting Nasser Straight," which was published in the Richmond News Leader of Thursday, January 28, 1965, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SETTING NASSER STRAIGHT

Eighteen months ago, Congress took note of the intensity of Col. Gamal Abdel Nasser's anti-American activities, and voted to cut off all aid to Egypt, except that aid extended under Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program, through which the United States provides one-fourth of the Egyptian people's caloric intake. This week, the House recognized the futility of extending even this aid by voting to block all further food shipments to Egypt.

The provocations for this aid cutoff are palpable: On November 26 of last year, uncontrolled mobs burned and sacked the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library in Cairo. On December 19, Russian-built planes of the Egyptian Air Force shot down an unarmed plane owned by the John Mecom Oil Co., of Texas. On December 23, Colonel Nasser told the United States to go drink sea water, an Arabic equivalent of the Western "go jump in the lake." In the same speech, Mr. Nasser also admitted candidly that his country is supplying arms to rebel forces in the Congo, at the same time that the United States is opposing the rebels through its support of the Congolese regulars. Egypt also has persisted in maintaining 40,000

troops in strife-torn Yemen, delaying a peaceful settlement of Yemen's civil war.

Yet Mr. Nasser's anti-American campaign would not have been possible without American aid. Since 1946, he has received almost a billion dollars in aid from the American people; of this, two-thirds, or $575 million, were handed out in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. Much of this aid has been economic, paid for in Egyptian currency that cannot be removed from that country. At last estimate, the United States owned almost a quarter of a billion dollars in Egyptian currency, much of which has been lent or given to the Egyptian Government over the years.

For Nasser, America's aid in agricultural programs has made possible a diversion of his nation's resources into the purchase of $1 billion in arms from Russia. According to Columnists Allen and Scott, U.S. funds have financed such unannounced projects as $2,631,000 for groundwater investigation in the Western Desert; $1,725,000 for assistance to an engineering school at the University of Assiut; $1,113,000 for agricultural education and related activities; $843,000 for national economic planning; $605,000 to improve crops and livestock; $317,000 to train Egyptian police officers in the United States; $142,000 to improve cooperative marketing; and $136,000 to develop hydraulic research.

Mr. Nasser acknowledges his gratitude for U.S. aid in unmistakable terms: "If the Americans think that they are giving us a little aid to dominate us and control our policy, I would tell them we are sorry." And then, we "can go drink sea water."

Following this, Colonel Nasser had the arrogance to ask for $37 million—$22.4 million in wheat, $8.8 million in tobacco, $5.6 million in vegetable oil—still outstanding under a $431.8 million food for peace agreement signed in October of 1962. It was the extension of this $37 million that the House this week voted against, in keeping with a provision added to the Foreign Assistance Act approved for fiscal 1965. This provision authorizes withdrawal of assistance from any country that commits aggressive acts against any other country receiving U.S. aid. Egyptian-sponsored activities in Yemen and the Congo alone would justify the action of the House in halting aid under this provision.

If the Senate should sustain the House vote, which is thought highly unlikely, it would serve notice to the world that the United States intends no longer to finance activities that work in direct contravention to this country's interests. One may understand the fierce nationalism that dictates the policies of Nasser in proclaiming his disdain for American aid, but it still seems logical to insist that U.S. aid be extended only to countries that will use this aid for the economic development of pro-Western peoples. The House vote, at least, puts the world on notice that Uncle Sam's patience is not without limit.

One Down and Ninety-nine To Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Chicago has been fortunate to be among the best-informed, most up-to-date cities in the world owing to the full and accurate coverage of all the news by the newspaper and broadcasting media in the city.

This reputation for accuracy and integrity is well deserved, as evidenced by the following story describing the Washington office of WGN and WGN-TV, two of Chicago's finest broadcasting and television facilities. The men who staff this office, Bob Foster, bureau chief; Greg Guinan, reporter; and Bert Martin, cameraman, are responsible for covering all that is newsworthy in Washington and it is to their everlasting credit that they perform this monumental task so smoothly and efficiently that millions of people in Chicago and the Midwest rely on WGN for the news each day.

Following is an article which appeared about this news bureau in the Chicago Tribune recently. I bring it to the attention of my colleagues with the hope that it will give them a renewed appreciation of the invaluable public service rendered by the members of the communications media.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

ONE DOWN AND NINETY-NINE TO GO

(By Marion Purcelli)

Quick to dispel the old adage that "the first hundred years are the hardest" is Bob Foster, Washington bureau chief for WGN and WGN-TV.

Foster, tightening his career belt as he nears the first anniversary of the bureau's opening, sat serenely in his office and reflected the difference between his old assignment, covering the State legislature in Springfield, to his new one, covering the national beat.

"It's a continuing complex situation," he said. "It's a time-consuming operation I never worried about in Springfield. The problems of logistics has emerged monumental. The capitol building there houses a majority of State offices and both houses of the legislature. Other important offices are in buildings just a stone's throw away.

"In Washington, concentrating on the Congress alone, there are three buildings for House Members and two for Members of the Senate. And the House and Senate offices are two blocks apart.

"When it comes to the basics of getting a good interview, each area has its advantages.

"The national politician, though often difficult to reach, is easier to interview and more attuned to speaking openly about national issues. The State man, though easier to find, isn't as quick to deliver his message.

"The man in Washington is extremely conscious of his responsibilities to the constituency and finds television news interviews give him a satisfying, easy, and inexpensive way to get across his message or attitude about a national issue."

Ward L. Quaal, executive vice president and general manager of WGN, Inc., announced upon opening the bureau: "The in-depth reporting of the news and dissemination of information is broadcasting's first assignment and we believe our local news coverage to be the best in mid-America.

"The opening of the Washington bureau will be but one of a series of steps to parallel WGN's local efforts with vast improvement in news service on a national and international basis."

Fulfilling this obligation permeates Foster's life.

"WGN listeners and WGN-TV viewers now have a better idea and knowledge of what's going on in Washington and how it affects them," he said. "We are the only independent station in Chicago concerned with bringing the message of government to the people back home. And, during this election year, everyone has become aware of just how important government is to us.

"It is our concern to carry the story that interests mid-America. To talk to legislators on bills that may be of national interest, but will affect the Midwest. It's my job to ask questions seeking answers that will be most interesting, are of most interest, and those that prompt a startling response."

Assisting Foster is a staff that includes Reporter Greg Guinan, Cameraman Bert Martin, and girl-Friday Linda Dietz.

"Our overall reason for being here," said Guinan, "is to provide Chicago with a service the networks can't offer. The scope is too great for the networks who find it impossible to talk about every facet that will influence every area of America. We can and have beat them on a day-to-day coverage of news that has its roots in our area.

"From the day I entered college and law school I became fascinated with radio and television broadcasting. Politics, history, and government have always had a certain fascination for me. In Washington, I find myself in the center of the universe; this is the ultimate for a newsman—to be covering the national scene of the first nation of the world."

Martin, too, finds Washington a fascinating place to work.

"It doesn't have the urgency of covering the news beat back home. There you go from fire, to press conferences, to feature stories, to accidents, to crime. Here things happen according to schedule. You can go to the Congress and know exactly what day and hour a vote will be taken on a bill.

"It's less challenging for a photographer; but requires more time and imagination. In essence the cameraman is operating a recorder and, without a reporter asking interesting or provocative questions, the film appears very dry. To bring interest to a picture I vary the reporter's position in reference to the subject, change desk props, and use lighting tricks.

Martin went on to express the drama of working in the Nation's Capital.

"There's not a man alive who was born and raised in America or who has become a naturalized citizen who can walk down the Capitol steps without being completely awestruck. The cold chills must run up and down your back because this is not only the seat of a national government, but the basis for democracy throughout the world.

"Everything that begins in the tiny precincts of every tiny town in America finds its culmination here. It has the flavor of international politics and socializing, as well as the flavor of local precincts."

And what of the next 99 years?

"Since the establishment of the bureau," said Quaal, "we have kept our listeners and viewers apprised of the activities and views of Members of Congress with reports tailored for our signal area.

"In the months and years to come, we hope to increase our coverage of the Washington scene with news emanating from the White House, Cabinet, and sub-Cabinet bureaus, and offices of major executive agencies."

Let's hope that Foss, his crew, and all their viewers will be around long enough to see it happen.

On Observing the 47th Anniversary of the Republic of the Ukraine

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my thoughts to those of my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the most valiant people ever to grace this

earth. We are gathered today to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the Ukrainian Republic. Our meeting this afternoon, however, is not a completely festive occasion, for while we honor the men and women who struggled to make the Ukraine a free republic we are also mindful of the terrible burden borne by those who today live in the Ukraine.

Recently, we have heard many overtures from the Soviet leaders that they desire cordial relations with the Western world. Might I suggest that these leaders, who for so long have unjustly considered the Ukrainians as Russians, release these valiant people from the shackles of Communist imperialism. Might I also suggest that the U.S. Government go on record recognizing the rights of the people of the Ukraine to be free and self-governing.

I have the honor of representing a number of loyal Americans of Ukrainian descent. Nothing could please me more than to see these wonderful people reunited with their loved ones. It would indeed be a joyous day in Syracuse and Onondaga County if the Republic of the Ukraine were released forever from the yoke of Communist slavery.

Closing of Veterans' Administration Facilities

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement of the Veterans' Administration concerning the closing of regional offices, VA hospitals, and domiciliary homes has been a matter of considerable concern to me, as I know it has been to many of our colleagues.

The apparent ground for this action is economy, but in my opinion, there must be close scrutiny to determine whether, in fact, the closing of Veterans' Administration facilities will mean savings in view of the economic impact both on individuals and communities.

The closing of the VA hospital at Castle Point, N.Y., will alone mean the disruption of 250 patients, the loss of 340 jobs, and the loss of a $2,400,000 annual payroll to the community.

Furthermore, the closing of these veterans' facilities appears to be directly contradictory to President Johnson's announced plan to care for the aged, wage war on poverty, and establish experimental centers designed to overcome diseases which have long plagued mankind.

It is worth noting that domiciliary homes, four of which are scheduled for closing, are occupied by veterans without funds, of advanced age, and suffering from crippling diseases.

In addition, the Veterans' Administration policy of not operating hospitals in rural or semiurban areas is sure to work undue hardship on veterans, their families and their friends. At a time when more hospitals are needed in our rural and suburban areas, why close hospitals that would cost $150 million to replace, and then ask for $90 million to build new ones?

Mr. Speaker, any readjustment in the number or operation of our veterans' facilities should be supported by more substantial evidence than has been offered in this instance by the VA, and such action must be demonstrably in accord with the long-range health care objectives of the administration.

Ambassador Stevenson's Eulogy of Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson delivered a magnificent eulogy to Winston Churchill in the Washington National Cathedral yesterday. I commend Ambassador Stevenson's superb address to the Congress and to the country.

The inspiring address follows:

TEXT OF STEVENSON'S REMARKS

Today we meet in sadness to mourn one of the world's greatest citizens. Sir Winston Churchill is dead. The voice that led nations, raised armies, inspired victories and blew fresh courage into the hearts of men is silenced. We shall hear no longer the remembered eloquence and wit, the old courage and defiance, the robust serenity of indomitable faith. Our world is thus poorer, our political dialog is diminished and the sources of public inspiration run more thinly for all of us. There is a lonesome place against the sky.

So we are right to mourn. Yet, in contemplating the life and spirit of Winston Churchill, regrets for the past seem singularly insufficient. One rather feels a sense of thankfulness and encouragement that throughout so long a life, such a full measure of power, virtuosity, mastery and zest played over our human scene.

Contemplating this completed career, we feel a sense of enlargement and exhilaration. Like the grandeur and power of the masterpieces of art and music, Churchill's life uplifts our hearts and fills us with fresh revelation of the scale and reach of human achievement. We may be sad; but we rejoice as well, as all must rejoice when they "now praise famous men" and see in their lives the full splendor of our human estate.

And regrets for the past are insufficient for another reason. Churchill, the historian, felt the continuity of past and present, the contribution which mighty men and great events make to the future experience of mankind; history's flickering lamp lights up the past and sends its gleams into the future. So to the truth of Santayana's dictum, "Those who will not learn from the past are destined to repeat it," Churchill's whole life was witness. It was his lonely voice that in the thirties warned Britain and Europe of the follies of playing all over again the tragedy of disbelief and of unpreparedness. And in the time of Britain's greatest trial he mobilized the English language to inspire his people to historic valor to save their beleaguered island. It was his voice again that helped assemble the great coalition that has kept peace steady through the last decades.

He once said: "We cannot say the past is past without surrendering the future." So today the past of his life and his achievement are a guide and light to the future. And we can only properly mourn and celebrate this mighty man by heeding him as a living influence in the unfolding dramas of our days ahead.

What does he tell us for this obscure future whose outlines we but dimly discern? First, I believe, he would have us reaffirm his serene faith in human freedom and dignity. The love of freedom was not for him an abstract thing but a deep conviction that the uniqueness of man demands a society that gives his capacities full scope. It was, if you like, an aristocratic sense of the fullness and value of life. But he was a profound democrat, and the cornerstone of his political faith, inherited from a beloved father, was the simple maxim—"Trust the people." Throughout his long career, he sustained his profound concern for the well-being of his fellow citizens.

Instinctively, profoundly, the people trusted "good old Winnie," the peer's son. He could lead them in war because he had respected them in peace. He could call for their greatest sacrifices for he knew how to express their deepest dignity—citizens of equal value and responsibility in a free and democratic state.

His crucial part in the founding of the United Nations expressed his conviction that the Atlantic Charter he and President Roosevelt audaciously proclaimed at the height of Hitler's victories would have to be protected throughout the world by institutions embodying the ideal of the rule of law and international cooperation.

For him, humanity, its freedom, its survival, towered above pettier interests—national rivalries, old enmities, the bitter disputes of race and creed. "In victory—magnanimity; in peace—good will" were more than slogans. In fact, his determination to continue in politics after his defeat in 1945 and to toil on in office in the 1950's to the limit of health and endurance sprang from his belief that he could still "bring nearer that lasting peace which the masses of people of every race and in every land so fervently desire." The great soldier and strategist was a man of peace—and for the most simple reason—his respect, his faith, his compassion for the family of man.

His career saw headlong success and headlong catastrophe. He was at the height. He was flung to the depths. He saw his worst prophecies realized, his worst forebodings surpassed. Yet throughout it all his zest for living, gallantry of spirit, wry humor, and compassion for human frailties took all firmness out of his fortitude and all pomposity out of his dedication.

Churchill's sense of the incomparable value and worth of human existence never faltered, nor the robust courage with which he lived it to the full. In the darkest hour, the land could still be bright, and for him hopes were not deceivers. It was forever fear that was the dupe. Victory at last would always lie with life and faith, for Churchill saw beyond the repeated miseries of human frailty the larger vision of mankind's "upward ascent toward his distant goal."

He used to say that he was half American and all English. But we put that right when the Congress made him an honorary citizen of his mother's native land and we shall always claim a part of him. I remember once years ago during a long visit at his country house he talked proudly of his American Revolutionary ancestors and happily of his boyhood visits to the United States. As I took my leave I said I was going back to London to speak to the English

Speaking Union and asked if he had any message for them. "Yes," he said, "tell them that you bring greetings from an English Speaking Union." And I think that perhaps it was to the relations of the United Kingdom and the United States that he made his finest contribution.

In the last analysis, all the zest and life and confidence of this incomparable man sprang, I believe, not only from the rich endowment of his nature, but also from a profound and simple faith in God. In the prime of his powers, confronted with the apocalyptic risks of annihilation, he said serenely: "I do not believe that God has despaired of his children." In old age, as the honors and excitements faded, his resignation had a touching simplicity: "Only faith in a life after death in a brighter world where dear ones will meet again—only that and the measured tramp of time can give consolation."

The great aristocrat, the beloved leader, the profound historian, the gifted painter, the superb politician, the lord of language, the orator, the wit—yes, and the dedicated bricklayer—behind all of them was the man of simple faith, steadfast in defeat, generous in victory, resigned in age, trusting in a loving providence and committing his achievements and his triumphs to a higher power.

Like the patriarchs of old, he waited on God's judgment and it could be said of him—as of the immortals that went before him—that God "magnified him in the fear of his enemies and with his words he made prodigies to cease. He glorified him in the sight of kings and gave him commandments in the sight of his people. He showed him His glory and sanctified him in his faith."

Ave Maria Endorses President Johnson's Immigration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the January 30, 1965, issue of Ave Maria, a journal published in my congressional district, in support of President Johnson's proposal for reform of our immigration laws.

The editorial follows:

QUOTA SYSTEM SHOULD GO

During the presidential campaign we heard some bitter talk about changes in immigration policies that would "let down the floodgates." From our vantage point, we do not see President Johnson's proposals on reform of the immigration laws as doing this at all. They do open the gates to reason and humanity.

Briefly, the reform called for in the President's recent message to Congress would drop the outmoded quota system based on national origins and would base admission on U.S. needs for skills on a first-come-first-served basis. It would give favored treatment to members of separated families. It would restrict immigration from any one country to no more than 10 percent of the total immigration figure but unused quotas (such as England's) could be shifted to another country.

The quota system has always favored the Nordic races. The President's proposal, we think, would eliminate the discrimination that is implied, in varying degrees, to all other peoples, especially those of dark skin.

The quota system has kept persons of talent and skill from entering the United States. To admit these people would not add to the unemployment problem in our country. Anyone who will look at the "want ad" section of any large city can note numerous openings demandings special skills that cannot be filled now or in the foreseeable future by U.S. citizens presently unemployed.

We believe freedom of movement for all peoples is a value to be guarded and promoted. The President's plan for immigration is not only to our own best interests. It is humane in its application to peoples all over the world.

Allen T. Klots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on New Year's Eve 1964, Allen T. Klots, one of the fine men of New York, quietly passed away after 75 years of activity, energy, and contribution.

I knew Mr. Allen Klots from the time I was a small boy and he was one of those men who provided inspiration for the young people around him. He has had an amazingly broad record of accomplishment.

He was a former president of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, a vigorous advocate of court reform, and a wonderful outdoorsman. He was proficient as a figure skater and as a sailor.

Allen Klots was a member of the law firm of Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts in New York City for many years and in 1931 and 1932 had served as assistant to Secretary of State Henry Stimson in Washington. He served on the Mexican border with New York's National Guard and in 1916 he went to France as a lieutenant with the 77th Division of the American Expeditionary Force. After being wounded he became adjutant to Mr. Stimson, then a lieutenant colonel in the 305th Field Artillery Regiment.

Allen Klots had many years of active practice in New York and of service to the community.

The list of Allen Klots' accomplishments would take too many pages to spell out, but a partial summary is contained in the New York Times obituary of Mr. Klots, which follows.

Mr. Speaker, New York and the country has lost a valued citizen.

The obituary follows:

ALLEN T. KLOTS, LAWYER, DIES—FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION HEAD

LAUREL HOLLOW, LONG ISLAND, January 1.—Allen T. Klots, former president of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, a vigorous advocate of court reform and a yachting enthusiast, died of a heart attack in his home here yesterday. He was 75 years old.

Mr. Klots was a member since 1913, and a partner since 1921, of the law firm of Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts, 40 Wall Street.

He served in 1931 and 1932 as a special assistant to Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson, Mr. Klots was a confidant of Mr. Stimson's and served as executor of his estate.

After serving on various bar association committees for many years, Mr. Klots was elected president of the association in 1954 and 1955. During his two terms he was active in urging court reform.

His thorough presentation of the case for overhauling the judicial structure prompted Mayor Wagner to appoint him chairman of the mayor's committee on the courts in 1956. He served in the post for 3 years, laying the groundwork for the eventual reorganization of the city's courts in 1962.

He also served on the bar's steering committee in 1958 in its drive for court reorganization throughout the State. Its efforts were successful and much credit went to Mr. Klots.

Mr. Klots, who was born in Brooklyn, was graduated from Yale in 1909 and from Harvard Law School in 1913, where he was an editor of the Law Review.

CAUGHT STIMSON'S EYE

He joined the firm of Winthrop & Stimson as a clerk, one of many taken on, but his thoroughness caught the eye of Mr. Stimson.

However, Mr. Klots left the firm to join the New York National Guard to serve on the Mexican border. In 1916, he went to France as a lieutenant with the 77th Division of the American Expeditionary Force.

After being wounded slightly 3 times, he was taken on as an adjutant to Mr. Stimson, then a lieutenant colonel in the 305th Field Artillery Regiment.

Mr. Klots stayed in France after the war for a year as a member of the staff of the American Relief Commission in Paris.

When he went back to Mr. Stimson's firm in 1921, he was made a partner.

He followed Mr. Stimson to the State Department as his assistant, and became one of the Secretary's closest advisers.

He accompanied Mr. Stimson to many conferences, including the 1932 General Disarmament Conference in Geneva.

Among Mr. Klots' assignments was the gathering of information on the Soviet Union in preparation for recognition by the United States. Mr. Klots also delved into Asian affairs, including early Japanese aggressions against China.

Though too old for active service in World War II, Mr. Klots lent his 40-foot cutter to the Coast Guard to patrol Long Island Sound. He joined the Coast Guard Auxiliary to serve aboard the cutter on night patrols.

He was an excellent sailor, and won a number of Atlantic Class sloop races in Long Island waters.

Every year he took a month's vacation to sail along the Atlantic coast. Though an arduous undertaking, he maintained this ritual up until last year.

When it was too cold for sailing, he took to skating. His family said he threw himself into the sport with the same fervor he would apply to a court case. In 1960, he was elected president of the Skating Club of New York.

In his spare time, he could be found working on a committee of the Association of the Bar.

In 1948, he headed a committee that urged Congress to adopt reforms of congressional investigating procedures. The resolution was admittedly aimed at the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In 1955, he declared himself in favor of appointment by the Governor of judges to the State's higher courts after screening by judicial commissions. Mr. Klots said that voters in New York City frequently had to choose among 20-to-35 candidates for judicial office about whom they "know practically nothing."

Mr. Klots, a former mayor of Laurel Hollow, had been a director of Schieffelin & Co., chemical manufacturers and importers of wines and spirits. He was a former treasurer of the New York Law Institute and was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, Delta Kappa Epsilon, Skull and Bones; the Downtown Association and Yale Clubs in New York City; the American Law Institute, the Metropolitan Club in Washington, the Chevy Chase Club in Maryland, the Cold Spring Harbor Beach Club and the Beaver Dam Sports Club in Locust Valley.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Mary Isabel FitzBrown Klots; a son, Allen Jr. of New York; a daughter, Mrs. Joan Porter of Laurel Hollow; a sister, Mrs. Constance Fowler of Springfield, Ohio, and two grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held Monday at 11 a.m. in St. John's Episcopal Church, Cold Spring Harbor.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

National Transportation Institute Addressed by George K. Whitney, Trustee of Massachusetts Investors Trust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the 1965 National Transportation Institute was held in Chicago on January 19. It has come to my attention that this was a most successful meeting, attracting more than 800 leaders of business, industry, finance, and transportation.

It was presented by the Transportation Association of America, in cooperation with the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry and the Traffic Club of Chicago. In addition, 30 other national, regional, and local business and transport organizations assisted in arranging the institute.

The institute is an annual daylong seminar on transportation and economic issues, featuring outstanding leaders from transport carriers, shippers, investors, and government transport officials.

The general chairman for the institute was John F. Smith, Jr., president of the Inland Steel Co., which has been a longtime and active member of TAA. Overall theme of the meeting was "Dynamic America Grows With Dynamic Transportation."

The institute program featured an outstanding array of transportation experts. At one session, four carrier leaders discussed what they want in 1965 from government, from equipment manufacturers, and from users.

These carrier leaders were F. D. Hall, president of Eastern Air Lines, Inc.; William G. White, president of Consolidated Freightways, Inc.; Robert S. Macfarlane, president of the Northern Pacific Railway Co.; and J. W. Hershey, chairman of the board of American Commercial Lines, Inc.

The institute luncheon featured remarks by General Chairman Smith and a commentary by George K. Whitney, a trustee of Massachusetts Investors Trust. Also on the luncheon program was a tribute to Frank C. Rathje, Sr., retired president of the Chicago City Bank & Trust Co., who served as president of TAA from 1949 to 1954. The tribute was delivered by the chairman of the TAA board of governors, Frank O. Prior, retired chairman of the board of Standard Oil Co., of Indiana.

In the afternoon, the institute resumed with a program featuring two Government transport experts and the president of the National Industrial Traffic League.

Lowell K. Bridwell, Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, spoke on "Transport's Role in the Great Society."

From the Bureau of the Budget came its principal transportation economist, Gordon Murray, who spoke on "Balancing the Books on Transportation."

"A Shipper Platform for Progress" was outlined by the NITL president, C. H. Wager, the general traffic manager of Shell Oil Co.

Mr. President, this institute occurred on the 30th anniversary of TAA, a national transport policymaking organization whose membership is an across-the-board section of top leaders from all phases of transportation concern—users, investors and all six types of carriers are represented.

TAA's work on national transportation policymaking—a constant effort to achieve a consensus among the different types of TAA members—is carried out under the able leadership of the TAA board chairman, George P. Baker, dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, and TAA President Harold F. Hammond, of Washington, D.C.

TAA was formed in 1935 primarily to resist nationalization of the railroads. This is a subject back in the news with the recent announcement by the Railway Labor Executives Association that RLEA now favors Government ownership and operation of the railroads. This amounted to reversal of a 45-year-old rail labor policy against nationalization.

Mr. President, I was impressed in reading the National Transportation Institute luncheon commentary by Mr. Whitney. In this address, he came forward with a proposal which I believe would be a better way to settle problems which remain between railroad management and labor.

Mr. Whitney in effect proposed summit conferences between the leaders of transport management and transport labor in all the various modes, including the railroads. These top-level conferences would seek to agree on statements of common goals over the next 5 to 10 years. If these can be ratified, Mr. Whitney suggested, then the implementing details would follow easily in bargaining sessions off to a good start because of the existing top-level agreements on principles.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to record that part of Mr. Whitney's address in which he proposed his way of settling differences between management and labor in the crucial transportation industry. It is entitled "A Challenge for Transport Leaders," and I commend it to the attention of Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHALLENGE FOR TRANSPORT LEADERS

Now, as to my "challenges" which are of a general nature and four in number—and can only be met through cooperation in the finest sense among these various parties at interest:

First, leaders of all transport segments must think anew and with open minds. Transport "troops" now committed to a rearguard battle to preserve the status quo must be reassigned to the "front line" to fight for more breakthroughs in technology, new and improved services, better equipment, and lower costs.

Two, leaders of all transport segments must also think wisely. We must profit from past mistakes, otherwise we shall repeat them. Planning should refuse to tolerate for the future such burdens as labor-management stalemates, outmoded services, archaic labor rules, artificial rates, obsolete equipment, discriminatory taxation, and the uneven hand of Government controls in which some Government departments are at odds in their use and in their regulation of transportation.

Thirdly, leaders of all transport segments must also think cooperatively. All must join in building a bigger market rather than concentrating on holding a set share of a smaller market. The long-range goals of transport labor and management, of Government and carriers, of investors and carriers, of users and carriers, and of the public and carriers are identical. All want and must have an adequately profitable and vigorously modern coordinated transport system which in the ultimate will best serve their own goals.

Lastly, leaders of all transport segments must think practically and begin to focus with greater emphasis on areas where there is already agreement. For example, why not zero in now on ending discriminatory taxation and getting more weapons to use against illegal for-hire carriage? Progress is more likely to occur when parties in contention work first on the least controversial components. This avoids major collisions on major principles, and such collisions normally stymie action on even the smallest step forward. We cannot build a better transport system by any overnight miracle. We must build it day by day, step by step. Let's take a step forward whenever we can.

Having listed those generalized goals, I now propose a specific "demonstration program" of modern transport statesmanship.

I urge the leaders of transport companies and transport-labor—in each of the various modes—to sit down together in an atmosphere of mutual respect and ratify statements of broad principles and goals to be met in each mode over the next 5 or 10 years. Such meetings would have to be founded on the joint realization by management and by labor that the future of both depends on each other. They must act in the best public interest, and they must attract investment capital.

I urge management to take the initiative on this instead of sitting back and waiting for the presentation of periodic demands by the labor organizations or waiting for the heavy hand of Federal Government to make the first move. Now is the time to elevate labor-management relations—to transform this very crucial fundamental of progress

from a partisan duel to a serious joint consideration of the massive challenges which lie ahead. The selfish welfare of these partisans and the general welfare of the economy are commonly dependent on such action.

Once broad principles are set, such as mutual acceptance of the increasing introduction of automation, mutual recognition that the impact of technology on employees should be cushioned, mutual agreement on the ever growing need for employees of higher training and new skills, mutual acknowledgment of the necessity for new techniques of operation which highly coordinated transport services of the future will require, then implementing the details should flow quite smoothly in truly enlightened bargaining sessions.

Can this be accomplished?

We can stand still if we want, but the future will never stand still. Either it will overwhelm us, if we are unprepared; or we shall master it if we are prepared—for a stronger economy and, thus, a better life for all. The time has come for private enterprise in transportation to mobilize intelligently for the inevitable battles of progress it must win if we are to remain the first Nation on earth, which in turn depends on the best transport system which men have yet devised.

We—all of us together—can make that system even better under enlightened capitalism.

A Tribute to Dr. John James Tigert, Florida's Great Educational Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, in recent days this Nation and the free world have mourned the passing of the century's greatest statesman, Sir Winston Churchill. The people of Florida not only shared the long vigil and grief which Sir Winston's final illness and death inspired, but they also mourned simultaneously the passing of one of their own great and dearly beloved citizens, Dr. James Tigert, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, and longtime president of the University of Florida.

Dr. Tigert, a Rhodes scholar from Tennessee at Oxford, England, at the beginning of this century, met and admired then the young and aspiring British statesman, Winston Churchill, at the Oxford Union. Later in life their paths were to cross again when an honorary degree was conferred by the University of Miami upon the wartime British leader. Dr. Tigert, then president emeritus of the University of Florida, and holding a chair of philosophy at the University of Miami, was assigned the seat of honor next to Sir Winston at a dinner given in his honor by the University's Board of Trustees, and there these two great men resumed an acquaintance begun half a century earlier at Oxford's famed Student Union. The one had become an illustrious world leader; the other, an illustrious educator, both without peers in their respective areas of service.

Few men have exerted a more lasting influence upon our great State of Florida than Dr. Tigert. The majority of Florida's leaders of the past two decades graduated from the institution which he served with such distinction. There were but few years in the past half century when he was not active as chairman or member of councils or committees concerned with educational matters from the local to international level. His career as a student at Vanderbilt University has been expressed admirably by a great southern educator, Dr. Edwin Mims, in his History of Vanderbilt when he said:

> He might be taken as the best example in his generation of a student who combined scholarship, social life, and athletics.

He served as president of the National Association of State Universities, of the Southeastern Athletic Conference, and of his fraternity, Phi Delta Theta; and he served 13 years as a member of the senate of of Phi Beta Kappa. He was a member of the Land-Grant College Association's executive committee for nearly two decades.

When he retired and became president emeritus, he was named as American member of the Indian Commission on Higher Education by the Government of India, and under the chairmanship of India's present scholarly President, Sr. S. Radhakrishnan, helped to write a proposal for the revision of the Indian educational system, especially adapting the land-grant college program, with its agricultural teaching, research, experimentation, and extension to the Indian scene.

Dr. Tigert's death in Gainesville on January 21, 1965, has brought forth wide press coverage and editorial comment from many parts of the Nation. As one who has shared the privilege of his friendship and the inspiration of his leadership for 30 years, I should like to have inserted in our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few items of tribute to a great and good man—A news release appearing in the Gainesville Sun, dated January 22, 1965; an editorial also appearing in the Gainesville Sun of January 24, 1965; a funeral tribute by Dr. Delton L. Scudder, head of the department of religion at the University of Florida, at the funeral service, Sunday, January 24, 1965, and a release appearing in the Florida-Times Union of Jacksonville, January 26, 1965, relating to the establishment of the Dr. John J. Tigert Alumni Chair of Distinction, by grateful alumni of the University of Florida.

The material follows:

[From the Gainesville (Fla.) Sun, Jan. 22, 1965]

DR. TIGERT DIES; NOTED EDUCATOR

Dr. John J. Tigert, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and for two decades president of the University of Florida in its mushrooming era, died yesterday after a long illness.

From his birth on the Vanderbilt University campus 82 years ago until his illness at the University of Florida Hospital, Dr. Tigert had been a towering figure in education.

The president of Kentucky Wesleyan College at the age of 27, he was appointed U.S. Commissioner of Education by President Warren G. Harding at 43 and came to the University of Florida in 1928.

At that time, the student body numbered 1,800 males. When he retired in 1947 to become president emeritus, the school was coeducational with an enrollment of 7,500.

In his youth Dr. Tigert was an active sportsman. He played halfback and fullback at Vanderbilt in 1902 and 1903 and also lettered in basketball, ran track, and kept score for the baseball team.

At Oxford, England, where he was Tennessee's first Rhodes scholar, he rowed, played cricket, tennis, and baseball.

While president, he helped organize the Southeastern Athletic Conference, initiated the first public grants-in-aid for football players and started a system of requiring all undergraduates to receive a liberal arts education.

"What good is an engineer or an accountant who can't spell," he once said.

He is remembered as being friendly and positive.

"When he said something, no one misunderstood him," said Robert C. Beaty, his dean of students.

He would go out of his way to pick up hitchhiking students and carry them to town after a warning with a Tennessee twang:

"Get in, but wipe your feet first."

Tigert was awarded 12 honorary degrees and contributed more than 200 articles to scholarly magazines.

He had undergone an abdominal operation 3 weeks ago.

American flags on the University of Florida campus will fly at half-mast for 1 month, according to University of Florida President J. Wayne Reitz.

Dr. Tigert was a member of the First Methodist Church of Gainesville, where he was on the board of stewards.

He was also a member of the Gainesville Rotary Club, the Masons, and numerous honorary societies.

Dr. Tigert's family requests that in lieu of flowers, contributions be made to the memorial scholarship fund for the University of Florida College of Medicine. Checks may be sent to the University of Florida Foundation.

Funeral services were scheduled for 3:30 p.m., Sunday, in the First Methodist Church of Gainesville. Rev. Thomas G. Mitchell will officiate. Burial will be private.

Survivors include his widow, Mrs. Edith Bristol Tigert of Gainesville; a son, John James Tigert of Long Island, N.Y.; a daughter, Mrs. Maurice Rivas, of Miami, and five grandchildren.

Jones-Johnson Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

[From the Gainesville (Fla.) Sun, Jan. 24, 1965]

DR. TIGERT FINAL RITES TODAY; MANY STATE DIGNITARIES TO BE IN ATTENDANCE

With many of the State's dignitaries in attendance, University of Florida President-emeritus Dr. John J. Tigert will be laid to rest today. Dr. Tigert died Thursday at the J. Hillis Miller Health Center after a long illness.

Rev. Thomas G. Mitchell, First Methodist Church, will preside at the private burial. He will be assisted by Rev. W. H. Lewis, minister of visitation, First Methodist Church; Rev. U. S. Gordon, First Presbyterian Church; and Dr. Delton L. Scudder, head of the University of Florida Department of Religion.

Music will be under the direction of Mrs. E. Ruffin Jones.

Active pallbearers will be Addison Pound, Sr., Harwood Dolbeare, Dr. Donald Morrison, Sr., Stephen O'Connell, Erwin A. Clayton, Dr. Lester L. Hale, W. H. Chandler, and Raymer F. Maguire, Jr., of Orlando.

Honorary pallbearers include Members of the Florida congressional delegation: Senators SPESSARD L. HOLLAND and GEORGE SMATHERS; Representatives ROBERT L. F.

SIKES, CHARLES BENNETT, A. SYDNEY HERLONG, PAUL G. ROGERS, D. R. MATTHEWS, DON FUQUA, and SAM M. GIBBONS.

Representing the board of education will be Tom Adams, secretary of state; Tom Bailey, State superintendent of public instruction; Earl Faircloth, State attorney general; Ed Larson, State treasurer; Doyle Conner, commissioner of agriculture; Ray E. Green, State comptroller.

Honorary pallbearers from around the State will be W. A. McRae, Federal judge; Doyle E. Carlton, former Governor; Richard Ervin, former attorney general; R. A. Gray, former secretary of state; Senator John McCarty; Gen. Albert H. Blanding; Gen. James A. Van Fleet; Bishop Hamilton West, northern diocese of the Florida Episcopal Church; Monsignor J. P. O'Hanoney; Dean John Beery, University of Miami.

Honorary pallbearers from the University of Florida and formerly with the University of Florida will be Dr. J. Wayne Reitz, president; Dr. Harry Philpott, vice president; Dean Emeritus W. T. Arnett; Dean Emeritus R. C. Beaty; Col. E. M. Edmonson; Director Emeritus Willard M. Fifield; Dean P. A. Foote; Dr. K. H. Graham; Dr. Harold H. Hume; Director Lewis F. Haines; Richard S. Johnson; Dean Emeritus John F. Martin; Dr. John V. McQuitty; Dean Emeritus James W. Norman; Assistant Dean Emeritus J. Ed Price; Dr. Harold Riker; Dean Dennis K. Stanley; Allen Skaggs; Dr. G. Ballard Simmons, Florida Atlantic University; Dean Emeritus Joseph Weil; Director Stanley West; Associate Dean Emeritus Harold W. Wilson; Frank Wright; Dr. Joseph R. Beckenbach; Dean Marvin A. Brooker; Dr. J. C. Dickenson, Jr.; and Dr. Marshall O. Watkins.

Gainesville friends who will be honorary pallbearers are Judge J. C. Adkins; F. W. Buckolz; J. W. Butler; Joe Crevasse; Jess Davis; S. T. Dell; Pat Keeter; Dr. T. V. McCaul; Judge John A. H. Murphree; Albert A. Murphree; M. M. Parrish; H. H. Parrish and William M. Pepper.

Also from Gainesville will be C. Addison Pound, Jr., Earl P. Powers, Clarence Thomas, Dr. Gordon B. Tison, Dr. G. W. Schwalbe, Hart Stringfellow, Justus Williams, Hayford Enwall, Senator W. A. Shands, Dr. H. J. Babers, Dr. J. M. McClamrock, Dr. Lamar Crevasse, Dr. Glen O. Summerlin, and Dr. E. H. Woodward.

Members of the Interfraternity Council and Phi Delta Theta Fraternity will also be represented.

The Tigert family has received many telegrams from highly respected persons throughout the United States sending their respects and sympathy.

Besides telegrams from State, Government officials, telegrams have been received from notables such as James G. Stahlman, publisher of the Nashville Banner; Alvin M. Owsley, former Ambassador to Romania and Ireland; Mr. and Mrs. Harold Vanderbilt, from the board of Vanderbilt University; Wayne O. Reed, deputy on the commission of education; Robert J. Miller, executive secretary of Phi Delta Theta Fraternity; and Harold P. Hamilton, president of Kentucky Wesleyan College, where Dr. Tigert was president in 1909.

Dr. Tigert's family requests that in lieu of flowers, contributions be made to the Memorial Scholarship Fund for the University of Florida College of Medicine. Checks may be sent to the University of Florida Foundation.

[Gainesville (Fla.) Sun, Jan. 24, 1965]

DR. JOHN J. TIGERT

How can one assess the greatness of a man more accurately than by reviewing his accomplishments?

In the case of Dr. John J. Tigert the list is impressive.

Honor graduate at Vanderbilt University; Tennessee's first Rhodes scholar; professor of psychology and philosophy; president of Kentucky Wesleyan College at age 27; U.S. Commissioner of Education; president, University of Florida for 19 years; holder of 12 honorary degrees; author of 200 scholarly articles; established Institute of American Affairs at the university; established University College at the university; cofounder of the Southeastern Conference for college athletics.

The caliber of his greatness also is attested by the eminence of the emissaries from high officialdom in the State and Nation who gather today to honor him and to pay their last respects to his memory.

His name already is memorialized in the Administration Building, Tigert Hall, at the University of Florida. But even more enduring is the courage, vision, and educational sinew which he built into the university.

He was one of the first great administrators to insist that professional men and women, regardless of their speciality, need to be educated as well as skilled. It was on this premise that the University College was founded, during his administration, with its required basic general education program. This program, which is still continued, has brought wide recognition to the university for its uncompromising stand on the importance of broad liberal training for all students.

Recently President Radhakrishnan of India, in sending his personal greetings to his "good friend," Dr. Tigert, characterized him as a man who inspired both affection and esteem.

That is perhaps the ultimate praise that can be given.

FUNERAL TRIBUTE TO JOHN J. TIGERT, PRESIDENT EMERITUS, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, JANUARY 24, 1965

(By D. L. Scudder)

Some three decades ago John J. Tigert made a total commitment to the young men of Florida: to the liberation of their minds, to the upgrading of their lives, to the conditioning of their bodies and to the enhancement of their spirits.

The far-reaching obligations which pursued this commitment have been discharged. An honest, forthright, useful life has been lived. Young men have been strengthened and many lives memorably enriched.

As spokesman for the University of Florida, I would like to voice the genuine tribute which you as members of the university community, both present and absent, would wish to have uttered here if you stood in my place: the grateful acknowledgement of those who experienced the power of his leadership, the benefits of his guidance, and the gift of his friendship.

Dr. John Tigert was a plain-spoken man, as honest and as candid as that day was long when the sun stood still. His yea meant yea, and his nay meant nay. His word was his bond. He meant what he said, and he said what he meant. Both friend and foe alike knew where he stood, and more often than not, he stood on high and holy ground.

A plain-spoken, forthright man merits a plain-spoken tribute. Hence let us say quite simply: Dr. Tigert was the salt of the earth.

Salt is a flavor, a seasoning which when properly added brings out the natural, intrinsic taste of food it seasons. Excessive application, salt which calls exclusive attention to itself, spoils what it might otherwise enrich.

And so, President Tigert, though distinguished and widely acclaimed in his own right, was essentially a humble man who seasoned the university's life in such a way as to bring out and to enhance the native gifts of his faculty and the substance of their labors. It was the university's life that he wished men to savor, not solely his own. He did not think the university existed to magnify his own reputation, but rather that he existed to foster the university.

Now salt is also a preservative. In the ancient world people put olives down in brine to conserve them for later use. Occasionally fish, eggs, and meat were likewise so preserved.

It is true that John Tigert labored likewise to preserve the high traditions of liberal arts education as understood in the West from former days. He determined that the young men who came to the university to learn how to make a living be further given that basic humane knowledge and the skills which lead to the enrichment of life and freedom of spirit. He sought to preserve not only the traditions of learning, but the finest traditions of sportsmanship, student responsibility and conduct. He strove to create the conditions under which boys might become men of trust, responsive to the principles of honor, liberty, self-control, duty, and service.

Again, salt is also an antiseptic, a solution in water which counteracts the destructive forces of infection and decay.

Hence we may say also proudly that Dr. Tigert possessed moral valor. He dared again and again to contend with men and with policies in whom and in which he sensed sham, self-interest, shortsightedness, false economy, sloth or stupidity. He fought firmly for the right as God gave him to see the right, and I believe that there was no final malice in his heart even toward bitter foes. This greathearted man understood the meaning of the prayer he so often uttered: "Our Father, forgive us our tresspasses as we forgive those who tresspass against us."

We who knew him will not soon forget the depth of his integrity and the magnificance of his service. We will long remember the warmth of his friendship and the cordial hospitality of his home so splendidly graced by the wife he adored.

The only true homage we can pay to this good man this day is to continue his work. It is a consolation for all to know that he knew well before the termination of his long and effectual life that the responsibilities of his office now rest in capable hands of a successor deeply committed and responsive to the ends for which he labored.

If you chance to read a list of the qualities and qualifications of the men whom Americans seek to assume the position of a university presidency: wisdom, scholarship, administrative genius, business acumen, counselor, public orator, and fulfiller of the destines of state, it dawns upon you that what they are really seeking is the Messiah. No man can meet such standards, but I expect that we Americans get better university presidents than we deserve.

Dr. Tigert was one. He was the salt of the earth.

[From the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Jan. 26, 1965]

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA ALUMNI ESTABLISH MEMORIAL TO DR. TIGERT

GAINESVILLE, January 25.—The University of Florida Alumni Association executive council has earmarked $20,000 a year to establish the Dr. John J. Tigert Alumni Chair of Distinction on the Florida campus.

The chair is designed as a living endowment to honor the former university president who died here January 21. Dr. Tigert served almost 20 years as president of the University and was president emeritus at the time of his death.

Raymer Maguire, Jr., of Orlando, chairman of a special alumni committee to establish a memorial in honor of Dr. Tigert, announced the plans to create the chair. The $20,000 to establish the project will be a part of the alumni association's 1965–66 loyalty fund campaign. University of Florida President J. Wayne Reitz and a special committee will determine criteria for the selection and naming of the recipient of the award.

Remarkable Men of History: Lyndon Baines Johnson and Winston Spencer Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in a perceptive commentary on "Remarkable Men of History," William Randolph Hearst, Jr., observes that President Lyndon B. Johnson and Sir Winston Churchill shared "a fierce and identical pride in the parliamentary form of government, common to both our lands, that is the essence of democracy."

Important lessons for our time are underlined in this study of America's Chief Executive and the late British statesman by the editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers. Under unanimous consent, I include the comments of this distinguished American newspaper editor in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

REMARKABLE MEN OF HISTORY

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

This week has been rich in history. We have seen, hopefully and happily, Lyndon Baines Johnson, of Texas, ascend to the pinacle of public office—and then be dramatically whisked to hospital, suffering from a respiratory ailment which his doctors assure us gives no cause for concern.

And we have watched, helplessly and sorrowfully, Winston Spencer Churchill, of Britain, slip toward the end of a life unmatched in greatness.

The origins of these two remarkable men of the 20th century could hardly be more diverse. President Johnson stems from pioneer stock in a harsh and arid region of Texas.

Sir Winston is the product of centuries of aristocracy, steeped in the ancient traditions of Britain—and, we can proudly add, an American mother.

Yet there is no doubt that the two, if history had placed them as contemporaries in office, would have found much in common and a wealth of mutual admiration and respect.

Above all, both would have shared a fierce and identical pride in the parliamentary form of government, common to both our lands, that is the essence of democracy.

The lives of both, in fact, have been greatly influenced by long experience in the deliberative chambers of government. No one has been more inextricably entwined with the British House of Commons than Sir Winston; he is indeed the child of that House, as he had so proudly observed.

And few can compare with Lyndon Johnson as the embodiment of Congress; for years he was the undisputed king of Capitol Hill, transforming the post of Senate majority leader from its hitherto figurehead status to one of unprecedented power and effectiveness.

But what indeed can be said about Sir Winston Churchill to do justice to the man? At the close of two-thirds of the 20th century he so clearly dominates the historical scene as to dwarf his contemporaries and match any of his predecessors.

It is an exceedingly safe bet that no one of his stature will arise, anywhere in the world, during the lifetimes of any of us.

During the past week, moreover, the world watched him wage as valiant a battle as any he has engaged in during his brave and colorful life. Felled by a stroke at the age of 90, his great heart has fought on and on to the astonishment of his doctors and to the fervent prayers of his family and friends.

We venture to guess, however, that this sheer bulldog tenacity comes as little or no surprise to Adolf Hitler's former generals or any other foes he vanquished but a short time ago.

A junior officer always in the thick of combat, a dashing war correspondent—and hairbreadth escape artist—brilliant parliamentary debater, talented painter, patient bricklayer, master politician, visionary statesman, superb historian, mighty war leader, and a dignified and sentimental gentleman who wept when the ragged, bomb-battered Londoners cheered him during his tours of their devastated streets and homes—all these and more are Winston Churchill.

History rolls inexorably on, but we shall never see his like again.

The story of the Man of the Century has undoubtedly been in President Johnson's thoughts during this past week. L.B.J. has always been influenced by greatness and a sense of purpose in others; hence his devotion to the memories of Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Sam Rayburn, and Franklin Roosevelt.

A man so rooted in democratic tradition could not, then, fail to include Sir Winston among his mentors.

Both men elevated the practice of politics to unequaled heights. For Sir Winston, politics meant duty, in the manner of his forebears the Dukes of Marlborough.

Lyndon Johnson has always felt that the art of politics transcends all others; that only through politics can diverse views among factions and nations be reconciled.

We can wonder, though, what else besides the example of Churchill has occupied the President's thoughts during this momentous week. The explosion of an atomic bomb in the remote fastness of Communist China? The enigmas of Kosygin and Brezhnev and perhaps Charles de Gaulle? or Lee Harvey Oswald and a $12.78 mail-order rifle?

We may never know which formed the President's preoccupation. For this tall, gregarious Texan is now the loneliest American. But there are many things about Lyndon Johnson that we do know—and the time is certainly appropriate to appraise him on the basis of these once again.

First, it is somewhat paradoxical that whereas L.B.J. garnered the greatest electoral majority of any President, he remains a largely unknown quantity to vast numbers of Americans outside Washington, D.C., and Texas.

He does not reflect the youth and magnetism of Jack Kennedy, the military fame of Dwight Eisenhower nor the crispness of Harry Truman. He comes closest, perhaps, to Franklin Roosevelt; but even there the similarity is by no means close.

Yet, in time, I think L.B.J. will become one of the Nation's best known Presidents, not only through communication channels, but through his accomplishments.

For today America is presented with a rare combination: A President with total experience of every nook, cranny, and pitfall of Congress—and with a Congressional makeup, in House and Senate, overwhelmingly disposed to favor of his programs.

The Congress, moreover, likes Lyndon Johnson. He is privy to its most inner councils; he can be described as a charter member of its establishment.

The congressional system is dominated by the committee chairmen—and this formidable band of Representatives and Senators feels at home with L.B.J. as perhaps with no Chief Executive before him.

As the "master compromiser" L.B.J. has earned the exasperation, admiration, enmity and unswerving loyalty of members of both parties. It is said that no one ever won an argument with him. His secret weapon, it is said, is a total aversion to division and rancor of any kind.

He has sometimes been accused, especially during his Senate tenure, of being too closely allied to Texas oil and gas interests. But L.B.J. shrewdly knew that a politician's first duty is to survive and stay in office—otherwise he is rendered ineffective and his goals of a Great Society or anything else become academic dreams.

He is the middle-of-the-roader who has always had to walk a political tightrope in his home State, a turbulent center of Democratic politics.

For years he was subject to the relentless hostility of the liberal faction of the Texas Democratic Party—yet now that he is in office he is instigating virtually everything that faction has advocated.

He is like his enormous State, both of the south and of the west. Yet few who know Lyndon Johnson will deny his broad sense of national consciousness; and as Senate majority leader the problems he faced and tackled were, of necessity, national rather than regional.

Again those who know him will tell you he is equally at home at a labor union get-together or at an Ambassador's salon. "O' Lyndon," an acquaintance one observed, "can talk to you on any level you like." And it is true that L.B.J. has an equal liking for the rough clothes of his ranch country and for Saville Row suits.

He is the Mr. Democrat who for many years loyally supported the foreign policies of President Eisenhower's GOP administration—because he felt it was his duty to do so, because it was essential that the Nation present a unified front to friends and enemies abroad.

He is the former unchallenged leader of the Senate who accepted the Vice-Presidency—against the advice of many closest to him—under the former junior Senator from Massachusetts. L.B.J. did this, again out of a sense of duty and of loyalty to his party.

Yes, I feel Winston Churchill and Lyndon Johnson would have gotten along well together. The sole holder of honorary American citizenship and the big Texan from the southwest plains would have proved a formidable team.

Thus the curtain rises on a new act in the life of one man and slowly falls on the final, mortal scene of another.

West Virginia Travel Film Receives Top Honors for Department of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the West Virginian department of commerce recently won top honors in a national contest for a travel promotional film, "West Virginia, Land for Relaxation."

The project was begun under the administration of former Gov. W. W. Barron and the present Gov. Hulett C. Smith, who at that time was commerce commissioner.

This film will do much to increase the tourist interest in the natural beauties offered by the Mountain State, and I commend the department of commerce for its initiative and production. The competition in the Outdoor-Travel Film

Festival was impressive and to win honors is indeed worth noting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the information be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTON.—The West Virginia Department of Commerce has taken top honors in national competition with its travel promotional film, "West Virginia, Land for Relaxation," Governor Smith announced today.

Leonard Barnes, president of the Michigan Outdoor Writers Association, and publisher of Motor News magazine, has advised the department that its film won first place in the outdoor-travel adventure, travel, and/or recreation category of the annual Outdoor-Travel Film Festival, sponsored by the Michigan Outdoor Writers Association and Detroit News.

Governor Smith, who as commerce commissioner authorized production of the movie in 1963, said the award was a great credit to the State.

The caliber of the competition was indicated by winners in other classifications, Smith pointed out. ABC–TV won the "Fishing" category; Evinrude Motors won the "Boating and Water Sports" Award; Winchester-Western won the "Hunting" category; and General Motors won the "How To Do It" category with a film on skiing.

Winning movies will be shown at the awards dinner at Tawas, Mich., on February 20. In addition, a 10-minute section of the film will be incorporated into a movie of segments of the winners. This film will receive wide civic club and TV circulation, Barnes advised the department of commerce. Also, a booklet will be published by the Michigan Outdoor Writers Association for national circulation describing winning films.

Smith pointed out that the travel movie was produced by the West Virginia Department of Commerce, filmed by Ellis Dungan Productions of Wheeling, and narrated by NBC's Chet Huntley. The narration script was written by Robert R. Bowers of the department of commerce.

Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, at the 30th annual meeting of the southern Governors' conference held in San Antonio, Tex., on October 14, 1964, a resolution was adopted in support of the Government's textile program for the early negotiation of international agreements to prevent disruption of U.S. markets for textile products made from wool, silk, and manmade fibers and for the vigorous administration of existing and projected international trade agreements to safeguard the rights and obligations of the United States.

As a representative from one of the largest textile manufacturing districts in the United States I feel that my colleagues will be interested in the contents of this resolution. With unanimous consent I place it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RESOLUTION IV—TEXTILES

Whereas the committee on the effect of imports on the domestic economy has reported to this 30th meeting of the Southern Governors' Conference that the U.S. Government has had in effect since 1961 a program designed to assist the American textile industry; and

Whereas the program called for a conference of the principal textile exporting and importing countries to seek an international understanding to provide a basis for trade that would avoid undue disruption of established industries; and

Whereas to date there is only an international agreement for trade in cotton textiles, now in the second year of a projected 5-year term, which is to moderate the adverse effect on the U.S. market from imports of such textiles while providing for increased future access to this market of the output of other nations; and

Whereas imports of textile fabrics and products manufactured from manmade, wool and silk fibers continue to enter the U.S. market freely and disruptively to the disadvantage of domestic mills making such fabrics; and

Whereas such imports serve to frustrate, to some extent, the purposes of the cotton textile trade agreement and to create great uncertainty for the industry generally; and

Whereas the textile industry is a primary industry of the Southern States; and

Whereas difficulties created for the U.S. textile-fiber-apparel complex by imports have a direct bearing the economies of the several States represented at this conference: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 30th annual meeting of the Southern Governors' Conference in San Antonio, Tex., October 14, 1964, calls for a reaffirmation of the Government's textile program, for the early negotiation of international agreements to prevent disruption of U.S. markets for textile products made from wool, silk, and manmade fibers and for the vigorous administration of existing and projected international trade agreements to safeguard the rights and obligations of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the members of his Cabinet Textile Advisory Committee, the Interagency Textile Administrative Committee, to each Member of the Congress and to Christian A. Herter, the President's special representative for trade negotiations.

JP–4 Versus Kerosene: The Industry's Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Airways Traveler:

JP–4 VERSUS KEROSENE: THE INDUSTRY'S POSITION

The question is often asked of us—why is JP–4 jet fuel used by a minority of carriers on oversea flights (it is never used domestically) when it is more dangerous than kerosene? It's a good question and we think we have the answer although it's probably not one which the industry will officially acknowledge.

The Airways Club's objective interest in aviation safety has won the confidence of a number of highly placed individuals in Government, in the airline industry, among the pilots and in other related fields. These gentlemen furnish us with information relating to flight safety which seldom, if ever, finds its way into print. One of these candid meetings was held last week with a leading industry jet fuel expert.

After some early and futile attempts to sell us the standard industry version of how one jet fuel is as safe as another, etc., our visitor gave us what was, in his opinion, the complete and inside position of those who manufacture and use JP–4. From their point of view, it's logical. Whether it's justified when considered solely in terms of safety is another matter.

A committee of experts has just submitted a report to the FAA about JP–4 versus kerosene. We don't know if or when it will be made public but the committee's recommendations are:

1. No single jet fuel justifies its exclusive selection over another.

2. The decision of which fuel to use should be left to the individual airlines.

3. The fueling manuals of the various airlines should be updated. This modernization should be accomplished by the airlines themselves.

4. The FAA should continue its research into the effects of lightning strikes on aircraft.

Of the four airline safety experts on the committee, two of them were employed by those carriers using JP–4. Others on the committee were employed by the petroleum companies which manufacture JP–4. Although the professional qualifications of these gentlemen cannot be questioned, it does seem to us that there might be a slight tendency to resist naming their companies as users of a dangerous fuel. We understand that there was some consideration given to soliciting the views of Airways Club member General Kenderdine but this was rejected. Perhaps it could be asked with validity if objectivity was really desired.

In spite of the committee's conclusions, we understand that the real reasons for the continued use of JP–4 are economy of operation and abhorrence of governmental control.

We have been told that—all things being equal (meaning price)—there is not a man on the committee who would not choose kerosene over JP–4. But the difference in price at most oversea areas between the two fuels is often formidable. Those U.S. carriers using JP–4 on oversea flights would have to absorb very substantial expenditures of additional money if they were to switch to kerosene.

When economic considerations become burdensome, flight safety becomes a luxury. Airline executives must become overwhelmingly convinced that the expenditure of such money is justified. Although they are aware of the inherently safer qualities of kerosene, they point out that few accidents can be directly attributed to one fuel or the other. Accidents are primarily avoided by highly skilled pilots, well maintained aircraft, well trained and dedicated traffic controllers, and just plain luck. Although kerosene is innately safer, there simply haven't been sufficient accidents to warrant the cost involved in switching to kerosene.

The thought of the Federal Government dictating to the airlines that this and not that jet fuel shall be used is a nightmare to the industry. It is an expected adverse reaction to governmental interference with business.

The petroleum industry, while maintaining a facade of indifference to whether kerosene or JP–4 is used, would lose the benefits of many large, signed contracts, and they would face the expense and time lag necessary to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

modify their facilities for fulfilling the increased demand for more kerosene should the use of that fuel become mandatory.

That is the problem—economics and the specter of governmental control versus the use of a safer fuel. Is increased safety worth the cost?

An interesting document has come into our hands. It was prepared by the Association of Casualty & Surety Companies entitled "Special Hazards Bulletin." It is dated 1958 which indicates that the airlines have been aware of this problem for years although the passengers have not. It must be pointed out that this is an objective report and not prepared by a committee composed of something other than disinterested people. Here are some of the findings:

"JP-4 at normal temperatures and pressures gives off vapors which are capable of forming ignitable mixtures with the air near the surface of the liquid. Kerosene grades of jet fuels are below their flash point range at normal temperatures and pressures but can vaporize to form ignitable mixtures in hot climates when temperatures exceed +95° F.

"JP-4 may form flammable vapor-air mixtures in a closed container in the range from −10° F. to +100° F. It can be seen that JP-4 represents the most serious practical hazard under normal temperature conditions as the ambient temperatures for most of the United States fall within this temperature range. Kerosene fuels have a temperature range of from +95° F. to +165° F., in which it may be possible to have a flammable vapor-air mixture in a closed container.

"JP-4 and aviation gasoline have a rate of flame spread about seven or eight times greater than that of kerosene grade fuel. This is an important factor in evaluating the severity of the fire hazard encountered under these conditions, and is also a factor which would affect the ease of fire control."

A final observation but perhaps the most shocking of all. The FAA provides many admirable and absolutely essential services to all commercial and general aviation. These benefits are expensive to furnish. At a press conference in Washington on December 16, Mr. Halaby stated that he was going to seek a new 2 cents a gallon tax on kerosene jet fuel to assist the Agency to meet its obligations.

Kerosene has never been taxed before; JP-4 is taxed. At present, the national average cost of JP-4 and kerosene is approximately equal. Since this is so, all the domestic airlines use kerosene exclusively and specifically prohibit the use of JP-4. Should this tax on kerosene be approved, we predict that economics will force the domestics to turn to the use of JP-4.

Tax on kerosene will assist the Agency to obtain more revenues should the domestic airlines continue to use it. If the proposed tax results in a massive switch to JP-4, there will be additional revenues from the increased use of that already taxed fuel.

When fighting for aviation safety, economic considerations make a powerful adversary.

Crisis For State Universities? Outlook: Worse Next Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Illinois, and many other States with land-grant schools, long prided itself on the fact that its State university was open to all high school graduates who wanted to enter. That concept has changed. The University of Illinois last fall turned away more than 5,000 fully qualified students, the first time such a limit was put on enrollments.

In the following article written for U.S. News & World Report, Dr. David D. Henry, president of the University of Illinois, and also head of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, gives his views on the problem confronting our State-supported colleges and universities. It should be "must" reading for those concerned with the financing of higher education, and that means every Member of Congress.

The article follows:

CRISIS FOR STATE UNIVERSITIES? OUTLOOK: WORSE NEXT FALL

(Interview with Dr. David D. Henry, head of University of Illinois: Why are States abandoning the idea that every high school graduate has a legal right to enter a State university? Can a student commute to college—and get a good education? What should a junior college system offer? How fast can new colleges be built? Are Federal scholarships essential? For answers to such questions, U.S. News & World Report interviewed Dr. David Henry, president of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and head of the University of Illinois, one of the largest State institutions in the United States.)

Question. Dr. Henry, are qualified high school graduates being denied admission to the University of Illinois?

Answer. Yes. Last fall we turned away more than 5,000 fully qualified students from two campuses. I might add that this was the first time such a limitation was put into effect in Illinois. Up to now, we have managed to stretch our capacity to take virtually all of the students who met our admission requirements.

This necessary action, therefore, has come as something of a shock to us as well as to our citizens and our State.

Illinois is not alone, however. For many years, in certain other States, qualified people have had either to go out of State for their education, or to go without if they were unable to finance an education away from home.

While I do not wish to make unfavorable comparisons among the States, it is widely acknowledged that California has probably achieved the most—erected the best structure of State service—in providing post-high-school opportunity for all qualified youths.

Question. What is the key point in California's approach?

Answer. California has recognized that there must be a State system of higher education that provides some kind of advanced educational opportunity to every student who seeks training beyond the high school level. It does this with its comprehensive multicampus State university for advanced undergraduate work, professional training, and graduate work, plus its State colleges and its junior colleges.

Question. Is the California system the shape of the future in higher education?

Answer. I don't think there is much point in trying to generalize about how any one State should get this job done.

The important thing is that there must be a State system. The parts of such a system already are in being in most places. Every State has its State universities, both limited-purpose and comprehensive institutions. Most also have either community junior colleges or 2-year branches of State universities.

The problem now is to expand, coordinate and evolve in a planful way, on the basis of what we have.

Any plan, in my opinion, ought to encompass the strengthening of the comprehensive universities and the State colleges or regional universities. And the 2-year colleges ought to cover four functions: one, the academic equivalent of the first 2 years of liberal arts and sciences for the students who will transfer to the university; two, general education for the students who do not intend to go beyond the junior college; three, technical education for the students who want post-high school vocational or technical training, and four, adult education especially adapted to the needs and the interests of the community.

Question. Is Illinois going to push junior colleges?

Answer. The junior college program that is recommended under our recently adopted master plan for higher education is a vital part of that plan.

By locating junior colleges where students can live at home while going to school, costs are minimal for everybody. It's cheaper for the student and for the people trying to provide the institutions.

Question. The students will commute—

Answer. You will find that half of the college students in America today are living at home while going to college, if you look at the urban institutions of all kinds: the branches of State universities, the junior colleges, the large State universities, and the private institutions located in cities.

Most people do not appreciate the growth and extent of the commuting-student movement.

Question. Can a commuting student get as good an education as the student who goes away from home to attend college?

Answer. We have accepted the idea that, while there are many virtues in going to college away from home—many advantages to the individual—a student can also remain at home, save the cost of room and board, and commute to college with real educational success. Further, he may have access to urban cultural and educational resources not available to the typical resident student.

The idea of the commuting student needs more exposition. The idea is an old one, particularly in Europe; but its rapid development in the past 50 years is an American phenomenon. It is not popular in England, for example; but most American educators believe that the commuting student can receive a sound education.

In Illinois, we think that the extension of public higher education should take place in the metropolitan areas. The new branch campus of this university, in Chicago, will serve commuting students and the Illinois master plan for the future has as one of its specifications that the major expansion in State-college units should be for commuting students.

BEYOND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Question. Does this mean that most of the new colleges in Illinois and other States will be junior colleges in big cities?

Answer. No, for it is obvious that we cannot rely exclusively on the junior college as the sole means of new capacity. Where are those who want to go on from the junior colleges going to go? There must be places for the students to continue higher education.

It would be a serious oversight if additional 4-year or degree-granting programs were not planned simultaneously with junior colleges, because the two are complementary.

Then, too, we must recognize that universities will continue to expand in the areas of specialized and professional education. The junior colleges will not set up, for example, engineering or pharmacy or veteri-

nary-medicine programs. All these areas are growing, also, and all demand specialized training from the start of the undergraduate's education.

Question. Going back to the 5,000 qualified students you had to turn away: Where did they go?

Answer. Our survey tells us that 13 percent did not enroll anywhere. Thirty-seven percent went out of State. This is unfortunate for Illinois, to drive young people out of the State for lack of educational opportunity. The remainder went to other State universities in Illinois, and to junior colleges or private institutions in Illinois.

Question. Are parents of those students resentful that their children didn't get admitted to the State university?

Answer. We have not fully assessed the answer to this question. We have done our best to make clear to the citizens that the university has done its planning, that the record will show we have been talking about this problem for 10 years, and that the State has been slow to take action.

No doubt there is some public misunderstanding and resentment. When faced with personal crises of this kind, people don't stop to ask the reasons; they just react to the situation.

We are hoping, however, as time passes and the broad questions get debated, that people will come to see that there is no easy solution, and that we will have to get busy to make some headway over the next 6 years.

We can't go back now and make up the years we lost. There is not much point, really, in arguing about it.

Question. Will the day ever return when all high school graduates in a State can count on being able to enter a State university?

Answer. I doubt it. In times past, the concept in many States has been that the State university should be available to all high school graduates who wished to enter.

The present concept is that the student who wants to go on to college isn't necessarily best served by admission to the State university. Nor is there an obligation upon the State university, or any one of the several State universities, to admit him.

In my view, the only responsibility on the State is to make some kind of advanced education opportunity available to those who can profit by it.

So the parent of 15 years ago who said in effect, "Well, it's my right as a citizen to have my child admitted to the State university," must now say, "It's my expectation that the State of Illinois will in some way provide an opportunity for higher education for my child." That opportunity may not be on our campus at Urbana, or at Chicago Circle. It may be at a State-supported junior college in his community.

This idea of differentiation of opportunity is a radical change, really, and it has come upon us within the last 20 years. We accept this change in Illinois. I think every State will have to accept it, ultimately.

Question. Will you have to turn away even more students next year?

Answer. We anticipate that the situation will be worse next fall, meaning that more will be turned away, even though we shall have our new branch campus at Chicago Circle open and admit a class of third-year students, and even though a larger enrollment is planned for Urbana.

We estimate that 1971 is the earliest we can expect orderly completion of plans to handle the situation we are now facing.

Question. How long does it take to build new colleges?

Answer. It takes years. One doesn't just appropriate money and the next year have a new campus. In our experience, 6 years is the minimum. You have to determine in what general area you are going to put a campus—then make site selections, get the appropriation, hire architects, design buildings, construct them, form educational programs, and recruit a faculty.

Most of the steps come in succession, not simultaneously. Some States would say 10 years is the minimum to plan and occupy a permanent campus, but we can't wait 10 years.

FEDERAL AID FOR STUDENTS

Question. President Johnson is proposing Federal scholarships for people unable to afford college now. As an educator, what do you think of this? Can you handle a big new group of students?

Answer. A massive scholarship program at this point, ahead of expanded capacity in our institutions to receive these students, would be, of course ill timed and unfortunate.

The biggest and soundest scholarship program would be to enable the institutions to serve additional numbers without personal scholarships. The land-grant system—the group of State colleges set up in the 19th century with the aid of land grants from Congress—has been the greatest scholarship program the Federal Government could provide in making education accessible to increased numbers.

I think an extension of that philosophy, in a program to strengthen State universities, State colleges, public junior colleges and private institutions as well, is a way to channel public assistance to students more effectively than through scholarships.

I hope nothing I say here will be taken as a discouragement to developing scholarship programs. Many States now have State plans. Illinois is one. It's a very good program and has helped students in this State to go to private institutions as well as to State universities.

Private donors are being importuned constantly to add to scholarship opportunities, and this ought to be encouraged.

Question. But you oppose Federal scholarships for individuals—

Answer. I would not be opposed to a limited Federal scholarship program that really sought out the needy student who is not being taken care of at the local level.

What I am speaking against, really, is a massive program whose main effect would be to help students go to different institutions from the ones they might otherwise attend.

So very often a scholarship does not help a student have a higher education, really; instead, it helps him to get his education some place where he would not otherwise have gone. I do not object to freedom of choice, but I do not think that it is a responsibility of the Federal Government, in other words, to finance a program for student mobility rather a program for student scholarships. This is an important point that often gets lost in the discussion.

A PROBLEM WITH TAXES

Question. How can the country pay for all these new colleges?

Answer. The only generalization you can make is that total expenditures on higher education ought to keep pace, at the least, with the economic growth of the country.

The problem is that, while the wealth of the country and of the States, in the main, can support the kind of growth we need, we find ourselves entangled with ancient limitations on tax sources or methods of taxation. There is uneven distribution, too, of tax benefits at the Federal level.

A great many of the failures to meet this higher-education crisis arose not because people were unwilling to pay but because they were unable to find a way to carry the load equitably.

In all my years of association with the General Assembly of Illinois and with similar bodies in other States, seldom have I encountered a feeling among these representatives of the people that what we were talking about was not needed. The difficulty came in that they felt bound and restricted by legal, traditional or constitutional limitations on their capacity to meet the needs.

Question. Is any breakthrough coming in the financing picture?

Answer. Yes. All the States are working over this question—studying how to get a better tax system, how to tax sources of wealth not now taxed, how to reduce taxes on sources of wealth considered to be overtaxed. I refer particularly to real-property taxes and excessive sales taxes, for example.

All the States are trying to do something. So often, however, any change is a difficult process, sometimes requiring a referendum of the people on a constitutional amendment. This process is complicated politically and in many other ways.

Question. Are Federal subsidies needed?

Answer. The Federal Government is concerned about State needs. The President has talked about the possibility of returning to the States some of the general revenue of the Federal Government to relieve the financial situation at the local level, particularly where increased expenditures are needed for social and economic progress.

This is certainly an interesting idea, and might be the way to get a breakthrough on financing of colleges at the State level. I sincerely hope the suggestion will have serious attention by the Congress.

Question. Does it cost more to educate each student in a State university than he pays in tuition and fees?

Answer. Oh, yes, of course. The student tuition covers only a fraction of what you measure to be your instructional costs. This is true at most private schools, also.

With us, the tuition charge represents approximately 20 percent of instructional costs at the undergraduate level.

We estimate a graduate student studying for his doctorate will cost us $4,400 a year. His tuition may be a few hundred dollars. On the other hand, the few hundred dollars would go further toward meeting the costs of a freshman.

The fact that the State heavily supports the costs of educating students at the State university is, of course, the heart of educational opportunity. This is why I said earlier that our State universities represent the finest scholarship program any country has ever established.

Question. Yet, even at State universities, the costs borne by students and their parents have been going up——

Answer. Yes, and the rise concerns us very much, particularly at our residence campuses. It is one reason why we are giving increased attention to the commuting student.

The typical exenditure at this campus for the undergraduate today is around $1,700 for tuition, room, board, books and other necessary expenses. When you realize we are serving families whose average income is around $6,000 or $7,000 a year, you can see what kind of impact college costs make in the typical family. We have reached the place where cost increases are limiting educational opportunity for many.

Question. Can a boy still work his way through college?

Answer. Some do, but it is getting increasingly difficult. The student ordinarily must lean on help from home or scholarship assistance, unless he is fortunate enough to have well-paying jobs over a great portion of the year.

Figure it out for yourself: Count the working weeks in a school year. Even in a time of good employment, how can you earn $1,700 a year and keep pace with the academic competition? This is a very serious problem for literally thousands of students.

I don't think the answer is more scholarships, because the really needy student might not qualify. Further, I don't think some scholarship committee sitting in Urbana ought to decide when a youngster can

go to college. That kind of economic selection is foreign to the whole idea of free opportunity for a higher education.

Question. What is the answer?

Answer. I would hope that we shall find a way to gear our total cost structure, at State schools, to meet the situation confronting the student and his family.

IS CRISIS WORSENS

Question. Dr. Henry, do all the overcrowding and rising costs and other problems add up to a crisis for State universities?

Answer. I would say rather that the people of our States and Nation are confronted with a crisis. After all, universities are here only to serve the people.

In this sense, the crisis is real. The developing needs for an adequate system of higher education are clearly outrunning the capacity of our colleges to supply those needs.

This is happening across the country. It is a condition which has been forecast for some years. Only now, however, are we coming to face the realities of supply and demand. And this situation is causing grave concern.

For the first time, people are coming to realize that they may not have enough doctors at the bedside, or pharmacists, or engineers, or teachers, or some of the other professional servants who are trained in the universities—or that their children may not be able to get into college.

Address by Carl T. Rowan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the rush of world events I think it is important that this body know of the work of our agencies in the frontline of the cold war in which we are involved. Before coming to Congress I was codirector of special projects for Radio Free Europe and I was convinced then and am even more convinced now—11 years later—that the psychological aspects of what we do abroad rank equally in importance with the economic, military, and diplomatic aspects of our foreign policy. This world, in the long run, must move in one or another direction, depending in some measure on our success in the art of nonmilitary persuasion.

Recently, in Toledo, I had the privilege of hearing an address by the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, Mr. Carl Rowan, and I think it contained the best explanation of the basic work of that Agency which bears the brunt of the important job required of the United States in the information field. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent, I place Mr. Rowan's speech before the Toledo Council on World Affairs in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY CARL T. ROWAN, DIRECTOR, U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY BEFORE THE TOLEDO COUNCIL ON WORLD AFFAIRS, TOLEDO, OHIO, OCTOBER 16, 1964

It has taken me a long time to get here, but I am delighted to be back in this lovely city. Many months ago I promised Mrs. Eyster that I would come back, primarily because of my admiration for the work that the World Affairs Council is doing in maintaining citizenship interest in problems of foreign affairs.

I have found it extremely difficult to get away from Washington, but I noticed recently that almost everyone else is out somewhere speaking, and I figured I would never have a better opportunity to sneak away.

But I have not come today to participate in the great political debate that consumes our country. I have come today to talk of the U.S. Government's activities in spreading information and ideas. I shall begin by making an assertion that, for all its seeming immodesty, is a hard fact of life: our informational, or psychological, or propaganda program—call it what you will—is today a vital part of our first line of national defense.

I say this because while it is true—and obviously so—that we have moved into the thermonuclear age, it is also true—though less obviously so—that we have moved into the age of persuasion.

In 1787, in a letter to Thomas Jefferson, John Adams wrote:

"Neither philosophy, nor religion, nor morality, nor wisdom, nor interest will ever govern nations or parties against their vanity, their pride, their resentment or revenge, or their avarice or ambition. Nothing but force and power and strength can restrain them."

John Adams' comment tells a lot about the world of the century and a half that followed. It was a world of force—a world where sheer power was a restraint, but only of the strong upon the weak. The world continued to be wracked by small conflicts and large wars because, as Milton said in "Paradise Lost"; "Who overcomes by force, hath overcome but half his foe."

In our age of weapons that are horrible beyond the ordinary man's imagination, force takes on a more appalling meaning. The thought of thermonuclear conflict leads us to paraphrase Milton: "Who overcomes by force, will overcome himself as well as foe."

The fact is, then, that now, for the first time in history, force does represent something of a restraint on men and nations. It limits their overt responses to their feelings of resentment and revenge, of avarice and ambition.

Still, these feelings, these emotions, and many more, are as much in abundance as they were in John Adams' time. Thus, the international contests of national pride go on. The difference is that, with force ruled out except in the most extreme circumstances, it has become a contest in which the gentle art of persuasion is of paramount importance.

To express this point in the sharpest context, let me quote Soviet Premier Khrushchev in a recent interview with a correspondent from Italy's Il Giorno:

"We have always advocated * * * that war should be excluded forever from the life of human society. * * * But at the same time we Communists have never agreed, and will never agree, to the idea of peaceful coexistence in ideologies. In this there can be no compromise."

Now there are many aspects of this art of persuasion that do not involve my Agency—most notably, the activities of our diplomats. But for the most part, it is the U.S. Information Agency that has the job of protecting this Nation's vital interests by influencing what foreigners know and believe. I say know and believe because we believe our first function is to inform. We believe that the first friend of tyranny is ignorance, and that wherever we can provide the light of knowledge, freedom's chances grow brighter.

It is our hope that out of new knowledge of man's past and of today's problems and possibilities, the peoples of the world will gain a new appreciation of, and respect for, what we are as a nation and what we strive to be.

To illustrate the distinction, and the importance of the informational as compared with the "propaganda" function, let me refer to the Agency's activities during the recent Gulf of Tonkin crisis.

After the August 4 attack, in international waters, on our naval vessels, it was decided that some U.S. military response was necessary. Plans were made for our planes to attack bases from which the aggressor boats had come.

In the nuclear age, prudence requires that all nations avoid miscalculations that could lead to widespread and horrible conflict. Thus we wanted the world—and surely any potential miscalculators—to know of the limited nature of our response and of or stern intentions for the future.

The President would say:

"But repeated acts of violence against the Armed Forces of the United States must be met not only with alert defense, but with positive reply. That reply is being given as I speak to you. Air action is now in execution against gunboats and certain supporting facilities of North Vietnam which have been used in these hostile operations.

"Yet our response, for the present, will be limited and fitting. We Americans know, although others appear to forget, the risks of spreading conflict—we still seek no wider war."

When the President broadcast his decision to attack the bases and spelled out U.S. policy for the future, peak radio listening time was long past in the Far East and USIA transmitters normally would have been off the air. Because USIA was a part of the decisionmaking process, and because the President and other Washington leaders know the danger of having the rest of the world respond out of ignorance, USIA could make advance preparations to get our story told where it needed most to be heard.

By the time the President spoke, VOA had roused our people in the Philippines, California, Okinawa, and Vietnam. We had in operation in the Far East alone 4 million watts—or 80 times the power of the most powerful station in America.

In 36 languages and worldwide English we told people abroad the facts—the who, what, where and why—of events in the Gulf of Tonkin.

We thought the facts alone added up to persuasion in its most effective sense—persuasion that we were a nation using our force responsibly to restrain the avaricious and ambitious, but ever careful not to destroy, in an act of revenge, man's fragile dreams of peace.

I need not add, I am sure, that our adversaries seek to paint a different kind of picture of us. The Communist propaganda apparatus constantly makes that clear. Thus, as doggedly as any action in the foxholes and trenches of any war of the past, the battle of ideas is being waged at fever pitch. It is a not altogether flattering commentary that while our people argue about our military posture, about supposed missile gaps and the need or lack of need for manned bombers, there is rarely any discussion of the adequacy of the resources that we are putting into the ideological struggle.

How well, you may ask, are we doing?

Consider international broadcasting. It would be nice to report to you that the United States of America—the Nation with the most professional, most immense, most technically competent domestic radio networks anywhere—is also the No. 1 international broadcaster of the world.

But we are not.

We are not No. 1 and we are not even No. 2.

The United States is No. 3 after Radio Moscow, with 1,350 hours a week, and Radio Peiping, with 909 hours.

The Voice of America broadcasts 790 hours a week.

Total output of international broadcasting by all Communist countries is a withering 4,375 hours a week—and in no less than 67 different languages. What is more, the Communist international broadcasting effort is not only large and growing larger, but is subtle and flexible in its scheduling, and apparently as ready to shift, change, cancel and replace shows as any American network mogul is after poring over the latest Neilsen and Trendex ratings.

Consider the see-saw radio barrage that Moscow and Peiping have been firing at one another.

At the beginning of last year, the U.S.S.R.'s broadcasts in Mandarin and Red China's transmissions in Russian were about equal quantitatively.

Then in May 1963 Peiping pulled ahead with added Russian output. Moscow reciprocated, catching up with the Chinese by July.

But last October China put on a massive expansion program and doubled its Russian-language broadcasts. Moscow replied more massively and pulled ahead. By this time there was feverish activity on both sides, and the content of the programs was growing increasingly bitter. In fact, so lengthy were the accusations and counteraccusations that some had to be broadcast in installments over a period of several days.

A Soviet journal accused Peiping of piracy in the use of radio frequencies, and at the International Radio and Television Organization meeting in Bucharest the Soviets rebuked the Chinese publicly for their "rude attacks."

When the Chinese Communists put an advertisement in a Brazilian newspaper, listing the wavelengths and broadcast times of Chinese programs in the Portuguese language, radio Moscow chided them for "using the people's money to inform the capitalist readers of Peiping's broadcasts."

So acrimonious did radio Peiping become that it recently dropped from its Russian broadcasts the expression, "Dear friends"—a phrase formerly used in all its announcements—and now contents itself with merely "Dear radio listeners."

In July of this year Radio Moscow countered with another ploy of one-upmanship, and started causing local interference to Peiping's Russian programs by carrying music on the Chinese frequencies.

Not to be outdone, Peiping replied with another massive increase of Russian programing, nearly doubling the time Moscow was using.

By August both sides seemed to be tiring of the battle: Peiping cut its programing back a bit, and Moscow canceled some of the interference.

Now this may appear to be a development that would delight USIA officers and cause us to sit back and chuckle while wishing a plague on both their houses.

We may chuckle, but we dare not sit back. Remembering Khrushchev's warning, "We will bury you," we know that the Peiping-Moscow fight is mostly to determine whether we get a Chinese or a Russian undertaker.

The fact is that while their intramural scrap was taking place, these Communist giants were extending their bids for power and influence by boosting substantially their broadcasts to the Far East, Africa, the Near East, and South Asia.

Radio Moscow established its first round-the-clock worldwide Russian-language service for the guidance of Soviet personnel abroad.

Both Russia and Red China were pushing aid programs in the telecommunications field, expanding efforts at language teaching by radio, and taking a program cue from the West: greater use of quiz programs and contests.

But in April of this year Radio Moscow made a significant change in emphasis. While increasing its attention to the underdeveloped world, it cut back sharply its broadcasts to Western Europe by 16 percent, and to North America by 10 percent. Significantly, though, the Russians have added eight new language services, including: Malayalam for Kerala State in India (where the local Communist Party hopes to win the State elections next January), Lingala for the Congo, Zulu for South Africa, Malagasy for Madagascar, and Uighur for the western Chinese province of Sinkiang.

Radio Moscow also beefed up substantially its output this year to Latin America. Other Soviet increases included a whopping 50 percent boost in Nepalese; and 40 percent in Mongolian.

Meanwhile, Radio Hanoi vastly expanded its programing to South Vietnam and increased its Lao language service.

Radio Pyongyang in North Korea quadrupled its Russian language broadcasts, and introduced a French service to Africa—the first time, incidentally, that a Far Eastern Communist country, other than Red China itself, has tailored special programs for African audiences.

And East Germany came up with an East European first: a Swahili service to Africa.

Not to be outdone by his comrades, Fidel Castro beefed up his broadcasting efforts last year, introducing two new language services: Creole, spoken in Haiti; and Guarani, a dialect spoken by the Indians in Paraguay. This year he added broadcasts in Aymara, spoken by the Indians of Bolivia and Peru.

Castro also beams a great deal of English-language programing our way, including two medium wave stations, "The Friendly Voice of Cuba," and "Radio Free Dixie," the latter a naive attempt to peddle the Red line to southern Negroes.

Just how large is the total Soviet propaganda effort?—not just radio, but including everything?

A study published by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in 1960 estimated, and I quote: "The various forms of Communist propaganda throughout the world involve a personnel of about 500,000 and an annual expenditure of approximately $2 billion."

The subcommittee continued: "It can be said that Moscow (with slight aid from Peiping) spends $2 a year per free man to be subjugated. To grasp the magnitude of this figure expressing the scope of the political war Moscow wages against us, we should remark that an American Senate committee has estimated the sums allocated by the United States to world propaganda at 1¼ cents per person per year. If the budgets of all other free countries are added the total hardly comes to 2 cents.

"On this point the Soviet effort is roughly 100 times as great as that of all the rest of the word." End of quotation.

Lest you think my citing that report is a prelude to crying poormouth and passing the collection plate, let me say that I think they painted the enemy taller than he is. The Communists are outspending us, but not even remotely by a 100 to 1 margin. Furthermore, I do not believe that merely more money in itself is going to carry the day for us. Our greatest resource in USIA is neither our budget nor our hardware—but our talented, hard working, experienced, and dedicated people and the idea of human freedom that they seek to sell.

We don't have all the money we need, but each year we learn new ways to stretch your tax dollars pretty far. Our operating budget this year is approximately $138 million dollars. That is a lot less than Proctor & Gamble spends to advertise its products around the free world. It is, by every modern standard, a pretty modest budget. As As you know, AID gets a lean budget these days—yet, if we had AID's budget for 1 year, it would carry us along for two decades.

What all of this means in practice, of course, is that we must discipline ourselves to a tight set of priorities: priorities in our message; priorities in our choice of communication tools; priorities in our selection of audiences; priorities in the the expenditure of our money and manpower.

To this tough-minded adherence to priorities we have to bring a meaningful mix of flexibility and imagination. We are on the ground in 106 countries. They are all different, and they all deserve carefully tailored attention.

That doesn't mean we say different things to different people, or attempt to talk out of 106 sides of our mouth. But our individual country programs are carefully designed to gain support for estabilshed U.S. foreign policy objectives relating to the particular country in question.

This means that the shape our programs take necessarily varies from country to country depending on U.S. policy needs. It means, too, that we employ every known tool and technique of communication. We go the whole gamut. We use ancient Asian morality plays—and avant-garde American art. We edit wall newspapers—and learned academic journals. We employ traveling village troubadours—and orbiting relay satellites.

We use in any given case the best communication medium available to get the right message to the right audience at the right time.

And despite our being outfinanced and outmanned by the opposition, we bow to no one in our determination to get the message through.

Reliable reports, for example, now indicate for the first time that the Voice of America is the most listened to international broadcasting service in Red China—and this despite Peiping's attempts to jam both our English and mandarin services. The distribution pattern of radio receivers on the China mainland being what it is, we are getting through to the most influential segments of that society: The political cadres, the students, and those in the professions.

In August we went on the air with a new medium wave station in Hue—right on the border of North Vietnam. Within 4 hours Hanoi began efforts to jam it—making it clear that the Communists take it very seriously indeed.

In November of last year we put one of our 50-kilowatt transportable transmitters into northeast Thailand. It carries programing in the local dialect of that sensitive area, and makes heavy use of mohlam, the ancient Asian minstrel form of storytelling. By weaving news and commentary into this musical format, our programing on the Lao border has now become No. 1 in popularity, despite the intense competition for the same listenership from Hanoi, Vientiane, and Peiping.

To blanket Vietnam and southeast Asia with a stronger signal, we flew three transportable 50-kilowatt transmitters from our site in Liberia to the Philippines, where they had improved our shortwave coverage by 40 percent.

The new permanent VOA facility in Liberia is now on the air, and together with the boost from our Greenville, N.C., complex—the largest and most powerful long-range broadcasting station in the world—our signal into Africa south of the Sahara is loud and clear.

The U.S. Ambassador to an important west African country reported that a lengthy tour throughout provinces convinced him that not only was radio the most important means of communications in the country, but that VOA was an habitual source of information for both officials and ordinary citizens. He cited a dinner he attended in the residence of a provincial governor. The governor interrupted the cocktails to tune in his East German radio to a VOA newscast. He found the best frequency without hesitation—apparently a habit with him—and talk was completely suspended until the newscast ended.

The governor told the Ambassador that he had been traveling with the president of his country, and other high officials, on November 22, and had been listening routinely to a VOA newscast when they suddenly learned with immense shock and grief that President Kennedy had been assassinated.

Traveling up a remote river in the interior of Africa, our Ambassador noted that the riverboat's chief steward, the dining room director, a maritime official, and three or four passengers in first- and second-class had transistor radios with them. There were also a number of sets on the lower deck in the tangled mass of third- and fourth-class passengers. At VOA news-program hours, the Ambassador could always head the signal on several radios simultaneously, and looking over the rail, he could see antennas below sticking outboard like fishpoles in order to obtain better reception of VOA on the steel-hulled boat.

Indeed, Voice of America is getting bouquets from some rather unexpected quarters these days. Recently one of the American Embassy officers was shopping in a Moscow radio store. From across the room he could hear one of the salesmen making a strong sales pitch to a Russian customer of a particular second-hand model. After extolling the set's virtues, its lovely cabinet, etc., the salesman capped his pitch with the remark: "And the set will bring in the Voice of America beautifully."

Nor is radio the only USIA medium appreciated behind the curtain these days. Our graphic arts exhibit, with visits to Alma Ata, Moscow, and Yerevan smashed all records for attendance for an American exhibit in Russia. In Moscow alone, more than 700,000 visitors jammed their way through during the 5-week stay in the capital, despite the fact that the exhibit site was a half mile from the nearest public transportation stop. On the first 2 days alone, 60,000 Muscovites stood in line for up to 3 hours in 20-degree weather to have a look. By mid-afternoon, the queue was hundreds of yards long, and thousands were still in line when the exhibit's doors finally had to be closed.

At the Alma Ata show, Soviet authorities were openly amazed at the dense crowds; but local press attacks on the exhibit only sparked even greater public interest. Many visitors discussed press publicity with the American guides, apologizing for inaccuracies and the critical tenor of the stories. On one Sunday, Izvestia excoriated the show, but this did not discourage visitors, many of whom were waiting in line with copies of the paper in their hands.

The 21 guides so magnetized the audiences that they occasionally had to leave the exhibit floor in order to facilitate the traffic flow. This generally elicited such comments from the crowd as "Where are the guides? I came to talk to the Americans." "I have your brochure so I don't have to look at the displays, but I wanted to hear the guides discuss life in America."

Visitors often confided to the guides that they followed American developments on the Voice of America. By far their strongest endorsement of VOA was as a source of information. "Give us news, news, and more news" emphasized one graduate student.

Without question, the American abstract art in the exhibit caused the greatest discussion. Debates even broke out on the floor. Interestingly, visitors sometimes cut short hecklers on the floor with comments such as "You're saying the same thing that Izvestia said. Shut up. We came to hear what the Americans have to say."

The thousands of comments written in the visitors' books of the exhibit range from enthusiastic acceptance to ideological outrage. Everything from: "The exhibit testifies to the spiritual decadence of your country. Art must be for the people and understandable to them, which is something which one can't say about your exhibit," to "It is excellent that you were not afraid to present abstract art. We need to know everything," * * * and "No doubt this exhibition will be the main exhibition of the year. In spite of the reaction of our stupid press, I like your art * * *"

But there were also comments like: "The exhibit in general is interesting. No one will deny that advertising is very advanced in America and has no rivals. And still, gentlemen of America, it was not necessary to kill your President, and especially such a one as Kennedy. For this humanity will not forgive you."

And * * * "It was a wonderful exhibition. But for God's sake, abolish racial discrimination in America."

The Graphic Art Exhibit is now in Rumania, and will go later to Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia. Our new exhibit, Communications USA, opened in Leningrad in July—with a mile-long queue waiting to get in—and is now in Kiev, prior to going on to Moscow.

There can be no question about the value of these USIA exhibits behind the curtain. They will not—by themselves—raise the curtain; but they do poke some welcome holes in it, and a lot of fresh air does get through.

But broadcasting and exhibits, of course, are only part of our story. A few years ago the complaint was common that we were getting our socks whipped off us in the distribution of low-cost books in places like Latin America. We have reversed the picture. Whereas only a few hundred thousand low cost American books were distributed in Latin America in 1960, about 6 million copies will be distributed in fiscal 1965.

And in our worldwide book publishing and and translation operations, we have moved from 1,520,000 copies of 108 editions in 1960 to 12,700,000 copies of 1,514 editions during the past year. Incidentally, we get a giant assist from private industry—something not available to our opposition.

In addition, in Latin America alone in the last 3 years, we have produced and distributed more than 37 million cartoon books which support democratic processes and the Alliance for Progress—and expose Castro's dictatorship.

We now produce television programs that are viewed in more than 70 countries, and millions around the world view USIA motion pictures each week. One newsreel, for example, "Africa Today," is seen by 30 million Africans each month in 746 theaters on that continent.

How are we doing more on almost the same amount of money as a few years ago? By watching our priorities. Recently we reduced by 40 percent the number of USIA magazines and other publications. We have reduced overtime sharply. In the last few years we have reduced our West European program by almost 40 percent and have redirected that effort to insure that it continues to do a vitally needed job.

What does it all add up to?

Frankly, I do not know. But there are those who judge us by what the enemy says about us, and if this is a valid measurement we are doing pretty well.

A Chinese Communist magazine recently devoted several pages to trying to prove that I am a "tool of Wall Street," and in July a Bulgarian weekly accused me of conducting a dirty propaganda campaign. Moscow radio says that USIA "provokes sleepless nights in Socialist countries," which may or may not mean that teenagers listen around the clock to Willis Conover's jazz selections.

And then there was the comment in the party journal, Kommunist, warning that USIA "uses the entire arsenal of the means of mass influence over the minds of men."

We don't dispute it, but we do point out that the most powerful weapon in our arsenal is what it always has been: the truth about what is happening in our society and the world—a truth that, happily, strikes the heartstrings and lifts the aspirations of ordinary men in every corner of the globe.

Drift Away From Our Republican Form of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mr. Ed Delaney which appeared in the Citizen-News of Los Angeles, Calif., on Monday, January 11. This article deals with a constant drift away from our republican form of government, and substituting a democracy. There is a vast difference. A democracy can very soon destroy the rights of any and all minorities, and, thereby, lessen the freedoms and liberties of the individual.

I recommend the article for your reading:

To pose a pertinent question: what should be our attitude when a former school teacher, long-time legislator, former Vice President and currently President of the United States downgrades this Nation by calling it a "democracy?" Are we to assume it was just a slip of the tongue and was not intentional? Unfortunately the printed text of the President's state of the Union message has the same—shall we call it—error.

Being candid and concise, in all the world there is no more despicable, lawless, irresponsible and reprehensible sham of government than a so-called democracy. It is such a term of depreciation that not a single civilized country in the world lists itself as being a democracy.

We can no longer overlook what some are mistakenly inclined to excuse as merely a matter of sematics in this regard. It is not. On the contrary it is something of vital importance. The younger generation is being misinformed by such seemingly intentional misrepresentation. To be specific: In the fourth paragraph of the President's state of the Union message are these words: "For the first century we struggled to hold together the first continental union of democracy in the history of man."

That statement, to the effect that we are "the first continental union of democracy in the history of man," simply is not true. To quote the paraphrase from the official training manual of the U.S. War Department, November 28, 1928: "Our constitutional fathers, familiar with the strength and weakness of both autocracy and democracy, with fixed principles definitely in mind, defined a representative republican form of government. They made a very marked distinction between a republic and a democracy * * * saying repeatedly and emphatically they had founded a republic."

This has been affirmed and reaffirmed down through the years by forthright Members of Congress, exacting editors, and some educators, but their number is small. Just as persistently, certain ones, for reasons and with objectives that are not too recondite, find it desirable to inject the word "democracy" where the word should be "republican."

Senator STROM THURMOND, Republican, of South Carolina, said on the floor of the Sen-

ate on January 11, 1961, that: "Our Government is not democratic but is a federated, constitutional republic and, under the explicit terms of the U.S. Constitution, the National Government is charged with the responsibility of insuring the people of each State a republican form of government and thereby preventing the institution of a democracy in any State."

But the pernicious influence of those, who for diverse reasons wish to perpetuate a deception, is observed toward the end of that state of the Union address, compiled by the President's word weavers. It reads that the Chief Executive, takes an oath, steps into office "and must then guide a great democracy."

This appears to be as good a time as any to make it unmistakably clear that an overwhelming percentage of our people resent and will resist the none too subtle efforts of some to degrade our Government by terming it a "democracy." A democracy cannot exist as a permanent government. It is a government of the masses resulting inevitably in moberacy. Its attitude toward property is communistic and the will of the mob is translated into what passes for law until some self appointed dictator establishes himself as the ruling caliph, king, emperor or what not and calls it anything except a democracy. Regardless of whether the Democrats in Washington like it or not, ours is—and with the help of God we hope to maintain it—a republican form of government.

Managing Our Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Shelbyville, Ind., News, in January 1965:

MANAGING OUR DEBT

If private individuals and private businesses attempted to manage their debt in the same fashion as the Federal Government, most of us know what would happen. The result, of course, would be early financial disaster—very possibly accompanied by sad legal consequences.

But the Federal Government, which tends more and more to treat individual citizens, private businesses and State and local governments as hapless children devoid of the omniscience emanating from a vast Washington bureaucracy, manages by managing to pile debt upon debt—all with an antilike abandon for the future.

All too few citizens these days, and apparently none at all among leaders in the seat of National Government, seem to care much about this—despite the lipservice to the contrary.

This is the background against which some interesting comment has come from the National Federation of Independent Business. "There is no reason," says the NFIB, "why the Federal Government should be allowed to continue a practice of legal embezzlement."

In a just-completed poll conducted by the NFIB among its members, they voted by a majority of 89 percent, with only 9 percent opposed and 2 percent undecided, to request the Congress to adopt legislation which would provide that whenever the Federal Government disposes of property the proceeds are applied against the national debt instead of being put into the general fund for spending.

"The attitude of the independent businessmen seems to be," according to NFIB President C. Wilson Harder, "That there is no difference between Government's position and a businessman who financed inventory or accounts receivable or has mortgaged property. The businessman knows when he sells the collateral on which he has borrowed money, it is necessary to repay the lender. Obviously, with the Federal debt over $300 billion, everything the Government owns is heavily mortgaged. Thus, any proceeds from sale of this property should be applied against the debt instead of being squandered in new spending of some kind."

This makes sense to everyone—except the Federal Government.

Churchill Was Dominant Figure of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled, "Churchill Was Dominant Figure of World War II," which appeared in the January 27, 1965, issue of the Leitchfield Gazette, of Leichfield, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

CHURCHILL WAS DOMINANT FIGURE OF WORLD WAR II

The death of Sir Winston Churchill serves to recall the days of decision after the Nazis and Fascists provoked World War II in 1939. Churchill was one of the few leaders in the free world who saw the danger of totalitarian government and the practical certainty all-out war was unavoidable.

The senselessness and utter tragedy of war was so generally recognized by civilized society during the period prior to the outbreak that many of us refused to believe the signs that pointed inevitably toward another holocaust involving far more casualties than the 1914–18 conflict.

The people and most leaders felt as Neville Chamberlain did in 1938 that war could be avoided by allowing part of the Nazi demands. However, not Winston Churchill who clearly saw and just as clearly enunciated the danger and folly of a policy of appeasement that was leading to a Second World War just two decades after World War I was fought "to end all wars."

When disbelief finally was replaced by realization that another war had come, a fatalistic kind of hopelessness descended on many leaders. After the fall of France, this hopelessness deepended, but most who lived through those times can remember the Churchillian words ringing above the gloom, promising eventual victory for the civilization that was threatened and defeat for the brutal forces that were tormenting Europe.

It was natural for England to turn to Churchill when the war effort appeared to be failing. Immediately after he became Prime Minister, a new spirit permeated the island kingdom. No one in his right mind expected the English to capitulate when days were darkest, but the people needed a lift, and Churchill added his spark to the indomitable will that carried a nation through critical times.

The world has paid tribute to Churchill who was a perfect symbol of the spirit that meets and conquers fear and danger. His oratory would have sounded pompous coming from others, yet coming from him it seemed appropriate and undoubtedly helped rally the strength and steel the fortitude of a people under constant threat of death and destruction.

It is an unforgettable experience for those who lived during a period that saw the drama of the Churchill years. Perhaps never again will such a stand as that made by England be seen, because now all-out wars probably will be measured in minutes or hours at most. The total destruction now possible in all-out war also could preclude any embarkation upon such a suicidal course, and figures of Churchill's stature may never again dominate the scene of nations fighting for existence.

Great Query for Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, when we pull back the curtain of headlines about the President's "less than a hundred billion dollar budget," we find this is only a start because a large reservoir of other billions of authorized funds is available to him.

David Lawrence, the noted columnist, appropriately asks, "How long can the Federal Government continue each year to spend far more than its collects in taxes from the citizens?" This is truly the "great query."

A comparison of our free spending figures and annual receipts is made in the following articles by Mr. Lawrence:

"GREAT QUERY" FOR GREAT SOCIETY

(By David Lawrence)

Perhaps in these days of the Great Society it is not inappropriate to propound the "great query." It is this:

How long can the Federal Government continue each year to spend far more than it collects in taxes or other receipts from the citizens?

For 6 consecutive years, the amount of money spent by the Federal Government will have been considrably in excess of the flow of tax funds to the U.S. Treasury during the same period.

No private business could keep going into the red every year and survive. The Government is supposed to be different. The American people are expected to believe that the U.S. Treasury's line of credit is unlimited and that confidence in the dollar will not diminish no matter what the figures show.

After describing the coming budget as a plan of action, President Johnson reiterates in the budget message submitted to Congress his assurances for a utopian era. He says, "The Great Society must be a bold society. * * * The Great Society must be a compassionate society. * * * The Great Society must be an efficient society."

But nowhere does Johnson say that the Great Society must be a solvent society. He

takes it for granted it always will remain so. Many a nation in world history has proceeded on the assumption that it can spend more than it takes in only to find sooner or later that public confidence breaks down and an inflationary epoch ensues.

The most perplexing aspect of the President's new budget for the fiscal year that begins July 1, 1965, is in the claim that the new budget is less than $100 billion. But is it? Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, points out that approximately $100 billion authorized in previous years is available for spending outside the new budget and that the total amount of money that the Government will be authorized to spend will be around $200 billion.

Any President can come up with a budget of slightly less than $100 billion for each of the next several years and get headlines implying that the actual budget has been kept within the $100-billion figure. This is because the reservoir of authorizations from previous years can be used.

But here is how the actual cash has flowed in and out of the Treasury in the last 4 fiscal years:

The spending amounted to $99.5 billion in 1961, which was $2.3 billion more than was received.

In 1962, $107.7 billion was spent and $101.9 billion collected in taxes and other receipts.

In 1963, $113.8 billion was spent and the receipts were $109.7 billion.

In 1964, spending totaled $120.3 billion, and $115.5 billion was collected.

For the fiscal year 1965, the outlook is that $121.4 billion will be spent and only $117.4 billion collected.

The indications are that for fiscal year 1966, which runs from July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966, expenditures will be $127.4 billion and receipts will be $123.5 billion.

So the announced plan to keep the budget below $100 billion doesn't tell the whole story.

People generally have faith in the solvency of their own government. They think that, in the long run, the economy somehow will be given a stimulus and that tax receipts will grow in such volume as to offset expenditures. But, unfortunately, the trend may go the other way. The spending, to be sure, is growing larger and larger each year, and money is being spent out of previous years' appropriations, along with current authorizations. So the only way to get a line on what's happening in Government finances is to watch the so-called "cash flow"—the actual outflow of cash and the actual inflow of cash.

Two significant sentences came over the news-tickers just a little while after the President submitted his budget message to Congress. They read as follows:

"President Johnson indicated that he will ask Congress to increase the current debt limit of $324 billion."

"Interest on the national debt is one of the largest items in the Federal budget. For the coming fiscal year, it will cost $11.5 billion."

As far back as the days of Adam Smith—who two centuries ago wrote "The Wealth of Nations"—government after government has come a cropper because faith in the monetary unit has dwindled and its purchasing power has been seriously diminished. Inflation usually has ensued as prices as well as wages have risen. If this affected everybody in a community at the same time, the transition would not be as painful as it is when prices go up faster than individual income. So the net result is a cessation of demand and a recession or depression.

Trading With the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the public is necessarily growing increasingly concerned over the questionable strength of the administration position vis-a-vis Red China, as well as the inconsistency of subsidizing other Communist governments while theoretically waging battle against the Red international menace.

This morning's Chicago Tribune, in a most potent editorial, discusses in some depth the question of trade and diplomatic dealings with Communist lands.

The editorial follows:

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

The pressure to recognize or at least do business with Communist China is building up. Even while Peiping denounces the United States as the world's No. 1 public enemy, Red China is putting out feelers for informal talks with the Washington "imperialists," and west coast businessmen are trying to get mainland China opened up for trade.

Significantly, both of these approaches are receiving close study and attention in Congress and in administration quarters. The trade approach comes from the San Francisco Area World Trade Association, an affiliate of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. Nor is trade an absent entity among the Peiping overtures advanced recently by Alvin Hamilton, a Conservative member of the Canadian Parliament.

As the former Agriculture Minister, Hamilton masterminded Canada's first huge wheat sale to Communist China. When he returned after more than a month's visit in Peiping late in December, Hamilton dropped in on Washington to spread the word quietly that the Mao Tse-tung regime might be interested in a "nondiplomatic dialog" with certain Americans about trade as well as the anti-Communist war in South Vietnam and relations with Formosa and South Korea.

Hamilton's unannounced meetings with key Senators were arranged by the State Department. The Senators also were informed that Secretary of State Dean Rusk favored the proposal of such an "informal" dialog with Red China. As for trade, Hamilton reported that Premier Chou En-lai expressed particular interest in obtaining American industrial equipment and surplus grain, as well as other commodities.

To Senator GEORGE AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, Hamilton expressed the opinion that "it will be only a relatively short time before your country will be trading with Communist China. That's inevitable because of the growing pressure by your business people, particularly on the west coast."

The San Francisco business group wants what it calls a normalization of relations with Red China to avail themselves of "beckoning and rewarding initiatives." These traders, in their report, assert there has been a complete breakdown of the American policy to isolate Red China economically and politically.

They report that commerce between mainland China and the non-Communist world is growing at a considerable pace. In the first 8 months of 1964, they said, figures show a "steady increase" in British-Chinese trade. Australia, Canada, Argentina, and France are also among those trading with Peiping.

What the west coast traders want is a chance to get their hands on a potential market of 700 million Chinese, now being tapped by their world rivals. Nor are they alone. You can hear the same pitch in Chicago from many businessmen engaged in trade with the Orient.

What we don't hear is any expressed concern about doing business with a Communist regime that fought us in Korea, backs our Communist opponents in the war in South Vietnam, tries to sabotage every American policy in Africa and Latin America, and wants to bury the American free enterprise system.

Administration officials describe the San Francisco report as an interesting straw in the wind, but profess no interest in altering policy toward Red China while the Vietnamese war is unresolved. Pressure from the west coast traders can be much more than a straw if Dean Rusk is interested in pursuing informal talks with Mao Tse-tung. These could point the way to appeasement and a Chinese Munich.

Flags Again Flying in Front of Union Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, several of our colleagues, including GEORGE FALLON, SAMUEL FRIEDEL, CLARENCE LONG, and I, commute daily from our homes in Baltimore. Leaving Union Station for the House Office Building, we never failed to be thrilled by the sight of the flags flying in Columbus Circle Plaza, with the dome of the Capitol in the background.

Then one day we noticed that the flags and the poles were gone. A week or more passed and they had not been put back in place and we inquired about them. We were informed that after more than 50 years there, their condition was such that they had to be taken down. After expressing concern at their removal, action was taken.

The chill January wind reddened the faces of the group assembled on the Columbus Circle Plaza at the base of the flagpoles in front of one of Washington's landmarks—Union Station. They were gathered to officially observe the restoration of the three poles which had been removed because they had deteriorated beyond the point of repair, after standing proudly in their original positions for better than half a century.

Since the three flagpoles are on Government property, their restoration was under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. Regional Director T. Sutton Jett inaugurated the action which culminated in flags once again being raised

to fly in front of Union Station, as they had for so many years before.

When it was announced in July 1964 that new poles would be erected to replace those which had been removed, many persons, in many walks of life, evidenced great interest because of their feeling that these three poles had added greatly to the beauty and impressiveness of the plaza. Work on the project was started early in August and carried on to completion during the next 5 months.

In brief ceremonies on Friday, January 15, 1965, those who had shared such a great interest in seeing the poles restored, stood silently while an honor guard from the Military District of Washington solemnly raised the flags to the strains of the national anthem played by members of the Metropolitan Police Band.

In addition to Mr. Jett there were Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia; Congressman GEORGE H. FALLON, of Maryland; Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke, District of Columbia Commissioner; Mr. C. R. Van Horn and Mr. B. J. Viviano, of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and Pennsylvania Railroad, respectively; Mr. C. W. Shaw, Jr., manager of the Washington Terminal Co., which operates Union Station, and his immediate predecessor, Mr. A. W. Johnston, now regional manager, Eastern Region, B. & O. Railroad; Col. George Webb and Mr. Whitney Irons, representing the District of Columbia Society of the Order of Founders and Patriots of America; members of the Metropolitan Police Department; and a number of railroad and Union Station representatives. It was my privilege also to be present.

Not only these, but travelers and passers-by, who stood under the Union Station portico and once again enjoyed an unsurpassed view of the Capitol dome beyond the gleaming white poles from which flew the flags of the United States of America and the District of Columbia.

They said it was the cold north wind that reddened faces and hands of those who stood in quiet reverence. But none said it was the wind, only the wind, that caused eyes to fill and glisten as the glorious colors rose toward the gray and wintry sky. Not a word was spoken, nor was there any need.

Lead and Zinc: Important Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] in connection with the importance of giving attention to the strengthening of the position of the domestic lead and zinc industries.

While I have been reserving judgment as to the form in which the Federal Government should undertake to encourage and stabilize the domestic production of lead and zinc, I believe it essential, from the standpoint of national defense, that we not permit these industries to deteriorate—or, for that matter, any of the domestic mineral industries having strategic importance.

The current problems of the domestic lead and zinc producers deserve a full and sympathetic hearing by the Congress. The legislation being introduced today would seem to provide a sound basis for discussion, and it is to be hoped that all segments of the domestic industry, as well as all Federal agencies having an interest in lead and zinc, will be provided an early opportunity to present their views as to the most practicable course which might be taken in the interest of maintenance of a healthy domestic industry in this field.

Tragic Sacrifices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the ratio of workers deciding to retire before reaching 65 years of age has increased each year since the opportunity to do so first became available to women in 1956. The percentage of women choosing reduced retirement benefits each year has risen from 12 percent in 1956 to 66 percent in 1964.

The opportunity for early retirement became available to men in 1961. Thirty percent of those retiring accepted lower benefits that year, 47 percent in 1962, 48 percent in 1963, and 49 percent in 1964.

The Advisory Council on Social Security points out in its recent report that reduced benefits represent great sacrifices for many who accept them. On the whole recipients of reduced benefits get $78 in monthly payments compared to $103 paid full beneficiaries. In many cases this cut is more than the retiree can afford to give up if he is to avoid accepting welfare aid.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the reduced benefits represent actuarial determinations of what can be paid per month for more months without exceeding the total expected payments to a worker who waits until 65.

But the end result seems unfortunate to me. It demonstrates the great desire of many people to retire earlier than 65, certainly. But I wonder to what extent it demonstrates compulsion as well. How many workers electing reduced retirements feel they can't go on, that their employers won't let them, that automation has taken their jobs, that their health won't stand it, and so forth?

The Advisory Council on Social Security has called for an inquiry into this aspect of early retirement and the sacrifices the present law compels. I hope the Social Security Administration makes the inquiry promptly and makes the information readily available. In the face of the demonstrably great desire and need of Americans to retire before 65, I feel that a system which penalizes so many persons so severely cannot claim to be operating satisfactorily. Changes will have to come.

The following is a press release on this subject which I issued:

TRAGIC SACRIFICES

WASHINGTON.—Has 65 become too old to retire?

Is the strain of earning a living getting to be too great for men reaching their early sixties?

Almost half the men who retired last year took cuts in their social security benefits in order to quit before they reached 65, Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan's 16th District, said today.

These cuts went too deep, many fear.

The average early retiree gets only $75 in benefits for each $103 paid someone in similar circumstances who works until he is 65 years old.

The Advisory Council on Social Security warns that lower benefits now being accepted in many cases won't keep them off welfare in future years.

"These are tragic penalties," Representative DINGELL said. "A basic aim of social security always has been to pay benefits which would keep retirees off welfare."

To give early retirees a better break the council urges Congress to modify the method of computing each individual's benefit "base." But this won't help all, the Council warns.

"I was one of the original advocates of permitting men to retire at the age of 62," Representative DINGELL said. "This change became law only 4 years ago, in 1961.

"Acceptance was immediate; 30 percent the first year, 47 percent the second year. Of the 2,500,000 men who went on social security benefit rolls during the first 3 years of this program, more than 1 million retired early in spite of the sacrifices the present law demands.

"The prompt change reflects almost universal feeling that any man who has worked steadily ought to be able to quit at about age 60 if he wants to.

"The United States is certainly rich enough to afford this.

"But the sacrifice many are making is tragic. The pressures on some men to retire must be very great.

"Some early retirees are being displaced by automation, I suppose; some doubtless feel they can't meet competition from younger men; and I expect some are being forced to retire by their employers. I have heard of cases in which employer have made up benefit losses, but these have been exceptions.

"Many men retire early to save their health.

"I think the first thing we must do is to find out more of the reasons behind early retirement, and how great these sacrifices really are. Social security benefits for man and wife replace 71 percent of a $150 a month income, only 52 percent of a $350 a month income, and just 31 percent of a $600 a month income. Is this fair? Or necessary?

"We need to know how many retirees are getting out voluntarily, how many feel forced to quit, how many of these men actually have worked only occasionally in recent years. Desire for earlier retirement is too great for Congress to ignore.

"The proportion of women accepting reduced benefits in order to retire early is even greater than men, 64 percent. Their reasons vary. Some are retiring from jobs, some ac-

cepting dependents' allowances, some are widows, etc. Nearly all men retiring on reduced benefits are former workers."

Increased Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we all realize that the effectiveness of our Government depends in large measure on a healthy political atmosphere. We further recognize that a healthy political atmosphere is based on consistent interest from the public. I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the January 21 edition of the Advertiser, published in Dolton, Ill., emphasizing an increase in interest in local, State, and National Government affairs on behalf of part of the citizens of south suburban Cook County.

The editorial follows:

INCREASED INTEREST

Among the many encouraging signs now appearing is one sure to arouse interest everywhere. We are referring to a very marked increase in interest in our local, State, and National government affairs.

Here within our local government this interest is being manifested in increased public attendance at broad meetings. In many instances this interest stems from the issue at hand. Residents, anxious to protect their property investments and the neighborhood usually appear in force, especially at zoning or rezoning hearings. Contrary to the opinions of many, this is a good sign for Mr. Citizen has the right, and the duty to either protest or approve any measure designed to change the status of the neighborhood where he resides.

We note in latest reports that regular board meetings are being quite well attended. Wasn't too long ago three was a crowd at the average board meeting.

The place to discuss the issues at hand is, in our opinion, at these board meetings where everyone is given the opportunity to lay his case before the board members. This privilege is extended at every regular meeting. This enables the citizen to make plain his opinions and this, we believe, is much better than discussing the matter over the back fence or over the telephone or in small groups since it is quite generally accepted that a story may start into circulation but by the time it makes the rounds, one might not be able to recognize it after the critics add their say-so.

And the interest in local affairs seems to be spilling over into State and National affairs for conversations with a great many of our friends and acquaintances leads us toward the conclusion that Mr. Average Citizen has a far greater grasp of issues than one might suspect.

And it is because many of our folks carefully watch the trend of the times that the two-party system in our country works quite well because Mr. Voter can change his vote any time he wants to. Nobody can stop him from doing just that.

That is why, whether they like to admit it or not, politicians have wide-open ears for any change in public opinion.

And so we urge many more of you to take an interest in local board meetings. You are sure to learn that governing a village isn't the easiest job in the world.

Cardinal Wyszynski Assails Nazi Trial Cutoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include herewith an article which appeared in the New York Times for January 27, relative to Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski of Poland, who has voiced his protest against the 20-year statute of limitations on trials of Nazi war criminals.

This follows the petition which a number of Members of Congress, including myself, sent a few days ago to the West German Legislature, asking that this statute of limitations be extended.

The article follows:

CARDINAL WYSZYNSKI ASSAILS NAZI TRIAL CUTOFF: IT IS NOT YET TIME TO FORGIVE, SAYS PRIMATE OF POLAND

(By David Halberstam)

WARSAW, January 26.—Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, the Roman Catholic Primate of Poland, has joined in this country's protest against a 20-year statute of limitations on trials of Nazi war criminals. The statute goes into force May 8 unless modified.

The Cardinal has often criticized Poland's Communist Government. His action underscored the breadth of feeling in Poland against the cutoff date.

In an address Sunday in the Church of St. Jacob, in suburban Ochota, the Cardinal said: "The time to forgive and forget is not yet ripe. The devil that flourished must be torn out by the roots."

The cardinal appealed against any moratorium on the war crimes and said: "We know that just punishment cannot be meted out in the face of the enormity of the crimes. But there is still eternal punishment."

Cardinay Wyszynski's speech coincided with a mounting wave of protest on the subject of the Nazi war crimes, a deeply emotional issue for many Poles.

West Germany has given no official indication that the 20-year limit on war-crimes prosecution might be extended. However, on January 18, Morris B. Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee, said the German Justice Minister, Ewald Bucher, had conceded the statute might be extended without violating the Constitution.

In recent days, there has been a series of public protests on the German statute of limitations.

A fourth-grade student recently came home from school, asked his father for a postcard, and announced that the entire school was sending protest messages to Bonn.

About 2,000 students attended a demonstration at the Warsaw Polytechnic.

The number of Poles killed by the Germans during the occupation is widely thought to be about 6 million—more than half of them Polish Jews.

The Nazis maintained mass extermination centers such as Treblinka and Auschwitz in Poland. There are reminders of the Nazi presence in almost every Polish city.

More than 100 plaques mark sites where Germans murdered Poles in Warsaw. A small section of a wall that remained after the razing of the ghetto still stands.

The general position of the Poles is that the Nazi crimes were so heinous and so far beyond the comprehension of man that there is no such thing as a statute of limitations.

Officials say that their archives contain evidence against up to 10,000 unpunished war criminals.

A Cut in Farm Income Would Worsen the Lot of the Invisible Poor in Rural Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, much attention has been given lately to President Johnson's war on poverty. I hope that my fellow Members, in considering agricultural legislation to aid the Nation's farmers, will not forget that poverty is a rural problem, as well as an urban one.

The Welfare Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in a study published last September, termed the rural low-income families as "the invisible poor." I recommend this report, entitled "Family Income and Related Characteristics Among Low-Income Counties and States," to my fellow Members, for it shows clearly the extent to which poverty affects rural America.

The report states:

Much attention has been given to the urban masses of the poor where 70 percent of the Nation's population is concentrated and where by income measures some 54 percent of the poor families are located. In the nonurban areas with 30 percent of the population, 46 percent of the poor families are dispersed over a broad geographic area. Although heavily concentrated in the Southeast, signigficant poverty pockets are also found in Texas, New Mexico, the Dakotas, and Alaska.

The study goes on to say that in some rural counties, where there is a large number of low-income families, the indications point toward a continuation of poverty in the future. It further says:

There is no one program which could be devised which would meet the needs of these withering county units with their low gross population and low income. This is a vast country where pressures for attention and action are more likely to come from urban areas since the factors leading to a concentrated voice for help are present * * * sufficient numbers for an aggregate appeal; proximity on the part of the poor to information about the relative differences between haves and have nots; proximity to the majority population, who have concern as well as fear of possible consequences; and opportunities for the plight of the poor to become visible to civic and political leadership. The poor in the nonurbanized county units, remote from the mainstream of national interest, are likely to continue as the invisible poor.

I sincerely hope that the "invisible poor" will not, in the eyes of the Congress, remain the forgotten poor. As the report correctly states, "no one program" offers the solution to rural poverty. That is why it is vital, if the war on poverty is to have a real meaning for all the Nation, that the Congress enact legislation this session to insure farmers against a loss in income.

On the surface, poverty may seem to be predominately an urban problem. Doubtless this is because the evils of poverty in the cities come to light more dramatically than in rural areas. But, as the Health, Education, and Welfare report shows, rural poverty is a very real problem. Using 1960 Federal census figures, the study makes this highly significant analysis:

Taking an annual income of $3,000 as a dividing line between families in poverty and those not in poverty, the chances of being poor in 1959 were roughly 12 in 100 among urban white families in the North and West and 18 in 100 in the South. For white families in the rural nonfarm areas, the risk of poverty ranged from 16 to 23 in 100 in the two northern regions and the West and reached 35 in the South. For white families living on farms the chances in 100 were from 28 to 42 in three of the regions and 52 in the South.

In other words, no matter what the section of the Nation, the chances of poverty were—and, I am sure, still are—greater among white farming families than among white urban families. Moreover, the report adds that nonwhite families living on farms are at "the very bottom" insofar as income distribution is concerned.

I would also like to call attention to the results of a poll published in the December 5, 1964, issue of Wallaces Farmer. It indicates concern among Iowa farmers on this subject. It is important to note that only 17 percent of those polled thought most farmers are getting along "fairly well" economically.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the article from Wallaces Farmer:

WALLACES FARMER POLL—WHAT FARMERS SAY ABOUT INCOME

Low market prices and rising costs of supplies and equipment have kept a squeeze on farm income in recent years. Opinions vary greatly as to just how severe the squeeze is.

We've heard reports from farmers of staggering dollar losses—especially in cattle feeding. On the other hand, USDA reports that total net farm income in 1963 was up from the year before, and that it has risen slowly but steadily since 1960.

How well are farmers doing? To get a good sample of farmer opinions, Wallaces Farmer Poll put the following question to Iowa farm men in October:

"We hear conflicting reports as to how well farmers are doing financially. How do you feel farmers are doing in general? Check the statement that comes nearest to your opinion."

	Percent
1. Most farmers have net incomes too low to provide a good living	40
2. Larger operators doing well. Smaller operators having a rough time	43
3. Most farmers are getting along fairly well	17

Many of the folks interviewed agreed with the young Poweshiek County farmer who pointed out, "I think the well established farmers are getting along all right. But it's tough on those who are trying to get started."

Part-time work is apparently the salvation of some farms. "Small farmers are having a tough time," said a Greene County farmer. "We couldn't possibly make it if my wife didn't have a good job in town."

Age made some difference in how farmers answered the question. Younger farmers thought things looked a bit brighter than some older farmers. Of those 21 through 34 years old, 54 percent thought larger operators were doing OK with small farmers getting hurt the most. Only 26 percent thought all farmers had incomes too low.

This compares with 47 percent of farmers 50 through 64 years old who thought all farmers had incomes too low.

The larger the operator, the less apt he was to be dissatisfied. Of farmers grossing less than $5,000, 49 percent said farm income is too low. Most of the largest operators, those grossing $20,000 or more, thought large farmers were doing OK but agreed that small operators were having a rough time. Only 20 percent of the top income group thought farm income was too low.

Of Farm Bureau members, 35 percent answered "too low"; 48 percent thought larger farmers were getting along all right; and 17 percent thought most farmers were doing well.

NFO members had a gloomier view, however. Of the NFO members, 64 percent thought low farm income was hurting all farmers. Only 4 percent felt that farmers were getting along fairly well.

More Democrats than Republicans thought farm income was too low for all farmers, though the difference politically was not great. Of the comments made by those interviewed, some were bitter, others more philosophical.

"Depends on the farmer. I think most are getting along fairly well if they are trying to manage," said a Decatur County owner.

"A man with land and equipment paid for never had it so good," said a Woodbury County farmer. "There soon will be a lot of big farmers. The others will be doing something else!"

"I haven't broken even in a couple of years. Farmers have to pay too much for what they buy in comparison to payment they receive." Sac County farmer.

A Palo Alto County farmer blamed costs for the squeeze. "Our grain prices are high enough, but seed corn, fertilizer, and machinery prices are way out of line. A farmer has a hard time making ends meet."

"You can't maintain a decent standard of living today on the average-size family farm without extra off-farm work to supplement your income. If you operate three or four average-size farms, with everything paid for, you can make a little money," said a middle-aged Lucas County farmer.

"All you need to do is look around. Farm problems and income speak for themselves. Most farms are run by part-time operators. Our young men are getting other jobs. You just plain can't make a living and pay your bills on an average size farm any more." Older owner, Lucas County.

What do farmers think of future prospects? Wallaces Farmer poll asked this question:

"As far as you personally are concerned, do you expect your income in the year ahead to be higher or lower than during the past year?"

	Percent
Higher	17
About same	66
Lower	16
No opinion	1

Younger farmers were more optimistic. In the 21 to 34 age group, 30 percent think they'll have higher incomes next year; only 7 percent think their incomes will be lower.

More older farmers foresee lower incomes, however. Nineteen percent of those 35 through 49; 19 percent of those 50 through 64; and 14 percent of those 65 or older expect lower incomes in the year ahead.

The higher the gross income, the more apt the farmer was to think that next year's incomes would be the same or higher.

Here's the way members of the major farm organizations voted:

[In percent]

	Farm Bureau	NFO
Higher	19	21
Same	65	47
Lower	15	32
No opinion	1	

Typical of the comments: "About the same. If I was sure income was going any lower, I'd feel like quitting."

"I wish I could check 'higher' and believe it. But to be honest I don't think I can do any better than say 'about the same'," reasoned a middle-aged farmer from Poweshiek County.

"Maybe some farmers are having a rough time, but I'm doing all right," said a young Humboldt County farmer. "Some of the ones buying farms seem to think they should be pitied because they're in debt. They'll have a farm when they're done. It's like working for wages and putting some in the bank."

"My income has to go higher. My expenses are getting higher every year, so I have to make money to stay in business," said a farmer from Lucas County.

"I hope the income is higher. I have another mouth to feed and it's hard enough to keep groceries on the table." Young father of five children, Allamakee County.

"I guess I'm an optimist," said a young Tama County farmer. "I think prices will be higher so my income should be higher, too."

Here's the picture given by USDA in its latest income estimates. In 1963, Iowa farmers had a total net farm income of $5,052 per farm. U.S. average was $3,643 per farm. Total net farm income includes the value of changes in inventories.

Preliminary estimates for 1964 indicate that net income realized by farmers will average about the same or slightly higher than 1963.

USDA economists don't foresee much change in 1965. They expect realized net farm income to average about the same as 1963–64 or very slightly higher. Cash receipts from fram marketings of livestock and livestock products will probably be higher in 1965. And Government payments to farmers will likely raise, though not as much as they increased from 1963 to 1964. These increases are expected to be equalized by a continued increase in production and operating expenses.

Award to Western College for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Institute of International Education staged a most impressive event in which a citation was awarded to the Western College for Women, Oxford, Ohio. This institution was one of the first to become aware of the broad benefits to be derived from international cooperation in the field of education and it is indeed fitting that it be recognized for its significant contribution toward this program. As further tribute to the college, and in the desire to call this award to the attention of my colleagues, I include the following in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The citation follows:

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND THE READER'S DIGEST FOUNDATION CITATION TO AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

To the Western College for Women, a pioneer among liberal arts institutions in the development of international education programs, the Institute of International Education and the Reader's Digest Foundation present their award for distinguished service.

Conscious of its responsibility to educate its students to live in an ever more interdependent world, the Western College for Women undertook a decade ago to transform itself into a center of international education. It has revised its curriculum to present an interculturally oriented program of higher studies. It has internationalized its faculty, until nearly half are nationals of other lands, and the majority have lived and studied in every major area of the world.

Western College for Women has encouraged its students to study abroad. In recent years as many as 10 percent of the student body have taken summer study tours to non-Western areas under the direction of qualified faculty members. It has sought to enroll well-qualified foreign students through a program of increased scholarships and assistantships and by cooperating with educational exchange agencies. More than 10 percent of the student body now comes from foreign lands.

Today the world perspective has been integrated into all aspects of campus life, academic and extra curricular, at Western College for Women in a program which is unique not only in purpose and concept but also in that it has been developed out of the college's own modest resources.

The IIE and the Reader's Digest Foundation are proud to give this recognition to the Western College for Women for the originality and quality of its international educational program.

The award was accepted by Dr. Herrick B. Young, president of the college.

Death of Dr. Virgil M. Hancher, Former President of the University of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I read this morning in the Washington Post of the death of Dr. Virgil M. Hancher, who was for 24 years president of the University of Iowa at Iowa City. Dr. Hancher was widely known as an educator, and he contributed much to the State of Iowa during the time he served as president of the University of Iowa. In addition to his long and successful career as an educator, he served his country well several years ago as an alternate delegate to the United Nations.

His death yesterday in New Delhi, India, where he was acting as an educational consultant for the Ford Foundation, comes as a shock to me, as I am sure it does to the many persons who are familiar with Dr. Hancher's contributions to higher education in Iowa and throughout the rest of the Nation.

I would like to extend my sincere condolences to Dr. Hancher's daughter and son-in-law, Dr. and Mrs. Richard Hockmuth of Marshalltown, Iowa. I am sure those who have known and worked with Dr. Hancher join with me in expressing sympathy and regret upon his death.

A Very Great Man Has Gone to His Reward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "A Very Great Man Has Gone to His Reward," which appeared in the January 25, 1965, issue of the Madisonville Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

A VERY GREAT MAN HAS GONE TO HIS REWARD

The stout, courageous heart of Winston Churchill has pumped its last and you can almost see this great man striding up a sunlit avenue to immortality, waving the famous V-for-victory sign to admiring millions.

Seldom is the printed word inadequate to any momentous occasion—solemn or joyful. But only the eloquence and the stirring voice of Winnie himself could adequately portray the emotions of the free world today—the sadness that he is no longer with us, the pride and thanksgiving that he was, indeed, very much with us in one of the world's most perilous hours.

Every American must mourn the passing of the only honorary American citizen, this saucy, tenacious bulldog who singlehandedly turned Britain's despair first into desperation and then into do-or-die spirit when the little isles stood alone against the mighty German war machine.

Who can doubt that it was Prime Minister Churchill, scowling across the narrow English Channel at a mad Hitler, who turned the tide back toward freedom when it seemed that all the lights were going off all over the world?

Here was, precisely and beyond any doubt, the human embodiment of John Bull—as never perhaps there has been a living Uncle Sam. Here was an alternately smiling and glowering countenance and a magnificent voice which lifted the British Isles out of a pit of certain disaster.

To paraphrase his own words: "never in the field of human conflict have so many owed so much to one man." For it was he who inspired the British people to superhuman efforts in the darkest days of World War II—such miracles as the evacuation of Dunkirk, the Royal Air Force victories in the sky against 7-to-1 odds and the resolution and courage of the British populace in the face of constant bombings.

When France fell, and the Battle of Britain was about to begin, Churchill uttered these prophetic words to his people—and to the world:

"The Battle of France is over, the Battle of Britain is about to begin. Upon this battle depends the survival of Christian civilization. Upon it depends our own British life and the long continuity of our empire.

"The whole fury and might of the enemy must very soon be turned on us. Hitler knows that he will have to break us in these islands or lose the war. If we can stand up to him, all Europe may be free and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands.

"But if we fail, then the whole world—including the United States, including all that we have known and cared for—will sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age. Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duty, so bear ourselves that—if the British Empire and its Commonwealth live for a thousand years—men will still say: 'This was their finest hour.' "

And, truly, it was their finest hour. Christian civilization marveled—and took new heart—at the indomitable courage of the British people.

Here, indeed, was the turning point for the powerful German war machine. And none understood it better than "Corporal Hitler"—as Churchill contemptuously called the Nazi dictator. For in the latter period of the war, Hitler literally frothed at the mouth at the mere mention of Sir Winston's name, or the sight of his picture. Adolph was sure that, except for Winston Churchill, the German hordes would have ridden roughshod across all Europe and even the world.

"Blood, tears, toil, and sweat" were all that Churchill promised the British people in their dark days. "We shall fight in the fields, in the streets, and from the rooftops—and we shall never surrender."

But he made their victories more joyful, too, with words like those uttered at the close of the fateful year 1941, recalling that surrendering French generals had predicted that "in 3 weeks England will have her neck wrung like a chicken." Said Winnie:

Some chicken. Some neck. These are words that will ring forever in the history of human greatness and valor.

Here was a man. A cigar-smoking, hard drinking calvary officer, polo player, scholar, journalist, foreign correspondent, author, artist, bricklayer, hunter, fisherman—a man who held virtually every important position in the British Government, truly the first statesman of the world. Here, too, was an embodied testimony to the jungle life of politics. For in his hour of victory the people turned him out, not for his own failings but for partisan political reasons.

Here was a man who lived a full life and savored it all, who achieved far more than his allotted three score and ten. It has often been said that man's highest ambition should be to leave the word a little better than he found it. If ever a man exceeded this ambition, certainly Winston Churchill went far beyond such high calling.

His stirring oratory and his inspiring, cigar-crunching countenance, will arouse and encourage free men so long as there is life on our planet.

We like to believe that there is a Valhalla to which great men—they of uncommon valor and purpose—go when they shuffle off the mortal coil. In this belief, there is no doubt that all that is immortal of Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill dwells now in such a place, in a seat of highest honor.

Grieve not for this great man. Only thank God that such men appear at the times when they are most needed. May it ever be so.

Public Pays for Power Lobby Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Senator from Alaska, the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, while

editor of the Portland (Maine) Evening Press, in 1931, wrote an excellent book entitled "The Public Pays," which exposes certain unwholesome practices of the Power Trust. This excellent and thoroughly documented book has now been republished, and I know that all who are interested in the subject of Public Power versus Private Power will welcome the fact that Senator GRUENING's work is again available. His work represents a public service of the first magnitude.

A recent review of Senator GRUENING's book answers the question as to why a book published in 1931 should be reprinted now. The review points out that the lessons the public should have learned in 1931, respecting the techniques employed by the private power monopolists, are worth repeating today in the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this review of Senator GRUENING's book be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The report follows:

PUBLIC PAYS FOR POWER LOBBY PROPAGANDA

(By Prof. Horace M. Gray, University of Illinois)

("The Public Pays" (new edition, 1964), by ERNEST GRUENING. The Vanguard Press, Inc., New York, $2.25.)

Why should a book published in 1931, and based on facts then contemporary, be republished in 1964 with no change other than a new introduction? Is this not an exercise in futility and irrelevancy—a nostalgic flashback that serves no useful present purpose? The retort proper is that those who learn nothing from history are doomed to repeat it.

During the decade 1920–30 the Power Trust after the fashion of privileged monopolies, defied the society that nourished it and mounted an arrogant assault against the public interest. This involved the hijacking of investors, exploitation of consumers, brainwashing the public by massive propaganda, subverting the organs of public opinion, attacks on public institutions, and wholesale political corruption. This challenge attracted national attention and in 1928 Congress authorized the Federal Trade Commission to investigate—a venture that required 6 years of intensive labor and produced over 70 volumes of documentary evidence.

In 1931, while this investigation was still underway, Mr. ERNEST GRUENING, then editor of the Portland (Maine) Evening Press, noting that the startling disclosures of the Federal Trade Commission were not being adequately reported by the national press, published a summary of the findings to that date under the title "The Public Pays." This well-written, thoroughly documented book became something of an American classic. The author not only portrayed the enormity of the offenses against public decency but demonstrated that the people were being forced to pay for their own exploitation and deception at the hands of the Power Trust. It was his conclusion that unless these malpractices could be stopped by effective regulation the only alternative was public ownership.

His warning, however, went largely unheeded; too few people were listening; nothing fundamental was done to eradicate these abuses. To be sure, the New Deal legislation of the early 1930's effected some minor reforms and imposed some mild restraints, particularly in the financial sector, but these laws failed to breach the main citadels of corporate power. The monopolists still held the field and dominated the industry; they retained their special privileges—the real source of their power; they remained free to use their economic power for political and social ends—to corrupt both Government and public opinion; they were free to commit aggressions against public and cooperative suppliers; regulation still guaranteed them the sinews of war in the form of excessive monopoly profits, and still permitted them to shift the costs of their depredations onto defenseless consumers. As if this were not enough, Congress later subsidized them at the expense of taxpayers by accelerated amortization, rapid depreciation, and investment tax credits.

History was now free to repeat itself. After a brief interlude of quiescence and regrouping the Power Trust mounted a second massive propaganda assault on the public mind. As Mr. GRUENING (now Senator from Alaska) points out in his new introduction, they are using the same techniques and the same falsehoods they used in the roaring twenties. Their objectives are also the same—to conceal their exploitations, to maintain their privileges, to destroy public and cooperative institutions, to frustrate public regulation and to prevent any reform legislation. Again, as of old, they are shifting the costs of this propaganda campaign to the ratepayers. Like the Bourbons they have learned nothing and forgotten nothing.

Must the same be said of the American people? Mr. GRUENING told them in 1931 what was afoot, but they neglected to follow his wise counsel. Now, in 1964, he tells them again, refreshing their memory of the first assault and pointing out that the second, now in full cry, is a repetition of the first. The alternatives are still the same: effective regulation, which will prohibit privileged monopolists from engaging in propaganda and political activities, or public ownership. The unfinished business of 1931—the problem we muffed and failed to solve—is still unfinished business in 1964. Will the American people heed Mr. GRUENING's second warning and take appropriate action to exorcise this malignant influence from the body politic?

Newspapers Waking Up on Budget Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, some convenient confusion exists about administrative budgets and cash budgets with respect to the cost of operating the Federal Government.

Columnist David Lawrence points out that a public awakening has started and that this is reflected in editorials from three leadings newspapers. His article follows:

SINGLE CHART TELLS BUDGET STORY

(By David Lawrence)

How to keep the budget under $100 billion without really trying—this is the talk of the town here.

Out of the 512 printed pages containing President Johnson's budget and supplementary tables and figures, there is one chart that tells the whole story in graphic form. It reveals how any President can keep the budget under $100 billion.

There are two white bands across the chart. One says that the new authorizations the President has asked Congress to give him amount to $106.4 billion. The other shows unspent authorizations enacted in prior years as totaling $96.7 billion.

By simply dipping into these two big funds and using some funds from each in a given year, a President can come up with $100 billion of expenditures or some other arbitrary figure in his estimated budget for the following year and still remain at a level of imaginary frugality.

The same chart reveals that out of the $106.4 billion of new authority asked by the President, only $72 billion will be spent in fiscal year 1966, which begins on July 1.

Out of the unspent authorization of $96.7 billion in prior years, the chart discloses that the President announced he will use only $27.6 billion in 1966.

By adding this $27.6 billion and the $72 billion, a budget of a little less than $100 billion is thus presented for the fiscal year 1966.

Where does this leave the two unexpended yet still authorized totals? Out of the new authority recommended for fiscal year 1966, the Treasury would have left $34.4 billion, and out of the unspent authorization of previous years, it would have $67.2 billion. This means that next January the President can again dip into unexpended but authorized funds totaling $101.6 billion as a reservoir available to make another budget below $100 billion.

This is the main reason why it is misleading for so much emphasis to be placed on the fact that the administrative budget for fiscal year 1966 will be less than $100 billion. It is to this that most prominence has been given, though there is beginning to be an awakening of public opinion on the subject, as shown in editorials from three leading newspapers that supported Johnson in the last election.

The New York Herald Tribune, for example, says: "Mr. Johnson's publicized preoccupation with keeping the administrative budget under $100 billion should not be permitted to obscure the fact that his budget, for fiscal 1966, at $99.7 billion, is the highest in the Nation's history. Nor should emphasis on the administrative budget obscure the payments that will be made into and from the assorted trust funds—and which will bring total Federal spending for fiscal 1966 to $127.4 billion."

The New York Times says: "The cash budget, which consolidates the activities of the Government's trust funds, estimates total payments for fiscal 1966 at over $127 billion and receipts at $123 billion. By focusing attention on the $99.7 billion spending figure in the administrative budget, the President is not merely giving less than a full picture of the Government's role. He also is limiting the effort to forge the budget into a truly flexible instrument for influencing the economy."

The Washington Post says: "Unfortunately most of the attention will be captured by the administrative budget, a bookkeeping concept that dates back to 1921. * * * Its principal shortcoming is that it excludes entirely the operations of the growing trust funds, the most important of which are those established for the operation of the social security system. * * *

"Much confusion can be eliminated by scrapping the administrative budget. The consolidated cash budget is a far more useful tool for purposes of both administrative control and economic analysis."

Careful examination of the 512-page book on the budget issued by the Treasury shows that the word "increase" in oulays appears more than 300 times.

The Republican Party, which theoretically is the opposition party, has never made a concerted attack on the unsound financing systems used by the Government as well as the administration's methods of minimizing

deficits. Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, for example, in a speech this week in Arizona at a national conference on poverty, scoffed at the critics of "deficit spending," and declared: "We should pay more attention to the deficits in education, poverty, discrimination, and health rather than deficits in dollars."

But the difficulty foreseen by some of the critics is that if public confidence in the financial operations of the Government is weakened, all the dollars in the budgets of future years might not be adequate to meet the rising costs and inflated prices of services needed for the effective functioning of the programs designed to promote education and health and to reduce poverty.

Watershed Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566 of the 83d Congress, which authorizes the Department of Agriculture to give technical and financial assistance to organized groups of farmers living in small watersheds where floods and soil erosion are causing serious damage, has been the key program for protecting our growers against disaster and in assuring future generations that the land will continue to serve the needs of our growing population.

One such project, authorized under this law, is the Bib Creek watershed project, planned and now under construction to protect some 150,000 acres in Greene and Craighead Counties, Ark. The Congress, creator of this watershed program, will be interested in a recent article appearing in the Paragould, Ark., Daily Press relating to the progress of the project as well as an editorial carried in the Jonesboro, Ark., Sun of December 22.

Soil and water conservation work is vital to the economy of our Nation and to the future of our people. Local groups of citizens, cooperating with Federal technicians authorized under Public Law 566, are getting the job done that must be done. These news articles indicate the value local citizens place on this important program:

[From the Paragould (Ark.) Daily Press]

FIRST WATERSHED LAKE COMPLETED

The first of 22 planned lakes and impoundments connected with the Big Creek watershed project has been completed and is now filling.

Pete Burns, soil scientist with the local Soil Conservation Service here, said today the 70-acre completed lake known as site 16, is located on the Greene-Craighead County line on property owned by Hilry Wood, Nolan Davis, John Little, and H. F. Miller.

Purpose of the retaining lakes and impoundments is to retard and reduce or stop the flooding of farmland in Craighead County and points south.

Farmers living in the flood control area have taxed themselves to finance the cost of right-of-way and easement purchases. The Federal Government is providing the money to construct the water retaining structures.

Four more lake areas are under construction. Burns said two are "basically completed" and the other two will be completed when the weather gets better.

Burns reported that plans have been made to solicit bids for the construction of site 15, a 73- to 255-acre lake to be built just west of site 16, in the spring. The lake site is on the Noah Carter farm. Burns said the basic lake will be 73 acres, but during flood stages will spread out over 255 acres. The entire project is scheduled for completion by 1970.

Lakes built in Greene County will be of little benefit to residents except for possible irrigation and recreation purposes. Farmers who own the land on which the lakes are situated, can control the private use of the lake. Farmers sold flood rights, but retained property rights.

Workers involved in the construction of the flood control project have already planted 100,000 pine seedlings to help eliminate an erosion problem. Plans call for the planting of 500,000 seedlings in the future. The seedlings should mature enough in the next 7 or 8 years to reduce the amount of erosion, according to Burns.

[From the Jonesboro (Ark.) Sun]

PRESERVING OUR HERITAGE

A big step in preserving the heritage of fertile farmland that we in northeast Arkansas enjoy for future generations is being made with the development of the Big Creek watershed in Craighead and Greene Counties.

When completed there will be 22 lakes, numerous soil conservation projects, and considerable reforestation along Crowley Ridge.

One of the major worries of conservationists is the constantly dropping water table in this area—a drop that is increased by the tremendous surge toward irrigation during recent years.

Construction of these lakes to catch and hold water during the rainy seasons of the year will do much to combat that problem.

Currently plans are being made to plant half a million pine trees in the watershed area. The first shipment of 50,000 seedlings came in from the State forestry commission a few days ago. Planting crews, under the supervision of Chuck Purvis, district forester, will put out these trees during December, January, February, and March.

This is the third year the watershed district has planted trees. In 1963, they planted 400,000, and last winter 235,500 trees were planted. So far 651 acres on 68 different farms along Crowley Ridge have been planted. Plans call for planting 1.7 million trees on about 1,700 acres.

Within 5 years these loblolly pine trees should begin to control the eroded land in which they are planted. Studies have shown this to be the most economical way to control gullies on this type of land.

Most of this land is not producing anything of value at present, and the cost of filling washes and establishing grass is almost prohibitive. Yet, these pine trees, if protected and managed, will produce a valuable crop and will also prevent further erosion.

Without control of the erosion above the flood control lakes, the water would be muddy and silt would soon fill the permanent pool. Fishing would be poor and most of the recreational benefits of the lakes would be lost.

So, not only will these trees save the soil, they will start producing a valuable crop and prolong the life of the flood control structures being constructed on Big Creek and its tributaries.

And the watershed will conserve valuable water and do much to prevent flood damage in this area—something that has happened regularly when large volumes of water come tumbling off the hills of Crowley Ridge after a heavy rain.

Conservation is necessary, if we are to preserve the heritage of fertility that we enjoy for future generations, and the Big Creek watershed is a step in the right direction.

Arizona Grower Finds Domestic Labor Plentiful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, many of Arizona's growers, along with growers in other States, are sincerely concerned about the failure of Congress to extend the program under Public Law 78 which permitted foreign farmworkers to come to this country to harvest our crops.

In the last Congress I sponsored legislation to extend this law through 1965. However, Congress granted only a 1-year extension and the program ended December 31, 1964.

I supported extension of Public Law 78—the so-called bracero program—because I felt that we had not yet reached the time when we could do without this supplemental foreign labor.

Because of the position I have taken in the past, I feel it is only fair that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the contrary views of a large and well-known Arizona grower, Mr. A. W. Bodine. He maintains that there is plenty of American farm labor available—that he even has to turn workers away from his fields, so abundant is the supply.

Mr. Bodine's views are set forth in the following letter he wrote to me on January 8, 1965:

Congressman MORRIS UDALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. UDALL: With the expiration of the Public Law 78, which was the bracero program, which you know I have been opposed to for the past several years, we now find ourselves in Arizona with plenty of American labor.

As you know, I have advocated for some time that there is an abundant supply of American labor for farm work. There might be tight spots once in a while but I feel sure if all of the growers and shippers of fruits and vegetables and all farmers in agriculture will make an extended effort to help themselves and others, there will be no need to run to Washington to get help on the labor program.

Today there is twice as much fruits and vegetables planted in Florida, Texas, Arizona, and California that is needed. There is no way that these crops can be used or consumed if all of the crops were to be harvested. Most of the acreage in the Imperial Valley and the Yuma district was planted with the thought in mind of showing Washington there would not be enough labor to harvest the crops planted. However the growers and shippers in those districts have been greatly fooled.

The normal planting of lettuce in the Imperial Valley should be 25,000 acres. The growers and shippers planted 42,000 acres for the winter harvest in 1965. Not only will it be impossible to sell this much lettuce but the loss in water alone that will be used to grow this excess acreage of lettuce, water which comes from the Colorado River, is

enough to make a good "Arizonian" pull his hair out.

MORRIS, before you yield to all of the yelling and shouting over any alleged shortage of labor, please get all of the facts from the right sources on the labor picture in Arizona and even in California.

Since the bracero program was announced to expire on December 31, 1964, and the Mexican national labor has been returned to Mexico, we are turning people away from our fields every day.

We use about 150 people each day in growing and harvesting our crops and I am glad we can hire all of these people. These are American citizens who need the work and at least they pay a tax on their incomes. This is more than the braceros did as they were exempt from income tax deduction by law. These American citizens are the people that will help the economy of Arizona.

Good luck in the new session of Congress and anytime that I can be of any service or help to you, please let me know. With kindest personal regards.

Very truly yours,

A. W. BODINE.

Frederick L. Deming, New Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on December 28, Frederick L. Deming, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, was named Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs by President Johnson. This Treasury post is vital in the field of international finance. Mr. Deming is well qualified to handle it.

Mr. Deming is not only a close friend, but an active participant in civic affairs in Minneapolis.

President Johnson is to be complimented on an excellent appointment. I am inserting in the RECORD the text of an article from the Minneapolis Star of December 29, 1964, about Mr. Deming.

The article follows:

UNDER SECRETARY—DEMING TO FILL VITAL U.S. TREASURY POST

As Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, Frederick L. Deming will have one of the most important financial posts in the Johnson administration.

He will be responsible for supervision of the Government's domestic borrowings to finance the Federal debt and also for dealings with foreign governments to assure stability of the world's major currencies.

A research-oriented economist, Deming describes himself as a political pragmatist, who is neither a "tight money" nor an "easy money" man in monetary policy.

BALANCE

He has described the objective of monetary policy as maintaining a reasonable balance between the amount of money and credit and the amount of goods and services available.

Deming, 52, is a native of Des Moines, Iowa, who became the youngest president of the 12-bank Federal Reserve System when he succeeded Oliver S. Powell in Minneapolis, April 1, 1957.

He received his B.A., M.A. and Ph. D. degrees from Washington University in St. Louis, Mo.

He was working on his doctor's thesis when he became interested in economic research as a career. Shortly thereafter he walked into the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis and asked for a job in research.

The "temporary" job lasted 16 years and led to the position of first vice president.

CIVIC LEADER

In Minneapolis he has been active in civic affairs, serving on the board of trustees of Macalester College and Westminister Presbyterian Church. He is president of World Affairs Center at the University of Minnesota and was the first president of United Fund, Inc., of Hennepin County. He is vice president of the Upper Midwest Research and Development Council and chairman of its research committee.

As chairman of the State junior college board, he helped develop recommendations to the 1965 legislature for establishing temporary, 2-year junior colleges to open next fall in Minneapolis, Circle Pines, and Thief River Falls.

Deming, who is attending a conference of the American Economic Association in Chicago, is personally acquainted with Robert V. Roosa, of New York, whom he will succeed at the treasury.

He also knows Roosa's predecessor, Julian B. Baird, former chairman of the board of First National Bank of St. Paul.

Both men, Deming said, have told him how tough the job is.

Churchill: Man of this Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday, the world paid its last respects to one of the mighty figures of this century—Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in today's RECORD, an editorial written by William Johnston of the Lewiston, Idaho, Morning Tribune on January 25, 1965, in tribute to this fine English gentleman, honorary citizen of the United States, and certainly man of this century.

The editorial follows:

CHURCHILL: MAN OF THIS CENTURY

The inexorable tides of time have brought a whole new generation to manhood since Sir Winston Churchill stood at the summit of his powers as the stirring symbol of freedom's defiance of tyranny.

How can a youth born in that fateful time of Western civilization's darkest peril fully comprehend that he has witnessed now the departure of one of the giants of the earth?

Yet, even the children of this post-Churchillian era do sense that the feeble, fading man, who lingered on to the age of 90 after all his deeds were done, was one whose like they will never see again. They know he was an unrivaled hero of their parents. Their history books are largely his biographies. Even these youngsters know, vaguely but certainly, that Winston Churchill was the dominant figure of the 20th century.

He was perhaps the most multifaceted genius yet produced on this planet. He was a fearless soldier, a superior military strategist, a talented war correspondent, a capable painter, an excellent biographer, an eminent historian, a superb orator, and one of the greatest statesmen in the whole, crowded history of the globe.

This century has hurtled many men to the heights of greatness—Ghandi, Roosevelt, MacArthur, Truman, Kennedy, and many more. Yet, the historians of future generations may chiefly ponder what other mortal besides Albert Einstein, perhaps, can be ranked second in the era's annals of greatness. Even now there can be little doubt as to whom will be ranked first.

What were the secrets of this transcendent personality? How did such a man evolve to lead the Western World, just when he was needed most, to deliverance from the ruthless ambition of totalitarian fanatics?

Fortunately for posterity, the major ingredients of his greatness are posted plainly in his stirring words and astonishing deeds. He was a remarkably direct man, for all his complexities of talents and purposes. He seldom doubted that he knew the route his countrymen and the world should go. He never hesitated to proclaim his conclusions. The story of his life is written plain and clear, and a most instructive and inspiring story it is.

As a child, he was particularly rebellious. "I used to think him the naughtiest little boy in the whole world," one governess related. He had no taste for the rigid discipline or classical orientation of his early school years at Brighton. His boundless energy could never be contained. His instinct for argument constantly exploded into conflict with authority. Arithmetic and Latin baffled and bored him. He survived these subjects chiefly by cramming enough information by rote into his phenomenal memory to carry him precariously through examinations. But he did begin at Brighton and later at Harrow Military School the nourishment of one abiding enthusiasm which sustained him all his life—and which quite possibly saved the Western World from Nazi conquest. He later wrote:

"By being so long in the lowest form I gained an immense advantage over the cleverer boys. They all went on learning Latin and Greek and splendid things like that. But I was taught English. Mr. Somervell—a delightful man, to whom my debt is great—was charged with the duty of teaching the stupidest boys the most disregarded thing—namely, to write mere English. He knew how to do it. He taught it as no one else has ever taught it. As I remained in the third form three times as long as anyone else, I had three times as much of it. I learnt it thoroughly. Thus, I got into my bones the essential structure of the ordinary English sentence—which is a noble thing. And when in after years my school fellows who had won prizes and distinction for writing such beautiful Latin poetry and pithy Greek epigrams had to come down again to common English to earn their living or make their way, I did not feel at any disadvantage.

"I would make them all learn English; and then I would let the clever ones learn Latin as an honor, and Greek as a treat. But the only thing I would whip them for would be for not knowing English. I would whip them hard for that."

Churchill left Harrow in 1892. That was a very long time ago as measured in the struggles and concerns of mankind. The passion for English and the love of military strategy he nourished there were considered quite insufficient for a time as a foundation for university training.

But the whole Western World was to listen, anxiously and intently, on June 4, 1940, after France had fallen to the Nazi panzer divisions, as Churchill demonstrated anew that "the ordinary English sentence—is a noble thing":

"Even though large tracts of Europe and many old and famous States have fallen or may fall into the grip of the Gestapo and all the odious apparatus of Nazi rule, we shall not flag or fail. We shall go on to the end, we shall fight in France, we shall fight in the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender, and even if, which I do not for a moment believe, this island or a large part of it were subjugated and starving, then our empire beyond the seas, armed and guarded by the British fleet, would carry on the struggle until, in God's good time, the New World, with all its power and might, steps forth to the rescue and the liberation of the old."

His majestic words, rolling like distant thunder, convinced England and perhaps America that the British were invincible. Even Adolf Hitler seemed convinced, for he never struck across the English Channel at a virtually defenseless island. Churchill himself was not deluded by his oratory. Years later he chided Hitler for stupidity in waiving his best chance to win the war.

Churchill's unbridled ambition is legendary, of course. His ego was monumental. As a brash young war correspondent, Churchill hesitated not a moment to criticize in detail the military strategies of seasoned generals commanding British battles in Africa. He cheered on troops in battle with the observation that "you are making excellent copy for my paper." Yet, he distinguished himself for bravery on the battlefield, and the annoyance he created always was tinged with respect. One of his early critics observed that Churchill "was born a demagog and happens to know it," and added that "at dinner he talks and talks, and you can hardly tell when he leaves off quoting his one idol, Macaulay, and begins quoting his other, Winston Churchill."

He never indulged himself in modesty and only tolerated those who "shrank from greatness." His successor as Prime Minister, Clement Attlee, was the butt of some of the most scorching Churchillian wit on this score. "He has much to be modest about," said Churchill. And again: "He is a sheep in sheep's clothing."

Yet, there was sympathy and understanding in him that somehow transformed his ambition and egotism into a personification of the aspirations of all the scattered millions he led and inspired. The caustic, dogmatic aristocrat he surely was. Yet, he also was "good old Winnie," the beloved, human, intensely personal leader of the least distinguished fighter for freedom.

Churchill's crowning triumph—the crushing defeat of Germany and Japan in World War II—was shadowed by two keen disappointments. One was that his comrade, confidante and sometimes competitor in arms, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, died shortly before the first atomic bomb brought Japan to its knees. The other was that Churchill himself was voted out of office by his countrymen after Hitler had been defeated but before the war in the Far East had been won.

He later described his premonition of the British election results of July 1945:

"On the whole I accepted the view of the party managers, and went to bed in the belief that the British people would wish me to continue my work. My hope was that it would be possible to reconstitute the national coalition government in the proportions of the new House of Commons. Thus slumber. However, just before dawn I woke suddenly with a sharp stap of almost physical pain. A hitherto subconscious conviction that we were beaten broke forth and dominated my mind. All the pressure of great events, on and against which I had mentally so long maintained my flying speed, would cease and I should fall. The power to shape the future would be denied me. The knowledge and experience I had gathered, the authority and good will I had gained in so many countries would vanish. I was discontented at the prospect, and turned over at once to sleep again."

Churchill was ever discontented with any suggestion that he would lose or fail. Yet, when disappointment or disaster struck, he never whimpered or wavered. His enemies might defeat him, but he never doubted that he would destroy them in the end. His own countrymen might abandon him, but he never regarded this as repudiation—just a temporary aberration. He had studied enough history, forecast enough history and made enough history to know beyond any deep doubt or posture of humility that his own place in history was secure.

Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill, the only honorary citizen of the United States and the greatest wartime leader who ever led his beloved Britain, is dead. The world cannot expect to see his like again.—B.J.

Corn Price Support in 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY L. GREIGG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, in analyzing the issue of agriculture as it faces us in 1965, I believe that an editorial which appeared in the Des Moines Register of December 28, 1964, presents an excellent viewpoint, and I recommend it to my colleagues:

CORN PRICE SUPPORT IN 1965

Charles Bailey, of the Register's Washington bureau, reported in an exclusive story the other day that the corn price support level would not be lowered in 1965, as had been predicted. Bailey reported that Agriculture Secretary Freeman had won out in a debate with the Budget Bureau over cutting the price support loan on corn.

Governor Hughes of Iowa backed Secretary Freeman in his argument for maintaining the corn price support level. The Farmers Union also rallied political pressure on President Johnson to prevent the price cut. Mr. Johnson has been searching every corner of the Federal budget for places to reduce expenses, and one place being strongly considered was the price support for corn.

If corn loans were lowered by 10 cents a bushel or about 10 percent, as Federal Budget Director Kermit Gordon proposed, assuming no other changes in Federal farm programs, this would mean a severe reduction in Iowa farm income in the next several years.

Gordon figures that the 10-cent cut in the corn loan would save $200 million in the Federal budget. However, this saving would result in a loss of farm income several times that large for producers of feed grains and of livestock.

A 10-cent reduction in corn price support would result in less participation of farmers in the feed grain program, thus enlarging corn acreage planted and total production. This effect could be offset by an increase in the acreage diversion payments to encourage larger participation, but since the motive for the cut in the corn loan was to save Government costs, probably this would not be done.

The loss of income from feed grains would be immediate. The cut in gross income from corn would be at least 10 percent. Since corn production would increase, market prices probably would fall more than 10 percent.

The cut in net income would be much larger, since production costs would continue at the same or a higher level.

The loss in returns from livestock would take place over 2 or 3 years as production increased in response to larger supplies of feed grain on the market at lower prices. Livestock prices would fall substantially, especially prices of hogs and grain-fed cattle.

The reason why a $200 million saving in the Federal budget for the feed grain program would cause a loss of farm income several times this size is the fact that demand for livestock products is highly inelastic. An increase in output of 10 percent brings about a drop of prices to the farmer of 35 percent or more. The farmer thus gets less gross revenue from the larger production than from the smaller.

There are better places to cut the budget than in the feed grain program if the President is serious about fighting poverty. The returns per dollar spent on the feed grain program in maintaining farm income are very high indeed—about $1.86 of farm income per $1 of Federal cost, according to a study made by the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service.

Wool Act Extension Introduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill calling for permanent extension of the National Wool Act of 1954. The National Wool Growers Association, at its 100th anniversary convention, held in Phoenix last month, adopted the following resolution:

The National Wool Act throughout its existence has been a program that has proven a step toward establishing our industry on a sound basis. It provides additional income for growers and at the same time leaves wool in a position to compete freely in the open market. We urge early extension of the act by the Congress. In view of the long-term requirements of sheep and wool production, such extension should be for as long a period as feasible but in no event for less than 5 years.

The National Wool Act is unusual in that since its inception it has worked to the satisfaction of the entire wool industry, from producer through manufacturer. All major organizations in the industry have supported its extension each time it has been up for renewal.

The wool producers would now, after 10 years of experience with the act, like to have it made permanent. In any event, they feel that they are entitled to an extension of sufficient duration to encourage producers to expand their flocks. The average life of a breeding ewe is 7 years and an extension for at least that period of time would provide producers with the economic stability necessary to persuade them that in-

creased investment in their operations is a prudent business move.

My bill calls for a permanent extension. Recognizing that the Congress can modify any statute at any time, I share the feeling of the wool growers that a permanent law would be of most benefit to them. If this is not possible of attainment, I feel strongly that an extension of 7 or at least 5 years would provide the sheep industry with the minimum necessary stability.

I therefore am happy to sponsor this measure in behalf of one of our important agricultural industries, and I am hopeful the Committee on Agriculture will give this measure early and favorable consideration.

State Department Cooperates in Collection of Evidence on Nazi Murders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following press release the Department of State issued on January 11, 1965, containing the text of a note delivered to the German Ambassador on January 8, 1965.

The note offers the cooperation of the U.S. Government in the collection of evidence to assist in the bringing to justice of Nazi mass murders:

TEXT OF NOTE SENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO THE EMBASSY OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY CONCERNING COLLECTION OF EVIDENCE ON NAZI MURDERS

On January 8, 1965 the Department of State transmitted the following note to the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in response to the Embassy's request, as part of a worldwire appeal, for assistance in collecting evidence concerning murders, perpetrated during the Hitler regime which are not yet known to the Government of the Federal Republic:

The Department of State acknowledges the receipt of the note from the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany dated December 22, 1964, requesting, as part of a worldwide appeal, the assistance of the Government of the United States in collecting evidence concerning Nazi murders not yet known in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The two principal repositories of German documents which might be of value to the Federal Republic are the Berlin Document Center and the National Archives and Records Service of Alexandria, Va. The Archives of the Library of Congress also contain some German documents.

The Federal Republic has of course for a number of years frequently consulted the Berlin Document Center, and the Center continues to give all possible assistance to appropriate German authorities. German investigators have also in the past searched the documents at the Library of Congress and may, if they wish, again investigate these files.

The Government of the United States has returned to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany over 80 percent of the German documents originally stored in the National Archives at Alexandria. In 1960, officials designated by the German Federal Government searched these Archives for material which could be of use in the prosecution of Nazi war criminals. In order to be certain, however, that no useful document which might still be in the Archives has been overlooked, the Government of the United States invites the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany again to search the German documents still remaining in the National Archives at Alexandria. Upon notification by the German Government of its desire to send competent and qualified authorities to visit the Archives, the Department of State will be pleased to make appropriate arrangements with the National Archives.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is aware that the Government of the United States of America has long had a deep interest in the efforts of the Federal Republic to find, prosecute, and convict Nazi criminals not yet brought to justice. The Federal Republic is also undoubtedly aware of the concern of many American citizens that the scheduled expiration in May 1965 of the 20-year period under the German statute of limitations for murder might permit presently unknown Nazi criminals to escape prosecution. In light of these considerations, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is assured that the Government of the United States of America will continue to assist the Federal Republic in every appropriate way in its search for evidence of Nazi crimes and criminals.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

WASHINGTON.

Proclamation From the City of Hialeah, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proclamation from the city of Hialeah, Fla. proclaiming February 7 to February 13, as the 40th Anniversary Week for the city of Hialeah, Dade County, Fla.:

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF HIALEAH, FLA.

Whereas the city of Hialeah was founded in 1925 and has grown to be the seventh largest city in the State of Florida, and the second largest city in Dade County, Fla.; and

Whereas 40 years have passed since the city was duly chartered by an official act of the State Legislature of Florida; and

Whereas the amazing growth of this city as an industrial center and residential community has been among the most rapid in the entire Nation; and

Whereas the leaders of this community and each and every citizen can be justifiably proud of the city's development and progress: Now, therefore,

I, Henry A. Milander, by virtue of the authority vested in me as mayor of the city of Hialeah, do set aside the period, February 7 through February 13, 1965, for an official "40th Anniversary Celebration" in the city of Hialeah, and in observance thereof I urge the residents of this city to take part in this celebration.

HENRY A. MILANDER,
Mayor.

Sir Winston Churchill

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the highlights of my service in the Congress was a visit with Sir Winston Churchill at 10 Downing Street in London in the fall of 1951. Mr. Churchill was again Prime Minister following Prime Minister Attlee and his labor government. I was with a group of my colleagues headed by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

As our congressional group was leaving Mr. Churchill's office, the Prime Minister called me back to inquire of his good friend, Jimmy Byrnes. The Prime Minister was very familiar with the history of our country and he knew of my States rights philosophy and devotion to the private enterprise system. Mr. Churchill with tears in his eyes said that England could no longer lead the free world and this responsibility now belonged to the United States. He said that England could become a second-rate power due largely to one party in England being wholly conservative and the other extremely liberal. Mr. Churchill said that after 6 years of the labor government under Mr. Attlee, he could do nothing to undo socialistic measures which had been instituted by the labor government. Churchill said it was impossible to induce businessmen to return and take over certain utilities that had been nationalized by the Government because these businessmen knew that someday the liberal government would come back to power and that business would be again nationalized.

Mr. Churchill, in referring to socialized medicine, said that it would be impossible for him to take a pair of pliers and pull the teeth from the mouths of the people given to them by the Government. He said they would howl to high heaven. He used this as an example to illustrate that there is no turning back from socialism and the erosion of initiative, private enterprise, and individual effort.

Mr. Churchill suggested that if the United States were to remain the heart and core of the free world, our two great political parties must continue to embody in each conservatives, liberals, and moderates. He warned that the United States would deteriorate and lose its prestige and position as a world power if one of our great political parties became completely conservative and the other totally liberal. Sooner or later, Mr. Churchill warned, the liberal party would come to power and the United States and its great institutions would be treated to socialistic schemes from which there is no return. Mr. Churchill said in order for the United States to continue its world leadership it would be necessary to keep a balance in both political parties so that the Nation could move forward in the middle of the road.

I was amazed at Mr. Churchill's keen insight into American political philosophy and was amazed with his foresight. I will always believe that Mr. Churchill called me aside for this word of warning because at that time I was a young man in my early thirties, and he knew that I was associated with the philosophy of States right and devoted to the private enterprise system and was a member of the Democratic Party which has traditionally encompassed all elements and classes of our American society.

Mr. Speaker, I have wished many times that the world had listened to Winston Churchill, a man of unsurpassed wisdom, culture, education, training, and experience in world leadership in the most critical time in our modern history. No one was more aware than Winston Churchill that the Polish corridor created after World War I was the immediate cause of World War II. Churchill was well aware that a Berlin corridor would set the stage for World War III. It will always remain a mystery to me how the incredible tragedy of the Berlin corridor was fostered on the world. War lords and agitators in their wildest imagination could have never dreamed up a more perfect way to insure another war. Winston Churchill knew, which many of us seem to forget, that Communist Russia was equally as guilty as Adolph Hitler in launching World War II. He kept constantly in mind that Communist Russia violated the integrity of Poland and invaded that nation and in its deal with Hitler received the largest slice of Polish territory.

Churchill was one of the greatest men in the history of the world but he did not have to be great to see the folly and stark tragedy of turning Central Europe over to Communist Russia. Churchill knew in the end that we won no victory in Europe. We only made it possible for Communist Russia to win the ultimate victory. It was with such sadness that Churchill saw Poland, the very nation that the free nations went to war to preserve, gobbled up by the ruthless Communist aggressor, thus depriving the Western World of a victory over the forces of oppression, dictatorship, and aggression.

Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill typified all that was great, all that was grand, gallant, and magnificent about the British Empire. Winston Churchill is an example of British statesmanship at its best. Churchill was incomparable as a patriot, soldier, historian, and statesman. We are all indebted to him today for standing like a stonewall guarding the ramparts of freedom when the chips were down.

Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the life and character of Sir Winston Churchill has been the subject of countless sincere and eloquent encomiums in recent days, and I would not presume to undertake an inclusive eulogy. I cannot let his passing, and the impressive funeral ceremonies, retreat into history, however, without a brief and heartfelt comment.

Sir Winston Churchill was the best of everything British. He was a man who could bring to the modern world the finest traditions of the past. Yet for all his achievements that would make him a legend in his lifetime, we saw in him, particularly, the greatness of human spirit. In many ways, he captured the spirit of Kipling's "If," and shining through a brilliant career we cannot help but see the greatness of an individual that would be translated into magnificent accomplishments in the realm of public service.

Sir Winston Churchill was the embodiment of the British spirit. He represented the greatness of the British past and British traditions. Yet for all of his achievements in the field of politics, in military affairs, in art and letters, he shall be marked by the indomitable spirit in a man whose pole star for greatness was courage. This was a personal courage that would be translated into the courage of a nation, an empire, and a cause. It was physical, and it was moral. One cannot look at him without a sure conviction that here was a man who, without hesitation or fear, would undertake any task, perform any duty, make any sacrifice which he might demand of others.

His stature will grow in history, and the posterity which owes him so much will study again and again the character of this man who not only inspired the free world by the leadership of his country in Britain's darkest hour but who had the vision, the courage, and the foresight after the end of World War II to direct the world's attention to the tyranny of communism and the aggressive aims of the Soviet Union. It could well be that the greatest debt the free world shall owe to this man who towered above others in our tumultuous 20th century shall be found centered in his leadership in the postwar years to prevent the enslavement of mankind by the Sino-Soviet bloc.

The State of the Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Henry Ellenbogen, president judge of the court of common pleas, Allegheny County, Pa., in an address to the American Trial Lawyers Association reported dramatic progress in disposing of backlog cases. He noted good results too from an emphasis on conciliation. All of this was accomplished without detracting from the right of trial by jury and justice was well served. I include the text of Judge Ellenbogen's excellent address at this point in my remarks:

THE STATE OF THE COURTS

(An address by the Honorable Henry Ellenbogen, president judge of the court of common pleas, Allegheny County, Pa.)

It is a real pleasure to be with you this evening. It is a privilege to join the Honorable Wallace S. Gourley, Chief Judge of the Federal District Court, in speaking on the "State of the Courts."

I believe that you are inaugurating here tonight a tradition of great importance. In the interest of the community, the profession, and the court, it is entirely fitting and proper that we should render an accounting of our stewardship on a regular basis. The American Trial Lawyers Association is an appropriate forum.

JUSTICE IS THE BASIS OF SOCIETY

Justice, and the courts of law which administer it, are the basis of our organized society. The more those who are closely associated with the courts know about their operation, the more will true justice be dispensed. The more the private citizen is informed of the activities of the courts, the more faith and respect will he have for the law.

Yes, it is clearly our duty and our privilege to report to you and to the people. This is because ultimately it is the people who will determine the quality of the work of the courts as they do the performance of all other government agencies.

My appearance here tonight is a result of what happened 23 months ago. It was on March 1, 1963, that I succeeded to the position of president judge of the court of common pleas. I found a number of complex problems which demanded immediate attention. Our court was more than 3 years behind in the handling of litigation. Our court was under manned. Age-old procedures, coupled with inadequate administrative machinery, severely handicapped the efforts of the judges to cope with the mounting backlog of cases.

A YEAR OF ACCOMPLISHMENT—1964

Tonight, I can proudly report that the picture has changed. One thousand nine hundred and sixty-four has been a good year. It has been a year of solid accomplishment. Credit for that belongs to the judges, to all the judges of the court.

Guidance and leadership are necessary in every endeavor. I have attempted to provide that leadership. But the volume and quality of the work turned out by the court are directly dependent upon the efforts of each individual judge. The court made great strides in 1964, because the judges accepted their responsibilities and persevered in their task. We can all be proud of this.

There have been many innovations since March 1, 1963. Many came to full fruition in 1964. We established a new system of calendar control. Today cases on the daily trial list are first conciliated by the judges assigned to calendar control. Only if that last effort at settlement fails, is a jury selected to try the case. This strong emphasis on settlements has eliminated many expensive and time consuming jury trials.

TIME OF JUDGES CONSERVED

We have insisted on the policy of no postponements. We have sharply increased the number of trial courtrooms in operation. We have strengthened and enlarged the system of selecting standby juries ready to be sent to a trial room as soon as the case being tried there is completed. This has permitted every judge to spend more of his time in the trial of cases.

We have freed the judges from the task of presiding at divorce hearings. Our argument procedures have been rearranged so as to save much of the time of our judges.

Our efforts to secure an adequate number of judges have been partially successful. At the expense of a great deal of time and effort, we demonstrated the need for at least five

additional judges. The legislature finally allotted us three. They took office in September 1963.

EDP FURNISHES FACTS—NOT ESTIMATES

There were a number of innovations which contributed to our progress. Among the most important were the establishment of the administrative office and an electronic data processing system. This has made possible an accurate assessment of the work of the court. Never before was it possible for us to know with any degree of reliability the results of our labors or the exact nature of our challenge. Now we are dealing with facts, not guesses or estimates. Here are some facts about our progress:

In 1964 the court of common pleas disposed of 3,805 cases. This is by far the greatest number of cases disposed of in any 12-month period in the history of the court. In 1963 we disposed of 2,186 cases—the previous all-time high. Note that we exceeded that record in 1964 by 1,619 cases.

DISPOSITIONS INCREASED TWO AND ONE-HALF TIMES

The dramatic progress which we made in 1964 becomes even more evident if we recall that a total of only 1,567 cases were disposed of in the entire year 1962. Think of it. In 1964 our court disposed of nearly 2½ times as many cases as were completed during 1962. These totals do not include a vast variety of divorce hearings, custody, habeas corpus and other petitions, and an infinite variety of motions and orders of all kinds.

The speedup in our court has greatly reduced the backlog of cases at issue and ready for trial. As of December 31, 1964, a total of 5,139 cases were awaiting trial in our court. Contrast this with the 6,829 cases pending on January 1, 1964, and the nearly 8,000 cases pending on March 1, 1963.

These records have been set despite the fact that the high rate of filings of new litigation has continued unabated.

CONCILIATIONS SAVE TIME AND MONEY

Our emphasis on conciliation brought good results. The judges settled 639 cases during the conciliation periods. This does not include cases settled from the daily trial lists. Here, again, many months of trial time and tens of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money were saved because jury trials were obviated.

I will not tire you with additional statistics tonight. It is important, however, that complete statistics be available. The court must be concerned with the number of cases before it, and the waiting time of these cases and other related statistics. To ignore the total picture, or to fail to press for as rapid a disposition as possible, would be like the farmer who turns his back on a whole field and rejects the use of modern equipment while he contemplates his small, hand-tended garden.

I am especially proud that all of this was accomplished without in any way impinging or dertacting from the right of trial by jury. I still regard this traditional right of free men as the backbone of ou American system of justice in civil as well as in criminal cases.

JUSTICE HAS BEEN WELL SERVED

The result of all this is that justice has been well served. More litigants than ever before who wished jury trials received them. More litigants seeking redress in equity cases or money damages received them in jury trials or in negotiated settlements.

Furthermore, fewer litigants have had to wait long periods of time for justice to be rendered.

The quality of justice, too, has been good during 1964. I have not heard a single complaint from a litigant which questioned the justice of his negotiated settlement. However, I have received many letters from litigants complaining bitterly about delays in having their cases heard. And so it is good to be able to report that the average waiting time of cases ready for trial as of December 31, 1964, was only 12.9 months. I hasten to add that this does not represent the present picture. It is due to a procedural experiment which delayed the placing of cases at issue during 1963. The true waiting time today is less than 2 years, a remarkable improvement over the 3½ years of not so long ago.

We are insisting that older cases be given priority, placed on the trial list and disposed of. As a result of that, I am able to report that only 8 percent of the cases ready for trial were placed at issue prior to 1962.

It is my experience of 39 years as a lawyer at the bar, and as a judge in the court, that justice always suffers when cases must wait a long time for trial. Evidence is lost, memories fade, witnesses move away or die, and justice suffers whenever there is a long delay.

Now, for another matter of great importance in any report on the state of our courts. I would be derelict in my duty to the court and to the people if I did not use this opportunity to call attention again to the totally inadequate physical facilities which are hindering the court. I am happy that the Federal Government has recognized the needs of Judge Gourley's Federal district court. Our court needs the same attention.

AFTER 50 YEARS NEW QUARTERS A MUST

Every day it is becoming increasingly evident that the court of common pleas cannot function efficiently in quarters designed for the Allegheny County of 1915—fully 50 years ago. The pace and the problems, the volume of work, and the needs of our people have changed vastly in half a century.

Ask the jurors who must do without seats in our assignment room, who must use inadequate rest room facilities; who must stand in halls crowded by lawyers, litigants, and witnesses. Ask the judges who must change from one temporary courtroom to another. Ask the litigants and lawyers who must seek justice in hot, stuffy, ill-lighted courtrooms without the benefit of conference rooms such as are provided in other courts.

Ask anyone knowledgeable about the inefficiency of quartering personnel in widely separated areas. Ask them, too, about the awkward and fatiguing conditions which place judicial secretaries and other staff members on a floor above the judges they serve.

Ask anyone about the lack of air conditioning, which in the year of 1965 is a necessity rather than a luxury, if efficiency is to be the criterion. These are the inefficient and disheartening conditions under which we attempt to cope with the mass of important litigation which our complex society generates. An improvement in the physical facilities of the court would mean little to me personally. I have air conditioned my chambers at my own expense. I am certain that many, if not all the other judges have the same feeling about it.

A NEW HALL OF JUSTICE WILL BENEFIT THE PEOPLE

It is the people who deserve a new Hall of Justice. It is the taxpayers, big and small, who will benefit from efficient court facilities when they serve as jurors and when they must come to court as litigants seeking justice. Each individual citizen, and the community as a whole, will benefit when we obtain a new court equipped to handle the cases expeditiously.

It is important for each individual citizen to realize the great personal stake which he has in a well-functioning judicial system. His life, his liberty, his property, and the happiness of himself and his family depend, in the last analysis, upon the excellence of our judicial system.

It is for this reason that I am here tonight to present a state-of-the-court message—to give an accounting of our stewardship.

We have made remarkable progress in 1964. The judges of the court have reason to be proud of its record. But we are not done. There are still too many cases awaiting trial for too long a time.

There may be temporary setbacks. Differences of opinion may slow the pace at times. Our progress in the year ahead is only conjecture. But I have no doubt of the long-term outcome. The needs of the people will be met.

It is proper to note the progress which we have made in 1964. But this day is not a day to celebrate our achievements. The need calls rather for rededication. The hopes, the happiness, and the very lives of untold thousands of our citizens depend upon how well we meet that challenge.

The New Arithmetic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a lot of nonsense has, in the past, been written about the Federal budget. Undoubtedly, a lot of nonsense in the future will be written about that budget.

In the following column from the January 29, 1965 edition of the New York Herald Tribune Roscoe Drummond has placed the spending program in proper perspective. I commend his column to the attention of our colleagues:

THE NEW ARITHMETIC: A GROWTH ENVIRONMENT WITH BUDGET TO MATCH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The Federal budget does not grow in a vacuum.

It grows all right, but most of the time in response to legitimate needs.

Three years after Franklin D. Roosevelt became President, the Federal budget was no more than $6.5 billion. Twice during the Eisenhower administration the budget topped $80 billion despite the fact that Eisenhower and Taft had agreed that a ceiling of $60 billion ought to be put on Federal spending.

The budget doesn't grow because the President loves to spend money and Congress loves to pass taxes. It grows for other reasons and some of the reasons why President Johnson's 1966 budget is $2.2 billion higher than his 1965 budget are that these things have happened in the past 12 months:

There are 4 million more Americans than a year ago. (This is like adding a city larger than Chicago to the Nation. There will be more than 10 new Chicagos in the next decade.)

Three million, two hundred thousand young people reached college age.

One million, seven hundred thousand new families were formed.

One million, three hundred thousand were added to the labor force.

One million, five hundred thousand persons reached retirement age.

The Nation grows and the budget grows. The only time when there has been any sizable drop in Federal spending in the past 30 years is when in the late 1940's, President Truman cut the heart out of the defense budget. And that proved disastrous.

The new Johnson budget is $99.7 billion. That's higher than the peak of World War II budgets which in 1945 reached $98.3 billion.

It is misleading to describe the Johnson budget as a peacetime budget. It is actually a war and peacetime budget. The cold war forces the United States to pour half of its yearly revenue into defense.

The size of the Johnson budget reflects the fact that the President is trying to do two things at the same time: put all the money into defense which the cold war demands and begin to put a lot more money into meeting domestic needs.

This means that the present Johnson budget represents the easiest spending decisions the President will have to make. Easiest because he put an arbitrary ceiling of $100 billion on the budget and used this ceiling to resolve spending decisions, easiest because a large part of the funds for the Great Society came out of savings.

The harder decisions lie ahead. The very growth of the Nation will force the President to drop the arbitrary $100 billion ceiling next year.

But the central and painful decision which Mr. Johnson will have to make is how adequately the Government can finance the Great Society without sacrificing the unyielding demands for defense and security.

What the President really faces is a cold-war budget with a mounting commitment to meet peacetime domestic needs too long delayed. This is what will make the next budget—and the next—far harder to decide.

President Johnson says that the Great Society must be "bold," "compassionate," and "efficient." He says that "less urgent programs must give way to make room for higher priority needs."

There would be no budget problem at all if there were no cold war. But Red China and the Soviet Union are not going to help Mr. Johnson build the Great Society.

A Story of Frustration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune has been publishing a series of articles entitled "New York City in Crisis" which outline some of the problems facing that great city. In an article which appeared on January 30, 1965, Marshall Peck described the frustration experienced by the Cooper Square Development Committee in its efforts to develop a community oriented urban renewal plan. The alternate plan outlined by the Cooper Square Committee included vital public housing which the Board of Estimate eliminated. Today I telegraphed the mayor of New York City again urging that the decision of the board of estimate be reversed.

The article follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 30, 1965]

COOPER SQUARE'S STORY OF FRUSTRATION

(By Marshall Peck)

One day in November, 1960, Miss Thelma J. Burdict, chairman of the Cooper Square Community Development Committee, called on Mayor Wagner at city hall. She and other committee members, who had stirred the community to fight against a slum clearance committee bulldozer-type refurbishment, told the mayor about their own ideas to plan ahead for Cooper Square.

Mayor Wagner, Miss Burdict recalls, was "very, very encouraging." She told him the plan her committee envisaged would be prepared under auspices of the community itself, and based on its needs and character.

"This is the way we want to think about redevelopment in the city," is the way Miss Burdict remembers Mayor Wagner's reaction to the proposal.

"But after we gave him the plan," Miss Burdict continues, "well—then he said nothing."

What transpired between that day in 1960, and today, or for that matter, since 1956, when the Cooper Square site was proposed for title I redevelopment, is the story of a neighborhood that has cried out for action, and been frustrated in getting it.

The plan as proposed by the slum clearance committee was dropped at the recommendation of the housing and redevelopment board, which had succeeded the former in May 1960.

The Cooper Square Committee presented its own alternate plan to the city in July 1961.

The city planning commission designated the area as suitable for urban renewal in December 1963, but it linked the Cooper Square site along with what is called the St. Mark's area.

Then, last November 19, the board of estimate overruled the city planning commission's own specific recommendation, and blunted the key of the Cooper Square alternate plan proposal by authorizing that a city-owned vacant lot be turned over for privately sponsored middle income apartments instead of public low rent housing.

"Yes, you might infer that this was a reversal of city policy," said a planning commission spokesman yesterday. And he added somewhat dryly, "the city can change its mind, apparently it's been doing that of recent."

Miss Burdict and members of the Cooper Square Community Development Committee have for the last 5 years waged a war for renewal in their own community. The alternate plan took shape under the guidance of the people that live there, in cooperation with the city planning commission and under direction of professional planners recognized as competent by the city. They were literally bowled over when they got word last June that plans for the middle-income building were afoot in an area needing low-income housing.

By October, they were making every effort to get to see the mayor, who in 1960 had praised their ideas, and ask him what had happened. The vacant lot, at Houston and Chrystie Streets, was to be the site of the first new building, and thereby the redevelopment could go ahead with orderly relocation by stages.

An all night vigil at Gracie Mansion in November exacted what the Cooper Square Committee took to be a promise that Mr. Wagner would see them, but it wasn't until last Monday—the day the Herald Tribune presented the first article of its New York City in Crisis series—that Miss Burdict received word that the mayor would meet with committee representatives on Friday.

Thursday night Miss Burdict, Executive Secretary Wilbert Tatum, and others gathered at the committee's headquarters at 69 Second Avenue. Strategy was mapped: "We must stress aggressiveness, determination, we will fight to the last ditch," someone said.

Then yesterday, as the committee readied its forces for a frontal assault on city hall, word came that Mr. Wagner was sidelined with a cold and, regretfully, would not be able to see them. The appointment was rescheduled for Monday at 3:30 p.m. Same place, same sides.

Miss Burdict, Mr. Tatum, Walter Thabit, planning consulant who mapped the alternate plan in a slick, professional 69-page book (dated July 31, 1961); Harris L. Present, housing consultant; Prof. Percival Goodman, of Columbia, an architect; Raymond S. Rubinow, foundations consultant, and others reached city hall anyway and stood in some confusion, concern and uneasiness in the entry hall.

"We're sorry Mr. Wagner is ill," Miss Burdict said. "We hope he will be well enough to see us on Monday." Somewhat more briskly, she added: "And we're looking forward to a positive statement Monday that he will use his offices to reverse the decision against low-rent housing on that key landsite."

"That's the first step," said Mr. Tatum, "then we have to break up the linkage between Cooper Square (Delancey to East Ninth, between the Bowery and Chrystie-Second Avenue) and the over-all city-planned project (Delancey to East 14th, between the Bowery-Third Avenue and Forsyth Street-First Avenue)."

"Cooper Square was planned by the community, and ready to go—long ago—," said Mr. Present, "and all this delay and change * * * in effect, it's sabotage."

"Any community action which is constructive is a rare thing," said Professor Goodman. "It's too bad that a community committee can assemble for hundreds of meetings, and put heart and soul into an effort, and then be pushed in the face. To put it mildly, the city is not very friendly to its citizens when something like this happens."

Mr. Goodman and Mr. Present, and others who commented, were, of course, not referring to Mayor Wagner's incapacity yesterday. They were blaming him, as leader of the city, for not following up and pressing for action on the endeavors they reviewed with him, and which he praised, 4 years ago.

One of the committee members said that Milton Mollen, city housing coordinator, had advised the Cooper Square group on January 5 that "we will work out the problem together—and if the worst comes to worst, we'll meet and talk over alternatives."

"The whole notion of democratic procedure is a falsity," growled a committee member.

Meanwhile committee members reported they had word that the housing and redevelopment board, which has the assignment of shaping the future of the renewal in the overall area designated by the city planning commission, was sending out letters announcing that a hearing on application to the Federal Government for survey and planning funds will be heard before the board of estimate in February.

The city planning commission reacted somewhat unhappily to the situation that has developed.

"We feel very strongly about public housing, we have not changed our position," a spokesman said, in reference to the switch from the low-rent to middle-income building approved, in effect, by the board of estimate.

"It's too bad—people take us on our faith, and then the signals change."

As for the reason for the designation of a larger renewal area, rather than the smaller area desired by the Cooper Square committee, the spokesman said he felt the commission had attempted to formulate a renewal area that would offer the most for the lower East Side neighborhood.

"We would be considered negligent if we said it should be done in two shots—instead of just one," the spokesman said.

Sentiment against the original title I slum clearance committee proposal was aroused when the community saw it as a plan "prepared with almost total disregard for those who were being displaced."

Among other things, there was no thought given to artists and to the homeless men of the Bowery. Thought has been given to these groups in the alternate plan, its supporters say. Further, local people believed that "a perfectly sound business district was to be emasculated."

As pleased as the Cooper Square group was to see parts of its alternate plan adopted by the city planning commission, it was dismayed to find that the commission wrapped them up in a larger chunk.

So, while the community had a plan, and organization, and hopes, residents waited and waited and waited, while controversy streamed back and forth about expansion (which would cover 11,000 households, instead of the Cooper Square's proposed 2,100).

"Well," said Miss Burdict, "if nothing else, maybe our organization and work is a great example of tenacity—a group of people who have worked so long together."

"And with so little effect," added Mr. Thabit.

Coeur d'Alene Press Banquet Honors North Idaho Teams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, each year, the Couer d'Alene Press sponsors a banquest to honor the outstanding sports teams in northern Idaho.

Winner of this year's Press Award was the Kellog (Idaho) Wildcats basketball team. The College Athlete of the Year Award went to Joe Chapman of the University of Idaho grid team, and the Top Booster Award went to Ron MacDonald of the Athletic Round Table.

Guests at this annual event included such top sports personalities as Joe Foss, commissioner of the American Football League; Bob Mathias, Olympic winner of the decathalon; Pete Reiser, former Dodger baseball player and new manager of the Spokane Indians; Bill Lindermann, world champion rodeo cowboy; Maury Wills, shortstop for the Dodgers, and Vernon Law, former Idaho high school star and now with the Pittsburgh Pirates.

Others included Dee Andros, coach of the University of Idaho Vandals; Jim Moran, rookie star with the New York Giants; Keith Lincoln, player for the San Diego Chargers; and Bert Clark, coach for the Washington State University Cougars.

Contenders for the Team of the Year Award were: The Kellogg Wildcats cage team—coached by Tom Kane, and undefeated in league action and winner of the title for the second time in 3 years.

The Wallace track team, coached by Ben Tyvand, and led by Jim Scheller, winners of the district title and undefeated in dual meet competition.

The Couer d'Alene Legion baseball team, coached by Arnold Halpern and winners of the Panhandle conference, the district playoff and the regional title, and also third in the State tournament.

The Couer d'Alene basketball team, coached by Elmer Jordan and winners of the Panhandle conference title after an excellent season.

The Post Falls Trojans basketball team, coached by C. W. Totten, and winners of the State class 3–A after an undefeated season.

The Sandpoint Bulldogs football team, coached by Francis McDonnell and Inland Empire cochampions and also cochamps of the Panhandle conference.

The Couer d'Alene Vikings football team, coached by Cotton Barlow, and cochampions of the Panhandle conference.

The Plummer baseball team, coached by John Reager, and winners of the class B title with a record of 9 wins and 1 loss.

The North Idaho Junior College basketball team, coached by Rollie Williams and finalists in the western regional playoffs for the NCAA junior college tournament.

The Kootenai Warriors basketball team, coached by Rudy Miles, and third place winners in the State tournament after a season record of 24.2.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a column written by Bob Maker, sports editor of the Coeur d'Alene (Idaho) Press, regarding this momentous January 20 event:

The article follows:

CALL 'EM RIGHT

(By Bob Maker)

What's for next year's press sports banquet?

This question was heard and it seems many enjoyed the banquet Wednesday with its array of stars.

One of the big things about these invited guests, was their humility. Each of the great personalities took time to relax and meet folks, kids and fans and many times the fellows went way out of their way to be nice to many people.

Joe Foss was a tremendous hit with the fans and, of course, he had many of his fans around as there are so many now living here who have roots in South Dakota.

I think that the story Foss told about his first and only attempt to enter the prize ring was a classic.

Bob Mathias kept asking just what he could do to make sure that he pleased everyone while here in the city. This athlete, who is a model for the youth of today, was very anxious to hit the slopes of Schweitzer Basin and right after a luncheon yesterday, headed for Sandpoint to give the great ski resort the big try.

I believe that if all the kids in our city were of voting age, Maury Wills could unseat any of the local politicians by a landslide vote. Wills is a dedicated man with an aim in life to be a fine citizen.

Vernon Law got quite a few chuckles from his stories of pitching in the early part of the season and, of course, he is a dedicated baseball man. Law said yesterday that after 17 years in baseball he is getting a little pressure from his boys to stay home this year. However, the great hurler feels that he probably will be down at Fort Meyers, Fla., when the call comes for spring training. Law also said that if he figured not to sign this year, he wants to be near where plenty of that wonderful stuff (money) is kept and that is why he is looking forward to a banking career.

Peter Reiser has always been a dyed-in-the-wool fan of Branch Rickey. Reiser started out with Rickey and, after a long career in the major leagues, he still enjoys to tell stories about the great wizard of baseball.

Reiser tells one story about Rickey that he feels everyone who plays in a sport should remember. Rickey once told Reiser, when he started out with his first contract, that Reiser was the greatest baseball player in the world. Then he backed off and told the young rookie that if he could continue to believe that he was this great player, he would succeed in the major leagues.

Peter O'Malley impressed most everyone at the banquet with his firm grip on his new office and because of his interest in community activities of this area. This young man is a very talented executive and should make a great partner in the team of Peter "O" and Peter "R" as they bring some fine baseball to this area.

The fans also found that Keith Lincoln is just as smooth and just as much at home before a large group of sports fans as he is on the football field.

Lincoln, who could probably make his way in the movies as a matinee idol if he ever gives up football, thinks that his investment in Coeur d'Alene with Western Frontiers and their new building projects is a good one and he is looking forward to when the new North Shore development is completed.

Dee Andros' speech that included the introduction of his staff and the other coaches of Idaho was great. Andros feels that if he can get a long-term contract from the Idaho officials within the next 10 days he should be around this area for a long time. Andros wants to stay at Idaho and I know that the sport fans of Idaho hope that the university officials will come up with the right answers if they want the Andros-type of football to continue at Vandal land.

Dick Fry reported for the WSU staff and expressed regrets that Bert Clark, the talented coach from the Cougars, was ill.

Clark had come down with a throat infection 3 days before the banquet and up until the last minute he hoped to be on hand.

There were many who had a hand in many details that made the banquet run smoothly. Len Cantrell of the Gyros and Nort Hall were very helpful in helping on the transportation and, of course, Doc Mattei of the Indians was one of the experts when it came to sweating-out airplanes.

Roy Wellman, Dave Dillworth, Don James, and Lee Adams handled things at the door with Todd Hagen in expert style.

Bob Barlow was a genius in arranging the seating and tables and Gene Boyle's fine group of lettermen from the IHM Academy were very impressive in their ushering duties.

Russ Brown of the NIJC student body, the Hydromaniacs and their flag that served as the backdrop for the stage were indispensable; and music of the NIJC band was appreciated.

One big thing that was overlooked by many was the fact that John Freligh of the Brunswick combined with Wes Hatch of the NIJC Student Union to break their serving record. The crew served the meals in just under 22 minutes and that broke the standing record for last year of 45 minutes all to pieces.

Now, if we can all sit back and talk about the banquet and get back into the groove of boosting our own athletic teams as they jump into the final half of the season, this will be another great year.

Co-op Crews Praised After Oregon Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a disaster such as has occured in the Pacific Northwest in recent weeks often serves

to demonstrate the best that is in people. This has been shown time and time again in dramatic acts of heroism and in simple acts of human charity.

Both of these qualities are apparent in the following story, written by Ted Rodgers and appearing in the February issue of Rural Electrification magazine. It tells the roll of locally owned rural electric cooperatives in making the burden of a devastating flood a little more bearable to affected residents of Oregon.

CO-OP CREWS PRAISED AFTER OREGON FLOODS

(By Ted Rodgers)

The stark, real face of disaster can best be viewed by looking over the aftermath of the disaster itself. The aftermath of the Christmas floods in the Pacific Northwest presents as close a view of this fact as one may ever wish.

The horror of violent death was not the real tragedy in the Christmas floods, for there were few lives lost. The real tragedies of this storm were best expressed by a man standing knee deep in mud where only 2 weeks before the fruits of an entire life's work had stood, who when asked what he intended to do simply shrugged his shoulders.

Tragedy is a little girl in Scottsburg, Oreg., looking through the ruins of her home for a favorite doll which had missed evacuation; it is a man in Agness, Oreg., removing two dead cows from the second floor of his home where he had taken them in a futile effort to save them from drowning; it is a woman in Douglas County, Oreg., who still looks up whenever she hears an airplane and remembers the night the water came into her home and she prayed for rescue from the air.

Disaster takes on many faces: despair, defeat, anger, resignation, determination. This last was best exemplified by a young woman walking down a long mud- and snow-covered Douglas County road. In her arms were two heavy bags of food, and on her face was, instead of the look of tragedy, the determined look ow someone who made this grueling trip every day for many more than her 20-some years.

Floods, like wars, produce their share of heroes. From the history of the Christmas flooding in rural areas of Oregon, every rural electric cooperative in the Nation can take a certain amount of pride, for the people of the flood-stricken area are quick to place at the top of their list of heroes the men of the rural electric systems.

In the service area of Coos-Curry Electric Cooperative of Coquille, Oreg., one of the hardest hit areas was the little community of Agness, 20 miles up the famous Rogue River from the resort town of Gold Beach on the Pacific coast.

Although a small dirt road exists to Agness, it is out of service and impassible many times each year even under normal weather conditions. After the flood, many parts of the road were nonexistent and the only way to reach the town is by river aboard the historic Rogue River mail boats.

After the 90-foot crest of the Rogue had knocked out four bridges in the area, destroyed about 18 homes, and severely damaged the area's electric supply, the people of Agness started a pool with each participant guessing the day electric power would return.

There were no winners. The Coos-Curry Electric Cooperative restored power to Agness, not in a month, as the conservative guessers estimated, but in 6½ days.

To achieve this, the co-op performed a miracle which stands as a close second to the miracle which brought power to Agness in the first place. The town was first energized only 2½ years ago. (Rural Electrification, July 1962 issue.)

A line crew under direction of Chief William Baxter arrived in Agness about 48 hours after the crest. They worked day and night and on the 7th day the lights in Agness came back on.

Mr. and Mrs. Luther Best, of Agness, expressed the feelings of the entire community. They said, "No one believed it could be done."

Mrs. Best noted that, "We want everyone to know what an outstanding job these men did, under the most trying and hazardous conditions, in bringing back the power. I know that we speak for all the people of Agness when we say these men truly made the situation tolerable."

Another Agness resident said that, "Before the lights came back, we had a real crisis. After it returned, we just settled down and started to clean up the mess."

Lex Farre, long time skipper of one of the riverboats, explained the co-op people "were the first ones up to Agness and through the rebuilding period, and in spite of the amount of work they had on their own lines, they were always quick to help out the people of a community in which they didn't even live."

The manager of the Coos-Curry Co-op pointed out that their equipment damages were estimated at around $10,000, with about $7,000 of this concentrated in the Agness area.

Despite the damage, there was one favorable result. The people of Agness, Oreg., and other residents along the Rogue River will certainly never stop being strong supporters of the rural electrification program. These people saw it work for them.

In Douglas County the cooperative was also hard at work rebuilding its damaged system and acting as angels of mercy for stranded members.

The Douglas Electric Cooperative of Roseburg, Oreg., was hit by the storm with initial damage of $30,000, estimates Harold Backen, manager.

Before the Umpqua River, receded, co-op crews were on their way. By boat, by car, and on foot they moved into the area, restoring services at an astonishing pace. Their shortest outage was less than 55 minutes and their longest was less than 48 hours.

These co-op crews, wet, cold, and most certainly exhausted after working shifts of 20 or more hours, took time out to arrange through the co-op office a supply of bread, milk, and other necessities and to transport it to a small store in Elkton, Oreg., which was cut off from its source of supply.

From this point the provisions were distributed to people in need and the co-op crews went back to work.

In one town after the other along this angry river, the story was the same. Disaster. People completely wiped out. A man in the Scottsburg area had made one payment on his car and had yet to make the first payment on his new home. He lost both, and the total lack of flood insurance in the area makes the losses final and irretrievable.

"The loss of a few thousand dollars worth of equipment will not greatly injure our co-op. It is the permanent loss of 25 or 30 members' homes, the elimination of virtually all our irrigation loads and the temporary loss of uncounted members that we will feel," Harold Backen reported.

The co-ops realize that the fortunes of geography in their areas which necessitates building most of their lines on high ground saved their systems from destruction. They also realize that damages done to their member-consumers is damage done to them. Instead of weeping from afar, they are working around the clock to relieve the burdens which rest on many of their members.

In Douglas' service area, electric heaters and blowers are being made available to member-consumers to help them dry out soaked and warping floors and ceilings.

Power use men, such as Howard Crinklaw of Douglas Electric, are constantly visiting flood-damaged homes, helping out and seeing that flood-stricken members are receiving all the service and help the co-op can give.

Coos-Curry Electric and Douglas Electric were not the only co-ops involved in the flood. Blackly-Lane County Electric Co-op in Eugene, Oreg.; Wasco Electric Co-op in The Dalles, Oreg., and other co-ops throughout the flooded areas of the Pacific Northwest acted with the same speed and efficiency which marked the Coos-Curry and Douglas operations. Co-op power in every case was restored as quickly as possible when it was needed most.

People in rural America can take note of the experience of the rural people of Oregon and add one name to their list of "friends in need"—the name of their locally owned rural electric cooperative.

VA Closure of Kansas City Facility Would Impair Service to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this House as well as thousands of their constituents have already had something to say about the most disturbing announcement of the Veterans' Administration's proposal to close 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries. Many more will be heard from in the long spring and summer that lies ahead. Some may be emotional. The majority will not be impulsive statements made in a moment of perturbation but a well-reasoned presentation of facts to challenge the contentions of Administrator Driver. Issues will be raised and many worthwhile arguments will be presented which the VA with their large and well-trained staffs have very conveniently omitted to bring into consideration.

Appearing in the Friday, January 29, issue of the Examiner, a newspaper in my home city of Independence, Mo., one of the past commanders of Fraas-Fain Post No. 1000, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and a man who presently holds the very important assignment as post service officer, writes in a column entitled "The Friday Forum." In my opinion this is an excellent presentation of how the closing of the regional facility in Kansas City would hamper and impair the service now being rendered to our veterans, widows, and dependents, not only in the city of Indepedence and suburban Kansas City, but throughout all western Missouri. Past Commander Buehler's protest as addressed to the editor of the Examiner follows:

PROTEST VA ORDER

In the name of economy, the Veterans' Administration in Washington has seen fit to order the closing of the local VA regional office. There are more than 50 regional offices in the United States, and the Kansas City facility has one of the highest efficiency ratings among them, according to the VA. There is but one more employee in the St. Louis office than there is here in Kansas

City. If the proposed closing takes effect, it would seriously hamper and impair the service that is now being rendered to our local veterans, their widows, and dependents of this community. The local regional office houses the chief attorney for investigating minors and incompetent veterans, the staff for the veterans loan guaranty program, GI appraisals, and its staff helps to assist widows in their claims for pensions and dependent's benefits. It also helps the veteran in filing his claim for pension or service or non-service-connected benefits. All of these programs would be seriously impaired if the proposed closing takes effect. It would impose a financial hardship on the veteran, his widow, and his dependents by making them have to travel to St. Louis to make their personal contacts with the VA. Overnight stays in St. Louis would become a popular habit with the local veteran as most times the VA could not process his claim in the course of a day's time.

Contrary to the Budget Bureau and W. J. Driver, who is the acting VA administrator, the veterans are not seeking special favors nor are they a Federal welfare case to accept what handouts the Federal Bureau of Health and Welfare can give them. They only want what is due them as prescribed by Congress and the only thing that the widows want is the pension benefits and the orphan benefits as prescribed by law.

By the closing of this facility, the health and welfare of all veterans, widows, and their dependents not only from the Independence area, but also the areas to the south of us, Springfield, Joplin, Warrensburg, and those areas would be seriously affected as well as the areas to the north of us.

The city of Independence should go on record as protesting this action by the VA. It is to the interest of the community to do everything possible to retain this office. All civic organizations should join in this action. Letters of protest should continue to flood the Congressmen's offices, also the Senators' offices. I am sure that the widows and veterans have sent theirs, and I am asking that all interested citizens send theirs.

MERVIN BUEHLER,
Fraas-Fain VFW, Post Service Officer.

Address of the Honorable James A. Farley Before the International Benjamin Franklin Society, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues an address delivered by our good friend, the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., before the annual luncheon meeting of the International Benjamin Franklin Society, in New York City on January 23, 1965.

With his customary wit and wisdom, our former Postmaster General reminds us of the achievements of the past and the promise of the future. It is fitting that the Benjamin Franklin Society has bestowed upon him its Benjamin Franklin Medal, for he has shown the imagination, courage, and optimism of the first Postmaster General for whom the award is named.

General Farley's address follows:

THE GREAT AMERICAN SOCIETY OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN AND PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., before the annual luncheon meeting, the International Benjamin Franklin Society, Inc., New York City, January 23, 1965)

I am extremely grateful to your distinguished body for honoring me with the Benjamin Franklin Medal. I consider him to be among the foremost citizens our country has ever produced. Accordingly, to receive an award bearing his name puts heavy strain upon my modesty. Despite this high honor, I have maintained a sense of proportion, however, by remembering an occurrence at the Polo Grounds when the great Percy Haughton came down to coach Columbia. Columbia was ahead when the regular fullback's talent for kicking suddenly disappeared. Four times in a row he punted 12 yards. Percy Haughton threw in a green sophomore who promptly punted 75 yards, which won the game. As the radiant boy came off the field, Haughton rushed out and shook his hand. "That was a wonderful kick, boy," he said. And then he added, "if you meant it."

Benjamin Franklin was the first Postmaster General in the Colonies. When our country was founded he saw to it that the establishment of a postal system was among the first orders of business. Since Committees of Correspondence between the Colonies resulted in their union, it isn't strange that they were continued in order to preserve it. It has been used to preserve other things, too; among them political parties. For example, I sent out over 28,000 letters of appreciation myself when the Democrats won the 1932 election. But I will resent any implication that President Roosevelt appointed me Postmaster General because I was the best customer.

Incidentally, when I took office I was struck by the fact that the Postmaster General in 1814 was named Return J. Meigs. I asked my assistant to find out why. It appears that the father of Return Jonathan Meigs courted a young lady for a long time. She consistently refused to marry him. One evening he called and told her that for the last time he was going to ask her to marry him. She refused. Whereupon he picked up his hat and departed. Apparently she hastily reconsidered, because just as he opened the front gate she opened the door and called, "return, Jonathan Meigs." And, if one may pun, the first return of that marriage was appropriately enough called Return Jonathan Meigs, and he subsequently became Postmaster General of the United States.

So much has been said of Benjamin Franklin's accomplishments on American soil that it seems to me that his successes abroad are overlooked. I do not mean the successes which would have been better left unsaid. But since it has been said, I will observe that any man who can be the idol of thousands of women and still get any army of their husbands and sons to fight a war 3,000 miles away is a first-class diplomat. In a more serious vein, today the Battle of Saratoga is considered to be the turning point of the Revolutionary War. I believe the victory of Saratoga was the turning point all right; but principally because Benjamin Franklin convinced the French Government then that it was. It was the French Fleet which bottled up Cornwallis at Yorktown; and it wouldn't have been there if it hadn't been for Benjamin Franklin.

Like all American children, Benjamin Franklin's example was before me. One of the most striking things to me was the manner in which he established himself in Philadelphia. He carted his own paper through the streets on a wheelbarrow to show that he didn't consider himself above the way he earned his living. He worked hard at it and his business grew.

He matched his trust in God with his faith in himself and he never lost his sense of humor. This reminds me of an old Maine story. A young farmer took over an abandoned farm. He worked day and night and in 2 years the place was blooming. So much so that the parson stopped his buggy by the field where the young farmer was ploughing one day and said: "Hiram, you have a great farm here. It is amazing what God and man working together can do." "Is that so," said Hiram, crossly. "Well you should have seen this place when God was working it alone."

Self-reliance and optimism are two main traits of the American character. I believe they are unimpaired. I submit that there is small difference between the colonial statement—"trust in God but keep your powder dry"—and the statement of our President "that our guard is up but our hand is out."

Another American characteristic is purposeful vision—dreaming, if you will. The Founding Fathers dreamed of a great country but not even they could have possibly envisioned the Nation and the American civilization as it exists today. Benjamin Franklin, farsighted though he was, would be utterly astounded by our world of radio, automobiles, and airplanes. Indeed, the advances are so stupendous that it is hard for us to imagine how cruel life was in those days. For example, can you imagine what medicine must have been in those times—considering that man discovered anesthesia only 125 years ago? I am sure that had Benjamin Franklin predicted this age as it exists now even he would have been called mad.

So, therefore, out of our own history I will make this prediction; that the Great Society proposed by President Johnson will be accomplished—and sooner than people think. If 20 million Americans in prairie schooners traveling at 4 miles an hour could build a great country in 125 years I say that 200 million Americans traveling at over 500 miles an hour can double that heritage in the next 15 years. I, myself, travel 40,000 miles a year—a lifetime of travel in Franklin's time—and there isn't a day that I don't think our country should add to its motto—"and forgive us, O Lord, for taking so much for granted." The gifts of the Lord to our country are so great, indeed, that if the Founding Fathers, by some miracle, could visit us today I am sure they would find themselves in a position which once confronted the late great Mr. Justice Holmes. Mr. Justice Holmes had written an opinion which struck the imagination of one of his following of brilliant young students. This young man labored far into the night in order to show the importance of the Justice's views. By the time he was finished he had nearly written a book.

He brought the manuscript to Mr. Justice Holmes, who glowed with appreciation as he read the brilliant expansion of his ideas. When he completed reading it, the young man eagerly asked, "Mr. Justice, is that what you meant when you wrote the opinion?" "No, boy," Mr. Holmes boomed enthusiastically, "but it certainly is what I mean now."

By the same token, I can't conceive of the Founding Fathers having this marvelous civilization in mind when they wrote the Declaration and the Constitution, but I am sure if they returned they would endorse it fully today. They would endorse it because it has expanded man's knowledge, well-being, and conscience. And I firmly believe that the great services Benjamin Franklin was able to render the American people was in large part due to the fact that he was a first-class businessman—with a businessman's social imagination.

This has been overlooked from time to time in our history. For example, I thought at the time, and I so told President Roosevelt, that the attack of the liberal New Dealers was unfair and unnecessary and therefore doubly unfortunate. As the history books indicate, my views did not prevail. However, there was one incident in this sharp split in policy which both amused me and summed up the case for the conservatives in one small sentence. It occurred in this manner. Much of Mr. Roosevelt's legislation was being held up in the Rules Committee by its chairman, John J. O'Connor, of New York. The President, irritated, asked Congressman O'Connor to call at the White House.

"John," the President said freshly, "why do you have such a high regard for American business?" "I'll tell you why," tartly retorted Mr. O'Connor. "It is because outside of the Government it is the only place a man can get a job." The President roared, "John, you have a point."

Since the 1930's the business world and the U.S. Government have embarked on a vast joint enterprise—the unlocking of the forces of nature through research—and the use of new energies for the benefit of mankind.

No man in Benjamin Franklin's time—and no man now—can foresee the vast new sources of energy and insights which will come to us. Sometimes, it is closer than we think. For example, I was struck a few years ago by what I was told was an ordinary news story from Oregon. At a State celebration, one of the oldest persons in that State, a lady nearing 100 years of age, was brought to the speaker's microphone to speak of Oregon's early days. She said that she and her husband had first come to Oregon as teachers in an Episcopal mission school. They lived in a log cabin they built, and they taught in a log cabin school. Her husband was an instructor in what was then a new field, science. Once every 3 years the bishop inspected the schools. On his next visit he asked her husband what he was teaching in science. Her husband answered that he was teaching that science was the greatest tool ever given to man by God and that through it man would build a wonderful new society.

The bishop cautioned the young teacher. He said that man already had the steam engine and the telegraph and that, indeed, there were even a few telephones. The bishop suggested that God had given enough, perhaps as much as was in store for man and that the principle job of a young scientist was to teach gratitude for the gifts already received. Whereupon her young teacher husband answered that in his opinion those were but the beginning, and that great new inventions were certain. "In fact," he said to the bishop, "I foresee the day when man will fly." "Young man," said the bishop, sternly, "if you were to continue in this view I should have to reexamine your contract. You are approaching blasphemy."

The old pioneer lady paused and added: "There would be nothing exceptional about this story except that the bishop's name was Wright, and his own two sons invented the airplane my husband predicted."

What heartens me most is that this is not an isolated occurrence in these United States. For example, Benjamin Franklin sent up a kite with a key into a thunderhead—and found the lightning was electricity. Professor Faraday was able to put electricity into storage batteries—or we would be meeting here tonight by candlelight.

These are recurrent miracles in our history, to such an extent that we can expect many more. But even as we press forward it seems to me we should not forget to thank God for what we've got, as Bishop Wright suggested to the young scientist. Religion and science are no more opposed than the government and business. What is needed is understanding. Here, again, I think Benjamin Franklin made a great discovery in human relations. Said Franklin, "A man walking in a fog, seeing another man at a distance, can perceive that that man is enveloped by fog. But he cannot perceive that the same fog which envelops that man also envelops him."

I submit that our own points of view are very clear to each of us but to understand another man we must realize that his point of view is as clear to him as ours is to us. We have made great progress here. In my opinion, the last 25 years have produced understanding between business, labor, and Government, unparalleled in history.

One of the great steps forward in understanding is to discount the silly presumption that business, particularly big business, has no imagination. A mere examination of the operation of American business completely belies this. After all, the research departments of all large corporations might well be called the imagination division. And as anyone with the slightest experience can testify, it takes as much imagination to apply an invention as to conceive of it. I say this to rebut the presumption that American business has as its sole guide the balance sheet. The fact is, boldness and imagination are the driving power of American industry. The balance sheet is merely a lighthouse, a navigational aid to the guidance of any enterprise.

I press this part of Franklin's heritage of imagination because it is a key to the 21st century—as his electrified key was the key to the 19th.

I am not talking in the abstract. I am reliably informed that the actual manufacture of atomic energy came about in this way. Alexander Sachs, a banker and industrialist of wide experience and wider imagination, heard that the German scientists were close to a breakthrough on atomic energy. He consulted Dr. Albert Einstein, who told him it was not only possible but probable. Mr. Sachs asked Dr. Einstein to write a letter to President Roosevelt, which he himself undertook to deliver. He also asked him to estimate the cost. It was about $2 billion.

Mr. Sachs called upon the President, who was interested but unconvinced. It might seem strange but Mr. Roosevelt didn't want to spend that much money on an uncertain experiment. He was noncommital.

But Mr. Sachs was undeterred. He searched his mind all that night for an example which would convince the President. The next day, he appeared at the White House astonishing the President at breakfast. "What brings you here, Alex," the President asked. "Mr. President," said Mr. Sachs, "there is an intangible fact here which must be considered. It has affected the fate of nations before. For example, after Napoleon had overrun Europe he stormed and fumed because the British Fleet prevented him from invading England. 'How can I defeat a nation,' he raged, 'which has as its allies the winds and the tides.'

"One of his ministers told him that there was a man in Paris who said he could defeat both wind and tide. Napoleon was finally prevailed upon to meet him. The man appeared before Napoleon and his marshals in civilian clothing. Napoleon said to him, 'In what army do you hold rank?' The man answered, 'None.' 'Then in what navy are you commissioned?' Napoleon thundered. 'None,' said the man, 'I am a civilian.' 'Show him out, show him out,' Napoleon said savagely. It is an imposition on His Imperial Majesty to take up his time with this nonsense.' Mr. Sachs paused. "Mr. President," he said, "the man who was shown the door was Robert Fulton. Under his arm he held the plans for the steamboat which would have defeated Britain. And while the history books say Napoleon fell because he overstretched the strength of his army, I believe he fell because he refused to stretch his own imagination. I fear our country might fall through the same fault."

The President's answer was typically immediate. "Alex," he said, "we will go ahead with atomic energy and we will call it Manhattan project."

I hope I have outlined in part to you why I am so enthused about President Lyndon Johnson. I will admit that if I weren't, as a Democrat, I'd keep quiet. But since when I didn't agree with President Roosevelt I let him and the world know, it seems to me I made a fair case for intellectual sincerity when I speak so approvingly of President Johnson. Let us consider the analogies.

Benjamin Franklin established the University of Pennsylvania—at a time when the Colonies had less than 3 million people. Is it not fair, therefore, to say that Benjamin Franklin and the University of Pennsylvania show how completely sound is the President's tremendous educational program as part of his Great Society? Perhaps President Johnson has the same insight into this as Benjamin Franklin—the insight which comes to a man who has spent his youth working for such education.

Benjamin Franklin was a leading businessman of the Colonies. He could not have operated, however, unless he had the confidence of his Government. President Johnson has already indicated that he has as much confidence in the business community as the Founding Fathers had in Benjamin Franklin.

It is a law of young children and of young nations that they grow or die. The pessimists may point out that the national debt was less than $12 million in Franklin's time. But the national revenue was only $10 million per year. Certainly, the national debt is over $300 billion now. But the gross national product is $660 billion. Had we held the national debt to $10 million our country would not have grown.

Over 55 percent of the American people hold jobs in industries which did not exist in 1900. Expanding business has provided 70 million jobs right now. But the various governments within these United States are going to educate people to hold 100 million jobs—an expense which private enterprise couldn't possibly bear. Thus, even from a narrow viewpoint, the President is embarked on the greatest personnel search and training program in history—and the first to support it should be private business.

Even more so do I support the President's research projects. As Franklin took the lightning from the sky, as F.D.R. unlocked the energy in the split atom, who shall say that President Johnson's explorations will not find vast new resources of energy in space?

Even closer to this earth, when Columbus landed in the West Indies he could not possibly have known that a whole hemisphere lay west of those reefs. But Columbus conquered only the surface of the sea. President Johnson has started work which will not only change sea water into fresh water but will make of the sea a vast mine of metals in solution. In our time we will see great deserts bloom with fresh waters—and large cities manufacturing products from the solids extracted to make sea water fresh.

Well, you will ask, who is going to do all this? Permit me to tell you that in my opinion you are. This is not only the legitimate expression but the very purpose for which free enterprise exists. No society can be great without being free, and no society can be free without the free expression of free enterprise. I hope I have made my conviction clear—that the base of a great society is free enterprise and a free government in a partnership of freedom. President Johnson has left no doubt that he re-

gards this partnership as the foundation of the Great Society.

Again, I must thank you for this award, which has such deep significance for me—and I hope you will not consider it amiss for me to mention that in the Great Society which you are about to build, next only to faith, hope, and charity an American believes in imagination, courage, and optimism.

Sometimes our own American language best expresses it. Thus, a diplomat new to Washington saw on our Archives Building the ancient statement, "The Past is but prologue." "That is classic language," he said to the cab driver, "but how would you say it in the American language." "In the American language," the driver said, "we'd say you ain't seen nothing yet."

That is the meaning of the coming Great Society and for my part in it I promise to do my best to give you larger pauses and greater refreshment.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

The Kids of Wrangell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the former Assistant Secretary of Interior and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. C. Gerrard Davidson, recently spent a year in Wrangell, a small fishing and lumbering village in southeastern Alaska. In a delightful article that appeared in the Reporter, Joan Davidson reveals the experience of their children, who "have flourished in a world cut to a child's scale." I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "The Kids of Wrangell," from the November 5, 1964, issue of the Reporter, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KIDS IN WRANGELL

(By Joan K. Davidson)

For more than a year, here in this small fishing and lumbering village in southeastern Alaska, our children have flourished in a world cut to a child's scale. Wrangell, on a green and thickly wooded island, has one long street. Four blocks of it are paved, and the rest is mud and rocks and puddles. What Wrangell lacks in breadth of choice it makes up for in simplicity and clarity. Everybody's job is work a child can see. One's friends' parents run fishing boats, or pick shrimp in the cannery, or guide machines at the lumber mill, or wait on table, or manage a store, or shovel ice on fish. They are home for lunch. They can be found and visited at any time of the day. No father vanishes in the morning to an office who knows where to do who knows what.

The week in Wrangell has its rhythm. Monday is the day of plenty. Alaska steamship arrives from Seattle, bringing our only fresh fruit and vegetables, meat, milk, and eggs, at about twice stateside prices. And cottony white bread, made in Portland and tasteless enough when eaten there fresh. Many Wrangell people buy it, though it is a week old and expensive, in preference to the fine bread made daily in our good little bakery—thus demonstrating once again the appeal of the exotic. Monday is the day for magazines and packages and manna from Sears. And Monday is New York Times day—the week's supply in a bunch. Into this peace of no TV, no daily newspaper, and only intermittent radio, the Times bursts like an explosion. On Monday there is politics, Vietnam, the race question. By Tuesday we have had enough of that clamorous world and draw the quiet of this place about us again.

During the week the fresh produce in the stores dwindles, until by the weekend, or even Thursday, there is often not a head of lettuce to be found, or a pound of butter, or an orange—and the grocery bins are forlorn and bare.

Though perhaps the worst hardship we have had to face is the sympathy of friends and relations who imagine us buried under ice and snow getting along bravely on a diet of blubber, the fact remains that winter here was, for many weeks, dark and cold. From November until March we awoke in a pitch-black house, and there were mornings when we all wore coats and boots and mittens at breakfast. On winter mornings the children started off on their mile walk to school with the moon still brightly shining as steam rose in white mists from the sea, and came home in the darkness of 3 o'clock to a house where lights were already turned on.

The public school in Wrangell, comfortably wooden and old fashioned, mixes all shapes and sizes and kinds of students—Indians, Japanese, Scandinavian, fast ones, slow ones—in a way that almost no city or suburban school can do any more. It is staffed, in general, by superior teachers who came to this frontier country long before the time of the Peace Corps, wanting to teach native children.

The school playground is respectably furnished with jungle gym, seesaws, and a metal merry-go-round, but most of the children ignore these irrelevancies and go about the serious business of play in their own way, in the real world. The real world is outdoors, everywhere. A child in Wrangell is free, and safe, to go anywhere, needing grownups only to make sandwiches. Water is all around us, but Wrangell children learn early to respect river and sea. Eagles have been known to swoop down and carry off a pet cat or small dog, but never a baby yet. And though bears inhabit the forests, they are not often seen near town.

The primal force that rolls the tides seems also to guide the comings and goings of Wrangell children. In the snowy months they swoop down hillsides on sleds and cardboard trays, and skate and skid around the pond in the woods. At Christmastime there is the magical walk in among frost-crusted trees to cut a big fir for the living room and a small hemlock for each child's own.

Before the salmon even begin to run, boys scrape aside the snow in the roadways to make room for marbles, kites go aloft, and ropes everywhere spin around jumping girls. Soon, sure enough, daylight begins to come earlier and stay longer. Then on the warm spring afternoons hide-and-seek time arrives, sending children of all ages dashing among the houses and far into the woods until it is late for supper.

On weekends and all during the long summer our children were on the beaches, gathering pebbles and starfish and rusty boat whistles and whitened antlers, climbing rocks and drift logs, and snagging old boots out of the water. Or they rode their bikes on the dirt road that leads from town—2 miles in one direction, past the city dump and the Indian petroglyphs, to a glorious bay where there are remains of an old whaling pier; or in the other direction, past the Wrangell Institute (one of the two boarding schools in Alaska run by the Federal Indian Bureau for native children from communities too small to support a school of their own—Eskimos from the Arctic Circle, Aleuts, Athabascans from the interior) 8 long miles till the road stops at Pat's Creek, a clear, fast-rushing river.

Totem poles are rooted here and there in the village. Some, untouched since the Tlingit Indians carved them many decades ago, stand splitting and fading, crisscrossed with electric wires against a backdrop of churches and oil cans. The chamber of commerce or some other do-gooder has recently dressed up others with bright new store paint, making them ugly and grotesque like an old woman with rouge.

On the edge of town is Mount Dewey, a deep-green, mysterious, 20-minute mountain that even a 4-year-old can hoist himself up on by means of roots and branches, although a dog often needs a boost. Tall, bare-trunked evergreens grow all the way to the top, and thick moss is underfoot. Caves and hideaways dot the ascent. At the summit a child can lie on his back on lichen-covered boulders watching the wind sway the great trees above him and listening to their trunks squeak together. From far below comes sawmill buzzings, and sometimes the pealing of ships' bells.

Wrangell children are close to the commerce of great ships; the Japanese lumber ships that arrive from Nagoya and Osaka, high and empty, and depart a week later squatting low in the water under loads of lumber and gigantic cedar logs strapped across bow and stern; the elegant ferry, swift as an ocean liner, that sails the Inside Passage, cutting through Wrangell waters twice a day; the white and gleaming tourist boats that during the summer months call at Wrangell two or three times a week and spill out for a few hours on the town their cargo of retired Canadian gentlemen and ladies in tweeds, who strike unerringly for the gift shop. The school band greets every tourist boat, and at the first strains of martial music, carried to all corners of the island on clear summer air, children emerge from everywhere, running.

There have been memorable expeditions: to Anan Creek, halfway around the island by boat, to watch bears fish salmon out of a turbulent river, and to hike up to the headwaters where the salmon spawn; to Garnet Ledge, at the mouth of the Stikine River, redolent of the gold rush, to hack away with picks at the hillside and come home with pocketsful of dark red, 12-surfaced garnets; a trip by seaplane to visit Indian villages. Here we stumbled on one, long since deserted, of which nothing could be seen as we approached from the water but a lone totem pole standing on the beach, badly charred. After wading ashore, we bushwhacked through dense undergrowth and finally emerged, bitten and scratched, into a clearing where the sun shone through into the dark silence of giant trees. There, lying on the forest floor, were ancient totem poles, at least 60 feet long and 4 feet across, their carvings still discernible through the moss that covered them; and before us, still standing, immense figures of cedar—eagles, beavers, bears, human beings. One felt the nearness of Raven, who the Tlingits believed brought the sun and moon and stars to earth in a wooden box.

Children have useful work to do in Wrangell. Most of them are taught early how to handle a gun. Some help provide moosemeat and venison for family meals, though our own boys have been restricted to shooting soup cans off logs. From our house we can see the crab wharf and know when the boats come in to unload their squirming cargo in great wire cages. Then in a minute a child can be down the hill and in the

cannery, where the crabs are butchered, steamed, and "shaken"—and can bring home a bagful of fresh crabmeat for lunch. A child who hangs patiently around the town wharf when the salmon are being weighed and packed with ice is often rewarded with an undersize fish to take home. He carries it high, since it is usually as long as he is.

What has been the good life for our children has, for a while, been the good life for us, too. But moving back to New York is going home for us. It will not be going home for the children, and I cannot help grieving a little that their world, once so clear, will now become in large part incomprehensible; that childhood's natural abandon will now be constrained by the perpetual need for somebody's permission; that the exhilaration of being useful may now wither in the unreality of made-work city jobs. But at least they have tasted one kind of freedom. They probably won't forget it.

Churchill: Titan Among Pygmies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said about the passing of Winston Churchill, an event that saddened the entire free world. Ralph de Toledano, in his syndicated column of January 22, 1965, paid a fitting tribute to the statesman many regard as the greatest public figure of the 20th century. Under unanimous consent, I include the column, entitled "Churchill: Titan Among Pygmies," in the RECORD at this point.

The column referred to follows:

CHURCHILL—TITAN AMONG PYGMIES

(By Ralph de Toledano)

I think I shall always remember the quizzically quiet voice of Winston Churchill as it announced to the world that the Allied forces had invaded Normandy. His words, sober and unafraid, were punctuated by the equally quiet murmur of a young corporal—listening with me at the same battered portable radio to which we had all huddled. "Those poor guys in the first wave," he kept repeating—and those of us who had a greater knowledge of war respected the sentiments but suspected at the time that it was the third and fourth waves which would get the brunt of the counterfire.

The German batteries had already zeroed in on the amphibious assault as we heard Churchill's broadcast to a tense and waiting world. But what he said zeroed in on our emotions and made us all one in the great ordeal and adventure of war. Those of us who were in uniform felt it one way. Those who had remained civilians or had tasted of death in other conflicts knew it differently. But at that moment we were all prisoners of Winston Churchill, of his courage, and of the rhetoric in which he clothed it.

History will remember him in other great moments of life and death—the defiant singer of the Battle of Britain, the prophet of Fulton who pointed to an Iron Curtain that America's leaders failed to see. They will remember him in the years of his despair as he warned England and the world that appeasement and cowardice simply fed the cruelty and ego of dictators. They will see him as we saw him in his photographs, squat against history, the very essence of the British bulldog, surrounded by the subtleties and deviousness of a Roosevelt and a Stalin.

In his coma, as life ebbed slowly from him, it was easy to remember the scenes of bravura. Once he has been laid to rest, the historians and the critics will begin the autopsy on his era and the statesmanship that bear his name. There will be much to subject to analysis and much that was wrong. Winston Churchill was a man of intuition, and there were times when this failed him.

The color of our contemporaneity might be different if the King's First Minister had realized the tragic consequences of his easy acceptance of Tito's bona fides and his callous disregard of Mikhailovich—chetnik leader, Yugoslav patriot, antifascist zealot, and anti-Communist fighter. His casual behavior at Yalta—certainly Chamberlain was not very much more naive in Munich—still plagues eastern and central Europe.

But no one expects a man of Churchill's genius to be perpetually right or inexhaustibly perceptive. He made his mistakes and the world will pay for them till they have been eradicated by the mistakes of other men. It was not so much the policies he enunciated that made Churchill great. Much more it was the grandeur of his vision, the glory of his rhetoric, and the faith in freedom's destiny which he carried everywhere with him.

That faith was what made him a titan among those who saw the road ahead as a twisting lane of compromise. That faith lifted him above more intelligent, in the narrow sense wiser men. No man in our lifetime could shake the moral pillars of our society and make small men tremble as Winston Churchill could.

Looking back on the decades of this century—or on those years which followed the collapse of democratic values and the rise of totalitarianism—there is no man who can match the Churchillian stature. Franklin Delano Roosevelt may have cut a wider swath in history. He may be remembered longer, if only because he was an American President and Churchill was a British Prime Minister. But compare F.D.R.'s ghost-written speeches and the sweep of Churchill's own prose. Go back to the recordings and listen to the two men. Roosevelt gave us a handful of phrases—clever and successful. Churchill sounded for the world a call to arms in the rhythm of an imperishable language.

Roosevelt was the master politician of an age that rewarded politics. Churchill was a spokesman of hope—the hope that free men would live through blood, sweat, and tears of war and torment and emerge sustained by their victory. Great men are the products of their time, but they also fashion those times into an image greater than themselves. This Churchill did.

He served England well, but his service was also to the world and to the human spirit. As he spoke to us we were lifted for seconds or minutes above the human condition which is our fate.

Winston Churchill served you and served me. Let him now rest, not in peace but in triumph.

Kentucky Power Lights Up Ecuador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article—from the Louisville Courier-Journal—concerning the efforts of the Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperatives to bring electricity to Santo Domingo de los Colorados, in Ecuador.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Dec. 27, 1964]

KENTUCKY POWER LIGHTS UP ECUADOR

(By Ernest L. Clark)

About 250 families in the little Ecuadorian town of Santo Domingo de los Colorados had a brighter Christmas as a result of the generosity of the 250,000 customers of Kentucky's 28 rural-electric cooperatives.

That 250 is the number of additional homes the cooperative there was able to supply with electric power with about $90,000 worth of used equipment donated by the Kentucky cooperatives.

J. K. Smith, manager of the Kentucky Association of Rural Electric Cooperative Corporations, recently returned from a 2-week visit to Ecuador and said last week, "it was a rare experience to see transformers hanging on palmtree poles in the jungle providing service to those needy people."

Smith, along with Charles Stewart, manager of the Warren County Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., Bowling Green, and several national rural-electric officials made the trip at the invitation of the cooperative there and the U.S. Agency for International Development, to make recommendations on what else can be done electrically to help the people.

POTENTIAL IMPRESSES

Although the natives are extremely poor with little or no education, Smith said he was highly impressed with the potential. "If they can ever get the country opened up, it will make a great market for our products," he said. "The people don't seem to care about ideologies; they are looking for someone to give them hope." He added that he couldn't praise the Peace Corps enough for what it is doing there. "They are doing a tremendous job and making real friends for the United States."

Smith said the country is trying mightily to pull itself up by its bootstraps. The capital city, Quito, is fairly modern with a population of 270,000. Outside the city is something else.

The Kentucky association got interested in helping the people there as a result of a trip made by Stewart in 1963 at the invitation of the Agency for International Development to study the feasibility of establishing electric-power cooperatives in some of the areas. The Agency then asked the Kentucky group to sponsor the Santo Domingo co-op.

Smith said the used equipment in the form of transformers, wire, meters, and other items was collected by his association from its member cooperatives and reworked at its plant at 4515 Bishop Lane.

BY BANANA BOAT

It then was trucked to Gulfport, Miss., and transported free on a returning banana boat to Ecuador. Smith said the material might have been worth $4,000 or $5,000 as scrap here, but the Ecuadorians put the $90,000 value on it.

The material helped the cooperative there to establish enough equity for a $650,000 loan from the Agency for International Development to build a new generating plant and add 100 miles of powerline. Its source of electricity now is a very antiquated diesel plant. Smith said he saw electricity being furnished one area from the generators of an anchored old U.S. Navy PT boat.

Smith and Stewart recommended the immediate establishment of another cooperative

power system, at Daule, a town of about 12,000.

Stewart in his earlier visit also recommended a cooperative for the town, and on their recent visit found the organization already being formed with more than 1,000 members signed up for power. A banner across the town's main street proclaimed a welcome to Stewart and added, "This is your cooperative."

SEEKING GENERATORS

Smith said his group is looking for some used generators to send to the cooperative. "We'll probably send them some other materials too," he added.

Smith said the lack of education and training, and some unusual labor laws in the country, make progress go at a snail's pace. U.S. engineers have helped plan and construct the powerlines, but they have had to battle problems unheard of in the United States. Creosoted poles, for example, last only about 6 years in the tropical climate, compared to an average of 30 in the United States.

Now they are trying concrete, he said.

Smith said the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce has started a move to solicit donations of materials from Louisville industries to help the country. He said it needs just about everything, but said playground equipment for schools is especially short.

Groundhog Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today is a very important day in this Nation which will deserve the attention of this Congress. It is Groundhog Day—and as is his custom the groundhog emerged this morning from his burrow on Gobbler's Knob at Punxsutawney, Pa., at sunrise.

I have been informed that he saw his shadow and after a while again disappeared into his comfortable den to await the arrival of spring. This ominous retreat by Mr. Groundhog is as you all know an infallible forecast of 6 more weeks of winter.

As Mr. Groundhog reappeared today for the first time since he entered his burrow to sleep away the winter months, he could not help but notice the many changes that have occurred.

For instance, we have inaugurated a new President of the United States amid pomp and ceremony, and for the first time in 14 months, this Nation has a Vice President. The new Congress is in session and is busy at work on many new programs.

The new President has announced plans for a new way of life which he calls the "Great Society." This new era is of great interest to the Punxutawney groundhog because he is very proud of his lineage. He is the one and only pure groundhog in the world, and the only one that can claim the distinction of being an infallible weather prophet.

Of course there are imposters and those who challenge his supremacy but in every challenge of his pedigree, the Punxsutawney groundhog has emerged the winner. So this aristocrat of groundhogs will eagerly await the arrival of spring so that he can participate in this glorious age that the new "Great Society" will usher in.

The Punxsutawney groundhog has brought fame and renown not only to himself, but also to his native home—the Borough of Punxsutawney.

No place in the world on this Groundhog Day will receive the attention and acclaim as will this borough. Radio commentators, television reporters, newspaper accounts and many other news media all over the world will proclaim this day and applaud Punxsutawney.

Besides being the friendly habitat of Mr. Groundhog, Punxsutawney is a community of wonderful people, beautiful homes, thriving industry, educational opportunities, and countless other advantages.

The people of Punxsutawney welcome all Members of Congress and citizens everywhere to visit this remarkable and pleasant city.

I am pleased to say that Punxsutawney is located in the 23d Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which district I am proud to represent in the Congress.

Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans and an estimated one-tenth of the world's population were able to follow the ceremonies connected with the funeral of Sir Winston Churchill on Saturday. The press of the world along with the man in the street shared the thought that this man had truly been "the man of the century."

The three newspapers representing the major cities of the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan all have editorialized within the past week on Sir Winston and, I feel, did an excellent job of conveying to their readers a shared sense of pride that this man lived and that this man devoted his talents and energies to the cause of freedom for over a half century of service to his nation and to the world.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD under unanimous consent, an editorial from the January 25 Jackson Citizen Patriot, "Sir Winston Churchill Truly Was the Man of the Century," from the Owosso Argus-Press of the same date entitled, "World Mourns as a Giant Passes," and another January 25 editorial from the Lansing State Journal, "Freedom Has Lost a Valiant Champion." If there is a way to express in words the feelings of every American, these editorials have succeeded.

The editorials follow:

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, Jan. 25, 1965]

IN OUR OPINION: SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL TRULY WAS THE MAN OF THE CENTURY

The man of the century is gone. At 90 the stout heart of Sir Winston Churchill has beat its last.

Free peoples everywhere, and those who would be free, mourn him.

A symbol of courage in the face of adversity, in determination to do what is right and good in the face of impossible odds, has faded from the world scene. It may be many more centuries before his kind crosses history's pages again.

Historians may argue over whether Sir Winston Churchill or one or more of his contemporaries had a greater impact on the human race and the fate of the world. Certainly Hitler and Stalin, in their evil ways, affected the course of history.

But the man who played a major role in two great wars, each time applying his genius and his leadership to the fight against evil, will stand out above all others when the final judgments are made.

There is no question about the genius of Churchill. His energy seemed to be totally without limit. And it was expended almost solely in the service of the country he loved and on behalf of men and women who love freedom and dignity.

He had his bad times, to be sure. He was repudiated by his people on a number of occasions. Generally this happened because he was ahead of his time; when his vision was so great that ordinary human beings could not fathom it.

When he was overruled by his government or its allies, time usually proved him to be right. This is especially true in his rejected efforts to assure the safety of Europe after World War II by forcing the Russians into a position where they would have to keep their word. Failure to follow his advice was one of the greatest errors of free world leaders.

One of the strangest events in the history of democratic government occurred as he was rejected by Britain after he had guided the nation to victory in World War II.

The career of this great man did not end there. In characteristic fashion, he stepped down gracefully but went on gathering facts and preparing himself to respond when the call came to serve again. It was only a few years later that he was brought back to again become Prime Minister.

Even when he stepped down from the active leadership of this party and served only as a member of Commons, he remained a powerful force in the Government.

As a man who became a legend in his own lifetime, the historians and students of leadership have compiled dozens of volumes on Churchill. Now that he is gone, this work of setting down all the facets of a remarkable life will be stepped up.

The written record will not be necessary to keep the Churchill memory fresh in the hearts of men.

His leadership in Britain's darkest hour, his magnificent speeches which rallied men and women of all the free world will not be forgotten.

His "V" for victory sign, flashed by his fingers, the cigar that was his trademark, the rumbling voice offering the world nothing "but blood, toil, tears and sweat," are burned deep in the memories of all who lived through those perilous times.

His great rallying cry for the people after Dunkirk, also will be long remembered:

"We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing ground, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender."

These are words for brave and free men to live by; one of the many precious legacies left to them by Sir Winston Churchill.

[From The Owosso (Mich.) Argus-Press, Jan. 25, 1965]

WORLD MOURNS AS A GIANT PASSES

When a great man passes, a mountain is leveled, leaving in view a bleak and cheerless plain. Thus it is that the world has an empty look without Sir Winston Churchill.

Few men now or in ages to come will likely question that Churchill was the titan of the 20th century. His greatness took many shapes. He was a universal man, with a rich cluster of talents which he lavished generously upon a host of spectacular endeavors undertaken over a span of eight decades.

Sir Winston was great first of all because he was the living, vibrant embodiment of the indomitable will of the freemen.

When, in Britain's dark days in World War II, he exhorted his countrymen to fight if need be on the beaches and in the towns and fields, he spoke for the unquenchable spirit of every man on earth who prizes liberty.

That this man stood ready and able to lead in that critical hour was a stroke of the highest good fortune for all the free world. His eloquent, driving, inspiring statesmanship through the great war is already fabled.

Here was a man who did everything with flair and dash and fierce determination. His energy was boundless. His grasp of diplomatic, political and military affairs was superb.

Despite his evident brilliance, he never suffered detachment from the people. His eloquence was aimed square at the heart and mind of the ordinary man. His sharp, thrusting wit made a man laugh and then grit his teeth to fight the harder.

As he spoke with force, so he wrote with power and beauty. Winner of a Nobel prize for literature, he was an eminent historian and biographer. He saw, and could convey, the drama in life because he was inevitably a leading player.

Born for center stage, he took that birthright almost from the outset. The world heard of Winston Churchill when, as a journalist covering the Boer War in South Africa near the turn of the century, he managed a clever escape from an enemy prison. It was never to be without word of him again.

His entry into politics was natural and expected. Whether in the government or in the opposition, Churchill relentlessly made his impact. In the troubled 1920's and early 1930's, he was a lone voice crying warning.

The war chose him for his time of final greatness. It was the perfect meeting of the man and the moment. History shaped him into enduring granite.

Many who loved him will remember him for his brandy and cigars, his bowler hat, his "V" for victory sign, his amateur bricklaying, his painting, his many crotchets.

But all will remember him as a man who showed the world what it means to breathe free, to take the fullness of life and give it back in massive measure.

[From the State Journal, Lansing, Mich.]

FREEDOM HAS LOST A VALIANT CHAMPION

The free world's grand old man is dead.

At the age of 90, Sir Winston Churchill succumbed Sunday to a stroke, and freedom lost one of its most valiant defenders and eloquent spokesmen.

He was truly a titan of the 20th century, a man whose greatness had many facets. During his four score years and 10 he was a journalist, an eminent historian and a statesman.

With a superb understanding of diplomatic, political and military affairs, Churchill had a major part in shaping the history which he recorded and he had the gift of eloquence that touched the heart and stirred men to the highest heights of human achievement.

His greatest service to mankind came in World War II when liberty was imperiled by the powerful and ruthless forces of nazism and fascism.

He was a firm rock against which the waves of evil lashed in futile fury until, in great measure through his courageous and able leadership, free men were rallied to defeat the enemy.

No one knows what might have happened if there had been no Winston Churchill in the forefront of the struggle in the dark days when as Prime Minister he exhorted his countrymen to fight if need be on the beaches and in the towns and fields, or if he had lacked the ability to comprehend the Nazi menace in its early stages, or the determination to resist it to the end.

Churchill was an individual who seemed to have been destined for his decisive role in history when the world was at the crossroads—one leading to universal tyranny and the other to the preservation of liberty and human dignity where they existed.

Many richly deserved honors came to Sir Winston in his lifetime, among them the Nobel prize for literature. One of the greatest was bestowed last year by Britain's Parliament in which he had served for an almost unbroken 64 years as a Member of the House of Commons.

On that occasion, the House paid him tribute by adopting its first special motion of gratitude to an individual Member in more than a century. The last previous motion had honored the Duke of Wellington who defeated Napoleon at Waterloo.

In 1963, President John F. Kennedy signed a proclamation making Churchill the first person ever to be made an honorary American citizen by act of Congress.

Winnie, as he was affectionately known to millions, will long be remembered by many for his bowler hats, his big cigars, his amateur bricklaying and painting, and his sense of humor.

But all free peoples will always remember him as the man who helped so much to keep them free.

The Recent Cheating Incident at the Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached articles; one appeared in the Washington Post on February 1, 1965, and the other appeared in the Denver Post on January 24, 1965. I wish to call the attention of each of my colleagues to these articles and to suggest that they read them in order that they may have a better understanding of the recent cheating incident at the Air Force Academy:

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 1, 1965]

ACADEMY INVESTIGATION

Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert has acted with commendable dispatch in convening a special committee to investigate the Air Force Academy in the light of the current crisis over cheating that has led to the resignation of more than 90 cadets. Further, the proposed scope of the inquiry, an examination of the entire system of cadet life and the role of athletics at the Academy in addition to the immediate conflict over the cadet honor system, shows a determination not to dismiss the incident as merely a case in which a few "bad apples" tainted the chivalrous young warriors in Air Force blue.

The Committee, headed by former Air Force Chief of Staff Thomas D. White, is fortunate in having the services of Hardy Dillard, dean of the law school at the University of Virginia, an institution that possesses one of the oldest and most successful collegiate honor systems. But they will need to look much deeper than the cheating incidents themselves and the allegations of parents that their sons only tolerated cheating on the part of others. The service academies' curriculums, faculties, and emphasis on big-time athletics have all been criticized from time to time, often with justification. The White Committee, if it uses the full scope of its directive, may be able to provide a guide for change and revision that will benefit the service academies and, ultimately, the officers who man our Defense Establishment.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Jan. 24, 1965]

HONOR CODE RIGHT SYSTEM AT ACADEMY

Apparently the Air Force Academy is dealing firmly and swiftly with the cadet cheating scandal that has erupted for the first time in the institution's history.

This is as it should be; nothing would be gained by a hesitant approach to the problem, and an investigation prolonged by indecision could do a serious disservice to the reputation of our youngest service academy and the morale of the men enrolled there.

So far an atmosphere of the strictest security has surrounded the current incident that has resulted in the resignation of at least 29 cadets. Others apparently are involved. At the heart of the matter is the Academy's proud honor code, the same code that obtains at the Military Academy at West Point and, in a somewhat different form at the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

It is a code in every sense of the word, not a method such as many schools have developed to enhance student responsibility. It demands of the cadet that he must not lie, cheat, steal, nor tolerate those who do. The last phrase of the code gives it its unique strength and perhaps creates the most misunderstanding outside the service institutions.

Superficially, it obligates a cadet to squeal if he observes lying, cheating, or stealing by one of his peers. Is this a proper system under which to educate young Americans, even to train them for a military career? It is a natural question.

We believe the answer is yes when it is explained that the reporting of such infractions is done through a cadet honor committee, which has representatives throughout the cadet wing, that the investigation of the infractions is by and large conducted by the cadets themselves and that the decision to resign in most cases is reached without the guilty subject being confronted by supervisory personnel.

The success of the honor code is realized through its tacit acceptance by all those entering the Academy. It implies that the cadet who cheats has denied himself the right to be a member of this group of highly favored young men. Thus, it is an intrinsic yardstick of moral behavior, clearly recognized as such by everyone who puts on the uniform of an Air Force cadet.

The code has not broken down when an incident like the current one occurs. On the contrary, it is working, and visibly. Scandal is unfortunate. In itself it is no credit to the institution involved. But the system under which it came to light and under which it

is being resolved seems to be the right one, and the institution should be the stronger after the case has been cleared.

Handicap in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 26, this House took action to prevent the administration from providing surplus food for Egypt. Six of the Congressmen from Iowa were distressed by this action because we felt this action to be shortsighted. The fate of an appropriation bill should have been decided on its merits and not on some extraneous issue that has popular appeal. Tying the hands of the President of the United States is not the way to retaliate against the President of the United Arab Republic.

The lead editorial in the Des Moines Register of January 29 commented on this action. I feel this article is pertinent to this issue and wish to include it in the RECORD:

HANDICAP IN FOREIGN POLICY

The vote of the U.S. House of Representatives to prevent the administration from providing surplus food for Egypt under the food-for-peace program is an unwise interference with the conduct of foreign policy.

There is little probability that the Johnson administration would be rushing to offer surplus food to President Nasser of Egypt after his recent slurs against the United States, and in view of the fact the U.S. information library in Cairo was burned with small effort by the Egyptian Government to do anything about prosecuting the arsonists. However, the administration should have flexible authority to bring Egypt into the food-for-peace program if this seems to be in the U.S. interest.

Food for peace is a valuable form of foreign aid to a country like Egypt. Sales are made from U.S. surplus stocks for Egyptian currency, and the U.S. Government retains a degree of control on the aid to make reasonably certain that it goes to the benefit of hungry people. This kind of aid has been useful in helping to stiffen resistance of Poland and Yugoslavia to the commands of Moscow. It has given the Soviet satellites a bit more opportunity to be independent of the Soviet Union.

It is no credit to the Republicans that they voted almost to a man for this curb on executive authority in food for peace in order to embarrass the administration. It is no credit to the Republicans and many Democrats that they voted for it just to please those Jewish voters in their districts who applaud anything which seems to be a slap at Nasser, the arch enemy of Israel.

These Congressmen were placing petty, short-run political considerations ahead of the national interest in an effective foreign policy. Congress frequently has done the same sort of thing in tying the hands of the President on trade policy with the Communist countries, though all recent administrations have found that wide discretion in trade and aid policies is important to the conduct of foreign affairs.

The Senate probably will reverse the House action, but this does not make the House Members who voted for this rider to a Commodity Credit Corporation appropriation bill look any better. They should have been debating CCC commodity loan and sales policies which were relevant to the legislation, instead of trying to make a gesture of defiance against Nasser.

We are glad that Iowa's six Democratic Representatives (five brand new ones) voted responsibly to let the President decide on food for peace for Egypt. Only H. R. GROSS, Republican, voted the other way.

The Worthy GI Bill Comes to an End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as one who has a continuing and abiding interest in the great sacrifices that our veterans have made, and as one who is deeply grateful for the opportunity afforded me under the GI bill, I would like to submit this fine editorial from the January 30, 1965, Iowa City Press-Citizen concerning the GI bill and its impact upon America. I commend this report fully to my colleagues:

THE WORTHY GI BILL COMES TO AN END

The United States' most extensive excursion to this time into Federal aid to education ends Sunday, when benefits to veterans of the Korean conflict are terminated. This GI bill, like its World War II predecessors, brought far-reaching changes to colleges across the country and to the individuals who received its benefits. Its effects upon the Nation have been equally great and will continue for generations.

Final figures for the Korean programs are not yet available. The Veterans' Administration, however, estimates that about 2.4 million veterans of the armed services during the period legally defined as that of the Korean conflict (January 27, 1950–January 31, 1955), took part at a cost of about $4 billion. This was about two of every five eligible. About $14 billion was spent on a similar program for World War II veterans, benefiting a proportionally larger number. Education and training was of all types, but most significant aspect of the program was for college.

No one knows precisely how many thousands of those millions came to the University of Iowa, but for several semesters after World War II veterans numbered more than 5,000, and made up more than half the total enrollment. There were 5,800 at the peak, in the first semester of 1946–47, and the number declined slowly until 1950 when a sharp drop came. The Korean program brought a new upsurge and a new peak of 2,256 in the fall of 1956 when the university's total was 9,900. The last of the World War II veterans here on the GI bill attended classes in the summer of 1960; 18 veterans of the Korean conflict will have their benefits terminated Sunday.

The impact of the GI bill and the veterans it brought to the University of Iowa was enormous, mirroring the changes affecting campuses throughout the Nation. Veterans were the first married students to appear on the campus in large numbers; their scholarship aid made graduate study a common part of higher education for vast numbers; veterans showed that students of all social and economic groups could succeed in college, not just those from middle-class families in which college long had been traditional.

These developments in our colleges and universities might have come anyway; they probably would have. No one will ever know, however, how much the GI bill speeded this opening of college doors to millions for whom they might have remained closed. Nor will anyone ever know how many were able to attend college—or take other educational training—with GI bill assistance who could not have done so without it.

The program took a lot of money, yet there can be little question that this was an investment which is paying rich returns not only to the veterans who became students, but also to the Nation. It's probable that the country even will get back directly the money it spent for veterans in higher tax payments resulting from the higher incomes their greater education made possible. Certainly, if the future greatness of this Nation is to rest on excellence of mind and breadth of knowledge—as it must—then the GI bill is one of the bulwarks of that greatness.

The experience with that program offers a powerful argument for those who contend that the Nation has a responsibility to nurture, conserve and develop its human resources just as it does to protect its natural resources. If the GI bill is any guide—and it is—then the most effective way of developing our human resources in this one aspect is a system of governmentally financed scholarships for able students whose capabilities might be lost otherwise.

Cutting the Melon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, a recent and very welcome addition to the pages of Newsweek magazine is a column written by the noted economist, Henry C. Wallich. In the February 8, 1965, edition, Mr. Wallich analyzes President Johnson's fiscal 1966 budget. His column, entitled, "Cutting the Melon," points out quite appropriately that if our outlays for defense are cut back as they have been, then a portion of these savings should be employed in reducing the public sector.

Dr. Wallich cautions that "we must resist the tendency of national budgets to maintain their level after expanding in an emergency." In assessing President Johnson's record, he points out that he made a good start in his first budget but that his second "shows no progress."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place Dr. Wallich's article, "Cutting the Melon," in the RECORD at this point.

The article referred to follows:

CUTTING THE MELON

(By Henry C. Wallich)

President Johnson has inherited from his predecessors a budgetary resource of great potency—the great defense effort that the country has made since the Korean war. Last year for the first time it became possible to cut back defense spending, and this year's budget contains a further small defense cut. Relative to our rising gross national prod-

uct, defense expenditures are down rather sharply. That is the melon that Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy have bequeathed to Mr. Johnson and which he is now slicing up skillfully.

During the late Eisenhower years, the defense budget was running at approximately 10 percent of gross national product. Now President Johnson has brought it to approximately 8 percent. This saving of 2 percent of gross national product has helped the President cut taxes, make a start on the Great Society, and still inch toward a balanced budget.

BRILLIANT PERFORMANCE

To catch up with the tricks of Mr. Johnson's brilliant budget performance, the analyst must do two things: First, as most people know by now, he must disregard the administrative budget which shows only part of Federal expenditures. It does not matter much that this budget, with $99.7 billion of expenditures, shows an increase over its predecessor of only $2 billion and stops short of the magic $100 billion level. The more revealing total is the cash budget, which includes the Federal trust funds for social security, highways, etc., left out of the administrative budget. The cash budget is put by Mr. Johnson at $127.4 billion, up $6 billion.

Second, the analyst must separate defense expenditures from civilian. If defense is unavoidable, civilian expenditures are closer to "discretionary" expenditures. Mr. Johnson is putting up these civilian expenditures quite steeply—at a rate of almost 10 percent in 1 year.

Mr. Johnson is to be commended for raising some items while cutting others. The essence of good budgeting is to defeat the deadly stalemate of forces that keeps the political peace by letting everything go up in the same proportion. But let us look at his figures in perspective. During the 1950's, the heavy defense budget necessarily squeezed civilian expenditures. That gave rise to the hue and cry about private affluence and public squalor, or neglect of our great national priorities. Now that the defense burden is diminishing, we can catch up on the civilian side.

THE CRITICAL ISSUE

The queston is how much. Since we are also treating ourselves to substantial tax cuts, private affluence is not being overlooked. But we can do this mainly because, in a long recovery from recession, tax revenues have been rising faster than normally. The critical issue still remains the size of the public sector within the economy. In the fiscal year ending in June, the Federal share came down a little. It seems scheduled to remain unchanged in the new budget.

The Federal Government, moreover, is not the sole public claimant. State and local expenditures make growing demands, in the main badly needed, to be sure. But Federal plus State and local spending, if kept rising at this rate, would gradually enlarge the share of the public sector.

For this, there is no call. We have been through a defense emergency which compelled us to increase the share of the public sector. With this threat stabilized, and defense going down, the share of the public sector should shrink, although probably not back to its pre-Korea level. More of the defense melon should be devoted, in other words, to reducing the public sector. We must resist the tendency of national budgets to maintain their level after expanding in an emergency. Mr. Johnson made a good start with his first budget. The second shows no progress.

Perhaps the budget can be defended on grounds of safeguarding the economy against recession. The business outlook toward the end of the year justifies some such precaution. But Mr. Johnson could have done this also with a little less increase in spending and a little more of a tax cut. Congress, which now must pass upon the budget, would be very wrong if it allowed itself to believe that the salvaging of the $100 billion administrative taboo makes this anything but a very generous budget.

The Baited Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the February 1965 issue of Nation's Agriculture magazine, President Charles B. Shuman of the American Farm Bureau Federation outlined a trap facing our Nation's farmers, a trap baited with subsidy payments designed to entice the farmer into giving up a large portion of his economic freedom in return for Federal subsidies.

It seems that the farmer cannot escape from the Federal Government even when times are good, as there are those in the Agriculture Department who simply do not want him to become too prosperous or else he may lose his dependency upon the Federal Government.

For the information of my colleagues, the editorial from Nation's Agriculture follows. I recommend that its contents be read carefully:

THE BAITED TRAP

A few days ago the Secretary of Agriculture announced a reduction in the price support for cotton with a corresponding and partially offsetting increase in direct Federal subsidy payments to qualifying farmers. Similar actions have previously been taken for other crops. What is the purpose of these strange actions?

Almost every price-related action of the Department of Agriculture during the last year has been aimed at pushing farm prices down. Market prices for wheat were forced down below the world price as a result of the deliberate dumping of Government stocks on the domestic market during the 1964 harvest season. The market price for corn and other feed grains would undoubtedly be much higher in this drought year if it were not for the feed grain program and Government policies to hold prices down.

The original concept of price supports has been perverted and they have become price ceilings for wheat, cotton, and feed grains as a result of the deliberate dumping of CCC stocks on the domestic market. A reduction in the support price makes it possible to lower the CCC release price. Is it any wonder that many farmers are asking, "Whose side is the Department on?"

The apparent reason for these price-wrecking activities is to punish noncooperators and to force more farmers into the programs in 1965. The gleeful announcements by the ASCS of increased signups indicates that the scheme is working.

Perhaps some politicians have another motive. If market prices are pushed down and replaced by subsidy payments, farmers will be forced to look to politicians for much of their income. Nearly 20 percent of the 1964 net farm income was in the form of direct payments from the Federal Treasury and this percentage is scheduled to go even higher this year. To many politicians, this seems like a good idea—making farmers dependent on annual appropriations of the Congress for their living. When election time comes around it is easy to get votes by spreading scare stories that the handout will be ended if the opposition wins. Once farmers come to depend on direct subsidy payments their political, as well as their economic freedom has come to an end—they will vote right or else.

Another group supporting the plan to deliberately force farm prices down and substitute payments consists of those who favor the socialization of agriculture. Their theory is that Government can control and manage the farms and farmers of the Nation with better results than will come from free-choice decisions made by individuals in response to the demands of the competitive market.

Farmers are caught in a trap. By increasing the payment rate and forcing market prices down under voluntary programs, the Department penalizes those farmers who wish to produce for the free market and rewards those who accept the socialized market. Many are forced to sign up to buy protection against having their income destroyed by unrestricted dumping of Government surpluses. As they come to depend on payments rather than price, farmers can be controlled by the threat of withholding the subsidy.

Yes, the trap of socialism is baited with tempting payments. Farmers should demand that the price-wrecking, payment-baited policies of recent months be ended promptly. I am confident that the Congress did not intend for farmers to be given such shabby treatment. I am hopeful that President Lyndon B. Johnson will renounce these schemes and seek ways to use the pricing mechanism of the free market with more vitality.

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

The New Rural Power Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the following editorial entitled "The New Rural Power Play," which appeared in the February 1, 1965, issue of the Wall Street Journal:

THE NEW RURAL POWER PLAY

For the past year or so the Nation's rural electric cooperatives have been running into increasing criticism from Congress. With electricity now available to practically all rural areas, some lawmakers find it strange that the Government insists on subsidizing the co-ops' rapid growth as a supplier of power to cities and industry.

At times the criticism has been so sharp that you would think it might lead the co-ops and their Washington overseer, the Rural Electrification Administration, at least to go slower for a while. But they evidently operate on the idea that the best defense is a stronger offense.

The first target of a stepped-up offensive, launched at the rural co-ops' convention last week in Miami Beach, is the Nation's stockholder-owned electric power industry. A group of 106 of the private power companies,

declare the co-ops, overcharged their customers by $3.4 billion in the 7 years ended in 1962.

To arrive at this figure, the co-ops first decide what would be a fair profit for the private companies. Though such a judgment is hardly likely to be unbiased, the co-ops obviously like it better than the decision of the various State public service commissions, which rigidly supervise the private companies' rates.

If there have been overcharges, the cure would seem to be improved State regulation. It's hard to see how it will help much, as the co-ops appear to think it will, to use their operations as a yardstick for measuring proper private utility rates.

In addition to being tax free, the rural co-ops get Government loans at 2 percent, a rate far lower than those available to private companies and, for that matter, much lower than the cost of the money to the Government. In this situation, it's pretty silly to try to compare co-op rates with those of the taxpaying private firms.

The comparison won't get any better if the yardstick is merely enlarged, and yet that's about the only change the co-ops suggest. REA Administrator Norman Clapp implies that the Government, far from being overly generous with the co-ops, has actually been rather niggardly. In the next 15 years, he says, the co-ops will need vastly expanded amounts of capital if they are to continue to grow.

So the second target of this new rural power play is, not surprisingly, the taxpayer. He can only hope that enough Congressmen now will see where the line is heading. And pull the plug.

Self-Employ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the New York Law Journal is the official legal paper of New York, the publisher of which is Jerry Finkelstein who continues to do an effective job improving the content of the paper. One of the interesting articles that appeared recently was on the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1962. It is as follows:

SELF-EMPLOY: PENSION, PROFIT PLANS UNDER KEOGH LAW GREW IN 1964

Self-employed professional and businessmen are qualifying pension and profit-sharing plans with special income tax advantages under the Federal law at a high rate, according to Commerce Clearing House, national reporting authority on tax and business law.

More than 8,400 plans were approved in IRS district offices during the first three quarters of 1964. Of these, 3,318 provided for profit sharing, 3,377 set up pension plans, and 1,713 were classified as bond purchase plans.

These self-employed retirement plans qualify under the Federal law passed in 1962. Such plans permit an income tax deduction of up to $1,250 per year for contributions made to a plan on the self-employed individual's own behalf. This deduction may be increased, however, by the amount that the self-employed person contributes to the plan on behalf of his employees.

The law requires that all of the self-employed person's regular employees with 3 or more years of service must be fully covered by the plan, and contributions made on their behalf must be fully vested.

More substantial income tax benefits can be realized by individual business and professional men through traditional types of retirement plans established under professional corporation or association laws, now effective in 32 States, than under the Federal Self-Employed Retirement Act.

Persons who participate in a qualified traditional-type plan created under a State professional corporation or association law suffer less stringent limitations on contributions and deductions governing funds they set aside for retirement purposes.

But plans under these State laws face tough sledding if the IRS adopts proposed changes in its regulations which have been hanging fire for over a year, CCH said.

Standards for establishing the corporate characteristics necessary to obtain traditional-type benefits through plans set up under these State enabling laws include continuity of life, centralized management, limited liability, and free transferability of corporate interests. They would be tightened substantially under the proposed regulation amendments.

Presently pending in Congress is a bill which would automatically classify professional corporations or associations formed under State laws as corporations for Federal income tax purposes.

If passed, the bill would mean that such organization would not have to meet the strict standards contemplated by the IRS in order to adopt retirement plans with the greater tax advantages than those available to plans qualifying under the Federal Self-Employed Retirement Act, CCH said.

More liberal treatment for plans set up under the Federal act is also provided in another bill now pending in Congress. This legislation proposes to increase the self-employed individual's deduction for his plan contributions to $2,500 a year, currently $1,250. This bill is sponsored by Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, author of the bill which eventually became the 1962 Federal act.

Gen. John P. McConnell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Arkansas is proud today. Gen. John P. McConnell, a native of Logan County, Ark., was sworn in yesterday as Chief of the Staff of the U.S. Air Force, a position of great responsibility in this, a troubled world. No better man could have been selected. He is qualified in every respect to assume this great responsibility.

I was present on January 31 when the Arkansas State Society of Washington, D.C., met to honor General McConnell. He delivered a masterful address concerning the responsibility of all of us, and especially that of our military services.

As part of my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the following article from his hometown newspaper, the Booneville Democrat, of December 28, 1964; and an Associated Press article from the Christian Science Monitor of Thursday, December 24, 1964:

[From the Booneville (Ark.) Democrat, Dec. 28, 1964]

BOONEVILLE NATIVE: GEN. JOHN P. MCCONNELL TO BECOME USAF CHIEF

Gen. John Paul McConnell, son of Dr. and Mrs. S. P. McConnell, has been nominated to be Air Force Chief of Staff and will take over the No. 1 post February 1. He succeeds retiring Gen. Curtis E. LeMay.

Announcement of the nomination was made Tuesday by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. He told a news conference at the LBJ Ranch in Texas that President Johnson had already approved McConnell's selection.

The general has served as Deputy Commander of the Strategic Air Command and, from 1962 to last August, he was Deputy Commander in Chief of the U.S. European Command. He has been filling the position of Vice Chief of Staff, the Air Force's No. 2 job, since August.

A native of Booneville, he attended public schools here and graduated magna cum laude from Henderson State College in 1927, then graduated from the Military Academy at West Point in 1932, and the Army Air Corps Advanced Flying School in 1933. He still considers Booneville his home.

McConnell's advancement has been rapid. He rose from second lieutenant to colonel in 10 years and was promoted to brigadier general in 1944, when he was 38.

During World War II, he served in India, Burma, Ceylon, and China. At the close of the war, he was Chief of Staff of the Army Air Corps in China.

Some of his military assignments include commander of the 3d Air Force in England in 1952; commander of the 2d Air Force in 1957, and vice commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command at Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr., in 1961.

Among General McConnell's many high military decorations are:

Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with three Oak Leaf clusters, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Bronze Star, the Commander of the Order of the British Empire, and the Air Medal. He also has been decorated by the Nationalist Chinese Government and holds the right to wear Chinese Air Force pilot's wings, along with his USAF command pilot's wings and combat missileman's badge.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 24, 1964]

AIR FORCE CHIEF TRAVELS FAST

WASHINGTON.—Gen. John P. McConnell, who will become Air Force Chief of Staff February 1, is a man who likes to travel. He can be ready in 15 minutes for a 15,000-mile trip.

This probably results, in part, from his conditioning during 30 years of flying to the far corners of the world.

An Arkansas-born "soldier statesman," General McConnell was named Tuesday by President Johnson, acting on the recommendation of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, to succeed retiring Gen. Curtis E. LeMay.

Mr. McNamara handpicked General McConnell last May 1 to become Vice Chief of Staff and heir apparent to General LeMay. Mr. McNamara was said to be impressed by General McConnell's sharp-minded capabilities.

WEST POINT GRADUATE

These showed up early in the general's life.

He had already been graduated in 1927 from Henderson-Brown College (now Henderson State College), Arkadelphia, Ark., when he entered the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

A year after his 1932 graduation from West Point, General McConnell was graduated from the Air Corps advanced flying school.

During World War II, he held various training posts in the United States before he was assigned to the China-Burma theater. By 1946 he was still in China as senior air adviser to the nationalist government.

Between 1947 and 1950 General McConnell was in Washington handling Reserve and National Guard affairs. He held various

European commands in the early 1950's, becoming director of plans at Strategic Air Command Headquarters under General LeMay in 1953, 2d Air Force commander in Louisiana in 1957, and vice commander of SAC in 1961.

EUROPEAN POST

The next year he left for Europe and a post as deputy commander in chief of the U.S. command, second only to Army Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer who is both United States and NATO commander in Europe.

He is a reader of books with military meaning, such as those of Churchill and Bismarck, and "appreciates but is not a devotee" of classical and semiclassical music, according to his official biography.

It adds that he is "fastidious" in selecting formal or casual civilian clothing, has an eye for color combinations, likes Georgian style houses and prefers country living.

General McConnell is married to the former Sally Dean of St. Paul, Minn. They have two sons, Bruce, 14, and Dorsey, 10.

Protect Our Pin Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I testified before the U.S. Tariff Commission on a matter of extreme importance to the economy of the State of Connecticut and to the Fifth Congressional District, which I represent. I refer to the Tariff Commission's investigation on safety pins under section 351(d)(2) of the Trade Expansion Act.

Briefly, by way of explanation, the import duty on safety pins was increased from 22½ to 35 percent ad valorem, effective December 31, 1957. Despite this increase in tariff, domestic production and sales have declined and imports have continued to increase. I have asked the Tariff Commission to recommend to the President that if an upward adjustment is not appropriate at this time, the President should be urged to leave in effect the proclamation effective December 31, 1957, increasing the duty on safety pins to 35 percent ad valorem.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the statement which I made today at the hearing of the Tariff Commission.

At the request of the Governor of the State of Connecticut, Hon. John N. Dempsey, I have also submitted to the Tariff Commission a letter from the Governor, which included with my statement, urges that the duty on safety pins be maintained at its current rate.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN S. MONAGAN, DEMOCRAT OF CONNECTICUT, BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION AT 10 A.M., TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1965

Re investigation on safety pins under section 351(d)(2) of the Trade Expansion Act.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Tariff Commission, I appear here today on a mission of vital importance to family members and industries who depend for their livelihood and profit upon the safety pin industry in the United States which, for the most part, is centered in the Naugatuck Valley of Connecticut. The payrolls received and taxes paid by this industry are real factors in the economy of our State.

This is a subject in which I am sure that members of the Tariff Commission are well versed, for safety pins have been the subject of "escape clause" investigations in every year but one since 1957. It was in January 1957 that serious injury to the domestic safety pin industry by increased imports was established and the Tariff Commission recommended an increase in the duty from 22½ to 35 percent ad valorem as necessary to remedy such injury. The President agreed with the Commission's findings of injury and increased the duty as recommended, effective December 31, 1957.

This is an industry which for the last century has given considerable employment to the people of my congressional district, although I am sure you are aware from your studies that despite the 35-percent duty imposed since 1957, domestic production and sales have declined and imports have continued to increase. Between 1959 and 1963, imports have supplied an average of 31 percent of the U.S. safety pin market. From 1959 to 1961, the number of man-hours annually worked in our safety pin industry have declined by 239,000 to an average of 380,000, a decline of approximately 38 percent. Some of our largest domestic plants are located in the Waterbury labor area which, according to the U.S. Department of Labor's "Area Trends in Employment and Unemployment" for December 1964, was classified in group "D," an area of substantial (6 to 8.9 percent) unemployment.

We have already lost some of this industry to another part of the country, not because of lack of skilled labor but because of the competition created by lower wage scales. Of even greater importance is the increasing threat of economic penetration from abroad through these low-wage products.

As you know, the problem of this industry is not an isolated one. The effects of our current trade policy have been felt in the bicycle industry, the table silver industry, the rubber footwear industry, the clock industry, and the brass industry generally—all vital industries in my section of Connecticut.

To continue relaxing the restrictions on imports at a time when an international financial condition is increasingly weaker would not appear to be a statesmanlike policy.

Parenthetically, I might say that even though compensation for injury is no substitute for business, even this is denied under the current language and interpretation of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Gov. John Dempsey, of Connecticut, has requested that I read into the record his statement in which he strongly urges that your report to the President include a recommendation that the duty on safety pins be maintained at its current rate and, with your permission, I will do so at this point.

JANUARY 15, 1965.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I strongly urge that your report to the President include a recommendation that the duty on safety pins be maintained at its current rate.

I make this appeal for a number of reasons.

Connecticut may well be termed the "home of the domestic safety pin industry" since most of the plants manufacturing this item are situated in this State.

Further, the industry is concentrated almost wholly in the Naugatuck Valley where currently there is a problem of unemployment. Two of our safety pin producing plants are in the city of Waterbury where, the Connecticut State Labor Department reports, the unemployment rate for the month of December 1964, was 5.1 percent, 1 percent higher than the average for the State.

Should any of our safety pin producers transfer their operations outside of Connecticut to areas of lower labor cost, as they may do if their competitive position is further weakened by low-priced imported pins, the unemployment problem would of course be aggravated.

I am aware of the importance of making every effort to remove unnecessary trade barriers. I feel, however, that such efforts are not advantageous if they penalize our working people by depriving them of jobs.

Therefore, on behalf of the many Connecticut people whose livelihood depends on the safety pin industry, I hope very much that the duty on this product will be maintained at the rate which went into effect on December 31, 1957.

Sincerely,

JOHN DEMPSEY, *Governor.*

My office has been deluged with correspondence from the worried employees of Connecticut's safety pin plants, and I have received appeals for help from officials of the Risdon Manufacturing Co., Naugatuck, Conn., the Oakville division of the Scovill Manufacturing Co. in Waterbury, and the Star Pin Co. in Shelton.

Legal representatives of the industry are prepared, I am sure, to present statistics in detail to show the sales, production, and employment declines that have resulted from increasing foreign imports despite the 35-percent duty effective since 1957. They will prove that the increase to 35 percent ad valorem in the rate of duty was inadequate to remedy the sales injury found in 1957 to have been caused by imports. They are also prepared to show that the injury has persisted despite the increase in duty and that further injury will result unless additional protection is afforded.

I feel that any lowering of the existing duty will pose a very serious threat to the survival of the Connecticut safety pin industry and to the economic well-being of several communities and the employment of many thousands of people. The Waterbury-Oakville, Naugatuck-Shelton, communities which stand to suffer the most are important segments of the economy of the Fifth Congressional District. I urge you, as I shall urge the President, to give these people the benefit of job security through the continuance of what at best is inadequate tariff protection.

This Commission, in its wisdom, saw fit to establish the 35-percent tariff in 1957 on the basis of its findings that the share of the U.S. market supply by imports increased from an average of 5 percent during the 5-year period 1946–50 to 21.3 percent during the 5-year period immediately preceding the 1957 finding. Clearly, there should be no reduction of the tariff at this point, since it has been shown that during the period 1959–63 imports have supplied an average of 31 percent of the U.S. market.

Domestic sales of safety pins in the United States had declined from an average of 13.1 million gross during the 5-year period 1946–50 to only 10.8 million gross during the 5-year period immediately preceding the 1957 finding. This was a decline of 2.3 million gross, or nearly 18 percent.

Now we find that during the last 5-year period 1959–63, domestic sales of the same 4 producers have declined to 8.4 million gross annually, a further decline of 2.4 million gross or 22 percent, which was a greater decline than was used as a basis for the finding of injury in 1957.

Let me read you a paragraph taken from a letter addressed to me by a salesman for one of the affected companies:

"This action is not only vital to our company and its obligations to the many thousands of family members involved, but also to the very existence of our industry. I have been with the company for 15 years and have sold our product (safety pins) against those of imported origins. The much lower cost to our customers, due to the lower wage and living standards in those countries of import origin, has reacted disastrously to our sales. I have seen the volume in my sales territories over the past 10 years decrease anywhere from 40 to 60 percent of that to which we worked prior to the influx of imports."

On the merits of these arguments, in support of the welfare of Connecticut workers and the well-being of Connecticut industry, and on the basis of your own knowledge, which comes from a succession of thoroughgoing studies of this industry, I respectfully urge that the Tariff Commission recommend to the President that the rate of duty on imports of safety pins not be reduced, and if an upward adjustment is not appropriate at this time, the President should be urged to leave in effect the proclamation effective December 31, 1957, increasing the duty to 35 percent ad valorem.

The Optimistic Abernethy View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues in the House know, I am privileged to represent in the Congress one of the largest textile manufacturing districts in the United States. In the 10th Congressional District in North Carolina will be found numerous cotton and synthetic fiber textile plants.

The success of the textile industry in my State has been due in a large measure to the foresight and ability of the outstanding men who have been leaders in the industry down through the years.

Mr. Julius W. Abernethy, of Newton, N.C., has been one of these leaders who has been responsible for the tremendous growth of textile manufacturing in my State. This outstanding business executive has not only been a leader in textile manufacturing but has made major contributions to the educational and civic life of his community and State.

The December 3, 1964, edition of America's Textile Reporter has a story which describes Mr. Abernethy and his place in textile manufacturing. I believe my colleagues will find the life and work of Mr. Abernethy to be most interesting. I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The story follows:

THE OPTIMISTIC ABERNETHY VIEW

(Here is an opinion, best expressed by a man who has seen it—the textile industry situation—for a great many years)

Julius W. Abernethy is a man who has been around the textile industry long enough to remember the day Spencer Love had a hard time raising $150,000.

Today, at the youthful age of 70, he is probably the largest individual investor in the American textile industry. If not, he certainly can lay claim to doing more trading in textile shares during his over 50-year association with the textile industry than any other living American.

And today he is just as confident as then that textile shares are "the safest investment a man can have." He ought to know. "The textile industry is a better investment than steel; it is better than tobacco; it is better than anything," he told America's Textile Reporter in an exclusive interview during the 23d Southern Textile Exposition.

"Why are people building all these mills? Because they think the same thing. At one time mills were running one week and shutting down a week or running 3 days one week and 4 the next. Today they're running 6 days and are still having a hard time filling the demand. I'll never stop buying."

One of Mr. Abernethy's most recent textile-related ventures involved Roberts Co., Sanford, N.C., textile machinery manufacturers, which announced in July that Julius W. Abernethy had been elected to the board of directors and chairman of the finance committee. At the same time, Roberts announced the company had authorized $2.6 million of new capital funds from "private sources"—that private source being Julius Whitener (he's kin to Congressman BASIL WHITENER, of North Carolina) Abernethy of Newton, N.C.

The Reporter asked Mr. Abernethy, who is on the executive committee of Dan River Mills, chairman of the board of Carolina Mills, and chairman of Tryon Corp. (a private investment company), why he had put his money into Roberts Co. in view of the stiff competition among textile machinery manufacturers.

He replied: "They were doing too much business for their capital and I figured there is a future for the company. At least about a third of the mills have got to modernize or get out—either one. And about a third of the mills are not fit to put new machinery into. It's like buying a house 100 years old and trying to put in new furniture. You can't do it. And you can't air-condition these old mills—these old three-four-five story plants. There's too much lost motion in the old ones."

The Reporter: "As an investor in Roberts Co., how do you view the company's future?"

Mr. Abernethy: "Well, I think there's enough business for the next 5 or 10 years to keep them all busy. The mills are either half good or no good. Some fix up just the card room and some fix up just the spinning room. But you've got to start at one end and go all the way through. Mills have got to put their equipment in good shape. They can't fix up just a part of a mill. They've got to fix it all to get the full benefit. I have stock in some mills now where labor costs are twice what they ought to be.

"They've got to put in new machinery, quick, for their costs are 7 to 8 cents a pound more than another mill making the same thing, and there's not that much profit in it."

Speaking of the better equipment available today, Mr. Abernethy said: "Take the new winders for example. We bought 12 of them. We put two of them in one mill and cut out 27 hands. In another case, one new winder took the place of eight old winders. You can now wind for a third the old cost. Now this is one reason why I went to Roberts Co. I also think they have a good line of equipment and I think they can make it $5 a spindle cheaper than Whitin or Saco-Lowell."

He predicted that Roberts' sales would reach about $15 million this year and about $20 million next year.

The Reporter: "What is your interest, incidentally, in Whitin?"

Mr. Abernethy: "My group and I have 10 percent of it, or over 100,000 shares. If they don't make money soon, someone's going to buy it. People get tired of waiting and want something eventually."

The Reporter: "What mills do you have an interest in today?"

Mr. Abernethy: "I don't know, but I've put a lot of them together in the past few years. It is all part of a trend to either merge mills or merge with somebody. In this way, we can have diversity and get better management."

As an example, Carolina Mills' (Maiden, N.C.) annual report for 1963 points out some earlier mergers brought about by the Abernethy interests, as follows: "Carolina Mills was incorporated in 1928 when J. Alfred Moretz of Hickory, N.C., merchant and receiver in bankruptcy of the Carolina Cotton Mills of Maiden, joined with financier Julius W. Abernethy, of Newton, N.C., and the mill's attorney, Thomas P. Pruitt, to effect a reorganization."

Mr. Abernethy pointed out in this interview that Carolina Mills presently is doing around $20 to $22 million this year and should do $25 to $27 million next year. He recalled that shortly after the reorganization in 1928 the mills did $200,000 the first year. Today Carolina Mills operates some 14 plants. "We are figuring on a new one now," he said, "and we are putting up another one in Lincolnton (N.C.) right now—a synthetics plant."

Carolina Mills' report went on, in part: "In 1941, Mr. Abernethy, Mr. Pruitt, and Mr. Moretz acquired a controlling interest in the New City Mills of Newton, operating this plant as a separate unit until 1947, when it merged with Carolina Mills. * * * A small integrated weaving mill, renamed the Abernethy Manufacturing Co., located in Laurinburg, N.C., was purchased in late 1942 by Mr. Abernethy, Mr. Pruitt, and Leonard Moretz together with Herman Smith * * * Julius Abernethy who has served as president of Carolina Mills since its inception in 1928, resigned from this position in 1960 * * * (and was) * * * succeeded as president by O. Leonard Moretz."

The Reporter: "Mr. Abernethy, as an individual, you have perhaps a larger financial interest in the American textile industry than anyone we know, for every time we turn around you are going into a new endeavor."

Mr. Abernethy: "I expect that's right. I am going into two or three new ones now. Kenlon Mills in Allendale is one (my group has a third of that) and a finishing plant is another. I am also in a corporation that does nothing but buy undervalued stocks. Within the past 90 days, I raised a million dollars for one mill overnight. I didn't even have to show my face. They just took my word. I don't like publicity, but that's all I've gotten since I've gone into Roberts Co. However, I always try to keep my name in the background."

The Reporter: "What mills do you actually hold an interest in today?"

Mr. Abernethy: "I have large holdings in about 25 mills and smaller holdings in about 50 more. I have 20 percent of American & Efird, or over 100,000 shares. I did have a lot of Aberfoyle and have a little yet. I sold out of it a couple of times then bought a little of it back. Let's see now, going down the line, I am interested in all the Belmont Mills (the Lineberger and Stowe groups) and in some of them pretty heavy. I've got some Wiscassett. Then there's BVD and United Mills. I'm the oldest living member of Carolina Mills. And then there's Fulton Mills, which I've been in and out of three times." (Mr. Abernethy is the largest outside stockholder in Dan River Mills, has a substantial interest in Burlington Industries. He merged Mooresville Mills into Burlington and kept most of the stock for himself, his children and grandchildren of which he has 3 and 12 respectively.) "You have to pay above the market to get control. You can't do it at the market price. You have to pay about a third more."

About accusations he is "taking over" Roberts Co., Mr. Abernethy remarked: "I say,

hell, no. I'm not taking anything over. I don't want to take it over. I just want somebody else to do the work. The new man at Whitin told all his stockholders I was a raider. It made me mad. That's why I went into Roberts. He said I raid. I don't raid anything."

Mr. Abernethy's holdings are so large and widespread, he had difficulty enumerating them all. However, he has stock in Textiles, Inc., of Gastonia, and is a board member, as he is with American & Efird. He and his family own a third of Spindale Mills and a third of A. M. Smyre Manufacturing Co., of Ranlo, N.C. At one time he held a half interest in Dan River Mills and is credited with helping amalgamate the Woodside and Iselin-Jefferson interests. "They wouldn't have made the deal if it hadn't been for me. They were about $6 or $7 million apart. I was the largest stockholder in Alabama Mills and I agreed to take $7 or $8 less than the book value to put the deal over," he recalls.

Mr. Abernethy admits he has been instrumental in a bunch of mergers but has never made a dollar out of any one of them personally. He contends he works for the stockholders and "this is why I have such a large following. No one ever loses money. I always buy something that is undervalued."

He recalls the day he bought the old Bloomfield Mill of Statesville, N.C. from Charles A. Cannon—a purchase that eventually netted him around $3 million. "I had some stock in it that I paid $300 a share for, that was paying 10 percent quarterly. The mill only had $108,000 capital. They had put in brand new machinery back in 1928 or 1929. And when the crash came. They had to shut it down for 4 or 5 years. Taxes were running around $9,000 a year or a little more. Then came the NRA. Cannon couldn't get them to lower taxes. He asked me if I wanted the whole thing for $25,000. I said "yes," I would take it. It so happened that I had $5,000 of old Burlington stock in my pocket I had bought somewhere and paid $90 a share for it. I put that up as a binder. I had to raise $5,000 in 10 days. This was right after the banking holidays in 1933. There wasn't any money anywhere. In 90 days I had to pay $10,000 more, and I had five years to pay the balance at $2,000 per year. In less than a year, I had paid off the whole thing and started the mill up."

Mr. Abernethy hired a group to run the mill and later told them he would sell half interest for $50,000, to be paid for out of net profits in 5 years. In less than three years they had made enough money to pay him his $50,000. "Then," he said, "I turned around and said I would give them $100,000 for their half of it back. I never put but $25,000 in that mill and paid it back out of the mill. I made over $3 million out of that mill, gave my kids each 30 percent and I kept 10 percent. And I paid the Government more than $2 million in taxes."

Despite his incredible ability to turn handsome profits on textile stocks, Mr. Abernethy claims he knows nothing about the mill business. "No, I didn't know anything about it then and I don't know anything about it now. That's the reason I've made a success of it. I bought mills back in the 1930's that no one else would buy."

One of his first mill investments was the old Union Mill (now a part of the American & Efird chain) before World War I. The mill owed some $100,000 to the banks and couldn't pay. Mr. Abernethy bought nearly a half interest when it was trading 20 to 30 cents on the dollar.

Born in Hickory, N.C., in 1894, Julius Abernethy has been trading in textile stocks for at least 50 years. He's been trading in something for 60 years, since he was 10 and had, as an industrious young fellow squirreled away about $300 in savings in the saving and loan association in Hickory.

At age 12 he put this money to work.

His mother operated a small grocery store on Hickory main street. Next door was a shoe store where shine boys were raking in four or five dollars on a Saturday.

"I figured there was some way I could get hold of some of that money, so I bought a couple of bicycles and charged the shine boys a nickel to ride around the square three times. I got to the point where I was making $8 to $10 a day."

Soon young Julius had increased his savings to $1,200 which he took and built four houses at $300 each or $100 per room. But he made the mistake, he says, of putting the deeds in his name at age 12. He couldn't sell them until he was 21, but he paid for them and later sold them for around $4,000.

That was the beginning.

Without any formal education—he completed the seventh grade—it is conceded by most who know him that Julius Abernethy can read a financial statement faster and more accurately than a Harvard economist.

It is doubtful he knows his actual net worth.

He told the Reporter: "I never consider I have any money as long as I owe the bank a couple of million dollars. I always give them more collateral than they want and I say, take some more, take some more. I give them three or four for one. And they say, don't ay that note, it is the best note we have in the bank."

About the value of keeping a stockholder happy, he says: "While I will never object to raising the wages of labor, it is just as important to keep a company's stockholders happy. Dissatisfied stockholders can hurt a company as much as dissatisfied labor."

Joshua B. Everett of Louisville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article about Joshua B. Everett, of Louisville, Ky. He is one of Kentucky's distinguished citizens. The article was published in the Louisville Times of December 26, 1964.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEOPLE YOU SHOULD KNOW—"JOSH" EVERETT, LOOK ALIKE OF HITCHCOCK, IS A DIRECTOR, TOO

(By Helen Leopold)

The manager of Bentley's, a swank London restaurant, stopped at the oyster bar to greet a familiar-looking patron.

"How did you like the Dover sole that I airmailed you to Hollywood last week, Mr. Hitchcock?" the manager asked.

The patron looked blank.

"But you are Mr. Hitchcock?" the manager insisted.

Joshua Burgess Everett, of Louisville, enjoys telling what a hard time he had proving that he wasn't Alfred Hitchcock, the famous British movie director. The incident occurred on one of Everett's annual trips to England.

Everett shares more than a passing resemblance to the jowled Hitchcock, with his round eyes and triumphant manner.

He is also a born director—though his theater of operation is far removed from Hitchcock's macabre themes.

HE'S AN ORGANIZER

Everett concentrates on running organizations of every conceivable kind—business, welfare, civic, and social.

And he does so with an admitted sense of drama.

"I dramatize everything that I possibly can. Always have. Love to roll out the red carpet whenever it's possible," he said.

"Josh" Everett, who was born and reared in Maysville, Ky., has been an international banker (as a vice president of the Bankers Trust Co., with main headquarters in New York and London).

When he retired in 1941 due to ill health, he planned to rusticate as a country squire and run his farms around Maysville.

But Gov. Simeon Willis "dug him out," he said, and Everett became the unsalaried chairman of the State department of welfare and other related agencies.

Everett has been connected with a number of businesses here and in New York City and has been involved in no less than 31 civic, cultural, and welfare organizations as diverse as mental health, ballet, and projecting plans for developing Louisville's waterfront.

Everett is a past president of the community chest and the Louisville Park Theatrical Association, and next week retires as president of the 48-year-old Louisville Industrial Foundation after 16 years as its head.

WOULDN'T THINK OF RETIRING

But retirement is a word missing from Everett's extensive and expressive vocabulary. The 70-year-old executive will probably be as busy as he was before.

He is still president of the Kentucky Branch of the English Speaking Union and last month was honored at an investiture at the British Embassy in Washington, D.C. He was presented by British Ambassador Lord Harlech, with the O.B.E., making his a Commander of the Most Illustrious Order of the British Empire.

This award was ordered by Queen Elizabeth II in recognition of Everett's outstanding accomplishments as the E.S.U. president.

Membership has increased from 260 to more than 900 during Everett's years in office. exchange scholarships have been increased, and a formidable list of ambassadors and other diplomats have made Louisville's E.S.U. meetings outstanding in the United States and the Commonwealth.

"I've certainly got myself into a lot of things," Everett said.

"It's mainly because I like contact with people. Then I like to take over things that need to be pulled together. It's no fun when they're well-oiled.

"I also like to put things on a sound fiscal basis. I'm first and foremost a banker, you know."

DISPLEASED BY INEFFICIENCY

Inefficiency can make him roar with displeasure.

Anything that impedes progress is hard for him to endure. This attitude even includes the weather. He admits that heat "undoes" him; cold and rain, sleet and snow are incredible nuisances, and he flatly refuses to drive his car unless the streets are clear.

Frequently he is pacified by his pretty, gray-haired wife whom he married in 1957, when he was a 62-year-old bachelor.

He said that "marrying my wife, Grace, was the smartest thing I ever did in my life. I love a home. Always have. Had one when I was a bachelor.

"Grace is a wonderful woman. She and I have a wonderful time. We laugh at the same things. Only trouble is, she's no walker. When we travel she complains that I wear her out. I like to poke around when I'm away."

The Everetts go to England every May, and take several trips to New York each year, mainly for the theater, of which he is particularly fond.

The Everetts' apartment at the Willow Terrace underscores his personality. In the large, green living room is a Princeton chair (he is a loyal alumnus, class of 1918, and an enthusiastic supporter of the Triangle Club, of which he was a member).

In a living room cabinet are models of almost every ship on which he has crossed the Atlantic (which is about 60 times).

In his small study are photographs of his family, including his parents, the late Mr. and Mrs. John Chenoweth Everett of Maysville, and nieces and nephews and their young.

PROUD OF AWARD FROM UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

There are certificates and other memorabilia which line the walls from floorboard to ceiling.

Everett is especially proud of the Sullivan Medallion, the University of Kentucky award for outstanding service to the State. This was given in 1945 in recognition of Mr. Everett's work as chairman of the State board of welfare, under Governor Willis, from 1944 to 1948.

When he resigned at the end of Willis' term, a Courier-Journal editorial called Everett's tenure "the end of an era."

It pointed up his nonpolitical moves; his initiation of studies, and effort to make progressive changes during the difficult war and postwar years.

For example, a newspaper story said that under Everett's regime youngsters at the Kentucky Children's Home in Lyndon were "better housed, better cared for and better educated" than at any previous time.

A total of $400,000 worth of work was done at the home, with new buildings constructed mainly of scrap materials and leftovers from other institutions.

Everett even pinch-hit as superintendent (sans salary) of the institution for a few months, when no one could be found to replace the superintendent who left to take another job.

Let the People Decide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court decision on State legislative apportionment came as a blow to the long-recognized right of the States to determine the manner in which their legislatures should be constituted.

An editorial in the current issue of the Farm Journal points out that the people of our country are faced with one of the most momentous decisions in the history of our Republic on this question.

The editorial, citing means available by which the citizens can recapture their right to determine how their legislatures are to be made up, follows:

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

This year will see us make one of the most momentous decisions in the history of our Republic:

Will the people, who are sovereign in this country, retain the right to decide how their own State legislatures are to be made up or will they have such crucial decisions handed to them by a few judges?

That is the real issue in the battle on reapportionment which has followed the unprecedented decision of the U.S. Supreme Court last June.

It is not primarily a battle over whether rural America or urban America is to control the legislatures—although it is that, surely enough. More basically it is a question of whether the people are to have a choice, whatever that choice may be.

All power has rested with the people in this country from the days of the Pilgrims. The Revolutionary War was fought over that principle. The Declaration of Independence said that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed" (not from Court decree). The U.S. Constitution recognizes the primacy of the people. So does every State constitution in the land.

But now, by a 6 to 3 split decision, the Court upsets an American system of government worked out over a period of 250 years. These omniscient men say in effect that our American system has been a farce from the start. By this logic our U.S. Senate must still be an absurdity.

To see what this means, consider the recent case of Colorado. In 1962 Colorado citizens, in popular referendum, rejected a plan of basing both houses of the legislature on population only. In 1964 they voted instead to have the senate represent, to a degree, diverse geographic areas. Even the county that included Denver voted for it. This was the way the people of Colorado, knowing Colorado, wanted it. But that did not matter. An allwise Court said they could not have it that way, thus setting itself up as bigger than the people.

Some States will want apportionment based one way, some another. Naturally so—their situations vary greatly. This is a political decision, and as such is the province of the people—not of a few judges.

Well, is this the way we want to leave it? If so, we do not realize what has happended or we are a different breed of Americans than our forefathers.

There is just one thing to be done now: Pass a constitutional amendment taking the matter out of the Court's hands and giving it back to the people.

An amendment can come about in two ways:

1. Two-thirds of both Houses of Congress can pass an amendment and send it to the States. Three-fourths of them then must ratify it.

Last session the House passed a bill directing the courts to keep hands off. The Senate would have passed another bill asking for a stay had not four Senators with big city constituencies filibustered it to death late in the session.

In this session Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, and Congressman MCCULLOCH, Democrat, of Ohio, are introducing a constitutional amendment early enough to wear out any filibuster. It can get the necessary two-thirds majority if Congress hears from you and your organizations back home.

2. There is another method, little known. If two-thirds of the State legislatures ask Congress to call a Constitutional Convention it is obliged to do so. A uniform resolution to expedite concerted action has been submitted to every legislature. Urge yours to pass it—this may be your best hope.

Write your State legislators and your U.S. Senators and Congressmen. See that your organizations pass strong resolutions and send them. Do it at once—the need is immediate. Let us not be the generation that lets courts be bigger than the people.

Baltimore's Second Cardinal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I believe many of my colleagues in the Congress share with me the pride and joy all Marylanders felt when Pope Paul VI announced the elevation of the Most Reverend Lawrence Joseph Shehan to cardinal, a prince of the Roman Catholic Church. I take this opportunity to invite all the Members' attention to an excellent article written by Cherrill Anson entitled "Baltimore's Second Cardinal," which appeared in the Baltimore Sun on Sunday, January 31, 1965.

Baltimore is the oldest Catholic diocese in the United States and has been signally honored in having one of her most illustrious sons selected as the only American among the 27 newly named cardinals.

People of every faith are gratified that Archbishop Shehan has been so recognized because of his great humanism, his outstanding knowledge and ability as well as his unbounded love for mankind. In 1963 the archbishop established a precedent by addressing 100 Episcopal clergymen in a Protestant church and, on February 14, 1965, he will become the first Baltimore archbishop to speak to a Jewish group when he addresses the Chizuk Amuno congregation in its synagogue in our city.

At the council in Rome, Archbishop Shehan, as a member of the Vatican Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity, supported the adoption of a declaration affirming that Jews and other non-Christians had no special guilt for the death of Jesus Christ.

In the interest of furthering love and understanding between all religions and in the spirit of brotherhood, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the very informative article I referred to, "Baltimore's Second Cardinal," which is as follows:

BALTIMORE'S SECOND CARDINAL

(By Cherrill Anson)

Baltimoreans abroad on Charles Street on a spring afternoon 45 years ago could have noted, making their way north, two slight, black-dressed figures: the elder equipped with walking stick, a scarlet skullcap peeking from beneath his hat. James Cardinal Gibbons, frail but active at 85, was out for the daily constitutional which had already become a part of the city's folklore.

The promising 22-year-old seminarian who was by his side that day had reason last week to recall the stroll. The Most Reverend Lawrence Joseph Shehan, cardinal-designate, for the past 3 years Archbishop of the See of Baltimore and soon to become the second prince of the church assigned to it in its 176-year history, remembers that his rector at St. Mary's Seminary had sent him that day to accompany the aging prelate, who died the following year.

The two walked the mile to North Avenue, then turned south on Calvert Street. "He was such a kind, thoughtful man," Cardinal-Designate Shehan remembers of his predecessor, who was known during his lifetime as the country's most distinguished Catholic churchman. "He had the ability to establish personal rapport and to confer personal marks of affection. We stopped at a Calvert Street home where there was illness, and while I sat in the parlor His Eminence went upstairs to visit the sickroom."

"The talk that afternoon was of books," the 66-year-old prelate reminisced Tuesday, brown eyes reflective behind rimless trifocals, the vividness of the magenta skullcap against his white hair making him a striking figure. "Cardinal Gibbons asked if I had read 'The Faith of Our Fathers,' which he had written. I was glad to be able to say that I had. And he gave me some good, fatherly advice. I was preparing to leave that fall for Rome, where I was to finish my theological studies."

RITES IN ROME

On February 22 the Baltimore-born clergyman will once again be in Rome. This time he will be the only American to be elevated in a colorful consistory during which Pope Paul VI will hold above his head the flat red hat with its 2 clusters of 15 tassels which symbolizes the authority of the members of the Sacred College of Cardinals.

The elevation of Archbishop Shehan and 26 others whose names were announced Monday will bring to 103 the strength of what has been called the Papal Senate, by whom and from whose ranks popes have been elected since 1179.

Archbishop Shehan will become the 6th living U.S. cardinal and the 14th native-born wearer of the red hat in the history of American Catholicism, which began in Baltimore in 1789. The Baltimore archdiocese now takes in most of Maryland's western shore, serving 500,000 souls.

Within the local church hierarchy, the cardinal-designate is considered a moderate progressive, possibly not as eager to experiment or to make changes as Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston or Joseph Cardinal Ritter of St. Louis; but far from being as slow to depart from the status quo as James Cardinal McIntyre of Los Angeles. He is most open to new ideas when they are presented as logical developments of traditional concepts. In his position as a bridge between points of view, he is considered to be rather similar to Pope Paul himself, as well as like Cardinal Gibbons, who was known as a mediator.

NO STANDING ON DIGNITY

The third child and second son of the six children of Thomas Patrick Shehan and Anastasia Dames Schofield, has a reputation for acting with dignity without standing on it. To Catholic visitors the cardinal-designate offers a quick handshake in an effort to ward off the traditional obeisance of genuflection and ring kissing.

The adjectives used most generally to describe him fall into two constellations. One concerns a man innocent and uncomplicated of temperament but not altogether predictable; gentlemanly, tactful, self-effacing, scholarly, courteous, personally undemanding, shy but accessible. To this category belongs the archbishop who made a practice of hearing Saturday afternoon confessions and delivering Sunday morning sermons at the Cathedral of Mary Our Queen. (The cardinal will probably continue to do so.) To it, also, belong the willing speaker, fond of weaving into his own addresses the lofty, polished, 19th-century prose of John Henry Cardinal Newman, and the Vatican Ecumenical Council delegate who walks the streets of Rome as a simple priest would, without a special show of color at his throat to mark his rank.

The second cluster of descriptives tells of a gifted, vigorous executive who has negotiated the financing of a $24 million high school building program since assuming the archbishopric; the articulate spokesman for the thoughtful consideration of pivotal renovation in the life and operating structure of the 600-million member Roman Catholic Church, who emerged as a figure of international importance in three sessions of the Vatican Ecumenical Council; and the moral leader whose quiet strength of conviction has put a new face on archdiocesan involvement with movements for civil rights and Christian unity. A man who takes no vacations, who lives and breathes his job, who is congenial but no "hale fellow" is the picture drawn.

SHEHAN'S LAW OF RETURNS

Humor, however, is not excluded from the portrait. The cardinal-designate once delighted an audience by postulating "Shehan's law of increasing returns," a reference to the fact that he stands just a few inches over 5 feet. In fundraising, he told them, this has been an asset. "The law," he said, is this: "The smaller the resources, the more abundant the returns—up to a point." Or, in his case, "the smaller the individual, the more likely he is to receive help from others."

The story of Catholic education in the Archdiocese of Baltimore since December 8, 1961, when he became archbishop by right of succession on the death of Archbishop Keough, would seem to prove the cardinal-designate's point.

The new archbishop, who had been a prize student himself and who had always taken the deepest interest in education, inherited a school system which lacked enough physical facilities to take care of its needs. The most striking deficiency was in the area of secondary instruction. Only 45 percent of the graduates of parochial elementary schools were being accommodated in Catholic high schools.

That figure, now up to 70 percent of the girl graduates and 60 percent of the boys, will undoubtedly be even higher by the fall of 1967 or 1968. By that time it is hoped that the last of seven $3,500,000 high schools will be in operation. The first of the group, Bishop John Carroll High School in Bel Air, opened last September as the first "coinstitutional" secondary facility in the archdiocese. It employs a modified form of coeducation which is finding favor with Catholic educators: Boys and girls are instructed in separate wings linked by an administrative unit, but join each other for the use of science, library, chapel, and cafeteria facilities.

Although Archbishop Shehan opposed the Kennedy aid-to-education bill, he is interested in supporting the $1,255 million Johnson measure, which last week was given the Justice Department stamp of constitutionality.

By attempting to aid the child, rather than the school, the latter seems to have found a way around the church-state deadlock. It suggests that public and private school children (parochial school students among them) might share educational centers which would provide "supplementary services" such as chemistry and language labs, using the facilities at different hours or on different days. Another part of the bill proposes that books and other instructional materials might be provided for needy parochial, private, and public school students.

"The Catholic hierarchy has been struggling to reach this point for 10 years," the cardinal-designate commented. "The proposed legislation would establish the right of children in private and parochial schools to receive help given to education generally."

SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Providing physical plants for the needs of a combined secondary and elementary school population of 77,000 which is expected to reach 87,000 by 1968 is big business, as is the construction of the entire range of facilities needed for Catholic life.

Archbishop Shehan has turned the very massiveness of Catholic institutional construction, which runs into many millions of dollars each year, into a weapon in the archdiocesan antidiscrimination arsenal.

As of June 1963, contractors doing business with the archdiocese have been required not to discriminate against an applicant for employment because of race, religion, color, or national origin. The first contract to include this clause was that of the $3 million Catholic Center office building, which will open soon at Mulberry and Cathedral Streets.

The war against racial injustice among his communicants, which Archbishop Shehan considered the most pressing of the issues which faced him at the end of 1961, has been carried out in his characteristic manner: undramatic, stubborn, efficient.

Early in 1962 and without fanfare, parochial school outings in segregated Gwynn Oak Park were banned. When Fourth of July demonstrations were held at the park in 1963, Catholic priests accounted for the largest single body of clerical demonstrators, with the archbishop's knowledge and consent. The next month he personally participated in the giant civil rights march in Washington and in October archdiocesan representatives made a strong plea for the passage of the city public accommodations law. (The law was eventually passed, but wtihout an open occupancy clause.)

COMMITMENT TO EQUALITY

In January 1964, the working details of an archepiscopal directive to Baltimore's four Catholic hospitals, which called for equal treatment of patients, equal opportunities for medically qualified physicians to obtain staff privileges and nondiscrimination in the acceptance of applicants for nursing schools, were calmly negotiated. That March the archbishop contributed the weight of religious opinion which helped to get a statewide public accommodations law passed by the legislature. And in April the archbishop was one of the principal speakers at a rally of more than 5,000 Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders who met at Washington's Georgetown University in an effort to spur Senate passage of the Federal civil rights bill.

The manifesto of the archbishop's civil rights commitment occupied the entire front page of the Catholic Review on March 1, 1963. Presented in the form of a sometimes sharply phrased lenten pastoral letter, it chastised timid legislators and banned all practices of racial discrimination in Catholic schools, churches, social organizations and charitable institutions.

Although its most immediate effect was to open all Catholic services to the 42,000 Negroes of the archdiocese on a nonsegregated basis, the letter is considered to have had an even broader impact. Although it is an article of moral persuasion rather than a political edict, it could be construed as a continuing goad to the consciences of the Catholic majority in city council; in addition to standing as an example for the non-Catholic community.

Ranking as a consuming passion of the archbishop's last 3 years, along with the struggle for civil rights, has been his involvement as a leading North American exponent of ecumenism.

Ecumenism is the powerful drive toward religious reunification which has emerged in the past few years, stirring advocates of many faiths and traditions to reexamine ancient barriers and to grope toward an aware-

ness of the essential oneness of spiritual experience.

The concept embraces the improvement of Roman Catholicism's relations with non-Christians, although its most obvious goal is the ending of schisms which rent the church painfully hundreds of years ago.

APPROVAL OF HIS WORK

Of his designation as cardinal by Pope Paul, Archbishop Shehan says: "The honor would not have come if there were not approval of my work in racial justice and Christian unity."

In the latter field the work began less than a month after his succession to the archbishopric with the establishment of the first Archdiocesan Unity Commission in the United States.

The commission sponsors an elaborate program of ecumenical instruction ranging from special prayers said by the youngest schoolchildren to college credit courses to a Protestant-Catholic television program to a speakers bureau.

The cardinal-designate himself shattered precedent at the beginning of 1963 by becoming the first Catholic archbishop in Baltimore to address a meeting of Protestant Episcopal clergy. He stood firm on Catholic doctrine but offered the very fact of his presence as a donation to the ecumenical cause.

"Ten years ago, I can't imagine myself being invited to address a group like this," he told more than 100 clergymen of the Episcopal Diocese of Maryland gathered at St. Michael and All Angels Church parish home. "And," he added with a smile, "I can't imagine myself having accepted."

When he addresses a brotherhood gathering soon in the auditorium of Chizuk Amuno congregation on the subject of the first Vatican Ecumenical Council in 92 years, he will become the first Baltimore archbishop to speak to a Jewish group under synagogue auspices.

SCORES ANTI-SEMITISM

On September 28 in Rome the cardinal-designate addressed a powerful condemnation of anti-Semitism to the council. The influential Vatican Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity, of which he is a member, prepared the document on ecumenism which was adopted at the last session of the Vatican Council, as well as two other significant declarations which await the final attention of the fourth and last session, scheduled to open September 14. One asserts the right of religious liberty; the other denies that Jews and other non-Christians hold any special guilt for the death of Christ.

On October 22 he told the assembled council delegates that "the question of the morality of modern warfare should be dealt with openly and without any ambiguity or any kind of equivocation"; and that, regarding the thorny problem of family planning, the council should express in unmistakable terms the church's ardent desire to consult with "true experts, both lay and clerical." A dialog between the church and the world, he said, would not endanger the doctrine of the church.

The cardinal-designate's unsuccessful fight last spring with the Maryland Board of Public Welfare over the exemption of Catholic caseworkers from the obligation of referring non-Catholic married clients in need of child spacing advice to clinics would seem to exclude him from the ranks of extreme liberals in the field of birth control. But his awareness of and sympathy for family problems is reflected in a plan which he revealed the other day as he sat in the drawing room of the archiepiscopal residence at Mulberry and Charles Streets.

The plan is to set up, probably in each Catholic hospital, a family planning clinic which would bring a battery of services to bear on family problems. The staff would offer instruction in the rhythm system and would also minister to emotional difficulties. The prelate stated that he had "every intention" of seeing that a pilot clinic was established in the near future, possibly by spring.

Partly for the sake of convenience and partly as an act of faith in the central city, Archbishop Shehan moved in August from the rectory at Mary Our Queen (where he still spends weekends) to the old Archbishop's house at 408 North Charles. Here he rises by 5 a.m. to read (history is his specialty), study, and offer devotions. Luckily, since they already occupy him until midnight, his duties will not be increased as a result of his elevation. He sometimes drives his own car, smokes cigars moderately, and watches TV news programs after dinner. He gets his haircuts at Sam's barber shop on St. Paul Place, where he waits his turn among the other customers.

BORN IN ROWHOUSE

Born in a rowhouse at 2439 Greenmount Avenue (then York Road), the cardinal-designate moved with his family when he was young to a house in a semirural area at No. 3 Kennedy Lane, now Kennedy Avenue. The home was next to that of his paternal grandparents, Daniel Shehan, of Limerick, and Mary Kelly, of Galway, who met on the boat from Ireland, married and set up a dairy farm in a pocket of country about 1850.

The clergyman's grandmother, who was in charge of the sale of the milk and butter, set him to driving the milk cart and making deliveries when he was 10 or 11; he also delivered newspapers. About this time the family moved to 334 East 25th Street, convenient to St. Ann's Church at Greenmount and 22d Street, where the second Shehan son had been an altar boy for several years.

While making a fine record at St. Ann's school he felt his calling for the church grow, encouraged by Msgr. Cornelius Thomas, pastor of St. Ann's. The question of his future came to a head when he won a scholarship to St. Charles College, a Catonsville presseminary, at the end of grammar school.

"My family thought 13 was young to leave home, but they were not really in a financial position to turn the scholarship down," the future cardinal recalls. Thomas Shehan supported his wife and children comfortably by serving as an agent for a manufacturer of tailor's supplies, but the family was by no means wealthy.

After he was ordained in Rome in 1922, the 24-year-old priest became the curate of his mentor, Monsignor Thomas, who was then pastor of St. Patrick's Church in downtown Washington.

Father Shehan became a depression era director of Washington Catholic charities; Monsignor Shehan was named pastor of St. Patrick's after Monsignor Thomas died in 1941; Bishop Shehan was consecrated in 1945. During his 23 years in Washington, the young clergyman struck up a close relationship with the present Vatican secretary of state, Amleto Cardinal Cicognani, then apostolic delegate to the United States. Cardinal Cicognani, who holds the most important post in the external administration of the church and has been credited with preparing a warm welcome for the Baltimorean at the Vatican, used to polish his English by attending the cardinal-designate's lucid sermons.

NAMED COADJUTOR

In 1945 young Bishop Shehan came home to be made auxiliary to Archbishop Curley and pastor of SS. Philip and James' Church on North Charles Street. After Archbishop Curley's death in 1947, he became auxiliary to his successor, Archbishop Keough, at the latter's request. He left this post in 1953 to do a dynamic job of organizing the new diocese of Bridgeport, Conn. From this position he was recalled in 1961 to serve the ailing Archbishop Keough as coadjutor, with the right of succession.

Although as a practicing intellectual humanist he may be thought of as a citizen of the world, the future cardinal sounds gratified as he says that he "knows of no likelihood that Baltimore will lose him" because of his elevation. The city of which he is so fond is the home of his surviving sister and brothers: Miss Mary Shehan, a retired Federal employee; J. Brooks Shehan, the sales manager of a petroleum company, and Dr. Daniel Shehan, a dentist.

Of his native city, the name of which he pronounces with the faintest whisper of a "Baltimore accent," the future cardinal has said: "Those who just pass through, or remain briefly, may see only the defects which lie on the surface. Those who stay to become part of the living whole are conscious of its less obvious but deeper and more enduring attractions.

Adjust the Fine Tuning on the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a reaction to the President's Great Society which appeared in the Compton Post, Compton, Calif., on January 27, 1965. The editor, Hank Watton asks for a few definitions to supply us with a clearer picture so that we can "tune in" on the whole program. The editorial follows:

ADJUST THE TUNING ON THE GREAT SOCIETY

Much has been said and written about President Johnson's Great Society. While the title leaves us a bit cold, we might warm up to the idea if the picture was a little clearer. At the moment the image is a little distorted.

If Mr. Johnson means by Great Society that private enterprise is to be encouraged to expand and develop its resources to the extent every person who is willing to work may have a job under our system, then we are for it. But if he means that the Government must demand more from the willing worker so that those who shudder at the word "work" may live in high fashion, then we are against it.

If the President means an education for every student who is willing to work for it; willing to study and help himself through college; be given an opportunity to attend the college of his choice in accordance with the rules and regulations of the college, then we are for it. But if he means an effortless education with preferential treatment going to the willy-nilly; with unlimited aid going to schools at the cost of the long arm of the Federal Government directing the show; and private schools being swallowed up in the public system, then we oppose it.

If the Great Society means helping a willing but unfortunate man caught in a moment of need between jobs; help until he can stand on his own two feet and again support his family, then we applaud the idea. But if he means an open invitation to seek ways of being put on the relief rolls because the dole is better than the wage, then we are not with the President.

If Mr. Johnson means an opportunity for every American family to own a home and chunk of the good earth by education, jobs

through private enterprise, encouragement of savings and other constitutional means, then we should back him 100 percent. But if he means an exchange of freedoms and the taking from those who have worked hard and managed to accumulate under our system and pass it out to those who feel the "Government owes them a home," then, in our opinion he is wrong.

If he means the sharing of our brains and business like cooperation with other nations of the world so that they, too, may rise up and become a better place for people; if this is what he means, we like it. But if he means that our country must become a mecca for the world's people who seek unlimited charity at the expense of our sovereignty and our 200-year-old principles and economic system, then we would have to oppose the idea.

The hazy picture which we see of the proposed Great Society seems to be a fair production. Mr. Johnson should adjust the fine tuning, enabling all of us to get a clear picture. If he cannot do this, then perhaps Congress should do a litle editing and repairing. We do not object to joining the Great Society but we must first examine the goals, methods, and costs. So please, Mr. President, adjust the fine tuning.

Hospital Insurance, Social Security, and Public Assistance of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to insert into the RECORD an analysis of the background and provisions of H.R. 1—medical care under social security—prepared by Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Few men come more qualified to discuss this great extension of social security. Mr. Cohen acted as the Assistant to the Executive Director of President Roosevelt's Cabinet Committee on Economic Security which drafted the original social security law. He served as technical adviser to the Commission on Social Security from 1935 until 1952, in charge of program development and legislative coordination.

He is presently on leave from the University of Michigan where he is a professor of public welfare administration in the school of social work.

Wilbur Cohen is an author and recognized expert, a genius, in my opinion, in his field. He has received an impressive list of awards from various organizations in the social welfare field and has been honored with an honorary doctorate from Adelphi College.

I confidently submit this analysis for the consideration of the House:

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF HOSPITAL INSURANCE, SOCIAL SECURITY, AND PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1965

A. HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

1. Eligibles (over 18 million persons):

(a) Persons aged 65 and over who are eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits (numbering about 16⅔ million).

(b) Other persons who are aged 65 and over (about 2 million) or who will reach age 65 within the next few years, but with the cost for them being paid from general revenues.

2. Benefits (payable July 1, 1966, except for posthospital extended care):

(a) Payment of up to 60 days of hospital care, with the patient paying a deductible amounting to the national average cost of 1 day of care.

(b) Payment of up to 60 days of posthospital care in extended-care facilities upon transfer from the hospital.

(c) Payment of all costs above a modest deductible (one-half the deductible for hospital care) for outpatient hospital diagnostic services furnished within a 30-day period.

(d) Payment of all costs for up to 240 visits a year by visiting nurses and other health workers in the patient's own home.

3. Financing:

(a) A completely separate hospital insurance trust fund established in the Treasury: The trust fund would be separate from the existing old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and disability insurance trust fund. The following percentages of covered earnings would be earmarked for the separate hospital insurance trust fund:

[In percent]

Year	Employer	Employee	Total	Self-employment
1966	0.30	0.30	0.60	0.45
1967–68	.38	.38	.76	.57
1969 and after	.45	.45	.90	.675

The contributions beginning in January 1966 would enable a fund to be built up before benefits became payable. It is estimated that the fund would be about $600 millon as of July 1, 1966.

(b) Actuarial status of the fund: The contributions provided in the bill for hospital insurance have been determined by the chief actuary of the Social Security Administration to be sufficient to cover all the costs of the benefits (and administration) for persons entitled to social security benefits. The actuarial estimates are based on the assumptions recommended by the advisory council on social security that hospital costs will continue to rise faster than earnings for the next 10 years.

(c) Illustrative costs: The social security contributions to be set aside for hospital insurance during 1967–68 and during 1969 and later years would be as follows:

Hospital insurance cost

1967–68

Annual earnings	Weekly	Monthly	Annually
$4,000	$0.29	$1.27	$15.20
$4,800	.35	1.52	18.24
$5,000	.37	1.58	19.00
$5,600	.41	1.77	21.88
1969 AND AFTER			
$4,000	$0.35	$1.50	$18.00
$4,800	.42	1.80	21.60
$5,000	.43	1.88	22.50
$5,600	.48	2.10	25.20

4. Administration: By the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through the social security program. Hospitals could elect to be represented by a private organization (such as Blue Cross) to negotiate their contracts. The secretary could also delegate to such organization the functions of receiving payments from the social security program.

Payments would be made to hospitals and other providers of services on a cost basis. The cost of hospital services would be based on semiprivate accommodations (two-, three- or four-bed rooms).

5. Complementary private insurance: The bill authorizes creation of an association of private insurance carriers to sell, on a nonprofit basis, approved policies covering health costs not covered under the social security plan. Participating carriers would be exempt from antitrust laws.

B. SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

1. Social security benefits would be increased by 7 percent. Thus, the minimum benefit payable to workers retiring at 65 would be increased immediately from $40 to $42.80 per month; the maximum old-age or disability insurance benefit would be increased from $127 to $135.90. The 7-percent increase for the 20 million present social security beneficiaries would amount to approximately $1.3 billion a year.

2. Benefit increases would be paid retroactively to January 1, 1965. If the law were enacted in June 1965, for example, this would result in retroactive payments of about $750 million in the fall of 1965.

3. The maximum annual earnings on which contributions and benefits are figured would be increased from $4,800 to $5,600 a year, effective January 1, 1966. This would increase to $149.90 the maximum benefits payable to workers retiring or becoming disabled in the future. The maximum family benefit would be increased from the present $254 a month to $312.

4. The social security contribution schedule (combined for social security cash and hospital benefits) would be changed to the following:

[In percent]

Year	Employer	Employee	Self-employed
1966–67	4.25	4.25	6.4
1968–70	5.0	5.0	7.5
1971 and after	5.2	5.2	7.8

5. Self-employed physicians would be covered. For employees who receive tips in the course of their employment, those tips amounting to $20 or more a month would count as wages.

C. WELFARE AMENDMENTS

Several changes in laws governing the Nation's public assistance programs are proposed as part of the bill now before Congress. Under the bill, these changes would be effective January 1, 1966.

Increase in Federal assistance share

The bill would increase the Federal Government's share in expenditures by States for the following public assistance categories: Old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to families with dependent children.

The basic Federal share of payments for old-assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled would be increased from twenty-nine thirty-fifths of the first $35 to thirty-one thirty-sevenths of the first $37 expended for each recipient. The maximum amount in which the Federal Government shares would be raised from $70 to $75 per recipient per month. The Federal share of payments above the first $37 would vary from 50 to 65 percent, as now, depending on each State's per capita income.

In the aid to families with dependent children program, the Federal share would go up from fourteen-seventeenths of the first $17 to five-sixths of the first $18. The maximum amount in which the Federal Government shares would be raised from $30 to $32 per recipient per month. The Federal share of payments above the first $18 would vary

from 50 to 65 percent, as now, depending on the State's per capita income.

The above amounts are based on average payments, not on the payment to an individual recipient.

A State would receive additional Federal funds resulting from these changes in the formulas only to the extent that its total expenditures for public assistance during any quarter exceeded such expenditures for an average quarter of fiscal year 1965.

The cost of these changes would be about $75 million for the last 6 months of fiscal year 1966.

Exempt income for the aged

The present law permits States to exempt up to $30 per month (the first $10 plus half of the next $40) of earnings of old-age assistance recipients from consideration as income when computing their grants.

This bill would increase that exemption to a maximum of $50 per month (the first $20 plus half of the next $60).

The cost of this change would be about $38 million for the last 6 months of fiscal year 1966.

Federal participation in assistance to persons in TB or mental factilities

Another provision of the bill would remove the present restriction in the Federal law which precludes Federal sharing in public assistance payments for aged recipients who are patients in institutions for tuberculosis or mental diseases.

The cost of this provision would be about $500,000 during fiscal year 1966.

At present, the only allowable Federal sharing is for up to 42 days of care for aged patients in general hospitals who have been diagnosed as TB or mental cases.

The bill provides that States wishing to take advantage of the additional Federal funds will be obliged to use them to increase expenditures for mental health purposes through public health or public welfare programs.

Protective payments

The bill also permits States to make protective payments—that is, payments to interested third parties—on behalf of needy aged, blind, or disabled recipients who, because of a physical or mental condition, are unable to manage their money.

At present, Federal sharing in protective payments to these groups is not authorized.

Concurrent OAA and MAA payments

Under present Federal law, there may not be Federal sharing in a payment for medical assistance for the aged if the aged person receives old-age assistance in the same month. The bill would permit such Federal sharing during the month that an aged person entered or left a hospital or nursing home.

The cost would be about $1 million in fiscal year 1966.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL FOR HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED AND FOR CHANGES IN SOCIAL SECURITY AND PUBLIC ASSISTANCE (INTRODUCED IN THE CONGRESS AS H.R. 1 AND S. 1)

TITLE I—HOSPITAL INSURANCE ACT OF 1965

Persons entitled

People age 65 and over who are entitled to monthly benefits under the social security program or under the railroad retirement system would be provided protection beginning July 1, 1966 (January 1, 1967, for posthospital extended care), against the cost of inpatient hospital services, outpatient hospital diagnostic services, posthospital extended care, and home health services. The number of people age 65 and over who would get protection as persons eligible under social security or railroad retirement is estimated at 16⅔ million as of July 1, 1966.

In addition, the bill would make it possible for essentially all people who are now 65 and over, or who will reach 65 in the next few years but who are not eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits, to have the same protection. (This provision would not apply to aliens with relatively short residence in the United States or to active or retired Federal employees who already have the opportunity for protection under Federal employee health insurance plans.) The cost of this provision would be met from general revenues. Men and women who will reach age 65 before 1968 and who do not meet the regular insured status requirements of the social security system would be deemed insured for the hospital and related benefits. People who reach age 65 after 1967 would be insured for hospital and related benefits if they have three quarters of coverage for each year elapsing after 1965 and before the year in which they became 65. The provision would not apply to women who reach age 65 in 1972 (or later) and men who reach age 65 in 1974 (or later) since in those years the number of quarters of coverage that would be required to qualify for hospital benefits would be the same as, or greater than, the number required for social security cash benefits. About 2 million persons would be covered under this provision as of July 1, 1966.

Scope and duration of benefits provided

The services for which payment would be made under the bill include:

1. Inpatient hospital services for up to 60 days with the patient paying a modest deductible amount equal to the average cost of 1 day of hospital care; hospital services would include all those customarily furnished by a hospital for its inpatients; payment would not be made for the hospital services of physicians except those in the fields of pathology, radiology, physical medicine, and anesthesiology provided by or under arrangements made by the hospital, or services provided by an intern or resident-in-training under an approved teaching program;

2. Posthospital extended care for up to 60 days (in a facility having an arrangement with a hospital for the timely transfer of patients and medical information about patients) after the patient is transferred from a hospital;

3. Outpatient hospital diagnostic services subject to a deductible amount (equal to one-half the deductible amount for inpatient hospital services) applied for each 30-day period during which diagnostic services are furnished;

4. Home health services for up to 240 visits during a calendar year (120 visits in 1966) for a home-bound person in the care of a physician and under a plan established by a physician for the use of such services; these services would include intermittent nursing care, therapy, and the part-time services of a home health aid.

No service would be covered as posthospital extended care or as outpatient diagnostic or home health services if it is of a kind that could not be covered if it were furnished to a hospital inpatient.

An individual would be eligible for 60 days of hospital care and 60 days of posthospital extended care in each benefit period. A new benefit period could not begin until 90 days had elapsed in which the patient was neither in a hospital nor in an extended care facility. The 90 days need not be consecutive, but they must fall within a period of not more than 180 consecutive days.

Free choice of physician and hospital

Under the bill, no change would be made in the freedom of choice of physician and hospital. No service performed by any physician at either home or office, and no fee he charges for such services, would be involved or affected. No supervision or control over the practice of medicine by any physician or over the manner in which services are provided by any hospital is permitted.

Basis of reimbursement

Payment of bills for hospital and related services would be made in generally the same manner as is now customary in Blue Cross plans. Payments to the providers of service would be made on the basis of the reasonable cost incurred in providing care for beneficiaries. A provider of services could not charge the beneficiary for services which would be covered under the program, except, of course, that the provider could charge the patient the deductible amounts and extra charges for a private room, unless medically necessary, or private duty nursing.

Administration

Responsibility for administration of the program (except for railroad retirement annuitants and pensioners) would rest with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. But the Secretary would use appropriate State agencies and private organizations to assist in administration. Provision would be made for the establishment of an Advisory Council which would advise the Secretary on policy matters in connection with administration.

The administration of provisions for determining the eligibility of providers of services to participate in the program would be divided among the Federal Government, the States, and private agencies. Under the bill, conditions of participation for providers of services related to health and safety, in addition to those spelled out in the proposal, could be established. Before formulating any such conditions the Secretary would consult with appropriate State agencies and recognized national accrediting bodies. In any case, these conditions for hospitals could not be more strict than those required for accreditation by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals. Accreditation by the joint commission would be accepted as meeting all requirements for hospital participation save the requirement that the hospital have a utilization review plan. State agencies would be used in the administration to inspect the providers of service to determine whether or not they meet the specified conditions and are eligible to participate.

Role of private organizations

Any group of hospitals—or group of other providers of covered services—could designate a private organization of their own choice, such as Blue Cross, to receive bills for services and to pay these bills for whichever of their members prefer such an arrangement. The Secretary would be able to delegate administrative functions involving relationships with hospitals.

Financing

A special hospital insurance trust fund would be established for the program. Into the trust fund would be allocated 0.60 percent of taxable wages paid in 1966; 0.76 percent of taxable wages paid in 1967 and 1968; and 0.90 percent of taxable wages paid in 1969 and thereafter. Allocations of 0.45, 0.57 and 0.675 percent of self-employment income taxable under social security would be made, respectively, in the taxable years 1966, 1967–68, and 1969 and thereafter.

The following examples illustrate the cost of the hospital insurance for the aged program to the employee in 1969 and thereafter (his employer would pay an equal amount): An employee earning $3,000, the average taxable wage per employee in 1963, would pay $13.50 a year; an employee earning $4,000 would pay $18 a year; one earning $4,800 would pay $21.60 a year; and an employee earning $5,600 a year, the maximum earnings subject to contributions under the bill, would pay $25.20 a year.

The cost of providing hospital and related benefits to people who do not meet the

regular social security insured status requirement would be met from general revenues.

Complementary private insurance

The bill authorizes creation of associations of private insurance carriers, exempt from antitrust laws, to sell, on a nonprofit basis, approved policies covering health costs not covered under the social security hospital insurance program.

TITLE II—SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Seven-percent benefit increase

The bill would provide a 7-percent across-the-board benefit increase, effective with respect to all social security insurance benefit payments which would be due for months after December 1964. Increases would go to each of the more than 20 million social security beneficiaries on the rolls.

Contribution and benefit base

Under the bill the maximum amount of earnings that is taxable and creditable for benefits would be increased from $4,800 to $5,600 a year (effective for calendar years after 1965).

One result of this change, taken together with the benefit increase, would be that the maximum benefit amount for a family would be increased to $312 per month when the increase in the earnings base (now $4,800) to $5,600 would have its full effect on benefits. Also, the maximum individual benefit, now $127 at the $400 average monthly earnings level possible on the $4,800 base, would be $149.90 at the $466 average monthly earnings that would be possible on the $5,600 base.

Tax rate

The tax rate schedule under existing law and the revised schedule (including contributions for hospital insurance) that would be provided by the bill follow:

Year	Employee-employer rate (each)		Self-employed rate	
	Present law	Proposal	Present law	Proposal
1966–67	4.125	4.25	6.2	6.4
1968–70	4.625	5.0	6.9	7.5
1971 and after	4.625	5.2	6.9	7.8

Improvement of actuarial status of disability insurance trust fund

The financing of the disability program would be strengthened by allocating an additional 0.17 percent of taxable wages (and a corresponding proportion of taxable self-employment income) to the disability insurance trust fund. Such a reallocation of contribution income would not affect the overall actuarial balance of the program, and would leave both the old-age and survivors insurance and disability insurance trust funds in actuarial balance.

Automatic annual recomputation of benefits

The bill would provide for annual automatic recomputation of benefits to take account of earnings after entitlement.

Coverage provisions

The bill would make several relatively minor changes in existing law with respect to coverage requirements, so as to expand the coverage of the existing social security program in the direction of more universal coverage of all working people. The bill would provide coverage for self-employed doctors of medicine, and would cover interns on the same basis as other employees working for the same employer. And the bill would provide for the coverage, as wages, of cash tips received by an employee in the course of his employment.

TITLE III—PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Increased Federal payments

The matching formula for the needy aged, blind, and disabled (and for the combined program, title XVI) would be revised to provide a Federal share of $31 out of the first $37 (now twenty-nine thirty-fifths of the first $35) of average monthly assistance per recipient and the maximum average matched would be increased to $75 (now $70). The bill would also revise the matching formula for aid to families with dependent children so as to provide a Federal share of five-sixths of the first $18 (now fourteen-seventeenths of the first $17) and would increase the maximum matched to $32 (now $30). A provision is included so that States will not receive additional Federal funds except to the extent total expenditures increase.

Earnings under OAA

The earnings which may be excluded in determining eligibility of the aged for cash assistance would be increased so that a State may, at its option, exempt the first $20 (now $10) and one-half of the next $60 (now $40) of a recipient's monthly earnings.

Removal of mental disease and tuberculosis limitations

The bill would remove the exclusion from Federal matching in old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged programs (and for the combined program, title XVI) as to aged individuals who are patients in institutions for tuberculosis or mental diseases, or who have been diagnosed as having tuberculosis or psychosis and, as a result, are patients in a medical institution. As a condition of Federal participation in such payments to, or for, mental patients, certain agreements and arrangements to assure that better care results from the additional Federal money would be required. The bill provides that States will receive no more in Federal funds under this provision than they increase their expenditures for mental health purposes under public health and public welfare programs.

Eligibility for MAA

The bill would modify the eligibility requirements for medical assistance for the aged so as to allow Federal sharing in MAA with respect to aged recipients of cash assistance in the same month provided it was a month in which they were admitted to or discharged from a medical institution.

Protective payments

The bill would add a provision under which, for protective purposes, payments could be made to third persons on behalf of old-age assistance recipients (and recipients under the combined title XVI program) rather than directly to the recipients when these recipients are unable to manage their money because of physical or mental incapacity.

(Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, January 1965.)

HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED—THE CONSERVATIVE APPROACH

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

It is generally recognized that the problem that older people face in financing the cost of health care has become serious and widespread and presents a grave threat to economic security of the aged in this country. In response to the need to make old age more secure against this threat to economic independence, President Johnson has proposed that the basic hospital and related insurance needs of the aged be financed through social security.

I

Let us review very briefly the thinking behind this proposal.

The social security approach in my opinion offers the most practical mechanism by which people would be able to provide for health costs they will face in old age. It is while they are working that people are best able to contribute toward the cost of health care needed in old age. Under a contributory social security hospital insurance program, specific benefits would be provided as an earned right and the proposed program would avoid the personal indignities associated with means-test programs which classify people who are aided as being too poor to pay their own way. Also, since social security benefits become available while the aged still have resources, the program helps them to preserve their independence throughout their lives. Conversely, under public assistance programs savings must be all but exhausted before help is made available. Once an aged person has exhausted his resources to the point where he can qualify for assistance, it is practically impossible for him to replenish them and again become self-reliant.

I am absolutely opposed to socialized medicine. By that term I mean the Government owning the health facilities and employing the practitioners. I do not consider the administration's proposal to finance hospital insurance through employer and employee contributions a form of socialized medicine since it does not provide for the Government to own or operate the hospitals nor does it provide for the employment by the Government of any of the practitioners. There are, however, many people who sincerely believe that any form of governmental program for the financing of medical care is a form of socialized medicine. If you accept this definition, then the Kerr-Mills program is a form of socialized medicine; and since the American Medical Association supports the Kerr-Mills program, the conclusion must be that the AMA is in favor of socialized medicine. It is for this reason that I do not endorse these broad definitions of socialized medicine but rather adhere to the strict definition I have spelled out above.

I sincerely believe that unless some reasonable method is found to take care of the cost of financing hospital and nursing home care for our elderly citizens, the Congress, the State legislatures, and the people generally are going to find some way to do this which might not be as sensible or sound as using the social security system to finance the costs. In other words, I believe that financing catastrophic hospital and related costs for the elderly through the social security system is a method of preventing socialized medicine. I do not think that the overwhelming majority of American citizens want socialized medicine, nor do I think such a system would work in such a large and diverse country as ours as compared with the homogeneous character of Great Britain and some other countries.

There is nothing very radical about the social security system. As a matter of fact, it is a very conservative approach to dealing with this kind of problem. The social security financing system is based on the idea that the individual will contribute part of the cost of his protection. It thus stresses contributory participation against the free or general revenue or welfare approach embodied in the Kerr-Mills program.

The American Medical Association vigorously supports the Kerr-Mills welfare approach to paying for medical care. But in 1956 when the same idea was being debated in Congress, the American Medical Association was vigorously and firmly opposed to

this step. They said it was needless, wasteful, dangerous, and contrary to the established policy of gradual Federal withdrawal from local public-assistance programs. (Hearings before the House Committee on Ways and Means on "Public Assistance Titles of Social Security Act," 1956, p. 331.)

The Kerr-Mills approach fails to recognize that the problem of health-care protection in old age is not just a problem of the very poor. Even the aged person who has enough income to get along comfortably may suddenly find himself faced with a hospital bill running into thousands of dollars. I believe what is needed is a method to protect the great majority of the aged, who are neither very poor nor very wealthy and who retire with small assets and an income that is just about enough to cover their daily needs.

Hospital insurance under social security would be provided as a right, without regard to a person's savings, private insurance, home ownership, and the like. Protection furnished in this way would permit the aged to protect their assets, protect their self-respect, and to gain comprehensive protection by supplementing the basic social security hospital insurance with private insurance and other resources.

If hospital insurance under social security is adopted, the financial problems the States face in their efforts to aid the needy aged with their medical costs will be greatly reduced. But an adequate Kerr-Mills program that is intended as the main attack on the health-cost program of the aged cannot be financed without a heavy fiscal drain on the States as well as on Federal general revenues. Many States simply cannot afford adequate Kerr-Mills programs for the aged as well as the needy children, the disabled, and the blind without some additional help.

The Kerr-Mills program is a necessary underpinning to all other programs so that any individual who does not have private insurance or social security will still be able to have his medical needs met. It is a residual system. It necessarily uses the welfare approach because it has to take into account the needs of the individual, but it can never be a satisfactory system as a primary approach. It can only be a supplemental system and work reasonably well if it covers only a relatively small number of people. If it has to cover very large numbers of persons then it is my feeling that in the long run the people of this country will rebel against the use of a welfare approach and attempt to find something more satisfactory. One form this reaction might take is to remove the means test entirely, or make it so high that practically everybody over 65 would be covered. If we were to wind up with such a system, a system where the costs are paid from general revenues just like money to build dams, harbors, and new post offices, I do not see how pressures to expand that type of program to cover all costs and all services for more and more people could be resisted. What would be missing is the brake on increasing costs that social security has because you have to raise the employee and employer contribution to pay social security.

The proposal for hospital insurance through social security is a middle-of-the-road approach between those in favor of sole reliance on the welfare approach through Kerr-Mills on the one hand, and socialized medicine on the other. I do not want to be engulfed, nor do I want our Nation to be engulfed, by either the welfare approach or the socialized medicine approach.

The contributory social security program stresses the obligation of the individual to contribute financially to his own security and that of his own family.

While the proposed hospital insurance program for the elderly would by no means provide protection against all of a beneficiary's health costs, it can be expected that once the basic health insurance needs are met under social security, many beneficiaries could, for the first time, afford to make their coverage more nearly complete by purchasing supplemental protection (against the costs of physicians' services, drugs, etc.) from nonprofit and commercial insurance carriers. Like the present social security program, the proposed program would depend upon public assistance to fill in the small and diminishing gap that would not be filled by the combination of protection afforded through social security and the private sector.

II. SUMMARY OF THE HOSPITAL INSURANCE PROPOSAL

Prohibition against any Federal interference

The proposal specifically prohibits the Federal Government from exercising supervision or control over the practice of medicine, the manner in which medical services are provided and the administration or operation of medical facilities.

Free choice by patient guaranteed

The proposal specifically provides that a beneficiary may receive services from any participating provider of his own choice.

Eligibility

The proposal is limited to coverage of the aged because the aged as a group have low incomes and high medical care expenses. Moreover, they are at a period in life where their incomes and assets are more likely to go down than up. Their income is, on the average, about half that of those under 65; at the same time they require three times the hospital care of younger people. Furthermore, since most aged people are not employed they have in general no opportunity to obtain economical group insurance. The individual or nongroup health insurance that may be available to them is about 1½ times as expensive for the same benefits—because of higher acquisition cost, premium collection cost, and other administrative costs—as group insurance would be.

Hospital insurance protection would be provided for all people who are aged 65 and over and entitled to monthly old-age or survivors insurance benefits or to benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. An individual would be eligible for hospital insurance protection at age 65 even though his monthly cash benefits are being withheld because of earnings from work. In addition, protection would be provided, under a special provision of the plan, to many people aged 65 and over who are not eligible for benefits under the social security or railroad retirement systems.

Almost all of the people who will be age 65 and over in July 1966 would be protected under the proposal. The few not protected under the legislation would consist for the most part of retired Federal civilian employees, who have their own health insurance program, and aliens with relatively short residence in the United States. Of the people protected under the proposal, about 16⅔ million would be covered as persons eligible under the old-age and survivors insurance or railroad retirement programs and about 2 million would be protected under the special provision.

Under the special provision, aged people who are not insured for cash benefits under the social security or railroad retirement systems would be deemed insured for hospital and related benefits only. Uninsured people who reach age 65 in 1968 would be deemed to be insured for hospital benefits if they had earned as few as 6 quarters of coverage in covered work at any time—11 fewer quarters of coverage than men of this age need to qualify for cash social security benefits.

For people who reach age 65 in each of the succeeding years, the number of quarters of coverage needed to be insured for hospital insurance protection would increase by three each year. Thus the provision would not apply to women who reach age 65 in 1972 (or later) and men who reach age 65 in 1974 (or later), since in those years the number of quarters that would be required to qualify for hospital benefits would be the same or greater than the number required for social security cash benefits.

The cost of the coverage for aged persons who do not meet the regular insured status requirement of the social security law would be met from general revenues. Thus, the provision of the same hospital benefits for persons who are not fully insured under the social security system would not be inconsistent with the principles upon which the system is based. Funds obtained through the application of social security contributions would be used only to pay benefits of those who have contributed over a sufficient length of time to acquire insured status, and over the long run only persons who make significant contributions would be eligible for benefits.

Benefits provided

The proposal would provide payments for inpatient hospital services, the follow-up care in an extended care facility, certain organized home health agency services and outpatient hospital diagnostic services.

Inpatient hospital services were selected as the point of concentration in the bill because of the great financial strain placed on people who must go to the hospital. Medical expenses for aged people who are hospitalized in a year are about 5 times greater than the annual medical bills of aged people who are not hospitalized, and hospital costs account for the major portion of the difference between the health bills of the hospitalized aged and those not hospitalized. Further, the occurrence of hospitalization one or more times in old age is to be expected. It is estimated that 9 out of every 10 people who reach age 65 will be hospitalized at least once before they die; 2 out of 3 will be hospitalized two or more times. Another reason for placing primary emphasis on protection against the cost of hospital care is that hospital insurance is the part of the protection against health costs on which there is the most experience in this country—through Blue Cross and other Government programs—with the result that adequate models for administration are available.

Services for which payment would be made

Hospital services: The proposed inpatient hospital benefits would (except for the deductible amount) generally cover the full cost of all hospital services and supplies of the kind ordinarily furnished by the hospital which are necessary in the care and treatment of its patients. Up to 60 days of hospital care would be covered. The full coverage of hospital costs follows the recommendations of expert groups studying hospital insurance. As hospitals acquire new equipment, adopt new health practices, and improve their services and techniques, the additional operating costs resulting from such changes would automatically be covered under the proposal without need for modification. Thus, coverage would always be up to date. Furthermore, this built-in responsiveness to changing medical practices and needs would provide assurance that the program would provide the proper financial underpinning to improvements in care.

Posthospital extended care: The proposal provides payments for the cost of posthospital extended care (in a facility having an arrangement with a hospital for timely transfer of patients and medical information about patients) in cases where a hospital inpatient is transferred to such a facility to continue to receive professionally supervised convalescent and rehabilitative care (while under the care of a physician) needed in connection with a condition for which he had been hospitalized. The requirement that the patient had been trans-

ferred from a hospital is one of the measures included in the bill to limit the payment of extended care benefits to persons for whom such care may reasonably be presumed to be the most logical medical step following intensive inpatient hospital care.

Home health care services: Payments would be made for visiting nurse services and for other related home health services when furnished by a public or nonprofit agency in accordance with a plan for the patient's care that is established and periodically reviewed by a physician. Since the nature and extent of the care a patient would receive would be planned by a physician, medical supervision of the home health services furnished by paramedical personnel—such as nurses or physical therapists—would be assured.

Outpatient diagnostic services: In the case of outpatient hospital diagnostic services, payment could generally be made for any tests and related services that are customarily furnished by a hospital to its outpatients for the purpose of diagnostic study. Payment would only be made for the more expensive diagnostic procedures because a deductible amount (equal to one-half the deductible amount for inpatient hospital services) would be applied for each 30-day period during which diagnostic services are furnished.

Patient's need and economy served: The proposal provides payments for posthospital extended care, home health agency services, and outpatient hospital diagnostic studies in order to promote the economical use of hospital inpatient services. In doing so, the proposed legislation would support the efforts of the health professions to limit the use of hospital beds to the acutely ill who need intensive care and to make more efficient use of other health care facilities. Moreover, coverage of these services is consistent with the recommendations made by authorities who have studied the causes and effects of improper utilization of hospital care. For example, the availability of protection against the costs of outpatient hospital diagnostic tests would avoid providing an incentive to use inpatient hospital services in order to obtain coverage of the cost of diagnostic services. The availability of this protection would also give support to preventive medicine by meeting part of the costs of expensive procedures that are essential in the early detection of disease.

Included and excluded services

Payment would be limited to health services which are essential elements of the services provided by hospitals. Since the primary purpose of the proposal is to cover hospital costs and a major reason for the coverage of other services is to provide economical substitutes for hospitalization, the proposed legislation is framed to permit payment for posthospital extended care, home health, and outpatient hospital diagnostic services only to the extent that they could be paid for if furnished to a hospital inpatient. Thus the outer limits on what the proposed program would pay for are set by the scope of inpatient hospital services for which payment could be made. Services covered outside the hosital are more limited than those in the hospital. Following is a description of the various services for which payment would be made under the proposal.

Room and board: Payments would be made for room and board in hospital and extended care facility accommodations. Generally speaking, accommodations for which payment would be made would consist of rooms containing from two to four beds. Covered accommodations are described by number of beds, rather than the frequently used designation of semiprivate. The differences that exist among hospitals in the use of the term "semiprivate" would create an undesirable lack of uniformity of benefits provided if that term were used.

Payments could also be made for more expensive accommodations where their use is medically indicated. Where private accommodations are furnished at the patient's request, the payments that would be made would be the equivalent of the reasonable cost of accommodations containing two to four beds. Room and board would not, of course, be paid for where the beneficiary is receiving care under a home health plan.

Nursing services: Payments would cover all hospital nursing costs, but not private duty nursing. Private duty nursing would not be paid for since it can be expected that the nursing services regularly provided by hospitals and extended care facilities which would participate in the program would almost always adequately meet the nursing needs of their patients.

Payments for home health services would only cover part-time or intermittent nursing care such as that provided by visiting nurses. Where more or less continuing skilled nursing care is needed, an institutional setting is more economical and generally more suitable.

Physicians' services: The cost of physicians' services would not be paid for under the proposal except for the services of hospital interns and residents-in-training, and for the professional component of certain specified ancillary hospital services described below under other health services.

The proposal would cover the cost of the services that hospital interns and residents-in-training furnish but only while they are participants in teaching programs that are approved by the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals or, in the case of an osteopathic hospital, approved by the Committee on Hospitals of the Bureau of Professional Education of the American Osteopathic Association. This coverage of the services of interns and residents is in agreement with the generally accepted principle of hospital payment that third parties should contribute a fair share toward the hospital costs—in large part consisting of educational costs—of interns and residents.

Drugs: Payment could be made for drugs furnished to hospital and extended care facility patients for their use while inpatients. The proposal would provide payment for drugs which are approved by the hospital's pharmacy committee (or its equivalent) or which are listed in the United States Pharmacopeia, National Formulary, New Drugs, or Accepted Dental Remedies. A hospital's drugs must, of course, meet the standards established by these formularies in order for the hospital to be accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation.

The drugs prescribed for a patient as part of his home health care would not be paid for under the proposed program. The decision to exclude the cost of drugs from home health service payments is part of the more basic decision not to provide coverage of drug and other outpatient therapeutic costs under the program. The coverage of drugs outside the institutional setting would, of course, add greatly to the cost of the program and would present exceedingly difficult problems in limiting payment to needed drugs and covering the payment of a multitude of small bills without excessively cumbersome and expensive administration.

Supplies and appliances: Under the proposal, payment would be made for supplies and appliances so long as they are a necessary part of the covered health services a patient receives. For example, the use of a wheelchair, crutches, or prosthetic appliances could be paid for as part of hospital, extended care facility or home health services but payments would not be made for the patient's use of these items upon discharge from the institution or upon completion of the home health plan. Extra items, supplied at the request of the patient for his convenience, such as telephones in hospitals, would not be paid for.

Medical social services: Payments would cover the cost of the medical social services customarily furnished in a hospital, as well as such services furnished in an extended care facility or as part of a home health plan. Such services often perform the important function for the aged of facilitating a return to normal life at home.

Other health services: Payment would be made for the various ancillary services customarily furnished as a part of hospital care, including various laboratory services and X-ray services and use of hospital equipment and personnel. Among the covered services would also be physical, occupational, and speech therapy. Payment for ancillary services would cover the costs of services rendered by physicians in four specialty fields—anesthesiology, radiology, pathology, and physiatry—where the physician furnishes his services to an inpatient as an employee of the hospital or where he furnishes them under an arrangement with the hospital which specifies that payment to the hospital for the services he performs discharges all liability for payment for the services. Thus, whether the services of any particular specialist are covered would depend entirely upon the arrangement between the physician and the hospital. The chart below lists the specific kinds of hospital and related care for which payments could be made and those which would not be covered.

Limitations on payment

The proposal includes a number of limitations on the payment of hospital and related benefits, primarily because of considerations of cost and priorities of need.

The deductible provision and the other limitations on inpatient hospital and posthospital extended care payments would be applied on a benefit period basis. In general, the benefit period would coincide with the beneficiary's episode of illness. Under the proposal, the benefit period would begin with the first day in which the patient receives inpatient hospital services for which payments could be made and would end after the close of a 90-day period during which he was neither an inpatient in a hospital nor an extended care facility; the 90 days need not be consecutive, but they must fall within a period of not more than 180 consecutive days. This limitation is designed to provide a cutoff point in the payment of benefits for persons who are more or less continuously institutionalized persons without, however, denying payment for persons who suffer repeated episodes of serious illness.

Duration of benefits: Inpatient hospital care for as many as 60 days during a benefit period would be covered under the proposal. A maximum of 60 days of posthospital extended care is provided for each benefit period.

Under the proposal, as many as 240 home health visits could be paid for in a calendar year. The limitation placed on the payment of home health benefits is written in terms of visits rather than days. Unlike the institutionalized patient, people receiving home health services do not receive health care on a full-time basis. Home health services involve periodic visits to the patient's home by therapists, nurses, and other professional personnel. The amount of home health service which is covered would be unaffected by whether a variety of services is offered on the same day or different days.

Deductible provisions: Payment for inpatient hospital services during a benefit period would be subject to a deductible

amount equal to the average cost of a day of hospital care.

A deductible of one-half this amount would be applied against payments for diagnostic services furnished within a 30-day period primarily to reduce costs and to avoid processing a large volume of small claims. Thus the program provides protection against the cost of the more expensive procedures—not only the single expensive test but the series of tests in which costs add up to large amounts.

Health services and supplies that could be paid for under the proposal

	Inpatient hospital benefits	Posthospital extended care benefits	Outpatient hospital diagnostic benefits	Home health agency benefits
Room and board	Coverage limited to bed and board in a 2- to 4-bed room or in more expensive accommodations where medically required.		Not applicable	Not covered.
General duty nursing services	Covered (benefits would not cover private duty nursing)		do	Coverage limited to part-time or intermittent nursing care.
Physicians' services	Not covered except where furnished by an intern or resident-in-training in the course of a teaching program approved by the AMA or, in the case of an osteopathic hospital, by the AOA, or where the services are in the field of pathology, radiology, anesthesiology, and physical medicine and are rendered through the hospital. Services furnished in an extended care facility by interns and residents-in-training under an AMA or AOA approved teaching program of the hospital with which the facility has an arrangement for timely transfer of patients would be covered.			Not covered except where furnished by an intern or resident in the course of an AMA or AOA approved hospital teaching program.
Physical, occupational, and speech therapy.	Covered		Not applicable	Covered.
Medical social services	do		do	Do.
Drugs	do		Not applicable (except as needed for diagnostic study).	Not covered.
Other services and supplies necessary to the health of the patient.	Covered if the hospital customarily furnishes them to its patients.	Covered if generally provided by extended care facilities.	Covered if customarily furnished by the hospital to outpatients for the purpose of diagnostic study.	Medical supplies (other than drugs) and the use of appliances are covered. Also, to the extent permitted by regulations, part-time or intermittent services of a home health aid would be covered.

Conditions for participation of providers of health services

One of the keys to determining the nature of the health services which would be paid for under the proposal is the type of institution which may participate in the program. Therefore, the question as to what, for purposes of the proposed program, is a hospital, an extended care facility, or a home health agency is of considerable significance. There are no universally accepted definitions of the various health facilities. The type of institution providing health services on which there is closest agreement on definition is, of course, the hospital. The definition of a health institution includes within it elements related to the quality and adequacy of the services which the institution provides. For example, one of the conditions an institution must meet to satisfy the American Hospital Association requirements for listing as a hospital—the same condition which would have to be met before an institution could participate under the program—is provision of 24-hour nursing service rendered or supervised by registered professional nurses. This is one of the characteristics that differentiates a hospital from other institutions; in addition, of course, an institution which does not meet this condition cannot offer adequate services as a hospital.

The proposal therefore spells out the conditions that an institution must meet in order to participate in the program. These conditions offer some assurance that participating institutions have the facilities necessary for the provision of adequate care. Also the inclusion of these conditions is a precautionary measure designed to prevent the program from having the effect of undercutting the efforts of the various professional accrediting organizations sponsored by the medical and hospital associations, Blue Cross plans, and State agencies to improve the quality of care in hospitals and other health care facilities. To provide payments to institutions for services of quality lower than are now generally acceptable might provide an incentive to create low-quality institutions as well as an inducement for existing facilities to strive less hard to meet the requirements of other programs.

Specific conditions for participation of hospitals: An institution, to meet the definition of a hospital, must (a) be primarily engaged in providing diagnostic and therapeutic services or rehabilitation services, (b) maintain clinical records, (c) have bylaws in effect for its medical staff, (d) have a requirement that every patient must be under the care of a physician, (e) provide 24-hour nursing service rendered or supervised by registered professional nurses, (f) have in effect a utilization review plan, and (g) be licensed or approved under the applicable local law. In addition, the institution must meet certain health and safety requirements to be established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

These specified conditions provide a basic definition of a hospital and embody minimum requirements of safety, sanitation, and quality. As such, they are fully in accord with the established principles and objectives of professional hospital organizations. The requirement that there be bylaws in effect for the hospital's medical staff—included at the specific suggestion of representatives of the American Hospital Association—is intended to assure that the hospital's staff of physicians would be organized in the professionally acceptable manner characteristic of most hospitals. Such a requirement would encourage the fullest contribution by medical staff to the operation of the hospital and to the quality of medical services furnished by the individual staff members.

Hospitals accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals would be conclusively presumed to meet all the statutory conditions for participation, save that for utilization review. However, in the event the Joint Commission adopts a requirement for utilization review accredited hospitals could be presumed to meet all the statutory conditions. Linking the conditions for participation to the requirements of the Joint Commission provides assurance that only professionally established conditions would have to be met by providers of health services which seek to participate in the program.

Health and safety standards: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would have the authority to prescribe conditions in addition to those specifically listed (only, however, in the case of hospitals, to the extent that these conditions have been incorporated into the requirements of the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals) where such additional conditions are found to be necessary in the interest of the health or safety of beneficiaries. This authority is proposed because it would be inappropriate and unnecessary to include in a Federal law all of the precautions against fire hazards, contagion, etc., which should be required of institutions to make them safe. Payment for services in institutions where there are fire and health hazards could seriously undermine the efforts of State health departments and professional groups to eliminate dangerous conditions in health care institutions.

States could require higher standards: The national minimum conditions for participation by providers of health services could vary for different areas and classes of institutions. If a State decided, for example, that all extended care facilities within its jurisdiction should satisfy higher requirements than are stipulated for use generally in all States and requested that certain specified higher requirements be applied with respect to institutions within its jurisdiction, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would have the authority to apply these State rules in the Federal program. Thus the Federal program could support the States in their efforts to improve conditions in institutions. In no event, however, could the conditions for participation of hospitals go beyond those required for accreditation by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals.

The States would have the function of applying the requirements for participation in the Federal program to the institutions within their jurisdictions. In this way, too, the States would have the opportunity to coordinate their current efforts in appraising the quality of institutions with functions which would be performed under the proposal.

The conditions for participation were framed so that medically supervised rehabilitation facilities could qualify either as hospitals or extended care facilities. Some rehabilitation facilities are for all intents and purposes hospitals and in fact some are licensed as hospitals. Others are more like extended care facilities than hospitals in the extent of their medical supervision, staffing, and scope of service. An institution of either type, which conducts a program of rehabilitating disabled people, could participate in the program by meeting the conditions specified in the proposal for a hospital or an extended care facility.

Mental and tuberculosis hospitals excluded: Institutions providing care primarily for mental or tuberculosis patients are excluded from participation. The main reason for this exclusion is that most of these hospitals are public institutions and are supported by public funds. Nor did it seem reasonable to cover private but not public institutions. It should be kept in mind that the care provided by general hospitals to persons afflicted with mental disease or tuberculosis would be included.

Conditions for participation of extended care facilities: To meet the definition of an extended care facility an institution (or a distinct part of an institution) must have an agreement with a hospital for the timely transfer of patients and medical and other information about patients or be under common control with a participating hospital, and (a) primarily provide skilled nursing care for patients requiring planned medical or nursing care, or rehabilitation services, (b) have medical policies established (and with provision for review of these policies) by a professional group (including one or more physicians and one or more registered professional nurses), (c) have a physician, a registered professional nurse, or a medical staff responsible for the execution of such policies, (d) have a requirement that every patient be under a physician's care and provide for another physician to be available in emergencies when the patient's physician is not available, (e) maintain clinical records, (f) provide 24-hour nursing services sufficient to meet nursing needs in accordance with the policies developed as provided in (b) and have at least one registered professional nurse employed full time, (g) provide appropriate methods and procedures for dispensing and administering drugs and biologicals, (h) have in effect a utilization review plan, and (i) be licensed or otherwise be approved as required under applicable local law. Extended care facilities must also meet such conditions essential to health and safety as may be found necessary. The requirement that an extended care facility have a transfer agreement with a hospital—for the timely transfer of patients and the timely interchange of medical and other information about patients transferred between the institutions—would help to assure the proper level of care as the patient's needs change.

These conditions describe the essential elements necessary for an institutional setting in which high-quality convalescent and rehabilitative care can be furnished to patients who have passed the acute stage of their illness. The proposed program is not intended to cover services furnished in nursing homes generally, many of which are oriented not to curing or rehabilitating the patient but to giving him custodial care.

Requirement for review of utilization of services: The utilization review plan required for participation in the program by hospitals and extended care facilities must provide for a review of admissions to the institution, length of stays, and the medical necessity for services provided as well as the efficient use of services and facilities. Such a review must be made in each case within 1 week following the 21st day of each period of continuous hospitalization, and subsequently at such intervals as may be specified in regulations. In the case of admissions to extended care facilities, the review must be made at such intervals as may be specified in regulations. In the event of an unfavorable finding the review group must notify the attending physician of its findings and provide an opportunity for consultation between the committee and the physicians.

These provisions with respect to utilization review mechanisms follow the kind of recommendations for utilization review that have been made by private study groups, State and National medical societies, and State agencies. The utilization review requirement in the bill provides that not only would hospital and extended care facility staff reviews meet the requirement but other phyiscian review arrangements outside the hospital or extended care facility would be acceptable for purposes of the program as well. The proposal provides specifically that the reviews could be carried out by a group established by the local medical society. Furthermore, if and when the joint commission includes a utilization review requirement for accreditation, accreditation by the joint commission could be accepted by the secretary as sufficient evidence that a hospital meets the requirements of the law.

Conditions for participation of home health agencies: To meet the definition of a home health agency an organization must (a) be a public agency or a nonprofit organization exempt from Federal taxation under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, (b) be primarily engaged in providing skilled nursing or other therapeutic services, (c) have medical policies established by a professional group (including one or more physicians and one or more registered professional nurses) to govern these services and provide for supervision of these services by a physician or a registered professional nurse, (d) maintain clinical records, and (e) be licensed or approved under applicable local law. As in the case of hospitals and extended care facilities, home health agencies would also have to meet further conditions, to the extent these conditions are found necessary in the interest of the health and safety of the patients.

Home health services covered: The conditions for participation of home health agencies are designed primarily to provide assurance that agencies participating in the program are basically suppliers of health services. The proposal would cover visiting nurse organizations as well as agencies specifically established to provide a wide range of organized home health services. The provision of services under such agencies is now only in the initial stage of development. The services covered are based on the practices of the agencies now in existence which furnish a broad range of organized home health services which may be used as a substitute for continued hospital care. These agencies, while few and generally of recent origin, have established excellent records of operation so that it seems reasonable to expect new providers of services to adopt the pattern of organization found successful thus far. These home health service agencies offer primarily visiting nurse services but many offer other therapeutic services.

Payment to providers

The provisions for paying for covered services follow the recommendations of the American Hospital Association—that is, payments to providers of service would be made on the basis of the reasonable cost of services furnished. The Secretary would be authorized to develop a method or methods of determining costs and to provide for payment on a per diem, per unit, per capita, or other basis, as most appropriate under the circumstances. The principles for reimbursing hospitals developed by the American Hospital Association provide a basis for determining how costs should be computed. However, since the elements of cost are, to some extent, different for different types of providers of health services—for example, hospitals as contrasted to extended care facilities—a number of alternative methods of computing costs are permitted so that variation in practices may be taken into account. In computing reimbursement on a reasonable cost basis, the program would be following practices with respect to reasonable cost reimbursement already well established and accepted by hospitals in their dealings with other Federal and State programs and with Blue Cross.

Exclusion of Federal hospitals

No payment would be made to a Federal hospital, except for emergency services, unless it is providing services to the public generally as a community hospital—a rare situation, but the exclusion of such institutions would be a hardship to beneficiaries in the localities involved. Also, payment would not be made to any provider for services it is obligated to render at public expense under Federal law or contract. The purpose of this exclusion is to assure that Federal hospitals would not be used to furnish care under the program as well as to avoid payment for services which are furnished under other Government programs to veterans, military personnel, etc. Furthermore, this exclusion would have the effect of reducing future need for Federal hospitals for veterans and retired members of the armed forces and place more emphasis on the use of voluntary hospitals for their care.

Emergency services

Payment could be made to nonparticipating hospitals for emergency inpatient hospital services—or emergency outpatient diagnostic service—if the hospital agrees not to make any charges to the beneficiary with respect to the emergency services for which payment is provided. The proposal does not cover use of the emergency ward for outpatient purposes except where the diagnostic service provision, subject to a deductible, applies.

Agreements by providers

Any eligible provider may participate in the proposed program if it files an agreement not to charge any beneficiary for covered services and to make adequate provision for refund of erroneous charges. Of course, a provider could bill a beneficiary for the amount of the deductible, and for the portion of the charge for expensive accommodations or services supplied at the patient's request and not paid for under the proposal.

An agreement may be terminated by either the provider of service or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary may terminate an agreement only if the provider (a) does not comply with the provisions of law or the agreement, (b) is no longer eligible to participate, or (c) fails to provide data to determine benefit eligibility or costs of services, or refuses access to financial records for verification of bills.

Administration

As in the case of other benefits under the social security system, overall responsibility for administration of the hospital and related benefits would rest with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Similar responsibility for railroad retirement annuitants rests with the Railroad Retirement Board. Agreements by hospitals and other providers with the Secretary would be made on behalf of both the Secretary and the Board.

The proposal provides for the establishment of a Advisory Council to advise the Secretary on administrative policy matters. The Advisory Council, appointed by the Secretary, would consist of a chairman and 15 members who are not otherwise employees of the Federal Government. To assure representation of the health professions, the membership of the Advisory Council would include persons outstanding in hospital or other health activities.

The Secretary would also be required to consult with appropriate State agencies, national and State associations of providers of services, and recognized national accrediting bodies. These efforts would be especially oriented to the development of policies, operational procedures and administrative arrangements of mutual satisfaction to all parties interested in the program. This consultation at the local and national level would also provide additional assurance that varying conditions of local and national significance are taken into account.

Role of the States

The Secretary is authorized to use State agencies to perform certain administrative functions. It is expected that the Secretary would exercise this authority fully, and it is believed that all States would be willing and able to assume these responsibilities. State agencies would be used in:

(a) determining whether and certifying to the Secretary that a provider meets conditions for participation in the program;

(b) rendering consultative services to providers to assist them in meeting the conditions for participation, in establishing and maintaining necessary fiscal records and in providing information necessary to derive operating costs so as to determine amounts to be paid for the provider's services;

(c) rendering consultative services to providers and medical societies to assist in the establishment and testing of utilization review plans and procedures.

State agencies would be reimbursed for the costs of activities they perform in the program. As in the cooperative arrangements with State agencies in the social security disability program, reimbursement to State agencies for hospital insurance benefits activities would meet the agency's related costs of administrative overhead as well as of staff. In recognition of the need for coordination of the various programs in the States that have to do with payment for health care, quality of care, and the distribution of health services and facilities, the Federal Government would pay a fair share of the State agency's costs attributable to planning and other efforts directed toward the coordination of the agency's activities under the proposed program.

What is contemplated in administration of the insurance program is a Federal-State relationship under which each governmental entity performs those functions for which it is best equipped and most appropriately suited. State governments license health facilities and State public health authorities genereally inspect these facilities to determine whether they are conforming with the requirements of the State licensure law. In addition, State programs purchase care from providers of health services. On the basis of experience and function, State agencies would assist the Federal Government in determining which providers of health services conform to prescribed conditions for participation. Furthermore, where an institution or organization that has not yet qualified needs consultative services in order to determine what steps may be appropriately taken to permit qualification, such consultative services would be furnished by the State health or other apropriate State agency. Other types of consultative services closely related to conditions of the hospital benefits program or similarly related to State programs and requirements should logically be provided for or coordinated in the State agency. There may, of course, be situations where a State is unwilling or unable to perform some or all of these certifications and consultative services. In any such situation, the Secretary will have to make other provisions to carry on these activities.

Role of private organizations

The proposal would provide the opportunity for considerable participation by private organizations in the administration of the program. Groups of providers, or associations of providers on behalf of their members, would be permitted to designate a private organization to act as an intermediary between themselves and the Federal Government. The designated organization would determine the amounts of payments due upon presentation of provider bills and make such payments. In addition, such organizations could be authorized, to the extent the Secretary considers it advantageous, to perform other related functions such as auditing provider records and assisting in the application of utilization safeguards. Such activities are likely to prove advantageous where private organizations have developed experience and skill in these activities. The Government would provide advances of funds to such organizations for purposes of benefit payments and as a working fund for administrative expenses, subject to account and settlement on a cost-incurred basis.

The principle advantage hospitals and other providers of services would find in an arrangement of this sort would be that the policies and procedures of the Federal program would be applied by the same private organizations which administer the existing health insurance programs from which providers now receive payments. The participation of Blue Cross plans and similar third-party organizations would have advantages that go beyond the benefits derived from their experience in dealing with various types of providers of services. Such private organizations serving as intermediaries between the Government and the providers, would reduce the concern expressed by some people that the Federal Government might try to interfere in hospital affairs.

Complementary private insurance

A guiding principle in the formulation of the program is the desirability of encouraging private insurance to play the same complementary role to hospital insurance for the aged under social security that it has played under the retirement, death, and disability benefit provisions of the social security program. It was in part because of this principle that the decision was made to provide a program oriented toward meeting only the major costs of hospitalization. It was assumed that with social security providing basic protection of this form beneficiaries would obtain additional private supplementary protection and private carriers would seek to provide such protection. While the hospital insurance protection that would be provided by social security would be significant and substantial, it would not cover all of the health costs that are capable of being insured against.

The bill, therefore, authorizes the creation of nonprofit associations of private insurers to develop and offer for sale to aged persons health benefit plans covering costs not met under the Government program—specifically plans covering most of the costs of physicians services. These activities of private insurers would be exempt from Federal and State antitrust laws.

Financing

The hospital insurance program would be financed by allocating 0.60 percent of taxable wages paid in 1966; 0.76 percent of taxable wages paid in 1967 and 1968; and 0.90 percent of taxable wages paid thereafter, to a special hospital insurance trust fund that would be established for the program. Allocations of 0.45, 0.57 and 0.675 percent of self-employment income taxable under social security would be made, respectively, in the taxable years 1966, 1967–68, and 1969 and thereafter.

The following examples illustrate the cost of the hospital insurance program to the employee in 1969 and thereafter: A worker earning $3,000 would pay $13.50 a year; one earning $4,800 would pay $21.60 a year; and a worker earning $5,300 a year, the maximum earnings subject to contributions under the bill, would pay $25.20 a year.

The cost of the benefits for persons not insured under the social security or railroad retirement systems would be borne by general revenue of the Treasury.

Separate trust fund: Under the proposal there would be a separate trust fund for the hospital insurance program, in addition to the present old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the disability insurance trust fund. Under the proposed law, hospital insurance benefits could be paid only from the hospital insurance trust fund, just as under present law disability insurance benefits can be paid only from the disability insurance trust fund.

The income to the hospital insurance trust fund is estimated actuarially to meet the costs into the indefinite future. Estimated contribution income to the new trust fund for 1967 (the first year of the program's full operation) would total $1.98 billion and estimated expenses $1.78 billion. Payments made on behalf of persons who are not eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits would be made from the trust fund but the fund would be fully reimbursed for all costs involved in such payments from general revenue of the Treasury.

Effective dates

Benefits would be payable for covered hospital and related health services furnished beginning July 1, 1966, except for post-hospital extended care, for which the effective date would be January 1, 1967. The allocations to the hospital insurance fund from social security contributions would begin in 1966. The allocation for 1966 would enable a fund to be built up before benefits become payable.

III. SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF "HOSPITAL INSURANCE, SOCIAL SECURITY, AND PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1965"

A. Hospital insurance for the aged

1. Eligibles:

(a) Persons age 65 and over who are eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits (numbering about 16⅔ million).

(b) Other persons who are age 65 and over (about 2 million) or who will reach age 65 within the next few years, but with the cost for them being paid from general revenues.

2. Benefits (payable July 1, 1966, except for extended care):

(a) Hospital inpatient services for 60 days in a benefit period, with a "deductible" of the national average cost of 1 day of care to be paid by the patient.

(b) Post-hospital extended care (in a facility having an arrangement with a hospital for timely transfer of patients and medical information about patients) for 60 days in a benefit period. The services would be covered only in the case of transfer from a hospital. (Effective January 1, 1967.)

(c) Home health services (such as a visiting nurse) up to 240 visits a year.

(d) Outpatient hospital diagnostic services (such as X-ray and laboratory services) with a deductible for services in any one month, equal to one-half of the deductible for inpatient hospital services, to be paid by the patient.

3. Financing:

(a) A completely separate hospital insurance trust fund established in the Treasury: This trust fund would be separate from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the disability insurance trust fund.

An earmarked allocation from the social security contributions would be made to the separate hospital insurance fund.

(b) Allocations to the fund: Amounts equal to the following percentages of earnings would be allocated to this separate fund:

[In percent]

Year	Employer	Employee	Total, employer and employee	Self-employment
1966	0.30	0.30	0.60	0.45
1967–68	.38	.38	.76	.57
1969 and after	.45	.45	.90	.675

The allocation for 1966 would enable a fund to be built up before benefits became payable. It is estimated that the fund would be about $600 million as of July 1, 1966.

(c) Actuarial status of the fund: The allocation of contributions provided in the bill have been determined by the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration to be sufficient to cover all the costs of the benefits (and administration) for persons entitled to social security benefits. The ac-

tuarial estimates are based on the assumptions recommended by the Advisory Council on Social Security that hospital costs will continue to rise faster than earnings for the next 10 years.

(d) Illustrative costs. The amount allocated during 1967–68 and during 1969 and later years for hospital insurance—0.38 of 1 percent and 0.45 of 1 percent, respectively, on the employee—amounts to the following for employees earning the annual amounts shown:

Hospital insurance cost

1967–68

Annual earnings	Weekly	Monthly	Annually
$4,000	$0.29	$1.27	$15.20
$4,800	.35	1.52	18.24
$5,000	.37	1.58	19.00
$5,600	.41	1.77	21.28
1969 AND AFTER			
$4,000	$0.35	$1.50	$18.00
$4,800	.42	1.80	21.60
$5,000	.43	1.88	22.50
$5,600	.48	2.10	25.20

4. Administration:

By the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through the social security program. Hospitals could elect to be represented by a private organization (such as Blue Cross) to negotiate their contracts. The Secretary could also delegate to such organization the functions of receiving payments from the social security program.

Payments would be made to hospitals and other providers of services on a cost basis. The cost of hospital services would be based on semiprivate accommodations (2, 3, or 4 bedrooms).

5. Complementary private insurance:

The bill includes the Javits amendment (modified somewhat) to authorize creation of an association of private insurance carriers to sell, on a nonprofit basis, approved policies covering health costs not covered under the social security plan. Participating carriers would be exempt from antitrust laws.

B. Social security amendments

1. A 7-percent benefit increase to the 20 million social security beneficiaries equal to about $1.3 billion a year; the same increase over present law would be given to those who become beneficiaries in the future. The minimum primary benefit would thereby be increased from $40 per month at present to $42.80; the maximum from $127 to $135.90. The average primary benefit, which is currently about $77.50, would be increased to about $83.

2. Benefit increases would be paid retroactively to January 1, 1965. If the law is enacted in June 1965, this would result in retroactive payments of about $750 million in the fall of 1965.

3. The maximum annual earnings on which taxes and benefits are computed would be increased from $4,800 to $5,600 a year, effective January 1, 1966. The maximum primary benefit would thereby be further increased to $149.90 and maximum benefit for a family would be increased from $254 at present to $312.

4. The social security contribution schedule (combined for social security and hospital benefits) would be changed to be as follows:

[In percent]

Year	Employer	Employee	Self-employed
1966–67	4.25	4.25	6.4
1968–70	5.0	5.0	7.5
1971 and after	5.2	5.2	7.8

5. Self-employed physicians and tips are covered.

C. Welfare amendments

The public assistance titles of the Social Security Act would be amended as follows:

1. The Federal share under all State public assistance programs is increased a little more than $2.50 a month for the needy aged, blind, and disabled and about $1.25 for needy children effective January 1, 1966. Cost: from general revenues, for the last 6 months of the fiscal year 1966, about $75 million.

2. Federal funds to the States would be authorized for aid for the needy aged in mental or tuberculosis institutions. Cost: about $38 million from general revenues for the last 6 months of fiscal year 1966.

3. Earned income to the needy aged which is disregarded is increased slightly. Cost: about one-half million dollars for fiscal year 1966 from general revenues.

4. Amendment to Kerr-Mills program relating to the Federal share being paid for both cash and medical services to needy aged in the first and last month of care in a medical institution. Cost: $1 million in fiscal year 1966 from general revenues.

Herbert A. Abramson of Newton: Auto Dealer of Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I insert into the RECORD at this point an article which appeared in the Boston Traveler of Monday, February 1, 1965, regarding my close personal friend, Herbert Abramson, of Newton, Mass.

Last Sunday, in Las Vegas, Nev., Herb was announced the winner of the 1965 Saturday Evening Post Benjamin Franklin Quality Dealer Award from a group of 22 finalists from throughout the United States and Canada.

This is a tremendous honor as well as splendid recognition of the talents of this dedicated young American and I am more than pleased to have the opportunity to bring the article to the attention of my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives:

HERBERT A. ABRAMSON OF NEWTON: AUTO DEALER OF YEAR

(By John A. Rooney)

LAS VEGAS, NEV.—A Newton man was announced as the winner of the 1965 Saturday Evening Post Benjamin Franklin Quality Dealer Award, Sunday.

Herbert A. Abramson, 34, president of Silver Lake Motors, Inc., Newton, became the first New Englander and the youngest dealer ever to be so honored.

He was selected "Automobile Dealer of the Year" at the 48th annual convention of the National Automobile Dealers Association, in Las Vegas, Nev.

Jess L. Ballew, Post publisher, presented the coveted Benjamin Franklin Award for his outstanding qualities in citizenship, community service, and contributions to the industry.

He was named from a group of 22 finalists from throughout the United States and Canada.

The award is sponsored by the Saturday Evening Post in cooperation with the National Automobile Dealers Association, and the Automotive Trade Association Managers.

The purpose of the competition is to focus attention on the great majority of the Nation's new automobile dealers, who are ethical, fair dealing, and highly respected for their community efforts.

Abramson, who attended Boston University's College of Business Administration and Harvard Evening School, started as a junior salesman with a dealership in 1948 and worked his way up to manager.

He is a founder of the United Cerebral Palsy Foundation of Massachusetts, founder and twice president of the New England Kidney Disease Foundation and a former vice president of the Boston University Library Fund.

He is active in the Combined Jewish Appeal, the Boston Children's Hospital Medical Center Building Fund campaign, and presently is a trustee of the Massachusetts Memorial Hospital, and a member of the Massachusetts Highway Safety Committee and the Governor's consumer council.

He is treasurer and a founder of the Greater Boston Automobile Association, founder and first president of the only automotive lodge of B'nai B'rith. His other affiliations are: former vice president, New England Advisory Council of Chrysler Corp. and director of the Dodge Retail Selling Association.

The Newton Junior Chamber of Commerce named him its "Outstanding Man of the Year" in 1963, and he also received the National Junior Chamber of Commerce's Distinguished Service Award.

Among those who acclaimed his community efforts were: Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, former Gov. Endicott Peabody, Mayor Donald L. Gibbs of Newton, Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., Boston University President Harold Case, and Edward Gallagher, executive director of the Boston Better Business Bureau.

Abramson, who opened his firm in 1960, is married to the former Harriet Benson of Newton. They have one son, Warren.

Plight of Uncommon Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Ingham County, Mich., News has, I feel, pointed out a valuable lesson to any who would place security above freedom in its January 27, 1965, editorial, "Plight of Uncommon Man."

I hope that all my colleagues note this view, since it illustrates graphically the heritage of our past which has sprung from uncommon, rather than common, men. By inserting this editorial in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, I wish to associate myself and, I am sure, many colleagues with the view that we must not permit the "uncommon desire" for individual freedom to vanish under the conformity which would deny all men the choice over their own destiny.

PLIGHT OF UNCOMMON MAN

President Johnson sent his budget message to Congress this week. In it he has everything for the common man in the Great Society he talks so much about.

There isn't much there for the uncommon man, though, except conformity and higher taxes.

Whether the builders of the Great Society realize it or not there are still a great many uncommon men—men who want to have something to say about their own destiny, their own personal Great Society, their own financial fortunes, their own provisions for their families, their own provisions for their old age, their own provisions for food, shelter, and clothing.

The United States was not formed by or for uncommon men. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Jackson, and all the other great heroes out of our past were not common men. The patriots who fought the British, the rugged new country, the Indians, and the elements to establish the United States were not common men. They were uncommon men with an uncommon desire to establish a home in a land of individual freedom.

We have lost that desire for individual freedom. Now it is individual security at the expense of individual freedom.

Today Americans have a passion to be kept from womb to tomb or at least it seems that way to the people we send to Washington.

Congressional Responsibility for the Common Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 1, 1965, during the organizational meeting of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, in his first remarks as new chairman of that committee, outlined his views as to the responsibility of the Congress in carrying out the congressional mandate that the Congress shall provide for the common defense of the United States. In my opinion, I think it is one of the most monumental statements made in 25 years I have had the privilege of serving on congressional committees connected with our armed services.

Mr. RIVERS' remarks referred to the integrity of the Congress of the United States, and its responsibility as far as the military structure of this country is concerned.

There are those, for good or other reasons, who do not believe in the necessity of a Congress. There are those who twist words and circumvent the intent of this Congress, continually flout the words of the law in our faces and take the law unto themselves, denying—by their actions—the hearthstone of our Nation, that it is a country of law and not of men. They take unto themselves a power which they do not have by law.

I do not blame them. I blame the Congress, I blame us, for not exercising our responsibility and not performing our duty to see that we protect our rights.

But if this continues, this Nation is gone. The tyranny of the majority is just as vicious as the tyranny of the individual.

In the months to come, I am sure this committee will have the opportunity under the leadership of L. MENDEL RIVERS, to prove to this Nation that we will discharge our responsibility as written in the Constitution, and that this committee and the Congress are not creatures of an agency or a department but that the department is our creature and it is ours to direct and guide.

I think the statement made by Mr. RIVERS should serve as a warning to those people who persist and insist that they do not need Congress. They must come to Congress and they must get the Congress approval before any action can be carried into operation.

The words stated by the new chairman of the Armed Services Committee are just as solemn as the words that were said and discussed in Independence Hall in Philadelphia before the Declaration of Independence was written and proclaimed to the world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks made by the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS at the organizational meeting of the committee, and I commend them to each of my colleagues:

The CHAIRMAN. Members of the committee, for many years, like many of you, I have listened to one of the great statesmen of our era, the Honorable Carl Vinson, address the members as he presided over this committee at the opening of each new Congress.

Today, fate and fortune transfers this privileged responsibility to me.

I am not sitting here as a successor to Carl Vinson. No one will really ever succeed him. But I shall do my best to fill his footsteps, and with your help some day I hope to achieve some portion of the success he had attained as the chairman of this great committee.

I would like to congratulate each of you on your reelection, or your election, and especially do I congratulate those who have been elected to membership on this committee.

This begins the 19th year in which the Committee on Armed Services has been in existence.

Prior to 1947, there were two committees dealing with defense matters—the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee. The Armed Services Committee was formed as a result of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and met for the first time in January of 1947.

We have more new members on this committee in this Congress than at any prior time in the history of the committee. So I trust the older members will bear with me while I discuss some of the responsibilities and procedures of the committee.

This committee has jurisdiction over the common defense generally, and particularly the size and composition of the Armed Forces; pay, promotion, retirement and other benefits and privileges of the Armed Forces; strategic and critical materials for the common defense; scientific research and development in support of the armed services; all forts, arsenals, military reservations, navy yards, ammunition depots; air bases, missile sites, the fantastic complex of military communication networks; the procurement of military aircraft, naval vessels, and missiles; the organization of the Department of Defense; the Selective Service System; and even the conservation, development and use of naval petroleum shale and oil reserves.

This is a heavy responsibility, gentlemen, but it is one we have never ever failed to meet.

While there is always hope that we will attain a world of genuine peace, nevertheless I think we are all agreed that the only way we can guarantee peace is to be prepared for war.

Now there is one overriding duty imposed upon the Congress, and part of it in turn imposed upon this committee, and that is the power vested in the Congress to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States and in particular the power, and thus the responsibility to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to make all laws which shall be necessary for carrying into execution the powers that I have just mentioned.

I don't plan to overlook that part of the Constitution.

Now there is a duty imposed upon the Congress, and no one has this responsibility but the Congress of the United States.

As far as I am concerned, this committee will be operated on behalf of the House of Representatives in accordance with that constitutional mandate.

We will be always be happy to receive the views and recommendations of the executive branch of the Government, but we will not hesitate to initiate our own legislation, express our own views, and write our own laws.

To do this, the House has provided a membership of 37 Members—25 representing the majority, and 12 representing the minority. In addition, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico is assigned to this committee.

It is now my great privilege to introduce the new members of the committee: ALTON LENNON, North Carolina; WILLIAM J. RANDALL, Missouri; G. ELLIOTT HAGAN, Georgia; CHARLES H. WILSON, California; ROBERT L. LEGGETT, California; DONALD J. IRWIN, Connecticut; JED JOHNSON, Jr., Oklahoma; FRANK E. EVANS, Colorado; RODNEY M. LOVE, Ohio; FLOYD V. HICKS, Washington; HERVEY G. MACHEN, Maryland; SPEEDY O. LONG, Louisiana; E. S. JOHNNY WALKER, New Mexico.

SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

I welcome each of you and again congratulate you upon your election to this committee.

I know you have been told by others that this is a hard-working committee. That is an understatement.

I am not going to sit in Mr. Vinson's seat and not do some of the things he did.

I welcome each of you and again congratulate you on your election to this committee.

I know you have been told by others that this is a hard working committee. To give you an idea of the workload of the committee, let me tell you what the committee did in the last Congress:

The full committee met 127 times; the legislative subcommittee met 104 times; other subcommittees met 135 times, for a total of 366 meetings.

The committe reported 80 bills and resolutions to the House; 79 passed the House. Of these, 2 became private laws; 57 became public laws; and 2 concurrent resolutions were approved; 18 House-passed bills were not acted upon by the other body. And, of course, this is par for the course.

In addition, 265 acquisitions and disposal projects were referred to the Real Estate Subcommittee for consideration. 250 were approved; 2 disapproved, and 4 are pending.

We produced 69 printed hearings and special reports—contained in excess of 10,600 pages.

I hope each member will keep in mind the importance of attendance at the full committee meetings, and his subcommittee meetings. The rules of the House require that we keep records of the business transacted by the committee, and this includes attendance records. The attendance record—mark this—of each member at committee and subcommittee meetings is public information and is available to anyone upon request.

Today, of course, is an organization meeting. Tomorrow we will begin our posture and procurement hearings. We will proceed this year, as we have in the past, with a posture briefing which will be conducted in connection with the bill that authorizes the procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and research and development within the Department of Defense.

We refer to that as 412.

Last year's bill contained an authorization for $16,914,000,000, to give you an idea of the magnitude of this undertaking, almost $17 billion.

Now, during these hearings we will go into many facets of our defense posture. Among other things, we will ascertain the status of the Vinson-Trammell Act.

And I intend to determine the position of the Department of Defense with respect to the 65-35 language affecting ship repairs and conversions which is now contained in the Defense Appropriation Act, for the last 2 or 3 years, I think.

Now, as members of this committee, you will receive and hear a great deal of highly classified information. Whenever we are to hear witnesses presenting classified information, we will go into executive session.

It will be our policy to hold as many of our hearings in open session as is humanly possible, always keeping in mind the nature of the information we receive during these hearings.

Before we go into the business of formally organizing the committee, I would like to stress one very significant point. While there are 25 members of the majority and 12 members of the minority, this is a nonpartisan committee in every sense of the word.

We all have one goal in mind—the maintenance of our national security.

For the 18 years that I have been a member of this committee, I have been impressed with the outstanding cooperation that has always existed between the majority and minority, regardless of the party in power. I know that Mr. ARENDS, as ranking minority Member for several Congresses, cooperated fully with Mr. Vinson in every respect. And I am quite confident that Mr. BATES, as the new ranking minority Member, will continue the complete cooperation that we have enjoyed in the past.

We are not Republicans or Democrats on this committee—we are Members of Congress working here as a team to attain a common goal—the security and safety of the Nation.

I hope that this spirit of nonpartisanship will always continue to prevail because there is no room for politics in national defense matters.

Food Sales to United Arab Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include in today's RECORD the text of a statement by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, chairman of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, on January 31, 1965, on legislation which was recently before this House, dealing with food sales to the United Arab Republic.

Rabbi Bernstein and the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, as evidenced by this statement, wholeheartedly agree with the action taken by the majority Members of the House of Representatives last week.

The statement referred to follows:

STATEMENT BY RABBI S. BERNSTEIN

We have received many inquiries about pending legislation to discontinue food sales to the United Arab Republic.

We have always supported foreign aid and we have urged economic development for the peoples of Israel and the Arab States. We have believed that economic development might help to bring about peace and cooperation in the Near East.

For that reason, we have long urged the administration to put conditions on our aid in order to insure that it is really used for development and not to finance aggression.

We believe that our views are shared by most Americans, and we have urged the administration to give effect to these policies.

It is now obvious that President Nasser has outraged the patience of the American people by policies which disparage our aid, undermine our strength, and humiliate our purpose.

Accordingly, we think that the action of the House of Representatives reflects the broad national consensus that aid should not be extended to nations which insult the American people and menace the peace. We believe, in fact, that this action can strengthen the administration in its dealings with the Egyptian Government, since it conveys most dramatically the overwhelming sentiment of the American people.

The Free Southern Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday New York Times theater section for January 31, 1965, had an article by W. F. Minor which will be of great interest to those concerned with civil rights. It describes the activities of the Free Southern Theater which performs plays in Mississippi. Many of those in the audience have never before seen a stage play. The Free Southern Theater which does not charge admission operates on a shoestring budget. The actresses, actors, and others associated in this endeavor have made a substantial contribution to the civil rights movement. By bringing the theater to those who have been denied the experience, they have broadened horizons and aided the cause of human dignity.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 31, 1965]

THEY ARE WAITING FOR GODOT IN MISSISSIPPI, TOO

(By W. F. Minor)

HATTIESBURG, MISS.—"Befuddlement," declared John O'Neal, stroking white shoe polish through his wiry dark hair and smearing white grease paint on his Negro face.

"Yes, the adjective is befuddlement. That's the way they respond to 'Godot,'" he declared as he sat on a wooden stool applying his makeup in the tiny anteroom of Mount Zion Baptist Church, deep in the Negro neighborhood of this south Mississippi city.

Outside, waiting in the pews and in the little raised section for the church choir, an eager audience of 150 Negroes, tots, oldsters, and a handful of whites, mostly students active in civil rights, sat waiting. They were waiting for "Waiting for Godot," which would be presented, free of charge by the Free Southern Theater. They waited with more expectancy than a Broadway first-night audience.

The Free Southern Theater is the outgrowth of an idea that O'Neal had when he came South 2 years ago as a civil rights worker with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. It is now at the end of a 28-city tour through Mississippi, begun in November.

Precisely at 8, the lights inside the little Negro church went out. Up front, where the preacher usually stands, two spotlights strung on a rod across the top of the gabled ceiling, caught two players of "Godot" in their glare. Some Negro elders and their wives still trooped in.

O'Neal, 24 years old, an English and philosophy major from Southern Illinois, put on the finishing touches in the improvised dressing room. "The reaction to 'Purlie Victorious' is enthusiastic. The audience relates early and quickly," he said. "But 'Godot,' ask James." James, a tall blond, crewcut beak-nosed young man, was also busy applying grease paint. He identified himself as James Cromwell, 25, of New York City, a graduate in theater from Carnegie Tech. He directed "Godot." "It is not a popular play and is not supposed to have the same reaction," he said. "There are those, however, who want to look at the play and see something beyond Mississippi."

He gestured as he held three fingers full of grease paint. "When it was presented in Miami, everybody walked out," he said. "It hasn't happened to us in Mississippi."

"At least not quite everybody," O'Neal interjected.

AUDIENCE REACTION

Outside, in the church, the Mississippi Negro audience, to whom Beckett was as distant as Mississippi is from Broadway, tried gallantly to follow the play and laugh when they found something amusing. "It adds a dimension of language and stretches the terms people already know," O'Neal continued. "For example, after we played in rural Holmes County, Miss., a friend passed through at random on Monday following, and stopped at a cafe and a little girl walked in. The woman manager asked the girl, 'What are you doing?' The child responded, 'I'm waiting for Godot.'"

The children in Mount Zion Church laughed at the antics of Vladimir and Estragon. The pitiful gibbering and contorted dance of Lucky, the personal slave of Pozzo, is taken by the audience as a kind of slapstick humor.

At the end of 1 hour and 20 minutes the intermission comes and about half the crowd filters out the back door and into the coolness of the night.

"I get some points," a Negro elder says as he rubs his chin, "but it gets me scattered out before I can figure it out." He puts on his hat and leaves.

For the next hour and 20 minutes people drift away and only about two dozen remain to the end. Those who remain are invited to participate in a discussion with the cast on the play and what meaning they got from it.

The discussion is good. Some seek meaning that is not there. But there is introspection in the questions of others.

"Why do you pick this play? It seems a very unusual play?" The players are asked. They do not answer. Afterward the players of the Free Southern Theater—three whites and five Negroes all in their twenties—remove their makeup and gather their props into a light closed truck to push on to another Mississippi city. "We don't answer that question of why we present 'Godot.'" says

Cromwell. "We do it because it moved us and we thought it worth while."

IDEA'S BIRTH

O'Neal says he collaborated on the idea of putting together a professional integrated theater in the Deep South with Gilbert Moses, 22, a round-faced Negro graduate of Oberlin College, who had acted in Cleveland's Karamu Theater and off-Broadway.

Together O'Neal and Moses gathered a few professionals and semiprofessionals in New Orleans in late 1963 and early 1964. By the summer of 1964 they were ready with "In White America," which they played in several Mississippi towns before Negro audiences.

More professional people came in—Murray Levy, 29, a New Yorker who arrived fresh from Broadway where he was an associate producer of "The Sign in Sidney Brustein's Window," by the late Lorraine Hansberry; Moses' wife, Denise, 21, a University of Michigan graduate; Grace Brooks, 28, formerly of Aiken, S.C., and Penelope Hartzell, 22, an Earlham College graduate.

Last November they went on the road with "Waiting for Godot," and Ossie Davis' "Purlie Victorious." They appeared in 30 Mississippi towns. So far they have had to cancel in Canton and Natchez, because the local arrangements were unsatisfactory.

Finding a place to show is a real problem everywhere they go, Moses and O'Neal said. Oddly, the traveling biracial theater group has not met with the harassment from Mississippi white racists that has befallen others.

"I can't separate my civil rights commitment from my commitment on this," says O'Neal, "but I do not consider the Free Theater as the cultural side of the civil rights movement. We're not out to propagandize. We think the theater has a validity of its own and is relevant to other things that have happened."

O'Neal says he considers the Free Southern Theater a career. He points out, however, that F.S.T. is separate and independent from the loosely knit Council of Federated Organizations which sponsored the explosive Missisippi summer project.

The only Mississippian in the group is Stanley Taylor, 23, from Woodville, Miss., one of the Black Belt counties in the southwest part of the state. Taylor, an English-major graduate from Southern University at Baton Rouge, said he joined the group after hearing about it on television in New Orleans where he had gone to take a stab at writing.

Taylor, a brown-skinned Mississippi Negro, tossed aside a reporter's suggestion that he had escaped from Mississippi. "I don't consider that I have escaped and I hope to come back some day," Taylor declared.

The F.S.T. has gone to New York in pursuit of funds to keep it going. Two benefit performances are scheduled. "Waiting for Godot" will be performed at the New School on Friday and "Purlie Victorious" will be offered at the American Place Theater on February 14. The theatrical group is entirely supported by donations and the players exist on a minimum salary which O'Neal declined to pinpoint "because it's so small."

Luther Hodges, a Man of Vision

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, throughout history political theorists have attempted to set up a model for the ideal public servant who would provide his people with good ethic, vast experience, and insurmountable knowledge. We find Plato confronted with this problem some 23 centuries ago, and even today there are those skeptics who say that the ideal public servant does not exist. Apparently, such people know nothing of the career of one of the most remarkable men of our time, Luther H. Hodges. In less than 13 years Governor Hodges has rendered outstanding public service to his native State of North Carolina, to the United States, and to the free world.

Like Winston Churchill, Secretary Hodges became an internationally known figure comparatively late in life, and yet like Churchill this man has made an indelible impression that will never be forgotten. Mr. Hodges was elected Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina, his first political office, at the age of 52 and subsequently served as Governor of the great Tar Heel State for more than 6 years before becoming Secretary of Commerce during a critical period of world history.

Luther Hodges became one of the greatest Governors of any State in the history of our country. He served longer as Governor of North Carolina than any man in the modern history of the State. He was a tireless, energetic, and forthright Chief Executive. His administration in North Carolina was marked by phenomenal industrial and economic growth. In an age and a time of salesmanship and public relations Governor Hodges excelled in selling his philosophy and ideals. He was one of the greatest ambassadors his State and the South has ever known.

Governor Hodges personally went after new industry and worked tirelessly for industrial expansion for his people. He made frequent trips throughout the Nation and the world to talk with industrialists, encouraging them to locate a plant or subdivision in North Carolina. His methods and tactics became a model for other Governors and planning boards throughout the Nation.

During the administration of Governor Hodges, education and research made great strides in North Carolina. Roads were vastly improved and the advantages of tourism in North Carolina as a vacationland were well advertised under his leadership. He pointed the way for other Southern States and laid the groundwork for a new-found economy that has projected the Southland as a recognized leader in numerous industrial endeavors.

The South and the Nation can be proud of Governor Hodges' record in easing racial tensions, in pointing the way for the South and the country during a time of turmoil and social upheaval. Governor Hodges realized that the answer to racial problems was to provide more jobs and opportunities.

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy in recognizing Governor Hodges' intense loyalty and patriotism asked that the Governor become Secretary of Commerce in his administration. As Secretary of Commerce, Governor Hodges participated in some of the most momentous decisions in the history of our country and in the history of freedom. As the senior member of the administration's first team, Luther Hodges' advice and counsel was constantly sought and heeded by the young President.

Luther Hodges realized more than any other contemporary American that if the United States was to continue to be the heart and core of the free world and the arsenal of democracy, we must get our economy moving. We must find jobs and opportunity for our youth.

During the administration of Luther Hodges the American economy moved forward as never before. The enemies of America were counting heavily on depression, unemployment, and downward business trends in the United States. Today the United States is on a much firmer foundation than in 1961, and we face the future with confidence. Mr. Hodges was largely instrumental in inaugurating trade policies which have benefited this country and our allies throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, Luther Hodges became Secretary of Commerce at a time when the great textile industry of this country and its employees had their backs to the wall. Unemployment was rampant. Mills were operating on curtailment and closing was the order of the day. The textile industry had been promised relief from unfair imports. The Democratic National Conventions of 1956 and 1960 called for consideration to be given this great industry so vital to the defense of the Nation. President Kennedy appointed Secretary Hodges chairman of a five-man Cabinet committee to remedy the desperate and critical situation in the textile industry and among its more than 2 million employees. It was a near impossible task, but Secretary Hodges, by tact, diplomacy, leadership, and constant efforts was able to reach a voluntary agreement with the leading textile manufacturing nations of the world.

Step by step Secretary Hodges implemented the seven-point program of President Kennedy. Under President Lyndon Johnson's administration, Luther Hodges saw his objective fulfilled with the elimination of the two-priced cotton system. The textile industry now with the other great industries of this country is moving forward.

During this period I had the opportunity to work with Secretary Hodges and observed him closely in meetings with President Johnson, President Kennedy, the members of the Cabinet, and great industrial leaders throughout the Nation. It was the Secretary's ability to deal with diverse elements and with people that enabled us to be finally successful.

Secretary Hodges is distinguished in appearance, mild in manner, always gracious, thoughtful, and courteous. He is a man of great courage and determination, one who fights for a successful but honorable conclusion. These are the traits of a man of vision, and it is to such men that this Nation will always turn.

As a political campaigner, Secretary Hodges is unsurpassed. I have campaigned with him on the stump and I have seen firsthand how he could even win hostile audiences. This unique attribute is the gift of very few politicians.

He loved to campaign, because he wanted to meet people. He is undoubtedly one of the greatest men of our time. He is a man of accomplishment and achievement in both public and private life. After 13 years of devoted service to his State, Nation, and free world he is going to take a well-deserved rest. I cannot talk about Luther Hodges without making mention of his wonderful, charming, and gracious wife who has helped this great man so much during his outstanding career. Mrs. Dorn, a native North Carolinian and a fellow alumna of the University of North Carolina, joins me in the hope that for Secretary Hodges it will only be a short rest, as our country is still in need of men of his character, integrity, and superb leadership.

LeMay Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Gen. Curtis LeMay on February 1 has been marked by moving and fitting tributes to a man who can be called the "father of our ready Air Force." The editorial of that date in the Washington Post is but one of the sound analyses of General LeMay and his career.

I would especially call the attention of the House to the editorial's statement that General LeMay "did not assume the improbable was impossible," and I hope that this standard will never pass from the minds of those who are in charge of our services. Under unanimous consent, I wish to include this editorial in tribute to General LeMay in the RECORD, and at the same time pass on to General LeMay my congratulations for a job well done and for best wishes in the years ahead.

LEMAY RETIRES

Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, retires today after nearly 22 years as a general officer, and still at an age when he has many years of activity ahead. He won his first star in 1943: a general at age 36. He went on to be the first postwar Chief of Air Force Research and Development in a period when the Air Force distinguished itself by its farsighted support of advanced research programs. He has fairly been credited as very nearly the creator of the Strategic Air Command. Under General LeMay that force became the model, unmatched really anywhere or any time, of a military force not only technically superb, but held at a standard of alertness never before found in peacetime. Most people could not bring themselves to believe that a nuclear Pearl Harbor could happen—as many could not believe the original Pearl Harbor could happen. But LeMay did not assume the improbable was impossible, and he was able to make his standard the standard of the force he commanded. It is an example that should not be forgotten. He has had a sometime difficult tenure as Chief of Staff. But he has always served his country well, and when the Senate the other day confirmed him in the permanent rank of four-star general, it was granting him no less than what he has clearly earned.

Old Fort Belknap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, too often in our rush to keep up with the unbelievable rapid changes in our modern world, we neglect those reminders of our past which are so important to maintaining the proper perspective for our growth and progress.

I think it is vitally necessary for our young people to be able to relive our rich history by visiting places which are a part of that history and by seeing the type of environment which built the pioneer spirit which has thrust our Nation to the forefront of world leadership.

It is for this reason that I am so pleased to see such a dedicated effort being made to preserve one of the major forts of the Texas frontier, old Fort Belknap, near Newcastle, Tex.

The January 1965 edition of the Cattleman, the magazine of the Texas & Southwest Cattle Raisers Association, carried a wonderful article about this old fort. I include it here for the benefit of my colleagues:

OLD FORT BELKNAP: HERE WAS ONE OF THE MAJOR FORTS OF THE TEXAS FRONTIER, ESTABLISHED ON THE SALT FORK OF THE BRAZOS IN 1851

(By Louise Cheney)

Situated 13 miles northwest of Graham, near the town of Newcastle in the picturesque rolling section of central west Texas stands old Fort Belknap, established as a military outpost on the Salt Fork of the Brazos in 1851. Once within arrow shot of the savage Comanches, it is identified with hastening civilization to western Texas and pushing the frontiers toward the Pacific. Reliable historians have established that it was the most important Federal garrison of its day and time. A trooper who was stationed at the old outpost in 1867 claimed it to be the most beautiful frontier fort in all of Texas.

The site for the post was selected by Brevet Gen. Goldsmith Belknap and was named in his honor.

Around the middle of the 19th century the warring Comanches succeeded in chasing the Apaches out of northern Texas and remained to rule the area west of the 99th degree of west longitude. Two years after Fort Worth and a chain of military garrisons running from north to south in Texas had been established to protect westward immigration, a new line of forts was requested by the Texas Legislature, which body also asked the War Department to remove from the Lone Star State the Indians that were making depredations from the "territory of the United States".

The recent Mexican War had increased the need for protection of the frontiers for by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hildalgo Mexico ceded not only Texas but all of the vast southwestern territory to the Pacific to the United States. Then in that never-to-be-forgotten year of 1849 the clarion cry of gold rang out through the Nation when the yellow metal was discovered at Sutter's Fort in California. A great migratory flood of humanity surged westward to the Golconda of the Pacific with the speed and force of a hurricane.

In 1849 Capt. Randolph B. Marcy acting on orders from the U.S. Government laid out a wagon trail from the Red River near present day Gainesville, across Texas and thence into New Mexico as a portion of an overland trail for wagons to California. This way led directly through Indian strongholds. The marauding redskins raided the settlements of the frontier and attacked many immigrants.

HOSTILE INDIANS

So great was the red menace on the Marcy Trail for the westward bound travelers that the Adjutant General of the United States on April 1, 1851, issued orders and instructions to General Belknap to take two companies of the 5th Infantry and explore the territory of the western boundary of Texas and select two or more locations for a new military garrison with a view toward, "sustaining the line of defense of the 8th Military Department and fulfilling the conditions of restraining the incursion of the hostile Indians against Texas."

General Belknap proceeded into west Texas as ordered and recommended three locations, one being on the Brazos 10 miles below the crossing mapped by Marcy. In his report to the Adjutant General he wrote:

"After careful and minute examination of the country bordering on the Red Fork of the Brazos, I fixed a point about 10 miles below Captain Marcy's Crossing and about the same distance above the junction of the Clear Fork with the stream. This I judge to be about the hundredth degree of west longitude and it is the most western point that a fort can be established where timber and other material necessary for the construction of barracks can be found; and west of which on account of the scarcity of timber and water it is not probable that white settlements will be made for a century if ever."

General Belknap, on June 24, 1851, mapped out the site for the proposed garrison which was near the present-day town of Newcastle. He placed Captain Carter L. Stevenson in command and gave him instructions for the erection of the post and for digging for water. It was a dry hot summer and often the temperatures soared as high as 106°. Captain Carter failed to hit water on the site selected by General Belknap even though he bored 68 feet into the parched earth. He remained there until November and never succeeded in finding any water. The site for the garrison was then changed to another location about 2 miles below the original by orders of General Belknap who had been away on other duties though desperately ill. On November 2, Brevet Maj. Gen. Perisfor S. Smith who was in command of the 8th Military Department, rode in and on November 3 declared the site as a military post and officially made it the headquarters for the 5th Infantry Regiment.

At this time the illness of General Belknap grew much worse and he was ordered by an army physician to Fort Gibson for hospitalization. He started but never reached his destination for the gallant officer who had put duty above his health, passed away with typhoid fever in a wagon near Preston on the Red River on November 10, 1851.

After the orders from the War Department came to establish the post, construction was immediately started on the buildings which were known as jacals, a type of edifice copied from the Spanish. These jacals were erected by placing poles in picket formation and filling in with screens of mud, wood, or adobe mortar.

However, the jacals were only intended to be temporary affairs since the garrison was considered to be of vital importance in that section of Texas and plans were drawn to build permanent edifices of stone. Many of these proposed stone buildings were completed in less than 2 years.

DESCRIPTION OF FORT BELKNAP

Lee Myers, well-known historian and writer of Carlsbad, N. Mex., who makes a specialty of thoroughly researching all the old military posts west of the Mississippi gives the fol-

lowing description of Fort Belknap from his copious files:

"In 1853 Col. W. G. Freeman received orders from the War Department in Washington to report on the 8th Military Department. Below is a description from the Freeman report:

"'One officers' quarters consisting of two rooms and passages 18 by 18 with front porticos, and glazed and thatched. Type of edifice was jacal.

"'Camp officers' quarters (jacal) consisting of four rooms with passages in each block 18 by 18 thatched. Front porticos glazed. Old quarters (jacal type) 18 feet wide. Porticos thatched but unglazed.

"'Hospital (jacal). Three rooms with passages. Thatched and unglazed throughout entire length.

"'Adjutant office. Jacal type consisting of three rooms all glazed. Porticos thatched in both front and rear. Size 36 by 28.

"'Billiard room (jacal). Front portico glazed, thatched. Stable picket thatched.

"'Magazine (stone). Shingled. Twenty-two by eight and a story and half high.

"'Corn house was of stone and was a half a story high. Size was 80 by 20.

"'Stone comprised the bakery which was 20 by 20 and stood a story and a half high.

"'Infantry quarters were two stories in height, were glazed and shingled. Size was 80 by 28 (475 when completed). Three unshingled. One by two masonry completed to the first story. Six began.

"'Company kitchen (jacal) was thatched. Inside was a stone fireplace with chimneys. Size was 18 by 45.

"'Commissary's store was of hewn stone, stood two and one-half stories high and size was 80 by 20.

"'Stone comprised the story and a half commanders officers' quarters. Basement was 52 by 45. There were rear and front porticos and two rooms 16 feet by 16 feet, 6 inches, one room 17 by 16. Building was glazed and shingled.

"'Camp officers' quarters consisted of four rooms 17 by 17 with two passages and comprised two buildings each a story and a half, and both were shingled and glazed. Size was 92 by 18. These were planned but not yet begun.

"'Library and stone office. Both were shingled and overall size was 48 by 18 with two rooms 18 by 18 and passage 12 by 18. This building was in the planning stage but work had not commenced.

"'The guardhouse was a one-story stone edifice with a sunken basement and rear porticos and consisted of two 17 by 17 rooms with passages above and below. This, too, was in the planning stage. The foundation bed and chimney of the sawmill were stone. Overall size of the above was 40 by 20.'"

Capt. James B. Leach, while camped at Fort Belknap on September 1, 1857 with a wagon train reported that the post was "handsomely situated and that the old stockade buildings which formerly served the purpose of garrison were being replaced by handsome buildings of stone and that already the fort was beginning to assume quite an imposing appearance."

EXCELLENT SPRINGS

Lieutenant Freeman also reported on the advantages of the location and the ordinance situation at Fort Belknap. He noted that there were excellent springs within a few hundred yards of the garrison and that the post was situated over a field of bituminous coal, said field extending 15 miles. He stated that building materials with the exception of shingles and flooring were available, that limestone was present in large deposits and that extra-good brick could be fashioned from the clay in the vicinity.

Ordinance was at the fort in considerable quantity and was well kept. The magazine was sturdy being constructed of stone. The ordinance consisted of one 6-pound gun, one 12-pound howitzer, and two 12-pound mountain howitzers, 800 pounds of fixed ammunition of various kinds, 550 pounds of powder, 47,000 musket cartridges, ball and buck, and 10 sets of harness.

At the height of its activity Fort Belknap was far out on the Texas frontier and was a portal opening into the great Far West. It became the hub of all activity for the region and was well known all over. Many land surveys as far as 50 miles away had their field stones, base distance, and direction from the post and buffalo hunters, traders, and settlers post and buffalo hunters, traders and settlers mingled there.

Two Indian reservations were placed near Fort Belknap in 1854 so that they could rest in the protection of the troopers. In December of 1855 the 2d Cavalry Regiment (same being created by an act of Congress) reached the fort. Albert Sydney Johnston was colonel and none other than Robert E. Lee was lieutenant colonel. Part of the purpose of the creation of this special regiment was to act as a guard for the Indian reservations.

NEVER ATTACKED BY INDIANS

No sooner had the fort been established than it became a haven of refuge for the early settlers of that part of Texas. The nearby town of Belknap which sprung into existence coincidently with the garrison flourished because of its protection. Although within sound of the dread Indian warcry, never was the post attacked by the red warriors but some devastating raids were made nearby. Two of these depredations serve to show how rough the frontier was in that day and time. Jesse Stem, a former Indian agent and a friend, a man named Lepperman were ambushed, slain and scalped by the Comanches on February 12, 1854, only a short distance from Fort Belknap. Then 10 years later in 1864 a band of several hundred, whooping, bloodthirsty redskins raided Elm Creek Community, only 7 miles from the fort, and killed 12 persons, 5 of whom were rangers. They took away as captives, one white woman and her two small grandchildren (both little girls) and two Negro children.

Young County was organized in 1856 and the county seat was created close to the garrison. In August of that year the first session of county court was held in a Fort Belknap building.

In 1858 the Overland Pacific Mail and Stage Line between St. Louis and San Francisco went into operation and its route ran by Fort Belknap which became a way station, in fact it was the only one on the long stage route going west where teams of horses were changed to mules and going east were replaced by horses. The stageline prodded the advancement of the town of Belknap and the vicinity. Within a year after the Overland Mail was created the small town was booming, boasting of three hotels, five general stores, a blacksmith shop, several residences, and two wagon yards.

Many notable expeditions had their beginnings at Fort Belknap. Captain Randolph Marcy left there to trace the Red River to its source. On September 15, 1858 Brevet Major Earl Van Dorn, captain of the 2d Cavalry left Fort Belknap on an expedition against the Comanches who were on the war path in the northeast. His victory against the savages was one of the most spectacular and successful in all the history of Indian warfare. His force left 56 dead Indian warriors behind.

In 1860 the troopers at the garrison were desperately needed to help stanch the Indian uprisings in the northwest section and practically all the forces were pulled out of Fort Belknap for this purpose, a move which was intended to be only temporary. But before they could return came the Civil War. General Twiggs surrendered Fort Belknap to the Confederates. That spelled the death knell for the colorful guardian of the frontier for never again did it return to its former glory. After its surrender a few Confederate soldiers and Texas Rangers were stationed at the post from time to time but there was never a sufficient garrison to protect the vicinity.

Federal troops again occupied Fort Belknap in 1867 for a short period. But the once beautiful post had become prey to time and weather, neglect and dilapidation and was unfit for a garrison by that time so the Government gave orders to abandon the fort permanently and moved the troopers to another west Texas post—Fort Griffin.

The years passed and again silence, decay, and desolation held sway where once the troopers had lived.

TRAGEDY DURING YULE SEASON

When the fort was abandoned a quantity of gun powder was left behind. This was an error—an error that caused a tragedy one Christmas in the 19th century. People visited the old post from time to time and children would scoop up handsful of the powder and set fire to it to cause explosions.

One Christmas several children visited the old garrison to obtain some powder to celebrate the Yule season. Bud Johnson, one of the boys went inside to get the powder. A few minutes after he entered there was a deafening explosion and Bud's body hurtled through a window. The frightened children carried him home and soon after they arrived Bud died. It was never determined just what happened inside the old powder house.

But even though time took its toll of the old garrison as the years kept rolling by, Fort Belknap did not die in the memories of the descendants of the interpid pioneers who dared the perils and hardships of the early and rugged frontier to bring civilization to Young County. When the Texas Centennial was planned, a committee formed in the vicinity to draft plans for restoring the colorful old post. Ben G. O'Neal who was then a State senator was able to obtain amendments to the centennial bill providing for the restoration of old well-known buildings such as old military garrisons of the frontier days as a part of the centennial celebration.

The eager committee in the Young County vicinity including County Judge E. M. Remington, Mrs. C. F. Marshall, G. R. Whitely, Mrs. J. W. Bullock, Rufus Helm, Roy Veal, E. H. Remington, J. H. Watson, Mrs. G. A. Terrell, and Mrs. O. T. Anderson set to work to have 15 acres of the fort grounds restored as well as a few of the main buildings.

They secured title to the 15 acres and then had 6 of the original stone buildings restored. The walls of the corn house and the arsenal had withstood the encroachment of 80 years and were still standing. Those two edifices were completely restored.

Two large barracks, one kitchen, and the huge two story hewn stone commissary were restored from stone on the original foundations exactly as they were when first constructed in the middle of the 19th century. Then a 4-foot wall was built around the land. The original well drilled at the old garrison was still in good condition. The shrubbery and flowers on the grounds are now being watered by this ancient well that supplied the soldiers and their mounts over a century ago.

The committee formed the Fort Belknap Society which is a nonprofit historical association. This body cooperates with the Young County Commissioners to maintain and beautify the grounds and buildings. The old arsenal was restored and made into a museum for the ladies.

The caretaker of the fort occupies half of the upper story of the commissary building. The 17 Club has made a club room of the other half. The lower story houses a museum where many relics of early pioneer days may be seen.

The committee also erected granite markers and placed them around the stone wall of the grounds pointing the roads leading to and from the fort. Markers also identify the Butterfield Stage Road as well as the military roads of the 19th century leading to Fort Phantom Hill, San Antonio, and Fort Washita (the latter in old Indian territory).

In 1957 the society secured from the Department of the Army two old iron 6-pounder cannons—the same type and caliber that guarded Fort Belknap in 1853.

The grounds of the old post are a favorite picniking and outing place for all the vicinity. The restored garrison draws thousands of tourists annually not only from the Lone Star State but from every State in the Union as well as Canada.

To visit the frontier guardian today is to whirl back with the speed of an astronaut in orbit into the middle of the last century. Within the buildings with their many relics it is easy to imagine the post fully garrisoned with blue coated troopers, to see in the mind's eye the boundless prairies alive with the beady eyed buffalo and bounding antelopes, to conjure up the sounds of marching feet, the high notes of the bugles and to hear the dread Indian war cry ringing through the wilderness. Truly the old fort seems to become an ingredient of another century with its old style architecture and ordinance and truly history is to be relived in its confines and a heritage to be won.

A Year of Decision?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there is continuing agitation for the enactment of firearms legislation to restrict the constitutional rights of the American citizen to own and use firearms. A number of such bills have been proposed. It is very important that Congress consider carefully any proposals which are advanced to change the time-honored right of U.S. citizens to own firearms.

I confess concern about the easy access to weapons of criminals and unsupervised juveniles who should not have such access and some restrictive action may be necessary. But before we take such action, let us be sure that it does not accomplish more harm than good. The fact is, the registration of guns or restrictions on ownership will not discourage the criminal. More likely, it will only discourage ownership of firearms for the protection of responsible citizens. We do not want to burn the barn to get rid of the rats. Therefore, all bills proposed must be carefully examined and none passed in an atmosphere of emotionally inspired haste.

This subject has been treated fully and capably in Guns magazine in the March 1965 edition by its editor, Mr. E. B. Mann. Under permission granted, I include it for the information of my colleagues:

A YEAR OF DECISION?

(By E. B. Mann)

Now that the sound and fury of the election is over, Americans who believe in "the right of the people to keep and bear arms" are asking each other, "Where do we stand now, in terms of firearms legislation?"

The sad fact is that nobody knows. The educated guess is that 1965 will be a year of decision regarding firearms legislation, with action at the national level and, perhaps more dangerous, with wildcat antigun proposals popping up in dozens of State legislatures. National action is likely to move slowly, and this should give us time to organize whatever forces we have in opposition. The deadly danger at the State level is that State legislatures often act swiftly and with little or no warning on such matters.

November 3, the day of decision, brought landslide victory to one party; crushing defeat to the other. To us, so far as anyone can tell at the date of this writing, it brought neither. Some of our friends in the U.S. Senate, some of our friends in the U.S. House of Representatives, were defeated. Fortunately for us, the same is true of some of those in both Houses who were alined against us. The score appears now to be about even. Fortunately for us, ours is not a partisan issue.

But there are many new faces in the National Congress as its legislative bodies get back into action. And the sad fact mentioned earlier is that no one seems to know how these new legislators feel about firearms legislation.

Why don't we know? We don't know because some of our national progun leaders have told us that we must not dirty our hands with politics—and thousands of us have accepted this as an excuse to sit back on our lily-white hands, do nothing, and then scream bloody murder when antigun people are elected. Queries from this office to shooters in many States have disclosed an appalling dearth of information regarding attitudes of candidates regarding firearms legislation. Most answers were simply, "Don't know." Several even chided us for asking. "This is not," they said, "a matter for partisan politics."

That's right. The way a person feels about firearms legislation is not a matter of party. There are ardent believers pro and con in both parties. But no voter is bound to either party for support transcending his convictions—and the honest citizen with honest convictions who refuses to participate in politics, or who participates without knowing how the candidates stand on important issues, has nobody but himself to blame for whatever is wrong with the government he finances.

This magazine is as nonpartisan as any; but we are not afraid to ask candidates of both parties how they stand on issues we think are important. We believe that firearms legislation is an important issue. We know that it is an issue that will be decided by the legislative bodies of our States and our Nation.

If every shooter in America would remember that it is his vote that elects the members of these legislative bodies, we could within a foreseeable future win enough legislative strength to defeat any antigun proposal that might be offered. We can't do that by keeping pure of politics.

The reelection of Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, makes it highly probable that the much cussed and discussed Dodd bill to amend the existing Federal firearms statutes may be the first item of firearms legislation to confront us at the national level. In view of this probability, and in view of the widespread confusion regarding the Dodd amendments, perhaps it is apropos here to review the content and the circumstances surrounding the Dodd proposals

It should be remembered, first, that Senator DODD did invite representatives of many branches of the firearms industry and of the shooting sports to Washington to discuss the measures for firearms control under consideration by his subcommittee As one of those so invited, I can state from personal knowledge that those discussions were long, outspoken on both sides, that they included word-by-word study of the existing statutes as well as the proposed amendments, including testimony from leading law enforcement agencies regarding the need (or lack of need) for additional controls or for changes in the existing statutes, and as to the probable effectiveness (or lack of effectiveness) of the proposed additions or changes.

I was criticized for saying at that time, in an editorial in this magazine, that the action of the Dodd committee in inviting discussion with industry and shooting sports leaders was commendable, that the discussions were fair, and that the subcommittee members were amazingly amenable to deletions of or changes in their proposals. Those statements were more severely criticized later—largely, I think, because of an increasing, nationwide misconception of the motivation, aims, and actual wordings of the Dodd amendments.

In my opinion, Senator DODD has only himself to blame for these misconceptions and for the vitriolic and ill-founded attacks that have been made on him because of them. As a politician, Senator DODD is no more averse to publicity than other politicians, and no less willing than other politicians to climb aboard what may seem at the moment to be a vote-getting bandwagon. Following the assassination of President Kennedy, a wave of national hysteria convinced many politicians that any antigun publicity was good publicity for whoever could get it—and there were plenty of sensation seekers in the news media who were willing to give it. Senator DODD let himself be shown and quoted as strongly antigun, thereby incurring the anger of untold thousands of shooters; and, to the utter dismay of all who had found him amenable to reason in earlier discussions, even let himself be stampeded into attempting to railroad his amendments into enactment in their original wordings, ignoring the changes agreed upon by all parties in those earlier discussions. That attempt was blocked by prompt action by representatives of the National Rifle Association and others. The Dodd amendments were still in the hands of the Senate Commerce Committee when Congress adjourned its last session and so were never offered for enactment.

Just what does the Dodd bill do? First, it is not a new bill; it is an attempt to amend the old existing Federal Firearms Act. It's intention is to make it more difficult for juveniles lacking parental consent, persons convicted of felony, and other specified undesirables, to obtain guns by mail order. In the wordings agreed upon in the discussions between the Dodd subcommittee and the representatives of the firearms industry and shooting sports—and we are advised that Senator DODD is now content to abide by these wordings—the four noteworthy amendments are as follows:

1. The Federal firearms dealer's license fee is increased from $1 to $10, and the person licensed must be 21 years of age or over.

2. Manufacturers and dealers must label packages being shipped to show that they contain firearms, and must notify the carrier that firearms are being shipped.

3. Agents of the common carrier (i.e., the express company) are forbidden knowingly to deliver firearms to a person under 18 years of age, or to a known criminal, or drug addict.

4. A person ordering a gun by mail shall enclose with his order a notarized affidavit stating his true name, age, address, felony convictions if any, and whether he has complied with local and State firearms laws. The affidavit must also state the name and address of the principal law enforcement authority in the buyer's community. The seller is then required to forward, by regis-

tered mail, a copy of the buyer's affidavit and a description of the gun (as to type, but not including serial number) to the law enforcement authority named in the affidavit.

It was (and is) the feeling of the firearms representatives participating in the discussions that the first three of these amendments are not damaging, may even be beneficial to shooting interests. Surely no one will quarrel with the requirement that a firearms dealer should be an adult; and if a Federal license is needed at all, it should be worth $10. Clause 2 imposes no hardship on the buyer; it affects only the shipper.

Clause 3 merely makes it possible for the delivering agent to demand proof that the receiver is 18 or older, and to withhold delivery to persons known to him to be criminal. No one believes that this will be completely effective in preventing guns from getting into bad hands; everyone hopes that it will help.

Clause 4 is the principal cause of misunderstanding regarding the Dodd amendments. There is no denying the point that filling out an affidavit and having it notarized is a nuisance that may be annoying to the legitimate buyer—but it is a petty annoyance compared with some of the major ones he might now be experiencing except for the efforts of those who accepted this one. There is no denying, either, that these affidavits can be falsified, forged, or otherwise made valueless. But—

Clause 4 does not include police registration of firearms by serial number. Firearms representatives demanded, and the Dodd subcommittee agreed, that the amendment specifically stipulate that the affidavit shall not include the serial number of the gun.

Clause 4 does not give the police authority the power to forbid the sale. The original wording here did require that the police authority must approve the affidavit before the sale could be completed; but this was strongly opposed by industry, shooting sports, and law enforcement representatives alike, and the Dodd subcommittee finally agreed that this granting of permissive police power was unjust to buyer and seller alike and should be omitted.

Clause 4 does enable (but not require) the local police authority to ascertain whether or not the buyer is of lawful age, is or is not a law-abiding person. Law enforcement people (those present at these discussions, and others) are quick to admit that very few police agencies have the time or the manpower to investigate all of the thousands of mail-order gun buyers. Nobody thinks these affidavits will suddenly make it impossible for criminals and/or juvenile delinquents to obtain guns. Everybody knows that having to fill out the affidavit and have it notarized is a nuisance to the law-abiding buyer, and that many will resent it. The one argument in its favor is that it does place one additional obstacle in the path of the undesirable gun buyer; and if the police do investigate, and do prevent the delivery of a gun into criminal hands (as they already have the right to do, under existing statutes), perhaps it is worth trying.

Doubt was expressed, in our discussions with the Dodd people, as to the willingness of any common carrier to accept the responsibility which clause 4 imposes. The word "knowingly" weakens that responsibility, but was essential, since certainly the agent of the carrier could not reasonably be punished for delivering a firearm to a well-dressed and affable stranger who later turned out to be a member of the crime syndicate. He could, however, and would be expected to use whatever knowledge he might have about the known bad guys in his community; and he could, and should, demand something better than the mere name on the package before delivering a gun to an obvious subteenager.

In an address given before the Chicago Railway Special Agents and Police Association last October, William B. Johnson, president of REA Express, accepted on behalf of his company the responsibility of restricting the delivery of mail-order guns to the extent suggested in the Dodd amendments. President Johnson's sentiments as expressed in this speech are not of a kind that gun people would find very palatable, but they do commit his agents to the exercise of caution in the delivery of mail-order firearms.

Many observers believe that the Dodd bill will be forced out of committee and presented to the Congress for vote during the 1965 sessions. We do not suggest that you support it; but we do suggest that, before you oppose it so vehemently as to make presently openminded lawmakers mad at all of us, you remember that there are many bills in the offing that are infinitely worse than this one—and that the men who advised the Dodd committee that they had better come up with a gun bill with teeth in it" are still men of power in Washington, ready and eager to make headlines with really tough gun legislation.

There is also one bill in preparation that could supplant the Dodd bill very soon after it is enacted (if it is enacted), and which could go far toward improving the entire climate of public and legislative opinion regarding guns and gun laws generally. That bill is the progun law in process of preparation by this magazine. You will hear more about that, now that the election is over and once we can learn who's who in 1965 Washington.

Meanwhile, get into politics in your own community—to the extent, at least, of being alert to what may be (and probably is) cooking in the way of gun legislation. Let us know what you find out. We'll help to the limit of our resources. But don't wait. Rally your friends, the friends of guns and the shooting sports, and take action. It's your State and your community. It's your right—and because rights go hand in hand with duty, it's your duty—to see that it's the kind of a community, the kind of a State, you want to live in.

And if you get your lily-white hands soiled a little with politics, rub a little gun oil on them. You can then at least continue to smell like a shooter. And you might not be able to do that if you let the other fellow run your politics.

Narcotics Addiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important article on one of the most crucial problems facing our Nation's cities—narcotics addiction. This article, by the able reporter, Gertrude Samuels, appeared in the New York Times Magazine on Sunday, January 17, 1965. Although we are aware of the dreadful statistics concerning narcotics addiction in the cities, we sometimes forget that behind the statistics are the stories of human desperation and despair. By graphically relating the story of an addict in New York City, Gertrude Samuels reminds us that the problem of narcotics addiction is a human problem, which robs this Nation of the talents of many citizens. The following article also supports the statement of the Advisory Council of Judges of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency:

The narcotic drug addict is a sick person, physically and psychologically, and as such is entitled to qualified medical attention just as are other sick persons. * * * [He should] not be criminally prosecuted.

The complete article follows:

THE PEOPLE VERSUS BABY

(By Gertrude Samuels)

Advisory Council of Judges of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency: "The narcotic drug addict is a sick person, physically and psychologically, and as such is entitled to qualified medical attention just as are other sick people. * * * [He should] not be criminally prosecuted."

The ordeal began on a Friday morning not long ago, on the fourth floor of the Criminal Courts Building in Manhattan. Outside the part 2 courtroom, a carbon copy of the day's calendar was posted. It listed a score of cases for hearings, trial and sentencing. Baby's name was on row 10.

Josephine Delia Gomez—the name inscribed on row 10—gave Baby an unimagined dignity. Below her name were listed two codefendants, Dennis Camp and Frances Benton (these are not the real names). All three were charged with a "1533"—loitering for the purpose of using narcotics. Baby and Denny were additionally charged with a "3305"—possession of narcotics. The second charge, a felony, was the serious one.

I first met Baby 7 years ago, while on assignment to write an article about gang girls. I spent several weeks then with her group—14- to 17-year-olds who ran with gang boys in East Harlem.

Baby, the prettiest and most volatile of them, already a school dropout, was just beginning to get into trouble. She was experimenting with marihuana—it was considered in her milieu "square" not to smoke reefers at weekend sets (parties)—and she was starting to experiment with sex. Yet she was fiercely devoted to her widowed mother. Baby was proud that she had taken work in a laundry to help, with her older sister, Angela, to pay the rent.

The mother grieved and carried on that Baby was a gang girl, and she went to the store-front church to pray. But Baby, by the time she was 16, had gone from the mild kicks of pot to the big kick of heroin.

Over the years, I kept in touch with her, through her Youth Board worker and directly. Her mother, both afraid and ashamed of Baby, had her committed for "incorrigibility." After 2 years in an upstate jail, Baby took jobs but failed to hold them. She usually needed three or four decks of heroin daily, a $20-to-$40-a-day habit, to function. She made the money on the street or by pushing the stuff.

At times she seemed eager to get into a hospital for detoxification, or to find a job out of New York; other times, especially when she was in the money, she would disappear for weeks or months. Then she would call spontaneously, "just to talk to someone, it's my birthday * * * off the stuff * * * looking for a job." But it was mostly a compulsion to spill it out before disappearing again into the street.

Still, at 21, she seemed to reach for some sort of dignity when the cops picked her up every couple of months for prostitution or larceny. "Baby," she would snap when they asked her name at the stationhouse. Then, changing her tone, she would pronounce her real name as though registering for school. "Josephine Delia Gomez," she would say primly, "and I want to call my mother." (Her mother had long before locked her out, ever since she had pawned their radio to get money for a fix.)

But Baby she was on the street, with her stained blouses and tight toreador pants and her arms blackblotched by the needle.

After arraignment on the narcotics charges Baby had made bail. Would she show for trial? I was waiting in the courthouse. The court was in a brief recess.

Outside, Frankie—Frances Benton, one of Baby's codefendants—was arguing with the arresting cop. She was pregnant, bulging under her dirty white overblouse, yet she managed to sound more flirtatious than quarrelsome. Frankie was the white member of the trio; but there was no race problem here—she would sleep with anyone who had heroin.

"Why did you do it?" she was demanding, batting her blue eyes under their false lashes, waving a half-eaten chocolate bar at him. (All day Frankie chewed on chocolates or cookies, sucking with a child's compulsion.) "We were just sittin' in that hallway. We were cold. We wanted to get in from the cold. We live on that street."

"Yeah, I know." The cop was uncomfortable.

"So why d'ja do it?"

"Now, you weren't just sitting. I wouldn't be here, and you wouldn't be here, if that was all."

He moved off. He would testify and he wanted to avoid this involvement. He was irritated because he felt the charge wouldn't stand up against her, since no decks had been found on her at the time of her arrest.

Frankie chased after him, her brown skirt riding up her legs. I caught her arm. She swung around angrily.

"Where's Baby, Frankie?"

"Don't bug me. I got my own worries. Ask Denny." She nodded to the tall, ebony-colored young man slowly walking toward us. She sucked on the chocolate bar.

At least Denny—Dennis Camp, the third of the defendants—wore a clean shirt under his old leather jacket. He walked jerkily, as if propelled by someone else, or fighting the effect of a fix.

"You seen my lawyer?" he mumbled. "He's here, then he ain't here. I paid him $25, but he went off and say he can't do nothin'. Gotta talk to Legal Aid, get some advice."

Frankie's lawyer suddenly appeared, a slackjawed fat man whose gray suit hung on him like a sack and whom she called, with unexpected aplomb, "counselor." And, appearing almost simultaneously, to run coffee and candy for her, was a thin little man of uncertain age who fawned on the girl. "My little friend," was the way Frankie introduced him indifferently. Little Friend looked anxiously from the lawyer to Frankie, made her stand near Denny away from the noisy corridor crowd, worried over her like a father—or a pimp?

Just as the recess ended and the black-robed judge took his seat on the bench, below the legend, "In God We Trust," Baby made her appearance, breathlessly. With her was a tall, husky young Negro, sweating in a bulky brown cardigan and pulling on a pipe. He was as quiet as Baby was talkative.

"Meet Hank," she said. "He made me come. I didn't have any money to come. No one cares, no one, my mother, my sister, no one gives a damn about Baby." She looked around vaguely. "Oh, God, I'm tired."

She threw her arms around Frankie, then me. She began to slump. Then she stood up straight, tore the black kerchiefs off her head, smoothed her hair, and pursed her mouth in an earnest effort to concentrate. Baby was high.

"The Legal Aid man should talk to you and Denny," I said.

We joined Denny who had wandered to the first row of seats outside the rail. That was a mistake. Feeling the drug, he had stretched out as though still on a stoop in Harlem. Legal Aid got Denny to a rear seat, near Frankie and Little Friend. He came back to Baby to check out the facts of the arrest.

Perhaps because Legal Aid was attractive and soft spoken, perhaps because he didn't probe too much but made her feel that he believed her story, he gradually brought Baby back from wherever she was to reality and the courtroom. It was at rare intervals like this that Baby could react with a mixture of remorse and appreciation.

Her heart-shaped face with liquid eyes and tentative smiles seemed young and defenseless. But though she had substituted a skirt for her usual toreador pants and wore a buttoned-up jacket to conceal her arms, her frizzy, dyed-red hair, clinging skirt and torn sneakers were all too apparent. "Prostitute-addict," her looks and record shouted to any judge and lawyer in a felony court—and probably not more than an hour or two away from the next fix.

And yet she still seemed to want to make an attempt to straighten out. Just after the initial hearing on the charges against her, 3 weeks before, for example, she had tried again.

With her 6-year record as a "pusher" and "pross" and terms at Hudson Training School, Women's Prison and the reformatory upstate, she knew the court would be tough on her this time. So Baby had signed herself into a religious "crusade" in Queens. There, without any medical or psychiatric help, a hundred addicts were taking a cold-turkey cure—trying voluntarily to kick the drug habit through religious conversion. I had visited her during that period.

In a large auditorium hung with banners that proclaimed, "He has sent Me to heal the brokenhearted," the young men and women, white and colored, belted out religious songs, came to the microphone to tell candidly how long they had been addicts—1 year, 5 years, 8 years—and how they now hoped to "bring our souls to Thee, Lord." Some shivered and rolled in the aisle to "When the Saints Come Marching In."

"We're now abstaining dope fiends," one young man shouted happily.

After a week she found the living arrangements "too crude * * * we were sleeping in hallways in the house where we all lived * * * no room of my own." She slipped off "to see my mother."

She never got to her mother. She made it as far as her old connection in the bar on Lexington Avenue. The cycle had begun again.

Now I heard her trying to convince Legal Aid that she had been "cured" through the religious crusade. She was going to go back there, she said earnestly, after he got these charges dismissed. The judge will like that idea, she assured him.

He shook his head. "He'll be more interested in whether you have a decent place to go to tonight. Now, just the details of the arrest. You and Frankie and Dennis were there in the hallway," he prompted. Did they have any decks on them (the small, glassine envelopes that hold the heroin, the possession of which is a felony)?

"No," Baby said, instantly awake. "Well," she added, grudgingly, "Frankie didn't have nothing. He went in her blouse and felt her up like they always do, but she didn't have nothing. But Denny and me—well, we had two bags. But they were empty."

Legal Aid said that if the laboratory tests showed that the "empty" bags had contained a narcotic Baby and Denny would be found guilty of possession on the "3305," though he would try for an adjournment until the lab tests came in. On the lesser charge of "loitering," he was certain they would go free for lack of evidence.

Legal Aid added that it would strongly help her case if he could show that she had a decent place to live during her parole for the next couple of weeks.

"Oh, God, I'm tired," Baby said. She glared around the packed courtroom, as though the uniformed cops, the plainclothesman with their shields pinned to their lapels, the clerks, the witnesses, the spectators were all her judges.

"That voice," she said wildly. The clearly enunciating voice of the bridgeman, standing between the bench and the public, was bellowing new cases.

A large girl stood before the bench, her private lawyer, white-haired, pleading her case. The charge was assault, third degree.

"All right—$25 on a disorderly conduct charge," the judge said crisply, tossing papers to the bridgeman.

An older woman in a well-tailored coat and flowered hat hurried inside the rail. "I'm her mother, your honor," she said. "I'll pay her fine. She is not bad, and she's sorry, your honor. Thank you, your honor."

"Pay your fine at the desk," the bridgeman said.

"My mother's not here," Baby moaned.

I told legal aid that the Village Haven might take Baby that night. It tries to help addicts, find them clean rooms and later interest them in jobs.

"It would help," said legal aid. "And Frankie needs detoxification, her lawyer says. Better let a hospital know that she's held up by the court."

Baby gave me one of her melting looks. "I'll do anything you say. I'm so tired."

I telephoned the Village Haven. A woman said in warm tones to bring Baby in any time that night. In the morning they would get her started "on a program."

A hospital for Frankie was a tougher problem. First, the psychiatric social worker, then the narcotics floor nurse said that the hospital routine couldn't be upset for anyone, that if "the patient" didn't get there by the 4 p.m. closing time, she would not be admitted until Monday.

"OK, but she's pregnant. If she goes back on drugs this weekend," I said, "you will be responsible for what happens."

There was dead silence on the other end of the wire, and then the nurse said to bring her down after the trial, whatever the time.

Just before 1 o'clock the bridgeman called Baby's case: *The People of the State of New York v. Josephine Delia Gomez, Dennis Camp, Frances Benton.*

They stood at the long brown table before the bench. Legal aid stood between Baby and Denny.

There had been a dozen similar narcotics cases that day; some shooting galleries had included 8 to 10 defendants each. The assistant district attorney looked as bored as the judge.

The lawyers pleaded their clients not guilty to the charges.

"Well, we'll adjourn for lunch. Be back here at 2 o'clock for the hearing."

Outside the courtroom, as Hank hovered near, saying nothing, Baby started to shake. "That goddam judge is bored stiff. Did you see him yawn?" She took my arm. "Take me to lunch. I'm so tired. What's going to become of me?"

"It's all set for Village Haven, Baby."

"I'll work. I learned how to type, at the reformatory, you know—not fast, but I'll improve." She was spilling over with plans. "And I can sew good—my mother learned me. Do you think they'll get me work?"

She rattled on in desperation and hope. How could the law and the people, with their anticontamination austerity, hold meaning for these sick people with compulsions for the drugs that were destroying them? "I'm so tired," she repeated. "What do I have to look forward to in this life? I'm tired of sleeping in hallways. I'm tired of the johns and the bars and shooting up and getting sick. I've had this goddam nausea. But I haven't been using lately," she said, suddenly wide awake and fearful. "For 2 weeks I haven't touched it. I'm not hooked."

I said I believed her.

She ate like a starved person—but first she opened the white napkin carefully,

savoring the civilized cleanliness before she put it on her lap.

"Who's Hank?"

"A friend," she said evasively. "He's got a wife and kids, but I can trust him. He's an addict, too," she added in the same tone.

"Pushing, like you, too?"

"Yeah, a bit," she said, the curtain coming down between us again. "Where else we gonna get the money? Gotta live."

"The only thing, Baby, is to get clean and stay away from the old neighborhood. You have to be responsible for the things you do now, or they'll keep taking you in. You're too well known."

She agreed. She gulped the food and asked for a glass of milk. She went to the washroom to tidy herself for the afternoon ordeal.

We were back in the courtroom promptly at 2 p.m. But now jail cases were being heard—those who had not been able to buy their freedom with bail. From the detention pen, they carried in the cynicism and the smells of the poor. The voices of the principal characters in each human drama seemed to grow softer in the dying afternoon.

There were now only a couple of cases left. One involved a tall, illiterate man with six prior convictions. He had been arrested with two decks of heroin in his hand. Baby was wide awake and tense.

With a shrug that seemed to say, "What's the use?" the man told the judge, yes, he had bought the drugs a few minutes before the arrest—"from Walt on the corner."

The judge never looked up. He scribbled something. He ordered the prisoner back to the pen. The colored court papers, the busy pen, the rubber stamps, seemed to have lives of their own.

Baby, who had been listening hard to this case, straightened her blouse, flattened her hair. "That goddam judge," she said through her teeth. "We're all animals, not worth looking at."

It was past 5 when Baby's case was finally called. The whole trial, on the loitering charge, took less than 10 minutes, and seemed anticlimactic.

The uniformed cop testified that while he and his partner were patrolling East Harlem in their "combat car," they saw "one male, white, enter a building," and because he looked suspicious, they followed him in. He disappeared, but in the hallway they saw the defendants seated on the stairs "in a stupor and glassy eyed."

Legal Aid interposed objections to the officer's "observations" and "opinions"—and on cross-examination was able to discredit the officer's story by forcing him to admit that he couldn't remember what the defendants were wearing or whether they were talking incoherently. Further, since the loitering charge under section 1533 requires that there be proof that defendants are loitering for "the smoking of opium," the prosecutor's case on this charge collapsed—as it does in many cases—because the police did not witness the actual taking of drugs.

At the end, Legal Aid moved "to dismiss on the grounds that the People have not established their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt." The judge grunted agreement.

The defendants stood rigid while the ambiguities of law and language rolled over them.

"When do you want a trial on the '3305'?" the judged asked.

The fat lawyer began to explain that his client, Frances Benton, needed hospitalization. Legal Aid and the prosecutor cut him off furiously.

"Your client isn't even charged with '3305'," Legal Aid shouted.

"My God," the prosecutor said with disgust.

Frankie's lawyer began to sweat profusely. He put a hand to his head. He apologized to the judge. The other attorneys, ignoring him, agreed on trial 2 weeks later on the charge still remaining against Baby and Denny.

The judge asked: "This girl"—pointing to Baby—"has a decent place to stay meantime?"

"Yes, Your Honor," said Legal Aid, "she is going to Village Haven."

"Good."

He signed the release papers, tossed them to the bridgeman, rose and stretched. There had been 38 cases since 10 a.m., narcotics charges coming up with fearsome regularity. The caseloads are heaviest in these lowest of the poor man's courts.

Outside in the corridor Little Friend offered Frankie more cookies and cigarettes, looking as though his horse had come in.

"We go to the hospital now," he said happily.

"No," Frankie said.

"We must go," he said, shocked.

"No hospital," she screamed at him. "I'll go on Monday."

I said, "The hospital is breaking its rules to take you at this hour. Now we're going downstairs, and we're getting in a taxi, and we're taking you to the hospital, Frankie. Then we're taking Baby to the Haven. That's what you told the judge, and that's how it is."

"Gimme a cigarette, Hank," Baby said, turning away. I don't know the moment that it happened, but Baby was suddenly full of energy. She tucked her blouse deep inside her shabby skirt. She pulled her kerchief out of her handbag. She gave Hank a mirror to hold while she tied it over her hair. She took out a lipstick for the first time that day, and brushed it on her mouth skillfully. "I gotta call my mother," she said.

"You can do it from the Haven."

"I told my mother I'd call her as soon as this was over. She has to know. She wants me to go back to this religious crusade."

The black eyes were no longer wild. Baby was in command of Baby again, weighing her words, sizing up those around her. The hand that replaced the mirror and lipstick in the torn bag no longer shook.

"It's pouring outside," I said to Little Friend. "Go and get a taxi."

He ran off fretfully, not looking at Frankie.

"Now we're getting in that elevator," I said, "and we're all going in a taxi, and we're going to see this through."

"I gotta call my mother," Baby shrilled.

"You can call from the Haven, Baby. You're tired, Baby, remember, tired?"

She stared at me, hard eyed but thoughtful. "OK," she said quietly, "let's go."

Little Friend had the taxi waiting. Denny took off as soon as we got outside. Mumbling, "Bye—see you, Baby," he pushed up his collar and, ignoring Baby's frantic "Where'll I find you, Denny?" he simply faded into the rain.

We dashed to the taxi. "Legal Aid was real nice," Baby said. "Better than your stinking lawyer, Frankie."

"My stinking lawyer didn't even remember that I was up on only one charge," Frankie said with a short laugh. "For my 19 bucks, he wanted to give me two charges."

Little Friend laughed uproariously. The girls ignored him.

"I have to go for 2 weeks to the Bible study," Baby said clearly.

Everyone was silent.

"Do you think you can get me into the hospital, too?" asked Hank. It was the first time he had spoken. "If I could get dried out, I could get a job maybe. You got some pull there?"

"I think they have a waiting list for the men."

"Yah, they tol' me," he said tonelessly, turning away.

At the entrance to the hospital Baby said, "You get Frankie settled. Hank and me will wait for you here. Gimme a cigarette, Hank." Her manner was positive.

"You'll wait? We'll only be a minute."

"Yeah."

Frankie and Little Friend went with me. The duty officer said we were expected, but the nurse was delayed, and we had to wait for her.

"I'll get you some chocolate and things," Little Friend said to Frankie.

"She can't take them up with her," the duty officer warned. Little Friend went to get them, anyway. I told Frankie I would tell Baby about the delay.

When I got to the entrance, Baby and Hank were gone. She had conned us again.

I went back to Frankie. She didn't have to be told. She said casually. "You know where to look for her, of course. Lexington and 100th. But it won't do any good yet."

Little Friend was back. "I gotta go now," he said to her. "You be good. Do what the nurse says."

"Yeah, yeah, get lost. No—thanks. You were a good help."

He left with a wry smile.

"It won't do any good," Frankie said again. Her wise eyes were somber, almost kind.

She slid out of the brown corduroy coat with its dirty lining. She had worn it all day, over the long tunic shrouding her belly. One could see now that it had been a crucial covering in court. Inside her elbows were the dark patches from the needle.

"I've known Baby a long time. I live on the next street," she went on. "She's a good kid, always takes the risks for the rest of us. She carries the works. She gets the stuff even when we cant pay. She talks all the time that way about her mother. She hates her mother. No one cares about us, anyway."

"I knew Baby before she got like this," I said, "before she was hooked."

"Yeah, well, the mothers don't care when you get hooked. I got no parents. I got a sister, but her husband couldn't stand me. I got sentenced for prossing and he didn't want me in the house after that." She nibbled on the chocolate bar.

The nurse arrived. She greeted Frankie coolly. Frankie had been a patient before and a trial to them. I shook hands with her and wished her luck. She held my hand, and the blue eyes where not unkind.

"I don't think it'll do any good to look for Baby," she said. "She hasn't had her fill yet. She'll have to come to you. She hasn't hit bottom yet."

As she left, Frankie calmly dropped the rest of her cookies, chocolates, and cigarettes on the desk of the duty officer. "Have a ball," she said to him.

The dreary drama had played itself out. Frankie was right about one thing. Baby was still on her course toward self-destruction. In the heroin culture which had dragged her down, she could follow the course to its logical conclusion—to a slab in the morgue. Or, somewhere along the line, because she knew that some of us wouldn't give up, she could begin to feel guilt, a powerful weapon in any arsenal. The only thing now was to wait, and to hope that the feeling of guilt would be stronger and come first. That she would want to call one person again.

I went to the telephone to tell Village Haven not to expect us.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bill on coffee agreement and took up supplemental agriculture appropriations.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 1744–1783

Bills Introduced: 30 bills and 8 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 939–968; S.J. Res. 37–40; S. Con. Res. 17; and S. Res. 76–78. **Pages 1749–1751**

Resolution Reported: Report was made as follows:

S. Res. 76, providing $442,700 for Committee on Commerce to make certain studies (no written report)—referred to Committee on Rules and Administration.

Page 1745

Sundry Resolutions Adopted: Ten sundry resolutions, as follows, were adopted without amendment:

Printing: S. Con. Res. 9, to print additional copies of prayers offered by Senate Chaplain Peter Marshall during the 80th and 81st Congresses;

Printing: S. Res. 22, to print as a Senate document a history of the Pima Indians and the San Carlos irrigation project;

Printing: S. Res. 23, to print as a Senate document certain censuses of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona;

Printing: S. Res. 29, to print as a Senate document a compilation entitled "Mineral Potential of Eastern Montana—A Basis for Future Growth";

Printing: S. Res. 33, to print as a Senate document a report on the status of Colorado River storage project and participating projects;

Joint committee membership: S. Res. 73, providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on Library;

Printing: S. Res. 74, providing for the preparation and printing of a new edition of the Senate Manual; and

Gratuities: S. Res. 70–72, providing for payment of gratuities to survivors of deceased Senate employees.

Pages 1794–1795

President's Message—D.C. Home Rule: President transmitted message covering his legislative recommendations for restoration of home rule to D.C. citizens, which was referred to Committee on the District of Columbia. **Pages 1743–1744**

Coffee: Senate passed, by 56 yeas to 23 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), S. 701, to carry out U.S. obligations under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962, after adopting committee amendments en bloc.

Pages 1793–1799, 1801–1805

Supplemental Agriculture Appropriations: Senate made its unfinished business H.J. Res. 234, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965 for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture.

Senators Holland and Miller each filed notice of intention to move to suspend rules for purpose of proposing an amendment to the joint resolution.

Pages 1772, 1805, 1809–1810

Confirmation: By 75 yeas to 7 nays, Senate confirmed nomination of W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. **Pages 1783–1793, 1811**

Nominations: Senate received nomination of Donald W. Hoagland, of Colorado, to be Assistant Administrator for Development Finance and Private Enterprise, Agency for International Development; and 114 postmasters. **Pages 1810–1811**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today.

Pages 1792, 1805

Program for Wednesday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 3:35 p.m. until noon Wednesday, February 3, when it will continue consideration of H.J. Res. 234, supplemental agriculture appropriations.

Pages 1806, 1810

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

Committee on Banking and Currency: Committee began hearings on S. 743, 797, and 814, bills which would change gold reserve requirements against Federal Reserve deposits and Federal Reserve notes, having as its witnesses Senator Dirksen; C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; and William McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

Appendix

Bill Bradley, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Princeton Alumni Weekly, Frank Deford, staff writer for Sports Illustrated, presents a vivid portrait of the qualities and abilities of one of Princeton University's illustrious athletes, Bill Bradley, an All-America basketball player. Not only is he considered the best college basketball player in the world, having won an Olympic gold medal and the Most Valuable Player Award at the Madison Square Garden tournament, but he is also known to be a hard-working student, which brought him the award of a Rhodes scholarship. Despite the pressures put upon him, Bill Bradley continues to be the same boy from a small town in Missouri, who recognizes the challenges that face all youth and is prepared to meet them. At a time when articles on the scandal at the Air Force Academy fill the press, it is heartening and reassuring to be reminded that the majority of the youth of this country has a high degree of motivation. Bill Bradley is an outstanding example.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Frank Deford's portrait of Bill Bradley, Princeton, 1965, be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PRINCETON PORTRAITS—BILL BRADLEY, 1965

(By Frank Deford, 1961)

If you look at all of him squarely, Bill Bradley seems too good—and too much—to be true. He is the best college basketball player in the world (he won an Olympic gold medal and was the best on the U.S. team in Tokyo); he is studious, religious, ambitious, popular, and respected by his peers; he is trustworthy, loyal, helpful, courteous—he is, in short, Jack Armstrong and might also be Horatio Alger, except for the fact that his father is a bank president and is paying for Bill's room, board, and tuition at Princeton.

Fortunately—you have to look hard for a flaw—the quirk of a permanently arched left eyebrow gives him a mischievous, almost satanic, appearance, but that, too, is quickly disputed by the sober, purposeful eyes, far more accurate gages of this young man's personality. Bradley is dark, angularly strong, with a few more than 200 pounds on a lithe 6-foot-5 frame. His smile truly reflects his warmth, though he can hardly be called the happy-go-lucky type. But it does belie his rigorous determination and self-discipline. Bradley insists that he is not a natural athlete. Without detracting from the immense effort he has put into basketball, few observers would agree with this estimate. It probably is true that his more modest academic success is the result of hard work rather than natural aptitude. Any Princeton student will tell you that a man who studies as much as Bradley does should be better than a B student—even if that would be A at most other schools.

Despite the fact that Bradley and Princeton get along marvelously, there is still mild astonishment that the best player in the country should be matriculating at old Nassau, an institution which has produced twice as many president as basketball All-Americas, i.e., James Madison, Woodrow Wilson, and William Warren Bradley. But there are certainly no regrets on Bradley's part about his choice of college. He picked Princeton in the 11th hour, leaving Duke at the very altar and about 60 other schools and their coaches on the road to the church. All had been attracted by a high school career in Crystal City, Mo., that included 3,066 points and 2 years of prep All-America. One of the losing coaches said sourly that Bradley could have been the greatest college player ever, but performing in the relative obscurity of the Ivy League would deprive him of that chance.

It has worked out, of course, in reverse. The novelty of having such an athlete performing in the shadows of ivy-walled Nassau Hall—without a grant-in-aid, without ersatz courses of study—has only enhanced Bradley's reputation. In the unique setting of the Olympic trials, where all of the best amateur players are thrown against each other in direct competition, without the support of familiar teammates, Bradley was the only undergraduate selected. Further, he had to make the team as a guard, after playing almost exclusively as a forward for Princeton, because the coaches thought he was too small for the forecourt in this competition. When they discovered they were wrong, he went back to forward and became the most valuable player on the winning U.S. team.

At Princeton, Bradley blends in easily though, basketball aside, he is still not a typical undergraduate—he is more serious and less blase than most. He plays basketball with an air of nonchalance, however, and is treated with roughly that attitude on campus. This delights him. He enjoys contrasting his reception after the Olympics with the full-blown parade that the town of Princeton gave its gold-medal winner, Diver Lesley Bush. "I flew back," he says, "and took a bus from New York and finally got to Princeton about 9 one morning. Thirty straight hours of travel. There was nobody to meet me. I just walked down to my room. A few people said hello or welcome back, but that was about it."

Actually, Princeton does take a prideful interest in its All-America—in its own fashion—and Bradley has had something of a lasting effect on the school. When he arrived, games at snug little Dillon Gym (2,600 rollout seats) were characterized by the atmosphere of a public hanging. Students showed up mostly to take out their wintertime frustrations on opponents. On one notable weekend the visiting Harvard captain was driven into fighting with some of his tormentors on Friday night, and on Saturday night the Dartmouth players were pelted with rubber-band-propelled paper clips.[1] An appeal by the coach and captain during Bradley's sophomore year helped, but it was more his regal presence on the floor that finally brought an urbane attitude to basketball watching. "It's like—well, I don't think you could chuck garbage at anyone on stage when Caruso's up there too," an undergraduate explains.

Sellouts at Dillon were common enough, but after Bradley started playing, basketball seating had to be restricted on the same basis as football. About 440 extra (and bad) seats will be crammed in this year, but still only students, faculty, a few alumni and opponents will be able to get in. It is no coincidence that Princeton has finally become serious about building a much larger indoor athletic complex. Plans are being speeded for a new arena that will seat upward of 7,000.

PRODIGIOUS PURPOSE

But Princeton students hold Bradley's basketball skill less in awe than they do his prodigious purpose. He studies in virtually all of his free time and seldom gets more than 6 hours' sleep. Before one game last winter, when he was completing an important history department paper on nativism in the United States after World War I, he trained with four straight nights of about 2 hours' sleep each. His teammates say that he plays so well on the road simply because travel keeps him away from Firestone Library and obliges him to sleep more. Two hours before every home game he goes back to his room in Dodge-Osborn Hall and is able to drift right off for a 40-minute nap. "Well, you know, I'm so tired, it's not hard," he says. He is so conscientious that he has been known to ask roommates to wake him up from a nap at, say, 5:27 instead of 5:30. To save other minutes he takes many of his meals at the student union, which is several hundred yards closer to the library than his eating club, Cottage.

Bradley lives—after the library closes at midnikht—with five roommates. The only other basketball player among them, Bill Kingston, is perhaps as close to him as anyone. "Getting to know Bill has been worth the 4 years here," Kingston says. "But always, I just wish he could be more outgoing." Donald Mathews, a young instructor who was Bradley's adviser last year and became a friend as much as a teacher, says: "He comes to generalizations painfully. I think Bill is becoming more mellow, but he will never shoot the breeze, as it were, without having done some studying on the subject."

Bradley is restrained intentionally because of the special pressures upon him—he says things like, "No one has to know my motives," and "I don't have to wear my heart on my sleeve"—but he is also naturally reticent. "Of course," teammate Ed Steube says, "it would be nice to have Bill loosen up, but then, you see, it wouldn't be Bill Bradley."

Bradley does find the time for an occasional party, to stomp out a little rock 'n' roll and to see some musical comedies. He is socially popular, not through wit or special grace, but because he is genuinely interested in others. Conversely, the vast amount of public interest in Bill Bradley often confuses and disconcerts him, especially the talk that he "made good on his own" despite family affluence. Filling out Princeton's standard athletic forms in his freshman year, he identified his father as "banker." On the same form, as a sophomore, he changed that to read, "works in bank." As a junior, he just left the parent's occupation entry blank.

[1] The offending individual was promptly expelled.—ED.

Bradley toured Europe after his senior year in high school, so he was not exactly fresh off the midwest front porch when he arrived at Princeton. He is not naive about the challenges he faces, but neither have his schoolboy precepts been altered very much. In his room at Princeton a few days ago, he said: "If the time ever comes when I can't cry sometimes or can't jump up and down and get really excited or get moved to the point of chills, then I've changed and I'll know it. But just because I am an All-America, that doesn't mean my opinions have changed. I hope I have matured but—and I don't mean this literally, of course; not out of context—but I guess I'm still the same boy from a small town in Missouri."

Coming from a small town named Crystal City seems almost too perfect for an All-America, and the fact that Bradley is not already being called the Crystal City Kid or something similar is a pretty good indication that he is not colorful. He sure isn't. And because he is so uniformly excellent that no facet of his game stands out, it is even difficult at first to tell how good he is on the court. In high school and at Princeton, for instance, he has had to be the big shooter, and he has averaged 30 points per game in college. Yet when he played an exhibition game against Baltimore with the Olympic team, the Bullets' Bailey Howell qualified his praise to say: "He didn't seem to even look for shots." Only once—when he scored 51 against Dartmouth last winter—has he ever deliberately tried to push his own point total. He had tied his Ivy record of 49 in the game, and the fans cried for more. "I just took three shots to make two points," he says, "so I could get out of there." It is a good guess that he will not score as much this year for Princeton, since the team has picked up more talent.

On the Olympic team, where scorers abounded, he was content to be more of a playmaker, though with his diverse skills he was actually an all-court catalyst, sparking every phase of team play. Significantly, he played much more than any other American. "He just seems to know what to do, when to do it and how to get it done," says Alex Hannum, the San Francisco Warrior coach.

Bradley was the only U.S. player smart and flexible enough to convert his style to take advantage of the international rules, which so favor an aggressive offense. He drew many more fouls than his teammates by driving far more than he normally does. And his foul shooting is already legendary; once he hit 58 in a row. With meticulous practice he has developed just about every shot. He can hook as well as jump-shoot or drive. He is equally adept at going to his left or right and shoots with either hand. Cincinnati Royal Coach Jack McMahon recalls when Bradley was a high school junior: "He went to Ed Macauley's basketball camp. He had hurt his right arm, but he went down there anyway, and Ed said, 'Just practice with your left hand.' So he hit 9 of 10 free throws lefthanded."

Bradley is not a spectacular jumper, but he gets good position. He is not exceptionally fast either, but he has quick hands, and when he gets loose on a break, his loping, cutting strides make him appear as fast as anyone. He can improve his accuracy from a distance, and he probably will if he decides to turn pro. At Princeton, his dedication to scholarship has restricted his basketball practice, but he has been almost fanatically faithful to the game ever since he was reprimanded for missing a session when he was 12 years old. This was hardly the result of even minor delinquency, however—he had passed up the practice for a Boy Scout meeting. (Similarly, the story goes, the only time he was heard to curse was when he muttered "damn it" as he rushed from his room—late—to teach Sunday school.)

But of all his accomplishments, it is most typical that Bradley has now vastly improved the two elements of his game once considered weakest. Princeton Coach Bill van Breda Kolff noted immediately upon his star's return from Japan that he was much better off the boards—"He's no longer an Ivy League rebounder." Some observers have insisted that he was not sufficiently aggressive overall; but the pros he played against as an Olympian do not agree. "When he puts a block on you, he lets you know it," says Tom Hawkins of the Royals.

Even more significant is Bradley's spectacular improvement on defense. When he came to Princeton he was like many high school stars whose coaches have shielded them from heavy defensive chores in order to keep them out of foul trouble. Van Breda Kolff schooled him thoroughly and made him guard the opponents' toughest men. Jack McMahon says, "I knew about Bradley's offense, and I knew his versatility. I know at Princeton he has to score. But what impressed me when he played against the Royals was that he was so aggressive on defense." The highest accolade of all, however, comes from Hank Iba, the Olympic coach who is a fanatic on this aspect of the game. He names Bradley as the U.S. team's best defender.

A COMPLETE PLAYER

Bradley is, then, a complete player. And a winner, too. He has led Princeton to two ivy titles, and this year the Tigers should breeze to a third. He has already gathered in every honor this side of Miss Teenage America. His own highest sports goal was to make the Olympics, and having played so magnificently in Tokyo, he may indeed find it difficult to be stimulated in his last college season. As a pro, though, Bradley would have much more of a challenge than just living up to his reputation. At his height, in the NBA, he is pegged as too small for a forward, and too big—or, rather, too slow—for a guard. Says Ed Macauley, a St. Louisan who has known Bradley since high school, "I think Bill will have to be a guard in the pros, and if he is, he will have to make a major adjustment. He can do everything—shoot, pass, dribble and play defense. But until he does make the adjustment in style there must be at least some reservations about him."

Harry Gallatin, on the other hand, has hardly any doubts about Bradley's future. The St. Louis Hawks coach feels that he can star as a swing man, playing the way John Havlicek has done. "Bill probably will spend a majority of his time as a guard and he will have his problems" Gallatin says, "but his assets will more than make up for any trouble he might have with the smaller backcourt men."

Speculation about Bradley's ability to play pro basketball is, however, somewhat moot. He is not so sure that he will try it. "If I wanted to prove myself and I knew I had the desire to continue, I'm sure I would," he says. "But right now, there are too many alternatives. I don't need basketball competition. The attitude is what is important, and I've gotten that out of the game already. I love the game. It's part of me. I don't think, however, that it's an inseparable—there ought to be a better word—oh, well, an inseparable part of me. At one time I thought I couldn't live unless I played baseball, and I gave that up."

Bradley is considering six alternatives to the pros. Some of them are admittedly smokescreens—"I say some of this to confuse people; it's still my business"—but he is obviously interested in both law school and study abroad. The other possibilities are the ministry, government work, business, and the Air Force. His future is likely to remain indefinite for a while because Bradley, right now, is more concerned with the present, and particularly with his thesis, which is a major part of a Princeton senior's grade. His topic is "The 1940 Senatorial Campaign in Missouri," and he did a great deal of work on it over the summer at the Library of Congress when he was in Washington. (He split the rest of his time between helping in Governor Scranton's campaign and practicing for the Olympics.) Bradley has personally interviewed one of the losers of that 1940 campaign and hopes to meet with the winner when he gets a Christmas break from basketball. The winner maintains a library in Independence, Mo. Bradley is also an eager public speaker—he virtually solicits engagements from youth groups—and because of his forensic aptitude and his qualities of leadership, it has been suggested that he already has his dark eyes on that Senate seat he is now writing about.

One usually levelheaded New York journalist has asked Bradley—seriously—if he would like to be President. Bill dismisses such talk as foolishness and insists it would be presumptuous even to answer the question. But they are going to be writing about this young man for years to come—and not just about the way he dribbles a basketball.

"He is a Christian the best way he can be, through the rigors of Calvinism," Donald Mathews says, trying to explain him. "He's never going to lose. Bill is always going to come back. Do you know?" He smiled and paused. "Do you know just how hard it is to defeat a 16th century Puritan?"

Farm Policy for Commercial Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, few issues are of greater interest or importance than that of U.S. agricultural policy. For more than 30 years, Congress has been searching for solutions which would promote our agricultural economy and national welfare, yet at the same time preserve traditional values represented by the family farm.

Recently the Honorable Claude Wickard, former Secretary of Agriculture and Rural Electrification Administrator, who since 1961 has been serving on the National Agriculture Advisory Commission, delivered a very significant address at the farm science program, held at Purdue University.

The authority for Mr. Wickard's speech stems both from his distinguished Government career and his farm experience, for he is a lifetime Indiana farmer. Still actively engaged in cultivating the soil, Claude Wickard brings to this problem unusual perspective and understanding.

I ask unanimous consent that his excellent address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD; and I commend the address to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"FARM POLICY FOR COMMERCIAL FARMERS"—SPEECH BY CLAUDE R. WICKARD, FARM SCIENCE PROGRAM, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, JANUARY 19, 1965

For the purpose of this talk, commercial farms are defined as those selling $10,000 or more of farm commodities. They comprised about 25 percent of all farms last year, and they accounted for 78 percent of all cash income from farming. There were nearly a million of these farms last year, and their number bids to increase numerically and relatively.

These commercial farms constitute the most efficient farming system in the world. Their efficiency makes it possible for American consumers to have the world's best diet at the lowest cost in terms of their incomes.

American consumers today spend less than 19 percent of their incomes for food, and the farmers only receive 37 percent of this amount, which is the lowest in history except for the depression years. It is clear that the commercial farmers are making the greatest contribution to holding down the cost of living and holding inflation in check. No other group is sacrificing more to help hold down the cost of Government.

The commercial farmer's efficiency and low farm prices mean that more income is available for other consumer goods. This is an important factor in developing industrial activity and increasing taxable income.

The efficiency of our farming system has enabled the Nation to expand its exports, thus helping it to maintain a desirable international balance of payments.

We have been able to use our abundance of low-priced farm products to help struggling nations throughout the world strengthen their economies and securities.

The owners and operators of the commercial farms, as a group, have not benefited financially by their increasing efficiency, because it has led to more production than can be sold at profitable prices. Acting as an individual, without effective national farm programs, each farmer is forced to increase his output in an effort to offset lower prices resulting from overproduction. Thus it is possible for our commercial farmers to become the world's most efficient paupers, because they cannot avoid the price-depressing effects of their own efficiency.

Our National Government has played a most important part in developing the world's most efficient farming system. Its land policies, including homestead laws, have made it possible to have almost all of our farmland under the ownership and operation of those who live on the Nation's farms, thus providing the most incentive to work hard and to adopt progressive and efficient methods. Through the research of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the State experiment stations, we are constantly finding better farming methods. Through the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, including the Extension Service, the Nation's farmers readily obtain the information they need to apply these improved methods on their farms.

It is the national interest for governmental agencies to help farmers become more efficient. However, it is not in the national interest for the Government to permit this efficiency to become the hard master rather than the faithful servant of those who live on the land.

If low net incomes to the commercial farmers of the Nation are allowed to cause slow attrition of the present farming system, it will be replaced gradually by some other system. The incentives inherent in the present system would gradually disappear. The Russians have learned production is low when the farmers are not rewarded for their individual efforts. If corporate or other large-scale organizations take over the Nation's farming, they will demand and receive much more income from their investment, their management, and their labor.

The year ahead will be a most decisive one for the commercial farmers. The laws which provide the programs for the 1965 crops of wheat and feed grains expire this year. The programs for these crops during the past 4 years have given the producers a modest increase in income. In addition they have reduced the large and costly carryovers present at the beginning of the period by about one-third. If we were to make an additional reduction half as large, our carryovers would be down to a desirable and prudent level from the standpoint of national security.

If no legislation is enacted for the 1966 crop of wheat, we will be forced to hold another wheat referendum like the one we held a year ago last fall. If the result is the same, wheat producers stand to lost perhaps $400 million annually.

There is another reason this is a fateful year for wheat producers. The International Wheat Agreement expires July 1, 1965. Our Government is participating in efforts to extend the agreement but for 1 year only or until July of 1966. This is because we do not know what legislation we will have for the crops of 1966 and future years and we don't know the kind of commitments we can safely make for such crops.

In view of recent actions by the European Economic Community, it seems probable that our exports to the member countries will decrease unless there are very favorable results from the Kennedy round of trade negotiations now in progress in Geneva. For this and other reasons the prospects for dollar exports of wheat are not too bright.

If there is no feed grain legislation this year, price supports for feed grains will be about one-third less for the 1966 crop. This is because the legislation governing the 1966 crop will automatically revert back to the same legislation we had for the 1960 crop. Thus, we will return to the overproduction of the late 1950's. I do not think it is necessary for me to describe the adverse effects on the feed grain and livestock producers under that situation.

The chances for enactment of effective legislation this year are none too bright for many reasons. Effective voluntary crop programs cost money. This year's feed grain and wheat programs, including the food-for-peace program, cost over $2½ billion. Unfortunately, the general public thinks that the commercial farmers don't need this much financial assistance.

The commercial farmers are a small part of the Nation's voters. Their congressional representation will decrease even more under the new legislative apportionments soon to be made. There will be demands for large expenditures for the benefit of rural people who are not members of the commercial farm families. Millions of these people are poverty stricken. There is an old Washington saying that the Congress tends to pour oil on the wheels that squeak the loudest.

The President has many projects for his Great Society. They should receive favorable consideration. They will cost a lot of money. The President has another goal. It is keeping Government expenditures at a comparatively low level. Cuts will have to be made somewhere.

Because of the unawareness of the great contribution being made to the Nation's economy by the Nation's commercial farmers, these farmers may find themselves in what for them is a profitless prosperity.

I have found that the general public is fairminded. If it were aware that the commercial farmers were receiving so little reward for their great contributions to the Nation's prosperity, I am sure it would be most sympathetic. I am also sure that if the general public found out that it was necessary to raise food prices and taxes to correct this inequality, its sympathy would be much less moving and enduring.

There are still those who say that there must be no interference with the law of supply and demand. The fact is that there is direct interference with the law of supply and demand in practically every phase of our economy. Not only that, every other agricultural nation is fixing farm prices and negotiating terms of trade with other nations. In these situations it is plain stupid to think the law of supply and demand will solve the economic problems of this Nation's farmers.

On the encouraging side we have made some very important gains in recent years so far as knowledge of the commercial farmer's problems is concerned. Part of this knowledge has been gained through experience. We know now that lower farm prices do not lower total farm production. We have learned that reducing the number of people in farming does not reduce production because we have had the greatest exodus from agriculture that has ever taken place in any industry in any nation.

Leading the way in sound analysis of the farm income situation are the Nation's agricultural economists. Starting about 4 years ago, five different groups of economists from the land grant colleges and the Federal Government have made reports of their estimates relative to the effects of a gradual withdrawal of the Government from all efforts to support farm income.

On the average these reports indicated that net farm income would decrease one-third. Prices for corn would go down to 80 cents per bushel; wheat would go down to 90 cents a bushel; and hogs would go down to 12 cents per pound.

Dr. Walter Wilcox, a highly respected economist in the Library of Congress, recently estimated that if there had been no Government farm programs during 1961, 1962, and 1963, net farm income would have been only one-half what it actually was. Most authorities think it should have been higher—not lower.

It is also encouraging to have the agricultural economists in general agreement as to the necessity of retiring cropland from the production of cultivated crops, if production and demand are to be brought into balance.

During the past few years I have been identified with two groups which have considered the commercial farm problem in what I think is a competent and impartial manner. In 1959 I became a member of an Indiana farm study group. I have found the other members of this group to be sincere and competent men. In our considerations we have been aided by very valuable information and facts supplied by the members of Purdue's agricultural economics staff.

This study group has released a list of recommendations. The principal recommendation was the retirement of 60 to 80 million acres of cropland from the production of cultivated crops. It is advised that this retirement be concentrated on the less productive land.

Early in 1961 I was appointed by President Kennedy to the National Agriculture Advisory Commission. This Commission is a bipartisan group and is about as representative of farming interests as it could possibly be. It has met frequently during the past 4 years and has worked diligently and intelligently in an effort to find the proper remedies for the Nation's farm problems.

Last November 13 the Commission's findings and recommendations were released in the form of a 42-page booklet called "Farm Policy in the Years Ahead."

Dr. George Brandow, agricultural economist at Pennsylvania State University and

president of the National Association of Agricultural Economists, was chiefly responsible for the preparation of this report. I believe it merits your careful study and consideration. Much of what I am saying in this talk is presented in the report in a more detailed and more intelligible manner.

One of the principal recommendations in the report concerns a long-term retirement of 40 million acres of low productivity cropland. This program is to be put into effect over a period of 5 years.

The Commission's report also recommends annual retirement of more productive farmland from the production of specific crops to avoid overproduction of these crops. This phase would be implemented by programs similar to the current feed grain and wheat programs with the idea of merging these programs into one as much and as soon as practicable.

It is most reassuring to know that there is growing support for a cropland retirement program and I am mildly optimistic about its acceptance by the Congress. I should tell you, however, that anything that sounds like another version of the old soil bank has not been at all popular in Congress in recent years. This sentiment was demonstrated last year when the Congress refused to pass legislation for renewal of the expiring conservation reserve contracts.

The Commission favors the expansion of the food stamp program. It favors more aggressive measures which will help regain and hold our share of the world markets including exports to countries behind the Iron Curtain. The inclusion of nonsurplus farm commodities in the Public Law 480 programs is also advocated.

My experience convinces me that we have a very responsive National Government. It has been my observations that if a group of our citizens will agree upon and actively support legislation which is in their own interest and in the national interest, the National Government will respond favorably.

Therefore, everything depends upon the degree of unity which can be reached among farm people relative to remedial legislation and the united and active support of these people for such legislation. We will always have honest differences of opinion concerning details of farm legislation but as in all far-reaching and important legislation, those differences will have to be compromised if we are going to preserve and strengthen the world's best farming system.

Passing of Gold as Circulating Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, with all the discussion I have read and heard recently about removing the gold backing from our domestic money supply, I do not believe I have seen a clearer or better explanation of why this step should be taken than appeared recently in the Arizona Daily Star of Tucson.

Written by William R. Mathews, a distinguished newspaper editor and publisher, the editorial makes clear that this "gold cover" is not needed and that its removal would benefit our balance-of-payments situation.

Without objection, the editorial follows:

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Jan. 13, 1965]

PASSING OF GOLD AS CIRCULATING MONEY

As the gold question begins to warm up over the propriety of legislation to remove the 25 percent of gold backing for the domestic money supply, memories go back 50 years when gold and silver were considered to be the only real money. That was particularly true in California and Arizona, where the use of gold and silver dollars was a conspicuous one.

The coming of the Federal Reserve System, with its prompt clearing of checks, helped to develop what had been a limited practice into a universal one. Checks became the new money. As the system improved, there was less and less use of gold and silver.

However, legislation required at first a 40-percent backlog in gold for the Nation's money. Anyone could get gold or silver on demand, and that is what happened during the Big Depression. Hundreds of thousands of people, if not millions, did demand gold, which they stored in their safe deposit boxes.

Then came the 1933 bank holiday. When President Roosevelt took office on March 4, 1933, he made, on the advice of his financial advisers, a public demand for all gold to be surrendered to the Federal Government. At that time gold was priced at $20 an ounce. In 1934, President Roosevelt asked that the price be raised to $35 an ounce. He expected it would cause a rise in prices, but it barely caused a ripple in the financial markets.

In 1945, Congress reduced the gold backing from 40 percent to 25 percent, where it is today. The trouble now is that, in order to meet our balance of international payments, we have to reduce our entire gold stock to 27 percent, and apparently it is destined to go lower.

There is nothing alarming about this situation, because it can be met. Much of this gold stock of $5 billion could be released by confining the gold backing to actual monetary stocks. At the present time, it includes backing for the deposits of private banks with the Federal Reserve System.

An important group of distinguished bankers and economists believes that the entire backing of gold should be removed, and the entire gold stock used to meet international payments. To old-timers raised on the hard-money theory, this suggestion is a shocking one. Yet, they might recall that ever since F.D.R. devalued the old gold dollar, and made the private holding of gold a crime, our currency has not been convertible into gold.

Our currency for the past 30 years has been a managed one, in which gold has been used only for the settlement of international balances. Our currency will not be affected either way in value by the removal of the gold backing that exists today. The gold backing would constitute a reserve for the payment of international balances large enough to handle any spectacular attack on the dollar. It is a general rule of banking that when people know that Uncle Sam has the means to pay his international balances in gold, the speculators of the world will not speculate in dollars.

In this matter of international payments, Uncle Sam is still in a strong position. We still sell several billion dollars more in goods and services than we buy. The deficit in our international payments balance is caused by military payments to our own troops abroad; foreign adi; tourist expenditures; and American capital seeking investment not only in Europe, but nearly everywhere in the free world.

The future will see much discussion about raising the price of gold. The Economist, weekly news magazine in London, several years ago recommended a tripling of the price to $105 an ounce. The biggest beneficiaries of that would have been the big gold producers like the Soviet Union and South Africa. Someday, as the population of the world continues its spectacular increase and there is a resultant increase in commerce and banking of all kinds, the price of gold will have to be raised. That is one reason why the existing gold inventories are so carefully husbanded.

The Late Publisher Harry Kates of Gladewater, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we of the Gladewater, Tex., area sustained a great loss when Publisher Harry Kates of the Gladewater Mirror passed away last fall. A very fitting and appropriate editorial was written by Publisher Carl Estes of the Longview Daily News Journal and printed December 3, 1964, in the Longview Morning Journal. Mr. Kates not only was a outstanding publisher but he was a splendid gentleman and a fine Christian man. We shall always miss him.

The editorial follows:

FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

The western Gregg County and Gladewater area has lost a valued friend and public benefactor in the death of Harry Kates, publisher of the Gladewater Daily Mirror. We here in Longview join his many friends throughout Texas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma in mourning his passing due to a heart attack suffered shortly after a Thanksgiving Day family reunion.

Mr. Kates, who has published the Gladewater Mirror for the past 10 years, had a long and varied career in the newspaper field. He was recognized in 1963 by the Texas Press Association for 50 years of service in the newspaper field. He was recognized in 1963 by the Texas Press Association for 50 years of service in the newspaper profession, a recognition he had earned by dedicated and resourceful work.

He was a native of Claremore, Okla., the son of the late Mr. and Mrs. A. L. Kates, a pioneer Oklahoma family. His parents purchased the Claremore Progress in 1893, years before that territory was admitted to the Union as a State, and operated it for many years.

In 1938, Harry and his brother, the late Bill Kates, purchased the Progress. Harry acquired his brother's interest in 1941 and operated the newspaper until 1947 when it was sold. Harry then purchased three southeastern Oklahoma weekly newspapers, the Broken Arrow Ledger, Jenks News, and Bixby Bulletin, which he published for 5 years. He owned and published the Winn Parish (La.) Enterprise and daily Winnfield News-American for a period prior to purchase of the Gladewater Mirror in 1954.

Across the decade we had known our neighbor publisher, we had observed his hard work and dedication to duty—not only to his business but in a much broader sense to the city and community which the Mirror served. Though recently in ill health, he was restless when not at his office. His first thoughts always were given to the job of giving the community the best newspaper possible under the circumstances.

He also was active, as his personal circumstances would permit, in the Gladewater Chamber of Commerce, the American Legion, and the Presbyterian Church. Through his newspaper he encouraged and supported countless community service enterprises and organizations, all of which contribute to community progress and welfare.

It is to the credit of his family and associates that his service to the community was carried on with diligence and purpose well beyond his own personal endurance and strength and, as he had hoped and planned, will continue to serve the Gladewater area faithfully and well.

All of us here in Gregg County and East Texas will continue to hold him in honoring memory for the long and distinguished service he has rendered as a publisher, as an enterprising citizen and a dedicated family head. Despite the physical weakness and limitations to which we all are subject, it can be said of our neighbor publisher: Well done, Harry Kates.

Veterans' Administration Hospital, Rutland Heights, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which has been adopted by the Massachusetts State Senate regarding the proposed closing of the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Rutland, Mass. I need not tell you of the hardships which would result to veterans of the First Congressional District, as well as others in the Commonwealth who avail themselves of these facilities. Therefore, I commend your attention to this problem:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PREVENT THE CLOSING OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL AT RUTLAND, FEBRUARY 1, 1965

Whereas the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has proposed that the medical-surgical facilities of the Veterans' Administration, located at Rutland, be closed on June 30, 1965; and

Whereas the closing of these facilities appears to be contrary to the philosophy of rendering maximum benefits to the veterans of the country whose timeless efforts and unselfish sacrifices should always be remembered: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to instruct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to rescind his directive ordering the closing of the veterans facilities at Rutland; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Surgeon General of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congres and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, January 27, 1965.

THOMAS A. CHADWICK, *Clerk*.

A true copy. Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Gen. Curtis LeMay

SPEECH

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, one of this Nation's most courageous military leaders retired this week after a distinguished career of service. On behalf of a grateful citizenry, I want to express appreciation and extend a most deserved "well done" to Gen. Curtis E. LeMay from the people of my congressional district in Kansas. We are indeed indebted to General LeMay for his monumental contributions to the freedom, defense, and security of the United States and the free world.

We will never forget the genius and vision of this man who contributed so much to America's formidable strength in the air. General LeMay was the father of the Strategic Air Command. There is no doubt that the power of SAC has served as America's greatest deterrent to war. General LeMay waged a determined effort to build a flexible weapons arsenal including both missiles and manned bombers.

Curtis LeMay certainly is not a "yes man." His leadership and counsel were based upon 38 years of military experience in hot and cold wars. He fought for what he believed was necessary to keep America strong. General LeMay believed that only through strength can we prevent war. On February 4, 1964, he told the House Armed Services Committee:

It is my personal belief that only by being strong enough to win a war will our desire to prevent war have a true meaning.

He knows and understands communism; and I believe he demonstrated a know-how for stemming Communist aggression and ambitions. In those same hearings a yeaer ago, he stated:

The Soviet Union has periodically proclaimed peaceful coexistence and a gradual political change as the goal of international communism. But in the past, these proclamations have been followed by new forms of aggression.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation will always require the advice, counsel, and service of such leaders as General LeMay. We need such voices as his to speak out even though others in positions of leadership may not be in agreement. I know that General LeMay will continue to contribute to the greatness and strength of the United States. I believe the following excerpt from a recent editorial in the Wichita, Kans., Eagle may account for General LeMay's retirement as U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff at age 58; but it also points up the debt which all Americans owe to General LeMay:

LeMay will be missed. His service to our Nation has been considerable over the years. And, while his nonconformism may have caused difficulties for the Defense Department and the administration, there is a certain value in having a man who is not afraid to speak his mind in the upper echelons of our Defense Establishment. Our Nation's defense is too important to have nothing but "yes men" running it.

The 400th Birthday of St. Augustine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to invite all of my colleagues to visit St. Augustine, Fla., this year to participate in the 40th birthday of America's oldest city.

You will not only have a delightful vacation, but you will enjoy the historical restoration program which is being made possible by so many people.

I am pleased to enclose an article from the New York Times which outlines in detail some of the restoration program:

ST. AUGUSTINE ASTIR AS 400TH BIRTHDAY NEARS

(By C. E. Wright)

ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.—Visitors here during the next several months will see the biggest building boom this ancient city ever has experienced. Almost all of it is a part of the preparations for St. Augustine's quadricentennial, which begins on September 8, although there will be preliminary events before then. Some of the building is also a part of a $20 million restoration program that will go on for many years after the 400th anniversary celebration is over.

About $5 million in work is either in progress or has been completed. The largest single investment is that of the Catholic Diocese of St. Augustine. It has a big program for the Cathedral of St. Augustine, which faces the plaza in the city center, and for the Mission of Nombre Dios, where the colonial and religious history of what is now the United States began on September 8, 1565.

Construction at the mission will include a 200-foot-high steel tower and a votive church in time for next September's ceremonies. A new library and research center are also planned.

CLOSED FOR RECONSTRUCTION

The old Cathedral of St. Augustine, which was erected between 1791 and 1797, has been closed for reconstruction and restoration. It was partly burned during the 1880's, and, in the rebuilding, its interior took on some nondescript Victorian characteristics. The restoration project will provide a return to Spanish architecture.

The cathedral will be enlarged in the rear, where some modern buildings will be torn down to make room for the expansion. In all, the Catholic Diocese of St. Augustine will spend about $2 million for improvements. Most of the money has been donated by parishes throughout the country.

The National Park Service is spending more than $1 million. One of its major projects is the straightening of Castillo Drive, which has a number of sharp curves as it passes the Castillo de San Marcos.

The reconstructed four-lane roadway will not only eliminate these curves, but will also provide a larger parking area on the fort side of the highway. The new parking lot will accommodate 160 cars, whereas the present one holds only 60.

Acquisition of the necessary land cost the Park Service more than $500,000; about $250,000 of this went for the old Bennett Hotel, a St. Augustine landmark.

Much of the restoration work that is going on is on historic St. George Street, which lies a block to the west of the fort. At the north end of this street, where it connects with Castillo Drive, stand the original city gates.

ANOTHER RESTORATION

Just south of the gates is the Ribera house, which was built about 1730. It is being restored on the massive foundations that were found when the old Park Hotel, which had occupied the site for many years, was torn down. The foundations were the largest ever discovered in St. Augustine.

This restoration project will be completed in February. It will be the only house in St. Augustine where visitors can see the architecture of the original Spanish period before 1763.

Farther south on St. George Street, the Oliveros house, built in 1798, is being restored. Across the street from the Oliveros house is the Benét house, restoration of which has been completed. This was once occupied by relatives of Stephen Vincent Benét.

South of the Oliveros and Benét houses is the William McHenry house. McHenry, a Scot, lived here during the second Spanish occupation. His house is being reconstructed on the original foundations.

Casa Hidalgo, the Spanish Government exhibition building, is being constructed at a cost of $200,000. It will be primarily a cultural center, featuring exhibits of the decorative arts, historic materials of the Spanish conquest of the New World, and Spanish handcrafts.

At the corner of King and Aviles Streets, the Florida building is being erected. It will be completed in April.

Aviles Street, which contains many of the oldest structures in the city, will also come in for some restoration work. For example, there are plans to construct buildings typical of the 1763–83 British occupation period.

It will be devoted to exhibits of British navigation and exploits of that early period, including Sir Francis Drake's voyage of 1586, when he sacked and burned Cartagena and St. Augustine. Among the exhibits will be a map of St. Augustine that Drake drew at that time.

The Pan American Building, now being erected on Charlotte Street, will house Latin American exhibits, mainly art objects, artifacts and other cultural features.

Money for this building was donated by numerous U.S. industries. It will be completed before the September 8 anniversary.

COMMISSION APPOINTED

Federal participation in the quadricentennial is being supervised by a national commission that was appointed by President Kennedy. Beyond that is the work being done by the National Park Service.

The complete restoration program envisages that, eventually, about 200 houses and other buildings will be restored to their original architecture, or as nearly like it as is possible. The rate at which this work will be carried out will depend largely on donations and the willingness of private owners to do the work at their own expense.

Tribute to Gen. Curtis E. LeMay

SPEECH

OF

HON. HOWARD H. CALLAWAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 1, a great American, a great patriot, and a great general—Gen. Curtis LeMay—retired from active service. I would like to add my tribute to the many already spoken for this outstanding man.

General LeMay's career speaks for itself. Entering the armed services as a flying cadet in 1928, he retires this year as Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

These 37 years of service saw so many achievements—the development of bombing techniques and the many bomber commands in World War II, the Regensberg raid, command of Strategic Air Forces in the Pacific, the Berlin Airlift—and the command and development of our Strategic Air Command.

General LeMay's influence and contributions to our air defense are unmeasurable. As commander of SAC, he built, from the remnants of World War II, an all jet manned bomber force, and supervised plans for the development and integration of an intercontinental ballistic missile capability.

As Commander of SAC, and as Chief of Staff, the general has always stressed the importance of maintaining a balanced military concept of manned bombers and missiles. He knows the danger of discounting the precision of the manned bomber and placing our reliance on the missile alone as a peacekeeping deterrent.

For his philosophy, his leadership, his ability—America and the entire free world are indeed indebted to Gen. Curtis LeMay. As he retires, Mr. Speaker, may I add my good wishes to the many he has already received, and my fervent hope that General LeMay will continue to lend his counsel, experience, and advice to a grateful nation.

Deal for Soybeans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in the light of many objections to the granting of an export license by the U.S. Commerce Department for the sale of soybeans to the Soviet Union, I feel that an editorial appearing in the Carroll Daily Times Herald of Carroll, Iowa, on Saturday, January 30, 1965, merits attention. It follows:

DEAL FOR SOYBEANS

Commerce Department approval of the first export license for sale of about 4 million bushels of soybeans to the Soviet Union will doubtless touch off further controversy. The dispute over the 1963 policy change has never quite died down. But the conclusion drawn then by the administration and a majority of thoughtful Americans is still valid: the advantages of such sales greatly outweigh any drawbacks.

There are two main arguments against permitting sale of food to the Soviet Union and other Communist nations of Eastern Europe. One is that we are thus bailing them out and freeing their economies for heavy industry and war material production. The other is that the Soviet Union may turn around and ship food to others—Cuba, for example—thus weakening our economic crackdown on hostile regimes.

One circumstance knocks both these arguments into a cocked hat. This is that we are not the only nation with surplus food to sell, and that if the Russians cannot buy it from us they will buy it elsewhere.

There are several points in favor of the policy of increased trade with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. One is that maintaining bridges to those countries offers some promise of lessening tensions that were so characteristic of the time when the cold war was at its peak. Another is that more trade will help our balance-of-payments situation and further aid our economy by reducing our surplus crop storage costs. Such sales also are a reminder to the world that our free enterprise system of farm production is vastly superior to the Communist system.

All in all, the sale of soybeans, wheat, and other surplus farm products behind the Iron Curtain is a good thing. It is encouraging to find the Government carrying on with this policy established a couple of years ago.

Iowa's Champion of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, recently all Iowans have been mourning due to the death of the late president of the State University of Iowa, Dr. Virgil M. Hancher. Dr. Hancher became president of the State University of Iowa at a time when the State and the Nation was in the depths of a great depression, and through his hard work, his ability, and his loyalty and devotion to his State and his alma mater, he brought the State University of Iowa to the front rank of universities of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD this fine editorial from the February 1, 1965, Davenport Times-Democrat concerning Dr. Hancher.

The editorial follows:

IOWA'S CHAMPION OF EDUCATION

In the death of Dr. Virgil Hancher there is a temptation to measure his accomplishments as president of the University of Iowa by citing the figures. During his 24 years, the number of students increased from 6,667 to 14,480. The size of the campus was increased by three and a half times.

As significant as these gains are, Doctor Hancher would be the first to disavow such a gage of what he endeavored to do—and did so.

"We need to understand the gospel of quality," he said on one occasion. "It is brains and not inert materials that create wealth."

In his understanding of the need for adequate financing if the facilities of education are to meet the need of the student, he worked untiringly to obtain increased appropriations from the Iowa Legislature. He succeeded in large measure, with trust and confidence supplanting doubt and suspicion, as he pleaded his cause:

"Education is an investment and not merely another expenditure. Society should support these great institutions, because it is society as a whole which reaps the greater benefit. The tax cost of education is not a loss to the economy. It is an investment in human capital. No longer do we ask: 'What can we afford to spend on education?' Rather we ask: 'What can we not afford to spend?' "

It was in pursuit of such educational ideals that he did so much to build up the expansive physical plant at the University of Iowa, including development of the memorial union and projects for the student center and graduate house. One of his last contributions was the envisioning of the fine arts campus which is a new goal of the university. The medical school, the school of religion, and the science department notably enjoyed the benefits of his broad interest. He was among the first to foresee the challenge of space research, and to provide the means by which Iowa has had such a distinguished role in that field. General education courses, the arts and humanities, and the whole range of education advanced because of his determination that the University of Iowa should become one of the Nation's finest institutions of higher learning, and that it would be "more directly interwoven with the life and activity of all Iowans."

Doctor Hancher will be remembered for many attainments—as a leader of educators' associations, as a public figure entrusted with major governmental assignments, and as one who did much to give Iowa a national image and status it did not have before. Most of all, though, he should be honored for his immeasurable contribution to excellence in education.

Nation of Peeping Toms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this distinguished body know, I have reintroduced legislation (H.R. 980) to protect postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter. A similar bill, H.R. 319, passed the House of Representatives last year by an overwhelming vote but died in the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee when Congress adjourned. I am hopeful my colleagues will give this legislation the same overwhelming support when it comes to the floor for a vote in this Congress.

In connection with this measure, I think the Members of this body will be interested in an editorial which appeared in America magazine January 9, 1965.

The editorial follows:

NATION OF PEEPING TOMS

Sooner or later, a public revulsion against the commercial exploitation of prurience is bound to come. There are even signs that it may have set in already.

Marya Mannes, for instance, has not been known hitherto as a crusader against smut. But in an article in the New York Herald Tribune, last month, she said: "The huge sales of books like 'Harlow'—wretchedly written and squalidly conceived—make it increasingly evident that we are encouraging a nation of peeping toms, avid for sexual intimacies which they themselves apparently fail to achieve."

The question raised by books like "Harlow," "Candy, Here Goes Kitten," and Mary McCarthy's "The Group," according to Miss Mannes, is one not of censorship, but of taste—"a word and concept which might well be taken out of lavender lace and reinstated as a positive factor in the public climate."

To restore taste to its role as the arbiter of letters, she says, "It must be divested of its long and unfortunate kinship with fashion or social mores in general, and redefined in terms of human values." Here she is surely right. Society lives by its commonly accepted standards, which are largely conventional, but are rooted in a solid substratum of permanent human values. If there are no such values, then there is no criterion by which to distinguish bad convention's from good ones.

A society that has become so liberal that it refuses to admit any standard of taste other than personal preference is a sick society. "For," as Miss Mannes says, "when anything goes—and we appear to have reached that state in the arts and letters as well as in social behavior—everything goes."

"It cannot be up to government to define such standards, least of all to attempt to legislate them," she is careful to add. The maintenance of the canons of taste, she says, must be left to the conscience of publishers.

Certainly law is no substitute for a healthy public conscience or for publishers with a conscience. There is much that is tasteless, offensive to refined sensibilities, or even corruptive of public morals that law cannot touch. But it is going too far to say, as Miss Mannes does, that "censorship * * * is not only ab' orrent but virtually inapplicable."

In the first place, "censorship" is the wrong word. It properly means that material must be submitted, prior to publication, to some agency that has authority to decide whether publication will be permitted. But in our system of law, obscenity legislation almost universally acts to punish publishers or distributors after publication. The only practical question in this country is whether this kind of legislation can be enforced.

In principle, at least, the answer is yes. In the 1957 *Roth-Alberts* case (354 U.S. 476), the U.S. Supreme Court laid down a legal test for obscenity: "whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest." The publication and distribution of such material, the Court said, could be penalized without depriving the defendants of due process of law.

Since 1957, the Court has leaned over backward to make its own norm ineffective. Philip B. Kurland, a leading constitutional lawyer, remarked in the November 1964 Harvard Law Review: "The Court is unwilling to say that pornography comes within the protection of the guarantees of freedom of speech and press. At the same time, it seems unable to say when it falls outside that protection." As a result, while the Court dithers, the United States continues to become a nation of peeping toms.

We're the Last To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the St. Paul, Minn., Dispatch of January 19, 1965, points out a major weakness of U.S. foreign policy today—the concealment of facts from the American people. The editorial writer accurately states that this policy "is dangerous and an insult to the maturity of the American people."

WE'RE THE LAST TO KNOW

Senator WAYNE MORSE, with whom we disagree more often that not, makes a valid point when he says the American people are entitled to know if the United States is escalating the war in southeast Asia, and, if so, to what extent.

The Senator, who has long been a critic of U.S. involvement in Laos and South Vietnam, made the observation in referring to recent American air strikes against a bridge and communication routes in Laos.

A group of 20 U.S. fighter-bombers reportedly knocked out a bridge in Laos which has been primarily used for reinforcing and supplying the Pathet Lao Communists in Laos. The raid, apparently, was only secondarily directed at harassment of supply routes used by the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

Neither the Pentagon or the State Department has admitted the raids. Neither has the State Department commented on the legal justification for the air strikes in Laos or said whether the raids were requested by Prince Souvanna Phouma, the Laotian Premier.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has said only that no air strikes have been carried out against North Vietnam.

In the absence of any formal declarations by the Johnson administration as to just what is going on—just what current American policy in the area is—there can only be speculation.

One school of thought is that the United States has been carrying out air strikes for nearly 6 months as air reconnaissance missions requested by the Laotian Government. The raids have been stepped up and are in greater force lately as a psychological device to impress upon the North Vietnamese—without directly attacking them—of American determination to stay in southeast Asia.

The implication should be clear, this argument goes, that the raids could be extended quickly into North Vietnam if Communist operations in Laos and Vietnam do not cease.

If the United States is carrying on a deliberate policy of air strikes in Laos why don't we say so officially? The raids would be a violation of the 1962 Laotian agreement in Geneva but the Communists have violated the pact so often it has been a dead issue for some time. The American people ought to be told if this is the new U.S. policy.

The Communists in Laos and North Vietnam obviously are aware of the attacks: the Soviet Union and Peiping are aware of them. Some of our allies probably have been appraised of them.

But, as is so often the case recently, the American public is the last to know about what is actually going on in the critical areas of southeast Asia. There is a risk of the war in South Vietnam and Laos escalating. The risk grows every day. A foreign policy based on concealing that fact or attempting to avoid explaining U.S. actions or new policy decisions with no comment is dangerous and an insult to the maturity of the American people.

Churchill Funeral Raises Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, while there has been a great deal of conversation about various reasons why Vice President HUMPHREY was not sent to the funeral of Sir Winston Churchill, it re-

mains for our David Lawrence to be one of the first to bring this question out in the open in his article which appeared in the Washington Star on February 1.

It seems unfortunate that Mr. HUMPHREY was not designated to head the delegation to England because it could not help but leave a question in the minds of our people about the seriousness of President Johnson's illness and the desire not to have the Vice President beyond the United States at that time.

Mr. Lawrence's article follows:

CHURCHILL FUNERAL RAISES QUESTION

(By David Lawrence)

Why didn't President Johnson send Vice President HUMPHREY to attend the funeral of Sir Winston Churchill? This question has been asked by many people here in the last few days. But while official quarters have not supplied the answer, the decision on the part of Mr. Johnson was based on obvious circumstances.

The truth is that, although Mr. Johnson came back from the hospital the middle of last week, he stayed in bed much of the time for several days thereafter. The President was aware that throughout the country there was a nervousness about his illness—a fear that it might take a serious turn.

If, indeed, he had been well enough to resume his regular activities, there wouldn't have been so much concern. But because Mr. Johnson had not fully recovered from his illness, it was recognized that to send the Vice President out of the country at such a time would cause some apprehension.

The whole question of whether a President himself should go out of the country at all has often been debated. Some lawyers have taken the view that whenever a President leaves the jurisdiction of the country either the Vice President should be considered in office or that a constitutional amendment should be adopted clearly setting forth that the President does not necessarily have to be in this country to exercise the duties of his office.

Inasmuch as public opinion lately has been somewhat apprehensive during President Johnson's illness, sending the Vice President abroad at this time might have compounded the worries of the Nation.

The U.S. Government did, of course, pay honor to the departed statesman by sending an official delegation. It would have been regarded as a higher tribute if the President himself could have gone to London, but everybody in Britain as well as in this country realized that Mr. Johnson had been ill and that his physicians would not want to take any chances of a reinfection or of some other medical consequence which might result from a journey abroad.

Perhaps Mr. Johnson did make one mistake. He might well have chosen Dwight Eisenhower to represent the U.S. Government, not just as a man who had twice served as President but because of his ties with the British people and leaders while he was general of the American Armies and supreme commander of Allied Forces in Europe during World War II.

The fact that Winston Churchill and Dwight Eisenhower were such close friends, and together made some of the major decisions during the war, was enough to warrant the designation of General Eisenhower as an official representative.

While General Eisenhower attended the funeral, he did so as a private citizen and as a friend invited by the Churchill family. In his farewell tribute, broadcast over the British Broadcasting Corporation as the funeral ceremonies were ending, he said somewhat wistfully:

"As I, like all other free men, pause to pay a personal tribute to the giant who now passes from among us, I have no charter to speak for my countrymen—only for myself.

"But if, in memory, we journey back two decades to the time when American and Briton stood shoulder to shoulder in global conflict against tyranny, then I can presume—with propriety, I think—to act as spokesman for the millions of Americans who served with me and with their British comrades during those 3 years of war on this sector of the earth."

There has been much talk here about why the President didn't appoint some Members of Congress to go along as a part of the American delegation. Inasmuch as Sir Winston's political life was spent for the most part in the House of Commons, and since he had addressed the Congress of the United States on his visits here, it would have seemed appropriate to send the leaders from each House as a part of the official delegation.

Since Chief Justice Earl Warren and Secretary of State Dean Rusk represented the judicial and executive branches of the Government, the delegation might logically have included prominent Members of the legislative branch.

The Vice President, as Presiding Officer of the Senate, would of course have represented Congress as well as the Presidency. But Mr. Johnson unquestionably was sensitive to public opinion when he decided not to complicate the problem further by sending the Vice President out of the United States at this time.

There is, moreover, a nervousness these days about the whole question of presidential succession, and Mr. Johnson has sent a message to Congress recommending that something be done to clarify what happens when a president is disabled.

The very prominence given to this subject indicates the country is not satisfied with the vague arrangements that have been made between a president and a vice president, even though they informally agree what should be done in the event that the Chief Executive is temporarily too ill to serve.

Iowa Hospital Administrator Speaks Out on Medicare Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a communication from Mr. M. E. Welker, administrator of the Wayne County Hospital, Corydon, Iowa, in which he expresses his views on the medicare issue.

What he has to say makes a great deal of sense, and I believe his views on this important issue deserve the widest possible circulation.

The text of his communication follows:

CORYDON, IOWA.

DEAR SIR: I would like to express my views, opinions, and questions to you about the proposed medicare bill. I have followed this very closely as have many people and before any act comes of this, I think those making the decision should look closer at the bill, the conditions existing in the medical field, and the American people. My qualifications for writing this letter are as follows:

1. I am a hospital administrator—with a B.A. in business administration, a master's degree in hospital administration, 4 years' experience in the hospital field, age 30, married, and with two children. Thus I feel I possess some qualifications to speak intelligently on the subject and that I am in a group (in which in 1 year will comprise almost two-thirds of our country's population) that this type of legislation will affect for many years to come; not just today or 5 years hence.

2. Iowa has the largest percent of persons over 65 in the United States. Wayne County (which is in southern Iowa and in which I have lived for several years) has the largest percent of older people in Iowa. Thus I am in an area which is familiar with this older group of people, their problems, and opinions.

3. Last, as a taxpayer, I am concerned about our country's debt and spiraling tax structure, of which there seems no end with the present course we are on.

A. To start with, there is no argument that persons over 65, if they need help, should not have a place to turn for financial help when and if they need medical care. With today's rising medical costs, older persons' meager savings can be wiped out. This should not occur. However, we have found here in Wayne County that many of our 65 and over group have insurance. Many more are purchasing insurance every day for adequate coverage. Many are on relief and their bills are handled by local welfare agencies. Their relief status, however, would not change just by the presence of some medical care bill. Many are also able and very willing to foot their own bill and do not feel that they need assistance. In fact, they are indignant if we mention MAA to them (Iowa just started theis MAA program in 1964). Many children would, and can, take care of their family's financial need if called upon to do so.

With the biggest segment of our older people covered in some fashion, this leaves only one group uncovered: those who have enough income to take care of their everyday needs, but do not have enough savings to afford the blow of a big medical bill. However, this year MAA has even taken care of this group and very adequately here in Wayne County and Iowa. (As a side note about MAA—it was placed in the hands of Blue Cross, as the fiscal agent, without setting up a new agency and spending a lot of funds needed for paying the medical bills.)

B. I would like to comment on the medicare bill as I understand it now stands.

1. The proposal for medicare pays for 60 days of care in a nursing home affiliated with a hospital or approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, following hospital treatment.

(a) I would like for you to check on how many such accommodations in your State qualify as affiliated or are able to meet this approval. I will venture to say not many.

(b) About the part "following hospital treatment." Many people who need nursing home care do not need hospital care first. Thus if the doctor or family request nursing home care for one of the family, they are first going to have to "con" some way of getting mother or dad into a hospital so that she or he can be transferred to a nursing home. (Don't say, "this can't be done according to the bill," because it can be and will be done. Don't kid yourself, it will vastly increase the cost of this proposed legislation. Hospital stays cost a lot more than nursing home stays.)

(c) The average stay, nationwide, for nursing home care is about 180 days. Who pays for the additional 120 days at about $8 per day? This bill, as proposed, is a far cry from taking care of the nursing home requirement which many of these people will need. No bill could.

2. The present proposal pays for drugs supplied only to hospital or nursing home patients.

(a) I have talked to persons over 65 whose weekly drug bills run as high as $15 to $30, depending on their condition and whether mother and dad are both on medication. Under the medicare proposal their needs (their most expensive needs) would not be taken care of. Under the present MAA legislation, this drug expense is taken care of; again if they need financial help.

(3). The present medicare bill calls for the following as far as social security payments are concerned. The employer-employee rate, right off would go up to 4.2 percent of the first $5,600 of earnings or a maximum of $235 per year—it is now $174. Self-employed would pay 6.3 percent on the $5,600 maximum, up to $325, an increase of of $93,60. By 1971, the total tax (employer-employee) would be more than 10 percent.

(a) From a taxpayer's position this is terrible in and of itself. I rebel against it, where does it end? what becomes of my paycheck? will it soon all go to the Government and they in turn pay me? This is not our form of government. From a hospital administrator's point of view—there were 1,840,287 full-time people working in hospitals in 1963. Here's what the first increase in social security taxes would mean to only the hospitals' share of social security costs. The first increase would mean an increase in total hospital costs, across the Nation, of $56,128,753.50. We are trying to decrease costs not increase them. If you raise our costs that much this means our rates will have to be increased proportionately. Increased hospital rates will cost the medicare program more and the social security rate increase will not take care of it. What then—raise the social security withholding some more? Sir, this bill will not solve the problem, especially if it is not based on need, but instead is an open door policy as now proposed.

(4) I am presently paying $190.80 per year for health insurance. This policy covers my wife, children, and me for now and my wife and me beyond age 65. It pays for all needed care. What will I need with medicare 30 years from now, Most policies presently being written will cover past age 65. If medicare should pass, this means that I will, in effect, be forced to carry two hospital policies. One of these I do not need. However, I need insurance now for my family and me. I have also taken care of my needs with the same policy for my retirement years. Sir, I can take care of my own needs if the Government will only let me. Again, we need a program, but we need a program based on need, not a blanket coverage.

In conclusion, I ask that you answer some of these questions truthfully in your own mind first before voting in favor of this medicare proposal. I repeat (only because I think this is very important), yes, there are many people needing financial help when it comes to medical care, but there are many more who do not need help. Yes, this care will have to be done through some sort of taxation, but not through social security. Let it be taken care of by the States, on a local level where they are more familiar with their people's needs. I don't say that MAA is entirely the answer, but it comes a lot closer to the answer than the proposed medicare bill. I, as a taxpayer, do not necessarily mind the burden of taxation if it goes to people that need help, but on the other hand I will fight to the last if I am taxed for the payment of care for people who do not need financial help.

I ask that you talk to the people in your area and explain these proposals to them and what it means to them in total cost.

As an administrator of a hospital I am not against this help of the needy—it will make my collections look better, but as an administrator I feel this bill is throwing money down a hole. It will not meet the needs of those who truly need help, but by trying to spread the cost out over everyone it will "short change" those whom it should be assisting.

Please reconsider these items, reread them if necessary. If you still think that this King-Anderson bill is the answer, then vote for it. But if these items leave doubt in your mind, stand pat and work for something that will truly help those who need help. Let me help myself. Let's keep a little initiative before the American people.

Respectfully yours,

MONTE E. WELKER.

Hotheads on Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of last week, the House decided that it would be proper to cut off sales of surplus food to the United Arab Republic.

I shall be among the first to say, Mr. Speaker, that we should not tolerate the burning of U.S. libraries and I want it known that I do not condone the recent statements of the United Arab Republic's President, Gamal Abdel Nasser. But I still do not believe that the action approved by the majority of this body was appropriate or correct.

Since coming to Congress I have served with three Presidents and I have opposed amendments similar to the one before the House last week in each of their administrations.

I firmly believe that the conduct of this Nation's foreign affairs rests with the President of the United States, be he Democrat or Republican.

In my opinion it is pure folly for this body to take away one of the tools so necessary for a President to carry out the complex foreign policy that must be carried out in these times.

The New York Times, in an editorial entitled "Hotheads on Aid," sums up my position. Under unanimous consent I place the Times editorial of January 28 at this point in the RECORD and I commend it to all those who were in the majority last week:

HOTHEADS ON AID

The new foreign aid program is getting off to a poor start.

The House vote to cut off sales of surplus food to the United Arab Republic reflects a growing resentment throughout this country toward President Nasser, his statements and his policies. But the action of Congress—emotional if understandable—would defeat its own purpose. Tying the hands of the President of the United States is not the way to retaliate against the President of the United Arab Republic.

The question of whether aid should be provided to the United Arab Republic and other developing countries whose governments threaten world peace—and therefore the interests of the United States—is exceedingly troublesome and difficult. It demands a cool, far-ranging appraisal to determine if the United States will be helped or hindered by curtailing or eliminating aid. But such an assessment cannot be carried out if Congress limits the administration's freedom of action in advance and incidentally gives President Nasser a fresh excuse to threaten vital American interests.

Congress, of course, has every right to express its frustration and displeasure. It has many ways of making known its feeling without going to the extent of jeopardizing the administration's efforts to correct the situation. Yet the action against Egypt puts Congress in the position of assuming primary responsibility for the conduct of the Nation's foreign policy.

This has never been the task of Congress. It is not now. But this is where giving vent to emotion will lead. There is justification for a reexamination of the aid program to the United Arab Republic. The way to get meaningful results, however, is to give President Johnson an opportunity to demonstrate that aid will be used where it can do the most good. This means that the House would be wise to cool down and withdraw its ban on food shipments, allowing the administration ample room for constructive negotiation.

Tani Bahti, Archeologist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure and pride that I report today a little incident that occurred a few days ago on a rocky hillock near the Santa Rita Mountains in southern Arizona. The incident is doubly significant; it tells us something about the great excitement and adventure to be found in the world around us, and it tells us something about what is, not wrong, but right with our society.

The heroine of this little story is a young lady with the pretty name of Tani Bahti. Tani is 10 years old, and I am pleased to be one of her older friends.

It seems that Tani has made one of the most remarkable archeological discoveries of recent times in Arizona. On a Sunday afternoon 2 weeks ago Tani's family took her on a picnic south of Tucson. During the picnic Tani picked up what appeared to be an interesting rock. Instead of a rock it turned out to be a prehistoric earthern vessel containing nearly 1,500 pieces of turquoise, all of them worked or carved by some ancient artisan. It was only the third pottery cache that has been reported in Arizona. And it was discovered by a 10-year-old with a sense of wonder and curiosity about the world around her.

What makes me so proud is that Tani promptly turned her valuable discovery over to the Arizona State Museum, where it can be studied by anthropologists and eventually enjoyed by the public. This simple act of honesty and unselfishness reveals that, with all that may be wrong in our society, we have some things to be proud of, too.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I will insert at this point an article from the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson, Ariz., recounting Tani's discovery.

The article follows:

FULL OF TURQUOISE: PREHISTORIC POT FOUND BY GIRL

(By Carle Hodge)

Professional archeologists are turning turquoise-green with envy over what a small, freckle-faced girl found.

While on a picnic Sunday, 10-year-old Tani Bahti chanced upon a small prehistoric pot full of pendants and beads fashioned, appropriately, from turquoise.

Staff members at the Arizona Museum, where the jackpot promptly was deposited, yesterday described as staggering the odds against a discovery of the sort.

The Cragin School fifth-grader's father is Tom Bahti, the veteran dealer in Indian crafts.

Moreover, she picked up the earthen vessel on a rocky hillock near the Santa Rita foothills where the family had gone on countless picnics previously. Until Sunday, not so much as a potsherd had turned up there.

The plain, squat pot, about the size of a small grapefruit and covered lid-like with an equally simple bowl, isn't much to see. One might mistake it for a strange stone, as Tani did when she stooped to examine it.

If reckonings of the museum researchers are right, however, it is what they call a "Sacatonphase" Hohokam utensil, meaning it was molded about 850 years ago.

The contents were what made it, in Tom Bahti's words, "a pot at the end of the rainbow sort of deal." Besides nearly 1,500 turquoise bits, including two tiny frogs, there were two dozen shell necklace pieces and three birds carved from shell.

Each fragment had been worked, and apparently all were worn as jewelry, the museum's Dr. Bernard L. Fontana said.

Fontana recalled that only two ancient pottery caches have been reported in Arizona. A hunter stepped into one in the Santa Catalinas in 1939, and a second was excavated near Oracle 8 years later.

These were crammed largely with shell, most of it unworked, and in neither was there much turquoise.

Dr. Raymond H. Thompson, the museum director, was lavish in his praise of the Bahtis' wonderful cooperation in giving the institution the material.

"We promised Tani she could go visit it whenever she wishes," her father added.

Why the cache was left unprotected on a nearly naked, windswept slope is a mystery that may never be resolved.

"Someone suggested an Indian left it there and figured on going back for it," Bahti said. "But I wonder why he didn't put it in a crevass."

Tribute to Dr. James Mercer Tribble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago Dr. James Mercer Tribble came to Senoia, Ga., established his office, and began the practice of medicine.

On February 1, 1965, friends, family, and patients filled a large auditorium to honor him and to express appreciation and gratitude for his years of service.

Dr. Tribble knew that something was taking place, but he did not know what it was. He was surprised almost to the point of being overwhelmed when cousins, sisters, brothers, children, and grandchildren arrived to play their roles in a "This Is Your Life" type of program.

The entire community participated in the planning of this tribute to Dr. Tribble. Many of the community leaders, especially younger men and women, worked tirelessly to plan and present this program. It was my honor, privilege, and pleasure to be present and to actively participate in his community's expression of appreciation.

His services as a dedicated physician, citizen, soldier, and community leader are in accordance with the highest of American tradition. It is with pleasure that I include as a portion of my remarks a letter which I read and which was presented to Dr. Tribble on this occasion:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1965.

Dr. JAMES M. TRIBBLE,
Senoia, Ga.

MY DEAR DR. TRIBBLE: Last December I participated in the planning of this tribute to you on the 50th anniversary of the commencement of the practice of your profession in Senoia, Coweta County, Ga. I was asked to make the presentation of this expression of appreciation to you, and I have looked forward to being here with you tonight.

Circumstances beyond my control nearly prevented me from being here. Immediately after the conclusion of this meeting I must return to Washington so that early tomorrow morning I can be present at an important meeting with the Committee on Appropriations.

During the 50 years since you first came to Senoia, in February 1915, you have been a good physician, a good citizen, a good community leader, and a good friend. You have treated the sick; you have comforted the afflicted; and you have eased suffering and cured illness. You have responded at all hours of the day and night. You have called upon those who needed your help. You have used your God-given talents and you have acquired skill and science in behalf of your neighbors and your fellow man.

As a citizen and community leader you have given freely of your time and your material goods to make your community a better place in which to live. Senoia and Coweta County are each truly a better place because of your life and the many contributions which you have made.

For many years you served as mayor of Senoia. As the head of the city government of the city in which you have lived and served for 50 years, you have assumed and fulfilled your full measure of civic responsibility.

As a soldier and officer in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Army, you served your country in the cause of freedom in two world wars. In World War I you served from 1917 to 1919. At the termination of your active duty status in World War II, you continued as a Reserve officer during the years in between. When the American forces were mobilized at the beginning of World War II, you volunteered and returned to active Army service as a Colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army. In this capacity and as a field hospital commander, you served in such a manner as to reflect credit upon the highest traditions of the U.S. Armed Forces.

For all of these things, Dr. Tribble, we express our sincere appreciation and our heartfelt gratitude. Most of all, however, we are thankful for having been a part of this community with you and for the privilege of calling you our friend.

Good physician, good citizen, good community leader, good soldier, good friend; James Mercer Tribble, doctor of medicine, citizen of Senoia, Ga., United States of America.

As one of the many privileged to know you, my friend, I am grateful for the privilege and honor of participating in this 50th anniversary program which honors you.

With warmest personal regards and every good wish, believe me,

Sincerely your friend,

JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
U.S. Representative in Congress,
Sixth District of Georgia.

Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include herewith my statement made this morning before the House Rules Committee on legislation sponsored by a number of other Members of Congress and myself, to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

I have been and continue to be a strong advocate of congressional reform to modernize the procedures and processes of the Congress, and I am hopeful that the majority of my colleagues will see fit to support this legislation.

My testimony follows:

The creation of a Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization should occupy the highest priority on the agenda of the 89th Congress. During the past several years, more and more voices have urged the Congress to take a vigorous and exacting look at its machinery and procedures. A wide segment of the public, scholars, and members of Congress feel the efficiency and internal democracy of the legislative branch are undermined by such factors as: a maldistribution of power, through seniority, innumerable duplications of hearings before committees, reduced congressional influence in the formulation of legislation, and inadequate powers for the central leadership. Whatever specific measures are in order, it has been clear to most that a fully comprehensive and systematic review of the Congress by the Congress has long been overdue. It is nothing less than that purpose to which we should commit ourselves by creating a Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization.

Such a committee, of course, is not without precedent. The procedures, machinery and organization under which today's Congress operates are largely deprived from the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The groundwork to this bill, in turn, was laid by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, known as the LaFollette-Monroney Committee. Twenty years have passed and the complexity of political problems and legislative operations has increased enormously. It is time again for the Congress to put itself under careful scrutiny.

At the onset of this session, the House approved a series of significant reforms designed to provide more equitable rules under which legislation can be introduced and debated. These steps were long needed and welcome. But we cannot be content with patchwork. No institution can persevere if

it is not prepared to examine its basic purposes and goals. To meet such a need, a Joint Committee on Congressional Organization must be prepared to ask fundamental questions. Is the duty of Congress primarily to initiate legislation? To process the needs of individual constituents? To oversee the administration of the laws? Are all these functions still compatible or must the Congress decide to make some final choice of priorities?

An increasing number of proposals from outside the Congress as well as from within new merit careful consideration. For this reason, a joint committee must be empowered to call upon outside experts and members of the other branches of Government whose counsel the Congress respects. The joint committee must equally be free to examine the rules, procedures, practices and precedents of both the House and the Senate. We cannot fail to meet these prerequisites if justice is to be done to the complexity of the issue of congressional reorganization.

Many are rightly impatient for swift reform. But we cannot afford to be impatient if impatience does not allow us to ask all the questions, again and again, with deliberation and reflection.

I strongly support the establishment of a Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization. I urge the House and Senate to be satisfied with nothing less than an examination of purposes as well as procedures and of ends as well as means.

Bayh Has Best Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "BAYH Has Best Solution" from the January 29, 1965, issue of the South Bend, Ind., Tribune endorsing the proposal of my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Indiana, the Honorable BIRCH BAYH, for a constitutional amendment to provide for presidential succession.

The editorial follows:

BAYH HAS BEST SOLUTION

The deep concern over the health of President Johnson, unmistakably mirrored in the news coverage of his hospitalization, is surely another reminder of the urgency to resolve the problem of assuring continuity of the Presidency.

The problem is, of course, twofold, involving disability of the President and vacancy in the office of the Vice President.

Fortunately, the illness of Mr. Johnson was not disabling in the strict sense of the word. For he has no written disability agreement with his Vice President as Dwight D. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy had with theirs. And, in the case of his death, however distasteful it may be to think of that possibility, the United States under the existing law would again be left without a Vice President as it was for 14 months after the assassination of President Kennedy.

The constitutional amendment resolution introduced by Indiana's junior Senator BIRCH BAYH, provides for closing the disability gap legally as well as for filling a vacancy in the Vice Presidency. A splendid feature of the proposal is that it would not leave the disability decision entirely in the hands of the President. The Cabinet and Congress would be given a necessarily powerful voice. The Bayh proposal is the best that we have seen. It should be adopted.

Prudence dictates that the issue be disposed of in the calm permitted when the President and his Vice President are around and functioning, not in a high-pressure atmosphere.

Congress will exercise good sense if it imposes on itself some sort of a deadline for overhauling the existing line of succession act.

Local 323, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Opposes Sugar Purchase From Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reports circulating in Florida recently that this Nation might buy sugar from Castro's Cuba gave cause for concern not only among Florida's sugar producers, but the great number of Floridians and Americans who are firmly opposed to any form of recognition with Communist Castro.

One such group of Americans who feel strongly on this matter is Local 323 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers located in West Palm Beach, Fla. This local has made its feelings known in no uncertain terms by adopting a resolution on the subject of sugar purchases from Castro, and I ask that it be included in the RECORD at this point.

Regularly moved and seconded at a meeting of IBEW Local 323, that a committee be appointed of three persons to draw up a resolution opposing the alleged dealings with Castro Cuba to the detriment of Florida sugar growers.

Be it resolved, That whereas the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Doyle Conner and Columnist Jeanne Perry have both stated in the Palm Beach Post Times that negotiations were in process to allocate sugar quotas to the Castro government. Denial by the State Department, because of past experiences, must be viewed skeptically.

Whereas the economy of Palm Beach County and adjacent counties and indeed the entire State of Florida is now geared to the expanding sugar industry. We heartily recommend that quotas be enlarged but under no circumstances go below the present allotment.

Whereas the Spanish speaking employees, technicians, engineers, chemists, comptrollers, auditors, and etc. have in the main, learned to speak English and in many cases are studying to be citizens of the United States which is in keeping with President Johnson's qualified immigration proposal.

Whereas the importance of this resolution to the Nation, we respectfully ask that it be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that this chore be performed by our own Hon. PAUL ROGERS: Therefore let it be further

Resolved, That there be no negotiations whatsoever with Castro or his ilk and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, the Honorable Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, and the Honorable Representative PAUL ROGERS and to Mr. Harry A. Vaughn, president, Florida Cane Growers Association and also president of United States Sugar Corp.

Passed unanimously January 15 at regular meeting of Local 323, I.B.E.W. President, Wally Lamb, officiating.

Committee:

L. W. KELLOWAY.
ELTON HEWITT.
JAMES WRIGHT.

Tire Manufacturers "Company Stores" Should Be Eliminated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have believed that rubber tire manufacturers should not be in the business of retailing their products. When it happens—as it has increasingly happened in recent years—the consumer is the one who gets hurt.

On January 4, 1965, I reintroduced my bill to prohibit this retailing by the rubber manufacturers. Its number in the 89th Congress is H.R. 566. It was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and I hope that it will be scheduled for hearing early during the current session.

One of the consistent supporters of this bill has been the National Federation of Independent Business and I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter of support received by me from the Federation's vice president, Mr. George J. Burger:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., January 29, 1965.

Re H.R. 566.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Believe me, you are to be complimented for your consistency in reintroducing H.R. 566, commonly known as the rubber tires bill which would provide complete divorcement of the tire manufacturers in the retail field.

This subject matter has been explored continually before the Small Business Committee; that is, the increasing inroads of the majors in the tire industry to invade and control, directly or indirectly, the distribution of tires and tire servicing.

Apparently the trend of large producers of other commodities directly invading the retail field where at the same time they solicit business from independent retailers in the respective industry has caused alarm in other segments of our economy as to the seriousness of the trend.

Just a day or two ago I was contacted by a spokesman for a small business group in a major industry, in an important commodity, as to their alarm with reference to a similar situation taking place within that industry. I mentioned to him the objectives in your bill, which will result at an early date in a conference between that individual and others.

At the time of the conversation it gave me an opportunity to review a committee print of the Senate Small Business Commit-

FULL OF TURQUOISE: PREHISTORIC POT FOUND BY GIRL

(By Carle Hodge)

Professional archeologists are turning turquoise-green with envy over what a small, freckle-faced girl found.

While on a picnic Sunday, 10-year-old Tani Bahti chanced upon a small prehistoric pot full of pendants and beads fashioned, appropriately, from turquoise.

Staff members at the Arizona Museum, where the jackpot promptly was deposited, yesterday described as staggering the odds against a discovery of the sort.

The Cragin School fifth-grader's father is Tom Bahti, the veteran dealer in Indian crafts.

Moreover, she picked up the earthen vessel on a rocky hillock near the Santa Rita foothills where the family had gone on countless picnics previously. Until Sunday, not so much as a potsherd had turned up there.

The plain, squat pot, about the size of a small grapefruit and covered lid-like with an equally simple bowl, isn't much to see. One might mistake it for a strange stone, as Tani did when she stooped to examine it.

If reckonings of the museum researchers are right, however, it is what they call a "Sacatonphase" Hohokam utensil, meaning it was molded about 850 years ago.

The contents were what made it, in Tom Bahti's words, "a pot at the end of the rainbow sort of deal." Besides nearly 1,500 turquoise bits, including two tiny frogs, there were two dozen shell necklace pieces and three birds carved from shell.

Each fragment had been worked, and apparently all were worn as jewelry, the museum's Dr. Bernard L. Fontana said.

Fontana recalled that only two ancient pottery caches have been reported in Arizona. A hunter stepped into one in the Santa Catalinas in 1939, and a second was excavated near Oracle 8 years later.

These were crammed largely with shell, most of it unworked, and in neither was there much turquoise.

Dr. Raymond H. Thompson, the museum director, was lavish in his praise of the Bahtis' wonderful cooperation in giving the institution the material.

"We promised Tani she could go visit it whenever she wishes," her father added.

Why the cache was left unprotected on a nearly naked, windswept slope is a mystery that may never be resolved.

"Someone suggested an Indian left it there and figured on going back for it," Bahti said. "But I wonder why he didn't put it in a crevass."

Tribute to Dr. James Mercer Tribble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago Dr. James Mercer Tribble came to Senoia, Ga., established his office, and began the practice of medicine.

On February 1, 1965, friends, family, and patients filled a large auditorium to honor him and to express appreciation and gratitude for his years of service.

Dr. Tribble knew that something was taking place, but he did not know what it was. He was surprised almost to the point of being overwhelmed when cousins, sisters, brothers, children, and grandchildren arrived to play their roles in a "This Is Your Life" type of program.

The entire community participated in the planning of this tribute to Dr. Tribble. Many of the community leaders, especially younger men and women, worked tirelessly to plan and present this program. It was my honor, privilege, and pleasure to be present and to actively participate in his community's expression of appreciation.

His services as a dedicated physician, citizen, soldier, and community leader are in accordance with the highest of American tradition. It is with pleasure that I include as a portion of my remarks a letter which I read and which was presented to Dr. Tribble on this occasion:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1965.

Dr. JAMES M. TRIBBLE,
Senoia, Ga.

MY DEAR DR. TRIBBLE: Last December I participated in the planning of this tribute to you on the 50th anniversary of the commencement of the practice of your profession in Senoia, Coweta County, Ga. I was asked to make the presentation of this expression of appreciation to you, and I have looked forward to being here with you tonight.

Circumstances beyond my control nearly prevented me from being here. Immediately after the conclusion of this meeting I must return to Washington so that early tomorrow morning I can be present at an important meeting with the Committee on Appropriations.

During the 50 years since you first came to Senoia, in February 1915, you have been a good physician, a good citizen, a good community leader, and a good friend. You have treated the sick; you have comforted the afflicted; and you have eased suffering and cured illness. You have responded at all hours of the day and night. You have called upon those who needed your help. You have used your God-given talents and you have acquired skill and science in behalf of your neighbors and your fellow man.

As a citizen and community leader you have given freely of your time and your material goods to make your community a better place in which to live. Senoia and Coweta County are each truly a better place because of your life and the many contributions which you have made.

For many years you served as mayor of Senoia. As the head of the city government of the city in which you have lived and served for 50 years, you have assumed and fulfilled your full measure of civic responsibility.

As a soldier and officer in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Army, you served your country in the cause of freedom in two world wars. In World War I you served from 1917 to 1919. At the termination of your active duty status in World War II, you continued as a Reserve officer during the years in between. When the American forces were mobilized at the beginning of World War II, you volunteered and returned to active Army service as a Colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army. In this capacity and as a field hospital commander, you served in such a manner as to reflect credit upon the highest traditions of the U.S. Armed Forces.

For all of these things, Dr. Tribble, we express our sincere appreciation and our heartfelt gratitude. Most of all, however, we are thankful for having been a part of this community with you and for the privilege of calling you our friend.

Good physician, good citizen, good community leader, good soldier, good friend; James Mercer Tribble, doctor of medicine, citizen of Senoia, Ga., United States of America.

As one of the many privileged to know you, my friend, I am grateful for the privilege and honor of participating in this 50th anniversary program which honors you.

With warmest personal regards and every good wish, believe me,

Sincerely your friend,

JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
U.S. Representative in Congress,
Sixth District of Georgia.

Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include herewith my statement made this morning before the House Rules Committee on legislation sponsored by a number of other Members of Congress and myself, to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

I have been and continue to be a strong advocate of congressional reform to modernize the procedures and processes of the Congress, and I am hopeful that the majority of my colleagues will see fit to support this legislation.

My testimony follows:

The creation of a Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization should occupy the highest priority on the agenda of the 89th Congress. During the past several years, more and more voices have urged the Congress to take a vigorous and exacting look at its machinery and procedures. A wide segment of the public, scholars, and members of Congress feel the efficiency and internal democracy of the legislative branch are undermined by such factors as: a maldistribution of power, through seniority, innumerable duplications of hearings before committees, reduced congressional influence in the formulation of legislation, and inadequate powers for the central leadership. Whatever specific measures are in order, it has been clear to most that a fully comprehensive and systematic review of the Congress by the Congress has long been overdue. It is nothing less than that purpose to which we should commit ourselves by creating a Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization.

Such a committee, of course, is not without precedent. The procedures, machinery and organization under which today's Congress operates are largely deprived from the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The groundwork to this bill, in turn, was laid by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, known as the LaFollette-Monroney Committee. Twenty years have passed and the complexity of political problems and legislative operations has increased enormously. It is time again for the Congress to put itself under careful scrutiny.

At the onset of this session, the House approved a series of significant reforms designed to provide more equitable rules under which legislation can be introduced and debated. These steps were long needed and welcome. But we cannot be content with patchwork. No institution can persevere if

it is not prepared to examine its basic purposes and goals. To meet such a need, a Joint Committee on Congressional Organization must be prepared to ask fundamental questions. Is the duty of Congress primarily to initiate legislation? To process the needs of individual constituents? To oversee the administration of the laws? Are all these functions still compatible or must the Congress decide to make some final choice of priorities?

An increasing number of proposals from outside the Congress as well as from within new merit careful consideration. For this reason, a joint committee must be empowered to call upon outside experts and members of the other branches of Government whose counsel the Congress respects. The joint committee must equally be free to examine the rules, procedures, practices and precedents of both the House and the Senate. We cannot fail to meet these prerequisites if justice is to be done to the complexity of the issue of congressional reorganization.

Many are rightly impatient for swift reform. But we cannot afford to be impatient if impatience does not allow us to ask all the questions, again and again, with deliberation and reflection.

I strongly support the establishment of a Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization. I urge the House and Senate to be satisfied with nothing less than an examination of purposes as well as procedures and of ends as well as means.

Bayh Has Best Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "BAYH Has Best Solution" from the January 29, 1965, issue of the South Bend, Ind., Tribune endorsing the proposal of my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Indiana, the Honorable BIRCH BAYH, for a constitutional amendment to provide for presidential succession.

The editorial follows:

BAYH HAS BEST SOLUTION

The deep concern over the health of President Johnson, unmistakably mirrored in the news coverage of his hospitalization, is surely another reminder of the urgency to resolve the problem of assuring continuity of the Presidency.

The problem is, of course, twofold, involving disability of the President and vacancy in the office of the Vice President.

Fortunately, the illness of Mr. Johnson was not disabling in the strict sense of the word. For he has no written disability agreement with his Vice President as Dwight D. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy had with theirs. And, in the case of his death, however distasteful it may be to think of that possibility, the United States under the existing law would again be left without a Vice President as it was for 14 months after the assassination of President Kennedy.

The constitutional amendment resolution introduced by Indiana's junior Senator BIRCH BAYH, provides for closing the disability gap legally as well as for filling a vacancy in the Vice Presidency. A splendid feature of the proposal is that it would not leave the disability decision entirely in the hands of the President. The Cabinet and Congress would be given a necessarily powerful voice. The Bayh proposal is the best that we have seen. It should be adopted.

Prudence dictates that the issue be disposed of in the calm permitted when the President and his Vice President are around and functioning, not in a high-pressure atmosphere.

Congress will exercise good sense if it imposes on itself some sort of a deadline for overhauling the existing line of succession act.

Local 323, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Opposes Sugar Purchase From Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reports circulating in Florida recently that this Nation might buy sugar from Castro's Cuba gave cause for concern not only among Florida's sugar producers, but the great number of Floridians and Americans who are firmly opposed to any form of recognition with Communist Castro.

One such group of Americans who feel strongly on this matter is Local 323 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers located in West Palm Beach, Fla. This local has made its feelings known in no uncertain terms by adopting a resolution on the subject of sugar purchases from Castro, and I ask that it be included in the RECORD at this point.

Regularly moved and seconded at a meeting of IBEW Local 323, that a committee be appointed of three persons to draw up a resolution opposing the alleged dealings with Castro Cuba to the detriment of Florida sugar growers.

Be it resolved, That whereas the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Doyle Conner and Columnist Jeanne Perry have both stated in the Palm Beach Post Times that negotiations were in process to allocate sugar quotas to the Castro government. Denial by the State Department, because of past experiences, must be viewed skeptically.

Whereas the economy of Palm Beach County and adjacent counties and indeed the entire State of Florida is now geared to the expanding sugar industry. We heartily recommend that quotas be enlarged but under no circumstances go below the present allotment.

Whereas the Spanish speaking employees, technicians, engineers, chemists, comptrollers, auditors, and etc. have in the main, learned to speak English and in many cases are studying to be citizens of the United States which is in keeping with President Johnson's qualified immigration proposal.

Whereas the importance of this resolution to the Nation, we respectfully ask that it be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that this chore be performed by our own Hon. PAUL ROGERS: Therefore let it be further

Resolved, That there be no negotiations whatsoever with Castro or his ilk and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, the Honorable Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, and the Honorable Representative PAUL ROGERS and to Mr. Harry A. Vaughn, president, Florida Cane Growers Association and also president of United States Sugar Corp.

Passed unanimously January 15 at regular meeting of Local 323, I.B.E.W. President, Wally Lamb, officiating.

Committee:

L. W. KELLOWAY.
ELTON HEWITT.
JAMES WRIGHT.

Tire Manufacturers "Company Stores" Should Be Eliminated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have believed that rubber tire manufacturers should not be in the business of retailing their products. When it happens—as it has increasingly happened in recent years—the consumer is the one who gets hurt.

On January 4, 1965, I reintroduced my bill to prohibit this retailing by the rubber manufacturers. Its number in the 89th Congress is H.R. 566. It was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and I hope that it will be scheduled for hearing early during the current session.

One of the consistent supporters of this bill has been the National Federation of Independent Business and I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter of support received by me from the Federation's vice president, Mr. George J. Burger:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., January 29, 1965.

Re H.R. 566.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Believe me, you are to be complimented for your consistency in reintroducing H.R. 566, commonly known as the rubber tires bill which would provide complete divorcement of the tire manufacturers in the retail field.

This subject matter has been explored continually before the Small Business Committee; that is, the increasing inroads of the majors in the tire industry to invade and control, directly or indirectly, the distribution of tires and tire servicing.

Apparently the trend of large producers of other commodities directly invading the retail field where at the same time they solicit business from independent retailers in the respective industry has caused alarm in other segments of our economy as to the seriousness of the trend.

Just a day or two ago I was contacted by a spokesman for a small business group in a major industry, in an important commodity, as to their alarm with reference to a similar situation taking place within that industry. I mentioned to him the objectives in your bill, which will result at an early date in a conference between that individual and others.

At the time of the conversation it gave me an opportunity to review a committee print of the Senate Small Business Commit-

tee, "A Staff Report to the Committee," dated July 27, 1953 (12 years ago), and the report then stated some alarming situations, and I quote in part from that report:

"The present-day problems of the small and independent tire dealers have been brought to the attention of the committee with such insistence that the chairman considered it advisable to instruct the staff to inquire into the current status of this traditional adjunct of the automotive industry, many of whose members feel that a continuation of current competitive practices within the rubber tire industry will, in the not-distant future, bring their existence as small enterprisers to an end."

In the same report, in 1926 the independent dealers handled 89.3 percent of the replacement demand for tires. By 1952 their share of this market had shrunk to 50 percent. It was stated recently by the Saturday Evening Post that the independent's share of the replacement had shrunk to an overall low of about 27 percent.

From the same report there is a very important statement which says:

"In addition to all other considerations, it is known that in times of national emergency, the servicing and reconditioning of tires by thousands of independent dealers is essential to our national economy."

I know from experience, which you will admit is about the best teacher, what has happened in our own metropolitan area, New York—of the decline or the elimination of efficient independent tire sales and servicing institutions due to the inroads of rubber tire producers in the retail field. This same situation, without a question of doubt, is happening in all metropolitan areas throughout the Nation. I don't come to this conclusion without having factual knowledge of over half a century background as an independent in the rubber tire industry and having nationwide contacts with independents in that industry throughout the Nation.

I trust that you can find it convenient, as a matter of information to your colleagues, and because of the importance of this legislation, to insert this communication in the RECORD.

Thanking you for your usual cooperation, and for your exceptionally valuable help to small business.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Prof. Carl D. Degler of Vassar Presents the Case for Federal Assistance to Nonpublic Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Mr. Francis Keppel, stated that the matter of church-state relations as it pertains to education, is a problem to be solved, not an issue.

Contributions such as that made by Carl D. Degler in his article in the New York Times Magazine on January 31 represent constructive steps toward the resolution of this problem.

The article, entitled "Aid for Parochial Schools—A Question of Education, Not Religion," is a brilliant presentation of the great contribution being made to American education by the nonpublic school and an examination of the efforts that may be made to strengthen this important segment of our educational system along with public schools.

Writing with the impartiality of an educator who has neither an immediate or personal interest in the subject, Mr. Degler refutes many of the arguments advanced by opponents of aid to nonpublic schoolchildren—particularly the contention that such assistance would constitute a violation of the Constitution.

Noting that constitutional restrictions are less rigid than some opponents of Federal aid would have us believe, Mr. Degler cites well-known examples where nonpublic schoolchildren have received and are receiving Federal assistance.

Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues may have the benefits of Mr. Degler's examination of the problem of Federal aid to nonpublic schools I place the text of his article below:

AID FOR PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS: A QUESTION OF EDUCATION, NOT RELIGION

(By Carl N. Degler)

It is time that Americans face the question of Federal aid to parochial schools. If we truly believe in the national goal to improve education for all, we should stop our shifting and squirming and try looking at the problem realistically. With good will, understanding, and leadership from the national administration the conflicting views can be harmoniously resolved.

Although the question of Federal aid to private schools affects secular as well as religious schools, the issue centers upon the Roman Catholic parochial schools. They educate the preponderance of non-public-school-children and when the issue is resolved for them, it will be resolved also for Lutheran, Jewish, Episcopalian and secular private schools as well. Therefore, in what follows, the parochial schools are used as the example, though what is advocated for them applies to all others.

The issue, it should be stressed, is not a partisan religious one. Indeed, as one who was raised a Protestant, I hold no brief for parochial schools nor for the virtues of religious as opposed to secular education. The case for Federal aid to private education, it seems to me, is pragmatic and secular.

The starting point of all discussions on the question is the simple fact that almost 6 million American schoolchildren—about 1 in 7—are educated in private schools, more than 90 percent of which are operated by the Roman Catholic Church. The proportion in some States is considerably higher. Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Hampshire, for example, have almost a quarter of their children in private schools; Rhode Island counts 29 percent and Wisconsin 27 percent. In cities like Pittsburgh, New York, and Chicago, the proportion of children in Roman Catholic schools alone is between 30 and 40 percent.

From the standpoint of numbers alone, Roman Catholic schools are functioning as quasi-public institutions. The immediate question is: As public education is steadily improved with more funds, better equipment and higher pay for teachers, can the parochial schools match that improvement? The answer seems to be "No."

Ever since the late 1950's the parochial schools have been growing fast, considerably faster than the public schools. Between 1940 and 1963, the number of pupils in parochial schools jumped 129 percent, as compared with a 53-percent rise in the public schools.

Needless to say, this rapid growth has been a tremendous drain upon the financial resources of the parishes and dioceses, which support the schools. Stiff tuition charges are now common for parochial schools, and they continue to go up. A recent survey of 136 diocesan high schools showed that two-thirds had raised tuition since 1955; 90 of them charged $100 or more a year. These charges, of course, are in addition to general contributions by the parishioners.

At the same time, one of the principal financial advantages of parochial schools has been waning. Because so many of the parochial schools have been traditionally staffed by nuns, instructional costs have been considerably lower than in public schools. But as the parochial schools have multiplied, the number of available nuns has not kept pace. In 1945, nuns outnumbered lay teachers in parochial schools 13 to 1; in 1959, the ratio was 3 to 1; by 1970 it is estimated that the number of lay teachers will be double that of nuns.

In itself such a reversal means a tremendous increase in costs. A nun's subsistence and allowance runs between $650 and $1,250 a year, while lay teachers in parochial schools are paid an average of $3,400. Heavy as the increase in costs will be as the shift from teaching nuns to lay teachers is made, it will get considerably heavier as the parochial schools try to staff their schools with the best lay teachers. The present average pay of the lay teacher is considerably below the average of $5,200 for public schoolteachers. Moreover, few of the parochial schools provide fringe benefits like pensions, which are taken for granted by public school teachers.

In short, the quality of teaching is endangered in the parochial schools, if it has not been reduced already. As the situation now stands, parochial teachers are working under tremendous handicaps, with class sizes far above the average for public schools. Class rolls of 50 or 60 students are common and ones of 90 are not unknown. The average class size in the public schools is 26. Although the educationally optimum number of students in a class is certainly debatable, it is safe to say that quality of education must be inferior, all other things being equal, when classes reach such size.

Two points in President Johnson's recent congressional message on education would provide some oblique Federal aid to parochial schools. One calls for $100 million of grants for library and textbooks for both public and private schools. The other calls for $100 million for the creation of "supplementary education centers" at which public school systems would allow parochial school children to use some of their facilities and attend some of their classes on a shared-time basis.

Revolutionary as these proposals may be considered by some, they are inadequate on both financial and constitutional grounds. Neither lifts much of the financial burden under which the parochial schools now stagger. Moreover, two States (New York and Iowa) have already indicated that shared time violates State constitutional bans on aid to religious schools. Other States, with similar explicit prohibitions in their constitutions, will undoubtedly arrive at the same conclusion in short order. In sum, the need for Federal aid to private schools in general, and parochial schools in particular, remains as crucial as ever.

To one not immediately involved with parochial education, the present crisis undoubtedly appears unfortunate, but outside his concern. He may simply shrug his shoulders, remarking that Catholic children should go to public schools. But this attitude is surely as socially shortsighted as it is insensitive. The enormous rise in parochial school enrollment in itself attests to the strong interest of many parents in religious education.

(Some critics have argued that this increased attendance is actually a result of a desire to escape racially integrated public schools, but the number of such cases is really negligible. The argument certainly does not apply at all in southern cities like New Orleans or Charleston, or in the South as a whole, where parochial schools have led the region in desegregation. Indeed, one could make a good argument that in many communities, North and South, the parochial school is more socially, as well as more racially, heterogeneous than the public schools simply because of the larger districts from which the parochial schools draw their students.)

The fact is that several million future citizens are going to continue to be educated in parochial schools, regardless of what others of us may think about their merits or demerits. In such circumstances, no one who is alert to the central role that education plays in our increasingly technical society can afford to be indifferent to the quality of parochial schools. What kind of improvement in job opportunities and in the technical skills of our people can be achieved when one-seventh of the children are left behind in inferior schools? One does not have to be a Catholic to be alarmed at such shortsightedness—he has to consult no more than his own self-interest.

There is a further social reason for including parochial schools in Federal aid to education. Unfortunately, in the debate over this question, some overzealous Catholics have muddied the waters. They assert that those parents who send their children to parochial schools are taxed doubly for education: once for public schools and again for parochial schools.

Legally, of course, the argument is specious. No law requires Catholic parents to pay for parochial schools or denies their children access to public schools. But if the argument lacks legal substance, it carries moral force. Catholic-school parents do in fact pay more for education than non-Catholics—and, in doing so, they actually save the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Because of this, non-Catholics who smugly invoke the doctrine of separation of church and state are no more disinterested interpreters of the principle than are Catholics. The question of Federal aid to parochial schools needs recognition of the Catholic contribution and the national good, not slogan trading.

Nor does it mitigate the Catholic parents' sense of financial burden to recall that the doctrine of separation of church and state in America as it pertains to education grew up pragmatically and not as a result of an abstract principle. Many know that all public education in America began as Protestant education, becoming secular only when Catholics, in the early 19th century, protested and demanded a share of the school funds to open their own schools. The Catholics failed to get the funds, but America got secular public schools. The point is that rigid, automatic adherence to an absolute interpretation of the doctrine of separation is a real source of social division.

To achieve the social harmony necessary for any healthy society some recognition of Catholic problems in education needs to be made by the rest of Americans. For too long, non-Catholic Americans have viewed the Roman Catholic Church as something more (or less, according to some) than a religion. Many Protestants still see it as simply concentrated power, something to be feared and fought.

Today, however, Catholics constitute a quarter of the population. The first Catholic President is as memorable for his sophisticated style as the first Catholic presidential candidate is remembered for his lack of it. Indeed, it is the new power and prominence of Catholics that constitutes the dynamite in the school issue.

To meet every plea for recognition of the Catholic parents' problem with the automatic response of separation of church and state can only drive Catholics to an unwise use of their power. One adamantine response begets another. The result is social division and, ultimately, national stagnation. Social amity requires that all Americans, not just Catholics, assume part of the burden of the parochial schools' pursuit of educational excellence.

The emphasis here is on understanding, not on right. It should be clear that no private school has a right to public aid. Some unthinking advocates of such aid, it is true, have argued that the constitutional doctrine of freedom of religion implies that the state must support church schools, else they are being denied their rights under the first amendment.

Such a contention is nonsense. Freedom of economic enterprise does not mean that all businesses must be kept afloat by the state. But, if the public good demands it, the Government may support certain enterprises, as it does the merchant marine and farming. That is a matter to be decided by public debate, not adjudicated according to immutable principles. Similarly, private education may be—indeed, should be—assisted by the Federal Government, though not as a right.

But, it will be objected, the case is different in regard to education, where social need is not the only consideration. What of the constitutional doctrine of separation of church and state? Does not the Constitution prohibit any kind of support for religion, even for the schools? Actually, as I have been implying, the constitutional restrictions are less rigid than some opponents of Federal aid to parochial schools would have us believe.

Despite the decidedly pragmatic nature of their culture, Americans like to think that the separation of church and state in the United States is strict. Even John F. Kennedy fell into this cliche when, during the 1960 campaign, he spoke of believing "in an America where the separation of church and state is absolute. . . ."

In truth, it has been neither absolute nor consistent. From the very first administration, Congress has provided for chaplains out of public funds, and the President has proclaimed days of thanksgiving. The Constitution itself recognizes Sunday—the Christian Sabbath—as a day of rest. To this day, at the service academies, attendance at chapel is compulsory. And, above all, both the Federal and State Governments continue to support religion through tax exemptions of church property that run into hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

The one unbreachable tenet, and rightly so, has been that the Government may not support any religion or church directly. And this no advocate of Federal aid to parochial schools suggests. Nor is it an argument against Federal aid to religious schools to say it would be an opening wedge to direct support of religion. For more than 150 years, in one form or another, indirect aid has been given without breaching the essential principle; there is no reason why the effect would be any different now.

The Supreme Court has recognized that the doctrine of separation is not absolute. In 1930, in the case of *Cochran* v. *Louisiana*, the Court set forth its first major interpretation of the meaning of separation as applied to schools. The case concerned a Louisiana law that had provided for State-supplied textbooks for private schools, including parochial, as well as for public schools. When the law was challenged by a taxpayer on the ground that public money was being spent for a private purpose, the Court rejected the argument, asserting that the books served a public purpose; namely, the education of the children.

Admittedly, the Court conceded, providing textbooks indirectly aided religious institutions, but that was not the intention of the State; hence, the law was not contrary to the constitutional prohibitions. Today several Sates provide free textbooks to private schools.

The principle of benefit to the child was also the basis of the Court's reasoning in the Everson decision in 1947, which permitted the use of public funds to pay for the transportation of children to a parochial school. A year later, in the McCollum case, the Court outlawed an Illinois practice of allowing religious classes, under the released-time program, to be held in public school buildings. Here the aid to the child was in support of religious teaching only.

Thus the Court drew a line between those acts of Government that aid religion directly and those which aid religion only indirectly while pursuing a broader social purpose. Presumably, the child-benefit principle, as long as it does not support religious teaching as such, is capable of extension beyond textbooks and buses.

In fact, it has already been applied, though the Supreme Court has not considered the constitutionality of any of the applications. The best-known instance, of course, has been the GI bill of rights, passed at the end of the Second World War to aid veterans' education. Catholic colleges and universities received funds, through their students, along with secular institutions. Even veterans studying for the ministry and priesthood could call upon the law for benefits.

Parochial schools participate today in State and Federal school lunch programs. Shared-time programs, endorsed in the President's message and already in operation in some cities, also constitute an application of the child-benefit doctrine. Purists may argue, as they have in regard to public buses being used by parochial school children, that any such services, by saving money for religious institutions, constitute a violation of absolute separation. But neither the American people nor the Supreme Court have been purists in the past in this regard; certainly there is no reason to begin now.

There is also evidence that many Americans are becoming aware of the need for some kind of accommodation on the issue. In 1961, the Gallup poll reported that 57 percent of the population wanted no Federal funds to go to parochial schools. But by early 1963, 49 percent favored including parochial schools in any Federal aid, while only 44 percent were opposed. (The remainder were undecided.)

With the child-benefit doctrine available in constitutional interpretation and with public recognition of the need for Federal aid to all schools increasing, the time seems propitious for the Johnson administration to take the final step. What precise form Federal aid should take is, of course, a matter to be decided in the public forum.

Obviously it should not include any direct support of religious instruction. Probably the most useful form it could take would be financial grants for augmenting salaries of teachers of secular subjects, for laboratory equipment, for new classroom construction, and for outfitting libraries. The amount might well be in proportion to the total educational appropriation of the parochial schools, and be distributed on a per capita basis.

The expenditure of the funds would probably be most efficiently overseen by the U.S. Office of Education, but congressional concern about Federal control might well cause this function to be placed in the hands of State departments of education. Regardless of the level of government that undertakes the supervision of the expenditures, though, it should be understood that with a grant of money goes the right to see that it is used as intended.

Moreover, since this aid is a matter of policy and not of right, the amount granted to any individual private school would be considerably less than the full cost of operation. Thus public schools would remain the principal recipients of public funds—indeed, the only recipients on the local and State levels. There would, therefore, be no need to fear that the public schools would be superseded either in money or in public attention by the private or parochial schools.

To bring the issue explicitly before the Nation will undoubtedly arouse heated discussion and perhaps even some latent fears and ancient animosities. But the question is too important to be weakly evaded and too urgent to be merely palliated. Of all recent Presidents, Lyndon Johnson, with his proved powers of public and private persuasion, is eminently fitted for the task of public education and leadership that the subject demands.

Certainly the Great Society he dreams of and the mutual understanding among Americans he cherishes deserve no less. Moreover, once the thorny issue is faced and Congress has acted, the effect may well be as socially healing as the passage of the Civil Rights Act has proved to be for another threat to national amity and social progress.

Putting Baseball Under Antitrust Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I took the floor of the House to urge that Congress take action this session to strip organized professional baseball of its present exemption from the antitrust laws.

I was pleased to note, that yesterday the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. HART, introduced a bill into the Senate which would put baseball squarely under the antitrust laws, along with the other professional team sports of basketball, football, and ice hockey.

His bill, S. 950, differs from legislation which I have introduced on the same subject in that it grants certain exemptions from the antitrust laws in areas necessary for the teams' sports operations.

Although my bill, H.R. 6, does not specify areas of exemption, it may be necessary to grant some privileges in order to safeguard the public interest in these sports. It is important, I believe, that these exemptions be granted by Congress, not by court decision as is currently the case with baseball.

Senator HART has long been concerned with the problem of team sports and antitrust. He is to be commended for his efforts at bringing responsibility back to our national pastime. Further, it is my understanding that, as a part of committee hearings on S. 950 and related bills, testimony will be heard on both the sale of the New York Yankees to the Columbia Broadcasting System and the proposed transfer of the Braves franchise from Milwaukee to Atlanta.

Both these actions by baseball management need thorough exploration in order to determine what effect they will have on the public interest and the welfare of the sport. Review of these instances of apparent contempt for the public interest on the part of baseball team owners can assist in formulating new legislation.

At this point I would like to include in the RECORD a portion of an article entitled "Two Strikes on the Image" by Roger Angell, which appeared in the October 24, 1964, issue of New Yorker magazine.

Mr. Angell believes that baseball's image has been hurt primarily because of confidence-destroying actions by baseball management. He puts it this way:

> It is sadly apparent to me that baseball has long since exhausted * * * indulgence and now deserves whatever it may get from Washington; Congressmen cannot now do more damage to the sport than its owners have done already.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues as Congress begins its scrutiny of professional team sports.

The article follows:

TWO STRIKES ON THE IMAGE

(By Roger Angell)

As we all know, when the typical American business executive turns out his bedside light he devotes his next-to-last thought of the day to his corporate image—that elusive and essential ideal vision of his company which shimmers, or should shimmer, in the minds of consumers. Do they like us, he wonders. Do we look respectable? Honest? Lovable? Hmm. He sighs, stretches out, and tries to find sleep by once again striking out the entire batting order of the New York Yankees. As he works the count to three and two on Tom Tresh, it may suddenly occur to this well-paid insomniac that baseball itself has the most enviable corporate image in the world. Its evocations, overtones, and loyalties, firmly planted in the mind of every American male during childhood and nurtured thereafter by millions of words of free newspaper publicity, appear to be unassailable. It is the national pastime. It is youth, springtime, a trip to the country, part of our past. It is the roaring excitement of huge urban crowds and the sleepy green afternoon silences of midsummer. Without effort, it engenders and thrives on heroes, legends, self-identification, and hometown pride. For 6 months of the year, it intrudes cheerfully into every American home, then frequently rises to a point of nearly insupportable tension and absorption, and concludes in the happy explosion of the country's favorite sporting spectacle, the world series. Given these ancient and self-sustaining attributes, it would seem impossible that the executives of such a business could injure it to any profound degree through their own carelessness and greed, yet this is exactly what has happened to baseball in the past 10 years. The season that just ended in two improbably close pennant races and in the victory of the Cardinals over the Yankees in a memorable seven-game world series was also the most shameful and destructive year the game has experienced since the Black Sox scandal of 1919.

The fervent loyalties of baseball are almost, but not quite, indestructible. I know a New York lawyer, now in his seventies, whose heart slowly bleeds through the summer over the misadventures of the Cleveland Indians, a team representing the hometown he left in 1919. With immense difficulty, I have sustained something of that affection for the San Francisco Giants, once my New York team, but I know that my attachment will not survive the eventual departure of Willie Mays. Since 1953, 6 teams have changed their homes and 4 entirely new teams have been born, so exactly half of the 20 major league teams must count on a loyalty that is less than a dozen years old. At this writing, it seems entirely possible that faltering attendance will cause three more franchises—Cleveland, Kansas City, and Milwaukee—to shift to new cities within the next two seasons. Another team, the Angels, will conclude its brief tenancy in Los Angeles at the end of next year; starting in 1966, it will represent Anaheim, Calif., which is the home of Disneyland.

The irritation and dismay that I share with most baseball fans over this queasy state of affairs is not caused entirely by the appearance in our ball parks of so many semi-anonymous ballplayers with unfamiliar insignia on their shirtfronts, or by the inept play of so many of the new teams, or even by the ridiculously expanded new schedules, which now require the majors to play 1,620 games, as against the old 1,232, before they can determine two winners. Grudgingly, I can accept the fact that it was sensible for baseball to enlarge itself and to spread toward new centers of a growing population. What I cannot forgive, what no baseball fan has been able to forget, is the manner in which the expansion was handled. In 1957, Walter O'Malley, the owner of the Brooklyn Dodgers, abruptly removed his team to Los Angeles after making a series of impossible demands upon the city of New York for the instantaneous construction of a new ball park. He was followed at once by Horace Stoneham, who took his Giants to San Francisco while piously denying that he had any understanding with O'Malley, although every schoolboy knew that National League schedules required the presence of two teams on the west coast. Within a few days, the largest and most vociferously involved baseball audience in the country was deprived of its two oldest franchises and left with the new knowledge that baseball's executives cared only for the profits inherent in novelty and new audiences, and sensed no obligation whatever—not even the obligation of candor—to the fans who had built their business.

The subsequent operations of Mr. O'Malley, the other owners of big-league teams, the league presidents, and Commissioner Ford Frick have been watched by knowing fans with growing cynicism. In 1961, O'Malley, supported by Frick, permitted the establishment of a rival team in Los Angeles only after imposing such punitive conditions and rental fees that the Angels could not possibly succeed. The result, of course, is Anaheim. In the 1962 draft creating two new teams, the National League owners, ignoring the much fairer system inaugurated by the American League the previous year, protected their player investments so carefully that the squads were manned entirely by a miserable collection of culls and aging castoffs, and the two teams—the Houston Colt .45s and the Mets—have been a disgrace to baseball. The perverse loyalty of the Met fans—the New Breed—is at least partly engendered by a hatred for the kind of coldblooded success typified by Mr. O'Malley and by the owners of the New York Yankees.

In the past few years, baseball has staged such unedifying spectacles as the loud public wrangle carried on by Charles O. Finley, the owner of the Athletics, in his attempt to secure more favorable stadium-rental terms from the municipal government of Kansas City. At various times since he purchased the club in 1960, Mr. Finley has threatened to move to Oakland, to Atlanta, or to almost any other city or hamlet that promised him a ballfield and the kind of profits he considers his due. Last winter, his

negotiations with Louisville reached the point where the American League had to threaten him with expulsion before he accepted terms and signed a new lease for the Kansas City park. Mr. Finley, it should be added, is the man who clothes his players in horrendous green and gold uniforms and who had to be restrained by the baseball rules committee from enlivening the national pastime with orange baseballs and green and gold bats. His notion that baseball owes him a free, or almost free, municipal ball park and the right to move wherever and whenever he chooses is neither eccentric nor atypical. Consider, for example, the fact that the Braves, who have been established in Milwaukee only since 1953, are now casting hungry eyes on Atlanta. This team—pennant winners in 1957 and 1958, and formidable contenders from 1952 through 1960—enjoyed 4 consecutive years in which their attendance topped 2 million, and in 1957 they established a league gate record of 2,215,404, so there can be no doubt about Milwaukee's enthusiasm for the sport. But now that the team is old and attendance is down, the chance to move on to new audiences, in the pattern established by O'Malley, may prove to be more tempting than the hard work involved in staying put and rebuilding the club. There is a powerful rumor that Milwaukee will move to Atlanta next year or the year after; in that case, Kansas City may become Milwaukee. Cleveland has just postponed, for the time being, a jump to Seattle, Oakland, or Dallas, but a move is clearly in the wind. If these shuttlings ever do take place, big-league baseball will have established itself once and for all as a fly-by-night tent-show entertainment, and several million more fans will understand at last that baseball's executives view them as dimwitted louts who will automatically attach their attention and loyalty to the most recent second-rate team that happens to wear the home uniform.

The most meaningful event of the 1964 baseball season was neither the Cardinal breathless, last-day capture of the National League flag nor the same team's victory in the long gladiatorial bloodletting of the series. It was, of course, the news on August 13 that the Columbia Broadcasting Co. has bought control (80 percent) of the New York Yankees for the sum of $11,200,000. The shabby and by now typical manner of the maneuver was as dismaying as its significance. Charles Finley, of Kansas City, and Arthur Allyn, president of the Chicago White Sox, were both informed of the deal in telephone calls from the American League president, Joe Cronin, who in one breath told them that league rules required them to vote on the transaction and in the next that their vote was meaningless, since he already had the three-quarters majority necessary for it to pass. This call came only 2 days after the annual major league executive meetings in Chicago, during which the deal was never mentioned to Finley, Allyn, or the public. Finley's and Allyn's subsequent shouts of rage and the astonished editorial protests of the press were so piercing that Cronin convened a league meeting in Boston to consider the possible antitrust violations implicit in the sale. The meeting turned into a whitewash, in which various proposals for reconsideration was ruled out of order or brushed aside and a tentative change of heart by the Baltimore owners (which could have killed the sale) was ruthlessly muscled down. A few facts about the inner councils of baseball may explain how this was possible. Dan Topping and Del Webb, the former owners and continuing managing executives of the Yankees, are as powerful in their league as Walter O'Malley is in his. Topping and O'Malley are both members of the majors' executive council, along with the two league presidents and Commissioner Frick. American League President Cronin is a brother-in-law of Calvin R. Griffith, the president of the Minnesota Twins. The Cleveland Indians are anxious to move their franchise, and would need the approval of the Yankees and other clubs in order to make the shift. Lee MacPhail, the president of the Baltimore Orioles, is the brother of Bill MacPhail, director of sports for CBS. Several American League executives own blocks of CBS stock; the owners of the Los Angeles Angels, who also needed league approval for their franchise move, operate CBS affiliates in California, and John Fetzer, president of the Detroit Tigers, operates CBS-affiliated stations in the Middle West.

It is always possible, of course, that the eight club owners who voted for the sale of the Yankees to CBS believed that the deal was simply a straightforward business transaction, possibly good for baseball. If so, they understand neither the business of baseball nor the subtler structure of the sport. Television now exerts the most intense pressure on all aspects of baseball. Since the war, its total exposure of major league games has destroyed most of the minor leagues. The widely varying amounts of TV revenue enjoyed by the big-league clubs have made the rich teams richer and do much to explain why so many poorer clubs want to shift franchises. The potentialities of pay television, first attempted in California this year, are as yet unknown, but this new device may vastly increase the revenue of baseball, while causing further financial disruption in less populated baseball territories. Many hard-pressed ball clubs have put their hopes in a plan, tentatively scheduled for next year, for a weekly Monday-night baseball spectacular on coast-to-coast television, from which all teams would draw an equal share of the profits, now estimated at better than $6 million. The Yankees, of course, already derive considerable money from their own telecasts and broadcasts—$1,200,000 from local stations, plus an additional $600,000 from CBS itself for their part in the nationwide "Game of the Week" telecasts. To drop CBS into the middle of this rich, untidy gumbo as the owner of baseball's No. 1 attraction is more than an engraved invitation for congressional antitrust investigations; it is a pure and terrifying death wish.

For decades, baseball has been teetering above the sword edge of antitrust legislation because of its minor-league chains, its buying and selling of athletes, and its rigidly controlled franchise rights. It has escaped so far by pleading that it is not engaged in interstate commerce, and by relying on the tolerance of legislators and high-court justices who love baseball and understand that if baseball were to operate in a free market, like all other businesses, the sport as we know it would be destroyed. It is sadly apparent to me that baseball has long since exhausted this indulgence and now deserves whatever it may get from Washington; Congressmen cannot now do more damage to the sport than its owners have done already.

Laborsaving Device

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to refer to the cover page of the Idaho Farmer of January 21, 1965.

The caption under a splendid picture of a new machine tells what ingenuity can do in meeting the challenges of high costs and labor shortages facing farmers in producing and harvesting their crops.

In the production of beans, which is one of the most profitable crops grown in southeastern Idaho and is of the finest variety, the tedious task of polesetting and trellising is a time-consuming, laborious job for bean growers.

I congratulate Harvey H. Rasmussen of Preston, Idaho, who invented and constructed this machine which removes much of the tedious hand labor in polesetting jobs. In Franklin County where Mr. Rasmussen grows beans, he uses the new machine on his own crops and does custom work with it for several bean-growing neighbors.

The machine is mounted on a tractor, and it sets two rows of poles properly spaced. At the same time, it strings the bottom cord, the horizontal wires, and the diagonal strings. Five men can now do the work which formerly required upward of 9 or 10.

Health Insurance for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, Congressman DURWARD G. HALL, of Missouri, recently gave an excellent analysis of the comprehensive medical care bill which many of us are sponsoring in the House of Representatives. He discussed the bill in his regular report from Washington and I should like to insert his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

His remarks follow:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN DURWARD G. HALL

The House Ways and Means Committee has begun executive hearings on the various proposals that have been introduced in the Congress dealing with medical care for persons over 65 years of age.

The bill advocated by the Johnson administration, known as the King-Anderson bill, H.R. 1, would impose an additional social security tax on employers and employees and would provide a specified number of hospital days in each benefit period for certain persons over age 65. The King-Anderson bill has no provision for doctor bills, drugs, and care outside the hospital.

A recent Gallup poll revealed that 77 percent of the American people have a mistaken concept of the benefits that would be offered under this bill, which has inaccurately been labeled "medicare." Actually, it would be more appropriate to label it "hospicare," since "medicare" implies total health coverage.

It has always been my belief that legislation to met the problem, which admittedly exists, should follow three basic principles.

1. It should be focused on those who need help.

2. It should be voluntary, rather than compulsory in nature.

3. It should be administered as close as possible to the people in the respective States.

With those guidelines in mind, I've introduced legislation in the House of Representatives, which I believe will provide a much more satisfactory solution to the problem than the King-Anderson bill.

Basically, my bill would authorize Federal grants to the States on a matching basis to help persons 65 years of age and older pay costs of comprehensive health insurance. The private insurance industry, both the "Blues" and commercial carriers, would administer the program.

For individuals with incomes below the limit set by each State, the Government, using matching Federal and State funds out of general revenue, would pay the entire cost of the premiums. For individuals with incomes between the minimum and maximum, the Government would pay a part of the cost on a sliding scale according to income. Individuals with income above the maximum would pay the entire cost, but they would have the benefits of an income tax deduction for such payments, as well as statewide bargaining for noncancellable health care policies.

An important aspect of my bill is that it would dispense with the so-called means test which the present Kerr-Mills bill now requires to be conducted by each county welfare department. Instead, each individual would simply certify his income to the responsible State agency at least once a year.

The Hall bill would provide comprehensive medical, surgical, and hospital benefits. Benefits would include, not only payment of hospital and nursing home charges, but also payment of medical, surgical, drug, and other costs. Furthermore, there is no limit to the duration of coverage, thus providing protection against catastrophic illness.

The King-Anderson bill, on the other hand, limits inpatient hospital care to 60 days per benefit period. It omits entirely surgical care, physicians care in the home or office, drugs and medicine outside the hospital, and most nursing home care and private nursing duty.

In essence, the choice between the bill which I have introduced, and the King-Anderson bill, is a choice between a bill which would pay all medical costs—hospital, surgical, and drugs—for persons who need help, and a bill which would pay only one aspect of those costs—hospital care—and then only for a limited period of time, for all persons, regardless of need.

I'm happy to report that several members of both parties are sponsoring legislation similar to the bill I've submitted, and I'm confident that this approach will receive detailed attention in the hearings now underway in the Ways and Means Committee.

Let's Reserve Judgments Regarding Air Force Academy Honor Code Violations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, regrettably the Air Force Academy has been racked by an episode of cheating. An investigation is being, and should be, carried out with dispatch. The rights of each cadet must be, and are being, scrupulously protected, yet the incident must be thoroughly and professionally probed.

There are literally dozens of reporters and photographers awaiting outside the Academy grounds to expose and spectacularize the events in minute detail. Unbelievably there are many who seem to revel in demeaning the cadets, individually and collectively, possibly out of pure jealousy or a sense of personal or moral inferiority.

The Air Force Academy cadet code is exceptionally high and honorable. "We will not lie, cheat or steal—nor tolerate among us those who do." Reflect on this. Not only does it require the cadet to be moral, but it equally requires him to reject evil. Both requirements are absolutely necessary. A society or group which tolerates lying, cheating or stealing is doomed. Think how much better our society would be if only more groups, organizations and nations would adopt and adhere to such a code.

Would there be the Bobby Baker scandal if another segment of our society had lived by the honor code of our Air cadets? How can standards be enhanced—even maintained—by tolerating breaches of our laws or code of ethics?

This incident may be a personal and family tragedy for a few young men who failed to measure up. They should not despair. They have lives to live and marks to make. This lesson may serve them well.

The cadets who remain, the overwhelming majority, have learned much by sharing the embarrassment. But they can be proud of an institution and service which has been strenghtened by their splendid adherence to an exemplary code of personal conduct.

Those who decry and demean the Air Academy Honor Code would better serve the Academy, youth and our country, by trying, instead, to live by it. They would have more empathy for those who failed, and more appreciation of those who have measured up.

The Military Academy and Air Force Academy have similar codes of conduct. Cadets of other academies, and students of many other quality universities, are not obliged to "not tolerate" moral, ethical and legal violations. The obligation to "not tolerate" honor code violations does not require "tattling," "squealing," or "ratting." Parenthetically, those who customarily use these latter terms, too often have no, or a low, moral code themselves. It actually would be sufficient and proper compliance for a cadet who had been proffered illicit examination answers to say directly to the profferor, "This is a violation of our code of honor, I suggest that you report it." Many an honorable cadet has reported his own violation—thereby not placing any unfair onus upon his fellow cadets to tolerate his violation.

Some may not appreciate such a demanding code, but let us not deny its essential benefits to those to whom it can mean life or death. Let not false rumors or unfounded gossip build up any pressure to change or mollify this superb code of personal conduct.

A code which is self-enforcing is quite superior to a code which requires an extramural Gestapo or policing unit. Neither society, nor any part of society, should be required to rely upon an extramural investigating and enforcing agency. The military services should not be peculiar, but certainly they cannot tolerate the underworld philosophy that "any conduct is permissible unless you get caught by an outsider." The citizen who has the courage and the dedication to make a citizen's arrest is a better citizen than one who stands by unconcerned as crimes are committed, saying "crime is none of my business—only the police should enforce our laws."

If an honor code relieves the violator from being discovered or reported by a fellow citizen or fellow cadet, there are many in every society who would take every advantage of such immunity. If an honor code relieves the innocent victim or witness from any obligation to report the violator, there would likewise be some in every society who would then operate criminally with impunity.

I am confident that the investigation will disclose that the cadets who have resigned did so after an overt honor code infraction. Even if this is not true in every single instance, our immediate sympathy should not be permitted to discredit or discard an honorable code of conduct.

We should commend the Academy for employing a high code and be gratified by the great majority of cadets who are willing to live by it—to their everlasting credit and to the everlasting benefit of our still-moral-Nation and military services.

We should be careful to not discredit or discard something just because it is good or difficult.

Every thorough study of undergraduate honor codes will disclose that there is considerably less cheating at our Military and Air Force Academies than at other academies and universities.

Effective control of student cheating can best be achieved through a demanding honor code enforced by the students. Almost all will comply. The others should seek another university or place in society with a code of conduct more to their standards. A high code of honor, strictly and fairly enforced by peers, contributes as much as anything else to the central and overriding purpose for maintaining and attending a service academy.

Rather than modify or weaken the U.S. Air Force Academy Honor Code, it might be better to institute and enforce a similar code at other academies and universities.

Should we not devote our thoughts to preserving and perfecting the honor code and our efforts to striving to measure up to it?

Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues today to an excellent project in democracy which was organized last fall by the students at Carl Schurz High School, which lies in the very heart of my congressional district.

I take this opportunity to call attention to this project because it again demon-

strates how often our society fails to see the good things that our young people do today and instead lament only their shortcomings.

Carl Schurz High School is the largest high school in my district, and it is indeed inspiring to know that these young people who are the future citizens of America organized a project which made the entire student body aware of the basic issues involved in the 1964 campaign.

This was done in a manner that was completely nonpartisan, and in no way violated the complete impartiality of both the faculty and the student body of this school, but it did give more than 2,000 youngsters an opportunity to see democracy in action, and I am sure that this project will make each of these young people better citizens upon graduation.

I believe the faculty at Carl Schurz High School and the student body deserves the highest commendation for this unique project. I am particularly grateful to Mr. Keith Santilli, Mr. Nike Bliss, Miss Donna Lauer, and Miss Marge Moeller for preparing the following memorandum which spells out this inspiring work of our young people.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM: A STUDY OF THE 1964 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

We believe the future of the United States to be dependent upon the interest and knowledge evident in the American citizen, therefore, the U.S. history classes of Carl Schurz High School made a comprehensive study of the 1964 presidential election.

Background material inclusive in this study was information concerning the voting requirements for Chicago and Illinois, information regarding the operation of a voting machine, a history of the electoral process, and general histories of both major political parties.

In detail, students researched information concerning the presidential and vice-presidential candidates in addition to the platform presented by each party and the issues under debate in this campaign. The biographies, accomplishments, and opinions of the candidates were examined carefully. Many possible sources of information were explored—newspapers, magazines, books, and both partisan and nonpartisan material. Personal letters were written to the candidates as well as to national headquarters of both parties. Further facts were gleaned through letters to the Senators and Congressmen representing Illinois and, locally, interviews with city aldermen, precinct captains, and ward committeemen. The political material and election information collected from these sources were made available to the entire student body.

Each student who participated in this study compiled his findings into a single booklet ranging from 25 to 75 pages in length and presented from a nonpartisan viewpoint.

Highlighting the study was a mock election held in class the day before the actual election. The results we obtained paralleled the opinion of the American voters.

On election day, Schurz students went out and urged registered citizens to vote, reminding them of the rules and regulations of the polling places.

After completing this study, we feel that in the coming years the knowledge we gained will help direct our choice of public officials and have made us more aware of the qualifications which are so necessary for good government.

Tobacco: Billions in Taxes—The Integrity of a Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about the costs of farm programs, but very few people realize that since our mammoth effort to establish a parity position for our farm families began back in 1933, the Federal Government actually has collected in taxes from just one crop—tobacco—more than twice the dollars spent on all farm price-support programs, for all crops, through the price stabilization agency, the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Federal and State excise collections on tobacco in these last 32 years have amounted to $52 billion—$39.5 billion by the Federal Government and $12.5 billion by State governments.

The Federal levies on tobacco and tobacco products have produced more revenue than the combined costs of farm price-support programs, amounting to $15 billion, and the food-for-peace program, costing $12.5 billion.

The Federal and State excise collections amount to more than $3 billion a year. In contrast, the tobacco program, which maintains decent prices for the people who produce tobacco, has cost only about $39 million during the entire life of the program.

Incidentally, the tobacco farmer receives only about 3 cents for the tobacco in a package of cigarettes which sells at retail for an average of 28 to 30 cents.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt the Members of this body generally are aware that we now have some very serious problems in the operation of the tobacco program. These problems have developed through vastly increased per acre yields of tobacco, through our failure to develop large new export outlets, and because of the report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, on smoking and health.

My purpose today is to impress upon my colleagues the importance of protecting the integrity of the tobacco program and of improving this program. To this end, I have written to the President suggesting that of the many billions of dollars collected through tobacco excises, the Federal Government plowback 1 cent of the 8-cent-a-pack levy upon cigarettes, in programs to continue America's supremacy of foreign tobacco markets, to maintain the stability and prosperity of tobacco producers and the industry generally, and to undertake research in the field of smoking and health.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the facts set forth in this letter to the President, and the suggestions embraced therein, are of interest to Members of this body; therefore, I am inserting this letter in the RECORD.

The text follows:

JANUARY 6, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I commend your recommendation, presented in the state of the Union message, that family purchasing power be strengthened by a substantial cut in Federal excise taxes. Such an adjustment should contribute in a very sound and solid way to a growing economy and a strong nation.

You did not set forth, in your message, what precise excises you want reduced; but the press on December 27, 1964, reported that you would ask the Congress to repeal or cut all these levies except those upon tobacco products, alcoholic beverages and highway use.

The tobacco tax is one of the oldest levies in our revenue system. Perhaps no tax is felt by a greater number of our citizens, from the tobacco producer, through workers in manufacturing plants, on to the user of tobacco products. Therefore, I respectfully submit a suggestion with respect to this tax, embraced in the context of these facts:

1. Since 1933, when the tobacco program and other farm programs first were inaugurated, Federal and State Governments have collected $52,019 million in excise taxes upon tobacco and tobacco products—the Federal Government $39,431 million and State governments $12,588 million.

2. The $39 billion from Federal tobacco collections alone during this 32-year period are substantially more than twice the grand total of $15,026 million expended by the Government through the Commodity Credit Corporation on all farm price support programs for all crops since these programs were inaugurated. The Federal tobacco levies have yielded more money than the combined costs of all these farm price support programs and the food-for-peace program through which this country has invested $12,486 million to lessen hunger among friendly peoples around the world.

3. While $52 billion has been collected in tobacco excises by Federal and State Governments, the cost of the tobacco program, which has protected the income of tobacco farmers since 1933, has been only $38 million.

4. Meanwhile, during these 32 years, our tobacco and tobacco product exports—without any export subsidy—have amounted to $10 billion, contributing substantially to our Nation's balance of payments with other countries. In this connection it might be well to mention that during the first 100 years of our history as a nation, it was the export of tobacco and cotton that maintained America's financial integrity before the world.

5. Tobacco is an $8 billion industry in the United States. Hundreds of thousands of farm families in 21 States are engaged in the growing of tobacco. There are some 550 plants, employing approximately 100,000 workers in 30 States, engaged in the manufacture of tobacco products. Approximately 1,500,000 businesses with many hundreds of thousands of workers are in the tobacco trade.

6. The $3 billion-plus now collected annually by Federal and State Governments from tobacco levies amounts to more than twice the income farmers actually receive each year for all the tobacco they produce. The total of these excises is 10 times the profits, after taxes, of all cigarette and other tobacco manufacturers.

7. During the Korean conflict, the Federal excise on cigarettes was increased from $3.50 to $4 per 1,000 cigarettes—or from 7 to 8 cents per pack. Under the revenue law approved October 20, 1951, the cigarette levy was to have reverted to $3.50 at the termination of the Korean hostilities; but the reversion to the prewar rate has been post-

poned year after year. Under the law, unless there is further legislation, the cigarette excise will drop back to $3.50 per 1,000 on July 1, 1965.

8. In recent years, great increases have been attained in the per-acre yield of tobacco on our farms so that, despite severe restrictions upon acreage devoted to this crop, surpluses have accumulated and now endanger the operations of the tobacco price stabilization program. This program has been the most successful of all farm programs in protecting and improving, at the least cost, the incomes and standard of living of those farm families engaged in the production of a crop. Coincident with the increasing per-acre yields of tobacco in the United States, other areas of the world have developed and expanded tobacco culture, and now are competing in world markets which have been dominated by our tobacco since colonial times. The quality of our tobacco is superior to any produced anywhere else in the world, and is preferred in world markets, but price competition has become intense. The severity of this competition can be measured by the fact that in 1963 the average export price of Flue-cured (cigarette type) tobacco was: United States 82.1 cents, Canada 71.7 cents, Rhodesia-Nyasaland 63.3 cents, and India 36.1 cents. The world price competition has been much more severe in 1964, but average export prices for this year are not yet available. Our tobacco has been able to hold markets where superior quality is required, but the price cutting by other exporting areas now is being severely felt.

9. The soundness of our tobacco economy, its ability to yield revenues to our Federal and State governments, its contribution to the Nation's balance of payments, the continuation of the tobacco program that has meant so much to the many thousands of farm families producing tobacco, all rest in a substantial way upon the holding and expansion of our foreign markets for tobacco. The export of tobacco is a proper concern of our Government in the interest of our Nation.

10. New problems for tobacco developed early this year in the report of the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General on "Smoking and Health."

Now, therefore, in the light of the foregoing, I respectfully petition your serious and careful consideration of a recommendation which I have arrived at after the most searching deliberation.

If it is your judgment that the excise on cigarettes not be reduced from $4 to $3.50 per 1,000, as now is scheduled to occur on July 1, 1965, then let us by appropriate legislation assign an amount of money equal to the proceeds from the 50 cents difference between the $3.50 and $4 levy for these specific purposes:

a. To enable and promote the export and marketing of American tobacco around the world;

b. To bear all costs of the tobacco price stabilization program;

c. To finance research and inquiry into smoking and health.

This proposal in effect would assign 1 cent of the 8 cents a pack levy on cigarettes—or about $250 million annually—to the above specified purposes.

Mr. President, since Federal and State governments are collecting annually on tobacco products three times as much money as our farmers actually receive each year for their total tobacco crop, this proposition of plowing back a portion of the Federal excise collections makes sense to me.

It will make the tobacco price stabilization program self-sustaining, as the sugar program now is self-sustaining through a special sugar levy.

It will make certain that American tobacco will remain supreme in the tobacco markets of the world, thereby guaranteeing the continued effectiveness of our tobacco price stabilization program and decent incomes for those many thousands of Americans who produce tobacco.

It will assure proper and effective concern for the health of all Americans who use tobacco.

Moreover, it is my conviction that in going this route our Federal and State governments in the long run will derive even greater revenues from tobacco, and tobacco's contribution to America's critical balance of payments with other nations will be greatly enlarged.

With high esteem and warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

A Foundation for the Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished president of Brown University, Dr. Barnaby Keeney, has so well stated the case for use of Federal funds to advance the humanities and the arts that I should like to bring his words to the attention of Congress. Dr. Keeney was chairman of the Commission on the Humanities, whose report stimulated my own interest in establishment of a National Humanities Foundation—H.R. 334. I include here excerpts, as printed in the Christian Science Monitor, from an address delivered by Dr. Keeney to the Triennial Council of the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa:

A FOUNDATION FOR THE HUMANITIES

(By Barnaby C. Keeney)

(Excerpts from an address to the Triennial Council of the United Chapters of the Phi Beta Kappa by the president of Brown University, and chairman, Commission on the Humanities.)

Should Federal funds be used for the humanities and arts? This is, of course, the question that must be answered first. The arguments that Federal funds should not be so used are based on grounds that run from principle through economics to tactics and expediency. The basic fear is that the use of Federal funds in these sensitive areas will lead to control of thought in a way much more dangerous than the possibility of control of thought in science and technology.

There are good grounds for such a fear. The painting and sculpture approved by the Soviet Union does not inspire the same admiration as Soviet achievements in physics and in space. On the other hand, however, art subsidized by the French Government has, in our times, occupied a more important place than science subsidized from the same source. One may suspect that the nature and purpose of the government doing the subsidizing will have something to do with the degree and effect of control.

I myself feel that if the Federal Government in this country ever takes control of the humanities, the arts, and the social studies—or the sciences themselves—it will not be primarily because the Government has spent money on them; it will be because the people of the United States tell their Representatives that they wish such control to be exercised. If the people make such a decision, there will be control whether funds are expended or not. I do not believe that they will wish to reach such a decision.

It is sometimes asserted that funds should not be expended on the humanities because we have problems of higher priority and but limited funds. The amount that could prudently be expended in a decade would not exceed the amount necessary to get a man on the moon a year earlier than we otherwise might. Later on I shall advance the argument that the health of our culture is more important to us both at home and abroad than a moonless year.

The Los Angeles Times approves the humanities, but questions the need of additional expenditure for them on the grounds that an appropriate number of students study them. I believe this conclusion is based upon statistics published by the U.S. Office of Education on earned degrees conferred in 1961–62. In that year some 72,000 bachelor degrees were conferred in the arts and humanities, including arts education, whereas 180,000 odd were conferred in the social sciences, mathematics, engineering, the physical sciences, and the biological and health sciences. This would seem to be an appropriate distribution. However, it is a splendid illustration of the danger in reading only the first column of the satistics. Over in the third column one finds that only some 1,500 doctorates were conferred in the humanities, while about 8,000 were conferred in the other fields, a most inappropriate distribution of an inadequate total. One must conclude from these data that the undergraduates studying the humanities a decade from now will be less well taught than students in the other fields, and that their numbers will exceed their training.

An argument of expediency is that Federal expenditures in the humanities will discourage private and particularly foundation giving. The record, however, shows that private foundations have expended more money and a greater percentage of their funds on the sciences and engineering since the establishment of the National Science Foundation than before. Anyone who has raised money knows that money goes where money is, and he is likely to suspect that abundance of funds, from whatever source, will increase rather than decrease the flow of additional funds.

One of the tactical arguments is based upon the fear that a new foundation will make blunders in its initial gifts, will become the target of congressional criticism and the laughingstock of the public, will quickly disappear and set back rather than advance the cause of the humanities and arts, I see no reason to believe that the sort of board and director proposed for the foundation would make any more stupid mistakes than any other board and I suspect that they would be able to defend themselves and their decisions.

Finally, some mature humanists have argued that funds are not necessary at all, that they themselves starved in their youth and it was good for them, and that their intellectual offspring should starve as well. Poverty is a virtue greatly exaggerated by those who no longer practice it.

The arguments for the use of Federal funds to support the humanities range likewise from principle to expendiency, and even to nonsense. I shall start with the last. Some humanists are apt to say in private and in public: "I am a humanist. I like doing my research. I am as important as the scientist. Do not ask me what my research is good for, because that would destroy its purity. Just give me some money." The more often this argument is asserted, the less likely is the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, because our Congress has no right to spend Federal funds for anything that does not give some assurance of advancing the national interest.

Then it is argued that the development of technology and automation and a greatly increased national product will reduce the labor force, and the working day of those who remain in it, to the point where the use of leisure will become an increasingly serious problem. Therefore we must educate ourselves and our children to use leisure properly and profitably, particularly through the improvement of our minds, and we must provide greater opportunities for humane study and artistic appreciation. This is an important argument, but is perhaps a second-rate one.

The real problem is not the utilization of leisure, important as it may be, but rather the development of an ethic and an outlook appropriate to new circumstances. We have now an ethic in which work is equated with virtue. Before long we shall have to develop one where not to work very long for a living and to be content is as virtuous as labor itself.

This will require hard work by some well-trained philosophers who have competence outside the area of symbolic logic. We are going to need those philosophers very badly. As important is the use of the freed time. We can employ it trivially or constructively.

Despite the interesting work of intellectual primitives, most enduring literature and art are the product of people who possessed a body of humane knowledge about which to think, write, or paint, and most social advance has been accomplished by persons who know the society and its background.

Then it is argued that history will judge us by our culture rather than by our material accomplishments. Therefore we must polish up our image for the greater edification of future generations and also for the admiration of the underdeveloped nations that are alleged to have great respect for culture and none at all for bathtubs. It is probably a sound rule to believe that one's image will take care of itself if one does what he should, provided always that he has a good public relations man. This argument, therefore, is at best peripheral. Let us instead concentrate on what we should do.

The humanities and arts are of central importance to our society and to ourselves as individuals. They at once express and shape our thoughts. They give us the beautiful to see and teach us what to look for. The development of thought undoubtedly reflects institutions and circumstances, but these are shaped by ideas. The two are, in fact, inseparable. Our relations to one another as individuals and to our society are formed and determined by what we know and think. Our use of knowledge is inseparable from our ability to express it in words or in shapes.

Only through the best ideas and the best teaching can we cope with the problems that surround us and the opportunities that lie beyond these problems. Our fulfillment as a nation depends upon the development of our minds, and our relations to one another and to our society depend upon our understanding of one another and of our society. The humanities and the arts, therefore, are at the center of our lives and are of prime importance to the Nation and to ourselves. Very simply stated, it is in the national interest that the humanities and arts develop exceedingly well.

Congressional Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the February 6, 1965, issue of the New Republic contained an interesting and thought provoking editorial which commented upon efforts to make foreign policy on the floor of the House and Senate.

No one who is devoted to orderly procedures and constitutional action can applaud the trend in recent years to legislate in such a way that the hands of the President are tied. After all, he is responsible under our Constitution for formulating foreign policy.

The editorial suggests that bills which have foreign affairs implications should be considered by a foreign policy committee such as the House Foreign Affairs Committee or the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The idea deserves serious consideration and I earnestly commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

CONGRESSIONAL FOREIGN POLICY

Good constitutional theory claims that Congress can play a constructive role in the formulation of foreign policy. Experience shows that it almost never does. Last week, an odd coalition of House Republicans, Democratic isolationists, and Representatives with large Jewish constituencies voted a partial prohibition of surplus food shipments to Egypt. House Democratic leaders argued in vain that the issue was not President Nasser's recent discourtesies to the United States, but the freedom the Executive must have in conducting foreign affairs. At the very least, they said, Congress should address itself to such matters after hearings by responsible committees, consultation with foreign policy experts, and debates on the current diplomatic context. The House action observed none of these precautions. The prohibition passed in the form of a floor amendment to a supplemental appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation. A more unsatisfactory way of directing American diplomacy is really difficult to imagine.

The trouble with congressional fiddling with foreign affairs is not merely the lack of knowledge that most Congressmen bring to the subject. Except for a few Senators and fewer Representatives who habitually follow external affairs closely, Congressmen are more naturally concerned with the problems and politics of the hometown or State. It is only when a detail of diplomacy, quite divorced from the sweep of policy, appears to contain some political advantage to exploit, that Congress bursts into action. The frustrations of America abroad in the last few months—Sukarno, the Philippines, the Congo, the library burnings—are all politically exploitable, and they were given expression in the nose-thumbing at Egypt.

The great tide of congressional assumption of power, however meddlesome, in foreign affairs rose after World War II in reaction to the Executive agreements which structured the cold war status quo. The catcalls over Yalta became so shrill, and partisan interest in international politics ran so high, that Presidents took to asking Congress for resolutions of support in order to forestall opposition. Executive action in Formosa, Suez, Cuba, and Vietnam was reinforced by theoretically useless but politically helpful declarations from Congress. But the price the Presidency paid for asking Congress to countersign its blank checks was more rather than less interference. The Bricker amendment to limit treatmaking power bounced around for years before it could finally be disposed of; the Connally amendment effectively removing the United States from World Court jurisdiction—and the Battle Act—restricting the Government's efforts to promote trade with Communist countries—are enshrined in law.

In the last days of the 88th Congress, Democratic and Republican leaders watched helplessly as a band of jingoistic Congressmen sneaked through an amendment to the food-for-peace bill which in effect prohibited shipments to Poland and Yugoslavia. Senator FULBRIGHT called the provision "subversive of U.S. policy;" Senator AIKEN said passage "could be a setback for democracy." Not the least shocking aspect of the affair was that the Senate group which finally dealt with the amendment was the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which is expected to have and has, not the slightest knowledge of foreign affairs.

Whatever its original objectives, the food-for-peace program is no longer simply a good way to reduce stockpiles of wheat and corn, but an instrument of foreign policy. Senator FULBRIGHT has said that "either Public Law 480 (food for peace) deals primarily with U.S. agriculture, in which case it ought not to deal with U.S. foreign policy; or it does deal primarily with U.S. foreign policy, in which case it comes under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee." Under the present rules, that remains the choice. Congress might well consider a new arrangement, however, under which bills which have foreign policy implications come at some time before a foreign policy committee competent to consider them. Such a procedure might not satisfy the meddling itch, but it could dull its most abrasive expression.

Soviet Distortions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the latest issue of Prevent World War III, No. 65, winter, 1964–65, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 24 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., contains a timely article on Israel-Arab relations. This article exposes the efforts of Soviet propagandists to distort the factual background concerning the causes for the present tensions in the Middle East. Soviet propaganda endeavors to gloss over the fact that it was the Arabs who invaded Israel in 1948. It was also the Arab leadership that deliberately encouraged Arabs to leave their homes in Israel thereby creating the so-called refugee problem. This problem has now become a political football to further the ulterior aims of certain Arab leaders. The fact that the Soviets have gone out of their way to encourage Arab intransigence, is certainly not in keeping with Soviet professions that all problems between states should be solved by negotiations. The article follows:

SOVIET DISTORTIONS

In previous issues of Prevent World War III (Nos. 61 and 64), we dealt with the deliberate distortions of fact committted by the Soviet publication International Affairs in "explaining" to its readers the background and implications of the Jordan River irrigation project undertaken by the State of Israel. In so doing, we were primarily motivated by the desire to expose those mischievous maneuvers which contribute to heating up the already charged atmosphere in the Middle East.

Peace in the Middle East is a sine qua non for world peace, and those who willfully play on the fears and ignorance of the peoples in

that area cannot escape their responsibility for the consequences that may arise from these machinations. It seems, however, that this authoritative Soviet publication prefers to continue its campaign of poisoning relations among the Middle Eastern states and to befuddle its readers though it professes to be a scholarly and factual magazine.

The September 1964 issue of International Affairs is a case in point. In one of its features, ironically titled "Facts and Figures," International Affairs endeavors to reply with complete objectivity, if you please, to a question posed by one of its readers about the "problem of Palestine refugees in Arab countries." Here is an extremely delicate and complex issue which must be the concern of all humanitarians, but the "explanation" of International Affairs is nothing less than a cynical manipulation of the "facts and figures." It is a callous effort to play on the emotions and fruitless hopes of these refugees rather than a sincere attempt to clarify the problem and to point a way toward its positive solution.

According to International Affairs, the refugee problem arose in 1948 "when the British and American imperialists provoked the Arab-Jewish war in Palestine." This strange formulation is made even stranger when in the next paragraph one reads that after the formation of the State of Israel "war broke out" between the Arab countries and Israel. Of course, "war broke out," but International Affairs carefully avoids telling its readers the "whys" and the "wherefores" concerning the outbreak of that war. Actually, as historical records will testify (which even the Soviets cannot erase), there would have been no war if the Arab countries had not launched a military invasion of the new State.

On the very day that the United Nations General Assembly, with the Soviet Union's full support, endorsed the establishment of the State of Israel, the Arab Higher Committee which coordinated Arab policy, publicly declared that the U.N. resolution was "null and void." The committee warned that it would "not permit its implementation. * * *" This brazen lawless defiance of the United Nations signaled the Arab military attack which turned out to be one of the darkest days in the lives of the Palestine Arabs.

A leading authority on Arab culture in history, the noted Italian Professor Francesco Gabrieli, wrote in his recent book "The Arab Revival": "While on May 14 the Jewish National Council (Vaad Leumi) proclaimed the State of Israel at Tel-Aviv, the Arab States of the League (Syria, the Lebanon, Transjordan, Iraq, and Egypt) invaded the territory of Palestine in accordance with the threats that they had made and the pledge that they had taken." That the Arabs deliberately launched a military aggression which compelled their intended victim to fight back, is confirmed by none other than President Gamal Abdul Nasser of Egypt. Writing in his book "Egypt's Liberation," Nasser admits that the Arab attack "was a duty * * *" (p. 90). In this connection, Nasser recounts that the day after the United Nations approved the resolution mentioned above, large numbers of Egyptian officers decided to offer their services to block its implementation. Nasser himself, personally, approached the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem (Hitler's chief henchman in the Middle East) and assured this notorious pogromist that Egyptian forces were ready and willing to join the attack. "They are at your command any time you wish," Nasser informed the ex-Mufti (p. 91). Following this disclosure, Nasser reveals how the Arabs secretly prepared for the attack: "The Arabs entered Palestine in a single wave of enthusiasm. They did so on the basis of common knowledge and a common estimate shared by all as to the outer borders of their security" (pp. 94–95).

There is a saying that a half-truth is worse than a lie. This is the tactic employed by the Soviet publication when it tells its readers that "war broke out." But this is not all. According to International Affairs "more than 1 million Palestine Arabs were driven into neighboring countries" during the course of this war. The flight of these Arabs is subsequently described as "the mass expulsion of the Arab population. * * *"

What are the facts? In the first place, the figure of 1 million refugees is pure invention. It is not supported by any authoritative study including the reports of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) which is responsible for the caring of these refugees today. Indeed, as early as October 1950, UNRWA admitted in its interim report that it was impossible to obtain the exact number of genuine refugees because of the violent opposition "on the part of the undeserving recipient and his friends and supporters." The most exhaustive study of the actual refugees numbers was undertaken by the noted United Kingdom statistician, Dr. Walter Pinner. Dr. Pinner examined with particular care the census of the British Mandatory Government. His meticulous investigations resulted in the conclusion that no more than 539,000 Arabs left Israel territory and did not return.

Not only has International Affairs concocted the figure of 1 million refugees, it has also invented the fact of their expulsion. The Arabs who left Israel were never expelled. On the contrary, they were, in effect, driven out by their so-called leaders. Let Arab sources testify: On April 3, 1948, the Near-East Arabic Radio said: "It must not be forgotten that the Arab Higher Committee encouraged the refugees to flee from their homes in Jaffa, Haifa, and Jerusalem and that certain leaders have tried to make political capital out of their miserable situation. The Arab States must not allow the future of the refugees to be sacrificed to make political capital out of their fate."

Emile Ghori, the Secretary of the Arab Higher Committee and one of its representatives before the United Nations, admitted to the Beirut Telegraph on September 6, 1948: "The fact that there are these refugees is the direct consequence of the Arab States in opposing partition and the Jewish state. The Arab States agreed upon this policy unanimously and they must share in the solution of the problem."

On September 27, 1948, the Near East Arabic Radio attacked the Arab Higher Committee's record in these words: "It is besmirched by the flight of its leaders and their encouragement of the Arabs to leave their homes even though no previous arrangement had been made for their housing and resettlement."

The American-Lebanese daily Ali-Hoda summed up the strategy of the Arab leadership when it wrote on June 8, 1951: "Brotherly advice was given to the Arabs of Palestine, urging them to leave their land, homes and property and to stay temporarily in neighboring, brotherly states, lest the guns of the invading Arab armies mow them down. The Palestine Arabs had no choice but to obey the 'advice' of the League and to believe when Azzam Pasha and other responsible men in the (Arab) League told them—that their withdrawal from their lands and their country was only temporary and would end in a few days with the successful termination of the Arab 'punishment' action against Israel."

Another major "fact" mentioned by International Affairs in its "explanation," is that in December 1948 the United Nations General Assembly passed a resolution supporting the return of the Arab refugees—a resolution which, according to International Affairs, Israel refused to implement. Here again, the half-truth is preferred to the outright lie. What are the facts? In the first place, it was the Arabs, who rejected the implementation of the basic resolution of November 1947 establishing an Arab State and a State of Israel on the territory of Palestine. It should be noted that the Soviets themselves proposed and supported this very resolution. However, it was the Arabs who refused to adhere to the United Nations decision and instead replied by launching a military attack.

The U.N. resolution of December 1948 must, therefore, be understood in that context, for the resolution was designed to bring about a peaceful solution through negotiation. That is why the resolution contained a number of provisions besides the one applying to the refugees. The very key paragraph in the U.N. resolution sums up the intent of the United Nations decision when it called upon Israel and her Arab neighbors to "seek agreement by negotiation conducted with a view toward the final settlement of all questions outstanding between them."

This is precisely the heart of the whole matter since the Arabs refuse even to sit down at the same table with Israelis to discuss the implementation of the entire—we repeat—entire resolution. The Arabs do not want to negotiate. They want unconditional surrender which, in practical terms, means the destruction of Israel.

Ahmed Shukairy, the self-proclaimed spokesman for the Arab refugees—a man who worked for the Nazis and their henchmen during World War II and who is currently one of Nasser's marionettes—denounced the late Secretary General Hammarskjold's suggestions to solve the refugee problem in these words: "We must all be aware that the Arab refugees will not return to Palestine unless Palestine returns to the Arabs" (New York Times, Mar. 19, 1959). Shukairy was merely echoing the views of his mentor, President Nasser. On February 20, 1960, Nasser declared: "You shall liberate Palestine. * * * Today we proclaim to the whole world that we will retrieve our rights with our own hands and that, as we shed blood in the past, we will shed blood and lay down our lives in the future for the glory of the entire Arab nation." Several months later (May 8, 1960) Nasser repeated this theme: "The rights of the Palestinian people are the rights of the entire Arab Nation, and no matter what plots are hatched by Zionism and Imperialism, no matter how great the support of Zionism in the United States and France, we hereby proclaim our determination to retrieve our rights by force of our arms."

The propaganda line of the Nasserites on the Arab refugee problem is clear and unmistakable. It was summed up by Radio Cairo in the summer of 1957 when it told its listeners: "The fact that Israel is trying to solve the refugee problem proves she has an interest in solving it—and this alone is reason enough to rule out any such attempt by us. * * *" This tactic gives the game away. The Arabs do not want a solution of the refugee problem for that would deprive them of a potent weapon which serves as an excuse for their policy of war against Israel. This is not really a novel trick. As a matter of fact, Hitler's Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop developed the same approach in dealing with Czechoslovakia. At that time, von Ribbentrop specifically instructed the Sudeten leader Henlein to avoid negotiations with the Czechoslovakian Government so as to preserve Hitler's alibi for invading Czechoslovakia on the ground that the Sudetans were being persecuted. It may very well be that Nasser learned this gambit from some of his German advisers. In any event, it is the key to the persistent refusal of the Arab leaders to negotiate as contemplated under the United Nations Charter.

Naturally, without negotiations the Arabs can proceed to the next step and this is precisely what they have done last spring when they set up a so-called Palestine Liberation Organization. According to International Affairs, this organization, headed by the notorious Shukairy, functions as a "government." However, International Affairs does not tell its readers that Shukairy's setup has no mandate from the Arab refugees and that it is purely an agency of the Cairo government. More recently, this so-called government has announced that it would establish a Palestine "liberation army." What is its central purpose? This is no secret, for Shukairy has stated that the Arab refugee problem must be solved by the sword.

International Affairs is silent on this blatant move to launch war against a peaceful sovereign state. Yet, the Soviets are forever proclaiming that all states must employ the tools of diplomacy rather than the weapons of the military to resolve their differences. Apparently, the Soviet Government had some mental reservations when it recently proposed that all territorial disputes be peacefully adjudicated. The Soviets do not relish the idea of Communist China moving in on Soviet territory which the Chinese Reds claim for themselves, but they seem prepared to applaud the planned piratical Arab attack against Israel.

Let it be said at this point that there can be no successful double bookkeeping in the field of international relations. The Soviets should know that a principle must have universal application if it is to be respected and effective. The Russians can hardly expect sympathy for their troubles with the Chinese Communists while they are willing to lend aid and comfort to those who are planning to feast at the expense of others. If the Soviet Union truly wants peace, let it remember that peace is indivisible. This is what their own former Foreign Minister, the late Mr. Litvinov, propounded. He who incites aggression against others, can hardly hope to have peace at his own borders.

Congress Should Invite Gen. Curtis E. LeMay To Address a Joint Meeting

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay respects to a great American of whom President Johnson just recently said "all free men are in your debt." I am speaking of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, of the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fortunate and often noted fact of our history that during periods of crisis we have seen the rise of men of foresight, courage, and determination come to the forefront.

Time after time, the greatness of individuals has provided the rest of us with the leadership and inspiration needed to enable us to come through a period of torment, of potential catastrophe—not only to survive, but also to emerge from the trial with unprecedented strength and a more solid confidence in the future.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay is one of those individuals. Today America is safer, more secure and faces a brighter future because of the leadership he gave us as U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should invite General LeMay to address a joint meeting to give us and the Nation a summation of a lifetime of dedicated service in defense of free men the world over.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Arsenal Technical High School, Indianapolis, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the seventh annual Bellamy Award for the State of Indiana was won by Ronald Strahl, a student at Arsenal Technical High School, in Indianapolis. In extending greetings to Wausau Senior High School, recipient of this year's National Bellamy Flag Award, Ronald described the colorful history and achievements of Arsenal Technical High School, one of our Nation's largest secondary schools.

Because of the outstanding record made by Arsenal Tech, I ask unanimous consent that this brief, yet excellent, tribute be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RONALD J. STRAHL, ARSENAL TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Arsenal Technical High School is one of the largest secondary schools in the country. Its 76 acres comprise a collegelike campus and attitude among its student body. At one time, over 7,000 day students passed through the gates, making Tech the largest high school in the United States. Now, nearly 5,000 day pupils, along with 3,500 evening students and 1,650 summer school students attend Tech.

Tech has received 26 Freedom Foundation Awards, more than any other school. Our ROTC unit has received 43 consecutive honor rating awards in annual Federal inspections.

Tech has a colorful background. Established as a Civil War arsenal in 1862, it furnished ammunition to the Union soldiers on their way to the war fronts of Kentucky and Tennessee. In September of 1912, the old arsenal was procured from the Federal Government and established a sthe city's third high school.

Fifteen buildings and a driver education trailer grace the greenery of the campus. Six buildings are the original Civil War structures, including the barn, which is now used for music classes, not horses. The old arsenal itself has been converted into the administration building.

Tech is one of very few comprehensive schools. It offers a wide variety of classes, ranging from analytic calculus and Latin-Greek derivatives for the scholar, to international relations and psychology for the curious-minded, to such technical and vocational courses as masonry, foundry, plumbing, electronics and airplane mechanics.

Indianapolis has another Bellamy distinction. Elementary Public School 102, dedicated last year, has the official name, the Francis Bellamy School.

Arsenal Technical High School is proud to be a part of the Bellamy Award family of schools. For my school, I extend a very sincere and cordial greeting to the family's newest member, and host this year, Wausau Senior High.

Empty Shoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable newspapermen I have ever known lies ill at this moment in a hospital in a small northern Arizona community.

For 51 years this outstanding individual has served as editor-publisher of the same newspaper in the same community.

He has been machinist, printer, linotype operator, editor, teacher, advertising manager, speaker, civic leader, writer, historian and rancher.

But more than that, he has been a symbol of honesty, of purposeful dedication, of absolute integrity—a man who has preferred to light one candle rather than cry out at the darkness.

I commend to my colleagues the accompanying editorial and further ask their prayers for the complete and early recovery of Mr. Frank Wells, Sr.

[From the Williams (Ariz.) News, Jan. 28, 1965]

EMPTY SHOES

(By Frances Wells Roberts)

This week Frank Wells, Sr., editor and publisher of the Williams News lies in the Williams Hospital, victim of a stroke. Suddenly the Williams News staff is faced with a mighty big pair of shoes to fill. In this day of specialization it is worth a moment to consider the size of this pair of shoes.

Their endurance has been remarkable. More than 51 years of editing and publishing the Williams News; starting an infant newspaper the Northern Yavapai Record, and raising it to the mature age of almost 30 years; 14 years of publishing a tourist magazine, Scenic Southwest; more than 51 years of providing job printing for the locality; and almost that long providing local citizens with absolutely fresh eggs.

For the occupant of these shoes was a versatile man. He ran not only a publishing house, but also a chicken ranch and these occupations demanded a man with many talents. He developed the Williams News from a small shop with handset type and hand run presses to a plant noisy with machinery. But he was never the type of editor who sat behind a desk and gave orders because many times there was nobody to give orders to.

He ran the linotypes, the presses, and, if a machine broke down, he repaired it. He wrote the news and the editorials and when the hungry pages demanded advertising, he sold ads. The complications of profit and loss demanded records, and he kept books. He was a speaker, debater, and peacemaker. He fought for his town and when Williams needed water, he urged, lectured, wrote, and attended meetings, figuring ways to solve the problem.

And when he didn't have enough hands for all the work, or enough feet for all the miles, he taught others to run linotypes and presses, to write news and keep books, and to work together to solve problems facing the community. Since he didn't have enough to do, he also raised chickens so that local citizens could have trustworthy eggs.

But his inquisitive mind wasn't satisfied. He wanted to know about Williams and its history. In the late twenties he published a booklet about old Bill Williams, mountain man, a work still listed for reference in public schools, and he filled his newspaper with interesting facts about the past history of his town. His newspaper files are a valuable record.

Still not satisfied, he wrote two novels and several short stories in the past 3 years.

Machinist, printer, linotype operator, editor, teacher, advertising manager, speaker, civic leader, writer, historian, and rancher. The size of these shoes. It's a shock to find them empty. And while we try to fill them partially we are tempted to say, "They just don't make 'em like that any more." We'll set them aside and hope that he'll be back to write editorial chat again.

The 40th Anniversary of City of Hialeah, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a proclamation issued by Mayor Milander, of the city of Hialeah, setting aside the period from February 7 through February 13, 1965, to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the city of Hialeah, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The proclamation urges the residents of this city to take part in the celebration. Hialeah is one of the most vital and progressive cities in our State. It has a long and illustrious history, and its future is unlimited. All of Florida is particularly proud of this very fine community.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION—CITY OF HIALEAH, FLA.

Whereas the city of Hialeah was founded in 1925 and has grown to be the seventh largest city in the State of Florida, and the second largest city in Dade County, Fla.; and

Whereas 40 years have passed since the city was duly chartered by an official act of the State Legislature of Florida; and

Whereas the amazing growth of this city as an industrial center and residential community has been among the most rapid in the entire Nation; and

Whereas, the leaders of this community and each and every citizen can be justifiably proud of the city's development and progress;

Now, therefore, I, Henry A. Milander, by virtue of the authority vested in me as mayor of the city of Hialeah, do set aside the period, February 7 through February 13, 1965, for an official "40th anniversary celebration" in the city of Hialeah, and in observance thereof I urge the residents of this city to take part in this celebration.

Signed in the office of the mayor of Hialeah, and the official seal affixed hereto, the 11th day of January A.D. 1965.

HENRY A. MILANDER, *Mayor*.

Legislation Needed for Interstate Highway Extension Into Southwest Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to extend the Interstate Highway System into southwest Florida. The route would be along the same lines as U.S. 41, passing through Tampa and on to Bradenton, Punta Gorda, Fort Myers, Naples, Miami, and Homestead. This new superhighway would not only link cities in the rapidly growing gulf coast of Florida, but would serve the vital interests of Homestead Air Force Base and the various U.S. Naval and Coast Guard operations in the Florida Keys.

Recall the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, when large numbers of military equipment and personnel were moved into south Florida on short notice. This situation pointed up the need for providing military authorities with a high-speed access into an area of critical importance to the Nation's defense.

Yet military needs are not the only basis for extending the Interstate Highway System into southwest Florida. A good example for such an extension may be seen in Lee and Collier Counties as they are typical of the phenomenal population expansion which has taken place in our State. Lee County's population increased 25 percent in the past 4 years, and Collier County increased over 43 percent in the same period. As all indications forecast continued expansion in the future wise planning dictates that adequate roads such as an interstate extension be constructed now.

Finally, the 14 million tourists who visit Florida each year are citizens of virtually every State in the Union, and many of them use interstate superhighways outside Florida to reach their destinations. As more than 82 percent of Florida's tourists travel by automobile, the extension of an interstate route into the lower Gulf coast would not serve the economy of the surrounding area but the demands of millions of Americans who tour our State as well.

For these reasons I urge prompt action on legislation designating a new interstate highway route into southwest Florida. Since first introducing such legislation in 1959, I have worked to see an interstate highway become a reality in this area. Our State has changed greatly since then, and the need for a new superhighway has become even more pressing. Proper planning and foresight demand this highway improvement now.

Our Commander in Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, recently I stated on the floor of the Senate that in failing to take Berlin ahead of the Russians, General Eisenhower merely carried out orders from his Commander in Chief not to do so.

Several days ago, I received a letter from a man in Pennsylvania, evidently no friend of General Eisenhower, who not only challenged my statement, but said that, under the Constitution, the President was just the General Manager of the Nation. I replied that I knew of no authority on the Constitution who construed it in that manner; and I quoted the Constitution as reading: "The President shall be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement commenting upon that language. The statement is by a distinguished constitutional authority, Prof. Edward S. Corwin, of Princeton. In his book entitled "The President: Office and Powers," he wrote:

Commenting in Federalist 69 on this provision, Hamilton wrote:

"In this respect his authority would be nominally the same with that of the King of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first general and admiral of the Confederacy; while that of the British King extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies—all which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature."

"Rendered freely, this appears to mean that in any war in which the United States becomes involved—one presumably declared by Congress—the President will be top general and top admiral of the forces provided by Congress, so that no one can be put over him or be authorized to give him orders in the direction of the said forces. But otherwise he will have no powers that any high military or naval commander who was not also President might not have. Additional testimony as to the purely military significance originally attached to the clause is afforded by Story's statement in his commenaries, written nearly half a century later, that the only objection leveled against it in the States' ratifying conventions was that "it would be dangerous to let him (the President) command in person." "The propriety," Story adds, "of admitting the President to be Commander in Chief, so far as to give orders and have a general superintendency, was admitted."

And that the clause was still in 1850 the forgotten clause of the Constitution is shown by Chief Justice Taney's opinion in Fleming v. Page, in which, in holding that the military occupancy of the port of Tampico in the course of the Mexican War by the order of the President did not annex that place to the United States, the Chief Justice, speaking for the unanimous Court, said:

"His (the President's) duty and his power are purely military. As Commander in Chief, he is authorized to direct the movements of the naval and military forces placed by law at his command, and to employ them in the manner he may deem most effectual to harass and conquer and subdue the enemy. He may invade the hostile country, and subject it to the sovereignty and authority of the United States. But his conquests do not enlarge the boundaries of this Union, nor extend the operation of our institutions and laws beyond the limits before assigned to them by the legislative power.

"In the distribution of political power between the great departments of Government, there is such a wide difference between the power conferred on the President of the United States, and the authority and sovereignty which belong to the English Crown, that it would be altogether unsafe to reason from any supposed resemblance between them, either as regards conquest in war, or any other subject where the rights and powers of the executive arm of the Government are brought into question."

Kansas Day, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, I helped the State of Kansas celebrate its birthday. I participated in Kansas Day ceremonies in Topeka. Although I had joined in this observance before, this was my first experience as a Member of Congress, so I had a different perspective and came back to my duties in Washington with a new appreciation for my State and the people who make you proud to be a fellow Kansan.

The gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable GERALD FORD, minority leader of the House, was the principal speaker of the Kansas Day Club banquet, which provided the climax for the birthday celebration. His remarks were a challenge and an inspiration to Republicans of Kansas who have the distinction of having the only all-Republican delegation in Congress.

The Kansas Day Club, in charge of the banquet, is to be commended for the program which was presented. I wish to

call attention to the names of the officers and directors and the program for the 1965 Kansas Day banquet for which they were responsible.

I also wish to include with my remarks an editorial from the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital which captures the flavor and significance of Kansas Day—"Kansas Day and What It Means":

KANSAS DAY CLUB OFFICERS

Hon. J. C. Tillotson, president, Norton.

Mrs. Fred B. Curtiss, vice president, Burlington.

Clyde N. Christey, secretary-treasurer, Topeka.

DIRECTORS

First District: Wayne Gattshall, Goodland; Mrs. Paul Sundgren, Hugoton.

Second District: Frank Meek, Wamego; Mrs. Viola Pritchard, Topeka.

Third District: Willis McQueary, Osawatomie; Mrs. Vern Alden, Wellsville.

Fourth District: K. B. Bruce, Hillsboro; Mrs. Charles E. Wilson, Abilene.

Fifth District: Charles McCall, Emporia; Mrs. Richard Hixon, Fort Scott.

Hostess chairman: Mrs. Celia M. Maddux, Topeka.

Decorations: Mrs. Glenn Cogswell, Topeka; Miss Lahoma Dennis, Topeka.

PROGRAM

National anthem: Jim Parks, Topeka.

Invocation: Rev. George Burak, pastor, Holy Name diocese, archdiocese of Kansas City in Kansas.

Dinner.

Introductions and recognitions: Hon. J. C. Tillotson, president, Kansas Day Club.

Remarks: Mrs. Fred Curtiss, vice president, Kansas Day Club.

Toast to Kansas: Rudy Belton, chairman, Kansas TARS.

Remarks: Hon. Oliver H. Hughes, chairman, Kansas Republican State Committee.

Remarks: Hon. Wm. H. Avery, Governor of Kansas.

Musical selections: Kansas State University singers, William Fischer, director.

Introduction of guest speaker: Hon. ROBERT DOLE, Congressman, First District.

Address: Hon. GERALD R. FORD, Congressman, Michigan, House minority floor leader.

Closing: "God Bless America," led by Hon. Paul Shanahan, secretary of state.

Adjournment.

KANSAS DAY AND WHAT IT MEANS

(By Gordon Martin)

We come now to another Kansas Day, our own special birthday celebration as a State. And let us, for the moment, suppose that we have been called upon to describe Kansas Day to a stranger. What would we say?

Kansas Day, we might begin, is a day climaxing a 2-day birthday party celebrating the admission of Kansas to statehood on January 29, 1861.

What's so different about that? Every other State has its birthday too. But our own birthday is special. It fires the Kansas spirit.

Kansas Day is the day that people from all parts of the State converge on the capital, gather in the halls of the statehouse and jam the lobbies of hotels.

It's the rancher from western Kansas striding along Kansas Avenue in high-heeled boots, a man with a handshake that is a handshake.

It's his wife and her new formal gown.

It's the businessman from the city or the small town come to Topeka to talk politics, meet old friends, and make new ones.

It's the lady standing in the hotel lobby selling sunflowers made of bright yellow and brown felt.

It's native sons and daughters bragging about their heritage.

It's one cup of coffee after another and, for those seeking it, a stronger libation.

It's women dressed fit to kill (Lord, what a relief from those marketplace slacks).

It's a meeting of—of all things—the past presidents and the past vice presidents of the Kansas Day Club.

It's the man who wants to run for office and the man who wishes he hadn't.

It's tea at the Governor's mansion and visitors at the Memorial Building where Kansas is truly enshrined.

It's talk of crops and the price of steers on the hoof and wondering out loud what those fellows in Washington are going to do next.

It's smoke-filled rooms and Alf Landon's hat.

It's young people following in the footsteps of their forebears, willing and eager to have a say about government.

It's old people with Kansas pride which grows through the years.

It's oratory, some good, some bad, some excellent and some just middling.

It's the legislature under the watchful eye of the electorate.

It's KU and K-State arguing over basketball.

It's republicanism, not that the Democrats don't participate, but it was through a group of young and vigorous Republican editors that the Kansas Day Club was born.

It's the memory of William Allen White, Ewing Herbert, Sr., Charles M. Harger, Charles F. Scott, W. Y. Morgan, Arthur Capper, and others who helped give Kansas its abiding strength.

It's a harkback to the gay nineties and the glory that was once known by the departed Throop Hotel, scene of the first Kansas Day Club meeting in 1892.

It's the vision of Carry Nation and Mary Elizabeth Lease—one with a hatchet, the other exhorting farmers to raise less corn and more hell.

And when the last hurrah dies away and the roads lead out of Topeka tomorrow, it's wilted corsage and lasting memories, along with the realization that the statehouse still stands and, along with it, the strength that has made Kansas what it is in the hearts of its people.

Eulogy to Michael A. McGrath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the passing to his Heavenly reward on January 31, of Michael A. McGrath, one of Ohio's most beloved and outstanding citizens.

Michael McGrath's passing will be lamented throughout the entire Irish-American community.

Michael McGrath, who, in his lifetime, was an outstanding lawyer and specialist in the insurance field, was also the past national president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America.

Michael McGrath was an Irish-American of great warmth and intelligence, and one who was extremely proud of his Gaelic heritage. His life was dedicated to the principles of the Ancient Order of Hibernians; namely, friendship, unity, and Christian charity; and Michael McGrath lived these traditions on a day-to-day basis every day of his life.

In addition to his service with the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Michael McGrath also served as member and officer of the Clan Nae Gael, the Irish good-fellowship society and the United Irish Society of Cleveland.

He was a former administrative assistant for the late U. S. Representative Charles A. Mooney, of Ohio's 20th Congressional District, and most active through the years in the affairs of the Democratic Party of Cuyahoga County.

Mr. Speaker, with the passing of men such as Michael McGrath, so, too, passes an era in which the Irish of this land had to fight for recognition without the benefit of laws that exist today against discrimination. Michael McGrath was in the forefront of that struggle for national recognition of his rights. He was a credit to his nation, to his church, and to his family and always steadfast in his defense of America's historical heritage of liberty and freedom.

On the occasion of his passing, our hearts go out in sympathy to his daughter, Janice Hurd, his two grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren, as well as his sister, Mrs. Katherine Paes, of Concord, Calif.

Missouri Senate Resolution 20

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a resolution recently adopted by the Missouri State Senate in Jefferson City, Mo., appearing in the Journal of the Missouri Senate, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The resolution is in tribute to a gentleman well known to State legislators in Missouri for his distinctive abilities to successfully combine the activities of a representative of business with a devout and dedicated interest in good government, and more particularly effective legislation.

Mr. D. Gary Spencer, formerly executive director of the Missouri Oil Council, is now associated with our former colleague Frank Ikard and the American Petroleum Institute as director of the Washington Information Office, an advancement indicative of sturdy and tenacious principles in a career commingling business, governmental and political interests. I share the sentiment expressed by the members of the Missouri Senate, many of whom are my former colleagues in State government.

The resolution of the Missouri Senate follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 20

Whereas the senate has learned that Mr. D. Gary Spencer is leaving the State of Missouri to accept an appointment as director of the Washington information office of the American Petroleum Institute; and

Whereas for 24 years Gary Spencer has worked and consulted with this body in his position as executive director of the Missouri Oil Council and its predecessor, the Missouri Petroleum Industries Committee; and

Whereas his services in providing factual information, advice, and assistance in connection with legislation affecting his industry, as well as his pleasant manner and cooperative attitude, have been greatly appreciated by this body: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 73d Missouri General Assembly, That this body express to D. Gary Spencer its sincere regret on his leaving, its congratulations on his new appointment, and its best wishes for his future success; and be it further

Resolved, That suitably prepared copies of this resolution be sent to the Missouri Oil Council, the American Petroleum Institute, and to Mr. Spencer by the secretary of the senate.

Unwise Restriction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the House recently voted to ban food shipments to the United Arab Republic. This is a very important decision which has a tremendous impact upon the present and future conduct of the Nation's foreign policy.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to include the following editorial from the Riverside, Calif., Press-Enterprise of January 29, 1965, which I hope will help to shed some light on the issue.

The editorial follows:

UNWISE RESTRICTION

It may very well be a mistake to send further economic aid to President Nasser of the United Arab Republic. And if it is not a mistake, it certainly would at best be a galling necessity.

In addition to arming the Congolese rebels and letting street mobs burn a U.S. information library, Mr. Nasser has bluntly told us to like it or lump it. He has even implied that the United Arab Republic can do very nicely without American aid.

So why not take him at his word? Quite possibly we ought to. However, although insulting words and hostile acts cannot help but prompt angry thoughts about their perpetrator, they are not at all times the proper measure of a profitable response.

That is why the President and the State Department need a good deal of latitude in adjusting to day-to-day changes, not only in our relations with the United Arab Republic but also in the United Arab Republic's relations with Britain, France, Israel, Red China and Russia. All these relationships are subject to possible changes, some perhaps at a moment's notice.

The needed latitude would be denied the President and the State Department if Congress carries through with an amendment which the House unwisely attached to the supplementary appropriations bill for the Commodity Credit Corporation. The amendment flatly prohibits sale of surplus food to the United Arab Republic. All it really does is to vent the Nation's spleen at the cost of unwisely binding its foreign policy makers.

Oh, We'd Die for Whatshisname

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, our old friend, Arthur Hoppe, has written a very humorous but noteworthy article on what is happening in Vietnam which pretty much describe the situation in that country. This article appeared on January 31 in the San Francisco Chronicle. His article follows:

OH, WE'D DIE FOR WHATSHISNAME

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Good news from South Vietnam. We have at last achieved a certain measure of stability and experienced leadership out there. Now we're getting generals overthrowing the government who have already overthrown it before.

This is a great stride forward. Formerly, a new general would overthrow the government and before he could set up a numbered Swiss bank account and locate the back stairs he, in turn, would be overthrown. This created great confusion and low morale. So it's good to see where General Khanh who overthrew General Minh and was overthrown by Mr. Huong has now overthrown Mr. Huong.

Perhaps I'm being optimistic, but it appears we may be well on our way to the ideal solution which we at long last achieved in that neighboring bastion of democracy, West Vhtnnng.

It was in the 37th year of our lightning campaign to wipe out the dread Vietnarian gorillas. The loyal royal army was, as usual, lying around in the trenches, composing sad love songs. Our military advisers were advising them, as usual, to get out there and fight.

"All right, men," cried Cpl. Homer T. Pettibone. "Let's march forward and die for our beloved leader, Gen. Phats In Phire." And the loyal royal army responded in unison: "General who?"

"Sorry, men," said the corporal. "I forgot. Since last Tuesday you are requested to die for Gen. Woks Lak Duk, under whose firm example * * * countermand that. This message from GHQ says henceforward all troops will please die for Gen. Thang Sa Lot, whose gratitude * * *." And each time, the loyal royal army's battle cry would ring out: "General who?"

This imposed a terrible burden on our military advisers, trying to remember which general to exhort the troops to die for. Moreover, our psychological testing branch issued a 148-page report showing that not knowing whom to die for seriously sapped the average soldier's will to die.

Finally, our State Department stepped in and reluctantly agreed to negotiate a settlement. The settlement, after much haggling, was negotiated between the two most powerful generals of the loyal royal army. Under its terms, Gen. Hoo Dat Don Dar agreed to overthrow the government on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, while his cousin, Gen. Hoo Dat Opp Dar, consented to overthrow it on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and weekends.

This master stroke not only assured continuity of government but, as one of our officials put it, "We now have a clear picture of where our aid money is going." Because, to cement the pact, the two generals opened a joint numbered Swiss bank account.

But the most drastic change was in the field. "At last, men," cried Corporal Pettibone, "you have a general to lead you whom I know each and every one of you is dying to die for." And in response, a brandnew battle cry sprang, as if by magic, from every throat: "General Hoo?"

Flexibility?—Not for the United Arab Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I have received considerable evidence from the 13th Congressional District of Illinois of strong support for the action taken by the House last week to bar the use of funds under Public Law 480 for the purchase of surplus agricultural commodities for the United Arab Republic. I am hopeful that the House action—which I believe reflects the feeling of the majority of the American people—will be sustained in the final legislation granting supplemental appropriations to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

For many years there has been strong protest in this country against continuing our aid to aggressor leaders such as Nasser, and it is time that the Congress exercise its authority and make known that our people will not tolerate abuse and will not extend aid to strengthen leaders whose aggressive policies endanger the peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert at this point an editorial of the Chicago Sun-Times of February 3 which clearly sums up the issue and the reasons for the deep concern of the American people. The editorial follows:

FLEXIBILITY?—NOT FOR THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Presidential flexibility in the conduct of foreign affairs is generally essential. It should not be curbed in any other than exceptional circumstances.

One such circumstance has arisen, however. It is that having to do with the surplus foods which President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic receives from the United States on easy credit at giveaway prices. The House adopted, by an overwhelming majority, an amendment to the $1.6-billion supplementary appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation which forbids such sales to the Egyptian Government. The State Department is trying desperately hard to have the Senate junk that amendment. Indications are it will succeed, the Senate Appropriations Committee having voted to go along with the Department.

So Nasser, arms supplier for Congolese rebels who have been slaughtering missionaries and other Caucasians, probably will continue receiving surplus American funds for almost worthless Egyptian currency

which cannot be spent outside his domain. His nation neither raises sufficient foodstuffs to feed its population nor has it the foreign exchange necessary to meet that deficit. But he has the money to construct missiles with which to threaten Israel and with which to send his army crashing into Yemen, where it is now ingloriously bogged down.

The State Department, apparently fearful Nasser will, in retaliation, ban oil shipments through the Suez Canal, wants flexibility retained so that it can continue its long and unsuccessful efforts to woo him. Wooing Nasser, a State Department specialty, merely results in a continuation of his efforts to thwart U.S. policy at every turn while keeping the Middle East and now Africa in turmoil.

This is the man who, after permitting or, some say, inspiring street mobs to burn down a U.S. information library in Cairo, then proclaimed his friendship for Soviet Russia in a speech in which he asserted the United States could go to hell and take its aid along.

The House reflected American public opinion in voting to ban further shipments of surplus food to Egypt. The Senate would do well to follow suit. For the State Department, given the chance, will, as it has done on many previous occasions, continue working at cross-purposes. A not inconsiderable part of the mess in which U.S. foreign policy is now mired has resulted from the State Department's insistence on continuing foreign aid for nations whose leaders openly challenge U.S. policy. How many Sukarnos, Nassers, and Ben Bellas must the United States coddle and support until, bold and contemptuous, they engage in wrecking the peace.

Nasser has told us he doesn't need our aid. Why then should the State Department insist on making its continuance possible? There are other nations which do need it; nations whose governments aren't continually upsetting the peace by aiding rebels against other governments, or threatening war against their neighbors or, as in the cases of Nasser and Sukarno, actually engaging in territorial violations of other nations.

The State Department has a stock answer, one it has used for years. We must keep the channels of communication open; we must have flexibility so that we can negotiate. Or, now and then, it is suggested that we must make allowances; that speeches such as Nasser's recent tirade against the United States were designed for home consumption.

All of this makes sense—so long as it works. But it no longer makes sense when, after years of such tactics, it becomes obvious that it hasn't worked in a particular instance.

It is by such efforts as the State Department is now engaged in—efforts to prevent Senate approval of the House amendment directed against Nasser—that our State Department has contributed to the widespread and increasing dissatisfaction with our foreign aid programs.

Foreign officers are too prone to abstract and esoteric thinking in a world of brutal reality. A little more pragmatism in the State Department might contribute to order in a disordered world. So might a little less oil.

The Soul of a Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in the unusual storms which have plagued the Nation recently, my own congressional district—the 12th of Illinois—was hard hit. In response to emergency calls, I went home and met with local officials, checked with utility supervisors, and saw firsthand what the people were enduring. I have tried to describe what I saw, heard and felt. However the humility and understanding displayed in a full page statement published January 29, 1965, in the Woodstock Daily Sentinel provide a graphic and frank description of the freakish and tragic events as well as the companies' actions above and beyond the call of duty.

Signed by the two corporations which provide electricity in northeastern Illinois—Commonwealth Edison and Public Service Co.—this statement refutes the old conception that a "corporation is a body without a soul." I hope that many Members will take time to read this thoughtful thumbnail sketch of the "soul of a corporation":

WE'D LIKE TO GIVE YOU ALL A MEDAL FOR THE PATIENCE OF JOB, THE UNDERSTANDING OF A SAINT, AND THE HARDINESS OF DANIEL BOONE

It was tough—darn tough. Tough for you and, we admit it, tough for us.

If we live to be a hundred, chances are we will never see another week, according to the weatherman, like this week, the week that was. It was a freak.

This storm did not roar in. It came in on cat feet. No wind, just a quiet, relentless drizzle that froze as it hit. The ice formed quietly for many hours and then began its devastating work with rifle-like reports late Saturday night and early Sunday morning.

Branches fell, trees crashed and power lines went down. Everyone called us but few got through. An estimated 100,000 phone calls reached our service centers in the first 72 hours of the storm. We were swamped. Many failed to reach us.

This meant frustration. People wanted straight answers. "We know things are bad—but just tell us when we will be back in service. Then we will know what to do."

We couldn't say. Lines were snapping faster than we could fix them.

In some homes lights would pop on and everyone would sigh with relief, and then they would blink off again—and stay off. Yes it was frustrating.

There were mistakes. There were bound to be. After you have sat for a couple of days in a 38° house, some of these mistakes seem mighty stupid. We could have been better organized, but this was a situation for which it was hard to rehearse.

Powerline work is always dangerous. Under storm conditions even highly trained, experienced experts are risking their lives. You can't send just anyone up a pole to splice a high-tension line. It is also possible to be killed on the ground.

The equipment for the men and on the trucks is highly specialized too. We begged, borrowed, and darn near stole anything that would help us.

We gathered together the largest line-repair force ever assembled in the Midwest, top linemen—the pros who can work with 12,000 volts and more on 50-foot poles and talk about it afterward. The men came from Pennsylvania, Colorado, and all the nearby States.

These foreigners, arriving by plane and truck—trucks equipped with different radio frequencies than we use here—worked tirelessly under hazardous conditions. There were a few slipups. Some got out of touch, some got lost, but none lost courage and none would admit to fatigue.

One housewife opened her door to be greeted by "Public Service Co. of Colorado, ma'am." "Oh," she said, "Is that why it took you so long to get here?"

During the first 72 hours these crews restored over 250,000 customers. Almost all of you are back, but we will be cleaning up and rebuilding for months ahead.

We want to thank the news media for the finest coverage we've ever seen. For many of our customers this was their only way of knowing about our progress.

We received tremendous cooperation from city governments, police and fire departments, school systems, civil defense units, Red Cross, the Salvation Army, military installations.

Since we can't award each and every one of you a medal for your unswerving patience beyond the call of duty, we at least want to take the time to thank you all.

It's great to be back.

COMMONWEALTH EDISON AND PUBLIC SERVICE CO.

The Honorable James Quillen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday some 30 of our colleagues rose to pay tribute to the gentleman from Tennessee's First Congressional District, JIMMY QUILLEN.

It was shown that his 72 percent of the popular vote was tops among Republicans last November. In addition, JIMMY has made an outstanding voting record for his 2 years in the House of Representatives.

An editorial appeared in the February 2 edition of the Chattanooga, Tenn., News Free-Press pointing out Congressman QUILLEN's constructive performance in Washington. Under unanimous consent I place this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GOOD VOTING RECORD—BOTH WAYS

A Tennessee Congressman, Representative JAMES H. QUILLEN, of the First District, has won the distinction of polling the largest percentage of popular vote among all the Republicans elected to Congress in November, and GOP leaders plan to honor him on the floor of the House tomorrow for this achievement. Representative QUILLEN, who lives in Kingsport, polled 72 percent of the popular vote in his congressional district to lead the ticket for his party in all the races for Congress throughout the Nation.

While this accomplishment in itself is impressive, Tennesseans should be even more impressed by the fact that Representative QUILLEN has shown by his voting record in Congress that he deserved his landslide victory. During his previous term in the House, he cast his vote on the conservative side of the ledger a cumulative total of 97 percent of the time, according to ratings of Americans for Constitutional Action, and voted 100 percent conservative on the ACA index during the final session of that last Congress.

Getting the votes at the polls is important to the candidate and to his party. How the candidate casts his own votes once he gets to Congress is important to the people he represents. Tennesseans have reason to be proud of Representative QUILLEN.

Churchill—1874–1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of January 25, 1965:

CHURCHILL—1874–1965

The world will never be quite the same again. The death of Sir Winston Churchill leaves a void that is filled only rarely. He was a very great man, a very lovable man, a very human man whose sense of humor was on a par with his sense of greatness.

In the darkest days of World War II, Sir Winston's sense of wit never diminished. His statesmanship was enhanced by his ability to laugh, even at himself, and to demolish his enemies with ridicule.

He was a man who worked and played and lived in the grand style—in great days of modern history. As one of his wartime associates said, with pride, even his mistakes were great ones.

Western civilization owes its survival to him more than to any other man. By sheer willpower, plus an indomitable determination to wring "Corporal Schicklgruber" Hitler's neck, he rallied the world from near defeat to go on to victory with his unforgettable words: "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat."

It is difficult not to be sentimental about "good ole Winnie" as his fellow countrymen called him. But Churchill was a sentimentalist—in the grand manner, too.

He never was more emotional than when he first addressed a joint session of the American Congress—less than 3 weeks after Pearl Harbor. Tears came to his eyes as he wished that his American-born mother could have seen him that day. But in a flash the chuckle was back when he thanked Congess in his best Victorian manner for inviting him to address it:

"I cannot help reflecting that if my father had been American and my mother British, instead of the other way round, I might have got here (in Congress) on my own."

Churchill was an Englishman's Englishman. But he belonged to the free world—as a statesman, world strategist, historian, orator, raconteur, gourmet, animal lover, grammarian, amateur painter—even bricklayer. He was an ardent dabbler in everything of interest in life. Of all descriptive words that might be placed beside his name, he preferred to be looked upon as a Victorian—a relic of the heroic days when the British realm spread around the world and the widowed Queen wore the Imperial Crown.

True to his heritage, he never reconciled himself to the dismantling of the Empire. Long after it was certain the tide was running out, he stoutly proclaimed he had not become the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the empire. He didn't; he was out of office when India and Burma gained independence.

And at the age of 88, when he was made an honorary citizen of the United States, he showed that he had not given up his lifelong fight to preserve Britain as a great and noble power. Thanking President Kennedy for the latest of many honors, Churchill wrote as the former prime minister of a "great sovereign state," and added:

"I say 'great sovereign state' with design and emphasis, for I reject the view that Britain and the Commonwealth should now be relegated to a tame and minor role in the world. * * * Let no man underrate our energies, our potentialities and our abiding power for good."

Churchill's literary contributions alone would have served to perpetuate his name. His monumental histories of both World Wars and of the English-speaking peoples are an eloquent record of his country and his times.

But he rose to unmatched oratorical heights in the speeches he made in the House of Commons in the war when about all he had to fight with were words. Mr. Kennedy recognized this in signing the honorary citizenship proclamation with this appropriate metaphor:

"In the dark days and darker nights when Britain stood alone—and most men, save Englishmen, despaired of England's life—he mobilized the English language and sent it into battle. The incandescent quality of his words illuminated the courage of his countrymen."

For ages to come, free men will turn to Churchill's wartime speeches for inspiration to carry on the struggle against tyranny.

It was in England's darkest hour after Dunkirk—one Churchill turned into her finest hour—that this roly-poly man with a cherubic face, a cigar and a V-sign, and little more than cricket bats for weapons, defiantly told Hitler:

"We shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be; we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and on the streets, we shall fight in the hills—we shall never surrender."

He wasn't bluffing. He was a man of great personal courage—dauntless and fearless—at his best when the odds against him were greatest. He never hesitated to stand alone for what he considered right.

Even in old age, he never flinched. Asked in 1949 on his 75th birthday if he had any fear of death, he replied: "I am ready to meet my Maker. Whether my Maker is prepared for the great ordeal of meeting me is another matter."

Hon. James H. Quillen, of Tennessee

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor and a privilege to participate in this recognition of the election achievement of the honorable gentleman from the First District of the State of Tennessee, Congressman JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN.

Achieving a majority of votes, as we Republicans have come to find out, is a difficult and trying task. Nonetheless, the gentleman from Tennessee has persevered. He has in fact succeeded in achieving a tremendous vote plurality in 1964 which no other Republican Member of this House has equalled. We must attribute Congressman QUILLEN's amazing election success to the wisdom of his constituents, to the diligence of his campaign, and to the quality of his service. It would be well for many of us to thoroughly examine Congressman QUILLEN's techniques in the hope of gleaning some insight into his outstanding achievement.

I hail the gentleman from Tennessee, and I look forward to his improving his performance in 1966—if possible.

The Greatest Growth Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of February 1, 1965, contained two articles which are worthy of consideration by every Congressman. One is on the Area Redevelopment Act and the other on the REA. The editorials follow:

THE GREATEST GROWTH CENTER

It has long been clear that the Government's approach to redevelopment of depressed areas has itself been in need of some redevelopment. But it is by no means clear that the changes under consideration will eliminate the program's more depressing aspects.

One mildly heartening development, noted in last week's Presidential Economic Report, is an indication of a certain disillusionment with the notion that just about any area can be revived if you inject enough Federal dollars into it. Up to now that old pork-barrel theory has seemed to underlie most of Washington's redevelopment efforts.

In the short run, of course, the idea may often appear to work out. But the operations of the Area Redevelopment Administration have abundantly shown that merely feeding in Federal cash cannot restore health to an area lacking the manpower, material, and natural resources on which a genuine revival might be built.

From now on, promises a Federal planner, quoted by Mr. Janssen in this newspaper recently, the Government will not be looking merely for the neediest cases but for those that show the most potential for growth. That certainly sounds more sensible, and yet it provides no guarantee that aid will not continue to be based more on politics than on economics.

The politicking, in fact, may be expanded. Instead of concentrating on counties and similar smaller areas, the Government now proposes to make over whole regions, much as it is trying to uplift the 11-State Appalachia region in the East. So sweeping are the plans that, as some officials see it, a program for upper New England might even move across the border to encompass Canada's Maritime Provinces.

Washington officials insist it's not their intent to remodel these huge regions on their own. They will rely largely on plans drawn up by State officials within the regions—though they add that the States must submit rational plans. It's too early to tell whether the States definition of rational will always conform with Washington's.

Some questions of definition could arise when it comes to designating the growth centers which are to get the bulk of Federal aid. Practically every community considers itself a growth center, and local pride isn't likely to be diminished by the prospect that such a designation will bring a Federal reward. If the community is important politically to the party in power in the State, is it probable that the State's officials will choose to pass it by?

What is much more likely is already indicated by the outlook in Appalachia. Though Federal officials expect to wind up with only about 50 growth centers in the area's 359 counties, they're talking of labeling a lot of the left-out localities secondary centers and scheduling them for somewhat smaller Federal help.

Political pressures, therefore, are sure to call for vastly expanded amounts of Federal assistance. Meanwhile, there is no assurance that the regional approach will be able to surmount the practical problems faced by the ARA or even to avoid all of its blunders.

To take one problem, the ARA has found that manpower and materials often must be imported from prosperous areas for projects in distressed communities, which certainly limits the local benefits of such activities. The ARA furthermore has sometimes helped set up companies to compete with existing firms which already were having trouble finding enough business to stay afloat. In short, the new approach may possess all of the practical and political pitfalls of the old.

Since a dynamic economy will always encompass areas that are declining and others that are on the rise, it stands to reason that few of those having strong potential for growth will long be overlooked by private business—or lack help from State and local governments. Many States and localities are, in fact, far along on such self-help, and they might do even more if Washington had not preempted so many of their tax sources.

Nonetheless, the administration apparently is convinced that no growth center can properly grow without a lot of heavy-handed help from the Government. It's just that sort of thinking that has made Washington the greatest growth center of them all.

THE NEW RURAL POWER PLAY

For the past year or so the Nation's rural electric cooperatives have been running into increasing criticism from Congress. With electricity now available to practically all rural areas, some lawmakers find it strange that the Government insists on subsidizing the co-ops' rapid growth as a supplier of power to cities and industry.

At times the criticism has been so sharp that you would think it might lead the co-ops and their Washington overseer, the Rural Electrification Administration, at least to go slower for a while. But they evidently operate on the idea that the best defense is a stronger offense.

The first target of a stepped-up offensive, launched at the rural co-ops' convention last week in Miami Beach, is the Nation's stockholder-owned electric power industry. A group of 106 of the private power companies, declare the co-ops, overcharged their customers by $3.4 billion in the 7 years ended in 1962.

To arrive at this figure, the co-ops first decide what would be a fair profit for the private companies. Though such a judgment is hardly likely to be unbiased, the co-ops obviously like it better than the decision of the various State public service commissions, which rigidly supervise the private companies' rates.

If there have been overcharges, the cure would seem to be improved State regulation. It's hard to see how it will help much, as the co-ops appear to think it will, to use their operations as a yardstick for measuring proper private utility rates.

In addition to being tax free, the rural co-ops get Government loans at 2 percent, a rate far lower than those available to private companies and, for that matter, much lower than the cost of the money to the Government. In this situation, it's pretty silly to try to compare co-op rates with those of the taxpaying private firms.

The comparison won't get any better if the yardstick is merely enlarged, and yet that's about the only change the co-ops suggest. REA Administrator Norman Clapp implies that the Government, far from being overly generous with the co-ops, has actually been rather niggardly. In the next 15 years, he says, the co-ops will need vastly expanded amounts of capital if they are to continue to grow.

So the second target of this new rural power play is, not surprisingly, the taxpayer. He can only hope that enough Congressmen now will see where the line is heading. And pull the plug.

Joseph G. Rayniak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, as the year 1964 was drawing to a close, the Nation lost to eternity a citizen who contributed much to the welfare of our Nation and the world.

I am referring to the late Joseph G. Rayniak, former president and vice chairman of Outboard Marine Corp., the man who, perhaps more than any other, helped make the outboard motor available to Americans and others throughout the world.

A fitting biography and tribute to Joseph G. Rayniak is contained in an article which appeared in the Waukegan News-Sun on December 19, 1964.

As a mark of respect so richly deserved, I am asking that portions of that article be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With this reprint there is also tendered the expression of sorrow which touched all with whom he came in contact. Also, I extend to his son, Joseph L. Rayniak; his daughter, Miss Mary Jane Rayniak; and other members of the family, sentiments of deepest sympathy. The article reads, in part:

Joseph G. Rayniak, the man who made the name of Johnson Motors as well known as Ford or Chevrolet, died unexpectedly yesterday.

Born January 19, 1891, in what is now Czechoslovakia, he and his family moved to this country and settled in Pittsburgh in 1899. The only son in his family, he was forced to leave school at an early age. He worked in the coal mines and later in a glass factory.

From there, he went to Detroit where the new auto industry was creating a world capital of machinists. Discovering that elementary arithmetic was not sufficient for mechanical engineering, he spent the next few years combining work with night school.

He met Miss Edith Harris in Detroit and on November 20, 1914, they were married. Their first child, Mary Jane, was born in Detroit.

He had become an apprentice toolmaker, but his mechanical flair and extra schooling broadened and advanced his career where he became superintendent of the 1,300 men in the Packard Motor Co. toolroom at the age of 26.

This was in 1917 and with World War I underway, Mr. Rayniak and his family moved to Elizabeth, N.J. He joined the Dusenberg Motor Corp. to tool up and build the Bugatti engines for the French Government.

In 1919, Joseph L. Rayniak was born and a year later the family was in South Bend, Ind., where Mr. Rayniak was made factory manager of the Johnson Motor Wheel Co., a motorbike firm.

Nearly caught in the depression a year later, the firm reorganized as the Johnson Motor Co. and began producing 35-pound motors which clamped onto rowboats.

Recognizing the need for a lightweight motor, Rayniak found aluminum the answer and replaced sand castings with diecastings. He worked 12 to 15 hours a day to scrutinize all production methods.

In 1927, Johnson Motors moved to Waukegan and gave him the chance to revamp production completely. During World War II when 95 percent of all production went into Government contracts, Johnson Motors became the first to die-cast cases for high-altitude oxygen regulators for fliers.

During this time, Mr. Rayniak was one of 24 American industrialists picked by the Government to explore German production methods as key plants began falling behind American lines.

After the war, Mr. Rayniak as general manager systematized Johnson's reconversion so it was one of few manufacturers in the Nation that laid off no workers during retooling.

In 1957, the Johnson Motors plant housed the world's largest unit-frame diecasting machine ever built. The idea for the machine had first struck Mr. Rayniak during World War II.

That same year, he was named Light Metals Man of the Year by Modern Metals magazine.

The Outboard Marine Corp.'s board of directors named him president in 1953 and in 1959 he was named vice chairman of the board and manufacturing research director.

Outboard Marine Corp. was created during the stock market crash when Johnson Motors and Outboard Motors Corp. merged. Outboard Motors Corp. had been created in 1928 by a merger of Elto, Evinrude, and Lockwood Motor companies when Johnson began to lead the industry after Mr. Rayniak had made improvements on an alternate firing engine.

While a tall man in industry, J. G. Rayniak was equally tall in civic stature.

In 1955, Mr. Rayniak, News-Sun publisher F. Ward Just and Elwyn F. Wightman were appointed to the newly created Waukegan Port Authority. Later the same year, he was named a director of the Citizens National Bank and one of 18 directors of the Illinois Manufacturers Association.

He also helped raise funds for an addition to Victory Memorial Hospital, served on the board of the Waukegan Water Works and was president of the Lake County Boy Scout Council in the 1930's.

He retired from Outboard Marine Corp. in 1961 after 41 years with the company.

His wife, Edith, was stricken in their home December 26 last year and died in Victory Memorial Hospital.

Cardinal Shehan of Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial in tribute to Cardinal Shehan, of Baltimore. The editorial, pre-

sented by Herbert B. Cahan, vice president, WJZ-TV 13, on January 26, 1965, follows:

Baltimoreans of all faiths will rejoice in the elevation of Archbishop Lawrence J. Shehan to cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church. It was in Baltimore that the Catholic Church was formally established in this country. It was in Baltimore in 1886 that Archbishop James Gibbons, a native son, became America's second and most celebrated cardinal, serving his city for 44 years. Appropriately, the second Baltimorean to become cardinal is also the first Baltimore-born archbishop since Cardinal Gibbons.

But the honor to Archbishop Shehan has more than just ceremonial significance, even to non-Catholics. As the leader of the Baltimore archdiocese, he has been in the forefront of two great movements. He has exerted a powerful moral influence toward the elimination of racial barriers in and beyond the community. He has furthered the ecumenical movement set in motion by the late Pope XXIII.

In this second role Archbishop Shehan is a particularly fitting leader for Baltimore. Traditionally, the ecumenical spirit has always been strong in this city. The same spirit is generously evident within the personality and intellect of the newest American prince of the Roman Catholic Church, Lawrence Cardinal Shehan, of Baltimore.

Oversea Teachers' Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have long been interested in the economic status of our oversea teachers.

Public Law 86-91—1959—provides that oversea teachers' salaries are to be in line with the scale of teachers' salaries here in the United States. While teachers' salaries in the United States have risen an average of 15 percent since 1960, the Department of Defense has not provided any salary schedule increase for oversea teachers. According to the law enacted in 1959 there was to be a review each year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress to rectify the injustice of the past by easing the economic plight of teachers in oversea military schools by bringing their salary schedules up to a level comparable to teachers in the District of Columbia area.

In the February 1965 issue of the American Teacher magazine there appears an article pointing up the plight faced by these oversea teachers and under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point this very timely article:

OVERSEA TYPISTS PAID MORE THAN TEACHERS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—An American teacher in a military dependents school overseas must have a college degree, a teaching certificate, and 2 years of classroom experience in the United States. The starting salary is $4,535 a year.

A clerk-typist, hired by the Defense Department to work in the same school, needs only a high school diploma but starts at $4,600 a year.

The fringe benefits for each are exactly the same.

And this, said Gael Pierce, a teacher in a dependents school in Madrid, Spain, and president of the Madrid Chapter, Overseas Federation of Teachers, Local 1470 is just one of the reasons why the oversea teachers "have reached the breaking point of frustration."

Pierce flew to Washington to present the teacher complaints to the Defense Department. He is also president of the Overseas Federation of Teachers Council.

Salaries are an important item, he told a news conference, but not so important as the declining quality of education in the dependents schools.

"The children of American servicemen overseas are being cheated," he said. "They are getting a cutrate, bargain-basement education, because of the misguided parsimony of Congress and the Defense Department."

Pierce cited these examples: "We are using a science textbook which was printed in 1948 and which says the highest altitude ever achieved by a manmade object is the 250 miles of the WAC Corporal rocket.

"There are no kindergartens, no school nurses. Guidance and counseling services have been cut back and so have the special teachers of reading and music, and special education programs for the handicapped.

Pierce said Congress has set a per pupil limitation of $285 in the oversea schools, compared to the U.S. average of $432.

A law enacted by Congress in 1959 took the teachers out of civil service and pegged their salaries to those paid in large cities in the United States. The teachers' representatives said the average annual salary in the large U.S. cities is $6,600, compared with an average annual oversea salary of $4,720.

The Defense Department has said Congress has not provided enough money to pay the higher salaries. The teachers contend the Defense Department has never asked Congress for the money.

Salute to a Great General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include an editorial in tribute to Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, that appeared in the Columbus, Ohio Dispatch, February 2, 1965. As my colleagues know, this great American is a native of Columbus, Ohio, and all of us are mighty proud of his great military record as well as his dedication to American principles. The editorial follows:

SALUTE TO A GREAT GENERAL

Today Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, the Columbus boy who made good in military aviation, is back in the ranks of the civilians. It is a pleasure to welcome this tough, vital, still productive man to his new life after a fabulous career in the U.S. Air Force.

No one can say what contribution he still may make to the Nation, but we feel with reassuring certainty that his life outside the military area will be no less rewarding to the well-being of the United States.

Curtis LeMay has held a general's rank in the Air Force since 1943. Command and decision are a great part of his makeup. There is room at the top of the civilian ranks for such a man of command and decision.

True to the finest tradition of the military, General LeMay is very economical with his words. His brief interview on the eve of his retirement gave few clues to his future plans. It is noteworthy that he did not close the door on the possibility of a new career in politics.

Military careers translated to political undertaking have not always been salutary changes of endeavor, but the prospects of success for a man such as General LeMay appear to be better than the average as gleaned from history.

We wish Curtis LeMay well in whatever he chooses to do with his fresh civilian life. And we know that whatever he will do will be to the profit of all of us.

Kellogg, Idaho, Jaycees Announce Charlotte Eastman Essay Contest Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay written by Charlotte Eastman, a student at Pinehurst School located in Shoshone County, which won a recent contest sponsored by the Kellogg, Idaho, Jaycees, and which was printed in the January 28, 1965, issue of the Kellogg Evening News:

WHAT MY COUNTRY MEANS TO ME

(By Charlotte Eastman)

"One nation under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all." That is what my country means to me. It is one Nation, even though only a few hundred years ago we were only 9 colonies. We worshipped under God and through Him, we had the courage to become an independent country. We took all the responsibilities that go with self-government and that has helped us to make us the country we are today.

We are an indivisible country during both war and peace. We have learned that when there is peace, we must be united and work together for the whole economy of the United States. In war, we cannot be divided or we would be destroyed. "A house divided against itself cannot stand."

In America, we have liberty, and justice for all. These are definitely necessary for peace and happiness. All men must have freedom and rights within the law. They should have certain personal rights too. Among these are "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." All these things help to make our country the best one in the world.

My country, America, is an unusual country. It was settled by people wanting freedom from unjust and tyrannical rule. And still today, people come to the United States to escape oppression.

In America, we can always be sure of having a voice in our government. We have Senators and Representatives to represent us and state our problems to the leaders of our country. If it is within their power, these leaders try to correct the problems.

Some countries don't have enough food or Federal money. But in America, we waste enough food to feed another country. We can always be sure of at least two meals a day and many people in other countries

never know when they're going to have their next meal. Most of the time, we have enough Federal money but when we don't, the Government makes taxes. This sometimes hurts the people and isn't always received gracefully, even though the people know they have to support the Government.

These things, worshipping God, having freedom, liberty, and justice for all, helping our country, other countries, helping ourselves, and others, are all parts of being American. America has given so much and we should all be grateful for living in this wonderful country. We should strive every day to be loyal and devoted to the country we love, America. It is the land of free men and the home of brave men. It is a country for true patriots who live and die trying to make the United States a better place for all. That is why you should "ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

Another CCC Dumping Binge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in order that Members of Congress may be advised of the attitude of farm organizations toward the practice of the Commodity Credit Corporation regarding grain sales, I submit for the RECORD a portion of the GTA Daily Radio Roundup for February 1, 1965.

I would like to call to the attention of Members of this House the fact when feed grains legislation was considered, many of us expressed concern about the authority granted the CCC in selling feed grains, pointing out that low prices could break the competitive market. This GTA statement endorses the wisdom of our early conclusion.

I urge that the Congress in this session consider legislation to correct this devastating practice which has driven farm parity to a depression-time level.

The material follows:

GTA DAILY ROUNDUP

Here is a bit of information that we haven't seen in print but that is being generally talked about. It is that Commodity Credit Corporation is planning to go on a dumping binge and get rid of wheat and corn by the hundreds of millions of bushels. The reason is not the amount of grain that CCC has title to but the shortage of money in CCC's till. It needs cash and will sell willy-nilly to get it.

CCC's selling price, you know, is 105 percent of loan plus some token charges. You can bet your bins that the market price will be affected by huge CCC sales at only 105 percent.

The entire farm and grain industries are urging USDA to raise that CCC selling price to 115 or 120 percent of loan plus actual carrying and interest charges. Then CCC wouldn't sell much, but it is not overloaded with grain anyway. And the markets would have some price leeway. That would give farmers a chance to sell their grain through regular channels instead of being forced to turn so much over to the Government.

The Government would save gobs of money, and that would help turn off the Budget Bureau's loudspeaker. Farmers would benefit by getting a better price for their grain. Even noncompliers would benefit a little, but after all, they are farmers too, and the entire rural community sorely needs more income.

A Practical Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I had the privilege of participating in seminars conducted by the State Department's Foreign Service Institute of the Office of International Scientific Affairs.

These are activities that are directed toward educating our Foreign Service officers and other Government officials concerned with international relations in the nature and scope of this Nation's power in science and technology and as they relate to our foreign affairs. This is a very enlightened porgram which will be of tremendous importance in the years to come in understanding the major role our science and technology play in our relations with the other nations of the world.

At one of the meetings of the Institute, a paper was delivered by Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., now of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and formerly the Scientific Advisor to President Eisenhower. This, to me, was one of the most penetrating analyses and expositions of how matters of science and technology have been integrated into our foreign policy in the past and how they should continue to be used to advance our interests and the cause of peace in every corner of the globe.

Everyone who reads this presentation cannot fail to be impressed by Dr. Killian's lucid and well organized presentation of this very complex subject. I strongly urge every member, who must deal almost on a daily basis with some aspect of science and technology, to read Dr. Killian's paper, which follows:

A PRACTICAL IMPERATIVE

(By J. R. Killian, Jr.)

I

Since this is the first time the Foreign Service Institute has offered a course on science and technology as a vector of foreign policy, I feel, in presenting my remarks, the sense of privilege that attends participation in significant first occasions. I congratulate the Department and the institute for inagurating this new course. It is forward-looking recognition that our foreign policy will be well served by an integration not only of political, military and economic components but of scientific technological components as well. Even though the policies and actions of the Department of State must always be shaped principally by political considerations, its mission to defend and advance our national interest will increasingly require the discerning inclusion of these other elements.

This integration, then, of science and technology into foreign policy is not just an abstract, academic concept but a practical imperative. It is needed now. Let me illustrate.

The United States has been engaged since 1954 in an admirable, beneficial, and widely acclaimed atoms for peace program. Has this effort had the sustained benefit of searching scientific examination both to make it most effective for peace and to reduce the possibility that it unwittingly may aid the proliferation of nuclear weapons? We face still unexploited opportunities for leadership in making nuclear power more widely available but can we do it in a way that does not aid the spread of nuclear weapons?

This is not a rhetorical question; it drives directly at the problem of how we deal policy matters of this kind, involving subtle technical considerations.

The example I cite points up the importance of the Department's having its own resources for making independent technical judgments. Just as our Presidents have found it wise not to be entirely dependent upon the several departments and agencies of Government for technical guidance and have therefore called upon an independent committee for objective scientific advice, the State Department can beneficially have at its disposal uncommitted competence for its guidance. I would say the same thing about the other Government departments when they must deal with crucial policy questions on which there may be disagreements and special interests within Government.

There are other compelling reasons for the State Department to follow its present purpose in equipping its personnel for dealing with the impact of science and technology on foreign affairs. All of us—whether we be in the scientific, academic, or government communities in this country and abroad—are still in the kindergarten stage in really understanding how to use science and technology in foreign affairs. We need State's leadership to get us out of this elementary phase, and to move toward a mature international science policy.

And then there is the diplomatic opportunity to grasp a powerful new lever to advance our national interest in the world arena. The United States has exceptional technical resources that are understood all over the world, both by advanced peoples and by less-advanced peoples. This scientific and technological strength is among the most conspicuous, most admired, and most persuasive features on the American landscape—more so, to other peoples, than even our cherished democratic system which has made our flourishing technology possible. In this striking fact, in this worldwide appreciation of the quality of our science and technology and the education which supports it, lies a unique diplomatic opportunity, if we can but cultivate the complicated skills and understanding required to exploit it, and create the condition where this skill and understanding can be made really at home in agencies concerned with affairs abroad. The power of our science and technology to serve national goals at home and abroad also presents to the Department of State a compelling reason to pursue policies designed to maintain and augment this quality.

Not the least of the ways this strength serves our Nation abroad is through the meaning and impact of our achievement in basic science, as distinct from technology. This purely intellectual stature, this demonstration of American devotion to creativity and to disinterested search for truth, confounds those who see us as materialistic and utterly practical. This flowering of American pure science appeals widely and deeply to the best hopes and aspirations of all men; it is in the deepest sense a manifestation of a great society. In myriad ways our foreign policy should and does support this high achievement and interpret it, with advantage to the Nation, to friends, and foes.

These opportunities, assets, and urgencies lead me to attach great importance to this

course and to similar programs now developing in our universities. I am glad to learn from Mr. Herman Pollack of the plans now developing in the Department's Office of International Scientific Affairs for a number of special briefing projects on space, desalination, and so on, for senior foreign officers. I am told also that the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace is projecting a course to be given at Oak Ridge this spring designed to give those with no scientific background enough understanding of the nuclear field so that they may at least have some insights into the significance of nuclear developments when they encounter them. All of these efforts are very much on the beam. They also recognize that the ethos of our foreign policy should not be flawed by intellectual parochialism, that our policy and outlook need not fall into the crack between the two cultures.

Believing strongly as I do in the importance of science and technology promoting international collaboration, I must also say to you that I am allergic to those well-meaning citizens, not in government, who overromanticize science and technology as offering a joyride to the millennium and as a sovereign remedy for all ills. To his embarrassment the engineer-scientist engaged in technical aid, for example, has sometimes been viewed by these uncritical enthusiasts as a sort of Mary Poppins, flying around bringing order out of chaos by snapping his fingers, or as the TV witch who masters the orneriness of human nature by twitching her nose. As foreign service officers, you know that neither nature nor humans are so obliging, particularly in the foreign field.

The actual potential for the discriminating use of science and technology in support of foreign policy is too great and too vital to our national leadership in the world arena to have it demeaned by exaggeration, oversimplification, and amateurism. This is especially true in our foreign aid program. Our technical aid, for example, benefits from careful preparatory study and research. It is encouraging to see a research program for this purpose in the Agency for International Development.

At this point let me put on my academic cap and gown and venture a gratuitous suggestion that more candidates for foreign service should be sought who have had a basic education in science or engineering. They should be expected to meet the same tests or be intellectually as talented as all other candidates, but they should also be made to feel they and their specialized insights would be welcomed in the Department. I understand that the last study of the preservice education of foreign service officers showed less than 150 who had majored in the sciences, engineering, or mathematics. Whatever the reason for it, this number is disappointingly small in the past several years, I am told, only about 4 percent of the intake of junior foreign service officers majored in one of these fields. The question might be asked whether the current foreign service examination is broad enough in concept so that those who have majored in science and engineering are on an equal footing with other majors in taking it. The studies which the State Department is making of these matters is another example of its awareness of the roll of science in its affairs.

I recognize that only limited opportunities exist in the foreign service for the professional practice of science and engineering, but I am encouraged to believe that the State Department is now seeking a more diversified mix of talents, and that it recognizes the need for some increase in the small fraction of men who are generalists in action, but who have an education in science or engineering, to work alongside the generalists whose majors were in the humanities or the social sciences. That so few graduates in science and engineering now enter the public service reflects in part the pressing need for their services as specialists, but it also results from inadequate orientation in our colleges and an assumption which is too widespread in government that those with a major in science or engineering are ill-prepared to serve as generalists. More and more the engineer is receiving an education which equips him to fill that broadest concept of engineering as a profession which couples science with society, which deals with men and organizations as well as things. Some seasoning of the foreign service with men of this cut can be useful as we seek to use science and technology to support our diplomacy and to give our diplomats more levers to help them control events in an age of science. Their presence in the foreign service together with programs such as the course starting today will greatly aid the integration of science and technology with foreign affairs.

II

The relationship of science to foreign policy has interested me continuously ever since I became the President's Science Adviser and Chairman of his newly constituted Science Advisory Committee, in 1957, at the height of our post-Sputnik panic. That new Committee, located in the White House, was confronted from the start with a basketful of problems relating to the international role of science and technology. It assisted the State Department to reestablish the science attaché system that had been discarded under budget pressure. One of the first standing Panels of the Committee to be appointed was the Panel on Science and Technology in Foreign Affairs. Dr. Detlev Bronk, the Chairman of this Panel, and I, were called upon immediately to participate in the preparation of position papers for the NATO Heads of Government meeting in December 1957. Acting upon recommendations made by the "three wise men"[1] the United States stressed at that meeting the importance of harnessing science for the benefit of the free world, and supported the appointment of a science adviser to the Secretary General of NATO and the creation of a science advisory committee to be devoted to the strengthening of Western science. I had the privilege of accompanying the President to that meeting and of seeing these proposals approved—actions which subsequently contributed significantly to the renewal of European scientific strength. This was but one of the ways in which U.S. foreign policy at that time was seeking to stress science in foreign affairs, and Sputnik had given the subject a dramatically enhanced importance. It might be said that in World War II we learned to mobilize scientists for war and that in the period following Sputnik we began to learn how to mobilize scientific advice for Government policymaking.

From the beginning, the President's Science Advisory Committee addressed itself to arms limitation studies and specifically to new technology bearing upon the detection of nuclear tests. In the United Nations mounting fears of fallout from nuclear tests led to a growing debate about testing programs. Against this background, a suggestion of mine to the National Security Council, based on scientific discussions in the PSAC, that the time had come for a reexamination of the technology of detection and inspection as a way of safeguarding a possible nuclear test ban prompted lively interest. It in fact led the NSC to approve the appointment of an ad hoc interdepartmental committee to consider the feasibility of detection and monitoring systems. The encouraging report of this committee to the NSC led to the proposal for an international conference of experts which the Soviets accepted. Thus began the long series of negotiations, marked by many setbacks and frustrations, both technical and diplomatic, but which nevertheless finally brought us to one landmark agreement a year and a half ago in the limited test ban treaty.

There is no question that the Geneva Conference of Experts was undertaken without the thorough preparatory study that the participants strongly felt was needed. So too was the conference on surprise attack. And even though subsequent findings on detections of tests made some of the conclusions obsolete, nevertheless the conference inched negotiations ahead. Perhaps we may never find it possible to prepare adequately for handling the technical aspects of international negotiations—as illustrated further by some of our telecommunications conferences in the past—but we should have more technical resources to help us prepare.

As a third example of the use of scientific advice, I point to the major role taken by the Secretary General's Science Advisory Committee in initiating and planning the United Nations 1963 Conference on the Application of Sciences and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas—a historic step in providing a world forum on the applications of science to human betterment.

I recall these past events by way of pointing up how scientists, acting as advisers in the right place at the right time, serve our policymakers in the field of foreign affairs on matters of great moment. The development of nuclear weapons and the foreign policy problems associated with them, the spreading awareness that the bread, health, and safety of nations, and indeed their survival, depend upon a highly creative technology, and finally the appearance of technological spectaculars, such as space vehicles, have together amplified recognition that science and technology suffuse the foreign as well as the domestic policy of nations. At the same time, it has now been amply recognized that some of the substance of science and technology in arcane to the generalist policymaker, and that in consequence he must depend on expert advisers who can make the estoeric complexities meaningful in terms of their usefulness and relevance to matters of state. The result has been that in an ever-growing number of countries scientists or engineers have become advisers to prime ministers, chairmen, and presidents, and country after country, large and small, has related to its policymaking councils, advisory and coordinating mechanisms manned by scientists and engineers—governmental agencies that did not even exist a decade ago. These multiplying arrangements for introducing science into policy afford our foreign service officers, including our science attachés, a new reading on the aspirations of nations. In the major countries one finds growing communities of people interested in the relation of science to public policy as distinct from the practice of science and technology. As W. Murray Todd wrote recently in the "Bulletin of the Atomic Scieintists": "By now a fairly indentifiable group is beginning to emerge which advocates the creation of mechanisms and theories of science policy. This group should be of prime interest to our science attachés * * * because U.S. science policy cannot be divorced from that of other countries. Knowledge of the personalities involved and their influence among scieintists and parliamentarians may be extremely useful in the future."[2]

The growing use of the expert is one of the striking developments in the political administration of modern States. The repeated demonstration that knowledge indeed is power, together with the vast accumulation of specialized knowledge, are among the reasons for the new place of the specialist-scholar in the political process. As Harvey Brooks has observed, "In most of the Western World the first instinct of statesmanship is to turn intransigent problems over to 'experts' or to 'study groups' * * * Much of the history of so-

Footnotes at end of speech.

cial progress in the 20th century can be described in terms of the transfer of wider and wider areas of public policy from politics to expertise."[3] Accepting this as true, for good or ill, the fact stands clear that in dealing with policies infused with science and technology it becomes increasingly important for the generalist policymaker himself to have understanding as well as expert advice so that he himself identifies the technical problems and brings to bear his discriminating judgment as a generalist in coping with them.

Last month, James Reston, in reporting on a European trip he had taken, summed up the effect of scientific progress very well when he wrote: "Everywhere the politicians and even the statesmen are merely scrambling to deal with the revolutions in weapons, agriculture, and industry created by the scientists and the engineers. The latter have transformed man's capacity to give life, to sustain and prolong life, and to take life; and the politicians no longer find that they can deal with all the new complexities and ambiguities in ideological terms.

"The new science has created a new diplomacy. The New World differs from the old Continent on many specific problems, all of them serious and complex, but at least in the great industrial nations—which are the only ones that have the power to start a modern nuclear war—there is a new caution and respect for the facts created by the scientists and the engineers."[4]

III

Let me now draw from my grab bag a random assortment of observations about the present state of science and technology and about the communities which deal with these professions.

I resist playing a well-worn record containing a refrain that I confess to have been guilty of repetitious playing in the past. It is entitled, "The Accelerating Rate of Change." Indeed, we are in a period of rapid change and knowledge is growing exponentially, and I would not minimize the problems created for policymakers by the galloping horses of technology, but we have come bromidically to overstress the newness and uniqueness of this condition. Certainly the periods when Kepler, Galileo, Newton, Darwin, Watt, Faraday, and Maxwell were making their discoveries were times of profound intellectual and social change. And you must have heard of the remark that passed between Adam and Eve when they were being driven from the Garden of Eden: "You must recognize, my dear," said Adam, "that we are living in an age of transition." As did our forebears, we today are apt to explain all our troubles by ascribing them to a high velocity of change.

We also hear facile and romantic talk today about world-shaking technological changes around the corner and about these leading inevitably to some form of world government or one-world organization. Now it is possible that these changes and effects may occur, but I am rather inclined to agree with Albert Wohlstetter. "There are," he has written, "without doubt large changes in technology impending. But how fast they will come and just what they will be is not really predictable. Still less are the widespread political and economic consequences of these changes.

"The changes coming are neither intrinsically benign nor malign. In any case, they are best not viewed in terms of the apocalypse or the millennium. The apocalypse might come, but it need not. And the millennium is not about to."[5]

In its political effects technology seems actually to be pulling in opposite directions. On the one hand, as technological systems, both civil and military, grow greater in scale, they transcend all political boundaries, and indeed their spatial requirements increasingly find the globe itself too confining. As they grow in scale and impact, they seem to call inevitably for correspondingly larger political units, and, indeed, I think this may be the result of large technological systems. On the other hand, modern technology, especially modern communication and transportation, seems to be among the factors encouraging the current fragmentation of the world into a growing number of self-determining political units, a resurgence of nationalism, and a new power structure that is more and more multipolar. Thus facile generalizations about the effects of science and technology on the scale of political organization cannot always be accepted at face value.

I turn next to a profile of today's scientific community, both national and international.

Save when divided by war or iron curtains, the scientific community tends always to be transnational, because the act of creation leaps over political boundaries. A scientist in an underdeveloped country may make a discovery that will be one of the decisive factors in a technical breakthrough by a great industrial research team in America. We see, consequently, a vast network of international organizations and communications in this transnational society. There are an astonishing number of these organizations, both private and intergovernmental, with our Government formally participating in nearly threescore of them. The number of scientific meetings (not including those devoted to technology) has been estimated at around 1,500 a year, in which about 10,000 scientists participate. Much of this activity is largely independent of the political relationships between governments and represents a powerful voluntary cultural force binding national communities together. The Foreign Service plays a great role in facilitating this interchange and in doing so it helps to strengthen our own science by bringing it into close association with creative work the world over.

Increasingly the work of scientists and engineers calls for international programs and working groups. International laboratories for example, are increasing in number. With CERN in Geneva leading the list, we see new establishments such as those related to Euratom and exemplified by the International Laboratory of Genetics and Biophysics in Italy and those financed by the International Atomic Energy Agency such as the International Theoretical Physics Center, also in Italy. There is the CENTO Institute of Nuclear Science in Tehran and the International Computation Center in Rome. Multinational cooperation is seen also in the programs sponsored by the vigorously active International Council of Scientific Unions, such as the immensely successful International Geophysical Year and the new International Years of the Quiet Sun. Currently in the planning stage or in progress under the auspices of ICSU are the international weather program being carried out through the World Meteorological Organization, the International Hydrological Decade initiated by UNESCO, and a coordinated oceanographic study of the Indian Ocean. This partial list indicates the extent to which scientists and engineers find it necessary to create international working structures or communities better to advance science and technology.

Some progress has been made in achieving true international education, especially in science and engineering. The recently proposed and designed International Institute of Science and Technology to be located in Europe, which was encouraged by our Government has so far been stymied, but the idea is too sound to die. I hope we will strive to revive it.

Let us look at other characteristics of the scientific society. The United States, Europe, the U.S.S.R., and the rest of the world each has about one-quarter of the total world population of scientists and engineers. Both Europe and the U.S.S.R. are increasing their numbers faster than the United States. In fact, the number of scientists and engineers Russia is adding each year is twice the number we are adding.[6] We may thus expect an increasing Soviet capability to launch and sustain large-scale technological enterprises, including technical aid to developing countries. We may expect European nations—along with Japan—to become more formidable competitors of ours in industrial technology. This is especially true because a smaller proportion of their scientists and engineers are engaged in military work, thus a larger proportion are available for industrial innovation.

One of our binds in the utilization of scientists and engineers in the United States is that our supply is spread over a great military program, a vast industrial establishment, a growing educational system, and our commitments abroad. It is a striking fact that about 3 out of every 10 scientists and engineers in the United States are working directly or indirectly on our military and space programs, an allocation that in a way reflects our international commitments. To maintain our world position may well require us to educate more scientists and engineers both for maintaining the creativity of our industrial research and development and for deploying more of our technological talent to aid in the economic development of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Even though our scientific and engineering community is spread thin, it is nevertheless large and very busy. Altogether we have about 1.7 million professional scientists and engineers. In addition to their work in production, public works, management, and teaching, they are manning the largest research and development program the world has ever known. In dollars expended annually, it amounts to about 3 percent of our gross national product. Of this total the Federal Government funds about 60 percent which in 1964 amounted to $15 billion. Thus it is now expending more for research and development than the total Federal budget prior to World War II. As Don Price has said, "the plain fact is that science has become the major establishment in the American political system: the only set of institutions for which tax funds are appropriated almost on faith, and under concordats which protect the autonomy, if not the cloistered calm, of the laboratory. The intellectual problems involved in this new status are likely to trouble scientists almost as much as the fears of the apocalyptic uses to which their discoveries may be put by the politicians."[7]

One of these intellectual problems was noted in a recent report of the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Utilization of Scientific and Engineering Manpower when it stressed that the massive influence of the Federal Government on the deployment and utilization of scientists and engineers imposes on it an entirely new order of responsibility to prevent malutilization, and to assess in advance the effects of its decisions to undertake or discontinue large projects. When the Government is considering the participation of the United States in large international projects, this recommendation should be kept in mind.

Despite problems of scale and of manpower shortages, American science and technology, as I have already stressed, are today in a position of world leadership, although we could lose this leadership if we become bemused by admiration of our own superiority or if Government policies failed to continue to be as wise as they are now. Actually, we may be only at the beginning of unexampled

Footnotes at end of speech.

scientific and engineering achievement. With the future so promising this is not the time—as some people occasionally suggest—to relax our scientific effort or for timid talk about having reached some kind of ceiling or plateau in our upsurge of scientific and technological strength.

But I reemphasize the increasingly able competition from abroad. On the European continent industrial research is recapturing much of its prewar vigor, and we are acutely aware of the impressive advances in the Soviet Union. Japan is no longer just copying Western technology. It has become highly innovative and imaginative, as American industry is discovering in the marketplace. We need to take constant readings on these changing technological tides and to have abroad the men who have the technical sensitivity to appraise and report them.

Population growth and the ever-increasing energy and raw material needs of modern societies impose requirements on foreign policy that involve new relationships between technology and politics. So too does the growing scale of technological systems as demonstrated in communications, power networks, the land environment of space systems, and transportation. On the North American Continent alone we see emerging spectacularly bold engineering concepts such as the NAWAPA project to store water at high elevations, mainly in Canada, after collection in Alaska and Canada, and to distribute it throughout the southern provinces of Canada, in the United States, and into Northern Mexico. We hear associated with this engineering proposal ways to reverse the dropping water level in some of the Great Lakes with international boundaries.

Similarly there is the proposed Hamilton Falls hydroelectric project to generate economically useful power not only for Canada but for parts of New England and for New York City.

Overseas, there is the great Indus River development, including a program devised by American scientists and engineers, by invitation of the Pakistanian Government, to halt the loss of productive land in West Pakistan through waterlogging and salinity. A recent report points out that every 5 minutes in this area an acre of land is being lost by waterlogging while there are 10 more mouths to be fed.[6]

The opportunities among nations for regional cooperation in river valley development are being widely recognized. One where political problems are acute, to say the least, but where much might be accomplished is the United Nations Lower Mekong Basin scheme in southeast Asia. There are bold ideas for tapping artesian basins—in north Africa and Arabia, for example. I am not commenting on the technical or political feasibility of these projects. I cite them as examples of what is to come or might be done.

Everywhere there is the urgent need for energy and water. Thence, the great and growing efforts to find economical methods for desalination of water, with some schemes involving huge nuclear reactors to provide energy. There are political problems galore, as well as technical ones, associated with such projects when they are international.

The atmospheric sciences and the collection of weather data by their very nature require global undertakings, as do other scientific and technical activities, such as oceanography, control of disease, and telecommunications, especially satellite communications.

In dealing with these trends and needs—regional, global and superterrestrial—our Government and its foreign officers will need sophisticated, tough-minded, technical advice on the feasibility of projects, on the alternatives which should be considered, on the contribution we can make to them, on their impact on our own manpower and economic resources, and on their timing and need. With this kind of judgment available, however, such large-scale programs of development and technology can multiply the helpful political choices available to us and afford us new opportunities to contribute to the welfare of the human community.

The spectacular growth of computers and data processing, a technological revolution that is really just beginning, leads one inevitably to ponder new forms of machine-aided cognition and the great systems of information storage, dissemination, and retrieval that lie ahead. It is not fantastic to contemplate that interconnected systems will enable the management of great organizations to have immediate information on and be responsive to the status and progress of all parts of the organization, even where widely dispersed.

In a recent address as president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, the Right Honorable Lord Brain made the following comment on the failure of leadership to anticipate the current population growth and its dangers: "Our greatest need today, then, is to acquire the power of looking ahead, forecasting, and preparing for the consequences of the accelerating developments in science and technology. Many years ago, H. G. Wells pointed out the need for what he called a 'world brain' to correlate information and extrapolate on the world scale, and I hope that one day we shall achieve something like that.

"To my mind, the important division between people is not between the classical and scientific outlook on life, but between those who see the world * * * which science is creating * * * and those who see it in terms of the static environment, and frozen emotional attitudes of the past."[9]

The great scale of scientific and engineering projects may occasionally cause large-scale, unexpectedly harmful effects, or fears of such effects. Pollution of the atmosphere, harbors, and streams, the waterlogging in West Pakistan (unexpectedly caused by sustained irrigation), manmade changes in the outer environment of the earth are examples. Because these effects can break across all boundaries, they require sophisticated attention by foreign service officers along with foresight and caution by scientists undertaking such projects.

So far I have dwelt mainly on the supranational effects of technology, but we should not forget the scientific work which continues to influence man's cultural outlook. This is a period of new advances in astronomy as well as nuclear physics, in the life sciences, especially genetics, as well as in medicine, in mathematical linguistics and psychology, as well as in archeology. This great age for science finds nations willing to invest many millions of dollars in great radio and optical telescopes to explore aspects of the universe unimaginably far away and long ago, and in huge particle accelerators to probe the inconceivably small particles and brief events of the atomic nucleus. These large investments and activities are far removed from any immediate practical application and yet man's insatiable desire to know and his deep need for wonder lead us on. Inevitably they also lead, these matters of the mind and spirit, to a reinforcement of the conviction that knowledge and wonder are a common bond among all peoples and that they can with benefit ultimately pool their efforts to pursue them and to create the great laboratories, instruments, and institutions that are increasingly needed and are sometimes beyond the capacity of any one nation. To understand and be enriched by an awareness of these potentials of the creative mind and of multinational efforts are plainly worthy and high-priority missions for all professional estates, but they would seem uniquely to be the mission of those who practice the new diplomacy, even by the most severe standards of national self-interest and hardheaded strategy.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Report of the Committee of Three on Non-Military Cooperation in NATO. U.S. Department of State Bulletin, Jan. 7, 1957.

[2] "Science in the State Department" by W. Murray Todd. "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists," December 1964, p. 28.

[3] "Scientific Concepts and Cultural Change," by Harvey Brooks, Daedalus, winter 1965, p. 66.

[4] New York Times, Sunday, Dec. 13, 1964, p. 8E.

[5] "Technology, Prediction, and Disorder," by Albert Wohlstetter, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, October 1964, p. 15

[6] In presenting this profile I have drawn upon the report, "Toward Better Utilization of Scientific and Engineering Talent: a Program for Action." The National Academy of Science, Washington, D.C., 1964.

[7] "The Scientific Establishment," by Don K. Price. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 106, No. 3 (June 1962), p. 235.

[8] "Science and Technology for Development: Report of the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas," vol. 1.

[9] "Science and Behavior," by the Right Honorable Lord Brain, F.R.S., Nature, supplement to vol. 203, No. 4948. Aug. 29, 1964, p. 943.

Cardinal Shehan of Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the only American among 27 new cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church appointed by Pope Paul VI on January 25 was Archbishop Lawrence Joseph Shehan of Baltimore. Regarded by his colleagues as "priestly, scholarly, the essence of courtesy and tact," he has served as the spiritual leader of Maryland's 430,000 Catholics in the Baltimore archdiocese since December 1961 where he has worked continuously and conscientiously to promote Christian unity and combat racial prejudice.

The second cardinal ever appointed from Baltimore, Archbishop Shehan will join five other Americans in the College of Cardinals when he receives his red cardinal hat in Rome on February 22.

Following the announcement of his selection for elevation to cardinal, WJZ-TV of Baltimore broadcast the following editorial tribute which I include here in the RECORD:

CARDINAL SHEHAN OF BALTIMORE

Baltimoreans of all faiths will rejoice in the elevation of Archbishop Lawrence J. Shehan to cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church. It was in Baltimore that the Catholic church was formally established in this country. It was in Baltimore in 1886 that Archbishop James Gibbons, a native son, became America's second and most celebrated cardinal, serving his city for 44 years. Appropriately, the second Baltimorean to become a cardinal is also the first Baltimore-born archbishop since Cardinal Gibbons.

But the honor to Archbishop Shehan has more than just ceremonial significance, even to non-Catholics. As the leader of the Baltimore Archdiocese, he has been in the forefront of two great movements. He has exerted a powerful moral influence toward the elimination of racial barriers in and beyond the community. He has furthered the ecumenical movement set in motion by the late Pope XXIII.

In this second role Archbishop Shehan is a particularly fitting leader for Baltimore. Traditionally, the ecumenical spirit has always been strong in this city. The same spirit is generously evident within the personality and intellect of the newest American prince of the Roman Catholic Church, Lawrence Cardinal Shehan, of Baltimore.

Postmaster General Gronouski Addresses Oklahoma Press Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General John A. Gronouski visited Oklahoma last week for an address before the annual midwinter convention of the State press association at Oklahoma City.

His remarks on the operation of the Post Office Department and its future are significant and constructive, and I herewith enter the text of his speech:

I am happy to be here with you today. I take great pleasure in the opportunity to speak to this distinguished group of newspaper editors and publishers. And I am honored that your invitation should have come through two men I have long admired: Senator MIKE MONRONEY and Congressman CARL ALBERT.

My respect for Senator MONRONEY and Congressman ALBERT is so great that I could easily devote the entire time I have allotted to me this morning in a tribute to them.

As you know, MIKE MONRONEY is chairman of our Postal Operations Subcommittee, and he's one of the acknowledged experts in the United States on the postal service. As such, he's a pretty tough taskmaster on all of us in the Department. He keeps a sharp eye on us. But he's a fair taskmaster, too, and I'm proud to call him my friend and trusted adviser.

Of course, anything I could say about CARL ALBERT was expressed far better by his own colleagues in selecting him as their majority leader. And having selected him, they can tell you that there is no harder worker in Washington today, or a more brilliant one.

It was my honor to share the platform with him at a senior citizens' rally in Atlantic City last summer with a group of other Government officials, and I must say that I had reservations about ever doing it again. The fact is, he upstaged us all. But here I am again, not a glutton for punishment but a victim of his persuasiveness. The fact of the matter is, it's an honor to be upstaged by CARL ALBERT.

I read an item in Editor & Publisher the other day which reported that one of your newspaper engravers here in Oklahoma City, Raymond Frazier by name, has collected enough postage stamps to start a small post office of his own.

I hope he thinks it over before doing anything drastic.

In the first place, I don't think the public is quite ready for a whole new set of ZIP code numbers.

And then, too, I'm not at all sure he knows what he'd be letting himself in for. "Postmaster General" is a nice sounding title, but there are a lot of headaches that go with it. In fact, I've been putting in a 15-hour day ever since I took the job, more than a year ago, and I'm just beginning to identify some of the problems. You know, the President talks about the Great Society as a place where leisure is a welcome chance to build and reflect * * * and a place where man can renew contact with nature, but at the rate he's been working us, I'm beginning to get the idea that the Great Society doesn't include the Cabinet. Secretary Udall may have a chance to renew contact with nature once in a while, but you can bet he's spending more of his time renewing contact with the members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

So my advice to our friend is to stay with engraving. It's a quieter life all the way around. In addition to that, he's a lot better off on that side of the newspaper than the other side. As Postmaster General, I often find myself looking right into the editorial barrel, so to speak, and it gets a bit nerve racking. It's a lot safer on the firing end.

The most recent editorial fad seems to be writing open letters to the Postmaster General, wondering aloud why he can't run the Post Office Department like a business and show a profit for a change.

Of course, under law, we're prohibited from making a profit, but we do try to operate under sound business procedures. I was beginning to convince some people of this, too, until the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. came along last month and announced rate reductions on long-distance calls. I don't know whether it was deliberate or not, but they made the announcement the same day I hinted at the possibility of increases in second- and third-class postal rates.

The open letters really had fun with that one. In fact, they're still coming in.

"Why is it, Mr. Postmaster General," they ask with undisguised sarcasm, "that private enterprise can reduce rates while the Government is preparing to raise them?" Of course, there's seldom an attempt at understanding the differences between the two operations—such as the fact that the telephone company installed phones in remote areas only when it became economically feasible to do so, while we established rural routes whether they made money or not, simply because we're a public service organization. Or that it's easier to transport a voice than a letter. Or that it's still a whole lot cheaper to send a 3-ounce letter from coast to coast for a nickel than it is to make a 3-minute call for a dollar. These things are not considered because it's automatically assumed that, if the Government operates a service, it's bound to be inefficient. "Gray flannel suit socialism" is the way one columnist referred to the postal service.

The whole thing bewilders me at times. A businessman would have to pay a private message delivery service $3.25 to pick up a letter and deliver it 3 miles away in the city of Washington, while we will charge him 8 cents to fly it across a continent.

And so we have different requirements and different problems, and we should recognize them.

But that does not mean that we should become bemused by them. There are certain areas of similarity that we would ignore at our own peril. When we can learn from private enterprise, we intend to do so.

Actually, our rate structure is based in large part on our present method of operation. If we can modernize that operation, we can modernize the rate structure as well. Last week, I appointed an advisory panel of distinguished business, economic, and labor leaders from all over the Nation to study this whole question and to assist me in my recommendations to the President. This is part of President Johnson's policy of consulting with outstanding experts in private industry in formulating and carrying out Government programs and services.

Frankly, I cannot say at this time what their recommendations will be. But I can say that whatever the decision is, it will be based on the soundest advice available in this Nation.

Basically, our challenge is this:

Our mail volume, now running at an annual rate of 72 billion pieces a year, is increasing at an explosive rate. No one is complaning about it, because it is part and parcel of our national prosperity. Nevertheless, it has increased by about 166 percent since 1940 and continues to increase at the rate of 2 billion pieces a year.

The trick, of course, is to find a better way of sorting the mail so we can keep it moving—and that is just what we are doing, through ZIP code. And the most important aspect of ZIP code is the one which deals with our large-volume mailers.

Many people do not realize it, but 75 percent of our total mail volume is business mail. We spend a lot of our time and effort keeping up with it. One program which we have recently initiated in this regard is called VIM—vertical improved mail—which speeds the delivery of business mail in high-rise office buildings. Replacing the time-consuming operation of walking from office to office, from floor to floor to deliver the mail, we can now handle the entire operation from a single mail room in the basement by the use of a vertical conveyor system. This means that every tenant gets his mail as soon as it is sorted, and continues to get it throughout the day.

But the most significant breakthrough has come at the sending end of our operation. We now have discovered a way to keep a large proportion of our business mail out of the post office entirely until it reaches its destination area—to send it directly to one of our 566 new sectional centers without once unbagging or sorting it. And that is the real kep to ZIP code. When we do that, we have gone a long way toward meeting the challenge of growth in the postal service.

How do we propose to do it? By asking large-volume mailers to use their automatic data processing equipment to sequence their address lists by ZIP code numbers and then presort their mail before they give it to us.

This is a lot to ask of a mailer, but I assure you it is not a one-way street. In the long run, his cooperation will save him money by helping us hold down rates, and will assure his mail much speedier delivery.

This program of presorting is more than just desirable, however; it is vital.

And so, with this in mind, I am, by administrative action, planning to require all large-volume second- and third-class mailers to presort.

Further, I plan to ask Congress for legislation to require the same of large-volume first-class mailers. We are now far enough along on our ZIP code program for this to have an immediate effect on our overall postal operation—and frankly, I do not see any other way out.

I am not so naive, however, to think that we will escape criticism entirely.

But I do not believe we are asking anything unreasonable of our mailers. In fact, a major reason A.T. & T. has been able to save money—and pass that savings along to the public—is that each year they are asking their customers to do more and more of their work for them. Long distance dialing is a case in point. Several years ago, when you wanted to call long distance, you asked the

operator to place it for you. Today, you dial it yourself.

That's exactly the type of cooperation we are now asking of our customers—and we believe the results will be just as meaningful.

The other vital area of cooperation, of course, lies with the average mailer's use of ZIP code. Obviously, the program will not reach its full potential if people fail to address by ZIP code—or fail to include ZIP code in their return address.

To help speed this program along, I announced, earlier this week, a new program to imprint ZIP codes right on the postmarks of the more than 30,000 post offices that individually serve one ZIP code area. They will carry the ZIP code number in the lower portion of the familiar circular postmark. This, I believe, will speed the use of ZIP code by years and will be a tremendous boon to the volume-mailer in ZIP coding his lists.

As you probably know, we have been working for some time on an optical scanner which will be able to "read" ZIP code numerals on envelopes and sort the mail. We have now made the big breakthrough in this area. In about a year, we expect to begin installing these sophisticated new machines in large post offices throughout the United States. When you realize that each machine will be able to "read" and sort at the rate of 35,000 letters an hour, you begin to understand why I call this the icing on the ZIP code cake.

Presorting by ZIP code is, of course, the major postal achievement of our era—and because of it, we would still need ZIP code if we never had an optical scanner. But the scanners, themselves, will help us move the mountains of individual mail that will continue to pour into our large post offices, will speed delivery and will keep our workforce at a manageable size—which, in turn, will allow us to hold rates down to a reasonable level.

This is not a pie-in-the-sky dream. This is a goal that can be reached in a few short years.

It's not going to be easy, but we intend to strive for it—and we intend to succeed.

Thank you.

Niagara Falls Threatened With Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, in his recent state of the Union message, President Lyndon B. Johnson outlined his plans for preserving the natural beauty and scenic wonders of this great Nation. I quote from the President's message:

> For over three centuries the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and has enlarged our vision. We must act now to protect this heritage.
>
> More ideas for a beautiful America will emerge from a White House conference on natural beauty which I will soon call.

I wholeheartedly endorse the President's proclaimed goal to preserve this Nation's natural grandeur.

In keeping with the serious purpose of the President's message, I would like to take this opportunity to call attention to a situation that threatens the continued existence of the most awe-inspiring natural wonder in this country—the American Falls of Niagara.

Recent surveys have shown that immediate corrective action is needed if we are to prevent the American Falls at Niagara from being transformed from a "world wonder into nothing but a series of cascades."

Over the course of many years, steady erosion and fallen rock has resulted in a massive pile of debris at the base of the cataract. It has been estimated that upwards of $10 million would be required to accomplish the task of removing this fallen rock, strengthening the cliff where necessary, and grouting portions of the upper river bed; all for the purpose of restoring the splendor that once was the roaring, majestic American Falls.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to commend highly the editors, publishers and staff of the Niagara Falls Gazette for the outstanding public service they have performed in calling attention to this most critical matter.

On Sunday, January 31, 1965, the Niagara Falls Gazette carried an excellent editorial concerning the impending threat to the American Falls at Niagara. The editorial, follows:

REMEDIAL WORK URGENT TASK

Disaster threatens the American Falls at Niagara.

This alarming news is detailed in today's editions of the Sunday Gazette.

It is news that should cause deep concern throughout the Niagara community, throughout the Nation and in every land where Niagara's fame has spread.

The danger lies in the probability of another rockfall that could reduce the majestic cataract to a boulder-filled rapids.

Fortunately, a remedy seems available. But its need is urgent.

In recent years millions have been spent to preserve the grandeur of Niagara Falls.

Scenic preservation has been a key consideration in water diversion for power and other purposes.

Remedial works have been built to lessen erosion and spread the flow of water on the Horseshoe Falls. The beauty of the Canadian cataract has been guaranteed for future generations.

But at the American falls it's different.

Here there have been minimum preservation efforts. Meanwhile breaks in the precipice have sent rocks tumbling into unsightly piles that have shortened the water's drop and formed a sloping cascade. The crest has become jagged and bare in spots.

Geologists say more rockfalls are probable. The next one might slice away enough of the crest to change the falls into a rapids. A spectacle of unparalleled beauty could become an object of casual curiosity.

Engineers recommend a dewatering of the falls—by a coffer dam across the American channel at the head of Goat Island. This would be a simple project.

A detailed study of the dry cliff would show its strengths and weakness, indicate what remedial measures should be taken. Rock removal, reinforcing the escarpment's face, strengthening the upper river bed might be necessary.

What agency should do this?

That may be a matter for high-level decision. Certainly the Congress, the legislature and local governments should be concerned. President Johnson and Governor Rockefeller might be interested in fixing responsibility.

The Niagara is an international river over which the United States, Canada and Great Britain have exercised control. The American falls lies within the State of New York and divides portions of a State park.

Possibly the International Joint Commission should initiate consultations.

We believe the project lies within the concept of President Johnson's program for beautifying America. It should be brought to his attention.

Golden Eagle: The Killer Bird

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that our Government spends millions of dollars—and properly so—to destroy predatory animals, and at the same time protects our leading predatory bird—the destructive golden eagle. Yet, the predatory animals and the predatory eagle destroy the same livestock and wild game.

These predators have been killing small lambs, kids, and wild game since time immemorial.

It will be recalled that in 1962 the Congress enacted Public Law 884, designed to protect the bald eagle and the golden eagle. But in that act it was required that the Secretary of Interior issue blanket permits for the destruction of the golden eagle, upon request of a Governor, in those counties of a State where the golden eagle operates.

On the face of it, the ranchman, farmer, and game conservationist, would appear to be protected in their right to defend themselves against the ravages of the predatory golden eagle. But not so. Despite the obvious intention of the Congress, the Secretary of Interior proceeded to issue a regulation which effectively tied the hands of victims of these predators by prohibiting the use of airplanes—the only known means of effectively coping with the problem. Thus, the eagle was left free to kill and destroy at will.

It will also be recalled that shortly after prohibiting the use of aircraft in chasing the eagle, the Secretary appointed a task force of experts, all employed in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, to make an on-the-spot investigation of the problem. After an exhaustive study, that task force unanimously recommended the use of airplanes. But, strangely, the Secretary refused to accept the recommendation of the group he had appointed to study the subject.

Since that time vast numbers of livestock and wild game have been destroyed by the golden eagle. The bald eagle, however, very rarely ever attacks domesticated animals. There are only isolated examples of that.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent Associated Press story from San Rafael, Calif., which describes an example of the golden eagle in action.

The article follows:

KILLER-EAGLE KILLER GETS IN TROUBLE

SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.—Rancher Leroy Martinelli wished Wednesday night he hadn't said a word about killing those two eagles he caught killing his sheep.

He said they were two of a team of three eagles that worked in tandem to slaughter lambs not more than a week old.

The 36-year-old rancher said he shot a bald eagle Monday and a golden eagle Tuesday—each "right on the lamb" when he fired his shotgun.

Martinelli said he used his shotgun after watching three birds—one bald eagle and two golden eagles—successively attack the same lamb, each lifting it up and carrying it for about 12 feet and then dropping it. The lamb got up and tried to run away each time, he said, while the mother ewe bleatingly pursued it.

Eagles are protected by both Federal and State laws.

Martinelli said he didn't know this until after he turned the two birds over to the sheriff's office.

When word got out the State Fish and Game Department and the U.S. Fish and Widlife Service in Sacramento began investigating. So did the U.S. attorney's office in San Francisco.

And, "The bird society began giving me calls," Martinelli said.

"I was really quite surprised at the kind of fuss this stirred up," the rancher said. "I thought I was justified, seeing those little lambs, some only 2 or 3 hours old, being killed and the mothers bawling after them."

Martinelli said he gathered up eagle-killed carcasses of seven lambs—the latest victim found Wednesday—and put them in cold storage.

"Those eagles, their condition was poor," Martinelli said. "They were in need of food. That's why they killed."

Salute to Curtis LeMay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the "Salute to Curtis LeMay," carried in the Cleveland Press this week is yet another reflection of the high esteem in which the Nation holds this great Air Force general. As one of his strong admirers, I am particularly proud of the general's Ohio origin and of the fact that Mrs. LeMay is from Lakewood, Ohio, in the 23d District, which I have the privilege of serving.

Along with many others who bear deep regard for General LeMay's views, I regret that I will not again face him across the table in my Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, but I share the hope that his strong and vigorous voice will be heard, and heeded, in these days of perilous national security.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the tribute from the Cleveland Press.

[From the Cleveland Press, Feb. 1, 1965]

SALUTE TO CURTIS LEMAY

As a boy in Ohio, Curtis LeMay wanted to go to West Point. He didn't make it. So he got into the Army Air Corps the hard way—as a reserve cadet at Air Corps flying schools. It was a good thing for the country that he did. He became a great air general.

In wartime, he saw his job as a simple one: "To get the bombs on the targets" regardless of what the problems were. He did it superbly—both in Germany and Japan. When junior officers grew fainthearted, he flew missions personally to show them the way.

After the war, again luckily for his country, he was head of the Air Force in Europe when the Russians threw up the Berlin blockade. LeMay's airmen broke it, and saved Berlin for the free world.

Since then, many a politician and military rival has felt the blunt rasp of General LeMay's scorn. When he thought a proposition wrong, he said so. He didn't hesitate to tangle even with his Commander in Chief, the President. In battles of policy, just as in battles of bombs, he fought to win.

Today, LeMay retired with at least 30 decorations and honors from all over the world. But he'll have none higher than his country's gratitude. Greater Cleveland is proud to have a claim on the general—even though it is only by marriage.

What About Spain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an editorial which appeared in El Diario-La Prensa on January 19, 1965, concerning our outmoded immigration laws. The present law with its obsolete national origins system is an anachronism which, as the editorial points out, discriminates against persons of Spanish origin as well as others. I have sponsored the administration's bill which would eliminate at long last the national origins system. The editorial should be read by all who are interested in a just immigration policy.

WHAT ABOUT SPAIN?

President Johnson's proposal to end the quota system in our present immigration law has brought about a variety of comments. There are those who are opposed because they feel it would add to the unemployment problem. But the majority support it because it is just and logical. Among this latter group an editorial from the New York Times which appeared last Thursday merits special mention. In part it said "* * * The quota system was one ugly fruit of two generations of propaganda about race in Europe and America."

But the New York Times does not stop there and later continues "* * * Thus it is that the United States stands self-condemned before the world for imposing severe restraints on immigration by men and women from Athens and Rome, two of the chief sources of glory and greatness in that Western civilization Americans share and defend today."

What about Spain? Was not golden age Spain a primary font of glory and greatness for Western civilization? The same day that the above words appeared in the New York Times, El Diario-La Prensa published the news that again this year Spanish plays will be given as a part of the Shakespeare Festival. Plays drawn from the rich heritage of the Spanish theater a successor to the Greek and Roman school as well as a sharer of the glory of England. The president of the festival, Mr. O. Roy Chalk, will once again preside over this aspect of the festival.

But not only in the theater has Spain contributed to universal culture. Literature has seen Cervantes, Quevedo, Lope de Vega; painting counts with Murillo, Goya, Velázquez, El Greco, Zurbarán; music, Albéniz, Granados, Falla. In science, philosophy, architecture, and in all the branches of civilization, Spain has sent its culture to all the cardinal points, toward all races, toward all languages.

"The country that produced Plato, Aristotle, and Demosthenes is limited to a 308 immigrant quota per year * * *" continued the New York Times. "The country of Dante and Michelangelo is limited to 5,666." And what about the nation that produced Cervantes, Goya, and Quevedo, and to which we owe nothing less than the discovery of America? The same discrimination that exists against Greece and Italy exists toward Spain. The descendants of the discoverers are prevented from entering the land which their forebears discovered for the Western World.

Spain is just as much Mediterranean Europe as Greece or Italy and is as Latin as the latter. But against Spain the England of Elizabeth I evolved its "Black Legend." A legend later spread with diabolical pleasure by France and later by the very United States where Spain has become so fashionable since last year.

It is true that the descendants of Spaniards who have been born in the Americas, the Latin Americans, have never been submitted to the quota system. But the curious thing is that another discriminatory practice, more or less a contemporary of the quota system, the literacy test which was originally designed for slaves, Greeks, and Italians is today affecting the Puerto Ricans most of all. The Puerto Ricans, descendants of Spaniards and U.S. citizens are still required to take a literacy test in English in order to vote. We have not the slightest doubt that the literacy test has a racial motive since it was also an "ugly fruit of two generations of propaganda about race in Europe and America."

It has been the destiny of Spaniards and their descendants to pay for the sins of others and they have not been able to participate in the advantages given the rest. We see a changing pattern taking place.

The Burning Torch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a poem written by Mrs. Marlene Bondurant.

THE BURNING TORCH

(By Marlene Latimer Bondurant, Alexandria, Va.)

High upon a grassy hill overlooking Washington
There is a torch that shines each day and night in Arlington
In memory of a man who was loved throughout the land . . .
The caisson rolled to the muffled drums of the band
While the young and old, rich and poor, from sea to sea

Grieved and mourned for John Fitzgerald Kennedy;
In a fleeting moment, gone was a nation's noble one,
Gone was a loving father, beloved husband, and son.
There is a torch that burns all day and all night—
A constant reminder of an added fight;
This eternal flame that burns will always be
A living memorial to John F. Kennedy.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

A Report on the Substantial Rise in Florida Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From Aviation Week & Space Technology, Jan. 25, 1965]

SUBSTANTIAL RISE IN FLORIDA MARKET SEEN—EARLY AIRLINE RESULTS INDICATE WINTER TRAFFIC MAY SHOW SIGNIFICANT INCREASE FOR THE SECOND STRAIGHT SEASON

(By Richard G. O'Lone)

WASHINGTON.—Early traffic trends indicate that the 1964–65 Florida season may generate a substantial increase in airline business for the second consecutive year, thus bringing the growth rate of this previously erratic market more in line with the general boom in domestic air transport.

All eight major airlines serving the State, many of them offering greater capacity in the form of new jet transports, report Florida business increases ranging from modest to substantial during late 1964 and early 1965. All are uniformly optimistic that the traffic surge will continue.

Particular interest is focused this season on the east coast-Florida market, in which troubled Northeast Airlines is once again fighting for its survival as a trunkline. The Civil Aeronautics Board feels that award of temporary Florida routes to Northeast in 1956 has resulted in financial disaster to the carrier, due partly to the fact that the growth of the Florida market anticipated in 1956 has never materialized.

The Board's most recent ruling that there is no room for Northeast in the Florida market with National and Eastern airlines currently is being appealed by the carrier.

While the Florida market growth rate was dismally far below expectations in the years 1957–62, the tide began to turn during the 1963–64 season (A.W. & S.T., Mar. 2, 1964, p. 39), and apparently the growth is continuing this winter.

For example, Eastern Air Lines, operating 20 percent more capacity into the State than it did last season, reported a 25-percent Florida traffic increase in December. Northeast, anxious to maintain its place in the Florida sun, reported an average 22-percent increase in its Florida traffic for the last 6 months of 1964. Northwest Airlines pointed to a 30-percent increase in advance Florida bookings through mid-February.

Movements at Miami International Airport, hub of the Florida market, were 13 percent greater in November than in the same 1963 month, and when all the figures are in, the terminal will have handled more than 5 million arrivals and departures in 1964—a record for that airport. In the Christmas-New Year's bowl games scramble, during which several Florida carriers set 1-day records, Miami International was "busting at the seams," according to its director, Alan C. Stewart.

The Florida Development Commission counted 209,542 passengers arriving in Florida in November—a 9.5-percent increase over the previous November—and the December figures were expected to show a similar boost.

This is how the Florida season is shaping up, according to spokesmen for the eight major carriers:

EASTERN

With two more Douglas DC–8's and six new Boeing 727 jet transports in its fleet, Eastern was offering 10,000 seats per day in and out of Florida—2,000 more than last season.

December was a "whopping big month," when the carrier boarded nearly 170,000 passengers for Florida cities. On January 3, Eastern set an alltime 1-day record for itself of 6,700 passengers moving out of Miami.

Advance bookings are "exceptionally heavy and extremely encouraging." The cold snap that dropped Miami temperatures into the thirties on January 17 was eyed warily, although the long-range forecast called for a mild Florida winter.

NATIONAL

This carrier, which accounts for more than 30 percent of domestic airline traffic in and out of Florida, was equipped with another DC–8 and four new 727's for what it expects to be a record winter season. Additional 727's were to go into service in January, February, and March. In 1964, National carried about 2 million passengers in and out of the State, 17 percent over 1963.

National also set a Miami enplanement record on January 3, when it boarded 4,846 passengers—a 34.7-percent increase over the carrier's previous record, set April 5. National's advertising campaign this season is built around the figure of Ponce de Leon, the Spaniard who first explored Florida, urging travelers to rediscover Florida.

NORTHEAST

This airline started booming Florida in October, exhorting citizens to sneak a week in Florida before the official season began and prices went up. The now-familiar figure of Jim Dooley appeared again in 60-second television spots, inviting people to come on down to Florida on Northeast. Group fares were pushed.

Northeast officials believe the campaign has paid off. In the last 6 months of 1964, traffic on its Boston-Miami-Fort Lauderdale route rose 38 percent over the 1963 total, and a 32-percent increase was recorded on its New York-Miami-Fort Lauderdale route. However, declining business on the Philadelphia-Miami-Fort Lauderdale route forced Northeast to cut its daily flights there from two to one, and traffic dropped 40 percent. The carrier has cut its Florida jet capacity this season from eight daily Convair 880 round trips to six, probably due to earlier CAB criticism that it was operating excess capacity.

NORTHWEST

On December 15, Northwest equaled its 1963 seasonal peak of six jet and one Lockheed Electra turboprop round trips daily between the Midwest and Florida. On January 1, two jets were added, one of which replaced the Electra, and another jet will be added February 12, giving Northwest an all-jet fleet of Boeing 720B's and 727's to handle what is expected to be an excellent Florida season.

In the December 15–21 period, revenue passenger-miles on the Chicago-south routes rose 4 percent over the 1963 total, and in the December 22–28 period, the increase was 14 percent.

Taking its cue from the national elections, Northwest built its Florida promotion this season around newspaper advertisements furnishing campaign material for wives who want their husbands to take them to Florida. The material includes a bumper sticker, an auto aerial pennant, a bookmark, placecard and attaché case tag, all of which bear the message, "Flying south to Florida? Go Northwest." Wives are urged to clip the material and use with imagination. Also included is a lawn sign, "to get the neighbors on your side." Prominently featured is Northwest's upside-down U.S. map, showing a jet headed from Chicago to Florida, which attracted considerable attention last season.

DELTA

Although its Florida capacity is about the same as last season, the three new DC–8's in Delta's fleet have afforded the carrier flexibility in handling Florida traffic substantially ahead of last season. For example, Delta was able to add a Friday DC–8 flight out of Chicgo when business dictated, and this flight will be added to the regular schedule February 1.

In September, Delta had planned to operate 67 extra sections to handle the holiday rush between mid-December and early January. Instead, it operated 125—most of them carrying Florida travelers. The carrier set a systemwide record by operating 15.8 million revenue passenger-miles January 2, and then broke it the next day with a total of 18.1 million. On that same hectic weekend, Delta operated 72 special sections in and out of Florida.

UNITED AIR LINES

In December, United recorded an 18.6-percent increase in Florida traffic from its four key northern cities—Cleveland, Buffalo, Rochester, and Pittsburgh—and it foresees a 1964–65 season increase of 15 percent. It is operating 727's, some of them nonstop, from Cleveland and Pittsburgh to Miami and Tampa, and piston equipment is operated to the two Florida points from Buffalo and Rochester.

At the Pittsburgh airport, United has installed a Florida room where passengers awaiting a flight to that State can relax in a Florida-like atmosphere, complete with orange juice. On the morning nonstop 727 flights from Cleveland and Pittsburgh, a special champagne breakfast is served.

TRANS WORLD AIRLINES

On December 13, TWA added an afternoon nonstop Boeing 707 flight from St. Louis to Miami to supplement the morning Kansas City-St. Louis-Tampa-Miami 880 flight. The morning flight is carrying about 10 more Florida passengers daily than it did last year, and the two flights combined are carrying about 100 persons a day. TWA believes this modest increase is significant, in view of Eastern's addition January 6 of a nonstop St. Louis-Miami jet.

AIR CANADA

The Canadian carrier, which operates DC–8's and British Aircraft Corp. Vickers Vanguards to Tampa from Toronto and Montreal, said Florida business this season is coming close to the airline's target growth of about 10 percent. The family fare plan has met with particular success.

The significance of this favorable Florida market trend is subject to varying interpretations, depending on who is talking. The CAB majority, in its latest opinion stripping Northeast of its Florida routes (A.W. & S.T., Dec. 7, p. 29), acknowledges the gains, but claims they indicate only that the market is "subject to unpredictable ups and downs." The minority believes that the Florida surge is here to stay.

Northeast, trying to prove there is room for it in Florida, claims that the east coast-Florida market grew 8.3 percent in 1963 and 1964, and 14.7 percent during the 1962–64 period. Eastern, anxious to get rid of a competitor, pointed out that during these same periods, the domestic industry was growing 12.4 percent and 28.5 percent.

Overconfidence in the Florida market growth rate began in 1956, after traffic for the State had tripled during the preceding 5 years. In awarding Northeast its temporary Florida routes that year, CAB predicted an average annual growth rate of 15 percent.

Instead, the boom collapsed, and during the next 6 years, business rose and fell erratically, producing an average annual growth rate of only 1.0 percent.

The New York-Miami route, key segment in the east coast-Florida market, was in even worse shape. During that period, its average annual growth rate was a minute 0.9 percent. In those same 6 years, the east coast-Florida market grew 5.4 percent—an average 1.6 percent per year—while the domestic trunkline business was growing by 30 percent.

The picture began to change in 1963, when the New York-Miami business jumped 10 percent, spurring a general east coast-Florida market increase of 9 percent and a statewide rise of 9.3 percent. The surge boosted the 1963–64 season to record heights, producing a first-quarter jump of 10.3 percent in Florida airline traffic over the comparable 1963 period.

The Balance-of-Payments Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Ban It, Is Congress' Answer to Problem," written by Eliot Janeway, and published in the Washington Evening Star of today, February 8, 1965.

I feel that the headline is not so adequate as it might be. It puts too much of the blame on Congress for the failure to examine into the problems of international trade.

I hope the administration will face up to the problem and will prepare to make recommendations to Congress along with the short-range objectives which I expect they will attempt to meet again. Although they have been unsuccessful in the practices they have recommended over the last year and a half or 2 years, and I hope they will give us some indication of what their long-range plans are for establishing a base for international trade and the liquidity of money, which is basic to free world trade.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAN IT, IS CONGRESS ANSWER TO PROBLEMS

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK.—The all-American illusion is that the way to solve a problem is to pass a law banning it. Earlier in this century, alcoholism was felt to be a bad problem. We passed the prohibition amendment. A little later on, foreign wars were seen to be a danger to the United States. Accordingly, we passed the neutrality act. When, nevertheless, alcoholism and wars continued to plague us, we were both surprised and disappointed.

But we don't seem to have learned the lesson yet. At least, we're still grappling with the thorny problem of our balance-of-payments deficit—as if the way to cope with this complicated international puzzlement were by a simple, unilateral act of Congress.

In 1963, the Kennedy administration advertised the interest equalization tax on assorted U.S. foreign investments as the answer to the dollar payments deficit. Many in Congress had misgivings that the tax wouldn't reach the roots of the problem. Bills weren't getting through Congress in 1963, and so nothing happened.

When Johnson took over, there was a dramatic change. He was on trial to show that he could persuade Congress to pass the entire Kennedy package, and he did—including 1964's equivalent of prohibition and the neutrality act, the interest equalization tax.

When critics and skeptics pointed out that the proposed penalty tax left a wide loophole for bank lending, as opposed to investment, the Gore amendment was tacked on. It gives the administration standby power to extend this foreign investment prohibition tax to bank loans too.

Now the biggest payment crisis yet to confronting the dollar and so the Gore amendment is being dusted off and presented as the new nostrum. If we fall for this one, it will take us a year to discover that we've merely slapped a patch over the hole in the dike, and that the dollar payments problem has broken out somewhere else.

The root of the problem lies in the fact that we're trying to operaate the 20th century's internationalized economy with an outworth 19th century financial mechanism.

Back in the 19th century, before we modernized our domestic financial mechanism, we used to suffer from unemployment in Pennsylvania when the money supply was needed to move a wheat crop in Kansas. Then, we created the Federal Reserve System.

SYSTEM ANSWERED PROBLEM

Soon we found we could move the crops in Kansas and keep the mills running in Pennsylvania at the same time, without being short of money in either place.

The balance-of-payments problem is the international cousin of this old domestic dislocation which under the leadership of Senator Carter Glass, we solved 50 years ago. But the world has not yet worked out an international equivalent of our Federal Reserve System.

Consequently, one country's payment surplus must always be another country's payment deficit—the way it used to be between Pennsylvania and Kansas. Like the boom and bust of the old frontier days, one country is always paying the bill for another.

It's our turn to pay again, which is why we have a payments problem again. It's not that the United States is in trouble, as if our exports were failing.

It's because just about every other country in the free world is either in trouble or teetering on the brink of trouble, and in need of our dollars which we've been sending as emergency aid when they haven't gone as private investment.

If it made foreign policy sense for the United States to let Italy, Britain, Japan, and Brazil go over the hill, and to put France into a bind we'd have no payments problem. We'd also run out of allies and customers.

Forest Service Observes 60th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, February marks the 60th birthday of the U.S. Forest Service as a key branch of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The Second Congressional District, which I represent, contains approximately 12½ million acres of national forest land including all of some 10 national forests and portions of 3 others.

Accordingly I have had an opportunity to work closely with the Forest Service on many matters of importance. This Service is to be commended for the fine job it has performed over the six decades of its operation.

Two days ago the Service issued a statement on its 60th birthday anniversary. Without objection, I would like to have this statement printed at this point:

Since their transfer to the U.S. Department of Agriculture 60 years ago this month, the national forests have deposited in the Federal Treasury nearly $2 billion, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said today.

This money was collected from the sale of timber and fees for grazing, recreation, special use permits, mineral leases, and water rights.

Sixty years ago this month the forest reserves were moved from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture. At that time they covered 75 million acres. Today the national forest acreage is more than 182 million.

"The timber reserves came into the Department of Agriculture February 1, 1905," the Secretary said, "and in that half fiscal year deposits in the Federal Treasury were a little over $73,000. For the first full fiscal year they were $757,813. Last year, receipts from the national forests and grasslands totaled $137,196,454.

"It took 53 years to deposit the first $1 billion. We'll pass the $2 billion mark next year or the year after—in less than 10 years. This increase in receipts would not have been possible without intensive land management."

Well over 90 percent of the deposits were from the sale of national forest timber. In 1905, the timber cut was 68.5 million board feet, as compared with 10.9 billion board feet last year. Over the years, some 162 billion board feet has been harvested from the national forests, and a continuous supply remains.

Research has helped make the best use of forest crops. Among many such developments was the semichemical pulping of hardwoods in paper manufacture. This technological breakthrough by the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., provided a new use for low-value hardwoods and an economic boost to areas with large hardwood forests such as Appalachia, the Northeast, and the North Central States.

National forest grazing fees have brought $131 million into the Federal Treasury since

1905, but this is not the major value of the national forest range. Ranch operations and the economy of local communities have been built around the national forest grazing lands which provide seasonal forage to supplement an estimated 88 million acres of private lands. These combined rangelands contribute to the income and tax base of many local communities.

About 6 million head of sheep and cattle owned by more than 19,000 ranchers and farmers graze on the national forests under controls and fees worked out by the Forest Service and the users. Ranchers as individuals or working through their grazing associations cooperate with the Forest Service in improving the range and in planning the use of pastures by livestock. The object—to provide sustained grazing and protect watershed, wildlife, and recreation resources.

Water is of primary concern to the Forest Service because it is basic to the economy of the West. More than 50 percent of the water supply of the West flows from lands under its administration.

Methods based on many years of research findings are being used to meet current needs for water quantity, quality, and timing. For example, watershed scientists are using huge snow fences or cutting timber in patterns to control the snowpack and thus improve the volume and the timing of the runoff. They are manipulating vegetative cover from brush to grass to increase water yield.

Another national forest use, short in monetary returns to the Treasury but long in public enjoyment and returns to the local communities, is recreation. In the last 40 years (recreation records have been kept only since 1924) use of the national forests by recreationists has multiplied 30 times.

In 1905 no one dreamed that recreation would need serious management or study, but the Forest Service is conducting research on how to develop national forest recreation opportunities.

About one-fourth of the recreation use is for hunting and fishing. Recognizing that people also enjoy wildlife, as well as hunting and fishing, the Forest Service is working with other groups in protecting rare and endangered animals and birds. Also it is taking definite steps to improve the habitat for both game and fish by opening up tracts in which animals like to browse, sowing the type of food they like, and building waterholes and fishing ponds—all unheard of 60 years ago.

Research in protecting the forest lands has come a long way since 1905. Today, foresters fight forest insect infestations with insects, and tree diseases with antibiotics. Probably the greatest of these changes has been in forest fire fighting.

Today's emphasis is on forecasting fire behavior. Weather patterns which trigger "blowup" fires have been identified. New techniques for air and ground attack with chemicals have been tested and are being tried out.

The Forest Service experience and scientific findings in forest management and protection have been passed on to private landowners through Forest Service cooperative programs with the States. Since 1940, when records were first kept, 932,038 woodland owners have received technical management assistance from local foresters.

Assistance has been expanded to help the private landowner develop the many resources in his forest. This includes recreation developments such as campgrounds, ski slopes, fishing facilities, hunt clubs, as well as the harvesting of frequently overlooked forest products such as ferns, blueberries, and maple syrup.

Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the three attached letters—one from Mrs. Edwin F. Pundsack, Cincinnati, Ohio, one from Mr. P. H. Thomson, Bellevue, Ky., and one from Mr. William F. Heimlich of Falls Church, Va.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 1965.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: I am enclosing an article from our Cincinnati Enquirer.

My brother was a member of the 1st Amphibious Brigade during World War II. Upon his return home he said that they were held up for 2 weeks in Germany, giving the Russian the opportunity to be the first to enter Berlin. Also, that the American boys were furious about the delay. They felt that they should have been permitted to take Berlin and then continue on and take the Russians.

If only General Eisenhower had pretended that he had not received the orders or had disregarded them.

Sincerely,

AURELIA C. LUNDSACK.

BELLEVUE, KY.,
February 2, 1965.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You are correct, General Eisenhower did not make the decision, he could only follow orders from the Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt. He is the one who made the fatal error.

Our boys reached Berlin first, were ordered to pull back 3 to 5 miles and wait until the Russians could get there and both armies go into Berlin together.

We had the best trained and fastest moving army in history and I believe the situation would not exist today in Berlin if it had been left up to our generals.

Ask any man out of the 83d Division and they will tell you how they had to move back and wait.

The President was the Commander in Chief and gave the orders—see what happened to our fine General McArthur from going over President Truman's head. I also believe that Korea would not be what it is today, had we let General MacArthur go his route.

Just goes to show you what a "tie" salesman knew about any military decisions, along side of a West Point general.

Senator keep after these untruths that tend to run down our good and faithful officers.

J. H. THOMPSON.

FALLS CHURCH, VA.,
February 4, 1965.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You are to be congratulated for setting the record straight on the Berlin episode in 1945. My interest was deeper than most—since I was one of the five American officers assigned by Supreme Headquarters to plan the Berlin operation. I participated in this planning and was later the only officer from the original planning group to serve an extended period in Berlin where I was AC of SG-2 from 1945 to 1947, and held other positions there throughout the military occupation.

Prior to beginning the planning for the Berlin operation, which is quite a story in itself, I was sent to London, England for extensive briefings by Lord Vansittart and other members of the British Foreign Office and by Ambassador Robert Murphy and other members of the U.S. State Department. These briefings followed the agreements in London in the fall of 1944 relative to the establishment of zones of occupation in Germany and to Berlin.

The newspaper accounts which triggered your remarks were not accurate.

We could have and should have captured Berlin weeks in advance of the Russians and if you will afford me an opportunity I will give you a first-hand account of the situation which, to the best of my knowledge, has not been included in the memoirs of field commanders who were close to the situation. Briefly, however, the military situation was favorable to us and there was no tactical reason why we should not have pressed on to Berlin and beyond. I am sure that General Eisenhower will agree with this.

I would welcome an opportunity to visit with you some day and perhaps you would be my guest at lunch at your convenience for that purpose.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. HEIMLICH.

Weymouth Kirkland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the death of Mr. Weymouth Kirkland, one of the Nation's best known lawyers, senior member of the law firm of Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz & Masters is a loss not only to the great city of Chicago, but to all freedom-loving people throughout the Nation.

Mr. Kirkland was an outstanding trial lawyer and a fighter for freedom of the press. He was a commissioner of public works in Chicago under Mayor Carter Harrison, Sr., in 1879. He was admitted to the Illinois bar in 1901. He was chief counsel to the Chicago Tribune and other newspapers in cases which are landmarks in the field of newspaper law.

In this connection, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial which appears in the Chicago Tribune on Friday, February 5, 1965, as follows:

WEYMOUTH KIRKLAND

It is with great sadness that we perform the office of saying farewell to Weymouth Kirkland, learned in the law, a wise counselor, and a fast friend. Mr. Kirkland's years were long and his reputation eminent in

the bar. We doubt that there was anyone in Chicago who was not aware of the stature and reputation of what came to be known as the Kirkland firm.

Mr. Kirkland's career will always be associated with some of the great landmark cases securing the freedom of the press against the encroachments of governments. *Near* v. *Minnesota*, *City of Chicago* v. *Tribune Co.*, and *Hebert* v. *Louisiana* were among Mr. Kirkland's triumphs as an advocate in this great cause.

Although his voice is now gone from the courtrooms, Mr. Kirkland's memory will live not only among his friends and members of his profession, but through the Weymouth Kirkland scholarships in law and the Weymouth Kirkland courtroom at the University of Chicago law school.

Mr. Kirkland's family roots went back to this country's earliest days, but he was in fact a self-made man, training for his profession by the old practice of reading law and completing his legal education at evening school. For a number of years he was associated in practice with the late Col. Robert R. McCormick, until Colonel McCormick withdrew to devote full time to his management responsibilities with the Tribune.

But it is not only for his brilliance in the law that Mr. Kirkland will be remembered. He was always an interesting, perceptive, and charming companion. Among his distinguishing characteristics were an innate courtesy, frankness, and agreeable manner, nor did he lack the common touch. A cub reporter who approached him for information or interpretation could always expect to be received with the same consideration Mr. Kirkland would have extended to his editor.

These were the qualities which marked an unforgettable man.

Mr. Kirkland was active in the civic life in the city of Chicago—a member of the American, Illinois, and Chicago Bar Associations and an honorary member of the Legal Club of Chicago. He was also a fellow of the American Bar Foundation.

Mr. Kirkland was a Republican and was renowned as an after dinner speaker and a toastmaster. He was known to those who knew him best for his humanity, generosity, and integrity.

Thousand of Chicagoans from all walks of life knew him and regarded him as a friend.

Values for Our Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by Father Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J., Ph. D., at the fall conference of the New Jersey Junior College Association, on October 21, 1964, at Centenary College, in Hackettstown, N.J. The Junior College Association has been of material assistance in meeting the great need for higher education facilities in our State, and has been an inspiration to a number of our counties in establishing further junior college facilities. I appreciate the efforts which Father Yanitelli has given this movement in our State.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALUES FOR OUR STUDENTS

(By Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J., Ph. D.)

Anyone who has tried to set foot in the jungle of value theory with its nearly impenetrable tangles of psychological, philosophical and religious undergrowth, its ethical, esthetic, hedonistic snares, will be glad to hear that this is not what we are talking about, at least not directly. Axiology or the theory of value, is however, the subject from which these remarks derive simply because, as Rudolf Eucken has said as far back as 1912:

"The concept of value is now placed in the center of an important and fruitful movement. Regarding it as a whole, this movement represents the modern type of thought as opposed to the antique."

Considered in the light of the contemporary American philosophical impetus which is away from the objective ethics, the objective juridicial order and the morality of the past, Eucken's statement sounds more modern in 1964 than it did before World War I. Hence the growing dilemma of American education (and in a larger sense, of American democracy); namely, that academic freedom is invoked to eschew anything that remotely resembles indoctrination toward a public ethics or a public morality, and yet freedom desperately needs ethics and morality to survive. In a democratic sense it is what Plato meant when he said that "Republicans can only live by virtue," and by that he meant the conscious self-discipline of the free citizens who would preserve the living freedom of the republic in which they live.

No I am opposed neither to academic freedom nor to civic freedom. I merely state that the preservation of these freedoms carries with it certain built-in problems and that part of the understanding of values consists in understanding the problems connected with freedom.

For instance, I cannot accept any value which is based on feeling alone. Feeling alone, like passion alone, is at best irrational. Feeling and passion taken in themselves constitute the prime sources of prejudice, bigotry and intolerance. They become the sources of action taken without rational judgment—that is, judgment based on objective evidence.

Do not misunderstand. I am totally in favor of feelings, and the role they play in action. God loved Daniel in the Old Testament because he was a man of strong desires. Nor am I against commitment to one's convictions. But I think that to be fully human a man's feelings and passions must be guided by reason. It is reason and judgment that raise man above the animal and vegetable levels of life. It is reason and judgment that enables man to reflect, to analyze, to compare, to learn. In the end, it is reason and judgment that makes value meaningful.

As a consequence, it becomes clear that values bear a special reference to the human person. They refer to his freedom of choice. They involve what Jean Paul Sartre calls man's "engagement" in life and all the limitations that that implies. Values are, in the words of Prof. Philip Jacob "a standard for decisionmaking." Because values involve a preference, a criterion and a choice, one can readily see that they are involved with the things that matter most. They are "goals and purposes apart from which everything we do loses its point."

In their most human sense then, the values under discussion involve a free personal commitment of oneself based on a criterion reached by critical judgment. The essence of what I am going to say on "Values for Our Students" may be summed up in this, that our students must make some beginning in the realm of free, personal, knowledgeable self-commitment by the time they leave us or we shall have failed in our task as educators. Our failure will be manifest in two glaring ways: First, because our catalogs speak of educating "the whole man" toward "a well-rounded personality," for "service to society" and "citizenship in a democracy" and, I submit, none of these things can be done without some sort of critical judgment, without some sort of criterion for action, without some sort of personal self-commitment to a value. There just does not exist a "whole" man who does not live by a hierarchy of values.

And the second evidence of our failure would be like the first: We educate to integrate, to develop the total personality of the student, not just his intellect—again check the catalogs for verification—and there can be no integrated personality without a sense of values based on a critical evaluation of the realities in life, the uses of personal freedom, personal conscience (another name for integrity), personal rights and the rights of all other men, personal dignity and the respect for each man's dignity, all those values which relate to man and his existence on earth, man in society, man as a private individual, man as a citizen in a democracy.

One can debate forever on the teaching of values: whether it can be done at all, whether the American college should teach or try to teach or has a right to teach, values. The whole debate—in my humble opinion—is meaningless as far as we are concerned. The fact remains that in college some kind of value communication is impossible to avoid. As Kate Hevner Mueller put it:

"Such controversy is unrealistic, for any institution which includes a group of teenagers is up to its neck in the teaching of values, no matter what theoretical position on the matter is formally declared."

From another point of view, American higher education seems to be getting itself more and more deeply into a dilemma of its own making. On the one hand, it is committed at least in principle to some sort of democratic formation for citizenship. On the other hand, the Lehrfreiheit and the Lernfreiheit of academic freedom are often interpreted not only as a contradiction of any form of dogmatism or indoctrination, but also as a contradiction to taking a stand and making a commitment. In the latter case, we have the sorry spectacle of an education which is committed to noncommitment and absolutely rejects the absolute.

The dilemma has been called a "standing paradox of education" by Ralph Barton Perry, Harvard's Edgar Pierce Professor Emeritus of Philosophy. His book on "Realms of Value" identifies moral education with the teaching of values and makes the point that moral education is crucial to our times and to our society.

"Its (moral education's) importance is pointed up by the grave crises of modern civilization. The development of technology culminating in the applications of nuclear physics threatens to destroy mankind; and they can be converted to good, rather than destructive uses, only provided they are subject to moral control. Society is threatened at home by conflict between employment and labor, and the only possible solution of the problem is a moral solution. Mankind lives under the horrid threat of a war in which all may go down together, and the only escape lies in implanting in the minds of men good will and the spirit of justice; Political democracy is profoundly corrupted by the development of the mass mind, and the only salvation of democracy is to instill in the people at large the virtue of integrity. Civil rights are perpetually jeopardized and often destroyed because the people neither

understand them nor respect them. The favoritism and venality of public officials is notorious."

Without going into the question of the teaching of values, caution should point out the dangers inherent in two extreme attitudes sometimes taken on the subject. The first is that of the educator who evades his responsibility in order to appear objective. He takes no stand, refuses to consider normative questions, and claims that his job consists of providing factual materials and nothing more. Prof. John E. Smith of the Yale Department of Philosophy says of such an attitude:

"This approach is evasive not only because of the failure of the instructor to take a stand on issues about which he expects a choice from the student, but it is misleading because no one can in fact confine himself to presenting nothing but the factual materials. Every presentation of every subject involves selection and evaluation; nothing is more to be avoided than an instructor who is actually communicating * * * a great many uncriticized answers to questions which he claims not to be raising at all."

The second danger, the opposite extreme to be avoided, is the dogmatic instructor, even when he feels he has the right solution or is contributing to a good cause. The line between preaching and teaching must not be broached in the classroom, and perhaps those of us who are of the clergy would do well to learn that exhortation to good can be no substitute for competence in any subject matter, not even theology as an academic discipline.

A further observation is necessary at this point; namely, that values bear a relationship to a valuer—a limited human being whose valuation need not be correct, whose valuation need not be accepted. For myself, I personally believe that values have no real meaning without an ultimate recourse to God. Values relate to conduct. Conduct cannot escape being moral or immoral. And to me no morality makes final sense unless man is responsible to God. There is no other lasting source from which the value of values can arise.

However, I also believe that there are, to paraphrase our late President Kennedy, certain nonnegotiable elements, values which arise from the human condition and give meaning to the life which we are hopefully educating students to live.

As a director of student personnel services, the whole focus of my work is to bring educational meaning to everything—well, almost everything—the students do outside the classroom. The specific values I am about to discuss can be learned in the classroom, certainly—in any number of subject matters. However, I see them lived in student life and in student activities and it is to these areas I would principally address myself.

The first and greatest of these nonnegotiable elements is, of course, freedom. And the first and greatest knowledge that must be learned about freedom—and especially freedom in a democracy—is that freedom is not an absolute. Absolute freedom leads only to anarchy, disorder, and the jungle law of the survival of the fittest. The greatest value that our students can attach to the notion of freedom is that freedom, in order to be real freedom, must necessarily be limited. In a democracy where all men must be equal before the law, each man's freedom must be limited by an eminent respect for the freedom of his neighbor.

I am not free to walk into your house uninvited. I am not free to help myself to the contents of your purse, nor am I free to disturb the peace of the community by shouting "fire" in a crowded theater. In short, two nonnegotiable conclusions come to light: (1) My freedom is not absolute. It must be limited by respect for my neighbor's right to freedom, and (2) It is the limitation itself imposed on freedom by respect for my neighbor's rights that guarantees both my own freedom and my neighbor's.

There is, moreover, another value which must be attached to freedom, and which is also nonnegotiable—again especially in a democracy—and that is the value of responsibility. The freeman accepts the consequences of his free acts and learns to live with those consequences. The man who acts irresponsibly is neither free nor mature. There can be no greater value for a free human being than his commitment to rational responsibility. This is the only intelligent use of freedom.

From this notion, there derives the value of conscience according to one's knowledge. If the truth our students learn in the classroom would make them free, then they are obliged to commit themselves to that truth insofar as it is known to them.

Nothing subtle is intended here, only the simple fact that conscience guides a man to live by what he knows. It means that the man's word given for convenience only and withdrawn when inconvenient, makes selfishness the norm of free choice and a mockery of the neighbor's rights. In other words, the value of honor involves justice which means the commitment to render to our neighbor what is his due as a free human being.

The value of good taste, the commitment to decency by whatever standard so long as the commitment is honest—this, too, we proclaim as an end to be achieved by our educational efforts. Just what good taste may be, can provoke argument, discussion, and debate forever. But even at its most extreme interpretation, the value of good manners, the value of thoughtfulness for another's feelings, the value of all the social graces, all bear a direct relationship to man's freedom and the respect due to my neighbor's rights.

Because the area of good taste is surrounded by the pitfalls of censorship and the denial of another man's proper freedom, each man must determine for himself what norms he will follow. More than that, though, he must pay the respect to another's norms that he rightfully expects will be given to his own. No man can legislate for another. Each man has the right to his private preferences.

So I would say to you, that if you are serious about educating the whole man, each according to the catalog of his own institution, you cannot escape some kind of commitment to the values of freedom and responsibility, conscience and integrity, good taste and courtesy.

Apart from these three aspects of values for our students, which, for want of a better term, I have called nonnegotiable in one form or another, there is another aspect of values that we, as educators, ought to understand clearly. I speak of the simple fact that values cannot be legislated. As a clergyman, let me assure you that values cannot be legislated by college administrators any more than morals can be legislated by preachers.

Anyone who has had anything to do with student government or student organizations knows that campus spirit cannot be legislated. By the same token, neither can student apathy be ruled out of existence. Students creates their own spirit. They create their own moral atmosphere by their tolerance of each other. It is therefore of maximum importance that the educator learn to communicate rather than legislate. For communication is really the last free approach to the problem; and to communicate, the educator simply has to know something about the students' world.

As for the student, college is indeed a world, his world. Richard Hughes described it well in "The Fox in the Attic": "After all, it is only grown men ever who think of school as a microcosm, a preparation for adult life: to most boys at any time school is life, is itself the cosmos: a rope in the air you will climb higher and higher and then quite vanish into somewhere incomprehensible anyhow."

The prevailing majority of students arrive at college not only uninformed but also psychologically unformed. College may be the last and most crucial step in nature's preparation for a mature adulthood, but rare is the student who realizes it. He is still growing physically; and, if he is fortunate, college will one day suddenly awaken him to the fact that he can think. This last step, which consists in the development of his powers of abstract reasoning, frequently enough overwhelms him. With it comes the fierce striving for identity as an individual, what Rudolph Allers has termed "the formation of self." And since self-realization must be accompanied by an independence which reacts at times violently against all restraint, the student usually begins at this moment to look upon all authority as evil. His parents, his faith, his conscience, the college administration, the police, sometimes even the usher in the local movie theater, all take on the abhorrent aura of restrictive symbols, the authorities that keep him from doing what he wants to do and from being what he wants to be.

His own college world is not and cannot be terminal but is a preparation for something else. Its orientation is totally beyond itself. And yet, when those who have been through it try to explain the student's feelings about things in terms of their experience, the communication is at best superficial. Necessarily so, because the student cannot be expected to understand that which can only be learned by an experience he is yet to have. As one Harvard graduate reflected on this fact: "Someone could advise you from now to doomsday, unless you learn these things on your own you would not take his advice."

In addition to the more personal awareness of his own growth in these matters, the coming to terms with the fact of sex, his own talents and propensities, the college student also is part of that collection of his equals in age, occupation, and interest known as the peer-group. The struggle for the esteem of the group often conflicts with the individual student's drive toward self-realization. Because the group whose respect he cherishes and hungers after is composed of individuals in exactly the same phase of life, individuals who are undergoing the same growing pains of becoming adults, he sometimes suffers a spiritual blindness, a strange inability to evaluate. At this point and in this context, he no longer thinks for himself. All unawares he becomes a member of the class identified by David Riesman as "other-directed." He becomes the nonconforming conformist, nonconforming to the authorities of the stodgy adult world, conformist even down to the minutiae of dress, hairdo, tastes, pleasures, and attitudes to the likes and dislikes of the peer-group. Students form a large segment of the lonely crowd.

All too frequently the college permits a wall of separation to be built between the academic life of the student on the one hand and his life outside the classrooms on the other. This paragraph is really a plea to make the extracurriculum a natural extension of the curriculum, in other words to bring the concept of educational values to bear in every phase of the student's experience. If the extracurriculum is not conceived in educational terms, we educators are fooling ourselves. More than that, we are reducing our task to the level of supervised fun and games—and that at a time when it is the administrator's and the faculty's greatest challenge to make a continuum of the curriculum and the extracurriculum, of intellectual formation and of

value formation. They are all four inseparable. They meet in the one student. Together with the home and certain other offcamlus factors, they constitute the entirety of his inner and outer environment. At this stage of life, they are the shapers of the man. Leibnitz's dictum: "Le present est gros de l'avenir" applies most aptly to the student's college life in its entirety.

VALUES FOR OURSELVES

All of which leads inevitably to the question of values for ourselves. No man can give what he does not first have himself. Which simply means that if we do not have value convictions ourselves, it would be hopeless to talk about communicating values to our students. On the other hand, the question of values for our students puts a double obligation on us to be clear about the values for ourselves.

It further obligates us to take another look at the college catalog which is itself a publicly stated commitment. It obligates us to review our own commitment to our profession as educators. We are in this difficult business for a purpose and a periodic review would help us to understand that purpose a little better for each one in his own mind. Our students need now more than ever a sense of personal commitment. If we do not have it ourselves, how can we ever expect to communicate it in terms of value to our students?

I give you the extraordinary model of a little Jewish girl writing in her dairy while the Nazi terror was wrecking her world with blood and violence, these words of wisdom, of value judgment, and of social responsibility. Anne Frank could write while the world was coming apart:

"I know what I want, I have a goal, an opinion. I have a religion and love. Let me be myself and then I am satisfied. I know that I'm a woman with inward strength and plenty of courage. If God lets me live. * * * I shall not remain insignificant, I shall work in a world and for mankind."

Ladies and gentlemen, God has let us live. Let us therefore, have a goal, an opinion, religion, and love. Let us be ourself. Let us work for the world and for mankind. Let us commit ourselves to the values that make our lives significant.

Hon. J. Vaughan Gary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure a few days ago of attending a dinner held in Richmond, Va., in honor of my friend and predecessor in the Congress, the Honorable J. Vaughan Gary. One hundred of Mr. Gary's closest friends gathered to pay tribute to his many years of public service. Praise was showered upon Mr. Gary by the toastmaster, John J. Wicker; by Richard S. Reynolds, Jr., president of Reynolds Metals; and by old friends William T. Luck and Wilmer O'Flaherty. In the course of this well-deserved praise mention was made of earlier tributes to Mr. Gary by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon and Postmaster General Gronouski. As my measure of respect, and under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include those tributes by Secretary Dillon and Postmaster General Gronouski at this point in the RECORD:

REPRESENTATIVE J. VAUGHAN GARY CITED FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon presented the Treasury's Distinguished Service Award to Congressman J. Vaughan Gary, Third District of Virginia, at a ceremony held at noon today at the Treasury Department.

The new Distinguished Service Award was established by Secretary Dillon last year as the Treasury's highest recognition which may be conferred on an individual citizen who is not an employee of the Department. The award is given "in recognition of distinguished public service."

Today marked the second time the award has been given, and the first time that it has been conferred on a Member of Congress.

After having been a Member of the House of Representatives from the 79th through the 88th Congresses, Congressman Gary did not seek reelection and is retiring from the public service. During seven of these Congresses, including the last five continuously, he has been chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Departments of the Treasury and Post Office. He will return to the active practice of law on January 1, renewing his affiliation with the law firm of Shewmake, Gary, Gobbin, Blackwell, Elmore, and Belcher, in Richmond, Va.

Following is the text of Secretary Dillon's citation of Congressman Gary:

"As a Member of the House of Representatives, in the 79th to 88th Congresses, inclusive, and as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Departments of the Treasury and Post Office during the 81st, 82d, and 84th through the 88th Congresses, Mr. Gary has made outstanding contributions to the public service.

"His leadership abilities and prestige in the Congress, his depth of understanding of this Deparment's programs, his penetrating analysis, and his skillful handling of the appropriations for the Treasury have provided the Department with financial resources to fulfill its mission in a most effective and economical manner.

"In addition to his exceptional legislative abilities, Mr. Gary has all of the fine personal qualities of a traditional Virginia gentleman. His every action reflects the highest personal integrity, a gentleness of manner, and consideration for the viewpoints of others. He is a true disciple of Jeffersonian principles.

"Mr. Gary has been an invaluable counselor to me as Secretary of the Treasury, and to my predecessors, in the conduct of the affairs of this Department. We shall sorely miss the benefit of his wise counsel and leadership in future Congresses. He is a most deserving recipient of the Treasury Department's Distinguished Service Award."

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, POSTMASTER GENERAL, AT THE CENTRAL RICHMOND ASSOCIATION LUNCHEON HONORING CONGRESSMAN J. VAUGHAN GARY

Today, I have come to Richmond to set into motion the machinery for building a magnificent new city post office.

That in itself is a major event, for this structure, when completed, will be one of the most modern postal facilities in the world, designed specifically to meet the needs of your fine city. It will further enable us to provide your citizens and your business firms with the best possible service at the lowest possible cost.

I am sure I am echoing the sentiments of each of you here today when I say that this post office is long overdue. The main part of your present structure is more than half the age of our Nation—having been completed in 1858. As a landmark, I am sure it is a source of pride to the citizens of this historic city, but as a functional clearinghouse for ever-growing volumes of mail, it is woefully behind the times. Richmond is a vibrant, pulsating city, with its feet firmly planted in the 20th century, and its postal facilities must be no less up to date.

So I am happy to be the harbinger of yet another step toward modernization.

Having said that, however, I must confess that your new post office is not the only reason for my presence here today. My other prime objective is to pay tribute to one of the best friends the Post Office Department ever has had, and one of the most dedicated Congressman a constituency ever has elected—your own Congressman J. Vaughan Gary.

As you know, Congressman Gary today ends a distinguished career in the U.S. House of Representatives, and I can think of no more appropriate comment to make in connection with his retirement than to quote one of his own colleagues: "With him will go knowledge and experience that we will probably never live to see duplicated again." We in the postal service echo that sentiment.

The statistics of Vaughan Gary's career are familiar to all of you here today. Elected to Congress in 1945, his talents were soon recognized when he was named chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Treasury and Post Office Departments just 4 years later. In the intervening years he has come to be known as one of the leading spokesmen in the House for fiscal responsibility. And, as ranking Democrat on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, he capped his career during the past session of Congress by steering President's Johnson's highly successfull foreign aid bill through the House, in addition to his other pressing duties.

These tell the achievements of the man—but little of how he went about accomplishing them, or, for that matter, little about him personally. And that, I think is the most impressive story of all. I have not known Congressman Gary long, having met him when I took over as Postmaster General just 15 months ago, but I consider myself privileged to have known him at all.

First, let me preface my personal remarks about Mr. Gary by telling you that my opinion of the Congress has been drastically altered during my tenure of office in Washington. I think that from my old vantage point in Madison, Wis., I held much the same view of Congressmen as many American citizens: that they belong to a rather gentlemanly breed of public servants whose work is neither too hard nor too exacting. But I know now how wrong I was. To have seen the amount of work these men turn out under the most unimaginable pressures and responsibilities, to have gotten to know many of them and witnessed their personal devotion to the well-being of their country, has been one of the most educational experiences of my life. And I think that the highest tribute I can pay to Congressman Gary is to say that he represents the ideal of the best in our National Government. I don't say there are many to equal him, but I do say that most of them are cut from the same bolt of cloth.

I paid a courtesy call on Vaughan Gary shortly after assuming office in 1963 and, as former Tax Commissioner of Wisconsin, I was delighted to learn that he had served for 10 years as counsel and executive assistant of the Virginia Tax Board. Public finance is an experience not at all dissimilar to walking through a settlement of hostile Indians and I immediately felt I had found a kindred soul. Since he was the chairman of my subcommittee, I asked, out of deference, if he had any advice for a beginner in the postal field. A lesser man would have jumped at an opportunity like that. But Congressman Gary, in his wisdom, knew I would be much more receptive to advice when he was reviewing my budget request and refrained from speaking his mind. He replied,

instead, that he only wanted to be helpful in any way he could. I have since come to realize fully the generosity and value of that offer.

It is no exaggeration to say that he has been one of the great experts on postal operations in the history of Congress—and he didn't get that way just by sitting in his chair, listening to a lot of testimony. He was a hard worker who always did his homework, and he saw to it that his subcommittee members did the same.

He, as much as any man, is responsible for the program of modern operational research and mechanization in the Post Office and, perhaps most important of all, he has been our friend and adviser, as well as our most constructive critic.

Any Cabinet officer who ever worked with him will tell you that Congressman Gary wielded one of the sharpest pruning knives in history. When he reported out an appropriations bill, you could be sure there was no fat on it. Of course, it was to be expected that honest differences of opinion would arise. But even on those occasions, he was always the perfect gentleman, making his cuts without inflicting undue pain. In fact, he is the only man I have ever known who could take a pound of flesh without spilling an ounce of blood.

And so I think it is important to remember, on the occasion of Vaughan Gary's retirement, that while the citizens of Richmond are losing a dedicated public servant, the entire Nation is losing a respected voice of prudence and progress. As I said at the outset, we may never see the likes of him again.

Finally, because the postal service has been so close to his heart, because he has contributed so much to its improvement, I would like to use this occasion to give one final progress report for his benefit.

Because of his vital interest in mechanization, I am certain that Congressman Gary will be pleased to learn that we have inaugurated our new program of vertical improved mail—or VIM service—in high-rise office buildings. For many years, we have been delivering mail in these buildings by hand, letter carriers going from floor to floor, from office to office.

We estimate there are more than 11,000 of these carriers—many of them spending their entire workday in a single building. Twenty-three of them are necessary to service the Empire State Building alone.

Now we have begun to convince builders to install a vertical conveyor system in their new high-rise structures which can be operated by a single postal employee in a basement mailroom. Each tenant has his own locked mail trays in which he receives his mail at various intervals throughout the day. The result is a tremendous savings to us in terms of man-hours and improved mail service throughout the building.

Earlier this month I inaugurated the first such system in Dallas, Tex., which will be part of a 34-floor office building in the center of town, and builders in many other cities are now following suit.

One of the areas of our service in which I have been most vitally interested during the past year has been that of parcel post. We have taken three major steps to improve this service.

First, we have inaugurated a program to reduce damage by conducting exhaustive surveys to determine the major causes of such damage and then by taking immediate steps to eliminate those causes.

Second, we have inaugurated a new program of pool casing. This is a system by which large mailers of parcels can presort their packages by sectional centers, pack them in large pool case containers and send each case directly to its area destination with the confidence that their parcels will arrive safely and swiftly.

And third, we are well into our program of scheduled delivery of parcel post in many areas throughout the United States. The key to this program is ZIP code which I will discuss in a moment. In brief, we are now able to guarantee next-day delivery of all ZIP coded packages within a given radius and you can imagine what a boon this is to mailers of perishable goods. We are looking forward to the day when we can put this system into operation in the Richmond area.

ZIP code, itself, of course, is the most important single postal innovation in this century. It is our answer to the most pressing problem of all—ever increasing mail volumes. I like to call this increase a mail explosion, which is taking place side-by-side our population explosion. In fact, it is more than that, because our mail volume is increasing at a higher rate than our population. It has now reached the tremendous total of 72 billion pieces a year—as much as the rest of the world's combined volume.

There are many facets to ZIP code. One is that it simplifies our sorting procedures and reduces the chances of error. Before ZIP code, there were thousands of sorting possibilities and it was obviously impossible for any human being to memorize them all. Under ZIP code, however, every letter will go to one of 566 sectional centers, according to the first three numbers of the code. In the near future, an optical scanner will further speed the process by "reading" the ZIP codes and sorting the letters automatically.

ZIP code is also a means by which we can improve upon our transportation and distribution procedures. And, because we can send mail directly to the 566 sectional centers, it allows us to eliminate several handlings along the way.

And finally, ZIP code is a means by which large mailers can use their automatic data processing equipment to sequence their mailing lists and then presort their mail according to sectional center destination. From the point of view of its total impact, this is the most important facet of all. Most people do not realize it, but 75 percent of all our mail is business mail. And when we reach the point where the majority of this mail isn't even unbagged until it reaches its destination area, then we will truly have solved the problem of the mail explosion. That day, I might add, may not be far off. At the present time, I am planning steps to require all large volume users of second and third class mail to presort and I am also planning to ask Congress to provide legislation to require the same of large first-class users. I think, in the long run, the American business community will be happy about these actions, because they will guarantee them speedier mail service and will help to hold rates down to a reasonable level.

And so, Congressman Gary, you are leaving us at the beginning of an exciting new era. Many of the plans which you helped us to inaugurate are just now beginning to bear fruit. Our performance during this past Christmas season, I believe, was proof of the pudding. If you remember what happened in Chicago last year, when the mail bags were stacked up in trucks from the main post office all the way up to the Merchandise Mart—and stayed there until after December 25—I think you can appreciate what we have managed to accomplish in 12 short months.

This year we handled even more mail and did it in record time. One of the ways by which we were able to accomplish this was with the addition of a new mechanized parcel post station in Southside Chicago, and I know it would have gladdened your heart to see all those new machines saving us money and speeding the mail. We probably wouldn't even have had those machines if it hadn't been for your insistence years ago.

But I think I should remind you, Mr. Gary, before you start thinking that you're going to miss all the excitement in Washington, that there is a bright side to your retirement: You won't have to be around when I go to Congress for a rate increase on second- and third-class mail next month. You can sit down here in your law office, watch the fireworks go off up north, and think of me dodging the brickbats. Come to think about it, being Postmaster General isn't much different from being State tax commissioner. I'm still in Apache Territory and the Indians are still on the warpath.

At least it will be peaceful here in Richmond—and you certainly deserve the change.

And I know that a few years from now, when the new Post Office is completed here, you will take great pride in the knowledge that you, more than any man, were responsible for it.

A Long Journey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, as we start work on the long legislative process ahead, we will encounter many difficulties. However, I feel the editorial that appeared in the Perry Daily Chief of Perry, Iowa, speaks very well to our situation, and I would like to insert it into the RECORD so that it might be read by all of my distinguished colleagues:

[From the Perry (Iowa) Daily Chief, Jan. 11, 1965]

A LONG JOURNEY

The Great Society is not so much a goal as a journey.

It was a journey the first settlers were on when "they saw the coast of a new world," to borrow words from President Johnson's state of the Union message.

It is a journey our children will take up after us.

Though the goal of the Great Society is an ideal always before us, always beyond our grasp, there are many stages along the way toward it, many secondary goals we must achieve.

The President outlined a long list of them. Some were specific, such as increased aid to education, retraining of displaced workers, raising of the minimum wage, new attacks on crime and delinquency.

Others were more general, such as seeking the peace, strengthening the economy, improving "the quality of life for all."

The emphasis of the President's message was on the domestic front. Though world affairs will continue to draw upon our energy and courage, "today," he said, "we can turn increased attention to the character of American life."

This is because "we are in the midst of the greatest upsurge of economic well-being in the history of any nation."

Yet it is a well-being that millions do not share. It is a lopsided prosperity, a society with certain flaws which can no longer be tolerated.

For the first time the Nation has the means and the will to attack the root causes of poverty and other social ills. We have the 11th-hour challenge to conserve the beauty and resources of our land for future generations.

We have the unprecedented opportunity to show the world that our material prosperity is no fluke, but that it and our dream of a good life for all men are natural consequences of free government by freemen.

Now that the Nation has had time to weigh the President's words it is evident that they were less a blueprint than an exhortation, despite his calm measured manner of speaking. He promised detailed proposals for national action in the coming weeks.

Mr. Johnson was given an overwhelming mandate by the people in November. He has a fresh Congress well disposed toward the course he has charted for the Nation.

Undoubtedly, there will be setbacks, failures, changes of direction. But the Johnson era has fairly begun.

Northern California Still Numbed by Devastation of Christmas Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, a story written by the Associated Press on the havoc wrought by the Christmas floods in northern California vividly portrays the situation facing the people in my district.

I felt my colleagues would be interested in reading this article for their personal information and edification. I, therefore, insert this newspaper clipping in the RECORD at this time:

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STILL NUMBED BY DEVASTATION OF CHRISTMAS FLOOD

EUREKA, CALIF.—A sea of mud and silt still covers miles of northern California, 1 month after the devastating Christmas week floods.

The area looks as if a berserk giant from a scary fairy tale had stalked the land.

Wreckage and debris that once were homes, businesses, barns and schools lie in twisted, weird shapes like surrealist paintings.

Massive log jams, reaching 25 to 30 feet high, blanket the landscape. Sections of bridges and chunks of highways are scattered about fields.

Northern California is a blend of noise and silence.

COMMUNITY GHOSTLY

The highway crews, farmers, ranchers and businessmen work almost around the clock to restore the roads and the land and its towns.

Pepperwood, a community of 250 once famous for its vegetables, lies buried under the sticky silt as high as desert dunes.

The only visible sign of life Friday was a lost goose wandering over the mud flats where fields once bloomed.

Weott, a frequent stop for tourists traveling the Redwood Forest trails, is as silent as death. No one remains in the ravaged community of 300.

The post office is perched atop the bus station. A motel lies in a cavern below the surface of the road.

The force and havoc of the holiday floods that roared across most of Northern California becomes more vivid as the waters recede. The death toll was 23; the damage estimate ranges from $300 to $500 million.

John Erreca, public works director for the State of California, visited the stricken area recently and said, "This makes you cry inside."

Hundreds of those caught in the flood waters of the Eel, Russian, Klamath and Feather Rivers are returning to scrape out a new life from the scarred lands.

"These people have remarkable tenacity. They know there are no favorites when the rivers strike," said Charles Shallen, Humboldt County director of public works.

They wade in deep mud to lay new foundations under their homes. Much of the furniture is stacked on the second floors of larger homes.

The damage to the economy of northern California has been deeper than the physical hurt.

Harvey Harper, a car dealer in Eureka, said the flood had wiped out hundreds of jobs.

"We feel the pinch every day. In every 24 hours we are called upon to rewrite six to eight car payments. People just can't meet the payments when they don't have an income."

Three-fourths of the lumber industry, the biggest moneymaker in northern California, was swept away by the floods.

Don Falk, a Eureka attorney, said, "People are still shocked, but the deeper shock is coming. We are losing $600,000 daily in personal income. We're trying to salvage our property, even more we're trying to salvage our economy."

Chilean Student Visitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my privilege to visit with a group of 15 students from Chile who are attending the University of Texas on a student exchange program. They spent 2 days in Washington, visiting our Capitol, the State Department, and other historic spots of interest in this area.

It was my pleasure to tell these young people that we here in the United States feel a special bond with the people of Chile. Their country, like ours, is a nation of immigrants—a melting pot of Spanish, German, Italian, French, Swiss, and other nationalities. Their idea of self-government closely parallels that of our country. Chile is as democratic as any Latin American country in the Western Hemisphere. Their President is elected in much the same way as ours. Their courts are established by law as are those of our country. Throughout their government—as with ours—there is a system of what we call checks and balances—separation of powers—a system unique to a true democracy.

While the economy of Chile is perhaps not as diversified as that of the United States, that country makes a substantial contribution to the world's economy by its large exportation of copper and nitrate.

The bonds of friendship between Chile and the United States have been strengthened by that country's participation in the Alliance for Progress program, created by the late President Kennedy, and in the Organization of American States. The meeting of the Foreign Ministers in July last year made the attitude of the countries of the Western Hemisphere entirely clear with respect to their position toward Cuba and Castroism.

This exchange program, which permits students from Chile to come to our country to live, to study, to get to know us better, further unites the young people of our two countries. These young people are the future leaders of the world. A deeper understanding through their personal contact cannot help but lighten the difficult task of leadership which lies before them.

It was both a privilege and an honor to be with these young people. I am particularly pleased to list the names of those students with whom I visited—and for whom I wish the very best in the years ahead.

The students who are participating in this program are: Ledy Aguero, Patti Cermanatti, Soledad Ranirez, Gaston Araya, Jose Corres, Julio Escheverria, Estenco Gonzales, Carlos Nieto, German Pequeno, Edwardo Ravani, and Ricardo Whiting. They were accompanied by Prof. Carlos Foreste, Mrs. Cindy Keever, and Dean Joe W. Neal.

Taft Family Record Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the attack on the late Senator Robert A. Taft and other members of the Taft family have been a source of disappointment to those of us who know of the distinguished service they have rendered to this country and to the Republican Party.

The magazine America last year in discussing the war on poverty said certain things about the supposed lack of a Republican position and lack of interest which I found both highly inaccurate and partisan. I replied to the editors of America to point out to them that the Republicans on the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee had unanimously made recommendations in connection with obtaining more employment and retraining before the administration did.

I note with interest that the Honorable Charles P. Taft, of Cincinnati, has found it necessary in the January 9, 1965, issue of America to submit a letter defending the good name and integrity of his distinguished father, Chief Justice William H. Taft. Because it is important that these efforts to correct an error are noted by as many responsible individuals as possible, I feel that careful readers of the RECORD, especially the press who probably read the America article about the Tafts in the first place but did not get to see the correcting letter by Charles P. Taft, should have access to it. Below follows the full text of a letter entitled "Chief Justice William H. Taft" submitted by Charles P. Taft, as printed

in the January 9, 1965, issue of America, page 30:

CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM H. TAFT

EDITOR: Father Austin P. Morris ("Pressure Politics in the Church," November 14) made a most unfair statement about my father's record as judge and Chief Justice. He is described as "dutifully restraining labor's efforts to improve working conditions." This is a most inaccurate account of his labor decisions.

In 1917, the Hitchman Coal & Coke case was decided, with the opinion written by Mr. Justice Pitney. This was a most anti-labor decision. Within the first few months of my father's service as Chief Justice in 1921, he wrote the opinion in the American Steel Foundries case, which permitted picketing by persons representing the local labor council who had never been employed at American Steel Foundries. This was a unanimous decision which included Justice Pitney and turned the whole tone of Supreme Court labor decisions.

In addition, he wrote the opinions in the stockyards and grain exchange cases, establishing Federal power to regulate business in both areas under the interstate commerce clause. Mr. Justice Frankfurter told me that these two cases were the very solid basis for the Wagner Act decisions in the 1930's, 15 years later.

Father Morris' report about my father's opinion of Justice Brandeis is again most unfair, because it designates the time of the opinion as the period when he and Brandeis were serving together on the Supreme Court. Actually, it was expressed when Brandeis was nominated. My father's views later changed very much. The two men became good friends and colleagues with mutual respect. My father's most vigorous criticisms in private were for Mr. Justice McReynolds, who was well over on the right among the members of the court.

Apparently, Father Morris thinks that my father was "that type of statesman who appears unalterably convinced that all improvement is to be obtained through the faithful and loyal preservation of the past." Father Morris has obviously not read Mr. Pringle's account of my father's administration. He was attacked by the protectionists, by the bankers, by the railroad men, and by others for similar reasons, because of his Canadian Reciprocity Treaty, the amendments to the Hepburn Act regulating railroad rates, the postal savings bill and, of course, the adoption of the inheritance tax and the submission of the income tax amendment and the direct election of Senators amendment. These measures hardly represent the faithful and loyal preservation of the past.

CHARLES P. TAFT.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

No Pity for the Provident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it does seem that all of the emphasis during this session has been directed toward awards for the improvident without any thought at all of considering those of our citizens who, by sacrifice, are provident and take care of themselves.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 3, 1965, calls attention to our somewhat overemphasis of this subject:

NO PITY FOR THE PROVIDENT

In case you hadn't noticed, budgets are going up all over the place, not just in Washington, D.C. California, New Jersey, and New York are among the States asking their legislatures for king-size allowances.

New York's spending proposal is up $600 million to nearly $3.5 billion, and it is accompanied by hearty new tax bites. A 2-percent sales tax would be imposed (New York City already has 4 percent) plus 100-percent boosts in levies on auto registrations and cigarettes. Even all that isn't enough; bonds will also have to be issued. There is no end in sight to the growth of these burdens on the people.

Why should it be so? Governor Rockefeller of New York put the matter in an interesting light. "We will not avoid our responsibilities," he said, "and leave a vacuum which would be filled by the Federal Government."

The theory would carry more weight were it not for the fact that the Federal Government is busily filling up every nook and cranny it can, whether a vacuum exists or not. In particular President Johnson's budget demands stupefying outlays for education and social welfare, and these are the very areas where State and local spending in much of the Nation is notably on the increase. Many of us would prefer to pay on the State and local level, but what we find is every type of officialdom embarked on a spending rampage.

The truth appears to be that, apart from the spending proclivities of most politicians, the Nation is getting into that classic situation where the provident must pour out ever more of their resources to support a rapidly growing army of the improvident; more correctly, the people who are willing to take anything anyone is willing to hand them.

The Nation must always take care of the relatively few who truly cannot care for themselves because of unavoidable misfortune or inadequate endowments. But that is not the same thing as the creation of a handout state. If such a state is what we collectively want, then at least we have a duty—for the sake of our children if nothing else—to examine some of the basic questions involved.

In the field of education, some questioning is going on, though apparently not in the Halls of Congress and the State legislatures. At a time when the Government wants to put every kid in college, professors in various institutions are appalled at how many are already overloading the campuses without any intellectual business there: Those for whom college is just a means of postponing work, who are interested only in the social activities, who would be better off learning a skilled trade.

Even if the fetish of college for everybody is accepted as national policy, however, the question of the burden remains. How much more of your income does the State or Central Government have a right to take in order to educate somebody else's child? If the answer is that there is literally no limit, then how long is the whole thing going to be possible in a time of swiftly increasing population?

The same applies to welfare spending. Do you have a moral obligation to subsidize a man who would rather take relief than work, families that refuse to abide by the most minimal standards of behavior? The social workers customarily say that chiseling is a fairly small part of welfare, but the actual facts are not always easy to ascertain. What cannot be denied is that welfare spending, municipal, State, and Federal, is soaring.

In sum, we think the handout philosophy is getting out of bounds, not only in terms of money but in terms of charity and ethics; all too often it is becoming a corrupter of charity and ethics. It is time someone told the Governors and lawmakers and administrators that the provident, too, have some rights to their own sustenance. If they are not to have rights, the Nation will be undercutting the main source of its enterprise and well-being.

Man's Journey to Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I am pleased to include an address given by Capt. Michael J. MacInnes, U.S. Navy, Catholic Chaplain Corps research team, Navy Yard, Washington, D.C., to the February 5 breakfast meeting of the Capitol Hill First Friday Club, St. Peter's Church, Second and C Streets SE., Washington, D.C. Father MacInnes, a Franciscan priest ordained in 1941, and a U.S. Navy officer since 1943, has been in action in both the Atlantic and Pacific Fleet operations. His remarks on one of today's most pressing topics, unity, are constructive and significant, and I herewith enter the text of his speech.

MAN'S JOURNEY TO UNITY

(By Capt. Michael J. MacInnes, U.S. Navy)

Original thinkers are very few. I assure you I am not one, but would like to share with you the thoughts of one. Therefore, this short talk might be entitled "Variations by MacInnes on a Theme From Teilhard de Chardin." The theme is a happy one but, in some ways, a disturbing one.

In our lifetime we are going through an era of accelerated change, so rapid, in fact, that the underlying meaning of the changes escape most thinking men. The nonthinkers are concerned only with the superficial aspects of the changes. The old saying, "things will never be the same," was said, no no doubt, the first time, by Adam to Eve in the Garden of Paradise. He, at least, understood why they would never be the same.

God never intended that things should remain static—quite the opposite. He alone is immutable. Man by his very nature is subject to change. This is the way God made us. When I say "us," I mean not only "us" at this present moment but humanity from the beginning to the end of existence. Why this reason for change?

Man is the result of God's highest evolutionary process on earth. This process has not ended with the dawn of reason. It continues in its highest form. Life itself is defined philosophically as "movement from within." This "movement from within" is continually perfecting the individual and carrying humanity to greater heights and accomplishment. To speak of human life is to speak of intellectual movement expanding in consciousness and knowledge. Since mankind is the sum of human beings, mankind is always moving forward from within. This means change, change leading to the unification of mankind under the providence of God. It is an inevitable change. At times it can be checked but never denied. It adheres to our nature as the law of photogenesis in a plant causes it to seek sunlight.

Man is not an isolated individual. He is a conscious part of the human race. He is

born in society, lives and grows in society, learns in and relates to society, and causes society to evolve, that is, to change. Man's progress is not circumscribed by race, language, culture, or country. It is supranatural. The race, humanity, society, mankind—call it what you will—embraces all of us from the first to the last man on earth. Therefore, each individual contributes to and derives benefits from the race. He has both rights and responsibilities vis-a-vis all humanity.

As man grows through change, so humanity grows and its progress is toward unity. Organically and intellectually, modern man is little different from his ancestors of the ice age; but, because of the intervening experiences and progress of the race, modern man is superior in self-knowledge, awareness of his place in and responsibility to the universe, his ability to comprehend the whole of life, and the consciousness of his relationship with all things.

Just a brief time ago, the horizon of most men stopped at the edge of his village, his relationships were confined to a handful of his equals, and his vocabulary was limited to a few spoken words to express his meager thoughts. Yet even then, he was as always becoming, no matter how slowly and imperceptibly. He was reaching out to enlarge his universe by association with the world around him and his fellowmen. At times great movements or events accelerated his consciousness and tendency to unification.

Since we cannot know the present except by understanding of the past, let us note some of these movements and events since Christ that have stimulated the progress of humanity toward greater involvement with his fellowmen: Christianity, the Crusades, the renaissance, the reformation period of exploration and discovery, colonization of the world rise of modern states, industrial revolution, American and French revolts, unification of modern Europe, nationalism, World War I, international communism, the League of Nations, great depression, World War II, United Nations, NATO, SEATO, Vatican Council I, Vatican Council II, World Council of Churches, and Ecumenical Movement.

The changes within our society effecting unification are self-evident. They have been as inexorable as the laws governing the course of the starts in the universe. Was it not Senator Dirksen who said, "There is nothing as strong as an idea whose time has come"?

Increased industrialization and mechanization have been the vehicle carrying this progressive evolution of mankind toward unity. Material progress, wonderful as it has been, is but a means to an end. It is not progress in itself. Progress is a force—a consciousness of all that is and all that can be. It is the force stimulating mankind throughout the world today and stirring it up to the dismay of many.

At certain moments in history, human consciousness has risen to the perception of new dimensions and values. Our age is such a moment of awakening and transformation. The ills which afflict us are birth and growing pains. What looks like no more than a hunger for material well-being is in reality a hunger for higher being: for a condition where the individual can hope to attain to the fullness of his personality, his energies, his power of action, and his consciousness by a well-ordered integration into humanity.

Progress means change: and to effect change is to undermine the painfully established order. The pain must be endured. You cannot prevent the change. You can only try to understand and guide it. You cannot hold back this movement toward unification of mankind any more than you can stop an avalanche. It is assured by God in accordance with His eternal laws. Material progress alone will not satisfy mankind. If you concentrate in your legislation on material progress alone you misunderstand humanity and you misunderstand the times. No longer can you be concerned with the isolated individual, be he your constituent or a citizen of our country. You must combine all things for the perfection of all men, to integrate them with the unified group in which mankind must eventually culminate both organically and spiritually. The lowliest individual in the world still seeks the liberty, equality and fraternity guaranteed to him by his nature:

Liberty to become; that is, the chance to develop his potentialities to the fullest.

Equality: to participate; that is, the right to live coextensively with all mankind.

Fraternity: to join the evolutionary progress; that is, to be represented on the evolutionary wave still in progress.

Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I quote herewith an extract from the February 6, 1965, issue of the West Virginia Hillbilly:

MEDICARE

Dr. Sjoerd Steunebrink, who doctored in Holland where he didn't like it, and in Summersville for the Laird Clinic, where he did, had something to say from Houston, Tex., last week where he is afraid he's not going to like it if medicare passes.

What we know on this short-lived West Virginian and his distaste for the Government in medicine, we got from the Houston Post, which wrote him up this way:

Dr. Sjoerd Steunebrink, a Houston physician who left his native Holland to escape socialized medicine in particular and socialism in general, feels that he is hearing the same old refrain being played in the United States.

Steunebrink said the current drive in the United States for medicare imitates the actions of the Dutch in 1950. Holland, a Socialist country, also got its strong push to the left through socialized medicine, he said.

"Medicine is used as bait (by Socialists) because medicine works on the sentiments of the people. Everyone feels sorry for the amputees and the blind," the doctor explained.

The 6-foot, 7-inch native of Amsterdam listed his criticisms of socialized medicine.

"Doctors are overburdened with bureaucratic paperwork and 'silly' inconveniences," he said. Patients can come to see the doctor every day and visit him, seeking free bandages and cotton. They frequently call doctors throughout the night on minor matters. Recuperated patients must receive notes from their doctors authorizing their return to work.

Patients are unhappy with the system, according to Dr. Steunebrink. They are assigned to certain doctors and cannot change to another physician, regardless of how unsatisfied they may be. The patient is assigned a number upon entering the doctor's office. He clearly is treated as a number, not a human, Dr. Steunebrink said.

Prescriptions and consultations are done by the number. There is no time for proper examinations or for a favorable doctor-patient relationship, due to the large number of patients and the services they seek, he added. A seriously ill person—such as one with pneumonia—must wait his time in the doctor's office while the physician treats the not so ill, the hypochondriacs, and those seeking free supplies, prescriptions, and various paper forms.

A serious emergency—such as a man suffering a heart attack—does not bring the expected rush to a hospital, Steunebrink said. Before the man could enter the hospital, another type of physician—a controlling doctor—must be summoned and visit the patient to determine that the case is serious.

"It is needless to say that the man might die if the stroke is acute or if the controlling doctor is on another case and does not arrive for 2 or 3 hours," Steunebrink added.

A patient cannot go to a specialist, unless the regular doctor to whom he is assigned suggests it. Then, another type of controlling doctor—whose job it is to keep down expenses to the Government—must be summoned and approve the use of a specialist.

Steunebrink, while in Holland, was a third type of controlling doctor—one to check on patients absent from work to determine if they were ill or merely pretending to be.

"I had precedence over the family doctor," Steunebrink said. "If their family doctor had ordered them to bed until Wednesday and I decided that they were able to go to work on Monday, they did. This conflict in orders occurred often."

He added that patients who became rude over his order for them to return to work could be fined one-fourth a month's salary. Also, he said, patients listed as sick were supposed to be in bed at all times. It is illegal for a near-well convalescent to be sitting up, reading, or drinking tea.

While defining the doctors as dedicated men, Steunebrink said that the endless red-tape, restrictions, and responsibilities are disheartening, and the physicians often become slack.

"I did not study medicine for so many years to become some sort of law-enforcement officer," he added.

Crowded hospitals create problems. The doctor said that because of the shortage of rooms, many persons in need of hospitalization and minor corrective surgery are excluded. Hernia cases are put on the waiting list for surgery. The wait may be 2 or 3 years. Often the corrective operation never takes place.

Steunebrink sees medicare as the beginning of socialism in the United States, such as prevails in Holland, where it "began with medicine, but now runs the businesses of all businessmen."

National Children's Dental Health Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the 20th century has rightly been called the age of miracles. People fortunate enough to be living in this era have been witnesses to and even participants in many of mankind's most remarkable advances: This is especially true in the field of health, including dental health. February 7 through 13 is a timely week in which to remind ourselves of this, since it is being celebrated throughout the country as the

17th National Children's Dental Health Week.

The science and art of dentistry has made giant strides in this century to minimize the pain, disfigurement, loss of productive time and cost arising from mankind's most prevalent affliction, dental disease. Our proper concern over the still appalling rate of dental disease should not blind us to this fact. The discovery of the great benefits of fluoridation, the increasing use of drug therapy in dental practice, the highspeed instruments to both reduce the discomfort of dental treatment and conserve the precious time of the dentist are all of relatively recent origin. Today we are on the threshold of new breakthroughs, perhaps even including a vaccine against tooth decay.

I am proud to say that the dental profession of the United States has long been the world leader in these progressive developments. In American dentistry, the members of the Pennsylvania Dental Association hold high place. This year, under the able direction of Dr. Walter F. Hrin, of Johnstown, president of the Pennsylvania Society of Dentistry for Children, the Pennsylvania group, together with parallel societies in all of the States, are making use of this week to tell the American people, especially the young, the story of dentistry, to recall to our minds the vital importance to dental health and the simple, routine procedures all of us should follow in order to achieve and maintain good dental health.

If the profession is to succeed in its efforts during this week and throughout the year, it needs the unified help of all of us. As it has often and truly been said, the health of our people is the nation's most valuable resource. The intimate relationship between dental health and general well-being is well-established and it seems to me that Children's Dental Health Week is a good time for all of us to keep in mind that our high rate of dental disease could be reduced drastically and swiftly if each individual would cooperate more closely than ever before with the profession both in regard to his own health and that of the youngsters in his family.

My sincere congratulations to the dentists and all others associated with that profession on the 17th National Children's Dental Health Week.

Charles Daly: From J.F.K. and L.B.J. to G.W.B.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last fall Charles U. Daly came from the White House to the University of Chicago as vice president for public affairs. He brings to a great university a background of experience and knowledge which will fit him to serve the university well.

I am extending my remarks to include an article from the Chicago Maroon which contains an article by David Aiken setting forth a campus appraisement of Charles Daly:

(By David L. Aiken)

"When I left Washington, I felt that an opportunity to carry on the finer parts of President Kennedy's existence rested in Chicago," says Charles U. Daly, who served as staff assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson before coming to University of Chicago last fall as vice president for public affairs.

Daly was one of only four men who worked from the White House to get administration bills through the House and Senate. He and one other man were in charge of House liaison, while one man took the Senate. All were under the direction of Lawrence O'Brien, special assistant to President Kennedy who has been kept on by Johnson.

O'BRIEN TO QUIT AS L.B.J. AID

Daly is quite certain that O'Brien has notified Johnson that he intends to resign this spring, to let Johnson have his own people on his personal staff. "Although Johnson is anxious to keep O'Brien, and even boosted his salary last month to the highest possible level, I'm sure that O'Brien is so convinced that each President must have his own team that he definitely plans to leave in the spring," Daly said.

Daly spoke in a Maroon interview in his office on the fifth floor of the administration building, which he has occupied since November after he finished his duties on Capitol Hill. Daly, who is only 37, sat across a long table piled with letters, some from the Washington Congressmen and bureaucrats he got to know since February 1962, when he joined the White House staff.

HELP FUNDRAISING

Part of his job at the University of Chicago will be to help this university emulate Stanford University's highly successful fundraising drive in 1961. Before going to Washington, Daly spent almost a year editing publications developed for the Stanford drive. He joins Richard F. O'Brien, now at the University of Chicago as vice president for planning and development, who was also director of the Stanford development program.

The other parts of Daly's job have been announced as "(1) public relations; (2) community relations; (3) external communications, including (the university's) publications; (4) alumni affairs and (5) special conference assignments. He also will assist in the development of activities to commemorate the university's forthcoming 75th anniversary," says the publicity release given out to announce his appointment in September. While Daly already has started work on several projects, he says he is still finding out just where he will prove to be most useful.

One task for which he is well suited, of course, is to keep government men aware of what the University of Chicago and higher education in general need. He notes, however, that he is not the only man connected with the University of Chicago who has experience in pacing the halls of the capital, and he will have many duties besides chatting with his friends in the Federal agencies.

SAW OLD BOSS INAUGURATED

During last week's inauguration festivities, Daly dropped in to pay his respects at the White House, but also managed to slip in a considerable amount of discussion with officials and Congressmen. He invited some of them to come out and take a firsthand look at the campus, and chat with administrators, faculty, and students. Visitors who have already dropped by include Daly's close friend Pierre Salinger, who was Kennedy's press secretary, and was Senator from California for a while, after the death of Senator Clair Engle. Also, there have been visits from Congressmen, and a Federal tariff commissioner.

This sort of tactic in approaching Congressmen seems in keeping with the approach Daly and the other legislative liaison men used for the White House. "We couldn't use arm twisting, because arms get numb pretty fast when we have to keep going back in a month or two to every Congressman. Besides, many of them could say they ran well ahead of the President in the 1960 election."

Instead, Kennedy's men tried to "establish an identity of interest between the Congressman and the President, and keep aware of their district's problems." There were only four liaison men, he said, because the Congressman had to feel he could be sure of getting to the President's ear through his aids, and "you couldn't be sure of that if there were 20 or so men trying to get the President's ear."

L.B.J. DOES MORE HIMSELF

The job was slightly different when Johnson had to take over, Daly said. Johnson tends to pick up the phone and do his own talking more than Kenendy did, and also has a more pragmatic approach: "less motivated by ideals than by practical requirements" in his dealings with Congress, Daly noted.

Kennedy obviously won tremendous loyalty from his aids. After the late President was assassinated, Daly says, "Johnson really strained himself to make the Kennedy people feel welcome, and we were delighted to be asked to finish as much as possible of the unfinished agenda Kennedy had left."

The job became easier with the changed attitude of the Nation and Congress after the assassination, Daly said. Although "the program passed following Johnson's entrance would have been passed for Kennedy, we would not have come so close to passing medicare under Kennedy as we did with Johnson."

DANGER WITH EASIER PASSAGE

"Now, Johnson can pass anything," Daly continued. In this new situation after election of a big Democratic majority and a change in House rules to overcome stumbling blocks to liberals, many Congressmen, ironically, see a danger, even for the liberals, Daly noted.

"The danger is that what Johnson sends up to Congress would be viewed only as a minimum. The liberals might want to load a lot of extra benefits onto the medicare bill, for instance," he noted, implying that the administration would not think this wise.

The new ease of getting bills onto the floor without blocks from the House Rules Committee will be "wonderful for some bills for which the liberals have been fighting for years. Some people, however, don't want other bills brought up which might be hard to vote against, even though they're bad bills. For instance, there's a bill which has been around for some time to pay bonuses to any World War I veterans that would be almost as big as those paid to some disabled World War II veterans," Daly said.

The most difficult bills to lobby for Kennedy were the Urban Affairs Department proposal, which failed partially because southerners when they learned that Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, was intended to head it; the civil rights bill; and medicare. Johnson signed a civil rights bill last year, and will have an easy time of getting another version of the Urban Affairs Department and the medicare bill, Daly predicted.

LIFE OF PUBLIC SERVICE

While Daly has gone to work for a private university, he speaks warmly of his years in public service. He got his start in 1959 and 1960, when he worked under then Senator John Kennedy and then Representative Stewart Udall, as a member of the American Political Science Association's congressional fellowship program.

"I think there are great advantages in public service," he commented. "I would, of course, have great interest in seeing that students interested in that direction get whatever help I'm capable of giving them."

Working for Kennedy is "a hard act to follow," Daly said, because of "the things that Kennedy did in Washington, the atmosphere he tried to instill, what he learned about civil rights, and what many of us learned about the importance of civil rights and the responsibility of everybody to take interest in the international field."

The University of Chicago, however, seems to him the right place to try to follow that act, because "the attitude of people here to the general and world communities makes you feel these people have high ideals, and they will have high impact on the local and world scene."

President Johnson Offers a Realistic Approach to Agricultural Legislation

SPEECH

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I am very pleased with President Johnson's message on agriculture and rural development, which was delivered to the Congress Thursday. It offers a realistic approach to drafting agricultural legislation that will serve the interests of all America, both urban and rural.

The President's message clearly demonstrates that he understands the difficult problems confronting rural America. It demonstrates that he is firmly committed to the task of solving them. I sincerely hope the President receives the support of all the Congress in that task.

I want to specifically emphasize two important points the President made in his message:

First, that poverty is a rural, as well as an urban problem.

The rural unemployed and underemployed are largely out of sight—

The President said. But they are there, nevertheless, and I hope the Congress will enact the sort of legislation proposed by the President that will make the war on poverty a truly effective force in rural America.

Second, that the farm commodity programs are valuable and should be—in the President's words—"continued and improved." Some critics have suggested that these programs are too expensive. But the only valid test of any Government program is not whether it costs money but whether it accomplishes the purposes for which it is intended.

Last September, for example, the Library of Congress reported that for each $100 of net Commodity Credit Corporation expenditure on price support and acreage diversion programs in 1961, 1962, and 1963, farm income was increased $236. And if there had been no price supports during those 3 years, the report added, it would have resulted in an annual loss in farm income of some $6 billion, as well as annual losses of several billion dollars in farm real estate values.

As a Representative from Iowa, a State where both the rural and urban economy is heavily dependent on corn production, I was particularly happy to read this portion of the President's message:

Voluntary feed grain and wheat programs should be extended. Specific recommendations will be transmitted to the Congress which will permit the operation of these programs to be simplified and make it possible for additional crops—particularly soybeans—to be grown as needed on acreage diverted from grains.

Authority should be continued for the Secretary of Agriculture to set price support levels and to adjust other program features as conditions may require.

The feed grains program has been a success. It is essential for Iowa, and for the other States that have benefited from its operation, that the feed grains program be continued. But there is always room for improvement, and I endorse the President's recommendation.

Allowing farmers to raise soybeans on some of the land diverted from feed grain production should add flexibility to the program, reduce the overall cost to the Government, and increase farm income for those participating in the program.

Moreover, by increasing soybean production, the change should bolster America's farm export position. There is now a heavy demand abroad for soybeans and it is estimated that the United States will need at least 200 million bushels for export this year, if it is to maintain its competitive position in the world market. And, as the President pointed out in his message yesterday, the welfare of American agriculture is linked closely to foreign trade.

The Congress still has before it the job of enacting specific legislation in specific areas of agriculture. That will not be an easy task. But the general philosophy of the President's message is a most encouraging point from which to begin.

The Cheating Scandals at the Air Force Academy

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I would like to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for his very fine statement on the most unfortunate situation at the Air Force Academy. Certainly the gentleman's knowledge as a graduate of West Point and as one who has maintained a continuing interest in our service academies has enabled him to shed light on this very difficult problem. The gentleman's thoughtful remarks today should do a great deal toward increasing public understanding of the regrettable problems at the Academy. I congratulate my very able colleague for the significant contribution he has made.

Home Rule?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it was with real delight that I noticed in the Washington Sunday Star of February 7, their editorial on home rule. To me it displays a lot of commonsense reasoning and I am so glad that at least one of the Washington papers can see the point that our constituents from every district in the United States are just as much interested in and have just as much right of some control over the Federal city as have those who happen to live in it.

The editorial follows:

HOME RULE?

In his message on home rule last week, President Johnson gave a somewhat misleading picture of our city's 19th century history. The past is not, however, the important consideration. In any examination of the 1965 home rule bill, the future of the Nation's Capital is what matters.

This future, in our view, depends on a continuing, indeed a growing, identification of Washington as the Federal City—the city which the whole Nation recognizes as its own. The tie that binds is sentiment, of course, but its practical expression must be in money. The people of the District cannot, by themselves, give the United States the capital it deserves. The Nation as a whole must help build and maintain here a city of which all Americans can be justly proud.

In those quite mythically glorius days of old when the District had home rule, the Nation as a whole could not have cared less about Washington and its problems. It ignored them. The territorial government established in 1871 bankrupted itself trying to make up for lost time in developing a proper Capital City. So Congress took over in 1874 with the present commission setup, the United States undertaking to share regularly in the city's costs.

Even under this arrangement, it has been a long time since the Federal Government has contributed a fair share. The great danger in the home rule concept is that, having once again relieved itself of responsibility for the day-by-day governing of the city, Congress also would be tempted to wash its hands of financial responsibility for it.

An effort has been made of late to meet this objection in home rule legislation. Recent bills, like the present one, provide a formula for an annual payment based primarily on the tax value of Federal real estate holdings in the District. The sum produced by the formula, moreover, would be advanced to the District from the Federal Treasury each year, without further congressional action.

The Star has said before, and we say now, that we could not oppose a home rule law which thus pinned down an equitable, flexible Federal payment. We are not enthusiastic about the prospect of home rule. But if home rule is the only context in which Congress will consider a payment formula—if the community could in this way be relieved of the annual humiliation of begging for money that should be forthcoming as a matter of right—the prospective gain would seem worth the risk.

The key word there is if. Congress, in our opinion, is most unlikely to make an open-end commitment to supply to an elected city council regular, substantial, and increasing amounts of public money to spend as the council sees fit. It is true—and it is important to recognize—that any future Congress could in theory renege on the promise. But it also is true that having predicated the establishment of home rule on this financial arrangement, Congress would be morally bound to observe the payment formula while home rule remained in effect. And Congress does not like to bind itself.

The home rule case is based on the philosophically appealing, democratic proposition that the community belongs to its inhabitants, and that they should govern it. The problem of Washington, however, is that it does not belong to its inhabitants; it is a special community, formed for a special Federal purpose. Can anything but the Federal authority oversee the fulfillment of that purpose? Can the government of this unique area properly be left to the people who happen to be living in it?

Proponents of home rule would argue that the President and Congress retain, under this bill, a veto over decisions of the local government. They can hardly have this thing both ways. If home rule works, the people of the city will run the city—and a giant step will have been taken away from Washington's essential position as a Federal responsibility. If Congress and the President continue to make the city's important decisions for it, then home rule begins to look like a chaotic sham.

Some advocates of the new bill say that anyone who disagrees with them can be motivated only by racial bigotry. It is an old tactic, and a dishonest one. Let us be quite clear about this. The reason one should think carefully about turning over this city to the people who live in it is not that a large proportion of them are Negroes.

The reason is that they happen to live in Washington, D.C., the Capital of these United States, which is, and ought to remain, a different sort of city.

The GOP's Thinker-in-Residence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, much has been writen about the shifting structure of the Republican organization in the House of Representatives. The one and only news article I have seen which shows some insight into what has happened and is happening appeared in the Washington Star of January 27, 1965.

I thought it was news when the House Republicans on January 6 selected a Ph. D. in Government to serve as their Assistant Sergeant at Arms, particularly as this was symbolic of what the whole movement is about. However, it seems the news media have not yet learned to report in living color. Their sketches remain black and white with good guys and bad guys dominating the scenes:

WASHINGTON CLOSE-UP: THE GOP'S THINKER-IN-RESIDENCE

(By David S. Broder)

William B. Prendergast, Ph. D., graduate of Notre Dame, the University of Louvain and the University of Chicago, O.S.S. veteran, Annapolis professor and, until last August, research director of the Republican National Committee, unpacked his books yesterday in a bare-walled office on the third floor of the Old House Office Building and set up shop as the Republicans' new thinker-in-residence.

The 50-year-old Marylander is carried on the House payroll as the $23,000-a-year minority Sergeant at Arms, but his job is to clear the mental cobwebs, not the aisles. The GOP's new House bosses—Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD and Conference Chairman MELVIN R. LAIRD—installed him in this top patronage post because of his brain, not his muscle.

Cynics may take it as a measure of the Republican Party's desperation that, having exhausted its supply of war heroes, cowboys, and businesmen, it is turning finally to the intellectuals. But last weekend's party meeting in Chicago fairly echoed with pleas for "constructive proposals, not just blind opposition"—and constructive alternatives don't come off the shelves of Goldwater's department store.

Prendergast's new assignment is to help the House Republicans think of sensible things to say about the Great Society. It's similar to the work he did for 8 years at the Republican National Committee, where his carefully documented analyses, critiques, and proposals were valued by Republicans like Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky.

As an incidental, Prendergast probably did more during this time for GOP public relations than anyone officially charged with this responsibility, simply by providing a stream of newsmen with ideas and facts that challenged administration propaganda.

With their typical lack of acuity, the Goldwater men who took over the committee last summer decided they didn't need Prendergast's kind of talent, and he took himself to a television network, which found ample use for his political expertise.

But Prendergast is a partisan and he is happiest when he is engaged in fomenting policy debate.

With the backing of FORD and LAIRD, he plans to assemble an eight-man research staff, including specialists in foreign policy, welfare programs and economic affairs.

"Some of these research people will have strange titles," he says. "We may have an assistant telephone operator with a Ph. D." Jobs like that one and Prendergast's own have long been part of the patronage system in the House, but now they will be filled by working eggheads, instead of somebody's nephew.

Prendergast also plans to bring in outside experts as consultants on these projects and to use perhaps 25 staff members from Republican congressional offices to "keep books" on administration and congressional action in as many major fields of policy.

From these, FORD and LAIRD hope, will come the ingredients of a Republican legislative program and an effective critique of President Johnson's plans.

An important side-effect will be improved briefings for Republican Congressmen and a great variety of projects on which promising Members can cut their teeth—and earn publicity.

Four task forces are in operation already, covering such fields as agriculture, economic opportunity, minority staffing, and congressional reform and implementation of the 1964 party platform. More will be forthcoming.

All this is subject to the obvious criticism that brains don't necessarily win elections. Prendergast learned that himself, when he ran unsuccessfully in Democratic districts for the House and the Maryland State Senate.

But if intelligence is no guarantee of political success, it's at least preferable to ignorance. The Republicans should know. They've tried that.

Skilled Immigrants Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 15, 1965, there appeared an editorial in the Chicago Sun Times on President Johnson's message to the Congress on the revision of the present immigration law.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the great Chicago Sun Times for editorializing and taking a positive position on one of the most important problems facing America today. The repeal of the 40-year-old national origins quota system of the immigration law is long overdue.

Every President since President Truman—President Eisenhower, the late President Kennedy, and now President Johnson has unveiled our immigration policy as sordid before the eyes of the world.

In this connection, and under leave to extend my remarks in the appendix, I include an editorial which appears in the Chicago Sun Times on Friday, January 15, 1965, as follows:

SKILLED IMMIGRANTS WELCOME

President Johnson's message to the Congress calling for a reform of the immigration laws is a necessary, useful, and humanitarian proposal.

In brief, the President made the following major points: Drop the quota system based on national origins and base admission on U.S. needs for skills on a first-come-first-served basis. Give favored treatment to members of separated families. Restrict immigration from any one country to no more than 10 percent of the total immigration figure but allow unused quotas to be shifted to another country. Give nonquota status to parents of citizens and to Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago.

The quota system has been responsible for keeping many persons of useful talent and skill from immigrating to the United States. To admit such persons would not add to the unemployment situation in the United States now or in the foreseeable future.

In Chicago, for example, there are great shortages of many special skills. There are few skilled hand tailors in Chicago. These craftsmen traditionally come from Italy. The waiting list of emigrants in Italy now numbers 250,000. Great Britain, on the other hand, has no waiting list and its quota is seldom, if ever, filled. Under the President's proposal Great Britain's unused quota could be assigned to Italy.

There are also shortages in Chicago of skilled furniture refinishers and cabinetmakers. There are critical shortages in other

highly skilled handicrafts that are normally apprenticed in Europe for long years. It is difficult to find a gourmet chef in Chicago, and there is even a shortage of high-fashion hair stylists in this area.

The list of skills in inadequate supply in the United States is a long one. It includes diemakers, glassblowers, machinists, chemists, professors, and teachers for every level of education, engineers, librarians, nurses, and veterinarians, dental and medical technicians.

The President's suggestions are also humanitarian. He notes that thousands of the citizens of this Nation are needlessly separated from their parents, children, or other close relatives. He would give favored treatment to these cases. He would remove some of the restrictions against Asians so that refugees fleeing famine and Communist oppression could be accepted in the United States.

The quota system of immigration, adopted 40 years ago, was designed to preserve the ethnic and national balance of the United States as it existed in 1920. Under that system Great Britain may send 83,000 to the United States but Greece only 308 in any given year. Italy is restricted to 5,666.

The present immigration quota system, based on race (and favoring the Nordic over all others) is not only inequitable, it reflects adversely on the principles that are the very foundations of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The President's proposals for change, which are largely the same as those set forth by President Kennedy in 1963, are sound and should be adopted.

Robert Bray—Chief of the Division for the Blind, Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, often we hear criticism of Federal officials and Government employees for failure to do what was expected of them. I have received a letter from Mr. Kenneth Jernigan, director of the Iowa Commission for the Blind that I feel deserves to be quoted in the RECORD. It could well serve as an impetus for all of us.

Mr. Jernigan said, in part:

It is, therefore, a real treat to find a Federal administrator who, without pressure or prodding, goes beyond the call of duty to give efficient and worthwhile service. The person I am referring to is Mr. Robert Bray, Chief of the Division for the Blind of the Library of Congress. As you may know, our Iowa Library for the Blind has been in existence since 1960. More than 2,000 blind Iowans are now borrowing more than 8,500 braille books, talking books, and taped books, each month. To many of them the books have been as important as life and sanity. The blind college student (we now have more than ever before in the history of the State), the blind professional man or woman, the blind child in elementary or secondary school, the elderly blind person in the nursing home or with relatives, the blind housewife, the ordinary blind citizen—all of these have benefited immeasurably from the services of the library. In many respects it is the most important department of our commission. This fact is confirmed by letter after letter in our files from blind persons throughout the State.

A great deal of the credit for this service must go to Mr. Bray. He does far more than merely make arrangements to provide us with books. His advice and suggestions are always available, and always competent and to the point. He has exerted himself to find new ways to improve the library service and make it better. He has demonstrated real initiative instead of merely waiting to do what he was asked. In a letter of this type it is difficult to convey the picture but some people are able and willing to bestir themselves to get things done while others are not. Mr. Bray is one of the former.

Incidentally, he does not have any inkling of the fact that I intend to write this letter. I look at it this way: If he were doing a poor job and not giving us good service, I would be writing to you to ask that you help me raise a ruckus with him. If he were doing a passably good job in his service to the people of our State, but nothing special, then I would probably not be writing at all. As it is, his service to us has been so outstanding that, in my opinion, it deserves attention and commendation. I feel certain that you want to know how the Federal programs are working in our home State and that you want a balanced picture of the successes as well as the problems. It is for this reason that I have written you concerning Mr. Bray.

Should Be Discarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Sheboygan Press on Saturday, February 6. The editorial cites another example of a Government "service" which really is no service at all, since it has outlived its usefulness. I feel that Postmaster General Gronouski is quite justified in bringing this to the attention of the Congress.

SHOULD BE DISCARDED

Postmaster General Gronouski's plan to ask Congress to take the banking business out of the post office appears to have merit. He is convinced that postal savings is a losing proposition after 54 years, and he has some good reasons to back his premise.

Since its peak year in 1947, the number of depositors who save through post offices has plunged from 4,200,000 to just over 1 million. Total deposits have dwindled from almost $3.4 billion to $416 million. One simple explanation for this drop is that the interest rate for postal savings is 2 percent, compared to 3 or 4 percent offered by commercial federally insured banks.

Gronouski said he felt there were two good reasons for eliminating the system: The decline in the use of the service and President Johnson's order to trim out the deadwood in Federal service. He might also have added that the Postal Savings System has outlived its usefulness. It was created in 1911 when waves of immigrants were coming to the United States, and they were accustomed to saving at their post offices in Europe—a practice that still flourishes in many countries. The widespread banking network in the United States today makes postal savings unnecessary.

The Postal Savings System has been outmoded and should be discarded. No doubt a savings in the cost of operations of the Post Office Department would result from such action.

The Troubled Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested, as I know all of us are, in the grave problems which confront us now in the Congo. I am pleased to insert here for the RECORD and for the information of my colleagues a very interesting article about this troublesome situation, which appeared in the January 21 issue of the Manchester Guardian Weekly.

The article follows:

FANFARE FOR AN ARMY OF MERCENARIES

(The second of a series of articles on the Congo by Tony Mockler)

The occasion, though not the real cause, of the Congo's present civil war was entirely political. In September 1963, President Kasavubu abruptly dissolved parliament, and a number of politicians fled across the river to Brazzaville, where they set up the revolutionary committee, the CNL, whose avowed purpose was to overthrow the Adoula government by violent means.

In the same month the first outbreak of rebellion occurred in the province of Kwilu. (There are now 21 small provinces—small in a relative sense, since the smallest would be larger than Belgium—in the place of the 6 large provinces into which the Belgian Congo was divided. Normally, however, the names of the six large provinces are used to denote the general area. This creates a certain confusion.) There the young rebels called themselves Mulelistes after their leader, a former deputy, M. Pierre Mulele, who in spite of the divine powers which his followers attributed to him, is now believed to be dead. The Congolese Army proved unable to control more than the three main towns, including the capital Kikwit, and to some extent the roads between them. The situation has improved, if only because thousands of suicidal rebels have been killed, but even towns are still precariously held.

In February 1964 the CNL established a branch in Bujumbura, capital of the independent kingdom of Burundi, under the direction of Mr. Gaston Soumaliot and M. Martin Kassongo. By April a serious revolt had broken out in the Province of Kivu; during May the army was badly beaten, and on May 31 M. Adoula, the Prime Minister, requested assistance from the U.N. forces. These, however, were due to be withdrawn by mid-June from Kivu, and so no assistance was given. The whole eastern part of the country was thrown into further disorders by the roaming bands of Watusi warriors, who had been expelled from Rwanda after the December 1963 disturbances there. Meanwhile the rebellion spread down into North Katanga, and Albertville fell to the rebels.

In the early days of his government, last July, M. Tshombe visited Stanleyville and laid a wreath at the Lumumba monument. In early August Kindu and then Stanleyville fell almost without a shot to the rebel General Olenga, and many of the 7,000 soldiers in Eastern Province went over to the enemy. The rebels now controlled, more or less, Eastern Province, Kivu, the northern half of Katanga—and there were still major revolts in Kwilu and Kasai.

At this stage it was obvious that the army was both incompetent and disloyal. M. Tshombe began to recruit white mercenaries, reenlisted about three battalions of ex-

Katangese gendarmery (who had been disbanded by the United Nations forces), and also had two efficient battalions of Congolese commandos to rely on, one of which had received paratroop training together with General Mobutu, the commander in chief, in Israel that spring. Indeed at the fall of Stanleyville less than 100 of these commandos at the airport nearly recaptured the city.

The turning point came in August when the rebels attacked Bukavu, the capital at Kivu Province. Colonel Mulamba, an ex-adjutant of the Force Publique, succeeded in driving them out. In the east, Government forces retook the initiative, and with the paratroop operation of November 23 all major cities were once again in Government hands. But even now control, for instance, of Stanleyville extends only to the center of the city and the airport; and control means one thing by day and another by night. Outside the main cities the Government authority is limited to South Katanga, South Kasai, the Ubangi Province in Equator, and the western provinces of Léopoldville.

In his final report to the Security Council, at the end of June, U Thant stressed the importance of the Congolese Army and was cautiously optimistic about its state. It was, he wrote, "now an integrated body of soldiers, about 29,600 strong, under a unified command." Events swiftly proved that he was wrong; it was a mistake to apply European terms and concepts to at least this African army. Sometimes they fought very well, at other times units went over en masse to the rebels, often they seemed to be little more than gangs of armed bandits. It is impossible to pinpoint this unit as reliable and that one as shaky: A Katangan battalion may be reliable against the Balubas but unreliable at Stanleyville—all depends on circumstances.

But the main difficulty lies not so much in tribal loyalties as in a different idea of discipline. Briefly, a European officer or soldier if given a stupid order will grumble but in the last resort loyally get himself killed, whereas the Congolese would only obey orders that seemed to him feasible. This may be a far more human and rational attitude but it does lead to difficulties in the field. Hence the overwhelming need for European officers and the enormous success of European mercenaries—for, of course, the same rules of conduct and of discipline apply to the rebels.

At the beginning of last year, M. Adoula, faced with the Kwilu rebellion and the likelihood of more trouble to follow, had three choices. He could either ask the U.N. forces to stay on, or apply to African states for troops, or turn to the West. The United Nations, approached informally, had to refuse—the money was not there; nearly $400 million had been spent on the emergency operation, and as a result the whole organization was in a state of crisis and near bankruptcy. The African states, through the OAU, would only agree to supply troops if they could choose the countries to send the men. This the Congolese Government, mistrustful of the Arab north African states, has never agreed to. There remained the West.

Last spring Belgian officers, many of whom had been with the Katangan gendarmery started to come back to the Congo as military advisers. At first there were 150 of them—staff, training, and logistic officers—by now there are another 180, including 100 pilots. These officers, however, soon found themselves in an almost impossible position; the Belgian Government refused to allow them actually to use weapons, and as a result when attached to a Congolese unit in action their position and prestige was nil. The situation has now been resolved in this way: the regular Belgian officer attached to a unit has under his command a Belgian mercenary officer, who, of course, is under no inhibitions about the use of weapons. There are now somewhere between 200 and 300 of these mercenaries attached to the Congolese Army.

The Americans have a military mission, here, but their role has been limited to the supply and maintenance of transport including airplanes, general supplies, and weapons.

The military successes of the Government have been largely due to the all-white mercenary commandos, whose strength has ranged between 300 and 600 men. The composition of the mercenary forces is changing fewer rank and file and more ex-professional officers are being enlisted.

Whatever criticisms may be leveled at the mercenaries (and there is no doubt that looting is their favorite pastime), from the military point of view they have done their job extraordinarily well and their presence in one form or another will certainly be needed in the foreseeable future. Generally speaking, the Congolese Army is still badly officered, badly trained, and badly disciplined. Yet without the armed forces—and, realistically, that is equivalent to saying without the mercenaries—anarchy and disorder would reign unchecked.

Can such a small group—a few hundred white soldiers, backed by a few moderately reliable Congolese battalions—continue to hold an empire like the Congo together? It is, as the mercenaries admit, only by the incompetence of their enemies that they have managed to achieve so much.

The present lull in activity, in addition to semireliable reports, suggests that the rebels are training, probably with advisers from other African states or even from China, and training is all that is needed to put them in a position of military superiority over great areas of the Congo.

It is, then, no exaggeration to say that though the Congolese problem cannot be solved by simply military means, everything depends on the military situation. Should the rebels succeed in recapturing some of the larger towns and provincial capitals, it seems likely that their success would set off riots in the main cities. The decisive defeat of a mercenary or mercenary-led force would, with its effect on morale, be the signal for anarchy and complete chaos.

It seems extraordinary that in the 20th century, when armies millions strong have become a commonplace, the fate of an enormous country should depend on a force far inferior to "Xenophon's Ten Thousand"; and that this force should have a personal loyalty to M. Tshombe which rivals the Greeks' loyalty to Cyrus. Feudal, classical, or just African, this is how things stand.

Spirit of Gilmer, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, for nearly half of a century I have been reading and enjoying the Gilmer Mirror. Its publishers, editors, and management always have been very outstanding, indeed. A fitting editorial appeared in the Longview Morning Journal on January 31, 1965, about the Gilmer Mirror and its splendid history.

The editorial follows:

SPIRIT OF GILMER

The Gilmer Mirror, founded in 1877 and published weekly by Russell H. Laschinger and Ray H. Greene, long has been a faithful mirror of the life and progress of Gilmer and Upshur County. Today, through a recent enlargement and modernization program, it is recognized as a leader in the new spirit of Gilmer and a showplace of progress in its own right.

Russell and Georgia Laschinger, who joined the Mirror as junior partners of her father, the late George Tucker, on July 1, 1924, have diligently recognized and recorded 40 years of Gilmer and Upshur County progress. They now are the senior partners and it is their turn to tell their children, Sarah and Ray Greene and Mary Laschinger, how they have been doing things for 40 years.

The age of experience and stability, and the age of ambition and courage, when combined, become a wonderful springboard for progress. The beautiful Gilmer Mirror Building, a showplace at the crossroads of the two busiest highways in Gilmer, is as modern and attractive, as pleasant and functional, as can be found anywhere. While it has come up from a base of knowledge and resources built up across many years, it embodies all that is new and proved in ideas and methods for the modern weekly newspaper.

A new brick and glass front, with large new offices and reception area to serve the public; central heating and cooling, and a new photographic darkroom; a landscaped and paved parking area; and the new offset printing process—these are among the costly and highly useful features of the Mirror's new building and plant. Gilmer and Upshur County people rightly are proud of this newspaper facility which serves the local needs in such progressive fashion.

As "Miss Georgia" Laschinger wrote recently, concerning the 40 years she and Russell have been with the Mirror, "We had much to learn about the newspaper business. For that matter, we are still learning, as publishing a newspaper is a complex and ever-changing process." Indeed, it may be said that there is nothing so constant as change. The successful are those who across the years adjust most rapidly to change while keeping a firm grip on faith and purpose. The Laschingers have served the Gilmer area well across the years.

Associate Publisher Ray Greene, whose father was a distinguished newspaperman before him, is doing a wonderful job of both hard work and leadership. He proudly points out that the Mirror in recent years has won newspaper awards in regional, State, and National levels, including the Texas Press Association sweepstakes award in 3 years, and the Anson Jones award of the Texas Medical Association. We confidently predict for Pubishers Laschinger and Greene many more awards in the years immediately ahead.

While it has an illustrious 88 years of service to its historic credit, the Gilmer Mirror today is prepared to lead the community by showing the way of progress as well as to mirror the spirit of the new Gilmer of 1965 and the years of promise that stretch out ahead. We congratulate our neighbor publishers and salute the good people of Gilmer and Upshur County where new industry and the prospects of more to come is bringing about a brighter future for all east Texas.

CARL L. ESTES.

VA Cutbacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, as you know I have strongly opposed and deeply

resented the proposed cutbacks and consolidations by the Veterans' Administration in its services to our veterans. On the 19th of January I took the floor of this House and voiced my opposition to this proposal and at that time requested the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to immediately investigate this action by the Veterans' Administration and also requested the VA to withhold its proposed cutbacks until such time as the investigation could be completed by the committee.

Fortunately, the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee has decided to hold hearings to investigate this unwarranted action by the Veterans' Administration, yet the Veterans' Administration has not seen fit to withhold its proposal until this investigation can be completed. Therefore, those of us who are interested in the welfare of the veteran must continue our fight to prevent this unconscionable action from occurring. Recently, Mr. Howard L. Kabler, State commander of the Ohio department of the Disabled American Veterans, issued a statement on the DAV's position in this matter. Mr. Kabler, who resides at Ripley, Ohio, in the Sixth Congressional District, has been an outstanding leader among the war's disabled for a number of years. He served 23 months in the European theater with Company B, 116th Infantry, 29th Division, during World War II, was wounded several times and still carries shrapnel in his back. He has been the service officer in Brown County for a number of years and is well acquainted with the problems of the veteran. Because his statement is so cogent and points out without equivocation exactly what will become of the veteran as a result of this unconscionable action by the Veterans' Administration, I take deep pride in calling his statement to the attention of my colleagues and because it likewise reflects my views and position in this matter, I include it verbatim in my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, there are many places to eliminate waste, improve efficiency, and to save money but this is not one of them. This proposed cutback is poor economy and will certainly provide additional material for the war upon poverty. If this action by the VA is permitted to occur it simply means breaking faith with our veterans. It makes little sense to spend billions to eradicate poverty in the United States, to spend additional billions in foreign aid to raise the standard of living over the entire world and then virtually pull the bed out from under the veteran, the individual who is primarily responsible for this Nation's freedom.

The freedom we revel in today was assured to us by the veterans of the great wars. It would, therefore, seem little enough to provide these facilities and services to our veterans. These services cannot be measured by the usual dollar and efficiency yardsticks. The care of our veterans must not become subject to the cold calculations of an electronic computer. It is unconscionable to submit the health, care and welfare of our veterans to a machine void of compassion. In administering the VA program the primary objective should be service to the veteran rather than to operate the facilities as a commercial enterprise. We owe it to our veterans to provide them whatever is necessary and to have it conveniently located. Aged and sick old soldiers ought not to have to travel far to see a doctor. He ought not be made to go a long distance to see a counselor at a regional office. If he is hospitalized he ought to be close enough to home for his friends and relatives to visit conveniently. Is the Great Society of the Johnson administration now going to dump the veteran? I sincerely hope that this Congress will take action which will meet the human needs of our veterans rather than the budgetary desires of the administration and I commend to my colleagues the following statement by Mr. Kabler:

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—Mr. Howard L. Kabler, State commander of Ohio Department of the Disabled American Veterans, the organization chartered by the Congress and which is composed exclusively of those veterans who served in the Armed Forces of our country in time of war and were wounded, gassed, or disabled in some way as a direct result of their services, has issued the following statement regarding the order which has been issued by Mr. William J. Driver, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, to close certain VA regional offices, VA hospitals, and domiciliaries throughout the country, effective June 30, 1965.

The news that Mr. William J. Driver is closing the VA regional office in Cincinnati, which is serving 550,000 veterans in southern Ohio and countless dependents, the TB hospital at Broad View Heights, Ohio, 16 other VA regional offices, 10 other VA hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries throughout the country—is the most drastic and unjust action ever taken against veterans and the widows of veterans in America's history. It is reminiscent of the so-called Economy Act of 1933 which drastically reduced benefits to wounded, gassed, and blind veterans of World War I until it was finally repealed. This act ejected these veterans from soldiers' homes with the clothes on their backs. If the clothes were Government issued, they were ejected with less.

And now the men who were the Nation's heroes following World War II and the Korean conflict in which they fought to preserve our Nation's freedom are facing the piecemeal destruction of the benefits the Congress has ordered that they shall receive. How much longer is this vicious, coldblooded effort on the part of the Veterans' Administration to strip war-disabled veterans of their benefits to continue—while the Federal Government scatters billions of our dollars all over the world?

Ohio's wartime disabled veterans and their dependents will suffer untold hardships by the closing of the VA regional office in Cincinnati. The veterans and their dependents living in the 50 counties of southern Ohio have been served by this office for many, many years. On April 1 of this year this office is to be closed and the remnants merged with the VA office at Cleveland, nearly 300 miles away. It is admitted that the present Cleveland and Cincinnati offices both have constant backlogs of claims and require overtime work at night and weekends in an effort to keep abreast with the demand. In this planned move, more than 100 VA employees will be eliminated on Mr. Driver's theory that automation will fill the gap. At the same time all of these claims must be developed, decisions made, and adjudications completed by the human mind. The results would be chaotic.

The Cincinnati VA regional office, which presently has 308 employees is housed in a Federal Government-owned building and has much unused space. This proposed move to Cleveland would require equal space in privately owned property in downtown Cleveland at high commercial rates.

This proposed closing of seven VA hospitals would immediately eliminate 2,974 patients and would be only the beginning. Mr. Driver says that modern or advanced medical techniques will reduce the demand for hospital beds. This statement contradicts the cry of virtually all American cities urgently needing new and additional hospital beds. The present VA hospitals have waiting lists and numerous rejections with no beds available for veterans.

Within the past 2 years the Congress approved legislation authorizing 4,000 separate beds for the care of chronic, helpless veterans requiring constant care; at this time not one such bed has been made available. The Congress also approved medicine for the helpless veterans but up to now not $1 has been allocated.

Domiciliary care has been made available for homeless, destitute, and unemployable war-disabled veterans in America for nearly a century. This barracks-type of custody following the Civil War was known as the Old Soldiers' Home. This new order would immediately release 3,220 such veterans to find shelter elsewhere. Mr. Driver states that with the pension program these homes are outmoded. He knows that this is not true. The remaining 14,000 now housed would follow the exodus under his order.

By this proposed closing of the 28 VA operations Mr. Driver states that he will save $23 million. Based upon reliable authority, this statement is about as far from the truth as we are from the sun. But, in the meantime, is no consideration to be given to the tremendous sacrifice to be experienced by the crippled and sick defenders of our Nation and the widows of veterans as they are removed from the Great Society program?

Are the laws enacted by an understanding Congress over the years for the care of war veterans and the widows of veterans to be ignored by the recently appointed Administrator of the Veterans' Administration? Are the meager savings to be realized under his order to be used in the foreign aid program to help our proven enemies?

The Veterans' Administration hospital has just received an order to furnish physical examinations, out-patient treatment, and hospital treatment to the members of the Peace Corps and the Job Corps, which in the past has been handled by the Public Health Service. It is certain that this will greatly lessen medical service to our veterans.

It appears that Mr. William J. Driver the newly appointed Administrator of the Veterans' Administration does not agree with millions of our citizens who feel that providing certain benefits for veterans who were disabled as a direct result of war service and for the widows of this group of veterans—should be considered one of the costs of war.

I urge all members of the DAV and of the Women's Auxiliary to write President Lyndon B. Johnson, White House, Washington, D.C., the U.S. Senators from Ohio, Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE and Hon. STEPHEN M. YOUNG. (The address of each is U.S. Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.) And to the Member of Congress from their district, requesting them to stop this heartless, unjustified attack against the benefits of veterans who have served our country in time of war and against the benefits of widows of those veterans who have passed on.

HOWARD L. KABLER,
State Commander, Disabled American Veterans, Department of Ohio.

Tribute to Joseph Sunnen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute today to a great humanitarian—Joseph Sunnen of St. Louis.

Joseph Sunnen is an accomplished inventor and a successful industrialist. But more important, he is a benefactor of his fellow man. Long before the phrase became fashionable, Joseph Sunnen began a personal war on poverty.

Through the years he has selected for his stewardship those causes which have been neglected because they seemed too trivial or too unpopular.

For this reason he has devoted his life and his resources to create a public awareness of uncontrolled population growth. And he has been a pioneer in advancing the proposition that birth control is one answer to the poverty which afflicts mankind.

As a testament to Joseph Sunnen's contributions to the birth conntrol field, the International Planned Parenthood Federation last year presented him with a citation commending "his perseverance in defying the forces of prejudice and ignorance which would deny the benefits of family planning to those who seek it."

The life of Joseph Sunnen reflects the virtues of American tradition—the legacy of Horatio Alger. It is a life of humble origin. The son of an impoverished coal miner, he was forced to leave school in the seventh grade to share the responsibility of supporting a family. Blessed with an inventive mind, he applied his mechanical genius to gain a prominent place in the industrial community.

His fortunes have been great because they were shared with the unfortunate. And for those who have been deprived of the right to control the size of their families through ignorance or indigence the name of Joseph Sunnen is especially meaningful.

Tens of thousands of migrant workers in California have learned his name because they were given free birth control materials. And long before the poverty-ridden reaches of Appalachia received wide public attention, Joseph Sunnen was attending to the needs of weary, frightened mothers. From the slums of Chicago to the ramshackle huts of Puerto Rico, the despair which accompanies unplanned parenthood is transformed each day into new hope. In some 35 countries around the world there are fewer hungry, half-naked children because Joseph Sunnen is spreading a gospel of social conscience.

Much remains to be done before controlled parenthood can be meaningful for millions around the world. But each day the personal realities of the population explosion become memories for a few more parents.

Perhaps the missionic zeal of Joseph Sunnen is best summed up by Poet Robert Frost:

> But I have promises to keep
> And miles to go before I sleep
> And miles to go before I sleep.

For those despondent parents, to whom childbirth can be no longer a blessing, we extend deepest gratitude to Joseph Sunnen. He has kept his promises well and we wish him Godspeed for the many miles ahead.

Junior Legion Baseball Marks 40th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, the South Dakota State Legislature recently adopted a resolution requesting the Governor of South Dakota to designate the week of August 29, 1965, as Junior Legion Baseball Week.

We in South Dakota are extremely proud of the fact that nearly 40 years ago one of the most worthwhile youth programs of this Nation, the American Legion baseball program was founded in the great State of South Dakota.

Today, a marble monument stands at Milbank, S. Dak., as a dedication to the initiation of this fine American program. The program's years of existence can be explained best by a portion of that dedication: "A program of service to the youth of America."

South Dakota always has been a strong baseball State and our Legion baseball program has received fine support. This year, to mark the 40th anniversary of Legion baseball, the little world series will be played in South Dakota, the place of its birth.

The Sidney L. Smith Post 24 of the American Legion will host this year's series at Aberdeen. It will mark the bringing together of the Nation's finest junior Legion baseball teams and it will contribute to the physical, mental, and moral health of today's youth.

Mr. Speaker, the action of the South Dakota State Legislature is a fitting tribute to the value of this program. The little world series, the boys who will participate in the event, the sponsoring American Legion and all junior Legion baseball players merit the recognition and attention of not only the people of South Dakota but also of the Nation.

The Decatur Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, communities hit by recently announced plans to close defense installations can take heart from the experience of Decatur, Ill., in the 22d Congressional District.

The Army's decision in January 1961 to deactivate its Decatur Signal Depot over a 15-month period came as a severe shock to its 1,300 civilian employees and to Decatur merchants and business leaders.

Fearful prognostications were made of the dire consequences expected to flow from loss of payrolls.

That was initial reaction. Then the shock became a stimulant for a unified and successful effort to convert the big Government plant into a taxpaying source of employment by private industry.

Today, the signal depot site is shared by two giants of American industry—Firestone Tire & Rubber and General Electric.

Firestone began operations in February 1962 just 13 months after the Army announced its deactivation plan and 2 months short of the deadline for complete shutdown of the facility.

General Electric moved in later. Together the two companies are now employing 2,300 workers, a thousand more than were working at the signal depot at the time it was ordered closed.

A third major firm, the Caterpillar Tractor Co., during the same 4-year period, has added 3,600 workers to its payroll and is now engaged in a $10 million expansion program. Firestone and General Electric are expanding too.

Hopes are high that 1965 will see the start of another new private industry where a closed defense plant now stands idle. Local leaders finally succeeded in June 1964, in having the Navy's Macon arms plant declared surplus. Closed on a standby basis for 6 years, the plant has been sold to the WGT Corp. of Philadelphia, which has been negotiating for its use by a manufacturer of hard metal goods. Completion of the negotiations has been delayed by redtape, currently a routine antitrust study by the Justice Department. If the deal goes through, Decatur will benefit from another payroll of up to 400 persons.

So the enterprises that have grown out of Government war factories are an important factor in Decatur's current prosperity and future hopes. At the same time the local economy is buoyed by the continued growth of its food-processing industry, as evidenced by the $10 million expansion program of the A. E. Staley Manufacturing Co., one of the world's largest corn and soybean processors.

On March 1, 1961, the Decatur Association of Commerce issued a statement pointing up the anticipated adverse impact of the signal depot's closing.

Largely due to the efforts of the association itself, in harmony with other civic leaders and local governmental officials, its gloomy forebodings never came to pass.

Instead of an anticipated $7,670,000 loss in annual personal income by January 1, 1964, personal incomes in Decatur had risen almost $13 million to a total of $190,957,000.

Instead of a $3,510,000 expected loss in bank deposits there was a gain of $60 million over the 3-year period. Against an expected decline of $4,680,000 in retail sales, there was an increase of $77,000.

Employment increased by more than 6,000 in the 1961–63 period, and 1,625 more new jobs became available in 1964.

In a recent statement titled "The Decatur Story," H. C. Rethwisch, manager of the Association of Commerce's industrial department, gave these facts and pointed out other advantages of private industry to communities as compared to government-owned and operated facilities.

Property and personal taxes paid by the companies that took over the tax exempt Government plant increased local revenues by some $165,000 annually, allowing city tax rates to be cut while services increased.

The managerial personnel brought in by the blue chip companies have built new homes, adding further to tax revenues; more important, through their participation in community activities, they are making a substantial contribution to the civic life of the area.

Mr. Rethwisch was careful to point out that the military personnel who came to Decatur were also good citizens. But, uncertain of their tenure, they bought few homes and did not become as community oriented as their counterparts in the private industries who have come to stay.

Decatur's transition from a substantially defense based to a largely civilian economy has been orderly and complete. Following the sharp dip in early 1961, it quickly recovered and is now moving forward at an accelerated pace.

Community attitudes are bullish.

Writes Mr. Rethwisch.

Workers with skills are in short supply. Out of a winter of despair has come the spring of hope.

Mr. Rethwisch's statement follows:

THE DECATUR STORY: CONVERTING MILITARY INSTALLATIONS TO CIVILIAN USES

(By H. C. Rethwisch, manager, Industrial Department, Association of Commerce, Decatur, Ill., Jan. 20, 1965)

The first announcement of the closing of a military installation comes as a severe shock to community leaders and its citizens with attendant loss of jobs and the resultant drop in payroll and buying power and a further shock to community pride.

It is this shock which serves as a stimulant which when translated into action brings about a unified force merging the best thinking of the private enterprise forces, i.e., the Association of Commerce and the city officials and such other agencies and individuals expedient to solve the dilemma of unemployment and get the facility back on the tax roll. It is when leaders have agreed that all in the community will either suffer or prosper together that an action program will evolve. This points up the problem facing any community when a governmental facility closes. In Decatur there were two distinct problems:

1. The Army Signal Depot employed 1,300 workers in January 1961 when ordered to phase out over a 15-month period. It was then declared surplus and finally purchased by Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. who began operations on February 14, 1962. The General Electric Co. acquired plant site, mentioned later.

2. The Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant (Macon Arms Plant) was closed on May 15, 1958. It was declared surplus after much effort in June 1964 and was sold on November 18, 1964. It remains closed pending final approval of the sale by the Justice Department.

The two firms that now operate parts of the Signal Depot have increased employment to 2,300 in less than 4 years. This, of course, does not include Macon Arms, not yet in operation, nor does it include Caterpillar Tractor Co. which, alone, could add some 3,600 workers to this total. There were 1,625 jobs added in the Decatur labor market during 1964. During World War II, Caterpillar Tractor Co. operated the Victor Ordnance Plant in the manufacture of engines; later it became the Signal Depot. It was out of their experience here that Caterpillar decided to build a plant of 750,000 square feet to which they added another 750,000 square feet and are now in another expansion of 650,000 square feet or $10 million.

Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. took over from the Signal Depot 1,700,000 square feet to which they are now adding 360,000 square feet and General Electric Co. acquired a portion of the real estate on which to build 100,000 square feet facility to which they are now adding 250,000 square feet.

Moreover, when the Macon Arms Plant is activated by private enterprise, plus the additions indicated, employment will move upward, as will tax revenues and the total economy. Another locally based plant, the A. E. Staley Manufacture Co., is in a $10 million expansion program, although it is not directly related to military installations closing, bringing total expansion alone to around $75 million.

On March 1, 1961, a statement was prepared by the Association of Commerce pointing up the impact of the closing of the Signal Depot. On this same date a news release was given the Decatur Herald & Review. These figures compare 1961 and experience as of January 1, 1964. Data for the year of 1964 not available but will show gains in all categories.

	Mar. 1, 1961, experience	Jan. 1, 1964, 3-year experience	Change
Mar. 1, 1961, losses predicted:			
$620,000 in monthly payroll		[1] $650,000	[1] +$30,000
1,000 transferring elsewhere		247	
3,848 fewer people	[2] 78,004	83,978	+5,974
1,456 fewer households	25,900	26,400	+500
52 fewer businesses	776	1,032	+256
1,391 fewer autos	54,118	59,110	+4,992
962 fewer jobs to serve the 1,300 displaced persons	[3] 44,125	[3] 50,150	[3] +6,025
Economic dollar impact:			
$7,670,000 loss in personal income	$177,973,000	$190,957,000	+$12,984,000
$3,510,000 loss in bank deposits	$103,018,969	$163,394,797	+$60,375,828
$4,680,000 loss in retail sales	$146,423,000	$160,804,000	+$14,381,000
$163,000 loss in taxes (on retail sales)		$240,000	+$77,000
Motor fuel taxes increased	$430,000	$468,094	+$38,094

[1] Estimated.
[2] Population Jan. 1, 1961.
[3] Number employed.

Per capita income, after taxes, increased from $2,211 to $2,378; or $175 over the national norm.

Property and personal taxes added by the three companies who purchased the facilities amount to some $165,000, annually, which will increase as expansions are completed and Macon Arms is put in operation. This excludes Caterpillar Tractor Co. which could well double the tax revenues; meanwhile, city taxes have declined 3 consecutive years and services have increased.

There are other values accruing to the city. The bringing into Decatur blue chip companies has brought top managerial personnel; they have built homes which bring in added tax revenues. More important is the fact they have blended into the community and have become outstanding citizens, taking their places among civic clubs, schools, and other community activities, and are contributing a substantial part in both leadership and dues in local organizations, including the Association of Commerce. They have brought in new blood and ideas without any attempt to superimpose their ideas. They contribute to the tax support of schools and add to the church revenues. They share their part of community responsibility.

While the military personnel included top-flight persons, by reason of the uncertainty of their tenure, they bought few homes and did not become so well community oriented as do their civilian counterparts.

In order to expedite and bring about an orderly transition, the local chamber of commerce must serve as a coordinating agency, a catalyst, and work closely with the city officials and other groups. A community brochure should be available pointing up community offerings just as would be done in attracting any new industry. It should be a factual presentation, free of community bromides that are designed to enhance community pride.

Prospects may visit in person, write, or telephone for information of an infinite variety. Answers must be readily available. Also needed is a brochure of the facility which will be prepared and made available by GSA showing specifications, illustrations, and other pertinent data.

Some prospective bidders will need to be met at the airport and escorted to and from the facility. Some visitors will have an interest in the machinery equipment; others in real estate only. Naturally, all inquiries and visits must be treated in confidence. Much of the machinery is of a highly specialized nature and will have no production-line value. It can be meaningful, therefore, to get machinery prospects in touch with real estate prospects who may wish to collaborate on the bid and enhance the value to each, assuming machinery and real estate are being offered together.

It is suggested your community be represented at the bid opening and secure a list of the unsuccessful bidders as potential prospects to locate in your city. It would be well to secure a list of those who registered to inspect the facility. Some could be real prospects, yet not bid.

In Decatur with the Association of Commerce working hand in hand with the city administration and citizen groups, the transition has been orderly and complete. The economy dipped sharply and has recovered and is moving forward at an accelerated pace. Community attitudes are bullish. Workers with skills are in short supply.

Out of a winter of despair has come the spring of hope.

The Politics of Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, last year I inserted in the RECORD a speech given by Eddy S. Feldman, president of the Los Angeles Board of Municipal Art Commissioners, on the subject of citizen participation in the cultural life of the city. That speech generated much interest and comment by those fortunate enough to hear it delivered and to read it in print.

Mr. Feldman has again lectured on a subject which is timely and thought provoking. His speech, entitled "The Politics of Culture," was made at the Western States Art Commissions Conference in San Francisco on December 3, 1964. I am pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

THE POLITICS OF CULTURE

(By Eddy S. Feldman)

The title of my lecture is "The Politics of Culture." Politics is said to be "the science and art of government; the science dealing with the form, organization and administration of a State or part of one, and with the regulation of its relations with other States." [1]

I do not think anyone will deny that we are concerned with politics—with the science and art of government—here. Some of the participants in this conference are elected public officials—politicians, if you will. Others are appointed to office by the elected ones. They supported the right candidates. Perhaps I should say that we are more concerned with politics in its Aristotelian sense, as a term contemplating the usages and traditions, the arrangements and policies through which men are governed and by which they attempt to shape their destinies. However, before I have reached the end of this paper I shall have alluded to that terribly practical problem of politics: the attaining and holding of office in government, so that one may exercise the pleasure of being Aristotelian.

(I am not concerned here with the internal politics of private cultural institutions. That is a uniquely difficult subject, the discussion of which carries with it risks sometimes too awful to contemplate.[2] Sometimes, though, these private political struggles become problems for Government, too.[3]

Culture, I take, quite arbitrarily, and within my own frame of reference, to include the practice and enjoyment of the performing and visual arts, including architecture and urban planning. It does not exclude the making of motion pictures, nor the performing of popular music.[4] Consequently, we reach the conclusion that the politics of culture is the method by which public government deals with the practice of the arts.

Now, we may ask ourselves, why should the politician seek to provide an environment conducive to artistic-cultural creation with which he will have to deal? Is the practitioner of art of any value to the body politic? One writer has responded affirmatively:

"The claim of art to our respect must stand or fall with the validity of its pretension to cultivate and refine our senses and faculties until seeing, hearing, feeling, smelling, and tasting become highly conscious and critical acts with us, protesting vehemently against ugliness, noise, discordant speech, frowsy clothing, and rebreathed air, and taking keen interest and pleasure in beauty, in music, and in nature, besides making us insist, as necessary for comfort and decency, on clean, wholesome, handsome fabrics to wear, and utensils of fine material and elegant workmanship to handle. Further, art should refine our sense of character and conduct, of justice and sympathy, greatly heightening our self-knowledge, self-control, precision of action, and considerateness, and making us intolerant of baseness, cruelty, injustice, and intellectual superficiality or vulgarity. The worthy artist or craftsman is he who serves the physical and moral senses by feeding them with pictures, musical compositions, pleasant houses and gardens, good clothes and fine implements, poems, fictions, essays, and dramas which call the heightened senses and ennobled faculties into pleasurable activity. The great artist is he who goes a step beyond the demand, and, by supplying works of a higher beauty and a higher interest than have yet been perceived, succeeds after a brief struggle with its strangeness, in adding this fresh extension of sense to the heritage of the race." [5]

These are values so desirable that it is no longer open to question that government and the politician have an obligation to encourage cultural development.

Thus the individual in this country, at least, is assured by basic political decisions made at an early date in our history of the right to pursue happiness.[6] The right to pursue happiness included the right to pursue artistic satisfactions.[7] Indeed, superior achievement in the arts is now established as a national goal.[8]

Many occasions arise when political action is needed to allow the happiness to exist which the body politic may pursue and to assist in the accomplishment of superior achievement in the arts.

The need for governmental aid to preserve and develop the arts is frequently occasioned by what has been called the law of the inefficiency of art,[9] which guarantees that the cost of most kinds of cultural services will climb upward at a rate faster than the cost of other goods and services. Besides, the construction of buildings for museums and galleries and auditoriums is usually so expensive that it cannot be done without public help. Rarely will there be found today the single donor outside government (or large foundations) who can give the funds needed to house an art collection or a symphony orchestra.[10]

There are numerous illustrations of tax moneys being authorized for the building and operating of museums in this country.[11] And even when dynamic personalities in powerful places do promote the construction privately of a music center or art museum it may be on land donated by or leased at low cost from government.[12]

There are those unhappy proponents of subsidy who like to point out to us that British and European support of the arts has preceded us in time and quantity.[13] However, if we will look about and observe not only what has happened but also what is going on now we will see that we have no need to feel inferior to our British or European cousins in this respect, for there has certainly been much recent activity governmentally. This conference is one example. Five years ago it probably could not have been got together. Today it seems quite natural and easy to form an association for the exchange of views and techniques on government and art.

New laws are passed and old ones revitalized. President Johnson signed Public Law 88–579 on September 3, 1964, which establishes a National Council on the Arts, and on July 16, 1963, Gov. Edmund G. Brown signed Speaker Jesse Unruh's assembly bill No. 1 creating a California Arts Commission. In Los Angeles City creative administration of the charter provisions which set up the Board of Municipal Art Commissioners in 1911 [14] has transformed that agency from one passively waiting to approve—or occasionally disapprove—completed civic building plans, to one which is energetically pressing for excellence at initial design stages.

Communities and their managers increasingly recognize that to make a better life for the citizenry, to attract and keep industry which employs skilled workers,[15] and, indeed, to provide additional employment itself in cultural activities, a vigorous political interest in the arts must be maintained. Part of the secret of the success of the Arts Council of Winston-Salem, N.C., which has ingeniously housed itself in the same building with the chamber of commerce (organized business) and the united fund (organized money raising), is the financial assistance given by the city of Winston-Salem through its community foundation.

Concurrently with this awakening of government—rather, precedent to it—is the fantastic interest in our cultural life shown by the people—those for whom government exists. An affluent society, the members of which are better educated and more highly skilled, and who possess much more free time than ever before, finds it is engaged in a cold war which is now being fought for men's minds and loyalties and not brutally for real estate. The overwhelming growth of cities, the sharp decline of farm population, the amazing proliferation of cultural institutions, buildings and literature, and the support of international cultural exchanges demonstrate this vast interest.

Now, the boundaries of political action as it relates to cultural activities are determined in part by our democratic political structure founded upon an economic system of relatively free enterprise. This implies, generally speaking, that government may support the arts, but that production of artistic events will be kept to a minimum. Such support may take the form of outright subsidy to cultural organizations; assistance in the formation of cooperative arts councils; providing of expert advice on local cultural problems;[16] funds for construction of facilities ("bricks and mortar");[19] and a variety of tax incentives.[20]

Nevertheless, positive entrance into artistic production may be required where the need is present and where no one else is forthcoming to fill it. Thus, there may be a demand for youth and adult choruses and orchestras, but there may be no private person interested in helping organize and operate them. So we have the municipal band, sometimes alone, or sometimes as part of the police and fire departments. Artistic and musical activities may be found to have therapeutic values;[21] government probably will have to provide them, as does the Bureau of Music of the Los Angeles Municipal Art Department. There may be culturally disadvantaged communities to which private entrepreneurs will not go because of the seeming absence of appreciation for artistic events, and because the low level of incomes leaves no money for tickets. The government may have to help create audiences in those areas. A splendid illustration here is the cultural resources program in New York City schools carried on through its bureau of audiovisual instruction with many private producers of artistic events.

By the way, it should be recognized that the filling of these needs is not simply recreational in nature. Their satisfaction appropriately resides in an agency of government not administered as part of a recreation and parks program.[22]

Furthermore, government is engaged in its own building programs. It has a positive responsibility to provide a good design in its structures. These will be around for

Footnotes at end of speech.

some time. The design of these structures has great impact on the people, upon private builders and upon their architects. An independent body, an art commission, if you please, to pass upon their design is imperative.[23] A community which demands no excellence in its own facilities cannot be heard to complain that it is being made less beautiful and more ugly by others.[24] (The new technology may help us here. Space science may even enable us to communicate sometime in the near future without all those telephone poles.)[25]

The implication of all of this for politicians is truly exciting to contemplate. Bernard Shaw reflected that: "The statesman should * * * rank fine art with, if not above, religion, science, education, and fighting power as a political agency. Yet we have not even a ministry of the fine arts; and our promiscuous democracy confronts our rulers with the vote of an electorate taught to regard fine arts as sinful so far as it is taught anything at all about it. The situation is saved only by the impossibility of life without art."[26]

Surely the quality of politicians will have to improve: what if the electorate were to enjoy an increase of 10 to 20 points in the average intelligent quotient as a result of all the emphasis on education and culture? The nature of appeals to the voters, at least, would have to change, I should think. In any event, the kinds of decisions to be made will be more varied: how much money in the budget is to go to police and fire, and how much to libraries, museums, and string quartets? (Without trying to be misleading about the problems of running a city I find it distressing that the 1964–65 budget of the city of Los Angeles allocated some $20 per person to police activities, but only 10 cents per person to activities defined herein as cultural. One reservation comes to mind. The bidding for works of art can only get keener for everybody is getting into the art act,[27] and the good product is somewhat limited. The other day the British National Gallery purchased Cezanne's "Les Grand Baigneuses" for close to £500,000. Some concern was expressed in a letter to the Times (London) that "in these days of financial crisis * * * such a clumsy huddle of filleted females is dumped on a wondering public and such a record price is paid for its acquisition.")[28]

The politician who aspires to office or who seeks to remain in office may well ask who will help get him elected. Well, he may find that the most active people politically are the most active ones culturally. They contribute money to campaigns (they have more of it to give), they talk a candidacy up, they attend meetings, they push door bells, they vote. He cannot afford to overlook this element of the electorate. But the old-fashioned, last-hurrah appeals to them will not do. Intelligent and restrained promises of program to improve the quality of living should have powerful vote-getting effect.

Beyond this fairly selfish political consideration there remains the public welfare which is involved in the politics of culture. Our very national security depends upon sound decisionmakers. With instantaneous communications the have-nots of the world are aware of what the haves have, and they want it. Remember, as James Baldwin has said,[29] the most dangerous creation of any society is that man who has nothing to lose. We must satisfy those needs and eliminate the danger or others will exploit the danger by promising satisfactions. But a cultural sophistication must flavor our technology[30] or even the emerging peoples of the world will find our contributions sterile, our national goals a fraud.

As for ourselves, we should strive to be something more than wastemaking machines doomed merely to consume more and more so as to keep the economy going. It is appalling to hear the scientists preaching a new hedonism because we are laggard as consumers.[31] The politician of culture must try to restore some sanity and balance to our technology. He must help organize a search for beauty in our frantic rush to industrialize and build. He must try to lead us to a society characterized by a cultured tranquillity and order, so that some meaning can attach to the individual and give a sense of identity to each of us.

---

[1] Oxford English Dictionary, vol. VII, p. 1074.

[2] See Ets-Hokin versus the San Francisco Establishment, as reported in the San Francisco press Nov. 24 through 27, 1964.

[3] Note the current dispute on the financing of the Hollywood Motion Picture Museum in which the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors finds itself embroiled. Los Angeles Times, Nov. 11, 1964.

[4] Alvin Toffler in his dynamic and quite heroic book, "The Culture Consumers" (St. Martin's Press, 1964), p. 10, attacking the cultural elitists, takes a somewhat narrower view of the word.

[5] Bernard Shaw, "The Sanity of Art," 1895. The Ecumenical Council declared in Rome, on Dec. 4, 1963: "Very rightly the fine arts are considered to rank among the noblest activities of man's genius * * *." New York Times, Dec. 5, 1963, p. 29.

[6] For example, on July 4, 1776.

[7] Ralph Purcell, "Government and Art" (Public Affairs Press, 1956), pp. 2–3.

[8] "Goals for Americans: The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals," 1960, p. 7. It is implicit and explicit in President Lyndon B. Johnson's conception of the Great Society. See his address at commencement exercises at the University of Michigan, May 22, 1964.

[9] Toffler, supra, note 4, p. 163.

[10] Even the gift of $5 million by the H. J. Heinz Foundation and others to the Pittsburgh Symphony was conditioned on the raising of $5 million from the public. New York Times, Nov. 19, 1963, p. 46.

[11] In Illinois, as only a single illustration, an 1893 law provided for taxation to operate museums in parks.

[12] See the new Los Angeles Music Center and the new Los Angeles Art Museum which are built on land donated by the County of Los Angeles. (This is a generalization which obscures several involved and complicated transactions.)

[13] Hope Stoddard, "Subsidy Makes Sense" (American Federation of Musicians, n.d.).

[14] The original Los Angeles Municipal Art Commission was organized in 1903.

[15] When North American Aviation, Inc., was seeking 65,000 acres of land for new facilities among the three site-selection criteria was proximity to higher education centers and cultural and recreational activities required to recruit and maintain a stable group of scientists, engineers, and high-skill-level technicians. See "Proceedings of Conference on Space, Science, and Urban Life," Oakland, Calif., Mar. 28–30, 1963, (The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 1963), p. 182.

[16] The 1964–65 budget of the Los Angeles County Music Commission provides for disbursement of $477,077, less a nominal amount for administration, directly to musical organizations. Almost half the $1,300,000 derived from the San Francisco hotel-motel tax was allocated to several local cultural institutions in 1964–65.

[17] California Statutes, 1963, ch. 1742, sec. 8(d).

[18] Ibid., note 17.

[19] For example, in connection with educational television broadcasting facilities. U.S. Public Law 87–447 (1962).

[20] These are discussed at length in Toffler, supra, note 4, ch. 13.

[21] Tarmo Pasto and Peter Runkel, editors, Art and Understanding in Mental Health, Mental Health Research Center, Sacramento State College, Sacramento, Calif., October 1964.

[22] I will not try to define the respective boundaries of recreation and parks departments and cultural departments at this time. There seem to be real enough boundaries. The attempt to do so may prove troublesome since power, prestige, and money may become involved. One detects a tendency in recreation administrators to attempt to widen their jurisdiction. Thus, in 1963, the New York Legislature made a finding that "Recreation is a basic human need, essential to the cultural, physical, moral, and spiritual well-being of the people of the State." Laws, 1963, ch. 837, sec. 1. It then defined recreation to mean "those activities which are diversionary in character and which aid in promoting entertainment, pleasure, relaxation, instruction, and other physical, mental, and cultural developments and exeriences of a leisure time nature."

[23] Art. XV of the Los Angeles City Charter provides that the design of public buildings, bridges, approaches, fences, retaining walls, lamps, lamp posts or other similar structures must be approved by the board of municipal art commissioners.

[24] There is an astonishingly large literature building up on ugliness in cities. In 1962 the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architecture held a First Conference on "Aesthetic Responsibility." It is reported in the AIA Journal, June 1962, at pages 33 and following. The quotation marks are AIA's, and the responsibility seems to be the other fellow's. See also Peter Blake's "God's Own Junkyard" (1964), and Tunnard and Pushkarev's "Man-Made America, Chaos or Control?" (1963). Also, see the recent favorable judicial decisions which hold that the community can constitutionally protect its esthetic sensibilities. *People v. Stover*, 12 N.Y. 2d 462 (1963). And although the Seagram people were unlucky in the outcome of their litigation against a realty tax assessment made higher because of the design of its New York City headquarters (see *Joseph T. Seagram & Sons, Inc.* v. *Tax Commission*, 14 N.Y. 2d 314 (1964)), we find increasingly more concern being expressed about the value of beautiful real estate and buildings in condemnation cases. This is important even where the litigants are unsuccessful. See, for example, the decision of the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Tennessee Valley Authority* v. *An Easement and Right of Way Over Land in Logan County, Kentucky*, 336 F. 2d 76 (August 27, 1964).

[25] See "The New Scientist," London, Nov. 12, 1964, p. 442.

[26] "Everybody's Political What's What" (1944), p. 183.

[27] Business enterprises now, more and more, are purchasing the work of musicians and artists. Thus the Basic-Witz Furniture Manufacturing Co. commissions compositions by classical composers and retains Van Cliburn to perform at a showing of its new line of furniture, while Mr. Bart Lytton, Lytton Savings & Loan Association, offers counsel on how businessmen may do business with artists. Los Angeles Times, Dec. 1, 1964.

[28] Nov. 24, 1964, p. 13. The matter was even discussed in the House of Lords. The Times (London), Dec. 3, 1964, p. 16.

[29] "The Fire Next Time" (1962).

[30] "The ultimate weapons will not be military weapons but trained minds." Dr. Charles N. Kimball, in Proceedings of Conference on Space, Science, and Urban Life, supra, note 15, p. 74.

[31] See Dr. J. Herbert Holloman in conference, supra, note 15, at p. 85: "Today [1963] there is insufficient demand by the consumer and by the businessman for the products and services that the economy can provide * * *. We must take steps to increase

consumer demand." Frederick Pohl's picture of society in the year 2000 included laws which were passed to compel consumption because of the excessive output of an automated technology. Columnist Arthur Hoppe in an article, "The Last of the Small Time Spenders," San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 26, 1964, quotes a speaker at the 1984 convention of Our Society for Patriotic Consumption: "But we cannot rest on our laurels. Let each of us, weary though we may be, get out there and buy, buy, buy; spend, spend, spend. Let us each selflessly do our utmost to preserve our new American way of life."

The $100 Visa Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, administration officials now vigorously deny it, but they have been quietly studying the idea of imposing a $100 visa tax on Americans who wish to travel abroad.

This marks a case where alert newsmen nipped an obviously foolish idea in the bud. Chicago's finest Washington correspondent, Walter Trohan, exposed the plan first in his Tribune column. Other top reporters, including those on my hometown Cleveland newspapers, the Plain Dealer and the Press, quickly followed through.

Although the plan probably will not be sent to Congress for consideration—the early glare of publicity may have defeated it—it illustrates again the self-defeating and devious routes the executive branch will take rather than confront reality.

As Mr. Trohan points out in the following column, there are far more direct means of shoring up our gold. I recommend his remarks to the attention of my colleagues, in the hope that it will consider legislation to halt the seepage of gold through social security and veteran payments to citizens of Iron Curtain countries, and through wasteful expenditure of foreign aid.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert Mr. Trohan's comments:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON—NO TAX TOO FOOLISH TO WIN SUPPORT IN WASHINGTON

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, January 31.—No tax is so foolish or heavy and no regulation so rigid and destructive that it doesn't have advocates in Washington. Where fat cats are away, bureaucratic mice like to play at getting their money, even though it may hit the poor more heavily than the rich.

The unfavorable balance of payments has sent bureaucrats scurrying around for culprits and strange means of shifting the tide. Some bureaucrats have solemnly proposed limitation of American spending abroad by setting a limit on dollars American travelers can take out, say $100. Other bureaucrats would put a $100 price tag on an exist visa for American travelers.

Neither of these programs is being seriously considered within the Johnson administration, but they have their advocates. And even if they should be, neither proposal would have a ghost of a chance of getting through any congressional committee, in the opinion of leading Democratic Senators and Congressmen.

Responsible State and Commerce Department officials say it would be impossible to fix a workable limit on American spending abroad. An attempt was made by the Kennedy administration in cutting the allowance for duty-free imports from $500 to $100. Those who want to make more purchases abroad send back as many as 30 of the duty-free $10 gift packages or pay the duty, which is not large.

PROPOSALS TURNED DOWN A YEAR AGO

Knowledgeable travelers would circumvent any spending restrictions by working through companies or friends abroad. The $100 visa tax would bring complaints more than it would restrict travelers, now numbering more than a million a year. Top officials turned thumbs down on these suggestions years ago, but the ideas keep bobbing up in the minds of young bureaucrats when they lunge into thought.

Foreign aid advocates blame the outflow of American private capital in foreign ventures rather than foreign aid for oversea deficits. Since foreign aid began, the United States has poured $96 billion overseas. During this period foreign-invested private American capital totaled $3 billion. In 1963 new American foreign investment was $3.9 billion and the net income from foreign investment was $4.2 billion. The Federal Government should encourage the export of private enterprise for what it returns.

In 1963, $2.9 billion was spent by and for U.S. troops abroad. Many of these troops could be safely brought home, because our main war deterrent is the strategic striking air forces and missiles. Bringing troops home would stem an annual outflow of a billion dollars. Americans stationed abroad, under various agencies, spend and cost hundreds of millions more.

MANY DEAD BUT CHECKS ARE CASHED

Two other great loopholes for the outward flow of American dollars are the 112,325 checks totaling $70,486,327 the veterans bureau sent to veterans and dependents living abroad in the fiscal year ending last June 30 and $116,835,000 paid to social security beneficiaries who choose to live abroad, even behind the iron curtain. The most recent monthly figure for social security payments is $9,195,136 paid to 143,152 beneficiaries abroad in December 1963. Many foreigners return home when they qualify for such payments to enjoy the better life.

Many of the beneficiaries are dead, but their checks are still being cashed. A foreign postmaster was taking 50 percent of a dead man's check and when this was discovered he explained that he thought it was foreign aid and that he was sharing it with the family.

A high Government official said the foreign social security and veterans payments are a bucket of worms. No one wants to investigate because it involves so many American departments and so many foreign governments and officials. It is possible that registration and supervision of foreign beneficiaries of American benefit programs could save millions and keep bureaucrats so busy they wouldn't dream of trying to impose unworkable restrictions and punitive taxes.

Rugged Individualism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD an article appearing in the Sunday, January 10, 1965, edition of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat written by Sue Ann Wood a very perspicacious news reporter whose writings are receiving increasing attention outside the St. Louis community.

In these days of governmental wars on poverty, sight is being lost of the pioneering spirit that took this country out of poverty into affluence. The subject of this article, Johannes Priester, would have to be taken struggling and kicking into President Johnson's poverty category. Indeed, there are many people in the United States who choose to live on the edge of what we call the money economy and derive most of their sustenance and joy directly from nature and their fellow man without the medium of money. This is their pursuit of happiness which it would do us well to remember.

The article follows:

TWENTY MILES, BUT A CENTURY AWAY—86-YEAR-OLD JEFFERSON COUNTY FARMER LEADS PIONEER LIFE

(By Sue Ann Wood)

Johannes (John) Priester, 86, lives in a two-story log farmhouse less than 20 miles from St. Louis, in Jefferson County, but the life he leads is nearly a century removed from most of his neighbors.

He has no use for electricity. Kerosene lamps provide all the light he needs and a wood stove keeps the house plenty warm—hot, in fact. A cistern provides enough water for Mr. Priester and his two mules, and the mules give him all the extra help he needs to plow and do other farmwork.

Until a few years ago, Mr. Priester drove his 1924 Ford truck if he wanted to travel more than a few miles from home, but the truck is stored in his barn now. He never cared much for driving anyway. He much prefers to use "shoemaker's horse—the feet" to get where he's going.

It was a mild winter day when a visiting reporter and photographer knocked on Mr. Priester's front door, that looks out on a peaceful valley and wooded hills in the vicinity of Spring Forest Road. He opened the door with a sizzling skillet in one hand, just lifted off the small wood stove in the center of the main room of the house, where he cooks, eats, and sleeps.

LIKES TO WALK

He welcomed the visitors inside and went on with the task of cleaning the skillet in which he had been interrupted. This involved pouring hot water in it from a teakettle on the stove, going outside to throw the greasy water away and then tearing off a page of newspaper from a stack on a table to polish the pan.

Within a few moments he held up the glistening skillet, cleaner than anything ever seen in a television detergent commercial.

"A newspaper beats a rag for cleaning," Mr. Priester declared. "You have to wash a rag but you can just burn the paper."

Bubbling away atop the stove were a coffeepot and a stewpan in which, Mr. Priester said, he was cooking a rabbit shot by a friend. A brother, who lives nearby, or neighbors bring his groceries for him now that he no longer drives.

"I used to walk even when I had the truck," he pointed out. "I'd go to Breezy Heights, about 2 miles from here, once or twice a week and walk back with coffee and sugar. I can still get the coffee but the sugar is too heavy."

FARMS 53 ACRES

Asked about his farm, Mr. Priester sat back and stroked his silky mustache and stubbly beard for a few minutes as he thought of how long he had lived there.

"It was in 1913 that I bought this place," he said. "It has 58 acres—53 in cultivation. I've raised a lot of wheat and hay—also corn, potatoes, and onions. As long as I've been farming, I've always had potatoes to sell until this year. The women have quit peeling potatoes; they buy them in cans now."

His grandparents moved to St. Louis from Germany before his father, the youngest of six children, was born, Mr. Priester said. His father and several uncles bought land in Jefferson County before there were roads in most of the area and he was born on a farm near Breezy Heights, he said, on July 8, 1878.

Although most people call him John, the holy communion certificate framed on one wall shows that his name actually is Johannes and a slight accent reveals his German heritage.

His health is good and his eyesight and hearing are excellent.

"I never wear glasses, even to read," he said proudly. "I can see better at night than plenty of fellows. Many a time I walked home from a dance at 2 or 3 in the morning and could see fine, even if it was cloudy and no moon."

ESCAPED MARRIAGE

Grinning, he admitted he was "quite a spot," in his younger days and never missed a dance.

"Not square dancing," he scoffed. "Give me a good waltz."

How did he escape marriage all these years?

"I was too wise. They couldn't catch me," Mr. Priester said brusquely. "I went with one girl for 7 years but then she moved to town—St. Louis. She wanted me to sell out and move there too, but I wouldn't. So we didn't get married."

He took the visitors on a tour of the farm, pointing with pride to an iron cooking stove in a room of the house used only in summer.

"That's a No. 1 good little stove," he declared. "I bought that when I bought this place, 52 years ago."

A clock in the front room was bought in 1902, Mr. Priester reported. It still keeps time, he said, although "it ticks so loud I don't like it." He prefers to check the time with his Elgin pocket watch, purchased in 1903.

Age seems to have little effect on the working condition of most things at the Priester farm, including the owner.

LIKES HIS MULES

His two mules, Bets and Jack, are 13 years old. Mr. Priester gazed fondly at the animals, munching hay in the barn. The mules, he said, using a favorite phrase, are "a No. 1 good team for pulling a load."

He uses the mules to pull the plow or mower or a wooden sleigh for hauling wood and fodder.

"I wouldn't have a horse," he said. "You have to buy 100 horses before you get 10 good ones. Horses are too fiery and fidgety. You can't trust them as much as a mule."

Mr. Priester has owned many mules over the years and once turned down an offer of $700 for one team. Money is just money but a good mule is hard to find, he explained.

The 1924 truck, standing on chocks in another outbuilding, has a steel body and self-starter, Mr. Priester said, as he pointed out the fine points of the vehicle. It still has its second set of tires and the original pistons, he added.

"There's not a dent or bent fender on that truck," he said. "I never had an accident."

Acknowledging that the truck is an antique, Mr. Priester said collectors have tried to buy it from him.

"I wouldn't sell it," he said flatly.

USED COVERED WAGON

Before he got the truck in 1924, he used a small covered wagon to haul potatoes and other produce to market in St. Louis. The wagon, its canvas top in good condition and the name "J. Priester" in bright yellow letters still visible on the side, is stored with some old farm equipment.

"I used to haul all the potatoes that wagon would hold," he reminisced. "Once it carried 39 bushels of potatoes, and apples, pears and turnips, too—52 bushels in all. I used to go to the Chippewa Market and peddle from the wagon in South St. Louis.

"It took about 5 hours to get there from here. That was good stepping for a team. And those mules knew the roads as well as I did."

His hay wagon, bought some 60 years ago, has a handmade tongue and hay frame. His tractor, purchased in 1927, needs a little work on the engine, he admitted, but still runs all right.

Gazing out over the valley and hills for several minutes, Mr. Priester agreed that the view was a fine one—"especially in the fall when the hillsides change colors."

WELL-AGED SUITS

He was wearing blue work pants and jacket and a brown felt hat that had been carefully mended around the crown. Mr. Priester guessed that the hat might be "about 10 years old," relatively new for his wardrobe.

Going back into the house, he opened a bottom bureau drawer and lifted out the newer of his two "good suits," almost never worn. He unfolded the dark suit coat and chuckled as he said, "This is the new one—only about 35 years old. Look—the lining is still in it. And here are the pants and vest that belong to it."

The "old one" was taken from a corner wardrobe stand—a suit that he got when he was 23 years old, still in wearable condition.

"When I bought it, the man said the color would never fade, and it hasn't," he said, smoothing a hand over the dark, hard-finish wool.

Reaching in a pocket of the coat, he pulled out a pair of black velvet ear muffs, the kind that cup over each ear. He used to wear them to church in cold weather, Mr. Priester said. He tucked the muffs back in the pocket before hanging up the coat.

WORKS HARD

He still works hard every day, splitting wood, cutting brush and doing other chores, Mr. Priester said, and manages to stay in good health. Although he has had several accidents—being thrown by a horse or toppled from a hay wagon—he never has been seriously hurt. Bitten by a copperhead snake last year, he treated the bite with turpentine and never bothered to see a doctor.

Does he ever wish for modern conveniences, such as electricity or running water, the visitors asked?

"I could have electricity but it's cheaper without it," he said. "Coal oil is all I need. If I eat early and go to bed early, I don't even need a light. In summertime, I don't use any.

"I have a cistern. Even in dry weather, I had plenty of water for the mules and myself.

"Television? Who wants to sit all day and watch that? TV is harder on you than work. You sit up 'til 11 or 12 o'clock at night looking at it."

Mr. Priester "likes a good breakfast" and eats plenty of bread and potatoes, he said. He used to smoke a pipe and chew tobacco but gave up both habits about 12 years ago and he never drinks much, he said, except "maybe a glass or two of beer."

SPURNS PENSION

He never has applied for a pension and, since he owns his farm, has few expenses.

"I lost a lot of my money," he said, "when I put it in a place that went broke. If it weren't for that—gosh darn, I'd be the richest bachelor around here."

It wasn't so much married life he rejected as the prospect of moving to the city, back when he was considering marriage, he indicated.

Address to Annual Meeting of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce on Thursday Evening, January 14, 1965, at the Hotel John Marshall, by Arleigh Burke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege the night of January 14, 1965, to attend the annual meeting of the Richmond, Va., Chamber of Commerce and hear an inspiring and thought-provoking address by Adm. Arleigh Burke. In his interesting talk Admiral Burke spelled out the challenges facing the United States in the world today. With the thought that his remarks will be of interest to my colleagues, and under the permission granted, I am pleased to include his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS TO ANNUAL MEETING OF THE RICHMOND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON THURSDAY EVENING, JANUARY 14, 1965, AT THE HOTEL JOHN MARSHALL, BY ARLEIGH BURKE

Gentlemen, my first title for this speech was "The Beauties of the First Frost of the Season." For we are living in the most marvelous era of all history. At no time have the people had greater opportunities. And of all the world, no place is more comfortable or holds more opportunities than the United States. Within the United States there certainly is no more wonderful State than Virginia—and Richmond is the essence of Virginia.

Truly we are fortunate people. In counting our blessings, high on the list should be that we were born and raised in the United States.

This country of ours is the leader—and the envy—of all other nations. Why? Because in peace and war we demonstrated that we were the most powerful nation in the world. Not only is our actual production great, but our productive capacity is greater than many other larger nations combined. Our tremendous gross national product of some $620 billion is growing.

Our food production, far in excess of our needs, is a wonder of a spectacular age. Our steel production is much higher than that of any other nation, although we are now importing more steel than we are exporting. We—with more cars per person than any place else on earth—are manufacturing 8 million cars a year, and to continue this recitation of abundance and well-being: more super highways, more cloverleafs, more telephones, more televisions and radios, more refrigerators and blenders and vacuum cleaners. We are better dressed, better housed, better fed. Even the poverty stricken in our land of plenty are much better off than 90 percent of the rest of the world.

We not only have abundance. We have power—all kinds of power.

We have mighty military strength, mighty nuclear delivery capability, a tremendous conventional military strength, well-trained military men, and professional services devoted to serving constitutional government and abhoring any thought of taking power—

overtly or covertly—not properly theirs as servants of the Executive leadership.

Now, all these blessings of liberty—these fruits of an abundant harvest—did not just happen. We all know the many reasons why our predecessors were able to forge this powerful, generous, wealthy state. We should never forget that the essential ingredient was their will—their will to work hard, to compete, to endure, to overcome hardship.

But here is the paradox—what makes many people a bit squeamish? From our posture of well-being, abundance, and power, we look upon a world literally a sea of troubles. In spite of the astonishing advances in technology and in living conditions, our globe is in a state of unprecedented turmoil, all over—including our country.

For the very reason that there has been so much progress in technology, in communications, in electronics, in weaponry—difficulties in one nation have immediate impact on other nations. Technologically speaking, isolationism becomes impossible. One nation's troubles become another nation's problems. For the nation which hopes to lead the free, this is emphatically true.

Danger and opportunity seem to ride the same waves in our modern world. It is much like the old days of the whaling industry, when tall masted ships would put out of New England ports, sail the far flung oceans, track the whale—and then put out their little boats, until the harpooner targeted on a sensitive area. Then the death battle would begin, with the boat pulled by the line made fast by the harpoon in the whale's side. Finally came the fatal blow with the lance. Or sometimes—the mighty whale, with his powerful jaw, might crack the boat with its imperiled crew. The dreadful defeat and probable death—or—the splendor of victory and its great financial reward—until the last—stood in abeyance for the crew members.

True, in 1965 no victory or defeat in the economic, military, or international political fields will be complete. But four particular challenges confronting our Nation in 1965 could bring both danger and opportunity which could be enormous—and which might be decided one way or the other with terrific consequences, but by a very narrow margin, very much as these whaling ventures were decided.

For 1965 these four particular challenges are by no means the only ones. But these are four in which 1965 may be the decisive year, to be followed by great advance, or great defeat. The four challenges I discuss today are those which in 1965 will likely become acute.

I. THE SOVIET WORLD

The first challenge is the happenings going on in the Soviet world. For the way we decide to deal with these could well determine the outcome of the cold war—and us. The Western alliance in the 1950's, and even at the time of the October 1962 missile crisis had remained firm and viable—even before threats of nuclear blackmail. Because we had been firm for a long time, a Soviet return to the popular front strategy of the 1930's, and of the 1920's, seemed to offer more to the Soviets, especially in view of their deepening economic crisis at home.

The Soviet Union is having a serious rift with its Communist neighbor—and onetime dependent—Red China. The rift is not about the Communists' aim and objective of dominating the world, but about how to go about getting control of the world and subsequently, deciding who is to do the directing—Red China or the Soviet Union. Back in October of 1957, Khrushchev signed with Red China a treaty giving her both nuclear and economic aid, and for 2 years that aid poured in. By 1959, Khrushchev apparently decided, first, that Red China was getting too much interested in nuclear weapons assistance, which he did not want to give; second, that Red China might soon contest the Kremlin's leadership position; third, that the resources going to Red China could better be spent in other areas to win the cold war. So by June of 1959, he started to cut off this aid. No wonder Mao yelled.

Inflated, recalcitrant Mao Tse-tung is apparently pressing his challenge to the Soviet Union at every point—now—just as he did in the last days of the Khrushchev dynasty. He sent Chou En-Lai to Moscow after Khrushchev's departure, with assurance that Red China would be happy to resume the previous cordial relationships with the Soviets—but on Red Chinese terms. The Soviets apparently do not believe they can pay that price—and those terms mean all-out aid, among other concessions.

The Soviet Union command over its satellites is weakening a little, as demonstrated by the Eastern European satellites going to Moscow after Khrushchev's ouster, and demanding an explanation as to why Khrushchev was discarded. Albania and Poland and some of the other satellites ruled by Communist regimes, are exercising some independence from Moscow and now, are not so easily coerced as they once were.

Last autumn Khrushchev was overthrown by a coalition with the support of the Red army and the secret police. But not another power struggle is brewing between Brezhnev and Kosygin. The Communist system requires a strong dictator, with power enough to demand compliance from all others.

But the fact that within the Soviet Union there is a struggle for power, and within the Communist camp there is a struggle for leadership, does not mean that we are confronted with a less dangerous situation. Here, indeed, is the promise and the peril. A unified West and a good strategy among free world allies could take advantage of Communist disunity. On the other hand, a disunified West can do nothing to take advantage of a disunified Communist camp. The Red Chinese cannot help the Kremlin out of economic troubles. But the West can. The Red Chinese do not have the potential resources to build a stronger Soviet base for advanced weapons and power. But the West does. The Red Chinese, even working with the Kremlin, do not have the capability of dividing NATO. But Western nations entering into unilateral agreements with the Kremlin without consulting allies, can indeed upset NATO. These facts explain why Khrushchev and his succesors have moved toward a strategy of detents with the West.

Now, how we estimate this situation, and what strategy we devise to deal with it—as I said earlier—could determine the outcome of the cold war. This is the first major challenge facing our policymakers in 1965.

II. SOUTHEAST ASIA

Now to turn to southeast Asia, the second major challenge facing our policymakers. Let us define the challenge. It is to defend the integrity of South Vietnam, but to this assertion, we often get the response: what if they don't want to defend themselves? Why are we there in the first place? The answer is this: not primarily because of South Vietnam, or the people there, as important as this may be. We are there to preserve our strategic position in the Far East. We must defend our own position in southeast Asia, to help protect Malaysia, Australia, the Philippines, Japan, and our other friends. To defend this very strategic position in the Pacific we fought World War II.

The Red tide in south Asia will have to be turned back. The Communists won at Dienbienphu, moved into the newly created independent states, took North Vietnam, infiltrated Laos and joined in a troika rule. Red China attacked India and disclosed India's weaknesses. Sihanouk, of Cambodia, started siding with the winning Communists—reluctantly, he says. He has thrown out our representatives, refused our aid, and now follows the Communist line. Sukarno, of Indonesia, led his rich country in revolt against the Dutch, forced them with U.S. assistance, to turn over West New Guinea to Indonesia instead of making it an independent nation or leaving it under the beneficent control of the Dutch.

The United States is seriously involved in South Vietnam. If we go in deeper it will cost us more men, effort, and dollars, and the the Red Chinees and North Vietnamese will probably increase their activities and there is always the possibility of escalation to a bigger war. On the other hand, if we pull out and leave South Vietnam to its fate, all of southeast Asia, Malaya, Thailand, Burma, India, and even the Philippines eventually may come under Communist rule and exploitation. Even this would not be the end. With Asia gone, the Middle East and Africa would be seriously threatened, and maybe eventually—untenable.

Now, we hear much about the fact that victory in South Vietnam must depend upon a new attitude on the part of the South Vietnamese. That is true. But it is just as true that victory there in 1965 must depend upon a whole new attitude on our part as well.

III. AFRICA

Now to the third challenge in 1965—another crisis point—Africa. Even if we restore and rebuild NATO, the flank of the West can be turned in Africa and Latin America. Here, the popular front strategy of subversion, propaganda, proxy, and strange alliances reaches maximum effectiveness.

At one time we felt that the Congo should become an independent nation. In the thinking of many Americans, any alternative was better than colonialism—regardless of whether it was enlightened or not, no matter how conducive it was or wasn't for justice, or improved education, or improved medical care. In blind use of the word self-determination, there was little thought of what real representative government meant, and even less of the dangers of totalitarianism, terror, and chaos. Often in the condemnation of existing regimes in Africa, all in the name of self-determination and democracy, it is forgotten that we did not allow the self-determination of the South during our War between the States, and that Hitler took the Sudetenland under the guise of self-determination. As for so-called democracy, we should remember that Algeria, Ghana, Guinea, Mali, and Egypt—archcondemners of Tshombe—tolerate absolutely no political opposition within their totalitarian countries.

The United States supplied tactical and logistic support in defeating Tshombe's forces, but Tshombe, a couple of years after turned out to be the only hope of restoring order in that country beset by warfare. The rebels, supported and assisted by the Communists, have killed thousands of their fellow black men, and hundreds of Europeans.

When the chaos, rapacity, and cannibalism became so rampant as to endanger several thousand Europeans, Belgium, and the United States had to send forces at the request of the Congo Government to prevent the Europeans from being killed. That necessary and correct action, saving the lives of many, hopefully will mark a turning point in our African policy.

Nineteen sixty-five may well be a decisive year in Africa. The Communists are stepping up aid in operation against Portuguese Mozambique, in hopes of enlarging the African chaos from the Congo to Angola and Mozambique. All central Africa could become similar to South Vietnam. Let us hope that in 1965 the tide may be turned toward stability and order. Let us hope that the American airdrop of Belgian paratroopers will truly mark a turning point in our policies, and that no longer will we join in the perverted anticolonialism which has served to

advance terrorism, totalitarianism, and the forces of Red Chinese communism.

IV. THE DOLLAR CRISIS

Now I turn to the economic challenge facing the United States in 1965. No sooner did the British Labor Party take office than they were met with a severe economic crisis, just as they were when they last took office in 1946. And now, as then, they called upon their allies to bail them out. In 1946 we loaned them $3¾ billion and this time 11 nations scraped together $3 billion for them. The British Government levied a surtax of 15 percent on imports and raised their bank rate from 5 to 7 percent. These actions, of course, have an adverse effect on the U.S. economy at a time when we ourselves are having severe balance-of-payments problems.

Measures taken by Britain so far have done little to remedy the root problem—the strengthening of the basic productive efficiency of the British economy.

This leads to our own problem—which cannot be solved by gimmicks either. Accumulation of short-term claims by others against the dollar—including the French we might note—and the loss of our monetary reserves have created a serious imbalance. If our creditors abroad were to lay claim to our gold, we would not have enough to pay. A basic corrective to this is to expand our exports, but this can only be done by becoming more competitive. At the very time of this overriding need, labor costs are going up. Because of cost and price trends, there is considerable concern about the outlook for corporate profit margins in the next 12 to 18 months. If there is inflation, we are in trouble; the profits squeeze could cause a downturn in our economy, and of course the balance-of-payments situation is a continuing problem. And the pound sterling problem could become a crisis for the United States, too.

I would like to stress, that if the position of the United States as the world's banker is impaired, the entire strategic posture of the United States is impaired. In meeting the crisis of the cold war, the United States has had the luxury of acting without serious economic constraint. Now our freedom of action is being placed in real jeopardy. It is well to recall that the failure of the London Economic Conference set the stage for the isolationism that gave Hitler the freedom for aggression.

But in this challenge there is opportunity—the opportunity to tighten our budget, put our financial house in order, increase productivity and incentive, and become more competitive. How to meet this financial challenge will be a major problem confronting our policymakers in 1965.

OTHER CHALLENGES

We will have many other problems to face in 1965 too. Some of them may be just as acute as those I have mentioned.

Cuba is still Communist. Latin America has many difficulties—and those difficulties are different in different parts and will require different actions. The Middle East may erupt again. Certainly Nasser will. We have NATO problems—and some of the European countries like Italy and Turkey may have crises which will have heavy impact on the United States. The U.N. may cause us some unpleasant surprises. Internationally, it may not be an easy year.

Internally it may not be smooth sailing—in spite of our great hopes. Prices may have to increase because costs increase. Our crime problem and delinquency problems are not going to be solved easily. Other things like urban renewal, unemployment, civil rights actions, inflation tendencies—seem to be always with us—and not getting any easier.

V. OUR BIGGEST PROBLEM: OURSELVES

Can we meet the great challenges of 1965? Will we falter, delay, confuse the problems, think solutions can wait until 1966, and then until 1967? If we do think this, they, like the whale at bay, may turn and destroy us. I think what worries many Americans is not the crises themselves, so much as our ability and willingness to meet the crises.

We are in a time and an age when many of the mainsprings of Western civilization are in question. Karl Marx long ago challenged the values which indeed had brought the peace and unparalleled advances of the last century. Today, the modern Communist challenges the values and concepts that form the basis of the Judeo-Christian heritage. He also challenges the very basis of democracy as we have finally developed it through evolutionary methods in our country.

Now, simply this external challenge to our American way of life might be wholly good for us. The historian Toynbee talked of challenge and response as the basis of progress and growth. The Nation, or the civilization that merely rests on its oars is surely doomed.

But it is not the external challenge that offers maximum danger. It is the danger, to use the phrases of Ortega y Gasset, that discord might outweigh concord within a nation. And as that Latin philosopher noted, when internal discord becomes too great, a nation will die. Groups fight groups. Class fights class. Individuals look out for themselves—and their group—and try to destroy all opposition. If we develop a tower of Babel, we too many be confounded. People become increasingly self-centered. Crime increases, even on the streets of the largest cities. And citizens feel they have no responsibility to become involved to prevent murder, or rape, or dishonesty.

To the historian this has a familiar ring. It was just such discord, not the barbarians, that brought about the fall of Rome. During the 600 years of the Pax Romana, those barbarians tried to invade, but were turned back. In the classic history by Professor Rostovtzeff, he notes the condition that presaged the fall: Roman citizens had lost their balance; hate reigned between peasants, landowners, army, government officials; taxation, as Rostovtzeff notes, turned into organized robbery; the currency was inflated; productivity and trade declined, and lawlessness abounded on the seas, on the once marvelous highways, and in the cities.

The Emperor Diocletian tried to revitalize this decay, and for a while it seemed he had, by reorganizing the government, adding police protection, boosting the army, wiping out dissidents. Yet all his so-called reforms increased bureaucracy, taxation, and power at the top so the fall was merely harder when it did come.

The discord that causes the death of nations relates to discord over values. Standards become no longer meaningful. There is tolerance of wrongdoing—not out of sympathy—but out of a desire not to have to do anything about it yourself. To ease our conscience, we develop a sort of relativism, where absolute truth and honor and duty vanish.

The strength of our civilization has been its trust in absolute values that could not be compromised. When the children of Israel made their exodus from slavery in search of freedom, they soon found that man cannot survive his animal nature in a freedom that is merely license. The law given at Mount Sinai was an effort to achieve that balance between liberty and restraint. Many of the subsequent leaders of that newly founded nation—Joshua, David, for example—were great men who none the less were beset by human frailties. But they never called wrong right, nor justified a failure by lowering the standards, nor suddenly deciding the law was relative, nor announced that the end justified the means.

Our Nation can meet the challenges, and turn the perils to a promise of a better world, if we keep the standards high. But it won't happen if we build the golden calf out of paternalistic government, or accept the something for nothing philosophy. When a nation fails to work, to innovate, to invent, to reinvest, to produce more efficiently, it will lose its greatness, its power, its hope. Our foreign policies cannot be shaped according to a neutralish popularity contest easily manipulated by Communists or others who would do us in. We must not be ashamed or apologetic of the values which built our civilization. We must stand firm in the conviction that evolution, not violent revolution, is the way of true progress. On these values, we must not be divided.

Facing 1965—the four challenges I have mentioned—and the many others I have not mentioned—let us—even where our strategy and tactics fail—raise a standard to which the wise and honest may repair. That is the wonderful language of the greatest Virginian of them all, the Father of our country.

National character is still the strongest element of national power. We blundered often during the American Revolution and won it. We may have sometimes blundered in the cold war. In our abundance, it is easy to build euphoria about our economy and about our struggle with communism, and such euphoria is conducive to blunders.

But we can blunder and still win, if we are sure of our values. The world awaits leadership sure of its values. In such assurance, 1965 can be a year, not earmarked with signs of decline and reaction, but marked with a renaissance of energy, hard work, determination to meet these problems before they get out of control. Then we can find the sunlit uplands of a better world after 1965—a year of decisions.

Training Is Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the vital facts about our national unemployment is its ingredient of lack of skill. Education and training are vital today and without them no one can forge ahead in our complex society.

These points were well presented in a recent editorial in the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times of February 1, 1965, and this editorial is so pertinent that I ask leave to include it at this point with my remarks.

THE AVAILABLE JOBS

In a little more than 18 months' time, there will be at least 1,823 additional jobs available in the Danbury labor market area, the manpower coordinating committee of the State labor department has reported.

But these jobs are not just for anybody. They require at least a high school but less than a college education.

The 1,823 figure is probably low, because it covers only firms which are already in the area. It does not take in engineering and other professional needs.

The point to remember is that these jobs will not be available to high school dropouts.

Nor will many of them be available to those who do not obtain some education or training beyond high school.

These facts were reported to area business and industrial leaders last week.

Some other important facts were disclosed, too. Of the 1,600 who have been listed as

unemployed in the 14-town area, nearly two-thirds are in the unskilled or semiskilled category.

And a big chunk of the unemployed are under 25 years of age.

The lesson is clear. Those who want to get ahead in the future must have at least a high school education. They must be willing to take additional courses or to enter a training program.

For instance, the survey showed there will be a need for 201 machine operators by September 1966, 177 screw-machine operators and set-up men, 102 inspectors, 81 auto mechanics, 70 general salesmen, and 62 secretaries-stenographers.

In other words, there are opportunities aplenty for those willing to work for them.

Broadcasting Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, recently in San Francisco the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, E. William Henry, made an excellent presentation on one of our most vexatious problems in the broadcasting industry. I commend his remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

ADDRESS OF E. WILLIAM HENRY, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, BEFORE THE COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JANUARY 15, 1965

Throughout the years in the field of broadcasting perhaps no single quesiton has generated as much controversy and debate—both within the FCC and without—as section 315 of the Communications Act—that part of the law whose requirement has become a household word. I refer, of course, to its provision for "equal time."

This law touches several concepts of the utmost importance to a democratic society. So I want to consider with you today not just the equal time requirement, but also the tremendously high cost of political broadcast time, and the proper role of broadcasting in the political arena.

First of all, let's discuss the bedrock principle of section 315—equality.

How many common phrases bear witness to the depth of man's response to the idea of equality. "All men were created equal"—"Equal justice under law"—"Equal protection of the law"—"Equal rights"—"Equal opportunities."

How many phrases suggest our abhorrence for equality's opposite—"favoritism"—"special interests"—"special privilege"—discrimination."

The belief that political candidates should have equal opportunities to reach the public thus has an ancient and honorable lineage. And it is no wonder that the phrase "equal time" evokes such an immediate response in the American imagination.

The idea is simplicity itself, and is quickly understood. Each candidate is entitled to equal time to present his views. Wives have been known to use it against husbands, husbands against mothers-in-law; and at least one secretary I know has used it against her boss.

Yet this idea—the heart of section 315 of the Communications Act—is under heavy attack. For years, some broadcasters have opposed it, and sought its elimination from the law. Many newspapers—often as a reflex action—have castigated it. And a little over a month ago, the presidents of two television networks called, in separate speeches, for its repeal.

Robert Sarnoff of NBC called television journalism a "shackled giant" and the equal-time rule one of its restricting shackles. In his view, "a law that requires a Government agency to direct the manner in which the public may be informed in an election campaign is inconsistent with the aims of democracy."

Frank Stanton of CBS was even more colorful. He called the equal-time rule "a discredited and unworkable legal relic of a generation ago," and said "it is section 315 that keeps our political methods a century behind our communications." Decrying the refusal of Congress to suspend the law during the 1964 campaign, he urged the electorate to speak out for its repeal "with such a loud and unmistakable demand that neither political stalling nor parliamentary juggling can silence or contradict it."

These are harsh words from men of good will and good faith. And we can be sure they will be joined by others in seeking to persuade the new Congress to take section 315 off the books. The banner that waves over their bandwagon is labeled "freedom"—freedom from undue restrictions, freedom to report the whole truth, freedom to bring 20th century communications into 20th century politics. This freedom, they say, cannot live with the rule of equality, and hence equality must go.

Well, at the risk of being run over by this bandwagon, I would like to enlist today as an advocate of equality. For my fundamental response to them is rather like Andrew Jackson's instructions to his troops at the Battle of New Orleans: "Boys, elevate them guns a little lower."

Let's take a look at the law itself. Section 315 stems from a provisions of the Radio Act of 1927. Its essential features have always been the same: first, a requirement that if a broadcaster permits a candidate to use his facilities, he must offer "equal opportunities" to all other legally qualified candidates for the same office; and second, a requirement that broadcasters refrain from censoring candidates who use their facilities.

In 1952, Congress found that a number of broadcasters were charging candidates more for the use of their facilities than they did commercial advertisers for the same amount of time. It therefore inserted a sentence prohibiting this kind of cost discrimination.

In 1959, Congress became concerned lest section 315—as interpreted by the FCC in the Lar Daly case—unduly disrupt broadcasters' legitimate journalistic functions. It added a provision exempting four kinds of news programs from the "equal time" and "no censorship" requirements. At the same time, it expressly reminded broadcasters of their obligation—with or without section 315—to be fair—"to operate in the public interest and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance."

You will notice that Congress has thus attempted to draw a line between two different functions—on the one hand, a candidate's use of broadcast facilities solely for his own political purposes, and on the other, his appearance in various kinds of news programs to serve primarily the broadcaster's purposes.

Let me here emphasize that this distinction touches the heart of the controversy surrounding section 315.

At bottom, we have a struggle between opposing aspects of what political broadcasting is and should be.

To the broadcaster, political programing is journalism—the irreverent but legitimate daughter of the newspaper. In political programs the broadcaster seeks to explain the political news, and to select the times when the electorate will see the candidate, and when it will not.

To the candidate, however, the broadcasting medium is simply the extension of a platform, a town hall, a city park—a giant means for his personal communication with the electorate, made possible by modern technology. From this point of view the biggest fact on the horizon has nothing to do with journalism. It has to do with money. For the great bulk of political broadcasting in this country is created and paid for by candidates and their supporters, with broadcasters supplying time and facilities for a fee.

Broadcasting is often an extremely profitable enterprise, particularly the television industry. Stations in the top 50 markets average some $1,425,000 each year in pretax profits. These earnings represent some 36 percent of average gross revenue. Average return on investments differ widely, but some confidential statistics in our files would make all of you here today green with envy. Some stations earn two or three times their total initial investment in after tax, net profits each year.

Television time is a luxury item with a luxury price tag.

While the actual expense figures for the 1964 election are not yet in, it is estimated that $40 million may well have been spent for radio and television time alone, of which half was spent at the national level. And these funds—all these millions—come from political contributions by individuals such as yourself, which are nondeductible, "after tax" money.

One half hour in prime time for a network nationwide broadcast costs a candidate about $60,000. One hour usually runs somewhere around $100,000.

In San Francisco, you have four commercial television stations—three affiliated with a network and one independently programed. What do you suppose it costs a candidate to buy a single 10-second prime time announcement on an affiliated station? $400. If he wants to economize, he may purchase 10 seconds on your independent station for only $225. For the same 10 seconds on one of the New York network stations he would pay about $1,250—or $125 per second. No wonder that the estimated costs for the last New York senatorial race are in the neighborhood of $4 million.

No wonder these money problems have been dubbed "bucklash."

Consider also, for example, the Indiana candidates who want television coverage in the northwestern part of their State, and must buy Chicago audiences. Similarly, congressional candidates in the first district of California can rely on Eureka stations for televised access to the northern part of their district, but for coverage of other large counties—Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, Marin—they must pay San Francisco prices.

The latest statistics indicate that at the national level the major parties spend somewhere between 35 and 40 percent of their campaign funds for television and radio, and while the proportion is less at the State and local levels, it is rising rapidly.

Reconsider, for a moment, Carl Elliott's race for the U.S. House of Representatives last fall, which I mentioned earlier today. Having spent more than $20,000 of his own money in 1962, he was faced in 1964 with an even tougher race. The night before election he found that the only way to counteract a piece of last-minute opposition propaganda was to go on television. Time was of the essence—nothing else would do. It cost him $15,000, and he had to mortgage his automobile in the process. Next day the voters turned him out.

Carl Elliott knows firsthand the truth of Will Rogers' comment that: "Politics has got so expensive that it takes lots of money to even get beat with."

The sad fact is that more than one candidate has mortgaged his house, hocked his car and saddled his future with a crushing load of debt in order to pay for broadcasting time. And often the debtor ends up on the losing side—sometimes after years of service in high elective office. The tragedy for the individuals involved is serious. Its larger effects upon the country may be disastrous.

Think of the qualified people who never enter the race because they have heard of such tragedies or because they can't muster the initial resources. Think of the candidates who do enter, laden with political commitments to those who have bought support as they would a market commodity. Even a nation committed to free enterprise should not overwhelmingly tempt a candidate to sell his political favors.

It was once a proud boast in this country that any mother's son might become President. We will never know how large a part that boast played in the American dream—the vision that drew millions to our shores. Over the years, however, something has happened to it. One hears it advanced—if at all—in a shamefaced or ironic manner. More and more one hears the opposite belief expressed—that only a rich man can hold our highest elective office.

We simply cannot afford a result so fundamentally at adds with all this country stands for.

I believe, therefore, that this Nation should reduce the cost of political broadcasting—the cost to candidates in terms of money, and the cost to the public in terms of prostituted patronage.

All right, say opponents of section 315. The way to reduce effectively the cost of political broadcasting is to repeal this law. Repeal, they say, will permit broadcasters to give more free time to major candidates, without having to give equal time to every would-be dogcatcher. Break the shackles, they repeat, and broacasters will still be fair to all parties.

To this argument let me adopt Speaker Sam Rayburn's adage that "The most valuable phrase in the English language is 'just a minute.'"

Let's revert to fundamentals. Those who seek repeal of the equal-time rule are asking for a great deal more than freedom to disregard frivolous candidates. In dealing with major candidates, they want the right to pick and choose, to broadcast some of their words but not all of tehm. They want the right to censor, and to treat candidates unequally.

There is nothing inherently sinister in this. What the advocates of repeal have in mind is journalism in the classic sense. They want to present, not the candidate's version of his campaign, but their version of it—not necessarily the candidate's view of the facts in the case, but their version of the truth as they see it. To do this, they must select, they must edit, they must pick and choose. Their guiding star must be their own news judgment. And the rule of "equal time" and "no censorship"—which makes so much sense when we think of the candidate on a broadcast platform—is anathema to their journalistic endeavor, whether there are 2 candidates or 20.

Let's consider what repeal would mean—both for paid time and for free time.

As we have seen, from the broadcaster's point of view, paid political broadcasting is simply a business. Moreover, however much free time may be donated in the future, this business will remain a large one. Politicians will still buy, and broadcasters will still sell.

With respect to paid political broadcasts, section 315 performs a valuable function. It insures all legally qualified candidates the right to purchase equal amounts of time at the same rates and in comparable segments of the broadcast day. It requires that candidates be charged no more for time than advertisers would be charged for comparable purposes. And it makes certain the candidate's right to use the time he purchases as he sees fit, without interference or censorship by broadcasters.

A great many broadcasters agree. In a speech last April, Mr. Lawrence Rogers, president of Taft Broadcasting Co., made a statement well worth pondering. He said:

"It would be no problem at all for a small town radio operator to be 'taken over' by a machine boss without section 315. In my own experience I have seen political machines deliberately try to buy all the time on the air for a given party or candidate, in order to freeze out the opposition. Section 315 protects the operator from such tactics. And it does so clearly and firmly."

Is there any reason to undermine these requirements? The basic complaint is that section 315 requires equal treatment for splinter groups and crackpot candidates. The blunt fact, however, is minority and fringe candidates almost never have the funds to pay for the kind of broadcasting done by the major parties. The fundamental attack on the requirement of equality simply does not apply to paid political broadcasting.

And now, what about free time? Free time includes not only the donation of a platform for use of the candidate as he sees fit. It likewise includes a wide variety of programs—interviews, press conferences, debates, discussions, etc. Such programs are sometimes outlets for candidates, sometimes vehicles for journalism, and often both at the same time.

In this situation, it is well to remember, one man's shackless are another man's freedoms. The repeal of section 315 would profoundly alter the conditions of political debate in this country. Do we want to give broadcasters the power to censor political debate? Do we really want to put broadcasters in a position to say to candidates, "If you want to reach the people through this medium, you must do so on our terms and in the way we think best"? I think not.

For what is at stake in a repeal is something much larger than the future of broadcast journalism. It goes to the very heart of the political process in America. And my doubts about the wisdom of the repeal of section 315 do not stem from a low estimate of the fairness and objectivity of broadcasters. They arise much more out of questions concerning the wisdom of placing that power in the hands of any single group of men.

When the original Radio Act of 1927 was under consideration, a Congressman from Texas proposed a provision which is the direct ancestor of section 315. On the floor of the House he said:

"The power of the press will not be comparable to that of broadcasting stations when the industry is fully developed. If the development continues as rapidly in the future as in the past, it will only be a few years before these broadcasting stations, if operated by chain stations, will simultaneously reach an audience of over half of our entire citizenship, and bring messages to the fireside of nearly every home in America. They can mold and crystallize sentiment as no agency in the past has been able to do. If the strong arm of the law does not prevent monopoly ownership and make discrimination by such stations illegal, American thought and American politics will be largely at the mercy of those who operate these stations. For publicity is the most powerful weapon that can be wielded in a Republic. * * *"

Let me note in passing that, for the founder of a discredited relic of bygone times, this gentleman displayed a good deal of foresight. We do not have monopoly ownership today in American broadcasting. But, in television ownership we have a high concentration of ownership. For practical purposes, three network organizations create or control the great bulk of all the programing appearing on American television screens. For purposes of national political campaigns, the decisions of one official at each network may be critical.

Consider these facts: The largest 50 television markets include almost three-quarters of all the television-equipped homes in the Nation. While those homes are served by 171 television stations, the stations are owned by only 75 separate owners. The largest 10 television markets include some 40 percent of the country's television homes. They are served by 42 stations with only 21 separate owners. Only 9 organizations own 30 of those stations. I repeat—9 organizations control three-quarters of the stations reaching 40 percent of America's television homes. Repeal section 315, let these 9 agree to support one presidential candidate, and that candidate is halfway home.

When we speak of repealing the "equal time" and "no censorship" rules, therefore, we are talking about placing tremendous power in the hands of a relatively few people. One can have the greatest confidence in their character and integrity without wishing to place them under the strains and pressures that would arise—or to place candidates even more rigidly in the position of wooing their favors.

Moreover, complete neutrality and impartiality are neither possible nor desirable in any journalist, including a broadcaster. No one can edit or select without some point of view to guide him. Indeed, partisanship is the essence of journalism. "Throw the rascals out" is the watchword of the classic fighting editor. Harsh words and brash deeds uncover news—and sell newspapers.

What wave of the future do some of our broadcast journalists seek? Is it one that will be ridden by namby-pamby corporate vice presidents, unwilling to dirty their hands with the fighting issue of the day? And would these vice presidents, once freed from the "no censorship" requirement, be willing to allow candidates their usual bluntness and provocative remarks?

The proposal made by some that we replace section 315 with a general requirement of "fairness" in dealing with candidates seems to me even less acceptable. As I have noted, the Communications Act today imposes a general requirement that broadcasters be fair—that they allow reasonable opportunities for the discusion of conflicting views on issues of public importance. The FCC has had considerable experience with the administration of this doctrine—enough to teach us that it will not do as a general set of ground rules for broadcasting in political campaigns absent section 315.

In the extraordinary pressure of a campaign, the broadcaster needs to know his obligations and the candidate needs to know his rights. Neither can wait for the resolution of numerous philosophical disputes or engage in extended investigations and discussions. Both must plan. And they cannot be constantly asking the FCC to resolve questions of what is "fair" and "reasonable" at the height of an intense campaign.

In any event, broadcasters now have, in substantial measure, the journalistic freedom for which they cry. In 1959 Congress exempted from the equaltime rule newscasts, news interviews, news documentaries, and on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events. These include such programs as "Issues and Answers," "Meet the Press," "Face the Nation," etc. They also include regularly scheduled programs of this kind originated by local stations for local candidates. The exemptions also take in local newscasts as well as Huntley and Brinkley, Walter

Cronkite, Ron Cochran, and others. The list is long indeed.

These exemptions allow full freedom to journalize in regular newscasts and news interviews. The more broadcast time and effort that goes into journalism of this sort on a day-to-day, week-to-week basis, the more freedom a broadcaster has to journalize during elections—for more programs will thus fit the exempt categories. Those who provide expanded news coverage in ordinary times—local as well as network—will have expanded elbow room during campaigns.

Admittedly, these exemptions do not solve all problems raised by section 315. But one thing is certain. No system will work if its operators don't want it to work. The exemptions for news programing will not achieve what Congress intended unless broadcasters are willing to use them in the spirit in which they were designed.

We do not advance matters by trying to make section 315 the whipping boy for every real or imaginary problem that crops up during political campaigns. We cannot solve the basic problems of political broadcasting by thinking of them as a struggle between the forces of progressive journalism and a bunch of benighted politicians. Nor can we solve those problems by thinking of them as a fight to prevent nationwide thought control by diabolical broadcasters.

In short, we must reconcile liberty and equality with a generous portion of fraternity.

What we need is a serious, concentrated effort to face up to the specific problems that beset political broadcasting.

My basic position is reform rather than repeal. A sound program of reform, in my judgment, is represented by the following:

1. Leave section 315 unchanged with respect to paid political broadcasts.

In the field of paid political broadcasting, the requirements of equal opportunities and no censorship serve valid and important public purposes. So does the rule that politicians cannot be charged more than advertisers for the same kind of services. None of these requirements causes significant problems. All should be retained.

2. Require minimum votes or signatures for equal opportunities with respect to free time.

In the field of free political broadcasting, the situation is more complex. The existence of splinter groups and fringe candidates, combined with equal time requirement, does restrain some broadcasters from granting all the free time to major candidates that they otherwise might—and the exemptions for news programing do not resolve this problem. But if it is unreasonable to require equal free time for all—major or minor—candidates, why not concentrate upon the source of the difficulty?

One reasonable proposal that has often been made is to require "equal opportunities" only for candidates of parties that polled a particular percentage of the vote—say 5 percent or more—in the last preceding election for the office in question. To handle major third parties that appear on the scene between elections, it has been suggested that we permit an alternative way of qualifying for "equal opportunities"—by filing a petition bearing the certified signatures of a minimal number of registered voters.

Of course, this proposal has limitations. The rare occasions on which a petition procedure might be necessary could pose some administrative problems. In addition, the proposal could not be applied to primary elections, to the nominating process generally, or perhaps to certain kinds of local, nonpartisan elections. It would certainly be a step, however, in the right direction.

Why shouldn't we apply such a proposal to all free political broadcasts that are not already exempt from the "equal time" rule? To a large extent, we would resolve the problem of fringe candidates without stripping from the major contenders for office the protections that section 315 now gives them.

3. Insure some free time for minority parties and minority candidates.

Some sacrifice of the principle of equality is necessary if we are to progress at all in achieving other goals. No one who treasures free speech, however, can consent to a blanket silencing of minority voices—simply because they are, at a particular point in time, in the minority. Broadcasters have generally expressed their desire to give some free time to such candidates, if they are once relieved of the obligation to give them equal time. I believe that the great majority of broadcasters will do this. If they do not, there is ample protection for the lesser candidates in the general provisions of the Communications Act.

As I have indicated, broadcasters are now required generally to "afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance." In the limited sphere involved, I believe that the FCC can reasonably be expected to administer this matter under its "fairness doctrine" so as to assure reasonable treatment for minority candidates.

4. Require broadcasters to grant free time to major candidates—in an amount equal to time sold—for use as the candidates see fit.

Resolving the problem of fringe candidates will help to produce more free political broadcasting. The television networks have demonstrated their eagerness to provide free time for the presidential race, if they can avoid the minority candidate problem. The fate of free time at the hands of other broadcasters and in other races, however, is much more doubtful.

In the 1962 senatorial campaigns, there were 28 States in which there were only 2 candidates and 8 States in which there were 3 or more. Stations which did not face the problem of minority candidates did not give appreciably more free time to senatorial candidates than stations which did have to consider minority candidates. Nor were there proportionately more stations giving free time to senatorial candidates in the States where there were no minority candidates.

The presidential campaign is unquestionably the most important and the most dramatic of all. But the problem of campaign costs is not limited to campaigns for the Presidency. In many respects, it is deeper—and its effects more to be feared—in campaigns for lesser offices. If we are seriously intent upon reducing the costs of political campaigning in this country, to secure more free time for the presidential campaign alone is merely to attack the top of the iceberg.

I would therfore advance a suggestion I first made some time ago—that we require a broadcaster to offer, at a minimum an equal amount of free time for each hour of time sold. Time would continue to be sold candidates individually; but when a major candidate purchased time an equal amount of free time would then be afforded for the use of all the qualifying major candidates in that race.

For example, suppose that candidates A, B, and C are contenders for the same office. Candidates A and B are major candidates; candidate C does not meet the 5-percent test. Candidate A buys a total of one-half of time from a particular broadcaster. The broadcaster would then be required to offer one-half hour to the major candidates in the race, so that A and B would each receive 15 minutes free. Each time any candidate purchased time, the same result would follow.

This plan has many benefits. It would assure all major candidates some free time. This time would be allocated equally among them, and could be used as they saw fit—for debates, discussions, or separate broadcasts. The decision as to the total time, free and paid, to be devoted to any particular race would be left right where it should be—with the broadcaster. And the plan would apply, without a complicated formula, to a wide range of races.

This proposal would not apply, of course, to races where the proposal to eliminate fringe candidates from the "equal opportunities" provision is not feasible. Moreover, to avoid problems of last-minute changes in the plans of candidates and to give the broadcaster an opportunity to plan his schedule, we could insert a reasonable "cutoff" date, eliminating the free-time-for-paid-time requirement for, say, the last week in any campaign.

I recognize that the result would affect broadcasters earnings—particularly the smaller stations. So I think it reasonable to consider ways in which the general public might assume a portion of that burden. For the people have as great a stake here as the broadcaster.

One solution would be to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit broadcasters to deduct from their taxable income not only the out-of-pocket costs of free political broadcasts (which are now deductible) but some portion of the profits which are thereby sacrificed. The objection to this proposal lies in the complexities it would introduce into our tax laws—both in the mere introduction of another special deduction, and in the calculation of its appropirate amount—at a time when great efforts are being made to simplify and streamline those laws. If these problems can be overcome, however, the proposal has, to my mind, great merit.

In summary, while we cannot afford to jettison the present law, neither can we afford to stand still. At stake here are the basic lines of communication between the citizen and those who seek the responsibilities and power of public office—indeed, the very essence of a self-governing society.

Frank Eleazer

SPEECH

OF

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in the Congress in recognizing the high honor that has been paid Frank Eleazer by his colleagues of the press. Frank has directed the coverage of the House of Representatives for United Press-International since 1954. He was elected last week to a seat on the standing committee of correspondents, which oversees the operation of the congressional press galleries. While, as a new Member of this body, I have had to follow his excellent coverage of the House as an observer rather than a participant. I can point with pride to the fact that he cut some of his journalistic teeth in my Congressional District on the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch. Frank joined the Times-Dispatch before Pearl Harbor and left sometime thereafter to serve his country. He did not return to Richmond after the war but we are all proud of the fine work he has done here in bringing to the country the activities of the House with the spirit of a man who loves his work and the fairness and integrity of a man who knows his job.

USIA Explains to People Overseas "How the U.S. Government Helps Its People"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Information Agency is distributing to publications overseas a series of articles explaining "How the U.S. Government Helps Its People." Recently, its International Press Service furnished to USIA posts overseas for distribution to publications in over 100 countries an article by Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, U.S. Department of Commerce. The article tells how this 158-year-old agency of the Federal Government provides essential research and information for the welfare not only of the people of the United States, but many other nations, in its widespread activities. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the USIA article:

THE U.S. COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

(By Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, Director [1])

Toward the end of the 18th century a new and fledgling nation came into existence on the eastern seaboard of the North American Continent. It had fought a long and bitter battle with its mother country for freedom. Now, standing alone on somewhat shaky legs, the needs of this infant Nation were many.

Among the most pressing was the need for navigational charts that would enable the 60,000 coastal vessels of the burgeoning Nation to proceed safely on their course. Roads in this period were notoriously poor, if not lacking entirely, and water travel was the major means of transporting both man and beast, as well as the young Nation's commerce.

But a century and a half ago the charts of America's coastal waters were so few and sketchy that navigation was exceedingly hazardous. Heavy shipping losses occurred because the only charts available in those days, such as the sketch maps from the British *Neptune*, the inadequate notes of Captain Southack and of the British Pilot, and the charts and sailing directions published by Blount, were incomplete and full of errors. The coasts of the new country were lined with the wrecks of ships which fell afoul of uncharted reefs and currents.

Out of this need for a Federal program of hydrographic surveys was born 157 years ago the Coast and Geodetic Survey. At the prompting of President Thomas Jefferson, the Congress in 1807 authorized a "survey of the coast," a survey which Congress thought would encompass only a few thousand square miles.

From this humble beginning has grown an agency whose work now encompases the entire world, an agency upon which millions of people rely for the safety of their lives and their property.

The U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Nation's first technical agency and its oldest scientific body, consists of only 2,800 commissioned and civilian personnel, but its services to the Nation and to the world are many.

[1] The author has served with the Coast and Geodetic Survey for almost 41 years and has headed the agency as its Director since 1955.

In the vast Pacific Basin millions of Americans, Japanese, Filipinos, Canadians, Latin Americans, and others rely upon the Coast and Geodetic Survey to warn them against the onslaught of destructive tidal waves spawned by earthquakes perhaps thousands of miles from where they live. This is accomplished by the Survey's seismic sea wave warning system, with headquarters in Honolulu.

And all around the globe, in some 60 nations, seismographic stations established by the Coast and Geodetic Survey automatically record every day, every year, the hundreds of thousands of earthquakes that wrack this earth. The 276,000 seismographic records taken annually pour into the Data Analysis Center maintained in Washington by the Coast and Geodetic Survey so that, hopefully, some day, an advance detection and warning system may be established that will help protect mankind against one of nature's most terrifying cataclysms.

Without the work performed by this agency, which is now part of the U.S. Department of Commerce, the sea and air commerce of the country would be struck a crippling blow. Upon the accuracy of its nautical and aeronautical charts depends the safe passage of the country's ships and planes and those of other nations traversing this country's waterways and air space. Approximately 30 million of these charts are distributed each year.

The "white fleet" of the Coast and Geodetic Survey travels millions of miles along the shores of the United States and across the oceans searching out the secrets of the seas, a largely unexplored area of the globe. Its oceanographic operations—second only to the Navy among U.S. Government agencies—embrace many types, including hydrographic surveys, marine gravity and magnetic surveys, oceanographic surveys of physical, geophysical and chemical properties, and tidal surveys. The data obtained from these operations are vital to the advancement of our commerce, engineering, navigation, and basic and applied research.

There is an urgent need for knowledge of the characteristics of sea water, its density, composition, conditions for acoustic propagation, and subsurface currents. Comprehensive information is being sought of bottom materials as well as the physical dimensions of the oceans, including depth, shoreline configuration and submarine features.

Economy in ship operations requires more exacting knowledge of water depths, alongshore currents and the peculiarities of underwater turbulence. Data are being sought of great value to the fishing industry, including detailed seasonal data on the properties of sea water, its biological productivity and water-mass mixture.

Nor are the oceanographic activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey limited to the shores of the United States. Its activities extend to the farflung quarters of the earth. The Coast and Geodetic Survey has participated in an international study of the South Atlantic and, more recently, one of its ships engaged in a 6-month 30,000-mile study of the Indian Ocean. Out of such participation in international studies will come benefits of incalculable value not only to Americans but to peoples all over the world.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey also provides geodetic, geophysical, photogrammetric and cartographic data for charting and scientific purposes. Surveys are made in the United States and its possessions to determine the horizontal and vertical positions of a network of control points which are permanently marked on the ground for topographic, geologic, and other types of mapping, for planning large-scale engineering projects and for scientific and defense needs. The positions and descriptions of these points are published and distributed to Federal, State, and local agencies and the general public.

A far cry from the early work of the agency is that now being done with earth satellites, known as satellite triangulation. This new endeavor will permit accurate measurements of the earth's size and shape. The isolated land masses of the earth will be more accurately positioned in relation to each other. A network of geodetic positions may at last link together all the lands of the earth.

The work involves the simultaneous photographing of a satellite from three or more points on the earth's surface. The satellites Echo I and II have been employed to resolve a triangle, or network of triangles, of continental or intercontinental proportions. An initial result of this work has been the establishment of the precise location of the Bermuda Islands in the Atlantic Ocean, 449 years after they were first visited by a Spanish voyager.

These three-dimensional networks will also be extended to Puerto Rico, the Bahamas, and Panama, with possible connections to the coasts of South America and Africa. On this three parties are now working.

The exact positioning of land surfaces whether with the use of satellites or other advanced techniques employed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, is of great importance to the national defense. The agency contributes materially to national security in the rockets and missiles program. This support is divided into geodetic applications in the highly sensitive areas of missile guidance and guidance and target pinpointing.

While the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey over the past 157 years has broadened from a narrow application to the shores of the United States until its activities have extended all over the world, its major base of operations is still in the United States.

Its down-to-earth activities, those shorn of glamour and adventure, complicated, exacting, oftentimes monotonous, are of tremendous importance to the country. To name but a few is to illustrate their impact upon the everyday life of the Nation. Thus, its geodetic surveys form the basis of all national mapping and are therefore essential for well-ordered planning. They are the early requisite for many large-scale engineering projects, such as water resources development, geological exploration, transportation routing and highway construction, and property surveys. Basic geodetic surveys provide unique service to the petroleum industry and the discovery and exploitation of new oil-bearing regions are aided by its gravity and other geodetic operations.

Many metropolitan areas and States, particularly those undergoing rapid expansion, rely upon geodetic surveys to provide the basis for large-scale mapping. These surveys provide accurate coordinates on which are based engineering surveys for construction, land acquisition and development, and transportation. Full use is made by State and local authorities of Coast and Geodetic Survey geodetic control in detailed mapping and construction of reservoirs, pipelines, aqueducts, canals, highways, powerlines, etc. The Mackinac Straits Bridge (Michigan), the 24-mile Lake Ponchartrain Causeway (Louisiana), and large tunnel-bridge projects, to mention just a few, depended upon precise geodetic surveys.

The agency's geodetic information is a prime requisite for the precise location of State, county, and municipal boundaries, and public and private property lines.

A major concern to development and maintenance of water systems, particularly in western areas, is the subsidence of land areas due to the removal of underground water and oil. This subsidence alters the grades of waterways, resulting in expensive repairs and alterations. Moreover, the subsidence

threatens the submergence of large areas of arable land. The Coast and Geodetic Survey engages in periodic releveling in these areas to obtain data regarding the subsidence rate. These data are used in engineering evaluations and plans for correcting subsidence.

The original task of the agency in charting the Nation's shoreline continues. The early geodetic effort was to provide shoreline control for the nautical chart, while early oceanography furnished hydrographic data for the nautical chart. The agency continues to contour the ocean bottom and to chart the depths and dangers for marine traffic. These completed charts contribute to the general commerce, the fishing industry, the vast pleasure boating public and the national defense. Proper charts indicate the shortest safe routes, help in establishing low rates of marine insurance and protect over $100 billion worth of cargo shipped over American waters annually.

Circulatory surveys are conducted in estuaries and adjacent coastal waters to determine their capability to furnish adequate means of disposal for increased industrial and other waste, without harm to the population, recreation, and fisheries. These data on currents also aid in the economical planning of marine traffic.

In engineering seismology, the Coast and Geodetic Survey continues to play an important role in the construction of structures which will withstand the shock of earthquakes. The engineering seismologist, through his instrumental studies of earthquake forces and his experiments with model structures, has been able to establish mathematical formulas for use in the design of commercial and industrial structures that have proven to be earthquake resistant. This is of tremendous importance to cities in earthquake-threatened areas.

This, then, is a somewhat brief account of how the Coast and Geodetic Survey has grown from its early beginnings until its service to the public encompasses not only the United States, but millions of people in other countries.

No account of the activities of this agency of the U.S. Government would be complete without a few words about its dedicated people. They consist of 240 commissioned personnel and 2,600 civilians. Their ranks include distinguished scientists, engineers and technicians in cartography, geodesy, geomagnetism, gravimetry, oceanography, photogrammetry and seismology.

The commissioned corps largely administers the agency's operations, manages much of its field activities, and commands its fleet of ships. Qualified civil service personnel direct many field activities in the physical sciences, as well as major agency operations.

This more than a century-and-a-half-old agency of the Government has established over the years a record of which the Nation can be proud. Its commissioned and civil service personnel look to the future with confidence in their ability to advance the commerce, the security, and the national welfare of the country.

Selma, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I have offered a resolution asking for an impartial congressional committee to be appointed by the Speaker to go to Selma and determine what the true facts are; determine what the people of Selma and business officials are doing and have been doing, and what any outside agitators are doing and have been doing, and make a report back to the American people through the Congress of the United States. I am enclosing two editorials which point up the fact that Selma is a city of law abiding decent upright citizens regardless of what might be said in the newspapers in this country; that there is no finer city in America than Selma, Ala.

The editorials follow:

[From the Dothan Eagle, Jan. 29, 1965]

PUBLICITY HOAX

The cunningly calculated and federally sanctioned torment of Selma and Dallas Counties is the biggest, cruelest, and most unjust publicity stunt staged in a long time by and for television in particular and for agitating magazines and brainwashing newspapers in general.

After dining in white cafes, sleeping in white hotels and enjoying all other public accommodations without bloodletting or any other cause celebre to attract national attention, the imported troublemakers switched their profession of injustice to claiming Negroes were unable to register as voters. They've managed to have some heads knocked, Federal court injunctions issued and miles of television film taken. The publicity harvest has been great indeed. But, what about the real facts as regarding the registration of Negroes as voters?

Although it can't get the message across to the Nation, the Dallas County board of registrars asked State authorities last December for special permission to hold additional registration days in January "to give our citizens further opportunity to qualify." The people of Dallas County were so informed and both foreign and domestic agitators knew of this.

Says a board statement that is studiously ignored by visiting television crews, correspondents and assorted carpetbaggers:

"* * * What happened? On the 4th of January two Negroes and four white persons appeared and executed applications; on the 5th no Negroes but six whites; on the 6th four Negroes and one white; on the 12th four Negroes and two whites; on the 13th seven Negroes and one white.

"Then here, on the 18th, shows up a long line containing such great numbers until it surely was obvious to all no such number could hope to be processed in 1 day.

"Furthermore, a number of applicants having gained admittance to our office indicated clearly they did not want to be there. There, also appeared several Negro would-be applicants who could not read or write."

The much maligned, libeled and abused registrars added:

"1. What is it they want?

"2. Is it really the vote and good of our Negro citizens?

"3. Is it simply to sow discord and stir trouble?"

So, the agitators get publicity in vast, prompt, and excited amounts and that's the reason for the whole sorry performance in the first place. The Federal Government should know the true score because it has its agents, overseers, and others in Selma in great numbers. The inescapable conclusion is that it is a happy partner in this sorry enterprise.

[From the Dothan Eagle, Feb. 5, 1965]

A SIGNIFICANT EVENT

The Hammermill Paper Co., has announced that it is going to establish a $30 million pulpwood plant in Selma and, further, that construction will be underway in 2 weeks. Approximately 1,000 persons will be employed in the construction and the plant will have about 250 permanent employees when it begins production. The payroll will run in the neighborhood of $2 million a year.

Something that is certain to be appreciated by the people of Selma is the timing of this announcement. At the moment Selma is being libelously painted by television, demagogs, agitators, troublemakers, political opportunists, and rabble-rousers of all hues as an undesirable community, the last place in the world to put an industry. Yet, heré are the Hammermill people announcing that they have chosen Selma as the site of a $30 million establishment and a place where the company is investing much of its future.

There is something else that the people of Selma are most certain to appreciate and cherish always. While their community is being besmirched by evil individuals and organizations, the chairman of Hammermill's board of directors said that one of the deciding factors in locating the plant at Selma was the "character of the community and its people." What a magnificent rebuke for the vile agitators and would-be assassins of Selma's good name. How confusing this must be to those throughtout the Nation who have swallowed the distorted and vicious publicity about Selma in recent weeks.

This action by Hammermill is also of untold value to the rest of Alabama and the South. It gives the lie to that sneaky, conniving, insidious element whose spokesmen have been saying that unless the southern States lie prostrate, integrate and assimilate, new industries will pass them by—that unless they acquire a new image of subservience their smokestacks will be taken away. No less satisfying, it is a sharp reprimand to the timid and supine on the homefront who have been singing the same tune.

Let us look at another aspect of this heartening announcement of a new industry for Alabama. Gov. George Wallace, whose term has been marked by tremendous industrial growth, said that the occasion of the Hammermill announcement was "one of the finest moments of my administration." Significant, also, was the praise the industrial newcomers gave Governor Wallace and his staff in locating the plant. Declared one: "We have never received nor will we ever in the future receive more cooperation than has been accorded to us by the State government."

It's a happy event in more ways than one for Alabama and the entire South.

Best Foote Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following editorial from Barron's National Busines & Financial Weekly under date of January 18, 1965.

This editorial, entitled "Best Foote Forward?—Dogmatism Can Do the United States More Harm Than Smoking," was issued subsequent to the meeting of the Inter-Agency Council on Smoking and Health in Washington on January 11, 1965; and the pun in the title

refers to the fact that, according to the editorial, the chairman of the Council, Mr. Emerson Foote, is a retired proponent of the pleasures of smoking a famous national brand of cigarettes—for a financial consideration.

This is but another facet in the weird activities of those who have banded together to discourage the consumption of tobacco and to invalidate the basic American legal principle that a defendant is innocent until proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

This editorial cogently points up the weakness of the report on smoking and health to the Surgeon General and the recently staged pronunciamentos of the Inter-Agency Council on Smoking and Health, whose crusades, as the editorial points out, come "perilously close to substituting official dogmatism for scientific truth."

In inserting this editorial in the RECORD, I want to point out that there is pending in the Congress a resolution I have reintroduced from the 88th Congress to initiate a crash research program, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, into the quality and health factors of tobacco and other ingredients and materials used in the manufacture of tobacco products.

I feel encouraged to believe that the Members of this House, after reading the Barron's editorial, will conclude, as I have certainly concluded, that the proper approach to the smoking and health problem is not through the strident pitch of Madison Avenue admen, retired, or active, but through the cold and objective scientific approach, based on actual laboratory findings, instead of on fuzzy, and highly questionable statistics. The great advances in the American scientific community have been made through unimpassioned and pure scientific investigation methods. We should not abandon in this crucial matter the tried and true criteria which have governed our great national scientific discoveries and advancements of the past.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that both law and science cry out for a proper approach to this problem. Tobacco should be considered innocent, according to our basic American legal tenets, until proved guilty. And if tobacco has in it any elements, or if its processing has in it any factors detrimental to the health of our people, then science cries out that these elements and factors should be pin pointed, isolated, and removed. I sincerely hope that we employ the American way in dealing with this matter.

The editorial follows:

BEST FOOTE FORWARD?—DOGMATISM CAN DO THE UNITED STATES MORE HARM THAN SMOKING

With apologies to Prof. C. Northcote Parkinson, whose word is invariably law, we would like to advance the following tentative thesis: the effectiveness of advertising men varies inversely with their distance from Madison Avenue. In support of the proposition we might cite Messrs. Benton and Bowles, whose brilliance in the arts of communication and salesmanship dimmed on Capitol Hill, and, regarding the Ambassador to India, vanished altogether in the shadow of the Taj Mahal. Last week in Washington a recently retired huckster named Emerson Foote became an even more compelling case in point. Mr. Foote once made millions by persuading people to buy Lucky Strikes; however, his impassioned pitch against smoking, though delivered in a semi-official capacity and with the full endorsement of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, left a nationwide audience cold. He ran it up the flagpole, so to speak, and nobody saluted.

Widespread indifference to the blandishments of the National Interagency Council on Smoking and Health (which Mr. Foote serves as chairman) may reflect nothing more than the well-known perversity of humankind. As the council's leading light, a reformed chain smoker himself, was quoted as saying, "Anyone who disagrees has rocks in his head." That's a pretty hard line for a man who used to work on the premise that the customer is always right, and it's equally wide of the mark. The disappointing response to the latest health scare—on Wall Street cigarette stocks actually rose—may be explained in other ways. Despite widespread advance publicity, which hinted at startling disclosures, the Council offered nothing sensational or even new. As an old hand from Madison Avenue ought to know, people rarely get excited about reruns.

No credit to advertising, the carefully staged fiasco in Washington also showed Government in a less-than-flattering light. While nominally a voluntary group of socially conscious citizens, the Council, in fact, is supported in large measure out of public funds. Hence its advocacy of the findings of the Surgeon General, while sincere, may be viewed as neither distinterested nor free of bias. The same is true of the official findings, which, since their appearance a year ago, have come under increasingly critical scrutiny. In pretending to know what it only suspects (and quite a few qualified observers doubt) the Public Health Service, in effect, has turned its back on other promising lines of inquiry. In pursuing its crusade against the filthy weed, the agency, as last week's questionable display suggests, has come perilously close to substituting official dogmatism for scientific truth.

Such comments would have sounded like heresy on Monday, the first anniversary of publication of the famous report of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health. In honor of the great day, the National Interagency Council issued a progress report of its own. During the past 12 months, according to Dr. Luther L. Terry, U.S. Surgeon General, both men and women in significant numbers have given up smoking. "I am convinced that our findings of a year ago, widely publicized and followed up throughout the year by an alert and responsible press, have had a discernible and encouraging effect on the smoking problem." While much has been achieved, however, much, of course, remains to be done, a theme which Emerson Foote proceeded eloquently to expound. Cigarettes, charged the former ad man without a trade of mildness, are responsible for at least 125,000 and perhaps as many as 300,000 deaths per year. "Either figure," he added harshly, "represents a national catastrophe."

Both speakers predictably made the headlines. However, the true significance of what they had to say (or, more precisely, the lack thereof) was reported only on the ticker, not in so many words but in a meaningful rise in depressed tobacco stocks. After repeatedly running for cover at every fresh health scare, investors at last seem to have regained their nerve. Perhaps it's time that Main Street followed suit. To judge by last week's events, the United States has been oversold on the hazards of smoking. For one thing, despite a pose of independence, the National Inter-Agency Council is largely a creature of Government. Two of its three officers are staff members of the Public Health Service; headquarters, so Barron's has learned, are located in the National Library of Medicine in Bethesda, Md. Formation of the Council, observed the Surgeon General last week, is a "heartening example of national concern." He failed to add that his office, in effect, had helped to conjure it up.

While long on dedication and zeal, the Council seems painfully short on objectivity. To illustrate, although the Report on Smoking and Health did not see the light of day until January 1964, Dr. Terry made much of a Public Health survey which purported to reveal a sharp decline in smoking since 1962. Thereby he modestly took credit for a trend which, if it exists at all, might have set in many months prior to publication. Moreover, there are serious grounds for doubting the validity of the findings. A lengthy affair, the survey included "questions in depth on the smoking habits, knowledge, and attitudes of the general population," which, either by accident or design, could only tend to prejudice the results. The latter's suspect nature was pointed up just 24 hours later, when the Tobacco Tax Council, which tallies the excise levies paid in 48 States and the District of Columbia, reported that on the basis of these figures, cigarette sales in November rose 5.6 percent from the like year-ago month.

As for the other principal speaker, he plainly failed to put his best Foote forward. His hair-raising estimate of the number of casualties lost to coffin nails—125,000 to 300,000—is statistical nonsense. Scientifically it has no basis in fact. As the Surgeon General's advisory committee was careful to observe, "the total number of excess deaths causally related to cigarette smoking in the U.S. population cannot be accurately estimated." What the committee did conclude is that for a wide variety of diseases, the mortality rate among smokers significantly exceeds that of nonsmokers. Its findings were hardly the last word on the subject; as Barron's noted at the time, they ignored the advent of the filter cigarette, which today accounts for nearly two-thirds of the total. Since then statisticians have challenged both their methods and conclusions; physicians such as Dr. Joseph Berkson, of the Mayo Clinic, remain skeptical of their diagnosis. As one witness told a congressional committee last summer: "The smoking and health hypothesis is only one of several possible explanations of the survey data in the Surgeon General's report and, all things considered, may well be the least plausible * * * what we are dealing with is not so much scientific method as scientific guesswork * * * guesses may have merit, and may sometimes prove correct, but they are a poor substitute for scientific procedures, and a flimsy foundation for public policy."

Beyond the issue of smoking, last week's extravaganza cannot fail to raise disturbing doubts about the Government's role in science. Under Dr. Luther Terry, the Public Health Service has made a mockery of the scientific method. It rejects the exchange of views with its critics; it uses unsound procedures; it conceals the limitations of its findings. Finally, to judge by the appointment of Emerson Foote, it places the strident claims of the pitchman ahead of the unobtrusive quest for truth. Propaganda may make headlines; it cannot foster a Nation's welfare or health.

Zinc Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as we all know there is much time—too much time—spent at the beginning of a new Congress in the organizing of both

bodies, their committees, and subcommittees. And while all this is going on, all too little legislation is moving ahead.

I refer specifically at this time to a matter that affects many industries and the continued growth of our economy, a problem that we examined last year and found worthy of passage only to have that effort nullified by the inaction of the other body and final adjournment.

The diecasters in my district, as well as others throughout the country, along with the steel and brass industries, are facing a critical zinc shortage estimated by the International Lead and Zinc Study Group to be 185,000 tons in 1965. The seasonal demands of the automotive, machinery, appliance, and construction industries are aggravating and will continue to aggravate this problem during the first half of the year.

The supply shortage we now face was postponed by the release last summer of 75,000 tons of zinc from the national stockpile. Furthermore, it would not be quite so bad today had the Senate acted on H.R. 12435 which waived the 6-month waiting period on an additional 50,000 tons.

Mr. Speaker, the producers and consumers agree in forecasting a supply deficit of approximately 185,000 tons for the current year. Legislation requesting immediate release of 150,000 tons of zinc from the national stockpile surplus of 1,500,000 tons has been introduced and is pending before the Committee on Armed Services.

There is no reason to slow down the economy while awaiting departmental reports. This matter should be expeditiously handled by the committee and brought before the Congress for consideration. The release of 150,000 tons of surplus zinc will supply immediate needs and replenish depleted stocks without disrupting normal trade channels. Such action will benefit producers, consumers, the Government and the public, but only if action is taken now.

Corporate and Municipal Financing Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the House is faced with making a decision upon an extraordinarily difficult problem, namely, the suspension of the "gold cover" on reserves. It has been variously said that only two men in the world fully understand the intricacies of our monetary systems or that only nine men in America understand the monetary problems of the United States. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to insert two columns by a very knowledgeable and astute commercial and financial editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, Sidney Brown.

CORPORATE AND MUNICIPAL FINANCING AHEAD

(By Sidney Brown)

WILL FREEING GOLD COVER CORRECT 15-YEAR $31 BILLION EXTERNAL DEFICIT OR STOP THE GOLD OUTFLOW?—DE GAULLE'S GOLD STANDARD CALL GIVES PAUSE TO PANIC-STRICKEN DRIVE TO END GOLD COVER

Last week gave birth to two simultaneous opposing forces of panic and pause regarding the pending gold bill.

The February 3 further depletion of our gold stock by $100 million on top of the $200 million just previously on January 12 spurred frantic efforts to undo the gold cover behind Federal Reserve deposit liabilities in order to obtain $4.9 billion free gold (February 3 figure) to support the dollar internationally in the face of the 14th adverse payments balance in the past 15 years. The pause came from President de Gaulle's sharply worded but vague February 4 suggestion that the major countries study a return to the gold standard, and chastisement of U.S. money supply policies harming the world as well as ourselves. For the moment at least, he caused some introspective soul searching as to whether we will be better off without the existing gold cover check to domestic credit expansion—one of the principal causes of the gold outflow despite brilliant patching of leaks and of an estimated $31 billion external deficit since 1949 besides cold war and early post-World War II humanitarian reasons.

Just when the protective braking effect of gold at long last was about to force our monetary authorities to check the inordinate bank credit expansion (denied to be such by Messrs. Martin and Dillon), Congress began at full speed to remove the most important brake—one ultimately connected to our demand-time deposits' explosion where money supply expansion for the most part occurred (see this column of February 1 for details).

The main argument for removal of the gold cover advanced by William McC. Martin and Douglas Dillon, who head our Federal Reserve and Treasury, respectively, in their February 1 statement to the House Banking and Currency Committee were either of a strawman or half-truth variety, or were assertions without proof or were in the realm of speculation.

They both stressed the insufficiency of gold stock growth to support "orderly growth in the volume, of money and credit" to accommodate the economy's pace even if, they said, the gold outflow dried to a trickle. They pointedly ignored the fact that a correction in the balance of payments and restoration of normal conditions conducive to monetary gold stock growth—including gold production at the existing mint price—should provide more than enough gold for future foreseeable economic growth needs without excessive issuance of bank credit.

Moreover, neither admitted they would finally have to cease temporizing with the gold outflow problem if the existing gold ratios remained. They spoke of temporary measures which the law permits waiving the requirement temporarily, but spoke not of dumping "nudging" and allowing conditions inviting foreigners to buy more from us and to invest more here. Yes, lipservice was paid to correcting the adverse external balance worded exactly as all previous exhortations. The cruel blow was Douglas Dillon's audacious innuendo, and even stronger statement, that we do not want to help ourselves if it means it will be at the expense of other nations and today's international liquidity. No one suggested that be done or that it is at all necessary.

At the moment the American bond market is jittery wondering whether and how credit will be tightened—raising interest rates significantly or insignificantly. It is unfortunate that the gold brake did not take effect sooner which would have forestalled De Gaulle's bombshell criticism of our monetary policies and the contradictory arguments posed by our monetary and fiscal chiefs to cut the gold cover.

Even Mr. Martin admitted tacitly gold's virtue of protection against irresponsible public policies, and spoke highly of gold's international use as a disciplinary influence on monetary and other policies. Unfortunately he forgot that deposit liabilities and not currency is the culprit needing the gold cover's ultimate braking protection—which the gold bill ignores and which, therefore, should not be enacted.

LAST WEEK'S $100 MILLION GOLD DROP BRINGS YEAR'S TOTAL TO $300 MILLION AS AVERAGE FREE RESERVES WERE INCONGRUOUSLY STILL KEPT EASY

Member banks' average free reserves were $102 million in the February 3 ending week compared to $138 million in the prior week. The latter is a revision from the originally estimated $55 million. Last Wednesday's free reserves came to $240 million and, though down from the preceding Wednesday figure of $578 million, stayed on the easy side due to Federal Reserve buildup of its deposit liabilities by a high $724 million increase over that of January 27 resulting primarily from a massive credit-assist purchase of $743,850,000 U.S. bills. The Fed's monetization of U.S. securities came to a new outright record high of $37,386,894,000. A $80,400,000 decrease in RP's brought the Fed's total holdings down to $37,386,894,000.

The fact that the Fed liberally boosted bank credit as of Wednesday, though, on Tuesday it saw this year's second slice into our gold stock to the tune of $100 million take place, is a most fascinating lesson of walking methodically to the edge of a cliff. Three weeks ago, January 12, witnessed a $200 million gold withdrawal—a total for the year of $300 million. In spite of innumerable handwritings on the wall, the Fed as of last week persisted in its political policy of neutral credit ease. Because the gold reduction took place on Wednesday, the latest week's average shows $30 million decline and the averages this week will continue to reflect the decrease. Most likely the $209 million of U.S. Governments held in custody by the Fed for foreign accounts is related to the latest gold stock attrition. Will this week finally mark a change in monetary policy?

The 14 New York Reserve city banks had an average net borrowed free reserve position of $43 million and 8 major banks had a basic reserve deficit of $432 million composed of $69 million borrowed from the New York Fed, $377 million net borrowed Federal funds and a plus free reserve of $14 million. Credit tightening on average for all the Nation's member banks came from a drop in the float and an increase in required reserves and a decline in vault cash. Commercial and industrial borrowings from banks apparently was quite strong this week compared to last year's week. The outlook for this week is an average $200 million decline in bank reserves assuming no Federal Reserve offsetting measures or unexpected changes.

Averages of pertinent Federal Reserve credit data

	Week ending—				Month of—		Year ago—	
	Feb. 3	Jan. 27	Jan. 20	Jan. 13	January	December	Week	February
Free excess reserves	$102	$138	$112	$165	$195	$126	$124	$91
Governments held [1]	36,876	36,440	36,460	36,816	36,693	37,371	33,009	33,009
Gold stock	[2] 15,157	15,187	15,187	15,330	15,273	15,396	15,512	15,480

[1] Includes governments bought outright and repurchase agreements.
[2] The Wednesday gold stock was 15,088,000,000—down $100,000,000 from the prior Wednesday and down $300,000,000 since Dec. 30, 1964.

Was Congress Fooled on Benefits of Cotton Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the textile mills have had critical publicity recently over the excessive cost to taxpayers of the new cotton program and the apparent lack of results for consumers, and it is not surprising to see some counterattack. As this helps to complete the record on the curious character of what is euphemistically called the one-price cotton program, I include herewith the text of a defensive article as it appeared in the February 3 issue of Women's Wear Daily.

ONE-PRICE COTTON BENEFITS OVERSOLD?

(By Si Lippa)

NEW YORK.—Textile men are becoming painfully aware that the industry may have committed a colossal blunder in its strategy to obtain passage of the one-price cotton law.

The blunder may not prevent passage of an extension of the law when it expires July 31, 1966, but it will make passage immeasurably more difficult. In short, the industry is facing a much tougher fight than it anticipated.

The mistake—to put it in the simplest terms possible—was that the industry hammered away at the theme that the law could result in a lowering of prices of cotton merchandise to consumers. Opponents of the law have already served notice they will ask the industry for evidence of lower prices and the industry will be hard put to produce it.

Some of the industry's best friends are also troubled. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, addressing a recent meeting of top textile executives in New York, had some prepared remarks about the industry's public relations with respect to one-price cotton and lower prices.

He warned that the cotton industry has a public relations responsibility of educating consumers regarding the law and retail prices.

"The consumer," his text read, "naturally feels that lower cotton costs should be reflected in lower retail prices to him. If costs are cut and consumer prices are not correspondingly lowered, you will have a job to do explaining how the cuts got lost in the maze of manufacturing and selling."

The case must be thoroughly explained and the criticism met so as not to undermine the confidence of the consumer, he observed.

These words had been prepared for a meeting of the Market Committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute. ATMI has been the chief force behind the drive for the cotton bill, representing about 85 percent of the textile industry with the exception of woolens.

Unfortunately, Senator PASTORE discarded most his text, including these remarks, when delivering his address, so his admonition was not heard by the 400 executives attending. It is perhaps significant, however, that in preparing an advance résumé of Senator PASTORE's address for the press, ATMI omitted these critical remarks.

The two-price cotton program was indeed a monstrosity: domestic mills were unfairly discriminated against in their purchases of raw cotton; cotton consumption was declining and other fibers, particularly rayon, were encroaching on traditional cotton uses; the Government was incurring an unnecessary expense in buying and storing cotton; imports—made of American cotton purchased at lower prices than U.S. mills could buy it—were coming in and "knocking the brains out of domestic producers," in the words of James Robinson, president of Indian Head Mills.

Besides, a payment to American mills to counteract the 8½-cent discrepancy between domestic and export prices of raw cotton was not revolutionary. The Government had been paying an equalization fee to cotton-fabric exporters to permit them to compete in world markets with lower priced foreign-made cotton textiles.

Finally, there was no question that the ability of American cotton mills to grow with the prosperous economy here was seriously impaired and it was no crime for millowners to want profits commensurate with the expansion of the country's economy—profits that were denied to them through no fault of their own and through the workings of an unfair and discriminatory law.

While all these arguments were mentioned, the industry chose as its chief battleground the fact that consumer prices would be lower. It was certainly a more dramatic argument and it eventually attracted the support of consumer groups, organized labor—and Congress.

While some textile men now say they never promised lower prices, the record is clear. As late as December 2, 1963, 4 months before passage of the bill, J. Craig Smith, president of Avondale Mills, told a congressional committee enactment of the one-price bill would not give the industry a windfall, because the economic makeup of the cotton textile industry is such that a reduction in the price of cotton would be quickly translated into lower prices for cotton products in stores.

On the following day, Representative HAROLD COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, sponsor of the measure, said consumers would enjoy yearly savings of $500 million if the bill became law.

That figure quickly became $700 million, a sum used frequently by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in plumping for the bill. Textile men might have had their reservations about these claims, but there is no record of anyone standing up to refute them.

Now there is concern in textile ranks. No one has pressed any panic buttons, but Mr. COOLEY himself came close to doing so a few weeks ago. He commented that a recent reduction in the price of men's shirts from $4.25 to $4 was a result of lower cotton prices. No one caught Mr. COOLEY up on this statement, although it is quite obvious that the cloth going into a man's shirt could not be reduced anywhere near 25 cents, based on the reduction in the raw cotton going into it.

Cotton men also knew, at the time the bill was being debated, that buying of gray goods had been brought to a virtual halt pending action on the bill. They knew that regardless of the result of the vote, a pent-up demand for cloth would make itself felt, making it impossible to effect any price reductions.

Now, with a new bill extending the present law about to be introduced, the industry is running scared. The traditional opponents of the law have lined up against an extension and the Textile Workers Union recently hinted it may not support the measure.

The entire scope of ATMI's (for all intents and purposes this means the industry's) public relations program has at one time or another been subject to criticism. Back in November 1963 Hugh W. Close, president of Spring Mills, bemoaned the fact that a strong program is lacking, that the public still pictures cotton textile mill owners as some sort of Simon Legree, cracking a whip over toiling millhands.

ATMI's too has apparently found something to be desired in its program. It has had about three public relations directors in the last 4 years. Its PR men in its various offices in New York, Washington, Charlotte, and other southern cities are all highly capable in gathering facts and dealing with the press, but they are more versed in "publicity" than in literal "public relations," which encompasses a broader but unified program of getting a message across to the consumer.

Robert C. Jackson, ATMI's executive director, a brilliant spokesman for the industry, has been more concerned in the last few years with the legislative program and with trips abroad to advise on international agreements to control imports.

There is a crying need for a coordinated program aimed directly at the consumer, who perhaps is not as adverse to American companies making a fair profit as are some Members of Congress.

New Yiddish Language Book in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I read this morning that the first Yiddish language book published in the Soviet Union for over 4 years has appeared.

The book, however, is already in so-called scarce supply in Moscow bookstores, as reported by Theodore Shabad in the New York Times.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Shabad reports that the Russian people were given no advance notice of the book's publication, though there were advance orders. There have been, no doubt, serious shortcomings in the official distributing of this work.

And so we have an officially inspired attempt to curb the unfavorable foreign reaction to continued Soviet anti-Semitism. It is, of course, a propaganda move. We must continue to direct the

force of organized public opinion against the crudity of Soviet anti-Semitism, for it can bring a certain relief to the situation.

I am attaching the New York Times report which reads as follows:

NEW YIDDISH BOOK SCARCE IN MOSCOW—86 COPIES OF 15,000 TURN UP AND ARE QUICKLY SOLD

(By Theodore Shabad)

Moscow, February 7.—The Soviet Union's first Yiddish-language book in 4 years, published in an edition of 15,000 copies, appears to have been lost in the mysterious workings of Moscow's book distribution system.

A survey of downtown bookstores today disclosed that 86 copies of the attractively printed 485-page volume reached a single Moscow bookstore in the last week of January. The small supply was sold almost immediately on the basis of advance orders.

A spokesman for store No. 119, on Kirov Street, said no more copies of the book were at the warehouse. But that an additional shipment was expected.

"We are accepting additional advance orders," she said.

Publication of the book, "This Is How We Live," a collection of 18 articles about the life of the Soviet Jews, was preceded by a wave of publicity directed abroad. Publication of the book has not yet been announced in the Soviet Union's Russian-language press.

DISCRIMINATION IS CHARGED

The absence of new Yiddish-language books in the last 4 years has been interpreted in some quarters as evidence of discrimination against the Soviet Union's Yiddish-speaking minority.

"This Is How We Live" is the first of a series of Yiddish books to be published by Sovietish Heimland, a Yiddish literary magazine that was founded in 1961 and was converted from bimonthly to monthly publication this year.

A 550-page anthology of poetry titled "Horizons" is to be published later this month. Six other books of poetry and fiction are in preparation.

Today's spot check of stores suggested that the Soviet Union's distribution system had not learned how to cope with its new commodity on the book market.

No. 119, the only store that has stocked Yiddish books in recent years, specializes in Soviet books published outside Moscow. They include Russian-language publications from other cities of the Russian Republic and books from ethnic republics of the Soviet Union in their own official languages.

Although Yiddish books are printed in Moscow, they have been sold in a store for out-of-town books on the ground that they were published in one of the non-Russian languages of the Soviet Union.

Most Soviet bookstores have departments selling books in English, French, German, Spanish, and other languages that have been printed in the Soviet Union. Almost no books are imported from Western countries. A wide range of books published in other Communist countries are available in a store set aside for them.

At one time Yiddish books were sold in a store specializing in foreign-language books. But when it was pointed out that Yiddish was a language spoken in the Soviet Union, these books were moved to No. 119.

It remains to be seen whether Soviet book distributors will continue to sell the promised Yiddish books through the single outlet in Moscow, which has the largest Jewish population of any Soviet city. Of Moscow's 7 million people, 250,000 are Jewish.

"This Is How We Live" is also scheduled for publication in Russian, English, and French, suggesting that exports are considered to be a substantial part of its market. It seems hardly likely, however, that virtually the entire 15,000-copy edition of the original Yiddish version should be destined for export.

The book's theme is that Jews have become thoroughly assimilated under the Soviet regime, that they are found in almost all walks of life and display no separate national feelings tending to set them apart from the rest of the Soviet people.

The subjects of the documentary stories range from the skipper of a fishing trawler to the manager of a large state farm in northern Kazakhstan.

The authors, many of them regular contributors to Sovetish Heimland, range from the 87-year-old Z. Vendorf to Irina Rudensky, 38, a graduate of the Moscow Aviation Institute.

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at Governor's Conference on Agriculture, Louisville, Ky., February 3, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a 2-day Governor's conference on agriculture was called this week by the Governor of Kentucky, Hon. Edward T. Breathitt. Almost 1,000 farm and business leaders attended the conference in Louisville where on February 3, the main address was given by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman. I found Secretary Freeman's speech to be excellent and I wish to commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT THE GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON AGRICULTURE, SHERATON HOTEL, LOUISVILLE, KY., FEBRUARY 3, 1965

Through most of the past week I was in Western Europe for conferences with Common Market officials and public appearances related to exports of American agricultural products.

I also met with food trade and farm organization representatives. And at a food exposition I had the opportunity to talk with some of the key buyers—housewives.

This trip in the interest of protecting and expanding foreign markets for agricultural products was not my first. Over the past 4 years I have been throughout the world, representing our farmers and food industry and Government, promoting increased utilization of American food and fiber. Similar oversea efforts have been made by other representatives of Federal and State governments, of the food industry, and of farm and commodity organizations.

These combined efforts have had excellent results. Our agricultural exports in 1964 climbed to over $6 billion—an all time high. They represented a fourth of the total of all U.S. exports. And Kentucky's share has an annual value in excess of $65 million.

Our agricultural economy, our total economy, and our balance of payments are better because the products of American farms are needed, and wanted, abroad.

Around the world there is obvious appreciation for our food. Yet in Europe, the Middle East, in Asia and in Africa, and in the Soviet bloc I have found interest in our food more than matched by admiration for American farmers.

All over this world the American farmer is looked upon as a maker of miracles. There's a reason why people in other lands picture the American farmer wearing a crown instead of a straw hat.

This is the reason: The era of abundance the United States knows is still a goal for most countries. In some it has not even achieved the status of a goal—it is still a dream. So all the world wants to know how our farmers created history's first era of abundance, and wants to know how they maintain it. So while the peoples of other lands listen with interest to the American food story told by our traveling salesmen, they pile question upon question as they seek more knowledge of the American farm story.

Perhaps there is an even better understanding abroad than here at home of the achievements of the American system of family farms, and that system's great contributions to the total welfare of our people.

I know this for sure: There is a highly publicized misunderstanding here at home of what our family farmers have accomplished, how they did it, how they can maintain it, and what the role of government has been and must be in the days ahead.

It is time to set the record straight.

Truth is the basic element in freedom—and if the people of this Nation and their elected representatives are to be free of either passion or prejudice in determining public policy in a vital area like food and agriculture, they must operate in an atmosphere of truth.

It is time to set the record straight * * * time to review and explain fundamental facts * * * and I am accepting your courtesy and hospitality—and your podium—to do it here and now.

It is time to quite calling success by the name of failure.

It is time to quit calling the most successful free enterprise productive system any society has ever known a relief-welfare State program.

It is time to quit equating a better life for one segment of our rural society with a lesser life for another, because such an equation downgrades our national sense of justice as well as the potential and the flexibility of our economy.

It is time to quit putting the labels of "pampered" or "subsidized" upon the backs of farm families who take hard risks, and work hard, and meet the demands of responsible citizenship. Those who cannot understand or appreciate their contributions should at least respect their dignity.

It is time to set the record straight, and here are basic facts:

The family farms of this Nation have created an abundance unparalleled in world history. Americans buy more of a greater variety of quality foods at less cost in terms of take-home pay than any other food buyers anywhere else in the world.

Since 1950 the cost of medical care has jumped 63 percent. Our consumers are paying 52 percent more for professional services than they did in 1950, and 38 percent more for transportation. Yet farm prices—the prices that farmers receive for what they sell—are lower now than in 1950. While Americans are paying 63 percent more for medical care, 52 percent more for professional services, and 38 percent more for transportation, our farmers are receiving 8 percent less for their products than they did 15 years ago.

What if the farmer were charging 63, or 52, or even 38 percent more? We would be eating less, and at the same time would be shifting money now being spent for the products of factories and for services into food.

Rather than the consumer-taxpayer subsidizing the farmer, the contrary is true.

In 1963, in testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture, I said that if the family farm is permitted to die "let the consumer beware." I repeat the warning, in all sincerity, in this year of 1965. It is the family farm system that enables our consumers to have it so good.

And there's more to this great production story.

In addition to providing all the foods our people want to buy, and can buy, our farms produce enough more to provide healthful diets for those who cannot pay at all or can pay only part of the cost. These consumers, through the school lunch and school milk and food stamp and direct distribution programs, receive $750 million worth of food each year.

The State of Kentucky is a pioneer in one of the most dynamic, and effective, of these efforts to wipe out diet deficiencies throughout our Nation—the food stamp program. Under this program low-income families have the opportunity to invest limited resources in better diets. Floyd County was one of the first eight counties in the country to try out the new food stamp approach, back in 1961. It was joined by Knott and Perry Counties in 1963. Since the summer of 1961, the food stamp program has been responsible for $4.4 million of new purchasing power in the three counties. Not only low-income families, but the entire economy of the area has benefited from this dignified, businesslike approach to utilization of our food abundance.

Just this week four additional counties—Breathitt, Johnson, Martin, and Owsley—adopted the food stamp program. Along with Tennessee, Kentucky is first in benefiting from the expansion of this effort authorized by the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

Kentucky's utilization of the food stamp program is a tribute to the vision and concern of Governor Breathitt, Economic Security Commissioner Powell and his staff, and your business and banking people who cooperate so well with the State administration and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Yet, we could not have moved nationally, or locally, into the food stamp program unless there had been an abundance of food. The foundations of this program are found on family farms.

In addition to enough food for those who can pay, and for those who can pay none or part of the cost, our farmers have been producing enough more to permit hard sales abroad at the rate of $4.5 billion a year, plus $1.76 billion worth a year to use as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy through our food-for-peace program.

Life is richer, fuller, and more promising for all Americans because of this tremendous production achievement. If you classify as a miracle something that had never been made to happen before in all the long history of men and farms, we have a miracle on our hands.

Anyone who can find error and wrongdoing in that achievement can, believe me, criticize motherhood, turn his back on the flag, kick a friendly dog, and slap a baby all at the same time.

But food supply is only part of the family farm story.

Our family farms are prime consumers.

They spend more than $29 billion a year on the goods and services related to agricultural production. They use more petroleum than any other industry. They take 6 percent of all the rubber consumed in the United States each year. They use 5 million tons of steel a year—a third as much as the automotive industry. They consume about 4 percent of the Nation's electric power.

Farmers spend another $12 billion a year on family living—for food, clothes, cars, furniture, medicine, and other products and services from town and city sources.

Farming employs 6.1 million workers, and 3 out of every 10 jobs in other employment are related to agriculture. Approximately 10 million Americans have jobs storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising the products of agriculture. Manufacturers of food and related products alone employ nearly 2 million workers and have an annual payroll of around $9 million.

All Americans depend on the people of family farms as producers. A high proportion of American workers depend on them as consumers.

We should not—we cannot—underestimate the stake the Nation has in not only the continuation, but the strengthening, of this productive system.

We have been maintaining this free enterprise productive system through farmer-government cooperation in commodity programs—programs designed to adjust production to needs without waste of human or natural resources * * * programs designed to support prices received by farmers for many of the commodities they sell.

We couldn't have achieved the results we know without them. These programs will determine the future of efficient, commercial family farms and consequently are of critical importance to all Americans who benefit so much, in so many ways, from those farms.

It is these programs that are now under attack.

It is charged they are no longer necessary, or are too expensive, or are helping the wrong farmers, or ar relief efforts no longer needed in an affluent society, or are a combination of all these.

Now, I am not a defender of the status quo in commodity programs. The mechanical methods of supply management and price support must be constantly adjusted. Those that are good can always be made better, those that are not responsive to changing needs and conditions must be updated. And we must be acutely conscious of cost.

But I do defend, and advance, the principle and purpose, and declare the success of these programs.

I want to make this clear:

1. These programs are essential to all Americans—to every area of the society—because all Americans reap substantial benefits from efficient commercial family farms.

2. If we abandon the principles of supply management and price support now, we shall sound the death knell of the family farm and bring an end to the era of abundance as we now know it.

3. While the goal of reducing the cost of commodity programs is a sound objective, one that can and must be achieved, we must constantly measure gains in government savings against possible economic and social losses to the whole of society. Efforts to cut costs must not be at the expense of parity of income for many thousands of farm families.

4. Commodity programs are not now, nor have they been under this administration, welfare programs. Commodity program expenditures are not a dole, they are an investment in good management of national resources.

5. Only a small number of farmers—about 5 percent of the total—are now earning incomes comparable to earnings in other segments of the economy where investments are similar. But even these farmers, independent nongovernment studies reveal, would experience a quick income loss of as much as 50 percent without the commodity programs. Actually, the larger family farms—those grossing $10,000 a year or more—would suffer most. Such a knockout blow for efficient farmers would be hard enough to shake the entire economy.

6. Creating new hazards for the efficient family farm will not ease the very real economic and social pain afflicting the families on small farms with inadequate productive resources. To do that would be applying the wrong remedies to the wrong ailments in double dosage.

President Johnson put the current agricultural picture in proper perspective in his recent economic message to the Congress.

"Americans owe much to the efficiency of our farmers," the President said. "Their independent spirit and productive genius are the envy of the world. We must continue to assure them the opportunity to earn a fair reward for their efforts. I will transmit to the Congress recommendations for improving the effectiveness of our expenditures on price and income supports."

Then the President went on to say:

"Many small farmers cannot expect to earn good incomes from farming. But they—along with other rural Americans—will have an opportunity to share in the fruits of our society through faster economic growth, better education and training opportunities, and improved health and community facilities. We must extend the benefits of American prosperity to all our people, including those in rural America."

The President's comments show recognition of two distinct, yet related, areas for rural opportunity development—one in full-time farming based on adequate productive resources, the other in utilization of combined farm and nonfarm earning opportunities. The second calls for the creation of new job opportunities in the rural communities for those who wish to do something other than farm, or need jobs that will augment returns from farms which in themselves cannot become adequate income sources.

Efforts to make the two areas of opportunity development competitive for attention and resources will benefit neither. These efforts must complement one another—progress in one will enrich the other.

Commodity programs may mean 10 to 20 percent of net income to a small farmer, and are often indirectly helpful in other ways. But commodity programs alone will not meet their needs. They are, however, economic instruments vital to the very existence of the commercial family farm. As such they merit the continuing interest and support of city and countryside alike.

Governor Breathitt's commission on agriculture, and your Kentucky leadership associated with the commission in this conference, have sights set on a billion-dollar annual agricultural income for Kentucky. That would be an increase of between $300 and $400 million from the current annual level of gross returns from farming. That is a big jump, but you have launched your drive from a running start. Kentucky's farm income has been on the rise over the last 4 years, and preliminary figures show it was better in 1964 than in 1963. And the commodity programs I have been discussing tonight have had a role in your fine progress.

I am confident that you can reach, and even exceed, the billion-dollar goal you have set for yourself if—as a nation—we can reach our goal of parity of income for the efficient family farm.

I want to commend your outstanding Governor, and all of you, for not limiting your interest to commercial agriculture as you drive to reach the billion-dollar farm income goal. It is important and appropriate that new avenues of earning opportunity for those with limited farm resources and for nonfarm rural families should also get your attention.

I pledge you tonight the wholehearted cooperation of the U.S. Department of Agriculture on both fronts.

I have tried, at some risk or misunderstanding, to make myself crystal clear on two distinct aspects of our farm and rural development programs. On some occasions, when I have demonstrated my enthusiasm for the nonfarm and related aspects of rural

areas development, I've been accused of abandoning the farmer. By the same token, my emphasis here on commodity programs in no way lessens my dedication to other opportunity-building efforts in rural America.

There is a place, a real need, for all of them.

But tonight I primarily want to be on record emphasizing how serious—even disastrous—it would be to turn backward from the commodity programs.

These programs were designed to improve earning opportunities for family farmers, and they're doing it, at the rate of a billion dollars a year more in net income than was earned in 1960.

These commodity programs were designed to bring supplies into better balance with demand and to move surpluses into consumption and in most areas—particularly feed grains and wheat—they're doing it.

The commodity programs were designed to provide consumers with an abundance of food at fair prices, and they're doing it.

And—most of all—they were designed to perpetuate the family farm system of agriculture and avoid the economic and social hazards attached to large corporate farming, and they're doing it.

The family farm, measured in terms of today's investment and production standards, is a growing rather than diminishing institution. Let us resolve to maintain appropriate incentives, so that American family farm free enterprise agriculture will continue to perform miracles for all the American people.

Views of Halibut Fishermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a communication from the Deep Sea Fishermen's Union of the Pacific expressing the views of its membership in regard to halibut fishing in the north Pacific Ocean.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, this has been a very controversial subject and for the enlightenment of my colleagues I would like at this point to include in the RECORD excerpts from a letter I received from this distinguished group:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: On behalf of the members of the Deep Sea Fishermen's Union of the Pacific, I would like to give our views on what we think should be the U.S. position on halibut fisheries in the North Pacific and we believe could be the U.S. position for all coasts of the United States.

The U.S. position on fishing limits should be U.S. jurisdiction of natural fishery resources, in, on and over its Continental Shelf. The Continental Shelf to mean as far off-shore as the depth of the overlying waters permits the exploitation of the natural fishery resources of the areas.

We recommend that the halibut population on the Pacific North American Continental Shelf be reserved for use of American and Canadian long-line fishing fleets. Vice versa, that the halibut population on the Pacific Asian continental shelf be reserved for use of Japanese, Russian, and other Asian nations. In both areas we recommend retention of strict quota and conservation measures to conserve the halibut resource on a maximum sustained yield basis. Where necessary certain areas should be set aside as sanctuary for immature halibut. We recommend a total prohibition on the taking of halibut by trawls, or nets, or any gear other than hook and line:

(a) A treaty should be entered into with Canada so that they could fish halibut on the U.S. Contiriental Shelf, up to a 3- or 12-mile limit. Also, that the halibut quotas be divided on a 50–50 basis between United States and Canada.

(b) Why propose a 50–50 division of halibut quotas? At the present time the Canadians have an unfair advantage in that they are able to economically build new and larger vessels becaues they are able to utilize them for year around operation, i.e., in halibut, salmon, herring, and dragging for bottom fish. Even with our new construction subsidy law, we know of only one proposed vessel to be built in the Pacific Northwest.

(c) The increase in the availability of halibut, brought about under the International Pacific Halibut Commission's conservation program the past 40 years has not gone to the U.S. halibut fleet. This increase in availability of halibut has gone to the Canadian and now also to the Japanese and possibly the Russian fleets. The following is the percentage of the halibut quota caught by the United States and Canadian fleets in various years.

[In percent]

Year	U.S. Fleet	Canadian Fleet
1964	44	56
1960	53	47
1955	62	38
1950	67	33
1945	72	28
1940	76	24
1935	78	22

Source: Market News Service, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Seattle. Some other facts: International Pacific Halibut Commission.

Year 1954: Seattle halibut fleet, 186 boats; 1,089 men.

Year 1964: Seattle halibut fleet, 87 boats; 518 men.

We recommend that a conservation program be established for all species of bottom fish on a maximum sustained yield basis. This program to apply to United States and Canadian drag fleets as well as to foreign fleets operating on the U.S. Continental Shelf. If the United States is not at present exploiting some species of bottom fish on its Continental Shelf, other countries could be licensed to fish for these species under our sustained yield conservation program. Some day we may want to exploit these other species of bottom fish and we should make sure now that there will be fish in the future.

We believe all countries should have exclusive jurisdiction over their Continental Shelf fishery resources. It is possible that the United States could enter into treaties with other countries for U.S. fishermen to fish on their Continental Shelfs. The United States should, however, develop and utilize its own Continental Shelf fishery resources.

On the makeup and method of choosing commissioners and advisory board members of various fishery commissions. * * * The people in the various fishing industries would have more confidence in these advisory boards and commissioners if they had the right to choose their own representatives or at least have a voice in their selection.

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE R. NORDAHL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

A Very Personal Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

[From the Shelbyville News, Feb. 3, 1965]

A VERY PERSONAL STAKE

We've been bombarded so heavily and for so long with facts and figures concerning Federal Government spending and the Federal budget, that it's safe to say that most of us have come to regard it all as pretty impersonal. But the stake that each of us has in all this is really a very personal one.

To begin with, just as a matter of keeping the record straight. President Johnson's recently announced budget for the fiscal year starting July 1 hardly begins to tell the whole story of Federal spending. This administrative budget which Mr. Johnson pegs at just under $100 billion—$99.7 billion to be exact—is only a part of the tax money handled by Government. When all of the trust funds for pensions, highways, unemployment, etc., etc., are added, the total comes to around $126 billion. And thus the amount you pay out in taxes comes to many more billion than the total shown in the regular budget.

Social security taxes, earmarked for roads, taxes going for unemployment compensation and other levies boost the bill many billion above the figure publicized by the administration.

The Federal budget alone—just the administrative budget of about $100 billion—is some $20 billion higher than it was only 5 years ago. Have any idea of how much you pay in Federal taxes for the various spending categories?

Well, as an example, let's take a married man with $5,000 of taxable income—after allowing for all deductions and exemptions. His income tax for 1965, due next year, will be about $1,000. He'll also have to pay many other taxes, but consider for now only the principal parts of his Federal income tax.

Most of his tax dollars, a litttle less than $500 or 48 percent of the total, will go for defense. In addition to this, he'll spend about $11 for military aid abroad and another $25 for further development of the atom, which is primarily for war purposes.

In addition, past wars will be costly to him. For instance, about $46 will go for veterans and about $116 for interest on that fantastic national debt (something like paying the interest on the home mortgage). Still, the total for this is down a little bit. Defense and past wars now take about 66 percent of taxes paid to the Federal Government compared with 80 percent 5 years ago.

Money for space exploration, as some of us have noted, is going up very fast and will take something over $50 this time from our $5,000 man. This is seven times more than 5 years ago—and the race to the moon and to other planets wil become even more costly in coming years.

Around 11 percent of his tax—about $110—will go for social programs, a package of items covering health, antipoverty, manpower training, and education (which has quadrupled in the past 5 years).

Assistance to foreigners will cost him about $23, or 2 percent of his total. This is mostly for economic aid.

And our $5,000 man will cough up 6 percent of his total or about $56, for help to farmers. Most of this money will be used to support farm prices in one way or another, and the remainder will be used to subsidize the export of surplus commodities and for other programs.

You may fit into the tax niche occupied by this one taxpayer. But whether you do or not, the example should provide a basis for figuring where most of your Federal income tax money goes. It's a pretty personal thing, isn't it?

The Forest Service Looks Forward to 1975

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association, a group whose interests and activities are of paramount economic importance to the South and to the Nation, held its annual meeting in Atlanta, Ga., last week. One of the featured speakers for this meeting was the Honorable Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. This outstanding departmental executive delivered such a fine speech that I feel it should be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am very glad to ask that this be done.

THE FOREST SERVICE LOOKS FORWARD TO 1975

(By Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association annual meeting, Atlanta, Ga., February 3, 1965)

The subject of your annual meeting this year—"What To Expect From 1965 to 1975"—is an interesting and timely choice. I am delighted to be here to learn of your expectations and to outline for you some of the things that we in the forest service see as we look ahead at these next 10 years.

With a solid 25 years of achievement and growth under your belts, it is fitting that you, the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association, should examine expectations for the future and make your plans accordingly. Let me say at the outset that from where I stand, your prospects were never brighter than they are in this year of 1965. Certainly the likelihood that U.S. pulpwood consumption may triple by the year 2000 presents a great opportunity here in the South. There is cause for real optimism based on what may logically be expected from this forthcoming decade.

The general shape of what you should expect from the Forest Service between now and 1975 can be revealed by a quick look at the past decade and at our current plans and programs. I foresee no sharp alterations in our course here in the South. It has always been a stimulating experience for me to see and hear, firsthand, accounts of the progress in forestry that is being made in this region—through both private and public efforts. I know that this will continue.

Yet no administrator, no conservationist, no forester, can ever be completely satisfied with the pace of events toward the goals he has set before him—even here in the South where such progress may be more evident and more satisfying than in some other regions. We would like to see the course of Forest Service programs changed—especially the ones which coincide with your objective; not to the right, not to the left, but upward. You can expect each of us in the Forest Service to push our programs upward—and to work shoulder to shoulder with you in pushing your programs along toward our common objectives.

We have much to build on. For example, as pulpwood production in the South doubled since 1950, our research folks worked hard with you in providing detailed and reliable surveys and statistics on these trends—State by State and even by counties. I think they have led the Nation in furnishing this kind of information to your industry.

The technical breakthrough in direct seeding of the southern pines has resulted in a sharp upward trend in regeneration by this method, with resultant savings of both public and private reforestation dollars. Hardwood pulping research and development are reflected in a rising volume of hardwood pulpwood consumed. New techniques of producing and handling chips have been significant advances. Cooperative forest protection programs, expanded national forest timber sales, record cooperative reforestation accomplishments, and concurrent efforts by private and public foresters to improve management practices on all forest land, are a few more examples of the kind of progress that results from our joint efforts. This progress can be expected to continue and, we hope, accelerate.

You can expect from the Forest Service continued appreciation, support, and encouragement of your forestry efforts. I have said repeatedly that we welcome and urge the forest industries to take up just as large a share of the total forestry effort as they possibly can. Our primary concern has been, and will continue to be, that the total job gets accomplished—and not who does what. Here in Atlanta at the Society of American Foresters meeting in 1962, when I spoke of Forest Service plans with regard to small private woodlands, I said, "Our goal in developing any program is to propose measures tailored specifically to accomplish what is needed but is not likely to be accomplished otherwise.' A few months ago, many of you heard Assistant Secretary John A. Baker at the American Forest Products Industries annual meeting say with respect to the job of rehabilitating seriously depleted forest lands in Appalachia, "If the forest industries you represent take on that job, we will support you to the best of our ability." These policies will continue.

The new timber trends report, which we hope will be off the press later this month, makes the forestry sucess story here in the South abundantly clear. In the years since its predecessor, the timber trend report, much has changed for the better in this region. Forest industries have demonstrated the importance of intensive timber management as an economic factor in successful private forest enterprises here in the South. Some of the pulp and paper industries you represent have developed unparalled forest management systems, based on the most modern and enlightened policies and techniques. Your efforts to promote sound forest management practices on private lands seem to be increasingly effective. Your prompt and enthusiastic support of the principle of multiple use management of forest lands—both public and private—has been a strong, positive factor in the past that augurs well for the future. All of this is especially important because this region accounts for about half of the Nation's timber-growing capacity.

I could go on at length in a similar vein with regard to the progress your industry has made, and stimulated, in the fields of fire control, research, economic development of rural areas, provision of outdoor recreation opportunities available to the general public, and all the rest. My point is that much of the credit for the improved forestry situation developing here in the South rests with the forest industries, and especially the pulp and paper industry. We in the Forest Service recognize this, we welcome it, and we congratulate you.

Now, to be a bit more specific.

A great deal of what you may expect from the Forest Service has already been described in some detail. The 10-year development program for the national forests, endorsed and sent to the Congress by President Kenedy in 1961, is a blueprint that is guiding many of our current activities on the national forests. Unfortunately, the development schedule recommended in that program has not been fully realized. From a budget standpoint we are more than a year behind schedule already. Also, it is apparent that some development needs were not adequately foreseen in preparing that 10-year program. The impact of recreational use at new water impoundment areas is a case in point.

Less than a year ago, Secretary Freeman sent to the Congress a comprehensive national forestry research program. This, too, is a 10-year outline of what the Forest Service—working with industry, universities, and others—hopes to accomplish.

I think that most of you have seen the two booklets describing these programs. Instead of reviewing their highlights for you here today, perhaps it will suffice to say that you can expect the Forest Service to push hard to implement these programs fully. We may add to them or modify them somewhat, but I am sure that our overall policy in this next decade must be to intensify development and management of national forest resources as rapidly as possible. Similarly, we plan to move ahead our research program on as wide a front as we possibly can.

We do not yet have a comparable 10-year program to guide our activities in the state and private forestry field, although we hope to have one approved this year. I know that you are especially interested in what to expect from the Forest Service in this area. However, I cannot be specific in this regard until Secretary Freeman and our sister agencies in the department have agreed with and endorsed the essential features of such a program. Nonetheless, it seems appropriate that I should outline the general shape of our current thinking on this subject.

Most of you know that we have been waiting for completion of the timber trends analysis to provide an up-to-date perspective on timber program needs. That report clearly precludes any "crash" program recommendations directed specifically at small private holdings. But it does spell out some very real needs and problems that must be recognized in reviewing the current timber situation—and what is in prospect 30 or 40 years from now. Program emphasis, we think, should be centered around protecting the resources, improving the quality of future crops—especially hardwoods—strengthening marketing efforts and utilization technology, contributing toward needed land use adjustments, and achieving technically sound multiple use management of resources on the bulk of the Nation's forest land.

The long-range outlook for softwood supplies here in the South must be of prime interest to you folks. As I read it, the "trends" study indicates increasing reliance upon the South for softwood timber supplies in future decades. We project an upward trend in the harvest of southern pine sawtimber that is in sharp contrast to the decline in cut experienced in the past decade or so. With a substantial surplus of growth over cut now evident in the South, we have concluded that timber supplies will be adequate to support a sizable expansion of the forest industries. Assuming only present levels of management, however, we also foresee that in 25 years or so, softwood growth and inventories will not be sufficient

to support rising national demands for timber. Part of this outlook stems from the continuing decrease in the net acreage of softwood types in this region.

I am interested in your opinions with regard to the need for additional efforts during the next decade to accelerate artificial regeneration and management of the southern pines—specifically on private lands for timber production purposes.

You can expect that in our forthcoming State and private forest program, the Forest Service will recommend only those increased efforts that we think are justified. They will be built on the solid base of existing cooperative forestry programs. They will be shaped in full recognition of past, current, and prospective private efforts—such as those so well established here in the South. They will constitute our considered judgment developed after careful appraisal of the available facts and information. I think that you will find them to be rational and appropriate.

A growing number of Forest Service activities are not neatly spanned by our national forest, research, and State and private forestry programs. In looking ahead we must expect that this will continue. In preparing our 10-year programs, we did not anticipate the impacts that the accelerated public works program, the land and water conservation fund, the antipoverty program, the Appalachia program, and other conservation-related legislation would have on the Forest Service. Even at this date, I can only offer conjectures about what we may expect in this regard.

There is no doubt that the land and water conservation fund will expand our land acquisition program here in the South during this next 10 years. I know that forest industry people have serious reservations on this score. For that reason, let me tell you as clearly as I can what to expect. For one thing, the lands we hope to acquire under this new law are not highly productive pinelands. Tracts with primary value for public recreation are more typically found in mountainous hardwood country. Tracts acquired in the flatwoods would have to be associated with reservoir development, stream or river frontage, or some other recreational feature or value. Our tentative plans for fiscal year 1966 indicate that only 18 percent of the area to be acquired is in the southern region. And 88 percent of that area—some 25,000 acres—is in the hill country of Oklahoma, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, and Arkansas, within existing national forest boundaries.

During this next 10 years we also hope to step up our land exchange program substantially. We are making progress in reducing our backlog of cases and we welcome new proposals to tidy up ownership patterns here in the South.

In short, we don't expect national forest ownership of commercial forest land area in this region—currently about 5 percent of the total—to be increased appreciably.

We can logically be expected to take an increasingly active interest in promoting the economic development of rural areas. We have noted that the most heavily forested areas tend to coincide with the most severely depressed local economies. The timber aspects of the Appalachia regional development legislation now before the Congress is one example. Our department's deep interest in rural areas development, rural renewal, cooperatives, and related matters can be expected to influence many of our actions in this next decade.

The establishment of Job Corps conservation centers on national forest lands in the South, beginning this month, will certainly have a bearing on our programs and accomplishments in the years immediately ahead.

Cropland retirement or other devices to achieve needed land use adjustments may again become a major factor in reforestation here in the South. Before long you folks will be handling pulpwod harvested from plantations established early in the recent soil bank program. That this is possible is a striking tribute to the productivity of forest lands in this region.

We must all expect to witness increasing competition for land and resources here in the South. For example, one of the few things that has kept pace with the rising volume of pulpwood harvested is the rising volume of recreational visits to the forest lands which are producing the timber. Perhaps this next decade will mark a return to the historical downward trend in the acreage of timber-producing land. Certainly the shrinking acreage per capita will continue apace.

Emphasis on natural beauty and esthetic values in our rural areas is a strong emerging force that is obviously related to forests and forestry. All of us must expect a challenging public interest in what we do to, and with, forested land. For example, we have long sung the praises of selective logging and all-age management. But now we find even-age management, which involves clearcutting, to be advantageous in many situations. One of our greatest mutual problems is to help the public understand what we are doing and why, when they see the "ugliness" of a newly cutover area.

Surely change will be the hallmark of this next decade. Your association, the forest industry, the Forest Service, and the other agencies represented here today—all will be part and parcel of the sweeping social and economic growth of this region and its people. Our Chief Executive and our Congress are clearly working toward new objectives and new emphasis on a host of matters which bear on our work and our programs. As public servants, we are committed to these objectives.

For my part, my expectations from this next decade are colored by my hopes. I hope that forestry in the South will reach new heights of technical and economic achievement. I hope that our agencies and our organizations, both public and private, will be able to look back with pride in 1975. May we see that we have played responsible and responsive roles across the full range of the dramatic growth that will have unfolded here in the South.

Poverty War Questioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

We are greatly concerned about effective methods of getting at the root causes of poverty in the United States. There has been considerable publicity concerning the administration's so-called war on poverty. The Congress has been asked to appropriate substantial funds for the broad programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. William Farha, a constituent of mine in Wichita, Kans., recently advanced several thoughts which are worthy of consideration by the Members of Congress and other interested Americans. Mr. Farha's thought-provoking ideas were contained in a letter to the editor of the Wichita, Kans., Eagle. The letter follows:

Yes, let us all use commonsense in trying to eliminate poverty in our Great Society. The Good Book says, "By the sweat of your brow you earn your bread." I am sure that every citizen is for conquering poverty in our beloved land and the world. On the other hand we must not overlook or misunderstand what war on poverty means.

If we should improve the world, we should begin to improve ourselves.

If we would save the world, we should begin by saving America.

A bankrupt America cannot save the world, or itself.

Any government that is big enough to give you everything you want, is big enough to take everything you've got.

The more is given the less the people will work for themselves, and the less they work the more poverty will increase.

The question is: are we contributing to the solution, or to the problem?

WILLIAM FARHA.

WICHITA, KANS.

"Time for Decision" Speech of J. Edgar Hoover Recommended to Every American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: One of the most dedicated Americans to the country's security has again received well-deserved recognition for his lifelong efforts to awaken the public to the increasing dangers of relaxation from strict moral standards with resultant increased crime rates. In a speech at Loyola University, November 24, 1964, FBI Director Hoover was honored by the presentation of the "Sword of Loyola," and is the first person to receive such an award. Remarks by Mr. Hoover conveyed a message to which all should heed and practice.

I heartily endorse Mr. Hoover's remarks because I believe they are timely and trust that he and his organization will continue to receive the well-deserved support from our citizens.

"TIME FOR DECISION"

I am deeply touched to be selected as the first recipient of the "Sword of Loyola." It is very difficult to express happiness in words, but I assure you I will always cherish the great honor you have paid me tonight. I am humbled by the meaning of this distinguished award.

St. Ignatius Loyola belongs to that glorious band of men who make the history others write. And he is an enduring symbol of fierce determination and the dauntlessness of soul which swing the human race a little nearer to the ultimate fulfillment of that divine purpose toward which the whole of creation moves.

It is most fitting that you should establish this award in the name of a man who turned aside from narrow self-interest to dedicate his life and his sword to God. By your ac-

tion you remind the world that St. Ignatius proved there is sufficient divine power in the soul of each of us to move the universe—if we will use it.

I am convinced there is a compelling necessity for us to make that effort now.

To every man and every nation there comes a time when decisions must be made about grave problems. Further delay in seeking solutions can bring disaster. That time has come for the United States.

The moment has arrived when we must face realistically the startling fact that since 1958 crime in this country has increased five times faster than our population growth. Serious crimes—murder, forcible rape, robbery, burglary, aggravated assault, automobile theft—have mounted steadily since the end of World War II. In 1951 these crimes for the first time topped the 1 million mark, and more than 2¼ million serious crimes were reported during 1963.

Even more ominous is the fact that this terrifying spiral in crime has come about through a growing wave of youthful criminality across the Nation. Last year for the 15th consecutive year crimes involving our young people increased over the previous year. For all serious crimes committed in the United States in 1963, youthful offenders were responsible for a staggering 72 percent of the total arrests for these crimes.

What a grim and unhappy commentary on the moral climate of this great Nation. The moral strength of our Nation has dedecreased alarmingly. We must return to the teachings of God if we are to cure this sickness.

These shocking statistics together with the public's apparent indifference to them are indicative of the false morality we are tolerating today. It is a false code which is based on the worship of things of man's own creation. It is as imperfect and feeble as man himself. However captivating to the senses, this type of moral climate cannot give the support nor the strength which is so vital to our national survival. This breakdown in our moral standards can only render us impotent as a people and as a Nation.

Law and order are the foundations upon which successful government must stand. Without law and order, society will destroy itself.

We must never forget that government cannot favor one group or one special interest over its duty to protect the rights of all citizens. We must constantly guard government against the pressure groups which would crush the rights of others under heel in order to achieve their own ends.

The law of the land is above any individual. All must abide by it. If we short cut the law, we play a dangerous game which can only result in total defeat for all of us because if we destroy our system of government by law, we destroy our only means of achieving a stable society.

It is a great misfortune that the zealots or pressure groups always think with their emotions, seldom with reason. They have no compunction in carping, lying and exaggerating with the fiercest passion. They cry liberty when they really mean license.

Justice has nothing to do with expediency. It has nothing to do with temporary standards. We cannot, and will not, permit the FBI to be used to superimpose the aims of those who would sacrifice the very foundations on which our Government rests. I take humble pride in emphatically stating here tonight that as long as I am director of the FBI, it will continue to maintain its high and impartial standards of investigation despite the hostile opinions of the detractors. Furthermore, the FBI will continue to be objective in its investigations and will stay within the bounds of its authorized jurisdiction regardless of pressure groups which seek to use the FBI to attain their own selfish aims to the detriment of our people as a whole.

Unfortunately and too often humanity, if left to itself, moves along the line of least resistance. That is the reason we make such slow progress, and why we are prone to wait for pathfinders to blaze the way for us to follow. Each of us hopes that beyond the despair and darkness of today there is something better in store for tomorrow. It will be tragic if nothing but hope is brought to bear on the problem of crime in the United States today.

We must have men and women with ideals, with faith and hope and determination who will transmute noble purpose into accomplished action. If we are to reverse the crime picture in this country, we must make a sustained effort to stir the complacent ones to awareness.

We mollycoddle young criminals and release unreformed hoodlums to prey anew on society. The bleeding hearts, particularly among the judiciary, are so concerned for young criminals that they become indifferent to the rights of law-abiding citizens.

We must have judges with courage and a high sense of their duty to protect the public and to adequately penalize criminals if we are to stop the spread of serious and dangerous crimes against society.

We must adopt a most realistic attitude toward this critical problem. We have tried the lenient approach and it has failed.

It is the fashion among many to sneer at ideals, to flout them with derisive jeers as the insubstantial dreams of their naive, and to scornfully prophesy that most men will abandon their ideals as useless encumbrances in the race for wealth and fame. The cynics are too often right, but the fault is not with the ideal—remember that. A worthwhile ideal may be difficult, but it is never impossible, of attainment.

I believe in the omnipotence of the human spirit. Man has repeatedly shown that he can both make and master circumstances. It will take this type of determination on the part of the majority of our people if we are to halt increasing numbers of our young people from swelling the crime statistics columns each year. We badly need a moral reawakening in every home in our Nation.

The voices of temperance, logic, and decency must speak out. Terrorism cannot be tolerated in a free society. Hate, terror and lawlessness are not the American way.

I trust you will give consideration to my remarks and not dismiss them as typical of the traditional age-old lament about the moral climate of one's native land. We are courting disaster if we do not soon take some positive action against the growing moral deterioration in this land.

It is a grievous trend which is being steadily reflected in the attitude of contempt which many of our people have for the values which made this Nation great.

Today, patriotism seems to be out of style. Those who express their love of country are often looked upon as paranoiac patriots or rightwing extremists.

Let me quote from an article which appeared in a recent issue of a student publication of one of our Midwestern colleges. Entitled "Nix Patriotism," this article stated, "Patriotism is an emotion that is marked by ignorance, stupidity, prejudice, autism, fear and hostility."

We can only pray that this undesirable trend which is evidenced among students in all too many of our colleges and universities can be reversed before it is too late.

This attitude can be seen in the widespread public indifference concerning the real threat of world communism. The philosophy of communism flourishes best in an environment where personal responsibility and self-discipline have been undermined by immorality, materialism, and expediency.

Its duplicity is difficult for young Americans to comprehend. If our young citizens turn an objective, analytical searchlight on this ideology and its organizational arms, they will understand communism for what it is—a materialistic, godless dogma dedicated to world domination.

When man places himself above the law and bases his decisions on his own selfish interests, he aids the Communists' relentless efforts to destroy the ideals of our civilization. He contributes heavily to reducing life to the code of the jungle, by making it easier for communism to spread its deadly doctrines, terror and the brutalization of man. What Ignatius Loyola taught, communism seeks to destroy.

The man who has no objective values by which he judges his actions—who allows his passions to run wild, unchecked by a moral standard of what is right—that man is surely risking the loss of his immortal soul.

Faith in man cannot exist without faith in God. Faith in God takes root and grows strong only when it is expressed in service and good works.

It seems we are never converted in mass to any genuine reform in society, science, religion, morals, or government. There must be a beginning and the time is now.

America stands at the crossroads of destiny. It is a common destiny in which we shall all finally stand or fall together. Though we contest with utter vigor for the prevalence of whatever attitudes and policies may possess our souls, may we ever remember that we finally must be all for one and one for all against the vicissitudes of fortune—and perhaps against the world.

We are still capable of producing leaders who have the power to move, quicken, and transform their environment, and to awaken an answering thrill of appreciation and support in us who read or hear of their struggles and achievements.

I sincerely hope the "Sword of Loyola" will mark the beginning of a new and enlightened era in the United States.

Man is blessed with the liberty to choose between opposing factors, between action and inaction, between good and evil, between God and the Devil. Surely our immediate situation requires an endeavor by man to raise himself above ordinary standards to a higher degree of achievement.

As Americans, we should learn to trust God, to know His teachings, and to live in His ways.

This is truly a time for decision.

Panel of American Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a bold, new experiment that was started in Kansas City and is now finding its way across the country. I refer to the Panel of American Women, conceived by Mrs. Paul Brown, a constituent. Most of us are rarely touched by discrimination personally and when we are in the company a friend who may be a Negro, a Jew, a Catholic, or a member of some other minority, it often seems the better part of social grace to avoid any discussion that might be embarrassing. Mrs. Brown has wisely concluded that the best way to learn of the agonies of discrimination is to hear from

those who have been discriminated against. For a club program, Mrs. Brown brought together four women, a Catholic, a Jew, a Negro, and a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant, who were willing to discuss frankly discrimination and how it affected them personally. The panel was an instant success and the idea began to spread. It has been adopted in Little Rock, Des Moines, St. Louis, Omaha, Philadelphia, and Topeka. In the January issue of the Ladies' Home Journal there is an article on the Panel of American Women. I commend to you, Mr. Speaker, and to our colleagues in the House a section of that article reporting the remarks of the four members of the Kansas City panel:

PANEL OF AMERICAN WOMEN

"I am Shirley Morantz. I am rearing four children, eight puppies, two mud turtles, and a pink-eyed hamster. My son, Keith, is 18, my daughter, Jeryl, is 14, Richard is 11 and Andy is 8. My husband, Stanley, is ageless." There was a giggle, then laughter, from the pews in the conservative church in the middle class neighborhood in Kansas City, Kans. The ice had been broken. There had been ice because there was going to be talk of bitter things—prejudice, bias, discrimination—and the 200 women who came to Stephens Memorial Methodist Church, that sunny afternoon had come with set faces and sober attitudes, obviously expecting a challenge to thought, and perhaps some pain. Mrs. Morantz is Jewish, and she was serving on a "Panel of American Women." Before her opening remarks, the church organist had played Beethoven's "Adagio." There had been a brief invocation, and a few words of greeting from women of the congregation. The panel moderator, Mrs. Paul Brown, introduced her speakers—a Jew, a Negro, a Catholic, a Methodist—and the women in the pews braced themselves for harsh realities. Then, suddenly, it was all right. The women were smiling, and Mrs. Morantz continued: "My father was born in Russia, came to the United States, and then to Kansas City with his parents when he was 8 years old. He never attended school beyond the third grade. He is one of the original self-made men, owning a prosperous business here and participating in many community affairs. My mother was born in England, en route to Kansas City from Russia. Together these two people created a middle class American Jewish family. I was the middle child of three. I have never known what it is to be hungry, or not to have sufficient clothing and a comfortable home; and I was never aware of any personal insults because of my religion. The summer before my freshman year at the University of Kansas City I was called upon by a committee of sorority girls. I guess, during the conversation, I let my religious convictions be known. There were no more calls from the sorority. This was my first really conscious experience of being left out because I was a Jew.

"I guess the greatest thing that ever happened to me was meeting and falling in love with my husband, Stanley, a nice Jewish boy who grew up with the ethical teachings of his faith. He taught me that if you are going to live by those teachings, you have to work at it. Because I am a Jew, I cannot be insensitive to what happens to others. I know that some of my friends have not been allowed to purchase homes where they wish because of gentlemen's agreements; or play golf on a golf course they may enjoy, or often attend a college of their choice. I know that my father's synagogue was bombed, my Jewish community center desecrated. I know that in my lifetime and yours 6 million Jews were murdered in Germany—all this simply because they were Jews. Sometimes I stop and ask myself: 'What is so terrible about being a Jew?' I am proud to live by my religion, and yet so many have suffered indignities because of it. But, I must reach out in many directions. When a Negro's home is burned by an arsonist, my home is also endangered; when anti-Catholic literature is circulated, I have been maligned. When a well-qualified physician is refused admittance to a hospital staff because of his race or religion, I feel the loss—for myself as well as my community, which cannot benefit by his skill. It is hard for me to believe that a whole State in our democratic country becomes a monster because a 5-year-old child needs heroic courage to be the first Negro in an all-white school. We all suffer because these things are violations of our democratic principles and religious beliefs. Every human being has the right to walk with dignity. If we were all alike this could be a very dull world. What makes it so exciting to me is that we do have this kaleidoscope of patterns from our various backgrounds. I want to be able to enjoy that which is uniquely my heritage and also enjoy the freedoms that make our country such a special place in which to live. Each time a group such as this asks for a program to learn about the differences and likenesses of Americans, then I know that people are on the move toward better understanding of all of us."

"I am Bernadette Hoyt, wife of a newspaper editor. We have six children; the oldest is 16, the youngest nearly 4. Together with my mother we live in a large stone house crowning a high hill. Before we moved in, it was the neighborhood haunted house, but we spoiled the fun by filling it with live people. Now friends call it 'Withering Hoyts.' We are Catholic and belong to St. Louis Parish. My father came from a strong Protestant background. My mother's background was just as deeply Catholic. My parents resolved their religious differences in a way that may not have been totally satisfactory to themselves, but which my bother and I, as children, accepted without question. We went to public schools during the week and to Mass on Sunday with my mother. It was not until I was older, away from my family at school, that being a religious hybrid troubled me. There I finally became a Catholic by conviction as well as habit. I feel that I have one advantage over most of my Catholic friends. Being inside the church, yet living outside, has helped me to understand better the convictions of the differing faiths. My husband and I feel that one of the problems of all religious-minded people today is that of keeping their faith and the faith of their children alive without keeping it under glass. When I was a junior in high scool my family moved to a small college town which was predominately Danish-Lutheran. There were few of my religion in the town, and for the first time I felt the discomfort of being an outsider. The feeling came home to me suddenly and vividly at a New Year's Eve party. It was a well chaperoned party with fine people. But, of course, as midnight struck, the boys got gay. They capered around the girls, kissing each one in turn. As one young fellow planted a hearty kiss on me, he whirled dizzily and said, 'Wow. I just kissed a Catholic.' I was suddenly aware of a distinction I had felt only vaguely before. My reaction was instinctive. I gave him a good hard slap and answered, 'And I just slapped the son of a Lutheran minister.' I hope my own daughters will have more poise.

"Another experience as a religious minority had a stronger effect on my life. I thought I would like to be a teacher, so I attended a teachers college for 2 years. In Iowa most teaching jobs were in small communities. There are few large cities in the State. But reports were coming back from Catholic graduates that they were having difficulty getting teaching positions in these small towns because of their religion. To avoid this hazard and embarrassment, I changed my course and my school and consequently the direction of my life. This problem still exists for Catholics and Jews throughout the rural Midwest. Recently my husband went to a small town to investigate the story of a rural schoolteacher who was dismissed because of her religion. When he knocked on the door of one of the school-board members, and explained he was from the Catholic diocesan paper, he was ordered off the premises with the assistance of a large dog with an excellent set of teeth. I don't think it likely that my children will meet these same kinds of situations. Today there are fewer communities like those of my experience—or like my father's solidly Protestant environment or my mother's Catholic town. I find my own children are a new breed and typical of their generation. They are different because the world is different. You might call them children of the post-Kennedy era. As such, they are not likely to experience doubts about their own acceptance as citizens, much less the deep and degrading rejection which some of their forefathers knew and which some minority groups still suffer. That doesn't mean that their world will be free of religious tensions and conflict, but I think my children will know better than my generation how to live in a mixed society. Our 10-year-old had the right idea recently when he wanted to build a grotto. (A grotto, I had better explain, is a little outdoor sanctuary in which to pray.) James wanted to build one near the children's clubhouse, but he decided against it. 'I can't do that,' he said, 'because the other fellows in the neighborhood helped with the clubhouse and they aren't Catholic.' He is learning how to make democracy and pluralism work. At the same time, he will not be less Catholic for loving the generosity and integrity and purity of heart that flourish among people of other religious traditions. I want him to know, however, that what happened to the Jews in Germany happened in the center of Christian culture. And that in our own country we still permit a whole segment of humanity to be humiliated, deprived and degraded because God pigmented their skins differently. We do well to pray for unity, but we don't need a new theological structure to unite on behalf of justice and the works of mercy. I want to practice my Catholic faith, and teach my children that through this faith we want to work with and for others."

"My name is Susan Peterson. I am the wife of a physician and mother of two children—Walter, 10, and Suzanne, 7. We are churchgoing believers in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. We are truly patriotic Americans. But because there is a gap between democratic principles and practices, we are, as Negroes, classified as inferior and undesirable. Because of these unjustified generalizations, I have found it necessary to strengthen my understanding in my fellow man. When a bullet, a bomb, or a lifeless body threatens to extinguish the flame of promise. I am forced to rekindle my spirit and that of my children with faith, however blind. My grandfather fought in the Civil War. My father served in France during World War I. Still, today, I am often faced with the suggestion that I should prove my eligibility for ordinary day-to-day rights. My father finished business college, but there were no business opportunities open to Negroes, so he became a fireman—one of the first Negro fire captains in Kansas City. My mother was part-time secretary, part-time seamstress, full-time friend and parent. Together, my parents were intelligent, devout Christians, eager to enrich my sister and me culturally. We were given art, piano and ballet lessons. They were also intent on shielding us from racial prejudice; and although this is impossible, we were held close to our middle-class Negro community. I entered Kansas University at the age of

16, where I learned what it meant to be nonwhite. In my first class, the instructor asked me to move to the rear of the room. Because I was anxious to see and hear, I didn't move. I later learned that my refusal was interpreted as defiance; my raised hand was ignored and my written work returned unread. At a conference with the freshman dean, my teacher discounted the possibility of her attitude having racial connotations. She contended she had no recollection of my presence in the room. This demanded great imagination, since mine was the only brown face in the room. After college, I entered nursing school and became head nurse at a sanitarium. It was during this time that I met my husband, who was an intern. He entered the Army Medical Corps (by special invitation) and became a first lieutenant at Camp Rucker near Dothan, Ala. We were married there, and had many experiences. There was the kindly-lookin' gent who told my husband he must remain a 'good nigger' if he wanted to keep his captain's bars; and the private's wife who asked how much I would charge to wash and iron her clothes. White soldiers backed down the street to avoid saluting my husband. In Jacksonville, a sergeant embraced my husband because, It's good to see somebody from Missouri—even if it's only a nigger * * * sir,' and then he saluted.

"But there was also a hopeful side of life. We made many wonderful friends. We enjoyed many priceless hours in a musical-appreciation group and a discussion club. My husband became one of the camp's favorite doctors; soldiers from other companies sought his guidance, and his CO admired and respected him. After 36 months in the service, 24 of them overseas, he returned to Kansas City to complete a residency in surgery and today is a member of the surgical board and a fellow of the American College of Surgeons. A few years ago, I returned to nursing, this time at a veterans' hospital. One night I answered a patient's cry and found him dazed, but apparently in good condition. He extended his hand, and I gladly took it. 'Mrs. Peterson,' he said, 'I'm so glad you came quickly, I must have had a nightmare. I thought there was a big black nigger standing at the side of my bed.' When my voice finally came, I assured him he was safe and agreed to stay with him until he fell asleep again. The following night he rang for me as soon as my tour began and apologized many times over. Today, the tone of my patient's words is completely forgiven and almost forgotten; there are more positive experiences. In Kansas City, a public accommodations ordinance has been approved by a majority of voters. A Federal civil-rights law has been enacted, lifting the morale of millions of Americans. I envision an America in which my children can be seated in any classroom in Kansas, Alabama, or in life, and be graded according to proficiency and not the pigmentation of their skin. I envision a day when our children can go with us into the South with dignity and without fear. I envision a time when all men will dine at the table of brotherhood. And, finally, I believe the day will surely come when all men will awaken from this nightmare of hatred and, like my patient, take their brothers' hands with remorse and say, 'I'm sorry.' "

"My name is Pat Gunn. I am the wife of Russ Gunn, a Kansas City businessman, and mother to Stephen, 10, and Louanne, 6. I was born in a small East Texas Community, one of those sleepy, quietly decaying communities so typical of the thirties and the depression. My family was part of the minority group of the town. The majority of the people were Negro, but no Negro was allowed to vote. My father was on the school board, and I had heard him speak with respect of the Negro superintendent and his teachers. Why, I asked, couldn't they vote? 'Why, honey, if we let them vote, we'd have to let all Negroes vote,' my father replied. 'So what,' I answered, 'we let all kinds of white folks vote.' This earned me a swat and a warning not to get smart. One fall the town was aroused by the murder of a sheriff. A group of men lynched a Negro and burned his body. Of course, none of my family or the 'nice' people of the town were involved. But we didn't do anything to stop it either, that I know of. A fine Negro man worked a farm owned by my grandfather—then bought it from him, paying for it over the years. We would go to the farm deep in the piney woods—play hide and seek with his children, swim with them, and finish up with a picnic under the trees. We enjoyed each other—out there. But they did not visit us in town, unless they came to the back door. I was led to believe that it would not be tactful to treat them in town as we did on the farm. They would be embarrassed. I know I was embarrassed when I turned 13 or 14 and discovered that the farmer's children had been told to call me Miss Patty. My trips to the farm became fewer and fewer—and then we were all in high school and separated by too many things to remember that we had once shared the secret hopes of the future. The small Negro girl and the smaller white one wanted much the same things of life. But I would be limited only by my ability and my income. I was white. My Negro friend could do better in school than I, attain a higher degree in college, be kind and good, do all those things a child is told he must do to be an acceptable member of society, and still find most doors closed in her face—because she was a Negro; her skin was dark. She would be barred from hotels, restaurants, and theaters, and even from schools and jobs, because of her color. What a heartache, a Negro mother must have as she tries to explain to her child why he isn't wanted in so many places, no matter how fine he is. Faced with the same situation, I might have said, 'To the devil with your world—you've kicked me in the face before I've even started. I quit.' I knew that Jews were discriminated against and even persecuted. I had not seen much of it in school. My friends were Americans, Texans, and I did not relate them to the suffering Jews of Europe and history.

"Then, in my freshman year at the university, I heard a lecture on the 'History of Western Civilization.' We listened with indifference. The instructor was saying things we all knew about Jesus of Nazareth: 'So the Jews agitated for His execution, and the Romans bowed to their will to prevent local trouble.' Suddenly, a dark-eyed, intense boy leaped up and shouted, 'Stop it—stop it! Dear God, how my people have suffered because you blame us for that! My parents died in Germany, and no one cared because you say we killed Him. Do you ever read what He taught? What He said on the cross?' We all sat there stunned. Later we found out that the boy had survived a concentration camp. His words bothered me for days. Did I hold Jews responsible for the death of Jesus Christ? Did my church foster this idea? If so, we shared the guilt for the murder of 6 million Jews. Was this behind the fact that Jews could not live in certain neighborhoods, belong to some country clubs, even go to some medical schools or practice in some hospitals? Did my Jewish friends think I felt this way? What is it that makes us prejudiced against the Negro, the Jew, the Catholic? Are we afraid of those who are different? Are we so insecure? I don't want my children to achieve security that way. I want them to respect their dignity as human beings and the dignity of every other human being. If I treat anyone as less than human, I degrade myself to that extent, I don't want my children to lie every time they say the Pledge of Allegiance—'with liberty and justice for all,' not just the white Anglo-Saxon Christians. We teach our children in school that our diversity is one of our great strengths as a nation, the great melting pot, but we seal them off from a whole world of experience with other kinds of people. How ridiculous in a world where time and distance means so little—where all are neighbors with the whole world. I want for all children what I want for my own. When the rights of one are denied, the rights of all are threatened. I firmly believe that we have a responsibility for every child. In effect, each child says, 'Here I am—born with certain inalienable rights.' God help us to see that each child enjoys these rights."

"Peace by Finesse"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, community leaders and intellectual leaders throughout the world are searching for ways to turn the coming era into an age of progress and abundance, rather than an age of terror.

One of these leaders is Joseph W. Sill, M.D., M.P.H., a resident of my congressional district, who has written at length on social problems in general and the problem of achieving a peaceful world in particular. This accomplishment is in addition to his achieving an outstanding career as a medical researcher and administrator, both in civilian and military life.

One of his recent publications is entitled "Peace by Finesse"—available from the Ad Hoc Committee To Foster Peace by Finesse, 831 Milan Street, South Pasadena, Calif., for $1. Dr. Still describes the proposals outlined in "Peace by Finesse" as follows:

"Peace by Finesse" outlines a sort of self-help plan for the less-developed parts of the world; a plan whereby they could isolate themselves from the great powers as the Monroe Doctrine and the two oceans isolated our country during its early underdeveloped phase; a plan whereby they could import, without strings, great power capital and know-how just as the United States was able to do in its early weak and underdeveloped phase.

If we look for specific proposals as to ways whereby we might finesse the present impasses in Vietnam or the Congo, we are disappointed. "Peace by Finesse" was written nearly a year and a half ago before these matters had reached their present status.

However, if we ask ourselves: Could the regional zone of peace arrangement suggested in "Peace by Finesse" be useful in these situations? I believe the answer is "Yes" in both cases.

Within recent weeks the organization of African unity has taken steps to form a regional bank and a research organization to serve the developmental needs of that area. If this area of Africa was to be established as a regional zone of peace from which the Africans themselves would agree to exclude any and all military intervention by any outside government, would this not enable all of the outside nations—Red China, the United States, Belgium, the U.S.S.R., Britain, and France—to feel safe in withdrawing their arms; safe in the knowledge that the organization of African unity would wish to

preserve the strict neutrality of their African regional zone of peace, and would, therefore, not wish to see any outside intervention from any source enter the regional zone of peace?

Of course, the OAU might find it necessary to employ some people from advanced countries to assist them. They might even wish to employ white mercenary soldiers or civilian officials to assist them. But if they did this on the basis recommended in "Peace by Finesse," that is by dealing directly with individuals rather than with governments, this would not bring the cold war back into the picture.

In Vietnam it seems to me the best solution we can now see is to change the framework—the background—for considering the problem. This could be done by forming a southeast Asian zone of peace in which all of former Indochina, Burma, Thailand, India, Pakistan, Malaya, Indonesia, and no doubt other nations in that area would be included. If this regional zone of peace was also to form a developmental bank and a research organization to assist the bank in reaching wise decisions, and if the regional zone of peace would also assume the responsibility for preserving its own neutrality, as between the United States versus the U.S.S.R., the United States versus China, the U.S.S.R. versus China, and so on, would this not provide as satisfactory a way to end the present senseless bloodshed as can be found?

I am aware that the Soviet Union is insisting that the Security Council maintain a monopoly on peacekeeping and thus maintain the power of the five great powers to veto action by the Security Council. In my recollection, this was not the intent when United Nations Charter was adopted. The veto was intended to prevent three or four great powers from using the Security Council to organize an assault on one or two others. The only thought in anyone's mind was to prevent great power wars. Obviously, the Security Council is poorly suited to handling disputes such as those in the Congo and Vietnam. Based on such reasoning I find it a very sensible idea that the nations of the Southern Hemisphere should set up their own machinery to exclude the cold war struggle from their territory and then do their own peacekeeping.

I strongly urge our Department of State and all who are concerned for bringing peace to the Congo and Vietnam to seriously consider the proposals of "Peace by Finesse" as a possible way to end these brutal wars.

Following is a short excerpt from "Peace by Finesse," published in Gandhi Marg (an Indian journal of Gandhian thought):

A NEW ROAD TO PEACE

(By Joseph W. Still)

This paper is written by a peacemaker who has been too often disappointed by Geneva conferences, Camp David meetings, summit conferences, general disarmament conferences, and so one, and who has therefore lost confidence in the great power approaches to peace.

Not only have I lost confidence in the high-level approaches, but I have even less confidence in the little man's three P's—postcards, placards, and picketing approach. Having closely followed and having participated in quite a few of these kinds of efforts for a number of years I have gradually reached the conclusion that the great power leaders cannot possibly make peace. After all, every leader of an advanced country is pledged to preserve the sovereignty and to advance the interests of his country. How can we expect men with such a charge to violate their pledges, to trust each other, and to relinquish their country's "right" and power to make war? On a question so vital as this they would need almost the unanimous support of their people to proceed.

Is it reasonable to think that a few picket signs or a few thousand cards or letters are going to force them to do something that millions of their fellow citizens are afraid to do?

For related reasons I have lost faith in the power of national peace organizations, be they private or public, to make international peace. I have noticed that most American peace organizations always reserve their strongest criticisms for Russian or Chinese warmongers. And, of course, the reverse is true of most peace organizations operating from a base in Russia or China or elsewhere. The reason for this nationalistic approach to peacemongering (even on the part of private peace agencies) probably results from the fact that, to date, almost all such efforts have been "anti," antibombs, antitesting, antiarmaments and so on in their directions. Thus no matter how mildly they criticized these measures they have appeared to many people to be unfairly or unwisely criticizing their own national governments for carrying out what these governments all call defensive policies and measures. This observation has led me to feel that if we want to "sell" peace to a majority of the world's peoples we must develop a positive affirmative program for living it and acting it and stop wasting our energies merely opposing with words those who have been charged with defending the national sovereignty of their countries. When the propeace movement has built a sufficiently large body of public sentiment for peaceful international living it will then not be difficult for the various national leaders to liquidate the cold war and other military threats to peace. But until world public opinion reaches a point where it is good politics to be for peace, it is unrealistic to expect that the majority of politicians or leaders of any of the great powers are going to do anything except talk peace while they prepare for war, if necessary.

Such observations and much study have led to the conclusion that the positive brand of international peace can only be promoted by an international organization of people who are able and willing to work to place the international needs of all humanity ahead of the national needs of smaller national groups and even above their own personal economic or professional interests; and to the conclusion that such a group of internationally minded peacemakers can only be organized through the pursuit of a specific program for promoting peaceful international living, working and playing. The program outlined in this paper is one which seems to meet these specifications. I hope it may help to open up a new road to peace.

This attitude does not mean that I would like to see all or even any of the present peace movements go out of existence. I would only hope that, to the extent they can do so, some of them would find ways to shift their efforts from an antiwar to a propeace position.

Another attitude which it seems to me is important for all peacemakers to adopt is the attitude that the time for making real peace is short. Every day until real peace is achieved is a day on which a nuclear accident could occur. Hence, we should plan a propeace program which would have as its goal the elimination of the major causes of the cold war during the next 10 years, if possible.

Finally, it is essential that all peace mongers accept the full implications of Pope John's statement: "At this historical moment the present system of organization and the way its principle of authority operates on a world basis no longer correspond to the objective requirements of the universal common good."

This statement is a challenge to try to think through—to invent—a "system of organization" which would "correspond to the objective requirements of the universal common good".

The basic paradox that faces peacemakers has been succinctly stated by President Johnson who has said, "The world has become a neighborhood before it has become a brotherhood". You can get into an airplane and fly to any place on the globe and be there before this time tomorrow. You can pick up your telephone and in a few seconds, or at most in a few minutes, you can talk to any one of the several hundred million people in this world who also have telephones. You can send a telegram or an airmail letter to anyone on earth and it will reach him in no more than a day or two. If a message is sent by radio or television it can instantaneously reach millions of people. In fact, through the use of a Telstar system, we could, in theory, imagine all of the 3 billion people in the world seeing the same picture and hearing the same message at exactly the same moment in time.

Clearly, such a situation requires laws and rules. Just as the automobile brought stop signs and traffic signals to our streets so have air travel, radio, and television, not to mention rockets and space ships, made it necessary to establish ways to regulate these forms of international traffic.

Unfortunately, although the advanced countries have developed the transportation and communication facilities that have made the world a neighborhood, it has not developed enough of the people-to-people friendliness and brotherliness to permit it to operate as if it were a real brotherly neighborhood. In our fears of each other every country is policing its borders and planning as if it is threatened by an invasion.

When East and West first began to woo developing countries their leaders thought they had found the key to rapid advancement. Just play off one side against the other. Get East and West to outbid each other, and presto, all problems could be solved.

Unfortunately from their viewpoint, that situation did not last long. Now both Soviet and American strategists have developed their long-range strategies. And all the great and middle powers have each decided what areas are of vital importance, what areas are of secondary importance and what areas are of little importance to them. And with few exceptions they are no longer bidding strongly against one another except where immediate and vital interests seem to be involved. At this time there seems to be a general reappraisal of the concept of foreign economic aid going on in both the advanced and developing countries.

Now if this situation meant that developing countries were free to go ahead in peace in order to develop their resources that would be fine. But because the world has become a congested neighborhood, no such freedom (the kind that the United States enjoyed for over a century) will ever again exist. The Congo crisis, as one example, has proved that. Katanga Province contains one of the world's major reserves of uranium. And that was and is too important, both militarily and financially, to be overlooked and ignored by the great powers. So the Congo was brought to civil war before it had finished celebrating its independence.

Such facts as these must have caused many leaders of developing countries to wish their country could enjoy the same isolation from foreign entanglements, the same freedom to advance, that America enjoyed in its youth. They must frequently wish that they were surrounded by a moat of oceanic proportions as America was.

Now that many young developing countries are settling down to the long and difficult task of changing from underdeveloped to advanced status, as quickly as possible, their leaders are discovering that the East-West struggle is extremely distracting, and is seriously delaying and hampering their development. In point of fact they must often wish that both the United States and the U.S.S.R. and their close allies could be

shipped to the moon so that they could develop at a normal rate. Like President Monroe, their leaders must long for real tranquility and peace—long to isolate their countries—so that they could undertake, without too much fear of interruption, the long-range projects so necessary for the full development of their economically backward countries.

Considerations such as these could lead an Asian or African Monroe to decide to use his country's vote in the General Assembly to politically isolate his and other developing countries from the cold war. He would then ask himself: How could we quarantine my and other developing countries, as President Monroe did the United States? How could we isolate them politically and militarily without giving up the opportunity to get economic development aid from either East or West or elsewhere?

None of these developing countries has the advantages of geography that the United States enjoyed. But one way to achieve a similar political isolation for the group as a whole would be for the General Assembly, acting under the authority of the 1950 uniting for peace resolution, instigated by John Foster Dulles, to pass a resolution establishing a theoretical zone of peace—an area from which cold war competition would be banned—a truly neutral area; an area which any nation could join provided that it would accept the requirements laid down for entry and membership. Possibly the zone should be subdivided for administrative purposes into regional subzones.

The two basic requirements for membership in such a zone of peace would be: (1) that an applicant country would sign an agreement to relinquish its power to make war on other nations, and (2) to relinquish its right to permit a country not a member of the zone of peace to use its soil for any purpose not acceptable to a majority (or perhaps all) of the countries which are members of the zone of peace. In other words, each nation in the zone would pledge to maintain strict neutrality with regard to the cold war struggle and to keep that struggle or any international struggle from being conducted on its soil.

To implement the first requirement, the General Assembly Peace Treaty would need to establish an international military force capable of protecting the boundaries of the zone of peace members from external aggression. Probably the members of that force should be limited to nationals of zone of peace countries. Certainly there should be no organized forces from the great powers or their close associates. And the people performing military or other services for the zone of peace, at least those working at policy levels, should be given dual citizenship in the zone of peace as well as in their own nations.

With their national boundaries guaranteed by zone of peace membership and protected by the international military force of the zone of peace, as well as agreement to submit disputes to the World Court, countries in the zone would need only to maintain small internal police forces to preserve law and order within their own boundaries.

It is difficult to estimate how large a zone of peace military force would be needed. At the time of their birth as independent nations most of the developing countries have had practically no military forces. It was only when they became politically involved in the cold war that some of these countries were able to obtain modern weapons. Perhaps if they had the possibility of joining the zone of peace they would be glad to turn their weapons and military forces over to the zone in order to have the more secure protection that the larger developmentally oriented organization could provide. And it seems quite possible that the zone of peace military force would not need to be large. Its greatest power would rest in its symbol as an instrument of peace and any nation which challenged this would attract to itself a great deal of adverse world opinion.

To implement and control the second main membership requirement for countries joining the zone of peace—the requirement excluding cold war competition from the zone of peace—the members of the zone of peace would establish review councils which would scrutinize from an international political viewpoint all prospective agreements between members of the zone of peace and outside countries. These review councils would be empowered to either approve or reject each proposed agreement in order to insure that no arrangement was made that would endanger the neutral status of the zone of peace.

Perhaps these feview councils could use the administrative, factfinding and policing machinery of the already existing U.N. agencies such as UNESCO, WHO, SUNFED and so on as secretariats to help them arrive at decisions regarding the desirability of proposed agreements. If so, they should be able rather easily and quickly to put the review council machinery into operation.

Presumably the rivarly between the great powers and the existing "balance of terror" would prevent any of them from making a direct military attack on a country in the zone of peace. Thus, in effect, the great powers would become indirect guarantors of the zone of peace against great power aggression. The situation would be somewhat similar to the way the rivalry between France and England once underwrote the Monroe Doctrine and the isolationist policy of the United States.

Of course, as already suggested, those countries entering the zone of peace would lose the bargaining power that they now possess as a result of being able to play off one side of the cold war against the other. So when countries relinquished that bargaining position and joined the zone of peace, many of them might find it even more difficult than at present to attract assistance from the great powers. To meet this possibility the zone of peace should arrange machinery to assure that all members would receive developmental assistance on a fair and essentially equal basis. At first glance it would appear that both East and West great powers would, under the circumstances just outlined, lose interest in large parts of the underdeveloped area. But actually, the total political and economic strength of the developing countries (hopefully abetted by some of the neutral advanced countries) in the zone of peace would be increased by their combining themselves in the larger zone of peace organization.

The developing countries do possess some important natural resources that cannot be synthesized. Perhaps they could set up machinery to promote economic cooperation between their members. If so, the enhanced economic and political bargaining power resulting from this arrangement might add billions to the income of the developing countries, perhaps more than they ever will get through UNESCO, WHO, etc., as they now are being supported largely by great power contributions.

The group's bargaining power, especially if it set up machinery to promote economic cooperation—somewhat like the European Common Market—between the zone of peace members, would certainly be much greater than the sum of the individual powers of the separate members. As a matter of fact, the formation of a zone of peace and the related machinery mentioned may be an economic necessity for the developing countries. They probably need such organizations, merely to enhance their bargaining position in dealings with the international economic groups which have already been formed in the advanced countries—the Soviet bloc on the one hand, the European Common Market, the Outer Seven and the United States-Canadian groups on the other.

Presumably many of the developing countries would join the zone of peace if it was established and thus isolate themselves politically and militarily from the cold war. This could and probably would make a tremendous change in the nature of the cold war. Whether it would actually lead to a reduction in the size of the cold war budgets is not easy to guess. But certainly such a step would stabilize world politics and stop the recrudescence of incidents in developing countries such as those which in the past few years have so often taken us to the brink of world war III.

Such changes would tend to sharply polarize the U.N. into a positive (propeace) pole, the General Assembly, and a negative (antiwar) pole, the Security Council. Whether or not such a polarization is desirable and how far it should be allowed to develop need to be carefully considered. The General Assembly certainly should not secede from the United Nations or the Security Council. Possibly much of the difficulty which the U.N. has encountered as a peacemaking agency is due to the overwhelming dominance which the great powers assigned to the negative pole of the organization. In any case, it appears that the time has come to formally establish better balance within the organization. Possibly the U.N. budget should even be divided, so that the Security Council would control the budget for its own war-preventing activities and the General Assembly the budget for its peace-promoting work. Certainly the Security Council-dominated U.N. has not been very successful in promoting peace and prosperity for the developing countries, so that whether the great powers like it or not it seems to be rapidly evolving into a bipolar organization. The growing demands in both South Africa and South America for achieving a nuclear-free status is but one example of this drive toward neutrality.

Consideration of these possibilities make it seem likely that if the General Assembly should choose to act along these lines there really is very little that the great powers could do to stop it.

It is an interesting speculation whether Secretary Dulles envisioned these long-range possibilities; possibilities which at the time when he promoted the uniting for peace resolution seemed motivated only by a desire to win a cold war ploy, but which now can be seen to be very much in harmony with some of his religious beliefs in the essential unity and brotherhood of man. In any case, some such solution as this, which will enable the developing countries to make continuing positive efforts for peace, seems necessary unless their leaders are to rest content for the world to merely stagger from one crisis of the developing countries to another, from one brink to the next, never knowing which will be the last one, and letting the problem of the advancement of the developing countries wait for the end of the cold war.

Tribute to Judge Prescott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the annual bar association banquet held at the Washingtonian Country Club, Gaithersburg, Md., on January 28, honored one of Maryland's most distinguished citizens,

Judge Stedman Prescott, chief judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland. I found the thoughtful remarks in the principal address of the evening delivered by His Excellency, J. Millard Tawes, Governor of Maryland, and the significant honors he paid to Judge Prescott so interesting, I feel they deserve the widest possible circulation. I, therefore, submit them here to be included in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY HON. J. MILLARD TAWES, GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND

I am delighted to have this opportunity to join you in paying respect to one of our State's greatest jurists and one of our most devoted citizens.

It seems to me that Judge Prescott has lived up to those precepts which give the man the right to be called a great leader.

I have heard it said that a great leader is one who has achieved success, who has lived well, laughed often and loved much; who has gained the respect of intelligent men and the love of little children; who has filled his niche and accomplished his task; who will leave the world better than he found it. Whether by an improved poppy, a perfect poem or a rescued soul; who has never lacked appreciation of earth's beauty or failed to express it; who has always looked for the best in others and given the best he had; whose life is an inspiration, whose memory will be a benediction.

This sums up the greatness of the man we honor tonight, chief judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, Chief Judge Stedman Prescott.

ADDRESS BY GOV. J. MILLARD TAWES

I am always a little awe struck when I appear before a group of learned lawyers such as are gathered here this evening at this banquet. It is the feeling of inadequacy, of insufficiency, that one has when confronted by others so knowledgeable in a field about which he knows little or nothing.

Many times during my long career in politics and public service have I wished that I had followed an early inclination I had to study law and become a lawyer. For it is no exaggeration to say that during all those year I have been utterly dependent upon lawyers—upon their advice and upon their guidance.

It was so on that first day that I took the office of clerk of court in Somerset County back in 1930. It is so today, now that I am the chief executive of this State.

As the head of one of the coequal, coordinate branches of our State government, my association with the judiciary for the past 6 years of necessity has been close. I hasten to add that the association has been most pleasant for me.

Regarding the coequality of our respective branches of government, let me say that there are times when one is tempted to believe that one of them, like the animals in George Orwell's "animal farm," is more equal than the other.

But that is beside the point. The checks and balances which our forefathers wrote into our basic laws have made it possible for me to do many things to my liking.

For example, it made it possible for me to elevate to the highest judicial post in the State so estimable a person as the man we are honoring here this evening—Chief Judge Stedman Prescott, of the Maryland Court of Appeals.

It is fashionable nowadays for speakers to indulge in the topic of the vast changes which have taken place in our society. And indeed, with all the changes that we see about us, it is a topic which is hard to evade.

It is refreshing, therefore, when on occasion we discover that some things change so little; or, as the French proverb goes, the more it changes the more it remains the same.

Last year, I was asked to speak before a group in New Jersey, the occasion being the observance of the 300th anniversary of the founding of that State.

In the preparation of my remarks, I engaged in a little research to compare our two States, among other things the roles they played in the drafting of our Federal Constitution.

It is most interesting today to reflect upon the deliberations of that body of statesmen who in Philadelphia wrote this great document.

We Marylanders recall with a measure of pride that the idea of a "more perfect union," as expressed in the preamble of the Constitution, had its birth in the capital of Maryland, in the celebrated Annapolis Convention of 1786.

It was at that convention that Hamilton and Madison drafted a resolution pointing up "important defects of the system of Federal Government, of a nature so serious, as to render the situation of the United States delicate and critical."

At the meeting at Annapolis, a call was issued for another convention in Philadelphia the following year, and it was at the latter convention, of course, that the Federal Constitution was framed.

New Jersey, with strong dedication to State sovereignty, was the author of a plan of government which, when finally melded with that of Virginia, became the basic structure of our Federal system—a system which, with only relatively minor modifications, has served our Republic throughout its history.

It was this meeting in Philadelphia that I should like to discuss.

For not only was our charter of government drafted there, but a whole pattern of democratic thinking and democratic action was laid out by those wise and enlightened statesmen who met in Philadelphia in 1787 to perfect their Union of States.

Interestingly enough, and ironically enough, the main issue at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 was what today we call the issue of "fair representation"—an issue which has plagued, and is plaguing, our three coequal and coordinate branches of government.

Madison, in his Journal, summed up the matter in these words: "The great difficulty," he wrote, "lies in the affair of representation and if this could be adjusted, all others would be surmountable."

Madison went on to say that the two gentlemen from New Jersey—Paterson and Livingston—felt that "it would not be safe for Delaware" to allow Virginia, which was 16 times as large as Delaware, 16 times as many votes in the legislative body.

How little things have changed. How much this sounds like the plaints we hear nowadays from small, rural communities smarting under decrees from our higher courts.

But of course the men in Philadelphia, working on a system of legislative apportionment, were free to exercise their will and their judgment, untrammeled by a superior political force. In fact, as we know, at the same time they were creating the legislative body, they were establishing the court which now rules on the equity of legislative representation.

The Virginia delegation, which had arrived earlier, had their plan for a constitution ready for presentation when representatives from the other States arrived in Philadelphia early in 1787.

The Virginia plan called for a strong centralized government and on the crucial issue of legislative representation, an apportionment based on population.

The Virginia plan was discussed for many weeks, and a bitter dispute arose on the question of States rights. It might be well to note that the phrase in that day bore a slightly different connotation than the one sometimes placed upon it in our time.

New Jersey was a strong advocate of States rights and of a decentralized Federal system. The main point in argument was about representation. Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, said, "Give New Jersey an equal vote, and she will dismiss her scruples and concur in the national system."

The convention was deadlocked on this point, and here occurred what our historians have called "the great compromise."

The suggestion was made that each State be equally represented in the upper House of the Congress and that the representation in the lower House be based on population, to be determined by a census taken every 10 years.

When the vote was taken on July 16, 1787, the Convention adopted this compromise. Maryland, with New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware, and North Carolina, voted for the compromise. Pennsylvania, Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia voted against it. New York lost her vote because her delegates were absent, and the New Hampshire delegation had not yet arrived.

Thus, by the narrowest of margins the vital question of representation was settled, and the Convention within the next few weeks went on to settle the remaining issues.

This is not to say that all disputes were placated and that the delegates were pleased with their handiwork. On the contrary, there was much dissatisfaction and a general feeling that perhaps too much had been compromised.

The venerable Benjamin Franklin, then 80 years old, acknowledged that there was much in the Constitution of which he disapproved, but he said he was not sure that he would always disapprove them.

These were his words, among the wisest he ever uttered, on the great compromise:

"For having lived long," he said, "I have experienced many instances of being obliged, by better information or fuller consideration, to change opinions even on important subjects which I once thought right but found to be otherwise.

"In these sentiments, sir, I agree to this Constitution with all its faults, if they are such; because I think a general government necessary for us.

"I doubt, too, whether any other convention we can obtain may be able to make a better constitution. For when you assemble a number of men, to have the advantage of their joint wisdom, you inevitably assemble with those men all their prejudices, their passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests and their selfish views."

And then Franklin asked this question: "From such an assembly can a perfect production be expected?"

He went on to say:

"It therefore astonished me, sir, to find this system approaching so near to perfection as it does; and I think it will astonish our enemies, who are waiting with confidence to hear that our councils are confounded like those of the builders of Babel; and that our States are on the point of separation, only to meet hereafter for the purpose of cutting one another's throats.

"Thus," he said, "I consent to this Constitution because I expect no better, and because I am not sure that it is not the best."

Franklin ended his speech by appealing to those around him who still, like himself, harbored some objections to the Constitution, to "doubt a little about (their) infallibility" and in unanimity put their names to the instrument.

There is, I think, as much to be learned about the art of politics—about the science of people governing themselves—in the proceedings at the Constitutional Convention as there is in the document that was produced there.

For one thing, there is the lesson to those of us who may be inclined toward self-interest to protect the weak from the strong, the small from the great.

We know today that little Delaware is not going to be swallowed by the greater States around her, but we rejoice that the men who created our Government gave thought to her relatively inferior condition and thus established as an irrevocable principle the right of minorities to be protected against majorities.

And then, there is the lesson to the overzealous and the impatient that a compromise of purposes not only in inevitable in a democracy but is sometimes—as was certainly the case with our Constitution—desirable.

For as Franklin said, if we assemble people, as we do in a democracy, to have the benefit of their joint wisdom and joint intelligence, we must accept their prejudices, their errors of judgment, their selfishness and their other shortcomings.

We have nothing to fear that in our democratic society we must give a little and take a little, because we are not infallible, we do make mistakes and in any given situation we may be wrong.

We who have the advantage of being able to look back upon nearly 180 years of experience may wonder how the men in Philadelphia ever could have been so skeptical about the work they produced—how they could have been so dejected about the compromises they had had to make.

Certainly never before, and never since, has an instrument of government of such excellence been produced.

Under it Americans have been able to live in the greatest measure of freedom, on the highest level of prosperity, in a nation that has grown stronger and greater with every passing year.

We are most grateful, then, that our ancestors were wise enough to make concession, to compromise their purposes, to settle their differences, and enter into an agreement that made it possible to create a nation, undivided and indivisible.

We are grateful that the councils in Philadelphia were not confounded like the builders of Babel, but instead that in the end they spoke with one voice, loud and clear, for a system of government under which Americans could earn a livlihood for themselves and their families and live in harmony with their neighbors.

For the legacy they left us—a legacy of life, liberty, and happiness—we are reverently thankful.

The Foreign Oil Imports Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, everyone concerned with the manner in which the foreign oil imports program affects the domestic industry and national security will want to read the incisive statement of Mr. M. D. Abel, president of the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association, made in response to a recent report of the Department of the Interior.

The Government reports that the oil industry is enjoying prosperity. But the prosperity of the huge international companies should not be confused with the relative depression for domestic independents, who do not benefit from the foreign oil import program. The Government, in fact, concedes that the small independent producer is in trouble, and that there is a problem of inadequate exploration. Many authorities see a direct link between the present foreign oil import quotas and the deteriorating conditions in the domestic oil industry. It is to this problem that Mr. M. D. Abel addressed his remarks.

With unanimous consent I am inserting the statement of M. D. Abel, president of the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association:

AN APPRAISAL OF THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES

Hard-pressed domestic independent oil producers can only regard the Kelly-Lattu report as a pitifully inadequate and grossly misleading "appraisal" of the petroleum industry in this Nation.

If the forthcoming Interior Department hearings concerning the oil imports program are to be approached in this context, there seems little hope that present officials will prove any more willing now than in the past to face up to the real issue of a fast-growing imbalance in this industry. The question was not whether "the oil industry" is enjoying prosperity, or whether adequate resources are available to meet foreseeable consumer needs. Rather the need was for information as to extent of and cause for a relative depression for domestic independents during peak prosperity for international companies. We have here a case of poverty amid plenty, pure and simple, or what Gov. John Connally has called "our own Appalachia" in the prosperous oil industry. However correct may be the assertion that Interior had available inadequate statistics for a comprehensive look at independents, it could overlook only with great difficulty the mountains of evidence that present governmental policies are failing to come to grips with the problem, and that the oil imports program in particular is not even approaching declared objectives.

Particularly distressing is the virtual rejection of the national security concept which underlies the oil imports program. Entirely beside the point is the Interior declaration that national security extends "far beyond the limited objective of assuring a supply to meet our own needs during a national emergency," and that national security embraces the security of both the United States and its free world allies, and both domestic and foreign sources of petroleum. The section relating to the import control program is largely given over to emphasis upon the objective of maintaining prosperous and happy foreign oil sources. International considerations are due attention, of course, but this report would seem to subordinate all other considerations to the preservation of available supplies from other countries.

It's one thing to say, as does the report, that "the United States needs the oil resources of the Middle East," and there is for the security of NATO nations "an equally compelling need for continuing production in other major producing areas." However, it is another thing entirely to infer that U.S. security commitments in the Eastern Hemisphere require importation of Mideast oil into this country. In fact, such movement tends to weaken security objectives of both this Nation and her allies.

The security clause in the Trade Act prescribes criteria relating to the objective of a healthy home industry. If Interior officials do not like this limited concept, and wish to insist upon a one-world resource viewpoint, then they should lobby for a change in the law. In the meantime, there should be adherence to the law as Congress wrote it and, we believe, as Congress intended to write it.

We submit that Congress had good reason to concern itself with U.S. relative self-sufficiency of this No. 1 munition of war. Only an adequate supply available from home sources can assure us the bargaining power to obtain oil resources from other nations on terms which are both economically reasonable and relatively secure. Any one of our major import sources could be cut off in short order, as was the case no later than 1957 when the Suez Canal was closed and the Middle East supply denied us and our free world allies. The day America loses her relative self-sufficiency in oil, foreign oil will cease to be cheap in any sense. Congress recognized this, whether or not Interior officials wish to do so today.

The report concedes that the small independent producer is in trouble, and that there is a problem of inadequate exploration. But it appears not to recognize the direct link between these two occurrences.

It notes the need for developing new reserves without increasing output, but purports to see this as primarily a problem for State conservation reform. Overdevelopment of the 1950's is called the most important reason exploration is not keeping pace with expanded requirements, when, in fact, virtually all increased domestic demand since has been supplied from imports and offshore leases, and it is these less secure sources which account for our surpluses today.

It infers that the loss of ground by independents to the major companies is a natural result corresponding to shifts in crude production from older to newer areas, noting that major companies rather than independents drill the deeper and better prospects. It thereby ignores that Federal policy favoring more prolific offshore production, largely on Federal lands, accounts for a substantial part of the surplus. The problem is not so much that independents haven't shared in deeper offshore development as it is the fact that surplus output from this major-company-dominated source has denied independents the economic incentive to drill anywhere, including the shallow prospects which are available to them.

A basic problem raised by the report is the combination of "excess" productive capacity (some 700,000 barrels per day over total demand) and insufficient exploration to cover tomorrow's needs. In detailing the many assumed causes for this situation, very great care was taken to rule out even the possibility that an inadequate imports program underlies the problem.

It would seem obvious that imports—which along with offshore production has accounted for virtually all demand increases during the life of the mandatory program—must be required to mark time until domestic production assumes a better balanced share of the total U.S. liquids hydrocarbon market. Only then will domestic independents be in financial condition to restore lagging exploration activities.

It speaks of a "well-defined trend" toward fewer and fewer smaller companies, acknowledges the shrinkage of their share of total production, and then forecasts a continuation of this trend. Recent developments, it says, may signal only "the onset of a long-term trend toward fewer and larger independents." Sellouts and mergers are pictured as a logical result of the fact that "at any point in time, a given producer may determine that his financial interests are better served by sale of oil in place rather than by continuing to produce." It thereby interprets as a normal and healthy trend toward efficiency what is in fact an alarming trend toward monopoly concentration in this great industry.

Interior's report curiously poses problems without penetrating beyond superficial causes, and then tends to dismiss need for

solutions. A case in point is the product imbalance situation which has led to serious products price erosion in recent years. Noting that uneconomic domestic residual fuel output is on the wane, the report indicates satisfaction over refiners' resultant opportunity to cut down domestic crude needs and at the same time utilize new processes to increase output of other products. At the same time it recognizes that "other products" are in oversupply already. Yet the practice of dumping gasoline on the market, with resulting price wars, is simply criticized as illogical without relation to import policy. Ignored is the obvious: if imports are to be relied upon increasingly to meet demand for residual fuel, then other product imports and imported crude must be correspondingly reduced to avoid excess supplies on the domestic market. As a matter of fact, the report carefully eliminates residual fuel oil and its portion of total demand from virtually all charts, tables, and discussions relating to the supply-demand problem.

It is unfortunate indeed that, as we approach the hearings on the oil imports program, Interior would find occasion to gloss over industry conditions in such sweeping generalities as the following: "The industry as a whole is growing, it is in excellent financial shape, and it is demonstrating daily its ability to live in today's competitive world."

The facts are that Federal policy is failing to provide an adequate foundation for a healthy domestic oil industry so essential to our national economy and security. Both with respect to Interior's implementation of the oil import control objectives, and its handling of Federal offshore lands, the Federal Government is seriously weakening the capacity of domestic producers to fulfill their obligation to this Nation.

We hope that the hearing will provide no stacked cards for setting and reevaluating Federal policy.

In general, this report clearly necessitates a new approach on our part. The facts of our distress, and of inadequate domestic exploration, have been recognized beyond dispute. But Interior officials responsible for this report not only misapply these basic facts, in such a way as to minimize considerations of a more adequate import program, but also serve up a number of inconsistencies in the process.

Closing of VA Hospital in Lincoln, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, last month the Director of the Veterans' Administration announced the closing of the veterans hospital in Lincoln, Nebr. I appreciate the concern of the administration to expend Federal funds wisely. I do, however, question if the closing of the VA hospital in Lincoln, Nebr., will achieve the purpose of saving Federal funds.

I would like to point out that the closing of the VA hospital will in the long run cost the people of this Nation greater sums of money than will be saved. First, this hospital has been serving veterans for 34 years. The hospital has established a fine reputation among the veterans. We can never overlook the prime purpose of a veterans hospital—to bring adequate services to veterans close to their residences. We cannot overlook the tremendous positive psychological factor to veterans when assuring them of adequate medical care. The trust and confidence veterans have in a hospital is immeasurable and cannot always be stated in terms of dollars saved.

I seriously question whether closing the 280-bed hospital in Lincoln will provide the Lincoln, Nebr., area with maximum veterans' care. I have noted that a Nebraskan veteran was recently notified by the VA hospital in Omaha that since no beds were available, his name would be placed on a waiting list. It apepars to me that if Omaha VA Hospital has already a waiting list with the Lincoln VA Hospital still in operation, the future appears dim indeed concerning maximum care of veterans in the eastern section of Nebraska. To close a well-staffed hospital in which veterans have great confidence and for which there may well be a need is not a wise savings of Federal funds.

Secondly, the Lincoln VA Hospital is a leader and pioneer in medicine in the Lincoln area. The hospital enjoys respect from the doctors of the Lincoln area, as testified by a leading Lincoln, Nebr., physician, Francis Newmayer, M.D. Numerous Lincoln doctors have served with distinction on the hospital staff. They have contributed their services to the hospital and have in return received much medical knowledge from the hospital. The Lincoln area doctors are proud of this hospital and consider it an honor to be called upon to serve as consultants in the hospital.

The Lincoln VA Hospital has in numerous incidences set the medical pace in the Lincoln area. It first introduced the use of the kidney machine in kidney surgery. It also introduced to Lincoln physicians the gastro camera. Right now it is yet one of the few hospitals in the country that has a gastro camera and trained personnel to operate it. This hospital was the first in the Lincoln area to successfully perform heart surgery in the replacement of a section of the aorta.

The team of doctors composed of VA hospital personnel and consulting Lincoln residence doctors is presently working extremely well, contributing toward medical progress in the Lincoln area.

The President's Great Society program has laid heavy stress upon health care for this Nation. I believe that in keeping with the President's goals the Lincoln VA Hospital can be utilized most effectively. This hospital could, in addition to serving veterans, serve as a health care center. Medical research could be continued and enhanced even to a greater degree. To discontinue the services of a Government hospital at a time when we are calling for an increase in medical care does not appear to me to be a savings of Federal funds.

The third reason for continuing the operation of the Lincoln VA Hospital is an academic one. The Lincoln VA Hospital has over the past decade served as a cooperation institution in the preparation of medical doctors, dentists, social workers, psychologists, and nurses. This hospital is used rather extensively by the University of Nebraska medical college and Creighton University medical college. The hospital has been used by these universities for medical field experiences for interns and premed students, for demonstration purposes, and for laboratory experiences.

Presently, the Lincoln VA Hospital has the only approved training program in orthopedic surgery in the State. It is also the only hospital in Nebraska cooperating with the University of Nebraska in the dentistry program of the university. Dr. Richard Bradley, a consulting dentist of the VA hospital and an instructor at the University of Nebraska feels that the closing of this hospital will severely affect the university's oral surgery program. This hospital provides the only opportunity for students to gain knowledge in oral dental surgery in Nebraska. I have received telegrams from the medical colleges at the University of Nebraska and Creighton University stating the need for the Lincoln VA Hospital in their medical programs, which I quote below as follows:

> Continuation of the Lincoln VA Hospital could significantly add to medical teaching potential of Nebraska.
>
> CECIL L. WITTSON, M.D.,
> *Dean, University of Nebraska, College of Medicine.*

> Hospital is part of the educational program of our medical school and has potential for increasing role in medical education.
>
> RICHARD L. EGAN, M.D.,
> *Dean, Creighton University, School of Medicine.*

As I mentioned, the academic quality of the medical curriculum of the University of Nebraska and Creighton University would be affected by the closing of the Lincoln VA Hospital. Such a setback of medical programs will in the long run cost the taxpayers of this Nation greatly.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the closing of the VA hospital in Lincoln would not result in as much Federal savings as one would believe. When one calculates the transfer of patients and staff to other hospitals, the savings are rather small. We have been told that 85 percent of the hospital operating budget goes for personnel. Since personnel will be given jobs in other hospitals, this would, in actuality, result in a 15 percent budget savings. When one further considers the numerous free hours donated by consulting doctors, the academic uses by the University of Nebraska and Creighton University, the medical progress initiated in Lincoln, and the confidence of veterans in this hospital, the 15 percent becomes rather insignificant as compared to medical progress that is being made in the Lincoln, Nebr., area through the Lincoln VA hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I have presented what I believe to be some rather strong reasons for continuing the program of the VA hospital in Lincoln, Nebr. One cannot always measure savings in terms of dollars and cents. We must look closely at the role an institution can play in leadership in a community. I believe that

the Lincoln VA hospital has demonstrated such leadership and that not to continue this institution would in the long run result in no savings of Federal funds.

Voices Raised Against Reducing Statutory Requirement on U.S. Gold Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have expressed my deep concern with the critical situation of our shrinking gold reserves. The fiscal sickness which has created the problem has been with us for many years. The causes were certainly known to not only the Nation's leading economists but to the average Member of this body—and if they were not, they certainly should have been.

The House Banking and Currency Committee is preparing to clear a bill which will reduce the statutory requirements of our gold reserve to back deposits by commercial banks in 12 Federal Reserve banks. Steps should have been taken, even if they may have appeared somewhat drastic at the time, to deal with this problem long before we reached the critical position in which we find ourselves today.

While it may be too late, it is to some degree encouraging to find that 46 members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy have voiced some opposition to the reduction in or removal of our gold reserve requirements because such a procedure will mean a further weakening in the quality of our dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of inserting in this statement excerpts from the joint statement made by this group which commands the attention of every legislator in the Congress as well as the financial advisers to President Johnson:

A reduction in our gold reserev requirements constitutes a move toward a weaker currency. A repeal of those requirements would throw this Nation into a flat money system, the weakest and most dangerous type of money known to man.

The present relatively low ratio of our monetary gold stock to our nongold dollars and the fears of other nations regarding the future value of our dollar arise from the profligate and reckless expansions of our nongold dollars and the widespread contentions that gold is an unimportant or unnecessary element in a good monetary system. To weaken still further the quality of our dollar is to make even more dangerous the position in which this Nation now finds itself.

The correct solution is to be found in giving our dollars of all varieties the quality of integrity. Then the demands for our gold, in preference to the more convenient and economical substitutes, should tend to subside. To provide this quality, the gold standard should be instituted at the present statutory rate of $35 per fine ounce of gold. Such action should cause the Government and banks to exercise greater restraint in the use of nongold substitutes, should induce the release and addition to our monetary gold stock of a large portion of the $12,672 million of gold earmarked for foreign account, and should cause an exportation of gold to this Nation.

There is no good susbtitute for a thorpughgoing gold standard and the restraining influences it exercises over governments and banks in the uses of nongold money and credit. Our present monetary difficulties illustrate the importance of that fact.

Tribute to the 40th Anniversary of Hialeah, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the unique features of the great State of Florida that the celebration of the 400th anniversary of one of its cities can occur at the same time as the observance of the 40th anniversary of another. Yet make no mistake about it, the 400th anniversary of St. Augustine will not be celebrated with any more enthusiasm than the 40th anniversary of that pearl of Dade County, the beautiful city of Hialeah.

Founded by one of America's aviation pioneers, Glenn Curtiss, and his friend, the western cattleman, James H. Bright, the city of Hialeah has become one of the best known places in the United States.

On his first trip to the South, Glenn Curtiss visited his Curtiss Flying School headquarters near Miami. Adjoining the school's flying field was the Bright ranch. Curtiss soon formed a friendship with James Bright which resulted in their partnership in a farseeing real estate venture.

Their first major project was a town designed as a playground for visitors and residents alike. For it, they chose a name of Seminole Indian origin. In Hialeah a large tract was set aside for the Miami Jockey Club, and there a luxurious clubhouse and the finest race track in the country was built.

In a full-page photographic spread on January 24, 1965, the New York Herald Tribune spoke as follows in a facetious way, justly noting Hialeah's beauty:

Hialeah Race Course, a dozen miles from downtown Miami, stages the east coast's No. 1 winter race meeting. The 40 racing days at Hialeah, which run through March 3, coincide with "the season" in the Miami area. While it is as hard on the pocketbook as any other horse park, Hialeah always is easy on the eyes. When they look up from their racing forms, honest, upright horseplayers see fine horses, bright silks, palm trees, social notables, flamingos, flowers, much greenery—and many other honest, upright horseplayers, all dedicated to the proposition that it ought to be possible to pick a winner in every race.

As it celebrates during the week beginning February 7, 1965, the 40th anniversary of its founding, Hialeah and its citizens and officials can take pride in the city's growth and development. It has become much more than a playground, although satisfaction is naturally to be taken in the international fame of its recreational facilities that include among many others the renowned race course. The proclamation for this anniversary celebration recites some of the aspects of Hialeah's achievement as a city:

Whereas the city of Hialeah was founded in 1925, and has grown to be the seventh largest city in the State of Florida, and the second largest city in Dade County, Fla.; and

Whereas 40 years have passed since the city was duly chartered by an official act of the State Legislature of Florida; and

Whereas the amazing growth of this city as an industrial center and residential community has been among the most rapid in the entire Nation; and

Whereas the leaders of this community and each and every citizen can be justifiably proud of the city's development and progress;

Now, therefore, I, Henry A. Milander, mayor of the city of Hialeah, do set aside the period, February 7 through February 13, 1965, for an official 40th anniversary celebration in the city of Hialeah, and in observance thereof I urge the residents of this city to take part in this celebration.

In the city of Hialeah there are 60 churches. There is an excellent newspaper, the Home News, a growing library supervised by Mrs. M. Harshbarger, and a magnificent public school system. The Aetna Artist Guild, organized in 1961 to encourage and promote art appreciation, is presided over by Mrs. Maria Valiante. The city's recreation department, with an annual budget of over $200,000, conducts classes in arts and crafts, and supervises dances for young people. On the teaching staffs of the public schools there are 9 art teachers, 5 speech and dramatics teachers, and 15 music teachers. Clearly, education and the arts are a major part of the life of the city of Hialeah.

Most important of all, among its citizens and its officials there is a highly developed sense of civic duty and civic pride. On this occasion of their 40th anniversary celebration I extend to them my most sincere congratulations and best wishes.

The President's Agricultural Policy

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on agriculture outlined a program which is broad in purview, yet sensitive to the needs of the individual farmer and the specific problems of rural America. The message puts in proper perspective the invaluable role of agriculture in the national economy and should serve to repudiate any suggestion that this administration is only interested in a fraction of American farm families. It represents instead a rededication to our goals of preserving the family farm and expanding opportunities throughout our rural areas.

I am particularly gratified that any doubts about renewing the successful feed grains program were resolved with the President's recommendation that it be extended and improved. Since its inception this valuable program has contributed substantially both to farm income and the reduction in surplus production of these commodities.

The President has properly emphasized the correlative nature and the mutual interdependency of agricultural policy and our trade and foreign policy objectives. We must pledge ourselves to continued efforts to develop world markets for our agricultural abundance, and to the wise use of that abundance through the food-for-peace program as an effective step toward our goals of economic security and political stability throughout the world.

While enacting programs to assist economic development in rural areas, we have too often overlooked the necessity of providing for their implementation and initiation in the vitally affected areas. I, therefore, am extremely pleased with the President's request that the Secretary of Agriculture create a Rural Community Development Service to aid other Government agencies in making their services more readily available in rural areas. I have previously discussed this problem with the Secretary and officials in the Department of Agriculture with a view toward the establishment of an office to consult with representatives of rural areas and coordinate Government programs so as to better assist them in realizing the full benefits of existing programs to revitalize and preserve small towns. I hope that we may assist in any appropriate manner the valuable functions of this proposed office.

I also wish to offer my support for the President's proposal for creating reserve stocks of agricultural commodities. This will insure an adequate reserve of vital agricultural commodities to satisfy national security and emergency needs while at the same time properly separating the cost of this critical program from that of farm price and income support programs.

The message clearly indicates that it is the policy of this administration to insure freedom of choice and opportunity for rural Americans and not an impersonal and insensitive program of economic attrition and disaster to drive people from the land. As a communication of challenge, and yet of hope, it establishes an appropriate basis for congressional review of our agricultural policy.

Goldwater Impugns Internal Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading weekly newspapers in my State of New Jersey is the Belleville Times. Its publisher and editor is Frank A. Orechio, one of the most respected newsmen of the State. In the current edition of the paper, published on February 4, Mr. Orechio wrote an editorial in which we should all be interested. In this editorial, Mr. Orechio pays tribute to the diligence and integrity of a group of Federal employees all of us have already or will soon have our annual close contact: the staff of the Internal Revenue Service. And, having received your permission, I would like to make this editorial a part of our RECORD, as follows:

GOLDWATER IMPUGNS INTERNAL REVENUE

A couple of weeks ago, the Republican National Committee met in Chicago to dump Barry Goldwater's handpicked chairman, young Dean Burch, of Arizona, and replace him with the midwestern pro, Ray Bliss, of Ohio.

The 1964 GOP standard bearer took the occasion to publicly accept blame for his defeat. But in the process, Goldwater muddied up the waters by accusing President Johnson of using the muscle of Federal Government to influence the election. Elaborating, Goldwater specifically accused the President of using the power of the Internal Revenue Service to intimidate taxpayers and recruit support.

Unless Goldwater produces specifics, he stands guilty of the worst kind of mudslinging. The big question remains as to why he stooped to this technique long after the election was lost. If Goldwater was sincere, why hasn't he asked for a congressional investigation?

Through our personal association over the years with Internal Revenue Service employees, in New Jersey and the Nation, we are satisfied this is one arm of Government which is beyond the reach of partisan political influence. This is one department of Federal Government that cannot and is not being used for political influence or purposes, Goldwater's charge notwithstanding. On behalf of the thousands of dedicated, loyal, IRS employees, we resent the implications of Goldwater's assertion.

Even though we disagree with much of his political beliefs and campaign utterings, we continued to hold Goldwater in high esteem as a principled public official. However when he makes so reckless a charge as accusing the President of the United States of intimidating taxpayers through the use of Internal Revenue Service pressure without bothering to supply a single fact to support so serious a charge, he then becomes nothing more than a discredited officeseeker. We can only conclude the charge was a phony.

Senator Byrd Urges One-Package Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, in a strongly worded reminder to the Nation, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and long a faithful guardian of our national fiscal affairs, cited the need for tighter control of Federal spending and urged that congressional spending authority be placed in a single package, rather than split up in several separate bills as at present.

One of the Nation's leading financial newspapers, the Wall Street Journal, in its issue of February 4, 1965, commented favorably on Senator BYRD's proposal.

Under the present slipshod method of making appropriations, it is impossible for Congress to know whether we are spending more or less. It is generally more. Unless the recommendation of Senator BYRD is carried out, there will never be any substantial reduction in Federal expenditures.

Under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial in which the Journal's comment is expressed, as follows:

SENATOR BYRD URGES ONE-PACKAGE SPENDING

Once again Virginia's Senator, HARRY F. BYRD, has reminded the Nation of the need for tighter control of Federal spending. The fact that few in government appear disposed to pay heed does not invalidate the warning.

What Mr. BYRD specifically proposes is machinery for putting congressional spending authority in a single package. As it now is, Presidential budget requests in a single package go to Congress which divides and subdivides them into a number of separate bills, some of which authorize spending over not just 1 fiscal year, but several.

Thus, in the Senator's words, "Congress does not know whether it is authorizing a deficit"—or, as is presently unlikely—"balancing the budget, or developing a surplus." None of this could happen, he reasons, if spending authority were placed in one package, the size of which would be limited by estimates of Federal income for the fiscal year involved.

"Congress would put an annual expenditure limitation," says Mr. BYRD, "against all expenditure authorizations, including current appropriations, unexpended balances, back-door-spending items." Moreover, the Secretary of the Treasury would be required to submit a revised estimate of revenue at each stage of the legislative process on the single money bill.

Whatever the merits of the Senator's mechanics, his basic idea is that the Government's spending should somehow be related to its income. And since the administration is in no way eager to restore any such relationship, this year's plea by the Virginian is not likely to win any more active adherents than those of previous years, which is to say not very many.

Yet for the sake of future stability it must be hoped that the Senator and those few who do support fiscal prudence are in a role not unlike that of Isaiah and his "very small remnant." It took a long, long time, but the remnant triumphed.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate adopted 35 resolutions providing funds for committee operations and took up stockpiling bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 2129–2180

Bills Introduced: 39 bills and 2 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1011–1049; and S.J. Res. 43–44.

Pages 2131–2132

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 28, proposed Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1965, with amendments (S. Rept. 56);

Report of Committee on the Judiciary on Immigration and Naturalization (S. Rept. 57); and

Report of Committee on the Judiciary on Revision and Codification (S. Rept. 58). Page 2131

President's Message—Conservation of Natural and Human Resources: President transmitted message with his legislative recommendations in the fields of conservation, recreation, removal of pollution from water and air, and preservation of the natural beauty of America—referred jointly to Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and on Public Works. Pages 2205–2209

President's Message—Wilderness Preservation: President transmitted first annual report of the National Wilderness Preservation System—referred to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Page 2209

Bill Rereferred: Committee on Rules and Administration was discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 14, authorizing Architect of the Capitol to construct a memorial to James Madison, and the joint resolution was then referred to Committee on Public Works.

Page 2148

Appointments to Board: Vice President appointed Senators Yarborough, Brewster, and Allott as members of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

Page 2147

Supplemental Agriculture Appropriations: Senator Russell was excused from further service as a conferee on H.J. Res. 234, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965 for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and Senator McClellan was appointed in his place. Pages 2147, 2180–2181

Committee Funds: On call of calendar, Senate adopted 35 resolutions providing funds for committee operations, as follows:

S.J. Res. 61, to provide $95,000 for operation of Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences;

S. Res. 10, providing $106,000 for Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations;

S. Res. 15, providing $133,000 for Housing Subcommittee of Committee on Banking and Currency;

S. Res. 28, providing $135,000 for Committee on Foreign Relations to conduct inquiries into foreign affairs;

S. Res. 54, providing $435,000 for Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of Committee on Government Operations;

S. Res. 56, providing $57,500 for Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of Committee on Government Operations;

S. Res. 58, providing $57,500 for Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of Committee on Government Operations;

S. Res. 36, providing $105,000 for operation of Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

S. Res. 39, providing $150,000 for Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of administrative practice and procedure;

S. Res. 43, providing $195,000 for Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of constitutional rights;

S. Res. 41, providing $7,500 for Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations;

S. Res. 45, providing $100,000 for Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of improvements in judicial machinery;

S. Res. 44, providing $162,000 for Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of immigration and naturalization;

S. Res. 47, providing $5,000 for Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of national penitentiaries;

S. Res. 48, providing $120,000 for Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of patents, trademarks, and copyrights;

S. Res. 51, providing $60,000 for Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of trading with the enemy;

Appendix

Nasserism Without Illusions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the latest issue of Prevent World War III, No. 65, winter 1964–65, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War II, Inc., 24 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., contains an impressive analysis of the Nasser regime. I believe this article is a refreshing antidote to the illusions about the character of the Nasser regime which have been carefully cultivated in influential quarters. Security-minded Americans are always ready to support a realistic policy in the Middle East. This means that such a policy must take into account the aggressive nature of the Nasser government, which not only threatens neighboring states, but also endangers the U.S. position in that vital area of the world. Under these circumstances, a continuation of U.S. aid to Egypt is a shortsighted and, indeed, a dangerous policy.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NASSERISM WITHOUT ILLUSIONS

A favorite theory running the rounds in top Government circles today is that the Nasser government has reached the crossroads in its domestic and foreign policies. It is on that basis that the State Department works tirelessly to convince Members of Congress that massive U.S. aid to the Egyptian Government can tip the scale and turn Nasser into a model leader of peace abroad and prosperity and democracy at home.

OFFICIAL LINE

The State Department's line emerged in the last session of Congress when the House of Representatives debated an amendment to the foreign aid bill proposed by Representative Oliver P. Bolton. The essence of Congressman Bolton's amendment called for the withholding of U.S. aid to Egypt on the grounds that that Government's policies encouraged aggression, endangered peace, and threatened the vital interests of the United States in the Middle East. Congressman Bolton was supported by a number of his colleagues including Congressmen FABRSTEIN, RUMSFELD, and ADAIR. In supporting Bolton's proposal, Congressman WILLIAM F. RYAN declared: "The United States must not be a silent partner in Egypt's arms buildup."

The State Department's standard argument opposing this amendment, was found in the position taken by Representative CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Representative GALLAGHER asserted that U.S. aid to Egypt was vital because it was a powerful "influence for peace and stability." Such aid, he went on, provided the United States with the necessary "leverage" that could steer Egypt away from dangerous actions and reduce Egypt's dependence on the Soviet bloc.

The assumption underlying Congressman GALLAGHER's argument is that the Nasser regime has not as yet made up its mind which way to go. However, the very admission that Nasser is allegedly poised at the crossroads, confirms that his regime has ample opportunities for blackmailing the United States. But if this subtle argument is beyond the ken of those who support the State Department's line, then let us once more examine briefly the concrete facts bearing on the character of the Nasser regime which will also shed light on the direction it is taking.

THE BUDGET

A reliable guide, one which can hardly be subject to dispute insofar as interpretation is concerned, is Egypt's budget. After all, it is the budget which sets down in cold figures what the Egyptians will do in the way of employing their resources. In other words, it is the budget which mirrors most accurately Egyptian policy, and not her propagandists and apologists in Washington.

The military side of the budget which, incidentally, does not include all expenditures for the military, since many items are concealed in "industrial development" and other ambiguous programs, rose from 70 million Egyptian pounds in 1951–52 to more than 172 million pounds in 1964–65. This amounts to almost an 150-percent increase. In contrast, expenditures for social services have been frozen for the years 1964–65. In its report on contemplated expenditures for the coming fiscal year, the Egyptian budget committee noted that the general budget was "a true interpretation of the mature results which have been achieved and which are still to be achieved * * * and manifestation of the country's determination and will to march forward."

The staggering expenditures for items relating to the arms industry cannot help but adversely affect other factors of the Egyptian economy. Obviously, in a country, one of the poorest in the world, the impact will be particularly hard. Thus, we find that in the current year there has been a sharp increase in the prices of consumer goods, including food. For example, the price of sugar was up by 10 percent in the spring, 30 percent for beef and mutton, 40 percent for fish and 8 percent for butter (London Financial Times, Apr. 23, 1964). The government has also deliberately increased the prices for popular brand cigarettes, beer, shoes, and cotton materials (New York Times, June 21, 1964).

Price increases in consumer goods are only part of the burden. The average Egyptian is also the victim of a serious food shortage. This has embarrassed Egyptian authorities who are now compelled to import tens of thousands of live cattle and sheep. But this is not all. The food crisis would have been far greater, were it not for the United States which has been supplying at least 60 percent of all of the wheat and wheat flour consumed by the Egyptian people. The importance of U.S. assistance was emphasized by Congressman BOLTON when he revealed that the State Department was currently discussing in Cario terms for a new 3-year agreement for the shipment of U.S. surplus food commodities to Egypt.

The last word from Representative BOLTON is that the State Department has "postponed for an indefinite period" a new deal with Cairo. Apparently, Congressman BOLTON's public spirited efforts in exposing State Department deals with the Nasser government, have slowed down the rush to shore up the wobbly Egyptian regime. Of course, "indefinite" postponement does not mean that the battle is won, for it is conceivable, nay, even possible, that once the widespread protests die down, the State Department will again send a mission to bail out Nasser. That is why it is essential to keep on the alert for an "indefinite period."

It is interesting to note that despite all of the propaganda passed out by Egyptian authorities to explain why living costs are soaring and why food is scarce and dear, the average man in the street has not been taken in. As reported in the New York Times dispatch referred to above, many Egyptians believe that "grocery supplies are short and higher priced because they are going in bulk to Yemen to feed not only 30,000 to 40,000 Egyptian troops there but also the Yemeni." This point is extremely significant for it gives the key to the real character of the Nasser government. It shows which policies have priority.

TROUBLE ON THE LAND

Thus, we find that Egypt has embarked on a new policy with regard to the utilization of its agricultural and land resources. It now appears that the Egyptian Government has decided to place its main emphasis on the exploitation of the land for the cultivation of cash-producing crops rather than food-producing crops. These cash-producing crops, which include cotton, fruit, and flowers—of all things—are designed for export purposes so as to fetch much-needed foreign exchange. In this connection, Congressman Bolton charged that Nasser sells two-thirds of his cotton crop to pay for $1 billion worth of Soviet arms. This means that the meager resources of Egyptian agriculture are being diverted to programs which may build up Egypt's war potential but will certainly not fill empty stomachs.

The number of empty stomachs in Egypt must be rising. Since 1958, Egypt's population has increased by 15 percent. To put it another way, there are now over 3½ million more mouths to feed since 1958, but as one report puts it, "the investment demands of the development plan make it impossible to increase the production of consumer goods to an extent compensating for the increase in population * * *" (Middle East and African Economist, July–August 1964). In short, one can describe Cairo's economic policy as one which, to use an old cliché made famous under another dictatorship, gives priority to "guns over butter."

The increasing burdens which the average Egyptian must shoulder in these circumstances, has been further aggravated by the degeneration of the land reform program which Nasser has been trumpeting. In the beginning, the program achieved a certain amount of redistribution of the land so that a number of families received land which had previously belonged to the feudal landlord class. However, the land distribution program was uneven so that as of today only one-quarter of the small landholders can subsist on the income from their farms.

The remainder of small landholders who were also supposed to enjoy the benefits of the reform, have to seek employment elsewhere to supplement their meager farm earnings or work on the estates of the large landowners.

Contrary to the impression which the Egyptian propagandists try to convey to the world, the land reform program did not reduce the number of large landowners. Indeed, their numbers have risen from 9,000 in 1952 to 16,000 in 1962. The amount of land they own, approaches half of the total owned by the small landholders. But even here Egyptian authorities are now intent on further consolidation of landholdings which can only come about at the expense of the small farmers. This development will inevitably cast them into the ranks of the already 4 million landless agricultural laborers "now roaming villages in search of seasonal work and owning nothing except the single cotton garment they wear" (Financial Times, London, Apr. 7, 1964). All this is going to be done to build up the cash-producing crops; i.e., those crops which, as has already been noted, can bring in the necessary foreign exchange to augment Egypt's war potential.

MILITARISM

The role of the military in Egyptian life is central to an understanding of what is going on in Egypt today. President Nasser himself paid tribute to the military factor when he spoke before the Egyptian military college on June 18, 1964: "We worked to establish social justice and build a sound and strong national army. We also worked to establish a sound democratic life. * * * The army played a major role in achieving these aims. The people are grateful to their armed forces which were always ready to make sacrifices. * * * Have the responsibilities of the armed forces ended? These responsibilities grow as the state grows and its importance increases. This places more responsibilities on the armed forces."

It is indeed the Egyptian armed forces which are the core around which all Egyptian life revolves. It is the basis of Nasser's rule. When we refer to the armed forces we do not think of the average soldier but rather of a select group of officers and their placemen. It is the army which provides the basis for the Egyptian ruling bureaucracy, a system which has been built around 3,000 to 4,000 men. In these circumstances, the Egyptian state rests on a military structure. All of the civilian institutions of the Government are pure facade. Patrick Seale, a noted Middle East analyst, reports: "Egypt continues to live under security laws virtually indistinguishable from the martial law which was suspended with a fanfare on March 23." (London Observer, July 26, 1964.) Mr. Seale further reports that instead of loosening controls over the people, the Cairo regime has given the public prosecutor unchecked powers which, together with the "powerful state security apparatus, built up over the past decade, falls across all political activity."

THE SOVIET LINK

As for Egypt's relation with the Soviets, there is no evidence to support the State Department's assertion that U.S. aid helps to steer Nasser away from a pro-Soviet orientation. As Congressman BOLTON puts it, it is precisely our aid which enables the Nasser regime to mortgage Egypt's cotton crops in return for Soviet arms. Instead of weakening Egypt's economic ties with the Soviets, there is a definite intensification of collaboration between Moscow and Cairo. Thus, a Soviet broadcast (May 7, 1964) pointed out that the 1958 Soviet-Egyptian agreement "provides for construction of 36 industrial projects, 80 percent of them are heavy industry propects. * * *" As for Soviet-Egyptian trade, this Soviet commentator notes that whereas a few years ago the Soviet Union's share in Egyptian trade amounted to only 2 percent, it now tops 15 percent.

The growing military and economic bond between the Soviet and the Cairo regime were reflected in the warm embraces between Nasser and Khrushchev at the Aswan Dam celebrations. Indeed, Mr. Khrushchev was so appreciative of Nasser's usefulness that he pinned him with the "Hero of the Soviet Union" (General Amer also received this honor) a reward which is only given to the most reliable and effective supporters of Soviet policy. In September of this year, the mutual admiration and affection between Cairo and Moscow was dramatized when Egypt's Premier Ali Sabri paid a state visit to the Soviet Union where has was accorded the highest honors. In the presence of the Soviet leadership, Mr. Sabri said: "The United Arab Republic, its government and people remember with gratitude that the U.S.S.R. and its leaders were and remain in the vanguard of sincere friends who supported the United Arab Republic in all its battles. * * *"

Thus, it is not difficult to answer the question as to which road Nasser will take. Actually, there never was a crossroad for Nasser. The very structure of his regime, built as it is on the foundation of military power, predetermined Nasser's domestic and foreign policies. It is, therefore, understandable that the Egyptian people, as reported by the New York Times, have not swallowed the official explanation for the food shortages. They know why food is scarce and dear. They know that Nasser's military adventures abroad are depriving them of many of their elementary needs. It may very well be, however, that they are willing to accept this situation on the assurances of Egyptian authorities that this is only temporary. But the outside world which has not been ensnared by Egyptian propaganda, can see that Nasser's policies are intrinsically based on military buildup for adventure. This means that all other programs are geared to these objectives.

The scales have already been tipped. The dark shadow of aggression and more aggression looms over the Middle East. The bells are tolling. Tragically, our own policymakers do not hear them or do not want to hear.

Kent Cooper, Hoosier Journalist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I am presenting for the RECORD, two excellent editorials. One is from the Columbus Evening Republican and the other from the Indianapolis Star, both distinguished Indiana daily newspapers. Each editorial concerns the life and achievements of one of the great men of American journalism, Kent Cooper, who passed away a little more than a week ago.

Kent Cooper, a small-town boy, was born 84 years ago in Columbus, Ind. He became one of those remarkable leaders of the journalism profession that Indiana has given the Nation down through the years.

In Indiana, Kent Cooper began his newspaper career as a teenage boy, working as a reporter for the Columbus Evening Republican after school hours. Later, he went to Indianapolis where one of his contemporaries as a cub reporter was the late Roy W. Howard.

It was in Indiana's capital city that Kent Cooper organized a news service he called the United Press. Later, he sold the company to the Scripps organization and his old friend, Roy Howard, became New York bureau manager, while Mr. Cooper held the same position in Indianapolis.

Eventually, Kent Cooper resigned from United Press and joined the Associated Press news service. By 1921, he had become general manager, and in a 35-year career marked by energy and imagination, he left his imprint forever on American journalism.

Kent Cooper, the son of a Democratic lawyer who served in this House of Representatives for three terms—1889–95—believed deeply that individual freedom and the underlying strength of this great Nation depends upon an informed public. He succeeded brilliantly in service to that concept.

In Indiana, he also will be remembered with affection as the young boy who taught himself to play the violin, wrote his first song at 16, and that same year entertained in Crump's Opera House for $1 a night.

Mr. Speaker, Columbus, Ind., the Nation and the fourth estate have lost a valuable citizen to whom we owe much gratitude.

The editorials follow:

[From the Columbus (Ind.) Evening Republican, Feb. 2, 1965]

DEDICATION

Kent Cooper, whose death Sunday in Florida at age 84 marked passing of the last of a group of men who fathered the modern-day newspaper, was an outstanding example of the dedicated newspaperman.

And it was in the form of dedication to others, which may be the secret of all dedication, not really dedication to a job, but dedication to what that job can do for people.

Expressing his personal feelings only upon rare occasions, Mr. Cooper wrote in his autobiography in 1959:

"If I could have publicly expressed myself to Associated Press members and employees as I do now to those who read these lines, I would have said that if they wanted to know what had motivated me in my endeavors on their behalf, it was that I did not strive to see how much good I could do for myself but how much good I might do for them through the Associated Press.

"This, then, must be my farewell to all Associated Press members, their managing editors, and last but not least, to all Associated Press employees.

"I have the highest conception of the mission of newspapers. It was an honor to serve them for nearly 60 years. Profoundly I feel that they must prosper so that they may continue to inform the public. For that reason until my dying day I shall yearn to be instrumental in advancing their welfare."

And as long as there are those like Kent Cooper, a Columbus boy who made good in the biggest way, the newspaper business will thrive and prosper. And as long as other ventures have dedicated men such as the Hoosier, who started his career on the Evening Republican, they too will thrive and prosper.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Feb. 3, 1965]

KENT COOPER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

It was a long way from tossing newspapers onto porches at Columbus, Ind., to heading the world's greatest news service, but Kent Cooper made the trip.

He was 11 when he began folding papers for his route in his little home town, and the year was 1891. It was a simpler, easier-going world than ours—one of horses and buggies, quiet, tree-lined streets, where children grew up in leisure, and the space beyond the lots at the end of town seemed boundless.

But marvels and terrors were stirring in the earth—inventions that would advance our material progress, and our peril, more in a few generations than in all the previous time of man, and wars and revolutions that would change the shape of the world and the nature of society.

The smalltown Hoosier newsboy became a reporter. He was the resourceful type who could dig a crumpled carbon paper out of a courtroom wastebasket and come up with a sensational scoop. He was the undauntable type who, when he was refused a pay raise, organized his own news bureau. He was the imaginative type who saw in each innovation in communications a means for speeding transmission of the news—and made haste to adapt it to this function. He was the colorful type who demanded that writers use brisk, crackling language that conveyed the drama of the events they described.

He built the Associated Press into a vast global news network that could speed the facts of a Balkan assassination to a Kansas City milkman before the next of kin had been notified, or a declaration of war or armistice to the homes of America before the troops in the field knew.

Associated Press brought London, Berlin, Moscow, Paris, Rome, Cairo, Tokyo, Calcutta, Brisbane, Kuala Lumpur, and a thousand other far-off places to the Nation's doorstep.

And for well over half a century, "K.C. of the AP," as he called himself at managing editors' conferences, moved among presidents, kings, tycoons, dictators, celebrities, and common folk and presided with vigor and brilliance over the reporting of a planet in transition to help our Nation and our world to understand itself.

Kent Cooper played a giant role in making Americans the best informed people on earth and advanced a tradition which, as long as it endures, will be one of the strongest guarantees of our freedom.

Debtor Nations—Long in Arrears—Depleting U.S. Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Nashville Banner, of Nashville, Tenn., published in its February 2, 1965, issue an excellent editorial suggestion on the problems now plaguing our country as the result of the gold crisis. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Debtor Nations—Long in Arrears—Depleting U.S. Gold," be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBTOR NATIONS—LONG IN ARREARS—DEPLETING U.S. GOLD

Speaking of gold—pursuant to the topic of admitted concern as foreign demands diminish the U.S. reserves—the problems confronted in that study of international accounts are not for easy solution. They are cumulative. They defy the simple formula of a King Canute, standing at the water's edge and commanding a halt in the ebb and flow.

At the same time, they do demand treatment looking to reversal, in the quickest time possible, of the drain. For the fact is that in 7 years the United States has lost $7.3 billion worth of gold which in the ratio fixed by law backs its currency. In 1957 its holdings were $22.9 billion; they now total $15.6 billion. And other nations now hold $27 billion in dollar claims, for which payment in gold could be demanded from the United States.

So, it does matter whether—in dribbles or larger chunks—the drain continues. For example, the French cash-out, even in the amount of another $150 million or so, as recently, matters.

The ironic fact is that much of this raid on the gold reserves is by nations owing the United States billions in debts long overdue—going as far back as World War I.

The U.S. News & World Report provides a thought on that—pointing out that many Frenchmen do not agree with President de Gaulle in that posture of recurring demands; they are anxious to get more American capital to help develop their industries. And France receives about 200 million U.S. dollars per year as a result of U.S. military operations.

Today, France has due and unpaid debts to the United States lying over from World War I of $4.3 billion. There is another $2 billion from this era which are not yet due.

In 1931, the United States approved a 1-year moratorium on these war debts, and since that time France has refused to resume payment. In fact, she no longer even carries them as existing external debts.

France is among 20 nations which have not settled debts from the First World War. The total is $20 billion.

Also hanging in the fire are loans to France of $592 million as a result of the second war. The first, $409 million still is outstanding, being payable in annual installments through 1980. France paid $21 million in 1964, is due to pay $22 million this year, and $22.6 million in 1966. In addition, $719 million loan from the Export-Import Bank is still outstanding, plus a $4 million on a third loan.

Actually, to a great extent our present gold crisis is of our own making. Too many dollars are falling into foreign hands in which gold is demanded in exchange.

By trimming our present foreign aid program to bare essentials and taking positive action toward collection of World War I debts solid gains could be made in halting the gold outflow.

Our gold is still going out. It's high time U.S. representatives had a heart-to-heart talk with President de Gaulle and others whose nations have been long in arrears on legal debts.

This Nation's gold stocks have gotten so low that any withdrawal against them is serious. And it certainly makes no sense at all that we find ourselves in a position of having our gold siphoned off by those who owe us billions of dollars.

Tax on Telephone Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most regressive of our outmoded Federal taxes is that which the millions of telephone users in the Nation are obliged to pay regularly for the privilege of using their telephones. In the 86th, 87th, and 88th Congresses, I have introduced legislation which would wipe this tax from the books. Other Members of Congress who share my sentiments in this regard have also introduced such legislation but we have never been successful in getting the support necessary to remove it. In fact, there has been opposition to repeal legislation that has not been very vocal but has indeed been firm on each occasion when the excise tax extension bills have been considered.

Hopeful that the 89th Congress will get around to doing something about this tax, I take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let It Be Done," which appeared in the Southtown Economist which pays deserving tribute to my colleague, EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of the Fourth District of Illinois, for his fight to repeal this tax.

The editorial follows:

LET IT BE DONE

Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of the suburban Fourth District, has again petitioned Congress to eliminate the tax on telephone calls. He pointed out that the tax was imposed during World War II to discourage telephone usage during the emergency, but that instead it is costing subscribers a billion dollars a year.

Hale Nelson, vice president of the Illinois Bell Telephone Co., said that the tax costs the average telephone user $22 a year. In addition, he asserted, excise taxes on other utilities imposed during the war have since been repealed.

President Johnson announced recently he was going to recommend the elimination of taxes on toilet articles, cosmetics, jewelry, furs, and leather goods. He would make even more friends if he also got rid of the telephone tax because most every family today has a telephone and uses it frequently.

There is nothing new, however, in the retention of temporary taxes. It is axiomatic that a tax once levied, regardless of the reason, continues indefinitely or forever. The Illinois sales tax is an example. When enacted it was to provide funds to aid the unemployed during the 1929 depression and it was to remain in effect for 3 years. More than 35 years have passed and the tax not only is still with us, but it also has been increased.

The spenders of Government funds hate to give up, but they should be forced by public opinion to do so.

Address by Austrian Foreign Minister Bruno Kreisky at the Opening of the John F. Kennedy Library Exhibit in Vienna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1965, the John F. Kennedy Library Exhibit opened in Vienna, Austria. At the opening an eloquent and moving address was delivered by Austria's Foreign Minister, Dr. Bruno Kreisky. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY AUSTRIAN FOREIGN MINISTER DR. BRUNO KREISKY

On November 22, 1963, less than 15 months ago, we received the shattering news of John F. Kennedy's assassination.

For many of us, who were fortunate enough to be guided by wise parents and good teachers, the simple tale of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" was among the first books we read. When Harriet Beecher Stowe, the author, visited Abraham Lincoln in the White House, he greeted her with the words, "So you are the little woman who wrote the book that made this great war."

And indeed it is with the book of that little woman that the memory of that great President has been imprinted in our minds; because, as Carl Sandburg said, "Lincoln stood perhaps taller than any other of the great heroes," and "none threw a longer shadow than he."

Again, John F. Kennedy's death was not merely a tragic event; it cast a long shadow over all of us all over this planet.

The men who fought in the last war returned weary and worn. With an effort, and often disheartened, they groped for a way to a new life in peace. They had looked into an abyss none had seen before; they had experienced unparalleled cruelty even more in the very heart of Europe than elsewhere; and they were overawed by the heinous power of the arms that had been given into their hands.

The very best of them, those marked for leadership in times of peace, found themselves exhausted before their lives had really begun; ridden by feelings of guilt, they could not help but regard themselves responsible for their fathers who had allowed the unspeakable to happen, as well as for the fact that they themselves had been unable to prevent it from happening.

In the postwar period, therefore, the destinies of our world were guided by old men who were not directly responsible for the war; some, indeed, had vainly attempted to stem the tide until their voices were silenced. The day after tomorrow we will bury the greatest of them. Had he not lived, Europe would have succumbed to barbarism.

Old men, then, were at the helm in America, in England, in Italy, in Germany, in France, and here at home.

Fifteen years after the end of the war, however, the American people elected John F. Kennedy, 43, and a hero of the Second World War, their President. Never before in history had such a young man wielded such power. It was a rare event, and everywhere in the world it was felt to be so: there were some who were doubtful and even afraid that this young man would not be able to rise to the task; and others more secure in the hope that he would succeed. In the 3 brief years which remained to him, Kennedy demonstrated that a member of the generation which had emerged from the shadows of an experience more terrible than any acquired by generations past can grasp the reins firmly. He did rise to his task: with a wisdom one had only expected from older men; with a prudence that, one might have thought, only vast experience can command; and with a determination that could only have sprung from a character of steel.

Whoever had met him, as I did, when he had come to Vienna to confer with the Soviet head of government and, again, a few years later, when only weeks separated him from his death, could not help being impressed by the visible change the pressure of events had brought upon the man. In retrospect, the ominous days when the world stood at the brink of war—the greatest and, most probably, the last of wars—are linked to other, brighter days when the powers once deadlocked in a fateful confrontation met again at the conference table to sign a pact on the partial cessation of nuclear tests and to seal their determination to preserve the peace. This vital link was wrought by John F. Kennedy within one brief year. We cannot conceive of a more distinguished achievement, or of a more convincing demonstration of Kennedys capacity for leadership, or of his grasp of history and his ability to guide it creatively.

We were all griefstricken when Kennedy died. But the young felt a special kinship to him. Whatever their political orientation, to them he represented the changing of the guard, the accession of the younger generation of its proper role in history. He gave them the courage to test their mettle in a field which had been barred to too many of them too long. Somehow in these 3 years he also imparted a new style, a new flair to young people all over the world. And while they felt the loss even more deeply, we are all the poorer. For John F. Kennedy, who did great things in the brief span given to him, was perhaps even more distinguished by the promise he held out to us: here was a man, we felt, who bore the stamp of greatness, who would make our world more rich and more free.

In this exhibition, many of the small things that were part of Kennedy's life have been assembled with great care. They will help keep our memories of him alive. And yet, it will be the big things by which we shall remember him best—above all by his stake in a New Frontier of freedom toward which he had widened the horizons of his nation and, indeed, of the world.

His ideas animated his successor when he said:

"We worked for two centuries to climb this peak of prosperity. But we are only at the beginning of the road to the Great Society. Ahead now is a summit where freedom from the wants of the body can help fulfill the needs of the spirit.

"We built this Nation to serve its people.

"We want to grow and build and create, but we want progress to be the servant and not the master of man."

If America remains true to that spirit, Heinrich Heines words about Lafayettee will equally remain true: "Day by day for the past 40 years, Lafayette has been saying the some things over and over again; invariably he keeps gesturing toward North America; it is he who inaugurated the revolution with a declaration of the rights of man; and even now he insists upon his declaration, without which, he says, no good can come to mankind—that one-sided man with his one-sided compass of freedom."

The Decline of an American Industry—The Rise of Foreign Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the severe hardship the wool industry is experiencing in the United States, particularly in New England.

Over the years while little was being done to protect the interests of American wool manufactures, and thus preserve the livelihood of the thousands engaged in this work, the industry has declined at an alarming rate. This is true despite the general increase in textile consumption in this country. The bleak picture presented by this segment of the American economy has been aggravated by the massive influx of foreign wool imports.

Here are some of the facts and figures which make up this sorry picture. Between 1958 and 1963 the importation of woven wool cloth into this country increased by 69 percent. During this same period, the importation of all types of wool products increased 175 percent. But in the United States the production of woolen and worsted fabrics declined by 10 percent in the first half of 1964. In 1947 there were 167,000 production jobs in the wool industry. By 1964 employment had dropped to less than 60,000. Approximately 10 New England woolen and worsted mills have closed in the last year and a half. The national figure is even less encouraging.

I wholeheartedly support President Johnson's statement that it is essential that the wool textile industry be restored to good health, and for this reason I insert into the RECORD the text of an address by Mr. Richard I. Goodrich, president of the Boston Wool Trade Association at the annual meeting of the Boston Wool Trade Association on November 17, 1964. The state of the wool textile industry demands that Mr. Goodrich's remarks be given nationwide attention.

"U.S. WOOL INDUSTRY FACES THE MOMENT OF TRUTH"—ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT RICHARD I. GOODRICH AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BOSTON WOOL TRADE ASSOCIATION, NOVEMBER 17, 1964

On September 28, 1964, President Johnson, speaking in Portland, Maine, said, in part:

"I can assure you that there is no major official in this administration who has not been made fully aware of the hardships created every time a mill is shut down or forced to operate on part time.

"In the past 10 years, imports (of wool textiles) have soared from less than 5 percent to 20 percent of American consumption, with particular concentration in worsteds. This administration has made and will continue to make vigorous efforts to solve this problem. I share with our late beloved President Kennedy the view that wool textile and apparel imports must be kept at reasonable levels. We have been trying to work out effective arrangements with other wool-textile-producing countries. Two missions have been sent abroad for this purpose in recent months. Thus far, a multination meeting has not been convened, but we intend to continue our efforts vigorously. I can assure you that we shall work hard at this problem. I consider it essential that the wool textile industry be restored to good health."

These are direct quotes from President Johnson's speech. These are strong words from a pragmatic leader. Speaking in Portland, Maine, and in Providence, R.I., his remarks took on added import as he was addressing the people of New England, an area which has suffered more than any other part of the country from the erosion of the wool textile industry. Among those who heard or read his speech, were wool textile workers, many of whom had just lost their jobs, and thousands of others over the years had lost their jobs because of the closing of a number of woolen textile mills.

In the last year and a half, 10 more New England woolen and worsted mills have closed their doors forever, throwing out of work nearly 4,000 people. These mills have survived the attrition of the last 10 years, during which time nearly 300 woolen and worsted mills closed their doors, and were

among the strongest financed, best equipped, most efficient mills in the country. Every one gave as a major reason for their closing "excessive and uncontrolled imports from low-wage countries." If mills such as these were forced to close their doors, what does the future hold for those who are still struggling against insurmountable conditions, including the woolen and worsted divisions of even the largest, most successful diversified textile units in the country?

In the same speech, President Johnson voiced his disappointment over the unsuccessful attempts of two high-ranking Government missions to Great Britain and Italy, whose pleas for a government-to-government meeting were bluntly rejected. We share his disappointment. Ambassador Reischauer received the same blunt rejection from the Japanese. The sought-for meetings were not to impose our thinking on the governments concerned, but were an invitation to sit down and discuss matters which are so vital to our wool textile industry.

The paramount need of this industry is for imposition of quantitative limits on wool product imports while maintaining present duties and tariffs on these same products. The unjustifiable refusal of foreign nations even to come to a meeting to discuss the working out of a fair and equitable international arrangement has thus far blocked achievement of this goal.

We are heartened, however, by President Johnson's affirmation made both here in New England and in the South, of his determination to restore the wool textile industry to good health, and his conviction that imports must be held at reasonable levels. We are confident of his desire and ability to bring about this result.

In direct contrast to our hat-in-hand approach to international conferences, recently the newly elected British Government overnight took forceful unilateral action to cut down imports, increase exports, and so defend the value of the pound sterling and improve the unfavorable balance of trade which threatened their economy. Apparently there was no concern on the part of the British of world opinion, or to the affect this action would have on other countries—not even members of the EFTA to whom the British are bound by a trade pact.

I respect the British and other countries who have taken similar action for their realistic approach in defense of their national self-interest, the preservation of the value of their currency, their industries, and the jobs of their workers. The United States must learn that national self-interest to insure the preservation of industry and jobs of its people must be the prime concern of any nation which hopes to remain strong.

President Johnson is a man of action, whose policy is "Let's get the job done." So far, the problems of the wool textile industry have been submerged in an ocean of talk, and we welcome President Johnson's approach of "Let's get the job done," and we add: "Get it done now."

Opportunities may soon come when he can institute proceedings to "get the job done."

There are and will be, however, other matters confronting the industry which demand a great deal of serious thinking on the part of wool dealers, growers, and manufacturers. The wool industry is old in tradition and some of the methods and customs have not changed over the years. No industry or no segment of an industry can hope to maintain indefinitely the status quo in a fast-moving and ever-changing world. In the battle of fibers, wool must move with the times in order to maintain its position or even survive. I am not here today to advance any specifics. I am merely suggesting that the time has come for a reexamination of the validity of positions taken by different segments of the industry for the purpose of determining what courses of action are best calculated to promote the welfare of the total wool industry.

The experience of the past few years has to my mind proven two things: (1) the common goal of the wool industry can best be achieved through cooperation of all its segments; and (2) the various branches of the industry are going to "sink or swim" together. I don't think it is likely in the future that one or another segment can prosper while others are depressed. Prosperity, or the lack of it, will be shared throughout the wool industry.

I submit that it is time for all of us to set aside our preconceived notions and stopgap programs and to devote our best efforts to the formulation of total industry positions which can best be advanced by the industry as a whole, and will best serve the interests of the entire industry.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

1. International Wool Textile Organization: The Boston Wool Trade Association is represented and has a voice in wool affairs both nationally and internationally. Last June, in Berlin, for the first time representatives of the U.S. wool industry met as delegates with members of the IWTO.

At this meeting, a compromise was worked out whereby the American wool industry will continue to be represented at future IWTO meetings and will have a voice in all committees as well as memberships in the council, where positions of the U.S. wool industry can be presented and defended.

2. As president of the Boston Wool Trade Association, I have been designated as an official U.S. delegate at the International Wool Study Group meeting to be held in London, England, starting December 7. This is an international organization, comprised of some 40 nations concerned with the production, export, and manufacture of wool. It may be expected many wool problems of deep concern to international wool and wool manufactuer will be discussed.

3. Herter committee: I have also been appointed, on behalf of the wool textile industry, a technical representative of the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. This group of trade representatives will act as advisers to Chief Negotiator Christian A. Herter and his staff. During the so-called Kennedy round, we presume, we will have opportunities to confer with our negotiators on matters of importance to our industry.

Last year, we honored Clinton Hester on his 20th anniversary as counsel for the Boston Wool Trade Association and for the splendid job he has done for us over the years.

This year, I would like to pay my respects to Jack Crowder and to express to him our sincere appreciation for the outstanding job he has done for the trade.

For 6 years, we have kept our problem as a top priority one, at the highest level of both the administration and Congress.

Before his tragic death, President Kennedy regarded the solution of our problem as a personal commitment, and after that, President Johnson took over with the same personal concern and repeated the same determination to do what must be done to control imports. Influential members of the administration and powerful friends in both Houses of Congress have worked toward the success of our fight for relief for the industry. That we have been able to do this is to a great degree due to the work and ability of Jack Crowder. He has brought to us a dedication and a determination to succeed and has unstintingly contributed his skill and knowledge to this end. He has the confidence and the respect of all who work with him, and his advice and counsel are invaluable.

Philippine Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 30th anniversary of the adoption of the Philippine Constitution, a national holiday in the Philippine Islands.

It is indeed fitting that we in the House of Representatives take this opportunity to extend our congratulations to the Filipino people and to reaffirm the bonds of friendship and mutual cooperation which link our two countries.

The people of the United States have long had a warm regard for the people of the Philippines. We respect their aspirations for economic advancement and a better life for all. We recognize their achievements in building a society based on equality and social justice. We are proud that the Philippine people have chosen and maintained a constitution which is patterned after our own U.S. Constitution.

The Voice of America has prepared a special program for broadcast today which will convey directly to the people of the Philippines the commendations of the American people on this important anniversary occasion.

In my capacity as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific, I have made a statement for inclusion in this program. Among others contributing remarks to the Voice of America broadcast is the Philippine Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Oscar Ledesma.

At this point, under permission granted, I include both statements and urge them to the attention of my colleagues:

STATEMENT ON PHILIPPINE CONSTITUTION DAY FOR VOICE OF AMERICA BY HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1965

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to send a message of congratulations to the people of the Philippines on the 30th anniversary of the adoption of the Philippine Constitution.

The day on which a people choose a democratic constitution to be the instrument of their government is a momentous event. And when that constitution survives depression and war, occupation and devastation, it becomes a truly outstanding document of the rights of men.

So it has been with the Philippine Constitution, adopted on February 8, 1935, by 202 delegates of the Philippine people. Wise though they were, these men could not foresee the future of their country.

They could not know that only a few years later their beautiful land would be the scene of ruinous warfare.

They could not know that the Philippines would become an occupied land.

They could not foresee the ultimate victory over foreign tyranny and the ultimate nationhood which would be earned by their people.

Although the men who wrote the Philippine Constitution were not prophets, they were steeped in traditions of freedom and principles of liberty. They knew that government belongs to the people.

The Founding Fathers of the Constitution believed in the inherent worth of all men and the right of citizens to justice before the law.

They structured the Philippine Constitution to reflect these deeply held beliefs. In doing so they created an instrument inflexible in its principles of liberty and justice, but resilient to the rigors of time and history.

We in the United States are particularly proud that the delegates to that convention 30 years ago saw fit to model the Philippine Constitution after our own U.S. Constitution.

There could be no greater tribute to our revered Constitution than the realization that it provided some of the inspiration for the constitution which governs the people of the Philippines.

Just as the American Constitution has become the world's oldest active Constitution so, too, the Philippine Constitution, having survived difficult years, will continue to prevail through future trials and tribulations.

While the constitutions of other nations have been born and have died, the Philippine Constitution—and the Republic which it created—have thrived and grown strong.

On this auspicious anniversary, therefore, on behalf of the people of the United States and myself, I extend greetings and best wishes to the people of the Philippines.

May your country continue to grow and prosper, and may our two nations continue to flourish together in a spirit of friendship and cooperation.

REMARKS OF PHILIPPINE AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES OSCAR LEDESMA, ON THE OCCASION OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE PHILIPPINE CONSTITUTION REBROADCAST TO THE PHILIPPINES BY THE VOICE OF AMERICA, FEBRUARY 8, 1965, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Two days ago, my staff and I went to see Chief Justice and Mrs. Earl Warren off at the airport. Chief Justice Warren has been invited by the Philippine Constitution Association to participate in the 30th anniversary of the adoption of the Philippine Constitution.

I believe that I express the deep appreciation of the Philippine people for Chief Justice Warren's acceptance of the invitation. His participation is as much a reflection of what I feel is the mutual regard and esteem, which Americans and Filipinos have for each other as well as a testimony of their profound faith in the validity and enduring quality of the fundamental law.

I am pleased to be able to say a few words on this occasion. I speak from Washington, D.C., where as the representative of our country to the United States, I see how the basic provisions of the American Constitution, like ours, "entrench more firmly * * * the system of constitutional government," guarantees the rights and freedom of the people and assures the continuity of a regime of justice, liberty, and democracy in both our countries.

Thirty years ago, when the convention adopted the Philippine Constitution, that distinguished patriot and statesman, the late Claro M. Recto, who was its President, rightly declared that henceforth "the fatherland expects from its sons their unquestioning loyalty, and their unfaltering devotion," adding that "the cause of that sacrosanct ideal of liberty for which our heroes and martyrs gave of their blood and their lives compels us to move forward with unshaken faith in our destiny."

It is a tribute to the wisdom, the farsightedness, and the sense of history of the framers of our Constitution that this fundamental document, like a rock, has withstood the swirl of disturbance, the turmoil of subversion, and the violence of war. Because of its binding and unifying character, the Constitution, even as it has restrained the irrational impulses to which man is subject, has insured the orderly transfer of power from one administration to the next.

Because it has anticipated the weaknesses to which all regimes are subject and because it has foreseen the exigencies to which a nation is heir, our Constitution has trenchantly given expression to the idea that Filipinos constitute a free society where the people are sovereign; it has given articulation to the right of the individual. It delimits the excesses of irresponsible leadership and the naked and aggressive use of power by providing for a system of checks and balances among the three branches of Government.

At this point, I recall what one scholar has said in this respect. "It is the duty of every citizen to defend the Constitution. Any violation of its provision is a blow to the regime of law and a step toward the institution of a rule of force with all its perils and uncertainties."

Framed 30 years ago, the Constitution effected the transformation of the Philippines from a Commonwealth to a Republic. It is a tribute to the thinking of the Delegates to the Convention, that they took into special account the historical experience of Filipinos, their struggle for freedom, their wish to live in dignity in a free society, their desire for national identity and unity. It is easy to see therefore why the Philippine Constitution underscores the development of our national patrimony, stresses the preservation and enhancement of our heritage, and instills in every Filipino the imperishable concepts of universal brotherhood, of international law, the defense of the state, and social justice. In its renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy it implicitly affirms its belief that men should live together in peace and harmony, cooperating with one another in order to protect their common interests and promote their welfare. It emphasizes the paramount duty of parents and the state to rear the Filipino youth in civic efficiency and teach them the imperatives of civic responsibility.

The provisions I have cited vitalize the democratic processes in our country; they serve as a constant reminder to us that while the free and open society we live in enables us to give the fullest play to our capabilities and an opportunity to develop our potential, it still is subject to the pressures and tensions that can lead to irresponsibility, to misery, to oppression, and to injustice.

We are fortunate that our political life, our social institutions, our feeling of national oneness and our belief in our destiny have suffered no radical and violent changes. The continuity and stability of our institutions are evident; we are quick to spot our mistakes and our errors and are ready to propose and institute remedies.

There remains only the important task of giving substance to our efforts dedicated to the economic progress of our people.

The Philippine Constitution, rooted as it is in the equalitarian concept, the freedom of man, and in representative government, lends itself easily to this objective of attaining economic progress.

Having achieved that economic growth that would give the Filipino assurance of security in his future and the future of his children, and extend to him what President Macapagal has called the good life, which is the rightful heritage of mankind, we will then be able to say that we have achieved the fullest measure of our independence, having been able then to equate political with economic freedom.

This, to my mind, is one way of evaluating the significance of the Constitution in our time.

One Thousand Miles of Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, now that the talk is about the Appalachia region and the specific legislative proposal to combat poverty and deprivation there, it is proper that we focus attention on a region in our country where the conditions, if anything, are worse.

Recently a significant conference was held in Arizona, to which were attracted the leading thinkers and activists of our country in order to discuss this question of poverty.

One of the sharpest, most cultured and free minds in our Nation, that of Ronnie Dugger, the editor of the Texas Observer, wrote an incisive report as the result of this conference.

With unanimous consent I am inserting this report:

ONE THOUSAND MILES OF POVERTY

TUCSON, ARIZ.—"Draw a line between Dallas and Houston and look west," said Bob Choate. One sees broad prosperity, yet, "incredible percentages of people exist on annual per capita incomes of below $800 a year. * * * Many counties have adult median years of education averaging under 6 years.

"Of the total population in Texas, 28.7 percent of the families live on a median family income of less than $3,000—18 percent of these on less than $2,000. Of the total population in New Mexico, 24 percent of the family incomes are less than $3,000. In Arizona the story is the same: 21 percent—14 percent in California—Colorado, 18 percent."

In fact, according to the Bureau of the Census, one-fourth of all Americans with a yearly income below the poverty line of $3,000 live in these five Southwestern States:

	Number of persons
Arizona	476,137
California	4,740,653
Colorado	589,846
New Mexico	340,740
Texas	4,010,572
5-State total	10,157,948
National total	[1] 41,220,300

[1] The characteristics of population, Bureau of the Census, 1962.

Within these States there live large numbers of three generally impoverished ethnic groups: the 4 million Latin-Americans, concentrated along the border strip; 2,500,000 Negroes, concentrated at each end of the area and in cities in between; and the 200,000 Indians, some still on reservations and some not.

"The living conditions of the Mexican-American are perhaps America's best kept secret," Choate says. So they would not continue to be, this slight, wiry scion of a conservative Boston publishing family set about to attract people to a National Conference on Poverty in the Southwest, and last week in Tucson more than 2,200 people attended it. Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY and President Johnson's director of the war on poverty, Sargent Shriver, made addresses; some of the speakers had no credentials except that they were poor. Staff people from the new, New Deal-like Office of Economic Opportunity, as well as bureaucrats

from many other agencies of Federal and lower-level government who are concerned with aspects of poverty, mingled with chiefs of Indian tribes, Negro ministers, Latin-American educators, Anglo welfare workers, leftists from California and civil libertarians from Chicago. There were not many labor leaders here, nor were bankers, industrialists, or merchants conspicuous, but the turnout, fivefold more than what had been expected, convinced Choate that "we have done something." Bexar County Commissioner Albert Pena of San Antonio, who had planned to attend but was prevented by a budget hearing, said he was delighted the conference had happened. "Not enough people know that the mexicano has a problem. They've made white people out of us, and we don't know where we are," he said.

"To my mind," wrote Rev. John Wagner of San Antonio, executive secretary of the National Council for the Spanish-speaking in a paper filed with the conference, "south Texas is one of the greatest, most distressing, and most unknown pockets of poverty anywhere in the United States, and I would like to refer to it as '1,000 miles of poverty.' This large area in the southern part of Texas almost stands apart from the rest of the Nation (in) the extent of its problems."

Perhaps 150 Texans were in attendance, including Terrell Blodgett, Gov. John Connally's director of the Texas OEO, but not Blodgett or any other Texas official with anti-poverty responsibilities appeared on the program of the conference. A representative of the Texas Employment Commission was scheduled to speak, but simply did not show when his time came and he was called on by Father James Vizzard of the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor.

Vizzard was one of the three cochairmen of the conference; the other two were James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, and Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers. Vizzard was angered when the TEC spokesman failed to appear and made a statement to the conference on the spot, calling for a congressional investigation of State employment commissions.

"In my personal knowledge," he told the Observer afterward, "three State employment services in the southwest—those in Texas, California, and Arizona—are much more an agency for employers, or are in effect hired employees of the employers, rather than for the workers. There is enough collusion and destruction of workers' rights to justify a congressional investigation."

Governor Connally, who could not have attended the conference because the 2-day inaugural festivities for him in Austin were simultaneous with it, sent a message explaining this and extending his best wishes. "Texas has its share of the problems of poverty but we are exerting money and efforts in many directions to meet these problems, and with the assistance of the Economic Opportunity Act we are confident that we will meet our responsibilities," he said.

Shriver, keynoting the conference, was dressed in a natty gray suit and could not shuck his naturally aristocratic manner, but his message belied his style.

At once the Director of the Peace Corps abroad and the OEO—initials that seem likely to become the first authentic successor to such shorthands as the WPA and the CCC of the 1930's—Shriver heaped contempt upon "experts" who had predicted the failure of the Peace Corps and who predict the failure of the war on poverty now; he would not abide people who think of the poor as "them," as ones apart from the rest of us.

"It used to be extremism to worry about poverty or about social justice of any kind, especially if you thought the Federal Government could do anything about it," Shriver said. This is not so now, he said, but plenty of people still want to put distance between themselves and the poor. For these people, "the poor still live in another country, city, or State" and are a class to themselves. Shriver told of a letter he received from a person who believed "we should go ahead and send them money" and was thus, Shriver said, thinking of the poor as "them" and trying to confine contact with them "to the U.S. mails." Too often, he said, we have been making sure that if we shake hands with the poor, we're wearing gloves. In the past people helping the poor have not trusted them, but have feared them, and "fear breeds fear."

The Peace Corps succeeded, he said, because the corpsmen drink the same water, eat the same food, live in the same kind of houses, use the same transportation, and speak the same languages as the people they are working with. Having to learn from the local people, they have been learners as well as teachers, receivers as well as givers, Shriver said. Nor are they out to impose their thinking or way of life or values on their hosts, but rather only to solve local problems in ways that make sense and are acceptable to the people concerned.

So it should be, Shriver said, in the war on poverty in our own country. Experts have said southern officials would not cooperate with Negro leaders in the South; public and parochial school authorities would not work together; volunteers would not come forward without the exotic appeal of service abroad; rural white youths and young Negroes from northern slums, put together, would riot; communities and towns would refuse to permit integrated job corps camps near them; southern Governors would veto installations in their States. But as of today these critics of the program have been wrong at every turn, Shriver said.

"As of today," he said, "there isn't one veto on the record from any southern Governor on any program of the war on poverty. Every Republican Governor has okayed war on poverty projects in his State.

"We did not come here with a Federal bank book," Shriver said. "We came instead to listen to the voices of the poor and to the voices of those genuinely concerned to learn about poverty." He spoke, in closing, of a new vision for the region, the society, and all humanity.

Lester Oliver, chairman of the White Mountain Apache tribe, responded for Indian tribes of the Southwest. "Our needs are great," he said, and while Indians do not want handouts or doles since their life is based on self-sufficiency, they have to have education, training, and some economic assistance. On his own reservation, he said, half the employable males are without work, and 900 of the 1,100 families live in substandard homes without minimum utilities.

Michael Harrington, author of "The Other America," the book on poverty in the United States which is generally given a large portion of the credit for popularizing the issue, has been advising the OEO people off camera since the planning began but does not want to take a job in the program. Harrington proposes a contniuing arms'-length evaluation of the war. After Shriver's speech, Harrington complained of the small sums allocated to the war so far—$1.3 billion in the 1965 Johnson budget. "We could get a lot of money for this if it was a highway program," he said.

In the framework of his support of the 1964 OEO legislation as a first step, Harrington criticized the war so far because it is not job creating. The Socialist writer called attention to a report from a Senate subcommittee that recommended spending $5 billion a year on the war through 1968—$30 billion in all—and estimated that if this was done unemployment could be reduced from the present 5 to 3 percent by 1968. Harrington also contended that there is a yawning gap in the program: the absence of any serious attempt to do away with slums.

The law says the poor shall be involved in the war on their own poverty. Harrington said the poor were, in the mobilization for youth program in New York City, and it was promptly attacked on grounds that seven people working in it had subversive connections. The actual reason, he said, was that the New York program was mobilizing political power to change social conditions and was therefore too serious a threat to "the power structure."

Dr. Ben Yellen of Raleigh, Calif., a medical doctor turned pamphleteer for Latin American farmworkers in California, told of seeing them squatting on the curbs on both sides of the street waiting for medical care from the one welfare doctor; said that some days the doctor didn't even show up. When his letters to the editor weren't printed, Yellen said, he bought himself a mimeograph machine and has been going up and down the street handing out pamphlets excoriating the big growers for paying low wages and the Government for permitting Mexican nationals to work in California at lower wages than American workers can accept.

On the Mexican side of the border, he said, the wages are 15 cents an hour, so when a Mexican national earns 35 to 50 cents an hour in the United States he is a big earner. U.S. citizens, however, cannot live on this. Yellen told of helping mexicano farmworkers, U.S. citizens, file suits against the authorities under a California law that prohibits discrimination against workers on the basis of their national origin. The theory is that the bracero and border commuters programs discriminate against U.S. workers because their national origin is American. Once the suits were filed, Yellen said, he could make his charges against the growers with immunity from lawsuits.

Women from Mexico also go up and down the Imperial Valley, which opens onto the Mexican border, knocking on doors seeking housework at from 35 to 60 cents an hour. This is fine for them but ruinous for the working needs of native Mexican-American women, Yellen argued.

Henry Munoz, Jr., director of the department of equal opportunity of the Texas AFL-CIO, filed a paper with the conference condemning the commuter system in particular. Estimating, on behalf of Texas AFL-CIO, that as many as 100,000 Mexican citizens commute to jobs in the southern United States, including, of course, all along the Texas-Mexican border, Munoz wrote:

"Wages and working conditions deteriorate: For the past 5 years, the unemployment rate in Texas cities along the Rio Grande has been far in excess of both the State and National employment rates, soaring at times to as much as 15 percent for periods as long as 20 to 30 months.

"Nearly half a million Texas workers are still getting paid 1875 wages—when they can find work * * *. They do not have the right to join a union for protection. They are not protected by a minimum wage and hour law. They have no workmen's injury or unemployment compensation * * *.

"Most of the families in the counties in which the migrants reside have less than $3,500 per year income. These are the main victims of this Nation's bracero and commuter policies, but their fellow citizens who must assume increased taxes also suffer due to this great community of low-paid workers."

According to a 1964 U.S. Department of Agriculture leaflet, "Rural Poverty" (to which attention was called during the Tucson conference), there are 24 counties in the five-State southwestern area that have a median rural family income between $1,535 and $2,212, causing them to fall among the 250 poorest counties in rural income in the country. Twenty-two of these 24 counties are in Texas, mostly in the southern (Latin-American) and eastern (southlike) parts.

The counties, with their median income for rural families—all of them in Texas unless otherwise specified—are:

Starr, $1,535; Jim Hogg, $1,665; Houston, $1,704; San Jacinto, $1,737; Zapata, $1,766; Grimes, $1,797; Washington, $1,803; Kenedy, $1,844; Marion, $1,924; Freestone, $1,935; Leon, $1,946; Red River, $1,959; DeWitt, $1,961; Falls, $1,970; Robertson, $1,999; Lavaca, $2,009; Lee, $2,017; Rains, $2,044; San Augustine, $2,068; Walker, $2,083; Mora, in New Mexico, $2,094; Bastrop, $2,107; Madison, $2,111; Sandoval, in New Mexico, $2,121.

Paul Jacobs of Citizens for Farm Labor in California told a hearing during the conference that any war must have an enemy and in the war on poverty among farmworkers the enemy is the big growers. Gov. Pat Brown is a Democrat, and all Democrats like other Democrats, especially rich ones, Jacobs said; when Brown joins the rich Democrats who are big growers in resisting the discontinuation of the bracero program that was providing them cheap labor from Mexico, Jacobs said, "he has joined hands with the growers who in California are the enemy." Jacobs said the war against poverty among farmworkers will be lost unless the fight is joined with growers who have "a vested interest in poverty" and government officials who support these growers' cause.

A Texas Western College professor, Clark S. Knowlton, chairman of the department of sociology, told the conference that there is a "tortilla curtain along the Rio Grande." Romanticism and the Southwestern "atmosphere," he said, have concealed "Spanish-American poverty, economic decline, malnutrition, abandoned villages, eroded lands, high rates of infant and adult mortality, and out-migration, economic and cultural exploitation, and apathy and despair."

Knowlton proposed the establishment of governmental handicraft boards to encourage a renewal of craft skills among the Southwestern poor; State or Federal marketing and grading services for village products, such as Christmas trees, fruit, chili, and vegetables; the formation of village cooperatives and the encouragement of Mexican-American small businessmen to create local industries; "a massive land purchase program" to restore to the villages the range and crop land "that once belonged to them"; and the rehabilitation of adequate village irrigation systems.

Yet cities, too, came in for their share of attention during the conference. A background paper called attention to census figures showing that the non-Anglo populations in 17 standard metropolitan areas in the Southwest have low incomes and that Laredo and the Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito area in Texas and the California labor market areas of Los Angeles-Long Beach, San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, and San Diego contain large numbers of poverty-stricken families.

The subculture of Latin Americans in a border city was delineated by Marion Cline, assistant professor of education at Texas Western College in El Paso. The city of El Paso is reluctant to spend tax funds in the mexicano slum areas and private enterprise shies away from investments so close to the border, he said. A child growing up in this situation clings to his native Spanish, watches Spanish TV programs from Juarez, and listens to Spanish radio broadcasts, and having no or few Anglo friends, is embarrassed to use his broken English. Growing up in an overcrowed house, he finds it hard to study, even as, in school, he finds the proceedings difficult to understand. About 70 percent of the Latin Americans in El Paso drop out of school before high school graduation, Cline said; perhaps 10 percent of the Latin American population there attend college, and "all but very few fail out or drop out. It appears they never had a chance to begin with. Perhaps it won't always be so."

Mrs. Vera Burke, director of the social services department of the Bexar County Hospital District, presented a grave indictment of conditions in San Antonio.

The district consists of a general hospital with 330 beds and a geriatric and convalescent sanitorium with 250 beds and is part of the South Texas Medical School Hospital. It serves the poor, whose illnesses, Mrs. Burke said, "are frequently a result of severe economic deprivation."

She pointed out that mothers getting aid to four dependent children who are under 16 years of age get just $115 a month for them from the aid to dependent children program. "Most of these families live or, shall I say, exist on $115 a month, and it is, therefore, easy to see why our hospital wards are filled with children suffering from malnutrition and diarrhea," sicknesses usually associated with underdeveloped countries, she said.

In December, 1964, in San Antonio, 2,520 families containing 8,862 children under 16 were getting an average aid to dependent children payment of $87.46 a month; the average per child was $24.87 a month. In addition in Bexar County, 10,211 recipients of old-age assistance were getting a maximum of $83 a month; 274 blind people were getting $90 aid at the most per month; 420 permanently and totally disabled persons were getting, each month, a maximum of $69 aid.

Mrs. Burke said: "In San Antonio the schools do not require that all children be immunized against such diseases as diphtheria, whooping cough, and polio with the result that in 1962 San Antonio with a population of a little over 600,000 had 4 percent of all diphtheria cases in the United States." The cost of providing medical treatment of these sicknesses would have more than paid for immunizing every schoolchild.

Compulsory school attendance laws in San Antonio are not enforced, she said. "Frequently children are taken out of school because of inadequate clothing, inadequate food, and ignorance on the part of parents on the importance and value of an education. Can we really hold these parents responsible for not sending their children to school if we as a community do not provide them with the basic necessities for keeping children in school, nor show them the rewards for continuing in our schools? It is not possible to inculcate standards of middle class morality on an empty stomach in housing that defies description.

"Children are brought to our hospital malnourished, unkempt, and frequently abused by their parents; they are the innocent scapegoats in a life that is like a 'page out of Dickens'."

The district's clinical facilities, designed for 10,000 to 15,000 visits a year, in 1964 handled 172,954 visits, she said. "In our hospital, which has 39 obstetrical beds, 3,504 babies were born in 1964. Simple arithmetic will show that the mother's stay in the hospital averages 48 hours. Is it a wonder then that the baby is frequently neglected and is brought back to the hospital several weeks later weighing less than its birth weight."

The thrust of the statement of the Dallas County Department of Public Welfare, presented by its staff director, G. R. Coker, seemed to present a more positive sounding picture than Mrs. Burke's statement, but touched also on apparent deficiencies in the Dallas situation. "We are admitting we are administering a limited service that in the last 8 years had doubled" in total cost in Dallas County, he said.

The State of Texas, Coker said, has no general assistance program for the poor, and the Dallas County program is not required by State law. As a State, Coker pointed out, Texas ranks 34th in old-age assistance payment (an average of $70.24 a month) 45th in aid to the permanently and totally disabled (57.24 a month), 42d in aid to the blind (69.39 a month), and 45th in aid to families with dependent children ($81.73 a month).

"It is obvious that these programs are not adequate to meet the needs of welfare families, or to help them move above their current status as poverty stricken persons," according to the statement of the Dallas County Welfare Department.

The total expenditure for 1964 by the Dallas County Welfare Department, according to its report, was $710,000 which was 3.6 percent of its total budget. The average spent per client was $21.34. The agency's Federal food division issued 444,600 pounds of federally donated foods to 182,000 persons.

The Reverend Earl Allen, CORE leader in Dallas, and Clarence Laws, regional director of the NAACP in Dallas, each assailed the Dallas school system for maintaining effective segregation under cover of token integration and for denying Negroes the opportunity to progress adequately in the school system. Herbert Wincorn, of Dallas, told of a vocational training program for unskilled unemployed people jointly conducted by the industry concerned in Dallas—the textile industry—and the schools. Four Dallas people who went to Tucson to tell of their poverty got no chance to. Although about $20,000 of Federal money was spent in part to bring about 120 such people to the conference under subsidy, few of them had a chance to be heard.

Each morning of the conference a breakfast was held during which officials of the Federal war on poverty described various aspects of the law and told what to do to get under its provisions. (In subsequent issues on poverty in this region the Observer will make use of insights here obtained.) It was learned during the conference that of the seven regional offices to be opened for the war, one will be in Austin and another one in San Francisco and that these two offices will correlate the antipoverty program in the Southwest.

If the conference on poverty here was a "pseudoevent," that is, one contrived to happen for reasons of publicity, at least one aspect of it was not: the testimony of six Arizona social workers that the Arizona State Welfare Board should stop its conscientious objection to the war on poverty. One of the panelists, Steve Allen of TV, while apologizing if his remark sounded dramatic, still said that if there was any retaliation against the six for their bitter indictment of Arizona welfare, please to tell him, and he would tell the country.

Roy Elizondo, of Houston, related that although Houston is a "Space Center USA," 300,000 of its people live in poverty. Carlos Truan of LULAC (the League of United Latin-American Citizens) in Texas told of that organization's projects to help Latin Americans. Jackie Robinson, a Negro Republican, just announced he's about through with the GOP if it doesn't come around on race questions and initiate its own war on poverty. Dr. Julian Samora delivered an informative position paper on poverty among Latin Americans in the Southwest.

After the conference President Johnson announced that Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, San Antonio, who addressed it after having given a prayer at the President's inauguration, and Mrs. Grace Olivarez, of Phoenix, an official of the conference, are among the 14 persons who will advise him on the war on poverty.

The Vice President, HUBERT HUMPHREY, delivered to the conference a ringing, improvised but vital and free-flowing oration. His theme was plain: that the United States now has the means to end poverty and has no moral excuse if it does not do so.

The conference in Tucson, he said, was important because it was sponsored by 53

national organizations and because of the diversity of those who attended. "Here, diversity is the common denominator. Difference. And yet out of that diversity and out of that difference comes a common purpose."

From the preamble to the American Constitution HUMPHREY singled out the purpose, "to promote the general welfare," and said that anyone failing in this commitment "has in a very real sense repudiated his citizenship."

"If we are half as astute as we are in devising these fantastic missile defenses * * * we'll rout this enemy of poverty in short order. We can really do whatever we want to do. We have the means to do it. The time has come when we can answer the Lord's Prayer. This prayer for daily bread—we have the means. I don't mean just Americans. I mean people everywhere."

HUMPHREY spoke of removing from the countenance of the Nation "this sickness of poverty." The old-fashioned words like compassion and charity have definite, present meaning, he said: "If you can practice it in private life why can't you in public life, in a government of, by and for the people?

"What we need to do is to examine our economic, social, and political structure and try to find out why there are still millions in poverty," he said.

"The deficit of poverty is of concern to us. The shame of it.—It should be of concern to us at home and abroad. We're going to attack it here * * *. Go on home and awaken your communities. Tell 'em whether they know it or not the war is on, and tell 'em not in Appalachia or Pennsylvania—tell 'em start it right here, there are some enemies right here.

"We need to change. What we were doing before was not enough. The way we were doing it before was not enough. We've got to change," the Vice President said.

"IN A LAND RICH"

"In a land of wealth, families must not live in hopeless poverty. In a land rich in harvest, children must not go hungry. In a land of healing miracles, neighbors must not suffer and die unattended."—President Johnson, in his inaugural address.

Gov. Harold E. Hughes, of Iowa, Cites Need for Farm Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor, one of the Nation's finest newspapers, carried an excellent article in its issue of Saturday, February 6, on Gov. Harold E. Hughes, of Iowa. The article gives a very accurate reflection of Governor Hughes' philosophy and personality, and I commend it to my fellow Members.

I am sure I speak for nearly all the Members of the Iowa delegation in the House of Representatives when I say that Governor Hughes is one of the most effective and farsighted chief executives in Iowa's history. And I am sure, too, that I speak for the majority of the people of Iowa, since Governor Hughes—and the Iowa Democratic Party—won an overwhelming victory at the polls last November.

Governor Hughes' remarks on the close relationship of agriculture to industry are particularly timely. In his Chicago talk, the Governor said:

Industry has gone far ahead of agriculture in volume in Iowa. The gross industrial output is four times that of agriculture. But we are still dependent on farm prosperity.

If the farmer doesn't make money none of us does. When he can't buy, factories cut down production, people lose jobs. It sets up a chain reaction.

Iowa has 25 percent of the Grade A land in the United States. But our farmers are in trouble due to the cost-price squeeze. A cutback in farm price supports would hurt them and the entire Middle West.

Farm prosperity is vital to the entire Nation, as well as to Iowa and the Middle West, and I hope my colleagues will keep this in mind when the Congress takes up the important job of enacting agricultural legislation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the article from the Christian Science Monitor:

IOWANS REACH HIGHER

(By Dorothea Kahn Jaffe)

CHICAGO.—Iowans could be a bit complacent. Their "tall-corn State" has the lowest unemployment rate in the Nation, has had marked success in attracting new industry, and keeps breaking farm production records.

But the 6-foot-2-inch determined man beginning his second term as Governor sees much yet to be done, he made clear in an interview here.

Harold E. Hughes, sixth Democrat to hold the office since 1846, was reelected in November by a 2-to-1 majority, running ahead of President Johnson.

While this has given him confidence, he is not resting on his record. Like the college athlete that he was (State discus champion, all-Iowa football guard), he is working to improve the score.

STRONG CONVICTIONS

He discussed his State's progress and needs when he flew to keep a speaking date here. He spoke with strong convictions on each subject.

Relief?

"It pays to spend more rather than less. Halfhearted programs waste the taxpayers' money. Programs should be designed to help people get jobs, get off relief. Adequate, efficient programs are a sound investment.

Education?

"Better training for jobs in industry is needed. I am recommending the establishment of four vocational-technical schools at the post-high-school level. These could be expanded into 2-year municipal colleges with the possibility of transferring credits to academic colleges.

"They should be supported by a local property tax matched by Federal funds, administered by local school boards."

CHAIN REACTION

Agriculture?

"Industry has gone far ahead of agriculture in volume in Iowa. The gross industrial output is four times that of agriculture. But we still are dependent on farm prosperity.

"If the farmer doesn't make money none of us does. When he can't buy, factories cut down production, people lose jobs. It sets up a chain reaction.

"Iowa has 25 percent of the grade A land in the United States. But our farmers are in trouble due to the cost-price squeeze. A cutback in farm price supports would hurt them and the entire Middle West."

Governor Hughes wants to lessen the need for price supports. He is is urging:

Increased State financial support for research into new uses for farm products with a view to making them commercially practical.

Promotion to open foreign markets in countries where American farm products are needed and acceptable.

(He plans already to send a trade mission to Western Europe to promote the sale of Iowa beef. "The meat-eating capacity of these people can be increased," he said).

BRANCH PLANTS

Governor Hughes has learned of the farmers' problems firsthand. His father was a farmer and he himself drove a farm supply truck for about 2 years. He got to know many country people making those business calls, he said.

When it comes to development of any kind, Governor Hughes believes in working for it. During the first 2 years of his administration, he tells you proudly, more than 100 branch plants were opened in the State.

Through the Iowa Development Commission citizen missions were organized to visit industrial cities of the United States and "sell Iowa." The Governor joined them in visits to Chicago, Minneapolis-St. Paul, and New York.

He told manufacturers interested in new locations that the Iowa people are great workers—the kind of folks who want to do a day's work for a day's pay, who don't think in terms of coffee breaks, who really want new industry to come in. Then he offered survey findings to prove what he said.

HANDICAPS OVERCOME

With similar enthusiasm he has promoted tourism, talking of the beauty of the river-bounded State and its recreation facilities. His zeal has brought many cars rolling into Iowa.

Governor Hughes' personal record is a story of overcoming handicaps. Returning from service in World War II he fought a personal alcohol problem and won. Hoping to help others, he allowed his story to be published in Look magazine last year.

With only limited undergraduate work at the University of Iowa, he has acquired a striking grasp of social, economic, and educational matters.

He won his first elective office in 1958 shortly after switching party affiliations. He lost his first bid for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in 1960 but won it and the election in 1962 and 1964.

The Price of Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives is discussing H.R. 3818, the bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities.

This morning I received a letter from one of the most distinguished attorneys in Nebraska's Second Congressional District, Mr. Roy Harrop, of Omaha. He has had a longstanding interest in a stable national currency, and I think his remarks are appropriate at this time.

I think the Members of this body will be interested in Mr. Harrop's comments as well as the attached column by Alice Widener:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: I am interested in the Nation's economy, also for a number of years have been interested in the gold-mining industry of the Black Hills, near Deadwood in Lawrence County, and have been watching the financial events that have been taking place under this Democrat administration. Former President Kennedy did not act to remedy the situation by increasing the price of gold, nor has President Johnson; however, former President Roosevelt did increase the price of gold from $20.67 to $35 per ounce. The price of $20.67 per ounce was established when a nickel was important money.

Now there is only one mine, the Homestake, in the entire State of South Dakota, that can mine gold for $35 per ounce, and this company could not do so if they did not own all the water rights of that area, furnish water to Deadwood and Lead and also make electric power which they sell, and in spite of all that they cannot afford to pay union wages to their miners. Instead, they have them working on piece-work contracts, and those miners have a difficult time to make a living on this basis. Others who own mining property are being sold out for taxes, and the Homestake Mining Co. and other investors are buying this land for $7 per acre. So all the mining companies there as well as those of the other 12 mining States, including Alaska, have been forced out of business.

Yesterday the Omaha World-Herald carried an article, written by Alice Widener, economist and magazine publisher, entitled "A Job the Little Fish Had Better Get At," meaning the voters of this country, and she asks her readers, the Little Fish, to wire Congress "Cut down the budget, not our gold reserves." She further adds, "If the funny money men win, and the crash comes, don't say nobody ever warned you."

Based on our present economy, it is self-evident that the price of gold is far too low and should be doubled or tripled to bring it into line with other commodities. This act alone would put at least a million men to work in the Western States in the gold mining industry and another million to furnish supplies for these miners and not take one penny out of the taxpayer's pocket but would open up and develop the West, which is being held down by Wall Street and international bankers who now propose to put us on a paper money diet while they tax the people of this country $12 billion annually for use of the people's credit, and these bankers do not pay any income tax on the loot they receive.

I think this article is timely and more important than any other thing Congress can take into consideration at this time. And it might do some good for the Republican Party if they would show they are interested in development of the western part of this Nation, also keep this Nation from going the way of the Weimar Republic in Germany which happened in our time.

Have you noticed that they are rapidly taking the silver certificates out of circulation and replacing them with Federal Reserve shin plasters, nothing back of them, and the silver bullion turned over to the Federal Reserve banks. And when they are about it, raising the price of gold, they should also raise the price of silver so the silver mines can again produce and provide further employment for our unemployed. The Congress has a right to do this under our Constitution, which says Congress shall establish the value of gold and silver and of foreign coins and regulate the value thereof. But this is something they have shied away from since the time of Abraham Lincoln when he issued Treasury notes, good for all debts public and private, and won the Civil War at a time when there was no gold or silver to back our money.

More and more people are getting interested in this financial setup and they do not want this country to collapse for the lack of proper financial management.

Closing with kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

ROY M. HARROP.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Sunday World Herald, Feb. 7, 1965]

A JOB THE LITTLE FISH HAD BETTER GET AT

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK.—The most important congressional debate in our Nation since 1865 is taking place.

It is between the funny money and honest money men, otherwise described as advocates of "new economics" and "classical economics."

On its outcome hangs the morality and integrity of our Nation. These, in turn, depend on a sound national currency.

In all history, no nation that ruined its currency escaped moral ruin.

If the funny money men win, there will eventually take place in our country the kind of hair-curling financial crisis predicted by former Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey.

He warned of catastrophe unless the Government quit spending money like a drunken sailor.

What happened? He was thrown overboard from the ship of state.

As of now, it appears the funny men will win. And so the most important thing for the helpless American people to do is to make sure they know exactly where to put the blame when the inevitable crash comes.

In the days of the great depression, the people's ire was misdirected by leftists against capitalism and a national scapegoat—the American businessman.

He never has full recovered his courageous self-confidence, and has remained psychologically and emotionally on the defensive for 30 years or more.

The leftists held in the 1930's that Americans should emulate the Socialists, preferably the Soviet Socialists, and also claimed that deficit spending would eliminate poverty, unemployment, war, and all the other ills of society.

To all those hard-working, thrifty, decent Americans who probably will be fleeced out of their savings and pensions, I have a suggestion:

Get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 26, 1965, and read Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' funny money speech, "Why We Should Repeal the Gold Cover Requirement." (The Senator was for many years a pillar of the Socialist League for Industrial Democracy.)

His speech is replete with forebodings of monetary disaster, but his advice on how to prevent it is advocacy of all those funny money policies which brought us to the brink of it.

After you have studied the Douglas speech, get a copy of the Senate Finance Committee document, "Investigation of the Financial Condition of the United States, Part 7, August 18, 1959," and read the statement (pp. 2208–2216) by Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah, on "The Problem of Inflation."

He attacked the views of the influential Keynesian spendthrift, Prof. Seymour Harris, who had said, "I would not be unhappy about a 1 percent inflation, even if it does, say, over 40 years, wipe out 50 percent of your savings, as it would."

Then Senator BENNETT quoted a statement made in 1959 by Malcolm Bryan, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta:

"If a policy of active or permissive inflation is to be a fact, then we can secure the shreds of our self-respect only by announcing the policy. This is the last of the canons of decency that should prevail.

"We should have the decency to say to the moneysaver, 'Hold still, little fish. All we intend is to gut you.'"

Little fish, you had better not hold still! You had better move now to protect yourselves from the manipulations of the funny money men and Keynesian believers in new economics.

These men profess to be concerned with your welfare, but they intend to gut you as Malcolm Bryan of the Atlanta Federal Reserve Bank, and the late Senator George Malone, of Nevada, and Senators WALLACE F. BENNETT and HARRY F. BYRD, and former Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey have charged.

Little fish, wire Congress: "Cut down the budget, not our gold reserves."

If the funny money men win, and the crash comes, don't say nobody ever warned you.

Resolution Requesting Members of Congress To Adopt Legislation Outlawing Discrimination in Employment Based on Age—40 to 65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the Buffalo Aerie No. 46, Fraternal Order of Eagles, at Buffalo, N.Y., requesting Congress to adopt legislation which will outlaw discrimination in employment due to age. In providing equal opportunity for employment, we must not forget or overlook this group of citizens between the ages of 45 and 60 in their need for equal opportunity. It is a disgrace for our people who have carried the tax burden of our country thus far to arrive at the autumn of life and find they are no longer needed and are suddenly turned down on employment because of their age.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO ADOPT LEGISLATION OUTLAWING DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BASED ON AGE—40 TO 65

Whereas job barriers against older workers in industry are cruel, wasteful, and unsound, and deprive the economy of much valuable skill and experience; and

Whereas the most neglected man in the employment picture today is the man between 40 and 65, who is too young to retire on social security but too old to find a job; and

Whereas by 1975, one-third of all Americans will be between the ages of 40 and 65 and considered unemployable by a majority of employers; and

Whereas discrimination in employment based on age deprives persons in the prime of life of the earnings they need to provide a decent standard of living for themselves and their families and causes persons from 40 to 65 to live under the shadow of constant fear that, if they lose their job, they will be unable to find another; and

Whereas it is irrational for a society to do with one hand everything possible to extend the life of man while, with the other hand,

writes him off as useless because of the date of his birth; and

Whereas in 1964 Congress adopted Public Law 88-352 which makes it an unlawful employment practice for an employer with 25 or more employees and engaged in an industry affecting interstate commerce, to discriminate against employees or applicants for employment because of their race, color, religion, sex or national origin; and

Whereas section 715 of Public Law 88-352 provides that the Secretary of Labor shall make a study of discrimination in employment because of age and shall report the results of such study to Congress not later than June 30, 1965, "and shall include in such report such recommendations for legislation to prevent arbitrary discrimination in employment because of age as he determines advisable": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States be requested to enact at their present session legislation which will make it an unlawful employment practice for employers to discriminate against employees or applicants for employment because of their age being between 40 and 65.

FRANK O. PETERS,
President.

RAY B. BATES,
Secretary.

Glaring Need for New Mine Safety Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Anthracite Tri-District News of the United Mine Workers of America in its edition of Friday, February 5, 1965, in one of its lead articles, has once again recalled the tragic mine disaster at the Sheppton mine, near Hazleton, Pa., during the summer of 1963, a story with such human interest that it drew worldwide recognition. The purpose of the article, however, was to again bring to the attention of the Congress the glaring need for new mine safety legislation, legislation to include all mines regardless of size and number of employees. I have introduced in the 89th Congress, as I have done in prior Congresses, a bill to provide the safety for miners that they so badly need in many circumstances. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress, in its wisdom, will pass this vitally needed legislation.

The aforementioned article follows:

CONGRESS WILL TRY AGAIN TO IMPROVE MINE SAFETY—DOG HOLES ARE TARGET

HARRISBURG.—The present 89th Congress, like the 88th and the 87th, is being asked to apply Federal mine safety provisions to all mines, regardless of size.

Federal mine safety laws now cover mines employing 15 or more workers. Pennsylvania regulations, in turn, apply to those with 5 or more men. Let out of most controls are the hundreds of "dog-holes," the Sheppton kind of mines, where 1 to 4 men work, often in complete disregard of the safety procedures developed over 100 years.

Representative JOHN H. DENT, Democrat, of Westmoreland, has introduced a bill, as he has in the past two Congresses, to have the Federal regulations apply to all mines. DENT says the record of disasters and deaths, especially in Pennsylvania, proves coverage should be extended to the smaller mines.

Safety control of the "dogholes" has been an issue in Pennsylvania since 1870, when the State's first major mine safety law was passed. Invariably, however, both in the Pennsylvania Legislature and in Congress, the case for pocketbook economy has triumphed over the cause of mine safety.

In the last Congress, Rules Committee Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, said of DENT's proposal: "This bill would apparently close down the small mines in the very areas where they are now helping to keep the economy going." SMITH succeeded in killing the measure, despite the fact that 202 Representatives supported the attempt to bring the bill out of committee while 151 opposed it.

The spectacular Sheppton mine cavein near Hazleton in 1963 should have produced increased safety legislation for small mines, just as so many other mine accidents over the years have brought about some of the more stringent safety requirements for larger mining operations in Pennsylvania.

In the one-exit Sheppton mine, one man was killed, and an estimated $500,000, including $60,000 of State money, was spent to rescue two other miners.

These fly-by-night operations contribute so much to the earth-scarring and stream pollution problems in Pennsylvania, simply because they are such marginal mines economically.

Civil Service Annuities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced bills to provide, first, for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired civil service employees, and, second, for the increase by 10 percent of annuities under $3,000 and 5 percent of annuities over $3,000.

I firmly believe that retired civil service employees need a pension boost—and need it soon. The pressure is most severe upon those retirees with annuities under $3,000. In these inflationary years, annuities of under $3,000 do not go a long way. I sincerely urge the Congress to raise these levels and give these retirees the means for a better standard of living. The plight of other retirees—even though their annuities may be over $3,000—is also real, and deserving of aid.

I also feel that the Civil Service Retirement Act should be amended to provide for the recomputation of certain annuities; namely, those of persons who, upon retiring prior to October 11, 1962, elected a reduction in annuity to provide survivor benefits for a spouse, and those of spouses being paid survivor benefits. I am urging that these annuities be recomputed under the more equitable formula established on October 11, 1962, so that those persons retiring earlier, or their spouses, will no longer be discriminated against as regards the size of their annuities.

I urge this Congress to give serious and favorable consideration to this remedial legislation.

U.S. Trade Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 27, 1965:

TRADE TROUBLES: IMPORTS EXCEED EXPORTS IN BRITAIN—BUT UNITED STATES PILES UP SURPLUS—RISING PRICES HURT SALES OF FOREIGN NATIONS' GOODS—UNCLE SAM'S CAPITAL OUTFLOW

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

In a massive turnabout of trade, nearly all the world's great industrial nations now import far more than they sell abroad.

The single mighty exception: The United States, whose multibillion-dollar trade surplus is the envy of foreign capitals.

Recent worry over the soundness of the pound sterling has riveted world attention on Britain's trade plight. Month after month, Britons have been buying far more abroad than they have been able to sell, and the subsequent outflow of funds has tended to deplete the Nation's sagging currency reserves. From Paris to Tokyo, the cry has gone up: "The British must work harder and modernize their factories. They must learn to compete more effectively in international trade."

A close inspection of the record, however, discloses there's nothing very unique about Britain's sickly trade deficit of more than $3 billion yearly. Latest International Monetary Fund statistics—based on three quarters of 1964—show combined exports of the eight leading industrial nations of continental Europe, plus Japan, are lagging some $6 billion annually behind imports.

Not entirely by coincidence, this deficit almost exactly matches the magnitude of the U.S. trade surplus, and it is a far cry from the $31.7 million surplus registered by the same nine nations as recently as 1959. (The "industrial" nations of continental Europe, by IMF definition, are the six Common Market countries, plus Sweden and Switzerland.)

Many of these nations admittedly have long sustained trade deficits. The record clearly demonstrates, however, that lands which once sported fat trade surpluses have seen their surpluses shrivel, and other nations traditionally plagued by imbalanced trade have seen their deficits grow larger.

The trade deficit of France—a nation not hesitant to proffer financial advice to its distressed British neighbor—is nearly $1 billion annually, IMF figures indicate. Only 4 years ago, France had a trade surplus of nearly $600 million.

Four years ago West Germany's trade surplus exceeded $1.7 billion. In the third quarter of 1964 the same country had no trade surplus at all—its climbing volume of imported goods exactly matched its sagging export volume.

JAPAN'S DEFICIT GROWS

Japan's trade deficit totaled $143 million in 1959. IMF statistics show the Asian nation's third-quarter deficit in 1964, on an annual basis, was nearly four times that amount.

At a time of much official fretting over U.S. competitiveness in world markets, the record of recent years helps make clear Uncle Sam's fundamental strength in the no-holds-barred battle of international trade.

The picture could change, of course; IMF figures, in fact, show some narrowing of the U.S. trade surplus in recent months.

Moreover, the road ahead is dotted with perplexing imponderables. To cite just one, protective farm policies taking shape within the Common Market seem bound eventually to crimp America's $1 billion a year sales of agricultural products to the economic bloc. For the present, however, as an IMF economists puts it: "It's plain nonsense to talk about the United States not being able to hold its own in international commerce."

Sidney Homer, a partner and economist of Salomon Bros. & Hutzler, a New York securities firm, adds: "Five or 6 years ago we were told that the United States had become noncompetitive in world markets, that the new factories of Europe and Japan, with their cheap labor, had all but destroyed our ability to sell abroad. We now know that while there was a germ of truth in this warning, the facts were vastly exaggerated."

CAPITAL FLOW PROBLEM

The record also demonstrates the degree to which the nagging U.S. balance-of-payments deficit is rooted in matters of capital flow, rather than trade. It further underscores how very little the rising exchange reserves of such lands as France have to do with the economics of commercial competition.

The nine industrial countries whose combined trade balance so drastically deteriorated between 1959 and late 1964 in the same span managed to add $10 billion to their combined supply of gold and reserve currencies. Reserves of the U.S. trade colossus in the same period plunged $5 billion.

What has happened is that the U.S. trade surplus, despite its great size, has been insufficient to offset a cascading outflow of U.S. capital—dollars for investment abroad, for foreign aid and for the defense of most of the free world. By one recent estimate American investment abroad—much of it in the very industrial lands whose trade balance has deteriorated—now approximates the staggering sum of $100 billion, nearly twice the total investment of all foreigners in the United States.

"If the United States ever decides, because of its gold losses, to clamp strict controls on this outflow of capital, a lot of foreign countries besides the United Kingdom would find themselves in a financial squeeze," warns the economist of a large New York bank. "They would have to try to get their trade balances into much healthier condition than is now the case."

Such effort would doubtless entail a good deal more economic conservatism than most industrial lands have exhibited in recent years—again, the United States is the great exception.

The table below, based on IMF data, traces what has happened to the cost of living—the generally accepted yardstick of inflation—in key industrial countries since 1959.

LIVING-COST RISE SINCE 1959

	Percent
Japan	34
Italy	26
France	23
United Kingdom	15
West Germany	13
United States	7

In view of the cost-of-living record, it's not surprising that in most industrial lands the average price level of exports has been moving up; in France and Germany, for example, the export price level has climbed roughly 10 percent since 1959. Nor is it surprising that the average price of U.S. exports has barely budged in recent years.

It's true that U.S. prices are measured from a comparatively high base; in absolute terms, the cost of many U.S.-produced goods still exceeds that of foreign-made merchandise. Nonetheless, the record since 1959 suggests there is a significant tie between the relatively high degree of inflation abroad and the foreigners' deteriorating trade posture.

A few statistics on money supply—demand deposits plus currency in circulation—help point up the economic conservatism that underlies Uncle Sam's stable price record. Between 1959 and last year, according to the IMF, the U.S. money supply rose 9 percent. In the same span, the money supply in Germany climbed 40 percent, and that was a mild rise by some standards. Italy's money supply increased 77 percent in the period, France's rose 78 percent, and Japan's rocketed 121 percent above the 1959 level.

BEHIND BRITAIN'S PLIGHT

Why, among the great industrial nations, is only Britain in such financial straits? Since 1959, its trade deficit has roughly doubled, but the record clearly shows this is the rule, not the exception.

Much of the answer appears to lie in Britain's rejection from the Common Market. In the 4 years through 1962, before French President de Gaulle dashed British hopes of joining the bloc, U.S. direct investments in the United Kingdom averaged $286 million yearly. Since then, this annual investment rate has dropped to about $150 million.

In the 4-year span before the De Gaulle rejection, U.S. direct investments in Britain amounted to 75 percent of all U.S. direct investments elsewhere in Europe. Since then, the rate has dropped to about 20 percent.

Forewarned-Forearmed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the letter to the editor, which appeared in a recent issue of the Tri-County News, an outstanding weekly newspaper in my district at Sevierville, Tenn.

Mr. Marshall P. Chapin, advertising manager for the Tri-County News, wrote me, enclosing the letter and stating in part:

"I recall in my Latin days the words 'praemonitus-praemonitus', which means 'forewarned-forearmed.'

"If Russia is only a 'Hiss' away from all of our top secrets, we need to do something about security, and we need to do it now."

The letter to the editor follows:

Dear Sir: Oak Ridge, the Atomic City, was as secret as "two plus two."

I was employed on the advertising staff of a small daily newspapers, the first time that the beehive at Oak Ridge, later to be known as the Atomic City, attracted my attention.

Our advertising director, while conducting the daily staff meeting of our advertising staff, announced a project so tremendous and so secret that only five persons in the United States had a complete knowledge of the vast development in progress at Oak Ridge.

Just 6 hours later, 7 persons (at least) knew—the engineer I asked, and I, plus the aforementioned 5.

The engineer, who was my next door neighbor, told me as calmly and as simply, as he would have given me the answer to "two plus two." The top secret objective of Oak Ridge: "couldn't be anything but an atomic bomb."

It was just that simple to him and to thousand of more employees at the "Ridge," who knew that "two plus two" equals four. Included among these were dozens of spies, who also knew that certain things add up to an atomic bomb, just as surely as "two plus two" equals four.

In a simple trusting atmosphere, cloaked with a false sense of security, Americans worked feverishily toward developing the atomic bomb, while Russian spies calmly made notes of their progress, and back in Russia work progressed that was to deve op the atomic bomb for the Russians years before certain people in this country believed that they could.

In an area overrun with spies, "two plus two" cannot remain top secret for long, especially when that "two plus two" adds up to an atomic bomb.

Proof of this was recently demonstrated as Russia developed the laser just after we did.

As long as we have Russian spies, and American traitors, Russia will be only a "Hiss" away from us in whatever we develop.

Sincerely yours,

BURL JOHNSTON.

Marshalltown Newspaper Notes Lack of Wisdom in Banning Sale of Food Commodities to Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the House of Representatives voted yesterday to reverse the position it took January 26 with respect to the sale of surplus food commodities to the United Arab Republic. I think this body acted unwisely, and without careful consideration, when it voted last month to cut off the sale of commodities to the United Arab Republic under title I of the food-for-peace law. While I disagree with almost everything President Nasser has said or done, especially in the last few months, I nevertheless believe that the Congress should act with great caution when considering any action that would tie the President's hands on matters of foreign affairs.

The Senate revised the resolution passed by the House of Representatives on January 26 so that the President may authorize the export of commodities to the United Arab Republic if he determines that it is in the national interest. The House, by refusing yesterday to tie the hands of its conferees avoided a serious mistake.

I am sure that both the House and Senate conferees will now work in good faith to reach an agreement that both Houses of the Congress can accept as being in the national interest.

There has been a good deal of comment in the press over the question of selling surplus commodities to the United Arab Republic. I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members an editorial in the Marshalltown, Iowa, Times-Republican for February 5. The

editorial makes the point that foreign trade, since it affects the national interest of the United States, is a matter that should be judged from the standpoint of long-range benefits to this Nation. The editorial states:

A study of history will reveal that it is never good long-term policy for a nation, such as the United States, to ban the shipment of food products to other nations for any reason, except in a war emergency.

And the editorial adds that:

To ban the shipment of food to Russia, or to Egypt, or to Red nations in general, is not good foreign policy if the lessons of history are to be followed, and it is dangerous to future U.S. markets to ban trade with any of these nations.

Of course, the United Arab Republic, despite many of President Nasser's policies, is not, in precise terms, a member of either Communist bloc, Russian or Chinese. But the sale of farm commodities to the United Arab Republic, just like the sale of commodities to the U.S.S.R., is a matter involving the foreign policy of the United States, and it is therefore important that the President is not hamstrung in his efforts to promote the national interest in this very delicate area.

The editorial also discusses the domestic economic advantages, including those for Iowa farmers, that can be obtained by pursuing a wise foreign trade policy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the February 5 editorial from the Marshalltown Times-Republican, together with a brief editorial from today's New York Times that echoes the views of the Marshalltown newspaper:

[From the Marshalltown Times-Republican, Feb. 5, 1965]

BEST TO SELL SOYBEANS, FOOD TO RED NATIONS

When the Johnson administration last week approved the sale of $11 million in soybeans to Russia, that put soybeans on the front page as news because of the involvement in foreign affairs and trade dealings with Communist nations. The sale of wheat to Communist nations has previously been important news and the sale of food to Egypt was being hotly debated in Congress at the same time the soybean sale to Russia was approved.

That the sale of American surplus crops to Communist nations can become deeply mixed in foreign affairs is indicated by guesses in market circles that the Soviets may be buying the beans to reship to Cuba. Government data on the use of soybeans in Russia indicate that the Soviets were simply trying to make up for a lack of soybean shipments from China and that the beans will probably not be reshipped to Cuba.

Such guesses about what Russia may do with the soybean order recalls how China's misfortune opened the way for Iowa farmers to cash in on growing soybean demand over the world.

Once the biggest producer of soybeans of any nation in the world, Red China has dropped out of the world market as revolutions and internal shifts have cut the crop. It is significant that recent and reliable farm reports from inside China indicate that soybeans are not among the crops now being grown in greater quantity in China. It can be seen also why Russia is buying U.S. soybeans to fill a shortage in shipments from China.

That the soybeans bought by Russia might also be reshipped to Cuba recalls past farm crop sales to Cuba which were highly important to Iowa farmers. Cuba, before its break with the United States, was one of the best markets for the shipment of Iowa farm crops and especially lard and pork—products for which Iowa farmers now need bigger outlets. In former years, Cuba could buy quantities of Iowa farm products, actually in exchange for sugar, because the United States was Cuba's biggest buyer of sugar. Now that we no longer import sugar from Cuba, selling Iowa farm goods to Cuba is banned, and Iowa farmers are growing more sugarbeets to help make up for Cuban sugar. But sugarbeets in Iowa do not make up for the loss of the Cuban market for other farm products.

A study of history will reveal that it is never good long-term policy for a nation, such as the United States, to ban the shipment of food products to other nations for any reason, except in a war emergency.

The American people may consider logically that they are in a "state of war" with Red China and with Cuba and hence the sale of farm products to these two nations may be banned as a temporary measure. But to ban the shipment of food to Russia, or to Egypt, or to Red nations in general, is not good foreign policy if the lessons of history are to be followed, and it is dangerous to future U.S. markets to ban trade with any of these nations.

Iowans may take note that the world demand for soybeans is now growing faster than production, and this is especially true of soybean oil. Hence, the outlook this year is for higher soybean prices and the threatened surplus may not occur.

Canada competes successfully against the United States in selling wheat to other nations, and especially Communist nations, and Canada is increasing its production of soybeans, flaxseed, rapeseed, sunflower seed, and mustard seed. Iowa farmers should note they can grow all these oilseed crops as well as soybeans, and as well as Canada does, and hence can avoid any future overproduction of soybeans.

Our editorial comments usually refer to soybeans as "Iowa's miracle money crop," and a recent Associated Press report said many farmers call soybeans "the Cinderella crop." Southern States are turning to soybeans and Iowa farmers will have more and more competition, but the demand and the price outlook are very favorable now.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 9, 1965]

SENSE ON FOREIGN POLICY

The House has acted wisely in removing the ban it had placed on sending shipments of surplus food to the United Arab Republic. Motivated by national resentment against President Nasser, its restrictive action had taken form as a move against the traditional freedom of the President to conduct foreign policy.

In reversing its stand, the House is not expressing approval of Egypt's leader; it is recognizing that Mr. Johnson must have the flexibility to deal with him. By getting out of the foreign policy act, it has put responsibility back where it belongs.

Politics and the Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to notice a growing awareness on the part of businessmen on the desirability of their maintaining an active interest and participation in politics.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a book written by David J. Galligan, entitled "Politics and the Businessman." It performs a valuable public service in bringing home forcibly the expanding role of businessmen in the affairs of their community, State and Nation. Mr. Galligan is a New Jerseyite who has done outstanding work through the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce in promoting courses and seminars for businessmen in practical politics.

I do hope that Mr. Galligan's book will help dispel apathy and indifference on the part of some businessmen regarding their vital role in the Nation's political structure.

Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Everett L. Winborn of Kalona, Iowa, has written me on a subect that should be of vital importance to all Americans—the conservation of our natural resources. I was very much impressed by the way in which Mr. Winborn expressed his concern at the possibility of cutting back public funds for conservation work on privately owned lands, and I hereby submit his letter for insertion in the RECORD so that others may read his views on this important subject:

JANUARY 28, 1965.

Hon. JOHN SCHMIDHAUSER
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am district commissioner of the Soil Conservation Service of Johnson County. I am well aware of your interest in soil and water conservation. I am deeply concerned with the possibility that funds might be cut back for work on privately owned land.

Our very productive soil will all too soon be deposited in the Gulf of Mexico for future generations to try to reclaim if better conservation practices are not expended rather than diminished.

With 70 percent of the Nation's lands in private ownership, I am sure you can readily see that public funds are vitally important to protect resources vital to all Americans both now and in future generations. Landowners are working well in advance of any government help now. Any cutback in aid would seriously cripple both the amount and the quality of soil and water conservation practices on private land.

Let us not forget the lessons learned in the dust bowl 30 years ago, when everyone felt the horrible effects of unconcerned management of the soil. I am also convinced that Americans do not expect landowners to bear any more of the monetary cost of conserving our soil and water. Americans want their water supply and food resources preserved carefully and are willing to cooperate generously, through their taxes, for such a worthwhile project.

Respectfully submitted.

EVERETT L. WINBORN.

An American Who Was Born With His Clothes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, during the past year we have had increasing interest aroused in our national immigration policy and proposals have been placed before the Congress which would change present policy. In consequence, much has been written about immigrants who came to the United States and who have contributed to our national progress.

In my Congressional District there resides a former immigrant whose story typifies the American dream in its full reality. His name is Nathan Haddad and he is now a vigorous 74 years of age. He came to this country from the Middle East over 50 years ago with little knowledge of the language, few tangible assets, and limited acquaintanceships. But, he brought with him the intangibles which really count—courage, determination to succeed, a great respect for the rights and the duties of American citizenship and a deep and generous spirit. He was, in his own words, born again in the land where he settled.

Now Nathan Haddad is closing his mercantile store and retiring from business in a community where he has been active for over a half century. Last week he published in the community newspaper, the Coal Valley News, a statement expressing his gratitude for the acceptance which gave him the chance to give of his ability without restraint to the growth and betterment of his adopted country.

In salute to a career which would do honor to any American, I offer for your consideration the public statement of Nathan Haddad. Let it remind us all once again that we are indeed a nation of immigrants:

STATEMENT OF THE MAN WHO WAS BORN IN BOONE COUNTY WITH HIS CLOTHES ON

This is my statement. It may look to some like the Haddads are disposing of their store and other property and moving away.

We are disposing of our store at 364 Main Street, Madison, the final closing date being February 27, 1965, at 5 p.m.

We have had no other choice. My son, Fred Haddad, as president of Heck's Enterprises, has his time fully occupied in general supervision of the Heck's stores at Charleston, St. Albans, two stores in Huntington, Ashland and Parkersburg, with four more stores planned for opening this year.

As for Nathan, I have retired. At the age of 74, I feel that I should disengage myself from all business activities. I have therefore decided to liquidate the Madison store.

I feel that I owe this statement to the many faithful customers who have dealt with us over the years, who have not only been nice to us, but with whom we have enjoyed a delightful acquaintance and association over these many years.

Our success in Boone County and in the adjoining area has depended upon the goodwill and patronage of the people of the valley—to all of whom I wish to express our most grateful and humble appreciation.

But I am not moving away. I have spent over 50 years of my life in Boone County, and the people here are my people. I regret to close the store. I cherish the interest and regrets expressed by so many of you; nevertheless it is time I rest from these labors.

I will stay around, however, for one business reason—to see that the Junior Haddad Recreation Center continues to serve the community.

I hope now to have more time to do everything I would like to do for the area and to participate in affairs of public need and interest.

Other than to wind up the affairs of Haddad & Co. and to see to operation of the pool, I will not be going back into business of any sort. I am definitely retiring, and from now on I intend to be a gentleman of leisure—doing what good I can in and for my community and the area—as long as my health and allotment of time permits.

For, I assure you, Madison is my home and the people of the valley are my people, and this country is my country. I came among you 55 years ago, a youth who could speak only a few words of English. I am grateful for the treatment I and my people have received. I cherish my citizenship rights and I declare my intention to live out my life in the county and community where I have not only been tolerated but permitted to become a useful citizen and my business an important part of the business and life of the area.

I hope I have been and that Haddad's has been a useful and integral part of Madison and the valley. I assure all that I cherish the acquaintance and associations I have had with each and all of you—whom I cherish as my people and my friends.

I do most sincerely regret to close Haddad & Co. store after so many fruitful years of doing business among and with you. I want all of you to believe that I sincerely regret that I must terminate this business. I shall remain among you, grateful that you accepted the Lebanese youth who came among you so many years ago.

Permit me now to express my sincere appreciation for your toleration, acceptance, friendship, and patronage over these many, many fruitful and enjoyable years. I truly hope that I have been able to return to the community and the people services and values somewhat commensurate to that which I have received.

I assure you all that I cherish my long years of citizenship and business and community associations with a free, kindly, and generous people. I am most happy to spend my remaining and, I trust, useful years in the land and among the people of my adoption whose tolerance and patronage I acknowledge and deeply appreciate.

Sincerely,

NATHAN HADDAD.

The Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who represent the States of Arizona and California this has been a historic day. It marks the end of many years of controversy and many long months of patient negotiation. Together we have gone before the House today and introduced legislation to provide for authorization of a Lower Colorado River Basin project.

The three Representatives from my State have just issued a joint news release reporting this event. I should like to call it to the attention of all my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, the news release follows:

CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Arizona's 3 House Members and 31 California Congressmen joined today in the introduction of a bill to construct the central Arizona project as part of a Lower Colorado River Basin project.

Following introduction of the bills the 34 sponsors joined in a letter requesting Chairman Wayne Aspinall of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to obtain executive department reports and schedule hearings at the earliest possible time.

"We think chances of passage this year are excellent," said Representatives RHODES, SENNER, and UDALL in a joint reelase. "This action heralds a new era of cooperation in which we can begin to solve the critical water shortage of both Arizona and California."

The legislation declares it is the intention of Congress to make the Colorado an adequate supplier of water not only for existing projects and the central Arizona project but for other projects authorized in the future. The Secretary of Interior is ordered to undertake planning to this end.

Essence of the historic compromise:

1. California agrees to immediate construction of the central Arizona project and a southern Nevada project without insisting on construction of any lower basin works for California.

2. Arizona agrees that California, which must take a cut from its present 5.1-million acre-foot use to 4.4 million acre-feet, will be guaranteed a minimum of 4.4 million acre-feet until such time as an additional 2.5 million acre-feet can be developed for the basin.

3. Congress will declare its policy to provide the additional 2.5 million acre-feet and directs the Secretary of Interior within 3 years to determine how this water can be obtained by imports from other areas, desalinization, or a combination of these and other methods. He shall submit feasibility reports on specific projects to accomplish this goal.

Water engineers say that it will be approximately 25 years before Arizona might feel any pinch from the 4.4 million acre-foot guarantee to California. Moreover, California has an equal stake in finding the additional 2.5 million acre-feet of water, the Arizonans pointed out, because (1) its existing use will be cut some 0.7 million acre-feet by the compromise, and (2) within the next few years the growth of southern California will require far more water than the 5.1 million acre-feet now being used. Thus, both States will have a powerful incentive to provide new water. Furthermore, the compromise bill provides the machinery for eventually developing more than the 2.5 million acre-feet of new water which is to be the initial objective.

The united stand by the Arizonans with the large California delegation considerably brightens prospects for action in the current session of Congress. Senators from Arizona and California have indicated they will support the new bill if it passes the House.

The central Arizona project would include Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon dams, aqueducts to carry water from the Colorado to central and southern Arizona and Orme, Buttes, Hooker, and Charleston dams. Bridge and Marble would increase river storage capacity and generate power to help pay for the project.

This initial construction would cost about $1.5 billion during the next 10 years. More than 80 percent of this would be spent for construction in Arizona.

Negotiations on the joint bill involved not only Representatives and Senators from States involved but the Governors of Arizona and California and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

The Arizona House Members praised the spirit of statesmanship shown by California spokesmen during more than a year of negotiations.

Today's bill directs the Secretary of Interior to investigate alternative sources of water, including dessalinization, weather modification, water renovation, and conservation measures. And he would plan works to import water into the basin from other areas. Provision is made for water exchange clauses to meet needs of shortage areas in Arizona outside the central Arizona project system.

The Arizonans said it is their understanding that the 2.5 million acre-feet to be made available before the California guarantee disappears may come from any source, provided such source is financed by Federal funds or by private or State funds from outside California. They said it is also their understanding that the time-honored principle of water exchange may be utilized in fulfilling this obligation. In other words, if the Federal Government were to build a plant on the Pacific coast to desalinate seawater, and the products of the plant were made available to the city of Los Angeles, the amount of water thus produced should go toward making up the 2.5 million acre-feet of new water in the Colorado Basin, they said.

Overall coordination of planning, priorities and construction in this effort to solve the region's critical water shortage is given to an advisory group to be known as the Colorado-Pacific Regional Water Commission. It would consist of a chairman appointed by the President, one member each from Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico and Utah appointed by the respective Governors, and one member appointed by each of the Secretaries of Interior; Agriculture; Army; State; and Health, Education, and Welfare. Provision is made for employment of necessary staff.

Flint: The Town Where Everyone Goes to School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring an outstanding educational accomplishment to the attention of my colleagues, who will soon be considering President Johnson's 1965 education proposals.

In the Parade magazine supplement of the January 31 Washington Post, there was an article entitled, "The Town Where Everyone Goes to School." That town is Flint, Mich., the largest city in my district with a population of 200,000 persons, 50,000 of whom are students.

The Flint public school system is one of the most progressive and highly advanced systems in the United States and I am delighted its excellence has been accorded national prominence.

Success, however, comes only to those who are determined to achieve it—and the Flint story is a prime example.

The system today is the result of the hard work and commendable efforts of the Flint Board of Education, Charles S. Mott, a civic-minded philanthropist who annually donates $2.3 million through the Mott Foundation and the taxpayers of Flint who consistently support school proposals.

If we, as Congressmen, are looking for the proof that community education programs are effective in combating unemployment, in curbing juvenile delinquency, and in promoting civic improvement, let us look to Flint.

At this point, I would like to insert the aforementioned magazine article which, I believe, justifies my statements:

THE TOWN WHERE EVERYONE GOES TO SCHOOL

(By Sid Ross and Neal Ashby)

FLINT, MICH.—"Nobody in Flint wants to stay home and watch TV," says 18-year-old Sandra Wogen. "There's too much going on at the schools."

And afternoons, evenings, and weekends, they don't stay home in Flint. Mothers, dads, kids and grandparents flock to the city's 50 schools to learn, teach, play, plan, and participate.

For in Flint, every school is a community school, and members of the community make full use of them for recreation, sports, clubs, adult education classes, social gatherings, and cultural programs.

One citizen doesn't ask another if he's going to school tonight, but what he's going to do there.

Stanley Wogen, a 43-year-old auto plant employee, may attend a men's club meeting while his wife, Eleanor, teaches a flower arrangement class. Their four children, one of whom is college freshman Sandra, have spent hour on hour at their schools, taking part in organizations, activities and special classes.

Flint schools open at 8 a.m., when the Sunrise Singers practice in many of the elementary buildings. When classes end at 3 p.m., the adult-community activities go into action until 10 p.m.

Fees of only $1 to $5 are charged for each of more than 1,000 adult education courses. These are waived for those 65 and older. Every woman on the Wogens' block has taken at least one adult course.

All other community school activities are free.

The Wogens first became involved in the program more than 10 years ago, when they moved into the community of Merrill Elementary School.

Eleanor, a native of Flint, had left high school to marry Stan Wogen during World War II. Then, in 1953, the first thing she did was return to Northern High School to get her diploma in the evening session.

That first summer the Wogens put little Sandra into the Merrill School's "tot lot" recreation program. The same year Stan and Eleanor joined the new men's and women's clubs, which immediately began work on benefit projects.

NOT JUST TAXPAYERS

"More and more," Mrs. Wogen recalls, "we all began to feel, really feel, that the adults, the community, were part of the school system, not just taxpayers."

When Sandra entered sixth grade she joined the Merrill "Teen Club," and her parents acted as chaperones at club parties.

Soon afterward, Mr. and Mrs. Wogen joined the "Couples Club," which meets one Saturday night a month for gymnasium sports and dancing.

Sandra, after a young lifetime of after-school lessons and activities, is now a summertime Tot Lot leader. She has liked school so well in Flint that she's taking a teaching course at Flint Junior College.

Scott Wogen, 14, is a ninth grader at Emerson Junior High, whose men's recreation group he highly approves. With a slight twinkle in his eye, Scott says: "It gives the fathers something to do at night."

Says Wendie, 13, an eighth grader at Emerson: "All the activities at the schools kept the people and families together." She is one of nearly 15,000 current members of Flint schools' Teen Clubs.

Even more outspoken in his praise is 9-year-old Randy Wogen, a fourth-grade pupil at Merrill School.

"I talked to other kids who moved here from other places, and they said they didn't like school," Randy relates. "We kids don't understand that. In the summer we have sports and shows. We have movies on Saturday. I spend most of my time at school."

How did Flint's schools get so different from others in the Nation? In 1935, Flint industrialist-philanthropist Charles S. Mott, now 89, gave the board of education $6,000 to keep a few schools open after classes as an anti-juvenile-deliquency measure.

It's all grown from there, to a point where the C. S. Mott Foundation now donates $2.3 million a year toward the Flint community schools program, the only instance in the United States in which a foundation aids a local board of education.

But the program suffers no lack of support from this industrial community of some 200,000 persons, 50,000 of whom participate actively.

Since its depression-time inception, the community schools movement has curbed juvenile delinquency, provided breakfasts for children who come to school hungry and turned weed-covered plots into parks.

Schools over the Nation are open an average of 1,400 hours a year. The Flint total is 3,800.

Take a Look at New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by John M. Cummings which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on January 28, 1965, concerning that great leader, the Honorable James A. Farley of New York.

TAKE A LOOK AT NEW YORK

(By John M. Cummings)

There are so many facets to the career of James A. Farley that it was not surprising to find that in the cultural line he is an authority on Benjamin Franklin.

Now, as everyone knows, Ben Franklin, Boston born, is claimed by Philadelphia as its very own. Here he lived for all but a few of his earlier years. And here, such mortal remains as may have survived the natural processes of time, lie in the graveyard of historic Christ Church.

It was a bit surprising, however, to discover that New York has an organization known as the International Benjamin Franklin Society, Inc. It was before this organization with the imposing name that genial Jim delivered himself of some observations on the man who, as a lad of tender years, walked up from the Philadelphia waterfront with a loaf of bread tucked under his arm.

In this town, of course, we have the Poor Richard Club which, at its recent annual dinner commemorating the birthday of B. Franklin conferred its gold medal on the president of the Coca-Cola Co. The Franklin society in New York performed a similar service for the president of Coca-Cola Export Corp., Jim Farley.

There was no Coca-Cola in B. Franklin's day. When the new arrival from Boston walked up High Street with a loaf of bread under his arm, he ate it dry. Or maybe he got a draught of water from a friendly householder or the fountain where city hall now stands.

New York is "the greatest city in the world—and everything is wrong with it" according to the title of a series of articles currently appearing in the Herald Tribune. There may be some who might doubt the truth of the first claim to fame, but the confession of weakness is all too apparent to resident and visitor alike.

Nevertheless, the old town puts on a good front. Now that Mildred Custin is over there the general tone of Fifth Avenue and other high-toned mercantile neighborhoods is likely to be enhanced. The chief trouble with New York has its roots deep in politics. Ever since the white man bilked the Indians by purchasing Manhattan Island for $24 in cheap, gaudy beads, sharpsters have been at work. Legend has it that Brooklyn Bridge has been sold and resold to gaping yokels a dozen or more times.

Just now the World's Fair in the "greatest city in the world" is in trouble. It has a financial bellyache. A day or so ago a tavern keeper over there offered $3½ million to rescue it from complete disaster. It is expected to resume business for a second season in April.

Jim Farley is in no way to be blamed for financial distress of little old New York. As a student of Franklin he knows something of Poor Richard's maxims. It was Franklin's view that a penny saved is a penny earned. Boss Tweed disposed of this, as applied to government, many years ago when he headed for a foreign shore with a good part of the treasury.

Just now much of the political trouble is centered in Albany. For the first time in 30 years the legislature is in Democratic hands. And the Democrats, fighting among themselves, have been unable to organize either the senate or the assembly, Mayor Wagner, of New York, has accused the chairman of the State Democratic committee of attempting to bribe certain of the Albany statesmen in the effort to effect an organization in both chambers. A Democratic Governor, Franklin D. Roosevelt, once chased Democratic Mayor Jimmy Walker from his perch.

From all this Jim Farley stood and still stands above—quarreling members of the party he once served as national chairman; and the country as Postmaster General.

The little men running Democratic politics in New York these days have no feeling for Farley, unless it be hostile. And now BOBBY KENNEDY, New York's new U.S. Senator, reputedly is deep in the fray, Jim Farley could do worse than throw in at this the maxims of B. Franklin.

Arthur Dunn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years the Members of Congress have been well-served by Arthur Dunn, a pleasant and kindly man who operated the elevator in the House Wing of the Capitol, which serves the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Members going to the House Chamber from other floors.

We were saddened to learn of his passing last Wednesday night, February 3, after a short illness. Through his approximately 19 years of service on Capitol Hill, Arthur Dunn earned the esteem and friendship of all those he served so well. We shall long remember his cheerful greetings as we appeared for work each day, and I want to extend my deepest sympathy and condolences to the members of his family on their great loss.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD at this point an article about Arthur Dunn which was written over 10 years ago by Robert Bauman as an English theme in the Capitol Page School.

Through the years Arthur Dunn retained all the fine qualities mentioned by Mr. Bauman. This thoughtful little article applied just as appropriately to Arthur's last days of work as it did 10 years ago when it was written.

ARTHUR DUNN

(By Robert Bauman)

Each morning when I arrive for my day's work at the Capitol I ride the elevator to the second floor. Although elevators are usually very uninteresting places there is one thing that makes this one outstanding. It is the little man who runs it.

This man's name is a simple one—Arthur Dunn, and he is, himself, as unpretentious as his name. He is a jolly little man, not more than 5 feet 2 inches and he gives a sparkling "good morning" to me and the same greeting to everyone, be it page or lawmaker. Arthur has a quality which not many men have. He has the rare gift to radiate happiness.

Some gloomy days, when things seems to be going all wrong and it looks as if the Republicans might not be able to win control of Congress in the next election, I get on board Arthur's elevator and his cheery greeting makes me feel better immediately. He has that power.

In this world of skepticism and struggle, it is good to know that there are still people like Arthur with his bright bow tie, who can make you feel glad you are alive.

I think a remark that Senator MUNDT made recently applies to Arthur Dunn particularly. The Senator said: "We all need to do our work with a smile on our face but a serious purpose in our heart."

Who Can Think of a Better Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, present difficulties in Alabama growing out of the movement to equalize civil rights have received as much public attention in recent weeks as our critical affairs in South Vietnam. Much of the editorial comment has been repetitious of positions previously taken, and has contributed little to a better understanding of the problem.

An editorial by Jack Maurice, editor of the Charleston, W. Va., Daily Mail, however, states the essentials of the situation in clear and unequivocal language. Those who believe Federal intervention in State and local affairs must come only as a last resort will appreciate the choice of alternatives offered to the people of Alabama.

The editorial follows:

IT IS RUDE, CRUDE, AND PLAIN TIRESOME, BUT WHO CAN THINK OF A BETTER WAY?

For our part, we would greatly prefer that Martin Luther King did not insist so righteously upon his demonstrations. All this marching back and forth has a tendency to tie up traffic, disturb the peace, overcrowd the jails, and depress business.

Our prejudice and preference aside, the fact remains that unless Dr. King and his followers do demonstrate, nothing ever happens in an area where something is bound to happen and long overdue. These people are clearly entitled to register and vote. Every law book in Alabama and the United States says so.

Alabama may set its qualifications for voting pretty much as it pleases (this, too, is in the law), but once it sets them, it must apply and enforce them equally. It cannot require the white man to recite his name, age and address in order to qualify and require the colored man to commit the Constitution to memory and recite it backwards in order to register and vote.

The good folk of Selma do not see it this way and take exception to the rule. They are living out a myth whereby they assure themselves that they have a right to live by the law of their preference even as they deny others the same guarantee. They set great store, for example, in the law against disturbing the peace and no store at all in the laws defining civil equality.

For a society which makes any pretenses to freedom and equality this poses a difficult problem. It is the problem of how to disestablish a minor version of the police state without erecting a major version of the police state upon the wreckage.

For all of the censure heaped upon him as an "outsider" and "professional agitator," Dr. King thinks there is a way. It lies in confronting Alabama with a choice between doing something to end this basic civil inequality or living in a continuing and vexing unrest.

There is a lot wrong with this method, the worst of it being the fact that it should not be necessary. But this is not really the question. The question is this: All else failing, who has thought of a better way to bring the irresistible force to bear upon the immovable object?

Minnesota School Boards Association Opposes Extension of School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from Mr. W. A. Wettergren, executive secretary of the Minnesota School Boards Association, expressing the association's opposition to extension of Federal aid to education. Mr. Wettergren says MSBA's opposition is because "money is being put where it is not needed and programs known by

the school board and superintendent to be in need of assistance go unnoticed."

I believe my colleagues will find MSBA's assessment of value, and submit it for the RECORD:

JANUARY 27, 1965.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
U.S. Representative, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE NELSEN: The Minnesota School Boards Association recently completed their annual convention in the St. Paul Auditorium. The attendance this year was the highest ever with a registration of over 3,200 school board members and superintendents of schools. This association sets the educational policies for over 97 percent of the pupils in the public schools of Minnesota.

During the annual business session on Wednesday, January 13, with but three dissenting votes, the membership again passed a resolution opposing the further extension of Federal aid to education. This position was even more adamant than ever before taken by this association.

I believe it is fair to indicate this position is taken due to the fact that the Federal moneys being put into private education have not been as effective as they should have been. There is entirely too much interference from Federal and State authorities over how this money is to be distributed and for what purposes. No one person, or board, in Washington or in St. Paul, can really state to a certain school district and board in a certain area that this is what is good for you and your district, consequently, money is being put where it is not needed and programs known by the school board and superintendent to be in need of assistance go unnoticed.

If we must have this program I would suggest that more practical thought be incorporated into the program. Certainly we must bless the educator, the colleges and universities, and State departments of education, but we must be reminded that "theory without practical application develops a somewhat hopeless situation."

It is my humble opinion these are some of the reasons for what we believe to be the failure of Federal aid to education programs on the elementary and secondary level. The Minnesota School Boards Association is opposed to the extension of this kind of a program.

Sincerely,

W. A. WETTERGREN,
Executive Secretary.

Anniversary of the Independence of Ceylon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, after more than four centuries as a colony of European powers, Ceylon became a sovereign state within the British Commonwealth on February 4, 1948. Last week the people of this small pear-shaped tropical island, just off the southern tip of India, celebrated the 17th anniversary of this historic occasion. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate His Excellency, the Governor-General of Ceylon, Sir William Gopallawa, the Prime Minister, Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, and His Excellency, the Ceylonese Ambassador to the United States, M. F. de S. Jayaratne.

Ceylon has always been an important connecting link in trade between the East and the West. Its tea, rubber, and precious gems have been an irresistible lure since the times of the sailing ships. Ceylon is also a major link in the world's air transport system and an important base in the world's network of communication.

Soon after it became independent, Ceylon sought membership in the United Nations, but was barred for 7 years by the veto of the Soviet Union. In December 1955 it finally became a member of the world organization. Ceylon is now an eager participant in the U.N. efforts for peace as well as in programs of the specialized agencies. It is also a charter member of the Colombo Plan which was organized in 1950 at a meeting in Ceylon's capital city of Colombo.

American-Ceylonese relations have always been friendly. Trade relations have been mutually satisfactory between the two countries, and there is increasing cultural exchange. The continued political and economic evolution of Ceylon as a free and independent democratic state is important to the United States.

Our country has made known to the people of Ceylon its sincere interest in their efforts to help themselves. In the 18th year of Ceylonese independence, this can best done by helping them to increase their food and industrial production and to build their confidence in their ability to make economic and social progress through a democratic society.

Freedom Award Presented to AFL–CIO President George Meany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of an address by AFL–CIO President George Meany at the Freedom Award dinner of the International Rescue Committee, Wednesday, January 27, 1965, at the New York Hilton Hotel, together with a copy of an article about this award which appeared in the AFL–CIO News of January 30.

Through his great service to free world labor, George Meany has earned this high honor which places him with such distinguished previous award winners as Adm. Richard E. Byrd, Sir Winston Churchill, Gen. William J. Donovan, and Mayor Willy Brandt of free Berlin.

In his address responding to this honor, President Meany delivered a message on the dangers of Communist aims and efforts to remold the world on the pattern of totalitarian dictatorship which should be heeded by us all.

I am presenting President Meany's speech for inclusion in the RECORD as a means of giving it the broadest possible dissemination which it deserves.

The material follows:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS BY AFL–CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY TO THE FREEDOM AWARD DINNER OF THE INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE, JANUARY 27, 1965, AT THE NEW YORK HILTON HOTEL

I deeply appreciate the honor which you have bestowed on me this evening. I accept it not as a personal tribute to me but rather as a recognition of the contribution of the American trade union movement to the cause of human freedom and democracy.

For three decades the International Rescue Committee has worked tirelessly and effectively in that same cause. The Committee has endeavored to bolster the spirit and sustain the courage of the victims of tyranny to give them asylum and moral and material support, and to build their capacity as fighters for right and justice.

The great mass of refugees aided by the IRC were not human beings fleeing from natural disasters like floods or earthquakes; nor were they displaced by the force of embattled armies locked in combat. They were refugees from manmade calamities—from the terror of governments engaged in the ruthless extermination of the rights and freedom of their own people. That is the great tragedy of their lives and of our times. That is the tragedy that all men of reason, hope and good will must join in averting wherever it threatens.

The American trade union movement has a long history of devotion to the cause of human freedom all over the world. Today, to a greater extent than ever before, we were active in that cause.

The representatives of American labor are at this moment lending their support to the advancement of workers' freedom in Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

To give you some idea of the scope of our involvement in this work, more than 24 percent of the income of the national AFL–CIO is spent outside the country—though we do not expect to ever be repaid or to collect any dues in these faraway places.

Why should American labor be interested in the conditions of workers in Bolivia, Nigeria, Pakistan, or Ghana? For that matter, why were we active in rebuilding free trade unions in France, Germany, Japan, and Italy in the crucial years immediately following World War II? The answer is really very simple—we are interested in the achievement and preservation of free societies on the practical theory that every instrument of oppression that exists anywhere in the world is a potential threat to the continued existence of democracy and freedom in this land of ours.

Let us imagine, for a moment, where we would stand here in America if the Soviet plan to extend communism to all of Latin America by way of Castro's Cuba were to be successful. To what extent would such a circumstance jeopardize our free way of life here in the United States?

We know from actual experience that trade unions cannot exist in any atmosphere except that of freedom.

Likewise we know from bitter experience in our lifetime that no dictatorship of any kind whether of the Hitler type or the Soviet type can exist without controlling the lives of the workers and their organizations.

President John F. Kennedy made this point very well when he said in addressing a trade union convention in West Berlin on June 26, 1963: "I urge you gentlemen, in meeting your responsibilities to those who belong to your unions, to also realize that your unions will not survive except in a world of freedom. I urge you to hold out, as we are trying to do in the United States in the AFL–CIO, a helping hand to those who seek to organize trade unions in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. This is how a free society remains free."

That is why we in the labor movement in America take the position that, in any approach to the complex and crucial problems of the world today—human freedom is basic and fundamental.

We want a world in peace, but we mean peace with freedom—not the peace of the slave labor camp or the surface tranquillity of people living in constant fear of a tyrannical government. We support the principle of international cooperation to ease world tensions, but we are convinced there can be no permanent cooperation or relaxation of tension between nations without that mutual trust and respect that can come only where all enjoy the dignity of freedom.

We are convinced beyond question that there is no long-range hope for world peace unless it is based on the elemental spirit of freedom that lies within the breast of all men.

While American labor uses its influence and material resources to defend and preserve free societies all over the world, our No. 1 concern is with the preservation of a free way of life here at home.

We make no apologies to anyone for our defense of the American system. Oh, yes, we are constantly portrayed by Communist propaganda as capitalist lackeys, or agents of Wall Street—but this does not concern us very much. We can prove beyond question that we have acheived more for the workers of America through free trade unions operating within the American economic system than have the organizations of labor in any other place on earth—no matter what label they operate under, be it Socialist, Communist or any other.

Very frankly, we of the trade union movement like this system. We, of course, intend to continue our efforts to improve the standard of America's workers by improving the system. We do not propose to abandon it for a pipe dream or some ideological fantasy conjured up by those who do not understand the real needs and aspirations of a working people.

I believe that most American businessmen are coming to recognize the role of the trade union movement as a bulwark of our American system. I do not mean, of course, that we have no disagreements or conflicts. But I have observed over the years a growing appreciation by thoughtful leaders of industry, of the vital part that strong and responsible trade unions play in our system and in the defense of our democratic free way of life.

An outstanding example of this is the American Institute for Free Labor Development which was established in Washington by the AFL–CIO to train young Latin American workers in the fundamentals of trade unionism as it is practised in this country.

This is a joint venture. Many employers have joined with us in this undertaking and these employers are part and parcel of the American Institute for Free Labor Development and they provide equally with the labor movement the financial support that makes the institute possible.

Similarly, it should by now be clear to businessmen as well as workers, to management as well as labor, to intellectuals and farmers no less than to our Government leaders that all of us have a vital stake in the preservation of that system.

The idea that some can make progress or profits by doing business with those who would destroy all of us is just plain nonsense. If we lose the cold war, if totalitarian communism engulfs the entire world, as the leaders in Moscow so fondly hope, not only trade unions but business management, profits and all other aspects of our present system will be wiped out. No single group or element in our society will be spared.

In this light, I wonder why some of the leaders of American industry have been calling for the expansion of trade with and the extension of long-term credits to the Communist regimes. Surely, they know that no Communist Party in or out of power has dropped its basic aim to remold the entire world on the pattern of totalitarian dictatorship.

Why then are some of our businessmen so eager for our Government to grant economic concessions to the Communist dictators? Why are they so disinterested in the requirement, beforehand, of steps that might warrant the resumption of normal trade relations, by reducing world tension and eliminating the causes of the cold war? Why are they now indifferent to the proposition that concessions should be called for in return, such as an end to Communist aggression in South Vietnam, dismantling of the Berlin Wall of Shame, agreement to German national unification in freedom, and the acceptance of international inspection and supervision of disarmament? I wonder why these businessmen, in their eagerness for profits, have forgotten the disastrous experience of "business as usual" with the Nazi and Fascist dictatorships prior to World War II. Have they forgotten how the New York City Third Avenue elevated scrap iron sold for a profit to the Japanese war lords came back to the American people in the most cruel casualties at Guadalcanal? Surely they do not want the enemies of freedom to be so strengthened by American long-term credits and technical proficiency as to be encouraged to resort to new aggressions which might precipitate a nuclear conflagration.

One prominent industrialist recently urged the extension of trade with all countries as a solution to world problems. He said: "I think the place to start is in commerce and trade. It is the best, because you are not concerned with the economic, political, or religious views of those buying your product. The only thing that matters is profit and competitive advantage."

This man, who is not alone in his view, apparently believes that he can do business in an international vacuum.

He would have us believe that the political differences between American democracy and the Russian and Chinese Communist dictatorships are similar to the political differences between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. Obviously, it is easy for one who believes that "the only thing that matters is profit and competitive advantage" in commerce with the Communists, to equate the differences between the great religious faiths with the differences between the ideology of communism and the ideals of democracy.

Why should American free enterprise seek to rescue its sworn enemies from the snare of their own economic fallacies? The Russian and Chinese Communists share a common basic aim—the destruction of democracy and the free enterprise system throughout the world. They only differ as to how they would bury us.

With help from American industry, the Soviet Communists might overcome some of their present serious economic difficulties. With such American help, they would find it less difficult to accelerate their production of more destructive nuclear weapons and at the same time ease the heavy burdens of armament on their disillusioned people.

But will such American business policies and practices help our country and promote freedom and world peace? Will it help strengthen democracy in its world-wide struggle with dictatorship? Or will such economic aid to the Kremlin only help the Soviet dictatorship in its policy of arming for Communist world conquest.

Those who would risk weakening essential liberty to purchase a little temporary profit deserve neither liberty nor profit. President Lyndon Johnson reflected this conviction when he struck the following keynote in his message on foreign aid:

"We live in a turbulent world. But amid the conflict and confusion, the United States holds firm to its primary goal—a world of stability, freedom, and peace where independent nations can enjoy the benefits of modern knowledge. Here is our difference with the Communists—and our strength. They would use their skills to forge new chains of tyranny. We would use ours to free man from the bonds of the past."

Why provide the Communist rulers with "skills to forge new chains of tyranny"? I do not question the patriotism of these confused captains of American industry. But I would point out to them that the American business community has been doing quite well in garnering profits without strengthening the enemies of our democracy. Why endanger our entire free enterprise system by putting faith in the promises and pretensions of the Communist leaders? Why should we help them avoid the pitfalls and perils of their own false and despotic doctrines?

These shortsighted advocates of business as usual could learn much from the refugees aided, over the years, by the work of the International Rescue Committee. Among the artists and scholars, scientists and simple workers, they would find men of business and industry who could tell them much about the economics of trade and commerce under tyranny.

They would find men of wealth whose property was taken from them; businessmen whose enterprises were seized; and merchants whose profits were forfeit.

When freedom was lost, all was lost. All came to the same level and were driven to the same last hope—escape to freedom, leaving all else behind. In the light of their experience, can anyone seriously propose that we should feed tyranny with one hand, while we welcome its refugees with the other? I am perhaps too simple to comprehend the virtue of such logic or the necessity for such duplicity I believe in the cause of freedom; I cannot understand that we can advance that cause if we sell it out, for a bit of profit or a better balance of trade.

In the fight for freedom, our country and its leaders should always have a sense of the urgency of the world crisis. Let us always show a feeling for the people under the yoke of dictatorship. Let us never forget that the exiles and refugees of today are the symbols and spokesmen of a cause that is also our cause. In their hands, firmly clasped with ours, is the tomorrow of freedom.

Let us keep faith with them. Let us not lend aid and comfort to their oppressors.

In the final analysis this is exactly what the International Rescue Committee stands for.

[From the AFL–CIO News, Jan. 10, 1965]

MEANY BIDS U.S. BUSINESS REJECT TRADE CONCESSIONS TO COMMUNISTS

NEW YORK.—AFL–CIO George Meany challenged American free enterprise to refuse economic concessions to Communist regimes whose basic aim is "the destruction of democracy and the free enterprise system throughout the world."

The AFL–CIO leaders spoke here at a testimonial dinner in his honor sponsored by the International Rescue Committee, which presented him with its Freedom Award. Previous award winners have been Adm. Richard E. Byrd, Winston Churchill, Gen. William J. Donovan, and Mayor Willy Brandt of Free Berlin.

A message from President Johnson lauding Meany's service to free world labor and terming the award "most appropriate" was read by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Meany's address raised serious and probing questions about a strongly developing campaign in some business and industry circles to grant long-term credits and expand trade between the United States and the Soviet Union and its satellites.

He stressed that the labor movement strongly supports the Nation's economic system because "we have achieved more for the workers of America through free trade unions operating within the American economic system than have the organizations of labor in any other place on earth."

Secondly, he pointed out that Communist parties throughout the world still retain as their chief objective the overthrow of the free enterprise system and remolding the entire world on the pattern of totalitarian dictatorship."

Thirdly, while American labor supports international cooperation to ease tensions, "we are convinced that there can be no permanent cooperation or relaxation of tensions between nations without that mutual trust and respect that can come only where all enjoy the dignity of freedom."

With these postulates, Meany then asked a series of rhetorical questions: "Why so eager?"

Why are those American businessmen who are so eager for economic concessions to the Communists indifferent to the proposition that concessions should be called for in return—such as ending Communist aggression in South Vietnam, dismantling the Berlin "Wall of Shame," agreement on German unification in freedom, acceptance of international inspection, and supervision of disarmament?

Why should the American free enterprise system seek to rescue its sworn enemies from the snare of their own economic fallacies? With such American help, said Meany, the Communist countries would find it less difficult to accelerate their production of more destructive nuclear weapons and at the same time ease the heavy burdens of armament on their disillusioned people.

Meany, who earlier had been referred to as America's No. 1 freedom fighter, was given a standing ovation by an audience which consisted of political, labor, and business leaders. Cochairmen of the dinner were President David Dubinsky of the Ladies' Garment Workers and Stuart T. Saunders, board chairman of the Pennsylvania Railroad.

The AFL–CIO president quoted from Johnson's message on foreign aid, in which the President had stressed that our difference from the Communists is that they would use their skills to forge new chains of tyranny.

Describing them as confused captains of American industry, Meany asked those favoring economic concessions to the Soviet bloc, why provide the Communist rulers with skills to forge new chains of tyranny. He warned that free enterprise would be endangered if we were to place faith in the promises and pretensions of the Communist leaders.

Referring to the 32-year record of the IRC in helping refugees from totalitarianism, he asked if one could seriously propose that we should feed tyranny with one hand, while we welcome its refugees with the other.

IMMIGRATION LAW QUERIED

Honorary chairmen of the dinner were New York's Senators JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, and ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Democrat. JAVITS, who spoke briefly, said that there was a unique opportunity in the present Congress to change the McCarran Act on immigration. He criticized its shortsighted handling of refugees and said that there were many injustices imbedded in this law.

The IRC, beneficiary of the dinner, is a private, nonsectarian agency which provides relief and rehabilitation services to democratic refugees on five continents.

Personal Diplomacy: Only a Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the naive manner in which President Johnson begged the dictators of the Soviet Union to meet with him this year typifies the muddled thinking that now dominates our foreign policy. There is no reason to believe that President Johnson would be more effective in dealing with Communist dictators than were Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, who cooperated so graciously with Stalin at Yalta and Potsdam.

Columnist Max Freedman, writing in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, very effectively analyzes the history of Presidential contacts with Soviet dictators.

The article follows:

PERSONAL DIPLOMACY: ONLY A HOPE

(By Max Freedman)

It is too late now to offer advice on this matter to President Johnson. He has announced that he expects to visit Russia this year and to be host to the Russian leaders in this country before the year ends. If, after this announcement, the exchange of visits does not take place, there would be an ugly new phase in Soviet-American relations. We can now only mark the limitations of the kind of personal diplomacy to which the President is pledged.

There can be no doubt of the verdict of traditional diplomacy. Most diplomats would want the President to stay at home and to leave the negotiations with Russia to our Ambassador in Moscow and the State Department. They have little trust in personal diplomacy, attended as it is with vast publicity, raising false hopes, bequeathing a smudge of imprecise impressions instead of exact agreements, and mocking the brave promises with cruel disappointments. They have ample precedents both here and in Britain to justify their doubts.

The most calamitous experiment in personal diplomacy was conducted by Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain. In the months that preceded the disastrous Munich agreement, he cast aside and derided the warnings of the Foreign Office and made his chief adviser, Sir Horace Wilson, an official of the Treasury Department with no special competence in foreign affairs. This particular folly will certainly be avoided by President Johnson. He will have all the expert knowledge of the State Department at his call and he will use it.

Even with this powerful assurance, doubts still remain. Dean Acheson, speaking with his incomparable authority as a former Secretary of State of immense distinction, has repeatedly warned us that the risks far outrun the gains when any President engages in personal diplomacy with the men in the Kremlin. There is a compulsion on the President to bring home some agreement that will prove that the meeting has not ended in failure. Sometimes this agreement is a mere illusion, at other times the agreement has been bought at too high a price.

Mr. Acheson sees a special merit in the American system which keeps the President above the details of actual negotiation and allows his power to be used with decisive effect as the final guardian of America's interests. He would have the President depart from this position only under the most exceptional conditions. It is doubtful if such conditions now exist.

On the public record, from President Wilson's journey to the peace conference in 1919 to President Eisenhower's meetings with the Russian leaders, celebrated with mocking brevity in "the spirit of Camp David" and "the spirit of Geneva," there is nothing to dispute the wisdom of Mr. Acheson's warning.

Nor was President Kennedy's experiment more successful. He went to the Vienna conference at short notice after the disaster of the Cuban invasion. He had the laudable purpose of forming a personal estimate on Khrushchev—just as President Johnson now wants to form his own judgment of Russia's new leaders—but the Vienna conference soon led to a new crisis over Berlin and the meeting with Khrushchev did not prevent him from sneaknig missiles into Cuba.

Even at the time the weakness of the Vienna conference was clearly apparent. No summit conference with Russia should ever take place without thorough diplomatic preparation in advance and unless certain issues have been defined in a way which can be settled only by the personal decisions of the supreme leaders. Both these fundamental rules were ignored and violated by our side before Vienna. It is greatly to be hoped that they will be fully observed now. Otherwise President Johnson may enjoy a brief personal triumph at the price of a long-term injury to American interests. This paradoxical and dangerous result is quite possible in this sort of personal diplomacy.

It is, of course, very desirable that President Johnson should go to Western Europe before his trip to Russia. He is fully aware of the proper sequence of priorities. One hopes that the consultations with our European allies will help him in the Moscow talks, though he will not negotiate anything affecting their interests without their consent.

In short, there is nothing to do now but join in the general hope that President Johnson will not only gain pleasure from his trip to Moscow but will also fulfill his high purpose of strengthening the moment all this remains a hope, not a conviction.

Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh, Pa., Post-Gazette of Monday, January 25, 1965:

WINSTON CHURCHILL

The world has lost the greatest figure of this century in the death of Winston Churchill. He was more than one of the outstanding British statesmen of all time; he was by virtue of his unrivaled attainments truly a citizen of the world.

There is so much to admire in Sir Winston's amazing career that one hardly knows where to start in appraising it. Where most men are distinguished if they succeed in only one career, he was brilliant in several. Sir Winston wrote enviable records as a journalist, historian, soldier, and statesman. In the latter role he came not only to embody the bulldog determination of the British people but also to fire imaginations and inspire the

whole free world to turn back the threats of totalitarianism.

Who will ever forget this leader's inspirational messages in the darkest hours of World War II, when it seemed all too likely that Great Britain might succumb to Nazi Germany? Even now we can hear his thrillingly sonorous voice as he responded to Hitler's threat to invade Britain: "We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills, we shall never surrender."

And who will forget these memorable words as Sir Winston became Prime Minister in 1940: "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat."

He had much more to offer, of course. He has courage, talent, patriotism and enormous vigor—all of them spent unsparingly in the preservation not only of Britain but of free men everywhere.

Sir Winston's fabulous career spanned three generations. At least two of them knew him as a titan on the stage of world events. He did much more for history than to write it; no man of his time did more to make it. His place in it will be secure for so long as men can read. The first 60 years of this century may justly come to be known as the Churchill Era.

While civilized people everywhere will mourn the passing of this remarkable man, none will be moved so deeply as the members of the English-speaking world to which he contributed so much. Certainly we Americans will feel the loss as keenly as if he were a U.S. citizen by more than congressional adoption.

Kathy Balderson Tells "What My Country Means to Me"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, one of my young constituents, an eighth grader by the name of Kathy Balderson, of Weiser, Idaho, recently won first place in an essay contest sponsored by the Weiser Junior Chamber of Commerce. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include her essay as it was published in the February 4, 1965, edition of the Weiser, Idaho, Signal.

The essay follows:

"WHAT MY COUNTRY MEANS TO ME"

(By Kathy Balderson)

To me America is many things.

America symbolizes life. When President Kennedy was tragically slain on November 22, I was suddenly frightened. Suddenly America was without a leader. If perhaps the world's greatest leader could be felled couldn't the world's greatest country also fall? It was a frightening thought. Then I had no idea what being a true American was. I did not know that a true American could pick himself up after a great downfall with a smile on his face, if tears in his eyes. Americans did just that. In that same horror-filled 24 hours America had a new President, a new symbol of greatness.

America is a symbol of security. I know that I don't have to fear that tomorrow a new government run by hate and fear will rule. I am safe in the thought that police are ready to protect my safety; courts to protect my rights. I know there are no secret police or governmental spies to fear. I feel safe in the thought that I won't suddenly be cut off from my family and friends by an inhuman, unsurmountable wall.

America's vastness is thrilling. Every type of geographical difference is found here. The people are also different according to their surroundings. Yet they are all bound together in the same spirit of Americanism, a spirit of adventure. This spirit led settlers ever westward seeking vast lands unmarred by human hands. This same spirit remains today in modern America, our space experiments, our atomic research. As long as Americans remain there will always be with them this same longing for discovery and exploration.

But most important of all is freedom. What else could inspire a handful of adventurists to defy in the 1700's the greatest military power in the world? It was the love of freedom that inspired President James Monroe to issue in 1823 the Monroe Doctrine so that South American countries could love as we love this great gift from God. Wasn't it God that gave us the insight to see the true meaning of freedom? How else, unless it was His will, could a remote group of colonists have defeated, against overpowering odds, Great Britain? How could our Constitution have survived so many years with so few changes unless it was meant to be written?

Yes, freedom and the United States of America were meant to be.

I love my country.

Eagles Urge End to Age Discrimination in Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie 290 of Manchester, N.H., has forwarded to me a copy of a resolution urging adoption of national legislation to outlaw discrimination in employment based on age.

I applaud my brother Eagles for their efforts to focus attention on an important national problem. The problem is complex, with competing policies in fierce conflict. Unfortunately, when the policies of Big Government and big interests are in conflict, the legitimate rights and aspirations of the individual are all too often lost.

Because the problem of employment discrimination due to age is a deeply important one, I am placing this resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO ADOPT LEGISLATION OUTLAWING DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BASED ON AGE—40 TO 65

Whereas job barriers against older workers in industry are cruel, wasteful and unsound and deprive the economy of much valuable skill and experience; and

Whereas the most neglected man in the employemnt picture today is the man between 40 and 65, who is too young to retire on social security but too old to find a job; and

Whereas by 1975, one-third of all Americans will be between the ages of 40 and 65 and considered unemployable by a majority of employers; and

Whereas discrimination in employment based on age deprives persons in the prime of life of the earnings they need to provide a decent standard of living for themselves and their families and causes persons from 40 to 65 to live under the shadow of constant fear that, if they lose their job, they will be unable to find another; and

Whereas it is irrational for a society to do with one hand everything possible to extend the life of man while, with the other hand, writes him off as useless because of the date of his birth; and

Whereas in 1964 Congress adopted Public Law 88-352 which makes it an unlawful employment practice for an employer with 25 or more employees and engaged in an industry affecting interstate commerce, to discriminate against employees or applicants for employment because of their race, color, religion, sex or national origin; and

Whereas, section 715 of Public Law 88-352 provides that the Secretary of Labor shall make a study of discrimination in employment because of age and shall report the results of such study to Congress not later than June 30, 1965, "and shall include in such report such recommendations for legislation to prevent arbitrary discrimination in employment because of age as he determines advisable": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States be requested to enact at their present session legislation which will make it an unlawful employment practice for employers to discriminate against employees or applicants for employment because of their age being between 40 and 65.

RAYMOND P. SOARES,
President.
WILMOT G. MERRILL,
Secretary.

The Past, Present, and Future of the Manpower Development and Training Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an address by Mr. R. C. VanWagenen, chief of the Business Education Division, California State Department of Education, delivered to the California Council of Business Schools.

This address is a perceptive analysis of the impact of the manpower development and training program and the potential of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as well as a provocative illustration of the problems that we can anticipate in the near future.

All too often we find that we are so busy coping with day-to-day problems that we fail to anticipate the problems of tomorrow and thus multiply the difficulty of dealing with those problems. It is comforting to learn that men such as Mr. VanWagenen are looking toward anticipating tomorrow's problems by creative thinking today.

Mr. VanWagenen's speech follows:

THE PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

(Talk given by guest speaker for the conference, Mr. R. C. Van Wagenen, chief, Bureau of Business Education, California State Department of Education)

Study the past. The past is prolog (Archives, Washington, D.C.). The Manpower Development and Training Act, along with other Federal legislation, was passed to alleviate some of the social problems growing out of displacement of workers brought about through automation and technological change.

EVENTS LEADING UP TO THE PASSAGE OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

There were a number of forces at work in our society which gave impetus to the passage of a new (Manpower Development and Training Act) education act. These forces created a series of events which developed pressures on educators, legislators, and various groups seeking solutions to many of our social problems. Some of these events or forces at work were:

1. The rising rate of unemployment, especially among youth.
2. Increased interest of the public and the press in education as a possible solution to some of our social problems.
3. The rapid increase in the birth rate has produced surplus workers in many occupational categories, especially in the entry positions.
4. The impact of the increasing participation of women in the labor force.
5. Pressures from minority groups.
6. Political pressures for full employment and accelerated national growth.
7. General recognition that former vocational acts were not adequate to deal with our labor and employment problems in the space age.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE ROLE OF EDUCATION

Donald N. Michael, director, planning and programs, Peace Research Institute, said in a speech at the American Vocational Association convention at Atlantic City: "Since there will be fewer jobs in the future for the unskilled and the semiskilled worker, there will be a growing number of persons who will be economically useless in the economic sense of the word." He said further, "The answer to our problems growing out of automation is education. This education is difficult to come by. It is a mass job for millions, and we have to change the whole educational bureaucracy. This will be a slow process. We should have started 10 years ago. Vocational education should now begin to educate for leisure time as well as for a vocational pursuit. The general feeling is that we will solve this problem as we have in the past through a little ingenuity. The problem is, we have had no experience with automation in the past. Therefore, we have no background for solving this particular type of problem. There are more dead civilizations than live ones, which would indicate some of these civilzations were not able to adjust to social change."

UNEMPLOYED YOUTH AND ADULTS

It is difficult to visualize what the social consequences might be if 80 percent of the labor force would be supporting 20 percent of the unemployables on social welfare programs. Our social welfare programs in the Nation have grown at an alarming rate. The national cost is second only to defense. The answer to the rising rate of unemployment for both youth and adults, according to the experts, is both education and the creation of new jobs associated with a faster rate of national growth.

THE GROWING UNEMPLOYMENT OF YOUTH

Large numbers of youth are out of school and out of work. The rate of unemployment for minority youth groups is even higher. Unemployed youth in our large cities is social dynamite according to Dr. Conant. The fuse is already being lit by organized groups in some communities. Unemployed youth and the problems related to it are receiving national attention in government, in the press, in education—in fact, throughout society. The problem of youth employment is further compounded by the fact that 3 million new workers will be entering the work force each year at the end of the decade that started with 2 million new workers per year.

THE DIMENSION OF THE PROBLEM

The President's Committee on Youth Employment in its report published by the Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, said, "Today's youth are tomorrow's adults—production and service workers, technicians, professionals, clerks, and managers—parents or other heads of families. For most, their admission to this adult world, their badge of belonging, is a job. The kinds of jobs they used to be able to fill are disappearing, and many of the jobs that are available demand much more skill and training than they now can offer. To hundreds of thousands of boys and girls between 16 and 21, the problem is immediate and desperate. Among these are tomorrow's castoffs and chronic dependents, those who will live in poverty of body and mind, and who will bring up their children in their own image."

INCREASING PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN THE LABOR FORCE

A revolution in women's employment has occurred in the course of the present century. One-third of all women in the United States age 14 and over are in the labor force in any given month. It is estimated that this percentage will rise over 50 percent in the next decade. This means that young women should be trained in our schools for gainful employment in anticipation that a large number of them will spend many years in the labor force.

Our experience in administering the Manpower Development and Training Act has revealed the fact that there is an increasing number of women unprepared to assume their role as head of household and provide financial support for dependent children. Many of these women now receiving aid to needy children lack salable skills necessary to secure employment. The mounting cost of social welfare programs in all categories is of great concern to this Nation.

PRESSURES FROM MINORITY GROUPS

Minority groups tend to suffer most from unemployment in the large metropolitan areas. Many of those minority groups lack the basic education necessary to succeed in an occupational training program. The jobs available to these youth in the unskilled and semiskilled classes are very limited. Unemployment breeds unrest, delinquency, and despair. Minority groups very often resort to group action as they strive to gain equality in employment and social status.

POLITICAL PRESSURES FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT AND NATIONAL GROWTH

A high rate of employment is always the dream of the political party in power. There is always a concern that this Nation remain strong, ever moving ahead toward new goals of national growth.

There was a time when the leaders of this Nation were concerned with the missile gap. At the advent of sputnik our educational system responded to pressures to train more scientists and improve the offerings of the basic subjects. The National Defense Education Act was a tonic to undergird science, math, and foreign language, etc. The driving force on our educational system was to keep up with the Russians in the missile race. Recent events show that we still lag. A new challenge appears on the horizon. Dr. James B. Conant, president emeritus of Harvard University, makes this observation: "Today the fate of freedom in the world hangs very much in balance. Our success against the spread of communism in no small measure depends upon the successful operation of our own free society. To my mind, there is no question that a healthy body politic necessitates a sound economy and high employment. The history of communism shows that it feeds upon discontented, frustrated, unemployed people. Unemployment among youth under 20 years of age is about 17 percent, or more than twice the rate for all workers. These young people are my chief concern, especially when they are pocketed together in large numbers within the confines of the big-city slums. What can words like 'freedom,' 'liberty,' and 'equality of opportunity' mean to these young people? With what kind of zeal and dedication can we expect them to withstand the relentless pressures of communism?"

The Congress passed the Manpower Development and Training Act legislation and other acts by an overwhelming majority indicating its interest in improving our employment picture while at the same time attacking some of the chronic social problems.

THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM IN BUSINESS EDUCATION

Let us look at the record of the Manpower Development and Training Act in its past 2 years of operation as far as business education is concerned.

The Bureau of Business Education has supervised the Manpower Development and Training Act programs during the school years 1962–63 and 1963–64.

Enrollments in business classes for 1962–63 were 1,385. Of this number, 959 completed training, or 69 percent; and 670 persons who completed training found employment, or 49 percent of those originally enrolled, or 70 percent of those completing training.

Enrollments in 1963–64 were 2,200. Of this number 1,006 completed training and 683 are still in training. Taking into consideration those completing and those still in training, this shows a holding power of 77 percent at this time.

Job placement figures are now available for programs which have enrolled 704 persons during 1963–64. These figures show 512 completed the training or 73 percent. Of the number completing the training, 361 or 51 percent found employment up to June 30, 1964.

Private business schools offering business training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act accounted for about 15 percent of the training programs.

HOW HAS MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT CONTRIBUTED TO SOLVING SOME OF OUR SOCIAL PROBLEMS?

How stable is this program?

1. Not all persons who enroll in the classes finish the training, but by far the majority have—nearing 77 percent.
2. Not all Manpower Development and Training Act trainees find jobs after training, but the majority do soon after finishing training—about 70 percent. Others find training-related jobs.
3. Not all Manpower Development and Training Act students succeed on their jobs, but by far the majority do, and employers generally are commendatory.
4. Not all trainees are appreciative of the opportunity to get training for gainful employment, but by far the majority are most appreciative.

WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THE TRAINING PROGRAMS?

About 60 percent are general clerks and clerk typists.

About 20 percent are stenographers.

About 5 percent are secretaries.

About 2 percent are salesmen.

Other training programs are reproduction typists, medical secretaries, general clerks,

duplicating machine operators, comptometer operators, etc.

WORK OF THE BUREAU

The publications (publications available on request):

Progress report of business education programs under Manpower Development and Training Act.

Sample business education training plans conducted under Manpower Development and Training Act.

Two business education conferences of teachers for Manpower Development and Training Act programs.

A LOOK AT THE FUTURE OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

1. The act requires one-third matching of Federal funds under this act for fiscal 1965 and 1966, and 50 percent thereafter. This raises a serious problem for both private and public schools. It is not known now whether the State or local schools will match the amount needed or whether the Federal act will be amended.

2. The Economics Opportunity Act (poverty) is now becoming operative. It requires matching of 10 percent in kind, which may mean use of facilities rather than outlay of cash. Much of this money—nearly $1 billion in this act—will go for education. It is estimated that California will receive about $70 million. It is not known whether or not this act will overshadow the Manpower Development and Training Act, especially for disadvantaged youth.

3. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 will take up the slack, but this also is a 50-percent matching. This raises a question as far as private schools are concerned.

4. Individual referrals are now coming through, and we find private schools can handle these referrals perhaps better than public schools in the main. The matching is a factor here after July 1, 1965.

Manpower training and retraining will be needed more in the future than in the past because of the rapid rate of technological change.

Here are some general observations and predictions:

It is opportune that we examine the situation in which we find ourselves after 12 years of experience with the electronic brains.

Is the computer running wild? Here are a few observations from an article in the U.S. News & World Report, February 24, 1964:

"There's a boom in electronic brains—and it's skyrocketing. They're taking over in offices, factories, banks, government. Is it all to the good?

"For a dozen years now, computers have been doing amazing things.

"People talk about computers that read and write, design airplanes, create music, balance assembly lines—computers that almost think for themselves.

"All that, it turns out, is just the start, a rough beginning.

"What scientists are working on now are computers that will develop their own intuition and emotion. They will speak when spoken to, be able to see and hear. Computers will play hunches and make their own decisions.

"There is talk of machines with chemical instead of mechanical brains, able to outperform man and, in a sense, able to reproduce themselves.

"Today's best computers—or electronic brains—are crude when compared to what lies ahead."

THE COMPUTER IS 12 YEARS OLD

"This boom in computers came almost overnight. It was a dozen years ago that the first commercial computer was installed in the United States. That first model is now on display as a historical relic in the Smithsonian Institution.

"Look around the country and you find almost 20,000 computers in action. They range from desk-size models to mammoth machines that fill six-story buildings, costing from $20,000 to $6 or $7 million. You can choose from a hundred different models and makes.

"Sales are booming. More new equipment was introduced in 1963 than ever before, and 7,000 new computers are on order. The total domestic market for computers, peripheral equipment and services climbed to $3.5 billion in 1963, and will climb higher this year. A decade ago, annual volume was about $10 million."

THERE IS A SHOWDOWN COMING IN AUTOMATION

"The big issue is jobs. There are fewer jobs for men and more for 'electronic brains' to be found in factories. The question that is raised:

"Is automation a boon—or a curse?

"In the glass industry, 14 men attend the glass-blowing machine that makes 90 percent of all the glass light bulbs produced in this country.

"In the auto industry, 10 operators man a machine that turns out motor blocks. Ten years ago, 400 men were required to produce the blocks.

"In electronics, 2 workers now turn out 1,000 radios a day. A few years ago it took 200 men to do the same job.

"Electronic brains make automation of this kind possible, enabling machines to control their own operations and make their own decisions with little or no human aid.

"Labor leaders claim that automation of this kind is putting 2 million men out of work each year.

"Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, sees a crisis ahead, contends that new machines and technology will throw 28 million men out of work in this decade. George Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, calls automation a curse. Labor points to a specter of a chronic mass army of unemployed.

"Top businessmen contend that without automation the United States will fall by the wayside against foreign competition. At stake are billions of dollars in profits and America's still favorable trade position abroad.

"Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board, of United States Steel Corp., argues that automation—like it or not—is here to stay: 'Even if it were possible to block change in America, or to slow it to a snail's pace, other men and other nations would merely pass us by while our dragging feet trudged to national oblivion.' "

SOVIETS AHEAD OF UNITED STATES IN THEORY OF AUTOMATION

Dr. Norbert Weiner, noted scientist, reacted to questions as follows:

Question. "On your last trip to Russia, did you find the Soviets placing much emphasis on the computer?"

Answer. "I'll tell you how much emphasis they're placing on it. They have an institute in Leningrad. They have one in Yerevan in Armenia, in Tiflis, in Samarkand, in Tashkent, and Novosibirsk. They may have others."

Question. "Are they making full use of this science, in a way comparable to ours?"

Answer. "The general verdict—and this is from many different people—is that they're behind us in hardware—not hopelessly, but slightly. They are ahead of us in the theorization of automation."

TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTIONS ARE AS OLD AS THE HUMAN RACE

"The first man who picked up a club to brain his enemy made bare hands obsolete.

"The control of fire, the invention of agriculture, the domestication of animals, the smelting of metals, the invention of writing, of money, and of printing, the industrial revolution—each of them seemed to those in their throes to be primarily the occasion for injustice and suffering; but each of them eventually freed the human race for more meaningful and creative lives. There is one major difference between the onset of cybernation and all of the previous technological revolutions. We can see this one coming, and to some extent get ready for it.

"The domestication of the horse made the human being obsolete as a beast of burden. For a while, perhaps, he was out of a job; but he did not descend to the horse's level. He became a rider.

"The invention of the horseless carriage made the horse obsolete as a beast of burden. He became a pet. The man on horseback became the man behind the wheel.

"Cybernation may make the man behind the wheel obsolete as a driver. But he will not become obsolete as a human being. We may no longer need him to guide the movement of a mechanical conveyance; but we need him to help guide the destiny of the human race."

AUTOMATION AND BUSINESS EDUCATION

It is estimated that computers generally are used 80 percent of their time to solve business problems or for business applications and 20 percent for scientific applications. What does this mean to business educators? It means, briefly, that we must identify the new jobs now being created and those which are being eliminated and make adjustments in our business education programs accordingly.

Mrs. EDITH GREEN, Congresswoman from Oregon, said in her presentation at the national meeting of private business schools: "It is a national waste to train for jobs which no longer exist. Some of our vocational education programs are still designed for jobs created at the beginning of this century."

ONE OF THE ANSWERS TO AUTOMATION AND TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE IS EDUCATION

Our Founding Fathers developed a basic concept of education when they said, "Man is capable of governing himself." It works this way or it should. If because of ingenuity man develops sophisticated machines which produce an economic good, man also must find solutions to the social problems the machines create. If he does not solve these problems he cannot govern himself, neither can he survive as an individual. Education for the new technologies created is of major concern to the Nation at this time.

What will happen if we do not solve our social problem of unemployment through education? One solution is to pay persons not to work, as we pay farmers not to plant crops.

Robert Theobald, an expert on cybernation, talks about income provisions in a cybernated era in his book, "Free Men and Free Markets."

"The moment of truth in automation is coming a lot sooner than people think. The shattering fact is that the United States is still almost totally unprepared for the approaching crisis.

"Two percent of the population—by implication the 2 percent at the upper administrative levels—will, in the discernible future, be able to produce all the goods and services needed to feed, clothe, and run our society with the aid of machines."

Mr. Theobald states that in an automated society it might shortly be impossible to provide conventional market-supported jobs for everybody and that a part of the population would therefore be deprived of any possibility of obtaining sufficient income. We would need, then, to develop new concepts to justify new patterns of income distribution. In particular, it proposes that each individual in the United States should be guaranteed an income which would be adequate to allow him to live with dignity.

How this may come about or the social problems it would create is not known at

this time. It is important to note that many economists and sociologists are now talking about such solutions.

Before we try such solutions, we must thoroughly explore the role of education to solve our grievous problem of unemployment.

Theobald says: "If cybernation makes it impossible to provide market-supported jobs for all, the individual will feel guilty and society will resist any set of measures which provide income without commentorial toil. On the other hand, it will be recognized that it is unjust to deprive people of an adequate income if their toil is not needed in the productive system."

If the Manpower Development and Training Act fails, other acts will come into being; for education is the American way. It will be a costly process, but less costly than subsidizing persons in idleness and much better for the individual and the Nation in general.

Education Aid for the Needless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by Charles Withers and appearing in the February 6 issue of the Rochester Post-Bulletin of Rochester, Minn. I am calling this editorial to the attention of my colleagues because I think it is an outstanding example of local reaction to the Federal Government's shotgun approach to every problem of American society.

I think you might find that this reaction of astonishment is indicative of similar feelings throughout the country.

IS ROCHESTER SCHOOL DISTRICT "NEEDY"? "YES," ANSWERS SPENDTHRIFT UNCLE SAM

(By Charles Withers, Post-Bulletin editor)

For months this Nation has been scolded by politicians, educators, columnists, and commentators about the plight of nonwhite pupils in "deprived" school districts. Any person with an ounce of compassion had to agree that something meaningful had to be done to improve schooling for Negro children from culturally backward homes. It was said that preschool experience is essential for such children, that the school must substitute for the home because otherwise these "deprived" youngsters are already a year behind middle class white pupils by the time they begin kindergarten, and then the educational gap widens.

In his education message to Congress last month, President Johnson earmarked $1 billion to help educate children of low-income families. Immediately the huzzahs went up that at last this Nation has seen the virtue of spending Federal tax money to help educate poverty stricken children, rather than wait about 15 years and have to spend even more money for relief and welfare programs for unskilled, unlearned unemployables.

So far, so good. As we said, no one with an ounce of compassion could deny that the Federal Government does have a necessary role to play in helping ghetto school districts and other "deprived" school districts. It would undeniably be in the national interest to spend money to train and educate such youngsters rather than to have to carry them on the dole years later.

But hold the phone, it doesn't seem to work that way.

The administration in Washington, as Democrats are so likely to do, didn't shoot at this particular problem with a rifle. No indeed, a great big shotgun was used to pepper every conceivable school district.

Do you think that the Rochester School District is a "deprived" district? Or that the other school districts in Olmstead County and throughout the First Congressional District are?

Well, here's news for you: the bureaucrats in Washington do.

In fact, it's estimated that 85 to 90 percent of all public school districts in the Nation will qualify to dip their hands into that $1 billion of Federal largesse.

Under President Johnson's Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, a "needy" school district is described as one which has at least 100 public schoolchildren ages 5 to 17 from families earning less than $2,000 a year, or such children must make up at least 3 percent of its enrollment.

This writer asked Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE to check the Census Bureau and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington, D.C., for their figures relative to the President's proposal. Here are the figures QUIE was given for the entire First District of Minnesota:

County	Number of families earning $2,000 or less	Number of children (5 to 17) in these poor families	Percentage of all children in county (5 to 17)	Estimated amount of money to be received
Olmsted	1,406	1,000	6	$255,000
Dakota	1,074	768	4	195,000
Dodge	664	478	13	121,000
Fillmore	1,462	1,038	17	264,000
Freeborn	1,432	1,017	10	259,000
Goodhue	1,259	882	10	224,000
Houston	822	593	13	151,000
Mower	1,358	971	7	247,000
Rice	1,263	896	9	228,000
Steele	866	632	10	160,000
Wabasha	743	538	12	137,000
Winona	1,398	997	10	253,000

As you can see, there is going to be plenty of Federal money available for every school district. Never mind that this means that the Federal Government won't be able to do anything important for the really "deprived" kids in ghetto school districts. It's much more important to spread that dough all around the country. You can influence a lot more voters that way. Just like with Medicare—it won't be of much help to the really hard-up patient, even though it is propagandized on that basis, because too much of the resources will be wasted satisfying those who don't really need it.

But that's the good old political shotgun approach, friends. Never mind that little target that really needs help and could easily be taken care of with a rifle. Get out the blunderbuss, boys, and scatter the pellets on everything and everybody in sight. Not only do you buy more votes that way, you also keep expanding the power and control of the Federal Government at the expense of local and State government.

Oh, yes, we almost forgot. We printed above the figures for the counties in the First District. Such full information was not available for the principal cities but here's what we could get:

Number of families earning $2,000 or less

Rochester	517
Red Wing	270
Austin	423
Albert Lea	317
Faribault	358
Owatonna	260
Winona	586
South St. Paul	226
West St. Paul	127

So you don't have to worry, "needy" Rochester and "needy" Austin, et al, will get their full share of all those luscious Federal dollars going to their counties. The entire "needy" First District will be showered with something like $2.5 million in plums, and all of Minnesota is said to be in line for $19.2 million in Federal goodies.

And best of all, friends you can be pretty sure that this is just the beginning of kindly, generous Uncle Sam's handouts for all these "deprived" school districts. The amount is virtually certain to grow in years to come as all kinds of new needs are uncovered.

So you and I and everyone else who didn't realize that Rochester and Olmsted County were in such terrible distress that we couldn't handle the problem on the local and State level, have now been so informed by good old Uncle.

As taxpayers we can all feel grieved, but don't you really feel sorry for the truly "deprived" kids in those ghettos who will never be helped enough to catch up this way?

Which Is Best for Our Nation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Harold Norman, editor of the Elmore, Minn., Eye, has consistently supported improved Kerr-Mills protection to other medicare proposals because he believes "it will do much more for those who need it." I place Mr. Norman's persuasive comparison of health plans in today's RECORD:

One of the first administration bills to be presented in Congress, and which is expected to be passed, is medicare. This newspaper has been against medicare since it was brought up 2 years ago, and has favored the Kerr-Mills form of medical assistance.

Let's look at the two bills and see which is best for our Nation. First, medicare provides up to 45 days in the hospital; 90 days if you pay $10 for the first 9 days; or up to 180 days after a deduction of 2½ times the average cost of 1 day's stay in the hospital. It provides 60 days nursing home care in a "skilled nursing home facility" following hospitalization. There are only a few of these in the United States. It will include outpatient hospital services for diagnostic studies only, during any 30-day period after an initial payment of $20. Home health service would be furnished by a visiting nurse for a maximum of 240 visits in the calendar year.

What medicare doesn't cover: bills for drugs, medicines, dentures, eyeglasses, or hearing aids; doctor bills, whether office visits or house calls; surgeons' fees or dentists' bills.

Kerr-Mills will provide, in addition to hospital and nursing home care, funds for doctors, dental care, private nurses, laboratory and X-ray facilities, and drugs. This plan, financed for the needy and near needy, is available without cost and is financed by Federal funds matched by participating State funds. Since 1960, when the act was authorized, 42 States have participated in whole or in part. Where it has failed is in States that have not administered it properly. But this is a local problem and can be corrected.

Those favoring medicare object to the Kerr-Mills bill, first because it is operated by the States and the Federal Government has no control. Second, the plan is for those

over 65 that cannot afford hospital or medical care. There are no benefits for those that can take care of their own medical bills.

Dr. Walter Judd, a medical doctor and a former Congressman, in an article in the Reader's Digest, states, "Medicare does not permit, it compels every wage earner to participate. The wage earner does not contribute, he is taxed. The medicare taxes paid during the wage earner's working years do not go to pay the heavy costs of medical care in their later years. The taxes they pay today would go to pay today's beneficiaries. Tomorrow's benefits would have to be paid for by tomorrow's taxpayers."

Because medicare provides aid to all persons over 65, whether they need it or not, its benefits to those who do need aid are wholly inadequate. This program, which is to be "hooked" to social security, has many people worried about the heavy burdens that will be placed on them by social security.

In 1936 when social security started, the tax was 2 percent of the first $3,000. Now it is up to 7.25 percent on $4,800. In 1966 it will be 3.25 percent, even without medicare. If medicare passes the tax will be 9 percent on $5,600, and at least 10 percent the following year. The Government always underestimates costs on programs such as this, and many believe that the tax could go as high as 15 percent and still not pay the costs.

The proponents of medicare state that over half of the persons over 65 have incomes of less than $1,000 a year. This they did by figuring wives and unemployable dependents, and not just counting the head of the house. Dr. Judd states that only one-third of the income of Americans over 65 comes from social security. That amount is $35 billion. He adds that the income of the aged has risen much faster than the cost of medical care. While the number of older people raised by 40 percent in the past 10 years, their income rose 130 percent, compared to 80 percent increase for the entire population.

Kerr-Mills is a much better answer than medicare, because it will do much more for those who need it. Medicare is a step in the door to future socialized medicine.

How Free Is Free?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

One of Indiana's most remarkable citizens is J. Irwin Miller, of Columbus.

He is chairman of the Board of Cummins Engine Co., a former president of the National Council of Churches, now a member of that body's executive committee; a trustee of the Committee of Economic Development, the Ford Foundation, and Yale University.

His leadership in many fields, his service to many good causes, and his abiding sense of duty to his fellow man has brought him many public honors. In response to an award made in Indianapolis, Mr. Miller spoke on the subject: "How Free Is Free?"

The Indiana Civil Rights Commission was so impressed with his remarks it obtained permission to reprint them in pamphlet form and I offer them for the RECORD.

HOW FREE IS FREE?

(By J. Irwin Miller)

In our recent national discussions on civil rights, on the proper role of government, and on the fate of the individual, we too often make the mistake of not beginning at the beginning. We plunge directly into arguments about our present circumstances and what we do not like about them as if somehow, were everything changed to suit us, the world would be set right.

Now it is quite true that we live in an age where the forces of bigness, especially of big government, are making themselves felt upon the individual. It is further true that these forces may even, one by one, be taking the individual's liberties away from him.

The trend started when government first started. With the coming of primitive governments, our distant ancestors lost the freedom to murder their neighbors. With the establishment of our own new and revolutionary government, our young individuals lost the freedom not to go to school. They were deprived of the right to choose to be illiterate.

My great-grandfather kept a cow in his front yard in downtown Columbus. That freedom is now denied me. I even have to chain or fence my dog. We have lost the freedom to manufacture impure foods, to sell narcotics, to run open gambling houses, and to keep slaves. What are things coming to?

Now this isn't wholly funny. We once had each of these freedoms. Were those times better times? Would we choose to return to them? I think we would not like to return to them, and I think there is some profit in asking ourselves why we choose not to return to a wholly unregulated society.

Let us begin by asking which society is truly the freer society? When one man murders another man, there are two freedoms involved, not one freedom. There is the freedom to murder at will, and there is the freedom not to be murdered at will. Since you cannot grant one of these freedoms without denying the other freedom, you come up against a fact that seems to be all but overlooked in today's debate: Freedoms compete with each other.

When you have to deal with competing freedoms, it follows that you may have to choose one freedom as being more desirable than its competing freedom, and you are therefore forced, as a society, to deny one freedom in order to grant the other. In recognition of this inevitable state of affairs, our ancestors generations ago decided that the freedom not to be murdered was a more desirable freedom than the freedom to murder.

One man's freedom to own slaves denies to another man the freedom not to be enslaved. One man's freedom to keep pigs inside the city limits denies to another man the freedom to drink pure water. And so on into areas a great deal less dramatic, where the competing freedom is more easily obscured and the choice a great deal more difficult to make.

MY PROPERTY RIGHTS

The house in which I live is my house. Surely I should be allowed to rent or sell to persons of my own choice. If private property does not mean that, what does it mean? I have built a business which now employs many people. I will survive competition only if I choose my employees very carefully. If I cannot choose my own workers for my own business, what does private enterprise mean? Or if I cannot choose whom I will serve or whom I will not serve in my restaurant, my store, my lunch counter, if I am not free to do that, what is left for me of this free society we all talk so much about?

The key word here, I think, is the word "me," "my," "mine." What do I mean when I say my house, my business, my restaurant? Does anything happen to the worth of my house if the firemen have no concern for fires in the neighborhood, or the policemen about robberies in the neighborhood, or the neighbors about trash and weeds in their frontyards, or about thoughtless ill-trained children in their families?

ACCORDING TO FOUNDING FATHERS

Back in 1783, one of our Founding Fathers had some thoughts on the subject. In that year Benjamin Franklin wrote to another Founding Father, Robert Morris, and this is what he said:

"All property, except the savage's temporary cabin, his bow, his matchcoat and other little acquisitions absolutely necessary for his subsistence, seems to me the creature of public convention. Hence the public has the right of regulating descents and all other conveyances of property, and even of limiting the quantity and the uses of it.

"All the property that is necessary to a man for the conservation of the individual and the propagation of the species is his natural right, which none may justly deprive him of, but all property superfluous to such purposes is the property of the public who, by their laws, have created it and who may therefore, by other laws, dispose of it whenever the welfare of the public shall demand such disposition. He that does not like society on these terms, let him retire and live among savages. He can have no right to the benefits of society who will not pay his club toward the support of it."

What does that last word "club" mean? I had to hunt to find out, but I learned from the dictionary that in the 17th and 18th centuries one meaning was "A combination of contributions to make up a total sum." So what is Ben Franklin saying? Is it not something like this: Everything which I call mine and to which I attach most worth is a combination of continuous contributions voluntarily given by others. If they withhold their contributions, which many are free to do; my neighbors—their manners and thoughtfulness; my workers—their willingness to work honestly for me; my customers—their willingness to buy from me; if they withhold all these contributions, then my property, my house, my business each has a very great deal less worth to me, if indeed any worth at all.

Franklin is saying further: You or I have no right to this combination of voluntary contributions which I call my private property unless I too make my club—offer my voluntary contributions to the property and rights of others—in amounts and quantity sufficient to confer on their private property the worth which I wish to attach to my property. To Ben Franklin suppliers, shareholders, workers, managers, customers, even the communities in which they are located, are all, in effect, owners of a business, which must be run and managed in the interest of each, not neglecting the others.

FROM JUDEO-CHRISTIAN TEACHINGS

Our Judeo-Christian tradition has even more frightening advice for us. We are told in Christian Gospel that he that would save his life (what more valuable piece of private property?) must lose it; that a man must order his life, operate and employ his property for others or their value to him will vanish.

We have a long-established newspaper in my State which carries every day at the top of its front page a memorable piece of scripture, scripture that is concerned with freedom and liberty: "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." And what is this spirit of the Lord? The first public words uttered by Jesus spoke of it: "He opened the book and found the place where it was writ-

ten "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor.' "

Liberty for each of us is found not at all, unless it be found in a dominant sacrificial concern for the liberty of the other fellow, and especially the deprived and disadvantaged. Property has no value for any of us unless each of us has a primary care for the property rights of the other fellow, and especially of the other fellow least able to look out for himself.

HOW FREEDOMS ARE LOST

Ben Franklin, through his hard experience in building a society in the New World, and Jesus and the prophets in their wisdom, all saw here a law as immutable, as inexorable as the law of gravity—a law which, if violated, brought penalties as severe as those which attend the violation of any of the laws of the physical universe. So the surest way to lose freedom to own a home of one's choosing is to attempt to deny that freedom to another. The surest way to lose the free access to learning and education is to deny that freedom to someone less powerful than oneself. The surest way to lose the freedom to run my business is to run it on contempt of the general interest.

Government may fall into this error, too, and enact arrogant or unwise laws. But government cannot, therefore, be barred from this field any more than we should be barred from owning a house simply because some are bad householders. Government must be concerned with the preservation of our true freedom, or we shall all destroy ourselves in a fearful jungle of our own creating. Government in attempting to steer us truly into conformity with the laws of nature and of our own being is working to save us from ourselves, to preserve our freedom against the most deadly of freedom's poisons. There is no danger that besets us today which is more grave than this: that we shall fail to understand the nature and demands of freedom and, in so failing, extinguish freedom's life in our midst.

The man or woman who today fails to place his own interest and rights second to the interest and rights of the most deprived members of our society is working for the destruction of this good society as surely as is any enemy overseas.

Government cannot guarantee to preserve us from ourselves, but government can restrain us from outright suicide. Our present course could become a suicide course unless we choose better. Government, school, and church can help us to will to choose a better way.

Winston Churchill and the Human Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include an editorial in tribute to Sir Winston Churchill, written by Mr. Norman Cousins, distinguished citizen of New Canaan, Conn., and editor of the Saturday Review of Literature. This editorial appeared in the February 6, 1955, issue of that magazine:

WINSTON CHURCHILL AND THE HUMAN POTENTIAL

What is it that is most significant about the response to Churchill's death? Is it the size and depth of the outpouring of acclaim and grief? This is not what is most significant. Several times during the 20th century—most notably following the deaths of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mahatma Gandhi, John F. Kennedy, Jawarharlal Nehru, Pope John XXIII—there have been worldwide demonstrations of loss deeply felt. What is most significant about the response to Churchill's death is the reflection in it of the changes he created in the people he reached. In speaking to the strength inside people, he caused that strength to come into being.

The human potential is the most magical but also most elusive fact of life. Men suffer less from hunger or dread than from living under their moral capacity. The atrophy of spirit that most men know and all men fear is tied not so much to deprivation or abuse as it is to their inability to make real the best that lies within them. Defeat begins more with a blur in the vision of what is humanly possible than with the appearance of ogres in the path of a hell beyond the next turning. Because of Winston Churchill, millions of people discovered their ability to come fully alive. They knew they faced total danger, but he helped them to find their capacity for total response. They also learned it was far less painful to pit the whole of themselves against a monstrous force than it was to sit on the sidelines half alive. And the beginning of the end of the Hitlerian nightmare came not when the Nazi military juggernaut was at last slowed down but when free men became unblocked inside, when they stopped equivocating about values, when they put aside relativistic notions of good and evil, and when they came to respect the rights of generations yet unborn. They lost what they most needed losing, their cynicism and awkwardness in the presence of greatness. It was not rhetoric alone that enabled them to do this. It was the recognition the rhetoric gave them that history was what men made it.

Courage to him was more than a spirited charge into a hurricane of flying bullets. It was a wondrous human assortment—hearty laughter, warm feelings, and the enjoyment of living in general. The ability to come fully alive was to be seen not solely in terms of a full adrenalin response to danger but in comprehending the creative possibilities that come with the gift of life. There was nothing freakish about versatility; what was unnatural, rather, was the man who permitted himself to develop in only a single direction. The highest privilege was the freedom to choose; the meanest affliction was to live without option. He gave options to a world quickly running out of time and space.

In all the acclaim accorded Winston Churchill, little has been said about his impact on the philosophy of his time. Yet one of his most profound contributions to his age was the evidence he offered that men are not at the mercy of historical determinism, that they do not need to worship their helplessness, as has happened occasionally under existentialism. Churchill stands in the great tradition of Franklin-Holmes-James in the proof he offers that the uniqueness of man is represented by his ability to reverse old forces and create new ones. Churchill claimed he did no more than to sound the roar. He did much more. He shattered the notion of a philosophical or political inevitability. In so doing, he gave reality to freedom and nobility to reality.

All this was possible in Churchill not because of his courage alone, or because of his knowledge of the human potential and how to reach it, but because he could look beyond causes to their consequences. He had a highly developed sense for the anticipation of crisis. He was a superb politician but he had none of the average politician's fear of identifying an unpleasant fact or of calling for sacrifice. In an atomic age, the only thing greater than the danger is the propensity for drift. The most cherished national possession is the lull. The means for incinerating the planet are being developed in a dozen or more places, not all of which are led by men who believe in the theory of natural goodness or the desire to ennoble the human estate. The consequences of these actions will be averted not by any abstract belief that justice and the good, if left to themselves, automatically triumph in the end, but by the energies and actions of enough men who, like Churchill, believe in their capacity to do the impossible.

—N.C.

Gold Reserve Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I today voted in favor of the administration's position to eliminate the requirement that each Federal Reserve bank maintain a gold certificate reserve of at least 25 percent against its deposits. This vote I cast most reluctantly.

This is a most complex issue and one which few people in the world, including Congressmen, fully comprehend. It has been rushed through the House Banking and Currency Committee with such dispatch that it is impossible to believe that it has been adequately considered. Only two witnesses appeared before the committee. Likewise it was rushed through the House Rules Committee. The Senate committee is still taking testimony. The past fiscal policies of Democratic administrations have put this great Nation in most serious and desperate financial circumstances and the present administration has done nothing but to add to these problems.

During the long years of Democratic administrations beginning in 1932, we have had annual deficits piled on top of annual deficits. In fiscal 1965 we had a very substantial deficit and have a built-in virtually budgeted deficit for 1966 as the budget has been submitted by President Johnson. If in these 2 prosperous years we must continue to have deficits, I submit that there is little hope that we can chip away at the national debt. We have been continuously warned that we cannot continue to spend more than we take in.

Our balance-of-payments problem has been aggravated by the failure of this administration to take positive and aggressive action to halt this trend. The problem has been multiplied by our continued shipment of money in the aid of foreign governments, some of which are actively hostile to us. We have only yesterday seen the administration forces insist upon freedom for the President to offer additional millions of dollars to Egypt's Nasser.

In spite of repeated warnings that these policies could not be continued without severe effects, this administra-

tion continues blandly going its way, domestically and in the foreign field, spending money as if there were no end to it.

The Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board have both testified that the action taken today is essential to the interest of the United States of America. It is apparent that responsible private banking sources feel that in our present situation we have no choice but to remove the gold cover, or face real national disaster immediately.

As a responsible Member of Congress, I am doing what my conscience dictates to me to be responsible action. I do so reluctantly and desire to spread my remarks in the RECORD.

Underwithheld Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to introduce as cosponsor with my colleague, JAMES B. UTT, legislation designed to correct a wrong which inequities in last year's tax laws have created.

On April 15, millions of Americans will owe their Government substantially more than they expected. Because last year's tax cut bill dropped withholding below the actual tax rate, taxes were underwithheld to a larger degree than many Americans realized.

The underwithholding of taxes came about through passage of the bill in February and amendments which set up a two-stage drop in the tax rate, but a larger, one-stage drop in withholding.

Many of us warned at the time the bill was passed that this would present an unfair burden on the taxpayers this April. Now the time is at hand, and I feel that since the Government got millions of Americans into this mess, it is incumbent upon the Government to help ease the burden.

This can be done simply and effectively by allowing the tax difference on withholding to be spread over the next year. This will give the American taxpayer the opportunity to adjust withholding taxes during the remainder of 1965 to take care of the extra underwithholding he would be forced to "pay back" on April 15.

In essence, it would restore a two-stage withholding system to correspond with the two-stage tax cut we enacted last year.

There is, in addition to lessening the economic shock to the American household, a great stake for our national economy in this tax measure. The impact of millions of Americans going into debt to pay extra taxes cannot help but have a deleterious effect on the momentum of our economy. By cutting the amount of tax owed on April 15 this year, we will be assuring a continuance of purchasing power kept in the hands of consumers who control the direction and momentum of our business world.

I feel this is a good bill, a just bill, a necessary bill. I urge early action on this measure by the Congress.

Life Magazine Hails President Johnson's Education Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of an editorial from the January 29, 1965, issue of Life magazine praising President Johnson's elementary and secondary school proposal.

The editorial follows:

NEW LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

President Johnson's proposals for extending Federal aid to education are admirable, ingenious, and an important part of the New World he welcomes. They are obviously the work of a politician and a statesman, avoiding as they do the most crippling deadfalls of controversy without yielding on principle.

The President has asked for $1.5 billion, two-thirds of which would go directly to school districts serving substantial numbers of students from poor families. Other projects would include funds for books and libraries, the creation of "supplementary educational centers," aid to State departments of education, and the establishment of "regional educational laboratories" where research and teacher training could be accomplished. Some $260 million would aid higher education.

The argument over Federal aid to education has been long and severe and often irrelevant. Instead of debating the main point—whether or not the Federal Government is encroaching on traditional State, local and private authority—controversy has centered upon the church-state question; that is, how to justify public funds being spent on private, primarily parochial, schools. The approach has more than once stymied plans for Federal aid to schools. In 1961 President Kennedy's bent-over-backward declaration that direct aid to Catholic schools was unconstitutional destroyed hopes of any sizable Federal grants during his term of office.

Johnson's contribution is a practical formula for getting aid to students instead of to schools, thereby skirting the whole debate. The validity of this tactic will probably have to be tested in the courts. But it now seems to be meeting the qualified approval of teachers and Protestant and Catholic spokesmen. This in itself is a considerable breakthrough.

Let us note, however, that the main embodiment of the formula, the "shared time" concept under which parochial schoolchildren would have access to a variety of new special facilities such as auditoriums, labs and libraries, is a way of improving our whole educational system and not just a gimmick. Experts agree these facilities are needed; putting them up on a joint-use, neighborhood basis not only gets around the parochial question but makes economic and educational sense.

On the larger question of the Federal role, the President cites the late Senator Robert Taft's dictum that there ought to be a "basic floor" under such "essential services" as education, guaranteed by Washington even though education remains primarily the business of the States and localities which foot most of the bills. (Even with the new $1.5 billion request, the Federal share of the total education budget will amount to only about 15 percent, a figure low enough to allay fears of a Federal "takeover.")

The "basic floor" responsibility is a strong one and is part of President Johnson's general preoccupation with slums, unemployment and the undereducated poor. But without denying the role that education can play as a route out of and up from poverty, Federal aid can have a broader and more important role—to help raise the quality of education for everybody. The Government can do this not by spending huge amounts of money but by spending lesser amounts selectively. Parts of the President's program tacitly recognize this larger responsibility; most of it, however, is concerned with making education widely accessible but not necessarily better.

This emphasis must eventually give way to overall improvement. Our educational establishment, chronically strapped for money, has barely begun to make use of many new discoveries relating to the learning process, nor has it yet approached a true understanding of the potentialities of the human intellect. Carefully allocated Federal funds will be welcome and necessary if we are to have finer schools and colleges. Still more important will be the constant attention and encouragement of leaders like President Johnson who know that a society's greatness depends on the quality of its education.

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association Annual Meeting Resolution on "Hard Money Policy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association held their annual meeting. This organization represents the 1,000 or more rural electric cooperatives in the country. There are some 5 million members of these rural electric cooperatives, and when the families of these members are taken into account the number of people which these cooperatives serve with electricity is impressive indeed; it amounts in total to more than 16 million people.

At their annual meeting a number of resolutions were passed. One is of special interest to me and, I am sure, the Congress.

This resolution deals with interest rates, and in my opinion correctly charges that high interest rates and tight money are economic evils. The resolution goes on to compliment Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, for his tireless efforts in protecting the public in this vital economic area. The resolution also recommends passage of the Federal Reserve reform resolution introduced by Mr. PATMAN on H.R. 11.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and the rural electric cooperatives, are to be commended for the stand they have taken on this subject.

Whereas the interest rates paid by the U.S. Government have doubled in the past 25 years, due largely to influences and pressures aimed at achieving artificially high interest rates throughout the national economy; and

Whereas high interest rates are an unwarranted burden upon the vast majority of citizens; and

Whereas Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, has worked tirelessly to acquaint all Americans with the economic evils of high interest and tight money, and has proposed urgently needed corrective action in the monetary policies of the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend Congressman PATMAN for his efforts and urge the Congress to give prompt and favorable consideration to his proposals for monetary reforms.

The FCC and Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial from the Washington Post dated February 6, 1965:

THE FCC AND RELIGION

The Federal Communications Commission currently has under consideration a new application form for those who seek broadcast licenses. It has need of one. Its present application form asks a question which is none of its business—a question which is no part of the business of any governmental agency in the United States. The question concerns the extent to which the applicant for a license or for a renewal of a license has served or intends to serve the propagation of religion.

Religion is, it goes without saying, an important element of American life. But it is of the very essence of religious freedom in America that the exercise of it be altogether voluntary and free from any governmental interference. The fact is, however, that the FCC has been interfering flagrantly. Deploring its policy, FCC Commissioner Lee Loevinger said in a speech recently to an annual convention of the National Religious Broadcasters: "The FCC decisions and practices in this area leave no room for doubt that the Commission has established religion as a required element of broadcasting service, and has applied this standard to mean such religion as meets the FCC definitions and notions of acceptability * * *. The Commission specifies in its application forms and its statements and opinions the particular elements and kinds of programing which it asserts to be in the public interest. In so doing it plainly exerts official authority and influence in favor of the types of programs specified."

This is precisely what the Supreme Court has repeatedly said the first amendment forbids any Government agency to do. The FCC can, and should, stop doing it forthwith—by the simple expedient of removing any reference to religion from its application forms. In addition to this, in order to stop the volunteering of promises to promote religion on the part of applicants, it ought to issue a simple, succinct statement of policy that it will not give weight one way or another to religion in its licensing decisions. It can do more to advance religious freedom by such a hands-off policy than any amount of religious broadcasting can conceivably accomplish.

Amend the Export Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, inadvertently, there was omitted from the February 4, 1965, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement on H.R. 4362, introduced that day to amend the Export Control Act of 1949. To correct this error, I wish to call to my colleagues' attention the press release and statement issued that day on this subject:

Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, today introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to arm the President with the power to prohibit American businessmen from furthering restrictive trade practices or boycotts imposed by a foreign country against other countries friendly to the United States.

Joined by Congressmen CHARLES JOELSON, Democrat, of New Jersey; JONATHAN BINGHAM, Democrat, of New York; SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican, of New York; JOHN LINDSAY, Republican, of New York; and OGDEN REID, Republican, of New York; he called for an amendment of the Export Control Act of 1949 to declare "* * * it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States."

ROOSEVELT pointing out that American trade with the United Arab Republic would be closely scrutinized because of that country's long and bitter campaign against Israel, said, "America must not place its own and its friends' security in jeopardy by turning a blind eye upon Egyptian activity which causes tumult in the Near East or appears to diminish the position of our friends in that part of the world."

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES ROOSEVELT, DEMOCRAT, OF CALIFORNIA, CALLING FOR AMENDMENT OF EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

I am delighted to join with you and my four other colleagues in introducing bills to amend the Export Control Act of 1949, and I concur in the joint statement which you have released. However, I would add another compelling reason for the enactment of this legislation.

While we must be diligent in preventing other nations from intruding into our affairs and imposing their will on American businessmen, we must be equally diligent in assuring that these same American businessmen do not engage in activities which either directly or indirectly aid the prosecution of restrictive trade practices or boycotts aimed at countries friendly to the United States.

This possibility is particularly acute with regard to the long and bitter campaign waged by the United Arab Republic against Israel. We must not allow our foreign policy or the fulfillment of our international responsibilities to be undermined by even the most innocent cooperation between American businessmen and the United Arab Republic in its campaign against Israel.

America must not place its own and its friends' security in jeopardy by turning a blind eye on any Egyptian activity which causes tumult in the Near East or appears to diminish the position of our friends in that part of the world.

To the extent that such Egyptian activity is enhanced by the receipt of articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, from American businessmen, we must be prepared to not only control, but also to prohibit the flow of such goods and services to the United Arab Republic from this country.

I firmly believe these bills properly arm our President to exercise such control, and thereby to protect our international posture.

Supplemental Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the question today is quite different than it was when the matter of agricultural commodities aid under the Public Law 480 program for Nasser was before the House last week.

Today under the Senate amendment the President is required to give aid only when he finds that it is in the national interest.

We face crises in several areas with respect to international involvements and dangers to our security. In such situations, I think the President must have some flexibility that will enable him to act as he deems best in the conduct of crucial foreign policy matters and believe the proviso contained in this measure to act for the national interest is a satisfactory, workable formula for the next 5 months or so when the House will have another opportunity to review and reevaluate this issue, as it should have from time to time.

I think these considerations should move the House to clarify and qualify its position and make very clear its intention to stand behind the President in matters affecting the national interest and security of the United States.

In this regard, I bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House a memorandum recently furnished me by the State Department in answer to my request of early January for information concerning recent events in the United Arab Republic.

This is the statement from the Department of State:

Recent incidents in the United Arab Republic have caused many Americans to question the sale of American commodities to the United Arab Republic for local currency under Public Law 480. These incidents include the burning down of the USIS library in Cairo, the shooting down of an American-owned plane over United Arab Republic territory, and remarks of December 27 made by President Nasser. The great bulk of our assistance to the United Arab Republic is in the form of Public Law 480 sales which meet about one-quarter of all the food grain requirements of its people. Termination of this program would not affect United Arab

Republic capacity to carry on its military programs, but could well convince the United Arab Republic Government that the United States is not sincere in its professed desire to help improve the living standards of the Egyptian people. Arbitrary termination could result in rapid deterioration of our relations with all Arab States and in increased hostile pressures against Israel.

The burning of our USIS library in Cairo was a senseless act of destruction which the great majority of Egyptians deplore. The mob attacking the Embassy consisted of African students, with few if any Egyptians participating. The Egyptian police responded to the Embassy's call for assistance but did not arrive in time or sufficient numbers to protect the Embassy compound. On the day after the attack, our Ambassador in Cairo delivered a note of protest to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The following day our Embassy received a note from the United Arab Republic Government expressing regret for the damage done and willingness to compensate for the losses sustained. A detailed reckoning of the damages is being made and when it is complete a bill will be presented to the United Arab Republic Government. Meanwhile the United Arab Republic Government has made temporary quarters available. In a meeting with our Ambassador on December 19, President Nasser offered a gift of 1,000 volumes and an encyclopedia for a new American library in Cairo.

The shooting down of an American-owned plane over the United Arab Republic has been investigated by the U.S. Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency. A preliminary report by those investigators indicates that communications failures and the apparent failure of the pilot to follow certain prescribed procedures for overflying the United Arab Republic were involved in the incident. While recognizing that certain procedural errors may have occurred, the U.S. Government does not consider them sufficient justification for the United Arab Republic action of shooting the aircraft down. A protest was made to the United Arab Republic Government on December 24 which reserves the right, pending completion of all aspects of the investigation, to claim restitution for loss of life and property.

The remarks of December 27 resulted from a misunderstanding of the motives of the food for peace program. We know that the United Arab Republic authorities fully recognize the importance of the Public Law 480 program to the economy of the country.

Current consignments of commodities to the United Arab Republic are in accordance with U.S. commitments under a 3-year agreement signed in 1963. The Department now has under consideration a new request from the United Arab Republic for a supplementary agreement. The interested agencies of the U.S. Government, including the Department, have not reached a decision on this request.

Aid to Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, my position with respect to aid to Egypt and other countries dedicated to a course of world aggression remains one of strong opposition. I joined my colleagues when we expressed this feeling as the sense of the Congress last week by voting to cut off shipments of surplus food to the United Arab Republic.

The question before the House yesterday, Monday, February 8, 1965, was not one of reaffirming this position or changing it. Rather, the question was whether the sense of the Congress should be expressed in a manner contrary to the traditional separation of power and responsibility in the sphere of foreign affairs. The amendment added by the other body is one acceptable to me as it was acceptable to a majority of the Members of the House.

I would not want to see the hands of the President tied because of our expression of opposition. It is more fitting to convey our feeling to the Chief Executive without impairing the flexible position required to negotiate with other countries. The other question before the House was whether to tie the hands of our committee going into conference on the bill.

Our feelings have been conveyed in a responsible manner. Let us hope that the United Arab Republic will understand its full meaning and significance.

Calendar of Events at the National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events at the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART CALENDAR OF EVENTS, FEBRUARY 1965

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 7

Painting of the week: Constable. "Wivenhoe Park, Essex" (Widener collection). Gallery 58, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "The Exhibition of Watercolor Drawings of John White (1577–1590)." Central lobby, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Commemoration of Death in Sculptural Forms." Speaker: John Brooks, staff lecturer, National Gallery of Art, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: The Concord Trio, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 14

Painting of the week: El Greco, "St. Martin and the Beggar" (Widener collection). Gallery 30, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Games in Art." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Origins of Impressionism." Speaker, William Truettner, staff lecturer, National Gallery of Art. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Melvin Ritter, violinist. Jane Allen, pianist. East garden court, 8.

All concerts are broadcast by Station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5). The Radio Picture of the Week is discussed during the intermission (about 8:40 p.m.) followed by comments on the music by Richard Bales, conductor of the National Gallery Orchestra.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 21

Painting of the week: Monet. "Palazzo da Mula, Venice" (Chester Dale collection). Gallery 70, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Objets d' Art: The Treasure Room." Central lobby, Tuesday Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Rembrandt Landscapes: Paintings, Drawings, and Etchings." Speaker: Carter Nelson, staff lecturer, National Gallery of Art. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Montgomery Chamber Ensemble. East garden court, 8.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 28

Painting of the week: Daumier. "Advice to a Young Artist" (a gift of Duncan Phillips). Gallery 60, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Architecture of the National Gallery." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." "Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Monday, 1; Sunday, 5.

Sunday film lecture: "Art—circa 1848." Speaker: Raymond S. Stites, curator of education, National Gallery of Art, Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Claudia Lindsey, soprano; Kenenth Manzer, pianist. East garden court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, 737–4215, extension 272.

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission as free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Collections: Paintings and sculpture from the Andrew Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are on the main floor. The Garbisch American Primitive paintings, Kress Renaissance Bronzes, and Widener Decorative Arts are on the ground floor.

Radio picture of the week: Color reproductions by subscription allow you to follow the picture of the week discussion on the radio each Sunday night. Eleven- by fourteen-inch reproductions, together with short texts, will be mailed for February, the last month of the series. $1 postpaid.

Continuing exhibition: "The Watercolor Drawings of John White (1577–1590)." Central Gallery. Through February 22.

Recent publication: Catalog. "The Watercolor Drawings of John White," from the British Museum; 54 pages, 10 by 7½ inches, introduction by Paul H. Hulton, assistant keeper of prints and drawings, the British Museum; with one color plate and 40 halftone illustrations; $2 postpaid.

New reproductions: Eleven- by fourteen-inch color reproductions. Bellini, "Orpheus"; Blake, "The Great Red Dragon and the Woman Clothed With the Sun"; Blake, "Queen Katherine's Dream"; Cassatt, "Mother and Child"; Dürer, "Portrait of a Clergyman"; Giovanni di Paolo, "the Annunciation"; Goya, "the Duke of Wellington"; Greuze, "Monsieur de la Live de Jully"; Luini, "the Illusion of Cephalus"; Memling, "Madonna and Child With Angels"; Verrocchio, "Lorenzo de' Medici." 25 cents each.

Orders under $1, add 25 cents handling charge.

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuosly, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

Facing the Facts in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world are focused on Vietnam. The deceitful, ruthless Communist attacks on South Vietnam bases a few days ago emphasize once again the importance of that struggle and the lengths the Communists will go in gaining control over all of Vietnam and southeast Asia.

Recently, on January 26, 1965, Richard M. Nixon discussed the Vietnam problem with the Sales Executives' Club of New York. His message was most timely, penetrating, and appropriate, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit Mr. Nixon's speech for inclusion in the RECORD:

"FACING THE FACTS IN VIETNAM"—ADDRESS OF RICHARD M. NIXON, SALES EXECUTIVES CLUB OF NEW YORK, JANUARY 26, 1965

I would like to take as my text today one of Winston Churchill's statements which will lead us to a discussion of what I believe is the most important decision that Lyndon Johnson, the President of the United States, and the American people will make during these next 4 years.

Let me read this statement. The time, 1938, immediately after the partition of Czechoslovakia. Churchill, speaking in the House of Commons, said this: "The belief that security can be obtained by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion."

It was true then. I think it is also true today. And, as you might have guessed, I am referring to another small state—not in Europe, but in Asia—the state that is much in the news today because of the troubles we are having there, Vietnam.

This subject has been discussed so much that you are, perhaps, tired of it. Certainly many Americans are very tired of what has been happening to Americans—to our Embassy, to our consulates, to our libraries, and to our people in Vietnam, where we are trying to help.

We get the impression that the Vietnamese do not want to help themselves, and so take it out on us. It would be very easy to become frustrated at this point, to become defeatists, to throw up our hands or to find out how not to handle the situation, which is the usual weapon of diplomats.

But I would suggest that this week, while tributes to Winston Churchill are being paid all over the world, we should remember what he said in 1938.

I would like to talk about Vietnam in terms of American public opinion, of the stakes that are there for Americans in the cause of freedom, of the alternatives we have, and the choice I think we should make.

First, what is American public opinion concerning Vietnam today? This can be broken down into different groups. The first is the growing group that is following the line of Senator MORSE, of Oregon. They say, let's wash our hands of the place and get out before we are thrown out. Every poll indicates that more and more Americans are frustrated with what is happening there and want us to get out.

The second group—also growing—perhaps the largest in the country, seems to be represented by most of the editorial support of the major Eastern papers. They feel that we must find a negotiated solution to the problem. We must neutralize Vietnam, on some sort of guaranteed basis. Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, is the major spokesman for this group. Walter Lippmann is, perhaps, the major spokesman among the Nation's columnists and pundits.

Then, of course, there is a third group—perhaps the smallest—which contends that the way to end the war in Vietnam, and the only choice for America, is to find a way to win it.

There is unanimity in all of these groups over one point: Our present course of action in Vietnam will not do. And I want to be very blunt about that. We are losing the war in Vietnam, and if there is not a change in strategy, we will be thrown out in a matter of months, certainly within a year. This is the problem that confronts America today.

Let's see what the stakes are. What is this battle all about? We start with one small state, as Winston Churchill would have termed it. It is not a very important state, as states go. Only 15 million people. But, looking at those people and this state, we find that the great majority of those 15 million people do not want to come under Communist domination. They have heard from their friends in North Vietnam and know what communism is. They have proved that they are willing to fight to avoid becoming Communists.

A great lie has been perpetrated throughout the world, not deliberately, but perhaps by oversight, to the effect that the South Vietnamese will not fight for their own freedom. But 200,000 casualties suffered in the battle against communism proves otherwise.

This is Vietnam, 15 million people, not wanting to be Communists, very bravely fighting with 60 percent of their country already under Communist domination. Looking at those people and that small state, I think that perhaps everybody in this room would probably say it is not worth risking a war—a big war—over those few people and that little state.

This is only part of the stake. Let us look at the bigger part.

What if the stake also included all of Southeast Asia? You have heard this before, and many now tend to downgrade this kind of analysis because they think it is too pessimistic. But I have made four trips through this area, two in the last year, and these are my conclusions:

First, if Vietnam is lost, all of Southeast Asia is lost. Look at the surrounding countries. Laos has already been lost. Cambodia is leaning so far in the direction of communism that Vietnam could push it over the brink. Thailand is a country that wants to be on our side, but it is a nation that has always been on the winning side, and this is the only way its independence has survived for a thousand years. Burma is an economic slum, with immense problems and immense pressures, and it will go. Malaysia could not possibly stand with its 10 million people surrounded by a sea of communism.

Then there is the biggest prize in southeast Asia, Indonesia. News about Sukarno has not been pleasant lately, but the prize is 90 million people on the richest land in that entire area, with an immense mineral potential which has hardly been tapped.

What will happen to Indonesia? A reporter from the New York Times on January 8 wrote from the scene: "Diplomats think Sukarno is heading toward alinement with Communist China. Communist successes in Vietnam have convinced him that Chinese communism is the wave of the future in Asia."

That is why the battle in Vietnam is not just about Vietnam. It is about Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and all the rest. If the Asians in that area—who have been overrun by the Japanese and the Chinese—get the impression, as Sukarno has, that because of what is happening in Vietnam the wave of the future is communism, they are going to go Communist before the wave engulfs them.

That is not all of the story. The biggest prize of all is, of course, Japan, a miracle of development and the greatest industrial power in Asia—the only country with the possible chance to counterbalance China once China develops its industrial might.

The 200 million in southeast Asia, next to the United States, form the biggest trading area for Japan. If these people come under Communist domination, or are influenced by Communist control, Japan will inevitably be pulled toward neutralism, toward even pro-communism, in order to survive.

I remember a very graphic illustration of this many years ago at the beginning of the Korean war. One of our top experts on communism, when asked if we were justified in going into Korea to save that country, said that what we have to realize is that to the Communists the war in Korea is not about Korea, but Japan. Of course, he was right, because if Korea had gone Communist at that time, when Japan was just recovering from World War II, Korea would be like a dagger pointed at the heart of Japan. Japan would possibly have been pulled toward neutralism, or even communism.

The fall of southeast Asia would produce an even greater impact, and in summary, this is waht is involved: The battle for Vietnam is the battle for Asia. It affects southeast Asia and Japan. In the long run, the Pacific could become a "Red sea."

How? Look again at the map. Indonesia stretches a thousand miles across the Pacific, and is only 14 miles from the Philippines. You can see what would happen if Indonesia came under Communist domination and the Philippines were subjected to guerrilla activities which presently exist in Vietnam.

There are even greater stakes in what I would call an almost mystical sense. They are mystical in that they involve what goes on in the Communist mind, both in Moscow and in Peiping.

We've all been reading about this conflict that began between Khrushchev and Mao, and now seems to have been swept under the rug for the moment. Oversimplified, this conflict is really an argument between the "hardliners" and "softliners" in the Communist world. The "softliners" want coexistence with the West, and don't wish to provoke another confrontation such as we had recently in Cuba. They want to beat the West through economic competition.

The "hardliners"—not only those who dominate China's Government, but those now in a minority in the Soviet Government—take a different view. They say world communism can only gain its ultimate objective through the continuing support of revolution throughout the world. They believe that rather than downgrade this kind of operation, they should step it up in Viet-

nam, in Africa, in the Near East, and in Latin America.

In the event that Vietnam falls, or is neutralized, which is the equivalent of falling, this will be an immense vindication of the "hardliners," who will then be able to argue that if it worked in Vietnam, it will work every place. They will say that the West has no effective answer to indirect aggression.

Let us go back to our analysis of Korea. The Korean war had to be fought, and this war did one thing, if it accomplished nothing else. It stopped the Communists from using "overt aggression" to accomplish their objective of taking over a country. The practice proved too dangerous.

The war in Vietnam involves indirect aggression—the taking over of a country by revolution. Our capacity to meet indirect aggression is what will determine whether we get in or stay out, find a way to win, or agree to neutralization.

But let us see if there really is an easy way out of this dilemma. We have already indicated that Vietnam is being lost the way we are presently waging the war, or helping the Vietnamese to wage it. Is there an easy way out?

The most popular suggestion first, neutralization. Sounds good; after all, Switzerland is neutral, Holland is neutral, Austria is neutral—why not Vietnam?

The same situation does not apply. When we have a nation immediately bordering on an immense power complex such as Communist China, neutrality, when you agree to it, is only surrender on the installment plan.

Look at Laos. We entered into the Laotian neutrality agreement with the best of intentions. We thought this meant that Laos would be saved. But what it finally meant is indicative of the fate of Vietnam.

Neutrality, where the Communists are concerned, means three things: We get out; they stay in; they take over.

Neutralism will not work, though it sounds good as an easy way out. It is a good way to inform the people of Asia that we are on the losing side and that eventually the Communists will win.

The second point of view is also popular, and part of the "how-not-to-do-it" school. This school of thought prevailed at the time of the murder of Diem. In effect, it was said that before we can have a military victory we must have political reform. Those subscribing to this principle find out all the difficulties involved in winning the war in Vietnam and, particularly, point out something that is very true—there is great political dissension in that country at the present time. The Buddhists are tremendously stimulated and, in many cases, controlled by the Communists.

We had political reform, and Diem is gone. Still a military victory eludes us. This same school still holds that we must have political reform before military victory.

I couldn't disagree more with this kind of thinking. We in America must learn that America's form of democracy works well here, although it is not a very easy system to run. But it cannot be imposed on peoples with entirely different backgrounds in Asia, Latin America, and many other places of the world.

When we proceeded on the assumption that political reform had to come before military victory, I was there in Asia soon afterward, talking with the chief of state of another country friendly to the United States. He told me that the murder of Diem meant to him—and to many other Asian leaders—just three things: It's dangerous to be a friend of the United States; it pays to be a neutral; it sometimes helps to be an enemy.

This same deadly pattern seems to be engulfing some of our policy decisions in Vietnam.

There is another easy way out. This one sounds to Americans—particularly to the philanthropic, good-hearted people of this great country of ours—as the real solution to guerrilla warfare in Vietnam. They say to make the people happy by providing the rice, food, schools and all of the other things that make for the good life. When they have all of these things, they feel, the Communists will not be able to take over.

I wish this were true. It would cost us only money, and no lives.

But a conversation I had with a village chief proves otherwise. When I asked him what one thing he would want if he could get it from the United States, he replied simply that all he wanted was security. Not a new well, more rice, a better school, more peace corpsmen—just security. And small wonder. In a village only a few miles away, the Communists had torn its chief apart only a few nights before.

We finally get back to the very difficult decision we have to make. We must realize there is no easy way out. We either get out, surrender on the installment plan through neutralization, or we find a way to win.

It is not easy to win. It is very easy to say that if we just extend the war to the north it will end within a matter of months. But, this may not be the case. Most of the military experts agree that unless we, in effect, "quarantine" the war in Vietnam by cutting off all Communist-dominated interference from Communist North Vietnam and from Laos, there is no chance for the South Vietnamese to defeat the guerrillas in South Vietnam.

I believe this is the decision we should make—"quarantine" the war and use American air and sea power to cut supply lines and destroy staging areas in North Vietnam and Laos which now make it possible for the guerrillas to continue their actions.

But let me make one thing clear: There should be no use of atomic weapons. They are neither necessary nor advisable. We should use American manpower only in the air and on the sea. The South Vietnamese can handle the ground fighting.

Let us look at this strategy. It is a risky one. Won't the Communist Chinese come into the war? It would be very easy to reassure you that they would not come in. I don't believe they will. On the other hand, in making a decision to win the war in Vietnam we must not discount that risk. Now is the time to face up to the fact that what we are dealing with in Vietnam is Chinese Communist aggression.

It is dangerous and foolhardy to try to gloss over the truth as to what the war in Vietnam really involves:

First, the war in Vietnam is not about Vietnam but about southeast Asia.

Second, the confrontation in Vietnam is, in the final analysis, not between the Vietnamese and the Vietcong nor between the United States and the Vietcong, but between the United States and Communist China. If Communist China were not instigating and supporting the Vietcong, there would be no war in Vietnam today.

Third, a U.S. defeat in Vietnam means a Chinese Communist victory which could decide the fate of Asia for generations to come.

In summary, the risk involved in ending the war in Vietnam by winning it is far less than the risk involved in losing it.

Looking for example, at Red China's position, let us consider the reasons they might not enter the war.

At the present time, the Soviet Union and Red China are enemies not allies as they were at the time of the Korean war. From that standpoint, this is the best time to stop Chinese aggression. The Soviet Union is not now interested in the Chinese gaining success in Asia, or any place else.

Second, without the Soviet Union, Communist China is a fourth rate military power. With the Soviet Union's logistical support, it could be dangerously formidable.

Third, time is not on our side, but on Red China's side. Every day that passes, the Chinese nuclear capability increases. Five years, ten years—we might not be able to make a stand there, or any place else, without risking a nuclear war. Now we can.

We must also recognize that the Chinese industrial capacity at present is very small, compared to what it will be later. Anyone who has visited Hong Kong or Taiwan knows what the Chinese people can do when their remarkable personal characteristics are mobilized in an industrial society. In 15 or 25 years, Red China could become one of the great industrial powers of the world.

The question is, do we wait until then or do we now show them that we want to live in peace with them and with others but that we will not tolerate direct or indirect aggression in which they impose their form of government upon the people of another nation against their will.

There are risks, yes. But the risks of waiting are much greater. This becomes apparent when we look ahead and realize that if South Vietnam is lost, and southeast Asia is lost, and the Pacific becomes a Red Sea, we could be confronted with a world war where the odds against us would be far greater.

All that I have said is somewhat pessimistic, but I would like to leave one optimistic note with you. While the military, political, and strategic problems are immense, from the standpoint of good news I can assure you that the battle of ideas in Asia has been won, and is being won, day after day.

Ten years ago, the Communists were arguing in South Vietnam that to go Communist would mean a better way of life. This is not the case today. People all over Asia know that in Communist China and North Vietnam life is not nearly as good as it is in Japan, Taiwan, or Maylasia and Thailand, the countries that have chosen freedom rather than communism or socialism. This message is sweeping that vast area of the world.

So at a time when we have won the ideological battle, our problem is: Can we now prevent the Communists from accomplishing through raw power what they cannot accomplish through persuasion?

The course of action I advocate is one that is not popular in America and would probably not get a vote of confidence in Congress or by a Gallup or Harris poll. I will remind you, however, that Winston Churchill, in 1911, took a very unpopular stand when, seeing the buildup of the German fleet, insisted on taking the Royal Navy and modernizing it. But the British people were forever grateful that he did it, because the British fleet saved Britain in World War I.

Before World War II, Churchill was like a voice in the wilderness talking about Czechoslovakia and stopping Hitler. It was unpopular then, both in Britain and in the United States. But, when he became Prime Minister, the British, American, and all free peoples were grateful that he had the vision to see the danger. When this danger became apparent to everyone, he was there to lead them.

In 1946, we heard of the Iron Curtain, in an announcement by a major world statesman that the Soviet Union, which had been our ally during the Second World War, was now a potential enemy of freedom.

Nearly everyone assumes that when Churchill made that speech in 1946 that it was met with universal acclaim. Not at all. In America and in much of the free world, Churchill was chided for being a warmonger. But, within a year came the Greek-Turkish aid program and the Marshall plan, and he was proved right.

I would suggest today that we have a similarly difficult problem in southeast Asia.

And I repeat Churchill's statement: "The belief that security can be obtained by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion."

I think that we in America, in this generation, are fortunate that we have the privilege to live in a century which produced a man like Winston Churchill. We will be even more fortunate if we heed his words as we honor his memory.

Ifs, Including Taxes, Mark 1965 Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in a year-end economic review of Massachusetts business in the Boston Herald, George Minot covered the problem of the impact of shifts in defense spending. He commented:

If there is any self-evident fact, it is that New England will make as significant a contribution to a world that may well be gradually disarming as in one where military defense necessarily occupies as large a role as it does now.

This is a healthy realization that with a little imagination our economy can respond to economic change and move on to even greater achievements.

This goal will not be achieved without a great deal of thought and preparation, but Mr. Minot's article is a hopeful sign that the appropriate steps will be taken. I insert his article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

IFS, INCLUDING TAXES, MARK 1965 OUTLOOK: MILITARY LOSSES CAN BE MET

(By George Minot)

Its too bad these first-of-the-year business and industrial reviews don't mean what thew say—they are not reviews at all. If they were, the articles in them would be far easier to write.

For New England had a big year in 1964. In almost every field you can think of—from industry to recreation and agriculture—those who put their shoulders to the wheel came out well.

There were big 1964 advances in transportation, in education, and in cleaning out old areas and making them new.

Visitors to Boston would hardly know the place. The West End, the North End, and the South End—all are undergoing major face-lifting operations. Boston no longer gives the impression it is living on past glories. It is alive, going forward.

It is still the "hub" of all New England. The prosperity of the entire section depends more on the prosperity of Boston than many Massachusetts legislators or officials from other States, sometimes are willing to admit. Here, one needs hardly be told, are the great educational institutions, the great medical centers, the great musical and scientific centers.

Here—and you hesitate a minute—is the home of the Red Sox and the Bruins. And the only place they can go is up—to the eminence of the Celtics, for instance.

But in a first-of-the-year review you don't want to look back on what happened or didn't happen in 1964.

It's 1965 that interests you now.

When you start to talk about what is going to hapen in coming months you at once begin to tread on more dangerous ground. There are too many of those things the experts call imponderables. For instance, there is the matter of taxes.

If you look at any of the State capitals, or if you have listened to some of the inaugural addresses of incoming Governors these last few weeks, you will notice that all of them need money.

Gov. John W. King, the first Democrat to win reelection as Governor of New Hampshire on a fine record he made in his first term, is going to seek the first increase in State taxes since 1957. Along with most other Governors in this section, he sees a need for increased aid to education, a pay raise for many State employees, and reorganization of State departments to make them more efficient.

The story is much the same in Vermont, where another Democrat, Philip H. Hoff, was first elected 2 years ago, that State's first Democratic Governor in 109 years. Reelected in the great sweep of last November, Hoff now, for the first time in the State's history, has fellow Democrats in the jobs of lieutenant governor, State secretary, treasurer, auditor of accounts, and attorney general.

Maine didn't elect a Governor last fall, and Republican Gov. John H. Reed continues in office, but now he has a legislature solidly controlled by Democrats. Reed is seeking a budget of $175,418,000 to operate the State for the next 2 years, of which almost $10 million is for supplemental appropriations. To pay for this program Reed is seeking a tax increase on timberlands and tobacco and, like Governor King in New Hampshire, wants a markup in liquor prices, both these States being in the liquor business.

Massachusetts, perhaps more than its neighbors to the north, needs a broader tax base. During the campaign Governor Volpe talked a great deal about a sales tax which its advocates say would bring in $125 million or more revenue. But in the past the State legislature and the labor leaders have hesitated to recommend this source of revenue.

Each year there is talk about a State lottery or legalized off-track betting. The money derived from these questionable sources hardly would be a drop in the bucket, however, because the needs of the State are so large.

While the New England States are searching frantically for new and painless money sources, State officials always keep in mind the high rate of tax mortality among politicians. Taxpayers continually are demanding more services; they want bigger and better schools and highways, for instance, but they show a tendency to vote against candidates and elected officials who talk too much about higher taxes to pay for these things.

They keep in mind such facts as that in the 5 years from 1958 to 1963, State and local tax rates rose twice as fast as Federal taxes. They are told that State and local taxation is now increasing twice as fast as income, and economists tell them that since World War II the Federal debt has gone up only 20 percent while State and local debt has gone up some 600 percent.

There is an optimistic side to the tax picture, because the Federal Government has promised a "substantial" reduction in excise taxes which make up a $14 billion package and cover almost everything from automobiles to whisky. Nobody knows yet what the people in Washington mean by "substantial," or which taxes will be cut or when.

Businessmen hear all sorts of rumors, speculation, and informed word. And hundreds of them, representing practically every excised-taxed industry or business in the country, are on record regarding the "urgency" of outright elimination or at least reduction in Federal excise taxes. Overall reduction probably will wind up in a House-Senate conference, and a good guess would be that the tax cut would run between $3 and $4 billion.

Thus if the tax picture is cloudy as businessmen look into 1965, so is the matter of the whole economy. There are a number of "ifs" on the horizon. There:

If there is a steel strike.

If the steel companies further raise prices.

If the Federal Reserve is forced by the balance of payments to tighten money.

If Britain devalues the pound.

If the situation in southeast Asia should develop into a major conflict.

If the outflow of gold is stepped up drastically.

If the predicted leveling-off in business, which many persons predict for the latter part of the year, should develop into a downturn.

Most of these things, of course, will never come to pass. But they make the outlook more cloudy than the easier task of looking back through 1964. In that year, despite some heavy layouts in individual electronic plants and the continued shrinking of the once-dominant textile industry, this region still showed a gain of 34,100 jobs from the year before, with just short of 4 million persons employed in nonagricultural jobs.

Statistics perhaps do not mean much to individuals who either are gainfully employed or are looking for work—anymore than do long-range forecasts—but anybody interested in New England business cannot help but see that the area will gain tremendous economic advantage through the location in Cambridge of the huge National Aeronautics and Space Administration's research center—once the political and local squabbling ceases over just where its final site will be located.

Most of the prophets of doom who were so noisy not many weeks ago about the projected closing of such military installations as the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard at Kittery and arsenals at Springfield and Watertown are quiet now.

They have made their protests to the New England congressional delegation and received assurances that the politicians in Washington would see what they could do.

But the chances of any reversal are almost negligible.

Those protesting today are the same ones who told you that New England never would survive the blow of some 40 years ago when it became evident that a considerable part of New England's textile industry was moving South.

This area proved capable of adjusting itself then and attracted new industries and changed its pattern of economy.

The defense conversion and military cutbacks present a problem, but there is no question that these challenges cannot be met at all levels of the economy. And there is no reason that good planning should not be able to turn this problem into an opportunity.

The statement has been printed many times, but it cannot be emphasized often enough: that New England has scientific and technical skills unequaled in any other part of the country, and that it has a "labor market" the envy of other localities.

Here, small businessmen and those who work for them have the know-how, a term perhaps impossible to define, but something that is recognized all over the world. Nowhere is there a work force so highly and so individually trained. Nowhere are there educational institutions that can surpass Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Brandeis, Tufts or Northeastern.

The whole impact of the gradual changeover in the defense and disarmament fields is going to upset many areas in months to come. Nevertheless, if there is any self-evident fact, it is that New England will make as significant a contribution to a world that may well be gradually disarming as in

one where military defense necessarily occupies as large a role as it does now.

Take a single instance, one brought up the other day by Everett Ware Smith, president of the New England Council. It was that of Presque Isle, Maine.

Two or three years ago that northern Maine community lost its Snark missile base. Along with it, the community lost 275 civilian jobs and some 1,200 military personnel. Instead of collapsing, Presque Isle brought 200 new jobs into the area to replace those which were lost when the base closed. Everybody there got behind a drive to build Presque Isle into a bigger, stronger, and more vital area than ever before.

What this community did, others can do. And will.

Our Responsibility to the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the subject of medical care and hospitalization for the aged has brought to my office, and I assume, to many offices a vast volume of mail. Most of the correspondence which I have received to date has been from my constituents who expressed themselves in favor of a medicare plan which would alleviate their financial hardship in obtaining proper and adequate medical attention.

We all know that the elderly citizen does not possess the necessary funds to properly treat his ailments which require immediate and full attention through qualified and trained personnel.

Among the many letters which I have received to date, there came a very timely and thought-provoking article which appeared in the Bergen Record of Saturday, January 30, 1965. Two of my constituents, Mr. Frank Uhl and Mr. Murray Ganhard, have directed my attention to the article, which I think should be brought to the attention of this honorable body.

Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article which I refer to above:

GOLDEN YEARS: AGED POINT UP MORAL ISSUE

(By Thomas Collins)

The Federal Government recently lent $25,000 to a cooperative in Louisiana that was engaged in making fruitcakes. It was a 15-year loan, at 4 percent.

A 66-year-old retired man or woman who has cancer would like a little of that benevolence. They can't have it. If they could borrow $25,000 they might be able to buy a cure. At least they could buy a softening of the pain and some comfort for the time remaining to them.

A couple of months ago a severe drought spread across the United States. Counties began appealing to the Federal Government for emergency help. The U.S. Agriculture Department came through, offering drought aid to 900 counties in about 27 States. Among other things, it offered livestock feed at cutrate prices to livestock raisers in 24 States.

The 66-year-old retired man or woman who is twisted with arthritis cannot get cutrate medicines, or doctors, or hospitals—or cutrate anything they need to save their lives and stop their hurting.

If you think this column is building up to an endorsement of Medicare you are wrong. If you think it is building toward the premise that our Government will do more for a fruitcake or a hungry hog than it will for a pensioner in pain, you are on firmer ground.

In the drought crisis, the Agriculture Department went further than cutrate livestock feed. It offered emergency loans to farmers in 928 counties to tide them over the crisis.

The 66-year-old retired man or woman cannot get from the Government an emergency loan to tide them over a heart attack.

Tornadoes, hurricanes, and such, usually bring forth greater benevolences than fruit cakes or hogs. A tornado can roar through the property of people in any region of the United States, lifting the room, knocking down the fences, and upsetting the privy in the backyard * * * and amid the glorious publicity about it all that comes in the papers and on TV to the victims, and the tributes paid to their courage, they can get Government help to get back on their feet.

The 66-year-old retired man or woman lying in lonely courage at home with a bleeding stomach can get no help unless they can pay for it. They can declare themselves paupers and get some help. But the fruitcakes, the hogs, and the privy need no declaration of poverty—only people.

A farmer raising one of the major crops of the country can get from the Government an all-risk insurance policy that provides protection for his crops. A 66-year-old retired man or woman can't get the same thing for their health.

A city or town can get lots of money from the Small Business Administration of the Federal Government to develop their communities and get life moving again. The town puts up $2; the Small Business Administration puts up $8.

The 66-year-old retired man or woman, lying in a semi-invalid condition all across our country and yearning to get life moving again would like a little of that.

The things that are said here have not been designed to say it is right for the Federal Government to be giving away so much money for so many causes. Nor is it intended that they give the impression that the ailing old folks should get on the gravy train that is passing by.

Rather, these words seek to point up the fact that some of the human beings around us are not so important as voters, and not so important as economics.

This is one of the grave moral issues of our time. It is beyond the practical and the economic. It gets into the realm of our religious beliefs, and what kind of people are we. Politics, the medical profession, and health insurance companies shouldn't decide it—our moral concepts should.

Older people in this country are in urgent, painful need of better medical consideration than they are getting. Anybody who wants to dispute this will have to come up with something better than the 2,000 letters a month this column is getting from the people who do the suffering.

Supplemental Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the imposition of restrictions on our conference committee. This is not a politically wise position for a new member from my district. However, both I and the distinguished Congressman whom I succeed, the Honorable August Johansen, were sent here to vote according to our own best judgment after the arguments had been properly heard. He did not, and I shall not, do otherwise.

We are about to decide whether we resolve today, before proper and thorough studies by this Congress, an issue which is in no way related to the urgency of the supplemental appropriation to the CCC. We vote on whether we abandon or continue a system of committee study which has assisted Congress to order thoughtfully its activities.

The advantages to be gained by yielding to our emotions are obvious. The responsibilities of this body lie elsewhere.

Let us properly hear the arguments on these two unrelated issues, soon but at another time, and decide them individually, and on their own merits.

Address by Mayor Robert F. Wagner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to submit herewith the keynote address by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, at the Gracie Mansion Conference on Narcotics Addiction held on February 3, 1965.

The mayor has recognized this very serious problem and obviously is making every effort to cope with it. I am certain that under his expert and knowledgable guidance great progress will be made to eradicate this scourge. I am particularly pleased to bring to the attention of this body the accomplishment of the city of New York in this connection.

The address follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT GRACIE MANSION CONFERENCE ON NARCOTICS ADDICTION

I thank each and every one of you who have come here for this Gracie Mansion Conference on Narcotics Addiction.

I hasten to explain to the literal-minded from out of New York that the New York Hilton Hotel is not considered to be an extension of Gracie Mansion. We hope to have some of you at Gracie Mansion tomorrow.

Unfortunately, the limitations of space at Gracie Mansion are such that the entire conference could not be convened or contained there. Nevertheless, I hope that all of you attending this conference will feel that you are, indeed, meeting under the auspices of the highest level of the executive branch of the city government. That was my intention in convening the Gracie Mansion Conference on Narcotics Addiction.

At this point, I want to make a keynote statement for this conference. My hope and expectations are that from this conference will emerge signposts in the direction of new programs and modifications of existing ones; in addition, we will look for the outlines of a plan for greater collaboration and concert in the conduct of the massive effort required to deal with the narcotics problem, and even for a mechanism for fuller and freer exchange of information on new devel-

opments in this field. Finally, I hope that there may develop an approach for exposing new practices and undertakings to impartial and objective scientific evaluation, so that there may be as little delay as possible in the sanctioning of new techniques as well as basic solutions to this raging problem.

This is not only our hope but also our purpose in convening this conference. I thought—and all my expert advisers thought—that we had reached a point at which this conference could serve an outstandingly useful function. The White House Conference of 2 years ago had most salutary effects and set the stage for new thinking, a new gathering of opinion, and a new sweep of action. As a result of that Conference, there was formed the Presidential Commission on Narcotics Addiction and Drug Abuse, some of whose distinguished members are leading participants at this conference.

There is much that still remains to be done to implement the results that flowed from the White House Conference, including the recommendations of the Presidential Commission. At this Gracie Mansion Conference we shall surely give thought to some of the proposals made by the Presidential Commission. Certainly, more Federal as well as State leadership and action—and funds—are vitally needed.

So we are gathered here, to face the problem as we in New York City see it, and to review what is being done—and more importantly, what ought to be done that is not being done.

The late Winston Churchill once said that the motivations of Russian foreign policy were a riddle in the center of an enigma wrapped in mystery. Precisely the same might be said of the narcotics problem.

The complexity of the problem and of each of its several aspects is little appreciated, neither by the general public nor even by some of the experts in the field. Of course, by overlooking this complexity it is easier to arrive at simple solutions. The only trouble is that such solutions frequently won't work when practically applied or tested.

The control of the traffic in narcotics is one such complicated problem. The traffic in drugs is the vehicle of the infection. As such, it must command as much of our attention as any other aspect.

The control of the addicts so as to restrain their criminal and antisocial behavior, is another such problem.

The prevention of the spread of the contagion is still another problem.

The cure of addiction by medical or psychological means is another problem.

The rehabilitation of the addict who has abandoned the habit, to prevent his relapse into addiction, is still another problem intimately related to the problem of his return into the environment which contributed to his addiction in the first place.

These are among the problems to which the various panels will address themselves and, hopefully, help us to distinguish truth from error, and fact from fiction.

At this point, I would like to try to give the narcotics problem a perspective that is seldom used; namely, the perspective of proportion in the scale of time.

The first general recognition of narcotics addiction as both a destroyer of individuals and as a social evil related to criminality was about 60 years ago. Legislative restrictions and controls were established in 1909, extended in 1914 and further in 1924, at which time the Federal Bureau of Narcotics was organized.

It is not widely known, at least among the general public, that the incidence of narcotics addiction has greatly decreased in absolute numbers since the 1920's, and even more so in ratio per population unit. In the 1920's, according to the best statistics available, the addict population was approximately 250,000, or 1 in 400. Today, the addict population in the United States is calculated at approximately 50,000 to 100,000, or 1 in 3,000.

Selective Service reports from World War I show that 1 out of every 1,500 men was rejected as a narcotic addict. In World War II, the rejection rate for this reason was 1 in 10,000.

As a historical footnote, I cite the major steps taken in 1919 by the New York City Health Department to deal with the narcotics addiction problem. The health department opened two clinics to give medication to the addicts. Seven thousand addicts were treated during a period of 10 months. At the end of this time, the clinics were closed. The health department historian, who supplied me with this information, in describing the conditions under which the clinics were closed, said, and I quote: "Chaos was profound."

Of course, I do not want to reflect a false sense of comfort from the figures showing the decline in the addict population from the 1920's to the present. Obviously, there has been progress in reducing the addict population over the long reach of years. Our present judgment is that the number of addicts in New York has been on the increase during the last 2 years. It certainly has been on the increase among teenagers. We know that increasing numbers of young people begin today by sniffing and end by shooting up—and some begin by shooting up and end the same way.

We have never had any hard statistics on the number of addicts. Seeking to remedy this, in 1963 a new health code regulation was adopted, requiring any person knowing of an addict to report him to a central and confidential registry. To date this record shows a total of 23,000 addicts in New York City. The registry is growing, although it shows no signs of reaching the 50,000 figure which some authorities have estimated as being the possible number of addicts in New York City.

Regardless of the numbers, we know that narcotics addiction, especially among the young, has one of the most horrifying and ramifying social impacts of any disease we know.

The typical addict who reaches the plateau of his tolerance steals approximately $100 worth of goods a day to support his habit. The cost to the city in terms of robbery to support addiction has been estimated at $600 million to $1 billion per year. That cost is spiraling upward. There are many other equally heavy costs, too.

The population group most affected and afflicted is the most precious part of our population—the young. That is why there is an increasing demand by society that the answers be immediately found, although some of these answers have been unsuccessfully sought for hundreds and hundreds of years.

In recent years, we have assembled an increasing number of facts about narcotics addiction. The total sum of these facts does not yet add up to solutions to the problem. We know some answers to some of the questions, but we do not yet know how to convert those answers into practical and effective attacks upon the problem. We are trying many different approaches. Some of them work in some cases, but in most cases do not; others work under some ideal circumstances, but fall down under practical, everyday circumstances.

But the facts are being assembled with increasing rapidity. Research, which once was spasmodic and disorganized, is now beginning to surge forward in manner as organized as research can be. You will hear the results of some of these efforts in the addresses and panel discussions at this conference.

Now I propose to discuss what is being done about the narcotics problem in New York City today—what the city government is doing and what others are doing.

Between 1919 and 1952, little was done by the city government for or with narcotics addicts. In July 1952, Riverside Hospital was opened for adolescent male addicts, and later for adolescent female addicts. On May 3, 1963, Riverside Hospital closed its doors to addicts after having served a total of 3,066 of them. Generally speaking, it was an unsuccessful operation.

Moreover, during all those years and until very recent times, if an adult addict wanted to "kick the habit," it could only be done in the hospital wards of the city jails. For adult addicts, except for emergency cases, there was no medical facility at any city hospital.

Since 1958 the following changes have been made:

City hospital facilities are now available for the detoxification of all addicts; none who wish to be detoxified are denied the facility for doing so. Hospital beds available for this purpose have been increased from 25 in November 1959 to 300 by February 1965. The waiting period for hospitalization has declined from 5 months to 5 days. During 1963 medical detoxification was offered to 7,366 addicts. Today, emergency medical care is available to the addict 24 hours a day in any city hospital.

Our hospitals Commissioner Ray E. Trussell is developing plans to make Manhattan General Hospital the addiction hospital in New York City. Not only will treatment for the addict be offered there, but it will be a center for drug addiction research.

I can announce, for example, that in the very near future, $80,000 will be transferred from other scheduled uses in the hospitals budget to Dr. Vincent P. Dole at Manhattan General Hospital to pursue his trail-breaking study on drug maintenance for the addict.

The State government, after a disappointing start, has seriously begun to implement the Metcalf-Voelker Act and is significantly increasing the number of civil commitments for the long-term cure of addiction as an alternative to criminal sentences.

Information and referral offices on narcotics addiction have been established in all city health centers.

Our health department has created the central registry to which I have already referred.

Our health department has the first and only functioning day-care center for addicts in the United States.

Research in problems related to drug addiction is increasing and intensifying greatly. Within the past 2 years, $1,580,000 has been given in grants for narcotics research in New York City. These grants have been given by the Federal Government, by private foundations, and last but by no means least, by the Health Research Council of the City of New York.

On November 22, 1961, by executive order, I created the office of narcotics coordinator which was placed in the department of health. Our present coordinator, Dr. Catherine B. Hess, under the immediate supervision of Health Commissioner George James, and with the full assistance and cooperation of the interdepartmental health council, has provided both the leadership and the coordinated effort that are so desperately required in this field.

There must be more of the same, and there will be more of the same, as far as the government of the city of New York is concerned.

Now I turn to the efforts at drug traffic control.

Of course, if the original source of the plague, the growth and manufacture of opium, could be adequately controlled, there would be no serious narcotics problem at all. For informational purposes, this will be one of the presentations to be made at this con-

ference by representatives of the United Nations and the World Health Organization.

Our own police have greatly intensified their efforts against the traffic at all levels and are training police personnel for even greater efforts and understanding of the problem.

Police Commissioner Murphy has increased the narcotics squad by 30 percent. It now represents the largest single municipal narcotics law enforcement group in the world.

The police department has provided for special 2-day courses in narcotics problems for all plainclothesmen, youth division, and tactical patrol force men.

These training courses are being planned to include the entire detective force and other units, including the uniformed police.

On September 9, 1964, the police department announced an incentive program whereby awards are made to all policemen to make two different felony arrests of narcotics offenders in the period of 1 year.

Since August 1964, the pressure has been on, and the addict and the pusher know it. The police—and that means the city of New York—mean business against those who do business in narcotics.

Meanwhile, the police department and the health department have been working together trying to resolve the criminal aspects of narcotics addiction. Both departments are providing educational material, visual aids and community meetings for parents and interested people of the community.

Many voluntary groups in our city, with official encouragement, are dealing with the problem of drug addiction as one of their major interests. Requests are being received from some of these organizations for the establishment of halfway houses. We are working on the establishment of halfway houses.

Approximately 200 community groups in New York City have expressed their concern and interest in the addiction problem, and are readily available to function at the grassroots level.

The prevention field is receiving more and more emphasis in New York City. New techniques are being developed for the early recognition by parents and teachers of drug use and addiction, and also the practice of glue sniffing and indulgence in so-called pep pills.

Now I would like to phrase some questions to which I hope answers might be given by the end of this conference:

1. What is the present state of knowledge concerning the addictive drugs, addiction itself, and the treatment of addiction?

2. Can the factors which predispose a person to narcotics use be identified; and if so, can they be dealt with?

3. What is the significance of the apparently rising use of narcotics by teenagers?

4. What is the relationship between narcotics use and criminality, and should there be stricter laws with regard to narcotics use?

5. Is the narcotics addict a criminal, a sick individual, or a sick criminal?

6. What access should the medical profession have to the addict?

7. What has been the experience of other countries and areas in dealing with the narcotics problem—England and Sweden, for instance—and what can we learn from their experience? How transferable is their experience to the problem in New York City and the United States?

In regard to the answers to some of these questions, we are all aware that there has been much controversy, and, indeed, a substantial lack of agreement among the experts as well as the pseudoexperts. There is still violent controversy concerning even the philosophy of the problem. Myth, mystery, and misery remain the chief characteristics of many aspects of narcotics addiction.

But the time has come, in my judgment, for all in the field to close ranks as much as possible and to organize the maximum attack upon all the various aspects of the problem.

I sincerely hope that as a result of this conference, machinery might be developed for the coordination and concentration of effort among all government and voluntary agencies and groups concerned with narcotics addiction, so that there can be the most effective and efficient use of available resources.

For our ultimate efforts, many forces will be required, and many paths need to be followed. We need not expect the ultimate truth to be revealed at this conference, but only some paths at the end of which the truths might be found.

Let us then pursue with impartial mind each available path, and see if we can find the ones which penetrate deepest through the dark and give the greatest hope of leading to the light.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Issues and Answers—ABC Radio and Television Program With Senator Dirksen as Guest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the Issues and Answers program on ABC Radio and Television, Sunday, February 7, 1965, on which I was the guest.

There being no objection, the text of the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISSUES AND ANSWERS, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1965

(Guest: Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, Senate minority leader; interviewed by John Scali, ABC diplomatic correspondent, and Keith McBee, ABC Capitol Hill correspondent)

The ANNOUNCER. Senate minority leader, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, here are the issues:

Do you approve of the American air attacks against North Vietnam?

Can we win the fight against the Communists in southeast Asia?

Is President Johnson handling General de Gaulle correctly?

Now for the answers from the dominant voice of the Senate Republicans, Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois.

To interview Senator DIRKSEN, ABC Capitol Hill correspondent, Keith McBee, and ABC diplomatic correspondent, John Scali.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, welcome to "Issues and Answers."

Senator DIRKSEN. Thank you.

Mr. SCALI. Was the Republican leadership consulted by the President in advance of our decision to retaliate against North Vietnam and what do you think of the decision?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes, they were consulted. If by "Republican leadership" you mean the Republican leader in the House and the Republican leader of the Senate. The Speaker was also consulted and likewise the majority leader in the Senate, so there was consultation as to the exact situation that developed, why it developed, and what they hoped they might do to meet the situation.

Mr. SCALI. Well, do you approve of the decision?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes, I think I do, knowing all the facts. First it must be remembered there was a holiday in Vietnam, and in Vietminh, also, meaning the northern half of that area. And when the holiday was over in the light of the fact that the new Soviet leader, Mr. Kosygin, was out there, there came this attack. It was a complete surprise, of course. It was not anticipated although I suppose they are prepared, generally speaking, for whatever attacks may come, knowing that it is guerrilla warfare and that they strike without any advance notice. And in resonse to it, something had to be done and action was taken.

Mr. MCBEE. Senator, as in the case of the Tonkin Gulf attacks of last summer will this action by the President necessitate Senate approval or House approval?

Senator DIRKSEN. Now that we are there and in the light of the resolution that we passed some time back, I believe, in his authority as Commander in Chief and other authority that the President is amply weaponed with all the necessary authority to take what action must be taken.

Mr. MCBEE. The old resolution holds up still?

Senator DIRKSEN. That is right. And then of course I think he relies in part—and rightly so—upon the understanding that was had back in 1953 or 1954, after Dienbienphu fell and we had to determine after the Geneva Conference what we would do with respect to Vietnam, the preservation of a stable government out there and the preservation of a government at all against outside attack, meaning, of course, the Communist attack.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, I know, because you are vitally interested in this development, that you have been in touch with the White House not only before but since. What do you know about the results of the attacks?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, I would have to give you a general answer, of course. I am pretty sure, based upon conversations, and a conversation with the President no later than this day—in fact, early this day—that immediate action was taken. Secondly, that it was deemed to be adequate, insofar as results are known, so that no time was lost in meeting this situation.

Mr. MCBEE. Senator, John here broke a pretty good story the other night. He said that he had ascertained the Russians were thinking about supplying the North Vietnamese with the same kind of antiaircraft rockets that they had given Castro. Do you think that this action, especially with Mr. Kosygin in Hanoi, might deter them from such an action?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, that, of course, is in the speculative field. Obviously I do not know. The Russians may do it. They may send them to China and let the Red Chinese do it. Assuming, of course, they are on speaking terms, and they must be, since Kosygin did stop off and have a visit with the Red leaders of China. But whether rockets have been moved in is a matter I can't say, unless I had knowledge. That knowledge presently I do not have.

Mr. SCALI. The fact that Premier Kosygin was visiting Hanoi at the time must have been an important factor in the decision on whether to strike at this time in retaliation. What is your understanding of this, Senator?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, actually without having knowledge and perhaps no understanding, I have a fairly clear idea of what this must add up to because if Mr. Kosygin had first visited with the Red Chinese leaders before he went to Hanoi and possibly Hai Phong also in that upper area, and then the holiday came over, they had the dinner for Kosygin and then the attack comes, obviously they are waiting to see what the reaction from South Vietnam and the United States is going to be.

Now if I were sitting there musing and speculating on the subject I might come to the conclusion, if there were no reaction at all that perhaps we were getting ready to pull out, or we were not wanting to take a chance on a deeper intervention by the Chinese and by the Soviet Union, and I think as a speculative matter it is highly important, and if I had to make the determination, I would have made exactly the same determination, namely to retaliate and to be sure that it was adequate retaliation.

Mr. MCBEE. The time is good then, and we surprised them?

Senator DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. SCALI. You think, then, there was no alternative, in view of what the provocation was?

Senator DIRKSEN. Not unless you want all of the Orient to suddenly feel that we have lost face, and you would want the whole wide world to feel that either we were so weak or so disinclined that we would not take any action.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator, after we attacked the gunboat bases following the Gulf of Tonkin incident, the Chinese and the North Vietnamese did not themselves retaliate against these attacks. What do you think the outlook is now, is it riskier than it was previously?

Senator DIRKSEN. Of course there I go out on a limb, in other words. It is a wholly speculative answer.

Mr. SCALI. Right.

Senator DIRKSEN. You cannot tell, there is no basis for any surmise as to what they might do. They might believe that we are really serious about this business and this may be the end of it for a while except these little sorties across the border in order to keep the guerrilla warfare steamed up.

Mr. MCBEE. Senator, is not this beginning to take the shape of a policy? We have this long war of attrition in Vietnam which we are attempting to win on the ground and yet periodically when a political crises especially looms, then we strike, as in the case of Tonkin and as in the case of the attacks today. Do you think this is our long-standing, long-range policy?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, it is our policy as of the moment because, first, let me say we have three choices: We can do what we are doing at the present time and we can give, if they assault us. We could move across that parallel with everything we have got. Who knows what kind of retaliation it will invite. And third, we could pull out if we so desired. But my own notion about pulling out is that we forsake the southern end of our outside Pacific perimeter which runs from Korea to Vietnam, and if that is done, why your flank is turned, military speaking, and then what happens to Guam and to the trustee islands and to the Philippines out in the Pacific, because you are going to have to maintain that flank, whether or no.

Mr MCBEE. Well, not to belabor the point but doesn't it appear that we maintain the ground war until hopefully ultimate victory but occasionally we have to bring them up short?

Senator DIRKSEN. Right. Of course our first job out there, if we can get it done, is to establish some kind of political stability. That is one of the real problems in Vietnam today. It hasn't worked out too well as yet, what with the fall of three or four governments since the Diem government. Now then we have to work at it because unless you have stability you have exactly nothing. At the same time you have got to maintain a military posture out there in order to sup-

port that government and to defend it and throw a shield around it against these constant and almost uninterrupted attacks from the north.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator, do you think there was any alternative to this attack on our part? Do you think that silence or doing nothing would have been completely misunderstood?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, the alternative, as you know, when interpreted in the Orient, is actually not an alternative at all for us because unless you stand your ground, unless you meet the attacks that are made—and this was a serious attack it is my understanding now, the latest report which may not have actually gotten out as yet, is that there were over a hundred who were wounded in addition to those who were killed. Well, this is a pretty serious attack.

Mr. MCBEE. We agree on that, but I must interrupt for just a moment. In just a moment we will be back with more issues.

(Announcements.)

Mr. MCBEE. Senator DIRKSEN, so far as you know do all of our military leaders concur with the military action in Vietnam today?

Senator DIRKSEN. I am reasonably sure, and it is based upon an inquiry that I made, that they do concur unanimously, and that goes for General Taylor and it goes for General Westmoreland as well, who are on the ground.

Mr. MCBEE. Well, General Taylor all along has favored some sort of escalation of the war. I assume this is along the lines of his suggestion to the White House.

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes, and I think what action has taken place is quite in line with any suggestion that Taylor made.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, do you expect the President will call the joint congressional leaders to the White House in the next few days to discuss this and give them the latest information?

Senator DIRKSEN. Without actually knowing, I would say it is entirely impossible, now, knowing the President and having sat across from him in that Senate Chamber for many years, fought, bled, and died together oftentimes——

Mr. SCALI. Do you mean possible? I thought you said "impossible."

Senator DIRKSEN. No. I was going to say having fought, bled, and died together up there a good many times, I know what his attachment is to the Congress and how anxious he is to have the people's elected representatives know all the time what is going on, so, on the basis of his penchant for having these leadership meetings when there is a serious problem before the country, I would guess that before too long there will be a leadership meeting.

Mr. MCBEE. Senator, what is the point of crisis that leaves you in a completely bipartisan position? In 1962 in the Cuban missile crisis you said to President Kennedy "You take care of the Nation, I will take care of the Republicans." In matters of emergency like this, you depart party and become the Senate leader who will back the administration——

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, let me put it on a broader ground. We have always taken the position that we are entitled to be informed as to what is going on abroad where we are involved, and we are entitled to have a chance to offer any suggestion, any substitutes, any alternatives that come to mind. But when that chance has been afforded and the time comes to make a hard decision, we feel that we have got to conjoin because this is a hostile world full of fever and this country cannot afford to show a disunited face to the world and in consequence we have invariably pursued that line.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, on both occasions when we have struck across the border and hit military targets in North Vietnam, we have announced that it was in specific retaliation for Communist attacks against American forces.

How do you stand generally, sir, on the idea of additional strikes into North Vietnam, not necessarily in specific retaliation but as a means of bringing home to the Communists that we are not going to pull out and that if they continue this policy of infiltration it will risk a bigger war?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, first let's be clear that what happened, now, is strictly a retaliatory move and does not contemplate going any further than that. Now that is a matter of broad policy as to whether or not you go beyond retaliation and strike, let us say, the industrial area of Hanoi and Hai Phong. It is not for me to say. It is a decision for the President and the National Security Council. But I think at all times they are fully aware that you might get retaliation in reply, and who knows to what extent, and in what volume that may come, and how deeply we could become involved with Red China and for that matter the Soviet Union if she proposes to supply weapons to Red China and then in turn to North Vietnam?

Mr. SCALI. Do you think as conditions are developing there a total victory for the side of freedom is possible?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, patience is a virtue, you know, where guerrilla warfare is involved. Look how long it took the British. Was it 13 years in Malaysia, before final freedom eventuated and even now the British are out there in larger numbers and have to defend it. So if you are trying to save the freedom, liberty, the stability, and the form of government of a country like Vietnam with 11 or 12 million people, you have got to summon a lot of patience. And it is evidenced, of course, by the fact that since this all began after the Geneva undertaking in 1954, we have had 54,000 of our American advisers in and out. That is a rather euphemistic term, as you know, when you talk about advisers, but that is the fact. And so there may be as many as 23,000 or 24,000 at the present time. You have to summon up all the patience in the book in dealing with a situation of that kind.

Mr. MCBEE. Senator, there was loose talk before this program that politics might creep into our little discussion.

Recently you have undergone an election not of your making. A great many pundits and columnists have said that the real Republican leadership in your party, which is not enjoying some disarray at this moment, falls upon you, and you yourself have said in announcing the GOP Coordinating Committee some weeks ago that the elected Republican is the Republican leader.

Don't you feel, sir, that the mantle of Republican leadership indeed rests upon your shoulders at this time?

Senator DIRKSEN. I am not so sure about that. Let us say it rests on a number of shoulders. But there is this fact: You have 172 Republican Senators and Congressmen serving in this, the 89th Congress. Now they come here with the suffrage of the people. And consequently they are entitled to and they do go on the record with respect to all questions of policy, both domestic and foreign. They couldn't escape a kind of leadership if they wanted to because here it is. And they must go on the record and that record is a part of the scroll of the Republican Party for all the country and particularly the voters to see in 1966 when we go back to the polls in the bielection.

Now we try to coordinate all this. The Governors are elected, too. To be sure their principal orbit is the State domain and the State problems but no less they have an interest in national affairs. That would be true of those who have been candidates for the Presidency, or who have been President of the United States. Eisenhower and Landon, and in the candidate field Goldwater, Nixon, and Dewey. Consequently they like to be heard and they have been leaders of the party.

Now if you coordinate all that and get the necessary task forces, together with the implementing personnel, and base that on the national committee and then, of course, lay it before your elected Congressmen and Senators, you have a pretty cohesive force where you have a sharing of the leadership.

Mr. MCBEE. But Senator, in front of all this hydra is a voice and that is the Senate minority leader, isn't it?

Senator DIRKSEN. Don't derogate it all to the Senate minority leader. There is a very distinguished House minority leader, too, JERRY FORD, of Michigan, and a very capable leader indeed, I must say. So maybe we are the funnels and maybe the joint leadership meetings which we try to contrive, every week, if possible, is the forum where these things have to be beaten out and then, of course, given to you at the press conferences that follow.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, do you think much progress has been made in changing the image of the Republican Party that is presented to the people? The reason I ask that question is that some critics and indeed some members of the Republican Party felt that perhaps Senator Goldwater presented too conservative an image and this was a factor in the election defeat.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, you know I don't get fired up, particularly, about this question of images. I have always said that the record has to be the image, and everybody contributes to it. Because an image is an amorphous and composite thing. So we try to build the image by what we do because that is the thing that ultimately counts.

We had some difficulties in the late unpleasantness of 1964, if I can refer to it in that fashion, and I think too often, of course, what one man may have said, even as an aside or even to a reporter, too often was dramatized and made to appear that that was a party position when as a matter of fact it wasn't.

Take for instance TVA. Actually what was disclosed in the press didn't come from our candidate. Never said it in that fashion at all. It was speculating. But it didn't go for the rest of the party. I was here when TVA was established. I was against it to begin with. You are not so naive, after more than 30 years in Washington. You know very well you couldn't dislodge TVA if you wanted to. But just think of the impact of such a statement upon those who are wedded to the idea of public power. And if I went on, I would have the whole campaign laid out for you right like now.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, if we could just get into the international area a bit more, as you well know, General de Gaulle let the United States have it in two specific areas this week (a) he attacked the dollar as a medium of exchange and he suggested a conference to put the United Nations back on the track, in his view, by including Red China in some kind of discussion.

How do you stand on those proposals?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, first of all it would appear to me that De Gaulle's gold proposals meet no favor anywhere with those who are expert in that field. Goodness knows I am no monetary expert. I was here when we passed the Gold Reserve Act in 1934. As I recall, I voted against it. They said at that time there were 13 people in this country who knew all about money and I wasn't one of them. So I played trump and I voted against it. But just look at this picture today. We have about four or five gold mines more or less. We have one that is a real producer. Tell me where in the world are you going to get the gold for gold cover for deposits in the Federal Reserve System and for the Federal Reserve notes? It is not fair. And we have to depend on the dollar.

And thank goodness that the rest of the world clings to that dollar because that is the best piece of money there is in the world today.

Mr. McBEE. General de Gaulle pretty much must have anticipated the reaction to his suggestion. Why do you think he likes to tweak our nose?

Senator DIRKSEN. I am not sure whether that is just an inborn characteristic, whether it was meant, of course, to gain some publicity—although why should a man of the stature of Charles de Gaulle have to resort to those things in order to get publicity? He doesn't have to. All he would have to do is to set foot outside the palace and they are ready to take his photograph and hang on every word. And I am glad it is that way. But these little shots in the dark may fire his imagination a little bit, but it hasn't perturbed or caused any rumblings in the financial chancelleries of the world, fortunately.

Mr. McBEE. Thank you, sir. In just a moment we will be back with more "Issues and Answers."

(Announcement.)

Mr. SCALI. Senator, the Communists are claiming that they shot down some of the American planes that attacked these installations. From your conversations what do you know about our losses?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, it is entirely possible, and the lowest picture as I got it this morning is a good deal larger than it was last night when I got these reports. It indicates, of course, the dimension of this action over there and that they are playing for keeps.

Mr. SCALI. Well, we are, too?

Senator DIRKSEN. Oh, indeed we have to.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator, how do you go on this business of perhaps introducing American fighting troops if necessary in order to win the war?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, what are these advisers doing if they are not advising and giving necessary training to fighting people? Because that is our real role over there. The Vietnamese picture and the Vietnamese Army has to be kept in the very middle of this situation all the time, and our best operation of course is to give them the best weapons possible and the best kind of training in order to meet this jungle and guerrilla warfare.

Mr. McBEE. Senator DIRKSEN, we have not run out of subjects certainly but out of time. Thank you very much for being with us on "Issues and Answers."

The ANNOUNCER. Our guest this week has been Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican of Illinois, Senate minority leader. He was interviewed by ABC Diplomatic Correspondent John Scali and ABC Capital Hill Correspondent Keith McBee.

Next week at this same time "Issues and Answers" will bring you the leading ladies of the United Nations, with U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Mrs. Marietta Tree, Nicaraguan Ambassador to the United Nations, Senora Hope des Somosa, and the Liberian Ambassador to the United Nations, Mrs. Angieu Elizabeth Brooks. We hope you will be with us.

An Air Cadet's Views on Insurgency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter sent to me by a constituent who is now a student at the U.S. Air Force Academy.

I believe his views on counterinsurgency are of interest at this time for two reasons—because of the present crisis in South Vietnam and because they show that at a time when the Air Force Academy is under fire for cheating by some of its students, there are others who are doing serious, purposeful work.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 12, 1965.

DEAR SIR: Four years ago you appointed me as a candidate for the U.S. Air Force Academy, and I was accepted. I will graduate in June, with a major in national security affairs, and so far my 3½-year cumulative grade point average is 3.04. The problems of counterinsurgency fascinate me. I am convinced that with enough effort, imagination, and time to catch up, we will eventually be able to develop the art of counterinsurgency to such a level as to make Communist insurgency movements impractical.

I am very much concerned about the present debates in Congress as to whether the United States should continue its present efforts in South Vietnam.

I profoundly respect, and will defend the right of people to freely express their ideas, and in the midst of all this I also have confidence that most of the newspapers and decisionmakers in this country are conscientious enough to do some research of their own on such important issues. However, I would like to contribute some additional points (from a national security point of view) which I think are worth consideration.

Guerrilla insurgency, in its present stage of development, is perhaps the most efficient means ever developed for one nation to gain control over another. It is a relatively inexpensive effort, and it is the most practical approach left in this nuclear age. The art of counterinsurgency, on the other hand, is far less developed and is inherently more difficult. It is far easier to ambush buses, assassinate schoolteachers, and throw bombs into restaurants, than it is to prevent these things from happening. Unless counterinsurgency can be more effectively developed, my generation will probably never see an end of situations such as we now have in South Vietnam and in the Congo.

Communist insurgents receive most of their popular support not because the people want communism, but because the insurgents have convinced the people that they will ultimately win. If the insurgency movement is not permitted to develop beyond a certain stage for a prolonged period of time (say, 10 years), it will grow stagnant. Ten years of indecisive fighting can be very discouraging. On the other hand, if the United States pulls out of South Vietnam, it will prove to the rest of the world that Communist insurgency (with its terror tactics, purposeful and planned aggression, dogmatic intolerance, etc.) is more effective and more popular with the people than anything we have to offer. Communist insurgency, if this happened, would become very popular wherever there are dissatisfied people. "Why obey these laws when we can kill the policemen?" Insurgency is only inevitably successful if we allow it to succeed by our indifference.

Too many people cry about "our boys getting killed overseas," when they could be saving more lives by putting some effort into reducing our highway fatality rate. Insurgency is going to be around for a long time. Most of us volunteer or very willingly accept assignments in South Vietnam. Personally, I would much rather give my life in an effective effort to stop Communist insurgency there than to sit back for 15 years and watch similar situations develop in Asia, Africa, South America, and even in Mexico. Could we stop it then?

This is just a cadet's view of the national security aspects of why we should continue our efforts in South Vietnam. The two world wars of this century have shown us a very profound truth: We cannot stay out of a world by ignoring it.

Sir, I would appreciate it if you would insure that these things, which seem so obvious to us, are not overlooked. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER C. CURRIE,
U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado.

Veterans' Administration Closings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, one of the most cogent statements made during the recent hearings before the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee on the Veterans' Administration hospital closings was that of the Disabled American Veterans. I believe this statement is a fine summary of the arguments against the VA's position, and I subscribe to the views it expresses. I believe it should have the wider circulation which publication in the RECORD will give it.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY CHARLES L. HUBER, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF LEGISLATION, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, JANUARY 28, 1965

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Disabled American Veterans appreciates the opportunity to appear before you to present our views in connection with the recently announced decision of the Veterans' Administration to close some of its currently operating facilities.

Specifically, the Administrator intends to abolish 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries. It has been alleged that the closing of these facilities will not adversely affect the quality of care which the Congress has authorized for veterans; will effect a savings of $23,500,000; and will not diminish the availability of service provided to veterans and their dependents.

The 215,000 members of this organization, composed of wartime disabled veterans, are deeply concerned over the announced closings and the affect which we believe it will have on the over-all veterans program. For whatever reason the Veterans' Administration has offered for the justification of this action, it is our sincere feeling that the action is ill-timed and ill-considered. It is our belief that if the closings occur, the adverse affect will be immediate and profound and the impact will extend far in the future. Additionally, we were given no prior opportunity to study the Veterans' Administration plan for closing of these facilities.

We quite frankly feel the way this entire matter has been handled is an affront to the Nation's veterans, the Congress, and the general public.

The closing of 17 VA regional offices will definitely deprive many veterans of the benefit of personal contact with the Veterans' Administration and the services it provides. These veterans will be disadvantaged in comparison with others located near the 50 regional offices which will remain open.

The majority of veterans calling at the regional offices are those who cannot express themselves through correspondence; those desiring to appear in person before the rating board; and those with complicated cases that can only be handled by personal contact.

The loss of service would extend also to veterans' widows who very often must come to regional offices for expert assistance. To properly assist and counsel a veteran or widow, we know it is essential that the claims file be available. If the proposed Veterans' Administration plan goes through, the claims file would not be available in the remaining contact offices. Veteran and widow claimants would only be given routine information at the contact offices. A great deal of correspondence would go back and forth between the contact officer, the regional office where the file is located, and the claimant. We do not believe the mailbox is an adequate substitute for personal contacts necessary for the proper consideration of a claim for benefits.

An Executive order authorizes the Veterans' Administration to send a parchment certificate signed by the President to widows upon the death of their veteran husbands at a time when thoughtful sentiments mean so much. This is a strange paradox, indeed, when you consider that the services of the regional office which she so desperately needs are being taken away from her.

The services, which our ex-servicemen are entitled to by law, will be made so unavailable and inaccessible that in the final analysis they will not be able to take advantage of them. Our files, as well as the files of the Veterans' Administration, show thousands of veterans coming to the various regional offices throughout the country daily for personal interviews, counseling, appearances before the rating boards, et cetera.

The closing of 17 VA regional offices will only effect a savings of $3 million in fiscal year 1966. In our opinion this small savings certainly cannot be justified when it will cause such drastic reductions in the services provided to veterans.

The proposed closing of 11 VA hospitals will leave a gap in large areas where ill and aged veterans will have no hospitals and will be required to travel 300 miles or more to the closest VA facility. This will not only create a severe hardship for the veterans but also for their families, most of whom cannot afford the expenses involved in traveling vast distances to visit veteran patients.

It is an established fact that not all veterans admitted to VA hospitals throughout the country need the extensive diagnostic study, expert consultations, and treatment which are admittedly available at the larger hospitals, particularly those in the vicinity of approved medical schools. We should bear in mind that a great many veterans are hospitalized for illnesses which are no doubt serious in nature, but which can be treated in the conventional manner by the expert medical personnel currently available at VA hospitals all over the land, including the so-called remote areas.

A similar situation exists with respect to the VA domiciliary program. Not all the veterans in these facilities require the expert diagnostic and medical care which is readily available at the larger hospitals affiliated with medical schools. Domiciliary members generally require routine geriatric care but do not require the wide variety of services available at the larger hospitals. There are, of course, occasions when extensive care is essential and it becomes practical and necessary to transfer an individual to a large hospital for appropriate care. These occasional transfers may involve a moderate expense and a degree of inconvenience to the Veterans' Administration. However, it is not a proper reason for a change of policy in the operation of the domiciliary program, a change which would lead to false economy, less care, and perhaps even the total abandonment of the program. In this connection, the DAV in previous appearances before this distinguished committee, and other committees of the Congress, has voiced strong opposition to any move designed to reduce VA domiciliary functions and services. It is our intention to continue in this direction.

There are involved in the 11 hospitals and 4 domiciliaries approximately 6,000 beds all of which are utilized for medical care and treatment of two classes of veterans—those who were wounded or disabled as the result of military service, and war veterans who cannot afford to pay for hospitalization. Approximately 3,000 of these beds (those in domiciliaries) are occupied by veterans who have a disability, disease, or injury which is essentially chronic in type and is producing disablement to such degree and probable persistency as will incapacitate him from earning a living for a prospective period. In short, Mr. Chairman, these beds are occupied by indigent war veterans, a majority of whom are chronically ill and unemployable.

The Veterans' Administration itself has termed the domiciliary as an institution which provides a home—bed, board, and incidental medical care—for men who are so disabled that they cannot support themselves.

The proposed closing action is most astonishing in light of a VA profile study made in 1961 which described the typical member of a VA domiciliary as a 64-year-old World War I veteran, disabled principally by heart disease, is unmarried, has an elementary school education, an income of $66 monthly from VA pension. His potential for rehabilitation is limited by his physical disabilty. He also lacks adequate income for independent living.

This is the VA's own description of a patient occupying 3,000 of the beds to be closed. These needy veterans cannot find encouragement in the Great Society's promise of a future "free of bodily wants and fulfillment of the needs of the spirit."

Closely related to the problems created by the closing of hospital beds is the situation with respect to Veterans' Administration nursing care. On August 12, 1963, President Kennedy authorized the Administrator, of Veterans' Affairs to activate and operate 2,000 nursing care beds in VA facilities. Public Law 88-450 approved last August, authorized 4,000 nursing care beds in the VA hospital system. Despite this clear-cut mandate, the Veterans' Administration has activated and is operating only 46 of the several thousand nursing care beds so urgently needed by our aging veterans.

A large portion of the $23,500,000 saved by the ordered closing is to be used for placing in operation part of the 4,000 nursing care beds. The other portion is to be used for furnishing drugs and medicines to veterans receiving non-service-connected pensions who require the regular aid and attendance of another person. What the VA is doing here is withdrawing funds from the service-connected veteran who, by law, has priority of admission to hospitals, and transferring such funds to programs which are primarily for veterans who do not have a service-connected disability. We do not believe this was the intent of Congress.

We believe serious consideration should also be given the loyal, conscientious career employees in the facilities to be closed who have given many years of dedicated service to the Veterans' Administration. The small percentage of the employees who are retained will be forced to leave their homes and community attachments and settle in different localities. The rest will be thrown into the labor market or in the ranks of the unemployed.

We realize that minor adjustments in VA regional offices, hospitals, and domiciliary programs are necessary from time to time. However, in giving serious thought to the VA's actions under discussion here today, the question arises as to what shall become of the veterans program in the future.

The veterans of this country want assurance from the Executive regarding future policy. They want to know what the future holds for them, what they can expect from the Veterans' Administration as to location of regional offices, hospitals, and domiciliaries, and the availability of service and treatment in the future. This assurance is needed and should come in clear terms from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Director of the Budget Bureau, and possibly the White House.

They want assurance about future policy as it relates to the 125,000 hospital bed ceiling; future plans for new beds, for closing beds; future status of the domiciliary system and the nursing care program; the number of contract beds now in use and future plans in this area; also about the recent VA policy change to permit admissions of Public Health and active duty personnel in Veterans' Administration hospitals. (This policy change was first communicated to us on January 25 when the Administrator responded to a question during these hearings.)

We believe the veterans of this country, the Members of the Congress, and the American public have a right to know about future planning in these and other areas. If the executive branch of our Government fails to respond satisfactorily, we would suggest, and indeed recommend, that the authority now granted the executive under present law be removed and that it be placed in the Congress of the United States to determine the quantity and location of Veterans' Administration facilities.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I might mention that we have heard considerable comment as to where the responsibility lies for the decision to close the VA facilities. We do not believe the new Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should shoulder full blame and responsibility for the closings. It has become obvious that the basic foundation of the veterans program, as enacted by Congress of the United States, is gradually being subjected to erosion by the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Driver has been placed in an awkward and embarassing position; a position we think should be shared by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, we are most grateful to you and the members of the subcommittee for affording the Disabled American Veterans an opportunity to present our position on this most important matter.

Thank you.

Anatomy of a Riot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will recall that Rochester, N.Y., was among the racial-strife punctuations of the 1964 summer scene.

As I reported to the House at the time, whole sections of my home community came apart at the seams. The fabric woven of law and order was rent asunder by mob rule.

I saw the situation firsthand, and still search with my fellow Rochesterians for the real reasons that touched off this terror.

Whether Rochester and its sister cities can sufficiently solve the race riddle to assure riot freedom in the future is unknown. But, the goal is being sought with urgency and understanding.

Rev. Arthur L. Whitaker, who is pastor of Rochester's Mount Olivet Baptist Church, is one of those Negro community leaders encouraging the comeback effort. Because he is my friend, I am aware of Mr. Whitaker's work and writings on the subject.

So respected are his views that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People chose to publish Mr. Whitaker's "Anatomy of a Riot" in the January issue of its national journal, the Crisis.

As a foreword to the inclusion of Mr. Whitaker's article with my remarks, I offer the following editorial from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of Thursday, February 4. I commend both the editorial and Mr. Whitaker's commentary which it praises to the consideration of my colleagues:

RIOT ANALYSIS

A voice of reason has spoken out on the Rochester riots, and from a predictable source in this city's Negro community—Rev. Arthur L. Whitaker, pastor of Mount Olivet Baptist Church.

The Reverend Mr. Whitaker, who has also lectured in sociology at the University of Rochester, has written a cool and collected analysis of Rochester's race relations in the January issue of the Crisis, national publication of the NAACP.

He criticizes members of both races for persisting in several errors which preserve the potential for violence—for looking for a "black messiah" as leader and spokesman for all Negroes, for example, or for branding Negroes as "Uncle Toms" if they confer with the white "power structure."

And he gives credit where many critics have heaped blame: "Some outsiders have mistakenly suggested that violence and lawlessness erupted because Rochester had done nothing about its racial problems. The city has taken steps to improve race relations."

His three suggested preventive measures are no panacea, as he acknowledges, but they are constructive.

1. Coordination of activities of social and civic organizations in the area of better housing, schools, and job opportunities.

2. Strengthening of the local NAACP and other civil rights groups by involving more people of both races in the membership and action programs.

3. Establishment of a domestic peace corps with emphasis on self-help by the Negro community and other interested groups.

The Reverend Mr. Whitaker is a man who thinks before he speaks, and then speaks calmly but pointedly. White and Negroes both will do well to listen.

SLUMS, NO WORK, GHETTO, DESPAIR—ANATOMY OF A RIOT

(By Arthur L. Whitaker)

Back of the incident that sent Rochester's "angry young men" into the streets last summer was an accumulation of grievances—unemployment, inadequate housing, and alleged police brutality.

The racial disorder, violence, and lawfulness which exploded in the city of Rochester, N.Y., on July 24–26, 1964, came as a "rushing mighty wind," with hurricanic force during the hottest July in the city since 1955. The toll exacted for these 3 days of havoc and devastation included 4 deaths, the arrest of nearly 1,000 persons of both races, and property damage estimated at more than $1 million.

On the first night and in the early morning hours of the next day, the full-scale rioting by Negro youth, in the main, raged with violence and lawlessness involving persons and property. The disorder was touched off by the attempted arrest of a Negro charged with disturbing a block dance in the Baden-Ormond area of the city, which lies to the north of the downtown business district. The area has been described as a slum with a high concentration of Negroes. The business and commercial establishments are mostly owned and operated by whites. A few Negro businesses can be found along three of the main streets of the area.

Two efforts have been made by the city to upgrade the district in recent years. The controversial Hanover Houses, a low-rent public housing project, was constructed in 1952 amid much debate, opposition, and tension. Hanover Houses consist of high-rise units situated along the Vienna-Herman Street area. Negro occupancy has increased steadily from 60 to more than 90 percent. The Baden Street settlement, the largest of five settlements, is located nearby.

The second effort on the part of the city to upgrade the area involved the relocation of 750 or more families and business establishments, beginning in January 1959, from the site of the Baden-Ormond project. At the time of the relocation, much of the housing in the area was dilapidated, deteriorated, unsanitary, and overcrowded. The slum clearance covered a 60-acre area. The newest housing project, Chatham Gardens, fronting on Joseph Avenue and adjacent streets, is one of two-story dwelling units for middle-income families.

On the second night, violence and lawlessness broke out in another Negro ghetto, the old third ward, once known as the ruffle shirt ward. The third ward area is located a short distance from the downtown business district in the southwest section of the city. It is a blighted area with slum pockets located throughout the various neighborhoods. It has some stable housing appraised from fair to good. However, transiency is high in this area. The third ward has been the focus and concern of the city's department of urban renewal and economic development. Like the Baden-Ormond area, the third ward has overcrowded housing and a high percentage of absentee landlords. Negroes pay high rents in both areas.

The Montgomery Neighborhood Center housed in a new modern building on Cady Street, is centrally located for the families and children it serves in the third and adjacent wards. The Montgomery center has recently completed a "self-study" of the community.

RACE RIOT OR RACIAL DISORDER

In looking at that weekend of violence and lawlessness from within a number of things needs to be reviewed and understood. First, there is need to clarify what occurred in the city of Rochester. What happened was not a race riot. Rioting by Negro youth and others, caught up in the psychology of crowd behavior, did occur. In a race riot two opposing forces, racial or ethnic groups, are engaged in open conflict. Such was not the case in Rochester. The rioting began about 11:30 on the night of July 24 when a police officer attempted to arrest a Negro youth accused of disturbing a block dance. The arrest sparked long-smoldering resentment of authority, intensified by reports of alleged police brutality in the city over the past several years. The violence and lawlessness subsided temporarily about 11 a.m. the next day only to break out again "across town" in the third ward area, Saturday evening and early Sunday morning.

The disorders gathered momentum quickly. The young Negroes were joined by adults and some white youths in the rampage. The gathering of a crowd is a monstrous thing when fanned by the fires of violence and lawlessness, the hurling of rocks, bottles, broken glass, and Molotov cocktails at humans, store fronts, buildings; the overturning of cars, and the looting of stores.

One thing was clear, the violence that erupted had a twofold aim—an expression of resentment against police authority and an overt attack upon white-owned business establishments.

The second night followed the same pattern. Again, the target was the white merchants. It would seem clear that the looting of the few Negro businesses occurred by accident. The pillage was extensive along Clarissa Street, Plymouth Avenue, Jefferson and Reynolds Streets in the third ward, with two additional complications.

On the first night (July 25) of the imposed 8 o'clock curfew, a white man was slugged, fell into the street and was run over and killed. The following afternoon a helicopter, carrying the head of civil defense, his aid, and pilot, circled the area along Clarissa Street, came in too low, hit a roof and exploded. The flaming aircraft crashed into the street and set fire to the house. One person in the house and the civil defense aid and pilot perished in this mishap.

Both incidents created additional stress and strain, but the helicopter crash created greater tension in an already tense and weary community.

WHY DID THIS HAPPEN?

The "why" of any catastrophe is never easy to answer in any situation where personal or social disorganization occurs. Some outsiders have mistakenly suggested that violence and lawlessness erupted because Rochester had done nothing about its racial problems. The city has taken steps to improve race relations. However, certain basic problems, making for unrest, remained unresolved.

1. Rochester's Negro population has had a phenomenal growth since World War II. The Negro population has increased from 7,590 in 1950 to 23,586 in 1960. Thus, during the 10-year period the Negro population more than tripled.

2. The tremendous growth of the Negro population taxed housing, particularly in the two main Negro ghettos, the Baden-Ormond area and the old third ward. Middle-class Negroes, for the most part have been able to escape the blighted areas. In moving into better residential areas they have, in instances, encountered discrimination and opposition. Less advantaged Negroes—those of little education, no skills, and low income—remain trapped in the ghettos, resentful and despairing.

3. De facto segregation in the schools: All of the schools in the zone of transition and adjacent areas, fanning out from the downtown business district, are predominantly Negro. The board of education's projected open enrollment plan, effective February 1964, has met with strong opposition from many of the parents in the neighborhood of the receiving school.

4. Alleged police brutality continues to be one of the main topics of conversation even as the city of Rochester attempts to re-create its image of good will. Among the various cases of alleged police brutality the Rufus Fairwell (August 1962) and A. C. White (January 1963) cases are the most controversial.

Additional charges of abuse were made by 13 men of the Black Muslim faith, charging

that police had broken into a religious meeting January 6, 1963.

Charges and countercharges acerbated existing tensions. Some 500 persons gathered to hear the debate on the proposal to establish a police advisory board at the council chambers on March 12, 1963. The police advisory board late became a reality despite the opposition of many, including the Police Locust Club.

5. Employment and the Negro: "The Negro and Rochester Economy," a series of five articles by William Vogler, published in the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle, April 22–27, 1963, gives some deep insights into job situations and employment. The series reviewed the employment policies of business and industry and the job classification complaints by Negroes in the city. It was pointed out that "a major factor behind white and nonwhite income differences is the unemployment rate. The male unemployment percentages in 1961 nationally were nonwhite, 12.9, and white, 5.7. The comparable Rochester rates in 1960 were nonwhite, 14.5, and white, 4.8."

It is evident that any appreciable percentage of unemployment in a community can create social unrest and social problems. Discriminatory practices in business and industry augment the hopelessness and despair of the unemployed, especially among teenagers and young adults.

The amount of education an individual has along with skills and experience are factors to be considered; these factors are related to whether or not the individual is employable from the standpoint of education and training in a given industry or business. The Democrat & Chronicle series cited a U.S. Department of Labor report: "Proportionately fewer Negroes than whites go to college, but from 1947 to 1961 the number of nonwhites in college rose at a faster rate than did the number of whites." Additional findings in the Labor Department study revealed: "Nonwhite males aged 25 years and over in 1962 had averaged 8.3 years of schooling, compared to 11.6 years for whites. But the nonwhite men in age group 25–29 had averaged 11 years of schooling compared to 12½ for whites nationally."

The occupational picture reveals that "the gap between whites and nonwhites in upper income jobs is less in Rochester than nationally. Similarly, it is smaller in the lower job categories."

Nevertheless, the angry young men, whether high school dropouts or graduates, for the most part have not been able to find job opportunities. Thus, one can see the why of the riots from the point of unemployed teenagers and young adult men who have reached their breaking point and hit back in the only way they know.

The newspaper series reported that business and industry in the city of Rochester are employing more and more Negroes. Some have been admitted to training programs. However, a large segment of the Negro youths has not managed to find employment and apprenticeship training.

All the foregoing factors of growth of the Negro population, overcrowded housing, de facto segregation in the schools, alleged police brutality, unemployment and others contribute to social unrest, social problems, and tend to foment a climate for violence and lawlessness.

ROCHESTER IMAGE

Unquestionably the rioting tarnished the image of the city of Rochester—a city which has long prided itself upon its civic achievements and its racial tolerance and good will. Despite the warnings of informed community leaders, city officials did not seem to realize how deep rooted and explosive were the social and economic maladjustments in the depths of the black ghetto.

During the past 5 years the city of Rochester had taken certain steps to improve the climate and to assist Negroes and other minorities. Many low-income Negroes will tell you the middle-class Negroes have fared better. However, both low-income and middle-income Negroes have been victims of subtle prejudice and discrimination, especially in the areas of housing and employment.

In addition to this, Rochester now has an office of the State commission for human rights, a Monroe County Human Relations Commission, and a police advisory board: All were opposed by a segment of the population with the cry that they were not needed. All have been highly criticized by some Negroes and whites as to their present effectiveness within the city.

The city's newspapers, radio and television stations have also contributed much to the understanding of the problems that exist.

Further, social agencies, churches of all faiths, separately and the Rochester Area Council of Churches (Protestant) through its commission on religion and race, have conducted workshops, programs, and lectures. Catholics, Jews, and Protestants jointly sponsored a notable workshop on October 30, 1963, in a conference on religion and race.

CONCLUSIONS

Violence is nurtured in an atmosphere of unrelieved frustration, resentment, and despair. Violence does not provide the answer nor can it be condoned. It stems from the social and psychological pressures which exist within the Negro community.

Violence, of course, is not uniquely Negro; it breaks out among other ethnic groups and in all socioeconomic classes. But last summer's riots in Rochester, New York, Philadelphia, and elsewhere were rooted in the social and economic disadvantages foisted upon the Negro by an apathetic, if not insensitive, society.

Upper and middle classes of both white and Negro communities, both North and South, must realize the depth of the despair and the extent of turmoil among the disadvantaged, undereducated, and underemployed Negro masses.

The potential for violent outbreak will remain as long as these situations continue to exist:

1. The tendency of both Negroes and whites to look for a black messiah as leader and spokesman for all Negroes. In a complex society such as ours, there can be no single leader for any group, black or white. There are various levels of leadership in all groups.

2. The inclination on the part of some Negroes to think that every Negro in conference with the white power structure is an "Uncle Tom," and to criticize him harshly.

3. The attempt to substitute resolutions, platitudes, and high-sounding statements for action to meet civil rights problems.

4. The tendency on the part of some white persons to impose collective guilt upon the Negro race for the misconduct of a minority.

5. The excessive dropout rate among Negro high school students, particularly in a city such as Rochester, with its highly skilled technology. Our youth must take as many apprenticeship training courses as possible.

The urban North and South must understand the specific grievances of Negroes. In Rochester we heard the angry young men complain about the following:

1. Shortweight in purchasing. Negroes must always pay for a pound of bacon when they get only half a pound.

2. Failure to get a job even though some Negroes scored higher in manpower training courses than some whites who got jobs.

3. High rents paid to absentee landlords who appear only when the rent is due.

4. The use of police dogs and brutal treatment by police.

In retrospect one thing is clear: so deep-seated were the grievances and frustrations that there was no easy, prompt way to turn off the explosive fury. Early attempts by grassroot leaders—political, civic and clerical failed to cool it. This was true, in spite of the efforts by them and leaders of the local branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, who tried to restore order through appeals via radio, television, press and direct contact.

Nevertheless, the local NAACP, augmented by a team from the national office and a representative of the State organization's legal redress committee, did arrange for defense counsel for arrested persons unable to secure a lawyer on their own. The NAACP and representatives of local groups met with the mayor, the city manager and other city officials to whom they presented grievances; mobilized support of religious and civic organizations; and went to the people in the street. Finally, after 3 days, order was restored.

While there is no panacea to ward off such outbreaks, some preventative measures can be taken, such as the following:

1. The coordination of activities of all social and civic organizations, concerned with improving race relations, in the area of better housing, schools and job opportunities.

2. The strengthening of the local NAACP and other civil rights organizations by involving more people of both races in the membership and action programs. Special effort will be required to reach the people caught in the residential and psychological ghetto.

3. The establishment of a domestic Peace Corps with an emphasis of self-help on the part of the Negro community and other interested groups.

Foreign Policy Winds Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we in Congress, the press of the Nation, and the man in the street are all greatly concerned about the situation in South Vietnam and the development of our foreign policy in relation to our Asian commitments.

Among the many editorials which recently have appeared is one from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel, in my home State of Indiana. I call attention to its contribution to the current discussion, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY WINDS CHANGE

The winds of change are blowing briskly through the halls of the State Department, as it seems obvious that our foreign policy stance is undergoing reshaping.

The signs are many and come from such bellwethers of that stance as Walter Lippmann, who recently advocated a pulling in of our horns which he admitted smacks of what in another day would have been called out-and-out isolationism.

Other noises of change are being keened by such as Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and longtime advocate of global foreign aid. It is Senator FULBRIGHT's seeming contention

now that this country has been forced to shape its domestic policy on the trap of its foreign policy. And he urges a reassessment, first, of foreign aid, and then an overhaul of foreign policy generally.

Latest of the drumbeaters for change is John Kenneth Galbraith, chronicler of "The Affluent Society" and onetime ambassador to India, who has authored a piece in the current Atlantic titled "Foreign Policy: The Stuck Whistle." He contends that the people expected dramatic changes on both the domestic and foreign policy fronts after the November election, but have had little to cheer them in the foreign policy field.

Here's what Galbraith opines:

"Most of all, people are tired of the litany of our foreign policy—with the endless calls for vigilance, the pious assertions of our own virtue, the repeated promises of prompt improvement in our affairs in Saigon and Paris, the never-ending reports of fruitful diplomatic missions and useful diplomatic talks when it is evident that nothing was accomplished, and the continuing assurances that we are tough minded and hardheaded and will never allow our better instincts to prevail. If Americans ever return to isolationism, it will be because, where foreign policy is concerned, they have been bored to death."

Typical is the most recent bloodless coup in South Vietnam where the civilian government has, for too many months, been a yo-yo dangled on the military's string. Vietnamese strong man Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh seemingly is of no mind to pay attention to U.S. requests for establishment of a stable government so the Vietnamese can get on with the prosecution of the war.

And despite our own proclamations of improvement in the situation, it is obvious each day that the situation steadily deteriorates. Nor does there seem to be an ability on the part of State or the administration to attack the problem from a fresh approach which might alleviate the grinding attrition we are currently suffering in another war we can't win.

Part of the reason for such inaction, Galbraith indicates is the mood of chronic contentment that prevails in our foreign policy, the instinct to continue present policies, "whether right, wrong, or potentially disastrous." He adds:

"Then, alas, comes the day of reckoning when the reality must be recognized and the price must be paid. Error has to be confessed and an escape plotted at a point when all the exits have been painted in. As a result, we give a maximum impression of political infirmity, both at home and abroad."

Obviously, the time has come to correct the usual inertia which seems to plague our foreign policy and there, seemingly, is evidence such change is in the winds.

Has Our Privacy Ceased to Exist?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, near the end of the last session of Congress I was named chairman of a Special House Government Operations Subcommittee assigned to investigate matters related to invasion of privacy by Federal agencies. The Washington World carried an excellent editorial last year on the subject of invasion of privacy. I believe this problem should be of the utmost concern to every Member of Congress and, indeed, all Americans. The text of the editorial follows:

[From the Washington World, Apr. 20, 1964]

HAS OUR PRIVACY CEASED TO EXIST?

Two new books, one by Vance Packard ("The Naked Society," David McKay), the other by Myron Brenton ("The Privacy Invaders," Coward-McCann), depict a society in which the right of an individual to privacy has been taken away.

Telephone conversations are monitored secretly, washrooms are equipped with television, newlyweds are studied through one-way mirrors to evaluate their "adjustment period," and police enter homes without knocking or disclosing their identity.

The locale of these nonfiction works is not a totalitarian state—the year is not 1984. The place is here; the time 1964.

The fact of surveillance of suspects by responsible authority is not of itself shocking, nor is it undesirable. The disquieting aspect of being watched or bugged is that Americans seem ready to accept these checks upon their privacy with little resistance.

If one must subject himself to being televised while cashing a check, must be screened and tested for security reasons when taking a new job, these are the rules by which we live, and accepting them is virtually painless—so, why not?

There are good and sufficient reasons why not.

Have we become so accustomed to being denied sufficient privacy that we are gradually losing our humanly independent nature? Do we so enjoy the comfort of not having to resist each new invasion of our privacy that shortly we shall welcome them?

Once upon a time not long ago, a man could keep a secret simply because it was to his advantage or comfort to do so.

Once a man could earn a wage known only to him and his employer—and occasionally his wife. Today, his yearly earnings—to the penny—are a matter of public record.

There is today not one area in which a man's life can truly be called sacred, no retreat to which he may take himself and feel totally secure—away from prying eyes.

Authorities have the right to search, to seize, and to prosecute those who would withhold information that is "vital or necessary to the national security."

Should a man declare his constitutional right and demand privacy through any number of constitutional amendments which allow this, he is branded a subversive, or is considered strange and untrustworthy by his neighbors.

This in itself should frighten us out of our collective wits.

But Americans will continue to smile benignly into the camera, to have their fingerprints taken, to allow their names, their annual incomes, and their daily activities to become more and more public. We simply cannot see any danger in it.

One day we will—but by that time it will have been too late to do anything about it.

We may not even recognize that it's happened; that individual freedom does not exist.

We will deserve it.

Glenn Doss With Whitewright Sun for 50 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mr. Glenn Doss has been with the Whitewright Sun, as an associate and editor, for more than 50 of the 80 years during which this newspaper has been published in Grayson County, Tex. On this occasion of the golden anniversary year of faithful and dedicated service to his community, tributes from far and near have been paid to Mr. Doss. One of these was a congratulatory tribute by the First National Bank of Whitewright, Tex.; it was published in this newspaper on January 14, 1965.

The Whitewright Sun has shown the traditional image of the valuable role which the rural weekly newspaper has played in the lives of rural families during the history of this country. Their vigor and untiring service to their communities, with an accent on the emphasis of local news of interest, have exemplified the rigorous spirit which founded this country.

Men such as Mr. Doss, who possess the intellectual discipline and stability of personality and character neecssary in order to remain in a demanding position with one newspaper for over five decades, certainly are to be highly commended. The fact that the people of Whitewright did not banish him, but, instead, honored him for 50 years of fidelity, is also a tribute to his fairness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this tribute to the Whitewright Sun printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE WHITEWRIGHT SUN ON ITS 80TH ANNIVERSARY

Since 1885, the Whitewright Sun has chronicled the life and times of the Whitewright area. It has done so in a friendly, helpful manner, without sensationalism or rancor. It has not only reported major news; it has devoted itself to reporting the day-to-day, personal activities which make America's smaller cities true communities instead of just groups of people.

As the oldest business institution in Whitewright, the Sun has contributed to the continuity of business life in the community and has reported it and recorded it for all time. It has provided businessmen with an advertising medium through which to build and grow.

As a public service institution, it has reported the joys of birth and marriage, the heartaches of illness and death, the pride of progress and accomplishment, the hopes for the present and the future. For all these years, every citizen of this area has known that at least one newspaper was interested in him, his life, his family from birth to death, his trials and triumphs, his memories.

As a journalistic institution it has had a remarkable history. Twice during the lives of most of its present readers it has received awards as the best all-round weekly newspaper in Texas. Many, many times it has received awards for editorial content, advertising, and general excellence.

For more than 50 of its years, Glenn Doss has devoted himself to the rigorous, difficult, but satisfying life of putting out a weekly newspaper, and doing it extremely well. His vocation is service to the people of this community, and this area. He has been fortunate—as have we—that he fulfills the ideals of his vocation so well.

Glenn Doss began his career with the Sun when he was still in Whitewright High School. Except for service as an administrative employee in the War Department in World War I, substantially all of his working

life has been spent with the institution which most clearly and most indelibly represents the Whitewright area to its own citizens and the world outside—the Whitewright Sun.

As it begins its 80th year of publication, we wish the Whitewright Sun, and its publisher, Glenn Doss, well. We hope the second 80 years of publication will be just as good as the first.

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK.
WHITEWRIGHT, TEX.

Unemployment in the Old-Age Bracket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great problems facing the Nation today is the unemployment of millions of folks who are classified in the older bracket between 40 and 65 years of age. If they possess social security, it certainly is not enough income to satisfy their needs during these modern high-cost-of-living conditions.

The following resolution requesting the Congress to adopt legislation outlawing discrimination against this age bracket is timely. This resolution was adopted by the Glen Park Aerie 2413, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Gary, Ind., and submitted by Paul J. Nadeau, president, and William C. Largent, secretary:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO ADOPT LEGISLATION OUTLAWING DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BASED ON AGE—40 TO 65

Whereas job barriers against older workers in industry are cruel, wasteful, and unsound and deprive the economy of much valuable skill and experience; and

Whereas the most neglected man in the employment picture today is the man between 40 and 65, who is too young to retire on social security but too old to find a job; and

Whereas by 1975, one-third of all Americans will be between the ages of 40 and 65 and considered unemployable by a majority of employers; and

Whereas discrimination in employment based on age deprives persons in the prime of life of the earnings they need to provide a decent standard of living for themselves and their families and causes persons from 40 to 65 to live under the shadow of constant fear that, if they lose their jobs, they will be unable to find another; and

Whereas it is irrational for a society to do with one hand everything possible to extend the life of man while, with the other hand, writes him off as useless because of the date of his birth; and

Whereas in 1964 Congress adopted Public Law 88-352 which makes it an unlawful employment practice for an employer with 25 or more employees and engaged in an industry affecting interstate commerce, to discriminate against employees or applicants for employment because of their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin; and

Whereas section 715 of Public Law 88-352 provides that the Secretary of Labor shall make a study of discrimination in employment because of age and shall report the results of such study to Congress not later than June 30, 1965, "and shall include in such report such recommendations for legislation to prevent arbitrary discrimination in employment because of age as he determines advisable": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States be requested to enact at their present session legislation which will make it an unlawful employment practice for employers to discriminate against employees or applicants for employment because of their age being between 40 and 65.

PAUL J. NADEAU,
President.
WILLIAM C. LARGENT,
Secretary.

Skiing in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, less than a generation ago the ski trails of America were only a few spider webs on a sparse number of whitened slopes. Today, they lace uncounted mountainsides; and skiing has become a booming major sport in every area visited by winter snows.

My State was in the pioneer vanguard of this tremendous sports development, with the construction by the Union Pacific in 1936 of Sun Valley, a magnificent lodge and ski resort in a monumental setting near Ketchum, Idaho. Its name became synonymous with skiing, and still is.

In recent years, several new ski areas have been added to the Idaho roster—including Schweitzer Basin, near Sandpoint; Brundage Mountain, near McCall; and Bogus Basin, near Boise—to implement what we Idahoans acknowledge to be the finest skiing in the world.

Following the purchase last year of Sun Valley by the Janss Corp., plans for its expansion and modernization have been announced by the new owners. The New York Times magazine of last Sunday published a well-written and interesting salute to Sun Valley, and the January edition of the Ford Times includes an excellent article lauding the merits of Brundage Mountain, near McCall, which in 10 years has produced 11 national ski champions.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have these two informative articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times magazine, Jan. 31, 1965]

HOW NOW, SHANGRI-LA?

(By Martha Weinman Lear)

SUN VALLEY, IDAHO.—When Sun Valley recently was parted from the tender bosom of the Union Pacific Railroad, wherein it had nestled sweetly—albeit at a deficit—for 29 years, and sold to the Janss Corp., a mammoth real estate development outfit in southern California, skiers across the country sniffed suspiciously at the winds of change. How now, Shangri-La?

Well, there are other splendid places. Aspen is the fun town, booming along in the après-ski hours on a base of 30 restaurants and night clubs. Vail is new, and full of sass, and therefore chic. Alta is the deep-powder skiers paradise, Stowe is the grand old burgher of eastern skiing, Sugarbush is beautiful people performing their tribal rites on the dance floor at Orsini's (and this season, of course, it is also ski school director Stein Eriksen, the former world champion, who is to American skiing what Burton is to Hamlet and fully as guaranteed to fill the house).

But Sun Valley is something more. The country's first true winter sports resort, born in 1936 of the loving labors of W. Averell Harriman, then chairman of the board of Union Pacific, christened by Steve Hannagan, the alltime big daddy of publicists, instantly adopted by movie stars and pre-jet-settlers, it became, and remains the dreamland of American skiing—remote, idyllic, and militantly unchanged.

Consider: The average large ski resort, gleaming new, may get a weekend crowd of 5,000 to 10,000 harassed souls fighting for space and survival on the highways, on the mountain, and in motels strung 20 miles along the road.

Sun Valley beds down 905 guests; in a holiday squeeze, 1,069. Guest No. 1,070, goodby.

Awaiting these 900-odd are an urbane village, perched neat and implausibly pretty—and, like a cruise ship, self-contained—amid the Sawtooth Mountains of southern Idaho; a staff of 600, most of whom regard anything beyond the Sawtooth as the outside world—and let it go hang; lodges, private cottages, chalet-style dormitories, clothing and gift shops, beauty and barber shops, drugstore and post office, movie house (sans marquee) and bowling alleys (subterranean), skating rink and two heated, outdoor swimming pools, clock tower and snow-covered village green—all snuggled together within the equivalent of a few city blocks. Sometimes even sleigh bells ring.

Nearby are two splendidly groomed mountains: Dollar, a beginners' haven, and Baldy—9,000-foot elevation, 5 colossal bowls above the timberline, 3,200-foot vertical descent and 22 miles of trails, most of them hard work. There are mountains with greater descent, but they pause now and again for runouts—flat places—where skiers can coast. Most of Baldy doesn't pause for anything at all. Aficionados say it is as challenging a mountain, overall, as any in Europe.

To the novice it looks like an empty elevator shaft. "Our approach is to grab him while he's still in a state of shock and get him on the chairlift," says ski school director Sigi Engl, but he doesn't really mean it. Every year Engl hires a psychologist to teach his instructors how to coax the novices down. There are eight chairlifts with never a wait; 80 instructors—larger resorts have 40 or 50—and, when last heard from, 135 inches of snow.

Such bodies as must occasionally dot any mountainside are sent to the 19-bed, 4-doctor hospital—its sundeck screened to screen the plaster casts from the virgin view of new arrivals to the valley. Dr. John Moritz, its director, has tended an average of 150 fractures a season for the past 25 years. Dr. Moritz does not ski.

"It's a tremendous asset, having the hospital here," says Sun Valley manager Winston McCrea. "Unfortunately, we can't publicize it." For years, the alltime record leg breaker at Sun Valley was a chap who came in fresh from Argentina and got his on the first run down. He was recently displaced by an arriving guest who tripped getting off the Sun Valley bus that brings train travelers in from Shoshone, 64 miles distant, and landed in a cast before his bags were unpacked. There has since been a New York lady who

broke an ankle on Park Avenue while walking her poodle, didn't know it, and brought her fracture into the valley, but she doesn't really count.

Whether in the hospital or on the top of Baldy or any place else in the valley, no guest, until the final reckoning, ever needs a nickel in his pocket, which makes the mood hospitable as can be. "It is just like a lovely club," one lady said recently, as her husband signed yet another chit. "You do not have to pay for anything."

Guests also say it is just like one big family, and just a second home and there is a familial air about Sun Valley. People do not come here for the weekend. They come here for the week, for the month, for the season, and they greet each other with the glad cries of summer campers reunited. And as with any big family, there are inner circles. Most of the college crowd bunks down in the dormitories for $3 a night—European plan, as are all accommodations. Single people, young families and a smattering of celebrities who do not like to dress for dinner are at Challenger Inn ($15 to $19 per person, double room), a big, L-shaped, quasi-Alpine structure designed to look like a lot of little quasi-Alpine structures. After a day's skiing this crowd heads for the Ram, where a trio plays, the tables are carved with a quarter-century's worth of initials, beer washes down pigs' knuckles and sauerkraut and gemütlichkeit hangs in the air as heavy as wet powder on a clump of evergreens.

The deluxe travelers are a snowball's throw away, in Sun Valley Lodge ($14 to $55), a stout Bronx cheer for functional design made of concrete poured into log molds. Here stay the famous, the chic, and the merely well-heeled—the kind of people who virtually monopolized Sun Valley until the family trade moved in after World War II.

The business nabobs, arrive before Christmas, bearing gifts, and linger long. There is a loyal Hollywood contingent, headed by Norma Shearer and her husband, Martin Arrougé, who met when he was a Sun Valley ski instructor. Ann Sothern owns a home in the valley and used to operate—truly—a sewing-machine instruction center just down the road. There is a hard core of international skiers ("We don't do anything for a living," one of them explained recently. "We used to try to make up something that we do, but it's no use. We just don't do anything"). Now and then one of the greats—an Olympic star or a top professional racer—stops in, and everyone else moves over.

Not long ago Toni Sailer, the 1956 Olympic champion from Austria, schussed into the valley sporting a 10-gallon hat, a double holster and an honorary sheriff's badge presented to him at Aspen. Newsmen awaited. Cameras ogled. But Toni, who spoke fluent English, suddenly didn't understand a word of it and would grant no interview. What to do?

Sun Valley news director, Dorice Taylor, who once taught English at Miss Hewitt's classes—and owned a part of the school, as well—knew what to do. Aspen had given him a tin badge, had they? She would give him a horse from which to conduct his interview. Toni promptly recovered his command of the language and didn't lose it again until after the interview, when Mrs. Taylor tried to explain that the horse was merely a loan.

At 5:30 of a recent afternoon, while beer flowed in the Ram, tea was being served from a samovar in the lodge lounge, an amenity as old as Sun Valley. "They used to call our tea table 'The Iron Curtain.'" reminisced Ronald Balcom of Palm Beach, dean of the valley's jet set. "We had a good group—the Ray Millands, the Gary Coopers, Bill and Mignor Winans, Evie and Van Johnson. Our pet instructors were always welcome. But anyone else got frozen out fast." ("You're making it sound snobbish," said his wife. "Well, it was," he said comfortably.)

"The place is more democratic now, but there still is nothing else like it. It's cozy. We come back after a year, the skiing is great, the guests and staff are old friends, the chairlift attendant gives my wife a clap on the fanny * * *. It's just like coming home again."

Outside, skaters glided on the rink immortalized by Sonja Henie in a 1938 sugarplum called "Sun Valley Serenade." In the lodge dining room Hap Miller, who came in with Sun Valley, was tuning up his orchestra for dinner-dancing. Sommelier Peter Riehl, who came in 2 years later and can tell at 30 paces who will want the Grands Echézeaux '59 and who the amusing little red, was readying his key and leather apron. And past visions rose again.

Miss Henie batted her baby blues at the camera while Glenn Miller wheedled magic out of a workaday tune called "It Happened in Sun Valley." Ernest Hemingway came down from his room in the lodge, where he wrote portions of "For Whom the Bell Tolls," and strode behind the bar to show them all how to mix a Bloody Mary, which he insisted he'd invented.

(Once—the valley loves to recall it—Hemingway, who is buried in Ketchum, a mile away, was asked for his autograph by a stranger in the Ram. He complied gracefully. Later the stranger passed his table and said, "Hello, Mr. Hemingway." Hemingway smiled affably. Soon he passed a second time and said, "Hi, Ernest." Hemingway nodded distantly. And then a third, and this time, loud and clear: "Hel-lo, Papa." Hemingway's beard lowered; his arm shot up. "Hel-loooo," he roared, "and good-byyyy.")

In Ketchum, an old lead-mining and sheep-herding town, Hollywood stars and other chic souls journeyed to the Christiania gambling casino and huddled up to the roulette wheel for warmth. Others graced crap tables in the Main Street saloons. "They'd come down on crutches, some of them, and stand around gambling for hours," recalls Whitey, genial boniface of the Pioneer Saloon. "The only heat in these places was a pot-bellied stove. Steak was 85 cents. Oh, my, it was gay."

Ketcham is still gay. The college crowd and young valley employees move down at night, into the nine bars and the Leadville Espresso House—a converted church—and the town shakes. But gambling went out in 1948. The casino is a supermarket now. Some of the smart-setters have gone on to the new smart-set places. Easterners often find it easier and cheaper to get to Europe (both train and air travel to the valley, from either coast, still involves several connections). And Sun Valley has begun, gracefully, to show its age.

"It's still unequaled in this country for snow, for conditions, for service, for hospitality," says Martin Luray, editor of Skiing magazine. "But the industry has been growing at the rate of 10 percent a year, and Sun Valley has stood still. It used to be big. Now it's small. That's part of its charm, but to keep up it has to change."

Thus, the dilemma facing the valley's new proprietors. Brothers Edwin Janss, Jr., 50, and Bill, 46, owners of resorts and budding resorts in California, Colorado and Hawaii, are both skiers (the younger Janss was on the 1940 Olympic team). They bought Sun Valley by default, as it were. Union Pacific had hired them as consultants on a proposed expansion of the area. "All of a sudden," says one, "the Union Pacific officials could see only investments, investments, and they wanted to get out. We liked our own ideas so much that we took over."

The Janss ideas include taming 1,000 additional acres of powdery ski terrain on the other side of Baldy, development of new homesites, increased guest capacity, improved accessibility and, eventually, a strong bid for year-round traffic. While open throughout the year, Sun Valley has traditionally made money in winter, held its own in summer (when prime hunting and fishing are available) and lost heavily in spring and fall. The Janss people envision changing this seasonal situation with a grab bag of activities and institutions that would make the valley an athletic, social, and cultural resort center—"for the new society," a spokesman says. A summer camp, perhaps * * * a preparatory school * * * a musical festival. But slowly, slowly.

'The thing is," said Janss Corp. President Victor Palmieri a few days back, sitting in the Duchin Room of Sun Valley Lodge and watching guests—the men in ties and jackets, the ladies in a virtuoso display of après-ski wear—dance to the sturdy society beat of Hap Miller's Orchestra. "The thing is, everyone who's ever been to this place considers himself a part owner. When the sale was announced, we got calls from everywhere—New York, Switzerland—wanting to know what we would do to the valley. We have exciting plans, but we have to tread delicately. How do you start changing a place that people love because it's never changed?"

In point of fact, some things had already changed. Upstairs, Hap Miller played on, but in the basement of the lodge was the first Janss innovation: the Boiler Room, converted from a boiler room, the piping exposed and artfully illuminated, the décor Mephistophelian modern and the ambiance fiendishly gay. A steel band played, and on the dance floor a hundred blithe spirits whooped it up.

"Man," cried a young ski instructor, stomping and twitching, "now this place is really gonna swing."

Hush, laddie; it's been swinging all along. But dolce, as befits shangri-la.

[From Ford Times for January 1965]

SKIER'S HEAVEN IN IDAHO

(By Rafe Gibbs)

The mountain wonders surrounding McCall, Idaho, have beckoned in turn to trappers, stockmen, lumbermen, hunters, fishermen, movie producers, and tourists. Now skiers from distant parts are heeding the call.

Near McCall, 110 miles north of Boise, is the new Brundage Mountain Ski Area, with a double-chair lift that provides a 5,355-foot ride to an altitude of 7,600 feet and a Tiegel Alpine platter lift for intermediates. A striking A-frame lodge offers a balcony view of soft loveliness contrasted with rugged grandeur. There are ice-silvered lakes, meandering meadows, and forests so thick they seem like carpets. Then, off in the distance, jagged peaks spear the haze.

From November 15 to May 15, the high altitude of Brundage Mountain makes for good skiing. One winter, when snow was short on many ski slopes in the Pacific Northwest, it was long at Brundage—100 to 110 inches, crisp, and fine.

Skiers take off on Brundage and swoop down its broad face, passing through cuts in evergreens with girth enough to be known as "king's pines." (In Colonial America all white pines larger than 24 inches in diameter 12 inches from the ground were reserved for the king.) Runs vary in length up to two and a half miles, with cross-country journeying possible for 6 miles down to the lakeside town of McCall. The area has both gentle slopes for the inexpert and challenging glides for the proficient. It has served as a training camp for the world ski championship contests of the Federation Internationale de Ski, and has drawn various tournaments. One recent winter, at the invitation of the University of Idaho, leading collegiate skiers from the West came to Brundage, and found youth-satisfying thrills in the descents.

The Brundage Mountain ski area is the materialization of a winter's dream by three of Idaho's leading citizens—J. R. Simplot, Boise, who parlayed his World War II dehydrated potatoes into a diversified industrial empire; Warren Brown, who as a 90-pound, freckle-faced kid in the twenties was one of the Nation's top dog-team racers and who later operated the Brown Tie & Lumber Co. (now Boise Cascade Corp.) at McCall; and Corey Engen, a transplanted Norwegian. All three love to ski, but Engen skis best. He is a former Olympic star and U.S. champion in both slalom and downhill racing.

EXPERT INSTRUCTION

As master of the ski slopes, Engen, lean and trim, is greatly admired by the youngsters of McCall. Ever since McCall began—in 1888—the town's youths, at about age three, have taken to skiing. For generations, however, skill had to be developed without the aid of instructions. Now there is Engen. Over a period of 10 years, McCall, with a population of 1,423, has produced 11 national ski champions.

Last winter I dined at Shore Lodge in McCall. The attractive lodge is threaded through the evergreens on the edges of Payette Lakes, and gives picture-window views of broad waters which in the summer reflect deep shades of blue. Now the lakes were frozen over, snow-covered. I was musing on the first sight of the lakes by Thomas McCall in the winter of 1888, which led him to believe the waters were a huge meadow. The waitress set down my dessert.

"This is the end of my shift, and I have to hurry up to Brundage," she said. "I don't ski a lick, and I should go home and rest my feet, but my son—he takes lessons from Corey Engen."

Ski spirit in the town of McCall received a severe test in the winter of 1953–54—before Brundage. The McCall Ski Club had just completed a $15,000 T-bar tow on McCall hill, when the lodge at the foot of the hill burned to the ground. Wood was still smoldering in the snow when the Brown Tie & Lumber Co. moved temporary, fabricated bunkhouses to the site, and ski club members began donating their time to build a new lodge. More than 200 pairs of skis belonging to youngsters had burned in the fire. News stories in the Idaho press brought donated skis in a hurry and in plenty. Skiing at McCall didn't even pause.

The progressive pace for this mountain area was probably established back in the first part of the 19th century by Donald "Perpetual Motion" McKenzie. One of the West's most famous trappers, Perpetual Motion was a giant of a man, weighing more than 300 pounds. He got his name in the McCall area because he never seemed to stand still except when squinting down the barrel of a rifle.

Today there is a sort of perpetual motion about McCall—of the relaxing kind. Snow skiers move over the mountains into the late spring. Then the water skiers take over on Payette lakes. On the lakes' edges, across from McCall, they skim past a picturesque old log fort. Some think perhaps Perpetual Motion slept (or tossed fitfully) there, but the fort was actually built more than a century after his time.

SETTING FOR THE MOVIES

When moviemakers decided in the thirties to film Kenneth Roberts' "Northwest Passage," they wanted a particular beautiful forest setting. But, because so much footage was to be devoted to the long trek of Rogers' Rangers, the scenery also had to be varied. The McCall area became the site, and the fort was built for some of the scenes. Also filmed at McCall: "Hudson Bay."

In season, fishermen ply both the lakes and streams, and at supper time you can smell the fragrance of frying trout, wafted from many tourist cabins. Mountain climbing, on foot or horseback, is another favorite sport of the area.

Perhaps the most significant feature of the place is the blended naturalness of its people, town, and mountains. When I first knew McCall in the thirties, it was a lumbering town—and it still is. Stroll one block off the edge of Main Street, and you are at the big mill of the Boise Cascade Corp. To the natives, it is an important industry; to the visitors, it is an intriguing sight. In both winter and summer, lumberjacks can be seen skipping over logs on the lake as they maneuver the giants of the mountains into the mill. January skiers pause and puzzle. The rest of the lake is frozen, but what the skiers do not know is that at the bottom of the water near the mill are perforated pipes through which air is blown to send the warmer water to the surface.

At restaurants, plaid-shirted "jacks" rub elbows with plaid-shirted visitors. Ever since the outsiders started coming in numbers of years ago, the "jacks" have taken them in stride. The natives enjoy conversing with the visitors, especially if they can set the eyes of the tourists popping with tall tales.

When Alaska and Hawaii were made States, a national research firm figured out that the new center of the United States was just a few miles north of McCall. But the natives take this unofficial calculation lightly.

Chuckled one: "That's arithmetic on a piece of paper. But you take Brundage Mountain—that's real, natural. It was made for skiing millions of years ago. Just lately, we've been taking advantage of it."

Baseball and Broadcasting: Financial Links

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, addressing the House on February 3, I called attention to the necessity of putting organized professional baseball under the Nation's antitrust laws.

In those remarks I cited the apparent growing collaboration between organized baseball and the Nation's broadcasting industry. One of my major allegations was that a significant number of individuals with busines control of major league teams also have financial interests in radio and television stations and networks.

In its issue of February 8, Broadcasting magazine, respected journal of the broadcasting industry, backs up my statement by providing interesting facts and figures on the financial and personal links between baseball and broadcasting.

To this list I might add that the chairman of the Baltimore Orioles, Mr. Joseph Inglehart, was a director of the Columbia Broadcasting System until last August when he resigned the latter position to avoid a conflict of interest when CBS purchased the New York Yankees.

The Broadcasting article also discusses the CBS Yankee transaction and the likelihood of this combine being scrutinized by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in hearings this month.

At this point I request permission to insert the article in the RECORD and urge my colleagues to give particular attention to the substantial list of relationships between baseball and broadcasting.

CBS, BASEBALL ON SENATE HOT SEAT—ANTITRUST SUBCOMMITTEE TO QUESTION NETWORK ON ITS PURCHASE OF NEW YORK YANKEES TEAM

CBS and other likely witnesses have been told that the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee is planning a hearing in mid or late February that will explore professional sports antitrust problems.

The subcommittee's principal interest in CBS is its acquisition of the New York Yankees baseball team last year (Broadcasting, Aug. 17, 1964). The panel wants to know whether proposed modifications in the application of antitrust laws to professional team sports ought to be changed—or even rejected—because of the purchase.

It also is understood that the Antitrust Subcommittee is considering hearing testimony of other broadcasters to learn whether CBS' ownership of the Yankees may cause competitive problems for broadcasters who might be interested in bidding on broadcast rights to the Yankee home games. CBS-TV will be offering Yankee home games on Saturdays and Sundays this season, except in markets located within 50 miles of other major league games (Broadcasting, Jan. 25).

Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee, last week introduced a bill that will be the focal point of the planned hearing.

S. 950, similar to legislation that's been offered in Congress since 1958, would bring organized baseball under the antitrust laws (it's considered exempt under Supreme Court holding). Simultaneously, the legislation would exempt professional baseball, football, hockey, and basketball from these laws in their dealings (considered unique to sports) that involve certain aspects of player contracts, franchise areas and safeguards against bribery.

Coincidentally, Senator HART, who has been a member of the Senate Commerce Committee since last February, was assigned last week to its Communications Subcommittee.

In other developments on Capitol Hill last week, Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, attacked the antitrust and sports question with a special focus on baseball. He said in a speech on the House floor Monday (February 1) that he wanted to bring baseball under the antitrust laws "to end the legal fiction that baseball is somehow sacrosanct as an industry and must be privileged with an exemption from our antitrust regulations."

The CBS-Yankee deal and the planned move of the Milwaukee Braves to Atlanta are evidence of need of such legislation in the Congressman's view. He spoke of a legal opinion written by Judge Learned Hand who found that lucrative radio and television contracts held by baseball clubs had changed the game from a sport to a business.

"He believed," Representative ZABLOCKI said, "that the players, radio, television, clubs in general, and the public make up 'an indivisible unit as much as actors and spectators in a theater, and are participating in interstate commerce'."

The Congressman added that he thought "the dollar" is behind the CBS purchase of the Yankees, and, "it may be the reason that persons with substantial radio and/or TV interests have been, and are, board chairmen and presidents of major league clubs."

Some of these relationships are:

AMERICAN LEAGUE

Detroit Tigers: John E. Fetzer, president, is also president and majority owner of

WKZO-AM-TV, Kalamazoo, WWTV-FM-TV, Cadillac, WJEF and WJFM (FM), Grand Rapids, and WWUP-TV, Sault Ste. Marie, all in Michigan; KOLN-TV, Lincoln, and KGIN-TV, Grand Island, both in Nebraska. All Fetzer television stations are affiliated with CBS-TV.

Los Angeles Angels: Gene Autry, owner of the Angels, controls KOOL-AM-FM-TV Phoenix and KOLD-AM-TV Tucson, both Arizona, and both affiliated with CBS-TV. Mr. Autry has 51.5 percent and Robert Reynolds (president of the Angels) has 13.8 percent of Golden West Broadcasters which owns KMPC and KTLA(TV) Los Angeles, KSFO San Francisco, KEX-AM-FM Portland, Oreg., and KVI Seattle.

Baltimore Orioles: Lee MacPhail, president, is the father of William MacPhail, vice president in charge of sports for CBS-TV.

NATIONAL LEAGUE

Pittsburgh Pirates: Bing Crosby, stockholder, is chairman of the broadcast division of Chris Craft Industries which owns KCOP (TV) Los Angeles, KPTV(TV) Portland, Oreg., and WTCN-TV Minneapolis.

Houston Colts: Judge Roy Hofheinz, president, owns 16 percent of KTRK-TV (an ABC-TV affiliate) and 25 percent of KTHT, both Houston, 9 percent of KRYS Corpus Christi, and 25 percent of KENS San Antonio, all Texas.

Milwaukee Braves: John Louis, vice president and stockholder, is chairman of the board of Louis stations: KTAR-TV Mesa-Phoenix, KTAR-AM-FM Phoenix, KYUM Yuma, and KYCA Prescott, all Arizona.

Following are the baseball clubs associated with subscription television ventures:

AMERICAN LEAGUE

Chicago White Sox: John Allyn, coowner, is president of Home Theaters, Inc., which holds a franchise for telemeter wired pay TV systems in Houston and Dallas.

NATIONAL LEAGUE

Los Angeles Dodgers: The club owns 2 percent of Subscription Television, Inc., now fighting California's antipay TV law.

San Francisco Giants: The club owns 1.5 percent of STV.

The Future of the Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the history of our Nation's two-party system and the role of a minority party were presented recently before the Economic Club of Detroit by our former colleague, Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce.

Under unanimous consent I present the address by Mrs. Luce together with her introduction by Dr. Harlan Hatcher, president of the University of Michigan:

THE FUTURE OF THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

(An address by the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce)

(The meeting was opened by President L.S. Bork, who presented Dr. Harlan Hatcher, president, the University of Michigan, as presiding officer.)

Dr. HARLAN HATCHER. We have waited a long time for this happy event when we might welcome as our guest of honor one of America's and the world's most distinguished and accomplished women.

Presenting her to this audience is a ritual of the occasion rather than a necessary introduction. Her varied and spectacular career and her fresh and unique contribution to the texture and the perception of our day are known and appreciated by all of us.

In the sense that there was once the concept of the renaissance man, there is now a corresponding idea of the 20th-century woman, and Clare Boothe Luce is her embodiment. Within the respective role of man and woman in relation to an era, the similarities between the 15th and the 20th centuries are sharp. Europe woke from the torpor of the Middle Ages. Intelligent men rediscovered the world around them and human knowledge burgeoned. They began discovering the earth and the joy and verve of living and learning here and now. A few giants succeeded in encompassing all fields of knowledge in one single lifetime—classical, scholar, writer, artist, scientist, statesman and soldier. We have to remind ourselves that even in advanced America the emancipation of women was still in progress after World War I, and that young Clare Boothe in her teens was a vigorous fighter for equal rights for women, including the ballot, in the early 1920's. How far away that seems.

I first knew of her as associate and then managing editor of Vanity Fair, the a la mode magazine for young writers and the growing band of sophisticates of the 1920's, a few of whom are in the audience tonight. She burst upon us as a full-blown artist in those grim and trying years of the 1930's with her brilliant satirical play "The Women," followed by equally impressive successful performances of "Kiss the Boys Good-Bye," and "Margin for Error." After those notable triumphs, it was more a question of equal rights for men.

Many of you will remember a new revelation of her bountiful gifts in her sensitive, perceptive, and moving comments on Europe at the beginning of World War II: "Europe in the Spring." Do you remember that?

Since that time through her pen and by direct action on the world stage, as correspondent for Life-Time-Fortune—and I might add, Sports Illustrated—as a member of the U.S. Congress, as Ambassador to Italy, she has played a prominent role. Any one of these activities could fill up the life of an ordinary woman. Mrs. Luce has done them all in stride and with distinction in the spirit and scope of a modern renaissance woman, not merely observing but participating, greeting an exciting era in human experience with eager acceptance and an unflagging zest for life.

And she now takes a look at our post-November 3 world. We welcome her and her husband and now become her eager listeners as she speaks to us on "The Implications of the Presidential Election." It is my honor to present Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce. [Applause.]

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE. General Bork, Dr. Hatcher, Mr. Cisler, distinguished guests, members of the Economic Club, and their wives and friends, it is a very great honor indeed to be asked to speak before this forum, which is so widely known as one of the most important forums in America. I am doubly honored since when I was forced, last spring, owing to illness, to cancel out on you, you so generously and trustfully renewed the invitation for tonight.

The little brochure which your committee put out some time ago announced that my subject would be "The Implications of the Presidential Election." Now the most obvious implication of that event is that there are a whale of a lot more Democrats than Republicans. So many more, in fact, that the real implication is that the Nation is now faced with virtual one-party Government.

And today, many thoughtful Democrats, no less Republicans, are finding the implications of that somewhat alarming. Is one-party rule consonant with the principles on which this Nation was founded? Will protracted Democratic rule end in dictatorship, or, as it would probably be called, "Democratic centrism?

So with your kind permission, I intend to talk about the future of the two-party system, and that means, of course, about the future of the Republican Party. But first it seems to me important to get the subject, if we can, into some sort of historical perspective.

Now you are probably familiar with that delightful ornithological creation of the late Robert Benchley's imagination—the killyloo bird. The habit of this curious bird was, according to Benchley, to fly backwards, because it could not tell where it was going until it had seen where it had been. A not altogether illogical habit.

So permit me tonight to play a far from scholarly killyloo bird, and go back to see where the two-party system has been, in the hope that by doing so we may find some clue to where it is going.

The two-party system has been frequently called the genius of American democracy. If true, this is a genius that the Founding Fathers were quite unaware of.

The Constitution has nothing to say about the two-party system, or, for that matter, about political parties at all. George Washington was "unanimously" elected—in the electoral college. Along with most of the Founding Fathers, he viewed parties—or "factions," as he called them—as a dangerous and divisive European notion.

Our first President was our last President to hold this view. The dim outline of the two-party system began to emerge even before Washington retired to Mount Vernon. A conflict of basic political ideas between Washington's two most famous cabinet members, Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton, soon produced Jefferson's Republicans—a states rights, agrarian-based party—and Hamilton's mercantile based Federalists, who advocated stronger powers for the chief executive. But when Jefferson won the Presidency in 1800, the genius of the two party system at once began to show itself: political thesis and antithesis resulted in political synthesis, and the winning party immediately began to appropriate the strongest issues of the losing party. Elected as the champion of agrarian interests, and a weak chief executive, within a few years Jefferson had adopted a good many Federalist ideas—especially those which gave the President the powers which Jefferson soon saw were necessary to develop the young Nation's resources. This enabled him to make the Louisiana Purchase, which, incidentally, accounts for about a third of the area of the continental United States as we know it now.

The upshot of the Jeffersonian party's capture of Federalist issues was that it absorbed Federalist voters. And the frustrated Federalist party, out of its most meaningful issue, was reduced first to "me-too" ism, then to snarling opposition for opposition's sake, and finally petered out. Jefferson's "Virginia Dynasty," which then came to be called Democrats, enjoyed one party government for a quarter of a century. This did not end in dictatorship. Thanks, no doubt, to Article I of the Bill of Rights, which guaranteed free speech and assembly, when another issue emerged it produced another party. We do well always to remember that parties and leaders do not create issues, issues create parties and leaders. The leaders are those who are the first to identify, expound, and embrace the issues. The issue that created the opposition Whig party in 1824 was Jefferson's old states rights concept which had again become relevant as Americans spread rapidly into the West, and new States were formed.

The cross-party migration of basic political ideas and issues, their expiration and their

renaissance in new formulations, dictated by new conditions, are wonderfully persistent phenomena in our two-party system.

The recent election has provided a fascinating example of this as we witnessed a Republican candidate espousing the 160-year-old Jeffersonian Democratic States Rights concept, while the Democratic candidate espoused the equally old Hamiltonian concept, dear for decades to Republicans—stronger powers for the Federal Government in dealing with our national problems and resources.

But the history of the two-party system, as we know it today, began when the Whig Party split wide open over the dynamite-packed issue of slavery, a transcendant issue fraught with vast economic, political, and moral implications for the still young Republic. The Republican Party was founded in 1856, with abolition as its crusading issue. It went on, in 1860, to elect a lifetime Whig, Abraham Lincoln, as its first President. A minority President, Lincoln owed his first election to a three-way split in his political opposition. A pre-election compromise between any two of the three anti-abolition parties that opposed Lincoln would have defeated him.

Perhaps this is the place to say that throughout American history party disunity and splits in national elections have again and again been the foolproof recipe for disaster.

With the election of Lincoln, the Southern States seceded, one by one, and the history of the next 4 years was writ in the blood of brothers.

But the long confrontation between Democrats and Republicans had begun. During the 104 years it has now lasted, Democrats have won the White House 11 times, Republicans 16 times. In terms of White House occupation, it will take five more Presidential terms for the Democrats to catch up with the Republicans. Turn and turn about in the White House has not been part of the genius of the two-party system.

From the election of Lincoln until Franklin Roosevelt's 1932 triumph, the Republican Party was clearly dominant. During those 72 years only two Democratic administrations made the grade: Grover Cleveland, in the last century, and Woodrow Wilson in this century. And though each served two terms, each—during one term—was a minority President who owed his election to—guess what?—a split in the Republican Party.

For whatever small comfort it may be to those of you who are Republicans, while Lyndon Johnson's 61.01 percent share of the popular vote and Franklin Roosevelt's 60.08 percent have never been topped, Republicans have also had their landslides.

Warren Gamaliel Harding reaped 60.4 percent and General Eisenhower 58 percent of the ballots of their fellow citizens. And to cheer you further, if Senator Barry Goldwater happened to be your man, a number of major party candidates in this century took far worse shellackings. In 1912 Republican William Howard Taft got a pathetic 24 percent of the vote, and in 1920 Democrat James M. Cox received a humiliating 36 percent. And loud indeed was the lamenting in Democratic ranks when, 4 years later, the supporters of the distinguished and universally admired John W. Davis found that only a miserable 34 percent of his fellow citizens judged him up to conducting the Nation's affairs.

Now, let us ask, what factors permitted the Republican Party to perpetuate itself so long in power? What factors brought about its downfall? Also, what factors kept the Democratic Party in existence during the fat 72 years of Republican domination?

We will then not be surprised if we also find that these same factors have operated since 1932 to keep the Democrats in the ascendancy, while also keeping the Republicans in existence. And we can speculate whether the same factors which brought about the end of Republican rule may not one day, sooner or later, put an end to Democratic domination.

It seems to me that during all periods of one-party domination the essential factors are the potent political P's: peace and prosperity, the power and prestige of the Presidency, the personality of the President, party patronage, the power of the press, and the persistence of polling patterns.

But first let me speak to a separate but related factor: the predisposition to pragmatism of the American people.

For many reasons that have often been explained by American historians and philosophers, the American people, more than any Western people, are uninterested in intellectual political theorizing and speculation. The average American accepts the political climate and structuring of the democracy in which he lives as an almost natural phenomenon, something like the weather, or the landscape.

This is especially true in the area of foreign policy. The man in the street speaks, for example, of "war coming" to America as he might speak of Hurricane Hilda striking our shores. For example, he never saw the relationship of our prewar Sino-Japanese foreign policies to Pearl Harbor, or to our eventual loss of China. In his view, a President is keeping the peace whenever he is not actively engaged in preparing to put our boys on transports. The average voter is also bewildered, if not bored, by what sophisticated citizens are wont to call the political dialog which swirls about many of today's appallingly complex foreign and domestic problems. Shall we blame him, when even Government experts talk of feeding them into computers in the hope of pulling out otherwise madly elusive solutions?

Today I believe that we must accept the fact that only those issues that clearly affect the average voter's pocketbook, or the physical welfare and security of his family, or that arouse his emotions—a point we shall touch on later—can influence his vote to any marked degree. His own existential condition is his chief framework of political reference—especially in presidential elections. "How'm I doin'—personally"—he asks, "under this President? Do I feel I'll do better or worse for myself if I vote for the other fellow?"

And this quickly brings us to the two most potent P's in the perpetuation of the party in power: peace and prosperity.

During the last campaign many fair-minded citizens were outraged by two Democratic TV spot ads. One showed a pair of ruthless male hands tearing up a social security check. The other showed a curly-haired little girl innocently engaged in plucking the petals of a daisy. As she pulls the countdown petal the mushroom cloud incinerates her. These brutal ads were unerringly aimed at any average voter who, while feeling he was doing OK under Johnson, might happen to feel he would do better under Goldwater. Coming from a party whose chief charge against the Republican candidate was that he oversimplified the issues, they were hypocritical and contemptible. But they did demonstrate that the two most effective charges that can be made today—as yesterday—in any presidential campaign are that the oppositin would, if elected, destroy prosperity—a concept which now irrevocably includes social security—and plunge the country into war. Of course the Republican candidate and his supporters leveled the same charges at the administration. Nixon explicitly predicted that if present administration policies were pursued we would wind up in a big war, or a ruinous depression. Why did Johnson's charges stick, and the Republican charges fail?

This brings us to the power and prestige of the Presidency. The history of this century shows that not even the very real threat of war can greatly damage the Presidential incumbent during an election. First, it is almost impossible for the opposition to get on the peace side of a President. This was proved by Woodrow Wilson's "too proud to fight" 1916 campaign, and by F.D.R.'s "Mothers and fathers of America, I promise you again and again and again * * *" 1940 campaign. Secondly, the President's power over the people's imagination, his hold on their loyalty, are always greatly enhanced when the war clouds begin to sock in. Patriotism and prudence are two more "P's" a President then gets going for him. The injunction not to swap horses in midstream does not always make sense—or Britain would never have had Churchill. But, rightly or wrongly, in this century the American voter has always obeyed it.

Nor does history show that when "war comes" this necessarily leads to the postwar defeat of a dominant party. The prime conditions here are that the war should be won, and postwar prosperity maintained.

The Republican Party survived in power after the Civil War, and the Spanish-American War. The Democrats did not survive World War I, partly because the war was followed by a short, sharp recession, and partly because the country was still "normally" Republican. In 1920 the GOP bounced back with Harding, in a landslide. The Roosevelt administration and the Truman administration survived World War II on a wave of prosperity, and because, after five popular Democratic administrations the Nation had become "normally" Democratic. I venture to suggest that the Democratic Party would have survived Korea in 1952 but for the advent of the charismatic Ike—an apolitical personality of enormous charm and a figure of vast prestige.

What was it, then, that the Republican Party, after 72 years as the dominant party, could not survive? The great depression.

The Republican Party's 72-year-old grip on the electorate collapsed when the so-called "Hoover bread lines" began to form. Hoover did not create the depression—it was worldwide. But a pragmatic people held him responsible for its domestic ravages, and in pure protest—another very powerful P—chucked out the Republicans. Here it may be useful to remember that after World War I the Democrats had become pretty much of a "me too" party. During Roosevelt's 1932 campaign he did not offer the people the welfare state programs we now call the New Deal. He campaigned on promises to do better, somehow, along the same old Republican lines. He promised fiscal responsibility, economy in Government, a sound dollar, a cutback in bureaucracy, no foreign entanglements, and if you please, isolation. Today we would consider Roosevelt's 1932 election program well to the right of Goldwater's.

But once elected, F.D.R. was quick to recognize that social security, welfare measures, and the protection of labor were the burning new issues created by the overnight industrialization of society. Some of his improvisations for dealing with the emergencies of the depression resulted in sound and lasting solutions to the country's new problems. His 1936 landslide ushered in what we must now accept as an era of Democratic rule.

Here we may ask if political pragmatism is the average voter's most trusted guide at the polls, why did the Republicans survive at all after 1932? Why did F.D.R. get only 60.08 percent of the voters in 1936? Why did the other 40 percent stick with Al Landon? Were all Republican voters, as so many of the Democrats of Roosevelt's era charged, bourbons, extremists of the economic right, or people cruelly indifferent to the misery caused by the depression?

Part of the answer—as every practical politician knows—lies in that seldom remarked factor in the story of the two major parties: the persistence of polling patterns, or, in other words, party prejudice and party loyalty.

Both are neatly illustrated by the story of the poor man who was asked why he voted against FDR in 1932, and who replied, "Because my father was a Republican." His friend retorted, "Suppose your father had been a fool, would you be a fool too?" "No," he said, "I would be a Democrat."

Voting habits, originally formed or reformed—in times of critical issues, are also often deeply rooted in ethnic, religious, cultural, class and even geographical loyalties. They tend to persist from generation to generation. This creates a hard core in each party of born Democrats and born Republicans. These visceral voters seldom leave the party of their birth in any significant numbers except in times of great national upheaval.

The most important example of how voting habits are formed and changed by a national crisis is offered by the Negro vote. The Negro, enfranchised by the Republican Party, remained adamantly loyal to the party of old Abe for 72 years. His big switch began in the thirties, when New Deal welfare legislation gave the Negro his first taste of economic equality with the white man, albeit only at the survival level. From then on the Negro vote steadily moved into the party of FDR. Despite the many civil rights measures taken by the Eisenhower administrations, in 1960 Nixon received less than 25 percent of the Negro vote. And John F. Kennedy's espousal of the Negro revolt, followed by his assassination in the South, gave the Negro a new Abe Lincoln image. Those who attribute the loss of the Negro vote in the last election entirely to the Republican candidate's stand on civil rights should be reminded that by 1963 all surveys of voter trends showed that from 85 to 90 percent of all Negro voters would vote Democratic in 1964—regardless of who the Republicans nominated.

In the New York senatorial race, despite Senator Keating's long years of genuine devotion to civil rights, and his introduction of many measures of benefit to his Negro constituents, despite his repudiation of the Republican candidate, he received only 10 percent of the Negro vote. And certainly no officeholder in any State in the Union has spoken more eloquently to the Negro's economic and social condition—and done more about it—than Michigan's own Governor Romney. Nevertheless, even he received only 18 percent of the Negro vote. Unless the Republican party now intends to capture the Negro revolution from the Democrats by making the Negro's social and economic advancement a prime crusading issue, the bulk of the Negro vote is sure to stay in the Democratic camp for the foreseeable future. And there, like all other Democratic bloc votes, it will grow rapidly larger. For the persistence of polling patterns, combined with the rapid growth of our population, will tend to increase the strength of this dominant party by almost mathematical progression. By 1960 there were already 20 million more registered Democrats than Republicans. Here again, for whatever consolation it may be to Goldwater voters, all voter surveys showed early last spring that the preponderance of "normal" Democratic strength would probably give President Johnson a landslide over any Republican nominated. And the latest census figures show that there will be 19 million more new voters before 1968. Six out of ten of these can be expected to vote their parents' party preference in the next election. This alone foreshadows another huge Democratic victory.

But paradoxically the irrational habit of voting the parental ticket has also helped historically to preserve the two-party system. It has prevented the proliferation of splinter parties and, so far, one party rule. The Democratic hard core, for example, helped to keep the "solid South" solid, and the urban ethnic groups, Irish, Jews, Slavs, Italians, locked in the Democratic camp during the party's 72 lean years. I hazard a guess that but for the born Republican vote President Johnson would have captured 80 percent of the ballots. The Republican hard core may well have saved the party from virtual annihilation.

Now I do not intend to say that the hard core, as it exists in both parties, is formed entirely by irrational party loyalty. It also represents a content of conscious devotion to traditional party ideas. The old liberalism of the northern Al Smith Democrats is still present in the hard core of the urban Democratic vote. And the States rights concept is still present in the hard core of the Democratic Party in the South, although the size of that core has now been whittled down, by backlash defections to the Republican candidate, but even more by a growing awareness in the South that as a way of solving the Negro question, the States rights concept is doomed. Certainly the hard core of the Republican Party still reflects its traditional Hamiltonian views of fiscal responsibility, Government encouragement of free enterprise, and devotion to the Constitution—ideas, one hopes, still relevant to American politics.

The hard core of a party represents its all but irreducible emotional and ideological content. Those who seek to give new leadership or new directions to a defeated political party must always begin by making peaceful compromises with its hard core elements. For they are the people who will not only vote for, but work for, the straight ticket, in good times or bad, come hell or high water. They are the bedrock on which a beaten party must build. It is estimated that 6 or 8 million Republicans left their party to vote for Mr. Johnson. For those who encouraged them to defect to scorn the views of the 26½ million who remained loyal to it, is both stupid and impudent.

So where does all this leave us in our discussion of the future of the two party system? The future of the two party system lies in the womb of time. But can we now even hazard a guess as to the future of the Republican Party?

Today the Republican Party is almost at its lowest ebb. I say "almost" because its congressional representation is still somewhat larger than it was after Roosevelt's 1936 landslide. But today, as then, both its organizational and ideological problem is how, peacefully, to mesh its essentially conservative "hard core" into a party of wider popular appeal. For party politics is, as we all know, making a mesh of things. In my view, both ideologically and organizationally, a Republican mesh of things can now be made only by moderate leadership. Plainly, without its progressive wing the GOP cannot hope to prevail in many States in the union. But without its conservative elements it must surely perish throughout the Nation. Commonsense tells us that the task of reconciliation cannot be left to the warring leaders of either of these camps.

But now let us honestly face the real dilemma of the GOP. What we call today the "moderates" are what are generally called—and I believe fairly—"me-too" Republicans. They are men who have consciously, or unconsciously, accepted the fact that all the winning contemporary issues have been preempted by the Democrats. Like the Federalists, after Jefferson's capture of their issues in the early part of the last century, the best they can do, until new issues emerge, is to offer constructive criticism of the administration's policies and programs. The worst, of course, they can do is to oppose them for opposition's sake. But whichever course they take, they seem doomed. For unhappily, as we have noted already in our Killyloo bird flight, "me-too" parties tend to disappear. There is just no substitute in politics for "getting there fustes' with the bestes'" ideas, issues, programs, policies. The voters do prefer a choice, and not an echo. But, as the last election demonstrated, the choice—however valid—must be an acceptable one to the majority of the voters.

So fresh out of acceptable choices, the near future of the Republican Party must now depend on the success or failure of the present administration.

Of one thing we can all be sure: in the years ahead everything is not coming up roses for the administration.

Many of you here in this room are far more knowledgeable than I am about the more ambiguous and contradictory aspects of our mixed economy, and the cumulative burden that the fiscal policies and some of the labor policies that six Democratic administrations have already laid upon it. And others, no doubt, think as I do, that in the dark riptide waters of foreign policy this administration has yet to prove it can sail a safe course between the Scylla of appeasement and the Charybdis of nuclear war.

If President Johnson fails to maintain peace and prosperity, even a me-too Republican Party can come back on a wave of pure protest, as the Democrats did in 1932, provided, of course, it has not meanwhile further reduced itself by internecine warfare.

But if President Johnson succeeds in maintaining peace and prosperity, the Democrats will most certainly stay in power. As Americans we must all hope and pray that he will succeed, for peace and prosperity are as precious to us all as they are precarious.

In either event, such has been the genius—so far—of the two party system, that the party out of power soon begins—especially after a crushing defeat—to throw away its crying towels and close ranks. The tasks its leaders then set themselves are to evaluate new ideas, reevaluate old ones, weigh the validity—and durability—of yesterday's issues, and diligently seek out the winning issues of tomorrow. And thus throughout the history of the two party system, the minority party holds itself in readiness to lead, if or when the majority party falters or fails. And—for such, too, is the genius of the two party system—this, the party out of power does not for the party's sake, but for the sake of the whole Nation. [Applause.]

L. S. BOAK. I wish to state for the entire membership how deeply indebted we are to you, Mrs. Luce, for this very fine and moving presentation. Our thanks to you, Dr. Hatcher, for your very fine performance of the duties of presiding officers. Thank you all for being here. The meeting stands adjourned.

Foreign Aid Is for Help—Not for Cheers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current debate over our foreign aid program, I thought my colleagues might be interested in the well-reasoned appraisal of what our aid program is de-

signed to do and not to do from the February 12 issue of Life magazine:

FOREIGN AID IS FOR HELP—NOT FOR CHEERS

Has the U.S. foreign aid program finally gone sour? For nearly 20 years it has been a key element of American foreign policy and a more or less prominent item in the Federal budget. This year, however, the atmosphere into which President Johnson has launched his appeal for an appropriation of $3.4 billion—the smallest yet—is heavy with antagonism. Even Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, longtime champion of foreign aid, has said he will no longer see the bill through the Senate.

FULBRIGHT objects to continued lumping together of military aid and economic development aid in a single legislative package. Johnson refuses to split his request for a pragmatic reason—that economic development aid, on its own, wouldn't stand a chance in Congress, especially this year. But FULBRIGHT's point is a good one, if only to remind us that economic aid, the nub of controversy, is only part of the whole foreign aid budget. A full third—military aid to friendly nations—is directly tied to our national security and thus has been less subject to attack (except by such as Senator WAYNE MORSE, who would like to see us abandon South Vietnam).

Complaints about foreign economic aid come from several directions. Some of them sound like this: The program is too big and tries to do too much. Other nations ought to help. The money is wasted, it hasn't made us any friends. And so forth.

The sum of complaints like these is impressive but not overwhelming. The logic behind foreign economic aid remains unchanged—to help friendly nations maintain their independence and become self-supporting—but it has been considerably harder to follow since emphasis shifted from postwar recovery to helping less developed nations grow up. And although it may be true, as FULBRIGHT says, that "We've been misled by the success of the Marshall plan in Europe to think that we can do it anywhere," our aid program has become more sophisticated and more—not less—effective.

Several recipient countries (Taiwan and Greece are the latest) have reached the "takeoff point" where they no longer need economic aid; others are close to it. Under the able direction of Agency for International Development Chief David Bell there has been a move to concentrate our efforts. Thus seven countries—India, Pakistan, Turkey, Nigeria, Brazil, Chile, and Tunesia—get two-thirds of our total economic aid. Other advanced nations are bearing part of the burden—France, in fact, devotes a much larger percentage of her GNP to economic aid than we do. Some affluent countries like Japan and West Germany should be doing far more.

Has foreign aid made us any friends? Senator KARL MUNDT would have us believe that it hasn't. He calculates that 21 nations which received aid in amounts ranging from $1.9 million (Mali) to $4.7 billion (India) voted against the United States at least half the time on key United Nations decisions. And 2 weeks ago a number of Congressmen almost succeeded in barring surplus food shipments to Egypt, piqued by Nasser's telling us to jump in the ocean and the mob destruction of the John F. Kennedy USIS library in Cario. A similar ban on aid to Indonesia nearly got through Congress last year.

Here we get into the debatable land between immediate and long-term aims. Sukarno and Nasser can both be pretty hard to take on occasion; we don't object to reminding them that U.S. aid is not automatic and our patience not inexhaustible. But there is also a case for keeping in contact with the 104 million Indonesians and the 27 million Egyptians, and foreign aid, like other policy tools, works best when not blunted. We prefer to let the State Department balance present irritations against possible future benefits.

If aid has not brought us a flock of loyal friends or constant self-serving expressions of gratitude, this should come as no surprise. Gratitude is not what we are after. This is particularly true now that more and more our aid is extended (as in the Alliance for Progress) upon the condition that recipients observe the salutary but painful disciplines of fiscal responsibility.

Our aid operation can be made still stronger and more useful. Authorizations should be made to cover more than 1 year at a time. Annual rehashing means stop-go planning. It also means that Congress spends a good part of each session tendentiously arguing foreign policy, and that the legislation itself can become a catchall for items as irrelevant as Senator DIRKSEN's attempt to block reapportionment. There should be further moves to funnel more of our funds through international agencies like the World Bank.

If the U.S. foreign aid program is to survive at all, it must be managed prudently and purposefully. In this respect Dave Bell and AID deserve high marks. Much of the glamour has gone out of it, but foreign aid still possesses plenty of humane and hard-headed values. These values justified it in the beginning and they still justify it as a sound instrument of American policy abroad.

Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 5, 1965, was designated Southwestern University Day in Texas by proclamation by Gov. John Connally.

Southwestern University was established as such in 1843. It traces its beginning to the establishment of Rutersville University, the first institution of higher education in Texas, which was established in 1840 at Rutersville by a pioneer Methodist minister, Martin Ruter.

This university is affiliated with the Methodist church. When the present charter was issued the privileges of graduates of Southwestern University were granted to the graduates of the Methodist schools preceding Southwestern. The charter was set on February 5, 1840.

Southwestern University has served the youth of Texas and the country continuously for 125 years. It has been located in Georgetown, Tex., since 1873.

The liberal arts college, outstanding in its field, has been referred to as the "mother of higher education in Texas" because of the many remarkable young men and women who have passed through its doors to achieve prominent success in their chosen fields.

Among its graduates, to mention a few, are at least two U.S. Senators, five bishops of the Methodist church, seven college presidents, two justices of the Supreme Court of Texas, one chief judge of the U.S. Court of Claims, several Federal judges, and many distinguished doctors, ministers, attorneys, businessmen, and educators.

In proportion to enrollment Southwestern ranks in the upper 2 percent of all colleges in the number of graduates listed in "Who's Who in America."

It has been my privilege to visit this campus many times, and I am personally acquainted with many of the faculty for whom I have the highest regard. Always the visitor is made to feel at home; always the visitor is impressed with feeling that here the finest of education in the liberal arts is offered; that here a deep sense of history permeates the faculty and student body.

Southwestern University is a most unusual and unique school, and one that not only survived some rough years but is now destined to become one of the largest educational institutions under Methodism in the southwestern part of the United States.

All Texans are proud to join in the recognition of this occasion. All will forever be indebted to Southwestern University for the contribution it has made to the educational, cultural, and religious life in our State.

Justice Must Follow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received several communications in protest over the fact that thousands of Nazi war criminals are still free, and have not been indicted or charged to answer for their barbarous crimes against humanity during and previous to World War II. There should be no consideration of forgiveness or omission of prosecuting the guilty to answer for their barbarous actions in exterminating human lives during that deplorable period. Prosecution should continue until the last murderer is apprehended and imprisoned.

I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks and a resolution, which I received from Dr. Philip J. Rosenbloom, president of the Northwest Indiana Jewish Welfare Federation of Gary, Ind., presented for the information of the Members of Congress:

JEWISH WELFARE FEDERATION,
Gary, Ind., February 5, 1965.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: We are forwarding, for your information, a copy of a resolution sent directly to the Justice Ministry of the German Federal Republic, Ambassador Knappstein of the German Embassy in the United States, and the Consul General of the German Government in Chicago.

The board of directors of the Northwest Indiana Jewish Welfare Federation, representing a constituency of 5,500 population, desires to make known in the strongest terms, its concern and apprehension that thousands of German war criminals, not yet apprehended or charged, may feel able to follow their private or public lives after May 8, 1965, free of any possibility of having to answer for their conduct during the Hitler regime. Our concern, we are relieved to note, is shared by the 17-nation council of Europe, and by prominent government and church leaders in all nations of the world. We urge you to use your good offices and official prerogatives to insure that an 1871 statute, designed in a climate concerned with much lesser crimes, does not become the basis for allowing countless criminals under the Genocide Convention of the United Nations, to which the Federal Republic is a signatory, to go free of responsibility.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dr. PHILIP J. ROSENBLOOM,
President.

Voting Rights for Selma, Ala.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the 15 Members of the House who made a factfinding trip to Selma, Ala. on February 5, I would like to add my voice to those calling for more vigorous enforcement of existing protections of the right to vote, and where necessary, new legislation to insure that this fundamental right is in fact guaranteed to all Americans.

While we were in Selma, we had meetings and discussions with Dr. Martin Luther King and his associates, with local officials, and with Negro residents of the community. There is no question that under existing practices and procedures the Negroes in Selma and all across what is commonly referred to as Alabama's black belt, are systematically and effectively being denied their legitimate and constitutional rights as citizens to register and vote.

In Dallas County, where Selma is located, the population is 57 percent Negro, yet less than 1 percent of the eligible Negroes are registered to vote.

In neighboring Wilcox County, Negroes represent 78 percent of the population, yet not one has ever voted.

Adjoining Lowndes County is 81 percent Negro but not one has ever voted there either.

Without the opportunity to vote, Selma's Negroes, and Wilcox' and Lowndes', are politically powerless. They cannot appeal to city or to county law enforcement officials, and although the Federal Government has attacked intimidation and discrimination in Dallas County in two voting suits, the progress has been painfully slow at best.

How could it be better, as a matter of fact, when in the State of Alabama only 2 days a month are allocated for voting registration. I am sure that this strikes most of us who come from States where the registration rolls are open 5 days a week, 8 hours a day, as rather strange and restrictive.

It is even more restrictive and discriminatory when we discover, as many Negroes of Selma told us personally, that they must stand in intolerably long lines; that they must wait not in the courthouse or on the street, but in an alley; that they must stand behind any white persons who may be registering to vote; that they are pushed, prodded and beaten by the local sheriff; that frequently they are jailed, often with very inadequate facilities, food, and care.

And when these indignities have been suffered, all too few even then are able to register.

We have, of course, accumulated too little experience under the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964 to know whether new and stronger legislation to protect and insure voting rights may be needed.

Our first emphasis, I believe, should be concentrated on the fullest and broadest enforcement of existing law. Very real questions can and should be raised, I think, as to whether we are getting the maximum possible impact out of the bill many of us labored so long and hard to enact last year.

For example, six demands that Negroes be permitted to register in Selma have been before the U.S. district judge, Daniel H. Thomas, since 1961. Last week, after nearly 4 years, Judge Thomas ordered a few of the admitted voting restrictions removed. But, under the act of 1964, some very knowledgeable constitutional lawyers argue persuasively that the Justice Department could have removed the voting restrictions as early as July 2.

Mr. Speaker, it may well be that we need new legislation to break down the remaining barriers to voting and full citizenship. In particular, we may need to provide a system of voter registration by Federal authorities when it is obvious, as in Selma, that this right is being denied, solely on the basis of race, by local authorities.

I respectfully urge the House Committee on the Judiciary, the Attorney General, and the President to give their immediate attention to this problem and by forceful administrative action, or new legislation, or both, to finally insure for all Americans the right to vote which is the cornerstone of our democracy.

Fino Seeks 10-Percent Across-the-Board Rise in Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduced my bill calling for a 10-percent across-the-board rise in social security benefits.

As the costs of living continue to rise, it becomes more and more important to raise social security payments to realistic minimums. Our senior citizens are being starved in the name of economy.

We are told every day by the administration and news media that we are in a period of unparalleled financial prosperity. Surely we are rich enough to provide large enough social security payments that the prosperity we enjoy is not marred by the poverty of our dependent senior citizens? It seems to me that a 10-percent across-the-board rise in social security payments is more than overdue.

I trust that the Ways and Means Committee will give serious and favorable consideration to this humantarian piece of legislation.

Congressman Bob Sikes' Address to the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association, Atlanta, Ga., February 3, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MASTON O'NEAL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very interesting address delivered by my good friend and colleague, ROBERT SIKES, of Florida, to the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association. This address was delivered in Atlanta, Ga., on February 3, 1965, and was well received by those present and widely reported by the Atlanta news media.

Even though the illustrious gentleman and outstanding Congressman BOB SIKES represents the fine State of Florida in our national Congress, it is with pride that I remind the Members of the House that he is a native of Sylvester, Worth County, Ga., which is located in the Second District of Georgia, the district which I so proudly represent in this body.

The address follows:

CONGRESSMAN BOB SIKES, ADDRESS TO THE SOUTHERN PULPWOOD CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, ATLANTA, GA., FEBRUARY 3, 1965

The Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association has an enviable opportunity to be one of the prime movers in the great story of the emerging industrial South. You are the producers of the raw material and the processors of some of our principal industrial products. You reach into virtually every community in the South. You are the principal economic support for a great many of these communities. Yours is one of the most important industries that we have.

I have enjoyed personal association and warm friendship with many of you. I know your people; I know your industry; I know something of your problems. So, I welcome this opportunity to talk with you about the present and the future of the pulpwood industry in light of existing and proposed legislation.

In the 88th Congress a series of measures were enacted which will have a far-reaching effect upon conservation and upon your in-

dustry. These were the Wilderness Act, the Land and Water Conservation Act, the Accelerated Public Works Act, and the Economic Opportunity Act, or antipoverty program. They will have an effect on forestry in general, on timber resource management, and specifically on your activities in the pulp and paper industry. They earned for the 88th Congress the term, "Conservation Congress." There is some good in all of these laws and some bad in most of them, but they are now law.

You can anticipate that there will be a prompt followup by the agencies of Government on all the tasks initiated by the new programs—the creation and expansion of the national wilderness system, the program of recreation land and water acquisition and development, and the Job Corps program. For years to come, Congress will be passing on the recommendations of the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior, and much will be done administratively. Congress will have no voice other than through control of appropriations.

The Wilderness Act will have little direct influence on us here in the South. Under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the Forest Service plans to acquire land in the South primarily for recreation purposes. It should be pointed out that the act does not create additional Federal authority for the purchase of land. There are those who would seek wholesale purchases of forest land under this new legislation. But Congress must be consulted and Congress, in this field, generally can be expected to go slow.

There will be some impact on your activities as the result of the Job Corps provisions of the poverty program. I was an enthusiastic supporter of the old Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's, and subsequently I sponsored Youth Conservation Corps bills. My enthusiasm for this program was lessened when it was presented to Congress as a part of the antipoverty program last year for I could envision what might happen if half wild Harlem youths were moved to the South to work in youth camps. Nevertheless, there are important needs in Federal forest, park, and natural resourecs development which conservation centers can help to meet. If they are properly administered and if discipline is maintained, they will serve as useful purpose.

Now, let's pass on to the area of new legislation. A major administration bill is the Appalachian Regional Development Act. This measure can be helpful to the forest industry. It can also mean overcontrol. In addition to providing for management of Appalachia's water resources, and the development of a broader transportation system in the region, the bill has a specific provision related to Appalachia's timber resources. Section 204 authorizes the establishment of private, nonprofit timber development organizations (TDO's) organized and operated under State law. The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to provide technical assistance to these organizations and through a loan program, provide up to one-half of their initial capital requirements. Obviously, this could become a wide open program, and care must be exercised to keep program sponsors from going overboard.

The Forest Service plans to step up all of its programs in the Appalachia area.

A number of proposed new national recreation areas have been submitted to Congress for its approval, and there will be others. A national recreation area can be established only by act of Congress. Although such an area will be administered primarily for recreation, compatible utilization of other resources is to be permitted. Thus, there would be no wholesale locking up of the timber resource from future use and management.

Congress is becoming more aware of and sensitive to the growing demand for outdoor recreation opportunities. For example, this Congress will consider again a bill to coordinate recreation uses around Federal multiple purpose water resource projects. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson indicated that he would soon submit to Congress a Wild Rivers bill. There will be proposals to establish the Allegheny Parkway in North Carolina and Georgia. I have introduced a bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to permit local public groups to acquire lands for recreational development under rural redevelopment programs. This is intended to provide additional recreational opportunities in those areas where they now are limited.

Bills will be considered which in essence extend the soil bank program. However, I think that Congress is going to take a long look at the justification for a continuation of these programs.

Other proposed legislation of interest to you includes bills directed at a growing problem stemming from the misuse or overuse of pesticides. Some problem areas which will be treated will be the coordination of pesticide use by Federal agencies, research on the prevention of pesticide injury to fish and wildlife, establishment of standards for pesticides, control of related water pollution, and grants to the States for pesticide control.

In about 3½ years, Congress will receive the report of the Public Land Law Review Commission, established in the last Congress. The Commission will be engaged in a review of the policies applicable to the use, management, and disposition of the public domain lands of the United States. This will touch on problems and policies of forest management in public domains directly affecting you and affecting Government ownership of large holdings.

Another study affecting timberland would deal with strip mine reclamation. A bill has been reintroduced authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to study strip and surface mine operations to determine the best way to attain restoration of desolate spoil banks with trees and grasses.

The problem of water pollution is slated for further consideration by Congress. The Water Quality Act, which, in the last Congress passed the Senate and was reported by the House Public Works Committee, has again passed the Senate. The legislation would establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The bill includes procedures for the establishment of water quality standards applicable to interstate waters, and it provides for strengthening the enforcement measures of the Water Pollution Control Act. Water pollution is a growing problem. Historically, control measures have largely been left in the hands of the States. Efforts to tighten control and place it in Federal hands are gaining strength.

I think it almost certain there will be additional Federal regulation on the use of water and over water and air pollution. We must face the fact that in a nation growing like ours, some of this is necessary. It can be administered with a minimum of interference if that is what Congress and the people insist upon.

I am painting with a broad brush. I have not even mentioned some of the things in which you are most directly interested, and, of course, I intend to do so.

There probably are three principal bugaboos which are of paramount concern to your members. One of these is the withdrawal of the 12-man exemption for logging and forestry. This would bring the pulpwood producers under the wage-hour law.

The Secretary of Labor made a specific point in his endorsement of the proposed fair labor standards amendments in 1964 to urge repeal of 13(a)(15) which exempts small logging operations involving not more than 12 employees from the act's minimum wage and overtime provisions. The bill will be reintroduced and there will be a vigorous effort by the Department of Labor, the Labor Committees of Congress, and the unions, to expand the wage-hour law to include these workers.

The timber and pulpwood industries have been particularly concerned with this exemption. Attacks have been made upon it over the last several years, and each year the attacks are intensified. Operators state that if the 12-man exemption were removed small sawmill operators and a very high percentage of the pulpwood producers in the Southeast would find compliance with the wage-hour laws so difficult that most of them would be forced out of business. Obviously, a great many unskilled and semiskilled workers who now make good wages would become unemployed.

Last year as an entering wedge a proposal was made to require the producer to certify at the time he put his wood on the yard that it was produced at rates not less than the minimum wage without regard to overtime. This was successfully resisted, but it will be back.

If the 12-man exemption is removed, those producers who benefit by it would obviously be required to put a crew leader into the woods with each crew to keep the records required by the Wage-Hour Act. This, of course, would add to the financial difficulties of the producers. The principal sponsor of these changes know nothing of timber and pulpwood, or of southern industry—and couldn't care less.

Another is a rewording of the capital gains taxes on timber sales. The timber industry would stand only to lose by repeal or modification of the provision. With increasing taxes, it is growing constantly more difficult to own timber land and an adverse revision of the capital gains tax structure would probably make it impossible. As you know, this is under the jurisdiction of the House Ways and Means Committee which has taken a realistic approach in their studies of the problem. I am glad to state that the chairman of that committee assures me they expect to continue to look realistically at the problem.

A third is the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This section upholds the right-to-work laws which are existent in many States. I do not consider it properly within the purview of the Federal Government to strike down State constitutions by legislative acts of the Federal Congress. As I recall it, there are 20 States, including my own, having such laws. But, if it happens, and if the courts uphold it—the latter almost a foregone conclusion—it can be anticipated that your employees would soon be subject to compulsory union status.

There will be emphasis in some quarters on extending coverage of the wage-hours law to presently exempt employees—principally in the service industries. There is pressure to increase the minimum wage from $0.25 to $1.50 or even $2 per hour. There is also talk of reducing the maximum hours to be worked without overtime from 40 hours a week to as low as 32 hours per week. Shortening the workweek presents obvious problems to industries which work on a 7-day-a-week basis. There are some industries which find it more costly to shut a plant down than to continue working the 40 hours per week, but reducing the workweek below 40 hours could bring unbearable hardship.

Of these only the capital gains question is dormant. There will be vigorous effort from the Department of Labor and in the committees of Congress to bring about the enactment of the other two.

There are other possible fields of legislation. There has been discussion of subsidizing and price fixing of timber crops. I see litle likelihood of this.

There is a question among your members about extensions in the timber price reporting program. This is a matter to be worked out through your own group and the various agencies of State and Federal governments which have an interest in it. Your representatives in Congress can be helpful by serving as intermediaries. No further legislation is indicated.

On January 22, the Secretary of Commerce proposed to reconstitute the American Lumber Standards Committee. There is a 30-day period during which public comment will be received. After this, departmental action will be taken. You know the pros and cons of this action better than I, but you cannot ignore it.

Generally, the legislation which concerns you stems from the agencies of government. Quite obviously there is in prospect a full and far-reaching set of legislative proposals. Some will help you; some will hurt you; some could put you out of business.

Now let's be very candid with each other.

You asked me to project the future of legislation affecting your industry.

Where did I go for my information?

I went to the committees of Congress and to the departments of government.

Why didn't I come to you?

Certainly, no one is more expert in this field. You have to be expert to stay in it and to pay the bills. But you are not the people who are making policy.

Policy should be a team effort. It should be developed by industry, labor, and government. It is not. Policy, more and more, is government devised and government directed. The power of industry to influence policy is shrinking. So is that of Congress. In your field, you are fortunate in that one agency with which you deal, the Forest Service, is dedicated to the conservation of natural resources, recognizes your problems, and in the main cooperates with you toward sound objectives. But other agencies with which you deal are going to tighten the restrictions under which you operate every time they have an opportunity.

It is significant that most of my projections to you today on legislation came from agencies of government—not from the committees of Congress. Some of the committees of Congress had no firm program to offer, not even for 1965. Now, I know it is early in the year. This is a new Congress and a new administration, but the fact remains that little by little Congress is ceasing to devlop policy. There should be a continuing program of policy development in congressional committees. These committees are permanent except for a few changes in personnel at the bottom of the list. There is always a carryorver of congressional committee staff members. There should be constant analysis and programing of legislative needs, but frequently there is not. Each year is considered sufficient unto itself. Each year most committees react to the urgency of the moment.

Some people say that Congress is dying on the vine. The Constitution vested great power in the Congress as an independent member of the great triumvirate of government. But year after year, I see Congress relinquish bits and pieces of its power to the President—and year after year it allows the Supreme Court to usurp other powers. Just last year the Senate failed to follow House leadership and strike down the Supreme Court's takeover of legislative apportionment processes. This year the House stripped its Rules Committe of virtually all power—and gave that power to the Speaker. Since the Speaker supports administration policies, this is about the same as giving it to the President. The Rules Committee has been a highly important balance wheel. It exercised restraint on some wild committee actions in past years.

Yet, the Congress is the only voice the people have in Government. Despite this fact, it is constantly under attack. It is always open season on the Congress. It is well to remember when the voice of Congress is stilled or muted, it is your voice in Government that is lost.

You can perform no greater service than to help to strengthen that voice. You can strengthen it by working with the Congress to develop the programs which your industry needs. You can't do this by waiting to react for or against programs which Government develops. Some Government programs are good. Others are as wild as a March hare. Whether good or bad, it is getting to be a one-way street. There should be cooperative development between you, the people who work for you, the people who legislate for you, and the people who administer your programs.

The writers of the Constitution did not intend Congressmen to become errand boys, but the exactitudes of the job are such that it is very easy for them to do just that. You can help your Congressman raise his job to the high level at which it was constituted, and he will welcome your help. He knows he should be first a legislator, an equal partner in the Government of the United States.

When you undertake to participate realistically in developing policy, you will sometimes find yourselves spinning your wheels. From your standpoint, the legislative outlook now may be much less than favorable. A topheavy liberal majority in Congress has solid control of both branches. Committees have been reorganized with liberals in command. Unquestionably, the new Congress can get out of hand. Elected in the main on L.B.J.'s coattails, there is only his restraining hand to keep it in balance.

The President can get virtually anything he wants from Congress. The bigger problem will be to keep Congress from passing more than he wants. Those of us who pursue a middle-of-the-road course very definitely have our work cut out for us if the legislative program is to be kept in reason. At this point, the 89th Congress looks like the most liberal one in history. Regrettably, the small slap at Nasser doesn't indicate a trend toward conservation. It was because of Jewish resentment at the Arabs, reflected in votes from U.S. districts with large Jewish communities.

But remember, pendulums always swing back. You have to start somewhere to be ready when the downward swing begins. If history repeats, the next Congress will be less liberal than this one. Your program should not wait for the next election. It should be a part of the next election.

Remember too, as your program is developed, the Nation is not going to stand still. People who want something from Government will find a way to express themselves. It is not enough just to want to be left alone. There is no way to be left alone in the complex modern world in which we live. You have to fight for your place in the sun or you won't have one. There is no better example of this than in your own fight to retain the 12-man exemption, and the present capital gains tax procedure. These have been of such extreme importance to you that you have placed their preservation among your principal objectives. Significantly, there are good supporting reasons. As a result, you have been successful. But the battle isn't over—it will be a continuing one.

This, then, indicates that a policy of opposition is not sufficient in today's world. It has to be a forward-moving policy and a sound one if it is to survive the conflicting pressures it will encounter. But you have to get in the swim.

I told the Florida Chapter of AMA some years ago their organization was getting nowhere with a policy of just plain opposition to medicare. There was a time when they could have taken the ball and scored on some realistic health alternative program which would adequately help the needy. Now, it is too late. Their voice is now scarcely heard in the centers of government.

No, opposition isn't enough. There has to be a logical program. That doesn't mean your program has to outspend the Government's program. It must be a workable program which is sufficiently progressive to offer Congress an alternative and to attract support. It should be a compendium of the views of industry, labor, Congress, and government. It must reflect a cross section of viewpoints, or it will be labeled a parochial approach. That means some give and take. You won't be able to dominate, and that you already know, but you can avoid being dominated.

Expressed very simply, it is most important that sound, constructive programs of information be directed both to Congress and to the people so that they may have access to comprehensive information on which to make intelligent decisions based on fact. Everybody else is doing this—some of them very effectively.

I have covered a wide area. I have discussed many things. We are entering what may be a period of great change. The responsibilities of the citizen to his country and to his government have not changed. Our country and our Government are no better or no worse than the people who make it up. It may very well be true that at no time in the history of mankind has it been more important for people who love and cherish the true blessings of democracy to determine to protect those blessings. You, more than most, can help.

Perhaps it is best expressed in a thing called patriotism—belief in America. Some people think patriotism is going out of style in this country—along with prayer in the schools. To many, the Fourth of July is just another day when they don't have to work.

I recall a night some months ago in Washington at a typical Washington banquet with too many speeches and too much smoke in the air. The hour was late and the guests were tired. Then as a final event, a Navy choral team appeared, and in song and word they told the story of America—of its humble beginning as a haven for the oppressed and a land of opportunity for all. They told how people who believed in this country and who loved it, worked for it, fought for it, and died for it, to make it the great land that we have inherited.

And when they had finished, that great crowd was no longer tired or bored. They were thrilled and electrified at a glimpse of a thing called patriotism; it is the lifeblood of any land. If we keep, truly keep, our patriotism throughout this land, we will not lose its traditions or its greatness. Let's not lose our patriotism; let's not lose our belief in America for this is indeed a decade of challenge. It may be a challenge for the survival of our Nation.

An Intolerable Affront

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, some of us who looked at the front page of the

Washington Post and saw the picture of the raid of Soviet students yesterday on the American Embassy were simply astounded. Here were crowds of students breaking windows in the American Embassy. In front of the students was a line of Soviet police standing immobile and careless to the actions of the students.

This meant in simple terms that police were on the job in Moscow yesterday with instructions to do nothing about student raids and damage done to the American Embassy.

The Washington Post of today, February 10, 1965, in an excellent article, "An Intolerable Affront," has set out the necessity of recalling our Ambassador from the Soviet Union for consultation to protect the lives and property of diplomats in the American Embassy in Moscow.

Nothing has so well demonstrated in recent years the necessity of the United States to take immediate action because the Soviet Union has indicated they do not intend to protect American lives in an American Embassy in Moscow.

There certainly should be some policy which would prevent a mere expression of our unhappiness with such a situation.

If every time the Russian Government took action which was unacceptable to us, students from American, Georgetown, Catholic, and George Washington Universities should demonstrate before the Soviet Embassy and destroy property and endanger lives without appropriate action from the Washington police, not only would the Soviets be astounded, but the citizens of the United States would indeed be ashamed.

In my opinion, this editorial has substance and in view of the seriousness of the situation in Vietnam, we should take strong action to indicate that we will not tolerate what happened in Moscow yesterday without some action on our part.

What happened in Moscow yesterday, would be bad enough in remote corners of the earth, but in a so-called civilized and progressive country as Russia, such action is unthinkable when not confronted directly with the strength and force of the Soviet Government.

The editorial follows:

AN INTOLERABLE AFFRONT

President Johnson should summon home our Ambassador to the Soviet Union for immediate consultation on what steps may be taken to protect the lives and property of diplomats in the American Embassy at Moscow. This is a matter of the utmost seriousness.

This country, thank goodness, is above reprisal on the same level and no responsible person would seriously urge American citizens to descend into this kind of barbarism. The Soviet Embassy and its staff are as secure as they would be in their own capital—and perhaps more secure. We are compelled the pay the Soviet Government the tribute of saying that it is capable of maintaining order in its capital and that such a demonstration could not take place without its knowledge and consent.

Such total disregard of diplomatic amenities imperils the continuation of normal relations. It is not a case of interfering with the serious work of diplomacy out of mere pique. That would be inexcusable, given the great importance of maintaining relations. But how useful can these relations be if our diplomats are to be viewed by the countries to which they are accredited as hostages against whom the mobs may demonstrate, on order, at every occasion of disagreement. It is not a case of suspending diplomatic intercourse; it is a case of acknowledging that normal diplomatic intercourse has been made impossible already.

It is no satisfactory solution to have the offending country pay for physical damage that has been done after such an assault has served the propaganda purposes intended. We should not be in the position of selling propaganda on these terms.

Let the American Ambassador come home and discuss these matters with the President. And let him stay here until we have arrived at some policy of response more effective than the mere pro forma expression of our discontent. It is bad enough to put up with this in the backward states that are without the disciplines of civilized society but it is intolerable to have to put up with it in a country where the rules of international intercourse are understood and can be enforced.

Waterloo Jaycees Urge Enforcement of Article 19 of United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Waterloo, Iowa, Junior Chamber of Commerce has adopted a resolution calling on the United States to urge the General Assembly of the United Nations to suspend the voting rights of the Soviet Union if that nation continues to refuse to pay its assessments. I commend the Jaycees of my hometown for the forthright position they have taken.

As clearly stipulated in article 19 of the U.N. Charter, the Soviet Union, and every other nation more than 2 years in arrears in the payment of their assessments, should be denied the right to vote in the General Assembly.

If the U.N. Charter has any meaning whatsoever, there can be no compromise on this issue.

The resolution adopted by the Waterloo Jaycees reads as follows:

Whereas the Charter of the United Nations, in article 19, provides that any member nation of the United Nations who fails to pay such assessments levied by the General Assembly for special purposes shall lose its right to vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has consistently refused to pay its special assessments arising out of United Nations aid and activity in the Congo; and

Whereas the United States, as the leader of the free world and as one of the founders of the United Nations, should continually and uniformly strive to uphold the United Nations Charter and adhere to decisions of the General Assembly: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Waterloo (Iowa) Junior Chamber of Commerce, That the United States recommend and urge the General Assembly of the United Nations to suspend the voting rights of the Soviet Union in the General Assembly unless and until such time as the Soviet Union pays its duly levied assessments; be it further

Resolved, That the United States has no alternative to the above action if it is to live up to its heritage of the rule of law. To compromise this important issue or to delay decision on the matter would place our beliefs in jeopardy and would endanger the United States place of distinction among the free nations of the world.

California's Helping Hand in Chile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, the last Congress won acclaim from the vast majority of citizens in my State when it gave support to a bold and imaginative step in foreign aid known as the California-Chile program. It was initiated by President Kennedy who envisioned that California, very similar to Chile in geography, climate, and therefore problems of development, might impart some of its experience and know-how in these areas to the developing nation in the Andes.

Funded by the United States and Chile, California would coordinate the program and contribute its human and technical resources for improvements in conservation, water development, agriculture and so on.

It was hoped that such a program would not only provide Chile with greatly needed technical help, but would decentralize our aid program and bring it closer to the people of both countries. Coordinated at the State level there would be greater opportunity for participation of the average citizen, both as an individual and a member of various civic and governmental organizations.

I am pleased to report that the program has moved from the planning into the implementation stage. Its beginning success, including the warm reception in Chile and in California, may well portend a bright new chapter in American aid for our developing neighbors to the south.

For the further edification of my colleagues, I include in my remarks the following article from the January 23 issue of the Economist:

HELPING HAND IN CHILE

The Chile-California program is a unique experiment in which one of the most highly developed areas of the United States is extending a helping hand to a much less developed but very similar one abroad. The scheme was launched officially last May with the opening of a headquarters in Santiago, Chile, but until Senor Frei won last autumn's presidential election in Chile the experts from private industry, the universities and State agencies in California could do little more than draw up blueprints. Now, with the assurance of a sympathetic government of Chile, they are converting them into practical measures; in so doing they are establishing a new "first in foreign aid."

True, the funds for the program are coming from Washington and the host country is financing both the technical and research assistance and the housekeeping and travel

expenses on the spot. But California is supplying all the technical experts. The State's initiative was inspired by the striking resemblance between California and Chile, thousands of miles apart and very different culturally, but both lands bathed in the western sun, hugging long coastlines and cut off from the rest of a continent by mountain ranges. Both depend heavily upon irrigation to make their deserts bloom with fodder for beef and dairy cattle, all kinds of vegetables, citrus groves, nuts, avocadoes, figs, and wine grapes. In both regions the population is congregated in a few centers; of Chile's 8 million or so inhabitants, 70 percent live in the four largest cities, with 25 percent in Santiago· with the port of Valparaiso this is in embryo a metropolis which could rival the urban spread of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

But on this foundation California has long ago built up a highly sophisticated urban and industrial society which Chile is only now struggling to emulate. Memories of their own growing pains make Californians sympathetic and so do historic ties dating from the days when both Chile and California were Spanish colonies and the best way to reach California from Europe was round Cape Horn. Sentiment aside, the technical experts in economics, agronomy, marketing, water development, transportation, and the like believe that they are exceptionally qualified to advise Chileans on how, starting with roughly identical resources, to rival California's achievement. The projects range from studies of the need for some method of telling the unemployed where jobs are to be found, in an economy where availability is often advertised by a sign hung outside the worker's house, to large-scale development schemes, such as the Maule River Basin project.

The latter, which is engaging the talents of specialists from the California Department of Water Resources and Stanford University, is a grand design to convert a fertile inland area of Chile into a counterpart of California's teeming San Joaquin Valley, where almost every imaginable foodstuff is raised in abundance. But in the long run the most significant scheme may prove to be the Budget Bureau project, in which Californians are instructing Chilean Government officials in the techniques of planning investment. In Chile, public investment accounts for some 50 percent of all capital outlays and to date it has proceeded on a hit-or-miss basis. Now for the first time the Chileans have begun to assign priorities to those investment projects which are most urgent and to abandon some bad ones.

In terms of the vast appropriations for foreign assistance approved annually by Congress, the Chile-California program is mere chicken feed—$600,000 last year, rising to an estimated $1.4 million in 1965. What makes it noteworthy is that 1 of the 50 States has taken a hand, on its own initiative, in making American foreign economic policy. Unfortunately, other States have difficulty in finding partners with such close natural affinities as that between Chile and California.

Visit to a Dead Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the family farm, once the mainstay of American life, has undergone tremendous changes in the 20th century.

We cannot halt changes that seem inevitable. We can only give direction to their changes. Changes that are directed are usually in the long run good.

Changes in agriculture have affected the family farm. Recently I read a rather descriptive account of the family farmlands in our Nation. I found this article to be interesting and wish to commend it to my colleagues.

[From Columbia magazine, January 1965]

VISIT TO A DEAD FARM

(By Frawley Hynes)

Within a radius of 2 to 3 miles of the family farmland, we can count eight deserted farmsteads. This is sad and a little frightening. Analyzed, it means that about a fourth of the rural people in our neighborhood have left the land. Multiply this by thousands of similar sections of the country and you have a very disheartening result, indeed. These people have been forced, by the down-scale prices of the last 10 years, to sell their land to neighbors or lease it to corporations; or have lost it to banks and insurance companies. Or, perhaps, have left it idle because they are weary of trying to continue the uphill climb toward a fair and just reward for their labors. Or, are financially unable to do so. The saddest part of the dilemma is that 9 out of 10 persons, thus inhibited, do not want to leave their homes and their land which may have been in their family for generations.

Statistics bluntly affirm that the cost of starting even a modest farming operation, is, at the least, $50,000. This is a staggering sum confronting, say, a young man just out of university or agricultural college or the Armed Forces, who wishes to make of farming a way of life common to his forebears. Either, if he is able, he must borrow to buy land and equipment with no assets but his youth, his strength and his enthusiasm; or he must rent at a high rate per acre; or, if he is fortunate, be backed by father or friend already established on productive acres that have managed to hold their own in the sliding agricultural economy. Alternately, he is forced to seek job and home elsewhere, in a distant State or in the already, ballooning urban areas, even though farming is bred in his bones.

All this is galling and frustrating * * * there is no more independent individual in the world than the farmer and, perhaps, this is his Nemesis. If all concerned would join together with one voice and proclaim unanimity of price and purpose, the financial status of agriculture would unquestionably rise and stabilize. Judging by the strides ahead made by other aspirants in other fields of endeavor, so, at least, it seems to us.

Rural life, with its attendant labors, is the oldest of all ways of life. Our first parents tilled the soil in the sweat of their brow and were nourished and clothed thereby. So it is an ancient, a prideful as well as a humbling way of life; for the farmer deals with and cooperates with nature for the welfare of mankind, as the Creator designated. From spring through autumn, he often works in all weathers from 12 to 16 hours daily. He toils with his hands, his head and his heart; physically, mentally, yes, and spiritually, if he is a true son of the soil. He needs must be, by the very nature of his calling, a specialist in husbandry, a sower, a reaper, a mechanic, a mathematician, an architect, an engineer. He is also, no matter how astute and diligent, how resolute and farseeing and knowledgeable, a mouse in the paws of economic progress; a pawn of the weather which can bless him with goodly harvests or ravage, in an hour, the fruits of months of hard and conscientious labor.

It's an honorable profession, farming. We are loath to see it lose dignity; to be forced to become big business, thus making the modest family farm expendable.

Farming has always been, and should be for those who choose it, a dedicated and distinct way of living. There seems to be something culpable and malfeasant in this unhappy draining away from the land those who love it; as though the world turns its back on the indomitable spirit of our pioneers and the heritage they bequeathed us. We fear and resent that something, whatever its font, whatever, its purpose.

Advance Urges Repeal of Section 14(b)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in the 88th Congress and again in this Congress I have introduced legislation (H.R. 3973) to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Jacob S. Potofsky, general president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, recently mailed a reprint from Advance, the official publication of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, which details the arguments for repeal of section 14(b). I urge my colleagues to read the following article from Advance:

SECTION 14(b)—AN INVITATION TO FREE RIDERS

Organized labor has made the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law its principal objective in the 89th Congress. And President Johnson has strongly indicated that he will ask the Congress to support such repeal.

Why is organized labor so intent on getting 14(b) off the legislative books?

While it is deceptively simple in language, this so-called right-to-work proviso has become a protection for free riders, a union-busting weapon for the ultrarightists, and a refuge for the employer who wants to exploit his workers in order to gain more profits for himself.

Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law reads as follows:

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or territorial law."

And this brief statement of policy has encouraged some 20 States to enact laws far more restrictive than the Federal act; laws that ban the union shop and deny both labor and management the right to negotiate in a free and open atmosphere. These laws hamstring union organizing and responsible development by banning union security provision normally negotiated in legal labor-management contracts.

Right-to-work advocates, among them some of the most rabid of the rightwing, antilabor groups now operating in this country, proclaim their concern for the worker. They have fervently endorsed his right to a better way of life through freedom of choice—that freedom being secured, they claim, by so-called State right-to-work laws.

This freedom they advocate so movingly is too often, for the worker, the freedom to work for subminimum wages and the freedom to be denied security and dignity on the job. The term "right to work" as applied to such State laws has absolutely nothing to

do with anyone's right to a job or full employment.

Union security provisions are important to the economy of a State, not only to the union seeking them. Even in 1905 when unions in this country were still in their infancy, Samuel Gompers recognized the significance of union security. At the time the AFL president said:

"The union shop, in agreement with employers, is the application of the principles that those who enjoy the benefits and advantages resulting from an agreement shall also equally bear the moral and financial responsibilities involved."

The key word is "responsibility." Under current Federal law, the union that wins certification as bargaining agent for a majority of the workers must represent all the workers in that unit—whether they are members or free riders. By law, that is the union's obligation. It is responsible for representing the entire unit, but it can be most effective only if all the workers are members.

Each worker gains a greater share of human dignity when his union is strong. He can be secure in the knowledge that he need not stand alone.

A union shop, the most mature form of union security, operates only where a majority of the workers in a unit have decided in its favor and come to terms with the employer on a contract clause guaranteeing its existence. To oppose union security in any form, as the right-to-work advocates do, is to argue that a minority has even more rights than the majority. But that philosophy runs counter to all the commonsense rules of democratic society.

Organized labor is not alone in urging repeal of 14(b). Some of the Nation's top employers are firmly convinced that responsible unions are good for business. And unions weakened by antilabor laws cannot perform responsibly in society.

Where unions are strong, industry has prospered. In fact, most of the States where industry and commerce have grown fast and prospered most in recent years do not have union security bans.

The economic picture in right-to-work States is not so healthy. Mississippi, South Carolina, Arkansas, Georgia, and others in this category are in deep economic trouble. Pay levels, and therefore buying power, are low. And where capital investment does go into new plants and equipment, it generally is in low-wage industries.

The result? An economy as unbalanced on the industrial side as that of a one-crop agricultural State. Despite propaganda to the contrary, big industry tends to avoid relocating in low-wage, right-to-work States.

Kansas, in 1958, adopted a right-to-work law, hoping it would encourage big industry to migrate. So far, that piece of State legislation has had quite the opposite effect. And a Kansas newspaper columnist noted ruefully that big industries "shun a right-to-work State as they would a pestilence." And Georgia, which adopted a right-to-work provision in 1950, has heard editorial voices calling for its repeal.

Today, 20 States have right-to-work laws banning union security provisions in collective bargaining contracts; 4 States that had such a law on the books have since repealed it. That means 30 States have rejected or refused to consider such laws.

Statistics show that the wage and income gap between right-to-work States and the Nation as a whole has widened considerably since the restrictive laws became applicable. In each of these antiunion States, hourly wages and per capita personal income have been falling farther and farther behind the national average.

For many people, the continued existence or repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is supposed to be a moral issue. Yet the Nation's leading churchmen of all major faiths have declared the union shop to be morally and ethically, as well as economically, sound.

"Right-to-work laws make the nonunion worker a moral parasite in a democratic labor force," declared the Rabbinical Council of America. And the Reverend William J. Kelly, former chairman of the New York State Labor Relations Board, has charged that, "Right-to-work laws are immoral according to Catholic social teaching."

On the same issue, the National Council of Churches had this to say: "Union membership as a basis of continued employment should be neither required nor forbidden by law; the decision should be left to agreement by management and labor through the process of collective bargaining."

The State right-to-work laws swing the balance of justice unfairly to the side of the employer—a situation that runs counter to the best American tradition. Organized labor has sought repeal of section 14(b) because its removal will void the legality of the so-called State right-to-work laws for all industries covered by Federal law. Labor's goal, in this case, is to achieve for workers throughout the Nation the full freedom to agree or disagree on inclusion of union security provisions in their collectively bargained contracts. Repeal of 14(b) will nail down that freedom.

Proving Our Will: Initiative Still With Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, action and counteraction have been taken in Vietnam. The question is: Where are we on February 10, 1965? Roscoe Drummond, in an excellent article in the Washington Post of today, February 10, suggests that the initiative is still with the Communists. That may very well be. On the other hand, it may not.

This article certainly points up the problem. Unless we can keep our lines clear, and our initiative ahead, undoubtedly the Communists could prevail. Time is short. The important part now is to be sure that the initiative shifts to us. Regardless of what action we take in the future, we must be sure that the Reds understand that we do intend to stand up to our commitments to our friends. The article, "Proving Our Will," by Roscoe Drummond, in the Washington Post of February 10, is herewith appended in full:

PROVING OUR WILL: INITIATIVE STILL WITH REDS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It is by no means certain that the U.S. air raids on Dong Hoi and Vinh Linh will persuade the Asian Communists that we mean business and intend to defend South Vietnam successfully.

That was its purpose, but the very fact American officials had to describe this retaliation as proof of our will to win leaves doubts in Hanoi, Moscow—even in Washington.

The bold Vietcong attack on the Army installation at Pleiku rests in part on the growing conviction in North Vietnam that the United States has for months been looking for a way to end the war rather than a way to win.

Now, the attack on American forces, with serious casualties, and the counterattack over North Vietnam give the United States an opportunity to show that it has the purpose and the will to do whatever is necessary to turn back the aggression.

The opportunity to make this clear beyond all doubt is now at hand. But this single retaliation will not be sufficient to cause the Communists to cease and desist.

We have delayed a long time before taking any action to bring the cost of the aggression to the aggressor in his homeland. A year ago Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, then in Saigon, urged Washington to approve a retaliatory policy—major attacks in South Vietnam to be met with major attacks on North Vietnam. No action.

After the torpedo boat attack on the U.S. destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin August 5 last year, we took a quick pass at the North Vietnamese coastal base and threw away the opportunity which this attack afforded.

On November 1 (2 days before the election) the Vietcong attacked the U.S. airbase at Bien Hoa, killed 4 Americans, wounded 72, and wrecked or damaged 28 planes, including a dozen jet bombers. No action.

When Ambassador Maxwell Taylor was summoned to Washington in December, he urged wider latitude for the U.S. military to reply to Vietcong attacks against South Vietnam with attacks across the border to the north. No action.

There is a final factor which may have persuaded the Asian Communists that we were trying to find a way out. This is the narrow explanation President Johnson and others have most often given of why we are in: to help the South Vietnamese help themselves.

True, but aren't we in Vietnam also to protect the interests of the United States? And don't we need to make it clear to the American people—as well as to others—that the United States is not going to be driven back to Pearl Harbor in the face of expanding Chinese aggression?

Peiping's clear aim is to drive the United States out of all of Asia. Such a result could be only calamity for the free world.

Perhaps the repeated attacks on our forces in Vietnam will galvanize the United States into doing what is needed and thus prove to be Hanoi's miscalculation. But the initiative is still with the Communists.

Government Island, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in my Eighth Congressional District of California, is a very important Coast Guard facility; namely, Government Island. Government Island has been the site of Federal agency activities since 1917 when the U.S. Shipping Board used the island as a construction center for World War I concrete ships. In 1922 the Shipping Board transferred its holdings to the U.S. Department of Agriculture which in turn placed the land in the hands of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads. The latter de-

partment still maintains a depot on the island.

The Coast Guard came to the island in 1926 and established a base using the wharf and some of the office space of the Bureau of Roads. In September 1931, the Coast Guard acquired 15 acres of land from the Department of Commerce to establish a permanent base.

Today this base consists of the entire 67 acre island, 49 buildings, wharfage for 3 major cutters and numerous small craft, and is the only Coast Guard training center in the western part of the United States. Staffed by 34 officers and 258 men, one of the important missions of this base is to serve as a Coast Guard training facility.

A function of the training operation is a marching unit, which consists of a band, color guard, and honor guard all under the supervision of Lt. (jg) G. C. Kornish.

The commanding officer of this training center, Capt. O. D. Weed, Jr., has recently told me that between August 1, 1963, and November 11, 1964, the marching unit has appeared at 88 performances, 43 of which were competitive parades. In these 43 parades the units have won 73 trophies, 59 of which were first-place honors. Eighty-one percent of the trophies were first-place awards.

In reality this unit is quite unique among military drill teams. Most drill teams consist of select, experienced servicemen using light-weight drill rifles. The Coast Guard group is an all-recruit team of men with only a few weeks to less than 3 months of military training. They also use the standard 9-pound M-1 rifle, which weighs 11 pounds with bayonet attached.

The band is normally comprised of 20 recruits, chosen from the recruit battalion, who have had prior experience with high school or college bands, and an additional 10 seamen apprentice who played with the band while undergoing recruit training, and who have been selected to continue for an additional 6 months. There are no rated musicians playing in the band.

All practice must be performed after normal training hours.

The honor guard is under the direction of Howard G. Ischar, petty officer in charge. The band director is Dallas N. Archibald, MU-P1. The drum major of the band is Lynn T. Crisler, SN.

We, in northern California, are very proud of the fine achievements of this marching unit. I am confident that its high standards of excellence and fine performance make the Government Island Coast Guard Band, color guard and honor guard among the finest in the Nation.

Address by Hon. Hollis Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hollis Williams, the Deputy Administrator for Watersheds, Department of Agriculture, recently addressed the Chicago Farmers Club. It was my privilege to work closely with Mr. Williams and his staff, particularly Mr. John Wetzel, during my service as chairman of the Subcommittee on Watershed Development, and I believe that Mr. Williams' address will be of interest to all Members of the House:

ADDRESS BY HOLLIS R. WILLIAMS, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR WATERSHEDS, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AT THE CHICAGO FARMERS CLUB MEETING, DECEMBER 14, 1964

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored by the privilege of your platform.

This organization—the Chicago Farmers—is known across the land as a club of distinction, composed, as it is, of members who might be said to double in brass. You are business and professional people, yet you have direct ties with agriculture as farm owners and operators.

Normally, a professional worker in agriculture, as myself, speaks to farm groups. Sometimes he speaks to urban groups, and occasionally to a mixture of the two groups. But seldom if ever does he meet with a group that actually has one foot in each of these two worlds.

Speaking to such an informed audience for the first time is a challenge not to be taken lightly, and I approach it with more than the usual number of butterflies in the midsection. My hope is to give you enough useful information so that you won't accuse your program committee of lowering its standards too much by inviting me.

My professional career in soil and water conservation is now hovering around the 30-year mark. This is to say—despite the light color of my hair—that virtually all of my adult life has been spent in the conservation business. This, then, is what I talk about whenever I'm asked to speak, for it is my area of competence—the only arena in which I feel qualified to compete.

Hugh Hammond Bennett, whom many of you remember as the "father" of soil conservation in the United States, started to organize a new bureau of Government about 31 years ago—an agency that was to become today's Soil Conservative Service.

Soil conservation was then a crusade, and its practitioners were crusaders and evangelists—Dr. Bennett, God rest his soul—the leading crusader and evangelist of us all. Soil erosion was the devil, and the loss of soil through water and wind erosion was the sin that we were all made to feel a little guilty about.

Hugh Bennett, by the only tactics he knew—and the only way, in fact, by which the attention of a nation could be focused upon a very real problem—laid the groundwork for the broadened resource conservation activities that have grown out of his original campaign against soil erosion.

The professional conservationists who man Hugh Bennett's Soil Conservation Service today are still crusaders, still idealists. But the job itself has expanded from a crusade into an established business—the business of conservation. And it is big business indeed.

Consider these big business aspects of soil and water conservation.

The soil and water conservation business on the Nation's privately owned farms and ranches each year requires 103 million gallons of diesel oil, nearly 75 million gallons of gasoline, 7.7 million pounds of grease, 1.7 million gallons of motor oil, and $4 million in pneumatic tire wear.

These items are consumed by some 96,000 pieces of equipment valued in excess of $1 billion that are owned by soil and water conservation districts, contractors, and individual landowners and are used primarily to install soil and water conservation measures.

Based on average prices paid, the annual cost of these commodities is an estimated $40.6 million—$16.5 million for diesel oil, $20.2 million for gasoline, $2.2 million for motor oil, and $1.7 million for grease.

In all, conservation districts, contractors and individual landowners own more than 284,000 pieces of equipment valued at more than $1.1 billion that are used primarily to install conservation measures. Much of it is trailer-type, such as tree planters, that is drawn by motorized equipment. The fuel-consuming equipment includes bulldozers, track-type and wheel-type tractors, dragline, back hoes, motor graders, and tilling machines.

Here is another big business example of soil and water conservation not included in the estimates just given: In the upstream watershed program in fiscal year 1964, contractors moved more than 30 million cubic yards of earth in building more than 250 dams, improving well over 300 miles of stream channel, and building other structures in over 315 small watersheds. This earth, if all placed in a single structure, would create a dam 30 feet high and 68 miles long. It would have a 14-foot top and 2-to-1 and 3-to-1 side slopes.

Yes, the job has grown tremendously as the Nation has grown. The conservation job today is just as vital as it ever was, and it is far more complex. Since the mid-1930's, the concept of resource conservation has broadened tremendously from a single idea—erosion control—to purposes that multiply each year.

The soil and water concept has come to mean protecting land against all forms of soil deterioration; stabilizing critical runoff and sediment-producing areas; improving grasslands, woodlands and wildlife lands; developing water supplies for municipal and industrial use as well as agricultural use; reducing floodwater and sediment damage for benefits to the people as a whole; providing soil capability information for urban as well as agricultural use; developing income-producing recreational facilities; snow surveys and water supply forecasts; a special drought-proofing program for the Great Plains States.

Modern soil and water conservation includes planning and treating complete watersheds as resource units. This means coordinating the management of crop, range, and forest lands, and the treatment of watercourses in the upper watersheds to minimize the damage of floods and sedimentation to improve the quality and regularity of water supplies.

Indeed, it is safe to say that today's soil and water conservation job bears little more resemblance to that of 20 years ago than the 1965 automobile does to the 1942 model. Only the basics are the same.

Our soil and water resources naturally divide themselves into two categories—those on our public lands and those on our private lands.

While the Federal public land agencies preserve choice natural and scenic areas along with the undistributed public domain and manage their natural resources for the use of all the people, they administer altogether only 21 percent of the land and water area of the U.S. mainland, or 34 percent of the 50 States.

The much larger acreage in private ownership—70 percent of the 48 mainland States or 59 percent of the 50 States—is in the care of millions of individual owners and tenants. The Department of Agriculture is responsible for the national program of conservation on these individual properties, and, through the Forest Service, on the 187 million acres of national forests and grassland as well. Its resource conservation responsibilities make the Department of Agriculture the principal guardian of a majority of our renewable natural resources.

Through technical assistance, consultation, education, and financial aid, the Department of Agriculture influences in the public interest the land use and management decisions that shape the future of renewable resources on these lands and on the lesser acreages belonging to the State and local governments. These include the most productive farming, timber, and grazing land in the country, and most of the seashores and shorelines of the Nation's lakes and streams.

The Department of Agriculture's conservation efforts are rooted in a deeply held concept of local control. The Department and its agencies, in dealing with individuals and with groups, does so through a recognized local organization.

An outstanding example is the soil conservation district, now called in many States soil and water conservation districts because of the growing importance of water conservation and development. The soil conservation district was conceived in the mid-1930's and began to flower in 1937. Today, the Nation is blanketed with more than 2,960 of them, and 25 States are completely covered by them. Conservation districts have become a permanent part of the American landscape and they have contributed mightily to changing the looks of that landscape from a scarred gullying one to an "America the Beautiful" pattern—one that features attractive contours and strips, wooded slopes, ponds and small reservoirs, and the green of widespread grasslands. The Soil Conservation Service is proud to be the technical partner of these local conservation districts.

Many changes in depth and breadth of the conservation movement have occurred in recent years. Perhaps many more are on the horizon. We have seen significant adjustments in land use.

Land is going out of agriculture at the rate of a million or more acres a year. The size and makeup of the family farm have been changing rapidly. Some farmers are turning to other enterprises—part time or full time—to supplement their income. Recreation developments are becoming one of the instruments for increasing their income.

The 1959 agricultural census showed that from 1954 to 1959 the number of farms dropped by 1 million and the average farm increased in size by 60 acres. This is again an agricultural census year. It will be interesting to see what has happened in the last 5 years.

We have seen continued pressure building up on our land. Intensification and greater efficiency in land use will probably adequately provide the food and fiber we need for the next few decades.

But land needed for other uses by the end of the century is a different story. Increased land requirements for recreation, urban use, transportation, wildlife refuges, and reservoirs will be tremendous. In fact, these added to all other land uses would equal more land than we now have in the 48 mainland States.

This points up very emphatically the need for multiple land use and careful land-use planning. Looking ahead to the end of the century, pressures on land and water will be very real if our population continues to grow as expected.

We have already seen pressures on water. Both its quantity and its quality may very well prove to be determining factors in the national economy. Our demand for fresh water has been growing even faster than population. Nationally, the demand for water is expected to keep growing for the rest of the century at a rate at least as fast as population. Irrigation, by far the greatest withdrawal use, may increase by half. Municipal use may double. Manufacturing use may quadruple.

My particular responsibility—the upstream watershed program—is one of our most promising and widely accepted new conservation programs. It actually got underway in its present form only 10 years ago but, such is the slowness of public policy development, had its beginning back in 1936 in the Flood Control Act of that year when Congress recognized for the very first time that agriculture had a role in flood control.

Although it is a fascinating story, time does not permit me to even give the highlights of the evolutionary process that finally resulted in enactment of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of August 1954. That legislation, plus broadening amendments to it that have expanded its usefulness to the local people in recent years, and its present and potential benefits, are more important than how it all came about.

The small watershed program, which in each project calls for local initiation and participation in the cost, has, I believe, measured up to the hopes and dreams of its longtime proponents who began fighting for this approach in the early 1930's.

If time permitted, hundreds of examples of its effectiveness as a tool in flood prevention, sediment reduction, erosion control and water management could be cited.

The program has helped to accelerate the conservation treatment of upstream lands, and it has helped in shifting out of cultivation land ill suited for such use.

It has demonstrated its validity as a workable mechanism for Federal-State-local partnership in resource conservation and development.

It has proved an effective means by which diverse community interests—and people of town and country—can work together toward common goals.

How well it has demonstrated these values, can, in fact, be measured.

The program's popularity among local communities is evident in the large and growing backlog of applications for help.

Its acceptance as a valid mechanism by which the Federal Government and the States and the local communities can work together is seen in the enactment of 285 laws in 43 States to expedite such cooperation.

Its merit as a means toward multipurpose development of soil and water resources is shown by the fact that more than 40 percent of the approved watershed projects now combine watershed protection and flood prevention with other purposes such as recreation, fish and wildlife development, irrigation, drainage, and municipal water supply.

Its practical value to the States is further evidenced by the growing willingness and interest of the State governments to make substantial financial contributions to the planning process. Contributions of 25 States totaled more than $2 million in fiscal year 1964.

Many improvements have been made in the original watershed legislation. Some of the most important were enacted in the Food and Agriculture Act of September 1962. This act added recreational development—including water resource improvement, basic facilities, and necessary land—as a purpose eligible for cost sharing. It authorized the Department of Agriculture to advance funds to preserve scarce sites. And, of special interest to urbanites, it authorized including capacity for future industrial and municipal water storage in watershed dams with repayment and interest charges deferred up to 10 years.

I shall not throw progress statistics at you—I have them here if you want to know—but we have made important advances in the past decade in developing the Nation's small watersheds. But the job ahead is a tremendous one. Indeed we have barely made a good beginning.

The best estimate is that there are 1 billion acres of land and water that need and are suitable for development as small watershed projects.

Local organizations through their applications for assistance indicate they have recognized this need on about 16 percent of this vast billion-acre chunk of America. We have authorized planning assistance for a little more than 7 percent of this area. We have approved plans for and work has been started on a little more than 3 percent of this job.

An essential ingredient in speeding up the job is wider public awareness of the value of small watershed projects in the economic development of communities across the land—many of which are doomed to a slow but sure decline and death unless they find a way out of the morass into which they are sinking.

Ten years ago we had to talk of the advantages of watershed projects in terms of ideas and opinions, based on limited experience. Today we don't need to rely on opinions or guesses. We have facts. The program has demonstrated its worth. It has proved itself.

Based on solid experience we can say that the 600-odd watershed projects we expect to be operating in fiscal year 1965 will help some 1,800 communities develop their land and water resources on about 36 million acres affecting a population of 4.1 million people. The protection of 2.9 million acres of flood plain will pay returns estimated at $39 million annually and bring 1 or more new industries to some 150 communities.

Let me turn from watershed work to the broader area of soil and water conservation needs on all our private lands, as revealed by the Department of Agriculture's county-by-county inventory compiled with the help of some 30,000 local people.

Nearly two-thirds of our cropland needs conservation treatment of some kind. About three-fourths of the privately owned pasture and rangeland needs conservation treatment. More than half of the private forest and woodland needs conservation treatment. An even larger proportion needs more protection than it is getting from fire, insects, disease and animals that injure trees. The 1 billion acres of land and water needing treatment in watershed projects that I referred to previously are located in two-thirds of the Nation's 12,700 delineated small watersheds, which are subdivisions of 160 principal river drainage basins.

You have been most gracious in your attention, and I will not impose further on your time although I will be glad to try to answer questions you may have.

Let me close by saying that we have become an urban Nation. Whether or not we shall have the will and the facilities to cope adequately with our resource problems at the local, State and National level is largely in the hands of the urban people, who now make up more than 90 percent of our society.

The urban people must understand, as far too few of them do, that our national standard of living, our strength as a people and as a nation, our future greatness in the world society—all these and more are wrapped up in our American land and its soil and water resources.

You Chicago farmers, as men unique in that you are part of both our urban and rural society, are especially qualified to participate in this program of urban education.

I urge you to do so.

Address by Hon. Douglas Dillon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following address by Hon. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, at the 16th annual dinner of the Brooklyn division of the Jewish National Fund, held at the Hotel St. George, Brooklyn, N.Y., on Sunday, January 31, 1965:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

I am indeed happy to be with you tonight—at the invitation of my good friend Congressman EUGENE KEOGH—and to join in celebrating the continued success of the Jewish National Fund in its great and humanitarian work of transforming barren wastes of land in Israel, into places green with trees, where abundant crops can grow, and where men can settle and work and thrive.

The fruits of your good work are indeed impressive. Since 1948, when the State of Israel came into being, more than 100,000 acres of land have—through the efforts of your organization—been cleared, drained, and prepared for cultivation. Over 70 million trees have been planted to protect the soil from erosion and to enrich the landscape. More than 1,700 kilometers of roads have been laid through terrain that is both mountainous and rocky. Today three-quarters of a million people live on land leased by the Jewish National Fund.

You have begun a program to reclaim the barren and unsettled north central portion of Israel and bring it within the mainstream of Israel's growing economy. More particularly, this, the Brooklyn division of the JNF, is engaged in a $2 million project—Kiryat Brooklyn—to reclaim land next to the Jordanian border in the north central portion of Israel. I am sure that not long after its completion 3 years from now, Kiryat Brooklyn, peopled with thousands of settlers, rich in cultivated acreage and fruit trees, will more than fulfill your hopes and justify your efforts. It will serve as a living testimonial to the excellent support the work of the Jewish National Fund has always received from its Brooklyn division—particularly under the leadership of such men as State Senator William Rosenblatt, your division president; Mr. Isaiah O. Zucker and Mr. Morris Putter, the cochairman of the Kiryat Brooklyn project; and Mr. Henry Solomon, the chairman of the board of the Brooklyn division.

Your efforts, therefore, have done much and will do more to help the State of Israel grow and prosper. I know that you are justly proud of your success—for it has not been easy and the obstacles have been many. The late President Kennedy once stated—and I quote—that:

"Just as our own West has sustained progress against the impacts of serious farm depressions, crop failures, credit crises, and droughts, so, too, Israel has had to exist on narrow margins of survival, in a constant climate of hostility and outside danger. Yet it has endured and its integrity remains unimpaired, and this success can be in a large measure attributed to the Jewish National Fund."

It is indeed fitting that the JNF is now honoring our great President's memory through the establishment of the John F. Kennedy Peace Forest near Jerusalem.

Private efforts by citizen's groups such as yours have been accompanied by our Government's efforts to help the people of Israel build a free and prosperous country. To speak only of one current matter involving my own Treasury Department, delegations from the United States and Israel reached agreement last October on the substantive provisions of an income tax treaty to promote trade between the two countries and to encourage U.S. private investment in Israel. This treaty provides, among other things, that the United States will grant to its taxpayers who invest in qualified enterprises in Israel a tax credit equal to 7 percent of their capital investments in those enterprises. In other respects as well, this treaty—which will shortly, we hope, be ready for signature by both Governments and then for final approval by the U.S. Senate and the Israel Parliament—should serve as a decided spur to greater American private investment, and thus greater economic growth, in Israel.

I am hopeful that 1965 will see the formal signature and ratification of that treaty by both countries. I know that the year will bring continued success to your efforts to give new life to barren earth in Israel.

Here at home, 1965 promises to be among the most fruitful in our history—a year in which we make new beginnings toward reclaiming barren or blighted aspects in our own national life, toward creating that America of social well-being that we have long dreamed of and left too long unrealized, toward the building of that Great Society to which President Johnson has summoned the Nation anew.

We have in recent decades met and mastered crises and challenges upon whose resolution rested our future as a Nation and the fate of the world. The great depression, the Second World War, the cold war—these have been all-encompassing problems whose solution has required our alert and undivided attention, our utmost energies, and all our resources. But while, in certain crucial respects, the times are now more dangerous than ever—for today we live always under the shadow of a nuclear cloud, as the Cuban missile crisis taught us not so long ago—they are also more calm.

For we have learned to live with the cold war, and to accept the burdens and pressures our Nation must bear as the leader of the free world. We have largely accomplished our freely chosen task of helping rebuild and rejuvenate a Europe ravaged by war, and we can expect that in the future Europe will assume more of the burden of helping the underdeveloped countries of the world pursue their own destinies in freedom and economic well-being.

And at home we are just completing our fourth year of sustained economic upsurge—the longest period of peacetime growth in our history. Since the start of the sixties, our total national output—measured in constant dollars—has grown by more than one-fifth. Jobs and incomes, profits and investment have reached new highs with almost monotonous regularity. And we have shielded these gains from the blight of inflation by maintaining a record of price stability unexcelled anywhere in the world.

To be sure, no one imagines that we have conquered the business cycle, either for the time being or for all time. Nor can we claim to have solved all our economic problems, for we still have many. But we have learned over the past 4 years that recession is not inevitable, and we have come to a new confidence in our ability to keep the American economy moving in all kinds of weather. In short, we stand on economic ground firm enough for us to turn our attention—far more than ever before in our history—to mounting a concentrated, reasoned and vigorous attack upon some of the acute social problems too long obscured or ignored in the life of our land.

Never have our prospects for success in that venture been brighter. For not only have we an abundance of technical, social, and economic resources, but we have arrived, I think, at a new national resolve to translate good intentions into practical and effective action. We have arrived at a new understanding that in efforts of this kind success does not, and cannot, come all at once, but comes slowly, often grudgingly, and over long periods of time. In a word, we have arrived at a new and dynamic realism in our approach to the social problems confronting us—and, in so doing, we have abandoned any resort to sweeping, impractical panaceas as either substitutes for action or excuses for inaction. As President Johnson's proposals well demonstrate, we have discovered that to be bold, we need not be rash—that to be practical or prudent, we need not be timid.

The list of problems in our society is long. But in any such list, the three most crucial problems—those which underly and encompass all the rest—are poverty, prejudice, and ignorance.

In launching the war on poverty and in leading the struggle for adoption of the Civil Rights Act last year, President Johnson helped awaken and arm the conscience of the Nation against poverty and prejudice as never before. All of us, I think, are becoming more acutely aware of how impossible it is to insulate ourselves behind a wall of unconcern—for in such matters, as events have taught us, unconcern is complicity, and to ignore the injustices of poverty and prejudice is to condone them.

As our moral vision is becoming sharper and clearer, and our conscience more aroused, we are also beginning to see how deep and pervading is the injury of poverty and prejudice to our national life. We are beginning to understand how these evils rend, not only the moral and social fabric of our society, but its economic fabric as well. We are beginning to become aware of how these evils impoverish the lives of all of us economically as well as morally.

Thirty-five million Americans—one out of every five citizens of the world's wealthiest nation—live in poverty. They not only fail to share adequately in the abundance enjoyed by the large majority of Americans, but they cannot contribute to our Nation's life and growth as fully as other Americans. To put it purely in terms of dollars and cents: Two-thirds of our poor families have an average income of $2,000 or less. If this could be raised just beyond $3,000—just over the poverty line—their total annual income would be $7 billion higher. As they spent this money in the local grocery or clothing store, and the local storeowner in his turn spent this money, and the money was thus spent and respent throughout the economy, it would lift the Nation's total annual output by an estimated $14 billion a year—with all the extra jobs, incomes, and profits that would mean.

On economic, therefore, as well as human grounds, poverty exacts from all of us a considerable price. And so does racial prejudice. Almost half of our nonwhite population lives in poverty, as compared with 16 percent of our white population. Unemployment figures tell much the same story. Last year, for example, nonwhite workers had more than twice the unemployment rate of white workers.

Prejudice and poverty mean only limited educational opportunities for Negroes and others. Because of limited educational opportunities and the color line drawn at far too many employment doors, Negroes and others find themselves largely shunted off to lower paying semiskilled and unskilled jobs. And then, for the children of these Americans, begins the same vicious cycle in which their parents were caught: for prejudice and poverty will deprive them, too, of their full educational opportunities, and prejudice and inadequate education will limit them to low-paying jobs. And caught in this vicious cycle as well is the Nation's economy—for discrimination, as President Johnson has said, costs this Nation nearly $20 billion a year, with all the jobs and incomes, profits and investment, and untold opportunities, that amount would mean.

In a report issued at the beginning of this month, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith said:

"At the very threshold of the Great Society looms a stubborn obstacle—the residue of prejudice left by the long years of human slavery and segregation. * * * What law can do to outlaw discrimination, the bipartisan Civil Rights Act of 1964 has largely done. * * * But the urgent task now is to translate the law into realization. To that end it must be effectively enforced; it must be supplemented by enlightened community practices and attitudes."

For, as the report goes on to say, "the demands of equality of opportunity are not quite satisfied when the law opens the door and says, 'All may now enter,' if some are made to carry on their backs the burden of inherited poverty and educational deprivation."

In any effort to wipe out poverty and prejudice, there is no greater obstacle than ignorance—no greater ally than education. Two-thirds of those families whose breadwinner has had 8 years or less of schooling live in poverty. Unemployment among young people in the 18 to 24 age group with an eighth grade education or less is close to 20 percent—more than three times the unemployment average for the Nation as a whole. Yet, to cite statistics such as these—as if the story they tell were not stark enough—is barely to suggest how huge and critical is the educational challenge that confronts the Nation today. For the costs of education are rising, and our educational resources—at all levels—are already sorely overburdened at a time when our young people are reaching school age in enormous numbers and our society more and more demands skilled and trained talent.

We are moving vigorously to meet this challenge. Already President Johnson has signed legislation giving education in the United States its largest forward stride since land-grant colleges were established almost a century ago. And in his education message just 3 weeks ago he presented a program that, more perhaps than any in our history, would hasten that day in our land when ability to learn, rather than ability to pay, will be the sole standard of educational opportunity—when every child will have the opportunity, in the President's words, "to get as much education as he has the ability to take."

The tasks, then, ahead of us are great, and so are the opportunities. Never has the vision of that Great Society President Johnson has portrayed had better prospect of approaching so near to achievement. But how near it approached to achievement must depend not upon the efforts of Government alone, but also upon the united efforts of private citizens, of States and localities, upon the personal efforts of every American, to help reclaim those aspects of our national life laid waste by poverty, prejudice, ignorance, and all other sources of needless human suffering.

Thus can we replenish the wellsprings of our country's greatness, and give new life to our land as the place beyond all others where men and men's hopes can flourish in all freedom and dignity and justice.

Study in Irritation: President's Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I append herewith an article by Marquis Childs, columnist for the St. Louis Post Dispatch titled, "Study in Irritation: President's Press."

Much has been said in the Washington press in the past few weeks over the President's failure to hold regular press conferences. Mr. Childs has fortunately pointed up not only the responsibility of the President insofar as his problems are concerned, but also his responsibility to the American people to keep them informed on what is happening.

There is a natural reluctance of all Presidents to face the press and for many of us on Capitol Hill, we have an understanding of that problem. However, I do believe the President could do a better job than has been done in the last 6 weeks in keeping the American people informed not only on what is happening abroad, but also on the local scene.

The President has a better chance to retain his image if he answers these questions forthrightly—even though many of them may be most difficult.

The article in its entirety is herewith appended:

STUDY IN IRRITATION: PRESIDENT'S PRESS

(By Marquis Childs)

To the man on whose shoulders rests the fearful burden of the Presidency the world has quite a different look than it has to his critics in the press. He sees it with a full knowledge of the flow of intelligence across his desk day after day.

Since the press cannot know all he knows, speculation on the danger points and the course to be followed is an added hazard. In the growing dispute between the President and the fourth estate this is Mr. Johnson's response to his critics. The latest crisis in Vietnam could serve as a footnote on the limits of public knowledge, as the President sees them, and, on the other hand on the right of that same public to know if in a democratic society proper judgments are to be formed.

This is a report on presidential attitudes on the eve of the latest alarm. Mr. Johnson feels that most of the criticism directed at him is not only petty but contradictory. One commentator tells him he must be more aloof and cultivate a majestic presence like that of Charles de Gaulle. Another critic accuses him of destroying the press conference in fear of facing reporters with amply scheduled time to prepare searching and informed questions.

Still another rebukes him for not seeing enough foreign diplomats and exchanging views with them. The President has a comprehensive knowledge of these lectures on his conduct of the office. He recites chapter and verse at the same time declining to say that they do, in fact, get under his skin.

All Presidents, beginning with George Washington, have suffered the hair shirt of the press. What is remarkable is that a man with 30 years of experience in public life beginning with the rough and tumble of Texas politics where the attack is often in frontier language—liar, thief, vote-stealer—should be so sensitive.

It seems to me all the more important to try to understand the President's viewpoint. He concentrates on the big things—on Vietnam, on the balance-of-payments problems, the Atlantic alliance. As the press plays up incidents such as the delegation to the Churchill funeral and the speculation of why Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY was not on that delegation, it seems to the President to put the little things ahead of the big things.

Speculation on the course he might follow in meeting the balance-of-payments threat included the possibility that the convertibility of the dollar might be restricted. That suggestion taken seriously by the financial community could worsen the situation and make essential the kind of drastic measures he hopes to avoid.

He is never unaware of the decision that he and he alone must make in the quiet of that oval office. As he talks of the travels to come in the late spring and early summer the vision is of a man in a perilous passage with no time at all to lose—a man fiercely impatient of small obstacles and the darts of criticism thrown at him in the middle of the crossing. The search for peace is uppermost in his mind with the realization that an incident such as the latest explosion of the war in Vietnam could put an end to all his hopes.

While the President does not put it in quite such simple terms he obviously feels that he should start on his travels not only with the weight of his great electoral victory of November but with the sense that he has the support of most Americans. His sensitivity and his ego to one side, this is an important factor in his present attitude.

The danger, of course, is that the fuss can turn into a feud, with damage all around. The President has recourse to a simple remedy. That is to hold a regularly scheduled weekly press conference in the State Department auditorium subject to cancellation only under extraordinary circumstances. He has handled himself well in that type of conference before, fielding every kind of question and, like all Presidents in the past, declining to answer where he thought it wise or necessary to stop short.

Mr. Johnson has an almost congenital reluctance to commit himself in advance to a course of action. He regards information as a commodity to be doled out at his sole discretion. These are the limits on his relationship with the press.

But there is another limitation having nothing to do with the Johnson temperament, and Vietnam is an example. This is war and yet it is not war. The politicians and the press clamor for information that might be prejudicial to the national interest and to the lives of men engaged in that half war.

These are some of the fearful complexities of a complex time.

Conditions Within Soviet Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD two editorials which appeared in the February 4 Palos Regional, an independent publication serving the Palos region of south Cook County, Ill. These editorials deal with conditions within the Soviet empire and are most timely in the observations made and the questions raised:

CAUSE FOR UNREST

Over the years, numerous surveys have been published illustrating the vast difference in living standards between this country and the Communist nations. They commonly take the form of graphs, detailing the hours of work that must be put in to earn enough money to buy various kinds of consumer goods.

These comparisons have sometimes been criticized on the grounds that they cannot take into consideration the great difference in background, customs, availability of re-

sources, geographical location and other factors that exist in the United States on the one hand and Russia on the other. But, it is significant to report, the comparisons work out in much the same way when applied to two nations without such differences, West Germany and East Germany—the first a capitalist state, the second pure Communist.

A worker in West Germany earns enough wage in 8 minutes to buy a quart of milk—across the Communist border it takes 18 minutes. The West German can buy a refrigerator with 103 hours and 55 minutes of work—his East German counterpart must labor 625 hours. The figures for a car are 1,238 hours and 56 minutes and 6,391 hours and 18 minutes respectively. So it goes.

In the closing months of the Khrushchev era, there were definite signs that the Soviet Government, plagued by consumer unrest, was leaning toward capitalist incentives, such as the once-reviled profit motive, in an attempt to spur production. One wonders if the new masters in the Kremlin will follow along.

WILL WE IMITATE FAILURE?

It's a well-known fact that the Soviet Union's long series of plans for stimulating production have been failures in many respects—most especially in the field of consumer goods. The Kremlin planners have laid down goal after goal, blueprinted in meticulous detail. But the paper projections have been one thing—and the actual results another.

So, reluctant as they may be, the Soviet bosses have been moving, if slowly, in another direction. They have been turning to that reviled of all capitalistic devices—profit. And they have, additionally, been focusing critical eyes on overall economic planning dictated from above.

This, according to the gospel as laid down by Marx, is heresy. But necessity compels it. The whole Communist economic system is under examination and change. Dramatic overhauls of concept and theory are called for and are published in Pravda, which is the official voice of the Communist Party. The basic idea is to eliminate bureaucratic indolence, established by centralized planning, and to offer profit to workers and managers as a reward for good performance.

There is a message in this for us. Recognizing the failure of Marxist theory, the Soviet Union adopts techniques of capitalism. Will we be so foolish as to choose the other course and move toward a planned, collectivist, centrally directed economics system which has proven so drastic a failure?

Threat Posed to Our Gold Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I take issue with the President's rose-colored picture of our national financial position. The threat posed to our gold reserves by France and possibly Germany is very real. The gold drain will probably get worse, not better. Yet here we have the President, shrinking from the tough measures needed to keep dollars at home.

He proposes the expansion of the interest equalization tax. He proposes a piddling cutback in the amount of goods tourists can bring back into the United States. The rest of his proposals are based on "effort" and "cooperation." To match his rosy picture, he has proposed a lackadaisical policy, which does not have nearly enough teeth in it.

I urge specifically that the following measures be considered: Higher interest rates in the United States to attract foreign capital and brake U.S. demand for foreign goods; a multimillion-dollar crash program to attract far larger tourist crowds to the United States; greater participation by our allies in sharing costs of U.S. oversea defense facilities; a cutback of U.S. participation in oversea development loan setups like the Inter-American Development Bank, which programs are tantamount to foreign aid. These are tough measures—the situation is a tough situation. The President has not faced up to the true depth of the challenge.

Residual Fuel Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the subject of residual fuel oil imports prepared by the Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, Inc., for the Independent Petroleum Association of America:

STATEMENT ON THE SUBJECT OF RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORTS PREPARED BY THE INDEPENDENT FUEL OIL MARKETERS OF AMERICA, INC. (IFOMA) FOR THE INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA (IPAA)

INTRODUCTION

The subject of residual fuel oil imports is one that has been utterly clouded and confused by the factor of politics to the point where the basic economic impact on our Nation has been lost in the confusion. It is a subject that is causing problems and repercussions throughout the world. It is the intent of this paper to put the record straight and the emphasis will be on how this issue affects and concerns the domestic producer of this product. In the latter regard it is essential that the import question be kept as two separate issues; namely, crude oil and residual fuel oil. They are two separate and distinct questions because, whereas domestic crude oil is in ample supply and is a primary resource raw material of our country, residual fuel oil is in short supply and is a byproduct of the domestic oil industry. It is for this reason that restrictions on crude oil imports are necessary for national security reasons whereas restrictions on residual fuel oil imports are not justified and in fact imperil our national security. The latter conclusion was proven beyond any question of doubt by the findings of the Office of Emergency Planning's memorandum to the President under date of February 13, 1963.

THE STAKE OF THE DOMESTIC OIL PRODUCER IN RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

Disregarding any emotional appeal to national security or interest, the questions that must be answered are:

1. What impact do residual fuel oil imports have on the domestic oil industry?

2. Do these imports supplant or supplement domestic residual fuel oil production?

3. If restrictions on residual fuel oil imports were removed, what would happen?

The answers to these basic questions are all intertwined. The domestic oil industry has a very direct tangible and intangible stake in this subject. This applies not only to national but also to our international industry interests. You cannot disregard the latter because what happens overseas does have an impact on the domestic oil industry and this even applies to residual fuel oil. Throughout Europe an inefficient and declining coal industry is successfully using the same false weapon of emotion re the sad state of the coal miner to get import restrictions placed on oil. It is not well known but special low vanadium, high quality residual fuel oil is exported from the U.S. gulf to Europe and Africa and this export business is at stake. Yet it is difficult, and in fact impossible, for our trade representatives to protect these trade restrictions by foreign countries when we are guilty of the same act. In fact, we started the fight. Approximately 5 percent of our total value of all goods imported into the United States is residual fuel oil. Since we have a nontariff barrier against such imports we have to exclude this item from any trade negotiations now going forward in Geneva in the GATT discussions which are aimed at reducing or removing trade barriers against our manufactured goods and commodities. This means that other countries with which we are negotiating not only have our trade team at a psychological disadvantage but their countries can also exclude a corresponding dollar value from the negotiations, only they will pick items of goods which we desperately want to sell such as chemical and oil country goods, electronic equipment made in Texas, et cetera. In fact the Common Market group of countries, to offset the sizable dollar value we had to exclude from the trade negotiations because of our import restrictions against residual fuel oil, included all chemicals—the oil producing States of America all have a vested interest in this one item alone, not to mention the many others that play an important role in your State economics and well being. Let's take three oil producing States (Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana) and see how important foreign trade is to these States, basing our conclusions on a study made for 1960 trade by the Department of Commerce.

Texas: Exported $837 million of manufactured goods and $447 million of agricultural products in 1960. The major exporting industries were chemicals, petroleum, wool, food, and machinery. In addition, Texas exported $32 million in sulphur, salt, and talc or 39 percent of State production. The exporting companies included big and little oil and chemical corporations and over 300,000 Texans owe their employment to export trade business.

Oklahoma: Exported $99 million of manufactured goods and $103 million of agricultural products in 1960. The major exporting industries were primary metals, machinery, food, petroleum, and fabricated metals. The exporting companies included many oil and oil equipment companies and over 50,000 Oklahomans owe their employment to export business.

Louisiana: Exported $254 million of manufactured goods and $82 million of agricultural products in 1960. The major exporting industries were chemicals, petroleum, food, paper and wood products, and fabricated metals. In addition, $15 million of salt and sulfur were exported, or 20 percent of State production. The exporting companies included big and little chemical and oil companies and over 173,000 Louisianians owe their employment to export trade.

The above statistics speak for themselves—all have a stake in export trade.

Finally, while on world trade, Venezuela is one of our best customers in the world. She uses the dollars she earns from residual fuel sales to buy our goods and services. Much of these goods and services originate in our oil-producing States, thereby contributing to the prosperity of these States—for, the more prosperous a State the more oil consumed.

Residual oil imports supplement but do not supplant domestic production. Due to technological refinery progress and the grace of God in the fact that the majority of our crude oil is high gravity and produces less resid than do the heavy crudes of Venezuela, less and less residual fuel oil is being produced in the United States. In fact domestic production that is available to east coast markets that are involved in this issue is now down to approximately 5 percent of total refinery yield from these refineries. At the same time demand through the years has been steadily climbing. As population increases and industrial economic development continues upward, the demand for power increases. An example of the latter's size is Florida where demand for power is increasing at the rate of 20 percent per year. Another factor that has caused demand for residual fuel to go up is the huge megalopolis that now extends from Boston to Washington—land is at a premium and single family homes are giving way to high-rise apartments, small hotels to large hotels, small industrial plants to huge industrial complexes. These facilities all need fuel and they will not consume dirty, hard-to-store-and-handle coal, so it is either gas or residual fuel oil. Unfortunately for our industry most have been denied a free consumer choice because of resid import restrictions and gas has taken the business. Granted the domestic oil producer may reply, so what, we don't produce the resid. But, any action of this nature that gives a market to a competing fuel by Government decree does have a negative effect on the oil producer since it makes the gas industry all that bigger and economically stronger and therefore better equipped and able to fight us for markets.

There is another intangible factor inbuilt into this issue and that is that the continuation of the present program is just one more step down the road to full Government control of our industry and our becoming a public utility.

Last year the Federal Power Commission released a voluminous study on a national power survey and the results tell a sad story for oil. It is estimated that oil's share as a source of energy for power in the United States will go down from 6 percent in 1963 to 4 percent in 1980, whereas nuclear energy will go up from 0.1 percent in 1963 to 19 percent in 1980. The report noted what we all know and I quote "U.S. import policies are an important factor in the consumption of residual oil by electric utilities as well as other users." The latter is further proven by the reports filed with the Secretary of the Interior by the large east coast utilities in protest against import controls which are denying them a free choice of conventional fuel, specifically, residual fuel oil. While on this subject, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries recently released a study on the next decade of world oil and came to the same conclusion; namely, that because of Government intervention (particularly in the developed countries of the world) and discrimination against residual fuel oil, consumption of energy source would be diverted from this product to nuclear power in the years ahead. Already this trend is in evidence on the east coast where nuclear powerplants are being built because conventional fuels are neither competitive nor available in the case of residual fuel. What hurts one member of the oil family of energy sources indirectly hurts all the oil industry. This is proven by the rapid takeover of energy source by nuclear power because of Federal Government decree and discrimination aganist residual fuel oil.

While it is not the purpose of this statement to present coal's argument, a brief summation of this issue vis-a-vis coal is in order. The coal industry is enjoying great prosperity and the future, according to the analysts, looks even better. Mine unemployment is due to automation, not resid imports—one miner does the work of three miners 10 years ago—160,000 miners produce same amount as did 450,000 10 years ago. The Appalachia bill will pass and we oil men will have to foot part of the cost as taxpayers. It is the old story, the coal mine owners always get us to assume responsibilities that our industry pays itself. For example, when an oil field is depleted we gamble our money to find new fields and then move on—the coal industry stays put until the poverty of Appalachia, coupled with the propaganda of coal, gets us to ante up and foot the bill. The same is true on research and development—we finance our own to the tune of over $500 million a year for research and development, whereas coal gets us taxpayers to pay the bill as witness the operations of the Coal Research Division of the Department of the Interior which is spending our money to find and develop a process to get gasoline from coal when we have gasoline "running out of our ears." When are we going to wake up?

SUMMATION

Imported residual fuel oil never supplanted domestic residual. At the present time the major portion of domestic resid going into the east coast is high grade, low vanadium product that is not produced overseas. It is estimated that less than 100,000 barrels a day of domestic produced resid enter the east coast market. This volume will continue to be reduced in the future if past trends mean anything. Prices are inflated at present due to values of import tickets. Based on a monthly price study by the Office of Emergency Planning, it would seem that the value of a ticket fluctuates from 18 to 40 cents depending on seasonal and climatic factors. Removal of controls on imports would remove this value and prices would be reduced in about a corresponding amount—but this would have no negative impact on the oil industry because this ticket price does not accrue to the base price of fuel but is rather a form of middleman's profit.

The evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of the removal of controls but, if for political reasons some form of supervisory surveillance is deemed necessary, then a system of open end licensing could be put into effect which would remove the present inequities and hardships being caused the independent marketer. A suggestion has been made that one solution might be to auction off the import quotas. Such a system would be the death knell of the independent marketer. The larger and financially stronger companies would bid up the auction price and the smaller independent would be out of business. The present system is nothing less than end use control of the consumer, who is tied to his historical supplier. There is no provision in the covering regulations for variations in geographical, climatic, or economic development conditions. The independent marketer is a captive to his historical supplier and therefore in no position to negotiate or bargain on prices.

Other than outright removal of controls, an open-end licensing procedure is the only fair and equitable solution. It would be a simple program: same eligibility as at present reimporters, namely, a deep water terminal equipped to handle oceangoing tankers, imported residual could only be used as fuel and not rerun through domestic refineries, importers would get quarterly "bank drafts of quotas" which they would deposit with the customs office in their area, and imports would be charged against this "draft" by the customs office. This system would return the market to a free enterprise system and the independent marketer would no longer be at the mercy and captive to one supplier. Actually the system is no different from the one in effect in the Department of Commerce to control exports of strategic goods to Communist countries—same procedure except this one would control imports. It would not entail any great addition in the workload at the Oil Import Administration—at the maximum, one additional licensing officer would be needed.

The best solution would be complete removal of controls, even if only for a trial period.

Hi, Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, this month, February 21–28, marks the annual observance of National Brotherhood Week.

It is well to have this annual reminder of the importance of practicing in our everyday lives the principles of equality and justice upon which our Nation was founded. Current events in many sections of our country bear witness to the sad fact that the meaning and spirit of brotherhood escape too many people who allow prejudice and hatred and fear to dominate their dealings with their fellow men.

In this connection, it is appropriate to call attention to a noteworthy editorial written by Woodrow S. Monica, D.M.D., of Orange, N.J., from the December 1964 issue of the Bulletin of the Essex County Dental Society and reprinted by the West Orange Chronicle, the East Orange Record, and the Orange Transcript. I know our colleagues will be interested in reading Dr. Monica's illuminating remarks which I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD:

EDITORIAL—HI, NEIGHBOR

Sometimes when I am introduced to a stranger he may ask: "Is that an Italian name?" * * * "I know some fine Italian people." Unwittingly, in his attempt to be pleasant, he reveals a cardinal clue to prejudice. For he who categorizes upon hearing a name or seeing a face, demeans himself and alerts his acquaintance. With his thin congeniality glistening like a calm sea at sunset, he hopes to maintain his supercilious status.

His bias, like a dye, is deeply ingrained. Paling at times—though indelible—vestiges will always show. I feel sorry for him. He is not wholly to blame. Surely he was not born with prejudices nor did he know them in infancy.

Who is at fault? No one in particular. Many of us, without being tainted, have witnessed petty peeves, gross intolerances and poisonous bigotries. Their telling stain blemishes only a few.

I have no quick answer for this medieval attitude, but I do have faith and confidence in the ultimate good of my neighbors. They may stumble, grope, injure, but eventually they may see the light.

La Porte (Ind.) Herald-Argus Endorses President Johnson's School Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an outstanding editorial from the February 4, 1965, issue of the La Porte Herald-Argus endorsing President Johnson's elementary and secondary school bill.

The editorial follows:

EDUCATION BILL FOR THE POOR

It appears the way will be smoothed for passage of President Johnson's $1.2 billion aid-to-education measure by a settlement of the problems arising from its provisions for aid to parochial school children. There will be some legal questions raised and constitutionality of the assistance to those other than public school pupils will probably be tested, but there are indications in Washington that the measure will be tailored to pass the legal barriers.

Of the total program $1 billion would go to public school uses, meaning that only about $200 million would involve assistance to private school students. About $100 million is to be set aside to buy textbooks and library books for private and public schools, and another $100 million for creating supplementary educational centers in which private schools would participate. The aid would go directly to the private school pupils, not to the schools themselves, thus possibly avoiding the thorny separation of church and state principle.

If this vast program is to have real meaning and value it must be made to serve primarily the children underprivileged educationally, the youngsters from the great city slums, and rural slums too, where the quality of education does not begin to equal that provided in moderately wealthy to wealthy communities. Poor communities do foster poor schools, while the better systems are in comparatively well-to-do areas. Aim of the measure is to reduce this disparity by the use of Federal means.

The slum school or the school in economically inferior areas actually has greater need for more educational sinews because of the human problems poverty creates. The child from the impoverished family is off to a poor start when he enters school because of his environment and because of a lack of cultural background. And to enable him to draw abreast of his more fortunate fellows special educational treatment is necessary. For him there should be the best in instruction, the best in equipment and the extra attention which will help him overcome his background and the dismal beginning of his under-6 span.

Apparently only Federal assistance will make possible the upgrading of school systems and individual schools where poverty is a deadly drag on the educational process. States and local communities typically cannot provide the financial means to give the necessary lift for these educational disaster areas. The administration's program represents an attack on a broad front of the bogey of inequality in education, an inequality which in the long run affects us all as a people because we can be only as strong educationally as our weakest links, wherever they are.

Louis Graves: A Singular Newspaperman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, there recently occurred a death in my congressional district of a man who occupied a most unique place in the annals of journalism and who exemplified the very best in the policies and practices of that profession.

I refer to Mr. Louis Graves, founder, owner, and publisher of the Chapel Hill Weekly for 31 years until some 10 years ago, when he sold the paper but continued to write his classic and inimitable columns from time to time as a contributing editor.

Louis Graves was born and bred in Chapel Hill, the site of the University of North Carolina. Although he left the village as a young man to pursue his career in journalism, serving as a member of the staff of the New York Times and as a freelance writer whose work appeared in leading publications, his heart remained behind in the little village which sheltered the institution he loved so well, the University of North Carolina. After a distinguished career in New York, and travels to many places as a journalist and a soldier in World War I, he returned to Chapel Hill as head of the department of journalism. After some 2 years of teaching, he yearned for what is said to be the ambition of all members of the fourth estate—a small-town newspaper of his own. In 1923, then, he established the Chapel Hill Weekly and this small weekly, impeccably written and edited, became known around the world.

When Louis Graves died at the age of 81 in his beloved village of Chapel Hill on January 23, 1965, his inquisitive mind and his searching intellect were as pronounced as when he actively edited the paper he founded. The world was his book and his interests and his knowledge were myriad. An article about Louis Graves and the way he ran his paper and his credo as a newspaperman appeared in the Chapel Hill Weekly of January 27, 1965. I would be but gilding the lily if I attempted to improve on this statement of what Louis Graves was and what he stood for; so I am inserting this article in the RECORD, believing that it will be of deep interest to the many Members of the Congress who knew Louis Graves, as well as to other Members who did not know him personally but who, I am sure, will value and appreciate this account of a man who elevated his profession to the highest ideals of excellence.

Not long before his death I had a letter from Louis Graves requesting some information on an aspect of our national life. In the letter he told me that his eyes were giving him some trouble but that his wife was acting as his eyes and doing his reading for him. To his helpmate and inspiration through the years—Mildred Moses Graves—I extend my deepest sympathy in the loss of her good companion of the years. Her bereavement is indeed that of North Carolina and of the Nation.

The article follows:

LOUIS GRAVES: A SINGULAR NEWSPAPERMAN—FOUNDER OF THE CHAPEL HILL WEEKLY

When Louis Graves was in Memorial Hospital last week, strangers kept coming into his room—doctors, nurses, orderlies, technicians, and various others whose business is to attend the sick.

Each new arrival soon found himself being interviewed. Mr. Graves wanted to know his full name, where he lived, where he came from, a little something about his work, and how he liked Chapel Hill.

Louis Graves was 81 years old and breathing his last. He had long since ceased to worry about deadlines, but he had never quit being a newspaperman. And that was the way he went out, a newspaperman to his fingertips, and to the end.

Chances are that if he had survived that last attack, little news items about the people who had attended him at the hospital would have turned up at the Weekly. And there probably would have been ideas for stories that his hospital stay had suggested.

His body aged and finally worn out, but his instinct for news and a passionate interest in people and in all that went on about him remained as fresh and unquenchable as it must have been in the days 42 years before when he had decided to set up Chapel Hill's first newspaper.

That passionate interest in people and the happenings around him and a superb talent for describing them in clear and flawless prose were what made Louis Graves a great newspaperman. With his spirit and talent given free expression, he probably would have been a great newspaperman in any other time and in any other place. It was a fortunate circumstance that he chose the Weekly as his vehicle.

Vehicle is the proper nomenclature, for until he sold it and went into semiretirement a little over 10 years ago, the Chapel Hill Weekly was Louis Graves. It faithfully reflected his interests, his opinions, his enthusiasms, and his occasional disgusts.

To say that it faithfully reflected life in Chapel Hill would be inaccurate. Louis Graves was not interested in who had been arrested for drunkenness, or who had been slashed in a Saturday night knifing, or who was being sued by his wife for divorce. So a recorder's court docket never appeared in the Weekly, although that is one part of life in Chapel Hill.

It would be accurate to say that the Weekly reflected what Louis Graves considered to be the good life in Chapel Hill. He told about what people in Chapel Hill were doing, where they had been, where they were going—the things that the people concerned wouldn't have hesitated to tell about themselves. He told about marriages and births, the visits to Chapel Hill of the greats, the near-greats, and the not-great-at-alls. He also told about deaths, but in a way that would spare the grieving as much as possible.

Louis Graves was forever writing about trees and flowers and birds, which he loved and nourished. The grounds at his home on Battle Lane belonged as much, if not more, to the birds as they did to Mr. and Mrs. Graves. When James Gust's bulldog, Muggie, had a new litter, it was page 1 news in the Weekly. The blooming stage of the flowers in the arboretum or in a neighbor's yard also was treated as major news. And he waged a long and relentless battle to save a single elm on Franklin Street from progress.

Withal his love for birds and animals and trees and flowers, Louis Graves' consuming interest was in people and it showed in the Weekly. (His major criticism of the paper after his retirement was the neglect of "Neighborhood Notes," the column of personal mention of Chapel Hill people.)

It would be a rare happening on almost any paper today, including the Weekly, but it was not at all uncommon for Louis Graves to restrict advertising or to pull ads out of the paper to get in some important news—such as a report of somebody spending a week at the beach, or holding a card party, or the dogwoods coming to flower. If it was about Chapel Hill people, or about anything that would interest Chapel Hill people, it was important news to Louis Graves.

Louis Graves' working methods were what you might call casual. For the most part, the Weekly just reported what he and Mrs. Graves (and later on Joe Jones) saw going on about the village and what they were told was going on. In later years, this method was refined somewhat: Mr. and Mrs. Graves from time to time would set up a couple of canvas chairs on the sidewalk downtown and visit with passersby.

In the old Weekly office on Rosemary Street, Mr. Graves and Joe Jones would take afternoon naps and sort of attune themselves. It was an unnerving experience to walk in there for the first time and see them both stretched out on cots reading galley proofs.

There was nothing casual, though, about how the news was written and treated. Louis Graves had love and respect for language. He wanted sentences to parse, he wanted the right verb tense, and the right word. The unabridged Oxford English Dictionary was his standard: if a word wasn't in the Oxford English Dictionary, as far as Mr. Graves was concerned the word didn't exist. Awkward grammar and misspellings pained him greatly and he expressed his dissatisfaction bluntly. Besides being a perfectionist in grammar, he was a precisionist in communication: he wanted sentences to say exactly what was meant, clearly and forcefully. And beyond that he wanted writing with distinction and style. His own copy was a linotype operator's nightmare. It was written and rewritten, edited and then the editing was edited before it went into type, and then the proof copy was corrected and edited again. But the end result was impeccable prose, with style and distinction, lucidity and force. He expected no less of all that went into the Weekly.

Reflecting Louis Graves' character as it did. The Weekly almost had to be an unconventional newspaper, and under his editorship it was.

The anniversary edition, that cherished moneymaking gimmick of almost all newspapers, was looked on by Mr. Graves with amused scorn.

In 1948, on the Weekly's 25th anniversary, instead of putting out an edition fat with ads congratulating himself on a quarter-of-a-century of tenure, Mr. Graves congratulated everybody in town but the Weekly, from milkmen and street sweepers, to doctors, lawyers, and university professors. And he added, in a characteristic note:

"Sometimes the pressure of getting to press on time and the long tedious hours required to compose and get into type information which our readers can consume at a glance and probably already knew anyway, makes us wonder if it's worthwhile to go through with the same irksome routine again next week."

The unconventionality also showed in his editorials. In one instance, when most newspapers in the State were debating the merits of lowering the voting age to 18, Louis Graves suggested instead that the minimum age be raised to 30. His idea was that immaturity was already too rampant at the polls for a secure democracy.

Politically, he was probably as independent as any editor ever can be. His choice of a candidate was based almost solely on the character of the man running for office. In town elections, he published the names of his choices unabashedly, and when he found no candidate to his liking, he remained editorially silent. In other elections, party affiliation meant practically nothing to him. He once supported a Republican for Congress for what he considered to be the best of reasons: the candidate was a friend and fellow townsman, and had had the good grace to pay Mr. Graves a personal visit and ask for his help.

About the best thing you can say about any newspaper editor is that he never prostituted his talent or his newspaper. That can be said about Louis Graves, without even minor exceptions.

He had a very special idea about what a newspaper should be and how it should be run and he shaped the Chapel Hill Weekly to conform with that idea down to the last comma and the last 14-point head.

He undoubtedly could have made a lot more money if he had chosen a somewhat more exalted newspaper role, and he could have made a lot more money if he had guided the Weekly toward more commercial ends.

But he remained true throughout to that very special idea, and in so doing he remained true to himself. Perhaps it is only incidental that he also remained true to Chapel Hill and the university and the best of what they both stand for, but he did that too.

If you ever knew him or knew his newspaper, you couldn't help but be a little better for the knowing.

With Louis Graves gone, the Weekly will never be the same. For that matter, neither will we.

United States Must Maintain Firm Stand on Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, according to some recent articles in the New York World-Telegram, Premier Eisaku Sato, after his return to Japan from his visit to the United States, insisted that as a neighbor, Japan cannot pursue a policy of enmity toward China. The articles say that in effect, Japan offers her friendship to Peiping, and proposed to be the honest broker between Peiping and the West.

When Prime Minister Sato met with President Johnson, he explored the question of Japan's trade with Communist China, and expressed the view that commerce should be separate from politics. Premier Sato also hoped to swing the United States in favor of his viewpoint that Red China should be brought into the U.N., and perhaps even receive diplomatic recognition. The point is not whether the Japanese should trade with the Reds—amounting to 2 percent of their foreign trade—the problem is that once Japan starts to succeed on this idea of exploration to soften the U.S. policy toward Peiping, they will exert their ways to move in and become more demanding; as the old saying goes: "If you give them an inch, they will try to gain a foot."

For Japan's own good as well as for the good of the free world, we should institute economic sanction to stop profiteering ships from going to the China mainland and to prevent the further strengthening of the Chinese Communists who aim at the destruction of the free world.

I take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that our President stood very firm and opposed the above-mentioned propositions of Premier Sato. I commend the President for making the rightful decision and I am confident he will have the strong support of the American people.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko (1746–1817)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Tadeusz Kosciuszko was one of the gallant and brave soldiers of fortune who was always willing to go anywhere and serve under any banner for the good cause of freedom and liberty. This gifted son of a well-to-do Polish peasant family was destined to be a soldier of rare distinction. He was born on February 12—the birthday of our own President Lincoln—219 years ago. He lost his father when he was 13 years old, but his yearning for education led him to the Royal School at Warsaw in 1765. He graduated from that school in 1769 with the rank of captain, and earned a scholarship to France where he entered the famous military school at Mezieres, specializing in artillery and engineering. In 1776 he was in Paris, and there be heard of the American Revolution. That stirred his imagination and his restless soul. At once he saw his chance for action in a good cause, and with borrowed money he sailed for America, arriving in Philadelphia in August of that same year.

On his arrival he applied for military service, and of course was admitted. First he was employed to draw up plans for the fortifications of the Delaware River. The succesful completion of these plans earned him a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army. In the spring of next year he joined the Northern Army at Ticonderoga, and there he advised on the fortifications of Fort Defiance. During the next 2 years he was placed in charge of the building of fortifications at West Point. Subsequently he saw action at Charleston, S.C., and was one of the first Continentals to enter that city after its evacuation by the British.

In recognition of his signal services for the cause of the Revolution he was made a brigadier general on October 13, 1783. A year later he returned to Poland, hoping to serve there for the Polish cause. In 1789 he was made a major general in the Polish Army, and for many years continued to lead his unfortunate Polish compatriots in their hopeless fight

against forbidding odds. He was sadly disappointed in his gallant attempts. Heart-broken, he ended his career in exile in Switzerland. On his 219th birthday, we do homage to his memory.

Handy-Dandy Little Suicide Kits and Do-It-Yourself Instruments of Mental Illness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD beginning at page A322, I described the need for far-reaching changes in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, as proposed in H.R. 1235, an omnibus bill to rewrite the 27-year-old law.

Today, I had the opportunity to appear before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to testify on one phase of this broad subject, the control of traffic in barbiturates, amphetamines, and related habit-forming stimulant or depressant drugs. Under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable OREN HARRIS, the committee has been holding extremely interesting hearings on H.R. 2, Chairman HARRIS' bill to deal with the problem of bootlegging and illicit distribution of the so-called pep pills and goofballs and bennies and other nonnarcotic dangerous drugs.

PLEA FOR EXPANDED HEARINGS

In my testimony, I cited the provisions of section 6 of H.R. 1235 as being, in a number of major respects, more effective than H.R. 2 in meeting the problem of these dangerous drugs. But my statement went beyond that to urge that the hearings on H.R. 2 be expanded for the purpose of going into the entire Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and rewriting all of its obsolete sections and adding new sections to meet new circumstances.

Because of the widespread interest among consumers and among consumer-minded Members of the House in the issues I discussed in my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 26, I think there will be general interest in my statement today on section 6 of this bill, as follows:

A SERIOUS GAP IN OUR LAWS—BUT JUST ONE OF MANY

(Testimony by Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN before House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on legislation to tighten controls over habit-forming depressant and stimulant drugs, Wednesday, February 10, 1965)

Chairman HARRIS and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you this morning. The legislation you are considering is of vital importance—vital in the literal sense that our lives are in danger from the continued widespread illicit traffic in barbiturates, amphetamines, and the related central nervous system depressant or stimulant drugs. We know that many of the head-on crashes on our superhighways—where a car or truck will suddenly careen across the median strip and plow into a car going the other direction, wiping out entire families—can be attributed to more than just fatigue on the part of one of the drivers. As the work of the Food and Drug Administration has demonstrated, illicit sales of the so-called pep pills at highway stops are so common that the use of such drugs constitutes a real and present danger to everyone who ventures out on a highway.

The barbiturates and the amphetamines serve very useful medical purposes when properly used, and nothing in this legislation, of course, would interfere with the doctor's freedom of action in prescribing such drugs or with the patient's opportunity to buy them through legitimate channels. But when the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration testified—as he did before this committee—that probably one-half of the 9 billion doses of barbiturates and amphetamines manufactured in this country in 1962 ended up on the bootleg market, then, Mr. Chairman, we are compelled by our responsibilities as Members of Congress to wipe out this bootlegging of pills which are major causes of highway homicide, which also serve as handy-dandy little suicide kits, and do-it-yourself instruments of mental illness and delinquency among youth.

Of course, you are not going to wipe out all traffic in instruments of homicide and suicide and crime no matter what kind of legislation you pass, but I want to point out—before someone raises the question of firearms regulation and we get into a long and emotional controversy on a completely different issue—there is nothing in the first amendment about the right of the public to buy any kind of poison they want to. In fact, we have many laws—including the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—which severely restrict the manufacture, distribution and sale, of unsafe products in commerce, and we have other laws which prohibit the illegal possession of narcotics regardless of whether they moved in interstate commerce.

We must stop the illegal traffic in nonnarcotic drugs which are frequent substitutes for narcotics and which when abused are habit forming and dangerous not just to the user but to the public. The legislation before you will go far toward accomplishing that purpose. It prohibits unauthorized possession of the pills, permits surveillance of all stages of production and distribution, and establishes criminal penalties for violators, particularly for sales to youths.

STRONGER PROVISIONS IN H.R. 1235

Commissioner Larrick pointed out in his testimony certain changes which he would recommend in H.R. 2, the bill introduced by Chairman HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that one of the sections of H.R. 1235, my omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, contains all of the provisions of H.R. 2 on control of the dangerous and habit-forming depressant and stimulant drugs, and, in the respects cited by the Food and Drug Administration, also contains language covering most of the points raised by Mr. Larrick.

For instance, my bill permits seizure of any drugs for which there are not proper records as required under the proposed law. There are safeguards in the bill to protect legitimate manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, of course, but the burden of proof would be placed upon them to prove legal ownership of any drugs for which they failed to keep proper records. Under such tight restrictions, I cannot imagine half of the annual production of 9 billion doses disappearing out of legitimate trade channels.

H.R. 2 would extend to Food and Drug officials the right to carry firearms under certain circumstances in the administration of this new section of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. H.R. 1235 would go further, as Commissioner Larrick urged, and give such officials the powers not only to execute and serve arrest warrants, and execute seizure by process issued pursuant to libel, but also to—

(a) Make arrests without warrant for offenses under this legislation "if the offense is committed in the officer's or employee's presence or if he has probable cause to believe that the person so arrested has committed, or is committing, such offenses";

(b) Make, prior to institution of libel proceedings, "seizure of drugs, containers, or conveyances if such drugs, containers or conveyances are, or if he has reasonable grounds to believe that they are, subject to seizure and condemnation" under the law, provided however that libel proceedings be instituted immediately thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, these are very strong powers, but they are not excessive; they are similar to the powers now held by alcohol tax agents and by narcotic agents. In the case of habit-forming dangerous drugs so widely bootlegged, we are dealing with criminal syndicates and hoodlums. Without such powers, the evidence can quickly disappear before warrants and libels can be issued.

FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT NEEDS MAJOR OVERHAUL

My purpose in coming here this morning is not just to suggest the substitution of the stronger provisions of section 6 of H.R. 1235 for H.R. 2, as a tighter bill and more inclusive in fighting bootlegging of these dangerous drugs. I am even more brash than that.

Mr. Chairman, I first introduced this barbiturate-amphetamine control legislation more than 4 years ago, so I am very anxious to see such legislation become law. I know that the chairman of the committee has also been a sponsor of such legislation for a number of years. But we both recognize—and I hope all of the members of the committee also recognize—that the situation with regard to these dangerous mind-affecting drugs, while very serious, is only one of a whole series of important problems which now exist in the administration of effective food, drug, and cosmetic regulation.

We have put a lot of blowout patches on the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 over the years, but the act itself needs a major overhaul. Instead, we have usually taken up one issue at a time, one Congress at a time. In 1954, we passed the bill on pesticides, but nothing was done on cosmetics, or on food additives, or about other glaring gaps in the law. In 1958, we passed a Food Additives Act, but again did nothing about cosmetics safety, or any of the other deficiencies in the act. In 1960, when the lipstick makers came rushing in for help, we quickly passed the Color Additives Act, requiring that all coloring matter in foods, drugs, or cosmetics (except hair dye colors) be proved safe before being used, but to this day we have done not a single thing to assure the pretesting for safety of any other ingredient in cosmetics. In 1962, under circumstances I do not have to recall for this committee—which worked a legislative miracle in getting the legislation through under tremendous difficulties—we closed the major loopholes in the clearance of prescription drugs following the thalidomide disclosures, but once again we did nothing about cosmetics, or barbiturates and amphetamines, or therapeutic devices or any of the other major loopholes in the basic act which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of FDA have repeatedly deplored. I included these things in my omnibus bill as long ago as 1961. The chairman of this committee also proposed many of these things in legislation he also introduced in the 87th Congress.

I introduced an omnibus bill in 1961 after having introduced separate bills on cosmetics in four previous Congresses, when I became convinced we were proceeding too slowly by taking up only one phase of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in each 2-year term of Congress. This is our basic consumer protection statute. It is 27 years old. Many provisions of it are obsolete. Some sections were bad 27 years ago, and are worse today. Yet we have approached this vast problem a nibble at a time, a Congress at a time, even conceding that some of the acts which you have sponsored in these past 10 years, Mr. Chairman, have been very important and very sizable bites indeed. But we haven't ever done since 1938 the kind of job done by this committee 27 years ago—that is, take a good, hard look at the entire act on foods, drugs, and cosmetics, and weed out the obsolete portions and replace them with effective provisions which truly protect the consumer in today's economy rather than that of 27 years ago, when technology and marketing were far different.

MAY BE ONLY CHANCE TO AMEND ACT IN THIS CONGRESS

In my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on January 26, I spelled out these necessary and long-overdue changes, as called for in H.R. 1235. In that statement, I went into detail on all of the previsions of my omnibus bill, and the reasons why the health and safety of the public, and the interests of all consumers, require passage of an omnibus bill such as H.R. 1235, rather than another piecemeal approach as in H.R. 2.

My plea is this: Please extend the scope of these hearings to include all phases of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act requiring improvement and amendment. You have made a fine, early start in this Congress on a most important aspect of the problem. But I am fearful that if we pass H.R. 2 by itself, that may be the only part of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act we can get to in this Congress. For I am mindful of the heavy legislative responsibilities of this committee in so many other fields—transportation, aviation, natural gas, power, the Public Health Service program, railroad retirement, communications, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the other regulatory agencies, and the fact that once you put this one aspect of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act behind you, the press of hearings on other issues may make it impossible to go back to this subject. At the pace which has been followed in the past, it may be years before we can complete action on such major loopholes in the law as those applying to:

1. Therapeutic devices, which can be marketed today without proof of safety and without proof of effectiveness and which, in many instances, are tools for the victimization of the elderly and sick, as Senator WILLIAMS' Committee on the Aging reported just last week.

2. Cosmetics, which can also be marketed without prior clearance for safety, except insofar as the coloring matter is concerned (and in the case of hair dyes, the colors can be virulently dangerous just so long as the label points out they may not be safe for some people to use).

3. Worthless dietary foods, another major source of defrauding the elderly and ill.

4. Factory inspection for foods, nonprescription drugs and cosmetics—the same loopholes in these fields which we closed for prescription drugs in the Kefauver-Harris Act of 1962.

5. Deceptive labeling and packaging: The public is really becoming aroused over the tricks which can be perpetrated under present law. I firmly believe that if we do not solve this problem through the noncontroversial features of section 2 of H.R. 1235, you will soon be faced with tremendous demand for much more stringent regulation.

6. Cautionary labelling of foods, drugs, and cosmetics—now exempt under the Hazardous Substances Labeling Act so that no information need be supplied on possible dangerous uses or misapplications, or on first aid steps to be followed in case of mishap or accidental ingestion, particularly by children.

There are many other changes in the basic Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 called for by H.R. 1235, including a proposed ban on interstate commerce in flavored or sweetened aspirin, a major cause of accidental poisoning of children under 5. In extending my remarks, I will list all of these provisions. But for right now, I fervently ask that you expand your hearings on H.R. 2 to include all phases of the act, and give our consumers the first real top-to-bottom review in 27 years of the many deficiencies in this statute.

Industrial Locations of the West—The San Leandro Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the cities in my congressional district, San Leandro, Calif., has historically been in the forefront of industrial and commercial development of the natural resources which it possesses as a city.

Recently, the Pacific Factory magazine, which is published on the west coast, heralded this development in an article entitled "Industrial Locations of the West—The San Leandro Story."

The San Leandro Morning News on December 25, 1964, carried a news article discussing the fine tribute paid to this city by the Pacific Factory magazine. Also, on December 22, 1964, San Leandro was further honored by a telegram from then Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, congratulating the city on the achievements it made during 1964.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD both the newspaper article and the text of Mr. Hodges' telegram:

PACIFIC FACTORY MAGAZINE IN SALUTE TO SAN LEANDRO

One of the year's finest stories on San Leandro has just been released by Pacific Factory magazine. An estimated 30,000 copies of the magazine are being mailed to executives up and down the coast and the country over, according to F. A. Louis Meyer, chairman of the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce industrial expansion committee, which prepared in cooperation with the chamber office, background material for use by Pacific Factory's editors.

The issue features what it calls "Industrial Locations of the West—The San Leandro Story." A subhead refers to 17 years of record industrial growth, and the city's industrial picture since World War II is well chronicled and documented, Meyer said.

Running through the story in addition to growth pictures, are emphasis on the economic balance of San Leandro and the 17 consecutive cuts in the city tax rate.

Photos include an aerial of the entire city with the marina featured in the foreground, the General Foods, Cal-Pak, and Caterpillar plants, and the railroad tracks serving this portion of the city's industrial area. Also, the industrial controls division of General Electric, Friden, and a preengineered building by Dudley Steel are illustrated. A number of San Leandro firms took ads in the issue and their individual stories are told.

An editorial in the front states, "The industrial development of San Leandro presents a challenge to other communities that want industry but fear it might destroy their character as residential cities." The editorial continues, "While welcoming industry, San Leandro has managed to become a still more desirable city in which to live, with handsome stores and shopping centers, a $1.75 million new library, and a rebuilt downtown retail area."

Chamber President James J. Halloran is shown and the San Leandro chamber receives considerable credit for its persistent and enthusiastic efforts in attracting industry at what Pacific Factory calls "an unparalleled rate."

The chamber's advertising-publicity committee, under the chairmanship of Paul Mennenga, considers the article so valuable it has ordered 500 reprints for distribution to new industrial prospects and those who are considering making investments here.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
December 22, 1964.

SAN LEANDRO MORNING NEWS PROGRESS,
San Leandro, Calif.:

On behalf of the President, it gives me great pleasure to send warmest congratulations to the citizens of San Leandro for the community's notable achievements in 1964. The establishment of 40 new business enterprises in the city during the year and the expansion of 29 others, creating 1,500 permanent new jobs and requiring $10.5 million in capital expenditures, reflect an extraordinary spirit of growth and confidence. It is also gratifying to know that the dynamic export expansion program of your chamber of commerce has been carried on with sustained vigor and purpose. I had the pleasure of participating in the 1962 White House ceremony awarding your chamber the first "export" citation ever given such an organization, and I am pleased that this important program is being continued. In addition your city's record in lowering the tax rate for the 17th consecutive year, while at the same time inaugurating such civic improvements as the new downtown plazas and expanded recreation facilities at the marina and golf course, attest to sound and responsible management by local public officials. My best wishes for continued progress in 1965 and throughout the remainder of this challenging decade of the 1960's.

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Hon. Joaquin "Mike" Elizalde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness and sorrow that I learned of the passing of one of the greatest friends the United States ever had, and I am proud to say also one of my closest friends, the Honorable Joaquin Elizalde. "Mike" as he was affectionately known to his many friends, was the first Ambassador of the Philippines to the

United States and served in that capacity from 1946 to 1952. Prior to that time however, he was Resident Commissioner of the Philippines from 1938 to 1944.

I got to know Mike when I first came to Washington in 1946 and was assigned to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I knew of no man who fought for his people, nor was a more firm defender of his people than Mike Elizalde. By the same token he was a most kind and considerate and compassionate man.

My thoughts are with his widow and children at this time but I am sure they will be sustained by the memory of a truly great man who will long be remembered in the history of his country.

Is Imperial Valley Doomed by Land Limitations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include the following article by Nettie Brown published in the Imperial Hometown Review on January 26, 1965.

I believe that this article presents an excellent study of the land limitation decision in Imperial County, Calif., given by Chief Solicitor Frank Barry:

IS IMPERIAL VALLEY DOOMED BY LAND LIMITATIONS?

(By Nettie Brown)

As 1964 faded, leaving farmers of Imperial Valley facing problems of an impending labor shortage because Public Law 78, authorizing supplemental foreign labor to work their fields had ended with the year, these farmers found themselves confronting another crisis that threatened their large-scale operations which have made Imperial County, Calif., the fourth largest of the Nation in valuation of agricultural products. On December 31, 1964, news services revealed that the U.S. Department of the Interior had reversed its former position held for 31 years, and issued the opinion that the 160-acre limitation statutes should be applied to lands receiving irrigation waters by virtue of the Boulder Canyon project; namely, Imperial Irrigation District.

The general manager and chief legal counsel of IID were summoned back to Washington, and, without publicity, were given the edict in a 41-page opinion of chief solicitor Frank Barry, backed by more than 60 pages of supplementary documents and correspondence.

Unprepared for the sudden reversal of long-established water practices, officials and farmers alike in Imperial Valley met the opinion with shocked disbelief; and turned their attention to the pressing problems of attempting to secure labor for the lettuce harvest then in process. After all, they had been involved in a battle with the State of Arizona for water rights for more than 20 years, and this added threat to their water supply just seemed to be part of a larger problem: to secure adequate water for all, by development of cheap desalination—or by bringing it from the northwest where even then fellow Californians were attempting to mop up from major floods that had claimed many lives, wiped out hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property, livestock and potential croplands—and allowed hundreds of billions of acre-feet of precious, life-giving water to escape to the sea.

Should the excess land laws, which would limit to 160 acres in one ownership any lands supplied water by a reclamation project, be applied to the Imperial Valley?

Neither the courts nor the various administrations of the Department of Interior have been in agreement as to the intent of the Congress when it passed, in 1928, the Swing-Johnson bills which made possible Boulder Dam on the Colorado River and the All-American Canal that is the lifeline of water for the lush winter garden of America known as Imperial, which only a brief half-century ago, was a burning barren desert.

Imperial Valley, most of which is encompassed by Imperial Irrigation District, is an area of approximately 600,000 gross acres in the extreme southern portion of California. It extends, generally, from the Salton Sea on the north to the Mexican border on the south; and from the Laguna Mountains on the west towards the Colorado River on the east. At present, more than 500,000 irrigable acres can be served by a system of canals bringing water from the Colorado River through the All-American Canal and the Boulder Canyon reclamation project.

Year-round agriculture is possible because of mild winters with few killing frosts. Average annual rainfall is between 2 and 3 inches, and the rains are irregular, seldom beneficial and often detrimental to crops. Because of the extremely arid climatic conditions, no dryland farming is practicable in Imperial; but soils are exceptionally fertile and the topography of the below-sea-level area is well fitted to irrigation farming.

Plans to turn the desert into a winter farming area were conceived by pioneers as early as 1849, but it was not until the period of 1892–95 that developments were physically initiated to divert Colorado River water for use in Imperial Valley. This was done through a canal which ran a portion of its course through Mexico, which was completed in 1901. But there was no security to the farmers in their water supply until after the construction of Boulder Dam and the All-American Canal which were completed in 1940.

Before examining the most recent, reversing opinion of the U.S. Department of Interior as regards to conditions under which such waters would be delivered to Imperial Valley, it might be well to explore the history and the purpose of the land limitation laws that have, in a measure, governed the development of the far west where farming was dependent upon waters brought in by the Government.

Prior to 1902, there was no reclamation law in the United States. The Homestead Act of 1862 had, until then, been found adequate to encourage the settlement of lands that were supplied with water by nature. No great investment was required to bring such lands into production as was the case in the arid areas of the far west. Under the Homestead Act, citizens over 21 years of age, heading families, could enter upon 160-acre tracts, and, upon completing certain requirements of residence and cultivation, file for ownership in 5 years.

As lands became taken up, Congress attempted to encourage irrigation, and passed the Desert Land Act of 1877, by which one owner could obtain 640-acre homesteads on proof of reclamation and payment of a nominal price to the Government. Later this was reduced to 320 acres, which matched the combined holdings of husband and wife of 320 acres under the Reclamation Act of 1902, with its 160-acre limitation provision.

In 1894, Congress passed the Carey Act, which provided a grant of 1 million acres to each of the Western States, for development by irrigation, "provided that the States could not sell or dispose of more than 160 acres to any one person." The intent of the law was to provide homesites for the crowded populations of the East, in a size that could comfortably support a family without need for great numbers of supplemental laborers.

As public lands rapidly disappeared through homesteading, it became apparent to Congress that it must provide irrigation waters for the remaining arid lands that could be brought into cultivation if irrigated; and that it must immediately retain what remaining sites there were in the public domain suitable for damsites and reclamation projects. And so the Congress passed the Reclamation Act of 1902.

Main provisions of the Reclamation Act was that receipts from the sale of public lands in the Far West arid areas were to be used for the construction and maintenance of dams and irrigation works for the storage and distribution of water; and that those who benefited by the works were to pay the capital costs, and the operation and maintenance costs of such works as benefited them. And, to ward off the impending threat of having the reclaimed lands snatched by large land speculators, the Reclamation Act clearly embodied the 160-acre excess land provisions that no water should be delivered to any lands of one owner in excess of 160 acres, and that the Secretary of the Interior should arrange for the sale of such excess lands should a landowner accept water through a reclamation project for 160 acres.

By 1902, only a few hardy pioneers had braved the desert sands of Imperial Valley, and it had only been 1 year earlier that the first irrigation waters had been brought to valley farms by wavering canals hand dug by the use of mules and fresno scrapers, from the Colorado River some 60 miles across the desert.

But the Colorado was an uncontrolled and unruly waterway, with alternate floods and dry spells, which nearly inundated the entire valley in 1906–7, raising the nearly dry Salton Sea of this sub-sea-level valley to encompass 330,000 acres. The gigantic fight of the pioneers, backed by resources and equipment of the Southern Pacific Railroad, to return the river to its course is a chapter of the lusty history of the area.

A development company was superseded by the forming of Imperial Irrigation District, and by 1910 about 180,000 of the valley's 600,000 acres were under cultivation. As this growth of farms progressed, Congress became interested in studying the problems of Imperial Valley, as in respect to intermittent floods and droughts; and by 1928, after a 6-year battle led by Congressman Phil Swing and Senator Hiram Johnson, the Boulder Canyon Act was passed. It authorized the building of Boulder Dam (now known as Hoover Dam) on the Colorado River, for the purpose of storing up the waters of the melting mountain snows and releasing them slowly for irrigation of farms in the river basin States and the building of the All-American Canal to serve Imperial and Coachella Valleys.

If the Swing-Johnson bills which fathered the Boulder Canyon project had been simple, and were passed by Congress without argument, the intent of the Congress would not have become a matter of controversy for the ensuing 35 years. But this was not the case. There was much discussion in Congress, and substitutions of phrases, and finally an entire bill, so that it became confused as to whether the original meaning of the authors had been retained or not.

A study of the legislative history of the Swing-Johnson bills brings to light these points:

From 1922 to 1928 there were introduced into the House by Representative Swing, and into the Senate by Senator Johnson, a series

of bills all directed to the matter of constructing a storage dam on the Colorado River, and the All-American Canal to take water to Imperial and Coachella Valleys.

From 1922 until 1926, the House bills had no reference to excess land provisions, although there were specific references to the Reclamation Act. On February 5, 1926, during a hearing of the House Interior Committee, acreage limitations was discussed. Mr. Swing pointed out that many Imperial Valley farmers had 640-acre homesteads, and that there was nothing in the language of his bills to require the 160-acre limitation. However, the bill under discussion (H.R. 6251) did spell out that the project act was subject to the reclamation law unless otherwise specified.

On February 27, 1927, H.R. 9826, also a supplement to the Reclamation Act, was introduced by Congressman Swing, and hearings continued on both bills. A specific provision relative to the application of the excess land law was written into H.R. 9826, using, in section I, this language: "* * * provided that all contracts for the delivery of water for irrigation purposes * * * for irrigable lands held in private ownership by any one owner in excess of 160 acres shall be appraised in a manner to be prescribed by the Secretary of Interior, and the sale price thereof fixed * * * and that no such excess lands so held shall receive water from said canal if the owner thereof shall refuse to execute valid, recordable contracts for the sale of such lands under terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of Interior."

In the remaining House bills on the project, from then on, and in H.R. 5773, the fourth Swing-Johnson bill, the foregoing quoted language, specifying the excess land provisions, was including; also included were references as to the bill being supplemental to the Reclamation Act.

While it is plain that the Members of the House knowingly and purposefully, over the objections of Representative Swing, included the excess land provision, there was no such provision in the Senate versions of the law, although it contained the reference to the Reclamation Act. However, the subject had been thoroughly discussed by the Senate, and an amendment including the excess land limitation was drafted, and placed upon the table—but it was not included in the bill when it was passed.

On December 6, 1927, Senate bill 728 was introduced without acreage limit. The subject was again fully discussed, but the proposed amendment was not passed.

In May 1928, H.R. 5773 (including acreage limits) had passed the House and was presented to the Senate. Senator Johnson moved to strike all of its provisions except the enacting clause, and to substitute the language of S. 728, which did not include excess land provisions. This was done, and the bill was debated from all angles—but passed with the language of S. 728. The Senate version of the bill was accepted by the House, passed, and signed into law by President Calvin Coolidge to become the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

Because of the repeated discussions and debates on the acreage limitation clause, and then its noninclusion in the final form of the bill, many legal minds maintain that it was undisputedly the intent of the Congress to grant an exception to the Reclamation Act to Imperial Valley landowners.

Records of the 70th Congress of December 13, 1928, show that Senator William King, of Utah, raised the point that the All-American Canal project was not truly a reclamation project, because reclamation projects are built from reclamation funds, while the bill passed authorized the Treasurer of the United States to place the entire construction fund of $38,500,000 in a special fund, for repayment over 40 years without interest; and that in the case of reclamation projects, the funds are placed in the reclamation fund.

Terms of the Project Act specified that the Colorado River Compact (ratified by the United States and Colorado River States) were included as terms of the Project Act, and were the "law of the river." Nevertheless, the fact that Arizona had ratified the compact did not prevent that State from attempting to make the 160-acre limitation provision of the Reclamation Act basis for disqualifying Imperial Valley from having "prior vested rights" to Colorado waters recognized, by alleging that valley landowners did not comply with the excess land law.

Arizona argued before the special master of the Supreme Court in the *Arizona* v. *California* water suit in 1958: "If illegal, use cannot be beneficial * * * Such alleged illegal use of water, in time, terminates the appropriative right, and a new and consequently junior appropriation must be made."

While the special master ruled out the inclusion of the acreage limitation controversy as irrelevant in the water suit before the U.S. Supreme Court, the subject of "prior vested rights" had been the basis upon which Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of Interior, had handed down the opinion in 1933 that the land limitation did not apply in Imperial Valley. The Wilbur opinion preceded a case in Imperial County superior court, in which it was ruled that the Imperial Irrigation District must supply water to landowners of acreage in excess of 160 acres. (Malan Case, July 1933—*Hewes et al.* v. *All Persons*. It was argued on behalf of the defendant, owner of 210 acres, that limiting water to only 160 of his acres would amount to "taking his property without compensation." The Court reviewed the Boulder Canyon Act, and the All-American Canal contract, and held that the documents contained nothing to limit acreage.)

While the opinion of the California court is not binding upon the Federal Government, it is at least authority for the view that excess lands restrictions do not apply to the All-American Canal project; and the fact that the Government, after the ruling, went ahead with construction, indicates acquiescence.

The fact of continued administrative interpretations were also stressed by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *Gerlach* when it opined: "Repeated appropriations of the proceeds of the fees not only confirms departmental construction of the statute, but constitutes a ratification of the Secretary (of Interior) as the agent of Congress in the administration of the act."

Thus it is seen that administrative interpretation and practice, since as early as 1911, has recognized existing or "vested" rights its removing the excess land laws from application to holders of such rights. Because the Boulder Canyon Act specifically recognized "prior vested rights," some Congressmen expressed the opinion that Congress could not legally enforce acreage limitation in such cases, because they had been preempted by State law, because of prior rights.

California law has required validation of contracts by court proceedings since 1897; and it was submitted that neither Arizona nor the United States could challenge local use after ratification of the Colorado compact.

Running through the legal maze, there is an ethical background reflecting upon whether or not the opinion of the Department of Interior should be reversed after 31 years, during which time farmers of Imperial Valley added to their acreage, secure in their protection by administrative ruling. Counsel for IID, arguing before the Supreme Court special master, put it in these words:

"Usually we find that any law has its basis in reason, as well as the reasonableness of the application thereof * * *. The continued recognition of an existing situation upon which people act and rely over long periods of time usually render it morally wrong to repudiate the established conditions * * *. Time and repeated recognition of the validity of particular acts often have lead to recognition of a legality or right that may be questioned. A long history of public recognition, including recognition by various departments of the United States * * * without any question heretofore having been raised as to the acreage limitations as to private lands in Imperial Valley is significant."

Farmers of Imperial Valley, many now farming thousands of acres, term any attempt to cut their holdings into 160-acre plots an attempt to return to horse and buggy days in the jet-space age. Many, of course, now farm lease lands, and would not be affected. Others hold large acreages in joint ventures with relatives that constitute a "family farm" with accumulative rights. But the dream of some nonfarm leaders that, by cutting up the land into small plots poor people would soon dot it with homes, and so stores and businesses would prosper, is, in this day and age, a fallacy. The high cost of farm implements would preclude most "poor people" from being able to farm, even if the land was given to them. And "rich farmers" would know that it would not be economically feasible to spend tens of thousands of dollars for needed equipment to farm 160 acres.

Perhaps, eventually, Congress will pass a law that spells out exemption from excess land laws for Imperial Valley; or it may be that Congress will specifically include Imperial Valley, and adjustments will have to be made in present big farming operations. But this will take time, perhaps decades. No doubt, when this day comes, if ever, the independent, industrious, and ingenious farmers of this area will go on growing and harvesting crops meeting and overcoming all challenges, including labor shortages and land limits.

The legislators of the 1920's who did not believe it important to be specific in their bills authorizing the fulfillment of the great dreams that made the desert "bloom as a rose," can be forgiven for today's controversies as we consider their great imaginative foresight. As the late Congressman Swing once stated, as he excitedly watched the delivery of water through the All-American Canal: "Crops will grow where they never grew before, as water will flow where it never flowed before * * *."

While the present Congress has the power to rewrite or sustain the original Boulder Canyon Project Act and All-American Canal contract by enacting a new law with terms clearly spelled out, it may be well to examine both the intent of the farmers of the original act, and the probable intent of the reversal of its interpretation, in regard to the application of excess land laws; and also the intention of the recently issued opinion of the Department of Interior.

During the 88th Congress, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. Senate made a thorough investigation into the acreage limitation policy which has been administered in various projects through the Bureau of Reclamation. Their findings were released in a 104-page report issued by the Department of Interior in 1964, and included the fact that, because of circumstances peculiar to the areas involved the excess land limitations of the Reclamation Act of 1902 had been waived in a number of projects; while in other projects, the land limit had been reduced to 80, 60, or even 40 acres. The factor upon which such exemptions were based was the productiveness of the land, and the ease in which farm families could support themselves at acceptable living standards on a smaller or larger tract, as explained by this quotation:

"* * * While an individual ownership of 160 irrigable acres, or a 320-acre ownership of husband and wife, if composed of the better class land under optimum conditions, may be considered to be adequate for the support of an individual or family * * * experience has shown that this same premise is not necessarily applicable with equal validity as

the productive potential of the lands decreases * * *."

Clearly it was the intent of the Reclamation Act primarily to provide small homesteads upon which, at the turn of the century, a family could support itself raising most of its own food needs. In addition, because any irrigation project must have advance assurance that there will be landowners to order water, and to whom the cost of the project could be charged, considering that no landowner could be forced to order water, it was necessary to break up large land holdings into small ownerships requiring water rights, so that communities could be developed.

It is evident, by the abrupt reversal of the previous policy and interpretation of the Boulder Canyon Project Act as affecting Imperial Valley by the present administration, that the Government is still concerned about promoting small family farms. No consideration seems to be given to the fact that the type of agriculture conducted in Imperial Valley is on a large scale, and the trend has been toward consolidating of farms for efficiency. This has resulted in less individual ownership; and the fact that many small farmers, unable to compete without heavy farming equipment that small acreages cannot justify, moved to the cities to take industrial jobs, as have their sons and daughters. The problem faced is one that troubled the Government after World War I, when food was at a premium: "How are you going to keep them down on the farm after they've seen Paree?"—Or after they have earned high wages in city industry.

In Imperial Valley, there were 2,932 individual farms in 1944, ranging in size from 10 to over 1,000 acres. Of these, 2,748 were under 500 acres. By 1960, ownerships were reduced to 1,391 in number, including 1,029 farms under 500 acres, and 24 ownerships of from 1,000 to 9,000 acres.

Some of the so-called "big farmers" of Imperial Valley are men who started with small acreages many years ago, working hard and bearing many hardships in the early years as they struggled to tame the desert without the benefit of air conditioning and modern equipment. By sheer determination and persistence they succedeed, and grandually increased their acreages. These "big farmers" are an integral part of the community, working for its success, serving on governmental bodies and committees, supporting local institutions, paying local taxes and buying locally. They are an asset to the community, and no one begrudges them a cottonpicking acre of land that they paid for and pay taxes on.

But there are big farming interests from other areas who purchased large blocks of Imperial lands after being squeezed out of other operations by the sprawling growth of metropolitan areas. They have no interests in Imperial Valley; pay as little taxes as possible; do their buying elsewhere and return few profits to the land that supports them. Complaints of local residents over these huge operations that are as parasites on the edges of the community are what led to the congressional reexamination of the application of excess land laws to Imperial Valley.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1964, I delivered a major speech on the Vietnam situation in which I urged that the United States seek a negotiated settlement in that wartorn area of the world. The situation has now reached crisis proportions. In today's New York Times there is an editorial and an article by the distinguished columnist, James Reston, which I urge my colleagues to read.

As the editorial says, there are crucial questions which remain unanswered, and the American people are entitled to a straightforward explanation of our policy.

As James Reston says, "the first step in this is clearly a self-imposed cease-fire on both side of the line."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1965]

WHAT PRICE VIETNAM?

There is no cause to quarrel with the sentiments of President Johnson in commenting to his Boy Scout visitors on the American reprisals against North Vietnam:

"We love peace," he said, "* * * but we love liberty the more and we shall take up any threat, we shall pay any price to make certain that freedom shall not perish from this earth."

The people of the United States do love peace; they love freedom; they will fight for it. Mr. Johnson was on completely safe ground, even to a little forgivable plagiarism from Abraham Lincoln.

But the American public is not asking for truisms about Vietnam. It must surely want sound, solid, persuasive arguments to justify the cost in lives and materiel, and the risks being run in this dangerous southeast corner of the continent of Asia.

The true reasons tend to be blurred by rhetoric. The United States is not in Vietnam, as is so often implied by the White House and State Department, in order to bring democracy, Western style, to Vietnam. It would indeed be helpful if Saigon did have a popular, stable, democratic government; but the historic, political, social, religious and tribal factors militate against such a development, without counting the personal rivalries of generals and politicians. Those who profit by the American presence want the United States to stay. Those who feel frustrated by American power—nationalists, Communists, Buddhists and probably the majority of the peasantry, who simply ask to be left alone—want the Americans to go.

The plain fact, which such fine language as President Johnson's tends to confuse, is that the United States is in Vietnam because it believes that its own security is involved. Vietnam is a battle in the cold war, which is sometimes hot. The Americans went into Vietnam in 1954 to fill the vacuum left by the French and to contain the advance of communism in that part of southeast Asia.

The motives are exemplary and every American can be proud of them, but the crucial questions are: Can it be done? Is the price too high? Was the military decision in the Kennedy administration to increase American forces in Vietnam mistaken? Are the dangers of escalation too great? Is this a good battleground of the cold war on which to fight? Is the United States losing more than it is gaining? All leads up to the basic question that some Senators are asking: Is this war necessary?

These questions cannot be answered by saying that "freedom shall not perish from this earth." The questions reflect genuine doubts and anxieties. They require precise answers. The American people should not be asked to take the sacrifices of Vietnam for granted. There has been a confusion in the public mind which Washington has thus far failed to dispel.

A straightforward explanation on a high intellectual level of practical politics and strategy is in order. Americans would then, at least, be in a position to resolve their own doubts one way or another.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1965]

WASHINGTON: A TIME FOR REFLECTION ON VIETNAM

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—This may not be a bad time to take a hard look at the nature and mathematics of the war in Vietnam.

According to the official intelligence estimates, the Communists are now sending between 500 and 1,000 new trained revolutionaries a month into South Vietnam.

These are both the brains and the bone structure of the Communist apparatus now operating below the 17th parallel. They number, to the best of our knowledge, between 28,000 and 34,000, and lead between 60,000 and 80,000 night raiders who operate in small units all over the country.

Behind these guerrillas in North Vietnam is an uncommitted army estimated here at 225,000 men. This is the successor to the force that defeated a French Army of over 380,000, ending 70 years of French control over Indochina, and cost the French 172,000 casualties.

THE DECEPTIVE FIGURES

The force levels on our side are impressive but misleading. The South Vietnamese have 240,000 men in their army, navy, air force, and marines; and another 290,000 in the national guard, military police, special forces, coast guard, and national police.

These are backed, trained, and often transported by U.S. forces, now numbering 23,000, who have overwhelming superiority in fire power, air power, and naval power.

The mathematics of guerrilla warfare, however, is nothing like the mathematics of normal warfare. The Algerian rebels prevailed over the best of the French Army, though they were outnumbered by more than 20 to 1.

The problem is quite different from what it was when the Communist PT boats attacked our destroyers in international waters in the Gulf of Tonkin. Then it was possible to attack and knock out the PT bases. The target was clear and the counterattack effective.

Stopping the flow of Communist infiltrators into South Vietnam, however, is a quite different thing. They leave from many different parts of Communist territory in very small numbers and reach the south by many different trails, most of them hidden in the jungle.

Trying to spot-bomb this steady trickle of revolutionaries is like trying to bomb a stream of water. We can make a big splash in the headlines, but the stream will go on.

THE INFILTRATION PROBLEM

President Johnson, therefore, still faces his most difficult problem. As long as he was faced merely with punishing an isolated Communist attack, he could strike and fall back. But stopping the infiltration, which as he says is the main problem, will probably require much greater risks than he has ventured to assume so far.

"We seek no wider war," he said in a White House statement. "Whether or not this course can be maintained lies with the North Vietnamese aggressors. The key to the situation remains the cessation of infiltration from North Vietnam and the clear indication by the Hanoi regime that it is prepared to cease aggression against its neighbors."

Nobody should underestimate the seriousness of this remark. It is a clear threat that the war will be extended unless Hanoi withdraws, and there is absolutely no indication by Hanoi or its Communist backers that withdrawal is intended.

The President does not want to go north or retreat south. But he is now in a position that satisfies very few people. He has com-

promised between those here who want him to go on about as before and those who want him to use his airpower on the Communist industry in the north. He has issued a challenge and given the Communists the initiative in deciding what to do about it.

A KOREAN SOLUTION?

This is an odd thing to do at a time when officials here are telling us that the war is really going well—despite the political troubles in Saigon—but anyway it has been done and an elaborate test of will and pride is now ahead.

In this situation, the main hope is that both sides will stop where they are for a while and think. The United States cannot win the battle on the ground without a major effort against the uncommitted North Vietnamese Army of a quarter of a million men, and the North Vietnamese cannot win against the air and naval power of the United States.

The Korean solution of a cease-fire and withdrawal on either side of the 17th parallel is probably the best anybody can get out of it, and the first step in this is clearly a self-imposed ceasefire on both sides of the line.

The National Medal of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, along with several of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I had the honor of being at the White House on February 8, 1965, for the presentation of the National Medal of Science to distinguished recipients of this honor for the year 1964.

The National Medal of Science was established by the 86th Congress to be awarded by the President to individuals "who in his judgment are deserving of special recognition by reason of their outstanding contributions to knowledge in the physical, biological, mathematical, or engineering sciences." The awards are made on the basis of recommendations received from the President's Committee on the National Medal of Science. The members of the President's Committee are: Dr. Frank Brink, Jr., chairman of the Rockefeller Institute; Prof. Hans A. Bethe of Cornell University; Dean Gordon S. Brown, School of Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Prof. Herbert E. Carter of the University of Illinois; Dean Kenneth E. Clark, College of Arts and Science, University of Rochester; Dr. Sterling B. Hendricks of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; Dr. J. Herbert Hollomon, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and and Technology; Dean Frederick C. Lindvall, division of engineering, California Institute of Technology; Dr. Walsh McDermott of the Cornell Medical Center; Prof. Roger Revelle of the Harvard School of Public Health; Prof. Frederick Seitz, president of the National Academy of Sciences; and Prof. Albert W. Tucker of Princeton University.

In 1962 Theodore von Karman was the first recipient of the medal and in 1963 President Johnson awarded the National Medal of Science to Luis W. Alvarez, Vannevar Bush, John R. Pierce, Cornelis B. van Niel, and Norbert Wiener.

The 1964 honorees are Roger Adams, Othmar H. Ammann, Theodosius Dobzhansky, Charles S. Draper, Solomon Lefschetz, Neal E. Miller, Martson Morse, Marshall W. Nirenberg, Julian Schwinger, Harold C. Urey, and Robert B. Woodward. Their biographical sketches follow:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF 1964 HONOREES

Dr. Roger Adams was born in Boston, Mass., in 1889 and studied at Harvard University, receiving his A.B. in 1910, and his Ph. D in 1912 from that institution. Since 1916 he has been associated with the University of Illinois where he is presently a professor of chemistry, emeritus. Dr. Adams has received innumerable honors including the American Chemical Society's Willard Gibbs Medal in 1936 and its Priestly Medal in 1946. Since the period of the First World War he has been a leading figure in organic chemistry and during most of that period he was the one recognized leader in the field. He earned this place of honor not only because of his numerous and distinguished contributions to organic chemistry but also fo rhis devotion to science and scientists active in the field. Dr. Adams' citation reads: "For superb contributions as a scientist, teacher, and imaginative leader in furthering the constructive interaction of academic and industrial scientists."

Dr. Othmar Herman Ammann was born in Schaffhausen, Switzerland, in 1879 and received his formal education at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology. He is presently a consulting engineer and partner in the firm Ammann & Whitney in New York City. Dr. Ammann's professional career spans nearly 60 years and is permanently recorded in the great bridges whose beauty and utility are the product of his bold and imaginative design. Such bridges include the Queensboro Bridge, Goethals Bridge, and George Washington Bridge. His latest and greatest achievement is the Verrazano Bridge in New York which had opened late in November. In all of his work Dr. Ammann has been responsive to the needs of the community and sensitive to aesthetic value as wel las function. Dr. Ammann's citation reads: "For a half century of distinguished leadership in the design of great bridges which combine beauty and utility with bold engineering concept and method."

Dr. Theodosius Dobzhansky was born in Nemirov, Russia, in 1900. He received his diplomate degree from the University of Kiev in 1921, following which he was associated with the University of Kiev and the University of Leningrad. In 1927 he came to the United States, becoming a naturalized citizen in 1937. Since 1927 he has been a member of the faculty at the California Institute of Technology, Columbia University, and is now a professor and member of the Rockefeller Institute in New York City. For a period of nearly 50 years Dr. Dobzhansky has been probably the world leader in experimental population genetics and its application to the problem of evolution. Dr. Dobzhansky's citation reads: "For fundamental studies of the genetic determinants of organ evolution and for penetrating analysis of the genetic and cultural evolution of man."

Dr. Charles Stark Draper was born in Windsor, Mo., in 1901 and received his B.A. degree in psychology from Stanford University in 1919. Since 1922 he has been associated with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and has three degrees from MIT—a B.S. in 1926, an M.A. in 1928, and an Sc. D. in physics in 1938. He is currently head of the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics and has been the director since 1939 of the MIT Instrumentation Laboratory, a laboratory which has been devoted to devising guidance, navigation, and control systems for airplanes, missiles, ships, satellites, and spacecraft. At the present time, developments made under Dr. Draper's supervision are in wide use by both the Air Force and Navy. Dr. Draper is also responsible for an extended curriculum of courses in the fields of instrument engineering and fire control. Dr. Draper's citation reads: "For innumerable imaginative engineering achievements which met urgent national needs of instrumentation, control, and guidance in aeronautics and astronautics."

Dr. Solomon Lefschetz was born in Moscow, Russia, in 1884 and received his early training in engineering in Paris. Coming to this country shortly after the turn of the century, Dr. Lefschetz was awarded his Ph. D. degree from Clark University in 1911 and was subsequently a member of the faculty at the University of Nebraska and the University of Kansas. In 1924 he joined the faculty at Princeton University where he is professor emeritus of mathematics. He has also directed research in mathematics at the Research Institute for Advanced Studies and now heads a research group at Brown University. Dr. Lefschetz opened up the field of algebraic topology which he and his students have pushed to the forefront of current spectacular progress in pure mathematics He has done outstanding work in algebraic geometry and in more recent years has directed research in the applied area of nonlinear differential equations. Dr. Lefschetz's citation reads: "For indomitable leadership in developing mathematics and training mathematicians, for fundamental publications in algebraic geometry and topology, and for stimulating needed research in nonlinear control processes."

Dr. Neal Elgar Miller was born in Milwaukee, Wis., in 1909 and received his B.S. degree from the University of Washington, his M.A. degree from Stanford University and his Ph. D. degree from Yale in 1935. He is presently Angell professor of psychology at Yale. Dr. Miller is primarily known for his work which has resulted in a greatly improved understanding of motivational factors as they influence learning and behavior. His early contributions to the understanding of frustration and aggression, and motivation and learning are classics. In more recent years Dr. Miller has been interested in the field of motivation from the physiological standpoint and has developed new techniques of intracranial stimulation and chemical injection to study the role which certain centers of the brain play in affecting responses to different reinforcements. Dr. Miller's citation reads: "For sustained and imaginative research on principles of learning and motivation and illuminating behavioral analysis of the effects of direct electrical stimulation of the brain."

Dr. Marston Morse was born in Waterville, Maine, in 1892 and received his early education at Colby College. In 1915 he was awarded an M.A. degree from Harvard and in 1917 his Ph. D. from that same institution. Dr. Morse subsequently served on the staffs of Cornell University and Brown University before returning to Harvard in 1926. In 1935 he accepted a professorship at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, N.J., where he has remained until the present time. Dr. Morse is well known for his work in topology and today some of the world's ablest young mathematicians are refining and extending theories developed by him, as a basic part of the new field of differential topology. Dr. Morse's citation reads: "For extraordinary achievement in creating analytic theories in the large, for statesmanship in the world of mathematics, and for distinguished service to his country in war and peace."

Dr. Marshall Warren Nirenberg was born in New York City in 1927 and received his

undergraduate and early graduate training at the University of Florida. In 1957 he received his Ph. D. from the University of Michigan and since that time has been associated with the National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md. Presently he is research chemist and head, Section of Biochemical Genetics in the Laboratory of Clinical Biochemistry at the National Heart Institute. Dr. Nirenberg's work has made possible direct experimental evaluation of the chemical processes of the genetic code. This work has illuminated the way in which genetic information is coded into the nucleic acids and used to direct the incorporation of specific amino acids into proteins. Dr. Nirenberg's citation reads: "For studies of the genetic control of protein synthesis and, in particular, for deciphering the chemical code relating nucleic acid structures to protein structures."

Dr. Julian Schwinger was born in New York City in 1918 and received his B.A. degree in 1936 and Ph. D. in 1939 from Columbia University. He has been associated with the University of California, Purdue University, and during the World War II was a member of the staff of the radiation laboratory at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Since 1945 he has been at Harvard becoming a professor of physics there in 1947. Dr. Schwinger's main work has been involved in fundamental problems of field theory and particle physics. He has given the most thorough foundation to modern field theory and is now active in finding new principles for bringing order into the multitude of fundamental particles. Dr. Schwinger has also contributed to other fields of physics including scattering theory and electrodynamics. Dr. Schwinger's citation reads: "For profound work on the fundamental problems of quantum field theory, and for many brilliant contributions to and lucid expositions of nuclear physics and electrodynamics."

Dr. Harold Clayton Urey was born in Walkerton, Ind., in 1893 and received his B.S. degree from the University of Montana in 1917, and his Ph. D. in chemistry from the University of California in 1923. In 1929 Dr. Urey became associated with Columbia University and it was while there that he developed techniques which led him to the discovery of the heavy isotope of hydrogen, called deuterium. For this discovery Dr. Urey received the Nobel Prize in 1934. After World War II he became interested in the study of the earth and solar system and has contributed greatly to the science of planetary and meteoritic chemistry. In 1945 he joined the chemistry department at the University of Chicago, and since 1958 has been professor at large, University of California (San Diego). By measuring the ratio of oxygen isotopes in fossil shells, Dr. Urey has been able to determine the temperatures of ancient seas. He has applied his knowledge of physical chemistry and chemical thermodynamics to elucidate the birth and early history of the earth, moon, planets, and meteorites of our solar system and to determine the conditions under which life could have originated on earth. Dr. Urey's citation reads: "For outstanding contributions to our understanding of the origin and evolution of the solar system and the origin of life on earth and for pioneering work in the application of isotopes to the determination of the temperatures of ancient oceans."

Dr. Robert Burns Woodward was born in 1917 in Boston, Mass., and received his B.S. degree from Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1936 and his Ph. D. from that same institution in 1937. Since that time he has been associated with Harvard University where he is presently Donner professor of science. Dr. Woodward's research has resulted in the introduction of a new approach to the synthesis of important natural substances such as cholesterol, cortisone, and most recently, chlorophyll. He has combined theory with a vast practical knowledge of organic reactions and structures to form a basis for rational synthetic planning and his work has brought him innumerable awards and honors. Dr. Woodward's citation reads: "For an imaginative new approach to the synthesis of complex organic molecules and, especially, for brilliant syntheses of strychnine, reserpine, lysergic acid, and chlorophyll."

At the ceremony in the East Room of the White House, President Lyndon B. Johnson was introduced by Dr. Frederick Seitz, President of the National Academy of Sciences. Dr. Seitz' introductory remarks and those of our President follow:

Dr. SEITZ. Thank you, Dr. Hornig. In 1959, the Congress of the United States established the National Medal of Science for creative achievement and leadership in science.

They indicated that the awards were to be given in four specific areas: mathematical, biological, physical, and engineering sciences. They also specified that the Awards Committee was to be created by the President of the United States, as composed in his judgment.

The Awards Committee is now in its fourth year. In these 4 years it has given the awards on two previous occasions. In the first year, 1 award was given; in the second, 7; and on this occasion it is the honor of the Committee to give 11 awards. I should state that the maximum number permitted in the original law is 20.

I had the honor to be chairman of the first Awards Committee, and Dr. Frank Brink should have been with you today. But as Dr. Hornig stated, factors beyond his control kept him from occupying this position at this time.

The Committee looks into many sources in selecting the award. It examines professional recommendations, recommendations of the great societies and academies of our country and, of course, seeks the opinions of outstanding individuals.

We shall now have the honor of hearing from the President of the United States. Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT. Thank you, Doctor. This house is greatly honored today by the presence of this brilliant company.

All the Nation is honored by these distinguished men on whom we come to confer our highest award for their work—the National Medal of Science.

As explorers, discoverers and teachers, these 11 Americans have enlarged the horizons of our times and we are very proud to recognize the contributions they have made with their useful lives.

In a broader sense, our recognition of them is acknowledgment of our pride in and our respect for the role and works of all our community of science in America.

Within the lifetime of us all, it has been widely held that America could apply the knowledge and concepts of science in other lands—but that we could not replenish the knowledge or enlarge the understanding of ourselves.

Today, I think that view has changed somewhat.

We have attained positions of world leadership in most branches of science. Our science is marked by quality as well as quantity. Over the past 10 years, one-half of the Nobel Prizes in chemistry, physics, and medicine have been awarded to Americans. The work of those receiving the Medals of Science speaks further of the quality of our science.

So today, we are challenged in science—as in all aspects of our society—to preserve these standards of high quality and pursue excellence as our goals.

Toward that end, we are striving to strengthen our foundations in physical science, in biological science, and in medical science. It is our hope—and our purpose—to create more and better scientific centers of excellence in the universities of our Nation. We are determined to make certain, also, that talented students in all parts of the country have opportunities to develop and utilize their talents more fully.

This is real seed time for our society—a time when we must go into new fields and go into old ones, to sow the seed for the harvest of a finer life by generations who come after us.

The effort we make to support and to sustain and to advance our science is vital to the success of this Nation's purposes. The challenge is great—but we accept it and we shall meet it, to the fullest degree.

Our objects today remain the same as when an early resident of this House said that "the main objects of all science are the freedom and happiness of man."

Science in America has done much to provide us with the health and the happiness and the hopefulness we enjoy. But we are proud and grateful that the benefits of our science serve not our ends alone. Whether in the keeping of peace or the exploration of space, whether to study the seas or combating of disease and poverty and ignorance, the cause of our science is the cause of all mankind.

As Thomas Jefferson once wrote to a friend in another land, "The field of knowledge is the common property of mankind, and any discoveries we can make in it will be for the benefit of yours and every other nation, as well as our own."

So this morning as we honor our outstanding men of science, let all the world understand that science in America is—and shall remain—dedicated to mankind's freedom, and mankind's justice and peace and not to mankind's oppression or enslavement or destruction.

Now let the citations be read for the 1964 awards of the National Medal of Science.

Thank you all for coming here and letting me enjoy seeing you.

H.R. 3784

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, in late 1964, after the adjournment of the 88th Congress, three witnesses were summoned before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in secret session. They were called because of their efforts in 1963 to persuade the State Department and the Attorney General to grant an entry permit to Professor Yasui, a Japanese law professor, who had applied for—and subsequently received—permission to come to the United States on a speaking tour. The alleged purpose of the subcommittee was the investigation of the enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, particularly the provision (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(3)) which empowers the Secretary of State and the Attorney General in their discretion to authorize the admission of aliens who might otherwise be inadmissible. These

three witnesses were two women, Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen, leaders, respectively, of the Women Strike for Peace and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and Russell Nixon, general manager of the National Guardian, a weekly newspaper which was the chief sponsor of Professor Yasui's speaking tour.

The role these witnesses played in connection with the admission of Professor Yasui amounted to nothing more than the exercise of their constitutional rights as American citizens to appear before an authorized representative of the State Department to express their views on a matter pending before the State Department. It is clear that there was nothing that these witnesses could tell the subcommittee that was of legitimate concern either to the committee or to Congress.

The jurisdiction of the House Un-American Activities Committee covers only subversive and un-American propaganda activities and the past operations of the committee have given rise to the widespread impression that witnesses summoned before the committee have necessarily engaged in some subversive or un-American activities. The witnesses, accordingly, were concerned that their appearance before the committee in secret session would reflect upon them and give rise to unwarranted inferences that they had been engaged in some nefarious practice. They were concerned also that inaccurate and damaging versions of what occurred in secret session could be reported and that the witnesses would not have an opportunity to spread upon the public record what actually occurred and what they actually said. For these reasons the witnesses requested that they be heard in open session.

Their position was based on the language of rule XI, paragraph 26(g) of the House of Representatives Rules which provide that public hearings shall be the normal rule for hearings conducted by standing committees as supplemented by subsection (m) of this paragraph and by rule IV of the rules of procedures of the Committee on Un-American Activities. These latter provisions set out the conditions for holding executive sessions; namely, where the evidence at a public hearing would either endanger national security—rule IV of the Committee on Un-American Activities—or where it would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate anyone—subparagraph (m) of rule XI, paragraph 26 of the House rules. It was plain that the testimony of these witnesses would neither endanger the national security nor defame, degrade, or incriminate anyone. On the contrary, the witnesses properly took the position that their appearance in secret session would impair their reputations and only a public hearing could effectively protect them. Nevertheless, the subcommittee, two of whose members were lameduck Congressmen, rejected the witnesses' request that their testimony be taken in public session and instead recommended that the witnesses be cited for contempt. Thereafter, the full committee, which included three lameduck members, voted to approve this recommendation and forwarded it to the Speaker, asking him to certify the case to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia in accordance with the provisions of title 2, United States Code, section 194. The Speaker, on the basis of a ruling by the Parliamentarian, held that he had no discretion or judgment in the matter and was required under the statute to certify the recommendation without regard to his own private or official view on the matter. The Department of Justice has since had an indictment returned against these witnesses charging them with contempt of Congress.

The train of events described above raises the following questions which require the attention of the full House:

First. The crime of contempt of Congress is in essence a crime of a political nature. When the statute upon which the prosecution rests was first enacted back in 1857 many of the Members of both in the Senate and the House voiced considerable misgivings about granting this power because of the possibilities of its abuse and the fact that it could be used by politically minded Congressmen to persecute witnesses for other than legitimate purposes. One of the safeguards provided was that a committee could not itself cite for contempt but its actions would have to be reviewed by the full House. Thus the rights of witnesses could be protected by the full House which has supervisory authority over any particular committee and can check any possible abuse of the contempt power of any committee.

As stated by Dean Griswold of Harvard Law School:

> The power of investigation is a power which is solely attributable to the collective body, the House of Representatives or the Senate.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Since the power exercised by a committee or a subcommittee, or a subcommittee of one, is the power of the House or Senate itself, responsibility for that power and its exercise rests not on the committee or the subcommittee of one or more, but upon the House or Senate, itself, acting, of course, by a majority vote of its Members. Griswold Per Legem Terrae, 14 Federal Bar Journal (1954) 21, 27–28.

The crime punished by title 2, United States Code, section 192, is the crime of contempt of Congress and there is no crime of contempt of a committee of Congress. Thus the House as a whole bears the responsibility for any prosecution under the statute and by the same token must take the blame and the onus for any action taken in its name. If there is protest or criticism of the action taken by the subcommittee, the criticism falls upon the whole House in whose name the prosecution is initiated.

Third. The refusal to answer questions of a congressional committee can be constitutionally punished only when the refusal "obstruct(s) the performance of the duties of the legislature," *Jurney* v. *McCracken*, 294 U.S. 125, 148. There are several reasons why the conduct of these witnesses cannot be found to have frustrated the duties of the House.

(A) Witnesses are required to appear before and answer questions of a legislative committee only when their testimony is necessary in aid of a legitimate legislative purpose. *Sinclair* v. *United States*, 279 U.S. 263; *Watkins* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 178. What important matter was pending before the House in December of last year that made the testimony of these witnesses so imperative as to justify their being cited for contempt? And why the haste? Why could not the matter have been put off until the convening of the new Congress, and with it the reorganization of the committee with new members to replace those not elected at the polls?

(B) If the testimony of these witnesses was so important as to justify their prosecution for contempt, why would not the subcommittee hear the testimony in public? The rules provide that committees should hold hearings in public except under circumstances which were not present here. In the light of the past history of the committee, the witnesses had adequate justification for their objections to testifying in secret. The committee has provided no factual basis for its insistence that the witnesses testify in secret.

(C) The stated subject matter under investigation was not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-American Activities. All matters relating to immigration are vested in the jurisdiction of the House Judiciary Committee, and specifically its Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization; rule II, paragraph 12(b) of the House rules. And under the terms of section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, 2 U.S.C. 190d, the House Judiciary Committee is charged with the responsibility of watching over the execution of the Immigration and Nationality Act by the executive branch. Accordingly, questions arising from the administration of that act, and its proposed revision or amendment, did not fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Indeed, under the provisions of 8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(6), the Attorney General submitted to Congress a detailed report of his action in admitting Professor Yasui. And, as provided by the Legislative Reorganization Act, this report was sent for study to the House Judiciary Committee, not the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Fourth. The subcommittee hearing, the citation for contempt by the full committee, and the certification by the Speaker all took place in the last three weeks in December while Congress was not in session. Congress, accordingly, was not afforded the opportunity to review as a body the actions of the committee, to judge whether the matter properly belonged within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-American Activities and to determine whether in any event these three witnesses should be punished because of their objection to testifying before the committee in a star chamber proceeding. The Speaker's certification added nothing to the committee's report, for the Speaker was advised by the Parliamentarian that he had no discretion in the matter and was required to send the matter to the U.S. attorney for prosecution, regardless of his own private or official judgment on the question.

In view of the circumstances underlying the citation, it is entirely appropriate and indeed imperative that the House review the matter now. The purpose of a contempt prosecution is to vindicate the authority of a House of Congress and not of a particular committee. It is only reasonable to insist that no one be prosecuted unless Congress as a body has determined that the prosecution is essential to vindicate its authority and that the conduct of the witnesses has frustrated its legislative process. As stated in a recent editorial in the Washington Post—December 28, page A10:

> Ordinarily, if the House of Representatives were in session, it would have a chance to protect itself against this sort of abuse of power wielded in its name.

However, the fact that the committee took advantage of the recess should not prevent the Congress from acting now. Since the onus of the committee's action falls upon the House as a whole, the House is entitled to an opportunity to deliberate upon and judge the matter.

Fifth. The case calls for review by the House for other reasons as well. Probably no other committee of Congress would have acted as did the Committee on Un-American Activities here by rushing through a citation for contempt in the closing days of the life of the 88th Congress. It is a fair inference from the manner in which the committee conducted itself that the action was taken not to vindicate a congressional need to secure information for a legitimate legislative purpose but rather because the committee disapproved of the action of these witnesses in exercising their constitutional rights in petitioning the Government to permit Professor Yasui to enter the country. The committee apparently believes that it was wrong to permit Professor Yasui to come into and address audiences in this country. It may have been annoyed by the fact that the State Department and the Attorney General agreed with these private citizens and not with the committee—we presume that the State Department and the Attorney General were not endorsing the views of Professor Yasui but were instead endorsing the traditional American view that American citizens have the right to hear and discuss any lawful ideas.

The fact is that the Immigration and Nationality Act was properly administered by these agencies, and that the appropriate congressional committee had no objection to the manner in which the act was applied. Obviously the admission of Professor Yasui called for no corrective legislation or action by Congress.

Disapproval, disagreement, and/or annoyance with the actions of these three witnesses and the Departments of Justice and State in connection with the Yasui visit to our country certainly do not provide any proper basis for Un-American Activities Committee's action in this case. And it appears to me that nothing more or less than this is involved in this contempt citation.

There is no reason for Congress as a whole to condone this conduct or even worse to permit its authority and its power to be employed in this unwarranted fashion.

For these reasons, I have introduced H.R. 3784 which has been referred to the House Judiciary Committee. The bill has two purposes: First, it provides that in the future no prosecution for contempt will be authorized unless the whole House approves of the action, thus preventing abuse of the congressional contempt power by any committee of the House, and, second, to vacate the injustice arising from the action taken in the closing days of the 88th Congress against these three witnesses. Certainly if witnesses are to be prosecuted for contempt, it should only be as the result of a vote of the whole House, not just nine Members, three of whom did not even return to Congress. I ask all of my colleagues to study this matter and to support H.R. 3784.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses received President's message on balance of payments and cleared supplemental agricultural funds for President's signature after deferring closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals until May 1.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 2473–2492

Bills Introduced: 34 bills and 4 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1081–1114; S.J. Res. 46–48; and S. Con. Res. 18. **Pages 2474–2475**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 3818, to eliminate the requirement of Federal Reserve banks to maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities, with supplemental and other views (S. Rept. 65); and

S.J. Res. 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, and to cases of Presidential inability, with amendments, and with individual views (S. Rept. 66). **Page 2474**

President's Message—Balance of Payments: Message was received from President transmitting his legislative recommendations to meet current problems respecting international balance of payments and outflow of gold—referred to Committee on Finance. **Pages 2500–2503**

Sundry Bills Passed: Senate passed five sundry bills as follows:

Without amendment and cleared for House:

Goddard Day: S. 301, to designate March 16 of each year as a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics; and

Chief Joseph Dam: S. 490, authorizing construction of the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington.

With amendment and cleared for House:

Yakima project: S. 794, authorizing construction of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington;

Nez Perce Historical Park: S. 60, authorizing the designation of Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho; and

Bighorn Canyon Recreation Area: S. 491, to establish Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Mont. **Pages 2492–2498**

Supplemental Agriculture Appropriations: Senate adopted conference report on H.J. Res. 234, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965 for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture. This action cleared bill for President. In connection therewith Senate, by division vote, agreed to House amendment to Senate amendment No. 1 (respecting elimination of agriculture research stations); and, by 62 yeas to 9 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), agreed to House amendment to Senate amendment No. 4 (to defer closing of veterans' hospitals or facilities). **Pages 2530–2539**

Gold: Senate made its unfinished business H.R. 3818, to eliminate the requirement of Federal Reserve banks to maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities. **Pages 2523, 2543**

Appointment to Joint Committee: Senator Fannin was appointed by Vice President to Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration. **Page 2506**

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that H.R. 3818, gold cover legislation, the unfinished business, would be considered on Wednesday, February 17; S.J. Res. 1, constitutional amendment respecting Presidential inability, would be considered on Thursday, February 18; and S. 805 (H.R. 45), increasing resources of Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, would be considered on Friday, February 19. Following these pieces of legislation, Senate will consider bill covering authorizations for Disarmament Agency, at least one of the education bills, and health bills, including the Regional Medical Complex for cancer and heart. **Page 2541**

Confirmations: The following nominations were confirmed: Donald W. Hoagland, of Colorado, to be Assistant Administrator for Development Finance and Private Enterprise, AID; and Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, of Illinois, and Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General, respectively. **Page 2543**

Nomination: One Navy nomination in the rank of admiral was received. **Page 2543**

Appendix

Control of Dangerous Drugs

SPEECH

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, since the widespread abuse of dangerous drugs such as the barbiturates and amphetamines, popularly known as "goof balls" and "pep pills," has become a matter of growing alarm throughout the country, it is highly encouraging to note that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has now completed hearings on the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965.

As a sponsor since 1962 of legislation designed to prevent the wholesale movement of these dangerous drugs into the black market, and thence into the hands of vulnerable teenagers, I welcome this further evidence of the committee's determination to deal expeditiously with this very serious situation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the statement which I presented to the committee last week:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE FLORENCE P. DWYER, OF NEW JERSEY, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN SUPPORT OF THE DRUG ABUSE CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to express my views to this committee on the urgent need to enact the legislation you are now considering, the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965.

As a cosponsor of the bill introduced by the chairman this year and as a sponsor of similar legislation in the 87th and 88th Congresses, I am deeply grateful that this committee has given to the drug control bill the high priority evidenced by these early hearings.

Almost daily, Mr. Chairman, and in almost any newspaper, we can read about the devastating effects of the easy availability of barbiturates, amphetamines, and other dangerous drugs—crimes of violence and depravity, widespread delinquency among the young, increased traffic accidents, the graduation into addiction to the hard narcotics, the ruined lives of countless individuals, the misery, and heartbreak and dislocation of innocent and helpless families.

The evidence is overwhelming. Local law enforcement agencies in my own State and in other highly populated areas of the country report an alarming spread in the abuse of the stimulant and depressant drugs, especially among teenagers and in middle and upper-middle-class neighborhoods where drug addiction previously has not been a major problem.

In reports to the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee in the Senate, the New York City Police Department said that dangerous drug arrests and drug seizures during the first 11 months of 1964 increased by as much as 393 percent in some categories over the same period in 1963; and the California attorney general cited a 75-percent increase in dangerous drug arrests from 1960 to 1963.

In the town of Seaside Heights, N.J., arrests for disorderly conduct, stimulated principally by dangerous drugs, increased 500 percent since 1960. Dangerous drug arrests in Chicago increased by 65 percent from 1963 to 1964; in Baltimore by 60 percent. Arrests of teenagers in Los Angeles for misuse of amphetamines and barbiturates grew from 50 in 1958 to 321 in 1964. In the Oklahoma City area, a 6-month survey recently identified 2,500 pill takers as opposed to a few dozen narcotics addicts.

I could go on and on, Mr. Chairman. The facts and figures are extensive and depressing, but more than that they reveal an unmistakable and startling upward trend both in the rate of addiction and in the rate of crime and other antisocial behavior directly related to drug abuse—and among the groups in our population to which we like to look most hopefully.

Just as the nature and extent of the evil are known and acknowledged, so, too, is the reason why. You cannot have growing addiction to dangerous drugs unless those drugs are readily available. The Food and Drug Administration has estimated that about one-half of the approximately 10 billion amphetamines and barbiturates annually produced by legitimate manufacturers end up in the black market—and these figures presumably do not include other, equally dangerous, stimulant and depressant drugs nor drugs manufactured illegally.

Attracted by the immense profit potential of a racket where pills can be bought for one-tenth of a cent and resold for 10 to 25 cents apiece, organized criminal rings have begun to move into the illicit drug field in a big way, according to the FDA. As an example, Baltimore police broke up one major pill ring after a woman sold undercover agents 200,000 pills during a 7-month period. Nationally, this vicious racket is netting upward of $500 million a year.

How could this happen? Undoubtedly, there are many methods used to avoid the legal requirement that dangerous drugs be dispensed only by prescription. But one such method—the ridiculously easy direct purchase of wholesale quantities of the drugs by unlicensed, unregistered distributors—may help explain why the problem has become so severe.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, CBS television news inaugurated its factfinding unit with a report on the dangerous drug menace to demonstrate the frightening ease with which these drugs can be procured. The unit's producer-investigator formed a dummy company, rented a tiny office, printed a few letterheads, contacted 51 drug firms, placed orders for amphetamines and barbiturates with 19 of the companies, and received deliveries on 47 percent of the orders from companies in 8 States, none of which bothered to check on the legitimacy of the operation.

For a total cost of $600.28, this fly-by-night operation, which could be duplicated by anyone, obtained 1,075,000 pills valued on the black market at $250,000 to $500,000.

Another channel for illicit trade in the dangerous drugs is the export market, especially to Mexico. The pills, a significant amount of which are manufactured in the United States, are shipped legally to outlets in Mexican border towns and then resold for the purpose of being smuggled back into the United States for sale on the black market.

Counterfeiting has become a further source of illegal drugs. Counterfeiters, who require only a tablet-making or capsule-filling machine and a garage or empty warehouse to be in business, have become so accomplished that industry experts often find it nearly impossible to distinguish fakes from the genuine article.

In the face of this growing tide of illegal traffic in dangerous drugs, the drug industry and Federal, State, and local law-enforcement agencies have been virtually helpless in attempting to control the situation. Some individual drug companies have taken etxraordinary precautions to prevent their products from getting into the black market, but they have been unable to control other, less responsible companies or to control effectively every step in the distribution process from manufacturer to consumer. While some States have strict licensing requirements, others do not. State and local authorities have little or no power to get to the sources of supply. And the Food and Drug Administration, under present law, possesses only very limited enforcement and inspection authority, especially when confronted with the difficulty of determining the origin of particular drugs and establishing whether they have been shipped in interstate commerce.

The present bill, Mr. Chairman, would help plug up these big holes in the regulatory scheme of things by means of which the illicit drug trade has been allowed to flourish, and it would provide the means for a concerted attack against the evil at all levels. The bill would require all manufacturers, compounders, and processors of the stimulant and depressant drugs to register with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to keep records of the quantities of the drugs they handle and the names of those from whom they receive the drugs and to whom they distribute them. Wholesalers, jobbers, distributors, carriers, and sellers of the drugs would also be required to keep such records. All such records would be available for inspection as would the facilities and establishments involved in the distribution of the drugs. Possession of the drugs by unauthorized persons would be prohibited.

The bill would also tighten regulations prohibiting the counterfeiting of drugs and would provide for more effective enforcement.

The penalties included in the bill are aimed especially at those who sell or otherwise supply dangerous drugs to persons under 18 years of age.

I find it particularly encouraging, Mr. Chairman, that there is almost unanimous agreement among those most concerned about the purposes and objectives of this legislation. While there are certain differences of opinion among members of the drug industry about the scope of the bill, these differences can certainly be resolved. Retail druggists, who expressed concern about recordkeeping and inspection requirements in previous versions of the legislation, will find that the present bill involves little more than an extension of existing requirements for maintaining records of prescriptions. Anything less than this would, I believe, seriously jeopardize the objectives of the bill.

As the committee knows, the legislation has also been endorsed by the President, who specifically requested approval of the measure in his health message, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other departments of the Government, by State and local law-enforcement agencies, and by individuals and organizations in the field of juvenile delinquency, among many others.

Before concluding this statement, Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to a problem which the committee's hearings have revealed with regard to the drugs covered by the bill. Although the bill automatically subjects to regulation the barbiturates and the amphetamines there are a number of other drugs which have similar properties and effects, which are known to be subject to the same abuse and to be equally dangerous, and which in some instances are directly competitive with the barbiturates and amphetamines. In the case of these nonbarbiturates and nonamphetamines, however, the provisions of the bill would not take effect automatically and could not become effective until the specified administrative procedures had been completed. In the meantime, manufacturers of the regulated drugs would be placed under a severe competitive disadvantage, and a known public health hazard would be permitted to continue unchecked.

I would hope that the committee, in considering the form in which the legislation may be reported, could agree on language covering all stimulant and depressant drugs which are substantially involved in drug abuse and make them subject to the bill's provisions in the same way and at the same time. It should be noted that the bill already provides a way of taking care of the converse problem, that of exempting those drugs which, even though they may technically qualify as barbiturates and amphetamines, contain so small an amount of the substance that the resultant compound is not subject to abuse.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the committee's willingness to consider my views on this vital legislation, and I am grateful for the committee's determination to act expeditiously in meeting the grave threat to our Nation's welfare which is posed by the uncontrolled abuse of dangerous drugs.

Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed by an eloquent editorial tribute to the memory of Sir Winston Churchill, undoubtedly the greatest leader who has been produced in the 20th century. The editorial was broadcast over station WOKE, in Charleston, S.C., on January 25, 1965, by Mr. Harry C. Weaver, president and general manager of Weaver Broadcasting Corp.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed, by so many, to so few."

So spoke the late Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill of England to the world in general and the heroic Britons in particular as the fighting English Royal Air Force faced 8-to-1 odds with Hitler's Nazis Luftwaffe in 1940 during the Battle of Britain.

These words came rushing back from the past leading up to World War II as the word was flashed around the world early yesterday morning that Britain's beloved Conservative had succumbed to death at the age of 90 after a long illness * * * the last of the principal chessmen in the European game of war including Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, and Roosevelt. Our thoughts go back to May 10, 1940—8 months after Hitler unleashed his Nazi juggernaut of destruction—when "Peace in our time" Neville Chamberlain had turned over the reins of the British Government to Sir Winston Churchill just 2 weeks before the evacuation of British troops from Dunkirk. We recall the burning words of the new Prime Minister of Great Britain as he addressed the British people that night with the first of his rousing summons to victory that boldly faced the possibility of defeat "* * * unless we conquer, as conquer we must, as conquer we shall" while the memorable strains of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony musically branded the "V for Victory" on the minds of freemen everywhere.

How can we Americans of that era ever forget that courageous leader of England with the two fingers of his upraised hand giving the "V for Victory" sign as Dunkirk fell to the Nazis on June 8 followed by France? These words by Prime Minister Churchill: "* * * for a thousand years, men will still say, this was their finest hour" rang in our ears as a massive air attack was launched by Nazi Germany against Britain on June 18, designed to destroy the Royal Air Force and devastate London in preparation for a cross-channel invasion of England. These attacks increased in force until on August 15 more than 1,000 Nazi planes struck at London and neighboring cities. Wave after wave of German planes were over England by day and by night increasing in intensity until the air blitzkrieg reached its peak of destruction and tragedy during the month of September 1940. In this month, civilian casualties included nearly 7,000 dead and nearly 11,000 injured. Amid the ruins of London, that grand old British gentleman who was made an honorary citizen of America by the U.S. Congress early in the Kennedy administration flung back this ringing challenge at Adolph Hitler: "* * * little that he knows of the spirit of the British nation or the tough fiber of the Londoners. He has lighted a fire which will burn with a steady and consuming flame until the last vestiges of Nazi tyranny have been burnt out of Europe." This spirit and toughness of the Britons reflected in the terrific prices that Hitler had to pay during the "Battle for Britain" for on one raid alone on September 15, 1940, the Nazis lost 185 planes which we believe helped to turn the tide of the assault against England for shortly thereafter the mass bombings ceased.

As Americans mourned the death of this great British statesman and President Johnson ordered that our national colors be flown at half-mast until the burial of the former Prime Minister, we recall the fighting words of Sir Winston Churchill: "Give us the tools and we will finish the job" which the U.S. Congress did in February 1941 by voting in lend-lease and then the cigar-smoking Britain leader in June of that same year that brought the United States of America into the world conflict taunted the Nazi leader of Germany by saying that: "We shall fight him by land, we shall fight him by sea, we shall fight him in the air, until with God's help we'll rid the earth of his shadow and liberate his people from his yoke."

We of the low country join with Americans and freemen everywhere in paying tribute to one of the greatest statesmen that ever lived and the history books of future generations will record the achievements of this beloved Englishman and adopted American. Not only a fighter of nazism but aware of the threat of communism as well, we recall the words of the late Winston Churchill when he warned us of the tyranny of the Communists by saying: "You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

Hold Your Hats, Kids, Here We Go Again

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, several incredulous constituents of mine have sent me newspaper articles detailing the efforts by New Jersey of antipoverty bureaucrats to raise the per capita income level of the State. With the President's admonition to "reason together" firmly in mind, no doubt, these antipoverty administrators have reasoned together that the best place to start fighting their war would be in their own bank accounts. They have proceeded to budget themselves salaries that are higher than those being paid other officials on a State or local level.

For example, the director of the program is paid $25,000 a year, more than any State cabinet officer, and his assistant receives $19,000 a year, $3,000 more than the head of the department of motor vehicles. In Newark, antipoverty officials are complaining that they did not receive all of the $567,000 for salaries that included a director's salary of $23,000, which is more than a superior court judge earns. The deputy's salary of $18,000 would have been more than that paid a chief of police and the director of public works department. In Newark, out of 93 staff members, 26 would receive more than $10,000 apiece, if antipoverty officials had their way. And we are told by the State deputy director that these salaries are not out of line with those paid in other areas of the State.

With all this money, vacancies are nevertheless occurring in the State offices, as former employees move on to higher paying local jobs on the strength of their experience in a program that has yet to get off the ground for those truly in need. This is all being paid for out of Federal tax funds.

Now I recognize that the job of using an antipoverty official is a difficult one. For example, as the State director has pointed out, there is the problem of finding poverty. In one of my counties, officials of several towns declared poverty stricken were less than delighted at the designation, since their own statistics indicated nothing of the sort. Finding ways to spend all of that antipoverty money obviously takes a good deal of initiative. Perhaps these New Jersey officials will receive the recognition they

deserve for discovering so quickly such willing recipients right in their own backyards.

The articles from the Hackensack, N.J. Record of January 27, 1965, and the Newark Evening News of February 3, 1965, follow:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Feb. 3, 1965]

PRUDENT CUTBACK

Some members of the board of trustees of the United Community Corp., the agency created to coordinate antipoverty programs in Newark, are unhappy because the Federal Government cut its budget.

UCC asked for $878,000 for its first year, including $567,000 for salaries. The Government pared this to $204,000, including $20,000 in local funds.

The complaining trustees blame politics for the drastic cutback and curtailment of Newark's war on poverty.

Not politics but prudence, it would seem, dictated the cutback. It suggested that even in Washington dollars are not unlimited. And what has been curtailed is not the city's war on poverty but a payroll in excess of half a million dollars for an organization not yet in business.

Included in the UCC budget was $23,000 a year for a project director and $18,000 for his assistant. Of 93 proposed staff members, 26 were down for $10,000 or more. And all of this was in addition to the payrolls of five projects, underway or planned, each headed by a director at $10,000 to $14,500.

How far out of line is the UCC salary scale becomes evident when the director's $23,000 and the assistant's $18,000 are compared with the $15,000 paid the city's director of public works and its chief of police, with the mayor's salary of $25,000, with the $22,500 paid superior court judges.

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, Jan. 27, 1965]

WAGES ARE FINE FOR ANTIPOVERTY: JERSEY STAFF DESIGNATED TO HELP NEEDY IS IN NO DANGER OF STARVATION

(By James F. Ahearn)

TRENTON.—New Jersey antipoverty staff workers have begun their mission close to home, by approving salaries for themselves regarded as lush by other State employees.

The director of the program, John C. Bullitt, draws $25,000 a year, more than any State cabinet officer. His deputy gets $19,000, or $3,000 more than the motor vehicles division director.

A check of payroll records yesterday turned up three more antipoverty positions paying $11,000 or better, and another two posts paying $9,500.

The salaries place no burden on the State budget, since the Federal government has put up the money to foot the bill.

Solid information and unfounded rumors about job opportunities in the new program have become a prime topic in statehouse scuttlebutt.

Some of the facts are:

1. Bernard Fulton, Jr., director of community assistance, is paid $16,500.

2. Paul Gary Tuerff until recently was paid $11,500 a year as chief of research and information. He quit to become director of the Atlantic City antipoverty program.

3. Rodney Mott was paid $11,000 a year as senior community field representative. He has been named director of the Monmouth County program.

4. Gregory Farrell has been getting $9,500 as senior community field representative. His appointment as director of the Trenton municipal program, at a salary of $12,500, was announced Sunday.

Bullitt commented ruefully at a news conference last week that the State office was turning into an incubator for local antipoverty executives.

A member of the office said applicants for the posts held by Tueriff, Mott, and Farrell were being interviewed.

The other $9,500 job is held by Mrs. Pauline Callahan, former Jill-of-all-trades with the now defunct tercentenary commission.

Two secretaries on the antipoverty staff are paid $6,874 and $6,366 respectively. These are not excessive salaries, but they are higher than the State average for such jobs.

Attention was drawn to the antipoverty pay scales last week with the disclosure that officials in Paterson were thinking of recommending a pay range of $17,000 to $20,000 a year for that city's antipoverty director.

Mayor Frank X. Graves' salary is $17,500. Sterns said the Paterson proposal was not out of line with salaries being paid elsewhere in the State.

Latins Stock Up on Their Own Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by the editor of the Miami Herald, Don Shoemaker. The article which recently appeared in the Miami Herald is entitled "Latins Stock Up on Their Own Future."

This article is a most informative and at the same time a most encouraging one, for it shows what a few men can do in that enormous country of Brazil and the historic country of Venezuela, as well as other countries, in developing a system of self-reliance and, as we like to call it here, free enterprise.

I am certain that all the people who live in our system will be much interested in this very informative article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Jan. 26, 1965]

INVESTMENTS IN FREE ENTERPRISE: LATINS STOCK UP ON THEIR OWN FUTURE

(By Don Shoemaker)

NASSAU, BAHAMAS.—A shade less than two decades ago, a brace of Norte Americanos spread out through the back country of Brazil with 400 knowledgeable young men who rang doorbells and tried to sell—of all things—stock in a power company.

These hopefuls bussed and buggied deep into the interior, where electric lights often were as frequent only as the town pump, in the interest of what their leader described (and still does) as "democratic capitalism."

The idea was "the development of local capital markets in Latin American countries through education in popular capitalism, by means of underwriting and distribution of local securities to the various middle classes."

The man with the idea was (and still is) Clarence Dauphinot, Jr., a remarkable man whose business acumen is properly tinged with shades of altruism.

His second primary objective has been to attract capital from the developed money market centers to investment in Latin American countries through short- or medium-term hard currency loans or, at times, in equity investment when the profitability and possibility have been commensurate with the risks.

This spells, among other things, Deltec Panamerican S.A., a holding company domiciled here in the Bahamas.

Deltec is a modestly capitalized complex of companies in major South American countries, whose breadwinner is a banking operation handling commercial paper. Mostly, it is brains—some of the best down south.

Once a year Deltec gathers in its executives, their advisers and friends, and has a brainstorming session about Latin America and its own past and future there. It is not unreasonable to say these sessions are at least as potent as a convocation of the Organization of American States (OAS) to the extent that something or other gets done.

The Brazilian doorbell ringers had their comeuppance, of course, when the economy turned sour, even though by that time they had educated 150,000 to 200,000 local folk in stock ownership. When times went bad, interest in equities began to disappear.

Even before this, Deltec had its problems. Door-to-door stock sales made some putative sponsors of Juan Q. Public rather unhappy because, putatively, he was being exploited by the Yankee who charged the big interest. Even at a 20 percent commission, which would appear excessive unless Deltec is right that the average sale required 11 visits by a salesman, the deal does not sound bad. It is quite possible that the recent Brazilian popular revolution, which is not yet fully appreciated in North America, had something to do with a couple of hundred thousand shareholders who had been introduced to private initiative.

In Brazil the grassroots revolution has installed a rather benign, civilian-oriented "military" dictatorship. Some of our more exotic foreign correspondents have dismissed the Brazilian affair as a nasty plot pulled off by a flock of fascist generals.

One of these military men, Gen. Castelo Branco, is now president. Like so many modern caudillos, he is U.S. military-trained, or at least exposed, and he is about as fascisitic as your little sister. The fact is that Brazil's revolution, in the words of unimpassioned onlookers, was "greeted with nationwide rejoicing." Speedily these types are trying to reconstitute the national economy, make up for painful years of inflation so staggering that in 1964 the budget deficit reached 64 percent of total expenditures, and get the country back on its feet.

What ails, or used to ail Brazil is only a small part of the Deltec operation.

It keeps a finger on a dozen pulses. Its salesmen once again will roam through Brazil. It has 60 agents in Argentina distributing securities. It is looking for shareholders in Venezuela, which it regards as a new showcase of Latin American democracy under President Leoni, the successor of the valiant Romulo Betancourt. Further, its friends and associates who bear witness to the fabulous continent see a limitless future in terms of U.S. interest because of L.B.J.'s recent tariff agreement with Canada on automobile parts.

This, so goes the argument, is proof that the United States will give a little hemispherically.

Deltec will start a mutual fund operation in Puerto Rico in a few weeks, reputedly the first such offering to native Puerto Ricans of investment in their own local companies.

It has been responsible also for some new ideas about the role of the North American businessman in South America.

Its people are high on Castelo Branco not simply because he may favor foreign investments. Rather, he is a symbol of political stability, which Brazil and some of its neighbors gravely need. Now Brazil quite literally is "back in the Western World," which means the potentially richest nation on earth will not go Communist.

Deltec, which has been called a "private AID program," also is interested in the pro-

motion of American business responsibility abroad.

Too often, U.S. affiliates and branches and their managers show little or no interest in the problems of the countries where they are located.

Venezuela, for example, has an institution popularly known as the "Dividendo." This is a sort of voluntary contract which obligates American and other foreign firms to subscribe 2 to 5 percent of their earnings before taxes to Community Chest-type programs. Some 300 firms belong in Venezuela. One of their projects is to help in the retraining of school-age youngsters, of whom Venezuela has a surplus: 50 percent of its population is under 15 years of age, and 80,000 new people enter the labor market annually.

If Clarence Dauphinot never signs another stock contract or negotiates a loan for a housing development in South America, the contribution of his organization well may justify all the sweat and soul searching which have gone into the sentiments of its friends.

Dictatorship, either of the right or the left, need not be the inevitable way of Latin America. Nor need the highly diverse countries there settle for anything else than worldwide recognition that they are rich in natural resources and well endowed in skilled hands.

A hard row is ahead for some friends of the United States down south. Colombia in particular will find it mean to hoe. Yet we have a right to be optimistic. At last we see clearly where we are going—assuming that we truly wish to get there.

Commemorative Stamp in Honor of Dr. Luther H. Gulick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Dr. Luther Halsey Gulick, pioneer and leader in the field of physical education.

I am informed that several national organizations are backing my proposal to issue such a stamp on the anniversary of Dr. Gulick's birthday, which occurs on December 4, 1965. My bill does not call for any specific denomination or design. The denomination and design are to be determined by the Postmaster General.

Dr. Gulick's leadership in the fields of education and recreation have undoubtedly influenced the lives of millions of young Americans across the Nation. Perhaps more than any one man, he was a pioneer in the development of organizations devoted to helping American youth become healthy and responsible citizens. The following are some biographical facts about him taken from the Dictionary of American Biography:

Luther Halsey Gulick was born in Honolulu, Hawaii, December 4, 1865, of missionary parents. He studied at Oberlin College, but illness forced him to quit school. In 1885 he enrolled at the Sargent School for Physical Training, Cambridge, Mass., and the following year he entered the Medical College of the University of the City of New York and received his M.D. degree in 1889.

Handicapped by heart trouble and severe headaches, Gulick became interested in physical education and hygiene. He organized the physical training course at the YMCA Training School, Springfield, Mass., and served as its ditor until 1903. He originated the triangle as the emblem of the YMCA denoting the physical, social, and spiritual aims of the organization. Sport enthusiasts will be interested to know that Dr. Gulick, in collaboration with one of his students James Naismith, devised the game of basketball.

Dr. Gulick held many leading posts in various organizations devoted to physical education. For a period of 16 years, from 1887 to 1903, he was secretary for the physical training department of the YMCA International Committee; he was principal of the Pratt Institute High School, Brooklyn, N.Y., from 1900 to 1903; director of physical training in the New York City public schools from 1903 to 1906, during which time he reorganized the physical education activities and instruction in hygiene, and established the Public Schools Athletic League.

Dr. Gulick also organized the child hygiene department of the Russell Sage Foundation and served as its director from 1907 to 1913, when failing health forced him to relinquish the post. Later, however, he and his wife organized the Camp Fire Girls movement. The last 5 years of his life were devoted to writing and lecturing on his favorite subjects, physical education and hygiene, seeking in this way to spread general knowledge among the people on these subjects.

Among the many offices he held were the following: chairman of the Physical Training Lecture Committee of the St. Louis Exposition, 1904; member of the American Olympic Games Committee, 1906 and 1908; delegate to the Second International Congress on School Hygiene, London, 1907; lecturer on hygiene, New York University, 1906–09; consultant, New York Hospital for Deformities and Joint Diseases, 1907; president of the American Physical Education Association, 1903–06; secretary, American School Hygiene Association, 1907; president, Public Schools Physical Training Society, 1905–08; president, Playground Association of America, 1906–09.

He also was a prolific writer in his specialized fields, serving as editor of "Physical Education," "American Physical Education Review," and others. Among his published works were, "Physical Measurements and How They Are Used," 1889; "Physical Education by Muscular Exercise," 1904; "The Efficient Life," 1907; "Mind and Work," 1908, and others.

Although in ill health, one of his last acts was to accept a call from the National War Council in the fall of 1917 to undertake a survey in France of the rapidly growing work of the YMCA with the American Expeditionary Forces there. His report on the kind of men needed and the training they were to receive helped improve the service of the YMCA to the American troops in France. His book "The Dynamic of Manhood," published in 1917, was based on his experiences and observations in France during that period.

Upon his return from France, Dr. Gulick retired to his camp in the Maine woods where he died on August 13,1918, at the age of 53. His pioneering efforts in the fields of physical education and hygiene should now be recognized through the isuance of a commemorative stamp on the occasion of the anniversary of the 100th anniversary of his birth.

In Defense of South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the January 1965 issue of the New Guard, the magazine of the Young Americans for Freedom, includes an article, by Randal Teague, which merits the consideration and study of the Members of this body. The article is entitled "In Defense of South Africa: South Africa, Favorite Scapegoat of World Opinion, Deserves U.S. Support, Not Censure, in the United Nations."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF SOUTH AFRICA: SOUTH AFRICA, FAVORITE SCAPEGOAT OF WORLD OPINION, DESERVES U.S. SUPPORT, NOT CENSURE, IN THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Randal Teague)

In the ceaseless struggle between East and West for the political and economic allegiance of the underdeveloped nations, the future of South Africa is vital.

For over a decade now the vocal and passionate Africa-for-the-Africans movement has gained momentum and has vastly overshadowed realistic attempts by the Government of South Africa to explain its controversial policies.

Peoples throughout the world have been treated to prophecies of impending disaster in the Republic of South Africa. When touchy incidents, produced by racial tensions, occur there, they are overly magnified into outsized riots and massacres, even though similar racial incidents occur in other African nations as well. Were it not for the anti-Communist forces outside of the continent who report such incidents to destroy myths concerning the responsibility of new black nationalist leaders, they would pass unnoticed in the world press. Because the distortion of facts about South Africa has become a common endeavor for the hostile Afro-Asian coalition, these incidents have been presented to a credulous and often naive public as evidence of sinister intolerance and oppression of the black people.

The Government of South Africa, however, led by Prime Minister Dr. H. F. Verwoerd, has an outstanding record of political and economic achievements. The Afro-Asian Socialist-Communist and the Western humanist-Socialist influences have concentrated their attacks on the racial policies of South Africa seemingly to divert world attention from the otherwise outstanding gains being made there.

RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

South Africa today has the highest gross national product, the highest par capita income, the lowest personal and excise taxes, and the lowest national debt of any nation in Africa. Furthermore, it has more miles of highway, more building construction, and more industrial development than any other nation on the continent. These are established facts. Nevertheless, this Afro-Asian bloc continues to humiliate the Government of South Africa, because of its racial policies. Needless to say, this bloc never mentions the record of achievement.

For instance, South Africa was one of only two nations to pay its World War I debt to the United States in full and on due date, and this record was maintained following World War II and the Korean war. South Africa is one of the few countries that has never requested economic assistance from the United States. Both in war and peace South Africa has shown herself to be a worthy political and economic ally of the United States.

This position was demonstrated in 1948 when the present South African Government sent a contingent of airmen to assist the United States and Great Britain airlift materials to a then free Berlin, and in 1950 when South Africa was one of only 16 member nations of the United Nations to send an air force to Korea, it was further demonstrated.

THE CULTURE AND DOMESTIC POLICY

Surely, no domestic policy, whether it pertains to race relations or not, should be a sole criteron for judging the overall internal policy of any nation, but since this issue seems to be the one which will be aired, we must consider it in detail.

South Africans share with Americans a basically Western European derived cultural and spiritual origin with associated values, and the fact that America and South Africa were predominantly settled by the same kinds of people, were opened by their respective pioneers, and were subsequently developed by the initiative and work of the white man is a mere statement of history. Apart from the many similarities in the historical colonization of these two areas, there are cultural and economic ties which should be considered in the determination of future policy. The bonds of friendship between these two countries were once strong.

Unfortunately, there are many Americans who believe that the 3½ million whites in South Africa are only relics of the colonial period, who unlike their British, French, and Belgian counterparts, refuse to bow out gracefully before a "rolling tide of black nationalism." The fact is that the 3½ million white population is a permanent one, most of them having come to South Africa after the Boer War at the turn of this century. South Africa is their only home, for they are not settlers. Africa is as much home to them as is Liverpool to some Britishers, and these South African whites are entitled by every right and tradition to play a part in the "new" Africa. It is this fact that totally destroys the concept that "Africa for the Africans" applies only to the black man.

It would be in error to try to accurately compare the race relations policies and problems of South Africa with those existing in the United States.

Negroes in South Africa are still rooted in the soil and most are only one generation removed from the barbarism of the bush; whereas, the American Negro has been in close contact with the white man and his culture for a century and a half and has, in varying degrees, assimilated his culture and his values into his way of life. In the tribal homelands of South Africa, a vista of economic, political, and cultural vitality and growth has already begun to develop as a result of policies specifically directed toward the achievement of positive objectives. These policies were conceived by Mr. M. D. C. deWet Nel, one of the leading economists of the West, and these programs have carried out successfuly interracial cooperation.

APARTHEID LAWS

The controversial apartheid laws, a system of legal codes governing racial relations in South Africa, are usually referred to by the anti-South African bloc as sinister and evil laws of the white man designed to suppress the black man. In actuality, they are based on the will and determination of the people and are no more suppressive than any other law to one who would step outside of it. It is a sensible program to provide the natives, mostly Bantu, with their own institutions on lines parallel to those enjoyed by the whites.

Apartheid is not a tyrannical attempt to drive the black men back to the bushlands but an enlightened way of providing them with a system of government based upon their owr customs and traditions. Most importantly, apartheid is a system designed and carried out by those most closely associated with the problems there.

Only an egalitarian radical, acting without knowledge of the customs and culture of the black man, would demand that the black culture be suddenly brought directly into line with the white one.

POSTWAR RELATIONS

Despite provisions of the Charter of the United Nations specifically prohibiting intervention into the domestic affairs of any member nation, certain delegates to the U.N. General Assembly have made it a point to sit in judgment on the domestic policies of South Africa.

Whether those policies are morally right or wrong, intervention by other states through the U.N. is not only a violation of recognized concepts of international law, but it is also indicative of a double standard being utilized by the U.N.

Continued U.N. General Assembly censure of South Africa has resulted from a noticeable lack of firm leadership by the Western Powers in general and, perhaps, the United States in particular. Because of close political and economic ties in the past between the United States and South Africa, and because of South Africa's faithfulness to the United States and its post-World War II position, the United States politically, even morally, owes the South African Government a determined measure of support in the U.N.

South Africa's Ambassador to the United Nations, Eric H. Louw, who has led eight South African delegations to the U.N. General Assembly, has made many eloquent pleas for the sovereignty of his nation.

During the post World War II period, the United States customarily assumed an attitude of indifference, especially in the U.N., toward the domestic affairs of South Africa. Since 1960, however, our Government has assumed an almost hostile attitude toward South Africa.

Although a deterioration in the relations between the United States and South Africa was evident in those matters conducted through the U.N. during the Eisenhower administrations, direct relations remained harmonious.

It was during the administration of John F. Kennedy that relations with South Africa reached an alltime low. The United States, even when it appeared that black nationalists to the north were prepared to move militarily against South Africa, agreed to cease all military material shipments to that nation. Economic trade sharply declined, and the United States became a party to an unofficial censure of South Africa in the U.N.

THE FUTURE COURSE

There seem to be three choices in South Africa. First, radically integrate the two races and cultures thereby creating instability at a time when stability is so necessary for continued peace and prosperity. This solution could easily result in a fiasco similar to that which has now occurred in the Congo. Second, allow the black culture to prevail, thus, returning to customs and a culture close to paganism. This would surely result in the formation of a government unfriendly toward the West, and the progress which South Africa has achieved would be terminated. Third, allow the white man to continue his present rule while gradually mingling the two races to insure future progress through cooperative efforts with the black man gradually assuming greater economic and political participation in the government and society. Under the circumstances now prevalent in South Africa, the latter seems to be the most practical.

While a decision concerning the deteriorating relationship between the United States and South Africa will probably not be the most important foreign policy decision rendered by the Johnson administration during the next 4 years, the direction pursued after having reached that decision could be decisive for the immediate security of Africa and the ultimate security of the West.

The success of any new direction of our foreign policy in regard to South Africa will have to overcome obstacles created by the events of the past.

South Africa's contribution to the Western Powers lies not only in her military strength, for it has strong armed forces, but also in her willingness to serve as a base for the West. The Cape of Good Hope is still the only sea route between the West and the East in the very possible event of closure of the Suez Canal to the West. Naval bases maintained there by the enemy would seriously jeopardize the use of those strategic waters during war.

South Africa has already given the United States a unique advantage by permitting us to erect tracking stations for space exploration and defense purposes on her territory. The only other tracking stations operated by the United States on the African Continent were recently confiscated by the revolutionary Government of Tanzania (formerly Tanganyika and Zanzibar). These tracking stations are vital links in the worldwide chain of installations which permit us to track Soviet space vehicles as well as our own. The replacement of these stations with tracking ships would not only be extremely costly but also technically unsatisfactory.

In summary, South Africa has faced the issues of the modern era wisely and is willing to go a long way toward combating the forces of communism. Russia's threats do not scare her as they seem to frighten most of the emerging nations of the African Continent. South Africa's domestic policies are based upon realistic plans for continued growth and prosperity.

Solving Urban Area Problems

SPEECH

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in the February 8, 1965, issue of the Washington Daily News, Mr. Bruce Biossat, a well-known and nationally syndicated columnist, summarized the work of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in the crucial field of urban area problems.

As Mr. Biossat points out, the increasing concentration of our population in a relatively few huge urban complexes, with the difficult and interrelated problems which such urban complexes inevitably cause, may well be today's and tomorrow's most urgent national concern.

Congress has an important role, in cooperation with States and local communities, in attacking these problems in a coordinated and effective way. The Advisory Commission, on which I am privileged to represent the House together with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], has recommended ways in which all levels of government can achieve the desired coordination. I recommend Mr. Biossat's article to our colleagues, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include it herewith:

STATES CHART WAY TO RELIEVE URBAN AREAS

(By Bruce Biossat)

The 50 States have in hand some advisory proposals which are intended to help them set their urban areas on a better course.

The proposals are part of a suggested 1965 State legislative program advanced by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a permanent bipartisan body set up by Congress and made up of Governors, State legislators, county officials, mayors, Members of Congress and the U.S. executive branch.

Anything reasonably inventive in this field deserves a good look, since the country's major urban complexes are awash in difficulties that seem only to grow greater as the areas swell in size.

Soon 75 percent of the American people will be living in less than 200 of these complexes—and their problems simply have to top any responsible public agenda.

Furthermore, it is in these areas—and the States which legally are their masters—where the really big new spending is going on today.

In fiscal 1965 U.S., State, and local governments will be spending an estimated $75.2 billion in direct outlays, an increase of more than $5 billion over the $69.8 billion preliminary total for fiscal 1964. That figure in turn is $5 billion higher than 1963.

Just 10 years ago, total State-local expenditures came to but $33.7 billion, so they have more than doubled in a decade.

Today's staggering figures include a heavy tax for waste and confusion. Much urban growth is haphazard, uncoordinated, amounting nearly to self-strangulation.

With education needs bulking large, local-State government costs may double again in half a decade. There seems great point in reducing the tax for waste.

Here the Advisory Commission's proposals come into play.

They include several pieces of permissive legislation that would allow such matters as mass transportation, control of urban water supply and sewerage systems, and the securing and preserving of open spaces to be dealt with on a coordinated footing.

They would also authorize metropolitan study and area planning commissions, regulation of planning, zoning, and subdivision in land beyond corporate boundaries, and the setting up of so-called "metropolitan service corporations," which could perform a variety of areawide functions.

This last envisions an agency which could operate on a broad scale the way more limited traffic, housing, and other other authorities do today.

It is a severe testing time for those (Republicans particularly) who argue that things are done best at the State and local level. This would appear to be the moment, above all in history, for this notion to be demonstrated to the fullest.

Unquestionably the huge urban clusters are today's and tomorrow's battle areas. But enlistment in the combat goes hard.

Militant conservatives, while talking the State-local game, would much rather take a few dramatic swipes at the United Nations than try to coordinate a sewerage system.

A Commendable TV Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am calling the attention of Members at this time to a highly commendable television program scheduled for next Monday evening, February 15, over the ABC network. It is to be sponsored by the Purex Corp., Ltd., which has its major plant in South Gate, Calif., in the district which I have the honor to represent here.

This 1-hour program will be a tribute to the Peace Corps—the first, to my knowledge, to be telecast nationally by a commercial sponsor with the Peace Corps as its subject matter. It will be one of a series of Purex specials starring Dinah Shore, with this particular program featuring Harry Belafonte as guest star.

I also want to pay tribute to the Purex Corp. for the policy it adheres to in seeking TV programing which has value not only as good entertainment but which also adds to our national store of knowledge and avoids any semblance of sensationalism.

The company follows a policy of noninterference with the knowledgeable, professional creation of its programs and the dissemination of that programing by the network people. Mr. Alan C. Stonemen, president and chief executive officer of the Purex Corp., has said:

We would question the qualifications of creators of television programs in advising Purex as to what ingredients should go into a detergent. And we would likewise question our own qualifications in presuming to tell the creators of programing exactly how to create.

This is an attitude which has drawn widespread praise of the company from the television press and magazines of the country.

The company's television policy is reflected in the following excerpt from its policy statement:

Purex does not censor the program, but relies on the good judgment and integrity of the network to provide the best possible entertainment and to present it with dignity and good taste.

Censorship by the advertiser of the content of a TV program would endanger any dramatic or historical values the program might possess. It would be comparable to trying to control the content of any magazine or newspaper in which we advertise.

Purex recognizes that its noncensorship policy and the network's efforts to meet public demand for vital and more interesting programs at times leads to the presentation of material on which strong differences of opinion may exist. To avoid such subjects as program material simply because of these differing opinions would severely limit the scope of TV entertainment. Sponsor domination that extends to imposing such limitations on programing, in our opinion, is not compatible with the network's obligation to the FCC and is not in the best interests of the public.

We have strong evidence that the millions of viewers who see our programs recognize their value not only as good entertainment, but as a real contribution to our American way of life which does not suppress differing opinions.

Kill Off the Helicopter?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following article from the New York Times:

KILL OFF THE HELICOPTER?

On January 14 the board of estimate in a unanimous vote approved use of the roof of the 59-story Pan Am Building, in mid-Manhattan, for commercial helicopter operations, to begin in mid-April. Ten days later President Johnson in his budget message advised Congress to discontinue Federal subsidies in support of passenger helicopter operations throughout the country, on the grounds that the subsidy was not in the national public interest.

Any Government subsidy must, of course, be submitted to unremitting review. But it would be most unfortunate and shortsighted to stop the subsidy to helicopter passenger service at this stage. For one thing, the Pan Am heliport itself, because of its great convenience, should encourage an immediate increase in passenger use to make trips to airports in 5 to 10 minutes that might require an hour or more by highway. If, as likely, the proposed new fourth major airport in the area is situated even farther away, the helicopter's time advantage will be enhanced.

While there is admittedly no prospect that helicopter service could exist this year or next without Government help, the time is approaching when break-even operations can be expected. The Civil Aeronautics Board believes that if the Government would provide $18 million (for helicopter services throughout the Nation) between now and 1970, the lines could begin in 1971 to show a profit. In the current fiscal year New York Airways is getting $1.9 million in subsidy.

The hopeful signs are the potential of the most modern equipment used, for larger load and all-condition instrument operation, the declining percentage of dependence on subsidy, contractual guarantees of some income from major airlines, the general increase in air travel, and the measurably enlarged public acceptance of helicopter service.

The Government has a large investment in helicopter service, through subsidy of past years. Stopping now would throw this investment overboard, would destroy the existing services just when New York's, at least, is within hailing distance of a time when it could pay for itself as an unequaled quick route to the airports.

Employment Problems of Young People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation is interested in positive steps taken by any group in meeting the employment problems of young people.

Because Clark County in my Third District of Washington is taking outstanding action, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to place in the RECORD today Clark County Commissioner Kenneth E. Teter's article which was printed in the October County News Digest.

In the summer of 1964 Clark County was able to take a positive step in meeting a problem which has become one of concern throughout the Nation—that of providing employment opportunities for boys 16 and 17 years of age.

This was carried out through a program that benefited both the boys involved and the entire county. While somewhat limited in scope, I believe it is a good example of what can be done when people work together to meet a problem of this nature.

Actually, the Clark County youth employment program had its start in the summer of 1963. At that time it appeared the county's park acreage might be increased considerably within the year.

The board of county commissioners, consisting of Chairman Lawrence Beauchamp, Jim Worthington, and myself, foresaw the possibilities of this situation and included an item of $2,000 for extra help wages in the budget for 1964.

In December of 1963, the Crown Zellerbach Corp. deeded an area of nearly 300 acres to the county for park purposes. This site, now known as Lackamas Park, more than doubled the amount of park acreage the county owned at that time.

Located north of the community of Camas, in the easterly part of the county, this new park site included a fine lake, thus providing the public with fishing, canoeing and rowboating and swimming, in addition to picnicking, hiking, nature study, and serene wilderness. It also contains some fine stands of second growth and old growth Douglas-fir.

Early in 1964, the county acquired 160 acres from the U.S. Government for a park site in nothern Clark County. This property, which we named Siouxon Park, is located along Yale Reservoir on the North Fork of the Lewis River. The land at Siouxon Park was in its native state of brush and timber, with a long shoreline on the reservoir.

To begin developing these new park sites as quickly as possible required more labor than was available in the county parks department. A youth employment program seemed to be an answer to our problem, as well as an answer to the problem of employment opportunities for youth.

Thus, the county had as much need for these boys as the boys had for employment, and our park board warmly endorsed the idea.

However, to get the youth employment program underway required more than just the backing and encouragement of the board of county commissioners and the approval of Clark County's park board. This help was fast coming.

Robert K. Axlund, chief probation officer for the county juvenile department, and a man well aware of the problem of employment for teenage boys, stepped in and did much of the work. He cleared the question of wages and hours, and minors work permits with the State department of labor and industry.

Permission for children of welfare recipients to accept wages without having their parents suffer a reduction in their welfare grant was obtained from the State department of public assistance.

Also working with us in preparing the program were such people as County School Superintendent Roy Sandberg; Prosecuting Attorney R. DeWitt Jones; County Park Superintendent Gerry Staley, and superior court judges Eugene G. Cushing, J. Guthrie Langsdorf, and Virgil V. Scheiber, who also serve as juvenile court judges for the county.

The board of county commissioners unanimously passed a resolution initiating our youth employment program.

Some 24 boys were selected for employment from applications which were distributed throughout the county and then reviewed by a screening committee.

We received further enhancement of our program from State, county, and private foresters who instructed the boys in forestry, conservation, suppression of vandalism, and related subjects.

While the boys did some work in other county parks, the great majority of their time was devoted to the Lackamas Park project.

Clark County paid the youngsters the minimum wage, withheld income tax and social security, provided industrial insurance and medical aid and, in general, treated the boys just as we do all our employees.

This meant it was necessary to dismiss two of them for failing to do the job. However, it should be noted the remainder all performed in an outstanding manner and fully earned every cent they received.

Though it was possible to carry out the program for only a limited time, the boys cleared many acres of brush and undergrowth, built several trails, erected restroom facilities, prepared drinking water locations, mowed grass, constructed a boat dock, and made many other improvements.

With what we have learned this last summer, we are eagerly looking forward to a much more expanded program next year. The Lackamas Park site, because of its large size and varied potential, will take several years to develop fully. In addition we have much work to do at our Siouxon Park on the Yale Reservoir. We anticipate more additions to our park system, and maintenance also must be continued on our existing parks.

This donation by Crown Zellerbach to the county's park system last winter, plus the efforts of concerned individuals, have given us an opening for further developing the county—and its young people, our richest resource.

Tribute to General LeMay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Curtis LeMay is a legend in his own lifetime. He is a symbol of effective military preparedness; of strength tempered with justice.

I have noted a very fine tribute to General LeMay in the Air Force magazine of February 1965. I am proud to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The LeMay achievements have been cited over and over again. The LeMay cigar has been chewed and rechewed in public print. Our own portrait of the retiring USAF Chief of Staff is painted against a background of people—Air Force people—for whom he waged battles as big and as important as any offensives he mounted over Germany or Japan. Here is how he said it himself (in the Airman, January 1964), and this is how we will remember him:

"There are quite a few devices and procedures in the Air Force today that seem to dwarf their human creators. As our missiles and electronics have begun to do the things we want them to do, you may have heard deriding comments about man's abilities. Perhaps you have heard that silo-sitting will replace flying * * * that voyages into deep space will be led by unmanned satellites * * * and that the computer thinks quicker and deeper than any mortal.

"Not so many years ago, they used to say * * * commission the Norden bombsight, not the bombardier * * * give sergeant stripes to the computing gunsight, not to the aerial gunner * * * or let 'George' the autopilot do it.

"Aerial victory in World War II was won by men * * * men who wore wings * * * men who had the daring and the intelligence to master the machines and to improve upon the procedures to reach the winning combinations.

"Nothing has changed. I salute the heritage of all men who wear Air Force wings. And I foresee that men with wings will lead the way in the coming conquest of space. I shall say this with full conviction until I am convinced that the airplane invented the Wright brothers."—THE EDITORS.

Miss Inez Tatascore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I advise Members of the House and their employees of the passing of Miss Inez Tatascore on February 4.

Miss Tatascore was for 18 years an employee of the House of Representatives, ably serving as secretary to my predecessor, the Honorable Sterling Cole. She returned to her home in Ithaca, N.Y., in 1953 to take employment there and has lived there since that time.

Miss Tatascore joined Congressman Cole's staff in 1935 shortly after he was first elected to Congress. Prior to that time, she had been a Tompkins County, N.Y. County court stenographer and secretary to the late County Judge Willard M. Kent. At the time of her death, she was confidential secretary to the Honorable Harold E. Simpson, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

Miss Tatascore had long been active in Republican circles and, in 1952, was an alternate delegate to the Republican National Convention in Chicago. She was a past secretary, treasurer, and vice president of the Young Republican Club of Ithaca and for many years has been a member of the Republican County Committee of Tompkins County.

I know that Miss Tatascore's many friends in Washington and in the State of New York will mourn her passing. She was an extremely able staff member to Congressman Cole and to the constituents of his congressional district as well as being of considerable help to me in recent years. She will be much missed by all who knew her.

The 5-Percent Manufacturer's Tax on Household-Type Hot Water Heaters Should Be Repealed

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill calling for the repeal of the 5-percent manufacturer's tax on household-type hot water heaters because I feel that this tax can no longer be justified.

In the first place, the tax is one of those "temporary" wartime taxes designed not only to raise revenue but to curtail the use of steel, copper and other metals in products classified as luxurious and unnecessary for home use in emergencies. There is a question whether such a tax should have been applied in the first place, but since it was, it should have been repealed long before this.

To my knowledge, domestic water heaters are the only type of plumbing equipment that carry a manufacturer's tax. It is particluarly unfair since it applies only to the family water heaters in the home and does not apply to heaters which supply hot water in hotels, apartments or other non-one-family dwellings.

Certainly the use of hot water today cannot be classified as a luxury. Every home depends upon it almost as much as food, clothing, and housing. An apartment dweller under the present system gets his hot water from equipment on which no tax has been paid while the equipment for the average homeowner either costs more because of the manufacturer's tax or the manufacturer is put at an unfair advantage.

The domestic water heater industry is a depressed industry. More than half of the plants have closed and more are in danger of being closed. Companies that operate in the red find it necessary to partially absorb the 5 percent Federal tax and operate further in the red. Some companies find it necessary to lay off workers and curtail their business. The amount of revenue gained from this tax is not sufficient to justify the problems created for this depressed industry.

Furthermore, it appears to me this tax on water heaters is a regressive tax, as it falls most heavily on families with low or modest incomes.

In the reappraisal of wartime excise taxes, I trust Congress will see fit to eliminate this unfair manufacturer's tax which has outlived its usefulness.

Family Farms in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial carried in the Corson County News, McIntosh, S. Dak., which I think is worth distributing for other Members to read.

The editorial, carried in the February 4, 1965, issue of that paper, is as follows:

FAMILY FARMS IN THE UNITED STATES

It seems the Johnson administration has chosen to preside over the liquidation of two-thirds of the family farms in the United States.

One can imagine the embarrassment of such Democrats as South Dakota's Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN. MCGOVERN and then-Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY spent considerable time traveling through the farmlands of America not many years ago blaming Ezra Taft Benson for causing a decrease in the number of farmers. It must be said in their defense they are also critical of the Presidential decree, although they elect to blame the Bureau of the Budget rather than the President.

The President said in his budget message farming alone cannot be expected to support more than a million families. There are now about 3 million people making their living on farms in this country.

The President expects to handle the surplus farmer problem by spending money to teach farmers new jobs rather than spending money to support or supplement farm income.

We believe that in trying to solve the so-called farm problem by moving two-thirds of the people off farms the President is going to create more problems than he will solve.

He is not dealing with just 2 million families. He is dealing also with the people who provide goods and services for these families. Liquidation of any large number of farm families will start off a chain reaction that will be felt in every corner of the land. Liquidation of another one-third of the rural people will mean liquidation of more than half of the small towns and cities in the Midwest.

Reducing the number of farmers will reduce the number of people that make the machinery and will create new unemployment problems in the industrial centers. Land that is now farmed by 100 small farmers with small tractors, combines and pickups can be farmed by 10 farmers with a few huge crawler tractors and fleets of transient combines.

Of course, as the President says, a million farmers can supply all the food and fiber we need now. One corporation could supply all the cars we need if all its competition were removed and it could triple its size.

The administration seems to have bought the idea that the technological revolution has made it impossible for more than a few people to make a living on farms.

Hogwash. The advent of tractors and combines and milking machines meant that a farmer could do the same work in less time. It meant that he could reasonably expect to work about the same hours as his city neighbors in the factories instead of the dark-to-dark routine that was his 30 years ago.

The thing that made it difficult for the farmer to exist was that Government programs cut down his acreage so that he could not produce as much as before and at the same time did not and do not give him a fair price for the products he sells. The Government, right or wrong, chose to set the prices for farm products and the Government set that price too low for the farmer to make a profit.

It is further folly to think that any sizeable number of people can make their living in areas like the Dakota's by means other than farming and selling to the people who farm.

What then do we propose to do with the millions of people Johnson proposes to move off the land. Obviously, they must go to the cities to compete with the people already there for jobs and there aren't enough jobs to go around now. The problems involved in such a migration stagger the imagination.

We should further concern ourselves with the loss to our country of moving the people from the farms and small towns to the huge cities. There is an atmosphere in rural America that cannot be duplicated in the cities. The contribution of rural America to the moral strength of our people cannot be underestimated. Who wants to trade the rural community with its 4-H clubs, churches and schools, where everybody knows each other and is concerned with the welfare of their neighbor and his children, for the concrete jungles, the juvenile gangs and the moral rot that breeds and grows in the large cities?

The hour is late for the people of rural America, and that includes everybody whether they live in the cities or on the farms in the Midwest. The President has made up his mind. Only Congress stands in the way of making the nightmare of the exodus to the cities a reality.

The people, most of whom supported Johnson in the last election, must make it known this is not what they wanted.

Sound Finance and Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am a frequent listener of "Three-Star Extra," the newspaper of the air. I was especially impressed with Ray Henle's remarks on February 1, 1965, and would like to bring them to the attention of my colleagues:

All the indicators seem to say, these days, the big trend on the Continent of Europe is toward sound finance and reliance on profits and private property in a system of enterprise free of government controls.

Many may think this, strangely, is not the dominant trend here in the United States which blazed the way of free enterprise for all the world to behold. But regardless, it is the trend in Europe and most of the countries are making hay along the way.

"Three-Star Extra" pointed out some while ago that President de Gaulle appears to be enjoying his Oympian view of things for the reason that he knows he has cornered plenty of gold and the financial structure of France is in good order.

West Germany has done so fabulously well following the path of sound finance and free enterprise that even the political party which opposes the Erhardt regime, the opposition Socialists, appear to be Socialist in name only. And the Socialists appear to be doing well in politics by proclaiming that Government ownership of industry no longer is part of their creed and as for Marxism—that's out entirely.

The Socialists are getting more like Erhardt's Christian Democrats every day. They no longer rant about nuclear power, no longer oppose rearmament, instead have come out solidly for the concept of NATO. And Socialist Leader Willy Brandt, mayor of Berlin, says, "We shall strive for stable prices and a sound deutsche mark. We shall not touch private property."

Similar allegiances to more right-of-center policies are being seen in Belgium, Luxembourg, and even in some areas of Scandinavia. In England, the Labor Party seems in trouble. Suddenly everyone appears concerned with sound money and with the concept of private initiative and enterprise.

Boy Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Boy Scout Anniversary Week is a most stimulating experience. Seeing the throngs of rugged and enthusiastic youngsters in uniform around Capitol Hill always instills a new confidence in the future of our country. The way things have been going in this old world for the past quarter of a century might ordinarily shake the assurance of those who must inherit the job of carrying on, but hope will rise and mankind in general will enjoy a better life if the philosophy of the Boy Scouts of America is extended and accepted through a greater part of the universe.

No creed can have a higher purpose when it is based on service to God, to country, and to fellow man. From its inception more than half a century ago, the Boy Scout organization has dedicated itself to the teaching of love of God, patriotism, courage, understanding of and consideration for others, and self-reliance. By encouraging youths to achieve excellence in whatever careers their character and ability enable them to qualify, the Scouts have produced outstanding individuals in every field of endeavor.

As one whose love of nature has steadfastly grown from my first memory of walking through the woods with my father, I have a particular admiration for the scouting programs which, by the simple expedient of experience, acquaint these boys with the wondrous gifts our Creator bestowed when he designed forests and mountains and trickling streams, then topped them all with an astronomical arrangement through which heat and energy is provided and stored by day and a magical and brilliant showpiece is unveiled at sundown. To tramp through the woods not only makes for healthy bodies; it develops moral fiber by nurturing an appreciation for the accomplishments of the pioneers who hewed the path that led to the miracle that is today's America.

With the progress that brings more leisure time, hiking and campouts should be encouraged wherever possible. They are infinitely more beneficial to physical and mental development than a young man will find at a soda counter, on a street corner, or behind the wheel of an automobile.

Finally, Mr. Speaker as Scouting principles and activities are practiced elsewhere on the globe, there springs a new hope that our prayers for world freedom and peace may be answered. Annual world jamborees enable young people from across the seas to meet and to know American Scouts and what they stand for. With Scouting available in more and more countries, we may have at last come upon the golden key that will unlock the barriers that divide nationalities and foment disorder among men. If, peradventure, lads brought up under Communist rule have adequate opportunity to become better acquainted with their counterparts in the free world, they may eventually come to recognize and accept the Scout's tenet of duty to God regardless of the athiestic teachings to which they are subjected at home.

It is an honor to honor the Boy Scouts of America.

Civil Defense Shelter Locator System

SPEECH

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the Union County, N.J., Civil Defense-Disaster Control Organization, headed by Col. Charles J. Christian, coordinator, and Jack R. Karel, M.D., deputy coordinator, has just announced the development of what may be the first shelter locator system in the United States.

Developed by Arthur Guarriello, shelter coordinator of Union Township, which is located in the congressional district I am privileged to represent, the shelter locator system is designed to provide an up-to-date and systematic means of keeping track of present and potential shelter facilities and supplies. The value of such a system, as a way of maximizing the usefulness of a shelter system in the event of an emergency, is obvious.

Since this shelter locator system is, so far as is known, the first of its kind in the United States, I feel certain it will be of interest to many of our colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a description of the system, together with samples of the cards used in the system, which were just published in the February 1965 issue of the Minuteman, the newsletter of the Union County Civil Defense-Disaster Control Organization:

SHELTER LOCATOR SYSTEM

As the national fallout shelter program progresses in all counties throughout the United States, millions of dollars of shelter supplies are being stored in our process of preparedness. It is therefore incumbent upon all directors that an accurate and readily available record of all these supplies and shelter facilities be in the municipal civil defense office. Here in Union County we can foresee that in the very near future we will have $1 million of shelter supplies in emergency storage. Lack of essential shelter information in civil defense offices when needed would make shelter operations very difficult.

The Union County Civil Defense and Disaster Control presents, possibly for the first time in the United States, a shelter locator system developed by Arthur Guarriello, shelter coordinator of Union Township. All shelter information is placed on 3- by 5-inch filing cards except that shown on the inspection sheet and inventory record when a 4- by 6-inch card is used. Both sides of the latter is utilized. This card is taken to the shelter as necessary. Also, a large municipal map is used in the control center. Item F is a legal sized file. Location cards are in 10 colors to correspond with colored areas of municipal maps.

A. LICENSED ALPHABETIZED FACILITIES BY TYPE

1. Schools.
2. Public buildings.
3. Churches.
4. Industry and office buildings.
5. Hotel, restaurant, and recreation.
6. Apartments and multiple story buildings.
7. Private residences.

B. POSSIBLE SITES

1. New buildings under construction.
2. Buildings not surveyed or have not been inspected.
3. Other buildings disapproved and recommendations made for modification.

C. STANDARD LOCATION RECORD CARDS

1. Map and boundary designations: (a) Population, daytime, nighttime, number of spaces in area, number of stocked spaces in area.
2. Facility status: Facilities that are licensed and surveyed. Filed by facility number. Complete history of facility. Stocked or not stocked.
3. Facilities not approved and no potential.

D. ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF STREETS

1. Map coordinates.
2. Standard location.

E. MUNICIPAL MAP WITH STANDARD LOCATION CODE AS DESIGNATED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

1. Subareas delineated.
2. Each area showing day and night population.
3. Stocked shelters.
4. Homes-shelters.
5. Shelters not officially approved.
6. Possible shelters.

F. FILE

1. By facility number—each containing all pertinent papers to a specific facility. Inspection sheet and inventory record.
2. By standard location—containing printouts.

Shelter locator system as presented, is now in operation in Union Township.

A

SCHOOLS

Name, location, and facility number

Franklin	2600
Hamilton	2701
Union High	2702
Jefferson	2800
Connecticut Farms	3002
St. Michael's	3103
Kawameeh	3200
Washington	3400

B

Green Lane.
YM and YWHA.

C-1

Location 02600:

Starting at a point at Stuyvesant Avenue and Hillside Avenue east to the Elizabeth River; south on the river to the parkway;

southeast on the parkway to the junction of Vauxhall Road; west on Vauxhall Road to Oakland Avenue to the junction of Stuyvesant Avenue; continue north on Stuyvesant Avenue to the Hillside line:

Daytime population	5460
Nighttime population	5500
Total spaces	235
Total stocked	235

C-3

Facility No. 02601: Stuyvesant Town, Manor Drive, Building No. 2.

PF factor: 1.

Capacity: 10.

C-2

Facility No. 02600: Franklin School, Lindy Terrace.

Capacity: 235. Tonnage: 2183. Cube: 248.

Item:	Quantity	Voucher No.
Biscuit	27	05375
Drum water	47	05375
Sanitation kit	5	05375
Medical kit A	4	05375

In order to add 945 spaces it would cost $5,670 for ventilating and $5,900 for auxiliary power.

D

Aberdeen Road: Map section 3-M, St. Loc. 00 27.

F FRONT

Inspection sheet and inventory record:
Facility number.
Facility address.
Facility name.
Person to be seen and telephone number.
Daytime population.
Nighttime population.
Number of approved spaces.
Number of nonapproved spaces.
PF factor.
Date shelter marked.
Date shelter licensed.
Date of inspection.
Condition of supplies.
Inventory of supplies.
Date facility stocked.
Sketch of shelter available.
Operational plan available.
Date water drums filled—on dunnage.
Date Radef equipment inspected.

F BACK

Inspection sheet and inventory record:
Shelter manager assigned.
Trained staff—position and number.
Potential increases of spaces.
Medical supplies kept from freezing.
FAMP supplies.
Radef kits in secure areas.
Other emergency equipment available.
Trapped water.
Telephone or jack in shelter.
Auxiliary power.
Emergency lighting.
Level of interest in program.
Remarks.
Date of pack and/or date of expiration should be noted.
Food pack.
Medical supplies.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Tallahassee Mound Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, some years ago, I introduced a bill establishing a national monument at St. Marks near Tallahassee. It has figured in Florida history from the earliest days of Spanish exploration and settlement. Now steps are in progress to establish a Tallahassee Mound Park. It is felt that Indian mounds which have been located near Lake Jackson are in the area where De Soto and his men wintered in the year 1539. His priests probably celebrated the first North American Christmas in the vicinity of the Lake Jackson Mounds at Tallahassee.

These mounds are scientifically laid out and once surrounded the village of Anhayea which lay in the center of the Apalachee province. Florida has a rich and rewarding history which dates back further than that of any other part of the United States. Much of it is still comparatively unexplored.

I should like to call attention to an outstanding article entitled "Because Florida History Is Like Salted Peanuts, All Should Help the Tallahassee Mound Park Plans," by Joe Crankshaw, which appeared in the Florida Times-Union, February 7, 1965:

BECAUSE FLORIDA HISTORY IS LIKE SALTED PEANUTS, ALL SHOULD HELP THE TALLAHASSEE MOUND PARK PLANS

(By Joe Crankshaw)

It is heartening to note that although this is February, some interests in and around Tallahassee are still thinking about Christmas. The Christmas in question is, of course, the first celebration of that holiday on the North American Continent which took place somewhere near Florida's capital city.

Historians have known for a long time that Hernando de Soto and his men wintered in the Tallahassee area in the year 1539, and they have long suspected that his priests probably celebrated the first North American Christmas in the vicinity of the Lake Jackson Mounds.

Tallahassee residents used to make some noise about the first Christmas, and this columnist was seeking to jog their memories when he wrote about the momentous event in December of 1963. Since that column appeared, numerous other writers have lent their talents to retelling the once familiar story and a great deal of new interest has been aroused.

But the best news of all appeared in the Tallahassee Democrat on Sunday, January 24. The capital city paper revealed that some persons had been doing more than just scribbling stories about the big event and actually were preparing plans for acquiring the historic site for the public interest.

Frank Deller, of the Tallahassee Chamber of Commerce, which has been a prime backer in attempting to preserve and develop the Lake Jackson Mounds, has met and worked out plans with a number of other important persons.

A comprehensive development plan has been prepared by W. A. Coldwell, planner for the Park Service, and will now be presented to a number of interested agencies. Hopefully the State will be able to purchase the land and contribute something toward its development. But other agencies and private groups will have to help if the project is to be successfully completed.

The most important work which will be done, however, will be the complete and competent investigation of the mound area by historians and archeologists. The mounds—there are several of them—are scientifically laid cut and once surrounded the village of Anhayea which lay in the center of the Apalachee province.

Most U.S. citizens get their history from books which are unfortunately oriented to the Pilgrim Fathers and often downgrade the vital development of the other Colonies and Florida. Both Virginia and the Sunshine State have histories far older than the cold New England areas.

The average tourist knows, for instance, that St. Augustine is the oldest city in the United States as far as continued existence is concerned, but very few of them realize the full extent of Florida's rich and rewarding history.

The celebration of Christmas in 1539 is just one of the many, relatively unknown facts of Florida's 400-plus years of Europeanized history on which no one is capitalizing, and about which this State is making little noise.

Some persons, particularly those who like to think of themselves as practical, will no doubt ask why anyone would be interested in working around a group of dirt piles in which he most certainly will find little of material value. These same people will also wonder what the State is doing assisting such an operation.

Pragmatists will not be satisfied with the answer that some knowledge is gathered only for the sake of knowing it, and they will see little information which can be garnered form the mounds which would have a modern application; but like the expeditions scheduled to go to the moon and elsewhere, no one knows what values will result until the trips are done.

On a more realistic vein, development of the mound area as a park will increase the number of scenic attractions and outdoor recreation areas available to the public.

Floridians who live in areas other than the one which will be directly benefited may feel that development of the mound area is no concern of theirs, but they will be very wrong. Historical groups throughout the State ought to speak up for the Tallahassee project, for indirectly they will also benefit from a successful project.

Florida is, as a Miami Herald editorial writer once observed, a State with "end-to-end history." The significance of that fact should not be lost on anyone whether he is in the tourist trade, the attractions business, or just one of the myriad other occupations in the State.

This State's history is like a can of salted and roasted peanuts; once you eat "just one" it often happens that you can't stop and must consume more. Just so it is with Florida history; a good sample often whets the appetite for more of the same.

Finally, Florida has the oldest city in St. Augustine, and it ought to fasten its claim to the first Christmas quite firmly in the people's minds.

Newsletter to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith a copy of volume 2, issue No. 1 of my newsletter to constituents, which will be mailed next week. The newsletter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1965.

WASHINGTON, D.C.—As the Representative in the U.S. Congress for our 13th Congressional District of Illinois during the 88th Congress (1963–64), I prepared and mailed periodic reports on the work of the Congress, the conduct of the Federal Government, and my efforts as your Congressman. Because of the favorable response to these communications, I will continue these reports during the 1965–66 sessions of Congress to inform interested residents (these reports are available to anyone in the 13th District on request) of some of the activities of the Federal Government which I feel are of special interest, and to present a discussion of important measures before Congress and the viewpoints of your Representative.

In addition, it is hoped that these reports will encourage you to voice your views on the national problems affecting the future and well-being of our Nation, or to seek assistance from your Congressman, your link with the Federal Government, on problems relating to the Federal Government. For a prompt response to any communication, whether written or by phone, please use the above Washington, D.C., address. The 13th District office in Winnetka, which is open during congressional recesses, is not equipped to handle congressional business. These reports are financed by contributions from residents of the 13th District and by me, and are mailed under the "frank," a Member's mailing privilege under his responsibility to keep his constituents informed.

THE 89TH CONGRESS BEGINS

While there is no crystal ball to predict the future, the President's state of the Union message and budget proposals, coupled with the overwhelming Democrat control (more than 2 to 1) in both Houses of Congress, lead any reasonable man to the conclusion that a majority of the administration's numerous requests will become law. Already, Presidential messages have been sent to Congress on health (and also the closing of the veterans' hospitals), education (raising the many difficult questions of church-state relationship), immigration, foreign aid, national defense, presidential succession, home rule for the District of Columbia, farm policy, conservation of natural and human resources, to mention but a few. Additional messages

are being received almost daily, and the committees of the Congress are beginning hearings, debate, and discussion on these and other matters.

Vietnam, the Bobby Baker scandal, the Congo, an expanded war on poverty, repeal of section 14B of the Taft-Hartley law, civil rights, excise taxes, transportation, urban redevelopment, air and water pollution, and legislative reorganization will unquestionably continue to be debated and possibly acted upon by the 89th Congress, as the Nation weighs the meaning of President Johnson's frequently used phrase, "the Great Society."

Obviously, many of the goals are commendable. However, under the Constitution, the Congress has the responsibility to legislate—to propose, examine, and shape any programs devised to achieve these goals. To fulfill this responsibility, the Congress has an obligation to act as the truly great deliberative body it is credited with being, and not as a mere rubberstamp. All proposals should be evaluated for their intrinsic merit, their cost, and their relationship to our system of government. It is my conviction that we have a Great Society. It is our task as Americans to strengthen and improve it, and vigorously prevent its destruction or deterioration.

CHANGES IN LEADERSHIP

The first official act of each new Congres, after the swearing in of the Members, is to organize the House and Senate and select party leadership. This process is usually accomplished without controversy, but this year opening day was the culmination of many weeks of campaigning by candidates for the post of Senate Democrat whip to replace newly elected Vice President HUMPHREY, and for the position of House Republican leader.

On the Senate side, after a stiff fight, the unbelievable happened. Fresh from an overwhelming presidential and Senate victory (68 Democrats to 32 Republicans), the Senate Democrats, with the support of many so called liberal Democrats, elected as their new whip, Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, who last year opposed and filibustered against the Civil Rights Act and who also voted against the limited nuclear test ban treaty, two of the major issues in the 1964 campaign. House Democrats also elected their whip from among those who had opposed the civil rights bill of 1964—Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana. Illinois' distinguished Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN was unanimously reelected to guide Senate Republicans as minority leader.

On the House side, Illinois senior Congressman, LESLIE ARENDS, was reelected to the important post of minority whip with the solid support of our Illinois GOP delegation, and Congressman MEL LAIRD, of Wisconsin, was elected chairman of the Republican conference. Congressman GERALD FORD, of Michigan, was elected minority leader of the House replacing highly respected Representative CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana. The following excerpts from Representative FORD's statement on announcing his candidacy for the leadership post contain some of my reasons for supporting FORD:

"In the past 33 years there has been but one 2-year period in which the Republican Party has controlled both the White House and the Congress at the same time. We have come to a point in history where fine citizens of all political faiths all over the country are gravely concerned about the very survival of the two-party system. We must begin a new chapter with new ideas, new spirit, and new leadership.

"The vitality of the two-party system, and indeed the strength of our form of government, will be severely tested in the months ahead. How our Republican minority conducts itself during the next 2 years will be crucial in determining the future of our party and the two-party system. Every Republican Congressman, charged with this heavy responsibility, wants our party to be dynamic and positive. We can become the majority party only if we in the House effectively represent and promote the best hopes and aspirations of the American people for themselves and for their country.

"We have within our Republican ranks a great wealth of talent, energy, and dedication. When properly channeled and utilized to the fullest, this talent will promote and communicate the image of a fighting, forward-looking party seeking responsible and constructive solutions to national problems. By finding ways to better utilize these impressive talents through new techniques and bold leadership, by a willingness to try new ideas, by leading rather than simply reacting, we can and we must develop the respect and the support of the American people. I am convinced that meaningful changes must be made now for the benefit of our Republican Party and the preservation of our two-party system."

At the request of Representative FORD, I have been serving on the GOP conference committee called the Quie committee on organization and structure of the Republicans in the House. Many of the recommendations of our committee have already been adopted and implemented with additional recommendations to be forthcoming in the hope that these changes will help to make our party a more effective instrument for government.

NEW COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

I have been named again to the Science and Astronautics (Space) Committee of the House. This committee has jurisdiction over National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs involving more than $5 billion annually or approximately 5 percent of the Federal budget, as well as astronautical and scientific research and development, the Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, and science scholarships. Committee membership is 31—21 Democrats and 10 Republicans.

Also, I have been appointed to the Committee on Government Operations, the chief investigating committee of the House, which has broad jurisdiction over almost all activities of Government and includes consideration of reorganization plans affecting the executive branch, acting on Government Accounting Office reports on misuse of public funds, and studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member. This 34-man committee is composed of 23 Democrats and 11 Republicans. My work on this committee will include service on the Moss Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information and also service as the ranking Republican on the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.

SEATING OF THE MISSISSIPPI CONGRESSMEN

The first major issue before the new Congress was the question of seating the Mississippi congressional delegation. There is little question but that residents of some areas of this Nation, despite the 1964 Civil Rights Act, are being systematically denied their constitutional right to vote because they are Negroes. However, to have opposed seating all elected Mississippi Congressmen, without a hearing or an investigation, and thereby deny a State its representation in Congress, would have been unreasonable and would have established a dangerous precedent. For this reason and others, I supported the position taken by both the Democrat and Republican leadership favoring the seating of the Mississippi delegation.

However, because of my strong conviction that no citizen should be denied, because of the color of his skin, his right to vote, I have urged an investigation of the denial of the right to vote and in addition have cosponsored a bill (H.R. 4556) which would provide for Federal action where a pattern or practice of racial discrimination in voter registrations is demonstrated. Whether or not the Democrat-controlled Congress will permit hearings to be held on this proposal remains to be seen. Hopefully they will move expeditiously to assure that all Americans are permitted to exercise this precious right.

HOUSE RULE CHANGES

Regrettably, many reports of the controversy concerning rules changes were grossly oversimplified and misleading. The Democrats, with a more than 2-to-1 control of the House (295 Democrats to 140 Republicans) met a few days before this vote was taken and agreed to three rules changes: (a) a 21-day rule on reporting legislation to the House for action at the request of the Speaker; (b) permitting a bill to be sent to conference regardless of objection; and (c) prohibiting the delaying tactic of demanding the reading of an engrossed copy of a bill before the final vote.

Republicans decided to offer additional rule changes, including (a) equal time for the minority in debating conference reports—now all time is controlled by the majority; (b) an opportunity for minority members to include their views in the printed House-Senate conference reports; and (c) increased minority staffing on committees. The Democrats moved to cut off debate to deny the Republicans an opportunity to offer their proposed changes. The only vote that was taken was on the previous question; namely, whether or not to cut off debate. I voted "no." The vote was yeas 224, nays 201. Yet this vote was reported as being for or against the rule changes.

The fact is that a majority of the Republicans planned to support a majority of the changes being offered by the Democrats, but did not have an opportunity to vote on them because of the steamroller tactics. The early days of this session have given many cause to recall Alexis de Tocqueville's warning about the dangers of a "tyranny of the majority."

U.S. AID TO NASSER

For some years, the United States has been giving aid and assistance of various types to the United Arab Republic. Last year I spoke and voted against continued assistance to Nasser under Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program, because of my conviction that our aid was enabling and, in fact, encouraging Nasser to reallocate his resources, conduct a trade agreement with the U.S.S.R. to build up a modern war machine, continue the Yemen war, and create unrest in the Middle East in direct opposition to announced U.S. foreign policy goals. At that time, we lost, and aid to Nasser was continued.

This year I again spoke out, in early January, urging termination of our aid to Nasser under Public Law 480. If anything, the arguments against continuing such aid are even stronger today when one considers Nasser's continued aggressions and his assistance to the rebels in the Congo. President Johnson, however, seems determined to continue this aid and in requesting "Presidential discretion" to deal with the matter, asked for additional funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation to finance this aid. In an attempt to assure passage of the measure, the bill was called up with great haste, and, regrettably, I was away from Washington participating in a series of seminars. However, to the shock of the administration, an amendment to the appropriation bill was passed denying further aid to Nasser. In the Senate, a similar amendment was rejected, thus forcing the bill to a House-Senate conference.

On February 8, a motion was offered to instruct the House conferees to uphold the House ban on Public Law 480 aid to Nasser. I supported this motion, but Presidential pressure was apparently sufficient to switch a number of votes, and, regrettably, the final vote was yeas 204, nays 177. And so closes the book on another year of U.S. aid to Nasser of millions of your tax dollars. One would think that if so many Members so readily recognize the impact of Presidential pressures on them that they would switch their votes, that they would also recognize the distinct possibility that similar administration pressures on Nasser might have an equally significant impact.

OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO THE 13TH DISTRICT

A fine American and dedicated public servant recently returned to private life, and, with his departure the veterans of this Nation lost the services of an able and effective friend. Mr. John S. Gleason, Jr., of Winnetka, was appointed in 1961 by the late President John F. Kennedy, to serve as Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. He has spent the past 4 years in his Nation's service demonstrating the wisdom of that appointment. We regret his departure from Washington, but welcome him back to the 13th District.

Our 13th District, possibly for the first time in recent history, is now represented in the official U.S. Marine Corps Band. Sgt. John B. Richardson, of Wilmette, Ill., a skilled musician, was selected to join this top unit late last year, and since coming to Washington, D.C., has performed at numerous official functions, including the recent inauguration ceremonies.

I am gratified to report that the GOP Members of Congress elected in 1962 have selected me to serve as chairman of the 88th club here in Washington. There is a great deal that our Republican minority, although small in numbers, can do to help assure that Government truly serves the people, and we look forward to a challenging year ahead.

Competitive nominations for appointments to West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force Academy, and the Merchant Marine Academy were announced by my office last month. Final selections are now being made by the respective academies and should be announced late in April. My selections were based solely on merit and the keen competition for the openings available resulted in an unusually high caliber of nominee. Applications for appointments to the U.S. service academies' classes commencing in the summer of 1966 are now being received in my Washington office.

RADIO "REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON"

My weekly radio reports on the work of the Congress are back on the air. Programs thus far this year have included discussions of the various proposals for health care for the aged, the question of the seating of the Mississippi delegation, the House rules changes, and a visit with Bruce Ladd, a resident of Arlington Heights who is in Washington, D.C., with the highly regarded congressional fellowship program sponsored by the American Political Science Association. These weekly reports on topics of current interest are broadcast as a public service by the following Illinois stations:

WEAW-AM, Evanston (1330 kilocycles): Fridays at 2:45 p.m.

WEAW-FM, Evanston (105 megacycles): Fridays at 8:45 p. m.

WNWC-FM, Arlington Heights (92.7 megacycles): Fridays at 6:45 p.m.

WNTH-FM, Winnetka (88.1 megacycles): Wednesdays at 5:15 p.m.

In addition, Congressman ROBERT MCCLORY, of Lake County, Ill., and I participate in a weekly public service broadcast by WEEF, of Highland Park (AM 1430 kilocycles and FM 103.1 megacycles).

A PERSONAL NOTE

Two years ago last month, as I began my service as your Representative in Congress, I took the oath of office and assumed the responsibilities of this high post. As I repeated those words last month, I reaffirmed my pledge to represent every resident of our 13th district, and our Nation, energetically, responsibly, with dedication, and to the fullest of my capabilities. As the Congress considers the major national and international issues, your counsel is invited. I, in turn, shall continue to endeavor to keep you informed through periodic newsletters, radio reports, frequent visits back to Illinois, and personal correspondence. I'll look forward to hearing from you.

OATH OF OFFICE OF MEMBER OF CONGRESS

"I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

DONALD RUMSFELD.

A Tribute to a Noble Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding citizens of Los Angeles, Mr. James E. Rogers, director of the Watts Community Center, is resigning to assume new duties elsewhere. His contributions to the betterment of our community are so significant that I could not forgo the opportunity to join with the Mother's Guild of the center in paying tribute to him and wishing him well in his new assignment.

This testimonial can be expressed no more feelingly than in the encomium of the Mother's Guild, which follows:

In honor of your fine years of service at the Watts Community Center of the Catholic Youth Organization, the Mother's Guild and Las Alumnas wish to thank you. Under your leadership we in the community have made much progress. Our loss is great but we feel that you must go on from here to greater things. You have served us with dignity and humility; for this we are grateful. The years you have spent among us will always be cherished.

Not only have we and our children benefited from your service, but the community as a whole. You have shared our every joy and sorrow. You have encouraged us when there seemed to be no hope. You have helped us to make our community a better place in which to live. You have taught, not by words but by the greatest of teaching devices, that of example. Years from now the seeds of your work shall bear fruit. We know that you love the portion of Pericles' of Athens famous memorial speech which best sums up how we feel about you: "So they gave their bodies to the commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with the greatest of all sepulchers, not that which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of man, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulcher of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives."

Mr. Rogers, we salute you and wish God's blessing upon you in your new job. Thank you for all that you have given.

Preservation of Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored legislation which would provide for the acquisition and preservation of the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site. Theodore Roosevelt took his oath of office here as President of the United States on September 14, 1901, following President McKinley's assassination. It is one of only four sites outside Washington, D.C., where the Presidential oath has been administered. Prior to President Roosevelt's association with it, this house has a long and distinguished history.

In addition to its historical significance, the Ansley Wilcox House is an example of postcolonial architecture, and has been recommended by the American Institute of Architects as a building that should be preserved.

A very timely article written by Jean Reeves appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on February 13, 1965, which gives us a good insight of the man who lived there for nearly 50 years—Ansley Wilcox.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article, which follows:

WARM, DEDICATED MAN: MR. WILCOX LEFT MARK ON BUFFALO

(By Jean Reeves)

The Wilcox House, at 641 Delaware Avenue, will be, so long as it stands, a memorial to two men whose lives were object lessons in good citizenship.

One was, of course, Theodore Roosevelt, who took the Presidential oath there September 14, 1901. A local committee is working now to assure preservation of the house as a national historic site in his memory.

The other good citizen was Ansley Wilcox. He lived there for nearly 50 years and left his impress on the dwelling and deep in the mind and heart of his adopted city.

Mr. Roosevelt came almost by accident to the house as a guest in the dark days after the assassination of President McKinley.

Mr. Wilcox, a friend through political associations, had met the Vice President purely by chance as he arrived at the old Iroquois Hotel, September 7, 1901, the day after the shooting.

Mr. Wilcox offered the hospitality of his home, and the Vice President gratefully accepted.

So when the President died it was natural that the ceremony, hurriedly planned, should take place in the Wilcox home. The new President wore a frock coat borrowed from his host, a memento given a few days later

by Mr. Wilcox to the Buffalo Historical Society.

Although Buffalonians know the Wilcox home and bits of its history, few are familiar with the man whose name it bears.

Old records at the Buffalo & Erie County Historical Society hint at the kind of man he was. Though the scope of Mr. Wilcox's activity as a citizen was narrower than Mr. Roosevelt's, it was no less dedicated.

And his concern for his fellow men went beyond laws into the fabric of their lives.

As an attorney immersed in law, Mr. Wilcox recognized early that municipal government was the one conspicuous failure in this country. He worked all his life in municipal reform movements.

He worked, too, for the revision of State laws and in investigations of misuse of public authority.

In a very human and private way, Mr. Wilcox often acted where the law was helpless.

He constantly bought up mortgages of families who were about to lose their homes, carrying the debts along until those men and women could find some way out of their financial troubles.

As a boy of 20, living with his sister and brother-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. George P. Sawyer, in Allen Street, Mr. Wilcox sat in on the organization meeting of the Charity Organization Society (now the Family Service Society).

What he heard sank deep into his soul, and he served the society throughout his life.

His concept of charity was not the almsgiving variety. He believed that men should be helped when they needed help but that a job was what most men wanted.

He was the sponsor of the plan for building the old Scajaquada Creek Boulevard early in the century.

It was described by a writer later as "a road built entirely by the strength of men's arms * * * and at a time when thousands in the city wanted and needed a job more than anything else in the world." This was in the wake of the 1907 depression.

Ansley Wilcox was born in Summerville, Ga., January 27, 1856, the son of Daniel Hand and Frances Louisa Wilcox. He was a descendant of John Willcocks, an Englishman who settled in Hartford, Conn., in 1636.

As a boy of 9, he sold one of his father's horses and tried to run away from home to join the Confederate Army.

"This was amusing in more ways than one," a friend of the family said many years later. "He who was later on to become the most inveterate enemy of slavery in all its forms, was determined as a boy to throw himself into the front ranks of its defense."

Not long after the incident, Mrs. Wilcox and her five children made their way through the lines to the North. It was a dangerous and difficult trip but one marked by "exceeding courtesy of treatment from soldiers on both sides," Mrs. Wilcox recalled.

As a youth, Mr. Wilcox distinguished himself both in scholastic work—he was through Yale College at 18—and in physical exploits. He won the intercollegiate sculling championship in Lake Saratoga while a student.

After a short course at Oxford University, England, Mr. Wilcox settled in Buffalo, and in 1878, was admitted to the New York bar.

On January 28 of that year, Mr. Wilcox married Cornelia C. Rumsey, member of a prominent Buffalo family. Mrs. Wilcox died in 1880 after the birth of their child, Nina, and in 1883 Mr. Wilcox married her sister, Mary Grace Rumsey. They were parents of a daughter, Frances.

Mrs. Nina Wilcox Bull has lived in New York for many years. Frances, later Mrs. Thomas F. Cooke, died in 1955.

The family moved into the house at 641 Delaware in the early 1880's and was active in the city's social life.

Mr. Wilcox, with the aid of a noted Buffalo architect George Cary, rebuilt the house. The portico was moved from the eastern end and added to the Delaware Avenue entrance. The two front parlors were joined to make one large library and a cellar was built.

But Mr. Wilcox very carefully preserved the historic features of the house and its Greek revival architecture.

As a corporation lawyer and as a speaker, Mr. Wilcox was well known. He was one of the counsel assisting in the entrance of the West Shore Railway into Buffalo in 1882. He was a legal adviser for the commission appointed in 1883 by Grover Cleveland, then governor, to acquire the land for the New York State Reservation at Niagara Falls.

In *Rogers* v. *The City of Buffalo*, Mr. Wilcox established the constitutionality of the civil service law, and in 1891 he carried to the U.S. Supreme Court the Briggs-Spaulding case, involving the duties of directors of national banks and their liability for negligence.

The Buffalonian headed the jury reform movement which led to the adoption of the New York jury law in 1895, under which a commissioner of jurors was appointed by the judges.

Governor Roosevelt named him to hear charges brought in 1900 against a district attorney of New York County. He also served on a committee about that time investigating complaints of cruelty to prisoners at the Elmira State Reformatory.

A new health law was enacted after a commission on which he served examined the public health laws of the State in 1913–14.

Mr. Wilcox also is credited with developing the idea of holding city and county elections in odd-numbered years and State elections in even-numbered years to "free municipal governments from politics." The suggestion was adopted at the New York State Constitutional Convention of 1894 and was widely copied by other States.

From 1885 to 1906 he served in the chair of medical jurisprudence at the University of Buffalo.

An intimate friend of Grover Cleveland, he was one of the original "Mugwumps"—independent Republicans who refused to support James G. Blaine and rallied to Cleveland, aiding in his election to the Presidency the first time in 1884.

Mr. Wilcox retired from law practice in 1917 to devote himself to philanthropic pursuits.

Mr. Wilcox died January 26, 1930. At a memorial service, the late Supreme Court Justice Daniel J. Keneficke said of him:

"The ties of political parties sat upon him loosely * * * at no time was he hidebound in his loyalties or a blind follower of the opinions of his party when opposed to his own clear ideas. He would not barter the integrity of his soul to preserve party loyalty."

Judge Kenefick noted, in eulogy, that Mr. Wilcox's natural abilities and industry could have carried him nearer the top in his profession and earned him greater financial rewards but "his philosophy of life took another and less selfish direction."

Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Marvin Haught is a sophomore in the Huntsville, Ark., High School and one of our young leaders of today and certainly one of the leaders of tomorrow. He has written what I think to be a wonderful poem, entitled "Freedom." As a tribute to him and an encouragement to him, I include his poem in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FREEDOM

The sun never sets on Old Glory,
As the globe rotates around,
For it is flown in almost every land,
At sea and on the ground.

Men have fought to keep her flying,
Have died within her sight,
With their blood imprinted her meaning,
In every corner that the sun does light.

First fought for independence,
Next, in the civil strife,
Also in two, great World Wars,
And now for Western life.

Let's hallow these brave heroic men,
Who gave their lives for freedom,
And keep their beliefs unchanged and unaltered
For every free nation and kingdom.

Let us fight to keep their convictions,
That in God's sight we're right,
And let us not in the future,
Treat our keeping power with slight.

Keep His name on all our money,
In our songs and in our schools,
Let His name resound throughout the land,
Like ripples in a pool.

—MARVIN HAUGHT.

We Call on Ol' Abe Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, one of Chicago's best known and best liked citizens is popular, urbane, sophisticated "Kup," whose daily newspaper columns are widely read. His annual conversations with beloved President Abraham Lincoln are highly regarded, and I present the most recent one for the enjoyment of my colleagues:

WE CALL ON OL' ABE AGAIN

This is our annual pilgrimage to an old and treasured friend who endures, 156 years after his humble birth, as the man who has affected most profoundly the lives, thoughts, attitudes, and actions of modern America. Abe Lincoln remains, in death, as powerful an influence as he was in life. His comments and observations are as timely today as when he occupied the White House five score years ago. Time hasn't altered Mr. Lincoln much. We found him swaying gently to and fro in his rocking chair.

"Come right in," called out ol' Abe. He always maintained an open door policy for reporters who often dropped in at the White House unannounced to chat with him. "What's on your mind this year?" * * * "Mr. President, we have a man in the White House today who believes in operating the Government on consensus. Do you approve?"

"Perhaps," replied Mr. Lincoln, "I was the first 'consensus' President. I believe the true function of a leader in a democracy is not to impose his will but to lead when he can, wait when he must, explain and persuade whenever possible, but always, in the

end, to accept the judgment of the people and their representatives when they have considered and disposed. The idealist will lose the whole loaf rather than be satisfied with half of it; whereas the successful politician learns to be content with whatever part of his program he can get, and hopes to get more later."

"The man in the White House today is waging war on poverty. Does that bring back any memories?" * * * "Permit me to recall what I said in a speech in Cincinnati exactly 104 years ago today: 'I hold that while man exists it is his duty to improve not only his own condition, but to assist in ameliorating mankind's; and, therefore, without entering upon the details of the present problems, I will simply say that I always was for those means which will give the greatest good to the greater number.' "

"Along the same lines, Mr. Lincoln, the current President wants to uplift the Nation to a Great Society." * * * "Every President since George Washington, urged a similar goal. Read their inauguration addresses and you will find the same ambition expressed in various ways. I said it this way 'We propose to give all a chance, and we expect the weak to grow stronger, the ignorant to grow wiser; and all better and happier together.' "

"Mr. Lincoln, you were the dominant figure in the Nation's first crisis in race relations. Do you foresee the full solution to this problem?" * * * "It will come with Negro education. And it will come only after whites and blacks gradually live themselves out of their old relation to each other."

"There is grave concern thoughout the land that the moral fiber of America is weakening, Mr. President, that we are losing sight of the virtues that made his Nation great."

"I heard it in my time, too," ol' Abe responded. "What I said then applies today: 'There is something of an ill omen amongst us * * * the growing disregard for law, which pervades the country. Accounts of outrages committed by mobs form the everyday news of the times. How shall we fortify against it? Let reverence for the law be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap; let it be taught in schools and colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpits, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts.' "

"You were one of the foremost attractions, thanks to the magic of Walt Disney, at the New York World's Fair last summer. Did you welcome this, Mr. President?" * * * "I will tell you what I told the planners for my inauguration, who insisted I stop at a hotel in Washington: 'I supose I am now public property; and I should be in a place where the people can have access to me.' "

"One more question, Mr. President. Your use of punctuation long has puzzled scholars." * * * "With educated people, I suppose, the punctuation is a matter of rule; with me, it is a matter of feeling. But I must say I have great respect for the semicolon; it's a useful little chap."

"Thank you, Mr. President; and happy birthday."

Rates of Political Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the House on Tuesday of last week in connection with consideration of the so-called gold reserve bill, H.R. 3818, I made certain statements and charges as to why we are in our present unsatisfactory monetary situation with which many of my colleagues may have disagreed. So, in support of that which I said and for the enlightenment of all Members of the House, I have asked unanimous consent to extend herewith my own remarks and include herein the following editorial entitled "Rates of Political Interest," from the Wall Street Journal of Friday, February 12:

RATES OF POLITICAL INTEREST

While the administration understandably feels it has a substantial political stake in continued boom, it must be questioned whether some of its policies are not shortsighted even for political purposes.

A principal policy, or bias, favors easy money, and it is now once again reaffirmed as Great Society doctrine. President Johnson has let it be known that he opposes any marked increase in interest rates or other tightening of credit. Insofar as his attitude affects the country's international balance of payments, his message this week shows he prefers the tightening the screws on U.S. tourists and on Americans who buy foreign securities or make certain bank loans abroad.

In part Mr. Johnson's sentiment presumably reflects the old time belief that higher interest rates help the bankers and hurt the little man. In part its reflects fear that credit tightening would dampen the economic expansion with who knows what consequences at the polls.

The opposition to credit restraint is not exactly unanimous, even within the Government. Some officials in the administration and the Federal Reserve System believe harder money might be a good idea, if not indeed a necessity, both as a partial remedy for the balance-of-payments deficit and a deterrent to financial excesses in the domestic economy. There are ample reasons for concern on both counts.

At home we find bank failures cropping up, admittedly few and far between at this point. Home foreclosures have been on the rise and are now at their highest level since 1939. Also growing are the number of risky, speculative loans stemming from the easy availability of money. The vaunted price stability of recent years—which means prices have been going up but not awfully much—is showing indications of strain.

These are warning signs, not necessarily the onset of major illness. They flash the message as plainly as possible that imbalances exist which must be corrected before they get out of hand. And they underscore the point that no amount of easy money is going to save those, whether bankers or little people, who fail in business or encounter difficulties because ease has led them into imprudence.

The same emphatically goes for the international-payments problem. Easy money, coupled with the other inflationary policies of extravagant Federal spending and unending deficit financing, is a prime cause of the chronic deficit, which late last year again reached proportions alarming even to Washington. Credit restraint, and financial restraint in general, is a classic response to balance-of-payments difficulties.

It would therefore seem evident that more easy money is not likely to solve the payments problem; it is more likely to aggravate the problem and negate the palliatives the money managers keep thinking up.

A number of such devices are picayune at best; thus the payments message calls for cutting further the exemption on tourist buying of foreign wares. Other gimmicks are verging closer and closer to exchange control; the President wants to extend for 2 years the tax on American purchases of foreign securities and he has decreed the tax applicable to oversea bank loans with maturities of more than 1 year. The control mentality is clearly a far more unrewarding and dictatorial approach than a restriction of the money pool itself.

What then of the supposedly expansion-curbing effects of monetary and fiscal restraint? The right answer, we suspect, is that the people who blissfully imagine an economic expansion can go on expanding safely forever without pause or correction have been badly misguided. Perhaps the most pernicious policy prevalent in official circles today is precisely this naive notion that the Federal Government has finally found the key to uniterrupted boom.

How little the officials have to go on—a few short years out of all the gyrations of economic history. How much they close their eyes to—the piling of absurdity upon economic absurdity, and those persistent warning signals at home and abroad.

Given appropriate circumstances and policies, the fluctuations of past business cycles unquestionably can be moderated, and have been so far in the postwar period. But they have been moderated largely by moderation in the business community. They will not be prevented by an economic philosophy which assumes all is for the taking and nothing for the paying.

If it be true, then, that easy money and its equally loose companion policies can be counted on neither to preserve the dollar's international standing nor to underwrite perpetual domestic prosperity, the political aspect of the whole matter may merit another look. A mild economic correction coinciding with an election period might well lose votes, but the Government in power would stand to lose more in the event its own policies brought on worse trouble.

Were we in the political business, we are not at all sure we would consider our interests best served by promoting the moment's ease without thought to what payments the months or years ahead might unkindly demand.

Publisher Harry Kates, of Gladewater, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of our splendid publishers in east Texas passed away in December. We of the Gladewater and east Texas area deeply appreciated Harry Kates. We lament his passing. To his family and friends I express my sympathy. I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Longview Daily News, December 3, 1964, concerning the passing of Mr. Kates:

FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

The western Gregg County and Gladewater area has lost a valued friend and public benefactor in the death of Harry Kates, publisher of the Gladewater Daily Mirror. We, here in Longview, join his many friends throughout Texas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma in mourning his passing due to a heart attack suffered shortly after a Thanksgiving Day family reunion.

Mr. Kates, who has published the Gladewater Mirror for the past 10 years, had a long and varied career in the newspaper field. He was recognized in 1963 by the Texas Press Association for 50 years of service in the newspaper field. He was recog-

nized in 1963 by the Texas Press Association for 50 years of service in the newspaper profession, a recognition he had earned by dedicated and resourceful work.

He was a native of Claremore, Okla., the son of the late Mr. and Mrs. A. L. Kates, a pioneer Oklahoma family. His parents purchased the Claremore Progress in 1893, years before that territory was admitted to the Union as a State, and operated it for many years.

In 1938, Harry and his brother, the late Bill Kates, purchased the Progress. Harry acquired his brother's interest in 1941 and operated the newspaper until 1947 when it was sold. Harry then purchased three southeastern Oklahoma weekly newspapers, the Broken Arrow Ledger, Jenks News, and Bixby Bulletin, which he published for 5 years. He owned and published the Winn Parish (La.) Enterprise and daily Winnfield News-American for a period prior to purchase of the Gladewater Mirror in 1954.

Across the decade we had known our neighbor publisher, we had observed his hard work and dedication to duty—not only to his business but in a much broader sense to the city and community which the Mirror served. Though recently in ill health, he was restless when not at his office. His first thoughts always were given to the job of giving the community the best newspaper possible under the circumstances.

He also was active, as his personal circumstances would permit, in the Gladewater Chamber of Commerce, the American Legion, and the Presbyterian Church. Through his newspaper he encouraged and supported countless community service enterprises and organizations, all of which contribute to community progress and welfare.

It is to the credit of his family and associates that his service to the community was carried on with diligence and purpose well beyond his own personal endurance and strength and, as he had hoped and planned, will continue to serve the Gladewater area faithfully and well.

All of us here in Gregg County and east Texas will continue to hold him in honoring memory for the long and distinguished service he has rendered as a publisher, as an enterprising citizen, and a dedicated family head. Despite the physical weakness and limitations to which we all are subject, it can be said of our neighbor publisher: Well done, Harry Kates.

The Jenkins Farce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of February 10 carried an editorial regarding the Bobby Baker case. The time is long overdue for the completion of this investigation and the American public is holding the Congress of the United States up to ridicule for the political shenanigans involved. This editorial correctly asks the question: "How stupid is the public supposed to be?"

The editorial referred to is as follows:

THE JENKINS FARCE

The latest antic in the Senate Rules Committee's investigation of Walter Jenkins, former Presidential aid, is an affront to the intelligence of the public.

Republican members of the committee have tried hard to find out what connection, if any, Jenkins had with an alleged kickback on the premium for a large life insurance policy sold by Don B. Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance man, to Lyndon B. Johnson when the latter was majority leader of the Senate. They also wanted to question him generally about his relationship with Bobby Baker. Reynolds testified he was pressured by Jenkins into buying useless advertising time on the LBJ network in Texas, and produced canceled checks to prove that he did buy the time. Jenkins gave a sworn statement to committee investigators denying any knowledge of arrangements for the purchase of the time. Whatever the precise meaning of this, the Democrats controlling the committee refused to call Jenkins so that he could be cross-examined. Apparently they have made no other effort to clear up this point.

Now, we are told, it is too late. Following Jenkins' arrest on a morals charge last fall, the committee did an about-face and issued a subpena calling upon him to appear and testify under oath. But Jenkins did not appear. Instead, his attorney and his psychiatrists showed up. The attorney is reported to have told the committee that Jenkins wanted to testify. But the psychiatrists raised all manner of objections. They said he might have to be carried away in an ambulance if put on the stand, that his health might be gravely injured, that it would be dangerous to have a committee-chosen psychiatrist examine him, and that there was no telling when, if ever, his condition would permit him to be questioned by the committee, even in closed session.

So now this remarkable committee has come up with a remarkable substitute. It will draft a list of written questions for Jenkins to answer, presumably with no threat to his health. But even here there is a catch. This list of questions will have to be approved by the Democratic majority, and this makes it virtually certain that there will not be even one searching question on it.

How stupid is the public supposed to be?

Boy Scout Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the 55th anniversary of scouting in America was observed on February 3 at city hall, Perthy Amboy, with area Scouts participating at the meeting of the city commission.

John J. Wolczanski, one of Middlesex County's outstanding civic leaders, was chairman of the program, and 14-year-old Joel Greenwald, of 23 Elm Avenue, Fords, presided as "mayor."

The theme of the Boy Scout program was "To Make Better Citizens and Leaders of Tomorrow." This was an appropriate theme, because the Boy Scouts have made—and will continue to make—better citizens and leaders of the future, with their varied and constructive programs and activities.

I have a particular interest in Boy Scout affairs, because the Boy Scouts of America national headquarters are located in North Brunswick, N.J., which is part of the district I have the honor to represent. Scouts are great assets.

I would like to insert three of the newspaper articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that covered the week's Scout activities.

The first article—"Boy Scout Day at City Hall, Perth Amboy, N.J., February 3"—was published in the Polish Ameriman Weekly, of Perth Amboy, on January 28, 1965. It follows:

BOY SCOUT DAY AT CITY HALL, PERTH AMBOY, N.J., FEBRUARY 3

PERTH AMBOY, N.J.—In observance of the 55th anniversary of Boy Scouts of America, a Boy Scout Day will be held on Wednesday, February 3, 1965, at the city commissioner's chamber, city hall, Perth Amboy, N.J. The Boy Scout movement was founded on February 8, 1910.

The Scouts will run the city as a Boy Scout mayor and other city officials will participate.

For aiding the Scouts in various ways, the following will be honored: Mayor James J. Flynn, Jr., Commissioners Oliver R. Kovacs, Dr. Richard M. Budnicki, Donald F. Olsen, Ernest M. Muska, the police and fire departments, and the local daily, the Evening News.

Among the events for the day, Mayor James Flynn, Jr., will sign a resolution; the Five Corners will be changed to Scout Street; will visit the local fire and police department; also visit the local daily (the Evening News), where the Scouts will get first-hand information on how a newspaper is prepared and assembled; and concluding with a luncheon at Lido Gardens. Beginning of the Scout Week on Monday, February 7, a brief ceremony will be held in City Hall Park, where the Scout flag will be raised.

John J. Wolczanski is general chairman of arrangements; assisted by William J. Geier, Scout executive; Philip Levitan, and Marvin Levey, all executive board members, of Raritan Council, Boy Scouts of America.

The second—"City Salutes Boy Scouts at Session"—was in the Evening News, of Perth Amboy, on February 4, 1965. It follows:

CITY SALUTES BOY SCOUTS AT SESSION

PERTH AMBOY.—The 16th annual Boy Scout Day and the 55th anniversary of Scouting in America were observed at yesterday's meeting of the city commission.

Scouts representing troops in the Raritan Council took part in the program which found 14-year-old Joel Greenwald, of 23 Elm Avenue, Fords, presiding as "mayor."

Greenwald, a life Scout, member of troop 58 sponsored by the Wesley Methodist Church and a ninth grade student at Fords Junior High, received the gavel from Mayor James J. Flynn, Jr.

The Scouts who represented the city commissioners—Dennis Lucas, troop 11; Richard Simon, troop 5; Michael Hricak, troop 7, and George Bassarab, troop 15—voted on motions, resolutions and ordinances, but at the direction of the commissioners themselves.

Commissioner Richard M. Budnicki was absent from the meeting, however. His standby was Joseph J. Breyta, chief of the uniformed fire department.

Other Scouts took over positions held by other city officials and later presented cups commemorating the Scouts' anniversary. Following a luncheon, the Scouts toured police and fire department headquarters and the Evening News.

Prior to the meeting, the Scouts visited city department heads and discussed their duties. Members of the Raritan Council's executive board presented plaques to the police and fire department and the Evening News for their support of the Scouts' program.

Flynn has proclaimed next week as "Boy Scout Week" here. During the observance, Smith Street will be "Scout Street."

The city hall program was arranged by John J. Wolzanski, chairman. He was assisted by Irving Golden, central district chairman, and Philip Levitan and Marvin Levy, members of the scouts' executive board.

The Reverend William H. Watson, now retired, gave the opening prayer. A former rector of St. Peter's Episcopal Church, Spotswood, and onetime assistant at St. Peter's here, the Reverend Father Watson has been active in the scouting movement for many years.

Other scouts who took part in the program were Edward Dudek, troop 16, Stephen Rosen, troop 2; Thomas Eaton, troop 56; David Wall, troop 57; Anthony Ruitz, troop 14; John Schreib, pack 54; Thomas Yuhas, pack 50; James Pelican, pack 5; Michael Todd, pack 57; and James McKenna, pack 56.

Golden said the new scout headquarters here, near Market and Grant Streets, will be dedicated March 25. A dinner will be held in the Fellowship Hall of the First Presbyterian Church at 7:30 that night.

On February 8, 1965, the Evening News published another article in connection with Boy Scout Week—"Observance Held for Scout Week." It follows:

OBSERVANCE HELD FOR SCOUT WEEK

PERTH AMBOY.—Scouter John Bernard, 92, raised the Boy Scout flag at City Hall Park Saturday in observance of Boy Scout Week and 55th anniversary of the founding of the Boy Scout movement, February 8, 1910.

He was assisted by John Wolczanski, of Raritan Council's executive board, Boy Scouts of America.

Witnessing the ceremony was a large gathering of Cubs, Boy Scouts, and Explorers with their Scoutmasters.

New Orleans Celebrates the 150th Anniversary of the Battle of New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the sesquicentennial of the Battle of New Orleans was marked on the Plains of Chalmette this year with ceremonies, reverence, and dedication to a truly great moment in American history.

During the observance held in and around the city of New Orleans January 1 through January 8 of this year, thousands of persons harked back to that time of destiny for the infant United States.

The Congress fittingly sealed its interest in the sesquicentennial by passage of a bill creating a special commission for the event. The Post Office Department issued a special commemorative stamp.

One of the great newspapers of this country, the Times-Picayune, of New Orleans, was vitally instrumental in assuring the success of this observance.

Beginning on December 13, 1964, and continuing through January 8, 1965, the Times-Picayune published an imaginative, engrossing series of articles capsuling the history of the area at the time of the Battle of New Orleans.

The series, by Paul Atkinson, a most articulate and able reporter, was written under the pseudonym of "Felix Bourgeois," a fictional character designated as "a composite of the average man in the street" during the days of crisis in old New Orleans in 1814 and 1815.

This diarylike, first-person narrative was an unusually effective way of bridging the history of 150 years.

It is therefore a pleasure to introduce into the RECORD this complete series as published by the Times-Picayune:

BRITISH APPROACH IN 1814 DISTURBING TO ORLEANIANS—CAN JACKSON HALT THEM?—QUESTION ON STREET

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—New Orleans celebrates the 150th anniversary of the Battle of New Orleans, January 1 to 8, 1965. These are the views of "Felix Bourgeois," an imaginary resident of New Orleans. His sentiments, however, represent a factual account of the many feelings and opinions being expressed at the time. He is, therefore, a composite of the average man in the street.)

(By Felix Bourgeois, as told to Paul Atkinson)

(First in a series)

DECEMBER 13, 1814.—New Orleans is very uneasy. Gen. Andrew Jackson arrived December 1, but the people are wondering if he can turn the tide as he has done so many times. Mainly, they are wondering if he can muster enough troops, for we are a real mixture of people—Creole, French, Spanish, you name it * * * and hardly any of us has had military experience.

But I hear that Maj. Gen. William Carroll and his Tennessee riflemen have arrived at Natchez today, and this is wonderful news. Yet my informant tells me they are badly armed, and Major General Carroll has asked General Jackson to let him take some rifles and arms that he found on a keelboat in Natchez.

Our first line of sea defense is under the command of Lt. Thomas Ap Catesby "Tac" Jones and consists of six ships on Lake Borgne. Commodore Daniel T. Patterson sent them out with the instructions to sink the enemy or be sunk.

I hear that the fleet has been discovered by the British, and our ships are in real trouble, because the wind has died down.

Since this is the first entry in my diary, I had best catch up with events.

I am told that the British sought the aid of Jean Lafitte, the pirate, who is still wanted desperately by General Jackson for his piracy on the Gulf of Mexico. The British sent Capt. Nicholas Lockyear as an emissary to Lafitte, but the pirate stalled them.

We hear in the French Market that it is Lafitte's intention to play both ends against the middle, so to speak. He supposedly is seeking to make a deal with Jackson and our Gov. William C. C. Claiborne. But everyone has said we don't need Lafitte.

I have a hunch we will need Lafitte. He has some fine cannon we can use and is a brave man in his own way.

Jackson came over to New Orleans from a successful fight in Mobile. The general is in bad health, and one wonders if he will be able to last much longer. He contracted malaria, and it seems to have sapped his strength.

However, from my brief encounter with General Jackson, it's possible, in later years, he will be called a hard-nosed general.

CAPTURE OF FLEET CAUSES TERROR IN MARKETPLACE—BRITISH GAIN CONTROL OF LAKE BORGNE

(By Felix Bourgeois as told to Paul Atkinson)

(Second in a series)

DECEMBER 14, 1814.—Oh, there's bad news tonight. Our little fleet under the command of Lt. Thomas Ap Catesby "Tac" Jones was captured today after a 3-hour battle on Lake Borgne.

I have never seen such terror in the marketplace. The news hit us like a bombshell, and even General Jackson seemed to lose his composure for a moment.

From the report I received, the wind died down at 1 a.m., leaving our six-ship fleet at the mercy of the British.

Our fleet was sadly outnumbered. It featured 180 men, 30 guns, and 6 ships. The British had 45 small boats and 980 men. Casualties for our side were 10 dead and 35 wounded; the British casualty list was 17 dead and 77 wounded.

One of the amusing incidents of the Battle of Lake Borgne was this. Commodore Daniel T. Patterson's gig, the *Alligator*, tried to join the five ships of our fleet, which had anchored at Malheureaux Island and Point Claire when Jones saw that he had no wind.

British Capt. Nicholas Lockyear sent 4 boats and 200 men to take the cockle-shell. In his report, he decribed the gig as "an armed sloop." That may have sounded good to Lockyear's superiors, but it certainly wasn't true.

I am inclined to agree with a British officer who said of the battle, "It was a wanton sacrifice of human life merely to maintain the idle boast of bulldog pertinacity." Meaning I intrepret, it didn't need to be so bloody long.

The battle gives the British complete control of Lake Borgne and means they can move their troops without our knowing of their coming.

Me, I don't have to tell you, diary, I'm worried.

YEAR 1814: GENERAL JACKSON TRIES TO QUIET FEARS OF BRITISH

(By Felix Bourgeois as told to Paul Atkinson)

(Third in a series)

DECEMBER 15, 1814.—Gen. Andrew Jackson has been busy today.

All sorts of rumors have been flying around the city, and the general moved to quiet them. He issued the following proclamation:

"The major-general commanding has, with astonishment and regret, learned that great consternation and alarm pervade your city. It is true the enemy is on our coast and threatens an invasion of our territory, but it is equally true that with union, energy, and the approbation of Heaven, we will beat him at every point his temerity may induce him to set foot upon our soil."

Additionally, General Jackson authorized a "levee en masse." This gives all male civilians license to take up arms in defense of their homes, whether or not they belong to a military organization.

These measures were a start, but the general went further.

General Jackson sent reinforcements to Fort St. Philip, ordered the U.S. regulars to defend "at all costs" a narrow strait which led into Lake Pontchartrain and summoned Gen. John Coffee from Baton Rouge at top speed.

BATTLE REPORT: MORE TROOPS RECRUITED, MARTIAL LAW DECLARED—MANY RUMORS CONTINUE TO CIRCULATE

(By Felix Bourgeois as told to Paul Atkinson)

(Fourth in a series)

DECEMBER 16, 1814.—Before today I was a man in the street. Today I am a soldier in the street.

General Jackson had recruited every person capable of bearing arms who did not volunteer (I must confess I did not volunteer). We had our choice of the military or the Navy, and me, I can't even swim.

The general also declared martial law. And it is a strict martial law. No one can enter or leave the city without reporting to headquarters, and to leave, one must have a pass. Also the street lamps will be put out

at 9 p.m. and anyone out past that time will be subject to arrest.

I thought that General Jackson's statement yesterday would put down rumors, but I heard some dillies today.

One said the British already had spies in New Orleans.

Then General Jackson was told that certain members of the legislature favored surrendering to the British because they would get a better break from them than from General Jackson. This rumor, of course, infuriated General Jackson.

Another rumor said General Jackson would burn the city rather than let the British get it. Of course, some people in the city are angry at this—including General Jackson.

For sure, all you have to do is listen. The rumors are swirling around the city.

BATTLE REPORT: GENERAL JACKSON SPENDS DAY IN PREPARING FOR FIGHT—SWIFT MESSENGERS SENT TO ASK FOR HELP

(By Felix Bourgeois, as told to Paul Atkinson)

(Fifth in a series)

DECEMBER 17, 1814.—This has been a day of preparation for General Jackson and all of us.

The general has paid particular attention to fortifying all points. Since we lost the battle of Lake Borgne, he knows the British attack may come from any direction.

Major Lacoste, commander of the dragoons of Feliciana and some free men of color, was instructed to group his forces at the confluence of Bayous Sauvage and Chef Menteur. He has two pieces of artillery. The major's instructions were to throw up a redoubt and guard the road.

Major Plauche was sent to Bayou St. John, Major Hughes to Fort St. John and Captain Newman, commander of Fort Petit Coquille at the Rigolets, was reinforced. General Jackson's orders to him were "to defend the fort until the last and if abandoned, fall back to Chef Menteur."

Captain Jugeant was told to enlist and form into companies all the Choctaw Indians he could find.

And swift messengers were sent to Maj. Gen. William Carroll, of Tennessee, and General Thomas, of Kentucky, to get his men and guns here in a hurry.

BATTLE REPORT: REVIEW OF ARMY REVIVES OPTIMISM AMONG PEOPLE—TROOPS ARE GATHERED IN PLACE D'ARMES

(By Felix Bourgeois as told to Paul Atkinson)

(Sixth in a series)

DECEMBER 18, 1814.—This was the big day for our troops. It was the grand review in the Place d'Armes.

New Orleans looked like the pre-war New Orleans. Revelry, ah, did we have it.

I heard one matron say, "Well, after seeing our fine troops today, I feel much better about those British."

That was the general tone of everyone. Suddenly, if for no longer than today, there is optimism that New Orleans and Gen. Andrew Jackson can somehow, turn back the British.

ALL AT REVIEW

All of our troops were up for the review. There were Major Plauche's battalion of uniformed companies made up of Creoles with some of American blood and Captain Beale's rifle company composed of the same stock.

Gen. David Morgan's group of Louisiana Militia wasn't dressed as finely as the rest, but they looked like fighters. They had been reunited from the country parishes.

Maj. Pierre Lacoste had 300 Louisiana freemen of color. Major Daquin had 250 freemen of color, who were refugees from Santo Domingo.

And there was even a small detachment of Choctaw Indians.

STRANGE MIXTURE

I know this sounds a strange mixture of men to fight the battled-hardened, haughty British forces who camp on our shores, but you couldn't get a man or woman among those at the review to believe that our lads can't do a sound job.

As General Jackson said, "Once we get our troops in from the outside, then we'll be OK."

I hear in the marketplace from a well-informed source that British scouts are scouting the land below us, seeking an unguarded water route up to New Orleans.

Since the loss at Lake Borgne, we are vulnerable practically everywhere. I fear the British will find a path right up to our doorstep.

BATTLE REPORT: BRITISH HAVING TROUBLES, MARKETPLACE RUMORS SAY—TROOPS RESTLESS WAITING FOR ATTACK

(By Felix Bourgeois as told to Paul Atkinson)

(Seventh in a series)

DECEMBER 19, 1814—I hear from the marketplace rumors to the effect that the British are having their troubles. The story goes that they are becoming restless waiting for the moment to strike against us.

My informant told me that one British officer complained, "I have suffered more from cold since landing in this place (Pea Island) than I did in all my former campaigns." And the informant said the officer had been involved in some snowy campaigns on the Continent.

The British forces have been plagued by insects, dreary wasteland, and cramped quarters.

Wives of the British soldiers who were brought over to occupy New Orleans have been bickering with one another, the informant added.

Since civilians who will take over the government of New Orleans—should the British win—must wait a while, they have been more content.

I hear that the British troops are real restless. According to the informer, this is how some of the arguing has gone:

"The 4th and 95th have argued about who performed most nobly under Wellington; the 4th and 95th then joined in bragging about that war to the inexperienced 21st, 44th, and 85th; these three retaliated by speaking of the Baltimore campaign and with the 4th bragged about their superior knowledge to the 95th which had not yet fought Americans.

"Then the 44th and 21st bragged of the Battle of Alexandria and their experience with Gen. John Keane. Highlanders of the 93d bandied words with lowlanders of the 21st, the latter calling the former, 'cattle stealers from the north.' These two bodies of Scotsmen argued belligerently with many Irishmen in the 4th and 44th."

If this bickering continues, I would say that we've got a chance.

BATTLE REPORT: GENERAL JACKSON ASKS PIRATE TO BECOME AIDE DE CAMP—COFFEE'S 800 MEN ARRIVE FROM BATON ROUGE

(By Felix Bourgeois as told to Paul Atkinson)

(Eighth in a series)

DECEMBER 20, 1814.—It had been a long day for Gen. Andrew Jackson and he had retired to his room about 9 p.m.

Then, according to my source, there was a knock on the door.

Jackson told the party to enter. In stepped Maj. A. Lacarriere Latour, General Jackson's engineer.

Behind Latour was a tall man in a scarlet shirt and yellow pantaloons.

Jackson and the man looked each other in the eye, as if they were engaged in a mental duel.

Then General Jackson spoke while extending his hand. "So you are Jean Lafitte, the pirate," he said.

Lafitte replied, "That I am."

Many historians, likely, will call this the turning point in the Battle of New Orleans. For it is no secret that Jackson needs Lafitte and Lafitte needs Jackson.

From this meeting of Jackson and Lafitte came these results: Jackson asked Lafitte, who was a mortal enemy not too long ago, to become his aide de camp.

Lafitte's chief aide, Dominique You, and exprivateer Capt. Antoine Belluche were named to head gun crews. The guns, of course, belonged to the Barataria pirates of Lafitte.

This was not the only good news of the day.

Gen. John Coffee's mounted infantry brigade of 800 men arrived from Baton Rouge. This swelled our forces considerably.

Bring on the British.

BATTLE REPORT: BRITISH GENERAL DECIDES UPON TROOP EMBARKATION—ORLEANS SLEEPS UNAWARE ATTACK IS NEAR

(By Felix Bourgeois as told to Paul Atkinson)

(Ninth in a series)

DECEMBER 21, 1814—It has been a week since the battle on Lake Borgne and the British are up to something. But what?

My informant at the marketplace tells me this:

The British sent out a four-man team to scout the area looking for an unguarded route into New Orleans. Lieutenant Peddie of the Quartermaster Corps returned and reported.

Lieutenant Peddie's recommendation met with varying degrees of enthusiasm. Gen. John Keane felt it was too dangerous. "This route is better for defense than offense," he said. "There is a bottleneck of land hemmed in by the Mississippi River on one side and a morass on the other."

ADMIRAL HAPPY

But Adm. Sir Alexander Cochrane was overjoyed. "My men can practically dump your army at the doorstep of the city," said Admiral Cochrane.

Keane protested lightly. Cochrane goaded him, saying, "If you want me to, I'll take New Orleans with my sailors."

That jibe did it. Keane made the big move.

Keane ordered embarkation at 9 a.m. for tomorrow, December 22. The Fifth West India Regiment will stay; the rest will move out.

The plan is for the 4th Regiment to arrive at the mouth of De La Ronde's Canal soon after dark tomorrow night. The rest will follow shortly thereafter.

WHEELS IN MOTION

Once Keane had made his choice, wheels were set into motion. Orders were passed down to the Army, and the Navy set up its boats in proper order to receive the troops.

It will not be a restful night for anyone on the British side. Soldiers will huddle against the cold and will sleep as best they can.

General Keane will worry, nap—and dream fitfully.

New Orleans will sleep peacefully. But if the city knew what is brewing down the river, maybe it would not sleep so easily.

GEN. JACKSON SAID FEARFUL OF ATTACK AT ANY MINUTE—BRITISH HARD AT WORK MAKING PREPARATIONS

(By Felix Bourgeois as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 10th in a series)

DECEMBER 22, 1814.—Gen. Andrew Jackson said on this day he had an uneasy feeling that the British would attack any minute.

He hold this to Maj. Gen. William Carroll who arrived with his Tennessee militia at Avart's Plantation. General Carroll informed

General Jackson that his men were tired, "but we can move in a hurry."

General Jackson was enthusiastic that Gen. Thomas Hinds and his dragoons also were arriving. They looked slick in their dark blue uniforms and crossed with white saber belts.

While New Orleans waited, the British, as General Jackson feared, were hard at work.

Carrying out Gen. John Keane's orders, the movement of troops began—or was supposed to begin—at 9 a.m.

But confusion seemed to reign in the British ranks.

Many troops, either following wrong orders or just confounded by the massive troop movement, got on the wrong ships. The general foulup prevented any orderly departure until around 11:30 a.m.

The day was a typical December day in south Louisiana * * * meaning damp, grey and gloomy. Some rain fell, but the sailors grimly continued pulling the oars and the soldiers in their boats huddled against the dampness and cursed it.

Some of the sailing vessels went aground, especially in Chef Menteur Pass which proved to be too shallow. Still, the barges plodded on.

By nightfall the rain had ceased, but cold had set in.

And, following General Keane's orders, fires, which had been built to shield against the cold, were extinguished at nightfall.

The British, "tourists" didn't particularly care for scenic Louisiana.

BATTLE REPORT: BRITISH TROOPS ENCOUNTER FIGHTING STAGED AT NIGHT—JACKSON QUICKLY ACTS AFTER WARNING

(By Felix Bourgeois as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 11th in a series)

DECEMBER 23, 1814.—This was a day of surprises.

First off, the British surprised Gabriel Villere and 30 others at the Villere plantation. They closed in around noon and actually caught young Villere sleeping on the porch.

Then, to coin a phrase, "he who surprises first, doesn't always surprise last."

Villere, knowing the plantation area minutely, eluded his captors and headed toward New Orleans to warn Gen. Andrew Jackson of the British arrival. By the time Villere arrived, runners from other plantations down the road had brought the same chilling news. I suppose it will never be established who gave the first word of the British arrival.

ORDERS ATTACK

But General Jackson wasted little time. "We must strike back tonight," said General Jackson.

General Jackson sent Gen. John Coffee, Hinds' Dragoons and Captain Beale's riflemen toward the swamp to attack the British on the right.

Using the 7th Regulars as an advance, General Jackson sent a detachment of Marines on the riverbank, the 44th Regulars to their left, followed by the artillery with two 6-pound cannons.

He also utilized Plauche's companies, Daquin's freemen of color and the Choctaws * * * all to attack from the left.

The *Carolina*, with Commodore Daniel T. Patterson in command, came sailing down the Mississippi River to provide "sea cover."

Overall plan was for Jackson's aggregation to attack near the river and Coffee's near the woods.

BRITISH STUNNED

The attack lasted well into the night. The British were stunned. They had never encountered night fighters, and were taken completely by surprise as shells came whistling in from the *Carolina*.

Fighting was furious * * * and confusing. Often, Americans and British passed each other in a dense fog that rolled in over the field of battle. British elements ran into each other in the confusion, as did our forces.

It was jolly well confusing.

BATTLE REPORT: U.S. FORCES HALT ATTACK AS BRITISH GROW STRONGER—NO CHRISTMAS GAIETY IN NEW ORLEANS

(By Felix Bourgeois as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 12th in a series)

DECEMBER 24, 1814.—The early morning hours were awful; and though it is Christmas Eve, there is no gaiety in New Orleans.

By 2 a.m., the British had retrieved all their wounded and dead and placed them in or around the Villere plantation mansion, which is now their headquarters.

British Gen. John Keane looked over the gruesome sight, and the casualty list was painful. The British had 46 killed, 167 wounded, and lost 64 as prisoners.

FOG HAZARDOUS

Gen. Andrew Jackson, by 4 a.m., decided it was useless to pursue the attack any further. He said wearily, "The British are getting stronger, and the fog makes it hazardous to fight any longer."

The American casualty list is officially 24 killed, 115 wounded and 74 captured by the British.

It is difficult to assess the value of General Jackson's quick retaliation against the surprise British maneuver.

I suppose that it was valuable in showing the British we mean business.

GENERAL AMAZED

General Jackson said out loud to some of his lieutenants that he was amazed the British did not continue on into New Orleans. Certainly, though the British had no way of knowing it, the city was unguarded and unaware of the British nearness.

Looking back on it, it is true that British Gen. John Keane was hampered in all the mixups that delayed the landing of his full force at the Villere plantation. He had planned for the whole force to be there by noon yesterday, and only one-third of it was there.

New Orleanians were quietly jubilant over the outcome; but for the families of 24 fallen warriors, this will be the saddest Christmas Eve of all.

BATTLE REPORT: RUMORS SWIRL—OPPOSING FORCES HAVE FOOD PROBLEM—CREOLES SPREAD DOUBT OF AMERICAN VICTORY

(By Felix Bourgeois as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 13th in a series)

DECEMBER 25, 1814.—It is Christmas Day, but there is little cheer for us; and I'm sure the British have less cheer.

I hear that the British had trouble getting food and supplies to their outpost at the Villere mansion. And we Americans had difficulty getting a supply train established to our position at Rodriguez Canal from New Orleans.

Rumors started swirling again today, and Gen. Andrew Jackson had many to consider.

The most startling was a report that the British landed at the Plain of Gentilly at Chef Menteur. Governor Claiborne has only a few half-trained regiments manning that spot.

General Jackson also was told there is panic in New Orleans. The Creoles have spread doubt that Jackson can turn back the British. They wonder how Jackson can mold together into a fighting unit such a diveragency of people.

Rumormongers also contend that, with loss of our little flotilla on Lake Borgne, we are sitting ducks for a British attack from most any direction.

They also scoff that Jackson failed by a considerable margin of putting down Gen. John Keane's advance guard at the Villere mansion the night of the 23d.

Some civilian "strategists" came out to look at our fortifications the other day, and they are telling in New Orleans that they will barely turn away a bullet, much less a cannonball.

General Jackson was riding past our line of defense this afternoon when rockets exploded and cannon thundered on the British side. He, as all of us did, thought an attack was near.

When our scouts returned, they told Jackson that the Duke of Wellington had come to take over British forces here. But later in the day this rumor proved unfounded, and it turned out to be the Duke's brother-in-law, Maj. Gen. Sir Edward Michael Pakenham. It is said 37-year-old Pakenham is one of the ablest generals serving under King George III.

There is a story that he carries a commission from King George III, which says that he will be designated, "Commanding General of British Louisiana," once we "dirty shirts," as we are called, are beaten.

I have a feeling that the revered Pakenham may not serve us as governor.

BATTLE REPORT: COTTON BALES ARE USED TO BUILD U.S. BASTIONS—REPORT OF LANDING AT GENTILLY FALSE

(By Felix Bourgeois, as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 14th in a series)

DECEMBER 26, 1814.—Where Christmas was dark, damp, and gray, today started out bright and warm. Maybe it is an omen—for sure, we need every little strand of hope.

Gen. Andrew Jackson was informed that, just as he suspected, the story of the British landing on the Plain of Gentilly was only an attempt to get him to divide his forces. The general did not put much stock in the story.

The general has no doubt that we must build up our bastions at the Rodriguez Canal. He feels sure that the British will attack in the area of the Lacoste, Laronde, and Villere plantations.

"We must have solid entrenchments," General Jackson told a staff meeting today.

Cotton bales, our engineer, Major Latour, found, come in handy. The ground is soggy and unfirm, so cotton bales were sunk into the ground behind our mud wall.

Planks were then laid across the sunken bales and nailed together so as to form a firm firestep. Without it, the men will sink into the icy mire hip deep.

Major Latour praises the cotton bales. He feels the soft fiber will absorb musket balls and will reduce casualties from glancing and ricocheting bullets.

I thought they might catch on fire easily. But Major Latour had the bales smeared with wet mud. This will cut down on the possibility of fire.

Many of our men believe that our official war color is brown—or, at least, muddy. It didn't take all of us long to absorb a brown color which makes us all appear as if we were making mud pies.

Our scouts tell us that the British have been busy placing batteries, while we are building our mud ramparts. They are up to some sneaky trick. But what?

BATTLE REPORT: CANNON PLACED ON LEVEE DESTROY SHIP "CAROLINA"—NO LIVES LOST IN LATEST BRITISH TRICK

(By Felix Bourgeois, as told to Paul

(The 15th in a series)

DECEMBER 27, 1814.—We found out about a dastardly trick the British played yesterday, but our knowledge came too late to save one of our ships.

Sir Edward Michael Pakenham ordered four 24-pound howitzers mounted on the levee out of reach of our fieldpieces behind Rodriguez Canal.

At about 8 a.m. these cannons opened fire on the *Carolina* and *Louisiana*, our two-ship fleet. They fired hot shot and scored a hit on the magazine of the *Carolina*. The ship went up with a thunderous roar. There were no lives lost, luckily, for our sailors abandoned ship before the hit on the magazine.

The *Louisiana* barely escaped. There was not a cupful of air on the whole river, so the *Louisiana* could not move out of range of the howitzers on its own.

Our sailors worked feverishly with sweeps and longboats.

Shots sent up geysers of steam all around; but none hit the *Louisiana*, though there was much ducking of heads when some whizzed by.

Finally, the *Louisiana* was moved out of harm's way. Comdr. Daniel T. Patterson had the boat moved to a position on the west bank.

Patterson immediately moved to set up long naval guns just below where the *Louisiana* was anchored. There were no embankments built around them, leaving them open.

Gen. Andrew Jackson was leery of this. But he was more wary that the British would outflank him over the Mississippi River. General Jackson has a deathly fear of such a British move.

I'm not a betting man; but if I were, I would not worry about the British beating us on the west bank. The real battle would appear to be impending in front of us here at Rodriguez Canal.

BATTLE REPORT: BRITISH MASSING OF MEN SURPRISING TO DEFENDERS

(By Felix Bourgeois as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 16th in a series)

DECEMBER 28, 1814.—"They ain't lobsters," shouted one Tennessee rifleman, who looked in awe today as the British moved out into the line of our fire.

We were surprised at the move by British commander, Sir Michael Edward Pakenham. He wheeled out his troops in tow brigades against our positions at Rodriguez Canal.

They were rigidly massed and looked much like puppets. We could only watch and wonder at them.

Gaudy they were. There were the scarlet coats of the infantry, the kilts of the Scots, and the green coats of the outflung riflemen.

PLAYS BY BOOK

Pakentham is a general who plays the game of war by the book. Actually, I got a feeling this will hurt him when the chips are down.

But his idea today was infantry subdues infantry, cavalry beats cavalry, and artillery bombs artillery. Since there was no cavalry, he said it was up to the artillery to clear the way.

Our artillery, according to Master Commandant Henley, fired 800 rounds of shots into the British.

There were some weird comments about the British and their spic-and-span uniforms and music. "Listen to that purty music," said one Mississippian from the Hinds Dragoons. "Look at all them proudful banners," said another soldier from Feliciana Parish.

GUNS RAKE BRITISH

Our artillery peppered the British with grapeshot and rumors are that about 200 to 400 were killed. Our casualties were minor, if any.

During the heat of the battle, a messenger came up to Gen. Andrew Jackson and told him that Governor Claiborne said the Louisiana Assembly is about to give up the country to the British. Jackson, somewhat peeved, told the messenger, "tell the Governor to make a strict inquiry and if the Assembly persists, blow it up."

Pakenham and Jackson differed on their analysis of the match today. Pakenham called it a "reconnaissance in force" and Jackson said it was a "battle."

Looks like it depends on who wins.

BATTLE REPORT: PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE FOUGHT AGAINST BRITISH—GENERAL COFFEE SUGGESTED "HUNTING PARTIES"

(By Felix Bourgeois, as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 17th in a series)

DECEMBER 29, 1814.—We've been getting in what might be called psychological warfare of late against the British.

It all began when officers of Gen. John Coffee's Tennessee riflemen suggested that "hunting parties" be sent out at night. The stealthy Tennesseans, accustomed to such hunting, were deadly in their aim.

Now one of the most sought-after commodities for a fighting man is sleep. But every time a hunting rifle barked its sound of death, the British raised the alarm. Consequently, there was little sleep for the weary Redcoats.

For the Tennessee riflemen, the missions were fun. Besides, pointed out one, "We get out of the 'goshdurn' ditchdigging and building the fortifications."

The British didn't take too kindly to this kind of warfare. They were accustomed to observing certain rules of protocol. For instance, in past battles between the French and English, sentries for the two were posted not more than 20 yards apart and some even slept.

British Lt. George K. Gleig put it this way: "This warfare is an ungenerous return to barbarity."

Many of our officers were worrying about Gen. Andrew Jackson. He looked sicker than ever because of his siege of dysentery. Yet, the man had boundless energy. Somehow, he kept going, directing the building of the fortifications.

In fact, the general had redoubled his building of the earthwork fortress. The "reconnaissance in force" or "attack" of yesterday realerted him to the dangers.

General Jackson had put 12 cannon in emplacements. How many the British had I don't know, but it is something near 30, I am told.

The British were bringing in supplies and reinforcements at a landing place near the Fishermen's Village down the Mississippi River, we were sure.

But as long as our Tennessee riflemen waged their war of nerves was it too much to ask that maybe the British would become disgusted and leave? Would be a wonderful New Year's present * * * but I'm afraid the big battle was near.

BATTLE REPORT: AMERICAN TROOPS HAVE DAY OF WATCHING, WAITING—GENERAL JACKSON GIVES ORDER TO BLOW UP CITY

(By Felix Bourgeois, as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 18th in a series)

DECEMBER 30, 1814.—This has been a day of watchful waiting, and little else.

It might be well to delve into the Louisiana Assembly incident of a few days ago. You'll recall Gen. Andrew Jackson was told that the legislature planned to surrender the city to the British and Jackson told the courier to "blow it up if need be."

Now it appears General Jackson has apologized for that gruff statement. Some of the legislators, who are loyal to him, were quite disturbed that Jackson—even in the heat of the skirmish December 28—would say such a thing.

But it is absolutely impossible to keep rumors from springing up in the legislature. One circulating now has it that Jackson will put a torch to New Orleans if the British drive him back.

There are only four legislators who have taken part in the battles for us. They are Gen. Garrique Flojack, Major Eziel, Mr. Bufort and Sebastian Hiriard.

British agents have reminded the legislators that the Loyalists were well repaid during the revolution of the 13 colonies. They pointed out Benedict Arnold had received 6,315 pounds in cash, an annual pension of 500 pounds for his wife, Army commissions for his three oldest sons and pensions of 100 pounds each for his five youngest sons.

The British sailors have had tough sledding. They have rowed 60 miles with their wounded and rowed back 60 miles with guns and ammunition.

Then the British soldiers have dragged the guns by long dragropes. They have used a homemade road which is soft and miry, to say the least.

Actually, if one were to take a poll of the morale of our men, I'm sure he would find their spirits high. Of course, one reason is the sniping done by the Tennessee riflemen and our Choctaw Indian friends on the British outposts.

I was told today by a British deserted that more British would desert if they could get to American lines. Seems the unerring marksmen are picking them off before they can surrender. What a pity.

Our iniforms are torn and tattered and really not uniforms in the true sense of the word. Yet I can't help but think we've got a lot more going for us than the British.

We shall see soon.

BATTLE REPORT: GENERAL JACKSON INVITES ALL TO VIEW PARADE OF MEN—BUT TENNESSEE RIFLEMEN OPPOSE "FOOFERAW"

(By Felix Bourgeois, as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 19th in a series)

DECEMBER 31, 1814.—One thing, for sure, is those Tennessee riflemen don't go for pomp and ceremony.

Gen. Andrew Jackson, seeking to curb the many rumors about our fortifications or lack of same, invited everyone from New Orleans out to see our line at Rodriguez Canal.

Today he has everyone he can spare practicing close order drills. He ordered our regulars, uniformed city companies and other smartly turned out units of the Louisiana State Militia to clean their equipment for the big parade tomorrow.

Some Tennessee riflemen were asked by Jackson to wash their filthy hunting shirts. But they declined to take part in what they called "fooferaw."

To many observers, this hardly seems the place or the time for such a review, but I suppose Jackson feels he has to put to rest all harmful rumors that float around about us.

Comdr. Daniel T. Patterson was busy removing guns from the *Louisiana*. He took two today, both 12-pounders.

Patterson was informed by a British deserter that the British are determined to sink the *Louisiana* with hot shot the next time it comes by. He decided to send it back up the Mississippi out of harm's way.

All day there have been sounds of hammering from the British lines. Early this morning, Colonel Hinds and his dragoons rode out to see what was up.

They reported back to Jackson that the British are setting up batteries of cannons within 700 yards of our line.

The scouts further noted some interesting facts. For instance, the Redcoats are having all sorts of trouble. In digging for earth, they hit water.

Hinds and his men found that the British have brought in enough powder and balls for 6 hours of continuous cannonading. This does not look good for us.

On this last day of 1814, I wonder how, 150 years from now, our city of New Orleans will rank this fighting. Will we be forgotten?

BATTLE REPORT: BRITISH CAUSE CONFUSION DURING PRECISION PARADE

(By Felix Bourgeois, as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 20th in a series)

JANUARY 1, 1815.—This was one of those days that make strong men weep and lesser men do worse.

It all began with wonderful intentions for Gen. Andrew Jackson and us. General Jackson, worried over many rumors that float around about our supposedly inadequate defenses, invited many of New Orleans' elite and the Louisiana Legislature out for a full dress review and general "open house." He slicked up the Macarte plantation house and hoped to receive all dignitaries there.

The day broke foggy. By 8 a.m., many carriages had brought local officials and their families to the parade ground. After an hour's wait, General Jackson decreed that the parade should go on.

ROCKETS SOAR

We were in precision formation, our uniforms—what we had—looking spic and span, when rockets soared into the air, horses reared up, carriages ran away from their owners.

General Jackson used some curse words that I'd heard used only a few times when the British rained down that barrage.

Dominique you, Jean Lafitte's No. 1 pirate, was slightly wounded; and he, too, let loose a torrent of curse words, more colorful I would say than Jackson's.

Cannonballs tore into our cotton bales and set some on fire. We were, to say the least, a bit panicky.

All visitors who came in from New Orleans fled back to the city. More than anything else, it was the humilitation of it all that got to General Jackson. The day on which he hoped to make a lasting impression he did—but that impression was a wee bit different than he pictured.

FIRE RETURNED

The surprise of the attack did not last long for us. Our artillery, bulwarked by Baratarians and particularly you, answered back fiercely.

By noon, there were few British guns firing. Then by 1 p.m., only naval guns put up the day before by Admiral Cochrane doggedly fired on. Finally, they stopped by midafternoon.

General Jackson was cautious the whole afternoon. When the British guns ceased, he thought they were readying an infantry attack. We did not know the British were worse off than we.

It seems the British made a miscalculation. They assumed sugar would withstand cannonballs as well as sand, but it did not. Instead, their parapets were blown sky high by our guns, and many British gunners were maimed.

CASUALTIES LISTED

After it was over, we counted 11 dead and 23 wounded. I believe the British put their figure at 32 dead and 42 wounded.

So the day ran full circle for us. It began in a blissful state of anticipation, blew up momentarily in our faces and again in the end looked delightful. For we had withstood General Pakenham's forces a third time.

General Jackson was moved to issue this communique to us:

"The major general tenders to the troops he has the honor to command his good wishes for a happy new year and especially to those officers and men at the pieces of artillery.

"The watchword for today will be fight on. The contractors will issue half a gill of whisky all 'round."

P.S.—That whisky hit the spot.

BATTLE REPORT: "ENTERPRISE" SLIPS QUIETLY DOWN RIVER IN DARKNESS—SUPPLIES ARE CARRIED PAST BRITISH TROOPS

(By Felix Bourgeois, as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 21st in a series)

JANUARY 2, 1815.—We showed the British a little *Enterprise* last night.

Well, to be truthful, it was the steamer, the *Enterprise*, and they didn't see it. I'll backtrack and tie this story together.

Gen. Andrew Jackson wasted no time in seeking to reinforce our rag-tag forces at Fort St. Phillip. He decided it would be a good idea to send down a 32-pound cannon with other supplies.

Capt. Henry Shreve has been bringing us supplies from New Orleans on his steamer. So General Jackson approached Captain Shreve with the idea of slipping by the British batteries.

I'm told the conversation went like this:

Craggy General Jackson, looking at the young Captain Chreve, asked, "I understand you're a man who always does what he undertakes; can you slip by the British?"

"I can do it if you'll give me my own time," replied Shreve.

Jackson, leery of contractors who take too much time, asked Shreve "how much time is that?"

Shreve, I'm told, answered, "24 hours."

So the *Enterprise* was loaded with the cannon and supplies. Cotton bales were fastened with iron hooks to the side facing the British guns and the sternwheel was carefully muffled.

The *Enterprise* cast off and slipped quietly down the river under cover of fog. Captain Shreve and crew hardly breathed, they told me later. They made it all the way there safely.

Their trip back was a mite scary. The fog lifted, and they were detected. But Captain Shreve called for more power and the sternwheeler chugged out of danger just in the nick of time.

Jackson got some bad news today, but he scoffed at it. He was told that the long-awaited Kentuckians had arrived in Baton Rouge but many were unarmed.

"I've never seen a Kentuckian without a gun, a pack of cards, and a bottle of whisky," snorted Jackson.

Our only wish is that the Kentuckians arrive before we get attacked by the British. Since the artillery battle yesterday, we can see them slowly rebuilding their forces and getting reinforcements.

The attack is near. I can feel it in my bones.

BATTLE REPORT: SPIES SAY BRITISH FORCES UNLOAD MORE AMMUNITION—AMERICANS CONTINUE WORK ON FORTIFICATIONS

(By Felix Bourgeois, as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 22d in a series)

JANUARY 3, 1815.—I was told that the British are having an awful time at Cat Island, their camp on the Gulf Coast.

They apparently made a mistake by bringing over their wives. Certainly the British soldiers and sailors are impatient, so you can imagine how impatient their wives are.

But I would say that the British really expected just to walk in here and trample us with ease. So far we've been able to repulse three big attempts by General Pakenham and his army.

Yes, we have spies checking on the British. Choctaw Indians are good at it.

One thing they saw is that the British are attempting to improve roads to the rear. These roads were damaged badly by rains.

Our scouts also checked closely and found British boats are continually bringing in ammunition and provisions.

Naturally, we are also.

Building of our mud ramparts continues at a steady pace. Gen. Andrew Jackson rides up on his white horse often, as many as three or four times a day.

Our general, however, is worrying that the troops from Kentucky won't get here before the British make what is sure to be one big move to overwhelm us. If these Kentucky men do not arrive in time, the general and everyone of us know we are in desperate trouble.

There are rumors that the main body of Kentucky troops is not far away from New Orleans. If these rumors prove correct, then there is certain to be much rejoicing in our ranks and in New Orleans.

We can only hope that our Kentuckians come well armed, for at best there are only 400 weapons available. These are kept under lock and key by Mayor Nicholas Girod for protection of the city.

BATTLE REPORT: KENTUCKIANS COME HARD WAY TO HELP DEFEND NEW ORLEANS—HAVE FEW GUNS BUT ARRIVAL HEARTENS CITY

(By Felix Bourgeois, as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 23d in a series)

JANUARY 4, 1815.—Gen. John Adair and his Kentuckians came in today, and just their appearance here buoyed our spirits.

However, on closer observation, it might be that we got only numbers in the Kentucky Militia. As far as I could tell, they had few weapons.

I recall last week that someone had told Gen. Andrew Jackson that the Kentucky people were ill-equipped and he just laughed. He said he'd never seen a Kentuckian "without a rifle, a jug and some cards." I understand he was astonished at the lack of guns.

HARDSHIPS ON WAY

From what I hear, we are lucky that the Kentuckians even came. Here is what I have heard from one of the Kentucky fellows.

This Kentuckian said that Governor Shelby of Kentucky had been told the U.S. Quartermaster would provide for them, so he arranged for them to gather on the banks of the Ohio River.

Well, my man said, nothing came. So there they were, ready to go but with no provisions.

He said that Col. Richard Taylor, quartermaster of the Kentucky Militia from Frankfort, borrowed some money and bought about 30 cooking pots and kettles in Louisville. He said that there was about one pot for every 80 men.

That should have been trouble enough. But when they got to the mouth of the Cumberland River, they had to tarry there 8 days while they fixed some old boats.

RATIONS SHORT

Their rations were about one-half of what they should have had, my informant said. But they added to them handsomely by hunting along the Mississippi River.

You have to hand it to these Kentucky militiamen. They left home with little else but one suit of clothes on their backs. Their jeans were homespun. Yet they came by rickety-old boats 1,500 miles to help us out.

God bless 'em.

BATTLE REPORT: NEW ORLEANS HOSPITALITY SCORES WITH KENTUCKIANS—MILITIA ARRIVES WITHOUT TENTS OR BLANKETS

(By Felix Bourgeois, as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 24th in a series)

JANUARY 5, 1815.—New Orleans hospitality scored again today.

You'll recall I told you yesterday of the arrival of the Kentucky Militia. And I also told you that they were ill clothed and ill equipped with weapons.

Just how badly off they were came out in a hurry. Gen. Andrew Jackson ordered 750 of the Kentucky Militia to the lines at

Rodriguez Canal and 250 of those had no weapons at all.

They had come in and immediately set up camp at Prevost's Plantation. Well, I'm told that it was some camp last night. There were no tents, no blankets and even straw was scarce.

The word got out around New Orleans of the awful condition of the Kentucky troops, and I've never seen New Orleanians open up their hearts so quickly.

The Louisiana Legislature immediately appropriated 6,000 to aid the Kentuckians. And another $10,000 was raised through private subscriptions.

I can tell you this. It has been an unusually severe winter in south Louisiana. Boy, does the ground get cold in a hurry around the plantations. I don't see how the Kentuckians stood all that cold, but they are from a colder climate than us, so maybe it was not too bad for them.

This I know. I'm glad the Kentuckians are on our side. They should prove to be remarkable assets.

What are the British doing? I'm told they are working feverishly to bring in supplies and ammunitions.

General Jackson, likewise, is working us overtime. He feels as everyone does on the front lines—that the British attack is certainly not far away. I'd venture to say that it is coming within the week.

The feeling in New Orleans is divided on the outcome. Some citizens have their possessions ready and can flee at any moment, especially if we fail to hold the British. I think, though, that our confidence is quite high, considering what we saw New Year's Day and December 28.

BATTLE REPORT: SCOUTS REPORT BRITISH FORCES ARE REINFORCED—GENERAL JACKSON HAS EIGHT BATTERIES IN LINE

(By Felix Bourgeois, as told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 25th in a series)

JANUARY 6, 1815.—We understand from our scouts that the British have just been reinforced with the 7th and 43d Regiments. They are under the Command of Gen. John Lambert.

I can just hear what's going through their minds. The new arrivals probably are listening to the British troops who have been here—and lost to us—and are cursing the weather, us, how we aren't fighting by the rules that are used in Europe and wonder why they're here to capture this wilderness, anyway.

The members of the 7th and 43d Regiments likely are asking the veterans, "What's it like to fight Americans? We've never done it before. Are they different from French fighters?"

I would guess the new British troops are thinking, "Well, these fellows couldn't beat the Americans, so we're here to rescue them and subdue the uncouths."

So much for the enemy. Everyone in New Orleans—and America—is wondering, "How about us? Can we beat the British?"

Here's how Gen. Andrew Jackson has us alined. There are eight batteries.

Battery 1, under the command of Captain Humphreys, has two 12-pound cannon and a 6-inch howitzer. About 90 yards to the left is Battery 2, commanded by Lieutenant Norris. It has a 24-pound cannon.

Battery 3, commanded by Lieutenant Norris. It has a 24-pound cannon.

Battery 3, commanded by Dominque You and one of Beluche's volunteers, has two 24-pound cannon. Twenty yards away is Battery 4, headed by Lieutenant Crawley. It contains a 32-pounder.

Our Battery 5 has two 6-pounders under the command of Colonel Perry and Lieutenant Kerr. Thirty-six yards farther is Battery 6, featuring a 12-pound cannon commanded by Garrique Fleaujac.

Then 190 yards away is Battery 7, a long brass 18-pounder and a 6-pounder, commanded by Lieutenant Spotts. Sixty yards away is Battery 8, a small brass carronade. It is commanded by Corporal Cheveau, using some of Gen. John Carroll's men.

Our cannon, we hear, will be outnumbered by the British, should they attack today. And certainly if the British keep getting cannon from their supply ships we'll be more outnumbered.

How about men? Well, here's how we are lined up.

From the Mississippi River bank to the high road, Beale's rifles are spread. Major Peire's 7th Regular are from the 1st to 3d Batteries are Plauche's volunteers and Lacoste's colored troops.

To the left of the 4th Battery are Daquin's Colored. Then the 44th Regulars extend to Battery 5.

The rest of the line, approximately two-thirds, is covered by Tennesseans of Carroll and Gen. John Coffee, Gen John Adair's Kentuckians.

Ogden's Calvary is camped at Macarte's plantation, the Hinds Dragoons at Delery's and farther back, Villere's militiamen as a reserve.

General Jackson has named Colonel Ross to command the right side of the line and General Carroll the left side.

We have only estimates, but I am told that we will be outnumbered by about 2 to 1. I must admit that, on the surface and numbers alone, it does not look good for us.

BATTLE REPORT: KENTUCKIANS ARE GIVEN GUNS FROM CITY ARMORY—GENERAL PAKENHAM REPORTEDLY ORDERS ACTION

(By Felix Bourgeois at told to Paul Atkinson)

(The 26th in a series)

JANUARY 7, 1815.—The time is getting near, Gen. Andrew Jackson was relieved today to learn that our Kentuckians got a few more weapons.

You recall I mentioned that 400 guns were locked up in the armory in New Orleans, but they are for defending the city specifically.

Well, General Jackson and Gen. John Adair of the Kentuckians finally talked Mayor Nicholas Girod into lending these weapons for 3 days.

So last night, under cover of darkness, these guns were removed. Mayor Girod wanted it done then because he feared the citizens would panic. After all, they are defenseless.

Our scouts saw the new British 7th and 43d Regiments marching in review today. They reported the new British troops were in high spirits. Maybe we can knock them down a peg or two.

From all the activity in the British camp, the battle is surely near. Gen. Andrew Jackson carefully inspects our defenses, and he believes that they are substantial and will hold up.

General Pakenham gave his orders. He sent Colonel Thornton's forces to the west bank of the Mississippi River. These are the 85th, the 5th West India, 400 marines, 200 seamen and artillery support in the form of a barge equipped with two 9-pounders and 2 howitzers.

General Pakenham said they will leave early tomorrow morning and will capture our guns on the west bank. Then they will turn our guns on us * * * at least, that is his plan.

Gen. John Keane's troops will include the 95th Rifles and the 93d Highlanders; General Gibbs, the 4th Regiment, the 21st Royal Scots, the 44th Regiment and the 1st West India bunch; General Lambert, the 7th Royal Fusiliers and the 43d in reserve.

Pakenham further plans that a company each from the 7th, 43d, 93d, and 1st West India will form a detachment under Colonel Rennie and will move along the high road under cover of the levee on the east bank.

A company of the 1st West India, he said, will skirt the woods to cover his extreme right.

Dragoons with horses will serve Pakenham. Those who are still dismounted will join the reserve as infantrymen.

General Gibbs wil be entrusted with the most important maneuver. His troops will strike the heaviest blow across the plains of Chalmette.

The 44th Regiment will go first. Of this group, 300 will carry ladders and fascines.

Pakenham had a vision. He saw "an unyielding, undaunted British Army marching relentlessly across the plain and to the attack."

However, General Jackson, I believe, knows that the battle is at hand. He ordered everyone restricted to camp; no one is allowed to go back to New Orleans.

I must admit as we hear rumors, hear the noise of the British preparations and wonder when the attack will come, we become less and less confident. I suppose every other fighting man, from time immemorial, felt the same way before he went into battle.

I have a feeling it is going to be a restless night.

BATTLE REPORT: AMERICANS WIN VICTORY ON PLAINS OF CHALMETTE—BRITISH GENERALS AMONG MANY KILLED

(By Felix Bourgeois, As told to Paul Atkinson)

(Last in a series)

JANUARY 8, 1815.—This is the happiest chapter in my story on the Battle of New Orleans. It tells of our complete victory over the British on the plains of Chalmette.

When the counting of casualties was done, we found we suffered 71 casualties and the British 2,057.

Gen. Andrew Jackson tried to get some sleep last night, but decided to get up at about 1 a.m. We could hear the British making ready to start an attack.

The general went along the lines checking with everyone, making sure they were ready. I recall that he took coffee with Dominique You, an aide to the pirate, Jean Lafitte.

General Jackson asked Dominique, "Where do you get this coffee? Do you smuggle it?"

Dominique smiled. "Maybe, general," he said in his Baratarian accent.

SOME HUMOR

How was it waiting for the British to move? There was some humor, of course.

We had a grizzly old sergeant named Sam Williams from Tennessee. He saw General Jackson standing erect and gaunt on top of the breastwork and broke out in song:

"Dah Gaberil stannin' by de gate;
Hy'm a-watchin' down beloh-h,
Dah jis one a' minnit foh tuh wait,
For tuh heah dat trumpet blow-w!
Den oh, Honey, we's a-cumin'—a-cumin';
Goody Lawdy! a cumin' for shoh!
We's ebery one a-cumin', a-cumin',
When we heah dat trumpet blow."

General Jackson looked at Williams unbelievingly. Before he could say anything, Gen. John Carroll told Williams, "Shut up, Sam. If the redcoats ever hear you trying to sing they'll run—run like hell. And we want 'em to come on."

The morning broke foggy.

MANY DELAYS

It did not start just as British General Pakenham hoped. According to his plan, his men under Colonel Thornton would have captured the west bank and would have taken our guns and turned them on us. But there were many delays, including a swift current which carried the British farther down river than was planned.

The fog began lifting. The head of the British column appeared to be about 200 files long about four ranks deep.

When they were about 500 yards away, our artillery opened up. So did the British.

Flashes of artillery lit up the fog and turned it into hues of the rainbow.

Still the British came, steadily, undaunted, just as General Pakenham envisioned yesterday.

Compounding the fog, smoke from our cannons hung over the scene. General Jackson ordered some cannons to cease firing.

There they were * * * the British were less than 300 to 350 yards away.

RIFLES CRACK

One rifle cracked out for us, then another, and another, and another. In 5 minutes, the whole front of the British line was a mass of death.

In less than 10 minutes, the first line of the enemy's column had disappeared, exposing the second, which was about 100 yards in its rear.

Furious shooting took its toll of General Pakenham and Gen. John Keane. Left in charge was Gen. John Lambert.

Meanwhile, across the river, U.S. forces were getting mauled and were forced to retreat toward New Orleans.

Early in the battle at Chalmette, General Morgan sent a courier from the west bank to General Jackson requesting more troops. But Jackson told him, "You'll have to hold with what you have; the big part of the battle is here."

He was right.

So withering and decisive was that first volley of gunfire from our rifles that half of the troops never fired a shot.

TRUCE OF SORTS

By noon, there was a truce of sorts. But the fighting continued on the west bank, and Jackson was faced with the choice of sending reinforcements there or waiting with all of his troops on the east bank.

Suddenly General Lambert, now in charge of the British, made a tough decision. He told Colonel Thornton on the west bank to pull back because of the monstrous defeat on the Chalmette side of the river.

This saved General Jackson the choice and assured us of complete victory.

The scene of carnage which I, Felix Bourgeois, saw today was one that I hope in future generations will not be repeated in New Orleans—or anywhere. But I know human beings can often be inhuman to each other, so it's not likely that we'll really learn too much from the Battle of New Orleans.

I hope that the people in New Orleans will remember with reverence those who died for them this day.

(Felix Bourgeois wishes to acknowledge the kind assistance of the New Orleans Public Library for considerable aid in refreshing his memory.)

Finest Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Longview Daily News, February 9, 1965, concerning Mr. Joseph M. Dealey, president of the Dallas Morning News.

I have read the Dallas News for several decades and have enjoyed it as a great newspaper.

The article follows:

FINEST TRADITION

Here in east Texas where for generations the great Dallas Morning News has been regarded as the bible of journalism, the contemporaries of Joseph M. Dealey are mighty well pleased to note that the Dallas News executive has been chosen Publisher of the Year.

The special award was presented to Mr. Dealey, president of the Dallas News, at the Austin Headliners Club's annual recognition party for Texas newspapermen.

His many friends here in Longview and throughout east Texas were made happy by the award simply because it was so well deserved. Publisher Joe Dealey not only is following in the footsteps of his illustrious forbears but he typifies in this modern era the finest tradition of the free and responsible press.

Joe Dealey is a third-generation newspaper family Texan who has come up through the ranks. His father and grandfather before him were working newsmen as well as executives. In family tradition, he continues to recognize that the quality of a newspaper stems from a combination of executive and staff ability, courage and purpose.

Joseph M. Dealey succeeded his father, E. M. (Ted) Dealey, as president of the Dallas News in 1960. He is the grandson of the late great G. B. Dealey, who established the News in Dallas in 1885.

Joe worked as a high school student in the News mailing room, graduated from the University of Texas, studied newspaper machinery and production at the Southwest School of Printing, and became a news reporter just before enlisting in the Air Force in World War II. After the war he again served as a reporter, then assistant news editor, assistant to the managing editor, then moved into corporate offices.

As president of the Dallas News, Mr. Dealey is recognized among his contemporaries as both a newsman and an executive who is making a notable contribution to Texas journalism. His example of courage and leadership is an inspiration to newspapermen throughout the State.

Dallas has bestowed upon him many positions of honor and numerous posts of public leadership in civic and welfare work. He has given of his talents and time to publishing associations. Through his leadership as a publisher, he has helped to give Dallas and Texas needed direction and program in such fields as education, arts and culture, commerce, and industry.

We here in Longview often have looked to Dallas across the years for assistance and encouragement. Joe Dealey and associates, past and present, have been both a challenge and an inspiration to us newspapermen. It is indeed good to see the News' president chosen as Publisher of the Year. It is proper recognition of a dedicated newspaperman who is doing a truly outstanding job in the finest tradition of Texas journalism.

How Good Are Tires?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article by James Ridgeway, entitled "That Superquiet, Squishy Ride," that appeared in the New Republic on January 30, 1965. The article points to potential hazards of allegedly defective automobile tires.

The article follows:

THAT SUPERQUIET SQUISHY RIDE

(By James Ridgeway)

A six-passenger automobile is equipped with tires designed to support only the weight of three occupants, not including their baggage. This startling admission was made at hearings before the Federal Trade Commission, where rubber manufacturers were asked to unravel the knotted strands of their business.

Neither the tire nor the automobile industries ever have developed maximum loads for auto tires, declared Mr. M. A. Wilson, chief of tire engineering at Goodyear. (Rather belatedly they now now are trying to come up with such specifications.) Instead, a usual practice in equipping cars with tires, he indicated, is to go by the handbook of the Tire & Rim Association, a technical advisory group, that recommends tire sizes and loads on the curb weight of the car plus three passengers.

In a statement to the Commission, Harry C. McCreary, Jr., chairman of McCreary Tire & Rubber Co., a small producer, said that auto companies had cut down so much on the amount of tires designed into their vehicles that some vehicles are sitting overloaded before anyone gets into them; others, particularly station wagons, are running dangerously around the highways 50 to 70 percent overloaded. McCreary said Detroit had saved a lot of money by cutting back on the amount of rubber used in tires.

Commissioner Philip Elman said that he owned a compact station wagon which during the summer he would load up with his wife, five children, pets, and baggage, then head toward New England over 500 miles of clear expressway. What assurance did he have that the tires were safe? Elman never got a straight answer: "Essentially your question is directed to the automobile industry," suggested one expert. "I cannot say that all tires for all cars are safe in all conditions," said another vaguely. Mr. Elman was urged to go to his tire dealer and state his needs; he was advised to buy tires that would take up the full load. "What bothers me," Elman said, "is that these standards suggest it is abnormal to fill up the car."

As the hearings wore on, the manufacturers were prodded into offering up other driblets of information:

Mr. Ross R. Ormsby, president of the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., a trade group that speaks for the industry, said the size printed on the side of the tire really isn't the size at all, but an approximate measurement called the name size. For instance, if you went to replace a tire bearing a name size of 8.20 (8.20 inches in width), the new tire might range in actual size from 8.50 to 7.95 inches in width. In other words, every automobile is being driven around with four different sized tires, and the possibility of a good deal of difference between the sizes at that. On big trucks, where tires must be paired, their selection must present a ticklish problem.

After New York State Senator Edward J. Speno put the screws to the tire crowd last year, threatening them with tough legislation, the industry brightly announced a voluntary program for setting minimum safety standards. These were based on specifications set for the Government in 1952 by the National Bureau of Standards; members of the industry agreed to have their tires put through tests at independent laboratories. The tires then would be certified as meeting the specifications. It all sounds very progres-

sive. But since 1952 autos go faster, roads are improved, and tires are differently made. The National Bureau of Standards considers the 1952 tests outdated, and Mr. Wilson of Goodyear himself referred to them as rather ancient. Even if a tire manufacturer should fail to be certified, he could go right on selling the tires. In fact, probably nobody would ever know the difference.

PRETTY BIG MESS

The manufacturers, of course, don't care to get the Federal Government into the act. But it's a pretty big mess by now; and the FTC could well propose to the Commerce Department that the Government's tire standards be brought up to date, and, should the industry refuse to go along with them, Members of Congress, Senator NELSON, for one, are all set to ram legislation down the industry's throat.

Mr. John F. Floberg, secretary and general counsel for Firestone, was undoubtedly reflecting a good deal of the industry's feeling when he declared: "Probably the worst thing the Commission could do from the standpoint of customer protection would be to attempt to establish grades of quality, as has sometimes been suggested, on the basis of physically measurable dimensions or mathematically countable characteristics.—I submit that the best standard, the time-tested and proved standard and the appropriate free enterprise standard of quality should be the one that has in the case of tires, as in the case of other consumer products, worked most satisfactorily; namely, the discriminating and sophisticated taste of the American consumer."

By a stroke of splendid good fortune, Mr. Henry Wakeland, a consultant to Speno's committee, was able to tell the Commission precisely how well the sophisticated American consumer fared in the hands of Firestone.

Last summer the Speno committee wanted to see just how badly tire buyers were being treated. It purchased tires and tubes based on price advertisements of a department store. While the tires didn't carry the manufacturer's name they were marked "Safety Special" and "Nylon." The committee sent them off to the National Bureau of Standards to see whether they would meet the Government's tests, which as already indicated are ancient.

Both tires failed the laboratory tests which simulate highway conditions. About half way through the 24-hour testing period, they suddenly lost air and collapsed. The test run produced broken cords and separated plies to such an extent that the tubes were abraded through. One tire was cut open and proved to have voids, tunnel-like hollow spaces, between the carcass and tread. The National Bureau of Standards said "poor workmanship" was involved. "Those tires looked like swiss cheese," Wakeland remembers. The committee traced the manufacturer from a shipping tag, found it to be Dayton Tire & Rubber Co., a subsidiary of Firestone.

Speno's committee had just as much trouble with high-priced tires. A New York State automobile club purchased premium tires for 20 vehicles. Complaints that the tires seemed to skid easily at first were brushed aside. It just couldn't be true, such was the reputation of the manufacturer and the price of the tire. The club's technical personnel conducted further testing, discovering that in stopping tests the tires produced skid marks on dry pavement 20 to 30 percent longer than those for comparable manufacturers. The club went to the manufacturer, who then changed the type of tread rubber in the tire specification and eventually replaced all the tires the club bought. The club was a big customer, in a position to develop its own facts. But the manufacturer never advised individual automobile owners that their tires, too, were unsafe.

In Europe automobile owners can obtain charts where the make of car and its intended use can be matched with various tire brands. Nothing like this exists in America. In explaining why not, Mr. Edwin H. Sonnecken, director of corporate planning and research at Goodyear, said the European tire market was different. For one thing, it was smaller, dominated by one grade of tire. Distribution was much more highly controlled. There was no mass distribution of tires. And anyway, European car owners looked at things differently. They regarded owning a car as a specialty, as a sport. Unlike Americans, they didn't take things for granted. And they kept their cars longer. Or was Mr. Sonnecken only describing how very successful the tire manufacturers have been in turning America into the biggest sucker market of all time?

While the Commission made hash of the tire people, it hauled up well short of taking on the automobile manufacturers, the real culprits. "This is like a performance of 'Hamlet' without the Prince of Denmark," Mr. Elman remarked in exasperation.

Detroit is the rubber factories' biggest customer. It demands of them tires of very small diameter for very low cars, tires with a soft and squisy ride that don't squeal on corners and are super-quiet on the highway. One way to make a compact car look bigger is to put small tires on it.

When Commissioner Mary Gardiner Jones asked why automobile tires weren't loaded for six instead of three people, the experts said she wouldn't like that. The ride would be too hard.

Bad Day on the Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message January 4, President Johnson said:

> Though total agreement between the Executive and the Congress is impossible, total respect is important.

The events of last week vividly contradict that statement. I refer to the White House repudiation of commitments on the closing of Veterans' Administration institutions and agricultural research stations. The following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 11 accurately points up the "Bad Day on the Hill":

BAD DAY ON THE HILL

The Great Society, whose leader is renowned especially for expertise in the legislative Halls, appears to have lost a battle but won a war this week on Capitol Hill. Even on those terms, it may prove to be a costly victory.

The big blowup came on Tuesday when House-Senate conferees thought they had reached a compromise agreement on riders tacked to a $1.6 billion agricultural bill. One of these lifted restrictions laid on the President in selling surplus food commodities to Egypt's unpredictable President Nasser. But this did not go to the real heart of the controversy. The fight actually hinged on plans to abolish certain Veterans' Administration hospitals and facilities and 20 agricultural research stations.

After Tuesday's session the conferees thought, or professed to think, that they had a firm commitment from Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and VA Administrator Driver to hold up the closing until the end of the fiscal year June 30. This would give Congress time to study each case and judge its reasonableness or unreasonableness.

Well, when word of this got back to the White House the President, or some unidentified individual acting for him, repudiated any and all such commitments. Secretary Freeman, who had written a letter confirming the understanding of the conferees, was ordered to withdraw it. Mr. Driver, who had not written such a letter, nevertheless disavowed any willingness to wait until the end of the fiscal year.

The conferees were furious, and made no bones about it. What right, they wanted to know, had the White House to upset what they considered to be a conference agreement?

Yet the supposed agreement had been overturned, and early yesterday the repair crews set to work. Larry O'Brien, the President's special assistant, hastened to the Hill. The conferees met again. After a reported phone conversation with the White House still another compromise was reached. The ban on sales to Nasser was lifted and May 1 was written into the law as time limit for congressional study of the proposed closings. After heated debate, the House and the Senate went along.

This will save some congressional face, but it will not prevent the two agencies from proceeding on May 1 with the program of shutdowns. And this is what they probably will do, unless the President has a change of heart in the interim.

But the victory for the President, if it can be called that, belongs in the Pyrrhic category. For the legislators are hopping mad—and Mr. Johnson has a long way to go on his legislative program.

What Is the Great Society?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Henry Watton is editor and publisher of the Compton, Calif., Post newspaper. He also is a member of the Democratic Central Committee in California. Therefore his editorial plea for a little more precise definition of just was is meant by the catch phrase "Great Society" has particular significance. In his January 27 edition Mr. Watton wrote as follows:

ADJUST THE FINE TUNING ON THE GREAT SOCIETY

Much has been said and written about President Johnson's Great Society. While the title leaves us a bit cold, we might warm up to the idea if the picture was a little clearer. At the moment the image is little distorted.

If Mr. Johnson means by Great Society that private enterprise is to be encouraged to expand and develop its resources to the extent every person who is willing to work may have a job under our system, then we are for it. But if he means that the Government must demand more from the willing worker so that those who shudder at the word "work" may live in high fashion, then we are against it.

If the President means an education for every student who is willing to work for it, willing to study and help himself through college, be given an opportunity to attend the college of his choice in accordance with the rules and regulations of the college, then we are for it. But if he means an effortless education with preferential treatment going to the willy-nilly, with unlimited aid going to schools at the cost of the long arm of the Federal Government directing the show, and private schools being swallowed up in the public system, then we oppose it.

If the Great Society means helping a willing but unfortunate man caught in a moment of need between jobs, help until he can stand on his own two feet and again support his family, then we applaud the idea. But if he means an open invitation to seek ways of being put on the relief rolls because the dole is better than the wage, then we are not with the President.

If Mr. Johnson means an opportunity for every American family to own a home and chunk of "the good earth" by education, jobs through private enterprise, encouragement of savings and other constitutional means, then we should back him 100 percent. But if he means an exchange of freedoms and the taking from those who have worked hard and managed to accumulate under our system and pass it out to those who feel the "Government owes them a home," then, in our opinion he is wrong.

If he means the sharing of our brains and businesslike cooperation with other nations of the world so that they, too, may rise up and become a better place for people, if this is what he means, we like it. But if he means that our country must become a mecca for the world's people who seek unlimited charity at the expense of our sovereignty and our 200-year-old principles and economic system, then we would have to oppose the idea.

The hazy picture which we see of the proposed Great Society seems to be a fair production. Mr. Johnson should adjust the fine tuning, enabling all of us to get a clear picture. If he cannot do this, then perhaps Congress should do a little editing and repairing. We do not object to joining the Great Society but we must first examine the goals, methods, and costs. So please, Mr. President, adjust the fine tuning.

We Build

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this January marked the 50th anniversary of Kiwanis International, an organization whose long history of dedicated and effective public service is well known. Recently, a speech commemorating this event was delivered in St. Louis by Edward B. Moylan, Jr., the international president of Kiwanis for 1965 and one of my most distinguished constituents and good friends.

Mr. Moylan joined Kiwanis 43 years ago as a charter member of the club of downtown Miami. Since that time he has given continuous service to our community, State and Nation through his devotion to the ideals of Kiwanis and through the leadership he has offered this organization.

He has served as president of the Miami club, as chairman of the international committee on resolutions, as lieutenant governor then as district governor, as an international trustee and, finally, as the 48th president of Kiwanis International.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech, stressing the Kiwanis motto, "We Build," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And, at this time also, I would like to give recognition to the Miami club president, Donald Elliott, and to all the organization's more than 260,000 members who are working to make this motto meaningful, and who are demonstrating that practical action is the best evidence of high idealism. I extend to them my congratulations for a half century of exemplary public spirit.

The speech follows:

WE BUILD

(By Edward B. Moylan, Jr., president)

I have chosen the subject on this occasion to talk about our motto—and our theme for this year, "We Build."

It is no mere accident that Kiwanis has woven its history around the motto "We Build." To build is germane to life. In fact, the more we think of building the more we are inclined to believe that "to build" is instinctive, intuitive, and innate. The little girl dabbling in dirt and water may make mud pies; her little brother wants to build a mud house. An older child on the beach, regardless of other activities, will strive at some time to build a sand castle. Older children want to build a playhouse, or a clubhouse, or a treehouse. Because building is so basic to human nature, poets have used this analogy in description of all kinds of development. Especially is this true with Markham, Longfellow, and Lowell. Essayists have followed through to describe character traits, economic systems, political movements in the terms of building.

It was a true stroke of genius when Kiwanis adopted "We Build" as its motto. Another stroke of genius is our decision that on our 50th anniversary we give added emphasis to our motto, "We Build."

Building is essential to progress; it is equally essential to preservation. The ancient Noah was intrusted "to build an ark to the saving of his household." That militant missionary apostle of the early church, Paul, used building as the criterion for judging every social indulgence. He said: "Does building edify? Does it build up?"

With marked determination to make a maximum contribution to life in this, the golden anniversary of our service, we have chosen as the focal point of our effort our motto "We Build."

We must have a goal. Men are deterred from high endeavor by the realization that there can never be Utopia on this earth. Others embrace a philosophy which says that if we cannot have a perfect panacea for our problems, we will seek no panacea at all. Not so with Kiwanis. We know that there is little accomplishment unless the goals are kept high. Our ideals must be lofty, our ambitions ethereal, and our commitments celestial. We subscribe to the theory that "a man's reach must exceed his grasp, or what's Heaven for." The urus of ancient Greece portrayed the cluster of grapes just out of reach of the aspirant, but the aspirant was straining and reaching. So must it be with us. It is not failure that is a crime, but low aim. We were a most useful people, a happier people, when we had each man hitching his wagon to a star. Too long have we said, "Search not the skies for opportunity; lower your head and seek security close at hand." May we bury every attitude which satisfies itself with the commonplace. The menace of mediocrity is a drag upon us. We make of ourselves a pigmy people when we content ourselves with less than our best. We must have a stupendous goal to lift the heart and set the soul to dreaming—a goal that will impel us to besiege and batter those forces which would destroy our world. Our world is volcanic; an eruption at any time could set off a holocaust that would exterminate most of the earth. Rampant are powers which cheapen life, which lessen the worth of the individual. When man feels that he is merely a cog in a wheel, that he is a number, that he is being groomed to become common fodder—and nothing more—than he shoots his own morals and blasts his own morale.

As never before our goal is: "We build the sovereignty, dignity, worth, responsibility, and accountability of the individual." Nothing less than this can merit our interest and attention. Nothing less than this can justify our existence. Only as we commit ourselves to this goal can we keep faith with our past. Upon this patterned path our predecessors pioneered. From them we take the torch and "on we go."

And then we must have a blueprint. To build we must have white lines on blue paper. Methodical, meticulous, careful plans assure the resultant edifice. Few have stopped to contemplate the engineering genius of Washington and the architectural talent of Jefferson in planning our Nation's basic structure. Whether building a doll cradle or a skyscraper, there must be some plans—plans that challenge our thought and demand our best.

We must preserve our belief in God, defend and maintain our freedom. Kiwanians must be willing to be tagged with a label in an all-out fight to defeat the liberal trend which would destroy our basic beliefs. We must also know that society will accuse us of facing backward as we devote ourselves to conservatism. To be victorious here is worth any price that we have to pay. The powers of darkness have given deathless devotion to the destruction of such phrases as: "In God We Trust," "This Nation under God." Our dedication and devotion to these ideals must be greater than that of those who would destroy them.

Kiwanians are increasing their potential for walking in the other fellow's moccasins. As we go into country after country the set determination is that we will understand our new neighbors in Kiwanis. Understanding breeds understanding, and understanding begets good will. So adequately have we practiced understanding between Canada and the United States that the names of our two countries have become synonymous with the inseparables of history such as Anthony and Cleopatra, Samson and Delilah, Jonathan and David, Holmes and Watson. Good will can cover the earth as the waters do the sea, but only if men are more determined to understand than they are to be understood.

Other nations are experiencing the encroachment of government into the field of business, especially among English speaking people. This encroachment, along with a planned economy, produces excessive taxation. Excessive taxation robs a people of originality, creativity, and moral honesty. In the United States the calendar year finds an individual well up into the month of May before he begins to earn the first dime for himself and his family. The first 4½ months he works to pay off all taxes. Our youth, as well as ourselves, must be educated even as to the true and intrinsic values in a free capitalistic system.

Some years ago a minister was chastized for letting his children read comic books. He readily answered, "The only thing which I try to keep my children from reading is the front page of the newspapers. I hate

for them to see the reports of corruption in high places." We must, as Kiwanians, crusade for honorable and honest men to offer themselves for public office. No one can challenge competency of those in high office, but in the realm of integrity there is much to be desired. One of our objectives is to remedy this situation with as much rapidity as possible.

We have long realized that professions, labor organizations, groups and news media cannot be cleaned up by outside pressure and crusades. The lifting of ethical standards must be done from within by those who are concerned. Kiwanians must insistently implement their influence within the organizations of which they are a part, not only to lead the organization to subscribe to a self-regulated code of ethics but to adhere to that code.

One of the greatest assets of Kiwanis is the emphasis which we place on youth—and we are not a cape half-turned. Our concern is also for the aged. The sacredness with which we regard life and living must never know any age limitation. Incorporated in our desire to inspire the young, to make significant and beautiful the sunset years, is our stress upon safety in all ages and areas of life.

Then we must have a course of action. How true it is that you cannot build a chimney from the top. You cannot suspend a roof in mid air and build a house under it. We must begin our work and continue the triumphal trip to our goals on the club level. As individual clubs gain information, they gather inspiration and impetus to achieve. Therefore, the watchword of the day is communication. Take nothing for granted. One of the greatest teachers of our generation said that he assumed that his pupils knew absolutely nothing about the subject at hand. With this approach, he made sure that each pupil went over the fundamentals. If we assume that Kiwanians know nothing, we are wrong; if we assume that they know everything, we are also wrong. We cannot take a middle ground assumption that they know something of our plans. Our course of action must be on the basis that we will go on the assumption that everything must be taught. We have a great history to tell. We have a great story to tell. Our 50 years of glorious history bears telling again and again. Those who have heard the story before will thrill to hear it again. Those who hear it for the first time will be enthralled by its dramatic appeal. Yes, we want to tell it again and again.

We are going to urge our local clubs to tell the Kiwanis story in every way in which it can be told—bring out every facet of its scintillating brilliance and beauty. We will tell it, inciting pride, leading men from luncheon halls to inspired service in the workaday world of which he is a part.

This year in Kiwanis we want to demonstrate to the world a program of action and service that the world would do well to emulate. We want to show that we are not sponges, to sop up the good things of God, but that we are as pipes to pass all good things on to others.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, during the campaign of last fall my district was highly honored by a visit from a great American, an outstanding businessman, and a peerless Democratic leader. Jim Farley came down from New York for a visit to Norfolk and made a most interesting and inspiring address. I know that many of his friends in the House will be interested in reading Mr. Farley's remarks, which were as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, MONTICELLO HOTEL, NORFOLK, VA., OCTOBER 15, 1964

My friends of the Old Dominion, may I now express my thanks again, as I have had occasion to so many times in the past, for the characteristic courtesy of Virginians in inviting me here tonight?

I do not come here to discuss business, nor budgets, nor balance sheets, because the really great values cannot be measured in figures. They can only be measured by the human heart. Indeed, out of the strong heartbeat of the Old Dominion came the first faint heartbeats of our mighty country—for Virginia is the honored mother of this Nation.

By their fruits shall ye know them and let us judge Virginia by her sons. Consider the litany of the mother of Presidents—Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Tyler, and Thomas Woodrow Wilson.

A President after whom our National Capital is named, and who is called the Father of his Country, needs no embellishment from me. I wish merely to note that all historians are agreed that the granite of the city which bears his name is no firmer than the granite of his character. I do not foresee that that will be history's verdict on Barry Goldwater or William Miller.

The continuity of Virginia did not end with General Washington. As clearly as our first President founded the character of this Nation, President Thomas Jefferson set forth its ideals, values which he held as being even beyond the Presidency of the United States. He set forth his exalted evaluation of his own epitaph: "Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom; father of the University of Virginia." He did not mention that he was the President of the United States. He asked only that he be remembered by the works he had performed for the liberation of the mind and soul of his fellowman.

There is a beautiful marble edifice in Washington dedicated to President Thomas Jefferson, and I cannot refrain from stating that I take much satisfaction out of the fact that President Roosevelt delegated to me the mission of broaching its creation to the leaders of the Congress and I labored for the appropriation required for the construction of that monument. But that marble pantheon is not his monument. His monument is this mighty Nation—because he and he alone, except for a few suggestions from John Adams and Benjamin Franklin, authored the Declaration of Independence—charter not only of a free nation but blueprint for a new and peaceful world—the Great Society itself.

That ideal did not die, indeed, if it ever does, we shall no longer be a nation. It has been carried forward and upward by the Democratic Party and its Presidents into the mighty hands of our present standard bearer—President Lyndon Baines Johnson. He has accepted the traditions of the past and the challenge of the future by a concept of which any of Virginia's Presidents would have been proud—the concept of the Great Society itself.

But before he can address himself to the continuance of the mighty vision of the Virginian Presidents, there are a few minor preliminaries to dispose of, and in which you and I have a part.

Little men have come forth, yapping at his heels and claim that this southern President is a danger to the South. But need I tell southerners that a man born in the heart of the South has also the South in his heart? Need I tell Virginians—mother of the Union—the blood of whose mighty regiments has flowed like the Potomac and the James in defense of the American flag—and whose blood will flow again if necessary in its defense—that there is no conflict of interest between love of the South and love of our country.

When President Johnson, under most trying circumstances, turned to us and said, "Let us continue," he meant the ideals of Virginia and the South and of these United States.

From 50 years of experience with your leaders, I tell you that President Lyndon B. Johnson comes not to destroy the South but to fulfill it, and the Nation—by fulfilling the ideals of Virginia and her Presidents.

And here, if I may, I strike a personal note. At the very first meeting of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Cabinet, of which I was a member, it faced one of the most serious problems in American history. The Nation's financial system was paralyzed. The banks had to be closed. In a matter of days they reopened—never to close again. That our country even had a financial system to revive was due in large part to the work of another great Virginian—Senator Carter Glass. He, a conservative Democrat of genius and integrity, had helped create that system at the behest of a Democratic President, far less conservative, President Woodrow Wilson.

In those first two F.D.R. terms, then and now, the Democratic Party had its disagreements within itself. Great though we thought him to be, some of us opposed a third term for President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Among those who opposed the third term were Senator Carter Glass and HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia. I stood with the gentleman of Virginia. I stood up to be counted—in the face of certain and overwhelming defeat—but I count it as one of the most profound satisfactions of my life, that Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia, got up out of a sick bed to make, at his own request, the long and painful journey to Chicago to place my name in nomination for the presidency of the United States.

As gentlemen we stood, and as gentlemen we fell—but we did not bolt the Democratic Party. We were too experienced, if I may immodestly say so, to deepen our defeat by expelling ourselves from our party—Thomas Jefferson's party, the party into which we were born and in which we felt we had earned our standings. By the same token, I urge you not to deny Virginia her right to first place in the Democratic Party—first in the South and first in the Nation as the birthplace of all three.

However, I have been too long in politics to believe that the Democratic Party has a monopoly on insight and integrity. I count over the years as some of my closest personal friends the leaders of the Republican Party. We both believed in the two-party system. We both tried to serve our country as best we knew how.

The Virginians who are Republicans are nonetheless the heirs of Virginia's traditions because they believe the Republican Party best expresses their views.

But I submit the incredible Goldwater-Miller ticket does not express the Republican Party. Consider the dignity of Presidents Hoover and Eisenhower and ask yourselves if they could possibly have uttered these statements of Senator Goldwater:

Said Senator Goldwater: "I fear the civilians; they're taking over."

Again Senator Goldwater said: "I don't have much use for platforms. At best they are a compounding of lies."

Still further: "I don't believe in Federal aid to education, or aid to the aged, or any kind of medical assistance. The child has no right to an education. In most cases, the children will get along without it."

Believing this, Senator Goldwater, in an overwhelming number of bills, voted against the Republicans in the Senate.

I leave it to you whether this man represents your kind of Republicanism.

Here is what Senator Goldwater has to say about nuclear war and world holocaust: "Now, I'll have to admit that I possibly shoot from the hip. I've been exposed to problems, and I don't have to stop and think about them."

Does Senator Goldwater realize the risks? Judge for yourselves.

Said Senator Goldwater: "There will either be a war or we'll be subjugated without war, real nuclear war. I don't see how we can avoid it; perhaps 5, 10 years from now."

May I point out that that would cover his term in office if elected?

Considering that the nuclear weapons are of such comparative power that a few would obliterate the cities of the Atlantic seaboard in one night, Senator Goldwater's irresponsibility comes close to a peak when he declares: "That word 'brinkmanship' is a great word."

"Right here in Seattle you turned out aircraft which shot down a lot of enemies, and you're going to do it again."

Apparently, from his statements, if war didn't come fast enough he would force it. Because, said Senator Goldwater: "Defoliation of the forests in southeast Asia by low-yield atomic bombs could well be done. It might kill a lot of monkeys, but it could be done at a time of day that it wouldn't kill people."

Again Senator Goldwater declared: "If I had my choice, I would go into south China. It would be fairly easy. You would knock out the railroads. If you did not convince them you would knock out the roads."

Nor does Senator Goldwater confine his saber rattling to Asia. Said Senator Goldwater: "I don't want to hit the moon. I want to lob one into the men's room of the Kremlin and make sure I hit it."

Can anyone, Republican or Democrat, imagine the Virginian Presidents discussing the nuclear destruction of half the cities of the world in those casual, irresponsible, and—indeed—vulgar words?

To those who urge carefulness in foreign policy, Senator Goldwater has an equally irresponsible answer: says Senator Goldwater: "A craven fear of death is entering the American consciousness."

Perhaps the destruction of Virginia's historic cities and landmarks would make less impact on Senator Goldwater than on others, because this man who aspires to be President of all of the American people has stated: "Sometimes I think the country would be better off if we could just saw off the eastern seaboard and let it float out to sea."

Now, my fellow Americans, Democrat or Republican, in all reason would you entrust the lives of your family, your State, and your country to a Commander in Chief who announces "he shoots from the hip."

Do you suppose our country's enemies are not aware of his statements and might be frightened enough to shoot first?

Well, I think and I hope I know what standing for principle means. I stood with Senator Carter Glass and Senator HARRY F. BYRD, in principle, against a third term for a great President and actually our dear friend—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. But I most earnestly and urgently tell you I am a hundred times more opposed to a first term for Senator Goldwater in 1964 than I ever was for a third term for F.D.R. in 1940.

The Virginian who wrote the Declaration of Independence declared that each of us and our children had the right to life, liberty, and happiness.

I submit this to the people of Virginia—whether or not the issue is life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—in the progressive, descent, not Democratic, not Republican, but American way—of President Lyndon Baines Johnson—or the nightmare of having a President so irresponsible that he himself states he shoots from the hip.

One word more. I do not believe that Senator Goldwater's insult to the American people is correct. When Senator Goldwater implies that because we seek to avoid nuclear war we are obeying a craven fear of death so is wrong. Americans do not fear death so much as they love God.

"Thou shalt not kill," is the law of God—and the American people do not want to kill tens of millions of Russian school children any more than we would have them kill tens of millions of ours. And not only for the love of our children but for the love of God Himself.

"In God We Trust" is the motto of this Nation—and God has put His conscience in each of us. I have spoken from my conscience and my heart tonight because according to the law of God and this Nation, each of us, in his own heart and in his own conscience must make his decision. I have told you mine. And now you must make yours and in the making of your decision may God be with you.

Resolution of Erie County Board of Supervisors, Buffalo, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution which was adopted by the Erie County Board of Supervisors, Buffalo, N.Y., in opposition to the closing of certain Veterans' Administration facilities in the State of New York:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY, BUFFALO, N.Y., FEBRUARY 8, 1965

Whereas the U.S. Government is embarking upon a very commendable program of economy in government; and

Whereas essentiality is a matter of vital interest to the American public; and

Whereas the health and welfare of our American war veterans must be a matter of continuing interest and essentiality to the American public in return for the great debt that, America owes its veterans; and

Whereas it has been proposed that certain veterans hospitals and hostel facilities be closed at a time when the need for veteran care is demonstrably at its highest; and

Whereas it would appear that the future care for our war veterans is the least that we, as the most prosperous and affluent society in the world, should provide for them in greatful appreciation to them for their contribution to the preservation and continuation of our way of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the present proposal of the Federal Government to close much needed veterans hospitals, and hostel facilities be halted; and be it further

Resolved, That the present level of veterans facilities and hostels be maintained on its present geographical allocation basis; and be it further

Resolved, That nothing be done to interrupt, interfere with or alter the present level of veterans' care; and be it further

Resolved, That this board of supervisors opposes the closing of any veterans hospitals and hospital facilities located in the State of New York, including particularly the veterans hospital located at Bath, N.Y.

WILLIAM J. ROSE,
LAURENCE W. FINN,
RANDOLPH A. MINEO.

One-hundredth Anniversary of the Salvation Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, many times throughout the years we have gone on record with our recognition of the Salvation Army's humanitarian work in various disasters, situations of depression, in wartime and in peacetime, at the Christmas season and other seasons, all months and all hours. Today I propose that we place on record a happy acknowledgement of the fact that this year the Salvation Army is 100 years old—that we express our appreciation for this century of service to God and man.

The history of the program aptly described as "heart-to-God, hand-to-man" is reflected directly and indirectly in the lives of people throughout our 50 States—to say nothing of the rest of the world. The dedication of the men and women who fight on all fronts of human need has earned for the Salvation Army not only our respect but our affection.

This centennial makes us think how long the Salvation Army has been feeding the hungry, sheltering the homeless, caring for the sick, helping all manner of the unfortunate, spreading its message of good will and planting seeds of hope. Even more important, the worldwide observance of the centennial makes us stop to think how much the Salvation Army has grown. All the lines of its service are now woven like strong threads into the patterns of our social service. And seeing all the Salvation Army hospitals, maternity homes, shelters, schools, missions, camps, institutes for the blind, residences for the elderly—a fantastic number of institutions as well as of services beyond measure—we marvel at the century of progress, the century of service, since it started in England in 1865.

A dedicated minister, William Booth, a nonconformist in that Victorian era of conformity, courageously went to preach the Gospel among the poverty-stricken in the East London slum. He preached on the corners of the streets because the people were in the streets, for this was one of the worst sections of the city during one of its worst periods of economic depression. Full of drunkenness, prostitution, degradation, it was beset by the general evil and specific crime that are born of poverty wed to hopelessness.

Booth had not meant to found a separate church. But his converts, destitute and shabby, were not at home in the

regular churches to which he tried to send them. So he banded them together.

Seeing the tragedy, the suffering of the men and women who were out of work, out of health, out of homes, out of hope itself, he was filled with compassion. He and his little group of followers strove to find shelters for the homeless, including children who had nowhere to go, to feed the hungry, care for the sick, and to help the alcoholics.

And this program of spiritual and material help was to be symbolized in the S on the Salvation Army uniforms today. On the collar there are two S's. One S stands for salvation, which is that William Booth was preaching. The other stands for service, which is what he was practicing.

Word of his work spread. The Salvation Army spread. To other parts of England. To Sweden. To the European mainland. It invaded the United States in 1880—from which time until this the history of the services it implemented, year after year, has paralleled much of the history of social progress in this country.

Today in 71 countries and geographical areas the Salvation Army's flag flies over everything from schools to leprosaria, from maternity homes to camps for the elderly. Its spiritual and social welfare ministry attracts people from all walks of life, all income groups, and the diversification of its program is matched only by the multiple needs of troubled humanity. We are familiar with the heartwarming sight of its mobile units, of the men and women who rush in with supplies in times of disaster. We know how they serve snacks or hot beverages to victims and workers in train wrecks, hurricanes, floods, earthquakes.

It would not be Christmas without their red kettles. But even the Army's most loyal supporters are not fully aware of the vast scope of the year-around activities whereby it helps people in need, at their point of need—whatever the need may be.

The Salvation Army, for example, operates 31 general hospitals throughout the world. It cares for frightened unwed or deserted mothers in 37 maternity homes and hospitals in the United States. It maintains 125 social service centers in this country where homeless men can reclaim their lives.

Each year the missing persons bureau of the Salvation Army acts as a worldwide network of hope for an average of 12,000 people seeking lost relatives or friends, while its League of Mercy takes comfort and cheer to 3 million lonely, sick, and unfortunate men and women in prisons, hospitals, and other institutions away from the mainstream of life. The Army maintains Evangeline residences where young women can have pleasant, low-cost accommodations. It operates Red Shield Clubs and USO Clubs where men and women of the Armed Forces can find a welcome, attend classes, enjoy athletic and other events. And travelers and immigrants are helped by the Salvation Army's Transportation and Immigration Bureaus.

Foster homes for children of broken homes—day care for children—clubs for boys and girls—camps for senior citizens—and many other allied services are among those provided by the Salvation Army. And—around the world—one of the world's greatest contributions to literacy. The Salvation Army has an amazing number of schools, 857 in fact. It staffs and operates some of them in undeveloped areas where villages are so far apart pupils could not travel to and from class, so they are also given room and board.

In parts of the world so remote that no other aid would be available to the afflicted from the time of their birth to that of their death, the Salvation Army has 10 institutes for the blind. It accommodates 1,301 sufferers from leprosy in well-equipped leprosaria in Malaya, India, Rhodesia, and Sumatra.

The unique army that was begun by William Booth in that London slum section is now one of the nongovernmental organizations of the United Nations. The ministry that he began is now conducted in 147 languages.

The Salvation Army, then, has much for which to be congratulated on this, its 100th anniversary. To its 25,000 officers and cadets, its million members, its 30,000 employees, and the countless citizens who support and serve with them in communities everywhere, let us say "happy birthday." And, humbly, let us all say it with gratitude. It is a remarkable century of service to God and man.

First Anniversary of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, February 10, 1965, marked the first anniversary of passage by the House of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It is fitting and appropriate that we at this time reappraise and strengthen our commitment to insure every citizen, those rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution.

Passage of the Civil Rights Act was a historic action. It was the answer of a forward-looking Congress to the urgent cries of an aroused citizenry. On July 4, 1964, I issued the following statement:

My opinions on civil rights come from the very depths of my own religious belief and conviction * * * that there is one God that created us all. My opinions stem from a firm commitment to America's political tradition "that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

We have come a long way since the days of tyranny and slavery, but our country, though mighty in the councils of the nations of the world, is not yet a perfect union. So long as the rights of a single citizen are denied or taken from him without due process of law, then the perfect union envisioned by the Founding Fathers is still merely an ideal, and the rights of all of us are in jeopardy.

When the people resort to lawlessness, when State and local officials fail to maintain law and order, when they fail to protect the rights of citizens, the Federal Government must meet these responsibilities quickly and forcefully.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is now the law of the land. It represents an important breakthrough in overcoming the barriers on the road minority groups are destined to travel toward full freedom in America. Effective and meaningful implementation of the law depends upon the elimination of fear, bigotry, and hatred through education and understanding.

These are not times for men of good will and conscience to remain silent. We must stand up and be counted. We must become involved to preserve the human rights of all citizens, the guarantee of which, by our Constitution, has made America great.

The law of the land must be resepcted and upheld for America to remain great. To paraphrase Senator HUMPHREY, let us move out of the shadow of States rights and move into the sunshine of human rights.

We must all work together to guarantee the rights of all.

Mr. Speaker, that statement is as applicable today as it was then, for now we must look ahead and provide additional safeguards for citizens not yet treated as our Constitution and morality dictate.

Because of a change in the travel schedule which conflicted with my observance of the Sabbath on Saturday, I was unable to accompany those of my colleagues who went to Selma, Ala., last week, as originally planned. Their reports and those of the mass media indicate that additional congressional action is needed—action to provide new safeguards to protect our most basic and fundamental right—the right to vote.

Obstacles have been erected to prevent registration in more than one American community for the sole purpose of denying the right to vote to certain of our citizens. It is apparent that the breakthrough of 1964, while it changed the law, did not change the hearts and minds of some men. Therefore, Federal legislation must be enacted to remove the obstacles to registration for every eligible citizen to exercise the right to vote.

We have a stake in the maintenance of the United States as the leader of the free world—a world which is constantly being challenged by the world of slavery behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains—and from an island only 90 miles from our shores.

How can we hope for democratic practices in other lands while we do not effectively practice them in our own country.

Just as there are no degrees of honesty, there can be no silence—there can be no hedging—there can be no watering down.

Democracy will thrive only if we remain alert to the acts of those who threaten it. In 1964, the Members of Congress joined in bipartisan support of the Civil Rights Act. I appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to again demonstrate their awareness and concern and to implement the Civil

Rights Act by passing appropriate legislation dealing with the specific problems of registration and voting.

IBA Agriculture Committee Position Paper on the Rural Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the Independent Bankers Association—IBA—is rapidly becoming one of the foremost allies of family farmers in their crucial drive for higher farm income. The concern of the IBA comes quite naturally. The organization's members are without equal in their close relationship with the farmer and knowledge of the financial condition of agriculture.

Independent bankers are aware that there has been no miracle in rural America to make possible the payment of increased expenses with less income. Farmers have had to compensate for lost income by increasing their credit, and many feel that use of this substitute has reached, or is rapidly approaching, the saturation point.

On behalf of the farmers of my district I am grateful to the IBA for its concern and efforts to solve the problems of rural America and to improve the economy of that important segment of our population.

The IBA recently published a position paper on the depressed rural economy. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the paper be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows.

IBA AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE POSITION PAPER ON THE RURAL ECONOMY

Should the disaster of the thirties seem remote in these soaring sixties, remember that the lengthening shadow of the great depression went unnoticed as America danced its way through the roaring twenties.

Depressions have always had their beginning at a peak of prosperity, and they always are farm led and farm fed.

It is now apparent that the mistakes of the twenties are being repeated. Commercial banks are loaned up to historically high levels in ratio to available deposits. The easy money of the sixties has made us a seemingly affluent society and we are now reaching for the Great Society.

But those who see a bright future for America apparently are not aware of a new shadow that has crept over the horizon. The most significant feature of the American economy today is this: rural banks cannot much longer continue to supply the credit needs of rural America. Since 1951, farmers have been using credit as a substitute for earned income because of depressed agricultural raw material prices.

With the inception of its agricultural research program 3½ years ago, the Independent Bankers Association has warned repeatedly that such credit could not continue indefinitely. The association has urged that action be taken to revive the economy of rural America before the point of no return was reached, but the downward drift has been allowed to continue.

The association now finds it necessary to caution its member banks to be concerned with the quality of their loanable assets. Country bank loans to farmers are dangerously close to deterioration.

The IBA is not alone in its concern.

At the recent convention of the American Bankers Association, the ABA urged a retreat from easy credit. In a convention resolution the ABA said "it is difficult to find justification for the degree of ease which now prevails in credit markets."

Insurance companies and large as well as small lenders are voicing the same caution. Similar experiences are being reported by the production credit associations and by the Farmers Home Administration. It has been said that unless corrective action is taken soon, the FHA will one day be known as the graveyard for bankrupt farm loans.

Firsthand experience of bankers throughout rural America show farmers holding assets of uncertain value which appear to support bank loans as collateral. The farm borrower continues to demonstrate excellent integrity. But his house falls in when his integrity and assets are measured against the profit entry on his operating statement. There just isn't enough left to make a dent in his debts.

In case after case, depreciation transfers are completely used up in paying operating expenses or providing food, clothing, and other bare essentials for the farm family.

Rural bankers believe we have been building our economic future on a weak foundation. Our facade of prosperity has been achieved at the expense of the producers of agricultural raw materials.

We have not constructed true economic wealth at all, but a will-o'-the-wisp prosperity in which some segments of the economy have been fattened by feeding upon another. Since the land represents the beginning point of our country's wealth, such prosperity can only be temporary. It will eventually fall of its own weight.

In the absence of adequate profits in agriculture, essential to reduction of ever-increasing debt, the time approaches when banks will have to terminate credit availability to thousands of farmers in rural America. This will force liquidation of numerous farm units and subsequently the destruction of thousands of rural businesses that serve farmers.

One result will be the loss of a market for an important portion of our total output of goods and services. This indicates a cutback in industrial production and an increase in unemployment. Whatever gains can be made through the administration's antipoverty program will be more than canceled out by the inability of the rural population to earn a living.

And remember—some 30 percent of the U.S. population lives in rural communities of 2,500 and under and on the farms surrounding them.

Because net farm income has declined while the income of other segments of the economy has soared to record levels, the farmer has been caught in a cost-price squeeze. The result has been a drop of more than 3 million in agricultural employment since 1949. This would seem to have been the source of a large percentage of the total unemployment today. It is now contributing more to the poverty of the Nation than any other single factor.

In the face of this, the prevailing economic philosophy calls for the elimination of 2½ million additional farmers. These would not just be the "little inefficient farmers." They would be a broad category of farmers—large and small alike.

We have apparently overlooked the most obvious answer to the unemployment problem. An expanded rural economy would slow down the outmigration of farmers. It would create an expanded rural labor force, both on the farm and in the rural communities.

Government figures show that the largest pocket of poverty in America today is in the rural areas.

The farmer is in a state of economic depression, because he is not getting a fair price for his production; that is, farm raw material prices are not in balance with the prices of other segments of the economy.

The situation has occurred not because of any inexorable laws of economics, but because important political and business interests have served to gain from maintaining farm raw material prices at depressed levels.

Our profit-starved rural economy has been dependent on massive doses of credit every year since 1953. This credit will one day have to be repaid. When we do this, we will deprive the market in some future years of the income necessary to consume our annual production at a profitable price level.

The farmer has been using credit to keep his head above water. His borrowing always is in anticipation of future profits, but the sad fact remains that repayment often is made from liquidation of assets accumulated in prior years.

There is a limit to the amount of credit that is available in the United States. Expanded credit cannot much longer serve as a substitute for adequate earnings in agriculture.

Ten thousand banks collapsed between 1931 and 1934 because of the necessity for rural bankers to withdraw loanable funds from agriculture. The reason the bankers were compelled to collect farm loans at an accelerated pace was severe underpayment for agricultural raw material production.

To prevent a repetition of this catastrophe, we recommend that the Federal Government give the same attention to farm prices that it has given to civil rights, the war on poverty, tax reduction, and other priority measures.

If farm prices are restored to relative balance with the rest of the economy, we can achieve a huge bonus of output and income by making full use of all of our resources and raw material, human and financial. We can provide full employment, full plant capacity, balance the budget, and commence retirement of the national debt.

Georgia Day—February 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the attention of this Representative body to one of the great events in our national history of 232 years ago.

The second week of February brings a day which should be honored not only by all Georgians, but the rest of our Nation—Georgia Day, February 12—for it was through the victory and tenacity of James Edward Oglethorpe and the Georgia Colonists that English supremacy was established in the southeast, a key victory for civilization.

When Oglethorpe founded Georgia February 12, 1733, and laid out its first

city, Savannah, it was the first step toward proving the worth of this military buffer colony which would stop the Spanish attacks on all the Colonies. The defeat of the Spanish by Oglethorpe and the Georgians at Bloody Marsh was a decisive battle for American continental supremacy—decisive for Spain as two decades later the Plains of Abraham proved for France, or Yorktown two decades later yet for Britain."

Following this victory, the Governors of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina addressed letters of congratulations and thanks to General Oglethorpe, showing their appreciation of the widespread results and benefits.

Many "firsts" for our Nation have originated at Savannah—the first planned city in America—and in Georgia through the years, but the important first step which was the basis for all was the venturing into the debatable land and founding on this date the Georgia Colony. All the English-speaking peoples and the free world of English laws can rejoice and boast of February 12—the Founding Day of Georgia—the day we celebrate, the 232d birthday of the State.

Leasing the Shale Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the even split of 3 to 3 on the advisory panel to the Interior Department, which signifies their inability to reach a decision on whether or not leasing of the public oil shale reserves should begin, raises serious concerns of public policy in my mind:

First. In view of the present abundance of oil wells in this country, is it timely to allow the Federal Government to take steps which can vastly increase the amount of oil available? Would this not restrict further the monthly quotas allowed present wells?

Second. Since the Federal Government has put many years and much money into research on a process for recovering oil from these shales, is this a proper time to enter into leasing arrangements? Is it not premature, and are not the leases apt, in fact, to be a giveaway?

Third. This is an era of conservation, and why, without impelling reason, should we begin to exploit one of the world's greatest oil reserves which is within our borders, not needed today, and of perhaps vital need at a future date?

I believe the editorial which appeared in the New York Times on February 14 makes certain important points, and under permission granted, I should like to insert it in the RECORD at this point:

LEASING THE SHALE LANDS

The Nation's richest treasure house of mineral wealth lies locked in the oil shale reserves on public lands in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah. A Federal advisory panel has split 3 to 3 on whether the Interior Department should begin leasing these lands for exploitation by major oil companies. We believe it should not.

Much too little is yet known about the profit to be made from tapping this national treasure and converting it to private gain. A number of experiments are now underway to provide some illumination on what the yield will be; there is little expectation that these test operations will have produced much trustworthy information before 1970. In the absence of such knowledge, the Government will be ill able to make any determination of whether it is receiving a fair price for long-term leases.

Moreover, there is no current shortage of oil to meet the country's needs for defense, business, or pleasure. Supplies from standard sources are abundant, and the financial health of the oil industry is exceedingly robust. If any new evidence was required on this score, it was provided by this weekend's report that a New York industrialist has just sold some oil company stock for $46 million more than he bought it for last June. The company involved—Union Oil of California—is a leader in shale oil development.

The eventual use of the oil shale deposits should be part of a coordinated national fuel policy, based on adequate total knowledge. It may be that new discoveries will demonstrate that America's reserves of oil are as inexhaustible as its store of coal, but that does not now seem to be true. Profligacy in exploiting these deposits is as unwise as it is unnecessary.

Buffalo Art Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on February 27 President Johnson's adviser on the arts will speak in Buffalo, N.Y., to open the 2-week Buffalo Festival of the Arts Today.

Mr. Roger L. Stevens, special assistant to the President on the arts and a well-known producer of Broadway plays and musical comedies, will speak at a dinner in the Albright-Knox Art Gallery to open the festival.

Following is an article about the festival which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News on January 16, 1965:

MODERN WORLD ARTS TO MAKE BOW AT BUFFALO FESTIVAL

The newest developments in contemporary art, music, drama, dance, movies, and poetry will be refreshed during the Buffalo Festival of the Arts Today from February 27 to March 13.

The Albright-Knox Art Gallery will bring from Paris, Zurich, Germany, and New York examples of kinetic (electronic and motor driven) sculpture and optic paintings for an exhibition, "Art Today: Kinetic and Optic Works."

The featured artists are to be Nicolas Schoffer, who will come from Paris to install two galleries of his electronic programed works, and Len Lye, of New York.

The Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra, directed by Lukas FOSS, will present the world premiere of "Traces," a work described as "an amalagamation of the arts," by Luciano Berio.

Mr. Berio will travel here from Italy to serve as director and stage manager for the work, a highly controversial production that deals in part with discrimination.

A major highlight of the festival will be the American premiere of four plays by Eugene Ionesco—"The Leader," "L'Impromptu," "Foursome," and "Bedlam Galore."

The plays will be directed by Richard Casey, for many years Melody Fair director. M. Ionesco has been invited to attend the premiere performance.

The festival will open with a dinner for sponsors February 27, at 6:30 p.m., in the Albright-Knox Art Gallery.

The main address will be given by Roger L. Stevens, Special Assistant to the President on the Arts.

A preview of the "Art Today" exhibition for gallery members will be open at 9:30 p.m. The exhibition will include the works of the Group Zero of Germany and Groupe Reserche d'art Visuel de Paris.

The Berio work will be presented by the Buffalo Philharmonic Sunday, February 28, at 2:30 p.m., and Tuesday, March 2, at 8:30 p.m., in Kleinhans Music Hall.

The philharmonic program also will feature the American premiere of "Threnody," a composition by Krzysztof Penderecki, of Warsaw.

The program will include, too, these compositions: "The Swallows of Salangan," by the American, Morton Feldman; "Deserts," by the American, Edgar Varese, and "Improvisations II sur Mallarme," by the French composer, Pierre Boulez.

An art exhibition, "Found Objects: Mid-Century Genre," opens Sunday, February 28, at 5:30 p.m., in Upton Hall Gallery, State University College, at Buffalo.

A symposium, "Tomorrow?," will be held February 28, at 8:30 p.m., in the Albright-Knox Auditorium. Mr. Foss will be moderator.

The participants will be Mr. Feldman, Harold Rosenberg, distinguished art critic; Mr. Casey, American Artist Larry Rivers, and Gregory Corso, poet on the faculty at the State University of Buffalo.

Textile Mills Have Banner Year, Thanks to Taxpayer-Financed Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, further information is at hand indicating the degree to which the so-called one-price cotton program enacted last year has become a bonanza to the textile mills. When the bill was debated, I warned that it would likely become a multi-million-dollar windfall to the mills, with little or no benefit to consumers. Every indication to date supports this prediction.

The following report, condensed slightly, appeared in the February 10, 1965, issue of the Wall Street Journal:

TEXTILES GET BRIGHTER—MILLS IN 1964 HAD ONE OF BEST YEARS SINCE EARLY FIFTIES, WITH HELP OF COTTON BILL; PROFIT GAINS SPUR STOCKS

(By Ted Stanton)

Textile mills in 1964 had one of their best years since the early 1950's, helped considerably by the cotton program that President

Johnson in his farm message said should be extended and improved.

Expansion, diversification, and modernization, all fueled by soaring earnings, are bringing a luster to textile company stocks that reflects the industry's brighter image.

The provision of the law that has been a major factor in the textile mills' gain permits them, in effect, to buy U.S. cotton at the same price foreign mills pay. It has provided for payment of 6½ cents for each pound of cotton domestic textile firms use. That's roughly the difference between the world price of about 23½ cents a pound and the higher, domestic support price for last year's crop. Mills formerly had to pay the higher price.

Mill executives are generally optimistic about this year's operations, too. Their confidence stems from the industry's overall firmness, and also from widespread expectations that Congress will vote to extend the one-price program, with, at most, minor revisions. The present law expires in mid-1966.

The table below marks the rise of some leading mills' stocks from the bottom of the 1962 market slump to yesterday's closing price. Many have outpaced the broad market advance; some have almost doubled, and shares of Burlington Industries, Inc., biggest concern in the industry, are up even more. Prices are New York Stock Exchange closing quotations, with those of J. P. Stevens & Co. adjusted for two 10-percent stock dividends.

	June 26, 1962	Now	Percent gain
Burlington Industries	18⅞	66¼	250
J. P. Stevens	24	47⅝	98
United Merchants & Manufacturers	18¼	27⅜	50
M. Lowenstein & Sons	8¾	17	94
Cone Mills	12⅛	24⅝	103
Dan River Mills	12¾	24¼	90
Dow-Jones industrials	535.76	901.24	68

The substantial earnings gains that are in prime force in these rises seem likely to continue into the summer at least. Industry profits in the first 9 months last year rose 38 percent from those of a year earlier, the Securities and Exchange Commission said. Third quarter profits were up 60 percent, three times the 18-percent gain reported for all manufacturers. An analyst close to the industry calls the outlook "better than in Lord knows how long."

* * * * *

When the bill took effect April 11, prices of cotton cloth slipped briefly. But then buyers, who had been holding off awaiting the bill's passage, began to pour their orders in, and prices edged up. Because of the rush, some mills early last fall had cotton goods output booked through this year's second quarter to a much greater degree than in several years. And prices generally held firm.

SOME EXECUTIVE CONCERNS

Some mill executives fret that if Congress delays acting on extension of the bill, the uncertainty of which Mr. Cone spoke could return. Adding to their concern: In his farm message President Johnson said he would offer specific proposals "to reduce the cost of this program and the level of cotton stocks." Administration sources indicate, however, that a radical overhaul of the cotton pricing program isn't likely.

In urging passage of the bill last year, industry and Government spokesmen suggested consumer prices would be cut, too. While prices of corduroy, denum, and some other goods have fallen, the widely used print cloths are generally above last April's levels, and critics of the bill cite this often. "They promised savings would be passed through, but on too many goods it just hasn't happened," says Max Milstein, House Dress Institute counsel. Commenting on mill earnings gains, he adds wryly, "I'd be more prosperous, too, if the Government would hand me a present of millions of dollars."

* * * * *

The wage rise southern textile workers won last year may soon be followed by another for those in the North. The union has announced plans to seek a 15-percent wage increase, a pension plan, and fringe-benefit gains for its northern members when it reopens its contract this spring.

George Perkell, Textile Workers Union research chief, noted the union endorsed the one-price bill last year but will await results of the wage negotiations before taking a stand this year. Last year's pay boost, he adds, "was advertised as 5 percent, but often worked out to less. The firms could have given us 25 percent across the board and still had 55 percent of the pricing bill's savings left."

Though the law's impact on earnings has been sharp for many textile companies, for others it has been negligible. Collins & Aikman, Inc., for example, which uses synthetic fibers mainly, notes cotton goods account for so little of the firm's output that "we'll hardly feel the law at all."

IMPROVING PROFIT MARGINS

Along with other favorable factors, nevertheless, the new law has helped to lift the industry's traditionally low profit margins. Some gains have already been posted. More are expected.

The SEC figures industry profit margins for 1963 at an average of 2.3 percent off from 2.47 percent in 1962. But for the first 9 months of 1964, profit as a percentage of sales was 2.9 percent, and for the third quarter alone it was 3.7 percent, the SEC reported. Here are some of the latest samples of profit after taxes as a percentage of sales, compared with year-earlier levels: In the year ended October 3, Burlington's was 4.2 percent up from 3.7 percent; in the 9 months to September 30. Lowenstein's was 2.4 percent, up from 0.8 percent; Cone Mills 3.3 percent and 1.5 percent and Dan River 4.2 percent and 3.4 percent both for the 9 months.

Prime reasons for the rise: The pricing bill, last year's tax cut, benefits of efficient new equipment, and sales gains that almost certainly pushed industry volume above 1963's record $15 billion. Nine month sales, the SEC said jumped 7 percent from 1963.

Another trend reflecting the health of the industry is the apparent reduction in unit labor costs. Official statistics aren't available, but one company executive notes that "'figuring employment against either total sales dollars or production would show a decline in labor costs."

The Textile Workers' Mr. Perkell says industry output per man-hour has climbed an average 5 percent annually in recent years while wages have gone up 2 percent a year on average, even with last year's rise. Fringe benefits, the union official contends, "have gone up only slightly."

A prime problem still facing the industry, executives and analysis agree, is the continuing competitive pressure of imports. Mills making woolens and worsteds, in which imports aren't regulated, have been hit hardest. The cotton goods inflow has been contained somewhat through an international agreement that took effect in 1962. A similar accord on woolens is desired by many in the industry.

Under the cotton pact, the flow of imports will rise gradually. "But," notes one executive, "it helps us because it provides for more orderly marketing procedures, allowing for more reasonable planning and production. In the past, we might be flooded by one item one year and then, after gearing to meet that competition, get flooded by another next year. Now we know in advance how much of each item is coming in and this creates some stability that previously was lacking."

Resolution Supporting and Defending J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Henry J. Halam, commander of Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29 of the American Legion at Miami, Fla., a post comprised of 3,000 Legionnaires, and of which I am a member, sent me a resolution drafted by the resolutions committee of the post pursuant to unanimous action of the executive committee and on motion of Past Commander James T. Ross, and adopted as resolution of the Harvey W. Seeds Post, expressing the views of the Harvey W. Seeds Post upon the recent controversy between the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

In order that the views of the Harvey W. Seeds Post upon this subject may be known I offer the resolution for the body of the RECORD:

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING, DEFENDING, AND COMMENDING J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR OF THE FBI, IN HIS CASTIGATION OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Whereas the public press has carried the story of the castigation of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., leader of one faction of the Negro political movement, by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the reply of King containing an innuendo reflecting criticism of the FBI and alleging that the remarks of the Director flowed from an unstable mentality; and

Whereas the American public, the Congress of the United States, the American Legion, and hundreds of other organizations have publicly, since J. Edgar Hoover was appointed Director of the FBI, approved of the Director and commended his high qualities as a patriotic American; and

Whereas the President of the United States, to publicly show the value of this great public servant, has heretofore issued an Executive order making J. Edgar Hoover indefinitely eligible for reappointment as Director of the FBI, even after he passes the age of 70 years; and

Whereas in connection with any statement of fact involving the FBI by the Director, J. Edgar Hoover, the character of the Director and his conduct of his office is prima-facia evidence of its truth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29, the American Legion, Department of Florida, regularly assembled, That as between the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and said Martin Luther King, Jr., this post chooses to believe J. Edgar Hoover in any controversy involving the FBI; and be it further

Resolved, That Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29 warns the American people to remember

that J. Edgar Hoover is the single greatest foe of communism and that his detractors leave themselves alined with those who would destroy him, the FBI, and our great Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29 does hereby heartily commend J. Edgar Hoover for striking out at any enemy of the Director, the FBI, or the U.S. Government, and that certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to J. Edgar Hoover, the President of the United States, the Attorney General, Florida Senators SPESSARD L. HOLLAND and GEORGE A. SMATHERS, and to Congressmen DANTE FASCELL and CLAUDE PEPPER.

(The foregoing resolution, drafted by the resolutions committee, J. K. Williams, chairman, pursuant to unanimous action of the executive committee and on motion of Past Commander James T. Ross, was duly adopted at regular meeting assembled, November 27, 1964.)

HENRY J. HALAM,
Post Commander.

Attest:

WILLIAM E. COX,
Post Adjutant.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring attention to an event of 47 years ago which the people of Lithuania would celebrate—if they could.

This is the 47th anniversary of their independence which was declared on February 16, 1918, at the close of World War I. But they are unable to celebrate this great event in their national history because of the imposition of another dictatorship some 22 years later.

Due to their control now by the Soviet Union, they are unable to continue annual celebrations of their brief liberty. So I would like to take this opportunity to speak in their behalf.

All wars cause death and destruction, misery and misfortune to millions of innocent and helpless people. The last war spread all these evils on a scale unprecedented and unknown. Unfortunately that war did something else, even more heartrending than earlier wars had done: some one hundred million peoples were deprived of their freedom and independence in Europe alone. That was a stunning and alarming shock from which the free world has not fully recovered, for when the fighting stopped in Europe, many nations which had regained their freedom and independence at the end of the First World War found themselves caught behind the onrushing Red army. They were imprisoned in their homeland under Kremlin-imposed Communist dictatorships. The Lithuanian people were among those thus sadly imprisoned behind the Soviet Iron Curtain.

These people had lived under alien regimes before, and had known hardships and suffering under foreign rule. They had endured the czarist Russian regime for more than 100 years before they regained their freedom and proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918. For a little more than two decades, during the interwar years, they toiled, sweated, and earned their living under their own free and independent government. Annually they celebrated their national holiday, their independence day with due solemnity and decorum. They were content with their lot, and happy for the peace they were enjoying during those years. Unfortunately in the fall of 1939, after the outbreak of the last war, everything seemed to take a bad turn, which soon proved disastrous and tragic for them. Early in 1940 Lithuania was attacked and overrun by the Red Army. Then in mid-July of that year it was made part of the Soviet Union.

Today there is no occasion to celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day there. The Lithuanian people are not allowed to celebrate it. Having been robbed of all their freedoms, they are totally subdued under the unrelenting Communist rule there. Under present international conditions and changing world tensions, we would be inspiring them with false hopes to assert that soon a way will be found to free them from their unhappy status. The least—and unfortunately the most—I can wish them on the 47th anniversary of their independence day is courage, fortitude, and patience.

Incredibilities of the Dock Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, while the dock strike is almost ended, and the picture is encouraging, the farflung effects of it will be felt for some time. Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, the maritime editor of the Baltimore Sun, has written an excellent article on this which I believe will be of interest to every Member of Congress, and I am, therefore, inserting it in the Appendix:

INCREDIBILITIES OF THE DOCK STRIKE

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

The longshoremen's strike that has paralyzed the Nation's waterborne commerce from the warm Gulf of Mexico up the entire Atlantic coast to the cold coast of Maine has affected the Nation's economy in ways that will take at least a year to overcome.

Curtailment of operations in the soybean industry in Decatur, Ill., by the grain millers in Minneapolis, by the closed sugar refineries in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, by the apple exporters in Winchester, Va., and complaints of food shortages for the poultry industry are minor examples of the severe economic repercussions resulting from the immobilization of nearly 800 ships—foreign and American—along the two seacoasts, along with billions of dollars of merchandise in the bottoms of the vessels, in the warehouses on the piers, in 50,000 sorely needed railroad cars scattered around the United States.

At this point one would dare bet that even the International Longshoremen's Association (AFL-CIO), whose 60,000 members are on strike, would welcome a way out via the White House as long as there would not be lasting legislation unpalatable to labor generally or harmful to future collective bargaining.

Even though this walkout still has a few days to go to catch up with the 34-day ILA tieup from December 23, 1962, to January 26, 1963, this one to date has exceeded that in monetary losses. More ships are already immobilized. More people have been laid off in industries allied with shipping and dependent on raw materials.

In 1962, the shipowners and industry were prepared for a strike. The ships were out and not returning to the States as rapidly as they are now. Industries had more raw materials on hand.

The present donnybrook has grown seemingly on its own, and no one quite knows how to shut it all off. It began December 16 when a verbal agreement was reached in New York between the New York Shipping Association and the ILA on local issues and on master contract terms (money items) for the other North Atlantic ports.

The master contract money package was 68 cents for wages, pension, and welfare benefits during the 4-year duration of the agreement. Also in New York, a fourth week's vacation and three more paid holidays were given, bringing the money cost to 80 cents an hour over the 4 years.

The historic portion of that agreement was the establishment of an annual wage guarantee of 1,600 hours for all legitimate dockworkers and the reduction in general cargo gang sizes of three men by 1968.

Everyone thought the New York agreement automatically meant peace on the waterfronts. In fact, some commentators flatly stated that the announcement of the agreement means 4 years of peace are assured on the Nation's waterfronts.

Strike preparations were halted when Thomas W. Gleason, ILA president, extended the contracts in all ports until January 11. The general atmosphere everywhere was one of confidence—all is well. The union officials were thrilled that, without a strike, they had reached a settlement in the port that sets the national pattern.

Two big mistakes were the failure to make a recording of what was agreed to verbally and to set the timing of that settlement.

Shouts from the gulf ports were heard immediately that New York might have settled, "But we haven't. They have to go on strike to support us."

"If we had planned for a more incredible, confused situation, we could not have gotten into a worse mess," is the way one shipping executive in New Orleans put it. "It's almost like a person turned out a barrel of eels and tried to catch them all. As soon as one was returned to the barrel, three others escaped."

And this was to have been the year when the ILA was going to negotiate contracts without any strike, when all ports would remain solid, when local issues were to be ironed out first, and then New York would determine the money package pattern for the remainder of the ports. At least that was the tune played last March at a contract bargaining workshop in the Commodore Hotel.

As has been customary and understandable under the present setup, nobody began bargaining on local issues until long after the ILA New York council presented the list of demands for that port June 25. Actually, one can't say there was any real bargaining in any port on local issues, except in New Orleans, almost up to the deadline of September 30 when the last contract expired. All collective bargaining was concentrated in New York for the North Atlantic ports, and

in one or two southern ports for the gulf and south Atlantic.

Negotiators in the other ports stood by, telephoning frantically: "What's going on there, what should we do?"

When it became apparent that no settlement could be reached in New York, what bargaining there was elsewhere was ordered halted. President Johnson instantaneously, more rapidly than any other President, invoked the Taft-Hartley Act. In fact, the law was put into operation faster than it had ever been used to stop a waterfront strike. Application of the Taft-Hartley Act then exhausted the only legal recourse available with the exception of emergency legislation to halt the walkout under the current round of contract negotiations.

Within 43 hours, the dockers were back on their jobs after the shortest walkout in their history. They were back until December 20 when the 80-day cooling-off period would expire. All of the formalities of the Taft-Hartley Act had to be adhered to then, including the vote on the final offer from management, which was rejected—as directed by ILA officials—in every port on December 15.

Unfortunately, the verbal agreement in New York was achieved on the heels of that vote. Therefore, the rank-and-file misunderstood, thinking that it was the same contract. How could there be a bad contract one day and a good one the next?

The misunderstanding was mild. When the parties sat down to spell out in writing exactly what was said in the negotiating room, there was considerable disagreement about that December 16 agreement. So on New Year's eve, the ILA bought into the picture for the first time its general counsel, Louis Waldman, to put down in writing what the ILA negotiators had agreed upon verbally 2 weeks earlier.

When it appeared impossible for the terms to be ironed out, the shipowners caved in on flexibility in the use of manpower—the same issue that has been holding up Philadelphia—in order to avoid a strike. They couldn't afford a tieup at the price already agreed upon for a contract.

When that settlement was announced January 6, New Orleans and Galveston ILA spokesmen made it clear that they still had problems and there was no settlement there.

Two days later, the New York rank-and-file also made it clear that they didn't like what they knew about the agreement and voted it down. That rejection triggered the current strike which few persons would concede at that time would be prolonged into a national crisis.

Trying to get the dockers back to work could be compared to trying to put a thousand eels back in a barrel.

The immediate hurdle to overcome was that of getting the vote reversed, so all efforts were concentrated in New York. Shipping associations in other ports were reluctant to bargain until they knew the outcome on the second New York vote—the pacemaker.

A vote too soon in New York was risky because a second defeat would have meant total collapse. The AFL–CIO, Seafarers International Union and National Maritime Union sent in professional public relations personnel to help launch an Operation Fact campaign to educate the ILA rank-and-file on the excellence of their contract, the first attempt to do so. The first formal press release by the ILA also was issued then, blaming the rejection on the press media for their interpretations of the contents of the settlement. The AFL–CIO and SIU staffers remained on the job throughout the drive.

Meanwhile, serious bargaining finally got underway in New Orleans, Galveston, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Hampton Roads. The eels in the barrel squirmed loose.

Baltimore reached a settlement shortly after the New York rejection was overturned, but the Baltimore rank-and-file turned their backs on the terms and said no.

The Texas ports deadlocked and have never moved an inch.

New Orleans bargaining hit a snag on jurisdiction and remained tied up right there, despite the pounding of James J. Reynolds, Assistant Secretary of Labor, who has done nothing night and day since August 1 but relentlessly fight the longshore barrel of eels.

There was a tinge of racism in the New Orleans situation, so Gleason was called down to the Creole city. His own vice presidents rebelled against his presence, but somehow he managed to remove the jurisdictional stumbling block.

But even he, backing up Reynolds and David H. Stowe, Labor Department longshore specialist, failed to make any headway in Galveston. So he departed for Baltimore to get the controversial jurisdictional clause removed from the local contract and make it more palatable for the next vote. It was accepted.

In the meantime, few persons paid attention to the stubborn impasse in Philadelphia, to statements by South Atlantic ILA vice presidents that they had a long way to go for settlements in their ports, or to the seriousness of the deadlock in Galveston.

But after New York's contract had been ratified for more than a week, Baltimore's vote was changed and New Orleans and Mobile both ratified, the realization of what was going on hit home because still no dockers returned to work.

The tradition of the ILA that all ports work or none does held firm. Another issue developed when Hampton Roads, Boston, and Baltimore all settled without any reductions in gang sizes. The pressure for a cut in Philadelphia became more imperative than ever because the ILA leaders fear that if no other port obtained a gang cut, New York longshoremen would wildcat and never return to work until their contract was changed.

The gang cutbacks was one of the reasons for the original rejection and the wildcat strikes December 21 when the Taft-Hartley injunction expired.

The dilemma now:

Even though Philadelphia settled one contract last night and may settle the others shortly and even though the ILA officials have hinted that should this happen they would call for a return to work in the North Atlantic ports while helping out the Texas and South Atlantic ports through selective boycotting of steamship lines serving those areas, this does not appear realistic at this time.

Undoubtedly the dockers in New Orleans and Mobile, which have contracts and which have injunctions hanging over their heads, would rebel if the ILA leadership so voted because a selective boycotting of the type being discussed would mean their ports would be hit just as hard as ever inasmuch as most ships going to the Texas ports are the same ones visiting the other gulf ports.

The southern ILA leadership undoubtedly would rebel and refuse in the future to support the north. The strength of the International Longshoremen's Association lies in its united front.

In the future, national bargaining could be the answer to avoid a repetition of this incredible predicament that has bottled up the flow of the Nation's commerce.

But a solution that would be face-saving for all parties without further disruption to the national economy must be found right now.

VFW Auxiliary Initiates Two Fine Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I call to the attention of Members of the House of Representatives two new programs instituted this year by the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

One program is designed for high school and college students; the other is for the members of the organization itself.

Under the leadership of Mrs. Marie A. Klugow, national president, of Tracy, Calif., a new annual Americanism award competition for students between the ages of 16 and 19 years has been instituted.

In an effort to encourage youth of America and to stimulate their ideals into the truest meaning of patriotism and good citizenship, the contest will offer a total of $2,000 in cash and three gold medals for the three top national winners. Citations will be given to 10 other participants.

It is open to all students between 16 and 19 who attend a private, parochial, public high school or college. Each entrant must fill out an application to be obtained through the local auxiliary and submit in writing not more than 300 words on the subject, "In Education Rests the Future of America."

The recipient of an award will be selected on the basis of his or her keen sense of purpose and worthiness as an individual. Applicants must show genuine interest in family, community, national and world affairs, display a sense of responsibility, truthfulness and loyalty and ability to present new ideas with sincerity.

All applications are to be returned completed to the local auxiliary by March 15, 1965. The local winner will be entered in district competition, the district winner in State competition. The application winning first place in each State will be entered in the national contest. National awards are: first, $1,250 cash and a gold medal; second, $500 cash and a gold medal; third, $250 cash and a gold medal, and 10 citations for honorable mention. State and local award winners will receive additional auxiliary prizes which vary with the community.

National award winners will be announced at the 1965 national convention of the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Chicago.

The second program initiated by Mrs. Klugow is not a contest. In a sense, however, there is an individual prize for every participant.

Mrs. Klugow, who is one of the outstanding citizens of my congressional

district, has prepared a code for women which she has invited every member of the auxiliary to sign. The code is as follows:

I promise to continue to show my reverence for God and to respect the freedom of all Americans to worship God.

I promise to speak out against violation of the Constitution of the United States of America.

I promise to show my love of my country on every possible occasion, including respect for the American flag and the national anthem.

I promise to exercise my right to vote in local, State, and national elections.

I promise to work for the improvement of my community and give my support to honesty and thrift in civic matters.

I promise to do my part to help lift the burdens of ignorance, disease, and poverty, especially through active support of sensible programs in education and vocational training.

I promise to uphold moral standards and to be especially concerned for the morals of children and young people.

I promise to be available wherever I can be of help in advising and guiding young people.

I promise to shun all forms of entertainment which advocate loose morals or belittle either religion or American principles of government.

I promise to show those qualities of gentleness, compassion, and kindness with which womanhood has been traditionally associated.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I can speak for every Member of the Congress in expressing appreciation to the Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for taking these steps to bring about increased love of country and to place emphasis on fine personal values.

Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the entire world was saddened by the death of Sir Winston Churchill. No man in our lifetime symbolizes both the tenacity and courage of a people struggling against tyranny for the preservation of their democratic way of life.

We Americans certainly join with our English friends in mourning the death of their great hero whom we can also claim as an honorary citizen of our country.

One of my constituents, Mr. John J. Williamson, of Alameda, Calif., was motivated to put his thoughts on this sad occasion into verse. Because I believe that the words of Mr. Williamson appropriately pay tribute to the late Prime Minister of England, I am pleased to insert this poem into the Appendix of the RECORD:

SIR WINNIE

(An original unpublished poem dedicated to our English friends and continued good relations between England and the United States of America)

A mighty Warrior, has breathed His very Last!
Like distant Thunder of War Drums, faded with; Reverberations of the Past
No longer Bestirs at rumble of Caisson, nor hears; Measured tread of Boot
Those ghostly Echoes of a freedom won, It's Heroes Death; War's "Fruit"!

In Requiem, let not; Bombs speak and Rockets Soar
Stay the Machine Gun's bark, noise of Tank and Jet Plane's Roar!
Count only, stacked Arms of those, That Lie
The rows of countless Dead, Their Living Pray; Often Cry!

Proclaim, that this gallant Soldier/Statesman was; A peaceful Man
True and Righteous Purpose, His simple and singular Plan
Freedom of free People; "Sir Winnie's" cherrished and avowed Goal
Determination to lead the Way, to Victory; In steadfast Role!

His "Lethal" Weapons, the timely Gesture and appealing Voice
A friendly Expression, at Time and Place; Not always by Choice!
The "Armor" with which, His body was; So admirably Gird
Were the Promises kept, either in spoken or written Word!

Yet, His was the Strength, Tyrants; Had shunned and forsook
The "Word", Teachings and Truth of; The "Good" Book
With It's Power, to Level; All Armies of the Land
Crush the Forces of Evil, wherever and whatever; The Demand!

This great Man, destined to become Legend, tho' deemed; Essence of Fact
Was quick to Perceive and Comprehend; Quicker to Act!
His Dignity and calm Reserve, exemplified; The Decent and Fine
Be-spoke of Noble Character, "Champange" 'Midst; Vintage Wine!

Like a Duke of Wellington, Lord Nelson and Kitchener; Rolled into One
Born of American Mother, He proved to be; Britain's finest Son
Displaying the tenacity of a Bull Dog in Prize Ring
He had the Courage of, the English Lion; Historic and Traditional Thing!

As British as, Orange Marmalade; Tea and Kippers
He was "Homespun", liked His "Easy" Chair, Cigar; Robe and Slippers
A Friend of All Who, shunned the "Mean" yet; Knew the "Ing"
A Loyal Subject of His, Benevolent; Queen and King!

Symbol of English speaking Peoples; One Accord
Their Loyalty and undying Friendship toward,
A staunch Ally America; That "Provident" Land
Whose Own "Queen" Lady Liberty, stands guard; Torch in Hand!

Mean't to be the "Floating Log" on a Sea of Despair
The last "Step" left of, a crumbling; Stair!
He, the Twig bent double, an England; That wouldn't Falter or End
Keeping Faith with the Unborn, knowing they'd Live; On His Struggle depend!

Yet, He was but a Catalyst, blending; Simple Hope with Faith of Man
In God's "Scheme" of things, part of; Overall Plan!
Mere Steward, called upon; To Perform and Attain
The Victory, a righteous Cause and good Purpose; Must Gain!

Unshaken and Immovable, in Path of; War's "Hurricane"
He exemplified Forces of Good, that the Evil; Disdain!
Tho' not a God, just Human and; Of Flesh and Blood
A Pawn of Fate, struggling in the Maelstrom of; Battle "Flood"!

He was the "Wallow" and "Steam" of a Jungle; Dense
The "Bee" in Port Moresby's stinging; Island Offense!
The Sweat and Tears, the Drive and "Goad"
Willingness to build, Burma's Hellish tho'; Vital Road!

He was "Tommies", Aussies, Anzacs, Cannucks and Scots
Nemesis of Hitlers, Mussolinis, Tyrants and all; Their Plots!
He was the "Silver" of the Thames, London's Fog; Charm of Its Bridge and Tower
He was "Great Britain", through and through; In Its "Finest Hour"!

Yet, He too was a Person, subject to all; Human Ills
Victim of Fevers, Aches and Pains, the Remedys and; Colored Pills
Feeling the Heartaches, Hopes and Longings; Tears and All
Searching for Happiness, hidden in terrible War; Under dismal Pall!

He was the inconvenience of "Queues", Rations and Petrol Stamps
The Smile in "Ducks", Tea and Crumpets; "Light" of Coal Miner's Lamps
Reminder of the Flowers, the Countryside "Scent"; Lush of green Grass too
The "Bat" and "Ball" at Wimbledon's Matches; "Cricket" everyone knew!

He was the "Gleam" from the White Cliffs of Dover
The Siren's "Sound" as Buzz-Bombs; Came over
Westminster's "In" Spire, the tolling Bell's "Chime"
"Refuge" of Air Raid Shelter, to run to, dive in; So little Time!

The living "Fire" of Spitfire Planes; Slowing a Panzer Drive
The "Guts" to take It, and dish It out; In order to Survive!
He was the "Parch and Thirst" of Desert Battle
The "Dimming" Light and dying Gasp of; Death's Rattle!

The "Rock" at Malta "Trial" of Tobruk; Epic of El Alamein!
The Point of Victorys' "V", Wings of; Its "Plane"
Both the Failure and the "Save"; In sacrifice of Dunkirk
The Royal Navy's "Miracle", by Fate's; Strange Quirk!

"There" in the Courage and Determination at Coventry
Providing the Will to stay, re-build; Not Flee!
He was a "Might", in the mightiest Effort to prevail
Strength of a Thousand Armies, all the Fleets; That Sail!

He was the "Die Cast,"
Delivered and Damned of "D" day's; Normandy Beach
The Drownings and Despair, The Deploy and the Devil; To Breach!
His was the "Wounds" and the Cries; The dying of Men
The Laughter and Shouts of Joy knowing, they'd never Retreat; Nor be defeated again!

He was the "Calm" War's Peace after "Storm," "Sport of Kings" Epsom Downs
Brightest Jewel's "Sparkle" in the Royal Crowns
The "Whimsey" in polished Poetry of a Bard
Grandeur and Precision, in change of, Royal Palace Guard!

His promise of "Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat"
Comrades in Arms will long remember, admonishing Sons; Not to Forget!
For He exemplified the inherent "Goodness" of Man
A Desire to Live in Peace, with His Brothers, when and wherever He can!

His Words will Echo loud in History's Halls
As the tolling "Peals" of "Big Ben" falls—
Upon the Youth of future Generations
Calling upon Them, to Emulate great Courage; That saved a Nation!

Tho' future Hitlers, Musso's, and Tojos; Might Rage
While Fortunes of War, They measure and Gauge
His calm Determination, remembered; Throughout the Land
Will give Credence to the Conviction and Its Fulfillment:
"There will Always be "Sir Winnie" and an England" ! !

—JOHN J. WILLIAMSON.

Closing of VA Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph L. Pudlo, Jr., national commander, Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A., has issued a statement with regard to the proposed closing of 32 Veterans' Administration facilities throughout the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert Mr. Pudlo's statement in the Appendix of the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY JOSEPH L. PUDLO, JR., NORTH CHICAGO, ILL., NATIONAL COMMANDER, POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS, U.S.A. ON THE CLOSING OF 32 VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES

After due study of all facts available to me, acting on behalf of the entire membership of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A., in my capacity as national commander, I do hereby register our emphatic protest and strong opposition to this curtailment of services.

It is the opinion of the Polish Legion of American Veterans that the closing of these 32 facilities will wrought an undue hardship on those who are in greatest need of the services provided for them by a grateful nation during the time of war. Certainly, the increased travel factor alone, will inconvenience those veterans of advanced age and/or those whose ailments are of a nature which will make long travel impossible.

In its statement, the VA points out that during recent years it has been phasing out various operations where the workload has been small. Further, it points out that the passing of time and expiration of benefit eligibility has lessened the need for direct assistance.

We are certain that the VA is also aware that this same passing of time has also increased the average age of the veteran population. Each year this advanced age will increase the demand for the very services and facilities that are to be closed out. It could therefore, be that the moves planned today, will cause an even greater hardship in the years to come.

Further, if the 11 VA hospitals concerned are of poor physical condition and low patient demand, how can the VA explain the fact that over the years it has refused to modernize these facilities, and why, though they are not filled to 100-percent capacity, is the patient load exceeding all of the VA estimates? This will be very hard to explain to the veterans who have been using or are in need of the services of these facilities.

We know that the VA statement includes the promise not to reduce the overall VA hospital total bed capacity; however, how can we be sure that the transfer of the patients involved will not only bring about a tremendous hardship not only to the veterans involved, but also to their entire families?

We have no quarrel with the fact that a savings will be realized by the consolidation of the 17 VA regional offices. We do, however, doubt that the service rendered to the veteran will be of the same calibre as it presently is. The added travel will induce many veterans to carry out their business by letter. This certainly will never be as efficient as the personal contact method. The savings involved, therefore, are quite unimportant if it becomes more difficult for the veteran and/or his survivors to attain the benefits provided by law.

In taking up the decision to close the four domiciliaries involved, we fail to see how the VA can be taking an active part in the administration's war on poverty.

The VA's very own studies have in the past pointed out the pathetic plight of the typical domiciliary patient. Any veteran, who is 68 years old, with no family, and drawing a meager $66 from his VA pension, surely ranks at the poverty level.

This alone makes the VA action directly opposite of the administration's plan for a Great Society. It is extremely painful for those of us who are more fortunate, to see men who have done so much to preserve our prosperity be completely forgotten.

We of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A., are equally aware of the call for economy by the administration. We feel that economy is conducive to good government; however, in view of the small savings involved, and being equally aware that these could be greatly reduced when at a later date some other governmental agency will have to take up the care of the veterans involved, we can find no justifiable reasons for carrying through this announced action.

Bearing all of the foregoing in mind, we of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A., call for the reconsideration of this proposed action.

Sokol Physical Fitness Commemorative Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today Postmaster General Gronouski presided over the unveiling of a special stamp issued by the U.S. Post Office to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Sokol movement in America.

Significantly, it was during the delivery of Mr. Gronouski's inspiring speech at this dedication ceremony that President Johnson, at another function in the White House, announced the formal appointment of Mr. Gronouski as Postmaster General for the next 4 years.

President Johnson is to be commended for his excellent choice. Mr. Gronouski has brought to his office a depth of understanding and a talent for administration which has helped in large measure to streamline and improve every branch of the postal service. His record will be hard to match in future years and I am particularly pleased we will have the benefit of his leadership for the next 4 years.

Mr. Gronouski's recognition of the great contribution made by the Sokol movement in this country is perhaps best manifested by his awareness of the tremendous cultural heritage which was brought to America by the various Slavic groups that have fostered the goal of physical fitness through the Sokol movement. Issuance of this commemorative stamp was of particular joy to the Czechs, Slavs, the Poles, and all the other Americans of Slavic background who participated so enthusiastically in this great Sokol movement.

I am happy today to include Mr. Gronouski's speech at the colorful ceremony during which the special stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Sokol movement was unveiled. Mr. Speaker, the Postmaster General's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL JOHN A. GRONOUSKI AT THE DEDICATION OF SOKOL-PHYSICAL FITNESS COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP, DEPARTMENT AUDITORIUM, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 15, 1965

This is the day you have been awaiting, and I share your pride in the postage stamp we are issuing today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Sokol movement in America.

That so many of you are present from all parts of the country is indeed a high tribute to the Sokol movement, and speaks well for the unity among your groups and for the cooperation within the Sokol Centennial Commemorative Stamp Committee.

You have my very best wishes for a successful and memorable centennial observance. I certainly hope that my schedule will permit me someday to attend one of your great physical fitness exhibitions.

We can take pride in the fact that Sokol and Falcon organizations were among the very first in the United States to combine

programs of physical fitness with cultural enrichment. Democracy needs both to survive.

The fact is that America is just beginning to wake up and face this problem. As a people, we have grown soft. The easy life has resulted in flabby muscles—and I do not exempt myself from that description.

This is the age of the pushbutton—not the pushup. Too many of us prefer to sit in an easy chair and watch a sport on TV rather than to participate in one. Even the exercise we used to get in brushing our teeth or carving a roast can now be avoided. There are electric toothbrushes and carving knives, to make life easier. And to travel any distance greater than 4 blocks, we seem to need an automobile rather than the old-fashioned shank's mare.

Fortunately, there has been a rekindling of interest in physical fitness. Much of this new interest has been generated by the President's Council on Physical Fitness. Stan Musial serves as Special Consultant to the President in this area.

He and his small staff, operating with a limited budget, have literally worked wonders in awakening America to the need for improved physical fitness programs. I'd like to quote briefly from the encouraging progress report Mr. Musial made to President Johnson:

"In 1961–62, only 47 percent of the Nation's high school juniors and seniors took part in physical-activity programs. Eighty-four percent participated in 1963–64.

"Eighty percent of the parochial schools now provide physical education instruction for most of their pupils, as compared to only 40 percent in 1960–61."

That's progress.

Perhaps some day soon, the rest of America will catch up with the Sokols and Falcons.

The Sokol physical fitness commemorative postage stamp we are issuing today should be an occasion, I think, to look back on—and pay tribute to—the men and women of the past who made the Sokol movement great. It is their postage stamp, too. These were your forebears of two or perhaps three generations ago who came to America determined to establish new lives for themselves and for their children. They came to the new land to be free—free from poverty, free from intolerance, free from persecution. Their dream was America, the land of liberty and justice.

It is unfortunate—but true—that immigrants from the Slavic countries were not greeted with open hands in those days. For in many parts of America there was a widespread feeling that in order to be a real American it was necessary for your ancestors to have arrived on the *Mayflower*. Or at the very least, to have fought in the Revolutionary War. And there was something almost sinister about a man who wanted to be an American but who had a name that was long and unpronounceable—by Anglo-Saxon standards.

Times have changed. And it was our ancestors who helped cause them to change. For by their very actions, their hard labor, their loyalty and dedication to the new land, they showed themselves to be good Americans in the finest traditions. In community service, in religious participation, in political responsibility these men and women demonstrated that they knew the meaning of democracy. And when it was necessary to fight to protect democracy, they fought and fought gallantly.

Those of you in this audience with grey hair will agree with me, I believe, that within our memories there has been remarkable progress in erasing the prejudices and discrimination our ancestors faced.

But in spite of great—almost revolutionary—progress we have made in the area of human relations, there are still men with distorted minds who base their opinions of a fellow American on what is his race, what is his creed, what is his country of origin? I appeal to you to use the strength of your organizations to join President Johnson in his crusade against all traces of discrimination.

Let me only mention one area which I know is the great and vital interest of all of you. For much too long we condoned immigration laws that set up archaic and discriminatory quotas based on the obsolete concept of superiority of certain races and of people from certain geographical regions. As the result, two-thirds of the total immigration quota goes to nations that never use all of this quota. In other countries, the would-be immigrant must wait interminably, until his quota number comes up.

In his state of the Union message, the President made the reform of our immigration laws one of his top priority legislative programs. And, in his recent message to Congress, Mr. Johnson called for a new immigration law based on principles which reflect our American traditions of fair play, and I ask you—who know the problems so well—to support fully this legislation.

Under this proposed law, immigrants who are close relatives of American citizens would receive preference in entering the United States. Parents of American citizens could join their children here without waiting for a quota number.

Another aspect of the proposed law would admit immigrants on the basis of their special skills and knowledge. It would bring to America new scientists, scholars, engineers, doctors, technicians, and skilled workers—all of whom would soon contribute to our national advancement.

In urging Congress to pass this vastly improved immigration law, President Johnson said: "Let a just Nation throw open to them the city of promise: * * * to those in other lands that are seeking the promise of America, through an immigration law based on the work a man can do and not where he was born or how he spells his name."

The Great Society can use the talents of such men and women from across the sea.

I don't know how many postage stamp collectors we have in the audience today, but to those of you who are not collectors I'd like to make it clear that every organization or person who wants a new stamp doesn't get one. Each year, we receive about 3,000 requests for new stamps. We issue only about 15 a year. So only events of highest national significance can be commemorated on new postage stamps. Sokol meets this test.

The Sokol stamp was designed by Norman Todhunter, an art director for a New York advertising agency, and a member of our Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee. This committee is composed of experts in art, history, philately, and printing who advise me on the subject matter and design of proposed new stamps. This 5-cent stamp is based on a bronze statue of a discus thrower which stands near the State Department building here in Washington. One hundred and twenty million stamps will be printed in black and red on white paper.

And I am going to see to it that an elderly man, a former member of your movement, now living in Poland receives a souvenir of this occasion.

For I think he is with us today in spirit. I'd like to tell you the story.

A short time after I announced that there was to be a Sokol postage stamp, I received a long and heartwarming letter from Poland written by a man who is 76 years old. He had read about the stamp in his newspaper and was naturally excited over this honor to Sokol. Many years ago, he had lived in New York and was a member of the Polish Falcons there, and he confided to me that these were the most fascinating years of his life.

He asked me to deliver a message to you, and I now quote from his letter: "Be exemplary citizens of the country which so generously gave you all of the blessings of a free man. Let your children know about the glorious past, as well as the sufferings of the country of your proud origin. The cross we have to carry isn't unbearable, because our spirit is immortal."

I commend you today not only for your excellence in physical fitness but also for the spiritual values inherent in your movement. Thank you.

Prices of Gray Cloth Rise—Textile Criticism Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Daily News Record, a publication of the textile trades industry, on February 8, 1965, carried an interesting report showing a price rise in gray cloth—exactly the opposite of what was predicted to occur as the result of the "one-price" cotton program enacted last year by Congress.

Missionaries for the industry, selling the proposal last year to Congressmen, insisted that gray cloth, the basic cloth from which finishes textiles are made, always goes up and down as the cost of raw cotton rises and falls.

Curiously, although the cotton program pushed the cost of raw cotton down over 8 cents a pound, the cost of gray cloth, according to this report, is rising.

Here is the news article, which raises once more the question of whether the taxpayer-financed cotton program enacted last year has become a multimillion-dollar windfall for the textile mills:

PRICES OF GRAY COTTONS RISE ON HEAVY BUYING

(By Harry Jenkins)

NEW YORK.—An estimated 25 million yards of cotton gray goods have been sold in the past few days, resulting in the beginning of a mill move to higher prices.

This market development comes at a time when Washington adherents of one-price cotton have been hoping cotton textile prices would soon come down, to help them in securing an extension of this legislation.

Continuing criticism of the failure of these prices to decline, as a result of one-price cotton, had stimulated the hope in important Washington circles that lower prices in the next few weeks would be of great help in gaining support to extend the law. In fact, it had been indicated efforts for extension would be held off in the hope that prices would decline.

However, in the past 4 business days, converters have covered heavily in printcloths and broadcloths. Their buying has been for fourth-quarter deliveries—and in a few cases for first quarter of 1966. Fabrics involved in this surge of activity go into low-end dresses, men's undershirts and shorts, sports shirts as well as some industrial uses.

Some mills increased prices late Friday, pointing out that their October-November-December output in printcloth and broadcloth was now close to 40-percent accounted for.

While price rises were not on an across-the-board basis, sellers intimated that in view of their tighly sold second- and third-quarter positions, broad increases were due within a short time.

Why are users of gray cotton cloth reaching out so far? There are numerous answers being given in the mill industry. Some big buyers were hurt s riously when they moved late on first-quarter deliveries. Having missed the market, they found themselves with gray goods ownership that was as much as a half-cent a yard higher than competitors'. A few of these have now put out a hedge by covering portions of their later needs.

During the last few quarters, average gray goods prices have been higher than in the preceding period. One big producer reported Friday the average fourth-period prices on his books were one-half cent a yard above the third-period levels. This has thus been a lure for buyers to cover ahead.

Another reason: The economic health of the Nation, the generally inflationary aspect, has created a willingness on the part of many users to make extended purchases. In the past week mills have received feelers from large companies regarding their price views on printcloth for delivery in the first half of 1966.

Finished goods business is reported good, though not in sufficient volume to support such far-off activity in gray goods, it is said. Many buyers are remaining away from second-half buying. Flushed with their bullish market, mill men are saying these buyers who wait will represent added strength for the market later on. These are the ones who keep spot prices high when they finally do move.

Trading Friday was heavy in the following-ing styles in printcloth: The 41-inch, 78 by 78, 4.05 yard at 18½ cents, fourth quarter; 41-inch, 78 by 76 at 18¼, fourth quarter, 41-inch, 78 by 72 at 17¾, fourth quarter; 48-inch, 68 by 68, 3.96 yard at 18¾, fourth period. Spots on this latter number moved at 20½, up one-fourth. One house refused to sell at these prices and quoted 19¼, on the 68-by-68's.

The 48-inch, 64 by 56, 4.40 yard moved at 17¼, fourth period; the 45-inch, 64 by 56, 4.75 yard at 15¾ for fourth-first quarter of 1966, then at 16 for fourth alone. The 36-inch, 64 by 60, 5.75 yard moved at 13¾, first quarter of 1966.

Two mills increased prices on 48-inch, 68 inch, 68 by 68, 3.96 yard at 18¾, fourth period. sales, up one-fourth.

In broadcloths 48-inch, 78 by 54, 3.95 yard was moved in volume for fourth period at 18¼ cents. Later this price was quoted at 18½. The 41-inch, 78 by 54, 4.60 yard was booked at 15½, likewise for October-November-December.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6815 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*
Grider, George W., *Tenn*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

Our Foreign Policies and Our Entanglements in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to call the attention of my colleagues to, a speech by Indiana's senior Senator, the Honorable R. VANCE HARTKE.

In his address, delivered before the Jacobi Society on February 6, Senator HARTKE offers a deep insight and a profound analysis of our foreign policies and of our entanglements in southeast Asia.

The speech follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR VANCE HARTKE AT THE JACOBI SOCIETY DINNER, STATLER HILTON, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 6, 1965

In 1945 President Roosevelt said: "The mere conquest of our enemies is not enough. We must go on to do all in our power to conquer the doubt and fears, the ignorance and the greed which made this horror possible."

It is in this context that I would like to discuss with you tonight the American role in a seething world, a world in which we have been forced to take the leadership.

Often in recorded history destiny knocks at the door with an iron clang. In our own short time as a nation, history has come to our door 3 times—once when we faced the impossible odds of the British power as we sought our own freedom; a 2d time when President Lincoln sought 75,000 volunteers to preserve the Union; and now in the 20th century when destiny has knocked almost constantly. Through involvement in world affairs brought on by our own success and by the ever-shrinking size of the globe, we have had to take up the task of defending the free world and the very concepts of the Judeo-Christian civilization.

The immediate question is not whether we are to become embroiled in a full-scale major nuclear war which could be the Armageddon of the Bible. Rather, it is a question of what our policies should be to bring lasting peace, freedom, political self-determination, economic development, and personal dignity to the world.

As always, the long-range idealistic goals of our Nation are threatened by an enemy. Alined against us now is international communism. I agree with President Theodore Roosevelt when he said: "We Americans have many problems to solve, many threatening evils to fight and many deeds to do. If—as we hope and believe—we have the wisdom, the strength, the courage, and the virtue to do them, we must face facts as they are. We must not surrender ourselves to a foolish optimism nor succumb to a timid and ignoble pessimism. Our Nation is the one among all nations of the earth which holds in its hands the fate of the coming years * * *. I believe firmly that we shall succeed."

I am subscribing to the goal of victory for us—for the free world.

In the early years of the Communist international conspiracy, the strategy was to operate from within a country and to promote revolution. The world Communist foreign policy has, in the last 15 years, turned to so-called wars of liberation, while from Moscow have come efforts toward peaceful coexistence.

Thus the Soviet Union has been able to take its seat in peaceful international relations while at the same time appealing to the have-not nations of the world, principally in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The posture of peaceful coexistence has served to allay fears of the neutrals, and to weaken the Western bloc. The so-called wars of liberation have taken a greater toll because we have not always known how to cope with them. Sometimes, we have made serious mistakes with long-term consequences. Sometimes we have vacillated until we were misunderstood or misinterpreted.

The difficulty is compounded because emerging people in newly independent countries see us less in the light of our own Revolution for freedom than they do as allies of those they regard as colonial imperialists.

We must expose the Communists—Russian and Chinese—as the true imperialists they are. And we must learn to distinguish between the ferment of people seeking freedom and the right to control their own destinies free of despotism on the one hand, and the revolutions and infiltrations inspired by Moscow and Peiping on the other.

I see little to distinguish the Soviet brand of communism from the Chinese brand. Any competition between the two—in Asia or anywhere else on the globe—can be of little encouragement to us now or in the foreseeable future because it is a competition of deviousness.

The synthesis of our final goals and those of the Communists—as well as this competition of deviousness—is in southeast Asia. At this moment, we are pouring men, material, and money into a place few Americans had heard of a few years ago, in order to meet a commitment to self-determination, to individual freedom, to economic development, and to our own long-term self-interest. On the other side are the Communists.

The active fighters are Asians trained and promoted by the Chinese Reds. Yet, their competitors in deviousness and duplicity are also at work. Russian Premier Alexi Kosygin has gone to Hanoi to show that the Soviet Union also is alined against us.

While we are not alone in Vietnam, having been joined by other SEATO nations including Australia, we are the chief supporters of a South Vietnam that is torn internally.

Since 1954 we have poured nearly $4 billion into South Vietnam in military and economic aid. That amounts to more than $266 for each of the 15 million South Vietnamese. Our aid figure today amounts to about $2 million a day. We have some 21,000 U.S. troops in that beleaguered land. Two hundred Americans have died there and additional hundreds have spilled their blood. More than 125 ships and airplanes of the 7th Fleet are committed to the waters around this peninsula.

How did all this happen? What are we doing in Vietnam?

For a hundred years before World War II, Indochina was a colony of France, ruled by a colonial Governor but with representation in the French Assembly. During the war, the Japanese moved in, but when France tried to return, the colonial peoples of the region—which included the present Laos, Cambodia, and both Vietnams—revolted for independence. Nationist groups wanted permanent independence; Communist-organized groups saw this as the first step toward delivering the whole peninsula into the Communist camp. But all were united on getting rid of the French.

The Communists were strongest in the area that is now North Vietnam, which is closest to mainland China, from which Chiank Kai-shek had been driven in 1949. In Laos, another Communist force, the Pathet Lao, controlled a large area in the northern part of the country. With outside aid, it seemed very possible that the Communists would achieve dominance.

At the same time, since the revolt against France included not only local Communists but other groups who sought democratic independence, the United States could not intervene on behalf of France without violating our principles of support of colonial people seeking freedom. But John Foster Dulles warned Russia and China against trying to pick up the pieces, even before the French defeat.

Settlement after the fall of the French came in an international conference at Geneva, where on June 21, 1954, agreements were signed to draw a cease-fire line across Vietnam. The northern half became the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, built around Ho Chi Minh's Communist forces, with 17 million people to South Vietnam's 14 million, and with the bulk of the industrial areas. The compromise was supposed to prevent civil war, and provided for a permanent settlement after all Vietnam election in July 1956. The situation was very much a parallel to that which created North and South Korea.

Most observers in 1954 felt that Laos and South Vietnam would have a short life, perhaps no more than 6 months, before the Communists took them over. Ngo Dien Diem had become the Premier of South Vietnam 2 weeks before the Geneva agreement. Our problem was to decide whether we should keep hands off, which was the French position, based on belief that it was impossible to save Indochina from the Communists. The other alternative was to give support to Diem, a stanch anti-Communist who had spent many years in the United States.

U.S. advisers and experts were divided. Those who urged help to Diem included Senators MIKE MANSFIELD and John F. Kennedy, who believed Diem could save his country with our help. In September of 1954 the southeast Asia treaty organization came into being, and SEATO was persuaded by Dulles to give Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam guarantees against invasion from North Vietnam. Once the decision was made, we were committed. We could not withdraw. Many say we still cannot without loss of "face."

For 3 years things were relatively quiet. Convinced they could not open direct attack, the Communists reverted to slow infiltration and buildup, especially in Laos. Diem took in nearly 900,000 Vietnamese from the north under a treaty provision which allowed exchange, but only a few left the south. In October 1955, the playboy king, Bao Dai,

was ousted and Diem became President of the Republic of South Vietnam. By 1961 South Vietnam had a per capita income of $110. North Vietnam had only $70 per person of income. Food production in the north was off 10 percent per capita. In the south, it was up 20 percent.

Part of the credit for the buildup in South Vietnam was clearly ours as we helped train and equip the armies against an expected invasion from the north.

The Chinese, meanwhile, were not to quit. Nor was Russia to fail to exploit the situation.

Infiltration by guerrillas was stepped up from North Vietnam by Chinese Reds while the Soviets fomented trouble in Indonesia and other nearby areas.

Russia sought to paint us as imperialists bent on imposing the white man's rule on Asians and, just this week, has agreed to supply airplanes to North Vietnam.

There is, of course, great and selfish interest, especially by Red China, apart from embarrassing us. Peiping has compelling reasons for coveting all the countries to the south. Southeast Asia would complement China, which is overpopulated and underfed. Southeast Asia grows more food than it needs. Thailand, for instance, normally is the fourth largest grain exporter in the world.

Of interest to both China and Russia, are these impressive figures on southeast Asia—production of 85 percent of the world's natural rubber, 55 percent of its tin and much of the oil in the Far East.

Future industrial and military power rides on the outcome of the wars on the peninsula of southeast Asia, the former Indochina, now North and South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Control of the area would place Communists astride sea and air lanes between Indian and Pacific Oceans, between Far East and South Asia.

Should Vietnam fall to communism, Malaysia, Thailand, Burma, and India could soon become victims of aggression. Eventually, Australia could become the target even as it was of the Japanese during World War II.

Ever since the beginning of the guerrilla warfare the United States has been committed by its treaty obligations and by the theory of prior administrations that the rest of the countries will fall should South Vietnam and Laos fall to the Communists. The so-called Domino theory.

The true beginnings of this struggle are hard to ferret out. Perhaps, as some say, they go back to our policy in China after World War II. Perhaps, as others say, the policy laid down in Korea of allowing the enemy to escape beyond a certain line is at fault. Perhaps, we have gone too far. Perhaps we have gone not far enough.

Perhaps our negotiated peace in Korea is interpreted as a pattern proving that we do not honor our commitments or that we are a paper tiger.

Perhaps the agreement our Government gave to the neutralist government of Laos is a pattern.

Small wonder, then, that responsible officials of our Government are calling for withdrawal while others are calling for extending the war into North Vietnam and for the bombing of Hanoi and guerrilla supply lines.

Small wonder that the Vietnamese people on our side of the line wonder where we stand.

We have in our zest to see our allies win, supported successive governments that do not have any popular base to which we say we are committed. And we have, at the same time, declined to extend the war or allow it to be extended. Perhaps both can be justified. In the short term goal of keeping South Vietnam free from communism without touching off the trigger of an atomic war. But these facts and our own conflicting statements about the extent to which we are committed with manpower cause confusion in Vietnam. Remember that we increased our force to some 21,000 from 12,000 at about the time we said we were going to bring 1,000 home. Remember that we have had three Ambassadors in 4 years.

So, while four members of the President's Cabinet offered to replace Henry Cabot Lodge, indicating the importance our Government gives to Vietnam, there is ample cause for wondering in southeast Asia how we intend to reinforce this feeling of importance.

We can wonder, then, whether Sukarno of Indonesia might be less anti-American if he understood what we are doing and where we are headed. Indeed, would he be telling us to keep our aid if he knew we honor our commitments and are steadfastly proceeding to a goal?

Let me pause a minute to emphasize my own contempt for Mr. Sukarno's attitude and that of Nasser and any others who tell us to jump in the lake.

I have been a supporter of economic and military aid for our allies as a matter of decency, good will, and self-interest. I have supported recent cuts in foreign aid. And I am probably the principal advocate in the Senate of others sharing in the problem of helping underdeveloped countries as well as the principal advocate of private enterprise assistance. Thus, I proposed that NATO countries get into the aid business. And for similar reasons I proposed the new businessmen's peace corps and tax credits for companies that extend their business into underdeveloped countries.

But just as consistent has been my insistence that our aid should neither go to our enemies or to those who bait us and tell us to jump in the lake. I have opposed sending food to Yugoslavia and Poland when they were closely alined with our enemies.

Now I oppose sending food to Indonesia and Egypt and I am the author of a bill to deny all aid to aggressors. My bill predates the recent action by the House to deny food shipments to Egypt because Nasser has seemed to support and—even foment—anti-American actions in his country.

Nasser told America to jump in a lake because he thinks he has us where he wants us.

The Middle East is a powder keg of proportions as great or greater than southeast Asia. Communism, neo-Nazism, age-old rivalries and poverty seethe and ferment in the sands and valleys of the Biblical world. In the background lie trade routes, chemicals, cotton, and oil.

Nasser is at once a stabilizing force and disruptive force. He holds the Arabs together, perhaps preventing all-out war. Yet, he rants and raves against us, against Israel and against our allies. He aids the enemies of peace and freedom in the Congo. He gets arms from the Russians and scientific brains from former German Nazis. He has received economic aid from us and food for peace. He has stood by while our buildings were burned and stoned. And then he told us to keep our aid.

As in Asia, it may be that our long-forgotten policies have caused this mess. It may be that we were too concerned over a latent threat to end our oil concessions. It may be that we were too hasty to stop the British and French from taking the Suez Canal and to stop the Israelis from cleaning out the Sinai Peninsula.

Nevertheless, America has never taken the kind of slap from a head of government that Nasser has accorded us.

The collective frustration of America found expression the other day in the House of Representatives when Congressmen wrote into an appropriations bill a provision that no more food was to be sent to Nasser.

Why, Congressmen and other Americans asked, should we force nations to take our aid when their leaders have told us to keep it? Congress truly was expressing frustrations of Americans.

The authoritative William S. White wrote in his column of January 29:

"It would be a great mistake to suppose that partisan malice was a primary or even major Republican consideration here, just as it would be to suppose that the whole thing sprang from a desire to please American Jews. And other particular friends of Israel.

"Any notion that our foreign policy in the Middle East is run with special tenderness for Jewish feelings is one of the special idiocies of our time.

"The truth is that this Government through the greater part of three administrations has been exceedingly kind to Nasser's Egypt and, in the process, perforce, far from altogether kind to the Israelis, whom he persistently threatens to destroy * * *.

"The truth also is that, while the Israelis are essentially on our side, Nasser consistently plays the international Communist game."

We Americans are slow to anger. We do not simply enter battles with the Communist aggressors for the joy of fighting.

Never in the history of the world has there been affluence such as we in America enjoy today. Never in the history of the world have the storehouses of grain and treasure been opened so fully so long to so many.

Yet we are resented and suspected. Even our benevolence is resented and rejected.

At the same time, courage and determination have earned us respect and friendship in our hours of trial. When President Kennedy blew the whistle on Russia and Cuba during the missile crisis, we won new respect throughout the world both for our President and our Nation. Every Latin American country, including those that had flirted previously with Castro, backed up up. In Africa the Russians were denied use of a landing strip they had financed. The leader of that country told me a few weeks later that landing had been denied because we were right in our dispute with Cuba and they respected our determination and would not let the Russians interfere with our prosecution of our grievance.

A clear statement by our President, backed with the necessary force, earned us respect and new allies during the Cuban crisis.

I believe this has again become necessary in all our foreign affairs, including the Middle East and Far East.

The President has properly been described by both administration spokesmen and other responsible people as the sole architect of our foreign policy. It is, then, clearly his responsibility to spell that policy out in all its ramifications.

Just this week, a man from Indiana was in my office asking: "What is our foreign policy? What are we doing in Vietnam? In Egypt and the whole Middle East? What happened to the tremendous mandate won by Lyndon Johnson last November?"

I replied that the President had laid out a magnificent program for a better life for all Americans, for ridding our Nation of disease and poverty, for greater dignity of the individual and for paring other expenses to the bone. This was use of the mandate.

But my constituent asked again, "Why then does he not lay down an equally imaginative program for winning the cold war? For meeting the goals in the world?"

I explained to my constituent—and I now explain to you—the President's background. He was probably the greatest majority leader in the history of our land. He led by welding divergent elements and interests in the Senate into an effective coalition.

It was natural, then, that as President, he would again lead by bringing divergent elements together. The technique has become known as leading through consen-

sus. It has worked effectively with domestic programs and it resulted in the overwhelming victory of November 3. Leadership by consensus cannot be applied to foreign policy.

Yet, the President can and must use the reservoir of good will obtained through his amazing consensus at home to lead us and direct us abroad. As my constituent correctly pointed out, President Johnson enjoys unparalleled popularity among the people of America and a tremendous mandate to lead. Our country has, likewise, a reservoir of good will similar to that which we found available to us in the Cuban crisis when unknown allies leaped to our side.

President Johnson must dip into both these reservoirs and use them to point the way. He must clearly enunciate his goals and how he intends to reach them. In this way, and only in this way, will he obtain the support he needs to bring us the eventual victory.

The President should and must tell America, first, and the rest of the world what our posture is; what our aims are; what our interests and commitments are; how we intend to meet these commitments. We must know where we are going and what we are going to do in Vietnam. We need to know how the President plans to handle Nasser and Sukarno and others who may tell us off. He must tell Americans how they must serve the cause of freedom and peace.

America has both power and mercy. It has, in recent months, demonstrated both.

Yet, vacillation and indecision can be confused with weakness. Discussion of alternatives in Vietnam can, in the absence of clear policy, from the architect of policy, be mistaken for strife.

The time has come for us to be both American and Churchillian in our approach to these problems and to their eventual solution.

The President is more than capable of this role of leadership with strength and determination. He must now map out the road ahead, tell us what vehicles to use and then lead us up the road.

This is essential to American leadership in a hostile world.

We in America have the maturity, the moral fiber, the brains, the courage, the wealth and the power to carry out a policy of honesty, integrity, and devotion to peace and freedom.

Ultimately we shall triumph. We shall win a lasting victory for lasting peace, honor, and freedom.

We shall win it with a great President who clearly defines the role of each and all of us and who will lead us to the victory.

The 50th Anniversary of the Nonpartisan League of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLLAND REDLIN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 50th anniversary of the Nonpartisan League of North Dakota, a movement that spearheaded significant reforms for the agricultural areas of the Midwest.

From the Nonpartisan League, there sprang two great political parties—the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota and the Progressive Party in Wisconsin. In North Dakota, the NPL has joined forces with the Democratic Party—and the organization is known as the Democratic-Nonpartisan League.

The Nonpartisan League concentrated, of course, on the problems of farmers, and its objectives were humanitarian, as well as economic. One of its primary goals, for example, was to strengthen educational opportunities for young people. Many credit the Nonpartisan League for developing the concept of central station electric power for rural America, culminating in the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration in 1935–36.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a product of the great Nonpartisan League tradition. My father enrolled as one of the pioneer members in 1916. My own political career began with membership on the State executive committee of the Young Nonpartisan League in the 1950's. In three races for the North Dakota State Legislature and in my race for Congress last fall, I have carried Nonpartisan League endorsement.

The modern Democratic-Nonpartisan League is keeping alive and vital the vision for a better life in rural America, as seen by the league pioneers of 50 years ago.

The February 1 edition of the Minot Daily News of Minot, N. Dak., published an excellent article by Dick Dobson on the founding of the Nonpartisan League. I ask that it be reprinted at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LEAGUE LAUNCHED HALF CENTURY AGO

(By Dick Dobson)

Fifty years ago this month, the Nonpartisan League, last of the historic and colorful agrarian protest movements, was born in North Dakota.

The NPL arose from the same discontent that produced the old Grange, the Greenback Party, the Farmers Alliance, the Populist Party and the other political action organizations which swept the Midwest in the late 19th century.

Always a fertile ground for agricultural agitation, North Dakota first rebelled in 1892 by going for the Populist presidential candidate, Gen. James B. Weaver.

As the old movements rose and fell, the embers of agrarian progressivism continued glowing in North Dakota until they burst into a full-scale political prairie fire in 1915.

Those flames, which spread into 13 States before they were extinguished, sprang up when North Dakota's 1915 Legislature declined to approve construction of a State-owned terminal elevator.

They were fanned by a State representative named Treadwell Twichell, who purportedly told a large delegation of farmers lobbying for the bill to "go home and slop the hogs."

Whether by design or chance, Arthur C. Townley, a onetime Socialist organizer and a bankrupt flax farmer, chose this propitious moment to launch the Nonpartisan League.

Townley had mulled over the idea of nonpartisan political action through control of the primary elections for some time, but it apparently was an associate of his, A. E. Bowen, who first advocated the plan.

Townley, then residing in Minot, drove the short distance to Deering in late February 1915 to "sell" Fred B. Wood, a prominent leader in the Equity Cooperative Exchange, on the idea.

In his book on the NPL, Robert L. Morlan said Townley got "a not too enthusiastic greeting" upon arrival at the Wood farm. He continued:

"Mr. Wood and his two grown sons, Howard and Edwin, had heard many schemes of how to save the farmer, but their interest mounted as they listened to this intense young man who eagerly explained his plans until far into the night.

"F. B. Wood thought the whole proposition fantastic and unworkable, but Townley kept after him for 3 or 4 days, when at last youth, if not age, was won over.

"Late one evening, Howard Wood and Townley scribbled a brief 'platform' on a scrap of paper by the light of a kerosene lamp in the kitchen of the Wood farm, and early the next morning they started out in a bobsled to talk to neighbors, Howard handling the introductions and Townley giving the sales talk."

The story of the NPL in its heyday from 1916, when it won control of State government, until 1921, when the Governor and other key officeholders were recalled, is well known.

One monographer credited it with bringing a "New Deal" to North Dakota when Franklin D. Roosevelt was only an obscure official in the U.S. Navy Department.

At its peak, the NPL had 200,000 dues-paying members. It evolved into the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota and joined with the Progressive Party in Wisconsin.

After crumbling as a national organization, the NPL still continued with occasional success in North Dakota. For 25 years, it was a personal vehicle of the late William Langer.

In 1956, the league broke its nominal Republican moorings and merged with the Democratic Party, a union which has produced new election triumphs.

Although the NPL is little more than a paper organization today, having been fully absorbed into Democratic machinery, it will live on, in name if not in fact.

The Nonpartisan League after 50 years is as native to the North Dakota political landscape as smoke-filled rooms and bombastic campaign oratory.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, so much has been written and spoken of Lincoln during the years intervening since his death that now our utterances are repetitious of something which has been written or spoken on some previous occasion. Out of the volumes that have been composed in testimony to Lincoln's greatness, none is more touching, more revealing, and more powerful than a memorial address delivered in this House exactly 49 years ago Friday by a Representative from Illinois, William A. Rodenberg. This oration has made a deep and lasting impression and whenever the name of Lincoln is spoken some phrase or some passage from it immediately comes to my mind.

In order that this memorable address may be brought to those who are now Members of the House and through these pages to the rest of the country, I am

including it as a part of my remarks today:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 12, 1916]

ADDRESS BY MR. RODENBERG

Fivescore and 7 years ago today the star of destiny shone resplendent over the cradle of an infant boy who, in the years to follow, was to be acclaimed by history as one of America's grandest contributions to the world's heritage of great and noble men. On that day, in a cabin home, amid the hills of Kentucky, Abraham Lincoln was born, and on this anniversary of his birth the memory of that great and godlike life thrills the soul of every American, giving him an inspiration of true nobility. [Applause.]

Abraham Lincoln—what a flood of mighty memories is awakened by that name. What a glorious panorama of patriotic achievement it presents to view. How it seems to fathom the very depths of duty and devotion, the innermost springs of sympathy and of sorrow. As we pronounce it reverently today the trials and tragedies and triumphs of the Nation's supremest struggle pass again in review before us and, rising above the stress and strife of conflict, grand and majestic, like some tall cliff "that midway leaves the storm," we behold the one great central figure of that epoch of heroism, the one neverfailing beacon light of national patriotism—our Lincoln—the world's Lincoln. [Applause.]

As I attempt today to pay tribute to a personality so great, a character so grand, so complex, and yet so simple, I am overwhelmed with a sense of my inability to do even partial justice to his name and fame. I shall content myself, therefore, with a brief reference to a few of his great traits of character which I believe have left a profound and lasting impression upon the American mind.

Why is it that no other name in the long roll of distinguished American statesmen stirs the heart of the Nation so deeply as that of Abraham Lincoln? Orators never weary of singing his praise, and hearers never tire of listening. Books on Lincoln multiply each year, and interest in them never flags. Every trivial relic of his homely life, every scrap of his writing, every prophetic saying, every jest, every anecdote, is treasured today by the people and bequeathed by them "as a rich legacy unto their issue."

It is not enough to say that Lincoln was a wise and patriotic President who died a martyr to a great cause. We have had other wise and devoted Presidents, and he is not the only martyr, but there is only one Lincoln. Washington we reverence, Jackson we admire, Lincoln we love. His memory is enshrined more deeply in the heart of the Nation than that of any other man, and there is none so close as he to the source of tears and of emotion.

This cannot be explained by the fact that Lincoln rose by manly effort from the humblest ranks of backwoods life to the highest position in the gift of any people. It cannot be accounted for by the fact that he was a noble embodiment of that splendid spirit of self-reliance that is bred of generations of lonely struggle under the shadow of the forest primeval. It is not even because he signed the great Proclamation of Emancipation.

These things are a part of the reason for the esteem in which we hold Lincoln, and so are his inexhaustible humor, his tense earnestness, his tireless industry, his history and fairness, his courage, and his steadfastness of purpose. His homely and unaffected words and ways had something to do with his popularity, and so had his sturdy commonsense. But not all of these sterling traits could make a Lincoln without something additional; nor is the secret revealed by naming what is usually regarded as the crowning trait of his magnificent character—the fact that he always sought the right as God gave him to see the right, and that he devoted his life to a steadfast pursuance of it when once he was convinced he had found it. This will explain much, but it will never explain the flood of tender emotion that wells up from American hearts at mention of his incomparable name.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the true secret of our love for Lincoln was his own love for his fellow man. [Applause.] In his ungainly, giant form there was a heart of infinite human sympathy, and this is was that illumined all his other traits of greatness and has made the imperishable halo that lingers around his head. [Applause.] Without these he might have achieved greatness, might have become President, might have freed the slaves as a political necessity, might even have brought the war to a successful close, and have fallen a victim to an assassin's bullet, and yet we should not today be speaking of him as we do. It is this one supreme trait of human sympathy that carries his name out of the realm of intellect into that of emotion. [Applause.]

It was this same deep human sympathy that caused Lincoln to hate slavery and to throw all of the power of his logic and eloquence against it. It was this, too, that enabled him to hold that marvelous balance of judgment which could put the Union above all else and could hold back emancipation until the right time. He could put himself in the place of the citizen of the border States and feel that any radical move would imperil the cause of freedom itself. This note of human sympathy sounded forth in his first inaugural; it ran throughout his relations with the soldiers during the great war, and animated his last acts as it had his first. The soldiers fighting on the field and dying in the hospital thought of him, and they said to each other: "He cares. He makes us fight, but he cares"; and they fought on as they never would have fought without that warmth of feeling for the head of the Nation.

Looking at the matter from any aspect and at any period of Lincoln's life, the prime cause of his greatness and of our present reverence for him is the fact that he was human in the best and truest sense of that fine word, and this is reason enough why the Nation loves the name of Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.]

The fast-falling shadows of the past leave few names of men not enshrouded by their gloom. Many of the heroes of today will be lost to sight in the dimness of the approaching twilight. Tomorrow's sun will lighten up new shrines surrounded by tireless hosts of hero worshipers. As we look toward the past, earth's greatest heroes seem in strangest company—Christ and the condemned men, the missionary and the cannibal, Lincoln and the despised black man—there they stand together in the crowd, on Calvary, surrounded by jeering multitudes; but today they are together among the immortals. [Applause.] These saviors of the race will never be forgotten. Lincoln's heart solved more problems than his brain. His very gentleness made him the great emancipator, reconciler, the composite character of the American people. Hope, which is the prophet in every heart, was king and priest besides in his. It ruled his life and consecrated his deeds. Other men turned their backs in despair on the Republic's future; he, through densest darkness, saw with prescient light and gaze the glory of the coming dawn. [Applause.]

In the city of Springfield, in beautiful Oak Ridge Cemetery, he sleeps the sleep of eternity. Many are the times that I have stood with bowed head beside that sacred tomb and thought of the great soul that once inhabited the tenement of clay now moldering into the dust from whence it came. And standing there in the presence of the mighty dead, my faith in humanity has been strengthened and my confidence in the perpetuity of the Republic and its glorious destiny has been made secure. [Applause.]

History tells us that when Robert Bruce, King of Scotland, was dying he asked that his heart be removed from his body and borne by knightly hands to the sacred sepulcher of the Saviour. Upon his death the Earl of Douglas, his trusted friend and companion, removed the heart from the body, placed it in a beautiful golden casket, and, surrounding himself with a number of brave young Scotch warriors, they set out on their holy mission. On the way they were attacked by a large body of Moors, who almost overcame them by force of superior numbers. When defeat seemed almost certain, Douglas took in his hand the sacred casket and hurled it far out into the midst of the enemy shouting:

"Lead on, heart of Bruce,
We follow thee!"

And the knights of Scotland, never having been defeated when following the leadership of Bruce, took new courage. They rushed upon the enemy with the fury of the whirlwind and gained the day. [Applause.]

Today the true and loyal citizens of this Republic, of whatever creed or ancestry, catching the inspiration that breathes upon them from the glorious memories of the past, with true American patriotism will take in their hand the great heart of Abraham Lincoln, encase it in their love, and hurl it far out into the midst of the enemy, shouting:

"Lead on, heart of Lincoln,
We follow thee;
We follow thee!"

[Prolonged applause.]

Hawaii Leads in Tropical and Subtropical Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has received worldwide acclaim as a center for the study of, and research in, tropical and subtropical agriculture and animal husbandry. For many years now, Hawaii by virtue of its mid-Pacific location, has acted as a pivot of information on tropical and subtropical agriculture and animal husbandry to the Pacific basin.

Recently, Hawaii's experts were called upon to assess the situation of livestock in Okinawa. A very able committee composed of Dr. Kenneth K. Otagaki, chairman of the State department of agriculture, Mr. Tokushi Tanaka, a University of Hawaii Extension Service poultry specialist, Mr. Williams L. Hugh, a swine specialist, Mr. Jack Ishida, agricultural economist, and State Representative Akira Sakima, a former pork producer, made up the consulting team.

Their recommendations were published in a report entitled "Livestock Production in the Ryukyu Islands." I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a summary of its recommenda-

tions as published on February 3, 1965, in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin.

The article follows:

HAWAII TEAM HELPS OKINAWANS WITH LIVESTOCK

The title of the report is "Livestock Production in the Ryukyu Islands."

Inside its brown covers are 34 pages of comments by a group described as the Hawaii Livestock Consulting Team.

Members of the term were Dr. Kenneth K. Otagaki, chairman of the State department of agriculture; Tokushi Tanaka, specialist in poultry with the University of Hawaii extension service; Williams L. Hugh, specialist in swine with the extension service; Jack T. Ishida, agricultural economist with the service; and State Representative Akira Sakima, former manager of the Island Pork Producers Cooperative.

The team flew to Okinawa last year as consultants to the U.S. Army and the civil government of the Ryukyus.

To Dr. Otagaki what is in the report now published is not as important as what it signifies.

MUCH TO CONTRIBUTE

He feels that Hawaii has much to contribute to the rest of the Pacific, as a result of its own advanced studies in tropical agriculture.

He thinks Hawaii's cultural bonds and language affinity with the Pacific nations also enhance the possibilities here.

Several of the local team, for instance, had Okinawan or Japanese backgrounds and could converse with the Okinawan farmers in Japanese rather than going through an interpreter.

"All we had to do was speak a few words in Japanese and the ice was broken," Otagaki recalled.

The Hawaii team found Okinawa far more dependent on outside food supplies than it needs to be, and found it could make much better use of materials and crops at hand in order to increase its production.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations of the Hawaii team point this up.

Among the points made:

1. The University of the Ryukyus should take a lead in research into livestock production and management, and coordinate directly with farmers through a strong extension program.

2. The government of the Ryukyus should include a department of agriculture.

3. Beef and dairy production can be upgraded by using agricultural byproducts and native forages as animal feed. Family units should be stressed, but a few corporate-type, intensive operations can be established.

4. Poultry production was identified as an area having strong potential if improved practices are adopted, and research is carried out to develop rations and breeds adapted to Ryukyuan conditions.

5. Swine production, similarly, can be improved by adopting a number of enumerated changes in production and marketing practices.

6. Cooperatives offer hope as a means of organizing and improving agricultural practices for the benefit of all. Again, specific recommendations are made as to procedure.

Otagaki feels the islanders were able to see and appreciate the Okinawan problems far better than mainland U.S. teams might have done, both because of cultural affinity and an acquaintance with similar agricultural problems and climate.

He thinks that just as business sells its talent abroad, Hawaii should look into the potential of sending its agricultural talent afield.

Hawaii has a world-recognized leadership position in tropical agriculture and should move to exploit it, he feels.

A Nicaraguan Canal?—Of Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the February 10, 1965 issue of El Diario La Prensa.

The editorial follows:

A NICARAGUAN CANAL?—OF COURSE

It is interesting to note that the first two Central American nations visited by Assistant Secretary of State, Thomas C. Mann, were Nicaragua and Costa Rica. Undoubtedly, this astute statesman has done so because this proposed area is the closest to the United States of America and the most desirable, philosophically, as a wedge against communism in the Latin American sector of the Western Hemisphere. It is an area where friends of the United States abound, and irritating, agitating Yankee baiters are unpopular.

The canal through Nicaragua has been seriously considered and discussed as a feasible point for many decades. During almost the past 50 years, it has been repeatedly evaluated as a logical point by Central American experts of our State Department and our Department of Defense. Such discussions, in themselves, are evidence of the logic of this canal. Logic from a technical point of view, logic from the political aspects and logic from an economic appraisal.

A canal through Nicaragua would, in a true sense, be a breakthrough into Latin American popularity and friendship. Nicaragua has consistently demonstrated friendship and loyalty to the United States. By virtue of the Chamorro-Bryan agreement almost 50 years ago, Managua gave Washington an "exclusive option" to open a canal through Nicaraguan territory. Nicaragua contracted and agreed not to negotiate with any other country or private enterprise for the opening of such a canal. In Wall Street parlance, it granted the United States a "call" on the canal. When dealing with a friend, it would seem to be a matter of elementary justice that a "call" deserves a "put." When Nicaragua gave an "exclusive option" to the United States to build a new canal, Nicaragua in return should have an exclusive option that we build the same through Nicaragua territory—this is, if it is feasible and desirable—which it is.

Would such an apparent preference (which is a matter of long standing treaty) for Nicaragua seem to be a reprisal against the people of Panama? Definitely not. Panama already has it canal. As a matter of good, old-fashioned Yankee business practice, we should be careful not to put too many eggs in one explosive container. In recent times, the Panamanians have given strong evidence that the proximity of U.S. forces and U.S. civilians has not made them overly happy. The fact that a new canal would be built through Nicaragua is our business and Nicaragua's business, and in no case signifies that the United States would abandon the present Panama Canal. Certainly, Panama has no "call" upon us and is not entitled to two canals. A canal built with U.S. taxpayer money through Panama would undoubtedly be strenuously opposed in Congress. Politically and philosophically, it is unfeasible.

Another major inducing cause to choose Nicaragua as the most desirable site, would be the fact that Nicaragua and its four neighbors; Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica, the new and expanding Common Market of Central America, would vastly improve their economies and their goal of a bootstrap operation to jointly benefit their 14 millions of people. The cost of a second canal through Nicaragua would not necessarily be more expensive than one through Panama for the reason that at least we may be assured of receiving dollar value for every dollar spent in construction costs. It would also be more than justified by the impetus given the development of a Common Market and the five nations of that region. These five nations of the Central American republics are closest to the enormous consumer and export markets of our country.

Because we have friends there, Central America has been the area most threatened by propaganda from Red China. We are sure that Mr. Mann understands this as he reviews the pros and cons for a new canal.

Nicaragua, si.

Diplomatic Irresponsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, in this time of unsettled world conditions it seems to be the thing to do for many of our citizens, newspapers, and congressional Members to prescribe methods for solving our international problems.

On this subject, the Milwaukee Journal, one of the most respected newspapers in this country, published an editorial in yesterday's edition entitled "Diplomatic Irresponsibility."

This editorial commends my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, now serving in his 17th year on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, for telling a committee of this body that too often Members of Congress are guilty of what he called "diplomatic irresponsibility."

For enlightenment of all Members of the House I ask unanimous consent to insert this editorial in the RECORD:

DIPLOMATIC IRRESPONSIBILITY

Congress regained its senses in time to reject the ban on sale of surplus food to Egypt. It has turned down a House approved amendment that would have taken the power to decide on such transactions away from the President. The proposed ban was unwarranted interference with the President's determination of foreign policy, even if it is true that President Nasser of Egypt is terribly exasperating and sound policy might dictate curbing food shipments to him.

Representative ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, told the House Rules Committee the other day that too often Members of Congress are guilty of what he calls "diplomatic irresponsibility." They propose and vote for emotionally charged, spur of the moment measures that tie the President's hands. Congressmen would not risk the charge of being fiscally irresponsible by proposing tax cut amendments from the House floor, ZABLOCKI said. The place to propose foreign policy measures is before the House Foreign Affairs Committee or the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. And he proposed that in any congressional reorganization foreign pol-

icy proposals be required to go to those committees.

In the meantime the House—the prime offender in these matters—ought to exercise self-control and not try to write foreign policy in amendments to such irrelevant items as a farm appropriation bill. It is, as ZABLOCKI says, plain irresponsibility.

Kosciuszko and Lincoln—Fighters for Freedom and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 we celebrated the 219th anniversary of a great Polish fighter and advocate for liberty and human rights, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a stranger to this country, inspired by a fervent love of freedom and liberty, came here on borrowed money to offer his services to our new Nation in the American Revolution to help gain our freedom and independence. His brilliant service in the American Revolutionary Army caught the attention of George Washington, who placed him in charge of the building of the West Point fortifications. There a monument stands erected to his memory by the American youth as a tribute to his leadership and heroism.

Upon returning to Poland in 1792, he led a tiny, but inspired, army in its heroic resistance against the Russian tyrant. Upon the unsuccessful termination of that insurrection he again came to the United States, which he called his second country, and for which he declared his love and affection.

By a strange and historic coincidence the 12th day of February is also the anniversary of the birth of another great citizen of the world, Abraham Lincoln.

Though they were born nearly a century apart, though one was a Pole and the other an American, one a soldier, and the other a statesman, they had many characteristics in common which would place them in the same category in the annals of American history.

Both of them had a fervent love for freedom and the ideals of democracy. Kosciuszko fought to give birth to this great Nation of ours and Lincoln made every effort during his time to keep it intact. Both contributed richly to make this Nation great. Both believed in the dignity of man. Both of them dedicated their lives to free men from oppression.

This Nation, and the world today, is sorely in need of the inspiration and leadership of great men like Kosciuszko and Lincoln.

In Lincoln's day half of our Nation was enslaved. Today half of the world is enslaved, and the fate of our entire civilization is at stake.

Our great American Nation has never shirked its responsibilities. It has never given in to a tyrant or aggressor, and, God grant it, will not do so today.

I hope we bear in mind that while we here enjoy the blessings of freedom, the native land of Kosciuszko, who fought and sacrificed to make our land free, still suffers together with the lands of many other peoples under the yoke of tyranny.

In honor of the memory of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, therefore, and in order to preserve for our children that freedom here which we hold so dearly, let us dedicate ourselves to a firm determination to make this country and the entire world safe for democracy, the democracy for which Kosciuszko and Lincoln fought so bravely.

John Ghizzoni, Man of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, American youth can find inspiration in two careers described briefly in an editorial appearing in the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat of February 5.

In a tribute to Mr. John Ghizzoni on his retirement as president of District 2, United Mine Workers of America, the newspaper reports on his unselfish participation in community affairs as well as on his outstanding record with the labor organization. The Tribune-Democrat at the same time lauds Mr. Ghizzoni's successor, Mr. Harvey Younker, as "an equally public spirited man" and widely recognized UMWA leader.

Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, for there is a particularly significant reference to each of these gentlemen that today's youngsters ought to hear: Mr. Ghizzoni started to work in the mines when he was 12, and Mr. Younker set out on a parallel career at age 14.

While it is impossible to overemphasize the value of a formal education, examples of this nature can be important to anyone deprived of an opportuity for full schooling. These instances are, in fact, proof positive that a person can attain a high level of learning without diploma or degree. The Ghizzoni and Younker boys refused to allow their dreams of success to dissipate because it was necessary for them to start working at such an early age. They were good workers and they became good, community-minded men. As Kipling wrote:

If you can dream—and not make dreams your master,
If you can fill the unforgiving minute with sixty seconds' worth of distance run,
Yours is the Earth and everything that's in it,
And—which is more—you'll be a Man, my son.

The editorial follows:

JOHN GHIZZONI, MAN OF SERVICE

Although John Ghizzoni has retired as president of district 2 of the United Mine Workers of America, it will be to the benefit of this area if he chooses not to retire from his roles in civic affairs.

And there is at least one indication that he doesn't plan to just sit back and take it easy—he has retained his longstanding position as an international board member of the UMWA.

As are most other labor union members, the Homer City man is a good example of a good citizen. He hasn't limited himself to union endeavors. In addition to having been helpful in many civic campaigns, he has served as a member of the board of advisers of St. Francis College, Loretto, and on the executive board of Adm. Robert E. Peary Boy Scout Council.

On a broader scale, he has represented this highly industrial district before a U.S. Senate committee studying economic and unemployment problems. At one time he was handpicked by former UMWA Preisdent John L. Lewis to be among 23 American delegates to the fourth world congress of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions in Vienna, Austria.

Mr. Ghizzoni started to work in the coal mines when he was 12 and has been close to the miners ever since. When he was 14 he received his first office in the UMWA. He served as secretary of his local for a number of years and then moved up to the presidency, going on in 1918 to become a traveling auditor for the international union. And in 1920 he was elected to his post as an international board member.

One of the organizers of the union's district 2, he was named to its presidency in November 1952 and held that job until he retired.

To succeed Mr. Ghizzoni as leader of the 130 locals in district 2, the UMWA's executive board has approved Harvey Younker, of Johnstown, an equally public spirited man. Among other civic endeavors, Mr. Younker has been active in Community Chest-Red Cross fund campaigns and has served as chairman of Cambria County Board of Assistance and on the board of Johnstown City-County Clinic.

Mr. Younker also started young in the mines, his first job being as a track boy at the age of 14. His mining career has been marked by activity in mine safety movements, and he is serving as president of Pennsylvania Bituminous Council, Holmes Safety Association.

In Mr. Ghizzoni and Mr. Younker, the labor movement has given to this area two good workers. It is hoped that both continue to serve the public as well as their union.

Judge Greene Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, in my home town of Greensboro, the county seat of Hale County, Ala., the Honorable Robert K. Greene retired as judge of probate, a position in which he had served with distinction for over 26 years.

A former president of the Alabama Association of County Commissioners and of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association, Judge Greene has always given freely of his time and talent to undertakings that have benefited his area and State.

The following editorial from the January 14, 1965, issue of the Greensboro Watchman is a fine tribute to an exem-

plary public servant and distinguished Alabamian:

JUDGE GREENE RETIRES

Before next week's issue of the Watchman is in the mails, Judge Greene will have finished his long tenure in public office, and gone into retirement. Hence, a few words about him—an acknowledgment of his stature as a man and an appreciation of him as an officeholder.

Bob Greene, as only his intimates call him, was born 75 years ago in Birmingham, and baptized Robert Knox. His father, Sam Erle Greene, was a circuit judge in Jefferson County for many years, and then the county's probate judge. His mother was Rosa Miller, of Talladega. In her later years, she spent much of her time with her son here in Hale County.

At Auburn, young Greene was a track star, and for many years his half-mile time remained on the books as the Southern record. Not long out of college, he moved to Hale County, to operate a family plantation west of Cedarville, not far from Lock 5. This farm was partly in the prairies, partly in river bottom lands. That was in 1911, and for all of those intervening years, almost 54 of them, Robert Knox Greene has remained a farmer in this county. Cotton then, as now, was his chief love and interest, although he has also gone in much for cattle.

Those were the happy days in Alabama before we had to worry with the boll weevil—but living, as he did, in the prairies, young Greene was faced with the overwhelming problem of transportation, now dismissed so lightly by us. Between Greene and the skimpily paved sidewalks of Greensboro there were 10 of the meanest and muddiest miles known to mankind. Those were the days when, in a wet winter, you had to add two mules to the hitch even to get over the roads with a lightly loaded wagon, and then, as the rains continued, you had to forget the wagon entirely, and take off on horseback through the unfenced countryside to get anywhere. And there even came times when a horse wouldn't do. Young Greene would just walk the sandy miles to lock 5, catch a river steamer to Akron or to Tuscaloosa, and then a train to Birmingham to see his family and the young lady whom he was courting, Fanny Evans. It was not too long after this that she joined him as a bride in the prairies of Hale County, and there her home—a gracious and hospitable one in the finest sense of the old South—continues to exist in spite of the disbelief of our liberal friends from the North who insist that this kind of living is nothing more than a legend.

Bob Greene has always been a successful farmer, but he loves nothing quite so much as cotton. He has been successful with cotton where others have failed, and we doubt whether he has ever had more than three or four real failures in this half century. We know that he didn't do anything in 1916—that memorable and flooded summer when, as an old Negro woman living nearby in the Bend recounted graphically: "I laid by my crop the first of July, and it was as fine a crop as ever you've seen, and then I prayed for the rain, but I must have prayed too hard. I asked the Lord to fill up the middles in my cotton, but when He got through filling up the middles, He filled up the cracks in my floor, too." There were other bad years, like the wet and cold summer of 1940, but by and large, cotton has been kind to Bob Greene, and he has returned the affection.

As a young man, Bob Greene took an interest in public affairs, and some 30 years ago, after an earlier failure, he was elected to the commissioners' court of this county, and then, in 1938, to fill an unexpired term for probate judge. He won a full term in 1940 and every 6 years since that time, most often without opposition, he has won another term. Last year, he felt that the time for retirement has come, so he stepped aside voluntarily. His successor, W. H. (Hal) Knight, will become the new probate judge next week.

Prior to all this there was another term of public service for Judge Greene, early in the 1930's, when he was called to Montgomery to help establish a farm system for those in distress because of the depression. Bull farmers, they were derisively called, even back in those days, but Greene insisted then, as he always insisted, that the way to help the farmer was not by direct dole but by a system of helping the farmer to help himself.

We are not so rash as to say that Robert Knox Greene is the finest probate judge in the history of State or county, but if you have a better candidate for such honors, we would like to know his name. No man has served so long in this office—some 26 years—in the history of Hale County, and no other tenure has seen such remarkable progress. The last quarter century has seen a lot of changes. We have emerged from the tail-end of the great depression; we have gone through 4 years of a worldwide war; we have been engaged in another major conflict, the Korean war, and in other highly irritating conflicts of a lesser nature; we have sweated continuously during the cold war, and we have finally emerged into a period of such prosperity that it must be regarded as some kind of economic euphoria. During all this time, Judge Greene has been at the helm in Hale County. It may be that we would have moved regardless of everything, but the fact remains that while we have moved in Hale County, even though largely with the tide, we have kept an even keel. That is more than can be said for State or Nation, and much more than can be said for most of our other counties, which had the same opportunities as Hale.

It sounds silly to say that Judge Greene's life spans this county from Reconstruction to the atomic age, but for all practical purposes, this is true. We cannot rightly add enough years to place him back in the 1870's and 1880's, but we do know that, when he came here in 1911, he came into and began farming in a county where there were many Confederate veterans still active—men who had fought through the war, and then through the terrors of the Reconstruction. Judge Greene knew these men; he talked with them, and he heard firsthand from them their tales of hardship, and how they had to make do with what they had at hand. This old agricultural era was dying. The plantation system, with cotton as the only crop, still dominated the scene. The countryside, and especially the prairie section, was teeming with Negro labor. The crop was planted with leisure and gathered with even greater leisure, without fear of boll weevil, with the planter delighted to get through picking by Thanksgiving Day. There has been a steady agricultural tide since then, and he has ridden the crest all the way. He has adapted himself to the new plantation system—indeed, he has been one of its chief architects in Alabama; he has equipped himself with tractors, and four-row cultivators, and poisoning machines, and he has called on the crop-dusting pilot to help him, and he has taken other steps to make more cotton than ever before, and to make it easier.

By education, environment, and birth, Judge Greene is a gentleman and a scholar. He is a man of culture, in the finest tradition of the South. He can discuss Shakespeare as readily as he can the evil habits of the boll weevil, and it's not too much to him which subject you choose. Judge Greene is a conservative. With his background, he couldn't very well be anything else. But he is not a blind standpatter. He remembers the past and the rich lessons which it has brought him, but he doesn't keep his head turned in that direction. He speaks and moves with great caution and the utmost deliberation—but he does speak his mind, and he does move when the time comes for it. When he draws slowly on that pipe, he is doing more than filling his lungs with tobacco smoke. He is making his decision, as he does dozens of times a day. Sometimes he is wrong, but—to draw on a new metaphor—his batting average is about as high as you can get in the tough league of Alabama public life.

When Greene became probate judge, an old lady on a bicycle could cover every foot of paved roads in Hale County, including the streeets, in 30 minutes. Now this county, thanks both to Judge Greene and the cooperative county board which has always worked with him, this county has a highway and rural road system unexcelled in Alabama. True, this era has brought with it both State and Federal assistance, but why is it that all of our Alabama counties, with the same opportunities as Hale, have not shown such progress? All through the years, Judge Greene and the county governing body have insisted on operating within their means, and the result has been that, when opportunity knocked at our door, we were able to open it and take advantage of it. This county has operated on a solid financial basis, without a breath of scandal, for more than 25 years, and that in itself is a great tribute to Judge Greene and his colleagues. We now have a shop and road construction system which is considered a model one for the South, and—without any available statistics—we are bold enough to say that, when it comes to fine rural roads, Hale County certainly ranks among the top 10 or 15 counties in America.

A similar strain of caution, mixed with an awareness that we must still keep on the move, has entered into every phase of our county life. As a result, we not only have a progressive county, but one free of bonded indebtedness. Hale County was very late in taking advantage of State and Federal aid in the building of a hospital, but when Judge Greene did see that such a hospital should be built, he lent all of his help and his prestige in seeing to it that we got the very best, and that we put it on the soundest base possible.

In brief, it has been a pleasant experience to live in a county which has such a man as Judge Greene as its head—to see him in action, and to enjoy that peculiar sense of security which we feel when a man of his stature and integrity occupy public office.

Anniversary Remarks Commemorating the Sinking of the "Maine"

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the event we commemorated yesterday, the explosion of the battleship *Maine* off the Havana Harbor in 1898, signaled the emergence of the United States as a world power. When our young men joined hands in common struggle with the valiant Cuban patriots to throw off the despotism of Spain, this country demonstrated a new sense of national conscience.

While our Government had been foremost in recognizing the independence of Spain's other colonies in the Americas and had backed them further by the Monroe Doctrine, we had never before taken up arms on behalf of another country's freedom.

The Spanish-American War grew out of deplorable conditions in Cuba that seemed intolerable to an aroused popular sentiment in the United States. Spanish misgovernment and oppression had given rise to numerous revolts which had made little headway in relieving Cuban ills.

The "reconcentration" policy of the Spanish commander, resorted to in 1896 to surpress rebellion, left thousands of prisoners to perish behind barbed wire and armed guard. Within the next 2 years, 200,000 people or, roughly, one-eighth of the total Cuban population, had been wiped out by famine, disease, and atrocity.

The American journalists did exaggerate in their releases to the public in terms of what has been called the new "yellow press." But the real sufferings of the rebels would have been horrible enough in any case to arouse deep sympathies among Americans. And, moreover, they were the sufferings of a neighbor.

Then on a Tuesday, February 15, 1898, two explosions illuminated the Havana Harbor, and the second-class battleship *Maine*, moored on a friendly visit, was reduced to a twisted hulk.

Two hundred and sixty American officers and crewmen lost their lives, most to be buried in the Colon Cemetery of Havana. Without doubt the catastrophe stirred up national feelings, and the excitement and the pent-up resentment toward the Spaniards solidified into the cry: "Remember the *Maine*."

With the declaration of war on April 29, President McKinley called for 125,000 volunteers. More than 1 million offered their services. They fought with valor and heroism in the face of the most adverse conditions, yet they were the most poorly treated of all our defenders. The enlisted man's pay was $13 a month. Still, idealistic young, men were willing to give their lives, and 11,000 paid the supreme price.

We went into war by land and sea in Cuba. On the other side of the world, Admiral Dewey destroyed the Spanish Fleet in the Battle of Manila Bay, inside the guns of Corregidor. By the war's end, United States had proven herself to be a powerful adversary and a country destined for leadership.

We give special honor to the 260 men who lost their lives in the destruction of the *Maine*, but we also pay tribute to all veterans of the Spanish-American War, to those in this country and to the valiant men of Cuba who gained independence for the island. They were men who fought with deep convictions and love of liberty.

Uncle Sam's Image

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville, Ind., News, February 12, 1965:

UNCLE SAM'S IMAGE

There was a time, well within the memories of a great many Americans living today, when this country's image in foreign lands was much different from what it appears to be now. It was an image of hope to millions who have since reached our shores to become American citizens. And it was an image of "Don't Tread on Me" to those who might have entertained thoughts of doing harm to our nationals or our property on foreign soil.

But in the latter respect, it has lately even become common to read in the press of attacks on Americans and American property in certain other countries. As this was written, the most recent of such incidents occurred in Moscow when a mob of some 3,000 Russian and Asian students attacked the U.S. Embassy. According to an on-the-scene report, the mob hurled rocks and other missiles to shatter every window on the first two stories of the building.

And all of this went on while an estimated 200 police stood by and watched. The fact is—and this has been pointed out many times—that such demonstrations are employed as a matter of government policy as a means of protesting some action of the United States with which the Kremlin does not agree.

The Soviet Union is not the only country which has and continues to use such tactics and, so far to a large extent and to all surface appearances at least, escaped our rightful wrath. Egypt is another recent example, and there are others.

We must recognize, of course, that we live in a world of greater international complexities than ever before—a world in which the great powers and even the secondary and lesser powers are striving for a sort of "big brother" leadership among the emerging nations. But even so, it would seem that some where along the line we lost some of the starch in our national spine. Whether we ever get it back remains to be seen.

Concealed Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, increasing concern is being expressed about the possibility of a new inflationary surge this year. Although the administration maintains that there has been no significant inflation in the past year, it has in fact been occurring, although largely in concealed form.

A recent article in the February 8 issue of the Wall Street Journal outlines the disparity between expansion in bank credit and growth in economic output. Since 1961, bank credit has grown 28 percent while gross output has increased by only 22 percent. Since wholesale prices have remained relatively stable in the same period, the question arises where the excess in the growth of credit over growth in capacity has gone.

The answer is that the steadiness in wholesale prices has actually been concealing a form of inflation. Without the excessive increase in bank credit over recent years, prices would have fallen. Price declines such as might have occurred in the past 3 years are important because they would have provided a margin to allow for commodity price increases while maintaining overall stability in the long run.

The problem of the relation between credit and prices indicates the desirability of a less expansionary credit policy on the part of the Federal Reserve. Such a policy not only would help to prevent concealed inflation, but also would help to reduce the persistent deficit in the balance of payments.

Under unanimous consent I include the article from the Wall Street Journal at this point:

THE OUTLOOK—APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

If the price of a stock were to hold merely steady while concentrated purchases of it were being made in abnormally heavy volume, professional traders would suspect an underlying weakness. They would look for the price to fall as soon as the special purchases were finished.

Yet when commodity prices remain merely steady during several years of record expansion of bank credit, the general reaction is to overlook the credit expansion and conclude that the price stability proves there isn't any inflation. At least that's what's been happening in the last few years.

The steadiness of commodity prices beginning with 1958 has been remarkable. The average of all wholesale prices for that year was 100.4 percent of the 1957–59 average, and in January the figure had risen only to about 101 percent. Nor has there been any but a minimum fluctuation in the meantime. Not only the annual averages but also the monthly figures have remained firmly around 101 percent, mostly a bit below.

In the same period bank credit has increased hugely. From the end of 1958 to the end of 1964 commercial bank credit—the total of loans and investments—has grown almost 50 percent or $90 billion. Moreover, out of the $90 billion gain for 6 years, $60 billion has come in the last 3 years.

That there is a close connection between bank credit and commodity prices is pretty well established in economic theory. An expansion in bank credit furnishes funds for an increase in economic activity. In turn this increase means direct or indirect purchases of additional goods. Either the goods are bought directly with the added credit, or the added credit pays for more employment, whereupon the newly employed either work with more goods or more equipment or use their pay to buy more goods for their own use.

Actually, the expansion in bank credit has been more rapid than the growth in economic activity. Bank credit in these last 3 years has grown 28 percent, while the value of the gross output of the Nation has increased only 22 percent. Furthermore, the gross output in physical terms has gone up only 15 percent.

The rest of the 22 percent gain in value of output reflects so-called price increases, but these have been pretty well confined to the prices of human work, that is, salaries, wages, and professional and service pay. As we have seen, wholesale commodity prices as a group have not gone up, and it can also be shown that the increase of less than 5 percent which has occurred during the 3 years in retail costs reflects mostly higher costs for services.

In any case, the question all this adds up to is where the excess in growth of credit over growth of production has gone. There is no clear answer to this, but it looks as if it has gone into keeping prices steady. Which in turn suggests that, without the extra credit expansion, prices would have fallen. That

is, the steadiness of wholesale prices appears to conceal a form of inflation.

The mechanism through which this has been done is probably the usual one of inventory stockpiling. It is true that manufacturing-and-trade inventory additions have been conservatively in line with gains in sales, but they've been substantial just the same—from a monthly average of $94 billion in 1961 to almost $108 billion now.

The existence of this problem of the relation between credit and prices is emphasized at this time by the possibility that a somewhat less expansionary credit policy may be adopted by the Federal Reserve System. There is no sign so far of such a change; the latest week's banking figures suggested the same policy of "cautious ease" that has been followed in recent months is still in force.

But the arguments for a change are strong because of the persistent deficit in the balance between U.S. outgoing and incoming payments of money. Washington at last seems to be on the verge of realizing that such a deficit cannot go on forever and must be cured by traditional methods, including restraint upon credit expansion.

It is being argued in Washington, in preparation for such a possible switch, that it would restrict loans being made outside the country rather than inside it. However, it is difficult to believe that any such clean separation of the effects of restraint could be achieved. The foreign loans our bankers make are at substantially higher interest rates than the loans made here, and restraint on the volume of available U.S. credit would tend to raise rates in both markets. This would probably mean that new lending would be reduced at home as well as abroad.

To accomplish a substantial reduction in new lending, however, the credit policy would have to be altered quite a bit. The present policy of keeping the banking system's unencumbered reserves, available for making loans, in a narrow fixed range tells the banks in effect to go ahead and lend as much as they please.

That's because the moment the banks lend enough to pull their reserves down below the target range, the Reserve System replenishes the funds. The banks have the feeling there is always more to come if they start to use up what they've got. The only kind of policy that would really act as a rein would be to let the reserves keep falling gradually as loans are made, that is, to avoid replenishing them fully.

If such a policy were adopted, the conclusion can hardly be escaped, in the light of the foregoing analysis, that one of the effects would be a distinct softening of commodity prices.

—GEORGE SHEA.

John H. Artichoker, Jr., Selected as One of the Nation's 10 Outstanding Young Men for 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the selection of John H. Artichoker, Jr., as one of the Nation's 10 outstanding young men for 1964 was an honor richly deserved. It was a source of special pride and pleasure for me, since John was born and reared in my district, and is a living testimonial to the advancement and achievement an Indian youth can attain with the determination and willingness to work John has demonstrated.

Born at Pine Ridge, S. Dak., John attended elementary and high school in that area. He was graduated from the University of South Dakota in 1951 after earning all of his college expenses. After working several years, he returned to earn his M.A. degree in 1957.

John has chosen to work among his people and is the first Indian to hold the position of superintendent of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Agency at Lame Deer, Mont. Just 34, he has a tremendous record of accomplishments and promise of a great future ahead.

Because his remarks at the jaycee award banquet were so very appropriate, I feel they merit the study of my colleagues in the House and Senate. They are as follows:

A century ago the sixties were a milestone in the life of the American Indian for it marked the end to an era of almost unlimited freedom. After the War Between the States, the attention of the settlers turned toward the west. Standing in the way of the settlers were the American Indians who fought to preserve their way of life, their freedom and their land. The Indians efforts were pitiful in contrast to the might of the aggressor and in a few short years the American Indian capitulated.

After a hundred years, the 1960's have become another milestone in the life of the American Indian—for throughout America the Indian is like an awakening Gulliver. Evidences of such an awakening began some years ago when Charles Curtis became Vice President of the United States. It was seen in the humor of Will Rogers and in the talent of the Tallchief ballerinas. In my home State of South Dakota, it can be seen by the reelection of Dr. Ben Reifel to the U.S. Congress. It was seen in the great achievement of Olympic champion Billy Mills.

The fact that Indians are achieving significant roles in American society is in itself not important. The important thing is that such achievement is possible under the free enterprise system of our American democracy. It is my privilege to be a servant of this great democracy and it is my hope that some way, somehow, the good men and women in government may tonight be recognized as it is my privilege to be recognized. Service in government is an honor and should be so considered by more young men and women everywhere. The strength of the day-to-day operations of government can be only as strong as the people who are willing to serve. This service can be as rewarding anyplace in the United States as it can be in the isolated pine covered hills of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation in Montana.

I am proud to be an employee of the Federal Government; and even more so, I am proud to be an American Indian and an American—for where else in the world, but in the United States, can the descendents of the conqueror reach out to grasp the hands of the descendants of the conquered with warmth and meaning?

In humility I extend my hand in thanks and in appreciation not only to these many people who have passed through my life to help me, but also to the junior chamber of commerce for making this night possible. This honor is almost overwhelming as it is accompanied by more than the acceptance of the award tonight—it is accompanied by the kindness and the greatness of the people with whom you work, with the new people you meet, and the kindnesses of people you've not yet met. It is a time when a young man can really feel the impact of the greatness of the people of this country and gain renewed strength to face new challenges that may lie ahead.

As the sign of the cross and the sign of the kiss have been symbols of faith and love these outstretched hands have long been a symbol of friendship and faith. Likewise, the practice of sharing has long been a tradition of the American Indian, and so it is in this tradition, I wish to share this honor with my people and my profession.

Lithuanian Independence: Its Meaning for Us in the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 14, 1965, the Lithuanian-Americans of Greater New York gathered at Webster Hall, New York City, to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the Lithuanian nation.

It was my great privilege to address this group of approximately 1,200 of our Lithuanian friends and to express my hope to them that their fatherland, Lithuania, will once again be free and independent.

In accordance with permission granted to me to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my speech made to this group and to include a resolution which was adopted by the Lithuanian-American Council of Greater New York at the gathering.

It is my hope that we can give this resolution strong support and to obtain for the Lithuanian people the freedom and independence they so richly deserve.

The remarks made by me and the resolution adopted follow:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE: ITS MEANING FOR US IN THE COLD WAR

It is indeed a great privilege and a pleasure to participate in this gathering as we commemorate the 47th anniversary of restoration of independence to Lithuania. I have enjoyed so much the personal contacts with so many of you, that I wanted particularly to be with you today.

The 47th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence occurs at a time when our Nation is embarking on a new era and under new leadership. Let us hope that it will prove to be an era of freedom for all peace-loving nations, including the enslaved nations suffering under the domination of communism and communistic tyranny.

It is easy for peoples such as ourselves to forget the tragedies that have befallen this heroic little country. Caught up in the maelstrom of unfolding history as we are today, pressed on all sides by problems in international and national affairs, and indeed concerned as we must be with the difficult tasks of pursuing life in this very complex modern era, all contribute to an attitude of mind that tends to regard the events of yesteryear a concern only for historians.

But this ought not to be the case.

History has lessons for contemporary man, and for us who have taken on such heavy

burdens in protecting our interests and those of the free world against communism, the tragedy of Lithuania has a profound and meaningful lesson.

In these next few moments I want to analyze some of the propositions and assumptions that many Americans have today concerning communism and the Soviet Union, and then drawing from the experience of Lithuania, I would like to relate these propositions and assumptions to the reality of recent Lithuanian history.

In our day we hear a great deal about the Soviet concept of "peaceful coexistence." In a veritable outpouring of statements from Moscow, Soviet leaders have assured the Western World that "peaceful coexistence" is the main line of their policy. In a word, they want to live in peace with us, so they say.

Underlying this concept of peaceful coexistence is the assumption, first of all, that the Soviets are trustworthy.

But can they be trusted to keep their word?

We have ample evidence from our own relations with the Soviets to test this assumption. They had pledged in the 1933 agreements on recognition, for example, not to conduct espionage or carry on propaganda activities in the United States. But, history has proven the emptiness of this pledge.

But, what about Lithuania?

Perhaps one of the most significant reliability tests of the Soviet pledged word came with the Soviet invasion and absorption of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. From the early days of the 1920's through the late 1930's the Soviets had concluded numerous agreements with Lithuania in which they solemnly pledged that they would respect the territorial integrity of the nation and respect also its national independence. Yet, despite their pledged word, the Soviets imposed the Mutual Assistance Pact upon Lithuania in the fall of 1939 and with the passing of only a few months invaded and finally absorbed Lithuania into the Soviet Union. This act of treachery was done with utter disregard of the Soviet pledged word, pledges solemnly made in negotiated treaties.

Thus, in this tragic instance we have a classic case study of Soviet disregard of treaty obligations when the politics of a situation or the ideological impulses to expand communism require that those obligations be ignored.

The idea of Soviet ideology and its impact on international relations is also relevant to the Lithuanian experience. In this present climate of artificially inspired "peaceful coexistence" we have been told by some of our most prominent people that ideology has no meaning whatever for the Soviets. These persons argue that we Americans should look at the Soviets in terms of traditional behavior of nation-states—that is, we should disregard the ideological ingredient of Soviet power.

Well, my friends, what can the case of Lithuania tell us on this point?

Had Communist ideology any relevance to Soviet conquest of this territory nation?

Was the conquest of Lithuania a military thrust designed to satisfy deep-rooted ideological Soviet impulses to expand communism?

I would argue for the case that ideology is indeed a substantial factor in estimating the full dimension of Soviet power. It is a factor that one can ignore at his peril.

Here are the facts.

Lithuania was an independent country. Before winning its independence during World War I, it had been for over a century a part of the Russian Empire. Nevertheless, Lithuania has its own historic past. Lithuanians are a non-Slavic people; their historical experience is rooted in Western rather than Russian civilization; and their culture is similarly Western oriented. In a word, Lithuania is a country totally foreign to Russia. The full span of their history has been marked by an absence of Russian ties, except that of a conquered nation.

Moreover, in 1939, the critical year for all Europe and the world, Lithuania had pledged itself to a policy of neutrality in the fast developing world crisis. It did not act in any manner that could give encouragement to or cause the dissatisfaction of any of the leading contending European powers. Lithuanian policy was directed toward one goal: national survival.

Thus, Lithuania was no threat to the Soviet Union. It provided no cause for alarm in Moscow.

Given these factors, therefore—that is, the lack of historical affinity and the declared national policy of neutrality—how then can one explain the Soviet conquest of that country, Lithuania, and its sister republics?

I frankly do not think that it can be explained in any other way than a manifestation of the Soviet desire to satisfy those deep-seated ideological impulses with the Soviet system and its leaders to expand the domain of communism.

The Soviet leaders and the Communist Party elite are totally committed to the ideology of communism, and their ideology demands of its adherents the continuing expansion of communism's boundaries until at last the ideology itself embraces the whole of mankind.

We should be reminded of this highly important fact today as we search for world peace, as indeed we must. World peace depends upon our ability to reach some sort of agreement, written or unwritten, with the Soviet Union on the futility of thermonuclear war. In so doing, we must ever be wary of the ideological dimension of the Soviet commitment in world affairs. We fail to do so at our peril.

Another assumption that seems to underlay the attitudes of many in their dealings with the Soviet Union is the belief that through the forces of modernity that are at work in the Soviet Union a type of liberalism has taken root and is beginning to assert itself in a way that is permitting a better and more tolerable life for the Soviet people.

Let us test this assumption against the reality of the Lithuanian experience.

There is, of course, no political freedom in Lithuania. Today, the people of Lithuania do not enjoy the freedom and liberty they once knew. Hopes for an evolving democracy in that country were dashed with the Soviet conquest. Today, Lithuania is firmly held within the grip of Soviet totalitarianism. Politically, Lithuania has been forced to take on the structure that exists throughout the entire Soviet Union. The Communist Party in Lithuania is the real source of power, as indeed it is in the other Soviet Republics. The Government itself is nothing more than a convenient administrative facade of constitutional federalism. Lithuanian Communist leaders hold absolute power over the nation, and the Soviet Communist leaders, in turn, hold absolute power over them. But, the people of Lithuania have demonstrated their devotion to freedom, liberty, and justice by not recognizing the Communist occupation of Lithuania.

I pay my humble tribute to the valiant fighters for freedom of Lithuania.

The same can be said for the economic and cultural areas of Lithuanian society. The Communist Party, through its monopoly on all sources of power within the state, orders the life of Lithuanians to suit its particular purposes and those of Moscow. There is no freedom of choice in the cultural realm. Here, Lithuanian writers, poets, and composers must conform to the deadly rubrics of "Socialist realism" that require art not for art's sake, but for the propagation of Communist power. As a result, there can be no flowering of Lithuanian culture as had been during the years of independence.

To repeat, Lithuania is held fast in the grip of Soviet totalitarianism.

Where then is there a possibility for a growing spirit of liberalism or democracy?

I would argue that such a possibility does not exist so long as the Communist monopoly of political power remains. There can be no evolution of this regime into a more tolerable system until vital principles can be taken into account. One of these vital principles is the necessity of dissent, and it is precisely this principle, so important to genuine democracy and liberalism, that is absent in Soviet Lithuania and indeed in the entire Soviet Union.

I seriously question, therefore, this assumption of an improving Soviet society which will produce a qualified form of liberalism. And to those who find merit in this view, I say, "Look to Lithuania."

Yet, there is still another proposition that we Americans hold in our views on foreign policy that has relevance to the Lithuanian experience, and it is based upon our general attitude of the nature of man. We as a people are optimistic. We have a penchant for looking at the brighter side of things.

Let these words of President Franklin D. Roosevelt be a constant reminder to all of us. "It is stated that Lithuania has lost her independence. It is a mistake to say so. Lithuania has not lost her independence. Lithuania's independence has only been temporarily put aside. Time will come and Lithuania will be free again."

We have great expectations that things will work out in the future, that man is ever progressing toward a new day of freedom and human perfection, and that we as a people will provide the motive power for those who seek freedom. We have, in a word, confidence in the future.

On this occasion, we are reminded that the Russian Communists cannot stop or forbid this program, or similar events that are being held in the United States and throughout the free countries in honor and respect to Lithuania.

We Americans know that this Nation has a generous heart and has always welcomed and assisted exiles and refugees. The goal of the present administration is to nourish independence, to build self-respect, and to breed trust among all nations.

Because this Nation fought for its own independence, it encourages independence for others. However, some of the descendants of the peoples of the enslaved countries appear to be worried about the development of an American policy toward the liberation of these captive nations.

The Democratic Party, at its national convention held in Atlantic City just this past year adopted the following language with respect to enslaved and captive nations. Let me quote the language of that portion of the Democratic platform—"We will encourage by all peaceful means the growing independence of the captive peoples living under communism and hasten the day that Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and the other captive nations will achieve full freedom and self-determination."

Let me say to you, that as long as I am a Member of Congress, I shall do whatever I can to bring this declaration to its fulfillment so that these enslaved and captive people can live as God meant them to—free and independent.

In our daily tasks in trying to find our way through the intricate maze of foreign affairs in search of our national interest we can again look to the case of Lithuania and to her people for an example of courage, perseverance, and confidence. Even though Lithuania has been a conquered country for the past 25 years, still the Lithuanian people maintain an abiding hope that the future will reward them for the oppression they

now so nobly bear. The Soviets have not been able to stamp out their desire for freedom and independence. Condemnation of Lithuanians for their so-called bourgeois nationalism, an ever recurring event in Soviet Lithuania today, testifies to the virility of these people and their dedication to the principles and spirit of national independence. When the Soviets complain vigorously about the continued resistance, so-called survivals of the past and call for a more vigorous antireligious campaign in Lithuania, they expose to the world the truth of Lithuanian attachment to the faith and national culture of their fathers, notwithstanding the extraordinary attempts by Soviet oppressors to destroy these vital sources of national life.

Lithuanians are a people in adversity; and yet far from succumbing to the tyranny of the Soviet Union, they have maintained the integrity of their nation and the inviolability of their national soul. This is a great tribute to the Lithuanian people; and for us in the free world it is an example to which we can point and one from which we ourselves can draw insipration for the future.

On this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence it is fitting that we gather here and pay tribute to these gallant and heroic people. On this day we should rededicate ourselves to the spirit of freedom which united the Lithuanian people with the peoples of the world. We know that the Lithuanians will continue to resist the despotism thrust upon them. Their courage, their perseverance, and their loyalty to the historic tradition of their nation will defeat the guns and tanks of their oppressors.

It is also fitting that we reflect upon the virtues and draw from their national experience what inspiration and example we ourselves can use in these trying days.

We should rededicate ourselves to those fundamental principles of freedom and democracy that have lain at the roots of our American heritage for here, in the last analysis, is our supreme glory and the sublime hope of all men for liberty and justice.

Lithuania must be saved, and her independence must be restored and the dignity of the Lithuanian nation must be preserved. On the anniversary of their independence day our prayers are with them that their freedom will not be long in becoming a reality.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN RALLY ON FEBRUARY 14, 1965

We, Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, citizens and permanent residents of the United States, gathered on February 14 of this year of grace 1965 at Webster Hall, New York, N.Y., to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the restoration of the Lithuanian independent state,

Voicing once more our indignation and our protest against the brutal suppression by Soviet Russia of Lithuania's independence, her forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union, and her transformation into a Soviet colonial possession;

Recalling the stand taken by both the great political parties of our country as expressed in their electoral platforms of 1964:

Pointing out that the global surge toward national independence poses a particular challenge to the United States and other Western countries to press for the restoration to Lithuania of a free exercise of the right to self-determination and for the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

Resolve,

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States, firmly to restate and vigorously to promote in diplomatic dealings with the Kremlin, as well as in the United Nations and elsewhere, the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania;

2. To ask the President of the United States to instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations dealing with the liquidation of colonialism "in all its forms and implications" to investigate the Soviet colonialism in Lithuania;

3. To urge that the Free Europe Radio extend its broadcast to include the Lithuanian language;

4. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and freedom;

5. To urge the American Lithuanians to support the policy of the U.S. Government, aiming at the liberation of the Soviet captive nations, and to renew their dedication to the struggle for Lithuania's freedom and independence.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL OF GREATER NEW YORK,
ANTANAS SKERYS, *President.*
VIDA RIBOKAS, *Secretary.*

Something for Nothing Costs Billions to the Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Alice Widener has again rendered a public service by pointing out some of the abuses of public funds.

Of course, the professional do-gooders that bleed from every pore for any cause where public funds are involved, not their own, will probably be offended because these facts have been publicized.

The Widener column follows:

SOMETHING FOR NOTHING COSTS BILLIONS TO THE TAXPAYERS

(By Alice Widener)

New Yorkers were stunned, just before New Year's eve, to learn that City Welfare Commissioner James R. Dumpson had requested a 1965 budget of $499,971,991 or half a billion dollars.

They were further astonished to learn that during last October alone, 455,444 persons received public assistance in New York City, of whom the vast majority were women with children and no male member of the household who could bring home a weekly paycheck.

In Commissioner Dumpson's public statement there was the admission that debt service is one of the two most costly items in his half-billion relief budget (the other is education).

Moreover, he admitted that each month "there are about 1,200 children born to families on relief, causing an automatic increase in the number of persons being supported by the welfare department."

It is essential to bear in mind that this enormous relief budget is being requested in times of general prosperity. What would be the budget in times of adversity? A billion? Two? Nobody knows.

But taxpayers do know now, in good times, that something is terribly wrong in the huge New York City community, and in almost all other big American cities where major welfare budget items are for debt service and aid to illegitimate children.

Closely connected with the absence of gainfully employed males from homes with mothers and children in the situation regarding unemployment insurance.

In New York and California, unemployed persons can collect weekly benefits for 26 weeks, which is half a year.

In New York, the very liberal Governor Rockefeller is talking about increasing the weekly unemployment insurance rate from $50 to $55.

Thus a single man could remain idle for more than half of 1965 and receive $1,430.

Imagine: $55 a week for not working. It makes a person stop and think. It makes me think about my sister-in-law who passed away a few weeks before Christmas.

She was a childless widow and sold dresses in a big Fifth Avenue specialty ship. Her weekly pay was $60.

In 26 weeks of hard work she earned $1,560—that is, only $260 more than an idle person receiving unemployment insurance for the same period at the current rate.

Welfare Commissioner Dumpson says that 84 percent of all applicants for relief in New York City come to his department for help because they are unemployed, and he says that more than 75 percent of these people are unskilled.

What I wonder is how many of these unskilled persons would become skilled enough to earn their daily bread and a roof over their heads if they knew they could get only $15 a week of unemployment insurance for a maximum of 3 weeks?

And it certainly does seem that most of the aid recipients are skilled enough to know every trick of the trade in getting relief and staying on it.

Nowadays it is considered to be evidence of ruthlessness and indifference to the plight of the poor to ask sharp questions about welfare and relief. Yet these questions need to be asked and frankly answered.

The continuing depreciation of the value of the U.S. dollar will eventually force Americans to face hard facts about life in our Great Society.

When finally we are forced to repudiate our Federal, State, and city debts, or service them in almost worthless paper, it is very likely that a loaf of bread will cost more than a dollar and so will a quart of milk.

Then what is going to happen to those of us who worked and saved all our adult lives to have an income of $200 per month after retirement? How far will the maximum of $127 per month social security go toward buying the subsistence food needed by a man or woman of 65 years and more?

In our country, before our dollars become worthless paper, we need to ask ourselves, "Who is being ruthless and indifferent to whom?"

I am a taxpaying, self-employed professional. My work entails much travel. At railroad stations and airports, I find it difficult to get a redcap or skycap. I find it is becoming more and more difficult to get a taxi.

I find it hard to get a handyman to do odd mending chores in my home, hard to get a window washer, hard to get a carpenter or seamstress.

So more and more, I am becoming a do-it-yourself jack of all trades, in addition to my writing trade, and I am paying higher and higher taxes to support able-bodied loafers on a 26-week dole and a pack of shrewd, lewd women making a profit out of sexual relations productive of illegitimate children.

I repeat, who is being ruthless toward whom, and what will be the real value of dollars consumed by New York City's half-billion-dollar annual welfare budget?

Literary Piracy, Charles Dickens, and the American Copyright Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, as chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, concerned with the American copyright law, I am pleased to include the following article by Dr. Edward G. Hudon, Assistant Librarian, Supreme Court of the United States, published in the December 1964 issue of the American Bar Association Journal. Dr. Hudon's scholarly article contains interesting and little-known historical facts regarding the development of the copyright law. I recommend it not only to lawyers and historians but to persons interested in literature:

LITERARY PIRACY, CHARLES DICKENS, AND THE AMERICAN COPYRIGHT LAW

(NOTE.—In this article, Mr. Hudon relates the story of the struggle in this country to obtain passage of a copyright law to protect foreign authors from literary pirates. The leader in the struggle was Charles Dickens, who received nothing from the American editions of his novels although they were even more popular in this country than in England.)

(By Edward G. Hudon, Assistant Librarian, Supreme Court of the United States)

Copyright as we know it dates back 250-odd years.[1] It owes its origin to a significant milestone in the struggle for freedom of the press—the victory that was won when the last of the English licensing acts was permitted to lapse in 1695 and the right to unlicensed printing became a reality.[2] But important as gaining this right was to printer and publisher, it was not accomplished without some sacrifice. Freedom from the heavy hand of the licensor also meant loss of the protection that the licensing laws had given to literary property as they had prevented one from printing another's copy without a license.[3] And once this loss occurred, literary piracy became rampant. Such chaos was precipitated among literary circles that Parliament was even petitioned for a return to some form of press regulation. A measure to that effect was introduced in Parliament, but fortunately it failed. Nevertheless, the petitioners—the publishers and booksellers—were persistent enough in their demands for some form of protection that on January 11, 1710, a bill was introduced in the House of Commons which became the Copyright Act of 8 Anne. As this went into effect April 10 of the same year, it provided "for the encouragement of learning by vesting the copies of printed boks in the authors or purchasers of such copies, during the times therein mentioned."[4]

EARLY AMERICAN COPYRIGHT LAW—A CENTURY OF PIRACY

In the United States, the need for copyright was recognized at the very start. As early as 1783 the Continental Congress resolved "That it be recommended to the several States, to secure to the authors or publishers of any new books not hitherto printed, being citizens of the United States, and to their executors, administrators, and assigns, the copyright of such books for a certain time * * *."[5] So, it is not surprising that even before the Federal Convention met in 1787, 12 of the 13 Original States had copyright laws.[6] Then, the adoption of the Constitution empowered Congress "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries" (art. I, sec. 8). This was implemented by the very first Congress with the Copyright Act of 1790 which, very much like its English predecessor, provided "for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books, to the authors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned."[7]

Hence, American recognition of the value of literary property came early. But from this it should not be assumed that literary piracy has never existed in this country. Very much to the contrary, there was all of a century of it, due to the fact that until 1891 American copyright law benefited only citizens and residents of the United States. Foreign authors received no protection whatever throughout this period and their works were pirated unremittingly by American publishers, particularly as the publishing houses of New York and Philadelphia forever strove to outdo each other.[8] Thus, in 1822 Matthew Carey, of Philadelphia, one of the more adept, produced for immediate sale within 28 hours, 1,500 copies of Sir Walter Scott's "Quentin Durward." That same year Carey scored another victory over his competitors by using from 35 to 40 compositors to prepare an American edition of Byron's "Don Juan" within 36 hours. In 1836 Carey and Hart beat Harpers to the distribution of "Rienzi" in New York simply by buying up all the seats in the mail coach from Philadelphia. British authors were victimized the most as the demand for English novels grew. Almost anything that was romantic or sentimental sufficed, no matter whether it was good, bad, or indifferent. Meanwhile, American authors suffered from neglect since, with a few notable exceptions, it was difficult for them to find publishers who had any desire or saw the need to pay authors for the right to publish what they wrote.[9]

While this went on, there were frequent protests against the wrong done by literary piracy. In 1810 and again in 1826 the New York Evening Post pointed out the evil of it all.[10] Later, in a series of articles that began in 1834, Willis G. Clark, Philadelphia poet, editor, and publicist, repeated the charge of injustice to foreign authors and publishers, and he pointed out the harm that was done to American literature.[11] The obvious solution was international agreement for the protection of literary property which Tom Paine had advocated as early as 1792. The idea first took hold in Denmark in 1828 when that country adopted a provision for international copyright on a reciprocal basis. The same thing happened in Prussia in 1836 and in England in 1837. Other countries followed suit so that by 1854 only the United States, Russia, and the Ottoman Empire had failed to act.[12] In the United States, John Neal stressed the need for some form of international copyright as early as 1828 in his magazine, The Yankee,[13] but almost three-quarters of a century was yet to elapse before anything could be accomplished. Meanwhile, it remained for two Englishmen, both of whom were bitter victims of American literary piracy, to get the movement underway. One, a publisher named Frederick Saunders, provided the initiative that launched the international copyright movement in the United States; the other, Charles Dickens, gave the movement the impetus that it needed to gain life.

AGITATION FOR INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT

Saunders came to this country in 1836 to establish an American branch of the British firm of Saunders and Oatley. He did this with the belief that publishers in this country might be deterred from pilfering his firm's literary property if American and English editions of its publications were issued simultaneously. As a foreigner he had no legal protection under American copyright law. Therefore, he took his stand on moral ground—the right of an author to his literary property. But American publishers promptly ignored this and almost ruined him financially as they proceeded to pirate his books mercilessly.[14] Nevertheless, his idealism was not completely fruitless. It at least caused the problem to be squarely presented to the public as he pleaded his case in New York newspapers. In addition, petitions were presented to Congress, the most celebrated of which was the British authors' petition in which 56 of the foremost British authors of the day stated their grievances. Prepared in London by the firm of Saunders and Oatley, it was presented to the Senate in 1837 by Henry Clay.[15] The Senate committee headed by Clay to which the petition was referred issued a favorable report, but all of this went for naught as the bill that was introduced failed to pass. The same thing happened to the bill when it was reintroduced by Clay in 1838, 1840, and 1842.[16] Thus, even the efforts of the very persuasive Senator from Kentucky could not overcome the opposition to international copyright that persisted in this country.

Charles Dickens' interest in the American copyright movement was anything but idealistic. He once wrote of the "American robbers," as he called American publishers: "The existing law allows them to reprint any English book without any communication whatever with the author or anybody else. My books have all been reprinted on these agreeable terms."[17] As soon as his works appeared in England, originals were rushed to this country where they were hastily reprinted in cheap unauthorized editions. Sir Walter Scott had experienced similar treatment earlier when, in as short a period as 9 years, no less than 500,000 pirated copies of his works were issued in the United States, some for as little as 5 cents each.[18] But Dickens could rightly complain of American literary piracy: "Of all men living, I am the greatest loser by it."[19] Indeed, in June 1840, he could write to the editor of the Knickerbocker: "I have never received from the American editions of my works, 50 pounds."[20] Therefore, it is not surprising that he was so firm an exponent of international copyright, a subject on which he gave vent to his feelings at every opportunity, particularly during his first visit to the United States.

Once Dickens landed on American soil on January 22, 1842, he lost little time in making known his resentment and indignation at the treatment that he received at the hands of American publishers. Ten days after his arrival he set the theme for his entire visit at a dinner given in his honor in Boston when, in no uncertain terms, he stated his belief that it was time for the United States to join the growing movement for the international protection of literary property. "There must," he said, "be an international arrangement in this respect; England has done her part; and I am confident that the time is not far distant when America will do hers. It becomes the character of a great country: first, because it is justice; secondly, because without it you never can have, and keep, a literature of your own."[21]

Seven days after his Boston remarks, Dickens spoke at a second dinner given in his honor in Hartford, Conn. Once more he coupled his plea for international copyright with an expression of personal indignation, but this time he used stronger language. After stating that he had "made a kind of compact" with himself never to omit an op-

Footnotes at end of speech.

portunity to refer to the topic while he remained in America, he begged leave of his audience to whisper two words into its ear: "international copyright." [22] Then he pointed to the specter of Sir Walter Scott who had suffered equally for the want of such an agreement. Had it been otherwise, Dickens commented, "Scott might not have sunk beneath the mighty pressure on his brain." [23] Dickens pictured Scott as "faint, wan, dying, crushed both in mind and body by his honorable struggle," with Waverley, Ravenswood, Rob Roy, the Highland Chiefs and all the others "hanging down their heads in shame and sorrow, that from all those lands into which they [had] carried gladness, instruction, and delight for millions, they brought him [Scott] not one friendly hand to help, to raise him from that sad, sad bed." [24] And with an obvious reference to American publishers, Dickens continued:

"No, nor brought him from that land in which his own language was spoken, and in every house and hut at which his own books were read in his own tongue, one grateful dollar-piece to buy a garland for his grave." [25] "Oh," Dickens went on, "if every man who goes from here, as many do, to look upon that tomb in Dryburgh Abbey, would but remember this and bring the recollection home." [26]

The immediate reaction to both the Boston and the Hartford addresses was opposition and disfavor that Dickens chose to consider an "outcry." [27] Thus, in reporting the second dinner the Hartford Times commented:

"Mr. Dickens alluded in his remarks to an international copyright law. In Boston he also alluded to the same subject, intimating that England had done her duty and it now remained for the United States to follow suit. It happens that we want no advice on the subject, and it will be better for Mr. Dickens if he refrains from introducing the subject hereafter, but it is not pleasant to pursue the subject further at this time." [28]

If this had any effect on Dickens, it was opposite from the one intended. He touched on international copyright in almost every speech that he made during the 6 months that he spent visiting every major American city. He dwelt on the subject so much that later he was accused of having made his 1842 trip primarily to agitate for an international copyright law. He denied the accusation when it was made by English critics of his American Notes,[29] but the same thing was repeated after his death by some of his biographers.[30] Whatever the motive for his visit was, he kindled enough of a fire as he toured America for the first time to cause such men as Horace Greeley to espouse the cause. He also inspired others to speak out who had not had the courage to do so before, although they shared the same interests that he did.

In November, 1867, 25 years after his first trip to the United States, Dickens returned for another 6 months to deliver a series of readings from his works. He now came to a country where he was perhaps even more popular as a writer than he was in England. In the past, this popularity had meant little or nothing to him financially since it was founded on literary piracy, but it now constituted his stock in trade and at the end of his readings he returned home $100,000 richer.[31]

Thus, Dickens' second trip to this country was a huge financial success. Perhaps that explains why, as he retraced much the same path that he had followed a quarter of a century earlier, he did not give evidence of his bitterness on the question of the lack of an American provision for international copyright. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the International Copyright Association was established in 1868, the year that marked the conclusion of Dickens' American readings and the beginning of renewed and more persistent demands for international copyright legislation. Even the clergy became involved and sermons were preached on the morality of it all. Then, in 1883 the American Authors Copyright League was formed and in 1887 the American Publishers Copyright League came into existence,[32] but still Congress delayed.

YEAR 1891 AND A CHANGE OF SENTIMENT

One may wonder why Congress put off for so long a matter that had such universal appeal. The answer lies in the fact that throughout the 19th century, international copyright had such influential opponents in this country that even a Charles Dickens and a Henry Clay were powerless. There were the publishers of Philadelphia, the labor unions of the bookmaking industry and protectionists in general.[33] All of these waged a delaying action that was effective enough to prevent the United States from becoming a signatory of the Bern Convention of 1886 which gave "automatic" protection to the authors of all member nations, a principle that the copyright law of this country still rejects.[34] However, as the 20th century drew near there was sufficient change of sentiment so that the proponents of international copyright, led by R. R. Bowker, G. P. Putnam and others, gained the upper hand and Congress enacted the International Copyright Act of 1891.[35] But even this was not achieved without concession. At the insistence of the labor unions of the bookmaking industry, the "manufacturing clause" of the act required that books be set and printed in this country to be eligible for copyright. The Copyright Code of 1909 added that books also had to be bound here, but it exempted original works of authors written in languages other than English. Since 1954, works protected by the Universal Copyright Convention, to which the United States is a party, have also been exempt from the clause.[36]

Although Charles Dickens did not live to benefit from it, this country has now given protection to foreign literary property for almost three quarters of a century. The basic principle for this protection has been "reciprocity" and "national treatment." [37] Since the Copyright Code of 1909, this has been said to exist:

"When the foreign state or nation of which such author or proprietor is a citizen or subject grants, either by treaty, convention, agreement, or law, to citizens of the United States the benefit of copyright on substantially the same basis as to its own citizens, or copyright protection substantially equal to the protection secured to such foreign author under this act, or by treaty; or when such foreign state or nation is a party to an international agreement which provides for reciprocity in the granting of copyright, by the terms of which agreement the United States may, at its pleasure, become a party thereto." [38]

While it is recognized that reciprocity still has considerable surface appeal with which to obtain foreign protection for American authors, it is now urged that this country would have much to gain and little to lose if it extended protection to all authors generally, regardless of nationality.[39] France has done so for over a century, and yet the works of French authors are protected in a greater number of countries than are the works of U.S. authors. The adoption of a similar plan by this country would not only, it is said, simplify our international copyright relations, but it might also foster greater dissemination of foreign works here—it would assure protection for the exclusive right generally considered essential to the investment needed for their reproduction and distribution.[40] In addition, there would be the advantage of the esteem that, it is claimed, this country would gain abroad as a result, and the impetus that would be given to the development of copyright relations among all nations. Besides, it is argued, reciprocity is now of little importance since U.S. authors are protected in about every country where copyright is valuable commercially.[41]

On this latter point—U.S. authors are protected everywhere that copyright is commercially valuable—opinion is anything but unanimous. The American Textbook Publishers Institute and the American Book Publishers Council have lodged strong complaints with committees of Congress over the unauthorized production of American books in Taipei, Taiwan, the capital of the Republic of China.[42] According to testimony presented to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, only Nationalist China, Red China, and the Soviet Union now practice literary piracy on a wholesale scale. Of the three, Nationalist China is said to be by far the worst offender. The principal complaint is much the same as the one lodged against American publishers by Charles Dickens more than a century ago—no provision for international copyright. Another complaint is the ineffective enforcement of Nationalist Chinese copyright laws even if an American published registers a book there at prohibitive expense.[43] Therefore, it remains to be seen whether, as it revises its copyright laws, this country will abandon its traditional policy of "reciprocity" and "national interest" in its protection of foreign literary property.

---

[1] The history of copyright is traced from its earliest times by Bowker, Copyright: Its History and Its Law (1912).

[2] For a study of these acts and of the history of the liberty of speech and press in general, see Hudon, Freedom of Speech and Press in America (1963).

[3] The various licensing laws and ordinances are discussed in *Millar* v. *Taylor*, 4 Burrow's Reports 2305 (1769).

[4] See Ransom, The First Copyright Statute: An Essay on an Act for the Encouragement of Learning 1710 (1956).

[5] For a period of not less than 14 years from the first publication, renewable for a second like period under certain conditions. 24 Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774–89 326.

[6] Bowker, op. cit. supra note 1, at 35.

[7] 1 Stat. 124 (1790).

[8] Eaton, The American Movement for International Copyright, 1837–60, 15 The Library Quarterly 95, 101, 102 (1945); Lehmann-Haupt, The Book in America 111, 112, (2d ed. 1951).

[9] Lehmann-Haupt, op. cit. supra note 8, at 112, 113; 4 Trent, Cambridge History of American Literature 546–549 (1921).

[10] Eaton, op. cit. supra note 8, at 101.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Id. at 97.

[13] Id. at 101.

[14] Id. at 102; Lehmann-Haupt, op. cit. supra note 8, at 108.

[15] H.R. Exec. Doc. No. 162, 24th Cong., 2d sess. (1837).

[16] See Solberg, Copyright in Congress, 1789–1904, Copyright Office Bulletin No. 8 148, 149, 155, 156, 158, 159 (1905); Solberg, International Copyright in Congress, 1837–86, 11 Library Journal 250 (1886).

[17] Wilkins, Charles Dickens in America 237, 238 (1911).

[18] 3 Cambridge History of American Literature 541.

[19] Wilkins, op. cit. supra note 17, at 237.

[20] Quoted by Eaton, op. cit. supra note 8, at 113 from the Knickerbocker, vol. 15, p. 529 (1840).

[21] Wilkins, op. cit. supra note 17, at 33.

[22] Id. at 93.

[23] Id. at 94.

[24] Ibid. See also The British Authors' Petition in Bowker, op. cit. supra note 1, at 343.

[25] Wilkins, op. cit. supra note 17, at 94.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Id. at 240.

[28] Id at 241.

[29] Id. at 239, 240.

[30] See, for instance, 5 Dictionary of National Biography 929.

[31] Wilkins, op. cit. supra note 17, at 238. See also America Revisited, 3 Forster, Life of Charles Dickens chs. 15 and 16 (1874).

[32] Lehmann-Haupt, op. cit. supra note 8, at 202-203.

[33] Id. at 203, 204.

[34] Id. at 205.

[35] 26 Stat. 1106.

[36] The manufacturing clause is discussed in Copyright Law Revision, Register of Copyrights Report on the General Revision of the U.S. Copyright Law, House Committee on the Judiciary, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 119, 120 (committee print).

[37] Id. at 117, 118.

[38] 17 U.S.C. 9b.

[39] Register of Copyrights, op. cit. supra note 36, at 118, 119.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Hearings Before the Senate Committee on Appropriations on H.R. 9499 (Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1964), 88th Cong., 1st Sess. at 179. See also the complaints lodged by the Record Industry Association of America, id. at 177, and by Reader's Digest, id. at 188.

[43] See Chinese Reprinters and World Copyright Practice—Copyright: A Chinese View and a U.S. Publisher's Reply, 185 Publishers' Weekly 22 (1964).

Examples of How Federal Funds Are Spent in Two Directions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in these trying times when we are concerned with the closing of our veterans hospitals, with the war in Vietnam, with Government competition, and interference with the free enterprise system, with an extremely complex fiscal policy, it is helpful to find a newspaper editorial which clearly points up some of these problems. I urge the Members of Congress to consider the following editorial from the Mobile Press of February 13, 1965, and to search for ways in which these problems can be solved:

EXAMPLES OF HOW FEDERAL FUNDS ARE SPENT IN TWO DIRECTIONS

The Federal Treasury is the richest of any in history, and it can borrow what it doesn't have. But eventually, we must all pay the bill (the day isn't far away now that it's February, come to think about it).

And so what Walter Trohan of the Chicago Tribune has pointed out must disturb us. He itemizes instances in which our money is spent to go in two directions at once.

While we are thinking of closing 12 VA hospitals, for instance, the Veterans' Administration is seeking funds to build 3 more.

In Boston, the United States is ousting 94 firms with their 4,000 employes to make room for a research center—and closing the vast Watertown arsenal which could be used as the research site without upsetting a soul. It can't think what to do with the arsenal.

Trohan has other examples, and we all can think of others.

We taxpayers are expected to shovel out billions to take land out of production, while another part of the Agriculture Department spends millions to irrigate new lands, that couldn't be farmed before, and still another supplies low-cost fertilizers to increase production of crops in surplus.

The Small Business Administration and the Area Redevelopment Administration are busy setting up new plants to make products for which there are already adequate plants—shifting jobs around and damaging taxpaying companies to benefit tax-subsidized ones.

We taxpayers subsidize both the production of tobacco, and the enormous outlays the Government uses to try to frighten us out of using the stuff.

We pay for a consumer program which is supposed to keep prices down, and for international agreements with foreign cartels designed to make us pay more.

Abroad, lately we have been giving aid to nations on opposite sides of what threaten to become shooting wars.

When will all this foolishness end? There's nothing in sight to indicate it will.

Huh?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie, Ind., Star, February 12, 1965:

HUH?

The State Department, dealing as it does with international problems of a delicate nature, has developed a language designed to injure no one's feelings.

There is, for example, no such thing any more as a backward country. If a nation is 500 years behind the times it is an "emerging state."

Then there is the nation that tries to play both ends against the middle. It advises that it will be forced into the arms of the Communists if it does not receive substantial aid from the West. At the same time it will be forced into the arms of the "imperialists" if the Soviet does not come across with aid.

In older, more simple days, such a country was called double dealing, double faced and double crossing.

Today it is a nonalined nation.

In this connection the term "neutralize" often comes into play. If a nation leans toward the orbit we toss in a few millions in aid. This used to be known as bribing the other fellow from joining your enemy. Now it is "neutralize."

Meetings between our country's officials and representatives of other lands often results in the statement, "There have been frank discussions and we have agreed in principle."

This means our diplomats fought like cats and dogs with the other fellows and ended up at loggerheads.

Frequently the communique adds, "The door has been left open for further exploratory talks at a future time." Which means each side hopes the other will relax its stubbornness and start making some concessions the next time.

War is a terrible thing so naturally no one would think of stepping up a war. What you do is "escalate military operations." This not only sounds prettier but has the advantage of obscurity, leaving many persons thinking that nothing much has changed.

Obsolescent equipment is no longer eliminated because that might lead some people to ask why so much money was spent on it in the first place. The equipment is phased out.

With the wide circulation that the State Department's pronouncements get in mass media we envision the possibility that some of this obscure talk may seep into our everyday world and make it more difficult for us to understand our friends and neighbors.

Consider the result when a fellow who just had an argument with his wife gives, in acceptable governmentese, his side of the story to a friend.

"My wife is an emerging person. When I got home late from playing cards we held discussions and agreed in principle. The door was left open for further talks and I hope she will eventually phase out her objections to my playing. My mother-in-law remained nonalined. She was neutralized when I promised to drive her to her bridge game Tuesday evenings. It is a good thing because if she had alined with my wife the entire incident would have escalated."

To which the sympathetic friend would probably reply, "Huh?"

And that is about the size of the reaction many of us get when we read pronouncements by Government officials.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, in 1918, after more than 125 years of virtual slavery, a nation was reborn on the distant shores of the Baltic Sea. That nation was Lithuania. Today we celebrate that memorable day, 47 years ago, when independence came once again to these people in Lithuania, but even as we celebrate her independence, she is no longer free. We speak, here today on the floor of Congress, of the greatness of Lithuania, but her own people in that land which is no longer independent, can only whisper the message of freedom to their children so that the dream of independence may someday come alive.

Two and a half centuries before Columbus discovered America, Lithuania was a united kingdom under King Mindaugas. She was a great power, indeed one of the greatest powers, in eastern Europe until the 16th century, when Poland and Lithuania were joined by marriage under a Lithuanian King. Her history from that moment was inevitably tied to the history of Poland. In the 18th century, when Poland lost her independence, Lithuania became another state that lay under the power of the czar. For more than a century Lithuanians fought desperately to keep their own civilization alive. For more than a century Lithuanians prepared for the moment when they would be free again. In 1918 that moment came and on February 16 of that year Lithuania again joined the roster of the nations of the world. For just over 20 years Lithuania

worked and grew as a bastion of freedom and culture in the north of Europe. Then in 1940 a cynical alliance was formed between nazism and communism and the troops of Stalin trampled Lithuanian freedom into the dust as they marched across the land. A year later the unholy alliance between Hitler and Stalin had dissolved and Lithuania was occupied by Nazi troops as they marched eastward. Three years later the same Nazi troops were driven from the land and Stalin once more occupied this country.

The late Winston Churchill, in one of his memorable speeches, spoke of an Iron Curtain that had fallen in eastern Europe from the Baltic in the north to the Adriatic in the south. Lithuania is the Baltic end of that Iron Curtain. The United States has never recognized the seizure of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. It seems to me, however, that something more than stirring words are right and proper at this time. We have a delegation at the United Nations. We have watched that delegation listen to the Soviet delegates, who have made long and pious speeches about the imperialism of the West. It is time, I think, that we start talking about the imperialism of the East. If a whole new world of African nations are shouting a great cry for freedom, then let them join America in crying for freedom for another small country—Lithuania. It is time, Mr. Speaker, for Adlai Stevenson to bring the freedom of Lithuania as a formal issue before the United Nations so that the newly emerging nations of the world may see not only who are the true imperialists of the 20th century, but, indeed who are the slave masters.

I am proud, today, to join my voice with my colleagues to commemorate the independence of Lithuania. I will be even more proud if this administration will take our words from this national tribunal and will bring them before the international tribunal of the United Nations so that out of this may come, once again, a Lithuania that is free to grow in greatness in the future as she has grown in greatness in the past.

Somebody Has To Pay It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the former economic adviser to the President, Walter Heller, apparently finds himself caught in his own net. This was aptly pointed out in an editorial on radio station WTVN, Columbus, Ohio, on February 8, 1965, as follows:

SOMEBODY HAS TO PAY IT

Published reports that Presidential Economic Adviser Walter Heller, has gone deeply into debt—nearly $20,000 to meet personal living costs come as no surprise to us. Mr. Heller's theories as applied to Government spending have produced the same result.

In fairness to Mr. Heller, he, along with others in similar positions, just are not paid enough to keep up with the kind of life they have to live. That is unfortunate and should be remedied. It is unrealistic to expect good men to make this kind of sacrifice.

So the reason for, and solution to, Mr. Heller's personal problem is to increase his income. Unfortunately the same line of reasoning must apply to our Government. We can't go on raising our national debt forever. Somebody has to pay it. We can't go on spending more without taking more in. If Government spending goes up taxes must go up too.

Perhaps Mr. Heller's personal experience with deficit financing will help clear up his outlook on how our tax dollars are to be spent. Perhaps he will realize that our taxes are not enough to cover the life he would like our Government to live.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include herewith a copy of the statement of Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, representing the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism, before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on S. 370, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

I agree with Rabbi Hirsch's views on this particular legislation and, would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the position he advocates.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF RABBI RICHARD G. HIRSCH REPRESENTING THE COMMISSION ON SOCIAL ACTION OF REFORM JUDAISM BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE ON S. 370 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, FEBRUARY 11, 1965

I am Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, director of the Religious Action Center, Union of American Hebrew Congregations. I appear in behalf of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism, a joint instrumentality of the Central Conference of American Rabbis and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Other national agencies which are members of the Commission on Social Action are the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods, and the National Federation of Temple Youth.

Our constituent agencies have not had adequate time to formulate positions on all aspects of S. 370, the bill before this committee. I therefore speak to you within the framework of positions previously taken by our groups. We have long affirmed the centrality of education in the development of human beings.

In 1960, the Central Conference of American Rabbis declared: "We believe that it is the obligation of the Federal Government, where the States are unable to do so, to provide the funds which will put our educational system on a sound basis. * * * It is our duty as teachers of spiritual values to help arouse public spirit in the citizens of our respective communities to vote the tax funds to meet the legitimate needs of the schools."

A resolution passed by the General Assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in November 1963, states: "In keeping with our Jewish tradition, which declares study to be a divine command, we maintain that education is not only a personal or a local, but a national problem * * *. Because public education is essential to the preservation of democracy, we support the enactment of legislation offering more extensive Federal assistance."

We commend President Johnson for placing Federal responsibility for improving education at the top of the Nation's agenda. However, we are concerned that in our Nation's desire to raise educational standards and ameliorate conditions of poverty, we may trample on precious principles and diminish cherished institutions.

This legislation raises serious questions of public policy which deserve careful deliberation before precedents are established from which it may be impossible to withdraw. A Great Society must preserve great institutions and great principles. The following should be of special concern:

1. THE MAINTENANCE OF A STRONG PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

Our traditional Jewish love of learning has impelled us to create, as our own religious responsibility, a vast network of private educational institutions for the perpetuation of Jewish religious values. We believe that private education has a vital and necessary role in our society. At the same time, we are firmly committed to our public school system as the bulwark for preserving America's democratic heritage and advancing its civilization.

It has been most disturbing to hear proponents of this bill in its present form speak of the great partnership that it fosters between public and private schools. Public and sectarian schools can no more be considered partners than can church and State be partners. By tending to equate public and church schools in the eyes of the law as equally entitled to public support, this bill will greatly stimulate the creation of separate parochial school systems in every denomination. The temptation to sup at the trough is not one to which most religious denomintaions have shown any exceptional resistance. As a network of parochial schools mushrooms, support for public schools would constantly be diluted.

This would occur at the same time that larger public appropriations for education are required at every level of government—Federal, State, and local. We would create a dramatic reversal in the ratio of parochial and public education in America. This very development has occurred in the Netherlands. For generations, governmental aid to parochial schools was prohibited, and under that system, four out of every five Dutch children attended public schools. In recent years, that country's constitution was amended to permit Government aid to parochial schools, and now four out of five children are attending the church-related schools. A country that changed its system of public appropriations for education has nearly eliminated its public school system in the process. A country whose parochial schools represented a voluntary investment in the free exercise of religion has seen that system become an arm of the state. A public school system has been nearly destroyed; parochial schools have been converted and perverted into a form of civil service. That is not the role and should not be the fate of either public or religious schools in this country.

Another factor largely overlooked in the consideration of this legislation is the relationship between segregation of a racial and economic character—and private education. America is now striving to achieve two great objectives—equal rights and opportunities

for racial minorities, and higher quality of living for the economically and culturally deprived. It should be frankly stated that many of the parents who now send their children to private and parochial schools do so in order to remove the children from the neighborhood public schools which have heavy concentrations of nonwhite minority groups.

Since title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not preclude religious discrimination, there would be a great temptation for parents in the South and in the major urban areas of the North to send their children to already existing or newly established sectarian schools—and thereby to avoid the integrated schools, or schools with large numbers of economically and culturally deprived children. Under present conditions, parents have the right, if they so desire, to provide a private education for their children at their own expense; but they should not have the right to a private education in a segregated school at public expense. How ironic it would be if Federal aid to education became an instrument for subverting the purposes of the Civil Rights and Economic Opportunity Acts.

Although in principle we do not oppose plans of shared time or dual enrollment, we do have reservations about the propriety, wisdom, and feasibility of the plan envisaged in this bill. In order for a public school district to obtain funds, it would have to demonstrate that it has "made provision for including special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services)" to students in private schools. Obviously, in order to formulate a program for including non-public-school students, there would have to be consultation with private and sectarian educational administrations.

The public school administration, which heretofore has been subject to the exclusive control of the general public, will now be confronted with a new dimension—pressure from private and sectarian school administrations. It is one thing for local public and private schools to cooperate on their own initiative—as has been the practice until now with shared-time plans. It is quite another thing for cooperation between the public and private sector to be a prerequisite for Federal support. Although the word "cooperation" is not found in section 205(a)(2), it does appear in section 205(a)(6). In either of these sections, it is difficult to see how the consultative process would fail to lead to some significant restraint and influence by the private agencies over the public agencies.

Contrary to the expressed goal for intermingling of children of all religions, most shared-time plans, as presently functioning, have children from parochial schools entering and leaving the public school as a bloc, thus vitiating the desired and desirable objective of personal contact between children of all religious backgrounds.

The most likely subjects to be shared in the public school are the science, vocational training, and physical education courses, whereas those taught in the private schools will be the value-laden courses such as history and literature. The public school may well become a school for occupational and vocational training, while the parochial school becomes the institution for the inculcation of social and human values. Furthermore, the undefined concept of "mobile educational services" made available to the private schools can easily lead to the placement in the parochial schools of public school teachers, whether on a temporary, rotating basis, or a permanent basis.

These potential abuses are mentioned in order to indicate that the mere establishment of dual enrollment plans will not necessarily foster democratic goals. In order to prevent these dangers from occurring, we urge that appropriate safeguards be instituted, both in the legislation and in administrative policy on National, State, and local levels.

We urge that title I, section 205(a)(2), which deals with dual enrollment and educational services, be amended to include the following:

The local educational agency shall give assurance that:

1. The program will not result in segregation of students by race, religion, or national origin.

2. All educational programs and procedures, including curriculum planning and selection of textbooks, will be in the sole province of public school authorities.

3. All educational programs will be administered by and conducted in the public schools.

2. PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY FOR PUBLIC FUNDS

It is an axiomatic principle that public funds can only be appropriated for a public purpose. The responsibility for compliance with public purpose rests initially with Congress. In respect to Federal aid to education, it delegates the administration of the use of public funds to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Thereafter, certain authority and functions are further delegated to States and localities. All this is as it should be, with one exception. Participation by private agencies, including sectarian religious groups, in administering programs paid for by tax funds, deprives Government of its proper responsibility and casts the public purpose of expenditures in doubt.

Both title II, dealing with library and instructional materials, and title III, dealing with supplementary educational centers and services diminish public responsibility and public authority for the expenditure of public funds. For example, in title II, what does a State agency do by "allocating" books and materials among the schools of the State for the use of children and teachers? We do not understand from this who owns the books or who determines the way they are distributed. The public authority is too vague; so is the public responsibility. The legislation should be carefully reworded in order to assure the basic principle that no religious institution should acquire property at public expense.

Title II should be amended to stipulate clearly that selection, ownership, control, and administration of library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials should be vested within the exclusive purview of a public agency.

We urge that section 204(b) of title II, which, as presently written, would permit the Federal Government to circumvent State constitutional prohibitions against support of religious education, be deleted or amended. It would be totally inconsistent with healthy Federal-State relations and with the expressed objective of this legislation, for the Federal Government to furnish aid which is contrary to the constitutional principles and practicies of any State.

In title III, the supplementary centers are clearly publicly financed, but they are not as clearly administered by, or accountable to, the public. The ongoing operation of the centers is left to the administration of the "nonprofit private agency" which sets up the center. To the extent that clear criteria of governmental authority are lacking, we see an unwise delegation of public authority from Government into the hands of private agencies. And, to the extent that many of the participating agencies will be sectarian or church related, we see a further erosion of meaningful separation of church and state. At the very least, let persons involved in the administration of such programs be denominated as individuals representing the community or public at large, and not sit as administrators of public revenues in the capacity of official representatives of of private groups.

Let us take steps to insure that students, teachers, and the community at large can identify the benefits in titles I, II, and III as public services, available to all without discrimination.

3. SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Our organizations are deeply committed to religious liberty and to the majestic concept of separation of church and state. We maintain that tax moneys should be used for public schools only and should not be siphoned off to Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, or any other schools under religious auspices. We believe that this tradition of separation is the mandate of the Constitution, the lesson of history, and the absolute precondition to religious liberty and interfaith harmony.

This bill includes precisely the kind of aid to religious institutions which President John F. Kennedy stoutly rejected as violative of our constitutional liberties. Why did the two education bills submitted by President Kennedy fail to pass Congress? There were undoubtedly many factors, but chief among them was the opposition of those who refused to support legislation unless aid was given to private as well as public schools. Last year's opponents of Federal aid to education are among this year's supporters. We must ask why. Have they suddenly altered their position? Not from the statements made in public and before the House committee and this committee, where they steadfastly continue to maintain that Federal aid should go to nonpublic schools as a matter of justice. Obviously, they must find in this bill a means of achieving their original objective—if not entirely, then in part; if not immediately, then eventually.

Conversely, many of the groups which heretofore refused to support legislation if aid were given to private education, have now endorsed this bill. For them, this year's urgent public school needs have taken precedence over last year's reluctance—and they are now willing to yield in their opposition to Federal support of private education.

We deceive ourselves as a nation if we use semantics to conceal what has actually occurred. Both the language of the bill and the language of those who support it tend to create the illusion that it is the child, not the school, to which Federal aid is to be given. However, in the guise of aiding the child, this bill does aid the school. Merely to insert language directing that tax moneys be "for the use of children and teachers" rather than for schools does not change the essential character of the recipient or of the use to which the money is put. Everything connected with any educational system is for the use of children and teachers.

If the "child benefit" theory is to be used as the basis for providing private school children with textbooks, instructional materials, and mobile services, then what cannot be given? Would not the individual child also benefit from better teachers, better teaching equipment, better science laboratories, and better buildings to house them? It is one thing to declare that we have changed our principles, or even to admit that although we have not changed our principles, political expediency has forced us to change our practices. But let us not delude ourselves into believing that nothing at all has been changed, or been lost. This bill does not, as some have maintained, avoid the church-state issue. It evades it. An end run around the principle can advance the ball of Federal assistance just as far as a direct plunge through the middle of the line.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

We urge that provision for judicial review of constitutional questions be written into this legislation, lest we find ourselves with an unconstitutional situation which cannot be repaired. The most expeditious system for obtaining such review would be by inclu-

sion in the bill itself of a provision which would insure that any Federal taxpayer will have standing to sue, and thereby test, the validity of any of these programs or provisions.

The problem of education is urgent but it is unwise to proceed before a genuine discussion and debate on the implications of this bill can take place. The overwhelming support for Federal aid to education reflects a spirit of compromise and tolerance. But compromise is possible without compromising basic principles and tolerance is more profound where expressed in respect for these basic principles. To paper over deep issues, in the name of a dubious consensus, is to do a grave disservice to future generations. A good bill with a major defect is about as serviceable as a majestic luxury liner with a hole at the waterline. The time to repair that defect is now.

The Closing of VA Hospitals

SPEECH

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the proposed closing of many Veterans' Administration facilities and hospitals has stirred up a great deal of community interest and righteous indignation among veterans, their families, and friends. Recently a Buffalo newspaper sent an investigator and reporter to the veterans hospital and domiciliary at Bath, N.Y., a distance of less than 100 miles, to see what could be learned about its complete operation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to include a report of Miss Margaret Fess' findings as it appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on January 17, 1965:

IMMINENT CLOSING OF VA HOSPITAL CLOAKS BATH IN GLOOM AND ANGER

(By Margaret Fess)

BATH.—Gloom, despair, and anger hang over this once tranquil little village.

Announcement of the closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital here struck like a bombshell. Patients and residents, some of whom have called the facility home for more than 20 years, are distraught at being uprooted.

Employees, mostly homeowners with children, are in despair. Village and town officials are angry over the economic blow to the community.

PATIENTS DEFIANT BUT BEWILDERED

Robert E. Porteous of New York City, a Princeton graduate, who has been a wheelchair patient there for 12 years, sums it up this way:

"It isn't just the closing of the facility. It is the way it is done. Our Congressmen are elected to represent the people. They have a right to know what is happening, but they were not informed in advance of this.

"This rule by directive is not democratic. It smells of fascism.

"My only living relative is a brother in New York City. Traveling in a wheelchair isn't easy, but I can manage the 300 miles from here to New York occasionally. If I am shipped off to some remote spot, seeing my brother will be impossible."

Hammond Douglas, a World War II veteran from the Bronx, suffering from a hip injury, has been a resident of the facility since 1959. He is assigned to part-time work in the admissions office. This is his feeling:

"I don't care for myself. I've learned to take things as they come.

"But I do fear for some of the older residents. I think that the emotional upset of being moved to a strange place could send them over the brink mentally.

"Right now, nearly all of the older men are in a highly emotional state—crying and bewildered.

"They should have been prepared for this gradually—say over a 5-year period. And, another thing. I have been informed that some of these domicile facilities to which transfers will be made have no hospitals. These men are reaching an age when they need medical attention."

In spite of zero temperatures, John Geyer, 76, a native of Buffalo, was wandering around the village streets trying to figure the whole thing out.

ORPHANAGE TO ARMY TO HOSPITAL TO—?

"This is the worst thing that has ever happened to me," he said. "My life hasn't been easy. I was brought up in the Buffalo orphanage, went into the regular Army and was in World War I. Later, I lived in New York City.

"I jus love it here. This place is like home. I don't know what I am going to do. I might go back to New York. I just don't know what to do."

Seated in the McDonnell Tavern, Anthony McKee, 56, of Rochester, World War II veteran, and Percy Stansfield, 69, of Providence, R.I., World War I, hashed the thing over.

"They've treated us very well here," said McKee. "We all like the facility and the town people have been wonderful to us. I'm a trumpeter in the band. I suppose I won't have a chance to play when I get kicked out of here."

Stansfield, who has lived in the facility for 20 years, said he was broken up.

BUSINESS PEOPLE FEAR LOSSES

Brendan McDonnell, the young tavern owner, had tears in his eyes. His place of business is located near the grounds of the VA hospital.

"This wipes me out of business," he said. "My grandfather started this business in 1897. My dad ran it for years, until he died last May. Then I took it over. I love Bath, and so does my wife and three children. These veterans have been fine people to deal with."

Down the road several blocks, Mrs. Floyd Gay stood behind a counter in her husband's gas station.

"This will wipe out half of our business," said Mrs. Gay. "We know nearly all of the employees and they are good customers. And we like the veterans. They are a nice bunch of old men and, as they walk past here, they always wave in such a friendly way."

HOSPITAL EMPLOYEES BITTER, CONFUSED

The only topic of conversation in the crowded canteen was the closing. Gerald Keeney, a carpenter, who has worked at the facility for 7 years, said:

"We're being treated like statistics—just something you would run through an IBM machine. I have six kids and own my own home.

"One girl is going to Syracuse on a full scholarship. I suppose I'll have to pull her out. I've already paid the entrance fee for another child to enter the Corning Community College next fall. Now that will probably be out the window."

The whole thing was summed up as a "dirty, sneaky deal" by Henry G. Masti, another carpenter, also a homeowner and the father of four children. Masti, who has worked at the facility for 6 years, denounced the fact that the employees had been given no advance warning so that they could look for other jobs.

"The Government wouldn't have dared do this before election," he said.

George A. Hedren, a painter, who spent 6 years in the Marines and 16 working for the Veterans' Administration, said:

"I thought I had my life all figured out. I would keep on working here, take care of my family in this nice, quiet village and eventually retire on a Government pension. Now I don't know what I will do."

Another painter, who has been with the VA for 10 years, said he felt the residents and employees had not yet realized the full impact of the closing.

"There are going to be a lot of hardships ahead for all of us," he commented. "The residents like it here and are all upset about moving. The employees probably will all have to take lesser jobs."

EXPECTS 400 HOMES TO GO UP FOR SALE

Another employee, who did not want his name used, pointed to the scarcity of available jobs in the vicinity of Bath and predicted that about 400 homes would be put on the market at the same time.

He also cited the loss of business to a community created by relatives and friends visiting the veterans.

Miss Tina Aschett, secretary to the Director, who has worked at the VA for 24 years, was in the same boat—undecided.

"We all feel as if the rug has been pulled out from under us," she said. "I was born here in Bath and love this section of the State. I just don't know what I will do."

MAYOR FEARFUL OF TOWN'S FUTURE

The mayor of Bath, Dr. Frank Nicklaus, a dentist, felt that the reasons given for closing were "flimsy," including the lack of auxiliary medical personnel.

"The doctors love it here," said Dr. Nicklaus. "We have our country club, plenty of means of recreation, a good school system, a fine class of inhabitants, and little crime.

"Two years ago there was talk of closing the hospital, but after a conference with officials we were assured that there would be no major changes in the forseeable future.

"This closing will affect every phase of village life—business, the school system, social, and political life. The VA employees are among our finest residents.

"I am flabbergasted that the Government would abandon such an excellent set of buildings. We haven't had time to look into bringing something else here to be housed in the buildings. But we would welcome a college, hospital, or something along that line."

Dr. Nicklaus said that, because of the finality of recent decisions in Washington, he had little hope that the order to close would be rescinded.

FINAL HOPE LIES WITH BANDED VETERANS

If there is any change in policy, he said, it would probably be sparked by the powerful veterans' organizations who are swinging into action all over the State.

The Bath facility consists of 53 buildings on 223 acres. Buildings and equipment are valued at $20 million. Included in the buildings are residences which now house about 740 veterans. The hospital has 273 beds.

There are four chapels, four libraries, a guardhouse, and fire station, store, canteen, baseball diamond, administration building, and other structures. Several of the residences have been closed because the Government has not alloted money for needed repairs and improvements.

However, in 1959 the Government built a new theater at a cost of $1,200,000. This also

contains a leisure room, quarters for music practice, sports section with lockers, billiard tables, shuffle board, craft, and hobby shops.

This year's operating budget is $4,764,625. About $3.5 million, or 79 percent, is for the payroll. Supplies are purchased by competitive bid, with most of the bids going to local concerns.

A number of the veterans have small social security or other forms of pension. Most of these funds are spent among village merchants.

The institution is steeped in tradition. Back in 1877, the State built the old GAR building as a residence for aging Civil War veterans. On Christmas Day, that year, 25 veterans arrived as the first residents of the home. This building has recently been redecorated.

From atop a hill, tombstones can be seen as far as the eye can reach. More than 7,000 veterans are buried in this cemetery. Each Memorial Day, an elaborate service is held here.

The grounds are replete with stately old trees, and Chocton Creek forms a border on one side. The men fish and swim in the creek. A favorite pastime for the veterans is watching baseball games during the summer. Junior leaguers or other local teams play there on weekends.

The facility serves veterans from six New England States and part of Pennsylvania.

Members of the domicile section are men who are ambulatory, able to dress, feed themselves, make their own beds, and take care of their lockers. However, all have disabilities which prevent them from being able to earn a living. All need custodial care, and some are blind.

About 50 percent of the patients in the hospital were once domicile residents.

EVICTION ORDERED BY END OF JUNE

The Veterans' Administration in Washington has issued orders that all residents and patients be moved out of the facility by June 30, the end of the fiscal year.

Residents of the domicile buildings will be transferred to VA facilities at Wood, Wis., Dayton, Ohio, and Hampton, Va. Patients in the hospital will be transferred to VA hospitals in Syracuse, Buffalo, and Canandaigua.

Thoughout the country 11 VA hospitals are being closed, and 17 regional offices. Officials claim the move will save about $23 million a year.

I also wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the same paper, dated January 21, 1965, adding further to the conclusion that the decision to close these facilities could not have taken into consideration the economic and human factors involved within the communities affected:

FACILITY LOSS HEAVY BLOW TO BATH

The scheduled closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital and domicile at Bath is hard to understand in the face of the concern in Washington over combatting poverty.

The 600 employees, most of whom are rearing and educating children, buying homes, and saving for the future, feel that a cruel hand in Washington has pulled the economic rug out from under them.

The loss of the $3½-million payroll, second largest in the village, will affect practically every business in Bath. The employees pay rent, taxes, mortgages, buy automobiles, clothing, food, gasoline, and even pay parking tickets.

Every one of the people they do business with in the village of 6,000 inhabitants will feel the pinch.

It has been estimated that 400 homes might be placed on the market at the same time. This could devaluate the entire real estate market for Bath and the surrounding section.

The veterans' facility spends about $1,250,000 for supplies and operating costs. The majority of the purchases are made locally.

Most of the veterans receive small social security benefits or pensions and spend their money with Bath merchants. Friends and relatives coming to see the veterans bring more money to Bath.

Veterans' Administration officials in Washington have stated that the closing of various facilities, hospitals, and offices throughout the country will result in savings of $23 million.

This has been questioned by Assemblyman Charles D. Henderson, of Hornell, who also has criticized the manner in which the closing order was issued without advance notice, hearings, or specific information.

Seventy-nine percent of the Bath facility budget is for the payroll to give custodial and hospital care to the veterans. No matter where they are transferred they will require adequate care.

Before the United States wipes out 600 jobs, placing a village in economic jeopardy, and uprooting 1,000 veteran patients and residents, New York's Senators and Congressmen should insist on full and open review of the Veterans' Administration directive that all veterans must be out of the facility by June 30.

Inviting More Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, describes in the following column from the New York Herald Tribune of February 12, 1965, exactly what is going to happen in certain areas of our country which are harassing citizens attempting to register to vote.

What these sections of the country do not seem to realize is that, as Mr. Drummond so aptly puts it:

The question is no longer whether this right—

Meaning the right to vote—

is going to be attained by all citizens—but how soon.

The article follows:

VOTE BAR BOOMERANG: ALABAMANS RISK NEW U.S. ACTION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The last-ditch opponents of Negro voting rights are not only fighting a losing battle; they are doing the most to bring about the very thing they say they don't want: further extension of Federal power to enforce the civil rights law.

The States do not have the constitutional right to apply these qualifications one way to white citizens and another way to Negro citizens.

This is what they are doing in Selma, Ala., and in some other areas. In doing so, it is the advocates of States' rights who are inviting further loss of States' rights.

Neither the President nor Congress is eager to have the Federal Government take control of the registration of citizens who are being denied their rights. This is what is going to happen if, as in Selma, Negroes who want to vote are taken to jail instead of the registrar's office.

I am not one who wants to see Congress rush into further extension of Federal power before the resources of the Civil Rights Act are fully tested and found wanting. But the demand for new legislation will be irresistible—and rightly so—if illegal devices keep on being used by public officials to frustrate the law.

It is well to remind ourselves how precise the Constitution is on this point.

The Constitution, while empowering the States to make the laws on voting qualifications, provides that "no State * * * may deny to any person * * * the equal protection of the laws."

It provides that "the right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

It directs that "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

If there is one part of the Civil Rights Act more unassailable than any other—indeed totally unassailable—it is protection for the right to vote. Three times during the past 8 years, Congress has passed "appropriate legislation" to enforce "equal protection" for the right to vote.

Further "appropriate legislation" will be forthcoming if local authorities make the mistake of continuing to employ anti-voting devices.

The question is no longer whether this right is going to be attained by all citizens—but how soon.

It is clear that the country, the Congress, and the courts are determined to secure this right to all eligible Negro citizens faithfully and steadily.

In the case of public school desegregation, some sought to discredit the ruling on the ground that it was "Supreme Court law," not congressional law. Even that false argument cannot be brought to support denying the right to vote.

This is a constitutional right for all Americans wherever they live in the United States. It is explicit and unarguable. It is the duty of the courts and of Congress to protect this right.

Every time local authorities try to misuse State power to deny a citizen his vote, they are inviting Congress to authorize Federal registrars to go anywhere they are needed to protect this right.

Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach has wisely stated that "eperience under the new civil rights law is too limited" to say whether additional legislation is needed. If it continues to be unlawfully defied, the act will unquestionably be strengthened.

Churchill Is Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following verse composed by Vernon Boyce Hampton of Staten Island, N.Y., on the occasion of the famous Churchill-Roosevelt conference of December 22, 1941. Churchill many times on his secret trips to America stopped on Staten Island, N.Y., and proceeded by train to Washington. With his passing, I feel it is fitting to rekindle these lines at this time:

CHURCHILL IS HERE

(By Vernon Boyce Hampton)

The dust of evening softly falls,
On sheltered cot and mansion,
An ending welcomed gratefully,
At close of Yuletide shopping.

Throngs hurry home,
Glad to exchange December night's crisp cold,
For fireside warmth,
An ambered room,
Companionship,
And radio's caroled song.

Peace upon earth and love are mounted here,
In quiet homes:
The season's sanctity is its own blessing,
Veiling the scar of war.
And dimming our bleak questioning,
Since death has struck.
Reality is just beyond the tinsel.

Our programed music stops,
Abruptly,
And a staccato voice,
Sharp as a sword, unsheathed,
Exclaims with scarce a pause excitedly:
"Churchill is here * * *
Arrived in Washington * * *
Tonight."

A thrill that stays our passion,
Holds listeners everywhere transfixed,
Startled, amazed,
And cheered:
The wonder and the daring,
Of the dare,
Strike awe in every heart.

Here is a man with rigid rod,
Of upright purpose,
Challenging the womb of time,
To bring to birth,
The vanished freedoms lost awhile.

Facing what other men dared not,
He came alone,
To bind the Anglo-Saxon world in one.
An hour he flew in space,
And spanned the latitudes,
For history to record salvation of a race.

Dunkirk behind.
And London blitzed and burned,
And of the future, no one knows,
What turn the wheel of infirm fortune
May reveal.
Yet here he is,
The man of destiny.

Pearl Harbor but a minute past,
And here is action:
Into this act we read,
The planning of the course,
To Victory:
Now Nations live,
That, moments since, despaired.

His daring quickens,
All the wheels of our great "arsenal,"
And thus,
Foredooms our foes.

Great Winston Churchill,
Here we honor you.
This is your home,
In part,
For Yankee blood courses your veins,
And heart meets heart,
In Freedom's cause anew.

The wild young Eagle of the Stars and Stripes,
Harks to your call, O Man of Britain,
And with spreading wings,
Screams to the fray.
Nothing can cease the battle,
Till the hosts of tyranny,
Are laid,
In vauntless dust,
Defeat and doom.

We fight your fight and guard your home,
In Britain's Isle, as here,
Home of our Freedom's birth.
We stand with thee till death,
These Anglo-Saxon States,
Born in the fire of battle,
With our own, * * *
(A family quarrel, that ancient one,
Long healed).
Freemen we stand today,
And none can disunite,
Nations so wed:
We stand with thee!

The thrill of this great hour remains,
As airwaves break the news again: "Churchill is here!"
And we listen, listen, listen,
To the rhythmic repetition:
"Churchill," "Churchill," "Churchill here!"
Anthemed for the world to hear.

The emotion of the moment does not wane;
The buildup to this climax is too strong,
For quick release,
Now we can hope and love and live
As Freedom's pawn,
In spite of war and the unknown:
Churchill is here,
Symbol of Victory!

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, marks the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. On this date in 1918 Lithuanians were finally able to achieve their longstanding goal of independence. Although the history of Lithuania includes a long series of subjugations by foreign powers, these foreign rulers have never succeeded in breaking the spirit of the Lithuanian people. Whether occupied by German, Polish, Swedish, or Russian forces, Lithuanians have remained faithful to their culture, their history, and their church.

Today this small but valiant country is once again a victim of the curse of foreign domination. In August 1940, Lithuania's 22-year-old independence was completely crushed when the country was taken into the U.S.S.R. as the 14th Soviet Republic. On June 23, 1941, the day after Nazi Germany attacked Russia, Lithuanians again manifested their desire for independence by staging a revolution and again declaring themselves sovereign. The invading Germans ignored the claims of independence and went on to institute a reign of terror and repression. Finally in the summer of 1944 Lithuania was once more occupied by Soviet troops and reestablished as a component republic of the Soviet Union. Soviet repression and subjugation of Lithuanian national independence continue to this day.

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a tragic history. Lithuania is a small nation whose people wish only to live in peace in their own country according to their own principles and traditions. They have not been allowed to do so. The Soviet aggressors have abolished all independent Lithuanian agencies and institutions and dissolved political, religious, cultural, social, and economic organizations. This transformation was accomplished through the use of force, against the will of the citizens of Lithuania. The Lithuanian people have bravely resisted the occupation and sovietization of their nation. Stalinist Russia, however, resorted to terror, deportations, mass arrests, and executions. Using these ruthless methods, Soviet authorities finally overcame armed Lithuanian resistance. Resistance to the regime still exists, however, and will continue to exist until the restoration of freedom and independence.

The hearts of freedom-loving people everywhere go out to the enslaved people of Lithuania. Long ago our own great nation fought to throw off the chains of foreign domination and we would be untrue to our heritage as Americans if we did not express our earnest hope and prayer that someday Lithuanians, too, will be privileged to live free lives in an independent country. Centuries of foreign domination have not destroyed the Lithuanian people or their desire to be free, and Soviet Russia will be no more successful. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with all Americans on this anniversary of Lithuania's independence in the hope that a free and independent Lithuania may be soon realized.

Work Dropouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 9, 1965, radio station WTVN of Columbus, Ohio, aired the following editorial:

Under broad antipoverty plans, the Government has initiated steps to help dropouts and other young people who have trouble getting and holding jobs. Unfortunately, the Government might be encouraging dropouts.

For example, down in Cincinnati, the Neighborhood Youth Corps will be a work-study program conducted by the schools. Youth will earn money for various odd jobs while living at home and attending school. The idea is fine. But now the Government insists on the minimum wage of $1.25 an hour. Considering the jobs are being created especially for these youngsters, and would be only temporary, the Government's insistence on the minimum wage is not only costly, but foolish.

Another program, the Job Corps, recruits young people to live in work camps. These youngsters will work and study and, hopefully, be trained for suitable jobs. In addition to free room and board, free clothing, and free health care, they're to receive $80 a month, or almost a thousand dollars a year. Thirty dollars a month is for haircuts, laundry, and luxuries, and the other $50 will be kept for them until they finish training.

Now that sounds pretty good. Eighty dollars a month, free and clear. Thirty dollars for haircuts, movies, and cigarettes. There are many working full time at demanding jobs who, after paying for rent, utilities, food,

clothing, and other necessities, clear far less than $80 a month.

We wouldn't be surprised if some of the adult wage earners demanded a Government program for those who want to drop out of work.

General Manager Robert Wiegand, who is also vice president of Taft Broadcasting Co., should be commended for pointing out the shortcomings in some of these pie-in-the-sky schemes.

Nettie Carter Jackson Democratic Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 5, 1965, the Nettie Carter Jackson Democratic Association of Staten Island, N.Y., held a panel forum on "The Negro in History." Members of the committee sponsoring this program were Kenneth Warren, Priscilla Baly, James J. Hasson, Jr., John Lawrence, Alfonso Largo, and Charles K. Smith, ex officio.

My administrative assistant, Anthony R. Gaeta, addressed the meeting, and under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his address:

NETTIE CARTER JACKSON DEMOCRATIC ASSOCIATION

Ladies and gentlemen, in observing Negro History Week, as we are doing here tonight, I would like to recall two sharply differing views of history—one of America's first literary greats, Washington Irving, called it "A kind of Newgate calendar, a register of the crimes and miseries that man has inflicted on his fellow man." The English writer, Thomas Carlyle, called history "The biography of great men." Both of these definitions are correct, and in the history of the American Negro both must be applied—the "register of the crimes and miseries" inflicted on the Negro is a long and shameful one, but side by side with it is another register of honored names, great Negro men and women who fought almost alone a century and more ago to end the crimes and miseries inflicted on their people.

Too many of us today look upon the struggle for civil rights as a movement of comparatively recent times and it is true, of course, that the Negro has made greater strides in the past decade than in any other period, but the struggle really began far, far earlier, carried on by dedicated and steadfast Negroes who were resolute enough to challenge a public opinion that held their race to be merely chattels with no rights whatsoever. These unswerving men and women were the pioneers whose devotion and sacrifice generated the momentum of massive protest against racial injustice, the momentum that won the civil rights bill.

Let us look at some of these great Negro leaders of the past—there was Bishop Richard Allen for one—born a slave in Philadelphia in 1760, Allen was early converted to Christianity and became a preacher of such power that he was regularly invited to preach in white churches, an almost unheard of concession in that day. But the Negroes who followed to hear his sermons were relegated to the gallery, and this rankled. On one Sunday, as Allen and his friends were being shown to the gallery, they dropped to their knees in prayer—and thus probably the first sit-in—or kneel-in, was born—and that was in 1787. Allen and his friends then walked out of the church to found their own, the African Methodist Episcopal Church. Allen went on to become a leader in the antislavery crusade. His greatest contribution to the cause of Negro freedom was his conviction that the moving force must come from the Negroes themselves, with help from sympathetic whites. To this end he devoted the rest of his life, and through his efforts Negroes first became aware of the strength that lies in solidarity.

One of Allen's contemporaries was a highly successful Negro businessman, James Forten, whose militance made him, possibly, the greatest of the free Negro abolitionist leaders in the early 1830's—he, too, believed that the emancipation of the Negro would come ultimately from Negro effort, he set himself the task of awakening Negro consciousness—history credits Forten with converting the great abolitionist leader, William Lloyd Garrison, to belief in racial equality—a daring and dangerous doctrine at that period in America's history, but with the fiery Garrison arguing the simple justice of equality, whites in numbers flocked to the cause.

And now I would like to repeat a declaration with a very modern ring to it, and I quote:

"*Resolved*, That the practice of nonresistance to physical aggression is not only consistent with reason, but the surest method of obtaining a speedy triumph of the principles of universal peace."

That sounds as if it came from Dr. Martin Luther King—but it did not. It was written in 1837 by a Negro, William Whipper, the son of a house servant, who developed his philosophy of passive resistance a dozen years before Thoreau wrote his famed essay on civil disobedience. Whipper also had another highly advanced conviction—he felt segregation was evil in itself, and stoutly opposed it in any public facility.

No list of early marchers in the cause of Negro freedom would be complete, of course, without the name of Frederick Douglass, whom W. E. B. DuBois called the noblest slave that ever God set free. Douglass, who bore the scars of the overseer's whip on his back, was a fighter—or, in the modern term, an activist—as he once put it, and I quote, "the man who has suffered the wrong, is the man to demand redress—the man who has endured the cruel pangs of slavery, is the man to advocate liberty." Though he was often threatened—and attacked by mobs several times. Douglass would not retreat an inch. The militancy of the Negro cause today is fired by the spark generated by this pioneer black abolitionist. To Douglass, emancipation was only the beginning of a long road upward. Throughout Reconstruction he fought for the ballot and land for the freed slave.

Earlier, I indicated that I would mention Negro men and women who had contributed to the Negroes' cause. To the ladies in the audience who might be wondering when I'd get around to their sex, I'll say—now. There was Phillis Wheatley, the writer and moralist—Sojourner Truth, the impassioned preacher and orator, and Harriet Tubman, who, as the most famous Negro guide on the underground railroad, let some 300 slaves to freedom in 19 forays into the slave States despite a $40,000 price on her head, an escaped slave herself, Harriet Tubman could have led a safe, uneventful life in the North. Instead, she chose to risk her life so that others of her race could be free.

There were many others whose contributions were equal to those whom I have mentioned. There are unknown numbers whose names have been lost to history. The battle they joined in that long ago day, when allies were few and the prospect of ultimate victory seemed dim indeed, has not been won yet, but it is being won. As President Johnson said not long ago, and I quote, "I have faith that the day will come when it is not necessary nor remarkable to give or receive human rights awards—not necessary or remarkable simply because justice will be colorblind and all men and women will be judged on their merits and not on irrelevant considerations of ancestry." That they firmly believed such a day would come is the true measure of the greatness of those early Negro leaders.

Independence for the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives today in reaffirming our resolution urging the freedom of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

These gallant nations have endured the yoke of communism for too long. They deserve the right to self-determination and to personal liberty for their citizens. Our recognition of their condition gives notice before the world that America rejects and repudiates Soviet imperialism wherever it is manifested.

Mr. Voldemars Korsts, special assistant to the President of the Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States, recently sent me a memorandum defining in precise and unequivocal terms the present plight of the Baltic States. Mr. Korsts and this distinguished committee urge the United States to seek a redress of these grievances before the United Nations.

I have joined with many of my distinguished colleagues in introducing a concurrent resolution to request the President to ask that this entire question be brought before the United Nations. It is my hope this resolution will be acted upon favorably by the House and Senate in the near future. Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and all the countries now forced to live under Communist domination deserve to have their case presented in the open forum of the world.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Korsts stirring memorandum follows:

THE BALTIC STATES—ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA—HAVE A RIGHT TO BE FREE AND INDEPENDENT

World War II brought an end to fascism, which preached superiority of some nations and races, and at the same time enslaved others. A United Nations doctrine was then brought to life; it promised liberty and freedom to all nations. The United Nations, however, made the mistake of not following it up. The Communists were allowed a free hand, resulting in the loss of many free nations behind the Iron Curtain. Thus did the Soviet Union—and, later, China—become colonial powers.

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were the first victims of communism during World War II. Those three Baltic nations have inhabited the Baltic region for thousands of

years. They had rejoiced in their freedom and independence, and were democratic and peace-loving peoples, with an old and valuable cultural heritage all their own.

In June of 1940 they were invaded and occupied by Soviet armed forces. Duly elected and popular governments were deprived of their constitutional rights and the leaders of democratic forces arrested and often summarily executed. Moscow-appointed emissaries set up puppet governments, which carried out any and all orders from above. What followed then was a shocking line of Communist secret police terror, and the series of deportations undertaken by the Soviets in 1941. The fact that in June of that year more than 200,000 persons—out of less than 6 million—were deported to slave labor camps is well known, as are the many postwar deportations. Since then other nationals have been settled in the Baltic region, with the clear goal of erasing the original inhabitants from history.

Living under heavy terror, the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been robbed of the usual constitutional rights: the freedom of speech, assembly, and the practicing of religion. Even when conditions improve temporarily in Russia, they do not change in the Baltic States. Practically, they are enslaved. Despite all this, their desire for freedom has not been crushed. They are waiting silently and grimly for the promises of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Charter to be fulfilled. They are desperate, because they know that, unless help is coming they will be scattered and destroyed.

We must help the Baltic peoples rid themselves of the Communist regimes in their countries.

The outright annexations of the territories of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union should be openly discussed and a demand should be made for the prompt reestablishing of their rights. The people of these countries are as fully entitled to their rights of self-determination as are the peoples of Africa, Asia, and the Americas: if some colonies are freed, why not all?

The Government of the United States has refused to recognize the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union. Every President since 1940 has reaffirmed this; yet, at the same time we must recognize that very little has been done to liberate the Baltic peoples. What we are talking about here is not a question of the right of self-rule of these nations, since this has been established beyond any doubt. The question is rather one of a practicable method for restoring their independence. The select committee of the House of Representatives (83d Cong.) to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, after holding 50 public hearings, during which the testimony of 335 persons was taken, made a number of recommendations. The committee stated that our moves should be guided by "the moral and political principles of the American Declaration of Independence." The present generation of Americans, the committee suggested, should recognize that the bonds which many Americans have with the enslaved nations are a great asset to the struggle against communism and that the Communist danger should be abolished and stopped during the present generation. The only hope of avoiding a new world war, according to the committee, lies in a "bold, positive political offensive by the United States and the entire free world."

To this we might add that such an approach would prevent a Communist takeover of more and more nations with an ultimate danger of the same fate to this country.

The work of the committee has been recognized and many concurrent resolutions, calling for freedom for the captive peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, have been presented to the Senate and the House. Such resolutions have requested the President of the United States to bring the question of the Baltic States before the United Nations, to ask a ruling for:

1. The withdrawal of all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and control from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

2. The return of all Baltic exilees from Siberia and other parts of the Soviet Union, where they have been deported by force or by the so-called voluntary work assignments.

3. The conduct of free elections in the three countries, under a direct supervision of the United Nations.

Let us show the courage to call the Communists to order, since theirs are the only real colonial empires left.

Today and not tomorrow is the time to do this. The suffering and subjugation of any nation must spur us to action. By maintaining the rights of others to be free, we confirm our own unyielding will to survive in freedom and in peace.

Therefore we urge you to act for the course of freedom and introduce and support such resolutions. The United Nations Charter provides the legal framework; the history and the heritage of the United States provides the courage and incentive; the brutally enslaved Baltic nations provide the reason for such action. The passage of resolutions calling for the restorement of independence of the Baltic States would be an important step not only for the freedom of these victims of communism, but a ray of hope for all captive peoples and a foundation for lasting peace with justice and honor.

Repeal of Right-To-Work Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable interest in the question of repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to enact right-to-work laws. Recently, my colleague from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] stated his position of conditional support for such repeal if fundamental safeguards are provided for workers.

In response to this suggestion, an editorial in the Jackson Citizen-Patriot of Jackson, Mich., February 9, 1965, analyzed the prosposal and Mr. GRIFFIN's position. I feel that all Members would like to be familiar with current thought on this vital issue, an dtherefore with unanimous consent I include this editorial, "Griffin Talks Sense on Repeal of Right-To-Work Legislation" in the Appendix of the RECORD.

GRIFFIN TALKS SENSE ON REPEAL OF RIGHT-TO-WORK LEGISLATION

Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN of Michigan carries considerable weight in the Congress when labor legislation is under consideration.

This stems not only from the fact that he is high on the list of Republicans on the Education and Labor Committee, but because he usually speaks with a maximum of logic and a minimum of emotion. That is why he was successful in guiding through Congress a few years ago the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law is one of the more difficult issues the Congress will face this year. That is the provision in the law which permits States to enact "right-to-work" laws. (Nineteen States have such laws.)

Section 14(b) is a favorite target of labor leaders. President Johnson has called for its repeal.

In a statement on the floor of the House the other day, Representative GRIFFIN said that he would go along with the repeal of the controversial item in the Taft-Hartley law, but ony if "fundamental safeguards" are provided for "the workers who are, or would be, compelled to join and make payments to a union in order to hold their jobs."

Representative GRIFFIN insists that if labor unions want the right to negotiate union shop agreements in all of the 50 States, they should accept his bill which would make it unlawful for a union requiring membership as a condition of employment, to do these things:

"1. To discriminate on account of race, color or creed;

"2. To use the dues collected for political purposes or for any purpose not related to the union's statutory function as collecting bargaining agent; or

"3. To fine or penalize a member for exercising any legal or civil right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States."

These qualifications Representative GRIFFIN would put on a repealer of section 14(b) sound reasonable enough. Certainly they are in tune with both the letter and the spirit of the civil rights law, the Bill of Rights, and the great mass of State and Federal legislation which has been adopted over the years for the purpose of preventing abuses of the weak by the strong.

It is disturbing, in fact, to reflect on the fact that the above-mentioned "rights" are not now protected by law. Representative GRIFFIN insists they are not, and can cite actual practices, plus court and National Labor Relations Board decision to support his point.

Representative GRIFFIN concedes the validity of one of the powerful points made by the unions against the right-to-work laws. That is that non-union employes become "free riders" who cash in on the benefits of union negotiations, but don't help pay the cost. We agree.

But he properly insists that the worker who must join a union and thus pay his share of the expense of collective bargaining has the right to make certain that his dues money is not used for other purposes. Also, that his "civil rights" should be guaranteed.

The Michigan Republican can be of great service to labor in revising the Taft-Hartley law. His position is sound because of his reputation and the fact that right-to-work laws never have been seriously considered in Michigan. His stand will bother him not at all in a political way.

The conditions he places in his support of the repealer are reasonable. If they are accepted, the chances of knocking out the right-to-work laws will be vastly improved.

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson Dedicates Rayburn Statue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our gracious and charming First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, delivered an eloquent ad-

dress at the dedication of the Sam Rayburn Statue in the Rayburn Office Building on Wednesday, January 6, 1965. Mr. Speaker, I commend this very appropriate and fitting address to the attention of the Congress and to the people of our country, as follows:

REMARKS BY MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, DEDICATION OF SAM RAYBURN STATUE, RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 6, 1965

Mr. Speaker, friends and admirers of Sam Rayburn: the first moment Sam Rayburn set eyes on this Hill was a day in March of 1913. He arrived from Texas Old Fourth District and stepped out of Union Station to see before him the breath taking beauty of the glistening white Capitol dome.

It was love at first sight.

Often, afterward he would recall the moment and envy others who experienced this sight for the first time.

The freshman Congressman checked in, received his office space, and carefully clipped from a country newspaper back home an editorial boldly predicting: "Sam Rayburn has served this district well in the Texas Legislature. In the Halls of Congress, he will go far."

Two days later, he sat with other new Members of the House to hear the inaugural address of the college president who had entered politics and been elected President.

The words of Woodrow Wilson never left him: "Here, muster, not the forces of party but of humanity." Often, he recalled this address as one of the high points of his life.

It is hard for us to remember now that Sam Rayburn was ever a freshman Member of the House of Representatives. For so many freshmen Members—over almost half a century—became alumni of the Sam Rayburn school. He left his mark on them all.

Two months after his death in 1961, one of these freshmen was asked to give a tribute at a dinner in Washington.

I would like to read from that tribute now, and in doing so, to dedicate this statue to all new Members of the 89th Congress and all future Congresses in hopes that—like Sam Rayburn—they will labor under the great white dome of the Capitol with the same faith in the people and the same nobility of purpose.

The tribute was given by my husband.

"Everyone who knew Sam Rayburn cherishes the moments they shared with him, whether it was in the hushed silence of the House before the tally of a vote is announced, during the unvarnished talk of the board of education, amidst the hubbub of a Democratic convention, or on quiet walks around Texas' old Fourth District to talk to the men and women of those flat black lands he loved so well.

"The House of Representatives was his great love. He was at once its master and its servant.

"There wasn't anyone in the United States who couldn't see the Speaker, if they were willing to sit a spell. To the dismay of his staff, he made his own appointments, often on the back of an old envelope in his hip pocket. And he read his own mail.

" 'When someone writes me on tablet paper with a lead pencil,' he once told me, 'I figure what he's writing me about is pretty important to him.'

"Authors for years to come will analyze this man who held sway over the House longer than any other mortal. They can turn to him for their text.

" 'You can't really say how you lead. You feel your way, receptive to those rolling waves of sentiment. And if a man can't see and hear and feel, why then, of course, he's lost.'

"Speaker Rayburn could see and hear and feel. He was part of this good earth.

"He furnished his own political party some of its most straightforward thinking and talking:

" 'I'm a Democrat without suffix, prefix, or apology.'

"He was younger than any of us. There was one thing he disliked more than old fogies, and, as he put it, that was 'young fogies.'

"The last speech he made to the House came the day he doubled Henry Clay's record as Speaker. He stood in that familiar well and said: 'I have so much faith in human beings. I know that people are good folks.'

"In a reflective mood one evening with a group of friends, he put it so well. He recalled how good people had always been to him. He talked of Flag Springs, the little town where he had gone to the one-room school.

" 'All of us are just a little way from Flag Springs,' he said, adding, 'You know, I just missed being a tenant farmer by a gnat's heel.'

"All of us are just a little way from Flag Springs."

That is the lesson this solid giant left here on the Hill he loved.

Would Increased Payment for Overtime Work Reduce Unemployment?

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague, Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND of the Second District of New Hampshire, has done us all a service by summarizing in brief and cogent form the problems associated with double pay for overtime proposal. The Johnson administration apparently still carries this proposal as one of its primary objectives. Before entering upon this new intrusion by Government, let us all analyze its ramifications.

Congressman JAMES CLEVELAND has exhibited his usual incisive understanding of an attractively labeled proposal. The impact upon skilled workers, small businessmen, and the consumer of requiring double penalty pay for overtime is likely to be extensive. We are all grateful to our colleague, Congressman JAMES CLEVELAND for contributing his superb analysis of this proposed legislation in the American Legion magazine for February 1965. I commend to the attention of all Members the article that follows:

WOULD INCREASED PAYMENT FOR OVERTIME WORK REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT?

(By Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican of New Hampshire)

The proposal for double-pay penalties for overtime would not reduce unemployment. Instead, it would penalize labor—in job opportunities, in earning power, and in living costs.

Proponents argue that such legislation would create more jobs because industry would hire additional workers rather than pay penalty rates for overtime.

In reality, this proposal would create more unemployment. While the Secretary of Labor says that the equivalent number of new jobs represented by workers now working overtime is over 900,000, he does not recognize that there are not available skilled men able to fill these positions full time. In fact, there is now a shortage of workers in many industries paying overtime rates.

Limited in plant space and equipment, many industries might be required to work overtime regardless of the penalty. This would create no new jobs.

The overtime penalty would aggravate unemployment by increasing the pressures to seek labor-saving methods in production. Rather than paying increased penalty rates or taking on inefficient or untrained personnel, industry would accelerate the introduction of automation.

If industries eliminate overtime, more moonlighting would occur. Those workers deprived of their usual overtime will seek other outside jobs. To make the same money, they will have to work longer on their second job, thereby decreasing their efficiency on both jobs, and taking some of the newly created jobs.

Workers now receiving doubletime pay, when cut off from extra income, would demand wage hikes to compensate for lost income; this demand for higher wages would be felt by all industries.

One of my chief objections to this proposal, besides the fact that it would not accomplish its objective, is its positive potential for harm to small business. Large industries, with their vast capital resources, might learn to live with this proposal. For the small businessman, however, this proposal could mean extinction. This is typical of many proposals by big government. Big business and big unions can find ways to get along with the bureaucrats' bright ideas. But for the small businessman this is not always so.

Further, some industries would have to pass on a portion of the increased costs of operation to the American consumer. A higher cost of living would provide a double penalty on the worker who already has lost part of his salary..

This "make-work, spread-work" proposal could create more unemployment, while at the same time having an inflationary effect on prices. It would hurt the competitiveness of industry, indeed put some small businesses into bankruptcy, and restrict their ability to grow and employ more workers.

More Government regulation of issues best left to free bargaining between labor and management is not the proper approach. The cure for unemployment lies in sustaining a high rate of economic activity and fostering small business and new business, along with expanded education and retraining programs to give the unskilled new opportunities to find employment. The cure does not lie with artificially created jobs, which in the final analysis will strangle business and further investment and employment opportunities.

New York's Middle-Income Housing Tangle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the dilemmas faced by New York City is the problem of adequate housing for middle income families in areas where these families will live. In recent years, more than 800,000 middle-income city

dwellers have fled to New York's suburbs. One of the reasons this important segment of the population has moved is the shortage of desirable housing which they can afford.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Jerome Zukosky, which appeared in the February 13, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune, in which Mr. Zukosky discusses this housing tangle in New York:

MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING TANGLE

(By Jerome Zukosky)

There are few certainties about New York City's housing problems, but public officials and civic groups frequently speak of an absolute shortage of middle-income housing.

If this is true, however, it would be difficult to explain the increasingly severe problem of finding tenants for such housing, costing families $30 a room a month or less, now being produced with city subsidies under the limited profit, or Mitchell-Lama, housing program.

Reports of the city's Housing and Redevelopment Board, made public recently by the Herald Tribune, show that during the last year between 3,000 and 5,000 such apartments have been awaiting takers in dozens of projects throughout the city. In many cases, builders have sought for over a year to fill their buildings, construction of which is induced by such subsidy as abatement of up to 50 percent of normal real estate taxes. Unlike the days of 5 years ago, when all apartments in such projects were spoken for long before construction started, city officials now are concerned at the fact that disposal of the units is growing more difficult.

The bulk of such housing now awaiting applicants has been erected on vacant land; the apartments are to help loosen up the existing shortage within overcrowded or blighted neighborhoods. This would be more convincing if it could be demonstrated that families are taking every apartment so provided. But families who can afford $150 or more a month for a two-bedroom unit are not rushing pell-mell to Williamsburg in Brooklyn or the Bruckner Boulevard area in the Bronx; the only "instant sellouts" are in middle-class white areas, such as Inwood, Yorkville or the West Bronx where there is reason to question whether public aid is necessary to provide housing.

Yet the demand for more middle-income housing is unabated from two sources, and the evaluation of their claims poses a difficult policy problem for city officials.

One source is the middle-class civic group which wants a project in its own neighborhood, generally one faced with increasing real estate values, such as Greenwich Village and Manhattan's East Side. That thousands of middle-income apartments are now available greatly limits the public policy questions involved. What such groups want is public subsidy to produce a housing bargain in neighborhoods where it is increasingly difficult to find one; their members would rather live there than in Brownsville or the reaches of the Bronx. This may be a legitimate objective, and so is the argument that economic diversity is a useful attribute of any area, but is it enough to warrant commitment of scarce public resources?

The second source of pressure come from builders whose risks are reduced if they obtain the low-rate mortgage loans and tax abatement provided by the limited profit program. If they couple these with a good location, they have the prospect of a quick sellout. City officials, for example, are currently considering proposals from United States Steel Corp. for apartments over railroad yards on mid-Manhattan's western waterfront, and from builders for Hudson River sites at Dyckman Street in northern Manhattan.

But such projects, if approved, will compete with precisely the apartments the city is trying to use to cement middle-income families into less desirable areas, such as the upper West Side of Manhattan, the southern Bronx or Williamsburg. One settlement house, for example, provided a large number of family-size units in its middle-income cooperative in the pioneering West Side renewal area but has found few takers so far.

Milton Mollen, the city's housing chief, over the last year has placed the bulk of all middle-income housing in urban renewal areas where a broader public interest is served by city subsidy. There such housing permits many families to remain in their neighborhood and, with low-income public housing and private investment, can promote economic and social diversification; institutions such as Columbia University and medical facilities around Bellevue Hospital are aided and new residential areas reclaimed.

This policy recognizes that what is in short supply is not simply middle-income housing per se, but middle-income neighborhoods that provide not only this but also racially integrated housing and the whole spectrum of facilities, such as the best schools, that such neighborhoods need to grow on their own. Sowing these seeds is a difficult process, and no one can accuse Mr. Mollen of proceeding swiftly. But such is the state of the middle-income housing shortage that Mr. Mollen's economists now question whether he can accomplish this task and subsidize apartments outside renewal areas too. In a report last year to the Housing and Redevelopment Board, the economists warned: "If we give orchestra seats away at balcony prices, who will want to buy balcony seats?"

Remarks of Representative Peter W. Rodino, Jr., of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have been deeply concerned with legislation to increase educational opportunities for every American citizen. I have here a letter from a constituent which offers some new thoughts on education and makes some suggestions which, I think, are worth looking at carefully. I, therefore, commend this to my colleagues' attention:

DEAR MR. RODINO, I have before me your letter of December 19, 1963, which replied to my former letter concerning Federal aid to education, a letter in which I enclosed an article from America magazine. In your letter you state the mission of education in America: "to insure that our children are alert and informed so that they will be prepared to lead in the continued growth of our Nation and to insure its supremacy in the world, today and tomorrow."

Newspaper and magazine articles indicate that Johnson is heading toward a more complete fulfillment of that mission by including parochial and private schools in the aid program. The idea of aid for specific subject areas rather than to schools per se is a step in a more reasonable direction.

The main concern of this letter, however, is with a less formal aspect of education; but your definition of education's mission holds true. For the aspect of which I write creates an awareness of America's position unequaled by geography or history books or by courses in school. I write of travel abroad.

The growth of our Nation today depends largely on sound international relationships. But such soundness must be more than a matter of mere trade or diplomacy. Such sounding must spring from a populace which thinks of people in other countries not as foreigners, but simply as human beings who happen to be born in a different locale. Nothing can create so healthy an outlook as travel.

Today in America we have reached a prosperity point where long-distance travel is within easy financial reach of more people than ever before. A trip to Europe, for example, is not the bourgeoise status symbol it once was. Of course, there are those who still distort it into that, but more and more such a journey is regarded as a necessary adjunct to true education. And rightly so. For in Europe, the why's and wherefore's of Western civilization reveal themselves at every turn—in the architecture, the art and in the traditions of the people. And consequently, the why's and wherefore's of America—its meaning and destiny—become abundantly clear.

I ask you then, as teacher and as traveler, is Congress going to deprive the people it represents of the right to such firsthand education experience? Is it going to fertilize the roots of education through Federal aid, while cutting off its most fruitful branches? Is it going to reinforce the unsound notion that only the moneyed few should travel? Is the U.S. Congress going to imply that monetary concerns are primary, that expedience may so easily ride over principle? Congress will do all this and worse if it formulates and passes a bill to fine tourists.

I am aware of the necessity for stopping the gold flow, but I am even more aware of the necessity for stopping it with imaginative, positive, balanced measures. America has suffered once this century for unnatural prohibitive action; let it not suffer again.

It is a negative law which would curb the freedom of Americans to travel abroad; it is a positive law that would encourage them to travel within U.S. borders. Bills which would improve recreational facilities, lower motel, hotel and transportation costs, induce good architecture, subsidize the arts, create or preserve handicraft guilds (to name but a few) such bills would provide humanizing outlets. Americans wouldn't have to leave America in order to use their leisure in a truly human way, if a truly human environment were achieved on her own soil.

It may be argued that such bills are too long-range for the present emergency. But if such bills aren't created soon, the present emergency may well become a future disaster.

As a resident of Bloomfield, N.J., and as a citizen who is convinced of the necessity of a balance of humanism in our country, I ask that you show no favor toward the formulation or passage of a bill which would fine tourists.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

JEANNE C. DOSCHER.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE: A TRIBUTE

On this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence our hearts go out to the persecuted Lithuanian people. On this occasion I would like to focus attention upon one phase of the persecution which they have endured since the forced annexation of their country by the Soviet Union during the war—and that is the persecution of religion. Since the Red army occupied Lithuania in a ruthless and calculating manner the Soviet authorities have persistently carried on a campaign to destroy religion, to wipe out every manifestation of it, and to transplant in its stead the atheistic, materialistic philosophy of communism.

Lithuania, a nation rich in religious traditions, prior to the Soviet annexation was largely Roman Catholic with over 80 percent of the population of nearly 3 million adhering to that faith. The remainder was comprised of Lithuanians professing the Lutheran, Jewish, and Greek Orthodox religions. Mindful of the need for a strong religious foundation to insure the moral and ethical vitality of the nation, the Lithuanian people had the wisdom to establish constitutional conditions conducive to the growth of a vigorous religious outlook. In independent Lithuania freedom of religion was guaranteed by the Constitution. Religious groups were free to propagate their faith, conduct religious services, maintain places of public worship, and administer educational institutions. In 1927, a concordat was concluded with the Vatican in which Lithuania established diplomatic relations with the Holy See.

Such was the wholesome religious atmosphere in Lithuania in the period following her declaration of independence. Such was the religious character of the Lithuanian nation. By constitutional guarantee, freedom of religion prevailed. In every way the practice of religion and its development within the nation were encouraged. Thus, the Lithuanian people were grounded in a strong and virile religious and moral ethic.

The Soviet conquests of Lithuania in 1940 and again in 1944 have threatened the heart and core of Lithuanian religious life. As a consequence of the corroding processes of Sovietization the soul of the Lithuanian nation has been exposed to the gravest peril.

Bishop Vincentas Brizgys, the former Roman Catholic bishop of Kaunas and resident of Chicago, has given a vivid account of the extent to which religion is persecuted within so-called Soviet Lithuania. On June 25, 1940, 10 days after the first Soviet occupation of Lithuania, Moscow abrogated the concordat with Rome, and the Papal Nuncio was ordered to leave the country by August 25. Thus the Lithuanian link with the Vatican was broken and the Catholic Church was isolated. Shortly thereafter, Bishop Brizgys stated, all private hospitals, schools, kindergartens, charitable institutions, orphanages, and the like were seized and the personnel arrested by Soviet authorities. Furthermore, the religious press was suppressed within the first week of the occupation; and religious books and other printed matter were banned or destroyed. All seminaries were seized, and monasteries taken over. All bishops and chancery staffs were expelled from their residences. A drive commenced on the observance of religious feast days. And then on April 25, 1941, the teaching of religion was absolutely forbidden throughout the entire nation.

Probably the most ruthless measure taken by the Soviet authorities in their antireligious drive was the attempt to liquidate the clergy. According to Bishop Brizgys, 150 Roman Catholic priests were arrested in Lithuania during the first Soviet occupation. Within 1 year 16 were killed and 6 have since been missing without a trace of their whereabouts. The remainder were liberated by the Lithuanian partisans when the Russo-German war began in June 1941.

When in 1944 Lithuania was again forcibly brought into the Soviet Union, the Soviet military authorities displayed some toleration of religion while the war continued. After the war, however, antireligious measures were again imposed with the same thoroughness and brutality as they were during the first occupation. Bishop Brizgys declared that during the first 2 years after the war 4 Lithuanian Catholic bishops and 89 Lithuanian priests were arrested, and subsequently many additional priests were arrested.

With unrelenting determination the Soviets have continued and even accelerated the process of Soveitization in Lithuania. Nor has the Communist attack been solely centered upon the largest religious group, the Roman Catholics. Communism is uniformly hostile in theory and practice to all religions. Only for tactical reasons does it sometimes differentiate between Protestants, Catholics, Jews, or members of the Orthodox church. In Lithuania all religious groups have felt the heavy hand of the Soviet oppressor.

On this 47th anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence we of the free world ought to reflect for a moment upon this time of troubles which has come upon the Lithuanian people. The Lithuanians are a people in jeopardy; they are a people fighting for their identity as a nation; they are a people struggling to keep alive even a spark of their religious spirit.

To this great people, let us, therefore, extend our hand in a symbolic gesture of everlasting friendship; let us raise our voices with those who like ourselves seek justice for the oppressed; and let us join with all the free peoples of the world in prayerful supplication that the soul of Lithuania shall always remain unconquered by its ruthless oppressors.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are faced by the threat of war with the Communists in southeast Asia, it is easy to forget about the silent struggle being waged against the tyranny of communism in other countries. February 16 marks Lithuanian Independence Day. It is a day which should not be overlooked, because the people of Lithuania need our support and we have much to learn from them.

For many years the Lithuanian people have been forced to submit to the oppressive rule of the Russians. Thousands who resisted were quickly rounded up and liquidated. Russian soldiers still abound in the country, and the Communist political apparatus controls every facet of Lithuanian life. The moment there is a flicker of opposition the power of the whole Soviet Union is brought to bear to destroy it.

In spite of the tyranny under which they live, the brave men and women of Lithuania have not given up the hope of regaining their freedom. We have freedom. We know how it enriches our lives and gives purpose to everything we do.

On this important day, let us make it clear that we stand by the Lithuanian people and that we are making every effort to check the spread of Communist imperialism. Together we will actively work for the day when people everywhere will be able to choose their own way of life.

House Concurrent Resolution 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, marks the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Unfortunately, there cannot be a true celebration of this independence day by Lithuania since she is still under the domination of the Soviet Union, which took that brave nation by force of arms on June 15, 1940. From that date her people have been enslaved and her lands overrun by leaders of a philosophy which seeks to destroy her heritage of freedom and peace.

We look forward to the day when Lithuania can again take her place among the free nations of the world. To help speed that end, it was my pleasure to introduce again in this Congress House Concurrent Resolution 40, which follows in its entirety:

[89th Cong., 1st sess.]

H. CON. RES. 40

In the House of Representatives, January 4, 1965; Mr. RHODES of Arizona submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, on the other hand, the Baltic nations having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the free Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas no real peace and security can be achieved in the world while Lithuania, Lat-

via, and Estonia remain enslaved by the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take such steps as he may deem appropriate to bring before the United Nations the question of Soviet action in the Baltic States for the purpose of urging the United Nations to request that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—

(1) withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

(2) return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union.

SEC. 2. The United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States.

These Remarkable Men of History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following very excellent editorial by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., to the attention of my colleagues. This editorial appeared in the Hearst papers throughout the country on January 24, 1965:

THESE REMARKABLE MEN OF HISTORY

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, the Hearst newspapers)

The week has been rich in history. We have seen, hopefully and happily, Lyndon Baines Johnson of Texas ascend to the pinnacle of public office—and then be dramatically whisked to hospital, suffering from a respiratory ailment which his doctors assure us gives no cause for concern.

And we have watched, helplessly and sorrowfully, Winston Spencer Churchill of Britain slip toward the end of a life unmatched in greatness.

The origins of these two remarkable men of the 20th century could hardly be more diverse. President Johnson stems from pioneer stock in a harsh and arid region of Texas.

Sir Winston is the product of centuries of aristocracy, steeped in the ancient traditions of Britain—and, we can proudly add, an American mother.

Yet there is no doubt that the two, if history had placed them as contemporaries in office, would have found much in common and a wealth of mutual admiration and respect.

Above all, both would have shared a fierce and identical pride in the parliamentary form of government, common to both our lands, that is the essence of democracy.

The lives of both, in fact, have been greatly influenced by long experience in the deliberative chambers of government. No one has been more inextricably entwined with the British House of Commons than Sir Winston; he is indeed the child of that House, as he has so proudly observed.

And few can compare with Lyndon Johnson as the embodiment of Congress; for years he was the undisputed king of Capitol Hill, transforming the post of Senate majority leader from its hitherto figurehead status to one of unprecedented power and effectiveness.

But what indeed can be said about Sir Winston Churchill to do justice to the man? At the close of two-thirds of the 20th century he so clearly dominates the historical scene as to dwarf his contemporaries and match any of his predecessors.

It is an exceedingly safe bet that no one of his stature will arise, anywhere in the world, during the lifetimes of any of us.

During the past week, moreover, the world watched him wage as valiant a battle as any he has engaged in during his brave and colorful life. Felled by a stroke at the age of 90, his great heart has fought on and on to the astonishment of his doctors and to the fervent prayers of his family and friends.

We venture to guess, however, that this sheer bulldog tenacity comes as little or no surprise to Adolf Hitler's former generals or any other foes he vanquished but a short time ago.

A junior officer always in the thick of combat, a dashing war correspondent—and hairbreadth escape artist—brilliant parliamentary debater, talented painter, patient bricklayer, master politician, visionary statesman, superb historian, mighty war leader, and a dignified and sentimental gentleman who wept when the ragged, bomb-battered Londoners cheered him during his tours of their devastated streets and homes—all these and more are Winston Churchill.

History rolls inexorably on, but we shall never see his like again.

The story of the Man of the Century has undoubtedly been in President Johnson's thoughts during this past week. L.B.J. has always been influenced by greatness and a sense of purpose in others; hence his devotion to the memories of Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Sam Rayburn, and Franklin Roosevelt.

A man so rooted in democratic tradition could not, then, fail to include Sir Winston among his mentors.

Both men elevated the practice of politics to unequalled heights. For Sir Winston, politics meant duty, in the manner of his forebears the Dukes of Marlborough.

Lyndon Johnson has always felt that the art of politics transcends all others; that only through politics can diverse views among factions and nations be reconciled.

We can wonder, though, what else besides the example of Churchill has occupied the President's thoughts during this momentous week. The explosion of an atomic bomb in the remote fastness of Communist China? The enigmas of Kosygin and Brezhnev, and perhaps Charles de Gaulle? or Lee Harvey Oswald and a $12.78 mail-order rifle?

We may never know which formed the President's preoccupation. For this tall, gregarious Texan is now the loneliest American. But there are many things about Lyndon Johnson that we do know—and the time is certainly appropriate to appraise him on the basis of these once again.

First, it is somewhat paradoxical that whereas L.B.J. garnered the greatest electoral majority of any President, he remains a largely unknown quantity to vast numbers of Americans outside Washington, D.C., and Texas.

He does not reflect the youth and magnetism of Jack Kennedy, the military fame of Dwight Eisenhower nor the crispness of Harry Truman. He comes closest, perhaps, to Franklin Roosevelt; but even there the similarity is by no means close.

Yet, in time, I think L.B.J. will become one of the Nation's best known Presidents, not only through communication channels, but through his accomplishments.

For today America is presented with a rare combination: A President with total experience of every nook, cranny and pitfall of Congress—and with a congressional makeup, in House and Senate, overwhelmingly disposed to favor his programs.

The Congress, moreover, likes Lyndon Johnson. He is privy to its most inner councils; he can be described as a charter member of its establishment.

The congressional system is dominated by the committee chairmen—and this formidable band of Representatives and Senators feel at home with L.B.J. as perhaps with no Chief Executive before him.

As the "master compromiser" L.B.J. has earned the exasperation, admiration, enmity and unswerving loyalty of members of both parties. It is said that no one ever won an argument with him. His secret weapon, it is said, is a total aversion to division and rancor of any kind.

He has sometimes been accused, especially during his Senate tenure, of being too closely allied to Texas oil and gas interests. But L.B.J. shrewdly knew that a politician's first duty is to survive and stay in office—otherwise he is rendered ineffective and his goals of a Great Society or anything else become academic dreams.

He is the middle-of-the-roader who has always had to walk a political tightrope in his home State, a turbulent center of Democratic politics.

For years he was subject to the relentless hostility of the liberal faction of the Texas Democratic Party—yet now that he is in office he is instigating virtually everything that faction has advocated.

He is like his enormous State, both of the South and of the West. Yet few who know Lyndon Johnson will deny his broad sense of national consciousness; and as Senate majority leader the problems he faced and tackled were, of necessity, national rather than regional.

Again those who know him will tell you he is equally at home at a labor union get-together or at an ambassador's salon. "O Lyndon," an acquaintance once observed, "can talk to you on any level you like." And it is true that L.B.J. has an equal liking for the rough clothes of his ranch country and for Saville Row suits.

He is the Mr. Democrat who for many years loyally supported the foreign policies of President Eisenhower's administration—because he felt it was his duty to do so, because it was essential that the Nation present a unified front to friends and enemies abroad.

He is the former unchallenged leader of the Senate who accepted the Vice-Presidency—against the advice of many closest to him—under the former junior Senator from Massachusetts. L.B.J. did this out of a sense of duty and of loyalty to his party.

Yes, I feel Winston Churchill and Lyndon Johnson would have gotten along well together. The sole holder of honorary American citizenship and the big Texan from the southwest plains would have proved a formidable team.

Thus the curtain rises on a new act in the life of one man and slowly falls on the final, mortal scene of another.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in the flow of history, esteem is due less to nations with abundant military power and rich in material goods, than to those which struggle courageously and determinedly for their own and others' rights to freedom and to a better future. And it is especially today, when the Soviet-im-

posed Red regimes are holding millions in slavery and openly seeking to impose their colonial rule on other nations, that the freedom struggle of the small Lithuanian nation acquires particular meaning.

It was in 1918 that Lithuanian independence was achieved. Yet freedom had but a short day in Lithuania: in 1940 the country was again seized by the Russian Bolsheviks, underwent a three-year occupation by Hitler, and has remained in the Soviet colonial prison camp ever since. On the day Lithuania's freedom was throttled, the population again girded itself for a long period of resistance.

The freedom fight has cost the Lithuanian people many lives, but at the same time it has strengthened their determination to uphold their national culture and traditions, and to insist on their right to choose their own political, economic, and social institutions. By its cultural values, its faith, and its world view, Lithuania continues to belong to the West and exemplifies Western man's readiness to defend spritual freedom, the principles of democracy, and fundamental human rights.

The Lithuanian resistance did not falter during the first Soviet Russian occupation, nor did it falter when the Russians were replaced by the Nazis in June 1941. The strength of the Lithuanian people, so courageously displayed during the German occupation, is as evident today when once again they find themselves the victims of Russian oppression.

The late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, believed, as I do, that Lithuania's freedom is the concern of all humanity.

He expressed this more eloquently than I might when he said:

> Together we must work to strengthen the spirit of those Europeans who are not free, to reestablish their old ties to freedom and the West, so that their desire for liberty and sense of nationhood will survive for future expression. We ask those who would be our adversaries to understand that in our relations with them we will not bargain one nation's interest against another's and that the commitment to the cause of freedom is common to us all.
>
> All of us * * * must be faithful to our conviction that peace in Europe can never be complete until everywhere in Europe men can choose, in peace and freedom, how their countries shall be governed * * *.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of World War I many oppressed national groups regained their independence. The Lithuanian people, one of the three Baltic nationalities suffering under czarist Russian rule, declared their independence on February 16, 1918.

The Lithuanians have a distinct place in the history of northeastern Europe. They are the most numerous of the three Baltic peoples and they have always been sturdy defenders of liberty. Although they have borne the heavy yoke of the Russian Government for more than a century, they have managed always to keep their love of liberty and their patriotism alive.

Both in the attainment of their Lithuanian independence and in its maintenance during more than two decades, I am happy to say, the United States made important contributions. The Lithuanians received great encouragement from the famous 14 points of our late President Wilson. It was a source of inspiration for them to know that their struggle for independence had the support of the people and Government of this great Republic.

In 1918 when the Lithuanian people earned their freedom they and their friends everywhere thought that their servitude and misery under alien rule had come to an end. This brave people who had struggled against Teutonic Knights in the 13th and 14th centuries, against their Polish overlords through the next four centuries, and finally against the regime of the Russian czars for more than 100 years, had at last broken the chains of their bondage. A new day had dawned for them, and a new promising life began for them as a nation. During the 20-odd years of their independence, from 1918 to 1940, Lithuanians were quite content with their lot. Since the outbreak of the last war fate has been unkind to them.

Early in that war they lost their freedom and independence. Lithuania was attacked and occupied by the Red Army early in 1940, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Then during the war it was overrun by the Nazis and held by them for some 2 years. Toward the end of the war Communist Russians returned and they have been there for more than 20 years. They have been treating Lithuanians more cruelly, and have imposed upon them a harsher regime than did the Russian czars, and today the Lithuanians are oppressed under Communist totalitarian tyranny in their homeland. Although they are not allowed to celebrate their national holiday there, we as their friends and sympathizers, observe the anniversary of Lithuanian independence and thus echo their patriotic sentiments.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, on this day commemorating the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we pay tribute to a nation that has lost the most precious possession a nation-state can hold; namely, its freedom.

During the interwar period, Lithuania took its place proudly in the family of nations. It established diplomatic relations with the nations of the world. It was an active member of the League of Nations. In every way, Lithuania sought to fulfill its obligations to international society as an independent nation-state.

The same can be said for internal Lithuanian affairs. Lithuania had prospered economically, culturally, and socially. Lithuanians could be justly proud of their national achievements during this period.

The point I am trying to make is simply this: By every objective criterion Lithuania proved her capacity to play a fit and honorable role in international life; Lithuania had fulfilled all the requirements humanity expects of a modern state. The Soviet conquest of Lithuania was, therefore, as senseless as it was cruel. There was no justification for this horrendous act of inhumanity and the oppression that has existed in the country since that time. The rationale for the Soviet conquest stems from a deep-rooted Soviet ideological commitment to expand communism. For this reason, the fate of Lithuania is a warning to all men of the free world who cherish their liberty.

On this anniversary of Lithuanian independence I add my voice with all others in praising the fortitude and perserverance, the nobility and resolve of the long-suffering Lithuanian people. And to them I extend my warmest congratulations on this their day of national dedication and express the hope that freedom will one day be theirs.

Church Attitude Toward Farm Labor Improving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the Catholic Herald, Sacramento, Calif., dated January 7, 1965, indicates that church groups now are recognizing a problem in the field of agriculture which some may have overlooked in the past. I refer to the cost-price squeeze which our farmers have faced for many years and, specifically, the fact that farmers generally cannot improve the wages of agricultural workers unless and until ways are found to increase farm income.

When anyone conscientiously and objectively studies the problems of our agricultural economy, the invariable conclusion is that farmers have not shared fully in the relative prosperity enjoyed by other groups. Most farm costs have risen, but farm prices have not kept pace. As the editorial suggests,

the surest way to improve the lot of the farmworker is to increase farm income.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD the text of the Catholic Herald editorial entitled "Justice on the Farm":

JUSTICE ON FARM

Many crises are destined to beset the agricultural front in 1965 if the problems of all concerned are not weighed on the scales of justice.

The basic issue is a perennial one, the plight of America's farm laborer. Now that the bracero program has been terminated, the issue must be faced: How to make work on the farm attractive enough to obtain the services of a sufficient home labor force to harvest the Nation's crops?

This goal can be accomplished only if the wage provided is a living one and only if employment conditions reflect a human concern for those who work.

It will not be realized unless the plight of the farmer is considered as an integral part of the total problem. In truth, that plight may be called the heart of the problem.

In an era of an expanding national prosperity, the U.S. farmer has been caught in a cost-price squeeze which is ruthless.

During the past 20 years, the farmer has seen the cost of production increase at a staggering rate, following the pattern common to all sectors of the economy. But unlike other economic fields, the price for farm products received by the farmer has not begun to keep pace.

Statistics bear out this observation. In 1947, the gross farm income was $34 billion. By 1963, it had increased to $41 billion. However, in that same period of time, the net farm income had decreased from $17 to $12 billion. The diminishing return is explained by production expenses soaring from $17 to $29 billion.

To keep pace with a modernized agriculture, the farmer has had to pay increasing amounts for new equipment and its maintenance, for products to enrich the soil and for electricity to provide water.

The farmer has not been able to control the amount paid for these factors of production. He has paid the inflationary amounts or gone out of business.

The only production factor which has been kept stationary like the farmer's gross income, has been the wage paid farm laborers.

In 1963, farm people received $1,480 of personal annual income per capita, of which $510 was from nonfarm sources. Per capita income of nonfarm people was $2,515. The average hourly return for farmwork was $1.01, while 1 hour's work in a factory averaged $2.46.

There can be no question on moral grounds that the farm laborer's wage must be increased—drastically increased. Neither should there be any question that the farmer who is expected to pay this increase must himself be given a vastly greater share in economic affluence through increased payments for his products. This, too, is a matter of elemental justice.

The average consumer paid 15 percent more, but farmers received 15 percent less in 1963 for the same kinds of food purchased in 1949. Purchasers of bakery products saw the price tag soar 42 percent in that period. Farmers saw their income in this area decline 12 percent.

Users of dairy products had to pay 18 percent more in 1963 than in 1949. The farm value of these same products dropped 5 percent in that time.

In terms of practical reality, these statistics mean that if the farm laborer's plight is to be improved—and improved it must be—the farmer must be given the means whereby it becomes possible for him to assume that increased production cost. He must be given more for his produce—a lot more.

If we really want to solve the problems which beset American agriculture, there should be in this year 1965 an across-the-board increase of 10 percent in the price farmers obtain for their produce. This should be followed in the two succeeding years by an annual increase of 5 percent.

Moral dictates impel us to improve the lot of the farmworker. The same justice demands that the farmer himself cannot be ignored. It is one whole picture. You cannot provide justice for one and not for the other.

Frances Seidemann Tells "What My Country Means to Me"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following winning essay written by Frances Seidemann, entitled "What My Country Means to Me," as printed in the Kellogg Evening News on February 11, 1965:

WINNING ESSAY IS PUBLISHED

(By Frances Seidemann)

(EDITORS NOTE.—Following is the text of the winning essay in the recent contest in Kellogg schools sponsored by the Kellogg Jaycees, topic for which was "What My Country Means to Me.")

My country means freedom and brave men. Men who were willing to take a chance and do things for themselves. My country still means freedom, but more and more people are saying, "let the Government do it, I don't have the time." The Government is doing more and the people less and the people complain that the Government is doing too much.

My country means a land of rolling hills, beautiful lakes and streams, steep mountain ranges, and modern cities. But the cities are getting bigger, the streams are becoming polluted, the hills are hidden by signboards and trash and the mountains are spotted with summer homes.

My country is more than a country, it is an idea, a way of life, an ideal of the people of many countries, but unless we do something we are not going to stay that way.

Still, for all its faults, my country has many other things; a democratic way of government run by the people, power and the will to fight back against our enemies, a chance for good education, and in the future we hope to have equality for all men.

My country means a lot to me because I need freedom. Freedom to think and act as I please without going against the law. For my country is a land of justice, too. Justice for all men, no matter what they have done. All men have freedom, but to have freedom we must give some up, because if we give too much freedom people will take advantage of it for their own ends.

My country has built up its resources and used everything it has to make it prosperous and powerful. We are the center of much trade and travel. We have great scientists and doctors. In the United States we have tried to conquer incurable diseases.

In the United States the people work together for the good of the people and the government. The people take an active part in government and most of them know about what is going on, both here and in other countries.

I am proud of my country because the people are willing to try and correct their faults and work together, using all their capabilities to solve our problems.

My country means many things to me. It means its history and its people, its present and its government, and its faults and assets. My country means a way of life and an idea.

My country is still young and look how far it has come. If my country did this in such a short time, who knows what it will do in the future?

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today marks another anniversary for a small but gallant nation—another anniversary observed in sadness. Forty-seven years ago, on February 16, the courageous people of Lithuania won their independence and for 22 years enjoyed a happy, free, and democratic way of life. Now this independence is only a memory, but it remains a cherished dream for millions of Lithuanians now behind the Iron Curtain and for their countrymen in America and throughout the world.

It is a privilege to join with my colleagues in the House in paying well-deserved tribute to the valiant people of Lithuania on this occasion, for as long as we here in America have the will to remember and to care, their hopes for liberation will be kept alive. I am confident that the people of Lithuania will one day regain their freedom, for they are a nation of Christian traditions with the faith to persevere. But we in the free world must give them the encouragement to continue the fight. We must continue to support their cause and do what we can to aid in winning back their national identity and independence. We can let them know that America still stands devoted, as they do, to the principles of justice and the right of self-determination.

All who cherish freedom in the world have a common interest, and likewise we share a common threat. Lithuanian Independence Day, therefore, should be for Americans a day of prayerful reflection and renewed dedication. In this regard, I personally am today introducing a House concurrent resolution calling on the President of the United States to instruct the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to take certain action in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

I know the people of my district join me in saluting the wonderful people of Lithuania and also in expressing the hope that soon, February 16 will once again be truly a day of independence for them and for all captive nations now behind the Iron Curtain. It will then be a happy day for all of us.

Milwaukee Honors the Memory of an Outstanding Citizen: Mr. Wilbur Halyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the city of Milwaukee last week honored the memory of one of its distinguished citizens, Mr. Wilbur Halyard, by naming a new city street in his honor.

In a letter to the streets and zoning committee of the Milwaukee Common Council, Alderman Vel Phillips paid tribute to Mr. Halyard's outstanding qualities which merited recognition by his chosen city. I take this opportunity to acquaint the House with the remarkable character and accomplishments of a man who contributed unstintingly to the development of the economy and society of Milwaukee and our country.

I include Mrs. Phillips' letter and a copy of the resolution adopted by the Milwaukee Common Council:

CITY OF MILWAUKEE,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 25, 1965.

To the COMMITTEE ON STREETS-ZONING OF THE COMMON COUNCIL,
City of Milwaukee, Wis.

GENTLEMEN: Wilbur Halyard will be remembered as one of Milwaukee's frontiersmen. He was a forerunner, a pioneer, with all of the vigor and strength of purpose that characterize those who forge ahead. Wilbur Halyard came to Milwaukee in 1923. With the assistance of his wife, Mrs. Ardie Halyard, he organized the Columbia Savings & Loan Association in 1925. He embarked upon a business career which grew and flourished; he took an active part in the civic life of his community. He was indeed a frontiersman in the new sense of the word that was envisioned by those who molded the New Frontier for the late John F. Kennedy.

Wilbur Halyard was essentially a quiet man. His efforts, his gains, were never heralded, perhaps because they were not dramatic. They were, however, worthy efforts, born and nurtured with heavy toil and as he himself expressed with a genuine "desire for self-improvement."

For those who did not know him, Wilbur Halyard was somewhat unconventional. Often abrupt in his manner, he was never able to feign patience. He was outspoken, direct, and unafraid of taking the unpopular view.

But for those who knew him, he was warm and gracious and most of all a gentleman in the "old tradition." He loved good conversation and very often took the time to think and meditate momentarily before he spoke. Perhaps the quality that shall be remembered and loved best was his genuine ability to laugh heartily at good humor including his own.

Wilbur Halyard was indeed not all things to all people, but to friends and adversaries alike he was a man of strong determination, a man of purpose, and a man of accomplishment.

It is both fitting and proper to commemorate his name in a way which will make permanent many of the fine qualities that he gave in abundance to our Milwaukee community.

Very sincerely,

VEL PHILLIPS,
Alderman, Sixth Ward.

RESOLUTION TO NAME A NEW STREET IN THE SIXTH WARD IN HONOR OF THE LATE WILBUR HALYARD

Whereas a new diagonal street running from North Sixth and West Brown Streets to West Garfield Avenue at relocated North Eighth Street will soon be opened in the sixth ward; and

Whereas it is fitting that this newly created street by named in honor of a civic leader who has devoted his lifetime to furthering the interests of the city of Milwaukee and its citizens; and

Whereas there is no person more deserving of this honor than the late Wilbur Halyard, who came to Milwaukee in 1923, founded the Columbia Savings & Loan Association in 1925, and, with his wife, Mrs. Ardie Halyard, guided the association until his death on January 17, 1963; and

Whereas Mr. Halyard's pioneering spirit, his courage, his determination, and his tireless efforts made him not only a successful businessman but an outstanding civic leader, whose influence for good was felt throughout the entire community; and

Whereas the members of this honorable body desire to give appropriate recognition and honor to the memory of Wilbur Halyard: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That the newly created diagonal street within the sixth ward is hereby designated to be known as North Halyard Street in reverent memory of the late Wilbur Halyard; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the permanent record of this council and a suitably engrossed copy presented to Mrs. Halyard.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as we observe the 47th anniversary of the restoration of independence to Lithuania we are also reminded of the disposition that has kept these brave people from the full realization of their rightful place as a free and independent nation.

Lithuania represents a civilization that was old when the United States came into being and we must shamefacedly confess our selfish preoccupation at the time the Communist colossus moved in to stifle their freedom. And all the while we were fighting a war to stem the Nazi onrush, we were collaborating with an equally ruthless juggernaut that has overrun her weaker neighbors. Added to this is the sad admission that it has become officially taboo to criticize these destroyers of freedom since it might upset the nice balance of peaceful coexistence.

What utter absurdity. How can we preach freedom for all peoples at the very moment we see communistic colonialism flourishing around the world? And we do have a vital stake in Lithuanian independence since our own freedom is only strong when it is predicated on the freedom of all other sovereign peoples. Let us, then, make it our firm policy to refuse to lend our aid to, or indeed traffic with, any nation that keeps its so-called satellites in thralldom.

Remembering the "Maine"

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] in commemorating the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor, a tragedy which resulted in the Spanish-American War. It is particularly fitting that Mr. O'HARA should be granted this special order since he is the sole Spanish-American War veteran still serving in the Congress.

Each year the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* is celebrated by the United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Wisconsin. Mr. Morris G. Oesterreich, past national commander of the United Spanish War Veterans and commander of the Wisconsin department, has for many years devoted his time and efforts to arranging this program. It is just one of the many worthy endeavors on behalf of veterans to which Mr. Oesterreich has energetically and fruitfully contributed.

This year he arranged for the program to be held at the Schlitz Brown Bottle in Milwaukee, facilities made available through the courtesy of Mr. Robert Uihlein, president of the Schlitz Brewing Co.

The principal speaker was Capt. Bernard A. Thielges, professor of naval science at Marquette University, Milwaukee. Because of the pertinence of Captain Thielges' remarks to this 67th anniversary commemoration, with consent, I insert the speech at this point in the RECORD and urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

THE 67TH ANNUAL "MAINE" DAY MEMORIAL SERVICE

Mr. Oesterreich, United Spanish War Veterans, friends, it is always a pleasure, a privilege, and an honor to be a participant at your various military and civic patriotic functions to pay tribute to the many brave Americans, living and dead, who have played such an heroic role in forming our great American heritage. I feel, however, that Mr. Oesterreich has misled me somewhat, as he indicated that the average age of the Spanish-American War veteran was now 86 years. After having had the privilege to meet many of you on previous occasions, and seeing you again here today, young as ever, I have concluded that Mr. Oesterreich has ample qualification for the Liars Club; and in this regard, perhaps you all belong. In any event, from the looks of you gentlemen I don't believe that I would relish the thought of defending San Juan Hill even today from an advance of men of your proven character, vitality, and patriotism.

Today, February 15, 1965, marks the 67th annual remembrance of the sinking of the U.S. battleship *Maine* in the harbor of Hav-

ana, Cuba. Let us reminisce for a moment and go back to those trying days of history. I am sure that to many of you the recollections will be quite vivid.

In January of the year 1898 there were serious riots and demonstrations against Spanish authority throughout Cuba. The American consul general, Fitzhugh Lee, cabled to Washington his doubts whether the Spanish officials could control the situation, together with the suggestion that it might be necessary to send warships for the protection of American citizens and property. The Washington authorities acted hastily and immediately dispatched the battleship *Maine*, under Captain Sigsbee, to Havana where she appeared on January 25, and was conducted to a mooring buoy by harbor officials. Her arrival caused great excitement among the populace; her reception by the Spanish authorities was a cold one.

While lying quietly at her moorings on the night of February 15 with no preliminary circumstances to excite the least alarm or suspicion, at 2145 hours the *Maine* was suddenly blown up and sunk with the loss of 266 men out of the ship's complement of 353. The report of the naval court of inquiry then convened, and fully substantiated in 1911 when the ship was refloated, showed that the disaster had resulted from a heavy external explosion, as by a mine, which drove the bowplates inward with probable subsequent explosion of the forward magazines. The incident precipitated the most acute tensions in the already strained political relations between Spain and the United States. The cry "Remember the *Maine*" raised by the American press and people became a powerful incentive to war. Ultimately, effective April 21, 1898, war was declared as existing between the United States and Spain.

Many of you gentlemen here today, from first hand experience, recall the events to follow. On the night of the 30th of May Comdr. George Dewey opened actual hostilities when he boldly sailed into Manila harbor in search of combat with the Spanish fleet. This daring act is more fully appreciated upon realization of the dangers and uncertainty that Dewey and his men faced. The harbor entrance off Corregidor, Manila, and Cavite were reported heavily fortified; the channel entrance reported mined, and the Spanish fleet lay in waiting under the protection of all this. Dewey was 7,000 miles from his nearest friendly port to which he could turn in the event of mishap or damage. Yet, in spite of all these obstacles and uncertainties, Dewey carried the offensive and sought the enemy. At 0540 hours of the morning of the 1st of May Dewey issued to his flagship captain his now famous order "You may fire when you are ready Gridley." Fire was rapid, the smoke was thick and pungent, the action was intense. By noon of this day, after five firing runs and after closing to 2,000 yards range, the destruction of the Spanish fleet was utterly complete.

Do you recall the great jubilation with which the news of Dewey's victory was received at home? Perhaps many of you have retained the news clippings and articles of this great event. The great lift of morale it gave our own people and forces was the exact reverse to the demoralizing effect the news had on the Spanish. Consider the opposing thoughts of Admiral Sampson while on blockade patrol off Cuba, and of the Spanish Admiral Cervera when, while enroute to Cuba, he was advised of the complete annihilation of the Spanish Far Eastern Squadron.

Half around the globe the spotlight turned to events off Cuba. On the 29th of April Spanish Admiral Cervera sailed from the Cape Verde Islands with what was to be the first contingent of the Spanish fleet. Where was he headed? Where would he strike? Up and down the Atlantic coast the cry rose for protection from a possible strike by the Spanish fleet. Demands for more guns, more ships, more troops came from the coastal cities. The arrival of Admiral Cervera in Santiago de Cuba on the morning of the 19th of May greatly eased the tension along the Atlantic coastline.

The U.S. fleet, under its capable commander, Admiral Sampson, was spoiling for battle with the enemy. On the 1st of June a close-in semicircular blockade was set up by Sampson's fleet off Santiago de Cuba. Troops were landed under General Shafter between the 22d and 26th of June, and by the 2d of July, after heavy fighting ashore, the city's fall was imminent. Admiral Cervera was ordered to depart the harbor even though such action was certain to lead to his destruction. On the morning of the 3d of July Admiral Cervera led his ships from the safety of Santiago's harbor into the path of the ready guns of Admiral Sampson. Within the day the Spanish fleet was no more—victory was complete.

Today we look back on the Spanish-American War as not much of a contest. It spanned an extremely short period of time, from the 21st of April, 1898, until the 13th of August, 1898, barely 4 months. Casualties were extremely light on both sides as major wars are measured, and forces committed were very small. However, at the time it was destined to be a long, bitter, and bloody struggle. Spain was considered a powerful nation with a quarter of a million men under arms, truly an impressive army for the times. Her navy was impressive. Although our own Navy was fairly well established, our Army was a bare 28,000 men. This was a pitifully small force to stand against the grand monarchy of Spain. Prominent military minds of Europe prophesied a stalement, "a long desultory war." Hong Kong papers dwelt at great length on the strength of the opposing forces, and considered Manila Harbor, with its heavy fortifications, mines, and the Spanish fleet within, to be impregnable. At the Hong Kong Club none would take a chance on betting on the American squadron—even with heavy odds offered. On the eve of the departure of the American squadron from Hong Kong, when a British regiment entertained a group of American officers, it is said that the comment freely expressed by the British was "a fine set of fellows, but unhappily we shall never see them again." Throughout the world the general opinion held that the Spanish Navy would be victorious.

Here again, as in more recent years, our adversaries did not consider the will, the energy, and the patriotism of the American people—men like you here today. Every man who participated in the war with Spain was a volunteer. Our total men under arms quickly built up to a total of 392,000, of whom, regretfully, only about 15,000 are living yet today. State militia responded promptly and with high patriotic spirit to the call to arms. The 1st Naval Battalion, New York, reported to duty fully armed and equipped within 6 hours of notification. Others, both Army and Navy, were equally as responsive. Overlooked, too, in weighing the forces of battle was the deplorable condition of the Spanish ships and material, and the indifferent training of her personnel. What a contrast, that Admiral Cervera's largest ship proceeded to war lacking her heaviest guns and that he was required to tow his destroyers across the Atlantic to make battle; yet the *Oregon* made a record voyage from Pacific to Atlantic (66 days—11.6 knots) ready for battle on arrival.

Isn't it great to sit around in such a pleasant atmosphere as this and reminisce—or to hold a bull session, if you prefer—over the events of our past in which we have played some small part? Yet, in so doing, we must be ever careful that we do not fall into the pitiful trap of becoming wedded to the past. For we are living in the present, not yesterday, and are preparing for a future of great mystery and excitement. In this preparation for the future, we must draw from the bank of knowledge and lessons of past history; for wise is he who can benefit from his own experiences and the mistakes of others without himself having to make these same costly errors at the risk of his business, his family, his life or his country.

The lesson which stands out so vividly from the Spanish-American conflict, as it so often does in such crises, is that of preparedness—in material—in training—and in the motivation of the will of the people of this great Nation to remain free. By all bets Spain was ultimately to win this war. Yet by cold statistics, how could she, considering the deplorable condition of her state of readiness? As opposed, American standards of readiness, energy and general efficiency were immeasurably greater as regards both material and personnel. As pertaining to the Navy, this was possible only because of the unconquerable spirit of its officers in the dark years of material degeneration after the Civil War, and because of some farsighted political leaders who had the wisdom to provide for the new Navy—a Navy of steam, not sail; and a Navy of armor and guns, not tinder and rifles. Today as never before this same farsightedness and boldness is required, as we must once again turn aside the outmoded tools of the past for a new Navy under missiles, rockets, and nuclear power.

Again we are faced with crises. Today, as in 1898, Cuba is once again under foreign domination. Throughout the past several months most of you have seen pictures and movies of angry mobs demonstrating against our country; pictures of American planes and pilots exhibited in the streets throughout several Communist countries; pictures of stage and street plays depicting the warmongering imperialistic American. You who have seen these pictures surely could not fail to observe a bitter hatred of the American—of you and me.

Fellow veterans, if we are to remain free and to help our friends to remain free—we must remain prepared. Just as many of you maintain sufficient force in your homes for protection of family and property (be it a gun or a bulldog); just as we must maintain and give our fullest support to our fine police forces to protect and make safe our streets, parks, cities and Nation for all decent people; so too must we maintain a ready and alert Military Establishment second to none. As a part of our great Military Establishment, your Navy still remains our first line of defense. It stands ever ready, wherever needed, whenever needed, capable of bringing to bear the number of forces required to do the task at hand—be it the show of the flag or the sting of a rocket. Your Navy can roam the globe without requiring permission from anyone and can show the flag from the Far East to the Mediterranean as no rocket or missile can do. As a Navy man, speaking for your Navy in particular, it must be strong, it must be ready, it must be "new." For, as stated by Gen. George Washington—whom I am sure you all hold in high esteem—"whatever efforts are made by land armies, the Navy must have the deciding vote."

Fellow veterans, this is our lesson of your day—as since proved over and over again—in the arena of strength and preparedness it does pay to keep up with the Joneses if we are to remain free. In the words of the late President Kennedy, "only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be used." If these weapons, then, never are used we will have made a fitting tribute of lasting peace to you gentlemen here today, to your friends and to mine, who have given so much that our country and all the world might be free.

Independent Banker Magazine Summarizes Federal Reserve Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the February issue of the Independent Banker, the voice of America's thousands of independent banks, carried a very clear and succinct summary of Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN's monetary reform bill now before the Banking and Currency Committee. This measure, H.R. 11, is intended to improve coordination in carrying out the Government's fiscal and economic policies. I am sure the summary of this proposal will be of value and interest to all Members:

REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN INTRODUCES OMNIBUS BILL

Between sessions of the Congress, the staff of the House Banking and Currency Committee digested the three thick volumes of 1964 testimony developed by its chairman relating to the Federal Reserve System. Reorganization and overhaul proposals introduced during the year were incorporated into a single comprehensive measure for reintroduction.

The bill is understandably a "Mother Hubbard" type proposal, seeking reform while wrestling with the independence of the Fed. Chairman PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, seeks action this year in contrast with the open forum he conducted in 1964.

The omnibus bill would reduce the Fed Board from seven to five members, reduce the Board terms from 14 to 5 years, and make the Chairman's term 4 years to match with that of the President. It would also abolish the Open Market Committee and transfer functions of the Board. A limitation that requires Fed Board members to represent special segments of the economy such as agriculture or finance would be removed. An annual Fed audit by the General Accounting Office would be required. The Fed would also be required to pay into Treasury 99½ percent of its income from U.S. securities and to go to Congress for operating expenses. The bill would provide for retirement of member-owned Fed stock. It would require the Fed to give up some of its historic independence by conforming more closely to the President's economic program, with congressional supervision.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my respects today to the people of Lithuania on this the 47th anniversary of the restoration of their independence in 1918.

Unfortunately, that independence has once again succumbed to the advance of Russian tyranny. Lithuania has not known freedom since the early days of World War II. But I am confident that Lithuania's day of freedom will come again. The unflagging determination of Lithuanian-Americans throughout this country to keep the plight of Lithuania before the eyes of the world convinces me that freedom and Lithuania can never long be strangers.

Let us all join with Lithuanian-Americans in today making our own recommitments to the cause of freedom everywhere.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it was 47 years ago today that the Lithanian people, who had lived for centuries under alien rule, proclaimed their independence and proceeded with the vigor that is characteristic of these people to improve and promote their social and economic welfare. Their efforts won the admiration of the free world and served as an example of what free men can do.

With great sorrow we recall that the independence of this nation did not endure for long. The invasion of Red army forces in 1940 brought unparalleled oppression, persecution, and tyranny and the forceful incorporation of the republic into the U.S.S.R.

The plight of the Lithuanian people—and, indeed, of all people who have been forcibly enslaved—should be of concern to all who cherish freedom. In commemorating this day of Lithuanian independence, we pay tribute to the courage of these people and their undying faith in eventual release. Their strength of character and their devotion to the high ideals of mankind will certainly prevail and will again bring them the freedom they so richly deserve.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Name Is Joe Foss—Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, America has had a tradition of applauding the "poor boy who made good." Horatio Alger wrote a library full of books on the subject. However, once in a while we find a young American who outdoes Alger, who makes a record for himself that is more dazzling than that of the imagined heroes of boyhood tales. Out in South Dakota we have such a man; and we are proud to share him with the Nation.

The former Governor of South Dakota, Joe Foss, is now the head of the young and growing American Football League. Throughout his life, he has made a phenomenal record for himself. He is respected by all who know him. His story is well summed up in an article written by Larry Felser, and published in the February issue of Columbia, the official magazine of the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. President, it is always a pleasure for me to comment favorably on Joe Foss, and I am delighted that I have an opportunity to ask unanimous consent to have this feature article reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NAME IS JOE FOSS—PERIOD

(By Larry Felser)

(Throughout his life the Commissioner of the American Football League has always done things in a straight-to-the-point, sock-in-the-jaw manner, whether shooting down fighter planes, coaxing a highway bill through the legislature or negotiating a $36 million television contract.)

Barron Hilton, son of the hotel magnate, and Bud Adams, the Texas oil baron were laughing loudly over a story told by Ralph C. Wilson, Jr., the Detroit insurance and car-hauling titan.

"OK, OK," rumbled the Lincolnesque man at the head of the conference table, "let's stop the lollygaggin' and get down to business."

Hilton, Adams, Wilson, and the rest of the American Football League's millionaire owners sobered abruptly, just like obedient high school sophomores.

When Joe Foss, the unlikely commissioner of America's fastest growing sports organization, says something, everyone gives him undivided attention.

Foss, the son of a South Dakota dirt farmer, does things in a straight-to-the-point, sock-in-the-jaw manner, whether it's zeroing in on a dangerous Cape Buffalo in Kenya, shooting down Japanese fighter planes over Guadalcanal, coaxing a highway bill through the South Dakota legislature or negotiating a $36 million television contract.

He uses the same style in dunning his Catholic friends to help subsidize a jungle mission run by one of his closest friends, Bishop Dan Stuyveberg.

"Joe Foss," says a National Football League executive, whose admiration is grudging, "is the best thing that ever happened to the other league."

In the high-powered world of pro football, Foss' AFL is near parity with the 42-year-old NFL in just five seasons. When it began, back in the fall of 1959, it had little more than a football, some strong financial backing, and the cigar-chomping Foss.

"I didn't know much about pro football when I started this thing," says Foss, whose background includes a Congressional Medal of Honor as one of America's outstanding air aces of World War II and two terms as Governor of Sonth Dakota, "but I worked at learning."

Sid Gillman, the imperious coach-general manager of the San Diego Chargers, will testify as to how much he learned. Gillman has furnished part of the commissioner's office with several fat fines he's paid as a result of clashes with Foss.

The league's owners will vouch for him, too. If they didn't know what Foss was made of before, they found out in 1962 when he voided a secret draft held by the league's owners without his knowledge. The draft was illegal, but the AFL had signed several top stars because of it.

Foss refused to recognize the early contracts and the players wound up in the NFL. Foss wound up with even more respect.

This untypical commissioner of a league they said couldn't get off the ground got his job in an unlikely way.

The AFL owners were holding a formation meeting in Los Angeles in 1959 and it was generally believed that Frank Leahy, the former Notre Dame coach, would get the commissioner's job.

However, the owners became disenchanted with Leahy and the job was still unfilled near the end of the meeting. During a recess, one of the club presidents met Foss in the lobby of the hotel. Joe was in Los Angeles on business for Raven Industries, a Minneapolis firm.

"I was asked if I would be interested in being the commissioner," remembers Foss. "I checked around and found that all the owners were solid citizens. But a lot of people told me the new league couldn't help but flop. That meant it was a big challenge and I'm a sucker for a challenge.

He took the job for $40,000 per year, plus expenses. His bosses must be satisfied with their "no man" commissioner. His new contract runs through 1966 at pay of $55,000 a year.

Joe found a filing case full of projects confronting him when he opened his first AFL office in Dallas. The most important one was selling the league to the public.

"There were weeks when I felt like I was giving a speech every 15 minutes on a different street corner," laughs Foss. "I made about 300 appearances that first season. It was a lot of like campaigning for office."

Foss' routine went something like this: A Monday night appearance in Duluth, Minn.; Tuesday noon luncheon in Des Moines, and Tuesday night in Gainesville, Fla.

It helps a lot that the former Marine Corps hero flies his own plane. He has for years. Sometimes the program chairman is driven to panic when the dinner is about to start and the principal speaker, Foss, isn't there. But somehow he makes it.

"Never worry about old dad," says Joe, reassuringly. "In 12 years I haven't missed 3 meetings."

As an Air Force National Guard general, and a football commissioner, Foss logs 200,000 air miles annually.

Neither the flying nor the speeches make him uneasy.

"I got over my fear of speaking before crowds a long time ago," he explains.

"The Government brought me back to the States from the South Pacific in 1943 to go on a tour to help sell war bonds.

"My first appearance was in New York City in front of city hall. I was pacing up and down in back of the platform while the late Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia spoke. When he finished he introduced me: 'Now I give you the only man who survived a head-on crash with a Japanese airplane,' he said. He'd forgotten my name.

" 'I don't know who the hell the mayor is talking about,' I said, 'but my name is Joe Foss.' "

The huge crowd knew his name and knew he hadn't been in any collision, as such. They also knew he shot down 26 assorted enemy aircraft, had been knocked from the skies 4 times, and had been awarded the Nation's highest award, the Congressional Medal of Honor. They roared their appreciation and Foss hasn't been ill at ease in front of people since.

"It's not what he says so much, but the way he says it," is the way a Kansas City newspaperman describes Foss' speaking style.

His conversational style has the same honest, disarming flavor.

A few years ago, a staff writer from one of the top news magazines was interviewing him. The questioning was obviously unfriendly, with an aim to ridiculing the young league. Foss asked him why the story had to be unfavorable.

"I'm in sympathy with you myself," said the reporter, "but my boss is strongly anti-AFL and he wants it this way."

"Well let's call up the big cheese and see if we can talk to him," suggested Foss.

The senior editor was astounded at getting a call from an intended victim. Foss talked to him evenly, discussed some controversial points reasonably and politely. The result was that the subsequent story, while not exactly friendly, was balanced and fair.

That's the way Joe Foss does business. He uses one guide: what is honest and fair.

Late in the 1964 season, a star tackle was suspended by Vancouver of the Canadian League. The player believed that he was a free agent as a result of the suspension and signed a contract with San Diego of the AFL.

However, Vancouver had worked a deal with Dallas of the National League, sending the player to the Cowboys for a player to be named later.

The Chargers claimed he was their property, but Foss overruled his own team and and voided the player's AFL contract. The result was that a team in Foss' league lost an outstanding performer, but Joe did what he considered the right thing.

Foss acquired his set of standards early in life.

"My dad was work trained," he recalls. "He always told me the most important thing in life was givin' it a try. I remembered that all through life. One time I fought in a college boxing tournament against a guy named Mel Anderson, of Huron College.

"Old Mel knocked me down 11 times in 3 rounds. But I always paid attention to what my dad told me and kept gettin' up and trying. Maybe it was crazy, but I did it."

His father was electrocuted in a freak highway accident when Joe was 18.

Getting to college under those circumstances is no cinch. Joe enrolled in Augustana College, in Sioux Falls, right after graduation from high school. He got through freshman year and quit.

"I found the farm needed me more than I needed college," he says.

But, after a year on the farm, Foss returned to college, this time on a football scholarship at Sioux Falls College. In 1937, he transferred to the University of South Dakota, where football was played in a faster league.

"I spent most of our games holding hands with the coach," he laughs.

In 1939, he graduated with a business degree, returned home and married his high school sweetheart, June Shakstead, and started a family.

With war approaching, Foss felt sure he would be drafted, family or not. He decided to enlist in the Marine Corps. At the age of 22, he had soloed a 40-horsepower Taylorcraft, so he had experience with planes. It helped him get into flight training and subsequently to Florida as an instructor pilot.

Foss had a low threshold of boredom then, and he felt teaching was not for him. So he badgered his commanding officer into giving his an assignment as executive officer of a fighter squadron.

That was August of 1942, and he was a first lieutenant. Two months later, he was at Henderson Field on Guadalcanal.

Foss won fame with the Grumman Wildcat fighter.

"Those babies get a lot of laughs in the old newsreels they show these days," he says, "but they were a hot crate then. They got you there and got you back."

In less than 4 months, Foss equaled the record of World War I ace Eddie Rickenbacker by shooting down 26 enemy planes.

Knocked out of the sky near the British Solomon Islands, Foss was pulled out of a lagoon by a Catholic priest named Father Dan Stuyveberg.

"I was all twisted up in my Mae West," tells Foss. "I can't swim, anyway. The natives on the nearest island ran to Father Dan's mission and told him 'a birdman has gone into the sea.'

"Father Dan, who is a big Dutchman, yanked me out."

Foss and the priest, who was consecrated a bishop several years ago, have remained good friends. The commissioner sends him frequent contributions to help his island missions.

"The last time I saw the bishop was 2 years ago," says Foss, "when he was on his way to the Ecumenical Council."

After the war, Foss entered politics and won two terms to the South Dakota House of Representatives. In private life he established a small but successful flying service in Sioux Falls.

He made a try for the Governor's office in 1950. He lost, but gave it another try in 1954 and won. He served two terms.

Despite his parade of success and honor, Foss never has lost sight of the fact that tragedy always has played a large part in his life. He lost his flying service after a fire and later a flood. His first son was born dead. Another died shortly after birth. His son, Frank, now an eighth-grader, survived polio. His teenage daughter, Cheryl, has cerebral palsy.

So his two terms as national president of the Easter Seal campaign in 1960 and 1961 were not ceremonial.

Neither is his title as AFL commissioner.

He won added respect from the business world last spring when he negotiated a 5-year, $36 million television contract with the National Broadcasting Co.

In a deal of that size, each side usually comes armed with agents, attorneys, and an entourage of executives.

NBC operated along those lines, but for the AFL it was Joe Foss. Period.

As Foss sees it, the only thing left for the AFL is an amicable settlement of its war with the National League.

"Until that comes, pro football rightfully will remain second to baseball as the national pastime," he says.

And if the two leagues ever merged under one commissioner, who would it be—Foss or Pete Rozelle of the NFL?

"I'd step aside," says Foss, simply. And typically.

Here Gather Those Who Tomorrow Will Shape a New Community Among Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to insert an article from the John Hopkins magazine about the university's unique and successful experience with an institute of advanced education open to an international student body.

Ten years ago Johns Hopkins University began this unique experiment in international education by opening the Bologna Center as a branch of its school of advanced international studies. The Bologna Center is a graduate training center for some of the best of the new generation of American and European civil servants, with a faculty drawn from many nations.

As a former professor at Johns Hopkins University I take pride in joining in the celebration of this successful venture. Graduates of the Bologna Center are serving with distinction in various government positions in all the governments of the free world. I am delighted to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a short summary of the history of this promising venture of joint activity between a great university of the old world, and an American school of distinction, the Johns Hopkins University:

HERE GATHER THOSE WHO TOMORROW WILL SHAPE A NEW COMMUNITY AMONG NATIONS

In February 1955, with 4 professors, 10 students, and borrowed rooms, an American experiment in education was launched in Bologna, Italy. It was an auspicious beginning, for the experiment has blossomed into a thriving graduate institution. This year, the Johns Hopkins Bologna Center will celebrate its 10th anniversary in its own handsome building. There, currently, 82 carefully selected young men and women from 14 countries study in an international atmosphere under a distinguished faculty.

The Bologna center is a branch of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, D.C. It originated as a logical extension of the reasoning which led to the earlier establishment of SAIS—the need for more highly qualified personnel in the field of foreign affairs. Both institutions grew in importance in the post-World War II period when the consolidation of new power blocs such as Western Europe, and the exigencies of the cold war and the nuclear age, demanded many more people trained in international economics, diplomacy, and the culture and history of various nations.

The center shares the aim of its parent institution: to prepare the best available candidates for careers in internationally oriented areas of government, business, teaching, and research. Like SAIS, it provides general training in international affairs, specialization in particular areas defined by geography or subject matter, and appropriate language courses. The standards at both schools are the same, and the programs are linked so that students may combine a year of study at the center with a year in Washington to receive the M.A. degree. Most Americans in Bologna are working for degrees after having spent a year at SAIS. A few Europeans, for whom there are a limited number of fellowships available, go on to Washington to continue their studies after their first year at the center. Occasionally students may reverse the sequence, Americans coming first to Bologna, Europeans going directly to SAIS.

The center's program is divided into two parts. The international studies program of law, history, labor relations, and economics is geared to both Americans and Europeans. The program of American studies is primarily for European students, and offers courses in such areas as American political philosophy, Federal system of government, economics, and diplomatic and cultural history.

The 15 regular faculty members of the Bologna center (five of them from the United States), are men of practical experience as well as academic distinction. They share a dedication to their work, exemplified by the European professor, living in Paris, who for 8 years made the round trip of more than a thousand miles between the two cities to deliver his weekly lectures. They are attracted by the opportunity to associate closely with foreign colleagues, and to teach—at the only American graduate institution on European soil—an especially able group of students.

Slightly more than a third of the center's students are from the United States: the rest come mainly from six Common Market countries, England, and Austria. They have considerable linguistic skills, including a good command of English, and come academically well prepared, especially the Europeans, many of whom have the equivalent of master's or doctor's degrees in law. They are alert, enthusiastic, and tend to be gregarious, as befits people who will spend a good part of their future careers in policy discussions and at the conference table.

In its first 10 years, the center has produced almost 500 alumni, many of them engaged in work involving the supranational organizations such as the Common Market and the Coal and Steel Community. A fifth of the graduates are in their country's foreign service, 22 in Italy alone. Throughout Europe, a year's shared experience at the center serves as a bond among them. They meet during the course of business, and in Vienna, Rome, Paris, and Brussels, in formally organized alumni chapters, which are something of an innovation in Europe.

The center's great contribution lies in its providing, for the European students, a radically novel academic atmosphere, and for the

Americans, the chance to gain an intimate, on-the-spot, knowledge of Europe. It is the opinion of one of the most important American diplomats on the Continent that in another 10 years, the Johns Hopkins Bologna Center will have a greater influence in shaping European affairs than any other educational institution.

The Nonpartisan League Lives On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, 50 years ago, a political prairie fire swept a new breed of agrarian politicians into public office in North Dakota. These men were members of the Nonpartisan League. This movement played a dominant role in the political life of the State for the next half century. It merged with the Democrats in 1956, to become the Democratic-NPL Party; but its progressive spirit still persists. Many of us remember with nostalgia that colorful period in our history.

In the North Dakota Legislature, on February 5, Representative Reuel Harrison moved, under the eighth order of business, that the remarks of Representative James Jungroth be printed in the State's House Journal. This contained an article in the Minot Daily News, written by Dick Dobson, and giving the history of the Nonpartisan League. I ask unanimous consent that this portion of the House Journal be included at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of the House, 39th legislative assembly, Feb. 5, 1965]

THIRTY-FIRST DAY AFTER RECESS AND THIRTY-SECOND DAY

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Representative Harrison moved that the remarks of Representative Jungroth be printed in the House Journal, which motion prevailed.

Representative JUNGROTH. Fifty years ago this month, a political movement which grew into national proportions was born in the State of North Dakota.

The political history of the United States will record a deserving place for the part played by people of North Dakota in the founding of the Nonpartisan League back in the year 1915. North Dakotans can be proud of the fact that from the Nonpartisan League of 1915 and 1916 there sprang two great political parties of the Midwest—the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota and the Progressive Party in Wisconsin.

As the 50th anniversary of the birth of the NPL is taking place this year, it is fitting that the origin of the league was brought to public attention in a recent Minot Daily News article. Writing in the February 1 Daily News, Columnist Dick Dobson had this to say on the founding of the Nonpartisan League:

"LEAGUE LAUNCHED HALF-CENTURY AGO

"(By Dick Dobson)

"Fifty years ago this month, the Nonpartisan League, last of the historic and colorful agrarian protest movements, was born in North Dakota.

"The NPL arose from the same discontent that produced the old Grange, the Greenback Party, the Farmers Alliance, the Populist Party and the other political action organizations which swept the Midwest in the late 19th century.

"Always a fertile ground for agricultural agitation, North Dakota first rebelled in 1892 by going for the Populist presidential candidate, Gen. James B. Weaver.

"As the old movements rose and fell, the embers of agrarian progressivism continued glowing in North Dakota until they burst into a full-scale political prairie fire in 1915.

"Those flames, which spread into 13 States before they were extinguished, sprang up when North Dakota's 1915 Legislature declined to approve construction of a State-owned terminal elevator.

"They were fanned by a State representative named Treadwell Twichell, who purportedly told a large delegation of farmers lobbying for the bill to 'go home and slop the hogs.'

"Whether by design or chance, Arthur C. Townley, a onetime Socialist organizer and a bankrupt flax farmer, chose this propitious moment to launch the Nonpartisan League.

"Townley had mulled over the idea of nonpartisan political action through control of the primary elections for some time, but it apparently was an associate of his, A. E. Bowen, who first advocated the plan.

"Townley, then residing in Minot, drove the short distance to Deering in late February 1915 to sell Fred B. Wood, a prominent leader in the Equity Co-operative Exchange, on the idea.

"In his book on the NPL, Robert L. Morlan said Townley got 'a not too enthusiastic greeting' upon arrival at the Wood farm. He continued:

" 'Mr. Wood and his two grown sons, Howardard and Edwin, had heard many schemes of how to save the farmer, but their interest mounted as they listened to this intense young man who eagerly explained his plans until far into the night.

" 'F. B. Wood thought the whole proposition fantastic and unworkable, but Townley kept after him for 3 or 4 days, when at last youth, if not age, was won over.

" 'Late one evening, Howard Wood and Townley scribbled a brief platform on a scrap of paper by the light of a kerosene lamp in the kitchen of the Wood farm, and early the next morning they started out in a bobsled to talk to neighbors, Howard handling the introductions and Townley giving the sales talk.'

"The story of the NPL in its heyday from 1916, when it won control of State government, until 1921, when the Governor and other key officeholders were recalled, is well known.

"One monographer credited it with bringing a 'new deal' to North Dakota when Franklin D. Roosevelt was only an obscure official in the U.S. Navy Department.

"At its peak, the NPL had 200,000 dues-paying members. It evolved into the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota and joined with the Progressive Party in Wisconsin.

"After crumbling as a national organization, the NPL still continued with occasional success in North Dakota. For 25 years, it was a personal vehicle of the late William Langer.

"In 1956, the league broke its nominal Republican moorings and merged with the Democratic Party, a union which has produced new election triumphs.

"Although the NPL is little more than a paper organization today, having been fully absorbed into Democratic machinery, it will live on, in name if not in fact.

"The Nonpartisan League after 50 years is as native to the North Dakota political landscape as smoke-filled rooms and bombastic campaign oratory."

Lithuanian Independence—The Struggle for Freedom Lives On

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to join my distinguished colleagues yesterday in calling attention to the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Few nations of the world have been forced to live longer under the heels of tyrants than Lithuania. For more than a century, her people were suppressed by the czars of Russia.

When Lithuania was finally freed on February 16, 1918, her people proved that they could achieve far more in the way of human progress in a short space of time than any comparable small nation the world has known.

Even in the tragically brief span of 22 years, the Lithuanian people were able to establish a growing economy, build a sound education system, and provide hitherto unknown opportunities for themselves and their neighbors.

Lithuania set an example for the free world. But when the Soviet Union sent its forces into the country in 1940, under the guise of protecting it from Nazi Germany, the struggle for a genuinely democratic society was brought to an end.

The Soviet Union asked the world to believe, then, that its occupation was only temporary. That, as the world has seen, was a lie.

Today, as it has for the past quarter of a century, Lithuania lives with the yoke of an alien government about her neck. Her people, whose spirit had flourished in freedom, have proved time and time again that their thirst for liberty is undiminished.

The United States has very prudently withheld recognition of the Soviet takeover of Lithuania. This country and all its people join free men everywhere in the fervent prayer that one day liberty will be restored to the proud land of Lithuania.

I consider it a high honor to join with my distinguished colleague and fellow Pennsylvanian, Congressman FLOOD, in paying tribute to this tragically suppressed small nation and its people.

Here in America we have been fortunate in having many Lithuanians as naturalized citizens. They have come here, not merely to escape tyranny and dictatorship, but to contribute their own

vitality and spirit and skills to the building of this great Nation.

I am proud of the contributions Americans of Lithuanian ancestry have made to my own district and I join with them in commemorating the independence of the land their fathers once called their own.

The Error of Attempting To "Write Off" Entire Voting Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a speech delivered by Representative ROGERS C. B. MORTON, of Maryland, at the Monmouth County Lincoln Day dinner at Sea Girt, N.J. Representative MORTON offered some wise counsel to our party.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REPRESENTATIVE MORTON'S REMARKS

The Republican Party can rise again from defeat and disunity and forge a Republican Party victory in 1966.

But to do this, we must understand what happened to our party in 1964. As the great philosopher, George Santayana, said, "Those who do not understand the past are condemned to repeat it." And we can all be sure that our Democratic friends understand this and will attempt to tie the albatross of 1964 to our candidates next year.

By all odds, 1964 should have been a banner year for Republicans. In the Senate there were 9 Republican seats at stake and 26 Democratic seats to be challenged. What happened? We lost three of our own and picked up only one from the Democrats.

In the gubernatorial races we had similar odds, but couldn't take advantage of them. And in those eight States where Republicans won, all ran substantially ahead of their standard bearer—one by more than 42 percent of the votes cast.

In the House of Representatives, where we were told by some national leaders that Republicans would make a killing regardless of the fate of the top of the ticket, we lost 41 seats.

Take Iowa for example. Since time, or modern political time anyway, began we held all the Iowa seats in the House. This year we hold one, and the Democrats occupy five.

In the 50 State legislatures, the very fount of Republican power in the past, we lost more than 500 seats and are now, overall, a minority party even in many areas once considered private Republican property.

What happened? Easy answers, but not necessarily inaccurate answers, are legion. Let's examine just a few:

The Republican presidential candidate was one of six GOP Members of the Senate to vote against the civil rights bill. Some 6 million Negroes voted last fall, and approximately 90 percent cast their ballots for the Democratic nominee. There is little doubt that the Negro attitude toward the Republican national ticket had an adverse effect on the failure to elect such a distinguished candidate as Ohio's Robert A. Taft, Jr.

Certainly Negro support of President Johnson was decisive in his carrying Florida, North Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee—all States where republicanism had begun to build a solid foundation in the last decade.

In 1964 we ignored the increasing Negro vote—and increasing it must be—but such an omission is not only cynically shortsighted, it is a refutation of the very traditions upon which our party was founded.

There were other sectors of the voting public which were ignored by Republican Party strategists last year, with the comment, "Let's write them off." The rank and file of organized labor, eggheads, esthetes, and intellectuals, the press—these and other important and influential groups got the writeoff treatment from Republican leadership—and write off was exactly what they did to our candidates in voting booths across the Nation.

The fallacy of the writeoff psychology is obvious. Let's look for a moment at that vital, influence-making sector called the fourth estate. Too often, in 1964, the attitude in high Republican circles was "What can we do—they smear our candidates and distort their views—nuts with news conferences—we'll package our remarks and buy the time on TV."

Year in and year out, Republicans have fared well with the press corps.

Negativism, in dealing with people, in dealing with groups, in playing out the role of responsible opposition—negativism has no place in the philosophy of the Republican Party, if we are once again to lead our country to new levels of individual accomplishment at home, and new security against the forces of totalitarianism abroad.

The American people demand, and we must offer them, positive programs to deal with the complex and changing world in which we live.

Soviet Anti-Semitism Must Not Be Tolerated—The United States Must Not Remain Silent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I will not be silent in the face of continuing and increased Soviet persecution of the Jews. Our Nation must not remain silent regarding this oppression. The circumstances impel me to again ask the support of my colleagues in seeking an end to Soviet anti-Semitism. Effective U. S. action is needed. I have acted. I now ask the action of my colleagues and the administration.

On January 28, I introduced two concurrent resolutions designed to increase the force of world public opinion against Soviet persecution of the Jews. One of the measures, House Concurrent Resolution 144, expresses congressional condemnation of discrimination based upon religion. It calls upon the President to urge the U.S.S.R. to stop executing persons for alleged "economic offenses" and to fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within the U.S.S.R.

A second measure, House Concurrent Resolution 143, expresses congressional support of U.S. efforts in the United Nations to secure universal condemnation and prohibition of anti-Semitism as an international offense.

The Congress should speak out forcefully in this grave matter. Oppression must not be ignored. By failing to act, we neglect our duty to mankind. I urge that the American people send the Russians a "bill of rights" as a formal appeal to restore Jewish religious and cultural rights in the U.S.S.R. The Schweiker resolutions would pave the way for such action. I suggest that the American people formally present the new bill of rights to the Russians through the United Nations or that President Johnson convey it directly to the Soviet Government.

When America speaks, the world listens, for the world knows that America speaks not only from strength but from her heart as well. If we effectively communicate our refusal to accept this oppression, the barriers will begin to fall. I suggest these items in the bill of rights:

Freedom of prayer: Allowing free functioning of synagogues and central institutions to serve the religious needs of Soviet Jewry.

Freedom of education: Allowing Jewish education in all forms, including the training of rabbis.

Freedom of religious ceremonies and rituals: Providing for removal of obstacles to the performance of sacred rights such as religious burial and circumcision.

Freedom to publish: Including Hebrew Bibles, prayer books, and religious texts.

Freedom to produce religious articles: Including such items as prayer shawls, phylacteries, and mezuzoth.

Freedom of artistic development: Allowing Jewish artists in the theater, music, and literature to develop Jewish culture in the Yiddish and Hebrew languages.

Freedom to travel: Permitting Jews to leave the Soviet Union so they may be united with their families in other countries.

Freedom from discrimination: Eliminating the anti-Jewish character that so strongly colors the official government campaign against "economic crimes." We take these freedoms for granted in our land but they do not exist for the Jewish people in Russia today.

Previously the United States has spoken out against anti-Semitism in other countries. Our Government has not taken sufficient action recently to protest increasing Soviet discrimination against the Jews. Now again it is time to act. For silence in the face of oppression—the sin of silence—only inspires increased oppression. The only reaction by our Government during the past 6 months has been silence.

If we commit this sin of silence by sitting and accepting the good life in our own country, rationalizing that the situation in Russia is too far away to be our concern, then the policy of oppression will continue. It will not change

without pressure, but well articulated public opinion can be vital. Public opinion can change things. In this year of diversity and challenge within our borders, we must still remind those who live outside that we are continually concerned about their oppression. We must present this appeal of conscience to the world for their consideration.

Despite Soviet assertions of religious freedom, and even though anti-Semitism is listed as a crime in the U.S.S.R., unjustifiable discrimination has been sustained and increased. News reports tell us that there continues to be ample and grim evidence that the Soviet Government is quietly singling out Jews as a group for discriminating restriction and unjustified punishment.

Synagogue buildings and seminaries have been padlocked; Jewish cemeteries have been arbitrarily shut down; ritual supplies needed for religious worship cannot be obtained; no Hebrew Bibles or calendars are printed; prayer books are irreplaceable; means for training rabbis and community workers are inadequate or nonexistent; unlike other religious groups Jews are not permitted to establish national organizations.

As a concerned people, Americans are obliged to speak out when others are oppressed. We do not and will not turn our backs on oppression, whether it exists within our own Nation or in other nations abroad. Oppression must not be ignored; it must not be dismissed as internal affairs not properly of our concern. For by failing to speak we neglect our duty to mankind. No policy is more firmly fixed in the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs than this moral imperative to come to the aid of oppressed peoples.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to pressing for action upon the resolutions which I have introduced, I have asked Secretary of State Dean Rusk for meaningful action by the administration in this pressing matter. On December 26 I wrote Secretary Rusk asking that the United States formally request an investigation of Soviet anti-Semitism by the United Nations Subcommittee on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities. In addition, I suggested that President Johnson publicly express the American concern with discriminatory treatment of Jews in Russia in his state of the Union address. Unfortunately our President apparently did not deem this matter sufficiently important for inclusion in his address. I deeply regret his omission of attention to this grave problem.

I am inserting a copy of my letter to Secretary Rusk in order that my colleagues may be fully aware of these proposals for action:

DECEMBER 26, 1964.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am very much distressed by the situation of persecution and deprivation now confronting the Jewish community of Russia.

The people of my district, whether they are of the Jewish faith or of other religions, continue to express their resentment toward this situation.

To my knowledge, there are about three million Jews in the U.S.S.R. They constitute the second largest Jewish community in the world. Although they are recognized as a nationality, they are not given the same rights accorded other recognized nationalities in the Soviet Union.

Despite Soviet assertions of religious freedom, and even though anti-Semitism is listed as a crime in the U.S.S.R., unjustifiable discrimination has been sustained and, apparently, increased. Communists try repeatedly to convince mankind of this doctrine's liberalism in terms of respect for the rights of man. Yet this is the one issue that they defy with the greatest of cynicism.

To Americans, this problem presents one of the most meaningful, and most sympathetically compelling, issues with the Communists; namely, the issue of freedom to practice one's religion and the issue of persecution on the grounds of faith.

News reports tell us that despite Soviet claims of religious freedom, there continues to be ample and grim evidence that the Soviet Government is quietly singling out Jews as a group for discrminating restriction and unjustified punishment. Senator JAVITS has pointed out that Jews and the Jewish religion suffer greater limitations and prohibitions at the hands of the Kremlin than any other religious group in the Soviet Union. Synagogue buildings and seminaries have been padlocked; Jewish cemeteries have been arbitrarily shut down; ritual supplies needed for religious worship cannot be obtained. No Hebrew Bibles or calendars are printed; prayer books are irreplaceable. Means for training rabbis and community workers are inadequate or nonexistent; unlike other religious groups, Jews are not permitted to establish national organizations; Jewish cultural life has been stifled and the once flourishing Yiddish language literature in books, theater, periodicals and newspapers has virtually been wiped out.

As a concerned people, Americans are obliged to speak out when others are oppressed. We do not and will not turn our backs on oppression, whether it exists within our own Nation or in other nations abroad. Since 1840 the United States has protested the persecution of oppressed minorities by foreign governments. Oppression must not be ignored; it must not be dismissed as internal affairs not properly of our concern. For by failing to speak we neglect our duty to mankind.

We have lodged protests and registered our disapproval in a variety of ways. These include direct communication to the governments concerned, recalling U.S. diplomatic representatives for consultation, direct references in the President's annual message to the Congress, termination of a commercial treaty, and the use of indirect action such as joining in multilateral acts of disapproval.

The list of such protests on behalf of Jews is long and honorable. In 1840 the United States condemned the persecution of Jews in Damascus.

In 1870 we urged the Ottoman Government to halt the killing of Jews in Rumania.

In 1877 the United States provided protection to Russian Jews settled in or near Jerusalem, and emphasized that "the sympathy of the United States for all oppressed peoples in foreign countries has been freely manifested in all cases where it could be done in accordance with the spirit of international courtesy and diplomatic usage."

In the next two decades the United States protested no fewer than nine times against the czarist Russian Government's repressive acts and persecution of Jews. These protests, backed by the American people and by resolutions of the Congress culminated in 1911 when President Taft terminated the Treaty of Commerce with Russia which had been in effect since 1832.

The United States has protested discriminatory action against Jews by Rumania, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Italy, and Poland. The record of U.S. protests to the Nazi government should still be fresh in our minds.

No policy is more firmly fixed in the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs than this moral imperative to come to the aid of oppressed peoples.

Mr. Secretary, I bring these matters to your attention at this time because silence in the face of oppression only inspires increased oppression. The only reaction during the past 6 months has apparently been silenced. This might be justified on the grounds that a major political election absorbed our attention for a short period. But that election is over, and it is time to confront once again the major questions of our time.

Constructive and articulate action is available. I would like to suggest for your consideration two steps which seem to me both reasonable and appropriate.

The first step may seem symbolic but it could have a profound and significant effect both here at home and throughout the free world.

In a few weeks, President Johnson will make his state of the Union address to the Congress. In his remarks on foreign policy, I would humbly suggest that the President seriously consider expressing himself on the specific question of the treatment of Jews in Russia.

I believe that honest comment on this question will receive abundant support from the American people.

As a followup to the President's remarks, I would request that the appropriate steps be taken so that this specific question be referred for review to the United Nations Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities. I am pleased to note that a subcommission has been specifically created to deal with questions of this nature.

Mr. Morris Abram, the American representative to this subcommission, has recently been to Russia and has firsthand knowledge of the situation. I believe he would ably articulate the U.S. attitude on such matters.

Would you kindly inform me as to your reaction to these suggestions and whether or not you would consider them appropriate at this time. Also, what alternative steps are presently under consideration by the State Department, what is being done to bring to this problem the attention and renewed concern which it needs?

Sincerely,

RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House act promptly upon measures such as the Schweiker resolutions. I deem it imperative that the people of the United States turn their attention and their action toward elimination of Soviet anti-Semitism. A number of my colleagues are similarly concerned.

The Burial of Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Grand Route to a Simple Grave." The article was written by

Jeanne Bellamy, an outstanding editorial writer, and was published on January 29 in the Miami Herald.

This article deals with the solemn ceremony to remind Britons of their glorious past, and yet the simplicity of the final act—the burial of Winston Churchill with his parents, in a simple resting place in a country churchyard in the village of Bladon, England.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRAND ROUTE TO A SIMPLE GRAVE: SIR WINSTON'S CHOICE

(By Jeanne Bellamy)

England gains a new place of pilgrimage tomorrow—the grave of Sir Winston Churchill.

Not for him the domed grandeur of St. Paul's Cathedral or the gothic arches of Westminster Abbey. Instead, he chose to have his body buried with his parents in a country churchyard. His only roof will be the English sky.

The spot is almost unknown now. It is St. Martin's Church in the village of Bladon, built against the wall surrounding the grounds of Blenheim Palace, where Sir Winston was born. Bladon is 70 miles northwest of London.

All tomorrow's mournful pomp leads to that simple, resting place.

But Sir Winston did not cheat his countrymen of the solemn ceremony they love. Last rites for him, in line with his wishes, seem intended to remind Britons of their glorious past.

His body has lain in state in Westminster Hall, built by the son of William the Conqueror nearly 900 years ago. For 600 years, the hall was the chief court of English law. Among others, King Charles I was condemned there in 1649.

The hall adjoins the House of Commons, center of Sir Winston's public life for 62 years.

Nearby is Westminster Abbey, dating back 1,200 years. A score of monarchs, including the great Elizabeth, are buried in the abbey. It also holds the tombs or monuments of famous Englishmen from actors and antiquarians to musicians, painters, poets, scientists, and statesmen. Among the last are Prime Ministers Benjamin Disraeli and William Ewart Gladstone, the last Briton to receive a state funeral 67 years ago.

Queen Elizabeth II and other heads of state will attend the services in St. Paul's Cathedral.

A Christian church stood on the site of St. Paul's as long ago as the year 604. The great fire of 1666 razed the structure then standing. The present church was completed in 1710 by Sir Christopher Wren. His tomb, in the crypt, carries the Latin inscription "Si monumentum requiris, circumspice." ("If you seek his monument, look around you.")

The tombs of Lord Nelson, victor of Trafalgar, and the Duke of Wellington, who conquered Napoleon at Waterloo, are the most conspicuous of many in St. Paul's.

Its high altar was damaged badly by a bomb in World War II. The new altar is a memorial to the fighting men of the British Commonwealth killed in that conflict. Behind the altar is the American Memorial Chapel, built with donations from Britons to honor members of the U.S. Armed Forces who fell while based in England.

Britons will line the streets of London to watch Sir Winston's casket pass by on a naval gun carriage drawn by seamen, to the music of 10 bands. More will line the Thames to see the funeral barge float toward Waterloo Station. Thence the body will go by train to Bladon for private graveside services.

Henceforth, no doubt, endless streams of pilgrims from every corner of the world will make their way to Bladon. Their feet will thread past the large stone cross marking the graves of Lord Randolph Churchill and Jennie Jerome of New York, Sir Winston's parents. They will pause reverently at the burial place of the great statesman-author-orator.

In the distance, visitors will see the towered and turreted bulk of Blenheim Palace, England's largest house. It was a gift of the nation to one of Sir Winston's ancestors, the Duke of Marlborough, who defeated the French and Bavarians, killing 40,000 at Blenheim in Germany in 1704.

The pilgrims will have much to ponder. Like other English-speaking people, Sir Winston had a goodly heritage, and he ennobled it.

Tourist Tax Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have been alarmed by persistent reports, some possibly leaked by the administration, that Congress may receive an administration request to impose a $100 tax on persons leaving this country. Freedom of movement by people is not a commodity to be taxed like textiles or coffee. For this would not be a levy on money spent abroad; it would be a steeply regressive restriction on travel itself.

We do have a serious balance-of-payments problem, but there are less counterproductive ways of handling it than this.

Mr. Speaker, I think all my colleagues will find the editorial in the current issue of the Travel Agent magazine relevant, and with consent I include it in the RECORD at this point:

LET'S KEEP TRAVEL FREE

(By Eric Friedheim)

Though proposals to tax tourists dismay the travel industry, there are hopeful signs that an enlightened Congress will reject such grave invasion of American freedom.

The right of U.S. citizens to travel freely has been abridged only in time of war when national security necessarily takes priority over nonessential movements. Never in peacetime, however, has the Federal Government attempted to frustrate what is an inherent privilege of a free people.

America's gold outflow, induced by an adverse payments balance, has created a serious emergency which must be overcome. But imposition of an excessive tax on international travel, aside from repugnant discriminatory aspects, is only a short-term palliative; actually if this Nation's outbound tourist traffic is curbed, the balance-of-payments problem will be aggravated even further as purchasing power of foreign buyers is reduced. The impact of keeping Americans at home soon will be felt in many areas, notably the seaports and the scores of cities in every part of the country that now serve as points of entry and departure for international passenger aircraft.

Foreign carriers—ship and air—are spending hundreds of millions of dollars in the United States every year, creating thousands of jobs and markets for American products. Some individual figures are illuminating:

Air France, with more than 30 offices in the United States, is deeply involved in our economy and spends about $25 million every year in this country for salaries, provisions, engines and spare parts, landing fees, telecommunications, advertising, and other items.

Lufthansa's annual American tab is about $12 million while Cunard spends $25 million a year.

Alitalia estimates that over the past 10 years its own payments balance in the U.S. market is in deficit. The Italian carrier has spent $155 million here and took out only $133 million. Even the national carriers of countries suffering from exchange shortages leave big chunks of money here and generate business for Americans. Air-India, a relative newcomer in the North Atlantic, already has boosted its annual spending in the United States to $9 million a year, not counting purchase of American airplanes.

Admittedly, international travel is an import—in effect, something one buys just like coffee or any foreign product. To place a prohibitive tax of $50 to $100 on every trip erects a tariff wall that would have worldwide repercussions and retaliation.

While the more affluent would not be deterred from going abroad, a tax of this magnitude would deny travel privileges from many Americans including students and teachers. Family travel would be discouraged because of the added expense.

An almost immediate byproduct would be a worldwide increase in fares and cargo tariffs to make up for reduced passenger earnings. Since a number of U.S. trunk carriers also depend on international route revenue, the domestic fares also are likely to rise.

A high tax on travel seems a simple solution to the balance-of-payments problem. But this cure is worse than the disease, fraught with serious economic consequences. The United States would be better advised to follow the example of those countries which have helped eliminate their payments imbalance by promoting inbound tourism.

A tax of $50 to $100 would have these additional adverse results:

Business travel abroad would be curbed—the United States would have fewer salesmen abroad selling American goods.

Loss of revenues from tourism would virtually wipe out the economy of many countries, particularly small nations such as those in the Caribbean. The United States would have to substitute direct aid or face the possibility of some of these nations moving into the Communist camp.

Furthermore, the loss in air transport would come principally out of the pockets of American-flag carriers who transport nearly 50 percent of all persons flying in either direction across the Atlantic. Travel agents, tour producers and other segments of the American travel industry would be seriously afflicted.

Almost always a positive approach to a problem is superior to a negative approach and this is no exception.

The positive approach for the United States is to:

Accelerate the Visit United States of America program with an all-out promotion program.

Provide tax incentives to encourage American businessmen to develop markets abroad, supplied from the United States.

Provide duty-free shopping facilities in the United States at ports of arrival where U.S. travelers returning from abroad can make purchases they would normally make overseas.

The travel industry is confident that Members of the House and Senate will not assent to proposals which not only will be ruinous to a multibillion-dollar industry but which really offer no solution at all.

Hucksters of Pornography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on February 6 the Wabash, Ind., Plain Dealer published an editorial under the title "Harass the Smut Peddlers." In it are some words of advice and suggestion to parents and the public. The editorial is worthy of contemplation. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARASS THE SMUT PEDDLERS

Smut peddlers are pouring a flood of filth through the U.S. mails and postal officials are almost powerless to stop it without help from the public and Congress.

The hucksters of pornography have been greatly helped in recent years by court decisions making it extremely difficult to prove that even the most sordid material is legally obscene.

As a result, postal inspectors and Federal district attorneys seldom can use the force of law to dam the flow of sexy trash.

But there are some things parents and the public can do.

One is to monitor mail addressed to children, especially that which originates in Los Angeles, New York, Montreal or Mexico. All are distribution centers of pornography.

Children shouldn't be automatically blamed if they get mail offering pornographic material or devices. In many cases their names are on purchased mailing lists, assembled by other hucksters.

If a young person answers ads offering pimple creams, books on growing up, physical culture courses or the like, his name is likely to end up on a smut peddler's prospect list.

Whenever such material is received, send it to your postmaster or Congressman. The postmaster will relay it to inspectors who can harass, if not arrest, the smut seller. Congressmen will add it—along with your strongly worded complaint—to an ever-growing accumulation of evidence supporting the need for stronger legislation.

Present laws against mailing obscene material are tough. Violaters can get 10 years. But courts have so broadly defined obscenity that convictions are rare.

Laws more clearly defining obscenity within the limits of constitutional freedom of expression are urgently needed and presently under consideration in Congress. Public support will help speed their passage.

The public can exercise greater influence over smut peddled on or under the counters of newsstands. In most such cases, pornography is only a small (but lucrative) part of the owner's business.

When unfavorable publicity or boycotts are threatened, newsstand operators generally remove the objectionable material.

More than mere morality is involved in this fight against literary filth. Psychiatrists tell us that many seemingly normal persons are actually borderline psychotics. In effect, such people are human bombs who can be frightfully detonated by the stimulus of vivid pornographic pictures or words.

When it happens, women and children are usually their tragic victims.

The problem of widely distributed pornography has grown far beyond the point of tolerance. It demands forthright action by the public and by Congress.

Would Give Preference to Skilled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, one does not need to look very far to discover the many paradoxes that are built into a $100 billion Federal budget. For example, we are paying Federal funds to farmers not to produce, at the same time, we are paying for reclamation projects to put more agriculture land into production. We are spending large amounts on Federal funds to subsidize tobacco, and, at the same time, we are expending funds to awaken the general public to the dangers of smoking.

We are closing down many veterans' facilities, and, at the same time, we are building others and expanding the war on poverty.

And soon, no doubt, we will be considering legislation in the field of immigration, whose purpose will be the very antithesis of the foreign aid program. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to administration plans to amend the McCarran-Walter Act to permit more people with special skills from the underdeveloped countries to come into this country.

At the same time, we are sending Peace Corps volunteers to these same countries to train people for new skills, and much of our economic aid is predicated on the fact that we need to develop better technology in countries where such skills are rare.

What I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, is why someone in the Great Society Bureau, which recommends new immigration laws to attract skilled people to this country, does not consult with someone in the Great Society State Department, which is trying to keep them where they are so they can be of benefit to their own emerging nation.

If I have oversimplified the case in calling attention to this paradox, then I call attention to the following editorial from the Carthage, Mo., Press, which also wonders, aloud, why we are going and coming at the same time:

WOULD GIVE PREFERENCE TO SKILLED

Recently the President asked for the elimination of the national origins quota system for immigration. He wants to give preference to skilled people, whatever their country or origin.

In practice, this will mean that more immigrants will come from the underdeveloped nations, and that they will tend to be scientists, engineers and other skilled people. A question which must be explored is what effect this loss of skills would have on the underdeveloped nation.

Sometimes emigration can help the underdeveloped nations, even when the emigrant is highly skilled. In some nations, even skilled labor can be in oversupply, since the economy may be too unspecified to make use of it. Thus, the gain from having one less mouth to feed can sometimes offset the production lost with the lost worker.

However, if a person has needed skills, particularly of a political, business, or managerial nature, his emigration can be a real loss for the underdeveloped nation. In its debate on the President's proposal, Congress should consider these losses and gains to the underdeveloped nations, in addition to the domestic impact.

Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Home Rule?—No." The article was published in the February 15, 1965, issue of the Richmond News-Leader.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond News-Leader, Feb. 15, 1965]

HOME RULE?—NO

At first glance, it would seem that advocates of home rule for the District of Columbia have an appealing case. Residents of the Nation's Capital are taxed, but they have no voice in the administration of the city's affairs, nor are they allowed to elect their city officials. Washington is a foster child of the Congress: Members of its board of commissioners are federally appointed; its major source of income is derived from congressional appropriations; and Congress dictates many District policies with little or no notice of what the residents would prefer. In addition, home rule proponents argue that a more intimate knowledge of the city's problems is vital to solving the problems; the impersonal nature of Federal control currently precludes an effective attack.

There is no doubt that Washington's problems are serious, but they seem more a consequence of the city's population than of impersonal control of the city's affairs.

A quarter of a century ago, the population of the city was 75 percent white, 25 percent Negro. As emigrating Negroes, many of them illiterate and unskilled, began to flock to the city in large numbers, thousands of white families fled to the suburbs. Now the city's population is 58 percent Negroes, 42 percent white, and indications are that the Negro percentage will continue to grow.

Last year, among cities of 500,000 to 1 million population, Washington was first in aggravated assaults. It was second in robberies, and fifth in all major crimes. In 1964, Negroes accounted for 87 percent of arrests made for major crimes. The city's crime rate has increased 83 percent in the past 7 years.

In 1963, more than 4,500 illegitimate births were recorded in the District, giving it the highest illegitimacy rate in the country—228.2 per 1,000 births. Of these 4,500 illegitimate births, 4,145 were Negro. Washington also has the highest rate of gonorrhea in the Nation—1047.5 per 100,000. The city's syphilis rate, 245.1 per 100,000, ranks second only to that of New York. A mushrooming school population, currently approaching 85 percent

Negro, demands unusual expenses for specialized training. With nearly 10,000 residents on relief, welfare costs now exceed $11 million annually. These are among the problems with which a predominantly Negro city administration, predictable under home rule, would have to cope.

Yet the fact that the District's population is largely Negro is not the most valid argument against home rule. Washington is not an average city: It is the National Capital. As such, it belongs not to its residents, but to the Nation. The Constitution explicitly places the responsibility for control of the District's affairs in the hands of Congress, "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever." If Congress saw fit to agree to a fixed amount to be paid the District from the Federal Treasury annually, in lieu of real estate taxes on the large Federal holdings of tax-exempt property in the city, that would be altogether in keeping with the constitutional provision that established Washington as the Federal city. The District may need more money; but home rule, no.

Remember the "Maine"

SPEECH

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is our privilege to join on February 15 in paying tribute to those who fought in the Spanish-American War.

The part that all the brave participants were to play in this brief but fierce conflict was triggered by the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, in Manila Harbor, on this day, February 15, 67 years ago. This event, which is sometimes referred to as "the Pearl Harbor of 1898" was to set off a sequence of engagements which culminated in the Battle of San Juan Hill, and on the first day of July 1898 we see that courageous and robust young American, Theodore Roosevelt, storming the heights of San Juan Hill, spurring his men on.

It was this land action, in support of our blockade of Santiago Harbor that accomplished the destruction of Spanish aggression and virtually brought about the end of the Spanish-American War. To those young Americans who laid down life before it was hardly begun for them, to the Rough Riders and their intrepid young leader as they stormed the ridges of San Juan Hill to pave the way to victory, and to all our brave men who served our great country in the Spanish-American War, we pay tribute.

But in honoring those who spread the account of this conflict, which brought the United States to its rightful place as a true champion of liberty, across the pages of history in the indelible ink of their bravery, we would be indeed remiss if we failed to honor a hero in our midst. We have among us a distinguished gentleman whose own brave life reads like the most imaginative and challenging of adventure stories. I speak of that distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA.

To say that truth is stranger than fiction is understating BARRATT O'HARA's adventurous life. His brave experiences took him through that rugged segment of American history, the "authors" of which we honor today. At the brave young age of 15 years, he landed in Cuba—3 days after Teddy Roosevelt and his Rough Riders had blazed the trail of freedom up San Juan Hill and for his participation in the seige of Santiago our colleague was awarded the Order of Military Merit in White, by the Republic of Cuba, for services rendered to the Cuban people in their struggle for independence from Spanish rule.

Each of us here knows of the incredible bravery and excitement with which BARRATT O'HARA's life has unfolded, and as our colleague in this great body he represents to us not only all that is the best and bravest in service to our country and to his fellow man during times of stress, but he has distinguished himself among us for his long and devoted service as a Member of the Congress of the United States. To this brave man we pay tribute, and by the honor we pay him as a symbol of all that is great and good in our American determination to protect and preserve freedom among all peoples, we also do honor to those who served—as did BARRATT O'HARA—in that bloody conflict, the Spanish-American War.

Guns and Weepers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, who represents my home district in New Hampshire, is one of the dynamic individuals who never dodges the challenge of duty. Recently, this quality involved him in an episode which might have had tragic consequences. The Washington Star of February 14 commented upon this occurrence in an editorial. The problem of regulating the purchase of firearms is receiving the careful study of my own Commerce Committee, so I do not necessarily endorse the position of the Star, but its commendation of Representative CLEVELAND is deserved; and therefore I request that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUNS AND WEEPERS

Representative CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, is not one of those curious types who can look the other way when someone is being murdered.

When he heard a woman screaming in distress outside his home at 2724 34th Street NW. the other night, the Congressman ran out to lend a hand. He saw a man carrying a woman toward a car and he shouted at the offender, thinking this might frighten him off. It didn't. Instead, another man, "practically raving," jumped out of the car. He was armed with a knife and he rushed toward Mr. CLEVELAND, who just managed to beat a retreat back into his home. The knife-wielder pounded on the Congressman's door with a shovel for a few minutes and then threw the knife through a pane of glass in the door. By the time the police got there, the trio had driven away.

This may have been some kind of family fight. But it could just as well have been an attempt at rape or murder. No one knows. The thing which impresses us is that Mr. CLEVELAND, who tried to assist the woman, was helpless when the armed man came after him.

He would not have been helpless if he, too, had been armed. A revolver, assuming a willingness to use it, could have brought down one lunatic, or at least held him at bay until the police arrived. But this dangerous character doubtless is still roaming around the city of Washington.

Those who seem to think that it should be a capital offense for a citizen even to own a gun never discuss this kind of situation. They prefer to weep and wring their hands. For our part, we favor sensible restraints on the sale of guns. But had we been in Representative CLEVELAND's position we would have liked to have had a gun in our hand.

L.B.J. Shock to Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Abilene, Kans., Reflector-Chronicle which points up some pertinent thoughts regarding objectives of the administration's farm policies.

The editorial follows:

L.B.J. SHOCK TO FARMERS

Is the national administration getting ready to do a turnaround on its agricultural policy? As a result of close examination of President Johnson's remarks in his budget message to Congress some farmers and farm organization leaders are beginning to get that chilly "written off" feeling.

The President declared that farming alone cannot be expected to provide a decent living in the future for more than about 1 million farm families, even with Federal assistance. This is less than a third of the families now listed as making or most of their living from agriculture.

This pronouncement came as quite a shock to those farm leaders who have been pressing for greater Federal aid to maintain farm families, and to Members of Congress whose constituents are largely rural.

Also, it goes rather sharply opposite Government spokesmen who have denied that farm programs they administer are contributing to an exodus from the land. Most candidates from the President on down have promised to work for the preservation of family farms.

President Johnson sees it as apparent that technological advances in agriculture are driving people out of agriculture. There are fewer and fewer small farm operations; like business, it is becoming necessary for farming operations to get larger to succeed. President Johnson said bluntly that many now trying to support themselves in agricul-

ture must find other ways of earning a living. This is bound to be a little embarrassing for Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, who has been advocating the opposite philosophy.

The President envisions the creation of millions of jobs in small towns, cities, and farming areas through the building of homes for the elderly, the development of recreation projects, development of businesses providing specialized services for "push-button" farmers, the building of industrial parks in areas close to natural resources, more watershed projects, and so forth.

Agriculture generally is in financial trouble. There's no question about it. But whether more old folks' homes and a fishing pole instead of a plow are the answer is something the Great Society apparently is going to have to find out.

The Need for Increased Imports of Residual Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cheaper Electricity: More Jobs." The editorial was published on February 13 in the St. Petersburg Times.

The editorial sets forth very clearly the importance of removing present restrictions on the importation of residual fuel oil, a matter which is of great interest not only to the State of Florida, but also to the eastern seaboard.

After dealing with this problem for several years, it is my hope that the Secretary of the Interior will recommend to the President of the United States that these restrictions be removed.

The economy of Florida and that of the Nation stand to benefit.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEAPER ELECTRICITY: MORE JOBS

Probably hardly anyone reading this will ever buy a drop of residual fuel oil in his life—or even see any. But you have a direct dollar interest in it.

On March 11 a hearing will be held before Secretary of the Interior Udall regarding import restrictions on residual, as it is called, which will affect the pocketbook of every reader—and millions of others.

In fact, customers of Florida Power Corp. alone have about $10 million at stake over the next 5 years depending upon the outcome of this hearing.

Residual is a viscous mass—so thick it has to be heated to 220° before it will flow as a liquid—left when lighter elements, such as gasoline, kerosene, naphtha, and domestic fuel oil have been distilled from the crude.

But this sticky stuff has a high heat content, and in Florida and along the eastern seaboard it is extensively used as a fuel by electric power companies and large industrial plants.

At the tag end of the Eisenhower administration, due to pressure by coal mining interests—the United Mine Workers included—and some domestic oil producers, import restrictions were imposed—in the name of "national security."

Consequently, Florida Power, other electric companies in Florida, and such industries as our phosphate mines, papermills, chemical plants and other industries have had to pay a premium of at least 25 cents a barrel on around 35 to 40 million barrels a year.

Since the price Florida Power pays for natural gas is linked directly to the price of residual, and your power rates are linked directly to fuel costs, electric consumers have been catching it coming and going.

Investigations by the U.S. Office of Emergency Planning and the Defense Department made in recent months have revealed that there would be no threat whatever to national security in lifting the import quota.

Other studies have shown that neither the coal industry nor the domestic petroleum industry would be injured. American oil companies produce very little residual. Those electric and industrial plants from Florida to New England which use residual for fuel cannot be converted to coal anyway.

Nevertheless, the Government has been under pressure from the coal interests to retain or tighten the restrictions.

It has been demonstrated often enough that no proof is needed for this proposition.

Cheap electric power means more jobs. More jobs mean more fuel consumed—of all types—and more prosperity for everyone, even including the coal miners, since prosperity in today's interdependent economy spreads far and wide.

The import restriction on residual fuel oil penalizes even those who support it. It is an economic folly which should be ended.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I deem it an honor and a grave responsibility to join my colleagues today in observing the 47th anniversary of the Lithuanian Independence Day.

As freemen, and as Members of the greatest legislative body in the world, we can speak out and we must speak out on the tragedy which has, for so long, pressed down on the peoples of Lithuania.

In a world where the fate of small nations is often decided by forces over which they have no control, Lithuania is a prime example of how a small, independent nation can be crushed by tyranny. More than once, in the course of its history, Lithuania has been occupied by foreign tyrants. This history began in A.D. 1009, nearly 500 years before the discovery of America. One must hope that a people of such character and sustenance, a people who in their 22 years of freedom during this century adopted a democratic form of government, must in the end prevail.

The late Winston Churchill once wrote:

Laws, just or unjust, may govern men's actions. Tyrannies may restrain or regulate their words. The machinery of propaganda may pack their minds with falsehoods. But the soul of man thus held in trance, or frozen in a long night, can be awakened by a spark coming from God knows where. People in bondage need not despair.

By paying tribute to Lithuania today, we are sustained by its history and its many achievements. And we help sustain the people of Lithuania in their hopes for ultimate deliverance.

National Bellamy Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 1963, it was my privilege to participate in the presentation of the 22d annual National Bellamy Award to Chattanooga, Tenn., Central High School. It was an honor for me to share that occasion with students, faculty, alumni, and friends of Central because the Bellamy Award stands for the greatness of our country, its heritage, its principles, its future.

In 1964 Bobby Johnson, Central High's student representative, offered a splendid address to the 23d annual recipient of the famous award, Wausau Senior High School. Under unanimous consent, I include Bobby Johnson's address in the Appendix of the RECORD:

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY BOBBY JOHNSON, CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL

Representing Chattanooga Central High School and the Volunteer State of Tennessee, recipient of the 22d annual Bellamy Award, I extend congratulations to Wausau Senior High and the State of Wisconsin upon this distinct honor. How well I recall the pride etched on the face of each Centralite as he reverently witnessed the presentation of the Bellamy flag, symbolizing the patriotism of our American heritage, portrayed by Francis Bellamy's "Pledge of Allegiance."

Tennesseeans, especially those from Chattanooga, the All America City, understand the price of our heritage. It was purchased with the blood of our great-grandfathers on the Chickamauga battlefield and the rocky cliffs of Lookout Mountain in the Battle Above the Clouds. Now this famous landmark may be reached by an incline, the world's steepest railway, propelled by TVA power. Today Chattanooga, the dynamo of Dixie, has become the electrical center of the Nation since the TVA and its surrounding recreational facilities have become a national tourist attraction.

The school spirit of Central was born in 1907 when Central High first opened her doors to 269 county students and has grown to be the largest Hamilton County school. Since the first graduating class of 1908, the school spirit has become a great tradition. This exuberant spirit expressed in pep meetings is extended throughout every phase of the school, substantiated by our enviable athletic record of winning several State championships and being recognized as No. 5 in football in the Nation in 1963. The quiet, diligent spirit is further exemplified by the service clubs, dedication of alumni and faculty members, and winning of 13 Freedoms Foundation Awards. Climaxing a distinguished history of honors, the Bellamy Award served as a magnet attracting other other outstanding awards, including the presidency of the State Association of Student Councils, National Council of Teachers of

English runner-up award, and second in the national ROTC rifle meet. Also, in 1964 two Central students were on the 3d Army ROTC rifle team that beat West Point for the national championship.

Just as our school reached its maturity October 11, 1963, so today you, too, understand the meaning of our principal's memorable words, "This is Central's finest hour."

Please, Mrs. Peterson, I'd Rather Do It Myself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which recently appeared in Printers' Ink:

PLEASE, MRS. PETERSON, I'D RATHER DO IT MYSELF

(By Gloria Brown, consumer, Los Angeles)

There's a knight on a white horse charging around our television screen these days armed with a box of laundry detergent that turns everything in its path sparkling clean.

Other than being mildly curious as to how I would clean the hoofprints off the carpeting if he suddenly decided to gallop through my living room, I've never been too concerned about the effects of his brief visits. This knight in sudsy armor is the creation of advertising, and represents a unique and wonderful selling device of our free enterprise system. To my mind, he is a relatively harmless fellow who is at least considerate enough not to imply that I, as a consumer, am some kind of helpless, blundering fool unable to decide intelligently how to spend my money.

This is not true, unfortunately, of a benevolent good fairy now flitting around the White House intent not only on creating hard feelings between me and my laundry knight, but determined to tell me what I ought to want to buy. I refer to Mrs. Esther Peterson, former labor lobbyist and now special assistant to President Johnson for consumer affairs. Mrs. Peterson's Los Angeles conference was planned for the express purpose of informing the public that we are being manipulated and mistreated by advertisers, and to advise us about what she believes we should really want as consumers.

Inasmuch as I have always been led to believe that the public and the consumer are one and the same, I frankly can't see why it is necessary for me to have Mrs. Peterson or anyone else act as interpreter to inform my elected Congressman of my purchasing problems. If I do have a complaint, I certainly can voice it to him. If I think he isn't paying attention, I can march down to my nearest ballot box on election day and lodge my protest. This is more than I can do with Mrs. Peterson, who doesn't have to answer to me at all.

If I have any complaints about a product, I can effectively voice my protest to the manufacturer by simply refusing to purchase his product.

We already have two Federal agencies, the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission, and both have ample power to protect me from dangerous foods and drugs, and false advertising practices.

If, as an average consumer, I am smart enough to earn my income, I am certainly smart enough to know what I want to buy. The manufacturer in today's competitive market constantly inundates me with questionnaires regarding my product preferences, thus exhibiting a definite interest in my needs. Having never received any type of questionnaire from Mrs. Peterson, I can only assume that she is more interested in telling me what she thinks I ought to want, than in finding out what I do want.

All things considered, I'll take my chances with my laundry detergent knight who doesn't cost me a thing, rather than with the paid concern of Mrs. Peterson.

Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the 16th of February it has become customary in this House of Representatives to pay tribute to the people of Lithuania and to their nation that had on this day won its independence.

It is fitting that we should commemorate this occasion, because we Americans should never become so taken up with the busy affairs of our national and international life that we cannot take at least a moment to pay our respects to a heroic people. In so doing we keep alive the idea that Lithuania was an independent country and that it was a victim of Soviet treachery. But we also keep alive within our own national tradition the supreme ideal of our commitment to self-determination for all peoples.

During the interwar period Lithuania had been an established, viable nation-state. Diplomatic relations had been established with other nations of the world, and in the League of Nations, Lithuania had done her part in maintaining world peace. In internal matters the Lithuanians had created a vigorous economic order. The social aspects of Lithuanian life were commendable, and culturally the nation flourished. And, of course, politically the Lithuanians charted their own destiny as they saw fit.

The point to make here is simply this: Lithuanians had proved their capacity to rule their own nation; they had won the respect and admiration of the world; they had a right to be proud of their achievements as a nation. This being true, what rationalization can there be for the Soviet conquest other than its compulsive drive to expand the borders of communism. This is a thought we must all bear in mind during these days of so-called peaceful coexistence.

To the Lithuanian people here in the United States, in Western Europe, and in their own homeland, I, threfore, extend my warmest congratulations on this their day of national commemoration. May they be given the inner strength to bear their oppression manfully, and let me say that we all look forward to that day when the principle of self-determination will be a respected universal principle for all mankind.

Rehabilitation of the Mentally Ill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said recently about our mentally ill citizens and the methods for treating them. Less than 100 years ago, our mentally ill were locked up and forgotten forever under the premises that there was no cure or help for them. Now, the story is different, and there are numerous cases to prove this point. Letting these people know that someone cares and rehabilitation are most important in helping these people back on the road to lead good and useful lives.

One incident, in particular, I would like to bring to your attention. So that all may know about the halfway house I am placing it in the RECORD for your attention. Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Leeman of Lee, Mass., have just such a house. They are providing a home for mentally disturbed patients from the Veterans' Administration hospital in Leeds, Mass., in order that when they are released they may return to their homes to play an active and useful role in their communities.

These people, after spending some time at the halfway house, have various responsibilities, and some even are gainfully employed.

This is just one example of how our mentally ill are being helped to help themselves and I commend your attention to the following article:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Feb. 10, 1965]

ADOPTED PARENTS HELP VETERANS GAIN NEW LEASE ON LIFE IN LEE

LEE.—Veterans' Administration mental patients are making the difficult transition from long hospitalization to community life by going to live with "adopted parents."

HALFWAY HOUSE

Such a halfway house has been built here by Gordon Leeman, a State conservation officer, who occupies part of it with his wife, two daughters, and a son.

The Leemans built the house last year—an 86- by 40-foot ranch-style, split-level home. They occupy the lower level.

On the upper level are six modern motel-style, twin-bedded rooms, four tile baths, a huge living room, dining room, stainless steel kitchen, and a den. Nearby is a large swimming pool.

The upper-level occupants are 12 veterans from the Northampton VA hospital. In season, some of these men cultivate a big vegetable garden. Others favor boating and fishing in nearby Laurel Lake. Still others go downtown bowling. None hangs around to brood.

This halfway house is the brainchild of two social workers at the Northampton VA hospital. They had witnessed the success of individual placement of screened patients in selected neighborhood foster homes.

"Could a number of patients be motivated to leave the protective walls of the hospital as a group for the halfway house?" they asked.

After weeks of screening, they finally chose an initial group of eight long-term patients.

PATIENTS PAY PART

Each patient must be able to pay $135 a month from his own funds for room, board, laundry, recreation, and personal services at the halfway house. Most can afford this by combining their social security and veterans' pension payments.

Of the original group chosen, four veterans now have paying jobs in the community. Others are showing slow but steady progress in the transition. Neighbors have taken the recuperating veterans into their homes, treating them as members of their families.

"We would like to hope that some day all will be going back to their families or on their own," a Veterans' Administration spokesman said.

Incidentally, the Leemans are so pleased with the results of their experiment that they're contemplating a four-room addition to their halfway house.

The Sugar Act and Other Farm Legislation in the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable ROBERT DOLE, of Kansas, was recently a speaker at the Fifth Annual Fargo Farm Forum in Fargo, N. Dak. In addition to making several sage comments on the status of farm legislation in the 89th Congress, he presented an excellent analysis on the prospects for sugar legislation in this session. I think my colleagues from urban as well as rural areas will find much of interest to them in this message. With unanimous consent I include Mr. DOLE's speech in the RECORD at this point:

"THE SUGAR ACT AND OTHER FARM LEGISLATION IN THE 89TH CONGRESS"—BY HON. ROBERT DOLE, OF KANSAS, AT THE FIFTH ANNUAL FARGO FARM FORUM, FARGO, N. DAK., FEBRUARY 5, 1965

The 89th Congress, now in the process of organization, will be an important one to U.S. farmers. Actions taken in this Congress will, for better or worse, affect our national scene for many years. When the New Frontier started there were some 4 million farms in this Nation. With the advent of the Great Society there were about 3½ million. Present Washington thinking being mysteriously revealed by the administration would indicate the future calls for a farm economy of only a million farms.

Let me illustrate it this way—look at the person on your right, then at the person on your left—those two folks may not be coming to meetings like this under the Great Society.

In the past several weeks the administration's farm proposals have been taking shape. First, there was the Budget Bureau Director's statement in the Saturday Review; next, the budget message calling for cuts in ACP, soil conservation, agricultural research, meat- and poultry-inspection expenditure, and slashes in the costs of commodity programs.

Yesterday, February 4, the President sent his farm message to Congress. Here in essence is what it said:

"Progress is never free of problems. Agricultural progress has made price and income support programs increasingly necessary and increasingly difficult.

"The basic need for farm programs arises from the farmer's economic isolation and his enormous capacity to produce. We have today at least 50 million acres more cropland than is required to produce all of the food and fiber that we can consume plus all we can export. Without programs to guide production, new crop surpluses would be inevitable. Even relatively small surplus can depress prices below cost of production levels.

"Our programs should:

"Provide efficient family farmers an opportunity to earn parity of income.

"Assist those small farmers who have little chance to enlarge their operations but whose age, physical handicap, or lack of education, prevent their shifting to other employment.

"Assist those farm families who seek to enlarge their productive resources in order to obtain a decent living and have the opportunity and capacity to do so.

"We must also continue to tie domestic farm policies to our international trade objectives by pricing our products for export at competitive world levels and by relating our production to the longer-term demands of world markets.

"Our objective must be for the farmer to get improved income out of the marketplace, with less cost to the Government."

The issues raised by the scheduled termination of the wheat and feed grains program, the cotton program, and the Wool Act in 1965 must be resolved.

With this in mind, "Why," you may ask, "would any Secretary of Agriculture want to intentionally disrupt market prices?" The reason is simple even if not sound. He wants to make economic life as miserable as possible for those farmers who do not participate in his programs. He does this in order to get the highest possible signup in his program so he can tell everybody how "popular" it is.

That may indeed be a short-term political solution, but it's made at the expense of every grain farmer in America, both cooperators and noncooperators.

We sought to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from selling surplus Government grain for less than 15 percent above the current CCC loan level plus carrying charges. Present law allows unrestricted Government grain sales into the domestic market at only 5 percent above the loan level. Secretary Freeman has recently gone even further in the direction of lower farm prices and has dropped both the feed grain and wheat loan levels another nickel a bushel below that in effect for 1964.

Interestingly enough, farmers and farm organizations the Nation over, many with diverse opinions on other aspects of the farm program, have agreed this proposal is a sound one.

Commonsense dictates that a higher CCC release price would strengthen market prices and raise farm income from grains.

The major farm organizations in my home State of Kansas have agreed this is a good idea.

Last year even the Democrats on the Wheat Subcommittee in the House of Representatives felt that an increase in the release price would increase farm income * * * but not Orville Freeman, and efforts to add the amendment were sidetracked.

I was among those in the last Congress who opposed the present cotton program and today it appears obvious the present cotton program just isn't working. Another million bales have been added to the surplus (total near 12.5 million bales) and many millions of more dollars ($543 million—total cost about $800 million), have been spent on expensive subsidies to textile mills and almost everybody else in the cotton business, except cotton farmers.

In my opinion Congress will support an extension of the 1954 Wool Act. This program has broad farmer support and is needed to keep our domestic producers in a competitive position with large-scale imports. I would expect that this program would be extended without too much difficulty.

I briefly mention these major commodity programs to you, because sugar legislation is tied in with them.

PROSPECTS FOR SUGAR LEGISLATION

With the pressure for the consideration of wheat, wool, feed grains, and cotton legislation, there will be a tendency to delay sugar legislation in 1965. You may have noted the President's farm message, February 4, did not contain any reference to sugar legislation. No group of farmers has received less consideration from the administration than the American sugarbeet producers.

Let's take a look at the record.

In the summer of 1963, amidst a market showing a 40-year high in domestic sugar prices, the Secretary of Agriculture asked U.S. sugar producers to expand their production. He promised in return that there would be no acreage restrictions on domestic production through the 1965 crop. The Department of Agriculture officially announced this. Yet last fall, the Secretary reversed himself and announced the imposition of acreage restrictions for the 1965 crop.

On January 31, 1964, President Johnson submitted to Congress his recommendations on agricultural legislation for the 2d session of the 88th Congress. Among other things he made the following recommendations concerning sugar which appear at page 4 of House Document No. 210, 88th Congress, 2d session:

"4. Sugar: The rise in sugar prices in 1963 reflected a reduction in world supplies. The Cuban crop was about one-half the pre-Castro level. Europe had two poor sugarbeet crops. But the fears voiced last year proved that the United States would be unable to obtain sufficient sugar proved groundless. Action by the Department of Agriculture assured sugar users an adequate supply and helped halt the price increase that attended heavy buying in anticipation of shortages.

"However, the experience of the past year—and the fact that foreign sugar quotas expire at the end of 1964—highlight the need for some action at this session of Congress to assure ample supplies of sugar to consumers at fair prices.

"I recommend the removal of marketing restrictions on the sale of domestically produced sugar during the calendar year 1964. This legislation will relieve the pressure on world market supplies at a time when these supplies are short.

"The effectiveness of our present arrangements for foreign sugar procurement are under intensive study. On the basis of this study I shall—early in this session—make recommendations for remedial legislation."

As can be clearly seen, the President advocated the removal of marketing restrictions on the sale of domestically produced sugar during 1964.

He also said recommendations would be made early in 1964 for remedial legislation on the procurement of foreign sugar.

What, however, have been the results?

An executive communication carrying the necessary legislative language to allow the marketing of sugar produced domestically in 1963 and 1964 was submitted to Congress on December 30, 1963. The administration, however, did not press for any action on this recommendation.

Some 31 sugar bills were introduced in the House during the last session and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. Seven of these bills were introduced by members of the Committee on Agriculture as early as

March 19, 1964, but the administration failed in the 88th Congress to give the committee either its own recommendations or its comments on the 31 bills pending in the committee.

In the meantime, the Committee on Agriculture tried to reconcile the divergent views within the sugar industry in an effort to work out legislation to extend the provisions of the act which expired last year. Throughout these meetings, administration spokesmen failed to give the committee any indication of the position that the executive branch had taken.

The final result, of course, was a deadlock.

Without going into all of the various ramifications and arguments concerning this complex matter, I would point out that the domestic beet industry made numerous efforts to reach an agreement and tried in good faith to keep this program going.

Beet producers were asked to increase their production in 1963 and 1964. They certainly had a right to expect their Government to allow them to market that production as the President promised in his agricultural message. As I stated earlier, beetgrowers were also officially informed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture there would be no acreage restrictions on their 1965 crop. They made their plans on the basis of this advice from their Government. In addition to the administration's complete abdication of responsibility, one of the chief obstacles in reaching an agreement was the insistence of the U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association that beet producers accept a 20-percent cut in their acreage in 1965.

Let us remember the entire Sugar Act did not expire in December 1964—just that part of it which deals with the method of acquiring foreign-produced sugar.

The result of this inept procedure has been a windfall for foreign sugar interests and a severe blow to the economy of a dozen beet-growing States like Kansas and North Dakota.

When the foreign quota provisions of the Sugar Act expired on December 31, 1964, the Secretary of Agriculture, through USDA releases, intimated he didn't have authority anymore to collect the quota premium (or difference between the United States and world sugar price) on the global quota sugar which once belonged to Cuba. As you perhaps know, this amounts to about 3 cents a pound on approximately 1½ million tons annually. He also said he didn't have authority to collect the escalated recapture fee which applied to country quota sugar obtained overseas. This, as you will recall, amounted to nine-tenths of a cent per pound on approximately 1½ million tons annually. The balance of our foreign sugar supply comes from the Philippines which are covered by a treaty only are not subject to the recapture fee formula.

In the same breath, though, the Secretary said he did have authority to administratively extend country quotas to dozens of foreign nations the world over to bring their sugar into the U.S. market in 1965.

What does this mean to the U.S. taxpayers? It means about $126 million in lost revenue in 1965. It means foreign sugar producers will be up to $126 million richer and the U.S. taxpayers will be out of pocket an equal amount * * * and American consumers won't get one bit of benefit because the entire U.S. price is going to foreigners. It would be enough money to restore many of the cuts outlined in the administration's farm budget.

At the same time, U.S. beet producers must take a cut in their 1965 production of 5 percent across the board, which means an 11-percent slash to old growers. This means, as you know, less processing and fewer jobs in beet areas.

This situation is simply not equitable and should be corrected immediately.

But frankly, I am not optimistic. Unless a very strong bipartisan effort is made, I'm fearful the Sugar Act, not even mentioned in the President's message yesterday, will not be revised one iota in this session of Congress.

It will lay dormant until next year when the whole act expires on December 31, 1966.

Without question the administration and the foreign sugar interests have things pretty much their own way these days. The administration has a 2-to-1 majority in the Congress and a 24-to-11 margin on the House Committee on Agriculture.

My message is not one of optimism but rather one of challenge. You and the millions of others who earn your living in America's most important industry must exert a maximum effort if you are going to save agriculture from the whims of a dispassionate urban Congress and an apathetic administration.

The challenge is yours, but you can count on the help from those of us who share your convictions.

Jewish War Veterans Aid in Reopening of the Yeshiva of Brighton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on December 17, 1964, the Yeshiva of Brighton, an outstanding philanthropic institution of learning in Brooklyn for more than a quarter of a century, was stricken by a serious disaster. A violent blaze which began in the basement area of the building completely destroyed the student synagogue and study hall, destroyed the contents of the library, and caused considerable damage to the entire interior of the structure.

So devastating was the fire that it was imperative that the school secure the support of the entire community before it could again open its doors.

First to come to its assistance was Mr. Jerry Nisman, commander of the Jewish War Veterans of Kings County, Brooklyn, N.Y. Mr. Nisman mobilized the full resources of his organization to publicize the crisis at the school and to solicit funds for the renovation of the building. Thus far his efforts have resulted in substantial sums of money being contributed to the institution from the various posts of the Jewish War Veterans and from the community at large.

Due primarily to his efforts, the Yeshiva of Brighton has been able, under the able direction of Rabbi Murray I. Friedman, principal, Joseph Ehrenreich, director, and Rabbi Harry Lax, assistant director, to resume its function of training future citizens in the traditions of their faith and in the principles of democratic living.

Mr. Nisman's actions demonstrate once again that in peacetime activities as well as in wartime pursuits this country's servicemen are foremost in their devotion and self-sacrifice.

We Remember the "Maine"

SPEECH

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at 9:40 o'clock this evening a few Americans will recall that 67 years ago Havana Harbor was the scene of death and destruction. We remember the *Maine*. It is entirely fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we recall that incident today, 67 years later.

The American battleship—second class—U.S.S. *Maine*, a gleaming 6,682-ton vessel, was commissioned in 1895. Three years after launching she was ordered to proceed from Key West, Fla. to Havana Harbor, under the command of Capt. Charles D. Sigsbee. Although the visit was termed a "friendly one," it was obvious the *Maine* was to represent American strength in the harbor, and to help Americans in Cuba in event their safety was in question. The Spanish authorities in Cuba protested, but the *Maine* made her way into the harbor where she lay moored to a buoy, just 500 yards from a Spanish arsenal.

Tension between the Spaniards and the Americans was running high, especially following the *Maine's* arrival, but it was not until the night of February 15, 1898, 9:40 in the evening to be exact, these tensions broke into violence. Two explosions ripped the American vessel—the first a dull, muted one, and the second, perhaps a magazine on board below the main and forward, a violent more powerful one.

Within seconds the powerful battleship was a twisted mass of steel. Indeed, the two explosions had sent parts of the ship, and even men and parts of bodies as high as 200 feet into the air. The explosions rendered the forecastel unrecognizable. The explosions were so great that watertight integrity perhaps could not help. In any event, the aft began to sink.

Mr. Speaker, naval disasters are always appalling and tragic with losses of human life. The cataclysm of the *Maine* was particularly dreadful, as 260 officers and men were later buried in Colon Cemetery, Havana. Had the entire crew been on board that night, the number of dead and maimed undoubtedly would have been much higher.

Both Spanish and American authorities began an investigation of this tragedy, emphasizing major concern as to the cause of both explosions. Instead of clearing the air, investigations merely served to cloud one of the most frustrating mysteries of a warlike act. Spanish investigators found the explosions to be caused by spontaneous combustion, probably in the coal bunkers, which in turn, sent fire rushing to forward magazines. American investigators decided the first explosion was an external blast, which in turn ignited forward magazines. Neither investigation was conclusive.

Regardless of these indecisive answers, Mr. Speaker, sinking of the *Maine* caused furor in this country. Anti-Spanish feeling ran high. Certain newspapers freely and openly made accusations against the Spanish, and the whole incident was soon reduced to the well-known slogan: "Remember the *Maine*."

In 1911, U.S. Army Engineers sealed off the after section of the vessel, and after building a cofferdam around the hulk, raised what was left of the ship, and floated it out to sea. During the raising of the twisted vessel, 66 more bodies were found. The remains of these American sailors were buried in Arlington National Cemetery. Also during the removal, American engineers and marine experts made an additional investigation, published in 1912. The report basically repeating earlier American findings, stated in part:

This [exterior explosion] resulted in igniting and exploding the contents of the 6-inch reserve magazine, A-14-M, said contents including a large quantity of black powder. The more or less complete explosion of the contents of the remaining forward magazine followed.

Although the American experts had evidence that the bottom of the ship was bent up and inward, European experts maintained the initial explosion came from within. For practical and technical purposes, the first explosion is still a mystery.

Somewhere on the high seas, on March 16, 1912, with guns booming, and sailors standing silently at attention, the U.S.S. *Maine* was sunk, her flags flying. We remember the *Maine*, and she, a ship who was only 3 years old and joined a long list of Navy ships and men whose contributions are now legend.

Mr. Speaker, I always feel an awareness of the Spanish-American War, not only because I, as many Americans, realize that Cuba is again not free, but also because my father served our country in that conflict.

I do not want to close my discussion of this 67th anniversary of the destruction of the *Maine*, without calling to the attention of this body, that there is only one Member in the 89th Congress who took part in that war, and he is a Member of the House of Representatives. I refer, of course, to our colleague and my good friend, Representative BARRATT O'HARA, from the Illinois Second Congressional District.

Mr. O'HARA was born at St. Joseph, Mich., April 28, 1882, and before he was 15 years old, he had enough excitement and adventure to last many men a lifetime. He had, for example, as a boy been on several expeditions of a dangerous nature to the hinterlands and jungles of Latin America. But this was not enough for BARRATT O'HARA. At the age of 15, while a sophomore in high school, he joined the 33d Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and was in Cuba only 3 days after "Teddy" Roosevelt's Rough Riders arrived. He was in a number of engagements, and participated in the siege of Santiago. He was decorated by the Cuban Government for his part in their war of liberation.

I am very pleased and proud today to join my distinguished colleague from Illinois in saluting this Nation's remembrance of the *Maine* and of those men who lost their lives while in the service of our Nation. I am particularly proud to pay a special tribute to the gentleman from Illinois for his service then and his service now.

Nuclear Power Needed in Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, with the important military posture hearings underway before the House Armed Services Committee and in view of recent events in the Vietnam theater, an editorial published in the Boston Globe on Monday, February 15, seems to me to be especially timely and worthy of careful consideration by the Congress. With full awareness of the Armed Services Committee's warnings about block obsolescence in our Navy and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy's recommendation that all future major naval vessels should be nuclear powered, I commend this editorial to you and our colleagues. The Globe editorial follows:

NUCLEAR POWER NEEDED

Two recent events point up a lesson in Washington. The first occurred January 17 when the U.S. Navy marked the 10th anniversary of the historic message, "Underway on nuclear power," transmitted from U.S.S. *Nautilus*, the world's first nuclear-propelled vessel.

History recorded another significant change last week—the policy of strong retaliation against North Vietnam for guerrilla attacks on American installations to the south. The bulk of our assault came from jet aircraft of the 7th Fleet.

The most recent strikes remind this Nation and the Communist enemy that the Navy is our balance of power in the Far East. It is a force which Red China cannot reach with its own limited seapower.

Coupled with the 10th anniversary of nuclear power, the new role of the 7th Fleet is also a reminder that the free world's most vital armada of warships still has antiquated propulsion.

Without nuclear propulsion, our warships cannot respond as quickly to crisis as their nuclear sisters. They must slow to a perilous 10 or 15 knots to spend hours alongside oilers, ammunition ships, refrigeration and supply vessels for frequent replenishment. More than one-fifth of the 125-ship 7th Fleet consists of logistic support vessels.

Danger of submarine attack is increased with a slowdown and in all-out warfare, the auxiliaries themselves become the targets of undersea marauders. In short, more American lives are risked for the sake of yesterday's power.

Contrasting efficiency was illustrated by the recent around-the-world cruise of the Navy's first nuclear-powered carrier, cruiser, and frigate. Steaming 31,000 miles in 57 days, our nuclear task force did not refuel or replenish in any way. Space required on nonnuclear vessels for fuel oil was used for food and other items.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's sharp pencil has to date retarded adoption of nuclear power on a wide scale. Congress is again asking if this is not a disservice to the Nation's security.

The fact is that nuclear propulsion, spread over the 25-year life of our warships, adds only 3 percent to the cost of building and operating a carrier striking force. This cost should be slashed further with adoption of newly designed, high-powered, long-life reactors.

Economy projects a pleasant glow. It must not become blinding. To deny the Nation a first-rate Navy in a world of recurring dangers to our liberty is folly.

The Rules of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial in today's Washington Post represents a remarkably perceptive discussion of the significance of President Johnson's policy of appropriate retaliation against North Vietnam in response to aggressive action by the Ho Chi Minh government.

I believe that this editorial deserves the careful study of all Members of the Congress as well as of other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am privileged to include the editorial in question from the Washington Post of February 17, 1965, as follows:

THE RULES OF WAR

The present lull in the actual fighting in South Vietnam may be a good time to examine what, by consent since World War II, have emerged as the "rules" of undeclared war. The "rules" that came into existence by practice and an absence of contradiction have notoriously favored aggression.

In summary, these accepted "rules" permitted an aggressor to launch military operations against a victim nation, but precluded any countermeasures that reached into the sanctuary from which the military activity was launched, supplied and directed.

These "rules" put North Vietnam in position to direct, supply and staff an army in South Vietnam. Prior to the incidents in the Gulf of Tonkin the North Vietnamese were in complete control of the degree of aggression, the amount of the risk and the possible consequences. They could keep the war going at a rate suitable to them. They could restrict it if the time seemed inopportune, they could expand it if the prospects for succes brightened. They could count in advance the utmost cost of failure—by determining the amount of equipment and the size of the force to be risked. Whenever the risks exceeded expectations of gain they could wait, to try later under more favorable circumstances.

The "rules" which were permitted to prevail confined the victim of aggression of this kind to defensive measures and precluded any response greater than the size of the aggressor's initiative. The possible gains of the aggressor were unlimited, the gains of the victim of aggression were confined to successful resistance. The possible costs to the aggressor were limited to whatever men and material he chose to commit; the possible

costs to the victim of aggression were unlimited.

No system ever offered a greater inducement to aggression. It was war made as safe for the power taking the initiative as it was possible to make it. The attacking power took no hazards more serious than that a given attack might not succeed; the defending power could look to no success that rose above that of beating off the attack with minimal damage.

What has created all the furor in South Vietnam has been a change in the pattern of this warfare amounting to an alteration of "rules" to which the free nations seemed to have given their tacit consent. The balance that weighed so heavily in favor of the attack has been altered. The threat of reprisal across national boundaries has raised the risk for the aggressor and lifted the goals attainable by the defender. It is a revision of the rules that compels a whole reexamination of the nature of this kind of war.

The nature of genuine wars of liberation arising out of spontaneous revolutionary movements within the borders of a country are not affected. They will yield, as in the past, to no military tactics but those applied against the Huks in the Philippines and the Communists in Malaysia. The dissident forces and domestic field forces as in the past no doubt will battle it out on the ground, in the sort of protracted guerrilla struggles with which we are familiar.

But the rules for wars over national boundaries and across national frontiers may have been fundamentally altered by the events of the past few weeks. The security of a sanctuary from which aggression can be safely launched cannot any longer be taken for granted. The risks of external aggression, disguised as a civil war of liberation, have greatly increased.

The Indonesian commander sending his paratroops or sea raiders to Sarawak, Sabah, or Malaya, hitherto could do so with reasonable assurance that the worst that could happen would be the failure of one particular mission. That assurance is greatly diminished, now, by the precedents of South Vietnam. There may be fewer future sanctuaries for this sort of armed excursion from outside a country's borders, if South Vietnam practices are followed elsewhere.

It is not remarkable that those who profited by the old "rules" dislike the changes. War on their terms involved minimal risks and optimal gains for aggressors. At the same time, it confined the defenders to tactics that denied them the opportunity for decisive blows, deprived them of the hope of any success greater than a small failure and removed from their reach any chance of terminating the war. The aggressors controlled all the options—when to fight, how hard to fight, when to stop, when to renew fighting—every decision was in their hands. It is to be hoped that these "rules" will not be allowed to prevail in the future.

Perhaps their elimination was the necessary precondition to any negotiated settlement in South Vietnam. As long as they were adhered to it is difficult to see why any aggressor could have been induced to stop the war.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the cause of freedom and independence for Lithuania is of particular interest to me. Many citizens who emigrated from Lithuania have settled in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois, particularly in the Waukegan and north Chicago area.

In connection with this observance in the House of Representatives in behalf of the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I call attention to the active support for a free Lithuania headed in the 12th Illinois District by Edward R. Skalisius and the American-Lithuanian Society.

The American-Lithuanian Society is observing Lithuanian Independence Day on Sunday, February 21, at the Lithuanian Hall in Waukegan, Ill. I am proud to convey advice to my friends of Lithuanian descent, as well as to all friends of freedom who will be gathered together on that occasion, that many in the U.S. House of Representatives recognize the plight of the enslaved peoples of Lithuania including many relatives and friends of American citizens whose origins are in that land.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 135 in behalf of the unfortunate people of all the Baltic States. It is my earnest hope that through actions of this Nation, combined with those of other freedom-loving peoples of the world, the Lithuanian nation again may become free and independent and that the great and good citizens of Lithuania may regain the precious liberties of which they have been deprived for many years.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanian Independence Day is the most significant Lithuanian national holiday. It symbolizes the culmination of their long and ceaseless struggle, often against forbidding odds, for their national goal. Its annual celebration signifies that, even though more than two decades ago Lithuanians lost their independence and have been living under the worst of tyrannies, they still cling to their ideals, freedom, and independence. Naturally, one of the best and perhaps the most effective way to keep the spirit of freedom alive among the Lithuanians is by observing and celebrating their independence day.

On February 16, 1918, as the Lithuanian people asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence, they saw the dawn of a new, brighter, and better day for them; in their freedom a new era of peace and joy was ushered in for them in their homeland. And they felt that it was up to them to make the very best of the opportunity thus offered to them, proving to their friends that they were worthy of the reward, of their national independence. Today the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day evokes memories of joy and happiness, of peace and prosperity that was the lot of Lithuania during the interwar years, until all that was ruined and they were robbed of their freedom by the greedy men in the Kremlin. On the observance of the anniversary of that historic event we are fully aware that for more than two decades Lithuanians have not known freedom. But we are heartened by the fact that they fervently cherish and nurse their love for freedom and independence.

What's Behind "Arab Summitry"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the winter 1964–65 edition of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., of New York, contains an interesting analysis of the efforts on the part of President Nasser of Egypt to create unity among the Arab populations of the Middle East.

A number of the Arab States are, as we know, very suspicious of Nasser's intentions. They know from bitter experience—for example, in Iraq and in the Yemen—that the Nile dictator's concept of unity is nothing less than Egyptian domination. As far as the United States is concerned Arab unity, Nasser style, would only increase the danger of war in the Middle East.

The article from Prevent World War III follows:

WHAT'S BEHIND "ARAB SUMMITRY"

It seems that the banner of "Arab Summitry" has, for the time being, replaced the rather tattered standard of "Arabdom" in President Nasser's ceaseless striving for glory and power. All too frequently in the past, neighboring Arab States discovered that under the signpost of "Arabdom" the Egyptian dictator was intent on beating them into submission and subservience. A shrewd pragmatist, Nasser has apparently decided that the pill needs a new kind of sugar and so, with the air of a gentle soul, he now appeals to his rivals in the Arab world: "Come, let us reason together."

The first of these ballyhooed summit meetings occurred this past spring. Although the results of this affair were rather nebulous and uncertain, a precedent was set. This is to say, the other chiefs of state seemed to accept the procedures whereby they came together to listen to Nasser's words of wisdom. With this initial triumph under his belt, Mr. Nasser called a second summit which met for about a week in early September. Little is known about the details of this secret confab, but Cairo's propagandists were in the most advantageous position to tell the outside world what supposedly had transpired. To put it another way, a good part of the news concerning the meetings was so processed that the end product was, for all intents and purposes, "made in Egypt." Even the final communique bears the handiwork of the Egyptians as it stressed the importance "of bolstering * * * joint Arab action within the framework of the Arab League."

TANGLED PROBLEMS

The months which had intervened between the first and second conferences were not happy ones for the Cairo government. The problems which were present in the spring, were still awaiting solution in September. The Yemen conflict, of course, was still one of the major dilemmas confronting Egyptian foreign policy. Since 1962, Egypt has been pouring hundreds of millions of dollars of military hardware into Yemen and has had to support Egyptian armed forces averaging from 30,000 to 40,000. This has been a severe drain on the Egyptian regime which is basically bankrupt economically and manages to stay in business thanks to the hundreds of millions of dollars coming from the United States and the Soviet Union.

The civil war in Yemen in which Egypt has so brazenly intervened, has already cost the lives of over 200,000 Yemen citizens. But the Egyptians, too, have had to pay a price as reports indicate that at least 20,000 Egyptian troops have lost their lives. Consequently, it is understandable that Nasser has been most anxious to apply a tourniquet to this wound which is bleeding the country dry. Unquestionably, this was one of the major problems which Nasser hoped to resolve at the second summit.

But there were other issues which were perhaps just as tough, looming as dangerous impediments to the realization of Cairo's foreign policy objectives. The continued resistance of Syria against Nasser's ceaseless subversion must be included in this category. Relations between Egypt and Saudi Arabia which have been deteriorating since the outbreak of the struggle in Yemen, are also threatening Nasser's long-range objectives. Furthermore, Nasser can hardly ignore the continued reluctance of Kuwait and Jordan to toe the Egyptian line. The Lebanese, too, are displaying a distinct uneasiness over Nasser's aggressive tactics. The firm stand taken by the British in protecting the peoples of the South Arabian Federation has driven Nasser to the point of exasperation. Finally, the steady refusal of the newly created African states to allow their foreign relations to be directed from Cairo, has also been painful to Mr. Nasser.

But a dictator is always anxious to maintain his image before the public. In Nasser's case, the need was to demonstrate to the outside world that he was the natural leader of the Arab peoples. Thus, he tried to camouflage the above-mentioned difficulties by pretending that the main business at the summit was the determination of Israel to go through with its Jordan River irrigation project. It was this which served as Nasser's convenient alibi for convoking the summit meeting, and while it was discussed with animation among the conferees it played second fiddle to the real issues which continue to plague Egyptian foreign policy.

FIASCO IN YEMEN

As previously noted, Nasser's hope in Yemen received little comfort after the first summit meeting. The failure of Nasser's armed forces to crack the opposition to the so-called republican regime set up under his aegis produced a stalemate. The United Nations, which had been entrusted to carry out previous agreements for the disengagement of foreign troops in Yemen, indicated in July that the task was virtually hopeless. The reports issued by Secretary General U Thant also showed that the main reason for the collapse of these agreements was that Egyptian forces remained in strength in Yemen despite Nasser's assurances that they would be withdrawn. As reported in the New York Times, August 30, 1964, "The main stumblingblock now is that the United Arab Republic has not withdrawn its forces as stipulated in the agreement."

On the very eve of the second Arab summit conference, Secretary General U Thant announced that the United Nations observation teams would leave Yemen. There was no alternative in view of the fact that Cairo persists in its mass intervention in that strife-torn country. For months, our State Department had assured Congress that Nasser would conduct himself in such a way as to justify large-scale U.S. aid to Cairo. Although many Congressmen were skeptical, they reluctantly went along on the assumption that the State Department could be right.

While the State Department spoke in optimistic terms, Egypt went ahead with its policy of taking over Yemen. Thus, on July 13, an agreement was signed between Egypt and Yemen designed to coordinate all of their policies in the political, military, economic, social, cultural, and propaganda fields as a step toward complete unity. President Nasser, speaking on the occasion of this coordination agreement (the Nazis used to call it "Gleichschaltung"), boasted: "Brothers, the truth is that unity between the Arab people in Yemen and the Arab people in the United Arab Republic was established since the first day of the glorious Yemeni revolution." Coordination between the Yemeni revolutionaries and Egypt, Nasser declared, was "not something new for us, because we have been successfully coordinating our work, particularly in the military aspect."

COORDINATION

This coordination agreement was regarded by Nasser as the opening gun in a new drive to smash the opposition to his aggression in Yemen, once and for all, and to present the victory as a fait accompli which would be accepted and given the stamp of official approval at the September summit meeting. Thus, a short while after the agreement was announced, the Egygptians launched a full-scale attack in Yemen. At the end of August they brodacasted to the whole world that their offensive had broken the back of the opposing Yemeni forces. Indeed, Field Marshal Abdel Hakim Amer, Nasser's leading military spokesman, announced that Egyptian forces, in cooperation with their Yemeni collaborators, were in complete control of the country. The victory, as reported by a Middle East correspondent for the London Sunday Times, "will undoubtedly bolster President Nasser's position at next week's Arab summit conference" (August 30, 1964). With that out of the way, this correspondent wrote, Nasser could then concentrate on South Arabia and the Persian Gulf. The New York Times confirmed this view when it carried a dispatch from Lebanon that the Egyptian campaign in Yemen "is indirectly aimed against British oil interests in the Persian Gulf, the defense of which is anchored in Aden" (September 1, 1964).

However, Nasser's trumpeting of victory turned out to be premature. The Christian Science Monitor carried a Middle East dispatch (September 2, 1964) which revealed that, while the Egyptians were in the midst of congratulating each other over the victory, a sudden turn in the climatic conditions on the battlefield changed that victory into a rather watery mess. When all seemed lost for the Yemini fighting the Egyptian forces, the Christian Science Monitor reported, "sudden torrential rains came, causing havoc and casualties to Egyptian forces. Egyptian armor was incapacitated, transport was cut and gaps in the Egyptian lines were opened. Royalists counterattacked and regained most of the lost territory. Meanwhile the momentum of the Egyptian offensive was spent."

This was a most embarrassing turn in Nasser's fortunes, as it was to his invincible armies and his propagandists. Therefore, when the summit conference convened in Alexandria, Nasser had nothing to show for all of his efforts. Crown Prince Faisal of Saudi Arabia arrived with head unbowed. Indeed, on the eve of his trip to the summit, Faisal publicly warned that, if Nasser did not restrain his aggressive predelictions, the Saudi Arabians would take appropriate countermeasures.

It was an awkward situation for Mr. Nasser, so much so, that he appeared paralyzed to do anything about Yemen when the chiefs of state came together at the summit. At the last minute, however, thanks to some of his loyal supporters, particularly Ben Bella of Algeria and President Arif of Iraq, Saudi Arabia was pressed to make some compromise that would save Nasser's face. The net result of their labors was an agreement calling for a 7 months truce between the Yemenis supported by Saudi Arabia and Nasser's forces. In return for withholding support from both sides, Nasser, according to the theory behind the agreement, would begin to withdraw his 40,000 troops and their military hardware from Yemen. This is what the summit accomplished for Yemen, and as one can see, it hinged on the word of a man whose pledges can hardly be taken seriously, when he had already announced to the world that Yemen's destiny was inextricably tied up with Cairo on the basis of their July coordinating agreement.

One can note Nasser's tricky tactics by more recent reports that, in connection with the contemplated peace talks, Nasser has brought in more Egyptian forces so that there is an estimated 46,000 in Yemen today. As reported by the New York Times, "Diplomatic Circles say President Nasser may have increased the troop strength so that he could announce reductions in the force at the appropriate time and still leave a sizable garrison in Yemen to prop up the shaky Republican regime" (Oct. 15, 1964). A subsequent dispatch from Yemen emphasized the continued hold which the Egyptians exercise over that country: "United Arab Republic aid is all-pervasive. Whatever the others do, they find Cairo advisers looking over Yemeni shoulders" (October 23, 1964).

TROUBLE IN IRAQ

The same kind of coordination was also achieved between the present Iraqi regime and Cairo. This too, was accomplished in preparation for the second summit conference. At the end of May President Arif of Iraq and President Nasser met to sign an agreement to coordinate their military, economic, cultural and political policies. The communiqué marking this agrement indicates who is the boss. Four major points were stressed:

First, to uphold the new Palestinian Committee dominated by Egypt which aims to liberate Palestine.

The second point endorses Egypt's efforts to take over the entire Arabian peninsula and the Persian Gulf.

The third point endorses Nasser's efforts to subvert the independence of Syria.

The fourth point reaffirms Nasser's hegemony in Yemen.

Patrick Seale, the Middle Eastern affairs expert for the London Observer, reported that the agreement with Iraq opened the door for Nasser's strivings to lay his hands on the oil resources of the Middle East. Moreover, instead of contributing to a calm atmosphere in the Middle East, Mr. Seale reports, this agreement has already aroused concern in Kuwait and in Iran. He writes: "Iran, too, is likely to consider an extension of Egyptian influence as a threat to its interests in the Gulf" (May 31, 1964). In this connection, few people in the West realize how Nasser's agents in Iran are working overtime to undermine the authority of the Iranian Government. The Nasserites there are adopting violent methods including sabotage. Their ultimate purpose is to bring about conditions that would help to detach important

territories from Iran and incorporate them with neighboring Iraq which is under Nasserite control.

As for Iraq itself, Seale reports, the agreement gives Nasser "a powerful voice" in that country's affairs. Constitutional measures were not required, Seale notes, to effect this "coordination" as long as President Arif is at the helm. Unquestionable, Arif is Nasser's main card in Iraq. From the very moment that this gentleman assumed a prominent role in Iraqi affairs, he demonstrated complete loyalty, or, if you prefer, subservience to Nasser and his ambitions. Arif has been fortunate to have his life spared through the tumultuous years beginning with the brutal murder of the Iraqi King in which he was involved. Arif was also successful in overthrowing the dictatorship of General Kassim and in the process launched a new blood bath against all of his opponents. His main prop does not come from the people of Iraq, but from Nasser's agents.

ARIF'S "BIG BROTHER"

President Arif's feelings toward Nasser were expressed in a press interview with the English-language Bahgdad News: "To me, President Nasser is a big brother who collaborated with us to reach our great aim." (July 24, 1964). Arif has good reason to be thankful; for that matter, so does Nasser himself, for, on the very eve of the second summit, a plot to overthrow Arif was uncovered. According to reliable reports which subsequently filtered out of Iraq, Arif arrived at the summit conference in an Egyptian airplane because he could not trust his own aircraft when he found out that he was the prime target of a planned coup d'état.

From what one can gather from the New York Times (Sept. 23, 1964) and other sources, it appears that elements of the outlawed Baathist Party and sections of Iraqi armed forces were poised to strike before Arif could take off for Cairo. Hundreds were arrested before the plot could be carried out, thanks to an informer. Arif and his henchmen then rushed to secret hideouts until loyal army units and Nasserite agents took care of things. According to the New York Times' Middle Eastern affairs expert, Dana Adams Schmidt, diplomatic observers saw in the attempted coup "one more indication of the precarious position of the Arif regime whose main hold on power now appears to depend on Nasserites." This is confirmed by a fact which has been hardly publicized; namely, that since the early summer Egyptian troops have been stationed in Baghdad. As a matter of fact, more were flown into Iraq precisely while President Arif was posing at the summit conference as the unchallenged spokesman of his people.

Thus, as in the case of the fizzle in Yemen, President Arif came to the summit conference with his tail down. This, too, was a source of great embarrassment for Nasser who had worked so hard and spent so much money and sacrificed so many lives to build up a great "coordinating" front with Yemen and Iraq intended to overawe and bully the other chiefs of state at the summit conference. It should be noted that Arif's rule is so shaky that even the agreement to bring Iraq and Egypt close together, has been temporarily shelved. "President Nasser's fear apparently is that, if union were established and President Arif overthrown, it would be as damaging to his personal prestige as the secession of Syria from the United Arab Republic in 1961" (New York Times, Oct. 17, 1964).

SYRIA

Obviously, the collapse of Nasser's "coordination" policy could not help but adversely affect the proceedings at the summit. For example, the Syrians, led by their chief of state Gen. Amin el-Hafez, came to the conference undaunted and unbowed just as Crown Prince Faisal. It is a fact that Nasser tried to "coordinate" Syria in his grab-bag scheme prior to the summit. In June, Nasser's agents, taking advantage of Lebanese hospitality, were planning to strike at Syria. Their activities became so blatant that the Syrian Government dispatched an official note to the Lebanese Government pointing out that these elements were endangering relations between the two countries. The note mentioned that Syria and Lebanon were on good terms but that these subversive elements were using "the territory of brotherly Lebanon * * * as a springboard for subversive activities by plotters wanted by Syrian justice." The note stated that these activities were not only directed against Syria but could harm Lebanese independence and "divert Lebanon from its traditional neutral policy."

Despite this official communication and other warnings, the Nasserites continued their plottings on Lebanese soil. One month after the Syrian note was sent to Lebanon, the Nasserites announced a new political organization whose objectives was to overthrow the Syrian Government and to bring it into the Egyptian fold (New York Times, July 20, 1964). However, Nasser was unable to shake the leadership of the Syrian Government. Moreover, that leadership took additional heart by Nasser's failures in Yemen and Iraq.

It should also be borne in mind that the Syrian Chief of State General Hafez is not one who will take a rear seat while Nasser drives the show. With utter ruthlessness he has cracked down on the Nasserites in Syria and he continued his posture of defiance during the summit conference. For one thing, Hafez questioned Nasser's leadership and the policies governing the establishment of the so-called Palestinian Army. He questioned the role of Mr. Shukairy, Nasser's henchman and self-proclaimed leader of the Palestinian refugees. These direct attacks enraged Nasser and soon his propagandists were taking potshots at Hafez. In turn, the Director General of the Syrian Broadcasting System issued a statement accusing an influential Cairo newspaper of attempting to "sow dissention" among the delegates at the conference with "distorted" reports. Although the paper was not named, the Syrian blast pointed to Al Ahram, whose editor Mohammed Haikal is one of Nasser's closest confidants. It is not surprising, therefore, that in reporting the Syrian-Egyptian feud at the summit as well as Nasser's heavyhanded tactic toward Saudi Arabia and Lebanon, the New York Herald Tribune should have carried a headline over a dispatch from Alexandria which read: "Arab Unity Talks: Cracks in Facade" (September 10, 1964).

OTHER FIELDS TO CONQUER

Nasser had had high hopes that summitry would accomplish what he had not been able to achieve by more direct and cruder means. Unquestionably, the fundamental weaknesses of the Egyptian economy aggravated by a lack of natural resources, compelled Nasser to look for support from neighboring states. This is done under the guise of furthering Arab political unity by examples of mutual economic assistance. Nonetheless, the fact remains that it is Egypt which needs her neighbors much more than they need her.

Thus, when the first summit conference adjourned, five major projects were put on the planning boards. Actually, they were not new schemes as they had been gathering dust in the archives of the Arab League (dominated by Egypt) for some years. The first of these was a proposal to establish an Arab common market under Arab League sponsorship. The general idea, of course, was to break down tariff barriers among the Arab States on the grounds that this would benefit all the countries involved. Up to now, the idea has not caught fire, for only a handful of states have indicated their approval of it. Moreover, from a technical point of view, an Arab common market has a rather bleak future. In the first place, manufacturing in the Arab countries is on a relatively low level and marketing techniques are in their infancy. Furthermore, the Arab States depend more upon the outside world for manufactures rather than from their own area. Even though theoretically it is possible that a common market may be established one day, its main function, as seen from Cairo, would be to enable Egypt to penetrate the economies of neighboring states and to influence and direct their development so as to subserve the interests of Egypt itself.

Besides the visionary idea of an Arab common market, plans called for the establishment of an Arab bank, an Arab tanker corporation, a Pan-Arab airline, and an Arab shipping company. It is interesting to note that in each one of these projects Cairo would play the leading role. For example, Cairo would control 30 percent of the Arab shipping company. The Pan-Arab airline would also fall under the control of Egypt which, together with Iraq, would control 40 percent of its capital. The tanker corporation which would build a fleet of ships to carry Arab oil to the world markets, would also be effectively controlled by the Egyptians, although Cairo itself has little oil to export of its own. The Arab bank to which Kuwait is expected to contribute the lion's share of the capital, would be located in Cairo. In short, all of these economic schemes are, in reality, an integral part of Cairo's objective to lord over the whole Middle East. Nasser hoped that the second summit meeting would lend fresh impetus to the implementation of these projects, but here again, little of a concrete nature was accomplished.

PALESTINIAN ARMY

How did the summit meeting fare in its deliberations on how to block the further peaceful economic development of Israel? Even here, the summit which began with such fanfare, ended in a tangled mess. This is not to say that the resolutions calling for the creation of a Palestinian Army, having as its object the launching of military aggression against Israel, are to be underrated. It is an old story that, when the Arabs cannot agree among themselves, they immediately reach for the old reliable anti-Israel line. Yet, even on this point there was a great deal of wrangling—so much so that even Nasser himself was compelled to remark that the conference was "going around in circles" (New York Times, Sept. 14, 1964).

It is not too difficult to understand why this should be so. The fact is that this Palestinian army, which grossly violates the United Nations Charter, and the newly created joint military command would be under the thumb of the Cairo government. All reports from the conference agree that Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon were most reluctant to permit their armed forces to be controlled by the Egyptians. Nor did they like the idea of having forces under this joint Arab military command stationed in their countries.

The Egyptians, of course, were anxious to tighten control via the joint Arab military commanad in the hope that this would open new doors for subversion. Another compelling reason why the Egyptians want to dominate the military setup stems from their plan to become the chief market for the sale of Soviet made war equipment. Desperate as Egypt is for hard currency, the Nasser regime calculated that it could obtain such funds through the sale of Soviet military hardware to the Arab countries. This did not go well with the other Arab states which still receive arms from the West and plan to do their own marketing directly with the Kremlin if they should decide to purchase

Soviet arms. In other words, the other Arab states rejected Egypt's proposition that she serve as the middleman for such arms deals which would bring subtsantial profits to her empty treasury.

In spite of these frictions, one must not downgrade Nasser's determination to employ force in the pursuance of his imperialistic aims. Last spring, he shouted to a cheering crowd in Yemen: "We swear by God to expel Britain from all parts of the Arab world." Only the blind will be unable to see that this violent threat is directed against all of the Western democracies including the United States.

Ironically, when Mr. Nasser shakes his fists at Britain, many of the neighboring Arab states, as if by instinct, tremble for they know, as unfortunately our State Department refuses to see, that Nasser has his eye on Kuwait, the Persian Gulf, Iran—indeed, on the whole complex of the Middle East with its enormous economic and strategic resources. Nasser's summitry cannot be properly understood unless these facts are pondered and weighed.

From time to time, one finds reports in the press conveying the idea that Nasser is a man of moderation who is trying so very hard to calm the nerves and emotions of other Arab leaders. But this is a false image of the man who is best known by other Arab leaders. "It is a pity," the London Financial Times wrote, "that while be (President Nasser) is the symbol of Arab national unity for some Arabs, for others his personal ambitions are the biggest obstacle to it" (June 1, 1964).

On that note, we predict that summitry, too, will pass away for Nasser as his frustrations continue to mount. We also venture to predict that, as other states become more and more disenchanted, Mr. Nasser will again revert to more forceful means. Are U.S. policymakers prepared to meet that inevitable crisis which will challenge America's own national interests? Certainly, security-minded Americans are entitled to a clear and unambiguous answer.

Presidential Succession and Disability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity of presenting to the Committee on Judiciary my views on the need for legislative action to resolve the complex problems of presidential succession and disability and vacancies in the office of Vice President. The committee is to be highly commended for the serious attention which is being given to this very important matter.

I am among those in the Congress who are concerned over the problem and on January 6, 1965, I introduced House Joint Resolution 143, which is identical to the resolution introduced by my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my testimony before the Committee on Judiciary in support of House Joint Resolution 143:

STATEMENT OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE GARNER E. SHRIVER, OF KANSAS, TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 10, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to express support of the vital deliberations which this committee has undertaken in regard to the complex problems of Presidential succession and disability, and vacancies in the office of the Vice Presidency. Most adult Americans recognize there is a need for congressional action after careful study of all proposals.

I have introduced a resolution, House Joint Resolution 143, to amend the Constitution to clarify the latent ambiguities and the shortcomings of existing law. My proposal embodies the major recommendations of the consensus arrived at by the Conference on Presidential Inability and Succession sponsored by the American Bar Association.

Under the terms of my proposed amendment, the Constitution would provide that in the event of the permanent exclusion of the President from office—that is, removal, death, or resignation—the Vice President shall succeed to the office for the balance of the unexpired term. This will have the effect of giving a legal basis to the precedent established by John Tyler.

In view of the growing importance of our Nation's second highest office and the recurrent history of vacancies connected therewith, it is highly desirable that that office should be filled at all times. On 16 occasions, totaling more than 37 years, the office of Vice President has been vacant. In all our Nation has been without a Vice President in excess of 20 percent of the time during its history. My proposal if adopted would amend the Constitution to provide that in the event of a vacancy, the President shall appoint a Vice President with the advice and consent of both Houses of Congress.

In connection with the paramount problem of disability, I propose that in the case of such an eventuality, the powers and duties but not the office, shall be discharged by the Vice President for the duration of the inability or until the expiration of the President's term of office.

The President may establish his own disability by issuing a declaration in writing to that effect. Where he fails or is unable to do so the Vice President with the concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet or such other body as the Congress may provide, are authorized to establish the fact of Presidential disability.

Similarly, the ability of the President to resume his powers and duties, may be established by his declaration in writing. If the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet fail to concur with this decision of the President, the matter would be brought to the Congress for resolution.

History as well as commonsense indicate that we cannot insure against or be spared the sorrow of a fallen leader. We have it within our power, however, to remove the cause of great anxiety and apprehension that arises out of the uncertainties of the present law. Our failure to capitalize on the present opportunity will render meaningless the tragedies and near tragedies of the past and the sorrows of the American people which have inevitably flowed in their wake.

Mr. Chairman, this is a problem which your committee is well qualified to consider and to recommend a legislative solution. I commend this committee for launching these important hearings. Thank you for the attention you will give to the resolution which I have introduced.

Federal Aid Almost as Old as the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, with criticism from many sources about Government taking over functions which belong to State and local administration, I was very much interested in reading an article from the February 1965 issue of the Catholic Extension magazine, about the priest who served in Congress. In addition to his ecclesiastical duties, he was of great service to the community in so many areas, even to serving one term in the Congress. Helping to meet these needs made it necessary for him to call upon the Government for financial assistance in many instances, so we can see that even with the rugged individualism and determination of the early citizens, there was need for Federal aid.

I believe this article on Father Gabriel Richard, a Member of the 18th Congress, and the only priest to have been a Member of this body, will be of interest to all the Members and therefore, I am inserting it in the Appendix:

THE PRIEST WHO SERVED IN CONGRESS

(By John C. O'Brien)

Among the Members who assembled in December 1823, for the opening of the 1st session of the 18th Congress was a French-born Sulpician, Father Gabriel Richard, the first and the only Roman Catholic priest ever to occupy a seat in that body. He had been elected to represent the newly formed Territory of Michigan in the House of Representatives as delegate.

In those days the House conducted its business in the pillared rotunda familiar to today's tourists as the Hall of Statuary in the Capitol. Most of the beaver-hatted men who presented their credentials on that opening day no longer are remembered. But two of them, Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, and Henry Clay, of Kentucky, were to make history as Members of the Senate. Another, James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, was to become President of the United States. And Sam Houston, a Member from Tennessee, went on to make a name for himself as the victor in the defeat of the Mexican General Santa Anna at the Battle of San Jacinto and as first President of the Republic of Texas, which lasted from 1836 to 1838.

The priest from the Michigan Territory also achieved enduring, if local, fame, not so much as a legislator but as a pioneer builder and educator in the city of Detroit. He is commemorated by a statue which stands in a niche in a facade of Detroit's city hall.

The priest did not take his seat immediately, for his election had been contested by one of his opponents. There had been some question whether he would be able to journey to Washington to present his credentials and his defense against the protest. For some months he had been in jail because of his refusal to pay damages in the sum of $1,116 assessed against him in a libel suit brought by one of his parishioners. The parishioner had remarried after a divorce, and, in 1821, on order of Bishop Flaget, Richard had proclaimed a decree of excommunication.

The priest was released, however, in time to report for the opening of Congress. He was advised later by such legal lights as Clay, Webster, and John Tyler, who later became President, that the suit was unconstitutional.

There appears to have been no doubt that Father Richard had received a plurality of the votes. Only about 1,500 qualified electors voted in the sparsely settled territory and of these Richard received 444, 23 more than his strongest opponent. Seven candidates contested for the office.

VOTE FRAUDS

Illiteracy prevailed among the French-speaking voters and there is evidence that Richard's opponents took advantage of this to defraud him of votes intended for him. One election worker boasted before a justice of the peace that he switched "damn many" votes of voters who thought they were voting for Richard, "for damn them they cannot read." Another witness swore that this same worker had switched from 16 to 20 votes from Richard to one of his opponents.

The opponent who filed the protest against the seating of Richard was the runner-up Maj. John Biddle, a brother of Nicholas Biddle, of Philadelphia, the famed lawyer and financier. At the time the major held the powerful position of register of the land office.

Biddle, who had migrated to the territory after graduating from Princeton University, based his campaign upon the claim that his influential connections in the East would enable him to get more in Washington for the territory than the priest, an argument reminiscent of that advanced by President Kennedy's brother, EDWARD, when he was running for the Democratic senatorial nomination in Massachusetts last year.

Biddle's contest, however, was not based upon the claim that Richard had not received a plurality of the votes. This had been attested by the election canvassers. The contention was that Richard was an alien, a subject of a foreign power, because the court in Detroit which had naturalized him was not one specifically named in the naturalization law as qualified to confer citizenship.

Regardless of the validity of his naturalization, there was no question about the priest's allegiance to his adopted country. His advocacy of American principles and his denunciation of the British at the beginning of the War of 1812 excited great indignation in Canada. He was seized by the British and imprisoned until the end of the war. The British allowed him, while he was in their custody, to work among their Indian allies, and he is credited with having saved the lives of many American prisoners.

A few years later, William Woodbridge, the first delegate from the territory, cited Richard's imprisonment by the British in a letter to the Secretary of War.

"He," said the delegate in reference to Richard, "is undoubtedly one of the most learned men in the United State. He has wonderful control over the minds of the French-Canadians in the territory and over the Indians, many of whom are Catholics."

Congress convened on December 1 and 11 days later Richard presented his credentials which were referred to the Committee on Elections to be considered along with Biddle's protest.

Two other contests that year were exhaustively debated, but it did not take the committee long to dispose of Biddle's objections The committee held that, although the Territorial Court which had naturalized Richard was not mentioned in the naturalization statute, it had been the intention of Congress in passing the law to consider jurisdiction upon any court that had been legally established.

The committee also made the extraordinary finding that Congress "had no authority to exclude an alien from holding a seat in Congress as a delegate from a territory."

A NATIVE OF FRANCE

Richard had been a subject of the King of France. He was born in La Ville de Saintes on October 15, 1767. His father was a civil servant and his mother, Genevieve Bossuet, was connected with the family of Bishop Bossuet, the famed pulpit orator.

He studied theology at the seminary in Angers and later attended the Sulpician Seminary at Issy. He was ordained on October 15, 1791, and for a time taught mathematics at Issy.

A wave of anticlericalism swept France with the outbreak of the French Revolution. After an encounter with a mob which left him with a scar, Richard fled to America, with a companion, Ambrose Marechal, who later became Bishop of Baltimore, arriving in Baltimore June 24, 1792.

Bishop John Carroll assigned the young priest to work with the French, the half-breeds and the Indians in the vast Northwest Territory. In 1798, he was transferred to Detroit to aiist the aging Father Michael Lavadoux, pastor of St. Anne's Church, the second-oldest continuously maintained parish church in the United States. On the latter's retirement he succeeded as pastor and became vicar-general of the whole region.

From the day he arrived in Detroit, then little more than a trading post, Richard worked tirelessly to promote the spiritual and material welfare of the entire community.

He was deeply concerned about the plight of the Indians who were being robbed of their lands by unscrupulous white speculators. One suspects that he sought election to Congress because, having been frustrated in his efforts to persuade the Federal Government to help his charges, he felt that as a Member of Congress he could get something done.

SCHOOL FOR INDIANS

One of Richard's many projects for the promotion of education in the territory was a school for the Indians which he established on a 200-acre tract called Spring Hill in Detroit, owned by the Federal Government. He journeyed to Washington early in 1809 "at great expense" he noted in a letter, to induce President Jefferson to provide Government assistance for his school.

Jefferson, it appears, agreed to permit Richard to use the Government's tract of land gratis, help furnish the school and pay $400 a year toward the maintenance. Accepting the Government's promise at face value, Richard spent all of his own money equipping the school.

In a letter to Jefferson, dated November 17, 1809, the priest wrote that he had supplied furniture, provisions, clothes, and utensils. At a cost of $80, he had bought in New York a loom, a dozen spring wheels, a spring jenny, an organ, a printing press (the first in the territory) and 60 reams of paper. He also had employed a schoolmaster, a weaver, a printer, a bookbinder, a mason, and a carpenter.

But the Government did not live up to its agreement.

"Sir:" Richard wrote to Jefferson in 1810, "Will you be so good as to hear me once more? Pardon me if I take up so much of your time."

He reminded the President of the agreement for use of the Spring Hill tract without rent. Now, he said, he was being dunned by the collector of duties for $205 in back rent. Not a penny of the promised $400 a year had been forwarded, he complained, and bills he had submitted on behalf of suppliers had not been paid.

"Now all our work is lost," the priest moaned. The land had been put up for public sale and bought out from under him for $5,000.

But he had not despaired. "I have not given up and I will not give up the design of instructing Indian children," he wrote to Jefferson.

Nor did he give up. In a few years he had established six primary schools, two academies and when death caught up with him he was planning to found a Catholic college. His zeal for education knew no bounds. He studied the Picard method of teaching the deaf and the dumb and taught the method to prospective teachers in the territorial normal school.

He found time to edit a child's speller, a Bible for the Indians, a selection from the French poets and wrote devotional books. He started a newspaper, Essais du Michigan, the first in the territory, but because of the irregularity of the mails he was forced to cease publication after a few issues.

So highly was he regarded in the territory as an educator that the Governor requested him in 1809 to draft a plan for education to be submitted to Congress. The plan had the approval of the President.

Some educators regard this plan as the foundation of Michigan's present educational system. It contained the first suggestion for vocational education ever advanced.

Richard proposed the establishment of primary schools 5 or 6 miles apart. Since the parents would be unable to pay tuition, he stressed the necessity for Government support. The incapacity of parents to pay, he noted, was due to want of industry in the community. Therefore, he proposed, that the schools should "teach agriculture, useful arts and trades, such as carpenter, blacksmith, shoemaker, weaver, etc."

But reading, writing, "ortography," arithmatic, geography, grammar, history, natural philosophy, composition, etc., should not be neglected.

Also fine arts, music, and drawing should be taught.

"Children," he said, "must be led to science and virtue by a flowery road."

PREACHES TO NONCATHOLICS

Richard appears to have been imbued with the ecumenical spirit. When he became pastor of St. Anne's there was no other clergyman in the community. Although his English was imperfect—his letters are full of odd constructions and spellings—he was invited by the Governor and the council of the Territory to preach to them. Thereafter for many years he preached at noon once a week in the council house for his non-Catholic neighbors.

His readiness to work with non-Catholics for the betterment of the community was evinced again when he joined with the Rev. John Montieth, an Episcopal clergyman and Princeton graduate recently arrived from the East, in founding what is now the University of Michigan.

With two other collaborators they obtained a charter from the Governor and judges of the Territory in 1817. The university's first name was Catholepistenniad. The name was changed to the University of Michigan in 1821, when provision was made for a board of trustees, of whom Richard was one. In 1837 the school was transferred to its present site at Ann Arbor and was reorganized under a board of regents.

At the outset, Richard and Montieth were the faculty. Gov. Lewis Cass named Montieth president and professor of universal sciences, economical sciences, literature, chemistry, natural history, and historical sciences.

Father Richard was named professor of intellectual sciences, astronomy, and mathematics.

During his 2 years in Congress, Richard presented petitions for grants for schools, for land surveys, roads, bridges, and quays. He pleaded for fairer treatment for the Indians. He quickly won the esteem of Clay, who was Speaker. When Richard's English faltered, Clay used to help him make himself understood by rephrasing his arguments.

At Clay's suggestion, Richard introduced a motion for a $10,000 appropriation to sur-

vey the Great Sauk Trail from Detroit to Chicago. The money was voted, and an additional $3,000 the next year. This survey led to the building of a road which is now part of Interstate Highway 94, built at a cost of $250 million.

For the Indians he wanted the Government to pay fair compensation when their land was taken from them. "It is well known," he said, "by everyone that they have been grossly cheated." Considerate treatment of the Indians, as he wrote in a letter to the President, was good policy, "as it prevents them from going to war and joining our British neighbors."

Richard ran for reelection in 1825, but was defeated by one of the men who had opposed him in his first campaign. He devoted his remaining years to various projects for betterment of Detroit and the territory. When an epidemic of Asiatic cholera broke out in 1832, he labored for 3 months night and day administering to the victims. As he must have known would happen, he contracted the disease and on September 9 of that year he died.

If Lincoln Was President Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following eulogy on Lincoln by a distinguished Kansas attorney, Col. D. Arthur Walker. The oration was delivered at the annual Lincoln Day Ceremony at Independence, Kans., on February 12, 1965.

Mr. Walker eloquently recalls those qualities of mind and spirit which were the greatness of our 16th President, and I commend his speech to the attention of my colleagues:

IF LINCOLN WAS PRESIDENT TODAY

(Speech of D. Arthur Walker, of Arkansas City, Kans., at Lincoln Day ceremony, Independence, Kans., February 12, 1965)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it was a bit less than 150 years ago in the timbered hills of rural Indiana that a little lad, with a broken heart and tear-filled eyes, knelt down on the earthen floor of a crude log cabin and tenderly kissed the calloused hand of his angel mother. For a few moments the only sound in the room filled with shadows and sorrow, was the sobbing of the little lad, and then came the soft voice of his father saying, "Abe, will you go out and make some pegs for mother's coffin? I've got the boards near ready." At that the boy arose from beside the body of his mother and stepped to the door of the cabin. Then for a moment he paused—and as a little boy turned his tear-stained face for a last look at his mother—then turned his face to the world outside, took a deep breath to stifle his sobs, straightened his shoulders and stepped across the threshold a man—a man whom the entire world would love, respect, and know as Abraham Lincoln.

From that most humble beginning this man, without the benefit of any formal education, devoid of wealth, and lacking the aid of influential friends, became the President of our great Republic, and the American most widely known throughout the world.

No words have ever been uttered by any American that are better known—or will longer be remembered—than his tribute to the soldiers who fell on the battlefield of Gettysburg.

That he was a genius no one can deny. What intellectual food did he feast upon to reach the pinnacle of fame? History tells us the books he read as a boy, which shaped his philosophy and actions as a man, were the Holy Bible, Weems Life of Washington, History of the United States, and Franklin's Autobiography.

From the Bible he got his wisdom, his warm heart, a love of justice and fair play, his hatred of intolerance and oppression and his conviction that all men are created equal.

From the Life of Washington he got courage, he got a respect for our flag, loyalty to our country, a deep conviction, that to risk danger is always to be preferred to accepting disgrace and humiliation, and, that those who wish to continue to receive the blessings of independence, must, like those who signed the Declaration to obtain independence, be ever willing to pledge their lives, their property, and their sacred honor.

From the history of the United States he learned the basic reason that people organize with a tribe, a clan, or a country is to protect their persons and their property. That each citizen must protect his country—and the country must protect each citizen. That when citizens are unwilling to risk danger to protect their country—or their country is unwilling to risk danger to protect its citizens and their property—then that country is on the road to oblivion. Lincoln further learned that the moving cause of our Declaration of Independence, which brought on the Revolutionary War, was the fact set forth therein, that the King of Great Britain "has plundered our seas, ravished our coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people."

He read and understood, and he believed, the statement of Alexander Hamilton who said:

"A nation which can prefer disgrace to danger is prepared for a master and deserves one."

And finally, from the work of Benjamin Franklin he learned that whether it be an individual, a city, a state, or a nation—you cannot long survive if you spend more than you take in. That there is no such thing as "Federal aid" or "Federal funds." The Government creates no wealth. All the Government does is to distribute, wisely or unwisely, the taxes it has taken from the laborer, who frequently must deprive himself of a coat for his child, a rug for his home, or food for his family to pay his taxes.

Yes—this was the philosophy of Lincoln, and these were the books that furnished the food for his mind.

So it is that on the birthday of the Great Emancipator we pause a moment to consider what Lincoln would do today if he was President.

What action would Lincoln take against a score of countries that have accepted the sweat and sacrifice of our taxpayers under the guise of "foreign aid" and in return for our benevolence torn down our flag and burned and descrecrated our national emblem?

What action would Lincoln take against a score of countries that have accepted the sweat and sacrifice of our taxpayers under the guise of "foreign aid" and in return for our benevolence hurled stones at our officials, set fire to our embassies, and put the torch to our libraries?

What action would Lincoln take to obtain the freedom of dozens of Americans now wrongfully imprisoned in a score of countries, fine men and women rotting away in foreign jails in order that some petty tyrant may humiliate and disgrace our own beloved country, the most powerful nation in the world.

And what action would Lincoln take to halt "deficit spending," the dizzy dance of economic ruin whereby we continue to spend year after year billions of dollars more than our Government income?

Would Abraham Lincoln take any action to stop the insults to our flag, the oppression and humiliation of our citizens, the wanton destruction of American property, and to save us from ultimate financial disaster? I think he would.

What would Lincoln do?

First he would display to the world some genuine old-fashioned courage. The people of this great country have not lost their courage—it's our leaders. Lincoln would notify Mr. Castro, Mr. Nasser, and Mr. Communist wherever he might be, to release all American citizens being wrongfully detained within 48 hours or our Army, Navy, and Air Force would be directed to take such action as might be necessary to secure their release. Our citizens must protect our Government in times of danger, and in return our Government must protect our citizens in time of danger—and until our President has the courage to do this, we will not have the respect of other countries, and what is worse, we won't have the respect of our own countrymen.

Do you think Lincoln would have this courage? I say that he would. In 1861 when Lincoln was inaugurated for his first term the seven powerful Southern States had already seceded. They had formed the Confederacy, adopted a constitution, elected their president, selected their flag, were starting to print their own currency, and were starving the Federal troops in Fort Sumpter.

Lincoln had two alternatives. He could avoid danger by failing to send help to the Federal troops. He could have ignored and abandoned them, and although our Nation would have been humiliated and disgraced there would have been no danger of war. On the other hand if he tried to send supplies to the troops at Fort Sumpter the South said it would mean civil war.

Many Presidents have had difficult decisions to make, but no President ever had a mode difficult decision to make than Lincoln at this hour. Security or danger? Respect or disgrace? Courage or cowardice? You and the entire world remembers and approves the decision he made and the man who displayed such courage in 1861 would be courageous today.

A second thing Lincoln would do if President today, would be to bring back character and integrity to that office and to all officials who occupy positions of public trust. What a refreshing thing it would be to see the "fast buck," "wheeler dealer" boys, including some of our leaders who regard themselves as "smart operators," fold their tent and silently steal away from the happy hunting grounds of the Potomac.

A third thing Lincoln would do as President would be to display some wisdom in our international affairs instead of our impulsive, hour-to-hour diplomacy that not only has confused the rest of the world, but even worse, has confused the people of this country.

What is our foreign policy? No one knows, and it is not by reason of the fact the President and State Department won't tell us. The pitiful thing is they lack the wisdom to formulate a long range foreign policy.

Here are some samples of our foreign policies:

Not long ago Nasser decided to steal the Suez Canal. Britain and France rushed in to stop the theft and we rushed in and

stopped Britain and France. For our pains we alienated two of our longtime allies, gave the Comunists control of Africa and got our buildings, as well as our fingers, burned in Cairo, as a token of Nasser's appreciation. Did this help our image throughout the world?

We gave Castro the money and munitions to throw Batista out of Cuba without giving any thought to what kind of ruler Castro might become. Then we prepared the plans to throw Castro out, landed the troops, had the Navy standing by ready to supply air cover, and then at the critical moment deserted our allies and sailed for home. Did this help our image throughout the world?

In Vietnam in the past few months we have been told that everything was fine and all our troops would be out of there by 1965. Then we were told that things were in a desperate situation and we should send more troops, then we were told that the Catholics were causing the trouble and we threw them out of power and put in Buddhists. Then we threw the Buddhists out and tried to force a new form of civilian control over the military, and the military revolted and took control from the civilians, and all the time hundreds of Americans are being killed or injured, we are assured by our President we are not in a war, that we are just helping the people of Vietnam to help themselves.

From the way things are going, it would appear that if we will give the Vietnamese a little more help, we can put them completely out of business.

What is our basic trouble in Vietnam?

Our basic trouble is that we have no crystal-clear policy for being in Vietnam.

Senator JOHN J. WLLIAMS of Delaware, within the past few days said of our troubles in Vietnam:

"The first order of business is to make up our minds as to our policy."

If Lincoln were President today he would first determine what our policy is in Vietnam.

We should be in Vietnam for only one of three different reasons. First: to maintain peace in southeast Asia. Second: to establish a stable government in Vietnam. Third: to protect our western flank in the Pacific for military security.

Each of these reasons is separate and distinct from the others and require a different policy on our part to make it work.

For example: If our policy is to maintain peace in southeast Asia, then we should work through the United Nations or SEATO.

If our policy is to establish a stable government in Vietnam, we should carefully select the strongest and best leader available, put him in power and then let him do the job in the manner he feels is best.

If our policy is to protect our western flank in the Pacific and give military protection to Formosa, Okinawa, and the Phillipines, then we should ignore the public opinion of the Communists and proceed to establish a garrison such as the British did at Gibraltar, or the United States at Guantanamo.

One thing is certain, Abraham Lincoln would adopt a long-range policy that would be understood by all—and having adopted it, would carry it through and not be blindly shooting from the hip and changing our policy from hour to hour.

A few years ago Gen. Omar Bradley said, "It is time our country chartered its course by the stars and not by the light of each passing ship."

It seems the time has come to substitute wisdom for impulse in our international relationships.

And now a word about our so-called national image.

I believe that at the present time we are taking the earnings of our taxpayers and scattering them among 107 or 108 foreign countries in some sort of an attempt to win an international popularity contest. We have been trying to win this imaginary contest for 20 years now and to date we have been consistent—we have lost in every country. We say we wanted to help our national image.

Image of what? The only image we have created is that Uncle Sam is a rich, benign, befuddled, timid, and sometimes cowardly old man. Whatever image we may have created has hurt us and I for one am ready to return this image malarky to the Ivy League stargazers who prefer images over realities.

I believe if Lincoln was President today he would eliminate this hour-to-hour, off-the-cuff, impulsive international diplomacy and in its place apply some wisdom and stability.

He would give assistance only if assistance was urgently needed. This practice of our Government taking the U.S. taxpayers' savings each year and giving each of some 107 or 108 countries a handout, whether they need it or not, and doing this year after year is not wise—it is foolish and can be likened to a man filling a bushel basket with his savings and starting down the street giving a handful of bills to the first 107 or 108 people he meets and if asked why he is doing it, he replies "I really don't know but I started doing it years ago and I suppose I must continue."

Again Lincoln in his wisdom would give assistance only to those countries who are our friends and cease giving strength to those countries who seek to destroy us. He would give assistance only when needed, to those countries who have the same philosophy of government, the same concept of the dignity of men and women, who are willing to carry on commerce with us, work for the mutual good of both—and if called upon—to bear arms for the mutual protection of both.

And finally, if Lincoln was President today what would he do about "deficit spending," this dizzy dance of economic disaster?

In recent years the words "conservative," "moderate," and "liberal" have been repeatedly used and seldom defined. Without attempting to define the terms I believe one distinction of each is:

A conservative is a person who believes in paying his debts.

A moderate is a person who has discovered you don't need to pay your debt if you will keep the interest paid.

A liberal is a person who doesn't care whether the principal or interest is ever paid.

In this year's budget of the money our Government will spend is an item of interest on the public debt of approximately $11 billion. Now $1 billion is one thousand million dollars; $11 billion therefore is eleven thousand million dollars for interest alone for 1 year. Now here is something about the interest due each year on our public debt that may amaze you. At the present time our Government either rents or owns approximately 2,000 computers. Most of us assume a computer can give the correct answer to any problem, but in the U.S. News & World Report of January 4, 1965, it says on page 74:

"In each of the past 3 years interest on the debt has been underestimated by more than half a billion dollars. The average error in those years amounted to $623 million.

In other words, with all our computers and technological and scientific data the closest we could come to figuring the annual interest was $623 million. The Government shrugs this off as a minor error—and I guess if they don't intend to ever pay, it doesn't make much difference as to the amount.

Permit me to give you one more illustration. The total cost of World War I for the 2 years or better we were in, with over 4 million men and women trained and more than 2 million sent overseas, was $22 billion, or $11 billion per year to pay for carrying on a full-scale, all-out war. We are now spending more money each year on interest than was spent each year carrying on World War I.

Some statisticians foresee that within 5 years one tax dollar out of five will go to pay interest, within 10 years, one dollar out of three will go to pay interest, and within 15 years one tax dollar out of two will be needed to pay our interest, and with ever-mounting debt, and increased interest rates, we have accelerated our speed to economic catastrophe.

If Lincoln was President today would he try to keep our spending within our income? To do this he would have to have the courage to cut down on projects or personnel.

Would Lincoln have the courage? Would he have the courage to direct all Federal agencies ot reduce their personnel by 10 percent and their expenditures by another 10 percent? This one directive would not only stop deficit spending, it would give us a surplus to begin the long return to national solvency.

Take our State Department for example. It had about 6,000 employees a little over 10 years ago. Today it has over 25,000. Would a cut of 10 percent of their personnel, cutting it back to 22,500, or almost four times the number it had 10 years ago, be unreasonable?

And how about the elimination of many of our unnecessary projects that cost us millions of dollars, such as the effect of epsom salts on a frustrated frog, or whether the rustle of silk is more seductive than the crackle of calico.

Would Lincoln have the courage to tell the people the truth without sugar coating the facts? You know that he would.

Would the people of this country respect a President and respond to his request to help put our country in order? You know, and I know, the people of this country would respond and do their part.

The smartest politician of the last decade took over as our President a few days ago. At the same time the greatest statesman of this era lay dying in his London home.

What a difference in the leadership of the two men. Our politician President, knowing full well the desperate needs of this country had not the courage to put the facts before the people and ask their help in solving the problem—instead he offered a lifetime of tranquilizers, a free ride from the cradle to the grave without work or worry, with labor for none and recreation for all.

Compare if you will that politician prescription filled with pacifying opiates to the speech of the great statesman to the people of Great Britain in their darkest hour when he said:

"I promise you nothing but blood, toil, tears, and sweat.

"We shall fight in France, we shall fight in the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our island whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender."

Of one thing we may be sure—if Lincoln were President today he would have the courage to tell the people the truth, to trust their loyalty and devotion to their country to do whatever was necessary to preserve our Nation. This was what he did to preserve our Union during the Civil War—this is what he would do today.

Yes, if Lincoln were President today we would have courageous leadership. If our leaders had shown the slightest courage we would not have been defeated in Cuba, Panama, or in the Congo, we would not have suffered the humiliation of paying $50 million ransom to Castro to obtain the freedom of his captives, we would not have been so afraid of public opinion of the Communists that we let American teachers, doctors, priests, and nuns be tortured and fed to the cannibals of the Congo; with any show of courage on our part there would today

be no Castro, Sukarno, or Nasser, or Berlin Wall, and neither would there have been any war over these incidents.

This afternoon as the quiet shadows fall on a hallowed tomb at Springfield, Ill., there is a coffin within that tomb, and within that coffin lie the mortal remains of Abraham Lincoln, who was one of the most beloved and respected men that God ever created. Struck down by an assassin in his hour of victory the lips of Lincoln are forever sealed, and it is for you and me to speak for him if his ideals and philosophy are to be carried on.

What can we do? We can speak to our Senators, our Congressman, our Governor, our legislators, our friends, our neighbors, and most important of all, to the young men and women of 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 years of age whose votes could well be the deciding factor in the next presidential elections.

But you ask, "Isn't that more than one person can do?" I shall close by reciting an old quotation I feel appropriately answers your question:

"I am but one person, I cannot do everything, but I can do something. What I can do, I should do, and what I should do, by the grace of God I will do."

George D. Dean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the journalism profession recently lost an outstanding and dedicated member in the death of my old and dear friend, George D. Dean, an associate editor of the Sacramento Bee in Sacramento, Calif. Mr. Dean died of a heart attack on February 8, 1965.

With his passing the journalistic profession is poorer because he was a fine reporter and a conscientious craftsman. He was one of the best informed reporters in the United States on the subject of conservation and reclamation. For many years he wrote editorials for the Sacramento Bee explaining to untold thousands of Californians the importance of the great Central Valley's project and many other reclamation and conservation activities. Always a good reporter, Mr. Dean took the time to acquaint himself with the many intricate details involved in numerous Federal and State water and power projects. As a result, his editorials were factual, hard hitting, and true to the mark.

His distinguished career with the Sacramento Bee began on August 25, 1925, and he had been an associate editor since June 2, 1943. A fuller appreciation of the impact of his untimely death can be realized by recalling the words of California's Governor, Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, who said of him:

George Dean was a newspaperman and editor in the finest tradition of the Sacramento Bee. In his long and dedicated career as a newspaperman, he never wavered from the principle that the heart of every story must be the truth. He served the Bee well and in doing so he served California well. He will be sorely missed.

Negro History Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week Americans throughout this country celebrated Negro History Week to focus attention upon the great contributions Negroes have made to the United States and to the world throughout the ages, their great cultural heritage and particularly to pay honor to those dedicated men and women who, through great personal sacrifice and courage, helped to advance the cause of Negro rights and dignity in the United States.

Unfortunately, too many Americans tend to forget the great contributions that have been made to this country by Negro men and women. Foremost in this distinguished array can be counted men such as the great educator, Booker T. Washington, who helped to advance the cause of Negro higher education and whose biography has been an inspiration to American youth.

One can also note the outstanding accomplishments of George Washington Carver who made outstanding scientific accomplishments and gave an important impetus to a new industry in the South.

Another outstanding American was Frederic Douglass who, at the risk of losing his own freedom, fought the great social injustices of the last century and helped bring the fight against slavery to the North. This man's life also offers an inspiration in his rise from slavery to become American Minister to Haiti.

But these men were just the commencement of a long line of American Negroes who have made outstanding contributions in the arts, sciences, government, education, religion, and athletics. Some prominent names of Negro people making such history are: Rev. Martin Luther King, winner of the 1964 Nobel Peace Prize and leader of the civil rights movement; the Honorable Carl T. Rowan, Director of the U.S. Information Agency; Mr. James Baldwin, the noted author; Mr. Sidney Poitier, noted actor and winner of the Academy Award; Miss Leontyne Price, noted opera star; Mr. Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; and, my former Peace Corps colleague, the Honorable Franklin H. Williams, U.S. Representative to the United Nations Economic and Social Council. This, of course, is only a very partial list of the many American Negroes who have donated to the development of America, not only within the boundaries of this country, but overseas as well, in the promotion of international understanding, goodwill, and a better understanding of America.

Significant developments have occured over the past 200 years and American Negroes have increasingly taken their rightful place in American history and society. Their contributions and achievements can be cataloged with great pride.

The celebration of Negro History Week should not, however, simply be a reflection on the past, or even an acknowledgement of the present, but rather a rededication by all Americans to strive for further justice and equal rights until all men can be judged by the content of their character rather than by the color of their skin. There should be a new resolve to work diligently until all Americans are truly equal and the vast opportunities and wealth, to which American Negroes have contributed so heavily, are denied to no one.

Ronson Corp. Award Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, an increasing number of our great corporations are contributing to the education of young men and women throughout the Nation. I commend Ronson and the National Association of Tobacco Distributors for their splendid contribution to education as outlined in the following news story. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that one of the award winners is from my congressional district.

The news story follows:

WOODBRIDGE, N.J.—Two award-winning college students will be the guests of the Ronson Corp. for all-expense-paid trips to one of the Nation's largest trade conventions in Chicago next month.

Since 1957, Ronson, maker of the world-famous line of cigarette lighters, electric shavers, and appliances, has been sending two students to the convention of the National Association of Tobacco Distributors (NATD) each year in order to provide them with an opportunity to observe—firsthand—American free enterprise in action.

Cynthia Kay Tribelhorn, 18-year-old freshman at Colorado State College at Greeley, and James E. Haralson, Jr., a sophomore at Wofford College, Spartanburg, S.C., are the recipients of this year's expense-paid trips to the NATD convention. The meeting opens March 13 at the Conrad Hilton.

The winners have been chosen as the top scholars from among students who receive scholarships under NATD's college aid grants program for children of wholesaler employees and the college scholarship award program for the sons and daughters of retailers, served by NATD member wholesalers.

Mr. Haralson's father is a retailer, operating J. E. Haralson's Market, at Calhoun Falls, S.C. The elder Haralson is a customer of Cliff Weill, Inc., tobacco wholesaler of Richmond, Va., and an NATD member.

Miss Tribelhorn of Westminster, Colo., is the daughter of John Tribelhorn, employed by the Rothenberg & Schloss Cigar Co., a Denver, Colo., tobacco distributor.

The awards were announced jointly by Joseph Kolodny, managing director of NATD and Louis V. Aronson II, president of Ronson.

NATD started its college aid grants program in 1959 with scholarship awards to 14 students. This year it made awards to 50. Manufacturer-supplier members of NATD—including Ronson Corp.—finance the grants.

which are cash awards to the sons and daughters of tobacco wholesaler employees. The new college scholarship award program instituted in 1964 which is sponsored solely by NATD, provides awards to college-age children of retailers serviced by NATD members. The first group of those winners number 20.

The NATD convention lasts a full week and attracts over 10,000 distributors, dealers, and manufacturers operating in the $8 billion tobacco industry.

"The student guests not only see free enterprise in action," Mr. Kolodny said, "they find out how important trade associations and their conventions are to American prosperity and the American way of doing things."

James F. McCloud Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, recently a high honor was bestowed on one of my constituents, Mr. James F. McCloud of Oakland, Calif.

"For his most valuable services for the promotion of the work of the church and Catholic Apostleship in Argentina," Mr. McCloud was awarded the title of knight commander in the civil division of the Order of St. Gregory the Great by Pope Paul VI.

Antonio Cardinal Caggiano, head of the Catholic Church in Argentina, decorated Mr. McCloud at a ceremony in Buenos Aires on January 7, 1965, which was witnessed by Mrs. McCloud and their four children. It is significant to note that this is the first time this award has been made in Argentina since its inception in 1831 by Pope Gregory XVII.

Such awards of high distinction, however, are not new to this engineering graduate of the 1941 class of Stanford University. Just last month, Mr. McCloud was named Argentina's Executive of the Year. He is the first U.S. businessman ever to achieve such recognition.

The award was bestowed upon Mr. McCloud, who is president of Industrias Kaiser Argentina—IKA—by the El Economista newspaper. Engineer McCloud was cited as "a prototype of the modern executive: young, resolute, possessing a large amount of sensibility, through this entire attitude a need to act is visible, to put into action a creative imagination of notable fertility."

Mr. McCloud, a veteran of 23 years with the Henry J. Kaiser organization, was commended for "his relevant activities and uncommon effort of achievement closely related to the fact that 1964 has been for IKA a truly brilliant year." He was selected for the honor over a large and highly qualified group of candidates.

These two recent awards recognize years of accomplishment by this American businessman who has done much to demonstrate to Latin Americans the rewards of enlightened capitalism and democratic action.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in bringing Mr. McCloud's achievements to the attention of our colleagues.

Twenty Years of Excise Nuisance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the record is clear on who spearheaded the battle for repeal of the retail excise taxes on so-called luxury items. House Republicans proposed this last summer, but were defeated in a narrow party line rollcall of 185 to 207 last June 17. I voted for repeal at that time and shall vote for it again when the opportunity presents itself.

The administration has since indicated a change of heart and has let it be known that its proposals will be forthcoming. During this waiting period, many of us have had an opportunity to carefully examine the retail excise tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. There is no question that consumers and retailers alike would benefit from elimination of taxes which 20 years ago they were assured were temporary contributions to the war effort.

Since Congress convened in January I have introduced three measures to remove retail excise taxes on telephones and telegraphs; on cabaret, motion picture, and legitimate theater admissions; and on club dues and fees. I am studying further legislative repeal in the excise area. It is, therefore, a pleasure to have one of the Nation's leading newspapers, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, join in my efforts. I am pleased to insert the Plain Dealer's February 16 editorial on the subject:

TWENTY YEARS OF EXCISE NUISANCE

Retail excise taxes passed as temporary fundraising measures during World War II have reached their 20th anniversary as a peacetime nuisance that no one is celebrating.

Piled up before House and Senate committees are nearly 100 different pieces of legislation calling for repeal or reduction of the so-called luxury taxes imposed on many articles and services in daily use as necessities.

President Johnson has said he intends to ask Congress to repeal the taxes on such articles as cosmetics, toilet goods, jewelry, furs, luggage, women's handbags, and perhaps some others.

Until specific requests are received from the President, Congress is reluctant to tackle excise tax legislation.

The excise taxes are especially obnoxious to merchants, it having been estimated that it costs about $300 million a year to collect and report the taxes. Their elimination would be welcomed by operators of drugstores and others charged with the distasteful duty of collecting them.

There is additional expense to the Government to interpret, enforce, and police the taxes.

For years, efforts have been made periodically to lift the 10-percent excise tax on telephones, the only one of the utilities that is classified as a luxury.

Ohio phone users pay the Federal Government an average of $43 million a year for the privilege of using the phone. This tax costs users throughout the Nation an average of $855 million a year.

Air travel still carries a luxury tax of 5 percent, although it is now a major form of transportation and serves many areas unreachable by any other form of public transportation. The industry has long since shaken the luxury classification.

Elimination of the taxes will represent a saving to the consumer, but more important will be banishment of a nuisance that costs too much to collect.

President Johnson should lose no time in sending to House and Senate his recommendations that will speed up consideration and action on proposals to end or reduce retail excise taxes.

Kilgore, Tex., Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a splendid editorial about Kilgore, Tex., and the award given Kilgore recently. The editorial appeared February 16, 1965, in the Longview Daily News. Mrs. Beckworth and I were present with Mayor Bean and Mrs. Lewis when the award was conferred on Mayor Bean and Mrs. Lewis in behalf of their fine city and its citizens.

The editorial follows:

KILGORE HONOR

Kilgore basks in the spotlight of national attention and honor today by virtue of having won first place in the National Cleanest Town and Civic Improvement Contest.

The award, a handsome 30-inch-high gold trophy, was brought home to Kilgore Wednesday noon by Mayor Foster T. Bean and Mrs. Lamar Lewis, chairman of the chamber of commerce civic affairs committee.

Kilgore's beautiful trophy is inscribed: "First Place—National Cleanest Town Achievement Award for Civic Improvement." It represents Kilgore's national triumph for accomplishments among cities of 10,000–25,000 population.

The southern anchor of Gregg County's "triangle cities"—Longview, Kilgore, and Gladewater—has scored a civic improvement victory which beat out some of the strongest competition ever noted in the nationwide contest.

A year ago, Kilgore won a certificate of commendation in the contest. This year, Kilgore topped two larger cities—Neptune, N.J., which was runnerup last year and had been expected to take top prize this year, and Marietta, Ohio.

The national award for Kilgore did not result from any snap judgment by the contest judges. Kilgore has made a determined effort over a period of more than 2 years, and showed solid accomplishments in a broad program which embraces improvements in beautification, slum prevention, health and safety, juvenile decency, fire prevention, civic pride, and new business.

It was noteworthy that Kilgore received special recognition by the national advisory council at the awards dinner for the com-

pleteness of its entry and its adherence to the rules, and the admiration of the judges for the high degree of youth cooperation in the city's cleanup and beautification program.

Credit for this fine work belongs to many people who served on the various projects which were headed up in the work of the Kilgore Chamber's civic affair's committee, the cochairman of which are Mrs. Lewis and Harold Anderson. They have had the encouragement and support of our contemporary on the other side of the Sabine, Publisher Charles Devall. And they have had the cooperation of the fine people of Kilgore, a community which across the years has insisted on keeping out the criminal and other undesirable elements which blight so many cities.

Kilgore thus has set a high example of civic pride and self-improvement which every city and community in east Texas should take to heart. This example of hard work and accomplishment most certainly is in keeping with our President's theme of maintaining beauty as a worthwhile part of our Nation's heritage.

The Longview Daily News, on behalf of the people of Longview and Gregg County as well as those throughout east Texas, extends commendation to our Kilgore neighbors for the fine example of civic improvement they have set before us, and warmest congratulations on receiving the coveted national award. The honor is highly merited.

Three Legislators Become Authors—Evins, Bolling, and Reuss Focus New Interest on the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is of interest to all Members of this body to take note of what seems to be a new literary trend in the House of Representatives.

As you know, our friend and distinguished colleague, the Honorable RICHARD BOLLING, the gentleman from Missouri, is the latest Member of the House to join the company of bookwriters.

Congressman BOLLING's new book, "House Out of Order," just published by Dutton, is the third book written by one of our colleagues to appear recently. Congressman BOLLING carefully examines the wheels of Congress and advocates some thoroughgoing reform measures.

"The Critical Decade," whose author is our colleague, the Honorable HENRY S. REUSS, the gentleman from Wisconsin, was published last year by McGraw-Hill. Congressman REUSS, who is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and also a member of the Joint Economic Committee, devotes himself to economic and monetary problems, as well as to the rules and procedures of Congress.

"Understanding Congress," the work of my distinguished colleague from Tennessee, the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, was published in 1963 by Clarkson N. Potter, Inc., of New York. At the time of publication, Congressman EVINS' book was the first complete visection of Congress by a living Member in many, many years.

Congressman EVINS has received considerable acclaim for his book, in which he offers a scholarly and incisive view of Congress at work, and points out that some procedural changes are needed to speed up the work of Congress, but holds that Congress is more misunderstood than at fault.

Congressman EVINS has made a very balanced and thoughtful presentation, utilizing his great depth of perception and his splendid dedication which have so characterized his long record of public service.

Each of these books has in common a focus on the organization, operations, and work of the Congress and all are concerned with questions of congressional reform.

It seems to me that these books are particularly timely with respect to the studies and debates projected for this session in connection with legislation looking toward reorganization of congressional operating methods and machinery.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I accurately express the sentiments of my colleagues in congratulating these three distinguished legislators and authors who have given us all a better insight into the workings of Congress through their scholarly efforts.

Small Business Loan Program Reaches New Peak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, during 1964 the Small Business Administration approved a record $425.8 million in business loans to nearly 11,000 small firms. The previous high was 6,836 loans for $369.4 million in 1961.

Under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD recent information released by Administrator Eugene P. Foley of the Small Business Administration in this regard.

The release follows:

"Small firms receiving financial help from SBA in 1964 reported they had more than 115,000 employees," Foley said. "Without doubt, if there had been no SBA assistance, many would have faced very hard sledding and been forced to operate at reduced levels with fewer employees.

"Instead, because of SBA help, there was generally expanding production and sales and increased employment both for new firms and established enterprises. An additional 6,700 new jobs were made possible by SBA in 1964 through 200 loans to local development companies. These loans totaled $30.7 million."

During the year SBA also approved 4,009 disaster loans of all types for $91.7 million; 141 purchases of debentures totaling $23.2 million to assist small business investment companies in getting started or to expand their operations, 141 loans for $34.3 million to help provide SBIC's with additional operating revenue.

By comparison, in 1963 SBA approved 4,975 business loans for $278.2 million; 2,503 disaster loans for $30.1 million; 115 loans for $18.2 million to local development companies; 169 purchases of debentures totaling $28.6 million to assist small business investment companies in getting started or to expand their operations; and 179 loans for $37 million to help provide SBIC's with additional operating revenue.

West Germany Bows to Cairo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the West German Government's breach of contract to sell arms to the State of Israel is shocking and irresponsible.

This is not only a problem of West Germany vis-a-vis Israel, but rather that of a Western power succumbing to the threats of an enemy of the West, to the possible embarrassment of Bonn's Western friends. Dictators cannot be appeased. The outcome of this decision will undoubtedly be a source of regret on the part of the Bonn government.

I commend the following excellent article from the Economist of London, February 13, 1965, to my colleagues:

ARMS FOR ISRAEL—WESTERN TIMIDITY HAS MADE THE MILITARY AID GOING TO ISRAEL LOOK MORE SINISTER THAN IT REALLY IS

In a bad world the sorry alternative to disarmament is to work for a rough balance of power between countries or groups of countries that consider each other a military threat. This is at least as true in the Middle East as it is anywhere else. While it would be queerly unimaginative to have no scruples about supplying additional tinder to an area that smoulders so persistently, Western governments have tentatively accepted Israel's argument that this involves the lesser risk. The greater one would be to allow the Arabs, which in this case means specifically Egypt, to reach the stage of believing themselves so much more powerfully armed than Israel that they will be encouraged to take the initiative of striking first. Since 1959, when the supply of Russian weapons to Egypt became limited by little more than their cost, the Governments of the United States, France, Britain, and, now it turns out, West Germany have been concerned to prevent Israel from dropping too far behind. The reasoning behind this policy stands up better than many of the ways adopted for carrying it out.

Secrecy is part and parcel of the whole unsavory business of arms trading. But if secrecy is exaggerated beyond the frontiers of fuzziness, if discretion becomes deceit, the exposure when it comes, as come it must in time, comes with a bang. So it has been with the West German agreement to supply Israel with some £30 million worth of conventional war material. The agreement dates back as far as 1960, and two-thirds of the sum is already accounted for; yet it is only now, and in the most inept possible way, that the German Parliament and public (and the Israel Parliament, too) have learned a little of what has been going on. Consequently, a policy that is stoutly defensible in

itself was so obscured behind the sinister-seeming folds of its cloak that it has been stabbed by its own dagger.

Naurally, with Israeli officers training in Germany, there have from time to time been rumors in the press; probably President Nasser, at least, has had a fair inkling of what was going on for a year or more. Recently, West Germany has come in for its share of scolding from Cairo, but with German investment building up in Egypt, Nasser shrewdly kept his fire in reserve. It blew up now because the Egyptians, it seems, miscalculated Bonn's reaction to their invitation to Herr Ulbricht, the East German leader, to visit Cairo next month. The visit may have been wished on the Egyptians by a Moscow anxious to launch Herr Ulbricht on new diplomatic paths; even so, it fits in well enough with Cairo's concept of nonalinement. Confronted by Bonn's hard reaction, President Nasser (accused already and loudly by the Israelis of making sinister use for military purposes of German scientists) dived into his pocket for what was, from his point of view, the perfect counterblast. In the explosions that followed, it has been the West German Government that has had to duck; on Wednesday, the president of the Bundestag confirmed the news, already spread by a jubilant Cario, that Germany had suspended the supply of arms to Israel.

In 1960, when Dr. Adenauer and Mr. Ben Gurion met and agreed on the arms deliveries, the arms scale was beginning to tip seriously toward Egypt. The Soviet Union had started sending military hardware to Cairo in 1955, but at that time with some regard to balance. Between 1959 and 1961, the flow of weapons was unclogged and, with Russian help, Egypt was able roughly to double the size of its forces. It then devolved on the former tripartrite powers—America, Britain, and France, who after the establishment of Israel had tried to maintain a balance of strength between Jews and Arabs—to help Israel to keep up. The United States was reluctant to be involved directly, since this would surely be interpreted as competition of a sort between Moscow and Washington. (This rule was broken in 1962 when, concerned about Egypt's possession of ground-to-air missiles, America agreed to let Israel have short-range Hawk missiles.) From this sprang the German secret commitment.

There was never a question of a parity between Egypt and Israel. On the calculation that an Israeli behind a gun is three times as effective as an Egyptian, and on the usual defense-to-attack ratio, the Israelis have aimed at getting an armory roughly equal to a third of Egypt's. But the Israelis themselves are now doubting their own calculation: the proportion of Oriental Jews (lesser fighting men than their European compatriots) in the Israel army has increased with the new immigration trends; the Egyptians, meanwhile, have had practice training in the Soviet Union and a long hard taste of the real thing in the Yemen. And in certain areas of defense, the Iraelis protest that they have still no effective counter to Egyptian power. For some time, they have been expressing their concern about Egypt's fleet of fast patrol boats carrying ship-to-shore missiles whose range might be short and inaccurate but which could still do horrid damage to Israel's coastal cities.

The suspension of German shipments is disquieting, both for itself and for its possible effects. It is understandable that, in election year, Bonn was under powerful domestic pressure to cut short an embarrassment. But would there have been so much fuss if the deal, from the first, had been more straightforward? In 1962, America's public decision to send the Hawk missiles set off a violent reaction in Cairo, but not for very long. And France, which in the past has been fairly forthright about the military aid it sends to Israel, is now managing to mend its fences with the Arabs, including Egypt, while steadily refusing to allow Arab pressure to influence its policy toward Israel.

Or so it seems. If the French persevere, and particularly if they get away with it, General de Gaulle's way of doing things could, in this respect, be an object lesson to others—including Britian when Mr. Eshkol, the Israel Prime Minister, pays his promised visit to London late next month. If the West believes, as it does, that Israel has the right to continue to exist—behind its present frontiers—there is nothing underhand or shady in supplying the power that gives this belief a more solid foundation than pious hope: only hypocrisy or excessive timidity make it so.

At the same time, it is important for Western countries to adjust to the fact that while they may fully believe that the weapons going to Israel are deterrent, and deterrent only, the Arabs do not. No westerner is likely to make much dent in the Arab tenet that sooner or later Israel will press for more land and that Western armor gives it the means for the supposed inevitable aggression. But while there may not be much point in arguing with Arabs about this, there is every point in trying to convince Arab friends, and this should include President Nasser, that we ourselves are acting in good faith toward them. In order to do this, we must first make totally certain that it is true.

Statement of Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch Before the House Committee on Education and Labor on H.R. 2362, February 1, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement given in testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee by Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, representing the Committee on Social Action of Reform Judaism, a joint instrumentality of the Central Conference of American Rabbis and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Rabbi Hirsch is the director of the Religious Action Center of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and appeared before the committee on February 1, 1965, in connection with hearings on H.R. 2362, the administration's aid to education bill.

Rabbi Hirsch raises important objections to certain provisions contained in the bill. I believe that the committee and the Congress should examine all facets of a possible conflict with the separation-of-church-and-state philosophy expressed in our Constitution before approving this measure.

Rabbi Hirsch's testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF RABBI RICHARD G. HIRSCH REPRESENTING THE COMMISSION ON SOCIAL ACTION OF REFORM JUDAISM BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR ON H.R. 2362, FEBRUARY 1, 1965

I am Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, director of the Religious Action Center, a Union of American Hebrew Congregations. I appear in behalf of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism, a joint instrumentality of the Central Conference of American Rabbis and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Other national agencies which are members of the Commission on Social Action are the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods, and the National Federation of Temple Youth.

I last appeared before this committee in support of the Economic Opportunity Act. It is a privilege to appear again in support of the broad principles of Federal aid to education and improvement of educational opportunities.

Our constituent agencies have not had adequate time to formulate positions on all aspects of H.R. 2362, the bill before this committee. I therefore speak to you within the framework of positions previously taken by our groups. We have long affirmed the centrality of education in the development of human beings. A resolution passed by the General Assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in November 1963 states:

"In keeping with our Jewish tradition, which declares study to be a divine command, we maintain that education is not only a personal or a local, but a national problem. * * * Because public education is essential to the preservation of democracy, we support the enactment of legislation offering more extensive Federal assistance."

We commend President Johnson for placing Federal responsibility for improving education at the top of the Nation's agenda. However, we are concerned that in our Nation's desire to raise educational standards and ameliorate conditions of poverty, we may trample on precious principles and diminish cherished institutions.

This legislation raises serious questions of public policy which deserve careful deliberation before precedents are established from which it may be impossible to withdraw. A great society must adhere to great principles. The following should be of special concern:

1. SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Our organizations are deeply committed to religious liberty and to the majestic concept of separation of church and state. We maintain that tax moneys should be used for public schools only and should not be siphoned off to Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, or any other schools under religious auspices. We believe that this tradition of separation is the mandate of the Constitution, the lesson of history, and the absolute precondition to religious liberty and interfaith harmony.

This bill includes precisely the kind of aid to religious institutions which President John F. Kennedy stoutly rejected as violative of our constitutional liberties. Why did the two education bills submitted by President Kennedy fail to pass Congress? There were undoubtedly many factors, but chief among them was the opposition of those who refused to support legislation unless aid was given to private as well as public schools. Last year's opponents of Federal aid to education are among this year's supporters. We must ask why. Have they suddenly altered their position? Not from the statements made in public and before this committee, where they steadfastly continue to maintain that Federal aid should go to nonpublic schools "as a matter of justice." Obviously, they must find in this bill a means of achieving their original objective—if not entirely, then in part; if not immediately, then eventually.

Conversely, many of the groups which heretofore refused to support legislation if aid were given to private education, have now endorsed this bill. For them, this year's urgent public school needs have taken precedence over last year's reluctance—and they

are now willing to yield in their opposition to Federal support of private education.

We deceive ourselves as a nation if we use semantics to conceal what has actually occurred. Both the language of the bill and the language of those who support it tend to create the illusion that it is the child, not the schoool, to which Federal aid is to be given. However, in the guise of aiding the child, this bill does aid the school. Merely to insert language directing that tax moneys be for the use of children and teachers rather than for schools does not change the essential character of the recipient or of the use to which the money is put. Everything connected with any educational system is for the use of children and teachers.

If the child benefit theory is to be used as the basis for providing private school children with textbooks, instructional materials, and mobile services, then what cannot be given? Would not the individual child also benefit from better teachers, better teaching equipment, better science laboratories, and better buildings to house them? It is one thing to declare that we have changed our principles, or even to admit that although we have not changed our principles, political expediency has forced us to change our practices. But let us not delude ourselves into believing that nothing at all has been changed, or been lost. This bill does not, as some have maintained, avoid the church-State issue. It evades it. An end run around the principle can advance the ball of Federal assistance just as far as a direct plunge through the middle of the line.

2. THE MAINTENANCE OF A STRONG PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

Our traditional Jewish love of learning has impelled us to create, as our own religious responsibility, a vast network of private educational institutions for the perpetuation of Jewish religious values. We believe that private education has a vital and necessary role in our society. At the same time, we are firmly committed to our public school system as the bulwark for preserving America's democratic heritage and advancing its civilization.

It has been most disturbing to hear proponents of this bill in its present form speak of the great partnership that it fosters between public and private schools. Public and sectarian schools can no more be considered partners than can church and state be partners. By tending to equate public and church schools in the eyes of the law as equally entitled to public support, this bill will greatly stimulate the creation of separate parochial school systems in every denomination. The temptation to sup at the trough is not one to which most religious denominations have shown any exceptional resistance. As a network of parochial schools mushrooms, support for public schools would constantly be diluted.

This would occur at the same time that larger public appropriations for education are required at every level of government—Federal, State, and local. We would create a dramatic reversal in the ratio of parochial and public education in America. This very development has occurred in the Netherlands. For generations, governmental aid to parochial schools was prohibited, and under that system, four out of every five Dutch children attended public schools. In recent years, that country's constitution was amended to permit Government aid to parochial schools, and now four out of five children are attending the church-related schools. A country that changed its system of public appropriations for education has nearly eliminated its public school system in the process. A country whose parochial schools represented a voluntary investment in the free exercise of religion has seen that system become an arm of the state. A public school system has been nearly destroyed; parochial schools have been converted and perverted into a form of civil service. That is not, and should not be, the fate of either public or religious schools in this country.

Another factor largely overlooked in the consideration of this legislation is the relationship between segregation of a racial and economic character—and private education. America is now striving to achieve two great objectives—equal rights and opportunities for racial minorities, and higher quality of living for the economically and culturally deprived. It should be frankly stated that many of the parents who now send their children to private and parochial schools do so in order to remove the children from the neighborhood public schools which have heavy concentrations of nonwhite minority groups.

Since title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not preclude religious discrimination, there would be a great temptation for parents in the South and in the major urban areas of the North to send their children to already existing or newly established sectarian schools—and thereby to avoid the integrated schools or schools with large numbers of economically and culturally deprived children. Under present conditions, parents have the right, if they so desire, to provide a private education for their children at their own expense; but they should not have the right to a private education in a segregated school at public expense. How ironic it would be if Federal aid to education became an instrument for subverting the purposes of the Civil Rights and Economic Opportunity Acts.

Although in principle we do not oppose plans of shared time or dual enrollment, we do have reservations about the propriety, wisdom, and feasibility of the plan envisaged in this bill. In order for a public school district to obtain funds, it would have to demonstrate that it has made provision for including special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio, and television, and mobile educational services) to students in private schools. Obviously, in order to formulate a program for including nonpublic school students, there would have to be consultation with private and sectarian educational administrations.

The public school administration, which heretofore has been subject to the exclusive control of the general public, will now be confronted with a new dimension—pressure from private and sectarian school administrations. It is one thing for local public and private schools to cooperate on their own initiative—as has been the practice until now with shared time plans. It is quite another thing for cooperation between the public and private sector to be a prerequisite for Federal support. Although the word "cooperation" is not found in section 205(a)(2), it does appear in section 205(a)(6). In either of these sections, it is difficult to see how the consultative process would fail to lead to some significant restraint and influence by the private agencies over the public agencies.

Contrary to the expressed goal for intermingling of children of all religions, most shared time plans, as presently functioning, have children from parochial schools entering and leaving the public school as a bloc, thus vitiating the desired and desirable objective of personal contact between children of all religious backgrounds.

The most likely subjects to be shared in the public school are the science, vocational training, and physical education courses, whereas those taught in the private schools will be the value-laden courses such as history and literature. The public school may well become a school for occupational and vocational training, while the parochial school becomes the institution for the inculcation of social and human values. Furthermore, the undefined concept of mobile educational services made available to the private schools can easily lead to the placement in the parochial schools of public school teachers, whether on a temporary, rotating basis, or a permanent basis.

These potential abuses are mentioned in order to indicate that the mere establishment of dual enrollment plans will not necessarily foster democratic goals. In order to prevent these dangers from occurring, we urge that appropriate safeguards be instituted, both in the legislation and in administrative policy on National, State, and local levels.

3. PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY FOR PUBLIC FUNDS

It is an axiomatic principle that public funds can only be appropriated for a public purpose. The responsibility for compliance with public purpose rests initially with Congress. In respect to Federal aid to education, it delegates the administration of the use of public funds to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Thereafter, certain authority and functions are further delegated to States and localities. All this is as it should be—with one exception. Participation by private agencies, including sectarian religious groups, in administering programs paid for by tax funds, deprives government of its proper responsibility and casts the public purpose of expenditures in doubt.

Both title II, dealing with library and instructional materials, and title III, dealing with supplementary educational centers and services diminish public responsibility and public authority for the expenditure of public funds. For example, in title II, what does a State agency do by allocating books and materials among the schools of the State for the use of children and teachers? We do not understand from this who owns the books or who determines the way they are distributed. The public authority is too vague; so is the public responsibility. We urge that the legislation be carefully reworded in order to assure the basic principle that no religious institution should acquire property at public expense.

Similarly, in title III, the supplementary centers are clearly publicly financed, but they are not as clearly administered by or accountable to the public. The ongoing operation of the centers is left to the administration of the nonprofit private agency which sets up the center. To the extent that clear criteria of governmental authority are lacking, we see an unwise delegation of public authority from government into the hands of private agencies. And, to the extent that many of the participating agencies will be sectarian or church-related, we see a further erosion of meaningful separation of church and state. At the very least, let persons involved in the administration of such programs be denominated as individuals representing the community or public at large, and not sit as administrators of public revenues in the capacity of official representatives of private groups.

Let us take steps to insure that students, teachers, and the community at large can identify the benefits in titles I, II, and III as public services, available to all without discrimination.

We urge that provision for judicial review of constitutional questions be written into this legislation, lest we find ourselves with an unconstitutional situation which cannot be repaired. The most expeditious system for obtaining such review would be by inclusion in the bill itself of a provision which would insure that any Federal taxpayer will have standing to sue, and thereby test, the validity of any of these programs or provisions.

The problem of education is urgent, but it is unwise to proceed before a genuine discussion and debate on the implications of this bill can take place. The overwhelming support for Federal aid to education reflects a spirit of compromise and tolerance. But compromise is possible without compromis-

ing basic principles and tolerance is more profound where expressed in respect for these basic principles. To paper over deep issues, in the name of a dubious consensus, is to do a grave disservice to future generations. A good bill with a major defect is about as serviceable as a majestic luxury liner with a hole at the waterline. The time to repair that defect is now.

Consulting Engineers Council Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address before the Conference of the Consulting Engineers Council at the International Inn in Washington, on February 15, 1965:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY, OF NEW YORK, AT THE CONSULTING ENGINEERS COUNCIL CONFERENCE, INTERNATIONAL INN, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1965

Mr. William W. Moore, president; Mr. Sidney A. Silver, president of the Washington chapter of Consulting Engineers Council; and friends, I feel indeed honored to follow such noteworthy and experienced speakers as my colleague from Minnesota, and my chairman last year on the Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Federal Interstate Highways Program of the Public Works Committee—Hon. JOHN BLATNIK. It was through these meetings that the need and absolute necessity for the public good for our State highways departments to utilize the services of consulting engineers more fully, to bolster what had proved conclusively to be inadequate, inexperienced, and poorly paid State engineering departments became evident.

I also feel priviledged to follow a speaker of such great renown in the maritime industry as Ed Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America.

The ship building and repair problems in my own city—the greatest port in the world—in shipbuilding in both the private and public sector, is on the lips of virtually every citizen in our city. I know that he has acquainted you with the changing economic patterns as they affect marine engineering and construction and has left you with the sound thesis that in the public domain it is economically advantageous to use consulting engineers rather than to have the Federal Government take this field as its own and sustain large technical staffs year in and year out.

I think I can illustrate in some instances that the Federal Government must mastermind an engineering project, but at the same time use consulting engineers to the maximum advantage.

In June 1964, I introduced H.R. 11757 to provide for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. I was joined by many Members of the House, and Senators MAGNUSON, PASTORE, BARTLETT, Engle, JACKSON, MCGEE, YARBOROUGH, and COTTON introduced the legislation in the Senate. These bills were referred to the Committee on Commerce in the Senate and to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the House. Various amendments were adopted and the bill in final form was approved by both Houses and signed by the President on September 22, 1964. It is now Public Law 88-609.

You will note that this law provides for the appointment of a commission of five men from private life to make a full and complete investigation and study, including necessary on-site surveys, and considering national defense, foreign relations, intercoastal shipping, interoceanic shipping, and such other matters as they may determine to be important, for the purpose of determining the feasibility of, and the most suitable site for, the construction of a sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; the best means of constructing such a canal, whether by conventional or nuclear excavation, and the estimated cost. The Persident shall designate as chairman one of the members of the commission.

The law also provides for the ultilization by the commission of the facilities of any branch of the executive agencies and further provides that a report shall be submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress on July 31, 1965, and that the commission shall continue its work but must expire by June 30, 1968.

A total of $17,500,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the entire study. Funds are available to initiate work in this fiscal year after the members are appointed and an amount of $7.5 million is included in the budget just submitted to Congress for the fiscal year 1966. The President has not yet appointed the members of the commission.

It is very probable, in my opinion, that the Corps of Engineers will be called upon together with the Atomic Energy Commission to undertake the field and office work comprising the survey and study in a similar manner to the procedure followed in the construction and development of the St. Lawrence Seaway. The corps has already completed a number of studies in connection with alternative routes, particularly with respect to the Nicaragua route, which the corps studied about 15 years ago.

The President declared in a statement on December 18, 1964, that investigation of an alternative route for the canal was essential to the welfare of the country for national defense and for other reasons. At his direction, Secretary of the Army Alles and Assistant Secretary of State Mann visited the four countries involved—Panama, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Nicaragua—to discuss with these Governments the international problems that might be involved in consideration of such a canal. The general thinking now is directed toward the study of two possible locations in Panama and one location in Colombia. The study of these three alternative routes are the only ones which are included in the formulation of the total cost estimate of $17,500,000. The legislation provides for a sea level canal, since it is generally accepted that a lock type canal, such as the site in Nicaragua, would not be feasible from a national defense standpoint because of its vulnerability during war, and a sea level canal following this route would be an inordinately expensive one because of the huge excavation required. These facts, however, are under careful reevaluation.

Several consulting engineer firms have already been utilized for preliminary studies on a nuclear-constructed canal. In 1960, Parsons, Brinkerhoff, Quade & Douglas conducted an engineering study on the costs and effects of using nuclear explosives for peacetime purposes, particularly for the construction of this canal. The overall need for this canal was predicated on a study by Booz, Allen, Hamilton in 1964 predicting that Panama Canal traffic by 1980 would exceed the capability of the present lock canal.

And, incidentally, for those of you who feel that a consulting engineer firm that has already researched in the Government area has an advantage in this field, H.R. 3420 and S. 949, introduced by Chairman HARRIS and Chairman MAGNUSON of the House and Senate Commerce Committees, will provide for a program for business and industry to benefit from recent discoveries of scientists and engineers who have been working for the Federal Government. Incidentally, the National Society of Professional Engineers has endorsed this legislation, so I wouldn't hold that against the bill.

As engineers you can realize that the prominence given to the early studies of the Nicaragua route was based upon the use of Lake Nicaragua and the series of locks on the Atlantic and Pacific sides. If the national defense aspect did not enter the picture, it would probably still be competitive with any other route. The use of natural waterways in Nicaragua and Costa Rica, plus the elimination of heavy excavation through the use of locks, might easily outweigh the economic disadvantages of the higher costs of the locks and the longer transit time required for the movement of vessels in such a system.

There are many fields involved in the proposed study which could be profitable to consulting engineers. Extensive topographic mapping will be required, some of it through areas not yet explored in any detail. A large number of core borings will be required which should represent an opportunity for the consultant engineer who specializes in that field.

The peculiar relationship of the tides at the Atlantic and Pacific ends of a sea-level canal may require consideration of bank protection works or other devices to reduce any adverse effects of reverse currents. This may offer possibilities for the consultant who specializes in hydraulic studies. Whether or not there will be any need for outside work to be undertaken in connection with a possible use of nuclear energy as against conventional methods of excavation is a matter which, so far as I know, has not yet been determined. All in all the study and the project itself if it materializes will be of such scope that there will be undoubtedly many opportunities for consulting engineers in many fields.

I am certain that all engineers will agree that there must be an awareness on the part of the Federal Government not only in our largest engineering projects, but also in the design of our smallest devices. However, I am of the opinion—as are many of my colleagues—that the Government should use the private sector and actually be the supervising agency in the overall process. At the same time I must face a political fact, that no Government agency gets smaller by its own design. I, therefore, must urge you to sell your profession. To do so, you must communicate with not only your Representatives in Congress, but your friends in your own State as well. Your association is your collective voice and they have the machinery and ability to explore methods of communication in the areas where your profession can most be benefited. Support them and you must all gain.

I want to congratulate you on your comprehensive conference and to wish you all good fortune in the future.

A Bouquet for Francis A. Coy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, long recognized

as one of the Nation's leading newspapers, has the pleasant editorial policy of awarding bouquets to Cleveland citizens who are performing outstanding community tasks.

Surely few could be so deserving as Francis A. Coy, whose continuing contributions were recognized in the February 16 Plain Dealer columns:

A BOUQUET FOR FRANCIS A. COY

A Plain Dealer bouquet to Francis A. Coy, who today will assume leadership of the Greater Cleveland Growth Board.

Greater Cleveland is fortunate to have a man such as Frank Coy to serve in this post, one of the most important in the community.

The growth board needs the proven abilities and great energy of its new leader to accomplish fully the immense task confronting it.

Judging from Coy's past performances, he will settle for nothing less than overwhelming success.

Coy is a man of action and accomplishment. He possesses imagination and drive. He inspires those who work with him. He believes in Cleveland and its people.

A permanent resident here since only 1958, Coy already has left an indelible imprint on the city's life—cultural, civic, business.

As president of the May Co., which he became on June 1, 1961, he has directed expansion of Ohio's largest department store, adding new meaning to the May Co. slogan—"Watch Us Grow." His coworkers are devoted to him and his interest in his company and its employees are indicative of his faith in them.

Coy's interests are as wide as his energy and zeal are great. He has been a leader in the United Appeal, a trustee of the Cleveland Orchestra Board, a director of the Salvation Army, chairman of the Council for High Blood Pressure Research, to mention but a few.

Coy's organizational and administrative abilities are generally credited for making Cleveland's Parade of Progress last summer the overwhelming success it was.

To Frank Coy, and his devoted wife, Virginia, goes this Plain Dealer bouquet—along with a vote of community confidence.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McCarthy, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Smathers, Clark, Pell, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, ———, ———, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Are We Turning Away From Talent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a most thoughtful and provocative speech delivered by the distinguished U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, before the annual meeting of the Education Writers Association on February 13 in Atlantic City, N.J.

In his speech, "Are We Turning Away From Talent?" Commissioner Keppel raises some important questions regarding our present methods of recruiting and qualifying young men and women for the teaching profession. In a period when we are beginning to recognize the crucial relationship between poverty and educational achievement, and to appreciate that we must take new initiatives in educating children from very poor backgrounds, I applaud Commissioner Keppel's willingness to seek new approaches in recruiting and licensing teachers to serve in our understaffed schools, particularly in poorer neighborhoods.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of the Commissioner's speech at this point in the RECORD:

ARE WE TURNING AWAY FROM TALENT?

As you in the Education Writers Association have reported so tellingly, we have come to a new day in education. Your reporting of education has at last moved from the want-ad sections to the front pages of our newspapers. And education itself has moved from the wings to front and center on the stage of American society.

It's a fine, rare sensation to be in demand. I'm delighted to share this sensation with you here today.

Of all men, President Johnson has doubtless done most to keep education on the front page. From last year's campaign to this year's inauguration, he has repeatedly told us that education is "the first work of our times and the first work of our society."

Before his election last November, the President pledged to put education at "the very top of the American agenda." After it, he made good this pledge by sending to Congress the most promising, practical, and far-reaching program for education in history.

This program proposes to do something about American elementary and secondary education, with particular emphasis on the schools of our blighted areas, which need the best and usually receive the worst of our efforts. It proposes to turn universal education from a comforting fiction into reality. It proposes to practice what we have always preached—that quality education is the true right of every American. Most exciting of all, this program seems likely to come to fulfillment in the weeks and months ahead.

SOME QUESTIONS

Because of the high public interest in education, I think it is time to ask some pertinent questions:

Has this new sense of public excitement pervaded our classrooms in the elementary and secondary schools of the Nation?

Has it pervaded our programs of teacher selection and teacher training, of teacher recruitment and teacher promotion?

Do we recognize that public education is the public's business and that the way we select and esteem our teachers will ultimately make our schools succeed or fail?

Finally, in seeking teachers for education's new and demanding assignments, are we getting the best we can find or are we, in effect, turning away from available talent?

The place to start our inquiry is with our recruitment of teachers for America's schools. Now, in February, we have come to one of the peak periods in teacher recruitment. As we meet here in Atlantic City, recruiting teams from school districts across the Nation are visiting college campuses thousands of miles from home to staff our classrooms in need of teachers for this coming September.

But what kind of teachers are they seeking to find? Beyond the essential need to maintain high standards, are they finding teachers who are able and highly motivated toward one of education's foremost problems—to raise the quality and equality of education for the children of our poor? As recruiters, are they as successful, say, as scouts for football or business or science who are also combing the countryside for new recruits?

These questions come to focus today because of two recent developments. On one hand, we recognize the need for a national commitment to raise the level of educational opportunity in the neglected schools of our city slums and our depressed rural areas. These are the schools which have suffered most because they are especially challenging and because many teachers have declined to meet this challenge. All too often, they have preferred to teach in the newer, better equipped schools of suburbia before classes of the more fortunate and privileged.

SOURCES OF POTENTIAL TEACHERS

At the same time, we are finding a new reservoir of potential teachers who want to teach in precisely those schools and classes which have been most neglected. Among these highly motivated candidates are those who have already taught abroad as Peace Corps volunteers. Now back home, many are looking for opportunities to teach. They don't need to be recruited. They are already willing and eager to teach. But have we actively sought them out?

Let me read to you, in part, a letter I recently received from Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps and now also Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity—the principal arm in our war against poverty. This is what Mr. Shriver says:

"I am writing to express my concern about the problems encountered by returning volunteers wishing to teach in the United States.

"As you may know, approximately half of all Peace Corps volunteers abroad are serving as teachers. In the next 24 months, more than 4,000 volunteers will return from teaching assignments in Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

"While many Peace Corps returnees are now teaching here at home, others have reported to me that they were unable to meet certification requirements set by the various States. As you know, this is not a new problem, but one which is having a marked effect upon the abilities of the Peace Corps volunteer to contribute to elementary and secondary education in the United States."

As an example, consider the experience of one former Peace Corps teacher who is currently working at the Office of Education. He returned last fall to the United States after completing 2 years of teaching in Nigeria. He served overseas with distinction as teacher and principal in a school of several hundred Nigerian children. Although he had little previous teaching experience at home, or any definite plans to enter teaching as a career, through his experiences in Africa he developed a taste for teaching—particularly teaching in a difficult and challenging situation.

On his return, he presented as qualifications the fact that he had a college degree and 2 years of satisfactory teaching abroad. He sought to get a job in several school districts, asking for an assignment to teach the economically deprived. He was advised that he lacked the proper qualifications—courses in teacher education and supervised practice teaching. His oversea experience would not apply. On this basis, our schools lost him and his talent.

ARE WE LOSING QUALIFIED APPLICANTS?

Let me cite another instance where Peace Corps volunteers who have taught overseas have been rebuffed in their efforts to teach at home.

In one of our North Central States, for example, a volunteer who had done practice teaching to prepare for his Peace Corps assignment and had taught for 2 years in Latin America applied for a teaching post. He was told that he had to have 8 hours of practice teaching recorded on his college transcript. His transcript, of course, did not record his 2 years of teaching abroad. He was advised to go back to college and make up these hours.

I am, of course, by no means underestimating the value of practice teaching. What I am saying is that practice teaching may, in fact, take place in circumstances such as the Peace Corps affords and that it can be sensibly and wisely evaluated within our school system.

These examples, fortunately, are not universal. But where they exist, they resemble nothing so much as a rather mad version of a children's cardboard game, played with infinitely intricate rules. If you land on the penalty square, you are sent back to "go." There is no recourse, no appeal.

In real life, these would-be teachers who are sent back to "go," simply go elsewhere and are heartily welcomed. But they don't go back to our schools and the loss is ours, not theirs.

In recent years, the United States has become increasingly aware that it has not made the best use of our human resources. This waste of talent is a principal reason for our present concern with disadvantaged children and their education. But if education is to

resolve this problem, clearly we must make maximum use of the talents which are now in short supply and which we urgently need.

Therefore it is no longer defensible to turn away potential teachers at home who are not only highly motivated to teach the deprived but have successfully taught them in Africa, Asia, and Latin America—from Ghana to India, from Peru to the Philippines. If we are too rigid to make room for them, to accommodate them instead of confronting them with rigid regulations, we have only ourselves to blame.

In years past, the teacher certification agencies of this country have performed a vital service for our schools. The thrust, the determination, the goal of their undertaking was to increase professional standards and to defend those standards when efforts were made to weaken or subvert them.

We owe their undertaking a substantial debt. We must continue to exercise the greatest care to be sure we get the most thoroughly qualified teachers in our schools. But this is no excuse for needless rigidity.

In the light of our present challenge and opportunity, should we not examine the regulations to see if sound accommodations can be made without damaging the true intent of certification standards? Do we lack the ingenuity to seek and employ promising talents whenever and wherever they become available?

I think we have both the ingenuity and the ability to use it. Some imaginative steps are already underway. Members of the Peace Corps staff, for example, were on the west coast last week. They were invited to discuss plans with school and university officials to develop urban teaching internships in several of the larger cities.

SOME APPROACHES

Cleveland will begin such an internship program this fall, putting 50 Peace Corps veterans into urban classrooms—letting them teach while they work toward their professional requirements.

In Syracuse, planning for Peace Corps teachers begins even before they leave for oversea assignment. There the superintendent writes to volunteers who trained in the Syracuse schools urging them to consider teaching in Syracuse as a career when they return home. He assures them they will be given a "red carpet" treatment.

Other cities, including New York, Baltimore, Washington, Portland, and Seattle, are now developing sound and highly imaginative programs to employ a wide range of talents, abiding by the spirit of the regulations, not merely by their form. But the examples, at present, are all too few.

From the Peace Corps and, in a short time, from VISTA, its domestic equivalent, our schools have the possibility of finding willing and eager help for the toughest job in education today—a job which is far too often rejected as not only difficult but as somehow demeaning.

Our schools must not only have the chance to use these volunteers against poverty. They must deliberately and actively seek them out. They are not asking for special pay, special privilege, or special status. They are only asking for an opportunity to serve.

We need, then, to recognize that those who would "gladly teach" are those we must welcome most—and that without them, education cannot possibly meet the extraordinary challenges it faces through the remaining years of this century.

Finally, let us consider the principal weaknesses that trouble us and frequently confound us in the employment of teachers. What are these weaknesses? To my mind, they are three in number.

WEAKNESSES IN EMPLOYMENT PROCEDURES

First is the weakness of inflexibility.

Inflexibility reveals itself in archaic habits of administering our schools, habits which stand against the changes that have overtaken our society.

In our modern era, we have come to see that race, religion, and national origin must be irrelevant to educational opportunity. Yet we still see them saddling our educational enterprise.

At the same time that we are setting out to end discrimination by race among our students, we still see race as a factor in the administration of our schools. We have begun to move toward integrating the students. We are still a long way from integrating our staffs.

As a result of recent Federal legislation, thousands of individuals are going to be carrying on activities of an educational nature in our cities. They may not be within the confines of the school as we have known it, but they will be of a decidedly educational nature. They may not all be trained teachers, but they can offer greatly needed assistance to our schools.

So it seems to me that we must face up to the entire question of the better use of personnel. We must begin to look more carefully at the jobs in our schools which can be performed without college degrees.

I have spoken before about the need to develop a greater variety of teaching positions—from master teachers to interns to teacher aids. I still see the development of this flexibility as offering a reasonable solution to the teacher salary dilemma. Through it, we can begin to raise salaries in relationship to maximum skills and responsibilities.

Second is the weakness of defensiveness.

This is manifested every time teachers meet and assume that any critical voice is the voice of an "outsider," that a voice for change is somehow a voice against education. Whenever a Dr. Conant is ill received at a teacher meeting, I think the trouble is with the meeting and not with the speaker.

Defensiveness is particularly irrelevant in 1965 when the American public, through its duly elected representatives, seems likely to give education the opportunity it has long sought but rarely received.

Today, as never before, education is in the public's interest and is the public's business. Neither in defense nor in support, not in praise nor in criticism, can we longer regard education as the exclusive business of educators alone, or of any other single group in our society. Education is the concern of all our people. Upon this concern we can build wisely and well for the future.

The third and final weakness I should like to note is education's present insularity.

We must move from the days when the school stood as a fortress within the community—almost a fortress against the community—into a new era when the school can be the very center of community activities.

We must move from the old habit of closing our school gates at 3:30 in the afternoon and between June and September every summer. This schedule perhaps made sense in days when we were an agricultural society and our children were needed on the farm. It makes little sense today in a nation that has rather abruptly converted from a farm and rural economy into a largely urbanized economy.

SCHOOLS CENTRAL TO COMMUNITY

Our schools are needed now as never before. They are needed for a range of opportunity beginning in nursery classes and continuing on through adult education. They are needed by the whole community and they can no longer serve us as islands apart from our people.

Moreover, the community itself can bring a powerful range of new services into our schools—and we should welcome it. To make use of these resources is one of the major provisions of the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provides for supplementary educational centers and services.

Thus far, the possibility of these services has been little understood. Some have even regarded these proposed services as representing a new sort of school system to be superimposed on the old.

What this measure, in fact, would do is to bring to bear on education the extraordinary cultural resources which have been growing and expanding in our communities without much notice and with far too little use. Among these expanding and already available resources are museums, art galleries, symphony orchestras, theaters—a whole flourishing range of cultural opportunity which has sprung up, almost unnoticed, within the past decade or two.

Consider, for a moment, the facts of this astonishing growth:

In 1920, there were about 100 symphony orchestras across the country. In 1940, there were about 500. Today, in 1965, there are more than 1,400—a fourteenfold growth in only 25 years.

Today in the United States there are almost 3,500 museums of all types—scientific, historic, general—compared to only 1,000 in 1920. One-third of these museums were established since 1950. In the first 3 years of the 1960's, a new museum has been established every 3.3 days—the highest rate in our history.

In 1920, the American legitimate theater was confined largely to Broadway, to local stock companies, and to road show troupes venturing into our biggest cities. Today, there is no hinterland in the theatrical arts. From the leasing of plays, it is estimated that there are now about 50,000 community and educational theater groups across the country, with 10,000 of them established during the past 10 years. Today the theater is a living art in thousands of cities and towns of America.

USING OUR CULTURAL RESOURCES

But these are merely symptoms of the growing storehouse of cultural resources in every American community. The cultural and scientific arts are now expanding into a powerful new resource. There need be no educational backwater for any community or its schools or its children who choose to tap this reservoir.

Does this mean a third school system? Of course not. Instead, it offers us a magnificent opportunity to hitch our schools to a star, to make our first school system truly first in what it offers to our young people—a living array of the best that our Western civilization has achieved in 2,000 years.

If these resources are not the resources of education, then I think we had better look for a different definition. We are surrounded by possibility. We need only to bring these possibilities now into our schools.

Our schools, at last, are receiving the broad public attention they have long required. It seems clear that America in the future will expect from education not merely more of the same, but something new and creative and daring. It will expect education to seek and employ the best talents we can find as we embark on our new adventure.

The challenges to education have never been greater than they are today. But the opportunities for the teacher to be creative, to meet challenge, to contribute to society, have also never been as great.

Will our schools of tomorrow be in position to compete with other sectors of our society, to compete for talent, the best talent there is?

I think they must be. We must see that they will be.

The Appalling Erosions of Moral Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed with an excellent editorial in the San Francisco, Calif., Examiner on January 18, 1965. The editorial is entitled "The Appalling Erosions of Moral Standards" and raises a very important question which merits the attention and consideration of all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE APPALLING EROSIONS OF MORAL STANDARDS

What has happened to our national morals?

An educator speaks out in favor of free love.

A man of God condones sexual excursions by unmarried adults.

Movies sell sex as a commercial commodity.

Bookstores and cigar stands peddle pornography.

A high court labels yesterday's smut as today's literature.

Record shops feature albums displaying nudes and near nudes.

Night clubs stage shows that would have shocked a smoker audience a generation ago.

TV shows and TV commercials pour out a flood of sick, sadistic, and suggestive sex situations.

A campaign is launched to bring acceptance to homosexuality.

Radio broadcasts present discussions for and against promiscuity.

Magazines and newspapers publish pictures and articles that flagrantly violate the bounds of good taste.

Four letter words once heard only in barroom brawls now appear in publications of general distribution.

Birth control counsel is urged for high school girls.

Look around you. These things are happening in your America. In the two decades since the end of World War II we have seen our national standards of morality lowered again and again.

We have seen a steady erosion of past principles of decency and good taste.

And we have harvested a whirlwind. As our standards have lowered, our crime levels and social problems have increased.

Today, we have a higher percentage of our youth in jail—in reformatories—on probation and in trouble than ever before.

Study the statistics on illegitimate births—on broken marriages—on juvenile crimes—on school dropouts—on sex deviation—on dope addiction—on high school marriages—on crimes of passion.

The figures are higher than ever, and going higher.

Parents, police authorities, educators and thoughtful citizens in all walks of life are deeply disturbed.

They should be. For they are responsible. We of the older generation are responsible.

Our youngsters are no better and no worse than we were at the same age. Generally, they are wiser. But—they have more temptations than we had. They have more cars. They have more money. They have more opportunities for getting into trouble.

We opened doors for them that were denied to us. We encouraged permissiveness. We indulged them. We granted maximum freedoms. And we asked for a minimum in respect—and in responsibility.

Rules and regulations that prevailed for generations as sane and sensible guides for personal conduct were reduced or removed, or ignored.

Prayer was banned from the schoolroom and the traditional school books that taught moral precepts as well as reading were replaced with the inane banalities of "Dick and Jane."

Basically, there are just two main streams of religious thought in these United States. Those who believe in a Supreme Being. And those who do not.

The first group far outnumbers the second. But—this Nation that was founded on the democratic concept of majority rule now denies the positive rights of many to protect the negative rights of a few.

As prayer went out of the classroom so, too, did patriotism.

No longer are our children encouraged to take pride in our Nation's great and glorious past.

Heroes are downgraded. The role played by the United States in raising the hearts and hopes of all enslaved peoples for a century and a half is minimized.

We believe this is wrong. We are convinced that a majority of our citizens would welcome an increase in patriotism and prayer and a decrease in the peddling of sex, sensationalism, materialism, and sordidness.

In a few days the Examiner will present the first in a series of profiles of our Nation's heroes. We will salute the men and women who contributed so much to our national legacy in valor, science, education, religion and art.

In the months ahead we will also intensify our efforts to fight back against the appalling vulgarization of sex.

We do not propose prudery. Neither do we propose wild-eyed, fanatical patriotism.

In both areas, we propose to address ourselves to the problems as we see them with calm reason and respect for the rights of those with views contrary to ours.

As a newspaper we have an obligation to reflect life as it is, not as it ideally might be. We will, therefore, continue to print all the news. That which is sordid and tawdry we will treat in a manner suitable for a family publication.

Over the years we have refused to accept advertising which we felt exceeded the bounds of good taste. We will pursue this course with greater dedication in the future.

Our test will be our own standards of good taste. We do not claim infallibility. Readers have felt we erred in the past. Others will undoubtedly feel we do so in the future. Such errors of excess—if they occur—will be in spite of our efforts. Not because of them.

If the general public is as deeply disturbed as we are by the decline in national morals and in national pride, let it speak out.

Together we can put down the sex peddlers without lifting the bluenoses. And, with God's help, we can put prayer and patriotism back in our classrooms. And in our hearts and homes, as well.

Thirst for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, February 16, was Lithuanian Independence Day. Many tributes have been paid to the heroic people of Lithuania by Members of Congress in observance of this historic day.

Many Americans of Lithuanian descent are residents of my congressional district. They are rightfully proud of their rich heritage. They have contributed much to the progress of their communities and the Nation.

Many reside in the vicinity of Shenandoah where they are respected for their sterling character, their deep religious faith, and their devotion to our free and democratic way of life.

The Shenandoah Evening Herald, in its issue of February 16, paid a high and deserving tribute to these Americans of Lithuanian descent in an excellent editorial entitled "Thirst for Freedom."

With permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial with my remarks:

THIRST FOR FREEDOM

Truth crushed to earth shall rise again.

This fond hope rings true in the hearts of thousands of Americans and even to a greater degree with the enslaved people of Lithuania.

Today this freedom-loving Nation is observing Independence Day. There are no celebrations here on the part of Americans of Lithuanian descent, nor will there be any formal programs in the homeland of their forebears.

It is a sad state of affairs that the justly proud Lithuanian nation, old in history, ancient in bravery but ever new in achievements, finds herself enveloped in the darkest hours of her existence.

February 16, 1918, is a day cherished in the hearts of Lithuanians, for it was on this date that the nation proclaimed her independence and launched her own democratic Republic.

For almost a quarter of a century the country made spectacular strides in agriculture and land reform, industry, transportation, finance, social legislation, education, and cultural progress.

In 1938 the late President Hoover, who was involved in administering a program of relief and rehabilitation in the Baltic States at the very beginning of their independence, lauded their outstanding gains.

In comparison, President Hoover noted that at the time Russia was drastically rationing all food and clothing. They had an entirely unstable currency. In contrast, the Baltic States were enjoying a free economy, their currency was stable, their fiscal policies were all balanced, their industries were thriving, their agriculture was making an astonishing progress.

Then came the cloud of doom. On June 15, 1940, the rape of Lithuania occurred when the Red Army, 300,000 strong, poured into the Baltic State in a complete act of aggression. Using physical terrorization as their guide the Soviet captors aimed their campaign at making Lithuania over in the Communist image. Russian domination has resulted in depriving the people of the right of equality of opportunity, freedom of movement, the right to hold private property, freedom of enterprise, the right to choose and change jobs, and other political, economic, and social rights.

Has Russia been successful in creating the new order? To date they have succeeded in making the people miserable and more dissatisfied but they have not made Lithuania bow to the Soviet image.

True, Lithuania is enslaved, but the people carry in their blood the knowledge that, indeed, in William Faulkner's phrase, "man will not only endure; he will prevail."

Esso Repertory Theater Is One Improvement in Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, television has very often been criticized for a lack of quality and, more recently, for the virtual absence of any kind of worthwhile dramatic offerings. Therefore, the recent launching of an exciting new series—the Esso Repertory Theater—is worthy of note.

The Esso Repertory Theater, sponsored by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, is nothing less than an ambitious attempt to show viewers all over the country that theater is not confined to New York City, and that there is an impressive grassroots dramatic development all over the country.

To document this thesis, David Susskind, the distinguished producer famed for "Play of the Week" and "Festival of Performing Arts," arranged for his staff to tape programs in 13 different cities that feature repertory companies. These are Houston, Boston, Princeton, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Seattle, Cincinnati, Los Angeles, Chicago, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, Ann Arbor, and Washington, D.C.

The plays being performed range from the classics to the avant-garde, from Molière to Pinter. In the judgment of qualified observers, this project has great potential, and deserves the support and encouragement of everyone interested in good television fare, for it dramatizes effectively what can come from the support of art by commerce. It is to be hoped that this example will be followed by an increasing number of other public-service-minded corporations.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled "Repertory Theater in the Living Room" printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article was written by Paul Gardner, the television editor of the New York Times, and was published in that newspaper on February 14.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 14, 1965]

REPERTORY THEATER IN THE LIVING ROOM

(By Paul Gardner)

Beckett, Shaw, and Yeats—these three Irish playwrights have been selected by the Esso Repertory Theater to open a new series that will astonish skeptics who believed anthology had vanished completely from television. During the next 13 weeks the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), will present one-act plays by O'Casey, Molière, Sheridan, and Saroyan, in a healthy grab bag of the avantgarde and the classics, performed by leading repertory troups from Seattle to Boston. Repertory is most definitely "in" and Esso is keeping right on top of the news.

In a few weeks Esso will be one up on Lincoln Center by giving TV viewers a peek at the San Francisco Actors Workshop, which has been under the direction of Herbert Blau and Jules Irving, the two men recently appointed to replace Robert Whitehead and Elia Kazan. Preceding the west coast production of Strindberg's "The Creditors" will be Pinter's enigmatic brainteaser, "The Dumb Waiter," and, specifically this Wednesday, Shaw's "How He Lied to Her Husband," Beckett's "Act Without Words II," and Yeats' "Calvary."

The plays, produced for Esso by David Susskind and Daniel Melnick, will be on channel 5 Wednesdays at 9 p.m., and then repeated on Sundays at the same hour. Talented new actors will be introduced to television, theater buffs will be able to compare the styles of repertory companies, and adventurous viewers, accustomed to the predictability of situation comedies and mysteries, will have an opportunity to puzzle over the subtleties of some modern dramas.

"The idea for the series," says Susskind, "came from a general disenchantment with Broadway's sex comedies and abberated plays. I visited the repertory theaters in Los Angeles and Milwaukee and Washington, D.C., and became aware of the real theater that was happening, that we just don't know much about. These groups were not local societies run by high school teachers. They were Equity companies made up of professional actors who were tired of working in New York for only 2 months every year."

Susskind does not feel that the majority of TV viewers are ready for Pinter, who still mystifies critics, but, he says, they can be prepared, and eventually Esso will outdraw the old "Play of the Week" and "Festival of the Performing Arts," which did not succeed by playing it safe. Can you imagine doing Pinter on Kraft's "Suspense Theater"? Actually, that's where a Pinter script could go. Then we come to Beckett. These authors may be difficult, but they are speaking to us, about our time and our issues. Before the programs begin, Walter Kerr, drama critic of the New York Herald Tribune, will briefly discuss each writer.

Cincinnati's "Playhouse in the Park," whose artistic director is Brooks Jones, provides the opening triple bill this week. The 29-year-old founder of the company and former producer of the McCarter Theater in Princeton has, for the last two seasons, mixed Albee and Williams with Ibsen and Brecht—and discovered that they pay. As far as Jones knows, Beckett's "Act Without Words II" has never been performed in New York, but neither Esso nor Cincinnati flinched when he suggested the wordless theater-of-the-absurd piece.

In "Act Without Words" Beckett's two tramplike characters are going through simple motions that were important yesterday, but now, performed on a stage surrounded by faceless mannequins, seem shamefully meaningless. The only sound is Fred Karlin's music. "When you start watching the play, you'll think that something has gone wrong with your set," Jones explains. "The silence is observed by the two actors, who are gradually roused from a sleep. With humor—and irony—Beckett again examines the human experience, which he sees lost in a vacuum."

Yeats' "Calvary" is a poetic drama utilizing dance and music to retell and reinterpret the story of the Crucifixion. Yeats' poetry comes quietly as Jesus is lead to the Cross, and the writer reflects on the brutality of an act which is a significant part of Christian theology. The Shaw play, combining high comedy and farce, delves into the eternal triangle of husband, wife, and young man—in this case one who mislays love poems.

"'Calvary' was once tried out in the Village," Jones says, "and it may have been done in Lady Gregory's drawing room. Most people just leave it on the printed page. But the three plays are part of the Irish tradition. And you probably won't see them on Broadway for 20 years."

Tribute to Stanton D. Sanson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in the January 30 issue of the Report of the Florida Council of 100 there appeared an inspiring tribute to the late, beloved Stanton D. Sanson—a man who dedicated many years of his life to improving Florida education.

Mr. Sanson was en route to New York aboard the SS *Queen Elizabeth* when he died early in the morning of December 21. His wife, Maxine, was with him when he died.

Stanton Sanson was born in Philadelphia in 1900 and in 1914 started work at the Lincoln Hosiery Corp. of Philadelphia. In 1918 he became president of that corporation. He organized another hosiery mill in 1925 and was president and principal stockholder until he retired in 1962. Mr. Sanson amassed great wealth, not only from his hosiery mill, but from numerous other interests, and gave much of that wealth away before his death.

As chairman of the education committee of the Council of 100 Mr. Sanson authored the original survey which led to legislation to put before the people a $125 million bond issue for expansion of Florida's system of higher education. In 1963, he was named "Man of the Year" by the Miami Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Florida has lost a great citizen—our educational program has lost a great leader and benefactor—and I have lost a great friend.

The tribute to Mr. Sanson follows:

Stanton Sanson's first real vacation in years was his last. He died aboard ship pulling into New York harbor after 5 weeks in Europe. Though there was no cause for him to work at all, and in spite of a chronic heart condition, he maintained a schedule of enormous proportions—most of it philanthropic in nature centering around his keen interest in education.

In addition to his work as chairman of the education committee of the council he was a very dedicated chairman of the Florida Student Scholarship and Loan Commission. And along the way he managed to involve himself constructively in numerous other individual and institutional educational matters.

One consolation for Stanton—there can be none for his fellow members of the council—was that his achievements were acknowledged and heralded in his time. He was named "Man of the Year" by the Miami-Dade Junior Chamber of Commerce last fall and in recent months had received special awards from the University of Florida Alumni Association, Florida Atlantic University, and Miami-Dade Junior College.

A gregarious man who loved the challenges and the rewards that came after them, Stanton was as happy over his accomplishments as were the people who directly benefited from them. Of all the things said about his passing, perhaps the following brief editorial from the Miami Herald says it best:

MR. SANSON'S OBSESSION

"Stanton Sanson of Miami Beach went to work in a hosiery mill at the age of 14. By the time he was 18 he was president of the company and well on his way to being a man of wealth in a typical American success story. When he died the other day unexpectedly at 64 he had given much of that wealth away.

"The focus of Mr. Sanson's interest and generosity in his last years was the education of young Floridians. The man who had enjoyed little formal schooling embraced the cause of higher education with passionate fervor. He gave land almost as freely as he gave advice. He organized, financed, and led campaigns for education, including the highly successful drive for the college building amendment which he helped put across with Boca Raton's Tom Fleming. Even when the returns showed a lopsided result he was both incredulous and crestfallen that anybody could have voted 'against education.'

"Single mindedness can be destructive to a person or a group. In Stanton Sanson's case, obsession worked a great good at a time when Florida seemed to have lost its educational soul. Such men are rare, but their impact on society and on their times is heavy and lasting. Such will be the memory of Stanton Sanson, public benefactor to Florida's future."

Thomas C. Mann: Peacemaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, it delighted me, a constant champion of the cause of inter-American progress, to read an article by my dear friend, Father Joseph F. Thorning, in the June 1964 issue of World Affairs, the official organ of the oldest genuine peace society in the United States of America. The article which pleased me was entitled "The Honorable Thomas C. Mann: Peacemaker."

This gentlemen, as we know, represented the first major appointment by President Lyndon B. Johnson. Indeed, it was just 1 year ago—in January 1964—that Ambassador Tom Mann undertook the arduous task of serving our Government and our people in a threefold capacity: as Special Assistant to the President for Inter-American Affairs, as Supreme Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, and as Assistant Secretary of State. Prior to this appointment, the Honorable Thomas Clifton Mann and his charming wife, Nancy, had served brilliantly as Chiefs of Diplomatic Mission in San Salvador, the capital of El Salvador; and in Mexico City, the capital of the United States of Mexico.

Only last December, when, by appointment of President Johnson, I was a member of the U.S. delegation at the inauguration of President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, in Mexico, I had another opportunity to witness the many advances in that country and the effective role enacted by Ambassador and Mrs. Mann in the notable improvement in friendly relations between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico.

This is one of the numerous reasons which makes me eager to have my distinguished colleagues note the article by Father Thorning, who has been described by our good and great Democratic majority leader, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, as "The Padre of the Americas."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HONORABLE THOMAS C. MANN: PEACEMAKER

(By Joseph F. Thorning)

No sooner had President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed the Honorable Thomas C. Mann his supreme director of inter-American affairs than big and little infernos broke out in vital areas throughout the Western Hemisphere. It was a baptism of fire.

The first volcano, Brazil, had been erupting for several years. It reached the flashpoint of political catastrophe early in 1964. The combination of corrupt politics, reckless currency inflation, and the infiltration of Marxist elements into almost all echelons of government, including the Armed Forces, threatened to engulf, first, Brazil, and then the entire South American Continent, in chaos, civil war, and possible Soviet slavery. In short, Brazilian politicians were bankrupt. Despite the immense productivity of the "Golden Triangle," São Paulo-Santos-Rio de Janeiro, and the fabulous farm and mineral resources of Minas Gerais, Paraná, Santa Catarina, and Rio Grande do Sul, disease, malnutrition, polluted water supplies, and slum conditions reduced the efficiency of large portions of the population and acted as a brake on the general development of the country. Many administrtors and entrepreneurs appeared to have forgotten the motto of the Brazilians: "Order and Progress."

The second volcano exploded in Panama. Long-smoldering tensions between U.S. citizens in the Canal Zone, with its higher standards of living and cultural isolation, and Panamanian nationals were touched off by teenagers raising an American flag in front of Balboa High School. Resentment in Panama was so fierce that President Roberto Chiari felt obliged to break diplomatic relations with the U.S.A. and to lodge serious charges of aggression before the Organization of American States and the United Nations. Policymakers in Washington, including Thomas Mann, who needed leisure to regroup and reorganize international programs officials, and found they were faced with day-to-day crises demanding enormous expenditures of time and energy. Although the Panama question became the prime, initial concern of Secretary Mann, he, better than any observer, realized how widely the cause of inter-American amity had deteriorated throughout the hemisphere. Moreover, some of his colleagues had been heard to remark that the cause was hopeless and the job almost impossible. The gentleman himself, although aware of the dimensions and dangers of his task, was dauntless. From the start, in his quiet, undramatic style, he was confident of ultimate success.

The opening moves in the Panama imbroglio, however, were hardly auspicious. Whereas the Government and people of Panama expected both White House and State Department officials speedily to assent to Panamanian clamor for immediate negotiations about a new Canal Zone treaty, Thomas C. Mann regarded the brusque arraignment of his country before the bar of the OAS and U.N. as simple blackmail. He made it clear, with the complete approval of President Johnson, that the United States would not undertake, in advance, to guarantee substantive changes in the aforesaid treaty. Agreement to negotiate while a gun was held at the head of the party of the second part, he considered a sign of weakness which he did not feel.

In his view, new backbone had to be created in U.S. diplomacy. This virtue of fortitude was needed to show a new image. The picture of frustration and impotence, following in the wake of failures to uphold freedom and decency against the Castro brothers, Fidel and Raul, had led politicians in several other American republics to think that fear was the mainspring to U.S. responses to events abroad.

A clique in government, backed by a claque in the press, agitated for quick concessions to Panama. The panic outcries of this clique-claque awoke no echoes in the White House and were ignored by Mr. Mann.

Nor did he permit his determination to be undermined by repeated planted rumors that an agreement was imminent. Such rumors were countered with the remark that the United States was prepared, if necessary, to wait for meaningful discussions until after the presidential elections in Panama. Within a few weeks, journalists, politicos, and diplomats in Washington and in Hispanic America, including Brazil, got the message. They could see that there was friendliness, serenity, and courage in the Mann profile.

In the meantime, in the midst of resignations, realinements, and numerous conferences in the State Department, the Panama debate continued from mid-January to the first week of April. Something like a stalemate settled upon the case. The losses in Panama were severe. Tourism was at a standstill; investment funds dried up; Canal Zone payrolls were spent everywhere but in the Republic. One of the friends of Panama who suffered because of this economic pain in the Republic was Thomas C. Mann. As a sincere, dedicated Americanista, he was unable to be unmoved by the anxiety and anguish experienced by other Americans. He wanted amity and peace.

Fortunately for all concerned, and perhaps not without some connection with previous events, the people and the armed forces of Brazil acted to break the deadlock. With the ouster of the demagogic João Goulart and his brand of extravagant nationalism, the climate of the hemisphere changed, radically. Hostility to the United States, as a rallying-cry of leftist politicos, began to look a little shopworn. The new regime in Brazil indicated that the traditional friendship with its North American sister republic would be renewed, if not strengthneed. Officials in the Itamaraty Palace, Rio de Janeiro, intimated that another look would be taken at diplomatic relations with Fidel Castro's captive nation. The popularity of Marxism as a panacea for Brazilian poverty in certain regions was called into question.

At the same time, pledges were given that the overthrow of Goulart would not be an excuse for reaction. Genuine socioeconomic revolution was to be the order of the day. At the urgent request of President Johnson and Presidential Adviser Mann, Ambassador Lincoln Gordon remained at his post.

It was generally recognized that Mr. Mann and Mr. Gordon shared clear, constructive ideas about long and short term programs for Brazilian-United States cooperation. Both men were able to distinguish between sincere builders and Marxist wreckers. They could see the difference between self-seeking politicians and honorable military and civilian administrators. Knowing Latin America in depth, they knew that, at moments of crisis, the Army, Navy, and Air Force officers considered themselves as custodians of the national patrimony.

Neither Secretary Mann nor Ambassador Gordon had participated in the near-disastrous State Department policy, face to face

with a military takeover in Peru, in the summer of 1962. (Cf. the article, "What Happened in Peru?" World Affairs, fall, 1962.) The rash, precipitate suspension of diplomatic relations and of economic and military aid by the United States to Peru proved not only ineffective, but also counterproductive.

Topflight officials, such as Thomas Mann and Lincoln Gordon, acted wisely and decisively in the case of Brazil. Within 24 hours of the restoration of decency in Brazil, President Humberto Castel Branco was happy to acknowledge the warm congratulations of President Johnson.

Firm hands were molding State Department procedures. Weakness and vacillation might have been an invitation to civil war in the United States of Brazil and the emergence of Luis Carlos Prestes as the Soviet gauleiter of the largest and most populous nation on the South American continent. Domestic peace and tranquility were preserved. Political stability was established as the first requirement of social reconstruction.

For weeks prior to the decisive turning-point in Brazil, a clique-claque of downgraded politicians and their journalistic partisans had been filling many newspaper columns with untrue accounts of a confidential briefing given by Thomas C. Mann to U.S. Ambassadors summoned to Washington in mid-March, 1964. In this closed session and in off-the-record remarks, Mr. Mann reiterated some of the principles that had brought him wide acclaim in two important Ambassadorial assignments in El Salvador (1955–57) and Mexico (1961–64). Among the guidelines recommended to the U.S envoys were an insistence upon realities in each republic and practical measures of cooperation rather than purely doctrinaire approaches to difficult situations and dangerous reliance upon amateur diplomats.

The criticism of the new coordinator of inter-American activities mounted in volume and fury until the statements, falsely attributed to Mr. Mann, featured him in what honest observers in Washington described as "the unbelievable position of advocating neutrality in choosing between democracies and dictatorships."

The truth is that there is no more active and articulate champion of free elections and representative government than Thomas Mann. The fact is that he would want to promote honest elections, democratic ideals and parliamentary procedures in Fidel Castro's Cuba as well as in Honduras, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, and Brazil. All his preferences are for constitutional government and respect for human rights, everywhere.

This is the goal of the Johnson-Mann striving in the Alliance for Progress. To recognize that dictatorships of the left are as vicious and brutally inhuman as those of the rightist military dictatorships in a number of countries does not mean that tolerance of the latter, with emphasis upon a reasonably quick return to constitutional rule, is apt to produce permanent forms of tyranny. What history shows in the last 40 years is that military dictatorships of the left are more disposed to perpetuate police-state techniques and, because of the complacency of their Marxist symyathizers, to multiply themselves than are any purely military regimes.

The reasons for this phenomenon, writ large on the maps of the globe, are obvious: Marxist-Leninist ideology, with its glorification of deceit and violence, an utter ruthlessness in the application of such a philosophy of action and the close coordination of Marxist forces throughout more than 114 nations. Some of these countries are independent and some are completely dominated, if not enslaved, by Soviet and collectivized Chinese military dictatorships.

The generals, admirals, and air force officers in the Western Hemisphere, however, seldom do anything to help each other; the military dictators in Cuba, on the other hand, constantly ship agents, arms, and money to Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, and other countries in a remarkable exhibition of inter-American Marxist solidarity. It is evident that President Lyndon B. Johnson and his loyal chief of staff for Latin America both see the difference between a self-perpetuating system of despotism and uncoordinated, temporary, caretaker administrations. This distinction is no figment of the imagination; it is a reality.

President Johnson and Secretary Mann, it may be assumed, are confident that the Brazilian people will be accorded an opportunity, in the near future, to decide their destiny. They may also cherish the hope that, when in September 1964, the people of the Republic of Chile go to the polls, they will vote for freedom and social progress rather than for a halfway house on the road to government ownership and operation of the major means of production, distribution, banking, and exchange.

Government monopoly, as the experiments in the Soviet empire suggest, demands political control of major units of the press, radio, TV, and entertainment. Such a monopoly, on a global scale, in all likelihood, would limit, not enlarge the earth's fruitfulness.

Democratic leaders in the Western Hemisphere, including President Johnson and the Honorable Thomas C. Mann, are advocates of increased productivity. They know that, by multiplying not curtailing "the loaves and fishes," they can provide a strong foundation for prosperity and international cooperation.

This is the new orientation in the State Department. In this context, the Honorable Thomas C. Mann can be called an "architect of the peace."

On Pan-American Day, for the 20th consecutive year, Father Thorning gave the prayer at the opening session of the House of Representatives.

He said, in part:

"Grant to the noble people of the United States of Brazil the divine graces and human wisdom necessary to consolidate and to promote their recent triumph over evil forces that threatened to engulf their vast, vital nation in chaos, defeat, and Soviet slavery. May this South American victory be advanced by a new determination to mobilize and develop rich human and material resources in accord with the principles of brotherly love and social justice. In the efforts to attain such important goals, we pledge our help before God and invoke divine blessing with a view to new triumphs for the Brazilian and inter-American ideals of 'order and progress.'

"As we in North America, including Canada, rededicate our minds and hearts to the good neighbor relationship, we are happy to recognize that this policy of statesmanship has now been reinvigorated, with the support of both political parties, by the practical measures of self-improvement and economic partnership embodied in the Alliance for Progress."

Study Pinpoints Gross Bias of Reader's Digest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Reader's Digest has such wide distribution, I think the Members will be very much interested, as I was, in an article in the February 20 issue of Labor, which gives some enlightening information on the magazine. Under permission to extend my remarks, I am including it in the Appendix:

STUDY PINPOINTS GROSS BIAS OF READER'S DIGEST

Repeatedly, labor has cited examples of biased, one-sided, antilabor, reactionary articles constantly carried in the Reader's Digest. Now university publications are spotlighting the magazine's record of distortion, and its refusal to publish corrections or opposing opinions.

For instance, the latest (winter) issue of Columbia University's quarterly Journalism Review has a seven-page "Report on the Reader's Digest," written by Reo M. Christenson, professor of political science at Miami University in Ohio and former editor of the Toledo Blade.

Christenson, in his analysis, points out that about 70 percent of the articles in the Digest are either staff written, "or planned and planted by the Digest in other magazines, then reprinted in the Digest."

"These practices," he writes, "help insure that the Digest offers its own philosophy, not a sampling of American opinion. The philosophy is avowedly conservative."

ATTACKS IN GOVERNMENT

In line with that philosophy, the Digest has since 1944, he points out, "published more than 300 articles" to develop the theme that "Federal officials are congenitally extravagant, that deficit spending and the national debt threaten disaster, that Federal taxes are an unsupportable burden * * * and that Federal power is a menace to the liberties of every American, great and small." Moreover, such articles are reprinted by the millions.

Also, the Digest often publishes articles by ultraconservatives without letting readers know their private connections. As an example, Christenson cites an article smearing the U.S. Employment Service, carried under the byline of Congressman FRANK T. BOW, Republican, of Ohio. He points out the Digest "did not inform its readers that Bow has close relations with private employment agencies, who have a special interest in restricting the U.S. Employment Service."

NO REBUTTAL OR CORRECTION

The article further recalls the much-publicized article of a few years ago which charged the Bureau of Labor Statistics doctored figures relative to unemployment. Ewan Clique, Bureau Director, documented a whole series of falsehoods and inaccuracies in the article, but the Digest refused to print them. Nor would it report the fact that noted economists and statisticians issued a statement upholding the Bureau completely and finding the charges against it "to be without foundation."

"This sequence of events," Christenson continues, "illustrates what is perhaps the most disturbing Digest policy—its refusal to allow rebuttal or correction. * * * Its failure to give individuals and agencies attacked on its pages an opportunity for reply is indefensible by any professional standard."

Christenson goes on to detail numerous other cases of Digest distortion of the work of Federal agencies.

CITES SMEARS OF LABOR

He also touches on the Digest's treatment of the labor movement and finds that since 1952 the magazine has published 49 articles "primarily critical" of labor unions, 5 "neutral" and only 8 that "could be regarded as friendly."

He also lists many articles to illustrate "beyond cavil that the Digest is stanchly Republican—a fact that readers and educators have a right to know." He mentions educators because about a half million copies

of the Digest "are used regularly in U.S. classrooms.

"If the Digest is to continue being used in the classrooms," Christensen declares, "teachers at least owe it to their students to warn them of its bias, its partisanship, and the dubious character of its reporting on the Washington scene."

American Sokol Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this week many thousands of Americans of Slavonic origin or descent are celebrating the centennial of the founding of the first Slovak Catholic Sokol organization in the United States. This fraternal, cultural, and physical fitness organization, with its ideals of equality, liberty, and brotherhood, has made many contributions to the life of our country. A noted Slovak-American journalist, John C. Sciranka, recently sent me an article on the Sokol centennial which had been printed in Katolicky Sokol—Catholic Falcon—the official publication of the Slovak Catholic Sokol. I ask unanimous consent that this informative article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOKOL TRIUMPH AND OUR FELICITATION

Sokolism has proved to be the vanguard of fraternal, cultural, and physical fitness life among the new Americans.

Considering that there are some 35 million Americans of Slavonic descent living in the 50 States, there is a vast field for the Sokol Corps.

The Americans of Slavonic origin and descent have a rich heritage. Their history starts here even before the arrival of the first pilgrims on the Mayflower.

History proves that when the first Sokol Society was founded in 1862 in Prague, its founders, Tyrs and Fugner, succeeded in spite of many prevailing obstacles in uniting the Slavs.

In a very short period, Sokol organizations took root in various Slavonic countries, and we, their descendants are today paying tribute to their sacrifices during this Sokol centennial celebration.

And although living under the rule of despotic monarchs, and through two world wars and the Korean conflict, when the powerful empires and rich dynasties perished, Sokolism still flourishes.

The current centennial observance of the first Sokol organization in the United States and the issuance of 120 million Sokols physical fitness commemorative stamps, is indeed one of the greatest triumphs of Sokol ideals.

SLOVAK KING SVATOPLUK

This feat was accomplished by a Sokol unity, which was the dream and desire of our forefathers for the past 12 centuries.

At this time we recall the admonition of a Slovak King Svatopluk to his three sons, that only in unity there is strength. To exemplify this he used the separated and united twigs.

According to an old legend, Slovak King Svatopluk, after whom our group 7 of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., is named, summoned his three sons to his bedside before his death and after a fatherly admonition, gave them a lesson in the now often repeated saying that "only in unity there is strength." He gave each a twig and asked them to break it, which they did easily. Then he gave them a bundle of twigs and asked them to break them. This they could not do. So he asked them to stay united in their kingdom, for only by unity they will keep off the onslaught of their enemies.

To our sorrow, the sons did not take heed of their father's advice and the seed of disunity was implanted into the hearts of future generations. Due to this disunity, first the Mongolian hordes, then the despotic imperialists, and in our generation the pagan nazism and atheistic communism have gained power in the Christian Slavonic countries.

Perusing through the pages of history we learn that the spark of equality, liberty, and brotherhood was ignited by the founding of the first Sokol organization in Europe in 1862. Shortly before this historical date the cause of Panslavism showed its potent strength under the leadership of Ján Kollar, the archpriest of Panslavism, Paul Safarik, L'udevit Stúr and other Slavonic leaders.

SS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS

Simultaneously with the gospel of Panslavism and Sokolism came the observance of the millennium of the advent of Apostles SS. Cyril and Methodius to the present Slovakia and Moravia.

This millennium of SS. Cyril and Methodius in 1863 was observed by 80 million Slavs inspite of many obstacles. The Civil War was raging in this country and the true believers of Sokolism fought on the side of the famous emancipator, President Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we are observing.

But in Europe, this millennium was a sort of baptism for Sokolism for the fact is that wherever these two apostles were honored, the Sokol ideal took root and continued to flourish even to this day inspite of any obstacles, tyrants or oppressors.

When the time came to organize the Czechoslovak legions, the Sokols in Europe and America were the first to give initiative and under the leadership of that immortal son of Slovakia, citizen of France and cofounder of the first Republic of Czechoslovakia, Gen. Milan R. Stefanik, the Sokols were in the forefront as leaders and legionnaires of this famous legion whose "march of the 70,000" through Russia will always live in history. The Sokols as legionnaires in France, Italy, Russia, and other countries will forever live as legendary heroes. They marched to victory under the Sokol banners.

Prior to World War I, the Sokol spirit should be credited with many accomplishments of the Slovak and Slav leaders. We mention here only the monumental achievements of Archbishop Josef Strossmayer, famous orator at the first Vatican council and his great apostolate for the ideals of SS. Cyril and Methodius. Also Bishop Stefan Moyzes, and Dr. Karol Kuzmany, Catholic and Protestant leaders, who stood at the helm of the newly created Slovak Academy, the Matica Slovenská.

It was during this trying, nevertheless glorious period that Pope Leo XIII of the blessed memory issued the famous encyclical "Grande Munus" on September 30, 1880 in honor of SS. Cyril and Methodius as apostles of the Slavs, whom he also honored by renovating the basilica of St. Clement in the Eternal City, where St. Cyril is buried.

And it was the same Sokol spirit which led the Slovak and other Slavonic nations to the famous Velehrad, where SS. Cyril and Methodius preached and spread the gospel of brotherly love as true disciples of Christ, when Nitra, their original see already was in the hands of the enemies of the Slovak and Slavonic nations.

Today, the teachings of SS. Cyril and Methodius triumph for the sacred liturgy has again reverted to the peoples language.

SPIRITUAL TRIUMPH

In this glorious age of spiritual triumph, the Sokols are observing the centennial of their first organization in the United States. It is, indeed a double triumph for God and Nation, our Slovak Catholic Sokol motto.

With this great triumph, we are certain that the Sokol leaders will create the much needed Sokol Corps and adopt the firm program for the rejuvenation of the Slovak and Slavonic fraternalism in America.

During the Sokol centennial in the Capital of our great country, let us not only look to the past but use all our powers of concentration and wisdom for a better future.

Let us harness the vast talents of our American youth of Slovak and Slavonic origin and descent for the perpetuation and growth of those great fraternal and physical fitness ideals, initiated by our Sokol pioneers a century ago for greater America and the freedom of captive nations.

A View of the Vietnam Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that not one of us, no matter in which branch of Government he may be privileged to serve, can supply the complete answer to the dilemma of Vietnam. Particularly because of this fact, it is important that we make available to ourselves all pertinent background information, in order better to understand the problem, and to permit us to make such individual contributions as might seem useful toward the eventual solution in the interest of the United States and of the free world.

In this connection, and under leave to extend my remarks in the appendix, I include a commentary which appeared in the issue of February 3, 1965, of the Washington Report of the American Security Council, written by Dr. James D. Atkinson, international politics editor of the Council, and distinguished member of the faculty of Georgetown University:

NONE SO QUICK

There has been a mounting campaign to get the United States out of South Vietnam. Many reasons are given for this position. For example, we are told that the people in South Vietnam are fainthearted in the fight against the Communist Vietcong. Yet these supposedly fainthearted people have been enduring casualties measured in the thousands every year—and for many years—in defending themselves against communism.

In the vast area that is washed by the waters of the Pacific Ocean, the United States is fortunate—thus far—to have many staunch friends. These friends have indicated their friendship by joining with us in defensive treaties for the maintenance of peace in the Pacific Ocean area. Thus we participated with Australia and New Zealand in the ANZUS Treaty. Australia, New Zealand, the Republic of the Philippines, and Thailand (Britain, France, and Pakistan are participants but are not in the Pacific) joined with us in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, SEATO. South Vietnam came under the protection of SEATO in accordance with article IV of the treaty. We have mutual defense treaties with Japan, Nationalist

China, and South Korea. Thus the measures which we take—or fail to take—in Vietnam will produce a political and psychological fallout extending far beyond that strife-torn country.

OTHER TAKEOVER EFFORTS STARTED

Some of the far-reaching effects which might result if there were an American policy of appeasement in Vietnam have already been foreshadowed. This is because U.S. policy has sometimes appeared to be hesitant and unsure. Thus during the last days of December 1964 a cladestine Communist radio station run by the Thailand Independence Movement began broadcasting propaganda against the present pro-American government of Thailand. There has been a fresh outbreak of the Communist Hukbalahap guerrillas in the Philippines. Since the long drawn out Huk revolutionary activity in that country which peaked in the early 1950's was supported by the Chinese Communists, it is likely that the current terrorist operations of the Huks are once again being stimulated by the Red Chinese. If this upsurge in revolutionary action by the Communists in southeast Asia is taking place as a result of what the Communists interpret as our lethargy in that part of the world, one may well ask what the effect would be if we were to embark on a policy of appeasement in South Vietnam.

The Chinese Communists are attempting to change the balance of power in the Pacific. Their appetite is insatiable. Earlier it was Korea. Then it was Tibet and later an incursion into India. But now and for the past decade it has also been a drive into southeast Asia. And always accompanying this revolutionary advance in the Pacific has been Chinese Communist mischiefmaking in Africa and in Latin America. Almost daily the press reports details of the Chinese Communist support of the Communist guerrillas in the Congo. And no longer ago than October 26, 1964, our good Latin American neighbor, Colombia, reported that Communist-sponsored guerrillas in that country were equipped with arms supplied by Communist China and Cuba. In short, Chinese Communist revolutionary activity is in conflict with American interests not only in the Pacific but elsewhere. American withdrawal from South Vietnam will no more appease the Red Chinese ambitions than would our withdrawal across the Pacific to Hawaii. Rather, it would stimulate them to further conquests and so might well trigger an all-out war.

The Soviet Union is giving propaganda and political warfare support to the Chinese Communist efforts in Vietnam. The official Soviet news agency Tass announced December 30, 1964, that a permanent office of the Vietnamese National Liberation Front would be opened in Moscow. On January 5, 1965, the official Communist Party newspaper Pravda printed an aggressive letter of Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to North Vietnam's Foreign Minister. Said Gromyko: "The Soviet Union supports resolutely the just national liberation struggle of the people of South Vietnam against the armed intervention of American imperialism and the antipopular regime of Saigon. The Soviet Government demands that the United States stop all interference in the affairs of South Vietnam, that it withdraw its troops."

There are many public indications that the Soviet Union is in close touch with the Communist Vietcong. For example, on a Moscow Radio broadcast of January 14, 1965, Lieutenant Colonel Leontyev of the Soviet armed forces said: "The battle at Bin Ghia made it clear that the South Vietnamese guerrilla forces can now take on big engagements, engagements involving several battalions on either side." It has since been reported that units of battalion size have been brought into the South Vietnamese fighting from North Vietnam. From all of this it would seem not only that the Vietcong is committing large units to the fighting, but also that the Soviet Union is becoming encouraged to take a more belligerent tone by what it believes to be signs of American vacillation in southeast Asia.

THE CHOICES

What options, then, has the United States with reference to our policy in South Vietnam? In blunt terms it would appear that we have two options: To go; or to stay.

The policy of going is sometimes called a policy of neutralization. This would mean the formation of a government in South Vietnam in which the Communists or pro-Communists would participate. Sooner or later—and, if past experience with coalition governments is a guide, it would be sooner—the Communists would dominate the government. Reduced to its essentials the policy of neutralization is a policy of scuttle and run, a policy of appeasement. Both on grounds of morality and of self-interest, it should be rejected.

But why should we stay in Vietnam? The answer to this question is really the answer to another question. And that is why we are in Vietnam.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POSITION

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson answered this question. Said the President: "We are there, first, because a friendly nation has asked us to help against Communist aggression. Ten years ago our President pledged our help. Three Presidents have supported that pledge. We will not break it. Second, our own security is tied to the peace of Asia. Twice in one generation we have had to fight against aggression in the Far East. To ignore aggression now would only increase the danger of a larger war."

Both Radio Moscow and the Communist North Vietnam Radio Hanoi have commented somewhat impudently on the President's speech. Said Radio Moscow on January 7: "Once again he repeated the wornout lines that American armed forces are in South Vietnam to give 'help' and safeguard United States security in South Vietnam." And Radio Hanoi on January 9 said: "In his state of the Union address to the U.S. Congress on January 4, Johnson once again disclosed U.S. stubbornness in continuing its aggressive plot in South Vietnam. Johnson brazenly stated that the United States would stay in South Vietnam."

But President Johnson's words are not "worn out." His words reflect the verdict of history on the policy of appeasement. A firm policy in Vietnam today is the best guarantee of avoiding a general war tomorrow. How much might not have England—and the world—been spared had the appeasers of the 1930's listened to the advice of Sir Winston Churchill. Militarily Communist China is still a paper tiger—less powerful than Hitler's Nazis in the early 1930's. Today Communist China's challenge in the Pacific can be met without excessive risk. But the peril to freedom in the Pacific will continue to rise with each year if we refuse to face up to this challenge.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

If we stay in South Vietnam what can we do to improve the situation? The following steps would start us in the right direction: (1) Increased interdiction of Communist supply routes into South Vietnam and such related measures as might be required. (2) Recognition that Vietnam is a theater of military operations by the appointment of a military officer rather than a diplomatic officer as chief of the country team of U.S. personnel there. The protection of the people from Vietcong terrorism is a prerequisite before any semblance of stability can be achieved and this is essentially a military operation. Appointment of a military officer as head of the country team would be in accord with the priority of requirements in what is unquestionably an area of combat operations. (3) The establishment of a naval quarantine on North Vietnam as an aggressor against the peace of southeast Asia. The pressures on the present land supply routes by such a naval quarantine on North Vietnam will not be fully effective for several years. Precisely because of this, however, a naval quarantine would signal to our friends throughout the Pacific—and no less importantly to Communist China—the long-range determination of the United States to stop Chinese Communist aggression. The display of such firmness would be a psychopolitical act which would go far toward enlisting support for U.S. policy not in the Pacific alone but throughout the world.

A decision to stay in Vietnam is not the easy way out for the short run. Quite the contrary, it will mean an intensification of the long and hard struggle. It is to be expected in our political system that questions will continue to be raised about the wisdom of continuing to meet, indeed, even of having accepted the challenge in Vietnam. But viewed in a larger context, Vietnam is but a testing ground. Our resolve there is the measure of our will elsewhere. An American withdrawal from Vietnam would inevitably be followed by a withdrawal from other parts of the world in which it is said that we are "overextended." In such a context is Vietnam any more untenable than Berlin?

These words from the Book of Proverbs are helpful in evaluating the attitude of many toward our friends in South Vietnam: "None so quick to find pretexts, as he that would break with a friend; he is in fault continually."

The Threat of Communism to Our Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial by Mr. Harry C. Weaver of station WOKE in Charleston, S.C., dated February 12, 1965. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has repeatedly warned our country against efforts to subvert the thinking of our young people in this country, and he has emphasized the danger in permitting members of the Communist Party to go from campus to campus in this country, preaching their Communist diatribes against our free enterprise system and our belief in God.

I ask unanimous consent to have this excellent editorial printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Young people, throughout the world and our United States of America, are being used as pawns in the master plot of our Communist enemies to end freedom everywhere. These antifreedom forces understand clearly that youth is most vulnerable for questionable crusades and rebellions against authority, whether it be National, State, or local. With this knowledge, the Communists within our country and around the world are using the youth for their own deadly purposes.

Nothing in recent years has so clearly shown the power of the international Communist conspiracy as the continuous eruptions of student riots in one country after another and across the face of our American Republic. Angry mobs, aroused to a frenzy of hatred by well-trained agitators, have overthrown heads of foreign governments. Students in America have defied school regulations and authority, mutilated property and destroyed school morale and moral processes, brought discredit to the American way of life and encouraged godless, lawless, and revolutionary communism on college campuses. Student rioters are fully organized to embarrass the United States in the eyes of our friends, to incite demonstrations and riots, to plan and put into execution sex parties in the dormitories, in nearby hotels or motels, or prolonged weekends at American beaches or islands, to engage in other activities in coordination with phony religious organizations of modernism, materialism, socialism, atheism, and even communism, and to participate in campaigns designed to discredit and ridicule lawful bodies such as the U.S. House Committee on Un-American Activities. It may be taken for granted that the success of these enemy-fostered student demonstrations and riots will lead to further attempts to downgrade America in the eyes of the world, and to attack the remaining anti-Communist, pro-American leaders left in our American Republic.

We witness with amazement some of the disturbing trends by youth organizations in our Nation and in our sister State of North Carolina. In 1963 the State Legislature of North Carolina took action against the influx of Communist speakers appearing on college campuses and passed legislation prohibiting Communists or persons who have taken the fifth amendment from speaking on State-owned property. This is sound legislation to stop the exposure to, and advance of, godless communism and should be followed by all State legislatures in our Union. Known in North Carolina as the speaker ban law, the State Federation of Young Republicans went on record last Saturday in Charlotte in favor of the law, stated that it was a "just law and in no way infringes upon the constitutionally guaranteed right of free speech." In Greensboro, N.C., on the same date, 400 delegates overwhelmingly endorsed a movement to repeal the speaker ban law. Who were these delegates? None other than students of the Methodist Student Movement of North Carolina meeting in convention who adopted a resolution calling for the formation of a committee from that group to write letters to every member of the General Assembly of North Carolina expressing opposition to, and repeal of, the speaker ban law. What has happened to the religious and moral fiber of our youth that such a religious organization would be seeking the same objective as the dedicated followers of Revolutionist Gus Hall, of the Communist Party, U.S.A., who has spoken on numerous American college campuses? We American patriots must assume our responsibilities of recognizing and understanding the strange forces motivating our young people. Facing the same conditions which our Communist enemies use in exploiting American youth for evil purposes and eventual slavery, we must, in a positive fashion, direct the same forces to serve the ends of justice, truth, and freedom.

We take pride in the fact that our country is a nation of families. All of us, parents or not, think constantly about the welfare of our young people. The future belongs to them and we want, deeply and earnestly, to do all that we can to make that future a bright one. We strive to train them to meet the responsibilities and grasp the opportunities that the future will bring to them. But we Americans must remember that we are not alone in having an eye on our youth, and what they are learning in order to prepare themselves for adult life. Our enemies of freedom—the atheists and the Communists—are deeply interested in our American young people, not because of concern for their welfare, but because of a deep-laid plot to use our youth to help destroy the freedom that we hope to pass on to them. The English statesman and scholar, Edmund Burke, once said: "Tell me what are the prevailing sentiments that occupy the minds of your young men, and I will tell you what is to be the character of the next generation." Today's youths are tomorrow's future. No one is more keenly aware of this fact than the worldwide Communist conspirators against freedom; and no one is more eager to exploit, for evil purposes, the idealism, the enthusiasm, the readiness to believe, and the inexperience of our young people. We hear much of American ingenuity. Surely we can apply some of that ingenuity to our youth, with the desire to destroy the Communist enemy, rather than stimulating their desire to destroy law, order, and a government of free people. We hear a lot about juvenile delinquency but adult apathy can lead to something far worse than juvenile delinquency.

Recommendations by Mrs. Marion S. Wells on Mental Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today the remarks and recommendations of Mrs. Marion S. Wells, executive director of the Ohio Mental Health Association, Inc., which she made for the association to the ad hoc committee on continued mental health planning of the comprehensive mental health planning survey project now operating in the State of Ohio under the department of mental hygiene and correction with funds provided by Congress.

It seemed to me that Members of Congress interested in mental health legislation and the manner in which the recommendations of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health are being carried out in the States would be interested in the remarks of Mrs. Wells on behalf of a voluntary association which has been working for 35 years for the improvement and the expansion of services to the mentally ill and mentally retarded in the State of Ohio.

This organization has been a real force in mental health, particularly in the fields of education and State legislation, and her remarks concerning continued future planning are timely to support any move in Ohio and from Washington for moving toward providing U.S. citizens the best mental health services possible in the 1960's and for future generations.

Her remarks follow:

REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF MRS. MARION S. WELLS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE OHIO MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION

Judge Robison and distinguished members of the committee on continued mental health planning, it is a privilege to have an opportunity to appear before this committee to present testimony on behalf of the Ohio Mental Health Association. I shall direct my remarks to the matters of interest to the committee in carrying out its responsibilities.

The members of the Ohio Mental Health Association which supported both the Federal and State legislation implementing the comprehensive planning project have been gratified with the manner in which the Ohio survey has been activated. The enlistment of broad representation of individuals and groups, including both persons working in the mental health field and those who have not been involved to date, should certainly result in greater citizen participation and interest in the future expansion of the mental health services in Ohio, at the community level and statewide.

In preparing our testimony to be presented to you today, we have endeavored to follow the points suggested in the letter of invitation. First, it would be presumptive of our organization to express any objective evaluation of this project at this time since it will not be completed until July of this year. However, some observations from the sidelines can be expressed regarding impressions which have been gathered from discussing the project with persons who are participating in the survey.

There is no doubt that this undertaking has afforded an excellent opportunity for more people to get to know more about mental health generally, and particularly, to become better informed regarding the present services in Ohio and the areas of need. The leadership of this project is outstanding. The broad scope of the survey included all the major areas of concern for investigation, discussion and recommendations.

The next suggested point to be commented upon is the extent of the mental health planning done in the past by the Ohio Mental Health Association. This year the Ohio Mental Health Association celebrates its 35th birthday. During the past three decades, this association, composed of dedicated volunteers, has worked toward the improvement and expansion of services to the mentally ill and mentally retarded, the development of a greater citizen awareness to the problem, and to the truth concerning mental illness and mental retardation.

Thirty years ago very little progress had been made in changing the deplorable conditions that existed in our State asylums. The public was primarily interested in removing these afflicted ones from their midst and placing them behind locked doors. The motive was more to protect society than to provide humane care and treatment for these sick people. Consequently, a pioneering effort was required in order to change this whole concept and to bring about long overdue reforms which would correct these inhuman practices against those suffering from mental disorders and deficiencies.

It was the Ohio Mental Health Association that saw the need and prompted the legislation which corrected and strengthened the structure of the governmental agency responsible for this program in Ohio. Let us face the fact that the incontestable progress in this field in Ohio is due in a large measure to the efforts of this nongovernmental organization.

During these early stages, a plan of action was directed toward changing the situation as quickly as possible. The advances made in Ohio in the last several decades in our State services should not be minimized because of the lack of a so-called long-range master plan. Such an approach in this early stage was not feasible. As new techniques were advocated, plans were developed which left outmoded methods behind.

The Ohio Mental Health Association recognized early that the community held the answer to the problem of mental illness and

organized citizen groups to work at this level. It is only in the last decade, actually, that the community approach has been accepted by the professionals. Mental health, as the baby of the health programs, is just now coming of age and, as a result, requires careful analysis of "where we are, where we are going and how fast we can get there." This requires continuous evaluation and on-going planning that will be flexible enough to accept any new techniques that are discovered which will improve the care and treatment of the mentally ill and mentally retarded.

As has been suggested, I shall endeavor to review briefly some of the achievements of the Ohio Mental Health Association which required planning and the developing of an action program to bring about results.

As recommended by a Subcommittee on Mental Health of the Ohio Study Committee in the late 1940's, the Ohio Mental Health Association prepared legislation which, when enacted, etsablished the present department of mental hygiene and correction, thus removing this program from the department of welfare. This change in administration gave separate identity to mental health services and representation on the Governor's cabinet. This achievement has been recognized as the real breakthrough in Ohio in establishing the foundation of a State mental health program whose needs could be presented to the Ohio Legislature and whose budgetary requirements could be reflected in the figures in the budget.

A second achievement was the establishment of the State-local supported community clinic programs in Ohio. This program resulted from a demonstration project in Miami County sponsored by the local chapter of our association and financed through Federal funds granted to Ohio for this purpose. Dr. Harry Wain, who was then health commissioner in Miami County, was greatly responsible for this community clinic project and assisted in preparing legislation which provided for the joint State-local supported clinic program. The enactment of this legislation has resulted in approximately 38 community clinics being established in Ohio to date, mostly through the planning and initiating efforts of chapters of the Ohio Mental Health Association.

Much publicity was given several years ago to the hardships that were being placed on families of patients due to the inequities in the charging for the support of these patients in the State institutions. This problem was studied by a special committee of our association. As a result of data collected, our governmental relations committee prepared legislation which, when enacted, revised the law regulating the policies of the department in charging for support of patients in the State institutions, removing the inequities, and establishing a realistic policy geared to ability to pay of the patient or responsible relative.

Perhaps the most outstanding example of agency planning is the Chemo-therapy project which was conducted by the Ohio Mental Association over a span of 2 years in Clark County. This study was an attempt to find a solution to the high percentage of discharged patients who were returning to the State hospitals in a short period of time.

Using data secured from this demonstration project which provided medication for indigent, discharged patients after their return to the community, legislation was sponsored by our agency which made this a function of the department of mental hygiene and thus provided for these services to be rendered statewide. This legislation, known as H.B. No. 6—Hildebrand, had other provisions such as authorizing the department to operate community mental health service units in State hospitals, thus providing outpatient services to persons who were in need of help and who did not require hospitalization.

This bill has received national attention as Ohio became one of the first States to be prepared for the development of the community mental health program including the mental health centers as provided for in the newly enacted Federal legislation.

Another area in which the Ohio Mental Health Association has given much planning and action is in the enlistment of what are known as "the gatekeepers" in the community. These individuals include those who work with people, as the ministers, the teachers, the law-enforcement agencies, the social agencies, the parent groups, and the general practitioners.

The American Medical Association at the two national conferences on mental health which it sponsored emphasized the importance of using all professional and semiprofessional persons on the mental health team. This tends to make up for the serious shortage of professional people in psychiatry and to expand the involvement of other disciplines which should and could render a valuable service in helping individuals to make better adjustments to their environment.

Our planning at the State and local level has been directed toward orienting these various so-called gatekeepers in the community in order that they can assume responsibilities and assist in the development of local resources in the schools, courts, general hospitals, and mental health resources such as community guidance clinics and sheltered workshops.

The shortage of trained personnel has pointed up the importance of stimulating youth interests in the mental health field. These efforts have been carried on in a variety of ways, such as providing materials for schools and local libraries, involving youth in volunteer services in the community and in the hospitals. Special projects on mental health have been stimulated in the schools, including mental health plays, special reports, and projects involving career interests.

Many other areas, such as alcoholism, the problems of older people, insurance benefits for mental illness, rehabilitation, and prevention, have been studied and plans for developing programs in these areas have been evolved and activated to some degree.

And now the final point—our opinion on the need for continued mental health planning in Ohio. A new approach to mental health is being considered by the comprehensive committee.

The expansion of community mental health services will bring about a reduction in the number of persons who will be required to go to the State hospital for assistance. This does not mean State hospitals will not continue to play a part in the total State treatment program. It will make it possible to relieve the overcrowded conditions in the State hospitals by removing those persons who do not require an intensive treatment service. Thus, the State hospital will be able to carry on the services for which it is uniquely set up to do—that of an all-out therapy program on a continuing basis for persons who require these services and also for those few chronic patients who will need long-term hospitalization. This change will require continuous planning to provide for the correlation of services at the various levels and to maintain a proper balance of support.

The Ohio Mental Health Association has, for a long time, recognized the importance of the community sharing in the care and treatment of the mentally ill and mentally retarded. We believe that any planning for future expansion of mental health services and initiation of new services must recognize the importance of providing services close to the patient in his home community. Most patients should not be uprooted from their personal contacts with their families and their jobs.

Our association, which has represented all segments of the population in every part of the State, is vitally concerned with providing equal opportunities for benefiting from these community-based services. In some underprivileged areas, such as southeastern Ohio, it is not possible for the community to share on the same basis in the cost of operating these services as in the metropolitan areas. The inability of these less affluent communities to provide their share of the financial support and also to secure professional staff has been evidenced in the operation of the community guidance centers.

It is apparent that the large population in the metropolitan areas of Ohio require more services in the various health programs. But recognition must be given to the individuals living in the less populated areas who also are in need of the assistance which can prevent the occurrence of a mental illness through providing early diagnosis and treatment resources.

The Federal programs for the various major health problems have been planned to serve the underprivileged areas. It is imperative that our State mental health programs also be planned with this in mind. Provisions should be made for providing full support, if necessary, through State funds to initiate services in such areas and then to work toward securing whatever support is available in these communities. Particularly in southeastern Ohio, a great deal of interest in mental health has been evidenced. Every county in this area has a local voluntary mental health chapter of the Ohio Mental Health Association. State services should be expanded in this part of the State with consideration for the serious economic problems and also the difficulty of travel in this less populated section.

The sparse population in many areas would not justify full-time staff which indicates that planning for part-time services should be considered. Our association has advocated that where a psychiatric director is not immediately available for the clinic, the local medical association might be asked to provide medical direction for this community service until such time as a psychiatrist can be secured.

In summary, the Ohio Mental Health Association respectfully submits to this committee certain suggestions assuring the continuation of a mental health planning process here in Ohio.

To supplant what has amounted to spasmodic planning and study committees, it is recommended that a Continuing Planning and Advisory Committee be established through legislative enactment. This new body should be charged with specific responsibilities and should be accountable to the Governor and the departmental officals.

The composition of such a committee should necessarily be broad enough to include representation from the several areas of interest, as the legal, judicial, educational, industrial, medical, ministerial, and citizen's organizations. It should be empowered to appoint subcommittees to function in specific areas of concern and to make recommendations for action. In order that all parts of Ohio would have equal consideration, the committee membership should not only be representative professionally, but also geographically of Ohio.

The Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health which was established in 1955 by an act of Congress included in its final report in 1960 the following statement which seems to be an appropriate conclusion to this testimony:

"The outstanding characteristics of mental illness as a public health problem are its staggering size, the present limitations in our methods of treatment, and the peculiar nature of mental illness that differentiates its victims from those with other diseases or disabilities. It would follow that any

national program against mental illness adopted by Congress and the States must be scaled to the size of the problem, imaginative in the course it pursues, and energetic in overcoming both psychological and economic resistances to progress in this direction."

In another quote from this same report, the following is stated: "Without adequate financial resources, we cannot take care of patients, we cannot educate professional personnel for public service, and we cannot pursue the basic knowledge needed for the prevention and cure of mental illness."

The Ohio Mental Health Association, as it has in the past, stands ready to cooperate with the Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction and with any committee assigned to carry on the continued planning in the field of mental health in Ohio. We believe the citizen's organizations will be a vital force in continuing to expand the interest and cooperation of the individuals at the community level through organized citizen's effort.

The legislative proposals adopted by our agency to be supported during this 106th general assembly included items relative to consideration of any recommendations which may come from the work of the Comprehensive Mental Health Planning Survey prior to the adjournment of this assembly.

We will be happy to give our supoprt to securing action on any such recommendations so that, without loss of time, Ohio can move forward in providing the best mental health services possible to all of its citizens.

Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the poet laureate of Virginia, Ruby Altizer Roberts, resides in my boyhood hometown of Christiansburg, Va. Over a long period of years, she has devoted herself to the preservation and exaltation of verse in Virginia. I would like to quote herewith her poem entitled "Virginia":

VIRGINIA

(By Ruby Altizer Roberts)

Sometimes I think no other land
  Does so exalt the Spring,
With cardinal flash, with redbud fire
  And dogwood blossoming.

For here it seems God set once more
  An Eden print on earth,
And spoke another genesis
  Of man's potential worth.

Sometimes I think that I may be
  At least half-way forgiven,
If I surmise it may compare
  With either side of heaven.

Mountains look down on bluegrass hills,
  On fences white crossed, and bars
Mountains are proud down Blue Ridge way;
  They know the speech of stars.

When Spring's first lightning glitters out
  Bright as the sword of Lee.
The clouds let down their silver tears
  Into a silver sea.

And then it is the gray-clad mists
  That linger in the sky
Seem like the shadows of the great
  That never quite ride by.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, during this crucial period when the free world is engaged in a supreme effort to prevent the spread of world communism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, we often tend to forget those courageous peoples in parts of Europe who have lost this struggle and have succumbed to the forces of oppression and tyranny.

Included in this assemblage of conquered nations are the gallant Lithuanians who celebrated their 47th anniversary of independence on February 16. This independence was unfortunately short lived, lasting only 22 years.

The independent Lithuania was created as a soverign state at the termination of the first world holocaust of this century and was crushed at the beginning of the second major world conflict.

The stoic Lithuanians, however, were not defeated in spirit nor in their resolve to regain their independence. For over 125 years prior to their initial independence, they had suffered almost virtual slavery at the hands of several European powers but their desire, during this time, for freedom continuously prevailed. On June 23, 1941, these courageous people staged a revolution and declared themselves sovereign. They were, however, ignored and were occupied by the Nazis for 2 years until in the summer of 1944, they were once again occupied by Soviet troops and oppression. The Soviet powers then attempted a semblance of legitimacy by their typical ruse in proclaiming Lithuania to be a component republic of the Soviet Union.

The free world, however, can easily see through this sham and is fully congnizant of the deep and continuing desire of the Lithuanians to once again become a free and sovereign state and to take their rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanians only desire to live in peace and freedom and to pursue, once again, the process of nation-building that was so ruthlessly suppressed. These are industrious and hard working people who, if given the opportunity, could build a strong and prosperous nation.

Thus, as I am honored to join with other Americans and all freedom loving people in celebrating the independence of Lithuania. Let us reaffirm our determination to work for that day when the Lithuanians, as well as all enslaved peoples in the other Baltic and Eastern European states, may throw off the yoke of tyranny and once again live as free men and women, enjoying the freedom which they so richly deserve and working side by side with all free nations to create a better and more prosperous world.

Captive Nations Resolution of Metropolitan Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution of the Captive Nations Committee of Metropolitan Detroit, which is comprised of many hundreds of leaders of all of our major ethnic groups.

I heartily endorse the efforts of these leaders of various nationalities to continue the fight for free and self-determination for all of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, and to assure that free and unfettered elections are held at the earliest possible moment to choose duly elected governments for the people of the enslaved nations.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION—CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE OF METROPOLITAN DETROIT

Whereas this day, the 11th of February, 1965, marks the 20th anniversary of the Yalta agreement; and

Whereas the Soviet Government, in flagrant violation of its agreements and pledges, has followed a course of systematic enslavement, Russification, and subjugation of Eastern European and Asian countries by brutal force; and

Whereas the Soviet Government, disregarding the provisions of the Yalta agreement, has consistently refused to cooperate with the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom in carrying out those provisions, but instead has not permitted those countries to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems; has not allowed the holding of free and unfettered elections of governments responsive to the will of the people; has subverted the will of the people to totalitarianism, in negation of fundamental freedoms; has exercised economic exploitation in those countries forcing upon them discriminatory economic agreements; and

Whereas before World War II the nations which have been forcibly made into Communist colonies were sovereign states, forming an integral part of Europe and of its cultural heritage, contributing to Europe's political stability and peaceful development; and

Whereas the Soviet-occupied countries are an essential component of the European Continent, and the Iron Curtain, separating today the free from the enslaved 100 million Europeans being denied political and personal rights, is a serious menace to peace; and

Whereas the many and flagrant violations of the Yalta agreement have clearly shown that the Soviet Government accepts obligations in bad faith; demonstrating its untrustworthiness: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned, members of the Captive Nations Committee of Metropolitan Detroit, representing our respective organizations and a total of 600,000 Americans of Albanian, Armenian, Bulgarian, Byelorussian, Croation, Czechoslovakian, Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, Serbian, Slovakian, and Ukrainian extraction, assembled at the Veterans Memorial Building in Detroit on February 11, 1965, respectfully request His Excellency, the President of the United States, to condemn and expose the Soviet Govern-

ment's treachery and consistent betrayal of the peoples of the enslaved nations, through all appropriate means and media, including the United Nations organization; and publicly announce that the United States never acquiesced in, and overwhelmingly reprobates, the distortion of the purpose of the Yalta agreement, which makes that document worthless; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully urge His Excellency, the President, to stand in the forefront among those who demand restoration of full sovereignty to the captive nations, by means of free and unfettered elections in the interest of peace and in accordance with principles accepted by the civilized world and contained in the United Nations Charter.

Adopted February 11, 1965.

Gani Hamiti, Secretary, Albanian Agrarian Democratic Party (Balli Kombetar); Krikor Aladjadjian, Executive Secretary, Armenian Revolutionary Federation, Detroit Intercommittee; Atanas Dohcheff, American Bulgarian League of United States, Detroit Chapter; I. D. Brucky, Byelorussian American Association; Milan Buick, Trustee, Croatian Board of Trade; Jan B. Sklenar, Vice President, Czechoslovak National Council of America, Michigan District; Peter Einpaul, Secretary, Legion of Estonian Liberation; Rev. Fr. Andrew P. Jacobs, Hungarian Community of Metropolitan Detroit; Sigurds Rudzitis, President, Latvian Association in Detroit; Algis Zaparackas, Delegate, Detroit Lithuanian Organization Center; Bruno Stachura, President, Polish American Congress, Michigan Division; Eugene Popescu, Vice President, Union and League of Romanian Societies of America; Dusan Vukovojac, Secretary, Serbian Council; Lado Demeter, President, Slovak Federation; Michael Bazansky, President, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Metropolitan Detroit Branch; Mitchell S. Jachimski, General Chairman.

Miss Lena Wolfe—Swanson Junior High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Claude A. Swanson Junior High School in Arlington, Va., is celebrating its 25th anniversary this week. Special activities and festivities are taking place at the school to mark this silver anniversary. Hundreds of former students and teachers, county and school officials, and others, will participate in this event.

The occasion serves a dual purpose because special tribute is being paid to Swanson's first and only principal, Miss Lena Wolfe. A dedicated and beloved educator, she has served as the school's principal these past 25 years. I want to join Miss Wolfe's many friends and her present and past students and extend my congratulations and good wishes to her.

With permission to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article from the February 13 Arlington Suburban Leader:

MISS WOLFE SALUTE SET AT SWANSON

The name Miss Lena M. Wolfe may not be familiar to you unless you attended Swanson Junior High School or are a parent of a Swanson student.

For those who are unfamiliar with the name of Miss Lena M. Wolfe, let us introduce you to a dedicated, kind, and wonderful woman.

You see, Miss Wolfe is, and has been for the past 25 years, principal of Swanson Junior High School.

Being a very modest woman, it was a most difficult assignment to get Miss Wolfe to reveal some of her background for a story that she had no idea was going to appear in print.

And we might add, she did not reveal too much of her personal background, but volunteered a wealth of information about Swanson and some of the students who passed through the school's doors.

Miss Wolfe, although not a Virginian by birth, had Virginian parents and made her debut in Bottinneau, N. Dak. However, the family of five, one brother and a sister, returned to the Old Dominion State while she was still very young, affording her the opportunity of growing up in the Shenandoah Valley.

On completing her high school education, Miss Wolfe attended and was graduated from Madison College with a B.S. She earned her master's at Columbia University.

From this point, Miss Wolfe dodged, what was thought well-disguised questions, like an All-America halfback. In fact she completely outmaneuvered her interviewer with the finesse of a master chess player.

But tracing the 25-year career of this dedicated educator proved an interesting and amusing experience and provided a better understanding of what Miss Wolfe was like when not sitting behind her desk.

Needless to say, Miss Wolfe is Swanson's most loyal fan. And who better has a right to claim this distinction than the principal—the person who served as mother, nurse, councilor, and confessor to so many children and who has for so long been responsible for the school's progress.

She pointed out the school was named after Claude A. Swanson, former Governor of Virginia, Senator, and Secretary of the Navy under President Franklin Roosevelt.

Even the minor problems she's faced are still vivid in the memory of this alert, magnetic personality. For instance, she can recall the times that only one custodian, six were employed, showed up. And how she solved the wartime scarcity of teachers.

"Why, I didn't know from day to day which member of my staff wouldn't be coming in or would be getting married," she mused.

The former Washington-Lee High School and Thomas Jefferson Junior High School teacher, she came to Swanson from the latter school, remembers how funds from the school's budget were used to buy its first movie projector. Now all kinds of audio aids are available to teachers.

Miss Wolfe recalls that at one time Arnold Bus Lines collected students from Rosslyn to east Falls Church, Chain Bridge to Arlington Boulevard, excluding the immediate surroundings of Washington-Lee. Now only one bus is needed to cover their greatly reduced territory.

She proudly named former assistants who are now administrators—C. Clinton Cone, principal of Kenmore Junior High School; John Pleacher, principal of Gunston Junior High School; and William R. O'Meara, principal of Williamsburg Junior High School.

Miss Wolfe was quick to point out that more than 70 percent of the Swanson graduates go on to college and she remembers nearly all of them.

Included in this list are: Dr. Charles Biller, a psychiatrist in New York; Perry Currin, an athlete who played professional ball with the now defunct St. Louis Browns; Tom Hyde, an All-America football player at the Naval Academy; Sidney Cohen, economist in Lebanon; J. S. Petty, Episcopal minister; Dr. Fred Camp, chemical engineer, Ph. D.; Paul Smith, Jr., in foreign service work; Drs. Mike Durphy (Chapel Hill) and John Dobson (Duke); Jewell Miller, teacher; Davis Wrinkle, engineer; Myron Gerber, vice president of Drug Fair; Ross Jackson, in final year of Yale's Divinity School; Carla Smith, Peace Corps worker; and last but not least, Shirley (Beatty) MacLaine, of movie fame; plus many others too numerous to mention.

This petite lady, who enjoys classical and semiclassical music, reading (we promised not to reveal her choice here) and cooking for friends, keeps a busy schedule due to the many organizations of which she is a member.

Here's a rundown of some of the activities and organizations Miss Wolfe takes part in:

Civic interests—Served as member of the Arlington recreation committee previous to the county taking over those activities as part of the county government; member of the planning committee for Arlington's celebration of its Retrocession Act; member of board and past president of the Arlington Tuberculosis Association; member and past president of the Soroptimist International of Arlington; active PTA work.

Professional organizations—Member, Arlington Education Association, Virginia Education Association, National Education Association (life member); past president, District H-Secondary Principals Association; Virginia Secondary Principals Association; active in National Association of Secondary Principals Association; chairman, Virginia junior high school principals; member of board and past president of Virginia Council of Administrative Women; member, Kappa Delta Pi; listed in Who's Who of American Women; member of board, Hospitalization Group, Health and Welfare Council.

We could go on and on, but we don't feel it's necessary. Those who know her or have or are associated with her need not be told. Those who have just been introduced should have a good idea by now.

We know she's a wonderful little lady and feel honored and proud to feature her in the Surburban Leader.

May we congratulate Miss Wolfe on 25 successful years at Swanson and wish her continued prosperity in her chosen field.

Gronouski Gets Bum Rap on "Informing"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I was most delighted to learn earlier this week that President Johnson intends to reappoint Wisconsin's favorite son, John A. Gronouski, as Postmaster General of the United States.

This reappointment was not only well deserved but well received throughout

this country. The Postmaster General is the very embodiment of dynamic leadership, efficiency at the highest level of Government, and yet with the common touch that inspires confidence and industry.

On Monday of this week, the Madison Capital Times of Madison, Wis., published a report entitled "Gronouski Gets Bum Rap on 'Informing.'"

The article concerns the problem of Post Office handling of Communist propaganda coming into the United States at the rate of 84 million pieces of mail in a 3-year period, 1962–64.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of my colleagues will be enlightened on this problem by reading this article, written by Alfred Maund.

With unanimous consent I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

GRONOUSKI GETS BUM RAP ON "INFORMING": NO ONE GETS LIST OF RECIPIENTS OF OVERSEA MAIL

(By Alfred Maund)

WASHINGTON.—"Hell, Gronouski!" the Washington Post editorial was sarcastically headed. The text went on to complain about the Post Office Department's practice of intercepting mail from abroad deemed to be Communist propaganda, and of allegedly giving to the House Un-American Activities Committee the names of those addresses who insisted on their right to receive such mail.

I talked to the Postmaster General about the situation and I believe Wisconsin's dapper favorite son was dealt a bum rap. The fact shows he is doing what he can to blot an unhappy blotch on the history of the postal system, though hampered by a McCarthyite law.

Screening of newspapers and publications from overseas was begun by the Customs Bureau in the 1950's, by administrative decree. Once an item was deemed propagandistic, the Post Office got into the act by sending a double postcard to the addressee asking if he wished to receive the stuff.

If the addressee executed the reply card affirmatively he got the material. Otherwise the mail was destroyed.

Then the Post Office added another refinement to the routine. Because it didn't want to bother people with repeated queries about periodicals that arrived weekly or monthly, the Post Office considerately compiled lists of those who had stated they were willing recipients.

It is this listing that a Federal judge in California declared had been passed over to HUAC.

But, Gronouski asserts, these things took place under Eisenhower. The Kennedy administration dropped the practice after taking office in 1961.

"Then Congress passed the Cunningham Act which reinstated it in 1962. By law, we in the Post Office were required to be intermediaries between the customs examiners and the subscribers.

"However, I can assure you categorically that—since the Kennedy administration—at no time has anyone at all had access to the card file of subscribers except the postal employees who use it to mail out material.

"Furthermore," Gronouski continued, "after consulting with our legal people, I have issued an order to destroy these lists completely, so there will be no doubt about the matter.

"This is going to make for some difficulties. It will be necessary to send out postcards of inquiry every time a publication arrives and some people will be annoyed. They'll say, 'You stupid fools, I told you once.' But despite the awkwardness, I still think it's best with no lists."

Why? I asked. Who are you afraid might get their hands on the lists?

He smiled. "That's it. If there are no lists I don't have to be afraid of anybody getting their hands on them."

The statistics of the Cunningham Act during 3 years of operation make a sorry record of bureaucratic fiddle-faddling.

During the period 1962–64 the Customs Bureau stopped at dockside a total of 84 million pieces of mail. Of these, 35 million were addressed to "exempt organizations"—like libraries, universities, and government agencies—and allowed to pass.

Of the remaining 48 million, an agonizing reappraisal brought about the decision that 44 million weren't propaganda "in the sense of the law," and they were let go.

The hard-core 4 million were turned over to the Post Office for the elaborate processing routine.

Happily, the U.S. Supreme Court has agreed to review two cases involving the constitutionality of the law. One is an appeal from a New York decision upholding it, the other is from a California ruling calling it invalid.

Gronouski awaits the outcome, without official comment, but with a hopeful gleam in his eye.

The Price of Inaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the welter of words that have been written about the problems of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, few articles—if any—have been as well reasoned and as incisive as the February 16, 1965, editorial in the Journal of Commerce. It is especially gratifying to me, coming as it does from this respected journal of the world of finance, because it stresses the same points I have been emphasizing in talks to my constituents.

The editorial follows:

THE PRICE OF INACTION

It was many years ago, indeed, that Machiavelli compared the ills of state to those of the human body, noting that when a developing malady is in a curable stage its symptoms are perceptible only to a few men having special skills, but when allowed to spread to the point where the symptoms are perceptible to all, there is no longer any remedy.

The plight of the New Haven Railroad calls to mind the fact that as many times as this thought has been quoted down the ages, its lesson has yet to be learned, or at least has yet to be applied in some very important instances.

As far back as 7 years ago it was perceptible to some, at least, that the New Haven was heading for a crisis and that its passenger services in general and its so-called west end commuter services in particular were likely to be among the prime casualties. Nothing at all meaningful was done about this. When the property sagged into bankruptcy some quarters even seemed relieved, erroneously assuming that the receivers are required to restore any bankrupt rail services, even those that have no hope of an economic return.

Possibly they forgot the abandonment of the New York, Ontario & Western and overlooked the more recent case of the Rutland. Possibly they reasoned that the New Haven's "West End" commuter services were so essential to Fairfield and Westchester Counties, to the States of New York and Connecticut and to New York City that no one would let them go smash.

Today the New Haven's symptoms are perceptible to anyone who reads the papers occasionally, listens to TV, or is generally able to make heads and tails out of a balance sheet. But have its affairs reached that point cited by the Florentine where there "is no longer any remedy"?

We would say they have just about reached that point unless the States and local communities that count these services so important stop ducking the real issues confronting them and assume the responsibility of tackling without further delay what is plainly their own problem. Discussion is no longer enough, especially when, as in the past, it centers so exclusively around the subjects of how little might be done locally and of how the Federal Government might be brought to the rescue. Nor is the $800,000 annual contribution voted for car maintenance by Connecticut and Westchester County in equal amounts going to solve the problems of a railroad that needs something on the order of $12 million.

The northeastern Senators and State and Federal representatives who met to discuss this informally a little over a month ago did define the issue in some degree. But up to this point very little has been done and very little is definitely scheduled to be done. Practically all of the minimal assistance the road has received has been put up by the Federal Government.

This is wrong. The problem of the "West End" commuter services may affect an area so important that it can be classed as a national problem. But there would only be a valid reason for summoning the Federal Treasury to the rescue if the area involved lacked the resources to solve what is so plainly a local problem.

Taxpayers of Georgia, Kansas, New Mexico and Alaska should not be required to share the burden of commutation between New York City and Westchester and Fairfield Counties, or other nearby areas that also enjoy the distinction of being among the richest in the world. Nor could this problem be considered the responsibility of the Pennsylvania and New York Central, in the event these big lines are permitted to absorb some of the New Haven's freight services. Both have made it plain that if this is to be the price of the deal, they don't want it.

The only way out we can see at this point is through creation of a public authority sufficiently well financed by State and local communities to support not only the purchase and maintenance of the equipment required for efficient commuter services, but the operations thereof. This does not mean that the authority will have to operate the services itself. This could raise serious complications on routes where commuter and freight services use the same track and signal systems.

What the authority could and should do is pay the railroad sufficient money to operate the commuter services itself. The authority would have to ascertain that specified standards were being maintained, but it would also have to absorb whatever losses these services incurred.

The problems here cited are not limited to the New Haven alone. Before long some important decisions will have to be reached on the Long Island, as well. And the Erie-Lackawanna is in desperate need of help in maintaining commuter services on the other side of the river.

And what if nothing at all is done? Collapse of the commuter services is inevitable unless—on some fluke—the Federal Government does intervene at the last moment, an eventuality we cannot visualize in the present

state of affairs. But what if Washington should actually come to the rescue? In that event one could look forward to the nationalization of the first railroad service in the United States, there being no other satisfactory remedy. This would only raise a whole series of horrendous new problems, one of them being posed by competition between government and private services. But by that time the local communities and States might as well kiss goodby to the old doctrine of State and local rights. There can be no rights where responsibilities are discarded.

Ottumwa Courier Editorial Notes a Pioneer Step in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a fine editorial in the February 15 issue of the Ottumwa Courier, which describes a pioneer step in Iowa toward multicounty extension service.

As a way of planning for the future, through a study of how human and economic resources can best be utilized on a multicounty basis, 10 counties in south-central Iowa are participating in what is called the Tenco program.

The Iowa State University of Science and Technology at Ames, a land-grant institution, has offered much valuable help to the communities in the Tenco area and plans to continue doing so, as the Ottumwa Courier editorial points out.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the Courier editorial:

A PIONEER EXTENSION STEP

With the assistance of Iowa State University and the State Board of Regents, Ottumwa will become headquarters for a pioneer effort in the field of multicounty extension programing.

Friday, the Ottumwa Airport was named as the site for the first district office of the Cooperative Extension Service of Iowa State University.

Thomas A. Robb is the director and when the operation is in full swing other specialists in extension work will be headquartered here with him.

We are happy with the opportunity, not only because it is a statewide first for us, but also because it will help bring this area into statewide focus. An added bonus is the fact that it will bring highly trained and educated people to live and work among us.

Ultimately it will mean a better life for both our rural and urban people, and if the program spreads to other sections of the State—a better life for the whole of Iowa.

It is not an industry of course. So, it doesn't mean a great influx of population or money. But, through the informal education program of the extension service, residents will be familiarized with social and economic changes taking place so they may plan for the future. Thus, the district extension personnel will have an ultimate impact upon the communities of Tenco.

The operation also means that Ottumwa takes one more important step in making full use of a fine area asset; the old naval training station.

Rural Help Turns to Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to an article in the January 3 edition of the Baltimore Sun. I feel the contents of the article would be worth while for Members to see. I respectfully request that the article be included in the RECORD:

RURAL HELP TURNS TO JOBS—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SHIFTS AID TO FARMERS

WASHINGTON, January 2.—For 100 years the Agriculture Department has directed much of its energy toward helping farmers produce more and better crops and livestock.

Today, it is moving in a new direction—that of helping rural residents make the land provide more jobs rather than more crops.

PUSH TO OTHER USES

The agency's theme for the years immediately ahead will be the conversion of cropland to uses other than the production of crops. More and more, reports of its activities will deal with the word "jobs" rather than crops.

President Johnson has directed Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, to put special emphasis on programs designed to help low-income rural areas—both farm and nonfarm—develop economically through the establishment of such projects as new industries, recreation tourist services, hunting preserves, wildlife habitat, and trees for future timber harvests.

The Department figures that of the 350 million acres of land normally in use in producing crops, upwards of 50 million should be converted to other uses. These latter acres are not needed for the foreseeable future to produce food and fiber products—thanks to swift technological advances of the 25 years.

Most of the help which the Department will be able to provide in its job-development campaign will be advisory and promotional in character. It will not have large amounts of money to spend or lend.

TO HELP IN PLANNING

The agency's activities are expected to be along the lines followed in 10 test resource conservation and development projects now being pushed to Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Vermont, New Mexico, Georgia, South Dakota, Idaho-Washington, and Oregon.

The basic purpose of these projects is to assist local people in bringing about orderly development, conservation and use of natural resources in their project area, and by this means aid in providing employment and other economic opportunities to the people of the area. The department helps in planning but financing comes largely from private or other Government agencies.

WORK ALREADY DONE

Plan and work already done in the 10 test areas include:

Indiana: In counties of Crawford, Harrison, Perry, and Spencer—a new industry established to convert sawdust and manure into a soil conditioner, a boat-building industry expanded, a recreation lake being enlarged, and surveys of soils being accelerated.

Wisconsin: Counties of Price, Rusk, and Taylor—a lumber and veneer mill being established, two parks being improved and several private recreational developments are underway.

Pennsylvania: Crawford, Mercer, and Venango Counties—a full-time forester assigned to each county, one lake for housing development being completed, and one large motel is under construction.

Minnesota: Swift, Kandiyohi, Pope, Wadena, and Otter Tail Counties—a 70-mile canoe trail and 10 campsites developed, 1 game refuge and 1 water recreational project under construction, 1 carp fish trap almost completed, 2 golf courses and 1 driving range being installed, construction started on a lake for a 100-acre wildlife area and 2 parks improved.

BOWLING AND BOAT CAMP

Vermont: Parks of Addison, Orange, Rutland, and Windsor Counties—two rural housing developments under construction and one bowling alley completed.

New Mexico: Taos and parts of Rio Arriba, Los Alamos, and Sante Fe Counties—six irrigation projects either under construction or completed, one recreational area improved, and three under construction.

Georgia: Gwinnett County—one tract for an industrial park purchased and one tract for youth recreational area being obtained.

South Dakota: Bon Homme and Charles Mix Counties—one boat ramp and parking area in public recreational area completed.

Idaho-Washington: Latsch, Menewah, and Kootenai Counties in Idaho and part of Spokane County in Washington—1 test water control system completed, 30 more farm ponds built than normal rate, and 7 recreational areas improved.

RECREATION PROVISIONS

Oregon: Parts of Lane, Linn, Benton, and Douglas Counties—four recreational enterprises being developed and eight water-management projects underway.

In pushing nonfarm projects of these and other types, the Department is taking the view that the great bulk of the so-called commercial farmers, those with enough land and other facilities to make a fair to good living, need much less help then heretofore.

So, this opens the way, Department leaders way, to help those in rural areas who are not farmers or who have farm units of inadequate size to make a fair return.

Sinking of the Battleship "Maine"

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, today's observance of the 67th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* has special significance for the people of the State of Maine, the State whose name the *Maine* bore with such honor.

The battleship *Maine* visited Portland, Maine, on November 25, 1895. An official visit aboard ship was first made by members of the staff of the Governor of Maine. The battleship's commander then paid a ceremonial visit in Portland to Maine's Governor and Portland's mayor. The next day the Governor, the mayor, and a citizens committee were received aboard the *Maine* with appropriate honors.

The *Maine* was open to the public throughout the day, and hundreds of citizens of Portland along with many

Maine residents from other parts of the States visited her. On the evening of November 26 the commander and his officers attended a banquet given in their honor by the city of Portland. Amid all these ceremonies and festivities, who could have foretold the fate of the *Maine*? Who could have foreseen her watery grave in Havana Harbor with so many of her crew yet aboard, but dead in the service of their country?

A few short years after the visit to Portland, the battleship *Maine* cleared Key West, Fla., on her last voyage. On February 15, 1898, the *Maine* was blown up in an appalling catastrophe which brought upon this country the tragedy of war. News of the disaster was comunicated to the Secretary of the Navy in a dispatch which read:

Maine blew up in Havana Harbor at 9:40 tonight and destroyed. Many wounded and doubtless more killed or drowned.

As she has in all our wars, the State of Maine responded energetically and quickly to the call to arms in the Spanish-American War. Maine furnished a regiment of infantry, four batteries of heavy artillery, and a signal corps. This signal corps took a brave part in the Santiago campaign. The infantry regiment, encamped at Chickamauga, suffered badly from illness; it was about to be moved to Puerto Rico when peace was declared.

Many Maine men enlisted in the Regular Army and Navy, and the Volunteer Naval Reserve associations of Portland and Bath were mustered into Federal service. The full details of the raising of Maine's volunteer quota during the Spanish-American War are to be found in the 1899 message of Governor Powers.

In that message, the Governor of Maine noted:

At this time, when we sorely needed men, the University of Maine sent us more than 40 splendid volunteers, familiar with military tactics and drill, who enlisted as privates. It was a timely and much-needed aid. It encouraged others. It was an act that the State should not forget.

There was apprehension that the coast of Maine might be attacked by Spanish gunboats.

There was considerable anxiety in some of the towns and cities along the coast.

Wrote the Governor.

They feared that they might be attacked by gunboats on cruisers of the Spanish Navy * * *. I was convinced, after a careful examination, that the only real and effective defense for our coast towns was to establish batteries and mines, and to obtain, from the United States, cruisers to sail along the shores, and in conjunction with our delegation in Congress we succeeded in obtaining two cruisers, and having the coast very generally and effectually fortified.

The State of Maine does indeed remember the battleship *Maine*. Also remembered are the volunteers of that conflict, a war in which no draft act was needed to man our Army and Navy. To the surviving veterans of the Spanish-American War, and to the descendants of those Spanish War veterans who are no longer with us, all patriotic Americans today extend their praise and best wishes.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, independence day celebrations have different significance to different countries. The meanings such celebrations embody and the messages they convey vary greatly. Those fortunate peoples who have seldom had to struggle for their freedom in their homeland do not generally celebrate their independence days. Others who have taken their freedom for granted and have a rather vague idea about its meaning and significance celebrate it in a perfunctory manner and let it go at that. But with certain peoples it is a different, serious, and solemn matter; for them it is their national holiday, and as such they celebrate it with due solemnity and proper decorum. This is particularly so with peoples who in the past had their freedom and enjoyed national independence, but through some freakish turn of fortune, they had lost their independence and had become subjects of foreign overlords in their homelands, and then once more they regained their independence. To them the celebrations of independence days seem to be of immense significance. This is true in the case of the Lithuanian peoples.

As the result of the Russian revolution of 1917 Lithuanians attained their national goal by proclaiming their independence on February 16, 1918, and then set up the Lithuanian Republic. Then for about 22 years they toiled, and enjoyed their freedom, and of course celebrated annually their independence day in their independent country. Since the outbreak of the last war, however, everything went wrong as far as small states in Eastern Europe were concerned, and then began the Lithuanian tragedy. Very early in the war they lost their independence and were enslaved by the Soviet agents. Thus for more than 25 years these people have been deprived of their most elementary rights, their freedom, and today they are suffering under Communist tyranny. On the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence day we all hope and pray for their freedom.

Typical American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

TYPICAL AMERICAN

We've heard the typical American described as a man who has just driven home from an Italian movie in his German car, sitting on a Danish chair, drinking Brazilian coffee out of an English bone china cup, writing a letter on Canadian-made paper with a Japanese ball-point pen to his Congressman—to complain about too much American gold leaving this country.

The Peace Corps Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, when President Kennedy first proposed the Peace Corps, he was accused of trying to solve the world's problems with an immature idea and immature participants. After almost 4 years of operation we begin to see how very effective and far reaching the program really is.

The lead editorial in the Des Moines Register of January 22, 1965, has some comments that I feel need the wider distribution that publication in the RECORD will give it. What was said follows:

THE PEACE CORPS IDEA

The Peace Corps is less than 4 years old, but already it has made a place for itself. Congress has continued to vote funds for an orderly expansion. Requests from foreign countries for Peace Corps projects continue to exceed the available trained volunteers, in spite of political outbursts in some countries against corpsmen as "agents of U.S. imperialism."

These outbursts in themselves are a tribute to Peace Corps effectiveness. The Corps would not be worth attacking if it were not making an impact.

The Peace Corps pattern was one of the models for last summer's Mississippi project by a group of private organizations. It also is the model for several portions of the U.S. war on poverty, especially VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America), which started training its first 150 volunteers this January.

There are now some 10,000 U.S. Peace Corps volunteers serving in 46 foreign countries—always on request of the local country, working on projects worked out between Corps officials and the local governments.

Britain had a somewhat similar service corps going before the United States did, and so did a number of private United States and foreign organizations. Now a number of other governments have embarked on service corps projects—the sincerest tribute to the value of the idea.

UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, sent a young British sociologist traveling through Africa studying the work of the Peace Corps and other long-term volunteer service corps, public and private, of all nationalities.

In his first report, Glyn Roberts had much good to say about them and many suggestions for improvements. He praised particularly the care with which volunteers were selected and trained, but he thinks much greater care is needed in planning the projects they undertake. Many of the new African governments are inexperienced and rapidly changing, which makes joint planning with them difficult, but Roberts thinks it can be done.

He criticizes some of the volunteer organizations for not having enough supervision of volunteers in the field—and the U.S. Peace Corps for having too much. He takes note of

"evaluation sessions, medical checkups, fortnightly group trips, visits by the field representative, visits by the Peace Corps doctor, a sort of big brother system whereby each volunteer keeps an eye on another, just in case." The result is that "volunteers never get very far away from the United States of America in spirit or in practice."

The Peace Corps administration has been worrying about the possibility that it is getting bland volunteers now instead of the more prickly kind who would not only understand a new environment but "have the courage and drive to inspire change, affect attitudes, and encourage others to act for themselves."

The acting director of volunteers discussed this question in the December issue of "Peace Corps Volunteer." He concluded that the Corps is getting fewer "unusual" volunteers now than at the beginning; that is, fewer who join up for adventure and fewer from noncollege backgrounds (it is trying to recruit more "blue collar" volunteers now). But he thinks the current volunteers are more mature and better qualified than the pioneers.

The Agency's third annual report to Congress came out the other day. It speculated about the impact on the United States of the returned volunteers. About 2,000 are back from service already, and many more will follow. Many go back to school or into teaching on return, but many suffer painful indecision about their future. There is a "cultural shock" on returning as well as on going away. Many find their feelings grated by the "commercialism" and "provincialism" they find in their own country. But they are glad to be back, and see everything with new eyes, as if things did not have to be this way.

The Peace Corps started something.

Hall's Medical Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Joplin Globe of February 7, 1965, carried an editorial commenting on the bill I have submitted to provide total medical care for persons over age 65 in need of assistance.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Joplin Globe, Feb. 7, 1965]

DR. HALL'S MEDICAL PLAN

(By Rex Newman)

As Congress gets down to serious consideration of a number of bills dealing with medical care for persons past 65, southwest Missouri's Congressman, Dr. DURWARD HALL, who is one of the few medics in Congress, has come forth with a bill of his own.

A close student of this problem for several years, and regarded by many of his colleagues as a qualified expert on the subject, Dr. HALL aims his bill at total medical coverage for those who need it, but without the elements of compulsion and saturation payroll taxation.

The Springfield Congressman regards the administration bill (King-Anderson) as pretty much of a political phony in that it provides for only a specified and limited number of hospital days, and makes no provision for doctor bills, drugs, or care outside the hospital.

Dr. HALL said in a statement last week that a recent Gallup poll revealed that 77 percent of the people have a mistaken concept of the benefits offered by the King-Anderson bill, which he contends should be called "hospicare" instead of "medicare," because it gives hospital rather than medical care.

ELIMINATES TAX

The Hall bill is designed to meet real needs, yet without compulsion or the objectionable "means test," and places administration in the hands of the States and the private insurance industry. It also would get away from the burden of an added payroll social security deduction tax, instead using matching Federal and State funds out of general revenues.

For persons with incomes below the limit set by each State, Government would pay the entire cost of the premiums. For individuals with incomes between the minimum and maximum, the Government would pay part of the cost on a sliding scale, according to income. Persons with incomes above the maximum, or sufficient to pay for health insurance, would pay the entire cost as the majority of people now do. But they would have the benefits of an income-tax deduction for such payments, as well as statewide bargaining for noncancelable health care insurance policies.

"An important aspect of my bill," Dr. HALL said, "is that it would dispense with the so-called means test which the present Kerr-Mills bill now requires to be conducted by each county welfare department. Instead, each individual simply would certify his income to the responsible State agency at least once a year."

THE COVERAGE

The bill would provide comprehensive medical, surgical, and hospital benefits. Benefits would include not only payment of hospital and nursing charges, but also payment of medical, surgical, drug, and other costs. There would be no limit to the duration of the coverage, thus covering catastrophic illnesses.

The King-Anderson bill, on the other hand, Dr. HALL points out, limits inpatient hospital care to 60 days per benefit period and omits surgical care, physician care in the home or office, drugs and medicines outside the hospital, and most nursing home care.

Dr. HALL's bill is somewhat similar to the American Medical Association's alternative to the King-Anderson bill, except that it goes further in spelling out the complete benefits.

Several other alternatives to the King-Anderson bill have been presented by members of both parties, and all are expected to be studied by the House Ways and Means Committee.

NOT COMPULSORY

A central objective in the alternate measures—also true in the case of Dr. HALL's bill—is to keep the program divorced from compulsion under social security taxation. The objection here is not just to "socialized medicine," but rather to apprehensions that a blanket tax program will get out of hand, due to abuses among other things, to eventually become prohibitive in tax cost.

Opponents of a compulsory tax program say a study of the experience with similar systems in European countries show it has become by far the most expensive of all welfare programs. And since social security taxes at home already are approaching 10 percent, divided equally between employees and employers, it is feared that a medical care tax soon would double social security taxes and perhaps wreck the whole system.

"I am happy to report," Dr. HALL said in his statement last week, "that several members of both parties are sponsoring legislation similar to the bill I've submitted, and I am confident that this approach will receive detailed attention in the hearings now underway in the Ways and Means Committee."

Fiscal Responsibility a Must Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago on January 20, 1961, the American people were admonished: "Ask not what your country will do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

Those were noble words said by a President of the United States now dead. I do not cite them in a way that is disrespectful for our memory of that President, but as a point of reference for measuring certain subsequent events that have brought us to a critical juncture in our Nation's affairs that I, as a Congressman, feel an obligation to discuss with you candidly. In this way you will know the urgent truth about some of our Nation's fiscal and economic problems.

I wish I could report to you that progress is being achieved by your Federal Government solving the many problems that confront us in the fiscal economic area, but I cannot.

I wish I could say that we are moving toward a balanced budget so that we will no longer be encumbering future generations with taxes to meet the unpaid bills of this generation; but I cannot.

I wish I could assure you that the Federal Government's unrestrained compulsion to spend was being brought under control so that spending would not be mounting year after year beyond our capacity or willingness to pay; but I cannot.

I wish I could conclude that the massive Federal spending programs of recent years had brought us to a posture of sustainable economic strength and progress while also sustaining our human freedom and individual liberty; but I cannot.

I wish I could foresee the day when it would no longer be necessary to go through the degrading legislative procedure of enacting increase after increase in our statutory debt ceiling so as to finance the fiscal immorality of unending deficit; but I cannot.

I wish I could face the young people of today and tell them that the fiscal affairs and economic strength of the Nation they will soon inherit from us, their parents, will be as good as in the Nation that was bequeathed to us by our progenitors; but I cannot.

I cannot do these things because there are not enough elected officials—there are not enough responsible citizens—who have the principle and patriotism to care enough to do anything about these problems.

"Ask what you can do for your country"—let me tell you what we have done for our country since those words were spoken 4 fateful years ago.

SITUATION WORSENS

We have traversed the New Frontier and embarked upon the Great Society—a promisory new Golden Age of Peri-

cles—with deficit spending, mounting debt, dwindling gold and persistent unemployment marking every step of the way. Central authoritarian government has made sure that Federal contamination has insidiously or ruthlessly intruded into our State and local governments, our business, our homes, our daily lives. We have tried to spend ourselves rich, smart and secure; but all we have really done is undermine our basic structure of government, weaken our free enterprise system and impair our citizenship status vis-a-vis the Federal bureaucracy.

Since January 1961 the Federal spending level has increased by 25 percent from $80 to $100 billion, we have had sizable deficits in each intervening year—our last balanced budget was in 1960, we have added $30 billion to the public debt, we have had a deficit every year in our balance-of-payments position, and our gold supply has been reduced to its lowest level in decades. We are cutting our defense spending in the face of an alarming deterioration in world political conditions while we spend more for so-called welfare purposes. Our welfare programs have become a maze of contradictions and duplications with more of the same bungling and confusion promised for the future at greatly increased cost. A growing lack of confidence in the soundness of the dollar threatens to impair its stability and its acceptability as the base of the free world's monetary system.

TIME RUNNING OUT

I do not speak as an alarmist when I inform you that time will soon run out on us if we persist in a refusal to face the fiscal realities and if we continue to ignore the compelling demand for observing fiscal discipline. Blandishments from the banks of the Potomac or the Pedernales cannot obscure the problems nor dissipate the dangers involved. The pursuit of Government policy that is predicated on the theory of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect is about to lead us to, and over the brink of chaos in international finance. Our neglect in dealing with our balance of payments position now threatens to blow the whistle on our spendthrift ways. There are pitfalls and pratfalls ahead of the most grave magnitude if we do not act immediately and realistically to end the succession of deficits in our balance-of-payments positions and in our Federal budgetary practices.

Last year our balance-of-payments deficit was $2.6 billion—an all too small improvement over the $3.3 billion deficit of the year before. This means that last year we put at the disposition of foreigners an additional $2.6 billion resulting from the economic transactions—including governmental transactions—between the United States and the rest of the world. While relatively little of this deficit was taken out in gold, the fact is that our gold supply has been allowed to dwindle to the danger point as we have fiscally frolicked in the never-never land of the Great Society. Using approximate figures our situation is this: our gold supply amounts to just over $15 billion. Present law requires that $13 billion in gold be held to back the dollar. This would seem to suggest that we have $2 billion in "free" gold but such is not the case because of one additional fact. Foreigners—nationals and governments—hold $25 billion in short-term dollar liabilities which quickly could be converted into demands against our gold supply, and we must remember that foreign citizens, unlike Americans, can demand and hold gold.

Therefore, if we continue to resort to printing press money to finance budgetary deficits, these foreign observers will become concerned over the purchasing power of the dollar; there will be an increasing unwillingness to hold dollars and a growing demand for gold. Once confidence in the dollar is shaken, there will be a flight from the dollar of growing proportions to the very serious detriment of the entire free world. In this context it is to be noted that foreign assets that are U.S. owned substantially exceed foreign-owned dollar claims, but in our role as world banker we lend long and borrow short so that our flexibility in managing our international accounts is severely restricted. For the sake of brevity I have greatly simplified a very complex problem, but the facts and relative magnitude are as I have stated them.

DO-NOTHING POLICY

At this point we can well ask outsiders what policies is our Federal Government pursuing to avoid the possibility of a crisis of this nature? The tragic answer is that we are continuing to engage in the same basic practices that have brought us to our present predicament. We are still not striving with adequate diligence to acheive a balanced budget, and we are still producing printing press money. We are pouring billions of dollars abroad in Government aid programs to our problematical friends and even to our avowed adversaries. We hinder rather than help the activities of American private enterprise to expand the very considerable dollar benefits we derive from the business community's participation in world trade. We follow the course of political expediency and avoid adopting those disciplines and policies that would bolster the dollar, protect our savings, and bring long-term strength to our domestic economy.

Recently the Congress has approved certain changes in our legal gold reserve requirements so as to "free" approximately $5 billion additional of our present reduced gold supply. This expedient is no cure for the problem; it has merely bought us a little more time. If we continue our present fiscal imprudence, the crisis, when it strikes, will be made more severe as a consequence of this expedient. As its next panacea the Government proposes to coerce our private enterprise system to retrench—to go isolationist—in its oversea trade. The inevitable result of this policy is that American business will be rendered less competitive, and our level of exports will be impaired.

These concerns that I have expressed are not mine alone. The able head of the Federal Reserve Board has termed our balance-of-payments posture as our "most important problem," and he went on to say that the persistent deficits have put this country behind the eight ball. Well, when one of the world's foremost monetary authorities asserts that this Nation is behind the eight ball, I do not want to tinker, temporize or trifle. I want perceptive, forthright action to put that proverbial eight ball in the side pocket permanently, and I want to do it now.

It is foolhardy and irresponsible to think that this impending crisis will disappear if we ignore it; it will be ruinous if we think that we can sweep it under the rug and go on our merry spending way. We must immediately adopt disciplined monetary policies that clearly demonstrate our firm resolve to protect the purchasing power of the dollar. Our fiscal policies must again reflect a determination to live within our means. Our economy must be kept competitive and free to operate without the stifling influence of Government domination. If we will do these things, then—and only then—we will be able to achieve a Great Society that is something more than mere political hokum.

Appalachia: Bane or Blessing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the administration's program for Appalachia concerns me because of its seemingly conservative proponents rather than because of the extravagance of its scope. As originally envisaged, it was supposed to be geared to the needs of a so-called distressed area starting in Pennsylvania and running into the Deep South. From the outset I have felt that a great and wealthy State—say like Pennsylvania—should be able to offset the exploitation of its coal fields or other natural resources, from which she derived great benefit, without help from an overextended and deficit-ridden Federal Government. But now that other areas, led by New York's insistent pitch, are trying to cut themselves into this handout, it seems time for us to take a new look at what might well become a bureaucratic monstrosity, putting the old WPA and PWA into total eclipse. And, of course, by an outlay that will mortgage the entire Nation for decades to come.

Columnist Jenkin Lloyd Jones may be a bit extreme in his estimate of these proposals but certainly his stature as a columnist is such as to deserve a careful perusal of his article, which follows as a part of these remarks:

THE APPALACHIA DISEASE

Like hogs grunting to the trough, Congressmen are clamoring to get their districts declared "Appalachias."

The President's original Appalachia uplift plan has called for an initial expenditure of a billion dollars in 11 States along the Appalachia ridge.

Now Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN has come up with an amendment to the Appalachia bill to include 36 Missouri counties and 21 Arkansas counties, Senator FRED HARRIS wants to add 19 Oklahoma counties. Senator EDWARD KENNEDY says, "We in New England must be ready to advise the President of our needs when this new legislation (Appalachia) becomes effective." Senator JOSEPH MONTOYA is insisting that the entire Four Corners country of New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, and Utah be Appalachianized. Who wants to bet that the Appalachians won't soon reach clear to Alaska?

In the old days it was the custom of American communities to boast of their wealth, or at least their bright prospects. The homestead dodgers glowed with promise. The railroad agents regaled immigrants with utopian visions. The boomtowns sent forth their bands and booster trains. And the chamber of commerce tradition, the think-big, can-do, talk-it-up brand of self-hypnotism, started in America when Capt. John Smith described the miasmic swamps of Jamestown Island as a "faire and prettye land."

But while Charles Dickens saw only America's mud, bad table manners, and spittoons, and while Sinclair Lewis and H. L. Mencken hooted at our Babbittisms, this American habit of putting up a bold front and flashing a toothpaste smile paid fantastic dividends. The tent towns became shack towns and the shacks gave way to paint and trim. Your community was supposed to be a proud thing.

This pride made a great nation. The immigrant may have come from a Moldavian village that had drawn water from the same well for a thousand years, but 5 years after his arrival at a signpost along a Kansas railroad he was burning his fingers on skyrockets to celebrate the opening of the town waterworks.

But now we weep for Appalachia. A legend grows. Millions of Americans allegedly held prisoners in accursed regions. They are, to use the euphemisms of the hour, "disadvantaged," "deprived," "underprivileged." They must be rescued by a vast and special outpouring of Federal funds.

So appealing is this myth of the trapped and downtrodden Appalachian that, just before Christmas, when the Columbia Broadcasting System put out a heart-rending documentary on eastern Kentucky, 150 tons of goods and $57,000 in cash were rushed to the region by distressed Americans.

Now, maybe we ought to knock off the sentimental sobbing and political hand wringing about America's Appalachias and ask ourselves how come.

Some regions are in trouble because coal loaders have replaced bituminous miners. Some are in a jam because oil and gas are better and cheaper fuels than anthracite. The miner who was thrown out of work after 40 needs special consideration. He must either be retrained into a marketable skill or supported in some degree for the rest of his life.

But there is usually a good economic reason why an industry has not hurried into Appalachia. And there must be a limit to the sympathy productive Americans should lavish on the able-bodied man who sits on his cabin porch year after year waiting for someone to bring him a job.

County Judge Willie Kirk, of Martin County, Ky., said last month: "You'll find about 80 percent of our people just looking for another handout." And he added that some local families have been unemployed for three generations.

If the roads through Appalachia are poor they are at least passable. A young man can get out. And in three generations someone else has built Houston, Phoenix, Los Angeles, Anchorage, and Honolulu.

Appalachia is no stranger to the Federal dollar. The entire TVA is in Appalachia. The gigantic $1.2 billion Arkansas River project will touch many of the counties which Senators MCCLELLAN and HARRIS would add to Appalachia. The Four Corners country is the home of some of our most expensive and most dubious reclamation schemes.

But worst of all is the Appalachia psychology. Is our famous local pride going to be replaced by poor-mouth contests? Are Americans going to put on their dirtiest shirts and raggedest fishing pants and go crying their deprivations and disadvantages to Washington?

That isn't the way this country was built and it will not be the formula for its preservation.

Speech by Jim Waterbury of West Waterloo High School at Bellamy Award Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, West Waterloo, Iowa, High School, was officially represented at the 23d annual Bellamy Award ceremony at Wausau High School, Wausau, Wis., by Jim Waterbury. The text of this young man's speech at the ceremony follows:

SPEECH BY JIM WATERBURY

Two years ago, West High School received the Bellamy Award. These 2 years have added a special luster to the record of our school. We are certain that you of Wausau High School will also find the Bellamy Award an enduring and rewarding accomplishment.

The first time that both U.S. Senators and the Governor participated, as well as having the first live television coverage, was at West High's presentation.

West High has twice outgrown its physical plant. In 1956, we moved to a large new building and have recently opened a 17-classroom addition to accommodate our present enrollment of 1,900 students. We have a spacious student center, a fine cafeteria, and a large auditorium with a fine stage and stage equipment.

Sports are popular and well attended. In athletics last year, every team was represented in the various State tournaments. Our speech departments are active throughout the year with plays, promotion skits, and contests.

The biggest single event of each school year is West's Variety Show. Plans for this show start in late September and run throughout the year until the actual performance in early April. This 90-minute program features a swing band and swing chorus, a male chorus, and 20 or 30 acts—all executed with precision and polish acquired through months of practice done outside of schooltime.

Our school motto, "Duty, honor, service," is one that demands no complacency. Our school paper, the Spectator, whose editorials have won Freedoms Foundation Awards, serves to keep us aware of our daily responsibilities. The Spectator had the privilege of being the official publicity organ for the Bellamy Award this year. This gave us the opportunity to publish a special edition to announce the 1965 award winner.

In accepting this award, you have been charged with a great responsibility. Bear your honor proudly yet humbly, so that you, too, can see the distinction you have earned for yourselves, your city, and your State.

Federal Assistance for Housing for the Elderly in Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1964, I had the pleasure to report to this Chamber that St. Mary's Episcopal Church in Baltimore was sponsoring Maryland's first housing project for elderly persons of moderate income, financed by section 202 of the National Housing Act.

On December 5, 1964, I attended the formal dedication ceremonies at St. Mary's Roland View Towers and I was heartened by the congenial atmosphere and the cheerful confidence of the tenants. It was an experience which I hope to repeat many times. Life in St. Mary's Roland View Towers is, as its motto proclaims, "Not merely living, but a way of life."

In fact, the only sad thing about Roland View Towers is that there are not enough apartments to meet the overwhelming demand. I have been gratified to learn, therefore, that construction of a second Roland View Towers project containing 209 apartments will begin within the next 2 months.

I am further gratified to learn that in Baltimore the Memorial Episcopal Church is sponsoring 283 units, the Catholic archdiocese is sponsoring another 282 units, St. James' Episcopal Church 150 units, St. John's Episcopal Church in Havre de Grace 56 units, the Presbytery of Baltimore 225 units, and the Capital Area Association of Christian Churches will sponsor 300 units in Montgomery County.

But on January 30, 1965, I was asked to attend a meeting in Baltimore, at which all of these sponsors expressed concern that the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1966 contained no request for appropriations to continue the section 202 direct loan program. There have been several meetings since that time and all are unalterably opposed to the abrupt termination of section 202 until they have had an opportunity to examine any alternative program and to give their views to the appropriate committees of this Congress. This is a fair and reasonable demand from those who are expected to be the sponsors of such housing.

I was so enthused, Mr. Speaker, that I had printed 3,000 reprints of that excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated May 26, 1964, and mailed them to church groups throughout the 50 States. And just when we are succeeding in getting the churches and other nonprofit organizations to sponsor this much needed housing, the program may be terminated.

Now I have had immediate and positive reaction from church and union organizations, city and State agencies, and all who have an interest within the State of Maryland.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the other Representatives from the several

States have had a similar response, and I suggest that they might contact some of the organizations within their districts to apprise them of the situation and to ascertain their position.

The Fight Against Mail-Order Pornography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last month I introduced a bill into Congress designed to curb mail-order pornography by regulating the buying and selling of mailing lists. This proposal, H.R. 3027, currently is pending before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Since the bill was introduced, the Post Office Department has released its fiscal 1964 figures on its antipornography activities. Several conferences with representatives of the direct mail industry and others interested in the legislation have been held. The Library of Congress has issued a report on the constitutional basis for the regulation of mailing lists. Since these developments all bear on the legislation which I have introduced, I want to use this opportunity to bring them to the attention of my colleagues.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT ACTIVITIES

According to the report of the Postmaster General, the statistical results of the Post Office Department's antipornography program in fiscal 1964 were these: Arrests, 805; convictions, 627; suppressions, 8,175; and investigations, 15,975.

Both the total number of arrests and the total number of investigations were recordbreaking figures. Unfortunately, however, the number of convictions during fiscal 1964 declined slightly.

One has only to look at the increase in all categories since 1961 to realize what great strides in enforcing antipornography laws have been made in recent years. At the end of these remarks I will include a table showing the statistics in the four categories mentioned since 1959.

At the same time, however, it is evident that the Post Office Department is by no means able to cope with the problem. This becomes evident when one considers that postal authorities estimate that there are 100 million pieces of mail each year which contain pornography and come-ons for salacious materials.

My bill, H.R. 3027, was introduced in order to give new legal muscle to the Post Office Department's drive against the smut peddlers.

DIRECT MAIL REPRESENTATIVES

On February 3 I met with representatives of the Direct Mail Advertisers Association, at their request, to discuss the provisions of my bill. The discussion was most fruitful.

I found these gentlemen to be, in general, deeply concerned about the amount of pornography going through the mails. They were particularly disturbed about the amount of unsolicited pornographic come-ons reputedly mailed to children each year.

At the same time, however, they were wary of legislation which might cause undue burdens or hardships on the overwhelming majority of direct mailers who are legitimate businessmen.

In the main they were fearful that my bill would require them to transmit information on all their transactions as they occurred to the Postmaster General. I assured them that this was not my intention and advised them that, if necessary, the language of the bill would be clarified in that respect.

These representatives pointed out that my bill, as written, would not reach those illicit operators who compile, own and use their own rosters of addressees. They submitted that many of the worst smut-peddlers do not rely on rented or leased lists, but make up their own mailing lists from decoy ads in magazines or other sources. They suggested, therefore, that not just those who buy or sell mailing lists be covered by H.R. 3027, but also all who use mailing lists in the course of business.

Agreeing that the suggestion is a good one, I plan to submit an amendment to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee when the legislation is heard. The amendment will include under the bill all who deal with mailing lists in the course of business for profit, not just those who buy and sell them.

The proposal would still exempt from regulation nonprofit institutions, civic organizations and others who use mailing lists but not for financial profit.

CONSTITUTIONAL BASIS FOR REGULATION

In discussions and correspondence with persons interested in H.R. 3027, the question of the constitutionality of the regulation of mailing lists was raised. For that reason, I asked the Library of Congress to prepare a report on the legal basis of such a proposal either through "right of privacy" or the interstate commerce power of the Federal Government.

The report, prepared by Dr. Norman Small of the Library's American Law Division, is now completed. It finds that there is no basis to support a bill such as H.R. 3027 on "right to privacy" but ample constitutional precedent for it under the interstate commerce power.

In fact, Dr. Small believes that national legislation could constitutionally be enacted which would require buyers and sellers of mailing lists to register with State authorities as well as with Federal officials. While I believe that this requirement would be an extreme hardship to direct mail advertisers, it does open several new and interesting approaches to the problem of eliminating poronography.

For that reason, with permission granted, I include Dr. Small's report and the Post Office Department's antipornography statistics, and urge the attention of my colleagues to them:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT 1964 REPORT ON PORNOGRAPHY

Generally, cases conducted by the Department to enforce the obscenity laws are handled through criminal procedures. Every such case is examined in light of the 1957 Roth decision of the Supreme Court. The Roth test is whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest, and whether, in addition, the material goes substantially beyond customary limits of candor.

Administrative judgment is then made as to the probability of a violation, using the decision as a guideline. In most cases, the Department does not administratively judge the fact of obscenity. That decision usually lies with the courts.

With regard to obscenity in the international postal system, the closest cooperation between the Bureau of Customs and the Postal Inspection Service is maintained. This enables the Department to investigate and aid the prosecution of persons responsible for importing obscene items through the mails.

Arrangements also exist between the Inspection Service and the National Central Interpol Office in The Hague, for stemming the flow of foreign pornography into the domestic postal system.

The following statistics show the results of this program:

	Fiscal year—					
	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
Arrests	315	389	457	605	761	805
Convictions	272	306	377	503	637	627
Suppressions	(1)	(1)	1,019	8,229	7,925	8,167
Investigations authorized	7,747	10,226	14,394	15,672	14,616	15,975

[1] Statistics not available before 1961.

Source: From the Annual Report of the Postmaster General, 1964.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1965.

To: Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, attention: Mr. Sullivan.

From: American Law Division.

Subject: Information as to right to privacy in connection with the receipt of pornographic literature via unauthorized inclusion of addressee's name in mailing lists.

Is there any U.S. statute or English common law concept which would entitle a person to invoke the "right to privacy" in protesting the unauthorized inclusion of his name on mailing lists that are used commercially, that is, for the purpose of soliciting purchases of merchandise by individuals thus listed?

Insofar as any invasion of one individual's privacy is effected by the action, not of officials, Federal, or State, but by the conduct of another individual or business corporation, the power to afford relief therefor is a matter reserved to the States. Accordingly, Congress is vested with no authority to enact legislation directly granting protection against such intrusion. Admittedly, Congress has seen fit to exercise its power to regulate interstate commerce for the purpose of establishing regulations as to the registration of trademarks, and has included among the latter a stipulation to the effect that unless the individual in question has given his written consent, a trademark which "consists of or comprises a name, portrait, or signature identifying a particular living individual" is not eligible for registry. In enacting such provision Congress is not to be viewed as having recognized, or as hav-

ing sought to protect, a property right in one's name. Only the States are competent to define rights in property. All that Congress has attempted to achieve by the aforementioned provision is the withdrawal of the channels and instrumentalities of interstate commerce from use by those who seek to employ the same for deceptive, fraudulent, or immoral purposes.

As an exercise of the commerce power the quoted provision is analogous to numerous other enactments entailing utilization of the commerce clause to achieve objectives normally reserved to the States under their police power, specifically, the promotion of public morals, public health, and public safety.

Thus, the Congress has been sustained in barring from the channels of interstate commerce articles that are not intrinsically dangerous or impure but which have been produced under undesirable conditions or are destined to be used for unlawful or immoral purposes. Examples of such Federal legislation include provisions excluding lottery tickets from interstate shipment, stipulations in the Fair Labor Standards Act banning entry into the channels of interstate commerce of goods manufactured by child labor, the Mann Act forbidding use of the facilities of interstate carriage for the transportation of women engaged in commercialized vice, the Dyer Act proscribing utilization of such facilities for the movement across State lines of stolen motor vehicles, the Patterson Act penalizing the transportation across State borders of kidnapped persons, and the Filled Milk Act barring from interstate shipment filled milk products solely on the ground that such edibles, although not impure, were less nutritious than comparable products made from whole milk.

Also not to be overlooked in this connection are other Federal enactments embracing regulation of the use of the instrumentalities of interstate commerce with a view to assisting States in the enforcement of their own prohibitory laws. Examples in this category are the Webb-Kenyon Act forbidding carriers to accept shipments of alcoholic beverages for delivery in dry States and the Ashurst-Sumners Act imposing a like ban on the receipt by such transporters of convict-made goods consigned to States which had adopted legislation forbidding the sale of such products (Annotated Constitution, S. Doc. No. 39; 88th Cong., pp. 201–205).

If it could be established, in those States wherein a right to privacy is acknowledged, that judicial relief is available to individuals who protest the unauthorized inclusion of their names in consumer directories compiled by publishers for distribution at a profit, the last mentioned Federal statutes might be relied on to support adoption of a Federal law banning interstate shipment of such directories into these States. The constitutional justification of such measure would be that it was designed to prevent utilization of the channels of interstate commerce to effect an invasion of an individual right of privacy protected by the statutory or common law of the State of destination.

Unfortunately, no precedents have been found in any of the States which protect a right to privacy which support a right of recovery merely for unauthorized inclusion of an individual's name in a commercial, or consumers' directory. If reasons were sought to account for such absence of precedent, the following very probably would suffice as an explanation. First, the average citizen has been reluctant to expend the funds required to institute a suit aimed at establishing his entitlement to damages for such unauthorized inclusion. Second, it is extremely doubtful whether such unwarranted inclusion, without further proof of exposure to harassment at the hands of peddlers directly attributable to such inclusion, is a wrong of such magnitude as would justify the award of a substantial sum as damages. Consequently, in the absence of a right to recovery sanctioned by State law, a Federal regulation of interstate commerce imposing a blanket ban on shipment of unauthorized lists of consumers' names into States could probably not be sustained as a reasonable regulation; for the latter, having been designed to prevent evasion of a nonexistent State right, could be regarded as arbitrary and therefore violative of the due process cause of amendment 5.

However, the previously enumerated Federal statutes would appear to afford abundant justification for a less rigorous regulation founded upon the commerce clause. All States have enacted laws proscribing the distribution of pornographic literature.

Also, on the basis of evidence accumulated in previous investigations, the unrestricted interstate circulation of consumers' lists has been shown to be a contributing source of evil in that such lists have been utilized by smut peddlers to effect an evasion of such State prohibitory laws. Accordingly, it is within the province of Congress to adopt valid legislation designed to prevent an abuse of the facilities of interstate commerce which hitherto often has culminated in the violation or frustration of lawful State bans against the circulation of obscene printed matter.

The ameliorative measure which Congress, in the exercise of its power to regulate interstate commerce, would be competent to adopt might be one modeled after the Jenkins Act (15 U.S.C. 375–378) and designed to reduce evasion of the aforementioned State pornographic literature laws. By the terms of corrective legislation, publishers circulating consumers' directories in the channels of interstate commerce, whether by sale or by lease, would be required to report monthly to a designated State officer and/or a designated Federal official the names and addresses of all consignees residing in each State wherein deliveries have been made (15 U.S.C. 376). In addition, Federal penalties could be exacted for failure to report (15 U.S.C. 377), and Federal courts could be empowered to grant injunctive relief to prevent noncompliance with the reporting requirement (15 U.S.C. 378).

As a Federal regulation of interstate commerce designed to facilitate enforcement of State pornographic literature laws, this measure should meet the test of reasonableness; that is, it would satisfy the requirements of the due process clause of amendment 5. The regulation would impose so restraint on the publisher as to his compilation of the lists; i.e., his selection of names for inclusion therein, nor would it discourage the purchase of his consumer directories by entrepreneurs engaged in legitimate businesses. To be sure, the reporting requirement would effect a moderate increase in the publisher's postage bill, but this expense would not be an excessive price to pay for the added assurance that the instrumentalities of interstate commerce are not being used to promote illegal or immoral objectives such as in the past have been held to afford constitutional justification for comparable restrictions.

As to the status of the right to privacy within the several States, at least two, New York and Utah, have adopted legislation making it a misdemeanor to use, for purposes of advertising or trade, the name, portrait or picture of a person without his consent, and affording a person who has not given his consent a right to sue for damages or for an injunction. In other States the courts thereof have granted relief against acts which closely resemble invasions of the right of privacy without basing their holding upon any acknowledged and definable legal right of privacy. Courts in a third category of States, and these, commentators declare, are in the minority, have maintained that, in the absence of State enactment, there is no discernible right of privacy cognizable independently of the rules of property, contract, or libel law (41 Am. Jur. 925, 929, 933–934).

Read literally, the statutes of New York and Utah would appear to support a right of action by one whose name has been included without his consent in commercial directories or advertising lists compiled by mercantile establishments. Thus, the New York law provides that "a person, firm, or corporation that uses for advertising purposes, or for the purposes of trade, the name, portrait, or picture of a living person without having first obtained the written consent of such person, or, if a minor, of his or her parent or guardian, is guilty of a misdemeanor" (Civil Rights Law, secs. 50–51, McKinney, 1948). Both New York and Utah accord the victim civil remedies (Utah Code Ann. (1953) secs. 76–4–8, 76–4–9). As previously indicated, neither of these laws has been construed in any recorded precedent as supporting a right of recovery based solely on unauthorized inclusion of a name in an advertising list.

NORMAN J. SMALL,
Legislative Attorney.

Wausau High School of Wausau, Wis., Wins National Bellamy Flag Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following address by Ronnie Ashcraft, of Will Rogers High School in Tulsa, upon the occasion of the presentation of the National Bellamy Flag Award to Wausau High School, Wausau, Wis.:

ADDRESS BY RONNIE ASHCRAFT, WILL ROGERS HIGH SCHOOL, TULSA, OKLA.

After receiving the Bellamy Award in 1957, Will Rogers High School continued in its efforts to maintain the principles of American education which the award represents. One continued outstanding accomplishment is that Rogers' yearbook, the Lariat, ranked All American in national competition for the fourth consecutive year.

Will Rogers High School stands majestically on a gently sloping hill in the heart of a growing metropolis. It is the focal point of a beautifully landscaped campus envied by many colleges. However, the beauty of Will Rogers is more than brick deep.

Preparing students for the future is done with the capable assistance of our principal, Dr. Raymond W. Knight. In 1961–62, he was named principal of the year by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and is now serving as president of the Oklahoma Education Association.

Last year marked the conclusion of our 25th year. One of the high points of a special silver anniversary celebration was the announcement of the first Raymond W. Knight Scholarship Fund. The scholarship fund had been established by a $740 contribution by Tulsa radio station KRMG. This was done through a contract with the student council. Members sold advertising and operated the station for a Sunday afternoon and received all the profit. The silver anniversary ball was the largest contribution and was the prime reason for our ability to present the scholarships during the 25th

year. One of the first of two recipients of the $500 scholarship was Jim Pool, last year's Bellamy Award representative to Tennessee. Students are chosen on the basis of character, school service, leadership, and citizenship.

It gives me great pleasure to extend congratulations to Wausau High School as it receives the 23d annual Bellamy Award, and to present an authentic Indian headdress in friendship to our newest sister school.

Two Vital Aspects of Our Culture—Arts and Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to an excellent statement made recently in support of a National Humanities Foundation, as proposed in my bill H.R. 334. This statement, by Dean Jules Heller of the College of Arts and Architecture of the Pennsylvania State University, goes to the heart of the reasoning behind my bill. As Dean Heller points out, without the arts and humanities "we are reduced to a lesser degree of civilization and the danger of becoming more and more imbalanced—not only as a nation but as human beings."

Dean Heller's statement follows:

REMARKS OF DEAN JULES HELLER

As an individual deeply concerned to help secure a broad and permanent base for the Nation's arts and humanities, now and in the future, I urge the Congress, in the best interests of all the people, to endorse the proposed legislation dealing with these two vital aspects of our total culture.

We have only to glance across one ocean at the historical precedents and the diverse solutions to this important problem that obtain in the Western World: The Netherlands, Belgium, France, Austria, Luxembourg, England, West Germany, Italy, and Switzerland, to name but a few countries, have long since made it possible through governmental support for artists and audiences mutually to enrich their lives and to develop and sustain the cultures of their nations. Art patronage by government even obtains in Mexico, a country closer at hand, despite the fact that other significant problems trouble our neighbor. These governments have sponsored the arts in war and in peace, and silently offer us their combined and multifaceted experiences of thousands of years, if we but care enough to examine the records.

If the talents and resources of many of our people were utilized, if they were nourished through some degree of permanent subsidy by the Government, we could look forward with pride to a burgeoning culture which would stagger the imagination. Not only would the great centers of urbanization be enriched by the theater arts, concerts, exhibitions, operas, and other hallmarks of man's culture, but throughout vast regions of the country, in rural and farm areas, in counties, villages, and towns we would see a true renaissance emerge that was worthy of our free society.

The arts cannot exist on an ad hoc basis; they require a more permanent base, if they are to unfold and flower. To make the lives of all of our citizens more meaningful, more beautiful, more committed, more purposeful, we cannot neglect these goal-fulfilling human and humane ideas, ideals and pursuits. Without them, we are reduced to a lesser degree of civilization, and the danger of becoming more and more imbalance—not only as a nation, but as human beings.

I submit that the proposed legislation is but a small step in the direction this Nation should be headed; the time is now upon us to encourage, to strengthen, to develop, to enhance the arts—to leap into the future of the Great Society.

San Diego Naval Finance Center Awarded Presidential Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Navy Regional Finance Center in San Diego has just won recognition for an accomplishment which should indeed be gratifying to every citizen in the country—it saved money for the taxpayers.

I am particularly proud to represent the district in which this naval installation with its fine complement of officers and men has just been awarded a presidential citation for their "outstanding contribution to greater economy and improvement in Government operations."

I am including here with my remarks the text of the Presidential citation along with a report of the presentation by Rear Adm. W. H. Price to Capt. N. H. Anderson:

TEXT OF PRESIDENTIAL CITATION

Presidential citation is awarded to U.S. Navy Regional Finance Center, San Diego, in special recognition of an outstanding contribution to greater economy and improvement in Government operations during the 10th anniversary year of the Federal incentive awards program.

REPORT

The Navy Regional Finance Center has been awarded a Presidential citation for economy and efficiency of operations. Rear Adm. W. H. Price, commandant of the 11th Naval District, presented the citation today to Capt. N. H. Anderson, commanding officer of the finance center, during a ceremony at the Naval District Headquarters. The award was based on the successful completion by the finance center of a disbursing consolidation program which involved most major naval commands in the San Diego area. Prior to the consolidation the Navy operated six separate disbursing organizations in San Diego. Under the consolidation arrangement the finance center now furnishes centralized disbursing services to all local naval activities. This resulted in annual personnel savings in excess of $140,000, with equal or better pay service to military personnel.

This new concept for disbursing services which was tested by the finance center during early 1964 has now been approved by the Comptroller of the Navy as being worthy of adoption in other naval areas. Thus the economies achieved locally by the regional finance center will multiply several times over as this consolidation plan is applied elsewhere.

The Study of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, for all things there is a time. The Congress is constantly studying other branches of the Government, but now we are the subjects of a $230,000 study. Under a grant from the Carnegie Foundation, the American Political Science Association will be examining for the next 2 years various aspects of the operating procedures, methods, and organization of the Congress. This study of Congress, under the direction of Dr. Ralph K. Huitt, professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin, will be made by men with firsthand experience in research or on Capitol Hill, each studying in the area of his special expertise, each free to recommend changes independently of the others.

I am placing in the RECORD at this point, a copy of the statement issued by the study group and also a copy of the biography of Prof. Charles O. Jones, who will be studying minority party leadership. I have known Mr. Jones for several years and can testify to his qualifications:

THE STUDY OF CONGRESS

The study of Congress is sponsored by the American Political Science Association under a $230,000 grant made to the association by the Carnegie Corp. Its director is Dr. Ralph K. Huitt, professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin.

The study of Congress is in reality a number of related studies of various aspects of the organization, procedure, and operations of Congress by individual scholars who already have done research and had firsthand experience on Capitol Hill. About 15 studies will be made. Individual scholars will be free to recommend changes as they please, perhaps even contradicting each other, but there will be no official list of recommendations by the study itself. The purpose of the study of Congress is to provide comprehensive research studies which can serve in effect as staff papers for congressional committees or citizens groups which are interested in the problems of congressional reorganization.

The study of Congress should take approximately 2 years.

CHARLES O. JONES

Dr. Charles O. Jones, a native of South Dakota, who is teaching political science at the University of Arizona, will analyze minority party leadership in Congress for the study of Congress.

Dr. Jones' study will cover approximately the last 40 years, so that he can describe the variations in leadership style as well as identify the regular patterns of minority party leadership.

Dr. Jones is equipped by both education and experience to make this study. He received his undergraduate education at the University of South Dakota, receiving his bachelor's degree in 1953, magna cum laude, and the University of Wisconsin, from which he got both a master's and a doctor's degree. He was also a research student at the London School of Economics in political science for a year. He has taught at Wellesley College

and the University of Wisconsin as well as the University of Arizona.

Dr. Jones has been active in Republican Party affairs. Two of his books on the Republican Party will be published in 1965. One is "Party and Policymaking: The House Republican Policy Committee" and the other is "The Republican Party in American Politics."

As a political scientist, Dr. Jones has distinguished himself for his interest in getting college students into practical politics. He has directed numerous internship programs and was the associate director for a year of the National Center for Education in Politics in New York City. He attended the two national party conventions in 1960 as a fellow of the Eagleton Foundation.

Dr. Jones is an outstanding example of the new type of political scientist who combines first-rate scholarship and writing with practical activity in politics.

Unfair Medicare Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems created by all proposals to finance hospitalization of the aged under the social security system is the additional burden on younger people. Whatever advantages have accrued from income tax reduction may be more than wiped out by increases in the regressive payroll tax which falls most heavily on those least able to pay. Columnist John Chamberlain discusses the problem expertly in the following article from the Washington Post:

THESE DAYS: UNFAIR MEDICARE COSTS

(By John Chamberlain)

Okay, we're going to have medicare, or Federal hospital insurance for the aged. The poor old Kerr-Mills program, which has provided for Federal grants to States willing to meet at least a portion of their own hospitalization needs, never had a chance simply because so many of the local legislators in key States sat around waiting for Washington to do everything. It's a case of default as much as anything else.

Now we're evidently about to let something else go by default. In withdrawing his objections to a vote on medicare in Congress, WILBUR MILLS, the chairman of the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee, has ruled that there will be no public hearings on the bill.

MILLS was a vigorous opponent of medicare legislation up to last summer, but in capitulating he has, in effect, said: "Let's not worry about improving the bill by talking about it." But he himself is apparently having his own last say: he is insisting that hospitalization insurance be financed not by upping the ordinary social security payroll tax but by creating an entirely separate trust fund.

Well, if Representative MILLS is entitled to one last crucial word on the financing of medicare, why can't there be hearings on other alternative ways of paying the bill? It's hardly fair—or democratic—to cut off finance questions without letting every interested group have an opportunity to shed light on the subject.

The worst thing about the current medicare proposition is that it calls for a payroll tax on the first $5,600 of a man's income. This means that the individual will be paying $64 to a separate social security medical trust fund in addition to the $174 that now goes into old-age insurance. The total for the two social security trust funds would be $238 for 1965. Employers would be paying similar amounts to provide their matching end of the social security tab, making a grand total of $476 that might otherwise be available to workers in cash. And, as the social security taxes go up as planned, the total checkoff for an individual would be $562 by 1971—or 10 percent of a gross wage of $5,600 a year.

Thus the income tax cuts that have been hailed with such extravagant praise as "depression insurance" will be quite effectively canceled by the combined wage taxes for old-age insurance and medicare.

Since my own income is in excess of $5,600 a year, and since I have only a few more years to stumble through before reaching the age of 65, the present proposals for financing hospitalization insurance for the elderly don't represent any particular pain for me personally. In fact, I should be cheering for the principle of regressive taxation that is embodied in the medicare bill. If the poor and the young have to pay for medicare, why should the well to do and the close to being old offer any objections? It's no particular skin off our noses.

But, like the patsy that I am, I have been listening to the complaints of the poor and the young about loading the costs of the Great Society on young married couples in the $5,600 earnings bracket. These kids are just getting started in life, and are struggling to grind out a host of bewildering payments from $5,600.

The principle of regressive taxation that is embodied in the administration's current medicare proposal is an affront to every young couple in the lower middle income brackets. Why, in terms of their incomes, should they be called upon to pay a wildly disproportionate share of the cost of taking care of the old? Do we start the Great Society by grabbing the same amount of medical insurance money from the $5,600-a-year kids that we take from people named Harrison, Kennedy, or Rockefeller? Why not be decent about it and pay for medicare out of the general tax funds?

Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1965, the Americans of Lithuanian descent of the Miami area gathered at a meeting sponsored by the Lithuanian Council of Miami to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the February 16, 1918, declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution unanimously adopted at that meeting and sent to me by the president of the Lithuanian Council of Miami, Dr. S. Tamosaitis:

RESOLUTION BY AMERICANS OF LITHUANIAN DESCENT IN THE MIAMI AREA

Whereas this year is also the 25th year of Soviet ocupation of Lithuania. During this past quarter of a century the Soviets have oppressed and subjugated the Lithuanian people, causing great suffering by their constant efforts to russify and sovietize them: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we again express our appreciation to our Government for refusing to recognize the illegal U.S.S.R. occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and trust the United States will continue to do so; and

That we will continue our steadfast resolve to keep up our efforts to keep the cause of freedom and independence of Lithuania alive in the minds of the Government and the people of the United States, and also in the American press; and

That we hereby urge the President of the United States to instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to bring up the cause of the illegal Soviet occupation and annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, at every opportunity, and

That we send this resolution to the President of the United States and copies thereof to the Secretary of State, our U.S. Senators, and Members of Congress, and to the press.

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF MIAMI,
Dr. S. TAMOSAITIS, *President*.
JENNIE BUKAVECKAS, *Secretary*.

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday as part of the debate on the arms control authorization bill, Mr. HOSMER, my colleague from California, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an attack on what he inferred were two contract research studies of the Arms Control Agency.

The first study he mentioned was not contracted for by the Arms Control Agency at all nor did the Agency pay any money for it. This was the so-called Project Phoenix.

The other study he attacked was a joint research project sponsored by the Arms Control Agency and the Defense Department entitled "Study Fair." It was done by the Institute for Defense Analyses.

To set the record straight, I would like to include, as part of my remarks, statements by the Arms Control Agency on both of these studies:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—STATEMENT ON THE PHOENIX PAPER 1 CONTRACT STUDY CONDUCTED BY THE INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES FOR THE STATE DEPARTMENT

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Phoenix project was contracted for by the U.S. Disarmament Administration of the State Department before the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency came into existence. No further funding for the study was provided after the Agency was established. Because of its interest in the project, the contractor, the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA), continued the study at its own expense. Phoenix Paper 1 by Vincent P. Rock is only one of the Phoenix studies.

Phoenix arose from an earlier study by the Institute for Defense Analyses for the Disarmament Administration. The earlier

study had concluded that a stable military environment between the United States and the Soviet Union could become unstable if tensions increased.

The purpose of Phoenix was to get an independent view by nongovernmental experts of how arms control fits into the complex military and political problem of attempting to control international tensions. The Institute for Defense Analyses was chosen as an independent contractor because of its experience on the earlier project and because it had done work on related problems for the Department of Defense.

The papers written by Vincent Rock for the Phoenix project make two interrelated points: (1) that arms control agreements, while they can contribute to the control of tension, are not enough to keep international tension within safe limits; the control of tension needs to be tackled over a broader front; and (2), that substantive arms control agreements will probably not be reached until there is more communication, understanding and reduced tension between ourselves and the Soviet Union.

The author considered various arms control measures: proposals to reduce the secrecy of Soviet society (which is important for on-site inspection); increased trade with the Soviet Union; and various other areas of interaction he deemed to be constructive and in keeping with U.S. interests.

2. JUSTIFICATION

As the report itself states, the judgments expressed in the paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Agency. A research program in any field produces results to which exceptions can be taken. As far as the sponsoring Agency is concerned, however, judgment of a contract study should be based upon (1) whether the subject needed research, and (2) whether the contractor was responsibly selected.

As to the first point, the title of the study, "Common Action for the Control of Conflict: An Approach to the Problem of International Tensions and Arms Control" indicates that this was a subject pertinent to the activities of the Disarmament Administration and one which it should have studied.

As to whether the contractor was responsibly selected, the Institute for Defense Analyses was created at the request of the Department of Defense in 1956. It was formed so the Government could tap the reservoir of scientific talent represented by a number of the Nation's leading academic institutions. At the time the Phoenix contract was let, IDA's President was Mr. Garrison Norton, Assistant Secretary of the Navy in the Eisenhower administration. Mr. Vincent Rock has held positions in the field of national security affairs under both Republican and Democratic administrations. In general, IDA appeared to be well qualified to conduct the study.

3. CRITICISMS AND CONCLUSIONS

There are some criticisms that distort the report. For example, it has been claimed that Phoenix 1 urges: "That America converge her national institutions and values gradually toward Communism. * * * That we abandon Berlin. * * * That we set up Communist Parties in countries that do not at present have a Communist threat, that we retreat when threatened by the Soviets and that we overlook the assassination of pro-Western leaders."

None of these suggestions are made in the Phoenix report.

It has also been claimed that Phoenix 1 is a top-secret document. None of the Phoenix reports are classified in any manner.

Other criticisms involve assertions that certain foreign policy recommendations made by Rock are being followed as a guide for U.S. policy.

The Phoenix report was printed in July 1963. Many of the ideas contained in the report were advanced long before that date, although they were not previously approached from the standpoint of their relationship to arms control. The implementation of some of these long-standing ideas did take place after the publication of the Rock report. This was, however, coincidental. The fact is that the implementation of some of these ideas was related to an improved atmosphere in our relations with the Soviet Union.

A number of examples have been cited as foreign policy recommendations originated by Rock: "Example, the report recommended the United States seek Soviet cooperation in future space efforts."

Recommendations for international cooperation on the peaceful uses of space were made by the House of Representatives in House Concurrent Resolution 332, passed in June 1958; by President Eisenhower before the U.N. General Assembly on September 22, 1960; and by President Kennedy at a March 21, 1962, news conference. "Example, the report recommended that the United States consider assisting Soviet agriculture."

The expansion of farm exports was recommended by President Kennedy in his February 6, 1961, special message to Congress on gold and the balance-of-payments deficit, more than 2 years prior to the Rock report. "Example, the report recommended reducing restrictions on trade with the Soviet Union."

On July 14, 1958, President Eisenhower wrote Premier Khrushchev:

"Expanded trade between our countries could, under certain conditions, be of mutual benefit and serve to improve our relations in general. This would especially be true if it were accompanied by broad contacts between our peoples and a fuller exchange of information and ideas aimed at promoting mutual understanding as a basis for lasting peace.

"Our people have done a great deal in recent years to promote higher standards of living through expanded trade with many countries. They would like to trade with the Soviet Union as well, for the same purpose."

"Example: The report recommended increasing scientific cooperation with the Soviet Union."

In his January 9, 1958 state of the Union message, President Eisenhower recommended a worldwide program of science for peace. And President Kennedy said in his state of the Union message of January 30, 1961: "This administration intends to explore promptly all possible areas of cooperation with the Soviet Union and other nations 'to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors.'"

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—STATEMENT ON STUDY FAIR (FOCUS ON ARMS INFORMATION AND REASSURANCE)

Various recent publications have contained false information about the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the above-captioned research study done by the Institute for Defense Analyses under the joint sponsorship of the Agency, the Department of Defense, and the U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Station.

The subject of the attack is a 32-page paper written by Mr. Bruce Russett, a political scientist at Yale University. It is entitled "Information and Strategic Stability." The volume in which it appears, "Studies on Information and Arms Control," contains papers by several non-Government researchers which: examine barriers in the Soviet Union inhibiting information useful in verifying arms control agreements; explore the diverse types of accessible information; and discuss reasons why conflicts may be caused by misinformation or misinterpretation of information among adversaries in times of crisis. Mr. Russett addressed himself to the last subject. His ideas do not purport to represent any views but his own, as noted in the disclaimer at the beginning of the report. No specific arms control or reduction proposal has resulted from suggestions contained in the study.

It has been charged, for example:

1. That the Arms Control Agency "is trying to sap our military strength" and "blend our country into the Communist camp by making us too weak to fight."

This charge is completely false. U.S. arms control and reduction policy is directed at maintaining military balance by verified international agreements that would control and reduce armaments proportionately, thus giving no country an advantage over the United States. Such agreements were sought under the Eisenhower administration and are sought now because they would reduce the risk of war and the costly and dangerous burden of armaments.

2. That the research document states "the Government must use restraint in gathering intelligence data about Soviet intentions and capabilities."

The statement quoted appears nowhere in the Russett paper, nor has it been said by the Arms Control Agency.

3. That "the Disarmament Agency says there is 'significant danger in information which is too informative.'"

The U.S. Arms Control Agency has made no such statement.

4. That "one section recommends that, in order to prove to the Soviets that we have no designs on their territory, we would side with them to put down a rebellion in East Germany or Cuba."

The Russett paper does not recommend this, and the Agency does not support such an idea.

5. That "the grab-bag of surrender items put forth by the Disarmament Agency was dreamed up by the familiar Institute for Defense Analysis, which has to spend $10 million of the taxpayers' funds to tell us how to give away freedom and be safe."

These are not "surrender" items; they were not put forth by the Arms Control Agency; and the Agency spent only $10,000 as its share of this joint research project with the Department of Defense.

6. That the Russett paper proposes agreements that would delay or control the transmission of destabilizing information; e.g., "Automatic data-processing machines which would receive information, screen it, and give 'a sparse output.'"

The Agency has evaluated these and similar ideas and rejected them as impractical and lacking in merit as a basis for developing arms control proposals. At least one of these suggestions, however, has been grossly distorted and deserves comment. It has been charged, on the basis of the following quotations from the author, that he would sabotage U.S. submarines and unilaterally disarm our forces: "One proposed solution is for the Soviets to be able to demand that a few submarines, of their choosing, surface and make their positions known." This sentence is preceded by the author's statement that "It might be desirable, for instance, to assure the Soviets that no Polaris submarines were within firing range of the U.S.S.R.; and yet we could not afford to pinpoint the location of all of them." In context, the objective is to reassure the other side that we were not massing for an attack, if in fact we were not, thus avoiding a senseless preemptive attack by them on us due to nuclear jitters. Moreover, this and other ideas are presented from the standpoint of exchanging information, thus contemplating the possibility of reciprocal action by the Soviet Union. Finally, as indicated above, this proposal has not been adopted by the Arms Control Agency.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Vietnam is complex. Although the power exists to destroy North Vietnam, that course of action could lead to a Chinese invasion of South Vietnam and a Korean style war. Therefore, American airpower is not wholly relevant. And on the ground there is now a new type of war—a guerrilla war in which the Vietcong seems to have substantial support of the population. As the French learned in Algeria, large armies equipped with the most modern equipment are no substitute for the support of the population in guerrilla warfare.

In the midst of the complexities the New York Times and Walter Lippmann, the distinguished columnist, have written lucid and enlightening editorials and articles. The most recent appeared in today's New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune. I urge all my colleagues to read the following:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 18, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT ON VIETNAM

If the United States has a policy in South Vietnam, its outlines do not emerge with any clarity from the statement President Johnson appended to his speech before the National Industrial Conference Board yesterday.

The President reiterates that this country wants no wider war, yet his statement surrenders all initiative to the Vietcong and their external allies. "Our continuing actions will be those that are justified and made necessary by the continuing aggression of others," Mr. Johnson says. He stresses that the United States seeks no conquest and that its sole aim is to "join in the defense and protection of the freedom of a brave people."

All this is admirable as a reaffirmation of the consistent American position on the Vietnamese conflict, but it provides no answer to two factors that have emerged with overwhelming force in recent weeks. One is that the South Vietnamese, ruled by a succession of fragile governments under the domination of bickering warlords, are showing little appetite for doing any fighting in their own defense or even for helping to guard our troops against sneak attack. The second is that the nature of the Vietcong guerrilla tactics makes it almost impossible to hit back at the Communist forces without carrying the attack into North Vietnam and thus creating the wider war the President wants to avoid.

Each northward strike enlarges the peril of active intervention by Communist China and increases the pressure on Soviet Russia to abandon the withdrawn position it so plainly prefers. What is still lacking in the President's formulation is any hint of the circumstances under which a negotiated settlement, of the type proposed by Secretary General Thant of the United Nations, might be approached. Without such a move, the potentiality of a vastly expanded war increases each day.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Feb. 18, 1965]

THE VIETNAM DEBATE

(By Walter Lippmann)

We are just seeing another attempt to form a government in Saigon, and much depends, for the near future at least, on whether it is able to hold together for a decent time. For the reason why the situation in Vietnam has become so critical in the last 3 months is that South Vietnam has been crumbling and is at the point of collapse. The Vietcong have been so near winning the war and forcing the United States to withdraw its troops that Hanoi and Peiping have brushed off feelers for a negotiated peace. They believe themselves to be in sight of a dictated peace.

We, for our part, have found ourselves quite unable to put together a South Vietnamese Government which is willing or able to rally enough popular support to hold back the advancing Vietcong. The American Army fighting the Vietcong has been like men trying to drive away a swarm of mosquitoes with baseball bats. However, because there is nothing else to do, we keep on. We do not wish to face the disagreeable fact that the rebels are winning the civil war.

The easy way to avoid the truth is to persuade ourselves that this is not really a civil war but is in fact essentially an invasion of South Vietnam by North Vietnam. This has produced the argument that the way to stabilize South Vietnam is to wage war against North Vietnam.

The more thoughtless and reckless members of this school of thinking hold that only by attacking North Vietnam with heavy and sustained bombardment can we snatch a victory in South Vietnam from the jaws of defeat. They have not yet carried the day in Washington. But the President, when he ordered the retaliatory raids, no doubt intended to remind Hanoi and Peiping that the United States could, if it chose to, inflict devastating damage.

Apart from the question of the morality and the gigantic risks of escalating the war, there is no sufficient reason to think that the northern Communists can be bombed into submission. We must not forget that North Vietnam has a large army—larger, it is said, than any other army on the east Asian mainland except China's. This North Vietnamese army can walk, and nobody has yet found a way of bombing that can prevent foot soldiers from walking.

It is most likely that if we set out to devastate Hanoi and North Vietnam, this army would invade South Vietnam. In South Vietnam we could not bomb the army because that would mean that we would be killing our South Vietnamese friends. There is little reason to think that the Saigon government and its very dubious troops would be able to fight back, or in fact that it would want to fight back.

The Asian Communists fight on the land, and they think about war in terms of infantry. I believe that the reason why they are not terrified, nor much deterred, by our kind of military power is that they believe a war on the mainland will be fought on the ground and will be decided on the ground. There they have not only superior numbers but widespread popular support.

For this country to involve itself in such a war in Asia would be an act of supreme folly. While the warhawks would rejoice when it began, the people would weep before it ended. There is no tolerable alternative except a negotiated truce, and the real problem is not whether we should negotiate but whether we can.

It is not certain, given the weakness and confusion in South Vietnam, that Hanoi and Peiping, who are poised for the kill, will agree to a cease-fire and a conference and a negotiation. But while this has, I believe, been the implied objective of our policy, the time has come when it should be the avowed objective, an objective pursued with all our many and very considerable diplomatic resources.

Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and to include extraneous material, I include in the RECORD two editorials aired by radio station KSL, Salt Lake City, Utah, which is heard in part of my congressional district.

The first editorial, aired during the week of January 17, 1965, deals with what can be accomplished by free enterprise as compared with a government monopoly.

The second, aired during the week of January 24, 1965, portrays graphically just how large $100 billion is.

I commend the two editorials to the attention of my colleagues.

TELEPHONE

This, ladies and gentlemen, is the tale of two industries. Both are involved in communications. Both are nationwide. Both are monopolies in their field.

One is the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which has just announced it will reduce its long-distance rates by $100 million a year. The other is the U.S. Post Office, which plans to increase its rates by $300 million a year.

In the past 30 years, the cost of a coast-to-coast telephone call has been reduced from $9.50 to $2.25—or $1 after 9 p.m. In the same period, the cost of mailing a first-class letter has risen from 2 to 5 cents.

In those 30 years, the telephone companies have steadily paid dividends to their stockholders and have paid more than $22 billion in taxes into the U.S. Treasury. Meanwhile, the Post Office has lost more than $10 billion.

Through breathtaking technological advances in the telephone system, you can dial a number anywhere in North America, or put a call through in minutes halfway around the world. With a man carrying a bag from his shoulder just as he did 30 years ago, it takes 2 days to send a letter to the other side of town—with delivery once a day.

One of these industries is based on the free enterprise profit system. The other is run by Government.

Guess which is which.

THE BUDGET

Imagine yourself standing at the corner of Main and Broadway with $100 billion baled up in $10 bills that you want to give away.

You work hard at it. Peeling them off as fast as you can work, you give one away every second. You work at it 12 hours a day, 365 days a year.

But you hadn't better plan on early retirement, because it's going to take you 635 years to get the job done.

Or suppose you start a business and don't do too well at it. In fact, you lose $1,000 a

day, 365 days a year. It's going to take you somewhat more than 273,000 years to lost $100 billion.

Or, instead of giving away that $100 billion in $10 bills, suppose you decide to stack them up and keep them. You had better get a big yard and a tall ladder, because those bills are going to make 6,000 stacks, each the height of the Washington Monument.

That, in short, is what President Johnson was talking about when he presented a $99.7 billion budget to Congress this week. Except that the administrative budget he presented was really $28 billion short of the real spending budget when you include funds earmarked for social security, and highways, and such.

We just thought you'd like to know more about what $100 billion looks like. Oh, and while you're at it, you might also consider this:

You could give those $10 bills away once a second for 75 years, or stack them into 720 Washington Monuments just with the $12 billion interest we will pay this year on the deficits run up by our Government during the past three decades.

Anybody for a return to a balanced budget?

How Budget Is Distorted Demonstrated by Juggling Agriculture Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note an increasingly critical attitude toward the Federal budget on the part of newspaper editors and financial experts throughout the country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial by Jack Gore of the Fort Lauderdale News in which the CCC funds are discussed:

HOW BUDGET IS DISTORTED DEMONSTRATED BY JUGGLING AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION

A few days ago, in commenting on President Johnson's new budget, we pointed out how easy it was to misrepresent spending figures by deliberately understating spending needs and then going back to Congress later on to request supplemental appropriations.

Through this kind of figure juggling an adroit budget compiler can easily make it appear that an administration is going all-out for economy when the true facts are entirely different.

To illustrate what we man, it is only necessary to go back and look at the budget that President Johnson presented to the Congress last year. In that budget the President asked Congress to appropriate only $1,724 million to replenish the capital funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation although that agency had lost some $2,654,900,000 of its capital funds on the 1963 operations of the farm price support program.

As was pointed out on the floor of Congress at the time, this was a radical departure from previous practice as the legislators customarily appropriate sufficient funds to cover these capital losses just as soon as it is known what the losses will be.

But President Johnson, eager to establish an economy-minded image and badly wanting to create the impression he was more of a moneysaver than his predecessor, deliberately asked Congress last year to appropriate less than the full amount of the capital fund losses piled up by the CCC, and this "gimmick" made it appear he was cutting the Agriculture budget by more than one-half billion dollars below what the Kennedy administration had asked the previous year.

Congressman FRANK T. BOW was one Member of Congress who was not fooled by this "phony" economy measure, and he pointed out to his colleagues in the lower House that through this kind of figure juggling an actual $626 million increase in the Agriculture budget was being palmed off as a half-billion dollar decrease.

The truth of Congressman Bow's statement was made clearly apparent only last week when President Johnson asked the Congress to quickly approve an emergency supplemental appropriation of $1,600 million for the Agriculture Department to replenish its funds.

The President will get his emergency appropriation with little debate or opposition as the Commodity Credit Corporation must be kept in capital funds to continue its price support program and Congress has little choice but to come up with the necessary money.

The fact that this money would be needed was no secret last year when the budget was compiled and presented to the Congress. But for political purposes Agriculture Department spending was deliberately understated so that President Johnson could go before the Congress and the people and tell them what a marvelous economizer he was.

Since this figure juggling deal worked so well last year, it has again been employed this year to make it appear that by dint of wielding a sharp economy ax Mr. Johnson will be able to keep his new spending budget under the $100 billion mark.

The ax that President Johnson wielded, however, was about as phony and as sharp as the rubber tomahawk our children often use to play cowboy and Indian. Presumably, the President slashed one Veterans' Administration budget item by some $80 million. But this saving was achieved by changing the dates on which checks are sent out so that fewer checks than usual will be mailed during the fiscal year in question. There is no savings here, of course, as the checks will still go out and the money will still be spent. Yet, on the surface, President Johnson can claim credit for a decrease in Government spending.

Through such gimmicks as this, many employed on a billion-dollar scale, an image is created which is completely false and distorted. In this connection it should be noted that in addition to the emergency supplemental appropriation President Johnson has asked the Congress to approve for the Agriculture Department, he is asking for almost $5 billion more in supplemental appropriations for other departments in order to pay higher than estimated bills in the current fiscal year.

Honest mistakes in budgetmaking can be pardoned as nobody can fully anticipate what is going to happen in regard to Government revenues and expenditures some 6 to 18 months in advance. But there is a big difference between budget discrepancies brought about by honest mistakes in judgment and errors created by deliberately juggling the figures to arrive at some desired political objective.

President Johnson's new budget is strictly of the latter type. While it gives the impression Government spending will be held under $100 billion for the 1965–66 fiscal year, it is already certain actual spending will soar way above that figure, and the pity of it is that so few of our people seem to understand how badly they are being mislead by the architects of the Great Society.

Dr. Walter Johnson Analyzes the Election

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following article in the January issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists by Dr. Walter Johnson, eminent American historian and distinguished chairman of the History Department of the University of Chicago.

HAVE FAITH IN THE 20TH CENTURY

(By Walter Johnson)

"The most noteworthy Republican victories on Tuesday," declared Fred A. Young, the New York Republican State chairman, "were scored by soundly progressive Republicans who survived the deadly political backwash from the disastrous alternative course charted for our party since the San Francisco convention." And he added, "The Republican Party has paid a shattering price for that erratic deviation from our soundly moderate 20th century course."

The election was devastating for the Republican Party. Not only did the Johnson-Humphrey ticket carry the popular vote by a margin of 15,500,000, but the Republicans were left with the electorial vote of only Arizona, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Georgia. And across the country the Johnson landslide mowed down conservative and moderate Republicans alike.

The Democrats made a net gain of 38 seats in the House of Representatives (their margin will be 295 to 140) and added 2 to their already overwhelming margin in the Senate (it will be 68 to 32). The Johnson plurality of over 1 million votes in Ohio was too much for Robert Taft, Jr., to overcome and he went down by approximately 13,000 votes. Iowa lost 4 House Republican seats and held on to their fifth by less than 500 votes. Nine-term veteran conservative Katharine St. George was defeated in New York.

The Johnson sweep in that State also took control of the legislature away from the Republicans for the first time since 1934, and the speaker of the assembly and the senate leader were among the casualties. Some of th most telling defeats came at the State legislative level. In Michigan, Indiana (for the first time since 1936), Iowa, Utah, and Maine (for the first time in 50 years) the Democrats won control of both houses of the legislature. They also seized control of the house in Illinois, Colorado, and Pennsylvania and made major gains in such States as Wisconsin, Montana, North and South Dakota, Kansas, West Virginia, Ohio, Texas, North Carolina, and New Hampshire. With redistricting facing many States, the Democratic successes can lead to a reversal of small town and rural control of many legislatures. Moreover, the patronage of many State and local governments will now change hands and only add to the difficulties of rebuilding a Republican Party with real muscle.

All in all, everywhere except in the Deep South, the Democrats picked up strength in the Congress, the statehouses, and the county courthouses. But in Mississippi and South Carolina the Republicans won one Democratic house seat and gained five in Alabama. The party that began over 100 years ago as the party of the free States of

the North and the opponent of the extension of slavery into the western territories won with Goldwater and Miller only the electoral vote of Dixiecrat States (and Arizona).

PRIVATE VERSUS GOVERNMENT POWER

While it is a commonplace to say that presidential elections are important, 1964 was not only important—it was extraordinary. Beginning near the turn of the 20th century, the American people had to adjust their ideas and traditions to the problems created by the vast expansion of industry and finance since 1865. At the same time, they had to attempt an adjustment to the new position of the Nation in world politics.

Equality of opportunity under freedom had long been the purpose of American life. (But the institution of slavery and the continued restrictions after 1865 on the freedom of the Negro were tragic denials of the American purpose.) By the nineties, the closing of the western frontier meant to many people that the limit of horizontal mobility had been reached. At the same time, the rapid growth of transportation, industry, and finance threatened to produce a situation where vertical mobility, as well, would be checked. The father of the muckrakers, Henry Demarest Lloyd, formerly an editor of the Chicago Tribune, warned in 1894 that the freedom of America had permitted the creation of great wealth and now the holders of the wealth threatened to destroy the freedom of the individual to rise under conditions of equality of opportunity.

When the crisis in both vertical and horizontal mobility was reached, Americans reacted with pragmatic experimentation. In the years from 1901 to 1917 and again in the thirties, reformers or liberals or progressives as they were variously called extended the power of government—Federal, State, and local—to meet the challenges posed by an immense concentration of private power. One hundred years before, in Jefferson's time, the liberal position had been to limit government or public power. The liberal spokesman, Thomas Jefferson, held that in the past governments had been tyrannical and had deprived people of freedom and equality of access to economic and political power. Opposing Jefferson was that able, vigorous spokesman of the Federalist Party, Alexander Hamilton, who spoke powerfully for the more conservative position. He advocated a more powerful Central Government than the Jeffersonian liberals would accept. When Jefferson came to power, however, most of the Hamiltonian measures were retained indicating that Jefferson was a pragmatist and that the bulk of Federalists and Jeffersonians were not as far apart as their campaign rhetoric might indicate.

It was not until the last decade of the 19th century that the American people had come to grips with the question of how the American purpose was faring. By this time, Americans were no longer able to turn their backs on the problem of power and escape to the wilderness. In cities and States across the land—and most notably in the Midwest and Far West—there arose a nonideological grassroots demand that Government curb monopoly, that Government protect human and natural resources from exploitation at the hands of those whom the Republican Roosevelt called the predatory wealthy, and that Government play a larger role in economic activity. The liberals of the progressive era—backed by the vast majority of the people—demanded that the power of Government be extended since these economic royalists had been destroying equality and curtailing freedom. Although there were a handful of radicals on the left who wanted to root up the American system, the liberals of the day were motivated by the desire of reforming the system in order to preserve it. What was needed, therefore, was a Government strong enough to restore the American purpose. But, by no means, in extending the power of Government did these liberals advocate the all-powerful State. They were seeking rather a balance between private and public power which had been upset by rapid economic changes in the late 19th century. Herbert Croly in "The Promise of American Life" (1909) analyzed the problem in an articulate fashion and proposed the strong Hamiltonian state suffused with Jeffersonian principles.

Whether one speaks of Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, or Franklin D. Roosevelt, these liberal reformers were trying to make the benefits of the new frontiers of industry and technology accessible to the mass of Americans. Theodore Roosevelt remarked that it was "our task * * * to strive for social and industrial justice. * * * If on this new continent we merely build another country of great but unjustly divided material prosperity, we shall have done nothing."

The Square Deal of the Republican Roosevelt and the New Freedom of Wilson launched the adjustment of democratic institutions to the needs of the industrial age. Building on these precedents, the Democratic Roosevelt in the perilous days of the great depression added to the quantity of social reform realized but he added little to the intellectual conceptions of the pre-World War I liberals. By World War II, the United States had come face to face with the problem of power. It had increased public power to hold in check the economic and political power of private wealth.

In this same period, although Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson stirred some awareness in the Nation of the role that the United States should play in world affairs, it was not until 1939 and after that a majority shook off cherished traditions of isolationism and made portentous decisions in world politics. Never before in American history had developments outside the borders of the Nation so dramatically influenced American decisions. Despite a restlessness over the new position of the Nation and, at times, a reluctance to part with older ways, the vast majority of the American people made the transition not without dignity. But a vocal minority of neoisolationists, including the radical right, continued to demand a foreign policy based on the assumption that there were no limits to American power. They insisted that it was unnecessary to pay attention to the views of the Nation's allies of those of the uncommitted nations. And they adopted the simplistic view that the Communist nations were a monolith. Some spoke in terms of preventive or preemptive war. And some spoke of the "liberation" of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain as though America alone possessed nuclear weapons. The neoisolationists attacked both Republican and Democratic Presidents. Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson were well aware of the illusory quality of American omnipotence.

Pivotal point of the reshaping of the role of government in the economy and the Nation in world decisions has been political leadership by the two major parties. It is true, however, that the Republican Presidents, except for Theodore Roosevelt, lagged behind the Democrats in leading the Nation in making these adjustments.

THE GOLDWATER CAPTURE

The Goldwater capture of the Republican Party was a direct challenge to the broad consensus that had been built between the two parties. Ordinarily, attacks on the consensus have come from such minor parties as the Know Nothings, the Populists, and the Dixiecrats and the Progressives of 1948. In the past such elements withdrew from the coalitions that form the two major parties and took to the hustings to advocate their position in shrill and simplistic phrases.

But in 1964 the Republican nominee led the attack. How, in view of the disaster that he was to bring the party in November, did he win the nomination? One of the oldest rules of politics is that you cannot beat "somebody with nobody." The opposition to the Arizona Senator could not agree on any one candidate around whom to rally. Gov. Nelson Rockefeller conducted a determined campaign and did an important service in challenging Goldwater's limited views on world affairs and his belief that the Social Security System should be made voluntary. But Rockefeller was too liberal for the mainstream of Republican feeling. Although Goldwater did not fare particularly well in the 17 States and the District of Columbia which held primaries, no other single candidate did either. And in California, where a determined band of true believers concentrated on turning out the vote for Goldwater in southern California, he won only 51.4 percent of the vote to Rockefeller's 48.6 percent. But this slim victory gave Goldwater the entire California delegation at an important psychological moment 6 weeks before the convention opened. In addition, in many States which selected their delegates by conventions, Goldwater supporters had long been at work. Goldwater, himself, as chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, had since 1958 made himself available for fundraising dinners across the country. His personality was appealing, and he had helped local party units raise funds while other possible nominees had not.

The disarray of the Goldwater opponents was made complete by General Eisenhower. He had long advocated that many candidates compete for the post, and he steadfastly refused to back anyone. This left the Rockefellers, the Romneys, the Scrantons, and others without the support of the most important Republican votegetter of all. (The general's refusal to assume a leadership role should not have been surprising since as President he had consistently refused to be the leader of his party—in fact he had tried to place an aura of moral sanctity about his unwillingness to function in this role of the President.) Eisenhower's role up to and at the San Francisco convention resulted in his becoming the Von Hindenburg of the Republican Party.

My colleague Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau has pointed out ("Goldwater: The Romantic Regression," Commentary, September 1964) that it is a myth that Goldwater imposed "an alien conservative philosophy" upon the Republicans. His philosophy of individualism, free enterprise, States' rights, a weak Federal Government, a balanced budget, reduced taxes, victory over Communism, American omnipotence abroad either through isolation or domination, Morgenthau observes, "moves indeed in the mainstream of Republican thought." While Dewey and Nixon did not share it, since as coldblooded operators they were not committed to any philosophy, they paid lipservice to it. But both Eisenhower and Taft shared it in 1952. Eisenhower's romanticism, however, as Morgenthau writes, "was mitigated by vagueness and rendered relatively innocuous by indolence and by a desire for domestic and international peace."

The cleavage between Goldwater and Republican tradition, however, came over the Senator's desire to implement his political philosophy with political action. "His immediate predecessors as leaders of the Republican Party, romantic though they might have been, were no fools. When their romantic philosophy came up aaginst the hard facts of political life, it was the facts that won out," Morgenthau remarks. Although Goldwater's Republican opponents "bow to Goldwater's verbal picture of the lost paradise to be restored * * * in practical terms they are perfectly satisfied with the status quo. * * * Goldwater's determination to

make things over in the image of his philosophy appears to them as a reckless interference with the status quo which they find highly satisfactory in view of their pragmatic interests." I would add that while most of Goldwater's Republican opponents bowed "to Goldwater's verbal picture of the lost paradise to be restored," such Senators as KUCHEL and JAVITS and Governors like Rockefeller and Romney did not.

It was not only, however, that pragmatic Republicans shuddered at Goldwater's activist romanticism, but the Senator and his supporters demanded complete surrender by other Republicans to his position. The contempt with which the more moderate Republicans were met when they attempted to amend the civil rights and world affairs planks of the platform—and the booing of Governor Rockefeller; the nomination of Congressman William Miller; the way Goldwater hailed extremism in his acceptance speech; and the takeover of the Republican National Committee by true believers was part of a snarling mood that indicated there was no longer any place in the high command of the party for those who were not Goldwater activists.

Historically, the presidential nominating conventions have served as compromising ground for the pluralistic forces that form the coalitions of the two major parties. Factions that lose out on the presidential nomination have been assuaged in the platform, the nomination of the vice-presidency, the speech of acceptance, and in the management of the forthcoming campaign. But not in 1964.

This was made amply clear throughout the campaign. Although Leonard Hall, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, and Ray Bliss, chairman of the Ohio Republican Party—and the most skilled manager in the party—were brought into the campaign, it was only to arrange schedules. They had nothing to say about the type of campaign Goldwater and Miller would conduct. Dean Burch, Goldwater's choice as national chairman, said: "When we brought them in, we didn't intend it as a conciliatory gesture toward moderates. We just wanted their experience." And when Denison Kitchel, Goldwater's campaign manager, was asked if he had any regrets about the campaign, he said that he had none. "We did it the way he wanted to do it. We're satisfied." (Chicago Daily News, Nov. 4, 1964.)

THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

One of the legends put to rest on November 3 was that there would be wholesome defections in the North among traditional Democratic voters who resented the gains of Negroes toward full citizenship. The sizable percentage of the vote that Governor Wallace of Alabama, had received in the Wisconsin, Indiana, and Maryland primaries was cited as evidence. But primaries can be misleading because, unlike general elections, they are quite susceptible to being influenced by a single issue. (I recall that in the 1956 Florida primary the most important issue that seemed to emerge was whether Adlai Stevenson or Estes Kefauver could best curb the fruit fly.) In the November 3 election there was a complex range of issues, and it was President Johnson's adroit strategy to keep these before the public. Among those that he emphasized were prosperity, peace, and a responsible hand at the helm of Government and in control of nuclear weapons. And he laid heavy stress on the Great Society, which would bring advances in civil rights, attacks on poverty, more extensive Federal aid to education, and the extension of the social security system to include more adequate medical care for the aged. In all these issues, Goldwater by his own words—the Democrats and others had only to remind the voters—appeared as a radical threat to what had been achieved up to date or could be attained in the future. (For a nonpartisan analysis of what Goldwater's views actually were see Congressional Quarterly Special Report, "The Public Records of Barry M. Goldwater and William E. Miller," July 31, 1964.)

Moreover, President Johnson accentuated the need for unity—not the divisiveness of Goldwater—if the country were to achieve the Great Society. And he had behind him an extraordinary record of 11 months of accomplishment in the White House. When he assumed office after the assassination of President Kennedy, the Government was not unlike a house shattered by a tornado. Not only were John F. Kennedy's major legislative proposals hopelessly bogged down in Congress, but a number of executive agencies had not yet received their appropriations for the fiscal year that had begun the previous July 1. Lyndon B. Johnson took command with a sure hand, the appropriations were quickly forthcoming, and in the next few months he secured among other things the tax bill, the Civil Rights Act, and the antipoverty legislation. But this high skill in political leadership and legisaltive control led his Republican opponents to refer contemptuously to him as a "wheeler-dealer." As the election campaign exposed Senator Goldwater's inadequacy as a presidential figure, increasingly he staked his hope of winning on an attempt to destroy the character of President Johnson. Through innuendo, insinuation, hints, and smirks Goldwater and Miller treated the office of President "with utter vulgar disrespect," Walter Lippmann noted on October 27. "The character of the man who will continue to be President of the United States has been maligned by his rival in a manner which has hitherto been reserved for anonymous inciters of whispering campaigns."

Although President Johnson was unable to exalt the public in the manner of Franklin D. Roosevelt, he did make the choice between himself and Goldwater devastatingly clear. As Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT remarked (Saturday Review, Oct. 24):

"These, I think, are the basic issues in the current election campaign: in domestic affairs, whether we are to continue making organized efforts to resolve problems of education, employment, poverty, and race, or whether we are to abandon these efforts and let nature take its course for good or ill; and, in foreign affairs, whether we are to continue seeking ways of reducing the tensions of the cold war and thereby reducing the danger of nuclear war or whether we are to repudiate the policies of Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson and lead the Nation on a crusade to destroy communism all over the world—a crusade that must take us again and again to the brink, and ultimately over the brink, of nuclear disaster."

The front lash of Republicans and independents added immeasurably to the President's sweeping victory. Only in the Deep South did racial prejudice bring Goldwater any substantial votes. There, his strength was greatest in the traditional Democratic rural and smalltown areas of the black belt, where Negroes have been prevented from voting. But he did not fare as well in urban areas, including Atlanta, where Eisenhower and Nixon had improved the Republican stance. Not only were the Republicans in the fifties receiving an increasing white vote in the cities, but in 1956, Ike received approximately 86 percent of the vote in predominantly Negro precincts and Nixon 4 years later held a reduced but comfortable majority. But here in 1964, as well as in other southern cities, Johnson received over 90 percent of the Negro ballots. And in northern cities where Nixon had won approximately 29 percent and Eisenhower 35 percent of the Negro vote, Goldwater reduced the Republicans to less than 10 percent of the vote.

A REAL REPUBLICAN

President Johnson's popular vote of some 42 million is attributable to no section, ethnic or racial group, or class or vocation. He was the choice of the East, the Midwest, the Mountain States, the west coast, and the Southwest. He emerged as the choice of farmers, industrial workers, urban dwellers, and suburbanites. As that shrewd observer of American voting behavior, Samuel Lubell, has written (Chicago Daily News, Nov. 9): "The famed New Deal coalition has been restored with a new vigor and unity."

President Johnson's 15.5 million popular vote plurality—Franklin D. Roosevelt defeated Alf M. Landon by 11 million—should bury another legend. I recall a number of passages at arms with the late Senator Robert A. Taft, who contended there were millions of Republicans who stayed home rather than vote for "me too" candidates like Wendell Willkie and Thomas E. Dewey. I disagreed then and contended that the Republicans in order to win the Presidency had to persuade a number of those who had favored and/or who had gained from New Deal reform measures, and who knew the responsible role the country had to play in world politics, to vote Republican. Any conservative who threatened to reverse the social and economic changes of the depression era and who supplied neoisolationist answers to world problems had no chance of winning. (The modern Republicanism of Eisenhower, after all, was a pragmatic acceptance of the New Deal and Truman's containment policies although the rhetoric might have sounded like the opposite.)

Senator Taft, however, was adamant. A "real Republican" could win. Well, in 1964, the pragmatic conservative was replaced by the activist-nihilist conservative—"a choice not an echo." The slogan "In your heart you know he's right" was answered by one voter, at least, as he waited in a long line to cast his ballot, "in our guts we know he's nuts." (New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 4).

I now find myself in the position of having William F. Buckley, Jr., agree with me. He wrote on November 7 that conservatives should "finally and forever, put aside that consoling dogma they have tucked under their pillows ever since Willkie was defeated in 1940, namely, that the Republicans had only to nominate a sure-enough conservative to guarantee a sweep, coast to coast." (Chicago Daily News.)

Not only did a real Republican lose by the largest popular vote plurality in American history, but the Democrats scored a net gain of 38 seats in the House of Representatives. Fifty-four Republican Representatives on June 17 signed the following statement. "We are convinced that the nomination of Senator Barry Goldwater will result in substantial increases in Republican membership in both Houses of Congress." Among the signers who went down to defeat were Bruce Alger (Texas), Ralph Beermann (Nebraska), Steven Derounian (New York), Ed Foreman (Texas), W. H. Harrison (Wyoming), Ben Jensen (Iowa), August Johansen (Michigan), Robert McLoskey (Illinois), John Pillion and Katherine St. George (New York), Don Short (North Dakota), M. G. Snyder (Kentucky), William Stinson and Jack Westland (Washington). And three other incumbents, who signed the statement but did not seek reelection, saw their districts go Democratic. Meanwhile, Republican moderates and liberals survived with only a small drop in number. Only 4 of the 34 incumbent Republican Representatives who were endorsed by Charles P. Taft's committee to support moderate Republicans were defeated.

It is important to note that 11 out of the 21 Republicans outside the South who were against the final passage of the Civil Rights Act were defeated. And, while all 14 southern Republicans opposed the law, 3 of them

were defeated. But, at the same time, all the 12 southern Democrats who voted for the bill were reelected, with Representative ROSS BASS winning the Senate seat from Tennessee formerly held by Estes Kefauver.

The conservative coalition of northern Republicans and conservative southern Democrats was seriously weakened by the northern Democratic gains. And the six conservative southern Democratic seats won by Republicans in Alabama, Mississippi, and Georgia can only add to the increased influence of liberal northern Democrats in the Democratic caucus.

Meanwhile the Senate elections brought the Democrats a net gain of two. But the significant outcome was the reelection of all the liberal Democratic "class of 1958." (The one exception may be Senator HOWARD CANNON of Nevada, whose slight lead may be reversed in a recount.) Six years ago, when the Democrats won 13 seats from the Republicans, the Senate acquired a much more liberal orientation than the House of Representatives, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, the leader of the liberal wing of the Texas Democratic Party, captured 56 percent of the vote; GALE MCGEE, whose Wyoming seat was considered immensely vulnerable, confronted an extremely conservative opponent and won by nearly 54 percent of the vote.

Without an impressive amount of ticket-splitting, many Republican Senate and governorship candidates would have been swamped by the Johnson-Humphrey landslide. In Massachusetts, John Volpe won the governorship by 50.5 percent while Johnson swept the State with 76.4 percent of the vote. And the Attorney General, Edward A. Brooke, who ignored Goldwater, won by a 750,000 margin, the largest for a Republican in the State's history. In Michigan while Johnson was winning with a 67.7 percent margin, Gov. George Romney, who had refused to endorse Goldwater, was reelected with 56.3 percent of the vote. And in Washington, Republican Daniel J. Evans, who had been for Nelson Rockefeller before the San Francisco convention, won the governorship with 60.1 percent of the vote while Johnson was winning 62.4 percent.

A number of defeated candidates ran well ahead of Goldwater. Robert Taft, Jr. ran 12.6 percentage points ahead of the Arizona Senator in Ohio but lost by approximately 13,000 votes. Senator Kenneth Keating ran 12.2 percentage points ahead of Goldwater in New York and Charles Percy in Illinois ran over 335,000 votes ahead of the top of the ticket but failed in his bid for the governorship.

THE AFTERMATH

Senator HUGH SCOTT, who squeaked through in Pennsylvania despite President Johnson's record-breaking plurality of well over a million and a quarter votes, demanded on November 10 that "southern scalawags" and "hardcore radical right elements" be removed from the leadership of the Republican Party. He aimed his fire at National Committee Chairman Dean Burch and Executive Director John A. Grenier, of Alabama. SCOTT charged that Grenier had conducted the campaign with no intention of winning but with the strong intention of ruling over the ruins. "We have no room in the Republican Party for urn carriers who would carry the ashes of the party in their personal possession," the Pennsylvanian stated.

Although Senator Goldwater announced on November 4 that the cause of conservatism had not been hurt by his candidacy since he had polled 26 million votes, others pointed out that the party that had lost in 1960 by 112,803 votes lost in 1964 by 15,500,000. But Denison Kitchel, Goldwater's campaign manager, was adamant: "We may have to wait for 4 years, but we're going to get this Government back where it belongs."

Republican Governors disagreed. (The Republicans made a net gain of 1 Governor, giving them 17 out of 50.) Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho, chairman of the Republican Governors' Association, announced: "In the face of the greatest disaster in the history of modern presidential elections, surviving leaders of our party have to regroup and revitalize the party machinery—and soon, if we are to fight again, and win." A few days later Richard Nixon declared that the Republican Party had to steer its "too far right" course back toward the "high center ground."

After the Republican Party made a disastrous decision at the San Francisco convention, the country demonstrated that extremism in the defense of 19th century attitudes was a political vice. Unlike the Harding voters in 1920, the voters in 1964 rejected the "return to normalcy." A more mature electorate clearly indicated its rejection of a return to a 19th century past—before world problems pressed on the Nation, before public power had had to be increased to cope with private power, and before big government was essential to deal with the problems created by rapid technological and scientific change

When Senator Goldwater refused to concede the election during the evening of November 3, he told the reporters that he did not believe either in polls or in projections. And one might add—nor did he believe in the 20th century.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Ova H. Tolley, Dunbar, W. Va., in place of O. H. Young, retired.

Myrna F. Proffit, Hansford, W. Va., in place of O. G. Toney, retired.

William E. White, Newell, W. Va., in place of C. E. Mills, retired.

WISCONSIN

Ferne L. Thompson, Wyocena, Wis., in place of R. E. Andrews, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 19, 1965:

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Buford Ellington, of Tennessee, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Kenneth E. BeLieu, of Oregon, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

Graeme C. Bannerman, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

Lt. Gen. William H. Blanchard, 1445A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be general.

Maj. Gen. James V. Edmundson, 1863A, Regular Air Force, to be lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Robert J. Friedman, 1397A, Regular Air Force, to be lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. William K. Martin, 1697A, Regular Air Force, to be lieutenant general.

Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, 1530A (major general, Regular Air Force), to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, under the provisions of section 711, title 10, of the United States Code.

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. Charles T. Booth II, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving, to be vice admiral.

Adm. Harold P. Smith, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade indicated, when retired, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233, to be admiral.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Henry W. Buse, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, having been designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated, while so serving, to be lieutenant general.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Edward H. Frick to be colonel, and ending John H. Ziegler to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 3, 1965.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning William C. Adams, Jr., to be captain in the Navy, and ending John W. Winters, Jr., to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 8, 1965.

Appendix

Tribute to the Late President Herbert C. Hoover by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 19, 1965

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the memorial address for the late President Herbert C. Hoover, delivered by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL ADDRESS FOR THE LATE PRESIDENT HERBERT C. HOOVER

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, October 23, 1964, in the Capitol rotunda)

"I am the resurrection and the life sayeth the Lord. He that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. Whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die. The eternal God is thy refuge and underneath are the everlasting arms. The Lord is my light and my salvation. Whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life. Of whom shall I be afraid?

"Let us now praise famous men and our fathers that begat us. The Lord hath wrought great glory by them through his great power from the beginning; such as did bear rule and their kingdoms. Men renown for their power, giving counsel by their understanding and declaring prophecies. Leaders of the people, by their counsel, and by their knowledge of learning, meet for the people, wise and eloquent in their instruction; men furnished with ability, living peaceably in their habitations. All these were honored in their generations and were the glory of their time. There be of them that have left a name behind them, that their praises might be reported. But these were merciful men whose righteousness hath not been forgotten. With their seeds shall continually remain a good inheritance, and their children are within the covenant. Their bodies are buried in peace, but their names liveth forever more. People will tell of their wisdom, and the congregation will show forth their praise." (The Book of Ecclesiasticus.)

And, now, from the New Testament: "Let not your heart be troubled. Ye believe in God; believe also in Me. In my Father's house are many mansions. If it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto Myself. That where I am, there ye may be also. I am the way, the truth and the life. Because I live, ye shall live also. Peace, I leave with you; My peace, I give unto you. Not as the world giveth give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled. Neither let it be afraid."

Let us lift our hearts in prayer.

O God, who art the strength of those who put their trust in Thee, we bless Thy name for all those who have died in the Lord and now rest from their labors, having received the end of their faith, even the salvation of their souls. Especially, we call to remembrance Thy loving kindness and Thy tender mercies to this Thy servant for all Thy goodness that withheld not his portion in the joys of this earthly life; and for Thy guiding hand along the way of his pilgrimage, we give Thee thanks and praise.

Especially, we bless Thee for Thy grace that kindled in his heart the love of Thy dear name that enabled him to endure unto the end and to attain the victory. Yea, to become more than conqueror through Him that loveth us. We magnify Thy holy name that his trials and temptations be ended; sickness and death be past. With all the dangers and difficulties of his mortal life his spirit is at home in Thy presence, in whose right hand dwelleth eternal peace. Grant, O Lord, we beseech Thee, that we who rejoice in the triumphs of those who have fought the good fight and have kept the faith may profit by their example and becoming followers of their faith and patience, we also may enter with them into an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

In this memorial hour, bowing in this shrine of each patriot's devotion, whose spacious dome mirrors the epic of our Nation's life, we come to view with grateful pride the glowing pagent of the 90 years of the noble citizen who has passed on from our side and sight. A poignant explanation rings in our ears from the storied past. It is recorded in the Holy Book upon whose truths the character of Herbert Hoover was nurtured. As we come to recount his exploits it is a sentence written across a vacant place in the Nation's skyline. Know ye that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel. Fallen? That is but the poor blundering verdict of the human perspective with our spirit shadowed by the sadness of farewell as the drooping flags of an acclaiming nation whisper the Republic's edieú to one of its tallest sons. Even in this volcanic day, the 31st President of the United States seemed so much a part of the Nation's wealthy assets with his sage counsel, drawn out of the rich deposits of the long years. But our stricken hearts are crying out in those ancient words of wistful loss. "My Father. My Father. The chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof." For a workman who needed not to be ashamed has been caught up by the chariots bending low. Tenderly, this day of the Nation's grief, we bear the worn bodily tenements of the oldest Chief Executive to this highest pedestal of honor where so recently lay the martyred form of the youngest. As this day we think of his earthly pilgrimage beginning 2 years before the centennial of the signing of the immortal Declaration, and continuing an unabated pursuit of the highest and best for this land of his love and prayer to within a dozen years of her 200th anniversary, we are vividly conscious of a background of humanitarian achievement and of national contributions which for dedicated time and talent and substance strikes dumb any poor faltering words of appraisal or appreciation we could attempt to bring. Suffice it to say that the amazing record Herbert Hoover has left in the accomplishment of rescuing enterprises under our starry banner and belting the needy earth, speak for themselves in almost unbelievable results far beyond any poor power of ours to add or to detract.

The daring projects he assumed threw bridges across the gulfs of vast misery, bridges of mercy and help which became crowded thoroughfares for food and clothing and medicine for millions, including huddled armies of children who otherwise would have perished. And so it is ours today, gratefully, to salute one who brought sustenance to more starving humans than any other man who has ever walked this earth. It was his voice that persuaded America to gird herself for this world's summons by eating less and growing more; that she might be the savior of millions and millions without regard to political frontiers. In the midst of an economic hurricane, still he believed that the clouds were lies and that the blue sky is the truth. Later, standing in the sunlight of popular esteem, he was called upon by his White House successors to take a strategic part in strenthening the very structure of the Government. Meekly he came through the fires of criticism to adulation and coronation in the heart of the Nation that he had served so faithfully.

We cannot but remember that back of all his attitudes and motivation was a character strong, unbending, unblemished. Always, he wore the white flower of a blameless life. The faith in the supremacy of spiritual verities, in its roots, went back to the frugal upbringing and the strict but quiet beliefs of a Quaker home and the Quaker meeting-house. To that cradle of his later mature faith. We will take his body to its resting place on the coming Sabbath, and there at the spot dear to his heart because of the scenes of his childhood, multitudes will come in the years to be to repeat the national saga which has been written by his life for so lived he from his birth in singleness and gentleness and honor and clean mirth.

Again and again he warned, as he did in his closing message to Congress. These are his words now: "* * * that social and economic solutions will not satisfy unless they conform to the ideals of life that are rooted in religion and fed from purely spiritual springs." And he declared that if science outstripped our moral and spiritual resources as a nation, we are doomed. And that with brilliance without wisdom, and power without conscience, the fateful handwriting is on the wall. From the lips of this man the Nation revered, who was the very symbol of integrity in the things that make a man and make a nation truly great, shall we listen in this hallowed hour to one of the last statements of Herbert Hoover as he said: "The longer I live, and the more I see, the more confidence I have in the American system of constant goodwill and service to other nations and of free enterprise, and personal liberty." And then he adds, "We have a great way of life. Let's keep it that way." Thus, the 31st President ended his matchless

career solemnly confident that we would keep it. And keep it we will. So help us, God.

"Father grant Thy grace divine
To make these mystic temples thine;
When wasting age and wearying strife
Have sapped the leaning walls of life,
When Darkness gathers over all
And the last tottering pillars fall,
Take the poor dust Thy mercy warms
And mold it into heavenly forms."

And now—

"Earth to earth and dust to dust
Calmly now the words we say—
Left behind we wait in trust
For the Resurrection Day.
Father in Thy blessed keeping
Leave we now Thy servant sleeping."

Public Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 19, 1965

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently I came across a short article in the Saturday Review describing the progressive civic program conducted by the Ford Motor Co. It so happens that a few years ago I lost my administrative assistant, John Erickson, to this program and I am pleased to know that this activity has been singled out as a prime example of industrial good citizenship. Since I know that there is at least one Democrat working toward interesting Ford employees in political activities, I feel that the loss of my able assistant was not completely in vain.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

FORD'S CITIZENSHIP PROGRAM

(By L. L. L. Golden)

Not all of the 450 companies that have public affairs programs have found them successful. Many of them have lacked all-out management support; not enough steam has been put behind them. But not one of the corporations that has set up a serious, well-thought-out program of public affairs and given it a thorough test has dropped it.

It is easy enough to make grand gestures during national election campaigns and to ask employees to register, to vote, or to make contributions to the party of their choice. It is difficult indeed to develop a solid program that runs all year and makes a concerted effort to train employees to understand and participate actively in politics.

There are some outstanding examples of good public affairs programs. Chase Manhattan Bank, Monsanto Chemical, Western Electric, Johnson & Johnson, Olin Mathieson, all have worthy programs. One of the best in the country is that of the Ford Motor Co.

The Ford effective citizenship program was started in 1960. It is administered by the company's civic and government affairs office and has the complete backing of top management. It encourages employees to become active in civic and political affairs in the party of their choice, not as agents of the company but as private citizens. The company's philosophy was put this way by its chairman, Henry Ford II, in a speech in 1961: "We find that nonpartisanship is an essential feature in all such activities. In the case of employee programs, it is necessary to keep in mind that the objective is not to further the pet political theories of top management; it is to help build, in American political life, in the electorate, and in both major political parties a solid, active group of politically and economically informed and moderate people. Corporations are—or ought to be—politically colorblind."

Ford's effective citizenship program includes the effective citizenship course, the know-your-government seminars, the voluntary political contribution plan, the informed voter program, and the leave of absence policy.

The effective citizenship course, built around the basic format of the "action course in practical politics" of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, is presented in eight 2-hour discussion sessions during the employees' off hours but at no cost to them. They deal with such vital subjects as the political party, political leadership and its functions and problems, the political campaign, political clubs and political meetings, the political party and the determination of public policy, the organization of local government and parties, the individual and politics, and local political leaders. In the last category the discussion is led by Republican and Democratic county chairmen. The session leaders are all professionals in government and politics. The course is not concerned with issues. No company point of view is injected. Its purpose is to help those attending the course to understand the political process.

The object of the know-your-government seminars is to provide a practical understanding of how State and local governments work. A guest official makes his presentation and a free-for-all discussion follows. A seminar program is, typically, made up of five 2-hour sessions at which the mayor, the president of the board of education, the county judge, the State senator or State representative and, in the final session, Democratic and Republican Party officials discuss the functions of their offices and their problems.

The voluntary contributions plan encourages all employees to make contributions, not just before national elections, but at least once a year, to a political party or candidate. Every precaution is taken so that no one in the company except the contributor knows how much is given or to whom.

The informed voter program uses the theme "Know—Before You Vote." Information is provided to employees about voting procedures, the candidates, and the issues on the ballot. The company publishes voters' guides in the more than 30 employee newspapers.

Under the community service awards program citations are presented in each major company location to Ford employees who have given distinguished service in local affairs. The winners are chosen by committees of leading local citizens.

Under the leave-of-absence policy, leaves are given to employees appointed or elected to full-time public political office. They are without pay but employees returning to Ford are given equivalent jobs or better and are protected in their insurance and benefit plans while on leave.

One of the reasons for the success of the Ford public affairs program is that it is administered by professionals. The civic and government affairs office, which also has the responsibility for the company's government relations work, has a staff of more than 50 people, better than half of them on the professional level. They work out of eight regional offices. The managers of these offices include a former two-term member of the Iowa State Legislature; a former political science professor who was administrative assistant to former Gov. William O'Neil, of Ohio; a former administrative assistant to Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas; a former administrative assistant to Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, of Florida; a former four-term Member of Congress from California; a former chairman of the Democratic State advisory committee in New Jersey; a one-time administrative assistant to former Congressman Edward May, of Connecticut; and the secretary of the Governor's State Finance Advisory Commission of Texas.

What have been the results in numbers of Ford employees elected to office? As a matter of policy the company does not keep track of employees who hold public office or the level of their offices. But in 1964 in Michigan alone, a Ford employee ran for the U.S. Senate (he was defeated in the primary); another for the U.S. House of Representatives (he was defeated in the 16th Congressional District). The present Michigan State Legislature has three Ford employees. In one State legislative district two Ford employees, a Republican and a Democrat, ran against each other. And Ford employees ran for many local offices from mayor and councilman through almost the entire list.

Ford Motor Co. is not softheaded in its public affairs program. It knows that what is good for the country is good for Ford.

To Amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as Amended

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2998) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at this recent development, by which there has been proposed a 3-year extension for this Agency. I am also surprised that the Chairman has been willing to state that there is merit to a 3-year extension, instead of a 4-year extension which the committee itself recommended. In my own opinion, we should reduce it further. It should be a 2-year extension. What has taken place here strengthens my conviction that a case has not been made for an extension beyond 2 years.

The gentleman from Ohio, in urging support of the substitute, suggests that the next Congress will determine whether or not the Agency should have a renewal on its lease of life. But surely, in the case of an agency like this, it is obvious that there is need for such review within a 2-year period. The discussion between the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Ohio indicates quite clearly that no committee is likely to get an agency to testify every week or every 6 months. Unless there is some particular reason for the authorizing committee to have executive branch witnesses come, that probably will not be done.

I would reiterate the advisability—and surely there must be some validity

to the argument of those of us who are recommending this—of a 2-year extension for this Agency. I do not say that as a foe of the Agency but, as the gentleman from California has said, as a friend of the Agency. They are dealing with controversial matters, and it may well be if they do not have some kind of watch dog committee, such as our committee, they would be more vulnerable. I would urge defeat of the substitute and the acceptance of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think the sole purpose in accepting the 3-year compromise is a recognition that there is an honest difference of opinion between the parties on this particular issue, whether it should be 2 years, as the Republicans feel it should be, or whether it should be 4 years, as the majority of the Democrats feel. I think that is recognition of this honest difference of opinion, and that is the reason the chairman has accepted a compromise. This is in the historic tradition of legislative compromise.

This is a bipartisan Agency, and this is a bipartisan operation in which there are no politics. There is no attempt to jam anything down anybody's throat, nor should there be by acceptance of the reverse procedure. This is a legislative compromise, and it is an honorable compromise. The 3 years was accepted by the chairman, and I think that is the sole purpose even though some of us feel that it should be 4 years.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am glad the gentleman takes that position, and that the majority now recognizes there is some substance to an authorization of less than 4 years. We are still faced with what the other body may or may not do. I would think the compromise could have been made in committee where it might have received support. But, regardless of that, I do not think that the suggestion for having a 2-year authorization is an unreasonable one. I feel very strongly we should not extend this program for any longer period.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know whether the State Department has provided a position paper in the last 15 or 20 minutes on this compromise?

Mr. HAYS. The State Department supplied nothing to the committee. I am the author of the amendment. There is nothing dishonorable about a compromise. Some of the greatest issues in this Republic have been settled by compromise. I think the chairman is right in accepting it. Our friends on the other side argue for an extension of less than 4 years. I do not think anyone would lose any honor by accepting the 3-year extension. We do have the assurance that they will be back in the next Congress, which is all the amendment provides, and there will be a review by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

St. Joseph Valley Chapter, Indiana Society of Professional Engineers, Inc., Supports President Johnson's Call for Observance of National Engineers' Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, last month President Johnson issued a statement in connection with the observance of National Engineers' Week. The President urged members of the engineering profession to encourage more young Americans to consider careers in engineering and he specifically called on engineering societies to contribute to this effort.

I am pleased to say that the St. Joseph Valley chapter of the Indiana Society of Professional Engineers, Inc., has taken to heart the President's call. Mr. Russell C. Eck, president of the St. Joseph Valley chapter of the ISPE, and Prof. Walter L. Shilts, chairman of the awards and vocational guidance committee of this chapter, have recently written to tell me what their organization is doing to support the President's recommendations.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of President Johnson's statement of January 15, 1965, on this matter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 15, 1965.

The position of the United States as the foremost industrial power rests, in considerable measure, on technological leadership. Our engineering prowess is second to none—and we must keep it that way.

In the past, the American engineer has contributed much to the preservation of national well-being and security. New horizons beckon to us beneath the sea, in space, and in the interior of the earth. The greatest of the challenges presented will be related to improving the life of man. Better housing, modernization of transportation, freedom from the hazards of air and water pollution, greater control over the destructive forces of nature, and the establishment of a new and attractive urban environment must all be realized as we advance toward the Great Society.

During National Engineers' Week, I ask the members of this profession to assist in meeting these challenges by dedicating themselves to an even more active interest in our young people who will bear the engineering responsibilities of the future. Many high school students and particularly the children of disadvantaged families are unaware of engineering career opportunities and often fail to obtain a sound preparation for college study. The engineering societies and their membership can help to remedy this situation by providing guidance and disseminating information to students, parents, and school counselors. By thus nurturing technical talent in America's youth, you will be contributing significantly to the building of a better society.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the text of a letter from Professor Shilts, outlining certain activities of the St. Joseph Valley chapter of the ISPE in observing National Engineers' Week:

INDIANA SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS, INC.
South Bend, Ind., February 17, 1965.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: President Johnson's "Engineer's Week" letter stresses the role of the engineer in our modern society and properly emphasizes the need for engineers to take a more active interest in acquainting young people with the career opportunities in engineering. We of the St. Joseph Valley chapter of the Indiana Society of Professional Engineers are using several approaches to the dissemination of information, advice and encouragement to young people.

The chairman of our guidance and scholarship committee contacts all the high schools in our area each year and offers to provide engineers for "career days" and for group or individual counseling of students. At the same time he announces the competition for the Armco, Monsanto, and Gerber scholarships in engineering and furnishes application forms for interested students to use. The committee then interviews the applicants and chooses a local best candidate for each scholarship who then compete on a State and National level to be the actual recipients of the 4-year scholarships.

At our "Engineer's Week" dinner on February 25, members are asked to bring a deserving high school student as a guest to mingle with the engineers and their wives.

Our members are encouraged to and do participate as judges in the local science fairs to help promote good science programs in our elementary and secondary schools.

Respectfully submitted.

Prof. WALTER L. SHILTS, P.E.,
Chairman, Awards and Vocational Guidance Committee.

Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 19, 1965

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, there was hardly a community in the Nation in which the people and the press did not mourn the passing last month of Sir Winston Churchill, a man who, had the respective nationalities of his mother and father "been the other way around," might well have won election to this legislative body. It is fitting that members of the free press with whose British counterpart Sir Winston was associated in his memorable days as a war correspondent would carry mention of this man in their editorial columns.

The leading daily of Wyoming's capital city, the Cheyenne Wyoming State Tribune, of Cheyenne, has carried two such editorials. The first, under date of February 1, paid tribute to Sir Winston as well as questioning the composition of the delegation which represented official Washington at the funeral. A later editorial, February 3, concerned a summary of Sir Winston Churchill's capacities as a leader written by Denis

Brogran, a professor of political science at Cambridge University.

The Thermopolis Independent Record, in a February 11 editorial, affirmed that Churchill's "place in history is a towering one and will always remain so"—an observation with which few could disagree.

Mr. President, I feel these three editorials should be made a part of this body's permanent record on the illustrious living legend whose biography is virtually the history of man's last century. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, Feb. 1, 1965]

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

It seems deeply unfortunate that the United States of America which had made Sir Winston Churchill one of its own and to whom it had accorded so many honors as well as the love and admiration of its millions of people, was not appropriately officially represented at the final tribute paid him in London Saturday.

It is excusable that the President of the United States, who had evinced a sincere desire to do so, could not personally attend. But in his stead it would appear to us there could have been no more proper officially designated representative of the people of this country than Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

It is not enough to say that General Eisenhower has twice served this country as its President; more fitting to the occasion is the fact that he too is an old warrior and one of our very great living heroes of the holocaust that molded Churchill forever in the hearts not only of Britain and the English-speaking world but the champion of freedom everywhere.

The people of America deserved to have General Eisenhower as a comrade-in-arms and one of the few survivors of the topmost echelons of command of World War II, named to represent them in the absence of this country's Chief of State.

But unofficially, General Eisenhower did go, at the personal invitation of Lady Churchill; and in their hearts we are sure that he really represented the people of this country.

His moving discourse on his old friend and associate delivered over the British Broadcasting Co.'s television network Saturday as Sir Winston's cortege moved along the Thames, stirred the emotions of people everywhere.

Said the general: "Upon the mighty Thames, great avenue of history, move at this moment to their final resting place the mortal remains of Sir Winston Churchill.

"He was a great maker of history, but his work is done and the record closed."

General Eisenhower then recited Tennyson's "Crossing the Bar," and thereafter proceeded to speak at length on the great figure being mourned.

"I would, like all other freemen, to pay a personal tribute to the giant who now passes from among us," said General Eisenhower. "I have no charter to speak for my countrymen, only for myself. But if in memory we journey back to the time when Britain and America stood shoulder to shoulder in global conflict against tyranny, then I act as spokesman for the millions of Americans who served with me and their British comrades, in 3 years of war in this sector.

"To those men Winston Churchill was Britain. He was the embodiment of British defiance to threat, courage in adversity, calmness in her danger, moderation in her success."

General Eisenhower reviewed the war years and he spoke briefly and modestly of his own association with the Prime Minister and their precious friendship.

Then he concluded:

"At this moment, as our hearts stand to attention, we say an affectionate though sad goodbye to the leader to whom the entire body of freemen owes so much.

"In the coming years, countless words will strive to interpret the motives and describe exactly the virtue of Sir Winston Churchill—leader, statesman, citizen, that two great countries were proud to claim as their own.

"Of the many things so written and spoken there will ring out through all centuries one incontestable refrain: 'Here was a champion of freedom.'

"May God grant that we and the generations who will remember him heed the lessons he taught us in his deed, in his words, in his life.

"May we carry on his work until no nation lies in captivity, no man is denied opportunity for fulfillment.

"And now to you Sir Winston, by old friend, farewell."

A most moving and eloquent final testimonial; and although General Eisenhower had no formal charter, as he called it, from his Government to represent us at Sir Winston's funeral, the people of America can feel grateful and proud that their sentiments were so well and capably conveyed—and by one who himself is enshrined in their hearts.

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, Feb. 3, 1965]

LESSON IN LEADERSHIP

Denis Brogan, a professor of political science at Cambridge University, has written a brief summary of Sir Winston Churchill's capabilities as a leader. It is deserving of some study not only in connection with Churchill's life but with the leadership role throughout government and private industry.

Standing in direct contrast to the "Naw-zi" he hated so thoroughly as well as Mussolini (that "guttah-snipe" as Sir Winston called him), Churchill accepted leadership with the limitations peculiar to free institutions.

"Never for a moment," writes Mr. Brogan, "did he forget that he had his mandate from the House of Commons—and so from the people to whom he was responsible not only for the achievement of victory, but for the preservation of the old liberties of the land."

First, he was a loyal, devoted and obedient member of the House of Commons; and thus, writes Mr. Brogan, it was the leadership of a man who also was proud to be a servant; and to submit to often ignorant criticism and to the answering of silly questions.

This was in stark contrast to the dictators—this controlled, almost humble leadership if one may call Sir Winston humble.

Another characteristic was candor; no reluctance to have people see things as they really were. And with this, he also called on courage in such a fashion, says Mr. Brogan, that "even quite timid persons found their hearts filled with new energy as they listened to that indomitable voice."

Again, he points out, this was no command from above but a summoning of common courage and common resolve.

"In inspiring this courage, this common confidence, Sir Winston called on all hs great resources as an orator," writes Mr. Brogan. "Never has a democratic leader spoken with equal force to so many millions, including the many millions of the subdued nations of Europe and the many millions across the Atlantic who found in these brilliant phrases something much more important than phrases, the promise and proof of victory."

But he provided not only great oratory but also action because he gave great inspiration by his tireless energy. "In a war of unprecedented magnitude and novelty, he gave the impression of one ready to try everything, bound by no precedent, daunted by no novelty." That mistakes would be made was to be admitted; that disasters would occur was not to be concealed. But the people knew they would not lose, with Sir Winston, through any blind clinging to routine—to repeating the same old mistakes.

And in the darkest hours he always found humor and expression of his natural wit.

The leadership was personal, not merely official, but it was the leadership of a disciplined personality, of a great public servant, writes Mr. Brogan. The contrast between Churchill the leader and the dictator-leaders thus is sharp; for the former, "It took a very uncommon man to represent those suffering millions and win their deep and affectionate confidence."

[From the Thermopolis Independent Record, Feb. 11, 1965]

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

"And tell sad stories of the death of kings."

So the fine old line marches down the paths of time. And it comes, at last, to Sir Winston Churchill who wore no crown but lives, in eternity, with all the kings and captains who created, saved, and defended worlds faced with destruction, and with that destruction all that they meant and stood for.

He was many men, was Winston Churchill. He could be arrogant, opinionated, difficult. And he could be gentle, generous, humorous and responsive. But he was one thing always—the defender of human freedom who would never, desperate as the situation of the moment might be, consider the thought of capitulation or compromise. The cause must be fought through to its finish, whatever the price and the ultimate payment. And his words were weapons.

He was certainly one of the greatest Englishmen of all time. His place in history is a towering one and will always remain so. And the character of Churchill was perhaps best expressed when he said in Commons, after a disastrous British defeat: "* * * we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender, and even if, which I do not for a moment believe, this island or a large part of it were subjugated and starving, then our empire beyond the seas, armed and guarded by the British fleet, would carry on the struggle, until, in God's good time, the New World, with all its power and might, steps forth to the rescue and the liberation of the old."

The world is vastly richer because he lived in it; the world is the poorer because he is gone.

The Long Shadow Cast by Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the monument to Senator Estes Kefauver, the late Senator from Tennessee, will be one of service to the people and serving the public interest, as against monopoly and monopoly power.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by the eminent columnist, Marquis Childs, which appeared in the Washington Post

on February 19, concerning the book written by the late Senator Kefauver—"In a Few Hands: Monopoly Power in America"—be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE LONG SHADOW CAST BY KEFAUVER

(By Marquis Childs)

The long shadow of a tall, gangling Tennessean still falls across this Capital. Estes Kefauver is not missed by the comfortable Senate hierarchy whom he often irritated, but he is missed by a great many Americans who feel a Senator's duty is larger than getting dams or defense plants for his State.

His career as a patient prosecutor searching through the maze of monopoly power in America's economy is recalled by publication of a book he nearly completed before his death a year and a half ago. "In a Few Hands: Monopoly Power in America" reveals the two conspicuous qualities that made him unique in recent Senate history.

He had a dogged, persistent way of digging into a tangle of figures and facts to show how control over large segments of American business was held by a few men at the top of the corporate structure. The Senator was the enemy of "administered prices" by which he meant a pricing system in vital fields—bread, drugs, automobiles, steel—that no longer responded to competition. It was free enterprise, he contended, with much of the freedom and not a little of the enterprise removed.

As chairman of the Senate's Monopoly Subcommittee he questioned witnesses with a voice never raised above a level which at times was almost inaudible. Step by step the reluctant witness would be led down the path to the point at which certain conclusions were inescapable.

The other outstanding quality was his complete indifference to whether he was liked or disliked. Walking onto the Senate floor he could know that the establishment would pay a lot to retire him to Tennessee. Corporation executives would cheerfully have boiled him in oil. But he seldom gave the slightest sign that he cared about anything but the job in hand. This dedication helped to draw around him a devoted staff.

He could be made into a figure of fun—the shambling figure in the coonskin cap with the limp handshake—as his critics liked to do. Here, too, he seemed unconcerned as he went about wooing voters in a half dozen national campaigns with the dogged persistence of his Senate investigations.

While it was only a coincidence that his longtime friend and colleague, Senator ALBERT GORE, should have come out at this time demanding an investigation into one of the most remarkable tax cases ever to be decided by an Internal Revenue Service ruling, this is in what might be called the Tennessee tradition. Reversing a former ruling, the IRS in the Du Pont-General Motors case took action that GORE says will mean a tax savings going largely to the Du Pont family of up to $100 million. Although the reversal reached some time in December is entirely legal, GORE argued that the Senate Finance Committee should investigate whether the public interest had been served.

In the Tennessee tradition is an element of southern populism—justice for the individual and for the region, a deep-seated suspicion of the money powers and their machinations. Part of it is a strong sense of the peoples' right to know as shown in GORE's determination to bring all the facts in the Du Pont case to light.

Washington is strewn with monuments, many of them political monuments in atrocious taste and set down with little regard to appropriateness. It is highly unlikely in any foreseeable future that Kefauver will be memorialized in bronze or stone. But he has what is a more enduring monument in the Kefauver-Harris Act, which sought to apply stringent controls over drugs offered for sale in the mass market with its huge profits. The drama of the thalidomide scandal helped to bring about passage of these long-needed reforms.

The Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly is headed today by Senator PHILIP A. HART. The opportunity is wide open to carry on where Kefauver left off, and HART has a lot of the Tenneseean's zeal and dedication. But the makeup of the committee is far more conservative today. The powers that be in the Senate have seen to that.

Toward the end of his life certain lawyer-lobbyists closed in on Kefauver and checkmated his investigation into prices established by American drug firms in South America. His pessimism about the drifts toward monopoly is reflected in this posthumous book. Yet he ends with the conclusion that monopoly power will not for long be tolerated in a society in which the traditions of a free, democratic society are so deep rooted. This was the conviction of a public servant who went on to the end asking the hard, searching questions.

The Nonpartisan League Lives On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 19, 1965

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, 50 years ago, a political prairie fire was ignited; and it swept a new breed of agrarian politicians into public office in North Dakota. These men were members of the Nonpartisan League. This movement played a dominant role in the political life of the State for the next half century. It merged with the Democrats in 1956, to become the Democratic-N.P.L. Party; but its progressive spirit still persists. Many of us remember with nostalgia that colorful period in our history.

In the North Dakota Legislature, on February 5, Representative Reuel Harrison moved, under the eighth order of business, that the remarks of Representative James Jungroth be printed in the State's House Journal. This contained an article in the Minot Daily News, written by Dick Dobson, and giving the history of the Nonpartisan League. I ask unanimous consent that this portion of the House Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of the House, 39th Legislative Assembly, Feb. 5, 1965]

THIRTY-FIRST DAY AFTER RECESS AND THIRTY-SECOND DAY

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Representative Harrison moved that the remarks of Representative Jungroth be printed in the House Journal, which motion prevailed.

Representative JUNGROTH. Fifty years ago this month, a political movement which grew into national proportions was born in the State of North Dakota.

The political history of the United States will record a deserving place for the part played by people of North Dakota in the founding of the Nonpartisan League back in the year 1915. North Dakotans can be proud of the fact that from the Nonpartisan League of 1915 and 1916 there sprang two great political parties of the Midwest—the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota and the Progressive Party in Wisconsin.

As the 50th anniversary of the birth of the NPL is taking place this year, it is fitting that the origin of the league was brought to public attention in a recent Minot Daily News article. Writing in the February 1 Daily News, Columnist Dick Dobson had this to say on the founding of the Nonpartisan League:

"LEAGUE LAUNCHED HALF CENTURY AGO

"(By Dick Dobson)

"Fifty years ago this month, the Nonpartisan League, last of the historic and colorful agrarian protest movements, was born in North Dakota.

"The NPL arose from the same discontent that produced the old Grange, the Greenback Party, the Farmers Alliance, the Populist Party, and the other political action organizations which swept the Midwest in the late 19th century.

"Always a fertile ground for agricultural agitation, North Dakota first rebelled in 1892 by going for the Populist presidential candidate, Gen. James B. Weaver.

"As the old movements rose and fell, the embers of agrarian progressivism continued glowing in North Dakota until they burst into a full-scale political prairie fire in 1915.

"Those flames, which spread into 13 States before they were extinguished, sprang up when North Dakota's 1915 Legislature declined to approve construction of a State-owned terminal elevator.

"They were fanned by a State representative named Treadwell Twichell, who purportedly told a large delegation of farmers lobbying for the bill to 'go home and slop the hogs.'

"Whether by design or chance, Arthur C. Townley, a onetime Socialist organizer and a bankrupt flax farmer, chose this propitious moment to launch the Nonpartisan League.

"Townley had mulled over the idea of nonpartisan political action through control of the primary elections for some time, but it apparently was an associate of his, A. E. Bowen, who first advocated the plan.

"Townley, then residing in Minot, drove the short distance to Deering in late February 1915 to sell Fred B. Wood, a prominent leader in the Equity Co-operative Exchange, on the idea.

"In his book on the NPL, Robert L. Morlan said Townley got 'a not too enthusiastic greeting' upon arrival at the Wood farm. He continued:

" 'Mr. Wood and his two grown sons, Howard and Edwin, had heard many schemes of how to save the farmer, but their interest mounted as they listened to this intense young man who eagerly explained his plans until far into the night.

" 'F. B. Wood thought the whole proposition fantastic and unworkable, but Townley kept after him for 3 or 4 days, when at last youth, if not age, was won over.

" 'Late one evening, Howard Wood and Townley scribbled a brief platform on a scrap of paper by the light of a kerosene lamp in the kitchen of the Wood farm, and early the next morning they started out in a bobsled to talk to neighbors, Howard handling the introductions and Townley giving the sales talk.'

"The story of the NPL in its heyday from 1916, when it won control of State government, until 1921, when the Governor and other key officeholders were recalled, is well known.

"One monographer credited it with bringing a 'new deal' to North Dakota when Franklin D. Roosevelt was only an obscure official in the U.S. Navy Department.

"At its peak, the NPL had 200,000 dues-paying members. It evolved into the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota and joined with the Progressive Party in Wisconsin.

"After crumbling as a national organization, the NPL still continued with occasional success in North Dakota. For 25 years, it was a personal vehicle of the late William Langer.

"In 1956, the league broke its nominal Republican moorings and merged with the Democratic Party, a union which has produced new election triumphs.

"Although the NPL is little more than a paper organization today, having been fully absorbed into Democratic machinery, it will live on, in name if not in fact.

"The Nonpartisan League after 50 years is as native to the North Dakota political landscape as smoke-filled rooms and bombastic campaign oratory."

Basic Necessity

SPEECH

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one little-noticed deficiency in our national educational system is the lack of attention given to instruction in the use of libraries.

A recent study of prospective teachers showed that 60 percent could not use the cards in a card catalog properly and that 35 percent could not interpret a cross reference in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature.

These are shocking figures and the Lowell, Mass., Sun has dramatized them in a recent editorial calling for a required freshman college course in library fundamentals.

I want to call this editorial of February 15 to the attention of my colleagues by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks.

The editorial follows:

BASIC NECESSITY

To build anything, you need tools. If what is under construction is something called the Great Society, surely one of the basic tools is a sound educational system. And within that system, a basic accessory tool is surely the library.

But according to Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, more than half the Nation's public schools lack this requirement for forming educated, creative citizens.

To be exact, 53 percent of all public schools (70 percent of elementary schools) don't have libraries. In many cases, where libraries exist, they are inadequate.

The administration has slated $100 million to attack this situation as part of its proposed $1.5 billion Federal aid to education program.

Even if libraries were provided for these deficient schools, there is disturbing evidence that a sizable proportion of the teachers charged with instructing children in the use of them wouldn't know how to go about it.

Testing 4,170 prospective school teachers in 69 colleges in 38 States, Ralph Perkins, director of library education at the University of North Dakota, found that 35 percent of them were unable to interpret a cross reference in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature; 60 percent could not use the cards in a card catalog, and 90 percent did not know the meaning of a New York Times index citation.

Many of these prospective teachers didn't know the difference between a biography and a bibliography.

The reason, says Perkins, is simply that nobody ever taught them. In many colleges, a group tour of the library during orientation week is the only instruction students ever get.

The remedy is equally simple: A required freshman course in library fundamentals, conducted by a trained librarian.

The need would seem to be on a par at least with football stadiums and student recreation centers, if not dormitories, laboratories, and government research grants.

The Vanishing Seal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 19, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the February 1, 1965, issue of Barron's, a national business and financial weekly, I noticed a very interesting and revealing article. This article, entitled "The Vanishing Seal," is concerned with the Government contract to process the furs of the national supply of sealskin. The Fouke Fur Co., formerly located in St. Louis, Mo., and now of Greenville, S.C., has continually exhibited ability to process these sealskins to the complete satisfaction of the Government and the users of the final product. Nevertheless, the company is now experiencing difficulty in its contractual negotiations; and this article clearly outlines the problems involved. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VANISHING SEAL: IT HAS BECOME A SYMBOL OF UNION ARROGANCE

On George Orwell's memorable animal farm, the beasts at first were all equal, but in the end some proved more equal than others. By the same token, the Great Society holds out the promise of something for everyone; nonetheless, organized labor plainly intends to hog the lion's share. Merely by flexing its muscles, the AFL–CIO compelled a reluctant Department of Labor to decree that the untrained rank and file of the Youth Corps shall command no less than the Federal minimum wage; in a humiliating eyeball-to-eyeball showdown with George Meany's friend at court, Secretary Wirtz was the one who blinked. Railroad Brotherhoods flagged alarming headlines the other day by demanding that their industry be nationalized. Finally, with the solid support of the White House, union chieftains aggressively are pushing for Federal legislation banning State right-to-work laws.

These are all matters of great moment. However, perhaps the most striking demonstration of union militancy these days has erupted in a tiny and otherwise little-noticed corner of the U.S. economic scene, the fur business. The Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL–CIO), to which the skilled hands who produce fur coats somehow belong, are recklessly throwing their weight around in Washington. Specifically, by threatening to boycott one particular bidder, they are seeking to influence the award of a Federal contract to process the national supply of sealskin.

What the controversy involves in dollars and cents is relatively petty: 60,000 pelts, 10,000 coats, and perhaps $25 million per year. Pocketbook considerations aside, however, the whole affair also raises grave issues of public policy. Lacking even a cloak of legality, the furriers' union openly has moved to intimidate both the industry and the Government. Far from seeking to restrain or rebuff this naked attempt at coercion, the powers-that-be in organized labor, as well as some high-ranking Federal officials, in effect have encouraged it. Who processes the Nation's furs means very little in the scheme of things. Who makes—or breaks—its laws matters a great deal.

Law, domestic, and global alike, has played a major role in sealskins for nearly a century. To avert the threatened extinction of the fur-bearing seal, which mainly inhabits the northern Pacific, the United States, and three other maritime powers (Canada, Japan, and Russia) for nearly a century have regulated by treaty the size of the kill. Each year the Bureau of Fisheries gathers the U.S. share of the catch; for decades it then turned over the skins to the Fouke Fur Co. for processing, dyeing, and sale to the trade. This smooth working arrangement ended abruptly in 1961, when the Department of the Interior cancelled Fouke's contract. After weighing various bids, Interior proceeded to sign up with another processor known as Supara, an award which the General Accounting Office, in the fall of 1963, set aside as illegal. Since then the Department has held a fresh round of competitive bidding; after several postponements, it is scheduled to announce the results this month.

Further delay, however, would surprise nobody acquainted with the dubious history of the affair (Barron's, Oct. 21, 1963). As we observed at the time, the report of the General Accounting Office constitutes one of the most scathing indictments of bureaucracy on record. In awarding the sealskin contract to Supara, charged the GAO, Interior showed a cavalier indifference toward Fouke's patent rights, as well as toward its own potential liability in case of their infringement. Contrary to the Department's findings, the samples submitted by Fouke generally excelled in quality those of its rivals. GAO rejected the official explanation as to why the contract was cancelled, i.e., that Fouke lacked "corporate responsibility." Instead, it caustically noted that the successful bid was submitted by a company which claimed no previous experience in processing seal, lacked adequate facilities, and acquired a legal identity only after it won the award. In sum, concluded the General Accounting Office, Interior's conduct was "either improper or highly questionable." Hence, it declared the contract with Supara null and void.

While remarkably candid in most respects, the GAO failed to account for Interior's gross dereliction of duty. However, its report furnishes a few clues. Official dissatisfaction with Fouke after some 40 cordial years evidently sprang from the labor troubles which erupted when the company, for sound business reasons, decided to relocate from St. Louis to Greenville, S.C. For years prior to its decision, Fouke's product mix had shifted; for reasons known only to nature, the annual seal catch had begun to yield more female skins, treatment of which required special shearing machinery (of original design) and a new plant layout. While the move undoubtedly made economic sense, it proved a political blunder. For it aroused the ire of the Meat Cutters & Butchers, who,

labeling (or libeling) Fouke a runaway, took their grievance to the National Labor Relations Board.

Upon the company's offer of $90,000 in severance pay, the union dropped its complaint. However, as subsequent events have made painfully clear, it never stopped nursing its grudge. After GAO's devastating critique—to which, by the way, Interior pleaded no contest—Fouke by rights should have won the contract. Instead, the Department decided to solicit new bids, a time-consuming operation which has depleted inventories of processed skins and disrupted the channels of trade. It also has given the Meat Cutters fresh opportunity, which they are seeking to exploit to the hilt, to press their reprisals. Last Monday the authoritative Women's Wear Daily reported that "strong labor pressure" is holding up the government's award; the same source indicated that the fur union has "found a champion in George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO."

On Tuesday the union obligingly confirmed the paper's scoop. In language which Commodore Vanderbilt ("the public be damned") might have been proud of, Abe Feinglass, vice president of Amalgamated and director of its fur and leather division, issued the following statement: "Anyone who thinks they're going to shove a run-away shop down the throats of the fur workers of New York is crazy * * *." His words, said Women's Wear Daily, made it unmistakably clear "that local union workers would not handle skins processed by Fouke if that firm were to get back the Government contract.

To Seventh Avenue, which in its own interests had championed Fouke's cause, the pronouncement brought a sudden chill. Its ugly significance, however, ripples far beyond the garment center. In a formal dispute between Fouke and the fur workers' union, the statement would threaten an illegal secondary boycott. In the current state of affairs, which smacks of a vendetta, it sounds alarmingly like an appeal to breach of contract and to conspiracy in restraint of trade. Legal niceties aside, what we are witnessing is an exercise in long-range arm twisting. Fifteen months ago Barron's concluded: "The Truman administration was plagued by mink coats; Eisenhower's fell afoul of vicuna. Viewed in terms of public rather than private morality, seal now shapes up in equally scandalous fashion." So far we haven't been proved wrong.

A British Citizen Joins in the Campaign To Prevent Sonic Booms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received, much to my pleasure, an unsolicited letter from a British citizen who wishes to join me in my efforts to do something about sonic booms before they get completely out of hand in this country and throughout the world.

Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 658 which would prohibit supersonic flights over the continental United States by commercial aircraft that generate sonic booms of an intensity in excess of 1.5 pounds overpressure per square foot at ground level.

This legislation has been very carefully thought out. All of the available information clearly indicates that people and communities can tolerate sonic booms up to 1.5 pounds overpressure. But sonic booms in excess of this limitation are capable of creating serious property damage and adversely affecting the health of human beings and animals.

The people of Chicago are now experiencing sonic booms being generated by U.S. military aircraft during a series of practice missions over my city at supersonic speeds. There has already been considerable damage reported by residents of our community. But the experience we are now having in Chicago is merely a very small prelude to what it will be like in our country and in many other parts of the world within the next decade when commercial supersonic transports start crisscrossing our continent and other continents of the world.

My legislation does not interfere with progress. It merely provides that those who are pushing us into the supersonic travel age must take adequate steps in designing their supersonic transports that the aircraft will not generate sonic booms in excess of the known tolerable limitations.

This can be done if we compel the aircraft industry to recognize this problem now, while their proposed aircraft are still on the drawing boards and something can be done to reduce sonic booms. It will be too late to complain about sonic booms after the industry and our Government have spent billions of dollars on supersonic aircraft with no regard to the intensity of sonic booms which such aircraft will generate.

Mr. A. R. Lacey, of London, England, recently read about my proposed legislation and was kind enough to send me the following letter. This letter clearly indicates that the problem which I have tried to deal with in my legislation is of an international scope. I am certain that if the U.S. Congress would lead the way in serving notice on the designers of supersonic aircraft, that they will be compelled to operate within certain tolerable limits, parliaments throughout the world would quickly adopt comparable legislation.

It is for this reason that I am greatful to Mr. Lacey for sending me the following letter. I hope that my colleagues will carefully consider the dialog from Mr. Lacey on this vital issue:

DEAR MR. PUCINSKI: A few days ago it was briefly reported in the Birmingham Post that you are introducing a bill into Congress to ban sonic booms over a certain intensity in the United States. I am writing to wish you every encouragement in this. On the face of it your bill is a purely internal affair, but if it is successful it will almost certainly have repercussions outside the United States, and may bring to their senses the British and French Governments who are pursuing, in the Concorde, an economically absurd and socially futile and distressing project which presumably few people want outside technological and government circles and a few prestigemongers.

No doubt I do not need to rehearse the miseries that the sonic boom will inflict on everyone in its path. I will merely say that in this country, despite one or two isolated discussions on the BBC and in the Observer newspaper, and a few questions in Parliament last summer, the fate overhanging our peace of mind if SST becomes common does not seem to have caught hold of public attention yet, and the recent discussions about the Concorde, now apparently rescued, barely mentioned it. It seems fairly clear that the manufacturers will be interested solely in the amount of financial compensation they will have to pay for actual physical damage, and that the intangible amenity and psychological effects will be dismissed as mere luxury considerations.

It is manifestly far easier to prevent these things from starting than to stop them once they have started, and so I hope your bill will have every success, and will be imitated by other nations.

With best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

A. R. LACEY.

"The Citizen Soldier"—Article by Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 19, 1965

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Reserve Officers Association of the United States is once again sponsoring its traditional National Defense Week, which exalts the citizen-soldier concept of national defense, and also serves to salute the National Defense Act of 1920, the foundation of the modern American Military Establishment.

The observance of National Defense Week starts on the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, and concludes on the birthday of George Washington, both citizen-soldiers themselves.

Many of the ROA's nearly 1,000 chapters across the Nation join local military organizations and asssociations and civic groups to create a broader understanding by all citizens of the need for such defense forces so as to assure the survival of our Nation and the preservation of our liberties.

This year, National Defense Week has taken on added significance, due to the Pentagon proposal that would destroy the units of the U.S. Army Reserves, and would turn that component into a pool. As Senators well know, this will be the subject of extensive hearings in committees of both Houses.

Therefore, Mr. President, at a time when these hearings are pending and when National Defense Week is being observed, it is particularly appropriate that I call the attention of Senators to a masterly article written years ago by the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. It was published in the American Legion magazine in January 1952; and the beliefs of this great military leader are every bit as valid today as they were 13 years ago.

I am sure all Senators will agree to the timeliness of General MacArthur's observations.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Legion magazine, January 1952]

THE CITIZEN SOLDIER

(By General of the Army Douglas MacArthur)

One of the greatest contributions the American Legion has made to the Nation has been in the strengthening of the potentialities of the citizen soldier. Since the Minute Men of 1776 formed the ranks of the Continental Army and brought victory to its arms in the American Revolution, the security of the United States has rested more than all else upon the competence, the indomitable will and the resolute patriotism of the citizen soldier. The professional has had his role—and it has been a major one—providing trained leadership, initial security against surprise attack and the nucleus to an expanding force under conditions of national emergency. But in all of our wars, from the Revolution to Korea, the citizen soldier has met the full shock of battle, has contributed all but a fraction of the dead and maimed and has accepted the responsibility for victory.

Yet, despite all of this, he has never received either from our political or military leadership full credit for his role in safeguarding the security of the Nation, nor the support in peace which would better prepare him to carry his responsibilities in war.

The tendency has existed—as it still now exists—to regard him as an auxiliary rather than the main pillar supporting our national military strength. Only in rare instance have his views been sought or considered in the shaping of high policy governing the conduct of war or plans to secure the peace. Indeed, only in the most exceptional cases has he been called to share the authority of higher command or staff administration.

The need for a closer integration of the civilian defense components with the Regular services was clearly understood by the American Legion following the close of World War I, and its efforts largely resulted in the reexamination of the then long-existing military policy of the United States. There followed enactment of the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, providing for one Army composed of the Regulars, the National Guard and the organized Reserves. This was a long step forward, but experience demonstrates that it has not resulted in providing for the country the added security both intended and needed. Its results have been largely undecisive. We still enter wars tragically unprepared, and theretofore have found ourselves entirely lacking in that degree of military strength essential to preserve the peace. At war's end we still demobilize in haste and divest ourselves of accumulated war materiel with reckless abandon. We still lack a realistic appraisal of future potentialities, and saddle our people with wholly uncalled for burdens to cover past errors by replacing anew the power we have squandered and dissipated in the afterglow of victory. There could be no more serious indictment of our political and military leadership than this failure to profit from the clear lessons of experience. It is a failure which following World War II, still vivid in the American mind, lost us the fruits of victory and brought to us a sense of insecurity hardly surpassed in midst of war itself.

Now our military policy again requires revision. Under selective service and other statutes, we have called up large increments of our citizen soldiery with which to prosecute the Korean war and to bolster our own defense and the defense of many other lands. We have adopted the principle of universal military training, and the outlook is toward maintaining for many years—even in peace—an armed readiness for war.

All this, while intended and designed to strengthen freedom's defense, carries within itself the very germs to freedom's destruction. For it etches the pattern to a military state which, historically under the control of professional military thinking in constant search for means toward efficiency, has found in freedom possibly its greatest single impediment, to brush it aside as inimicable to established military policy. To avoid this historic pitfall, it is essential that civilian control over the citizen army be extended and intensified. Particularly is this true in the administration of the program of universal military training, if the youth of our land is to avoid being corrupted into a legion of subserviency to the so-called military mind.

This calls for a reassessment of the role of the citizen soldier now to become the major element of our military establishment during peace as well as during war. It calls for a realistic appreciation of the potential in professional competence which the citizen soldier can bring to the fulfillment of our military policy and aims. It calls for the elimination of arbitrary restrictions upon the advance of the citizen soldier in the ranks of military leadership, for which he may be trained or is already reasonably qualified. It calls for a much broadened opportunity for the professional preparation of the citizen soldier to permit his integration into the higher staff studies and planning designed to avert war if possible, to prosecute it to early victory if not.

This requires a basic change in attitudes. It requires recognition of the fact long understood but covertly denied that our Army, as befits a republic, is a citizen army. It requires that leadership from the top down be selected upon merit, carefully avoiding arbitrary class discrimination. It requires that the citizen soldier, if otherwise professionally qualified, have the opportunity to voice his views in the formulation of military and related political policy—a recognition that none have any monopoly upon the attributes to military leadership. It requires that we carefully avoid yielding to professional ambition at the expense of the primacy of the national interest.

Unless these principles are recognized and adhered to, we shall find that our citizen army lacks the esprit essential to the building of invincible force—that its officers lack the incentive to advance their professional competence—that the people lack faith in the integrity of their military arm.

This poses possibly the American Legion's greatest challenge. Its membership for the most part have been and are citzen soldiers of the Republic. They have learned, some from bitter experience, of the restrictions inherent in the long prevailing relationship between the Army's several components. They must insist upon that degree of efficiency and morale essential to maximize the strength of the new citizen army, which alone can come from close integration, with leadership and rank selected solely upon the basis of merit.

The American Legion is in best position to guide this normal development. It must alert itself against political efforts already noticeable to suppress the voice and opinion of the citizen soldier, whether active or inactive. It must insist that the role of the citizen army be to serve no special interests, but rather the common welfare and protection of all of the people.

Our country is facing one of the grave crises in American history—not so much from external threat, although the forces of evil which our own political and military blunders have helped so much to build, must by no means be ignored—but from internal pressures which threaten the very survival of our liberties. These pressures have already made sharp inroads into our free way of life and impaired much of the incentive which has encouraged development of those basic virtues and traits of character from which has emerged our traditional American initiative, American energy, and that indomitable American will which in past has preserved our moral balance and produced our material strength.

It is essential that the traditional role of the Army in these distressing times be carefully preserved—that it be not used as an instrument of tyranny or oppression, a form of pretorian guard, by those seeking to strengthen and entrench personal political power—but that it be used instead as a force of freemen dedicated to its sworn purpose of "defending the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic."

It is imperative that the citizen army now in the making be not corrupted by the same influences which have tended to corrupt the principle of representative government—that it be sustained on that high moral plane which befits the noble purpose it is organized to serve. This can only be if the service of the citizen soldier is held to a level of dignity and opportunity which commands his fullest measure of devotion.

To this purpose, the American Legion should enlist its wisdom and undeviating interest. It should utilize its full influence to the end that our military policy be so oriented as to insure a citizen army cast in the mold of our exalted traditions and dedicated to the primacy of the people's service.

The South Bend-Mishawaka Labor Picture, Continued Progress 1957–64

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month some 300 business and industry executives and labor leaders attended the second annual dinner and report meeting of the South Bend-Mishawaka, Ind., Labor-Management Commission.

They were complimented in an excellent address by Assistant Secretary of Labor Daniel P. Moynihan for their contributions to the effectiveness of a series of special programs developed to meet the problems that followed the decision of the Studebaker Corp. to quit manufacturing in South Bend. Mr. Moynihan notes that the Federal Government's role was facilitated because the programs were undertaken in a community that wanted to make them work.

The South Bend-Mishawaka Labor-Management Commission, a nonpartisan community agency, has made a valuable contribution to the furtherance of understanding in the relationship between management and organized labor. At the meeting George C. Hupp, chairman of the labor-management commission and a Federal labor conciliator, reported the results of a survey that demonstrated

the continuing improvement in the area's labor climate. The survey follows:

In September 1963, the South Bend-Mishawaka Labor-Management Commission, a nonpartisan community agency, announced results of the area's first comprehensive documentation of work stoppages—barometer to labor-management relations. The study disclosed that the area's 49 principal industries, employing the bulk of the blue-collar workers in St. Joseph County, Ind., had reduced work stoppages (authorized and unauthorized) 93.6 percent since the peak work stoppages year of the study, 1957. The study covered 6½ years.

The Commission in 1964 continued its work stoppages evaluation for the subsequent 1-year period, from July 1963, through July 1964. The same industries, with the addition of four new major plant acquisitions, were surveyed. The findings revealed that the area's work stoppages experience, which began a favorable downward trend in 1961, continued to pursue a down spiral in the 1-year period from July, 1963 through July, 1964. The 1963 work stoppages frequency was 32 percent below the 6-year low of 1962. The study showed the work stoppages frequency for the area for the first 6 months of 1964 further reduced 11.8 percent under the previous calendar year of 1963.

Similar improvement in work stoppages experience also was reflected by the six largest industrial employers of the area during the 12-month study period. The Big Six showed a combined 54.5 percent reduction in work stoppages in 1963 compared to the alltime low year of 1962. The work stoppages frequency for the first half of 1964 for the Big Six was identical to the previous 12-month period of 1963—a favorable indication in view of significant work agreement negotiations consummated and initiated in 1964.

Forty-two of the fifty-three firms surveyed in the July 1963–July 1964, documentation, including the new industries, boasted no work stoppages in that period. Thirty-six of these firms previously had recorded incident-free work schedules for 6½ years, from 1957 through the first half of 1963. The four major new industries reported incident-free labor-management relations since their arrival in the community.

A total of 149 work agreements were reached in South Bend and Mishawaka in a 1½-year period from July 1963, through the close of 1964. The AFL–CIO and building trades recorded a total of 76 of the 149 labor agreements, 66 of which were interstate in nature, and 10 intrastate. The Teamsters and independent unions registered a total of 73 work agreements in the 1½-year period, with 41 being interstate and 32 intrastate. During the same period, only three authorized strikes were charged against the labor-management record of work negotiations.

Serving with Mr. Hupp as members of the South Bend-Mishawaka Labor-Management Commission are: T. Forrest Hanna, Indiana Department of Labor; Stanley J. Ladd, St. Joseph County AFL–CIO Council; Roy B. Root, St. Joseph County Building Trades Council; John A. Toth, Torrington Co.; Norman C. Murrin, St. Joseph County Teamsters Local No. 364; Louis A. Tiedge, Bendix Corp.; Cecil H. Tanner, Dodge Manufacturing Corp.; and Eli D. Miller and Kenneth M. Burch, Chamber of Commerce of South Bend-Mishawaka, Inc.

Can the State Live on Crumbs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 19, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, and a charter member of the President's Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, my attention has been sharply focused on the compelling seriousness of the need of study and attention to the area of intergovernmental relations and our Federal system today.

Appearing in the Saturday Review for January 9, 1965, is an excellent statement of Federal-State fiscal relations by former Gov. John Anderson, of Kansas, who until recently was a member of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Many of the conclusions Governor Anderson has reached are the same as those reached by our subcommittee. Because of the pressing need for more effort in developing greater fiscal capacity and tax effort at all levels of government in our Federal system, I ask unanimous consent that Governor Anderson's article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF PROSPERITY: CAN THE STATE LIVE ON CRUMBS?—WHAT HAPPENS WHEN WASHINGTON CUTS INTO THE PIE OF LOCAL REVENUE

(By John Anderson)

The choices which Americans must make over the next 2 or 3 years concerning the critical question of Federal-State fiscal relations will greatly affect the future nature of the Federal system. The best way to begin a consideration of Federal and State fiscal relations is to sort out the salient facts about Federal, State, and local governmental revenues and expenditures. Some of these facts are startling and all of them have serious implications for the future. (By "serious" I do not necessarily mean "discouraging.") But first, some facts and figures:

1. Amazing as it may sound to some, Federal expenditure needs are leveling off while at the same time State and local expenditures are continuing to skyrocket.

2. By 1970 or thereabouts, barring drastic changes in the international situation, annual State and local expenditures will have passed total Federal expenditures, including those for defense and foreign aid. In the fiscal year 1963 Federal expenditures for civilian government totaled about $30 billion, in comparison to State and local outlays of $64 billion. I would guess that by 1971 State and local expenditures will have reached $120 billion, compared with a Federal budget of $110 to $115 billion by that time.

3. State and local government employment is rising steeply. These governments now have about 7,500,000 employees, compared with 2,500,000 Federal employees.

4. During the past decade State and local outlays grew more than 8 percent annually, or double the growth rate of the national income.

5. During the past decade State and local governments have had to increase tax rates repeatedly. At the Federal level there have been two large tax cuts, in 1954 and 1964, with talk of more good things to come.

6. State and local debt increased by 170 percent from 1952 to 1962, with over $80 billion outstanding at the end of the period.

7. The most costly functions at the State and local level have been and will continue to be those of education, roads, health, and welfare.

8. Taxes by all governments took about 25 percent of the gross national product in 1952, and the same proportion a decade later. However, the share taken by the State and local government continues to rise and the Federal share continues to decline.

9. In round figures, the State-local tax take is made up of 45 percent property taxes; 12 percent income taxes (most of which are only mildly graduated, if at all); 15 percent general sales taxes; 13 percent gasoline and motor vehicle taxes; and 15 percent miscellaneous, such as cigarette, liquor, and inheritance taxes.

10. Federal grants-in-aid continue to grow apace in both magnitude and variety. This aid tripled between the years 1952 and 1962. It now stands at $11 billion. The last Congress alone added between 10 and 30 new grant programs, depending on what one calls a separate program category.

11. The rate of tax mortality among State and local political leaders is very high. A Governor or mayor must raise taxes in order to meet his increasing responsibilities—but he is often voted out of office for doing so. Were he to choose to cut services rather than to raise taxes he would also be likely to get kicked out—so he usually tries to raise taxes at the beginning rather than the middle of his term. Also, we are told continually that any further increases in State and local taxes will drive industry out of the State or discourage new industry from coming in. In other words, political and economic pressures at the State and local levels are against tax increases.

12. We are told that Federal revenues are likely to outstrip expenditure needs over the next few years, with a budgetary surplus the likely result unless new domestic spending programs are undertaken by the Federal Government or unless the Federal debt is reduced.

These 12 basic facts generally tell where we have been, where we are now, and where we are tending in Federal-State fiscal relations. The essence of what they tell us is this:

The responsibilities for nonmilitary public services in government over the next few years are going to fall largely on State and local levels of governments. However, State and local revenue systems are much less responsive to economic growth than is the Federal revenue system. Consequently, State and local expenditure needs are going to outstrip revenues at current rates, while it appears that at the Federal level revenue at current rates is going to outstrip expenditure needs. The big question before us is: "Which of several alternate courses should be taken?"

An obvious possibility is to utilize judiciously any Federal budgetary surpluses for reductions in the debt or reductions in tax rates, according to the economic outlook at the time. It may be the result of an outdated Puritan ethic even to consider the reduction of debt. But I think we would all agree that, in years of full employment and firm or rising prices, an application of Federal surpluses to debt retirement would not be unduly deflationary.

On the other hand, to confine the use of Federal surpluses solely to Federal tax reductions or to debt retirement is objected to on

two grounds. First, it does nothing in a direct sense to ease the pinch on State and local governments. Second, if Federal tax rates are steadily reduced, and State and local taxes continue to increase, the result will be increased burdens upon property and consumption taxes, and lessened burdens on income taxes.

A second possibility is to utilize Federal surpluses for the initiation of some new and large Federal grant-in-aid programs in areas having a strong element of national interest. Some of the obvious fields would be education, highways, and mental health. It is not difficult to dredge up several other fields of State and local activity in which Federal financial assistance would be welcome.

However, this approach meets with some strong objections. In the first place, Federal aid in these new fields would inevitably be accompanied by Federal controls. Our existing Federal aid programs are accompanied by controls. New ones would be, too. In the second place, at Federal, State, and local levels we are approaching the limits of manageability in the variety and complexity of Federal grant programs. We can add new ones, but getting rid of old ones is practically impossible.

As the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has observed, "there is nothing so permanent as a temporary grant-in-aid." Many thoughtful people are coming to the conclusion that there must be simpler and better ways of making future Federal funds available to the States.

A third possibility is to initiate the concept of an unconditional Federal grant to the States—often referred to as a "block grant." The difficulty with this approach in the past has been that its advocates have coupled it with simultaneous elimination of present Federal grants. In addition to other arguments against such an approach, it is not feasible from a political standpoint. It would be hard enough to get Congress to agree with the concept of an unconditional grant; it would be impossible to get it to carry on a corollary fight with all of the interest groups that are involved in the existing program grants.

In our new situation of projected Federal surpluses, however, the possibility is advanced of initiating a block grant to the States to be used for virtually any purpose except highways and with no matching or other strings attached, leaving undisturbed the existing pattern of Federal grants in the various program areas. This approach has the advantage of administrative simplicity and a transfer of Federal funds to the States without accompanying controls. Furthermore, to the extent desired, the distribution of such a grant could be keyed to the fiscal capacity of the various States so that any desired degree of equalization between low- and high-income States could be accomplished. This general approach seems to be the one most favored by the administration.

The principal argument against this approach is the alleged lack of political feasibility. Specifically, how could one persuade Congress to turn loose billions of dollars of Federal funds each year, without any specifications as to their use by the recipient States?

Another argument is advanced against this type of approach; namely, that local governments, as well as State governments, should receive unconditional Federal grants and that the sharing of these funds between State and local governments should not be left to the discretion of the individual State. However, as a Governor, I cannot subscribe to this argument.

In the first place, the local governments are subdivisions of the State and operate under the provisions of State constitutions and statutes. Secondly, the division of responsibilities and, consequently, fiscal burdens between State and local governments, varies from State to State. Thirdly, no yardstick exists by which Federal funds could be distributed directly to localities on anything other than a per capita basis, because we have no measures by which to compare fiscal capacities of local government on a nationwide basis. Finally, the reapportionment of State legislatures on the basis of one man, one vote, may relieve some of the fears that the Federal funds would be disproportionately divided.

A fourth possibility would be to ease the State-local tax bind by means of a credit against the Federal personal income tax for State and local taxes paid. Such a credit would necessarily be less than 100 percent but would cover all State and local taxes. This would leave it up to each State and local government to determine the most equitable taxation method to be employed in meeting the massive increases in State and local expenditures, but at the same time would make it possible for a designated portion of such tax increases to be borne indirectly by the Federal Government. This would make tax raising more politically feasible at the State and local levels. It would also meet the argument of local governments that they should not have to depend on the State for a distribution of Federal aid. It is also one of the most politically feasible of all the approaches from the standpoint of the Congressman or Senator because it combines a Federal tax reduction with automatic help to State and local governments.

This approach, however, is open to the objection that it would be regressive in nature and would not benefit the people who pay State and local taxes—particularly sales taxes—but whose incomes are not sufficiently high to place them in a Federal tax bracket. This argument could be partially met by having the credit apply in a decreasing scale as one moves up in the tax brackets.

A fifth alternative would be to rebate a percentage of Federal income taxes to the State of collection. This has been proposed at various times in Congress. It would be a tax sharing rather than a tax credit arrangement. It would be simple to administer and would leave State and local governments free to chart their future policies on taxes and expenditures. However, it is objected to on the ground that existing fiscal disparities among the States could not be recognized in the rebate arrangement. New York and California, for example, being relatively high-income States with many citizens paying taxes in the higher Federal brackets, would get back a much larger per capita share than would low-income States.

I have attempted to describe briefly the present Federal-State fiscal situation, the major trends, and some alternate proposals for improving the balance in the fiscal relationships between our various levels of government. Up to this point, I have tried to be completely objective in stating the problem and in presenting the arguments for and against the various solutions that have been suggested.

At this point I would like to give you my own views on the most desirable path to be pursued.

Unlike some, I do not view the Federal tax system as ideal, either from the standpoint of equity or from the standpoint of maximum encouragement to economic growth. The corporate income tax rate is still at a high level. I am confident that further reductions in the corporate income tax would, for the most part, find their way into new investment in plant and equipment. Investment in new plant by private enterprise is an ideal stimulant to growth.

Next, I should explain the absence from the list of the five foregoing alternatives of a proposal that has been viewed fondly by many Governors over the years—that of exchanging some Federal tax sources for some existing Federal grants-in-aid. While I would like to see something of this sort accomplished, I and all of my fellow Governors know that it is neither equitable nor feasible. It was tried a few years ago during the Eisenhow administration when it was proposed that the Federal telephone tax be repealed and this tax source turned over to the States, while at the same time a group of grants-in-aid equal to the amount of Federal telephone tax be discontinued—leaving it to the States to pick up the responsibility for the functions formerly aided.

This plan collapsed when it became apparent that the transfer of the tax source would aid the wealthy States most and the poor States least, while the cessation of the grants would hurt the wealthy States least and the poor States most. Governors and Congressmen alike lost little time in turning their backs on that one.

I think that, whatever steps are taken to provide increased Federal aid to the States, the implication should not be left that the State and local governments can relax and stop trying to improve their respective revenue systems. The States are not trying to duck their responsibility; they recognize that much remains to be accomplished in strengthening the structure of State government and improving their tax systems, particularly with regard to the local property tax.

Now, let's get to the heart of the matter. Which of the five possibilities would be best for the States and best for the Nation, and what are the political feasibilities?

It is always an easy answer to say that the best government is that which is closest to the people. It is also easy to say, and it always sounds good, that Federal bureaucracy will be our downfall and that our strength lies in a strong free enterprise system.

These statements may be true, but what virtue they have lies in their generality.

It seems to me we must rely on a combination of programs in the fiscal fields—active in strengthening the State and local governments, yet utilizing, when needed, the combined strength of financial resources of the entire Nation.

If we reach the point of Federal tax surplus, we should not only consider tax reductions, but also apply some of the surplus to debt reduction.

I favor a rebate or tax-sharing program, the objections notwithstanding. It seems to me that such a tax-sharing program could be effective in strengthening the State governments and thwarting the ever-increasing trend toward centralized control. Such tax sharing should not preclude continued use of grant-in-aid programs. While I favor tax sharing over grant-in-aid programs, because of the extensive controls attached to some of the latter, I think it extremely likely that the Federal Government will favor a block grant plan so as to give States with lower gross State products relatively larger amounts of money, probably in combination with tax cuts and added grant programs.

There should be few strings attached except the requirement for a well-developed State spending plan. Performance should be measured, perhaps annually.

Every State will have to put more energy, talent, and money into planning, because the Federal money will likely go to education, environment control, perhaps urban and rural renewal. These will be fields of endeavor for both State and local governments. They will therefore require exceptional planning activities.

A Federal tax return program might be a major catalyst. Long overdue, it is needed to initiate regional thinking and action on public problems. Despite the practical difficulties in arranging useful cooperation among present groups across political boundaries, regional solutions are clearly mandatory, with the likelihood that political

obstacles will be readily overcome when sizable rebate funds are the incentive.

The Midwestern Governors' Association is currently working toward effective regional cooperation in the fields of equilization in Federal defense spending, in research and development, and in the interstate cooperation for utilization of graduate and professional school facilities in the colleges and universities by means of reciprocal contracts. Mental health programs and penal programs are also being explored for regional cooperative effects.

These trends point in one direction—the need for more management-trained and professional staff people in State and local government. Finding these people, integrating them into State governments, and paying for their services will be a major problem, and State governments must then compete with private industry, universities, Federal Government, and other institutions for the same people. The market will remain tight for another 7 to 10 years, because of the population-age distribution. States may want to consider contracting out some of their problems to skilled groups throughout the country.

Perhaps the Federal Government can be prevailed upon to distribute back to the States some of the talented people it now employs, along with money. This might have a considerable beneficial effect on the "brain drain" that is now such a major issue among many States. It could also mean that States like Kansas might celebrate the return of expatriates who have left Kansas to work in the Federal establishment because of the lack of challenging, adequately reimbursed, opportunities at home.

All these points are supported by the increasing regard and responsibility with which the voting public views government solutions to public problems. More professionals in State government should further enhance in the public mind the stature and status of government employment.

There is, of course, no easy solution, no pat formula. I hope my remarks may be interpreted as being related to a great opportunity to realize the federalist idea of solving the local problems at the local level, and utilizing the combined resources of all the people in solving the interstate problems for the common good.

Judge Clemens Named Winner of Memorial Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 9, 1965, the Bar Association of St. Louis, held a stated meeting honoring the judiciary. The events of that evening have been ably reported in the Hannibal Courier-Post. The recipient of the first Distinguished Service Award that evening was the circuit judge of the rural Missouri circuit in which it has been my privilege to practice. I submit the trustees in making the award distinguished themselves by the excellence and accuracy of their selection. Judge Clemens is a judges' judge. He is an impartial energetic judge whose court opens promptly at 9 a.m. and who brooks no delay in the orderly procedures of justice. Under this leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the Hannibal Courier-Post report of the occasion:

JUDGE CLEMENS NAMED WINNER OF MEMORIAL AWARD

James D. Clemens, judge of the 11th judicial circuit, has been awarded the first Distinguished Service Award by the trustees of the Walter E. Bennick Memorial Fund. The presentation was made Tuesday night at the second bicentennial meeting of the Bar Association of St. Louis, held at the Chase-Park Plaza Hotel, where the guest of honor was Mr. Justice Tom C. Clark of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Bennick Memorial Fund was established in memory of Judge Walter E. Bennick, who served on the St. Louis court of appeals from 1925 until his death in 1955. One of the aims of the Bennick Memorial, and the purpose of this award, is to foster diligence, honor and professional excellence in the administration of justice.

The trustees of the Bennick Memorial are Judge Norwin D. Houser of the Missouri Supreme Court, former Judge Fred J. Hoffmeister of St. Louis, and John C. Shepherd, past president of the Bar Association of St. Louis. In making the award for distinguished service the trustees selected Judge Clemens from the 37 circuit judges in the St. Louis Court of Appeals, District of Eastern Missouri.

Judge Clemens, 55 years old, lives at Bowling Green, where he practiced law for 20 years before being elected circuit judge in 1954. The 11th judicial circuit is composed of Pike, Lincoln, and St. Charles Counties.

The Agricultural Situation—Resolution of the North Dakota Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 19, 1965

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, it is apparent that farmers all over the Nation are facing serious financial difficulties. The problem seems to be the same almost everywhere—that of continual and sharp increases in the costs of operation and declining farm commodity prices.

If nothing is done to better the farm economic situation, it could have serious repercussions on the entire national economy.

Mr. President, the North Dakota Legislature, cognizant of this farm economic situation, passed Senate Resolution 2, sponsored by Senators Redlin, Becker, and Kisse, very appropriately calling this situation to the attention of the President of the United States, various Government agencies, and the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 2

Resolution urging consideration and study of the problems facing the farmers of North Dakota and the United States

Whereas agriculture is the basic industry of the State of North Dakota and recognized as the most important segment of its economy; and

Whereas the members of the Senate of the 39th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota are deeply concerned with the plight of agriculture in our State as it affects the farmers and general public, and note with alarm the increasing rate of farm mortgages and mortgage foreclosures, and regretfully admit that the various farm programs put into effect in the United States have, as yet, failed to provide a solution, or approach the farmers' hopes and dreams of farm prosperity based upon promises of parity of income; and

Whereas the seriousness of the farm situation has become so very apparent to the general public in recent months because of the unrest and violence which took place in the Midwest and which resulted from the unstable conditions of the farm economy, and which may be only a small preview of future actions if the chronic conditions of the farm economy are further ignored; and

Whereas agriculture is basic and necessary to a sound State and national economy and deserves the attention and unanimous support of the members of the Senate of the 39th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, and it is recognized that in this highly technical and mechanized age the individual farmer finds himself in a minority group by virtue of his willingness and determination to produce according to his dictates and personal initiative; and

Whereas the farmer of today is the assurance of freedom from want tomorrow: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, That our National Government be reminded of its responsibility for providing reasonable economic stability for farm products comparable to the cost the farmer must pay for goods and services he is compelled to purchase; and be it further

Resolved, That the National and State levels of government direct their attention and research facilities toward programs concerning wheat, feed grain, loan rates, the placing on the market of Government-owned wheat so as not to endanger the market price of wheat, the importation of beef, wheat, barley, and sugar, and the production of sugar so as to give the American sugar producer the opportunity to make use of his available resources and facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That any available monetary resources on the State and National levels of government be utilized to the maximum extent for agricultural research, to the end that improved crop varieties and new uses for crops will be developed and the inadequacies of the farm economy will be improved; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, Secretary of Agriculture, chairmen of the U.S. Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, the chairmen and leadership of both political parties, and each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

CHARLES TIGHE,
President of the Senate.
GERALD F. STAIR,
Secretary of the Senate.

FFA, the Organization With Personality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following speech given by Ray Turner, first-place winner in the Weiser, Idaho, Future Farmers of America chapter public speaking contest, as printed in the Weiser American on February 15, 1965:

FFA, THE ORGANIZATION WITH PERSONALITY

Fellow Future Farmers, honorable judges, ladies and gentlemen, everyone knows what personality is. Personality, as defined in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, is "distinctive qualities of an individual person." Therefore, personality is a word pertaining to humans. But there are those who will say that cattle have personalities, and any cat owner will swear that his pet is different from any other in the world, which is probably true.

But let's think of the word "personality" in terms of an organization. Can an organization or club have a personality? It certainly can. We may have to use a few different terms to describe the different types of personality of clubs, but essentially they'll be the same, because clubs are made up of people. For instance, a certain club could be called friendly or warm because it is one in which new members or invited guests feel instantly that they are a part of it. Or it could be snobbish or unfriendly simply because it is hard to join or the members do not make newcomers feel welcome.

Let's examine one organization closely and see what kind of personality it has. We'll take FFA, since that is the one most of us here are most closely connected with.

It takes good members to make a good chapter, so the characteristics of its members and the chapter itself must be the characteristics of its personality. I feel there are 11 characteristics, 1 for each letter of the word "personality" and after I have presented them to you, you should have a better understanding of what makes a good chapter work.

Publicity. This is where a chapter becomes good. Much emphasis is placed on the type and amount of publicity a chapter has in choosing the national chapter award winners. It's where a chapter can become strong through ties with local businessmen and farmers. A good FFA chapter in a community can do a world of good, but you must have publicity to let people know you are there. For example, let's say a chapter has planned a farm field day, but no one came because they failed to publicize it. A successful farm field day could have done a lot to help local farmers and strengthen the chapter. Publicity is the backbone of a successful chapter.

E is energy. This is something you must have. It takes energy to keep your organization rolling from one year to the next. It's so easy to pass the buck or just let things ride. A chapter with a president or any other officer or a majority of members without energy is in trouble. You can't pull deadweight very long in this highly competitive world and survive.

Responsibility. Were the FFA to advertise for members perhaps a catchy slogan would be "responsibility taught here." This is certainly true of the FFA, for it has a large number of offices to be filled by responsible energetic members. If there is only one thing to be said for the FFA; it is that it gives everyone a chance.

S is for, of all things, spectacle. The FFA has a lot of spectacle in it, but it serves a good purpose. It really awes you to see the FFA emblem outlined in colored lights or 10,000 blue jackets in one auditorium at Kansas City. You can be proud of your organization, it's big.

O is for officers. They're the leaders of the organization. Without them the FFA would not be anywhere. On their shoulders rests the responsibility to see that all the chapter's resources are put to the best uses. They are the cream of the crop of all the members, but remember they couldn't be leaders without someone to lead.

N is for numbers. This is a measure of the real strength of the FFA. Every chapter tries for 100 percent membership and attendance, but this isn't always possible. Numbers give a chapter power to conduct bigger and better projects. The FFA should be a voluntary organization, however. No one should be forced to join or attend who doesn't want to for this will breed either a dislike for FFA or a resentment at being forced.

A is for answers. The FFA has the answers for many high school students, especially seniors that are prospective college material. Through the FFA you can get many scholarships for an education in agriculture. There are many different careers in agriculture besides just farming and your FFA adviser can counsel you on what you should be.

L stands for learning. The FFA has lots to teach you but only if you want to learn. Everything you do in the FFA is voluntary. No one is going to force you to participate in contests or apply for awards and offices. What you get out of it is what you put into it. There are many rewards and a lot that can be learned but not unless you are willing to work.

I is interest. This is what separates the good chapters from the poor. A large number of members is no good at all unless they are interested enough to attend meetings and work. This is the biggest problem facing chapters. Interest is an easy thing to lose but it's hard to rebuild once you've lost it. There dosen't seem to be much you can do to get it because you can't make any group of members work who don't want to. You are better off with a small group of interested members than a large number who don't even come to meetings. Some years you will have it and some groups of officers can bring it out but others can't.

Time. You can't expect to accomplish anything in FFA without devoting some time to working for it. If you have any interest in FFA and do work at all you'll know that it can take a lot of time. But FFA will always reward you, if not with a personal reward, maybe with the feeling that you helped make your chapter a good one.

Y is for youth. The FFA is a young organization. As long as there are young men who are interested in farming and the future of farming, its prospects look bright.

Yes, all of these characteristics, publicity, energy, responsibility, spectacle, officers, numbers, answers, learning, interest, time, and youth, make up personality of the FFA. It's a great organization with much to give to those who will only look into it and be interested enough to receive what it has to give. Only the members can determine what kind of a personality it has, because they develop the characteristics of the chapter. A lot of "goofoffs" or "deadweight" doesn't give the organization a good name and may influence it for years to come by making younger members feel the organization is one of do-nothings. The personality of FFA is only as good as its members.

Letter From Publisher of Daily Times Leader, West Point, Miss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 19, 1965

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a verified copy of a letter to a Member of the House of Representatives from the Honorable William Henry Harris, publisher of the Daily Times Leader at West Point, Miss.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 7, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I'm truly sorry that you have the mental picture of our city and State which must exist in your thoughts. At the same time, I commend you for calling to seek facts, and regret that I could not answer more of your questions when you called Thursday morning.

The incident, as reported to you and obviously many others (we even had one call from a representative of the London Sun), was blown entirely out of proportion. The local Negro youth who was arrested would have been arrested by any hometown police department in the Nation. He was urging a crowd to ignore the instructions of police officers, and endeavoring to provoke a fight on the school grounds of a local high. Police officers have known him to be a troublemaker for a long time.

The 10 young people who demonstrated in front of the city jail Wednesday night (not 17, as someone had informed you) were asked repeatedly to leave. They refused. Later, one admitted that the COFO workers who arranged the demonstration wanted the group to be arrested.

We found out from Sheriff Joe Strickland that all were given the privilege of making any telephone calls they desired.

Bail was arranged for all 10 (not for the local youth who created the original trouble), and all have now been released pending routine hearing in city court.

We deeply regret the entire incident, but realize that it was a minor infraction of the law in the light of the daily happenings of the Nation. Mississippi's laws are not unlike those in any State—and we hope you will agree, Congressman RESNICK, that it would be difficult to maintain law and order if open disregard of law enforcement instruction were permitted to go unchecked.

White citizens of Mississippi have an affection for our fellow Negro citizens which is little understood in your area of this Nation. Our oldest staff member, from the point of service, on this country daily newspaper is a Negro. In our little newspapering operation, we have five Negro employees. They are valued staff members—and there's a bond of friendship between us which is deep and real.

Mississippi has problems. We're not unique in this. While every State has problems, the problems differ from State to State. As you know, we have—by far—the largest percentage of Negro population in the Nation. We do not consider this a handicap or a detriment. Our Negro citizens need more help than white citizens. This is true in New York, Mississippi, and in all States with a sizable percentage of Negro citizenship.

We have made tremendous progress with our Negro citizens—in education, in per capita income, in new industrial jobs, yes, in voter registration. Many were added to the voter rolls in this county during 1964. Not all who made application passed the qualifications. This is also true for a number of white citizens who made application.

Congressman RESNICK, our mutual problems are not going to be corrected by sending immature young people from Mississippi to New York, or immature young people from New York to Mississippi. The people of this State appreciate the constructive help offered by the FBI and the Justice Department—and we believe the statements made by those from these organizations who have come to Mississippi will bear this out. We do not believe that our Negro citizens

have been or will be helped by those who have come under the COFO banner.

Our invitation for you to visit Mississippi, and West Point, most certainly remains. We are enclosing a copy of Thursday's issue of the Daily Times Leader for your inspection.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM HENRY HARRIS,
Publisher.

Coddling of Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 19, 1965

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, a Washington, D.C., resident, Mrs. Florence M. Stellwagen, has called my attention to a most interesting poem of her composition. As a resident of the Federal city, which can lay dubious claim to having one of the highest rates of major crimes of any city in America, she is understandably disturbed at the coddling of criminals and the rationalization of mayhem.

I ask unanimous consent that the poem by Mrs. Stellwagen be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRICE OF LENIENCY

It can plainly be seen, if we'll take time to look,
That the trend of our times is to favor the crook.
Of the juvenile criminal, people will say:
"The kid was deficient in vitamin A."

If someone's too lazy to work for a living
His hard-working neighbors are urged: "Be forgiving."
When uncontrolled mobs commit riot and rascality
The cause is defined as "policemen's brutality."

And when, in a drunken rage, criminals kill,
Excuse is soon offered: "The poor chap was ill."
Assaults leave their victims in terrible shape
But we are assured: " 'Twas a slight case of rape."

The foulest of crimes and the worst of abuses
All seem to be coupled with ample excuses.
Are we growing so callous and void of discretion
That our own callow apathy fosters transgression?

Will some clever "expert" with mental agility
Rob every known felon of responsibility?
We're giving the criminals cause to rejoice
Because they're unpunished for criminal choice.

And dastardly acts, planned with care, all malignant,
Occur because we're not alert and indignant.
Whenever the public is stupidly lenient
To yield to temptation to crime is convenient.

Whenever no murmur of protest is heard
It seems that the criminal has "the last word";
While the faith of our fathers—a child's right to pray
His God-given right is denied him today.

No wonder the forces of evil rejoice
When one's not condemned for his criminal choice,
And our country's known enemy, subtle and sly,
Is fully aware that we sit idly by.

Unless we awaken, it may not be long
Till the toxin of danger becomes our doom gong.
For it's all too apparent to those who will look
That society favors the godless—the crook.

—FLORENCE M. STELLWAGEN.

The Future of Our Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 19, 1965

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the January-February 1965 issue of Progressive Railroading, a publication distributed to railway executives, features an article written by Ben W. Heineman, chairman of the Chicago & North Western Railway. I believe that other Senators, who increasingly are interested in transportation, particularly the problems of the railroads and how they have been meeting the challenges, will find the article most interesting. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S RAILROADS AND THEIR FUTURE

(By Ben W. Heineman, chairman, Chicago & North Western Railway)

(Ben W. Heineman was born in Wausau, Wis., on February 10, 1914, educated in the Wausau public schools and at the University of Michigan. He took his L.L.B. degree at Northwestern University in 1936. From 1936 to 1956, Mr. Heineman engaged in the practice of corporate law in Chicago, having his own law firm during most of that period with the exception of 2 years of Government service in 1941–43, when he was assistant general counsel, and chief, Court Review Branch of the Office of Price Administration in Washington. Later he was appointed legal advisor and assistant director of the North African Economic Board in Algiers, serving also on the civil affairs staff of Maj. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's command, and as assistant to Robert Murphy, then Ambassador to the French Government. In 1951, he became special assistant attorney general of Illinois in charge of the investigation and prosecution of counterfeit cigarette tax operations in Illinois. In 1954, Mr. Heineman was elected chairman of the executive committee of the Minneapolis & St. Louis Railway Co. He resigned his association with that railroad on April 1, 1959, and withdrew from his law practice to become chairman and chief executive officer of the Chicago & North Western Railway Co.)

It is not often that a purportedly obsolete industry can make a comeback—and in the field of transportation such an event is considered a rarity.

If we go by the evidence, however, this is occurring in the railroad industry which indicates in an increasing number of ways that it is crossing the threshold into a new era of progress and development. This is particularly remarkable in the light of the dismal position to which railroads had fallen since the turn of the century.

Many individuals, not only students of transportation but those oriented in one way or another to modes competing with the railroads, have been prone for a number of years to seize on every available opportunity to point out that the railroad industry had outlived its usefulness to the public. Each passenger train discontinuance and each branch line abandonment has been interpreted as but another step toward the eventual demise of the industry. The steady diversion of freight traffic, however, was the most convincing type of evidence that the railroads were truly obsolete. And no one in the railroad industry can minimize the significance of the fact that the railroads, which as recently as 1930 were handling three-fourths of all intercity freight traffic, had slipped to where they were handling less than 43 percent in 1961.

It is understandable that some spokesmen for the railroads' competitors were convinced that it was only a question of time when the railroads were through—and that in the competitive battle they were finally cornered in their own roundhouse.

This, of course, has not happened. Since 1961 there has been a halt in the downward trend in percentage of intercity traffic handled by the railroads. This trend has not only leveled off since then but gives indications of a gradual reversal. It now appears that railroad ton-miles will be up 6 percent in 1964 over 1963. If the railroads simply hold the line and maintain their current share of intercity volume, normal economic growth in the country would make the 1975 railroad freight load one-third greater than it is now. And by 1988 the freight volume could be double what it is today.

RAILROAD INDUSTRY DEMONSTRATING A NEW RESOURCEFULNESS

America's railroads definitely have not reached the end of the line. Even if I had rose-colored glasses I could not be more optimistic about the future of the railroad industry in an expanding economy.

My optimism is based on the conviction that the industry is demonstrating a new resourcefulness and is more and more adopting an attitude of self-help that will take it up the road of progress faster and more effectively than could be achieved by any other formula.

This is not to suggest that inequities of outmoded Government policies under which railroads are forced to operate should be minimized. To the contrary. The revolution that must and will eventually take place in Government transport policies has moved at an agonizingly slow place in terms of results achieved. This, however, should not be a deterrent in the basic objectives of fair play and equal treatment in transportation.

There are increasing signs that regulatory and other Government officials are beginning to recognize not merely the existence of these inequities in our transportation laws but the adverse effect they have on transportation progress as a whole in the Nation.

I anticipate that with each passing year these barriers to railroad progress will be taken down, piece by piece.

In the meantime, however, the railroads have not been waiting for something to happen. Since 1945 they have spent $20 billion of their own money—revenue or borrowed on private credit terms—on improvement in plant and equipment. These billions were spent for modernization which has included 27,000 new locomotive units, 1 million new freight cars, mechanized track maintenance, automated yards, remote control facilities for mainline train movements, and rapid data processing.

And while railroads were spending this $20 billion, it is fair to point out that their

competitors—the highway truckers, barge lines, and airlines—were also making substantial capital investments. It is also proper to add, however, that these expenditures would have been vastly greater were it not for the fact that a collossal $165 billion was spent by Government for improved road, water, and air navigation facilities for free, or nearly so, use by these modes.

Aside from substantial amounts the railroads have been spending for improvements, some of the most beneficial returns have been and will continue to be obtained by setting completely new standards of efficiency, eliminating waste and breaking away from unproductive tradition. The efforts of many railroads in developing more efficient plants and operations over the past several years by following such procedures are already bearing fruit.

The North Western, for example, was plagued for many years by the large deficits incurred by the operation of intercity passenger trains. As recently as 1956 its annual passenger deficit was in excess of $23 million, a deficit which contributed substantially to the net loss of more than $5.5 million incurred from operations of the railroad as a whole for that year. Since that time a program has been carried out for the elimination of the principal loss-producing passenger trains. Within 7 years the passenger deficit was reduced by almost $20 million, a reduction which contributed materially to an improvement in operating results which last year were the best since 1946.

The substantial reduction of intercity passenger trains has been one of the most significant factors in the strengthening of the North Western's competitive and financial position. The discontinuance of such unnecessary operations served to reduce substantially the drain on income from freight operations. Of particular significance is the fact that had the railroad continued to operate the passenger trains in the face of evidence that the public preferred other modes of transport, the railroad would have been obligated at some time in the future to purchase well over $100 million in passenger train equipment to replace existing equipment as it wore out.

I am convinced that there is no future for the intercity passenger train and I seriously question whether such service will ever make money for any railroad again. I have read the figures that say our passenger train volume in America is equal to transporting 15,500 persons from New York to San Francisco every day of the year. But it is also a fact that over 90 percent of intercity travel is by car—and that economists estimate 100 million automobiles will be moving over the countryside by 1975.

Most convincing have been the figures in our books. They say intercity passenger service costs more than it takes in and, at best, is regarded as a standby rather than a necessity by a highway oriented and air-minded public. And this message comes through loud and clear.

There is, however, a first cousin to intercity passenger traffic that is paying off for the North Western: suburban commuter transportation. While Federal and State funds were literally poured into new expressways right next to its tracks, the North Western started pumping new blood into a suburban operation that had been losing $1.5 to $2.5 million annually. Seven years and $48 million later, the North Western is operating a commuter service that is self-supporting and with a promising future as it attracts a steadily increasing number of riders.

The need for this kind of mass transit will compound itself in the years to come. The Nation's population in 1975 will be 40 million greater than it is today. Most of this population increase will be in metropolitan areas which will expand at an unprecedented rate.

SUBSIDIES NO SOLUTION TO MASS TRANSIT PROBLEMS

Subsidizing mass transit is not the final solution and, in fact, can actually compound the problem. A case in point is the network of expressways built with hundreds of millions of dollars of public funds in our metropolitan areas in the last three decades. These expressways are in themselves mass transit facilities. When such expressways were first planned, however, very little if any regard was given by their designers and planners to what extent such highways would divert traffic from existing mass transit facilities.

Our experiences on the North Western convince us that the congestion in metropolitan areas is not going to be reduced by each of the mass transit facilities going their independent ways. Only through a high degree of coordination by rapid transit, the commuter railroads, buslines, and expressway interests can we hope to find lasting solutions for the efficient movement of masses of people.

But it is in the volume movement of freight where the railroads have their brightest potential and where in recent years they have moved most rapidly in developing new transport techniques and new types of equipment.

RESURGENCE OF RAILROAD INCOME SPARKED BY PIGGYBACKING

Piggybacking is one of the most important rail innovations sparking the resurgence of freight income. Piggyback loadings are showing a constant increase and in 1964 almost 2 million truck trailers will have traveled part of their journeys by rail rather than road. The economy, convenience, speed, and dependability of such highway-rail coordination is effectively proving itself. By further working to develop additional ways to use piggybacking, this type of traffic could mount at an accelerated rate in future years.

Piggybacking is not only bringing new business to the railroads but permits them to share more directly in the benefits of off-track industrial development. This latter aspect has been brought into sharp focus for the North Western which a year ago invested $1.1 million in the construction of a completely new piggyback terminal at the western outskirts of Chicago. It is significant that this terminal is highly touted by developers of off-track industrial districts as a major transportation benefit. Until the arrival of piggybacking, such district were completely oriented to nonrail transportation, particularly trucking.

Certainly one of the more dramatic developments is that of the multilevel rack car which can carry 15 automobiles at a time. In 1964 more than 3 million new vehicles will have traveled in such cars by rail from factory to or close to dealer distributing points.

The railroad industry, however, should not assume that it has permanently recovered this traffic. Such an attitude is what resulted into a no contest a number of years ago when the budding trucking industry developed its own special highway trailer for the movement of new automobiles. It is in the best interests of the railroads to continue their research in the development of additional uses for the multilevel rack car, particularly for return loads. Greater utilization of the rack car could reflect in still lower charges to shippers of automobiles, thereby not only assuring but increasing the volume of this type of traffic moving by rail.

There are other new members, too, which are joining the traditional family of freight cars. The conventional gondolas, flats, boxcars and hoppers are now being supplemented by huge covered hoppers that carry as much as 130 tons of grain, by tank cars with 30,000 gallon capacities, by giant boxcars that require skylights to light up their cavernous interiors and by other specialized equipment.

Many of these new cars are designed either for increased capacity or for specialized handling. Each constitutes an improved weapon in the competitive battle for business. However, that weapon can be made even more effective as we achieve a combination of high capacity for specialized types of freight cars.

UNIT TRAIN APPLICABLE TO MANY PRODUCTS

The unit train is another example of how the railroads are putting volume-carrying economics to work by moving huge tonnages between fixed points at sharply reduced costs and charges. Nonexistent a decade ago, unit trains on some 25 railroads—the North Western included—are now carrying approximately 20 percent of all coal moving by rail. Even so the potential for such trains has hardly been scratched notwithstanding that their application is limited to only certain types of bulk traffic. The efficiency of the unit train is nevertheless great enough to have put a coal slurry pipeline out of business and it is conceivable that such a unit train of tank cars could make uneconomical the laying down of some new pipelines. Certainly unit trains can be expected to play a greater role in the future in the movement of iron ore, sand, and grain.

While the unit train offers the advantage of movement of great volume and sharply reduced costs, its successful operation requires a three-way coordination and participation by shippers, receiver, and the railroad. The shipper must be prepared for fast and efficient loading while the receiver must be equipped for equally fast unloading. As for the railroad, it must gear its operations so that they will smoothly mesh with those of shipper and receiver. The investment in such an operation can be justified to the benefit of all parties only if there are sufficient guarantees of high volume movements over a substantial period of time. The result, however, is the most streamlined form of railroad freight transportation.

MERGERS INCREASE OPERATING EFFICIENCY

Another form of railroad streamlining that only recently has begun to pick up speed is the merger movement. It is interesting to note that while merger of railroads was widely discussed and studied during the depression years of the 1930's, very little in corporate consolidations actually took place. Concrete steps toward control and merger of any significance have occurred primarily since 1960 in a rising economy.

Well-planned and sound mergers are those that result in a railroad that can grow with this rising economy by adding to operating efficiency through cost reductions, elimination of duplicate facilities, increasing of average haul and enhancing the ability of the combined carriers to provide better service than each was able to offer individually. While the welfare of the carriers and their stockholders are important considerations in a desirable merger, it cannot pass the test of soundness unless it also is clearly in the public interest for such a corporate marriage to take place.

As technology continues to offer new and more efficient ways of providing transportation, it also has the effect of increasing the excess capacity of the railroad plant. This will accelerate the need for fewer, more efficient railroad systems, performing transportation service at lower cost which will be translated into lower rates.

Merger alone, of course, is not the answer to the future of the railroads. Nor is it a matter of legislation, management, diversification, automation, or technology. The future depends on a combination of all these

factors and as much on our ingenuity in solving problems, being inventive and never ceasing to be competitive.

Every year there are more people in this land, producing more and consuming more. The market for railroad services stretches out into the future, seemingly without limit.

AND TOMORROW

We can make tomorrow as big as we want it to be. The railroads have a lot of things going for them that no other carrier has. Railroads have an inherent efficiency that is unique. It still takes less power to move steel wheels on steel rails than it does to move a rubber tire on a hard pavement or a plane through the air. This holds true notwithstanding that trucks now move on limited access expressways of pool-table smoothness and planes course through the skies at supersonic speeds.

Of all the forms of transport, railroads still retain the ability of moving goods in large volume and at costs no other carrier can equal. They can get into the heart of cities the way no plane or ship can. They move in storms that stop trucks cold. While highways and expressways can and have become outdated and inadequate, the steel rails have a capacity for a vast amount of additional traffic.

Imaginative, energetic railroading is the real key to our future. It is the kind of railroading that can keep coming up with more developments like unit trains, rack cars, and piggybacking and at the same time clearing away the obsolete and the unnecessary so that every mile and every minute of railroad operation is the most efficient and most economical that a railroad can be run. Most of all, the railroads must be competitive, making rather than meeting challenges, taking the initiative rather than being on the defensive.

As long as the railroads have the attitude that they must earn their way all the way, theirs will be an exciting future.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Address by Hon. John J. Rooney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend a meeting of the Propeller Club, Port of Washington, on Thursday, February 18, at which time my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, JOHN J. ROONEY, was honored and was the principal speaker.

I need not remind my colleagues that JOHN ROONEY is one of the most capable Members of the House and is sincerely dedicated to the best interests of our Nation.

However, I feel that the subject of his address on that evening is one that should be of interest not only to the Members of Congress, but to the Nation at large.

I compliment my colleague for his remarks and, although we sit on opposite sides of the aisle, I am in complete accord with what he had to say on this occasion.

Under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks the address given by the distinguished gentleman from New York:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN J. ROONEY BEFORE PROPELLER CLUB, PORT OF WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 18, 1965

Mr. Toastmaster, Reverend Father Harke, my distinguished colleagues in the Congress, honored guests, friends, ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate this opportunity to talk to you tonight about the American merchant marine. I am normally one of not too many words and almost never make a long speech. Having raised your hopes, now let me lower them. Tonight I am departing from my usual procedure.

Tonight I hope to offer some suggestions for further improving the status of our merchant marine. First of all, I know it costs money to keep our American flag on the seven seas. However, I am reminded of a remark made by Winston Churchill when he was told he should drink less liquor—that it took too much out of him. He said, "I have taken more out of liquor than it ever took out of me." I feel this way about the American merchant marine. The country has gotten much more out of the merchant marine than the merchant marine ever got out of the country. This may sound strange coming from a member of the House Appropriations Committee. But I believe that what we spend each year in enabling our U.S.-flag fleet to compete on the high seas is returned manyfold in jobs, in taxes, in service, in security, in the promotion of our import and export commerce, and in our national stature among the nations of the world.

It has been apparent to the Congress since the beginning of the Republic that the United States needs a strong U.S.-flag merchant fleet. One of the first laws passed by our earliest Congress was designed to encourage American-flag shipping. In our time the Congress, through the acts of 1916, 1920, 1928, 1933, and 1936, has reiterated this same need for an American merchant marine. As set forth in section 101 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Congress has established a basic overall maritime policy declaring that "the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States, and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times; (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; (c) owned and operated under the U.S. flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable; and (d) composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel."

Generally, all of our citizens are only concerned about our merchant marine during times of emergency. This appears to be true of each succeeding administration. However, this concern all too often diminishes with each return to peace. In short, peacetime is hard on our merchant marine. The same old story is always repeating itself. Congress adopts a policy to provide a merchant marine. Legislation is then enacted detailing how the policy will be carried out. In addition, aids or support programs are provided to make sure that we have a merchant marine. Then a strange thing happens. Our merchant marine gradually declines until a crisis arises. We then put on a crash program to build a merchant fleet and resolve legislativewise to never be caught short again. But for some strange reason the old cycle is repeated again.

The big question is, Why does this happen? Why are we always faced with a peacetime anti-merchant-marine complex? It even seems to creep into some avenues of Government. This is a strange phenomenon and might well be the subject of a special study to determine its causes. Certainly it exists in no other maritime country and shouldn't exist here. Our merchant marine is vitally important to our peacetime needs. We should not have to reply upon intermittent wars to give it continued strength.

The real causes of the ebb and flow of our merchant marine are obviously difficult to pinpoint. In a real sense we have never had in modern times an adequate, well-rounded, peacetime merchant fleet.

At the beginning of World War I our merchant fleet was carrying only 9 percent of our foreign commerce. Most of our foreign commerce then, as now, moved at the convenience of foreign-flag shipping. With the outbreak of war, these foreign-flag ships deserted our trades to serve their own needs. Freight rates soared. Ships to carry our cargo were not available even though freight rates increased approximately 1,500 percent between 1914 and 1918. In spite of this experience, our overdependence on foreign ships continued through the 1920's. During that decade the general strike of 1926 in Great Britain occurred. This immobilized many foreign-flag ships upon which our commerce depended, and we were again in rather desperate straits.

The situation was a little different at the outset of World War II. This country had the beginning of a modern merchant marine which was adequate to carry about 30 percent of our foreign commerce—thanks to the 1936 Merchant Marine Act. In addition, the coastwise-intercoastal trade employed 800 dry cargo ships that were immediately available to the war. While a shortage in total ships again developed, rate increases were kept normal in terms of other price increases. This was due in major part to the availability of a relatively more effective American merchant fleet and greater Government interest in the problem. This time the war lasted longer and our expanded shipping needs required a costly $12.5 billion building program.

Under this program approximately 5,000 ships were provided for ourselves and our Allies, making it possible to win the war. Had we maintained an adequate and balanced merchant marine program during our peaceful years, we would have had more ships in readiness and could have saved thousands of lives and reduced much of our costly war expenditure. But here again, the peacetime anti-merchant-marine complex was overly indulged in by those who could not grasp the need for healthy continuity.

During the Korean hostilities in 1950–53, the demand for shipping again rose sharply. Our commerce moved and freight rates remained reasonable only because we still had a fairly large private fleet in operation and an adequate number of vessels available in the reserve fleet.

Today we are back where we have been many times in the past. Relatively speaking, our overall merchant marine posture appears in worse condition in terms of number of ships and total amount of cargo carried than ever before.

Today, while liner carriers handle over 30 percent of our commerce in this area, American-flag ships overall are carrying less than 10 percent of our foreign, waterborne commerce. Domestic shipping, coastwise and intercoastal, has been almost eliminated by rate discriminations on the part of the railroads and permitted by the ICC. In the bulk trades which provide the basic sinews of our great domestic industries, American-flag shipping is practically unknown. Since 1925 the foreign commerce of the United States has increased more than 300 percent. During the same period, the actual tons of this commerce carried in American-flag ships has declined by 10 percent.

But there are some encouraging signs in certain segments of American shipping. The fine fleet of cargo liners being built by the subsidized group is a bright spot in the total picture. These splendid ships—the finest and fastest of their type in the world—will maintain a high degree of competence in the berth-line trade. In this area the purposes of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 are being met, and I congratulate the lines engaged in this most creditable endeavor. This success of the berth liners must be met and surpassed in the passenger, tanker, dry bulk, and coastwise services.

It is clear that we do not have the type of overall merchant fleet which Congress envisioned in its various reiterations of policy. This is due in some degree to identifiable reasons. Included among them is the failure of our administrative agencies to adequately carry forth their responsibili-

ties of developing programs designed to implement the Nation's maritime policy. It is due in some measure to recurring labor unrest. It is due also to an unwillingness on the part of management to promote maximum operation under the American flag. It is due to the lack of an economic nationalistic spirit among our exporters and importers to patronize the flagships of their own country. And last but not least, it is due in large part to the greed of a few U.S. corporations which would abandon the American flag and put the dollar sign above the welfare of a great nation and her people.

May I say, since coming to the House of Representatives in the 78th Congress, representing the vast Brooklyn commercial waterfront, it has been my privilege to participate in congressional maritime activities with considerable detail and responsibility. This experience has given me a few ideas which I would like to pass along to you.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

It should be crystal clear to the industry, to labor, and management, that if we are to have a strong American-flag merchant marine, it must be the result of cooperative leadership on their part. Collective bargaining disputes should be prevented from reaching such proportions as to tie up our ships and ports and impair the health and welfare of the Nation. The workers involved never recoup the lost pay resulting from such periods of idleness. Interruption of our shipping, resulting from jurisdictional labor disputes, is nonsensical. It is high time for all sides to pursue courses calculated to advance our maritime posture in the world. Moreover, it appears that they cannot look to the Federal Government to successfully implement the merchant marine policy as enacted by Congress without the most vigorous and affirmative leadership on the part of both labor and management themselves.

JOINT LABOR-MANAGEMENT EFFORTS

In the field of cooperation and promotion, joint labor-management groups can be especially effective. In this regard I compliment the industry on forming the Labor-Management Maritime Committee, which has been an effective organization since it was formed in 1950. I believe there should be more of this type of joint effort in promoting our maritime objectives. At all odds, the time has passed for the indulgence in any activity which will keep labor divided or management fragmented, or hinder either from cooperating with the other in the implementation of our merchant marine policy. Horizons are changing and new and untried concepts are being advanced. These must meet the tests of labor's and management's combined abilities and experience. If the industry and the Nation are to benefit from them.

In the final analysis, the basic problem of the American-flag merchant fleet today is lack of adequate cargo. This problem must be more vigorously attacked. I am sure that the average American would be appalled if he knew that less than 5 percent of our purely commercial waterborne foreign commerce was carried in U.S.-flag ships. I am certain also that many Americans, including those who are stockholders of some large companies, look askance at the use of foreign-flag ships (1) to keep from employing the people who buy their products; (2) to avoid the payment of their share of U.S. taxes; (3) to maintain substandard safety conditions and poor conditions of work on their ships; or (4) to create a foreign fleet whose value to the security of the United States is of no greater value than would be our reliance on their soldiers to defend us.

THE SIZE OF THE FLEET NEEDED

I hear a lot of talk among Congressmen and from industry people today about the future of the industry and the size of fleet we need. I suggest that Government, in cooperation with labor and management, determine the specific kind of merchant marine our Nation requires to implement our congressional maritime policy. Having done that, I would suggest that a program be developed which is designed to build and maintain that kind of a merchant marine and that such a program be presented to the Congress for consideration.

REORGANIZATION HAS NOT ACHIEVED MARITIME PURPOSES

Our maritime history has been prolific with administrative reorganization of the agencies responsible for carrying out our established merchant marine policies. With each reorganization there have been promises of a program to implement these policies. The last reorganization in 1961 was requested by the then Secretary of Commerce to give him the administrative authority to accomplish this. Today, 4 years later, it does not appear that much, if anything, has been accomplished. Some of the proposals now being advanced seem to be directed toward the demise of the merchant marine rather than to its promotion.

There have been suggestions that we should establish a Department of Transportation to carry out our congressional policy. I do not know whether or not we need this. However, it should be given serious study by the appropriate administrative agencies, in consultation with maritime labor and management, and determination made. Perhaps, instead of a Department of Transportation, what we need is to bring all transportation together under an independent commission responsible to the Congress. It would appear to me that if this were done, all of the administrative functions of such a commission should be separate and apart from the ratemaking functions.

BETTER USE OF EXISTING LAWS NEEDED

I suggest that we might make better use of existing laws. I call your attention to section 28 of the 1920 act which gives cargoes preferential treatment over inland transportation systems when assigned to American-flag ships; section 19 of the 1920 act which requires all Government agencies to cooperate with the Federal Maritime Administrator in administering maritime legislaton; section 212(b) of the 1936 act which requires the Maritime Administration to cooperate with the industry in generating cargoes for American-flag ships through various cargo preference acts; and the authority of the Office of Emergency Planning under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

INCREASING RELIANCE ON COMMERCIAL CARGOES

We must achieve greater utilization of our own merchant fleet in the transportation of American commercial cargoes. This will obviously call for greater effort in the development of a vigorous public relations and cargo solicitation program for the industry. The No. 1 problem will always remain—the development of more cargo for American-flag ships. In this regard I believe that there are probably sufficient laws on the books, if faithfully implemented, to achieve the desired goal.

THE EFFECTIVE CONTROL POLICY

On the Government side, it seems to me the maritime agencies have not displayed any great adeptness in carrying out their responsibilities under the law. For example, I have great concern over the effective control concept pursued by the Government where ships owned by American capital are permitted to transfer foreign and still be considered available for return in an emergency. I doubt either the wisdom or practicality of this. It will be difficult to succeed in mutual security arrangements with responsible allied nations when we place their merchant marine below that of the so-called effective control merchant fleet. The sooner the wartime tubs under the flags of the so-called effective control fleets vanish, the better off we will all be. We should replace them with American-built ships under the American flag.

THE TRADE ROUTE CONCEPT

The trade route concept should be strengthened to assure adequate U.S.-flag service to and from our ports. Undoubtedly there should be greater flexibility and variation in trade route patterns in order to develop maximum trade. I am opposed, however, to any wholesale abandoning of the trade-route concept. The philosophy of regular scheduled sailings is essential to our commercial well-being, with proper and reliable service to the shippers. The parity principle of the Merchant Marine Act is sound and should not be tampered with except to strengthen and support it. I am convinced that any abandonment of this principle will prove hazardous.

WE MUST MAKE THE MOST OF OUR SHIP CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Construction subsidies are available to responsible operators of American-flag ships engaged in our foreign commerce. Programs must be developed to assure the building of ships in American yards and their operation under the American flag. This is necessary to maintain our foreign commerce in keeping with our domestic growth. I have heard proposals that we allow ships to be built in foreign yards and then return to our foreign and domestic trades without losing any other benefits or privileges under existing law. This leaves me completely cold. Our shipyards are not only essential to our commerce but vital to our security. It would make just as much sense to build all of our security instruments abroad and transfer our industrial productions to foreign soil.

OUR PASSENGER SHIP SERVICE

For many years now we have permitted a deterioration in our American-flag passenger service. This has occurred at a time when most foreign nations are building up their passenger service. In the domestic cruise service, foreign-flag ships have almost a stranglehold on the business. In this field, particularly, I believe there are many ships carrying American citizens with safety capabilities greatly inferior to U.S.-flag ships. I doubt very much if there are really any foreign-flag passenger ships that could be placed under the American flag. They simply do not meet the American Bureau of Shipping Safety Standards nor those required of either the Government or the industry. Yet, the Maritime Administration—and, I may say, some of the companies—are reported to be considering the abolition of the American passenger ship.

I shall consider it a sad day in our maritime history when Americans who travel by sea must rely principally or entirely on foreign ships. The recent permission to transfer the SS *America* to Greek registry and then operate her in services where she carries almost 100-percent American passengers, is just further exemplification of the deterioration of our passenger-ship policy. I cannot help but recall that both the company, United States Lines, and the Congress provided for a suitable replacement of the SS *America* and special legislation was passed to achieve it, but the executive department 6 or 7 years ago declined to make it effective. Now it may be altogether too late.

THE MARINE HOSPITALIZATION PROGRAM

I must point out another development in which I have a deep interest. Beginning with the end of World War II the Bureau of the Budget began to adopt practices which seemed designed to eliminate medical and hospital care for our seamen. There have been persistent moves to close the U.S. Public Health Service general hospitals. Thanks

to the constructive work of shipping labor-management groups and the Congress itself, the Bureau of the Budget has not been permitted to carry out such a purpose to date. However, this year the Bureau, utilizing the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is again making a strong attempt to further impair this essential service by closing hospitals and transferring the seamen to veterans' hospitals already overcrowded and not tuned to the needs of shipping. I am one of those in the Congress who will oppose this ill-conceived proposal. The most concerted action by labor and management will be required to save these hospitals. It is unthinkable to me that a hospital service which has contributed so much to the medical and hospital care of the Nation should be under such heavy attack by the Bureau of the Budget. We should do everything possible to obtain a direct Presidential pronouncement to strengthen and maintain this service as well as our Veterans' Administration hospitals for the future. Such an action would be in keeping with all of the President's proposals on health and a greater society.

CARGO PREFERENCE

I can't believe that anyone is serious in wanting to phase out any segments of our industry from cargo preference in carrying Government aid. Those who argue that it is giving assistance where assistance is already given apparently do not apply the same criteria to the foreign ships. They should remember the scores of bargain-priced ships sold foreign to rehabilitate foreign fleets; the use of counterpart funds to help shipping and shipyard interests; the sale of American grain below our cost to the taxpayers to make shipments possible; the acceptance of foreign currency of questionable future value to provide the cargo which these foreign ships carry. We sometimes seem to have a strange philosophy in our country where we are blind to everything except what we can bestow on someone else. I believe our cargo preference laws are only one way of assuring that U.S.-flag ships may share in the product of American enterprise while at the same time sharing with those who are hungry and in need.

The Congress looks to the industry, both labor and management, for counsel and recommendations on maritime policies requiring congressional action. Building a strong American merchant marine is the job of all of us. In the industry, labor and management must close ranks and through deliberate cooperation, one with the other, come forward with recommended programs to lift our maritime posture to the high status it deserves. Aggressive action on your part in this regard is required.

In conclusion, may I say that the American merchant marine must always be alert and ready for change. We live in dynamic times. Let us always adopt the best of new methods and devices in the interest of progress. However, let us retain the stable and proven processes which time has tested, including those human standards which transcend all other considerations. There is no virtue in change merely for the sake of change. There is every virtue in modification required for true progress in a fast-moving world.

I am sure that you all now agree that I can be somewhat lengthy when the occasion calls for it. I hope my remarks may prove helpful in some manner to the American merchant marine. If they do, then my departure from short speeches in this instance will have been well worthwhile.

Tocks Island National Recreational Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the U.S. Senate is now considering S. 36, a bill to authorize the establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreational Area in the Delaware River Basin just 50 miles from the New York City metropolitan area. This bill will develop 70,500 acres of prime recreation land for the use of all citizens.

The Tocks Island area is within 100 miles of one-sixth of our Nation's population. This area is in the center of what we call megalopolis, the highly concentrated and still growing urban complex on the east coast. We now have an opportunity to develop an area containing much of the original beauty of the Delaware River. We may not have another opportunity to preserve it. The pressures for piecemeal usage of undeveloped land in this heavily populated area are intense. A delay will only raise the cost of future action, cause hardship to those who move into the area, and possibly forfeit forever the possibility of providing a major recreation area in the center of megalopolis.

At present more than 30 million Americans have a direct interest in the establishment of the Tocks Island recreational area. Creation of this park will add materially to the fabric of their lives. But equally interested are the untold members of future generations who will judge us by our actions in conserving the natural beauty of this area. The Senators from New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania are unanimous in their cosponsorship of S. 36. I know that the Senate will give the bill earnest consideration, and I hope that it will be passed promptly.

Mr. Aubrey Graves, of the Washington Post, recently wrote an article about Tocks Island entitled "'Starved' East Seeks Vast Recreational Area." The article is of interest to all those concerned with the creation of a Tocks Island National Recreation Area. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"STARVED" EAST SEEKS VAST RECREATION AREA

(By Aubrey Graves)

If developed as recommended by the National Park Service, 70,500 acres, including the Delaware Water Gap and land upstream of it, will be the site of the first national Eastern United States.

Bills now pending in the Senate and House would authorize establishment of Tocks Island National Recreation Area in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, in conjunction with the already authorized Tocks Island Reservoir project.

This is part of the determined effort by conservationists in and out of Congress to save some of the Nation's dwindling open spaces for the enjoyment of generations to come. The aim is to get the vast project established and in operation by 1975; members of the U.S. Corps of Engineers say it can be done.

The reservoir, a major unit of the comprehensive plan for developing and controlling the water resources of the Delaware River Basin, was approved by Congress in 1962, under the Flood Control Act.

The 3,200-foot-long Tocks Island Dam, rising 160 feet above the river bed, is to be built about 6 miles upstream from Delaware Water Gap, about 7 miles northeast of Stroudsburg, Pa.

The site is at the upstream end of Tocks Island, about 2½ miles upstream from Shawnee-on-Delaware, Pa.

Its purposes are to provide flood control, water supply, hydroelectric power and recreation. It will create a lake from one-half to 1½ miles wide, stretching 37 miles to Port Jervis, N.Y. It will inundate the village of Bushkill, part of Dingmans Ferry in Pennsylvania and Flatbrookville in New Jersey.

Facilities for swimming, boating, camping, hiking, picnicking, fishing and—in winter—skiing along with opportunities to hunt this game-rich region, are expected to draw 7 million visitors annually to the recreation area.

Provided the water level of the lake remains constant, or nearly so, during the recreation season from April to October, and that adequate additional land is acquired for public ownership, the reservoir, according to Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, could become one of the most significant areas for water-based recreation in the eastern United States.

Col. R. C. Marshall, of the U.S. Corps of Engineers, testified at a Senate subcommittee hearing on July 6, 1964, that a drawdown might be necessary, "perhaps once in each 10 years," in order to provide for low flow augmentation. "This damaging effect on recreation has been included in our estimates of the benefits," explained Marshall. He added: "we don't think it will be serious."

The scenery in this part of the country is breathtaking. The Gap, where the Delaware pierces Kittatiny Mountain, is, of course, world famous.

The area is 75 miles from Manhattan, 95 from Philadelphia. Within a 2 hours' drive are a number of towns each with a population in excess of 50,000. Thirty million people, roughly one-sixth of the Nation's population, live within a radius of 100 miles.

Said Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, "Anybody who owns a secondhand car can get there pretty quickly."

Udall said that due to failures of planning in the past, there remained only a limited number of potential recreation opportunities. "But here is a really superb opportunity to set aside an area and give it National Park management. We must take up this option before it is too late."

CLARK told the committee that land in the area had doubled in value in the past 5 years. The cost of acquiring the land in 1959, when the project was first pushed, was figured at $17.3 million. By late 1964 cost estimates had been boosted to $30 million.

"I have great sympathy for this type of project," Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, testified. "We must move now be-

cause delay simply compounds our difficulties and builds up our expense."

The very real shortage of Federal opportunities in the Northeast is "appalling," CLARK told the committee. "The West, were 15 percent of our people live on 39 percent of the Nation's land, has 72 percent of all our Federal recreation acreage.

"In the Northeast, including New England and the Middle Atlantic States, are one-fourth of our population. But here only 4 percent of the Nation's recreation areas are found."

The Senator declared that, in terms of number of people served, the project would not be expensive. "Tinra at this time would cost about $1 per person, because there are 30 million people who would be served by this area and the cost of acquiring it approaches $30 million."

The Pennsylvanian reminded his senatorial colleagues from Western States, that a large portion of the Nation's tax revenues, far in excess of the proportion of population, leaves the Northeast.

"This is rich tax territory," he declared. "These Mid-Atlantic States provide an enormous amount of the total of Federal revenues and we are entitled to get some of it back."

CLARK reminded the westerners that "this is real mountain territory; these are lakes and streams of fresh water where there is good fishing (including trout) and where there is camping and those other things you gentlemen know are really the glory of your part of the country.

"Here is an opportuinty to give us a little understanding in the East of what you gentlemen have been brought up with in the West."

Senator ALAN BIBLE, subcommittee chairman, emphasized the necessity for fast action on pending bills. "We find subdividers moving in very quickly," he said, "when word gets out that there is a possibility of creating a recreation area. We had better beware because this is going to become very expensive and we would live to regret the day that we did not properly create and preserve this area."

In the Tinra project, the idea is to increase substantially the amount of land the Engineers would customarily acquire for recreational purposes around the fringe of reservoirs.

Under the plan the Corps of Engineers would acquire 9,500 fringe acres under provisions of the 1962 act. Another 46,700 acres would be acquired by the Engineers for transfer to the Interior Department. The Engineers would operate the dam; the Interior Secretary would administer the recreational area.

Within the taking area are 50 farm units, 900 single-family units, including 139 year-round dwellers, 60 commercial establishments, 35 small camps, 3 golf courses and 5 churches. A total of 1,200 different ownerships are involved.

Howard Baker, Assistant Director of the National Park Service, said under questioning that these golf courses and churches probably would have to go. BIBLE objected.

"Golf is a fairly popular recreation: I hope the Park Service does not plan on destroying these golf courses, then go into development and 5 years from now decide that it wants to build a golf course."

Colonel Marshall said: "It is conceivable we can avoid these golf courses by simple boundary shift."

"What do you do with the five churches?" BIBLE persisted.

Marshall: "In our policy we take them, if necessary; they do not remain."

BIBLE then wanted to know: "What's wrong with having a church in a recreation area? Even though the congregation is going to move, it seems to me that out of the 7 million visitors expected, it is just conceivable that a number of them might like to go to church while they are in a recreation."

The Senator finally extracted a promise from Baker that the churches would remain, "if compatible." He then suggested that this promise be written into the bill.

The Senate bill to create Tinra, a completely bipartisan project, is sponsored by all the Senators from Pennsylvania, New Jersey and New York: CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania; CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey; HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey; JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York; and ROBERT KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York.

In the House, four bills have been introduced by Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, Republican, of Pennsylvania, Representative FRED B. ROONEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey; and WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey.

The project also has the endorsement of the three Governors concerned, Nelson Rockefeller of New York, Richard J. Hughes of New Jersey, and William W. Scranton of Pennsylvania. New York's Mayor Robert Wagner and Mayor James H. J. Tate of Philadelphia support it.

Opposition is minimal. No witness appeared to speak against the project in the Senate subcommittee hearing held on last year's bill, last July. Only two private owners whose property would be inundated objected during House subcommittee hearings on June 8–9, 1964. Twenty-six other witnesses testified in favor.

Said BIBLE: "In most of these projects that we have heard, there has been concerted opposition. To have a project come with as little opposition as we apparently have here makes our job easier."

Herlong-Curtis Eldercare Bill Supported by Junior Chambers of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the views of active free enterprise businessmen who make up the membership of the 5,000 chapters of the junior chamber of commerce. Note especially that a ratio of 14 to 1 of those chapters polled on the medicare issue favor the private sector Government approach to the Herlong-Curtis bill, rather than the compulsory social security total Federal Government administered King-Anderson proposal.

I wish to insert in the RECORD, at this point, a press release that I issued from my office on February 3, 1965:

HERLONG-CURTIS ELDERCARE BILL SUPPORTED BY JUNIOR CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, second ranking Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, today welcomed the support of the Hudsonville (Mich.) Junior Chamber of Commerce for his eldercare bill—H.R. 3727—an alternative to the King-Anderson compulsory Federal health care bill.

"I have been informed that the Hudsonville (Mich.) Chamber of Commerce will send a health care for the aged educational kit to 5,000 local junior chambers of commerce later this week, in an attempt to urge support of local chapters for the bill that Congressman HERLONG and myself introduced last Wednesday. I welcome this effort," CURTIS stated.

"I understand that the national junior chamber of commerce policy against medicare expired as a matter of routine after 3 years in existence" said CURTIS. "The Hudsonville Jay Cee Chapter, under the leadership of Mr. Robert Plekker, a dentist, and Mr. Norman Unema, an engineer, will initiate, as a coordinating chapter, a national jay cee effort to uncover the limitations of the administration's Federal health care bill, and urge, in its place, the backing by the local chapters of the Herlong-Curtis bill."

"Mr. Plekker stated to me that the health care approach that I have introduced would be in line with the national junior chamber of commerce belief that 'economic justice can best be won by free men through free enterprise.' "

The kit would contain a pamphlet comparing the administration bill with Herlong-Curtis eldercare and other materials whereby the local chapter could communicate their viewpoint to their Congressmen.

"I also understand that a referendum was sent to all 5,000 jay cee presidents, when it was discovered that the national jay cee policy expired, and that these presidents returned the ballots at a ratio of 14 to 1 in favor of reinstating the national policy against medicare, but it was too late to be adopted as official policy of the organization."

The Herlong-Curtis bill would allow States to contract with private health insurance companies or Blue Cross, to cover all citizens of the State over the age 65. The costs of the premiums would be borne totally by the States for those presently eligible for Kerr-Mills and OAA assistance. The bill would also allow tax deductions for those who pay their own premiums—thus emphasizing the prepaid health insurance idea.

We Treat Our Military Shabbily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the critical Vietnam situation heightens my longstanding concern over the notoriously inadequate pay we provide our military forces. I am particularly impressed by the story entitled "We Treat Our Military Shabbily," by Marion T. Wood, that recently appeared in the Saturday Evening Post. Mr. Wood states the true facts in a loud and clear fashion.

I sincerely ask each of my colleagues to spend the short time that it takes to read this article which follows:

WE TREAT OUR MILITARY SHABBILY

After 13 years as an officer of the U.S. Army, I recently resigned, frustrated and disillusioned. I was supposed to be guarding something grandly called the American way of life. But, by a cruel paradox, the society I had sworn to protect is a society that is indifferent and even hostile toward me and my comrades.

Built into the very foundation of this Nation is a distrust of soldiers, especially in peacetime. The Declaration of Independence denounces the British for keeping standing armies in the Colonies "in times of peace." The third amendment in the Bill

of Rights specifically prohibits the quartering of soldiers in peacetime "in any house without the consent of the owner." In war, the historic pattern has always been the same: When war was declared, the Nation suddenly rallied an army of civilians, trained and led by professionals who had long endured the persistent apathy and frequent scorn of their country. After the war, the civilians discarded their uniforms and became, as veterans, members of the privileged class. They were rewarded for service after getting out of the Army; those who stayed in were neither rewarded nor even long remembered.

After World War II, the pattern of hostility toward soldiers continued. Typically, the benefits of the GI bill were extended to veterans, but not to those who decided to make the Army (or any other service) a career. Then, however, for the first time in history we found ourselves in a twilight state of neither peace nor war. The cold war suddenly challenged our historic attitude that soldiers were good in wartime and bad in peacetime, and that the best soldier was an ex-soldier.

It was in this twilight that I chose the Army as a profession. Many friends and relatives were stunned. "You must be out of your mind," said one friend. Like so many civilians, they felt that the Army was a place for people who, as it was usually put, "could not do well on the outside." As a matter of fact, I had been doing well on the outside, which in my case was a small college. Membership in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps—ROTC—was required for the first 2 years. I enjoyed the experience enough to continue it during my last 2 years in college. My scholastic record was high enough to qualify me for a Regular Army commission at graduation. As a new infantry lieutenant in June 1950, I fully intended to make the Army my career.

As I look back I still see patriotism as the basic reason I decided to become an Army officer. I have not been able to find a more sophisticated explanation. Soldiers are generally embarrassed when they try to explain what it means to be a soldier. Phrases such as "service to your Nation" and "guardians of democracy" stick in a soldier's throat, as well they should. Good soldiers are soldiers because soldiering is a very real, very meaningful profession. This is especially true in a society where many men with high-paying jobs make no contribution to society. Soldiers, at least, have the satisfaction of knowing their Nation needs them. Yet from that Nation, soldiers often receive shabby treatment.

My introduction to how the Army treats its own came when the Army took 6 weeks to transform me from a college boy to a rifle-platoon leader, responsible for the lives of some 40 men. Six weeks is not much time. Then I was shipped to Japan, where the Army was frantically putting together outfits to send to Korea. Some consisted mainly of "stockade soldiers"—men taken from military jails—and untrained South Koreans. I landed in Wonsan, North Korea, in November 1950, without winter clothing.

Our equipment was often shoddy or in short supply. Weapons misfired; ammunition was scarce. There were not enough magazines for our automatic rifles. We were on the line 8 out of 9 months. There were few formal battles or engagements. It was a dirty little war, and the worst part of it was the feeling that no one really cared.

When I got back in the States in 1951, after my tour in Korea, I suddenly was a peacetime soldier. I had been warned that a soldier was a second-class citizen in many Army towns, the communities that live off the payrolls of military bases. The principal industry in most of these towns was taking soldiers for every dime they had.

In many Army towns the citizen most discriminated against is the soldier. Some policemen arrest them with flagrant entrapment techniques. I have seen police wait for a soldier to walk out of a tavern and enter his car. As he pulled away, he was stopped and arrested for "driving while intoxicated." Instead of protesting such injustice, the Army condoned it. Man after man was hauled before civilian authorities on such charges, convicted, and fined. Then these men were usually turned over to the Army, which fined them for "conduct unbecoming a soldier or an officer." The usual fine in one Army town a few years ago for an officer was $151.50, and a similar fine was paid to the Army. At one post where I served, soldiers were told officially that they should let their wives drive, for a wife could be fined only once—as a civilian.

When I was on my fourth tour of duty at Fort Benning, in 1956, about 9,000 families were living off-post. Many families lived in slums. Some used outdoor privies. Others shared bathrooms and kitchens, and slept in shifts because there were not enough bedrooms to go around. Finally, the Government authorized the Army to build 4,000 homes. But members of an area real estate board complained to Washington that the building of so many homes would ruin the local housing market. The authorization was cut down to 1,000 homes. The Army consistently caves in when challenged by local political pressure groups.

Most civilians think that a soldier's pay is tax-free, that he is financially coddled with "extras" that more than make up for his low pay. Soldiers do pay Federal income taxes and social security, regardless of where they are stationed in the world. They pay a 3 percent tax on food in all military commissaries. They also pay sales taxes where there are such taxes. The post exchange is highly overrated as a place for bargains. In many cases a soldier can buy goods cheaper at an off-post discount store. PX prices are deliberately pegged high enough to prevent area civilian merchants from suffering.

On-post Government housing is not free, and it certainly is not cheap. For example, at my last post, in a Government-owned housing project, I paid $145.05 a month for a small two-bedroom apartment. My next-door neighbor paid $175 a month for an identical apartment because he happened to be a colonel; I was a major.

Financially, the professional soldier is a second-class Federal employee. Until the cynically timed election-year pay raise recently voted y Congress, the pay of second lieutenants with less than 2 years' service had not been raised since 1958. The starting salary for a married second lieutenant, including all benefits, was about $4,500 a year. The average, new, Government civilian employee starts at $5,400. The civilian works a 40-hour week and is eligible for overtime pay. The soldier puts in a workweek of 50 or more hours; even a 65-hour workweek is not unusual. Of course, there is no overtime.

I am not suggesting that soldiering should be a 9-to-5 job with weekends and holidays off. A soldier is a soldier. It is a tough, demanding profession, and it has to be that way. As noncivilians, soldiers do not have many civilian rights. No civilian can be arrested for refusing to show up in his office or factory on a day he does not feel like working. A soldier can be court-martialed. The Army, rightfully, insists on extraordinary power over its men. The Army's mission is to defend the Nation, and to carry out this mission the rights of the Army must transcend the rights of the individual. No good soldier disputes this. And, in giving up rights guaranted to all other U.S. citizens, no soldier expects extra privileges. This is in keeping with a fine American tradition that contrasts sharply with that of more militaristic nations.

America's long and unbroken tradition as a nonmilitaristic nation is not being questioned by the military men who serve this Nation. They do not want more recognition or more power. They simply want a more equitable share of that American way of life they hear so much about. Their demand is not merely for better pay and benefits; they are asking for a realistic attitude toward the military.

From the military man's point of view, the society he guards is unable to make up its mind. The American society demands a first-class Military Establishment. Yet, by keeping military pay scales low, by seemingly equating a military career with low-status employment, this same society makes it difficult for dedicated men to enter, and stay in, military service.

Rather than a savior of his country, the American fighting man is looked upon as a parasite of an affluent, peacetime society. From Congressmen on down, Americans have refused to look realistically at what brushfire wars like Vietnam mean to the soldier who has to fight, and perhaps die, in them. The soldier is willing to fight and die, but he has a right to ask that he be treated as a first-class citizen.

It is nothing less than immoral for the American public, through it political and military leaders, to perpetuate a policy of deception and distrust toward the serviceman. Today's victim of this policy is lured into a military career by appeals to his patriotism—and promises of "security" that are callously broken. I resigned from the Army because I sought a new and more satisfying way of life. I wanted security for myself and my family. I found little of the security the Army had led me to expect. The Army told me, in a pamphlet promoting the Army as a career, that the Army was striving to "stabilize duty assignments, improve family stability, increase career attractiveness." The pamphlet emphasized what was supposed to be a basic Army policy: "The normal tour of duty will be for 3 years." In 13 years I moved 33 times, including 10 times in 9 years of marriage. And my experience was typical; I was a victim of the system.

The supreme irony comes when a man, with sorrow and reluctance, finally decides to resign from the Army. The same civilians who thought him foolish for joining the Army now look on him as foolish for resigning. They eye his rows of ribbons; they see a man of experience and valor withdrawing from their defense. They seem to sense that his absence is a chink in their armor. Perhaps they feel less secure.

In the year ending last June 30, a total of 1,483 regular officers resigned from all the armed services. The total was 1,622 in 1962 and 787 in 1961. The Nation cannot afford to lose these dedicated men. Nor can the Nation continue to believe it is possible to maintain a large Military Establishment whose members merely subsist on the fringes of the society they protect. Thousands of the men who guard America are raising families on incomes at or below the Government's own definition of a poverty income.

If American civilians want the security provided by a large Military Establishment, they must provide more security to the men in that establishment. These men are not hired gunslingers; most of them are husbands and fathers with families to support. These men would die for their Nation, and these families would mourn them with pride. These Americans are among our finest. And our finest should be nothing less than cherished.

When I decided to resign from the Army, I wrote a letter to myself to justify my decision. I want the opportunity, I wrote, to grow personally and financially, according to my own ability; I want to be part of a stable community; I want a home; but mostly I

want my children to grow up in an atmosphere which will more adequately prepare them to face the future with confidence. The U.S. Army does not offer these possibilities to me.

Now that I am a civilian, and proud of my military service and the U.S. Army, perhaps I should change that last sentence. For I know now that the Army was not alone in letting me down. America did too.

MARION WOOD.

Mexico and the Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed article in the Washington Star for February 21, 1965, is objective and a clear-cut statement of the problem which has arisen due to the termination of the bracero program. It is written by Mr. Jeremiah O'Leary, who is currently on an extensive tour of Latin American countries:

LATIN AMERICA—1965: MEXICO AND THE BRACEROS

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

MEXICO CITY, MEXICO.—For reasons that are perfectly easy to understand, the people of Mexico today have an emotional need to demonstrate an independent spirit toward the United States.

This mystique is rooted in the days of North American expansionism which cost Mexico ownership of Texas and California and much of the territory of the Western States.

It is this independence of spirit that has impelled Mexico's leaders to ignore the Organization of American States mandate against trade or diplomatic relations with Communist Cuba. And for the same reason, no Mexican politician or leader will admit caring a hoot about the end of the bracero program nearly 2 months ago.

Braceros (literally "strong arms") were Mexican farm workers who annually for many years crossed into the Western United States under Public Law 78 to help plant and harvest American crops. In 1964, the western farmers used 197,000 braceros and they took home or sent home an estimated $50 million in hard cash.

BRACEROS REAPED HARVEST

Mexican braceros helped the United States win World War II by growing food crops while millions of Americans were in uniform. For years, the braceros migrated north in season under Public Law 78 and earned 10 times more than the 8 pesos a day they could expect for similar work in their own land.

In the lettuce and carrot fields and the orchards of the West, they were getting $1.10 an hour, living under supervised conditions that were adequate if not fancy. And they were earning nest eggs that launched countless thousands of small businesses or burgeoning marriages.

It was a sad day for Mexico when the bracero law died at the end of last year under increasing pressure from American union and church groups. There are no trustworthy unemployment figures in Mexico but it seems likely true that most of the 200,000 braceros of yesteryear are jobless today.

UNIONS OPPOSE BRACEROS

Therefore, Mexico's leaders are watching with deep interest but no on-the-record comment the fight that is brewing in Washington about the use of braceros. The Western farmers and their legislators, including Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon, are plugging for a new law to reconstitute the bracero program but with refinements to protect the American farmworker. Such a bill has been introduced by Senator KUCHEL, of California.

The American unions are girding for battle, claiming that American unemployed can be found to do the work if the minimum wage of $1.25 an hour is offered. The union leaders say the American workers should get in their own land the benefits that were available to the Mexicans over the years.

The big Western farmers say they have tried to recruit "Anglo" unemployed but that they are either unsatisfactory or refuse to do the stoop labor required for crops like lettuce nd celery, or high ladder work with crops like dates.

The farmers say some of their winter crops are going to be critical because of the shortage of help and that the peak of the crisis will come next month.

Some Mexican officials believe they will win whether or not a new bracero program is launched by the United States.

They reason that the Mexican farmhands can be recruited in a hurry for the northern bonanza if the call is issued with a new law or under the more cumbersome immigration procedures. If not, some Mexicans believe they can profit by beginning to ship their own winter crops of tomatoes, lettuce, strawberries, and the rest into the United States.

Establish Visible Markers Delineating the Take Lines of the Missouri River Reservoirs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolution passed by the South Dakota State Legislature which is very important to those who live along the taking area of the Missouri River Lakes.

The resolution is as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

Concurrent resolution requesting the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army to establish visible markers delineating the take lines of the Missouri River Reservoirs

(Introduced by Messrs. Chance, Collingwood, Gunderson of Clay, Gunderson of Yankton, Hanning, Kime, Knudson, McDaniel, McKeever, McKenzie, Moore, Sahr, Smith, Sutton, Rhian, Rothstein, Varilek, and Wright.)

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of South Dakota, the senate concurring therein:

Whereas it was the pledge of the Corps of Engineers that the Missouri Basin development program would cause the adjacent landowners no economic loss; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers has failed to delineate the take lines of the Missouri River dams with visible markers; and

Whereas the taking lines of the Missouri River dams are by metes and bounds rather than along political subdivision lines; and

Whereas the owners of land adjacent to the Missouri River dams have been forced to hire private surveyors to plat and to survey the take lines, and then mark such take lines;

Whereas it is unfair to the adjacent land owners to have to pay for such surveying and the establishing of such markers; and

Whereas the lack of adequate markers for the take lines results in a problem of great magnitude affecting a large number of the citizens of the State of South Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, respectfully requests the Corps of Engineers to establish visible markers delineating the take lines of the Missouri River reservoirs; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Secretary of the Army of the United States; to the Chief of Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army at Omaha, Nebr.; to the Honorable KARL MUNDT and the Honorable GEORGE MCGOVERN, U.S. Senators from South Dakota; and to the Honorable E. Y. BERRY and the Honorable BEN REIFEL, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota.

CHARLES DROZ,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.
LEM OVERPECK,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.
NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

Farmers Oppose Government Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a poll of farmer sentiment by Farm Journal magazine, released last weekend, shows gratifying support for the marketplace, instead of Government controls, as the better way to guide farm production. Text of the Farm Journal release should have special interest as most of the major farm programs will expire during the 89th Congress:

MAJOR CHANGES IN FARM PROGRAMS URGED BY FARMERS

If the Nation's farmers were given the choice of writing a farm program for the future, they would make some big changes.

Most would scrap the present wheat, feed grain, and dairy programs. On these they'd lower support prices; move away from present Government controls, and would use the open market to guide farm production more than present programs do.

These are some of the suggested changes that come to light in a poll taken by Farm Journal, national farm magazine with a 3-million circulation distributed among farmers in all States. Replies to questions asked readers in the magazine's February issue are reported in the March issue (out February 20). Results are from a regionally balanced sample of 5,000 returns from the first 25,000 replies.

Farm Journal conducted the poll as a backdrop to the current congressional consideration of a number of commodity farm programs which expire with next year's crop.

Those answering split 50–50 on keeping the present cotton program, while the present tobacco program was approved by 64 percent. Each of these has price supports and allotments.

Farmers voted overwhelmingly against more government in farm programs. Four of the questions gave them an opportunity to vote for considerably stronger government programs. Yet only 3 percent voted for compulsory compliance with feed grain programs; only 14 percent voted to give all dairymen a production base with direct Government payments for reducing production below that base; only 18 percent voted for more direct Government payments in general; and only 22 percent voted for quotas on poultry production.

Four of the questions gave an opportunity to select between various farm program suggestions or no program at all. Here, 35 percent voted for no program at all on feed grains; 38 percent voted to eliminate all wheat programs; 43 percent would do away with any direct Government payments in general; and 78 percent voted for no program at all for poultry.

Where questions gave a choice of moving away from present programs to other choices, only 23 percent preferred the present wheat program; 26 percent the present direct payment provisions; 28 percent the present feed grain program; 30 percent the present dairy program; 35 percent the present program on reselling surplus farm stocks; and 35 percent preferred the present land retirement program.

The most popular program for feed grains and dairy would be to lower supports to 90 percent of the 3-year average market price; the most popular wheat program would drop supports to 90 percent of the world market price for wheat.

More than 4 out of 10 (43 percent) would eliminate direct cash payments to farmers where the Government pays farmers for the difference between the market price and a Government support level. Another 13 percent would prefer to see fewer such direct payment plans than at present.

The main regional differences showed that farmers in the eastern and western parts of the Nation are more opposed to Government farm programs than are farmers in the rest of the country.

Surprisingly, votes by size showed that the largest farm operators were more content with present programs than smaller farmers who raise some of the commodities. Smaller operators were more in favor of reducing cotton and dairy price supports and more of the smaller growers voted to do away with all wheat programs.

The Farm Journal results show that farmers would establish a fair practices law that would permit farmers to negotiate prices and contracts directly with processors—without fear of reprisal. At the present time, many farmers fear that organizing into such bargaining groups would cause processors to drop them from the customary yearly contracts to grow fruits and vegetables.

Farmers are dissatisfied with the meat import agreements that the present political administration drew up with Australia and New Zealand last year. Farmers think that the terms were too liberal; and 85 percent voted to tighten meat import regulations.

The question of State reapportionment brought an overwhelming 96-percent response in favor of permitting each State to determine for itself whether it would apportion its State legislature by population alone or whether it would apportion one house partly by area or other factors. Presently more than 40 States do apportion one house partly by factors other than population alone—but last year, the Supreme Court ruled that both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned by population alone. A constitutional amendment is pending before Congress.

This is the most elaborate of four similar reader polls conducted by Farm Journal since 1958. In each of them, readers have voted for less government in agriculture.

Address by John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General, at the Annual Banquet of the Texarkana Chamber of Commerce, Texarkana College, Texarkana, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General of the United States, delivered an excellent address before the Chamber of Commerce of Texarkana, Tex., on January 28. He discussed in his usual lucid and intelligent manner the business of his department.

In addition, he had some kind words to say about some distinguished gentlemen, particularly my friend, the gentleman from Texas, WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, and he also pays his respects to the highly respected chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, Hon. OREN HARRIS.

I believe most assuredly that the address deserves national attention and I am proud to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

My pleasure at being here with you today is twofold.

First, because the invitation came from your very distinguished U.S. Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN. Mr. PATMAN is one of those rare people in Congress who not only represents his constituency well but who also stands like a tower on the national scene. As the highly respected chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, he is one of the acknowledged experts in the United States on our monetary system. When he speaks he is always listened to, and he always speaks with a voice of authority and experience. He is also a fine gentleman, and I am honored that he should want me to come here to speak.

But one does not come to Texarkana and speak only of WRIGHT PATMAN, for this city boasts not one but two Congressmen of national stature. The other, of course, is OREN HARRIS, the distinguished chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I am sure that all of you, as businessmen, realize what a vital and influential body this committee is. At the present time, it is holding hearings on the illegal sale of narcotics and is scheduled to consider such problems as health, transportation, and the labeling of tobacco products. It is not too much to say, in fact, that much of the Great Society legislation will originate under OREN HARRIS' leadership.

I also welcome the opportunity to speak to this distinguished group of business leaders because—quite frankly—I need your help. I need the help of every postal customer in the United States to meet the challenge of the tremendous growth in our mail volume.

I call it a mail explosion which, in fact, is far outstripping our better known population explosion. To give you an idea of how dramatic the situation has become, I might point out that from 1940 to 1964, our population increased at the rate of only 46 percent, while our mail volume, during the same period, increased by 166 percent. We are now generating mail at the rate of 72 billion pieces a year, which is half as much as the rest of the world's volume combined.

But, let me assure you that my comparison between our population and our mail volume ends with a statement of the problems. The solutions are entirely different. Birth control is a hot enough issue without my advocating a plan for mail control.

Nor would I want to, for that matter.

Our mail volume is a true barometer of our national economy. When times are good, the amount of mail increases. When times are bad, it slows down. For example, our mail volume during the depression years of 1930 to 1933 actually slipped from 27 billion pieces to 19 billion pieces.

But the mail is even more than a barometer of the economy; it is a contributing factor to the economy, the lifeblood of our business community—a vehicle for paychecks, bank deposits, bids, contracts, pensions, bills, payments and business orders and merchandise. I am told, in fact, that the insurance industry conducts 90 percent of its business by mail.

So I am not going to ask you to stop sending so many letters and packages. Far from it. I welcome the business.

But if we recognize the mail explosion as a mid-20th century phenomenon, we must also recognize that it will take mid-20th-century methods to keep it moving.

In sum, we can keep the mail moving, and we can keep postal rates to a reasonable level, but we all have to change our thinking and our methods in the process.

And we will need the cooperation of the American business community to do it.

Why the business community? Because 80 percent of all our mail is business mail. If we can keep this mail from bottlenecking in our large city post offices, the rest will take care of itself.

You remember back in the 1940's when business and industrial leaders were recruited for Government service. They were called dollar-a-year-men and they brought to Washington a tremendous amount of talent and experience that otherwise would have been lost to us. Well, we are now going to expand on that program. We are going to call into Government service the $10 billion worth of automatic data processing equipment that is now in operation throughout our business community.

Using this equipment, large-volume mailers will be asked to sequence their mailing lists according to ZIP code and then presort their mail so that it goes directly to its carrier station destination before it is ever taken out of the sack. This will save us from having to sort the mail several times along the way—thus cutting down our manpower requirements—and will speed delivery in the process. McCall's magazine, for example, recently ran an experimental survey on ZIP coded mail to Florida and discovered that in every case, magazines were delivered at least a day earlier than before, and in some cases, 2 and 3 days earlier.

This program of presorting is the most revolutionary postal innovation of the 20th century. It represents a major breakthrough in the problem of ever-increasing volumes of mail—not only for the 1960's, but for the 1970's and 1980's as well.

And so, with this in mind, I am, by administrative action, planning to require all large-

volume second- and third-class mailers to begin ZIP code presorting.

Further, I am planning to ask Congress for legislation to require the same of large-volume first-class mailers. We are now far enough along on our ZIP code program for this to have an immediate effect on our overall postal operation—and frankly, I do not see any other way out.

Now I am not so naive as to think I am going to escape criticism. I expect it in fact. But I am a firm advocate of Harry Truman's law of Government service: "If you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen." Furthermore, I recognize my responsibility as Postmaster General for providing the best possible postal service at the lowest possible cost. If I failed in that, I would be criticized even more—and rightly so—by every large mailer and chamber of commerce group in the United States.

I know, too, that in requiring mailers to presort, I will be criticized for asking the business community to do part of my job. But there again I ask you to remember that public cooperation is an accepted fact of our times. Twenty years ago, the motto of America's retailers was "Service with a smile." Today, it is "Serve yourself." People pick out their own food in supermarkets, flock to self-service department stores and drugstores, and there are indications they may soon be pumping their own gas. They get their own coffee and soft drings out of vending machines, write out their own trip insurance, and rent their own trucks. All this is recognition of the fact that today labor is too dear a commodity to waste on jobs that the customer can do himself.

Perhaps the best example of the benefits that accrue from self-service has been provided by the telephone company. Several years ago, when you wanted to call long distance, you asked the operator to do it. Today you do it yourself. And, as a result, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. was recently able to announce an across-the-board rate reduction for long-distance calls.

So all we in the postal service are trying to do is catch up with the times so that we, too, will be able to put a check on soaring costs.

Last week, I established an advisory panel, made up of distinguished members of the American business and labor communities, to conduct a thorough study of our postal rates and to assist me in making recommendations to the President. And, in the meantime, we will move ahead with a number of programs to cut costs while maintaining the highest possible level of service.

From the mailers' point of view, presorting will be a major instrument in our efforts to keep postal rates at a reasonable level.

As you know, President Johnson sent to Congress last Monday a $99.7 billion budget for fiscal year 1966. But you may not know what a herculean task it was to contain the budget so effectively. I do, from personal experience, and I recongize what a significant achievement this is, for it represents the lowest budget, as compared with our gross national product, in 15 years. It is a tight budget, but it is also a budget with vision.

It will provide better and broader educational opportunities for our children, step up the war against poverty, promote advances in the Nation's health, improve conditions in the urban areas, strengthen our social security protection and foster continued economic expansion.

In striving for these goals, however, there is no room for Government waste. We must continue to provide, in the words of President Johnson, "a dollar's worth for a dollar spent." In his budget message, Mr. Johnson insists "upon stringent criteria to control the growth of Federal civilian employment. It is important," he said, "that we have enough people to carry on the Government's business efficiently, but we must also see that we have no more employees than we need."

As the head of the largest civilian work force in Government, it is my job to carry out those instructions—and I intend to do so, with your help.

Thank you.

Mortgage Foreclosures Highest Since 1939

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Wall Street Journal points out:

At the height of the Nation's longest peacetime boom, more Americans are losing their homes through foreclosures than at any time since World War II.

The foreclosure rate has risen steadily for the last 5 years. In 1964 the number of foreclosures exceeded 100,000 for the first time since 1939. For every 1,000 mortgages there were 4.59 foreclosures—twice the 2.34 figure for 1959.

In the midst of the longest peacetime boom in the Nation's history, the trend in mortgage foreclosures is a disturbing indicator that the underpinnings of this expansion warrant closer inspection—specifically, credit policies. A real estate analyst, Mr. Sanford Goodkin has called current mortgage lending troubles:

An iceberg of which foreclosures are only the visible smaller part—the rest would surface as foreclosures in a recession.

Foreclosures have been running especially high on FHA and VA mortgages with their low downpayment, 30-year terms. Such terms tempt buyers to move into houses where they have little cash invested, so that if they can't make the payments, they won't lose much.

A recent survey by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has produced some startling figures on foreclosure rates in individual States. In the 12 months ending September 30, Nevada had 48.32 foreclosures per 1,000 conventional mortgages—10 times the national foreclosure rate on all kinds of mortgages. Other conventional mortgage foreclosure rates were: Arizona, 11.54; California, 10.85; North Dakota, 8.92; Florida, 7.78.

Tighter credit policies would help to reduce these disturbing high foreclosure rates and promote more careful lending policies and thus the basic strength of the economy. I ask unanimous consent that the Journal article of February 11, 1965 be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

HOMEOWNERS' WOE: HOUSE FORECLOSURES HIT HIGHEST POINT SINCE 1939 DESPITE LENGTHY BOOM—MANY BUYERS PILE THEIR DEBT TOO HIGH, LENDING LAXITY, OVERBUILDING ALSO BLAMED: DEEP TROUBLE IN SANTA MARIA

(By Peter Gall)

SANTA MARIA, CALIF.—At the height of the Nation's longest peacetime boom, more Americans are losing their homes through foreclosure than at any time since before World War II.

As mortgage credit has grown easier, and rising pay has tempted home buyers to plunge headlong into debt, foreclosures have risen for 5 straight years. Last year they apparently topped 100,000 for the first time since 1939. Their rate hit 4.59 per 1,000 mortgages—almost double the 2.34 rate as recently as 1959.

To brake the trend, some mortgage lenders who used to concentrate on appraising the market value of a house now are adding a check into the credit of its would-be buyer. Many also are getting tough about collecting mortgage payments on time, to stop the payment delinquencies that often turn into foreclosures. Both moves, of course, affect many home buyers besides those foreclosed.

But whether these steps will stop the rise is still to be proved. The U.S. Savings & Loan League sees a recent steady decline in mortgage delinquencies, and says this foreshadows a leveling off in foreclosures—at least so far as savings and loans are concerned.

AN ICEBERG

But Sanford Goodkin, a real estate analyst, calls current mortgage lending troubles "an iceberg of which foreclosures are only the visible, smaller part—the rest would surface as foreclosures in a recession." Short of a general recession, he fears, economic shifts cutting employment and incomes in an industry or locality could touch off an explosive foreclosure situation in some spots.

This already has happened in some places—notably here in Santa Maria. In much of the United States the forclosure trend is seen only by mortgage lenders, the people who lose their homes, and their neighbors, and even they may regard it as a collection of isolated cases of personal bad luck. But in this town of 32,000, about 170 miles north of Los Angeles, the trend can be seen by anyone whose eyes are open.

In housing developments on Santa Maria's outskirts, a driver passes dozens of empty, foreclosed houses; in some they outnumber the occupied homes. Many bear "no trespassing" signs to warn vandals and looters that the premises are patrolled by private guards, hired by the foreclosers.

Santa Maria and its environs now hold a startling 500 such houses. Some 47 have been repossessed by the Santa Maria Savings & Loan Association—an institution that in 1962 had celebrated 35 straight years of lending on homes without a single foreclosure. Others are now owned by three other savings and loans, several mortgage lending companies, or the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration, which have had to take back many homes on which they had guaranteed the mortgage payments.

UNWANTED "DOGS"

The houses are a headache to all concerned. Many are in none-too-good condition, as is usual with foreclosed homes; if a house is well kept, its owner usually can sell it for enough to pay off the mortgage before the lender is forced to repossess. "What we get back are usually unsalable dogs—poorly located or poor quality," says one mortgage lender. In Santa Maria the VA has been spending about $650 a home, and the FHA about $800, on such items as landscaping, painting, carpets and drapes, to spruce up foreclosed homes so that real estate men can at least try to sell them.

But even then the foreclosed houses have been selling slowly, and often for less than their original price. Their presence, meanwhile, lowers the value of neighboring, still-occupied homes, as Santa Marians are bitterly aware. "How do you expect us to get any value out of our property in these surround-

ings?" asks one housewife angrily, as she points to waist-high weeds surrounding a foreclosed house across the street.

What happened? Santa Marians trace the trouble to cutbacks at nearby Vandenberg Air Force Base, which trimmed 3,000 from its civilian payroll last year—and undoubtedly this was the trigger. But a deeper look discloses other things that made the community vulnerable and they're by no means limited to Santa Maria.

THE BOB MOUGETTE STORY

Most important, perhaps, is the type of family financial management typified by the story of Robert Mougette, a sheet metal layout man for Douglas Aircraft Co. at the Vandenberg base. In 1959 Bob went on steady overtime, lifting his earnings to $200 a week from a former $160. So he decided he could buy a house, and furniture, and several other things, even though he had no savings account (he still doesn't, for all his 9 years of marriage and four children; "When we had it we spent it," he says).

The Mougettes consequently bought a three-bedroom house for $15,955—$1,000 in cash, $11,500 on a first mortgage, and $3,455 on a second mortgage—and quickly hit trouble. A drop in overtime soon forced Bob to take a "moonlighting" job, working nights in a gas station for an extra $20 a week, to pay his many debts. Then, last August, came the base cutback; to avoid layoff Bob had to quit the gas station and switch into an evening-shift job at Douglas—for only $120 a week. That wouldn't stretch to cover the $120 monthly payments on his two mortgages, plus loan payments on his car and furniture, plus doctor bills.

Four months later Douglas restored Bob's regular $160 weekly wage—but "4 months and I was wiped out," he says. Last November he declared personal bankruptcy, and by January his house was repossessed. He now lives in a low-rent apartment, is paying his other debts, and expects by summer to open a savings account; later he might try to buy another house. But "next time we'll have some money in our pocket and know what we're getting into," vows his wife.

Outside Santa Maria, a good many Americans have yet to make any such vows. Mortgage lenders and retail credit men alike identify as the basic cause of most foreclosures the tendency of many families to live, in Bob Mougette's words, "right up to the penny—maybe even beyond the penny." Even in areas without Santa Maria's local economic troubles, many house buyers take on so much debt that illness of the wage earner, or anything else temporarily cutting income or raising expenses, puts them out of their homes. Others take on too much debt to handle even with a steady income.

"It was just more than we should have bought," admits a Los Angeles mother of two, as she prepares to move out of her home in the Baldwin Hills area. Her husband bought the house in 1961 with a $19,000 mortgage loan. "Then we had to buy furniture and we went into debt to do that—pretty soon we had more debt than we could bear," she says. Her family hasn't made a mortgage payment since last August, and stands to lose its home in a few days.

FORECLOSURES ON BUILDERS

But foreclosures have other causes, too. In Santa Maria there's evidence of overbuilding by construction firms that spread their capital thin—and so not all the foreclosures have been on homes owned by individuals. Some builders defaulted on their construction loans, and lenders foreclosed the houses they were putting up before anyone bought them.

Such overbuilding has caused trouble elsewhere. In Phoenix, Ariz., overbuilding combined with a slowdown in employment set off a foreclosure spiral that was "like a snake biting its own tail," says an FHA official. Builders, he says, put up many houses for sale to construction workers; a drop in the housing market suddenly made their best customers the most frequently unemployed. At mid-1963 the FHA alone owned 1,000 repossessed homes in Phoenix, and it still holds 500 to 600 that it's trying to sell.

Across the continent in Huntington, N.Y., a rapidly growing New York City suburb, the builder of a huge development ran out of money in late 1962 with over 100 houses still abuilding. Banks started to foreclose them, and families that had put money down on their homes-to-be were threatened with loss of their investments before they ever moved in. Disaster was averted only when a better financed builder bought the development and finished most of the homes.

LAX LENDERS, TOO

Too-liberal lenders also must share responsibility for many foreclosures, say realty specialists. "The rising (foreclosure) rate has hoisted the flag that lending practices have broken down some place," says James Gillies, director of the real estate research program at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA).

Foreclosure rates run especially high on FHA and VA mortgages, with their low-downpayment, 30-year terms. These, say some realtors, tempt many buyers to move into houses in which they have so little cash invested that they don't lose much if they can't make the payments.

But in some areas foreclosure rates on "conventional" (non-Government-insured) mortgages also run startingly high. A survey by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board shows Nevada with an astonishing 48.33 foreclosures per 1,000 conventional mortgages in the 12 months ended September 30—10 times the national foreclosure rate on all kinds of mortgages, and even above the nationwide, all-mortgage foreclosure rate of 25 to 30 per 1,000 reached at the depth of the depression of the 1930's. Other high conventional-mortgage foreclosure rates disclosed by the Federal survey: Arizona, 11.54; California, 10.85; North Dakota, 8.92; Florida, 7.78.

One bank economist blames such rates largely on lending excesses. He says some lenders have made "careless appraisals," or have loaned money to builders in areas they knew were threatened by overbuilding, in their anxiety to get funds out drawing interest.

NOW, A CRACKDOWN

To promote more careful lending, the U.S. Savings and Loan League recently made an "Anatomy of a Residential Mortgage" study of 38 institutions' loans. Some findings: the self-employed, unskilled workers and salesmen post the highest mortgage delinquency rates; white-collar workers and executives, the lowest. The more dependents a borrower has, the greater the likelihood of delinquency. And, if a borrower lists a small loan company as a credit reference, the likelihood of delinquency is nearly doubled. Many S. & L.'s have changed lending practices in accordance with these findings.

Detroit Mortgage & Realty Co., which serviced about $275 million worth of mortgages in 1964, is cracking down in a different way. It says it is "trying to get borrowers away from the idea they have a 15-day grace period after the due date of their payment" (most mortgages impose a penalty charge for lateness only after 10 to 15 days). At the first sign of delinquency Detroit Mortgage now calls in the borrower and his wife, gets a list of every debt they have, and tries to work out a new payment schedule for all in which the mortgage payments would be made on time.

The thinking here is that many foreclosures start with a debt-burdened buyer paying late, then missing a payment or two. "Once a guy has missed a couple of months it's a real fight to get current again," even if he genuinely tries, says one lender.

Some don't even try for very long. Nick Samella, a California carpenter, missed the $105 monthly payments on his $15,000 house when he was out of work a couple of months last spring, and couldn't work out a schedule of reduced payments with the lender. So "when it began to look hopeless, I said the hell with it and began paying off other bills instead," he says. Result, foreclosure.

Sustained Power Is the Secret of Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following excellent editorial by Caleb King, Jr., editor of the editorial page of the Florida Times-Union. It well states the importance of our naval aircraft and of the lesson that we must all bear in mind, that we can only win by sustained power and by calculated action—not merely reaction. The editorial read as follows:

SUSTAINED POWER IS THE SECRET OF VICTORY

"Sustained Power at Sea" will be the subject of a talk by Capt. Gilven M. Slonim, now on duty in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, at a luncheon meeting of the Navy League here today.

Captain Slonim makes his appearance before the local organization against a background of disturbed world conditions to discuss a topic which is most timely in the wake of recent naval actions in the Vietnam conflict.

It is also a subject which impinges deeply on the people of this community always conscious of its close ties with naval power as a base for carriers and carrier air squadrons which operate in rotation to serve with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean. Jacksonville-based ships, planes, and fliers stand constantly ready to counter any enemy action in that section of the globe just as units operating in southeast Asian waters have delivered America's striking power to the Communist aggressors in North Vietnam.

It is appropriate and timely, therefore, to consider some of the implications of sustained power to be discussed by the Navy League's guest. Sustained power means the ability to apply military force to the enemy continuously and at a maximum level, rather than on an off-again, on-again basis. It means the ability to deliver and maintain whatever force is needed to deny the enemy his objective, seize the initiative, and carry the fight to the enemy.

In the case of carriers and carrier-based air squadrons, that principle of sustained power is predicated upon the carrier's unique characteristics of mobility and elusiveness.

Vietnam operations have again demonstrated the capabilities of carrier units in flying close support for land forces. Those capabilities extend, under other circumstances, to long-range operations, all enhanced by the carrier's ability to deliver its striking force and fall back to become a most elusive target in a vast sea.

The same principle of sustained power is applicable to any other action in the necessity of exploiting gains and maintaining the initiative. In the Civil War, the South was able to fight on long after defeat was certain because Union forces failed on many occasions to follow up their successes.

The essential lesson of sustained power, therefore, is that battles and wars are won by action—not by reaction to enemy initiative. Military leaders understand it well. The Nation's diplomats and civilian leaders should learn it better.

Ashley Halsey, Jr.: Analysis of William Tecumseh Sherman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the South Carolina Confederate War Centennial Commission last Wednesday graciously invited me as a guest to ceremonies marking the 100th year since the wanton destruction of our State capitol during Sherman's fiery "March to the Sea."

The Honorable Ashley Halsey, Jr., noted author, lecturer, and historian, delved into the character and motivations of the tall, gawky general during a revealing luncheon address.

His incisive probing of history during his talk produced many aspects of Sherman which should be of interest to students of the tragic war.

Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby include Mr. Halsey's remarks for their information:

REMARKS OF ASHLEY HALSEY, JR., LUNCHEON, FEBRUARY 17, 1965

This is National Law Enforcement Week. It is also national salesmen's week. That is fine as far as it goes. But it would be far more appropriate to this community and occasion, if it were national fire prevention week.

The late, Dr. Billy Ball, distinguished native of Laurens, editor of the State in Columbia and the News and Courier of Charleston, first dean of the School of Journalism at the University of South Carolina, and preeminent in my mind because he gave me my first newspaper job, once wrote a book entitled "The State That Forgot." The title referred to South Carolina, not the State newspaper.

Well, in going over the roster of SLED, our State law enforcement department—don't ask me why—I came across a most curious evidence that South Carolina has not entirely forgotten. What do you suppose is the largest squad of SLED? The homicide squad? The bank robbery squad? Not at all, it's the arson squad. Too bad they weren't around a hundred years ago today.

Now my friend, John May, asked me to speak of two of my fellow Charlestonians, neither a native of Charleston itself, members of different generations, but both of them notable in their respective ways.

I refer to the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, my beloved high school classmate, the most distinguished contribution that Charleston has made to national leadership since Jimmy Byrnes emerged upon the national scene, and another onetime resident of the Charleston area, William Tecumseh Sherman.

In different ways—again I must emphasize this—both of these notables have been rightly or wrongly identified with conflagrations. I shall defend only one of them. Let me deny, here, now, and for all time, that they threatened to burn down the high school of Charleston to get MENDEL and me out of it. MENDEL just stayed on to get a thorough education for his great career and I simply lingered to keep him company.

As for Sherman, that's another matter. It is intriguing to imagine the conversation that might have gone on if General Sherman and Chairman RIVERS had lived at the same time. Says Sherman: "No, sir, Mr. Chairman, I never once ordered my troops to build their campfires in old ladies' bedrooms. No, sir, Mr. Chairman, it isn't true that I cram my pockets with so many matches that they keep falling out and starting fires."

Sherman as a young Army officer was stationed for some time at Fort Moultrie, on Sullivan's Island, near Charleston. A tall, gawky midwesterner, he made many friends in the Charleston area. Possibly this was due to the caution with which he handled his matches in antebellum parlors. At any rate, he is reputed to have loved the low country scenery so much that he painted delicate watercolors of it. None of these, as far as I know, now hang in Charleston or Columbia art galleries.

But let me come to an important point. Many people to this day wonder why Sherman burned Columbia instead of Charleston. The answer is easy. The two cities have always been rivals. What was more natural than for Sherman, as a Charlestonian by adoption, to burn Columbia rather than Charleston? There's your answer, no mystery at all.

Actually, Sherman is said by some of his biographers to have loved the South. If so, he showed his affection later in most curious ways—somewhat like that fond New England daughter, Lizzie Borden, who, according to the verse, "took an ax and gave her mother 40 whacks." Thank goodness Sherman didn't really dislike the South. What would he have done?

Well, Sherman burned Columbia and I am here today to burn Sherman. So let me proceed. At this juncture, I shall speak seriously. What I have to say now is too grim for joking.

Usually any person's past is liberally seeded with clues to his character. In Sherman's we have to go back only a very few years prior to 1865. While doing research on my two books on the Confederate period, "A Yankee Private's Civil War"—the private was one of Sherman's—and "Who Fired the First Shot?" a compendium giving various facets of the war—I came across authoritative and indisputable evidence from Sherman himself of his willingness to burn civilians out of house and home. His motive in each instance appears to have been to protect army supply lines, but whatever his motive, listen to this:

"Cannot you send over about Fairfield and Adairsville, burn 10 or 12 houses of known secessionists, kill a few at random, and let it be known it will be repeated every time a train is fired on?"

That was to Brig. Gen. Louis Watkins, U.S. Army, in October 1864 and is signed from field headquarters at Rome, Ga., by W. T. Sherman, major general commanding.

Whether or not Watkins carried out this brutal and ruthless order I do not know, but if he failed to carry it out, it is to his credit and not the credit of his commanding general.

But we can go back further—to more than 2 years before the burning of Columbia, for evidence of Sherman's attitude and intent. While Sherman commanded in the Mississippi Valley, with headquarters at Memphis, U.S. Army river steamers were plagued by a perfectly legitimate military harassment. Confederate snipers and light batteries would slip up to the river bank and fire into them. On November 7, 1862, Sherman wrote a fiery threat of retaliation.

"The absolute destruction of Memphis, New Orleans, and every city, town, and hamlet of the South would not be too severe a punishment to a people attempting to interfere with the navigation on the Mississippi."

Here then is plain evidence of a willingness and intent to burn civilians out of house and home if necessary.

Where do we find this evidence? Why, in the official war records as published by the U.S. Government. It is hardly open to question much less controversy.

Let me dispose of the subject with perhaps the kindest public comment ever made on Sherman by a southerner. It had to come, of course, from an Atlanta editor, in this case the great Henry Grady.

In his humorous speech in New York City after the war, he described Sherman as "a little careless with matches."

Nobody is likely to argue with that statement. Thank you.

France Should Repay Her War Debts: A Brief Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the growing number of voices both in and out of Congress who are calling for pressure to be put upon France to resume payments on the World War I debt which she owes us. It is a well-known fact that France has not paid a penny on her World War I debt since June 15, 1931. As of June 30, 1964, her World War I debt amounted to over $6.4 billion; of this amount $1.9 billion in principal and nearly $2.6 billion in interest is past due.

I fully recognize that there was compelling circumstances in the depression of the 1930's, the fateful years of World War II, and the early years of reconstruction which can justify the moratorium of debt payment for possibly 20 years. But now nearly 34 years have elapsed since France made her last payment. She is showing new vitality, new economic gains, and a revived spirit of independence of action. She is in a favorable balance-of-payments position. At the same time, as all the world knows, our balance-of-payments position remains unfavorable and there is little prospect of early improvement. When we then receive word that General de Gaulle is determined to demand gold for its U.S. dollar holdings, it is high time to demand of him that he in all honor recognize this debt contracted nearly 50 years ago and start making payments.

There is no better time than now, when the distinguished Foreign Minister of France, M. Couve de Murville, is our guest in Washington, to bring this matter into the open. Therefore, I, too, wish to introduce a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that France start resuming its payments on its World War I indebtedness without further delay. France is in a better position to resume payments on these debts stemming back half a century than any other

nation of the free world which still owes us a legal debt from that time. By taking up the payments that have been neglected for nearly 34 years, France can demonstrate her moral integrity, her economic strength, and her belief in the cooperation of the free nations of the world.

The Price of Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Price of Control" from the edition of February 19, 1965, of the Wall Street Journal:

THE PRICE OF CONTROL

Since Britain has a Socialist government, it was to be expected that the authorities would busy themselves with setting up price and wage review boards. Still, the move is a piece of intellectual arrogance, and its lessons are not confined to the British Isles.

The boards are supposed to concern themselves with all aspects of wholesale and retail prices, wages and salary increases, reductions in hours and other changes in working conditions. Reports from London say the government is counting on voluntary acceptance of the decisions of the bodies through persuasion and the pressure of public opinion. If "voluntary restraint" doesn't work, however, "other methods" will be used—presumably meaning poor Britain is on the way to direct economic controls.

The progression is about as old as governments. First the politicians mismanage the people's money and devalue it with inflation. Then, instead of tackling the root difficulties, they try to cover them up with controls. Though the controls can cause all sorts of distortions and black markets, they may for a time check the price and wage spiral which is a symptom of the inflation. What they cannot do is stop the inflation.

When the government happens to be Socialist, the urge to control fits in neatly with the father-knows-best doctrine; the essence of socialism in practice is central direction of men, money, and markets. The trouble is that paternalistic government does not by a long shot know best, a truth to which we have abundant testimony on this side of the Atlantic.

Officials here don't talk about price-wage controls, or if they do it is to declare that, of course, it is preposterous to suppose we are going to have any such thing. They are nonetheless not above essaying a bit of indirect controlling, as when Presidents in effect repeal increases in steel prices and in the prime rate of banks. There is also maudlin self-praise of the Government's price-wage "guideposts," which are being so blithely flouted by the labor unions.

In the field of foreign transactions, moreover, the U.S. Government appears to be moving briskly along toward exchange controls. It has slapped a punitive tax on American purchases of foreign securities and bank loans abroad; it calls for "voluntary restraint" on the part of banks and business enterprises generally in their oversea dealings. What happens if, as is quite possible, voluntary restrain doesn't work to the satisfaction of the would-be managers?

A government which can look toward controls on Americans doing business abroad is perfectly capable of the same activity at home. We aren't predicting it will do so; we merely remark that the inflationary policies which have wrought such havoc in the country's international payments can set off a new wage-price spiral in the domestic economy, and there are some who think it is already beginning. Should that happen, the temptation will be strong for the officials to resort to more stringent forms of control.

Such a development would be self-defeating, among its many unhappy consequences. It would be an additional expression of this widespread confidence in governmental ability to run affairs for which the governors demonstrate very little inherent ability. In the United States or Britain or anywhere else a group of officials who cannot or will not preserve the value of the people's money ought not be permitted to indulge in the quackery of controls.

More broadly as applied to the newly expansionist policies of the U.S. Government, bureaucracies which have so ineptly operated so many programs should not be allowed to assume still large responsibilities without full accounting of their past errors. For it is by now well established, almost as a political law, that a government's propensity to mismanage increases with the increase of its undertakings.

Given honest money and minimum of supervision, people can handle their affairs better than a central authority can do it for them. And when overbearing governments multiply their burdens and restrictions, it is always the people who pay the price of control.

Goldwater Is Misquoted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in order that Members who have not read the letters to the editor in the March 1, 1965, issue of Newsweek magazine may be advised, I have asked consent to insert in the RECORD two brief letters carried in that issue on page 2B, and also the statement by Newsweek magazine:

A MISQUOTATION

You quote BARRY GOLDWATER as saying, "What it boils down to is that I wasn't dishonest enough to win this campaign" ("National Affairs," February 1).

His actual statement was: "People begin to write books about the campaign, and I have had a real interesting and amusing time reading them. In fact, what they boil down to mostly is that I wasn't dishonest enough in this last campaign to win. It is a little distracting to find writers feeling that in order to win an election one must be dishonest." Therefore, he was not stating his own opinion but the opinions of others. Was this misquotation deliberate?

CHARLES GERRETSON II,
Wilmar Junior College.

WILLMAR, MINN.

I feel that you owe to your readers, as well as to Senator Goldwater, an apology. I am sure you will be too busy to do this, however.

FRANK LANSINGER, Jr.

RICHMOND, VA.

The quotation was taken out of context, though not deliberately, and Newsweek apologizes to Senator Goldwater.

The Closing of Seven Public Health Service Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S. Public Health Service has expressed its deep concern with the action taken by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Veterans' Administration in closing Public Health Service hospitals and Veterans' Administration hospitals. This association, made up of more than 75 percent of the career active duty personnel of the Public Health Service, has expressed its concern in a thought provoking statement on the effect of the closing of seven U.S. Public Health hospitals and their relation to hospital care for veterans. The association, Mr. Speaker, voices the fear that the Veterans' Administration hospital system will be unable to handle the increased patient load from the closing Public Health Service hospitals, especially in view of the announced closing of 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals. I believe it is important that the appropriate committees of Congress ascertain the future policy of the Federal Government regarding hospital care for its several classes of beneficiaries. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ON CLOSING OF SEVEN PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITALS AND THEIR RELATION TO HOSPITAL CARE FOR VETERANS

This statement is made on behalf of the Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S. Public Health Service. The Commissioned Officers Association is an organization which represents approximately 3,600 members, which number includes over 75 percent of the career active duty personnel of that Service. These members are physicians, dentists, scientists, engineers, and other categories of dedicated professional personnel in the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service.

The press release of January 19, 1965, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, announcing the closing of Public Health Service hospitals in Boston, Mass.; Chicago, Ill.; Norfolk, Va.; Savannah, Ga.; Memphis, Tenn.; Galveston, Tex.; and Detroit, Mich., will result in undue hardship and in many cases, the loss of medical care for the beneficiaries of the Public Health Service and add to the already overcrowded conditions of nearby VA hospitals.

The release of January 19 states that the beneficiaries of the Public Health Service hospitals will receive hospital care through referral to Veterans' Administration hospitals. It is our contention that this transfer cannot be performed without impairing the medical care, and in some instances, eliminating it, for beneficiaries of the Public

Health Service hospitals and veterans receiving medical and health care in nearby Veterans' Administration hospitals. The national commander of the American Legion stated in testimony before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, "We understand that certain patients previously hospitalized in Public Health Service hospitals will be eligible for care in VA facilities. We have been unable to ascertain to what extent it would decrease the ability of the Veterans' Administration to care for war veterans. We fear that the VA hospital system as established by Congress is in jeopardy."

It is difficult to understand how the patients from the Public Health Service hospitals can be cared for by the VA hospital system when many of the VA hospitals that these patients are to be referred to are already operating at maximum patient capacity and have long waiting lists for those veterans with non-service-connected disabilities. The situation that exists in Texas is a good example of the above problem. The Public Health Service hospital in Galveston, Tex., had a daily patient load in fiscal year 1964 of 139 or 176 percent of capacity. Most of these patients are to be cared for at the Houston VA hospital. However, we have been informed that the constructed capacity of the Houston VA hospital is 1,242 and the present patient load is 1,219. Further, there is a long waiting list for those veterans with non-service-connected disabilities.

It is therefore, impossible to comprehend how over 100 patients can be cared for in a hospital that has only 23 beds available.

This is but one of several examples that point up the inconsistencies in the arguments raised to justify the closing of the Public Health Service hospitals.

The accessability of those hospitals to which the beneficiaries of the Public Health Service hospital program are referred is another important point completely overlooked or ignored by those responsible for ordering the hospitals closed. In many instances a PHS patient will be forced to travel great distances in order to receive hospital care, thus placing a tremendous and undue hardship on this patient.

In the case of the Savannah hospital, which is operating at 100 percent of capacity, many beneficiaries including the American seamen will have to travel to Charleston, S.C., to receive hospital care. This is true in spite of the fact that Savannah is a growing seaport and the health and care of the seamen from this port has an important bearing on the port and the State's shipping and commerce.

It is clear that the decision to close the seven Public Health Service hospitals did not emanate from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but rather from the Bureau of the Budget. The Department and the Public Health Service has time and time again demonstrated the need and the justification for the continuation and improvement of its hospitals.

Nevertheless, the Bureau of the Budget has persistently placed such continuing restrictions on capital improvements and major repairs as to bring about a progressive state of deterioration.

Congress recognized the need for adequate funds to maintain these hospitals in proper status. The Appropriations Committee for the Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare stated in its 1964 report:

"The committee noted that funds for repairs and maintenance of the Public Health Service hospitals are included in the 1965 estimates as directed in last year's report. However, the amounts and projects requested appear to reflect only the minimum necessary for emeregncy repairs to keep the hospitals in operation. Many of the Public Health Service hospitals are obsolete and overcrowded and are in need of major modernization. The committee will therefore expect to be presented with a plan for the modernization of the entire Public Health Service hospital system before January 1, 1965, and expects the 1966 budget estimates will contain funds necessary to initiate this plan."

Through its control of the purse strings, the Bureau of the Budget not only circumvented the intent of Congress by failing to provide funds for the "Modernization of the entire Public Health Service hospital system," but caused the order for the closing of seven Public Health Service hospitals.

The release announcing the closings, stated on page three, "Training programs conducted at the Public Health Service hospitals provide a significant scource of recruitment for the numerous activities that are staffed by PHS commissioned officers and for providing experienced national leadership for programs of clinical care, research, and other health services." The Commissioned Officers Association and indeed the Public Health Service fully agrees with this statement. It has been traditionally true that the Public Health Service hospital program has been the backbone for other important Public Health Service programs. However, this association believes that the curtailment of activities in seven Public Health Service hospitals will eliminate a large source of potential leaders for Public Health Service programs and seriously impair the entire mission of the Public Health Service.

It should be emphasized that, in order to retain Public Health Service commissioned officers as potential leaders for other Public Health Service programs, as has been done in the past, a strong program of orientation and familiarity with the commissioned corps is necessary. Clinical training in hospitals other than Public Health Service hospitals will not provide this orientation and it will be extremly difficult to retain these officers once they have completed their internship or residency.

In spite of the statement in the January 19 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare release emphasizing the importance of the Public Health Service hospitals as a training ground for potential leaders of other Public Health Service programs, the release states, on page 10, a study is now being made to determine the merits of transferring the health care programs for American seamen and the operation of the five modernized hospitals from the Public Health Service to the Veterans' Administration. This, obviously, would have a very deleterious effect on future programs of the Public Health Service.

The Dependent Medical Care Act which became effective December 7, 1956, was passed by the Congress for the stated purpose:

"To create and maintain high morale throughout the uniformed services by providing an improved and uniform program of medical care for members of the uniformed services and their dependents."

Since the passage of this act, the Public Health Service as a member of the uniformed services has provided within its facilities both inpatient and outpatient medical care for all members of these services which include active duty and retired members and their dependents of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, commissioned corps of the Public Health Service and commissioned corps of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The joint utilization of the medical facilities of all these services has resulted in improved medical care for these beneficiaries and has established a uniform level of medical care for these authorized personnel. The mandate provided by the Dependent Medical Care Act will be seriously impaired by the closing order.

As long as Congress continues the position that medical services are to be provided to certain beneficiaries in the Public Health Service hospitals, there should be an efficient hospital system, not only for providing needed medical care, but for contributions to clinical research and the training of professional health personnel. The recent order closing seven Public Health Service hospitals will seriously impair the medical care services to all beneficiaries of Public Health Service hospitals and weaken the entire program.

The Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S. Public Health Service hopes that the Congress will recognize the detrimental effect that will be caused by the closing of the seven Public Health Service hospitals and will take whatever action is necessary to cause the closing order to be stayed pending investigation of its justification and a determination of its effect on the beneficiaries of the program and the Public Health Service mission in general.

The Great Society: Page the Barbarians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Iron Age of February 4, 1965:

THE GREAT SOCIETY: PAGE THE BARBARIANS

The only thing that is missing from the Great Society story is the name of the barbarians who will take over. The world has been so "Americanized" that it appears no barbarians exist. They are all busy making down payments—and more are added to the list.

When the fall of Rome was made official, the Ostrogoths and others from the north had easy pickings. Of course, it took Rome about 600 years to actually fall.

But when the Great Society takes over, we ought to be in good shape to encourage some barbarian group—not now known—to take over from us have-it-alls.

There is nothing wrong with doing away with poverty except that you "can't hardly" do it. And there is nothing wrong, either, with seeing that oldsters—who are forgotten—get medical aid. And there is nothing wrong with trying to upgrade dropouts, displaced workers, and older men and women who have been fired.

It's just that human nature isn't about to change. Not too long ago it was said we had learned to love each other more. Maybe so. But what about Hitler's mass murders? What about the girl who recently was raped and murdered while more than 40 people hemmed and hawed. So human nature has changed?

We are not against L.B.J.'s aims anymore than leading Republicans in the Senate and House are; they said it was a good speech and had great aims. We think parts of it at least open Pandora's box and let us see what we have done to other humans. That's good for the soul—even if the box is closed quickly.

It may take some time to sap all the individualism out of us. But it can be done. The easier things are for us, the harder we will fall—or the harder our great-grandchildren will fall. Maybe we shouldn't worry about them.

We admit there are a lot more current things to worry about than what will happen in a couple of hundred years. But it ought to be on our conscience if we contribute to the downfall of Western civilization.

But just who will the "barbarians" be? Maybe they will be the Chinese. They have, for at least 4,000 years, "known" that they are the chosen people.

It may turn out they are right—just because today we are heading for the Great Society—and maybe oblivion.

Futility of the Administration's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the continued reliance on existing Federal farm programs illustrates the failure of this administration to discover a broad and effective solution to the plight of the American farmer. A prerequisite for any successful solution would necessarily involve a gradual dismantling of the costly and waste-producing system of price supports, which benefit only the relatively prosperous one-third of the rural community. A recent article in the Wall Street Journal outlines the futility and wastefulness of the present farm program and offers some constructive alternatives.

The revival of the soil bank idea to remove good acreage from production through the payment of premiums overlooks the fact that overcultivation is a direct result of the price-support sytsem which encourages farmers to cultivate as much land as possible. It would also cost, by conservative estimates, $1 billion a year.

What is needed, as the article points out, is a return to something approaching a free market in agriculture, which would lead to the idling of less desirable land and the conversion of it to other uses.

At the same time, the Government should spur efforts of rural communities to provide new jobs and encourage retraining and other educational programs which could fit farmers for more useful types of work.

Under unanimous consent, I include the Journal article in the RECORD at this point:

TWO SIDES OF THE FARM COIN

"We need to change much of our thinking on farm policy * * *. We need to separate the social problems of rural America from the economic problems of commercial agriculture."

Thus President Johnson recognized, in his farm message to Congress last week, that there are two sides to the farm coin, a fact that the Government up to now has largely ignored. There is the relatively prosperous upper one-third of the rural community, which gets most of the benefit from present price supports. And there are the rest of the farmers, who are either so small or so inefficient that they draw little help from current programs.

Recognition of this rural division is basic to a realistic approach to the problems of the farm economy. But there is a second step of equal importance: A gradual dismantling of the costly and waste-producing system of price supports. This step the administration still shows no willingness to take.

It's hard to explain this reluctance on any ground other than politics. Mr. Johnson clearly recognizes that successful farming has become a sizable business; he notes that a good farm in the Midwest now requires capital of close to $100,000, more than 10 times the figure for three decades earlier. There is no economic justification for continued coddling of this group and for the rest of the farmers the support system has long been a delusion.

Nonetheless, the administration proposes not only to preserve the present price supports almost intact but to launch other efforts to control agricultural surpluses. The most prominent of these is a revival of the old soil bank idea, paying farmers for taking land out of production.

The soil bank failed before because farmers, quite naturally, idled only their least productive acres. The Government now proposes to overcome this obstacle by paying premiums for taking good land out of production; conservative estimates place the cost of such a program at a staggering $1 billion a year.

This proposal overlooks the fact that the present overcultivation of farm land is largely a direct result of the price support system, which encourages everyone to cultivate as many acres as possible. A return to something approaching a free market in agriculture would, in all probability, lead to the idling of a good deal of less desirable land and the eventual conversion of it to other uses.

Elimination of price supports in stages, moreover, would free a great deal of money for helping the farmers who really need help. There is no question that the Government has an obligation to aid these farmers, since their troubles stem in considerable measure from the distortions created in the rural economy by past and present Federal programs.

If the Government wants to help the poorer farmers, it might consider that a free market farm economy would create additional jobs; for one thing, it would have to take over much of the present crop-storage activity of the Agriculture Department. The Government could certainly aid and encourage this employment-boosting conversion.

The Government could at the same time spur the self-help efforts of rural communities to provide off-farm jobs. It's conceivable that the Area Redevelopment Administration, as the President suggests, can be helpful in this, though the ARA's past record shows that, as Mr. Johnson also says, the agency is in need of improvement.

In addition, the Government could participate in setting up retraining and other educational programs that could better fit farmers for more fruitful lines of work. It could provide job information and other services that would assist farmers in the process of rural reconversion.

There is no scarcity of such alternatives. The President proposes that the present National Agricultural Advisory Commission, now heavily weighted with farmers, be changed to a broader based Commission on Food and Fiber; the commission may come up with useful ideas. Perhaps it will even see the futility of present price supports.

By acknowledging that the farm coin has two sides, the administration has made a start. But if the Government is not to go on forever pouring the taxpayers' coin into profitless programs, it will finally be necessary to take the second step and free the farm market of its Federal fetters.

GOP Magnificent in Viet Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, on the birthday of the first President of these United States, we customarily recall his advice to his countrymen upon resigning that high office. One hundred and sixty-nine years later, certain of his words retain a particular appropriateness for Americans today:

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so: for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize.

Commemorating the spirit of President Washington's Farewell Address, I ask consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, paying tribute to the bipartisanship of our minority leaders in the present threat to "peace abroad." The article follows:

GOP MAGNIFICENT IN VIET CRISIS

(By William S. White)

Magnificent is the word for the Republican Party and its congressional leaders in the crisis of national purpose and national will and national honor that is rising in southeast Asia.

Rarely in history has a minority party given such wide and generous support to an administration of the opposite party as is now being granted to President Johnson in his efforts to help halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam and thus to blunt the most recent grave challenge of international communism to peace and world order.

The assistance being extended by the outs to the in President, Mr. Johnson, is if anything, even greater than that extended to a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, by Mr. Johnson and his senior Democratic colleagues when the Republicans held the White House and the Democrats held Congress.

Whatever else may or may not be done in this Congress by Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN of Illinois, the Senate Republican leader, and Representative GERALD FORD of Michigan, the House Republican leader, it will be dwarfed by the historic contribution they are making to keep this country strong and united in the face of foreign war.

Indeed, watching them at work one can almost believe that as a Nation we may have actually reached here, for a time anyhow, that heretofore impossible and unattainable ideal—a politics, as to foreign affairs, of a maturity to match the complexity and gravity of these affairs in this decade. No doubt politics as usual will shortly descend over the scene; even so DIRKSEN, FORD and company are entitled to the most earnest of salutes for what thus far they have done and tried to do.

In their actions the phrase "responsible opposition" is taking on the dignity of fact; it is a reality and not merely an expression of what is desirable. If the President is able to bring this Nation through the trials of Vietnam without the stain of appeasement on the one hand or the horror of major war

in Asia on the other these men will have played a memorably significant part.

It is a curious thing to see how, when the heat is really intense and the way ahead is hard and hazardous, some high political reputations begin to look just a bit dubious and some hitherto more or less routine and pedestrian reputations begin to develop a strength, a vitality and an intellectual candor that had been, by most people, wholly unexpected.

So it is now. Some so-called foreign policy experts on the Democratic side in Congress speak for a new and cleverly worded form of isolationism. Because things are admittedly sticky in Vietnam because the non-Communist regime we assist is admittedly weak and scarcely "democratic" as we understand the word, these people have only a policy for surrender wrapped up in talk about the righteousness of "negotiation."

But negotiations are not possible with marauders until first they have been forced to cease their killing and looting and until first they have given some evidence that the end of any new negotiation will not be the same as the end of all other negotiations going back to 1954—that is, uninterrupted Communist aggression.

So DIRKSEN, FORD and company see the reality for what it is, describe it for what it is, and rejecting short-term partisan gain at the expense of the administration, stand with the President and the Democratic majority—and, in this case, with the vital interests also of the United States of America.

Now, FORD is a young man and no doubt has much of life and hope ahead of him. But DIRKSEN is an elderly man, by definition a man nearing the end of the long trail, and a far from hale and well man, too, if it comes to that. He has taken many a lump in his time, and a good many of them, in my opinion, he had coming to him. For he was not always the DIRKSEN of today; not any part of the DIRKSEN of today.

But for the last 4 years, at minimum, no public man alive has more faithfully, more courageously, more wryly and more responsibly served the higher purposes of this country. There ought to be a kind of medal for unassuming—and absolutely irreplaceable—service of this kind.

George Washington, Creator of the Purple Heart Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with many of the achievements of our first President, whose birthday we celebrate today, but few of us are aware that he was the creator of the Purple Heart Award, a badge of military merit.

The first Purple Heart Award was made on August 7, 1782, the day George Washington issued the order for its establishment at Newburgh, N.Y.

In 1932 Gen. Douglas MacArthur issued orders to reactivate this award which had honored the heroes of the War for Independence.

It is fitting that this award created by George Washington, one of the Nation's past great military leaders, has been used in recent years to confer distinction upon our outstanding military heroes.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the text of Washington's order in the Appendix of the RECORD:

U.S. ARMY HEADQUARTERS,
Newburgh, N.Y., August 7, 1782.

Orders of the day: For fatigue tomorrow, the 2d Massachusetts Regiment.

Countersign—York, Lancaster.

The general, ever desirous to cherish a virtuous ambition in his soldiers, as well as to foster and encourage every species of military merit, directs that whenever any singularly meritorious action is performed, the author of it shall be permitted to wear on his facings over the left breast, the figure of a heart in purple cloth or silk, edged with narrow lace or bindings. The road to glory in a patriot Army and free country is thus open to all. This order is also to have retrospect to the earliest stages of the war, and is to be considered a permanent one.

G. WASHINGTON,
Commander in Chief.

Secrecy in Government Should Be Eliminated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should take every step possible to reduce secrecy in Government, and I am pleased to join with many of my colleagues in urging the passage of legislation to assure that Government records are available to the public. Too long the records of Government agencies have been shrouded in mystery and secrecy, surrounding the operations of our Government in a paper wall, which sometimes even a Congressman cannot cut, and preventing citizens from access to information to which they are rightfully entitled.

Under th provisions of the bill I am introducing today, every Government agency would be required to "make all its records promptly available to any persons." However, sensitive information areas would be exempt, such as security and personnel matters and information that private concerns must submit to the Government. To enforce the right of citizens to receive information to which they are entitled, my bill provides that if a person is denied access to public records, he can go into a Federal district court and obtain an order for the production of agency records or information improperly withheld from him. It would be up to the Government to prove its right to withhold the records, and the courts could punish agency officials for contempt if they refused to comply with a judge's order.

The eight categories of "sensitive information" exempt from my bill are: national security secrets specifically protected by executive order; documents solely related to personnel records and practices; information specifically protected by other laws; privileged private commercial information obtained from the public, such as trade secrets; agency memorandums dealing solely with matters of law or policy; personnel and medical files; files of law enforcement agencies dealing with investigations; and reports of financial institutions submitted to regulatory agencies.

Secrecy in Government should be eliminated. It is by having a citizenry, knowledgeable in all facets of Government, that we remain strong. Freedom of information belongs to citizens whose Government is by the people, of the people, and for the people.

Congress should enact freedom of information measures to assure the free access of information from Government agencies, it can also lead the way by opening many of its executive, or secret, hearings to which the public is barred.

Congress Has a Responsibility To Find the Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most authoritative spokesmen for the U.S. Navy, and the armed services in general, has long been the Navy Times.

I am always interested in reading this publication, and I consistently find articles and commentaries of particular significance to Members of Congress.

In this connection, I wish to call attention to the editorial in the February 24 issue of the Navy Times.

This editorial focuses on numerous issues emanating from the Department of Defense, and the editorial concludes with the sentence: "Congress has a responsibility to find the answers."

Mr. Speaker, I unhesitatingly say that Congress will analyze and probe the issues referred to, and Congress will find the answers.

I therefore submit the editorial into the RECORD with the simple notation that it speaks for itself.

UNWISE—AND ARBITRARY

In a series of related moves Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has decreed:

Virtual abolition of the Army Reserve, leaving it a conglomeration of individual replacements.

Putting some of the drill pay units into the National Guard, abolishing the rest and abolishing many existing National Guard units.

That key executive, legislative and judicial officials must leave the Ready Reserves of all services.

That many members of the Standby Reserve may not maintain proficiency nor qualify for retirement.

Steps to curtail travel by Congressmen to military activities, particularly those overseas.

If Congress allows all these things to be done without first having its clear say on the

matter it might as well abandon any pretense of being a coequal branch of the Government. Even if all of the above could be proven to be wise and correct, the manner in which the Secretary went about them is an obvious disregard of the Constitution, which says Congress shall prescribe the organization of the Armed Forces. And the manner is in further disregard of laws passed by Congress which require such proposals first to be considered by certain legal advisory committees.

The move to cut out most of the travel to defense installations by national legislators was not just a move to cut the abuses of junketing. The insistence on keeping detailed costs estimates on all trips and the preparation of press releases spelling out the cost—which isn't being done for executive branch travel—is clearly an attempt to pressure lawmakers out of traveling. The more a Member of Congress can be exposed to military operations the better he will be able to perform his duties in connection with national defense.

Why not have detailed costs kept every time a wife of a service secretary or assistant secretary accompanies her husband on a trip, with details of the duty-free purchases brought back on military aircraft?

To the removal of officials from Ready Reserve units we can see no objection on constitutional grounds and not too strong an objection otherwise. It is clearly the prerogative of the military to say who shall fill what mobilization billet. And it is clear that most legislators and many other officials—but not all of them—can best serve by staying where they are in event of mobilization.

There are, however, some Congressmen—junior Members of the House, for example—and some other officials who may be of more value in a uniform in an emergency. We don't see why they could not stay in units as long as they signed a paper—such as the Air Force double availability statement—saying they would go into active service when called—resigning their civilian position if necessary.

Statements emanating from the Pentagon have tended to stigmatize all Capitol Hill reservists as freeloaders. On the contrary, a great many of them had long and impressive reserve records before going to Capitol Hill. Representative SAM STRATTON, of New York, for for example, a Congressman since 1958, hasn't missed a summer training cruise in the Naval Reserve since 1946 and was recalled to active duty during the Korean war.

We are particularly concerned about congressional staff members, most of whom serve brief tours on the Hill and many of whom would be more valuable in a military billet in an emergency. Individual decisions should be made in each case. Note that in the executive branch there was a careful screening to see just whom should be kept.

One congressional assistant, for example, has completed all the graduate level military education by correspondence that he was eligible for—the command and staff college of his service, the war college of his service, the industrial college of the Armed Forces—and all with high honors. His average at the industrial college was over 96. He has earned far in excess of the minimum required Reserve points annually—usually gaining about 100 excess points that could not be credited for retirement. A member of a Hill Reserve unit, he rarely missed a weekly meeting and he performed his active duty training every year at a specific job. He never took a trip with his unit—overseas or in the United States. He has been under written commitment since the early 1950's—when written commitments were first used by his service—to be ready for callup at any time.

Is it in the country's best interest to kick such a man out of the Reserve? There are many on Capitol Hill whose Reserve records are closer to this man's than to the popular image of the junketeering "minimum doers."

In moving to make it impossible for standby reservists to maintain proficiency, McNamara has made it virtually impossible for a legislator or other official to return to Active Reserve participation when his term of office is finished.

The implications for the general run of long-term ready reservists, who are being forced into the Standby Reserve by the cutback, is even more serious. It could have a telling effect on the morale of the Reserves and, indeed, the morale of the general population.

Mr. McNamara says we are not running a system to let people build up retirement. We are also, we hope, not running a system that neglects reward for past service and tells people past assurances of their Government are not valid.

There is a very practical reason for letting those who have completed 14 or 16 years or so in the Reserve continue to maintain proficiency and qualify for retirement: so that the next time you need new volunteers for Reserve service there will be some. They will be there because they know promised rewards for service will be kept.

Most of the reservists who now have 12 or 14 or 16 years of service have been in the Reserve that long because they were told if they retained their proficiency and held themselves in readiness they could earn a small retirement that would in part make all of the effort and inconvenience worthwhile. That, and a sense of that square old thing called patriotism.

As for the Guard-Reserve merger, we are in the same position as Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana, who says he can't comment because he doesn't know any of the details. For some reason Defense is not spelling these out. Presumably it will do so for a congressional committee. It should be kept in mind that this is not just a merging of the Reserve forces, it is a cutback of substantial portions.

Just why we suddenly need some 150,000 fewer trained Reserves is something we hope congressional committees will examine closely. There have been vague references to "contingency war plans" but no real answers. In the absence of further explanation it is impossible to avoid the impression that the proponents of the cutback are obsessed with budgetary considerations.

For, as with most actions in the Defense Department these days, there are the grand public announcements of great cost savings. The magic figure this time is $150 million. Of course, the actual budget doesn't show any reduction of $150 million but that shouldn't surprise anybody. Mr. McNamara has the knack of being able to propose the largest Defense budgets ever and still have the world believing he is saving $3.5 billion a year.

It should be obvious that a cut of 150,000 Reserves will eventually save money in drill pay and training costs. But it is not necessary to merge forces—a simple cut without a merger would save funds. And whether such a cutback in Reserve power is worth the small savings is a question still to be answered—by the experts whose very job that is.

Congress has a responsibility to find the answers.

Inaugural Day Prayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the nation that does not serve the Almighty will perish.

We should always remember Moses' ancient warning to Israel:

Beware lest thou forget God. And if you forget the Lord your God, I solemnly warn you this day that you shall surely perish. Like nations before you * * * you shall surely perish.

Mr. Speaker, we are a God-fearing nation, tolerant of one another's doctrinal differences, but united in theistic belief.

This is why America will still be standing steadfast when the ashes of the Communist empire are scattered to the far corners of the earth.

That prayer is relied upon heavily by our leaders is clearly illustrated by the prayers on the day of Inauguration of our Chief Executive.

The prayers at the National City Christian Church in Washington are so beautiful, so inspiring, so uplifting to the spirit, that I deem it appropriate to place them in the Appendix of the RECORD for historians to record:

A SERVICE OF PRAYER ON THE DAY OF INAUGURATION, JANUARY 20, 1965, AT THE REQUEST OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, AT THE NATIONAL CITY CHRISTIAN CHURCH, WASHINGTON, D.C., AT 9 A.M.

The organ prelude: "If Thou but Trust God To Guide Thee," Johann Sebastian Bach; "Son of Peace," Lawrence P. Schrieber, minister of music, Jean Langlais.

The processional hymn: "Holy, Holy, Holy," Nicaea.

"Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty!
Early in the morning our song shall rise to Thee;
Holy, holy, holy, merciful and mighty!
God over all, and blest eternally.

"Holy, holy, holy, all the saints adore Thee,
Casting down their golden crowns around the crystal sea;
Cherubim and seraphim falling down before Thee,
Who wast, and art, and evermore shalt be.

"Holy, holy, holy! tho' the darkness hide Thee,
Tho' the eye of sinful man Thy glory may not see;
Only Thou art holy; there is none beside Thee,
Perfect in power, in love, and purity.

"Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty!
All Thy works shall praise Thy name, in earth and sky and sea;
Holy, holy, holy, merciful and mighty!
God over all, and blest eternally. Amen."

The call to worship: The Reverend Dr. George R. Davis, minister, National City Christian Church, Washington, D.C.:

"Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me bless his Holy Name. For the whole earth is filled with His glory. And surely the Lord is in this place. This is none other than the House of God and this is the Gate of Heaven."

The "Gloria Patri":

"Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost;
As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be,
World without end. Amen."

The invocation (Dr. Davis): "Our Father, without our asking it, we believe Thou are here. Come near to us as we worship, in the spirit of Him whose words we would lift as our prayer."

The Lord's Prayer: "Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts as

we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen."

Choral response: "Hear Our Prayer," Edwin Fissinger.

"Hear our prayer, O Lord;
Incline Thine ear to us
And grant us Thy peace. Amen."

The greeting: The purpose of our worship: "It is fitting, on this day, at the invitation of our President, that we have come to worship God and to do honor to the President-elect and to the Vice-President-elect. The Disciples of Christ are proud that Lyndon Baines Johnson is in the tradition of the Disciples of Christ, but we're even more proud of his great ecumenical spirit. There is no denominationalism about him. And we rejoice more in that than even in the fact that he's a part of our great tradition. In addition to the men who in this interfaith service will participate, we are glad also to have from the Greek Orthodox Church those who participated in the processional, Rev. John T. Tavlarides, the dean of St. Sophia Greek Orthodox Cathedral and Rev. Demetrius G. Kalaris, the pastor of SS. Constantine and Helen Greek Orthodox Church. We welcome you here in the spirit of the One in whose name this place is dedicated."

Choral call to the reading: "Send out Thy light."

The reading: The Reverend Floyd S. Smith, associate minister, National City Christian Church (selected verses from proverbs, Isaiah, psalms, the Gospel of Matthew, and Romans): "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord. Righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people. The nation that will not serve Thee shall perish. The people said, 'All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do.' Then ye shall be a holy nation. Come now let us reason together, saith the Lord. If you be willing and obedient, you shall eat the good of the land. You are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; show forth the praises of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvelous light. Truly God is good to such as be of a clean heart. Blessed be the Lord God. All nations shall call Him blessed, and let the whole earth be filled with His glory. Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify God. Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers, for there is no power but of God. Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may prove what is that good and perfect will of God. I will make of thee a great nation. And I will bless thee. The Lord is high above all nations, and is glory above the heavens. Blessed be the name of the Lord. Amen."

A PRAYER

(Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz, Adas Israel Synagogue, Washington, D.C.)

May the Father of all mankind, Whose love embraces all the peoples of the earth, extend His blessings upon the President, the Vice President, and their families, and upon those who have been designated to lead the destiny of our Nation.

May we uphold their hearts and their hands in their quest for justice and righteousness.

Whatever the future brings to us, may it bring forth the best that is within us. We ask not that we be relieved of our burdens, but for the strength to bear them; not for the solution to problems, but for wisdom to understand them; not for escape from challenges, but for courage to face them.

May we find the will to conquer ignorance, to heal the sick, and to feed the hungry.

May the day draw nigh when all the children of man shall know the meaning of tranquility; when all the citizens of our land shall be blessed with the freedom to nurture the promise that lies within them.

We are grateful unto Thee, O Lord our God, Master of the Universe, for having blessed us with life, for having sustained us in dignity, and for having enabled us to reach this glorious day of promise. Amen.

Anthem: Worship in music—"The Last Words of David," Randall Thompson:

"He that ruleth over men must be just,
Ruling in the fear of God.
And he shall be as the light of morning,
When the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds;
As the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain.
Alleluia. Amen."

—II Samuel 23: 3–4.

The Sanctuary Choir, National City Christian Church, Judy Mussgnug, assistant organist.

A MEDITATION AND MESSAGE

(By the Reverend Dr. Billy Graham)

The Reverend WILLIAM M. BAXTER (rector St. Mark's Episcopal Church, Washington, D.C.). Be so gracious as to rise while Monsignor Manning leads us in prayer.

A prayer by the Right Reverend Monsignor Joseph L. Manning (archdiocese of San Antonio, Roman Catholic, San Antonio, Tex.):

"Our Father in Heaven, You have ordained that men shall band themselves together in civil societies; that they shall freely choose their form of government and select those who are to govern. But to those whom we choose to rule over us, You alone can and do give authority. We the people of these United States of America have elected unto ourselves a President and a Vice President and today we induct them into those high offices. As we place in their hands the visible symbols of the Presidency, You the Sovereign of the Universe, will delegate to them a portion of Your supreme jurisdiction. Help us to keep in mind that disobedience to lawful civil authority is disobedience to God. These are critical times. The temporal welfare not only of the people of the United States but of the entire world will depend not once but again and again upon the decisions of our President. As You love us, dear God, guide him and guard him. In times past, You have granted in exceptional measure wisdom to Solomon, strength to Sampson, zeal to Paul, love to Francis of Assissi and vision to John the XXIII. These gifts we pray for our President. And as he takes his oath of office today, grant that each of us will join him in that oath that we may work loyally under his direction for the welfare of all mankind and thereby merit together eternal happiness. Amen."

THE PRAYER OF DEDICATION, AND BENEDICTION

(By The Reverend William M. Baxter)

Now let us pray for our country.

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage; we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure profession. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom and knowledge those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, especially Thy servants Lyndon and HUBERT, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that through the obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity, fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Now the Almighty God, the Father of our Lord, Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, grant you to be strengthened with might by His spirit in the inner man as Christ dwelling in your hearts by faith ye may be filled with all the fullness of God. Amen.

Choral response: "God Be In My Head," Sydney Nicholson.

"God be in my head, and in my understanding;
God be in mine eyes, and in my looking;
God be in my mouth, and in my speaking;
God be in my heart, and in my thinking;
God be in my life, and at my departing."

—SARUM PRIMER, 1558.

A recessional: "O God our Help in Ages Past," St. Anne.

The organ postlude: "The Heavens Declare the Glory of God" (Psalm 19), Benedetto Marcello.

Social Security Income Limitation Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill to raise the limitation on income which individuals may earn without losing their social security benefits from $1,200 to $3,000.

Today, we live in a fast-moving and constantly changing world. The standards and the limitations of yesterday often are not good enough for today. We, the elected representatives of the American people, must ever be alert to the ever-changing society which we serve and the constantly changing needs of its citizenry.

Today Americans are living longer and longer, thanks to the miracles of modern medicine, laborsaving devices, and a whole host of other conveniences. While in 1900, only about 4 percent of the Nation's population lived to age 65 or over, today, in 1965, that figure has increased to over 10 percent. In my own State of Florida, for example, we outstripped the Nation with a population increase of 133 percent among our older population during the past 10 years, while the Nation as a whole showed an increase of 35 percent in this category in the same period.

With the benefits which the 20th century have bestowed on us as a nation, there have also been accompanying problems. With advanced age, health care is required. For those in their senior years, the necessities of life are more difficult to obtain. It is sad, but true, that

jobs for persons over 45 are hard to find, much less for those over 65.

Today, life can be rich and rewarding well beyond the purely customary retirement age of 65. For today, many of our older citizens are making very valuable contributions to their communities based upon their past experiences, their wisdom and their talent.

Today, the average monthly benefits under the social security system is a rather pitiful $76. It is just impossible for the average retired couple living in Florida, or in California, or any other place in the country, for that matter, to do more than merely survive on the savings from their earlier years plus social security payments.

Under the present social security law, an individual receiving benefits and fortunate enough to hold down a part-time job may earn only $100 a month in income without having his Government pension checks reduced.

Today, when the President of the United States has declared "unconditional war" on poverty afflicting American families with a total annual income of $3,000 or less it is high time, now, to act for the benefit of that segment of our population which has already contributed so much to their Nation's welfare and our society, and who can contribute so much more if they are allowed to maintain a decently adequate standard of living.

In my own State of Florida, among the 224,365 families headed by persons 65 or over in 1960, there were about one-tenth with incomes of less than $1,000. One-third had incomes of less than $2,000 and over one-half had incomes of less than $3,000.

Therefore, I am today introducing appropriate proposed legislation to raise the unrealistic income limitation of $1,200 to $3,000 annually. In my mind, this is a long overdue, fair, and proper way to help our older citizens live with respect and continue to be productive members of society. Surely, we can do no less.

Churchill Was Frank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert a letter to the editor by Albert Ferris, of Milton, Ind. It was carried in the Eastern, Ind., Farmer edition of February 16, 1965, and is a fine tribute to Winston Churchill.

The article follows:

CHURCHILL WAS FRANK

Much has recently been written in tribute to the late Winston Churchill. Perhaps one of the greatest tributes came during his life as we made him an honorary American citizen. Some have even suggested that he would have made a great leader for our country. However, our thoughts may have wandered in this direction, it is quite evident he would actually not have fit too well into the pattern of our prevailing social and political philosophy.

Churchill was ever frank with the English people. If things were going badly, he never concealed the truth from them. "I bring you bad news," he told Parliament on one of the darkest days, "and fear there may be even worse." As he never watered down defeat, so he never exaggerated triumph. Win or lose, he gave the people the unvarnished facts. No, Churchill would not have fit into the pattern of our Great Society adventure. He could not have consented to the limiting of the people's right to know. He would not have glossed over our obvious blunders in Vietnam or in our dealings with the Communist world. As an ardent foe of socialism, he would never have fit into our welfare state. He would never have stood mute before the covert operations of Billie Sol Estes and Bobby Baker. He most certainly would not have represented as an accomplishment in economy a budget under $100 billion, the while his projected expenditures were actually billions higher. No, "Winnie" would not have fit into our present political philosophy at all. And yet, as Morrie Ryskind predicted, "Centuries hence, when the Great Society has tumbled into the oblivion that awaits all schemes built on its quicksand of bread and circuses without toil, the little country churchyard at Bladon will still be the shrine to which the world will make its grateful pilgrimage."

On Section 14(b)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, John M. Redding, director of the National Council for Industrial Peace, publishes a statement in today's Washington Post concerning a matter that will occupy this body's attention in the not too distant future.

I refer to section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Redding's remarks on this matter are worthy of the attention of all my colleagues, Mr. Speaker.

In the likely possibility that some of my colleagues will not have the opportunity to read today's Post, I request unanimous consent to have Mr. Redding's statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

ON SECTION 14(b)

In his letter of February 15, Reed Larson of the National Right to Work Committee has not only presented a distorted and unreal picture of the American labor movement but has attacked the character of the U.S. Congress. To imply, as he does, that Congress would railroad repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act (the so-called right-to-work section) without full and open debate is to impugn the integrity and honesty of our great legislative body.

Aside from his profession of trying to slash the jugular vein of the labor movement with State laws that pervert and reverse national labor-management law and policy, Mr. Larson has made sweeping but unsustained charges of union bossism, invoked the Dixiecrat concept of States rights, and conjured a sinister charge of discrimination against the background of continuing civil rights debate.

Mr. Larson shows he has failed to do his homework on how the labor movement is organized and functions, that a union can come into being only through the vote of the majority of workers in a plant, and that a union shop arrangement can be negotiated with management only on approval by the union members.

He speaks glibly of compulsory unionism—a phrase coined by his right-to-work propagandists to make the union shop sound odious. And he carefully avoids mentioning that the State right-to-work laws—made possible by section 14(b)—enforce a compulsory open shop on a democratic labor movement. To Mr. Larson it is evil for a labor union, which under provisions of Federal law must represent all workers in a plant in negotiating pay raises and other benefits, to seek membership of the people the union represents.

But Mr. Larson, for his own purposes, attacks only the labor movement for this. He avoids acknowledgment that the American Medical Association and bar associations invoke compulsory closed shops in their professions. In most States, a physician or surgeon cannot practice unless he is a member in good standing of the medical association, and a lawyer likewise cannot practice unless he is a member of the State bar association.

This restrictive and discriminatory legislation is out of step with our times. In recent weeks, Indiana has repealed its right-to-work law. Only a few days ago, the New Mexico legislature rejected a right-to-work proposal by decisive majorities. Oklahoma voters rejected this law last May. President Johnson called for repeal of section 14(b) in his state of the Union message. Section 14(b) should be repealed in the interest of industrial peace and the economic advancement of our entire Nation.

JOHN M. REDDING,
Director, National Council for Industrial Peace.

WASHINGTON.

Col. John Glenn's Anniversary—An American Space Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 19, I had the pleasure to attend the National Space Club luncheon at which Col. John Glenn was the principal speaker.

As Colonel Glenn so aptly put it, anniversaries are a time for reminiscing, and while reminiscing is a pleasant task for most people; we who have been closely allied with the space program must continually look to the future. The two recent successful shots, Saturn and Ranger, have been most rewarding and prove that the American space program is solid in its foundation and well on the way to its objectives.

The speech follows:

SPEECH OF COL. JOHN GLENN, NATIONAL SPACE CLUB LUNCHEON, FEBRUARY 19, 1965

After events that have affected me in the past year, it might be appropriate to open my remarks by saying, "A funny thing happened on the way to the Senate." Some of the people at the Marriott Motor Hotel looked

rather aghast at me, for I must be the only man ever to check in and specify a room with no bath and no mirrors.

An anniversary is always a time of reminiscing, of taking stock and of noting subsequent events. Looking back over the 3 years since the flight of *Friendship 7*, I am impressed most of all by the tremendous progress the United States has made in space science and technology.

I am proud of the determination the American people have shown to become the world's leading space-faring nation.

This is a feasible, necessary and noble goal. We have this within our capability to do, and could not hold our heads high as Americans of the 1960's if we aimed at anything less.

When I had the great honor of appearing before a joint meeting of the Congress after my flight, I spoke of the unbounded future I saw for space exploration. I said then, "I feel that we are on the brink of an era of expansion of knowledge about ourselves and our surroundings that is beyond description or comprehension at this time. Our efforts today and what we have done so far are but small building blocks on a very high pyramid to come."

A quick review of what has been accomplished in these 3 years bears out the accuracy of that hope and prediction. To go back just a little further than 3 years, it is almost impossible for any of us to believe that the whole space era has been covered in the short time since our grapefruit-sized Explorer I first "beeped" its way around the earth.

Three years ago, we were very pleased with the three orbits of the *Friendship 7* and felt that all mission objectives were met. Yet, this year or next, the Gemini astronauts expect to make at least a 7-day flight and we look forward to the Apollo lunar landings in a few years.

Three years ago, the Atlas booster was the best we had available for manned space flight, but it was not yet renowned for its reliability.

I can well remember one of my first trips to then Cape Canaveral for the purpose of watching a night Atlas launch. My observation point was on the closest camera site to the launch pad. After several holds, a fact of life we became more familiar with on several later dates, the Atlas was launched and appeared to be programing as planned. As it went through the high-q area of greatest aerodynamic force, it suddenly erupted into the most beautifully awesome fireball I had ever seen. Needless to say, this particular event did not do much to build confidence for a budding astronaut. Debris came down over quite a wide area. I think it was during these observations that we conceived the idea that the best way to insure reliability would be for all booster engineers to watch each launch from only a canvas-covered blockhouse just as close to the launch pad as we could persuade them to get. In fact, in checking some of my notes made 3 years ago today, the day before the launch, just about this time, at 1:30 p.m., we were sitting in a booster review meeting going over all the last details of booster checkout.

Today, however, the Atlas booster has a superb record of 38 straight successes in NASA and Air Force use, including, I am happy to say, the four Mercury flights in earth orbit. I am sure most of you watched TV on Wednesday when the Atlas/Agena successfully launched Ranger VIII.

Three years ago, Mercury spacecraft were limited in weight to about 3,000 pounds. Today, the Saturn I booster is operational and can put 22,500 pounds into Earth orbit, or seven times the weight of Mercury. Saturn I-B, which will begin flying next year, will be able to orbit a payload equal to 11 Mercury spacecraft. Saturn V, which will fly in 1967, will be able to orbit a payload equal to more than 90 Mercuries. That's some jump—but it is no more than typical of the great gains we are making in national space capabilities.

Three years ago, shortly after my flight, Ranger III missed the moon by 22,000 miles and its TV pictures were unusable. But the Ranger people did not give up and you know the brilliant results achieved from Ranger VII and the equally significant achievements we expect from Ranger VIII tomorrow.

Three years ago, Telstar and Relay had not yet reached the launch pad, and achievement of synchronous orbit sounded good in theory, but had never been demonstrated. Today, Telstar, Relay, and Syncom have become known around the world as examples of American technological leadership and American belief in putting our technology to work for mankind.

Our Tiros and Nimbus weather satellites have told the same story to the world Three years ago, we had Tiros III at work. Now it is Tiros IX that marks the 10th consecutive success in our weather satellite launches. Its nine predecessors have transmitted over 415,000 pictures of the Earth's cloud cover. They have photographed every tropical storm and hurricane since 1960 and have been used with tremendous success by the Weather Bureau. As you know, a special hookup has been arranged between Washington and Moscow for exchange of weather satellite data, and this exchange will begin when the Russians get a weather satellite that can match our Tiros.

The pace of our satellite applications program has been so rapid that we can now look forward to the first commercial use of space for global communications this spring and the establishment of the first operational weather satellite network during the coming winter.

The first operational communications satellite will be called Early Bird—and that I am glad to say is not a translation from the Russian. It is a product of private enterprise.

What other uses are coming? On that one, you can let your imagination run wild, for the whole space program is centered on exploration and research and the greatest values will undoubtedly come from now unknown and unforeseen discoveries. Some of the immediate possible applications were outlined to you in November by Dr. Raffensperger when he mentioned how zero-g might lead us into new information on tissue regeneration and healing, or the formation of compounds, or how space-oriented meteorological information might lead us to first efforts at actual weather control, or of how infrared mapping studies could lead to better worldwide commercial fishing through study of ocean currents, water supply through location of underground streams, and many other possible applications.

Even though some information may not be as immediately useful, it all adds to our storehouse of knowledge which helps give us a mastery for the future.

Three years ago, no nation had yet made a successful flyby mission to Mars or Venus, although the Russians had been trying mightily—and still are. Then came Mariner II, which demonstrated great advances in spacecraft technology, midcourse changes in direction, and interplanetary communications, and became the first and still the only spacecraft from earth to make close-up observations of another planet.

The accuracy requirements for all these missions are almost incomprehensible and are one of the least understood parts of the space program. A good case in point was the launch of *Friendship 7* 3 years ago. The speed at insertion into orbit was over 25,000 feet per second or 5 miles per second, and the booster and spacecraft were accelerating at approximately 240 feet per second at a steadily increasing rate. At booster cutoff, each error of 1.4 feet per second resulted in a difference of approximately 1 mile in apogee on the far side of the Earth. When you consider that before the onboard signal for cutoff was received, information had to be obtained by radar at the cape, transmitted by landline to Goddard, run through the computers, returned by landline to the cape, checked against cape data and then transmitted 350 miles down range to the spacecraft, still allowing time for onboard delays in operation of relays, valves, and thrust termination, it looks like an almost impossibly accurate requirement.

Those accuracies, however, are rather crude compared with some now being obtained on the deep space probes.

Now we have Mariner IV which at 6 o'clock tonight will be 20,194,023 miles out from Earth on an extremely difficult and significant mission. As you know, there was a checkout of equipment aboard the spacecraft last week that indicates the chances are still good that we will get revealing pictures of Mars next July, when Mariner IV will be 134 million miles from Earth, so far it will take 12½ seconds to get a radio signal back.

Perhaps some day, there will even be reverse Mariner flights approaching the Earth and this could cause some problems such as the one I heard about recently which involved a Martian metallic man landing his spacecraft on Earth near a service station. He climbed out of the spacecraft, slowly walked over to the gasoline pump, faced it and demanded, "Take me to your leader." Receiving no reply, he repeated the command, "Take me to your leader". He finally leaned over close to the gasoline pump and yelled, "If you'd take your finger out of your ear, you could hear me."

Seriously, I don't know what the Mariner flights mean to you. But to me, Mercury plus Mariner and our other projects clearly add up to the promise of men on places well beyond the moon in the not-too-distant future. The unmanned probes and vehicles can give us invaluable forerunning information, but man's unique ability to perceive the new and unknown, analyze its importance, and relate it to practical application, can never be replaced.

I know all of us agreed fully with the words President Johnson wrote to the Congress last month, when he said: "Substantial strides have been made in a very brief span of time—and more are to come. We expect to explore the Moon, not just visit it or photograph it. We plan to explore and chart planets as well. We shall expand our Earth laboratories into space laboratories and extend our national strength into the space dimension."

That is the spirit that led to passage of the National Aeronautics and Space Act in 1958, the establishment of NASA, the acceleration of our program in 1961, and the determination that our national space program shall continue to add greatly to American power and prestige during each successive year of this decade.

Looking back over the past 3 years, I feel that rapid progress in our national space program has made the Nation safer and stronger.

But I am even more impressed by the potential value of the intangible resources we are creating for the Nation through an active, well-planned and well-balanced space program.

One of the great achievements in these early years of the space age has been the versatile and productive Government-industry-university team which we have brought into being and which helps make maximum use of new information. With our democratic system of government, and our free economic system, and our belief in seeking out the truth, we have created the institutions and the organizational framework to meet whatever challenges our generation and many more generations of Americans may face in space.

Eight years ago, we were not so prepared to welcome or to cope with the space age; but we are today. We look backward in wonder not at what we did 3 years ago, but at the distance we have come since then. We look forward with confidence and great expectations.

Many of you here are and have been vital cogs in our space efforts, for it is one of the greatest team efforts of all time.

I don't need to recount for you the vital role played by many of those you see around you. This is not just an anniversary for me. It's one for all of us, for practically every man here played some role in the events of 3 years ago. But the past is only good as it gives us the tools for tomorrow.

To wax philosophical for a moment, we might liken our space program to one of Plato's allegories. He told of prisoners chained in a cave for so long they had lost touch with reality and felt that their whole existence was wrapped up in the shadows they could see on the wall ahead of them. He goes on to say that if one escaped to the outside world and returned to tell the others of what really lay outside the dark cave, they would probably think him completely crazy.

Even though we have seen such tremendous breakthroughs in scientific knowledge in recent years, our knowledge has necessarily been limited to such a "cave", for practically all we know has been limited to this one tiny speck of earth in a much larger environment. But that is in the process of being changed and with a rapidity no one can forecast.

What a tremendous future we have in store.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 73a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

West Virginians Hear Challenging Spiritual Message From U.S. Senator J. Caleb Boggs at Governor's Prayer Breakfast—State's Chief Executive Hulett C. Smith Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Monday, February 22, 1965, it was my privilege to be in Charleston, W. Va., at the annual Governor's prayer breakfast. Sponsored by recently elected Gov. Hulett C. Smith, this memorable event was attended by approximately 350 citizens from all sections of the Mountain State. Mayors, college presidents, student leaders, clergymen, businessmen, representatives of State and local governments, labor unions, and industry were present.

The program was opened with the singing of "America," led by Jack Clinard, choir director at Alderson-Broaddus College, Philippi. Judge John W. Hereford, of Huntington, presided. Dr. William J. L. Wallace, president of West Virginia State College, gave an inspiring invocation.

Following breakfast, honored guests were introduced, including the former Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable William Wallace Barron.

The Old Testament lesson was read by the Honorable Paul L. Jefferson, District Manager of the Social Security Administration, and the lesson from the New Testament was presented by the Honorable Laban White, Jr., speaker of the West Virginia House of Delegates. Cecil Kelly, of Charleston, then delivered words of intercession for National, State, and local elective leaders.

Mr. President, it was my distinct pleasure to present the principal speaker of the morning, the Honorable J. CALEB BOGGS, U.S. Senator from Delaware. The sincere and stirring words of our colleague were warmly received by an appreciative audience. After outlining the difficult and dangerous times in which we live, Senator BOGGS pointed out that we must continue to rely on Almighty God for strength and guidance.

None of us is so self-sufficient that we do not need to lean on the Almighty. Our Nation's first leaders did, and were humble enough to acknowledge it. The great men of our Nation in the generations since have understood their own limitations and therefore turned to God.

At the conclusion of Senator BOGGS' address, Governor Smith spoke briefly. He emphasized the need for constant and thankful prayer as a source of direction for lives or service to mankind.

The program closed with the singing of the Lord's Prayer by Mr. Clinard, accompanied by Wayne Eich, and a meaningful benediction by Dr. Stewart H. Smith, president of Marshall University, Huntington.

Mr. President, I request that the following portions of the program at the West Virginia Governor's prayer breakfast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Introduction of U.S. Senator J. CALEB BOGGS by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH; devotional message by Senator J. CALEB BOGGS; remarks of Gov. Hulett C. Smith, of West Virginia; benediction by Dr. Stewart H. Smith, president, Marshall University, Huntington, W. Va.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR'S PRAYER BREAKFAST, CHARLESTON CIVIC CENTER, FEBRUARY 22, 1965

REMARKS OF SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, INTRODUCING SENATOR J. CALEB BOGGS, OF DELAWARE

It was with genuine appreciation that I accepted the invitation to participate in this noteworthy event—the Governor's prayer breakfast.

It is significant to witness those responsible in government, edcuation, and private industry joining together to ask guidance for enlightened leadership, to reaffirm a faith in the Divine Being, and to give expression to the principle of religious conviction. It affords us the opportunity to emphasize the fact that no physical courage, no brilliant intellect, and no great strength can be substituted for divine assistance, which sustains mankind.

I am additionally appreciative of having the privilege of introducing our guest speaker, the Honorable J. CALEB BOGGS, U.S. Senator from Delaware.

Senator BOGGS was elected to the House of Representatives in 1946, after serving with distinction and valor in numerous World War II campaigns of the European theater of operations. Since that time he has maintained an uninterrupted record of public service to this Nation and his native State of Delaware—6 years in the U.S. House of Representatives, 8 years as Governor, and more recently, 5 years as an able Senator.

Last year, Senator BOGGS was the principal speaker at the Connecticut prayer breakfast sponsored by the Governor of that State, and also at a similar event organized by the President of Costa Rica, in Central America.

It is my privilege to meet with this devoted colleague and my cherished friend, at our weekly Senate prayer breakfast. I am confident that his message this morning will be most helpful and inspiring.

SPEECH BY U.S. SENATOR J. CALEB BOGGS

Thank you, Senator RANDOLPH.

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, Governor Smith, distinguished guests, and friends, it is an honor to be with you here in the great State of West Virginia this morning, and it is an additional honor, I assure you, to be introduced by a Senator I admire as much as I do JENNINGS RANDOLPH. I consider him a friend, as I do his colleague, Senator BYRD.

I can't think of any better way to mark the birthday of our first President than gathering together at this wonderful Governor's prayer breakfast. This event has not come about by chance, I well realize. It has involved the hard work of many people, and especially the unflagging efforts of Judge Hereford.

It was my pleasure to meet Judge Hereford at one of our Senate prayer breakfasts in Washington and knowing him made me all the more eager to accept your kind invitation to come here today.

May I congratulate Governor Smith in having this prayer breakfast, and congratulate each one of you as well, because simply by being here this morning you are giving witness to the importance you attach to spiritual values.

Many of you have come here this morning at considerable personal sacrifice and inconvenience, and that makes your presence all the more meaningful. I salute you. I am sure you will find rewarding both the fellowship and sense of spiritual purpose evident in this gathering.

What we are doing today is the outgrowth of a movement started about 30 years ago in Seattle, Wash., where a group of businessmen met and resolved that some action must be taken to improve the corrupt moral and civic conditions of the community. From this nucleus prayer breakfast meeting, groups have been organized in every part of the United States and in many foreign lands.

I am personally most familiar with the Senate prayer breakfast group, which meets every Wednesday while Congress is in session. After breakfast in the Capitol we have a 30-minute discussion of some religious topic, with one of members designated each week as a leader. From 20 to 25 Senators usually attend, and the discussion is both informative and entertaining. Both of your distinguished Senators participate, I am happy to say.

Many of the participants, as you might imagine, feel they can make a spiritual point best by telling a little story, and some of the Senate's best storytellers belong to this group.

The other day Senator ROBERTSON, of your neighboring State of Virginia, for instance, used the following story to illustrate a point.

He told about this man who had been in the great Johnstown flood, and had helped rescue some of the people whose homes were swept away in that famous disaster.

He just couldn't forget the flood, and in his travels always telling about what a tremendous event it was.

He finally died and went to heaven. As soon as he got within the pearly gates he struck up a conversation with St. Peter.

"Let me tell you about the great Johnstown flood," he said, and then did, at great length.

"The next time you have a meeting up here, St. Peter," he said, "how about putting me on the program. I'd like to tell folks about this flood."

St. Peter obliged and a couple of weeks later got him on the program for a meeting.

Just as the fellow was about to speak, though, St. Peter leaned over and whispered to him:

"Perhaps I ought to tell you," he said, "Noah is in the audience."

These weekly prayer breakfasts mean a great deal to me personally, and I am glad to say the idea is rapidly catching on throughout the country. At the Presidential prayer breakfast in Washington earlier this month, for instance, it was reported that literally hundreds of small groups are meeting regularly to foster faith and freedom in this land and around the world. Participants include businessmen, civic officials, secretaries, clerks, housewives, and college students.

What has given the greatest impetus to breakfasts such as this one, of course, are the annual Presidential prayer breakfasts which I just mentioned. I dont know how many of you were privileged to attend this year's breakfast—although your Governor and Mrs. Smith were there, I know—but I give you my personal reaction that it was the most impressive of the 10 or so which I have been to.

The very fact that more than 2,500 busy people gathered together, including the President, the Vice President, members of the Cabinet, members of the Supreme Court, members of the diplomatic corps, Governors of the various States, and over half the membership of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, as well as religious and lay leaders from across the Nation, gives ample testimony of the importance annual event has achieved.

The Presidential prayer breakfast affirms, as does this one, that our Nation's leaders recognize their reliance upon God in the conduct of their private and public lives.

It is also indisputable evidence, it seems to me, of the key role that faith in God has played, and plays today, in the governmental life of the United States.

We have a spiritual heritage. It sets our Nation apart. It is an indispensable source of our country's strength.

I can't help but wonder what would have been the response if a breakfast such as this one were held about 190 years ago at the time of our Nation's founding.

If we can imagine for the moment that the great men of that day could have overcome the problem of getting quickly from one place to another, I am sure we could safely count on an illustrious attendance.

The man whose birthday we celebrate today would have come. Of that we have no doubt. He well understood, and frequently expressed, his dependence on God.

His little prayer after his inauguration in 1789 comes immediately to mind.

"Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy holy protection; that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government; to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large."

Old Benjamin Franklin would have come, I believe. Many will remember that in the midst of framing our Federal Constitution, it was he who said:

"If it be true that not a sparrow can fall to the ground without His notice, how can we hope to see a new empire arise without His aid."

These first heroes of our struggle to become a nation are here no longer, of course, nor are their dedicated companions, but I am convinced we are helping to perpetuate their ideals by gathering here together in spiritual fellowship this morning.

Like our Nation's Founding Fathers, we are of diverse faiths, but we recognize that this does not prevent our common acknowledgment of dependence upon God.

Like our Nation's Founding Fathers, we are of different backgrounds and occupations, but this does not diminish the understanding and appreciation we have of our Nation's spiritual heritage.

Like our Nation's Founding Fathers, we are not always satisfied with the conduct of our personal and public lives, but this does not prevent us from overcoming the defeats of the day and setting out anew toward goals to enrich not only our lives, but the lives of those around us.

Above all, our Nation's Founding Fathers accepted their responsibilities as men devoted to the cause of freedom, and this acceptance won for them, and us, the Nation we have today.

I have not the slightest doubt that in these different days and times we, no less than our forefathers, will accept our responsibilities and acquit them honorably.

But we need help, and that is what brings us together this morning.

To quote from Corinthians: "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

Our actions must be buttressed by faith, the same faith which guided the architects of our Nation. Their burdens were great, as ours are today, and we need great faith if we are to see our country through the troubles of this modern age.

Change and challenge are everywhere.

The world is aflame with the fierce desires of new nations lunging toward their own destinies.

We know the people of the world are buffeted by ideas based on a godless ideology which seeks to sweep away our basic beliefs in the individual worth and dignity of man.

We dare not be any less resolute than the patriots of an earlier day, particularly the great patriot we honor today. And we dare not overlook the rock of faith which supported our struggling Nation's leaders in their gloomiest hours.

You may have noticed the interesting article in the current issue of the American Legion magazine describing the cruel conditions under which Washington's tattered army crossed the Delaware River and captured Trenton. His soldiers' feet were bloodied by the ordeal and left the snow red. But they kept on, and their victory rallied the young Nation at a time when it was faltering badly. Who can doubt that Washington's great faith, and the faith of his men, was intimately involved in this miraculous performance by a patchwork army.

It takes but little reading of history to realize that those who strained to give birth to this Nation wrestled against tremendous odds, and stood to lose their lives and fortunes if their cause had been unsuccessful. Faith was the additional ingredient in a revolutionary struggle marked by a succession of defeats before the final victory. But the determination to guarantee to citizens of a new nation "certain inalienable rights * * * endowed by their Creator" was too strong, with God's help, to be denied.

We all know that in the course of our Nation's history our leaders have had to contend with many pitfalls, and that prayer has helped guide them through.

Who can forget Lincoln's well-known declaration: "I have been driven many times to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go."

If I could leave one thought with you today, it would be this:

None of us is so self-sufficient that we do not need to lean on the Almighty. Our Nation's first leaders did, and were humble enough to acknowledge it. The great men of our Nation in the generations since have understood their own limitations and therefore turned to God.

In modern times, as well as in the past, we can heed the spiritual thoughts of great men.

President Eisenhower, for instance, asked the Nation to pray with him at his first inauguration. His personal prayer is a moving declaration of faith, and I will quote part of it for you:

"Almighty God, as we stand here at this moment, my future associates in the executive branch of the Government join me in beseeching that Thou wilt make full and complete our dedication to the service of the people in this throng and their fellow citizens everywhere. Give us, we pray, the power to discern right from wrong, and allow all our words and actions to be governed thereby and by the laws of the land."

And President Kennedy said at a Presidential prayer breakfast 4 years ago:

"No man who enters upon the office to which I have succeeded can fail to recognize how the President of the United States has placed special reliance upon his faith in God. Every President has taken comfort and courage when told, as we are told today, that the Lord 'will be with thee. He will not fail thee nor forsake thee. Fear not—neither be thou dismayed.' "

Just 19 days ago, at the breakfast in Washington which I have mentioned, President Johnson solemnly said:

"I find for myself, as I know men and women throughout this great Government of ours also find, a sustaining strength from the moments of prayer, whether we assemble together or whether we pray silently alone. What has become a tradition and practice in our times is actually one of the oldest public traditions of our national life."

Finally, I would like to call attention to the concluding paragraphs of the inaugural address of your fine Governor, delivered just over a month ago:

"I pray to Almighty God that I be given the light to perform my duties with courage, wisdom, and compassion.

"With this prayer, I welcome the challenges and the burdens; the tasks and the responsibilities of this office."

These words follow in the splendid tradition of the other great Americans I have mentioned.

I don't have to tell you that we live in a turbulent 20th-century world. It is a world where men search for answers—and sometimes make the mistake of thinking that computers can answer everything for them. But computers don't fathom the human heart. To move the mountains of inner problems which modern life brings we need to turn to God. And if we learn to live and work in harmony with God's will—if we here make a commitment to do so and join others in other places with the same goal—then surely our communities, States, and the nations of the world will see a brighter tomorrow.

Regardless of our station in life, we are all builders of the future. In all that we do we are adding to the heritage of our children. Let us remember in our work the ancient psalm: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it."

Thank you for your kindness in having me here today.

REMARKS OF GOV. HULETT C. SMITH

We are here this morning because we have an understanding of the power of prayer, and because we want to renew and strengthen our personal relationship with God.

Prayer should not be "a sometime thing."

On George Washington's birthday, we are reminded of his frequent practice of prayer, as he led this Nation in its most crucial moments * * * and of his realization of the value of prayer.

In his first inaugural address, Washington, recognized the importance of prayer in the affairs of government when he said: "The * * * smiles of Heaven can never be

expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right which Heaven itself has ordained."

The same is true today.

Our determination as men and women living today, then, should be to make prayer not "a sometime thing," but a continuing habit.

Perhaps the biggest void in our understanding of prayer is that our prayers are often like voices of those crying out in need from the wilderness * * * instead of voices raised in thanksgiving and jubiliation for the good which is ours.

It has been said, "He who cannot pray when the sun is shining will not know how to pray when the clouds come."

Today, let us give thanks for the beauty of this land, as we ask for help in the leadership of our State and Nation.

Let us give thanks for the privilege of living in a free society, as we ask for the courage and compassion to perform our respective roles in society well.

Let us give thanks for the abundance which has been ours to share in the past, as we ask for help in bringing West Virginia and her people to a happy and healthy future.

Let us always pray with thanksgiving.

Those of us who have the responsibility of guiding the future of this State, and who have the privilege of being a part of government, recognize our great need to be in constant conversation with God.

Our State is at a new juncture in history, and today, we prayerfully seek His wisdom in meeting the many problems we face to take us from an era of mediocrity to an era of excellence.

The need for His guidance in our daily endeavors was the basis for the goal to add a chapel * * * a prayer room * * * to the State capitol * * * a quiet sanctuary, where men and women in government can have a place away from the complexities and often hectic schedule of daily chores and meetings for the most important meeting of all—a prayerful meeting and conversation with God.

Today, as we pray together, let our prayers be that we may all work together in a spirit of understanding and compassion, and that we may govern wisely in this State.

This prayer breakfast may be the rock that is thrown into a pond * * * from which ripples flow outward.

May it expand to our cities. May it go to our college campuses. May it lead men and women to come together for the highest purpose of all—the purpose of recognizing and understanding the greatness that can be ours through uniting in prayer to Almighty God.

BENEDICTION BY DR. STEWART H. SMITH, PRESIDENT, MARSHALL UNIVERSITY, HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

We thank Thee, Lord, for the privilege of participating in this prayer breakfast. We ask Thy richest blessing upon Governor Smith, his family and his associates in State government.

May we all return to our daily tasks refreshed and inspired—with a deeper resolve to help improve the educational, economic, and especially the moral conditions of our fellow West Virginians.

We know that the greatest strength we have is not political or industrial—but the strength of the human spirit.

Our Governor has called upon all of us to work with him in raising the sights of our people, in being unsatisfied with anything less than the attainment of excellence in all our endeavors.

Let us resolve this morning to help him lead our State to new heights of achievement and to help our people enjoy a healthier, happier, and a greater future.

We cannot do this without Thy guidance—O Lord, give us the courage and strength and determination to do what we know needs to be done. Amen.

Senator Dirksen Makes Admirers of His Detractors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial from the Champaign-Urbana News-Gazette dated January 21, 1965:

SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN MAKES ADMIRERS OF MOST OF HIS DETRACTORS

(By William H. Rentschler)

His face sags a little more, and the sad eyes are tired. His massive head, covered with wispy, tousled grey hair, is thrust forward. His voice is measured and resonant and instantly familiar to countless Illinoisans.

And when EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, leader of the small band of Republicans in the U.S. Senate, speaks, nearly everyone—friend and foe alike—listens. For this is a man who, in a third of a century as a legislator in Washington, has unmistakably carved for himself a place as one of the great parliamentarians in the Nation's history.

There was a time when some thought him more a clown, more a medium-grade Shakespearean actor, than a politician with the stuff of statesmanship in him. There were those who thought he was more a master of shallow histrionics than of legislative complexities. But EVERETT DIRKSEN has made admirers of most of his detractors and, in these recent years, he has etched an impressive record, and performed for posterity.

He can be a tough, shrewd, even caustic opponent, but he is almost never accused of sheer negativism. With Republicans across the land howling for scapegoats in the wake of the November 3 disaster, nobody is calling for DIRKSEN'S scalp. Yet he surely is not young, glamorous, or typical of the new image which some Republicans feel is essential to their party's resurgence. The answer is that nearly everybody—some grudgingly to be sure—respects the minority leader from Pekin.

It was DIRKSEN who rallied Republicans in the Senate to support the nuclear test ban treaty, which the late President Kennedy regarded as the high point of his brief tenure in the White House. For this, DIRKSEN incurred the wrath of some Republicans who resented his "collaboration" with the opposition.

It was DIRKSEN who labored painstakingly and brought into play his matchless behind-the-scenes skill to forge a civil rights bill that was acceptable to 80 percent of the Senate membership. For this, he won resounding praise from many normally antagonistic liberals, including some nationally syndicated columnists, who anticipated with unrestrained glee an open rupture between DIRKSEN and Senator Barry Goldwater, who voted against the civil rights bill. But DIRKSEN, ever the fox, graciously accepted the kudos and then proceeded to drive the final nail in the coffin of the anti-Goldwater forces.

It was DIRKSEN who in San Francisco delivered an eloquent nominating speech for Goldwater, ramming home the point that a great national political party must not insist on conformity, but must tolerate and even welcome divergent views.

It was DIRKSEN who sensed the historic impact of the Supreme Court's decision on reapportionment, which requires that all State legislative bodies be divided only on the basis of population. DIRKSEN reacted vigorously to what he saw as one more usurpation of the States dwindling prerogatives. He fought the battle in Congress, finally bowing to the arm-twisting prowess of the White House, but he has not yet lost the war.

Shortly after Congress convened earlier this month, this valiant warrior introduced a constitutional amendment, on which his staff had labored for a year, assuring the States the right to retain the "little Federal system," under which one house is divided on the basis of population, the other on geographical factors.

These are the big issues of recent American history in which EVERETT DIRKSEN has played a very big role. These are some of the historic episodes in his long career which surely qualify him for a measure of greatness.

In this 89th Congress the Senate's Republicans may be badly outnumbered and generally outvoted, but, with EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN at the helm, they will rarely be outthought. And DIRKSEN, all the while, will be adding to his record of legislative brilliance and influence.

Management and Development of the Salmon, Idaho, National Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEN B. JORDAN

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, we in Idaho have always tried to make every effort to improve our economic position without asking for outside assistance. Our record on this has been good. With so much of our land and resources still under the management and ownership of the Federal Government, we must at times call attention to the need for improving and accelerating the management programs of some of our Federal agencies and certain resource-development projects. Approximately two-thirds of Idaho's 53 million acres is still federally owned, and 72 percent of our commercial forests are under Uncle Sam's management. Salmon, Idaho, is one of our communities where the management and development of Federal lands have a very profound influence on the economy. It is situated in Lemhi County, where more than 80 percent of the land is under Federal ownership. Mr. Dave Ainsworth, who owns and operates radio station KSRA, in Salmon, in a recent editorial made some remarks that are both timely and interesting. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "It Seems to Me," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

Good afternoon, friends, some interesting figures were revealed this last week in a report made to the Timber Industry Committee of the Salmon Chamber of Commerce by Paul Kemp, forestry consultant employed by the Western Wood Products Association to represent the wood products industry and the Salmon Chamber of Commerce working with the Forest Service in the development of

the upcoming allowable cut figures for the Salmon National Forest.

Mr. Kemp's comments to the chamber of commerce committee were reported in the news. They merit some further comment and explanation.

Mr. Kemp said that on the basis of the inventory figures developed by the Forest Service covering the 1,129,800 acres of so-called commercial timberland in the Salmon National Forest, he could envision a possible and conditional annual allowable cut in the Salmon Forest of 75,656,000 board feet of lumber per year. This is somewhere in the neighborhood of three times the present cut in the Salmon Forest.

Whether that figure will coincide exactly with the figure which will be arrived at by the Forest Service remains to be seen. The Forest Office is still working on the actual proposal, which is to be completed by April 1. After that it must go to the office of the regional forester for final approval.

It is entirely probable that the Forest Service will view some of the inventory figures in a different light than does Mr. Kemp, who as a representative of the timber industry probably views the figures a little more optimistically than will the Forest Service. But it does appear that allowable cut for the Salmon Forest will be somewhat larger than they presently are.

However that may be, Mr. Kemp's use of the word "conditional" in describing the possible allowable cut in the forest is an important word, because allowable cut, based on a 100-year projection is affected so much by availability of timber and by interim reappraisal. There are many hundreds of millions of feet of timber in the Salmon National Forest which are subject to commercial cutting and subject to inclusion in a sustained yield harvesting plan for the forest which as of the moment are not now available because there's no way to get in and get out.

The Forest Service contends and probably rightly, that there are also large quantities of theoretically commercial timber—that is timber that if harvested would be sawtimber—which are located in areas of inaccessibility both as to road and physical aspects of the area in which they are growing, that are not subject to profitable cutting by methods now in use in the Salmon National Forest.

These are part of the conditions in connection with the possibility that there will be an actual allowable cut of approaching the 75-million-board-foot figure.

Another one of the conditions is the usability of the species which are involved in the forest.

Mr. Kemp gave the following figures as to annual cut by species. Douglas-fir, 37,823,000 board feet. Ponderosa pine, 10,693,000; whitebark (or limber) pine, 3,424,000; lodgepole pine, 7,825,000; alpine fir, 7,058,000; englemann spruce, 8,833,000. As of the present moment, the major cut in the Salmon National Forest is of Douglas-fir and ponderosa pine. Some of the other minor species are cut to a certain extent as they appear in small stands with the major species.

Some of the species are hardly cut at all. Lodgepole, for instance, of which there are vast expanses, much of it in stagnant thick stand of small pole size trees, is hardly cut at all. And there is much of the lodgepole that, unless large areas are thinned for some specialized use, would never reach sawtimber size. Lodgepole is a species that is used largely in the paper pulp industry. But there is no pulpmill in the Salmon River area, and with transportation facilities as they are, there's little chance there will be at least in the foreseeable future.

Whitebark, or limber pine, listed for 3,424,000 board feet of annual cut, may or may not be an important factor in the future of the timber industry. It is a high-growing tree, and is often found in areas now so inaccessible we are told it's entirely possible new methods of timber harvest will have to be instituted in the forest before it can be profitably harvested. As earlier indicated, this same condition holds true of some of the other more popular species.

The major condition which affects the general public in the Salmon River area, however, is the question of getting the roads built to make the timber accessible. Many of the major roads will have to be built with appropriated funds. Although construction of roads other than the major access roads, done with appropriated money, is actually charged back against the timber cut, it is not practical, Mr. Kemp pointed out in his report to the local committee, to expect today's cut of timber to exclusively stand the cost of road construction which will make possible timber harvests in the future years, maybe 50 or 75 years from now.

It was further pointed out at the meeting the other day that in view of the increased pressure for recreation, the road network in the Salmon Forest, much of it being constructed with the proceeds of timber sales, is greatly enhancing the recreational possibilities of the forest, and hence should be at least partially carried by appropriated recreational funds.

One comment that appeared in the meeting was the fact that there are many attractive lakes in the Salmon Forest which are to all intents and purposes totally unavailable to the recreation seeker, but which would become available and probably will be as the forest access road network is developed. Here again, the question arises, should the timber alone be charged with the construction of these roads which will ultimately greatly affect the usability of the Salmon National Forest as a recreational area?

These are all questions that must be answered—not by the residents of the Salmon River area, not by the Salmon office of the Forest Service, but rather by the Congress, and the President's advisers who are so interested in the development of the recreational possibilities of the multiple-use national forest lands.

Mr. Kemp made one most pertinent statement. He said, "If the Federal Government is willing to spend millions and billions of dollars to improve the economy of foreign countries, it might be persuaded to spend some of it to improve the economy here at home, particularly when the land involved already is federally owned."

This leads one to think back several months to the letter in "It Seems to Me" which first appeared in the Butte, Mont., daily, in which the writer suggested that one of the most important contributions that could be made to the development of the economy of the upper intermountain west would be construction, possibly as a Federal project with later operation lease to a connecting railroad, of a rail line into the Salmon River area. That, of course, goes back to the tragedy of 1939 when the old Gilmore and Pittsburg—an orphan, actually owned by the Northern Pacific but not connecting with NP lines, was torn up and junked.

This all seems to wander a long way from the question of the development of greater allowable cut figures for the Salmon National Forest, the development of markets for timber products of the forest, the development of a great recreational attraction for the area. But it is all of one piece. It is a part of the economic future of the Salmon River area. If it were possible that the allowable cut in the forest were tripled, and we could count on it, it's entirely probable that the payroll of the timber industry would increase materially—possibly not triple, because there would be economies in larger operation—but there certainly would be a greater employment directly in the industry. If it is possible that industry could be developed to use forest products which are now on the unusable list, if more rapid development were made of the recreational facilities of the Salmon Forest, it would all rebound to the immediate economic benefit of the area.

We, here in the Salmon River area, do not consider ourselves to be another Appalachia. We don't believe that we need vast sums of Federal money spent in the area to bring us back to life.

But, as we read some of the figures on the vast and speedy economic growth of the rest of the Nation, think of the fact that volume of business, population, and other economic factors have dropped here while the rest of the Nation is moving ahead, we sometimes wonder if at least a small portion of the great sums being spent to speed the economic development of foreign nations couldn't be spent here to improve the economic outlook of an area such as this. And the Salmon River area isn't the only section of the United States that finds itself in a state of more or less economic stagnation and regression because of factors entirely out of its control.

The President's economic advisers might take a look. The figures are available through the Census Bureau. It might be a good idea for someone to push the right button and ask one of those fancy computers to come up with the first simple answer—what areas of the country are not reacting to the growth which President Johnson hopes will lead to the Great Society?

These are things which are not in the way of handouts. They are simply a realization by the Federal Government of obligations in connection with areas whose livelihood depends upon their contact with Federal lands. With the Federal Government owning something more than 80 percent of the land in the county, the economy of Lemhi County cannot be entirely divorced from what the Federal agencies do with the land they own.

And that's the way it seems to me today. Join us at this same time next Sunday when we'll have some more ideas to discuss as it seems to me. This is Dave Ainsworth, wishing you a very good afternoon on another fine Sunday in America's beauty spot—the Salmon River area.

A Farm People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville, Ind., News of February 19:

A FARM PEOPLE PROGRAM

In his recent state of the Union message, President Johnson touched briefly on the Nation's farm problem, and he is reported now to be wrestling with a variety of new proposals designed to at least partly solve that continuing major domestic headache. There has been no indication as to what may be developed within coming months in the way of changes in the present farm program.

Meanwhile, one of the Nation's top minds on the subject—Dr. Earl L. Butz, dean of Purdue University's School of Agriculture—suggests a way to aid farmers who need it most, at a reasonable cost, while helping other farm programs.

What we need, says Butz, in an article appearing in the March issue of Farm

Journal, is a people program in agriculture to help older farmers, 55 to 65, to retire from small farms—if they want to.

"For too long," he says, "we have tried to help these people with price supports, compensatory payments, easier credit, and a variety of other legal and financial gimmicks. It hasn't worked.

"These people are the victims of too few acres, low volume of sales, inadequate capital, perhaps limited management—or a combination of all these. They are the real victims of technological farm progress.

"Trying to help them with commodity programs across the board has resulted in complicated political farm programs that have been unsuccessful. We have tried to solve manpower adjustment problems with production adjustment farm programs.

"These farmers would be better off—and revised agricultural programs would work better—if we helped these people with their special problems.

"They cannot easily move into other jobs, as can younger farmers. They can't learn new skills as readily, and employers prefer not to hire people over 55—since they assume insurance, pension and other fringe costs for a worker who will be with them only a few years.

"Besides, older people don't like to leave their home farm and community."

Younger people, Butz says, are getting off these small farms, either by growing bigger, getting better, or shifting into something else. The most recent census shows that of the commercial farm operators selling less than $2,500 of farm products a year, only 11 percent were under 35 years. But 43 percent were between the ages of 55 and 64. "For those selling $2,500 to $5,000 per year, 12 percent were under 35; and 25 percent were between 55 and 64.

"That's where the real people problem is in agriculture; among the older people (but not old) on small farms. Their income is too low for an acceptable living standard—especially in a society that seeks to abolish poverty. They aren't old enough for social security, but are too old to shift easily to something else."

Butz suggests that we offer direct cash payments to commercial farmers who are 55 to 64, and who sell less than $5,000 worth of farm products a year. These cash payments would be equivalent to social security payments and would continue until they are old enough to qualify for social security.

Butz estimates that the program cost would come to about $250 million a year—"equal to annual ACP (agricultural conservation program) payments which often increase production. And it should be easy to find the money in the USDA's (U.S. Department of Agriculture) budget of $6 to $7 billion, which includes perhaps $2 billion now being spent yearly in such a manner as to increase farm output through price incentives."

The Purdue dean says it could be handled this way:

1. Participation would be completely voluntary—no force of any kind would be used.
2. The operator would agree to put his farm in a land retirement program—and would be paid the going rate for that.
3. He could continue to live on his farm. He could grow products for his own use, but not to sell.
4. He could take part-time jobs up to a limit of $1,200 yearly.
5. Nonfarmers wouldn't be allowed to participate. Perhaps you'd have to have been farming a minimum number of years to qualify.
6. If the farm is sold, then these early retirement payments would stop.

Butz says this program "would go a long way toward helping the real victims of technological progress in agriculture, and would be a massive antipoverty program where it counts."

Is Criminal Qualified Juror?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., published in its February 17, 1965, issue an editorial which deserves much thought and consideration. It is entitled "Is Criminal Qualified Juror?" I commend this editorial to the attention of Senators during this time when consideration is being given to asking Congress to pass another civil rights bill, after already having done this in 1957, 1960, and 1964.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have this excellent editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Feb. 17, 1965]

IS CRIMINAL QUALIFIED JUROR?

Martin Luther King, echoing the sentiments of civil rightists in general, has discussed the issue of Negro voting with President Johnson himself and says he has assurance that further legislation will be proposed.

In view of the recent Federal court decisions and the Civil Rights Act of 1963–64, about all there is left is legislation which would wipe out all requirements established by the States to determine the qualifications of all citizens alike for the privilege of the ballot.

This sounds like what King is asking for when he says he reminded Mr. Johnson of the Democratic platform pledge to secure voting rights for Negroes without delay or harrassment.

He said he told the President and Vice President HUMPHREY that he wanted a law which would provide automatic Federal machinery to eliminate "crippling discretion on the part of hostile State officials."

Both King and President Johnson have spoken directly about Mississippi and Alabama, saying that the chief complaint is against the application by officials of literacy tests and the slowness of the registrars in issuing certificates. In many instances in the States in question there is no doubt that the complaints are legitimate.

However, there also is evidence that the boards of registration should exercise every precaution and enforce reasonable requirements to make sure that an applicant is qualified, or at least isn't disqualified, before issuing the certificate.

The tardiness of a young Negro elector in reporting for jury duty in Greenville County court a few days ago brought to light an alarming example.

Judge James H. Price was understandably aggravated when officers had to be sent for the juror. All jurors are important, but Negroes these days are especially important. Their absence from jury panels has been sure-fire grounds for appealing the convictions of Negroes. These cases have produced some of the most celebrated civil rights decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court and freed dangerous men.

Once the young man had attracted attention by his civic laxity, further inquiries were made. It was found that he had been convicted of four felonies and that at the time he registered to vote he already had served time on the chaingang for a crime which the South Carolina constitution says disqualifies any citizen for the privilege of voting.

There was all over South Carolina last summer a concerted but peaceful campaign to get Negroes registered to vote in the presidential election. Previously unregistered whites also turned out in large numbers. In Greenville and other counties, the registration board offices were open almost daily for weeks before the 30-day deadline before the election.

The registrars, we are sure, did the best they could. But they were swamped by both white and Negro applicants, with the latter being in the majority at many places and at many times. The registrars certainly couldn't have checked the court files to make sure no applicants had criminal records. So, one can't help wondering how many others, either unqualified or disqualified under the law, got by.

Are these the kind of voters Lyndon Johnson and Martin Luther King want to give unrestricted access to the ballot? Do they want illiterates and persons with criminal records serving on juries? Accused criminals might like to have somebody who had "done time" perhaps sitting in sympathetic judgment, but it hardly is in the best interests of society.

These questions are becoming urgent. We aren't belaboring the issue just to have something to write about. There is a concerted move on to wipe out all State requirements and qualifications for voting. And the incident in county court shows what can happen.

The Great Go-Now, Pay-Later Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, a good friend of mine, with station WTAE-TV in Pittsburgh, recently sent me an editorial which was broadcast over his station last week. It is good to see that more and more commentators are taking the trouble to point out that there is no magic money tree in this country. The money we vote in Congress of course must come eventually from the earnings of the people, though it seems this fact is often overlooked.

As we embark on the good ship Great Society, it is well for us to remember that we are traveling under a great go-now, pay-later plan and that, when the great trip is over, there will be great bills to pay. The sad thing is that while we are traveling first class, our descendants, who will have to face the bill collectors, may have to ride in the steerage.

I am glad to offer this editorial for the RECORD:

(The following editorial was presented by Franklin C. Snyder, vice president and general manager of WTAE, on channel 4 during the period February 12–16, 1965. A similar editorial was broadcast over WRYT radio by Geer Parkinson, station manager, on February 13–14, 1965.)

It is possible these days to have the illusion that money is pouring into Pittsburgh like trained pigs coming home to the farmer. Money coming in is a nice feeling, and you'll never hear us knock it; but let's not be under any delusions about it.

Where is this money coming from? Well, from Washington. Pittsburgh has just learned it stands to get $2.5 million under the war-on-poverty program.

In Harrisburg, the commerce department has sliced up a $20 million feedback to local communities under project 70. In case you've forgotton, Pennsylvania voters in the 1963 election approved a $70 million bond issue to buy land for recreation. This is one of those matching fund propositions. Pittsburgh will get $1.3 million; Penn Hills will get $77,000; Mount Lebanon gets $80,-some thousand; and other communities, varying amounts—provided they match these State funds with local money.

But—there's another trump card. The cities, boroughs and townships need match only half the State money. Federal dollars will take care of the rest. If you live in Mount Lebanon, for example, it is possible to have the pleasant illusion that $40,000 gets you $120,000. The rest will come off that money tree that grows some place out of town, and only the politicians know where.

Now this station agrees with the principles of the war on poverty. We agree with the goals of project 70, and urged its passage. We agree that there are things that have to be done, regardless of cost.

But, we also think people need reminding from time to time that these programs represent borrowing against the future, for there is no money tree other than your tax dollars. No fiscal abracadabra of Federal grants and matching funds can change the fact that for American taxpayers, the meter keeps running.

Livestock Credit—Address by Lee M. Stenehjem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, my State of North Dakota is honored to have, this year, one of its most distinguished citizens, Mr. Lee M. Stenehjem, of Watford City, N. Dak., serve as national president of the Independent Bankers Association. Mr. Stenehjem is a good banker; and he has also interested himself in, and has become a recognized authority on, many farm problems, including those of the cattle industry.

Recently, Mr. Stenehjem spoke at the convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association, held in Portland, Oreg. In his speech, he dealt with agricultural matters. I think the contents of his speech will be of great interest and concern to Members of Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stenehjem's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY LEE M. STENEHJEM, PRESIDENT, INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION, DURING AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, LIVESTOCK CREDIT PANEL, IN PORTLAND, OREG., JANUARY 27, 1965

Thank you very much, members of the American National Cattlemen's Association for giving me the privilege of taking part in this panel today.

I'm a country banker who is privileged to serve the cattlemen of western North Dakota and eastern Montana, and when I ponder the hazards and hindrances that hurt our beef cattle industry, I am put in mind of the rancher who climaxed a long run of hard luck by committing murder.

His herd had been hit by disease, drought and rustlers. His hay ran out, the price of beef went down, and his farm machinery was repossessed. His children went off to the city and his wife ran away with the hired man.

Weary of woe, our hero with slumping shoulders walked down the road, away from his foreclosed forties, and he met an optimistic preacher who heard his tale of travail and declared:

"Cheer up, Deacon, the worst is yet to come."

"So I killed him," explained the rancher, and the jury let him off scot free.

We know that he, and we, have been facing for many months a situation in which the price we get does not offset the cost we incur.

Until ranchers and farmers can together demand and get a more fair share of the market price, we will have to quit crying and concentrate on softening the other jaw of the squeeze, which is cost.

If we are to live with these low beef prices until some remedial action eventually gives them a boost, we have no choice but to cut our costs and operate even more efficiently.

Out in the North Dakota Badlands where I hail from, we have a stout hero in the great Teddy Roosevelt who stood for right living and taking the hard lot of duty instead of the comfortable easy way. As a sickly youth, he came to our rugged rangeland and found sheer joy in living, and real satisfaction in standing on his own two feet. If his head on Mount Rushmore were to swing around and face in the opposite direction, he would be gazing in the direction of the National Memorial Park where he regained his health and strength.

The subject of livestock credit stirs wide interest and brings us together here today. How does the country banker view the livestock credit business? Well, he's still the largest lender in rural areas. And ranchers and farmers are now using twice the amount of credit they used 10 years ago.

The country banker is not just a fair weather friend of the rancher; he is an all weather friend who sees himself as a partner of the rancher, and in the business to stay.

The banker today sees a ray of sunshine. Skies are beginning to brighten. The banker sees depressed prices bottoming out. And he notes the fast growing population of our Nation as a solid base for long-term confidence. And the prospect of a substantial increase in oversea exports of American beef is improving daily.

I would advise rancher and farmer to stop railing against low prices and act now to cut costs to the bone, improving the profit margin for the time being, until the inevitable upswing in price comes.

We can heed the counsel of Mrs. Stevens who admits: "I simply cannot make all the candy in the world, so I just make the best of it." We can steady our own position by making the best of our own operation, increasing the quality of our beef, and working in concert with others to improve the market situation in our industry.

I ask you to think of the community banker as a man ready, willing, and able to help you earn a profit in your cattle business. Banks hold first place as lenders in rural areas. We have a long record of credit service based on a firsthand knowledge of your needs. We are your friends in all seasons, including even the rough period of today with its low prices and outrageous rampaging of nature which we see clearly reflected here in Portland.

We of the Independent Bankers Association are not content to curse the darkness. We are lighting a torch by warning responsible officials of the Federal Government how the depression in rural America is a drag on the entire economy.

In recent months we have made repeated trips to Washington to describe the problem of rural underpayment to Vice President HUMPHREY, Agriculture Secretary Freeman, and the economic advisers of President Lyndon Johnson.

We are urging immediate top level Government action to bring the rancher and farmer's share of the market dollar into line with the shares of other segments of our economy.

Our association at its last annual convention in Minneapolis went on record urging a restrictive quota on beef imports, and we followed up this resolution by writing every Member of Congress to let him know just how we felt.

The topic of livestock credit brings up the matter of rates, and I can pledge you that our association stands foursquare for holding the line on interest rates. I can report that credit will not become costlier to you livestock borrowers in the next few months, even though banks now have to pay more for the money they borrow from the Federal Reserve, our central bank.

Officers of our association called recently at the White House and delivered a message to President Johnson, declaring that we independent bankers will not raise interest rates so long as we have anything to say about it.

Earlier this month, we sponsored a campaign that has induced thousands of concerned rangeland people and farmers and neighbors of their communities to write to President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY and to their Senators and Congressmen, informing them that economic conditions are not good in our rural areas.

To large degree, we bankers share the rugged individual conviction of you cattlemen. We do not run to Washington for a handout or expect the Federal Government to fill every conceivable need.

But we recognize that major decisions affecting our national economy, our livestock industry, banking procedures and agriculture are hammered out in Washington. That is where programs affecting us all are authorized. For this reason, we maintain a close watch in Washington on legislation and Government efforts for improvement of our industry. And our officers and committee leaders travel to Washington frequently to talk to high Government people about what the needs are and what ought to be done.

And we do know beyond any doubt that our segment, agriculture, is simply not sharing in the national prosperity. The rancher and farmer deserve a better shake, and until they get it, this country cannot come near to its potential of prosperity.

We hoped that a ground swell of public opinion expressed in personal letters direct to the President and to Members of Congress would convince them that now is the time to come to the assistance of rural America.

So you won't think we're just whistling Dixie, consider these few figures: In only 15 years, from the ideal days of full employment and maximum use of raw materials that followed World War II until last year, total compensation of employees has gone up 149 percent; income of small businessmen and professional men has gained 74 percent; total rental climbed 64 percent; total corporate profits are up 87 percent; in fact, the total average national income has increased 125 percent * * * but total net farm income has gone down by 17 percent.

The fact that farmers and ranchers have not benefited by one penny in the $265 billion dollars of total expansion in our country is deeply disturbing.

Unfortunately for him, the farmer and rancher has been subsidizing others in our economy, the processor, the consumer, the middlemen. As lenders serving the cattlemen and soil tillers, we see every day the sure signs that farm and ranch families are substituting credit for earned income, and you must admit this cannot long continue. Country bankers from many States tell me rural loans are in danger of deterioration.

What to do about it is the question. Because our American agriculture is so broad and diverse, even farm assistance programs conflict. Farm leaders and organizations have found it hard to reach the kind of agreement that in former years could enlist broad popular support for specific farm aid plans.

For 3 years, our association has been trying to arouse official Washington to awareness that our ranchers and farmers are struggling to survive.

We have observed that agricultural problems are neatly dumped into the capacious hopper of the Department of Agriculture, and thereafter dodged by other departments of Government and administrative heads.

What has since Coolidge's day been described as "the farm problem" is really the problem of too-low net farm income. And thus far, Government plans for restoration of prosperity on the farm have not made much headway.

There are obstacles in the way that lead to a workable solution. The average rancher and farmer wants to be self-sufficient and independent. The economics of agriculture is disputable and controversial in nature. The divisions of farmers and ranchers into organizations going their separate ways does not promote unity.

Our IBA spokesmen, Vice President Pat DuBois and Agriculture Chairman Russ Hanson, have told Secretary Freeman, Vice President HUMPHREY, the National Agricultural Advisory Commission and President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers that existing agricultural programs have accomplished little, and top-level action for improvement must be taken if the rancher, the farmer and their rural towns are to stay alive.

As small town bankers and businessmen, we know what you who live on ranches and farms are facing today. We have no easy answer, no pat solution, no crystal ball to point the better way. All we can do is work along with you, and use our utmost ingenuity, courage and effort to win out.

My main message today is to tell you that rural banks want to and can furnish dependable long-term credit to livestock men. The country banker knows the rancher and farmer well, and has a permanent stake in their local community. Smaller banks which may have lacked funds for loaning can now through correspondent connections draw on longer lines of credit to serve ranchers with dependable longtime loans.

The independent banker's interest in the cattleman is not routine or mechanical. It is a sincere interest based on mutual respect, friendship, trust, experience and good judgment.

The banker will prove he is your friend when you call on him for the help you need in your operation.

Tom Paine, the American colonial patriot, declared that "these are times that try men's souls." We who are sons of the pioneers who tamed these western plains and are opposed by low prices, skimpy profit margins, imports, drought, snow and extreme cold, we know just how he felt.

But we are self-reliant Americans, and when the going gets tough, the tough get going.

In time of stress, we feel a special warmth for one who senses our need and comes to help us meet it.

Your community banker is that kind of guy.

Thank you very much.

Social Security Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville, Ind., News of February 17:

SOCIAL SECURITY DOLLARS

We applaud President Johnson's promise to the American people that a prime aim of his administration would be to see that taxpayers received a dollar's worth of value for every dollar spent by the Federal Government.

In this connection, the question was raised yesterday by the head of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., as to whether benefits for bureaucrats or benefits for the aged needy constitute the first consideration of the social security system.

C. Wilson Harder, NFIB president, says this question should be considered as long as many questions are now being raised in the Congress on the social security system with regard to proposed legislation to increase benefits as well as include medicare. They should also be reviewed, he said, in the light of private insurance experience.

Harder points out that published reports show that the administrative costs of the social security system in the fiscal year 1963–64 reached a new high with the sum of $370,458,000 expended in this manner, or a gain of $41,418,000 over the previous year when the total administrative costs were $329,040,000.

The Administration alone, he says, is now taking 61 percent of the interest earned on the unexpended reserves, an increase from 56.6 percent of the previous year and a sharp increase from the 30.4 percent administrative cost registered in the fiscal year of 1957–58.

The unexpended reserves of the social security system are loaned to the Government for general purposes at a low rate of interest which yielded in the last fiscal year $606,704,000 and $582,043,000 the previous year. In 1961–62 the interest yield was $609,006,000 with only 51.8 percent going to administrative costs. In the fiscal years 1957–58 through 1960–61, the yield varied between $564 million and $591,713,000 with only 30.4 percent taken for administrative costs in the first of the years, but steadily growing each year.

This cost of operation compares quite unfavorably, Harder says, with that reported in the fact book of the Institute of Life Insurance.

The data compiled on the Nation's 1,507 life insurance companies indicates, exclusive of commissions paid to agents, shows they only spend 37.1 percent of their earnings on investments on administration. The true figure, Harder points out, is probably far below this, as the data from the life insurance companies includes the operation of some 1,507 different executive staffs, advertising programs, and many offices.

The Social Security Administration, he points out, has no collection problems, and has no investment problems as the surplus funds are automatically loaned to the Government at a low yield. The Nation's insurance companies not only have to engage in collection procedures, but must also devote a considerable part of overhead expense in the field of investing and investment management.

Thus, he feels, it is reasonable to assume that the Nation's private insurance companies perform the same functions that are necessary for social security administration at an overhead not exceeding 10 percent.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, whose principal activity is the operation of social security, now has, according to the Byrd committee report, 82,740 employees, while all the 1,507 life insurance companies employ in capacities other than sales work, only 91,000 people.

The comparison is further aggravated, Harder states, when it is realized that these 91,000 people—of whom 28,000 are male and the balance female personnel, handled in 1963, a total of 334 million life insurance policies, as compared with the social security accounts of a work force of 70 million people. In addition, the private insurance figures include 1,507 duplications in some 1,507 various occupations, such as telephone operators, stenographers, file clerks, etc. In addition, they also include the machinery for handling premiums, due notices, claims, bookkeeping, accounting, payroll clerks, investment management, and all other functions, as compared with the quite limited functions of social security administration.

According to the most recent report, social security now operates 613 district offices.

"Before any further extensions of social security are made," Harder says, "it would seem wise for the Congress to investigate thoroughly the efficiency of the operation. Every million dollars spent on maintaining useless bureaucratic functions is just another million denied to the aged needy. And while businessmen generally applaud the efforts of Defense Secretary McNamara to get more defense for the dollar, so would they welcome more benefits for the aged per dollar spent."

Constitutional Safeguards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the President's aid-to-education bill is now rather rapidly moving through the legislative process. Certainly, one of the major questions involved is the constitutionality of the use of public funds to aid private and parochial schools.

In its February 10, 1965, edition, the Christian Science Monitor, a most knowledgeable and highly regarded newspaper with national circulation, editorialized on this subject. In view of the seriousness of the questions raised, I should like to commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS

Greatly needed aid-to-education proposals in the past have uniformly foundered on the aid-to-parochial schools issue. President Johnson adroitly framed his recent proposal in such a way as to cut into the ranks of the opposition. He has succeeded in picking up National Education Association as well as certain Protestant, Jewish, and Roman Catholic support which had been denied ad-

ministration aid-to-education measures in previous years.

With this added support and with a friendlier Congress there is a real danger that the proposal may slip through without the addition of badly needed constitutional safeguards. The House Education Subcommittee approved the measure without major alteration in its form or content but did, we are happy to note, make some changes designed to bolster its constitutionality. Given the gravity of the issue involved, the speed with which the bill passed the subcommittee is not a promising sign.

In public hearings before the subcommittee, spokesmen for the American Civil Liberties Union and for organizations representing significant segments of Protestant and Jewish opinion voiced their opposition to the President's proposals on constitutional grounds. In addition, some of the groups which for the first time favored an aid-to-education bill urged, nevertheless, that Congress write in certain specific safeguards. Considering the magnitude of constitutional and public policy issues at stake, we sincerely hope that as the measure continues through the legislative process Congress will give these recommendations careful and deliberate consideration.

This bill represents a continuing process of erosion in the area of church and state. The measure appears to have been poorly drafted; it contains a number of potentially dangerous loopholes. As presently drawn, it threatens public control of educational funds. It forebodes further whittling away of the traditional interpretation of the "no establishment" clause of the first amendment; certain provisions set dangerous precedents or patterns of future aid to religious institutions.

The bill, as drawn, will launch the Nation into much wider involvement in shared-time programs in which pupils attending religious schools participate in certain public school activities. Such programs of dual enrollment could raise a number of vexing constitutional church-state questions. They raise, in addition, vital questions of public policy.

There is reason to assume, for example, that shared time would result in a proliferation of private schools, many of them religious, thereby ultimately threatening the predominant place of the public school in American education. The question also arises as to whether the local church authority would not seek to influence the teaching in those public schools to which parochial school students would go during shared time. We doubt the wisdom of promoting shared time without giving far more consideration to its possible influence on American church-state patterns.

Those who value church-state independence will look to Congress to clarify some other provisions of this aid bill, especially the proposals to provide Federal funds for supplementary educational centers and services and to provide free textbooks and library materials to students in private as well as public schools. Highly questionable is the effort to circumvent State constitutional provisions against support of religious education through providing directly the Federal aid.

We urge the Congress to tighten its legislative control over the funds to be appropriated under this measure in order to prevent the use of Government appropriations to aid religion in violation of the first amendment. We urge the inclusion of a provision for judicial review so that the technical question of standing to sue cannot prevent a test of the constitutionality of the administration's bill or any part of it.

Above all, we urge close congressional scrutiny of the entire bill to assure that it contains not a single provision which would enable the State to control the churches through public funds or the churches to profit from such funds or control public programs. This we understand to be the meaning of the first amendment, and this we believe to be the way the American people want to keep it.

The Adjudication of Veterans' Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has conducted a continuing study of the adjudication system of the Veterans' Administration over a period of several years. Extensive hearings held in the 86th and 87th Congresses resulted in the enactment of two significant public laws.

Public Law 87-666 established a new appeals procedure. Under the old procedure a claimant who desired to appeal the denial of his claim to the Board of Veterans' Appeals merely signed a notice of appeal to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The regional office then forwarded the file to the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

In most instances the veteran had never been informed of the facts found by the regional office and had not been informed of the reasons for the denial of his claim. Consequently, the issues were not stated and the so-called appeal was really more in the nature of a review by the Board of Veterans' Appeals. This system encouraged claimants who had been denied in the regional office to appeal to the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

Under the new system established by Public Law 87-666 a claimant whose claim has been denied in the regional office files a notice of disagreement. The regional office then reviews the claim and, if this review does not result in the withdrawal or allowance of the claim, then a statement of the case is prepared, a copy of which is furnished the claimant and his representative.

The statement of the case contains a summary of the material evidence, a statement of the applicable rules of law, and a statement setting out the reasons for the denial of the claim. The claimant then has 60 days in which to respond to the statement of the case. If the response of the claimant does not result in allowance of the claim by the regional office, it is certified to the Board of Veterans Appeals in Washington.

Statistics prepared by the Board of Veterans Appeals for the calendar year 1964 are included at the conclusion of these remarks. These statistics show that 41,565 notices of disagreement were received in regional offices during the year; that 2,214 of these were withdrawn; and that 34,602 statements of the case were issued. In 13,235 cases the appeal was abandoned when the claimant failed to respond to the statement of the case. Twenty-three thousand, seven hundred and twelve appeals were received by the Board of Veterans Appeals during the calendar year.

It is significant to note that the new appeals' procedure has substantially reduced the number of appeals received by the Board of Veterans Appeals. This is because more claims are now being finally determined in the regional office without going through the costly appeals procedure. This is largely due to the fact that the claimant under the new procedure receives such complete information about the denial of his claim that he recognizes the futility of proceeding further with it. This is shown by the fact that 13,235, or 37.9 percent of the claims were abandoned in the regional office after the claimant received the stateemnt of the case.

Under the old procedure, approximately 42,700 claims were appealed annually which is 18,988, or 44 percent more than the number of appeals received in the calendar year 1964. In fiscal year 1961, 3,831 claims, or 8 percent, of the total appeals were allowed by the Board of Veterans Appeals. Under the new system, in calendar year 1964 the Board of Veterans Appeals allowed 2,600, or 12.7 percent, of the appeals it considered. In the calendar year 1964, the regional offices allowed 5,730 claims, or 13.5 percent, after the notice of disagreement had been received and allowed 1,631, or 6.7 percent, after receipt of the claimants' response to the statement of the case. In all, a total of 9,961 claims were allowed after the notice of disagreement was received. This constitutes 23.4 percent of the 42,546 notices of disagreement disposed of during the calendar year 1964.

Public Law 87-671 established a procedure whereby the Board of Veterans Appeals might refer to independent medical experts outside of the Veteran's Administration claims which involved complex medical questions. In such cases the claim is first referred to the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration and, if this results in an opinion unfavorable to the claimant, the medical question involved is then referred to an independent medical expert outside the Veterans' Administration.

The statistics appearing at the conclusion of my remarks disclose that the Board of Veterans Appeals, during the calendar year 1964, acted upon 149 claims in which they had received opinions from medical experts outside the Veterans' Administration. Of these 149 claims the independent medical experts disagreed with the Chief Medical Director 51 times and agreed with the opinion of the Chief Medical Director 98 times. This means that 51 appealed claims, or 34 percent of the total referred to independent medical experts, were allowed.

Except for the relatively few cases which are referred to independent medical experts and except for claims aris-

ing under Government life insurance contracts, the decision of the Veterans' Administration on veterans claims is final and conclusive. A veteran's claim is, in effect, a claim against the Veterans' Administration and it does not seem proper that the Veterans' Administration should be the sole judge of a claim against itself.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has given consideration to the establishment of an independent tribunal to which all claims denied by the Board of Veterans Appeals might be appealed. This proposal has been opposed by some on the ground that an independent tribunal outside the Veterans' Administration might be unduly strict and impose rules which would interfere with liberal policies of the Veterans' Administration and require them to apply more restrictive rules in the adjudication of claims.

I believe the following report, showing that independent medical experts outside the Veterans' Administration reversed the opinions of Veterans' Administration doctors 34 percent of the time, shows that independent judgment, free from the influence of the Veterans' Administration, will not be more restrictive but, in fact, will be more liberal:

Status of appeals (4-stage process), cumulative from Jan. 1 through Dec. 31, 1964

	Number	Percent
Stage I. Notice of disagreement:		
1. Pending, Jan. 1, 1964	6,203	------
2. Received, to date	41,565	------
3. Disposed of, to date	42,546	100.0
(a) Allowed	5,730	13.5
(b) Withdrawn	2,214	5.2
(c) SOC issued	34,602	81.3
4. Pending	5,222	------
Stage II. Statements of case:		
1. Pending, Jan. 1, 1964	5,202	------
2. Issued, to date	34,602	------
3. Disposed of, to date	34,912	100.0
(a) Substantive appeal filed	21,677	62.1
(b) Failure to respond	13,235	37.9
4. Pending	4,892	------
Stage III. Substantive appeals:		
1. Pending, Jan. 1, 1964	3,100	------
2. Received, to date	25,078	------
3. Disposed of, to date	24,348	100.0
(a) Allowed	1,631	6.7
(b) Withdrawn	590	2.4
(c) Certified to Board of Veterans Appeals	22,127	90.9
4. Pending	3,830	------
Stage IV. Board of Veterans Appeals:		
1. Pending, Jan. 1, 1964	2,408	------
2. Received, to date	23,712	------
3. Disposed of, to date	20,514	100.0
(a) Allowed	2,600	12.7
(b) Remanded	2,504	12.2
(c) Denied or dismissed	15,142	73.8
(d) Withdrawn	268	1.3
4. Pending	5,606	------

NOTE.—Percentages shown in each stage relate to dispositions in that stage only.

Report of outside medical opinions requested by Board of Veterans Appeals, calendar year 1964 (Public Law 87-671)

Item description	Total	Disability compensation	Death compensation	Other
1. Independent expert medical opinions: [1]				
(a) Number requested, total	195	157	37	1
Percent of total appeals in these categories disposed of	2			
Number requested in connection with appellate consideration	164	132	31	1
Number requested in connection with reconsideration	31	25	6	0
(b) Number of favorable opinions submitted to a 2d medical expert or panel	0	0	0	0
(c) Number of unfavorable opinions submitted to a 2d medical expert or panel [2]	2	2	0	0
(d) Source of requests: [3]				
Congressional	24	17	7	0
BVA on own motion	75	57	18	0
Veterans' organizations:				
AL	27	23	3	1
AMVETS	4	3	1	0
DAV	19	17	2	0
VFW	27	25	2	0
Other	22	18	4	0
Veteran	6	6	0	0
Dependents of veteran	4	0	4	0
(e) Cost:				
Average per opinion	$48.89			
High per opinion	$150.00			
Low per opinion [4]	0			
2. Opinions requested from Chief Medical Director [1]	509	431	71	7
3. Number of appeals allowed after getting an IME or CMD opinion	209	171	34	4
Regular appellate decisions	166	134	29	3
Reconsideration appellate decisions	43	37	5	1
4. Disposition by the Board after getting an IME or CMD opinion:				
	Allowed / *Denied*			
IME	51 / 98			
CMD	158 / 257			

[1] Figures shown in items 1 and 2 relate to requests, not dispositions during report period. Although the Board requested 195 independent medical expert and 509 Chief Medical Director opinions, only 180 independent medical expert and 473 Chief Medical Director opinions were received.
[2] 2d medical expert opinion in each case was also unfavorable.
[3] Some may be dual requests, i.e., service organizations and Member of Congress, etc.
[4] 17 opinions rendered by the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology; no fee involved.

NOTE.—When the Board decides, on the basis of medical controversy or complexity, that the opinion of an independent medical expert is to be sought, an expert opinion is usually first obtained from the Chief Medical Director of the VA, if such opinion is not already of record. If the opinion of the CMD is favorable to the claimant, the Board usually decides the case without proceeding further. If it is unfavorable, the IME opinion is obtained by the Board before finally deciding the appeal.

Huron-Manistee National Forest Attracts Record Number of Visitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, one of the many tourist attractions in Michigan is the Huron-Manistee National Forest, and I am pleased to state that last year this was the second most used forest area in the Nation from a recreation standpoint. Eight of the fifteen countries in which this forest area is located are a part of Michigan's 10th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent.

The Huron-Manistee National Forests are situated within a day's drive for 45 to 50 million people and the record shows that more and more of these citizens are attracted to Michigan's great recreation wonderland.

These counties and the net forest areas acres within their boundaries are: Alcona, 102,901 acres; Crawford, 45,554; Iosco, 102,395; Ogemaw, 19,771; Oscoda, 142,880; Roscommon, 40; Mecosta, 2,534; and Montcalm, 1,381.

The combined area of these forests, located in the northern part of Michigan's Lower Peninsula is 866,500 acres.

Those of us who have followed the development of these two forests in recent years are going to miss Louis A. Pommerening, retiring forest supervisor, who started his career with the Forest Service in the Huron Forest in May 1933, and concluded his work last December after more than 30 years of faithful service to the Forest Service. He has been succeeded by John von Bargen.

I would like to pay tribute to Pommerening and compliment him on the splendid job he has done in administering these forests through the years. I know he will reap much reward in his retirement in the knowledge that the area has become such an attraction for visitors.

I also want to extend to the new supervisor, Mr. John von Bargen, and his staff my cooperation in future development of these two fine forests.

Our visitors are going to find their visits even more enjoyable in the future due to the improvements being made in these two forests. Within the past year 175 new family camping units were completed and when spring comes, work will start on 50 more camping units. A must on any visitor's sightseeing schedule in our area is Lumbermen's Monument in the Tawas City area and plans are underway to redevelop the site to make it even more attractive. Nearly 40 miles of forest roads were constructed in the two forests and another 10 roads were restored. The combined forests already have 792 miles of forest roads.

Michigan's visitors traveling slowly over these roads may be treated to the sight of a doe and her fawn, a strutting buck, and other animals whose habitat is within the boundaries of this forest area. Bird lovers, too, will be well repaid for their visit. Not only game birds but song birds abound. A few months ago I called attention of my colleagues to the efforts of the Forest Service to provide a refuge for the annual visit of Kirkland's warblers, a rare bird, which pays our section of the State a visit each year. Thirty-one bald eagle nests were spotted by forest rangers. Nine of these were active at time of location and 17 young were being produced.

To insure adequate cover for wildlife in the years ahead the Forest Service has a carefully managed program. Last year over 4 million trees were planted in the Huron-Manistee Forests. In addition two waterfowl dams were constructed and numerous wildlife waterholes were established.

Fishermen, hunters, nature lovers, mushroom and berry pickers, bird watchers, hikers, and all lovers of the out of doors will find the Huron-Manistee National Forests of interest.

Doing Business With Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the February 17, 1965, issue of the Buffalo, S. Dak., Times-Herald, as follows:

DOING BUSINESS WITH OUR ENEMIES

With the pledge of military aid to North Vietnam by Soviet Russia, the United States has again been placed in the position of direct trading with an avowed enemy.

There has never been any doubt as to Russia's intention to do all in her power to destroy the United States, but our leaders have been able to wink at these announced intentions and work for establishment and extension of trade with the Communists in the name of better relations. The better relations have included the stoning of the American Embassy with the approval of the Russian regime, and the jeopardizing of the lives of our diplomats in Russia and other countries under her domination.

With American boys being killed and wounded in South Vietnam, and Russian pledges of military assistance to their killers, there can no longer be any doubt that our vacillating foreign policy has led us down the street to failure in our position in the world.

It is still not too late for the United States to call a halt to this folly. In view of present circumstances, any attempt to honey up to the Communists by inviting them to the United States "to see how we live" makes about as much sense as hiring a crazed murderer to baby-sit with our children.

The United Nations have proven itself powerless to serve as anything but a tool of the Communists, who in turn laugh at any moral obligations to the world debating society. Recently, the noted political columnist, David Lawrence, advocated severing diplomatic relations with Russia. He may be right.

At any rate, unless the United States ceases to play the part of the less than bright country cousin in its deals with foreigners whose goal is to destroy us, our Nation is headed for more serious trouble than it has seen in its nearly 200 years of trying to make the world a better place to live.

The action in South Vietnam may not be considered war, but to the men who are daily fighting and facing death there, it is as real a war as any ever fought. To aid their killers is to break faith with them.

Winning in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star dated February 19, 1965:

WE CAN WIN IN VIETNAM

Before we get too worked up about the absence of U.S. combat forces in South Vietnam "who ought to be in there and doing the job right," and the resulting deaths of American specialists, and the confusion over the government of the place and its "attitude" toward the United States, etc., we had better take a look at how the job was done before.

Before the United States made the decision not to let the Communists run, unchecked, over the whole of southeast Asia, the French tried to throw them out of Vietnam.

They decided not to fool around and to do the job right.

The French sent their own regular forces by the tens and even hundreds of thousands, plus thousands of veteran German soldiers enlisted into the Foreign Legion, and went out to clobber the Vietcong.

Instead, they were clobbered themselves. They had 200,000 casualties and were run out of Vietnam altogether in a short space of time.

We stepped in to support a South Vietnam regime to prevent the Vietcong from overrunning the whole country and with that momentum and morale situation all the rest of the rich subcontinent.

The experts and the press reported that Vietnam was confused, naked, unarmed and morale shattered and "wouldn't last 6 months."

And we didn't rush in with massive combat forces to replace the French Army. We sent arms, training experts, supply handlers, and advisers—a mere handful.

That handful is now up to 23,000 men, mostly doing specialist "behind the lines" jobs, and a few serving as combat advisers.

Vietnam has resisted the Vietcong, as a result, under this system not for 6 months as forecast, and not for a couple of years, but for a dozen years, virtually.

Thousands have died and are dying. Thousands of guerrillas have been killed and their bodies carefully counted, and are being killed. Somebody is fighting the forces that cut down 200,000 Frenchmen, somebody more than 23,000 American fliers, mechanics, supply experts, advisers, etc.

About 300 Americans have been killed.

Would fewer Americans die if we let them have South Vietnam? And then go after us somewhere else, as they surely would?

De Gaulle has said from the first that we can't possibly succeed where the brilliant and gallant French have failed. If they couldn't do it with strong measures and direct war, how can we do it by carefully avoiding the use of combat units and just helping Vietnamese who will fight for their own country?

The Communists and their stooges, naturally, have been using every agency and device possible to propagandize the hopelessness of our effort, as well.

And they have the great advantage of tying their control over many devices of propaganda with their control over guerrilla efforts and "incidents"—and they are making a major effort to convince us it is hopeless right now, by both methods. And to scare us, in the bargain.

The fact remains that we have, thus far, done a far better job than the French, with all the frustrations involved, and without sending in an American Army, and without suffering 200,000 casualties as they did.

The record shows that it was not a stupid policy. It was a shrewd policy.

The record shows that we have vastly improved the free world's chances over what they were when we went in with this policy, and vastly improved the situation left us by the French.

The record suggests that having corrected their major mistakes, we can correct some of our own mistakes and do a still more successful job—and we can win.

The biggest barrier to that is the encouragement the Red Chinese take and their Communist allies from our discouragement. The killing of some 30 Americans in terror raids the last week was not designed for any actual military benefit. It was designed to horrify us, and to frighten us, and thus to cause us to give up and get out.

They are fighting a political war and hope to win it, not in Vietnam, but right here in the minds and votes of Americans in the United States.

And if they do, they will figure they can win anything they want by simply scaring us "cowardly" Americans—the paper tiger. And they will push us, and push us, and push us, until we just can't stand to be pushed any more.

And therein lies the real danger of a major war.

C. L. DANCEY.

Bank Loan Curb Will Cut Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the inevitable result of the application of the interest equalization tax to bank loans with a term of over 1 year will be to reduce the volume of U.S. exports. Thus a measure designed to help bring the balance of payments into surplus will actually have an offsetting effect that will tend to deepen the deficit.

The link between bank loans and U.S. exports is discussed at some length in the Monthly Economic Letter of December 1964, published by the First National City Bank of New York. The article points out how the remarkable expansion of world trade in recent years has required growing supplies of U.S. bank credit for financing purposes. The inconsistancies in the administration's

position is evident from the fact that while presumably attempting to increase world trade, the administration now seeks to restrict the financing required to carry on that trade.

Although it is often said that term loans of over 1 year do not finance exports, the article makes perfectly clear the various ways in which such term loans do finance exports and, at the same time, increase job opportunities and incomes at home.

In view of the administration's increasing reliance on restrictions in the field of international trade and payments, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Monthly Economic Letter be included in the RECORD at this point:

COMMERCIAL BANK TERM LOANS ABROAD

In the world today, nations are exchanging goods in rapidly growing volumes. Our own exports have expanded from $15 billion to $25 billion in the past 10 years. Understandably, the remarkable expansion of world trade has required growing supplies of credit.

Commercial banks in the United States and other principal trading nations extend credits to their foreign correspondents and customers. Indeed, the resources of commercial banks constitute a pool of private international liquidity that is drawn upon by creditworthy borrowers in creditworthy countries throughout the world.

Along with direct investment in bricks and mortar, commercial bank credit abroad has greatly expanded over the past 15 years as private U.S. capital has replaced U.S. Government aid to Western Europe and Japan—aid that had been an essential ingredient during the earlier postwar period in reinvigorating world commerce. In recent years, private financing has received further impetus from the restoration of meaningful currency convertibility among the principal nations. These trends and developments have in turn strengthened international competition in the field of money and banking; they have also created new opportunities.

Within a relatively short span of time, U.S. banks have girded themselves to play a prominent role in world finance. With the dollar the leading international currency, the United States the world's largest exporter and importer, and U.S. money and capital markets the single most important source of financial resources, this has been a natural evolution.

PATTERNS OF BANK LENDING

American commercial banks engaging in international business extend both short- and long-term cedits. According to definitions used by official statisticians, short-term credits are those with a maturity up to 1 year; they are frequently renewed from year to year. Loans beyond 1 year are called term loans. These term loans have been customary in domestic financing in the United States for a quarter of a century and have, since World War II, spread to the field of international financing.

U.S. banks have outstanding short- and long-term credits abroad of $9.5 billion. U.S. exporters, importers, and industrial and commercial firms also grant credits to their foreign clients; these amount to $2.3 billion at this time.

Of the short-term bank credits, about $1 billion consist of items held for collection largely on behalf of customers. An additional $2.5 billion of the short-term bank credits represent bankers acceptances. After a long period of inactivity, these have grown remarkably since 1950, with the encouragement of the Federal Reserve System; most acceptances are made under arrangements that involve exports from the United States. Loans to foreign banks and customers today amount to about $5.7 billion, of which $2.2 billion are short term and $3.5 billion are term loans.

THE ANATOMY OF TERM LOANS

There is general agreement that short-term loans by U.S. Banks are indispensable as a means of financing U.S. trade and other international business that directly benefits the U.S. balance of payments. Sometimes, however, the question is raised—particularly by those who tend to blame the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit on private capital investments abroad—whether loans in excess of 1 year serve purposes beneficial to the U.S. balance of payments. To assure export financing and "normal recurring international business," the administration's proposal and the House-approved bill for an interest equalization tax [1] exempted bank loans made in the ordinary course of business as well as all obligations maturing within 3 years. Before the tax was enacted last September, however, a provision was added in the Senate giving the President standby authority to extend the tax to bank loans with a maturity of 1 year or more.

[1] The tax and its implications have been reviewed in the April and November 1964 issues of this letter.

Changes in U.S. short-term banking credits abroad

[In millions of dollars]

	Collections	Acceptances [1]	Loans to—		Total [3]	Long term
			Banks [2]	Others		
1955	52	24	40	94	209	230
1956	87	137	93	94	411	168
1957	−17	255	45	−27	256	335
1958	−2	−43	213	125	292	188
1959	95	−74	8	32	62	183
1960	89	651	−35	22	729	153
1961	95	641	224	140	1,099	336
1962	−14	93	274	20	372	126
1963	146	596	−171	132	703	[4] 576
1963—January-March	22	90	−207	29	−65	−36
April-June	25	341	−94	24	297	[4] 178
July-September	24	−42	6	27	15	121
October-December	74	207	124	52	456	[4] 313
1964—January-March	100	136	103	29	369	231
April-June	1	242	67	84	393	64
July-August	23	−101	15	32	−30	130
Outstanding: August 1964	956	2,840	1,326	919	6,041	3,440

[1] Acceptances made for account of foreigners, including varying amounts of other financing.
[2] Including central banks and other official institutions.
[3] Excluding credits in foreign currencies, which amounted to $689,000,000 in August 1964.
[4] Excluding items reported by banks for the first time but representing certain credits extended previously. Such items amounted to $86,000,000 in the 2d and $193,000,000 in the 4th quarter of 1963. Of the latter amount, $150,000,000 represented trade credits sold to banks by a U.S. corporation.

Source: Derived from data published in the U.S. Treasury Department Bulletin and the Federal Reserve Bulletin.

The author of this amendment, Senator ALBERT GORE of Tennessee, stated that it seemed a "foregone conclusion" that the exemption of commercial bank term loans would be used to avoid the tax and characterized it as an "important loophole." In his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee last June, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon pointed out that the rise in long-term bank loans had started before there was any thought of the tax and that, in the light of detailed information made available to the Treasury, any possible evasion of the tax through use of bank loans could not be "more than 5 percent of the total bank loans."

Changes in direction of the flow of loans to less-developed and developed countries have been remarkably similar to the changes in patterns of direct investment. Until 2 or 3 years ago, the direction of the flows had been mainly to Latin America and Canada. In recent years, most of the term loans have gone to Europe, particularly to Italy during late 1963 and early 1964, and to Japan. The shifts in the geographic distribution are summed up in the second table.

Over the past year, changes in bank credits abroad, short as well as long term, have been particularly influenced by borrowings by Japan. These have grown substantially to support the expanding volume of Japanese trade and business activity. In recent months, the rate of bank lending to Japan has slowed down. As noted in these pages last month, Japan has floated sizable amounts of bonds in European markets.

Changes in U.S. long-term banking credits abroad

[In millions of dollars]

	Extended to—				
	Europe	Latin America	Japan	Canada	Others
1955	−21	240	−44	3	52
1956	95	67	−27	22	11
1957	164	116	6	33	16
1958	20	65	4	28	71
1959	−28	131	3	5	72
1960	−1	125	3	−28	54
1961	126	17	5	198	−10
1962	86	−45	50	30	6
1963 [1]	518	−5	129	−29	49
1963—January-March	27	−16	2	−19	−30
April-June	150	30	35	−28	77
July-September	82	−1	30	10	----------
October-December [1]	259	−18	62	8	2
1964—January-March	155	9	62	−6	11
April-June	80	−15	14	−13	−2
July-August	49	28	8	14	31
Outstanding: August 1964	1,385	1,037	333	270	415

[1] Excluding the $193,000,000 item described in footnote 4 to the preceding table. Its geographical distribution is as follows: Europe, $5,000,000; Latin America, $134,000,000; Japan, $46,000,000; and others, $8,000,000. The distribution of the $86,000,000 item has not been published.

A HELPFUL INNOVATION

The use of term loans in foreign operations is an adaptation of techniques developed in the United States for domestic lending. As is well known, term loans in the United States are generally made to finance acquisitions of plants, machinery and equipment, with repayment out of the cash flow—earnings and depreciation—expected to be generated by their use. The lender must satisfy himself that the borrower will have funds forthcoming to meet his obligations. The borrower can obtain terms that give flexibility in repayment schedules and permit efficient use of loan funds. Over half of the total dollar volume of business loans made by major New York City banks consist of term loans.

Banks extending term loans abroad must, however, satisfy themselves that the borrower will not only generate adequate cash flows but also will be able to convert his local currency earnings into U.S. dollars. Exchange risks—including the possibility, however remote, that exchange controls may prohibit remittances to the United States—and political risks are as much part and parcel of considerations bearing on the extension of a term loan as the general credit standing of the borrower. Other essential considerations are the balance-of-payments position of the borrower's country, the level of its gold and foreign exchange reserves and its short-term international indebtedness. Under certain circumstances, a country may appear to be "borrowed up."

Many of the term loans extended by U.S. commercial banks to borrowers in less-developed countries have been arranged in conjunction with operations of the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, the Agency for International Development and such private lenders as insurance companies. As part of policies to encourage U.S. exports, the Export-Import Bank has recently developed comprehensive insurance coverage for banks against political, military, and commercial risks on development loans. This can be expected, as was the intention, to increase the volume of term lending, particularly to some of the less-developed countries.

On a number of occasions, U.S. commercial banks also have granted loans to foreign governments or central banks as part of packages of financial assistance extended by the International Monetary Fund, sometimes in conjunction with credits from the U.S. Treasury or the Export-Import Bank. Such arrangements have often been negotiated with Latin American nations.

Loans to Europe and Canada have been extended primarily to foreign subsidiaries of American businesses. Sometimes, U.S. firms operating abroad have also been instrumental in helping arrange U.S. bank financing for many of the foreign customers and suppliers with whom they do business. Credits have thus been granted to finance purchases of oil tankers, freighters, airplanes, machinery, electrical equipment, etc. Because of their rapid rate of obsolescence, airplanes have been particularly well suited to financing through bank term loans, with maturities adjusted to the funds generated through earnings and depreciation allowances. Shipping firms have received substantial amounts of term credit by obtaining long-term charters from major shippers of such raw materials as oil, iron ore, and bauxite and assigning the charter income to the lenders.

Technical innovations in industry have thus been matched by innovations in banking techniques. Like advances in technology, the bank term loan is spreading to meet the needs of corporate enterprise here as well as abroad. The growth of international trade and multinational business organizations naturally creates demands for flexible financing on an international scale.

TERM LOANS AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Term loans help promote U.S. exports in the period following the year when they are granted; this minimizes their impact on the balance of payments. Subsequent repayments of the loans with interest increase U.S. balance-of-payments receipts.

Foreigners not only borrow in the United States but also keep deposits in U.S. banks and hold bankers acceptances and other short-term investments. Some of these deposits are normally connected with the loans granted them by U.S. banks. In fact, most nations hold short-term assets in U.S. banks in excess of the sums they borrow from them. The relevant data for selected countries are summed up in the table, which also shows the value of U.S. trade with the nations concerned.

Among the leading net debtors is Japan; its assets in the United States are, however, large. Japan is the second largest customer of the United States. This group of countries also includes several Latin American countries and Norway (because of shipping loans).

U.S. banking credits to foreigners set against the background of foreigners' short-term assets in the United States and U.S. foreign trade, August 1964

[In millions of dollars]

	U.S. bank credits abroad		Foreign short-term assets in the United States [1]	U.S. exports [2]	U.S. imports [2]
	Short term	Long term			
Canada	694	270	3,065	4,872	4,060
Italy	94	260	1,057	[3] 825	[3] 803
United Kngdom	277	72	1,951	1,384	1,115
Germany	133	133	2,361	1,217	1,100
Argentina	175	78	307	215	145
Venezuela	137	36	707	575	940
France	72	42	1,525	774	480
Switzerland	88	25	1,102	341	256
Belgium	31	71	424	[4] 606	[4] 418
Sweden	31	69	509	278	197
Netherlands	40	13	316	905	217
Japan	2,471	333	2,514	1,868	1,625
Mexico	572	418	674	967	649
Brazil	153	209	221	343	562
Colombia	250	56	149	249	255
Philippines	179	120	216	360	366
Norway	35	249	171	104	117
Chile	187	23	172	164	193

[1] Official and private.
[2] Year ended August 1964.
[3] Including Trieste.
[4] Including Luxembourg.

NOTE.—The countries are arranged in 2 groups: those where U.S. bank credits, both short and long term, are smaller than short-term dollar assets held by them in U.S. banks and vice versa. Within each group, the countires are arranged according to the size of U.S. bank credits to them.

Bank lending also appears as a complicating factor in our balance of payments because of the way in which Government statisticians present their accounts. When an American citizen makes a deposit in a foreign bank or a loan to a foreigner, the transaction is recorded as a capital outflow; but when a foreigner makes a deposit in a U.S. bank or buys U.S. short-term paper, the transaction is considered as one of the means of "financing" the U.S. payments deficit rather than a capital inflow that helps reduce the deficit. A committee of Government-appointed experts, which, under the chairmanship of Edward M. Bernstein, has since April 1963 been examining the asymmetries and anomalies in U.S. balance-of-payments bookkeeping, is to report its findings this month.

One thing is certain. Bank loans abroad to finance U.S. exports and other international business do not result in a loss of U.S. interntaional wealth. They help expand U.S. exports and job opportunities and incomes at home. They speed up economic development abroad. The law providing for the interest equalization tax, with its implied threat of removing the exemption for bank term loans, should be allowed to expire on its scheduled date at the end of 1965. Even if some immediate advantage were to be gained for our balance of payments by controls over bank lending, it would be more than offset by the damage such controls would do to the standing of the dollar as a reliable and freely usable currency.

A Bill To Broaden Coverage of Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduced my bill to broaden coverage of social security benefits to include brothers, sisters, and other dependent relatives of a deceased individual fully insured under the act.

At present, a dependent brother, sister, or other relative of a deceased wage earner is left in the cold as far as social security payments when that wage earner dies. Except for funeral expenses paid, all of the deceased's social security contributions are lost unless there is a surviving spouse.

My proposed legislation would remedy this great injustice. Under this legislation, if a dependent brother, sister, or relative of an unmarried wage earner can show that he or she was receiving at least half support from the wage

earner, that dependent would be entitled to monthly insurance benefits. To my mind, this sort of humanization of our existing social security law is a necessity.

What My Country Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I call attention to the signal achievement of one of the eighth-grade students of the Whitley County, Ind., schools, Richard Redman. Richard, who is enrolled in Marshall Memorial School—named after Indiana's onetime Vice President—recently was judged first-place winner for his essay entitled, "What My Country Means to Me."

Richard's essay was in competition with 50 other entries in the eighth-grade contest in Whitley County schools.

We can all take to heart the warm, patriotic message of this fine, young American. After reading his essay, it is easy to understand why it was judged a first-place winner.

The prize-winning essay follows:

WHAT MY COUNTRY MEANS TO ME

(By Richard Redman, Columbia City, Ind.)

I am an American youth. Because of my age, I am not a voter, a property owner, a wage earner, or an official. Nevertheless I am a citizen. Regardless of my age—yes, even because of it—I am important to my country and my country is very important to me. What I do, say, or think at school, at home, at church, on the street, or wherever I may be is an indication of the kind of citizen that I am and want to be.

Naturally, it makes me feel proud to refer to America as my country, but when I consider how it came to be mine, my pride is overshadowed with humility. I did not choose tihs great land to be my homeland; it was by the grace of God that I was born here and that this land of freedom and opportunity became mine. Furthermore, as I live today in the 20th century, under the blessing of God, I am enjoying a civilization established, preserved, and extended by others; their work and sacrifices have made my country great. These facts cause me to understand and appreciate my American heritage, and they influence me to do to the best of my ability what God and my country expect me to do.

Someone has said, "The difficult thing to remember about patriotism is that it is a sentiment to which is tied a bundle of obligations." These obligations are mine even as a youth. Now and all through my life I must live and work to preserve liberty and democracy. I can do this now through obeying laws, getting a good education, and being interested in local, national, and world affairs. Later in my life, there will come opportunities for voting, jury service, and perhaps military duty, to name just a few of the many privileges and responsibilities which will be mine as a worthy citizen of this country which means so much to me.

The late President Kennedy beautifully summarized each citizen's obligation toward his country when he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

As a good American citizen, I feel it is my duty to love, honor, and cherish the rights and freedoms which have been guaranteed to me and all other Americans in the Bill of Rights. This "charter of liberty" guarantees such fundamental rights as freedom of religion, freedom of speech and of the press, and the right of privacy and security. It is important for me to understand that freedom is not the privilege of doing what I want to do without regard for other people.

In spite of America's great strides forward in education, individual enterprise, industry, inventions, etc., there is still work to be done. America is not a utopia by any means. There are many problems to cope with, such as crime, poverty, unemployment, racial tension, foreign entanglements, and corrupt politics. Problems, weaknesses, and obstacles in the American way of life do not decrease my patriotism; on the contrary, they increase my loyalty and devotion to God and my country. They make me more conscious of my individual responsibility as a Christian citizen. They challenge me and all citizens "to carry ahead the ideals of democracy and keep the faith of our Fathers."

What my country means to me is summarized excellently in William Tyler Page's words, written in 1917 and later officially adopted as "The American's Creed." This creed reads as follows:

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; a government whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable, established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

Orders From on High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune dated February 20, 1965:

ORDERS FROM ON HIGH

The presidents and chairmen of the boards of nearly all the major corporations and banks doing a large international business were called to the White House Thursday to serve as a captive audience while President Johnson gave them their orders. His command was that they reduce oversea investments and loans this year in order to help correct the deficit in the international balance of payments which arises largely because of the administration's own policies.

The banks were told to cut foreign lending 75 percent and the corporations were directed to reduce their flow of dollars out of the country by 15 to 20 percent. The leaders of the business and banking communities were then steered respectively to the Commerce Department and to the Federal Reserve, where they were directed to file a flock of reports with Washington whenever they made a decision to send dollars abroad.

Mr. Johnson showed the iron hand in the velvet glove by expressing the hope that the balance-of-payments problem could be solved without controls and compulsion. Yet the squeeze of Presidential power was exerted as bluntly and directly as if a collection of Soviet provincial managers, planners, and bureaucrats had been summoned to the Kremlin to get their instructions about the regulation of the Communist economy.

We have come to a fine pass in this country when free enterprise is being reduced step by step to an obsolete phrase and government calls all the signals. As one of Mr. Johnson's auditors from Chicago observed, "Nobody asked the President anything. We just sat there."

Perhaps the President's tactics will provide the financial and business community with a new perspective on his methods. Many of its members supported him in last November's election, and a roundup of opinion in the current U.S. News & World Report shows that he still commands much favor.

Many of those interviewed seem to have learned the catchwords of the "Great Society" in justification of the "new economics." For example, a merchandiser says that while red ink in Government is always a worry, "there is a question whether there is really an increase in red ink if you compare the national debt to the gross national product."

Another executive isn't worried about deficits because "a business must operate within its own relatively limited resources," while "the resources of the Federal Government are limited only by the total wealth of the country." This gentleman adds, "This philosophy would have made our fathers' hair stand on end, but nevertheless it is a fact. More and more conservative businessmen are coming to the view that you can't look at Government in the same way you view a business."

A Wall Streeter comments, "We might as well give this fiscal innovation of deficit financing an opportunity to prove itself." A fuel supplier admits the "Great Society" will produce "continued inflation and an inflated dollar, but lots of goods will be sold under it."

To a surprising degree, the greatest spender in history has been viewed up to now as a "conservative" and a "middle-of-the-roader." But we find a more dispassionate view in the dissent of one businessman: "More and more, the Government is telling you how to run your business—whom you must hire, how much you must pay, whom you cannot fire. In 20 years, if this keeps up, there will be on incentive to be a businessman."

Isn't this a fair description of what happened at the Washington conference? Was not the President telling the 370 men in his audience how to run their businesses? And what could they do but sit and take it?

Vietnam Is Not Negotiable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the American Security Council's Washington Report, dated February 22, contains a remarkably perceptive essay by Frank J. Johnson, the publication's foreign editor. It reads as follows:

WHY WE CAN'T NEGOTIATE NOW

A great swirl of climactic events has followed President Johnson's order to give concrete effect to his repeated warnings to the

Communists to cease their aggression against South Vietnam. The difficult but extremely necessary decisions have at last been taken. Inevitably in such cases, an atmosphere of crisis is created by the outraged cries and threats of international communism. Just as inevitably, the calls for a "negotiated settlement" are redoubled on the free world side of the line. Many well-meaning people find it difficult to understand why President Johnson does not at least accompany his military action by an offer to enter into immediate negotiations to end the Vietnam war.

Undoubtedly, the President would like nothing better—nor would any other person of good will—if negotiation presently offered a reasonable prospect of fulfilling our pledge to defend the people of Vietnam; it is this pledge which we must honor if there is ever to be any hope of lasting peace in the world. But in considering negotiation the administration is faced with a series of very unpleasant facts, which are either unknown or forgotten by the general public.

One set of facts concerns the inherent nature of guerrilla wars. The military tactics and political purposes of such wars are not subject to stalemate or compromise. For example, much of the current argument for negotiation rests on the hypothesis that a "military victory" for either side is impossible. This is begging the question. Since World War II, when the guerrilla war came into vogue, they have invariably been won or lost. Either the guerrillas "win" in the sense of achieving a takeover of the country or government in question, or else they are militarily defeated, at least to the point where they are reduced to a harmless remnant. There have been no exceptions to this rule.

The guerrillas triumphed completely against the Dutch in Indonesia, against the French in Algeria and Indochina (except here they settled for North Vietnam in 1954 rather than risk U.S. intervention), against the British in Palestine and Cyprus, and against Batista in Cuba. They were decisively defeated in Greece, the Philippines, Malaya, Burma and—apparently—Venezuela. Whenever negotiations were held it was only for the purpose of ratifying the guerrilla victory. In the majority of cases this was not of a decisive military nature. The French were never beaten in Algeria and even after Dien Bien Phu they could have held on at least in Hanoi and Saigon. The Dutch could have held Indonesia for some time as could the British in Palestine and Cyprus. But either the will to resist was broken or else a reevaluation of national interests caused them to consider the area no longer vital.

CEASE FIRE MEANINGLESS

On the basis of all past experience, therefore, a negotiated settlement in Vietnam can only have the purpose either of confirming a Communist decison to abandon the drive for control of Vietnam, or else an American decision to admit defeat and withdraw. A cease fire would be meaningless. It would only leave the guerrillas in place and free to use the interval to run in more reinforcements and arms until they were ready for the next push. Withdrawal of all Communist guerrillas behind the 17th parallel, as is sometimes suggested, would be fine, but would of course be tantamount to a total Communist defeat in Vietnam. President Johnson has no intelligence as yet to lead him to suppose that the Communists are ready for anything of the sort.

On the contrary—and this is the second set of facts prevailing in the Vietnam situation—the Communist world remains unanimous in its declarations that the only basis for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam is the complete withdrawal of American forces, which is tantamount to a complete American defeat.

These statements might be written off as mere propaganda bargaining were they not backed up by a great deal of background information coming out of Communist China, which indicate that she believes time and events are very much on her side. Since the second hypothesis for negotiations is that they must include Communist China, her attitude is obviously decisive to the outcome. Here are some of the more public facts which the President must consider:

(1) Between December 21, 1964, and January 4, 1965, the first session of the Third National People's Congress was convened in Peiping. Nearly 3,000 deputies met behind closed doors to hear speeches by the leaders of Communist China. In addition to statements by Marshall Ho Lung, boasting that the Chinese people's army has been considerably enlarged, supplied with up-to-date equipment, and is now supported by powerful naval and air force units, the Chinese published, on December 30, an abbreviated version of Premier Chou En-lai's report on Chinese domestic and foreign policy.

The speech reflected great pride and self-confidence resulting from the explosion of the atomic bomb, the surmounting of the "very serious difficulties" between 1959 and 1961, resulting from the failure of the "great leap forward," and the intention of transforming China into a world power with the most modern industry, agriculture, technology, and defense within the shortest possible time. Reviewing foreign policy, Chou pledged support to all—and he listed each one—revolutionary movements and centers of unrest. He declared that Peiping would consider negotiation with the United States only after it had given up Taiwan and would deal with the United Nations only when it had thrown out Nationalist China.

Chou further asserted that the East wind would prevail over the West wind, and that favorable conditions for such an outcome are the "storm centers of world revolution in Asia, Africa, and Latin America." The speech forces the conclusion that the Chinese Communists are not only conscious of their power, but are also prepared to use it to support "wars of liberation" wherever possible in a continuing struggle against "imperialism."

(2) As a concrete example that Chou meant what he said and that the "falling domino" theory in southeast Asia was not a figment of John Foster Dulles' overstimulated imagination, Peiping formally announced on February 5, 1965, the formation of a "patriotic front" to overthrow the pro-Western government of Thailand and eradicate American influence there. For some time now, Communist agents have been infiltrating into Thailand in order to form the nucleus for subverting that country. The Thais have instituted energetic countermeasures which have so far kept them under control, but it is foolish to believe that Thailand would or could resist a Communist takeover backed by China if South Vietnam is lost. The Chinese do not even wait until one victim is gobbled up before proclaiming their plans to take over the next one.

(3) Mao Tse-tung stated in a January interview with American journalist Edgar Snow that the crisis in Vietnam will not lead to war between China and the United States so long as China is not invaded. He also said that the war in Vietnam would last only another year or two because the South Vietnamese are deserting in large numbers and the Americans will "lose interest." While this statement greatly reduces the likelihood of any Chinese retaliation against our raids on North Vietnam, it gives no comfort to those urging negotiation. If Mao really believes that the war will be won by the Communists in another year or two, then it is obvious that he looks on negotiation only to confirm this fact, which is another point he actually made in the interview. Unless he can be shaken in this conviction there is no possible basis for negotiation with China.

MUST STOP REDS

It is easy for those without responsibility to call for "negotiation," as though this were the automatic panacea for all the world's ills. But the U.S. Government is faced with the kinds of facts mentioned above, as well as much more grim data of a secret nature, which cannot be shrugged off. This is why it has consistently rejected calls for a new Geneva Conference and why even the British have supported this stand. It is accepted as axiomatic by most policymakers that under present circumstances negotiation could lead only to an American defeat.

Such a defeat cannot be accepted, not simply for reasons of foolish national pride, but because the Chinese have made it so very plain that Vietnam is only part of a much wider plan for aggrandizement and troublemaking. We are helping Vietnam because it is in the interest of free men everywhere that the Communist challenge be halted at this point.

The President is trying to create a new psychological situation in Asia. His decision to retaliate against North Vietnam is the only one which offers any hope of success. It has been long overdue and is all the more difficult for that reason, but it is still not too late. Mr. Johnson should be warmly congratulated for his action. If we carry through our policy with resolution there is still an excellent chance that we can "win" the Vietnam war at least in the sense that the Communists are induced to call off the war as a bad business and eiher withdraw the guerrillas into North Vietnam or else cease outside aid completely and leave them to their fate. Only then can there be a genuine basis for a negotiation which will ratify this decision.

The Communists will not come willingly or easily to such a disagreeable choice. Previous U.S. vacillation has led them to count the Vietnam war as already won. It will probably take time and a great deal of punishment before they call off the war. But they are practical men and eventually bow to reality. What is essential now is that the President be given the time to make the full effect of his new policy felt in Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow without being continually badgered to negotiate. The calls for negotiation only make the task harder and bloodier because it encourages the Communists to think that we may still falter in our purpose. It is still a Chinese article of faith that the world and domestic pressures can be mobilized to thwart any resolute action by the U.S. Government. Many past follies have confirmed them in this viewpoint.

TURNING POINT IN HISTORY

A great experiment is underway—the experiment to see whether we can successfully contain Communist China on the mainland of Asia. If we cannot, the consequences to our children are hideous to contemplate. The Chinese have the numbers, the drive, the ambition, and the eventual potential to rule the world. The days through which we are now passing will mark one of the great turning points of world history.

The United States has very strong trumps to play in this contest. If North Vietnam is willing, or is forced by China to sacrifice herself in a continuing effort to win South Vietnam, there is yet one final arrow in our quiver. We can threaten China with the one punishment she would most fear: the destruction of her nuclear plants by aerial bombardment. If forced to carry out this threat, we would at least prevent or delay the looming menace of a nuclear-armed China.

Review and Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, today we hear much about an administration by consenus and I have not seen anything that points up the dangers of such an administration as well as an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on February 18. The editorial follows:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK

PRECAUTIONS ON CONSENSUS

President Johnson offers himself as an apostle of consensus, a concept elusive enough as a word, let alone as policy. Whether this notion is promising or dangerous depends on just what he has in mind.

He seems to mean, at a minimum, less heated disagreement. "Let us reject any among us who seek to reopen old wounds and rekindle old hatreds," he enjoined in his inaugural address. "The time has come to achieve progress without strife and change without hatred: Not without difference of opinion, but without the deep and abiding divisions which scar the Union for generations."

In some respects, the vision is farsighted indeed. The President is rejecting a popular brand of political leadership which consists mostly of arousing the faithful to rise up and slay the infidel. This kind of politics sometimes has proved effective, and it must be particularly tempting for a President with huge congressional majorities.

As the President seems to realize so well, though, tough tactics have the unfortunate result of clouding communications among factions in our society. With their leaders often inciting them against each other, it's hard for opposing groups to remember that both may possibly be saying something worth listening to. Disagreement is resolved by brute force, which is less likely to yield intelligent policy than compromise borne of honest discussion.

A politics of consensus, by promoting moderation and compromise, could more nearly establish a true give-and-take discourse on national policy. That is unquestionably a high ideal, and perhaps the President is right when he says the time for it has come.

Yet there are some who are dubious about Mr. Johnson's ideal. Part of their reaction is simply aversion to the President's practical politics, and part is disappointment that the leader of the faithful professes friendship with the infidel. But a more significant part, we think, arises from concern over just what kind of tactics will be used to suppress strife and keep everyone happy.

A cynical formula for "consensus" could read merely: Throw tax cuts and lots of flattery to businessmen, the union shop and an Under Secretary of Labor to the unions, school aid to educators with a drop to Catholics, high price supports to farmers and transportation aid to cities. And so on.

The formula might build considerable harmony and reduce strife, for a while anyway. It's an ancient truism that if enough people are getting a big enough sop, they will hesitate to challenge the one someone else gets. But a consensus based on no more than this is not exactly an appealing prospect.

For one thing, a consensus thus cynically conceived would degrade rather than improve the quality of public discussion on Government policy, precisely because its cardinal principle is that no one very seriously challenge what someone else proposes. No proposal is perfect, and without challenge, the imperfections can only be discovered too late.

Second, such an enshrinement of logrolling tends to legitimize practically anything some group is brazen enough to demand. Such a faction more or less names its own price for not rocking the boat. No one bothers to object that even if a proposal is good for someone it may be bad for all of us. What's too easily ignored is President Johnson's own warning, "The national interest is greater than the sum of all local interests."

Most important, this sort of consensus seems to add up to a cementing of one of the central philosophies of the New Deal: "Let the Federal Government do it." With the Government already so dominant in our society, our era is hardly the time to do away with debate over giving Government more responsibility and hence more power over all of us. Now more than ever, the warnings need to be heard, not stifled.

In short, a politics of consensus could provide undoubted opportunities, but it runs the considerable danger that the consensus would be primarily an agreement for all of us to look the other way while each of us steals his favorite gem from the public treasure chest.

Good Going, Goodyear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD the following self-explanatory editorial which appeared in the Arizona Republic on February 14, 1965. I join the Arizona Republic in saying, "Good Going, Goodyear." The editorial is as follows:

GOOD GOING, GOODYEAR

The U.S. State Department and Communist Rumania had it all figured out.

The Goodyear Corp. would sell a modern synthetic rubber plant to Rumania. Inasmuch as State had been assured by the Rumanian Government that it wouldn't divulge the polyisoprene secrets to other Communist countries, it wasn't like giving away important production secrets to every Communist country. And, State reasoned, sale of the plant would help bring Rumania closer to the West.

But the State Department hadn't considered the reaction of the Goodyear Corp. And Goodyear refused to sell the plant to Rumania, thereby passing up an approximately $50 million transaction.

In the current company newspaper, published in Litchfield Park, Goodyear explained that it felt the dangers to the United States far outweighed the possible benefits in the proposed deal. The company believes the Communists could, if they desired, disrupt natural rubber markets in Malaysia, Liberia, and other undeveloped countries, using cut-rate prices (underwritten by the state) as economic clubs.

Furthermore, although respecting the State Department's belief in the Rumanians' promise, Goodyear said it preferred not to entrust its production secrets to the Communists.

The Rumanians will acquire the synthetic rubber plant, nevertheless; Firestone has agreed to build it. But at a time when Communist governments are waging war against American servicemen in Vietnam * * * when Soviet Russia stages mob attacks on the American embassy and roughs up U.S. newsmen covering the attacks * * * and when Peiping and Moscow are working to undermine freedom in the Congo and throughout Africa, it is heartening to know that one major American corporation refuses to do business with America's enemies.

Lenin once said that when the time comes to strangle capitalism, businessmen will be bidding for the right to sell the Communists the rope. Perhaps so. But Goodyear has demonstrated that it will not be among the bidders.

Private Capital Flows: The Balance of Payments Whipping Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in spite of repeated promises, the administration has failed to eliminate the deficit in our international balance of payments. Last year the deficit on regular transactions amounted to about $3 billion, compared to $3.3 billion for 1963. Especially distrubing are the figures for the fourth quarter of 1964, which show a deficit in the order of $1.4 billion or nearly $6 billion on an annual basis. The First National City Bank Monthly Economic Letter for February 1965, details our deteriorating payments position and analyzes recent administration proposals to deal with the problem.

The two measures most recently proposed as solutions to the chronic payments problem are a 2-year extension and broadening of the interest equalization tax, which was originally proposed as a temporary tax, a restriction of bank lending abroad, and a program of so-called voluntary restraint on direct investment. Restrictive controls over private investment abroad in the long run would work untold damage on our own economy as well as to world prosperity and economic development. Domestically, such curbs on lending would cut U.S. exports which are intimately linked with our oversea loans and investments. The letter states that:

> Postwar experience selective controls here and abroad shows unmistakably that one measure lays the groundwork and necessity for another. This is already being demonstrated. First we have the interest equalization tax, then provision for its extension to bank loans, and now more consideration of direct controls over capital. The proliferation is endless and so are the complexities.

There is an additional risk in proposing controls of this sort. They could be regarded as something which has in fact reduced the ability of U.S. dollar holders, here and abroad, to use or transfer them by their own choice. If the dollar is to remain trusted and respected, it must remain unfettered.

Under unanimous consent, I include the First National City Bank's Monthly Economic Letter for February 1965, in the RECORD at this point:

THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS, GOLD AND PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Uncertainties about sterling, pressures of private demand for gold markets outside the United States, France's stepped-up purchases of gold from the U.S. Treasury and, earlier optimism notwithstanding, the rise in the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit in recent months, all add up to renewed concern about international payments and gold.

The decision of the administration, leaked to the press in early January and confirmed toward the end of the month, to propose to Congress an easing of the 25-percent Federal Reserve gold requirement has given rise to searching questions regarding the U.S. gold position. The blame put in certain quarters on private investments abroad as the culprit in the U.S. balance of payments and the recommended solution of subjecting them to additional controls have created uneasiness in the market place.

A TURN FOR THE WORSE?

With clouds gathered on the international financial horizon, people want to know where we stand and where we are heading. The U.S. balance-of-payments deficit, as conventionally defined, amounted last year to about $2.6 billion—a disappointingly small improvement from the $3.3 billion of 1963. Judging from the preliminary figures so far available, the deficit during the last quarter of 1964, seasonally adjusted, was of the order of $1.3 billion; in the first 9 months, it averaged close to $0.5 billion each quarter.

This weakening is, understandably, a serious matter. At the same time it is important to retain a sense of proportion. One factor in the rise in the deficit during the last quarter of 1964 was the postponement by the United Kingdom of $138 million on yearend interest and amortization payments on its postwar indebtedness to the United States.

Another factor was the cleanup in the backlog of Canadian capital issues in the New York market accumulated pending the passage last September of the interest equalization tax. Canada is exempt from the tax, subject to certain understandings. When purchases by Americans of Canadian issues are bunched together for the last quarter, the aggregate is in excess of $300 million; these are gross figures—not allowing for Canadian debt repayments to the United States. U.S. capital, of course, helps finance Canada's deficit on goods and services with the United States, which has in recent years averaged well over $1 billion a year.

Yet another factor in the fourth quarter's enlarged deficit was the flotation of bond issues by Finland, Israel, Mexico, and the Inter-American Development Bank, all of which were also exempt from the interest equalization tax.

ELEMENTS OF STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS

The balance on goods and services has over recent years shown a large surplus; but this surplus has been insufficient to cover the deficit on other transactions, notably Government defense and aid outlays and private investments abroad.

In two accompanying tables, the conventional statistics are arranged to split the private and Government sectors of the balance of payments. We can see olearly the large and growing surplus generated by the U.S. private economy on commercial goods and services (i.e., excluding those financed by Government aid). The major contribution has come from exports. With continued stability in unit labor costs and in an environment of continued business expansion abroad, commercial exports last year reached $21.8 billion, up 13 percent from 1963.

Private sector of the U.S. balance of payments

[In billions of dollars]

	1961	1962	1963	1964 [1]
Goods and services:				
Commercial exports [2]	17.7	18.2	19.3	21.8
Imports	−14.5	−16.1	−17.0	−18.3
Trade surplus	3.2	2.1	2.3	3.6
Income on investments (net)	2.9	3.2	3.2	4.0
Other services (net) [3]	−.7	−.8	−.9	−.8
Surplus on goods and services	5.3	4.5	4.5	6.7
Capital:				
Long-term:				
U.S. investments abroad:				
Direct	−1.6	−1.7	−1.9	−2.1
Portfolio	−.8	−1.0	−1.1	−.2
Bank loans, etc	−.3	−.3	−.6	−1.2
Total	−2.6	−2.9	−3.6	−3.6
Foreign investments in the United States [4]	.6	.2	.3	.1
Short-term:				
U.S. investments abroad	−1.6	−.6	−.7	−2.1
Foreign investments in the United States	1.1	.2	.6	1.2
Total capital (net)	−2.5	−3.1	−3.4	−4.3

[1] 1st 3 quarters, seasonally adjusted, at an annual rate.
[2] Excluding exports financed by Government grants and loans.
[3] Including remittances.
[4] Including some foreign short-term commercial and brokerage funds.

NOTE.—Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: Derived from U.S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business.

Government sector of the U.S. balance of payments

[In billions of dollars]

	1961	1962	1963	1964 [1]
Exports financed by Government grants and loans	2.2	2.4	2.7	2.8
Defense:				
Expenditures	−3.0	−3.0	−2.9	−2.8
Purchase of military goods in the United States	.4	.7	.7	.7
Advances on military exports	-------	.5	.3	.1
Grants and loans (net)	−4.0	−3.4	−4.1	−3.8
Of which: Direct dollar transfers	−1.1	−1.1	−0.9	−.7
Repayments of loans:				
Scheduled	.6	.6	.6	.7
In advance of maturity	.7	.7	.3	.2

[1] 1st 3 quarters, seasonally adjusted, at an annual rate.

Source: Derived from U.S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business.

The surplus on commercial goods and services—about $6.7 billion last year—commands respect. It covers by a comfortable margin new U.S. private investments abroad of all sorts and those outflows, in turn, build investment income for the support of the balance of payments in the future.

Increased capital investments and the rising surplus on goods and services abroad are, to a large extent, interdependent. Investments, for the most part, are linked with exports; they provide jobs and incomes at home. As the U.S. Department of Commerce reported last December, direct investments result to only a limited extent in acquisitions of equity interest in existing foreign firms; a large part is related to expenditures on foreign production facilities. According to the Department's estimates, foreign affiliates of U.S. industrial corporations purchased in 1963 "at least" $5 billion of U.S. goods—about 23 percent of all U.S. exports in that year.

A year and a half ago, the spotlight was on purchases by Americans of new securities issued by foreign nations in the U.S. capital market. To dampen portfolio investments, the administration in July 1963 proposed the interest equalization tax; as expected, purchases by Americans of foreign securities not exempt from the tax have declined abruptly.

Even before there had been any thought of the tax, commercial bank credits abroad of more than a year's duration—term loans—had also begun to rise. This is not surprising. Following the restoration in 1958 of meaningful convertibility among the leading currencies, the remarkable growth of world trade accompanying strong business expansion has required rising supplies of credit. Last year, borrowings by Japan to support its foreign trade and business activity were particularly large; borrowings by Italy were also important. For reasons summed up in the December 1964 letter, the commercial bank term loans are a flexible and helpful instrument designed to meet essential needs of world commerce and multinational corporate enterprise.

Short-term capital movements appear in the worst possible light in official balance-of-payments bookkeeping. U.S. short-term investments abroad are treated as a factor in the payments deficit while foreign short-term investments in the United States are regarded as one of the means of financing it. (The other means—and perhaps the truly meaningful ones—are sales of gold and additions to dollar assets in the hands of foreign monetary authorities, etc.) Foreign short-term investments in the United States are not, however, merely a passive consequence of the state of the U.S. balance of payments. They are in fact the result of active decisions of foreign commercial banks, businesses, and investors to place deposits in U.S. banks and make short-term investments in our market. The practice of the United Kingdom and some other countries in calculating their balances of payments is to net private short-term capital inflows against private short-term capital outflows.

International movements of short-term capital are frequently regarded as footloose or hot money hopping from country to country in search of gains from exchange speculation. In fact, they are often an equilibrating element in international payments—provided, of course, that nations pursue appropriate monetary and fiscal policies. This pool of private international liquidity has, at one time or another over the past few years, helped redress the payments position of such countries as the United Kingdom, Canada, Italy, and Japan.

In the accounts that are affected primarily by market forces—merchandise trade and services, and private investment—the United States thus has a surplus. This surplus is, however, not large enough to match the U.S. Government's defense outlays abroad and the foreign exchange costs of U.S. economic aid to other nations. There is no denying that there are large tasks for the Government to perform. But these tasks can be carried out only so far as export and other foreign earnings can be developed. A reduction of $1 billion in the rate of Government expenditures abroad to be achieved by January 1965, compared with 1962, was put forward as an objective of administration policies in July 1963; by June 1964, these expenditures had been reduced by less than $0.6 billion.

THE OUTLOOK FOR THE U.S. GOLD STOCK

Very little of last year's deficit was taken out in gold. The U.S. Treasury gold stock declined by only $125 million, partly because of the special factors and circumstances described in this letter last month. During the week ended January 13, however, the U.S. Treasury gold stock fell by $200 million to $15,188 million—the largest weekly decline since November 1961.

This decline occurred amid a number of swift developments regarding gold. On January 7, in the wake of unusually heavy private demands for gold in the Paris market, the French authorities announced that they would step up purchases of gold from the United States. The stated objective is to maintain at 70 to 75 percent the proportion of gold in total gold and foreign exchange reserves.

From a broader point of view, the French move has generally been interpreted as having been motivated by a desire to enhance the international standing of the French franc. Last month for the first time in postwar years, France published its international reserve figures not in dollars, but in francs; Britain has expressed its reserves only in pounds sterling since 1958 and Switzerland has never changed the practice of stating its reserves in francs. France is also believed to be increasingly reluctant to see a continuing rise in supplies of dollars and sterling in world markets on the ground that the growing liquidity interferes with its efforts to hold down domestic inflationary pressures. There is also the view that the continued buildup of short-term dollar holdings by European central banks helps the United States to finance private investments in Europe; there is, in some cases, concern about the propsects of increasing American ownership of key national industries.

On the day that France announced its enlarged purchases of gold, news came out of the administration's intent to request Congress to reduce the 25-percent gold reserve requirement. With the heaviest gold turnover in the London market since the Cuban crisis in October 1962, the price there on the next day reached $35.20 per fine ounce. Following a U.S. Treasury statment later the same day warning that the official gold price is immutable and that the London gold markets is under firm control, the price declined rapidly. Official interventions in the London gold market during the past few months may have, at times, involved costs to gold reserves of countries participating in the London gold pool; the United States has a 50-percent share in net losses or gains.

The increased subscriptions to the International Monetary Fund later this year will be payable in gold to the extent of 25 percent. The United States will pay $258 million of gold to the Fund; its automatic drawing rights on the Fund will increase by the same amount. To minimize the strain on the U.S. gold stock by other nations that will have to pay gold to the Fund as part of their increased quotas, consideration is reportedly being given to various arrangements including a deposit of gold by the Fund with the United States. The Fund, it may also be recalled, sold, during 1956–60, $800 million of gold to the United States to invest the proceeds in interest-bearing U.S. Government securities; upon termination of the investment, the same quantity of gold can be reacquired.

The administration has proposed that Congress free up about $5 billion of gold by excluding Federal Reserve deposit liabilities from the 25 percent gold reserve requirement. If required, gold can also be released from the present requirement under the provisions of existing law; the mechanism for temporary suspension is, however, cumbersome and should be streamlined in the legislation now under consideration.

There is a practical need for this action: to provide reassurance to foreign governments and central banks that the United States will continue to supply gold to them at the established price of $35 an ounce and thus protect the position of the dollar, firmly linked to gold, as the anchor of the international monetary system.

As noted in these pages last December, the pressure on the gold ratio in the past 2 years has come not so much from gold losses but rather from the expansion in Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities. This calls attention to the fact that we have been increasing our money supplies rapidly. Long-range confidence of the world in the dollar will depend more on the wisdom and courage of our monetary and fiscal authorities than on a statistical ratio. The protection of our gold stock must remain a prime objective of U.S. Government actions and policies.

PRIVATE CAPITAL: THE WHIPPING BOY

The practical pressures to ease the 25 percent gold requirement together with the prospects of new demands on U.S. gold stock have increased the need to point to further concrete action in dealing with the deficit. President Johnson in his economic message on January 28 noted that there is a "need to reassess the adequacy of existing programs to deal with the balance-of-payments problem," the results to be reported in a special message to Congress.

The president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, Mr. Alfred Hayes, in a speech on January 25, came reluctantly to the conclusion that we must face the possibility of "a more direct approach on certain components" of our balance-of-payments problem, "even if it involves some compromise with our basic philosophy of complete freedom to lend and invest abroad." One of the possible lines of approach is extension of the interest equalization tax to "certain types" of bank loans, as can be done under existing legislation. "Another and to my mind a preferable possibility would be to enlist the support of our commercial banks in voluntarily reducing the heavy outflows of bank credit."

Whatever may be done "in the area of selective measures," President Hayes noted, should be regarded as "a temporary expedient, to be eliminated at the earliest opportunity." He stressed his belief that "any selective measure must be backed by a posture on general credit availability that is not so easy as to encourage excessive leakages that would thwart the purpose of the selective approach."

President Johnson emphatically stated that monetary policy must be prepared to move quickly if excessive demand should threaten inflation or if an outflow of funds should unexpectedly worsen our balance of payments. "We will be alert to restrain any persistent outflow of short-term private funds in response to relatively high short-term interest rates in foreign countries."

Whatever immediate advantage might be gained for our balance of payments by controls over U.S. private investments would be more than offset by the damage such controls would do to our own economy as well as to world prosperity and development.

A levy on bank loans could obviously apply only to those that are not aimed at financing exports. To administer it would necessarily encroach on private decisionmaking processes. Postwar experience with selective controls here and abroad shows unmistakably that one measure lays the groundwork and necessity for another. This is already being demonstrated. First we have the interest equalization tax, then provision for its extension to bank loans, and now consideration of more direct controls over capital. The proliferation is endless, and so are the complexities.

Furthermore, controls of this sort contain the seeds of future trouble. The risk is that they might be regarded—however wrongly—as something that has in fact reduced the ability of holders of U.S. dollars, here and abroad, to use or transfer them by their own choice. The dollar, to be a trusted and respected currency, must remain unfettered.

The world is already full of obstructions to the free movement of capital across national boundaries. Twenty years after World War II, even countries with balance-of-payments surpluses and, allegedly, overabundant dollar reserves, impede their nationals from investing freely in the United States. Capital markets outside the United States, with very few exceptions, are not freely accessible to foreign borrowers.

An increasingly nationalistic approach to problems of foreign investment in Europe as well as in many other parts of the world is a matter of deep concern. All too frequently, suggestions are offered to devise rules to violate the rules set forth in international agreements solemnly entered into over the postwar years to free international trade and investment. That people profit from investment whatever its source is overlooked.

NEITHER PANIC NOR COMPLACENCY

The balance-of-payments deficit has not brought about a decline in the Nation's wealth. Our new investments abroad, long term and short term, have more than matched the loss in our gold stock and the additions to our short-term liabilities to foreign nations. The rub is that while most of our assets are long term, our sharply increased liabilities are mostly short term. We cannot depend on the willingness of foreign nations to be patient creditors and build up without limit holdings of dollars and special U.S. Treasury obligations denominated in buyers' currencies.

Neither panic nor complacency is called for. With our economic resources, skills, and productivity, the task of keeping our international payments in tolerable order is easier than what any other nation must face year in and year out. But we can succeed only if we manage our financial affairs with discernment and courage.

While supported by what still amounts, after the losses of the past 7 years, to about two-fifths of the world monetary gold stock, the dollar basically rests on the values of our goods and the returns that can be gained from investment. The tax cuts have improved our business and investment climate. Record earnings and profits, and the performance of the stock market here, compare encouragingly with those in Europe. The practical need is to insure—by easing and simplifying taxes, as President Johnson noted in his economic message—that our markets, and the whole economy, are as hospitable as possible to foreign capital.

In a nutshell, we come down once again to the productivity of the U.S. economy, operating competitively under disciplined monetary and fiscal policies.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 47th anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence. On that day in 1918, the hopes and aspirations of over four centuries were realized. That the spirit of the Lithuanian people had not flagged long before is a remarkable tribute to their indomitable will and their craving for freedom and self-determination. That they demonstrated, after 120 years of alien rule, a great capacity for democratic government, for cultural achievement, and for responsibility in world affairs, makes it

all the more painful to find their nation once more subjected to foreign tyranny.

One might wonder at the apparent viability of the Lithuanian people, brutalized as they are by the Soviet Union; it might be reasoned that this suppression would be unbearable galling because Lithuania has a traditional reverence for political and religious freedom. However, let no man be deluded by the absence of a bloody revolution since the country's annexation by Russia in 1940. History shows that Lithuanian nationalism has not always manifested itself in armed revolts. For instance, in the 16th century, recognizing the common threat from the east, the Lithuanians reluctantly concluded a political union with Poland. However, they were careful to retain their own government, having its own treasury, armed forces, and law courts. And the distinct and rich Lithuanian culture was carefully preserved, and actually enjoyed its greatest development during the political amalgamation with Poland. True, this courageous people revolted often against czarist oppressors, in the full knowledge that if unsuccessful they would experience even greater cruelty and reprisals. But the Lithuanians have an unusual capacity for passive resistance, and it is this quality which sustains them now, and in which the Kremlin can find no solace or comfort.

A Night To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, this account of Miss Martin was published in the Washington Evening Star on January 26, 1965. Mr. Speaker, I, myself, had many pleasant visits with Mr. Churchill and I felt that Miss Martin's account was a fine recollection on her part which, in turn, reminded me of my individual visits with him. I felt that this article should be preserved as a part of the heritage of the American people as well as those of the rest of the world. May his memory live on through such fine stories as this.

The article follows:

A NIGHT TO REMEMBER: NEW YEAR'S EVE WITH WINSTON CHURCHILL IN 1942

(By Jackie Martin)

It was New Year's Eve. It is the one New Year's Eve I shall never forget. I'll forget all the other New Year's Eves—but this one I'll remember all of my life.

We left Ottawa about 3 p.m. I sat in my compartment by myself and through a diffusing screen of snow, smoke, and steam watched the gray afternoon get grayer. The engine woo-o-oooed at crossings, and I sat and thought, "Isn't this a swell way to spend New Year's Eve."

We rounded a sharp curve and I counted the cars—engine, baggage car, club car, four pullmans including the one I was on, the diner, then three more pullmans, and the observation car.

CHURCHILL ABOARD

Somewhere in those cars on the other side of the diner was Winston Churchill.

Maybe he was eating or sleeping or reading or preparing a speech or dictating letters or hearing (through a haze of smoke from his long cigar) that Gibraltar was taking an awful beating or that his boys at Singapore were holding or that somewhere over England Messerschmits had brought down 20 more youngsters of the RAF.

Or maybe he was sitting by his window like me and thinking that it was, indeed, a dreary New Year's Eve afternoon.

"Bet he's terribly tired," I thought. "You are pretty tired yourself," my feet answered. It was true.

For 2 days I had run after that famous old fellow, and when he moves, he moves fast. And when you are going at an awful clip, I think the follower gets much more worn out than the leader. Maybe I'm wrong—or maybe it was the last assignment that had made me physically cranky: Our bus got to the Uplands Flying Field 5 minutes after the Prime Minister. So in order to get up with him (you can write a story long distance but you can't make a picture that way) I had to run like mad for approximately two blocks—mostly on ice—with an open Grafic camera in one hand, a Rollieflex around my neck, and a heavy camera case holding bulbs, tripod, holders, and extra batteries over my shoulder.

The loose hand kept the bag and Rolli from flopping up and down, pulled the beret back on, when it threatened to fly off, and kept me nicely balanced.

I looked down at my hands. The veins stood up in open protest of the pace I had been going. I looked out the window again. A crossing bell was clanging. People standing there waving. The train sped on. How did they know it was Churchill's train? Its departure and itinerary were military secrets. We hadn't even been allowed to send a wire telling families when we would be home. Strange.

Another crossing, going up an incline, slower. There were more people, very close to the tracks. Anxious eyes, thrilled and glowing faces searched each car as it went by. Women and children. But the one who caught my eye was an old man—maybe 70—white hair. He stood straight and tall—searching, looking. I kept my eyes on him as long as I could and then jumped over to the other seat to watch him for a few seconds longer. Then he must have seen Churchill.

He looked as if he had seen his God. His head went up at a high proud angle. His hat went out in open homage. And the glory and courage that came to his face as Churchill's car flashed by was something that no mere man can ever inspire. I strained against the cold window and watched the lowered hat and proud old head blur from sight.

I sort of collapsed into the seat. I wanted to cry. I wanted to jump off the train and get that old man and let him talk to Churchill. I wanted to say to him, "Look fellow, I don't know how much more time you have, but this afternoon you lent yourself to something. A shining sword was laid on your shoulder—it was in your face—and I was proud of you—proud that a man of your age still had the spirit and courage and honor that put you apart from all the others as our train rolled by.

He was just an old Canadian at a crossing.

OUT OF OTTAWA

About an hour out of Ottawa, I realized that I was riding backwards and that always makes me sick. I moved over, thinking that if I weren't so tired I'd get my woolly bedroom slippers out of my bag.

In the compartments and cars around me there were a bunch of newspaper men and one woman reporter, and three photographers.

And here it was getting on towards New Year's Eve, getting darker and colder. Of course, I'd known the reporters to speak to for years. And the photographers, too. But none of them were my friends, especially. And who wants to spend New Year's Eve with people you just know?

I'd rather read a good book, I thought—but I don't like to read on a train—so I leaned my head against the window—and fell asleep. A fitful unhappy sleep, I heard Winston Churchill call as I raced to get in front of him for a shot, "Watch out for that propeller—watch out." And I had felt ashamed that I had worried him.

At 8 I woke, washed, dressed and went to the club car for a sherry before dinner. New Year's Eve dinner by myself. I'd rather be working—sitting at my desk with a hamburger and a cup of coffee—with photographers buzzing around.

I sat down next to Pedan of "News of the Day" Newsreel. Three or four other newsreel men like Hugo Johnson and Johnny Tondra were there too. Larry Lehrbas of Associated Press with bedroom slippers on his feet, was deep in a book. I don't know, maybe he just wanted to talk, or maybe he just sensed my loneliness, but I'll always be grateful to Pedan. He ordered a cocktail so I wouldn't have my sherry alone. Then he asked if he couldn't go into dinner with me—said he had eaten, but felt like talking.

Just before we left the club car for the dinner, Tommy Qualters, (the President's personal bodyguard who was on the trip with Mr. Churchill) came through the car with a piece of paper. It was the Prime Minister's New Year's wish for happiness and health to us. It was signed by his Naval Aide, Commander C. M. Thompson.

"Tommy, can I make a picture of you showing this greeting to the boys?"

"Sorry, Jackie, I don't think we better."

So I couldn't even make a picture of New Year's Eve. I thought, "what a night." But of course I couldn't be expected to anticipate what was coming. None of the reporters had the slightest idea. Some of them even went to bed—and when it happened—they were sound asleep.

So Pedan and I went to the diner, and he ordered up a bottle of champagne for celebration. It was flat. Amid apologies, the attentive steward removed it and brought another bottle. That was flat, too. I looked at Pedan. He looked at me—and we both looked out the window. He had been telling me about his daughter who was home from school. He wasn't going to have much time left to see her. We looked back. "Flat or not," I said, "Let's drink it. It is New Year's Eve—nearly. And there'll be bells at home." We solemnly drank the little bottle of flat champagne.

On the way back to the club car for the last half hour till midnight, I passed a compartment in which sat Doris Fleeson, Walter Thompson, special press representative for the Canadian Government, and a British reporter who had come to this country with Mr. Churchill.

I asked if they had seen the Prime Minister's greeting. They said they had. "Well, has anything been done about it?" I asked. They said not. I allowed as how it seemed plenty ungracious of us to receive a greeting from the Prime Minister and not even to send one back. So a greeting was hashed over—and then Doris hurried to her compartment to type it. It was given to the porter, who had exactly 8 minutes to get it back to the Prime Minister's aide.

Then we settled down to wait till the little hand and the big hand of Walter's gold pocket watch got together. It was a forlorn foursome if I've ever seen one. We said nothing for a minute or two. Our train roared through the night and the whistle wooo-o-ooed in a mournful tone. The wheels clicked off the sections of rail. There was silence within the compartment—I guess we

were all thinking what a terrible year it had been, what anguish it had brought, what would 1942 be like.

We heard the door at the other end of the car open, and in a voice that got louder at each step, we heard, "Ladies and gentlemen, the Prime Minister will greet you in the dining car. Ladies and gentlemen—" and he was gone into the next car.

JUMPED UP

We jumped up and were out of that compartment as if someone had shot us. Churchill. Finally, we would have an opportunity to see him close by—sort of one of us. New Year's Eve—to bring it in with Winston Churchill. We ran—the train going like mad in one direction—we running the other way and shouting to the others in closed compartments.

As we ran through the cars, afraid that he would get to the diner ahead of us, more people poured out of compartments ahead of us. We all ran—the train going around curves, we being banged from one side to the other. But that wasn't important. Three minutes till we'd all get a new chance at life—and we'd start it off with Winston Churchill.

We burst into the dining car and ran to tables. The four of us had kept pretty well together and we sat down at one of the larger tables—a little over half way toward the other end of the car. Tommy came by. Maybe it was he who had heralded this historical meeting. I didn't think about that. "Hey, Tommy—Tommy—please I gotta make some pictures."

"Sorry, Jackie, no pictures."

"But Tommy—we can't miss this."

Tommy was gone and out the dining car door—toward the Prime Minister's side of the train.

We all sat down. There was bedlam for a minute. Men in bathrobes and slippers, hair tousled but every one wide awake. And on each face a pleased but slightly strained expression. It was so unexpected. It had happened so quickly. And it was nearly 12. They'd have to hurry if they were going to make it.

Then the door opened and Qualters stepped back. Winston Churchill came through the door toward us. We jumped up and cheered so that the roof could have come off and we'd not have noticed it.

He was wearing his "Siren" suit, sort of a teddy-bear zipper suit. Blue—but not as light as his eyes. His heavy figure was slightly stooped. His cheeks were ruddy. His cigar was in his hand. And he came on toward us. About 5 feet from our table he stopped. Somehow he seemed to sense us rather than see us. He looked at Qualters who said, "Thirty seconds, Mr. Prime Minister."

There was complete silence in the car. Only the train rushing through the night and the whistle wooo-o-ooing in a mournful tone. I could have touched him, he was so close—this old man. He looked at me for a fleeting half second with those eyes—and the weight of the world was in them. "This is Winston Churchill" I thought, "this is the man whose courage, whose will, whose faith in God and Englishmen has saved the civilized world. It's not us and it's not Roosevelt—we got going too late for it to be us. It's this little guy."

I don't know why I thought of him that second as little. It was the teddybear suit, the ruddy cheeks, the white hair, and the slightly bowed head. His hand was reaching for the glass that sat close to him on the edge of the table. He started to raise it. We cheered lustily for it was midnight. It was 1942. O God—what would this year bring? The cheer died away. Somehow it didn't belong and it was lost in the sound of our engine up front. Silence the click, click of wheels on rail sections—the click, click—what was this man thinking, this man who had given the whole civilized world back its right to live in honor—the glass was being held up high.

"To the New Year," he said slowly, and the words came back from each end of the crowded diner. "A year of struggle and of peril, but a long step forward." Those with glasses in their hands drank. He put his on the table. But before the next cheer broke out, the wheels under us picked up his last phrase and clicked off in ever-increasing tempo—"But a long step forward." and the winter wind against the window whispered, "Ah, yes, ah, yes." "but a long step forward"—the wheels promised and the wind blew "ah, yes, ah, yes." "But a long step forward" the wheels pounded—and the wind echoed, "Ah, yes, ah, yes."

CHURCHILL SMILES

The cheer died away. Churchill stuck his cigar in his mouth and gave a puff. "Auld Lange Syne" he said, and crossed his arms. About eight of us were in the circle with him. To one side was Sir Charles Portal, head of the RAF. On the other side of the Prime Minister of England was a corporal—clerk to Sir Charles. And Thompson, and the English reporter and Doris, and Linkins, the Western Union representative. All through the car little circles were made by men holding crossed hands. The song was started, and Churchill sang "Should old acquaintances be forgot?" He smiled at me. I smiled back and tried to sing.

But something stuck in my throat. Should they be forgot indeed. How about Dunkirk? How about London? How about Egypt and on the sands the Englishmen who had died for their country. "And never come to naught." My God—How about Pearl Harbor and our boys? All right, it's 1942 now. This year we're behind you, Winston Churchill. You'll not stand alone any longer. He looked around and smiled, a smile I'll never forget. He was remembering his boys and the Messerschmits, all right. It was no use, I just couldn't sing anymore. I gave it up. But kept on pumping my crossed hands and holding tight to the hands that clasped mine.

The song ended. He stepped back a bit and raised his powerful head. He gave a swift glance around the car. Then he said slowly, and through a mountain-clad silence, "May we all come through safe—and with honor." Then he turned, and with his hand in the air forming the symbolic "V," walked to the door of the car. Every person in the car was holding up his or her hand and forming the "V." And we were singing, "For He's a Jolly Good Fellow."

At the door he waited a second. Then waved—and was gone into the night.

Everyone in the car found a chair as soon as he could. My legs wouldn't hold me any longer. I put my elbows on the table and my face in my hands. I was near crying but that wasn't the important thing. I wanted to remember every little thing about that New Year's Eve—while the last 15 minutes, so strange, so historical, were repeating themselves and surging within me.

I wanted to remember and to keep for always the full glory of those few minutes.

Somebody banged me on the back. "That's all right, Jackie," said the voice belonging to the hand, "nobody got the picture."

But just then that wasn't one of my worries. "Suppose I had gone to bed," I thought—and missed the one New Year's Eve I'll never forget. I wouldn't have had this for me. As we left the dining car I smiled, remembering the old man at the crossing, "This, brother," I said to him, "this makes us kin * * * somehow."

Thinking Things Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to set the record straight, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Vermont Royster, published in the Wall Street Journal of February 18 relative to certain statements in President Johnson's message on the gold situation.

THINKING THINGS OVER

(By Vermont Royster)

MUDDLING HISTORY

Tucked away in President Johnson's recent message to Congress on the growing monetary crisis, there occurred the following little aside on history.

"To go back," he said, "to a system based on gold alone—to the system which brought us all to disaster in the early 1930's—is not an answer the world will, or should, accept."

The remarkable thing about this statement isn't the undisguised crack at General de Gaulle, who has suggested that a monetary system anchored to gold is exactly what the world ought to accept. Rather it's the amount of muddled history he managed to pack parenthetically between two dashes.

Not that Mr. Johnson is wholly to blame. The same historical view had been even more explicitly stated a few days earlier by the Treasury Department—also in reply to General de Gaulle—when it referred to "the full gold standard which collapsed in 1931." Possibly both statements emanated from the same youthful writer in the Treasury whose memory doesn't reach back that far and who had no history books handy.

Anyway, the clear import of both the Treasury statement and President Johnson's parenthetical phrase is that prior to the economic disaster of the 1930's the world had the kind of gold standard General de Gaulle is urging and that it was the failure of this full gold standard which caused the debacle.

And the implication—the intended implication, as a matter of fact—is that the present "gold exchange system" is something thought up in the last couple of decades and is therefore better. In Mr. Johnson's words, "the system we now have * * * has served the world well during the past 20 years."

Well, it wasn't quite that way.

Until the First World War—way back in 1914–18—the major Western countries did in fact have a full gold standard, and it had served the world well for many years. The years preceding that war were ones of extraordinary economic expansion in this country and in Europe, with world trade multiplying manyfold without any of the alleged restrictive effects of such a gold standard.

The essence of that gold standard was that the major currencies were convertible into gold at any time by anyone. Trade balances between countries were settled in gold, and the reserves of these currencies were measured in gold.

The First World War, like the second one, resulted in enormous inflation, made possible because the gold standard was suspended. At the war's end the governments tried to return not only to the prewar system, but also to the prewar ratios between gold and their paper currencies.

This later effort was indeed unrealistic and did, in the modern terminology, create

a severe shortage of reserves necessary to finance world trade. There was lots more paper money and no more gold than before.

The result of this bind was the monetary conference of 1922 in Genoa, Italy, of which there must be some records in the archives of our Treasury Department. Out of this conference came the germ of what is now called the gold exchange standard.

That germ was contained in Resolution 9, which suggested that in order to economize on the use of gold in maintaining currency reserves some of the reserves be maintained in the form of foreign balances.

Translated out of economese, this means that while formally France, let us say, counted only gold as a reserve against its francs in circulation, it could under the new policy also count as reserves its holdings of dollars or pounds sterling.

Some of the trappings of the full gold standard were retained. In most countries you could still swap paper money for gold coins. Many in this country can remember when you could do it here.

But insofar as international trade was concerned, all was quite different—and in fact quite "modern."

Whereas under the full gold standard a net flow of funds from one country to another was accompanied by a flow of gold, so that if the reserves of one country were increased those of the other decreased, the new system permitted one country—the United States, for example—to export funds and still keep its gold. This was possible because the country receiving the dollar funds could count the dollars as part of its currency reserves. It didn't need to ask for settlement in gold.

The result was magic. The United States could export funds, increase the credit potential of the receiving country and keep its own credit potential since it still kept its gold reserve.

This in essence is what happened in the twenties. Capital which had fled devastated Europe began to return to recovered Europe but paradoxically also remained in the United States. Nominally the dollars abroad were claims on our gold but in practice the gold remained here. The result was a multiplication of monetary demand incommensurate even with the increase in production.

In short, inflation on a worldwide scale. And this continued until the pyramid collapsed in 1929–31.

What was done in the monetary conferences after World War II was to readopt, refine, and give a formal name to the system of reserve currencies. Once again the rationale was that there wasn't enough gold to go around—as probably there wasn't unless all currencies were revalued to account for the war's inflation. Besides, wasn't the good old American dollar as good as gold?

Just as before, it's been magical. The more dollars the United States created and shipped abroad, the more reserves created abroad for credit expansion. Meanwhile there was no diminution of our ability to expand credit at home because—until very recently—the gold stayed right here.

As a result we could run a continuous balance-of-payments deficit without apparently having any problem. There would never need to be any accounting so long as other countries would keep their dollars and not actually ask for settlement in gold. And why should they when everybody could build on the happy inflation pyramid?

If President Johnson wants to blame the great depression on the collapse of the world's monetary system of the twenties, few will dispute his economic judgment. But the system that then collapsed was very like the one we now have. General de Gaulle is better on history.

Abe Lincoln In Humboldt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the Lincoln's Birthday celebration throughout the United States, a daily newspaper in my district, the Humboldt Standard, published an editorial that I felt was most fitting. While this area is still reeling economically from the major blow dealt by December floods, it paused to give recognition to a situation of which Abraham Lincoln would be very proud. With unanimous consent I place this editorial in the RECORD so that it may be appreciated by all:

ABE LINCOLN IN HUMBOLDT

In the little valley of Nolin's Creek, a few miles from Hodgenville, Ky., on this date in the year 1809, a boy was born in a small, makeshift cabin. Tom and Nancy Lincoln named him Abraham.

The little three-sided log cabin still stands, sheltered now by a marble monument.

One hundred years ago, on April 14, 1865, Abraham Lincoln was martyred in Ford's Theater in Washington, D.C. One century—and "the great task remaining before us" still remains, especially in the Deep South.

But Abraham Lincoln must have observed, from his present vantage place the realization of his dreams with the presence here for the past 7 weeks of the details from the 6th Army.

The commanding officer of the Helicopter Control Center here, and of all helicopter operations, was Col. Charles Bussey—a Negro who is also an officer and a gentleman. Other Negro officers, and some of other races, gave orders to white junior officers and enlisted men. Those orders were obeyed, not only without question, but without resentment or hesitancy.

The color line has vanished.

All of the Negro officers and enlisted men who served here in the fully integrated command were received by Humboldt County residents not only as saviors, but as welcome guests.

We can only wonder what would have happened had this disaster struck Mississippi and Alabama, with the same rescue units sent to save the populace there?

All of America can take a lesson from the men of the 6th Army.

Abraham Lincoln would have understood, and been grateful.

He could not help but be gratified that his name remains, a century later a symbol of freedom, compassion and selfless dedication to his country.

He could understand better than most that the President of the United States must be resigned to ceaseless criticism and open hostility even as he receives worldwide recognition of his leadership and power.

He might find comfort in seeing that after generations of stagnation the great issue which split the Nation in his day is at last being resolved at an ever-quickening pace.

And in his wisdom he would comprehend that the differences which now confuse his country and engulf the world can in truth be composed through the same patient understanding and love of fellow men that have made Abraham Lincoln timeless and immortal.

A grateful nation again observes the birthday of a giant. It does it with respect and reverence, regardless of race, creed, or politics.

Davenport, Iowa, Alcoa Works Has Prime Role in Pegasus Satellite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion today to call to the attention of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives, a very fine accomplishment that the people of my congressional district have achieved in their contribution to our space effort. The Davenport Works of the Aluminum Co. of America played an extremely important role in the construction of the Pegasus, an exceedingly complex satellite which is due for early launching by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The highly skilled and dedicated workers in the Davenport Alcoa plant justly deserve the recognition and appreciation of our entire Nation for the contributions which they have made. I include for the RECORD a recent news analysis which appeared in the Davenport Times-Democrat of Monday, February 15, 1965, which describes this excellent contribution:

ALCOA HAS PRIME ROLE IN PEGASUS SATELLITE

An important role in the construction of Pegasus, the complex satellite due for early launching by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, was played by Davenport Works of the Aluminum Co. of America.

Pegasus was built by Fairchild Hiller Corp. out of aluminum supplied by Alcoa.

One of the largest man-made satellites (third in size behind Echo I and Alcoa foil-wrapped Echo II), Pegasus is a rectangle 96 feet long and 14 feet high.

ACTS AS TARGET

Its mission is to sweep across the heavens as a target for solid particles of matter flying through space.

The particles (meteoroids) range from microscopic motes to substantial chunks.

They may pose a hazard that must be overcome in the design of manned spacecraft exposed for long periods to meteroid bombardment.

A giant aluminum-sheathed Saturn I launch vehicle, fabricated of sheet plate, castings, and forgings also supplied by Alcoa, will place the 3,200-pound satellite in orbit.

ELEVEN TONS USED

Over 11 tons of metal from Davenport works is in each Saturn I, in the form of "Y" rings, which fasten the various stages together, "lox" and fuel tanks, reinforcing intertank structure and baffles.

Electric motors will flip the accordian-folded wing panels from a 6-foot furled package to their full length, giving Pegasus a 96-foot wingspread.

Wing panel framework, and the satellite center structure housing vital equipment are fabricated of aluminum plate and square

and rectangular drawn tube supplied respectively by Alcoa's Davenport and Lafayette, Ind., plants.

TWO HUNDRED RECTANGLES

The huge expanse of Pegasus' wings is divided and subdivided by aluminum members into more than 200 miniature rectangles.

Each opening is covered with Alcoa foil backed by plastic film, which is laminated in the foil mill of Davenport works and wired for sound to record and radio to earth each meteoroid hit and the force of the impact.

A unique arrangement of special equipment that senses infrared energy—thus indicating which part of the satellite is facing earth—enables scientists to determine the direction each meteoroid is traveling when it strikes Pegasus.

Such information will tell spacecraft designers the extent of possible damage from hits, enabling them to build manned craft which will be relatively unaffected by meteoroids.

Address by Hon. J. L. Robertson, Before the Ohio Bankers Association, Columbus, Ohio, February 12, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the remarks of the Honorable J. L. Robertson, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the midwinter meeting of the Ohio Bankers Association, at Columbus, Ohio, on February 12, 1965.

Governor Robertson touches again—as he has in the past—on one of the most pressing reforms needed in the financial field as it relates to Government control and regulation, to wit: the consolidation of existing bank regulatory agencies into one overall supervisory, coordinated, Federal Banking Commission. Such a Commission, while preserving the principle of the dual banking system, would eliminate the present overlapping of regulatory jurisdiction, fragmentation of responsibility, and the necessarily resulting conflicts of policy.

My bill H.R. 107, to create a Federal Banking Commission is the same bill I introduced in the 88th Congress.

Governor Robertson's remarks follow:

THE CHANGING WORLD OF BANKING

I am glad to be speaking in Columbus because there is something about the name that inspires one to want to strike out in new directions and try to foresee what may lie ahead on the uncharted sea of the future. The people of Columbus are fortunate to live in a city that evokes this kind of reaction. They are also lucky to live in a place that has a ready-made fame.

I had no such luck. I was born and reared in Broken Bow, Nebr. Just think of the difference. Not only was Broken Bow unknown to the outside world, but the very name conveys a sense of bad luck, if not outright failure. But do not waste your sympathy, for Broken Bow has come into its own. At long last it has broken into the movies, in a film called "The Broken Bow Story" produced by the American Petroleum Institute.

It is the story of how a small Nebraska community has tried to solve the problems brought about by changing times. Broken Bow has entered the arena to compete for tourist dollars with Paris, Rome, New York, Las Vegas.

My hat is off to my hometowners for showing so much of the spirit of Columbus. And it occurs to me that we bankers and central bankers might well emulate them in seeking to devise new ways of meeting our changing problems—and believe me, we have them. We will always have them because we live in an economy that is eternally in the midst of a perpetual gale of change.

Financial markets and institutions have generally played a leading part in the changes that have characterized American business, but during the last 75 years commercial banks have more often followed than led. Thirty years ago, for example, many bankers believed term loans—if not sin themselves—led to sin, and considered consumer lending to be far beyond the pale. For too many years commercial banking accorded undue allegiance to outdated rules of thumb. But recently, and at an accelerating rate, the walls of tradition have been collapsing as the pressures of competitive forces in all financial markets have swept the gale through bank offices.

Over the years, most banks passively accepted the deposits of the public and allocated them to borrowers. In the postwar years, however, something happened. Business firms discovered the high cost of holding extra dollars in nonearning form and they aggressively began to place their temporarily surplus funds in the money market. Similarly, small savers began not only to learn of mutual funds and other securities, but also became conscious of the yields and safety available at the savings and loan association, the savings bank, and the credit union.

Commercial banks, to be sure, were subject to legal limits on the amount of interest they could pay on their deposits—zero on demand deposits, of course, and limited yields on time and savings deposits. But many banks were not taking full advantage of existing latitude for their competitive endeavors. In mid-1960, for example, a large portion of our commercial banks, not aware yet of the changes at work, or perhaps convinced that it would not increase their fund sources, were not paying the maximum rate on any form of time or saving deposit. They were not aggressively seeking such funds. Many of them were content to speak of unfair competition and to seek demand deposits merely by emphasizing the importance of the services they performed for their customers. While other financial institutions waxed and grew fat, commercial banks found their own growth was small, indeed.

In exercising its central banking powers to achieve high levels of economic growth and employment, along with stable prices, the Federal Reserve must keep its eye on total flows of funds, and all sectors of the economy. Within that context, it cannot make the banking system grow any faster than the public's demand for bank services. The real determinant, therefore, of the size of individual banks and the banking system—in relation to the size of other types of financial institutions—is the amount of dollars of deposits they can capture.

Financial flows are like a network of pipes connecting a tank of water to many taps. The size of the total flow is influenced by many things, but in general the pressure in the tank is such that if more goes through one pipe, less goes through another. If you have ever been taking a hot shower when your wife turned on the dishwasher, you will know what I mean. Now the main pipe used to be going to banks, but other financial institutions, and other financial assets that the public could hold, tapped the tank, and the flows through these new pipes cut down the flow to bank deposits. In order to achieve desirable economic growth and stability, we at the Federal Reserve are concerned, as I said, about the total flow—trying to make sure that the whole system of pipes does not either run dry or burst with too much pressure. Our job is not to direct which pipes are used. However, if commercial banks themselves can expand their pipes, as many have demonstrated can be done, they will get a larger portion of the flow. In short, your growth depends more on you than on us.

As the last decade progressed, many people became aware of this. Individual bank managements began to try to do something about it. If you can't lick them and you can't join them, then copy them and go them one better. Banks began to do just that. The result has been an almost revolutionary evolution in banking during the 1960's, the major cause of which has been competition. The characteristics of the evolution are seen most clearly on the liability side of the balance sheet.

Banks grew tired of seeing funds that had traditionally been theirs go elsewhere—to other kinds of financial institutions or into financial assets other than deposits—and they decided to fight back. Not only did they aggressively begin to merchandise savings accounts, but also they decided that corporations could be persuaded to buy negotiable time certificates of deposits. Paying interest to corporate customers was painful, but banks had to fight back. And the fight has been successful. In 5 years, negotiable CD's rose from a few hundred million dollars to $13 billion and became the second largest money market instrument in existence—led only by Treasury bills. Corporations, State and local governments, and institutions found that the CD was a good substitute for bills and other money market instruments, and the banks found themselves with more funds to lend and invest.

Bank regulatory authorities helped banks go after interest-bearing deposits more aggressively by raising the ceiling rates four times since 1957. Many banks have taken advantage of these new limits. Banker cries of unfair competition have diminished, and recently we have heard some grumblings from other financial institutions that sound suspiciously like the bank complaints of a few years ago.

Time and savings deposits were not the only instruments pushed by the banks. Relaxation by regulatory agencies and the new aggressive spirit also led to some long-term capital borrowing. Since 1960 around $650 million of subordinated debentures have been issued. The old emergency security, with a smell of distress, became in the 1960's—in the view of some people—one of the signs of the aggressive bank. Another tradition crumbled.

In the summer of last year still another instrument to acquire funds came into use: the unsecured short-term note. The terms of this piece of paper are hard to distinguish from those of a CD, but since it is not called a deposit it is not (for the present, at least) subject to reserve requirements, insurance assessments, or interest ceilings. Although less than $200 million of these obligations have been issued thus far, this gimmick (that is what it really is) could become much more important in the future (unless, of course, the Federal Reserve should decide, under its existing powers, that these obligations should be called by their true name, "deposits," and regulated as such).

In addition to competition of bank deposits with both obligations of other kinds of financial institutions and a whole spectrum of other financial assets, another force at work on bank liabilities has been the desire of banks to manage their fund flows more efficiently. Since the Treasury-Federal Reserve "accord," and the return to a contracyclical monetary policy, we have seen a rapid

growth of the Federal funds market. This has allowed banks to manage their legal reserves more closely and market forces to better allocate surplus reserves. Not only does trading in these balances at the Federal Reserve give banks both additional liquidity and income, but it also gives us a very sensitive measure of the degree of tightness or ease in the money market.

This market is still, in the main, a reserve adjustment and liquidity market, but even here the gale is blowing. Just in the last few months we have seen a few major banks begin to pay in excess of the discount rate for Federal funds, in an explicit effort to promote the idea that Federal funds transactions need not be limited to the objective of reserve adjustment. If assets are available that yield more, it is argued, why not borrow Federal funds and buy them; the day the cost of Federal funds exceeds that yield, stop borrowing and sell the assets. This development is not inconsistent with basic market principles, and may serve to allocate funds nationwide in a more efficient manner. Unintentionally, it may even increase, in a small way, the effectiveness of changes in monetary policy—for instance, if and when we switch to a policy of so-called tight money—by linking more financial assets still more closely to Federal Reserve actions.

However, you may be surprised to learn that I know of a case in which Federal funds borrowing represents a major—if not the major—source of a bank's funds to finance a long-term and not-too-liquid portfolio. This represents a misuse of short-term borrowing; a misuse in which both the borrower and the lenders could get hurt.

Paralleling the more active use of the Federal funds market, there has been a similar growth in another source of funds. Dealers in U.S. Government securities have for years borrowed money via repurchase agreements with corporations, banks, and the Federal Reserve. Now banks are entering this market on the same side as the dealers and engaging in repurchase agreements with corporations—borrowing on their securities rather than selling them. Assuming, as I am willing to do for the moment, that this is not a device to pay interest on demand deposits, it represents just another example of the techniques now used by banks to gain needed funds.

All of what I have said so far can be summarized in one word: "change"—which, parenthetically, is not necessarily the same thing as progress. Banks are no longer passively accepting deposits or leaning on service alone to bring in funds. They are out competing for them. They are innovating, introducing new instruments, pushing old ones, changing the purposes of some, and generally paying the market price. They are using that ancient, and too often forgotten competitive shillelagh—price. In the process, they are bigger because they are capturing a larger portion of the flow of funds. It is not only because of the expansive policy stance of the Federal Reserve that 1964 saw the largest dollar increase in bank credit in a decade. It is not just changes in regulation Q that have caused time deposits to double since 1958. Rather, it is these factors and the growing competitiveness of banks—their active searching for deposits—that has resulted in a bigger banking system. To use my earlier metaphor, the banks have succeeded in expanding their pipes; perhaps it would be more correct to say they have tapped the tank with new pipes.

All of this suggests there has been a new awakening of banking, a new aggressiveness that has changed the nature of the banking business, a change which is exemplified by the fact that in the fall of 1964, for the first time in American banking history, time and demand deposits held by the public were of the same size. Textbooks are going to have to be rewritten, and the banking fraternity, the regulatory authorities, and the policymakers are going to have to feed all these new factors into their brains and their computers in order to steer a proper course.

Some of the consequences of this change can be seen, and others can be guessed at. For one thing, sophisticated management skills are clearly of increasing importance in this new banking market. Tapping the new sources of funds is not child's play. To the extent that these funds represent borrowing from the market what used to be borrowed from correspondents and the Federal Reserve, the borrower may find the market, in times of need, to be much colder and far less understanding. While banks can now gain funds from a greater variety of sources (and incidentally be emancipated from sole dependence on local area sources), by and large these new funds are much hotter—more volatile—than the old deposit flows. In this field the personal customer relationship is not as important today as the quoted rate—as both the customer and the bank become aware of alternatives.

Banks have always been borrowers—that is how they get their resources—but the latest developments are something new. They are new because more banks are now aggressively seeking short-term, price-sensitive money. This increasing emphasis on short-term funds from the market may actually increase the exposure of individual banks to sudden adverse drains—particularly since policy changes by the Federal Reserve that once influenced mainly your portfolios now also powerfully influence the relative cost and stability of your liabilities. As a result, in adversity many banks may be more dependent than ever on correspondent relations and ultimately on the lender of last resort—the Federal Reserve System. The discount window will, of course, always be there to protect communities and to meet the emergency needs of banks. But it would not be wise to count on its being there to save bankers from the consequences of going overboard in borrowing short and lending long. Furthermore, supervisory authorities should not count too heavily on the use of the discount window to paper over their mistakes and deficiencies.

Some bankers profess little concern about these possibilities, arguing that in the event of adverse shifts of deposits they can always garner the needed funds from the market by playing the game—that is, by offering a bit more for deposits. But this can be a hazardous game. At times, because of regulation Q ceilings, it cannot be played at all with respect to some sources of funds; there is no guarantee that regulation Q ceilings will escalate in step with market yields. In addition, some banks that experience a hemorrhage of deposits may not be able to replace them merely by raising the price. Yields rise when funds are in relatively short supply, and much more deposit money just may not be around. In 1959 some would-be Federal funds borrowers found themselves in just this situation—they found no lenders.

This problem is magnified now because some of the recent inflows to banks are liquidity balances of corporations. In the event of a contraction in liquidity, these balances may not be available to the banks at rates they can afford to pay—ceilings or no ceilings. These inflows—represented in the main by certificates of deposit—have replaced the stock of liquidity which corporations used to hold in the form of Government securities. And here, I think, we can learn a lesson from the past. In previous periods of rapid expansion and tight money these corporate holdings of governments have been liquidated pretty fast. If and when corporate holdings of CD's are liquidated for the same reason, banks will have to liquidate some of their assets too. This could add upward pressure on yields and present some real liquidity and perhaps solvency problems to those banks that have not made proper plans for such developments or have relied too heavily on the possibility of replacing this borrowing with new borrowing.

In short, today banks are relying less on traditional asset adjustments for the liquidity needed for both adverse clearings and increased loan demand, and more on deposit inflows and additional borrowing. Given the increasing liquidity risks associated with higher levels of interest-sensitive deposits and the difficulties of increasing borrowings in periods of tight money, this changed reliance could constitute the most dangerous risk resulting from the new trends.

Even if in such periods some bankers are able to get their funds at higher rates, they may find the game not worth the candle; today 180-day CD money costs about the same as the return on a 1-year municipal—adjusted for taxes. They may find themselves forced to choose between negative carries—as they pay more for their funds than they can safely earn on them—and selling long-term assets at a loss. Negative carries and capital losses are not very appetizing alternatives.

These problems are, of course, complicated by the fact that the evolution in liabilities has induced a similar evolution in portfolio management. With the cost of bank funds now more obvious, as well as higher, there has been increasing pressure on banks to reach out for more earnings. In doing so, they have acquired longer term loans and securities. They have sought tax exempts. They have looked for the capital gain. The larger ones have engaged in lending abroad on an unprecedented scale, and nearly all have attempted to employ more of every dollar borrowed. Not only are loan/deposit ratios at postwar highs, they are growing most rapidly at the smaller banks. More banks are entering the Federal funds market as lenders, as well as borrowers, with a consequent reduction in excess reserves and correspondent balances.

Incidentally, it is just possible that one of the reasons for the large expansion in banks' holdings of mortgage loans and tax exempts is tradition: a tradition that argues that time and savings deposits, being more stable, may more safely be invested in longer term assets. It could be, of course, that time deposits are less stable today than many think. The level of a bank's demand deposits may even be more stable now than the level of its interest-sensitive time deposits.

Every bank must test the volatility of its deposits and not blindly follow outdated rules of thumb. Maturities and other characteristics of bank portfolios must be related to the character of a bank's liabilities.

My purpose today is not to alert bankers, only, to the almost revolutionary character of recent changes in the banking business, but bank regulatory authorities, as well. They, too, will be challenged by this new wave of competitive bidding for funds and its consequences.

Those of us on the policy and supervisory side have to beware of the twin temptations of bureaucracy—the temptation to resist change because the status quo seems safer and more comfortable, or, at the other extreme, the temptation to let down the bars indiscriminately in order to calm the complaints or court the plaudits of the "client" industry.

We need to develop new supervisory guidelines on many issues if the public interest is to be effectively served. For example, what are reasonable uses today for highly volatile and highly interest-sensitive money? What is a reasonable pattern for maturity distribution of earning assts? How much should banks depend upon money market borrowing to ease liquidity pressures, and how much on asset maturities? To what extent—and

how—should banks be cushioned from the consequences of misjudgments in balacing the liquidity of their assets and liabilities?

A problem rarely spoken of for 30 years may return to wrinkle the supervisory brow: To what extent should small banks be protected from the ability of large banks to bid away their deposits with deposit instruments that pay more and are more marketable? How can this be done without depriving bank customers of the benefits of vigorous bank competition? Assuming that the pattern of reserve requirements is switched (as may happen) to a graduated scale based on deposit levels, will it be necessary—in order to avoid the demise of smaller banks—to raise the requirements at the billion dollar end of the scale? or, perhaps, to prescribe a high reserve requirement on deposits represented by negotiable CD's? Or can and should more suitable equalizers be devised?

Clearly, traditional regulatory attitudes are called into question by the change that has occurred. For example, both laws requiring interest rate ceilings on time deposits and those prohibiting interest on demand deposits can become real issues. As the styles and terms of bank liabilities proliferate, old dividing lines lose more and more of their meaning.

What is needed today, in my judgment, is a general recasting of bank regulation—to pay more attention to the functions and effects, both beneficial and detrimental, of bank assets and liabilities, and less attention to traditional forms and procedures, the significance of which has been altered by time and change. How can we bring about such a recasting? Must we stand pat until bitter experience reveals, in hindsight, what was too much, what was nearsighted, and what was ill conceived? Or should we avoid waiting to be tutored in the school of hard knocks by undertaking reforms based on all the good sense that reasonable men can focus on the problem?

In principle, I daresay, all of us would vote for the latter course. But it is ironic that, just when a well-coordinated, progressive reform of bank regulation is needed, our Federal supervisory structure is enmeshed in a tangle of overlapping responsibilities, conflicting philosophies, and procedural cross-purposes that makes prompt and effective action impossible.

If ever events called for a unified Federal supervisory structure, this surely is the time. The challenges posed by today's competitive pressures are clear. Bankers, supervisors, policymakers, and legislators must find the institutional framework and the intestinal fortitude to meet those challenges—and quickly.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Institute Fitting Memoral to Former President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, we have been reminded lately of the honors which go to great men after their death. In Great Britain, Sir Winston Churchill was honored last month with the pomp, circumstance, affection, and grief due the "Man of the Century." While the British honored this great man with ceremony upon his death, they have fittingly paid respect to him with a living memorial which will help to mold perhaps another Churchill. The memorial is the Churchill College, which opened last Easter at Cambridge University.

Since the 81st Congress I have introduced legislation to provide for a Government service school, and in the 89th Congress, on the opening day of the session, I again reintroduced a bill, H.R. 276, to provide for the establishment of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Institute, to be a graduate school for advanced studies in American Government. This institute would be for selected individuals of outstanding ability to pursue advanced studies in American political theory, methods, and institutions in preparation for public service with the Government of the United States.

This school might be established at one of our great universities, as was done in the Churchill College at Cambridge. This is no new idea. Graduate studies in government service have been the bulwark of stable European governments for centuries. With many critics of Government crying for better personnel in the Federal service, it would appear H.R. 276 is an answer to these critics, and fulfills an acknowledged need by our Federal Government. The Roosevelt Institute seems to me to be a more fitting tribute to our 32d President than the proposed 20th century "stonehenge" or any other static memorial.

An editorial from a recent edition of the Washington Post reads in part as follows:

CHURCHILL COLLEGE

It is a mark of superiority in ceremonial matters that the British have honored Sir Winston Churchill as he himself would have wished it—with memorial observances of impressive dignity culminating in a burial in a modest churchyard near Blenheim Palace, the great Englishman's ancestral home. As a lasting memorial to his achievement, the British are contemplating no vast and pretentious marble temple. Instead, the statesman's memorial will be Churchill College, which opened last Easter at Cambridge University.

If a living and useful memorial is appropriate to the greatest Englishman of his time, shouldn't Americans benefit from the example?

Department of Agriculture Honors George Washington Carver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a speech delivered last Thursday by our colleague, the Honorable HERBERT TENZER, of New York, on the occasion of a plaque being presented to the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a memorial to the late George Washington Carver.

Congressman TENZER was introduced to a distinguished gathering of public officials and civic leaders of the District of Columbia by Mrs. Rosa L. Gragg, chairman of the George Washington Carver Commemoration Committee. It is my great honor and privilege to have such a wonderful person as Mrs. Gragg as one of my constituents. The Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, accepted the plaque on behalf of the Department.

The speech follows:

Mr. Secretary, Mrs. Rosa Gragg, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, George Washington Carver's greatest contribution lay in his efforts to help the poor farmers of Alabama wrest a living from an indifferent soil. His bulletins were directed toward practical ends. They were simply and concisely written, they made the work of the laboratory available to the plowman.

Carver had a unique capacity for applying good ideas. He once stated his philosophy in these terms, "Look about you. Take hold of the things that are here. Let them talk to you. You learn to talk to them." In a similar vein, he showed that his faith was allied to his science, when he said, "I like to think of nature as an unlimited broadcasting system, through which God speaks to us every hour, if we will only tune in."

To perpetuate his memory, there was established at his birthplace, in June 1951, the George Washington Carver National Monument, consisting of 210 acres, located in southwestern Missouri, administered by the National Park Service.

This monument was added to the other tangible expressions of a grateful nation, such as the Carver Museum on the Tuskegee campus, dedicated by the late Mr. and Mrs. Henry Ford in 1941, and the new science building dedicated in his honor at Simpson College in 1956.

Today, while elsewhere there are those who toy and tamper with human rights, we add another page to the history of a nation's gratitude to an eminent botanist, a pioneer conservationist, and great benefactor of mankind.

On the occasion of the presentation of a plaque to further honor his memory, I have been authorized by the owners of Carver Memorial Park to announce a grant of a piece of land to the George Washington Carver Commemoration Committee, to be dedicated for use as a museum, where his great agricultural achievements and contributions to mankind can be viewed by the greatest possible number of interested persons near the Nation's Capital City. The location of the intended site is on U.S. Highway No. 1 approximately 2 miles south of Laurel, Md. The design will be decided upon in a competition and it is expected that it will be in harmony and in consonance with the design of the outstanding monuments and Government building in the Nation's Capital area. Here more than 300 synthetic products made from peanuts and the 118 products developed from the sweetpotato will be placed on display by manufacturers and producers of these products. The museum will also house interesting memorabilia marking the life and record of this slave boy who rose to humble manhood and who became one of our Nation's great scientists.

Mr. Secretary I have the honor to present this plaque in honor of George Washington Carver, eminent scientist, agricultural researcher, agronomist and benefactor of mankind. This plaque is presented to the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a permanent memorial by the George Washington Carver Commemoration Committee of the District of Columbia for his contributions to the Bureau of Plant Industries in the U.S. Department of Commerce; his nationwide program in soil rebuilding and crop rotation; his experiments with the peanut, sweetpotato and other plants, which produced hundreds

of useful products for mankind. Upon his death of January 5, 1943, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's telegram to Tuskegee Institute said, "all mankind are the beneficiaries of his discoveries."

Justice Felix Frankfurter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, a few short years ago at the law school in Cambridge, a bust of Justice Felix Frankfurter was presented to take its place alongside four other great jurists of our century: Justices Oliver Wendell Holmes, Louis D. Brandeis, Benjamin Cardozo, and Learned Hand. Now Professor Frankfurter, for he remained a teacher throughout his judicial tenure, has joined those others in answering that summons, for which no continuance can be granted. Professor Frankfurter will require no extension of time to plead. His life exemplified the creed espoused by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes when he spoke to the 50th anniversary of his class in June 1911:

To see so far as one may, and to feel the great forces that are behind every detail * * * to hammer out as compact and solid a piece of work as one can, to try to make it first rate, and to leave it unadvertised.

All of this Justice Frankfurter has done. The words of his last major opinion filed in dissent in March 1962, in the Tennessee apportionment case sounded a warning bell that still rings true today:

The Justice wrote:

"The Court today reverses a uniform course of decision established by a dozen cases, including one by which the very claim now sustained was unanimously rejected only 5 years ago.

"Such a massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past in asserting destructively novel judiciary power demands a detailed analysis of the role of this Court in our constitutional system.

"Disregard of inherent limits in the effective exercise of the Court's 'judicial power' not only presages the futility of judicial intervention in the essentially political conflict of forces. * * * It may well impair the Court's position as the ultimate organ of 'the supreme law of the land' in that vast range of legal problems, often strongly entangled in popular feeling, on which this Court must pronounce.

"PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

"The Court's authority—processed neither of the purse nor the sword—ultimately rests on sustained public confidence in its moral sanction. Such feeling must be nourished by the Court's complete detachment, in fact and in appearance, from political entanglements and by abstention from injecting itself into the clash of political forces in political settlements."

The struggle Justice Frankfurter went through in leaving his personal convictions behind came through most sharply in his 1943 dissent in the flag salute case. The Court reversed a previous decision and ruled that children of Jehovah's Witnesses could not be forced to salute the U.S. flag at school. Frankfurter, disagrgeeing, said:

"One who belongs to the most vilified and persecuted minority in history is not likely to be insensible to the freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution. Were my purely personal attitude relevant I should wholeheartedly associate myself with the general libertarian views in the Court's opinion, representing as they do the thought and action of a lifetime.

"FEELING AS JUDGE

"But as judges we are neither Jew nor Gentile, neither Catholic nor agnostic. * * * As a member of this Court I am not justified in writing my private notions into the Constitution, no matter how deeply I may cherish them or how mischievous I may deem their disregard."

He was with the majority in ruling that congressional committees must make clear to witnesses the pertinency of questions; in drawing a sharp distinction between subversive thought and action; and in striking down the State Department's restrictive passport regulations as not authorized by law.

Perhaps his most bitter defeat on the Court was his last one. That was the Tennessee apportionment case where six Justices voted to allow lower Federal courts to hear the complaints of citizens who think unequal voting districts dilute their right to vote.

For Justice Frankfurter, the Court's decision to step into what he called a political thicket was tragic.

The lamps of learning he has lit shall light the paths of countless generations yet unborn.

National Lutheran Council Endorses President Johnson's Immigration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted by the National Lutheran Council supporting President Johnson' proposal for revision of the immigration law.

Although the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, does not officially participate in the National Lutheran Council, it wishes to be associated with the substance of this resolution.

The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION

Whereas the National Lutheran Council has consistently expressed hope that Congress will establish immigration laws, "just to all and ministering most truly to the public welfare"; and

Whereas the National Lutheran Council has stated its "firm conviction that the existing immigration legislation has severe shortcomings, as a result of which neither traditional Christian humanitarianism nor enlightened self-interest are adequately exhibited," and has expressed hope that Congress will "seek a just and workable substitute for the national origins quota system"; and

Whereas the statement "Immigration Policy: Moral Issues and the National Interest," endorsed by the National Lutheran Council at its meeting on February 4, 1960, commended for study and consideration the following five possible objectives as the basis of a revised U.S. immigration law:

1. To supply our permanent population with a steady proportion of newcomers who have chosen the United States as their new homeland and who can impart to their American neighbors an understanding of the cultures, attitudes, and interests of other races and peoples of the world.

2. To assume the United States proper share of international responsibility for the resettlement of refugees and of other persons urgently in need of the compassionate haven of a new homeland.

3. To facilitate the reuniting of families.

4. To facilitate the entry of persons possessing special skills or other capacities needed by the American economy and culture.

5. To admit annually a reasonable number of the persons described above on an objective basis of selection which, while discriminating, will not be discriminatory with respect to race, national origin, color, or religion, testifying thereby to the U.S. recognition of the interlocking and mutual interests of all nations with regard to the migration of people, the interaction of cultures and respect of universal human rights; and

Whereas the proposed legislation submitted to Congress by President Johnson on January 13, 1965, represents substantial progress toward the fulfillment of the basic hopes and objectives expressed in prior National Lutheran Council resolutions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Lutheran Council reaffirm its concern for a fair and just immigration law, and express its hope that Congress will enact into law the principles and objectives contained in the President's proposal now before Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the congregations of the member bodies of the National Lutheran Council be encouraged to welcome immigrants into their fellowship and to assist them in continuing integration into community life.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, when the history of U.S. involvement in Vietnam is finally written, a great American newspaper—the New York Times—will have a special place for having lived up to the highest standard of courageous and incisive journalism. No newcomer to this complex issue, the New York Times published articles by Pulitzer Prize winner David Halberstram and Homer Bigart which brought to light the realities of the dictatorial Diem regime. Recently James Reston has analyzed the complexities of Vietnam in a number of penetrating articles, and the New York Times has put special emphasis on Vietnam on the editorial page in a series of in-depth editorials. I commend the following three editorials to my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1965]

THE WAR HAWKS

A comparatively small group of Americans, at this moment predominantly political in character and predominantly Republican in

politics, is doing its best to multiply the perils and frustrations of the war in southeast Asia.

This group ignores the realities of the present situation. It ignores the obvious war-weariness of the people of South Vietnam. It ignores the steady stream of desertions from the Vietnamese Army. It ignores the difficulty of protecting isolated American bases against the surprise attacks of guerrillas.

It ignores the possibility of an invasion of South Vietnam by the very considerable North Vietnamese Army. It ignores the problem of how an aerial counterattack could cope successfully with a massive ground attack of this character. It ignores the possibility of Chinese intervention. It ignores the logistics and belittles the cost in lives lost, blood spilled and treasure wasted, of fighting a war on a jungle front 7,000 miles from the coast of California.

The whole aim of this group is to expand the Vietnamese war, even if it means drawing in China and perhaps the Soviet Union as well. By its lights, President Johnson's declaration that the United States seeks no wider war is as much a prescription for failure as any attempt at a negotiated peace. It is one thing to say, as Secretary McNamara did in his testimony yesterday, that this country has "no other alternative than continuing to support South Vietnam against the Red guerrilla onslaught." It is quite another to argue that the road out of the present hazardous situation is to invite world destruction. The American people made it overwhelmingly clear in the last election that they do not want to plunge recklessly down that road.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1965]

REVOLVING DOOR IN SAIGON

Personal and group ambitions seem more consequential to some of South Vietnam's key military leaders than the war against the Vietcong. The world worries about the danger of a general war growing out of the U.S. effort to underwrite Vietnamese freedom with American men, money and arms. Yet, the primary worry for many of the generals and colonels who are supposed to be in direct charge of Saigon's war effort revolves around personal power.

In his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, at almost the time the latest coup was beginning, Secretary McNamara warned that without national unity and a stable government the South Vietnamese would not be able to make effective use either of their own armed forces or of the help the United States is giving them. His words were apparently lost on the battling warlords in Saigon.

Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of this newest in an endless series of internal upheavals is how unprepared every American policymaker in Saigon or Washington seemed to be for it. The available evidence suggests that the abortive coup was hatched in the South Vietnamese Embassy in Washington, where Colonel Thao was press attaché until recently and where Lieutenant General Khiem is currently ambassador. The total surprise of American officialdom indicates an abysmal failure of the Central Intelligence Agency and every branch of military intelligence. It is all much too reminiscent of the days when Washington gave over-ready credence to the late Ngo Dinh Diem's glowing reports of military victories and villages made secure.

The situation in Saigon is still too obscure to permit any forecast of who will emerge as ruler for a day, a week, or a month. But there are enough puzzles about the latest insurgence to raise suspicion that the Vietcong may have infiltrated the highest councils of the Vietnamese armed forces. Certainly, there is no prospect of the kind of stable government Secretary McNamara has rightly said is essential if our aid is to be of any real effectiveness. It is more urgent than ever for President Johnson to take a new, hard look at this worsening morass before honorable extrication from it becomes impossible.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 21, 1965]

THE DEBATE ON VIETNAM

A great debate on the Vietnamese conflict is now raging all over the United States. It goes from the White House, Congress, and the Pentagon to every home, office, factory, and farm. It is unresolved because the Government has not yet decided on its policy or, if it has, President Johnson is not telling the American people. The debate's subject, in its simplest form, is whether to fight a big war in Vietnam or to seek a way out through a combination of continuing defense and diplomatic negotiation.

The case for a vastly stepped-up American military commitment—as set forth in today's Magazine by military analyst Hanson W. Baldwin—is that the "Communist strategy of creeping aggression" must be stopped in Vietnam before it swallows all of Asia and the world. Under this theory, the United States should undertake saturation bombing of North Vietnam and send as many as a million American soldiers, sailors, and fliers into a "war to win."

Such an approach discards any pretense that our objective in Vietnam is to protect the Vietnamese people; it turns the conflict ino a maked ideological struggle that ignores all the deep cleavages recent years have brought in both the Communist and free worlds. Not one of our major allies in the West could be expected to endorse, much less actively assist, an American involvement so massive it would amount to a military occupation of leaderless South Vietnam. America's efforts to demonstrate the superiority of its social system by abolishing poverty and building a Great Society would vanish under the necessity for pouring our youth and treasure into a limitless solo adventure.

On the Communist side the effect of a large-scale American assault on North Vietnam would be to resolidify the fragmented Moscow-Peiping-Hanoi axis. Communist China would have to send her land armies to the rescue, as in North Korea, or be labeled a paper tiger. Soviet Russia, now manifestly unhappy about anything that would enhance Chinese prestige or dominion, would find it almost impossible to stand aloof. The end result would be an escalation of such dimensions that no one could be sure it would not wind up in the kind of calamitous atomic exchange Secretary McNamara described so graphically in his testimony last week.

There are many, of course, who contend that the United States will eventually have to fight a nuclear war with China anyway, and that it is better to have the showdown now when our superiority in weapons and delivery devices is so great. These are the same people who a decade ago were advancing precisely the same argument on why the United States should not wait to drop the bomb on Moscow. The notion that all Communists are alike and that all must be destroyed is the road to world annihilation.

The struggle between East and West is enormously complex, and nowhere more so than in Vietnam, a country that has been occupied or neutral for 2,000 years and that now shows no will to fight in its own defense. The Vietnamese, both North and South, have an inherited fear and dislike of the Chinese. The Russians undoubtedly have at least as much desire as the United States to keep them from being swallowed into Peiping's empire.

The course of sanity is to explore the initiatives opened up by Secretary General Thant and General de Gaulle for negotiations to seek a neutralization of Vietnam and all southeast Asia. For a year the objection has been that our military position is too weak to allow negotiations. Every week it has grown weaker, and the latest upheavals in the Vietnamese military and political structure indicate that total collapse may be imminent. To send hundreds of thousands of Americans into an endless jungle war or to bomb North Vietnamese ports and industrial centers on a saturation basis would be a surer road to global holocaust than to a victory arms can never win for either side.

All of Idaho Welcomes 1965 Girl Scout Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the February 18 edition of the Bonners Ferry Herald and which expresses all of Idaho's thoughts on welcoming the 1965 International Senior Girl Scout Roundup to our northern panhandle:

ALL OF IDAHO WELCOMES 1965 GIRL SCOUT ROUNDUP

Deep lies the snow over north Idaho's Farragut State Park where the International Senior Girl Scout Roundup will be held next summer. In somber silence the pines, the firs, and the cedars await the coming of spring, and sleeping on the bosom of the earth beneath the snowy mantle lie the countless flower seeds and plants that hold the promise of many lovely tomorrows.

And, oh, the memories this land of forest and field, lake and stream, and mountain and meadow holds.

Last night the south wind brought its first promise of the welcome spring. Soughing through the pines, the breezes seemed to be reminiscing about the days gone by. If one would listen close, here's what they might have heard the breezes say:

"Long, long ago," the breeze began, "only friendly Indians came this way. Kalispelms, they called themselves. Friends of the neighboring Kootenai to the north and the Nez Perce to the south. Here they pitched their tepees, bore their children, and lived their happy lives. And the Great Spirit to whom they prayed smiled on them.

"Came then the white men, David Thompson, Joco Finlay and all the rest of the buckskin-clad explorers, adventurers, and voyageurs. Strange were the names they gave: Pend d'Oreille, Coeur d'Alene, Mamaloos, Seneacquoteen.

"Tirelessly the years rolled on, and little of importance happened here. It was as though Fate was saving this area for a greater purpose, and it was in 1941 when the world was engaged in its second great war that destiny decreed that this should be the site of Farragut Naval Training Station. Barracks, fieldhouses, training schools, messhalls spring up in five great camps. One hundred thousand sailors to man the greatest armanda the world has ever known were trained here. From farm and city these recruits came. Pink cheeked youths they were, some sobbing out their homesick hearts in the darkness of the night, some braving their trails with fear in their hearts, some seeking excitement and adventure, all knowing that some would not return. But they were Americans—proud Americans.

"What of this great armada? Do you remember these? The *Mighty Mo*, the *Iowa*, the *Yorktown*, the *Lexington*, *Enterprise*, the *Wasp*, the *Princeton*, the *Sangamon*, the *Essex*, the *Intrepid*, the *Bunker Hill*, the *Franklin*, the *Santa Fe*, the *Ticonderoga*, the *Lunga Point*, the *Fighting Lady*.

"Where did they go? Remember? Casa Blanca, Salerno, bloody Anzio, Gold Beach, Omaha Beach, Guadalcanal, Coral Sea, the Solomons, Bougainville, the Gilberts, the Marshalls, the Marianas, Guam, Wake, Yap, Truk, Midway, Jaluit Atoll, bloody Tarawa, Peleliu Island, Cape Gloucester, Leyte Gulf, Mindinao, Saipan, Rabaul, Kwajalein, Mindoro, Tokishiki Shima, Tinian, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, Aormori, Tokyo.

"Gone now are the barracks, the fieldhouses, the training schools and the messhalls. Only the water standpipes remain as silent sentinals of the glory that was Farragut, and here and there an asphalt street, hidden in the grass, submits grudgingly to the erosion of the elements.

"A glorious page of history was written here," the dying breeze recalled, "but there are other things to come and we will come back when the Girl Scouts pitch their tents on this hallowed ground come summer. Yes, we will return."

Hear us now, Great Spirit. May Your smile shed its grace upon our land as we prepare to host the Girl Scout roundup. Make the sun shine and the flowers to bloom in profusion. Gone will be the wild roses and the syringa when they gather at midsummer. The June grass will be browning, too, but let the Indian paint brush add its crimson hue to the blue of the wild lupines, the purple of the vetch, the lavender of the fireweed, the white of the wild daisies, and the yellow of the tansy bloom. Strew Your garlands at their feet, for they are the flower of American womanhood. They are the daughters of those pink-cheeked youths who trained here long years ago.

Let them take Thy gentleness from the blue skies and the white clouds, Thy tranquillity from the peaceful landscape, and Thy strength from the mighty mountains. Help us to say: "Welcome to Idaho."

Salute to National Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a brief salute to National Brotherhood Week sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The article follows:

The National Conference of Christians and Jews have sponsored an Annual Brotherhood Week for more than 35 years.

It is a systematic and well-organized program to bring about a better understanding among the different groups, racial and religious, which constitute our population.

The week passes. The words, spoken and written will make little impression. Those who are prejudiced, those who practice racial and religious discrimination will continue as they have in the past. Good will and tolerance will be nice-sounding words.

Those who believe in equality do not need the yearly reminder. Those who preach and practice intolerance and prejudice are not moved by it.

It doesn't seem possible that prejudice and hatred are so widespread that an annual publicity campaign is needed to unmask it.

There is but one way to combat prejudice and religious hatred and that is by education. Education aimed at racial toleration should be begun in the homes and in the early grades of the schools when children are young and impressionable. Parents have a responsibility in teaching their children that the color, race, or creed of a person is of less importance than his character.

To preach brotherhood is not enough. It must be taught to the young. It must be practiced by men and women throughout the year. Until we accept this priceless virtue of equality, we cannot truly call ourselves Americans.

William Morris, the ancient Hebrew psalmist said, "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." The words of this learned man have more meaning today than when they were first uttered ages ago.

Whence Bipartisanship?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, with the vote last week wherein Democrats supported, for the present, an Arab policy of the last three administrations, I note Republicans making political capital and fanning the flames all over the country.

Perhaps our policies would be more consistent if Members studied the issues and gave leadership to the many times uninformed public.

The Republican temptation, currently the vogue, to abort bipartisan foreign policy on the slightest provocation, is not popular with the majority of Americans as witnesseth the November 1964 elections.

The facts and issues are, I believe, responsibly set forward by John Badeau in the following reprint of an article from "Foreign Affairs," American Quarterly Review:

UNITED STATES AND UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC: A CRISIS IN CONFIDENCE

(By John S. Badeau)

During recent congressional debates on aid legislation many harsh things were said about the United Arab Republic and its President. One Senator stated that "Col. Abdel Nasser * * * has been responsible more than any other single individual for keeping the political caldron boiling in the arid, strife-torn Middle East * * * pouring oil on whatever brush fires break out." President Nasser has been equally sharp and critical. Early in 1964, he publicly described American foreign policy toward the Arab world as "not based on justice but on the support and consolidation of the base of aggression, Israel, and we cannot, under any circumstances, accept it."

To be sure, much of this may be dismissed as political talk for the public ear. Nasser, no less than American Senators, has a constituency which periodically must be stirred up and marshaled for support. There is thus little new in the current skirmishing between Arab and American spokesmen—but those who follow United States-United Arab Republic relations closely feel there ought to be. For this increased tempo in verbal attacks comes during a period of notable improvement in relations, when both the United States and the United Arab Republic, as a matter of basic policy, have been trying to get along with each other.

For both parties the change began in the aftermath of the Suez affair. By its prompt support of the United Nations and its refusal to back the Israel-Anglo-French invasion, the United States gave practical proof of its impartiality in Middle East quarrels which threatened the peace of the area and the world. This was followed by a quiet mending of relations in the closing days of the Eisenhower administration. Economic aid to Egypt was cautiously reinstituted and a franker exchange of views took place. President Kennedy supported and expanded this policy, identifying the Middle East as an area vital to American interests. He sought to develop relations with Egypt around points of mutual interest, while recognizing that the United States had, and would continue to have, sharp differences with Nasser.

In making this approach, the United States paid particular attention to economic assistance. Whatever else the revolution in Egypt stands for, it is the most vigorous attack on the perennial problems of poverty, disease, ignorance, and privilege ever seen in the ancient Valley of the Nile. With a burgeoning population (doubled since 1936), severe limitation of arable land (3½ percent of the country's total area), and limited foreign exchange earnings (chiefly the cotton crop, Suez Canal tolls and tourism), it is obvious that the United Arab Republic cannot forge ahead with desperately needed modernization and social advance without substantial foreign assistance.

Here was a point of mutual concern on which closer American-Egyptian relations could be built. On its part, the United Arab Republic needed to develop a healthy and progressive society without being captured in the process by the Soviet bloc. But a socially stable and progressive Egypt was also in the interests of the United States, one of whose basic Middle East policies is to contribute wherever possible to tranquility through social progress in this vital region. Political and economic chaos in the Valley of the Nile would have repercussions in the surrounding area. Both in its own right, and as a major influence in the Arab world, the sound economic progress of Egypt is a desirable American objective. American economic assistance, chiefly through the Public Law 480 food program, was therefore increased.

Egypt's response to this approach opened a new era in United States-United Arab Republic relations. A cultural agreement was signed in 1962. In 1963, after 11 years of negotiation, Egypt entered into an investment guarantee agreement with the United States, aimed at stimulating and protecting American business interests. On several occasions, notably at the Economic Conference in Cairo in the summer of 1962, the United Arab Republic played a moderating role in containing African and Asian extremists. Nasser opposed the Soviet resumption of nuclear testing and shifted his policy away from supporting Gizenga in the Congo. While maintaining diplomatic relations with Cuba, the United Arab Republic displayed little enthusiasm for Castro and took a reasonably sympathetic attitude toward President Kennedy's showdown with Khrushchev. And for the first time in some years, the controlled press in Egypt gave a fairly objective, often sympathetic, account of American actions.

Against this background of cooperation, the shrill crescendo of bitter accusation between American and Egyptian leaders strikes an ominous discord. A popular Egyptian proverb says, "One day it's honey—the next onions." After the good diet of the past 3 years, are American-Egyptian relations in for a ration of onions? Under the present ad-

ministration, the United States made its most determined effort to protect its interests in the Near East through a reasonable rapprochement with the United Arab Republic. Are all such efforts bound to be fleeting? What is it that interrupts them just when everything seems to be going well?

The answer is not to be found so much in specific policies of the two countries as in the atmosphere within which these take place. At the end of the First World War an American observer reported that "Before all else (the nations of the Near East) need renewed confidence in each other and in us, and in our honest purposes of good." That is as true today as it was 40 years ago. The day of honey in Arab-American relations so easily changes into a day of onions because there is mutual distrust of each other's "honest purposes of good." Actions in themselves relatively minor become objects of deep suspicion because they are seen as cloaks for "imperialism," "neocolonialism," "pan-Arabism" or the personal ambitions of some Arab ruler. The crisis is often a crisis of confidence, generating a fog of suspicion which chokes good relations and makes it difficult to negotiate a lasting solution to differences.

It is a crisis in confidence which currently threatens American relations with the United Arab Republic. Although the mutuality of interests continues, the United States is wondering whether in the light of recent events it can trust the United Arab Republic to follow a reasonably consistent course of cooperation—or will it undercut vital American interests in the Arab world at its own whim? And can the United Arab Republic trust the United States to pursue its present course with continuity—or will the erratic winds of changing administrations and election pressures continually blow American foreign policy off course? It is doubt about these fundamentals of the American-Egyptian relationship which has created a crisis between the two nations.

One reason for such doubts is the very success of recent policy. Each party now finds itself playing an important role in the national interests of the other—a role in which the capacity to hurt is large. American food makes a massive contribution to the well-being of Egypt and is a resource on which the United Arab Republic national budget is currently based. While the country could get along without it (as the aftermath of Suez shows), the withdrawal of our food sales would create a serious economic problem. Moreover, the attitude of the United States influences both government and private credit resources in Western countries upon which the United Arab Republic now depends for its badly needed foreign currency assistance. Thus the United Arab Republic is nervous about anything which might suggest a sudden shift in American policy and scrutinizes carefully and suspiciously every American statement, fearing the worst.

But the United States also is nervous about Egypt. The United Arab Republic and its President are the single most powerful force in the Arab world. With the largest and most modernly equipped Arab army, the most powerful and sophisticated propaganda system and wide appeal among the Arab masses, President Nasser has a potential which cannot be neglected by any nation having interests in the Near East. He has the power to harm American interests to a considerable degree—as the response to his call for liquidating the American airbase in Libya shows. It is not simply a matter of power and ambition; Nasser typifies the socially revolutionary and politically self-determining forces which are at work in most countries of the Near East. If these forces, under the spell of Nasser's leadership, are aroused against American interests in Libya, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia, they can cause much trouble, even if they might not in the end totally destroy the U.S. position.

But this mutual fear is more than a current mood, bred by recent experience. There are, in fact, good reasons for the United States and Egypt to suspect each other—reasons which have a long history. Each nation has a bill of particulars against the other, drawn from the experiences of the last decade. It is this which forms the reservoir of suspicion from which a crisis of confidence is so easily drawn.

II

On Egypt's part, the first count against the United States is the unpredictability of its policy. American-Egyptian relations since the revolution in 1952 amply illustrate this. In the opening stages of the new regime, America was closely and hopefully identified with it, believing that a change in social and political conditions was long overdue in the Valley of the Nile. This led to a honeymoon policy, when sympathy and identity of interests seemed high.

In 1955 this cordial relation abruptly changed, due to Egyptian arms purchases from the Soviets. Failing to secure military equipment from the West on acceptable terms, Nasser turned to the Soviet bloc. The American reaction was a reversal of policy, which now set itself to contain and separate Egypt from its Arab neighbors. This was the policy of isolation—a long cry from the honeymoon which preceded it.

This policy failed. The United States was unable to isolate Egypt, the Israel-Anglo-French invasion of Egypt brought Nasser to the summit of his influence in the area, and it became clear that some new approach was needed. In the aftermath of Suez, America therefore shifted to a line that was cautious but correct, gradually reinstituting aid and seeking at least minimal normal relations.

Under President Kennedy, this was reinforced and expanded to become a policy of selective cooperation built on mutual interests. In no sense was this a return to the honeymoon, with uncritical support of all United Arab Republic policies. Rather it was based upon a sense of mutual needs and a willingness to concentrate on these instead of on the many disputes which had soured past relations.

Thus in less than a decade the United States has followed four different policies toward Egypt. While each is defensible in terms of the conditions which produced it, the effect on the Egyptian is to create the impression that American actions are unpredictable, not built upon clear principles—indeed, not even built upon a consistent view of America's own interests. It is this penchant for change in the American course which makes the Egyptian reserved and suspicious of us, especially during a period when relations are good.

A second cause of Egyptian suspicion is the rapid rise of American power, particularly in and near the Middle East. Prior to the Second World War, the American presence in the Arab world consisted chiefly of missionaries, educators, archeologists and a limited number of businesses, petroleum being the largest. The United States was a threat to no one; it had no bases, no troops, no fleets, and it diplayed none of the panoply of power Arabs expected from a great nation.

This changed after the war. Beginning with President Truman's commitment to the defense of Turkey and Greece in 1947, the United States played an increasing role in the area. Military bases in Morocco, Libya, Turkey, and Arabia, the powerful 6th Fleet always just across the horizon, support for the military establishments of Iran, Turkey, and Greece, the landing of marines in Lebanon—these were disturbing proofs to the Arab that the United States had become a military presence which could interfere with actions of the Arab states whenever it chose. What Great Britain once was, the United States has now become—the policeman of the world. Therefore the specter of American might in the Middle East always lurks just offstage and Egyptians are convinced that at some unexpected point it will step from the wings to play the dominant role in their affairs.

This fear is fed by a third suspicion—that the United States is too often in league with the forces of "imperialism and neocolonialism." What the Egyptians mean by this is not (despite the paragraph above) that America will deliberately seek to create a Middle East empire. It is that we are damned by our association with the British and the reactionary Arab regimes. As to Britain, many Arabs believe that the present remnants of its historic position in the Middle East are supported by the United States. While at the time of the Suez invasion in 1956 the United States joined in condemning (and thus terminating) the Anglo-French invasion, within a few days we froze Egyptian assets in America, refused to sell food and drugs to Egypt, and ended the CARE program. Obviously, it is argued, America was prepared to support Britain as far as it dared.

This identification with imperialism is given more substance by our interests in and association with Arab regimes which the Egyptian considers reactionary. By this he means the monarchies of the area and their governments which he claims do not represent popular consent or the interests of the people. The Egyptian argument is that these regimes are based upon an economic and political elite who keep power against the best interests of the common masses by cooperating with the foreign power having a stake in the country. He believes that the very character of the regimes in Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Libya (to name the current lot) drive them into subservience to Western, therefore American, power. This is the neocolonialism against which the nonalined world so frequently agitates as a threat to its untrammeled independence.

These three causes for distrust are brought to a focus in the problem that most continuously and deeply besets our relations with the Arab world—the question of Israel. There are many aspects to this tangled affair, but as regards American foreign policy the heart of the matter is that the Egyptian (and most of his fellow Arabs) believes that Israel exercises a veto power on American policy toward the Arab world. Whatever understanding of the realities of Arab life there may be in American circles, and however logically American interests can be served by at least an evenhanded policy toward the Arabs, the Egyption is convinced that when the cards are down Israel and its supporters can force the United Statse to make their interests paramount. Thus the Egyptian believes that no balanced American policy toward the Arab world can be permanent. Sooner or later it will run counter to Israeli interests, and when that happens, the U.S. Government is powerless to hold to its course.

So runs the Egyption indictment. But Americans have equally deep suspicions of the United Arab Republic. Most basic is the conviction that Egypt and its president are compulsive meddlers in the affairs of their neighbors. Both openly and secretly they stir up strife, support dissident movements and seek the overthrow of regimes of which they disapprove. Even Egyptions recognize this and express themselves in one of Cairo's many jokes about the regime. According to the story, when President Nasser went to Algeria last spring, he took with him a number of movie films, one of his favorite forms of relaxation. Among these was "Mutiny on the Bounty." After seeing the picture, the president sent a cable to the Foreign Office saying, "Contact the mutineers on the *Bounty* immediately. Tell them we support their cause and any attack on them will be con-

sidered an attack on the United Arab Republic."

During the past 2 years there have been five instances of United Arab Republic meddling which particularly disturbed Americans. The first was Egypt's support for the coup d'etat which overthrow the Imam of Yemen. What began as modest help to Republican forces against the Royalists ended with full-scale military occupation of the country. Egypt eventually had nearly 40,000 troops in the Yemen. A second instance was the dispatch of United Arab Republic arms and technicians in support of Algeria in its border dispute with Morocco—and this at a time when Cuba was also getting into the act.

The third incident was the supply of small arms to the Government of Cyprus during the current civil war on that unfortunate island. While any government has the legal right to sell arms to another government, it seemed that Greek Cypriots had ample quantities of weapons on hand, both for their regular and irregular forces. What reason had the United Arab Republic to contribute to an already overabundant supply except the desire to fan the fires of conflict between Greek and Turkish Cypriots? And why did Nasser welcome Makarios so warmly to Cairo this summer, unless the United Arab Republic is more interested in perpetuating than in calming the Cyprus disorders?

The fourth instance is perhaps the most serious. In February 1964, President Nasser, in a public speech heard throughout the Arab world, called for the ending of British and American base rights in Libya. The response was an immediate public furor in Libya which came dangerously near to ending in the abdication of the King. Once again Egypt was interfering in the affairs of its neighbors, and in a form directly challenging an American interest.

Finally, there is the current Egyptian campaign against the South Arabian Federation and its British sponsors. Here is an area remote from the United Arab Republic, without visible impact on Egyptian security interests. Whether the Egyptian offensive is a diversionary ploy in the Yemen affair or a more general stirring up of trouble for trouble's sake, it only confirms American opinion that the United Arab Republic is always minding someone else's business.

This continuous keeping the pot boiling by Egypt causes serious problems for the United States. Not only does it have a number of specific interests in the countries involved, but its policy has been to promote tranquility among Middle Eastern states. We believe that disputes, small in themselves, run the risk of inviting outside interference and so spreading into a major conflict. We do not want to see our friends in Arab countries threatened by Egyptian meddling and we do not intend to have world peace shattered by small-nation disputes.

The second set of American complaints against the United Arab Republic is related to the first. Egypt's ability to involve itself in affairs throughout the area is based in part on its military and propaganda strength, and this deflects money from urgently needed economic development. While not massive as modern armies go (about 150,000 men for a population of 28 million), Egyptian forces are the biggest and best equipped in the Arab world. Their weapons and aircraft are by far the most sophisticated. Egyptian secret activities abroad in the form of subsidies, weapon supply and agents are large and continuous. These efforts are supported and extended by propaganda including subsidies to newspapers, writers, conferences, foreign students studying in the United Arab Republic and an extensive multilingual radio program.

All this is expensive. It may be argued that all nations incur such expenses; they are accepted in our chaotic modern world as a necessary part of "national security" which costs us all so much. But the point for Egypt is that it cannot afford the role of a dominant or dominating power in the area and at the same time win its internal fight against ignorance, poverty and backwardness. Remarkable improvements have been made in Egyptian life under Nasser's regime, but it is still touch and go as to whether the Egyptian economy can permanently bear the burden. Why does the United Arab Republic insist on incurring a high bill for activities abroad when at least some of this money is so desperately needed at home?

A third general cause for American suspicion toward Egypt is the continuing concentration of political power in personal hands. This is what the American means when he speaks of "dictatorship"—not so much a theory of government (as fascism or nazism) as a practical situation in which the fate of society and individuals is determined by one man or a small group of men upon whom the citizenry has no form of restraint.

It was to be expected that in the early days of the revolution, Colonel Nasser and his associates should become the de facto center of power in the country. But if a revolution is to be anything more than a coup de'etat, it must eventually broaden its base, diffuse its power and build a rule of law. None of these things appears to have happened yet in Egypt. Laws are promulgated by Presidential decree, there is no provision for a "loyal opposition," and expressions of criticism of government policies are only possible within the very narrow limits set by the Government itself. The press is firmly controlled. At times private citizens are under sharp surveillance (as during the 1962 French spy trials) and guilt by association plays a large role.

All this does not add up to a police state in the full pattern so familiar in Communist countries. But it does have a profound effect on society, generating an atmosphere of unpredictability and curtailed liberty. Insofar as the American sees world issues as involving the principles of freedom and responsibility, he is suspicious of the character of the Egyptian regime and the direction it has thus far been traveling.

This suspicion is related to another American question about the United Arab Republic, namely its relation to the Communist world. The more extreme statements that Nasser is at least a crypto-Communist and that Egypt is in fact, if not in desire, a Communist satellite can be dismissed as uninformed and wishful thinking. But whatever its intentions, the United Arab Republic, as Americans see it, has put itself dangerously in fee to the Soviet system. The Egyptian Army is equipped from top to toe with Soviet weapons. This makes the nation entirely dependent upon Soviet good will for military spare parts and replacements. In fact, the Soviet monopoly on the Egyptian regime's chief instrument of power—its military establishment—gives the Russians an absolute veto on certain Egyptian policies if they care to use it. Whatever the United Arab Republic's dedication to independence may be, its freedom of action in relation to the Soviets is more sharply limited than it is in relation to the free world.

Added to this is the belief that Soviet and United Arab Republic policies in the Middle East too often coincide. A major Soviet objective has been to dispossess the Western powers of influence in the area, thus opening the way for Soviet action. The United Arab Republic would appear to serve this through its attack on the British position, foreign bases (which are all Western), and nonrevolutionary Arab States with which the West has close relations. Thus, while Egypt does not intend to be a Soviet satellite, its own activities sometimes aid and abet Soviet interests and cause problems for the United States.

Finally, there is Israel. Depending on the knowledge and emotional commitment of the American, his attitude ranges from seeing in Nasser the dragon who will devour Israel as soon as he is strong enough, to the more sober recognition that the United Arab Republic's continued hostility to Israel is the keystone of the Arab attitude which refuses to consider even a remote possibility of peace discussions. This concerns many Americans who are in no sense Israeli protagonists. Insofar as the Arab-Israel dispute is a constant source of tension and conflict, its lack of solution is a constant threat to tranquility, progress, and stability in the Middle East. Many Americans want it settled, not because they favor Israel or the Arabs, but because they are thoroughly weary of alarms and excursions which periodically set the world's teeth on edge. If the United Arab Republic would exercise its leadership in the Arab world for a gradual rapprochement with Israel, everyone would breathe easier.

Accusation and counteraccusation—how much of it is strictly true? Only a detailed study of each issue would answer this, and then it would be seen that there is confusion as to facts and highly questionable judgments in the interpretation of them. But one thing is clear, when all the mythology has been extracted from the mutual causes for suspicion, a hard core of fact remains. Egypt has sound reasons for mistrusting the United States, and the United States cannot help but mistrust it in return. The crisis in confidence is real, not artificial, and it is the chief factor which must be taken into account by both countries if they desire to continue reasonably cordial relations to their mutual benefit.

Can confidence be restored? Given the causes for suspicion recounted above, it may be argued that this is impossible; the gulf is too wide and has been deepened over too many years to be bridged now. This is certainly true for the immediate future. Both parties need to understand and admit that the restoration of confidence is a slow business and that no sudden change in foreign policies will bring it about immediately. For one thing, national as well as personal characteristics are hard to change. Egypt is a revolutionary society and nothing the United States can do will alter that fact. All the problems of dealing with its ebullient and frequently embarrassing activities will continue and must be recognized as part of the given situation. On its part, the United States will not change its character as a leader of the free world with interests that frequently run counter to Egyptian desires. No matter what Egypt thinks or does, America will not place its own and its partners' security in jeopardy by turnin a blind eye on any Eyptian activity which causes tumult in the Near East or appears to strengthen the Soviet position.

This is to say that both countries will get along better only if each is more realistic about its capabilities of easily and quickly influencing the other's course of action. Americans are prone to think that they can play God in Near Eastern (and other) affairs, shoring up or bringing down regimes, or by threats and economic pressure forcing the United Arab Republic Government to take actions which it judges to be against its basic national interests. And Egyptians equally exaggerate their limited ability to put pressure on the United States through propaganda, appeals to revolutionary groups in other countries, or agitation against American positions such as Wheelus Air Base and the petroleum interests at the head of the Persian Gulf. Each country can damage the other, but neither can force a basic change in policy unless it is prepared to re-

sort to overt action—and in this the United States is in the stronger position.

If this fact is accepted, it means that differences and clashes of interest between the United States and Egypt will continue for some time. The problem is not to wipe these out (which is impossible) but to curtail and contain their power to threaten a reasonable relationship between the two countries. For this both sides must be prepared to take some positive steps. For the Egyptians, there must be a greater appreciation that the public image they create in the American mind largely determines what it is possible for the U.S. Government to do. The United States is a democracy, which Egyptians do not fully understand. Neither the Secretary of State nor the President can sustain a policy toward Egypt (even when it is the best interests of the United States) without some Egyptian help in creating a climate of favorable public opinion. When this climate is unfavorable, it is not because (as alleged by Egyptians) the American press is controlled by pro-Israeli interests or American Senators who are captives of the Jewish vote. It is because of what the Egyptians themselves do. They can now do several things which will help their position.

One is to display more dedication to carrying out their word. Failure to make even token troop withdrawals under the Yemen disengagement agreement has seriously shaken American faith in President Nasser's bona fides. Actions taken against foreign companies in Egypt despite earlier agreements and promises have the same effect. In general, Egypt must work to correct the impression of undependability which its actions have generated.

Egypt can also affect the American attitude by emphasizing accomplishments rather than propaganda as its implement of influence in the Arab world. The sound development of the Valley of the Nile economy with resulting success in raising living standards wil do much more to win Egypt a good reputation in the Middle East an abroad than strident and vicious radio broadcasts. The real measure of the Egyptian revolution's place in history will not be the extent to which it can outdo other Arabs in invective, but the degree to which it can stand upon its actual accomplishments of a better society. The Egyptian image as a responsible Arab world power has been badly damaged by its unceasing and raucous broadcasts.

Again the American attitude will be affected by the efficiency with which the Egyptian social and economic plans are carried forward. Great changes for good have taken place in Egypt, but great wastage of human and economic resources has also taken place in the process. American economic assistance has been large; but it is difficult to make the case for its continuance unless the Egyptian developmental process is tightened and foreign adventures curtailed in the interest of internal development. Economic conditions in Egypt are not as bad as many foreign observers would like to believe, but they are considerably worse than the Egyptian official admits. If the American is to be induced to continue helping in the remaking of the Egyptian system, he must be given more confidence in the process.

Then there is the difficult matter of Israel, which creates a continuing and most exacerbating strain in United Arab Republic-United States relations. Americans cannot expect Egypt to change its basic attitudes on this, any more than France can expect the United States to change its attitude toward Red China. But there are several things Egypt can do to ease the situation and thus create confidence in America, particularly in non-Zionist circles. One is to let its actions speak rather than its words. The Egyptian policy toward Israel over the past few years has, in fact, been encouragingly moderate. Nasser's public eschewal of aggressive military action as an answer to the current Israeli utilization of Jordan waters in a case in point. The trouble is that Presidential speeches often outrun Presidential policies. The Israel dispute is unnecessarily dragged in on every occasion and vague verbal attacks on Israel are taken at their face value in Congress and by the American public.

Even more important would be some steps by the United Arab Republic toward alleviating the arms race with Israel. It is the American conviction that this can be done without imperiling the basic security of the United Arab Republic. Acceptance of international safeguards in the development of atomic power and some willingness to consider means by which the arms level can be frozen at its present position would create a very favorable world reaction. Even if Israel did not respond, or respond fully, Egyptian leadership in this would go far to encourage the great mass of Americans both in and out of Government who want only to see peace in the Middle East.

But the task of creating confidence is not Egypt's alone; the United States must also be prepared to make some changes. The first is a greater consistency of approach. American foreign policy toward Egypt has been so erratic largely because Americans—like Egyptians—react rather than act. They do not recognize that it is possible for two countries to oppose each other on specific issues while maintaining a continuing and mutually profitable relation. It is too often an "all or nothing" policy. Either American wheat buys Egyptian compliance to an American viewpoint, or there will be no American wheat. This assumes that the object of American aid is to bring Egypt to heel, and that when this fails the only alternative is pressure totally to stop the aid program. This seldom works, and particularly it does not work with President Nasser. If the United States desires to protect such national interests as involve the United Arab Republic, it must be prepared steadily and quietly to pursue a policy that does not fluctuate like the stock market with every political crisis. American policy must be aimed at maintaining a relationship with Egypt, not on seeking pretexts to sever it.

This means that the United States must be more clear sighted in defining for itself and the United Arab Republic what its vital interests are. There is a confusion in the American mind—even among policymakers—between American interests and what Americans consider desirable. The latter is as broad as the moral values of the particular observer and includes a free press, the parliamentary system, private enterprise—or even the whole gamut of the American political system. Desirable as these may be to the Americans, they are not per se American interests, involving the essentials of national security. It is these latter which are the central concern of foreign policy and the American approach to the United Arab Republic must be made consistent with them.

It is as difficult for the United States to decrease suspicions generated by its policy toward Israel as it is for the United Arab Republic in the same situation. But the attempt must be made if American interests in the Arab world are not to suffer needlessly. The United States—like the United Arab Republic—has certain commitments in the Arab-Israel situation from which it will not retreat. These include recognition of Israel as a sovereign and continuing member of the international community of nations and support for and collaboration with the United Nations in dealing with questions arising from the Arab-Israel dispute.

Arabs need to understand and respect these commitments, as Americans must do. It needs to be made clear both in Congress and in sections of the general public that the American commitment to Israel is limited. Our commitments are not based on the assumption that in every and all circumstances we will come to Israel's aid. Nor is Israel (or any other Middle East state) the chosen instrument of the United States in its policy toward the area. The basic consideration must always be what serves American interests in the Middle East. And this must be so regardless of its effect in helping or hurting either Israel or the United Arab Republic.

This principle is understood in policymaking circles in Washington and, in general, action accords with it. The difficulty lies in the sensitive domestic political situation. Often it is felt that Israel and her protagonists must be placated by public statements, even though these do not herald a shift in American policy. It is too much to expect that all politicians will resist the temptation to drag Israel into their election campaigns as a vote-catching device, but at least responsible Government spokesmen can take more care as to the place and content of their speeches. It was unfortunate that President Johnson's first policy statement on the Middle East was made before an organization identified with Israel, just as it would have been equally unfortunate if it had been made to a pro-Arab group. It would also help if American policy decisions involving Israel could be kept out of election campaigns, thus underscoring their character as considered moves based upon American national interest and not merely election gestures.

Difficult tasks are evidently involved for both parties. Many will say, "Why bother to attempt them, when the differences between the two countries are so continuous and exasperating?" The answer is that both Egypt and the United States need each other; their realistic national interests demand reasonably cooperative relations. This is why, despite the strains and vagaries of policy during the past decade, there has never been an irrevocable rupture. In each period of bad relations, as the point of no return approached, both parties paused, took a new tack and tried to repair the breach. In the aftermath of the Soviet arms deal the United States did not succeed in isolating Egypt and possibly bringing about its downfall; and Egypt, despite strenuous efforts during the same period, did not permanently hurt American interests in the Arab world. Both found their capabilities more limited than they thought and their mutual interests more powerful than they had admitted. They therefore gradually returned to a policy of fostering better relations.

It is these mutual interests which form the basis of an enduring relation between the two countries. Despite suspicions, clashes and differences in policy, the United States and the United Arab Republic have concerns in common on which a reasonable cooperation can be built. Egypt wants to develop in independence, without becoming either a Western or a Soviet satellite. Similarly the United States, now increasingly recognizing the inevitability (and often the utility) of the nonalined position of many nations, is concerned to see Egypt independent. Egypt wants a better and more stable social system, with a rise in living standards for the masses of the Nile Valley. Here again American and Egyptian interests coincide; a stable Egypt is very much desired by the United States, for a major catastrophe there would have repercussions throughout the entire Arab world. To improve its economic situation, Egypt needs continuing ties with the West; even if the Soviet connection were to be increased vastly, the Soviet bloc cannot do what needs to be done for the Egyptian economy. And all of Egypt's foreign cultural, intellectual and technical traditions are of the Western world. With them the Egyptian feels at home. To make this Western connection secure in both its economic and cultural aspects, Egypt needs good relations with the United States.

So long as the United States has vital interests in Arab lands and the United Arab Republic has a role of influence and leadership, the two countries cannot escape doing business with each other. The question is whether they can be sufficiently mature, clear sighted and patient to work out gradually a consistent and mutually profitable relationship.

Let Us Stand in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in earlier remarks on the floor of the House, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, respected military commentator, which appeared in the Sunday New York Times Magazine for February 21, 1965.

In the article, entitled "We Must Choose—(1) 'Bug Out,' (2) Negotiate, (3) Fight," Mr. Baldwin argues for a greater use of American military power in Vietnam. He believes we must fight a war to prevent an irreparable defeat.

While I do not agree with Mr. Baldwin's observations and recommendations in every instance, it is my belief that he has made a distinct contribution to the dialog on this issue.

Among his suggestions which I believe should be implemented are these:

First, the United States itself must provide maximum possible security for our installations in South Vietnam. Rather than rely on the South Vietnamese as we have in the past, we should use U.S. armed guards to defend against Vietcong attacks on our airplanes, helicopters, barracks, and other facilities.

Second, Mr. Baldwin points out that coordination between the various U.S. agencies working in Vietnam could be further improved. This problem was evident to me during my visits to Vietnam, the last in October 1963. Apparently there has been some improvement, but more could be done to streamline our operations.

Further, he suggests that military troops in Vietnam be made responsible for holding the areas cleared of Vietcong guerrillas, a task at present being done by internal security forces. This recommendation deserves careful attention.

I do not agree, however, with Mr. Baldwin's belief that a commitment of U.S. combat troops under United States-South Vietnamese joint command is necessary at this time.

Rather, I would hope to see greater efforts being made to convince our allies in Southeast Asia—especially the South Koreans, Nationalist Chinese and the Filipinos—to send forces into South Vietnam to assist in defeating Communist aggression there.

WE MUST CHOOSE: (1) "BUG OUT," (2) NEGOTIATE, (3) FIGHT

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

What should we do—"bug out" or fight? Should we be hawks or doves? Or is there a third choice—negotiations now?

Recent events in Vietnam indicate that "the war that is not a war" has reached a crossroads. Washington's policy of the past 4 years, based on the polite fiction that we were not fighting a war but merely helping the Vietnamese to defeat the Vietcong insurgents within their own territory, has reached a point of no return.

Compromise and consensus—perhaps applicable to some of the Nation's great domestic problems—cannot be guideposts to foreign policy. There must be a clear-cut and courageous decision. And though in Vietnam we face the hard problem of risking much to gain little, the risk must be taken; we must fight a war to prevent an irreparable defeat. We must use what it takes to win.

Our policy should not be "unconditional surrender" or unlimited victory. Our goal of victory should be the defeat of Communist attempts to conquer South Vietnam and extend their control deep into southeast Asia.

The reasons we must fight for Vietnam have little to do with making Saigon safe for democracy or freedom. There has been far too much cant on this point, far too much effort devoted to trying to establish a politically legitimate South Vietnamese Government after our own image. Nor does it do much good to argue the past, debating whether or not we should have become involved in Vietnam in the first place. The facts are that Communist expansionism in Asia has been consistent, related and progressive, that the end of the Korean war, without a simultaneous settlement in Vietnam, gave Peiping and North Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh the opportunity in southeast Asia they have so well exploited.

Belatedly, but nevertheless clearly, the United States became aware of the threat. Our commitments to Saigon began in the Eisenhower administration and were enormously amplified after the Kennedy administration took power 4 years ago. Today, we are committed—fully committed—by the words of Presidents and Cabinet members, by the actions of the Government, by the deep involvement of U.S. military forces.

U.S. global prestige and power is intimately bound up with the outcome of the Vietnamese struggle. In Vietnam, we are attempting to formulate an answer to the Communist strategy of creeping aggression, of subversion and insurgency, of what Khrushchev called "wars of national liberation." If the might and will of the United States cannot evolve a victorious answer to such tactics, we are undone; the map of the world will gradually become red. And if we will not fight in Vietnam, where—after the series of Communist conquests in the past 20 years—will we fight? Where will we draw the line?

The psychological and political consequences of a U.S. defeat in Vietnam, a U.S. withdrawal, or a negotiated peace likely to lead to a Communist takeover, would be disastrous in much of Asia. It would undermine Thailand (already openly threatened by Peiping), Laos (even now half conquered by communism), Malaya, the Philippines (with its growing anti-Americanism), Burma, India, Japan, and even Taiwan, Okinawa, and Australia.

For a long time after the politically stalemated end of the Korean war, Peiping was successfully depicting the United States to the peoples of Asia as a "paper tiger." The defeat of the French—backed heavily by American aid—in Indochina enhanced this image of a windy, weak-willed, feeble Uncle Sam. That image has since been dispelled by U.S. actions in and around the Taiwan Straits, during the Cuban missile crisis and, recently, by President Johnson's retaliatory air attacks upon North Vietnamese objectives. But the portrait of flabby indecision could be easily revived if the United States loses in Vietnam.

Strategically, South Vietnam is too important to be allowed to go by default. North Vietnam badly needs the rice of the South. More imporant, the area is the traditional rice bowl of the continent. Geographically, Vietnam is a long appendix pointing toward the rich archipelago of Indonesia and abutting strategic sea passages. Whoever dominates it will eventually control most of the Indonesian archipelago.

The strategic importance of the area is similar to the so-called "rimlands," or maritime nations, of Western Europe which represent a powerful bastion against the "heartland" of Soviet Russia. In Asia, the non-Communist strategic position vis-a-vis Red China is based upon mainland positions—Pakistan, India, southeast Asia, and the island bastions of the Philippines, Taiwan, Okinawa and Japan. If the "rimlands" of Asia fall to communism, the island positions will be doomed sooner or later. Ultimately the Communists will challenge us upon what is now our unchallenged domain—the oceans.

In a word, we must remain in southeast Asia for our own security needs. South Vietnam is in itself not "vital" in the sense that the United States cannot live without it. But if lost we would be forced to commence the next chapter of the world conflict in retreat, and at a disadvantage.

Despite the admitted importance of South Vietnam to the U.S. global position, the current breed of neoisolationists and the "doves" who believe we must cut our losses and get out advance many arguments against deeper involvement and in favor of withdrawal.

Most of the arguments represent the voices of defeat and despair, caution and fear.

"Why not negotiate now?"

Any negotiations opened now would lead from weakness, not strength. If we want to negotiate—and not to surrender—we shall have to raise our ante considerably. And "meaningful" negotiations are "meaningful" to the Communists only if they are faced with superior power and a position of strength.

We must "arm to parley." Personally, I seriously doubt whether talks can guarantee peace in Vietnam and southeast Asia, as some quarters have suggested, by neutralizing the area politically and militarily; in short, by eliminating the struggle for influence between Communists and non-Communists. Nevertheless, we need not fear negotiations if we speak from strength, by really putting up a fight for Vietnam.

Continuing U.S. air and sea attacks on North Vietnam would serve notice on Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow that the United States will no longer tolerate "sanctuary warfare." They might—hopefully—force Hanoi to the conference table. Indeed, such a policy would appear to be the minimum necessary to open any kind of negotiations. Yet even such a program will not "win" the war in the South.

"If the French couldn't win, how can the United States achieve victory?"

The implication of this argument is twofold: (1) we have donned the colonial mantle of the French, and (2) our power is no greater than that of Paris. Both suggestions are absurd.

As some of our diplomats have found to their discomfort, South Vietnam is distinctly an independent country—not, as in France's day, part of a colonial empire. In fact, the fear of Chinese Communist colonialism is probably greater in all of Vietnam, and in North Vietnam in particular, than the fear of United States "imperialism." As for a comparison between the political, economic, and military power of the United States and France, there is none. Particularly in the air and at sea we can mobilize power completely unavailable to France, backed up by the ultimate force which France did not possess—a nuclear arsenal.

"You can't win a war against guerrillas."

Not true. We have dressed up the fighting in Vietnam with a fancy name—"counterinsurgency," but some of its basic mili-

tary elements resemble the kind of war Americans have fought successfully many times in the past in Nicaragua, Haiti, and behind the main fighting fronts during the Korean war. Other anti-Communist guerrilla wars were won in Greece, the Philippines, and Malaya. The Portuguese seem to have done a pretty good job of stamping out the rebellion in Angola. Guerrillas can be defeated, but it takes careful organization, special training, and security forces that should be from 10 to 30 times larger than the guerrillas. It takes infinite determination and patience.

"Continued fighting or expanded U.S. involvement will mean higher U.S. casualties and greater risks of broadening the war."

Of course. You cannot win a war without spilling blood. We must pay the price of power. Risks are unavoidable in any foreign policy worthy of its name. The question is not whether there will be risks, but the degree of risk. For against the perils of action must be weighed the perils of inaction. Political and military history clearly reveal that compromise, hesitancy or appeasement merely lead to ultimate disaster. In Vietnam, the longer we wait, the greater the price we shall have to pay for even partial victory (as we are now discovering), and the more restricted our choice of options.

"We have no moral right to be in Vietnam, or to attack North Vietnam."

Neither do the Vietcong. Nor does North Vietnam have the right to support the civil war in the South. Our involvement was a response to Communist aggression. Since the beginning, Hanoi has organized, supplied and directed the Vietcong insurgency. We were invited by the South Vietnamese Government to come to its aid. A high moral purpose is an essential element of our foreign policy but we can be left with no purpose—moral or otherwise—if we are conquered by the doctrine that the ends justify the means. If we are inhibited from action by Hamlet-like indecision over legalistic concepts of international law, we shall lose the world.

"What's the use of further military involvement, when the political instability of South Vietnam pulls the rug from under our feet?"

Here is one of the more cogent objections to greater involvement. But in the long history of Vietnam there have always been feuding sects and factions. Moreover, the French left behind them a people still unequipped for self-government. Yet somehow or other the war has gone on, and somewhat better in some respects recently. Greater U.S. involvement—above all, a tangible determination to win—may well do more for Saigon's political stability than any amount of diplomatic pressures.

"Isn't the real danger that escalation might involve us in a larger war? Wouldn't the Chinese come in?"

"This is the $64 million question. It is quite clear that if the United States becomes more involved we must be prepared for greater effort by the enemy. Escalation in some form would be not only possible, but likely. But we have advantages. We are fighting, as we did in Korea, on a peninsula where our superior sea and air power can be most effective. North Vietnam's few powerplants and industries are vulnerable to destruction. The Gulf of Tonkin is easily blockaded. And China itself, with an obsolete air force and minimal naval power, could not defend itself effectively against a determined air and sea attack.

Nevertheless, an expanded effort by the United States in Vietnam may well be answered by an increased flow of supplies and men from North Vietnam, perhaps by an all-out attack by the North Vietnamese Army, and perhaps ultimately by aid from China into South Vietnam. Though the flow could be hampered and reduced by air attacks it could not be completely halted. It is quite possible that the United States might become involved in a new kind of Korean war. But this would not be hopeless by any means. In fact, some well-informed authorities believe the United States could win a Korean type of war in South Vietnam-Laos against the best that the Chinese Communists could throw against us.

"What about the specter of nuclear weapons? Wouldn't Russia join in, even if China didn't have enough A-bombs to do us any harm?"

There is no certain answer to these questions, but a full scale nuclear war is highly unlikely. The United States has scared itself to death by its own nuclear propaganda. The fear of a nuclear exchange—never probable, or even likely—has been the greatest single restraint upon a positive and firm U.S. diplomacy since World War II.

Presidents and public alike have been inhibited by the nightmare of the mushroom cloud. Yet the lessons of the Cuban missile crisis should be remembered. Is it in any way probable that the Kremlin would risk for Vietnam what it would not risk for Cuba? Moscow knows our nuclear power. Would Russia invite its own destruction as a nation by invoking the use of nuclear weapons in any cause except the defense of its own soil? The questions answer themselves.

We must also remember the risks of delay. If there is a danger of nuclear retaliation today by Peiping, how much greater will it be tomorrow when China will have accumulated a stockpile of weapons? Time is restricting our options.

Clearly, then, the stakes in Vietnam are large enough to warrant the risks of greater U.S. involvement. Whether or not we raise our ante, the enemy will. The Communists are implacably determined to triumph, and the only factor that can prevent their victory is superior power in all its forms. More of the same on our part will no longer serve any purpose, save slow defeat.

What should we do? First and foremost, we must recognize as a Government and as a people that we are fighting a war in Vietnam, not merely advising how to fight one. Such a recognition would awaken a greater sense of national and military determination, inspire a Presidential and congressional enunciation of purpose, and create a more streamlined military operation in Vietnam.

Second, the United States itself must provide maximum possible security in Vietnam to major U.S. installations, such as airfields, supply depots, and headquarters. Secretary McNamara's statement that it was impossible to guard against such attacks as those recently made by the Vietcong against U.S. airfields and barracks is no answer. Of course, 100-percent security is impossible in any war; defense against terrorism and sabotage is especially difficult. But there is no doubt whatsoever that we can provide better security to key installations than the South Vietnamese, who have been responsible for the job in the past.

We need U.S. ground tactical units in South Vietnam to defend our installations. We need infantry battalions, military police companies, Army Engineers, and Navy Seabees to build aircraft revetments, dugouts, and protected barracks. Yet all this is purely defensive; it should reduce U.S. casualties but it will not win the war.

Another essential measure is simplification and streamlining of both the high military command and the "country team" units, composed of representatives from various Government agencies, that support our aid effort in Vietnam. We must get more Americans and more Vietnamese out of the bistros of Saigon and into the bush. The coordination between the military, the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency and the Agency for International Development is far better than it once was. But it is still far from perfect, in Saigon or in Washington. The war has shown, for instance, that South Vietnamese-United States teams have been able in many instances to carry out the military portion of the "clear and hold" prescription for victory. But AID—not the military—is responsible for police and internal security forces in Vietnam, and these cadres rarely have been able to hold an area once it has been cleared of the Vietcong. Perhaps military troops should be charged with the "hold," as well as the "clear," part of the operations. Certainly internal policing needs a major overhaul.

A basic change in the prescription for victory demands a United States-South Vietnamese unified command such as now exists in South Korea.

Continuous and heavy air and sea attacks against staging areas, supply routes, training fields, camps and recuperation centers of the Vietcong in North and South Vietnam and Laos will be necessary for any appreciable diminution in the flow of men and supplies to the Communists. The one-shot retaliatory raids have only temporary and minimum military importance; viewed as political and psychological warnings, they are likely to provoke the Vietcong and North Vietnam to a redoubled war effort.

The history of airpower dictates the need for unrelenting, massive attacks. Bombing targets in North Vietnam probably would have to be broadened to include powerplants, bridges, industries, road junctions, docks and oil storage facilities. A naval blockade and naval gunfire may well supplement the air bombardment. To carry out effectively any such program as this, U.S. air and naval forces in the Western Pacific would require material strengthening.

Meanwhile, it would take years of effort inside South Vietnam itself to reduce the Vietcong to manageable proportions. Much larger and better led, South Vietnamese forces would be necessary. They would have to be supplemented by U.S. ground troops—perhaps in small numbers at first, but more later, particularly if North Vietnamese regular forces and Chinese soldiers joined the Vietcong.

How many U.S. soldiers would be needed is uncertain—probably a minimum of three to six divisions (utilized chiefly in battalion or brigade-size units), possibly as many as 10 or 12 divisions. Including Air Force, Navy, and supporting units, perhaps 200,000 to 1 million Americans would be fighting in Vietnam.

Obviously, this would mean a Korea-type conflict, a major war, no matter what euphemisms would be used. Nor could we wage it in the present "business as usual" economy. We would require partial mobilization, vastly beefed-up military production. Many weaknesses in our military structure would need strengthening. Even so, we could not anticipate quick success. The war would be long, nasty, and wearing.

No one could relish such a prospect as this; the stark statistics of war explain the President's reluctance to embark upon a path that has no turning.

Vietnam is a nasty place to fight. But there are no neat and tidy battlefields in the struggle for freedom; there is no good place to die. And it is far better to fight in Vietnam—on China's doorsteep—than fight some years hence in Hawaii, on our own frontiers.

Bonneville County, Idaho, Wheatgrowers Relate Comparison Between Wheat Prices and Equipment Purchases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, wheatgrowers in Bonneville County, Idaho, have been surveyed by their own association on one aspect of the farm situation which I believe has application nationwide. Responses to questions concerning the relationship of prices received for wheat crops to their intent and ability to purchase new field machinery reveal clearly the impact on the flow of domestic commerce.

Contrary to opinions expressed about the ability of our economy to remain at a high level, even if farmers are forced out of business, I believe this poll indicates the importance of farmers in our total economy.

The results of the survey, sobering as well as enlightening, obviously reflect attitudes of farmers in more than one area of the Nation. Therefore, I request that the report of the Bonneville County Wheat Growers Association be made part of the RECORD.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the survey follows:

BONNEVILLE COUNTY WHEAT GROWERS ASSOCIATION RELATE COMPARISON BETWEEN WHEAT PRICES AND EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

A survey just completed by the Bonneville County Wheat Growers Association revealed some startling facts, which should be of great interest to labor unions, the steel industry, automobile industry, farm implement manufacturers, and also our local and national chamber of commerce.

The Bonneville County Wheat Growers Association recently mailed questionnaires to Bonneville County farmers whose principal source of income is the production of wheat. The purpose of this survey was to determine the age of the major pieces of farm equipment owned by the farm operators—and to learn something of their intentions to replace old equipment with new equipment.

In addition to determining the age of equipment presently employed in the production of wheat on Bonneville County farms, the survey asked the operators to list the equipment, and value of the equipment, they would be able to replace in the next 2 years if:

(1) Present market price continues? This is presently $1.24 plus 41 cents or $1.65 on normal production on 60 percent of normal wheat production acreage.

(2) The price of wheat is $2 per bushel?

(3) The price of wheat is $2.36 per bushel? (The $2.36 is the price a French farmer receives for all the wheat he can produce, and also a figure which approaches our parity price of $2.60 per bushel.)

A tabulation of the survey, which was mailed to some 200 farmers, and which brought replies from 98 operators, reveals the fact that they own: 142 crawler tractors, 80 percent of which are over 10 years old; 19 percent, or almost one-fifth, are over 20 years old; 146 wheel tractors, 60 percent of which are over 10 years old; 19 percent of which are over 15 years old; 136 grain combines 73 percent of which are over 5 years old; 161 trucks (1½-ton and over), 81.5 percent of which are over 5 years old; 115 pickup trucks, 50 percent of which are over 5 years old.

In reply to the questions regarding the replacement of their old equipment, the answers were as follows:

At present low price, these 98 operators can afford to buy, during the next 2 years: 1 crawler tractor, 1 wheel tractor, 1 grain combine, 3 trucks (1½ ton or over), 10 pickup trucks, for a total value of $67,800.

With a $2-per-bushel price, these 98 operators feel they could afford to buy, during the next 2 years: 17 crawler tractors, 22 wheel tractors, 20 grain combines, 30 trucks (1½ ton or over), 26 pickup trucks, for a total value of $778,900.

With a $2.36-per-bushel price (the price in France, but 24 cents below 1964 parity in the United States) these 98 operators feel they could afford to buy, during the next 2 years: 55 crawler tractors, 52 wheel tractors, 58 grain combines, 84 trucks (1½ ton or over), 64 pickup trucks, for a total value of $2,368,659.

In analyzing the returns of this survey, it is apparent that a high percentage of the major items of equipment in use on Bonneville County wheat farms needs to be replaced. It is apparent also that the operators of these farms realize the need of replacing this old equipment. However, it has been over 16 years since Idaho farmers have received a parity price for their wheat, and if they continue to receive only 58 percent of parity, it is impossible for them to purchase the new equipment. A parity price is, of course, the price a farmer should receive for his commodity to enable him to stay out of the war on poverty, and pay for the labor and tools necessary to produce his crop.

Further analysis of the survey reveals that these 98 farmers faced with the prospect of receiving 58 percent of parity for their crop, anticipated spending only $67,800 for new equipment in the next 2 years. However, if if their price was up to parity, they feel they could afford to purchase $2,368,659 of new equipment. This is an increase of not 35 percent, not 350 percent, but a whopping 3,500 percent.

The board of directors of the Bonneville County Wheat Growers Association is suggesting to the State and National Wheat Growers Association that a similar survey be made at State and National levels. The board of directors feel that it is the responsibility of the Nation's farmers to inform industry and labor of the great loss of potential sales, and millions of new jobs for labor that are being denied the American labor force—simply because the American farmer is selling his produce so much below a parity price.

The world's 1964 wheat crop was the first in 6 years to be as great as the world wheat consumption. With the worldwide population explosion, it appears that wheat, or any food, would be good merchandise to have on hand. At present the United States is the only nation in the world which is not urging its farmers to produce more wheat. In 1964 when the Idaho farmers received $1.65 per bushel for the wheat produced on 60 percent of their normal wheat producing acres, farmers in Finland received $4.59 per bushel; farmers in Switzerland received $4.36 per bushel; farmers in Norway received $3.86 per bushel; farmers in Germany received $3.01 per bushel; farmers in Portugal received $2.94 per bushel; and farmers in Spain received $2.79 per bushel.

It is logical to assume that wheat producers of Bonneville County and the entire Nation, will not be able to replace their old equipment as long as the price of their commodity is so far below a parity price. It is time that industry and labor, as well as the farmer, awaken to the fact that American agriculture, with its high percentage of old equipment, is in poor condition. Old equipment requires many repairs, and can not be depended upon. Well directed sabotage or attack on steel plants, automobile, and implement plants, which produce new equipment and parts for old equipment, could rapidly reduce this Nation from a land of plenty, to a land of shortage.

It is interesting to note that the Idaho farmer receives 3 cents for the wheat in an 18-ounce box of nutritious wheat cereal which sells for 49 cents. If the Idaho farmer gave the wheat to the manufacturer of this nationally advertised cereal, it would still cost the consumer 46 cents per box. Only 6 percent of the cost to the consumer goes to the farmer for producing the wheat, and 94 percent of the cost to the consumer is for transportation, packaging, labor of processing, advertising, profit, etc.

It is also interesting to note that in 1948, when Idaho farmers received $2.84 per bushel for their wheat, a loaf of bread cost the consumer one-half as much as it does today when the farmer receives $1.65 per bushel. Thus we can conclude that the price of wheat has little or no affect on consumer cost of wheat products. It is difficult therefore to imagine that labor or industry could object to the full parity price for wheat when they will benefit so greatly. If we can assume that all wheat producers in the Nation are faced with the same problem as Bonneville County producers, we can safely say that labor, industry, and local business, as well as the farmer, are suffering a great loss from the depressed price of wheat.

The Bonneville County Wheat Growers Association feels that it has taken a step in the right direction in making this survey, and intends to see that copies of it go to labor unions, the steel, automobile, and major farm implement industries.

The "Great Society" and "war on poverty," which we hear so much about these days, will succeed only if each segment of our national economy has the income to purchase what the other produces. With an income reduced to 58 percent of parity, the Idaho wheat producer has taken a great leap backward—while the Chinese Reds take their great leap forward.

C. DONOVAN JAMES,
Bonneville County State Director.

United Maritime Effort Urged To Bolster Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the splendid speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] relative to our maritime policy has received wide coverage in the press and I believe that Members who read his speech in the RECORD of February 22 may also be interested in articles from the news which I ask leave to include with my extension of remarks today. The articles follow:

UNITED STATES, LABOR, INDUSTRY: UNITED MARITIME EFFORT URGED TO BOLSTER FLEET

(By Robert F. Morison)

WASHINGTON, February 18.—Representative JOHN ROONEY, Democrat, of New York, high-ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee, issued a call tonight to maritime labor and industry and the Government to act to strengthen the merchant marine. He also said "some of the proposals now being advanced seem to be directed toward the

demise of the merchant marine rather than to its promotion."

(Representative ROONEY, guest of honor at a dinner here given by the Propellor Club of Washington, D.C., did not mention by name Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson, but did come down hard on ideas discussed publicly and privately by Mr. Johnson as possible steps to be taken to form part of President Johnson's "new policy for the merchant marine.")

EMERGENCY SHIPPING

In addition, Representative ROONEY said "I doubt the wisdom or practicality" of the continuation of the policy of U.S. reliance on American owned or controlled ships under foreign flags being available in an emergency. He pointed out that "it will be difficult to succeed in mutual security arrangements with responsible allied nations when we place their merchant marine below that of the so-called effective control merchant fleet. The sooner the wartime tubs under the flags of the so-called effective control fleets vanish, the better off we will all be. We should replace them with American-built ships under the American flag."

Despite his reputation as a possessor of a tight fist, Representative ROONEY, whose subcommittee handles maritime appropriations, said that the "country has gotten much more out of the merchant marine than the merchant marine ever got out of the country. * * * I believe that what we spend each year enabling our U.S.-flag fleet to compete on the high seas is returned manifold in jobs—in taxes—in service—in security—in the promotion of our import and export commerce."

SUBSIDY PROGRAM HAILED

However, only in the area of the subsidized liner fleet was Representative ROONEY pleased at the maritime state of affairs. It is clear that the overall fleet is not what Congress had in mind in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act and subsequent promotional legislation. Failure to meet congressional maritime aims, in his view, was due to—administrative agencies not adequately carrying forth their responsibilities to develop programs to implement maritime policy, recurring labor unrest, "lack of an economic nationalistic spirit among our exporters and importers to patronize flagships of their own country, unwillingness on the part of management to promote maximum operation under the American flag."

Representative ROONEY said his 20 years in Congress dealing with maritime problems has convinced him that labor and management must achieve "cooperative leadership" to attain any progress so that bargaining disputes can be settled without "reaching such proportions as to tie up our ships and ports and impair the health and welfare of the Nation."

AIMS MUST BE OUTLINED

Also, Government, working with labor and management, should decide on "the specific kind of merchant marine our Nation requires" and present it to Congress.

He suggested giving serious study to a department of transportation, or at least a change to "bring all transportation together under an independent commission responsible to commerce." All administrative functions of such a body, he said, would be separate "from ratemaking functions."

As to some of the recent suggestions for possible changes, Representative ROONEY said proposals to permit any foreign ship construction by U.S. operators "leaves me completely cold." It would be a "sad day in our maritime history when Americans who travel by sea must rely principally or entirely on foreign ships," and "I can't believe that anyone is serious in wanting to phase out any segments of our industry from cargo preference in hauling Government-generated cargoes."

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

REPRESENTATIVE ROONEY HITS HARD AT MARITIME PROPOSALS

(By Robert S. Burns)

Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, of New York, yesterday sharply criticized virtually every point of the controversial merchant marine policy being advocated by the Maritime Administration.

The Brooklyn Congressman blamed the low state of the Nation's overall merchant fleet on the failure of Federal agencies to implement the present maritime policy. He also blamed labor unrest, insufficient promotion by management, and lack of support by shippers and corporations that operate foreign-flag ships for the decline of the American merchant marine.

Mr. ROONEY, in a speech prepared for delivery at a dinner meeting of the Washington Propeller Club, aimed his sharpest barbs at the Maritime Administration. To those who hold that the Nation is spending too much money to support American-flag ships, he said:

"This may sound strange coming from a member of the Appropriations Comittee. But I believe that what we spend each year in enabling our U.S.-flag fleet to compete on the high seas is returned manifold in jobs, in taxes, in service, in security, in the promotion of our import and export commerce and in our national stature among the nations of the world."

JOHNSON

Mr. ROONEY did not mention Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson by name, but he left no doubt to whom he was referring in charging: "Some of the proposals now being advanced seem to be directed toward the demise of the merchant marine rather than to its promotion."

Mr. ROONEY voiced his opposition to proposals pushed by Mr. Johnson by:

Opposing any wholesale abandonment of the policy of assigning subsidized ship lines to trade routes deemed essential to the nation's commerce.

Reaffirming his support of operating subsidies that enable American ships to compete in foreign trade.

Ridiculing the proposal to permit subsidized ship lines to build freighters abroad.

Deploring the failure of this country to halt the contraction of its passenger ship fleet.

Questioning the logic of denying American-flag ships the right to carry half of all U.S. government-financed foreign aid cargoes.

MAILLIARD

Earlier yesterday, Representative WILLIAM MAILLIARD, Republican, of California, also came to the support of the American merchant marine. In a speech on the floor of the House, he urged American industries to help reduce the balance-of-payment deficit by shipping more cargo on American-flag ships.

Only about 70 percent of the capacity of American freighters is being used by American shippers, the ranking minority member of the House Merchant Marine Committee said.

American lines would earn an estimated $350 million in increased operating revenue, 60 to 70 percent of which would help reduce the payment deficit, if American shippers fully utilized American tonnage, he predicted.

LINES PROMISE TO BACK PRESIDENT

The Committee of American Steamship Lines yeterday promised to support President Johnson's campaign to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit by promoting the use of American-flag ships.

Worth B. Fowler, CASL chairman and president of American Mail Line, said at a meeting of CASL presidents in Washington that his group has "established a permanent trade expansion committee to assist American manufacturers in locating and expanding suitable markets abroad for their products."

MERCHANT DEFENSE FLEET—TOO BIG?

Thorkil Host, president of the Moller Steamship Co., asked last night whether the United States was economically justified in maintaining a large fleet of merchant ships for defense purposes.

The president of the Danish-owned company spoke at the 55th annual dinner of the Traffic Club of New York at the Commodore Hotel. He said he supported the policy, but questioned how large the fleet should be.

Mr. Host criticized the Federal Maritime Commission's intervention in the activities in ocean freight rate conferences and the Nation's cargo preference laws.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Fishing in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, the Honorable Frank Boykin, recently called to my attention an excellent article written by Mr. I. B. (Buck) Byrd, chief of the fisheries section of the Alabama Department of Conservation.

Needless to say, fishing and related industries contribute to Alabama's economic health. Mr. Byrd's article, which follows, indicates that Alabama's 1,100,000 acres of water provide many hours of fishing leisure, as well as commercial fishing opportunities:

EVERYBODY HAS GOOD LUCK WHEN THEY GO FISHING IN ALABAMA

(By I. B. Byrd, chief fishery biologist)

Fish are one of Alabama's most important and valuable resources. Fishing provides relaxation and recreation to more people in the State than any other outdoor sport. Including children, about three-fourths of a million Alabamians spend about $50 million annually in search for the "big ones."

Alabama's 750,000 fishermen can't be wrong. Fishing is without a doubt one of the most challenging, entertaining, relaxing and rewarding outdoor sports known to man. Like the old man in Ernest Hemingway's book entitled "The Old Man and the Sea," almost everybody has the desire to catch and land the big fish. Then, once a big fish is caught, there is always the challenge to catch a bigger one. Some people fish for the "big one" and others fish so they can boast of the number they catch—regardless of size. A few admit fishing so they can "fib" because no one ever seriously questions the integrity of a fisherman. Some even fish to be with or without the wife or husband and family and still others readily admit fishing is the best nerve medicine—particularly when the fish aren't biting and they don't have to concentrate on a bobbling cork. One President of the United States once stated that he fished because this was the only way to get away from his busy routine "and pray for Divine Guidance." Regardless of the real reason that individual people may have for fishing, it is a restful and relaxing type of recreation and if you are lucky it provides meat for the table.

Fortunately, Alabama's fishermen are some of the most successful in the Nation. The catch per fisherman trip in Alabama is higher than for most other States; but this is no stopping place for the department of conservation's professional fishery biologists. The goal of the fisheries section of the game and fish division is to obtain even better fishing and and to strive to produce a maximum amount of desirable fish in every pond, lake and stream in Alabama. Great strides have been made through the cooperative efforts of fishery biologists of the Alabama Department of Conservation and Auburn University; but much more is to be done to supply the tremendous demand of future fishermen that will be created by an expanding human population and the anticipated shorter workweek.

By 1975 it has been estimated that there will be a demand for 11,105,000 man-days of fishing in Alabama annually and by the year 2000 there will be a demand for 17,187,000 man-days of fishing in the State annually. To satisfy the present demand and that which we are sure to have in the future, proper management of the State's waters is a necessity. This will require the skill of properly trained fishery biologists that are dedicated to improving fishing.

Fish management is complex and requires the skill of the professional. It requires the control of the fish population and the manipulation of the waters and all factors that effect the growth and propagation of fish. At present, more than one-half of all the fishing done in Alabama is done in its 20,000 small ponds and lakes that contain about 80,000 acres. This fantastic fishery is a direct result of management that was made possible through fisheries research. In most of these small lakes, there is no pollution, siltation, and rough fish. And, too, they are properly fertilized to produce a "bumper crop" of fish.

With its staff of trained fishery biologists and fish culturists, the fisheries section strives to maintain a well-balanced fisheries research, management and development program that is designed to provide the most fishing possible for each man-hour of effort and for each dollar spent. The activities of the section can be divided into the three categories of fisheries research and investigations; fisheries management and fisheries development.

Fisheries research and investigations includes a survey of all of the public ponds, lakes, and streams of the State to determine the factors limiting fishing in each pond, stream, or lake. This category also includes studies to determine the sources of pollution and the effects of the various types of pollution on fish and fish food organisms. Other investigational or research projects now in progress are experiments to evaluate new species of game fish imported from foreign countries, experiments of identifying and treating fish diseases and parasites, studies to determine new chemical and biological controls for obnoxious aquatic weeds and experiments to control rough fish that compete with game fish for fish foods.

Fish management projects that are presently being conducted by the fisheries section include the following: (1) Introduction of needed forage or carnivorous species of fish into public impoundments. (2) Stocking of new ponds and lakes and the corrective restocking of ponds, lakes, and streams where checks indicate a need. (3) Conducting biological checks to determine fish balance and advising pond owners of corrective measures. (4) Identifying obnoxious weeds and algae and offering recommendations for their control. (5) Checking new ponds before they are stocked and advising pond owners of proper management procedures to follow in order for their ponds to provide the best fishing. (6) Checking fish kills to determine the cause and recommend preventive or corrective measures.

The construction of State-owned public fish lakes, the development of public access areas to public impoundments and streams, and the development of artificial fishing reefs are the three primary development projects that are presently in progress.

Twenty State-owned public fishing lakes containing a total of 1,733 surface acres have been constructed by the Department of Conservation within the past 13 years. These lakes were constructed in those counties of the State that were deficient in public fishing waters and recreational areas. Nineteen of these lakes have been opened to public fishing for periods of 1 to 12 years and have provided a total of 1,500,000 fisherman-trips during which approximately 6 million fish weighing 1,900,000 pounds have been caught.

A total of 57 public access areas including paved boat launching ramps and car parking areas have been constructed by the Department during the past 5 years. These areas have been a real blessing to the fishermen, who had no place to launch their boats or park their cars in order to fish their favorite streams or lakes prior to the development of these areas. Public access to streams and lakes is vital to the fisherman and, in spite of the number of areas that have been developed to date, there is still a great need for more public access areas throughout the State.

Alabama fishermen are required to purchase a fishing license to fish in salt water. The funds from these licenses have been used for the construction of public launching areas along the gulf coast and for the development of artificial fishing reefs. These artificial reefs that consist of old car bodies, concrete blocks, and old barges concentrate salt-water game fish such as red snapper. Fishermen who fish over these artificial reefs consistently make good catches of red snapper and other salt-water fish. In these same areas there was little or no fishing prior to the construction of the reefs.

As mentioned previously, fish management is a rather complex science and there are no "short cuts" to good fish production. Poor fishing in many of Alabama's lakes and streams has been caused by a combination of factors including siltation, pollution, rough fish, and low fertility. Fishing in these waters cannot be materially increased until these factors limiting fish production are controlled or eliminated. Also, many of the streams in Alabama do not produce large yields of game fish because of their physical characteristics which are unsuitable for game fish habitats.

Pollution is the major factor limiting fish production in many Alabama streams. Industrial pollution has been particularly damaging in streams that are located adjacent to the industrial areas of Mobile, Tuscaloosa, Gadsden, Birmingham, Anniston and in many small communities having chemical, textile, mining, and lumber industries. A large number of communities and cities throughout the State discharge various quantities of raw domestic sewage into nearby streams or impoundments. In some cases, this has made large areas of waters unsuitable for fish or fishing.

The general use of pesticides and agricultural insecticides have caused severe fish kills in many streams and lakes during the past 12 years. These pesticides and insecticides should always be used with extreme caution near waters because they are extremely toxic to fish and fish food organisms.

The fish populations of the majority of the large impounded public lakes and streams in Alabama consist predominantly of rough or nongame fish. At the present time, legalized commercial fishing is the only practical method of removing these competitive species from public waters.

Low fertility is one of the major causes of low fish production and poor fishing in many streams and lakes of the State. The natural fertility of streams or impoundments is dependent upon the fertility of their watersheds. Therefore, the fertility of these waters will increase as soil erosion is effectively controlled.

Much time and money will be required to control the factors limiting fish production in streams and lakes of Alabama. Pollution may be corrected to a great extent by legislation and rough fish can be practically controlled by commercial fishing. However, improvement of soil erosion and low fertility can be accomplished only by wise land use and sound soil conservation practices.

Alabama is indeed fortunate to have such a vast amount of water. The State has about 30,000 miles of streams containing 110,000 acres plus 400,000 acres of large impoundments (reservoirs), 85,000 acres of ponds and small lakes and 500,000 acres of brackish waters. This is a total of about 1,100,000 acres of water. All of these waters plus the new ponds and lakes that are now being constructed in the State each year are capable of supplying ample fishing for Alabama sport fishermen now and in the future provided they are properly managed.

The department of conservation recognizes its obligation to the fishermen of Alabama and has, therefore, employed the best trained fishery biologists available for managing the State's waters. All of its district fishery biologists have master of science degrees in fisheries management and are dedicated to the objective of improving fishing in all of the State's waters. In order that fishery biologists may better serve the fishing public and more efficiently conduct fisheries research and management, a total of seven districts have been set up. At least one fishery biologist is stationed in each of the districts. Each biologist is primarily responsible for the fisheries management and research in his respective district.

The above information gives only a brief summary of the work being conducted by the fisheries section of the game and fish division in its efforts to provide good fishing to Alabamians who enjoy this fine sport. Fisheries research, management and development projects must be continued and expanded if Alabama fishermen are to continue to return from a fishing trip with a smile on their face. Surely they will.

Resolutions of Upper Missouri Water Users Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Upper Missouri Water Users Association, meeting in Billings, Mont., on December 9 and 10, 1964, in several concise resolutions stated the needs of water users in the four States represented in the association—Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

Their recommendations concern Federal land and water research activities, reclamation law and procedures, sugar-beet allotments, and relations between individual States and irrigation districts.

I ask unanimous consent that the nine resolutions be printed in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and I commend them to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 1—EXPANDED RESEARCH AND AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

Whereas the growth and development in the West, particularly in the Upper Missouri River Basin of the Great Plains, has been based on agriculture in which the utilization of water resources for irrigation has been an important factor; and

Whereas the food and fiber produced in this Great Plains area has materially contributed to the growth and strength of the Nation; and

Whereas the economy of this region will continue to be basically an agricultural one and its future growth and stability will be dependent on full development of the irrigation potential of the area; and

Whereas it is vital that future planning for development and utilization of the water resources in the Upper Missouri River Basin, recognize the importance of irrigation to the Upper Missouri River Basin and provide for the full development of the feasible and sound irrigation potential of the area by earmarking a sufficient amount of the available water resources for this purpose; and

Whereas a need exists in the Upper Missouri River Basin States for additional study and research directed to fully determine the value of irrigation to the economy of the region and Nation because of the increased and stabilized wealth that will be created from its development; and

Whereas the operating irrigation projects of the upper basin have a vital interest in the authorization and enabling legislation of new projects as a precedent leading to the recognition of the multipurpose benefits provided by the existing project without the participation of the beneficiaries enjoying such multipurpose uses; and

Whereas a need exists for enlisting the cooperation and support of other interested organizations and agencies in bringing all the resources of our irrigated agriculture to bear on these problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Upper Missouri Water Users Association in convention duly assembled in Billings, Mont., this 9th and 10th day of December 1964, That this association urges the four States represented by the association and all reclamation States to:

1. Join forces in a coordinated effort to compile, assemble, and examine existing research data relating to the value of irrigation to the economy with the view of defining and conducting new research in this field as needed so as to provide a comprehensive documentation reflecting the views of the States on the value of and need for irrigation development in the Upper Missouri River Basin and in the West; and

2. Utilize a substantial portion of the funds that will be available to the States under Public Law 88-379 for such research activity; and

3. Seek to have State funds and resources made available for this research activity to assure that the interests of the States and the region in future water resources development plans will be recognized and served; and

4. Join forces in a coordinated program whereby western irrigated agriculture can speak with one authoritative voice in the forums of the policymakers and legislators of the land relating to water resources development; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Governors of the States of Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, and South Dakota, and to institutions or agencies in said States which are or will be charged with the responsibility for land and water research activities, the Commissioner of Reclamation, and the Missouri River Basin planning officer for the Department of the Interior.

RESOLUTION 2—DETERMINE ACREAGE OF IRRIGABLE LAND

Whereas the provisions of the existing excess land laws are too inflexible and not in keeping with present economic and farm management requirements on many of the irrigation projects; and

Whereas piecemeal legislation has been enacted on various projects to recognize and relieve this situation; and

Whereas an economic size of irrigated farm is related to the limitations of soil, climate, and location: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That existing law should be amended to still retain the fundamental objectives of the Federal reclamation law but to permit the Secretary to determine the acreage of irrigable land which shall be considered an economic family-sized farm and nonexcess for purposes of water delivery.

RESOLUTION 3—GREATER TECHNICAL SERVICE NEEDED

Whereas considerable technical service is needed inside the farmers fence on Bureau of Reclamation projects; and

Whereas these technical services including soil and engineering surveys are needed for proper and efficient distribution and application of irrigation water which will best suit a practical farming system of crop and livestock enterprises and will conserve irrigation water and reduce seepage; and

Whereas farm operators can best obtain such technical services by cooperating with the local soil conservation district and with these services can develop a basic soil and water conservation plan; and

Whereas such technical service is not available in sufficient quantities through soil conservation districts because of demand for technical services throughout soil conservation districts and only a proportionate amount can be made available within boundaries of reclamation projects; and

Whereas the early availability of detailed farm plans prepared by the Soil Conservation Service would enable the Bureau of Reclamation to design and construct more efficient water delivery service to each farm unit at a very considerable saving in cost to the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Upper Missouri Water Users Association favor the inclusion of a line item in the appropriation of the Soil Conservation Service to provide for accelerated technical assistance to be used only as needed in soil conservation districts on Bureau of Reclamation projects throughout the Nation; be it further

Resolved, That officers of the Upper Missouri Water Users Association are hereby authorized to take any action toward this end which they deem desirable; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to all members of the four-States' congressional delegation, the National Reclamation Association, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Soil Conservation Service, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior and the Bureau of the Budget in Washington, D.C., also to the State reclamation associations and the State associations of soil conservation districts in the 17 Western States.

RESOLUTION 4—SOIL, WATER, AND RELATED RESEARCH

Whereas the continuation and expansion of a comprehensive soil and water research program through which basic data relating to irrigation and agriculture can be compiled are essential; and

Whereas such research activities should be directed to the more efficient use of our water and land resource and alternative uses of existing and new crops to provide farmers with additional income to match increasing costs and at the same time assure the production of an abundance of food and fiber for the population of this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Upper Missouri Water Users Association, That:

1. The Congress of the United States is urged to appropriate sufficient funds to implement the expanded program dealing with soil and water research set forth in Public Law 88-379 Expanded Water Research State Colleges.

2. The Department of Agriculture is urged to give a high priority to such an expanded soil and water research program.

RESOLUTION 5—APPLICATION OF RENTAL TO CONSTRUCTION CHARGE

Whereas certain lands, within the boundaries of irrigation districts, such as isolated tracts that are not suitable for irrigation, have been withdrawn by the United States for reclamation purposes; and

Whereas such lands are leased by the United States to the irrigation districts for releasing to water users within such districts that, in the case of several projects in this region, has resulted in the accumulation of credits from land sales, rentals, and other miscellaneous revenues; and

Whereas said lands, in most cases, are a natural and necessary part of the units for which they are leased and to the economy and operation of the irrigation district, and the revenues derived from such lands should be applied to the construction obligation of the district concerned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Upper Missouri Water Users Association, That this association urge the Commissioner of Reclamation to take such action to establish procedures whereby all rents and revenues received from such lands shall be applied to the current construction obligation of the irrigation district in the same proportion as the actual obligation of the district is to the total cost of the facilities constructed for the district.

RESOLUTION 6—SALE OF STATE LANDS WITHIN IRRIGATION DISTRICTS

Whereas lands owled by States within the boundaries of irrigation districts are served by canals, laterals, headgates, and other structures which are part of the district works; and

Whereas such land is not assessable for operation and maintenance and repayment of construction costs and does not otherwise contribute a proportionate share toward the cost of operation and maintenance of district works; and

Whereas such land does have infestations of noxious weeds and drainage problems; and

Whereas such land is not assessable for support of local weed control and drainage districts; and

Whereas such lands are a detriment to the management of a district and an unfair financial burden to the owners of other lands in irrigation districts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State land boards be requested and urged to offer for sale all State-owned lands which lie within the boundaries of irrigation districts.

RESOLUTION 7—INCREASE IN CROP ALLOTMENTS

Whereas the small farmer, typical of irrigation projects, is limited in his ability to support his family because of restrictive allotments of certain crops: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Upper Missouri Water Users Association, That this association—

1. Supports the allocation of any future increase in allotments to the small farmer; and

2. Urges that allotment acreage assigned to land that is acquired for highways, reservoirs, or other developments, be retained and distributed among the small farmers in the region or areas where such developments take place; and

3. Oppose any new restrictions on the production of sugarbeets in our four-State area.

RESOLUTION 8—ENDORSEMENT OF NRA RESOLUTION

Be it resolved, That the Upper Missouri Water Users Association support the National Reclamation Association resolutions passed at the annual meeting in Palm Springs, Calif., in general.

RESOLUTION 9—APPRECIATION

We, the members of the Upper Missouri Water Users Association, express our sincere appreciation to Harold Aldrich, regional director of region 6, Bureau of Reclamation, and the many members of his capable and efficient staff for their assistance in making the meeting of this association a success, and to the many participants in the program of this convention for their informative and timely presentation, and to all others who assisted in making the arrangements for this meeting.

Robert P. Bauman Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1965, the city of Cincinnati lost one of its most dedicated and accomplished civic leaders, my good friend Robert P. Bauman. Only 38 years old when he died, Bob Bauman leaves behind a brilliant record of achievement and the memory of a deep, abiding friendship for all those privileged to have known him. He will not soon be forgotten, by his friends or the people of the community he loved and served so well during his brief span.

A successful and respected business leader, Bob Bauman was immediate past president of the Cincinnati Real Estate Board and a trustee of the Ohio Association of Real Estate Boards.

A sincere humanitarian, Bob Bauman was untiring in his work to aid his less fortunate fellow townsmen. His efforts on behalf of the United Appeal and other similar programs were but a part of his major contribution in making Cincinnati a better place to live for all its citizens.

Bob Bauman was a deeply religious man, a member of the board of stewards and a former member of the board of trustees of the Hyde Park Community Methodist Church in Cincinnati. He was also a man loyal to those traditions and institutions which had helped shape and enrich his own life, not the least of which was his beloved alma mater, the University of Cincinnati.

I think of all the tributes we might pay to Bob as a civic leader, the one he would most appreciate is the fact that he did great credit to his university. He always took deep pride in the University of Cincinnati as being the finest of America's municipally owned institutions of higher learning. His personal record as a product of the university will serve as a source of pride and inspiration for all those who cherish that great institution as Bob did.

Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1965, the Cincinnati Post & Times-Star featured a column on Bob Bauman by one of its staff members, Bob Heidler. Under unanimous consent I insert this article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"GENTLEMAN BOB" IS LAMENTED

Robert P. Bauman, 38, partner with his father in the Oscar E. Bauman & Co., Realtors, and immediate past president of the Cincinnati Real Estate Board, died Thursday. Bob was full of honors earned in his industry and with the Home Builders Association, of which he was member, and in many civic enterprises and in Methodist church work.

At invitation of the Post & Times-Star, the following tribute was written for this expert on homes, and as a note of sympathy to his family, by Thomas Dooley, executive vice president of the board.

"He was our friend. We were privileged to have known him. He was a gentle man, kind and gracious in manner. His constant smile reflected his personality of charm and happiness.

"He was a strong man—firm in allegiance to principles of honesty and integrity by which he directed both his private and public life.

"He was a humble man, ever mindful of the expendability of man's earthly life and work compared with the destiny of his eternity.

"He was a proud man, justifiably, who worked for the merits of his country, his State, his industry, and his company.

"He was a leader, who shared unselfishly of his many talents in behalf of the profession he loved and who blazed the path of righteousness tempered with justice and charity.

"He was a follower, who pursued the truth, as he saw the truth.

"He shall be missed and remembered.

"May Almighty God grant to him eternal rest and to his lovely wife and delightful children, tender sympathy and understanding."

A Topsy-Turvy World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the assistant rabbi of Temple Israel, in Boston, is Harvey J. Fields, an Oregonian, whose family are still constituents of mine. He has called my attention to an interesting reprint of an article entitled, "A Topsy-Turvy World," written by Rabbi David Polish, of Evanston, Ill. I read from the article:

There is a world out in space which is an exact duplicate of our own. * * * Billions of dollars are spent by governments on the conquest of disease. Over the years, nations have poured their resources into medical research; and today no cancer, no vascular disease, no kidney ailments * * * exists.

The thoughtful, but tongue-in-cheek, article concludes as follows:

People are grumbling that under such a policy there will never be a war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Rabbi Polish's article entitled, "A Topsy-Turvy World," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TOPSY-TURVY WORLD

There is a world out in space which is an exact duplicate of our own. It is populated with men and women like ourselves. They live in countries like our own. They conduct business and raise families. They live under various economies and governments, and are divided into different national, religious and racial groups. They differ in only one respect. In each country there is a pathological obsession with human welfare. As a result, over 60 percent of the national budgets are devoted to a compulsive and hysterical desire toward sheltering life from the normal ravages of human existence which we accept more stoically. Billions of dollars are spent by governments on the conquest of disease. Over the years, nations have poured their resources into medical research; and today no cancer, no vascular disease, no kidney ailments, no degenerative disease exists. Unheard of sums are spent by governments on housing. They have so tortured their fiscal policies that slums and blight are unheard of. They are so overprotective of their children that they overpay teachers, and training schools for teachers have to turn candidates away. The perverseness of these conditions reaches its greatest height in their legislation against all private charities in behalf of human welfare. The outlawing of private charity has, of course, stifled the philanthropic instincts of the people.

There is only one exception to this restriction against private benevolence. Since the national budgets are so swollen with welfare appropriations, there is little left for national defense. It therefore becomes necessary for private citizens to raise money for armaments. Thousands of private organizations exist for this purpose alone. There are clubs to buy guns through raffles. People stand with tincups on street corners to collect coins for the purchase of hand grenades. Drives are conducted to acquire tanks. There are tag days for military aircraft. Cousin clubs sponsor dances to buy uniforms. The national governments simply neglect the problem of defense and let the burden fall on private agencies. But the inadequacy of this system is apparent to all. People are grumbling that under such a policy there will never be a war.

—RABBI DAVID POLISH,
Beth Emet Temple, Evanston, Ill.

The British Empire, as It Recedes, Leaves a Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Castle, Ind., Courier-Times editor of February 18, 1965:

THE BRITISH EMPIRE, AS IT RECEDES, LEAVES A HERITAGE: THE COMMONWEALTH IS PARTICULARLY INTERESTING PHENOMENON

As the Roman Empire receded it left in its wake a heritage of law, civil administration, and Christianity throughout western Europe. Roman (Romance) languages, of course, were to spread from Italy, France, and Spain to Latin America and elsewhere. This heritage became the broad foundation of Western civilization, and the cultural basis, too, for such developments as the European Community.

Today the British Empire is receding, and the heritage it leaves is altogether as remarkable. The Commonwealth of Nations is a spiritual and cultural link that still binds 700 million people together, acknowledging the Queen as a "symbol of the free association of the independent member nations, and as such the head of the Commonwealth." In addition the Queen is recognized as the head of state by 12 of the 19 independent Commonwealth countries; the remaining 7 are republics.

Britain's great gift to them (and to us, of course, and all the world) is parliamentary government by which the people are governed through their elected representatives. But there is also the English language, which the British Empire spread so effectively that it is the predominant language of the world. And then there is the British system of justice that has been carried almost everywhere.

Formerly there were considerable trade advantages to belonging to the Commonwealth, but the general lowering of trade barriers and the expansion of world commerce has made Commonwealth countries less dependent upon trade preferences. The loss of economic advantage, however, seems to make no difference in their sense of unity. Commonwealth countries are proud of their ties, which are mainly ties of culture and the Commonwealth is one of the important and significant political entities of this century.

It is an accepted fact that political entities are responsible and responsive to the laws of organisms as contrasted, for instance, with the laws of physics. They are born, grow, develop, adapt, and have varying life spans like the biological world. Like the biological world, too, the rule is infinite variety. As no two leaves are exactly alike, neither are any two nations. There was a time when we had dinosauers, and there was a time when we had city states—and the territory between the walls of one city and that of another came under no authority.

In our own time we are witnessing the efforts of nations to change and adapt to a changing world. There also are some new political manifestations: The growing consciousness of area loyalities as in the Arab States, the European Community, and the Organization of American States; the creation of the United Nations, and the vitality of the Commonwealth of Nations.

Political entities are always babies when they are born, just as people are babies at birth. It is their nature to require time for growth and development. The United States was a century old before it attained the age of responsibility. The U.N. is having growing pains just now. The Commonwealth, because it is older, and because there is no other political organism just like it, is particularly interesting.

Proposed Empire State Building Commemorative Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Empire State Building is known throughout the world, and is, of course, one of the outstanding symbols of America. Millions of visitors from America as well as visitors from overseas have visited the Empire State Building and its observatories. The building has become in the eyes and minds of millions of people all over, a symbol of New York, of the United States, and of the free enterprise system of America under which it was built. A request has been made of the Post Office Department to issue a 5 cent commemorative Empire State Building U.S. postage stamp commemorating the 35th anniversary of the opening of the world's tallest building in 1966.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the formal request, which is being made to the postal authorities, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the request was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPIRE STATE BUILDING,
New York, N.Y.

To: U.S. Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

Formal request: Empire State Building commemorative 5-cent postage stamp.

The Empire State Building, a towering monument to creative ingenuity and the American free enterprise system, respectfully submits this formal request for the issuance of a 5-cent commemorative Empire State Building U.S. postage stamp.

Such an issue would appropriately commemorate the 35th anniversary of the opening of the world's tallest building in 1966.

During the past 35 years, Empire State has become identified in the minds of millions as one of the Nation's outstanding landmarks—a symbol of America's greatness and technological leadership around the world. Because its soaring presence expresses the American way, it has virtually achieved the status of a public institution.

When persons from abroad think of America they often think of the great skyline of our largest city and of its Empire State Building.

Today, the New York City structure draws nearly 2 million visitors annually to its famed 86th- and 102d-floor observatories. Here these millions can scan a five State area for 80 miles—one of the most inspiring vistas ever fashioned by man. At the same time, the Empire State Building has drawn royalty, leading heads of state and other outstanding personages of the past four decades on a pilgrimage of wonders that will never cease. Both the Department of State, the United Nations, and other agencies, official, and unofficial frequently make it the first stop when they have distinguished visitors who want to see New York.

In a word, the Empire State Building's 1,472-foot high tower of steel and its 10-million bricks rank it as an "eighth wonder of the world," alongside the Eiffel Tower, the Statute of Liberty, and other world landmarks.

In historic perspective, the Empire State Building arose during the difficult years of 1930–31, when the Nation faced a severe trial.

It required men of vision and resolve to transform the dream of the world's tallest structure into reality. In this sense, the building was fashioned under our free enterprise system: Behind its vision and reality were real estate, construction, and businessmen pooling their talents and resources in one of the most daring construction enterprises ever undertaken. Men such as Alfred Smith, four times Governor of New York State.

It is in the spirit of men such as this—as well as the many smaller investors who today hold an ownership interest in the structure—that Empire State Building can be

termed a fitting monument to the American way of getting things done.

During recent years, U.S. postal authorities, in issuing commemoratives, have been forging into entirely new areas, honoring a wide range of cherished American values, such as wildlife, music, the fine arts as well as events and battles during our history.

As far as can be determined, no commemorative issue has ever honored the free enterprise concept—the guiding spirit of our prosperity and national strength. It is the judgment of those submitting this proposal that such an American concept would serve as a fitting subject for a commemorative issue, especially during an era when our Nation's resources are committed to preserving our way of life around the world.

At the same time, it is respectfully submitted that the Empire State Building represents one of the most significant symbols of America in the eyes of millions of our friends and allies in Africa, Asia, Europe, and Latin America.

As a soaring edifice of steel, the reproduction of Empire State on a stamp would serve as an attractive graphic commemorative issue. Its silhouette would be recognizable instantly—anywhere.

In framing this proposal, it should be noted that there are other possible avenues through which Empire State might serve as an appropriate subject for a 1966 commemorative stamp issue.

1. The building, by way of suggestion, could be related to varied themes concerning New York City from its current 300th anniversary to other aspects of the city or State.

2. Perhaps the Post Office Department would consider using the Empire State Building as a symbol to commemorate the tradesmen, craftsmen and pioneers of the American building and construction industry which has so transformed America.

In setting forth this formal presentation for an Empire State Building commemorative stamp issue, we trust that the Post Office Department will seriously consider our proposal. We believe it worthy of favorable action, and will cooperate in every manner.

It is our understanding that this request will also be formally submitted by the U.S. Post Office Department to the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee for their consideration.

Proposal submitted by:

ROBERT L. LUERY,
General Manager, Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.

This 16th day of February 1965.

Lesson on the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, Henry J. Taylor wrote another thought-provoking column the other day that all Members of Congress should note.

The article follows:

LESSON ON THE WELFARE STATE—ALL SPECIES OF EVERYTHING DIFFER

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Yellowstone National Park rangers warn tourists not to feed the deer. Deer gradually lose their initiative and end up unable to feed themselves when tourists are not there.

Beavers are courageous. They also prove again that some animals can reason. But do not build dams that beavers should build for themselves. They bloat up and die when pampered.

Don't feed the chipmunks and squirrels. They tend to assemble into crowds in the handout localities and thereby disturb Nature's balance.

Porcupines, in turn, want only to leave well enough alone. They're like some purposeless people who believe the only way to live intelligently is to have no purpose in life, and would not take a steady job if you hit them over the head with a club.

Do the rangers' warnings contain any warnings about the full extension of the welfare state?

Politicians find it profitable not even to admit there are a great many porcupines among our jobless. In truth, a lot of our hardcore unemployment is beyond fiscal policy or any amount of tax spending.

Joblessness is tragic and all efforts to relieve it are good efforts. But much unemployment is on a par with the mistaken sentimentality that condones criminality as chiefly society's fault and dismisses the individual from responsibility, an important false reading of human nature.

Is the welfare state a feasible state, or merely the state of mind of the Government spenders?

Apparently our leaders also refuse to evaluate basic human differences throughout the world. Yellowstone's rangers would never make that dangerous, costly mistake; you can always tell a wolf from a dog. A wolf never carries its tail higher than half-mast. A dog seldom bites the hand that feeds it. Wolves will. The wolfpack rule is each for himself. They do not all attack one victim.

On some mysterious signal each leaps at his nearest neighbor and the slaughter is on. Don't try to convert them to friends by largess. As soon as you cease the giving a wolf will attack you. Won't Nasser, Tito, etc.?

When you see a Yellowstone bear you are looking at a living puzzle. Bears in resort parks grow more demanding and unpredictable as time passes. They become aggressive and demand more and more handouts and finally use force, if necessary, to get what you've made them used to. So do the Russian bears in the Kremlin. This is a weakness in our appeasement policy toward the species "homo sovieticus."

A lynx's eyes are never still. Rangers find the wildcat incredibly stealthy. Communists throughout the world never act openly if they can dispose of the resistance in an underhanded way.

Don't cajole the Yellowstone mountain lion. Even the most ferocious male is a henpeck when with a lioness, and whimpers docilely in her tufted ear. But both will finally break into your house to get what you've been tossing out. Can we afford not to evaluate countries now demanding our dwindling gold instead of paying their debts?

All species of everything differ, among themselves and with other species (lions bluff, tigers don't) and all are pygmies compared to the whales in the seas—these giants which are completely different from the entire mass of land mammals.

Italian Philosopher Pietro once said "we would be wiser if we spent more time analyzing how humans are than how we wish they would be."

Yet you can hardly get U.S. policy to admit even that Swedes are different from Spaniards, although anyone who made that mistake in Stockholm and Madrid would be out of his mind.

This is how we get in trouble trying to be all things to all men, in foreign aid and even in alliances.

We brothers and sisters on this earth number more than 3 billion souls. If we would stop pretending mankind is identical and that nations are potentially alike (if they just had the time and money) and simply spoke as a good friend and helper in the world, we would help more, be more respected and come closer to our mission of peace and understanding.

Address by James G. Patton to Indiana Farmers Union Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, earlier this month the Indiana Farmers Union at its convention in Indianapolis had as a speaker the distinguished farm leader, James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union.

Mr. Patton has for many years been a leading expert on problems of the farm, and not alone on economic affairs. His concern for the life and betterment of rural America is well known.

In his Indiana address, Mr. Patton discussed farm policy and national legislation in a manner which makes a reading of his speech useful to all of us who are struggling with the farm problem. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being on objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF JAMES G. PATTON TO INDIANA FARMERS UNION CONVENTION, FEBRUARY 3, 1965, CLAYPOOL HOTEL, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

As the 89th Congress gets to work on a backlog of legislative needs, farm families are again concerned with the low level of their earnings.

This Nation's farm programs in recent years have prevented disastrous declines in prices and net income that would have taken place in the absence of farm programs. But they are not perfect by any means, and need improving, as evidenced by the fact that the farm income situation is not improving. This is the job of the Congress this year, and it has the unqualified support of Farmers Union.

I do not share the point of view that farm programs are costing too much. And I want to make it clear that we recognize the needs of the small or subsistence farmer as well as the needs of the farmers who market in volume in the commercial market. Their problems are different, as we in Farmers Union have long recognized.

It will take our Federal Government to develop the programs needed to win the war against poverty and to get parity of income for the so-called commercial farm family. You can be sure that Farmers Union, with the backing of its members, will lead the fight in Congress to see that sound, workable programs are enacted into law.

I want to make it clear that we in the Farmers Union have always supported programs to provide for protection and improvement of the income of all the people in America. Family farmers and their children, senior citizens, working people, and main street small business.

It was the leadership that I was privileged to give as president of Farmers Union that resulted in the establishment of the National Policy Committee on Pockets of Poverty that paved the way both under President Kennedy and President Johnson to the development

of meaningful and worthwhile programs to combat poverty in our Nation.

Rural America has 16 million of the 35 million in our Nation who are living at poverty levels. The incidence of poverty in rural America as compared to the incidence of poverty in urban and city areas, is twice as high. With 30 percent of the population, rural America has nearly 50 percent of the poverty. Many poverty-stricken families in rural America do not farm on a large enough scale to be called farmers. I would hasten to point out, however, that farm programs are of benefit to all families in agriculture who market commercial products from their farms.

Recently the Director of the Budget, in an article in the Saturday Review entitled "How Much Should Government Do?" indicated that almost 1 million farmers have gross sales of over $10,000 and that these million farmers had an average net income of over $9,500, taking into account all farm and nonfarm earnings.

Let's look at these figures.

While it is true that the average earnings of the top million farmers is $9,500, not all of the million farmers were as fortunate as to earn as much.

In a more penetrating analysis of the statistics on which the Budget Director based his conclusions, it is found that only about 140,000 farmers in the United States—the top-income bracket with gross sales averaging $40,000 or more—had net earnings approaching the parity level. Instead of 29 percent of farmers earning parity of income, only about 8 percent of farmers are near the parity level. And this top bracket would not be where they are without farm programs.

The 185,000 farms whose gross sales fall between $20,000 and $40,000 are further down the income ladder and without farm programs would be in economic trouble.

Every grain farmer knows that it takes gross sales of from $40,000 to $50,000 worth of grain to earn $8,000 to $10,000. The fact is that a grain farmer is doing exceedingly well to net $1 out of $5 of gross sales after all expenses are paid.

There are 594,000 farmers whose gross sales fall between $10,000 and $20,000. This group is 22 percent below the level of parity income.

There are 609,000 farmers whose gross sales average between $5,000 and $10,000. This group fell 75 percent below parity income.

Forty-three percent of farm families have net incomes under $3,000 as contrasted with only seventeen percent of nonfarm families. The $3,000 level is the benchmark for measuring poverty. These farm families need more farm programs to raise their incomes. But cutting the budget for agriculture does not help the rural poverty stricken. The most obvious result of cutting farm programs is to aggravate the rural poverty problem.

To say, as Mr. Gordon did, that 1 million farmers are receiving parity income is to distort and confuse the income picture in agriculture. If the concern of the Director of the Budget is that too few corporate farmers are getting too much of Government aid, I invite him to join in our effort to channel Government aid to the commercial family-type farmer. This would make a lot more sense than the $428 million cut in price support and commodity programs in the 1966 budget.

I have called upon Congress to restore the cut. The heartless and cruel slicing of the USDA budget is apparently the result of the administration heeding the advice of the out-of-step Committee for Economic Development. Farm organizations almost unanimously repudiated in congressional hearings the ill-conceived and fallacious recommendations of an earlier CED report to drive 2½ million farmers out of agriculture. Following these hearings, we anticipated that the administration would support the efforts of Farmers Union as well as Members of Congress to reach goals of parity income and a repopulized, recapitalized, revitalized, rural America. Now, however, we find that the Director of the Budget is parading CED philosophy into the USDA budget and using it to justify a cut in farm income and in the number of farmers.

The U.S. farming community has been progressive in lowering costs and improving techniques. Our agriculture is a dynamic industry which has been increasing output per man-year at a faster rate than the economy as a whole. In this last quarter century, agriculture has released more than one-third of its manpower to other sections of our economy and to the production of other goods and services.

Our agriculture has been able to respond dramatically to a national call for production to meet the requirements of two major world wars. It has further served the national interest by furnishing large quantities of food beyond domestic needs for the relief of hunger in other nations. Our Nation has been able to furnish thousands of technical experts to work in agricultural development in the less developed countries. This capacity, both in food and in manpower, has enabled us to carry out our foreign policy with confidence and with more competency than would be possible if food and fiber shortages existed.

Considering the benefits that our Nation receives from abundant, efficient production of food and fiber, the cost of farm subsidy and control programs in recent years is far from excessive.

Studies by research economists in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, at Iowa State University, Cornell University, Pennsylvania State University, and Oklahoma State University, indicate that crop acreage control, price support, and commodity storage programs have increased net farm income by something like $6 billion per year, or about 100 percent in the last several years. This increase in farm income has been accomplished at a public expenditure of less than $3 billion per year.

Because of the inelastic demand for farm products, a relatively small public expenditure for production restraints and administered prices in agriculture has made possible a doubling of net farm income over what it would have been otherwise.

If this seems unjustified on grounds of equity, it should be remembered that income per person living on farms has barely maintained its ratio to income per person in the rest of the country in the last 15 years, despite a sharp reduction in farm population. Farm programs have enabled farmers to hold their own in relative income instead of suffering what surely would have been a drastic decline as a result of the increase in production.

A policy of higher incomes to commercial family farm agriculture will not stop the migration of high-cost producers out of the industry. Such a policy would help strengthen a system of agriculture which has proved its worth.

The poverty problem in rural America is a different problem. It is a national problem, just as poverty anywhere is a national problem. It can and should be met through education, a market basket social security program that automatically adjusts benefits to a cost-of-living index, a comprehensive program of medicare, expanded public and private health services, job counseling, and the creation of new job openings through a policy of full employment and economic expansion to include capital imputs into rural America in sufficient amount to provide the capital to revitalize and recapitalize rural America. This poverty problem is not closely related to the commercial farm problem. If the subsistence or least-productive third of farmers were to leave farming, according to the Department of Agriculture, it would have little effect on the total market supply of farm products.

What kind of farm policy?

This country is rich enough that it can choose over a wide range of farm policy. We can afford to pay for a high degree of voluntariness and few regulations, if that is what the majority of farmers want, to maintain parity price and parity farm income.

There can be no question but that the way to achieve a given level of farm income at the least governmental cost is through production control. The most expensive way to reach a given income target in terms of Government cost is through direct payments.

Our farm income support programs have been compromises between these extremes. Farm income has been raised partly by production restraints and supply management, and partly by direct Government payments.

In seeking a higher farm income goal, we can (1) increase the Government's budget for direct subsidies to farmers or (2) tighten up production controls to increase returns in the market or (3) continue to combine these two approaches.

Farmers Union in its legislative activities this year will support:

1. More effective supply management programs. This does not rule out voluntary programs where farmers prefer this approach.

2. Operation of farm programs in ways that will preserve strength in the family farm.

3. Establishment of CCC commodity loans to reflect prices at which commodities can be readily moved into world trade channels making up the difference between such levels and parity income through certificates and/or direct payments.

4. Conversion of Commodity Credit Corporation into a banking operation with cooperatives and other trade groups handling commodity transactions, and

5. Making it mandatory that CCC not sell any commodity below 120 percent of the loan rate plus expenses.

Marketing orders and agreements under the supervision of the Government should be extended to other commodities, including milk for manufacturing.

From an economic standpoint, it makes little difference whether we make greater use of direct payments or tighten supply management and raise price supports.

At this point it is appropriate to ask whether a policy of increasing the effectiveness of the policy of raising farm income and perhaps in the process market prices to consumers, is politically feasible. The answer is clearly yes.

As a matter of fact, the AFL–CIO consistently has backed farm income support legislation in Congress. Consumer and urban groups, to the extent that they have taken an interest in agriculture at all, have been more concerned with the problem of poverty in agriculture—migratory farm labor problems, the absence of welfare legislation for farmworkers—than in food prices. The National Consumers League, for example, testifying in Congress on farm labor and rural poverty in 1964, argued that the consumer could well afford the increase in cost of food that might accrue through providing a minimum wage and better living conditions for farm laborers.

The truth is that practically all the objection to farm production controls comes from certain farm organizations and agriculture-related industries, which have a stake in large volume farm production, and from theorists who see such regulations as beyond the pale of prescribed doctrine of free enterprice. Farm organizations in some cases have argued that consumer antagonism required a reduction in farm controls. There has been talk of farm price support legislation being a "bread tax" on consumers. So far as I have been able to find, this protest does not come from consumers. Furthermore, when a national farm organization

based its attack on the wheat-cotton bill on the charge that the wheat program involved a "bread tax," I called together a meeting of Representatives of the Congress, with labor, farm, and consumer groups. The facts presented at the meeting resulted in complete understanding and agreement so that when the meeting ended the "bread tax" charge was a dead issue. The proof is that over 90 percent of the city Democrats voted with Farmers Union for the bill.

We have unity in agriculture when 24 national farm and commodity organizations sit down together, as happened 2 weeks ago, and draft a strong family farm statement. Moreover, we have friends in the towns and cities who understand that the economic welfare of farmers and working men and women are closely interlocked.

This is the hope we in rural America have for the future toward the development of programs to wipe out poverty wherever it exists, and toward the goal of parity income for our family farm agriculture.

Splendid Job, Jaycees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity at this time to commend the members of the Jaycees in the Knoxville, Tenn., area for their outstanding work in the field of governmental affairs.

Particularly noteworthy is the recent successful effort known as "Operation Cleansweep," in behalf of cleaner elections. It is gratifying to know that this project has been chosen as one of the outstanding contributions toward better government in our State. It is also deserving of recognition throughout our Nation.

I would like to include the editorial comments from the Knoxville Journal lauding this project:

[From the Knoxville Journal, Knoxville, Tenn., Oct. 31, 1964]

SPLENDID JOB, JAYCEES

Those of us who have been aware during the past few years that wholesale voting irregularities were the rule in every local election could not have been surprised at the results of a postal survey just completed by Knoxville's Jaycee clubs in their "Operation Cleansweep."

This organization of young Knoxville citizens, having in mind the precious heritage of all of us in preserving our franchise free of fraud, in recent days mailed out 10,000 letters addressed to persons registered in the office of the Knox County Election Commission. Not unexpectedly to us, 5,109 of these letters were returned to the sender, the Jaycees, by mail carriers who marked on them "no such house number," "addressee moved," or "address unknown." A total of 24 letters addressed to persons whose names still remain on the books of the Knox County Election Commission was returned because the addressees were dead.

These results are similar to those revealed some months ago through an investigation by the Knoxville Journal and Cas Walker of voter registration in the 1st, 5th, and 11th wards. They will certainly be used in the lawsuit which grew out of the Journal-Walker investigation calling upon the election commission to enforce the State laws.

Prior to the hearing of the suit in chancery court, however, these investigations will bear upon next week's voting. The Jaycees, and others aroused by evidence of widespread irregularities for which the election commission has been directly responsible, will be at the city's polling places on Tuesday. There, as watchers, they will be in position to challenge any voter about whose eligibility to cast a ballot there may be some question.

We congratulate the Jaycees upon their effective work and thank them upon behalf of the community for the contribution they are making to both its welfare and self-respect.

[From the Knoxville Journal, Knoxville, Tenn.]

MORE JAYCEE COMMENDATION

We have commended here before the successful campaign of Knoxville Jaycees in behalf of cleaner elections, an effort known as Operation Cleansweep. The work done by the Jaycees was nonpartisan in character. Members of the organization operated as watchers at Knoxville polling places and, in addition, a by-mail probe was made to turn up irregularities in registration which confirmed earlier investigation made by the Knoxville Journal and Councilman Cas Walker.

It is gratifying to note that in the latter days of January, Operation Cleansweep was chosen the outstanding project in the State in the area of governmental affairs.

As the top State project, the campaign of the Jaycees will be considered in national competition in a seminar of the organization to be held in Washington late this month on governmental affairs.

These honors garnered by the local Jaycees as the result of long hours of effort in behalf of clean elections are well deserved and serve as an inspiration to the community.

Opposition to H.R. 2998, To Extend Life of U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, radio station WOKE, Charleston, S.C., has taken a very strong editorial stand against H.R. 2998, which would extend the life of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Members of the Senate will soon be called on to vote for or against this proposed legislation, which should be of concern to all Americans who have not fallen for the fallacious idea that our Communist enemies are changing into peaceful Socialists, and can therefore be trusted to lay down their arms, without any adequate system of inspection.

I endorse the comments of station WOKE; and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

February is being observed by many patriotic organizations such as the American Legion and Daughters of the American Revolution as Americanism Month. This month was selected because of the birthdays of two of our greatest Presidents, George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, whose lives personified the principles of the American way of life.

The American Legion and the DAR have always stood foursquare for all things American, alerting our citizens to the dangers within and without our great Republic; for this most Americans are grateful. These patriotic organizations have been greatly concerned over the establishment of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the outlined procedure of total and complete disarmament by the pamphlet 7277 released by the U.S. State Department. Many Americans from various walks of life and connected with many different types of organizations have become alarmed to note the progress of the gravediggers within our Government in slowing down or stopping production of vital weapons in the defense of our American Republic and leaving our country and its citizens in a vulnerable position.

Another national organization that was instituted about 2 years ago to work toward the eventual abolishment of this agency that is a threat to our security is the Americans for National Security. The board of endorsers is composed primarily of retired military officers from the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. The success of this infant organization is that it resisted and partially succeeded in having the budget of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency reduced. The goal of the Americans for National Security group this year is the complete removal of this enormously dangerous Agency from the American scene. As we related in an earlier WOKE editorial, the original Disarmament Act established this Federal Agency for only 4 years, which will expire on June 30 of this year.

We have called for a natural death of this deadly Federal Agency by asking that the U.S. Congress not extend its life another 4 years. However, evidently the President of our Republic has bowed to the influence and wishes of the one-world appeasers of coexistence, accommodation, and even surrender for L.B.J. has requested that the Congress extend for 4 years the ill-conceived and ill-thinking Federal Agency with a $55 million budget attached to his request.

The Americans for National Security points up that such an extension would place our Nation's security and sovereignty in the hands of a one-world government, enforced by an international army of occupation. This liberty-loving group with headquarters in Washington, D.C., asked that one of their spokesmen appear to testify before the House Foreign Affairs Committee but were refused. The AFNS organization learned that no public witnesses were permitted to testify in opposition to this scheme and that the committee voted the bill (H.R. 2998) out of committee after 2 days of private hearings. As the Americans for National Security group emphasized to all concerned freedom-loving Americans, this was contrary to the custom of all previous years and evidently the opinions of patriots and taxpayers were unworthy of consideration by the members of this House committee for all opposition was silenced and gagged by this unprecedented action.

In the U.S. Senate, the reception was much better for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has informed the Americans for National Security organization that they can testify this coming Monday when the Senate bill (S. 672) for 4 more years of disservice to the American Republic and the $55 million budget will be considered by the Senate committee.

We have stated many times that we believe that this Federal Agency and its ultimate

purpose of stripping our country of its military force and striking power and turning the remnants over to the so-called peace force of the United Nations present the greatest threat to the security and well-being of all American citizens and that we Americans should do everything we can to seek the termination of this deadly and un-American Agency by instructing the U.S. Congress to abolish the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency by simply not extending its life for another 4 years on June 30.

What can you do, as an individual * * * a question that we have been asked hundreds of times? Sit down today and write a formal letter to Washington for inclusion in the record of the Senate committee. Address this letter of statement to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, but do it now for FULBRIGHT's committee has allowed only 2 days for public hearings on what could be the second step of the three-step plan of total disarmament and eventual surrender to the enemies of the American Republic.

The Americans for National Security organization feels that the real reason for L.B.J.'s Great Society is disarmament * * * that the money saved on military spending could be devoted to socialistic vote-buying schemes that would eventually leave us outvoted, outnumbered, propertyless serfs under a self-appointed cabal of internationalists and Communists.

Remarks of Congressman John C. Mackie at the Annual Meeting of National Limestone Institute, Washington, D.C., January 19, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the remarks made by Congressman JOHN C. MACKIE, at the annual meeting of the National Limestone Institute held in Washington, D.C., on January 19, 1965.

Congressman MACKIE is one of Michigan's best known public officials. He served as State highway commissioner for a number of years. Under his leadership, Michigan moved into a position of national leadership in highway construction and today has more than 70 percent of its designated 1,080-mile Interstate System open.

As president of the American Association of State Highway Officials, Congressman MACKIE played a major role in efforts to improve and expand the Nation's highway system.

I am glad to offer his excellent remarks for the RECORD:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN C. MACKIE AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF NATIONAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 19, 1965

It is indeed a pleasure to be with you today.

Last fall, when your president, Bob Koch, invited me to address today's session, I was in the middle of a political campaign and wasn't quite sure whether or not I'd be in or out of public life after November 3.

I was still State highway commissioner in Michigan and it seemed only natural that I should talk about highways. So I wrote Bob and said I'd talk on "The Future of the Interstate System."

Several things have happened since last fall. I was elected to Congress and I'm now an ex-State highway commissioner.

Since my arrival in Washington, many people have asked me what I did before my election to Congress. When I tell them I served as State highway commissioner for nearly 8 years, they invariably ask me which Governor appointed me to the job.

And they are usually amazed when I tell them I was elected. Until January 4 when I resigned, Michigan was the only State in the Nation that elected its highway commissioner in a statewide election. We had been doing it that way for more than 50 years until some political scientists decided there was a better way. They were helping rewrite our State constitution and decided a four-man bipartisan highway commission appointed by the Governor was better than a highway commissioner elected by the people. I don't quite agree with that theory, but that's another story.

One of the real pleasures of serving as State highway commissioner in Michigan was to guide the development of our freeway system. Eight years ago, Michigan had about 100 miles of freeways. Today, we have more than 1,200 miles.

About 800 miles of these freeways are interstate highways. The other 430 miles are State freeways built to interstate standards. The only difference is in the financing, 90 percent Federal money on the interstate routes and only 50 percent on the State freeways.

So I've had an opportunity to see firsthand the impact that interstate highways have on Michigan and its people.

Motorists love them. Business and industry like them. And so does the farmer.

Freeways are here to stay.

The present Interstate Highway System will total 41,000 miles when it is completed in 1972. About half of the system is now completed.

But there are problems ahead, mostly financial. Some people seem concerned about the balance of the highway trust fund and they suggest maybe the completion of the Interstate System should be postponed from 1972 until 1975 or later.

There are other problems, too. Most of the toll roads and turnpikes are part of the 41,000-mile Interstate System. Congress must decide how these toll roads and bridges are to become free just like the rest of the Interstate System.

In Michigan, I might add, all of our superhighways are toll-free with the exception of the $100 million Mackinac Bridge which is part of Interstate 75.

In my new role as a Congressman, I'll do everything possible to urge that the present Interstate System be completed by 1972—earlier if at all possible.

At the same time, I would hope that Congress would authorize additional interstate mileage to be built after 1972. Several proposals already have been introduced in Congress calling for a 10,000- to 20,000-mile expansion of the Interstate System after 1972.

I favor expansion of the system and I believe Congress should adopt the necessary legislation this year so the Bureau of Public Roads and highway departments in the 50 States can start now to plan for construction of the additional mileage after 1972.

Some people, including a few of my colleagues in the House, might think such legislation can wait until next year or the year after that. What's the hurry—1972 is a long way off.

I would only remind them that the original planning for the present Interstate Highway System began in 1921; that's right, in 1921. After World War I, the War Department made comprehensive studies of highway routes important to the Nation for the movement of wartime goods.

The Army officers who made the study worked closely with the Bureau of Public Roads which, by the way, was then a part of the Department of Agriculture.

The studies made in the 1920's formed the foundation for further studies out of which evolved the Interstate Highway System. But it wasn't until 1944 the Congress adopted legislation creating the Interstate System and another dozen years passed before adequate financing was made available to build the Interstate system.

So you can see it's not too early to start planning for after 1972.

America is in the midst of the greatest economic boom in its history, nearly 4 years of uninterrupted prosperity.

And a new wave of young drivers—the war babies—is upon us. They not only need more colleges to go to—but cars, roads, and parking space to go along with them.

In 1922—when I was 2 years old—Americans drove 67 billion miles. America was on wheels and rolling. Who would have believed it in 1912, 10 years before? But that was just the beginning. Let's see how the miles driven rose, then skyrocketed in the past few years.

In 1922 Americans drove 67 billion miles.
In 1932, 200 billion miles.
In 1942, 268 billion miles.
In 1952, 513 billion miles.
In 1962, 767 billion miles.

What will this figure be this year with 8 million new cars and hundreds of thousands of new drivers on our roads?

What will it be in 1972? My hunch would be that we Americans will drive more than a trillion miles that year.

Actually, traffic congestion has plagued mankind since early days of the Roman Empire. Julius Caeser was probably one of the first persons who tried to solve the problem. He banned wheeled traffic from the heart of Rome during the daytime. But this interfered considerably with sleep and didn't solve the problem.

We are spending billions to put a man on the moon while traffic jams continue to plague us as they did in Caeser's time.

The automobile industry is building and selling cars faster than we can build new highways to accommodate them.

The general population is growing at a faster rate than our highway capacity.

I am sure no one would suggest that we dispense either with new cars or new people, so the solution eventually must be an expanded highway program.

The importance of highways in the growth and development of America is gaining increased recognition. Road authorities at all levels of government are being called upon to be more intensely involved with local planning for development of industrial parks, urban renewal, airports and recreational park areas.

In order to meet our transportation problems, they must be attacked in a broad and impartial manner with a goal of developing the safest and best transportation system for the ultimate benefits of all our citizens, especially the traveling public. The motorist, after all, is the one who pays for our roads and streets.

Continued economic growth and good highway programs are inseparably tied together. Like love and marriage in the song, you can't have one without the other.

Thank you.

A Bill To Designate the Fourth Friday in September of Every Year as American Indian Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would designate the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day. The language of the bill is quite simple, and I will cite it briefly for the benefit of my colleagues:

That the fourth Friday in September of every year is designated as American Indian Day, and the President of the United States is authorized to issue annually a proclamation setting aside that day as a public occasion and inviting the people of the United States to observe that day as a day of educational and cultural observance.

Mr. Speaker, I thought perhaps my colleagues would like to be apprised of this intention so that they may join in this move to pay homage and render due honor to America's first citizens, if they so desire. My reasons for doing this are not to set them apart, but only to enable all Americans to convey to them the honor and recognition that they have long deserved, as part and parcel of the great historic tradition of our country.

Briefly, to clarify my reasoning further:

First. The American Indians are the original Americans and have resided on this continent since time immemorial; and

Second. They have made an indelible imprint on our national character and culture by their contributions to the history of the ancient world and the civilization of the modern world; and

Third. American Indians have lifted themselves from the status of a primitive race of people to that of an educated, responsible, patriotic, and significantly important section of our population; and

Fourth. American Indians have made persistent efforts to remain uniquely individual and independent as a race and as Americans; and

Fifth. Because of all of these things, the light of truth and knowledge should be turned upon the American Indians to aid in the development of a better understanding of them, to promote and encourage respect for them, and to help create conditions in which their economic, cultural, and educational welfare may be advanced.

With the adoption of this bill and the proper focus of national attention on the original inhabitants of this land, I believe we can start to develop far-reaching programs that will maximize the participation of Indians in the advancement of their personal objectives.

In this way, the Indian community will benefit from the evolving economic opportunities and all America will benefit from the broader display of Indian lore and its place in American history.

New York Times Speaks Out for St. Croix River Between Minnesota and Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the St. Croix River is the last clean river near a large metropolitan area. The Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area now has a population of 1,600,000 and will grow to 4 million in the next 35 years. The St. Croix should be preserved for recreational use.

I submit to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial from the February 17 New York Times.

THE NEW CONSERVATION—III

Two widely separated rivers—one in Maine and the other in Minnesota—exemplify the nationwide problem of reconciling the needs for industrial development, for recreation and for unspoiled beauty.

Deep in the north woods of Maine, the Allagash River flows for nearly 100 miles through great forests of spruce, birch, and maple. The Allagash is the only remaining river in New England that is still close to its original wilderness state. It is nearly as perfect for canoeing today as it was when the first Indians saw it centuries ago.

The Interior Department would like to keep it that way by making the Allagash a national riverway. But the Maine Legislature is now considering a bill to create an authority to build a mammoth hydroelectric dam on the Cross Rock site on the St. John River. This would destroy the Allagash, which flows into the St. John, by flooding it.

There is absolutely no necessity to ruin the primitive canoe country in order to harness the St. John. There are feasible places to build power dams above the mouth of the Allagash. Senators EDMUND S. MUSKIE and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, are among the sponsors of a bill in Congress to authorize hydroelectric development at two other sites in conjunction with the tidal power project at Passamaquoddy Bay.

Meanwhile, State officials in Minnesota are pondering the application of the Northern States Power Co., to build the first of two coal burning powerplants on the St. Croix River. This beautiful river, which for part of its length serves as the boundary between Wisconsin and Minnesota, branches off from the Mississippi only 20 miles from Minneapolis-St. Paul. The St. Croix is the only unpolluted river still running near a major metropolitan area in this country.

The proposed powerplant would put an end to that rare distinction. To cool its machinery, the plant would draw water from the river, later spewing it back 15° hotter. There would be a coal pile stretching along the river bank for a half mile, an endless string of coal barges coming and going, and from the plant's smokestack would pour sulfur dioxide, a noxious gas that pollutes the air.

This powerplant could just as well be built on the Mississippi in an area which is already highly industrialized. The upper portions of the river deserve protection as a wilderness river, while the lower portion needs controlled development as a recreation area for the 2 million people who live nearby. Senators GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, and WALTER MONDALE, of Minnesota, are cosponsoring a bill that would achieve these objectives but would not actually bar the building of this powerplant. Here, as in Maine, the local authorities may have the final say.

Yet the St. Croix, like the Allagash, is a natural resource that belongs to all of us. Congress will be failing the Nation if it permits these rivers to be despoiled by private greed and shortsightedness.

National FFA Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Future Farmers of America Week in recognition of the great contribution which this organization of the farm youth of America has rendered, is rendering, and will render to this Nation.

The Future Farmers of America stretch the length and breadth of our land as part of our vocational agriculture program in our schools. Brilliant in conception, it gives practical application to those lessons taught within the schools. Leadership, scholarship and vocational agriculture are made meaningful through participation in the FFA.

Might I allude to a personal reference, for no experience other than my church and my family has meant as much to me personally. Having once trod the trail of greenhand, chapter farmer, State farmer and American farmer, I know full well what the FAA can mean to a boy.

Perhaps the greatest thrill of my life came when I was elected by my fellow FFA members in Florida to serve as their State president. It was a thrilling and rewarding experience, and I feel that this experience and broadening were directly responsible for my ambition to serve as best I could, our fellow man. From this I feel came my election to the Florida House of Representatives and then to the Congress, and for this I am deeply grateful.

The FFA recognizes a new day in agriculture. It makes it meaningful. It teaches of increased productivity, of sound management of our natural resources, and for the good, full life which all would enjoy.

Florida is celebrating 37 years of FFA activity, with 9,700 members at present. During its years of operation in Florida, the FFA has had over 100,000 members.

In every county we have seen its benefits. Increased productivity has followed knowledge. Increased leadership has followed training. Increased scholarship has followed instruction.

This Nation is richer because of the Future Farmers of America.

In a day when knowledge and leadership are vital to our Nation, in a day when we require only the best of each individual in order to survive, the FFA has played a vital role.

I salute the men in the teaching and adviser role of the FFA, to those in its administration, and particularly to the young men who number themselves on its roll.

I join all Americans in saluting February 20–27 as National Future Farmers of America Week. All Americans are richer for its having been founded and for its success in enriching agriculture in particular, and American youth in general.

"To the Last Hour," Factual Story of a Living Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have the good fortune to be Members of Congress from the great State of California are indeed proud that our State is the home of one of the world's most far-reaching and creative industries: motion pictures.

During my travels as a Member of Congress, both in our country and abroad, I have encountered many self-styled critics of the California film industry. Because of the almost unlimited freedom the motion picture industry enjoys, its products are often susceptible to criticism. But I do not think such criticism is too high a price to pay for freedom of expression.

However, from time to time a motion picture comes forth that is very nearly above criticism. Recently, I learned about a film which I believe will be exactly that. This motion picture is presently on the drawing boards of the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Co. and is entitled "To the Last Hour." Although I know little about the technicalities of motion picture production, the very nature of this film demands comment—even by a layman.

"To the Last Hour" is a factual story of a living man named Oskar Schindler. On Christmas Eve 1963, the Government of Israel presented Mr. Schindler with a citation honoring him for saving the lives of 1,300 Jewish men and women in Poland and the Sudetenland during World War II. In commemoration of Mr. Schindler's bravery, a tree has been planted in his name in the famous Park of Heroes in Jerusalem. Perhaps the most significant point is that Oskar Schindler is a German and a Catholic.

From what I have ascertained, the theme of the film transcends the barriers of language, religion, nations at war and even personal heroism. The true hero of this story is the precept that man's humanity to man must always prevail; that if, in the face of incredible dangers and adversities, a man can be found who will become his brother's keeper, then we must accept this sign of hope that one day a true peace will be built from friendship and understanding.

I know of no motion picture in recent times that conveys so great a message or that has the potential to weave all peoples into the common thread of international brotherhood. I wish to congratulate Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. Co. and its president, Robert O'Brien, for lending their facilities and talents to the creation of a film of this scope.

New Medical Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to insert the following editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Pasadena (Calif.) Star News, Feb. 4, 1965]

NEW MEDICAL PLAN

The 22,000-member California Medical Association has brought forth a broad proposal for health care of the aged in this State, and it seems to go far toward curing the defects in some of the other plans submitted to date.

These include the administration's medicare program, the American Medical Association's eldercare program and the assorted compromise versions offered by Republican blocs in the Congress.

The CMA plan, unveiled Monday, is similar to the AMA's in its main thrust. It is more comprehensive than medicare because it would pay the doctor's bills, as well as the hospitalization and nursing home expenses, of persons over 65 who could not afford them.

Also, most of the payments in behalf of the elderly needy patients would be handled by private health insurance firms.

But the California plan varies in a major respect. Under it, the State and the Federal Government would pay—in advance—to the insuring firms. In effect, public funds would be used to pay the insurance premiums for elderly persons who otherwise could not procure adequate medical treatment.

Ths prepayment aspect appears to be unique. It is a refinement of the present Kerr-Mills program whereby the State and the Federal Government aid the destitute senior citizen—but only after illness strikes and crippling medical bills arrive. The CMA program would amount to buying protection on a sunny day for use when it rains.

"We believe that this prepayment concept would eliminate much of the red tape and the stigma of charity attached to existing health and welfare programs", declared CMA president, Dr. James C. Doyle. We agree with him.

A person would have to submit what the CMA calls "a simple income statement" in order to establish eligibility for the State-Federal prepayments of his health insurance policy. This is also a feature of the AMA's eldercare plan. The less comprehensive medicare plan sidesteps it; everyone would pay, via social security, and everyone would be eligible for its restrictive benefits.

One possible flaw in the CMA approach is that eligibility would be determined before illness strikes. We can foresee that a person who is not eligible when in good health might quickly become impoverished after major accident or illness occurs. What happens then? This is a facet of the CMA plan which probably needs further study and polish in order to assure fairness.

The California doctors' program also calls for the repeal of existing requirements that an elderly patient must pay for the first 30 days of $2,000 in a private hospital before becoming eligible for benefits. Instead, under the CMA plan, recipients would receive benefits from the first day of admission to any hospital of their choice.

The free choice of hospital is highly important. It would get around the problem that, at present, some publicly aided patients cannot go to hospitals of their own choice if the rates are above a statewide average.

Having formulated their own plan, the California doctors have moved rapidly to effect it. Assemblyman Casey, Democrat, of Bakersfield, already has introduced it in the legislature. We trust it will get the constructive attention there that it deserves.

The Liberty Bell Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., presented the George Washington Honor Medal Award to Mrs. Sara Lashley, of 1616 Pacific Avenue, Atlantic City, N.J., for an inspiring poem called "The Liberty Bell Speaks," which Mrs. Lashley wrote last year.

The George Washington Honor Medal was voted Mrs. Lashley by a distinguished national and school awards jury of the Freedoms Foundation for "an outstanding accomplishment in helping to achieve a better understanding of the American way of life."

Mrs. Lashley's stirring peom is even more significant when it is realized that she is the daughter of struggling Austrian immigrants. Her father, a court clerk in Austria, and her mother came to this country late in the last century and lived in New York, where Mrs. Lashley was born; then Hartford, Conn., and finally, Atlantic City, where Mrs. Lashley, now a widow, has lived the greater part of her life.

This talented woman has written the music and lyrics of a song entitled, "Wonderful New Jersey," which may some day become the official State song.

All Americans can obtain renewed inspiration from Mrs. Lashley's award-winning poem, "The Liberty Bell Speaks," which follows:

I see you pass before me through the years—
The young, the old, the rich, and poor, the humble and the proud—
Each pausing in his stride to look at me;
And some do find but hard-cast metal flawed
A cold, inanimate thing while others
See the hopes and fears of men who left their homes and hearths
To seek beyond the strange harsh sea a land
Which they would till and come to love
And which would fill the young
And ever passionate yearning to be free.

To walk—eyes clear, and head unbowed
Upon a soil—though newly found, with liberty endowed,
That from their loins the generations yet to come
Could stand with shoulders squared, and unbent knee
Before their fellow man;
I am the hopes and dreams of men long dead
And men unborn.

I am but cold hard metal—true flawed badly,
An inanimate thing yet cast by men who shaped me so,
That I might peal to heaven, for a hungry world
To hear the living bell of freedom ring.

Revolution in Economic Thinking Hits Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Jackson, Minn., County Pilot, Lewis George, viewing the revolution in economic thinking which has hit the country, concludes that the big spending, big debt, big deficit advocates have charted a "blueprint for disaster." As his editorial serves to crystallize the issue, with unanimous consent I place it in today's RECORD:

A REVOLUTION IN ECONOMIC THINKING HITS THIS COUNTRY

Has there been a deep-reaching change in the thinking of American people about such fundamental economic principles as balanced budgets and living within income?

The paucity of complaints about the giant Federal budget and the whopping State proposal of expenditures for the coming biennium would seem to indicate that traditional ideas of thrift and economy are old hat and the thinking of squares.

To conservative-minded individuals, the road to economic disaster no longer has speed limits or caution signs. The green light is on and such warning signals as "slow down, dangerous curves ahead" go practically unheeded.

We were appalled to read an article by one of the country's leading columnists the other day in which she points to this revolution in economic thinking. Incidentally, she believes the shift has occurred in a matter of months.

The columnist, Sylvia Porter, produced this startling analysis of the thinking in modern-day America:

"As a businessman, you welcome excise tax cuts because they'll stimulate your sales. As a consumer, you welcome excise tax cuts because they'll reduce the prices of many goods you must or want to buy and they'll leave extra spending money in your pocket. As a Congressman, you are delighted to get the chance to eliminate or reduce taxes your constituents detest and you intend to expand the cuts that President Johnson proposes.

"You are not alarmed by the fact that this will be the sixth budget deficit in a row; that there hasn't been a budget surplus since the year which ended in July 1960, and that in all the years going back to 1932 the Federal Government has achieved only six surpluses. You hardly notice budget deficits these days unless they are skyrocketing.

"You are not perplexed by a mix of tax cuts, gradually rising Federal spending, an unbalanced budget and a climbing national debt. You have become accustomed to this mix and you know that in 1964 it resulted in the greatest prosperity our country has ever known.

"You are far more concerned that the Federal Government follow policies which will create jobs, paychecks and profits than that the policies meet the financial traditions of a generation ago."

After reading the above comments, you must be amazed, outraged and gripped with a feeling of hopelessness for the future of our country as we are. Miss Porter's diatribe is a blueprint for disaster, reveals how to plaster a mortgage on our children and grandchildren and is a roadmap to an economic abyss into which this Nation will eventually plunge, possibly never to emerge.

Miss Porter concludes her essay with this observation, "This change in so short a period is what is so remarkable. And long after today's budget statistics will have been forgotten in the archives, this revolution in attitudes will be helping our economy expand at a pace sufficient to absorb our swelling numbers of workers and to preserve America's unique system of private-public enterprise."

If Miss Porter's analysis of the American mind today is true, a gigantic job of brainwashing has been consummated. Her thesis seems to indicate large Federal deficits and debts beget prosperity and the more we spend the sooner we will reach utopia.

At the present time, there appears to be few voices raised and little public sentiment for living within our income. A magic formula has been found, and lessons of history forgotten, as we hurry down the primrose path to financial chaos.

Lutheran Support VISTA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the National Lutheran Council at its annual meeting earlier this month adopted a resolution commending the VISTA program of the Economic Opportunity Act and encouraging Lutherans to consider participation in this Volunteers in Service to America as "an opportunity for meaningful service, and a fulfillment of their Christian vocation."

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON VISTA PROGRAM

"Whereas establishment by the U.S. Government of the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program provides an opportunity for individuals to volunteer their services for periods of time to assist in specific domestic projects in connection with the Economic Opportunity Act, and

"Whereas VISTA thus presents creative opportunities for citizens of good will and competence to serve human need, and

"Whereas the Christian's call to love for and service of his fellow man must involve him in a service in the world: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Lutheran Council: (1) Register its general endorsement of the objectives of the VISTA program; and (2) encourage qualified Lutherans to give consideration to participation in the VISTA program as an opportunity for meaningful service, and a fulfillment of their Christian vocation."

Adopted by the National Lutheran Council at its 47the annual meeting, Hollywood, Calif., February 8–10, 1965.

The Pony Express

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Lieutenant William Brewer Chapter, of the Daughters of the American Revolution, in Midland, Tex., has announced the winners of its annual essay contest. The subject this year is "Historic Trailways." The contestants, elementary and junior high school students, did much research on these trails that did so much to open up the American West and make this one great Nation, from coast to coast.

Under unanimous consent I place the four winning essays in this contest in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE PONY EXPRESS

(By John O'Brien, grade 6, St. Anne's School, Midland, Tex.)

The pony express began operating on April 3 of the year 1860. Horseback riders carried the U.S. mail from St. Joseph, Mo., to Sacramento, Calif., and back. The people who promoted it wanted to prove that the central route followed by the pony express was better than the longer southern route taken by the stages of the Butterfield Overland Mail.

Senator William Gwin was the chief promoter of the pony express. A rich firm of freighters known as Russell, Majors, and Waddell backed the project. Their slogan was "We want riders—young riders—good riders." The news spread quickly from ranch to ranch. Cowboys, stagecoach drivers, trappers, prospectors, and many other people rushed to join the newly formed pony express. This business of carrying the mail across the country seemed like a mighty exciting job. Although it offered high adventure to young men the pony express was a badly needed service. Deliveries of mail to California were so poor that western settlers began to feel that they were no longer a part of the United States. No wonder they welcomed this new express that provided letters from the East speedily and regularly.

The pony express followed the Platte River in Nebraska and through South Pass in Wyoming. At Fort Bridger in Wyoming the riders left the main trail and swung south of the Great Salt Lake in Utah then headed straight west across the salt desert to the Sierra Nevada Mountains at Carson City, Nev. This route saved them over 100 miles. Stations to change horses stood from 10 to 15 miles apart. Lonely keepers took care of the station, horses, and ponies.

The pony express was the linking connection between the East and the West that traveled 1,800 miles of mountains, plains, and desert. The riders rode at top speed from station to station. As the rider approached a station the keeper brought out a fresh horse or pony which was already saddled and ready to go. The rider jumped from his tired horse to the fresh one, grabbed the mail bags and was on his way again. If the next rider was unable to carry the bags the first rider would keep going. Generally a rider carried the mail 75 miles. There were about

190 stations, 400 station keepers and assistants and more than 400 horses and 80 riders. The riders earned from $50 to $150 a month. Most of them carried two revolvers and a knife to defend themselves against the Indians and bandits. The riders rode day and night through all kinds of weather. They carried the mail in leather pouches which were rainproof. The pouches were strapped to the saddle and never weighed over 20 pounds.

The first pony express trip took 10 days to travel the total trip. Later the trips were made in 8 or 9 days. This time was about 12 to 14 days shorter than the overland mail could make it. One time the mail was carried from Fort Kearney, Nebr., to Fort Churchill, Nev., in 6 days. This was a record. On short stretches riders would make up to 25 miles an hour and would regularly travel 250 miles a day.

The pony express served California well. The time was coming when the riders would be of vital service to all of the United States. As the year 1860 drew to a close the trouble between the North and the South was reaching the breaking point. If the break came, California's course might make all the difference. It's gold might be able to buy foreign aid in the cause of war because it had been admitted to the Union as a free State. Communications with California were of vital importance and the pony express provided swift communication. The most important news carried by the express was that Mr. A. Lincoln had been elected President of the United States. The news was telgraphed to St. Joseph, Mo., and was in the mailbox of the pony express as soon as the last click of the receiving instrument had died away. The next connection was at Fort Churchill, Nev. The pony express carried the election news between these two points—a distance of 1,800 miles and California was saved for the Union.

The pony express ceased operations on October 24, 1861. It had fulfilled its mission of carrying out vital communications between East and West. The telegraph now stretched from coast to coast. The promoters of the express were ruined financially but had provided a needed service.

The Oregon Trail

(By Carol Rucker, seventh grade, Episcopal Day School, Midland, Tex.)

Early in the 19th century, the muddy Missouri became the starting point of the three main routes leading into the West. The river itself, arching up toward Canada before turning west and then south to its source in the Rockies, formed the northernmost route. This route was a favorite of the fur trappers. To the south, the Santa Fe Trail spanned the Kansas prairies, followed the Arkansas River for a way and crossed the deserts to the town of Santa Fe in New Mexico. Between these two routes lay the great central trail, the most heavily traveled of them all. This highway through the wild heart of the continent was made up of many trails and had many names. It is most familiar to us as the Oregon, or Overland, Trail. The Indians sometimes called it the white-topped wagon road because of the long trains of covered wagons that crept along it. It snaked across the flat and forbidding Great Plains and climbed over the Continental Divide. Then it fanned out to reach its various destinations in far-off Oregon and California.

The persistent popularity of the name Oregon Trail can be attributed to Francis Parkman's classic volume of the same name. Parkman traveled over no more than the eastern third of the Oregon Trail on his famous visit to Fort Laramie and the Laramie plains in 1846. His book based on his experiences was first called the Oregon and California Trail but for later editions the shortened title was adopted.

Each spring pioneers gathered on the Missouri River, camping at different points from Independence, Mo., to Council Bluffs, Iowa. When the grass began to grow in May or June, they went on to the western prairies. The women and children traveled in the covered wagons, each of which was drawn by slow, lumbering oxen. Sometimes a dozen or more families traveled together for protection against the Indians. While the women and children rode in the wagons, the men and boys rode on horseback and drove herds of cattle and horses. At night the wagons were pulled into a circle and the people slept within the circle for prevention of an attack from savage Indians.

The daily morning routine started at 5 o'clock when a guard fired a shot, the men went after the oxen, the boys gathered wood and carried water and the women and girls started breakfast. By 7 o'clock, when the bugle blew, the pots and pans and tents were packed on the wagon, the oxen yoked, and the people ready to start off again across the eastern prairie.

The trip was long and hard. They climbed hills so steep that eight pairs of oxen were needed to haul one wagon to the top. They forded rivers that had dangerous quicksand, dragged through deep mud and traveled in dust so thick that they could hardly breathe. Often the people were lucky to make 5 miles in 1 whole day.

They had many troubles. The people died of diseases, Indians raided cattle, they ran short of water and there were terrible thunderstorms. After at least 5 months on the trail, however, the people were safe in Oregon.

The Oregon Trail in its 2,000-mile length was rarely a single track. In places it was 10 miles wide as emigrants spread out for better grazing or to avoid the dust. At best, the journey exposed the traveler to great hardship and suffering. At worst, it brought him death by thirst or by the arrow and scalping knife of the Indians. The heroic pioneers faced death at every stage of the long journey.

Cutoffs and alternate routes in the Oregon Trail multiplied as resourceful pioneers constantly sought for improvements. Starting from northwestern Missouri near Independence the emigrants went west into Kansas and then made almost a beeline to the Platte River in south central Nebraska. They followed the south side of the river to the junction of the South Platte and North Platte. Crossing the South Platte the travelers continued on the south side of the North Platte to Fort Laramie. Beyond that famous way station in eastern Wyoming the travelers remained on the south side of the river until 1850 after which there was travel on the north side as well.

Explorers and fur traders first traced the course of the Oregon Trail. In 1805, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark traveled on western section of the route in the region of the Snake and Columbia Rivers. Traders returning from Astoria also used the trail. Benjamin Bonneville is credited with taking the first wagons through South Pass in the 1830's. Nathaniel J. Wyeth also led companies over the trail. John C. Fremont surveyed a portion of the route in 1842 for the U.S. Army. In 1834 the first missionary group, led by Jason Lee pushed west from St. Louis with a party headed by Wyeth. They largely followed the Platte River. At the Snake River Wyeth built a post, Fort Hall. This was later bought by Hudson's Bay Company. It became an important supply outpost for emigrants on the trail. In 1836 Dr. Marcus Whitman and the Reverend Henry Spalding and their wives reached Oregon. Their wives were the first white women to make the journey.

Lewis and Clark: Trailblazers of the Northwest

(By Douglas Burton, grade 8, San Jacinto Junior High School, Midland, Tex.)

On September 23, 1806, 30 hardy explorers entered the frontier settlement of St. Louis amidst crowds of cheering people. Weary, but proud, these explorers had just completed an 8,000-mile journey which took them through rolling grasslands, vast towering forests, and icy mountain streams. This group of rugged mountain men would go down in history as the first white men to explore the Northwest Territory.

Why had they made this 8,000-mile journey to the Pacific? Who needed an expedition to the Northwest anyway?

The immediate reason for this exploration was the Louisiana Purchase. An enormous tract of land, three times the size of the Thirteen Original Colonies, the Louisiana Territory, had been bought from Napoleon for $15 million. Despite President Jefferson's symphathy toward the French, he knew that any strong nation controlling the Mississippi was a threat to the United States. While the Constitution did not provide for the acquisition of foreign territories, it did provide for the making of treaties. Jefferson admitted that he had "stretched the Constitution until it cracked."

Now that the purchase was final, a host of questions arose concerning the newly acquired land. All the land beyond St. Louis was completely unmapped. Many people thought prehistoric monsters inhabited the area or that the earth dropped off into boundless space. What lay past the source of the mighty Missouri?

To explore this vast wilderness, President Jefferson sent a corps of exploration headed by his own secretary, Meriwether Lewis. Lewis, a silent brooding man, was not a native to the frontier but he was educated in the ways of the woods. Lewis chose William Clark as his coleader. Clark was the younger brother of George Rogers Clark and a born leader. Unlike Lewis, Clark was a wilderness craftsman who understood both men and the woods, and his red hair and cheerfulness made him a favorite leader among the men.

The expedition was instructed to find a practical land-water route to the Pacific. They were to ascend the Missouri River, cross the Continental Divide, and descend the Columbia River to its mouth. Jefferson also hoped to establish peaceful relations with the Indians and obtain information on tribal customs, languages, climate, geography, and plant and animal life.

During the winter of 1803–4, the expedition made final preparations for the long journey. Encamped on the Mississippi River near St. Louis, Lewis and Clark recruited 28 rugged frontiersmen into the U.S. Army, selecting 4 as sergeants, and began training the men in military discipline. Although Clark had the rank of second lieutenant, both the leaders would be called captain by members of the expedition.

In addition to recruiting and training, Lewis and Clark had to obtain food supplies and equipment. Their lives would depend upon the friendliness of the Indians so they obtained many gifts for the trip. They secured a 55-foot keelboat and two pirogues which stored 6 tons of supplies and ammunition.

On May 14, 1804, the long and difficult journey was begun. The Missouri was the first test of the explorers; and as one chronicler of the expedition put it—it was not so much a river as it was a calamity. One of the sergeants died, apparently of appendicitis. At the same time, members of the expedition first encountered the numerous and ferocious American grizzly bears.

After 5 months of travel, the men stopped and built Fort Mandan in what is now cen-

tral North Dakota. One thousand miles from St. Louis, Lewis sent back specimens of Indian clothing, live prairie dogs, a prairie hen, and the bones, skins, and horns of strange animals.

While wintering at Fort Mandan, two important additions were made to the camp roster. A French-Canadian guide named Charbonneau and his squaw, Sacagawea, came into the pay of the United States. Charbonneau, who knew the language of certain river tribes, and Sacagawea, who spoke some of the languages of the mountain tribes, would prove invaluable in the months to come.

The coming of spring saw the explorers moving westward toward the source of the Missouri. At last, they reached the foot of the Rockies and eagerly searched for the Shoshoni, the mountain tribe from whom they had planned to buy horses. Finally, Sacagawea recognized certain landmarks of her people's homeland and the travelers soon met the Indians themselves. Through Sacagawea, the expedition secured the horses necessary for crossing the mountains.

Crossing the Rockies was the greatest hardship of the entire trip. Game was scarce and the men almost starved. But at last the party was descending the Columbia River. Great numbers of salmon were sighted and vast, unspoiled forests were encountered. At long last, on November 15, the waters of the Pacific Ocean came into view.

Winter on the Pacific was hard but morale was high for the men had now completed their mission. They named their coastal outpost Fort Clatsop.

In the spring, the expedition made preparations to leave Fort Clatsop. To make certain their American claims, Clark inscribed upon a tall pine tree: "William Clark December 3rd 1805—by land from the U. States."

The expedition then split up to explore more territory in the Rockies and the upper Missouri. Lewis and Clark were reunited at the mouth of the Yellowstone River to begin the long trek back to St. Louis.

On the return trip, the only bloodshed of the expedition occurred on the high plains. After peacefully traveling 6,000 miles, a band of treacherous Blackfeet attempted to massacre the explorers.

Finally, after being gone 2 years and 4 months in a vast, uncharted wilderness, the expedition reached St. Louis. A great celebration followed their arrival and the men were greeted as heroes everywhere. Soon Thomas Jefferson read these words from Lewis: "In obedience to your orders we have penetrated the Continent of North America to the Pacific Ocean."

In appreciation for their services, Congress voted a reward of 1,000 acres of land each to Lewis and Clark, with double pay and 320 acres to every man of the expedition.

Lewis and Clark not only blazed a new trail to the Pacific Ocean, but also strengthened the claims of the United States to the Oregon country. The expedition stimulated a great westward movement which would not be halted until a great nation stretched from coast to coast.

THE LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION

(By Pete Carter, fifth grade, Henderson Elementary School, Midland, Tex.)

Among the early explorers of the United States there were two men, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark. Lewis was an explorer and Clark was a hunter. As each of the boys grew up, they had one ambition. They wanted to travel where nobody had ever been before.

At least 20 years before 1803, President Thomas Jefferson had enlisted the cooperation of explorers and travelers in schemes to explore the Oregon Territory. Several beginnings were made and the journeys in some instances actually began, but none were carried to a conclusion.

In 1803 President Jefferson asked Congress for $2,500 for the expedition which was begun by Lewis and Clark the following year. The fact is unquestioned that the American claim to the Oregon Territory was the prime motive of this expedition.

The men chosen by Lewis and Clark for the journey were selected with special reference to the hazardous duties they were to perform. Omitting the 7 soldiers and 9 river men who acted as guards for the expedition, they came out with a total of 27 men: 9 were young frontiersmen from Kentucky, 14 were soldiers from the U.S. Army, 2 were French boatmen, 1 an interpreter and hunter, and the last a Negro servant of Captain Clark.

On May 14, 1804, the expedition, with abundant supplies, including weapons for defense, presents for the Indians, and articles for barter, left the mouth of the Missouri River on the Illinois bank for the first successful journey by canoe and overland from the Father of Waters to the Pacific Ocean. The journey was begun by water by a boat which was about 55 feet long. Progress was made at the rate of 10 miles a day.

On July 30, 1804, the expedition reached the place about 20 miles above the present site of Omaha, Nebr. where the first powwow was held with the Indians and a treaty was signed. Then by toilsome journey the expedition pushed on resolutely upstream, but met with a sad experience in the death of Sergeant Floyd on August 20, 1804. On September 5, 1804, Lewis and Clark saw their first antelope and on September 7 the first prairie dogs were seen. These two animals of the plains were first made known to science during this expedition.

On October 26, 1804, the Mandan Indian villages were reached where Lewis and Clark planned to stay for the winter. Here on the banks of a river a fort called Fort Mandan was built. The winter of 1804 was passed without serious illness or accident to the party.

On November 7, 1805, as reported in Captain Clark's journal, they saw for the first time the waters of the Pacific Ocean. Near the mouth of the Columbia River the expedition built a fort which they called Fort Clatsop in honor of the Indians who claimed the territory in this vicinity. The winter passed without event.

They followed the main route on the return journey. Provisions were scarce and Lewis was wounded, but after traveling separately for awhile the party was united and finished the journey, reaching St. Louis on September 23, 1806. The expedition lasted 2 years, 4 months, and 9 days. When they reached home, President Jefferson gave them some acres of land in which to grow crops. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark became very famous men because of this expedition.

Increased U.S. Participation in the Inter-American Development Bank

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 45) to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, hemisphere unity was given a real solid boost when on Thursday, February 18, this body passed the measure which insured 3 more years of Inter-American Development Bank activity through its Fund for Special Operations.

This is one of the finest kinds of self-help the United States can possibly construct for our Latin American friends. It ranks, in my judgment, second only to the Peace Corps operation as an instrument for the furtherance of this Nation's acceptance as a real friend. One with whom all of Latin America can cooperate to the mutual advantage of the nations on this continent.

Putting it in more simple terms, I would liken this program to that of a wealthy father who after middle age begins to feed his assets to his sons to manage for his and their benefit. This training of the sons in money management is far better than sitting tightly on his assets until death comes and the boys suddenly have the whole problem of money management dumped into their laps.

This Bank has been managed prudently and successfully enough to make its securities considered a prime investment by private investors throughout America and Western Europe. This is testimony enough of its value. The propriety of this Government continuing its support of one of the most effective antidotes against the Communist influence in the American Continent is well substantiated by the prudent investors of the free world.

Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, about 10 years ago, Justice Frankfurter said that "to pierce the curtain of the future, to give shape and visage to mysteries still in the womb of time, is the gift of the imagination. It requires poetic sensibilities with which judges are rarely endowed and which their education does not normally develop. These judges must have something of the creative artist in them; they must have antennas registering feeling and judgment beyond logical, let alone, quantitative, proof." Felix Frankfurter would not have said so, but he himself, most assuredly, was the exact kind of judge he was describing in those words.

No other Justice in our time has had such a profound impact on American jurisprudence. His career over a half century included the education of lawyers at Harvard Law School, White House adviser, and Justice of the Nation's highest court.

Justice Frankfurter's great influence in public life was not limited to his role

of teacher, adviser or judge. His lively personality and wit brought him a wide circle of friends in many other worlds than law. He left an impact on the minds of leading journalists, Government officials and scholars.

Matthew Josephson wrote, of Frankfurter, in 1940, "Wherever Frankfurter is there is no boredom. As soon as he bounces in—he never walks, he bounces—the talk and laughter begin, and they never let up."

Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, while this year we observe the 47th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania Day, it is interesting to note that the Lithuanians can actually trace their history back to the second century, A.D. In the belief that this will be of interest to the Members, I am listing the important events in Lithuanian history.

IMPORTANT EVENTS IN LITHUANIAN HISTORY

Second century A.D., Roman historian Tacitus praises the advanced agriculture of the Aistians/Latvians, Lithuanians, Old Prussians and Jatvegians.

Ninth century A.D., Aistian chemical activities described in Old English literature by Wulfstan, explorer of King Alfred the Great.

In 1251, introduction of Christianity to Lithuania. Baptism of King Mindaugas, his royal family and the other nobles.

In 1253, coronation of Mindaugas as the Christian King of Lithuania.

In 1323, establishment of Vilnius as the permanent capital of Lithuania by King Gediminas.

In 1362, Grand Pince Algirdas defeats the Tartars, and extends the boundaries of Lithuania to the Black Sea.

In 1410, Lithuanians with their Slavic and Tartar allies defeat the Teutonic Knights at Tannenberg in Prussia.

In 1569, formation of the Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth, and the end of Lithuanian Empire.

In 1772–95, partition of the Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth. Most of Lithuania occupied by Russia.

In 1812–63, three Lithuanian revolts against the Czar.

In 1864, Lithuanian language in the Roman alphabet outlawed by the Russians.

In 1904, Lithuanians regain freedom of publication.

In 1918, declaration of the restoration of an independent Lithuania with her capital at Vilnius.

1918–20, Lithuania fights for independence against Germany, Poland, and Russia.

In 1922, United States of America recognizes Lithuania as an independent Republic.

In 1935, first recorded court trial of 122 Nazis at Kaunas.

In 1940, Soviet Russian occupation of Lithuania, and the deportation of innocent people to Siberia.

In 1941, Lithuanians revolt against the Soviets.

In 1941–44, Nazi German occupation of Lithuania, and persecutions by the Gestapo.

In 1944, Soviet Russia reoccupies war-torn Lithuania, and persecutions by the NKVD.

In 1944–52, active bloody guerrilla warfare in Lithuania.

In 1953 to now, passive resistance continues in Lithuania and the other Soviet Russian enslaved nations.

Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Maryland and the mayor of Baltimore officially proclaimed February 16 as Republic of Lithuania Day.

Last Saturday the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore held its annual banquet to commemorate the affair and it was my privilege to be one of the guests, along with the Postmaster of Baltimore, William F. Laukaitis, and former member of the Maryland House of Delegates, Nadas Rastenis. The Reverend Anthony Dranginis of St. Alphonsus Roman Catholic Church gave the invocation and benediction. Mr. Thomas G. Gray, president of the council, served as toastmaster. The assembled group adopted a resolution which I wish to insert here.

We, American-Lithuanians of the Free State of Maryland, having met this 20th day of February 1965, at Lithuanian Hall, under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the February 16, 1918, declaration of independence of Lithuania, did unanimously adopt the following resolution:

Whereas 25 years have elapsed since the sovereign Lithuanian nation lost its national independence in the wake of the illegal annexation by the Soviet Union; and

Whereas during this period of time the Soviets have continuously tried to obtain recognition by the free world of their forcible seizure of Lithuania and the Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia; and

Whereas our brother and sister Lithuanians in our mother country are still suffering under constant Soviet pressures to denationalize them and sovietize their homeland and their children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we again express our appreciation and gratitude to our Government for its firm stand in refusing to recognize the fruits of the brutal Soviet aggression, and our trust that our Government will continue to maintain this just and honorable position and let the Government of the U.S.S.R. know in no uncertain terms how distasteful Soviet aggression and the harsh oppression of the captive nations are in the eyes of the free world; and

That we hereby reaffirm our steadfast resolve to continue even more strongly our efforts to keep the cause of freedom and independence of Lithuania alive in the minds of the Government and the people of the United States and in the American press; and

That we hereby request the President of the United States to instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to bring up the case of the illegal Soviet occupation and annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States at each and every opportunity.

THOMAS G. GRAY,
President.

L. LASKARSKAS,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I would like to mention that again this year I introduced a House concurrent resolution along the lines outlined in the resolution adopted at the banquet, which reads as follows, and which I urge the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to report out so that the House can act on it at an early date.

The resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 14

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through democratic process, to achieve a national unity and freedom of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this national unification of the free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, the Baltic nations, having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries, are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight, and die for national independence and freedom; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced incorporation into the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas no just peace and security can be achieved in the world while these and other nations remain enslaved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets—

(a) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

(b) to return all Baltic deportees from Siberia, prisons and slave camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision.

Agriculture and the Farm Programs in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out a few facts regarding agriculture in the United States and the farm programs. According to researchers in this field, the production of the American farmer is increasing at an ever faster pace.

In the 20-year period from 1920 to 1940, farm production increased at the rate of 1.1 percent a year. In the 15-year period from 1940 to 1955, the rate of increase was 2 percent a year. In spite of increasing acreage diversions, the rate of production since 1955 has

continued. The population of this country has also been increasing but the increase has not kept up with the increases in production. While the increase in consumption has been greater than that of population, it has not kept pace with the increases in production and we find that the domestic demand for farm products was expanding at a slightly lower rate than farm production in the last 10 years.

Moreover, had acreage allotments not been in effect during this period, production of farm products would have increased at a rate of about 3.5 percent a year. Had production been allowed to increase as fast as technology permitted, with no acreage diversion programs, the economists estimate that the volume of crop and livestock moving through commercial markets would have been larger than it was by 5 percent or more.

Economists find that a 1-percent increase in farm products sold lowers farm prices by about 4 percent. This means that farm prices almost surley would have fallen by 20 percent or more had there not been acreage and commodity diversion programs. Net farm income would have fallen even more. The economists estimate that wheat prices would have dropped as much as one-half, and feed grain prices more than one-fourth. These facts vividly point out the need for continuing and strengthening farm programs, if we are to maintain and improve income for commercial agriculture.

The 47th Anniversary of the Estonian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 47th aniversary of the establishment of the Estonian Republic. On February 24, 1918, the people of this historic land proclaimed a free democratic republic, and during the First World War successfully defended themselves against both German and Soviet offensives, which resulted in the renouncement of all claims to the territory of Estonia. The nation then set to the task of expanding her agriculture and industry and promoting trade with other nations. In the atmosphere of freedom, the people of Estonia made great progress.

Then came World War II, and in violation of existing treaties the overwhelming military might of the Soviet Union and of Germany alternated in occupying this land and depriving its citizens of their freedoms, culminating in the forced incorporation of the country into the U.S.S.R. The United States and other Western countries have refused to recognize this annexation.

Although the people of Estonia have been silenced and cannot openly commemorate this memorable day in the history of their country, we know that they continue to hope and work for liberation. And we who cherish the principles of freedom and justice must continue to share these hopes and to seek effective means to restore the independence of these people and the neighboring Baltic nations that have also fallen behind the Iron Curtain. The world cannot hope for peace so long as there is suppression of man's right to liberty and justice.

The New Haven Drama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues, particularly those from the Northeast, to an article in the February 13 issue of the New York Times. The article highlights the problems of the New Haven Railroad, which is so vital to our area, and I therefore, respectfully, enter it in the RECORD:

THE NEW HAVEN DRAMA: FINAL SCENES ARE ABOUT TO UNFOLD ON LINE'S MOVE TO DROP COMMUTER SERVICE

(By Robert E. Bedingfield)

The longrun drama of suspense, "The New Haven Railroad and the Commuters," is approaching its third act. The resolution is still in doubt. Will the rescuing forces, Federal, State, or both, gallop over the hill, drawn checkbooks glittering in the setting sun, to save the commuters with a continuing operating subsidy?

Will the court-appointed trustees lift the scalps of the commuters and ride off triumphantly to the Pennsylvania-Central reservation, with Federal Judge Robert P. Anderson applauding from the bench in New Haven?

Whatever the outcome, the following signs indicate that it will not be long in coming:

The New Haven reported yesterday a 1964 net railway operating loss of $17,056,000 compared with a $10,090,000 net railway operating loss in 1963. Despite a $1.3 million saving from the elimination of firemen from its diesel engines, as a result of last year's Federal arbitration award, the New Haven's operating expenses climbed to $115,204,000 from $110,466,000 in 1963. Meanwhile, operating revenues slipped to $121,597,000 from $122,788,000.

The New Haven's income from its share of the Grand Central Terminal properties rose to $5,307,000 last year from $3,869,000 in 1963. Other nonoperating investments brought $3,423,000 in additional revenues, up from $1,337,000 a year earlier, but the final 1964 net loss was $15,263,000 as compared with $12,264,000 in 1963.

Judge Anderson has pondered for more than a week the trustees' request for permission to begin abandoning commuter service from Larchmont, N.Y., into Grand Central Terminal—the first step toward ending all passenger service. The court is expected to rule on the request early next week, possibly on Monday. While it would be hazardous, as well as presumptuous to say in advance what any court would decide, Judge Anderson did show sympathy for the trustees' views at the February 4 hearing.

The trustees told the court they had actively negotiated for the New Haven's entry into the proposed Pennsylvania-New York Central merger, and had found that trying to retain the passenger service would create a fatal impediment. From the other side of the table, Alfred E. Perlman, Central's president, said the merged road would be glad to have the New Haven solely as a freight carrier, with its low-density branches amputated.

The New Haven's wage bill rose $3.2 million last year with agreement on railroad labor demands. Assuming no other changes, the bill will rise by another $1.6 million this year and $1.2 million next year for an aggregate increase in the 3 years beginning January 1, 1964, of $14 million. This is a cost that cannot be deferred to conserve cash, like taxes, interest due on outstanding bonds, payments on injury claims that were incurred before July 31, 1961, when the road lurched into bankruptcy, and deferral of per diem (car rental) payments in controversy for the last decade.

In the first 30 trading sessions of the New York Stock Exchange this year, $4,312,000 face value of New Haven first mortgage 4-percent bonds of 2007 have been traded at rising prices as have $6,406,000 face value of convertible 4½-percent bonds of 2022.

BOND SPECULATION

This last development is not in the same category as the other four listed above, of course. It is significant because, despite the deterioration in the New Haven's financial position last year, the bonds have moved from near worthlessness—the 4s sold as low as $147.50 for a $1,000 bond at one time in 1964—to the status of a valid speculation.

The only basis for such a conclusion by investors substantial enough to have purchased these securities in such quantities must be that purinite action cannot be much longer deferred.

The only action that would benefit the bonds—which are liens on whatever will be left of the debtor estate after prior claims are satisfied—would be to end the drain of deficit operation.

The negotiations between the New Haven trustees and the matchmakers of the Pennsy-Central marriage are more relevant. They could set before Judge Anderson a visible escape hatch from the continuing deficit that must eventually, if it continues long enough, consume the whole estate of the New Haven—an estate the judge is bound to try to preserve for its creditors.

AGREEMENT NEAR

Within a month it is expected that an agreement in principle will be reached, between the New Haven on the one side and the Pennsy-Central on the other. The merged road, if the merger is consummated, will buy the New Haven as a package. The package will embrace all the physical properties, including the New Haven's right to share in the profits from the valuable Park Avenue real estate north of Grand Central Terminal.

An essential part of that package will be assurance that if passenger service on the New Haven continues at all, it will continue under a cost-plus contract with some government agency.

Otherwise, the Pennsy-Central negotiators have made plain they will discount their offering price for the New Haven's passenger deficit. Sources close to the three railroads figure the discounted price would be so slow it would not be worth laying before the court.

All the members of the public who would suffer from the ending of New Haven service into Grand Central comfort themselves, as threats to continuance of the service mount with the contention that the public interest would not allow the discontinuance.

Before too much reliance is placed upon this protection, it should be noted that what is going on is no adversary proceeding with

the State, or the commuters, making demands for the continuance of service as an obligation of the New Haven.

Under the Federal Bankruptcy Act, the court of jurisdiction has the primary duty of preserving the estate of a debtor who has been shown to be unable to manage that estate himself. The trustees are servants of the court, and their duty likewise is to preserve the estate for the creditors.

Section 13 of the Transportation Act of 1958 spelled out the scope allowed regulatory agencies in protecting the inchoate public interest against the specific right of creditors or bondholders.

The Interstate Commerce Commission now has the right to order intrastate service curtailed when it is operated at a loss.

This right is modified by the duty to make sure that curtailment does not work an undue hardship on the traveling public. That duty is modified in turn by the provision that the railroad must not be placed under undue financial strain to continue the service.

OFFICIAL'S VIEW

Recently, Richard Joyce Smith, one of the New Haven's three trustees, showed little doubt that the New Haven could prove it was undergoing an unbearable strain. He said:

"I think we could have coped with anything but the new wage awards, which were made with no offset in the way of revenues."

Mr. Smith disclosed that the New Haven's free cash balances, as a result of paying out the increased wages, fell to $6,493,000 on December 31, 1964, from $7,696,000 last July 1

He predicted that by July 1, of this year it would be down to $4,418,000, assuming that no extraordinary expenditure or interruption of freight service occurs because of a blizzard, ice storm, or a serious wreck.

Overtime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the February 25, 1965, edition of the Machinist published by the International Association of Machinists carries an editorial commenting on the subject of overtime and its effect on job opportunities.

I commend the following editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

OVERTIME

Labor's drive to shorten the workweek without reducing take-home pay is losing ground. The hours of work in manufacturing industries are actually increasing. Last month, the average factory workweek was the longest in almost 20 years. Half the employees worked more than 41 hours a week, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The meaning should be clear to every union member. The penalty rate of time and a half is no longer working to encourage corporations to take on more help instead of lengthening hours. In fact, many corporations admit that it is now cheaper to pay for overtime than to hire new hands.

But overtime work does more than reduce job opportunities. It also takes a good deal of the steam out of union efforts to raise straight-time rates. For those lucky enough to draw some overtime, the pressures at home are lessened. It's a big reason why there isn't more rank and file demand for a greater share in the magnificent profits now piling up in so many industries.

A proposal to increase the overtime rate to double time under the Fair Labor Standards Act is now pending in Congress. It deserves our highest priority.

Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include "Appalachia," an excellent article in the Carpenter, issue of March 1965, published by United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America.

The article follows:

APPALACHIA

Appalachia is a 10-State swath of human misery which sweeps out of Pennsylvania southward almost to the Gulf of Mexico, down the Appalachian Mountain backbone of the east coast. Astride the ridges are portions of Maryland, Ohio, Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama, in addition to a large portion of Pennsylvania and the entire State of West Virginia.

That mountainous State is the heartland of the poverty belt, United States of America. Just about all of its territory is characterized by the combination of geographical and economic conditions which have brought poverty to the entire Appalachian chain. West Virginia is isolated. Its economy grew up and fattened temporarily on industries which drew wealth out of the land and returned little of the profit to the source. Timber and coal were the props for the economy in years gone by.

There was a time when Appalachia's black gold supported a human beehive of activity, although in those days employment did not necessarily bring material well-being. If nothing else, Appalachians at least had the self respect of a job.

Then came fuel competition. Oil, gasoline, pipeline natural gas, massive electric power distribution systems, and the death of the coal-fired steam locomotive combined to almost kill the coal industry. For the past 40 years, the coal market has been dwindling, and the unemployment rate has been declining even faster. Technological advances in coal mining methods have far outpaced the development of social tools to adjust to the changes.

Automation and mechanization have taken a fearful toll in Appalachia. Although the region provides about two-thirds of the Nation's entire supply of bituminous coal, and every flake of anthracite, production dropped 32 percent between 1951 and 1961. In the same 10-year period, employment plunged by 66 percent. Although there has been a slight increase in production in recent years, employment continues to fall off.

Hardwood timber, the second staple in Appalachia's earlier years, was neglected after the coal industry began to slide, and replacement of hardwoods by substitute materials and new, laborsaving methods of construction in the furniture and building industries cut into the market.

When the tide of opportunity moved elsewhere in the country, masses of people in the Appalachian mining and timbering districts were left without employment. Many had too little to even consider moving out to new economic frontiers. Others, who might possibly have made the move, felt bound by ties of family and home. But even so, in just 10 years from 1950 to 1960, an army of 2 million people left the region.

The deprived remainder of about 17 million suffers from 11 percent of all national unemployment, with only 5 percent of the labor force. Almost one family in three in Appalachia must survive, somehow, on $3,000 a year, or less. The ratio elsewhere, although still appalling in the world's richest nation, is one poverty-struck family in five.

It's true, of course, that there are some prosperous metropolitan centers within the Appalachian region. Erie, Scranton Wilkes-Barre, Weirton, Pittsburgh, and Johnstown, Pa.; Winston-Salem, Asheville, Knoxville, Chattanooga, Huntsville, and Birmingham are hardly collapsing. Serving as broker between the resource-rich interior and the country, these cities have a standard of living above the Appalachian norm, and in some cases, even above the national level.

And there are other areas of the Nation afflicted with poverty. The Ozarks, Mississippi Delta, and Lake Superior regions; parts of Nevada, Arizona, and Texas. But Appalachia is the hard core—the home of over one-half of the Americans whose income is below bare subsistence. Over one-half of the penniless in a region which represents less than one-tenth of the total U.S. population.

If we can bring these Appalachians back to productivity, restore them to their lost share of our cumulative wealth, the solution to restoring other national pockets of poverty should be available. And although the problems of Appalachia, may seem remote to those who do not live there, the tremors of economic impact are felt, however lightly, everywhere.

When he outlined his program for the attack on poverty, President Johnson said, "This investment will return its cost many fold to our entire economy. If we can raise the annual earnings of 10 million among our poor people by only $1,000—we will have added $14 billion a year to our national output * * * not mentioning what we will have done for these people themselves.

"In so doing, we can make important reductions in public assistance payments which now cost us $4 billion a year; and in the large costs of fighting crime and delinquency, disease and hunger. Our history has proved that each time we broaden the base of abundance, giving more people the chance to produce and consume, we create new industry, higher production, increased earnings and better income for everyone."

It has been pointed out that for every two lumberjacks working in the woods at the stump, there must be five men employed elsewhere to process the timber into finished products.

The coal industry, no matter how it might be revitalized, cannot alone support a thriving economy in Appalachia * * * nor can the farmland completely support a totally agricultural economy. The farms are too small in most cases, and the terrain is too rugged to permit use of modern, efficient techniques. Almost half the farms in the region have gross incomes under $2,000 a year.

Because Appalachia grew up dependent on the rails for communications, it is cut off from most of today's heavily truck-oriented commerce. For the most part, small, self-contained communities grew up around each mining or timbering center, and established few links with others. Town size remains small. Public facilities, such as sewer, water, power, waste disposal, hospitals, and police protection are nonexistent or wholly inadequate in most of Appalachia.

In West Virginia, for example, the isolation of two tiny communities is typical. To travel 45 miles from a major city to the first settlement requires 35 miles on one of three roads serving the entire country. 5

miles of gravel road, 3 miles of dirt road, and 2 miles on foot up a steep hill. Just on the other side of the hill from there is another small community, but to reach it by automobile it is necessary to drive back down dirt and gravel road to the highway, then back up progressively deteriorating roads once more. The mileage indicator would spin off 23 miles for the trip.

In wintertime, Appalachia's roads are mostly impassable. In summer, many are washed out. Isolation is so complete that many school-age children—beyond the reach of the schoolbus—are not required to attend at all. Poverty is so compelling that one youth participating in a pilot program preferred a swim across the Kanawha River to paying a 5-cent toll for a pedestrian bridge.

As may easily be imagined, there is a critical lack of trained, skilled manpower in Appalachia.

Just five of every hundred Appalachians have a college degree, compared with a national ratio of 8 to 100.

For the most part, Appalachia is a region almost without industry, and incapable of supporting itself off its own land. The way to get Appalachia back on its feet, most planners agree, is to provide it with the catalyst which will trigger development of a sound economic base for comfortable life.

Appalachia's problems were studied in depth by a Presidential Commission on the Appalachian Region. During the 1960 election campaign, President Kennedy visited the region, and promised to do something about conditions there. The Commission was formed and, in 1964, its report was published. President Johnson immediately sought money from Congress to begin rehabilitation, along the lines suggested by the Commission.

The most important element in any Appalachian rehabilitation, the planners point out, is better use of the abundant natural resources of the region—coal, water, timber, and other mineral wealth.

"The conversion and processing of its [Appalachia's] raw materials should be done locally to the fullest extent possible," the Commission report states, recalling the loss of wealth to outside areas that accompanied the first timber and mining booms. Also, "New industries, dependent not on the resources of the region, but on the strategic location and potential market which Appalachia represents, must be located in the region.

"The magnificent recreational resources must be developed with coordinated intensity if their employment potential is to be realized. Agricultural diversification should be accelerated and mining and timber employment and income expanded."

Water resources—which could be of great benefit to the region—are neglected now. Unchecked by dams or other control measures, spring floods tear away the mountain sides and fill the valleys. Industrial and sewage contamination threaten much of the game and fish which, up to now, abound in Appalachia.

Although proposed legislation for Appalachian aid closely paralleling the recommendations of the President's Commission was passed in the U.S. Senate last year, the House failed to act on it before adjournment.

President Johnson has been determined that the legislation should get priority treatment during this session of Congress, and the Appalachian bill is the second major measure up for consideration.

By mid-February, the Senate had approved a $1.16 billion measure, and hearings had begun in the House on the companion bill. Chances for passage look good. Johnson's legislative program has been bolstered by the support he received at the polls, and the increase in the number of Democrats in the Congress. Poverty-aid measures are also getting some prominent Republican support. Minority party leader in the Senate—EVERETT M. DIRKSEN—voted in favor of the Appalachian aid bill.

The Senate measure would apportion the bulk of the money—$840 million—to an improved road system. A total of 2,350 miles of main highways and 11,000 miles of secondary roads would be built to penetrate the social and economic isolation of Appalachia. The rest of the aid money would be used to establish health facilities, to reclaim land ravaged by strip mining and flood, and begin work on revitalizing the timber industry. Also, underdeveloped land would be converted to a promising beef husbandry industry. Water resources study would begin, and money would be provided for vocational training.

The transportation network receives priority because it is the key to every other part of Appalachia aid. Rather than develop the heavily traveled routes, the Commission report recommended, new roads should be run into areas with the most development potential.

To bring higher standards of health and nutrition to Appalachia, the President's Commission asked for several demonstration community centers for treatment of disease, as well as research.

Great promise is seen for development of an expanded beef cattle industry in Appalachia. Much of the acreage which is unsuitable for the plow would be put to work to meet the ever-increasing national demands for beef. This should be the area of major attention in agriculture, the Commission reported.

And although Appalachia's timber industry now exceeds the demand, contributing to the regional depression, the experts think there is an excellent possibility for an expanding market. Much of this hope is tied to the population explosion—continually generating need for more wood—and technological breakthroughs which are expected to show the way for new uses for hardwoods.

Water-use studies would concentrate on speeding up the program already underway by the Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the Department of Agriculture. The basic job is to set a master plan for flood and pollution control.

Appalachia is rich in natural resources which can provide the basis for recovery. But the most important resource of all is its people. To help them to full stature, years of isolation and educational inadequacies must be remedied.

To do this, a broad program of training and education is needed. Some assistance for basic educational needs will be provided by the school-aid measures which are now under consideration in Congress, if they pass. This seems likely. Additional help will be necessary in training and vocational education, and the President's legislative program for Appalachia provides this. Among other things, new school facilities must be built to bring education closer to many people of Appalachia, and to provide better facilities for those who already are able to attend school on a regular basis.

Before many Appalachia vocational trainees can be taught new skills, they must be taught to read and write. The region has a high incidence of illiteracy.

Appalachian aid seems finally on the way—aimed at the region's millions of people. If there were still uninhabited wilderness down the east coast's remote mountain ridge, there would be no need to be concerned. The fact that people are there—17 million of them—living in poverty, demands instant attention, not only for their own sake, but for the good of the Nation. "Their polled personal hopes, talents, and resourcefulness," noted the Appalachian Commission report, "is a reservoir of creative energy the Nation can no longer afford to ignore."

Medicare or Medical Care?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the February issue of Reader's Digest features an article written by Walter H. Judd, M.D., former U.S. Representative from Minnesota, pertaining to medical care for sick and needy people over 65. I believe that other Representatives, who increasingly are interested in the health problems of our needy, elderly people, particularly ways and means of helping them meet and solve their problems, will find the article most interesting. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICARE OF MEDICAL CARE?

(By Walter H. Judd, former U.S. Representative from Minnesota)

We must not play politics with the health of the Nation. In this trenchant analysis, a critic distinguished both as a doctor and as a legislator strips away the propaganda from the administration's medical program.

Shortly before the election last November, President Johnson was asked, "Mr. President, is medicare going to be on your list of 'must legislation' for next year?" The President answered firmly, "Top of the list."

Thus, advocates of federally financed health plans, who have fought a losing fight for nearly 20 years, gained new hope and confidence. Indeed, since the election, these advocates have talked of a "mandate" for their present favorite legislative formula: medical care for the aged under social security.

Congress, therefore, is faced with this solemn question: What shall the law they pass provide for sick and needy people over 65—medical care or merely medicare?

Seldom has an important piece of legislation been so confused and camouflaged by propaganda and promises. The name medicare itself is a notable case of mislabeling. Those who have studied the King-Anderson bill and the various proposals that have succeeded it know that medicare does not provide medical care for the aged; it provides only limited hospital and nursing-home care plus a few fringe benefits. Despite the slogans and the oratory, medicare would provide:

Nothing for doctors' bills, whether office visits or house calls.

Nothing for surgeons' fees, nothing for dentists' bills.

Nothing for drugs, medicines, dentures, eyeglasses, hearing aids.

Then what does medicare provide? Under the administration bill which passed the Senate last fall (the Gore amendment to the Social Security Act), these benefits—and only these—are available:

Up to 45 days in the hospital with no deductions; up to 90 days, if you pay $10 per day for the first 9 days; up to 180 days after a deduction of 2½ times the average cost of 1 day's stay in the hospital.

Hospital care would consist of bed and board, plus nursing and related services "customarily furnished by the hospital to inpatients." Specifically excluded, however,

are "medical or surgical services provided by a physician, resident or intern, except in the fields of pathology, radiology, psychiatry, or anesthesiology."

Nursing-home care would consist of a maximum of 60 days in a "skilled nursing facility" after discharge from the hospital, and would include medical services provided under an approved teaching program by interns and residents of the hospital with which the nursing facility is affiliated. (Few such hospital-affiliated nursing homes exist today.)

Outpatient hospital services would be furnished for diagnostic studies only, during any 30-day period after an initial payment of $20. Home health service would be furnished by a visiting nurse for a maximum of 240 visits in the calendar year.

Medicare advocates claim: "This system permits people to contribute during their working years to the heavy costs of medical care in their later years."

Says Dr. Ernest B. Howard of the American Medical Association: "Rarely have so many lies been packed into so few words."

NOT ON THE LABEL

Indeed, medicare, in many respects, is the opposite of what some proponents claim it to be.

Medicare does not permit; it compels every wage earner to participate in the plan.

The wage earner does not contribute; he is taxed.

The medicare taxes paid "during the wage-earners' working years" do not go to pay "the heavy costs of medical care" in their later years. The taxes they pay today would go to pay today's beneficiaries. Tomorrow's benefits would have to be paid for by tomorrow's taxpayers.

Under medicare the secretary earning $5,600 would pay exactly the same tax as the executive earning $56,000, since the tax base would be on earnings up to $5,600. The tax burden, therefore, would be borne largely by those earning $5,600 and less—the same people who even today are casting worried eyes on their paychecks, aware of the heavy burden imposed by social security deductions plus income tax.

And here is the final irony: Because medicare provides the same aid to all over 65—whether they need it or not—its benefits to those who do need aid are wholly inadequate.

MANDATE FOR MEDICARE?

Current propaganda for the administration bill interprets the Democratic victory of 1964 as a "public mandate for medicare." Yet, since 1961, when medicare started out in high esteem, the weight of public opinion has shifted, as increasing numbers of people learned the facts. The day after the 1964 elections, Samuel Lubell, of United Press International, reported on his nationwide tour ringing doorbells and questioning voters about election issues. He learned from his interviews that, although there was a feeling that "older people need help, details of the administration's proposal are not understood and the opposition of voters rises when they learn how limited is the assistance that would be provided and what it would cost in tax increases."

Many Americans are gravely concerned about the future of social security and opposed to heaping any additional burdens upon it. Their concern is justified. The payroll tax and the tax base both have been climbing steadily, from the original 2 percent of the first $3,000 of income in 1937–49, to 7.25 percent of $4,800 in 1964–65, and will increase to 8.25 percent in 1966, even without medicare. If the medicare bill is passed, it will necessitate an increase to 9 percent of $5,600 in 1966–67 and at least 10 percent the following year.

Nor is an end in sight, Dr. Barkev S. Sanders, who for 35 years was medical and welfare statistician for the Government, reminds us that the Government always underestimates future welfare costs. "On the basis of available evidence," Dr. Sanders reported in Nation's Business, "even in the first year of medicare, its cost would be at least three times the estimated cost. It is more probable that the multiplier would be four."

Inevitably, "medical care under social security" would become a political football. The first step would be to admit openly that medicare is inadequate; next, a little more would be added—always in an election year. And, as benefits increased, the tax inevitably would rise. In 1961 a medicare pioneer, former Representative Aime J. Forand, Democrat, of Rhode Island, virtually admitted that this would be the scheme. "If we can only get our foot inside the door," he stated, "we can expand the program after that."

WHAT'S WRONG?

The fault of the Government medical planners is basically the assumption that most Americans over 65 are sick, destitute, and incapable of taking care of themselves. Promedicare people have presented a frightening image with such statements as, "Incomes of the aged are inadequate even for a modest level of living * * *. The income of the great majority of the aged is little more than a monthly social security check * * *. More than half the aged have incomes of less than $1,000 a year."

Yet the 1963 Report of the President's Council on Aging itself provides facts to contradict such statements:

The "less than $1,000 a year" figure is based on the statistical trick of averaging in the zero incomes of wives and unemployable dependents who are over 65, while completely ignoring the fact that the actual income of the head of the house, or the family income, may be significantly greater.

Only one-third of the total income of Americans over 65 ($35 billion) comes from social security and other Government retirement programs.

The income of the aged has risen faster than the cost of medical care, and faster than the income of the population as a whole. "While the number of older people increased by about 40 percent in the past decade," the Council on Aging states, "their total income rose by more than 130 percent. This compares, for the same period, with an increase of 80 percent in the total personal income of the entire population."

Surveys in 14 States show that between 70 and 91 percent of patients over 65 pay their hospital bills promptly, largely out of income, savings, and private insurance. (This is a much higher percentage than that of younger people.) Ten hospitals in Allegheny County, Pa., have reported that, of 19,996 patients over 65 admitted during 1962–63, 97.4 percent paid up promptly: 76.9 percent with private insurance or their own funds, and 20.5 percent with benefits from the Kerr-Mills program. Only 2.6 percent of the hospitals bills were unpaid when the survey was made.

How do we reconcile these facts with the contention that the older American's problems come "dangerously close to making him a second-class citizen"?

WIDESPREAD ILL HEALTH

Equally false is the assumption that older Americans are mostly feeble and constantly ill. The Senate's Special Committee on Aging, for example, was told that four out of five old people suffer from chronic illnesses, and that they visit doctors 36 percent oftener than the total population. To most laymen "chronis illness" means an ailment that is severe and disabling. But to doctors the word chronic denotes duration and not severity of an illness. Statistics of the U.S. National Health Service show that more than half of older Americans who have chronic health problems are able to carry on their normal activities.

That the aged visit doctors 36 percent oftener than the total population sounds horrendous; but that percentage means exactly 1.8 more visits per year. Those over 65 average 6.8 visits to the doctor's office each year, compared with an average of 5 visits for the total population. And medicare, of course, would not pay for any visit.

A Health Information Foundation survey of elderly Americans not in institutions shows that most of them enjoy reasonably good health. Only 14 percent of those surveyed were classified as very sick. Of the remainder about half considered themselves healthy,; the other half reported some disability but not enough to interfere with physical functioning.

WHAT IS THE ANSWER?

Fortunately medicare is not the only answer to the health problems of the aged. Better answers are available. What we need is a voluntary system that will provide good medical care for all Americans, including those over 65 who are in need. Can this be provided?

Medical and hospital care already is within reach of a majority of Americans through voluntary health-insurance plans. Of the 18 million persons over 65, more than 10 million are now covered by one or another such plan.

For those who have no insurance and cannot qualify under the age limits of standard insurance policies, there is the popular Connecticut 65 plan, inaugurated in 1961. Thirty-two Connecticut insurance companies are pooling their risks in a voluntary association which offers noncancelable insurance covering hospital, medical and surgical expenses to Connecticut residents over the age of 65. Similar plans have been started in New York, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Virginia, Texas, Ohio, and California. The California plan is about to become Western 65, and will operate in Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington, as well as in California.

To make sure that older policyholders will be able to buy their own insurance, Representative FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, has introduced a bill which deserves special consideration. The bill would provide an income-tax credit equal to the amount of the premium up to $150 for those with incomes under $4,000, or up to $300 for a couple whose combined income is less than $8,000. It would authorize the same tax credit to a relative who wishes to purchase health insurance for a family member over 65. The credit would also be available to any employer who provides medical care insurance for his retired employees.

MAA—KERR-MILLS

At the heart of this voluntary system is medical aid for the aged—generally called Kerr-Mills—which, properly implemented, would guarantee that no one over 65 shall be without medical care because of inability to pay.

Unlike Medicare, Kerr-Mills can provide, in addition to hospital and nursing-home care, funds for doctors' bills, dental care, private nursing when needed, laboratory and X-ray facilities, and prescribed drugs. This plan, available to the needy and near-needy without cost, is financed by Federal funds matched by funds of the participating States. Since the law was enacted in 1960, 42 States have authorized participation. Benefits vary from State to State, and in some States the plan is not working as well as it might; but these faults are local, and experience shows that they are correctable.

Medicare advocates have two major objections to Kerr-Mills. First, the plan is operated by the States, and hence is beyond the control of the Federal Government. Second, the plan is exclusively for those over 65 whose low or marginal income will not enable them to bear the cost of the medical care they

need. There are no benefits for those who can afford good medical care.

The social planners complain that needy old folks must pass a means test (which they wrongly equate to a pauper's oath) in order to qualify for Kerr-Mills benefits. Actually, this test is applied by most churches, private charities, labor unions—and by Government agencies like the Veterans' Administration, low-rent public housing, and other programs. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare now uses the same means test to determine whether the earnings of a person over 65 are high enough to disqualify him from receiving his normal social security benefits.

Probably some form of liberalizing the methods of determining need should be included among the other amendments designed to make the Kerr-Mills plan everything it should be; but Congress should retain in the law a proper safeguard against the waste of public funds and the inroads of the free riders.

CAVEAT EMPTOR

Thus there are sound alternatives to the obviously unsound plan called medicare. There is no reason, therefore, why Congress should be stampeded into accepting a plan that has only political expedience in its favor. A majority of the people are now aware of the administration bill's shortcomings. And if such a bill were to be enacted into law, bitter disillusionment would begin as soon as the first benefits were applied for.

It must be recognized that no government programs by themselves can provide a fully adequate solution to the admitted need of many older people for assistance with their health problems. But there are some things that government can and should do to help. The administration has the opportunity to make an effective contribution toward adequate medical care for all, and at lower cost to the taxpayers in the lower bracket, (1) by endorsing and promoting voluntary hospital and surgical insurance; (2) by supporting supplementary plans such as Connecticut 65 and something like the Bow bill; (3) by including and honestly supporting the Kerr-Mills programs, which will take care of those over 65 who are in need of medical care and cannot pay for it themselves. By adopting such a course President Johnson can be instrumental in bringing to all Americans of all ages medical care that is truly worthy of a great society.

Fino Seeks Tax Change Allowing Unmarried Homeowner To Be Taxed at Rate of Head of Household

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduced my bill to allow any unmarried homeowner to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of household.

Where the taxpayer in question owns a home and is obliged to pay the expenses thereof, there is no reason for discrimination based on whether or not the taxpayer is married as far as determining the rate of taxation to be applied to that individual's income. My bill would end such discrimination.

The concept "head of household" ought to relate to the expenses of upkeep of an individual dwelling rather than to the vagaries of the marital laws. The marital status of an individual properly reflects itself in many aspects of our tax structure, but this should not be one of them.

Speaker Never Misses Dinner With Wife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress an article that appeared in the Boston Herald this week, written by one of Boston's outstanding newspaper columnists, Stanley Eames. It is very well written and reveals the fine character of our beloved and able Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. It is my opinion that when the history of this generation is told that amongst those who will lead the list of great and dedicated men will be the name of Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

The article follows:

[From the Boston Herald, Feb. 23, 1965]

QUIET HOME LIFE SUSTAINS MCCORMACK: SPEAKER NEVER MISSES DINNER WITH WIFE

(By Stanley Eames)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Life after 5 in the Nation's Capital has turned many a legislative head.

But one of the most powerful men in the United States has a simple way of unwinding after a hard day's work. Speaker of the House and Mrs. John W. McCormack take a ride to Washington's birthplace, Mount Vernon. On the way, they stop for ice cream.

The man who for months was only a heartbeat from the Presidency leads a curiously schizophrenic life. His days are a maze of the most intricate statecraft imaginable, demanding everything a complex and skilfull man can bring to them. His spare time is passed in stark simplicity.

SPEAKER IS 73

MCCORMAK and his wife have been married more than 40 years, and in that period they have never failed to eat dinner together, an almost miraculous record considering the demands of his office.

"Mrs. McCormack and I," the tall, white-haired Speaker says, "have always lived a quiet, happy life."

From the time of President Kennedy's assassination until HUBERT HUMPHREY was sworn as Vice President on January 20, MCCORMACK needed all the strength of soul that his own nature and the tranquillity of his home have given him.

Had President Johnson died, MCCORMACK would have become President. He is 73, and, for a man in his position, tremendously unassuming. There were those who said his age and background did not fit him for the office. It was even suggested that he resign the speakership.

The authors of this suggestion—which, incidentally, enraged MCCORMACK—failed to take into account the depth and sharpness which have been carved into the McCormack character by a lifetime of politics on the highest level. When MCCORMACK addresses himself to a political problem in Washington, the implications are often global, usually national, seldom parochial, and he is usually working closely with the President on it.

NOT DISMAYED

The Kennedy assassination left him undismayed at the possibility that he might inherit the country's toughest job. "I tried not to think of it," he said, "but, being human, occasionally I did. I was highly relieved when January 20 arrived."

A close associate said he prayed daily for President Johnson's health, but that he once said: "If God chooses me to do this job, I'll do my very best."

"This man isn't afraid of anything," the associate said. "If he had to, he'd have marched in there and done a job."

He is the most powerful Speaker of modern times, and he pilots the House with the ease born of long practice. The nerve center of the McCormack operation is not the House rostrum; it is one of his two suites of offices, where life is a virtually constant conference with different factions of legislators.

His day runs from 9 or so in the morning, when he breakfasts on orange juice, oatmeal and toast in his Hotel Washington suite, to 1 the next morning, when the Speaker puts away his sheaves of homework and retires.

One day recently, the big black Cadillac with the license number "18" rolled up to the Capitol earlier than usual. It was going to be a busy day. A commodity credit bill was having heavy going, because Republicans had tacked on amendments to prevent the closing of several VA hospitals and to place squarely on the shoulders of President Johnson the responsibility for any surplus food shipments to be shipped to the United Arab Republic.

VISITORS INCREASE

Into the inner office hurried Majority Leader CARL ALBERT of Oklahoma, closely followed by Congressman HALE BOGGS, the majority whip. A little later Lew Deschler, the parliamentarian, was summoned.

The visitors in the outer office built up, waiting patiently. Representative GEORGE MAHON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, disappeared into the inner sanctum and, finally, Representative GERALD FORD, House Repblican leader.

They conferred more than an hour. Then MCCORMACK was free for a few moments. He smiled pleasantly, joking, through the taking of pictures and the quick greeting of visitors.

He talked about the burdens of his assignment as Speaker. "Sure," he said, fiddling with the Knights of Malta rosette in his lapel, "I think about these problems at night. I work until after midnight on them at home.

"But I don't let myself worry," he said. "Worry leads to frustration, and frustration in a position of leadership is harmful." Jabbing a long finger for emphasis, MCCORMACK said earnestly, "You've go to have enough confidence in yourself to make decisions, even if the decisions aren't always right."

BUSY SESSION

He mused over the workload ahead. "It's going to be a very busy session," he said. "I'm interested in a lot of bills, but particularly so in medicare, Appalachia, pollution legislation, gold coverage, and the President's health research program." He will carry heavy responsibility for their passage through the House.

It had been a bad morning in Vietnam and, when his daily 11:55 press conference came, the room was filled with reporters who wanted to quiz him about it. The McCormack skill at fencing, half forgotten since he has not been called upon to debate on the House floor, was never in more evidence. He smiled easily, but his eyes were alert behind the old-fashioned rimless glasses, and he gave very little information. The conference was short, because the House comes in at 12.

"Time, Mr. Speaker," his legislative assistant, Martin Sweig, called, and McCormack and his entourage trooped to the House Chamber.

Before the conference, he had expressed regret to the Herald that President Diem had been ousted and assassinated in Vietnam. "At least," McCormack said, "he had some degree of stable government. Stern measures may have to be taken there. Stability and the will to fight for freedom are vitally important." To the press conference, he had said only, "President Johnson will do the right thing. He's got plenty of courage, never forget that."

He presides surely, almost offhandedly, hardly seeming to pay attention to what is going on. The results of his morning's work came to light during the afternoon when the House passed the commodity credit bill with only minor compromises.

MOUNTAINS OF MAIL

By 5:30, the House was out. McCormack returned to his offices, his furrowed face looking no more tired than it had in the morning when he arrived.

For a time, he dictated answers to some of the mountains of mail which come his way. (His office, for one of such importance, is operated with considerable simplicity. Virtually all correspondence, sooner or later, winds up in one of six boxes, marked respectively War, State, Post Office, Veterans' Administration, miscellaneous, and closed.)

Then it was time to review the day's work. He talked with Representative Mahon, Representative Wilbur Mills of the Ways and Means Committee, James Bailey of the Carpenters' Union, Representative Emanuel Celler of the Judiciary Committee, all in person. Through his telephone came calls from Congressman John Dent, of Pennsylvania, Senator Eugene Keogh, of New York, and Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana.

And then, another call, from Larry O'Brien at the White House. The Speaker was needed.

At 6 o'clock, he and his driver, George Donovan, went to the long Cadillac and rolled over the Pennsylvania Avenue where he conferred with the President.

But that night, as always, Speaker and Mrs. McCormack dined together. He has returned from the world of great and complicated events, on which the well-being of millions of persons depend, to the quiet, happy life which sustains him.

A Citizen Observes AID at Firsthand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article which appeared in the "Letters to the Editor" column of the National Voter publication of the League of Women Voters of the United States:

From: Mrs. Alexander A. Treuhaft, former member of the National Board of the League of Women Voters.

Alex and I have just had the fascinating experience of seeing the U.S. aid program at work. The International Housing Committee of the National Association of Home Builders, in cooperation with the State Department, arranged an African housing study tour, and we were fortunate to be participants. It was an absolutely ideal go-see trip. We visited eight countries and in each had excellent briefings by our Embassy staff and the AID (Agency for International Development) team, and met with the country's governmental officials most closely allied with the housing field.

Now it's one thing to sit at home reading all about newly emerging Africa, or discussing foreign aid at league meetings. But it is a very different matter to see the problems and struggles of a newly developing nation, to see AID in operation and learn firsthand about the part it is playing in helping these nations up the road to economic development.

I have a deep aversion to anyone who takes a flying trip to other lands and overnight becomes a self-pronounced pro about everything. So the following is not a pronouncement or a study in depth. It covers only a few of the AID high spots.

Almost the first thing we learned—a point that was evident as we went from country to country—is that while these newly emerging nations face almost insurmountable problems on their way toward development, the basic problem is development of the people themselves. The real need is to furnish them not only with the basic elements of food, clothing, and shelter, but to help them educate and train themselves in order to be participating members of their developing society. But this is a painfully slow process. Cultural patterns are not altered overnight, nor are people of many separate tribes molded into a cohesive nation in a wink. Thus economic development will be a slow, very slow process, and there will be need for aid and technical assistance from the developed countries for a long, long, long time to come.

The peanut crop of Senegal offers a good illustration. Groundnuts, as they call them, are the chief crop, accounting for 80 percent of Senegal's exports. Traditionally these nuts, grown on small, family-tended plots, provide a man's sole source of cash income—and cash is a misnomer since barter is the usual means of exchange. For generations these plots have been sown willy-nilly—no rows, no relationship to contour of land. A major task of the AID team in Senegal is to show the planters that by pooling their plots larger areas could be cultivated. Also, peanuts grown in rows would be far easier to fertilize, cultivate, and harvest, and would produce a larger yield. Not only does AID talk up these advantages, it has planted demonstration fields to prove the point.

But, alas and alack, most planters go on tending their tiny, helter-skelter clearing. Sure enough: having been told all this at the briefing, we returned to our room, looked out the window, and saw a man and his family trudging across a soccer field to a little clearing in the woods, where they went to work in the same old way in their tangle of plants.

This is a prime example of the frustration met in trying to help people help themselves. It is not that they are unwilling, but rather that an ingrained pattern is not quickly nor easily changed, and there are so many to be shown.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that France is gradually withdrawing the peanut crop price subsidy which it has been providing. So Senegal will be faced with finding new markets for its major products. AID's aim for Senegal is thus twofold: more and better peanuts, and diversification of its economy.

Overall, the changing face of Africa shows not only a redrawn map, but a changing pattern of living as well. Sleepy little towns of 20 years ago have almost overnight become roaring cities, overcrowded and underplanned as the rural population treks to the city in search of jobs. Teeming, filthy, tumbledown shantytowns almost floating in seas of mud are mute evidence of this rapid urbanization. Strikingly obvious is the need for planning for roads, schools, hospitals, water supplies, sanitation. But no need is greater than housing.

Nigeria is making the biggest strides toward meeting housing needs in cities. Perhaps this is because it seems to be further advanced than many other African countries. It is blessed with great diversity of natural resources, and has broad diversification of industry. It has enjoyed relative stability in its economy and government.

The Eastern Nigerian Housing Corp. was created by the regional government in 1961 to provide houses for low-income industrial workers and to make it possible for those workers to own their own homes by making a small downpayment and monthly installments over a 20-year period. Four men, comprising the AID housing team, have been acting as consultants to this corporation since 1962. They have assisted in planning—overall and for house design, site engineering, sewage disposal system, water and power lines—and information of the first savings and loan institution in Nigeria.

In the 2 years that the team has been there, amazing progress has been made at the pilot development in Port Harcourt. This city has more than doubled in size in the past 10 years and is now Nigeria's oil center and second largest port. Several hundred homes have already been built in the development; 3,000 units a year are planned. Public acceptance of savings-and-loan has exceeded expectations. As more people deposit their savings, more loan money will be available for purchase of these $1,300, four-room houses. This is truly an AID success story, and, interestingly, the only cost to the United States is salaries for the four-man team.

Over and over again, country by country, we were told of the high priority that education was being given in development plans. In most places the literacy rate runs about 20 percent. Each country claims compulsory education, but it is more of a hope than a reality because there are just not enough trained teachers, nor school buildings, nor even books. In Kenya, for instance, 70 percent of children up to 10 years old attend school, 20 percent up to age 14, and only 2 percent go on to secondary schools. Thus very few are prepared to receive the specialized training necessary to enable them to fill positions of leadership. AID is supplying both personnel and construction funds to help break this bottleneck. No investment will yield greater returns than that applied to training teachers who in turn will educate the children.

We came away somewhat dejected and discouraged by the enormity of the problems these countries face, but with a deep respect for their optimism and eagerness. We are more than ever convinced that thoughtfully planned and carefully administered technical assistance is of inestimable value. Development is a long, slow process, and whatever assistance we can give will help these people help themselves to a higher standard of living. Bring on a "time for action." I have firsthand proof and renewed conviction about the merits of foreign aid.

Taxation Without Representation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia which does not vote for its governing officials could with full justi-

fication revive the slogan upon which our revolution was fought—"No taxation without representation." This incredible state of affairs must be rectified by a home rule bill in this session of the 89th Congress. In both the 87th and 88th Congresses I introduced legislation to accomplish this.

Whitney M. Young, Jr., the able executive director of the Urban League, in an article in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on February 18, 1965, presented an irrefutable case for home rule for the District of Columbia. I urge all my colleagues to read it in the hope that it will spur action on this issue this session. The article follows:

THEY DON'T VOTE, THEY JUST PAY

The prospects for self-government for the people of Washington, D.C., are brighter today than at any time in recent history.

According to informed opinion, there may now be enough support in Congress to break the hold of the House District Committee—guilty of obstructing all home rule bills with disturbing regularity.

Headed by Representative JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina, the committee, dominated by southerners, has kept Washington's 764,000 residents—half of them Negro—voteless.

It is quite possible, however, that a majority of the House will now sign a discharge petition to force a home rule bill out of committee.

If so, it will be a dramatic reversal of form. The McMillan committee has resisted the pressure of responsible civic groups in Washington and of the Nation by the wishes of both political parties and Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy—all of whom endorsed home rule.

Whether they can now flout the wishes of President Johnson, who recently came out strongly for self-government for Washington, is debatable.

Five times since 1948 the Senate passed home rule bills. Each time the District Committee pigeonholed the House version. Once, McMillan resorted to a word-by-word reading of the bill to rebuff Washingtonians—who have expressed themselves favorable to the proposition by a 6-to-1 margin.

For almost 75 years after Washington was chartered in 1802, citizens enjoyed local self-government, electing their own mayors and city councils as intended by the Founding Fathers.

In 1871, however, Congress combined Washington with Georgetown and the county of Washington in order to coordinate better local improvements such as roads and sewage disposal. Due to mismanagement, typical of so many cities in that era, Congress took charge of the enlarged city in 1874—and has kept its people voteless since.

Today, Washington's taxpayers must furnish 87 percent of the Federal District's budget, yet they have no say in how the money is to be spent. They must also support a host of functions unique to a Capital City—wider streets and boulevards, spacious parks, the National Zoo, and the parades, pomp, and ceremony occasioned by receiving foreign heads of state.

Unfortunately, some typical southern Congressmen are determined to perpetuate this national disgrace—one which gives us some insight into the not-so-benevolent practices in some Southern States around election time.

A nation aroused over the flagrant denial of the right of Negro citizens ought to be no less disturbed over the mass disenfranchisement in the District—our ninth largest city.

According to the League of Women Voters, among those groups leading the fight for autonomy, the District Committee majority is not only "unsympathetic to Negro demands for full citizenship" but also opposed to "programs designed to alleviate urban problems common to all our cities."

Thus, the same hand which collects the tax dollars of Washingtonians without representation also reaches out to deprive urban residents in many other American cities.

Every American is entitled to the right to vote. The Founding Fathers intended the people of Washington to govern themselves—not to be governed by Congress.

Democracy can ill afford to allow a small handful of Congressmen—whose seniority and control of the District Committee is itself a byproduct of the one-party rule in effect in much of the South—to perpetuate this tyranny.

If the Government means business, and I believe it does, the administration should bring appropriate pressure to bear on those Congressmen who do not support government of, by, and for the people in our Nation's Capital.

A Valued Frendship in Danger—Our Deteriorating Relations With the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post for February 18, 1965, carries a disturbing account of an interview by Joseph Paull, a Washington Post staff writer, of Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, former Ambassador and High Commissioner to the United States from the Republic of the Philippines. General Romulo is now president of the University of the Philippines.

Recent student demonstrations protesting the fatal shooting of two Filipino trespassers have deeper causes, according to General Romulo, and stem from a general disillusionment with the United States. One of the specific causes noted is an alleged arrogance on the part of Air Force personnel at Clark Air Force Base.

If this be true, the Department of the Air Force should take firm and immediate steps to correct the situation.

In today's topsy-turvy world, the United States must insure its old and valued international friendship by a critical self-examination to determine whether we are following policies of comity and justice with these friendly nations. The State Department ought to consider seriously tne suggestion made by General Romulo to set up a conference of officials of both countries to seek remedial action. Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Paull's article in the RECORD.

PHILIPPINE STUDENTS DISILLUSIONED WITH UNITED STATES, ROMULO DECLARES

(By Joseph Paull)

BAGUIO, THE PHILIPPINES.—The traditional friendship of Filipinos toward the United States is becoming so disillusioned, especially among the youth, that both countries should confer on how to restore confidence, said Gen. Carlos P. Romulo.

The former Ambassador and High Commissioner to the United States, now president of the University of the Philippines, said that the attitudes of Filipino youth would be unrecognizable to Americans who were here a generation ago.

Recent student demonstrations protesting the fatal shooting of two Filipinos trespassing in separate instances on America's Clark Air Force Base on Luzon actually grew out of deeper issues, Romulo said. He explained that events of the last 30 years have demonstrated to the Filipino that Americans are no longer all powerful nor are they entitled to the unreserved adulation of Asian peoples.

In an interview at his weekend home in the summer capital of the Philippines, Romulo said the students at his university consulted him in advance and he did not object to their demonstrating, insisting only that they not join with leftist groups. Romulo said that despite press reports and statements of some observers, the student protests were orderly and dignified.

But behind the demonstrations, Romulo said, was a general disillusionment with the United States. Philippine-American relations, he said, are now outmoded and deteriorating.

Romulo urged that a conference of officials of both countries be set up to take remedial action.

Among the disillusionments Romulo listed as the roots of unrest: When Japan attacked the Philippines at the outset of World War II, the U.S. Navy moved its ships to Java; the efforts of the Filipino Army against the Japanese the next 4 years have largely been forgotten; after the war, the United States granted Filipino fighters only the GI bill's burial rights and payment was in pesos, not dollars.

Romulo said that before granting the Philippines its independence, the United States insisted that American businessmen be given parity with Filipinos; that the United States be given 99-year leases to its bases in the islands.

He said U.S. Army and Navy personnel conduct themselves well, but Air Force personnel at Clark Air Base have been arrogant and insulting. He added that the United States refused to take action even after more than a score of Filipinos were slain in less than 6 years at that base.

Furthermore, Romulo said, the United States grants more aid to such nations as Yugoslavia than to the Philippines.

Romulo, who has been criticized in the Philippines for being closely alined with the United States, said that the triumphal visit of Chief Justice Earl Warren to Manila recently was one note of optimism, but both countries should take action to restore their traditional friendship.

A Farewell to Felix Frankfurter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the death this week of retired Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter should serve as a reminder to all of the harm and wrong done in judging fellow humans by classification, or labeling.

It is all too often the case in public life, and seems to be in vogue today as it was in Washington 25 years ago.

At that time Justice Frankfurter had just been appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court. To some, he was a dangerous man—the label was "liberal." In the West it was usually pronounced much as one would the words "cactus" or banditti."

His appointment was criticized for his lack of experience as a practicing lawyer or as a judge—grounds strangely heard again in recent appointments to the same High Court bench.

Justice Frankfurter lived to earn a place among the immortals of American jurisprudence as an advocate of judicial restraint, a position his critics—and they were legion—would have said was impossible just 25 short years ago.

Pulitzer prize winner William S. White states the case classically well, the case for the abolition of the stereotype. I am happy to recommend to my colleagues his column from this morning's Washington Post.

It follows:

JUSTICE FRANKFURTER: THE LABEL WAS WRONG

(By William S. White)

The extraordinary spread and the extraordinary emptiness of cliche thinking has rarely been so clearly shown as in the long life of Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter.

For Justice Frankfurter, who is now dead in his 83d year, was more than a stalwart guardian of the American constitutional tradition and more than a brilliant advocate and lifelong lover of the Anglo-American political system and tradition.

He was also, and in this case quite unwittingly, a living refutation of the article of faith that every public figure can be put under a label clearly marked "liberal" or into a pigeonhole clearly marked "conservative" and that all that is clearly that. Current political criticism positively crawls with this form of instant nonthought, much as our dining rooms are positively awash with instant coffee.

For the better part of three decades, first as a professorial adviser to Franklin D. Roosevelt and later as a Supreme Court Justice presumed to be up to God knew what radical designs. Justice Frankfurter was seen by people who thought they were conservatives as a kind of American Rasputin urging on a wild revolutionary in Mr. Roosevelt.

They reached the conclusion that Justice Frankfurter was the mortal enemy of conservatism, Justice Frankfurter or themselves. He was first suspect, in the early days, because he had spoken up for the accused anarchists, Nicolo Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, in Massachusetts. His activity was seen, with the oversimplification that is the first and surest characteristic of cliche thinking, as necessarily proanarchy. After all, was he not defending anarchists?

He was, of course, defending not men and certainly not anarchy, but rather its deep and absolute opposite, the rule of orderly law; that is the Anglo-American concept of justice under responsible administration. It was a profoundly conservative stance that he was taking. For his concern was for the preservation of the right to a fair and coolheaded trial for accused persons wholly undisturbed by those popular passions which are quite as likely to blow up from the left as from the right.

They never blow up from among true conservatives because true conservatives accept the necessity for fair play even on those occasions when the game under those rules is going very much against them. They accept it because it is really their only principle in public affairs; and one can always sustain a solitary, limited and rational principle, whereas he well may weaken and abandon under pressure those unwisely open ended and impossibly idealistic principles with which the liberal tends to load himself down.

At any rate, the early Justice Frankfurter was widely viewed as a sort of intellectual bomb-tosser until, in the late fifties the central motivation of his life began to appear clearly even to the stereotypemakers, the cliche chanters. This central motivation was reflected in his long, brave, and largely vain fight on the High Bench to defend the Constitution as it was written from an emotional and reformist-minded Court majority.

Now, by this point, the course of his life and work was too plain for further doubt. As a private man, he was humane and "liberal"—liberal in the sense of being compassionate of man's condition and quite prepared to consider all sorts of innovations so long as they did not breach that Constitution which it was his duty to preserve.

He never believed the law and Constitution, however, were made to make men happy, or even well adjusted; he believed they were made only to make men free. He did not, that is to say, overstate his principles.

Like all who in the ultimate balancing up are more conservative than otherwise, he knew where the liberals had erred. Unlike them, he did not believe in the perfectibility of man; but rather only in the humanity of men, which is another thing altogether. He was a memorable man this Austrian-born immigrant who so enriched that English-speaking world which most of all he loved.

Samuel M. Levinson, Pittsburgh Business and Civic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Samuel M. Levinson is a part of the history of Pittsburgh, and was a vital force in the civic, cultural, religious, and charitable activities in all western Pennsylvania. Sam Levinson was a historic Pittsburgh personality and especially of the Jewish community up to the very day of his death, December 8, 1964.

Sam Levinson was born in Pittsburgh August 6, 1890. He began his early business life with his father in the collection of scrap iron, early 1912 and 1913, and following the death of his father, he entered the steel business. During this period and until our entrance into the Second World War, he was a tremendous athlete, excelling especially in basketball where he established the reputation throughout the entire county of Allegheny—Pittsburgh—of holding the forwards that he guarded to one basket a game, a phenomenal feat even in the old days.

Sam Levinson became president of the Levinson Steel Co., an outstanding company, and held that position almost 50 years until his illness. Sam Levinson was succeeded by his son Aaron Levinson, and the elder Samuel became chairman of the board.

The Levinson Steel Co., located along the Monongahela River on the south side of Pittsburgh, is considered one of the largest U.S. steel fabricators among the independent steel companies, and this company headed by Sam Levinson is considered a model for employer-employee labor relations.

Sam was a great leader in the Y.M. & W.H.A.—Young Men's and Women's Hebrew Association—and shortly before his death gave to the Pittsburgh Y.M. & W.H.A. a gift of $200,000 to be used by the "Y" for a summer rest place and camp in Monroeville near Pittsburgh to benefit those folks who could not afford summer vacations.

He was an original member of the National Conference of Christians and Jews and annually gave the Levinson Award, which was presented to the outstanding Pittsburgh personality who contributed most to "brotherhood."

Sam Levinson served as president of the James and Rachel Levinson Foundation—named after his parents—which has donated hundreds of thousands toward charity, given many gifts to Duquesne University, our Pittsburgh Catholic University, the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Tech, and Margaret Morrison College. The Levinson Foundation was the Rock of Gibraltar behind the civil rights movement. It supported strongly the movement to raise college scholarships for Negroes and a camp to give Negro children a chance for summer vacation.

Sam Levinson was treasurer of the Metallurgical Laboratory of the American Technion. For over 50 years he was a member of Lodge 44 of the B'nai B'rith, the oldest Jewish service organization in the world. He was chairman of the Laurel "Y" Camp Committee. In 1960 he received the Outstanding Award of the Pittsburgh Chapter of the American Technion Society for his contribution to the growing State of Israel. In 1961 he received the Outstanding B'nai B'rith Award in commemoration of the 118th anniversary of this great organization.

In 1958 Mr. Samuel Levinson was named by the National Conference of Christians and Jews as the citizen who contributed most to the brotherhood among men.

Throughout his business, cultural, charitable, and spiritual life, Sam Levinson contributed greatly to the renaissance of Pittsburgh and contributed immensely to the unity among Pittsburgh Jewry.

As evidence of Sam Levinson's broad interests, he was a life trustee and organizer of the Brashear Association, South Side, Pittsburgh, named in honor of Pittsburgh's pioneer astronomer.

Sam Levinson had thousands of friends and admirers; but was loyal to his family and employees. Sam's good wife is the former Rose Levinson, residing at 5438 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., the family home. The family consists of son Aaron, and two daughters, June Siegel and Netta Grollman, wife of Rabbi Earl A. Grollman.

For my own part, I have always admired Sam Levinson as a businessman with a warm heart, and as cheerful booster, and an enthusiastic worker for the civic good, and for community progress.

Judge Samuel Weiss of Pittsburgh, and former U.S. Congressman, says of Sam Levinson, his devoted friend: "Yes, there will be only one Sam, he was tops." And Sam really was.

At the funeral service, attended by a full congregation, there was delivered a moving eulogy by Rabbi Earl A. Grollman, which I quote in closing:

EULOGY FOR SAMUEL M. LEVINSON

(By Rabbi Earl A. Grollman)

Our Bible tells us our days are as a shadow upon the earth. The question is in life, what kind of shadow—what kind of shadow. The rabbis responded that there are three kinds of shadows:

There is first of all the shadow of a bird in flight. The bird flies away and there is neither bird nor shadow. So many of us on earth are like that shadow. We are here but a brief period of time and then we are gone, with no trace behind us.

There is then a second shadow—the shadow cast by a wall. In the morning when the sun is low, the wall casts a long shadow, but as the sun rises higher, the shadow becomes smaller and smaller until, at noon, when the sun is overhead, the shadow shrinks away. Many of us are like the wall's shadow. We have lives that are partial lives—not empty and not fulfilled; not meaningful and yet not deeply significant.

But there is a third shadow—the shadow of a tree which has its place upon the earth all day as long as the sun shines. The tree grows and its boughs spread thickly, and its leaves are many. The shade it casts is wide, and grateful travelers find renewal and revival, after the heat, under its protecting coolness.

Samuel Levinson's true life is so: a great tree of life, grown tall under the sun, casting the great shadows that never disappear; its fruit does not wither for its roots are deeply nourished in the living waters that are of God; and the pilgrims on the highway of life come and drink and are refreshed. And the tree stands across the time of many generations. Its shadow remains.

When you mention the name of Samuel Levinson, you think of a man—strong, assertive, masculine. Here was a man who loved life and lived it to the fullest. He worked hard and he played hard. Each experience—whether a crossword puzzle or an altruistic endeavor—each experience became not only a problem to be solved but a challenge to be met. He lived each day as if it were his last.

S. M. was a captain of industry. He walked with kings but he never forgot the common touch. He hated sham and pretense and pomposity. He said what he meant and he meant what he said. His word was his bond.

Sam loved his family—his wife; his son, Aaron; his daughters, June and Netta; his brothers and his sisters. If love is the voice of God, both Samuel and Rose Levinson heard the echo of the Almighty. Fifty-two years they lived and shared. When Rose called her husband Sweetheart, these were not empty words but a deep and abiding expression of the maturity of the years. It was a love that consisted not only of looking at each other, but in looking outward together in the same direction. God breathed the breath of life in Sam Levinson, but for the last 5½ years of sickness, Rose sustained this life, with kindness, patience and devotion.

And in a sense, Sam is more alive now than he has been through days of travail and pain. What more can be said of any man who lived well, laughed often, and loved much; who gained the respect of intelligent men and the adoration of little children; who filled his niche and accomplished his task; who left the world better than he found it; whose life was an inspiration and whose memory is a benediction.

So is his memory with us: a life fulfilled, a life of meaning, a precious heritage, the inextinguishable light, the shade upon right, whose shadows will never disappear.

Life's race well run; life's work well done. Amen.

Schools Pool Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article that appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express on February 17, 1965.

The article shows how a group of schools in Erie County, N.Y., have pooled their resources to provide educational services that the individual schools could not provide by themselves.

The article follows:

SCHOOLS POOL RESOURCES

(By Harlan Abbey)

HARKNESS CENTER

A comprehensive collection of educational services is housed in the Harkness Center, 99 Aero Drive, Cheektowaga.

The center consists of vocational classrooms for 185 students in northern Erie County schools, a learning resources center containing modern teaching machines, a library of 1,900 teaching films, a data processing center, a fulltime artist, a darkroom, and the offices of the Erie County's first supervisory district staff.

"Open house" will be held at the Center from 7 to 9:30 tonight.

COURSES OFFERED

Vocational courses offered are cosmetology, auto mechanics, practical nursing, machine shop, and electronics. The auto shop currently is being expanded and will accommodate 40 more students next September.

New courses to be added in a proposed $700,000 expansion will include aviation and building maintenance, food trades, and other courses now being conducted in rented space in member schools.

Ernest H. Hoeldtke, superintendent of the First Supervisory District, said "Many cooperative districts have some of our services, some have all of them, but none of them have all these services centrally located in one building."

HALF-DAY COURSES

Vocational students spend a half day at the Harkness Center taking specialized courses and a half day at their regular high school taking academic courses.

Dr. Ira J. Singer, director of curriculum development, said 500 teachers in the district have taken courses and workshops lasting from 10 to 50 hours at the Center.

"We conduct these courses here so we can introduce teachers to all our programed learning devices, our films and other equipment; we hope they then will make use of these devices in their classrooms," he explained.

COMPUTERS

The data processing center has a modern computer that schools use for payroll, budgeting, class scheduling, attendance, report cards, and recordkeeping.

Dr. Justus Prentice, assistant district superintendent and director of Harkness Center, said the district is seeking a grant to build a center to be used for teacher training, adult education, programs for school dropouts, and a Saturday center for disadvantaged students. Programed learning for students weak in certain areas also would be conducted here. A research library would be included.

The theory behind the Harkness Center is that schools in the same supervisory district can join to provide the specialized programs they would not be able to afford as individual schools.

The Case for a Nicaraguan Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1965, there appeared in one of America's great newspapers, El Diario-La Prensa, an editorial by O. Roy Chalk, the publisher, urging that the United States build a canal through Nicaragua. Because of the great importance of this issue, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to this interesting editorial. The editorial follows:

A NICARAGUAN CANAL? OF COURSE

It is interesting to note that the first two Central American nations visited by Assistant Secretary of State, Thomas C. Mann, were Nicaragua and Costa Rica. Undoubtedly, this astute statesman has done so because this proposed area is the closest to the United States of America and the most desirable, philosophically, as a wedge against communism in the Latin American sector of the Western Hemisphere. It is an area where friends of the United States of America abound, and irritating, agitating Yankee baiters are unpopular.

The canal through Nicaragua has been seriously considered and discussed as a feasible point for many decades. During almost the past 50 years, it has been repeatedly evaluated as a logical point by Central American experts of our State Department and our Department of Defense. Such discussions, in themselves, are evidence of the logic of this canal. Logic from a technical point of view, logic from the political aspects, and logic from an economic appraisal.

A canal through Nicaragua would, in a true sense, be a breakthrough into Latin American popularity and friendship. Nicaragua has consistently demonstrated friendship and loyalty to the United States. By virtue of the Chamorro-Bryan Agreement almost 50 years ago, Managua gave Washington an "exclusive option" to open a canal through Nicaraguan territory. Nicaragua contracted and agreed not to negotiate with any other country or private enterprise for the opening of such a canal. In Wall Street parlance, it granted the United States a "call" on the canal. When dealing with a friend, it would seem to be a matter of elementary justice that a "call" deserves a "put." When Nicaragua gave an "exclusive option" to the United States to build a new canal, Nicaragua in return should have an exclusive option that we build the same through Nicaraguan

territory—this is, if it is feasible and desirable—which it is.

Would such an apparent preference (which is a matter of long standing treaty) for Nicaragua seem to be a reprisal against the people of Panama? Definitely not. Panama already has its canal. As a matter of good, old-fashioned Yankee business practice, we should be careful not to put too many eggs in one explosive container. In recent times, the Panamanians have given strong evidence that the proximity of U.S. forces and U.S. civilians has not made them overly happy. The fact that a new canal would be built through Nicaragua is our business and Nicaragua's business, and in no case signifies that the United States would abandon the present Panama Canal. Certainly, Panama has no call upon us and is not entitled to two canals. A canal built with U.S. taxpayer money through Panama would undoubtedly be strenuously opposed in Congress. Politically and philosophically, it is unfeasible.

Another major inducing cause to choose Nicaragua as the most desirable site, would be the fact that Nicaragua and its four neighbors; Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica, the new and expanding Common Market of Central America, would vastly improve their economies and their goal of a bootstrap operation to jointly benefit their 14 million people. The cost of a second canal through Nicaragua would not necessarily be more expensive than one through Panama for the reason that at least we may be assured of receiving dollar value for every dollar spent in construction costs. It would also be more than justified by the impetus given the development of a Common Market and the five nations of that region. These five nations of the Central American Republics are closest to the enormous consumer and export markets of our country.

Because we have friends there, Central America has been the area most threatened by propaganda from Red Cuba. We are sure that Mr. Mann understands this as he reviews the pros and cons for a new canal.

Nicaragua, si.

The Honorable Alejandro D. Yango Looks at United States-Philippines Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, for many years now we have enjoyed good relations with the Republic of the Philippines, a Republic which we fathered. The heroic people of the Philippines under the leadership of Dr. Jose Rizal and Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo overthrew a tyrannical oppressor.

During the Second World War, when this great nation was under the scourge of another oppressor, we helped them regain their independence. Now, however, we find ourselves in a position where relations are becoming somewhat strained; where people who are hostile to the United States are taking advantage of misadventurous happenings to drive a wedge between our two great republics.

But, Mr. Speaker, men with rational minds, and with long experience in international affairs, are able to solve their mutual problems without bloodshed, and come to sensible agreement. Such a man is the Honorable Alejandro D. Yango, Philippine Consul General in Hawaii. His thoughts on recent events in the Philippines as presented in an interview by Mr. Jack Williams of the Honolulu Star Bulletin are worthy of note and with unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD:

PHILIPPINE DEMONSTRATIONS: CONSUL HERE FEELS ANTI-AMERICAN FEELING OVER BASE SLAYINGS WON'T BECOME WORSE

(By Jack Williams)

Anti-American demonstrations in the Philippines are serious but won't worsen, the Consul General of the Philippines in Hawaii believes.

Consul Alejandro D. Yango feels the demonstrations will subside because "we are close freinds and progress is being made to solve the problem."

The problem stems from recent killings of Filipinos by American servicemen at U.S. bases in the Philippines and resultant demands that the agreements between the United States and the young Pacific nation be ended.

Philippine Government officials seek revisions to the agreement between the United States and the Philippines on jurisdiction on the bases. Negotiations are now underway to modify the treaty.

In answer to the question "Are the anti-American demonstrations in the Philippines serious?" the man who handles the affairs of the Philippine Government in Hawaii actually had two answers: "Yes and no."

CREATE NATIONALISTIC FEELING

In an exclusive interview with the Star-Bulletin, he made this point:

"Yes, because they create nationalistic feelings on the part of the people on the Philippines. These feelings have come to the fore and because the demonstrations involve the naval base (at Subic Bay) and Clark Air Force Base, they are serious.

"No, because the U.S. Ambassador (William McCormick Blair, Jr.) and Philippine authorities have agreed to sit down across the table and talk about the problem.

"They are finding ways to solve it and the channels of communication are being kept open. Progress is being made and this is good."

(It was announced yesterday in Manila that the United States has offered the Philippine Government broader legal jurisdiction over key U.S. military bases. The offer was made by Blair in negotiating session with Philippine Foreign Secretary Mauro Mendez. It is expected to go far in answering criticism in Manila of the current pact.)

HAS HAD NO OFFICIAL WORD

The consul stressed that he has had no official word from Manila on the matter.

"All I know of the problem is what I read in the newspapers from Manila, from bulletins from New York from the Philippine Association, from the Philippine-American Chamber of Commerce and of course, from the local press."

But he did make these other points:

The status of forces agreement between the Philippines and the United States needs to be revised to enable the Philippine Government to exercise jurisdiction in appropriate cases over offenses committed within American military bases.

American people should realize that wherever the United States has bases, there have been incidents similar to the ones in the Philippines.

The cause of the incidents is not wholly the fault of Filipinos. There is connivance between people on the inside (of the bases) and on the outside.

Communists instigated the anti-U.S. demonstrations. Steps are being taken to counteract the Communist activities.

The appearance of Chief Justice Earl Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court in the Philippines will do much to help the situation generally. Warren is now in the Philippines to be guest speaker during the observance of the 30th anniversary of the enactment of the Philippine Constitution.

Filipinos generally admire the United States and its President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

The situation won't become worse because our countries are too close; too friendly.

FEELS PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE

Consul Yango feels real progress has been made in the case of A/1c Larry Cole, of Marshall, Mich., whom the U.S. Air Force has charged with unpremeditated murder in the killing of a Filipino at Clark Air Base in a pilferage case.

"Here, the U.S. officials have begun court-martial proceedings and this will do much to help the situation," he pointed out.

The other case that has aroused Filipinos to demonstrate against the United States concerns the fatal shooting of a Filipino at Subic Bay Naval Base by two Marine guards. The case is being investigated, but like the Clark Air Base case, the Philippines lacks jurisdiction. In both cases, guards said they opened fire to prevent pilfering.

Consul Yango said he is in full agreement with Philippines Justice Secretary Salavador Marino, who reported to President Macapagal last week on the situation and concluded the United States-Philippine bases agreement must be revised.

"At present, we have no jurisdiction on incidents involving crimes committed inside U.S. bases in the Philippines. We seek an agreement that will allow the United States to waive jurisdiction in favor of the Philippines. Even the Japanese have this basic agreement. We seek the same thing."

Yango said that Americans "should realize that wherever the United States has bases there have been irritants that have caused incidents. In Spain, Japan, Korea, and even Iceland, you have had trouble. It's not something that should surprise the American people. They are surprised that it happens in the Philippines because we are so close to you; we are such good friends."

He added that Americans should know that "we feel that when these things happen there is a strong feeling in the Philippines that there is connivance between the people on the outside and the people on the inside (of the base)."

Citing an example, he explained that bombs weighing 100 to 750 pounds have been secreted out of U.S. bases in the Philippines.

"These could not have been taken out without connivance between the people on the outside and people on the inside."

"This has been going on all the time; not just in the Philippines, but all over the world where you have bases—even here in Hawaii." He did not elaborate.

Yango cited a report made recently by Foreign Secretary Mendez of the Philippines that the Philippine Government was aware that Communists took part in the recent demonstrations against the United States and steps are being taken to counteract the Communist activities.

"As you know," he pointed out, "we outlawed communism in the Philippines. We are strongly anti-Communist and will continue to be that way."

MINIMIZES DEMONSTRATIONS

He minimized the demonstrations, explaining that it appeared only "a small group" was involved.

"They were merely exercising their right to demonstrate as guaranteed under our constitution—the right of peaceful assembly."

On January 22, a crowd of university students estimated at from 500 to 1,000 demonstrated in front of the U.S. Embassy in Manila, and called for an end to all agreements between the United States and the Philippines, including the military bases treaty. It was an orderly demonstration.

On January 26, 5,000 Filipinos marched on the Embassy, again demanding the end of agreements. The Philippine Congress was in joint session at the time to hear President Macapagal and the demonstrators went there to press their demands. Spokesmen said the demands would be given a full hearing.

Yango was critical of the reports in the American press (in Hawaii as elsewhere) that stressed the pilferage angle, but did not stress, when it was the case, the workings of American servicemen involved.

"There is a case of an American serviceman who headed a gang that took out boxes of ammunition from a U.S. base and provided it for Filipino demonstrators, but very little publicity has been given that case, in the United States." he complained.

But he ended the interview on a hopeful note.

"Negotiations between your Ambassador and our officials are now going on aimed at revising the status of forces agreement. This is good progress. The Cole case is moving in the right direction. The feelings of the Philippine people is being considered. Channels are being kept open and this is good. Our peoples are too close to let the matter ruin our friendship."

Both Blair and Mendez talked again this week on the matter and U.S. officials predicted in Washington that "through the course of time, a new article on jurisdiction and other matters, we feel, will emerge."

The Laramie Lifesaver: What Flight Service Stations in Wyoming Mean to Pilots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years certain Federal Aviation Agency officials persist in trying to close manned flight service stations and aviation navigation facilities in the State of Wyoming. My colleagues who are fimilar with the West know that Wyoming is one of the trickiest of the States in which to fly. VFR flying particularly meets its most stringent challenge in areas like Wyoming which is made up of plains ranging from 3,000 to 7,000 feet in elevation and of mountain peaks that pierce 14,000 feet into the air. Winds aloft, turbulence, mountain flying downdrafts, and other aviation perils are as prevalent in Wyoming as in any State in the Union.

Yet certain FAA officials persist in wanting to convert Wyoming facilities at Sheridan and at Laramie into remotely manned operations.

I am happy to have this RECORD indicate how life is saved as a result of these manned facilities, and I am happy to include in my remarks the following editorial from the Laramie, Wyo., Daily Boomerang. I hope this will be read by all who are interested in aviation, and particularly by those who have occasion to rely upon Government facilities when flying the airways of America.

[From the Laramie (Wyo.) Boomerang, Feb. 11, 1965]

STATION'S NEED POINTED UP

An Indiana pilot is alive today after he made an emergency landing near Bosler. If it hadn't been for a Federal Aviation Agency station manned 24 hours a day that pilot might very well have been found dead when he was eventually located.

When the pilot left Laramie the weather was clear with clouds to the north and west. He climbed over the clouds but found the mountains filled in so that landmarks were not distinguishable. He headed north to see if it was any clearer that way. He ran into more storm and headed back to Laramie.

At Laramie he found the field closed in by clouds and finally was forced to make an emergency landing near Bosler.

All of this happened in an area where the weather is supposed to be remoted out of Denver if the FAA station is abandoned as previously indicated.

The FAA managed to keep in contact with the pilot after he went down through relay messages between commercial planes and the ground. They knew at the FAA station here where the plane's general location was, but with that much to go on ground crews couldn't find it during the night because of blizzard conditions, although the downed pilot could occasionally see lights.

Weather proved a factor in continued slowing down of search operations the next morning. The downed plane was without radio communication now for its fuel supply had been exhausted. Finally a break in the weather allowed a plane to take off from Brees Field and in less than an hour the plane had been spotted.

Without FAA in the area no communication would have been established. Without the Agency on a 24-hour system the location of the plane would have been a matter of speculation. Without that location pretty well fixed, search pilots would have had a wide area to cover and only a brief period in which they could fly to spot the plane. Without FAA present, no one would have been aware for possibly days that the plane hadn't made it to its destination. Then, the search area would have been a vast one.

The pilot wasn't dressed for cold weather. He wouldn't have been able to leave his plane and walk out with any hope of success.

The single incident brings attention to the need for maintenance of the FAA station at Laramie. There's little doubt that if such a station hadn't been in operation in the area that the pilot of the light plane would have been found dead of exposure at a later date.

The FAA station plays an important part in aviation in the mountain area where weather is constantly changing. To close one down would mean disaster in many cases. It would set aviation safety back a number of years. The situation here has been found necessary in the saving of a pilot's life, but even under normal conditions it's sorely needed.

Ohioan's Bravery in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to an article that appeared in the Washington Post, Sunday, February 21, 1965, with reference to the particular bravery in the field, of U.S. Brig. Gen. Richard Rowland, the second ranking U.S. airman in Vietnam.

I draw the attention of the House to the fact that Brigadier General Rowland is a distinguished Ohioan, whose home is located in Lodi, Medina County, Ohio.

General Rowland's bravery certainly reflects great credit upon his country, the U.S. Air Force, and his home community. Ohio is indeed proud of this serviceman who, under conditions that are indeed desperate at this hour, acted so heroically so as to avert a planned bombing of an air operations center at Saigon, which air operations center is so vital to the continued and effective conduct of the war in Vietnam.

As Congressman at Large for the State of Ohio, I am indeed proud to represent a people capable of authoring heroes in a time of emergency of the caliber of General Rowland. This soldier merits our respect, admiration, and our appreciation.

The article follows:

U.S. AIDE DEFIED THREAT OF VIETNAMESE BOMBING

SAIGON, February 20.—A U.S. Air Force brigadier general in a dramatic move probably headed off a planned aerial bombing of the air operations center at Saigon's huge Tan Son Nhut Airbase late Friday by making himself an obvious target.

Brig. Gen. Richard Rowland, the second-ranking U.S. airman here, decided to establish himself inside the vulnerable center when he felt he had failed in several telephone attempts to persuade the enraged Vietnamese Air Force commander, Brig. Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, not to send Skyraiders to divebomb the base.

Ky was insisting on bombing the center in the midst of the huge military complex because the rebel coup leader, former Brig. Gen. Lam Van Phat, smuggled back into this country from exile, had seized the center as his headquarters.

STAYS IN CENTER

When Rowland decided Ky was still preparing to divebomb, he told the Vietnamese general that in that case he—Rowland—was going to enter the center. He did, and stayed there until the bombing threat faded with nightfall.

Rowland was talking to Ky by military telephone at Bien Hao Airbase about 12 miles northeast of Saigon, where most of Ky's divebombing force is established.

Rowland is a 46-year-old Ohioan who is chief of the U.S. Air Force advisory group here.

At dusk it appeared that General Rowland's mission might be a failure. About 7 p.m. word came that a strafing run was imminent and thousands of U.S. servicemen on the field were ordered to take cover.

The warning was hardly necessary. American servicemen for hours had been staying close to sandbagged bunkers and gunposts.

Suddenly a pair of Skyraiders that had been droning at a respectable altitude above the field suddenly roared down at the air operations center.

An American Air Force major yelled at Francois Sully, of Newsweek, and me to take cover.

The Skyraiders bored in and we flattened behind sandbags, but fortunately the Skyraiders also flattened out their simulated bomb runs and zoomed up again. All this time the air alert was sounding.

By 8 p.m. the danger seemed past. The Skyraiders continued to patrol at higher levels and servicemen began coming out of the sandbagged bunkers.

"Well, at least we trained them properly," remarked a U.S. Air Force adviser as he looked up toward the planes that by now had dutifully turned on their downward-flashing recognition lights.

JOHN MAFFRE.

Outside Medical Experts Support VA Hospital Closings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of my colleagues are aware of the Special Medical Advisory Group which has been established by law to advise the Veterans' Administration on the treatment of the sick and disabled veterans. It is composed of outside medical experts.

In view of the current controversy raised by the proposed closing of several VA installations, the hearings being currently held in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and my own desire to obtain a clear picture of both sides of this discussion, I was most interested in the recommendations of the Special Medical Advisory Group.

I feel that all of my colleagues should read the letter and statement, which follow, from Dr. Thomas M. Brem, who is Chairman of the Advisory Group and is a professor of medicine at the University of Southern California School of Medicine. Dr. Brem, speaking for the Special Medical Advisory Group, wrote as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 21, 1965.

Mr. WILLIAM J. DRIVER,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration Central Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DRIVER: You are aware I am sure that the Special Medical Advisory Group at its last meeting in January learned of the resignation of Mr. John Gleason. The group was naturally concerned with the appointment of his successor, and particularly with the interest, appreciation, and knowledge of the medical program that he might possess. In fact I was instructed by the Special Medical Advisory Group to communicate to the President our concern in this regard. We believe that the Veterans' Administration medical program, although not the largest budgetwise, is its most sensitive activity because it deals essentially with very necessary personal services with the attendant extraordinary complexities. I can assure you that I was greatly relieved and more than pleased to hear of your appointment as Administrator. This is my last year as a member of the group, but I will have no concern about the future of the Veterans' Administration medical program. With you and Dr. McNinch leading the way, I am confident that all of our efforts toward the best possible care of the veteran will be achieved.

I am also aware of the clamor attendant upon the announcement of closing or consolidating certain Veterans' Administration medical installations. As you no doubt know, these proposals have been discussed with the Special Medical Advisory Group by Mr. Gleason and Dr. McNinch on several occasions. In every instance the members have been in accord with the philosophy and desirability of these changes and have supported them. There can be no question that changes in the practice and effectiveness of medicine and in the distribution of potential patients demand changes in the distribution and organization of medical facilities.

I believe that I can speak for the Special Medical Advisory Group in strong support for the changes proposed. I am not sure of what I can do to support you in this, but you may be sure that I am anxious to do whatever I can.

With hearty congratulations on your appointment and very best wishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. BREM, M.D.,
Professor of Medicine, Chairman, Special Medical Advisory Group.

DR. BREM'S STATEMENT TO CONGRESS

Speaking on behalf of the special Medical Advisory Group to the Veterans' Administration, I would like to make the following observations relative to the proposed closure of several Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries.

Our sole interest in this is the provision of modern medical care of high quality to our eligible veterans. To this end, the problems of operating certain hospitals within the VA system have been discussed with us on various occasions. The great advances in medical knowledge and medical practice over the years have dictated significant changes in the provision of medical care. Medical care—diagnosis and treatment—are now far more effective than even ten years ago provided the newer knowledge and methods can be made available to patients. This, in turn, requires the application of teams of physicians, nurses, and technicians, and other professional personnel, skilled in modern methods and the presence of facilities and equipment to implement their skills. All of these are expensive and relatively scarce despite their effectiveness. It is quite apparent that they cannot be made available to all areas of the country, but rather must be provided in complete centers. The maintenance of small hospitals in remote regions makes it difficult to provide the type of comprehensive medical care to which our veterans are entitled. Sufficient highly trained and skilled professional personnel canont be persuaded to accept positions in these areas, nor is the provision of expensive facilities and equipment feasible.

No longer is it desirable that medical care be segregated into single diseases or categories. The day of the large tuberculosis hospital, the psychiatric hospital and domiciliary is past. Experience has shown that far better and more effective care and restoration are accomplished in a complete general hospital setting where the experts in the various fields can communicate and consult with one another—where modern modalities and facilities for treatment are available.

Knowing the nature of the hospitals proposed for closure, we must conclude that they cannot provide the full range of comprehensive modern medical care. Many of them have professional personnel vacancies in essential areas. Others have seriously outmoded plants. Still others have the undesirable segregation of domiciliary and tuberculosis patients from the rest of medicine.

Needs are always relative and examination of bed waiting lists indicate that these are quite low in relation to those of hospitals in other areas. Clearly there has been a migration of veterans and the obligation of the veterans hospitals is to follow this migration to the areas where the need and demand is greatest—where the provision of complete and broad programs of medical care is feasible. We do not believe that it serves the best interest of our veterans to provide incomplete or less effective care to those who live in out-of-the-way places when modern and comprehensive care can be provided within a reasonable distance. Convenience of care is a poor substitute for quality and completeness.

There can be little doubt as to where the needs are greatest and where the provision of effective and complete programs are feasible. Budgetary limitations require that decisions—sometimes uncomfortable and seemingly harsh—must be made as to the manner in which the funds are most effectively allocated. When these decisions require change, there are bound to be instances of inconvenience—even hardship. In the present instance, however, we are convinced that there will be many more instances of hardship relieved than created and that the overall medical program of the Veterans' Administration will be rendered much more effective in the services that it provides to our veterans.

We respectfully submit these views for your consideration.

Latin Unions Backing Boycott of Allies Shipping to Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently the Inter-American Regional Workers Organization adopted a resolution put forward by the Venezuelan delegation to impose a boycott of ships calling in Cuba. Once put into effect, such a move would have widespread damage to Cuba as the only practical way of supplying this Communist island is by ship. Many nations now allowing their ships to call in Cuba would prefer to retain the trade within the rest of this hemisphere than lose it through continued shipping for Castro.

Writing in the Fort Lauderdale News, Hector Morales has realized the significance of the new movement gathering in Latin American unions, and summarizes the changing conditions in them very concisely. I place the article in the RECORD at this point:

LATIN AMERICAN UNIONS TAKE SURPRISE POSITION

(By Hector Morales)

Twenty-five years have changed most Latin American unions from the extreme left to a strong stand against communism.

Communist-controlled unions of the pre-World War II era apparently have cleaned house and now are launching a campaign to boycott Castro's Cuba.

The Inter-American Regional Workers Organization (ORIT) unanimously passed a resolution calling for all unions in North and South America to boycott all incoming or outgoing Cuban products.

The action was the highlight of the ORIT's meeting during the weekend in Mexico City. It marked a complete turnabout of unions in Latin America whose history has been thwarted by international communism.

Back in the 1930's, when communism was rampant among college circles in the United States, Latin American unions were being taken over by a more radical phase of communism.

It all started in Mexico where Lombardo Toledano, an avowed Communist, molded the Confederation of Mexican Workers into the strongest union in that country.

From Mexico, Toledano launched a campaign to communize all nations in Latin America with the ultimate goal of total takeover.

Toledano's move was backed by the then President of Mexico, Lazaro Cardenas. It accumulated union rolls in the millions.

The plot behind this communistic control was to hamper first, and later destroy, private enterprise by means of revised constitutions of the 20 Latin American countries.

Toledano rode in glory for almost a decade. Only the declaration of war on the Axis brought his fantastic move to a temporary end. Several countries in Latin America joined the United States in its war efforts and the Communist unionist had to go along—Russia was at war with the Axis also.

After the war, Toledano's move began to evaporate. He was seized by FBI agents in San Antonio, Tex., on the first leg of a trip to Moscow. He was sent back to Mexico and he had to reroute his trip through European countries friendly to the Red cause.

His power was decimated first by the postwar boom in Latin America and later by a young generation of union leaders interested in the welfare of the workers rather than the international Communist movement.

This new crop of leaders has now astonished the world by their resolution.

The strength of this resolution hinges on the dockworker leaders boycotting shipments from and to Cuba. The aim is to present other nations—especially the European ones—with a choice: Cut off all trade with Castro or your ships will go unloaded and unattended in every Western Hemisphere harbor from Halifax to Buenos Aires to Vancouver.

The organization's decision did not bind local unions. There will be several unions, or syndicates as they are called in Spanish, that undoubtedly will disagree with the boycott.

Nevertheless, the action taken in Mexico shows union leaders are taking steps to safeguard the mere existence of their bodies. They know too well what has happened to unions in Cuba. Today, they are nonexistent.

Labor, in its implacable move, has taken a dim view of communistic methods. The idea is refreshing.

Characteristics of the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson urged the people of the United States to join together to help create the Great Society, he had in mind the creation of a world better and greater than we now enjoy.

There has been much speculation by scholars, pundits, and politicians regarding the goals of the Great Society. Dr. Thomas H. Hamilton, the brilliant president of the University of Hawaii, is a first-rate scholar who recently gave his views on its goals to the Honolulu Star-Bulletin in an article entitled, "Dr. Hamilton Cites Climate for Great Society."

Dr. Hamilton has listed several characteristics of a great society, which I find strikingly in accord with my views.

One of these characteristics has at least in part been reached in Hawaii, where for many years men of diverse faiths, creeds, and races have publicly recognized the goals of equality through cooperative effort in the social, political, and economic fields. At the same time, we have tried to recognize the right to be different and the truth that man's differences need not hinder him from unity for progress.

We in Congress bear a special responsibility to make this vision of President Johnson advance toward its goals, by legislation, by example, and by our public and private utterances.

Dr. Hamilton's article follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Jan. 27, 1965]

HAMILTON CITES CLIMATE NEEDED FOR GREAT SOCIETY

(By Thomas H. Hamilton)

Part of the trouble arises because language has so many uses. It can be used in a hortatory sense, as the phrase Great Society has thus far been used. It also can be used in the descriptive or prescriptive sense.

Language used in the hortatory way is, of course, nothing but a generalized appeal to get individuals to will something. Descriptive language describes things as they are, and prescriptive how to change the things that are.

Now there is nothing wrong, as sometimes is claimed, with the use of language in the hortatory sense. There are occasions when the need is to move people toward a generalized objective, through getting them to become emotionally involved.

For example, there is a parent term to that of the Great Society, namely, the Good Society, which has a long and honorable history.

The difficulty comes, of course, if you stop at the hortatory level. When one gets into action problems one needs to be descriptive and prescriptive.

One can, I think, break down the hortatory language into what are still value propositions albeit without quite the same purpose of generalized emotional involvement.

These value propositions will vary from individual to individual and from culture to culture due to a whole complex of variables which I am not competent to analyze. Therefore, when you ask me what the goals of the Great Society should be, you are really asking me to put forth personally held value propositions. I have no reluctance to do this, and they are as follows:

A Great Society is one characterized by:

A peaceful world where international disagreements are settled by law rather than violence.

A world in which each individual has the opportunity to work at a job which provides him and his family with sufficient income to live decently in terms of food, clothing, housing, and health.

Opportunities for each individual to participate in esthetic, recreational, and spiritual experiences which will permit him to grow in his humaneness.

Access to a good educational system, entry into which is not restricted by the economic, social, religious, or racial conditions of one's birth and in which a given student can continue to progress just as far as his diligence and talent will take him.

A social, political, and economic system in which both man's equality and man's diversity are recognized.

As to the part this university or any university should play in this, I think I am much clearer. It is the fairly traditional role of a university.

I am sure no Great Society will emerge unless our institutions of higher learning do a better job than they are now doing in preserving the valid knowledge of the past, discovering new and disseminating both.

A Businessman's View of the Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished American businessmen, Devereux C. Josephs, has written an article in the January–February 1965 issue of Think entitled "A Businessman's View of the Humanities." Mr. Josephs is a former board chairman of the New York Life Insurance Co. He was a member of the Commission on the Humanities, whose report stimulated my own interest in this field and resulted in introduction of my bill H.R. 334 to establish a National Humanities Foundation. Mr. Josephs makes the point that with more leisure time at his disposal, modern man needs something more than the pursuit of superficial pleasures to make his life more meaningful. I urge a careful reading of Mr. Josephs' article for a perceptive look at the problem of mass leisure:

A BUSINESSMAN'S VIEW OF THE HUMANITIES

(By Devereux C. Josephs)

President Lyndon B. Johnson in a speech at Brown University, last September, said: "And there simply just must be no neglect of the humanities. The values of our free and compassionate society are as vital to our national success as the skill of our technological and scientific age. And I look with greatest favor upon the proposal for a national foundation for the humanities."

This is not the first time in recent years that we have heard a cry for greater emphasis on the humanities. Lately, this word has been frequently projected out of its academic environment into nonprofessional discussions.

If I may generalize for a moment, the word humanities, as currently used, is the popular antithesis of the sciences. In the shorthand of lay discussion, it represents that which is subjective, intellectual, and sensitive in our lives as opposed to the materialistic, objective, and tangible.

Of course, we need both, and one complements the other. Unfortunately for the parallel growth of our natures, science has captured the vast attention of young and old alike. A danger lies in our psychological approach. Generally speaking, we have become the spectators but not the participants of a fascinating scientific show from which we take home, for our own use, the abundance from Aladdin's lamp.

We would be foolish to bemoan science as materialistic because our scientists and engineers have, with great ingenuity, consistently found ways to apply their discoveries to our convenience and physical well-being. We clamor the loudest for the affluence and the comforts of life which are derivatives of the scientists' intellectual curiosity. We have a tendency to forget how little materialism exists as they seek for the truth, and how much they have enlarged our horizons, stim-

ulated our imaginations and given us new habits of thought.

Nevertheless, the layman is more aware of the practical, tangible manifestations of science. It lifts his burdens, creates his industry. It warms him in winter and cools him in summer. It ministers to his health. It has reduced the pain of labor and the number of hours per day, the days per week and weeks per year which must be spent to support families in homes now freed of drudgery.

And most important of all, science is giving him ever-increasing leisure.

Leisure, however, is a gift of a different nature. It is not just another tangible product of science. It is a condition of being, and it is not a passive state like rest, or sleep. It is not time to be filled in. It is time released for our own use. It is science's greatest gift to mankind.

What we do with this divine gift rests squarely within our own minds. Only within ourselves can we decide whether to use time, waste time or, worst of all, kill time.

It is the prepared and well-furnished mind that will make the most gratifying decisions. This is the reason for the frequent appearance of the word "humanities"—the symbol of those furnishings of the mind that lead to enrichment of the spirit. This is the reason why educators and scholars emphasize its importance in the educational process.

Never before has a whole nation experienced mass education, mass access to recreation and intellectual resources coupled with the leisure in which to make the best of them.

Besides this we have had a revolution in communication caused by the vacuum tube and the transistor—a change wider in scope and far more rapid than the introduction of printing.

Such a new situation calls for reorientation with less emphasis upon the objective the tangible paraphernalia of our society—and more attention to the subjective. This much is certain: The employment of mass leisure is a social problem which we will have to face seriously in the decades ahead. Americans have become experts at consuming innovations and goods. Now we must learn to consume our leisure with equal skill and enjoyment. However, this will not happen without leadership, emphasis on facilities, and a constant vigilance against the vacuum (or is it vacuity?) that might occur.

How fortunate it is that we will not need expensive safari to pursue the pleasures of the spirit. A lively attention to the world around us, access to the thoughts and artistic achievement of others through all forms of communication is the equipment we need. It is not expensive as costs are measured these days, and the price of keeping it fresh and usable is unbelievably small considering its value.

It is this equipment, this subjective material called the humanities, that must be readily available in variety and quantity to promote and satisfy the growing demands and opportunities of leisure.

Because I have always had a very vague concept of the word humanities, the reader will forgive me if, in order to develop my thoughts, I adopt the definition used at the outset of the report of a commission on this subject on which I served. Later on I will describe the commission in more detail.

"The Humanities may be regarded as a body of knowledge and insight, as modes of expression, as a program for education, as an underlying attitude toward life. The body of knowledge is usually taken to include the study of history, literature, the arts, religion and philosophy. The fine and performing arts are modes of expressing thoughts and feelings visually, verbally and orally."

One can make a list of areas of scholarship; but can attitudes and insights be neatly partitioned between the humanities, the sciences and the social sciences? No such intellectual watershed exists. The scholar's term, "a discipline," carries an overtone of precision which troubles the uninitiated. Knowledge is an endless web which has no discreet divisions, frequently not even discernible shading from one subject to another.

Laymen, like myself, think mostly of knowledge in terms of the end result. Their interest is chiefly in harvesting the scholarship and endeavors of others. They are gratified by the performance of the symphony and give little thought to the training of the performers. They enjoy the book with limited appreciation of the studies that created it. They devour the conclusions of the scholars and the insights of the trained minds. In short, they are the eventual consumers of the output of the professionals.

In our own self-interest, it is we who must encourage, support, and facilitate the humanities—not as patrons, but as users. We have a very real concern with every process which furnishes us with accumulated knowledge, wisdom, philosophy and history, as well as literature and the arts.

To accomplish this, what do the humanists need? What should be urged by way of support? Unless there is a list upon which attention can be concentrated, the effort is rapidly diffused.

First of all, the scholars should be looked up to and applauded. These men are the searchers after knowledge. Through their interpretation, if only we will listen, the experience and learning of the past is made available for the guidance of the present into the future. Surely this is important. How else can we know what course to choose? Who else keeps the records of past successes and past mistakes? Continually, the scholars reappraise and reinterpret these records as they reach ever further back in time and ever more widely around the world.

If these scholars are to advance the humanities in their particular sphere, they will need: (1) time to pursue their studies; (2) sufficient recompense so that the present generation of scholars can devote themselves to their tasks and; of crucial importance, others will be eager to follow them—unless new recruits are attracted, scholars become a vanishing race; (3) adequate facilities for study and research. Such is the multiplication of knowledge that the research libraries are rapidly outgrowing their traditional levels of support and should be generously reenforced and expanded.

Now what do the educators need? (Here we must be careful not to confuse the needs of all education with our particular concern—the humanities.)

These men and women, and the institutions which they animate, look for many of the same things as the scholars, but their focus is not so narrowed nor so deep. They need all that will best educate, best humanize along the whole spectrum of teaching from the first grade to the graduate school, to the mature laymen who want the arts, literature, guides to appreciation, etc.

On this shopping list are increased emphasis in the curriculum, more endowments, professorships, financial support, status and larger public advocacy. Without status, how can the humanities flourish?

It is hardly an original thought to regard education as the bridge that carries this accumulation of knowledge and interpretation across from the scholar to the layman, who had better make sure that the bridge is strong and wide.

The wants of the creative artists and writers are essentially personal and subjective. Our interest here is that they shall be insured more freedom to express themselves and have a public that will support them.

The humanities, which began as the possession of an exclusive band of humanists and passed through a long period of intellectual snobbishness, are now shared as the common property of all of us.

How can they be expanded to fill their enlarged role in our diverse society? Although scholars and educators are anxious to promote this expansion, one should not expect a public clamor to arise merely because the special quality of the humanities might be lost. The laymen, as I said before, are the consumers. They have plenty of current opportunities for their personal intellectual enrichment. They do not create them, but only choose what now lies before them. Without a clearer understanding of just how the humanities come into being, they are not likely to worry over the effort required for their accumulation.

Here, then, lies the value of thoughtful laymen, the shapers of public opinion. When they understand the need, they can be counted upon to act. The time is propitious. A consensus is forming. By the very weight of their numbers, they can secure the necessary support for scholars, educators, and artists, just as their influences and pressures joined with the educators to accomplish the expansion in higher education over the last two decades.

But the layman, as always, turns to the scholars and teachers to provide leadership and the initial impetus. Consequently, a Commission on the Humanities was recently appointed by the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, "to consider the state of the humanities in America and to report its findings and recommendations to the sponsoring organizations." The commission (see membership below) met over the space of a year and delivered its report on April 30, 1964.

The three organizations that launched the commission are channels through which scholars and educators can express their concern over the extent to which the sciences have been attracting the intellectual aims of so many of the best minds of our time. They believed it was only natural that the discoveries in the physical world should be so exciting as to lead to an impoverishment of the humanities, especially in this scientific age. They identified a problem, and they took action.

What follows will be an attempt to describe just what is contained in the report by their commission and the proposals that can encompass in general terms the particular and immediate needs.

In spite of the 20 different educational and cultural experiences of the membership, we came promptly to the conclusion that it was not enough to view with alarm the ground lost to the sciences and social sciences, no matter how eloquently expressed.

Consequently, the Commission recommended: the establishment, by the President and the Congress of the United States, of a National Humanities Foundation modeled after the extremely admirable National Science Foundation.

This new foundation should also be freed of direct government interference by a managing board of 24 members, chosen by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and selected for their appropriate relationship to the field.

It should become a clearinghouse of knowledge and a promoter as well as a supporter of organizations and individuals to the extent of resources provided from Government or private sources.

For the details of this proposal and the rationale behind it, I refer the reader to the statement of the Commission which expresses the concept more fully and far more eloquently than can be found in this article. This statement, or the whole report (which includes the appendices from the various academic disciplines) can be secured by writing to: The American Council of Learned

Societies, 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y., 10017.

The proposal to establish a humanities foundation has this great advantage: Attention can be permanently focused on the area through the Federal Government. It will also be an agency for Federal financial help, and it might encourage private support as is the case with the Smithsonian Institution.

The Commission is only too aware that a proposal of this nature can always be set aside in favor of more immediate concerns, but there are other values which might flow from the Commission's report even if the proposal had to wait its turn. The first of these would be a wider circulation of the statement and discussion outside Washington: Even disagreement, if violent enough, would be useful.

Next, in my scale of values, is the use that this report (together with the appendixes) might be to a subsequent effort at a more propitious time. If congressional hearings had occurred, so much the better.

SPREADING THE GOSPEL

There is one last residual value. Those who worked on the report have learned to be more concerned about the subject and have become capable missionaries, anxious to spread the gospel even if only by word of mouth.

New programs are established not because of the imperative of logic, but as the result of a chain of circumstances in which logic is only one. Among the others which continually vary in importance are: timeliness, a strong current of opinion, a profound and conspicuous event, accidental concurrence with other events, overpowering advocacy, a vacuum, an unpredictable catching of public attention by phrase or manner of presentation.

Consequently, although its report has been finished, the commission has agreed to stay in existence to await favoring winds for the advancement of the recommendations.

In the meantime, the three sponsoring organizations have set to work to promote the cause with the following accomplishments to date:

Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, introduced a bill in the last Congress embodying the establishing of the National Humanities Foundation. He will reintroduce the bill in the new Congress.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, has readied a similar bill for introduction in the Senate.

The Association of American Universities passed a resolution at its annual meeting in October 1964 endorsing this proposal.

The report of the Commission has been widely circulated among educators, particularly university and college presidents.

Arrangements are being made to get the matter into discussion among educational policymakers in the 50 States; a speakers' roster has been compiled for the purpose.

Public information officers of many universities have been alerted and appearances on TV have already been reported.

Some Members of Congress have already been visited, and arrangements are being made to discuss the subject with others.

The Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Md., has announced it will support a special high level program in the humanities to help in reversing the decline of humanistic study in the United States. The program is designed to increase the output of young humanistic scholars to teach in the Nation's colleges and universities.

This is a good start. The direction has been pointed out. But there is little likelihood of action unless thoughtful laymen express their concern and arouse others.

Unfortunately, each layman has his own definition of needs for the humanities. In a vague fashion, he is for enrichment of his own personal living. He believes that there should be expansion and accessibility of what he himself wants. Some desire hi-fi records; some are the votaries of the films, or TV; others wish for more live performances in the arts. Most want more, better, and cheaper books and more extensive library facilities. Many would like adult education courses.

These unfocused wants cover a wide area of subject matter, maturity, depth, timeliness, background, and relevance. In fact, when it comes to satisfying these demands, we must recognize that we are discussing all the content of a rising cultural level.

Thus, each one of us, with different expectations from a growing interest in the humanities, needs a unifying factor. The scholars and educators head a march for more facilities; but this will prevail only if the great body of laymen realize that the gratification of their wants will depend on first satisfying the demands of those few who lead the procession. That is why the start should be made with a national foundation.

As consumers, we are in a unique position to make our wants felt, but we will not secure what we surely need unless we concentrate our efforts.

It is too early to tell what the results will be, but the time is ripe for this effort. Although we will not admit that the establishment of a National Commission of the Humanities this year will fail, we do not think our energies are wasted if the matter is put over for the present.

Public attention must be secured. How far it will go, and in what direction, no one can predict, but at the very least, a movement with a visible goal has begun.

How can we have a "Great Society" without greater attention to the humanities? How can we expect the stream of American life to rise above its source? How can the source be raised unless the public demands it?

J.F.K. and Freedom in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, several times in the past I have inserted articles on education by the Reverend Virgil C. Blum, S.J., chairman of the Political Science Department at Marquette University, Milwaukee. I have done so because I believe that Father Blum has a significant contribution to make to our national consideration of the proper relationship which should exist between church, state, and education.

At the present time an important education bill, the Elementary-Secondary Education Act of 1965, is pending before the House Education and Labor Committee. Undoubtedly, before the end of this session Congress will make a decision on this proposal.

For that reason, I am inserting in the RECORD a recent article by Father Blum entitled "J.F.K. and Freedom in Education." The article, which originally was printed in two segments in Our Sunday Visitor, offers valuable insights into problems of Federal aid to education.

Father Blum also attempts to set the record straight on certain misconceptions about President John F. Kennedy's views on that question.

Because of its pertinence to issues now before Congress, I urge the attention of my colleagues to this article by a distinguished Jesuit political scientist:

J.F.K. AND FREEDOM IN EDUCATION

(By Rev. Virgil C. Blum, S.J.)

Many people have a complete misconception of the late President John F. Kennedy's position on Federal aid to church-related education. True, he was under strong pressure to oppose such aid, and it was not the task, he thought, of the first Catholic President of the United States to tackle the job of giving Federal aid to church-related schoolchildren. Nonetheless, he advocated and supported the civil rights of all children, regardless of race, religion, or color.

For the most part, those citizens who misunderstood President Kennedy did so because they didn't take the trouble to study his statements on education carefully.

Under tremendous political pressure to take an absolutist position on the Federal-aid issue, Kennedy frequently declared his opposition to across-the-board aid to church-related schools. Note well, he said across-the-board aid. But what is across-the-board aid to church-related schools? Such aid is totally unrestricted. It would include aid for the teaching of religious subjects as well as secular subjects; it would include aid for chapel construction and chapel services; it would include aid for religious activities of all kinds. In other words, across-the-board aid would enable a church-related school to use Federal tax funds to support all the religious and secular activities in which it was engaged.

President Kennedy opposed such broad, unrestricted aid on constitutional grounds. In this he was right. Such aid is illegal under the establishment clause of the first amendment as it is now interpreted by the Supreme Court. This much of the President's position most people understood.

But they did not understand that Kennedy did not oppose all aid to church-related schools. Whereas he repeatedly stated his opposition to across-the-board aid to such schools, he clearly and unmistakably intimated that he favored restricted aid for the education of children in church-related schools, aid that was less than across the board; aid that did not include support for religious activities. He favored aid for church-related education that was categorical. That is, he wanted to help every American child, regardless of race, religion or color, to get a good education in the secular categories. In reading, writing, and arithmetic, and in all the other secular subjects.

RIBICOFF CLARIFIES

President Kennedy's thoughts and convictions on the Federal-aid issue were undoubtedly best known to ABRAHAM RIBICOFF. RIBICOFF, now the junior Senator from Connecticut, was Kennedy's first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Federal-aid problem was his problem. It was RIBICOFF's job to work out an acceptable Federal-aid program in consultation with the President.

After nearly 2 years of discussions and consultations with Kennedy about the question of Federal aid for church-related schoolchildren, Secretary RIBICOFF certainly had a clear understanding of the President's thinking on this subject.

But not until after his resignation as Secretary and election to the Senate, did RIBICOFF feel free to tell the American people precisely what Kennedy's position on the Federal-aid issue was. Addressing his Senate colleagues on August 6, several months before the President's death, RIBICOFF said: "It is widely believed that the administration opposes, on constitutional grounds, all aid to church-related schools. This is simply not true * * *(The Kennedy administration)

has never opposed all forms of such aid, either on constitutional ground or on their merits. In fact, it has expressed precisely the opposite view."

In other words, President Kennedy favored freedom and equal justice for all children, regardless of race, religion or color. He favored Federal aid for the education of church-related school children in secular subjects.

Senator RIBICOFF explained why so many people have a misconception of Kennedy's stand on the Federal-aid issue. "The President expressed the view," he said, "that it is unconstitutional to give church-related schools grants or loans on an across-the-board basis. But his opposition to such unrestricted forms of aid should not be viewed as opposition to all forms of aid. In fact, he specifically opened the door to loans or grants which are not given on an across-the-board basis."

This distinction is perfectly clear, but many people neither grasped it nor understood it.

Senator RIBICOFF pointed out that Kennedy had all along made the distinction between restricted or categorical aid, on the one hand, and across-the-board aid, on the other. But he added pointedly that this crucial distinction has largely been ignored in the education debate. Thus, while Kennedy was under pressure to oppose freedom in education, he nevertheless, demonstrated his commitment to religious freedom in education by making the vital distinction that would permit Federal aid for all children in all schools. But the parents and proponents of church-related education failed both to grasp the distinction and to create nationwide grassroots supports for legislation which provides equal justice in education for all children.

Explaining Kennedy's position, RIBICOFF said: "Many share the President's view that the Constitution does prohibit aiding a church-related school with no restriction whatever on the use of such funds. Aid in such form would support the plainly religious aspects of the school. But aid that is limited to certain specified uses or aid that is extended generally, but with certain specified exceptions, stands on an entirely different footing."

SPECIFIC PURPOSES

The reason such aid stands on an entirely different footing is clear—it aids education only in secular subjects, which serves a public purpose; it does not aid education in religious subjects, which serves a religious purpose.

To make the President's stand perfectly clear, RIBICOFF illustrates the crucial distinction. "It is one thing," he says, "to give $50,000 to St. Mary's High School and to permit those funds to be used for any purposes, which might include the building of a chapel; it is quite a different thing to give the same school the same $50,000 for the specific purpose of building a chemistry laboratory. The former is across-the-board aid; the latter is not."

Obviously, this distinction is not new, as the Connecticut Senator pointed out. In all its Federal-aid-to-education programs on the college level, Congress has never authorized, on an across-the-board basis, funds for church-related education. Its numerous programs have always provided funds for well-defined secular categories. In the light of this distinction, RIBICOFF concluded, "the [Kennedy] administration does not stand opposed to all forms of aid to church-related schools."

President Kennedy never took issue with RIBICOFF's statement about his [Kennedy's] position on Federal aid to church-related education. Neither did any of his assistants. This is highly significant. Because of RIBICOFF's recent high position in the Kennedy administration, this silence on the part of the President and his assistants indicates complete approval and approbation of the Senator's statement.

President Kennedy's position on the Federal-aid issue is clearly reflected by his brother and Attorney General, ROBERT F. KENNEDY. The junior Senator from New York supports freedom and equal justice for all children.

During his U.S. Senate race, ROBERT F. KENNEDY declared in a statement read at the New York State convention of Citizens for Educational Freedom that, if elected, he would support Federal aid for all children in all schools. Like his brother, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY supports categorical grants for the education of church-related school children in specific secular subjects.

"I believe," he said, "that, within the limitations imposed by the Constitution, Federal programs designed to assist individual children or to carry out important Federal policies should apply to all schools so that pupils in private schools are not precluded from receiving Federal assistance in appropriate categories."

Senator KENNEDY, for 4 years U.S. Attorney General, sees no constitutional barrier to Federal categorical grants for the education of church-related school children in secular subjects. In fact, he urges the immediate extension of the categorical aids of the National Defense Education Act to all children in all schools. Under this act, the Federal Government provides funds for equipment to teach children these secular subjects: mathematics, science, modern foreign languages, English, reading, history, geography, and civics.

In taking this position, President Kennedy was merely following a doctrine which Congress and the Supreme Court have adhered to for more than half a century. This is the doctrine of the primacy of secular effects. Applying this doctrine, the Court asks two critical questions when deciding whether a law violates the first amendment establishment clause: (1) What was Congress' purpose in passing the law, and (2) What is the primary effect of the law? If either the purpose or the primary effect of the law is to aid religion, the law is unconstitutional. If, however, the purpose and the primary effect of the law are secular, the law is constitutional. The fact that such a law may have secondary effects which aid religion is of no consequence. These effects are incidental and, therefore, irrelevant to the law's primary purpose and, hence, to the question of its constitutionality.

COURT'S LANGUAGE

The Supreme Court stated this test of constitutionality in clearest language in the Schempp Bible-reading case of 1963. It said, "The test may be stated as follows: What are the purpose and primary effect of the enactment? If either is the advancement or inhibition of religion, then the enactment exceeds the scope of legislative power as circumscribed by the Constitution. That is to say that to withstand the strictures of the establishment clause there must be a secular legislative purpose and a primary effect that neither advances nor inhibits religion."

President Kennedy endorsed this doctrine of the primacy of secular effects. Hence, his administration favored categorical, or restricted, grants to church-related schools. Such grants would be for the teaching of specified categories or subjects, as mathematics, reading, science, English, modern foreign languages, geography, civics, and history. The congressional purpose of legislation providing aid for the teaching of such secular subjects in church-related schools would, of course, be secular, and the primary effect of such legislation would be secular—the better instruction of children in secular subjects. Any benefit which might accrue to the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religions from the legislation would be wholly incidental and secondary, and therefore irrelevant to the purpose of the law and to the question of its constitutionality.

President Kennedy knew, of course, that the education of church-related schoolchildren in secular subjects serves a public purpose, and that it was, therefore, a proper subject of Federal support. The Supreme Court had made this perfectly clear in the Cochran textbook case and in the Everson bus-ride case. In the former case which involved a Louisiana law that provided textbooks for church-related schoolchildren, the Court said: "We cannot doubt that the taxing power of the State is exerted for a public purpose." In the Everson case which called into question the validity of a New Jersey law that provided bus rides for church-related schoolchildren, the Court said: "It is much too late to argue that legislation intended to facilitate the opportunity of [church-related school] children to get a secular education serves no public purpose."

When the Government promotes the general welfare by aiding church-related schoolchildren in the study of secular subjects, it is legislating validly for a secular purpose. President Kennedy's acceptance of this basic principle of law enabled him to urge upon Congress the passing of the college facilities bill. This bill as finally enacted after the President's death provides $1.2 billion for the construction of college libraries, laboratories, and classrooms. The act provides categorical grants. It provides funds for classrooms to be used exclusively for the teaching of mathematics, engineering, the life and physical sciences, and the modern foreign languages. The law, in fact, expressly prohibits the use of the classrooms constructed with the Federal funds for the teaching of religion.

PURPOSE AND EFFECT

Clearly, then, in the College Facilities Act, Congress applied the doctrine of the primacy of secular effects. No one can dispute the fact that the legislative purpose and the primary effect of the law are secular—the education of students in secular subjects. However, no one will deny that the secondary effects of the law incidentally benefit the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religions. But this aid is in an unintended byproduct of the law, and is, therefore, of no relevance to the secular purpose of the legislation and to the first amendment prohibition.

The secondary effect of a law which benefits religion does not change the secular character of the law. The Court has made this emphatically clear in recent Sunday closing law cases. Recognizing the fact that Sunday laws benefit the Christian religions, the Court, nevertheless, said in the McGowan case that this fact "does not bar the State from achieving its secular goals." So also, the fact that an incidental benefit may accrue to religion when the Federal Government aids church-related school children and college students to get a secular education does not bar the Government from attaining its secular goals.

This is but to say that, provided personal freedoms are unimpaired, the Government cannot be paralyzed in the exercise of its sovereign power by the incidental byproducts of a law.

With this doctrine of the power of government to legislate for the general welfare, the absolute church-State separationists take sharp issue. They maintain that, if legislation has byproducts which aid religion the establishment clause paralyzes the Government and renders it impotent to attain, through its chosen means, the general welfare and national defense.

This is the absolutist doctrine, incidentally, that the absolute separationists and discriminationists, in cooperation with the segregationists, have used so successfully to block Federal aid for all children in all schools. They have, thus far, succeeded in debilitating our National Government and rendering it impotent to promote the na-

tional welfare and defense through the better education of every American child in the school of his parents' choice.

PRECEDENTS

The doctrine of the primacy of secular effects, which was the basis of President Kennedy's distinction between unrestricted and categorical aid, has a long history in welfare legislation. Peculiarly, many citizens simply do not realize this. Under the Hill-Burton Act, for example, the Federal Government makes construction grants to private hospitals for the care and cure of the sick—a proper secular purpose. The fact that such grants incidentally benefit the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religions does not nullify the power of Congress to cooperate with hospital groups to provide adequate facilities to care for the sick, the primary effect of the law.

Federal grants to public and voluntary hospital groups were in excess of $2 billion by December 1963. Of this total, $1.14 billion was granted to voluntary groups, including, of course, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish hospitals.

Congress has, moreover, consistently applied the doctrine of the primacy of secular effects in enacting legislation in the field of education. In recent years Congress has established more than 50 distinct education programs which aid church-related education. Some of the more important Federal education programs that incorporate the principle of the primacy of secular effects are: (1) Public Health Services Act of 1937, (2) GI bill or rights of 1944 and 1952, (3) Atomic Energy Act of 1946, (4) National Science Foundation Act of 1950, (5) college housing loan program of 1950, (6) War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956, (7) National Defense Education Act of 1958, (8) National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, (9) Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, and (10) Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

Faced with all these precedents, the opponents of freedom in education say, "So what." They maintain that the Government can help church-related college students but not church-related elementary and secondary school students. What they mean, of course, is that students on the elementary and secondary levels are second-class citizens, while college students are first-class citizens. That is, born citizens are not really citizens with rights and liberties until they reach the age of civic puberty which is simultaneous with admission to college.

Since a substantial majority of our church-related colleges are Protestant, the doctrine of civic puberty is, of course, designed to protect the rights of the majority and suppress the rights of the minority.

Congress, however, has rejected, as did Kennedy, this doctrine of civic puberty. It has, for example, given help to below-college-level church-related school students in (1) the hot lunch program, (2) the education program for congressional and Supreme Court page boys, (3) the antipoverty program, (4) the war orphans educational assistance program, and (5) the GI bill of rights. Few people are aware, I suspect, that the Federal Government paid the education costs of 4,364,000 veterans in public, private, and church-related elementary and secondary schools. And, moreover, few people know that the Government gives grants of $110 a month for the education of war orphans who are attending church-related high schools.

All of which demonstrates that the attempt to reduce church-related school children to the status of second-class citizens, divested of their civil rights, and disqualified for equal Federal education benefits is futile, besides being in conflict with basic constitutional principles and guarantees.

DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES

Although President Kennedy favored freedom in education for all children, he felt that it was not the task of the first Catholic President, as his Special Counsel Theodore Sorensen put it, to find ways of implementing the civil rights of church-related schoolchildren. This is but another way of saying that equal justice for church-related schoolchildren will never be achieved unless and until it is claimed by parents through the democratic processes.

Constitutional authorities have told us repeatedly that the establishment clause does not prohibit Federal aid for the education of church-related schoolchildren in secular subjects. And they have told us, time and time again, as have politicians, that securing tax funds for the secular education of children who attend Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish schools is a political question. This is but to say that parents of church-related schoolchildren must make every effort to solve this problem through the democratic processes.

But it must be remembered that, in the American democratic system, this task can be accomplished only through organized group effort. In our interest group democracy, parents, organized for freedom in education, must formulate policies which guarantee freedom of choice in education and seek their fulfillment; they must provide Congressmen with information and convincing arguments to show that what is good for all children is good for America; and they must help to define the public interest in terms of religious freedom, equal justice, and the best educational opportunities for all children in all schools.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, no less than his predecessor, is keenly aware of the essential importance of interest groups in solving our Nation's education problems. This explains his telegram to the Fifth Annual Convention of Citizens for Educational Freedom in which he said: "Your contribution to the solutions of these problems through the American tradition of free discussion and debate deserves the support of all of us."

This is to say that the problem of Federal aid for church-related schoolchildren is political, and that, as such, it must be solved through the democratic processes. President Johnson will be no more successful in resolving this problem than was President Kennedy unless the parents of church-related schoolchildren become personally involved in the democratic processes through group activity. In this way alone can the Federal-aid issue be resolved in a way that best advances the education of all the Nation's children and best serves the national interest.

If parents fail in this, they fail the President and Congress, but, more importantly, they fail in their duties to the Nation, their children, and to the cultural heritage of our American society.

Laredo's Mayor J. C. "Pepe" Martin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIGIO DE LA GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, one of the oldest celebrations in the United States—and possibly the oldest international celebration in the Nation—is the George Washington Birthday celebration held annually at Laredo, Tex. One of the highlights of this celebration for the last 14 years has been recognition of an outstanding Texan as "Mr. South Texas." This year the honor went to Laredo Mayor J. C. Martin, Jr.

This distinction was accorded Mayor Martin in public recognition of the invaluable services rendered by his diplomacy and action in fostering the highest type of good neighbor relationships between Mexico and south Texas, his role and political acumen in securing benefits for and national recognition of his area of Texas, his success as a businessman, his leadership in education, his dedication and accomplishments as mayor of the city of Laredo, and his unselfish, splendid civic efforts in furthering a growing south Texas. He was the 14th "Mr. South Texas" honored by the George Washington Birthday Celebration Association.

In the acclamation for this honor, the official program said:

LAREDO'S MAYOR J. C. "PEPE" MARTIN, JR.

Laredo's Mayor J. C. "Pepe" Martin, Jr., business, civic, and political leader, is the 14th individual honored by the George Washington Birthday Celebration Association as "Mr. South Texas."

Martin is one of the youngest recipients ever chosen for the honor, but his outstanding record of service in various fields of endeavor marks him as one of the most deserving. He was chosen for the honor for his many accomplishments in the realms of finance, ranching, general business, and public education, and for his leadership in developing closer relations and better understanding between the people of south Texas and the people of Mexico. His many special talents and his unceasing and unselfish efforts to bring a greater measure of growth and development to all south Texas is recognized at the area, State, and National levels. No other south Texan has contributed so much in such varied fields for the benefit of so many of his fellow citizens.

Business, civic, and political leaders throughout Laredo, neighboring counties, and northern Mexico have acclaimed Martin's selection. Mayor Martin joins a select group of outstanding south Texans who have gained national and international recognition for various achievements in specialized fields.

Although at 51 he is one of the youngest recipients of the honor, Mayor Martin's record in such fields as business, politics, public education, finance, and international relations rivals those of his predecessors.

A product of Laredo public schools, Mayor Martin attended St. Edward's University in Austin. He married the former Anita Ligarde in 1938, and they have four children, Joe, III, Patsy Ann, Maria Alice, and Minnie Dora, and they have two grandchildren. A rancher by profession, Mayor Martin began his public service career as a deputy tax collector-assessor under A. F. Muller from 1936 to 1940. He became district clerk in 1940 and he held that position until he was elected mayor in 1954.

Locally he is a member and director of the chamber of commerce, director and vice president of the George Washington's Birthday Celebration Association, member of the Knights of Columbus, League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) Council No. 12, Elks Lodge, Woodmen of the World, Laredo Quarterback Club, Webb County Beef Cattle Improvement Association, International Good Neighbor Council, and Laredo Rotary Club.

The mayor is director of the Texas Good Roads Association, Laredo Savings & Loan Association, Southwest Agricultural Institute,

Laredo National Bank, and Laredo Boys' Club. He currently is serving his second 6-year term as director of Texas A. & I. College.

In the scouting program, Mayor Martin is honorary chairman for the Aztec District, district committeman for the Gulf Coast Council, Boy Scouts of America, and an advisory committeeman for the Girl Scouts of America. Mayor Martin is past president and past campaign chairman for Laredo United Fund, Inc., and is now a director of the organization, past president director of the Rotary Club, past president of the St. Joseph's Academy Parents Association, and former vice chairman of the Webb County Child Welfare Unit. He also is trustee for the Bruni Estate Mineral Trust.

Mayor Martin is a member of the Advisory Committee of Texas on Civil Rights and a member of the advisory board of the Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute.

A leading figure in political activities, Mayor Martin for years has been a ranking leader for the Democratic Party in south Texas. Locally he is president of the dominant Independent Club, a Democratic Party affiliate, and he was a district delegate to the National Democratic Convention in Atlantic City.

Mayor Martin has served as caucus chairman for the 15th Congressional District and the 21st Senatorial District at the State Democratic conventions. He was cochairman of the Democratic Party coalition which gave President Johnson a 10-to-1 vote majority in Webb County in last November's general election. The mayor has served as area coordinator for Gov. John B. Connally's gubernatorial campaigns. He led the successful fight to attain permanency designation for Laredo Air Force Base.

In 1962 the mayor was recipient of two major honors. That year Mayor Martin received the Boys' Club of America Medallion Award and he was named the "Man of the Hour" by the Laredo Active 20-30 Club.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Engineering for Human Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to include a very important address delivered by my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GRIDER]. The address was delivered before the Engineers Club of Memphis on February 22, 1965.

The address was on the subject of "Engineering for Human Needs," and was very appropriately made on the anniversary of the Father of Our Country. I am pleased also to include with the address a fine editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal. The editorial pays a high and fitting tribute to the words of our colleague.

The editorial and address follow:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Feb. 23, 1965]

CHALLENGE TO ENGINEERING

Engineering, as a profession, is generally conceded to be the practical application of man's knowledge about nature in ways that benefit humanity.

In his primitive state, the man who picked up a stone and discovered that by striking with it he could kill was the inventor. The engineer was the man who honed the stone to a sharp edge and put a handle on it. The purpose was to make the stone work better—to protect and to provide.

This is the crux of what Representative GEORGE GRIDER said to the Engineers Club of Memphis yesterday. As a compliment befitting Engineers Week, Mr. GRIDER addressed the group as "the elite guard of our society and civilization."

But he issued to them a challenge which should have a much wider audience and application. For Mr. GRIDER posed a question which has haunted men through thousands of years in which cultures have flourished only to wither and die. What the Shelby County Representative asked of engineers—the elite guard—is whether "our remarkable technological development will also end in stagnation and decline as those great civilizations have before us?"

"We, as individuals, must save the individual from being overwhelmed by his own numbers, exterminated by his own weapons or submerged by his own machinery," Representative GRIDER said.

In a sense, we think, he was speaking to all of us. Doctors, in reducing the death rate, have to think too, of the problem of overpopulation. Automakers have to consider the effect of their machine on our environment. The bridgebuilder has to have at least an idea of what he seeks access to on the other side of a river or an abyss. Civilizations that have been stifled by their own inventiveness are all too familiar, as Mr. GRIDER pointed out to the Engineers Club.

Practicality is inherent in engineering, and this is a practical age. But a voice cries out for the dignity of man and such a voice is sometimes too easily muffled by the whine of the machinery of progress.

ENGINEERING FOR HUMAN NEEDS

(By GEORGE W. GRIDER, Member of Congress)

From Stonehenge to Oak Ridge, from the Roman roads to the Tennessee Valley Authority, and from the pyramids to the moon, the engineers have been, and promise to be, long with us. It is a privilege, a presumption, and a great challenge to attempt to find something worth saying to representatives of so ancient, so august, and so modern a profession. Engineering is older than science, almost as old as religion, and always coexistent with the arts. Your invitation to help launch Engineers' Week is accepted with sincere appreciation.

This year, a special significance, dignity, and long-overdue recognition have been added to your profession. I refer, of course, to the new National Academy of Engineering which officially came into being last December 10.

Created within the existing framework of an 1863 charter, the National Academy of Engineering and the National Academy of Sciences have achieved an organizational "wedding." This recognition of the bond between technology and science should have come a century ago.

Whatever the causes and effects of this delay, I am confident that the new arrangements between the engineering and the natural sciences will be highly productive to both, and to society as well.

Without intending either to disparage the place of the political, military, or philosophical men of history, or to rehash things overly familiar to you, I should like to point up the role that engineering has played in the development of Western man.

The engineer was born when man first began to seek mastery over his environment; when, through the practical arts, he first attempted to shape Nature's gifts and forces to meet his needs and wants. Therefore, it can be said that engineering is as old as civilization. Five thousand years ago, the Egyptian Kings not only planned and erected pyramids and temples, but aided in developing an economy which made it possible to withdraw from productive labor thousands of workers needed to build such imposing, but, by our standards, useless structures as the great pyramid. The Egyptian engineer was a trusted noble of the court and an adviser to the King.

This remarkable era appears to have ended because the ingrown nobility and priesthood constituted too narrow a base for a truly great society. There was no public demand for continued progress and higher standards of living, because there was no public. The rulers avoided innovation—they were concerned only with maintaining status. We must conclude that the ancient Egyptian was quite satisfied to know how, but did not care about the why. Scientific apathy led to political decay.

Greece, the next in line of the great ancient nations, never failed to ask the question; in fact, never stopped asking "why." Because of the topography of their land, the Greeks became the first great harbor builders. An urbanized nation, they concerned themselves with city planning and public water supply. They pioneered in the excavation of tunnels.

There is in the Greek tradition an architect-engineer—skillful in design, and economical in his use of labor and materials. The Greek was an arch-technician and handed on technical methods and procedures which were to endure for centuries. But the Greek rulers and their political philosophers made a fetish of idleness and abstraction, disdaining material things and menial pursuits. Plato himself thought of the practical uses to which geometry was put in land surveying as a vulgarization of the lofty science. This Greek attitude afflicted the engineering profession for a long period in history. They did not know that engineering's practitioners must necessarily associate themselves closely with the practical arts.

The great link between science and engineering which is the key to 20th-century achievements was missed by the Greeks. Brilliant in philosophic and scientific speculation, Greek life did not provide the atmosphere in which their unusual abilities in mathematics and mechanics could be applied, tested, and improved. It took the human race close to 2,000 years to right this error.

Roman engineering was in large part imported from Greece. Under the Roman Empire, roads, bridges, and water supply facilities were built all over the ancient world from Asia Minor to Great Britain. However, as far as any continuing addition to basic technical knowledge was concerned, the Roman was disappointing. He lacked the intellectual curiosity of the Greek, and was a doer rather than a thinker. The Romans recognized engineering as a vital and potent insrtument in the building of a civilized life, yet the Roman mind lacked the inventive qualities essential to a continued technological advance—a condition which undoubtedly contributed to the decline and fall of the Roman Empire.

A new civilization arose from the remains of past accomplishments, however, and the notable masterpieces of stone construction in the Middle Ages remain wonderful even in this century of skyscrapers and high-rise apartments. These castles and cathedrals were in the ancient tradition of construction engineering, but the invention of gunpowder in the 14th century broke up the ranks of the old master builders of ancient times and moved engineering slowly toward modernism.

The Renaissance brought visions of a new mechanical era. Very few of the wonderful mechanical dreams were actually realized until centuries later, but the minds of men were suddenly freed of past fears and inhibitions, and—as we can see so clearly from the notebooks of that great genius of the Renaissance, Leonardo da Vinci—men dared to invent in their imaginations what might be.

Besides his imaginative concepts, the Renaissance man gave to engineering the use of segmental and elliptical arches, river canalization, the canal lock, and the printing press. Galileo and others freed natural science from the shackles of religion to prepare the way for scientific experiment.

Society owes an immeasurable debt also to the French engineers of the 17th and 18th centuries. The first corps of army engineers, a national highway department, the first engineering school, development of the cofferdam and the open caisson processes of foundation work, the first great work on hydraulic engineering, the

basic equation for flow in open channels—all are noted here.

The French engineers of this period were indeed the pioneers of modern engineering science, but they were overtaken in their prime by a bloody political revolution.

The British, because they had settled their political problems during the 17th century, became the first beneficiaries of the industrial revolution. To detail the individual inventions and enterprises of the industrial revolution in England would be to elaborate the obvious. However, there were trends of change operating beneath the elaborate activity of the factories which had a very important influence on the future of engineering and science.

Most important was the new alliance between engineering and private enterprise. No longer was the engineer's work almost exclusively in the area of public works. This alliance between engineering and private industry revolutionized the production of consumer goods and became the forerunner of the spectacular 20th century union of science and engineering and industry.

Remembering your American history, you know that Britain did not encourage her 13 colonies on the Atlantic seaboard to develop industrially. However, after our political revolution had been won, we set about our own tasks of importance—and transportation was the number one engineering problem of our frontier phase. Railroads became the American obsession and overshadowed all other forms of engineering for most of the 19th century. But two major technical industrial developments during this period were of great importance when the 20th century dawned—the discovery of a new process for making steel, and the birth of electrical engineering via the telegraph, electric light, and electric motor.

All of these events of history for 50 centuries appear to have been a preparation for the science and engineering of today. We are now concluding the final half of our second American century and are already planning the start of the projects which will sustain us in our third century and, we trust, beyond.

On January 4, President Johnson described the state of our Union in a message which explored the far perimeters of the American dream. Did you realize that almost every project that he named for action in the next 4 years involved engineering enterprise?

There are to be more large and small parks, seashores, open spaces; places of relaxation and recreation at the end of our highways; in our crowded cities, streets and open areas of beauty; regional development where there is now distress and depression; an end to the pollution of our rivers; a termination to the pollution of the air we breathe; desalting of the oceans; and a filling in of the gaps in knowledge to cope with exploding populations and with the growing scarcity of the raw materials of human contentment.

Engineers will be required to fulfill this bright dream, as they have been called upon throughout the history of human civilization to help man control and improve his environment.

President Johnson has given us a bold look forward into the oldest dream the human race has memory of—"the dream of freemen living happily together on a bounteous planet of a benevolent star." Today I have referred to other dreams which were dissipated because the visions were not implemented by sound though and sound design.

Engineering has helped man to survive, first through empiricism and more recently, in historical terms, bolstered by scientific theory and controlled experiment. Though engineering began as a practical art and depended on the experimental method of try it and see for increased knowledge, the practical art grew, and with it there developed a practical science to embellish it.

It has been said that the nuclear explosives of World War II alone might have been considered to be sufficient to break engineering's link with its empirical past. They were accompanied, however, by long-range submarines and bombers, proximity fuses, homing torpedoes, floating airfields, radar eyes that saw in the dark, guns that tracked and felled their prey automatically, and most astonishing of all, the computer, capable of humanly impossible rapid mathematical calculation and logical decisionmaking.

Our lives are spent among countless engineering wonders. Who notices a jet or a telephone or thinks of the cable lying on the ocean's bottom, or is lost in wonder that we view the Churchill funeral via a communications satellite? The fruits of engineering are marvelous, and they are everywhere.

No one can deny the great era of engineering achievement—and promise—in which we live. We are the heirs of the accumulated experience of 50 centuries, and our country leads the world today because of its resources.

And yet, as we stand on the threshold of the Great Society—and indeed the greatest society—I must ask you, as the elite guard of our society and civilization, whether our remarkable technological development will also end in stagnation and decline as those great civilization before us.

The Egyptian engineer responded only to a narrow and ingrown nobility, and his civilization was stifled.

The Greek missed the vital link between concept and execution.

The Roman was too preoccupied with building and gave no time to reflection.

France joined all the forces but was overwhelmed on the threshold because she neglected her people.

And now America leads the whole world as it again struggles toward the heights. And it is the engineer who will be the architect of that millennium toward which we strive. His will be the task of finding solutions to the problems that he has helped to create.

Will mankind be submerged and the individual lost in the massive, impersonal complexities of automation?

Will immunity from diseases and dangers cause us to so overpopulate this globe that the very mass of humanity will make a cipher out of the citizen?

Will the world's weapons leave us with no choices between dictatorships born of fear of the weapons or extermination from their use?

The engineer will build the society of tomorrow, if it is built; and the building will demand even greater use of his skills as a scientist-technician, a thinker and a doer.

But this society will never be built unless the builders of today are more than technicians. Today you have to ask a new question. Unlike the Greek who asked, "Why does it work?" you must ask, "Why should it work?"

The scientist who designs a weapon without having a voice in the decision to design it is not fulfilling his 20th-century duty to his discipline or to his society. The architect who designs public buildings without a voice in why or how they should be built is not fulfilling his citizenship.

The roadbuilder whose only interest in politics is to gain advantage on public contract letting may speed the flow of traffic, but he strangles democracy.

In short, it is not enough today to be merely a technician, a builder, or an engineer.

Unless all of us, working together, can find a way for each of us, each human individual, to live in dignity and in independence, the marvelous technical world we're building will be a useless and hideous shell.

We, as individuals, must save the individual from being overwhelmed by his own numbers, exterminated by his own weapons, or submerged by his own machinery.

Yours is an elite society that faces an exquisite challenge. Can you meet this test? I think you can. I think you welcome it. The 20th century has blended in the engineer a unique mix of the practical doer and the analytical thinker. Your influence pervades all branches of society and all levels of government.

And so, what better time is there than the present, during this Engineers' Week, for you to dedicate yourselves again to the task of not only building for the society of tomorrow, but also of shaping the character of that society.

In this endeavor I proudly and humbly join, with confidence that the engineer can add this new chapter to his already proud and illustrious history.

Activities of National Business Women's Week in Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it seems clear that, as Mrs. Ralph Patterson, Delaware chairman of National Business Women's Week, recently said:

As women are going into the professions, they've got to be better trained. There is plenty of space for women at the top, and they can achieve goals in life they may never have dreamed possible, but first they must have the training. Here BPW clubs can help; I feel they must concentrate even more than they have on encouragement and scholarships for young girls just beginning their work.

I am pleased to include as part of my remarks a recent interview with Mrs. Ralph Patterson which was published in the Wilmington Morning News, Wilmington, Del., on February 23, 1965:

BUSINESS, COMMUNITY ROLE OF WOMEN PUSHED

(By Linda Klein)

National Business Women's Week in Delaware activities this year will be spearheaded by Mrs. Ralph Patterson, an experienced and articulate proponent of women who "do" for their community.

Mrs. Patterson is the Delaware chairman of the week for the Business and Professional Womens Clubs, to be celebrated March 7–13. She is also director of Wilmington's Senior Center.

Obviously Mrs. Patterson is well qualified to speak on the role of the business woman in the community.

"I feel," she says, "that as women are going into the professions, they've got to be better trained. There is plenty of space for women at the top, and they can achieve goals in life they may never have dreamed possible, but first they must have the training. Here BPW clubs can help; I feel they must concentrate even more than they have on encouragement and scholarships for young girls just beginning their work.

"Women need to upgrade themselves, at any age and any level. We need more women in government. Two Presidents have asked, 'Show me who your able women are; I'll give them jobs in Government.' Here again, the BPW clubs can be of service."

Mrs. Patterson speaks of the business woman and her role in community service from background and experience. She came

to Wilmington from New York City in October of 1956 to organize the senior center. She had been director of the Yorkville Neighborhood Club in New York, a similar organization for older people, and has worked in YMCA and YWCA programs for many years.

"Our aim is to make people realize that life has not stopped," explains Mrs. Patterson. "They used to go to work each day, now they come here to find creative activity and stimulating experiences."

Creative activity includes everything from daily dances to classes in crafts, enameling, weaving, music and discussion groups. Stimulating experiences might include meeting new friends, the daily fellowship of lunch and games with old friends, learning new skills and helping others. All are a part of the senior center's program.

A typical day for Mrs. Patterson and her senior citizens might include a discussion group in the morning on the problems of the older person, led by State Senator Louise Conner, lunch at 12:15, dancing from 1 p.m. "until we're tired," and classes.

The looms, kilns, painting equipment and other materials available fill multiple purposes, Mrs. Patterson feels.

"Doctors frequently refer arthritic or stroke patients to us," she explains. "The activity involved, and the joy of creating, often make a person forget his pain while it is being helped. A great deal of physical rehabilitation goes on at this 'recreation' center. Nearly half of our people live alone; this gives them a place where they can have fun with people of their own age and interests.

"We are also involved in community service projects, such as mailing and stuffing envelopes. We work with the Red Cross, the American Cancer Society, and many others. Each Wednesday 50 to 60 people meet here to fill workers kits for door-to-door canvassing.

"And it's important to feel needed and useful—our rhythm band regularly puts on programs for other older persons' groups in the area. One lady, 94 years old, plays one of our eight harmonicas.

"We are open to anyone 60 years old or over. One man, 90, goes bowling three times a week—we recently celebrated his birthday with a bowling party. A visiting group calls and visits our sick members."

On the need for and the role of women in community service, Mrs. Patterson says, "If one has had a varied background, experience, training, it's a shame to waste this on staying home and minding the knitting. We all need goals in life; if you don't live up to your resources and talents and experiences, you are not carrying your share in your community or country."

Medicare Versus the AMA's Latest Substitute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association has recently circulated to all of our offices letters and literature about its new proposal called eldercare. The proposal purports to offer the elderly people of this country "comprehensive health care." I am sure many of my colleagues have wanted to see an independent and unbiased analysis of this proposal and a comparison of its features with those contained in H.R. 1, the King-Anderson bill.

I have just read such a comparison, and I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues. It is an article appearing in the March issue of Consumer Reports, a respected journal published by the Consumers Union of Mount Vernon, N.Y. Without objection, the article follows:

MEDICARE VERSUS THE AMA'S LATEST SUBSTITUTE

After two decades of effort, 1965 appears to be the year for medicare—a federally administered national hospital insurance plan, financed through social security contributions for persons over 65. This time the administration's medicare bill seems assured of passage. As usual, though, the American Medical Association has proposed a last-gasp substitute. A comparison of the two proposals is instructive.

The medicare bill may of course be altered in the legislative process, but its four basic provisions are not likely to be changed significantly. They can be outlined briefly. For those over 65, medicare would:

Pay the full costs of up to 60 days of hospitalization (in ward or semiprivate accommodations), minus a first-day deductible, for each benefit period (which begins on the first day of hospitalization and ends whenever the patient has accumulated 90 days out of the hospital within a period of 180 days).

Provide for an additional 60 days of post-hospital care for each illness in a convalescent or rehabilitation center operating under an agreement with a hospital (not an ordinary, custodial-care nursing home).

Pay for up to 240 home nursing visits a year under medical supervision, in programs organized by nonprofit voluntary or public agencies.

Provide payment for hospital outpatient diagnostic services and tests, minus a deductible that would exclude routine low-cost laboratory or other diagnostic procedures.

These provisions would be financed by an increase in the social security withholding tax. Ultimately, a citizen would contribute (to a special, separate health care trust fund within the social security system) 0.45 percent of his earnings up to $5,600, and his employer would contribute an equal amount. Special provision would be made for those now over 65 who are not covered by social security through the Government's general fund.

The medicare program gives the citizen free choice of physician and hospital. It does not pay the costs of doctor bills, out-of-hospital drugs, prolonged or catastrophic illness requiring long, continuous hospitalization, or extended custodial care in nursing homes.

CU's medical consultants believe that this is, by and large, a sound basic package. The 60-day provision would encompass all but about 5 percent of the usual hospital stays of older persons, and the extended-care proposal would both relieve the pressure on general hospital beds and spur the construction of badly needed convalescent and rehabilitation facilities in many communities. Services of this kind are essential in many illnesses following their acute stage and prior to the time a patient can return to his home or transfer (if necessary) to a custodial institution.

The provision for organized home nursing service has obvious value: such services often preclude the need for hospitalization and permit earlier discharge from hospital or convalescent center. Outpatient diagnostic services also are capable of averting many costly hospitalizations by encouraging the early detection and treatment of disease—at a time when it may be cured or controlled by relatively simple short-term procedures.

Since the heaviest health cost of the elderly is hospitalization, the medicare coverage could make it financially possible for the first time for many citizens to purchase voluntary insurance (of the Blue Shield type) to cover physicians' bills and other supplementary costs.

The AMA substitute for medicare at first glance seems invitingly comprehensive. (It is, in fact, a resurrection of proposals made during the Eisenhower administration that the AMA bitterly opposed at the time, and again just a few months ago at its house of delegates meeting. The AMA now refers to its new proposal as a redefinition of policy.) The AMA substitute simply proposes the use of State and Federal funds to buy Blue Cross-Blue Shield or commercial health insurance for indigent persons over 65—it does not say how the funds would be raised, in the absence of a social security tax.

The proposal does say, however, that a means test would be required to determine the eligible poor, with the States using State and Federal money to pay all, some, or none of the insurance premium cost, depending on the citizen's qualification under the means test. Means tests are—moral consideration aside—enormously expensive and difficult to administer. Furthermore, the program would be administered by the States, raising the possibility that there would be 50 different kinds of governmental machinery, eligibility standard, and payment procedures. (Under some State rules setting eligibility for help under the current Kerr-Mills law, ownership of property or even ability of one's children to pay can make an old person ineligible.)

The subsidized insurance would pay for physicians' and surgeons' bills and drug costs as well as hospital bills, and an AMA statement asserts that this would be "comprehensive health care" and not "limited to hospital and nursing home care representing only a fraction of the cost of sickness." As CU has pointed out, however, this "fraction" covers the heaviest, the most financially crippling share of the burden. Furthermore, since the AMA has not spelled out specifically what the private insurance would cover (and in existing voluntary insurance policies, cash benefits, days of coverage, and other provisions vary widely from plan to plan and from area to area), it is difficult to tell how comprehensive the protection of the AMA's proposal would be.

The current medicare proposal, obviously, will not solve every aspect of the Nation's health problems, even for those over 65. It does not and cannot guarantee good medical care to its beneficiaries, and it pays relatively little attention to the quality of the services it pays for (though the bill does contain a provision for periodic review, by the medical staffs of participating hospitals, of the necessity for hospitalization, length of stay, and other such features). However, it is a significant beginning.

The War in Vietnam—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, early this month Mr. Lucian C. Warren, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., arrived in

Saigon to participate in a 10-day tour of Vietnam to observe conditions there. He was officially invited by the Department of Defense to make this observation and to report conditions as he saw them. His report, which is in several parts, reflects his own uncensored views, and there were no restrictions with respect to the copy he sent to his paper.

Mr. Warren made several trips into the war zones and participated in a number of Air Force and Army combat missions. He was briefed by the U.S. Embassy, the U.S. Information Service, and the U.S. Military Assistance Command in South Vietnam. In addition, Mr. Warren had the opportunity to talk with rank and file soldiers both of the South Vietnam forces and American military forces in the combat zones. He also talked to civilian and military officials of the South Vietnamese Government, as well as natives in various sections of the country.

Mr. Warren is an outstanding reporter in our Nation's Capital for the past 20 years and a former president of the National Press Club. I commend his on-the-spot report of conditions in Vietnam to the attention of my colleagues.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the first of this series which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express on February 21, 1965:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM—SAIGON PRESENTS TWO FACES

(By Lucian C. Warren)

(Lucian C. Warren, who has reported the Washington scene with distinction for the Courier-Express for many years, has gone to South Vietnam to have a look at that war-torn land with his reporter's perceptive eye. This is the first of a series of stories on his experiences and observations. It describes his arrival in Saigon and his first day in that uneasy city.)

SAIGON.—"Pan American welcomes you to Saigon," proclaims a picturesque leaflet distributed to disembarking passengers just before arrival at the capital of South Vietnam.

The cover page shows two well-dressed American couples smiling happily as if they arrived for a vacation at the Riviera. Inside, after telling passengers how to get through customs and immigration stations, the pamphlet suggests that the city of Saigon "offers much to the pleasure seeker," with "fine wines, cognac and choice meals served at excellent restaurants and nightclubs throughout the city."

For awhile after arrival, a Saigon visitor might be fooled into thinking that Pan Am's idyllic message still rang true. The 20-minute ride from the airport into downtown Saigon at noontime offered initial supporting evidence.

CHILDREN PLAYING

Many children with schoolbooks were in evidence, some engaged happily in the Saigon version of tag.

The streets abounded with beautiful Vietnamese women, attired in spotlessly laundered oriental garments.

A noontime traffic jam, the prelude to a 3-hour siesta during the hottest period of the day, features hundreds of taxis, both of the motored and rickshaw variety, in a mad game of chicken. The idea seemed to be to come as close as possible to hitting another vehicle or pedestrian without actually doing so.

Certainly the Caravelle Hotel, at which this correspondent registered, was elegant enough with fancy draperies, polished brass fixtures, automatic elevators and air conditioning throughout.

CONTRAST

But it didn't take long for disillusionment to set in, and the drab and ugly aspects of a tropical oriental city engaged in one of the world's nastiest wars became clearly manifest.

A U.S. colonel entrusted with newsmen chaperoning duties, saw to it that immediately after the siesta the newly arrived reporters were shepherded to the local Pan American ticket office to get reservations for departure about 10 days hence. He said he had seen too many get caught without plane accommodations home to take a chance.

VENDORS

Along the street, one sidewalk vendor offered to sell "feelthy" pictures. We were warned to have on truck with such vendors of others of the moneychanging variety. Seems that these sidwalk entrepreneurs will offer a fantastic exchange rate for American dollars—something in the neighborhood of 140 Vietnamese piasters to the dollar, when the official rate is 70 to the dollar.

The gimmick is that these sleight-of-hand artists will punctiliously count out the 140 piasters, then vanish quickly before the victim discovers he is many piasters short. We were warned also that the pickpockets are more numerous than in Times Square and that the slightest jostle might mean that your wallet was being lifted.

PARLIAMENT BUILDING

On our way to filing the necessary application for accreditation, we passed a large and ornate building.

"That's where Parliament meets * * * when it meets," our escort remarked. But of course the Parliament hasn't met for many weeks as one military coup succeeded another in the Vietnamese Government game of musical chairs for the leaders. The only thing uniform about the coups was that Parliament stayed dissolved. Indeed, the Hall of Parliament was advertising orchestra concerts and other engagements as one way to collect a few rentals during the long and perhaps permanent parliamentary hiatus.

At the Vietnamese accreditation office for newsmen, a young Vietnamese woman took our applications and issued our accreditation cards with brisk precision.

"A clever girl," our guide volunteered. "She has lasted through four administrations."

BARBED WIRE

Soon after, we became official American war correspondents by being accredited at the U.S. Information Service headquarters.

A tangle of barbed wire in front was a sharp reminder that USIS not only had to worry about Vietcong saboteurs, but needs protection also from the rioting South Vietnam non-Communists when they might become displeased at the U.S. attitude toward the latest cynical coup d'etat.

A 5 p.m. press briefing for some 150 war correspondents, a daily ritual here, was almost totally concerned with the mad scramble to get U.S. dependents evacuated in a 10-day period.

KHANH SEES PRESS

Two hours later Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, South Vietnam's current military strongman, held his own press conference to announce that 24 South Vietnamese planes had successfully bombed military installations in North Vietnam with the help of a "cover" of U.S. fighter planes.

As he spoke, the rumble of firing could be heard, possibly as much as 10 to 20 miles away.

"They're probably lobbing shells at the Vietcong, who usually begin their military activity at dusk," someone explained.

BOMBING SCENE

As we bedded down later at the Caravelle Hotel, after first killing what looked like a giant cockroach and brushing our teeth with bottled water (tapwater might produce dysentery), we reflected that only 5 months ago a Vietcong bomb went off in the fifth floor of our hostelry.

Life certainly is not dull in Saigon.

Uncle Sam Is a Salesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include excerpts from an article by Ralph McGill, appearing in the Atlanta Constitution of February 13, 1965, pointing out the progress that our country is making in world trade and the great contribution made by former Secretary of Commerce, Luther Hodges, in increasing export sales.

UNCLE SAM AS A SALESMAN

Uncle Sam has become a go-getting salesman. He is, in fact, doing better than ever in history. He was, of course, obliged to do so. But the important fact is that he has not failed.

After the Second World War ended conditions new and strange were imposed on the economy and understanding of the United States. These have changed with the years.

There now is a prosperous Europe—instead of a bankrupt one as in 1945. NATO, a paramount necessity in the years after war's end, is in need of revision.

The treaties made by the late John Foster Dulles with Eastern countries were never very meaningful. They are less so today.

The story goes on and on—the need for revision of organizations and attitudes is great.

Increasingly, since about 1947, the balance-of-payments problem has become more and more acute. One way we can improve it is to sell more abroad.

Little attention was paid this important aspect of the U.S. economy until President Kennedy ordered it. In 1961 the then Secretary of Commerce, Luther Hodges, a former able Governor of North Carolina, was asked to set in motion a plan to increase trade.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Based on accomplishments, the program begun in 1961 proved to be sensational. An itemized account emphasized the impressive facts of it.

1. Since the inception of the program in 1961, exports have increased by 28 percent. They reached a total of $25 billion in 1964. This was 13 percent above the total of $22.3 billion in 1963.

2. Our trade surplus, exports over imports, has increased by a whopping 45 percent since 1960. Our surplus is currently at the rate of $6.8 billion; it is $1.8 billion, or 30 percent greater than a year ago.

3. Commerce Department and Department of Labor statistics agree that more than 3.4 million American workers are employed, directly or indirectly, in production, transportation, and marketing of the more than $25 billion worth of goods sold to foreign customers.

4. It is estimated that each additional billion dollars of exports creates about 135,000 jobs.

If we do not engage strongly and competitively in world trade we seriously will weaken ourselves with growing unemploy-

ment, a general worsening of our economic position, and a retreat into a political and economic isolation at a time when such a policy will invite disaster.

Who Is Tax Exempt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an article written by my very good friend, former Congressman Michael J. Bradley, which appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on February 5, 1965.

Mr. Bradley is a member of the board of revision of taxes for the city of Philadelphia.

The article follows:

A LETTER TO THE BULLETIN—WHO IS TAX EXEMPT?

I think the public would be interested in being better informed about real estate exempted from taxation in Philadelphia. Because there is some misconception in the minds of many about it.

The total amount exempted is approximately $1,345 million, which is 23.7 percent of the total assessed property valuation, of $5,537,380,400.

Unfortunately, a great many people believe that the overwhelming portion of this consists of properties used for religious, educational, or charitable purposes. Nothing could be more misleading. Actually, the amount of exemptions for churches, synagogues, cemeteries, educational institutions and hospitals amounts to only 6 percent of the total assessment figure. Another 1 percent includes orphanages, old people's homes, YMCA's, etc.

Of the total exemption of $1,345 million, between 67 and 68 percent applies to agencies of the Federal, State, and city governments. This, of course, includes such items as, believe it or not, more than $25 million for the city hall; all of the land in Fairmount Park and all other parks coming under the park commission; every firehouse, police station, playground, city pier, library, and every bit of property of any nature whatever owned by the city. The city property totals more than $350 million, and public schools $157 million. Federal Government installations, such as the navy yard, valued at over $85 million, and the Frankford arsenal is put at nearly $16 million. State properties are valued at nearly $42 million. The total for these various agencies is $861,060,550.

No charge could be placed against the property owned by State or city agencies and, of course, it would be foolish to do so even if it were possible. It would be taking money out of one pocket and putting it into the other, with needless expense for clerical hire and paper work. Likewise, no imposition could be placed against the Federal Government to consider payment of any charges when every State in the Nation is clamoring to retain Federal installations, and we have just been successful in keeping our own navy yard here.

There is more than $43 million worth of exempt properties owned by public utilities and approximately $1,800,000 owned by veterans' posts.

In my opinion, there would be no justification for taxing churches, synagogues, educational and charitable institutions, and I doubt if the legislature, which has jurisdiction in tax matters, would give any consideration whatever to such a proposal, particularly in view of the fact that the taxpayer is being saved hundreds of millions of dollars through the services to the community performed by many of these institutions.

It is unfair to have the public think that the amount involved in these exemptions constitutes the major portion of the properties which are all placed in the one classification of exempt real estate, and I think it is time that the matter be viewed in its proper perspective.

MICHAEL J. BRADLEY,
Member, Board of Revision of Taxes.

House Un-American Activities Committee's Misplaced Zeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of Congress to an editorial which appeared in my hometown newspaper, the Watertown, Wis., Daily Times, on February 8, 1965. The community daily newspaper editorial is recognized as a most accurate reflection of the views of citizens in the cities and villages making up the great heartland of the Nation. This editorial highlights the concern of thoughtful Americans about the remarkable ability of this committee to use its investigative powers to challenge individual liberties while apparently being unconcerned with more immediate threats to our society from other quarters. I wish to take this means to compliment the Watertown Times for presenting this statement to its readers:

HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE'S MISPLACED ZEAL

Recently the House Committee on Un-American Activities caused charges of contempt of Congress to be brought against three persons. Their offense was that they had refused to testify in secret session about their part in the "crime" of asking the State Department to permit a leftist Japanese professor to visit this country.

Many thoughtful Americans concerned about preservation of individual rights regard this as unconscionable harassment of citizens who have not even been charged with wrongdoing. It is pointed out, quite properly, that even if the Japanese in question were the wildest sort of radical there could be no question about the right of a citizen to make representations in his behalf—openly, as they were made—with an agency of the Federal Government.

The Un-American Activities Committee, commonly known as House Un-American Activities Committee, took its action—before Congress was in session, be it noted—on the grounds that the testimony of the three should be in executive session because it might hold others up to public scorn and calumny. The question arises whether the House Un-American Activities Committee has not done precisely this, without valid cause, in the cases of these three persons—each of whom had agreed to testify fully, but only at an open meeting of the committee.

This kind of misplaced zeal on the part of the House Un-American Activities Committee contrasts notably with its reluctance to tackle investigation of such more immediate threats to our society as the resurgent Ku Klux Klan and the Minutemen. The latter, described by Senator YOUNG, of Ohio, as a "band of psychotics," have the anarchic aim of building a private army to impose their will on society. The Klan is too well known to require description. The genuineness of the House Un-American Activities Committee's concern with what is truly un-American would seem more credible if the House Un-American Activities Committee would apply some of its zeal to such threats from the far right.

Progress Report of Unico National Immigration Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important legislative proposals of this progressive administration is the revision of the present Immigration and Nationality Act.

As one of the many cosponsors of this proposal, I have frequently urged that the discriminatory national origins quota system be abolished and that it be replaced with a system that is impartial, fair, and compassionate.

I have received a copy of the progress report of Unico, National Immigration Committee, of which Judge Charles De Fazio, Jr., of Hoboken, N.J.—a close friend of mine—is chairman.

This report thoroughly covers the injustice of the present immigration law and cites the urgency of Congress passing legislation that would remove this blemish from our record as a free and fair nation.

I hope with all my heart that 1965 will be the year that Congress amends the Immigration and Nationality Act. What a great achievement that would be—not only for this administration—not only for the United States—but also for our form of government, which is respected throughout the world for the freedom it advocates. However, that advocacy is not respected unless freedom is practiced in all of our Nation's activities—including our immigration policy.

As the New York Times editorial of January 14, 1965, pointed out:

> It [the revised immigration law] deserves enactment. It is time to rekindle that lamp beside the golden door and banish forever those shadows that have dimmed its bright flame too long.

The report follows:

PROGRESS REPORT OF UNICO NATIONAL IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE

(By Judge Charles De Fazio, Jr., chairman)

There is a proverb we learned as children, that "if you don't succeed at first, try and try again."

We of Unico have been trying since 1952, when the McCarran-Walter Act was adopted, to obtain repeal, amendment, or modification of same. We learned very early that the law was un-American because of its gross discriminatory provisions; and that the

effect on international relations, when legislation attempts to distinguish human beings into classes, labels, or stereotypes, creates an immediate conflict with the law of God and the law of man. The dignity of man is stigmatized by a standard known as the national origin quota test. All men are created equal and guaranteed the basic rights of life, liberty, and happiness. This is the law of our land and the law of God.

Unico has fought consistently for these past 13 years, and has never lost faith in its ultimate success for a modern and progressive immigration and naturalization law. H.R. 7700 and S. 532 introduced in the 88th session of Congress looked like a success and a breakthrough appeared at hand in the middle of 1964. This legislation has had the support of our last four Presidents, from Mr. Truman to Mr. Johnson, our present Chief Executive.

A short time ago, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY said of his late brother, our immortal President John F. Kennedy, on eve of publishing his book, "A Nation of Immigrants," that "I know of no cause which President Kennedy championed more warmly than improvement of our immigration policies."

President Johnson's forthright message on immigration reform revives an issue that should trouble the American conscience. I believe the true story of the status of immigration in America today is set forth in the New York Times on January 14, 1965, in a beautiful editorial as follows:

"I LIFT MY LAMP

"President Johnson's forthright message on immigration reform revives an issue that should trouble the American conscience.

"Since 1924 the United States has rigged admission to this country on a racist basis. The "Nordic" countries of northwestern Europe have large immigration quotas, while the Slavic and Latin countries of eastern and southern Europe have tiny quotas. This is the so-called national origins quota system designed to preserve the racial balance and implicitly the racial "purity"—then thought to exist in this country. The quota system was one ugly fruit of two generations of propaganda about race in Europe and America.

"Sharply improved scholarship in ethnic history and in anthropology in recent decades should have had a chastening effect. But when Congress last confronted this problem, it flunked the test. The McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952, which was passed over President Truman's veto, not only confirmed the racial quota system but introduced fresh anomalies and racist theories into the law.

"Thus it is that the United States stands self-condemned before the world for imposing severe restraints on immigration by men and women from Athens and Rome—two of the chief sources of glory and greatness in that Western civilization Americans share and defend today. The people who produced Plato, Aristotle, and Demosthenes are limited to 308 quota numbers a year. The people of Dante and Michelangelo are limited to 5,666. In this fashion the United States solemnly counts and calibrates the potential worth of all mankind. Is there not something terribly arrogant—and also absurd—in this self-righteous national posture?

"President Johnson's proposal would eliminate the racial quota system and place admission to this country basically on a first-come, first-admitted basis. It deserves enactment. It is time to rekindle that lamp beside the golden door and banish forever those shadows that have dimmed its bright flame too long."

The Johnson administration bill H.R. 2580 by Congressman CELLER and S. 500 by Senators HART and CLARK, contain proposals essentially introduced by President Kennedy in 1963 with some minor changes. There are a total of 27 Senators appearing as cosponsors.

Assurance has been given that a determined effort will be made to achieve passage of this legislation. In addition to the normal procedures of moving legislation, much depends on the grassroots support which the legislation will receive across the Nation. Again, this is where stable and sincere organizations like our own Unico can do a great job. We must do our best "to clinch" the project during this 89th session of Congress. This, I am sure we will do.

Now, a little background on the problem so that all may understand the current legislation.

The problem: The present immigration law allocates large immigration quotas to a few countries that do not fully use them—and small quotas to other countries that need them desperately. This inequity occurs because the law is based upon the unfair national origins formula which discriminates against southern and favors northern Europeans.

The allocations: The present law provides these immigration quotas: Great Britain, 65,361; Germany, 25,814; Ireland, 17,756; Italy, 5,666; Greece, 308; Spain, 250. However, on the average, 35 percent of the quotas allocated annually to the three northern countries are not used. As a result, these valuable unused quotas are wasted because the law does not allow them to be given to the southern countries that want and need them.

The results: Thousands of families of American citizens are helplessly divided with little or no hope of early reunion. Though a few relatives are admitted yearly to the United States, the backlog of those waiting in vain in other countries is rapidly approaching 200,000 in number. These unwanted, unfortunate people include the parents, spouses, children, brothers, and sisters of our fellow Americans.

The reaction: Americans in all walks of life throughout the country, including Congressmen of both parties, government officials, clergymen of all religious faiths, labor leaders, and various nationality and ethnic groups, have urged immigration reform. All major relief, welfare, and social agencies support a change in the law. And every President since Harry S. Truman has proposed legislation to humanize our antiquated immigration laws.

The outlook: Current administration proposals would replace the national origins quota system with these new criteria: (1) The skills of the immigrant and their relationship to national needs. (2) The family relationship between immigrant and persons already here. (3) The priority of registration or, first come, first served. The new law would also provide for allocation of unused quotas to countries that want and need them. Result: quota immigrants admitted would increase by only 6,000.

Finally, what is our job? Our task will be to make sure that our consistent and persistent interest is continued and each Unico chapter must do its share. To be sure, our target is passage of this law which will banish, after 5 years, the national origin quota system, among other discriminatory un-American practices.

We suggest the following five-point plan of action for success:

1. Ask your local newspapers to take a stand on the new immigration proposals if they have not already done so. Encourage the news media (periodicals, newspapers, radio stations) to feature informative articles on the subject as well as human interest stories. Do not overlook publicity in the newsletters of fraternal societies, political clubs, religious organizations, etc. As Unicoans, act as spearhead, cooperator, or liaison.

2. Public manifestations should be used to project support for the President's immigration reforms. These could be in the form of rallies, conferences, social gatherings or fund-raising events.

3. It is important to enlist the aid of other civic, religious, ethnic, political, or social organizations to assist in these endeavors.

4. Employ every feasible method and use every opportunity to keep the issue alive. We must not permit the matter to sink into oblivion as has happened in the past. Keep in touch with the national office. Write us about your plans, and let us know whether we can be of help in any way.

5. Contact your legislators, and I mean your U.S. Senators and U.S. Representatives (Congressmen) by phone, wire, letter or in person, urging robust and vigorous support and adoption of H.R. 2580 and S. 500. Our elected lawmakers highly evaluate the interest of their constituents as evidenced by the media hereinbefore outlined.

Dated: February 5, 1965.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES DE FAZIO, Jr.,
Chairman, Immigration Committee.

Let Us Know Who They Are

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to require the District of Columbia government to affix to the automobile license plates issued to foreign diplomats and their staffs the name of the country which they represent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear at the outset that this bill in no way compromises the privilege of diplomatic immunity; but I do insist that those thoughtless and arrogant foreign representatives and their employees who, under the cloak of diplomatic immunity, have continually outraged our citizenry by the flagrant abuse of this, their host country's rules and ordnances—and yet are able to hide behind the anonymity of a simply labeled "DPL" license plate which in no way identifies the country of the offender.

Here in the Nation's Capital, where these diplomats should certainly be on their best behavior, we have countless and repeated abuses of our traffic laws: speeding with impunity, double and triple parking, tieing up traffic by parking in no-parking zones, parking in front of fire hydrants, and on and on—the worst infractions imaginable. And yet, these diplomatic delinquents go their merry way fully aware of their immunity from prosecution.

But the offenders should not be immune from public scorn and they should feel the full weight of public scrutiny when they engage in these highhanded tactics.

I am certainly not attempting to tar all the foreign representatives and their employees with the same brush but I want those that constantly and cynically abuse our hospitality to be recognized; and at

the same time, I want those who recognize and observe our rules to receive public recognition and praise. In other words, let the personal reputation and esteem of a country's mission here in our Nation's Capital rise or fall on the way they observe or abuse our hospitality.

Flint Journal Salutes SS "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, since World War II Americans have realized that their fates are entwined with the destinies of people of other nations.

Not only our Government, but the people of the United States acting outside the governmental sphere have increasingly shown a desire to help the less fortunate of the world.

A leader in these people-to-people type programs has been Dr. William B. Walsh and the organization he founded 7 years ago, Project Hope.

Project Hope, the principal activity of the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., sponsors the voyages of the white hospital ship SS *Hope*.

In 4 years this floating medical center has brought American doctors and nurses to Asia, Latin America, and Africa, where they have trained their counterparts in the latest medical skills.

Mr. Speaker, the success of this magnificent project is appropriately saluted in a recent editorial in the Flint, Mich., Journal, and I wish to insert the editorial in the RECORD:

SS "HOPE" SETS SAIL AGAIN AS U.S. GOOD-WILL SYMBOL

Arnold Toynbee, English historian and author of such well-known works as "War and Civilization," "A Study of History," and "Civilization on Trial," several years ago wrote in the New York Times Sunday magazine: "The 20th century will be chiefly remembered * * * as an age in which human society dared to think of the welfare of the whole human race as a practicable objective."

A feature of our social development which inidcates that Mr. Toynbee's theory might become reality is an increasing recognition throughout the world that the security and welfare of the human race are interdependent within each geographical area, and the security and welfare of each area are depended on the security and welfare of the world as a whole.

This is a concept shared more and more by a great majority of people regardless of their race, religion, and nationality. And it indicates that the field of health and rehabilitation offers an effective approach toward international understanding. * * * This same area of understanding through the healing arts is being expanded by Project Hope. Only recently the hospital ship SS *Hope* returned from South America and now is headed on her fourth mission of mercy to ease human suffering in foreign lands. This cruise will carry the ship along the west coast of Africa. Earlier journeys have been to Indonesia and South Vietnam, Peru, and most recently to Ecuador.

The former hospital ship *Consolation* was taken from mothballs in 1959 and converted with private donations under the direction of the People to People Health Foundation into a floating medical school.

The ship carries up to 15 doctors, 24 nurses, a dentist, 22 medical and dental technicians, plus supporting personnel. It has 250 patient beds, 3 operating rooms, a special room for eye surgery, and an obstetrical delivery room.

The first aim of Project Hope is to teach, not treat. The main purpose is to train native medical workers in the rudiments of public health and medical treatment. However, at foreign ports of call, residents are invited aboard for examination and treatment. Operations performed run into the thousands and treatments into the hundreds of thousands. On the recent trip to Ecuador, 500,000 children alone were immunized.

The venture is one which people understand. It is providing a service in a field in which everyone speaks the same language. Relief of suffering is something that people in all countries can see and feel and relate.

Not only does the search for good health provide a common denominator among people of all nations, but it is fundamental to economic self-sufficiency. As Dr. Charles W. Mayo of the Mayo Clinic once said with great simplicity: "Sickness makes people poor. Poverty makes people sick."

It doesn't seem to be overstating the potential to point out that some of the most effective tools in the world today, as far as international understanding is concerned, can be found in the field of health.

In this field, the SS *Hope* is fulfilling its role as an impressive symbol in the far corners of the world of the good will of Americans. It is helping to demonstrate in a most practical way that imaginative private foreign aid can be tremendously effective, and that individual Americans are willing to finance it.

Resolution on the VISTA Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, our country today is graced with a truly superb moving, humanitarian force, the Volunteers in Service to America—VISTA—and it serves as a great primary part of the Economic Opportunity Act.

The National Lutheran Council recognized VISTA's contribution to the domestic tranquility of our Nation at its 47th annual meeting in Hollywood, Calif., February 8–10, 1965, in a fine resolution.

I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to this outstanding resolution. It follows:

RESOLUTION ON VISTA PROGRAM

Whereas establishment by the U.S. Government of the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program provides an opportunity for individuals to volunteer their services for periods of time to assist in specific domestic projects in connection with the Economic Opportunity Act; and

Whereas VISTA thus presents creative opportunities for citizens of good will and competence to serve human need; and

Whereas the Christian's call to love for and service of his fellow man must involve him in a service in the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Lutheran Council (1) register its general endorsement of the objectives of the VISTA program; and (2) encourage qualified Lutherans to give consideration to participation in the VISTA program as an opportunity for meaningful service, and a fulfillment of their Christian vocation.

The War in Vietnam—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the second part of a report on conditions in Vietnam by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, who has just returned from a 10-day tour of Vietnam.

Mr. Warren is the Washington correspondent for one of Buffalo's leading newspapers, and part II of his report which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on February 22, 1965, follows:

WAR IN VIETNAM, II—COPTER LOSS RATED LIGHT

(Helicopters are a new and potent weapon of warfare being brought fully to bear for the first time in the South Vietnam fighting. Lucien C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express who is taking a closeup look at the southeast Asia war, describes his visit to U.S. Army helicopter headquarters and his meeting there with a western New York officer.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

SAIGON.—Some old military traditions are being chopped down in the jungle warfare against the Communist Vietcong.

It used to be that generals and their aides-de-camp never got near the firing line. And for a number of years after World War II, the U.S. Army had to yield all major operations of aircraft to the U.S. Air Force.

But that's all changed now.

At headquarters of the U.S. Army Support Command in Vietnam, the man in charge, Maj. Gen. Delk M. Oden, and his aide-de-camp, Capt. Richard Kenyon of Medina, N.Y., are living proof that military traditions change.

SIX MEDALS

Major General Oden and Captain Kenyon each has three air medals to his credit in recognition of having flown 75 combat missions together in Vietnam.

They fly about 15 days each month in their role of helping support the South Vietnamese ground forces. Their command has about 500 aircraft at their disposal, of which 300 are Bell Aerospace UH1–B helicopters.

These are the choppers that rush South Vietnamese troops into trouble spots where the Vietcong may have the upper hand.

On the day the two men were interviewed at U.S. Army Support Command headquarters, the Bell choppers had just returned from a fierce engagement with the enemy.

NOT BAD

Elements of two South Vietnamese battalions were flown in to help resist a Vietcong attack in the Phyoc Thy area about 35 miles east of Saigon.

The Vietcong shot down three helicopters, killing one U.S. Army crewman and wounding eight others.

At least 18 Vietcong were killed during the engagement and much Vietcong equipment captured, as compared with 9 South Vietnamese who lost their lives.

All in all, the losses have been remarkably light for the chopper forces with only 21 lost in a year when 247,500 hours were flown by Army aircraft. An additional five fixed-wing craft were downed, but General Oden considers these losses remarkably light.

FOR THE CAUSE

He is proud, too, of the fact that his aircraft have the highest availability rate of any air force in the world.

The general's strong "right arm" and copilot, Captain Kenyon, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Duane Kenyon, of Lyndonville, N.Y. His wife, the former Virginia Mix, lives in Medina with their three small children.

Captain Kenyon was graduated from West Point in 1957 at the top of his class, and entered the Army Corps of Engineers. He has found time to take 2 years in advanced engineering at Princeton and has seen duty for 1½ years in Europe, before arriving at this hot spot.

"I think this a worthwhile cause, and I'm glad to be participating in this war against the Vietcong Communists," he says.

FLY IN RICE

His boss is satisfied that his men have made a real contribution to the Vietnamese war effort. Aside from flying troops to the hot spots, the choppers fly in supplies to so-called pacified areas, where the non-Communist Vietnamese are struggling to rebuild their country.

In one recent operation of this kind, the choppers flew in supplies of rice that tempted the Vietcong to return and raid the supplies. This made the villagers so angry that they cooperated in telling where the Vietcong might be found. Subsequent raids decimated these forces.

POLITICAL SHAKES

General Oden foresees a long war here before the Vietcong can be wiped out and he acknowledges the difficulties of working with a people whose government is unstable and politically immature.

"We're willing to remain here a long time and work hard at understanding the Vietnamese. I think our difficulties will begin to evaporate and the war will be won," he says.

If so, the work of the general and his Buffalo area aide-de-camp and their Bell-made aircraft will have made a major contribution.

No Time Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of this august body an editorial which appeared in the Westbury Times of Thursday, February 11, 1965. This Long Island newspaper has been consistently cited for excellence and has also been the recipient of many newspaper awards.

The editorial is as follows:

NO TIME LIMIT

There would seem to be a reasonable chance that the West German Government will repeal the statute of limitations on Nazi war crimes which is due to expire on May 8, 1965—certainly there should be no time limit to the punishment of those who perpetrated the henious crimes committed against humanity during the Second World War, including that of genocide against the Jewish people.

We are not in a position to demand that the Bonn government revise this statute of limitations—but since the crimes themselves were of a nature that revolted and outraged the entire world, the Westbury Times believes it would be fitting that a resolution be passed by the Congress of the United States requesting the West German Government to eliminate the soon-to-expire statute in the name of justice and morality.

In the event that Bonn takes no action, those Nazi war criminals who have not been indicted or have had no judicial procedure initiated against them before May 8, 1965, will be free of the threat of trial and punishment. This, as we view it, would be an affront to the millions who gave their lives to end this tyranny.

A Key Post in Able Hands—Ellington Directs Emergency Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has confirmed the nomination of former Governor Buford Ellington, of Tennessee, as Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, a key sensitive post to which he was recently appointed by President Johnson. As the Director of the Office of Emergency Planing, Governor Ellington also serves as a member of the National Security Council.

In selecting Governor Ellington for this post, the President has wisely chosen to place this important position in able hands.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Nashville Banner of February 20, 1965, follows:

A KEY JOB IN ABLE HANDS

Men who do not feel they know all the answers are possessed of the willingness to search for them—such is the caliber of stewards needed in positions of great responsibility. In picking former Gov. Buford Ellington as Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, President Johnson was selecting that kind of man. He put that important job in able hands.

Swift approval by the Senate Armed Services Committee, and confirmation yesterday by the Senate, attested to the faith of Congress in Mr. Ellington's capacity for this assignment. The swearing-in scheduled for today will launch him upon a task whose magnitude requires—in the national interest—a personal ability of corresponding dimensions.

Buford Ellington's experience is in administrative endeavor, the organizing and coordinating of effort to accomplish constructive purpose. With a job to do, he does it with the minimum of lost motion.

The Office of Emergency Planning is a staff arm of the President. Its Director advises the Chief Executive on the mobilization and management of the Nation's resources in the interest of national security. By law he is a member of the National Security Council. In wartime the OEP would be the nucleus of an overall resource control agency. In peacetime, its task relates to the husbanding of strategic materials, and the coordination of Federal and State effort in coping with major disasters.

It is a big responsibility requiring the best administrator obtainable. In Buford Ellington, it has that best; and Washington has officially taken note of that fact.

Again, congratulations.

Economic Benefits From Oceanographic Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most encouraging documents issued by a government agency in many months is the special report of the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, "Economic Benefits From Oceanographic Research."

The committee—NASCO—headed by Dr. Milner Schaefer, has made a detailed and thoughtful evaluation of future economic benefits that could result from oceanographic research, and compares these benefits with the cost of doing the research. During its year of study the committee recognized, of course, that research deriving from scientific breakthroughs and revolutionary technical innovations cannot be forecast. Similarly, dollar values could not be placed on oceanographic requirements for national defense, or the benefits, which are truly incalculable. We need only consider the strategic drop Polaris has given us in the nuclear arms race to understand the life-and-death importance of our national efforts in what has come to be known as "hydraspace" or "innerspace."

We have devoted only a minor fraction of our Federal research dollar to the marine sciences, but Federal support of this area of research, fortunately, has increased substantially in the past few years—from $24 million in fiscal year 1958 to $124 million in 1963.

Can we justify this rapid growth of appropriations? Dr. Schaefer's Committee answers with an emphatic "Yes." The fact is, we cannot afford not to devote greater attention to this final but most promising frontier on our hungry and troubled planet.

The committee's report conservatively estimates that a continuing national investment in oceanography of approximately $165 million a year—not counting defense expenditures—"will be an essential component in bringing about savings of nearly $3 billion a year, plus added annual production worth almost as much."

In other words, in a period of 10 to 15 years, with reasonable Federal support, we can anticipate an annual yield in return of about $6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, Congress will be devoting considerable attention to our national

oceanographic program this session, including several proposals designed to coordinate or accelerate this effort. I therefore commend to the attention of my colleagues, for their consideration, an editorial on this encouraging report by the Cape Cod Standard-Times of Hyannis, Mass.:

WOULD DO WELL

Were it not for the oceanographic advances already made at Woods Hole and similar centers of the science, some of the things envisaged by experts in the field would seem to have a tinge of science fiction.

The Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences has been plugging for a national commitment to spend $165 million a year on developing means of exploiting the seas.

Oceanographic experts envision such things as undersea animal husbandry and remarkable new methods of fishing (by means of electric currents, for example, which would herd fish into a funnel attached to a processing ship). They foresee submarine freight and passenger travel, undersea mining on a large scale, even the creation of ocean ship cities in the most productive waters.

Some of this is what has the ring of science fiction, until one recalls that moon shots and other developments make this an era in which science is catching up with science fiction. The truth is that what the oceanographers are proposing—that is, stepped-up oceanic research and development—makes excellent practical sense.

This point is underscored by their estimate that annual investment of the $165 million they ask will soon bring an enormously greater return. The figure they speak of—an annual yield of $6 billion within 10 to 15 years—may sound like exaggeration, but even a fraction of that would justify the magnitude of investment proposed.

Morever, there is reason to believe that the estimated yield is not much of an exaggeration if any at all. We are still in the hunting stage in getting food from the sea. It is likely that systematic breeding, feeding, and harvesting of fish would in itself bring a heavy return on the investment. Congress would do well to act on the advice of the oceanographers and appropriate the necessary funds.

Cigarette Smoking Caused 2,500 Deaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an article which appeared in the East Side News, a publication with wide distribution in my congressional district, which quotes the statement of Dr. George James, commissioner of health of the city of New York, in connection with cigarette smoking:

HEALTH COMMISSIONER SAYS: "CIGARETTE SMOKING CAUSED 2,500 DEATHS"

"Cigarette smoking was responsible for the death of some 2,500 New Yorkers from lung cancer, cancer of the larynx, chronic bronchitis, emphysema, and other diseases during 1964," Dr. George James, commissioner of health, told East Side News today.

"The hope that some pill or filter would make smoking safe should not be allowed to dull community understanding of the risks involved in smoking cigarettes," Dr. James said. "The only safe and effective action is to stop smoking."

While he opposes the banning of cigarettes as impractical and reminiscent of the prohibition era, Dr. James does advocate the printing of a warning label on all cigarette packages.

"The public has the right to be warned about the threat to health involved in smoking cigarettes," Dr. James said.

Declaring that cigarette manufacturers should not be allowed to suggest in their advertising that one cigarette is safer than another, he said: "Once cigarette manufacturers are allowed to imply that some cigarettes are less harmful than others, any battle waged by health authorities is automatically lost."

"There is no evidence," Dr. James continued, "that filters, whatever their content and length, have any effect whatever on carcinogenicity, cancer-producing ability."

Since it is much easier to keep people from starting a bad habit than it is to cure them of it once it is started, Dr. James emphasized the importance of educating the young. "Antismoking education directed at young people is of the highest importance," he said.

Dr. James concluded by pointing out that "in the last three decades, there has been a rapid rise in deaths from diseases associated with cigarette smoking. Unchecked, these diseases represent a continuing threat to the health of our community."

President Johnson's Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson is being constantly lambasted by the propaganda agencies of the international Communist gangsters in Moscow, Hanoi, and Peiping. President Johnson is for standing firm in South Vietnam in the interest of the United States and freedom throughout the rest of the world.

It is unbelievable to see prominent Americans join Kosygin, Chou En-lai, Mao Tse-tung, and Ho Chi Minh in demanding that the United States withdraw from South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the following is from the Washington report of the American Security Council on February 3:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POSITION

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson answered this question. Said the President: "We are there, first, because a friendly nation has asked us to help against Communist aggression. Ten years ago our President pledged our help. Three Presidents have supported that pledge. We will not break it. Second, our own security is tied to the peace of Asia. Twice in one generation we have had to fight against aggression in the Far East. To ignore aggression now would only increase the danger of a larger war."

Both Radio Moscow and the Communist North Vietnam Radio Hanoi have commented somewhat impudently on the President's speech. Said Radio Moscow on January 7: "Once again he repeated the worn-out lines that American Armed Forces are in South Vietnam to give 'help' and safeguard U.S. security in South Vietnam." And Radio Hanoi on January 9 said: "In his state of the Union address to the U.S. Congress on January 4, Johnson once again disclosed U.S. stubbornness in continuing its aggressive plot in South Vietnam. Johnson brazenly stated that the United States would stay in South Vietnam."

But President Johnson's words are not worn out. His words reflect the verdict of history on the policy of appeasement. A firm policy in Vietnam today is the best guarantee of avoiding a general war tomorrow. How much might not have England, and the world, been spared had the appeasers of the 1930's listened to the advice of Sir Winston Churchill. Militarily, Communist China is still a paper tiger—less powerful than Hitler's Nazis in the early 1930's. Today Communist China's challenge in the Pacific can be met without excessive risk. But the peril to freedom in the Pacific will continue to rise with each year if we refuse to face up to this challenge.

Cleanup Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, Senator GAYLORD NELSON discussed the pollution crisis in a recent speech to the Wisconsin State Bar Association. As Senator and as Governor of Wisconsin for two terms, GAYLORD NELSON has been an ardent advocate of sound conservation measures, especially legislation to clean up our polluted rivers and lakes.

I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to the excellent editorial in the Milwaukee Sentinel of February 22, 1965. The article follows:

CLEANUP TIME

Senator NELSON did an effective job of sounding the alarm about the pollution crisis in his speech on "America's Last Chance" at the midwinter meeting of the State Bar of Wisconsin.

Enumerating some of our major crimes of defilement, NELSON says we have destroyed our rivers, plundered our forests, strip mined mountains, overpopulated and overdeveloped our public parks, bulldozed away most of the green spots and open spaces in our cities, pushed heavy industry into the last sanctums of natural beauty, blighted the landscape with junk yards, dammed our trout streams, filled in our swamps, poisoned our birds, and suffocated our fish.

"A DULL, GRAY TIDE SWEEPS IN"

That's plenty, but it's not all. "A dull, gray tide of pollution is moving through our Great Lakes, following the path of human progress," NELSON warns. "This has been going on for more than 50 years, with mounting seriousness, but we paid little attention because we thought these lakes were so vast that even Americans could not destroy them. Now we are finding out otherwise. It turns out that the lakes are even more likely to be permanently ruined than the rivers, because they cannot purge themselves of pollutants as rivers can in time of high water runoff."

For those who may be inclined to dismiss all this as exaggerations, NELSON details the amount of pollution that already afflicts Lake Erie and the amount that is beginning to

turn Lake Michigan into a combined cesspool and chemical tank.

Nor can his remarks be dismissed as scare talk. It is that, but the public needs to be frightened so that it will be aroused to act before it is too late. "This," NELSON warns, "may be our last chance."

L.B.J. BOOSTS CONSERVATION

The "this" NELSON referred to was what he calls "a great new surge of interest in the conservation of natural resources" which was given a mighty boost by President Johnson's message to the Congress on natural beauty. NELSON quotes the President's words about making a "massive effort to save the countryside as a green legacy for tomorrow." To stop further pollution, not to mention correcting the defilement that already has been done, will indeed take efforts that are massive.

We have an illustration of the enormous dimensions of the problem in our own front yard. In Milwaukee, 300,000 persons are served by storm and sanitary sewers which are interconnected. During heavy rains, 252 sewer outfalls of the intercepting sewers discharge raw sewage into the Milwaukee, Menomonee, and Kinnickinnic Rivers, which flow into the harbor and then into Lake Michigan. The Milwaukee sewage treatment plant also bypasses sewage directly into the Milwaukee River during heavy runoff. Another combined storm and sanitary sewer discharges directly into Lake Michigan during heavy runoff.

Correcting this situation will be enormously expensive. But we can't afford not to correct it.

Crisis in the Milling Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, recently a 10-State grain and grain products freight committee was organized with James A. McCain, Kansas State University, as chairman. Today this group met in the caucus room in the Old Senate Office Building to discuss the serious problem confronting the milling industry in the Great Plains area.

The gravity of the situation was graphically illustrated by the presence of Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, Gov. William Avery of Kansas, a large number of U.S. Senators and U.S. Representatives, as well as a great number of persons directly and indirectly interested in the problems faced by the milling industry.

One of the speakers was J. H. Dean, general manager of the Farmers Cooperative Commission Co. of Hutchinson, Kans., and I feel certain his statement will be of interest to everyone concerned.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF J. H. DEAN, AT THE 10-STATE TRANSPORTATION CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 25, 1965

I would like to take a moment to identify the organization I represent. As has been stated, I am the general manager of the Farmers Cooperative Commission Co. of Hutchinson, Kans. This organization is owned by some 50,000 grain producers of Kansas engaged in the production of wheat and feed grain and it is the purpose of this organization to represent these producers in matters relating to the marketing of their grain.

There is probably no one single item of greater importance to wheat producers than the transportation provided for the movement of their product to its final market. This is why I am here today to speak in behalf of those producers we represent. During the past 15 years, our organization has marketed for our members approximately one-half billion bushels of wheat. In view of recent Government efforts to direct the flow of grain through normal free markets, we can reasonably expect this volume to reach 1 billion bushels in another 15 years.

We all know and can state without fear of contradiction that the mill market is consistently the highest priced market of any available to us. This means that when we market our grain through the milling industry, more dollars go into the pockets of the producers. We also know that whenever we move the milling industry farther away from the area of production, we, likewise, move the industry away from us as a market for over 50 percent of our production.

Down through the years as general conditions have dictated the fluctuation of freight rates both upward and downward, the rates for both wheat and flour have remained on a parity. The milling industry with vast investments in milling facilities have established their plants under a freight rate structure of this kind and it has proven itself to serve both the producer and consumer quite well. Our concern, then, is what we can expect will take place if legislation is passed to deregulate the railroads and open the whole area of transportation to an unregulated and highly competitive situation. I am sure most of you will agree with me that if rate regulations are removed, railroads will be forced by the competition that would develop to establish a rate structure with no regard to parity between products or the industries they serve.

We have only to look at some of the proposals made by some railroads in recent months to realize that without some degree of proper regulation, we would face the rankest kind of discrimination. Some of these proposals provide for the basing of their rates on volume shipped, ownership of railroad equipment by the shipper and the elimination of service in transit which has proven to be so important in the marketing and processing of wheat. What chance would a small shipper have in this kind of a rate structure? I am sure we all recognize that the handling margin on grain percentagewise is the thinnest of any commodity moving in commerce today. There simply is no margin on which any shipper might absorb any portion of a freight differential to keep him in a competitive position.

We don't want to create a situation that would ultimately eliminate the smaller businessman from the scene of grain marketing and processing, thus leaving these entire operations solely to the field of "big business." All of us are aware of the impact on producers should this happen.

One other point worthy of mention is the trend in consideration of mergers of some of the major railroad lines. I don't think anyone would be hard pressed to realize what would take place if we were to move into a situation of fewer and larger railroad companies with less and less regulation. Public interest must be paramount to prevent loss of industry in rural America.

Over the years, we have had stable markets through which we have been able to market our grain. The farmer could go to his local market any day with a single truck load of grain or as large a volume as he wished and he was reasonably certain of the price he would receive for that grain. He has had access to daily market quotations through his daily paper, his radio or his TV. All of this has been possible because the grain merchant has had stable freight rates on which he could rely to move the grain he purchased from day to day regardless of the volume. This kind of a marketing system is important to farmers and it is my hope we will not make some unwise moves to destroy it.

The answer to the above problems is not the deregulation of the railroads but rather a regulation of all modes of transportation so that they will all be operating under the same rules. If this is done, we can build a stable and strong transportation system in this country encompassing all modes. Certainly, this is important to agricultural producers, our national defense and the general economic welfare of our country.

In summary, it is the opinion of our organization that the best interests of farmers and the general welfare of the Great Plains region would be served by:

1. Maintaining the historical relationship of parity in freight rates for wheat and wheat products.

2. Protect the stability of our markets so important to farmers by maintaining proper regulations over grain rates by the rail carriers.

3. Provide proper legislation for regulation of all modes of transportation in the movement of grain, thereby providing equal opportunity to all carriers. Any such regulation should include a clearly defined exemption for the movement of grain from the farm to the first market by the producers.

The "E" Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the President's "E" Award for excellence in exporting is being presented this afternoon to Clupak, Inc., a worldwide licensing and research organization with headquarters in New York City.

As you know, the President's "E" Award for outstanding contributions to the increase of world trade was established by Executive order in December 1961. Clupak, Inc., is the first licensing organization to receive this great honor.

Clupak, which licenses its patents and trademarks for the production of Clupak extensible paper to mills and paper machinery manufacturers throughout the world, conducts its worldwide activities with no great outlay of American dollars in foreign countries.

The citation accompanying the "E" pennant given to Clupak, Inc., states:

Clupak, Inc., has successfully penetrated world markets with Clupak extensible paper. In concluding licensing arrangements for foreign production, the company surmounted skepticism and legal obstacles, demonstrated perseverance, product superiority, and the value of cooperative research.

These determined efforts to effectively promote Clupak extensible paper to the paper industry of the world reflect credit on management, employees, and the American free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted, too, that Clupak licenses, in all cases, call for

royalty payments in U.S. funds—thus furthering the objectives of America's export expansion program.

As a case in point, it is estimated that if the Clupak extensible paper now made every year in foreign countries were made in papermills built with American capital—instead of under license from Clupak, Inc.—it would have required an expenditure of $50 to $75 million for plant facilities alone.

This procedure is in line with recent call by President Johnson for American businessmen "to limit their direct investments abroad, their deposits in foreign banks, and their holdings of financial assets."

Clupak, Inc., currently has 44 licensees producing Clupak extensible paper in the United States and 15 foreign countries in Europe, Africa, South America, and Asia.

Licensees of Clupak, Inc., serve worldwide markets from Argentina, Canada, Chile, China (Taiwan), Colombia, England, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, Norway, Peru, South Africa, Sweden, and Yugoslavia.

Clupak extensible paper, an uncreped kraft with built-in stretch and extraordinary toughness, is used widely throughout the world for multiwall bags and for industrial wrapping paper.

Clupak, Inc., is owned jointly by Cluett, Peabody & Co., Inc., and West Virginia Pulp & Paper.

I am happy to announce the presentation of an "E" Award to this outstanding company.

The War in Vietnam—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include the third installment of the report by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Buffalo Courier-Express, on his recent trip to Vietnam.

Part III, which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on February 23, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, III—DISASTER STRIKES AT QUI NHON BASE

(Death can come swiftly and unexpectedly in the picturesque country of South Vietnam—and it has been coming to an increasing number of Americans there. Here, Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, describes a brief trip to the U.S. airbase at Qui Nhon, a pretty coastal town where only a few hours later Red guerrillas destroyed an American barracks and brought death to many GI's.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

DANANG, SOUTH VIETNAM.—It had been an uneventful, if a bit uncomfortable, flight from Saigon to this war-torn nation's second largest city, just south of the border with Communist North Vietnam.

I rode in a lumbering C-123 "Flying Boxcar," perhaps the Air Force's most reliable transport plane.

A public address system is unknown to the C-123, probably because the roar of the engines in its non-sound-proofed fuselage is so loud that it wouldn't serve any useful purpose.

SIGNS

Instead, the navigator manipulated a simple sign on approaches to and takeoffs from landing fields.

"Cam hut thuoc—No smoking," proclaimed the sign during the takeoff and landing period. While in flight, the sign was turned over to read: "Cam hut hut thuoc—Smoking permitted."

There was no accompanying sign about fastening seat belts, as the Air Force assumed that even the most stupid would know when to strap himself in.

A couple of dozen passengers on assorted war missions made the milk run with me on the afternoon's flight from Saigon to Danang. They sat in bucket seats facing each other, while in the rear was cargo and mail.

TALK

A C-123 does not provide reading lights, but a few attempted to read paperbacks with light filtering in through small windows. Most took the opportunity to seize 40 winks.

I attempted some conversation with my bucket seat mates, but shouting a conversation is not the easiest way to communicate.

I did learn that the man on my right, a North Carolinian, had just begun his year's tour of duty with the Army and was not at all enchanted with the prospect.

"I wouldn't care so much," he said, "if I had a decent place to live. The Army tries hard, but the accommodations aren't the greatest."

WAYSTOPS

The Saigon-Danang milk run provided for three intermediate stops on its 5-hour 400-mile run north along South Vietnam's coastline.

Natrong was the first stop. This, in more peaceful times, is South Vietnam's resort area. Here, Madame Nhu had a palatial Riviera-type home. Since the assassination of her brother-in-law, President Ngo Dinh Diem, she has been living in forced exile abroad.

But her home was not visible from the makeshift airport the Air Force had constructed. There wasn't even a snack bar around in which to while away the time while the C-123 unloaded and loaded cargo.

QUI NHON

At the next stop the accommodations were better. "The USAF welcomes you to Qui Nhon," read the sign on a small building, on the inside of which soft drinks and sandwiches were available.

The airport was not far from the ocean, where waves could be seen lapping gently at the beaches. It seemed an idyllic spot.

So it seemed too, to four Army enlisted men a month ago. An ideal place for a little fishing expedition.

The next day, their bodies were washed up on the shore. Their hands were tied behind their backs and Vietcong bullets had riddled their heads.

ALARM

The trip was soon completed after the Qui Nhon stop, and it wasn't many hours later when I had bedded down in the quarters of Col. Roy S. Geiger, deputy U.S. senior adviser for the Vietnamese Army's Corps I in the Danang area.

A mosquito netting was all that separated the colonel's bed and mine. Beside his bed was an emergency phone.

We had not been asleep long, when the phone rang.

The news was bad:

The Vietcong had blown up a hotel in which American enlisted men were quartered. There was one known dead and 27 missing. For several hours, Colonel Geiger's phone was busy as he assisted in lining up engineers to rescue men still alive, but buried, in the rubble.

The place of the disaster—the not so idyllic town of Qui Nhon.

Presentation of ARBA Award by Boyd S. Oberlink, President, American Road Builders' Association, February 23, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, a number of us were present at the American Road Builders' Association luncheon and were privileged to see our modest, able, and effective chairman of the House Public Works Committee, Hon. GEORGE H. FALLON, receive recognition for his outstanding contribution to highway progress. It is an honor to place the remarks of our friend, Mr. Boyd S. Oberlink, at the presentation of the ARBA award ceremony, in the RECORD:

PRESENTATION OF ARBA AWARD BY BOYD S. OBERLINK, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 23, 1965

One of the most agreeable duties of the President of the American Road Builders' Association is that of presenting the annual ARBA award, which is presented each year to a member of the association who has made an outstanding contribution to highway progress.

The president of ARBA does not select the recipient. The selection committee is composed of the award winners for the past 3 years. In this case, I think the selection committee itself deserves to be congratulated for its work, for I can think of no one more deserving of this award than GEORGE H. FALLON.

Congressman FALLON was assigned to the House Roads Committee when he first came to Congress, in January 1945, and has served the highway program ever since. He became the first chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads in 1949. He is attending his 21st ARBA convention.

Congressman FALLON is sometimes called the father of the interstate highway program. He does not call himself that, because he is always more than willing to share the credit and, certainly, many people played parts in the establishment of this program. However, no single individual did more than Congressman FALLON. He was the author of the bill which became the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 and set into motion the world's greatest public works program.

This one achievement would be sufficient to earn a place in the highway program's hall of fame, but Mr. FALLON has continued to distinguish himself ever since.

Back in 1956, the House Public Works Committee formally stated its intent to increase the authorization for the ABC highway program in annual increments of $25 million until such time as the authorization would reach the $1 billion level. Although this was a reasonable rate of growth—the necessary rate, in fact, to keep the ABC program in balance with the Interstate—the increases were never obtained without over-

coming formidable opposition. Mr. FALLON not only worked out the problem; he did it without incurring animosity.

Throughout his tenure as chairman of the House Road Subcommittee he has fostered harmonious relations with the executive branch of the Government, with the minority members of the subcommittee, with the State highway departments and with the representatives of the highway industry.

Because of this harmony, the legislative problems associated with the highway program have been worked out in an intelligent way, in an atmosphere of understanding.

On the occasion of the final enactment of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, several members of the House Public Works Committee made comments in the House Chamber praising Mr. FALLON for the manner in which the bill was handled.

I particularly like the comment by the late Congressman Dempsey, of New Mexico, concerning GEORGE FALLON:

"He is a man who does not especially like praise and most certainly does not seek it," Congressman Dempsey said. "He is a very modest person, or I would have a lot more to say about his ability. I congratulate him because I think he has done a magnificent job."

These words of Congressman Dempsey are as appropriate today as they were in 1956.

We could be more extensive in our praise, but it is appropriate to say, simply, that Congressman FALLON has done a magnificent job, and it gives me a great personal pleasure to present to him, without further ceremony, the ARBA Award.

VFW Prize-Winning Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the Minnesota winner in the annual Veterans of Foreign Wars voice of democracy contest is a student at Redwood Falls High School in my district. Young David Harvey, in his winning speech, stresses eloquently the importance of the individual in a democracy. But I am especially proud of David. This boy, who presented so well a philosophy which is close to the heart of every American citizen, is not himself an American citizen. David is a foreign exchange student from New Zealand.

Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent I place David's prize-winning speech at this point in the Appendix to the RECORD:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

When St. Paul was brought before the Roman governor, he used those magic words which gave him immunity from Hebrew justice "Civis Romanus sum."—"I am a Roman citizen." and he had the right to appeal to Caesar, which he did.

Today, as in the time of St. Paul, one's citizenship is a thing to be proud of, but saying that one is a citizen of a country and saying that one practices good citizenship are two different things.

Citizenship is not flagwaving patriotism, but for us it is identifying ourselves as those who are entitled to the rights and privileges of free men, and sensing the qualities of our obligations and responses to a community. Now let us discover what the challenge of one entitled to the rights and privileges of a free man actually involves.

Today we are surrounded by forces that threaten to take away our freedom. We all have heard of these over the media of communication, so there is no need for me to reiterate all the dangers that face us. Yet we are faced by an equally dangerous enemy within that threatens to take away our most important freedom—the freedom to think as we please, the freedom to make our own decisions and to act upon them. All the time we are told what to do, what to buy, how we should do this and how we should do that, and gradually we are allowing other people to do our thinking for us. The time will come when no longer will we make our own decisions, but some "big brother" will tell us what to do and what to think. We will be told who is good and who is bad, whom we shall love and whom we shall hate.

Happily, today we are only on the brink of this horror, but it is, nonetheless, frighteningly close. What we need to do now, at this moment, is to wake up and think for ourselves. When we do this we must not be affected by prejudice, be it racial, political or religious, and above all we must stick to our decisions once we have made them. If our ideas differ from those of the majority, and if we truly and genuinely believe in them, then we must stick to them as the American colonists did more than 175 years ago.

Individualism is a keynote of our society and it must be maintained by sustaining freedom of thought, and it is up to the good citizen to preserve this freedom as well as all the others. By upholding these freedoms when it is perhaps easier to be passive, which are the rights of every person, the citizen practices good citizenship.

Yet how many people criticize and censure the individualist for his different ideas; he is reviled, insulted, even called a Communist.

This is the wrong attitude to adopt toward those who use the freedom of thought, and it is this that is challenging us today. We must accept this challenge—a challenge which, if we do not accept, will take away our freedoms. To practice good citizenship we must fight for and preserve our freedoms—the freedom to speak as we please; the freedom to worship as we please; the freedom to live without having to worry; and the greatest freedom of them all—freedom to think as we wish. Preserve them, for if we do not, then we do not accept the challenge of citizenship—for these as we carefully exercise them, become not ours alone, but equal rights of others, strengthened like links in a chain.

Our Future Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, as a onetime member of the Future Farmers of America, I have been long aware of the keen insight such participation affords young men who learn the full values necessary to good citizenship. The role of the Future Farmers of America in today's complex world is increasingly more important.

Therefore, I am genuinely pleased to call attention of my colleagues to the excellent editorial in the Beloit, Wis., Daily News of February 17, 1965. The article follows:

OUR FUTURE FARMERS

Future Farmers of America Week is to be observed during the February 20–27 period. And this is one of those annual events that is fully worthy of the attention and interest of us all.

The stated purpose is "public recognition of the Future Farmers of America organization in developing better agriculture and rural citizenship." The young people who participate are brought close to the profound values that are a part of nature. They have a healthy and dedicated interest in crops, in farm animals, and in the ever-changing techniques which give our agriculture its vast efficiency and productivity and help make us the best fed people in the world. The city-dweller is totally dependent on the farmer for the means of life itself.

Beyond this, the Nation faces a critical problem of juvenile delinquency. Various cures are offered, based on the home, schools, and churches. In addition, those groups which work with youth, in all manner of fields, can do an essential job in building character, honor, and responsibility. The Future Farmers organization is one of the best of them.

Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce Statement on Proposed Head Tax on Travelers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement of the Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce, Buffalo, N.Y., concerning a proposed tax on residents of the United States who travel abroad.

The statement follows:

BUFFALO AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE STATEMENT ON PROPOSED HEAD TAX ON TRAVELERS

The proposal to levy a head tax of $100 on U.S. residents traveling to foreign lands or in fact any further Government restrictions affecting the natural rights of its citizens is vigorously opposed.

Such a tax not only would place an onerous burden on educators, students and others having a limited travel budget but also would add considerably to the cost of doing business abroad. It would be a serious detriment to increased and freer trade between the United States and friendly nations.

The goodwill now created by American tourists abroad would be considerably curtailed and if other countries imposed a similar tax in retribution, our growing number of foreign visitors would be lessened.

Revenues derived from the proposed tax might amount to somewhat less than a negligible $200 million and the balance-of-payments deficit might be lowered by a few hundred million dollars. This amount, compared to the U.S. billions flowing overseas through investments, Government loans and giveaway programs, would have very little effect on the balance-of-payments deficit.

We sincerely urge that no serious consideration be given to this proposal.

Go To Hell With Your Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, President Sukarno of Indonesia has joined a chorus of those around the world screaming "Yankee Go Home" and to go to hell with your aid.

Sukarno during the CBS television program, "Face the Nation," on January 31 told the United States to "Go to hell with your aid." The following UPI story of the Sukarno interview is from the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., on February 1 and appeared in newspapers throughout the Nation:

INDONESIAN PRESIDENT SUKARNO SPEAKING: WOULDN'T MIND IF COUNTRY WENT RED

WASHINGTON.—Indonesian President Sukarno said Sunday he would not mind if his country goes Communist.

"I am not afraid," he said. "I tolerate all ideologies."

He also praised Communist China because "China respects the freedom to be free." He denounced the United States because "you mix too much in our existence," and repeated his statement that Washington could "go to hell" with its foreign aid.

Sukarno spoke on a television interview ("Face the Nation," CBS) recorded in Djakarta, the Indonesian capital, and monitored here.

He said he would not mind a Communist takeover in Indonesia so long as the Reds did not "make trouble." He said he would fight communism if it did.

BIGGEST POLITICAL PARTY

A questioner noted that Communists form the biggest political party in Indonesia. "It would mean, wouldn't it, if that party controls this country, it would eventually become Communist?" he asked.

"I said I don't care about this so long as they are not damaging or making trouble against the state," Sukarno replied.

"In other words," he was asked, "if it evolved slowly without trouble, it would be all right?"

"Of course. Why not?" Sukarno said.

The Indonesian chief of state accused the United States of meddling in his country's internal affairs. He said his advice for improved United States-Indonesian relations was: "Leave us alone."

Asked if the Far East might not be "made over in the image of North Vietnam" if it were left alone, Sukarno said he was not afraid of such a possibility.

WANTS LEFT ALONE

"We just want to be left alone and you mix too much in our existence," he said. "Of course, then, some strata of the population go, say, Communist or go leftist."

He challenged his questioners to "mention an example" of China interfering in other nations' affairs. He said he could not blame Peiping for acting against what it might consider outside interference with the Vietnamese people.

He was reminded that American taxpayers were sensitive over his "go to hell" remark about U.S. aid. "That I don't know," Sukarno replied, "but really and again I repeat to go to hell with your aid if that aid is meant to give us any strings."

Agriculture and the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, there follows a summary of the latest pamphlet by the Conference on Economic Progress, headed by the renowned Leon Keyserling, entitled "Agriculture and the Public Interest." This study attempts to deal objectively with the whole U.S. farm problem, in its domestic and international aspects, and to relate this farm problem to the many other aspects of U.S. economic performance which depend so importantly upon the condition of agriculture.

Though you may not be in accord with all of the policies and conclusions of this study, I am confident you will nevertheless find it of interest:

I. SUMMARY AND THEME: WEALTH, HEALTH, AND BOOKKEEPING

GENERAL PROGRESS IN ECONOMIC THOUGHT AND ACTION

The past few years have witnessed great improvement in our economic and social thinking as a nation and a people. The essence of this improvement is that we are giving precedence to the realities of wealth and health, instead of subordinating them to the unrealities of mere bookkeeping. We have undertaken massive tax reductions, deeming the immediate condition of the Federal budget secondary to the long-range needs of the American economy and people. We are seeking to improve the financial mechanisms, both private and public, which will utilize our human and physical resources fully, in recognition that we still have great unmet needs in absolute terms, and that there is unlimited room for improvements in living standards and human enjoyment.

We have come to reject above all the proposition that our burgeoning productive powers should be deliberately restrained, as if we did not have the will and the brains to use them fully. Instead of restricting supply because there is not enough effective demand to use it fully and for good purposes, we are acknowledging that demand can always be lifted to the levels required to use fully the productive powers which represent the core of our real wealth. And we are infusing the intent to use our real wealth fully with recognition that it must be used along lines which combine wealth with health.

By this we do not mean only that we must use our wealth to serve the physical needs of people, although this indeed is called for when almost a fifth of our own population live in poverty, and when more than a third cannot obtain adequate medical care at costs within their means. Beyond this, the determination to combine wealth with health is embodied in the words of the poet:

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

The most recent counterpart of these famous words is President Johnson's insistence that we must care about where we are going, and not just how fast. The goals of the Great Society thus relate to the whole range of man's needs and aspirations, and they regard justice as an essential element in progress. Most encouraging of all, the President's declarations of intent are being accompanied by programs to implement them.

THE LAG IN APPLYING THE NEW THOUGHT AND ACTION TO OUR FARM PEOPLE

This veritable transformation in our economic and social thought and action has not yet been applied in comparable measure to our national farm policies and programs. In a basic sense, and with modifications in some degree, our performance in this area today is analagous to the situation a generation ago, when we plowed crops under and destroyed little pigs while millions of people in our own country were turning toward revolt because their families were starving. Even today, our thinking about the farm problem is imprisoned in the myths of overproduction and surpluses, and committed to the notion that we need much fewer farmers and much fewer farms. Yet millions of Americans still fail to obtain adequate nutrition; the almost two-fifths who live in poverty or deprivation do not really enjoy balanced and pleasant diets by American standards; our industries would need far more products of our farms, if they were operating at maximum employment and production; and overseas, the more than half of the peoples of the world who are seriously underfed constitute a threat to our security, and, even more clearly, a challenge to our morality. Almost every economy drive concentrates upon the high costs of the farm program in the Federal budget, and totally overlooks the devastating impact of what is happening to farmers and their incomes upon unemployment and inadequate economic growth throughout the whole U.S. economy.

From the time when we started to get America moving again until now, it is amazing how little focus of attention has been directed toward the backward movement of our farm families. In the paeans of praise of the longest economic recovery on record, and the highest levels of employment, production, and incomes ever, it is amazing how little attention is being focused upon the farm income shortfalls. In the heartening efforts, now being galvanized on a nationwide basis, to conduct an all-out war against poverty, it is amazing how relatively little discussion or program is being directed toward the extraordinary concentration of poverty in American agriculture.

Moving from these general propositions to the facts which underlie them, what are the facts about American agriculture—facts not yet evoking the policies and programs which should respond sensitively to them?

WE ARE NOT FACING UP TO THE CONCEPT OF FARM-PRODUCT ABUNDANCE

We are neglecting these facts: Taking into account both needed improvements in diets and population growth, and comparing 1975 with 1964, our domestic requirements for increased farm products are very great. Meat utilization should rise 27 percent; dairy products, 25 percent; fruits, 53 percent; and vegetables, 37 percent. Even potatoes should rise 20 percent, and wheat 8 percent. Cotton use should rise 21 percent.

We are neglecting this question: How much should our exports of farm products be encouraged to rise, if we are to draw upon the true productive capabilities of American agriculture in making our fair contribution toward the war against poverty and hunger, discontent and ferment, around the world? Again comparing 1975 with 1964, and including commercial exports as well as those in the form of aid, our exports of red meat should be nearly 9 times as high in 1975 as in 1964; dairy products, almost 10 times as high; food fats and oils, about double; wheat, about 50 percent higher, and cotton, more than double. These estimates do not include Communist Asia (Communist China,

North Korea, North Vietnam, and Mongolia), where somewhere in the neighborhood of 950 million people will be living by 1975. Other estimates in the study do.

We are neglecting these facts: Combining our real domestic needs and desirable export goals, and even assuming the exclusion of Communist Asia from these export goals, the total utilization of U.S. farm products should be 35 percent higher in 1975 than in 1964 for red meat; 46 percent for dairy products; 51 percent for fruits; 37 percent for vegetables; 49 percent for food fats and oils; 31 percent for wheat; 56 percent for corn; and 52 percent for cotton. If Communist Asia were to be included within the range of our export efforts by 1975, the total utilization of our domestic production would be even higher by 1975. For example in that event, compared with 1964, red meat use should rise 49 percent; dairy products, 68 percent; food fats and oils, 75 percent; wheat, 58 percent; corn, 89 percent; and cotton, 85 percent.

WE ARE NOT SHAPING OUR FARM RESOURCES TO MEET THESE NEEDS

We are neglecting these facts: Comparing 1964 with 1953, the shrinkage in the farm population by 33.3 percent, in farm employment by 31.1 percent, and in farm acreage by 14 percent, was utterly out of line with these real needs, current and prospective. In the overall, to meet appropriate utilization goals, farm acreage should rise above the 1964 level by about 10 percent by 1975, with wheat acreage up about 15 percent; cotton acreage should be held about stable. If Communist Asia were to be included within the range of our export efforts by 1975, total acreage would need to be up about 23 percent, wheat acreage about 33 percent, and cotton acreage about 26 percent. In either alternative, very large increases would also be needed in beef cattle and hogs on farms, dairy cattle on farms, poultry production, and egg-producing poultry. Farm employment, standing at 6.1 million in 1964, should be held at about 5.5 million in 1975, representing close to stabilization, even if Communist Asia were not included in our export efforts by that year. If it were included, we would need farm employment about the same as in 1964.

WE ARE MISCONSTRUING THE SO-CALLED FARM SURPLUSES

We are neglecting these facts: The furor about the farm surpluses ignores these real needs, and in addition exaggerates them fantastically. For the years 1953–64 on the average, our domestic farm production was only 1.8 percent in excess of its current utilization. But the true level of unemployment in the U.S. economy, representing surplus manpower, averaged 8.1 percent, allowing for part-time and concealed unemployment. And on the average, total national production fell short of maximum production by 8.8 percent. For most items now, the surpluses are below needs for an adequate food reserve.

WE ARE IGNORING THE FULL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FARM-INCOME DECLINE

We are neglecting these facts: The tragic decline in total farm personal income, amounting to almost 11 percent from 1953 to 1964, occurred while nonfarm income rose 47.9 percent (in uniform 1963 dollars). Even on a per capita basis, in 1964, farm personal income from all sources was only $1,494, contrasted with $2,595 for nonfarm personal income. In 1963, 43.4 percent of all farm families lived in poverty, contrasted with only 17 percent of all nonfarm families. Even if this were not so intolerable on grounds of equity and social justice, failure to reverse these trends drastically would offer no hope that we could achieve the desirable levels of farm employment and output.

We are neglecting these facts: The prolonged decline of farm income, and the forcing of farmers off the land, has contributed to our overall economic difficulties in amounts enormously exceeding the ratio of the farm population to total population, or the ratio of farm income to total national income. Probably one-third of the excessive unemployment in 1964—and maybe half—was attributable to the number of workers forced out of agriculture from 1953 forward. Between a fourth and a fifth of our total national production deficiency of about $590 billion, during the 12-year period 1953–64 inclusive, was directly traceable to the deficiencies in farm income from all sources. Correspondingly, the restoration and maintenance of maximum employment and production in the United States will be utterly impossible without the restoration of farm income. According to an equilibrium model for the whole U.S. economy, tested by experience, farm personal income from all sources should be $23.7 billion higher in 1975 than in 1964. Allowing for current disparities, this would be consistent with a needed rise in total national production estimated at $489 billion. Even with these gains, and allowing for the fact that the size of the farm population would shrink relative to our total population, per capita farm income from all sources would be about $3,508 in 1975, or only about 93 percent of a $3,785 per capita personal income for our entire population.

WE ARE IMPROPERLY APPRAISING THE COSTS OF THE FARM PROGRAM

We are neglecting these facts: The costs of the farm program in the Federal budget have been grossly exaggerated, quite apart from the fact that we should put the wealth and health of the Nation above pure bookkeeping. Comparing fiscal 1965 (estimated) with 1963, agricultural outlays in the budget fell from 5.8 percent to 4.6 percent of total outlays.

On a per capita basis related to total population, 1965 outlays in the farm category were only 12.3 percent of total per capita budget outlays for all domestic programs, even though 15 percent of the poor people in the United States live on farms, and even though about 18 percent of the total U.S. personal income deficiency in 1964 was represented by the deficiency in farm income from all sources. Measured in ratio to gross national product, agricultural outlays in the budget fell from 1 percent in fiscal 1963 to 0.7 percent in fiscal 1965 (a decline of 30 percent in the ratio), while nonagricultural outlays fell from 15.3 percent to 14.5 percent (a decline of only about 5.2 percent in the ratio). Implementation of all programs recommended in this study would hold agricultural outlays at about 1 percent of gross national product in a properly growing U.S. economy, and this would represent a declining ratio to total budget outlays if these were kept in line with the growing needs of a growing people. Besides, a very large part of the budget outlays in the agriculture category should not be charged to the farm program, but rather to other purposes, including the domestic war against poverty.

TOWARD PARITY TREATMENT FOR AGRICULTURE IN NATIONAL POLICIES

Viewing the facts as they really are, and the progress as a nation and a people which we are determined to achieve, the time is already late to commence a thorough reorientation of our thinking, policies, and programs related to agriculture. These efforts should all be pointed toward a rationalization of nationwide farm efforts which have suffered some erroneous assumptions, conflicting policies, and willy-nilly actions.

An appropriate instrumentality for progress might be legislation running parallel to the Employment Act of 1946, which has facilitated so much progress for the nonfarm population, but hardly addressed itself to the problems of the farm population. This new legislation might establish an Agricultural Employment Act, setting in motion a President's Economic Report for Agriculture, a Council of Agricultural Advisers to the President, and a congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report for Agriculture.

This would enable establishment of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power goals for agriculture, in balance with those established for the overall economy. It would facilitate the gearing of farm policies to these goals, including income parity for agriculture, and strengthening of the family-type farm. These goals and policies should stress a three-sided attack upon poverty: The poverty in our farm population, the deficient food and fiber consumption of the U.S. poor in general, and the poverty overseas within the range of our bountiful productive resources after taking care of our needs at home. This study, in its entirety, indicates clearly the types of quantifications, and the value priorities, which should enter into the establishment of goals under any such legislation.

To accord farmers and farm organizations a voice in the policies which affect them, more nearly comparable to the voice of other functioning economic groups in those policies which they are able (unlike farmers) to make effective in the marketplace, farmers should be adequately represented on the Council of Agricultural Advisers to the President, of which the Secretary of Agriculture should be chairman.

These proposals are not radical nor even novel, if measured against what we have already set in motion for others through the Employment Act of 1946, and in many other ways. They are consonant with the objectives of the Great Society. They will be regarded as radical or novel only by those who have not adjusted to the proposition that our farm people must not remain isolated from the mainstream of our American efforts, achievements, and aspirations.

Correcting a Public Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion of a recent criticism that former President Truman made of General MacArthur. Reportedly, Mr. Truman said that General MacArthur gave General Wainwright a cold greeting upon his release from captivity in August 1945.

William R. Mathews, a distinguished newspaper editor and publisher, was a witness to this Yokohama meeting, and, in a recent editorial, he related a different perception of the events that took place. I found his defense of General MacArthur most interesting, and I should like to call it to the attention of all my colleagues. The editorial appeared in the Arizona Daily Star on February 7, 1965.

With unanimous consent, the editorial follows:

CORRECTING A PUBLIC RECORD

(By William R. Mathews)

As an editor who recalled General MacArthur before Harry Truman did, I feel that I must come to the general's defense in connection with the recent statement Harry Truman made about him. Former President Truman charged him with giving General Wainwright a cold reception upon his release from capitivity, and avoiding meeting him.

It so happened that Julius Oakes Adler of the New York Times, Phil Jackson of the Portland (Oreg.) Journal and I were eyewitnesses to the arrival in Japan of both General Wainwright and General MacArthur. It took place at the Grand Hotel, one of the few undamaged buildings in Yokohama, on Friday, August 31, 1945.

As a newspaper reporter, I kept my notes made on the occasion. They read as follows:

"Friday, August 31: This afternoon Adler of the New York Times, Jackson of the Portland Journal, and I went into Yokosuka with the hope of getting to Yokohama or Tokyo. A Marine Corps friend of mine, Gen. Bill Clement, furnished us with a jeep and an armed driver. We wound our way over terribly bumpy roads to Yokohama. It was in complete ruins.

"We hear that the 8th Army Headquarters is at the fine new Grand Hotel. And we learn of General Richardson of Hawaii having a room, and so, led by Adler, we crashed in on him. Richardson took us to dinner in the dining room of the Grand Hotel. * * * General Stilwell came in while we were eating.

"Just as we went out of the dining room, we met General Wainwright's party coming into the hotel. I asked him about Col. Wade Killen and Colonel Young of Tucson. 'All right about a year ago when I last saw them,' he said.

"We went out to the sidewalk just as General MacArthur drove up in a Packard limousine. We saw him enter the hotel and there greet General Wainwright.

"We drove back to Yokosuka through the rain. About 9 o'clock we go to the cruiser *San Diego* to get a boat back to Ancon. If we had been 2 minutes later we would have been left ashore."

I mention this timing to indicate that both Wainwright and MacArthur arrived within 5 minutes of the same time at the Grand Hotel in Yokohama on the evening of August 31, 1945. The greetings were mutually warm and cordial.

Somebody told Harry Truman a fairytale, a most unjust one. General Wainwright stood at a position of honor in the front rank of American generals and admirals facing the surrendering Japanese. It was my good fortune to sit in a chair in the front row on gun turret No. 2 overlooking the surrender deck, where it was easy to see General Wainwright.

Anniversary of Yalta Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, recently the captive peoples of eastern Europe and their friends around the world observed the 20th anniversary of the Yalta agreements. It was originally thought that these agreements would be the basis of free nations' commitment to the peoples of the captive nations, for they guarantee representative government and free elections to each country. Although later agreements and concessions undercut these principles, they are, nevertheless, deeply significant to the freedom loving people of eastern Europe, and I include in the RECORD a resolution of the Assembly of Captive European Nations commemorating this occasion:

TWENTY YEARS AFTER THE YALTA AGREEMENTS

(Declaration unanimously adopted in the 619th meeting of the General Committee on February 11, 1965, rapporteur: Stefan Korbonski (Poland))

Twenty years ago, on February 11, 1945, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin concluded their conference in the Crimea by signing a communique known as the Yalta Declaration. The communique summed up their decisions on the fate of Eastern Europe—decisions that were taken without the participation or consent of the nations concerned.

The principles proclaimed in the Yalta Declaration on liberated Europe held out hopes to the peoples of Eastern Europe, who already felt the tightening of the Soviet vise. These principles included, indeed, the commitment of the three heads of state "to assist the people, in any European liberated state, to form interim governmental authorities broadly representatives of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment, through free elections, of governments responsible to the will of the people," and "to facilitate where necessary the holding of such elections."

But beneath the high-sounding words of the declaration on liberated Europe a fatally flawed pattern soon became evident. It was a pattern of western concessions on specific issues while still proclaiming lofty principles; a pattern of Communist minority groups being foisted on unwilling majorities against a promise of free elections. The emerging outlines of the specific agreements gave an early indication to the peoples of East Europe that there was little to expect from the West.

By confirming the division of Europe into military zones, adopted at the conference at Teheran, the Yalta Conference ultimately decided the fate of East-Central Europe, as Soviet military occupation was bound to turn into Communist political domination. In accepting the notion of governments friendly to the Soviets, the Western Powers showed their lack of awareness of the fundamental and unbridgeable conflict between the Soviet concept of such governments and the very principles proclaimed in the Declaration on Liberated Europe.

The abandonment of Poland at Yalta to the control of the Polish Communist Party, which was tantamount to Soviet Russian takeover, foreshadowed the way in which the principles of the Declaration on Liberated Europe would be applied in East-Central Europe. Two weeks after the signing of this declaration, the Soviets engineered a Communist seizure of power in Rumania. Other countries followed suit soon. The forcible incorporation of the Baltic States, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, continued. Eastern Europe was sealed off behind the Iron Curtain. In this process the Declaration on Liberated Europe served the Soviets as a guise of legality.

Today, 20 years later, the captive peoples of Eastern Europe still regard the commitments of free elections made at Yalta as binding. They consider as null and void all agreements on specific situations which have been made on the same occasion or later in violation of their right of self-determination. For them the restoration of self-government and genuine independence remain a central issue that cannot be put out of the way by some easing of the oppressive conditions.

In no part of the world is the principle of self-determination accepted in an abridged form. The captive peoples refuse to accept the limitation of that principle in East-Central Europe in the name of expediency. The tragic consequences of the actions taken at and after Yalta 20 years ago confirm the rightness of their stand.

Congressional Reorganization Study Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most scholarly and informative statements of the need for a study of congressional organization and procedures was presented to the House Rules Committee last week by our colleague, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, of California.

Congressman HOLIFIELD is one of the most intensive students of the House—its traditions, rules, precedents and procedures. During the past several years, he has spent many months in helping to coordinate bipartisan study sessions of the needs and problems of House organization in an effort to build a solid base of support for meaningful reorganization efforts to streamline the business of the House and to make the legislative branch more efficient and effective.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following statement by Congressman HOLIFIELD to our colleagues:

STUDY OF CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

(Statement of Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, before House Rules Committee in support of H. Con. Res. 20, February 2, 1965.)

I am delighted to appear before you today to testify in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 4, the Madden resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 20, an identical resolution. Briefly, these resolutions would authorize a joint committee to study the organization and operation of Congress and to make recommendations in the interest of strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of Government, and enabling it to better meet its constitutional responsibilities.

The joint committee would examine, among other things, the procedures and practices of hiring congressional officers, employees, and staff, and the structure and functions of committees. The resolution would authorize $150,000 for the first year.

A LOOK BACK

House Concurrent Resolutions 4 and 20 are identical with Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 introduced by Senator MONRONEY, of Oklahoma. As you all know, he was the cosponsor of the LaFollette-Monroney Act of 1946, which achieved the first comprehensive reorganization of the Congress in this century. Among the beneficial results of that action were these—

The complicated committee structure of the Congress was overhauled.

Members' salaries were raised—the first time in 20 years.

The concept of nonpartisan professional staff for committees was introduced.

The Legislative Reference Service was created, and research and information gathering for Members was expanded.

Some burdensome minor functions extraneous to the legislative process were shifted to other parts of the Government (as in the handling of tort claims and authorization for bridge building).

A degree of regulation over lobbying was asserted.

In these and several other ways the Congress was modernized and made more effective, demonstrating our capacity for critical self-examination and for adjustment to changes in the postwar world.

The LaFollette-Monroney Act was by no means perfect. Inevitably, there were compromises and there were omissions. Some of the statutory provisions remained in a deadletter (as in the provisions for a legislative budget ceiling on expenditures and for annual adjournment of Congress by July 31). Other provisions or purposes of the act were circumvented—perhaps for good reason (as in the proliferation of subcommittees following consolidation of committees).

REVIEW IS TIMELY

Almost 20 years have passed since the adoption of the LaFollette-Monroney Act. Wondrous changes have been wrought on the world scene. New technologies are transforming contemporary life and creating new opportunities—and new dangers. We struggle to keep freedom alive and flourishing in the world, to solve our vexing problems at home.

The Congress is a vital part of the democratic process. It is the great branch of Government which is closest to the people. It must pass on yearly budgets approaching $100 billion. It must continuously review the operations of Government and enact the laws to deal with complex and ever-changing requirements for our national security and welfare.

Therefore, the Congress must keep pace with the dynamic nature of events. It must have the staff and the resources to discharge its legislative duties effectively. It must keep the channels of legislative action unclogged, the machinery flexible, to respond to the exacting requirements of these crises years.

If the Congress remains static and inflexible; if it shows no capacity to keep pace with the times and to respond to great crises and compelling demands, then inevitably the initiative and influence of the legislative branch will be lost. The executive and the judiciary will fill the vacuum, the constitutional balance in Government will be gone.

This is not a doomsday prophecy. In many ways the Congress has shown its ability to enact needed legislation, and I am confident that it will again make a constructive record in considering the President's legislative and budgetary requests. We have also shown—in this body at least—that procedural rules can be changed in the interest of orderly legislative progress and providing reasonable opportunities for the House to work its will upon legislative matters of importance.

AN ANSWER TO CRITICS

Nevertheless, I believe that a review of congressional organization and operations is timely. Certainly the Congress should critically examine its own house at least once in every generation. And even if we came up with no far-reaching recommendations for reform; even if our achievements were measured in small dimensions, I would still say the reexamination is important and necessary. This is so because critical self-examination is an exercise in democracy, an effective demonstration to our critics at home and abroad that we are willing to listen and learn—and change.

It must be recognized that the Congress has been for many years the object of severe criticism in many quarters. Scholars have taken us to task. We are raked over by the newspapers, and we have suffered loss of esteem by the general public. Some of our Members, junior and senior, have raised their voices.

These strictures may have merit or not. Criticisms of the Congress frequently are but disguised disagreements over policy matters. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore our critics. We must have concern for the prestige of Congress because the Congress is democratic government in action. When the prestige of Congress suffers, democracy is damaged.

A joint committee of the Congress, such as proposed in the Madden resolution, can serve as a forum for responsible criticism. It can air the problems and difficulties and frustrations of the legislative process. It should help to clear the air, sort out the useful recommendations, and bring the criticism down to earth.

In the course of hearings and testimony on the workings of Congress, we can make a serious effort to explain, and help others understand, the real nature of our bicameral representative Legislature. We ourselves can be reminded of our history and the practices and procedures which have evolved over the years to enable the Congress to do its work. These matters can be made clear to the other branches of the Government, to the President and to the public.

We can help to educate a whole new generation of Americans in the democratic process. We should keep the education of the young particularly in mind, because youth is a large segment of our population, and they will be asking us why things are as they are in future years. They will seek and welcome explicit statements of the way in which Congress operates and why it does so.

CUE FROM THE EXECUTIVE

In considering a study of congressional reorganization, we can take a cue from the Executive. President Johnson, in the interest of economy and efficiency, has been studying the reorganization of the executive branch. Shortly he will submit to the Congress various plans for reorganization which will be duly reviewed. These plans will be submitted under the authority of enabling legislation for the exercise of Presidential initiative in executive reorganization. The President has said that he will ask Congress to grant this authority on a permanent basis.

The Committee on Government Operations, on which I have served since 1946, is charged with reorganization matters. It receives Presidential reorganization plans and reports on them to the Congress. It considered the basic enabling legislation, which has been extended from time to time, and which the President asks us to make permanent. It reported out the enabling legislation for the two Hoover Commissions and has studied the great body of material and recommendations for governmental reorganization produced by those Commissions. I had the privilege to serve with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] on the second Hoover Commission.

We should try to match on the congressional side the Executive interest and attention to reorganization. The Executive constantly is confronted with difficult problems of interagency coordination. There are important technical programs which involve a number of Government agencies, and some coordinating mechanisms have been created to develop more coherent programs, to minimize duplication, and to more clearly define national policies.

For example, the programs for oceanography or weather data collection and research may each involve a dozen or more agencies of the Federal Government. In the Congress the committees consider these programs piecemeal in the different committees, and often it may happen that the results of coordinated policy development on the executive side are dissipated on the legislative side. I do not know any easy answers to such problems, but I merely mention them to suggest that the Congress as well as the executive branch is faced with the need to establish mechanisms which insure that the defense and health and welfare of the country are advanced in rational ways.

SUGGESTED STUDY AREAS

Many subjects worthy of attention by the proposed joint committee already have been suggested in the speeches of Senator MONRONEY and others. These include such matters as congressional review of the budget process, more expeditious handling of the appropriations and legislative workloads, congressional staffing, and committee structure and functions.

I might suggest a few other areas of inquiry. One which is certainly worthy of attention is the means of bringing parliamentary precedents up to date. I do not know about the situation in the other body, but in the House the precedents were codified by Asher Hinds in 1907 and updated by the late esteemed Clarence Cannon in 1937. More than 25 years have passed since Cannon's precedents were published. A whole generation; and the pace of legislative work is swifter than ever.

It seems only right and fair that the Members in a modern legislature would have ready recourse to the revelant precedents. Our Parlimentarian, Lewis Deschler, gives us excellent and expert service on a nonpartisan basis, but broader participation in parliamentary debates and better preparation for floor action would result from access to published precedents. With all due respect to our esteemed Speaker, I might recall that his ruling on consideration of the Tuck bill last year referred to precedents which had occurred after those cited by Cannon. I respectfully suggest that it would be fitting if Mr. Deschler were to lend his name and talents to an updating of the House precedents, so that his great wealth of knowledge and experience is passed on to this and succeeding generations of Congressmen.

We have several support agencies for research and information gathering, including the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the General Accounting Office, the Office of Legislative Counsel, and (in the House) Coordinator of Information. Are these resources being properly utilized? Are they sufficiently staffed? Do their mandates need revision? Can they be made more responsive to the needs and interest of Members and committees? In an age of technological revolution and increasing complexity of programs, staffing by support agencies and in the Congress itself are matters of the utmost importance. This is not necessarily a plea for more staff but for better staff and better ulitization of existing staffs.

Of recurring concern is the matter of conflicts of interest affecting both elected representatives and employees of the Congress. Are there new rules to be written? Is there new machinery to be devised for advising Members and employees helping them to avoid conflict-of-interest situations? We must take note that in the other body a Committee on Ethical Conduct with equal representation by both parties has been authorized.

What about the regulations for lobbyists? Everyone knows they haven't had much effect. The Congress is lobbied by agents of interests all over the world. The right of petition for redress of grievances is a hallowed constitutional right, but the Congress and the public must have better means of identifying and regulating the powerful influences that play upon it year in and year out.

INQUIRY SHOULD BE BROAD

Many of the matters of possible inquiry would have to consider changes in laws and parliamentary procedures. House Concurrent Resolutions 4 and 20 contain a proviso that the joint committee would not be authorized "to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House." While this language is identical with that in the Monroney bill, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, I personally do not believe that the study efforts which will be made should be in any manner circumscribed.

The reason for this restraining language, as we all know, is the sensitivity of each House to the constitutional provision that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." Of course, any changes in the formal proceedings would be a matter for action separately in each House. I see no bar in constitutional or public policy against recommendations by a joint committee.

Indeed, the very purpose of a joint study effort is to lay the foundation in facts and analyses for each House to be able to judge whether changes in formal proceedings should be made. Therefore, the mandate of the committee should not be limited; and if it is authorized to study, certainly it should be authorized to make recommendations. I would gladly support an amendment to this effect in the resolution.

While I am on the subject of amendments, I note that the resolution does not have any specific time limit for its tenure. Whether or not this implies that the committee would lapse with the end of the Congress authorizing it, it might be useful to specify that the committee tenure would continue through the 89th Congress, with whatever stipulations are appropriate for the presentation of final reports.

Finally, I note that House Concurrent Resolutions 4 and 20 provide for equal representation of both parties on the joint committee. This follows the precedent of the LaFollette-Monroney special committee, which had equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats of both Houses.

Ordinarily, committees reflect the party composition of each House, and some Members may prefer that these ratios be reflected on the proposed joint committee. I recall that when I sponsored a resolution back in 1951 along with Senator HUMPHREY in the Senate, provision was made for more Democrats than Republicans, in accord with party composition of the Houses. However, there are matters in which party differences should have a lesser role. I note that the Senate Committee on Ethical Conduct has equal party representation. This follows the practice of the committee which was established to rule on the conduct of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy.

Certainly party differences need not be a factor in our study of congressional reorganization. I believe that a majority of the Members in both parties favor such an effort, and I am perfectly willing to see that both parties are equally represented on the joint committee. This would be a special joint committee and would expire when its work is done.

Equal bipartisan representation is justified in the same sense that a special committee is justified. Ordinarily, the Committee on Government Operations in each House has jurisdiction over organization matters, including legislative reorganization. While it is proper for the Government Operations Committees to have and exercise such jurisdiction from year to year, we are proposing here a comprehensive one-time review, encompassing both Houses of Congress and all its operation. A special joint committee detached from day to day responsibility and limited in tenure seems more appropriate for this task, which we similarly commissioned a committee to do 20 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to appear here and support the resolution for a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

Vietnam Discussion Needed

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned that we develop in the Congress, and among the people of this Nation, a more enlightened discussion of our country's foreign policy—particularly our policy in certain crisis situations such as Vietnam. Without this enlightened discussion, based upon facts rather than pure emotion, this Nation, the Congress, and the administration will be unable to properly develop a reasonable consensus as to our national intent. Consequently, we would be unable to adequately relate our policy and actions throughout the world to that national interest.

Instead, we will tend to merely react to crises in trouble spots around the world—crises created by our enemies in most cases. These reactions may well be inspired by the most laudable of goals—the protection of freedom and democracy, the honoring of commitments to our friends, the maintenance of our national honor—but, because an emotional reaction is never a sound basis for decisionmaking in the complex field of foreign affairs, the actual results may, in fact, reduce our effectiveness in achieving those goals.

The realities of the world today force us to recognize that our country is not all powerful; that our national will cannot prevail in every situation; and that we may even be wrong in our evaluation of what is desired by, or desirable for, the citizens of other countries. Under these circumstances, it is imperative that we realistically evaluate and assign priorities to matters affecting our national interest. We must carefully utilize our national forces and resources to achieve limited and practical goals, and we must be sensitive to the changing political forces in every part of the world.

With this introduction, I want to say that I welcome the increasing popular and Congressional concern on the subject of Vietnam. There are very legitimate, different points of view on this complex issue. They all need to be aired. Personally, I cannot agree with all of our actions in South Vietnam and the policies behind them. I intend to develop my own views on this subject before the public, and the Congress, during the days ahead.

Today, as a beginning, I would like to insert in the RECORD the newsletter which I sent to many of my constituents and to the newspapers of my district on February 15, 1965. I would also like to insert, at this point, the thoughtful column of Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Los Angeles Times of February 21, 1965. I shall follow this with a further elaboration of my views in the days ahead.

The newsletter and column follow:

WASHINGTON HIGHLIGHTS

(By Congressman GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., 29th Congressional District, California)

Last week in Washington there was some indication that the rapidly deteriorating situation in South Vietnam might finally produce some discussion of U.S. policy among the Members of Congress.

It is clear that the United States is carrying on an undeclared war against North Vietnam. U.S. forces are being used in air strikes against North Vietnamese targets. The pretense that we are merely supplying advisers to a friendly country to aid them in controlling guerrilla insurgents is hardly tenable under present circumstances.

The question for the American public, and for the Congress, to answer is: "When is a war a war?" Without a doubt, if a foreign power was to make an air strike on U.S. territory we would consider it an act of war. U.S. strikes on North Vietnam are quite comparable in magnitude to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and probably far greater in their relative damage to North Vietnam than was the damage done to the United States at Pearl Harbor. Probably, the North Vietnamese were not taken quite as much by surprise by our attack, as we were by the Japanese attack, but, in other respects, the events are comparable.

If we are at war with a foreign country (and I think we are), then Congress, which under the Constitution is the only body authorized to declare war, is cooperating with the executive branch in a violation of the Constitution. How far must we go in this ridiculous pretense? Is it possible that some day soon this country will find itself engulfed in a nuclear maelstrom, still blithely pretending that we are at peace?

I strongly disagree with this country's action, and lack of policy, in Vietnam. Even more strongly do I object to the squandering of billions of our tax dollars and hundreds of American lives in a situation which may involve us in world war III, without an opportunity for the American people and their Representatives in Congress to debate the issue.

What vital American interests are involved in an Asiatic jungle which France, after being bled dry, gave up over 10 years ago?

What evidence is available that the peasants of South Vietnam, or even the military puppets who claim to head the government, really want the United States in their country?

In 10 years our level of assistance has risen from about 1,000 men and $100 million, to 25,000 men and $600 million—supported by a large part of our Navy, which we do not even count in these figures. Instead of improving our situation, this has left us in a far worse position than we were in 10 years ago.

What astute American general is willing to predict what the situation will be next year or the year after? Will it be fifty or a hundred thousand U.S. soldiers? Will it be $2 or $3 billion per year in American taxpayers' money?

But the amazing part of the whole situation is that no logically foreseeable outcome of our present involvement in South Vietnam can either help America's position in the world today, strengthen democracy, or weaken international communism. The most realistic military analysts hope only for a temporary stalemate in Vietnam.

The additional chaos that we are helping to create in South Vietnam weakens the

possibility of North Vietnam being able to continue as an independent Communist force, or of South Vietnam achieving a viable neutrality. Further escalation of this war only drives the Communists closer together—South Vietnam with North Vietnam—North Vietnam with Red China—Red China with Russia.

Our carefree willingness to help destroy Asiatics only strengthens the rapidly growing view that white Americans are quite willing to lend their military technology to the destruction of as much of the nonwhite world as possible.

All of these things weaken America's position in the world today, weaken our hopes for a stable world, and endanger the future of our country.

I would hope that vast numbers of American citizens would join with me in demanding that we have a full, free and informed discussion of this problem by the public and by the Congress. Out of this discussion should come a policy which would protect America's interest and America's future.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Feb. 21, 1965]

ASIAN REDS, ON BRINK OF CONQUEST, MAY BE COOL TOWARD NEGOTIATIONS

(By Walter Lippmann)

We are just seeing another attempt to form a government in Saigon, and much depends for the near future at least on whether it is able to hold together for a decent time. For the reason why the situation in Vietnam has become so critical in the past 3 months is that South Vietnam has been crumbling and is at the point of collapse.

The Vietcong have been so near winning the war and forcing the United States to withdraw its troops that Hanoi and Peiping have brushed off feelers for a negotiated peace. They believe themselves to be in sight of a dictated peace.

We, for our part, have found ourselves quite unable to put together a South Vietnamese government which is willing or able to rally enough popular support to hold back the advancing Vietcong. The American Army fighting the Vietcong has been like men trying to drive away a swarm of mosquitoes with baseball bats. However, because there is nothing else to do, we keep on. We do not wish to face the disagreeable fact that the rebels are winning the civil war.

The easy way to avoid the truth is to persuade ourselves that this is not really a civil war, but is in fact essentially an invasion of South Vietnam by North Vietnam. This has produced the argument that the way to stabilize South Vietnam is to wage war against North Vietnam.

The more thoughtless and reckless members of this school of thinking hold that only by attacking North Vietnam with heavy and sustained bombardment can we snatch a victory in South Vietnam from the jaws of defeat. They have not yet carried the day in Washington. But the President, when he ordered the retaliatory raids, no doubt intended to remind Hanoi and Peiping that the United States could, if it chose to, inflict devastating damage.

Apart from the question of the morality and the gigantic risks of escalating the war, there is not sufficient reason to think that the northern Communists can be bombed into submission. We must not forget that North Vietnam has a large army—larger, it is said, than any other army on the East Asian mainland except China's. This North Vietnamese army can walk, and nobody has yet found a way of bombing that can prevent foot soldiers from walking.

It is most likely that if we set out to devastate Hanoi and North Vietnam, this army would invade South Vietnam. In South Vietnam we could not bomb the army because that would mean that we would be killing our South Vietnamese friends. There is little reason to think that the Saigon Government and its very dubious troops would be able to fight back, or in fact that it would want to fight back.

The Asian Communists fight on the land, and they think about war in terms of infantry. I believe that the reason why they are not terrified, nor much deterred, by our kind of military power is that they believe a war on the mainland will be fought on the ground and will be decided on the ground. There they have not only superior numbers, but widespread popular support.

For this country to involve itself in such a war in Asia would be an act of supreme folly. While the warhawks would rejoice when it began, the people would weep before it ended. There is no tolerable alternative except a negotiated truce, and the real problem is not whether we should negotiate, but whether we can.

It is not certain, given the weakness and confusion in South Vietnam, that Hanoi and Peiping who are poised for the kill will agree to a cease fire and a conference and a negotiation. But while this has, I believe, been the implied objective of our policy, the time has come when it should be the avowed objective, an objective pursued with all our many and very considerable diplomatic resources.

Annual Nathan Hale Essay Contest Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I had the opportunity to participate in the 25th annual Lincoln Pilgrimage conducted by the Meshingomesia Council, Boy Scouts of America, held in Wabash, Ind.

During the program, I was given the honor of presenting the council's annual Nathan Hale essay contest awards to Steven Murphy of troop 76 in Hartford City, Ind., and to William Van Dyke Jones, Den No. 3, Pack 49, Marion, Ind. This is a program sponsored nationally by the Freedoms Foundation as part of its effort to strengthen America's heritage.

I am always impressed by the ability of our youth to express themselves succinctly on the basic principles. The award-winning essays are as follows:

WHAT THE SCOUT LAW AND OATH MEAN TO ME

(By Steven Murphy)

The oath means a chance to better myself, physically, mentally, and normally. This means a chance to improve my loyalty toward my country, my troop, and my God.

The laws are a goal for all scouts. To achieve this goal is to live a good life. The laws are not to be learned, then forgotten. They should affect a scout for all of his life.

The Scout oath and laws are important and should help guide a Scout through life.

WHY I LOVE AMERICA

(By William Van Dyke Jones)

Why should anyone ask me why I love my country? Don't you love America? America is a land of freedom, a land of opportunity. Many people migrated to this great land because they wanted to be free and not to be told what to do. And that we can worship where we please and we have freedom of speech. And if Thomas Jefferson loved America enough to write the Constitution, I love it enough to write this essay.

Secretary of Agriculture Acknowledges George Washington Carver Plaque

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1965, I brought to the attention of the House a speech delivered last Thursday by our colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable HERBERT TENZER, on the occasion of a plaque being presented to the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a memorial to the late George Washington Carver. Dr. Rosa L. Gragg, chairman of the George Washington Carver Commemoration Committee, is one of my constituents.

Today, I bring to the attention of the House the remarks made by the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, upon accepting the plaque on behalf of the Department.

The speech follows:

SPEECH OF HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Dr. Gragg, Congressman TENZER, other distinguished guests, you do the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and me personally, a great honor in presenting to us this plaque commemorating the name and accomplishments of George Washington Carver, a great American who served his country and his State selflessly and with honor.

On behalf of the Department I am proud indeed to say a few words of tribute to this remarkable scientist; this teacher of rare ability. He was a truly admirable man. He remains so in our own memory and use of his achievements.

In his quiet, humble way, George Washington Carver did far more than most of us realize to shape the development of our USDA. He was born 2 years after the Department was established, and when he died the Department had 81 years of growth and accomplishment behind it. His life spanned many of the major changes in American agriculture; and the truth is that many of these changes he himself helped bring about.

He showed how agricultural products could be used industrially, and he led the way in bridging the gap between lab research and the practical application of that research on the farm. In so doing he foreshadowed the work of our modern utilization research and our extension programs.

Dr. Carver was a close personal friend of at least three Secretaries of Agriculture: "Tama Jim" Wilson, Henry C. Wallace, and Henry A. Wallace. Two of them taught him; one of them he taught—taught in the best way of all, informally, in quiet conversations while hunting plants in the woods and the fields.

Henry A. Wallace was only 6 years old at the time, but, looking back much later, he wrote: "Because of his friendship with my father and perhaps his interest in children, George Carver often took me on botany expeditions, and it was he who first introduced me to the mysteries of plant fertilization."

If he were living today, I dare to hope that George Carver would be my close personal friend, too. I think he would be especially interested in what we are doing through rural areas development and research.

Dr. Carver was a scientist with the common touch. Perhaps it was this which inspired him to study what was commonplace. We know that he made paints from Alabama clay. We know that he grew bumper crops on the dump heap at Tuskegee. We know that he pushed far ahead our knowledge of the sweet potato and its cultivation. We know that he found dozens of uses for the peanut.

His studies of the commonplace helped start the South on the long trek toward agricultural diversification and conservation.

He was a teacher who could not bear to see knowledge lie sterile in the laboratory, like the biblical talent buried in the ground. And so week after week, when his work in the lab and the classroom was finished, he hitched up a mule, carefully packed some exhibits from his projects in a wagon, and drove into the countryside to teach the benefits of crop rotation and conservation.

George Carver was also a truly humble and selfless man. When he was a student at Iowa State, he made the hard choice that determined his career. He had great talent as an artist, and he had an opportunity to go to Europe to study painting. But he gave it up to dedicate himself to science—because as he later said: "It has always been the one great ideal of my life to be of the greatest good to the greatest number of people," and because he saw in agricultural research, "the key to unlock the golden door of freedom to our people."

"Speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee," we read in the Book of Job. George Carver spoke to the earth and it taught him—and he taught others—and the saving knowledge has spread in an ever-widening circle even to our own day.

I accept with gratitude and humility this plaque honoring one of America's greatest agricultural scientists and teachers. We shall place it in a position of prominence. From it, we shall draw renewed inspiration. Seeing it, we shall remember that the Great Society we seek he began to build before many of us were even born.

Getting to Work and Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the problem of getting to and from work in our crowded metropolitan areas is no longer confined to any one region, it is a nationwide problem. Consumer Reports, in its February issue, presents the first article in a series that takes a thorough look into rush hour congestion—how it got that way and what can and is being done about it. Since it is a problem vital to all of us, I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues and, therefore, I am inserting part of this article in the RECORD:

GETTING TO WORK AND BACK

Every weekday morning between 6:30 and 7, commuters living in Pleasant Hill, Calif., 25 miles east of San Francisco, rise and dress, bolt a hasty breakfast, kiss their wives goodby, and drive off to their jobs in downtown San Francisco. They battle traffic through the Caldecott Tunnel and over the bay bridge. Downtown they find a place to park, then walk to their offices. After 5 p.m. they ransom their cars and battle traffic home again.

If luck is with them, the trip takes only an hour or an hour and a quarter each way. But on days when the freeways jam up, as they often do, it may take an hour and a half or even 2 hours. The monetary cost, including bridge tolls, parking charges, and car expenses (50 miles at 10 cents a mile), averages about $6.15 per day.

Beginning some morning in 1969, however, if all goes according to schedule, the Pleasant Hill commuters will have available an alternative route. They will be able to rise at 7:30 a.m. instead of 6.30 or 7, eat breakfast, then drive to the new Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station out in the country, halfway between Pleasant Hill and Walnut Creek. There a BART parking lot, with space for 1,350 cars, will be waiting for them; or their wives may drive them to the station and deposit them a few steps from the platform. Their wait will be short, for during the rush hour a BART train, dispatched and controlled by a computer, will pull out for Oakland and San Francisco every 2 or 3 minutes. There will be vacant seats waiting for them on the train—foam-padded seats, 4 inches wider than the usual transit standard.

Gliding along safely in quiet, air-conditioned comfort at speeds up to 80 miles per hour and averaging 50 miles per hour including the 20-second stops, they will prepare for the day's work or read their morning papers in good light for the 29 minutes it will take them to reach downtown San Francisco. At night they will reverse the route, saving another 30 minutes or more, and will arrive home relaxed and rested before 6 p.m. instead of disgruntled and grumpy at 6:30 or 7.

Their round-trip BART ticket, including parking at the BART station, will cost $1.40 instead of $6.15 by car. BART, moreover, may enable some families to get along with one car instead of two, or with two instead of three.

HOW OUR CITIES GOT SNARLED UP

In most large, traffic-plagued American cities today, a battle is raging between those who urge modern rapid transit like the BART system and those who favor more automobile freeways and expressways. Throughout the past decade or more, the freeway proponents have been victorious, for a number of reasons.

The United States entered the 1950's with a seriously inadequate urban public transportation system of buses, transit lines, and commuter railroads and an equally inadequate system of streets and highways. During the decade, conditions grew even worse. The number of autos registered rose from 40 to 61 million and of vehicle miles per year from 458 to 719 billion; but roadbuilding did not keep pace. Passengers abandoned public transportation lines for most uses, but continued to jam the transit vehicles for the rush hour trips to and from work in the central business districts of our large cities. Transit fares rose, and the trend to the automobile and to traffic congestion was intensified; yet peak-hour transit vehicles remained as overcrowded as ever. Our major cities seemed headed toward a monumental snafu.

Basically, there were three ways to deal with the problem: (1) modernizing and expanding our public transit systems; (2) concentrating on the private automobile and building more freeways and parking garages; or (3) creating a balanced transportation system, using each mode of travel for the job it could do best.

Here was a major public issue, with many complex engineering, economic, sociological, esthetic, and political facets. But before it could be adequately debated, the die was cast in favor of the private automobile. Congress in 1956 authorized a vast new nationwide Interstate Highway System to provide nonstop, limited-access high-speed travel on some 41,000 miles of rural and urban freeways designed with gentle grades, broad curves, and generous interchanges. The system was to be built in 16 years at a cost of $41 billion.

Why did this plan win adoption? Three reasons may be cited. One was the obvious, urgent need for some kind of transportation improvement. The second was the popularity of the automobile. Almost everyone was delighted by the prospect that the Interstate System would soon enable us to drive at 60 miles per hour or more almost anywhere—even to work and back.

But it was a third factor that turned the tide in favor of the Interstate System—a nationwide highway lobby, adequately financed and equipped with the elements of a powerful strategy for obtaining political action.

Pressing for the Interstate Highway System in 1956—and pooh-poohing old-fashioned plans to rebuild our rapid transit facilities—were the automobile manufacturers and their 64,000 local car dealers, the gasoline companies, the tire companies, and the influential motor clubs, including the American Automobile Association. Their allies included the politically well-connected highway contractors and the highway department officials in city halls and State capitals; the trucking industry, which wanted faster roads for its trucks; the cement and asphalt companies; and the many industries that profit from cars and roads. Seldom has a single public issue mobilized such a potent lobby.

The financing of the Interstate System, which might have been the insuperable obstacle to its adoption, was a marvel of ingenuity. To circumvent the opposition of economy-minded city councilors and State legislators, the highway lobby plan provided that 90 percent of the $41 billion would come from Federal taxes. But Congress, too, is economy minded. Therefore, the plan also provided that the financing should be set up entirely outside the regular Federal budget. Federal taxes on gasoline, tires, and accessories and tonnage taxes on trucks would be increased and the proceeds accumulated in a highway trust fund. The Federal 90 percent would not be classed as an ordinary appropriation, but would be dispensed out of this special fund. Congress bought the entire package. Moreover, cities wishing even more freeways than the Interstate System projected could get a 50-percent subsidy for them.

The plan looked foolproof in 1956. But today, with half of the 16 years of the Interstate System construction program behind us, critics are beginning to take another look. Many of them are not happy with what they see.

The rural portions of the system are relatively popular. The new rural freeways are fast and safer than ordinary roads; many people enjoy driving them, though some find them monotonous. Conservationists, of course, complain that the rural freeways sometimes invade this country's rapidly disappearing wilderness regions, wildlife sanctuaries, and other areas that should remain sacrosanct (though future invasions may be slowed down by the Wilderness Act of 1964). And other critics maintain that the billions being spent on rural freeways might better be devoted to more urgently needed public services—as though there were any assurance that if an appreciable portion of the money had not been spent on the highways, it would have been devoted to schools, health services, parks and playgrounds, or other public uses.

Far more numerous and more trenchant criticisms have been aimed at urban parts of the Interstate System.

LIMITED PEAK-HOUR CAPACITY

One major criticism concerns the freeway's limited peak-hour capacity. A single freeway lane can, in theory, carry 1,500 cars an hour at high speed, with 5 or 6 occupants in each car. Thus, if loaded to capacity, an 8-lane freeway should carry 1,500,000 persons past a given point in a day. But this is not what happens. Practical limitations reduce usable capacity to a comparative trickle.

Chart III [not printed in the RECORD] illustrates the most important of these limitations. It shows urban traffic divided into two main classes. First, there is a broad base of miscellaneous traffic—shopping trips, school trips, social trips, salesmen's calls, visits to the doctor and the dentist, and so on. For the great majority of these trips, the automobile has no rival. An urban freeway system adequate to handle such traffic has much to recommend it.

But superimposed upon this base is a second type of urban traffic—the journey to work and back. These work trips tend to be concentrated into a single hour or two, each morning in one direction and each afternoon in the opposite direction. Cars on such trips carry an average of only 1.3 to 1.5 occupants each, and most of them are headed for a compact, highly congested central business district, and to other densely developed neighborhoods. Under such circumstances—and they prevail in most large cities—congestion can be avoided in an all-automobile system only by building lanes that will be needed for only an hour or two each day and will therefore carry only a few cars per day.

Incredible as it may seem, capacity actually goes up when congestion slows traffic down. At 20 or 30 miles per hour, cars follow one another more closely, and 1 lane can therefore deliver 2,000 cars or more per hour intsead of only 1,500. But a freeway in this congested condition—as every driver knows—is vulnerable to being blocked altogether as additional cars try to worm their way into the stream of traffic, and as cars run out of gas, tires go flat, engines overheat, or fenders tangle. Then capacity drops to zero, while drivers gaze ruefully at road signs reading: "Speed limit: 60 miles per hour."

True, congestion can be somewhat reduced by making middle lanes reversible so that an eight-lane freeway, for example, can carry five or six lanes in the dominant direction during peak hours. Even so, the number of lanes adequate to serve the ordinary traffic to and from a central business district may have to be doubled or even trebled to handle without congestion those mountainous rush-hour travel peaks so clearly visible in chart III [not printed in RECORD].

The high cost of these added peak-hour-only lanes per car using them, along with the valuable downtown space they require, makes it unlikely that enough of them will ever be built. If they are built, they will fall afoul of the apparently inexorable rule that new roads soon attract enough new traffic to jam them. The Long Island Expressway in the east and the Santa Ana Freeway in the west, which vie for the title "world's largest parking lot," have become examples of the congestion they were to relieve.

PARKING GEOMETRY

It is a law of nature that once a commuter's car gets to town, it has to be parked. Here again the basic considerations are common to most large cities. It may be feasible to provide parking for central business district shoppers and miscellaneous visitors, even though it may involve costly underground or multistory garages. To provide, in addition, all-day parking for workers enormously aggravates the problem.

To allow not only for the space a car occupies but adequate maneuver space as well ordinarily requires about 350 square feet per car—almost twice as much space as an office or work area for one worker. That leaves room for only 125 cars per acre of parking lot or garage floorspace. When such space for central business district parking needs are combined with space needs for central business district expressways, the whole function of the central business district, which needs compactness, is impaired.

THE HIGH COST OF FREEWAYS

Urban freeways look like bargains to local governments because of the 50 or 90 percent Federal subsidy for the capital cost. Rapid transit systems like San Francisco's BART, in contrast, look enormously expensive because the whole cost must be borne at home. However, in the absence of a Federal freeway subsidy or if both systems were similarly subsidized, the comparison would be quite different. Here are the relative lengths and costs of the urban and rural portions of the Interstate System:

Rural:
Number of miles: 36,000.
Total cost: $22.5 billion.
Average cost per route mile: $625,000.
Urban:
Number of miles: 5,000.
Total cost: $18.5 billion.
Average cost per route mile: $3,700,000.

Costs for routes through congested areas, however, run much higher:

[Cost per route mile]

Freeway:	
Downtown San Diego (California)	$5,500,000
Pasadena (East-West) Freeway (California)	10,300,000
Prospect Expressway Gowanus-Prospect (New York)	13,600,000
Kennedy (Northwest) and Eden Expressways (Illinois)	15,600,000

These are not extreme examples. A 1961 San Francisco study estimated that future esthetically acceptable freeways for that city would cost more than $23 million a mile. A 1½-mile downtown stretch of Boston's central artery cost more than $40 million a mile. One estimate places the cost of a crosstown expressway in Manhattan at $100 million a mile.

San Francisco's 75-mile BART system will cost $13 million a mile. It will have a peak-hour capacity of 30,000 seated passengers in each direction. Even with 2 lanes reversible, a comparable $13 million-per-mile 8-lane freeway would have a peak-hour capacity of only 7,000 or 8,000 cars (10,000 or 12,000 occupants) before congestion began to slow travel down. And the rapid transit line, of course, requires a much narrower right-of-way and no costly parking facilities downtown.

Another aspect of cost is what the urban freeway does to local tax rolls. Within the city, the freeway takes valuable land off the tax rolls and thus increases the load on the remaining land. The effect can be substantial. Washington, D.C., for example, had 2,100 acres of highly taxed downtown land on its rolls in 1960. Construction of all highways then proposed would have reduced the taxable downtown area by 375 acres or 17 percent.

The loss in city tax revenues, it is true, may in many cases be balanced, or more than balanced, by increased tax revenues in the suburbs where undeveloped property near freeway interchanges is converted into high-tax shopping centers, industrial sites, and homesites. This may be fine for the undeveloped suburbs and for the property owners and speculators who reap the land-boom bonanza; but it is small solace for the residents of central cities, where the tax load is already heaviest.

For ordinary travel, the freeway is a very good buy. It more than pays its own way as compared with travel on ordinary streets and highways. But its economic advantage is lost when it is expected to handle the task for which it is least fitted—carrying peak-hour traffic into and out of the densely developed portions of our large cities.

THE SOCIAL COSTS OF FREEWAYS

To the extent that freeways have indirectly produced a deterioration of public transportation, they hurt particularly those who are too old or too physically handicapped to drive. These people must depend on the substandard public transportation—and they live under the continuing threat that what little there is may be curtailed or discontinued. Many continue to drive, though they should not, because there is no other way to get around. Licensing officials tend to revoke licenses only in extreme cases if alternative transportation is not available. Fifteen percent of the entire adult population or more may be in this group of aged or handicapped.

Other, far greater social costs of freeways are familiar to planners through the protests of families and businesses marked for uprooting. Freeway proposals for the District of Columbia, before they were scaled down, called for the displacement of 33,000 men, women, and children—almost 5 percent of the District's population. And additional thousands in the Maryland and Virginia suburbs were living in the paths of proposed freeway routes.

Before a federally subsidized housing project is approved, local sponsors must give assurance that uprooted families will be relocated. No similar assurance is required of highway departments planning federally subsidized roadways. Property owners ousted by a new freeway, of course, receive approximately the market value of their property—but it isn't always easy to find a new home at that price. Renters until recently got nothing, and store owners got nothing for the going concern value of their stores. To meet the protests, Congress in 1962 amended the Federal-Aid Highway Act to provide payments up to $200 for family moving expenses and up to $3,000 to stores. But since a way of life is at stake as well as moving expenses, these payments have not provided satisfaction.

Freeways also sometimes cut suburbs in half or amputate a neighborhood from the main community. In some States, approval of the local government is required before a new route can be built through its boundaries. In such States, even a village can force a new freeway to make a costly detour; a solid phalanx of villages often can and sometimes does block a new route altogether.

The historic landmark and the public park are other frequent victims of the freeway. A study made for the Minneapolis Board of Park Commissioners in 1960 revealed that the Interstate System planned to invade 15 Minneapolis park properties and that other State and county highways were scheduled to invade an additional 13. The park territory coveted by the highway departments totaled 295 acres—or 5 acres of park land for every square mile within the city limits.

A 1962 amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act provides that no Federal grants for urban highways will be approved after July 1, 1965, unless the proposed route has been reviewed as part of a regional planning process that takes social and community values into consideration. This is surely an important and long-overdue step in the right direction; it should have been part of the original 1956 plan.

But the new planning procedures will prove beneficial only for those communities that organize promptly and effectively to make

use of them. Otherwise the same old highway planners will continue to make the same old decisions from their new desks in a regional planning office. A future article in this series will consider ways in which consumer groups can effectively participate in the new planning process.

Showdown Is Only Way To End Red Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego, Calif., Union, February 13, 1965:

SHOWDOWN IS ONLY WAY TO END RED AGGRESSION

(By David Lawrence)

The United States has every justification for severing diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and sending home all personnel of the Russian Embassy in Washington. Not only has the American Embassy in Moscow been stoned and the safety of American diplomats jeopardized—with the full approval of the Communist regime itself—but the Soviet Premier has pledged military aid to the North Vietnam Government, which has been attacking and killing American citizens.

Americans are in South Vietnam on a legitimate mission—at the request of the existing government. The attacks on them are, therefore, in violation of international law and constitute a flagrant act of war by the North Vietnam Government.

Since the Soviet Union lines itself up with a government which has made war upon American troops, the question now arises whether reprisals or retaliatory actions against the North Vietnamese will be adequate. For the real enemies are Red China and the Soviet Union, both of which have come out in the open in support of the military operations against an independent government in South Vietnam.

These acts of aggression will unquestionably continue and aggravate the situation further unless the United States is ready to call for a showdown between this country and the Communists. What is needed is action by the entire Western alliance. There certainly is little to be gained by the United States in continuing to supply economic, military, or financial aid to countries which are unwilling to take the side of the United States and present a united front to the world against aggression.

There have been in recent months various plans to expand and enlarge trade relationships between the United States and the Communist-bloc countries, which means, of course, that products which are forbidden to be transported directly to the Soviet Union and Red China are then shipped indirectly to those same countries.

Many businessmen, both in Europe and the United States, who are mostly interested in making money, have been arguing that trade with Communist areas should be expanded. But this trend developed before the wanton attacks on Americans in South Vietnam and on the American Embassy in Moscow. Under present circumstances, an economic embargo becomes a logical weapon to force some kind of international cooperation that will restrain the enemy from further acts of aggression.

More important, however, than any other factor is the treachery committed in Moscow, where the Government itself instigated a mob attack on the U.S. Embassy.

It is difficult to see how President Johnson now can carry out any plans for a visit to Moscow. How can there be improvement of cultural relations or other exchanges as long as the Soviet Government is sending arms and supplies to the North Vietnamese to kill American citizens engaged in defending the South Vietnamese Government, whose independence was supposedly guaranteed by international agreements signed by the Communists themselves?

The severance of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union has often been suggested, but has usually been brushed aside as likely to be of no avail. The Soviets know this, and have taken advantage of the passivity of the United States.

A breaking of diplomatic relations could be based upon the many violations by the Moscow government of treaty obligations and American rights that have occurred since the United States did extend recognition. Certainly there have been few cases in history when nations have maintained diplomatic relations after the safety of their personnel has been threatened and violence has been directed against them.

Soviet Authorities Easing Up on Availability of Matzoh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I noted with great interest an article by Henry Tanner in this morning's New York Times indicating that the Soviet Government is making some efforts to insure that matzoh is available in Moscow this year for the traditional Passover.

Last year, as my colleagues will remember, many of us brought to the attention of the House the hypocrisy, duplicity, and official preventive measures which the Soviets took in order to stifle the production and distribution of matzoh.

We can say, without reservation, that this particular chapter has formed part of the officially inspired effort to suppress Jewish religious and cultural life.

Mr. Tanner now reports that two Moscow synagogues have received permission to make the unleavened bread available.

I am deeply hopeful that this sign of relaxation will mean sufficient supply for not only Moscow, but other communities throughout Russia.

The article follows:

SOVIET GIVES MOSCOW SYNAGOGUES PERMISSION TO BAKE MATZOH FOR PASSOVER

(By Henry Tanner)

Moscow, February 24.—Representatives of two Moscow synagogues declared today that enough matzoh would be available in the capital this year to satisfy the needs of Jews who wish to observe the dietary laws of Passover. Three bakeries have been in operation since mid-January.

Both synagogues received permission from the Soviet authorities to set up the bakeries in rented houses to produce matzoh on a nonprofit basis for their congregations and for outsiders who put in orders.

The situation in the capital thus is different from that of last year, when many Jews had to forgo the unleavened bread.

But private Jewish sources expressed concern that the current situation in Moscow might not be typical of other Jewish communities in the country.

They urged Jews in the United States and Western Europe not to abandon their efforts to ship matzoh to Jewish communities in the Soviet Union.

Communal bakeries have also been set up in Leningrad and perhaps in Kiev, these sources said, but they added that in other parts of the Soviet Union Jewish communities had not received permission.

PUBLICITY IS CREDITED

They added that they thought the improvement in Moscow and Leningrad was primarily the result of the publicity that last year's shortage had received abroad.

Some private Jewish citizens said that even with this year's baking operations by the two synagogues there would be enough matzoh only for a fraction of the Jewish population of the capital, which is estimated at half a million. There are about 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union.

At the Maryina Roshcha synagogue in Moscow this morning, two dozen men and women, most of them elderly, waited in a room to hand in flour and to place orders for matzoh.

In another room, a second group of elderly persons, who had brought their flour in 2 days ago, were about to receive their allotment of matzoh in big brown cartons. There were two large stacks of full cartons in the room.

The customers paid 1 ruble 40 kopeks ($1.55) for a kilogram (2.2 pounds) of matzoh. This is what the synagogue figures it pays for wages, transportation, rent for the house and other production costs. (At one New York City supermarket yesterday a pound of matzoh cost 31 cents.)

The flour was taken by truck to a distant suburb, where an improvised bakery had been set up in one of the few old dwellings that still have large, old-fashioned brick ovens.

Eight men and a young woman in white smocks and white caps were turning out thin matzoh at a fast clip under the supervision of a representative of the rabbi.

The supervisor said up to 1,100 pounds of matzoh a day was being produced. A second bakery set up by the synagogue in another suburb is turning out about 440 pounds a day.

George Lieb, president of the synagogue, said it hoped to produce 44,000 pounds for its 2,500 regular worshipers and for others who handed in flour and placed orders.

ABOUT 45-TON TOTAL EXPECTED

At the central synagogue, Moscow's largest, Chief Rabbi Yehudi-Leib Levin said the bakery set up by its congregation in a third suburb was producing 2,200 pounds of matzoh a day.

He said that his congregation had 10,000 regular worshipers and that 6.4 pounds a person was needed, or about 30 tons.

He expects the bakery to produce 45 tons by April 17, the beginning of Passover. The surplus will go to the small Cherkizovo synagogue, which is Moscow's third in size, and to other Jews who want to observe the Passover dietary laws even though they do not worship regularly.

Throughout the world, many nonreligious Jews observe the Passover dietary laws as a matter of custom.

The problem of procuring matzoh for Passover began 4 years ago, when Soviet state bakeries were ordered to stop baking it.

There has never been a ban on the baking of matzoh by individual families. But few families have the kind of oven needed for matzoh baking.

Those who were not able to do the baking themselves could not buy matzoh from their friends or neighbors either, since Soviet laws forbid the production and sale of matzoh, or anything else, by private individuals.

These laws, Rabbi Levin said today, are the reason the synagogues had to apply for special permission to bake and distribute matzoh. The synagogues have in effect been exempted from the law against private enterprise in baking.

In several instances in recent years Jews have received jail sentences for selling matzoh.

The rabbi said that this summer the central synagogue would build its own bakery. "Construction materials are already there," he said with a nod in the direction of the yard behind the building.

Sears Leads the Way in Profit-Sharing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a major fringe benefit of our system of free enterprise is that more and more businessmen and industrialists are making it possible for the workers of America to realize their dream of someday being able to retire in security and comfort. One plan which has gained great popularity in my fair State of Hawaii is the profit-sharing plan, now adopted by approximately 400 private firms.

An outstanding leader in this field over the years has been the Sears, Roebuck & Co., which operates one of the most successful branch stores in Honolulu. An almost fantastic story of its plan is told in an article by Shurei Hirozawa in the Honolulu Star Bulletin of February 16, 1965. Because I believe it may lead others to take a serious look at this amazing plan of a company which claims it "has everything," I offer the article for inclusion in the RECORD.

SEARS PROFIT-SHARING PLAN PUTS MANY ON EASY STREET

(By Shurei Hirozawa)

The secret of the fantastic benefits of the Sears profit-sharing plan is the amazing growth in Sears stock, which makes up 90 percent of the plan's investments.

This became apparent to members of the Hawaii section, Council of Profit Sharing Industries, as they listened to William McCurdy, administrator of the Sears program, at a luncheon yesterday at Ala Moana Banquet Hall.

Approximately 400 companies in Hawaii have profit-sharing plans.

Take a man over 50 who has been with Sears at least 25 years. His account might have had a value of $201,000 at the beginning of 1964, and by the end of the year it was worth $263,000.

The increase of $62,000 was mainly due to the appreciation in Sears stock, which went from about $97 a share at the beginning of 1964 to $128 a share at the end of the year, a gain of almost one-third.

AVERAGE FIGURES

What the man contributed was very minor, probably $500 during the year.

Average figures for those who have retired show the following:

Those with 10 to 15 years' service contributed an average $2,036 and retired with $10,754; with 15 to 20 years' service $2,036 and retired with $27,780, and with 20 to 25 years' service contributed $3,712 and retired with $60,669.

McCurdy said Sears employees are urged not to make partial withdrawals from their accounts not only because they lose tax benefits but stock splits and stock appreciation which are the factors that increase their benefits.

For example, two men started work in 1928 at about the same pay. One withdrew $5,000 in 1945 and $4,000 in 1955, but the other didn't.

When they retired, the one who withdrew from his account had $156,230 while the other had $234,095. This means that the $9,000 withdrawn cost the employee $77,865.

Or another example where an employee withdrew $12,000 to buy a house for cash in 1940. This meant the plan had to sell 220 shares of Sears stock to get him the money.

That 220 shares, through stock splits and appreciation would be worth $380,000 today, McCurdy said.

Employees contributed $43 million and the company $63.5 million last year, and today the plan is worth $2.6 billion.

About 90 percent of the funds is in Sears stock, and the rest in notes, bonds, cash, and other growth stock.

South Vietnam

SPEECH

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, most of the recent talk in and out of the Congressional Chambers about negotiation of South Vietnam is irrelevant.

Certainly, we must support the present position of the President to "not negotiate."

Under what authority is the United States entitled to negotiate—barter or trade away—any part or parcel of South Vietnam. We own nothing there.

We have no "rights" there. Are we not in South Vietnam simply and solely at the specific invitation of the Government of South Vietnam? Would any respectable invitee undertake to sell or trade away his host's property or possessions—let alone his freedom or liberty.

The Administration has a better "right" or authority to negotiate or trade away Alaska or Hawaii—at least in the latter cases we have some indicia of ownership.

If we have any justifiable reason to be in South Vietnam it is a responsibility—a responsibility to help defend their liberty from external aggression and a responsibility to help establish internal stability from insurgency—but certainly no right.

Somehow our State Department in recent years seems to excel in negotiating away free lands and the liberty of free peoples. The Communists never negotiate any nation away to freedom.

If we participate in negotiations which neutralize or communize South Vietnam, I doubt that many free nations will invite Uncle Sam back. Imperiled nations will tell us to go home while they still have their possessions.

Heroism in Oregon During Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues, particularly those from the Pacific Northwest, to the following account of heroism on the part of Robert Cody and others of Estacada, Oreg., in the rescue of persons caught in the flooding waters resulting from the disastrous storms in Oregon in December and January of this year. Certainly the unselfish and gallant efforts of these people are to be commended and will illustrate briefly the terrible hardships endured by many of the citizens of my State during this tragic period.

The heavy floods of December and January which brought so much damage to Oregon and hardships to Oregonians, provided a unique opportunity for the people of the State to exhibit their individual initiative and courage. No single action better exemplifies the spirit in which Oregonians met this test than the dramatic rescue of four trapped men at Paradise Park, 5 miles north of Estacada.

At 1 in the afternoon on December 22, Estacada Grade School Superintendent Robert Cody learned that two men, Don Brown, a Yale student home for vacation, and a Mr. Barrett, both of Estacada, were trapped on the roof of Brown's Paradise Park home by the rapidly rising waters of the Clackamas River. Cody, accompanied by Roland Girt of Estacada, set out in his motorboat to rescue them. After a rough trip through a raging river filled with debris, Cody and Girt succeeded in removing Brown and Barrett from the roof. The boat then turned back toward Estacada.

Shortly thereafter the boat became caught in a crosscurrent and was hurled into a large Douglas fir tree, where it snapped in half, the men being thrown in the 25-mile-per-hour current. Fortunately, the four managed to swim to trees, where they partially pulled themselves from the river. They soon attracted attention to their plight, but a helicopter sent to their aid failed to locate them. Three of the men hung onto the trees, partially submerged in the water and in imminent danger of being swept away, while Girt climbed to the top of a house. Finally, at about 7 p.m., about 4 hours after their spill, a National Guard DUKW set out to pick them up, but became itself an object of rescue attempts when it went aground.

It was 9 a.m., 18 hours after the motorboat accident, before an ex-Army DUKW, owned and operated by John McCallister, John Kobbe, and Mike Park, all of Beaverton, was able to reach the men and transfer them to shore. On the way back in, the Beaverton crew managed to pull out the National Guard DUKW as well; but only

after two Estacada boys, Mike Perry and Dickie Beal, waded up to their armpits in the icy cold water to attach a cable to the stricken boat.

Centennial of Lincoln College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Lincoln College at Lincoln, Ill., has begun its second century as one of the most respected institutions of higher learning in the Midwest.

The Illinois General Assembly granted a charter for the college on February 6, 1865. Six days later, on the birthday of President Abraham Lincoln, for whom the college was named, ground was broken for the first building, Old Main Hall.

Rebuilt after a fire that almost destroyed it in 1911, Old Main Hall still stands, its facade little changed in the 100 years that has seen the college's enrollment grow to 500 students.

The centennial celebration is described in the following article from the February 8, 1965, issue of the Lincoln, Ill., Daily Courier:

LINCOLN COLLEGE BEGINS SECOND CENTURY AFTER CENTENNIAL EVENTS

Lincoln College closed out its first 100 years and launched into its second century at a centennial celebration Saturday accompanied by academic pomp and ceremony.

One hundred was the magic number marking the academic procession to the gymnasium, a symposium on education, conferring of 10 honorary degrees—one for each decade in the history of Lincoln College—and a luncheon for friends of the school. Winding up the celebrating was an open house at the home of the president, Raymond Dooley, in the afternoon. Many of the visitors took the occasion to visit the Lincoln Room and Museum of the Presidents on the campus.

As the robed dignitaries processed from the administration building, the Sons of the Union Veterans of the Civil War, 104th Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, fired a volley in salute. In contemporary uniforms, the Chicago unit is commanded by Maj. John Brooks Davis, with Sgt. Roland Persenico barking the orders.

Its members formed an honor guard on both sides of the central aisle in the gymnasium after bearing the colors to the front. This touch of the War of the States helped turn back memories to the days when the college was established.

Approach of the procession was heralded with a fanfare by trumpeters Donald Day and Richard Kusk. A wind ensemble of Lincoln College musicians played a prelude as well as the processional. Invocation was said by Lincoln College Chaplain Elmo Pascale.

MUSIC OUTSTANDING

"A Ballad of the North and South," main musical presentation, added materially to the convocation program of memories. It was directed by Daniel Oberholtzer and lent a somber-at-times, gay-at-times note. There was the sad roll of drums, the shot at Fort Sumter and the singing, playing of several wartime songs which are still remembered, and other effects.

Oberholtzer directed the college choir and wind ensemble. Mrs. Oberholtzer was at the piano. Narrator for the impressive presentation was R. Daniel Mooney. The crowd showed its appreciation with prolonged and enthusiastic applause.

The welcome was extended by William C. Bates, Jr., president of the college trustees. President Dooley presided, pointing out it was the Illinois General Assembly which, February 6, 1865, enacted a law creating the school and giving it a charter. He called the college he heads an instrument of service.

Bringing greetings from the State of Illinois, Gov. Otto Kerner declared it an honor to attend in this the final year of the Civil War centennial. He pointed out the State charter enabled room for Lincoln College to expand, which he noted it is doing, declaring there have been many campus changes in the past century. Such growth, the State's chief executive pointed out, "is witness the demands are being met."

PRAISED BY KERNER

The Governor offered praise for the college program which by sound discipline is preparing youth to become citizens in our society—schools like the one here "fill a chink in the educational system," Kerner declared. They are helpful in today's theme of things for education. The Governor spoke commendably of the Lincoln Room and Presidents Museum. "These," he asserted, "stimulate and dramatize history."

In the symposium on American education entitled "American Higher Education in the Century Ahead," first speaker was Sister Mary Ann Ida, of Chicago, president of Mundelein College. She professed she is often puzzled by education writers today as they comment on women moving into public life. She spoke out strongly for the education of women, saying an interest in education should be one of their main interests.

Thus their self-realization is being brought out and they are moved closer to their full potential. She spoke especially in regard to those who are "unfinished" in both high school and college. As for those who point toward a fuller education, Sister Mary Ann proposed they should know themselves, understand themselves, have the desire to be fuller persons, and then ask how they can best use their abilities in world contributions.

Counseling is helpful to them in determining what they do as to scholarships, credit, and so forth. And such counseling, the Sister opined, brings fuller recognition to them as persons. She predicted there will be a great and inspiring impact when women involved in home, national and international culture will be returning for additional education. She was one of the 10 receiving honorary degrees, her sponsor being the Governor.

Dr. Robert J. Havighurst, a professor of education at the University of Chicago, and also a degree recipient, spoke concerning the role of the small independent college in today's educational scheme. It is, he admitted "uncertain in the future when it will remain small—but some will survive and succeed." Its destiny, he pointed out, is dependent for one thing on what is done relative to education in the State and National Legislatures.

WHAT TO GOVERN FUTURE

The role of tomorrow will also be linked to what alumni and well wishers do in the field of providing funds—and on the acts of the president and faculty. Dr. Havighurst set up markers on the road to success for small colleges—

Emphasis on teaching, close personal relations among faculty members and between faculty and and students—"the student is a person," he emphasized. Other guideposts are independence of government, maintaining "their own curriculum and their own mission."

From Dr. John Hope Franklin, came a discourse on the educational changes through the years. Recipient of one of the honorary degrees, the Negro historian noted the trend has been toward the conception of an education for all. Basic in this change has been the recognition of the capacities of all individuals—and from the educator came a prediction this expansion and extension will be continued in all directions. The result will be the assuming of new roles first in education, and then in society.

GET MORE FROM SOCIETY

In this way, the individual will be in position to get more out of society, Dr. Franklin opined. In order for education to succeed in the future, "It is necessary for us to assess its role." Dr. Franklin serves on the faculty of the University of Chicago.

Final symposium speaker was Dr. Norman J. DeWitt, who is chairman of the University of Minnesota department of classics. Also on the honorary degree list, he reviewed the past—then peered into the future of education. In 1865, he said, the grammar school, the academy and the literary (academic) college were the going education institutions—to, as he put it jokingly, develop one "to read aloud with elegance and with eloquence." In those days there were no liberal arts colleges such as today, Dr. DeWitt noted.

But there came about a revolution whereby the graduate schools of the university system were organized. And a part of this system was the liberal arts college established by Americans who had obtained German Ph. D.'s. The graduate schools established teacher training for the liberal arts college and their administrators—it became a scientific enterprise.

The Minnesota educator pointed out the flow of information—through all parts of the university system is increasing as colleges are reorganized. There are even computers, enabling the mastering of details at a higher level. Looking to the future, the professor said "it is exciting, even frightening, this ever seeking of more information through the university system."

HONORARY DEGREES CONFERRED

One of the outstanding features was the awarding of the honorary doctor of laws, doctor of literature, doctor of humane letters, doctor of science, and doctor of letters degrees to educators, an editor and a pastor. They were awarded by President Dooley, assisted by Dean David Stevenson. The list of recipients is elsewhere in the Courier.

Closing features included giving of the charge by Bates, the response by Dr. Dooley, singing of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic," benediction, fanfare, and processional. The president declared himself in an unique position—on hand for both the ending of the first century and beginning of the second at the college. He pledged continued conscientious efforts in the college's tomorrow.

The college is named for Abraham Lincoln, the first to be named for the Civil War President when he was living. Ground was broken for the first building February 12, 1865, anniversary of Mr. Lincoln's birth.

FCC Fairness Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, apparently the conclusion of the 1964 election campaign does not preclude a continuing effort by the Democrat National Committee to seek both equal and free time

in response to every presentation of conservative views on individual radio stations.

To illustrate the ridiculous degree to which this overt pressure campaign is being carried, I submit for the RECORD, the attached reply to the FCC from Mr. Luther W. Martin, general manager of the Show Me Broadcasting Co. in Rolla, Mo.:

FEBRUARY 13, 1965.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Mr. BEN F. WAPLE,
Secretary, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WAPLE: In response to your letter which was received this morning, and dated February 10, 1965, relative to the complaint lodged against KTTR by the Democratic National Committee, I reply as follows:

On June 25, 1964, KTTR received a form letter from Mr. Samuel Brightman, of the Democratic National Committee. This letter asked for no time, but simply warned the stations to which it was sent that in accord with the FCC fairness doctrine, they might be laying themselves open to demands for free rebuttal time if they carried a number of programs termed "hate clubs of the air" in the reprint from the Nation, May 25, 1964, which was sent with the form letter.

On June 29, 1964, I replied to Mr. Brightman's letter, asking a number of pertinent questions concerning the subject. No reply was ever received from Mr. Brightman to my letter.

On July 31, 1964, KTTR again received a form letter from Mr. Brightman, which was worded as if KTTR had offered him rebuttal time. Accompanying this form letter was a tape recording which replied to an alleged attack against Mr. Brightman by Dr. Carl McIntire in one or more of the McIntire programs. However, since KTTR does not air the McIntire series, we declined to give Mr. Brightman rebuttal time for a program which we had not initially aired. In our August 10, 1964, letter to Mr. Brightman, he was again reminded of our letter of June 29, and was again asked to reply to it. To date, we have heard nothing more from him.

Please note, Mr. Waple, KTTR has received no request from the Democratic National Committee for rebuttal time to any specific broadcast or any specific issue. Therefore, we have not provided them with any time.

Now, concerning their charge against KTTR, we quote their letter's paragraph concerning KTTR:

"Radio station KTTR, Rolla, Mo., in response to the committee's request for an opportunity to respond to the viewpoint presented on the 'Lifeline' program, sent a copy of a KTTR editorial criticizing the Commission's fairness doctrine and a pamphlet entitled 'Backlash, or Why I Am Going To Vote for Goldwater.' From the comments in the editorial it was clear that the station refused the request because of the absence of paid sponsorship. The station did not accompany the material with a letter providing any other basis for its refusal of the committee's request." (From p. 2, letter to FCC, from Democratic National Committee, Feb. 1, 1965.)

1. The Democratic National Committee requested us to respond to the Carl McIntire series of broadcasts, and since KTTR did not air the series the request was denied.

2. KTTR did supply the Democratic National Committee with a copy of our September 23, 1964, editorial, in which we discussed the FCC fairness doctrine and also discussed the "hate clubs of the air" article which the committee had sent with their initial letter of June 25, 1964.

3. KTTR did not send the Democratic National Committee any other pamphlet. Nor did our editorial deal with such a pamphlet. Instead, our editorial dealt with the Democratic National Committee's circulation of the "Radio Hate Club" article.

4. The Democratic National Committee is correct in one thing. KTTR did criticize the FCC "fairness doctrine." We do not approve of it, nor do we agree with it. However, this does not mean that we refuse to abide by it. The fact is, we don't like it, but we have to live with it.

5. KTTR broadcasts a different editorial or guest editorial every weekday, Monday through Saturday. Each day's editorial or guest editorial, is broadcast four times during that 1 broadcast day. Through this means, we have aired many guest editorials with which we do not agree; nevertheless, at the conclusion of each of the four daily editorial broadcasts, we publicly extend an invitation to listeners to submit guest editorials in reply to "Today's Editorial Broadcast," whether they agree or disagree. We challenge the Democratic National Committee to find any responsible KTTR listener who thinks we have been "unfair."

6. The Phelps County Democratic committee chairman was offered editorial time in 1964. The former Democratic Phelps County committee chairman was also offered time in 1964. We provided time, free of charge, to numerous Republican and Democratic candidates.

7. In our some 25 daily newscasts, we presented both the Democratic and Republican views and platforms as a part of our continuing daily news coverage, plus various candidate's expressions on various national issues.

We trust that the above information, plus the contents of the enclosed editorial will answer any necessary questions. We believe that we have treated these matters in a fair and upright fashion. However, if additional information is desired, we shall promptly supply it.

Very truly yours,

LUTHER W. MARTIN,
General Manager, KTTR.

ROLLA, MO.

Volunteers in Service to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, our Government has recently initiated a program in which Americans can lend their talents in the war on poverty. VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—has been created by President Johnson to help eliminate the social evil of poverty. This worthwhile program recruits, selects, trains, places, and provides the support of qualified volunteers whose services have been requested in fighting poverty in the United States.

The National Lutheran Council at its 47th annual meeting in Hollywood, Calif., February 8–10, 1965, reflecting the traditional Lutheran concern for the well-being of all men, passed a resolution supporting this important program. The Lutheran Church has an admirable record of providing for the indigent, the orphaned, the sick, and the needy. VISTA provides another opportunity for qualified Lutherans to serve God as good Samaritans.

Mr. Speaker, because of the valuable role that such dedicated Christians can play in implementing the President's war against poverty, I think it important that the full resolution of the National Lutheran Council be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON VISTA PROGRAM

"Whereas establishment by the U.S. Government of the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program provides an opportunity for individuals to volunteer their services for periods of time to assist in specific domestic projects in connection with the Economic Opportunity Act, and

"Whereas VISTA thus presents creative opportunities for citizens of good will and competence to serve human need, and

"Whereas the Christian's call to love for and service of his fellow man must involve him in a service in the world: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Lutheran Council: (1) Register its general endorsement of the objectives of the VISTA program; and (2) encourage qualified Lutherans to give consideration to participation in the VISTA program as an opportunity for meaningful service, and a fulfillment of their Christian vocation."

Adopted by the National Lutheran Council at its 47th annual meeting, Hollywood, Calif., February 8–10, 1965.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a "Voice of Democracy" contest and I am pleased to submit herewith for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the prize-winning essay from the State of Ohio entitled "The Challenge of Citizenship," written by a patriotic young constituent of mine, James Chess, from Urbana, Ohio. The final judging of the contest will take place here in Washington early in March, and I take great pride in the fine contribution made by this young Ohioan.

The essay follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By James Chess)

The masses of today's world are searching for a cause in which they can lose themselves. They grope among philosophies and teachings in an attempt to find a way of life that will provide for them happiness, security, and peace. They find themselves in a vicious cross-fire between Marxist communism and American democracy, and they lean first toward one, then toward the other. They compare facts and weigh evidence, but over and above all else, they observe the actions and examples set by both opposing powers.

This presents to the American people a challenge unparalleled in all of history, for what the world's millions decide concerning our Nation will well determine the historical course of this planet in the years to come. Within these throngs there is potential which can be held dormant no longer; there is patriotic fervor rarely seen in the world prior to this critical hour; there is a burning zeal

which, if directed into the proper channels, can effect the greatest influence for good that humanity has yet to observe. We have no election but to meet this challenge; for if we fail in this, the world's great peoples will not follow suit and abandon their quest. They will never cease in their valiant search. But rest assured, my fellow Americans, their conquest will not be an eternal one. Long ago it was said: "Opportunities are never lost; the other person makes use of those you miss." If we fail in this, our national commission, the Communists will rise to meet the occasion.

Though not totally without flaw, the Government of these United States is the most perfect yet established by man. We in this strong Nation have the political philosophy which the masses seek; we have found the answer, but all the promises we can make in this age will not sway them, for words are cheap. We live in a world filled to overflowing with tired souls; tired of predictions that never come to pass and tired of promises that are never realized. We of this country are obligated to take to the earth's four corners those freedoms by which this country was first anchored, and by which, with God's aid, it shall forever be moored. As ministers of liberty we cannot rest until this object of our march is obtained. In proportion to the degree in which we have received freedom, let us declare it to the world.

We accept the fact that "a chain is only as strong as its weakest link."

Involuntarily, each American is an individual link that attests to the strength, or lack of it, in the American cause. And what, in truth, is that American cause of which we speak? It was emphatically stated in the words of that "Firebrand of the American Revolution," Patrick Henry, when he said: "I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." It was clearly pronounced in Lincoln's Gettysburg address: "Forescore and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." This holy cause is engraved upon the hearts of all true Americans in the immortal words of America's birthright, the Declaration of Independence, when it declares, "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This is the binding tie that, indeed, should unite our members in kindred cause; the dignity of the individual, and the equality and liberty of all mankind.

Yet, has our beloved American cause become a common term that no longer expresses a significant truth? Have we lost that patriotic zeal that long ago spurred our fathers to attain liberty? Do we lack love of country to the extent that we are no longer stirred by our national anthem or to the point that so many of us do not know even the first verse to our Nation's hymn? Are we ashamed to declare with boldness our pledge of allegiance to our Nation's emblem, the Stars and Stripes? Do we shudder to contemplate the opinions of our comrades, when our eyes well up with tears, and chills play havoc with our spines, whenever we pause to recall how dear a price was paid that this homeland might be established?

American brethren, let us rise now together; and as citizens of this, the greatest nation on earth, let us march forth to meet the challenge that inevitably awaits us; let us perpetuate to the ends of the earth those ideals which have thus far sustained us; let us so pledge ourselves to the emancipation of all humanity, until generations hence shall be numbered with us under the banner of "we the people, and America shall remain the one, true hope of the world."

Vietnam: Negotiate or Escalate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House an interesting editorial in today's New York Times, which position I fully concur with and believe to be in the best interest of our country. The article follows:

NEGOTIATE OR ESCALATE

It is time for someone in Washington to remember John F. Kennedy's words in his inaugural address: "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

The pressures on this country to seek a negotiated settlement of the Vietnamese conflict are approaching a point where the United States is being isolated. In recent days Russia has joined France in appealing for talks; the British would like to see negotiations started; the news from Noth Vietnam hints at a desire to confer; India had previously expressed the same wish, and yesterday Secretary General Thant of the United Nations disclosed that he has been engaged in discussions with the United States and other involved nations and has made concrete proposals for a negotiated settlement.

Washington, to be sure, is not quite alone. Communist China has been adamant against negotiations, and it is quite possible that Peiping will refuse to talk. However, Mr. Thant, President de Gaulle and the Russians believe that China can be induced to join a reconvened meeting of the 14-nation Geneva Conference.

Yesterday, it was announced that American jet bombers, with Americans manning the weapons as well as the controls, are now fighting in Vietnam. Their involvement makes Americans open combatants in the war, not just advisers; thus the conflict has again been escalated. Correspondents in Washington are being informed that U.S. policy now permits attacks on North Vietnam even without further provocations. The point of no return on a wider war may be at hand.

A State Department spokesman goes on repeating that the United States will reject negotiations so long as Hanoi supports the Vietcong guerrillas; Peiping says it will not talk until all American troops are out of Vietnam. Both preconditions are utterly unrealistic. One of the fundamental reasons for negotiations is precisely to arrange for a cease-fire and nonintervention.

Unquestionably, President Johnson worries about the effect on South Vietnamese morale of any move toward negotiations, but the recent upheavals in Saigon have indicated that the will to resist the Vietcong, even among the commanders of the armed forces, is already near the vanishing point.

Time is working against the United States. Secretary Thant is right in saying that the situation is going "from bad to worse." The notion that to negotiate would be a defeat for the United States has become one of the most pernicious misapprehensions of the conflict. The United States is amply proving its military strength and its determination to stay in South Vietnam in present circumstances. An agreement to negotiate surrenders nothing; it opens up the possibility for determining whether the goals of effective neutralization now being sought militarily can be achieved at the conference table.

The most significant thing that Secretary Thant said yesterday was this: "I am sure that the great American people, if they only know the true facts, will agree with me that further bloodshed is unnecessary and that political and diplomatic negotiations alone can create conditions that will enable the United States to withdraw gracefully from that part of the world."

President Johnson is the man to whom the American people look for the true facts.

Message From South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues, and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a deeply warm communication from a family of young Americans serving the United States abroad.

To me, this message exemplifies the young Americans who are the unsung heroes of our foreign service. They are dedicated ambassadors of good will who thoroughly and wholesomely portray the American way in the large number of foreign stations where they serve our country.

I am proud to say that the Crocker family, from whom I received this communication, is from my State of Delaware. I would add that Mrs. Crocker and the children were recently evacuated from Saigon, in the evacuation of American families from South Vietnam. Dave, the father, is still on duty in Saigon.

The communication follows:

HAPPY NEW YEAR

For us in Saigon, the new year holds a bright hope and promise, as we see the old year fade into history after so much action, excitement, and adventure. The passing year has been a full one for the Crocker family.

The start of 1964 found us in Hong Kong, where we were enjoying an enforced vacation as refugees first class of our evacuation from Cambodia with the closing of the U.S. AID mission there. In mid-January, we returned to Washington, D.C., where Dave put in a couple months' temporary duty before transferring as a regional agricultural adviser to Vietnam. Mary Evelyn, Linda, and Tommy checked in at Stephens City, Va., for the second semester of school, and Susie continued in school in Tempe, Ariz. Dave went to Saigon in April, and the family came out in July, after school was out and Susie had rejoined the others. Dave revisted Phnom Penh, Cambodia, for Memorial Day weekend, seeing old friends, renewing old ties, and enjoying a restful holiday without the tensions of Vietnam. He brought Linda's Siamese cat back with him when he returned to Saigon, and she promptly had five kittens 2 days later.

In Saigon, the family settled into a nice new house and into the local community activities. Tommy, now a life Scout, is working toward eagle rank, and is well along

on the God and country award given jointly by Scouts and the church. Susie and Linda, together again after 2 years apart, in the teen club, church, high school, and Rainbow Girls, are busy as they can be. M.E. is teaching first grade in our American community school as well as her usual church and home activities. Dave has been busy continuously in the field, in the Mekong River Delta region, to which he was moved after arrival in Saigon. His work as agricultural adviser has dealt mainly with a large fertilizer program, rice production improvement work, and the multitude of problems of agriculture in a country torn by war. In the 15 provinces of his region, he travels by armed combat helicopters, military planes, and armed escorts to work with the farmers in the hamlets of the delta, and spends most of his weekends with the family in Saigon. This summer, while our minister, Reverend Evans, was on vacation in England, Dave had the privilege of conducting some of our services as licensed lay reader.

With the movements of the past year, we've said farewell to many old friends, met many new friends, and renewed many friendships from the past, from many other places. Many of our American friends of Korea and Cambodia times were seen in Washington, and many others are now with us here in Vietnam. Several we have visited and been visited by, by mail. Others we hope to meet again in our work and travels around the globe, and our prayers and best wishes go out to all of you, wherever you are this new year.

Affectionately yours,

The CROCKERS in Saigon.

Time for Talk in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, once again the New York Times has provided us with insight into the complex issue of Vietnam. Today's editorial states:

The notion that to negotiate would be a defeat for the United States has become one of the most pernicious misapprehensions of the conflict * * * An agreement to negotiate surrenders nothing; it opens up the possibility for determining whether the goals of effective neutralization now being sought militarily can be achieved at the conference table.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to read the following editorial:

NEGOTIATE OR ESCALATE

It is time for someone in Washington to remember John F. Kennedy's words in his inaugural address: "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

The pressures on this country to seek a negotiated settlement of the Vietnamese conflict are approaching a point where the United States is being isolated. In recent days Russia has joined France in appealing for talks; the British would like to see negotiations started; the news from North Vietnam hints at a desire to confer; India had previously expressed the same wish, and yesterday Secretary General Thant of the United Nations disclosed that he has been engaged in discussions with the United States and other involved nations and has made concrete proposals for a negotiated settlement.

Washington, to be sure, is not quite alone. Communist China has been adamant against negotiations, and it is quite possible that Peiping will refuse to talk. However, Mr. Thant, President de Gaulle and the Russians believe that China can be induced to join a reconvened meeting of the 14-nation Geneva conference.

Yesterday it was announced that American jet bombers, with Americans manning the weapons as well as the controls, are now fighting in Vietnam. Their involvement makes Americans open combatants in the war, not just advisers; thus the conflict has again been escalated. Correspondents in Washington are being informed that U.S. policy now permits attacks on North Vietnam even without further provocations. The point of no return on a wider war may be at hand.

A State Department spokesman goes on repeating that the United States will reject negotiations so long as Hanoi supports the Vietcong guerrillas; Peiping says it will not talk until all American troops are out of Vietnam. Both preconditions are utterly unrealistic. One of the fundamental reasons for negotiations is precisely to arrange for a cease-fire and nonintervention.

Unquestionably, President Johnson worries about the effect on South Vietnamese morale of any move toward negotiations, but the recent upheavals in Saigon have indicated that the will to resist the Vietcong, even among the commanders of the armed forces, is already near the vanishing point.

Time is working against the United States. Secretary Thant is right in saying that the situation is going "from bad to worse." The notion that to negotiate would be a defeat for the United States has become one of the most pernicious misapprehensions of the conflict. The United States is amply proving its military strength and its determination to stay in South Vietnam in present circumstances. An agreement to negotiate surrenders nothing; it opens up the possibility for determining whether the goals of effective neutralization now being sought militarily can be achieved at the conference table.

The most significant thing that Secretary Thant said yesterday was this: "I am sure that the great American people, if it only knows the true facts, will agree with me that further bloodshed is unnecessary and that political and diplomatic negotiations alone can create conditions that will enable the United States to withdraw gracefully from that part of the world."

President Johnson is the man to whom the American people look for the true facts.

Tribute to an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, Felix Frankfurter, who came to this country an immigrant boy and rose to a Supreme Court Justice died this week at the age of 82.

It is perhaps significant that the date of his death also marked the birth date of another great American, George Washington. I say another great American for Felix Frankfurter was just that—a great American. Though he was given many labels during the course of his public life, none aptly described this man, or perhaps all of them did, for he never strove to fit into any particular niche. His guiding star seemed to be the achievement of individual liberty as defined in our Constitution. Thus, I think he could best be describe as "guardian of constitutional liberties."

The Baltimore Morning Sun editorial of February 24, 1965, briefly but accurately portrays this American, and I recommend it to my colleagues.

The article is as follows:

FELIX FRANKFURTER

It can be said in full truth that Felix Frankfurter was one of the most influential men in the United States during the half century of his mature, active years. He was influential, moreover, because of the power and depth of his intellect and his personality. As is often the case of men of great intellectual capacity, he was interested in everything that went on, and had his own views to express. The scope of his daily reading was enormous and the range of his conversation was as wide as it was brilliant. The glow of his originality and his convictions shone out from his judicial opinions.

He was a complex man and simply refused to fit in—or, at least, to stay in—the liberal or conservative pattern by which we try to classify men in public life. He made the law his love and his career, as a teacher at Harvard Law School and as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, but he declined to be the cloistered professor or judge. He had many critics, for he reveled in the clash of ideas, and it undoubtedly brought amusement to him that in his early years he was denounced as a radical liberal and a leading spirit of the revolutionary New Deal, while during his last years on the Supreme Court he became a favorite of conservatives.

His influence was widespread and contagious. At the Harvard Law School he was the inspiration of scores of young lawyers, many of whom went to Washington in the early years of the economic depression of the 1930's to take part in the great expansion of the Federal Government's responsibility and authority. As a Justice of the Supreme Court his influence spread in other directions, encouraging among other things a profound respect for the traditions of our courts and, for that matter, of our entire governmental system. His last major opinion, in 1962, was a brilliantly composed dissent to the Supreme Court's majority opinion that the apportionment of seats in a State legislature came within the jurisdiction of Federal courts. He described the problem of districting legislatures as a "political thicket" and argued that the Federal courts should leave the settlement of such matters to the people and the regular political processes.

The United States was fortunate that he came here as an immigrant boy from Austria and that he gave this county so freely of his many talents. He was one of the giants of our time. All those who knew him, or saw him in the court, or heard him in lively talk at the dinner table, felt themselves privileged.

And Now, a Tax on Tourists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, few proposals have aroused such outpourings of alarm as the recent intimation that American tourists going abroad would be taxed $100 each. My daily mail bears witness to the concern of my constitu-

ents, many of whom had hoped to enjoy travel in other countries soon. Some of these letters quote from editorials, commentators, and even from a last Sunday's sermon—heard in a local church.

For serious consideration, I offer an editorial from the Waukegan News-Sun, which appeared in that Illinois daily on February 17, 1965:

AND NOW, A TAX ON TOURISTS

It is a sorry thing when the richest Nation in the world must consider penalizing a citizen the sum of $100 when he leaves the country as a tourist.

When one stops to think about it, one would have to conclude that official Washington had taken leave of its senses. It's not the balance-of-payments situation that is in bad shape—it's the reason, or lack of reason, behind the proposal.

Unfavorable balance of payments means that the United States is spending more abroad than it is taking in from abroad and that our gold supplies are being steadily depleted.

American tourists contribute to the deficit, certainly, but they are hardly the sole, or even major cause. Still, the 2 million of them who went overseas last year spent about $1 billion more than their foreign counterparts spent in this country. That amounts to about one-third of the total balance-of-payments deficit.

The $100 head tax is frankly designed to discourage Americans from going overseas and to reduce their spending there if they do go.

It has certain paper logic. Even if no one is discouraged from going abroad, the tax would bring in $200 million, based on 1964's figures.

But a tax on tourism is more than just the bureaucratic concept of milking the masses. Such a levy could deny the retired couple who have been saving for years, or the young college student operating on a shoestring, the one opportunity they may ever have to see the world.

The vast majority of travelers are not rich and $100 could make the difference between going and not going on a dream adventure.

This latest adventure in fuzzy thinking is more than simply subtracting x number of dollars from x number of people. You also take away from the experience of the Nation itself. To impose such a tax would be to put blinders on the Nation at a time when it has raised itself to leadership of half the world. True, the Soviet Union does the same thing, but we had always believed that the relationship of our Government to its citizens was on a higher level than in the U.S.S.R.

It is fantastic to think that Aunt Minnie spending a couple thousand dollars to see the sights in Paris and Rome is putting the United States on the path to economic ruin. Have our experts in Washington never considered the drain on the dollar from our military stationed overseas? And while foreign aid is more often in goods rather than dollars, it too plays a big part, as do a host of other economic conditions.

If we are really serious about stemming the unfavorable balance of payments, let us consider the problem in terms of the whole world economic picture. Could changes in our business and trade or our domestic and foreign policies lighten the burden? Such a study could provide the basis for a workable and lasting program.

If we are not serious about finding a solution, then let us go ahead with this plan to exact tribute from Aunt Minnie and the others who might want to see what's on the other side of the ocean. We might enlarge the program to extract $100 from every U.S. serviceman sent overseas also. And perhaps President Johnson might drop a hundred dollars in the pot on the way over to Moscow for the talks with the Soviet leaders.

Need for Basic Immigration Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received at my office a copy of the resolution passed by the National Lutheran Council at its February annual meeting in Los Angeles.

The resolution voices support for fundamental reform of the Nation's immigration statutes. This has long been a primary objective of mine.

Under unanimous consent I place the council's resolution on immigration at that point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION

"Whereas the National Lutheran Council has consistently expressed hope that Congress will establish immigration laws, 'just to all and ministering most truly to the public welfare,' and

"Whereas the National Lutheran Council has stated its 'firm conviction that the existing immigration legislation has severe shortcomings, as a result of which neither traditional Christian humanitarianism nor enlightened self-interest are adequately exhibited,' and has expressed hope that Congress will 'seek a just and workable substitute for the national origins quota system,' and

"Whereas the statement 'Immigration Policy: Moral Issues and the National Interest,' endorsed by the National Lutheran Council at its meeting on February 4, 1960, commended for study and consideration the following five possible objectives as the basis of a revised U.S. immigration law:

"1. To supply our permanent population with a steady proportion of newcomers who have chosen the United States as their new homeland and who can impart to their American neighbors an understanding of the cultures, attitudes, and interests of other races and peoples of the world;

"2. To assume the U.S. share of international responsibility for the resettlement of refugees and of other persons urgently in need of the compassionate haven of a new homeland;

"3. To facilitate the reuniting of families;

"4. To facilitate the entry of persons possessing special skills or other capacities needed by the American economy and culture;

"5. To admit annually a reasonable number of the persons described above on an objective basis of selection which, while discriminating, will not be discriminatory with respect to race, national origin, color, or religion, testifying thereby to the U.S. recognition of the interlocking and mutual interests of all nations with regard to the migration of people, the interaction of cultures, and respect of universal human rights; and

"Whereas the proposed legislation submitted to Congress by President Johnson on January 13, 1965, represents substantial progress toward the fulfillment of the basic hopes and objectives expressed in prior National Lutheran Council resolutions: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Lutheran Council reaffirm its concern for a fair and just immigration law, and express its hope that Congress will enact into law the principles and objectives contained in the President's proposal now before Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the congregations of the member bodies of the National Lutheran Council be encouraged to welcome immigrants into their fellowship and to assist them in continuing integration into community life."

Resolution adopted by the National Lutheran Council at its 47th annual meeting, Los Angeles, Calif., February 8–10, 1965.

Sixteen Eventful Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, the abatement of stream pollution is a matter of vital importance to our country. Therefore, I would like to call attention to the accomplishments of a regional control program conducted by eight States in the heavily industrialized, thickly populated area of the Ohio River Valley.

In 1948 the Congress approved a compact entered into by the States of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia for the control of water pollution in the streams of the Ohio River Basin. Working together, these States have compiled an impressive record. Almost a billion dollars have been invested by cities and villages for pollution abatement facilities.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an excerpt from the 16th Annual Report of the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

SIXTEEN EVENTFUL YEARS

Today, 99 percent of the sewage emanating from communities along the 1,000 miles of the Ohio River is piped into purification plants. Sixteen years ago all of this effluvia was poured untreated into the river. To visualize what these treatment facilities are handling in terms of quantity, here is a comparison: If this sewage flow had to be conveyed away in railroad tank cars for disposal, it would require a train 350 miles in length every day.

Matching this progress in cleanup efforts on the main stem of the river has been the installation of sewage-treatment facilities on tributaries of the Ohio. Throughout the entire drainage district there are now more than 1,300 communities—with a total population of 10,700,000—provided with purification plants. What this means is that 94 out of every 100 persons connected to a sewer system in the Ohio Valley has made an investment in pollution abatement. How much? The total is about $1 billion—averaging $100 for every man, woman, and child.

Another goal of this regionally coordinated crusade for clean streams initiated in 1948 by eight States has been the curbing of industrial-waste pollution. There are more than 1,700 industrial establishments whose effluents are discharged directly into streams of the Ohio Valley district. Today, 90 percent are recorded as complying at least with minimum interstate requirements—and some are rated as doing even better.

These are the salient facts that emerge from the 16th annual inventory of pollution control compiled by the member States of the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission. These States are pledged by a compact, approved by the Congress of the United States, "faithfully to cooperate in the

control of future pollution in, and the abatement of existing pollution from, the waters of the Ohio River Valley."

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the widely respected military editor of the New York Times, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, has written an excellent commentary on the situation in Vietnam.

The article appeared in the February 21, 1965, New York Times magazine entitled, "We Must Choose—(1) 'Bug Out,' (2) Negotiate, (3) Fight," in which he analyzes with clarity and deep understanding the purposes and effect of our actions in Vietnam.

In calling for a strong approach, saying that we must use what it takes to win, he says that, "Our policy should not be 'unconditional surrender' or unlimited victory. Our goal of victory should be the defeat of Communist attempts to conquer South Vietnam and extend their control deep into southeast Asia."

I believe Mr. Baldwin's summary of the Vietnam problem will be of interest to the Congress and under leave to extend my remarks submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

WE MUST CHOOSE—(1) "BUG OUT," (2) NEGOTIATE, (3) FIGHT

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

What should we do—"bug out" or fight? Should we be "hawks" or "doves"? Or is there a third choice—negotiations now?

Recent events in Vietnam indicate that "the war that is not a war" has reached a crossroads. Washington's policy of the past 4 years, based on the polite fiction that we were not fighting a war but merely helping the Vietnamese to defeat the Vietcong insurgents within their own territory, has reached a point of no return.

Compromise and consensus—perhaps applicable to some of the Nation's great domestic problems—cannot be guideposts to foreign policy. There must be a clear cut and courageous decision. And though in Vietnam we face the hard problem of risking much to gain little, the risk must be taken: we must fight a war to prevent an irreparable defeat. We must use what it takes to win.

Our policy should not be "unconditional surrender" or unlimited victory. Our goal of victory should be the defeat of Communist attempts to conquer South Vietnam and extend their control deep into southeast Asia.

The reasons we must fight for Vietnam have little to do with making Saigon safe for "democracy" or "freedom." There has been far too much cant on this point, far too much effort devoted to trying to establish a politically legitimate South Vietnamese Government after our own image. Nor does it do much good to argue the past, debating whether or not we should have become involved in Vietnam in the first place. The facts are that Communist expansionism in Asia has been consistent, related and progressive, that the end of the Korean war, without a simultaneous settlement in Vietnam, gave Peiping and North Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh the opportunity in southeast Asia they have so well exploited.

Belatedly, but nevertheless clearly, the United States became aware of the threat. Our commitments to Saigon began in the Eisenhower administration and were enormously amplified after the Kennedy administration took power 4 years ago. Today, we are committed—fully committed—by the words of Presidents and Cabinet members, by the actions of the Government, by the deep involvement of U.S. military forces.

U.S. global prestige and power is intimately bound up with the outcome of the Vietnamese struggle. In Vietnam, we are attempting to formulate an answer to the Communist strategy of creeping aggression, of subversion and insurgency, of what Khrushchev called "wars of national liberation." If the might and will of the United States cannot evolve a victorious answer to such tactics, we are undone; the map of the world will gradually become red. And if we will not fight in Vietnam, where—after the series of Communist conquests in the past 20 years—will we fight? Where will we draw the line?

The psychological and political consequences of a U.S. defeat in Vietnam, a U.S. withdrawal, or a negotiated peace likely to lead to a Communist takeover, would be disastrous in much of Asia. It would undermine Thailand (already openly threatened by Peiping), Laos (even now half conquered by communism), Malaya, the Philippines (with its growing anti-Americanism), Burma, India, Japan, and even Taiwan, Okinawa, and Australia.

For a long time after the politically stalemated end of the Korean war, Peiping was successfully depicting the United States to the peoples of Asia as a "paper tiger." The defeat of the French—backed heavily by American aid—in Indochina enhanced this image of a windy, weak-willed, feeble Uncle Sam. That image has since been dispelled by U.S. actions in and around the Taiwan Straits, during the Cuban missile crisis and, recently, by President Johnson's retaliatory air attacks upon North Vietnamese objectives. But the portrait of flabby indecision could be easily revived if the United States loses in Vietnam.

Strategically, South Vietnam is too important to be allowed to go by default. North Vietnam badly needs the rice of the South. More important, the area is the traditional rice bowl of the continent. Geographically, Vietnam is a long appendix pointing toward the rich archipelago of Indonesia and abutting strategic sea passages. Whoever dominates it will eventually control most of the Indonesian archipelago.

The strategic importance of the area is similar to the so-called rimlands, or maritime nations, of Western Europe which represent a powerful bastion against the heartland of Soviet Russia. In Asia, the non-Communist strategic position vis-a-vis Red China is based upon mainland positions—Pakistan, India, southeast Asia, and the island bastions of the Philippines, Taiwan, Okinawa, and Japan. If the rimlands of Asia fall to communism, the island positions will be doomed sooner or later. Ultimately the Communists will challenge us upon what is now our unchallenged domain—the oceans.

In a word, we must remain in southeast Asia for our own security needs. South Vietnam is in itself not vital in the sense that the United States cannot live without it. But if lost we would be forced to commence the next chapter of the world conflict in retreat, and at a disadvantage.

Despite the admitted importance of South Vietnam to the U.S. global position, the current breed of neoisolationists and the "Doves" who believe we must cut our losses and get out advance many arguments against deeper involvement and in favor of withdrawal.

Most of the arguments represent the voices of defeat and despair, caution and fear.

WHY NOT NEGOTIATE NOW?

Any negotiations opened now would lead from weakness, not strength. If we want to negotiate—and not to surrender—we shall have to raise our ante considerably. And meaningful negotiations are meaningful to the Communists only if they are faced with superior power and a position of strength.

We must arm to parley. Personally, I seriously doubt whether talks can guarantee peace in Vietnam and southeast Asia, as some quarters have suggested, by neutralizing the area politically and militarily; in short, by eliminating the struggle for influence between Communists and non-Communists. Nevertheless, we need not fear negotiations if we speak from strength, by really putting up a fight for Vietnam.

Continuing U.S. air and sea attacks on North Vietnam would serve notice on Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow that the United States will no longer tolerate sanctuary warfare. They might—hopefully—force Hanoi to the conference table. Indeed, such a policy would appear to be the minimum necessary to open any kind of negotiations. Yet even such a program will not win the war in the South.

If the French couldn't win, how can the United States achieve victory?

The implication of this argument is twofold: (1) We have donned the colonial mantle of the French, and (2) our power is no greater than that of Paris. Both suggestions are absurd.

As some of our diplomats have found to their discomfort, South Vietnam is distinctly an independent country—not, as in France's day, part of a colonial empire. In fact, the fear of Chinese Communist colonialism is probably greater in all of Vietnam, and in North Vietnam in particular, than the fear of U.S. imperialism. As for a comparison between the political, economic, and military power of the United States and France, there is none. Particularly in the air and at sea we can mobilize power completely unavailable to France, backed up by the ultimate force which France did not possess—a nuclear arsenal.

You can't win a war against guerrillas.

Not true. We have dressed up the fighting in Vietnam with a fancy name—counterinsurgency—but some of its basic military elements resemble the kind of war Americans have fought successfully many times in the past in Nicaragua, Haiti, and behind the main fighting fronts during the Korean war. Other anti-Communist guerrilla wars were won in Greece, the Philippines, and Malaya. The Portuguese seem to have done a pretty good job of stamping out the rebellion in Angola. Guerrillas can be defeated, but it takes careful organization, special training, and security forces that should be from 10 to 30 times larger than the guerrillas. It takes infinite determination and patience.

"Continued fighting or expanded U.S. involvement will mean higher U.S. casualties and greater risks of broadening the war."

Of course. You cannot win a war without spilling blood. We must pay the price of power. Risks are unavoidable in any foreign policy worthy of its name. The question is not whether there will be risks, but the degree of risk. For against the perils of action must be weighed the perils of inaction. Political and military history clearly reveal that compromise, hesitancy, or appeasement merely lead to ultimate disaster. In Vietnam, the longer we wait, the greater the price we shall have to pay for even partial victory (as we are now discovering), and the more restricted our choice of options.

"We have no moral right to be in Vietnam, or to attack North Vietnam."

Neither do the Vietcong. Nor does North Vietnam have the right to support the civil war in the South. Our involvement was a response to Communist aggression. Since the beginning, Hanoi has organized, supplied, and directed the Vietcong insurgency. We were invited by the South Vietnamese Government to come to its aid. A high moral purpose is an essential element of our foreign policy but we can be left with no purpose—moral or otherwise—if we are conquered by the doctrine that the ends justify the means. If we are inhibited from action by Hamlet-like indecision over legalistic concepts of international law, we shall lose the world.

What's the use of further military involvement, when the political instability of South Vietnam pulls the rug from under our feet?

Here is one of the more cogent objections to greater involvement. But in the long history of Vietnam there have always been feuding sects and factions. Moreover, the French left behind them a people still unequipped for self-government. Yet somehow or other the war has gone on, and somewhat better in some respects recently. Greater U.S. involvement—above all, a tangible determination to win—may well do more for Saigon's political stability than any amount of diplomatic pressures.

Isn't the real danger that escalation might involve us in a larger war? Wouldn't the Chinese come in?

This is the $64 million question. It is quite clear that if the United States becomes more involved we must be prepared for greater effort by the enemy. Escalation in some form would be not only possible, but likely. But we have advantages. We are fighting, as we did in Korea, on a peninsula where our superior sea and air power can be most effective. North Vietnam's few powerplants and industries are vulnerable to destruction. The Gulf of Tonkin is easily blockaded. And China itself, with an obsolete air force and minimal naval power, could not defend itself effectively against a determined air and sea attack.

Nevertheless, an expanded effort by the United States in Vietnam may well be answered by an increased flow of supplies and men from North Vietnam, perhaps by an all-out attack by the North Vietnamese Army, and perhaps ultimately by aid from China into South Vietnam. Though the flow could be hampered and reduced by air attacks it could not be completely halted. It is quite possible that the United States might become involved in a new kind of Korean war. But this would not be hopeless by any means. In fact, some well-informed authorities believe the United States could win a Korean type of war in South Vietnam-Laos against the best that the Chinese Communists could throw against us.

"What about the specter of nuclear weapons? Wouldn't Russia join in, even if China didn't have enough A-bombs to do us any harm?"

There is no certain answer to these questions, but a full-scale nuclear war is highly unlikely. The United States has scared itself to death by its own nuclear propaganda. The fear of a nuclear exchange—never probable, or even likely—has been the greatest single restraint upon a positive and firm U.S. diplomacy since World War II.

Presidents and public alike have been inhibited by the nightmare of the mushroom cloud. Yet the lessons of the Cuban missile crisis should be remembered. Is it in any way probable that the Kremlin would risk for Vietnam what it would not risk for Cuba? Moscow knows our nuclear power. Would Russia invite its own destruction as a nation by invoking the use of nuclear weapons in any cause except the defense of its own soil? The questions answer themselves.

We must also remember the risks of delay. If there is a danger of nuclear retaliation today by Peiping, how much greater will it be tomorrow when China will have accumulated a stockpile of weapons? Time is restricting our options.

Clearly, then, the stakes in Vietnam are large enough to warrant the risks of greater U.S. involvement. Whether or not we raise our ante, the enemy will. The Communists are implacably determined to triumph, and the only factor that can prevent their victory is superior power in all its forms. More of the same on our part will no longer serve any purpose save slow defeat.

What should we do? First and foremost, we must recognize as a Government and as a people that we are fighting a war in Vietnam, not merely advising how to fight one. Such a recognition would awaken a greater sense of national and military determination, inspire a Presidential and congressional enunciation of purpose, and create a more streamlined military operation in Vietnam.

Second, the United States itself must provide maximum possible security in Vietnam to major U.S. installations, such as airfields, supply depots, and headquarters. Secretary McNamara's statement that it was impossible to guard against such attacks as those recently made by the Vietcong against U.S. airfields and barracks is no answer. Of course, 100 percent security is impossible in any war; defense against terrorism and sabotage is especially difficult. But there is no doubt whatsoever that we can provide better security to key installations than the South Vietnamese, who have been responsible for the job in the past.

We need U.S. ground tactical units in South Vietnam to defend our installations. We need infantry battalions, military police companies, Army engineers, and Navy Seabees to build aircraft revetments, dugouts, and protected barracks. Yet all this is purely defensive; it should reduce U.S. casualties but it will not "win" the war.

Another essential measure is simplification and streamlining of both the high military command and the "country team" units, composed of representatives from various Government agencies, that support our aid effort in Vietnam. We must get more Americans and more Vietnamese out of the bistros of Saigon and into the bush. The coordination between the military, the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Agency for International Development is far better than it once was. But it is still far from perfect, in Saigon or in Washington. The war has shown, for instance, that South Vietnamese-United States teams have been able in many instances to carry out the military portion of the "clear-and-hold" prescription for victory. But AID—not the military—is responsible for police and internal security forces in Vietnam, and these cadres rarely have been able to hold an area once it has been cleared of the Vietcong. Perhaps military troops should be charged with the "hold," as well as the "clear," part of the operations. Certainly internal policing needs a major overhaul.

A basic change in the prescription for victory demands a United States-South Vietnamese unified command such as now exists in South Korea.

Continuous and heavy air and sea attacks against staging areas, supply routes, training fields, camps, and recuperation centers of the Vietcong in North and South Vietnam and Laos will be necessary for any appreciable diminution in the flow of men and supplies to the Communists. The one-shot retaliatory raids have only temporary and minimum military importance; viewed as political and psychological warnings, they are likely to provoke the Vietcong and North Vietnam to a redoubled war effort.

The history of air power dictates the need for unrelenting, massive attacks. Bombing targets in North Vietnam probably would have to be broadened to include powerplants, bridges, industries, road junctions, docks and oil storage facilities. A naval blockade and naval gunfire may well supplement the air bombardment. To carry out effectively any such program as this, U.S. air and naval forces in the western Pacific would require material strengthening.

Meanwhile, it would take years of effort inside South Vietnam itself to reduce the Vietcong to manageable proportions. Much larger, and better led, South Vietnamese forces would be necessary. They would have to be supplemented by U.S. ground troops—perhaps in small numbers at first, but more later, particularly if North Vietnamese regular forces and Chinese soldiers joined the Vietcong.

How many U.S. soldiers would be needed is uncertain—probably a minimum of 3 to 6 divisions (utilized chiefly in battalion or brigade-size units), possibly as many as 10 or 12 divisions. Including Air Force, Navy and supporting units perhaps 200,000 to 1 million Americans would be fighting in Vietnam.

Obviously, this would mean a Korea-type conflict, a major war, no matter what euphemisms would be used. Nor could we wage it in the present "business-as-usual" economy. We would require partial mobilization, vastly beefed-up military production. Many weaknesses in our military structure would need strengthening. Even so, we coud not anticipate quick success. The war would be long, nasty, and wearing.

No one could relish such a prospect as this; the stark statistics of war explain the President's reluctance to embark upon a path that has no turning.

Vietnam is a nasty place to fight. But there are no neat and tidy battlefields in the struggle for freedom; there is no "good" place to die. And it is far better to fight in Vietnam—on China's doorstep—than fight some years hence in Hawaii, on our own frontiers.

Britain: The Lion's Lost Its Roar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, U.S. Air Force, retired:

BRITAIN: THE LION'S LOST ITS ROAR

(By Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker)

What happened to Britain on the way to the future? This question currently interests both historians and economists the world over. Last year, a remarkable book published in England, "Suicide of a Nation?" explored the subject in searching detail.

This subject must be of interest to any thoughtful U.S. citizen deeply concerned about the security of our country, for as the British have been unable or unwilling to carry their prior share of the peacekeeping load, we have had to take up the additional burden.

A curious and tragic anomaly lies in the fact that although Britain won in the last war, the nations that lost have recovered

more quickly and now far surpass Britain in economic well-being.

I served alongside British forces for more than 3 years in World War II. Never did a people under trial show such stoic courage and steadfast determination. At the time of the Battle of Britain, at Dunkirk, as they stood alone before Hitler's might, they were magnificent. They deserve a better fate. If peacetime reward matched wartime effort, the British people today would enjoy a prosperity far ahead of any former enemy or ally.

But Britain has not prospered as have her former enemies, Germany, Italy and Japan, nor as have her wartime allies. In the last 3 years British exports increased by 13 percent. Common Market exports by 50 percent. A recent survey reports that more than half the young people of Britain would emigrate if they had a choice.

Many reasons have been advanced for this dismal picture.

I suggest, however, that when Britain's rise and fall has had the treatment of a Gibbon, when there has been time for the consensus of history, these reasons for the tragic decline of Britain will head the list:

After World War II, the British people did not go to work to the same degree as did the people of Germany, France, Italy, and Japan. The per capita productivity of Britain, postwar, was scarcely half that of Germany, and considerably less than that of France, Italy, Japan, and the United States. The British people clearly showed that they had had enough of "blood, tears and sweat." Thus, by their own decision, they deserted the "glory road" they had trod in the war years.

Next, the British people, postwar, spurned the brilliant leadership which had carried them to victory. Prime Minister Churchill was defeated in the general elections in 1945. Many friends of Britain said at that time that people who would discard the "man of the century" the moment danger passed were doomed and would deserve their fate. It is now clear that inspired, able national leaders are as necessary in peace as in war.

Finally, an examination of the state of the economy and welfare of the nations of Europe will show that those which prospered held to the principles and practices of the free enterprise system, the profit incentive and sound currency. The British followed the siren songs of socialism, the welfare state—"the world owes me a living"—and they are now reaping the inevitable harvest.

This conclusion can give a thoughtful U.S. citizen nightmares when he realizes how often in the past our country has followed Britain's example. Recognizing in time what has happened to Britain and why, can prevent a similar tragedy here.

Remarks by President James A. McCain, Kansas State University, at Meeting of 10-State Grain and Grain Products Freight Rates Committee With Vice President Humphrey, Washington, D.C., February 25, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REMARKS OF JAMES A. MCCAIN, PRESIDENT OF KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

I appear before you today as chairman of a Governors' 10-State Grain and Grain Products Freight Rates Committee representing Colorado, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Texas. These States have in common a great flour milling industry, the world's largest in fact, with Kansas as the No. 1 flour-producing State in the Union and Minnesota a close second.

This committee was created following a conference held last December 21 in Topeka, Kans., to which Kansas Gov. John Anderson, invited the Governors or their official representatives from the other nine States to consider and take appropriate action relative to the threatened loss of this industry from these States. Gov. William Avery, successor to Governor Anderson, has vigorously fostered the activation of our committee. Presumably, I have been appointed committee chairman because of my association with Kansas State University which, for more than a half century, has served as the national research and educational center for the great flour-milling industry and in cooperation with the University of Minnesota and other of our State universities has been a prime stimulus to the development of flour milling in the 10-State area.

In behalf of our committee and the leaders here today of industry, agriculture, and government from our 10 States and Iowa, I assure Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY of our deep gratitude for affording us the opportunity at this luncheon to impress him with the dimensions of this economic crisis and its potential impact on our area, including as it does the Vice President's great State of Minnesota. Similarly, we applaud and thank the Members of the Congress from our States who have joined us at this luncheon.

Our flour-milling industry is in jeopardy because of the disparity which has developed in recent months in railway shipping rates for wheat as opposed to shipping rates for milled flour. Although our 10-State committee has just begun operations, at its first meeting held on February 16 the committee agreed unanimously on its prime objective:

"To promote the establishment of transportation rates from this 10-State region that will protect the grain producers and encourage the retention and development of milling and other processing industries urgently needed to maintain a competitive position in the production, processing, and marketing of grain and grain products."

In the threatened erosion of our flour milling industry, each of our 10 States is faced with an economic setback of major proportions. No aspect of this crisis is more frustrating than its basic cause. The Federal Government in its infinite wisdom and power has not decreed that it is in the national interest to mill flour in New York and the Southeast instead of in Texas, North Dakota, Kansas, or Minnesota. Nor are we victims of the operations of our magnificent free enterprise system. Our millers have not failed to keep abreast of technological progress; they have, in fact, continuously, and at considerable expense, modernized their plants as more efficient machinery has been developed. We do not suffer from an inadequate labor supply, excessive labor costs, or bad labor-management relations, or from discriminatory taxes. Quite to the contrary, flour milling grew and flourished in our States because of a variety of natural advantages and these favorable conditions still persist.

We are losing this industry primarily because of a technicality, the fact that for various reasons the railroads have sharply cut costs for shipping raw grain without a commensurate reduction in shipping costs for flour. Of course, this is an oversimplified statement of the technicality which in all of its ramifications is in fact an issue of fiendish complexity.

Let me indicate the scope and importance of the flour-milling industry in one of our States: Kansas. Prior to the present crisis the 24 flour mills located in 20 cities had an estimated 2,500 workers and annual payrolls totaling more than $15 million. These mills purchased an average of just under 100 million bushels of Kansas wheat annually from 1959 through 1963, or almost half the State's wheat crop. The mills pay $7 million in taxes a year and spend $2½ million annually on capital improvements. At least seven other substantial industries exist in our State because of our flour mills.

Obviously, such an industry contributes directly or indirectly to the prosperity and well-being of every citizen of the State. As an indication of the size of the milling industry in neighboring States, for the 5-year period from 1959 through 1963, flour mills in Missouri purchased annually an average of more than 46 million bushels of wheat; in Minnesota more than 58 million bushels; in Texas more than 35 million bushels; in Oklahoma more than 20 million bushels; and Nebraska more than 16 million bushels.

In deploring the loss of this great industry, are we crying wolf? I can assure you that the wolf has entered the fold and has begun his feast.

Actually, four Kansas flour mills have already closed in the last 6 months chiefly because of this freight rate differential, and authenticated accounts of similar developments in other of our 10 States can be cited. The effects of these closings are calamitous.

Let's examine what has happened in one community where a mill recently closed, Winfield, Kans., a city of 10,000. The Winfield population has declined by 280, the number of households by 80 and the number of students in school by 73. Personal income has dropped $568,000 and bank deposits $183,000. There are 77 fewer passenger cars registered in the city, and the number of gainfully employed workers has declined by the 80 employees of the mill plus 52 workers in other businesses. Retail sales have declined $264,000. There have also been substantial losses in taxes, property values, insurance, bank and mortgage loans and other facets of the economy, according to business leaders of the city.

I can cite similar catastrophic results from mill closings in three other Kansas towns; my committee colleagues can cite examples from their own States of mills which have discontinued operations or may be forced to do so in the near future.

It is the height of irony that a freight rate differential subject to Federal regulation is creating new pockets of poverty at the very time the Federal Government is mounting a vigorous multibillion-dollar war on poverty.

Just how are the mills of our 10 States affected by these differential shipping costs? In 1962, prior to the current crisis, there was no significant difference in grain and flour rates from such Midwestern points as Wichita and Hutchinson, Kans., to mills and bakeries in the East and South. At that time a typical Kansas mill marketed 22 percent of its flour in the South and 14 percent in the East. This flour was delivered at $5.85 per hundredweight which was essentially the same price charged for flour milled on the eastern seaboard and in the South.

Because of technological progress in methods of hauling wheat by rail coupled with intensified competition from other carriers, the railroads in 1963 initiated sharp reductions in grain rates without commensurate reductions in flour. The Southern Railway, for example, in 1963 reduced grain rates 53 percent, but left the rates of flour unchanged. This process has continued until the Norfolk & Western, representing a merger of several lines serving the Midwest, posted last month reduced rates on wheat

shipments from Kansas City to Buffalo of 33.5 cents per hundredweight without lowering the 72.5-cent rate on flour. Exploiting the reduced rates on grain, mills in the South and East within the past year have been able to reduce their prices on flour by 34 cents per hundredweight. The mills of the Midwest have been unable to make comparable reductions. The effect on the individual mill is dramatic. The Kelley Milling Co. of Hutchinson, for example, has had a decline in sales from 1962 to 1964 to one broker in the East from 258,540 hundredweight to 88,000 hundredweight and to another from 152,000 hundredweight to 35,000 hundredweight.

The demise of flour milling on our 10 States would, of course, be an economic catastrophe in itself but it would in addition jeopardize two other major segments of our economy as well. Midwestern flour mills provide a market for 50 percent of the wheat produced in the Midwest; if these milling operations are moved elsewhere, our wheat farmers would be placed at a serious disadvantage. Our great livestock industry has a stake in this issue because of its reliance on millfeed. The cost to the stockmen of this feed would be increased $10 to $15 a ton if it had to be shipped into Texas and the Midwest.

In closing, let me assure you that our committee seeks positive, constructive solutions to our problem. Recognizing the vital importance to our wheatgrowers of moving wheat to export, as well as domestic, markets at the most competitive prices possible, we reject proposals which would raise shipping costs for grain. Likewise, we cannot countenance actions which would increase the cost of bread, the staff of life, and other wheat products to the consuming public. It is the glory of American agriculture, including such agribusinesses as flour milling, that ours are not only the best fed people on earth but that in the process the American family spends less than 19 percent of its income on food, the lowest proportion in the history of this or any other nation.

We believe our problem can be solved without causing dislocations to other segments of our economy. To this end, our committee will address itself immediately to an exploration of such possibilities as:

1. A reduction in shipping rates on flour by the railroads themselves with due consideration, of course, to the actual costs involved.

2. Petitioning the Interstate Commerce Commission for an evaluation of the economic effects of this differential between shipping rates for wheat and flour and for redress, if feasible. Governor Avery, of Kansas, has already initiated such action through the State corporation commission.

3. Possible corrective Federal legislation.

4. Effective utilization of research and technology involving agricultural production, processing, transportation, and marketing as a means of improving the competitive position of area mills.

And finally, our committee, admittedly at the risk of exceeding our authority, proposes to examine at least the extent to which other segments of the economy of our States might find themselves in similar jeopardy.

Is the threatened loss of our flour-milling industry symptomatic of a malaise permeating our area? John Donne's oft-quoted poem, "Never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee," has an alarming relevance to this situation. If we cannot reverse the trend in flour milling, what other source of wealth will be eroded next?

Your presence here today, Vice President HUMPHREY and Members of Congress, is a moving manifestation of concern for which we are profoundly grateful. We earnestly solicit your suggestions and cherish your support.

Galena One of 10 Favorite Cities, Holiday Magazine Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Galena Gazette, which is published in Galena, Ill., one of the cities in my congressional district, recently reported the fact that the March issue of Holiday magazine hails Galena as one of the cities in America that is of outstanding interest.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article from the Galena Gazette of February 18, 1965, in the thought that others may thereby read it and be inspired to pay a visit to this very historic, and in many respects, quite unique city:

GALENA ONE OF 10 FAVORITE CITIES, HOLIDAY MAGAZINE SAYS

The March issue of Holiday magazine in a special feature entitled "Holiday Handbook," by Michael Frome, presents an interesting, detailed account of preservation, restoration and reconstruction throughout the Nation. Included in the story are descriptions of 10 cities which the author says are "10 favorites * * * a guide to what may be visited across the country."

The following excerpt is what the author has to say about Galena:

"Galena, Ill., was settled by Virginia people in the 1820's as a frontier town. It soon became a hustling river port, the trading gateway to the upper Mississippi, and a pick-and-shovel mining camp in the center of what was then the greatest lead-producing region on earth. By the 1840's, it reached its heyday, with a population of 15,000, the hills above bow-shaped Main Street studded with brick and stone mansions, and as many as 15 river boats unloading at the levee at one time. Then came an obscure man, U. S. Grant, a champion drinker but a failure at soldiering, farming, auctioneering, and bill collecting, who made this place his home.

"Today, Galena has only 5,000 inhabitants. Its day in the mainstream of history was done by the 1870's, as a result of the railroads choosing Chicago for the hub of inner America. But on the hillside, the old houses and churches cling to the bluff. The most important is the two-story brick Grant home, which recalls the general's curious career, the rise from obscurity to his own special kind of greatness. Before the war he worked quietly in the family store for about $800 a year, and had few friends. Then he became drillmaster of the local volunteers, principally because he was the only man in town with military training. When he returned as the hero of the Nation, he was greeted by a crowd of 10,000, treated to an elegant reception at the DeSoto House, which still stands, and presented with his new home by the townspeople. He lived in it before his election to the White House and returned in 1879 for another 2 years. It has been restored by the State and contains the china and silver used by the Grants in the White House, his favorite armchair, and his military trophies.

"The State also has restored the Galena Market House, built in 1845, the last surviving example of the pioneer trading centers that once dotted the old Northwest. The Galena Historical Museum houses a collection of battle flags, guns, and famous paintings, including Thomas Nast's lifesize portrait of Lee's surrender to Grant at Appomattox. Not all museum pieces are museums, however. The old customs house, where all upper Mississippi River steamers were required to register, became the post office, and one old mansion, the Belvedere, built by a Minister to Belgium under Grant, has been given a new lease on life as hotel, restaurant, and gift shop, a Victorian showcase."

Presentation of Plaque in Honor of Dr. George Washington Carver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1965, a plaque was presented to the Department of Agriculture by the Carver Commemoration Committee in honor of Dr. George Washington Carver.

It is altogether fitting and proper that the building which houses the Department of Agriculture will display this plaque in a position of prominence so that those who gaze upon it may draw renewed inspiration.

Dr. George Washington Carver, as we all know, was not only a remarkable scientists, who contributed so very much to botany, but he was also a truly great American.

In accepting this plaque, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman recounted some of the accomplishments and great ideals of Dr. Carver. In order that the Secretary's remarks be made available to those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted among its pages.

Secretary Freeman's acceptance speech is as follows:

Dr. Gragg, Congressman TENZER, other distinguished guests, you do the U.S. Department of Agriculture and me personally a great honor in presenting to us this plaque commemorating the name and accomplishments of George Washington Carver, a great American who served his country and his State selflessly and with honor.

On behalf of the Department I am proud indeed to say a few words of tribute to this remarkable scientist, this teacher of rare ability. He was a truly admirable man. He remains so in our own memory and use of his achievements.

In his quiet, humble way, George Washington Carver did far more than most of us realize to shape the development of our USDA. He was born 2 years after the Department was established, and when he died the Department had 81 years of growth and accomplishment behind it. His life spanned many of the major changes in American agriculture—and the truth is that many of these changes he himself helped bring about.

He showed how agricultural products could be used industrially, and he led the way in bridging the gap between lab research and the practical application of that research on the farm. In so doing he foreshadowed the work of our modern utilization research and our extension programs.

Dr. Carver was a close personal friend of at least three Secretaries of Agriculture—"Tama Jim" Wilson, Henry C. Wallace, and Henry A Wallace. Two of them taught him; one of them he taught—taught in the best way of all, informally, in quiet conversations while hunting plants in the woods and the fields.

Henry A. Wallace was only 6 years old at the time, but, looking back much later, he wrote: "Because of his friendship with my father and perhaps his interest in children, George Carver often took me on botany expeditions, and it was he who first introduced me to the mysteries of plant fertilization."

If he were living today, I dare to hope that George Carver would be my close personal friend, too. I think he would be especially interested in what we are doing through rural areas development and research.

Dr. Carver was a scientist with the common touch. Perhaps it was this which inspired him to study what was commonplace. We know that he made paints from Alabama clay. We know that he grew bumper crops on the dump heap at Tuskegee. We know that he pushed far ahead our knowledge of the sweetpotato and its cultivation. We know that he found dozens of uses for the peanut.

His studies of the commonplace helped start the South on the long trek toward agricultural diversification and conservation.

He was a teacher who could not bear to see knowledge lie sterile in the laboratory, like the Biblical talent buried in the ground. And so week after week, when his work in the laboratory and the classroom was finished, he hitched up a mule, carefully packed some exhibits from his projects in a wagon, and drove into the countryside to teach the benefits of crop rotation and conservation.

George Carver was also a truly humble and selfless man. When he was a student at Iowa State, he made the hard choice that determined his career. He had great talent as an artist, and he had an opportunity to go to Europe to study painting. But he gave it up to dedicate himself to science—because as he later said: "It has always been the one great ideal of my life to be of the greatest good to the greatest number of people," and because he saw in agricultural research, "the key to unlock the golden door of freedom to our people."

"Speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee," we read in the Book of Job. George Carver spoke to the earth and it taught him—and he taught others—and the saving knowledge has spread in an ever-widening circle even to our own day.

I accept with gratitude and humility this plaque honoring one of America's greatest agricultural scientists and teachers. We shall place it in a position of prominence. From it, we shall draw renewed inspiration. Seeing it, we shall remember that the Great Society we seek he began to build before many of us were even born.

Congressional Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday February 21, the Boston Globe, in its editorial columns commented on a recently published series of papers called "Congress and America's Future."

These papers were originally prepared for the American assembly which was held last spring at Arden House in Harriman, N.Y. The Globe notes a number of the major points raised in these essays and cites the fact that a number of writers reported that Congress has lost considerable power to the executive branch. This development, the Globe added should not be accepted. Instead, it goes on:

Perhaps it would be useful for Congress to reassert itself, not by blocking or frustrating the executive, but by striking out in a positive and progressive way, and on its own initiative.

I think that there is a great deal of truth in this point of view and I wish to make the entire editorial available to the House by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONGRESSIONAL TROUBLE

In World War II, Gen. James McCormack, now chairman of the MBTA, was a major serving as aide to Gen. George C. Marshall, and was on duty very early one morning in the Pentagon when General Marshall, on arriving home from a global inspection trip, phoned his own office. At the time, Allied prospects looked gloomy indeed.

"This is General Marshall," said the wartime Chief of Staff. "Yes, sir," replied the major.

"What's going on?" General Marshall asked. And, temporarily forgetting protocol, Major McCormack blurted, "Good Lord, sir—if you don't know, who does?"

The story is useful here to make the point that experts do not necessarily have all the answers, yet can be quite useful. What brings this up is an interesting paperback recently published in which a group of experts examine "The Congress and America's Future" (Prentice-Hall, Inc.).

The volume is edited by David B. Truman, dean of Columbia College, and the contributors include Harvard's Samuel P. Huntington and Columbia's Richard E. Neustadt, soon to come to Harvard and the Kennedy Memorial Library.

As Dean Truman says, "criticism of the Congress is a hardy perennial of American life." Yet the reader gains the impression from this book by experts that the perennial is growing bigger, and that in fact Congress' real power and effectiveness seems to be passing, transferred more and more into the hands of the administration. This may be particularly true of the present Congress, so overwhelmingly Democratic.

It is true that Congress still has great power to block and frustrate; it often seems harder to pass a bill than to get a camel through a needle's eye. And congressional investigations are growing, there having been more in a recent 12-year period than in all previous sessions of Congress.

But in the more positive field of legislation, Congress instead of thinking up its own bills expects the administration to present them. An estimated 80 percent of the bills enacted into law now originate in the executive branch, Professor Huntington tells us.

Citizens today, when the White House is dominant, find it hard to imagine how natural it must have seemed when John Quincy Adams, after leaving the White House, ran for Congress and was proud to take his seat there. That was an era, too, when seniority did not apply, and when Henry Clay was elected Speaker at the age of only 34, when he first entered the House. Another Speaker of that time was only 30 years old.

Besides the seniority rule, much has been made of the committee system as a means of blockade. Congress has 36 standing committees and well over 250 subcommittees. But while they often bottle up bills, the committee system is necessary to make Congress business orderly. The trouble, for those who want to see changes made in the status quo, ensues when a vote on the floor is prevented.

What is it that has made Congress, since the days when it asserted leadership under Franklin D. Roosevelt, seem always to pull back on the reins? If the seniority system is part of the answer, so are the safe seats that make it possible. And it is surprisingly true that the safe seats exist not only in the South, where part of the pattern broke last fall, but in the North as well.

Three-fourths of all the House districts, we are told by H. Douglas Price, of Syracuse University, are relatively safe year after year. And in the 8 most populous States, which elect almost half of the House, there are as many safe districts as in all 11 States of the South.

Presumably the current redistricting movement, following last year's Supreme Court dictum of "one man equals one vote," could help change this—but the odds are against it. The gerrymander, born in Essex County, is an animal (or would it be reptile?) with more than nine lives.

At any rate, some observers think that the executive branch is now more representative of public opinion, reflecting as it does a clear-cut, national majority decision, than is Congress. Perhaps it is. President Johnson, firing off salvos of messages to Capitol Hill, surely has the initiative with legislation.

But if Congress power seems to be passing to the executive branch, the Nation can well be losing something most valuable. Professor Neustadt points out, for example, that 'the most critical of Government decisions, the war-or-peace decisions, have been snatched away from Congress by technology, despite the plain words of the Constitution."

Perhaps it would be useful for Congress to reassert itself, not by blocking or frustrating the executive, but by striking out in a positive and progressive way, and on its own initiative.

American Lithuanians of Rochester Support House Concurrent Resolution 290

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month it was my privilege to participate with many of my Lithuanian-American constituents at a ceremony commemorating the 47th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. The observance was held in my home community of Rochester, N.Y.

At that meeting, I announced my intention to join my colleagues in the House on February 16 in a further expression of American feeling for the oppressed people of Lithuania and their millions of soulmates in the other captive countries of Eastern Europe. Of course, I did take part in the special order on that occasion and also used the tribute to announce my introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 290. This measure, identical to a resolution I first introduced as House Concurrent Resolution 197 in the 88th Congress, calls on

the President to instruct our U.N. delegation to press for appropriate action against the Baltic States deportations.

Now, in further reference to the Rochester meeting which I addressed, I have the honor to share with my colleagues in Congress the text of the resolution adopted by those gathered. And I would point out that the vote for adoption was unanimous:

RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN LITHUANIANS OF ROCHESTER, N.Y.

We, American Lithuanians of Rochester, N.Y., gathered in meeting on February 14, 1965, to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the February 16, 1918, Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, did unanimously adopt the following:

"Whereas this year also marks the 25th year of Soviet occupation of the Lithuanians residing in their homeland; and

"Whereas, Lithuania, one of the oldest states in Europe, having established its kingdom in 1251, today exhibits all the characteristics of a colonially ruled nation: (1) conquest by force; (2) alien domination; (3) colonization by nationals of the ruling colonial power; (4) economic exploitation; and (5) forcible imposition of the cultural and spiritual values of the colonial power; and

"Whereas our brothers and sisters in Lithuania are suffering under constant Soviet pressures to denationalize them and to russify and sovietize their country and their children: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we again express our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—total freedom and independence; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we hereby reaffirm our steadfast resolve to continue even more strongly our efforts to keep the cause of freedom and independence of Lithuania alive in the minds of the governments of the free world; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we express our appreciation and gratitude to the Government of the United States for its firm stand in refusing to recognize the fruits of the brutal Soviet aggression; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we ask the U. S. Government to bring up the case of the Baltic nations before the United Nations of the respective peoples to governments of their own choosing within their own free and independent homelands."

PETER NORKELIUNAS,
Chairman.
ANTHONY SABALIS,
Secretary.

Prayer in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I reintroduced my bill to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to permit prayers in public schools and other public places in the Nation.

Through this amendment, I am aiming to reserve an inexcusable abridgment of the freedom of religion. Somehow, the courts have conceived of the first amendment as requiring the stripping of all vestiges of religion from the schools. This to me is absurd. The Constitution does not mean to say that the church and state should be isolated from each other; merely that they should each exercise no control over the other. In short, the Constitution was out to achieve religious freedom.

Somehow the courts have decided that the doctrine of separation of church and state means that religion must be drummed out of public life, presumably so that the religion of irreligious people will not be offended. I believe that the practice of religion is an essential ingredient of meaningful religious freedom. If religion, or the practice thereof, is to retreat before the advance of government, because government and religion cannot mix, then the idea of religious freedom may become less and less real. I strongly urge the Congress to take this opportunity to reiterate the real meaning of our religious heritage.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the worthwhile youth programs carried on by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is the Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest for four top scholarships.

It is my pleasure, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, to include the speech of the South Dakota winner. He is Thomas G. Johnson, of Sioux Falls, who cites the challenge confronting us as a nation to combat moral decay and overemphasis on materialism. His dissertation follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

"We are the greatest city,
The greatest nation,
Nothing like us ever was."

These immortal words of Carl Sandburg have been used to describe many of the great civilizations of our time; among them Rome, Greece, Carthage, and America. It is interesting to note that the evolution of mere countries into influential civilizations has come through the people of that country; its citizens. Ironically, the decline of civilizations can be traced to the very same source, the people of the country.

Today, America is enjoying its greatest period of prosperity. We are living in the lap of luxury. We are the world's cultural and scientific leader. In agriculture, our capacity to produce has long since surpassed our capacity to consume. The United States has become the world's political leader in the fight to stunt the growth of the communistic movement. Our gross national product continues to rise at an unbelievable rate.

And yet, our society is beset by the problems of juvenile delinquency, rising at a rate of 3 percent each year; mental illness, which accounts for one-half of all American illnesses; divorces and suicides climbing twice as fast as the population; and crime running rampant throughout the country, becoming one of the great social and political issues of our day.

Our society is faced with that timeless question: Why? A great part of the answer to that question can be found in looking at the great economic success we have had. For in our desire to better ourselves economically, we have begun to measure a man only by his productive power, only in the material success he has. In our fast-racing competitive society we have forgotten the virtues and moral standards upon which this country was so firmly founded. The only measure of man's existence has come to be production, and the pressure to produce has greatly depleted our emotional security.

The rise and fall of great civilizations, as previously mentioned, lies in the hands of the people. It is our obligation, therefore, as American citizens, to meet any problems which threaten the continuation of our way of life. Today that problem lies in moral decay and overemphasis upon materialism. Our challenge lies in the effective alleviation of these problems.

The strength of our Nation lies in our economic security and in our emotional security. Emotional security is found when the hope of an individual is surrounded by love and understanding by his peers. We must not look at an individual as a producing machine, but first as a human machine.

A football player once complained to his coach about being tackled excessively hard and his coach replied, "You'll never be tackled if you don't carry the ball, but you'll never make a touchdown either." The decision is yours.

And today we, as Americans, are also at the crossroads of decision. We can fumble away that ball of greatness to some other country, or we can pick up that ball and achieve victory in eternal greatness. And if the latter is done our reward will be echoed down the halls of history in these immortal words of Carl Sandburg:

"We are the greatest city,
The greatest nation,
Nothing like us ever was."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bills on expansion of inter-American development operations and on water resources planning.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 3455–3512

Bills Introduced: 20 bills and 2 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1280–1299; S.J. Res. 56; and S. Res. 82. Page 3457

Inter-American Development Bank: By 67 yeas to 14 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate passed with amendments H.R. 45, authorizing the U.S. to participate in an increase of $750 million in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, after acting on additional amendments as follows:

Adopted: By 60 yeas to 22 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Morse amendment to direct American representatives on the Board of the Bank to vote against any loan from the Fund for any project or activity of a country which has expropriated American property without adequate compensation; and, by 49 yeas to 32 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Gruening amendment to make U.S. contributions conditional upon repayment in U.S. dollars of at least one-third the aggregate of loans made from such contributions; and

Rejected: By 34 yeas to 48 nays, Long of Louisiana amendment (as a substitute for Morse "expropriation" amendment) stating it to be sense of Congress that during any period that foreign aid to a particular country is suspended by President because of expropriation of American property without adequate compensation, the U.S. Executive Director of the Bank shall cast U.S. votes against any loans by the Fund to such country; and, by 37 yeas to 44 nays, Lausche amendment to reduce proposed capitalization increase for the Fund from $750 million to $480 million.

Senate insisted on its amendments, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Fulbright, Sparkman, Mansfield, Hickenlooper, and Aiken.

S. 805, companion bill, was indefinitely postponed.

Pages 3512, 3519–3532

Authority To Report: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized until April 5 to file its report on narcotics and crime. Joint Economic Committee was granted extension of time until March 17 to file its report on the President's Economic Report. Page 3470

Water Resources: Senate passed with committee amendments S. 21, proposed Water Resources Planning Act (motion to reconsider tabled). Pages 3535–3540

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that on March 3 Committee on Foreign Relations hopes to report an amendment to the Arms Control and Disarmament Act authorizing increased appropriations over the next 4 years; also, on March 3 Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs hopes to have ready for reporting S. 426–428, and S. 645, relating to the Outer Continental Shelf, as well as S. 435, relating to Kaniksu National Forest, Idaho.

Committee on Rules and Administration will complete hearings March 1 on S. Con. Res. 2, establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and plans to report S. Res. 6 and 8, relating to cloture rule by March 9, but they will not be taken up at that time.

Page 3550

Nominations: Numerous Army and Marine Corps nominations were received. Pages 3550–3559

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today.

Pages 3525, 3529, 3530, 3532

Program for Monday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 5:34 p.m. until 11 a.m. Monday, March 1. At 2 p.m. Senate will hear tributes to the life, character, and service of the late Senator Engle. Page 3550

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—CLOSURE OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH STATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations heard Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman testify and answer questions with regard to his proposal to close certain research stations and lines of research.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

J
11
.R
v. 111
appt
Mar 1-31

Appendix

Three Arches at VMI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Three Arches There Are at VMI." The article, which was written by Hubert F. Lee, was published in Dixie Business, of which Mr. Lee is the editor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE ARCHES THERE ARE AT VMI

(By Hubert F. Lee)

MARSHALL.—Three arches there are at famed Virginia Military Institute, joining in fame the names of three great Americans—George Washington, Gen. Thomas J. "Stonewall" Jackson, and Gen. George Catlett Marshall.

When the George Washington Arch was dedicated in 1856, Gen. "Stonewall" Jackson was among those present.

Forty-three years later in 1897 the great "Stonewall" was to stand yet another time for the dedication of an arch. The "Stonewall" Jackson Arch, one of the entranceways through which the cadets must pass.

In that same year of 1897 young George C. Marshall became a cadet at VMI and during the 50 years since he graduated in 1901 he has been accorded untold honors. But none to mark in sentiment for him another day that will be storied in history as Marshall Day when the entranceway to the new barracks was dedicated as George C. Marshall Arch and the Virginia Distinguished Service Medal presented to him on May 15, 1951.

Elder Statesman Bernard M. Baruch, an honorary member of the chamber of commerce of the South, in delivering the dedication address termed General Marshall the "first global strategist." The address and the dedication services were widely covered by the wire services.

It is interesting to note that of the 17 Marshall Day sponsors, 5 are listed on the ballots as eligible to be elected Man of the South in any year they get the most votes. The five include William Lockhart Clayton, Hugh Roy Cullen, John Dumbrack Ewing, Jesse Homan Jones, and Leonard Kimball Nicholson.

Before Cadet George Marshall arrived in 1897 his father, a Pennsylvania coal merchant, wrote a preliminary letter advising his wishes to enter his son in the school; which read in part:

"I send you my youngest and last. He is bright, full of life, and I believe will get along very well."

That May 15 should be set aside as Marshall Day at VMI reflects the unity that has come to the Nation since the VMI corps of cadets fought as a unit at New Market on May 15, 1864. Each year the cadets on May 15 honor the 10 who died on that historical battlefield, when as a part of General Breckinridge's Confederate Army, the cadets were instrumental in the repulse of the Northern force under General Sigel.

To honor the son of a Pennsylvania coal merchant on New Market Day reflects the pride of the corps in their most illustrous graduate—George C. Marshall.

Three arches there are at VMI.

Urban Renewal: A Living Western Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps all government programs do not operate with optimum efficiency and implementation in all applications.

One program I have personally lived with over the past 10 years is the excellent Vallejo, Calif., urban renewal project under the management and leadership of Mr. James Richardson, a recognized western public housing and urban renewal leader.

The progress and success of the Vallejo project was verbalized last month by Robert B. Pitts, regional administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and M. Justin Herman, executive director of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, as the cornerstones were lain for the first two buildings in the Vallejo project.

URBAN RENEWAL: A LIVING WESTERN SUCCESS STORY

ADDRESS OF ROBERT B. PITTS, REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, AT GROUNDBREAKING CEREMONY, MARINA VISTA PROJECT, VALLEJO, CALIF., JANUARY 30, 1965

Mr. Nelson, Mayor Douglas, distinguished guests of the head table, citizens and friends of the city of Vallejo, this is indeed an auspicious occasion. Today the people of all nations are paying their last tribute to a distinguished Englishman. As I watched the expansive groundbreaking ceremonies this morning—I could not help but think of a paraphrase to one of the oft-quoted statements of this distinguished man. I am convinced that "Never before have so many dug so hard and come up with so little."

This occasion calls to mind another famous "Churchillian": If the city of Vallejo should exist for a thousand years, men will look back on this day and say—this was one of her finest hours.

I am sure that when General Vallejo first came upon this scene he was impressed by the abundant evidence of the marvels of nature. The expanse of water touching these shores, the rolling hills, the wooded valleys, all come together at this point to demonstrate the marvels of nature and the inherent wonders of the country in which we live. It was no difficult task for him to decide that this should be the site of "Casa de Vallejo," a place where man could live in peace, pursue his work, and enjoy the bounties of a wondrous nature.

But time has a persistent habit of undoing the dreams of man. In his search for a meaningful life, man inadvertently destroys many of the elements of nature which contribute most to that life. His industry—his ambitions—his restlessness and, all too often, his selfishness—wreck his environment and force him to confront the fact that his dream may become a nightmare. As the years have passed, many things have happened to the region which General Vallejo adored.

As man has moved in large numbers across the continent, he has, all too frequently, destroyed those things that first endeared this area to him. In the exploitation of this environment he has failed to find that balanced "compromise with nature." Even on a site as beautiful as that observed by General de Vallejo—the erosion of the land—the destruction of its foliage—the scarring of the landscape—and the pollution of its waters are increasing evidences of this unconcern.

But mankind is unpredictable. Frequently when the evidence of his destruction becomes apparent, he then turns to undo all he has done, and seeks to retrieve that which was beautiful and serene. So it is with this day in the life of the city of Vallejo. This is the beginning of an attempt to remake this area into something of beauty, utility, and expression of the finer spirit of man.

It is not the physical fact of the groundbreaking of the Marina Vista project that is most significant. Those who have labored long to reach this point may feel different. The fact that the time has come to break ground is a symbol of the end of a long period of frustrations, doubts, and difficulties. This, in the minds of many of you justifies the kind of celebration we share.

I submit that the most significant factor in what we do today is the spirit and determination which it represents. For here a people have realized that the beauty of their surroundings in the city that they have learned to love, can be restored, while at the same time, it can be made meaningful in a creative, productive relationship with the industry and drive of the human spirit.

It is this that we celebrate and it is for this that I commend the citizens of this city, their elected and appointed officials, and all who have joined in this display of determination and desire to make of this city a place in which men may thrive and live together in harmony with themselves and the forces of nature.

No small part of this dream is represented by the simple fact that the people of Vallejo did this themselves. There is no more retarding factor in the dreams of mankind than that which leads him to believe that his dreams can be assured through the works of others.

A nation—a city—or an individual, who senses that his destiny is in his own hands and not in the hands of some distant power, is that nation, or that city, or that individual, who shall achieve and enjoy those things that make life most meaningful. In the development of this project, Vallejo has demonstrated that it is that kind of a city. The Housing and Home Finance Agency has been pleased to have played some small part in

these efforts—we congratulate you on this day.

ADDRESS BY M. JUSTIN HERMAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SAN FRANCISCO REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AT CIVIC LUNCHEON, VALLEJO, CALIF., JANUARY 30, 1965 AT GROUNDBREAKING CEREMONIES FOR MARINA VISTA

Vallejo is justifiably happy with the progress marked by groundbreaking ceremonies this morning in Marina Vista. You citizens of Vallejo should be proud that in what is a short period of time for renewal processes you have reached the first stages of construction. You are also justified in your conviction of the benefits which will accrue in the future as more land is sold and structure after structure is started.

Under the leadership that you have had from city officials, the city council, and your redevelopment agency, under the able direction of James D. Richardson, and with the help you have had from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Urban Renewal Administration and Community Facilities Administration, and many other individuals and organizations too numerous to mention, you are indeed justified in your belief that Marina Vista will go forward to be one of the great assets of the city of Vallejo and Solano County.

I would say nothing today to restrict your enjoyment of this stage of accomplishment or your anticipation of future successes. However, other evaluations at complete variance from your experience and in denial of your anticipation are being presented to the country today. You can not escape the influence of such views, nor should you be indifferent to Vallejo's proof that the urban renewal process does work.

Whose voices are these? What are they saying? How valid are their statements in the face of what we have witnessed getting underway here in Vallejo today?

Some critics maintain that no matter how blighted a neighborhood, and no matter how badly it is abused by some of its residents, or how indifferent they are to its decay as they pass through on the way to other neighborhoods, it is still their home and should be retained for the people resident there. These critics are the exponents of the views of Jane Jacobs. You know her very special Greenwich Village scene, with mamas chatting on the stoops, watching the kids play among the pushcarts and passing trucks. These critics would impose by implication this solution to urban blight on all the communities and neighborhoods of America.

What such critics would have done with the vacancies, the shacks, the decay, and the antisocial behavior within the area which is now Marina Vista, I think not even Jane Jacobs could tell us.

There are other critics who believe that the residents and businessmen in blighted areas must organize themselves against the outer community. They must entrench themselves in a strengthened gheto. The outside community is the enemy. It must be plagued, badgered, and attacked until it makes concessions or is frustrated by its inability to concede the impossible. In effect, these critics insist that the poor have the right to keep themselves poor and that they have the right to keep the rest of the community poor as well.

Then there are the design critics who find that the structures built in the neighborhoods created by urban renewal are dull or banal. Whereas many a community in its urban renewal program has fallen short of its goals, and has not yet explored fully the potential for good design in renewal processes, no program for American communities in our century has done as much to lift on a broad scale the standards and goals of good design as has the renewal program.

Consider what you did here to make Marina Vista a delightful area with the design work of Beland, Gianelli & Associates, and Bond & Dougherty, as well as your panel of local architects. As a member of the 1964 advisory committee to the Urban Renewal Administration in its honor awards program to select outstanding urban renewal designs, I tell no tales out of school to say that our panel was unanimous in wanting the Marina Vista design submitted when construction is underway.

If urban renewal buildings are so ugly, drive along the Capitol Mall of Sacramento and compare the beauty of that area created by urban renewal with the rest of the city; or drive to Richmond's first residential product, the Plaza, and compare that with other developments in Richmond; or drive to our Golden Gateway Center in San Francisco and walk through its park and plazas and ask where a comparable residential area has been created outside of renewal; or examine the design created for St. Mary's Cathedral to be built in San Francisco's first western addition renewal project and ask whether this is a worthy product of renewal.

In greatest current vogue are the writings of Martin Anderson whose book "The Federal Bulldozer" seemingly has been distributed without cost to every columnist who might conceivably fill a column by attacking urban renewal. The book has a deceptive appeal because it is so loaded with statistics, chosen and presented to support his thesis. It is not easy reading, but a summary of Dr. Anderson's views may be found in the Harvard Business Review of January–February 1965. In that article he says, "The basic question is this: Should the Federal urban renewal program be continued, expanded, or should it be stopped? I shall argue that it be stopped."

To begin with, the title "Federal Bulldozer" is attention getting, I grant—but dishonest, nonetheless. It is dishonest because there is no Federal bulldozer. Anyone who professes to know even a little about urban renewal is aware that it can never occur except through local initiative diligently pressed.

The land that was cleared for Marina Vista was cleared because your city council decided it should be cleared. This is true of other cities. The urban renewal program is a local program.

Professor Anderson makes many charges which are either distorted or invalid. But he is careful. He qualifies his attack by stating that it applies to data "for the period I have studied." He took a 1961 reading. For any period there is a lag in the gathering of statistics for a national program. Since he took a period when the renewal processes were only beginning to deliver the new structures and neighborhoods, he had a field day in describing what had not yet been accomplished. To take a parallel situation, we might condemn in the first year as a failure the 5-year building program of a huge dam for the generation of hydroelectric power. We perhaps would find abandoned farms and homes, raw earth, no lake, no wildlife, no power generation and then condemn the whole project as a dismal failure.

Anderson says that more homes were destroyed than were built. Of course, homes had to be destroyed to make way for the new structures for which construction had not yet had adequate time to get underway.

He says the homes destroyed were predominantly low-rent homes. Surely he did not expect the renewal process to take place in unblighted areas. Who else but the poor are condemned to blighted housing and what other than the urban renewal program can rescue them from it?

He says that the homes built were predominantly of high rent. He forgets that the urban renewal program was only part of a comprehensive housing program of our country as adopted and developed by our cities. Public housing units created for families of low income in the period chosen by Dr. Anderson for his tale of woe were twice the number of homes destroyed. Is it not significant that here in Vallejo the first housing to replace the shacks that were in Marina Vista is that of the senior citizen housing development, Ascension Arms?

Dr. Anderson goes on to say that housing conditions were made worse for those whose housing conditions were poorest and he also alleges that housing conditions were improved for those whose housing conditions were best. These are either untrue or distorted. The national audited figures show that at least 80 percent of the residents of blighted homes were reestablished in standard structures. An independent study made by the University of California conceded that three out of four households of the first western addition area project bettered their housing conditions upon reestablishment.

Dr. Anderson who portrays himself as an advocate of an unrestricted free enterprise overlooks the elementary fact that land sold for residential use without special controls in renewal areas will be used in substantial degree by private developers for exploiting the highest priced market. But as soon as legislation was available, redevelopment agencies throughout the country allocated land for the FHA's moderate-priced private housing program. In San Francisco approximately one-third of all the housing programed to appear in renewal areas will be in this moderate-priced category. The price of such housing will be even lower if Congress elects to reduce the interest rate. This program, Government supported as it is with a submarket interest rate, is not an illustration of Dr. Anderson's concept of free enterprise. But he gives no support to any method for making this program reach even lower income groups than it now can serve.

Dr. Anderson throws off as an idle promise the tax gains anticipated by communities in the renewal process. He concentrates on the interim tax losses. You should have confidence that your projections of taxes, when Marina Vista is completed, even with so much land devoted to public plazas, parks, and open spaces, will triple your past tax revenues. In San Francisco's first three projects, with considerable land not yet improved, the assessments are already 40 percent above those of the preredevelopment period. Assuming a constancy of tax rates we can look forward to a flow into our city treasury each year of 10 to 13 times the original tax payments.

Dr. Anderson dwells upon land lying idle. Is there any other way of moving from a condition of blight to a condition of reuse without an interim period of idleness? Could Ascension Arms or the Bank of America building be started here today without the clearance first of their sites? More practically, would the sponsors have come into this area without the assurance that all blight would be removed and without the promise of other developments to help create a new and attractive neighborhood?

Perhaps the most critical question of all concerning urban renewal is this: Why do the years of idleness of land, its misuse and underuse—such as was the case in the Marina Vista area prior to redevelopment—fail to disturb critics like Dr. Anderson into producing an equally effective solution?

I respect but disagree with those who believe that Government is necessarily bad, that public capital should not be used to create foundations for private enterprise. Such critics will not learn the lessons of history and no amount of evidence will dissuade them from the comfort of their beliefs.

I do take issue with those vested property interests who want to hold on to what they have, even though the rest of the community

suffers. They've got theirs. I also take issue with those vested interests who want their own discipline to be the sole determinant of the fate of communities. Some, but not all, of the social planners and sociologists have come into their own with what I would describe as their "love that slum" attitude.

Nor can we be indifferent to the motivations of political strategists who see in the slum a political block with which to swing the vote in a community.

Finally, we are mindful of budgeteers who want to make the local community, already struggling under the antiquated, ad valorem property tax and frustrated with problems that are national, not local, in origin, pay more and more of the bill for regenerating land to new uses within the central city.

The urban renewal program is by no means perfect. It needs improvement. It needs more realistic recognition by the Federal Government of what cities are contributing to the process. It needs far less talk and far more legislation in financing mechanisms for the creation of low- to moderate-priced housing. It needs far better coordination than it is getting with various Federal aids and which hopefully may be possible under the President's proposal for a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The people of Vallejo should be proud of what they are doing with Marina Vista. But do not think it just a matter of local accomplishment—somewhat vaguely threaded to a Federal program. Vallejo's experience, admittedly not unique and exclusive, but of a quality and spirit that is worthy of emulation elsewhere, should be told and retold that the voices of gloom and doom will be silenced, and the voices of those who really want communities to go forward with the better life will speak up with suggestions for technical and financial advances in city, State, and Federal legislation.

There is a bigger battle being joined today as you will see in your State legislature and in the Congress, between those committed to defeating and those who want to improve the renewal process. Those who have brought Marina Vista to its present stage of accomplishment and promise need to make their voices heard.

Tell the country about Marina Vista.

Soybean Oil in Our Foods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, at a time when many sectors of our agricultural economy are afflicted by problems of oversupply and rising costs, soybeans continue to be a prime dollar earner for the United States in world markets, and sell considerably above the domestic support price here at home. This versatile commodity has opened many new markets, and has come to be used in numerous manufactured foods. Many Senators will recall that it was only in 1949 that the discriminatory tax on oleomargarine was repealed, and thus soybean production came into its own as a mainstay in American diets.

There has come to my attention an excellent article on soybean oil and the extent to which it is used in margarine, shortening, and salad and cooking oils, as well as other items, and its wholesomeness as an edible oil. This article entitled "Soybean Oil in Our Foods," appeared in the Illinois Medical Journal for December 1964. I believe it will be of interest to Senators and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUNDATION REPORT: A NEW SOURCE OF EDIBLE FATS

The soybean which for many ages has been a staff of life in the Orient, has become in the 20th century the chief source of visible food fats in the United States (table 1). The annual production of soybean oil is now over 5,000 million pounds and is greater than the combined output of all other edible vegetable oils as well as the combined annual production of all edible animal fats (table 1). Soybean oil now constitutes 72 percent of the oil consumed in margarine, 48 percent of the oil consumed in shortening, and 60 percent of the oil consumed in salad and cooking oils.[1] Since soybean oil is now an important constitutent of many foods as well as the major source of polyunsaturated fatty acids,[2] it seems desirable to discuss briefly the methods by which it is produced, its chemical composition, and its uses in foods.

TABLE 1.—*U.S. production of edible fats and oils and their consumption in foods*

[In millions of pounds]

	Production, 1960	Consumption in foods, 1962 [1]
Vegetable oils:		
Soybean oil	[2] 5,950	3,878
Cottonseed oil	1,875	1,299
Corn oil	340	318
Peanut oil	[2] 95	62
Safflower oil		35
Olive oil	5	58
Coconut oil	637	227
Meat fats:		
Lard	2,600	1,977
Tallow	340	407
Butter	1,500	1,382

[1] Includes vegetable oils used in manufacture of shortening and salad and cooking oils for export and oversea donation, estimated at approximately 700,000,000 pounds.
[2] Includes oil equivalent of exports.
Institute of Shortening and Edible Oils, Inc.: "Food Fats and Oils," 1963; Soybean Council of America, Inc.: Soybean Oil for Better Living," 1961.

TABLE 2.—*Fatty acid composition of soybean oil and other major food fats and oils*

[Percent of total fatty acids]

	Saturated fatty acids	Unsaturated fatty acids		
		Oleic	Linoleic	Linolenic
Soybean oil	15	24	55.0	7.0
Cottonseed oil	26	22	52.0	Trace
Corn oil	14	31	55.0	Trace
Peanut oil	21	49	30.0	Trace
Olive oil	15	73	12.0	Trace
Safflower oil	10	14	75.0	Trace
Butter	63–70	28–31	1.0– 2.5	0.2–0.4
Lard	45	46	9	
Beef tallow	46	50	4	

THE PRODUCTION OF EDIBLE SOYBEAN OIL

Crude soybean oil as expressed or extracted with solvent from the soybean is brownish yellow in color and has a characteristic flavor. This crude oil is first treated with water. Phosphatides, carbohydrates, proteins, and other mucilaginous materials are hydrated, become insoluble in oil, and precipitate out as a wet "gum." Dehydrating the wet gum under vacuum yields a viscous liquid which is sold commercially as soybean lecithin. The "degummed" oil is then treated with an aqueous alkaline solution to remove free fatty acids as soaps. At the same time, some pigments are removed. This refined oil is further decolorized by treating with activated clay. Finally, the oil is deodorized by vacuum steam distillation to produce a bland edible soybean oil.

Most of the soybean oil used in margarine and shortening is partially hydrogenated. The refined soybean oil is treated with hydrogen under pressure in the presence of a nickel catalyst to partially saturate its double bonds with hydrogen. This treatment yields a product which is solid at room temperature and has improved flavor stability.

Recently, a new salad and cooking oil made from soybean oil has been marketed. This product is produced by partially hydrogenating soybean oil to improve the flavor stability. Hydrogenation increases to some extent the saturated triglycerides in the oil. These triglycerides are removed by a process known as winterization. In winterization the oil is kept at 42° F. for several days until the more saturated triglycerides are crystallized. The precipitates are then removed by filtration. The partially hydrogenated and winterized soybean oil is therefore a liquid oil at room temperature with a high degree of unsaturation and good flavor stability.

TABLE 3.—*Chemical composition of commercial soybean lecithin*

Soybean oil	percent	35.
Lecithin	do	19.7
Cephalin	do	19.7
Inositol phosphatides	do	21.0
Carbohydrates (sterol glucoside)	do	3.6
Moisture and others	do	1.0
Vitamins:		
Inositol	milligrams per gram	30.0
Choline	do	29.3
Tocopherol	do	1.3
Biotin	micrograms per gram	.42
Folic acid	do	.60
Thiamin	do	.115
Riboflavin	do	.33
Pantothenic acid	do	5.59
Pyridoxine	do	.29
Niacin	do	.12

COMPOSITION OF SOYBEAN OIL

The major component of soybean oil is triglyceride which constitutes approximately 99 percent of the edible oil. The triglycerides are composed of 95 percent fatty acids and 5 percent glycerol. The fatty acids in turn, contain approximately 7 percent linolenic acid, 55 percent linoleic acid, 24 percent oleic acid, and 15 percent stearic acid. A representative analysis of the fatty acids in soybean oil and a comparison with other major food fats and oils is shown in table 2.

Two minor components of refined soybean oil which are of biological interest are sterols and tocopherols. Edible soybean oil contains 0.15 to 0.38 percent of sterols, 10 to 15 percent of which are present as esters with fatty acids. The sterols in soybean oil are composed of sitosterols, stigmasterol, and dihydrositosterol. Edible soybean oil contains about 0.15 percent of tocopherols[3] which are a mixture of ϕ, γ, and ζ isomers.

The phosphatides which are removed from soybean oil during refining are commercially marketed as soybean lecithin, a brown viscous liquid, composed of soybean oil, lecithin, cephalin, inositol phosphatides, and a number of vitamins. (Table 3.) A more palatable form of soybean lecithin is produced as pale yellow granules by precipitating the phosphatides from soybean lecithin with acetone. The fatty acids in soybean phosphatides are similar to those in tri-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

glycerides except that there is about 10 percent more palmitic acid and a reduced amount of oleic acid in the phosphatides.

FLAVOR STABILITY OF SOYBEAN OIL

During storage all fats and oils gradually react with oxygen to form hydroperoxides. When the peroxide value of fats and oils reaches about 20 meq./kg. or higher, they become rancid. Soybean oil also develops a characteristic beany and grassy flavor known as "reversion" when the peroxide value of the oil is still as low as a few meq./kg. Although soybean oil as now produced is the major food fat in the United States, research workers believe that further improvement in its flavor stability will lead to new markets. To solve this flavor problem, research is being conducted by government, university and industry scientists. At Rutgers University an attempt is being made to chemically identify the compounds which are responsible for the "reversion" factor. It is believed that mechanisms can be postulated once the chemical nature of the reversion compounds are known, and that the problem of reversion can be better solved if the mechanism is completely understood. At the Northern Regional Research Laboratory of the USDA methods are being investigated to lower the content of linolenic acid without substantial decrease of the essential linoleic acid.

USES OF SOYBEAN OIL

Soybean oil is used as a salad oil, in mayonnaise, salad dressings and canned soups and fishes. The partially hydrogenated soybean oil is used in margarine, shortening, and confectionery and as a cooking oil. The continued effort of the industry to improve the quality of soybean oil through better processing technology has resulted today in an oil which may be used for most general food purposes.

Until the recent emphasis on the nutritional value of polyunsaturated fatty acids, edible soybean oil was usually hydrogenated from an original iodine value of about 130 to about 75 for shortening and to about 80 for margarine. The conventional regular process of manufacture is now being replaced by a new special process in which a portion of the oil is only slightly hydrogenated to an iodine value of, for example, 113. This slightly hydrogenated oil is then blended with a highly hydrogenated oil to produce the required flavor stability and consistency. Margarine and shortening manufactured in this manner contribute more polyunsaturated fatty acid to the diet than those manufactured by the conventional method (table 4). Statements on these special products have recently been published by the American Medical Association.[4 5]

TABLE 4.—*Fatty acid composition (percent) of commercial household shortenings and margarines*

	Saturated fatty acids	Unsaturated fatty acids		
		Monoenoic	Dienoic	Trienoic
TYPE SHORTENING				
All vegetable fat, regular	19–33	53–75	6.0–14.0	0–1.0
All vegetable fat, special	22–32	44–55	22.0–33.0	0–2.5
Meat fat and vegetable fat	30–50	37–57	6.0–13.0	0–0.6
All meat fat	34–45	44–53	7.0–13.0	0–1.0
TYPE MARGARINE				
Regular	16–25	42–63	10.0–20.0	0–0.5
Special	15–30	30–57	22.0–40.0	0–0.5
Butterfat	63–70	28–31	1.0–2.5	0.2–0.5

IMPORTANCE OF SOYBEAN OIL

Recent medical advances indicate a potentially beneficial dietary effect of polyunsaturated fatty acids upon nutrition and disease. Kinsell, et al.,[6] and many others have demonstrated that vegetable oils in the diet can be used to lower the serum cholesterol level. The important work of Arild Hensen and associates on the relation of linoleic acid to infant feeding is summarized in Acta Pediatria.[7] Recently, labeled arachidonic acids were fed to mice and the radioactive elements were located in the hormone prostaglandin which is known to have the function of lowering blood pressure.[8]

As success with vegetable oil-containing diets, prescribed currently for small groups, is projected upon a large population, the problem of the supply of vegetable oils arises. As shown in table 1, soybean, cottonseed, and corn oil make up 98 percent of the highly polyunsaturated vegetable oils consumed in the United States. Since cottonseed oil is the byproduct of cotton and corn oil the byproduct of cornstarch, it is not likely that the production of these can be greatly increased even if there is a demand. Safflower oil, though it contains an unusually high percentage of linoleic acid, comprises less than 1 percent of the total fats and oils consumed in this country. This leaves soybean oil as the only oil in relatively abundant supply which contains more than 50 percent of linoleic acid. Because soybean oil is a wholesome oil and because its production can be easily, economically, and quickly expanded, it seems desirable to recommend the consideration of its use in experimental diets for biological studies. Furthermore, it seems desirable to recommend the encouragement of technical research for the improvement of the flavor stability of soybean oil with optimum nutrient retention.

---

[1] McKinney, L. L.: Soybean Research at the Northern Regional Research Laboratory—1964. Soybean Digest 24:34 (Sept.) 1964.

[2] Brown, Helen B. and Page, I. H., World Supply of Unsaturated Oils. The Lancet (Jan. 17) 1959, p. 152–153.

[3] Thompson, C. R. and Steenbach, H., Arch. Biochem. and Biophys., 4, 15–22 (1944).

[4] Council Statement: Composition of Certain Margarines. J.A.M.A. 179: 719 (Mar. 3) 1962.

[5] Council Statement: Special Short comings. J.A.M.A. 187: 766 (Mar. 7) 1964.

[6] Kinsell, L. W., et al.; Dietary Modification of Serum Cholesterol and Phospholipid Levels. J. Clin. Endocr. 12:909 (July) 1952.

[7] Hansen, Arild E., Stewart, Robert A., Hughes, G., and Söderhjelm, Lars.: The Relation of Linoleic Acid to Infant Feeding. Acta Pediatrica. 51; (supp. 137) 1–42, 1962.

[8] Boldingh, J.: Reported at the First World Fat Congress of the International Society of Fat Research. Oct. 12–18, 1964, Hamburg, Germany.

Widow Asks for Pilot Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, last May a passenger, self-insured from an automatic insurance machine for over $100,000, entered the cockpit of a Pacific Air Lines plane, shot the pilot and copilot, causing the aircraft to crash with a loss of 44 lives.

This tragic, needless waste of human lives must not again be duplicated. The Civil Aeronautics Board has ruled that five major crashes have been the result of sabotage after the purchase of large amounts of insurance on the lives of certain passengers.

The grief experienced by the families of the 44 people killed in the Pacific Air Lines crash is difficult to comprehend, but the only solace these survivors may have is the knowledge that some good may yet come from this tragedy. Such is the thinking of Mrs. Ray E. Andress, widow of the pilot who was murdered. Mrs. Andress has written a letter to the editor of the Air Line Pilot wherein she expresses her hope that legislation such as I have introduced outlawing all short-term flight insurance and establishing additional safety precautions on planes may be enacted, and less emphasis placed on entertainment of passengers.

For Mrs. Andress and the hundreds of others who have lost members of their family in needless airline accidents, we can only hope that some benefit may result by taking positive action to avoid future similar tragedies. I urge my colleagues to read her letter which follows:

WIDOW ASKS FOR PILOT SAFETY

As stated in your magazine, you are in real need of letters to the editor. Are you desperate enough to accept mine? I am not a pilot but the widow of one.

I'm writing to all airline pilots of all airlines. Six months have passed since the murder of my husband at the controls of his Pacific Air Lines flight No. 773 en route from Reno, Nev., to San Francisco, Calif. Two bills have been introduced to Congress in recent months to help protect you. They will be coming up for congressional hearings sometime in early 1965.

I'm tired of pushing passenger comfort. They have it, what with stereo, television, full-length movies, cocktails, etc. They only lack the follies from Las Vegas. I want pilot safety from your comfortable passengers.

Pacific Air Lines is working hard for passage of these two bills. They are not alone; are they?

MRS. RAY E. ANDRESS.

(No, they are not alone. ALPA was instrumental in having these bills introduced last year and will have them reintroduced again this year. The association is sparing no effort in working for their passage.—The Editors.)

Solid Support Needed Now for Large Solid Rocket Engine Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, many of us were disturbed when the fiscal year 1966 budget request from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration came to Congress without a request for funds for the large solid rocket engine program, and when the Air Force program in the same fields was drastically curtailed.

I cannot help but wonder at the wisdom of cutting these funds from the budget at this time. The solid-fueled rocket program is extremely vital to our Nation's position in the exploration and conquest of outer space, in both defense

and nondefense fields. To cut the funds now, after years of research and testing, would seem to me to be false economy. Industry already has its solid-fueled rocket research teams in its plants, and cutbacks would mean disbanding this able crew of scientists, and a possible setback in the future of our entire space program.

If the solid fuels had proved a dismal failure, there might be some justification for a curtailment of funds. But the program thus far has been as successful as any undertaken by the space agency or the Defense Department.

Just last Saturday the success of the work already accomplished was graphically illustrated at Brunswick, Ga., where the most powerful rocket motor ever built was fired successfully. This was the firing of a rocket built by the Thiokol Chemical Corp. It generated more than 3 million pounds of thrust, and, I hope, also generated some solid-fuel interest in the higher echelons of the Defense Department and the Bureau of the Budget.

William Hines, the able Evening Star staff writer, covered the firing of the rocket; and his account appeared in the February 28, 1965, issue of the Star. In addition, the March issue of Fortune magazine also devoted space to the solid fuel missile program.

Both articles deserve wide dissemination. I especially hope those high in the Johnson administration who are concerned with these matters will take time to read the articles. I ask permission to have both of them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 28, 1965]

SOLID-FUEL ROCKET PROGRAM REVIVED BY SUCCESSFUL TEST

(By William Hines)

BRUNSWICK, GA.—The most powerful rocket motor ever built was fired successfully near here shortly after noon yesterday.

Tethered nose down in a concrete-lined pit 120 feet deep, the huge experimental rocket generated more than 3 million pounds of thrust for just over a minute. It sent a plume of white flame and gray smoke high into the sky and emitted a low-register roar that could be heard and felt for miles across the Georgia coastal marshes.

The successful shot breathed new life into a program that had seemed destined for certain death. A $20 million fund for development of very large solid-fuel rockets was trimmed from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's fiscal 1966 money request in the scramble to keep the overall Federal budget under $100 billion.

AN "UNMITIGATED SUCCESS"

Indications from administration and congressional officials on the scene here yesterday were that money will be added to the NASA budget to keep solid rocket development on the track. This had been in wind before yesterday's firing but was made more likely by the outcome here.

A. O. Tischler, propulsion chief for the space agency, said shortly after the firing that it was "an unmitigated, unqualified, unequivocal, unadulterated success."

The rocket was built by the Thiokol Chemical Corp. at a $12 million plant south of here, midway between Savannah and Jacksonville. Thiokol and the Aerojet-General Corp. at a plant southwest of Miami have development contracts leading to production of solid fuel rockets 260 inches—about 22 feet—in diameter.

Yesterday's rocket was a "156-incher." It was 13 feet in diameter and 100 feet, 6 inches long. It weighed 455 tons, 400 tons of which was a single "grain" of propellant made of synthetic rubber, ammonium perchlorate and powdered aluminum.

While other 156-inch rockets have been fired before, they have never approached this one in either overall size or thrust level. Three million pounds of thrust—equivalent to the thrust of 200,000 large automobiles—is about twice the output of the big Saturn I superbooster which has flown successfully eight times.

The rocket fired here was not designed as a flight article. Its purpose was to show that extremely large rocket motors can be built and fired. If 156-inch rockets are ever used in space work, their most likely employment will be in later versions of the Air Force's Titan III.

The present Titan III, which will make its first flight in May, consists of an improved Titan II with two 120-inch diameter solid rockets strapped to the sides. The Air Force is already planning a version with 156-inchers, which would increase Titan III's weight lifting capabilities by 30 to 50 percent.

NO PLAN FOR 156-INCHERS

NASA, which recently took over direction of the large solid booster program from the Air Force, has no plans for 156-inchers. Its use of the 260, when and if developed, is also indefinite, but among uses suggested for the larger solid rocket are:

1. Clustered, as a booster stage for extremely large payloads (1 million pounds or more in earth orbit) such as would be necessary in manned flights to the planet Mars.

2. Singly, as a replacement for the first stage of the Saturn 1–V superrocket now nearing the first flight stage of its development.

LIQUID FUEL FAVORED

Large solid rockets, to date, have been on short rations at NASA, owing to a prevalence in the agency of influential thinking favoring liquid fuel boosters of the Saturn type. A struggle has been going on in the agency over solids versus liquids since 1961, when the late President Kennedy ordered "parallel paths" to be followed until a judgment could be made on their relative merits.

Since then, several billion dollars have been earmarked for large liquid rockets up to the Saturn V class, while large solids probably have received less than $100 million.

Elimination of 260-inch rocket money from the 1966 budget in January seemed to be the end of the line for large solids. However, strong pressures have been applied at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue to restore these funds as well as money for a large liquid engine called M–1 and a nuclear power plant called SNAP–8.

[From Fortune magazine, March 1965]

SOLID GROUNDWORK FOR SOLID ROCKETS

There is something fundamental about a solid-fuel rocket. In a time when the world, the aerospace world, especially, has become almost impossibly wound up in the coiling complexities of wires, transistors, pipes, and pumps, a solid rocket stands out as simple and monolithic as its name implies. The basic design is as old as the Chinese, a tube poured full of a highly combustible material and capped with a nozzle. But today's solid rocket is definitely a 20th-century product; modern propellants are cunning and fierce compounds that strain the polymer chemist's newfound art; case and nozzle fabrication alone have spawned whole new technologies in metal forming, plastics, and spun glass. Research, development, and fabrication of these descendants of Chinese fireworks are carried on in facilities worth about $300 million at some of the Nation's most technically advanced firms, notably Atlantic Research, Hercules Powder, Lockheed Propulsion, Rocketdyne, Thiokol Chemical, United Technology, and Aerojet-General.

The simplicity, and hence the implied reliability and cheapness, is the solids' selling point. Yet the pioneers in space rocketry—the Russian Konstantin Tsiolkovsky, the American Robert Goddard, the German Hermann Oberth, and Wernher von Braun—devoted most of their attention to liquid fuels, because they are more energetic and more easily controllable. The German V–2 was a liquid, and so are the Atlas, the Titan, and the family of Saturn space boosters. But military men have never been happy with liquid rockets. The success of small, solid artillery rockets during World War II, together with such promising developments as jet-assisted takeoff rockets for airplanes, led military planners to embark on the Minuteman and Polaris solid-fuel strategic-missile programs.

Emboldened by the unprecedented speed of development and reliability of these two missiles, the solid-fuel manufacturers in the late fifties began beating the drum for a solid booster for space use. They asserted that a very large solid could beat its liquid counterpart to the hardware stage, do it for a fraction of the cost, and end up as a far handier, more reliable product. Furthermore, they argued, their solids could be tailor made for any size payload, simply by stacking cylinders of solid fuel one atop the other or bundling them side by side.

So sold were the companies on their own arguments that Aerojet, Thiokol, United Technology, and Lockheed have gambled millions of dollars on huge mixing and testing facilities suitable only for very large space boosters. This has been done despite a decided coolness toward solids on the part of NASA's big-booster planners, led by Wernher von Braun. United Technology captured an Air Force contract to furnish 120-inch solids to augment the thrust of Titans. Austerely funded feasibility contracts have been issued to Thiokol, Aerojet, and Lockheed to build large test motors. But there has been no official mission defined for the large solid boosters and no assurance that their further development will be funded.

Nevertheless, at a time when inflated claims have been the aerospace industry's most abundant product, the solid manufacturers' promises have been reaching solid fulfillment. Working within a total budget only a fraction of the liquid program's, three manufacturers have test fired or have readied for firing several 156- and 260-inch-diameter solid motors with twice the thrust of the largest liquids built to date.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 21, the Lithuanian-American citizens of Lake County assembled at Gary, Ind., to commemorate the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. The following resolution was adopted unanimously.

The Lithuanian-Americans of Gary, along with all true Lithuanians throughout the country and world, last week held

ceremonies commemorating their 47th anniversary of independence.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION BY LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN CITIZENS OF LAKE COUNTY, IND.

Whereas 1965 marks 25 years since the Soviet tanks treacherously invaded peace-loving Lithuania and forcefully annexed the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

Whereas during this past quarter of a century the Soviets strived to obtain recognition by the free world of their forceful seizure of these Baltic States; and

Whereas thousands of natives, from these States were deported to Siberia, and many never to return: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby reaffirm our efforts to keep the cause of freedom and independence of Lithuania alive in the minds of the U.S. Government, and the free press; and

Resolved, That we request President Lyndon B. Johnson to instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, to bring up the case of Lithuania and other Baltic States, of the illegal Soviet forceful occupation and subjugation of these people; and

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, and copies to the Secretary of State, the Senators and Representatives of the State of Indiana, and to the press.

ALBERT G. VINICK,
Chairman.
PETER INDREIKA,
Secretary.

Never on Sunday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when my wife read about a proposal to hold national elections on the first Sunday in November, she was greatly distressed, and asked me to bring to the attention of the Senate the following passages from the Bible, which bear on the Christian doctrine that the Sabbath is the Lord's Day, to be kept holy, and a day of rest:

Exodus 16: 23; 20: 8; 23: 12; 31: 13-14-16; 34: 21; 35: 2. Leviticus 25: 3; 16: 31; 23: 3, 32. Numbers 15: 32; Deuteronomy 5: 12. Nehemiah 10: 31; 13: 15. Isaiah, chapter 56. Jeremiah 17: 21; Ezekiel 20: 12.

New Testament: Luke 6: 5; 13: 14. Matthew, chapter 12. Mark 2: 23; 3. John 7: 23. Acts 20: 7. I Corinthians 16: 2. Revelation 1: 10.

I assured my wife that no such bill would be passed by this Congress any time soon, and said I thought our Nation would have to go much farther down the road to materialism before any Congress would enact such a law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Never on Sunday," from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of February 26.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Feb. 26, 1965]

NEVER ON SUNDAY

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN has introduced in Congress a bill to provide for the holding of national elections on the first Sunday in November.

It'll never pass. Too many people will oppose it on religious grounds.

Mr. DIRKSEN's thought is that the citizens, in general, would have more time to vote if elections were not held on working days, and he thinks there would be a great increase in the number of voters if the balloting were on Sunday.

In presenting his bill, the Illinois Senator gave some facts, probably unknown to many people, as to why elections are now held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

In 1792, Congress passed a law fixing the first Wednesday in December as the day for the electors to meet to cast their votes for President and Vice President. The law also provided that the electors should be "appointed" in each State "within 34 days preceding the first Wednesday in December."

In those days, the legislatures of most of the States chose the electors. Later, when electors were elected by the people, shenanigans occurred because of the varying election dates in the States. Some people voted in one State and then crossed the line into another State to vote some days later. Also, the results in one State were used to influence voters in others.

So to prevent these abuses, in 1845 an act was approved providing that the electors should be chosen in all States on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

Senator DIRKSEN explains that choice:

The act of 1792 still required the electors to meet on the first Wednesday in December, and in fixing a uniform day Congress wished to make the time as close as possible to 30 days before that date. Public sentiment was opposed to holding elections on Sunday or traveling to the polls on that day. Therefore, it was desirable to have one day intervene between Sunday and election day because many voters lived far from the polls, and in those days it was often necessary to start out the preceding day.

Since many voters would object to traveling on Sunday, Monday was excluded. The first Tuesday was excluded because it might fall on the first of the month and inconvenience businessmen. The second Tuesday might fall on the 14th, which would leave only 22 days between election day and the meeting of the presidential electors. It was discovered that the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November * * * would always place the election day not later than November 8 and always about 30 days before the meeting of the electors.

Although the original reason for picking the first Tuesday after the first Monday is no longer valid, the date probably will remain unchanged for at least a while longer. If it is changed, it will hardly be to a Sunday.

Small Business Growth in Tennessee Highest in Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a news article in the Marshall Gazette of Lewisburg, Tenn., reports that small business firms in the State of Tennessee have increased 19 percent over the last decade and this growth trend is continuing.

This article also notes that a substantial contribution to expanded activities of the small business community is being made by the assistance programs established by the Congress for this important segment of our economy.

Today there exists more than 4½ million small business enterprises in the United States and the Congress has repeatedly declared, as a national policy, that the promotion of American small business is essential to preserving our free enterprise system.

Evidence of an upward trend in the establishment of new business firms, such as that in Tennessee, is therefore decidely good news.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article from the Marshall Gazette in the Apepndix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

OUTLOOK FOR SMALL BUSINESSES SAID TO BE BRIGHT IN 1965

Small Tennessee firms can look forward to continued business growth and expansion during 1965, Curry K. White, branch manager of the Small Business Administration, predicted today.

In a forecast for the new year, Mr. White said that at the present rate of growth Tennessee's small firms will increase about 1,300 a year for the next decade. "During the past 10 years," he said, "small businesses increased 19 percent, bringing the State's total to the current 69,300 small firms."

Summarizing SBA activities in the State, this branch manager reported that small businesses received about $10.7 million in prime military and civilian contracts during the 3-month period ended September 30.

These contracts, he said, resulted from SBA's cooperative set-aside program under which proposed Government purchases are reserved for competitive bidding by small businesses. Firms that performed these contracts provided such items as metals, plastics, wood products, and food.

The branch manager also reported that SBA approved almost $2.2 million in business loans to small Tennessee firms during July, August, and September, an increase of more than $1 million over the same period in 1963. "These loans went to small businesses to help finance expansion, new facilities, and equipment, and for working capital," he said. Since the agency was created in 1953, Tennessee small businessmen have received about $43.7 million in SBA business loans.

The branch manager pointed out that SBA has licensed four small business investment companies and surplus of almost $8.1 million for investment with small firms. These SBIC's are privately owned companies that provide equity capital and long-term loans to promising small businesses.

In addition, he said the SBA makes loans to local development companies to assist local small businesses. The 11 loans made in Tennessee resulted in creating 321 new jobs. The agency is working with business and civic leaders to extend the program to other communities throughout the State.

"Under this program," he explained, "the SBA, banks and locally organized development companies jointly finance community efforts to establish new small businesses and to expand existing little firms."

He reported that through September, communities in 45 States were using SBA's development company loan program, and that since the first loan was approved in 1959,

the agency has made 500 local development company loans totaling more than $71.5 million. The cooperative projects have created an estimated 27,000 new jobs.

In addition to financial and procurement assistance. SBA has provided management and technical help to many Tennessee small firms.

Approximately 10 retired business executives have volunteered for SBA's new SCORE program (Service Corps of Retired Executives), the branch manager said. Under the SCORE program, these retired executives counsel small firms on financial and management problems upon request.

SBA also cosponsors administrative management courses with educational institutions to provide management training for owners and managers of Tennessee small businesses. These courses, usually held one night a week for about 8 weeks, are taught by authorities in the management field. SBA has cosponsored 21 courses attended by 685 small, firm owners and managers.

The Tennessee branch office of the Small Business Administration is located in the Security Federal Savings and Loan Building, 500 Union Street, Nashville, Tenn. They also have a duty station located at 301 West Cumberland Avenue, Knoxville, Tenn.

The 1965 Fundraising Appeal by the National Council of Christ in the U.S.A., the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the United Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement which I recently prepared, upon request of the sponsoring organizations, in support of the spring fundraising program to be undertaken by America's three great religious faiths—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—through which funds are hoped to be raised to continue programs of assistance to the needy of other lands. These programs are emphasizing Sunday, March 28, as a date on which millions of Americans can make special contributions in response to the appeals which these organizations are making for support of religious voluntary assistance programs for the world's homeless, hungry, and destitute people.

The three appeals are: Catholic—"The Bishops' Relief Fund" appeal, March 21–28 in Catholic churches; Protestant—"One Great Hour of Sharing," with special offerings March 21–28 in the churches of participating denominations; Jewish—"United Jewish Appeal," a continuing effort with special emphasis at this season.

I am pleased to have had the opportunity to add my good wishes for success in the fundraising efforts and for continued effectiveness in the operations of these oversea relief programs, and I wish to insert, at this point, my statement of support of this fund drive.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT C. BYRD, U.S. SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA IN SUPPORT OF 1965 FUNDRAISING APPEAL BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A., THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE, AND THE UNITED JEWISH APPEAL

To all Americans, the opportunity to wish "Godspeed" to the joint appeal issued by the National Council of Christ in the U.S.A., the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the United Jewish Appeal is a welcome one for me.

This combining of their efforts for funds by America's great religious faiths—to carry on their programs of assistance to the needy of many lands—is within itself an inspiring action. To so attack a common enemy—the misery of a major portion of the world's population, stemming from war, disaster, destitution—is to offer testimony to the will to do service for others, a basic tenet of all three faiths.

We in the United States know that the lion's share of all oversea relief efforts stems from our voluntary organizations. But the compassionate and selfless programs which have been instituted by these organizations must be sustained by practical means. To fill the deep needs of the world's "have-not's"—for medical care, for food, for adequate shelter and clothing, and to obviate the terrible twisting of human minds from hostile and debilitating living conditions, all a daily part of millions of lives in Africa, Asia, and Latin America—costs many hundreds of thousands of dollars. It requires hundreds of millions of tons of food, medicine, clothing, and the varied implements of practical care.

Eradication of the world's ills does not seem likely in the early future, but one of the instruments at hand—the oversea relief programs sponsored by America's three major religious faiths—needs to be kept strong.

To share what we can abundantly afford, in answer to this appeal, is to invest in the betterment of our world, to make a contribution toward the advancement of mankind, and to take another step toward lasting peace.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States holds a Voice of Democracy scriptwriting contest. Thomas B. Locke, of Bridgeport, is Connecticut's winner, and he will participate in the national competition.

Under unanimous consent, I place his winning speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

It is certainly wonderful to be an American, to live in freedom, go to school, yell at the umpire, go to a movie, get married, raise a family, vote. Certainly, all of us as Americans know the rewards of citizenship in our great country, but all too few of us realize that citizenship is a two-way street. Besides the benefits that we enjoy every day, citizenship carries with it duties, duties we must recognize and perform.

A chain is as strong as its weakest link and a country only as great as its people. As citizens, we must be ever concerned about the welfare of our community, State, and Nation. We must take an active part in community affairs and read more of the newspaper than just the sport page, society page, and the comics. We must be law-abiding, taxpaying, and civic-minded people, who treasure our freedom and guard it zealously. We must be informed voters so that we select the proper leaders. We must be as watchful of our country as we are of our children, interested in its welfare and alert to anything that endangers it.

Good citizenship just doesn't exist of itself. It is like a garden. If it is planned, planted with care, periodically weeded and watered, and otherwise tended to, the end result is gratifying indeed. But a garden left without care for an extended period of time, becomes an eyesore. Our citizenship should be nurtured by studying our glorious history and remembering the deeds of our illustrious ancestors. We should pause periodically in our fast-paced lives and reflect on the beauty of our Nation all around us and remember those who made the supreme sacrifice that we might enjoy it.

Our country is so bountiful and there is so much available to us to make life pleasant that we tend to forget or ignore the "challenge" of citizenship. It is easy to be a good citizen while eating a hot dog at a ball game. It is easy to be a good citizen while watching TV in the comfort of our home. But if we do not work at being good citizens, how will our citizenship fare when put to a real test?

We were shocked during the Korean conflict by the large number of our servicemen who turned their backs on their country, and went over to the side of the enemy. How could such a thing happen? In our comfort and complacency, we couldn't understand it. But this was a time when citizenship was put to the acid test. It was a time when the roots of good citizenship either held a man strong in devotion to his country, or were torn up by the tremendous pressures brought to bear by the enemy.

Robert Browning, in his poem, "Rabbi Ben Ezra," discussed the potter's wheel. In Italy, the potters would take clay and make a rough form of a vase. They would then buff the clay on an abrasive wheel, grinding it smooth and shapely. Good clay could withstand severe buffing and beautiful and intricate vases were the result. The inferior clay could not sustain the buffing and would crack under pressure. America must be made of good clay if its freedom is to endure.

So let us not take our citizenship for granted, let us nourish it. Let us pledge anew our allegiance to the United States and the American way of life. Let us remember that our heritage is a result of the blood, sweat, and suffering of our heroic forebears, and let us pledge that we shall transmit this heritage to our descendants just as it was handed down to us, uncompromised and unblemished.

The Late Honorable James P. Kem

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House that the former Senator from Missouri, James P. Kem, has passed away. James Kem was a very distinguished citizen of Missouri, and many of us here knew him well. He was born in Macon, Mo., on April 2, 1890. He was graduated from the University of Missouri, and the Harvard Law School. He was a distinguished lawyer from Kansas City, and was president of the Lawyers Association of Kansas City.

Jim Kem was an avid student of the writings of our third President, Thomas Jefferson. He saw no contradiction in quoting Jefferson's teaching of "State's rights, economy, and simplicity in the operation of the Federal Government," which he did frequently to the proponents of the New Deal, Fair Deal theories of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. Jim Kem entered politics with a gusto when he became Jackson County, Mo., Republican in 1946 by fighting the Pendergast machine in Missouri and the theories of the New Deal. He served one term in the Senate, was unsuccessful for reelection in 1952, and then resumed the practice of law in Washington, D.C.

I wish to extend my deep sympathy to his family in behalf of myself and the Missouri delegation, and, I know, his many good friends. He was a distinguished American and a great Missourian.

The Death of Justice Felix Frankfurter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States have been saddened by the passing of Mr. Felix Frankfurter, retired Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and a man who has left an eternal mark on the legal and judicial history of this Nation.

Mr. Frankfurter enjoyed a career of nearly 20 years on the Supreme Court bench, beginning with his appointment in 1939 by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He brought to the Court his experience as a Harvard University law professor for 25 years, as well as a background as an attorney, scholar, presidential adviser, and Government administrator.

He has been recognized as one of the greatest scholars and teachers of law in Harvard University's long and distinguished history. Numbered among his former students are judges, former Cabinet members, and assistant prosecuting attorneys.

Mr. Frankfurter, as a friend and adviser to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was considered one of the architects of the New Deal, which helped steer the United States out of the disastrous depression of the early 1930's.

As a Supreme Court Justice, Mr. Frankfurter embodied a philosophy which has become known as judicial restraint. He firmly believed that a judge should look only at the validity of a law, and not its merits. He urged extreme caution in making decisions on the actions of the legislative and executive branches of the Government. He felt that the courts should move exceedingly slowly and deliberately in overturning actions of men and bodies elected by the people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mr. Frankfurter will stand in history as one of the truly great Justices of our Federal Supreme Court, ranking with such giants as John Marshall and Oliver Wendell Holmes. Let me close by citing the tribute paid him by his fellow Justices upon his retirement in 1963: "He has already made a contribution to our jurisprudence rarely equaled in the life of our Court."

Your Income Tax and Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in his column "In Washington," of February 26, 1965, Ralph de Toledano points out some fiscal facts which bear repetition. Under leave previously granted, I would like to include his remarks. The column follows:

IN WASHINGTON: YOUR INCOME TAX—AND GOVERNMENT SPENDING

(By Ralph de Toledano)

Like all Americans—both rich and poor—I have begun the heart-rending task of making out my income tax. I write this with tears in my eyes because I know the taxpayer can't win. Way back when, Rollin Kirby, cartoonist for the long-departed New York World, always depicted the American taxpayer as the man dressed in a barrel. And in those years, the Federal bite on income was far smaller than it is today.

From the vantage point of my own individual barrel—as I plod along minus coat, trousers, or shoes—I have been giving some thought to what happens to the money which you and I hand out to the Treasury. In this doleful exercise, I am aided by a book of sorrow called "Facts and Figures on Government Finance," which Prentice-Hall issues every year. The information in it comes from the Tax Foundation, Inc., a spoilsport organization which tries to keep its eye on the Yankee dollar as it moves from the taxpayer to the Treasury to Lord knows where.

This is a harder job than you would think. Even in this age of supersonic speed nothing moves as fast and as elusively as the long green amassed by your labor and mine. Even if its progress down the rathole were slower, most of us would miss it because we keep being diverted from the purpose at hand by the fancy talk of those fairytale writers, the Council of Economic Advisers—the men who presumably know what goes on in the great realm of economics.

Take, for example, the Federal budget. When it is published each year the average Joe—and let's both take a bow here—reads that it will be so many billions of dollars. This year there were great huzzas because President Johnson had kept the budget below $100 billion. In 1963, the last year for which we have full figures, we were also told that the budget had remained below the same figure. The fact is that the Treasury spent $118.8 billion, which to me is a fat difference. In the same year, the Government took in $114.6 billion. I wish I could handle my own budget that way, but to date I haven't found a landlord or a supermarket to go along with these advanced ideas in deficit spending.

Nowadays, however, many people are convinced that what the Government spends or how big the deficit grows is really not important. But what about social security? What the Government takes from you is supposed to go into a fund and what the Government pays out is supposed to come from that fund alone. The insurance companies make money and social security is supposed to be actuarially sound.

But what happened in 1963—and will happen even more dramatically as the years go by—is that the Federal old-age and other insurance programs took in $16.4 billion and paid out $18.3 billion. Which means that social security funds are drying up. The Government intends to increase your payments to that fund. But with an increasing percentage of the population moving into the retired ranks, it's a losing proposition. Either social security will go bankrupt or the Federal Government will have to make up deficits from your tax dollar.

If the tears aren't flowing too copiously, there is this to consider. Government spenders keep telling us that Government expenditures keep going up because the country is growing and with it the gross national product. But in 1929, the Federal Government was spending 2.5 percent of the GNP. Even in 1936, the year of the biggest outlays in relief and welfare spending, the Government was spending 10.3 percent of the GNP. In 1963, that figure was 19.7 percent of the GNP.

Or, if you wish, slice it this way. Again in that big-spending depression year of 1936, the per capita Federal tax bite was $30 a year. In 1963, it was $543—and the difference cannot be blamed on inflation.

By courtesy of the Tax Foundation and Prentice-Hall comes one other debunked explanation for what the Government takes. It is always said that though Federal taxes have increased, the real villain in upping the ante has been State and local government. Perhaps, by juggling the facts, you can make this charge stick. But right before me, I can read it plain:

In 1932, the Federal Government took 22.7 percent of every tax dollar with the balance going to State and local governments. By 1940, the Federal take had risen to 39.2 percent. And in 1963, it was 67.2. On the other hand, municipalities, which were getting 53.6 percent in 1932, had slipped down to 14.8 percent in 1963. (And then the educationists scold the cities for not putting more money into schools.)

And so to my income tax return.

Authorizing the Disposal of Zinc From the National Stockpile

SPEECH

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that

the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], who handled this matter in our subcommittee, worked very expeditiously. He was very fair. There were innumerable witnesses heard before our committee. Everyone was in complete agreement that this should be done and should be done now.

Then the full committee quickly, under the leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, moved ahead. We are trying to keep the pace, so that the other body can see what we have done and move as quickly as possible, so that these bills can be sent down to the White House, so that they may be signed into law.

Mr. PHILBIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Medicare and Eldercare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, medicare is a misnomer. Medicare is the first step down the road to socialized medicine. The first step down this road is to pay hospital bills. The next step will be to pay doctor bills, then coverage will be sought for all age groups.

On the other hand, eldercare will help the elderly with hospital bills and with doctor bills. At the same time, it will protect the general level of medical care from the hazards of socialized medicine.

In this connection, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to the excellent editorial in the Peoria Journal Star of February 18, 1965. The editorial follows:

MEDICARE AND ELDERCARE

Serious debate of medicare and several other bills dealing with the hospitalization and doctor bills of the elderly will begin shortly in Washington, and it seems obvious that some kind of law on the subject is going to be passed.

The Johnson administration is pledged to the King-Anderson bill, which has become known as medicare. And the American Medical Association has come up with the Hurlong-Tower bill, which has been labeled eldercare.

It is unfortunate that these tags, medicare and eldercare, have come into being because neither tells us the difference between these two proposals.

Medicare is a misnomer. The administration proposal deals basically with hospital and nursing home bills for people over 65 who are covered by social security. It does nothing about doctor bills.

There are other flaws in the medicare proposal and most of them have been exposed in the 2 years the subject has been debated. To us the most important of these is the manner in which it would be paid for—by boosting social security taxes.

The social security tax is completely unfair to low- and middle-income people, because they end up paying just as much as high-income earners. Although we have it deducted along with our income tax and file a report on it at the same time, it is not an income tax but rather a flat-rate tax which has nothing to do with the average person's ability to pay as the income tax does.

Eldercare has as yet not been subjected to much discussion, but we feel certain that it—like medicare—will turn out to be something less than it is cracked up to be. Yet we do like the general idea of the AMA plan, which seems to be predicated on the ability to pay and does offer more complete coverage than medicare.

Doctor bills as well as "bedcare"—that's really what "medicare" is—would be covered by "eldercare." And everybody would be eligible for coverage.

We anticipate that the big complaint against eldercare will be over its cost to those who participate. It will not be cheap—ranging from $11.50 a month for an elderly couple receiving the maximum social security check of $190 down to $4 a month for the single worker receiving the minimum social security check of $40.

These costs will seem high only to people who do not realize how costly hospitalization and medical insurance premiums really are for people over 65 today. They are not only much higher but they are rife with prohibitory features which make you ineligible if you have had a major illness before retirement.

The important point of both proposals, however, is the fact that they would help our elderly citizens a great deal and there can be no argument that they need help. Even the AMA—which has fought against anything which smacked of the Government inserting itself between the patient and the doctor when it comes to paying bills—has admitted this.

We have been in agreement with the AMA position on socialized medicine proposals over the years, because we know—and so does anybody who was ever in the military—that doctors who are on Government salary just don't perform like free-enterprising civilians. And we share the AMA's concern over medicare because we know it would be a foot in the door to eventual socialized medicine.

It follows as simply as night does day that any program which begins paying hospital bills for the elderly will be expanded to pay doctor bills and eventually extended to cover all people young and old.

That is the flaw in medicare. As we said we haven't heard enough debate about eldercare, but at this point it appears to be a proposal which would help the elderly and at the same time protect the general level of medical care in this country.

It would seem to us that the upcoming law will set the pattern for many years to come, and we can only hope that our representatives in Washington give it the full-scale discussion it deserves.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an essay entitled, "The Challenge of Citizenship," which was the winning speech of Mr. John P. Hancock, Jr., of Waverly, Union County, Ky., in the Voice of Democracy contest conducted annually in each State by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This is an excellent essay and I am sure it will be of interest to each Member of Congress.

The essay is as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

The road to freedom for humanity has been long, tortuous, difficult and bloody. Only a relatively small portion of our race has been able to travel it successfully. For the great mass of mankind the struggle for freedom has proven too difficult. The United States alone among nations has achieved the degree of freedom which we enjoy. It can be truly said then that at no other time in the history of man has man been as free as is the American citizen.

His citizenship opens up to him a great abundance of treasures desired by all the peoples of earth. But mere lipservice to democracies blessings pales to insignficance beside our duty to make the most of our better way of life. It is because of this that we as citizens must accept and fulfill a challenge. This challenge I speak of is the challenge of citizenship.

It is true that we cannot all be Washingtons, Lincolns and John Kennedys; they imparted a heritage to us. They came, left their mark and this country was not the same because these men had lived. How much of what they did and deeded to us was cherished and nurtured, by just that much this country gained.

However by fulfilling this challenge of citizenship we can be certain that the rights and privileges they gave so much for, will not perish. The future of our country and of the world depends on what we do with what others have left us.

In the true spirit of Americanism, we must rise to this mighty challenge with that same dauntless courage and grim determination that brought this Nation of ours into being and made America what she is today.

This challenge embodies a great many obligations. It means that we must apply the Golden Rule in our dealings with others.

It means acknowledging that an individual's religion is his own business and that all humans are equal under the law.

It means standing up for the American system even when it appears to work imperfectly or contrary to our first preference.

It means taking a personal interest in the neighborhood and community around us and now, as students taking an interest in our school—Literally "pitching in to advance the public good."

It means that honor and duty have meaning for us at a time when the crowd may covet something more measurable.

It means giving of ourselves to others in a world where the accent is on getting.

It means informing ourselves on political issues and candidates and working and voting for those we feel to be superior.

It means living the American creed with certain faith in a day when man's inhumanity to man will be ended and peace and brotherhood will endure.

In fulfilling this challenge we must reawaken to the menaces and dangers that lurk in our path, which means that we of today must again fight the battles for liberty just as our forebears did in former times. It is eternally true that the freedom we gain from citizenship is never permanently made secure but every generation must keep up the fight if it would enjoy its blessings. Only the cynic would doubt that the prize is worth the price.

Finally, it is a cliche that we live in a changing world. It is changing—perhaps too fast—and the burden of fast change will forever test the insides of a new generation of Americans. But this challenge of citizenship will remain to be fulfilled.

We must then love our country, revere its institutions, value its privileges, respect its name, rejoice in its proud history, in its unsullied liberty, its glorious past and the promise of its future. If we fulfill this challenge the precious right of citizenship will remain always ours but if we fail we will have lost it forever.

The 145th Anniversary of the Birth of Susan B. Anthony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on February 15 the National Woman's Party sponsored a special celebration of the 145th anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony. The ceremony was held in the Capitol against the background of the statue of Miss Anthony and two other pioneers in the suffragette movement, Elizabeth Stanton and Lucretia Mott. Floral tributes were laid at the base of this statue by representatives of a number of women's organizations and a number of tributes were paid by distinguished individuals, including representatives of foreign countries.

In my own remarks in this ceremony I recalled the work of former Members of Congress such as Katharine St. George and Jessica McCullough Weis, of New York, in supporting an equal rights for women amendment and I again reaffirm my support for this amendment to the Constitution for equality of rights for women in all fields not covered by the suffrage amendment. Following that ceremony I have again reintroduced a constitutional amendment resolution calling for this action.

I also quoted what I consider an outstanding tribute to Susan B. Anthony which was written by Ida Husted Harper. In her book on Miss Anthony she said:

> Every girl who now enjoys a college education, every woman who has a chance of earning an honest living in whatever sphere she chooses, every wife who is protected by any law in the possession of her person and property, every mother who is blessed with the custody and control of her own children, owes these sacred privileges to Susan B. Anthony. We do not underestimate the splendid services of other pioneers or their successors, but it is Susan B. Anthony's name that stands, and always will stand, as the everlasting symbol of women's emancipation.

Mr. Speaker, the ceremonies were keynoted by the famous and beloved chairman of the National Woman's Party, Emma Guffey Miller, and in her words of welcome she said:

> I am very happy and proud to welcome you to the 145th birthday anniversary of the indomitable and unquenchable Susan B. Anthony.

Had it not been for her and a few other determined women, we here today would not be enjoying half the benefits we now enjoy.

Why there is not more honor and acclaim paid to this remarkable woman seems incredible, for comparatively few young or middle-aged citizens realize what they owe to her—or even know of her. Something is surely lacking in our schools and histories.

But to Susan B. Anthony suffrage alone was not sufficient for she wrote in 1900, a few years before her death:

> Perfect equality of rights for women—civil and political, is today and has been for a half a century the one demand of, yours truly, Susan B. Anthony.

We gained political equality in 1920 but we do not yet have that perfect equality of rights for women and will not have it until we make the equal rights amendment a part of our Constitution.

As Congress returns today from its Lincoln Birthday celebrations all over the country, and as we enter upon a countrywide celebration of the birthday of another great American emancipator, Susan be Anthony, we remind Congress and the country of the famous words of Abraham Lincoln:

> I go for all sharing the privileges of Government who assist in bearing its burdens—not excluding women.

Twenty Years of Excise Nuisance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as the author of H.R. 4226, to repeal the Federal excise tax on such items as luggage, handbags, cosmetics, jewelry, and furs, I am very much in agreement with the Cleveland Plain Dealer editorial of February 16 entitled "Twenty Years of Excise Nuisance." Knowing that many of my colleagues are interested in this matter, I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial which follows:

[From the Plain Dealer, Feb. 16, 1965]

TWENTY YEARS OF EXCISE NUISANCE

Retail excise taxes passed as temporary fund-raising measures during World War II have reached their 20th anniversary as a peacetime nuisance that no one is celebrating.

Piled up before House and Senate committees are nearly 100 different pieces of legislation calling for repeal or reduction of the so-called "luxury" taxes imposed on many articles and services in daily use as necessities.

President Johnson has said he intends to ask Congress to repeal the taxes on such articles as cosmetics, toilet goods, jewelry, furs, luggage, woman's handbags, and perhaps some others.

Until specific requests are received from the President, Congress is reluctant to tackle excise tax legislation.

The excise taxes are especially obnoxious to merchants, it having been estimated that it costs about $300 million a year to collect and report the taxes. Their elimination would be welcomed by operators of drugstores and others charged with the distasteful duty of collecting them.

There is additional expense to the Government to interpret, enforce, and police the taxes.

For years efforts have been made periodically to lift the 10-percent excise tax on telephones, the only one of the utilities that is classified as a luxury.

Ohio phone users pay the Federal Government an average of $43 million a year for the privilege of using the phone. This tax costs users throughout the Nation an average of $855 million a year.

Air travel still carries a luxury tax of 5 percent, although it is now a major form of transportation and serves many areas unreachable by any other form of public transportation. The industry has long since shaken the luxury classification.

Elimination of the taxes will represent a saving to the consumer, but more important will be banishment of a nuisance that costs too much to collect.

President Johnson should lose no time in sending to House and Senate his recommendations that will speed up consideration and action on proposals to end or reduce retail excise taxes.

Chet Huntley Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on the NBC program, "Perspective," February 24, Chet Huntley discussed a most startling example of State Department ineptness in the conduct of American foreign policy. As Mr. Huntley points out, the United States is in the incredible position of recognizing, and thereby lending tacit support to, the Nasser-supported rebel government of Yemen.

Aside from the lack of logic behind such recognition, we have also managed to incur the antagonism of Saudi Arabia, one of our few remaining friends in the Middle East alone, which recognizes the royal Yemini rulers.

The contrast between our own State Department action, and the much wiser British policy prompts me to wonder who in our State Department made this decision, what actions, if any, we are taking to rectify the mistake, and whether the individual, or individuals, concerned are still in positions of high responsibility, which could lead to future instances of poor judgment.

The Huntley report follows:

> Every so often we are forced to wonder about some of the inexplicable workings of American diplomacy. Example: Saudi Arabia and Yemen.
>
> We must applaud the British who have managed to reestablish good relations with Saudi Arabia and its new King Faisal. Next door to Saudi Arabia is the backward little country of Yemen, where, a couple years ago, Nasser instigated a revolution against the Royal Yemeni rulers.
>
> The British read this as an attempt by Nasser to reach out and bring the oilfields of the Arabian Peninsula under his control. Just how our State Department read it is something of a mystery, for we were quick to grant diplomatic recognition to the new revolutionary Government of Yemen and thereby give Nasser an implied blessing for his war.
>
> Saudi Arabia, with whom we have enjoyed good relations for a long time, supported the Yemen Royalists, and publicly demanded that Nasser get back to Egypt where he belonged and ceases his aggression in Yemen. Our relations with King Faisal are certainly not what they should be or what they were with former Saudi Arabian rulers.
>
> King Faisal is opening doors to the West, with British counsel and help. For the first

time, Western phonograph records are now openly sold and played in Saudi Arabia. King Faisal is organizing a national band * * * which is buying its instruments in London. The King has granted permission for the construction of a television station on which Arabian women may appear. Two movie houses are operating in Jeddah. Girls are being educated. The King has established a central planning commission with European economic advisers. A roadbuilding program has been undertaken. The scores of local emirs, who used to receive large chunks of money from the national treasury, have now been placed on reduced budgets. And everywhere, British engineers and businessmen are busy signing contracts and establishing new British-Arabian relations.

Meanwhile, the United States is stuck with its implied backing of Nasser in neighboring Yemen. This is the same Nasser who recently looked the other way when a mob burned down the U.S. Information Library and attacked the American Embassy * * * the same Nasser who recently declared that the United States could take its aid and jump into the sea with it. Now this strange attachment to Nasser is costing us in Saudi Arabia, as the Egyptian strong man continues his war in Yemen. After the U.N. had demanded that he withdraw his Egyptian forces he responded by sending in more. We sent him more wheat and more aid. A few American companies trying to do business in Saudi Arabia must wonder what goes on.

Charles Percy's Report on Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles H. Percy, of Illinois, board chairman of Bell & Howell Co., has just returned from a study trip to the Far East where he talked with many leaders, including prime ministers and ambassadors. It was his fourth Asian trip in the past 10 years.

A series of reports on the countries which he visited is now appearing in the Chicago Daily News as an exclusive feature. I am sure my colleagues will find Mr. Percy's observations of interest and with unanimous consent I place the first report of the series in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Feb. 27, 1965]

CHARLES PERCY'S REPORT ON ASIA

(By Charles H. Percy)

As I traveled in Pakistan, India, Thailand, Malaysia, South Vietnam, Hong Kong, and Formosa, I perceived that for each of these nations there is one overwhelming problem, one dominant fact of life—the ominous "presence" of a powerful, ambitious neighbor, Communist China.

Each nation adjusts to this presence in its own way. Each measures its own capability to resist the Chinese pressure, its own material and psychological resources, its own position vis-a-vis its other neighbors, then plots its move according to its own self-interest.

India, for example, seeks to meet the Chinese challenge on its northern frontier by building up its armed forces, by relying more on its increasingly strong relationship with the United States, and by taking sterner measures against Indian Communists.

Pakistan, on the other hand, has established closer relations with Red China, seeing in this action the possibility of reducing the Chinese threat while acquiring a strong ally against the suspected aggressive tendencies of India.

Cambodia, weak and fearful, wavers, uncertain of the future and determined to be allied with whichever power dominates the region.

The U.S. Government and Americans generally are pleased that India is edging closer toward alinement with the West, and are disappointed that Pakistan and Cambodia are moving closer to China. Nevertheless, the intentions of all the powers of south and southeast Asia must be understood in the context of their own situations.

Make no mistake about it, no nation in this region wants to be dominated by China. But some are intimidated by the Chinese pressure. They know that China has aggressive designs on their sovereignty, and they feel that they cannot afford to antagonize or resist such a hungry and brutal neighbor.

They have learned they can displease the West, on the other hand, without risking the possibility of Western aggression on themselves.

In Karachi we talked with President Mohammed Ayub Kahn, a shrewd man, confident in his power and willing to use it. He said Pakistan began dealing with China because U.S. military aid to India had increased the Indian threat to his country.

He complained that the United States did not consult him before making the decision to grant military aid to India. Of course, had he been consulted, he would have rejected the proposition.

Informed observers still place Pakistan in the Western camp and note that Pakistan continues to permit a U.S. radar station there to monitor Soviet missile tests. Still, the new-found friendship between Pakistan and China has adversely affected U.S. relations with Pakistan, once a firm and cooperative ally.

While Pakistan moves closer to China, and Pakistan Air Line billboards in Karachi advertise twice-weekly trips to Peiping, India is still in a state of shock over the movements of Chinese troops across the poorly defined border between the two countries.

It had been 8 years since I had made an intensive study tour of India. On the day we arrived in New Delhi, the Times of India front paged a story that Pakistani astrologers are predicting that China will attack India again this year, that the government of Lal Bahadur Shastri, Nehru's successor, will fall, and that this will be "a crisis year" for India.

Fazil Ben, said to be the royal astrologer of Iran, also was quoted to this effect. Such predictions are not taken lightly in a nation where politicians often consult astrologers before making major decisions.

One wonders whether Shastri, a tiny, modest man, a victim of two heart attacks, famed more as a conciliator than a leader, can cope with the Chinese aggression.

Although he maintains India's position of nonalinement in the cold war, continuing good relations with both the Soviet Union and the United States, he has been hard on Indian Communists and has vowed to defend his country against the Chinese.

Shastri's sentiments are entirely with the West. In his first nationwide broadcast after assuming the Prime Ministry, he quoted only one foreigner, President Johnson. His grandson was named Kennedy. He has a good relationship with U.S. Ambassador Chester Bowles.

But Shastri has another problem that seems even more immediate than the Chinese presence on his frontier. Food production has remained constant for the last 3 years while each year 10 million babies have been born.

Although the birth rate remains high, the death rate has been cut almost in half. This means that India is suffering a population explosion at the same time that growth in food production has come to a halt.

The Indian Government is taking three measures to meet this problem—partial food rationing, efforts to increase food production, and a $200 million family planning program.

I asked Shastri his opinion of family planning and he smilingly replied that, considering his age 60 and his six children, he "could hardly have a personal dedication" to the program.

But he stressed that more progress in family planning had been made in the last 8 months than in the last 8 years. Food production, not China, is what keeps him awake at night, he said.

Both Shastri and President Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan expressed their deep appreciation for U.S. grain shipments, which they said keep millions of Indians alive.

In Thailand, the rice bowl of southeast Asia, the firmly pro-Western government of Premier Thanom Kittikachorn is faced with multiple problems of defense against Communist infiltration and terrorism.

Both Thanom and his brilliant foreign minister, Thanat Khoman, mentioned that with United States help Thailand is taking extraordinary measures to fight Communist subversion among the Lao people of the northeast, near the Laotian border.

Irrigation projects, farm-to-market roads, and dispensaries are being introduced to bring these people, who are ethnically closer to the Laotians than the Thai, into greater rapport with and dependence on the Bangkok government.

Still, Thailand faces other problems, Malayan Communist terrorists, supported by the Indonesian Communist Party, pillage the villages of southern Thailand, and Chinese Communists spread propaganda among the Thai hill people in the northwest.

The Thai leaders feel very strongly that there is nothing to be gained by negotiating with the Communists in southeast Asia.

Said Thanat: "The Communists want to exercise control over this area. We don't want them to control us. Can freedom and independence be cut in half? I doubt it. There is either freedom or a lack of it."

In Malaysia, in South Vietnam, in Hong Kong, in Taiwan, I heard the same point made repeatedly: Negotiation with the Communists could lead only to compromises that would permit additional areas to pass under Communist control.

I was told that, after each negotiated settlement, the Communists would again begin guerrilla warfare, working toward the next negotiation. Ultimately, it was said, the entire region would be taken by China at very little cost.

The alternative, say many leaders of southeast Asia, is to stand firm now in Vietnam, to win that war by whatever sacrifice is necessary.

The Gold Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the administration's attitude toward our gold reserve is confusing to the nth degree. First, we have a bill presented by the administration and passed by the House increasing the capital of the Inter-American Development Bank by $750 million

which is to be loaned to Central and South American countries. While the House was passing this bill, the President was addressing 370 business executives called to the White House, admonishing them to cut their expenditures to the bone where they involved sending our dollars abroad.

Then I read in the Independent Editorial Services, Ltd., issue of February 23 a statement that our colleague HALE BOGGS, of the Ways and Means Committee, is expected to offer an administration-backed bill providing for generous tax credits for private U.S. investments in underdeveloped countries and they refer to the President's mention of such plans in his foreign aid message. The tax credits would be applicable to insured investments—against expropriation, nationalization, discriminatory tax treatment, and so forth. On February 23 the Secretary of Commerce issued a news release of his talk before the Travel Advisory Council asking them to stimulate the travel of foreigners into this country but to curtail the travel of our people into foreign countries.

Because of the heavy drain on our gold reserve, it would seem that the time is right for the administration and the various departments of the administration to get together and at least play the same tune even though they might be using different instruments. It is apparent that dollars sent abroad, regardless of how they are sent, may return in the form of a demand for gold.

Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

In the proposed Peace Corps legislation that this body has received from our President, there is the opportunity for us to continue a part of our foreign relations program which has shown great return on the dollars we have authorized for it. The significance of this legislation is that it will authorize funds which represent only a small fraction of our overall budget for the next fiscal year, and only a small part of our total overseas programs.

The dollars spent in the Peace Corps program have gone a long way to prove to nations around the world that we seek to help others better themselves, and that we are a country seeking peace. Peace Corps volunteers, now numbering almost 10,000, have shown and are continuing to show that Americans will take the extra step to lend a hand to those who ask for it.

I am told that the authorization requested will provide the capability to put 17,000 volunteers in training and at work by the end of August 1966. It is unfortunate that we are required to spend billions for means of defense, when it can be shown that through much more modest expenditures we can contribute so much for the good of nations which are requesting our help. We should continue our efforts to be strong with our defense, but also provide the funds necessary to continue the work of the Peace Corps. I shall join those who work to enact this legislation for the next fiscal year.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I was recently visited in my office by a young man from Tucson, Ariz., who was here participating in the Senate youth program under sponsorship of the American Political Science Association and the Hearst Foundation. Today I was pleased to learn that this same young man has been named the State winner in the annual Voice of Democracy Contest of the Veterans' of Foreign Wars of the United States.

This bright young student, a senior at Tucson High School, is George Mark Rauh. His winning speech, I am pleased to observe, reflects a mature awareness of the important difference between true patriotism and chauvinism.

Without objection I insert at this point Mr. Rauh's excellent speech:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By George Mark Rauh)

Several months ago I read about an incident which dramatized for me the challenge of citizenship. It concerned a man in the process of obtaining his naturalization papers. Jay Daniels sat in court with the others. They had long awaited this happy day. But the proceedings were monotonous and Daniels grew tired. A gradual feeling of drowsiness crept over him and he fell asleep. Perhaps he dreamt of Jay Daniels, American citizen, of parades—the "Star and Stripes" flying high, the band blaring out the "Star Spangled Banner" as it marched down streets of gold. Suddenly Daniel was overcome with an uncomfortable feeling, as though he sensed two angry eyes glaring at him through the darkness.

He raised his head. No one in the courtroom spoke a word. All were watching him. Then, as he looked up, he met the angry eyes of the judge who could not contain his vehemence. The judge did not believe that any man who could fall asleep at such a time deserved to be an American. He sent Daniels from the courtroom with a stinging rebuke.

But how can we judge Jay Daniels? Certainly he was patriotic, for he had patriotic dreams. Did he then answer the challenge of citizenship? But more important, we must ask: Have we answered this challenge? For I believe that Daniels' actions symbolize those of most Americans.

Yes, we too are living under the effects of a deep sleep. It is the slumber of apathy. Indifference is the opiate of our masses. Just as Jay Daniels may have dreamt of flags and parades, many Americans fill their torpid sleep with expressions of superpatriotism. They believe that our flag is more than a revered symbol, that it has magic powers. Flag waving is their only answer to the challenge of citizenship. And for those who are not among them they have only intolerance. We can see that wildly chauvinistic dreams are not characteristic of good citizens.

But the rest of us do not have these dreams. Yet we sleep, also, in our own lives, in our own comfort, and our own security. We have been avoiding the many pairs of glaring eyes that try to pierce our unconsciousness, to enlighten our minds, to touch our hearts.

Already in the last 2 years the eyes which champion equality for the Negro have disturbed our masses and the Nation still shakes after turning over fitfully in its sleep. But after the passage of the civil rights bill, we still read about racial injustice occurring throughout the Nation. We are shocked at the massacre of Congo missionaries while 21 murder suspects go unprosecuted in the United States. Are we waking up or are we falling deeper asleep?

There are many more pairs of eyes attempting to awaken the great slumbering giant—our Nation with its limitless resources. The eyes of the starving, diseased slum child are avoided and unseen, as are those of the migrant laborer born into indescribable and inescapable squalor. Two eyes exist more terrible than any—the eyes of nuclear power—the monster which can consume us as we sleep, the monster which now spreads malignantly from nation to nation.

Yes, we are surrounded by a sea of angry, unblinking eyes. They challenge us to overcome the drugs of lethargy. They are the challenge of citizenship. But can we meet this challenge? I know we must and I believe we can, for Jay Daniels did wake up. He was later given a second chance and was granted his citizenship. Now the choice is ours. Will we wake up or will we sleep, perhaps, until it is too late?

Memories of Iwo Jima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a newspaper story sent to me by my good friend and constituent, Mr. Carroll E. Adams, of Shelburne Falls, Mass. This article, by Mike Bagwell, appeared in the Greenfield Recorder-Gazette, on Friday, February 19, 1965, and recreates the bitter conditions of all-out warfare which existed on the island of Iwo Jima on February 19, 1945. The story begins just 3 hours and 32 minutes to invasion.

This fine article recounts the bravery of my constituent, Stanley Pappas, then a U.S. marine and now the manager of a restaurant in Charlemont, Mass., who hit the beaches of Iwo Jima with the first waves of assault craft on that morning. Also woven into this story is the courage of my constituent, another marine, Paul LeMay, now a foreman at Montague Machine Co., Turners Falls, Mass.

It is with pride that I point to the individual bravery of each of these fine marines, at a time of great peril to their country, and I respectfully enter their story in the RECORD:

MEMORIES OF IWO JIMA

A pall of smoke drifted slowly off the barren, and shell-pitted land. The cold filtered sunlight of dawn illuminated slick, black beaches while a light breeze stirred tattered fronds of the few remaining trees.

The day—February 19, 1945. The island—Iwo Jima. Time: 0530 hours—3 hours, 32 minutes to invasion.

In amphibious landing craft offshore, U.S. Marines of the 4th and 5th Divisions huddled, waiting for a massive bombardment to cover their invasion.

Among them were Marines Stanton Pappas of Charlemont and Paul LeMay of Turners Falls.

For 3 days and nights in the heaviest prelanding bombardment of history, 6 battleships, 5 cruisers, 10 destroyers, and 12 aircraft carriers had thrown everything they had at 24,000 Japanese troops, sworn to defend the island to the last man.

Iwo Jima—The first blow at Imperial Japan itself. A volcanic 64 square miles of black rock.

To take it 5,895 Marines died; another 16,161 were wounded in 25 days of the bloodiest fighting in history. The Japanese casualties: 19,000 dead, 1,000 prisoners and more than 4,000 presumed buried alive in shattered caves and tuunels.

The invasion of Iwo Jima was strategic. Other small islands had been bypassed, their military value slight, Iwo was different. Iwo had two airfields and was a scant 660 miles from Tokyo.

Stan Pappas, now the manager of a Charlemont restaurant, hit the beaches with the first waves of assault craft at 9:02 a.m.

In another leading vessel was Paul LeMay, now a foreman at Montague Machine Co., Turners Falls.

Pappas, who lied about his age to join and at 17 was probably the youngest Marine on Iwo Jima, gripped his automatic rifle and leaped ashore. The LST beached as bullets whistling around.

"The one thing that comes to mind, thinking back on that ride toward shore," Pappas said the other day, "was the sight of the battleship *Tennessee* standing off not 500 yards from Mount Suribachi and pounding it with everything while naval aircraft flew the shore dropping napalm."

The Marines made a three-pronged attack on the eastern beaches. To the left, Suribachi rose 550 feet into the sky and in front were ridges of soft sand to the plateau beyond.

LeMay, one of a tank crew, remembers his heavy vehicles bogging down in the black sand, its tracks spinning. "What a moment," LeMay recalls. "I got out of the tank and remember the sickening feeling of stepping on the bodies of dead Marines. The tank kept leaping into the air with explosions all around."

The advantage was the enemy's. Secure in trenches and fanatical in resolve, the Japanese forced the marines to pay for every foot of ground. The final count, after 25 days, showed one marine died for every acre taken on Iwo Jima.

With casualties mounting, Adm. Chester W. Nimitz ordered elements of the 3d Division ashore just after noon.

With increasing fury, three U.S. divisions stormed the soft ridges and hit fortifications. Men charged blockhouses with grenades, ran in and emerged with bloodstained bayonets. The Japanese counterattacked along most of the front, in many cases hurling themselves bodily on U.S. marines and tumbling about in hand-to-hand combat.

Pappas and LeMay remember clearly their first night on the island. Pappas was in a hole near Mount Suribachi and LeMay still in his tank on the beach. Neither of them got any sleep. Pappas said the Japanese fired all night at U.S. positions and lobbed shells onto the beach where equipment was unloading.

LeMay said "the whole world seemed to shake" when a Japanese shell hit an ammunition dump near his tank.

So it went for more than 3 weeks. Riflemen would clear the ground, followed by demolition teams with high explosives to seal caves or drive out the Japanese with flamethrowers. Before the end of the first week, one airfield had been taken and soon, even while fighting raged through the island, crippled B-29's were landing.

The gallant marines of Iwo are honored at a memorial in Washington, D.C., where the U.S. flag flies 24 hours by Presidential proclamation.

Of the fighting marines, crusted with dirt, many of them weeping at the carnage, Fleet Admiral Nimitz said: "Uncommon valor was a common virtue."

General Services Administration Contract Procurement Helps Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions during recent years, the Congress has reaffirmed its declared policy that small business concerns should receive a fair proportion of Government purchases.

In this connection, it was especially heartening to receive a letter from Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr., Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, advising that almost 60 percent of that Agency's purchases are now being supplied by small business concerns. Two years ago small business was supplying but 40 percent of this volume.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include Administrator Knott's letter in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The letter follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1965.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Last August we reported to you that in fiscal year 1964, the General Services Administration placed 53.2 percent of the dollar volume of its total prime contracts, or $451.4 million, with small business firms. This was an increase of 12.7 percent above the fiscal year 1963 figure of 40.5 percent.

During the current fiscal year GSA has continued its efforts to implement more effectively the administration's policy that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services for the Government be placed with small business concerns. I am pleased to inform you that as a result of our efforts, during the first half of the current fiscal year GSA has further increased, to 57.7 percent, the dollar volume of its total prime contracts, or $267.4 million, with small business firms.

You may be assured that our efforts in behalf of small business concerns will continue.

Sincerely yours,

LAWSON B. KNOTT, Jr.,
Acting Administrator.

British Doctor: Why I Refused

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House will be considering medical care bills very shortly, I think the testimony of a doctor from England is worthy of consideration. His statement follows:

BRITISH DOCTOR: WHY I REFUSED

(Britain's doctors are generally dissatisfied with their conditions and pay under the National Health Service. Here are the views of a 54-year-old, well-respected general practitioner, who, after 30 years in practice in Britain, has decided to emigrate. For professional reasons he cannot be named.)

I am saying farewell to Britain in a mood of sadness and irritation.

Like many doctors today, I am leaving the National Health Service to practice my craft in another country.

But before I go I should like to tell what is happening to the family doctor and why he is one of a vanishing breed.

In the country I am going to I shall receive an income adequate at least to save me from constant worry.

I shall have enough time to give to my patients' problems; time to read and keep up with medical knowledge; even a little time, perhaps, to give some thought to my personal life.

I shall be able to treat my patients as I think best for them and not according to the wishes of a so-called Ministry of Health staffed by nonmedical bureaucrats and actuated by political interest and pressure from the Treasury.

In no country in the world has the standard of medical practice been as high as in Britain. Yet her doctors are the worst paid of any in the world.

Let me tell you what life is like for a general practitioner under the National Health Service.

I have a one-man practice of 3,000 people, which I started from nothing 30 years ago. My working day starts at 8:30 a.m. and finishes, if I am lucky, at 9 p.m.

I do 2 hours in surgery morning and evening, and the rest of the day, almost without a break, is spent in making visits. I work between 60 and 70 hours a week.

On average, I am called out from my bed 2 nights a week. I am required by my contract, under pain of heavy penalties, to be available to each of these 3,000 patients 24 hours a day for 365 days a year.

Many of the cases I am called to are trivial. But many are matters of life or death. I cannot afford to make mistakes.

Any patient can make a complaint about me to the local executive council. There were something like 600 such complaints against doctors last year, the vast bulk of them utterly trivial.

But I have no redress against a patient who offends me or wastes my time.

For this work, and for the heavy responsibility it entails, I am paid at a basic scale—the price of a packet of cigarettes for each person on my list.

Can you get a plumber to fix a leaking tap, just once, for that price?

I have not been able to afford a proper holiday for 3 years. First I must find a locum—no easy task. Then I must pay him 30 guineas a week, keep him, and provide him with a car. If he makes a mistake in diagnosis or treatment during my absence, I am responsible.

Since the start of the National Health Service I have had 16 years of desperate financial insecurity. My eldest son wanted to become a doctor, like his father and grandfather before him. I could not afford to keep him for 7 years, and he did not win a scholarship.

Do you wonder that I smile to myself when people who work from 9 to 5:30 5 days a week complain of being tired and overworked and ask me for a certificate for a week or two off?

And how do you think I feel as I sign passport forms for people bound for holidays in Majorca, Capri, and other places? There'll be no holiday for me this summer. Instead, with my wife and our two younger children, I shall be on my way to New Zealand—and a new life—at the age of 54 to practice medicine as it was meant to be practiced with time to examine my patients, to give them my best, and to be paid what that best is worth.

Growers Cheer Blast of U.S. Tobacco Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two articles from the Quitman Free Press, Quitman, Ga., dated February 25, 1965. These articles were written by Mr. Royal Daniel, Jr., who is a well known and widely read Georgia editor.

My friend, Royal Daniel, has so well captured the feeling of those who attended the hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Tobacco of the House Committee on Agriculture at Moultrie, Ga., on February 18, 1965, that I believe all of those who are interested in the tobacco problem will find his two following reports to be most informative:

GROWERS CHEER BLAST OF U.S. TOBACCO PLAN—OTIS TURNER, MR. FINLAYSON GIVEN OVATION AT HEARING

(By Royal Daniel, Jr.)

"We ask you gentlemen to consider here the rights of a minority under the democratic system," Otis G. Turner told a congressional subcommittee during a tobacco hearing last week in Moultrie.

"We have no other recourse. We know we can be outvoted because we are a minority. We ask you not to deny us the right, under the American free enterprise system, to grow tobacco for which we know there is a commercial market."

Mr. Turner is chairman of the Georgia Agricultural Commodity Commission for Tobacco. His testimony before the Tobacco Subcommittee of the Agricultural Committee of the House of Representatives was greeted with outbursts of applause, cheers and "Amens" from the thousand tobacco growers assembled in the Moultrie Junior High School gymnasium.

The Moultrie meeting was one of three scheduled field hearings by the committee to hear testimony on the issue of new legislation for poundage-acreage control of tobacco production. Two bills have been proposed for passage in Congress this year.

Hearings were held in Raleigh, N.C., on February 16; Florence, S.C., on February 17 and Moultrie, Ga., on February 18.

More than a dozen Congressmen were present for the Raleigh hearings. The number dwindled in South Carolina ending with a committee of five for the Georgia-Florida testimony.

Representative WATKINS M. ABBITT, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the subcommittee, presided. MASTON O'NEAL, member of the House Committee on Agriculture, although not a member of the committee, introduced his fellow Representatives. Others of the committee who heard testimony were PRENTISS WALKER, Republican, of Mississippi, JOHN MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina, and WILLIAM MATTHEWS, Democrat, of Florida.

Mr. Ed Finlayson, president of the Florida Farm Bureau, was the first Georgia-Florida grower of type 14 to testify before the committee. He told the Congressmen that new legislation would in effect put type 14 growers in a straitjacket of restriction. His remarks were greeted with cheers and applause from the audience many of whom had driven up to the meeting from Florida tobacco-growing counties.

Homer S. Durden, Jr., attorney for the Georgia Commodity Commission for Tobacco, testified before the congressional committee that there was no need for additional legislation. Reading portions of the USDA Agricultural Marketing Act, Mr. Durden stated that if the Secretary of Agriculture wanted to change tobacco marketing control to a poundage basis the existing legislation already gave him permission to do so.

Mr. Turner told the Congressmen that the proposed legislation was written for one reason and that "it is designed to kill the appeal of our court case that is now pending before the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in Atlanta."

Mr. Horace Godfrey, Director of Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation programs, began the hearing with a 40-minute explanation of the tobacco program complete with slides. Explaining the surplus in stabilization and the state of the foreign markets, Mr. Godfrey stressed a need for change in control of surplus procedures.

Mr. Godfrey was followed to the stand by L. T. Weeks, general manager, Flue Cured Tobacco Cooperative Stabilization Corp. of Raleigh and by Malcolm B. Seawell, executive secretary of Leaf Tobacco Exporters Association. All of the North Carolina visitors had prepared and mimeographed statements which they made available to the press.

During the morning nine persons testified before the barbecue served at the noon recess by the Colquitt County Chamber of Commerce.

At the afternoon hearing, 28 persons were heard by the committee.

Fred Voight of Ware County told the committee: "The word 'acreage' has no meaning in a poundage control program. Let's drop the word and use poundage control only after type 14 has been given a fair appraisal with supply and demand."

Dave Calloway, of Tattnall County, asked that every grower be cut in 1965 according to the amount that he has contributed to the Government loan program.

The same thought had been voiced the day before in the Florence, S.C., hearing by Frank Williamson, chairman of the tobacco committee of the South Carolina Farm Bureau: "those responsible for the unfavorable position tobacco is in should bear the burden."

Representative MCMILLAN, of South Carolina, expressed the opinion during the noon recess that South Carolina farmers were also overwhelmingly opposed to acreage-poundage legislation.

Harold Brown, Colquitt County farm agent read a statement opposing the change in legislative control of the tobacco marketing program signed by Representatives David Newton and Dorsey Matthews of Colquitt County who were detained in Atlanta by rollcall votes of the legislature.

Ford Spinks, State senator from the Ninth Georgia District, read a statement backing Georgia tobacco growers, as vice chairman of the Georgia Senate Agricultural Committee.

During the testimony of John Palmer, who spoke for the Tobacco Associates on the foreign markets, several Georgia growers were overheard to say, "What's all that got to do with Georgia tobacco. We can sell all the type 14 we can grow. Our quality is what they want. That fellow should go tell all that to those North Carolina growers."

C. C. Ramsey, Herman Odom and Willie McKinnon, members of the Georgia Commodity Commission for Tobacco were present among the witnesses. R. G. Daniels of Metter was one of the farmer-grower protestors to the legislation.

William Lanier, president of the Georgia Farm Bureau addressed the committee filing his previous statement made in Washington last week at hearings on the feasibility of poundage legislation. Since the Washington hearings Mr. Lanier was elected Georgia director of the Stabilization Corporation taking Mr. William Langdale's place on the board.

Among others to be heard were Dalton Law, of Tift County; R. R. Baker, of Colquitt County, and Mr. James S. Wershaw of Alachua, Fla.

The dramatic feature of the hearing was the ovation given to Otis Turner, of Coolidge, and Ed Finlayson, of Greenville, Fla.

LEAF HEARING—"BLOOD ON THE RUG," BUT NO CASUALTIES

(By Royal Daniel, Jr.)

A field hearing on tobacco by a congressional subcommittee was held in Moultrie last week and it proved a field day for Georgia-Florida tobacco growers to register their emphatic opposition to any new legislation to establish a combination of acreage and poundage in determining tobacco quotas.

There were more than 1,000 present in our estimation. Horace Godfrey, of the U.S. Agriculture Department, figured about 1,500. The Moultrie Chamber of Commerce provided a barbecue luncheon which was served to 895 persons, and by no means all remained to eat. They came from all sections of south Georgia and north Florida and even a few from Alabama.

Too bad Secretary Freeman was unable to be present—he has visited south Georgia several times—for it was a good show and a revealing show.

When Congressman WATKINS M. ABBITT, of Virginia, chairman of the subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee put his show on the road he started with 12 fellow Representatives in the cast. They played performances in Raleigh, N.C., and Florence, S.C., and the cast had shrunk from 12 to 4 when the third and last performance of the tour was given in Moultrie.

It was sort of like the old-time road opera companies which came South. The farther South they got the fewer oboes and bassoons were left in the orchestra and the bit-singers were doubling in brass.

Mr. ABBITT, who presides with dignity and grace and flashes of good humor, seemed to enjoy the audience as much as the audience enjoyed the proceedings. He was ably assisted by our new Congressman from the Second District, MASTON O'NEAL, of Bainbridge, who was master of ceremonies on the home grounds and among familiar people. Mr. O'NEAL, a freshman in Washington, is a veteran of 23 years in Georgia as solicitor general of the old Albany judicial district. He has the stance of a Congressman and the approach of a Congressman.

The first act of the show was expository and the stage was held for 40 minutes by Mr. Godfrey, of USDA. He explained clearly just what the new legislation contained and why it was there. He pitched the book well for Secretary Freeman and Mr. Murphy. He was assisted by Madison Avenue accessories—an illuminated slide sheet presentation, mobile microphone around his neck and a fine-tailored Italian silk suit which shimmered.

Mr. Godfrey impressed us as being a few years older than he looks. He seemed to sense this himself, because a couple of times he mentioned his long years of service in agriculture—31 to be exact. Only once did he jolt our credulity and that was when he made a sudden reference to "us old tobacco farmers." Some of the 1,000 sun-burned, weather-beaten dirt farmers also chuckled, so it was not lost.

Mr. Godfrey's theme, of course, was that with new legislation, poundage, as well as acreage; less fertilizer, perhaps; lowered costs of production, higher quality in home and foreign markets would result.

After the expository act, came the action. Mr. Ed Finlayson, president of the Florida Farm Bureau, took the stand. In gentle voice and with great dignity he said: "A poundage quota is based on the assumption the way to improve quality is to cut yields. This is not true."

"We in Georgia and Florida," he continued, "have been producing the type of tobacco they want and I don't think we should be held in a straitjacket."

A heretofore quiet audience burst into cheers and applause.

Now it was time for the man in the heavy role to take the stage. You could have heard a pin drop when Otis G. Turner, chairman of the Georgia Commodity Commission for Tobacco, stepped forward.

The USDA wing of the audience regarded him as the villain in the play. He turned out to be the hero. Farmers cheered, applauded, and hollered as he drove home some of his points.

In temperate language and the softest of voice, Mr. Turner took the proposed legislation apart right on top of the table.

In the first place, he said, no new legislation was needed because Secretary Freeman under the present law had full authority to switch from acreage to pounds or a combination of both, as he so desired and so ordered. The Commodity Commission's attorney, Homer S. Durden, Jr., confirmed this in his testimony.

In the lawsuit brought against Secretary Freeman by Georgia growers it was contended Mr. Freeman under the present law could establish a quota for type 14 tobacco, because Congress wrote that the Secretary should treat tobacco—not just as tobacco in a lump sum—but as "kinds of tobacco."

A Federal judge in Brunswick nearly 5 months ago agreed with the plaintiffs and issued an injunction against Mr. Freeman's cuts on quotas. The case was appealed and still rests in the courts in Atlanta.

Mr. Turner leaned forward in the witness chair at Moultrie and gently said, in conversational tone:

"We are opposed to this plan and I question the intention of the bill and I question the intentions of the proponents of the bill.

"It is all designed to kill our lawsuit now pending in the courts for 4½ months where comparable cases have been decided in 30 days."

Mr. Turner asked for consideration of a minority (type 14) and the right to continue under the free enterprise system in raising tobacco for markets which take practically all of it and customers who prefer it.

Mr. Turner left the stand amid cheers, yells and applause.

The cats were all out of the bags.

Maston O'Neal reminded everyone barbecue was waiting in the football stadium.

A Plug From the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, while I do not subscribe to the conclusion of Mr. George Dixon in regard to the film "The Greatest Story Ever Told", nevertheless I think he has done a great service for the American people in calling attention to what is transpiring in the White House in the way of using White House personalities ballyhooing films whether they are good or bad. His column, which appeared in Saturday's issue of the Washington Post, follows:

WASHINGTON SCENE: A PLUG FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

(By George Dixon)

A fantastic pandora's box of press agentry and advertising was opened at the White House the other day. The lid was ripped off when this official announcement was posted in the pressroom, a whoop and shove from President Johnson's sanctum:

"The White House says Lynda Johnson will pose in the White House library at 3:45 p.m. today with Charlton Heston in connection with the movie, 'The Greatest Story Ever Told.' "

"The Greatest Story Ever Told" has been widely acclaimed as "The Dullest Movie Ever Made." But think of the precedent it has helped set for exploiting the First Family in commercials.

If the President's eldest daughter can be used to plug the most tedious film of all time, why can't the rest of the Johnson family, and all the other White House familiars, be drafted for ballyhoo purposes?

There are wonderful possibilities.

The President's youngest daughter, Luci, has as much right to be tapped for commercials at Lynda. Luci, a devotee of the dance in its more energetic forms, might pose in the White House grand ballroom with Elvis Presley for an advertisement in which she is exclaiming:

"Look, Mom, since I plugged up my head with rock 'n' roll I have 20 percent fewer cavities."

Let us pass, for the moment, suggestions as to how Lady Bird Johnson and the President himself might be exploited for press agentry. We will consider first how some of the lesser denizens of the Executive Mansion could lend themselves to the more lurid forms of advertising.

White House Press Secretary George Reedy is a natural for several of the better known commercials. Reedy, who is being driven nuts by the way presidential assistant Jack Valenti horns in on his press relations, might be shown looking past Valenti, saying: "Leave the driving to us."

Or Reedy might be saying: "For fast, fast, fast relief from Valenti take a mixture of ingredients."

Him, the White House beagle, should be a ballyhoo artist's dream. Think of his commercial appeal if he posed beside a congressional pork barrel, barking happily: "It makes its own gravy."

There are many commercials made to order for another presidential assistant. His name is Lee White. What could be whiter than White on a white charger in white armor galloping past soiled lobbyists, who chant after him: "Stronger than dirt."

Larry O'Brien, the President's liaison man with Congress, is talking about quitting. L.B.J. might prevail upon O'Brien to stay if he kept blacking the contact man's eye until he whimpered: "I'd rather fight than switch."

The shapely young ladies in Reedy's office could do a tremendous job of soft selling by posing for Consensus Garters: "They hold up the economy." And McGeorge Bundy, the President's Special Assistant for National Security, could do a yeoman job of scaring off subversives. By George McBundy, as the Security Chief is better known among secure people, would reduce security risks to quivering wrecks by advertising that he has a tiger in his tank.

Bill Moyers, who seems to be top man now among presidential assistants, could be featured in an ad in which he is saying with customary humility: "See the difference quality makes."

The way Presidential Appointments Secretary Marvin Watson sometimes holds his arms stiffly away from his sides suggests a commercial in which he is asking: "All right, who's the wise guy that put the cement in my deodorant?"

Now to get back to the White House's two principal occupants:

The First Lady might pose for a great think and walk society commercial in Thinking Shoes, and the President might grace a travel ad in which he is exhorting the Vice President: "Go now, pay later."

"It Was a Rough Battle, but He Was Fighting It Well"—Mel LaBrode, Veteran Newspaperman and War Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the city of New Bedford, Mass., was saddened by the death of a kind, conscientious, and thoroughly dedicated newspaperman, Melvin F. LaBrode.

His devotion to his country, his professional energy and integrity, and his loyal service to his friends, particularly the American war veteran, as well as his personal courage in the face of many hardships and illness, could serve as inspiring models to any man.

The respect he earned from his fellow citizens was well symbolized, I think, by the fact that the city council called a special session to pay its respects immediately upon news of his passing.

"Mel" earned many tributes during his 47 years, including a Bronze Star and three battle stars as an officer in a tank-destroyer battalion in Europe during

World War II. He would have been much too modest to have ever recounted his own achievements and honors, but they certainly deserve our recognition and gratitude in this historic Chamber, where as a nation we work and struggle, seldom with the same degree of success, to attain the standards and ideals he served so well as an individual journalist, soldier, and member of his community.

I, therefore, commend to the attention of my colleagues in Congress the following article from the Standard-Times, the newspaper for which he had worked since 1937:

MELVIN F. LABRODE, 47, VETERAN REPORTER, DIES

Melvin F. LaBrode, 47, a veteran Standard-Times staff writer, died today, February 24, at St. Luke's Hospital where was admitted Monday night. He was the husband of the late Mrs. Juliette (Chicoine) LaBrode and a resident of 98 Nye Street.

A native of New Bedford and a lifelong resident here, "Mel" joined the Standard-Times staff in March 1937 and served on every beat during his long newspaper career. He was a familiar figure at city council and school committee meetings and was honored on several occasions by veterans organizations for his work in behalf of veterans. He wrote the "Veterans Affairs" column, a feature of the Sunday Standard-Times.

A graduate of New Bedford High School, he enlisted in the 101st Field Artillery, 1st Howitzer Battalion, National Guard, in 1936 and was commissioned a second lieutenant shortly after the unit was inducted into Federal service in 1941. He served 3 years in Europe with the 882d Tank Destroyer Battalion during World War II, earning the Bronze Star and two battle stars. He was promoted to major before being discharged.

UNDERGOES OPERATION

In the fall of 1962, "Mel," after months of hoarseness, went into Temple University Hospital in Philadelphia where it was discovered he had cancer. His larynx was removed.

He remained cheerful during his hospitalization, writing letters to working cohorts and his many friends. Then, in the spring, "Mel" came back to work full time. For several weeks, he worked in the city room turning out the "Hats Off" column, the "50 Years Ago" column, the "Veterans Affairs" column, and stories on the other assignments on his beat.

In April 1963, "Mel" was given what was supposed to be his first outside-the-office assignment since his return to work. It was at Post 1, American Legion and it turned out to be a heart-warming "welcome back" from his many friends of the post.

He was awarded a scroll praising him for his professional accomplishments and his "* * * boundless effort to inform the American public of the welfare, the achievements, and the ideals of the American war veteran."

In 1951, he had been honored by the National Department of Disabled American Veterans for his efforts to "* * * encourage and aid disabled veterans in their fight to reestablish themselves as useful citizens."

CITED BY VFW

Private A. Poirier Post, VFW, cited him in 1953 for his efforts to preserve valuable State documents in the archives division and in 1957, the Navy Recruiting Service of the 1st Naval District paid tribute to him for his "public-spirited cooperation" in furthering public relations between the Navy and people of the community.

Mel's voice disappeared in the operating room at Temple Hospital, but his zest for life and his interest in what was going on around him remained his trademark. Most of his "conversations" were conducted with pencil and copy paper, but he was "going to school" in Providence learning to talk again. It was a rough battle, but he was fighting it well.

He was a communicant of St. Anthony Church.

Surviving him are his only child, a daughter, Christine Ann; his father, Aldei LeBrode; three brothers, Aldei, Jr., Myles L., and John E., and two sisters, Mrs. Alphonse Fournier, and Mrs. Alfred Jeglinski. All but Myles, who lives in Acushnet, are of this city.

The Republican Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York, recently addressed the Executive Club of Chicago. His speech entitled "The Republican Challenge" was presented on January 22, 1965, and has received such widespread praise and favorable comment that I wish to call it to the attention of the Members of Congress.

His speech follows:

THE REPUBLICAN CHALLENGE

(By Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican, of New York, before the Executives' Club of Chicago, January 22, 1965)

Republicans have a job to do in whatever capacity we may find ourselves, in rebuilding the Republican Party. It is a problem and a challenge, not only for the Republican Party, but for the country as well. What strengthens the Republican Party, strengthens the two-party system, what strengthens the two-party system, strengthens the country.

I am optimistic that there will be a resurgence of Republican possibilities in the United States and that we will see Republicans on the march, regaining seats in State legislatures, in the Congress, and in shorter time than most now think. I am optimistic because I have faith in the commonsense of the American people and faith in the commonsense of the enrolled members of the Republican Party throughout the country. It is they who will have to make the choice as to the direction and the commitment of the GOP.

As I see it there are three points that are relevant to this discussion. The first is that the Republicans must recapture the center. The strength of the Republican Party in the 100 years of its life has been its representation of the great center core of America. It is for this reason chiefly that the American people have put Republican Presidents in the White House more often than Democratic Presidents.

The second point is the importance of understanding the function of political opposition. This point is particularly pertinent to the party and to the country because the Republican Party is more of a minority at this moment than at any time in its history, with one brief exception.

Point 3 is the importance of understanding that party direction and growth will only come through Republican candidates who stand for election in primary and in general elections across the country.

The political center is where the Republicans have been and should return. It is the Republican Party over the decades that has best been able to keep the center balance between public and private uses, that has kept Government and free enterprise in tune with each other rather than at war with each other and has best understood that because the free enterprise system is the great dynamo of America and the strength of the Western community, it carries with it a social obligation which has to be discharged. A Republican philosophy of the center sees the use of Government to provide enough order in society that every human being may live in dignity, respect law and receive justice, and exploit to the heavens the best in himself.

Americans have prospered, helped build and led the free system around the globe. They have had a sense of fairness about it, because we Americans are pragmatists and commonsense people more, I think, than any other people in the world. Business and labor, employer and employee, most all who work in and share the benefits of the free enterprise system, have for the most part a sense of public obligation about domestic and international affairs.

Holding the center also means that the Republican Party must be open to all. There must be a welcome mat out to all; and it may not be merely a passive welcome; but it has to be an active one. Republicans must search out those who have left and millions more in addition. We must see to it that our Negro citizens come back to the Republican Party and that scholars, writers, teachers, and intellectuals in every occupation, find a political home here. Neither businessman nor laborers, professional man or farmer, should ever feel a sense of discomfort in turning to Republican candidates. It must be an open society this Republican Party, in tune with the last third of the 20th century and ready for the 21st.

In a country as large as ours, as diverse, with as many different interests as ours, and with a unique system of federated States, there must be room in both of the two great parties for different shades of political opinion. If there isn't, we will no longer have a two-party system. Without sufficient intraparty flexibility, a big countrywide party will break. There must be sufficient bend in the arc that embraces the party in order to allow for and respect differences. Otherwise there will be a splintering into many parties which means the possibility of government by coalition, which our system is not geared for and the probability of government by minority, instead of majority, and, lastly, the certainty of sectionalism, East against West, South against North. I prefer to see the political debate take place within each community rather than between communities. I prefer also the countrywide communication that is caused by countrywide parties.

This wide umbrella of accommodation and respect, of course, means at the same time responsibility and the Republican Party in history, if anything, has been a party of responsibility, of reform, of good government, of sound administration. Responsibility means also the rejection of extremes of the right or left for the simple reason that extremes of the right or left refuse to be responsible or to assume responsibility. Neither do they respect the differences of others.

The center means individualism. It means keeping the balance between individual rights and group rights. It means protecting the individual and giving dignity to his uniqueness. Each person is important, for if one is degraded all are lessened. The integrity of each person should not be permitted to be breached by concentration of power beyond his control, whether it be the special concentrations of big business, or big labor, or big city political machines or local majorities, or the concentration of power that lies in government itself. Republicans should be sensitive to the balance point between individual rights and the nat-

ural expansionist tendencies of organized power groups. Republicans should be acutely conscious of check and balance, and the use of government itself to secure individual rights—their protection against invasion of other organized power groups.

This is the meaning of civil rights. Alexis de Tocqueville in his examination of the American system 20 years before the Civil War, astutely observed that the one thing he feared in America was the possible tyranny of the majority. It was the Republican Party that first saw the special duty of the National Government to lend its powers toward the protection of individual rights from their denial by local majorities.

The power of the National Government, in turn, must be checked, and individual rights secured from Federal invasion, by constant shoring up of the chief bulwark of individual freedom—the Bill of Rights laid down in our Constitution.

The Republican Party cannot be in the center if it ignores the cities, where 70 percent of our population now lives and therefore where 70 percent of the vote is found. How can Republicans as the best pragmatists of all ignore this area?

It is not as impossible to gain in the cities as some Republicans believe. If Republicans will demonstrate a care and concern for people who live in cities, they will be received with open arms. It isn't even necessary, I go so far as to say, to have final solutions to all of the agonizing problems that affect our urban centers. It is required that the people understand that Republicans understand the problems and pressures of the city people, care deeply, and work toward solutions.

Cities too long have been in the grip of a combination of special interests that have ignored the health, education, and welfare of individuals, that have in fact subverted individual betterment in the interest only of perpetuating machine powers. The political bosses and their special allies in business and labor get fat while the people suffer.

I believe that a whole campaign across the country can be waged around the neglect of the consumer, the harassed cliff of box dweller in the city, in the suburb, or in the countryside. When has he personally felt the benefit of alleged Democratic beneficence? He is beginning to catch on that the city hall politician takes to the soapbox just before elections and then retires to the clubhouse. If the harassed consumer discovers that there is just one person who really cares about him and who is independent of these tired political bureaucracies, he will turn to this person. This person can be, and should be, a Republican. All he has to do is show that he has a heart.

Policy is essentially a response to demands and demonstrated needs. Republicans, especially, being practical people, should understand the importance of responding to changed conditions. Frederick Louis Allen once noted that the Republican Party had labored long on a basic principle of "unrevolutionary and unsystematic and experimental change." A wise statement. Unrevolutionary change is better than revolutionary change. At the same time changes that are too systematic, or change merely for the sake of change can result in an overplanned society. Experimental change, designed to fit the needs of the occasion, is sound because if it doesn't work, it can be adjusted or dropped because it is experimental.

Superplanning, no; adjustment, yes; otherwise the free enterprise system either will not be allowed to work, or it will not work sufficiently in the public interest. Here again is the balance between public and private uses. "Wise progressivism and wise conservatism go hand in hand, and the wise conservative must be a progressive, because otherwise he works only for reaction which inevitably produces an explosion." These were the words of Theodore Roosevelt, a very practical Republican. Better there be carefree adjustments to the legal and social structure in any free country than there be bloodshed in the streets. And has it not occurred to all of us that this country has become the most powerful country in the world and the fastest moving of any newly emerging country, which we have been, in the shorter space of time, with only one bloody revolution? No other newly emerging free power has been able to do this in its history.

The second point that is relevant to this discussion is the function of the opposition. Its job as the minority is to try to become the majority. The opposition must really want to govern. If it has the attitude that its role is merely to oppose for the sake of opposition, it must mean that it has no real desire to govern. A political minority will not become the majority unless it demonstrates to the people what it would do if it had the power of government in its hands. This means programs, as programs are always required to meet different conditions. Here again I return to the theme that Republicans must demonstrate that they care.

Republicans should break new ground. I understand the importance of Republicans putting themselves on the side of the consumer. There is another neglected area where Republicans can and should define the role of the individual in an age of bigness and organized conformity.

President Eisenhower on leaving the Presidency warned the country to beware of the central power of the industrial military complex. Here is the biggest area of Central Government power of all. This is, in fact, the major part of the Federal Government, measured by the tax dollar and the budget. The Republican Party, consistent with its historical concern about big government can make a national issue out of the whole question of reconversion. What happens when that happy day comes and the industrial military complex has to be unwound? What happens when garrison state attitudes, in which every special interest in our system has a stake, overwhelm our initiative or sap our freedoms, or make us so dependent on "hardware" that we lose sight of individual excellence and ignore the humanities and other spiritual, cultural, and social values. There is no planning at all for this complicated eventuality. There is no new thought about it, or program—no idea. This is an issue by itself in any community which feels short changed in the allocation of taxpayers' money for the production of hardware. It ought to be a matter of deep concern to all Americans.

In foreign policy it is especially important for Republicans to understand the function of opposition. We have an obligation as the minority to insist that the Government state its policy. This administration is demonstrably weak in this area. Its tendency will be to avoid debate rather than conduct intelligent discussions.

Presently there is no clear policy with respect to the Far East, Vietnam, China. There has been little if any understanding of the new currents that have swept Europe or of the surges of nationalism that have been gripping the countries of Europe and the Continent itself. Clear policy, we, as members of the opposition, have a right to expect and an obligation to demand.

The third and last point that is pertinent to this discussion, is understanding the significance of running candidates. Policy has little meaning in the abstraction. It needs flesh and blood. It is right and proper that the political systems of each community develop and organize themselves around local candidates. This is meaningful. Abstract policy will not sell in the absence of the personality of candidates to put it around. The shape of the party will be controlled by the extent to which local candidates for office are developed, educated, supported, and tested. The extent to which the community is willing to involve itself in this production, is the measure of the health and vigor of the political system.

Dr. Johnson once said, "Our minds are only clarified by the sight of the gallows." One only discovers the meaning of the loss of power when a candidate is lost in a local or other election. Power lost is power gained by others, and here the control of parties and the formulation of issues and policies takes place.

Those who wish to shape the Government will do so by their involvement in local campaigns and with the daily headache that people in office or standing for office have. And it is almost trite to say that government is only as good as you wish it to be and candidates are only as qualified as you want them to be, but it can stand repetition because it is true. Involvement is the answer and involvement is the obligation.

My conclusion, then, can be simply stated. First, the Republican Party must recapture the middle ground which it abandoned and which the Johnson administration skillfully occupied as the result. Second, it must understand the function of the opposition in the parliamentary and governmental process. The Republican Party must demonstrate that it wants and deserves to govern. Third, the party's preoccupation must be the caliber of candidates for elective office.

I am optimistic about the future of the Republican Party because I believe in the connonsense of the people in their commitment to the two-party system and in the commonsense of the Republican electorate who ultimately will judge and declare what they want. It is not an easy business to run a party because the free democratic system and its processes are full of imperfections. But take comfort from the words of an honorary citizen of the United States, who, with love and sadness we remember today, Sir Winston Churchill, "Remember," said Sir Winston, "that democracy is the worst form of government ever devised by the mind of man, except for every other form of government."

Engineering for Human Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1965, Mr. Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, gave an excellent talk before the annual Science and Engineering Week convocation of Sacramento State College in Sacramento, Calif. In my judgment, Commissioner Dominy is to be complimented for a clear and comprehensive statement on the human benefits to be derived from great engineering projects. He urged the engineers of the Nation to keep before them the objective of human engineering for the needs of the people.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Dominy's address and commend his remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

ENGINEERING FOR HUMAN NEEDS

(Address by Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, at the annual Science and Engineering Week convocation of Sacramento State College, Sacramento, Calif., February 22, 1965)

The theme of Engineering Week is "Engineering for Human Needs." I cannot think of a more appropriate time for such a discussion.

The lay public usually thinks of engineers in terms of building big dams, big bridges, high buildings, or mile upon mile of airway strips and highways. The public generally does not look beyond the completed structure in considering the role of the engineer in our Great Society.

There is a tendency to think engineers design and build for the pure joy of accomplishment. I am sure that is true to a degree. I cannot think of anything that gives greater satisfaction to a construction engineer than to put the finishing touches on a structure such as Shasta Dam. Particularly if he has followed it through from its inception as so many of our people do.

But the real satisfaction to me comes in seeing a carefully planned structure do the job for which it is designed. I keep thinking back to my inspection trip with the House Public Works Committee after the yearend floods in California and Oregon. I am not a professional engineer. I am an agricultural economist by training. But the American Society of Civil Engineers was good enough to honor me with an affiliate membership so I can speak with pride not only as Commissioner of Reclamation, but as an honorary engineer, in considering our accomplishments.

The flood devastation along the coastal rivers in northern California was terrible. I could not help comparing it with the Central Valley where our reservoirs, together with those of the Corps of Engineers and the still uncompleted Oroville Dam of the State water plan, transformed a potential major disaster into nothing more than a highly beneficial rainstorm.

Dams and reservoirs designed and constructed by engineers performed as programed—and functioned perfectly. As a result, the central valley was protected through the threatening days and nights of high water and, at the same time, the valley was assured of a full water supply for irrigation canals and city mains for the hot dry summer months ahead.

This is an example of engineering for human needs—to plan, to design, to build to meet the needs of people.

The idea is not new. Aristotle said it more than 24 centuries ago. "The ultimate object of the state is the good life," he said. Then this ancient philosopher took a far look into Utopia which, he said, must be "situated in a healthy place, have an abundance of pure water, produce whatever the citizens need, and be easy to defend."

By our engineering for human needs we strive toward these goals today.

President Johnson, speaking last fall about furthering the Great Society, commented that there is nothing essentially new about the idea.

"The difference," he said, "is that for the first time in man's history, we really have the resources to make it possible."

The natural resources have been there almost since the beginning. It is the human resources, the knowledge and the capacity of man in our modern society, that makes this difference. The enlarged capacity of man to manage and cope successfully with his environment is a most important element in our striving to achieve the Great Society.

There are convincing evidences that today America is on the threshold of a development and a richness of life that will surpass anything the world has witnessed. The President has said that the Great Society he envisions will be a place where all will share in the inherent and spiritual richness of the Nation.

The foundation for such a society was laid, here in the West, with the taming of the wilderness by the early pioneers and the building of reclamation projects which developed and put to use the catalyst of all of our abundant natural resources—water. For without water, there is no life, no progress, no prosperity. That is why I feel regretful when I think of the billions of gallons of high quality water which were allowed to flow away to the sea last December. And I cringe at the devastation and human distress these uncontrolled waters left behind. And I am humbled at the wastefulness of such a loss because our civilization has the know-how and the capacity to manage our rivers so as to use them for our benefit and to create economic growth opportunities for our burgeoning population.

There have been great civilizations in the past. But they have dwindled and faded into history because the human resources, the mind of man and the governments that ruled him, were not equipped for the task. They proved unable to face up to the demands made by the inevitability of the continuance of life itself. They exploited their land and water until these resources failed and nations and people failed with them. We in these United States have sharpened our knowledge individually and collectively, to meet the tasks of the day. More importantly, we have a Government that exists for the people and is responsive to their will. And that will clearly is to conserve our natural resources by orderly development and prudent use for the benefit of our people now and for the generation yet unborn.

The expansion of our Great Society will not be solely the responsibility of the engineers. We all have important roles to play. Our Bureau of Reclamation, for example, is not made up solely of engineers. We have a far-reaching sampling of all the engineering disciplines on our staffs. We also have economists, soil scientists, meteorologists, hydrologists, geologists, and other technically trained people. We even require a few lawyers.

But above all we must have men of vision. Trained men with the knowledge and the ability to translate dreams into practical reality. That is why I am delighted to be here today—to speak of the importance of human engineering to an audience sparkling with youth and vigor but tempered—I hope—with the sobering desire for knowledge.

Let me quote again from our Bureau of Reclamation experiences. I could go far afield to quote other examples of our needs but reclamation is what I know best and it is also of most pressing and critical importance here in the Western States.

Someone asked me the other day if we are ever going to finish the Central Valley project. This is an understandable question, since we first undertook the construction of Shasta Dam 30 years ago and we have been building various divisions of the project ever since. I must say candidly that I doubt that the Central Valley project will ever have an ultimate phase. I am sure it will not happen in my time and I doubt if it will occur even within the lives of the youngest students here today. But I would forecast that we may construct the penultimate phase many times.

Our engineering and construction on the Central Valley project have progressed as the needs of the people have progressed. First there were Shasta and Friant Dams and the Tracy pumping plant and the initial network of canals and distribution works. But by the time these were operative, they were not enough.

The American River division consisting of Folsom Dam and Reservoir and the Sly Park unit were added. Then the Trinity division was constructed to bring in the first imported water. To utilize the imported water the Sacramento canals unit was authorized and is now under construction. Following that, the San Luis division was authorized to serve not only the Central Valley project but also as a key unit of the State water plan.

The New Melones Dam and Reservoir now being readied for construction by the Corps of Engineers is the latest addition to the Central Valley project.

Will these be sufficient to serve the needs of California? Clearly they will not. Before Congress today are proposals to authorize the Lower Colorado River Basin project—quite similar to the previously proposed Pacific Southwest water plan, and the Auburn-Folsom South Unit of the Central Valley project.

The former is a far-reaching program on which Arizona and California have at long last reached agreement to utilize completely the available water in the Colorado River and to investigate all practicable possibilities of importation of needed additional water.

The Auburn-Folsom South proposal is a new unit of the Central Valley project which has particularly critical importance right here in Sacramento. I have mentioned that existing storage dams and reservoirs did an extraordinary flood control job last December. What I did not mention is that Folsom Dam, on the American River, just a short distance above Sacramento, came within 12 hours of being topped by the high-flowing river.

There was, of course, no danger of a washout for these dams are designed and built to withstand any emergency. But had the rain continued a few more hours the full capacity of Folsom Reservoir would have been utilized and the swelling torrent down the American River that would have then occurred would once again have flooded much of Sacramento.

The Auburn-Folsom South proposal would include Auburn Dam on the American River above Folsom. Had this dam been constructed and in operation last December, there would have been another 400,000 acre-feet of flood storage capacity for waters captured and controlled for use later when the riverflow dwindles. The total storage capacity at Auburn, of course, would be much higher, 2.5 million acre-feet, but the water captured in the flood control space alone would be sufficient to supply Sacramento and the entire Central Valley with water for several weeks during the dry season.

Another major product of careful thinking and planning in today's engineering for human needs is the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest electrical intertie. We have come a long way in the use of electrical energy from that day when the imaginative Ben Franklin caught the power of a bolt of lightning with a kite or when the persistent and resourceful Thomas Edison induced the first tiny glow from an incandescent lamp at his laboratory in Menlo Park. What wonderful pioneers in the practicing art of engineering for human needs those two giants were.

Today, just as we take for granted that water will gush out when we open a tap, we take as a matter of course, the magic of light and power when we flip a switch. Who stops to think of the days and weeks and years of effort and the millions and billions of dollars which have been invested, just so that we can flip a switch almost anywhere in the United States and have light?

Within a year or two, that flip of a switch as far south as Los Angeles or San Diego, or right here in Sacramento, may activate energy from a hydroplant on the Columbia River system more than 1,000 miles away. Or conversely, a housewife in the Pacific North-

west may flip a switch in the winter darkness when the Columbia's flow is low, and bring energy from a thermal plant in southern California or Arizona.

This magic will be accomplished by interconnecting the power systems of California, Nevada, and Arizona with the Bonneville power system in the Pacific Northwest. Your own Sacramento Municipal Utility District will have a part in this interconnection as will our reclamation system of hydropower plants and transmission grids. For the first time, energy will be transmitted by direct current between switchyards and transformer points more than 800 miles apart.

And what is the significance of this? Will it be a major engineering achievement merely because we can boast that energy is being transported over the longest direct-current highway in the world? No indeed, it is a major engineering achievement, a major achievement in engineering for human needs if you please, because it will mean a maximum power supply at a minimum cost for millions of people in the population centers and outlying areas up and down the Pacific coast and inland as well.

There will be less need for a huge investment for standby service on the part of the utilities. There will be a better opportunity to follow the sun and the seasons in utilizing the available power supply. In California and Arizona, in the hot summertime there is a tremendous need for energy for air conditioning and pumping. This is just the time the Columbia River system is at its peak with a maximum output of kilowatts.

But the maximum power needs in the Pacific Northwest are in the wintertime when the sun stays low on the horizon. Then the lights stay on most of the time and the thermostat kicks the furnace on almost constantly. And it is during the wintertime that the Columbia's flow is the lowest because winter precipitation is piling up in the mountains as snow.

Until a way could be found to interconnect the utility systems of these two areas of differing needs, there would inevitably be waste and high cost operations in both. The intertie fills this need and, in my mind, it represents a high degree of engineering to fill human needs.

Engineers, however, must not only be capable in their professions but also be men of vision if they are to fulfill our needs. They must be practical men. Or, if I can put it bluntly, they must be engineers in the great science of politics. Let me explain why—and again I fall back on my own experience with the Bureau of Reclamation.

During the 1930's, when the Bureau of Reclamation undertook the great series of multipurpose dams such as Hoover, Shasta, and Grand Coulee, we were faced with constant opposition. There were doubts expressed that we could build such great structures safely. There were doubts concerning the expenditure of great sums of Federal moneys for such purposes. There were doubts that even if we could build the dams, the tremendous power supply that would be produced could ever be used. I recall a magazine article that said Grand Coulee power would be used to put taillights on jack rabbits, or words to that effect. As it turned out, these dams are some of the finest investments the Government ever made in the future of the Nation.

But still there is constant challenge, constant question, of every new reclamation venture that is undertaken. This, I believe, is as it should be. It is only in the full light of known facts and understanding that Congress can be expected to act on any major proposal.

But this calls for days and months; yes, more often than not, years of effort before a shovel of dirt is turned in actual construction. I know one of the most frustrating elements in our planning and design and construction shop at Denver is the constant demand, the constant challenge to explain why we must do it this way instead of that way, or why we must do it at all.

So it is important for engineers to have understanding and patience and the ability to translate their engineering equations and calculations into understandable terms for public acceptance. They must be articulate in presenting their case before the court of public opinion.

I recall the story of one of our top engineers who was working on a major dam in the 1930's. A group of reporters wanted a tour of the construction job in order to do a feature story on it. The construction engineer, tired and harassed from the multiplicity of problems he must face on a job of this kind, is reported to have said: "The public can go to hell. It is my job to build this dam and you can see it when it is completed."

Well, you can imagine how long such an engineer would last today. I can assure you that he would not be long with the Bureau of Reclamation. But nevertheless, it points up the importance of the engineer who would rise to the top in today's competition, being a master of political engineering and public relations as well. General understanding and acceptance is essential to the success of any public undertaking in this enlightened day and age.

We have another example of the importance of public understanding immediately before us in the Bureau of Reclamation. Two major dams have been proposed on the Colorado River as a part of the Lower Colorado River Basin project. One is in the Marble Canyon well outside the upstream boundary of Grand Canyon National Park. The other is at the Bridge Canyon site, which is near the headwaters of Lake Mead and downstream from the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park and Monument. This dam would create a reservoir which would back water up through the monument and 13 miles along the Colorado River where the river is the northwest boundary of Grand Canyon National Park.

The proposals have aroused opposition and criticism from some conservation groups who insist that the construction would ruin the Grand Canyon National Park. Such critics, while entitled to expound their position, tend to ignore a reservation for future reclamation development which was a part of the authorizing language applying to both the park and monument.

They becloud the issue by asserting that evaporation losses from the reservoirs would be more costly than the benefits which would be achieved. They accuse the Bureau of Reclamation of seeking to build the tremendous hydropower capacity which would be installed in the two dams at a time when hydropower is being replaced competitively by thermal power, particularly that generated at nuclear-fired plants.

I have attempted to explain that the reservoirs to be created by these two dams would not desecrate the Grand Canyon. I have a portfolio of color slides I have taken at Lake Powell, the magnificent new man-made lake behind Glen Canyon Dam, which I think, lend the lie to any such accusations. We have, in Lake Powell, a 186-mile-long lake with an 1,800-mile shoreline which gives promise of being one of the greatest national and international recreation areas of all time.

The same thing would occur downstream at the Bridge Canyon Reservoir which will provide a 93-mile waterway in the depths of the inner gorge of the canyon. At the same time, there would be more than 100 miles of natural river, with plenty of white water, through the great gorge of the Grand Canyon in the national park.

Our engineers are patiently gathering additional data to explain that hydropower is complementary to thermal generation and that the deep gorges in which the reservoirs will be located will keep evaporation losses to a minimum and far below the figures quoted by the opposition.

So here again, is a concrete example of why the engineer of today must be a well-informed and articulate individual if he is to do the public relations engineering which is an increasingly important part of the job.

I have confined myself this morning to a discussion of engineering for human needs in the United States. I would be amiss if I left the impression that this is all that concerns you and me here today. Our Bureau of Reclamation was one of the pioneers in helping the people of foreign lands to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps by better development and use of their natural resources.

From the days of the Marshall plan and the Point Four program down to the AID program as we know it today, we have had teams of our most competent engineers working on water development proposals overseas. At the same time, there has been a constant stream of top echelon planning engineers and budding students alike from overseas passing through our engineering center at Denver and learning by doing on our projects over the Western States.

The first such foreign trainees came to our Denver Engineering Center in 1920. They have been arriving in ever-increasing numbers ever since. A great number of foreign students have worked here in the Central Valley because your climate and meteorological circumstances are so similar to those they experience at home.

I am convinced that one of the strongest elements of future peace in our world society lies with human engineering for the needs of people wherever they may live. I have traveled the world over on foreign assignments and words fail me in attempting to tell you of the needs and wants of millions and millions of people.

It is understandable to me that communism, with its glib promises of a full belly in exchange for the freedom of the individual, has made inroads in our world society. People who go to bed hungry at night with the terror of a new day of uncertainty ahead, are not inclined to weigh political ideologies too carefully.

We must continue to broaden our consideration of engineering for human needs in our own beloved land. But engineering for the human needs of all the less fortunate people of the world must not be overlooked on our shrinking globe. The Peace Corps with its inspired volunteers has surely pointed the way for us to follow. They are reaching uncertain and unknowledgeable people and helping them to take the first halting steps on the road to self betterment. Can we do less than to further this effort with the skill and training we achieve in school and on the job?

And so, as we observe this annual Science and Engineering Week, let us keep in mind these goals of engineering for human needs:

1. Design and construction, no matter how challenging and intricate, are not an end objective. They must be a means to an objective that will stand the test of time.

2. That objective is to subdue the earth and all things thereon for the use and fulfillment of this and succeeding generations.

Keep these goals before you in your daily lives and the world will be richer for the years of your existence upon this planet.

Imports of Residual Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include therein a very intriguing and educational discourse between the president of the United Mine Workers of America, Mr. W. A. "Tony" Boyle, and Congressman JAMES KEE, my colleague, on a recent television "roundup."

I believe this is very worth while and deserving of the consideration of each Member of the House of Representatives and Senate:

AN INTRIGUING AND EDUCATIONAL DISCOURSE BETWEEN CONGRESSMAN JAMES KEE AND MR. W. A. BOYLE, PRESIDENT, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

This is JIM KEE, bringing you the "Kee Report."

I have with me today the president of the United Mine Workers of America, Mr. W. A. "Tony" Boyle.

As you know, the UMWA has been in the forefront of the struggle to restrict the importation of residual fuel oil—the waste product which threatens the coal market along the east coast. This is a problem of utmost economic importance to the coal-producing areas of the United States—especially southern West Virginia.

I have asked Mr. Boyle to tell you in more detail why the UMWA has so long—and so adamantly—opposed the unrestricted importation of residual fuel oil. Mr. Boyle.

President BOYLE. The underlying philosophy behind our policy on residual fuel oil imports is very simple. We do not believe that the fuel market of our east coast should be handed over to the products of a foreign nation. Nor, do we feel that the political or economic needs of the international oil cartel are sufficient grounds for allowing the dumping of a foreign waste product upon our shores to the detriment of our own industry and its workers. There is really a fundamental question of national policy at stake here. Our Government must decide whether or not the jobs and income of American workers are important enough to warrant protection from the ravages of unfair international competition. For this is what the importation of residual fuel is, and in the final analysis, it must always be treated as such.

We all know that residual fuel oil is a waste product, a product that can move only if the price is right, and if there is a market which has the equipment to use it. The only place where that market exists is on the east coast of the United States, in industries and commercial institutions especially equipped to burn it. Usually this places imported residual in direct competition with coal. Thus, residual oil stands poised above the coal industry and constantly threatens to crush it beneath a virtual deluge of a waste product.

A great deal has been said by the opponents of the current program to restrict the importation of residual fuel oil. To our minds however, they have skirted the major issue. They have failed to consider, or perhaps refused to consider what the importation of residual fuel oil means in terms of jobs. To our minds, this is crucial. To us a loss of markets is not a transfer of numbers from one sector of the economy to another. Nor is it an exercise in economic manipulations. Rather for every lost market, for each conversion to another fuel, we must face the stark problem of unemployment, and want and despair. We thus witness the tragedy of American coal miners out of work, and American families plunged into the dark abyss of poverty.

This is the real question here. It lies at the very heart of the residual oil problem, and indeed in many of the other difficulties arising from the dumping of foreign products on our soil. And it places the task of protecting American jobs squarely upon the shoulders of the administration, an administration publicly pledged to bring all of our people to a level of prosperity consistent with their human dignity.

Congressman KEE. Therefore, Mr. Boyle, you point out that the importation of residual oil is intertwined with the whole position of our trade policy.

President BOYLE. I most certainly do. It is interesting to note that the very people, both in the Congress, and without, who are asking for greater importation of residual oil, are at the same time demanding protection for their own industries which are not able to endure the rigors of unfair foreign competition. But, despite this inconsistency, the United Mine Workers of America, will continue to oppose the unrestricted importation of residual fuel oil and the exporting of American coal miners' jobs to foreign countries to boost their economies. We will continue to demand that the Government of the United States protect our jobs and give us an opportunity to serve the needs of our Nation's industry and commerce.

Congressman KEE. Thank you for your most informative presentation. You are to be highly commended for your dedication to duty, and to me, it is a real privilege to have this opportunity to continue to cooperate with you in any manner possible.

For Meritorious Service to the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend one of the outstanding weekly newspapers in America. The Locust Valley Leader, published in the Third District of New York, recently received well-deserved honors from the New York Press Association for the meritorious service it has rendered our local community.

This weekly publication, created in 1947 by Edith Hay Wyckoff, who is still owner and publisher, has consistently won honors and awards since its inception. In fact, Edith Hay Wyckoff received her 15th photographic award since she has been competing in the statewide contest in this year's ceremonies in Syracuse.

The awards received in the 1964 contest include first prize in sports news photography, third prize in general excellence, honorable mention for best news story, and honorable mention in use of locally orginated feature material.

Across the Nation our "weeklies" are rendering us a service that is a part of Americana. These publications mirror our lives, interests, and community occurrences. We depend on them for exposure of what is happening in our local government, where we may join our neighbors in local meetings and general information about the communities in which we live. It is such weekly publications as the Locust Valley Leader that keeps our communities throughout America informed of the local news and makes us aware of what is occurring in our immediate area.

The Locust Valley Leader has always been an enlightening source of information for the citizens of our community. It has upheld the highest merits of journalism in reporting the news. The awards it has most recently received exemplifies its quality and caliber.

Our community has grown to depend on the Locust Valley Leader. We look forward to each publication of this informative paper. We are proud of the Locust Valley Leader and its superior quality.

To the Locust Valley Leader, its owner and publisher, Edith Hay, her able assistant Edwina Bradic, their excellent staff and workers, I extend my praise and congratulations. I know that they will continue to perform in the superior way in which they have performed in the past.

The Need for Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding speech on the desperate need for conservation of our natural resources that the Honorable GAYLORD NELSON, distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, recently delivered before the State Bar Association of Wisconsin.

One of the situations Senator NELSON pointed to was the serious pollution problem in the Great Lakes. He made special note of the pollution problem in Lake Erie, which borders the district I represent.

The speech follows:

AMERICA'S LAST CHANCE

(By Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

A great new surge of interest in the conservation of natural resources is making itself felt in our country. The outstanding development was President Johnson's message to the Congress on natural beauty. This gave us what we have long needed—the leadership and inspiration of the President to summon all of America to save something of the land of beauty handed down to us by our forefathers.

The President's commitment of his administration to the cause of conservation comes on the heels of a number of other encouraging developments. The last session of Congress, which enacted the land and water conservation fund, the Wilderness Act, the Clean Air Act, and many related measures, is being

justly hailed as the conservation Congress, the session with the greatest achievement in this field since the days of Theodore Roosevelt.

The newspapers, the magazines, and the television industry have discovered conservation as a subject with broad popular appeal, and they are giving it attention it has not had for a long, long time. This reawakening of the Nation to what Secretary Udall has called the quiet crisis was helped greatly by the late President Kennedy's decision in the fall of 1963 to make a nationwide tour devoted entirely to the urgent problems of natural resources.

I welcome these heartening developments. They are long overdue and are of priceless value. They give us a new chance to save our land.

But I want to warn you that this may be our last chance.

I want to warn you that this fight to save our beautiful land is very nearly lost now, and America the beautiful could simply become a kind of a natural ruins, like Greece, which would be remembered throughout history for what it once was.

Just take a look at our vanishing America, the land which I am sure was once the most beautiful on earth and the most richly endowed with natural blessings.

We have destroyed our rivers, whose clear blue waters once delighted swimmers and fishermen, fish and wildlife. Every major river system in America is now polluted. Waterways that once were sources of pleasure and beauty and recreation are now forbidden to human contact and objectionable to sight and smell.

We have plundered our forests. Much of our State and local tax problem in Wisconsin today is caused by the fact that we ravaged our northland, recklessly consumed its one good crop, ruined its soil, and even altered its climate—leaving it almost destroyed for those to whom we sold it as a land of opportunity.

We are strip mining our mountains, ripping the earth to pieces with shovels as big as houses which spread ugliness, erosion, and siltation on a scale undreamed of a few years ago, and once the coal is gone the land lies barren and ruined for any purpose.

We are overpopulating and overdeveloping our public parks, turning many of these last refuges of cool, green beauty into sylvan slums. We are utterly failing in our obligation to add new park space, even though our population will double by the year 2000.

We are bulldozing away most of the green spots and open spaces in our cities, for highways and interchanges and parking lots and other forms of progress.

We are pushing heavy industry into the last sanctums of natural beauty, up the beautiful river valleys in quest of sparkling water to cool our hydroelectric turbines.

We are blighting the landscape with junkyards, with buildings deliberately designed to shock the eye, and with monstrous, electrified billboards which wage war with one another in the battle to catch the eye of the passing citizen.

We are planning a highway through the California redwoods.

We are building a steel mill in the Lake Michigan sand dunes.

We are considering a barge canal through scenic Lake Champlain, to attract oil tankers.

We are damming our trout streams, filling in our swamps, cutting down our trees, poisoning our birds, and suffocating our fish.

We are planning to turn the Grand Canyon of the Colorado into a reservoir.

Worst of all, we are destroying our sources of fresh water—the very basis of life itself—and the source of much of our scenic beauty and our recreational pleasure. Once it seemed that we could destroy only the water in our rivers, but now we are organized, and mechanized, and automated, and now we are embarked on a systematic campaign to destroy the greatest source of fresh water on the face of the earth—the Great Lakes themselves.

At this point people are inclined to say, "That's an exaggeration," but let me assure you that I am telling you only a tiny fraction of the problem.

A dull, gray tide of pollution is moving through our Great Lakes, following the path of human progress. I wish I had the time to describe it to you in all its shocking detail but I can mention only a few highlights, based on studies by the U.S. Public Health Service and our own State department of resource development.

The Great Lakes are becoming progressively more polluted every year—first of all, by community sewage systems which dump raw sewage into the lake; secondly by industries which dump lethal chemicals, and third by ships which dump almost every form of waste directly into the lakes.

This has been going on for more than 50 years, with mounting seriousness, but we paid little attention because we thought these lakes were so vast that even Americans could not destroy them. Now we are finding out otherwise. It turns out that the lakes are even more likely to be permanently ruined than the rivers, because they cannot purge themselves of pollutants as rivers can in time of high water runoff.

The southern tip of Lake Michigan is turning into a cesspool. Three steel plants, three oil refineries, several communities, and thousands of ships are pouring out pollutants at an astonishing rate—human waste, industrial acids, and iron slag. A Federal study shows that the organism which is the principal food for the finer grades of fish has practically disappeared, and trash fish have taken over. The study shows that pollution on the lake bottom in this area is practically irreversible.

In November 1963, 10,000 gulls and loons died along the south and west shores of Lake Michigan in this area.

Closer to home, two of the city of Milwaukee's four beaches were closed completely from 1959 through 1962, and intermittently after that, and the other two have been closed intermittently since 1959.

The Fox, Oconto, Peshtigo, and Menominee Rivers are seriously polluted. Green Bay itself is badly polluted at its southern end, largely by the pulp and paper industry but also by waste from canneries, milk processing plants, oil, tars, chemicals, and various other manufacturing byproducts. Green Bay looks from the map like a summer resort city. But its beaches have been closed by pollution for 25 years. The tide of pollution is steadily advancing up the Green Bay shoreline, toward our multimillion-dollar recreation area in Door County.

We live in the midst of this, but are we aware of the seriousness of it?

Over 250 American and Canadian cities use the Great Lakes for their public water supply. Fourteen million people—60 percent of the Americans living in the Great Lakes basin—depend upon the lakes for their water. They draw off 3.3 billion gallons a day for public use and 22 billion gallons for industrial use, using and reusing the water every day.

In Wisconsin 27 communities draw water from Lake Michigan—and many of these same cities dump sewage back into it.

In Milwaukee, 300,000 people are served by storm and sanitary sewers which are interconnected. During heavy rains, 252 sewer outfalls of the intercepting sewers discharge raw sewage into the Milwaukee, Menomonee and Kinnickinnic Rivers which flow into the harbor and then into Lake Michigan. The Milwaukee sewage treatment plant also bypasses sewage directly into the Milwaukee River during heavy runoff. Another combined storm and sanitary sewer discharges directly into Lake Michigan during heavy runoff.

If we want an example of where we are going, we need only look at Lake Erie. Our great American system has had more time to work on this lake. It is the dumping ground for the sewage outflow from Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Erie, and Buffalo. Among other things, it receives 2½ million tons of silt a year. Some people think it will eventually just fill up. But before it does, life will cease to exist in its waters. Studies show that the percentage of chlorides in Lake Erie—which closely reflects municipal sewage population—is 230 percent higher than in 1900. The water also shows an amazing concentration of calcium, sodium, potassium, and sulfate compounds. It is no longer simply water. It is a chemical tank.

Last summer, 2,600 square miles of Lake Erie—over one-quarter of the entire lake—were almost without oxygen and unable to support life because of algae and plant growth, fed by pollution from cities and industries.

Can you conceive of a human failure more enormous than the systematic destruction of a magnificent fresh water lake such as Lake Erie?

But don't feel too bad. American optimism is equal to a defeat of such a magnitude. It turns out that the Corps of Engineers is now planning to build a whole new lake—even bigger than Lake Erie—in Alaska.

And in our typical American way, we are prepared to do this despite the cost—in dollars or in natural resources or anything else. The new lake in Alaska would be created by building a dam 530 feet high. It would create a lake 280 miles long and 80 miles wide. The Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, after studying the proposal, said:

"Nowhere in the history of water development in North America have the fish and wildlife losses anticipated to result from a single project been so overwhelming."

In addition to costing $1,300 million, this project would reduce the annual salmon catch by at least 200,000 fish a year; destroy 2,400,000 acres of duck breeding habitat, destroy the range for 5,000 moose, and eliminate the habitat used by animals which provide 7 percent of the total Alaskan fur harvest.

But, of course, it is argued that that is the price of progress.

Well, this is our record. This is what we have done with the beautiful land given to us by our forefathers. This is how we have held in trust for the future our beautiful woods and waters and wildlife. This is how we have repaid the land which has given us the highest standard of living on earth.

Now that I have told of the defeats, let me tell of some of the hints of victory which now seem possible—now that our Nation seems to be rousing itself for one last chance at saving its heritage in the out of doors.

With bipartisan support, we have launched a fine program in Wisconsin to acquire the recreational resources we need for the future and to save some of the scenery and even some of the swamps to provide food and shelter for wildlife and to preserve some of the natural landscape as God created it.

With the Nation's conscience aroused and with the support of the Secretary of the Interior we seem to have an excellent chance to save the beautiful St. Croix River and its wild tributary, the Namekagon, as one of our first national scenic waterway projects and as an example to be followed in other wild river legislation.

Making up for our default of recent years, we are moving ahead with several excellent national park proposals, and I have high hopes that we can rally the united support we need to bring Wisconsin a national recreation area in the Apostle Islands in the next 3 to 5 years.

We have just passed a bill in the Senate to centralize the water pollution fight in an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

With the President's leadership we have hopes of controlling pesticides, helping cities build more parks, screen our junkyards, save some of our highway landscapes, clean up the foul Potomac, and build some hiking trails for the forgotten outdoorsmen—those who simply like to walk.

In the President's words, we can now make a "massive effort to save the countryside as a green legacy for tomorrow."

I hope every public official, every businessman, every bird watcher and deer hunter and ice fisherman and plain citizen, will join in this massive effort.

I hope we will each assume our responsibilities as citizens and stop our own littering and defacing of the landscape. I hope we will realize that when we take something out of our bank of natural resources we have to put something back in.

I hope our people will participate in the educational programs which are needed to spread the story of the conservation crisis far and wide. I hope they will support the legislation needed to save our land—good zoning and sanitation ordinances, reasonable regulation of industries to protect the public interest, sensible restraints on billboard construction, a significant investment in buying land and water resources for the enrichment of life in the future.

Most of all, I ask of all Americans a simple recognition of a fact of life.

We can't have everything. Our land cannot be used up and still be the land of our childhood.

The great resources of America—the soil, the timber, the minerals, the wildlife—have sustained us for hundred of years. But now we have got to think about sustaining them. The frontier is gone. If we destroy these rivers and lakes, if we plunder these forests and rip up these mountainsides and foul this air and water, there will be no new green paradise awaiting us over the horizon. If we don't save the America we have today, I don't think we will have another chance.

A Dedicated Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, tonight the citizens of Smithville, Tex., are joining in a tribute to their most famous son, Clifton C. Carter. Those of who are involved in the operation of our Federal Government know Cliff to be one of this Nation's most effective and efficient workers. In his present post at the Democratic National Committee, Cliff's tireless efforts have been of inestimable help to the President, to the Democratic Party, and to the Nation.

He is one of those rare men who is totally dedicated to public service with no desire for personal glory. All of us who have had the opportunity of working with him greatly admire Cliff and his work.

Mr. Speaker, the February 22, 1965, edition of the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Record News, paid tribute to Cliff Carter in an editorial entitled "A Dedicated Worker." The president and publisher of this newspaper, Mr. Rhea Howard, has long been a stalwart in the Democratic Party and has had the opportunity of viewing Cliff Carter's work firsthand and seeing the effective results thereof. I include herewith this editorial tribute:

A DEDICATED WORKER

One of the most appropriate appreciation dinners held in Texas in many years will be at Smithville, Tex., March 1, with Clifton C. Carter, assistant to President Johnson, as the honoree.

Carter is one of those rare selfless, diligent, dedicated, and devoted workers who receive very little, if any, publicity. Rather they work in the background with no attention to themselves to help our great leaders achieve positions of leadership.

It is essential that any man who wishes to serve his country in such positions as those achieved by President Johnson to have faithful and dedicated friends who help them along the way.

Carter has been such a person. You do not read much about him. He rarely has been interviewed. His picture is difficult to get.

Yet this selfless man who seeks no honor on his own account, has marched beside our President from the very first political campaign Lyndon Johnson waged.

Carter is a native of Smithville, Tex., but his home generally is considered as Bryan, Tex. He attended Kerrville Institute and the University of Texas. He is a World War II veteran, married and has three children. He is a successful businessman.

However, his importance for the moment to us is that he started helping Lyndon Johnson when the latter first ran for Congress in 1937. Since then Carter has been a volunteer worker in all of the President's congressional, senatorial, and presidential campaigns. He was regional chairman of Johnson's 1948 campaign for Senate, State campaign manager for Johnson in 1954, and a member of Johnson's staff from 1957 to date. He headed Johnson's regional office in Austin.

In the critical months since November 1963, Carter has been a special assistant to the President, acting as chief liaison man with the Democratic National Committee and key party leaders all over the Nation.

Carter served as the President's "ears and eyes" at the national committee headquarters and National Democratic Convention. During the last campaign along with Lawrence O'Brien he met daily with the party leaders at the Washington headquarters, reviewed the past 24 hours and helped make key decisions about action to be taken.

This man who served in a quiet and efficient manner deserves whatever honor they accord him at Smithville.

What Does the Separation of Church and State Mean to Me?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to share with our colleagues an article written by a young boy in my district, Edward Smisek of Londale, Minn. I believe that it is an excellent discussion of the question of separation of church and state:

WHAT DOES THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE MEAN TO ME?

(By Edward Smisek)

Have you ever watched the operation of a pendulum, swinging now this way and now that, back and forth, back and forth. This expressed my feelings as I tried to find the answer to the question, What does the separation of church and state mean to me?

I began to compare the pendulum with our Government, swinging back and forth, church and state.

Let's examine the phrase "separation of church and state." The state is a natural society which is devoted to our physical needs and the pursuit of happiness. The church is a supernatural society which is devoted to spiritual ends and the eternal life.

The same people compose the two societies simultaneously. So to bring a true separation of these two societies is obviously impossible, unless you are going to tear each of the members into two pieces.

And so the pendulum swings.

Does it really mean separation, or is it applied to the result of the act of separation, referring to early American history when some of the States had an established church of their choice.

The church and state now exist in separate spheres. Americans have accepted that condition as the best possible political arrangement to guarantee the freedom of religion. The church and state avoid seizing absolute power. Each can deal more competently in the things that are its own. This is the result of the adoption of the first amendment, which states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

And so the pendulum swings.

In order to keep the two societies separate, its requires cooperation and distinction since each of these two societies has authority over the same subjects.

Divided allegiance would mean a divided conscience and would result in chaos. Distinction and cooperation are correlatives; they must exist together. We need cooperation in the field of human relations and distinction in functions between church and state to assure religious and political freedom.

Every individual is a civic person subject to the authority of it's government. And every individual is likewise a religious person a creature of God, subject to the authority of conscience. The real basis of the first amendment is a recognition of the dualism of man himself.

Now can this work? I'll cite a few examples. An alarm rings at the fire station, the address given is that of a Jewish synagogue, does the firemen reply, "Sorry we can't go there to put out the fire, it's a Jewish house of worship, that's against the Constitution, we're civil servants." Of course not, that would be silly, as civil servants they are not going there to promote or aid the Jewish religion but to protect the property of American citizens. Here we have distinction and cooperation.

Public funds go to chaplains in the Army and Navy, also to chaplains in the Senate and the House of Representatives, why? Because our Government recognizes the needs of it's citizens and does not want to deprive them of the consolation of religion.

Religion is the basis of morality and therefore is necessary to good government.

If this were no so, why not abolish religion, as the Nazis of Germany and the Soviets of Russia. You know the results.

The passage of the civil rights bill, has assured by law a measure of equality for the Negro who has been subject to insult and abuse. But no law will guarantee civil rights unless there is a change in the hearts of men, motivated by the Christian teaching regarding the brotherhood of man.

And so the pendulum swings.

Church and state are mutually dependent, one upon the other. They compliment each other. It is the control of one over the other that the Constitution forbids.

What does this mean to me? It means I may attend the church and school of my choice, I may run for public office or a government or State job without the discrimination of law. I have the privilege of being an individual, forming my own opinions, and working at my choice of goals. This also means I have a duty to fulfill. I must concern myself with breaking and eliminating prejudices in myself and others by promoting greater understanding among my associates in school, church, clubs, civic, and social organizations. I have to take an interest in government issues, because we of our generation will be tomorrow's leaders.

We must be willing to support our church organizations and also pay our taxes, without grumbling, not as a necessary evil, but as a good, a way in which we can keep ourselves free.

See how the pendulum swings? Let's go back to that mental picture placing the Government in the place of the pendulum. Is it really taking sides? Would it work if it stayed on one side only? The answer is obvious, no, but as long as it swings in equal balance, back, and forth, gaining strength and momentum from each side the results are harmony and rhythm. To me this means freedom and equality as we live, in one nation, under God.

Coast Guard Training Center Should Not Be Moved From Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I was taken by complete surprise and shocked to learn that the Coast Guard is planning to transfer its Training Center from Groton, Conn., to Governor's Island in New York Harbor. The two Senators from Connecticut, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD and the Honorable ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, were similarly surprised to hear of this proposal.

The Coast Guard Training Center has been located at Groton for many years. It is an important part of the area not only from an economic standpoint, but also because of the place occupied by the men and their families in the local communities. Many of them have bought homes in the area, their children attend the local schools, they have established certain roots which are of vital importance to these families.

The transfer of the Training Center will affect about 1,000 people, as follows: 52 commissioned and warrant officers, 437 enlisted personnel, 3 civilian employees, 543 transient students, and 15 officers. The total annual salaries for all these people is more than $5.5 million. This, of course, constitutes a severe economic blow to the entire area of southeastern Connecticut.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, of which I am a member, has already begun its hearings on the Coast Guard's authorization for the coming fiscal year. I am not at all convinced that there is any savings involved in this transfer, since many millions of dollars will have to be spent by the Coast Guard at Governors Island. I do not think that the proposed transfer is economically justifiable, nor am I convinced of the claim that it would make for greater efficiency. On the contrary, it may cause a good deal of disruption of the Coast Guard's activities over many months, disruption in the lives of the families involved, and disruption in the communities who will suffer from this transfer.

I believe that very careful study should be given to this proposal before hasty decisions are reached. The people of southeastern Connecticut are most anxious that the Training Center remain in Groton for many reasons other than payroll, such as the fine personnel, their families, the tradition of its location, the geographic facilities and its strategic location at the entrance to Long Island Sound from the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. Speaker, during the past few days, since the announcement has been made public by the Coast Guard, I have received many telegrams, letters, and telephone calls from local officials and from individual citizens protesting the proposed transfer of the Training Center. I wish to insert some of these into the RECORD merely to show how the people feel about this matter. The following are several editorials and letters on the subject:

[From the New London Day, Feb. 18, 1965]

OPINION OF THE DAY—THE PROPOSED TRANSFER

Disclosure that the Coast Guard wants to transfer the Coast Guard Training Center from Avery Point to Governor's Island in New York Harbor, comes as a rude shock to southeastern Connecticut.

No talk of such a plan had reached public notice. No indication of a study or survey to this end had appeared. But suddenly it was proposed, the reasons being unsupported by figures. Part of a plan to take over the New York Harbor island for a number of Coast Guard activities—to center activities there, in the metropolitan area—the transfer is not now supported by persuasive reasons.

Word of this plan came first to Connecticut's Representatives and Senators in Washington. At some date soon Treasury Department appropriations will come up for congressional hearing in Washington. First official opportunity for the legislators to register public protest, and ask for convincing reasons for the change, will come then.

Southeastern Connecticut values this installation highly—fully realizes its importance not only to the economy of the region but in the armed services complex hereabouts. It is far from convinced that there are sensible reasons, including those of efficient operations, justifying the proposal. This area is not only proud of its Coast Guard connections, its know-how and familiarity with service needs and problems, but it has long felt the site ideal because of proximity to the Coast Guard Academy, to Navy installations, etc.

Shocked by this disclosure, southeastern Connecticut is justified in protesting and asking for significant proof that the change would make for efficiency, or that advantages not stated would be present. The alternative offered—proposed expansion of the Coast Guard Academy and relocation and expansion of the new moorings station—comes a long way from offering justification for the transfer.

[From the Norwich Bulletin, Feb. 19, 1965]

UNITED EFFORT NEEDED

The surprise announcement of the proposal to move the Coast Guard Training Station from Avery Point in Groton to Governor's Island, N.Y., is cause for great concern and stirred up a storm of protest that was quick to be felt in Washington. This spontaneous reaction on the part of area officials is understandable because the loss of such a valuable facility would be a tremendous blow to the economy of southeastern Connecticut, a blow the area can hardly afford to absorb.

In revealing his plan to transfer the station to Fort Jay, the Army's installation in Senator ROBERT KENNEDY's backyard which is to be abandoned under Defense Secretary McNamara's recent cutbcak order, Adm. Edwin J. Roland, Coast Guard commandant, said the move would save in the neighborhood of $20 million in capital improvements over a period of a few years. This so-called savings would hardly compensate for the immeasurable economic damage Southeastern Connecticut would suffer over the same period and in the future through the loss of the station.

It has been pointed out that any loss in payroll and personnel resulting from the proposed move would be covered by plans for expansion of the facilities at the Coast Guard Academy and the construction of a new Coast Guard mooring station in New London. True, these plans will prove extremely beneficial, but they are nothing we have not known about for some time and the benefits of the area will eventually derive from them will be but a very amal part of the more than $5 million payroll that will leave the area.

Although the matter must still be looked upon as one of an extremely urgent nature, it was implied during a House Merchant Marine Subcommittee hearing Thursday that no definite decision has been made as yet concerning the Groton station. According to Assistant Secretary of the Treasury James A. Reed, who claimed he was unaware of Admiral Roland's release of Tuesday, the move hinges on the outcome of a study being conducted to determine the feasibility of the Coast Guard assuming custody of Governor's Island. If such is the case, and we sincerely hope it is true, it would appear there is still time to prepare a strong and convincing case for retaining the training station in Groton.

Area government, business and civic leaders, and our Representatives in Congress, are to be commended for their quick response to Admiral Roland's announcement. They have taken the necessary preliminary steps toward getting to the heart of the matter and now must consolidate their forces in a determined effort to convince those conducting the study that Groton is the logical place for the installation in question.

The Coast Guard training station is an important part of southeastern Connecticut, not only from an economic standpoint but from the standpoint of the place the personnel and their families occupy in the various communities in the area. These and other vital factors should be kept in mind as the fight to retain this installation is planned and carried out.

THE FOLLOWING IS A COPY OF AN EDITORIAL DELIVERED BY ED LEONARD, NEWS EDITOR, STATION WICH, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, THROUGH FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19

The Coast Guard dropped a bombshell Monday with its announcement of plans to close out its training station, at Groton—transferring the operation to Governor's Island, N.Y.

The Groton closing—tentatively set for July of next year—was decided upon, according to the facilities around New York and because there is personnel housing in New York that the Groton-New London area does not have.

There had been no advance hints of the move. Even as recently as last month when Groton turned down a zoning request which derailed plans to construct an apartment project for Coast Guard personnel near Trumbull Airport, there was an absence of the warning—usually heard in such cases—that it might jeopardize the future existence of the training station.

The first shock of the announcement having worn off, the question now is, "What will the area do about it?"

Since transfer decisions of this type are not usually made in haste, the Coast Guard undoubtedly is determined to move, and it will take more than a demonstration of mere desire on the part of the area to reverse the decision.

Connecticut's congressional delegation already has said it will fight the move in Washington to the last committee, exerting whatever pressure it can to produce a change of mind. The fight could be a heated one since New York's Congressmen and Senators—and their considerable influence—will be working just as hard to make sure the move is effected.

On that score there is some speculation that the Coast Guard decision is at least a partial sop to New York which lost or will lose several Military establishments under the spending cutback ordered recently by Defense Secretary McNamara.

Connecticut lost no facilities or contracts under that cutback—and it may be that official Washington decided the State could afford the loss of the training station while New York might be mollified somewhat by getting it.

What this area must do now is to expend as much energy as it possesses to demonstrate that it wants to keep the facility and will, if necessary, review its thinking on the lengths to which it will go to meet the housing and other needs of the Coast Guard.

There is little else that can be done because the Coast Guard has not indicated that it is dissatisfaction with southeastern Connecticut that is prompting the contemplated move.

However, the very absence of major dissatisfaction does encourage the slim hope that a change of decision is possible.

So far as area efforts are concerned, there has already been some in-fighting between chambers of commerce at New London and Groton over who should lead it.

We would suggest that the goal being sought—the retention of a facility that means people, payrolls, and prestige—is too important to have the effort jeopardized by such side disputes.

The struggle to save the training station has too little chance at best. The odds against it can only be increased by anything less than a completely united effort.

RESOLUTION PROTESTING CLOSING OF COAST GUARD TRAINING STATION ADOPTED

NEWINGTON, CONN., February 19.—State VFW legislative leaders meeting here last night adopted resolutions protesting the reported closing of the Coast Guard Training Station at Avery Point and reaffirming the VFW's opposition to any moves to weaken the VA structure and its services to veterans through wholesale closing, and consolidation of existing facilities, and budgetary cuts.

State VFW Commander Walter A. Jackson, Jr., of Newington, said he was shocked to hear reports that the Coast Guard intends to move its training center out of Connecticut in view of its previously announced plans to expand the Academy and its facilities at New London. Jackson called on the 20,000 VFW membership in Connecticut to register their protests with their congressional representatives in Washington, D.C. Jackson said we must vigorously and continually oppose these unwarranted economy measures made at the expense of war veterans and our national security.

NORWICH, CONN.,
February 18, 1965.

Congressman WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
Washington, D.C.:

Southeastern Connecticut was shocked by the news of the possibility of the removal of the U.S. Coast Guard Training Station from Avery Point, Groton, Conn.

This may or may not be a move in the best overall interests of the area.

Presently we lack all the facts.

This message is sent assuring you that we have utmost confidence that your final action will be in the best interests of our southeastern Connecticut region.

Respectfully,

ETHEL V. MCWILLIAMS,
President, Norwich City Council.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SOUTHEASTERN CONNECTICUT,
New London, Conn., February 19, 1965.

Representative WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I am sure you can understand our complete surprise on hearing the news that the Coast Guard was planning to move the Training Station from Groton to Governor's Island in New York. Members of the business community in southeastern Connecticut are well aware of the economic importance of all the military facilities here and have done everything possible to maintain excellent relations with the military personnel during their tour of duty here.

We want to urge you, in your official capacity, to do everything at the legislative level that is humanly possible to prevent the consummation of the transfer of this important installation and we assure you that we, here on the home front, will do everything in our power that our facilities will permit to assist in any way possible to bring this about.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. MACDOUGALL,
President.

FEBRUARY 19, 1965.

Adm. EDWIN J. ROLAND,
Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ADMIRAL ROLAND: The members of our organization were greatly distressed at the unheralded announcement that the Coast Guard was contemplating a move of the Training Station in Groton to Governor's Island in New York.

Our organization has, throughout its history, been proud of the Coast Guard installations here, mindful, not only of their economic contributions to the whole area, but also of the quality of the personnel that they have brought to our region, and we feel that it would be a severe blow to us on many counts to lose this facility which has served the Coast Guard so well and so long.

It is our hope that this decision has not reached the "point of no return" and that every consideration will be given to all the facets of the problem which, I am sure, you and your office will do before these plans are finalized.

Because of this area's long attachment to the Coast Guard service, we offer you the services of our organization at any time if they are needed to solve any of your local problems and we would ask that you keep us informed of our deliberations and the detailed background of the reasons of this planned move.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. MACDOUGALL,
President.

CITY OF NORWICH, CONN.,
February 18, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
U.S. Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ST. ONGE: I respectfully request that you use your good offices to retain the U.S. Coast Guard Training Station at Avery Point, Groton, Conn. This facility has through the decades become an integral part of the entire area. It is strongly attached to the mores of the region. In fact, when the words "Coast Guard Academy" are mentioned, the thought immediately is registered of New London, Groton, Norwich, and the immediate vicinity.

The Coast Guard Academy has through the years furnished the Nation with excellent leaders who have had the use of the training center at Avery Point. The very fact that this facility has been operational for many decades indicates that trained personnel and professional staff are able to perpetuate such a vital institution. This area cannot afford to lose the training center and I know how much you have worked for the welfare of the entire State.

I also respectfully request your good offices in locating a branch of the University of Connecticut in Norwich. Gov. John Dempsey has given top priority to Norwich in the matter of new industry locating here. As you know, Norwich possesses diversified human skills and the productivity of its people is a matter of public record.

There are many problems that confront the community which can be resolved intelligently provided there is an exertion of leadership which I am attempting to provide the community. The location of a branch of the University of Connecticut would be a tremendous influence in locating new industry here as well as providing the techniques and professional personnel to man and operate a substantial industrial complex.

Thanking you for all your past services and recognizing full well the heavy burden of your office, please accept my warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

CHARLES R. IOVINO,
City Manager.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, every year the Veterans of Foreign Wars conducts a "Voice of Democracy" contest. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest sponsored by this great patriotic organization.

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington for the final judging as a guest of the Foreign Wars. I am very pleased that the winning contestant this year from North Carolina is a young man from my congressional district. He is Thomas Henry Croom of Newton, N.C., and his winning speech is entitled "The Challenge of Citizenship."

I know my colleagues will find this young man's speech to be most interesting, and I request that it be inserted in the appendix of the RECORD.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Thomas Henry Croom)

On a spring day in 1951, a group of young women sat at a table in a drug store in a small town in the United States. They talked about the fact that it was almost time to pay income tax. And most of them complained bitterly about having to pay taxes. But one in the group was silent.

She was a Latvian girl who, only a few months before, had arrived in America with her family, victims of the war in Europe and the Russian occupation of her homeland.

Finally, the young Latvian spoke. "I would consider it a privilege to pay the income tax."

Those were the words of a girl whose father, a Lutheran minister, had disappeared when the Russians overran Latvia and when the family had been forced to flee to a displaced persons camp in Germany. The father had not been heard from since that time. Now, this girl, at 17, was the head of the family, for the mother was aged and could not speak English.

In the months that followed, the family revealed an interest in all things American—a loyalty to America, a courage to meet all problems—that would make native-born Americans who came in contact with them stop and wonder, "Do I value citizenship enough?"

They tackled any job until they were able to buy a house, a car, and obtain the education they needed. They became active church members. They participated in community affairs. In everything they did they displayed a tremendous gratefulness at being in this country and an overwhelming desire to be American citizens.

The five are now American citizens. One is a doctor working among the coal miners in Kentucky. The only boy, a graduate of West Point, is a lieutenant in the U.S. Army. Another is a secretary at NBC radio in New York. The youngest is a graduate nurse. And, as often as possible, they return to that small town where they still own a home.

The story of this immigrant family would fill a volume. Let me simply say that whenever I think of anyone's meeting the challenge of citizenship, I think of these people. And remember the words, "I would consider it a privilege to pay the income tax."

The challenge of citizenship. The good citizen meets it by taking part in community affairs. He knows who the mayor is and who the town councilmen are. He is well informed on issues of the day, whether they revolve around school needs or highway controversies. He always exercises his right to vote. He realizes what goes on in his town, small or large, has an effect on the welfare of the Nation and, in the long run, the world. He agrees with Rousseau who wrote in "The Social Contract," "As soon as any man says of the affairs of state, What does it matter to me, the state may be given up for lost."

The challenge of citizenship. The good citizen meets it by being loyal to his community, his State, his Nation. This loyalty may be expressed in simple ways, by trading with local merchants and helping to boost the economy of the area, by supporting the high school athletic teams and musical groups, by contributing to worthwhile fundraising campaigns. Or it may be revealed through such volunteer acts as serving on an industry-hunting expedition—as many businessmen in my State have. For a young man fresh from college, loyalty to a community may be revealed by a decision to return home to work and use his talents rather than to seek "greener pastures."

The challenge of citizenship. The good citizen meets it by displaying courage. Sometimes a man must stand alone for what he knows is right. At such a moment, one might recall the words of William Jennings Bryan speaking at the National Democratic Convention in Chicago in 1896, "The humblest citizen of all the land, when clad in the armor of a righteous cause, is stronger than all the hosts of error."

If the poor immigrant girl could gladly assume the duties of American citizenship, how much more then, should we, the native-born citizens embrace with pride all duties and obligations of American citizenship? For this is our own, our native land.

Reclaiming Our Wasted Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has issued an urgent appeal to preserve the natural beauty that is part of our American heritage. Those of us who have come face to face with urban blight, littered highways, polluted air, and the destruction of scenic areas realize that increased activity at all levels is needed now to restore beauty in the United States.

The Los Angeles Times, the leading daily newspaper in Los Angeles, carried an outstanding editorial on February 15, which stressed the need to preserve and restore our national beauty. The editorial agreed with President Johnson that the task of conservation must be accepted by all levels of government, by business and industry, by private groups and by individual citizens. The Los Angeles Times should be commended for advocating this very sound approach—an approach well tested in California—to the problem of conservation. I would like to call your attention to this fine editorial:

RECLAIMING OUR WASTED HERITAGE

In his congressional message on conservation, President Johnson held up a mirror to the Nation. The reflection was filled with the manmade uglines that results from neglect, greed, and poor planning.

"For centuries Americans have drawn strength and inspiration from the beauty of our country," said the President. "Yet the storm of modern change is threatening to blight and diminish in a few decades what has been cherished and protected for generations."

His message was an eloquent appeal to preserve—and restore—the natural beauty that is our heritage.

It is ironic that the technology which produced the world's highest living standards has also contributed so greatly to the worsening of our natural environment. The "storm of modern change" has left in its wake befouled air, polluted water, and defaced landscapes.

It is incredible that any nation can turn its back on urban blight and unsightliness and the loss of scenic and recreation areas.

The automobile symbolizes the blessing and curse of our advanced civilization. For most American families, life without at least one car would be unthinkable. The national economy would not move without wheels.

Yet the automobile is a major contributor to air pollution throughout the Nation. Highways and freeways often cut concrete swaths through desirable residential and rural areas. Billboards spoil even well-planned roadways. And, finally, when automobiles leave the highway they fill junkyards that are rapidly growing in both numbers and ugliness.

The problem of conservation is serious, but the solution is not impossible.

California suffers from many of the symptoms of the national problem. Our air pollution is second to none. Our cities, although newer, often suffer from the old faults of poor planning, unattractive buildings, and insufficient park space. Our highway routes on occasion ignore residential or scenic values, and our billboards are among the worst.

California, however, has also shown the way to preserve and enhance the precious resource of natural beauty. We recently voted $150 million in bonds to acquire more parks and recreation facilities. We have not won the fight against air pollution, but our efforts have set the pace for the rest of the Nation. And for years this State has had effective State and regional water pollution control boards.

In addition, such nongovernmental organizations as Los Angeles Beautiful have waged a successful battle against civic ugliness.

The task of conservation, as the President noted, is one that must be accepted by all levels of government, by business and industry, by private groups and by individual citizens.

Governments can acquire land, plan public facilities better, and set higher standards. But the support and cooperation of every citizen, every company is needed.

Ugliness need not be a byproduct of progress—unless we are too apathetic to prevent it.

Massachusetts Winner of VFW Voice of Democracy Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the four scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes.

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as guests of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at the annual congressional dinner which this year is being held on March 9, next. The winning contestant from the State of Massachusetts happens to be an outstanding young man from the city of Watertown in my congressional district.

At this point I am pleased to include the most timely and inspiring speech of my young constituent, Patrick J. King. The selection of the very pertinent topic of citizenship responsibility and the most convincing projection of it is, indeed, a high tribute to this gifted young student and serves, in great measure, to restore our faith in the American youth.

The speech follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Patrick J. King, Watertown, Mass.)

From failing hands to us was thrown the torch. Be it ours to hold high; for this is the challenge of citizenship.

The hardest task, the most important job placed on our shoulders by our forefathers, was the responsibility to live like Americans.

In New York City recently, the cry of a woman fighting for her life as she was assaulted and brutally stabbed by an armed assailant was heard over many blocks. There was nothing to do but cart away the badly mangled corpse when the police arrived. When asked why there had been no report, the common answer was "We didn't want to become involved."

This is, unfortunately, the attitude of too many in this country today. We enjoy the privileges of our citizenship, but "let the other guy do it." When it comes to responsibilities, "just ignore it." We forget the responsibilities we must hold down in the citizenship we cherish.

Compare the founding of this Nation to the New York City incident. No comparison? An entirely different subject? No, just different people. For a few trivial pennies on a tea tax, mark how much less that is than a human life, 13 tiny Colonies rose up against the tyranny of the mightiest nation of the 18th century, England, thus winning freedom and founding an ideal of power and righteousness in the Western Hemisphere. Today these same Colonies have emerged a world leader and power.

Yet in this same country are traces of weak links. Good people, who believe in God, go to church every Sunday, and who didn't even have the decency to enforce one of His commandments, "Thou Shalt Not Kill." It was not necessary for them to subdue the attacker, or even to leave their houses. It would probably not have cost one of them the price of a telephone call to lift the receiver and summon the police.

When one shirks his civic duty, he is pushing the principles for which our ancestors fought back into the yellowed pages of history and slamming the book shut without further adue.

You, the individual, are shirking your duty if you do not vote. Every man need not run for public office, but, for those who do, every American citizen must support their efforts. There are bound to be people who will say "There is so much to do, I just can't vote; besides, what will one vote mean one way or another?" Let me recall for you a recent election wherein a man was elected Representative by a margin of one vote. What if he had not had time to vote for himself?

The challenge of citizenship is not an easy one, but we must meet it like Americans, with our heads held high, both feet on the ground, and our very lives in our hands, ready to risk them, to insure freedom for ourselves and our children, for this is the challenge of citizenship. Hold high the torch.

Congratulations to Monsignor Hladky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues that yesterday afternoon, the Very Reverend Monsignor Silvester Hladky was elevated to the office of papal chamberlain of his Holiness Pope Paul VI.

This recognition of his church to Monsignor Hladky was an occasion of great joy to his parishioners and his many hundreds of friends. Monsignor Hladky has served for many years as the pastor of Sts. Peter and Paul Church in Warren, Ohio. Not only has the monsignor served his people well, but he has also contributed generously of his time and effort to the betterment of the entire city of Warren.

His personal example of leadership in the social progress of this great city has done much to contribute to the moral and spiritual growth of this community.

I wish to share in this occasion of congratulations with his many friends and extend to Monsignor Hladky my every best wish of many more years of continued service to his church, his city, and his country.

The Yemen War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in the February 19 issue of Life magazine, an extremely thorough and interesting report was written on the continuing conflict in Yemen.

The author. Mr. George De Carvalho, has served us by his frank reporting in the best tradition of journalism. I am personally indebted to him for bringing this crucial, and widely misunderstood, warfare to the attention of the American people.

President Nasser of Egypt has committed himself to full military and political involvement in Yemen. It is a costly affair for Egypt, and one of the manifestations of that country's repeated disregard for peaceful norms of international conduct.

The Yemen war has never constituted a purely civil conflict. It must be realized that the sole obstacle to peace and stability and legitimacy in this country is President Nasser and his policy of aggression.

I have exerpted pertinent portions from the lengthy article, which read as follows:

YEMEN'S DESERT FOX

(By George de Carvalho)

For 28 months in this remote and rugged land a sanguinary but little-noticed war has been going on which has some of the looks and all of the cruelty of a bloodletting in "The Arabian Nights." Upwards of 100,000 people—soldiers on both sides and Yemeni civilians have been killed. This is at least equal to—and probably higher than—the military and civilian death toll in South Vietnam during the same period of time. The scene is a medieval country about the size of New England, monstrously mountainous and inhabited by 5 million unruly people. The protagonists are Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser and Muhammad al-Badr, the Imam, or ruler, of Yemen.

The war started in October 1962 when Nasser sought to enlarge his Pan Arabian power base in the Middle East by seizing a toehold on the oil-rich Arabian peninsula. Nasser engineer a coup which drove the Imam out of his acient capital, San'a, and into his caves, then replaced him with a puppet republican government supported by Egyptian troops. Relying on Nasser's pledge to get out of Yemen, the United States quickly—and prematurely—recognized the puppet government, despite the misgivings of the British. Nasser did not get out of Yemen. Now he has committed an army of 40,000 troops, along with hundreds of Soviet-made jets and tanks, to a military venture which has already cost him 20,000 Egyptian casualties (including 5,000 to 10,000 dead) and perhaps $500 million—one of the main reasons Egypt has a new economic crisis. Caught in a strength-draining stalemate, Nasser cannot pull out; he would suffer an unthinkable loss of face. Badr survives partly with Saudi Arabian military and financial support but mainly because Nasser can't get at him.

To get the Imam, Nasser has used airborne rockets, bombs, artillery shells, machineguns, grenades, and hired assassins. Once an Egyptian agent planted an adder in the Imam's sleeping blankets. Badr decapitated the deadly reptile with his dagger and calmly dropped off to sleep. Last summer the Egyptian armored spearheads pushed within 2 miles of the Imam's headquarters, but again he slipped away over the hills.

Cairo newspapers have repeatedly run the triumphant but premature headline: "Imam Dead." But when I visited him a few weeks ago in one of his secret caves, the Imam was very much alive, and moreover made it clear that he expects to kick Nasser's army out of Yemen and into the Red Sea. With a wide, white-toothed grin, he said confidently: "Yemen will be Nasser's graveyard."

Last year Nasser called up more reservists, raised two new divisions and bought more Soviet arms. His army in Yemen used a scorched-earth policy, burning the villages and crops of rebellious tribes, polluting wells, and carrying off livestock. In royalist areas which his troops could not penetrate, six jet squadrons strafed and bombed every living thing—including camels and goats—from dawn to dusk. Though Nasser deplores use of napalm in Vietnam, royalist Yemen is spattered with black splotches burned into the land by his Soviet-made napalm bombs. In January 1964, an Egyptian pilot, Capt. Mahmoud Hilmi Abbas, fled to Israel in a training plane after being assigned to his second tour of duty in Yemen. His explanation: "I cannot stomach machinegunning and bombing Yemen's defenseless villages."

At least 10,000 of the Imam's armed supporters have been killed and 30,000 wounded. These figures do not include civilian casualties, which are enormous. A Red Cross team in royalist Yemen has reported: "We encountered Biblical scenes of suffering. Women pleading for help held out to us their sick and wounded babies. We did not have enough medicine even for critical cases."

A few months ago, in October, after the failure of his 1964 summer offensive, Nasser agreed to a cease-fire and a peace conference. But even some republican delegates to the conference, which was due to meet last November, demanded Egyptian withdrawal from Yemen. Furious, the Egyptians executed 40 republican leaders and jailed 300. The conference was postponed indefinitely and the republican government collapsed, with nearly all ministers resigning..

Technically the October cease-fire is supposed still to be on, but the war never really stopped. Traveling at night, in December, to one exposed royalist position, across a wretchedly rutted trail, my jeep driver incautiously flicked on his lights. Within seconds Egyptian artillery slammed a barrage into the barren rocky mountainside. And last month the Imam's forces felt confident enough to launch a counterattack in force near the Saudi Arabian border, which supposedly resulted in 1,000 Egyptian and republican casualties.

The royalists still have nothing approaching Nasser's firepower—no heavy artillery, no

armor, no aircraft. But they have much more going for them than they had a year ago.

The Imam's allies include a fighting tribe of cousins, young princes of the Hamid al-Din dynasty. All are educated, English speaking, very ebullient, and extraordinarily tough leaders of men. The two youngest princes are 15 and 16; the oldest are in their late twenties.

The royalists have a few mercenaries—about 15 French and Belgian veterans of Katanga, Algeria, and Dienbienphu. They are advisers rather than fighters, because the Imam refuses to let foreigners fight the foreign enemy: the Egyptians.

So, Nasser cannot crush the Imam without vastly reinforcing his army in Yemen, which seems militarily and economically impossible. If Nasser's troops got lucky and killed or captured the Imam, that would be a severe blow to the resistance. But anti-Egyptian feeling is now so strong in Yemen that Nasser would have a fearful job pacifying the country, and another leader might well arise from the militant royalist military.

Meanwhile the Imam's forces are still too lightly armed to expel the Egyptians from strongly fortified positions. But they can go on hurting Nasser badly, ambushing convoys and encircling garrisons. Already some isolated Egyptian positions have to be supplied by air, at vast effort and expense. Certainly Nasser failed to realize what he was getting into when he took on these tribal ragamuffins. When Badr says, "Yemen is Nasser's worst mistake," he may be right—at least as long as the Imam lives.

Mail Snooping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1961, a vague and ill-defined bill passed the House which directed the Postmaster General to notify recipients of mail he deemed to be "Communist propaganda." At that time I warned that such a practice would lead to a Postmaster General's list of recipients, with all the implications which would flow from such a listing. I voted against that bill.

In January 1962, the so-called Cunningham amendment came before the House. It created in effect a program of censorship and interception of foreign mail. I was one of two who voted against that measure. Unfortunately, it became law. Now we know that the power to intercept "Communist propaganda" did lead to a Post Office Department list which was turned over to the House Un-American Activities Committee. The Postmaster General recently announced that the Department plans to destroy the list.

Snooping seems to be one of the Post Office's major activities. It not only snoops for foreign propaganda, but also uses "mail covers" at the request of various agencies. These activities so fundamentally transgress constitutional freedoms that it is shocking they have been allowed to continue. The Washington Post and the New York Times on February 26, 1965, published excellent editorials on the subject of Post Office snooping. I believe that all my colleagues should read the following editorials:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 26, 1965]

MAIL SNOOPING

Like the proverbial village postmistress who, according to legend, used to hold everybody's mail up to the light and scrutinize every envelope to find out who was writing to her neighbors, the U.S. Post Office Department now seems to have embraced snooping as a universal policy. It snoops on mail from abroad to see if it contains anything which could be called Communist propaganda. And instead of hurrying domestic mail to its destination, it apparently goes sniffing about for smut and feeling envelopes for fraud, peering at postmarks and generally conducting itself like a collection of professional peeping toms. All of this might be perfectly appropriate for a post office department in the Urals or the Balkans. But for the mail-carrying agency of a people who like to think that they live in the land of the free, it seems more like a dirty joke.

Let us say simply what is wrong with mail snooping. It interferes with the free communication of ideas which is indispensable to a free society. People who think that their letters are being scrutinized, like people who fear that their telephones are being tapped, are inhibited in the expression of their thoughts. When the Post Office Department lets it be known that it resorts to "mail covers"—even though it insists that it neither opens letters nor delays their delivery—it makes everyone uneasy that his own mail may be under surveillance and that he may get into trouble on account of something that someone else may send to him. In short, whatever benefits may accrue to law enforcement from this form of snooping are heavily outweighed by the injury it does to public confidence.

Postmaster General Gronouski seems well aware of this. His unwillingness to disclose to congressional investigators the names of those whose mail has been placed under surveillance is an acknowledgment of the damage done by this kind of investigation; disclosure of the names would be ruinous to reputations. And his decision to destroy lists of persons who have had the hardihood to ask to be allowed to received mail sent to them from Communist countries—instead of turning those lists over to the House Committee on Un-American Activities—is a recognition of the gross injustice of this kind of postal censorship.

These actions are a credit to Mr. Gronouski but an indictment of what the Post Office Department is doing. Let the Department confine itself to the difficult and inadequately discharged duty of getting the mail to its destination with celerity and leave to the Department of Justice the task of pursuing and prosecuting law violators. The American people can be trusted to evaluate their own mail when they get it.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 26, 1965]

MAIL COVER

The Post Office Department seems to be digging itself deeper and deeper into a hole of its own making.

First, it admitted that it has a list of 24,000 persons whose mail has been put under special surveillance in the past 2 years at the request of various investigative agencies. The Post Office is currently studying a demand for this list from a Senate subcommittee investigating the Department's practices.

Next, the Post Office concedes that it has kept a second list of all persons receiving "foreign political propaganda" through the mail. This list has found its way into the hands of the House Un-American Activities Committee and other agencies that have nothing to do with delivering the mail.

Since a Federal court in a case now on appeal has questioned the propriety of this practice, Postmaster General John A. Gronouski has announced that the Department will destroy this second list. Instead, a postcard will be sent to the recipient of such mail each time a publication from a Communist country arrives for him. Only by returning the card will he receive the publication. A subscriber to Pravda will presumably have to fill out a new card each day. Since more than 60 million pieces of mail arrived in the United States from Communist nations in 1963–64, that is going to mean a lot of postcards.

The Department would be better advised to ask Congress straightforwardly for repeal of this useless law regulating foreign propaganda mail. As for mail surveillance for criminal investigative purposes, it is as ugly as wiretapping. The privacy of the mails is a cherished American tradition that deserves to be protected, not chivvied about at the edges. The Post Office ought to go back to delivering the mail and stop playing detective.

Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a brief editorial which was published in the February 16, 1965, issue of the Norwich Bulletin, a fine daily newspaper in my congressional district.

This editorial stresses the need for greater and more adequate air safety devices and better ground-air control systems. It further suggests a congressional review of efforts by the Federal Aviation Agency and the respective airlines to establish a better air safety program.

It has also been suggested that, in order to alleviate the congestion at the Kennedy International Airport and other airports in the New York area, an international and domestic passenger and cargo terminal be established in the Norwich area of Eastern Connecticut in my district. Such an airport, serving perhaps primarily as an air cargo terminal, would similarly lighten the burden at existing airport facilities in Boston, Hartford, and elsewhere which are being taxed beyond the limits of safety.

I believe that these proposals deserve early consideration. For this reason, and in the interests of public safety, I am commending this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. It reads as follows:

[From the Norwich Bulletin, Feb. 16, 1965]

AIR SAFETY INADEQUATE

Investigators continue their search for the cause of last week's major plane disaster and the Navy has launched full-scale salvage operations in an attempt to raise the wreckage from the depths of the Atlantic off Jones Beach. The wreckage will play a vital part in the investigation which has already re-

vealed that shortly before the airliner crashed, carrying all 84 aboard to death, it narrowly missed colliding with another aircraft coming in for a landing at New York. This plane had even more persons aboard—98, plus a crew of four.

The pilot of the plane that survived reported of the other aircraft at the time of the near miss, "It looked like he went into an absolute vertical turn and kept rolling." Federal Aviation Agency officials have cautioned against drawing any conclusions from this. Still, though the near miss may not have caused the crash it seems reasonable to conclude that there was some connection between the two.

One point comes strongly to mind. This is that, but for the narrow gap that separated the airliners in what the surviving pilot called a close miss, there would have been a far greater tragedy. Had the planes collided, the toll might well have been 186 rather than 84.

The episode serves as a reminder that, although progress has been made in recent years, airborne safety devices and ground-air control systems are not yet adequate to deal with the threat of midair collisions. Every now and again there is a hair-raising near miss. Cases of actual collision, though not frequent, have occurred from time to time.

A congressional review of efforts being made along this line by the FAA and the airlines would not be amiss. If the air safety program needs a shot in the arm, it should be administered as circumstances indicate.

Enlargement of Guilford Courthouse National Military Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD a copy of the statement made today by the Honorable David Schenck, mayor of the city of Greensboro, my hometown, before the Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mayor Schenck came to Washington today and appeared before the subcommittee in pursuance of a subject which has been of sustained and deep interest to him—the preservation, protection, and enlargement of the Guilford Courthouse National Military Park, located in Greensboro, Guilford County, N.C. A modest sum for greatly needed land acquisition to prevent undersirable encroachment on the park's boundary was recommended in the budget for the National Park Service.

It was peculiarly fitting that Mayor Schenck should appear in this connection, because his grandfather, Judge David Schenck was the first president of a company formed by the citizens of Greensboro, nearly 100 years following the crucial battle of Guilford Courthouse, which was known as the Guilford Battleground Co. This patriotic organization raised the money to purchase, initially 30 acres, later increased to 100, to preserve the site of the battle.

It was through the sustained efforts and interest of the Guilford Battleground Co. that this site was preserved and that, in 1917, a bill was approved in the Congress making the Guilford Courthouse Park a national military park.

Mayor Schenck and I appeared today before the subcommittee in behalf of this project. The mayor's statement, in addition to presenting a forceful argument for the necessity of increasing the park boundaries without further delay, stresses in a most interesting fashion the historical importance of the park to our national heritage, which should be of interest to all those who feel that American historic shrines should be preserved before urban encroachments make their preservation impossible. I deeply appreciate the opportunity to insert Mayor Schenck's statement, as follows:

In 1779, British generals, seeking to suppress the upstart American revolutionaries, made an important strategic decision. They dispatched General Lord Cornwallis, one of their top military figures, to conquer the southern part of the Colonies. Cornwallis arrived at Charleston, S.C., to begin his southern campaign.

It was thought that the sparsely settled Southland, with much Loyalist sentiment, would soon return to British domination; and with this strong base of supplies, the British Armies could then put down the balance of the rebellious American patriots.

Cornwallis' campaign through the South reached a climax in South Carolina, with the battles of Camden, Cowpens, Ninety-Six and others. His success tended to prove the British strategy correct, for the entire South, below South Carolina, soon came under British domination; and Cornwallis moved on to the North through Charlotte, N.C., pursuing the badly outnumbered, but valiant, Gen. Nathanael Greene.

General Greene knew, however, that to save the infant American Nation, Corwallis, would have to be stopped.

At the village of Guilford Courthouse, now located on the outskirts of the city of Greensboro, N.C., in the northern part of the State of North Carolina, General Greene found terrain which suited him. He knew that here he must make a stand, or Cornwallis would completely dominate the South and move on to join forces with other British units to overwhelm Gen. George Washington in the North.

In a battle that has become a classic in military science, General Greene arraigned his forces, consisting of raw North Carolina militia recruited from the countryside, Virginia militia, and seasoned Continental troops and cavalry from Virginia and Maryland, in three lines across the road leading to Guilford Courthouse. Each line was instructed to take its total of the advancing British and fall back for further fighting. Each line did as instructed; and while the end of the day of the battle saw the British in possession of the battlefield, their forces were so crippled, their wounded so numerous, the ammunition so spent, that the southern campaign was to all intents and purposes finished.

General Cornwallis was forced to retreat, returning to a seaport in Wilmington, N.C., to lick his wounds. A few months thereafter, without ever fighting another battle, he moved on to Yorktown where his ultimate surrender took place, assuring the American Colonies their cherished independence.

Nearly 100 years after the March 15, 1781, battle, citizens of Greensboro, N.C., with a sense of history and with a desire to preserve the hallowed ground of the Guilford Courthouse battle, formed a company known as the Guilford Battleground Company. My grandfather, Judge David Schenck, was the first president of that company. The company raised money from private sources, through contributions, and sale of stock. It made an initial purchase of 30 acres. This was soon expanded to approximately 100 acres.

The land purchased was in a rural area 7 miles north of the village of Greensboro in 1882. Enough land was purchased to make a park and picnic ground in the vicinity of the place where the major battle engagements took place. Later, in 1905, a separate tract was purchased to include the site of the old Guilford Courthouse and General Greene's headquarters.

It never dawned upon these patriotic gentlemen in 1882 that the city of Greensboro would one day expand to engulf their park. In those days, the big Fourth of July celebration at the military park was of prime importance; and citizens took a 7-mile train ride to get out to the area where the battle took place.

In 1917, the Guilford Battleground Company sought and was successful in securing passage of a bill in Congress to make the Guilford Courthouse Park a national military park.

The land was donated without any cost to the Federal Government; and from that day to this, the park boundaries have remained virtually the same; and the park has been administered and improved—first by the War Department as a national military park; and since 1933, by the National Park Service. It is one of the smallest of all the national military parks commemorating a battle of this importance and this historical significance.

While the Guilford Courthouse National Military Park has remained the same, the surrounding area has not. The city of Greensboro is the most rapidly growing municipality in North Carolina. Our 130,000 population today will swell to 200,000 in another decade. The city is in the midst of an area where industrial growth is steady and where the surrounding countryside is rapidly being filled by residential subdivisions, commercial developments, and industrial plants. The very prosperity of our area now threatens the historic ground on which our forefathers fought the Battle of Guilford Courthouse.

To the south of the park, by fortune of circumstances, the city of Greensboro has large landholdings, including a cemetery and a city park. This, for some time, has protected the southern border of the national military park.

To the west, the east, and to the north, however, development is beginning to encroach on the park. A drive-in theater now stands on a portion of the land once occupied by the village of Guilford Courthouse. A clubhouse has been proposed almost upon the site of General Greene's headquarters. An industrial plant now stands where General Cornwallis was unhorsed during the battle; and on the north, the vacant land that covers some of the battle area is being planned for a residential subdivision at this moment.

Nearly 3 years ago, a movement was begun by citizens of Greensboro to enlarge this park, this being our last opportunity to secure additional land on which the battle was fought. If it is not purchased now, commercial, industrial, and residential development will take place and make the land virtually impossible to secure and preserve for future generations.

I, and other interested citizens of Greensboro have made several trips to Washington to visit the National Park Service and to Richmond to talk with the officials of the regional office which has charge of our territory. The historic significance of the land which we seek to have added to the park has been affirmed by the National Park Service; and a recommendation for the increase

in acreage has been made. In fact, the recommendation is for an increase in acreage somewhat beyond that which the current appropriation would purchase.

My plea to you, gentlemen, is to give us the funds to make this acquisition immediately. The time is late. The city government of Greensboro already has turned down two rezoning requests for property adjacent to the park in order to preserve the land for purchase by the Park Service. In addition, the city government of Greensboro recently purchased five areas adjacent to the park which was threatened for development. In addition, the city of Greensboro has expressed a willingness to purchase some additional land adjacent to its own city park in order to join up with land to be purchased by the Federal Government in order to give a large continuous park area surrounding the battleground site.

Our individual citizens and our city government have exhibited their good faith and, indeed, have invested money in the prospect that this park can be increased. The amount contained in the budget request is, we feel, a modest request, considering the greatness of the need; but it is a vital request which, if granted, can save this park from encroachment, and eventual engulfment by undesirable commercial and industrial development.

In addition, an enlarged park would given the National Parks Service a better opportunity to tell the historic story of the Battle of Guilford Courthouse. At the present time, a road runs directly through the park; and there is little room for a scenic drive or for the re-creation of sections that would have been familiar with those in the battle.

With enlargement of the park, the entrances can be protected. The city of Greensboro has plans for relocating the road through the park to the north. A loop drive through the battlefield area could then be constructed; and as a long-range project, the recreation of the village of Guilford Courthouse has been suggested. All of this would give our citizens and those devoted to our historic heritage everywhere a dramatization of the brave deeds that took place during this Battle of Guilford Courthouse.

We have been advised of the support of the entire 11-man congressional delegation of the State of North Carolina, as well as our 2 Senators. We hope you gentlemen will look with favor upon this budget request for Guilford Courthouse National Military Park, and help us to acquire this historic land before it is lost to us forever.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to appear before you today.

Hon. Frances P. Bolton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, we are justifiably proud of the many distinguished sons that the State of Ohio has furnished to these legislative halls. We are equally proud of that eminent daughter of our great State whose 25th anniversary of service, I would call to your attention.

The Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON was elected at a special election to fill the unexpired term of her late husband, Chester C. Bolton, and took her oath of office on February 27, 1940. That most able Member of this body served five terms with great distinction.

I need not detail the entire legislative career of the most competent gentlewoman from Ohio. Her capability as a Member of this House is fully recognized by us all.

As senior ranking Republican member of the Committee of the House on Foreign Affairs, she has demonstrated that she is indeed possessed with outstanding diplomatic ability. Her capability in this field has received recognition, not only here in our country but throughout the world. I am of the firm conviction that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] would be a most able Secretary of State.

I know of no one who has a greater knowledge of the complex problems of the newly founded nations of the continent of Africa. She has studied these with great diligence and has traveled in that continent to improve her knowledge.

I need not speak of her personal attributes. Here indeed is a most gracious lady. I wish to here acknowledge the aid and good advice that she gave me when I first came to the House of Representatives. Now 15 years later, I still rely on her good judgment.

I would not have you think that she has confined all of her activities to the field of foreign affairs. Her great interest has brought fine advances in the fields of education and health. Her great modesty prevents us from learning of the many philanthropic things that she has originated and continues to support.

I have often heard it said that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] is a great inspiration to all of the women of the world. Certainly she has shown that women can be most successful in public service. I do say that the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON is an inspiration to all Americans, men and women alike.

Here is a truly great American.

Samuel Hughes Morgan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, frequently a single family, over several generations, can make what is a vital contribution to an area and State. And all too frequently the importance of this contribution to the life and economy of the area is overlooked. Recently, an outstanding member of such a family in my district passed on. On that occasion, a noted Georgia editor wrote a tribute which I would like to share with my colleagues.

SAMUEL HUGHES MORGAN

(By John L. Sutlive)

Regrettably, and all too young, another member of the public-spirited Morgan family of Effingham and Chatham Counties has passed from the Georgia scene. He was Samuel H. Morgan, whose recent death at the age of 59 stopped a career that had followed the pattern set by his forebears.

This is a pattern of service to God, to country, to fellow men. The saga of the Morgan family is inspiring. It runs back into early American history and in the more recent years has been carried on by the generations headed by the late Samuel H. Morgan, the senior. Mr. Morgan and his children had a tradition to live up to, and they heeded unhesitatingly the call of character and responsibility.

As is not unusual on a team, and we apply that term to the Morgan family in its best sense, there are members whose works are better known publicly than others, although each member of the team makes his valuable contribution to the whole. The senior Mr. Morgan served well in several public areas—his church, education, and the development of Georgia's economy. His sons and daughter had the benefit and the inspiration of sound paternal and maternal precept and example and in discharging the obligations of their generation they did not fail.

Samuel Hughes Morgan, who to countless friends was simply and affectionately "Sam," was the youngest of the Morgan brothers. As a lad he lived in the home place at Guyton but, following his graduation from high school there, spent most of his life in Savannah. The interests that had long stirred the family found active appreciation in him. He had served on the Georgia Forestry Commission and quietly associated himself with many altruistic community and individual efforts. His was the quiet way of service, sincere and effective.

Sam Morgan was the last of his generation in the family business, which now comes under the guidance of the third generation of kinsmen. If we were to sum up his philosophy of life, it would be to repeat his frequent greeting: "What can I do to help you?" There can be no finer motto.

Vietnam—White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a concurrent resolution authorizing the publication as a House Document, of the Department of State white paper relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam—Department of State Publication No. 7839.

The document sets forth in clear and concise form the case against North Vietnam and the Communist aggression to take control of South Vietnam, and should be made available to those who want to know the facts.

This weekend's mail brought many requests from my constituents asking for an explanation of our involvements in southeast Asia. The Department of State white paper sets forth the reasons for our commitment to defend South Vietnam—a commitment made in 1954.

If our foreign policy is to succeed it must have not only bipartisan support, but the support of our elected representatives and the American people. To insure such bipartisan support we must

make certain that the American people are aware of the underlying reasons and the facts which justify this country's commitments abroad.

The solution to the Vietnam conflict is not offered by the Department of State in this white paper. It does not call for unprovoked escalation of the war in Vietnam or for withdrawal of U.S. servicemen. The white paper provides the facts and the proof of Communist aggression so that our citizenry may be able to judge the advisability of our role in southeast Asia and the future course of our defense of freedom in that area of the globe.

I urge my colleagues to support the concurrent resolution so that this document may be made available and distributed upon request.

Jim Wright's Brand of Diplomacy Wins Bravos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my friend, colleague, and fellow Texan, the Honorable JIM WRIGHT, for his outstanding work as a member of the U.S. delegation to the recent Fifth Annual United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference.

This was the third consecutive year in which Mr. WRIGHT has been appointed by the Speaker as a delegate to this important yearly meeting between lawmakers of the United States and Mexico.

I think perhaps the best indication of his effectiveness at the most recent conference is the manner in which his performance was reported in the daily press. I commend to my colleagues the following two articles—the first from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, the second from the Fort Worth Press.

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram Feb. 21, 1965]

WRIGHT BRAND OF DIPLOMACY WINS BRAVOS

(By Larry Allen)

LA PAZ, MEXICO.—Congressman JIM WRIGHT of Fort Worth stole the show at the Fifth United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference just concluded in this capital city of the Baja (Lower) California territory.

WRIGHT captured acclaim not only by outlining clear-cut proposals for further cementing the "never better" relations between his country and Mexico, but also by saying what he thought in warm, precise words that Mexican officials and lower California's citizenry found pleasant to the ears. They were spoken in virtually flawless Spanish.

As a matter of fact, his Mexican audiences insisted WRIGHT's Spanish was "perfect." He smilingly contended, however, he still has much to learn before that adjective would be applicable.

Anyhow, WRIGHT, chosen from 24 U.S. Senators and Representatives to say "thank you" to Gov. Bonifacio Salinas Leal and other Mexican hosts for the dazzling reception accorded to the Washington contingent, did it so masterfully at a farewell dinner that he "brought down the house with cheers and ovations."

Alfonso Martinez Dominguez, leader of Mexico's Chamber of Deputies; Senator Manuel Tello, formerly Foreign Secretary and onetime Ambassador to Washington, and other kingpins of the 24-member Mexican delegation to La Paz, all hailed WRIGHT's speechmaking and the positive results of the 2-day discussion.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, and chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee, said the La Paz parley was the best of all the conferences held annually since the interparliamentary assembly started in Guadalajara in February 1961.

MORSE declared WRIGHT "wowed them" by speaking Spanish at the Governor's dinner and his report on social problems between the United States and Mexico was a "fine job." Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, said WRIGHT's work in the assembly was "magnificent and his speech in Spanish was one of the most eloquent I have ever heard."

A shower of laurels also came from the Republican side.

Representative ALPHONZO BELL of California said: "To put it in the vernacular, Jim was the main star of our whole delegation. We of the United States scored heavily in improving and cementing our good relations with our Mexican neighbors. A substantial part of this was due to Representative WRIGHT's warmth, friendliness, and honesty in his statements."

Representative F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts, declared WRIGHT's performance in the interparliamentary conference was a "perfectly outstanding job."

"I am not a member of JIM's party," MORSE added, "but his contribution (in La Paz) made me mighty proud to be a Member of Congress, and indeed, to be an American."

The report stressed the desire of both United States and Mexican lawmakers to improve understanding and friendship and "a greatly expanded program of social, cultural, and technical interchanges, an increasing flow of private tourism and the steady application of statesmanship to the solution of the remaining problems which beset our common border."

WRIGHT said both the United States and Mexico had only "scratched the surface" in educational interchanges and that greater emphasis should be placed on increasing the number of students studying outside their own country, and a people-to-people program.

WRIGHT's report called for broadening of the Pan American Health Organization to speed up the eradication of diseases and their causes.

On the question of a new United States-Mexico pact to allow Mexican farmhands (braceros) to work in the United States, replacing the one that expired last December 31, WRIGHT's committee advocated: Guarantees that wage rates shall not be disruptive of prevailing rates or job opportunities among U.S. workers, and protection against "discrimination, mistreatment, or unjust exploitation of Mexican workers."

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Press, Feb. 21, 1965]

FORT WORTH SOLON CREDITED WITH AGREEMENTS—WRIGHT DRAWS PRAISE FOR WORK IN MEXICO

(By Terrance W. McGarry)

LA PAZ, Mexico.—Even as a national news magazine was speculating last week that Fort Worth's Representative JIM WRIGHT may make a Senate bid next year, the young Congressman began building a reputation as an effective behind-the-scenes force at the international level.

WRIGHT was one of the 21 U.S. Congressmen who met with 25 Mexican Congressmen in the fifth interparliamentary conference between the two nations in the Baja California city of La Paz.

The news magazine said two Democrats in Texas see him as their best bet to unseat Republican JOHN TOWER.

Congressmen from both countries said privately he deserved a major share of the credit for several of the agreements of the two-nation conference.

Chief among them was the virtually unanimous consensus by the two delegations that the bracero agreement should be renewed.

WRIGHT headed the American side on the committee that discussed the bracero situation, and emerged as the spokesman for the five-man coalition of border State Senators and Representatives that pushed hard to get that consensus.

The committee's final report, written by WRIGHT, spoke optimistically of "any and all future (bracero) agreements."

Before the conference began, the Mexican delegation was reported to be preparing to push for stiffer controls and more stringent labor department supervision in any future bracero agreement.

By the time it ended, both sides said the Mexican delegates would willing back a renewal of the contract under its old terms.

WRIGHT's delivery of the committee report to the concluding session of the conference drew the loudest round of applause of the evening. It took him several minutes to get back to his seat from the stage as he worked his way through the delegates waiting to congratulate him.

WRIGHT was picked to deliver the final words of the U.S. delegation, a speech of appreciation given by the Governor of southern Baja California after the conference officially ended.

One of the things that impressed several Mexican delegates was WRIGHT's use of Spanish occasionally outside the committee sessions. (The sessions were conducted with translators and the use of U.N.-style earphones.)

"We know Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. MONTOYA (Representative HENRY GONZALEZ, Democrat of Texas, and Senator JOSEPH MONTOYA, Democrat, of New Mexico) both Mexican-Americans, speak Spanish, but they learned it at home, as children," said one Mexican deputy.

"But for Mr. WRIGHT to speak Spanish means he must have taken the time and trouble to study the language, and practice it. This demonstrates a real desire to work toward a closer understanding."

Hon. Frances P. Bolton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise at this time to extend my own personal congratulations and those of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio to the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON on the occasion of the anniversary of her 25th year as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

It is most appropriate that the people from the 11th Congressional District pay

tribute to Mrs. BOLTON on this grand occasion because most of the 11th Congressional District as it is now constituted was represented in Congress 25 years ago by this most gracious and most capable Congresswoman.

I believe that it would be of interest to my fellow Members of Congress that, with the exception of 6 years, members of the Bolton family have represented the county of Lake in Congress since March 4, 1929.

My first recollection of the Honorable Chester C. Bolton was on the occasion of a Flag Day speech in the city of Painesville some 33 years ago when I remember my father telling me that we were going down to the city park so that I might have an occasion to hear one of the great leaders of our times, the Honorable Chester C. Bolton, give the annual Flag Day address.

It is with great pleasure that I extend my warmest congratulations to Mrs. BOLTON with the hope that the Good Lord, who has been so kind to her in the past, will allow her to stay with us for many years in the future.

We Do Not Envy President in Dilemma of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, to better appreciate the dilemma of the administration in Vietnam, we all ought to ponder the alternatives available to us now. One of the most astute and thoughtful dissertations on this subject was made in an editorial by Allen Griffin, president of the Monterey Peninsula Herald, dated February 18, 1965.

Under unanimous consent I insert Colonel Griffin's editorial at this place in the RECORD:

WE DO NOT ENVY PRESIDENT IN DILEMMA OF VIETNAM

What is U.S. policy toward the war in Vietnam? The policy is as undeclared as the war is.

It is entirely possible that between the time this column is being written and the time it is printed, the President of the United States will call an unscheduled press conference and announce U.S. policy toward the war in South Vietnam, that has moved over the border to southern areas of North Vietnam, causing worldwide repercussions.

Here to request clarification is French Foreign Minister Couve de Murville. He is requesting information as to policy, that has so far been denied the American people although the American press has vigorously pressed for a statement of policy.

Meanwhile, splendid American soldiers and airmen are being lost in increasing numbers, gallantly meeting the call of duty in a war increasingly difficult for them to understand. These men are the salt of our earth. They will do their duty. They believe in their country. But they are modern men, and they have the right to know.

There is one thing certain: the American people want peace. However, only those few who are willing and prepared to haul down the U.S. flag and put up foreign flags want peace at any price.

The Vietnamese people, all but the profiteers of war, want peace. And it is probable that the great majority of them want peace at any price. They do not share either our ideals or our ambitions for them.

The French, who have maintained business, agricultural, and cultural interests in Vietnam despite their defeat by the Vietminh in 1954, want peace for their own practical political and sentimental reasons, but they hope to see and perhaps to influence a negotiated peace. They are convinced that we cannot win a war that they failed to win with 400,000 troops, at least half of them French regulars.

The Chinese don't want peace in South Vietnam. They want the United States to get hurt. And they want to end up with greater influence in southeast Asia than Moscow.

The Russians don't want peace in South Vietnam unless it can be arrived at through humiliation of the United States. They are shipping and delivering arms to bring down American planes. They are providing aid and comfort to our minor enemy, but they and China are the major enemies.

Would any American not drunk or sick with political ambition enjoy being President of the United States under this condition? We don' think so. How would any reader of this newspaper like to make a choice of possible decisions?

Here are some alternatives:

1. Escalate the war. Send American doughboys or marines to guard our airbases and installations. Extend bombing in a northerly direction, testing the will of the minor enemy. Will that stop the Vietcong ground attacks or slow them down? What's your opinion?

2. Ask the British again (as we did in Korea) to plead with the Russians to act as intermediaries to bring about a cease-fire, an armistice, and negotiations for peace. The negotiations in Korea have worked, so far. Those made under the auspices of the Honorable Averill Harriman in Laos did not work. The arrangement dividing South and North Vietnam also failed to work, but the blame for that may be divided.

3. Escalate the war to the point that the Chinese enter it in Vietnam and Korea; then knock out the Chinese nuclear development plants and other means they have to build a nuclear capability, because within 5 or 6 years or less China and Russia will be able to whipsaw the United States into a state of perpetual tension, no matter how they hate one another. But—when the first nuclear bombs descend upon China, what will the Russians do? They hate the Chinese, but would the balloon go up?

4. Move up our war effort only to the point where our men die trying to maintain a status quo, not winning, not losing (anything but their lives), while we wait for the breaks. Time is on whose side?

5. Pull out through a means to be devised, although this may mean the beginning of another war of liberation in Thailand, in which we would again be committed on an even more difficult frontier, trying to save a gentle people who have no love for war and who have preserved themselves through the generations by patient negotiations and friendly wiles. Not a powerful, tough-fighting ally such as the South Koreans were under Syngman Rhee. And then, a stepup of liberation in the Philippines, and so forth.

There is only one piece of advice we would care to give President Johnson in the face of these disturbing problems:

Please, Mr. President, for the sake of the dignity of your office and of the American people, stop asking the temporary rulers of Russia, Soviet Premier Alexei N. Kosygin or his boss, Party Secretary Leonid Brezhnev, to come to the United States and learn about life here.

And please, Mr. President, stop asking these people to invite you to see their great land and people. Do not embarrass us.

Instead, help us by example to show our respect to our heroic dead and to the fine young men who are doing their duty, as they have learned to do their duty, in battle even today and tomorrow and in the days to come.

—A.G.

I especially like the magnificent idea that we try leading the world by example, in a manner at least as exemplary as the young men fighting and dying for us and for principle in the stinking jungles of a far-off country about which most Americans could care less.

Teenage Drinking in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 25, 16 of our colleagues joined me in introducing identical concurrent resolutions expressing the sense of the Congress that New York State should raise its minimum legal drinking age from 18 to 21 in conformity with the laws of all its neighboring States—a highly significant display of the concern with which the people we represent view the harmful effects of New York's teenage drinking law.

This weekend we have received further evidence of New York's irresponsibility in the form of a report to the Governor of Connecticut by the State's teenage liquor law coordination commission based on a 2-year study of the teenage drinking problem in that State.

It is evident from a reading of the story published this morning by the New York Herold Tribune, which I include herewith as a part of my remarks, that the commission's study was thoroughly and responsibly done. The commission has recommended both a tightening of Connecticut's own laws and, in self-defense, an increase in New York's legal drinking age.

New York's law, the commission protested, "acts as a magnet drawing teenagers into New York and acts as open invitation and attractive nuisance."

The Herald Tribune story follows:

A CONCLUSION ON TEEN DRINKING—PARENTS' FAULT

HARTFORD, CONN.—A special State commission that spent 2 years studying the problem of teenage drinking has come up with a conclusion: Parents are mostly to blame for the drinking practices of their children.

The teenage liquor law coordination commission submitted its report to Gov. John N. Dempsey over the weekend. Its key recommendation to curb drinking among tenagers: A law should be passed.

The commission recommended that since "Connecticut law does not forbid minors to drink," but merely forbids adults to serve or sell them liquor, the State needs a new law making it illegal for minors "to knowingly

possess alcoholic beverages without parental consent."

The effect of the proposed law would be that parents could be brought into court, if their children got into trouble while drinking, to testify whether they had knowledge of the drinking and approved of it.

The commission recommended that "all adults, in the conduct of their business, their affairs, and in their home life, recognize that their (own) drinking practices influence to a great degree teenagers in their imitation of adult drinking."

The commission report continued: "Teenage drinking is learned experience where the youngster is attempting to emulate the adult to be accepted by his peers. If parents and States differ widely in attitude toward uniform behavior in this regard, we cannot expect laws to be respected."

What can adults do to keep their children on the wagon? "Adults, especially parents," the commission said, "are urged to consider carefully their drinking customs and practices and to engage responsibly in them in light of their influence on minors."

As an "example of the kind of practice that might well be discontinued," the commission noted "the custom of serving children simulated cocktails in bars, restaurants, and homes."

The commission also took a swipe at New York State for continuing to permit persons 18 to 21 years old to buy liquor legally in bars and package stores.

"This law acts as a magnet drawing teenagers into New York and acts as open invitation and attractive nuisance," the commission report said.

Connecticut and New Jersey have long urged New York to raise its minimum age to 21, to match their own statutes, but the New York Legislature has turned a deaf ear.

There are pressures from within and without New York State, in the current session of the legislature, to raise the drinking age, and there are six bills on file to accomplish this. But there seems little chance of the legislation getting through.

New York's Governor Rockefeller, who has opposed past attempts to raise the drinking age, claims that studies of teenage drinking patterns across the country have shown youngsters pick up the habit in their homes at the average age of 14.

The Connecticut commission studying the problem was obviously in agreement on that point.

Drinking, the commission said, seems to be "an American social heritage, and children get on to it at an early age."

The commission also dipped briefly into the problem of narcotics addiction among teenagers, indicating drinking is connected with that problem.

It suggested that another commission be set up to make another 2-year study—this time on narcotics—since it found that some teenagers "have gone to drugs for a greater kick than is provided by alcohol."

Need for an Inter-American Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, for more than a decade following World War II a succession of rapid-fire emergencies—Greece, the Marshall plan, the Suez situation, the Berlin airlift, Laos, Lebanon, the Hungarian revolt, Quemoy and Matsu, sputnik—riveted our attention on Europe, the Middle East and Asia. In the process, developments in Latin America were largely ignored by the news media. At the same time, interest in Latin America among our academic community waned as more prestige became attached to studies of other regions.

Fortunately, the period of indifference to our Latin American neighbors has ended. Universities, foundations, and Government agencies now are attaching more importance to an understanding of the vast region stretching from the Rio Grande to the Straits of Magellan.

I am pleased to report that the University of Miami is making a special contribution to the effort to increase inter-American comprehension. The University of Miami has become the headquarters for the Inter-American Academy, a group founded to foster better understanding and cooperation through cultural exchange between distinguished scholars, teachers, writers, and leaders of the Western Hemisphere. The University has joined with the Inter-American Academy in publishing the Journal of Inter-American Studies, a quarterly publication which includes scholarly articles representing all phases of inter-American affairs.

With volume VII, No. 1, dated January 1965, the Journal of Inter-American Studies makes its debut in an attractive new format for which the University of Miami Press is to be commended. The edition contains an article by Dr. Henry King Stanford, president of the University of Miami, which sets forth the purposes and goals of the Inter-American Academy and Journal. According to Dr. Stanford:

> We have no choice but to see our futures as inextricably joined. We have no choice but to study each other and to learn from each other. Even the very diversity that exists among us can be understood only as we pool our knowledge and research, only as we study ourselves comparatively.

I strongly endorse Dr. Stanford's views on the need for an inter-American approach as well as recommend the Journal of Inter-American Studies to all serious observers of hemisphere developments.

Dr. Stanford's article follows:

THE NEED FOR AN INTER-AMERICAN APPROACH

Fortunate good judgment led the founders of the Journal of Inter-American Studies to place major emphasis in their new enterprise of 6 years ago on the most neglected aspect of studies related to the Western Hemisphere: the Inter-American aspect.

North Americans at that time had long been devoting scholarly attention to their neighbors to the south. But generally their study—sympathetic and understanding though it was—was of one people looking at other peoples through eyes that saw backgrounds, outlooks, and problems essentially different from their own. Thinking on the part of the North Americans was in terms of Latin American studies, Hispanic American studies, or even South American studies.

Latin Americans viewed North Americans as similarly alien to themselves and theirs. One exception existed on both sides. From the early 19th century the dream of a pan-Americanism existed, and slowly studies and activities emerged that focused on a special sort of pan-American cooperation, or even an assumed special affinity. But in all frankness, much that was involved was either highly artificial, or taken up with narrow institutional arrangements.

Perhaps even more striking has been the lack of study by Latin American peoples of each other. Writing in the April 1964 issue of Foreign Affairs, Dr. Philip W. Quigg pointed out that "there are some 30 North American correspondents in Mexico City; none from other Latin American countries. There are at the very least a dozen universities in the United States where one can study the history, culture, politics, and economics of Latin America in some depth; there is no Latin American university offering more than the most superficial survey in the same field. * * * Similarly, the average cultivated Latin American will have made several trips to the United States and to Europe, but none to other parts of Latin America."[1]

There can be no gainsaying that great diversity exists within the Americas. Certainly the last thing that should be attempted would be to cast this vast hemisphere, or even its various subregions, into a single mold and direct study and research to a search for uniformities.

Nevertheless, while Brazilians and Argentinians differ greatly from each other, they have much in common. If nothing else, they share many of the same sorts of problems. And the same goes for all of us. We should all respect each other's individuality. But only ignorance can come from an attitude that provincially sets each of us off as quite different from all others.

Beyond the impact of history and geography, modern technology has squeezed us all into a single small village. A disaster in a Rio de Janeiro has its instant repercussions in a New York. Buenos Aires is as close to San Francisco as the instantaneous link through a communications satellite.

We have no choice but to see our futures as inextricably joined. We have no choice but to study each other and to learn from each other. Even the very diversity that exists among us can be understood only as we pool our knowledge and research, only as we study ourselves comparatively.

It is here the approach taken by the founders of this journal looms so large. These men sought a medium where the varied intellectual resources of this hemisphere could be brought to bear on problems and matters of common importance and interest to us all.

A similar objective marked the establishment of the Inter-American Academy, of which the Journal of Inter-American Studies is the official organ. This body, which is still in its infancy, aims to bring together in a single grouping and on a continuing basis representative leaders of thought and intellectual life throughout the Americas.

The roster of members of the academy gives assurance that as communications and exchanges are developed among them, as their intellectual powers are increasingly pooled on matters of common moment in this hemisphere, a significant forward step will be taken toward meeting the pressing need for greater inter-American knowledge and understanding.

The headquarters of the Inter-American Academy are now at the University of Miami, and the university joins with the academy in publishing the Journal of Inter-American Studies.

The University of Miami is impressed by the opportunity opened by its association with the academy and the journal. The University of Miami since its founding has looked upon its location at the gateway of the Americas as thrusting upon it a special responsibility and a unique opportunity with regard to hemispheric affairs. And within

---

[1] Philip W. Quigg, "Latin America: A Broad-Brush Appraisal," Foreign Affairs, April 1964, p. 400.

the past year the board of trustees and I, as university president, have resolved upon a new dedication and new efforts in this field.

In the endeavors of the University of Miami, we naturally are concerned to increase knowledge and understanding of Latin America and the several Latin American countries as such. We deem it as important to know about the distinctive cultures and the rich heritages of the Latin American peoples as of any other peoples. We aim also to help Latin Americans who come to us to appreciate better the United States and its own distinctive culture, ideals, and institutions.

Our larger purpose, however, is to bring the various Americans of North and South together in one educational process so that they may study together and learn together about each other. We seek a genuine inter-American center where scholars from both hemispheres can pool their resources, fully explain, and explore their differences, and build sounder and more meaningful understandings. Further, we wish to provide a milieu in which both we and our Latin American colleagues can view ourselves and our common and separate problems in their world setting, in terms of interrelationships with other and more distant peoples and lands. To this end the university is developing its inter-American program of studies and activities, not in an isolated institute, as if we in the Americas constituted a world unto ourselves, but within a broad framework: that of a Center for Advanced International Studies which aims at excellence in the whole range of world affairs.

The University of Miami is devoting increased attention and resources to the accomplishment of its goals. And as we go forward, we do so with confidence that our purposes will be well served by the university's association with the Inter-American Academy and the Journal of Inter-American Studies.

International Coffee Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is vitally important that the Congress expedite passage of legislation to implement the International Coffee Agreement.

The bill to come before us this year will help the coffee agreement bring some stability to the world coffee market. Coffee prices have been fluctuating widely, bringing inflation when they are too high, and deflation when they are too low. This situation has dislocated the economies of the countries which produce coffee while bringing no lasting benefits to the consumer.

Coffee is important to more than 30 low-income countries, especially those in Latin America. The dollars these countries earn from sales of coffee they use to buy from us industrial materials and capital equipment they need for economic growth.

The coffee agreement contains safeguards to protect the American consumer, and will not allow interference with our trade. We will be able to import coffee freely. The bill to implement the International Coffee Agreement will help the United States make the agreement an effective instrument for stabilization. It will put new strength and vitality in the Alliance for Progress.

The "Vision Letter" of February 16 presented a most cogent and persuasive case for the Congress to move ahead on this legislation. I feel this editorial is deserving of wide circulation, and I present it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

It's high time the United States fulfills its obligations under the International Coffee Agreement. To put it bluntly, unless the Congress gets a move on, the United States will be put in the position of reneging on a treaty. The Kennedy administration signed the international pact in 1962, the Senate gave its advice and consent on May 21, 1963, and the State Department deposited the instrument of ratification on December 27, 1963. In sum, the United States signed on the dotted line to become a full-fledged member of a 54-nation agreement to give ballast to the price of coffee, the prime agricultural export of the developing world. What's missing? The Congress has failed to pass the legislation needed to implement the treaty. Without the active participation of the nation that imports over half the world's coffee, the pact, in the long run, is meaningless and the source of mounting anti-American feeling, especially in Latin America.

Our friends are completely baffled by the U.S. tardiness to act on a treaty it initiated and signed. Well, they should be. The story of the coffee agreement's handling in the United States is a long, sad tale but that is now water over the dam. The important thing is that the enabling legislation is again in the congressional mill and must be passed.

The overwhelming importance of the bill to Latin America cannot be overemphasized: coffee represents more than 50 percent of six nation's dollar earnings and is a major export in eight others. An estimated 12 million Latin Americans, most of whom own coffee farms of 5 acres or less, derive their livelihood from the commodity. Latin American nations cannot plan their future, as demanded by the Alliance for Progress, if they are left to the whims of the traditional market.

On the other side of the coin, U.S. aid to its neighbors is vitiated by wildly lurching coffee prices. As Senator WAYNE MORSE put it succinctly, "We would be wasting the American taxpayers' dollars in large measure if we were to turn down the coffee agreement which is so vital to the economic position of a number of Latin American countries."

Presently, the United States is in the shabby business of trying to enforce the coffee agreement by administrative stopgap measures. We submit that the United States must live up to its treaty obligations, do it openly, and do it now.

Representative Collier Speaks on Today's Challenge

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the text of a speech made by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable HAROLD R. COLLIER, at a recent anniversary banquet of Post No. 24 of the AMVETS in his district.

Because I believe it clearly spells out the challenge of today both as individuals and as a nation, I recommend its reading to other Members of the House of Representatives. Mr. COLLIER'S speech follows:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE COLLIER

Probably in every age, men have said, "We live in perilous times." Indeed, the Great Emancipator, whose birthday we observed just yesterday, must have had this feeling when the very structure of this Nation was imperiled—torn in a war which was fought for the survival of a united nation. Three times since the turn of the century, the freedom and human dignity of man was threatened by tyranny and even after these current conflicts, we live in a world today in which the symbol of the hammer and sickle is spread across nearly two-thirds of the globe. We live in a world that is torn with strife and seething unrest, and we are engaged in a titanic struggle for the minds of men. Is there, therefore, any wonder that I, as a representative in the greatest legislative body in the world, and you, who have fought to preserve this way of life, should be deeply concerned with the events of our time and the critical situation which we face in southeast Asia at this very moment?

To suggest that there is any easy answer to our international problems would be foolhardy. But to suggest that we should assume a no-good-to-worry attitude, is equally foolhardy, for certainly this is no time to relax our efforts to thwart the Communists in their drive toward their one and only goal—that of world domination.

There are those who have expressed deep criticism of our recent retaliatory strike against the Nort Vietnam agressors. Many of these seem to feel that we should have accepted the attacks by the Vietcong without raising a military finger. They suggest that we sit down and negotiate—some say we should completely withdraw the U.S. forces from that war-torn area and others oversimplify the problem by saying it should be dropped into the lap of the United Nations.

Certainly any of these three suggestions would be commendable if (and "if" must be in capital letters) first, the North Vietnamese had shown in the past any inclination whatsoever to negotiate a peaceful settlement. But everyone knows there is no such thing as a unilateral agreement. Obviously it takes both parties to enter into an agreement—and when one will not do so, how in the world can a dispute be negotiated? To merely pass off the situation with hollow words under these circumstances just doesn't make sense.

Without negotiating an agreement which would honor the right of South Vietnam to remain independent, free from attack from without by an aggressor, how can we possibly withdraw American troops? One must proceed the other. For the United States to merely withdraw and permit an aggressor to continue its overt military action would amount to abandoning a moral and legal commitment. Furthermore, if we did this we would have to suffer the consequences * * * and those consequences would undoubtedly be increased aggression by the Red Chinese against Thailand, Malaysia, and other areas of southeast Asia. If the United States is prepared to see Communist aggression devour all of this area of the world, then, of course, we could pack up and walk away.

As for the proposal to dump the matter in the lap of the United Nations, it must be remembered that the U.N. has already sent teams into Vietnam during the prolonged conflict and they have come up with nothing

concrete in the way of an honorable solution or settlement. To merely dismiss the existing problem in this way doesn't recognize the facts of life. For while the U.N. might continue to grope for a solution or settlement, what would happen to South Vietnam in the interim? Would not the fate of this nation be the same as others where millions are now helpless under the heel of totalitarian communistic rule, as is the case in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and many of the Balkan States? If we are willing to see the same price paid by the people of southeast Asia who are trying to withstand Communist aggression, where else do we intend to permit this to happen in either hemisphere?

The strength of this Nation has been established upon the will and the willingness of each generation to meet the challenge of its day, prepared to pay any price necessary to preserve the fundamental principles of individual freedom. We cannot afford to trade these individual freedoms for temporary security. Nor can we as a nation which is the last bastion of freedom in the free world pursue a course of appeasement or continue a course which has not in any manner improved our status among the family of nations.

There are those who feel that the strong feeling of nationalism or patriotism tends to hamper the cause of world peace. But I submit that any family which takes pride in its family unit can live more peacefully with its neighbors if it pursues the course of moral justice in all of its associations. We are not and have never been an imperialistic nation though we have frequently dedicated ourselves to causes in which we believe and which we hold to be part of human dignity. God forbid that we ever compromise this belief. Recent history has clearly proved that when we have dealt from a position of strength and when that position has been based upon a sound moral position, we have been successful. Where we have compromised a moral position and dealt from a position of weakness, appeasement, and vacillation, we have suffered setbacks. This year ahead will indeed be one of difficult decisions. Almost everywhere we look around the globe we see troubles. Vietnam is the prime example today, as was Cuba 3 years ago, and the overt action of Red China in the Chinese straits a few months before that. In Africa we are tied to the multiple problems growing from emerging nations who have not yet developed a sense of values for democracy which is so essential to their being a peaceful part of the world community. While the prime responsibility for major decisions to provide the maximum of internal security as well as our international strength and security is ladened upon the shoulders of the people in your Government, the fact remains that individually we all have a task to perform. We must not shirk from this responsibility as citizens of the greatest free nation in the world.

Calendar of Events at the National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events at the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, MARCH 1965

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Collections: Paintings and sculpture from the Andrew Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale Collections, with gifts from other donors, are on the main floor. The Garbisch American Primitive paintings, Kress Renaissance Bronzes, and Widener Decorative Arts are on the ground floor.

New reproductions: Eleven inches by fourteen inches color reproductions. Boltraffio, "Portrait of a Youth"; Goya, "The Bookseller's Wife"; Ingres, "Madame Moitessier"; Lotto, "A Maiden's Dream"; Masaccio, "Profile Portrait of a Young Man"; Monet, "Palazzo da Mula, Venice"; Ter Borch, "The Suitor's Visit." Twenty-five cents each. Orders under $1, add 25 cents for handling charge.

Color postcards: Franco-Burgundian, "The Trinity"; Unknown Artist, "New England Village"; Follower of Patinir, "The Flight into Egypt"; Clouet, "Diane de Poitiers"; Rubens, "The Meeting of Abraham and Melchizedek." Five cents each. Orders under $1, add 25 cents handling charge.

Fourteenth annual series of the A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts: On March 14, Sir Isaiah Berlin, Chichele professor of social and political theory, Oxford University, England, will begin a series of six consecutive Sunday lectures, entitled "The Roots of Romanticism."

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, MARCH 1, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 7

Painting of the week: Cézanne. "Vase of Flowers." (Chester Dale collection.) Gallery 60-A, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "The Early Renaissance." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Fantasy versus Realism in the Romantic Period." Guest speaker: G. Haydn Huntley, professor of art history, Northwestern University, Evanston. Lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: Adolf Drescher, pianist. East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 8, THROUGH SUNDAY MARCH 14

Painting of the week: Guardi. "Campo San Zanipolo." (Samuel H. Kress collection.) Gallery 37, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Early Venetian Art." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Roots of Romanticism (I)." Guest speaker: Sir Isaiah Berlin, lecture hall, 4.

Fourteenth annual series of the A. W. Mellon lecture in the fine arts.

Sunday concert: A Cappella Choir, Catholic University of America. Michael Cordovana, director. East Garden Court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, MARCH 15, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 21

Painting of the week: Kensett. "Newport Harbor, 1857." (Gift of Frederick Sturges, Jr.) Gallery G-12, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "The Late Renaissance." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Roots of Romanticism (II). Guest speaker: Sir Isaiah Berlin, lecture hall, 4.

Fourteenth annual series of the A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts.

Sunday concert: Aline van Barentzen, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY MARCH 22, THROUGH SUNDAY MARCH 28

Painting of the week: Chase. "Chrysanthemums." (Gift of Chester Dale.) Gallery G-13, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Mannerism, North and South." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Roots of Romanticism (III)." Guest speaker: Sir Isaiah Berlin, lecture hall, 4.

Fourteenth annual series of the A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor. Aline van Barentzen, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the educational office, 737-4215, extension 272.

Address by Hon. Walter H. Moeller, Democrat, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1965, our distinguished colleague from Ohio, Hon. WALTER H. MOELLER, made an outstanding address at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner meeting at Hickory, N.C.

I am privileged to represent Hickory in the Congress, and I had the pleasure of introducing my distinguished friend to my constituents. I feel that my colleagues will be greatly interested in reading his inspiring speech, and I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE WALTER H. MOELLER, DEMOCRAT, OF OHIO, FEBRUARY 27, 1965 AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY MEETING, HICKORY, N.C.

I am delighted to be with you this evening as we honor the memory of two great Americans, two great Presidents, two great Democrats—and two great southerners: Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

Let me say at the outset that I am a Democrat—a Democrat without prefix, without suffix, without hyphenation, and without reservation. So I feel perfectly at home in the South. For it was here that our party was born and here it was kept alive during the long droughts of yesteryear when

the Republican Party somehow managed to retain control of the White House and Congress for the worst part of 70 years.

But, of course, the Democratic Party did rise again and with it rose the South to its present position of eminence in our party.

A southerner, Lyndon B. Johnson, sits in the White House.

A southerner, RUSSELL LONG, holds the second most important position of leadership in the U.S. Senate.

A southerner, HALE BOGGS, is our party's whip in the House of Representatives.

Southerners serve as chairmen of 25 of the 36 standing committees of Congress. North Carolina itself is represented in these august ranks by no fewer than three members of your excellent delegation.

The Secretary of State is a native Georgian, and until just recently, the Commerce Department was directed by North Carolina's gifted and able Luther Hodges.

Small wonder that it is said that our Government speaks with a southern accent. I think I ought to make it clear right now that I am from southern Ohio.

I want to take this opportunity to commend your Congressman and my good friend, BASIL WHITENER. He is one of the hardest working and most respected Members of Congress. I have watched with something approaching awe BASIL's determined campaign, against long odds, to bring order out of the chaos that threatens the textile industry.

As you well know, the textile industry is being jeopardized by the almost unrestricted importation of goods from cheap-labor countries across the sea. Congressman WHITENER has been striving mightily to tighten up laws that permit this condition to exist—a condition that has contributed, at least, to the loss of more than a half million jobs in the domestic textile industry since World War II.

I am glad to say that BASIL is making progress to guarantee some needed protection to the American textile industry and to the remaining tens of thousands of men and women who learn their livelihood from it.

BASIL WHITENER was instrumental last year in the passage of legislation that makes American cotton available to American mills at the same price Americans were selling it to textile manufacturers overseas.

Prior to enactment of this long overdue legislation, our own mills were compelled to pay 8 cents a pound more for cotton grown in North Carolina, for example, than it was being sold to foreign producers. In short, the United States actually was subsidizing mills overseas at the expense of our own textile manufacturers and employees. Happily, Congressman WHITENER was able to help correct this gross inequity.

I know that you in North Carolina are well aware of BASIL WHITENER's continuing fight to preserve the domestic textile industry—which means so very much to the economy of the South. I just wanted you to know that we in other regions also recognize that he is a can-do Congressman.

Now, we Democrats meet here tonight in the warm afterglow of one of the most decisive, one-sided election victories ever scored by a political party in the United States. The immensity of our victory has led some experts to write off the Republican Party as a dead or dying force. I beg to differ.

The Republican Party was battered and bruised; its choice of candidates was rebuffed and rejected; its image was further tarnished. But the Republican Party is not dead; it is not dying. And, in my judgment, the Democratic Party could make no graver mistake than to regard the opposition party with complacency and indifference.

The Republican Party still has tremendous financial resources; it still has dedicated supporters, at least 27 million of them; the Republicans still control the governorship in such important "swing" States as New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Washington. The press remains largely pro-Republican.

So we Democrats must begin now to prepare for the 1966 State, county, and congressional elections. You may be certain that our Republican friends will wage the campaign of their lives next year.

Indeed the battle for the House of Representatives already has been joined. And, frankly, there is no assurance that we will be able to retain all or any of the 40 House seats we picked up on November 3.

The overwhelming sweep we scored in November has tended to direct attention away from the fact that results were so close in more than 100 congressional districts that the switch of a relative few votes would have drastically changed the outcome.

I read in the newspapers just yesterday that our old friend, Tricky Dickie Nixon, is staking his efforts to regain control of the GOP on the 1966 congressional elections. He is not to be taken lightly.

And I predict that the real battleground will be right here in North Carolina and in the South. There is no doubt that the high command of the Republican Party is scheming night and day to purge your Congressmen and other Democratic officeholders. The Republicans are a bit heady if not downright cocky about "operation takeover" in the South.

This operation was launched with a vengeance in 1964, and enabled the GOP to pick up five congressional seats in Alabama, one each in Georgia and Mississippi, and to retain House seats it held in Florida, Virginia, and North Carolina. So I say again that "operation takeover" has got to be regarded seriously. It must be combated at every turn.

Voters, North and South, have always responded to our cause, to the Democratic cause when we have taken the time to lay the Republican record before them.

We are going to have to do the talking about the GOP record—it is so sorry, so negative that the Republicans themselves would never dare to bring it up in public.

For the simple truth is that the Republican answer to the needs and aspirations of the American people is a constant, dogmatic "No."

Republicans in Congress said "No" to the social security program when it was conceived by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1935. Only one Republican in the Senate voted that year against a motion to kill the Social Security Act. Last year, 89 percent of the Republicans in Congress said "No" to needed improvements in this essential program. The Democratic Party said "Yes."

Republicans in Congress said "No" to creating the Rural Electrification Administration, which brought the wonders of electricity to millions of farm families and other rural Americans. The Democratic Party said "Yes."

Republicans in Congress said "no" in 1938 to guaranteeing a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour to the working man and woman of America. And the GOP has been saying no, no a hundred times no ever since. The Democratic Party said yes—it says the laborer is worthy of his hire.

Republicans in Congress say "no" to the needs of the farmer; they say no to the need for programs to help develop our natural resources, timberlands, and rivers and streams; the Republicans say "no" to extending a helping hand to the elderly. They say "no" to housing the poor. In fact, the Republican Party would be left speechless if the word "no" was stricken from the language.

Look at the record.

It seems that the "no party" would rather have a balanced budget than a balanced diet for the poverty stricken; the "no party" would rather reduce Federal spending with a meat ax than to increase job opportunities for our people; the "no party" would rather make a token payment on the national debt than to make an investment in the youth of this country by building classrooms and college facilities. No, my friends, the Republican Party won't dare speak about its record. Instead, it tries to confound and confuse the American people by sermonizing about "fiscal responsibility" and about how the big, bad Democrats are leading our Nation down the road to insolvency and bankruptcy.

So it is rather ironic that the most devastating depression in American history came when the Republican Party held the White House and controlled the Nation's fiscal policies.

It is rather ironic that the last three recessions in the United States came when the Republican Party held the White House and controlled the Nation's fiscal policies.

It is rather ironic that the Republican Presidential administration in the 1950's failed to balance its own Federal budget not once, not twice, not three times, not four times, but five times in the 8 years it was in office. It is rather ironic that the national debt increased by some $23 billion during the last Republican administration.

It would seem that once in office, the Republican Party says "no" to its very own campaign promises.

Now, what about the Republican-branded fiscal insanity of the Democratic Party, of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations?

Here, briefly are some of the facts about that:

Under the leadership of first President Kennedy and now Lyndon Johnson, the United States is experiencing the greatest and most extended wave of prosperity that any nation has ever known.

Our national economy has been booming now for 47 consecutive months. That's an alltime record.

The gross national product—the business of the Nation—has increased during the Kennedy and Johnson years from $495 billion to almost $700 billion. That's an alltime record.

Personal savings, the money that you and I have put away for a rainy day, now exceed $100 billion. That's an altime record.

During the 4 years of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations net farm income has increased by an average of $900 million a year. That is not an alltime record—the record was set during the Truman administration. The reason farm income is not at a record level now is that it nosedived by $20 billion during the eight disastrous confused years of the Benson-Eisenhower regime. But under the Democrats, our farmers are again making real progress.

The plain truth is that the American people have never had it better than they do today. Republicans can go on shedding crocodile tears about the fiscal insanity of the Democratic Party—and our people will go right on laughing all the way to the bank.

This is the factual story that we have got to carry to the people. We just cannot assume that the voters will be continually aware of the record of the party of Harding and Hoover, of Landon and Nixon, and, yes, of Goldwater and Miller. We have to carry the message to the people every day of the year—and not just during the campaign itself.

The attraction of our party is to the people who really want a choice and not an echo—an echo of the shrill, frightened voices which have always feared and rejected new ideas, which have always seemed to prefer stagnation to progress and retrenchment to growth.

The Democratic Party is the only party for those Americans who are willing to face up to the hard realities of the present and who look to the future not with suspicion and despair, but with confidence and boundless faith in the American way.

So let us go forth from this place and carry the message of the Democratic Party to every crossroad and branchhead in this great land of ours. It is a message that all of us can be proud of. It is a message that can be used to keep the Republican Party in its accustomed place—second place.

I have some spent little time tonight roasting our Republican friends. I should make it clear, however, that despite our differences, I regard them as good, loyal, patriotic Americans who are interested in sound government and doing what, in their judgment, is best for our country. It is just that they weigh the role of government in an entirely different scale than we Democrats use. As Franklin Roosevelt so eloquently said: "Governments can err, Presidents do make mistakes, but the immortal Dante tells us that Divine Justice weighs the sins of the coldblooded and the sins of the warmhearted in a different scale. Better the occasional faults of government living in the spirit of charity," F.D.R. went on to say. "Than the omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference."

Nobody has ever heard of a coldblooded donkey—or a warmblooded dinosaur, which seems to be the symbol of the Grand Old Party.

Now, if I may, a personal word of explanation about my pursuing a political career. I am an ordained Lutheran minister. Many people have asked why a man of the cloth would involve himself in the sweat and toil and pragmatism of politics.

The answer to that question, perhaps, may best be found in the parable of the Samaritan (St. Luke 10: 29-37).

You will recall that a man fell in with the thieves and they stripped him and left him half dead by the side of the road. Coming upon the unfortunate man, the priest and the Levite passed him by. They had no time to administer to the needs of their fellow man. But the Samaritan came along and did extend a helping hand to him. And Jesus said, "Go, and do thou likewise."

It seems to me that the profession of politics and government affords us the greatest opportunity to "Go, and do thou likewise," to lend a hand to the poor and the forlorn, to the sick and the halt. In short, to join in the exciting and challenging task of helping to build a better America.

That is my objective.

That is the objective of our Democratic Party.

What greater goal could man set for himself than to live by the teachings of the Master?

In closing, I want to cite a poem that to me points up the virtue of perseverence and the evils of complacency. I hope that we heed it always:

"Great nations rise and fall,
The people go from bondage to spiritual faith,
From spiritual faith to great courage,
From courage to liberty,
From liberty to abundance,
From abundance to selfishness,
From selfishness to complacency,
From complacency to apathy,
And from apathy back again into bondage."

Pleiku

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by Drew Pearson which appeared in the Washington Post of Friday, February 26. The following article sheds light on the recent incident at Pleiku in South Vietnam.

PLEIKU ATTACK NOT A HANOI PLOT

(By Drew Pearson)

Shortly after the Vietcong raid on Pleiku that caused the United States to retaliate with its first definite large-scale bombing raids on North Vietnam, this column reported that the United States had been mousetrapped and that the Pleiku attack was the result of a Chinese or North Vietnamese plot deliberately staged while Premier Kosygin was visiting Hanoi.

More complete information, now available from the battlefront, shows this column was in error. The Vietcong attack was staged by a bedraggled handful of 100 men, or half a company, which was able to achieve success only because of sheer stupidity and lack of alertness by the Americans and the South Vietnamese. The attackers had no idea that they would be able to penetrate to the very center of the American installation as they did.

That it was no Hanoi-conceived plot is obvious from the fact that Hanoi could not have planned to have all South Vietnamese personnel and all Americans asleep.

A little band of Vietcong passed through two villages before reaching Pleiku. The South Vietnamese in the villages are supposedly friendly to the United States but they sounded no alarm. The attackers cut the barbed wire around Pleiku completely undisturbed, and walked right into the center of the installation to place bombs alongside the barracks where Americans were sleeping and alongside planes which were completely unguarded. They retreated without an American or a South Vietnamese wounding a single one.

SUCCESS UNEXPECTED

There were some Vietcong casualties, but only from their own mortar fire. Their commander had never expected them to penetrate so far inside, therefore aimed mortars into the center of the American installation—another indication that there was no Hanoi plot.

Secretary McNamara, one of the most level-headed executives ever to boss the Pentagon, was mousetrapped when he got out of his sickbed to hold an emergency press conference and defended the American forces as victims of a sneak attack. Obviously he knew that some of the great military victories of American history have resulted from sneak attacks, as when George Washington sneaked across the Delaware to surprise carousing Hessians in Trenton. McNamara also knew that his own men were being trained in the art of the sneak attack at the very time he had the news conference.

Only on a few occasions have American troops telegraphed their attacks in advance, as when General Pickett sent a Confederate flag at the head of his troops in the famous charge at Gettysburg—a charge, incidentally, in which his defeat turned the tide of the Civil War.

Those who were really mousetrapped as a result of the Pleiku incident were not only McNamara but President Johnson and, momentarily, the State Department. Since then, Acting Secretary of State George Ball has tried to restore some reason and sanity to our mousetrapped thinking, which could have precipitated nuclear world war.

What happened was that Ambassador Taylor, an able but severely harassed man who has seen his hitherto great prestige gradually eroded in Vietnam, seized this opportunity to recommend retaliatory raids. He sincerely believed this was a Hanoi plot. Ordinarily his recommendation might have been discounted in Washington, but it happened that McGeorge Bundy, White House adviser on security matters, was in Saigon at precisely that time.

WHITE HOUSE PRESSURED

Bundy's brother William is Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East and has long advocated a stronger hand in Vietnam, including bombing the north. When McGeorge Bundy, therefore, joined Taylor in rushing back a premature, exaggerated account of the Pleiku raid, the White House finally yielded to advice which the Bundy brothers had been giving for some time and which has now caused serious loss of American prestige, demonstrations against American embassies around the world, even in pro-West countries, and eroded the better understanding Mr. Johnson had personally built up with the new leaders in the Kremlin.

What the American public has a right to expect is a congressional investigation or the court-martial of American officers asleep at Pleiku. The Pentagon alibi is that they are highly trained men who are not supposed to stand guard, which is correct. But the fact remains that no one, not even South Vietnamese, was on guard and, as a result, approximately 100 wounded, and several million dollars' worth of planes destroyed.

Enlarge Guilford Courthouse National Military Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before the Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies of the House Appropriations Committee to testify in behalf of an item which would permit a greatly needed acquisition of land to enlarge the Guilford Courthouse National Military Park, located in my congressional district and my home county of Guilford.

I had hoped that Mr. Burke Davis, a longtime resident of my congressional district, and eminent historian, biographer, and novelist, could also testify before the subcommittee in view of his historical perspective on the importance of the Guilford Courthouse National Military Park and the great importance of the Revolutionary battle fought there in March 1781. Mr. Davis, however, who now has an important connection with Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., and who presently resides in Williamsburg, Va., had an important engagement in New York in connection with his duties and was unable to appear. He prepared a fine statement in support of the appropriation, however, and in view of its historical interest and the importance of the subjects discussed, I should like to insert it in the RECORD believing that it will be of great interest to my colleagues.

Mr. Davis' statement follows:

The American Revolution was won in the South, and the climax of the bitter running campaign of 1781 came at Guilford Courthouse, on March 15. In a 2-hour battle, Lord Cornwallis lost a quarter of his already weakened army. His retreat from this point led him to Yorktown.

Today, the southern campaign of the Revolution is almost forgotten. The field of Cowpens, S.C., is remote and neglected and seldom seen by visitors. Sites of the frequent clashes between the forces of Corn-

wallis and Nathanael Greene across North Carolina are often unmarked, and some have been inundated by improvements in rivers. Only Kings Mountain and Guilford Courthouse National Military Parks are effective reminders of the gallantry of the Continental Army and our militia.

Guilford Courthouse, a site preserved through the efforts of local leaders over three generations, has never comprised more than a third of the ground where Cornwallis said he saw the most savage fighting of his career. The park is now crowded on every side, and in the past few years its integrity has been seriously threatened. On its southern border, developments make expansion impractical.

It is to the north of the park, in an area of much historic significance, that expansion should come. In the land to the north of the museum (itself perilously near the property line), one wing of the army of Cornwallis made one of the most desperate attacks of the battle.

After North Carolina militia and riflemen had slowed the British charge upon the first line, Virginia militiamen inflicted more serious casualties on the invaders from the second line. Fighting in this phase took place in large timber, in which some British and Germany infantry was fragmented and scattered. Several of these units, in the left, or northernmost wing, were lost from the main portion of the British army, and plunged into wooded ravines.

After a long struggle this wing emerged into the small meadow before the Continental Regulars of Greene, where the third line anchored the American cannon. In this meadow, after a hand-to-hand fight in which infantry, artillery, and cavalry were embroiled, Cornwallis carried the day by firing grapeshot through the backs of his own units. The action of the temporarily lost left wing of the British, coming into this meadow, was probably decisive. The terrain over which this wing moved and fought is now largely outside the military park, and lies to the north, where land is available for expansion.

Fire from American cannon raked the same northern terrain, and modern searchers have recovered several solid shot there in recent years.

It was also in the region to the north of the courthouse site that the route by which Greene retired from this field was located, a feature which should be added to the present series of displays at the military park.

More important, perhaps, than the considerations of historic deeds in the area north of the park, is the pressing need to preserve the entire site as a recognizable entity in this rapidly developing section. Since 1951, when I moved my family into the house which once served Cornwallis as hospital and headquarters, the neighborhood has lost its green and open character, and is now passing from a congested suburban, into an urban, district. All of this works to the detriment of this military park as a symbol of our great past. The current opportunity for its expansion is likely to be fleeting.

In my opinion, there is no important site in the military geography of the Revolution more worthy of congressional attention at this time than that of Guilford Courthouse.

World May Face Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, one of the most important problems facing the world is the population explosion. One of the results of this explosion is a tremendous strain on food resources.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article on this problem that was written by Dr. Raymond Ewell, of the State University of New York in Buffalo. The article, which was published by Chemical & Engineering News on December 14, 1964, follows:

FAMINE AND FERTILIZER

(By Dr. Raymond Ewell, State University of New York at Buffalo)

The world is on the threshold of the biggest famine in history. Not the world we live in, but the underdeveloped world, the three poor continents of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The populations of these continents are growing rapidly, and the production of food in these continents is lagging the population growth. This is the problem in a nutshell. This is the greatest and most nearly insoluble problem in the history of the world. And it is almost here.

If present trends continue, it seems likely that famine will reach serious proportions in India, Pakistan, and Communist China in the early 1970's. Indonesia, Iran, Turkey, Egypt, Brazil, and several other countries will follow within a few years. Most of the other countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America will fall in this category by 1980. Such a famine will be of massive proportions affecting hundreds of millions, possibly even billions, of persons. If this happens, as appears probable, it will be the most colossal catastrophe in history. It would be a completely new situation in the world's history—not enough food for the billions of human beings inhabiting the surface of this globe.

This would be the Malthusian doctrine finally coming true after 170 years.

The food-population problem will be the overriding problem of the last quarter of this century. The political and economic consequences of widespread famine in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are certain to be massive and far-reaching. It seems unlikely that stable governments can be maintained in countries where a large part of the population is starving.

The food/population problem seems likely to reach such enormous proportions by 1975 that it will dwarf and overshadow most of the problems and anxieties which now occupy our attention, such as the threat of nuclear war, communism, the space race, racial problems, unemployment, Berlin, Vietnam, the Congo, Cyprus, Cuba, and the like. These current problems will fade into the background as the enormity of the world food problem impresses itself on the Western World.

POPULATION EXPLOSION

Now that we have looked at the overall picture, let's look at some relevant facts. The populations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are now growing at rates of 2.5, 2.5, and 2.9 percent per year, respectively. These are their highest growth rates in history, and the rates of growth are still increasing. These high population growth rates are frequently referred to as the population explosion—and it really is an explosion. For example, a rate of 2.5 percent per year will double the population in 28 years.

The basic cause of the population explosion is the rapid drop in the death rate in Asia, Africa, and Latin America since 1945 as a result of the introduction into these areas of penicillin, DDT, and other modern medical and public health practices. Birth rates have remained practically constant, but death rates have dropped sharply since 1945.

Therefore, the population explosion is a new phenomenon—it has been a real explosion only since the end of World War II. Population growth rates were much lower before World War II—for example, 1.2 percent in both Asia and Africa in 1930-40, and 1.9 percent in Latin America during the same period. Before 1930 they were even lower. In fact, population growth rates above 1 percent per year were rare anywhere in the world before the 20th century.

Demographers have projected a growth in population of Asia (excluding China and Japan), Africa, and Latin America rising from 1.4 billion in 1960 to 2.3 billion in 1980. This is a minimum increase, in my opinion, because the population growth rates are still increasing. Should such an increase occur, the population in these three continents would increase by some 900 million people in only 20 years. This is a stupendous figure—900 million is a lot of people and 20 years is not much time in which to solve the many problems 900 million more people will bring with them. If China is included in this forecast, the population growth from 1960 to 1980 would be 1.3 billion. In the rest of this article China is excluded from the discussion because (1) it is on the other side of the ideological fence, and (2) we have little demographic or economic information on China. Japan is excluded from the discussion, also, because economically Japan is about the same as a European country.

The contrast in birth rates, death rates, and apparent population growth rates in major areas of the world between the developed and underdeveloped areas is striking. Particularly significant is that the underdeveloped areas with birth rates of 41 to 46 per 1,000 still have death rates as high as 12 to 23 per 1,000. This indicates the probability of further declines in the death rates with consequent increases in population growth rates, particularly in Asia and Africa. The birth rate is an irresistible force which is unlikely to change appreciably for 15 years or more.

The production of food in Asia, Africa, and Latin America has remained approximately constant for the past 3 or 4 years, and there is no social or economic development on the horizon that seems likely to increase food production in these continents enough to feed 900 million more people by 1980. In Asia the annual production of grain has remained constant at about 150 million tons since 1960 so that the per capita production of grain has declined from 16 ounces per day to 15 ounces per day during the past 3 years. In Latin America the annual production of grain has remained constant at about 42 million tons since 1958 so that the per capita production of grain has declined from 21 ounces per day to 18 ounces per day. Africa has had a small increase in grain production so that per capita production has remained at 15 ounces per day for the past 7 years.

Grain is, of course, not the only food, but it is the big staple and supplies a large portion of the food in these three continents—70 percent in Asia, 45 percent in Africa, 40 percent in Latin America. Potatoes, yams, and cassava supply an additional large percentage in Africa and Latin America.

GREATEST FAMINE OF ALL TIME

If these trends continue for a few more years, famine will inevitably result. And this would be famine on a scale never before experienced in the world's history. There have been many famines in history involving millions of people, but none involving hundreds of millions of people. Moreover, in past famines many people have died of disease as well as of starvation. Now modern medicine keeps people alive even though starving, and they still compete for a share of the inadequate food supply.

Not only will the forthcoming famine be widespread, affecting hundreds of millions of people, but it will be persistent and will probably get worse year by year, unless ways and means are soon found to increase agri-

cultural production. It is hard for us sitting in rich, comfortable, overfed America to realize that the greatest disaster in the history of the world is just around the corner. The efforts now being put forward by governments and private agencies to try to avert this disaster are much too small to cope with a problem of this magnitude.

The countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America vary considerably in their vulnerability to famine. India and Pakistan are undoubtedly the most vulnerable. These two countries will feel the brunt of the world famine first. China may be equally vulnerable, but we have little reliable data on the food situation there. Next in vulnerability come Indonesia, Iran, Turkey, Egypt, Brazil, and a few other countries. These countries have high population growth rates of 2 to 3.5 percent per year and population growth is already outrunning food production. Some Asian countries such as the Philippines, Burma, Thailand, Malaya, and Taiwan seem to be relatively secure against famine now, but they all have very high population growth rates which will soon soak up their present surpluses. Therefore these countries, too, will have food shortages within 10 to 15 years unless they can reduce their population growth rates. The same applies to most of the countries of Africa and Latin America.

BIRTH CONTROL OR FAMINE

What is the answer? What is the solution? There are three obvious possible answers: Reduce the population growth rate or increase agricultural production, or both. Reducing the population growth rate means reducing the birth rate since it is not socially acceptable to deliberately increase the death rate. In fact, birth control is the only answer in the long run. Improved agriculture could conceivably take care of the expected increases in population for 20 or maybe 30 years, but beyond that it would be impossible. Birth control is being actively promoted by governments and by private groups in most countries in the world today, but it is moving slowly in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and seems unlikely to cause any marked decrease in the birth rate before the 1980's. But ultimately, birth control is the only answer.

Widespread use of birth control is a basic social and cultural change which is certain to occur slowly in these countries. Birth control moved ahead very rapidly in Japan in 1948–55, but Japan has an educated, disciplined populace, whereas most of the underdeveloped countries do not. Oral contraceptive pills are probably not the answer in the underdeveloped countries for reasons of both cost and illiteracy. The most promising contraceptive method for these countries is the plastic intrauterine devices such as the Lippes loop and the Margulies coil. These devices are now being used in more than 25 countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, as well as in the United States, Europe, and Japan. However, mass application in Asia, Africa, and Latin America is likely to be slow.

Increasing agricultural production is, therefore, the only real possibility of averting world famine in the 1970's and 1980's. It is technically possible to double or even triple agricultural production in all of Asia, Africa, and Latin America through the use of more fertilizers, more irrigation, better seed varieties, more pesticides, and other improved agricultural practices. For example, the rice yield in Italy is 3,200 pounds per acre, in Japan 2,720 pounds per acre, in the United States 2,210 pounds per acre, in China 1,600 pounds per acre, but in India only 900 pounds per acre. For another example, the wheat yield in Denmark is 3,700 pounds per acre, in Japan 2,450 pounds per acre, in the United States 1,440 pounds per acre, but in India only 760 pounds per acre. Other basic food crops, such as corn, potatoes, beans, peanuts, cassava, bananas, and sugarcane show similar pictures. Many countries such as Pakistan, South Africa, Brazil, Ethiopia, and the Philippines, have crop yields as low as or even lower than India. This comparison of crop yields gives an indication of the potential for increasing crop yields in the low productivity countries.

SOCIAL CHANGE VERSUS FARM TECHNOLOGY

There is no doubt that agricultural productivity could be raised greatly in any country in the world—if there were time. But time is the crux of the problem. The use of improved agricultural methods represents a basic social and cultural change, and social change is a slow process. Most of the farmers of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are totally illiterate—they can't read or write or add numbers nor do they understand the elements of plant biology. Under these conditions, the introduction of scientific agriculture into Asia, Africa, and Latin America is likely to be a slow process. In fact, the social, cultural, and educational factors, not the technical factors, are the real bottlenecks in improving agriculture in these countries.

If the population would remain constant for 30 or 40 years, agriculture could change gradually and begin to supply a more adequate diet. Instead the population of these three continents will probably double in the next 25 to 30 years. Where will the food come from to feed 2 billion more people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America by 1990?

Of the various technical factors, increased use of fertilizer offers the best possibility for a quick increase in agricultural production. Field trials in many countries have established that moderate applications of fertilizer will give large increases in yields even if other technical inputs such as seed varieties and water supply are left unchanged. For example, the FAO freedom from hunger campaign has recently completed a series of 9,500 fertilizer demonstrations and field trials in 14 countries (Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, Morocco, Nigeria, Ghana, Senegal, Togo, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, and El Salvador). The trials included many crops such as wheat, barley, rice, corn, beans, cotton, potatoes, yams, sugarbeets, peanuts, and vegetables. These trials established beyond doubt that substantial increases in yields can be obtained by the use of moderate dosages of fertilizers even if no other technical factors are changed.

* * * * *

MINIMUM GOALS

How much fertilizer will it take? What facilities will be needed? How much will it cost? How will the fertilizer be distributed and applied to the soil?

As a minimum goal, let us assume that agricultural production should be increased enough to provide 16 ounces of grain per person per day in Asia, Africa, and Latin America in 1970 and also in 1980. This is the present level of consumption, so the minimum goal suggested is simply maintaining the present nutritional level, inadequate as it is. Everyone with any humanitarian instincts would like to see the diet of the undeveloped areas improved, but this is virtually impossible until the birth rate is reduced substantially. The underdeveloped countries will be pushed to the limit to maintain the present diet even with maximum help from the developed countries. The people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America ask only for enough rice, wheat, corn, and beans. Foods like meat, fish, eggs, and milk are beyond the reach of most of the people of these lands now and are likely to be even less available in the future as the populations continue to increase.

To provide 16 ounces of grain per day for the 400 million additional population of these continents in 1970 would require 15 million tons of plant nutrients, compared with consumption of 3 million tons in 1960–61. Consumption is probably about 4 million tons in 1963–64. To feed the 900 million additional population in 1980, 30 million tons of plant nutrients would be required. These figures were calculated on the basis that 1 ton of plant nutrient results in 8 tons of additional grain and that two-thirds of the fertilizer would be used on grain, one-third on all other crops. The overall tonnages of 15 million tons in 1970 and 30 million tons in 1980 compare with total world consumption of 30 million tons in 1962–63. Also for comparison, the current big Soviet fertilizer push has a target of 16 to 20 million tons of plant nutrients in 1970 (80 million tons gross weight of fertilizer).

To emphasize this point further, I am willing to put myself on record that if Asia, Africa, and Latin America are not using quantities of fertilizer approaching 30 million tons by 1980, they are almost certain to be engulfed in widespread famine.

The immediate problem is how can the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America obtain a supply of 15 million tons of plant nutrients by 1970 and 30 million tons by 1980. Domestic production of fertilizer in all three continents together was about 1.5 million tons in 1963–64 and a good estimate for 1970 production would be 3 to 4 million tons. Production in 1970 might be increased to 5 to 6 million tons by a new crash program of fertilizer plant construction, but generally speaking it is already too late to increase production greatly by 1970. I believe, therefore, that most of the fertilizer needed by Asia, Africa, and Latin America in 1970 will have to be imported from the industrialized countries. Some countries would have the foreign exchange to buy the fertilizer they need through commercial channels, but most countries would have to rely on foreign aid.

SELF-SUFFICIENCY BY 1980

For the longer term, in 1980, most countries should plan to become largely self-sufficient in fertilizer production—at least the larger countries. In round numbers, fertilizer plants cost about $1 billion per 6 million tons of annual production of finished fertilizer (on a plant nutrient basis). Therefore, enough fertilizer plants to produce 30 million tons of fertilizer would cost about $5 billion—10 percent of the cost of putting a man on the moon. If 30 million tons of fertilizer were produced and used in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, it would be a giant step toward solving the world food problem in 1980. Historians of the future may remark on whether it was more important to have devoted our resources during the 1960's to putting a man on the moon or to have devoted our resources toward averting the world famine of the 1970's.

Even after the quantities of fertilizer we have been discussing became available, there would still be a big educational job ahead to get farmers to use the fertilizer. This would require an extensive and intensive propaganda campaign together with adequate economic incentives. The countries of Asia (except Japan, of course), Africa and Latin America do not have enough agricultural specialists in their own countries to put over such a program. Therefore, the Western World and Japan would have to supply thousands of agricultural specialists if an intensified fertilizer program were to be successful.

The oceans offer a possibility of increased food production, but capital costs are high and the realistic potentials are generally overestimated. Total food from the sea, including both fish and vegetable matter, provides less than 1 percent of the total calories consumed in the world today, although fish may provide as much as 3 percent of total protein consumed. On the face of it the possibility of food from the sea playing a major role in feeding the hundreds of millions of additional human beings during the next 10 to 15 years does not seem realistic. Moreover, the capital investment required per

unit of additional food from the sea is much higher than in conventional land agriculture.

PROGRAMS FOR ACTION

To recapitulate then, there are several programs which need to be carried out concurrently to avert, or at least to alleviate, the impending food crisis in Asia, Africa, and Latin America:

Program: Shipment of surplus food from food-surplus countries to food-deficit countries.

Significance. This is now being done, of course, and will be particularly important during the next 5 to 10 years, and will probably continue indefinitely.

Program: Shipment of fertilizer from fertilizer-surplus countries to fertilizer-deficit countries.

Significance: Important during the next 5 to 10 years, but should be replaced by indigenous manufacture of fertilizer as soon as possible.

Program: Expansion of fertilizer manufacturing industry in fertilizer-deficit countries.

Significance: Should be accelerated as rapidly as possible and will be particularly important in the 1970's and 1980's.

Program: Reduction in birth rate and population growth rate in food-deficit countries.

Significance: Food-deficit countries should make plans to reduce the birth rate to less than 20 per 1,000 and the population growth rate to less than 1 percent per year, as Europe and Japan have already done. This is the only ultimate solution to the food-population problem.

The developed countries will have to give major assistance to the underdeveloped countries if this great food problem is to be solved. The underdeveloped countries simply cannot do it on their own resources. The alternative will be widespread famine and political instability on a scale unprecedented in the world's history.

We have been considering some far-reaching and very complex problems. I am sure that greater use of more fertilizers is the most promising approach to solving the world food problem, at least in the relatively short term of 10 to 15 years. Without a great deal more fertilizer, the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are going to be much hungrier in the 1970's than they are now. Thomas Malthus has had many deprecators in the past, but it looks as though he may be proved right after all—unless the world's resources are mobilized soon and effectively.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Getting to Work and Back—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues to the second half of Consumer Reports' excellent opening article in the series called "Getting to Work and Back." The article follows:

GETTING TO WORK AND BACK—PART 2

To many freeway enthusiasts, objections based on personal or local considerations seem selfish and even perverse. Sacrifices, they urge, must be made to the common good. There is some merit in this view. Individual objections can be pressed beyond reason.

Opposition can be expected to grow even more effective during the remaining years of the Interstate System construction program, as more communities experience for themselves just how a freeway affects community life—and as all the easy routes are completed, leaving unfinished and perhaps unfinishable the routes that dispossess the largest number of people, remove the largest amounts of taxable land from the rolls, despoil the best loved parks and views, or otherwise rouse the ire of the local citizenry.

If the high dollar cost and the high social cost of urban freeways were necessary to achieve a fast transportation system, the benefits might be balanced against the costs. But commuters are increasingly learning that for the trip to work downtown, the new freeways are not fast.

Consumers Union has examined unpublished data, for example, for a 12-mile-long stretch of Chicago's Congress Street (Eisenhower) Expressway, composed partly of 8 lanes posted at 55 miles per hour and partly of 6 lanes posted at 60 or 65 miles per hour. When traffic is flowing freely, a driver can cover the 12 miles with ease in 13 minutes. But during rush hour, the trip over the same 12 miles may take as long as 35 minutes.

This figure, impressive though it is, seriously understates the problem. For it does not include the excess time it takes to get into or out of a parking garage in rush-hour traffic, to weave through the congested local streets to a freeway entrance, to queue up at the entrance, and then to crawl up the ramp and push a way into the moving stream of traffic.

Wasted time can be evaluated in various ways. One approach values the commuter's time at some arbitrarily chosen amount, such as $1.50 per hour. On this basis, 30 minutes wasted each way each day costs each commuter some $325 per year. More complicated calculations have also been made. None of them takes into account what it means to wife, husband, and children to be cheated out of an hour together—and to have a father arrive home fretful, grumpy, exhausted, and late for dinner after battling traffic congestion on the new freeway.

OUR CONGESTED FUTURE

Freeway proponents point out that the urban freeway system is not complete as yet. Thus laymen may be tempted to dismiss current freeway congestion as mere growing pains—a temporary affliction that will be cured when the rest of the Interstate System freeways are opened to traffic.

Transportation engineers know better. The ultimate inadequacy of the center-city portions of the Interstate System was revealed in 1961, in a study commissioned by the Automobile Manufacturers Association and published under the title "Future Highways and Urban Growth." This study, made by the traffic consulting firm of Wilbur Smith and Associates, considers the urban traffic situation in 1972, assuming that all Interstate System and other planned urban freeways are completed by that date. Its conclusion: the annual rate of urban freeway construction will thereafter have to be doubled.

The Interstate System plan called for building 5,000 miles of urban freeway during the 16 years from 1956 to 1972; the 1961 report calls for building an additional 5,600 urban miles during the 8 years from 1972 to 1980.

BAN CARS OR BEAT THEM TO TOWN?

After looking at traffic-plagued cities, some critics have proposed that private automobiles be banned altogether from their congested central areas—thus forcing would-be drivers onto public transportation.

This solution is hardly popular; yet it is very close to what is actually happening—with no formal law or regulation to keep cars out—in some larger cities today. Fewer than 5 percent of the people employed in Manhattan south of 60th Street, for example, drive their cars to work—not because many of those who don't aren't eager to drive in, but because a combination of clogged streets, bridges, and tunnels, inadequate parking facilities, and high parking charges bar their entry.

Similarly in Chicago, only about 12 percent of those entering the central business district in rush hour drive in. In other large cities the barriers to entry are more porous—but access is strictly rationed all the same. Though few officials will openly admit it, congestion is quietly accepted as the cheapest device for discouraging additional drivers from driving to town. Indeed, congestion is politically popular in an off-the-record way because you don't have to float a bond issue to finance it.

It is here that the true significance of San Francisco's BART system, described above, becomes apparent. The bay area proposes to solve its journey-to-work problems, not by banning cars or by making it excessively slow, costly, and unpleasant to drive, but by offering a cheaper, faster, more convenient, less irksome way to get to town.

The ideal urban transportation plan, almost everyone now agrees, would combine a rapid transit system of BART quality or better with a freeway system adequate to carry the rest of the traffic. These two aspects of a sound plan are not incompatible.

Chicago's Congress Street Expressway and rapid transit line is the pioneering example of combined planning. It is, for the most part, an 8-lane expressway with a 2-track rapid transit line, and space for a third track, down the median. Rapid transit requires only about one-fifth of the width of the right-of-way; yet it has a theoretical peak-hour capacity of 30,000 seated passengers in each direction per hour (60,000 in the peak direction if the third track is installed). The expressway, occupying four-fifths of the right-of-way, begins to jam up when more than 6,000 cars (9,000 occupants) travel along it per hour in either direction. The expressway cost about $188,500,000; the rapid transit line cost an additional $36 million.

Two other new Chicago expressways also have space down the median for rapid transit, but funds to build the transit lines are lacking. Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C., similary plan to use freeway medians for a portion of their transit lines. The moral for other cities is clear. If a new freeway is being planned to enter your downtown area, has adequate consideration been given to provide room along it for future transit needs?

PRETTY GOOD ISN'T GOOD ENOUGH

Opponents of rapid transit make a completely valid criticism of the Congress Street transit line arrangement. They point out that even though its 2-track transit line could carry 30,000 seated passengers per hour, it actually runs many fewer cars than its capacity would allow and thus attracts only 13,500 passengers, including standees, during the rush hour. Hence the automobile expressway continues to jam up. To appreciate what's wrong with the Congress Street transit line, and with most other public transportation in the United States today, let's compare Chicago's Congress Street line with San Franciscos BART standards.

First and foremost, 50 percent of the passengers on the Congress Street line must stand during the peak hour. Even for the riders who do find seats, comfort is far below BART standards. The cars are not air-conditioned for example. And the service is only technically rapid transit. Scheduled speeds range from 17 to 26 miles per hour, as compared with BART's 50 miles per hour (both including the time of stops at the stations).

Moreover, the Congress Street line is only 9 miles long; much of its potential patronage lies beyond its outer terminus. Where it does reach, there are inconvenient arrangements for handling passengers driven to the train by their wives, inadequate peripheral parking for those who want to drive to the station, and inadequate feeder buses to bring passengers to the train. At the other end of the line, Chicago's distribution system for carrying passengers to their destinations fails to serve a number of new midcity developments where the transportation demand is heaviest.

These shortcomings are typical of most mass transportation lines in the United States today. Indeed, many are much worse. Mass transportation is patronized mostly by people who do not own cars, by those who would prefer to drive to work but can't afford it, and by those who fear they won't be able to find a parking place or to afford those that are available.

Chicago could remedy Congress Street's transit shortcomings at relatively moderate cost—much less than the cost of an additional freeway. It could also build high-quality transit lines along its other freeways at moderate cost.

But opposition from railroad interests and the highway lobby blocked action on transit improvement in the 1961 Illinois Legislature. It boils down to this: commuters are not yet organized as effectively as the highway lobby is, nor are they as sure of what fits their best interest. For instance, they are often misled when automobile club executives and other opponents of rapid transit tell them that the

BART system and similar proposals will handle at most only 5 percent or so of the trips people want to make. The figures may be right, but the implication isn't. For the 5 percent of trips that modern transit can handle best are the all-important trips to and from work.

ROLE OF THE COMMUTER RAILROADS

Many suburban commuters face a different sort of transportation crisis. Their communities' problem does not take the shape of a monumental traffic jam or overcrowded transit, but rather a notice posted at the local railroad station that the line proposes to raise its fares or curtail its passenger service—or discontinue service altogether.

Commuters faced with situations such as these often band together to protest, or hire lawyers to protest for them, at Interstate Commerce Commission hearings and at State public utility commission proceedings. They also petition their local officials and State legislators to "save our commuter railroads" by relieving them of taxes and by paying them tax subsidies.

Philadelphia has pioneered a better solution to the commuter railroad problem. During the 1950's farsighted Philadelphia public officials, looking at a map of the Penn-Jersey metropolitan area, noted that the rights-of-way of the dozen or more commuter railroad lines fanning out in all directions from downtown Philadelphia and from Camden could be used to create a magnificent public transportation system—if the lines could be tied together and service standards raised. Hence, when the railroads serving Philadelphia began petitioning for fare increases and for permission to curtail service, the city countered with an alternative proposal.

It offered to buy service from the railroads in accordance with a carefully drafted contract. It would seek to supply top-speed, comfortable, air-conditioned "Silverliners"—reputed locally to be the finest electric commuter cars in the United States today. These new cars would be added to existing schedules to shorten the intervals between trains and provide seats for more passengers. The railroads would be required to lower instead of raise their fares. Stations would be improved and additional parking provided around them. The city would foot the bills, with aid from a Federal demonstration grant.

The plan was tried initially on two commuter lines and proved so successful that it has since been extended to several more. Two neighboring counties, through the Southeastern Pennsylvania Compact (SEPACT), have now joined Philadelphia and the Federal Government in supplying the needed funds. Railroad commuters are getting better service for less money, and the rest of the city is benefited through fewer cars jamming the downtown streets and freeways. A similar plan has since been launched on some Boston commuter railroad lines.

The Philadelphia plan is important because of three major features that distinguish it from the usual "save our commuter railroads" pleas.

The subsidy is used directly for the benefit of railroad patrons, not to bail out railroad bondholders.

The plan does not just seek to maintain existing service. It assure more and better service at lower fares.

Every dollar spent—and this is the ingenious heart of Philadelphia's plan—brings the city and its suburbs one step closer to a consolidated, areawide rapid transit system capable of providing services close to BART standards.

In 1964, for example, John Bailey of SEPACT submitted a report showing how railroad rights-of-way could be utilized to provide a high speed 216-mile rapid transit system with Silverliner comfort, peripheral parking, and convenient central-city distribution at a cost of only $130 million. And $27 million worth of this conversion program had already been completed. New cars had been purchased, peripheral parking provided, and other improvements made. As a result, Bailey's package could be completed for an additional cost of only $103 million—less than the cost of building 8 or 10 miles of downtown freeway.

The Regional Plan Association has been developing a similar plan for New York city's commuter railroads.

WHAT'S THE ANSWER FOR YOUR CITY?

A surprising number of North American cities are now considering rapid transit proposals leading toward San Francisco-type service—and a few have already started building transit systems.

Toronto residents, for example, voted 10 to 1 for a new subway back in 1946. Trains rolled over the first 4.5 miles of the system in 1954—and success was so immediate and obvious that plans for expansion were promptly drafted. Some 6.5 miles are currently in operation—not very much, but enough to keep from 10,000 to 25,000 cars off Toronto streets each weekday. Construction now underway will provide 21 miles of transit by 1967, and future plans now call for 39 miles by 1980. Along with new transit construction, Toronto is also developing a computer-based traffic control system to handle the cars and trucks remaining on the streets with maximum efficiency.

Montreal is similarly building a new subway system—26.2 miles approved to date—after a mayor was elected on the platform: "Vote for me and get a subway."

Philadelphia voters last November approved, by a substantial margin, an $87,300,000 bond issue to finance subway extensions. The Philadelphia-Camden rapid transit line is being extended into the south Jersey suburbs at a cost of $50 million. And there is the pending proposal already described to convert 216 miles of Philadelphia's commuter railroad lines into a high-speed transit system approaching BART standards.

Atlanta has plans for a 65.4-mile rapid transit network. Voters last November approved a constitutional amendment that is the first step toward that goal.

Boston is planning major improvements with the help of State funds from a 2 cents a pack increase in the cigarette tax, imposed following a monumental traffic tieup in December 1963. Its old transit authority serving the city and 13 suburbs has been replaced by a new agency authorized to improve service to the city and 77 suburbs.

New York, Chicago, Cleveland, and Pittsburgh have plans for extending and improving their existing transit systems—but these plans fall short in varying degrees of San Francisco BART standards.

A few other cities—St. Louis, for example—have transit plans gathering dust in municipal office files, and several cities, such as Baltimore and Seattle, are beginning to get ready to make transit plans.

This optimistic review of North American transit progress is subject to one major qualification: All of the plans require public tax funds to subsidize construction; but to date only Toronto, Montreal, and San Francisco have firmly committed public funds in adequate amounts. Thus a tremendous field is waiting for action—not necessarily to rally support for BART-type public transit in every large city, but at least to examine the issues carefully and come up with reasoned support of some locally feasible solution to the transportation problem.

That Toronto, Montreal, and the San Francisco Bay area should be the leaders in laying money on the line for high-quality transit is hardly coincidence. "If you would make your city loved," said an ancient Greek proverb, "you must first make her lovable." Toronto, Montreal, and San Francisco have made themselves lovable cities—and it is at least partly in an effort to preserve their inherent quality from the freeway and the parking lot that residents of these cities and their suburbs have been willing to tax themselves for rapid transit.

The presence of three Canadian cities on the list is also worth a comment. American cities facing a choice between downtown freeways and rapid transit are deterred from choosing transit, even when it makes excellent sense, by our national freeway financing program. Since 90 percent of the cost of the new urban freeways included in the Interstate System and 50 percent of the cost of most urban freeways in excess of the Interstate System come out of the Federal "highways trust fund," even cities that want and need rapid transit have to date been tempted by the Federal carrot to build more freeways instead.

A change is in sight, however. The Urban Mass Transportation Act passed by Congress in 1964 establishes a national policy of aiding public urban transportation. If adequate funds are appropriated to achieve the goals set forth in the 1964 act, cities may at last be free to plan their transportation in terms of sound engineering and public policy rather than in terms of which plan will draw the lushest Federal subsidy. The next report in this series will consider financing proposals in more detail.

The War in Vietnam—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., just recently returned from a trip to Vietnam.

A series of reports on conditions as he found them is now appearing in the Courier-Express. I am sure my colleagues will find Mr. Warren's observations very interesting and, with unanimous consent, I include the fourth part of the series in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Feb. 24, 1965]

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, IV—RAID OF VIETCONG SUCCESSFUL

(By Lucian C. Warren)

(Guerrilla warfare traditionally is a series of small but deadly battles in which units of a regular army undertake to capture—or kill—detachments of irregulars hiding in and living off the countryside. Here Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, accompanies a detail of South Vietnam soldiers in a successful raid on a nest of Vietcong guerrillas.)

DANANG, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"The idea is to get your man in there as quickly as possible and then clear out," barked the Marine officer at an eagle flight predawn briefing at Danang Air Base.

"If your chopper is hit and goes down, there probably can be a recovery. The second H-34 should go alongside and effect a rescue. Get the man and the guns and get out and don't worry about the chopper."

Not long afterward more than a score of H-34's took off from Danang Airbase on the first leg of what the Marines call an eagle flaght, an operation designed to drive Com-

munist Vietcong forces out of jungle hiding places, capturing their equipment and killing off or capturing them.

RENDEZVOUS

First stop was a rendezvous at Tam Ky with the South Vietnamese 5th Regiment battalions, the forces which were to be flown into a Vietcong-infested area for the mopping-up operation.

I was permitted to join a segment of the 3d Battalion of the 5th Regiment, whose foreign advisers were Warrant Officer Wallace Thompson, an Australian Army man from Sydney, and Staff Sgt. Donald J. Shepherd, of Springfield, Ill.

Not long after sunup, the choppers were quickly loaded with the Vietnamese soldiers. The ones in my craft—9 men with short haircuts, none over 5 feet 4 inches tall—talked in Vietnamese and seemed eager for the fray.

SMOKE SIGNAL

At 9:05 a.m., the choppers swung low over the northern Thang Binh area, south of the coastal city of Hoi Ana. A lead helicopter dropped a red smoke signal indicating the spot for the soldiers to be landed.

I disembarked with the soldiers and lost no time in running to the nearest stretch of scrubby evergreen growth.

We were not shot at. But the presence of the Communist Vietcong in the area was attested to within 15 minutes when armed "Hueys"—as they call the Bell UH1B helicopters—began blasting away at the enemy a couple of miles away.

ON THE RUN

Warrant Officer Thompson was in constant touch with the leaders of the operation via his walkie-talkie. As electrical rockets and machineguns kept up a steady fire from the Hueys ahead, we learned that some Vietcong were on the run, others had taken to foxholes, while still other were heading for the Truong Chiang River in hope of safety there.

At intervals of between 15 minutes to an hour, our segment of the attacking force moved up according to plan.

Vin Van Thong, commander of the 2d company, 3d Battalion, a slight, bespectacled Vietnamese, at each halt would take out his map, jabber over his walkie-talkie, then smile with satisfaction as the operation unfolded successfully.

DIGGER

"He's a good little digger," said Shepherd.

"Digger" is the affectionate slang term applied to the Vietnamese soldier by their American advisers.

"Get him to tell you about his Sunday operation," added Thompson.

At one of the longer breaks in the moving up operation, Thong proudly recounted how on Sunday they had ambushed 120 Vietcong and captured, among other things, 57 Russian recoilless rifles, a 160 millimeter mortar, 6 Japanese machineguns, 4 M1 rifles, 3 submachineguns, and 6,000 meters of signal wire—all in all amounting to 1 ton of Vietcong war equipment that could not longer be used in their South Vietnam war of terror.

RESCUE

In halting English but glowing with pride, he told how a couple of days earlier he had helped conduct a successful evacuation mission for 200 Catholic Vietnamese refugees, who wished to be freed from Vietcong terrorism in their home territory.

A helicopter picked me up and returned me to Danang before the current Eagle Flight mission had been completed. But later an official communique noted these successful results: 42 Vietcong killed, 13 captured, and a large quantity of weapons seized, as against only 1 killed and 2 wounded of the South Vietnamese forces.

A small operation, but one of the signs that Uncle Sam and his South Vietnamese ally are learning a trick or two about guerrilla warfare.

The Principles of Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 the 156th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, an impressive address on "The Principles of Lincoln" was delivered at a Lincoln Day dinner in West Lafayette, Ind.

The address was delivered by James E. Dornan, Jr., a member of the faculty of Purdue University, located in the Second Congressional District of Indiana, which it is my privilege to represent.

Abraham Lincoln, a man of all the people, was the first Republican President of these United States, and as we again honor his memory with a special reenactment of his second inaugural, under leave to extend my remarks I offer Mr. Dornan's excellent exposition of the principles which were Lincoln's guidelines, and which have been guidelines for the Republican Party through the years:

Mr. Chairman, Representative and Mrs. Halleck, distinguished guests at the head table, and my fellow Republicans, it is of course a great privilege and a pleasure to have the opportunity to address this distinguished assemblage on such an occasion. I am sure that you have all noted with satisfaction, as I have, the tremendous turnout; coming as it does on the heels of the thrashing which we received at the polls in November, the size of the crowd tonight indicates quite clearly that reports of the death of the Republican Party have been magnificent exaggerations, and augers well for the future.

Before beginning my formal remarks, I would like to express the hope that my appearance here this evening will serve to lay to rest a certain myth concerning university professors which has received rather wide circulation of late: It is not true that all professors of political science in the United States in the 1960's are liberal Democrats. And some of you may someday want to tell your grandchildren that on February 12, 1965, you actually saw and heard one who isn't.

As your county prosecutor, George Hanna, indicated in his very kind introduction, I am a transplanted easterner, who has left the State of his birth and taken up residence elsewhere not in order to run for the U.S. Senate—which as you are well aware is a very popular reason for changing residence these days; rather, I have come to Indiana to assume a teaching position on the faculty of a great university, and thereby to reside in the heartland of America—that part of America which, it seems to me, best represents in this age of collectivism the spirit of a free people, that part of America which nurtured the giant of history whose memory we honor here this evening. And we are assembled this evening to renew; to rekindle in ourselves, that spirit of a free America; and to renew it by recalling for ourselves once again Abraham Lincoln's contribution to its formation. By so doing, we hope to draw from it the strength to weather the serious hours ahead.

For there can be no doubt that these are serious hours—for us assembled at Purdue on this February 12, for all Republicans gathered at similar dinners across the Nation, for all Americans, for all mankind—and I shall therefore speak to you in serious tones.

A little more than six decades ago, halfway around the globe in Zurich, Switzerland, a bald and stocky middle-class lawyer wrote a short treatise which he entitled "What Is To Be Done." Released soon afterward to an unreceptive world, the little pamphlet was largely ignored by its intended readership, the working class of Europe, and totally unnoticed by the statesmen then presiding over the power centers of the West, its circulation, in fact, as James Burnham has noted, was restricted to a rather motley group of emigre revolutionaries scattered throughout the capitals and major cities of Europe. But ignored though it was, that short pamphlet contained a blueprint for world revolution whose course races on in today's world, virtually unchecked. Its past successes are revealed by a brief examination of a world atlas: 63 years after the publication of "What Is To Be Done," Marxism-Leninism—the revolutionary doctrine expounded within its pages—is more than a mere set of ideas; it is a way of life for nearly a billion people in 13 nations, whose territory covers nearly one-third of the total land surface of the earth. It is, moreover, the organizing doctrine for revolutionary parties in 75 additional nations—parties large and small, powerful and impotent—all engaged in an unceasing struggle to extirpate from the very face of the earth all other political doctrines and systems and movements, and to replace them with their own narrowly rigid version of the good society. The author of the pamphlet was, of course, the man we know as V. I. Lenin; and six decades after the publication of his treatise Americans who have never heard his name confront the consequences of his mind, his energy, and his fearful talent.

In fact, for better or for worse, the entire recent record of American foreign policy and indeed of world history is very largely the record of our attempts to understand and counteract those consequences.

You ask, What has all this got to do with our topic for this evening? Just this. Forty years, almost to the day, before the publication of Lenin's pamphlet, another middle-class lawyer—this one tall, rather slender, and anything but bald, put his pen to paper in Washington, D.C., and issued another in the long series of documents which together constitute America's political heritage, proclaiming that freedom is the ultimate political value for all mankind. That document we know as the Emancipation Proclamation, and its author is known to history as the Great Emancipator, not only because he freed the slaves, but because his entire life is testimony to the glory of a free society.

Lenin and Lincoln—wholly dissimilar in personal appearance, in manner of living, in political philosophy—alike only in the common first and last letters of their surnames, and in the symbolic equality which the thought of each has come to assume for the contending forces in the revolution of our time. It is normally thought that only communism offers the people of the world a revolution in the 20th century, but the truth is that the democratic way of life offers to mankind a far more profound revolution, promises, in short, a liberation of the human spirit unknown in world history. And the conflict between these two revolutions—the Communist revolution and the democratic revolution—represents the crisis of our age. It is a conflict which goes forward on many levels; but I would suggest that at its most fundamental level, it is a conflict of spirit—a conflict essentially moral in nature that will be won by that force which succeeds in convincing the greater number of men that its principles represent the common aspirations of humanity.

And what are the ingredients of the spirit of freedom, the principles which we offer in opposition to the oppressive dogmas of Marxism-Leninism? They are, I suggest, nothing more nor less than the principles

which inspired the political career of the first Republican President, and which constitute the Republican spirit today.

The highlights of that career are of course familiar to all of you, for they have been immortalized in poetry and in prose, in the legendary tales which are a part of the conventional wisdom of our society and in the ponderous tomes of our academicians. Every American knows of Lincoln's birth in the humblest of surroundings in the Kentucky Appalachian country; of his family's move west, like that of countless thousands of others in the period of our national migration, in search of the American dream; of his railsplitting and boatman days in southern Indiana, where he spent the formative years of his life. Equally familiar is his early entrance into the rough and tumble world of Illinois Whig politics; his three-term service in the State legislature and his leadership of the Whig forces there, his thrilling—if unsuccessful—attempts to win election to the U.S. Senate, and his role in the founding of the Republican Party all mark him as one of the prominent political leaders in the long history of party politics in the United States. And, finally, history has ranked Lincoln among the greatest of Presidents, the savior of the Federal Union, whose resolute refusal to shrink from the use of force in defense of the right made possible the astounding growth of the American Republic in the last century, and our emergence on the international scene as a world power. All this is familiar to you, and I need not therefore try to emulate those who have written of his life more eloquently than can I.

But with the principles which inspired that career you may not be as intimately familiar; it unfortunately appears to be true that the Republican Party during the course of the past several decades has chosen to define its position most often in terms of immediate issues, and only rarely in terms of a carefully articulated body of fundamental principle. This, I believe, has cost us dearly; and as a contribution to the self-analysis in which our party is currently engaged, I would like to attempt a brief summary of the ingredients of the Republican spirit.

1. The Republican spirit is infused with a spirit of realism, infused with an awareness of the limits set by human nature itself to the achievement of the good, infused with a sense of the possible. The Republican knows that precisely because of the kind of being that man is, he will choose the wrong road as often as the right, he will neglect his obligations as often as he will meet them, he will abuse political power as often as he will employ it as the servant of justice. The Republican knows that precisely because of the kind of being that man is, utopian solutions to problems in the political and social order cannot work must, in fact, lead inevitably to disaster. And I remind you that the entire career of Abraham Lincoln reflects his own essential realism, his willingness to work with conditions as he found them, his refusal to commit himself to crusades for unattainable ends. Perhaps best indicative of his attitude—and least remembered today—was his fundamentally gradualist approach to the question of the abolition of slavery, reflected in his insistence that abolition ought to proceed at a pace which took into account existing conditions in the South. This insistence of Lincoln's, of course, earned him the lasting enmity of the radicals in his own party.

2. The Republican spirit includes a profound respect for history and for tradition. The Republican asserts that the pattern of future events will largely resemble those of the past, that history is one of our most reliable teachers, that what has worked well in the past is likely to work well, with appropriate modifications, in the future. Here let me remind you of Lincoln's profound respect for the work of the founders of the American Nation, and his insistence that their work must not be undone, even at the cost of a bloody Civil War.

3. Upon his understanding of political reality and of history rests the concept of government and governmental power which lies at the core of the Republican's political position. Because of his understanding of human nature, the Republican knows that the social and economic injustice that lies all about us can only partially and gradually be eliminated through common action in this political order, and partially eliminated at that only after arduous and long struggle. He knows, moreover, with Lord Acton, that all power tends to corrupt—is likely to be abused—and that therefore the power of any man or group of men to direct the lives of others must be carefully circumscribed lest it degenerate into tyranny. And he knows that the record of several thousand years of recorded human history bears unimpeachable witness to the degeneration of political power into tyrannical government.

Therefore, the Republican spirit embodies a notable suspicion of the overly powerful state and a favorable disposition toward limited government, toward the separation, diffusion, and checking and balancing of political power rather than its concentration. Today's Republican believes with Abraham Lincoln that a government should do for its citizens only what its citizens cannot do for themselves. And so, too, the Republican is an ardent defender of the American constitutional system, which is characterized by a limited national government, by the principle of federalism, by a system of separation of powers and checks and balances; for the Republican believes that we have developed in the United States the best governmental system yet devised for the protection of freedom.

4. The Republican spirit rests on a belief in liberty—not only because the alternative promises unimaginable horror, but more importantly because the path of freedom is the only path to the fulfillment of the individual and to the achievement of that which man as a being is peculiarly capable, the only path which permits him to exercise those God-given faculties of soul and mind and body which set us apart from the apes. And the Republican spirit rests, also, on a belief in equality—not a suffocating equality, imposed from above, that would make every man like every other man, but moral equality and equality of opportunity, a guarantee to every individual that he shall receive the change to enjoy the blessings of liberty. And here once again Lincoln is our exemplar: for what is his life but a testimonial to the possibilities for achievement offered to the free man by a free society?

5. The Republican spirit manifests a belief in the need for order imposed by law, and for social responsibility on the part of government and citizen alike. Too aware of the moral ambiguity of human nature not to recognize that liberty can readily degenerate into license, the Republican insists on a most careful balancing of the claims of freedom and order, and demands that his government stand ready to protect the freedom of all against the abuse of freedom by some. And all Republicans acknowledge their obligation and the obligation of government to the unfortunate members of our society who, through no fault of their own, have been unable to share in the good life of a bountiful America. But we insist, as did Lincoln, that this obligation is to be fulfilled through the framework of a free society, and must never degenerate into a simple exercise in vote buying through promises of ever-larger expenditures from the public treasury.

6. And, finally, the Republican spirit is infused with respect for the free economy and for the right of property. This respect is founded on the recognition that freedom is indivisible; that logically and historically economic freedom cannot be separated from other kinds of freedom; that economic power cannot be separated from political power; that economic power concentrated in the hands of government is just as immediate a threat to liberty as political power so concentrated. If freedom is to have any meaning at all, it surely must include the opportunity to employ to the full our talents and abilities, the opportunity to enjoy the fruits of our labor, the opportunity to accumulate wealth and to utilize it in accordance with our desires—all, of course, within a framework of social responsibility.

And on behalf of both these principles—respect for order and for property as the bulwark of the good society—Lincoln spoke eloquently throughout his public life. "There is no grievance," he said, "that is a fit subject for redress by mob law." And in one of the last public addresses of his life, his 1864 speech to the New York Workingmen's Association, he said: "Property is the fruit of labor—property is desirable—is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich, shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another; but let him labor diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

These, I think, are the ingredients of the Republican spirit, the principles to which all Republicans are dedicated and which distinguished us from almost all Democrats, the principles which we offer in opposition to the spirit of collectivism rampant in today's world. And it is within the framework of these principles that the Republican seeks his solutions to the complex problem of 20th-century America: he looks long and hard at proposals for further expansion of national governmental responsibility for the lives of Americans; he favors instead expanding the scope of State and local and private responsibility in meeting social problems; moreover, he believes that in today's affluent society a good number of our problems can be met at those levels. The Republican, further, examines each problem on its merits, in search of a solution that is satisfactory within the framework of a free social order, and on this basis takes his stand on such issues as medicare, on poverty wars, on aid to education, on welfare. And in the course of this examination he looks with care at the possible effect of policy proposals on the American constitutional system—a system which in its original conception provided for the balanced distribution of governmental power among three branches of Government, and provided most of all for reasoned deliberation on public problems by a Congress of the people's representatives. And when the Republican examines that system today, he sees it under relentless attack by proponents of a political orthodoxy who favor a constant aggrandizement of presidential power, a steady reduction in the prerogatives of Congress, and a regularized usurpation by the Supreme Court of the legislation function. Against all this the Republican offers increasing resistance—as Lincoln himself had to struggle constantly in his time to maintain the balance of our constitutional system against those who would have made the President and the Supreme Court the pawns of a dominant legislature.

Now what do our critics say of the Republican spirit as it unfolds in the 1960's? First, they charge that the Republican spirit is essentially negative, that we oppose every attempt to deal with the complex forces at work in our time, and initiate no counterproposals of our own. Well, let me remind you that Lincoln's political posture had its negative aspects, also: he opposed slavery,

revolution, and tyranny, and we too oppose all those things. But of course the charge is utterly without foundation, because for each and every negative Republican position there is a position corollary. Republicans are not merely against collectivism and overcentralization of governmental power; they are for a maximization of individual initiation, for a strengthened Federal system, for a free society. Republicans are not merely against a socialized economic system; they are for the right of business managers to direct their affairs according to the dictates of efficiency, for the rights of private ownership, for a free economy. Republicans are not merely against undue expansion of plebiscitary presidential power; they are for a Congress that will carefully consider policy proposals in accordance with the needs and desires of our citizenry, for an educated public opinion, for constitutional government. Republicans are not merely against centralization of medical care and public welfare; they are for the right of individuals to choose freely their own hospitals and doctors, for the right of doctors to practice medicine in accordance with scientific wisdom rather than the predilections of bureaucrats, for the expansion of personal and local community charity, and the dispensation of that charity to those in need, not to those for whom feeding at the public trough has become a way of life.

And secondly, our critics say that our solutions are oversimplifications, are unrealistic—suitable perhaps for a bygone age, but unrelated to and therefore dangerous in the complex world of the 20th century. Well, let me remind you that it is not the Republican Party which in 1965 has promised to eliminate poverty, evil, and ignorance from the world by spending a few billion dollars of the taxpayers' money. What could be more naive, more unrealistic, than that? And it is not the Republican Party which has a single, pat solution to every problem which besets our society—establish a new branch of the Federal bureaucracy, and open up once more the Federal Treasury. Indeed, I ask you what could be less complex, more simplistic than that? And let me remind you that it is not the Republican Party which for 45 years has consistently misunderstood the purposes of the forces of collectivism in the world, and mistaken every change in Communist tactics for an indication that the lion is at last ready to lie down with the lamb, and that peace on earth is just over the horizon. What could be more unrealistic—or more dangerous—than that?

No, it is not the Republican Party which promises to the American people in today's complex world prosperity through collectivism and peace through retreat. The Republican, in fact, offers no simple solutions to the problems which beset our society. He offers instead a philosophy rooted in principle, in enduring values ascertained through study and appreciation of the American tradition. He offers instead the arduous path, the challenging path—the path of freedom. And he offers this path under no illusions that herein lies the road to the millenium, but rather in the conviction that a great society which is truly human is one in which men are provided the maximum opportunity for self-fulfillment in liberty. And finally, he offers this path not only to Americans, but to the entire world, as our answer to Lenin's question, "What is to be done?" As Lincoln phrased it as he faced the crisis of war in 1861, "This issue embraces more than the fate of the United States. It presents to the whole family of man the question whether a constitutional republic, or democracy—a government of the people, by the same people—can or can not maintain its integrity against its * * * foes."

My fellow Republicans, we have in the second half of the 20th century an enormous responsibility. For our task is nothing less than that of resurrecting in the heart of an America surfeited with the spoils of affluence the spirit of Lincoln, the Republican spirit, the spirit of freedom. As Lincoln told Congress in his special message of December 1862, "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history." Indeed, we cannot; and if we are equal to the task, if we can close ranks behind the principles which unite us, and cease the petty squabbling that is reducing us to impotence, we shall succeed in resurrecting the spirit of a free America; and government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall indeed not perish from the earth, but rather shall win the world; and when in the hereafter we meet Lenin's ghost, we can say to him with pride, "Your countrymen are living in freedom."

An Airline Looks at Supersonic Transports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of publicity has been given to the continuing study with respect to the development of a supersonic aircraft. Recently, Mr. R. W. Rummel, the vice president for planning and research, Trans World Airlines, addressed the Society of Automotive Engineers in Philadelphia on the subject "An Airline Looks at Supersonic Transports."

Mr. Rummel has been associated with the aviation industry for many years and is recognized as an outstanding authority in the field of aviation design. He has devoted a major effort in recent months to the development of an American SST program. Mr. Rummel is a member of the National Aviation and Space Association, one of the top level research coordinating groups in NASA.

He is also a member of the Institute of Aeronautical Science and the Society of Automotive Engineers. He has appeared on many occasions before various governmental committees and commissions concerned with aviation and also has served as an expert witness before committees of Congress.

At this time I would like to have inserted in the RECORD excerpts from Mr. Rummel's remarks on the SST program as a valuable document on this most important subject.

Mr. Rummel's remarks follow:

EXCERPTS FROM "AN AIRLINE LOOKS AT SUPERSONIC TRANSPORTS," AN ADDRESS BY R. W. RUMMEL, VICE PRESIDENT, PLANNING AND RESEARCH, TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, BEFORE THE PHILADELPHIA SECTION, SOCIETY OF AUTOMOTIVE ENGINEERS, DECEMBER 9, 1964

There are many reasons why it is right to proceed with the development of U.S. supersonic transports. In the past, the public has always selected the fastest mode of transportation, even when some fare increase has been involved. There isn't any question but what the SST's will provide greater public convenience for many flight segments by reducing trip times to one-half or even to one-third of the present elapsed time.

Further, from the national policy point of view, the Concorde must be viewed as a threat to U.S. balance of payments, the maintaining of a healthy U.S. aircraft manufacturing industry, and quite possibly maintaining a healthy U.S. airline industry as well. An unhealthy airline industry could result if the ratio of deliveries between U.S. and foreign airlines were adversely affected in the future. Additionally, to a degree, U.S. prestige in world markets generally could be adversely affected by our lack of leadership in aviation. Aviation in general and SST's in particular require advancement in so many technologies that loss of leadership here is tantamount to loss of leadership elsewhere. This should be avoided.

Further, a sizable "plum" is involved Total airplane sales for the U.S. supersonic transport would probably run upwards of $9 billion. Finally, development of the supersonic transports is a logical step toward still greater speeds which will become technologically possible later on.

The airlines are properly and naturally concerned with such important factors as (1) are the basic economics of the design satisfactory and would operations be sufficiently reliable and safe? And (2) will the supersonic transport be socioligically acceptable both on the ground and in the air? How really bad is the boom, and what will public response be to it? Also, I believe many airlines currently express less than all-out enthusiasm for the SST because of the risk of need for financing and the making of principal investments prematurely. These are all reasonable concerns at this stage of supersonic transport developments.

Speaking for TWA only, I am confident U.S. manufacturers, working in partnership with the Government and the airlines, can and will, given the chance, produce a fine, acceptable SST. Acting on reliance in this belief, TWA placed the first order for the U.S. supersonic transport during early October last year. We have 10 U.S. supersonic transports on order, plus six Concordes, a total of 16.

At this point, I can't help but interject a compliment to the administration and especially to the FAA for its fine handling of the U.S. supersonic transport program to date. The program has been constructive and schedules have been maintained. The FAA's perspicacity in having offered delivery positions when it did is certainly noteworthy. The evidence of this is the relative sale of delivery positions of the Concorde and the U.S. project since the time U.S. delivery positions were first offered.

Twenty-nine Concorde delivery positions were on the books when the United States first made its delivery positions available. Today, 45 Concorde delivery positions have been ordered, an increase of 16. During the same time, 91 U.S. delivery positions have been sold. This is indeed a fine expression of confidence in the ability of U.S. industry and the Government. One cannot help but wonder, however, had the U.S. program not moved forward when it did, how many more Concorde delivery positions might have been sold. Probably quite a few. Also, if the U.S. program should now slow down and the Concorde should continue, would the Concorde receive renewed interest? I believe it is safe to say that it would.

However, be this as it may, hats off to Messrs. Halaby and Bain of the FAA for a job well done.

My personal appraisal of Concorde technical progress resulting from recent trip to Toulouse and Bristol is broadly and simply that the Concorde technical development is on schedule.

Unfortunately, however, it is still too soon to rely on evaluations of the economic characteristics of the Concorde. Further progress will be made, and more will be learned about this project as time goes on. Even so, it appears that the volumetric limit of the fuselage is especially critical. I do not intend to suggest the airplane is not a good, balanced design, only that the volumetric limit of the fuselage appears especially crit-

ical with respect to the economics of operation.

I would like to observe also that the wide-scale use of aluminum alloys at the temperatures expected to be encountered in Concorde operations may be more critical than the use of titanium at temperatures expected to be encontered in the U.S. designs.

It is clear, also, that with two production lines being established, one in England and one in France, it is certainly reasonable to believe aircraft can be produced at substantially higher production rates than are apparently envisioned—around four a month.

However, it appears that, depending partly on the nature of the U.S. program, there just isn't any doubt whatsoever but that the U.S. supersonic transport will finally be superior in virtually all respects except availability. It will be faster. It will be built of better materials. It will have more efficient powerplants. It will carry more payload. And, I am sure everyone would agree it will have the "edge" of greater research, development, and production resources which exist in the United States.

One reason why the U.S. transports have gained deserved worldwide acceptance and recognition is the fact that the manufacturers, through cooperation with and participation by the airlines, have been able to inject the lessons learned from operating experience into their designs.

This practice should be continued through out the SST development period. I'm sure the airlines are eager to continue to participate.

Once the airplane is built, preservice testing is an absolute prerequisite, and this probably will have to be quite extensive. I have often been a little bemused by the firmness with which various groups have declared the need for a specific number of hours of prerevenue service flight testing. One group will claim that this must be 5,000 hours, another 2,000 hours, another 3,000 hours, etc. I would observe that the amount of such flight testing which is appropriate can only be determined once the whole of the developmental testing program is known and understood.

It appears obvious that the program which is most certain to produce the best airplane is that program which requires the development and testing of prototype aircraft, and then further refinement and testing prior to producing aircraft in quantities. This is the surest but not necessarily the quickest way to produce operational supersonic transports. It probably is the quickest way to produce fully acceptable supersonic transports, however.

It is clear the prototype program not only produces the best airplanes but it is the most economical course to follow when all program costs are considered. Further, a dual prototype type program offers more advantages than a single prototype type program.

The main difference between the prototype and production type programs is that the prototype program allows for the incorporation of needed design improvements in the production aircraft which flows from experience with the prototype aircraft.

These might involve items ranging from aerodynamics and primary structure to improved system designs, accessories, and hardware. The prototype program permits needed improvements to be developed and incorporated without the encumbrance of sizable investments in production components. Thus, this type program accommodates the normal development cycle of fabrication, test, redevelopment, and the incorporation of the maximum number of fixes and improvements before rather than after commercial operations are undertaken. Further, such important aspects as sonic boom ground overpressures and operational procedures would be better defined and understood prior to investing hundreds of millions of dollars in production components. Also, it is always much more difficult to justify design improvements after production is heavily underway than before.

The prototype program would not only produce the best airplanes, but this kind of a program would be more economical. I'd like to show you how I arrive at this conclusion. Direct operating cost (less crew pay) for an industry fleet of 200 to 300 SST's operated for 15 years totals just over $27½ and $41 billion, respectively. If only 5 percent of this would be saved through improved design that would result from the "prototype" program, a savings of about $1.4 and $2 billion would result for the 200- and 300-plane fleet, respectively. An account by account examination of direct operating costs indicates that all elements other than crew pay can be affected by excellence of design.

There is sufficient merit to the arguments I have presented to warrant giving most serious consideration to adopting the dual prototype type program for the development and production of U.S. supersonic transports. I would commend serious consideration to this by government officials and industry alike. It seems clear that not only the best airplane, but considering all costs the most economical airplane, would result if such a program were undertaken. It must be recognized that there is one prime disadvantage involved and that is that the prototype approach would require approximately 2½ years longer to produce aircraft for commercial delivery—but this time would be well spent.

Now, in conclusion, I'd like to take a moment to summarize briefly some of the more salient points of this fairly broad and ranging discourse:

1. The United States should continue supersonic transport technical developments without interruption.

2. The Government program to date has been constructive and worth while.

3. There is no serious question but that the U.S. airplane will be substantially superior to the Concorde. This is not to say, however, that the Concorde may not be worthwhile.

4. The nature of the technical development program is one of the prime keys to economic success for the U.S. SST. Thoroughgoing tests at every phase of development are an absolute prerequisite for producing the best possible airplane.

5. The prototype rather than production type program would not only produce the best airplanes, it would likely do it more economically. The dual prototype program should be given most serious consideration.

A Bill To Increase Veterans' Funeral Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to increase the amount payable on account of the funeral expenses of certain veterans from $250 to $300.

In these days, it is not only the cost of living that is going up, but the cost of dying as well. The present allowance of $250 for burial expenses is obviously inadequate today.

I am therefore proposing that this burial allowance be increased to a more reasonable and more realistic amount. Even $300 is by no means enough, but it is at least a step in the right direction in trying to take care of our veterans who pass on. I hope the Members of this House will give this bill its strong support.

Mr. Robert C. Brown, of Fort Myers, Fla., Writes on France's Debts to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, France has surprised many students of international affairs recently with a demand for gold in exchange for U.S. dollars which have contributed so much to France's present postwar well-being.

Mr. Robert C. Brown, of Fort Myers, Fla., has written the editor of the Fort Myers News Press outlining the conditions surrounding France's present position in the U.S. gold crisis, as well as her position as regards the situation in South Vietnam. With his usual articulate form, Mr. Brown sums up the reasons why France is in a position of importance among world powers, and I place his letter in the RECORD at this point:

A very enlightening quote in the papers the other day, which was attributed to the French foreign minister, Couve de Mourville, gives an interesting light on the present play of France on the balance-of-payments matter. His quote, "The weak who know how to play on their weakness are strong. This is the secret of women and the developing countries."

To make the play is one thing but to flaunt it in the face of the world and what is considered world opinion is another matter. Any failure to react to such a brazen statement is to give it the currency of a truth unchallenged. Certainly this is a true exposition of the De Gaulle position. Defeated in 1954 when she suffered the loss of Indochina, defeated again in Algeria, proclaiming a grandeur of which we are the guarantor, France is in fact the weak man of Europe, a strawman of enormous stature but a man of straw, incapable of defending the exalted position to which she aspires. Her position is not the making of any one U.S. political party. It is the result of a continuing policy under both parties—1954 was one party, 1960 another. In 10 years since Dienbienphu France, with our help, has overcome the debacle of Indochina and Algeria and now she puts us on the fiscal ropes.

France won't pay what she owes us. France has never honored her commitments to NATO which is the shield that defends her. France, which is in arrears to the U.N., France which knows how to lead from weakness can do these things and we are rendered as helpless as a man before a cobra. If we did any one of these things can you imagine the hue and cry.

If we are not now at a point where we must think of our national interests first, then our representatives in Washington owe

it to a bewildered people to tell us how our interests are served when we continue to dish out largesse to France which owes us so much more for so very long a time. And while we are at it, is Douglas Dillon the man to judge our position in light of the fact that he has what might be considered a conflict of interest in the large French holdings of he and his family?

This gold drain matter has now reached a point where not only do we get hurt but our good friends, those who do not demand gold, will be hurt as well. They must now weigh the question of can they or can't they withhold the demands that they might make. Weak France can pull down the whole structure and only we can stop her by pointing out that we now demand she finally pay us what she owes us.

She owes it. She knows that she owes it. Our Treasury Department knows that she owes it.

I have in the file a letter from the Treasury Department which states, "The United States regards defaulted World War I debts as valid obligations due this country. Monetary authorities note that the United States entered into its present commitments without any reservations on World War I debts."

What are we waiting for? If there is some overriding reason, some awful development of a guilt complex which is state secret, isn't it about time now that instead of lowering the gold backing on our money we make a terrific effort to protect it and explain to the American people why we act like a debtor when the whole world and every banker knows that we are a creditor.

Aren't we big enough to stand up to a man who taunts us with the quotation which opened this letter? Is it indeed a bad mark to be patriotic? Isn't it just as important to protect ourselves as Vietnam? Isn't it just as important to husband our wealth as to pour billions into foreign aid, billions which France borrowed and won't pay back, millions of free aid which we gave from the fullness of our hearts when she was down.

Wasn't there anything mutual in the 1944–45 invasion which freed France from Hitler? Oh yes. I know the rationale of that one. We were saying our skins, too. But we did save theirs and I truly believe that there are many Americans who feel as I do. We ask no thanks but we don't deserve arrogance. Let those who share this feeling write to Senators and Congressmen and send this clipping along.

ROBERT C. BROWN.

Santa Clara County Lawyers Join Mississippi Vote Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if any other county bar association has been better represented in the legal work involved in the Mississippi vote challenge case than the Santa Clara County Bar Association of California. Of the 100 lawyers from the Northern States who volunteered to go down to Mississippi to help in taking depositions, 8 of them came from my home county of Santa Clara. They went as a matter of conscience, to help prepare a case for disfranchised citizens who can get no help from the bar of their own State. They went at their own expense, neglecting their own casework, for the period they were gone. But I am sure their clients in Santa Clara are as proud of them as I am. Since the following article from In Brief, the official bulletin of the Santa Clara County Bar Association, does not mention their names until the very end, I should like the RECORD to show here that among those who participated in this courageous and selfless task are John Thorne, Sol Zeltzer, Robert Tennant, Norman Howard, Ralph Steinberg, Alister McAlister, Ted Laskin, and Fred Reinheimer:

[From In Brief—Official bulletin of the Santa Clara County Bar Association]

"No right is more precious in a free country than that of having a voice in the election of those who make the laws under which, as good citizens, we must live."

The right to vote, as thus described by Mr. Justice Black in a recent case, underlies the controversy which is drawing attorneys from all over the United States to Mississippi. At least eight Santa Clara County lawyers have volunteered to spend 1 to 2 weeks in that State to assist with the taking of depositions to support a challenge to present voting conditions. Trustees of the county bar association, following discussion of the issues at their January meeting, took no position on the matter.

Basic to the Mississippi controversy is the allegation that thousands of Negro citizens of the State are being denied the right to vote, due to provisions of the Mississippi constitution and statutes which are alleged to be unconstitutional on their face and in their application. These laws require, among other things, that electors be able to read and interpret over 200 sections of the State constitution, be able to demonstrate proof of good moral character, publish their names and addresses in the local press, and be subject to anyone's challenge, with the registrar to determine the validity of each challenge. Allegedly as a result of such laws, their discriminatory application and the existing climate of fear engendered by racial violence over civil rights activity in voter registration drives, only 5 percent of the adult Negro citizens in Mississippi are registered to vote as compared to 67 percent of the white adults.

It is asserted that despite new civil rights legislation and stepped up activity by the Department of Justice, few inroads have been made to correct this situation. A different legal remedy, in the form of a contest of the election of five Mississippi Members of the House of Representatives, is now being pursued. The election is being challenged by five Negro citizens, each residing in one of the five Mississippi congressional districts, under the provisions of title 2, chapter 7, of the United States Code.

Article I, section 5, of the U.S. Constitution authorizes each House of Congress to judge the elections and qualifications of its Members. Title 2, chapter 7, of the United States Code, provides the following procedures for contesting the election of a Member:

A "notice of intention" to contest, stating its grounds, is filed by the contestant with the challenged Member—2 U.S.C. 201. The challenged Member answers—section 202. The contestant takes testimony of witnesses during a 40-day period. The Member then takes testimony for 40 days, and the contestant is then allowed 10 days for rebuttal testimony—section 203. Testimony may be taken by noticed deposition—section 204. Provision is made for issuance of subpenas (secs. 206–12), for transmittal of depositions to and printing of testimony by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, for filing of printed testimony with the Committee on House Administration (sec. 223), and for filing of legal briefs (sec. 223). Attorneys are expressly authorized to act for the parties in these proceedings—sections 215, 223.

Reportedly only three lawyers in the entire State of Mississippi are willing to serve in civil rights cases. As a result, the attorney representing the contestants has requested the aid of lawyers from other parts of the country. About 100 lawyers, including 8 from Santa Clara County, have volunteered to assist.

Several members of the Santa Clara County Bar have formed the lawyers' committee to support the Mississippi challenge. This group plans to solicit funds to help defray the travel expenses of some of the lawyers going to Mississippi. The committee has announced that donations may be sent to 1884 the Alameda, San Jose, Calif.

Santa Clara County lawyers who either have already been to Mississippi or plan to go include John Thorne, Sol Zeltzer, Robert Tennant, Norman Howard, Ralph Steinberg, Alister McAlister, Ted Laskin, and Fred Reinheimer.

Appointment of the Honorable Kenneth E. BeLieu as Under Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD my views regarding the appointment of the Honorable Kenneth E. BeLieu as Under Secretary of the Navy.

The Senate confirmation of a Presidential appointee to even the highest positions in the Department of Defense—or any of the executive department of Government—is usually a rather routine proceeding, particularly when the individual concerned has been unanimously recommended by the committee which held hearings on his qualifications.

However, there was a confirmation by the Senate on Friday, February 18, that was far from routine. It concerned a person well known and much admired by the members of the Armed Services Committee of this House, and by the House as a whole. I refer to the Honorable Kenneth E. BeLieu.

Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues in this House the pleasure of noting the unusual enthusiasm with which Secretary BeLieu's nomination was endorsed by the Senate. Among those endorsing his nomination, and speaking specifically to it, were the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD; the minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN; Senator STENNIS; Senator AIKEN; Senator SALTONSTALL; Senator JACKSON; and Senator DODD. These distinguished Members of the Senate, all of whom have been closely associated with Secretary BeLieu during his years on the staffs of the Armed Services Committee, the Space Committee, and Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, expressed deep satisfaction that one of such high

personal and professional qualifications as Secretary BeLieu had been appointed to the position of Under Secretary of the Navy.

In the course of the Senate colloquy endorsing Secretary BeLieu, President Johnson was complimented on making such an outstanding appointment. I would like, for myself, Mr. Speaker, to say that President Johnson's appointment of Secretary BeLieu is another demonstration of the President's well-known ability to recognize, develop, and bring to positions of high responsibility in Government, persons of rare ability.

Several years ago, then-Senator Johnson, recognized Ken BeLieu's ability as a member of the professional staff of the Senate's Armed Services Committee. It wasn't long before then-Senator Johnson appointed him to be the staff director for both the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee and the Space Committee of the Senate. Both of these committees were chaired by then-Senator Johnson. We all know of the loyal and able manner in which Ken BeLieu handled these difficult and very important assignments.

Shortly after the Kennedy-Johnson administration took office, Ken BeLieu was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Navy. In his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, he has impressed the members with his professional knowledge of his job, his understanding of people, his loyalty to his superiors, and his honesty.

At a time when our Nation and our Armed Forces are faced with growing crisis in Asia, President Johnson has, in his promotion of Ken BeLieu, made a timely and widely appreciated contribution to the morale of our fighting men, and the confidence of Congress and the Nation in the Department of the Navy and the Defense Department as a whole.

Throughout the Navy, officers and blue jackets alike know that, in the new Under Secretary of the Navy, they have a person who understands the problems of the man in uniform. They know he learned these things the hard way, in combat in World War II, and in Korea, where he had his leg blown off in action.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that Members of this House will join with me in extending our congratulations to Ken BeLieu on his appointment and confirmation as Under Secretary of the Navy, and in complimenting President Johnson for making such a wise and timely contribution to the morale and efficiency of our fighting forces.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars conducts each year a voice of democracy contest in which some 250,000 high school students throughout the Nation participate. The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I am exceedingly proud to report that this year the winner in the State of Alabama is Mr. Mike Ross, of Florence, Ala., a resident of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. The young man's winning speech, entitled "The Challenge of Citizenship," is beautifully composed and propounds a vital message for all Americans. This composition is a great credit to Mike Ross and to the young people of our Nation.

The speech follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Mike Ross of Florence, Ala.)

We, the citizens of the United States of America, glory in our heritage of personal freedom and human dignity.

We are the beneficiaries of the greatest legacy of freedom and prosperity ever inherited by any people in recorded history. But, like so many beneficiaries, we are inclined to forget the sacrifice of blood, sweat, and tears that purchased America and what we have come to call the American way of life. We have inherited this freedom and we have come to rely solely on this inheritance.

If we wish to maintain the fruits of the labor of our forefathers, each of us must realize our potential as citizens and exercise it to the fullest.

In order for the fullest capacity of our citizenship potential to be realized (i.e., our ability to aid the enrichment and further development of our country's heritage) we must have a plan to follow. We must know the steps which are necessary in order to make our latent abilities overt so that we may become well-informed, useful, and functional citizens.

In order for the finished product, a useful citizen, to emerge from this pattern there are three imperative rules we must follow. They are: Know something. Be something. Do something.

Let's take these imperatives and examine them one by one.

First: We must know something.

We must have a basic knowledge of the fundamental rules on which our democracy is established and the basic principles by which we are governed today.

Then we must enlighten ourselves concerning the current happenings of our Nation and world. We must have a knowledge of the issues, of their causes and nature.

In order to have this knowledge, we must learn to think through and evaluate the information which is presented to us. We must not take these things at face value nor should we make hasty generalizations. It is essential, first, to weigh the validity of the information against the biases and prejudices of those who present it to us.

Now our second rule for good citizenship: Be something.

We, as citizens, must not be content with being parasites of society, expecting our duty of citizenship to be performed by a small minority of active patriots. We must not continue to drain the lifeblood of the American way by forcing an extremely small group of active American people to bear our responsibility of keeping for this country the right to bear the name of a democracy. Yes, Americans must be proud of their country and they must show this pride by being active in its efforts to obtain peace, freedom, and security for the world.

Now the third imperative: To be a good citizen we must do something.

The best way for a citizen to do something about our rapidly deteriorating democracy is to express himself. In doing this we must share our knowledge with others. We must also be able to give an account of our beliefs in both religious and political matters, for we know that public opinion is actually based on what is said; therefore, if we wish to do anything about public opinion we must express ourselves.

Finally, we must revive and develop the ancient spirit of righteous indignation. The citizen who knows of public wrongdoing and remains silent through indifference of cowardice is as reprehensible as the wrongdoer. The Founding Fathers were willing to pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to hand us our sacred heritage of freedom. Too often we hear so-called good citizens secretly complain of corruption or injustice but refuse to lift a finger to expose or correct it. Their excuse is "Why stick your neck out," although they know full well that indifference to such evil is a deadly cancer that is rapidly knawing at the vitals of representative government. Yet, it has been repeatedly demonstrated that "the humblest citizen, when clad in the armor of a righteous cause, is stronger than all the hosts of error."

Thomas Wood Stevens in the closing lines of his epic poem "Pagent of Virginia" sounds a present day challenge to all Americans when he says:

"And this high charge I give unto my children:
Forget not; hail not; shape the years to come,
That those who save us our great heritage shall not be shamed.

"Lift up your hearts and live greatly,
That the strong spirit of our mighty dead,
May seem to live again in you, and sway,
Far into the future, equal destinys."

Every citizen of the United States of America has a grave duty, a duty to himself, his fellow man, and his posterity, to exercise his rights in government in order to preserve for this country the freedom for which our forefathers so valiantly struggled.

Today, more than ever, we must heed duty's call to put determination in our steps, rigidity in our backbones, and a zealous fervour in our efforts to further the cause of freedom. To know all we can, be all we can, and do all we can for a cause that is incalcuably worthy of our love, our loyalty, and, if necessary, our lives.

Immigration Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems we will deal with in this Congress is the urgent need to overhaul our entire immigration policy.

Hardly a day goes by without my encountering some instance of the irrational and unjust manner in which our present immigration laws operate.

The March issue of Fra Noi a monthly newspaper, reaching a quarter of a million Italian-Americans in the city of Chicago, contains two articles on this matter which perfectly illustrate my point.

The first is a news dispatch from Toronto reporting a top medical award to

Dr. Gustavo Bounous, an Italian immigrant to Canada. Dr. Bounous lived for a short time in America but was forced to move to Canada when his temporary visa ran out. Mr. Maurice R. Marchello, an attorney in Chicago, uses the case of Dr. Bounous to show how the national origins quota system works to the detriment of the United States.

I recommend these informative articles to all of my colleagues; therefore, with unanimous consent, I insert them in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The articles follow:

DR. BOUNOUS STORY—WE LOST HIM

TORONTO.—Montrealer Gustavo Bounous, dynamic example of brain drain at work in Canada's favor, received a top national medical award here last night for shedding a bright new light on how shock from bleeding causes death.

Dr. Bounous' work, which won him the medal in surgery from the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada, opens up the possibility of saving patients who succumb to hemorrhagic shock despite transfusions.

An Italian surgeon trained in Turin, Dr. Bounous, 36, moved to Montreal early in 1962 from Indianapolis when he was forced to leave the United States because his temporary visa ran out.

Working with laboratory dogs, Dr. Bounous tackled the puzzle of why early transfusions and treatment save patients in shock from bleeding but fail after a certain time that varies from person to person.

Dr. Bounous found that the chemical structures of cells in the lining of the bowel change in a state of shock until they reach a point where they can no longer accept oxygen. This cell exhaustion weakens the bowel lining, permitting poison body waste to escape and kill.

Putting dogs into a state of shock by loss of blood, he measured the ability of intestine cells to accept oxygen at intervals. He found that chemical changes gradually reduce the ability to take oxygen from the blood. The enzyme substance that permits the transfer of oxygen from blood to cell finally is depleted, causing complete breakdown of the cell.

If medical science can isolate and identify precisely what chemical is depleted in shock, it might someday be possible to give patients, who fail to respond to transfusions, a life-saving injection of the chemical.

CONGRESSMEN MUST ACT NOW—BIASED IMMIGRATION POLICY IS BRAIN DRAIN TO UNITED STATES

(By Maurice R. Marchello)

We as Americans of Italian origin do not envy Canada's gain in acquiring a fine citizen, but we are deeply concerned with the loss to America of such exemplary citizen prospects, due entirely to the shortsighted laws which limit and restrict them from entering our country.

We respectfully submit that all Americans should be equally concerned with this "brain-drain"—especially our Congressmen, who now have the power to correct it.

One can only conjecture how great this brain loss must have been over the past years. Just try to imagine what a tragic loss of talent our country would have suffered in the past 30 vital years if the Italian-born Fermi, Fubini, and Conto—to mention a few outstanding scientists—had to cope with the quota system to gain admittance to our country.

Fortunately, these three brilliant contributors to our country, because of their special circumstances, were able to avoid the immigration quota law restrictions.

Enrico Fermi, the father of the atomic and nuclear age, was accorded political sanctuary in our shores because he was an anti-Fascist exile.

Eugene C. Fubini, the valuable Assistant to our Secretary of Defense McNamara, and who controls our military communications satellite program was admitted outside the quota because his wife was an American citizen.

The late Chicagoan, Armando F. Conto, a television pioneer and a well-known figure in communications engineering, also was admitted as a nonquota immigrant because he was fortunate enough to have married an American citizen, whom he met in Europe when she was a student of foreign languages.

Congress now has the opportunity with presidential sanction to abolish forever the hypocrisy of our antiquated immigration policy. The quota system based on where a man is born has too often damned the gifted equally with the deprived.

American immigration policy should serve the best interests of Americans. While specifically we are now pointing up the hard plight of the humble, talented Italian prospective immigrants, we ask no more for them than we do for others, regardless from whence they come.

There is also the great need to correct, with compassion, certain wrongs done in the past. The agonizing separation of families brought about by the old quota system also is a strong consideration for the passage of the proposed legislation.

Basically, the recommended legislation gives equal treatment to all. So, let us now search not only in the heretofore favored lands of the Nordic Anglo-Saxons, but let us also climb the hills of Rome and Turin and explore the Mediterranean shores where, in the future, perhaps another Fermi, Fubini, and Conto type immigrant will add luster to the American firmament.

And when Congress does its rightful duty as urgently requested by our President and enacts the new legislation, the sad story of the U.S. loss of Dr. Gustavo Bounous will not be repeated.

Taking Off—In-Flight Movies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, because there have been some recent news reports on the possibility of prohibition of in-flight movies on the North Atlantic run, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a timely and cogent article in the February issue of American Aviation.

The article follows:

TAKING OFF

(By William V. Henzey)

It is doubtful if there ever has been a single addition to onboard service so well received by the public as in-flight entertainment. And few industry moves have been so productive of beneficial results.

As a result, it is difficult to get excited about the opposition to movies, stereo, et al. by some airlines. The opposition has been synthetic. It had its biggest heyday during the IATA traffic conference in Athens last fall.

But could there have been a carrier in the group who seriously thought the in-flight entertainment wave could be rolled back? A ban by IATA, or any other group, on movies would have drawn the wrath of the public down on the association and its members. In fact, we doubt that the government agencies involved, particularly our CAB, would have done less than boot a field goal with the appropriate resolution.

Some carriers talked about the added cost of installing movie and stereo equipment and indicated that once socked into the structure it would ultimately find its way into higher fares. This is ridiculous. Of course there is an added installation cost. But it's peanuts in the overall picture.

An airline that would raise the cost angle would add from $1 million to $5 million to its annual advertising budget without batting an eye. And if the relatively minor cost is worrisome to some carrier, let it cut down on the supply of booze on its flights (but not too far).

The fact is, no airline protest was advanced with the idea that it would be successful. Airline traffic and marketing men will tell you their longtime regular passengers were switching to the competitor who was showing a movie they hadn't seen.

But it goes beyond drawing passengers from one carrier to another. TWA's Tom McFadden put it well recently when he said, "in-flight movies are the greatest contribution to passenger relaxation since the advent of pressurized cabins."

McFadden's point is that the tensions of first-time riders are eased and boredom on long flights is relieved. And what an impact it must have on those who haven't yet flown to realize that somewhere, 5 or 6 miles up going just under the speed of sound, thousands of people are oblivious to everything but James Bond's newest device for mayhem.

Yes, in-flight entertainment is here to stay and it will spread throughout the world's airlines before the year is out.

The War in Vietnam—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the fifth part of a report on Vietnam by Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., which follows:

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express, Feb. 25, 1965]

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, V—REDS ENTER PACIFIED HAMLET

(In warfare it sometimes becomes difficult to sustain victory after a battle has been won, and this is especially so in guerrilla warfare. Here Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, discovers how resilient are the Red Vietcong of the southeast Asia jungles and how communities captured from them refuse to stay pacified. This is the fifth in a series by Warren on his firsthand experiences in South Vietnam.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

DANANG, SOUTH VIETNAM.—A pacified hamlet, in the language of U.S. military advisers and the South Vietnamese Government, is one which has been successfully wrested from the Communist Vietcong.

Such, supposedly, is the hamlet of Thanh Quit, where a few thousand South Vietnamese peasants reside in a 2-square-mile area, 12 miles south of Danang, the nation's second largest city.

There is no doubt that Thanh Quit was for many months in the grip of the Vietcong. So much so, in fact, that when superior U.S.-

aided South Vietnamese forces drove the Vietcong back into the jungle, the Thanh Quitians weren't overly cordial to their rescuers.

GRADUAL THAW

As a matter of fact, most of the villagers turned their backs on their rescuers during the first few days, convinced that the rescue operation was momentary and the dreaded Vietcong would eventually return.

But little by little the pacification forces showed they meant business. They brought in rice and medicine. A battalion was stationed there along with a number of APC's (armed personnel cavalry vehicles) as a means to keep the Vietcong away.

And when the rescurers finally erected a combination bamboo and barbed wire fortification around the main portion of town, the thaw became complete. The hamlet was considered totally pacified.

RED INFESTED

It was to this supposedly happy scene that I was escorted one afternoon by Maj. John D. Hamilton, of Niles, Mich., a U.S. senior adviser to South Vietnamese 4th Army Cavalry.

The road to Thanh Quit was along the nation's Highway Route 1 which connects Danang and Saigon over a 400-mile stretch of some Vietcong infested territory.

Although both Danang and Thanh Quit are considered pacified and relatively safe, the connecting road is not rated safe enough to travel without some form of protection. Hence two APC vehicles preceded and followed the jeep in which I rode, and there was one stretch of the road, where the jungle was only 200 yards away, that had been nicknamed the "bamboo shooting gallery" because of the fondness the Vietcong had for trying to pick off occupants of moving vehicles, particularly if they were recognized as Americans.

BAROMETERS

On this day, however, there were no incidents. As we entered the hamlet, little children waved gaily and shouted "Halloo, halloo, halloo."

"You can see," said the major, "how we're regarded. The attitude of the children is always a good barometer of how their parents feel."

Alas, the children's "halloos" were a bit deceptive, considering the state of the village that day. We stopped at the headquarters for the South Vietnamese battalion, and the major suggested we take a stroll through town.

"No, no," cried Capt. Pham Van Nghin, of the local South Vietnamese battalion, "Vietcong here, Vietcong here."

QUICK RETURN

In halting English, Captain Pham told his tale. For some reason most of the battalion had been moved elsewhere the day before, a fact that apparently the Vietcong intelligence was quick to gather in. They moved in quickly, cut the bamboo and barbed wire fortifications and began throwing their weight around. Even at this moment, some of the Vietcong were reported confiscating some of the town's goods at its marketplace.

Our caravan made a quick turnabout and returned to Danang. Each of us had a rifle ready to use; we wore bulletproof vests and the APC's had machineguns readied for action.

A LONG, HARD WAR

We made the trip back to Danang without incident, but the sudden unpacified state of the hamlet moved Major Hamilton to comment:

"This is a good example of why there is going to be no quick solution to this war.

"It is obvious it is going to be a long, hard war. It is difficult to get dramatic results of big, sustained victories.

EXPECTS TO WIN

"However, in the long run I think we are getting somewhere. I didn't come over here with the idea of losing this war, but winning it. I still have every hope of doing so, and in spite of what happened this afternoon I am not discouraged."

I learned later that the missing battalion personnel was returned quickly to the hamlet, the Vietcong chased out again and the barbed wire, bamboo fortification restored.

Pacification is a laborious, continuing, and repetitious process.

Noted Writer R. O. Beckman Gives Daily Lift to Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at a time when life is taking on a new aspect, when busier days reach a slower pace, when the senior citizens reaches retirement, he often finds that his conception of retirement differs from reality. Instead of facing the challenges of youth, the senior citizen may be faced with keeping his interest alive. Rather than give in to idleness of the mind, indifference to the world around him, many of our senior citizens today are like the youth of today—they have sought to preserve their enthusiasm, and have refused to give in to challenges.

One such person is Mr. R. O. Beckman, who's columns appear regularly in the Fort Lauderdale News, and who's audience is growing regularly as well. Mr. Beckman's writings offer inspiration to his readers, and give sound principles for living to young and old alike.

I include one of Mr. Beckman's columns in the RECORD at this point in order that he receive the widest possible readership:

BURDEN OF 70 YEARS NO REASON FOR BOREDOM

(By R. O. Beckman)

From a reader nearing the age of 70 come reflections about later life, which he and his wife regard as a bore. He writes:

"Have you ever thought how depressing it is to wake up every morning the same old person? Pulling on the same old pants or skirt for what will be just another day, brewing coffee in the same old pot? Then there's the difficult decision of whether you want your eggs boiled, poached, fried, or scrambled. (Why doesn't someone devise some new ways?)

"From force of habit you scan the morning paper or turn on the wireless, only to learn of more grisly deaths on the highway, juvenile delinquents that have run amok or more slaughter in Vietnam or the Congo. After coffee, you automatically reach for one of the brand of cigarets you smoked for 15 years.

"Passing a mirror on her way to the kitchen, the wife makes a face and remarks she looks like an old hag. You can't decide whether it would be unconvincing to say she doesn't, or too early in the day to start an argument by agreeing with her. Time drags along through the day. No phone calls or visitors and no mail except for advertising that's unwanted. The clock chimes every hour but nothing happens. We may recall the joys of the good old days or renew a long-standing argument as to whether to cash in on some stock we own or leave it to relatives since we have no children. And so to bed—exhausted from killing time."

If this couple is truly as bored as the letter implies, it is high time to take a fresh look at the mixed frustrations and blessings of life in the 1960's. Without a mental shot of adrenalin, they will be senile in no time. This can be avoided by snapping out of humdrum and ho-hum, effecting a change in ideas and scene, and extending their interests. Changes in daily routine, new outside contacts, travel, community service—these lend new purpose, meaning, and depth to life. A person who looks backward too often may turn into a pillar of salt like Lot's wife.

LIVE IT UP

Why deplore or laugh at youth for its affectations or mistakes? It is generally trying on one face after another to find its own. Why should the couple not spend extra savings to bring pleasure to themselves and others? Cicero once asked if anything could be more absurd than to multiply luggage as one nears a journey's end.

Dr. Harlan Hatcher, University of Michigan president, has a word of comment which fits age as well as youth.

"The easiest way is to live listlessly on a dead level of monotony, or to drift with the accepted and the expected into quiet desperation. The next easiest is to consume your energies in undirected revolt or rebellion or starve them in cynicism and unbelief. The most difficult and most rewarding is to combine knowledge and understanding of the requirements for change with those golden moments of clear visitation and faith in what it is possible for man to become. This is the source of joy and the excitement of the creative spirit which lifts us to a higher level where richer values and delightful colors surround and support our lives."

Award for Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, recently the Revere Journal, a newspaper which has covered the news for the citizens of Revere, Mass., in an objective and skilled manner, since 1881, won the first place award for general excellence among weekly New England newspapers having over 5,000 circulation.

The award was made on behalf of the New England Weekly Press Association by President John T. Hough at the association's annual award dinner in Boston. More than 300 publishers, editors, and other members of the organization were there, including Postmaster General John Gronouski, to see a panel of eight distinguished fellows of the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University award first place to the Journal on the basis of its "all-round outstanding attributes and high professional standards."

I am particularly pleased to see the Journal recognized in this way, Mr.

Speaker. The managing editor and publisher of the Journal, Mr. Sidney Curtis, his editor, Mr. Robert Long, and their staff have maintained a high degree of excellence in serving their community both as a source of public information and as a forum for constructive expression on the part of their readers. I am pleased to make their recent honor known to my fellow Members of the Congress and to point out that the Journal is an example of the kind of reporting which makes our democratic form of government a working reality.

I include at this point a reprint of the editorial which appeared in the Journal acknowledging this award:

WE ARE PROUD

It was with a deep sense of personal pride and humility that the publisher and editor of the Revere Journal accepted the first place award for general excellence at the New England Weekly Press Association Annual Awards Dinner last weekend.

Competition for the award presented to the winner for "all-round outstanding attributes and high professional standards" is keen. The judging in the contest was done by fellows of Nieman Foundation at Harvard University and in being declared the winner in its class the Journal is justifiably proud.

We are proud for many reasons. Each week we endeavor to give to the people of this community a newspaper encompassing all the events occurring in our city—from city council and school board sessions to the meetings of the Girl Scouts and other organizations. In these stories we deal only with the facts as they happen and reserve our opinions for our editorial columns.

In an effort to see that the finished product is pleasing to the eye and easy to read, Publisher Curtis has established a typesetting plant that is second to none. It features the latest equipment and makes the typography of this newspaper one of the best to be found anywhere. Even as this is being written the publisher is on a business trip seeking to purchase an offset press so that the readers of the Journal will be presented their news in the latest and most modern manner.

However, while we have all the material resources at our command, it still takes the hard work and dedication of a loyal group of employees to publish a prize-winning weekly.

The enthusiasm and tempo necessary to meet this goal is furnished by Publisher Curtis. He strives for perfection in every endeavor and will never walk away from a fight. He sets a hard hitting policy and in following his leadership we have been able to publish a top weekly newspaper that is looked upon with respect and admiration.

One of the Nieman fellows who served as a judge in the contest in a panel discussion said the Journal showed "great enthusiasm for local coverage and its stories were beautifully developed. It also showed it was a real crusading newspaper and backed up its fight for better government with strong editorials." Another of the judges stated the Journal "was well-written and its production was excellent."

We are proud of the honor that has been bestowed upon us. We attempt to give our readers the best paper possible each week and the presentation of this award assures us that we are fulfilling this obligation—we will continue to extend our efforts in order to prove that we are worthy of this high consideration.

Good Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the prize-winning speech written by Miss Linda J. Thyne, of Babbitt, Nev., which she entered in the Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy" contest, this year. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the four scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes.

The text of speech follows:

GOOD CITIZENSHIP

There has probably never been a time in our history when our citizenship was the subject of more widespread and anxious concern than today.

There is always the danger that we may think of our citizenship too narrowly. When we think of citizenship, we are likely to think of voting, or of serving on a jury, or of our services as public officers, or of paying taxes, or of the possibility of being drafted into the Army as soldiers. These are the specific tasks of the citizen and each is of the highest importance, but back of them stands living—living so that life shall be good and full, free and worth of the human race.

You cannot separate your citizenship and the exercise of your civic duties from the rest of your life. Your aspirations, interests, ideals, tastes, and habits influence the performance of your civic duties. If your life is noble and rich, your citizenship will express that nobility. If you are dishonest in your thinking and indifferent to the well-being of others, these qualities will degrade your citizenship.

Religious ideals have been called the foundation of citizenship. Citizenship finds its fullest expression in the roots of religion, which has ever emphasized the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. God gave man free will. Will to do what he pleases. Each person can make his own decision whether or not he wants to take up the challenge of citizenship.

One of the safeguards of citizenship is education. The American citizen has always had complex domestic problems to solve and to act upon. We now have, in our schools, 30 million young people who not only face domestic issues but who must become global minded. Our country and the world is changing so rapidly that new problems of life and government arise overnight and if we are to meet them with full intelligence, we must continue our study and education throughout our years.

We hear much conversation about the tremendous progress that we have made in our country, and we have. We certainly have made material progress. But where are we really in some respects? Namely, in the respect of citizenship?

Although man's inventions are getting bigger and faster, it does not necessarily follow that man himself is getting better. While we have become a nation of technological giants, we are also rapidly becoming a nation of spiritual midgets. Morality is determined by self-interest. "What's best for me" is the philosophy pursued by far too many people.

Good citizenship includes a better human understanding, a better communication between peoples, a better appreciation of our American free enterprise system and a radically changed attitude toward government and political processes.

It is the citizen's obligation to cherish and improve the great inheritance of democracy and self-government. There must be a reawakening on the part of all our people in their concern for individual liberty and freedom of initiative.

I believe that the dearest possession common to everyone of our 186 million people—is his citizenship. But I believe that the priceless privilege carries with it the duty as well as the challenge of defending our national honor, welfare and security by every means necessary.

An anonymous poet was right when he said:

"Let no one tell you as you grow
That nothing to the flag you owe,
Let no one whisper that it means,
But pleasant days and peaceful scenes,
And merely calls to mind a land,
Where wealth abounds on every hand,
Because no more that flag will fly,
When men for it refuse to die."

Voice of Democracy Contest Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a splendid "Voice of Democracy" essay, written by a fine young man in my district, the Second Congressional District of Louisiana. Mark Stephens, a student at Lutcher High School in Lutcher, La., has been chosen the winning contestant in my State in this annual essay contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Young Mark Stephens now has the opportunity to compete with contest winners from the 50 States for four scholarship prizes: A $5,000 scholarship, first prize; a $3,500 scholarship, second prize; a $2,500 scholarship, third prize; and a $1,500 scholarship, fourth prize. These prizes will enable deserving high school students, who have written the top essays, to help defray their expenses for their first year in a college or university of their choice.

The VFW is to be commended for sponsoring this "Voice of Democracy" contest—which provides young people in high schools across the Nation with the opportunity to think seriously about the meaning of democracy and to write stimulating essays on their personal views of our form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer for inclusion in the RECORD this thought-provoking essay on democracy by Mark Stephens of Lutcher:

(By Mark Stephens, Lutcher, La.)

The American system of government is based on the belief that most of the people will be mostly right most of the time. The fate of America, for better or for worse, is entrusted to the judgment and mercy of the majority. But in the deeper sense, I believe that the trust is meant to be shouldered by each individual and that all the individuals, working together must produce solutions to our problems.

Through the years our faith in the conscience of America has been well placed; but often, prejudice, bigotry, and fear in individuals have led people into large partisan groups fighting selfishly for their own interests. Good judgment has suffered and will continue to suffer because of this selfishness. Usually our voting has resulted in a middle-of-the-road approach to problems. But when fair and reasonable policy is adopted, using the good points from all sides, is it really always the result of the wishes of a tolerant, reasonable majority of the voters and leaders? I believe that much of the so-called "reason" today results from unreasonable people clashing together so hard that none gets his way entirely.

I really believe that on several occasions our country has lived in spite of its citizens and leaders, in spite of their ignorance in grasping the most important challenge confronting American citizens. That challenge is to put emotions and reason into their proper perspective and to make judgments based on intelligence and humanity. Men often forget that emotional inspiration is a gift and not a cause. It can give us energy, but it cannot be allowed to control our thinking. History teaches us that men are too diverse to be satisfied with one opinion. Judging many opinions requires a clear head.

Our Government was designed to allow us to use the minds of many men. The Founding Fathers set up a system that allows us to pick the best from these many minds and permits us to use it to set up government policy. Certainly the authors of the Constitution realized that most ideas worth mentioning in Congress would be worth fighting for and that even if men changed their positions on issues, it would not be because they had changed their minds. The system of compromise allows these men to do what is best for America. But I do not think that we really give this system its best chance to work unless we are reasonable in our loyalty to party, State, and political belief. If a man is a liberal for the sake of being a liberal and always votes liberally and is always suspcious of anything that might be called conservative, he will cheat himself of any good conservative beliefs.

I believe that there is too much of this prejudice today between parties and sections of the country. The challenge of reason has yet to be met completely. Certainly most people are not too extreme, but too many people are, and too many extremists influence our thinking, and too many extremists are our spokesmen. This situation clouds the issues and makes so much of our work nearsighted and intolerant. Those who really believe that this country could ever become completely liberal or conservative and stay completely liberal or conservative and still survive, miss one point in history: That life, for people or for nations, is like a pendulum; it swings both ways and we have to be ready to swing with it when necessary.

If we are to use our system of free thought and choice so that we can meet the many different types of problems, each individual American must clear the air around him as much as possible and find a good set of values. As long as our opinions are shaped so much by narrow thinking, we shall never be able to go left when we need to go left, or right when we need to go right, or quickly or slowly. We shall rise and decline and we may fall, like so many other nations before us. When the voice of patriotism is a psychiatric case who warns us to arm for protection against the Supreme Court, when the spokesman for a wise and necessary belief such as States' rights is an arrogant, crude insensitive racist; and when the voice of equality comes from a screaming rioter in the streets, this blindness is a real threat.

But in the same fundamental reasons that we have for believing in God, we find cause for hope, hope that Americans, now and tomorrow, will support the cause of sane, humane judgment and that America's promise can become its future.

Virginia Winner of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech on the subject of "The Challenge of Citizenship, 1964–65" that won first prize in the State of Virginia in the annual Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Its author is C. Linwood Duncan, of Danville, Va., in my congressional district.

More than 250,000 high school students participated in this contest, which has as prizes scholarships ranging in value from $1,500 to $5,000. The winning contestant from each State will come to Washington on March 9 for the final judging.

In his speech which won in the Virginia competition, my young constituent, I am proud to say, has shown a deep understanding of the subject. He has worded his thoughts in an interesting manner, profound with the principles on which this Nation has been built, and with considerable originality. I hope they may be widely read at this time of international strife when they have such a special meaning.

The speech follows:

The moment of truth—December 7, 1941—war fell on the United States of America. A spontaneous reaction occurred and recruiting offices were jammed as the citizens of America rallied to defend their Nation, from which they had reaped such fullness of life and such purposeful living. Now, this America, founded by the greatness of statesmen with patriotic love in their hearts, was witnessing a surge of an appreciative people. These people arose to the occasion to fight to preserve the inalienable rights established by their forefathers, those forefathers who had refused to be lured into complacency by mercenary demagogs.

In retrospect the year 1776 saw a small group of stalwart immigrants of assorted nationalities establish an infant among nations. These people knew what it was to be suppressed and to feel the iron hand of tyranny upon their shoulders. The one goal of these pioneers was to carve out a land which, after they had molded it into one dedicated to honesty, integrity, and forbearance, would enable them to glean from it the rewards due a citizen of a free country. It was Alfred Lord Tennyson who wrote, "Our vista ever widens as we move." Undoubtedly, this must have been the unwritten code of the early American pioneer. With heart undaunted and his face turned toward the unknown frontier, he pushed the mountains and forests back, conquered the unbridled rivers, and strode across gaping gorges and burning sands. So determined were his efforts that the tiny handful of colonies became the domain of freemen and the harbor of all those seeking refuge from border to border and from sea to sea, that he pushed onward and onward. The spirit of these early pioneers was carried on for over 165 years. Man fought and died for America's cause; they did not take the advantages afforded them by citizenship for granted, but were determined to use every means they had to preserve these cherished possessions for future generations.

The position that this country holds as a leader of nations in the world today may well be attributed to the strong men and women who, over the years, have fought to build a national integrity in an effort to forge a firm foundation. For history has repeatedly shown that no civilization survives without such. Is America still the land of such strength that even a struggling young nation can look to her for guidance and inspiration? Daily on our spinning globe, which teems with unrest, this question is being asked, as one by one nations buckle under the deteriorating and undermining forces of communism, socialism, apathy, and complacency. The answer to that question is not an unquestionable yes. However, one must give serious consideration to the part that today's American youth must play to make it a positive yes. Are young Americans of this generation willing to accept the enormous responsibilities handed to them by their forebears; those of safeguarding America's greatness and unlimited opportunities? Can young America, despite a coddled existence, in which a picture of uncomplicated and simple life has seemingly given the impression that the world is floating on a rosy cloud, face the facts of strengthening themselves and their Nation? If so, the United States of America can maintain its rightful place in the sun as a nation under God, with strength from God, a nation which still leads in the fight against tyranny and slavery.

As youth, we must not balk at the thought of adhering to tradition and methods which may ostensibly seem old-fashioned, for there are principles of life which are ageless. By the same token, we cannot afford to ignore new and progressive ideas. The price of freedom and citizenship is dear, hence not one of us can stop here and feel secure. We must be on the move constantly, ever widening our vistas until the world is purged of festering sores and all men alive can be blessed with the broadest concept of citizenship, which provides for the human dignity of man.

The War in Vietnam—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include another installment in the series by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, covering his recent observations in Vietnam. Mr. Warren is Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., and part

VI of his report which appeared in this newspaper on February 26, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, VI—WILL TO WIN VITAL FACTOR

(By Lucian C. Warren)

(Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, is paying an adventurous visit to troubled South Vietnam where he has seen some of the fighting between Government troops and Vietcong guerrillas. Here two high American officers, one of them a western New Yorker, discuss for him what it will take to pacify a country widely infiltrated with an experienced and determined enemy. Principally, they say, it will take U.S. persistence and will to victory in the face of temporary discouragement.)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"If we have the effort, willpower and desire to win this war, then we'll win it."

Those were the words of a man who should know, the man directly in charge of bossing American military efforts in South Vietnam—Brig. Gen. William E. De Puy, whose formal title is assistant chief of staff of the American military command for operations.

A man directly beside him, in the U-8 twin engine Army plane en route from Danang to Saigon, nodded agreement.

"I concur wholeheartedly," said Lt. Col. Donald D. Doerflein, formerly of Kenmore, N.Y., De Puy's executive assistant. "We can win if we'll just make up our mind to do so."

WORRY CITED

But what worries these two able military men is some kind of psychological letdown like Dienbienphu, the French military disaster that convinced the French that their cause was hopeless. The resulting negotiations resulted in the splitting of Vietnam at the 17th parallel, with the northern half going to the Communists.

"That defeat for the French wasn't as bad as it was cracked up to be," said De Puy. "All was by no means lost in a military sense. But it turned out to be a major psychological blow to the French will to win and they pulled out. That must not happen to us."

REDS DISCIPLINED

As he talked, De Puy looked out over the rugged, mountainous territory.

"See that," he said as he pointed to a whitish patch on a mountainside. "That's rice being cultivated the hard way by the Vietcong on the mountainside. What we're up against is disciplined, ruthless, and highly dangerous Communist organization."

And with a touch of sadness in his voice, he added: "And the South Vietnamese we are working with are a people belonging to all kinds of sects, living in a newly created nation that has no traditions and no clear idea of a civil service. When they get the proper leadership, they're wonderful fighters, but the problem is to get the right leadership."

DOERFLEIN RETURNING

De Puy and Doerflein had just spent the morning in Danang, the nerve center for military operations in the northern area of South Vietnam, not far from the demilitarized border zone.

An association of some months between the two men was to be shortly terminated because Doerflein had about completed his year's tour of duty in South Vietnam and will be returning in early March to Washington, where he will have new duties with the Office of Research and Development of the Defense Department at the Pentagon.

AREA NATIVE

Doerflein has deep roots in the Buffalo area, where he was born and brought up. His grandmother is Mrs. Catherine Doerflein, of 811 East Ferry Street, Buffalo, and his father, Peter L. Doerflein, a retired salesman, is now living in Silver Spring, Md.

A rangy 6-footer whose head scraped the top of this Army executive plane, Colonel Doerflein has fond memories of a Niagara frontier boyhood that culminated in graduation from Kenmore High School in 1943.

From then on he was a rolling stone gathering little moss, particularly in the matter of a college education.

ATTENDED UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO

Because of military service interruptions, the colonel helped himself, cafeteria style, to a college education where it was most convenient, including a 1½-year start at the University at Buffalo, followed by stints at Princeton, the University of Kansas, and the University of Omaha.

The prize finally was a bachelor of education degree at Omaha. His wife is the former Bernice Jarosz, of Buffalo, now residing with their three children at Tucson, Ariz.

Doerflein listened attentively as his chief expounded his views on the political-military situation in Saigon. Like a good executive assistant should, he let the boss do the talking, but it was clear that he was of like mind.

GENERAL'S COMMENT

What obviously bothered both De Puy and Doerflein most was the attitude of the folks back home.

"The people back home just don't have a clear picture of the picture here," complained the general, "and what would happen with a Vietcong victory. They're falling right into the trap set by the Communists, who have figured all along that Uncle Sam is a paper tiger.

"I still think we're going to stick this one out and win, but if we don't no one in this part of the world will ever believe us again and the other still free countries in this area can quickly become Communist."

ASSESSMENT

The general was asked for a frank assessment of the current military situation. In reply, he did not try to paint a rosy picture. As he sees it, the South Vietnamese forces with American help have the Vietcong clearly on the run in the southern or delta area of South Vietnam, where 10 million of the nation's 12 million live. The area immediately around Saigon has been well disinfected of the Vietcongs.

But De Puy acknowledged that the Vietcong at present have the upper hand in South Vietnam's central highland, while in the northern Danang area, there is presently a military standoff or stalemate.

TIME ON OUR SIDE

But in the long run, if the United States and South Vietnamese don't in the meantime lose their nerve, the general feels reasonably certain of victory. This is even attested by the attitude of interrogated Vietcong prisoners, who fear defeat in any long war.

The general summed it up: "In general there is more good news than bad news. And don't forget that time is on our side. It may take anywhere from 5 to 10 years, but this war can be won and it must be won."

CBS Officials Favor Shorter Presidential Election Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the two highest officials of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., have assured me of their continuing interest and support for House Joint Resolution 16 which I have filed for the purpose of limiting presidential campaigns to 60 days. CBS has an important and a responsible role in every national election campaign and it is encouraging to those of us who are pressing for action in the House to know that Mr. William S. Paley, chairman of the board, and Mr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., share our hope that we will achieve this objective.

With permission to extend my remarks, I include herewith letters which I have received from Messrs. Paley and Stanton:

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
New York, N.Y., February 12, 1965.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: Thank you very much for your letter of February 5, enclosing copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 4 and other material relating to your proposal for a constitutional amendment which would limit the presidential campaign period to 60 days.

I certainly share your hope that some step will soon be taken to achieve this objective which we both have been advocating for some time now.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. PALEY.

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
New York, N.Y., February 15, 1965.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: It was kind of you to write your letter of February 4. I was delighted to read your insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not only on February 3, which you forwarded to me, but your further insert on February 4. I am pleased indeed that you support the principle of shorter presidential campaigns.

As we at CBS have pointed out in the past, the direct and immediate way to accomplish this desired end of shortening presidential campaigns would be for the political parties themselves to come to an agreement on later convention dates and hence shorter campaigns. Perhaps this simple procedure is too direct and it is too optimistic to expect it to be adopted. Your resolution (H.J. Res. 16) may be the slower but more certain way of accomplishing what seems to us to be a most desired goal. CBS fully supports your objective.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK STANTON.

Ed Freeman Made a Strong Mark at Murray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding citizen in Tennessee, Ed Freeman, has just been made a managing editor of a great newspaper of the Nation, the Nashville Tennessean. I had the privilege and honor of being in college with Ed over 30 years ago.

Bill Powell, an outstanding writer on the Paducah Sun-Democrat at Paducah, Ky., has prepared an excellent article on Ed Freeman. I am greatly indebted to Representative FRANK ALBERT STUBBLEFIELD, from whose district Ed Freeman came, and Representative DICK FULTON, who represents the district where Ed lives.

Ed Freeman has certainly made a success due to his outstanding capabilities and determination to work and to do a good job whatever his task might be.

The article follows:

BILL POWELL'S NOTEBOOK: ED FREEMAN MADE A STRONG MARK AT MURRAY

When I went to Murray State College in 1938 Ed Freeman had already graduated. I heard a lot about him in a short time, however. Freeman was one of the favorites of our journalism teacher, L. J. Hortin, and he always got around to Ed quickly in trying to convince some of us that the lean times should not discourage us or make us drop out of college.

He admired Ed very much; Hortin had me admiring Ed long before I met him.

Freeman, to him and then to me, was symbolic of the poor youngster getting through college and making fine grades without having any backing at all.

Ed fired somebody's furnace and slept in a basement room to meet some of his college expenses. He also worked on a National Youth Administration job for a small monthly check. He worked anywhere he could and managed to pay his way, although there were many weeks when Ed didn't have a nickel in his pockets.

But it wasn't that Ed was just a hard-worker; he made brilliant scholastic marks and was one of the highest respected boys on the campus for the way he behaved and the way he treated people.

He was intensely serious, though, and never seemed to have time to play.

"Ed smiled some but I don't believe I ever saw him laugh," Bob Sanderson, our associate editor who was in school when Ed was, told me.

Ed graduated from Calvert City High School in the early 1930's and finished his Murray work in 1937.

When I got to Murray in the fall of 1938 Ed was working for the Murray Ledger and Times. He later became editor of the paper, which was a weekly at the time.

Then in 1940, while I was working on the College News and the National Youth Advocate, a small paper put out for the NYA students at Murray under the direction of the late Emerson Crowley, Ed answered a "help wanted" ad in Publishers Auxiliary. He got a job on a Spokane, Wash., daily but didn't have the money to pay his way there.

Ed didn't hesitate a moment said L. J. Hortin. He packed a little suitcase and started thumbing rides. He made good time across the country and was soon at work.

He had majored in English and social science and minored in journalism. He had a fine education and was making good progress on the Spokane paper when he heard of an opening on the Nashville Tennessean.

Ed liked the Tennessean and wanted to be a part of it. He was extremely happy when they hired him as a reporter. By 1943 Ed was the paper's city editor, working at night. He became day city editor 10 years ago and for the first time since he had been on the Tennessean he was at home nights.

The first of this year Ed Freeman became managing editor of the big and outstanding Tennessean and, incidentally, is back working at night.

The boy who fired furnaces and swept floors to get through Murray carried his dedication and determination in college into his newspaper job, and for a long time has been a steady, dependable, and knowledgeable "old pro" at covering and having covered the local news that interests the Tennessean's readers.

Ed now supervises all editorial departments of the paper and handles the communications with the mechanical department.

Ed is married to the former Miss Lois Farley of Murray. They have a son, Mike, and a daughter, Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Reynolds.

Mike is doing what Ed hoped he would do—he is in the newspaper business. Mike is managing editor of a daily in Decatur, Ala. Mary Elizabeth lives with Ed and his wife at 4960 Stillwood Drive, Nashville.

Mike has two children and Mary Elizabeth has one.

Ed is the son of Mr. and Mrs. C. K. Freeman of the Calvert City-Palma area. Two sisters, Mrs. Oma Bell and Miss Ona Freeman (twins) live at Symsonia. Two brothers are Clarence L. Freeman, who works in one of the plants at Calvert City, and John, who is an electrician in Pana, Ill.

The NYA helped Ed but it helped my graduating class much more than it did him, because the program was better established and broader when I got there.

I went to Murray without a job but soon found one helping with the chores at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Callie Hale. Orville Owens, of Symsonia, who is in Evansville now, and Vincent Taylor, of Hardeman, near Mayfield, went to Murray together the first day of school. Orville had a basketball scholarship and Taylor had a little money.

All three of us wound up on NYA making all of our college expenses.

I don't believe any one of us would have been able to stay in school 6 months without the NYA.

Owens, incidentally, is part owner of a large grocery store in Evansville. His partner is Aubrey "Top" Ryals, who played on the same basketball team Orville and I played on in 1936–38 at Symsonia.

I lost touch with Taylor when he was in the old Army Air Corps during World War II.

In Memory of Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation grieves over the passing of the eminent Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter. Last week, Senator Dorsey Hardeman, of San Angelo, Tex., introduced Senate Resolution 176 in memory of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, and this resolution was unanimously passed and signed by our distinguished Lt. Gov. Preston Smith.

Senator Hardeman is one of our State's outstanding legislators and historians and has been recognized for his achievements in many fields. I am pleased to include a copy of this senate resolution, which is as follows:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 176: RESOLUTION IN MEMORY OF MR. JUSTICE FELIX FRANKFURTER

"(By Hardeman)

"Whereas the senate has learned with regret of the passing of Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter, retired former member of the Supreme Court of the United States; and

"Whereas having been born in Austria and having come to the United States at an early age, he rose to the height of his chosen profession to become the 'Eloquent Dissenter' of the Nation's highest judicial tribunal and the 'needling conscience of the Court' with his 23 years of distinguished service as an Associate Justice thereof; and

"Whereas he was small of stature, but large of intellect and personal and judicial integrity who 'never sold the truth to serve the hour' nor violated, with impunity, his oath to support the Constitution and laws of the country he loved and served; and

"Whereas he sought to stay the heavy hand of arrogated authority so apparent in various decisions by the Court, such as in *Baker* v. *Carr*, 82 S. Ct. 691, wherein he charged that the equal protection and due process clauses of the 14th amendment—'have been invoked by Federal courts as restrictions upon the power of the States to allocate electoral weight among the voting population of their geographical divisions' which 'reverses a uniform course of decision established by a dozen cases' and, continuing, he decried the 'massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past in asserting destructively novel judicial power' stating that such 'demands a detailed analysis of the role of this (Supreme) Court in our constitutional scheme'; and

"Whereas his philosophy of government is expressed in the oft-quoted statement that 'The Constitution has ample means within itself to meet the changing needs of successive generations. * * * If the Court, aided by an alert and public-spirited bar, has access to the facts and follows them, the Constitution is flexible enough to meet all the new needs of our society'; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the Senate of Texas to pay its tribute of respect to the contributions of Judge Frankfurter in the preservation of constitutional law and his refusal to substitute political expediency for 'principles sanctioned by the wisdom and approved by the experience of the ages,' and to express its sympathy to his surviving wife: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the senate, That it hereby express its sympathy to Mrs. Frankfurter and its respect to the memory of Judge Frankfurter and that copies of this resolution, under the seal of the Senate of Texas, be forwarded to Mrs. Frankfurter; to the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States; and to the dean of the Harvard Law School, by the secretary of the senate, and that this resolution be printed in the senate journal today.

"PRESTON SMITH,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate."

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on February 24, 1965, by a rising vote.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Our African Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have been granted permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Daily Dunklin Democrat of Kennett, Mo., written by Jack Stapleton, Jr., following the appearance in Kennett of James J. Blake, Deputy Director of the

Office of Northern African Affairs of the State Department. Mr. Blake was the speaker in one of a series of public information forums, sponsored by the First Methodist Church in Kennett, and I am happy to report his message was well received by all who heard him. When I was back in southeast Missouri this past weekend, I heard many favorable reports on Mr. Blake's talk, and I know that as a result of his appearance many people throughout that area have a much better understanding of some of the problems this Nation faces throughout the world, and appreciate the difficulties involved in our attempts to create a favorable image and to gain confidence for the programs in which the United States is engaged.

Personally, I am gratified to know that the State Department does have representatives like Mr. Blake, who according to Publisher Stapleton's editorial, presented a logical, intelligent argument as to why we should not ignore this important problem. I am happy to include with these remarks, Mr. Stapleton's editorial:

OUR AFRICAN POLICY

James J. Blake is the Deputy Director of the Office of Northern African Affairs of the U.S. Department of State. Mr. Blake was in Kennett Sunday to deliver an address on this Nation's African policy, and to explain in some detail the difficulties involved in carrying out those policies among the new and emerging nations of the African Continent. Mr. Blake spoke at a public information forum sponsored by the First Methodist Church—and a good job he did, too.

Mr. Blake was impressive, principally because his facts and logic were impressive. If there were those who doubted the wisdom of our foreign policy as it relates to Africa before Mr. Blake started speaking, there should have been fewer in number by the time he finished.

What the State Department official said, in a word, was that America's interest in Africa is vital because of the continent's strategic position and its vast potential, and that our Nation's foreign policy with the 35 nations of Africa must be one that is designed to win the confidence of these emerging countries, despite all of the obstacles now in our way.

Mr. Blake argued, and with logic and facts as the basis for his argument, that intelligent foreign aid programs are a must for our African policy. We agree wholeheartedly; that is what we have been saying for years.

The argument for intelligent aid programs, used by Mr. Blake, represents sound thinking. The Communists now have some 5,000 technicians scattered throughout Africa; these technicians are assisting Africans in their efforts to build a nation where none has existed. These technicians are providing the know-how which is so lacking in so many of the emerging nations, and at the same time providing a basis of friendship with the Communist bloc.

This Nation has long gnashed its teeth at the loss of China, a loss which perhaps could have been averted with enlightened policies. The challenge of Africa is as formidable, requiring understanding from the American public and support of enlightened programs. The United States has not been standing still in Africa, as Mr. Blake pointed out Sunday. But we have a long way to go, simply because of our undeserved reputation as a colonial power.

Africa, rich in minerals and resources, has a land mass triple the size of the United States, has 60 percent of the world's gold supply, three-fourths of the world's cobalt supply, 90 percent of the world's diamond supply and a great, largely untapped potential of oil production. It is also a great storehouse of iron ore, chrome, copper, and other strategic minerals. Thus the continent takes on ever-greater importance, particularly in view of the danger that such resources might be inherited by the Communists in the event of American default.

As Mr. Blake noted, "Africa is too big and too important to ignore or for us to hope it will go away." He is right; prophetically right.

Some of the Nation's pundits have suggested in recent weeks that Africa presents so many problems that U.S. resources will be depleted by the time the Dark Continent is fully developed. The argument is fine as far as it goes, but the United States has both short-range and long-range objectives in Africa. We must, at all costs, prevent Africa from becoming a Communist satellite continent; we must strengthen self-government in Africa; even if at times these governments seem antagonistic to the free world; and we must make Africa economically and politically strong so that it can exert real leadership in the community of nations. When these aims are realized, Africa will have become a vital bulwark against totalitarianism. But not before.

The stakes are too high to gamble with short-sighted solutions—and politically popular foreign aid cuts. What is important is that Africa be preserved as 35 independent nations—not 35 Communist satellites.

With men like Mr. Blake helping shape the U.S. policy in Africa, the American public can be assured that every intelligent course of action will be followed to assure the best interests of the free world. And, with men like James Blake in the Department of State, it is certain that America will not be asking, "Who lost Africa?" 10 years from now—if the words of Blake and his fellow State Department planners are heard by the American public.

H.R. 2027: A Bill To Repeal Section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored a bill, H.R. 2027, to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act. This section reads as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State, or territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or territorial law.

The strongest advocates of preservation of this section of the law have banded together under the misnomer of "right-to-work" organizations. A more honest title for these groups should be "antiunion security" organizations because that—and that alone—is the sole intent and purpose of the right-to-work advocates.

Actually, there is no such thing as a right to work. Work opportunities are based upon the economic laws of our system and the law of supply and demand.

What the right-to-work advocates overlook or fail to mention in their feverish propaganda to promote their cause is that a union under Federal law, which attains certification as a bargaining agent for a majority of the workers, must represent all of the workers in that unit whether they are members or not.

The philosophy of the right-to-work advocates may be compared to the argument of a childless couple that they should not be required to pay school taxes because they do not directly use the educational facilities of the community.

The prohibition of management and labor unions from freely negotiating and executing union shop provisions in collective bargaining agreements creates a legislative umbrella under which a minority group of free riders may scurry. While sitting in the shade with none of the obligations or responsibilities to the union, they receive and enjoy all of the economic fruits and security provided them by the union.

To put this issue in simple basic terms, it is merely this: Should an individual employee for any reason at all in his own mind have the privilege of not paying dues to support a union which a majority of his fellow employees have chosen by the election process to represent all of them?

The aim and intent of the right-to-work advocates is to weaken the existing strong unions, destroy the weaker ones, and hamper and prevent the formation of new ones.

Congress should no longer provide this haven and shelter for this group. It should close this legislative umbrella which would require this group to move over to the sunny side of the street and exercise its rights in the democratic way under the free elective process and collective bargaining.

The quickest, easiest, and simplest way to close this umbrella is by repeal of section 14(b).

Different Views of Federal Finances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the February 13 issue of the Racine Journal-Times. The editorial offers an enlightening thought to those who are concerned over our economy and look askance at the Federal debt I therefore, respectfully, enter it in the RECORD:

DIFFERENT VIEW OF FEDERAL FINANCES

To most Americans accustomed to doing business in what we conceive to be a businesslike fashion, the national debt is a worrisome thing. The Federal Government now has $313 billion in outstanding obligations, and chances are very good that Congress will be asked to raise the debt ceiling again before the end of this calendar year.

Advocates of economy and the balanced budget are offended by an ever-growing debt,

and they wonder why the Government cannot operate in a more businesslike fashion.

The first answer to that question, of course, is that the Government is not a business. It operates to perform certain services, not to make a profit.

But Senator RUSSELL LONG came up with another answer last week. In Forbes magazine the Senate leader said, "This Federal deficit business is a lot of bunk. We don't really know whether we have a deficit or not. Any private company that had its books set up like the Federal Government would go broke. The way the Government does its bookkeeping, you just throw everything into the debt side. You don't even count your assets."

LONG put his finger on exactly the point where the comparison of the Federal Government with private business breaks down, in the financial reporting and accounting.

When a business prepares a profit-and-loss statement, or a balance sheet, it records as assets everything it owns—buildings, machinery, vehicles, property, etc.—as well as all debts owed to it. These are tangible things, with a dollar value, all of them more or less convertible into cash. Against that, it places its liabilities—outstanding debts, stock, and other types of obligations. When, for example, a business buys a building, that building is an asset, to the extent of its value.

The Government does not report its financial condition in this manner at all. A Government dollar spent, in excess of income, becomes debt, period. No attempt is made to balance off the Government's obligations against its assets, although those assets are very tangible. Not every Government asset—a moon missile, for example—is readily convertible, but neither are some of the assets of private industry.

The way Senator LONG figures it, the U.S. Government has $324 billion in capital assets, not counting the full value of property which could be available to the Government in any real fiscal emergency. Subtracting the $313 billion national debt, the Government in this content is actually $11 billion on the black side of the ledger.

LONG thinks the Government should report its financial standing in this manner. It would not make us any more or less solvent, but it might make some people feel better. And the next time you were told that you, along with every other man, woman, and child in the country owe such-and-such an amount as your part of the national debt, you could ask how much you, as an American citizen and stockholder in this Nation, own—as your share of the national assets.

Excerpt From Chapter XX, "Confessions of the Old Wizard"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, an old friend of mine, Ladd Dinkins, of New Orleans, has sent me an interesting comment and observation which is an excerpt from chapter XX of the "Confessions of the Old Wizard" by Hjalmar Schacht, which I am passing along to you at his suggestion. I have found it most interesting and thought provoking, and I am sure the Members of this body will also:

EXCERPT FROM CHAPTER XX, "CONFESSIONS OF THE OLD WIZARD," BY HJALMAR SCHACHT

Since the introduction of paper money by modern states the critical task of monetary policy has been to preserve the value of such money. The purchasing power of money must remain the same throughout the passage of time. It is only by means of a stable currency that the system of barter has been superseded. When a worker nowadays receives his pay envelope at the end of the week he must be able to feel that he can buy as much with it the following week as he did in the past one. He must be able to save until he has sufficient to purchase a piece of land, or build himself a hut or cottage.

The introduction of banknotes or government paper currency has been made feasible only because the state or the central bank have promised to exchange the paper money for gold at any time. To insure this possibility (that is, the redemption of paper by gold) at any time must therefore be the aim of all issuers of paper currency. Any state or central bank which deliberately or carelessly flings away this possibility is guilty of a crime against its citizens. Were a private individual to do so he would be branded as a defaulter and a cheat.

In former times there have been states that have gone bankrupt as a result of bad management; the deliberate manipulation of currency, however, has become a familiar feature only of the most recent history. As a result of two World Wars, many countries were reduced to desperate financial straits and looked upon devaluation of currency as the only way out. This deliberate devaluation was usually preceded by a natural decline in the value of paper money. When a nation's expenses exceed its income and it has to try and meet its commitments with such a quantity of paper money the value of paper money declines.

Such was the situation in which Germany found herself as the terrible outcome of World War I. And not only Germany. Other nations did not escape inflation, or devaluation of paper currency. But Germany was the hardest hit. It was the masses in Germany who suffered most under the inflation. In matters of money—as indeed in all matters of business—the educated section of the population grasp the devaluation process more quickly than the uneducated masses. Anyone who was alive to the signs of approaching inflation could safeguard himself against losses in paper currency by the purchase of assets which, by contrast, would maintain their value; for example, houses, real estate, manufactured goods, raw materials, etc. This wholesale recourse to real values enabled not only the well-to-do but also and especially the unscrupulous to preserve and even possibly to increase their assets.

Bracero Program in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, around the area of Eaton Rapids, which is in the south central portion of Michigan, the finest pickles in the world are grown. The farmers, and the industries which serve and depend upon them, want to make their commitments now for the planting and harvesting of this summer's crop, but they cannot do so. In the past, they have depended upon Mexican labor, which is capable of weeding and harvesting the crop more efficiently than any domestic labor thus far tried. Today, they are denied Mexican labor, and they have only vague promises of replacements.

These farmers cannot plant on promises. They need and should have hard information.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that my colleagues will want to know of the resolution adopted by the Eaton Rapids Chamber of Commerce:

RESOLUTION BY GREATER EATON RAPIDS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas, this U.S. Congress, during the year 1964, failed to reenact the Federal law commonly known as the Bracero Labor Act; and

Whereas the nonreenactment of this act directly affects the economy of the Greater Eaton Rapids area, being detrimental to that economy; and

Whereas the nonreenactment of this act has deprived certain local industries of essential labor, replacements for such labor from the local area and elsewhere being nearly nonexistent: Therefore be it

Resolved by the board of the Greater Eaton Rapids Chamber of Commerce, in session this 16th day of February 1965, That the Greater Eaton Rapids Chamber of Commerce hereby expresses its approval of the reenactment of the Federal law commonly known as the Bracero Labor Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Greater Eaton Rapids Chamber of Commerce and its individual members contact their elected representatives, either in person or by mail, to the end that the Bracero Labor Act shall be duly reenacted by the U.S. Congress.

CHARLES B. NICHOLAS,
President.

WLW Radio Station Wins Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend one of Ohio's outstanding radio stations, WLW, Cincinnati, Ohio, for receiving a well-deserved honor and recognition for meritorious service rendered on behalf of its listening audience.

On February 22, 1965, WLW radio station was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal Award by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., for its 1964 radio program, "That Certain July in Philadelphia."

This marks the second consecutive year WLW-radio has been so honored. Last year WLW won the highest award presented to a radio station—the encased George Washington Honor Medal—for its "Government Under Law" series.

WLW's winning entry this year was part of a regular feature, "People and Places" carried within "An Evening at Crosley Square" on a daily basis and hosted by WLW's Jack Gwyn. The award-winning show was written and narrated by Mr. Gwyn and produced by the WLW program department. Recognizing the negligible amount of material

featured on the airwaves commemorating our national holidays, "Of People and Places" dramatically revisited Philadelphia that certain July to trace the events which inspired Thomas Jefferson to write the draft for the Declaration of Independence.

Each year the Freedoms Foundation honors companies, individuals, organizations, and schools who best exemplify the "Credo of the American Way of Life." The news media industry is indeed fortunate to have such an outstanding service to the public and it is an honor and privilege to commend Radio Station WLW for its patriotic programs. WLW has contributed much in its broadcasting service to the people and such contributions are generally left unrecognized. For their efforts and valuable service to the listening audience, a commendation is in order.

Federal Reserve System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I include a statement of Robert D. H. Harvey, vice chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the Maryland National Bank in Baltimore in reference to the proposed reorganization of the Federal Reserve System as proposed in Mr. PATMAN's bill, H.R. 11.

I agree with Mr. Harvey that reorganization of the Federal Reserve System as proposed would have widespread adverse results throughout all segments of our economy and insert his statement here for the consideration of my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY ROBERT D. H. HARVEY CONCERNING THE CURRENT PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE THE INDEPENDENT STATUS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The Federal Reserve Act was passed in 1913 after a series of financial crises and was designed to strengthen the Nation's monetary system. Exhaustive studies were made at that time of the needs of the financial community. These supported the concept of an independent agency, charged with the day-to-day management of monetary policy which, basically, involves the supply of money and the availability of credit.

The system was strengthened in the 1930's. To avoid any possible conflict between fiscal and monetary policies, both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency were, at that time, removed from the Federal Reserve Board.

During the war years and postwar years, the System cooperated with the Treasury Department in financing World War II. The System was again reviewed by Congress in 1952 and once more it was determined that monetary policy should continue to be administered by an independent agency. The System's entire experience for more than 50 years testifies to this necessity.

Allegations that the recent policies of the System have contributed to the high cost of Government financing are without a real basis. The System does not support the price of Government securities as had been its practice during World War II. This was discontinued in the early 1950's. The cost of Government financing has, indeed, increased since the fifties, but this is attributable in a large measure to the increase in the size of the national debt, as well as to the demand for credit from individuals and business.

Other criticisms of the System are that it is not responsive to the fiscal policy of the Federal administration, and that it pursues a course which impedes the operation of the administration's policy. These too, are without broad foundation. The aims and methods of monetary control as administered by the Federal Reserve System—and fiscal control, as it is administered by the Federal administration—are two, diverse economic programs. They may necessarily be related because they operate in the same economic forum. However, since the purposes and procedures of monetary and fiscal policies are different, they should not be placed under a single control. This would seriously impair their operation since one policy, either monetary or fiscal, would then become the controlling policy. At present, each complements the other, and there is no evidence that in acting independently, either limits the effectiveness of the other. The borrowing function and the credit function can only operate for the general good if each operates independently.

Other reservations have been raised by Mr. PATMAN concerning the position of the Federal Reserve System and are outlined in his statement on file with the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. A comment on Mr. PATMAN's proposals has been prepared by the American Bankers Association and I would be happy to supply you a copy, should you desire one.

Address by Rabbi Joseph M. Brandriss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address that the members of the Maryland delegation to Congress were privileged to hear from Rabbi Joseph M. Brandriss, president of the Rabbinical Assembly of America of the Greater Washington Area. I wish to share with all Members of Congress, Rabbi Brandriss' indictment of the Soviet Union policy of persecution of Russian Jews, and to urge that America's diplomatic resources be marshaled against this Communist restriction of religious freedom.

His address follows:

STATEMENT BY RABBI JOSEPH M. BRANDRISS, PRESIDENT OF THE RABBINICAL ASSEMBLY OF AMERICA OF THE GREATER WASHINGTON AREA, MARCH 2, 1965

Distinguished Senators and Congressmen of our beloved State of Maryland, permit me at first to express to you the gratitude of the members of my organization, the Rabbinical Assembly of America of the Greater Washington Area, as well as our own gratitude for your having taken time off from your busy schedules to meet with us this morning. Be assured that we greatly appreciate it.

With me are Rabbi Tzvi Porath, the spiritual leader of the Montgomery County Jewish Community Center, and former president of the Rabbinical Assembly of America of the Greater Washington area; Rabbi Lewis Weintraub, spiritual leader of Temple Israel, and former president of the Washington Board of Rabbis; Rabbi Sanford Jarashaw, the spiritual leader of Temple Shalom, representing the Conference of American Rabbis; and Mr. Isaac Frank, the executive director of the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington, representing 124 Jewish organizations, and Rabbi Harry Kaufman, spiritual leader of Beth Shalom, representing the Orthodox Rabbinate of America.

We are thus representing all the constituent agencies of the Synagogue Council of America. We have come here to plead with you distinguished representatives of our great State of Maryland, to bring the plight of Russian Jewry to the attention of our President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, and to urge our Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson, to bring the violations of the rights of Russian Jewry before the United Nations.

We plead with you to communicate with the State Department and to urge it to intercede with the Russian Government that it put an end to its present anti-Semitic course. We would also like to request that you urge the House Foreign Affairs Chairman, and the members of the committee, to hold hearings and to support a resolution condemning Soviet anti-Semitism.

For quite a number of years the Soviet Government has been pursuing anti-Semitic activities of an alarming nature.

Synagogues are being closed. Their number has been reduced to less than 100 for 3 million Jews.

No Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917.

Hebrew schools are nonexistent.

There is no public Jewish religious instruction at all. Jewish children are not permitted to be taught the language of the Bible—the language that binds Jews together, and to their ancestral faith.

Despite the fact that Jews are officially recognized as a religious group, they are not permitted to set up any central coordinating body, similar to those of various Christian denominations, the Moslems, and the Buddhist, nor do the Jews have any religious publications, like the other religious groups have.

Of all the religious groups, only the Jews are prevented from establishing contact with their coreligionists in other countries.

The Russian Orthodox Church is now a member of the World Council of Churches. Soviet seminarians attend Protestant and Moslem institutions of learning abroad. No such permission is given to Jewish theological students.

The training of religious functionaries is limited to a single yeshivah, to a single school, which leads a precarious existence. Only five students are presently in attendance. Several out of town students have been refused Moscow residence permits.

Jewish cultural life too has been banned since the Stalin persecution of the Jews. A decade after Stalin's death, there is still no permanent Yiddish theater. Such kind of a policy on the part of the Russian Government toward Jews, violates the Soviet Constitution's guarantee of national self-determination, and the legal recognition of the right of all nationalities within the Soviet borders to cultural freedom.

The Soviet policy amounts to spiritual and cultural strangulation of Judaism in Russia.

The Soviet press and radio have been conducting an extremely bitter anti-Semitic campaign, not only against Judaism, not only against the Jewish religion and culture, but also against Jews as human beings, branding them as criminals. They are accused of disloyalty toward the state; they are accused of economic crimes. The Soviet press features trials that result in death sentences. To date, 36 such trials have been reported in 26 different cities. In these

trials, death sentences have been meted out to 70 individuals, of whom 45 are Jews.

In a number of cases, the Jewish religious affiliation of some of the "culprits" is made explicit. The synagogues are portrayed as the place of illegal transactions. Religious Jews are mockingly described as "money worshippers"; the rabbi is shown as their accomplice; their family connections in Israel and the United States are pointed up. In general, the Jews are presented as people whose only "G-d is gold."

We could go on and on. In sum, Soviet policy places the Jews in the most difficult situation. They are allowed neither to assimilate, nor to live a full Jewish life, nor to emigrate to Israel or any other place where they might live freely as Jews.

We therefore have come here to ask your understanding for the plight of Russian Jewry. We know that many of you have already approached the President, to protest the outrages perpetrated on the Jewish people in Russia, and we are greatly indebted to you for it.

American Jewry is most encouraged by your sympathy and helpfulness. We know that the Soviet Government is not insensitive to world opinion, and particularly to the American opinion. The mere fact that this year, the Soviet Government permitted the baking, as well as the importation of matzoh—the unleavened bread that is used by Jews during the 8 days of Passover—is a sign that the Soviets are sensitive to world opinion.

Again, we thank you for your time and patience and cooperation, and we do hope that your intercession will determine the new Russian Government to revise its past policies of discrimination and to give Jews full and unrestricted religious liberty which is guaranteed under the Russian Constitution.

Voice of Democracy Award-Winning Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include at this point in the RECORD the award-winning speech of Miss Patricia Ann Tomes of Norfolk, Nebr. Patricia is the Nebraska winner of the annual Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy" contest. She has thoughtfully chosen the importance of working together as individuals as her topic.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP, 1964–65

(By Patricia Ann Tomes, Norfolk, Nebr.)

"Democracy is the worst form of government, except for all the others that have been tried." Churchill here expresses my feelings on democracy. Even though we realize that our system is the greatest, we are not always satisfied with the ways of our Government; we wonder at some of the policies in a democratic society, but there is one thing we must be convinced of: the success or failure of a democratic society depends on us as individuals. A definite challenge to citizenship is the perfection of our society accomplished by the working together of individuals—by giving our fellow man the respect he deserves. To illustrate my point, a woman once stopped in her friend's yard and mentioned how beautiful a stately evergreen was. Years ago, her friend confided, their marriage had suffered from boredom and neglect. Then her husband planted a young spruce. If it died, they decided, they would get a divorce; if it grew they would stay together.

"You know," she said, "we caught each other carrying water to that tree."

Just as this couple, citizens also have differences. Perhaps I want the farmer to have better representation while you favor the urbanite. Maybe I want socialized medicine, and you are against it. No all people think alike, but we must have similar basic values—not biased because of color of skin or size of money pouch. The Negroes and the poor deserve good jobs, and comfort. If we do not better the conditions of uor oppressed citizens, we can never retain our own freedom.

As our young couple nurtured their marriage by solving their differences, we must nurture the tree of democracy containing individual differences. To insure growth we must perform certain duties which certainly include voting. As we stand in the voting booth with our country's future depending on our decision, we must vote for the benefit of all citizens, not just for our own selfish gains. Not the "eeny, meeny, miney, mo" type of voting—our voting must be good, honest, and informed. We must know what is right and vote accordingly for the good of the whole country. We must also help our fellow citizens to vote correctly—by not spreading malicious propaganda against people who are opposed to our views, but by presenting honest, unbiased facts, by distributing material which will alert our fellow citizens to actual circumstances.

Next, we must consider our laws. Since laws were established for the benefit of all, we must do our part in enforcing them as well as in obeying them.

But observing the laws and being a conscientious voter isn't enough. If we cherish peace and freedom for ourselves, we must see that other citizens also receive their rights as human beings. Making laws and enforcing them isn't the whole solution. In our daily contacts—our economic dealings, our social, and educational considerations—we must treat all fairly. It is by the perfection of the individual citizen that we obtain a truly great country. To insure freedom and democracy, we all must have moral, spiritual, and intellectual strength which includes our recognizing, loving, and considering the rights of all citizens. That is the challenge of citizenship.

Service Academy Athletes Are Unjustly Maligned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, following the cheating scandal disclosed at the Air Force Academy, a few persons seized upon this issue to point the finger of blame at Academy athletics.

Noting that 42 Air Force Academy athletes were among the 105 cadet resignations in the wake of the scandal, the inference was made that varsity athletics was the real culprit.

The apparent assumption is that an athlete is not really a cadet—that athletics is an ersatz function of the service academies.

Mr. Speaker, I say that these assumptions and inferences fly in the face of the actualities, and as a result the service academy athletes have been unjustly maligned.

The fact of the matter is that every cadet or midshipman who participates in intercollegiate athletics must pass the same rigorous entrance requirements as the nonathlete. Furthermore, the athlete must maintain the same high level of proficiency as any other cadet while in the Academy.

As for the cry of "professionalism," one only has to consider that a so-called professional athlete would hardly pick one of the service academies. An academy graduate must serve on active duty a minimum of 5 years after graduation; if an athlete aspired to play pro ball, he would go to a university where he could immediately play in the pro ranks after graduating.

I believe it is a fallacy to attempt to differentiate between the "athletes" and the "nonathletes" at the academies, because all cadets and midshipmen participate in some form of athletics.

This is amply stated in a report prepared for the Superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy. A portion of this report said:

The physical education and athletic program is so integral to the activities of the Brigade, just as are the academic and military programs, that it is erroneous to assume that athletes are not midshipmen or that midshipmen are not athletes.

In varsity sports alone, approximately 1,000 participate each season—fall, winter, and spring—representing the Naval Academy in intercollegiate athletics in 21 sports. About 2,300 midshipmen each season are members of intramural teams involving a total of 28 sports.

A program of physical education is continued throughout the 4 years so that all midshipmen receive instruction in such activities as swimming, wrestling, boxing, hand-to-hand combat, tennis, golf, handball, squash, personal conditioning and athletic administration.

The midshipmen are in a period of their lives which is important to their physical development and to the establishment of habits of healthful exercise and competitive spirit and teamwork that will serve them throughout their lives.

We believe that it is important for the midshipmen to be in good physical condition, for them to know how to stay in good condition, and for them to have acquired a genuine personal interest in physical recreation and competition.

The report further points out that Naval Academy varsity lettermen in football and basketball had excellent high school academic records before entering the Academy and have maintained high academic standing after entering.

The college board scores of these particular athletes differ very little from the scores for the entire classes of which they were members. The Naval Academy football and basketball varsity lettermen as a group have 38 percent of their number standing in the top half of the class for the classes of 1964 through 1967.

A Naval Academy professor made a statistical study covering a 10-year period—classes 1953–62—concerning midshipmen athletes in comparison with the

rest of the brigade. The professor's study noted:

A fairly comprehensive study of the modern era (classes of 1953 through 1962) shows that the student athlete is hardly distinguishable from his counterpart in the brigade in every facet of his full Navy career. As a group, entering student athletes win their share of prizes and awards, consistently stand higher in first class aptitude, and consistently stand slightly lower in relative standing for the completed course. The group of student athletes has a good retention rate for service careers.

Other studies at the Air Force Academy and the U.S. Military Academy have produced similar statistics with regards to the relative standing of the varsity athletes.

The Military Academy, utilizing the members of the classes of 1964–67 who were on the varsity football and basketball teams as a sample of athletes, found their mean score on the college entrance examination exceed significantly the national mean for high school seniors who enter college.

Additionally a review of the high school standings of this sample indicates that 70 percent were in the top 20 percent of their class and 90 percent in the top half. Considering that the high school standing is generally accepted as the one best predictor of academic success, this group of athletes demonstrates outstanding potential.

A review of the Military Academy classes of 1955–60 indicates no significant differences between retention rates of athletes and that of their class. In addition the officer performance of athletes is not significantly different from their contemporaries. As an example, the selection rate to captain for those first considered was 97.9 percent for athletes as compared to 97 percent for their contemporaries. It is further interesting to note that a survey made of Military Academy graduates in Korea established that physical ability measures were more related to the criterion of combat officer success than any of the academic course grades or final class standing.

The Air Force Academy made a survey of the high school records of members of its football and basketball squads. This survey, for the classes of 1964–67, showed that 80 percent of the football players were in the top quarter of their high school graduating class. A total of 77.3 percent of the basketball players, in the Air Force Academy classes of 1964–67, were in the top quarter of their high school graduating class.

In a breakdown of the academic grades for the spring semester of 1964, the Air Force Academy found that the average grade of all cadets was 2.81 on a 4.0 system. The average for the football squad was 2.67, and the average for the basketball squad was 2.56.

A similar correlation was found in the percentage study of cadets below the 2.0—or C grade—average. The percentage below 2.0 for all cadets at the Air Force Academy was 6.8. The percentage for the football squad was 7.0, and the basketball squad, 4.5.

These studies show that the high school records and Academy records of varsity athletes are almost identical with the overall cadet averages. The athlete is clearly no drag on the academic excellence of any of the three academies. In fact, a substantially greater proportion of the basketball and football squads than of their classmates were on the Commandant's merit list at the Air Force Academy.

Athletics and intercollegiate competition are healthy and essential to all three academies.

It is all too easy to hunt for a "whipping boy" in the case of the Air Force cheating, but the facts and figures clearly proclaim the folly of trying to make athletics the bete noir of this situation.

Plight of Russian Jewry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are becoming increasingly concerned about the tragic plight of the Jewish people in Russia. Last September I wrote to the President of the United States asking him to protest the discrimination against the Jewish people in Russia. I believe my colleagues in the Congress will be interested in reading a statement on this subject made today before a joint meeting of the Rabbinical Assembly of America of the Greater Washington area and the Maryland delegation.

STATEMENT BY RABBI JOSEPH M. BRANDRISS, PRESIDENT OF THE RABBINICAL ASSEMBLY OF AMERICA OF THE GREATER WASHINGTON AREA, MARCH 2, 1965

Distinguished Senators and Congressmen of our beloved State of Maryland, permit me at first to express to you the gratitude of the members of my organization, the Rabbinical Assembly of America of the Greater Washington area, as well as our own gratitude for your having taken time off from your busy schedules to meet with us this morning. Be assured that we greatly appreciate it.

With me are Rabbi Tzvi Porath, the spiritual leader of the Montgomery County Jewish Community Center, and former president of the Rabbinical Assembly of America of the Greater Washington Area, Rabbi Lewis Weintraub, spiritual leader of Temple Israel, and former president of the Washington Board of Rabbis, Rabbi Sanford Jarashaw, the spiritual leader of Temple Shalom, representing the Conference of American Rabbis, and Mr. Isaac Franck, the executive director of the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington, representing 130 Jewish organizations.

We are thus representing all the constituent agencies of the Synagogue Council of America. We have come here to plead with you distinguished representatives of our great State of Maryland, to bring the plight of Russian Jewry to the attention of our President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, and to urge our Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson, to bring the violations of the rights of Russian Jewry before the United Nations.

We plead with you to communicate with the State Department and to urge it to intercede with the Russian Government that it put an end to its present anti-Semitic course. We would also like to request that you urge the House Foreign Affairs chairman, and the members of the committee, to hold hearings and to support a resolution condemning Soviet anti-Semitism.

For quite a number of years the Soviet Government has been pursuing anti-Semitic activities of an alarming nature.

Synagogues are being closed. Their number has been reduced to less than 100 for 3 million Jews.

No Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917.

Hebrew schools are nonexistent.

There is no public Jewish religious instruction at all. Jewish children are not permitted to be taught the language of the Bible—the language that binds Jews together, and to their ancestral faith.

Despite the fact that Jews are officially recognized as a religious group, they are not permitted to set up any central coordinating body, similar to those of various Christian denominations, the Moslems, and the Buddhist, nor do the Jews have any religious publications, like the other religious groups have.

Of all the religious groups, only the Jews are prevented from establishing contact with their coreligionists in other countries.

The Russian Orthodox Church is now a member of the World Council of Churches. Soviet seminarians attend Protestant and Moslem institutions of learning abroad. No such permission is given to Jewish theological students.

The training of religious functionaries is limited to a single Yeshivah, to a single school, which leads a precarious existence. Only five students are presently in attendance.

Jewish cultural life too has been banned since the Stalin persecution of the Jews. A decade after Stalin's death, there is still no permanent Yiddish theater.

Such kind of a policy on the part of the Russian Government toward Jews, violates the Soviet Constitution's guarantee of national self-determination, and the legal recognition of the right of all nationalities within the Soviet borders to cultural freedom.

The Soviet policy amounts to spiritual and cultural strangulation of Judaism in Russia.

The Soviet press and radio have been conducting an extremely bitter anti-Semitic campaign, not only against Judaism, not only against the Jewish religion and culture, but also against Jews as human beings, branding them as criminals. They are accused of disloyalty toward the state; they are accused of economic crimes.

The Soviet press features trials that result in death sentences. To date, 36 such trials have been reported in 26 different cities. In these trials, death sentences have been meted out to 70 individuals, of whom 45 are Jews.

In a number of cases, the Jewish religious affiliation of some of the "culprits" is made explicit. The synagogues are portrayed as the place of illegal transactions. Religious Jews are mockingly described as "money worshippers"; the rabbi is shown as their accomplice; their family connections in Israel and the United States are pointed up. In general, the Jews are presented as people whose only "G-d is gold."

We could go on and on. In sum, Soviet policy places the Jews in the most difficult situation. They are allowed neither to assimilate, nor to live a full Jewish life, nor to emigrate to Israel or any other place where they might live freely as Jews.

We therefore have come here to ask your understanding for the plight of Russian Jewry. We know that many of you have already approached the President, to protest the outrages perpetrated on the Jewish people in Russia, and we are greatly indebted to you for it.

American Jewry is most encouraged by your sympathy and helpfulness. We know

that the Soviet Government is not insensitive to world opinion, and particularly to the American opinion. The mere fact that this year, the Soviet Government permitted the baking, as well as the importation of matzoth—the ritual bread that is used by Jews during the 8 days of Passover—is a sign that the Soviets are sensitive to world opinion.

Again, we thank you for your time and patience and cooperation, and we do hope that your intercession will determine the new Russian Government to revise its past policies of discrimination and to give Jews full and unrestricted religious liberty which is guaranteed under the Russian Constitution.

Pollution in Lake Erie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, it is widely recognized that one of the most serious water pollution problems in the Nation is that which besets Lake Erie, a portion of which borders the district I represent.

Recently, an outstanding presentation of the Lake Erie problem was made in a program that was broadcasted by WGR-TV in Buffalo. I call to the attention of my colleagues a major portion of the script for this program:

DANGER IN EVERY DROP

The beauty of Buffalo's surrounding waters today obscures a modern-day menace * * * the massive hazard of pollution. Unfortunately, much of this bright sparkling water would * * * if bottled * * * have to be labeled: "Danger in Every Drop." Without adequate safeguards, it could mean death * * * not only to portions of the human population * * * but to shipping, industrial production and recreational facilities as well.

Good evening, this is Pat Fagan. For two centuries Lake Erie has supplied the lifeblood for the stream of commerce that has built Buffalo into the second largest city in the second most populous State in the Nation. Ever since a French explorer christened this site on the Niagara Frontier with the felicitous phrase "belle fleuve"—or "beautiful flow"—its shining waters have been the crown jewel in the proud diadem of the Queen City of the Lakes.

But much has occurred historically since the discovery of the Great Lakes early in the 16th century. Huge harbors have mushroomed from its wild river mouths—primitive Indian canoe routes have become swarming channels of commerce—and once-isolated trading posts have quickened into the busy pulse beat of cities like Buffalo.

As State Health Commissioner Hollis S. Ingraham has warned, "polluted water can menace health * * * deter real estate development * * * interfere with recreation * * * and repel tourists." For in this unbottled poison, as he points out, "lurks a virus that stunts community progress."

And this is the danger in every drop. So much danger, in fact, that two worried Governments—the United States and Canada—have just asked the International Joint Commission to investigate the water pollution problem in Lakes Erie and Ontario. The request for the pollution study said the United States and Canadian Governments have been informed that the lake waters "are being polluted by sewage and industrial waste—causing or likely to cause serious health hazards on both sides of the border. Not only Buffalo is threatened—but many neighboring communities as well.

Cities on all of the Great Lakes * * * stretching their more than 2,000 miles more than halfway across the Northern American Continent—are all affected to some degree by water pollution. But the Niagara frontier is particularly vulnerable to this deadly virus because of its location on both Lakes Erie and Ontario—with its 43 million population in a 295,000-square-mile area directly dependent upon these two lakes for its water.

Locally, Buffalo's waterfront provides a vivid picture of pollution in "living color." This pollution extends along the waterfront from the river entrance to below Lackawanna. This so-called "black belt" is a blend of many contaminating factors. Stanley P. Spisiak, chairman of the Water Resources Committee of the New York Conservation Council, has estimated that a total of 350 tons of cyanide, phenol, ammonium, compounds, acids and suspended solids—plus approximately 2,710 gallons of oil—are dumped daily into the waters of Lake Erie and the Niagara River.

Of all the communities along the Niagara frontier, the city of Buffalo alone uses about 123 million gallons of water a day. Some of this, of course, is used industrially for cooling and processing purposes. For instance, it takes 65,000 gallons of water, weighing 270 tons, to process a single ton of steel.

The average Buffalo family of four uses 300 gallons of water a day. Every time you step into a shower, 25 gallons is consumed washing off the soap with the spray—every time you splash in the bathtub, whether you're big or little, another 36 gallons eventually run down the drain—and anywhere from 20 to 30 gallons are used for such ordinary household chores as washing the dishes or taking care of the family laundry.

Of this, the water you drink is literally only a drop in the bucket—about half a gallon a day. Yet this has always been the prime concern of local health authorities.

Buffalo's drinking water is under constant 24-hour analysis in the Erie County Health Department's testing laboratory on the top floor of city hall. Here, health department inspectors bring daily samples of water from the city's filtration plant at the foot of Porter Avenue. Bottled in sterile flasks, the water samples are first examined by a bacteriologist to determine its fitness to drink. The laboratory tests not only city water—but samples from wells, swimming pools, and public beaches in all parts of the county.

Toxicity is sometimes tested by placing guppies in samples of suspicious water. If the fish expire, it's a sure sign the water is suffering from either lack of oxygen or some form of pollution.

A high bacteria count is the chief menace in drinking water. When this is suspected, special millipore filtration tests speed up the routine diagnosis of the samples. The 10 members of the laboratory staff immediately swing into action, working around the clock to analyze the water in less than 18 hours and submit their findings to the Erie County health commissioner, Dr. William E. Mosher, and the health department engineer.

Such an emergency occurred on January 13, 1964, when Lake Erie dropped to its lowest level in 24 years, causing slush ice to block the intake to the Colonel Ward pumping station. After receiving a laboratory report that contaminated water was pouring through the rusty pipes of the auxiliary Massachusetts Avenue pumping station. Dr. Mosher issued this warning:

"This is an emergency. All citizens of Buffalo are warned not to drink water without boiling it at least 5 minutes. This boil order is being issued by the health department because of an emergency at the water intake. I repeat, Buffalo water is unsafe to drink. It must be boiled before drinking until further notice."

All Buffalo schools were ordered closed as low water pressure continued to plague the city, which normally uses 120 million gallons of water on a winter day.

The old Niagara River intake—pressed into service for the first time in 30 years—supplied about 70 million gallons, or three-fourths of the city's requirements. It was sediment from this old intake * * * plus the lack of filtration facilities at the Massachusetts pumping station * * * that resulted in the "boil water" order. The water entering the well at the Massachusetts station was at first very muddy. Massive doses of chlorine made the water safe * * * but quite unpalatable. As the crisis continued, Dr. Mosher was forced to issue another order:

"I've been advised that we are losing about 30 million gallons of water a day in our systems and, therefore, it has become necessary for me to ask all residents of Buffalo to use water only for essential purposes such as cooking. Water should not be used for laundry and so on. I'm also directing industry to reduce its water to the barest minimum and to use it only for emergency purposes."

In 24 hours, Buffalo's water emergency was over. The boil water order was rescinded * * * schools reopened * * * and affected factories resumed normal operations.

However, the health department—in its role of "watchdog" over the city's water supply—still cautioned citizens to run their tap water for at least 3 minutes before using it for drinking purposes.

The job of clearing the portholes to the clogged water intake was carried out by an Army surplus vehicle whose path was cleared through the ice fields by the Buffalo fireboat.

The military vessel used a scoop to remove some of the ice * * * then lowered small dynamite charges to blast open each of the 12 ice-clogged portholes.

No similar threat to Buffalo's water supply is expected to be posed this winter as the result of a city project now underway at the Lake Erie intake. First * * * dredges scooped away debris from the bottom of the lake around the intake and loaded it onto scows for dumping in deep water off Lackawanna. An estimated 25,000 cubic yards of debris was removed to permit a freer flow into the underwater ports of the intake. Later * * * specially fabricated metal "elbows" were attached to the intake. The 11-ton elbows are designed to lower the level at which water enters the intake.

Aside from such freak quirks of nature, along with the unavoidable runoff of filth after floods or heavy rainstorms when more than the normal amount of pollution pours into drains, the chief source of contaminated water is untreated sewage.

Conditions in Lake Erie were described recently by Frank P. Briggs, Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior, as "dangerous, deplorable and devastating." He charged that one of the chief reasons was "the indiscriminate dumping of domestice sewage by lakefront cities."

But Buffalo has a better record than most. Briggs admitted that the city still supplies good drinking water and has corrected a pollution problem that once was one of the worst on the lake.

Prior to 1930, municipalities paid little attention to the problem of providing treatment for sewage. State law at the time called for pollution abatement only in the case of a direct health menace.

But after an outbreak of disease affecting 40,000 residents of Niagara Falls * * * where the drinking water was polluted by untreated

sewage flowing down the river from Buffalo * * * special legislation was passed in 1935 creating the Buffalo Sewer Authority. The authority, which operates and maintains the city's 795-mile-long sewage system, inaugurated the construction of the first large-scale treatment works in New York State. It is now considered among the finest in the Nation.

The Bird Island sewage treatment plant, a complex of buildings, also accomodates several other county sewage systems. The primary purpose of the plant, which began operations on July 1, 1938, is to dispose of 61,000 pounds of daily waste without endangering the health of the city or other communities. It also decomposes, deodorizes, and disinfects sewage in a series of important steps that ultimately result in the discharge of nearly purified water into the Niagara River. So pure, in fact, that as one conservationist has pointed out, one cup of water out of every 20 drawn from a faucet in the average community has already been through a sewer.

But despite the effectiveness of this sewage control, polluted water from other sources poses a constant problem. One of these is industrial waste—which affects the waters of western New York in a special way. This is because Lake Erie is the shallowest of the Great Lakes and also serves the largest population. As a result, it has become the most heavily polluted of all the lakes. The fact that the lake level is now far below normal intensifies the pollution problem because water in vast quantities is required to dissolve the many industrial wastes poured into this lifestream of industry and commerce. But in the past 15 years local industries have spent tens of millions of dollars in attempts to rid the waters of these toxic materials. And—climaxing their efforts—a giant construction project to help combat water pollution in the Buffalo River is now nearing completion. When this $8 million water-cooling project is put into operation, it will provide five major plants with a regular, dependable supply of raw, untreated lake water for industrial use.

A huge intake is being built in Lake Erie with a pumping station offshore. A network of pipes will reach out from the station and deliver at least 100 million gallons of water daily to the five plants. After being used once, the water will be discharged into the Buffalo River—eliminating much of its pollution by ending stagnation and providing a steady flow of water to move out accumulated wastes.

Great Lakes water in some areas is so pure that it can safely be used to fill the cells of storage batteries; but, locally, industrial waste was blamed for the area's worst fish kill 10 years ago when tens of thousands of fish died in the Niagara River near the entrance to the Erie Barge Canal. They succumbed to deadly cyanide dumped into the water by a nearby industrial plant. Similar fish kills on a slightly lesser scale occurred in August 1963, in the Erie Canal near Lockport, a month earlier in Lake Erie near Silver Creek, and a short while before that along the Buffalo waterfront. Cyanide was again blamed for the river kill, lack of oxygen in Lockport, and a combination of both in Silver Creek.

As a result of this poisoning of the waters by industrial waste, Secretary Briggs reports great changes in the fish population of Lake Erie, once the most productive fishery of the 5 Great Lakes. He points out that 10 years ago the lake yielded almost 28 million pounds of excellent fish while last year it yielded 18 million pounds of mostly trash fish.

An industrial acid once seared the skin off a swimmer at Times Beach on Buffalo's waterfront—which has since been declared unfit for swimming.

Other summer beaches also pose perennial summer pollution problems—blamed both on sewage and industrial waste. Almost every summer in recent years Dunkirk's two Lake Erie beaches have been closed to swimmers after tests showed a high bacteria count. Beaches at Jamestown and Silver Creek also have been closed because of similar unsanitary conditions.

In contrast—with the exception of Times Beach—bathers sport and splash at most Erie County beaches all summer long in clear, uncontaminated water.

Agriculture, as well as industry, contributes to pollution by pouring fertilizer products and pesticides into the public water supply. Their effect on health has not yet been fully determined—but some scientists believe small quantities may accumulate in the system until there's a big enough concentration to kill not only bugs but human beings.

Garbage dumping—which has literally been a "burning" issue in Buffalo—is often another overlooked contributing factor. Drainage from improperly placed dumping sites adds materially to the massive doses of poison already polluting the lake.

The chief planner of the Erie County planning department, Arthur G. Wingerter, issued this summary of the problem:

"The old-fashioned dumps are frequently attacked for air pollution from open burning and the presence of vermin and insects, but water pollution also is a common result. Existing dumps are all too frequently located at a convenient spot to discharge the refuse over a bank or slope, and normally one would find a stream in the neighborhood of such a situation.

"In the county of Erie we have at least seven open dumps where stream water is polluted as it flows alongside or through the dump sites. In some instances, fish may be seen darting around in the clear waters of the upstream side of the dump. The water emerges on the downstream side in a condition unfit for any human use.

"Is it any wonder that we cannot maintain fish in our streams? Polluted waters destroy the use for all types of recreation. Even some of the accepted landfills on higher sites contribute to stream pollution where they are dug prematurely and allowed to fill with water."

A brandnew type of pollution also is causing growing concern among public health experts. This consists of the "bubbles of trouble" released by detergents * * * whose foaming suds sooner or later infiltrate the city's water supply. Detergents—consisting of oil and coal derivatives—are not as soluble as soap which is made from animal and vegetable fats and oils. Most biologists claim that small concentrations of detergents are not harmful—but, as with pesticides, their final total effect remains a medical mystery. No one is sure what prolonged exposure to small doses will do over a long period of time.

In some New York State areas, glasses of drinking water occasionally have foamy heads like glasses of beer * * * but so far detergents have posed no water pollution problem in Buffalo. In August 1963, Health Commissioner Mosher received word from the U.S. Public Health Service that the detergent level in Lake Erie was "almost unmeasurable."

But, even so, our water pollution problem is far from licked. The State has had the authority since 1949 to haul water polluters into court, but the State attorney general's office has been asked to prosecute only four cases in that 15-year period—none in the Buffalo area.

And the State department of health—which is charged with water pollution control and abatement—can't recall any fines ever being levied under the law which is being violated daily by communities, industries, and individuals.

Stanley P. Spisiak—acting as spokesman for the water resources committee of the New York State Conservation Council—is severely critical of the manner in which the State has handled the matter of water pollution control:

"It is my sincere feeling that the time for pussyfooting and sidestepping has long passed. It matters little as to who or what was to blame for failures in the past to enforce pollution laws. We can, however, benefit from the mistakes we have made in the past.

The most severe and gravest mistake we have made in the past has been our dependence upon the conservation department and its mobile pollution unit to first detect pollution as it exists and, secondly and more importantly, to enforce violation prosecutions when these cases are found.

"I state here for the record that there has been no effective enforcement whatever of any serious nature in the past 20 years nor is there any intent on the part of those in office currently or in the past to enforce any of the pollution laws in the State of New York as they apply to serious cases of industrial pollution.

"We have, constantly, cases in the summertime which are of minor consequence such as the canning factories which are prosecuted. However, the major ones—while they are detected—are permitted to continue. It is my feeling that unless we take the adequate steps now, and immediately, to enforce the existing laws and to change the system under which we operate we are doomed. I state also that I believe the conservation department is not in any position to enforce existing laws and should be relieved of its responsibility in both the detection and enforcement of the existing pollution laws. Their mobile pollution unit currently is the only acceptable means of determining whether pollution exists or not. It is my feeling that if the conservation department is relieved of this responsibility and the responsibility is given to the county and to local county officials we will have adequate enforcement."

The State health department takes the position that better water pollution control is up to the public. Locally, the Erie County director of environmental health, Michael J. Stankewich, had this to say about the pollution problem:

"Here in Erie County our health department, realizing that pollution is not only harmful to health but also detrimental to the growth of the community and damaging to recreational facilities such as bathing beaches, has done much to control pollution by controlling private sewage disposal and real estate subdivisions by persuading many communities and industries to construct treatment plants and seeing to it that these treatment plants are operated and maintained properly and satisfactorily.

"Much has been done to control pollution. I am proud of what has been accomplished and what is being done presently within the scope of our engineering personnel, but much more remains to be done."

Other experts agree that an all-out community attack is the only way to win the whole long war against pollution. Although time consuming and costly, the ultimate result * * * crystal clear water * * * would be the real diamond in the crown of the Queen City of the Lakes.

Medicare Not Good Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, much of the commonsense of the people of our country is reflected in the so-called smalltown newspapers established across our broad land.

One of the editors who effectively speaks for smalltown America is C. W. Brown, of the Oconomowoc Enterprise, Oconomowoc, Wis. His words on medicare, as usual, are couched in terms of good sense. I commend his recent editorial to my colleagues:

MEDICARE NOT GOOD ENOUGH

If the Federal Government wants to be a paternal father, OK, provided it is limited to need without meddling into the lives of persons who can be and want to be dignified, proud, self-sustaining, independent citizens.

Those who are in need (not just the elderly) should have help. Everybody wants them to have it, but why in the name of commonsense should the Federal Government pass laws to meddle in the personal affairs of the great mass of people, take their money away only to take over what the great majority can do and are doing for themselves, with their own means and/or by private insurance. That is exactly what big government is doing and wants to do more of, just to accomplish what everybody wants to do for those who really need it, without going beyond where the need exists.

Actually, an amendment to the Kerr-Mills medical aid bill would do a magnificent job without involving everybody, whether they need it or not. The amendment would be to start aid at a higher level of income and regulate the amount of aid that is given to the individual based on a graduated scale in proportion to his income. If some States wouldn't cooperate let the Federal Government do it if necessary. One method would be for the Federal Government to pay a higher percentage of the share of the cost. Under that system all States would want to come in. Since, at present, some States give aid at too low a level a minimum could be established and made so attractive to the States that they all would have it. That would take care of the need with dignity and let the rest of the people do what they want to do for themselves. The great majority now have private insurance which is the way they want it. The cost to the public would be but a fraction of the so-called medicare program. In addition this would not be tied to social security.

Medicare on the other hand obviously would mess up social security and possibly jeopardize it. In tying it to social security there would be added to an established program a cost factor which no one knows how much it will be. One former respected Government estimator on insurance for many years frankly stated the the Government's present estimate is only one-third and probably less than a third of what the actual experience will be. That alone is frightening enough to make people under social security violently opposed to tying social security to so-called medicare.

Another big advantage is that if the Government (Federal and State) directly pays the costs (only to those who need it) it would be part of the Federal budget where it belongs. Already too many items never appear on the budget so that the citizen never knows the full extent his government costs him. Social security assessment cost alone is headed into 10 percent of payroll up to $5,600 per year (that's just under 10 times its original cost—2 percent on the first $3,000 of income). Adding a continuing skyrocketing cost of medicare into that program could well result in a tragic mess and a needless one because the great majority do not need it. Yet the Government wants to force that cost into the program. The plan actually borders on the fantastic and one of fiscal irresponsibility. If medicare is forced down the general public's throat, it simply must be as a separate operation.

The truth is that medicare itself is not good enough. It does not pay doctor or drug bills. Hospital services are limited in time and only partially paid. And imagine the imposibility of providing visiting nurses care (in the medicare bill) of up to 240 home calls a year—across the Nation into such as the plains of Wyoming to the slums of New York. And imagine the countless number of people required to administer the program and the added costs involved when basically the need is for so relatively few. Something better should be offered for the needy which can be done at certainly far less cost.

Editorial on Death of Former Justice Frankfurter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, there have been many words written and spoken praising the life and contributions of Felix Frankfurter. This was a man who gave much to the interpretation and practice of American law and jurisprudence.

A recent editorial in the Connecticut Jewish Ledger gives the highest praise to Mr. Frankfurter, a praise he fully deserved.

Under leave of the House to extend my remarks, I include this editorial in the RECORD:

FELIX FRANKFURTER

The Grim Reaper has visited American life this week and snatched from our midst one of the luminous and particularly gifted spirits of our generation. The death of Felix Frankfurter, while it occurred in the fullness of his years, nevertheless improverishes us and America is the poorer for his going even as America has been the better and the richer for his long and distinguished life of service.

It is not for us to pass judgment upon his philosophy of law or his interpretation of the U.S. Constitution. This has been done, and will continue to be done, by those who are experts in that field. But this we know, that Felix Frankfurter did not think of law or jurisprudence merely as something that is inanimate or impersonal. Law, to him, was always alive and inasmuch as law and people are inseparable, he saw the law as an instrumentality for the happier and more secure life of the people of the United States even as he saw people as the free beneficiaries of disciplined, responsible, enlightened progressive guidance and direction for wholesome, useful and creative living. In this attitude, he was a son of the Jewish heritage which conceived of law as a guide on the way of life and as a challenge to responsible living.

Outside of the realm of jurisprudence and the Constitution, Felix Frankfurter also made a significant contribution to the major fact of modern Jewish history in that he was allied with the late Louis D. Brandeis in important stages of the development of a new Jewish life in Palestine before the creation of the State of Israel, and remained interested and concerned in this historic phenomenon.

He was an inspired and inspiring teacher and through his interpretations of the law, whether accepted or rejected by his judicial colleagues, he profoundly influenced the course of America, indeed, of human life.

As his Jewish brethren, we rejoice in the many contributions which he made. As his fellow Americans, we salute and bless his memory in gratitude.

Challenge to Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1965

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call the attention of this body to the annual Veterans of Foreign Wars nationwide Voice of Democracy contest. This year, more than 250,000 high school students participated in the contest, competing for the 4 scholarships which are awarded as top prizes.

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington for the final judging as guests of the VFW.

Indiana's winner is Miss Nancy Tellman, of my hometown of Columbus.

Her speech is a remarkable example of the awareness of the vast majority of America's young men and women of their responsibilities as citizens who will soon inherit the task of leading our Nation.

I should like to enter the full text of her speech in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

CHALLENGE TO LEADERSHIP

(By Nancy Tellman)

Our world today is not a quiet one. It is one in which firing squads, terrorist bombs, barricades, force, and fear, are very real in the daily lives of our fellowmen. Hitler's gas chambers and Khrushchev's tanks in Budapest are chapters not of ancient but of modern history. So are the police dogs of Birmingham. The Vietcong is real. The Berlin Wall is real. In short, threats to our democracy and freedom are found all over this unhappy planet. If ever there were a time to rise up and be counted as a citizen, it is now, for the strength of a democracy is never greater than the will of the people to uphold it.

Our democracy was set up emphasizing the liberty and worth of the individual. With the population explosion and "millions and billions" used as common, everyday words, it is hard to think in terms of only the individual. Yet I believe that is the secret to our world. The value of all human arrangements must be measured by what they do to enhance the life of the individual. You and I as individuals should develop ourselves to our full potential and become good citizens of our country, our State, our county, our own community. But today a

good citizen is more than one who votes, more than one who keeps himself informed about his government, more than one who believes in principles.

Thomas Jefferson declared that all men have God-given inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But let's be realistic—not all of our moral and social conflicts are going to be solved in this one statement. Benjamin Franklin once said, "To get the bad customs of a country changed, it is first necessary to remove the prejudices of the people." To free ourselves from prejudice, an education is a necessity. An education provides the knowledge to intelligently discuss and question the ideas of others. It is the responsibility of a good citizen to think for himself.

This old world may be sorely troubled, but it is far from being a hopeless mess. Hardly a day passes without the opportunity to stand up and be counted on some important issue. However, there seems to be an unwillingness to speak out publicly against the evils which we lament privately. Our motto seems to be: "Don't get involved. Let somebody else stick his neck out." We have too much wishbone and not enough backbone. We cannot passively enjoy our government and our democratic way of life. We must steadily create it. The ideal citizen of a democracy has enough spirit to question the decisions of his leaders and enough sense of responsibility to let decisions be made. He has enough pride to refused to be awed by authority and enough humility to recognize that he, too, is limited in knowledge. Even at my age, I have begun to realize this, and I have learned that there are no short cuts, free rides, or sure things in life. And there are no substitutes for hard work, courage, imagination, and enthusiasm.

This is what it takes to be a good citizen. And don't think for one moment that we can't do it—because the last four letters of the word American spell "I can." This is our challenge to citizenship.

Coral Gables, Fla., High School Debaters Take Top Honors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Coral Gables High is one of the many fine schools in the Fourth Congressional District of Florida whose students continue to excel academically and in extracurricular activities.

On February 21, 1965, the Coral Gables High debate team was awarded the trophy as it made a clean sweep in winning all three categories in the 10th annual high school Cherry Blossom National Invitational Debate Tournament sponsored by Georgetown University.

Daniel S. Schwartz took top honors, being named the best speaker among the 400 competing debaters. Daniel has won many other debating honors among which was his selection last year as the Florida winner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy contest.

Dave Weiss and Wayne Silver were named in the top 20 and top 10 debaters, respectively.

Also, Daniel Schwartz and Wayne Silver took top honors of the 182 teams in the 2-man debating competition.

Meanwhile, the team composed of Joel Perwin, Dave Weiss, Wayne Silver, and Daniel Schwartz won first place in the four-man debating team competition. This team has won nearly every major tournament entered this year.

The Georgetown University tournament, which began on Friday, February 19, and went through Sunday, February 21, was one of the largest high school tournaments ever held with over 100 schools from 30 States participating.

The winners of the two-man competition, Dave Weiss and Dan Schwartz, were presented the Ryder Challenge Cup, named in honor of Father Ryder who established the Georgetown Philodemic Debating Society in 1831. The winners of the trophy went through six preliminary rounds which narrowed the field to 16 teams. These qualifying teams then met in four sudden-death rounds, leaving eight teams, then four, then two, and finally the winning team. The Coral Gables team won a total of 10 straight debates, defeating Fordham College Preparatory School of New York in the final round for top honors.

The topic for the debates was "Resolved, That Nuclear Weapons Should Be Placed Under the Control of an International Organization." The judges awarded the debate to Coral Gables by a score of 6 to 1.

Each year many of us in Congress, if not all, on request, furnish material on the national debate topic to students all over the country. I am sure my colleagues will be pleased to learn that students appreciate and do use the material successfully. Dan Schwartz in a recent letter to me said in part:

> I am writing this to you, sir, because you were very instrumental in helping us achieve the honors we have won this year.

The real credit, of course, goes to these fine young competitors, their outstanding coach Kenneth N. Rosenthal, and to the excellent teachers of their school. I am sure my colleagues join me in extending hearty congratulations to them all.

Tribute to Congresswoman Bolton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 27 our esteemed colleague, the gentlelady from Ohio, FRANCES P. BOLTON, observed her 25th anniversary as a Member of this body. For over 15 of those years, I have been privileged to serve with the gentlelady on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Her dedicated and untiring efforts on the committee during some of the most critical periods in our Nation's history have helped shape the successful policies that have carried us through those troubled times.

Mr. Speaker, I have found FRANCES BOLTON a constant source of inspiration and assistance during these many years of our close association. I wish to extend my personal congratulations to the gracious lady for her long service and many great achievements.

Traveling Brotherhood Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is heartwarming to learn that some men are making positive efforts to lead this world to full brotherhood.

Among these men are four Connecticut theologians from four different faiths who have joined together as a team which goes on television, to luncheons, to schools, and other places to discuss interreligious and interracial problems.

The Connecticut Jewish Ledger recently printed an article about this group and under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include the article in the RECORD at this point:

FOUR CLERGYMEN FORGE UNIQUE TRAVELING BROTHERHOOD TEAM

HARTFORD.—A unique team of clergymen—possibly the first of its kind in the country—has been created in this part of Connecticut. While its goals have been modest, its successes already are spectacular.

Dubbed the "brotherhood team," this quartet has gone on television once a month to engage in serious discussion of interreligious and interracial problems. From these TV symposiums have come numerous engagements before organizations and high school groups.

The group was originated by Rabbi Henry Okolica of Congregation Tephereth Israel, New Britain, who originally asked them to appear on his weekly Sunday morning program on WHNB-TV, channel 30—"Jewish Life." Joining Rabbi Okolica on the panel were the Reverend Joseph Odell of St. Gertrude's Roman Catholic Church, Windsor; the Reverend Allan House O'Neill of St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, Meriden; and the Reverend Richard A. Battles, Jr., of Mount Olive Baptist Church, Hartford.

"It was felt," Rabbi Okolica pointed out, "that this group could do a great deal to improve race relations and brotherhood in the area. The team has grown to appreciate one another's viewpoint in their differences in theological matters. It is hoped that it can help create a better understanding of all men."

CONTINUE TV APPEARANCES

While continuing once-a-month television appearances on "Jewish Life," the brotherhood team has spoken at Kiwanis Club meetings, high school assemblies, ORT gatherings, and the like.

In Waterbury, a high school assembly was scheduled to introduce to the young people the thought that this Nation needs a constant reminder of its obligation to assure all men freedom of opportunity.

"Being a member of the team," Father Odell told the Connecticut Jewish Ledger, "has done more for me than anyone. It

has been an inspiration to see the reaction of the young people, the men's groups. I believe that a spiritual growth has taken place in all those who witness these meetings. A dimension has been added to the understanding of the dignity of the human person."

Father Odell praised Rabbi Okolica for his initial push and for being "the main factor in developing the panel into a team."

Father O'Neill pointed out that the good of it has been the fact that people of very different points of view have sat down together.

NO FRACTURED FRIENDSHIPS

"While we may disagree violently on theological matters," the Meriden clergyman declared, "there are many other areas in which we can agree. And, most important, when we disagree, it doesn't fracture the friendship."

He added, "The difference in viewpoints has added to the richness of the team's work." He said that questions thrown at the panel in high school assemblies show that "the kids are ahead of the adults on questions of race."

The Reverend Mr. Battles, himself a leader of the Negro community in the civil rights struggle, said, "I feel privileged to serve on this team. Each of us has had an opportunity to express personal opinions."

Rabbi Rosenblum's Prayer for Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the famous 369th Veterans Association, Inc. had its installation of national officers at the 369th Regiment Armory on Sunday, January 31, 1965. At this very impressive ceremony William K. De Fossett, who has served the association with unusual dedication, was again installed as the national president. I extend my congratulations to him and the other officers of this splendid organization. It was a special privilege for me to speak at the ceremonies, and I am honored to belong to the 369th Veterans Association.

Rabbi William F. Rosenblum, of Temple Israel, chaplain, 369th Veterans Association, delivered a commemorative prayer for Sir Winston Churchill. Dr. Rosenblum's prayer is so beautifully written and so fitting that I wish to share it with my colleagues.

Dr. Rosenblum's inspiring tribute to Sir Winston Churchill follows:

COMMEMORATIVE PRAYER FOR SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL DELIVERED AT THE INSTALLATION OF OFFICERS CEREMONY OF THE 369TH VETERANS' ASSOCIATION, INC., SUNDAY, JANUARY 31, 1965

(By Rev. Dr. William F. Rosenblum, chaplain, 369th Veterans' Association, rabbi, Temple Israel of the city of New York)

Our God and Father of us all, into Thy presence a saddened yet grateful Nation, indeed a sorrowful but grateful world but yesterday committed one of their noblest sons: Sir Winston Churchill.

Unyielding in war, he was equally steadfast in peace in the defense of freedom and justice. He served not alone his native land, but all to whom liberty is dear.

O Lord, may we, who understand how precious and imperative are justice and freedom, resolve that the remembrance of this great man of our century, whose pen was ever as mighty as his sword, will inspire us to walk in his path; to make his design for living our guide for the future—never seeking only what is convenient, never hesitating to become involved and to sacrifice, never surrendering to the wrong.

Thus will we be able to establish here among men that brotherhood which will reflect Thy fatherhood and bear witness to Thy majesty, Thy glory, and Thy unity. Amen and amen.

Teenage Drinking in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it was encouraging news to those of us who are seeking to persuade New York State to raise its drinking age from 18 to 21 to note on the front pages of the New York Times and New York Herald Tribune for today, March 2, that Governor Rockefeller has announced for the first time that he would sign such a bill if the legislature passed it.

Governor Rockefeller's position represents a very significant and welcome change. While he remains somewhat skeptical about the good effects of raising New York's minimum legal drinking age—and none of us, Mr. Speaker, look on such a step as a cure-all—the Governor recognizes that a great many people in and out of the State feel very strongly about the need for the change. And he concedes that "it is bound to have beneficial effects."

At the same time, unfortunately, the majority leader of the State senate, Mr. Joseph Zaretzki, appears to have experienced a change of heart of the negative kind. As recently as February 22, Mr. Zaretzki stated he had no position on the drinking issue and seemed to concur in the opinion of his colleague, Assembly Speaker Anthony J. Travia, that a bill increasing the drinking age to 21 would be voted on by the legislature for the first time this year. Now, however, a few days later, he is quoted as seeing no need for the bill. I hope, before a decision must be made, that he will review his party's official position on this issue and will reflect further on the high cost—in terms of human lives and the public welfare—of New York's present law both for his own State and its several neighbors.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 2, 1965]

GOVERNOR YIELDS ON DRINKING AGE—SAYS HE WOULD SIGN 21 AGE LIMIT BILL, BUT CONTENDS IT IS NOT A MAJOR SOLUTION

(By Douglas Robinson)

ALBANY, March 1.—Governor Rockefeller said today that he would approve a bill to raise New York's minimum drinking age from 18 to 21 should the legislature pass such a measure.

In announcing his approval, Mr. Rockefeller said he was convinced that raising the minimum age was "not going to be a major solution" to the problem of teenage drinking.

In the legislature, meanwhile, the Democrats pushed through bills to reestablish mandatory free tuition at the City University of New York. However, Mr. Rockefeller warned that he would veto any such measure sent to him for signature.

The Governor made his statement on teenage drinking at the opening of a news conference in the Red Room of the executive suite in the capitol.

ADDRESSES CHURCH GROUP

Later, at a conference of the State Council of Churches, Mr. Rockefeller repeated his belief that such a law would not solve "the serious problems that concern all of us.

"But because so many people felt so strongly and it is bound to have beneficial effects—although I think some people overestimate some of them—I will sign it," he added.

The audience applauded the Governor's pledge. The group, which represents Protestant churches throughout the State, has sought a 21-year limit for several years.

There are at least 6 measures that have been filed in the current legislative session that would raise the drinking age to 21 throughout the State or in New York City. Similar legislation has been offered in previous years but none has come to a vote.

STATE UNDER PRESSURE

In recent months, New York has come under increasing pressure from New Jersey and Connecticut, both of which have 21-year limits, to impose a standard age level. Both States contend that a uniform drinking age of 21 would reduce highway deaths of young people who cross into New York to drink.

Last month Governor Rockefeller said that raising the age limit might ameliorate the conflict but added that he would take no action until the legislature had a chance to consider bills before it.

At the time, the Governor said that "changing the law won't solve the problem." Rather, he said, "a good deal could be done by the example set in the home."

Joseph Zaretzki, the senate majority leader, indicated that he saw no need for the bill when he said today that "it will not stop drinking by teeanagers." He said that "the least we could do or should do is local option."

"I don't think you can stop drinking by law," he asserted. "The home influence is the best preventive I know."

Mr. Zaretzki's comments put him in opposition to the 1962 Democratic State platform and to a Democratic task force that earlier this year urged adoption of a 21-year age limit.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 2, 1965]

GOVERNOR WOULD SIGN DRINK AT 21

(By Richard L. Madden)

ALBANY.—Governor Rockefeller discolsed yesterday that he is ready to sign a bill raising the minimum drinking age in the State from 18 to 21. But the Democrat-controlled legislature did not seem eager to pass it.

* * * * *

Mr. Rockefeller's pledge to sign a measure increasing the drinking age came at a meeting with representatives of the New York State Council of Churches, which had long advocated such a move.

The Governor told a news conference later he had reiterated his view that increasing the drinking age would "not be a major solution" to the problem of teenage drinking.

"However," Mr. Rockefeller said, "I stated that if a bill is passed I would sign it."

It was a major policy shift by the Governor, who had been reluctant to change the

law on the ground that control of teenage drinking was the responsibility of the home.

Officials of Pennsylvania and Connecticut, where the drinking age is 21, have long urged New York to raise its drinking age. They have contended that their teenagers cross the State line and drink in New York, and sometimes, as a result, are victims of tragic automobile accidents on the way home.

Whether the Democrat-controlled legislature will sanction a drinking-age increase for the Governor's signature was a question. Assembly Speaker Anthony J. Travia, of Brooklyn, said he had not discussed such a measure with his Democratic colleagues. Senate Majority Leader Joseph Zaretzki, of Manhattan, noted that the measure was being studied by the legislative excise committees, but observed, "You can't stop drinking by a law."

Mr. Zaretzki suggested that "home influences" were the best measures against teenage drinking. Some form of local option that will give counties adjacent to neighboring States the power to regulate drinking age might be "a possibility," Mr. Zaretzki said.

Editorial Praising Senator Dodd's Statement on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I recently have made several statements concerning my belief that the United States would be making a sad mistake to fail to live up to her commitments to the free, anti-Communist world and to South Vietnam by pulling out of that country at this time.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, has also voiced his views on this vital question and in doing so recently gave one of the best speeches yet delivered on the subject.

The Washington Star has taken note of Senator DODD's speech. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the Star.

The editorial follows:

DODD ON VIETNAM

One of the most impressive speeches to date on Vietnam has been delivered by Democratic Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut. It provides an interesting obligato to the swelling chorus of negotiation talk.

The Senator has not sugar-coated his words. He thinks some of his friends and colleagues, such as CHURCH, of Idaho, and MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, are off their rockers when they call for negotiation now with the Communists. He has put forward a powerful argument against retreat at this time. And he has set forth a devastating, even alarming, assessment of the so-called militant Buddhists. With events to back him up, he has left little room for doubt that the leaders of these vaguely organized religionists serve the Communist cause.

In presenting this thesis, Senator DODD—a man distinguished for many things, including his role as a prosecutor of the Nazis at the Nuremburg trials—has put special emphasis on the fact that the free South Vietnamese are fervent fighters against the guerrillas of the Communist-led Vietcong. The statistics are striking and encouraging, despite Saigon's political instability. In the Senator's words, the South Vietnamese are one of the most anti-Communist people in the world. And they include over a million refugees who have fled from the Red north in a fighting spirit.

There are other statistics worth quoting. Some people have the idea, because of confusing headlines and rather shallow news stories, that the free Vietnamese are being clobbered by the Red guerrillas. Nothing could be further from the truth. Senator DODD has cited verifiable figures showing that the Communists, in terms of casualties, are still very much on the losing end of the struggle.

So there is much to be said for Senator DODD's basic thesis that the United States should yield no ground in Vietnam. Instead, and we agree, he advocates a tough line to make clear to Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow that they will be risking a war of incalculable consequences if they seriously try to drive us out of Asia and destroy what is left of freedom there.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6815 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*
Grider, George W., *Tenn*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on February 19 the National Space Club and the Aviation Space Writers Association at a joint meeting in the Mayflower Hotel honored Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, retired, on the third anniversary of the first U.S. manned orbital flight made on February 20, 1962.

Many of us have forgotten this great accomplishment and the confidence that it reestablished in this country after having seen the Russians make great headway in the field of astronautics.

Colonel Glenn made a very fine speech on this occasion and I am happy to make it a part of these remarks and to also include the opening remarks of President Thomas Turner of the National Space Club:

OPENING REMARKS OF PRESIDENT THOMAS TURNER OF THE NATIONAL SPACE CLUB

It is a great honor to have so many friends of John Glenn here today to celebrate the third anniversary of the first U.S. manned orbital flight. In introducing Colonel Glenn, I would like first to show a film that will serve to take us all back to that great day 3 years ago when for a few moments all our hearts stood still. Our speaker is a man who was born in Cambridge, Ohio. He was educated at Muskingham College and attended the University of Maryland.

During World War II he fought as a fighter pilot in the Marshall Islands with the U.S. Marine Corps and successfully completed 59 missions; a few years later during the Korean conflict, he once again served in combat against the enemy, this time completing 63 missions. He has been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross five times and the Air Medal with 18 clusters.

Prior to joining the National Aeronautic Space Administration, he went through the Test Pilots School at Patuxent River and also served at the U.S. Navy Bureau of Aeronautics, now the Bureau of Weapons, as a member of its fighter design branch.

In 1962 he was awarded the National Aeronautic and Space Administration's Distinguished Service Medal by the late President John F. Kennedy for his epic flight around the earth on February 20, 1962. I would like to introduce Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., astronaut, consultant at the National Aeronautic and Space Administration, director of the Royal Crown Cola Co., and governor of the National Space Club.

REMARKS BY COL. JOHN GLENN, NATIONAL SPACE CLUB LUNCHEON, FEBRUARY 19, 1965

After events that have affected me in the past year, it might be appropriate to open my remarks by saying, "A funny thing happened on the way to the Senate." Some of the people at the Marriott Motor Hotel looked rather aghast at me, for I must be the only man ever to check in and specify a room with no bath and no mirrors.

An anniversary is always a time of reminiscing, of taking stock and of noting subsequent events. Looking back over the 3 years since the flight of Friendship 7, I am impressed most of all by the tremendous progress the United States has made in space science and technology.

I am proud of the determination the American people have shown to become the world's leading space-faring nation.

This is a feasible, necessary, and noble goal. We have this within our capability to do, and could not hold our heads high as Americans of the 1960's if we aimed at anything less.

When I had the great honor of appearing before a joint meeting of the Congress after my flight, I spoke of the unbounded future I saw for space exploration. I said then, "I feel that we are on the brink of an era of expansion of knowledge about ourselves and our surroundings that is beyond description or comprehension at this time. Our efforts today and what we have done so far are but small building blocks on a very high pyramid to come."

A quick review of what has been accomplished in these 3 years bears out the accuracy of that hope and prediction. To go back just a little further than 3 years, it is almost impossible for any of us to believe that the whole space era has been covered in the short time since our grapefruit-sized Explorer I first "beeped" its way around the earth.

Three years ago, we were very pleased with the three orbits of the Friendship 7 and felt that all mission objectives were met. Yet, this year or next, the Gemini astronauts expect to make at least a 7-day flight and we look forward to the Apollo lunar landings in a few years.

Three years ago, the Atlas booster was the best we had available for manned space flight, but it was not yet renowned for its reliability.

I can well remember one of my first trips to then Cape Canaveral for the purpose of watching a night Atlas launch. My observation point was on the closest camera site to the launch pad. After several holds, a fact of life we became more familiar with on several later dates, the Atlas was launched and appeared to be programing as planned. As it went through the high-q area of greatest aerodynamic force, it suddenly erupted into the most beautifully awesome fireball I had ever seen. Needless to say, this particular event did not do much to build confidence for a budding astronaut. Debris came down over quite a wide area. I think it was during these observations that we conceived the idea that the best way to insure reliability would be for all booster engineers to watch each launch from only a canvas-covered blockhouse just as close to the launch pad as we could persuade them to get. In fact, in checking some of my notes made 3 years ago today, the day before the launch, just about this time, at 1:30 p.m., we were sitting in a booster review meeting going over all the last details of booster checkout.

Today, however, the Atlas booster has a superb record of 28 straight successes in NASA and Air Force use, including, I am happy to say, the four Mercury flights in earth orbit. I am sure most of you watched TV on Wednesday when the Atlas-Agena successfully launched Ranger VIII.

Three years ago, Mercury spacecraft were limited in weight to about 3,000 pounds. Today, the Saturn I booster is operational and can put 22,500 pounds into earth orbit, or seven times the weight of Mercury. Saturn I-B, which will begin flying next year, will be able to orbit a payload equal to 11 Mercury spacecraft. Saturn V, which will fly in 1967, will be able to orbit a payload equal to more than 90 Mercuries. That's some jump—but it is no more than typical of the great gains we are making in national space capabilities.

Three years ago, shortly after my flight, Ranger III missed the moon by 22,000 miles and its TV pictures were unusable. But the Ranger people did not give up and you know the brilliant results achieved from Ranger VII and the equally significant achievements we expect from Ranger VIII tomorrow.

Three years ago, Telstar and Relay had not yet reached the launch pad, and achievement of synchronous orbit sounded good in theory, but had never been demonstrated. Today, Telstar, Relay, and Syncom have become known around the word as examples of American technological leadership and American belief in putting our technology to work for mankind.

Our Tiros and Nimbus weather satellites have told the same story to the world. Three years ago, we had Tiros III at work. Now it is Tiros IX that marks the 10th consecutive success in our weather satellite launches. Its 9 predecessors have transmitted over 415,000 pictures of the earth's cloud cover. They have photographed every tropical storm and hurricane since 1960 and have been used with tremendous success by the Weather Bureau. As you know, a special hookup has been arranged between Washington and Moscow for exchange of weather satellite data, and this exchange will begin when the Russians get a weather satellite that can match our Tiros.

The pace of our satellite applications program has been so rapid that we can now look forward to the first commercial use of space for global communications this spring and the establishment of the first operational weather satellite network during the coming winter.

The first operational communications satellite will be called Early Bird—and that I am glad to say is not a translation from the Russian. It is a product of private enterprise.

What other uses are coming? On that one, you can let your imagination run wild, for the whole space program is centered on exploration and research and the greatest values will undoubtedly come from now unknown and unforeseen discoveries. Some of the immediate possible applications were outlined to you in November by Dr. Raffensperger when he mentioned how zero-gravity might lead us into new information on tissue regeneration and healing, or the formation of compounds, or how space-oriented meteorological information might lead us to first efforts at actual weather control, or of how infrared mapping studies could lead to better worldwide commercial fishing through study of ocean currents, water supply through location of underground streams, and many other possible applications.

Even though some information may not be as immediately useful, it all adds to our storehouse of knowledge which helps give us a mastery of the future.

Three years ago, no nation had yet made a successful fly by mission to Mars or Venus, although the Russians had been trying mightily—and still are. Then came Mariner II, which demonstrated great advances in spacecraft technology, midcourse changes in direction, and interplanetary communications, and became the first and still the only spacecraft from earth to make closeup observations of another planet.

The accuracy requirements for all these missions are almost incomprehensible and are one of the least understood parts of the space program. A good case in point was the launch of Friendship 7, 3 years ago. The speed at insertion into orbit was over 25,000 feet per second, or 5 miles per second, and the booster and spacecraft were accelerating at approximately 240 feet per second at a steadily increasing rate. At booster cutoff, each error of 1.4 feet per second resulted in a difference of approximately 1 mile in apogee on the far side of the earth. When you consider that before the onboard signal for cutoff was received, information had to be obtained by radar at the Cape, transmitted by landline to Goddard, run through the computers, returned by landline to the Cape, checked against Cape data and then transmitted 350 miles downrange to the spacecraft, still allowing time for onboard delays in operation of relays, valves, and thrust termination, it looks like an almost impossibly accurate requirement.

Those accuracies, however, are rather crude compared with some now being obtained on the deep space probes.

Now we have Mariner IV which at 6 o'clock tonight will be 20,194,023 miles out from earth on an extremely difficult and significant mission. As you know, there was a checkout of equipment aboard the spacecraft last week that indicates the chances are still good that we will get revealing pictures of Mars next July, when Mariner will be 134 million miles from earth, so far it will take 12½ seconds to get a radio signal back.

Perhaps some day, there will even be reverse Mariner flights approaching the earth and this could cause some problems such as the one I heard about recently which involved a Martian metallic man landing his spacecraft on earth near a service station. He climbed out of the spacecraft, slowly walked over to the gasoline pump, faced it and demanded, "Take me to your leader." Receiving no reply, he repeated the command "Take me to your leader." He finally leaned over close to the gasoline pump and yelled, "If you'd take your finger out of your ear, you could hear me."

Seriously, I don't know what the Mariner flights mean to you. But to me, Mercury plus Mariner and our other projects clearly add up to the promise of men on places well beyond the moon in the not-too-distant future. The unmanned probes and vehicles can give us invaluable forerunning information, but man's unique ability to perceive the new and unknown, analyze its importance, and relate it to practical application, can never be replaced.

I know all of us agreed fully with the words President Johnson wrote to the Congress last month, when he said: "Substantial strides have been made in a very brief span of time—and more are to come. We expect to explore the moon, not just visit it or photograph it. We plan to explore and chart planets as well. We shall expand our earth laboratories into space laboratories and extend our national strength into the space dimension."

That is the spirit that led to passage of the National Aeronautics and Space Act in 1958, the establishment of NASA, the acceleration of our program in 1961, and the determination that our national space program shall continue to add greatly to American power and prestige during each successive year of this decade.

Looking back over the past 3 years, I feel that rapid progress in our national space program has made the Nation safer and stronger.

But I am even more impressed by the potential value of the intangible resources we are creating for the Nation through an active, well-planned and well-balanced space program.

One of the great achievements in these early years of the space age has been the versatile and productive Government-industry-university team which we have brought into being and which helps make maximum use of new information. With our democratic system of government, and our free economic system, and our belief in seeking out the truth, we have created the institutions and the organizational framework to meet whatever challenges our generation and many more generations of Americans may face in space.

Eight years ago, we were not so prepared to welcome or to cope with the space age; but we are today. We look backward in wonder not at what we did 3 years ago, but at the distance we have come since then. We look forward with confidence and great expectations.

Many of you here are and have been vital cogs in our space efforts, for it is one of the greatest team efforts of all time.

I don't need to recount for you the vital role played by many of those you see around you. This is not just an anniversary for me. It's one for all of us, for practically every man here played some role in the events of 3 years ago. But the past is only good as it gives us the tools for tomorrow.

To wax philosophical for a moment, we might liken our space program to one of Plato's allegories. He told of prisoners chained in a cave for so long they had lost touch with reality and felt that their whole existence was wrapped up in the shadows they could see on the wall ahead of them. He goes on to say that if one escaped to the outside world and returned to tell the others of what really lay outside the dark cave, they would probably think him completely crazy.

Even though we have seen such tremendous breakthroughs in scientific knowledge in recent years, our knowledge has necessarily been limited to such a cave, for practically all we know has been limited to this one tiny speck of earth in a much larger environment. But that is in the process of being changed and with a rapidity no one can forecast.

What a tremendous future we have in store.

The Future of Aeronautics in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on January 26 and 27 of this year, the Panel on Science and Technology of the Committee on Science and Astronautics held its 6th meeting. The panel, which is composed of 15 of our country's leading scientists and educators, met with the committee to evaluate the progress of aeronautical research and development as it will affect the future of aeronautics in the United States.

An outstanding member of the panel is Dr. H. Guyford Stever, installed last month as president of the Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh, and a major contributor to the proceedings of the panel meeting. His presentation should be of serious interest to every Member concerned with the growth and advance of aviation in the United States.

Dr. Stever is a man of eminent achievement in science and engineering. He began his career as a staff member of the Radiation Laboratory at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, from which came our radar technology of World War II. He has been a professor of aeronautics and astronautics at MIT and has served as chief scientist to the U.S. Air Force. He has given of himself to the Government for many years as a member of many advisory panels and boards of the Department of Defense. I am sure that, in reading his presentation which follows, you will recognize that he is a man who knows what he is talking about:

THE FUTURE OF AERONAUTICS IN THE UNITED STATES

(By H. Guyford Stever)

The strength of America's expanding economy is based on many factors, not the least of which is the fact that we have the best, most complete, and most used air transportation system for making our economy efficient and effective. The scheduled commercial airlines, which make about 7 million flights a year from almost 600 airfields, are only part of this picture. There are over 10 times that number of airfields in the Nation and most of these are available to 40,000 planes owned by corporations, and another 80,000 planes owned by individuals.

In addition to facilitating the growth of all elements of our economy, this civil aviation itself constitutes a substantial business and therefore a substantial part of that economy.

It is about this civil aviation that we speak today. We are trying to separate it from its sister giant, military aviation. In one sense we can so separate these fields, but in another sense we cannot; for ever since the very beginning of manned aircraft flight a substantial portion of the research and development costs for the technology was paid for by the military aviation section of our Defense Establishment. It was only after World War II, with the advent of guided missiles both defensive and offensive, and later with the birth of space, that military expenditures on flight devices began to diverge away from developments of direct application in civil aviation.

In starting this discussion of the future of civil aviation one must ask whether or not the demand for more service and for greater capability and performance will continue. Most predictions indicate that it will.

Before we ask ourselves what elements of our already strong technology should be further supported in order to improve civil aviation, we must ask ourselves which feature of civil aviation would we like to improve. I have a list in the order roughly of my priority, of desired improvements. The first item on my list for improvement is the elimination or reduction of in-flight delays due to atmospheric conditions, crowding of the airways and landing facilities, and the elimination of delays and cancellations in takeoff time due to weather or any other factor.

The second item in my priority list for improvement of civil aviation is that of increasing the city coverage of the scheduled airlines. The corporation and individually owned planes offer much greater performance here than do scheduled airlines. At first this seems to be a matter only of the

economics of airline operation. Clearly, cities that do not generate much traffic cannot be served with many flights. At present, in fact, the feeder airlines, the short-haul airlines to cities which do not qualify for mainline service, depend heavily on subsidies, sometimes a very large fraction of their total revenues. If technology can reduce the cost of air transportation, the city coverage could be improved.

A third item for improvement is the transportation to and from airports with respect to both time and convenience. The advent of VTOL may improve this considerably; until then, it is a matter of urban transportation.

The fourth item of improvement is the increase in the speed of flight. Actually, as far as the in-flight part of a journey is concerned, already tremendous progress has been made. Eventually, presumably jets will be used even by the short-haul feeder lines. Air travel time has indeed been cut down.

How far does an improvement in speed continue to make sense? The biggest questions with respect to the advent of supersonic transport is simply the problem of spending great resources in order to shorten a flight time which is already short in many cases compared to the ground travel time. Most of you know that half an hour at the terminal is a minimum except for those few cases where aircraft are operated as buses in shuttle flights; if one calculates in addition to the half hour on the ground, another half hour to get to the airport from the center of any city, one discovers that most of the flight time is in fact spent on the ground for flights of a few hundred miles.

Still another area of improvement has to do with increasing comfort. For first-class travel on a modern jet for the hours involved, most passengers are indeed as comfortable as one can expect from travel.

A final area of improvement has to do with safety. Actually, the airlines of the United States have operated for many years well below the one passenger fatality per 100 million passenger miles. This is better than private automobile transportation, although not as good as bus and railroad transportation safety records. Still, there remains a large percentage of American people who have not flown and do not care to fly; their opinions of flying are strongly based upon the crash record of aircraft. They do not consider the statistics.

As a country we have more generally stated objectives for improvement in our civil aeronautics picture. In the first place, we must insure that our economy continues to have the best air transportation system to give it a continuing advantage in world competition. Secondly, it is impcrtant for us to insure that our aeronautical developments are sufficiently great to continue our leadership in home and world sales of our aeronautical products. Third, in technical matters, there is always a matter of recognized world leadership which adds to our stature in the world around us.

What does technology offer in the improvement of civil aeronautics? What will we get from the large sums of money that our Government is spending in aeronautical research? About $1 billion is spent per year by the Department of Defense alone in aeronautical research. The research and development in aeronautics by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, although only a small fraction of their total budget, still is between $100 and $200 million according to one estimate I have seen. The Federal Aviation Agency spends $50 million on research and development. To this amount, already over a billion dollars, goes some private research and development money which is difficult to estimate.

For civil aviation, I believe that the area of technology which needs the greatest support over the years immediately ahead is that of guidance and control so that our air traffic control system can, first, improve the performance of our current air transportation and second, handle the increased volume which has already been indicated can be as much as doubled in the next 10 years.

At the airports, one of the problems that must be solved is the automatic landing of aircraft. Airports are one of the principal bottlenecks and causes of delays in the system. More airports are needed, but particularly automatic techniques for landing aircraft more rapidly are needed.

Another point where air traffic control requires new equipment is to establish an in-flight radar system which gives complete information, that is, three-dimensional information, extremely accurately on aircraft.

I believe that all the fields of engineering and science involved in this area offer more than ample promise to produce quite substantial improvements. In fact, the fields of engineering and science, behind radio radar, communications, inertial tracking, and information handling, are amongst the most promising of all.

These technologies of guidance and control contribute not only to traffic handling capacity, growth, prevention of weather delays, prevention of traffic delays, but also and most importantly, increased safety. If done perfectly, air traffic control would eliminate in-flight collisions and many of the landing accidents due to faulty control in both good or bad weather.

There is one thing to be guarded against. The air traffic control system could be developed in such a way that individually and company owned planes could be priced right out of business, because of the expense of the required guidance and control equipment.

I believe that the next most promising area of technology for improvement of our civil aviation is that of propulsion. Over the decades, and right up to now, most of the major improvements in engines or aircraft have been sponsored by the military services. These military services knew that the long leadtime development item in bringing out a new military aircraft was the engine, requiring several years, possibly a half a decade or more. In the last few years, partly because of the question on the further usefulness of aircraft in military actions, and partly because of the growing expense of each engine development. Engines were planned more specifically for particular aircraft and they tended to slow down the development cycle of the complete aircraft.

Today, fortunately, there seems to be a return to the realization that engine developments must be continuous to make best progress. The Department of Defense is developing new engines for aircraft of the future. And many of their developments will be useful for civil aviation.

Most of the advances in propulsion for civil aviation will come in the field of turbojets and their various derivatives. I consider this field of technology rich in promise in bath variety and magnitude.

A third area of great import to the future of civil aviation is in materials and structures. The development of aircraft to date has been greatly dependent upon the development of new materials. Beginning in the late 1920's, the light metal revolution, the alloys of aluminum and magnesium, and the development of aircraft were practically synonomous, and they are still being improved for subsonic aircraft use. When aircraft designs began pushing into the supersonic regions where the skin temperatures became higher, and the properties of the light metals and their alloys began to deteriorate, the steels came into being. Then followed the titanium revolution, first for jet engine components and later for complete aircraft. It appears, from the small amount of information that has been released on the A-11, that the titanium revolution has been accomplished and that a complete mach 3 airplane has been built using this new technology.

One can ask, are there other revolutions, or even improvements, that are possible, and the answer is generally yes. In the first place, titanium, steel, aluminum, all can be improved in their properties. More important, however, there are potential revolutions. The structural efficiency can be greatly improved if beryllium can be made usable in jet engines and in aircraft. An even greater potential is promised by the boron fiber technology.

Again, the improvements in materials and the structural techniques of using them can be used in many ways. Improvement of the structural efficiency can be used to make smaller aircraft to do a given job, or more effective helicopters and VTOL airplanes or higher speed, longer range aircraft.

A fourth area of technology that offers great promise for aeronautics is aerodynamics. There is very much to be learned in the entire range of Mach numbers from very low to the high subsonic at which we are now flying, and into and above the supersonic. Furthermore, even for the high subsonic speed aircraft, improved aerodynamics such as boundary layer control, reduction of skin friction, the improvement of flaps' design, the employment of blowing to improve flaps, improvement in leading edge stall, getting better airfoil shapes, all will improve aircraft design. In the case of the aerodynamics of lower speed craft, VTOL and so on, helicopters, a tremendous amount of data must be gotten. There seems to be a new field of aeronautical science emerging in which aerodynamics and propulsion are merging. The employment of some engine power, not to insure thrust, but to increase lift or reduce drag as in the case of boundary layer control, or blown flaps, are good examples. Actually, the field is just beginning to yield some of its technical treasures.

In areodynamics, it must be said that the country was harmed by the tendency for individual aerodynamacists and whole research laboratories to shift to the more glamorous higher speed aerodynamic fields. Many of the best aerodynamicists converted themselves first from subsonic to transonic, then transonic to supersonic and on to the extreme hypersonic speeds of reentering space vehicles. Until we interest more young men in the ordinary speed aerodynamics, we will not get all we can out of the field.

As I review my remarks on the promise offered by research and development in the areas of guidance and control, propulsion, materials and structures, and aerodynamics, several conclusions seem to stand out. First, a continued bright future for aeronautics in the United States will not be limited by lack of promise in any of the component technologies. There is no leveling off of possible technical gains. None of the fields are devoid of new promising ideas.

A second conclusion is that research and development in these different fields are supported in quite different ways.

1. In guidance and control, research, development, design are done mostly in industry, some in Government, and a small amount in academic labs. The Government support for component developments is channeled through both the FAA and the Department of Defense. For civil aviation the systems for air traffic control are the responsibility of the FAA.

2. In propulsion almost all of the support of the technology and most of the complete engine developments used in civil aviation have been accomplished in industry, but planned and supported by the military services. Some research is done in Government labs. For light aircraft, exception must be made.

3. In materials most technology comes from the materials and supplying industry, and the structural techniques of using these materials from the aircraft companies. Most of this technology is supported by the military services.

4. Aerodynamics has traditionally been a team effort between the aerodynamic laboratories of the old NACA, now a small part of NASA, the aircraft companies, and the military services with some research done by academic labs. Aerodynamics research has been supported by NASA and the military, and much of the aerodynamic development is done on the big aircraft contracts themselves.

One can truly say that the development program behind civil aviation does not have much centralized planning control. If any of the agencies should decrease the interest and support of aviation for any reason, there would be an imbalance of major proportions created. Possibly here is a point where Government structure and agency responsibility should be restudied. At least the Congress and the administration must continue to balance developments in these many fields.

One of the most important assets in the aeronautical strength of the United States is not served solely by the support of research and development. Within our great areospace industry, we have teams of engineers and businessmen who have mastered the techniques required to engineer, design, construct, test and produce great aircraft. And behind them are the industries supplying the components and materials. Of all of our assets, these may well be the most priceless. Unless these teams are constantly enlivened by in fact going through the entire procedure by coming out with completely new aircraft, they will lose their priceless competence. Fortunately, as the number of the types of aircraft have been reduced, these great companies have been able to keep their teams together and their systems capabilities alive by application to guided missiles and also to spacecraft.

Behind all of the applied research, development and design and testing for civil aviation there lies basic research in the fundamental physical sciences. Some support for these, of course, comes from the military services and NASA. However, the National Science Foundation carries the brunt of this load, and rightly so.

I have indicated some of my thoughts on the distribution of research and development. What about support for specific systems and aircraft? My highest priority is on that equipment for the FAA to improve by large orders of magnitude their capabilities in air traffic control, both the inflight and the terminal control and landing. I have already introduced some of these.

For specific projects leading to aircraft for the civil aviation of the future, I have already mentioned that I thought the development of the high subsonic speed, very large transport which is now getting underway in the military is one of the most important developments as far as offering promise for the future of commercial aviation.

One might ask what new important developments in vertical takeoff and landing aircraft should be undertaken for civil aviation. From the standpoint of civil aviation, I believe that this area is receiving a reasonably good development from the military support. Straight helicopters, compound helicopters, as well as lift engine, fan-in-wing, tilt engine, and tilt wing VTOL and STOL aircraft are being tried for important roles in the military battlefield and near battlefield transportation. Most of the technical points which are important for future civil aviation are being developed in these military projects. It is my opinion that this area is not neglected as far as the development of aircraft. I do believe that as the VTOL aircraft are developed, that the air traffic control system must be prepared to incorporate them in its total air transportation picture. And I also think that the Congress should study ways to encourage airline operators, or entirely new entrepreneurs, possibly by subsidies, possibly by changes in regulations, to try some experiments in actual VTOL transport companies.

We have discussed at great length in this meeting the supersonic transport. Its operation will involve certain problems, some of which are really unanswered at the present time. One of these is the supersonic boom problem. You also know by now that the supersonic transport, as envisioned at the present time, will probably not be applicable except over the long overseas routes and possibly the transcontinental runs. There are many important problems of air transportation that the supersonic transport will have no impact on. Still, it is my opinion that supersonic transport prototypes will be built.

There are other questions about where the future financial support of air transportation should go. One has to do with the impact of space transportation versus earth transportation. Space travel, for a long time to come, will be confined, I believe, to exploration and to scientific research. Even when it becomes more practical for passenger and freight transport, I doubt that transportation involving rockets at extreme altitudes flying most of the way around the world will have a heavy impact on the air transportation picture on earth. If it ever promises to, decisions can be made at a much later time. I do not think that our civil aviation should at the present time be concerned with space. There are problems enough in the support of conventional subsonic aircraft, supersonic aircraft, VTOL planes, and the air traffic control system. One asks the question, should we presently be supporting, for civil aviation purposes, work in hypersonic flight in the mach 6 region? Certainly, hypersonic flight is technically feasible. Supersonic combustion, turbo ramjets, hydrogen-burning rockets, and air-breathing engines, all of these deserve some research, and I believe that they will get this research through the military and NASA, for the space and military programs will be the principal beneficiaries for some time.

There is one concern that I have had for some time with respect to the future of aeronautics in this country. That concerns the education of engineers who are interested specifically in civil aviation developments. Good students often shape their lives around the ideas which they first began to embrace in the research done when they are obtaining advanced degrees. Since the strong movement toward space and missilry started within the last decade, there has been a marked movement of many of the best professors and students away from the kind of aeronautics applicable to civil aviation. There are many more fellowships available in the space sciences than there are in aeronautics and there is a great deal more research support. This could result eventually in a serious lack of highly motivated, superior quality engineers interested in the design of civil aircraft and their components. This shortage will not be felt for some time because at the present, I think we have a great deal of this talent in the many qualified industrial companies.

Tributes to Mrs. Frances P. Bolton

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

(Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I asked to be recognized for a Democratic minute once before, and Sam Rayburn gave me 4 minutes all told. The conversation was all about diapers, and I promised him that I would make you all laugh, and you all did. However, this time the conversation will not be about diapers. This time I am speaking very deeply from my heart and saying that I appreciate all the courtesies that you have shown me. Particularly I appreciate the fact that you have ceased to think of me only as a Congresswoman, which I was never elected to be. I believe you will not find such a word in the dictionary. I am just one of the boys. I appreciate that more than I can possibly say because we have it back and forth sometimes, and that is what makes for good statesmanship and makes for good sense and makes for the camaraderie we have in this marvelous organization which is the House of Representatives of the United States. I cannot begin to tell you how deeply overcome I am by this expression. I had not expected it at all and I had said nothing about it, but I do want to say to you that I am wearing a pin that was given to me the other night, a pin of gold with diamonds in it and the number "25" underneath. I had that given to me the other night in Cleveland at a Lincoln-Douglas debate anniversary, at which time Ed Brooke, the attorney general of Massachusetts, came down from Boston to speak, and the audience numbered about 2,000. They were mostly nonwhite. They gave me this pin, which I value as much as anything that I have ever possessed. The 22d district has in it the 18th ward, and they go Republican all the time.

So again I give my thanks to all and particularly to you, Mr. Speaker, for this great courtesy.

Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, the sense of this amendment is simply to strike out the access roads paragraph of section 201. Section 201 does two things. The major portion of it is to authorize a system of development roads which will cost $805 million. My amendment does not affect those. It leaves them in the bill intact. But in addition to that section 201 authorizes an additional 1,000 miles of local access roads, the Federal contribution to which will be $35 million. My amendment would eliminate those local access roads. I would like to read

the description of local access roads on page 13, line 15, where it says:

In addition thereto, there are authorized to be constructed not in excess of one thousand miles of local access roads, that will serve specific recreational, residential, commercial, industrial, or other like facilities or will facilitate a school consolidation program.

That means that local access roads can be constructed to serve a specific subdivision built by a contractor for his personal profit. One road can be constructed to serve a specific resort built by a resort owner for his personal profit. These local access roads can be constructed to serve a particular recreational area built by a speculator for his personal profit. In the history of the roadbuilding program of the United States of America the basis upon which we have provided Federal assistance is that roads will serve a group of people or an area and therefore the Federal-Interstate Highway System serves a large number of people and the Federal-State primary and secondary aid system serves areas and groups of people; the Federal urban road system serves areas and groups of people. But this is the first time that I know of where we have stated that we will authorize Federal funds to build a specific local access road to serve a particular industry built for profit by the owner of that industry or a particular subdivision built for profit by the owner of that subdivision or a particular resort built for profit by the owner of that resort.

This particular provision of $35 million—and all my amendment strikes is $35 million; it leaves the whole development road system of $805 million—would be an open invitation to people who for profit would try to get sufficient political control at the State level and maneuver the allocation of Federal road funds for the construction of a specific road to serve their specific profitmaking enterprise. I do not believe Federal funds should be used for such a purpose.

L.B.J. Should Seek Advice of Whitener on Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have read the President's message on crime, and he has suggested the possibility of appointing a crime commission for the District of Columbia. I certainly hope the President will take into consideration that the House District Committee has held hours, days, weeks, and almost a year's hearings on the subject of crime in the District of Columbia. The Honorable BASIL WHITENER has presided over all these hearings, part of which were joint hearings with the Senate District Committee. Our committee had the privilege of hearing crime experts from almost every section of the United States, including the Government law enforcement officials here in Washington. I certainly would suggest that the President give serious consideration to appointing Hon. BASIL WHITENER, who in my opinion is one of the outstanding attorneys in the United States and certainly one of the ablest attorneys in the Congress of the United States, as chairman if such a commission is appointed. Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an editorial recently appearing in the Gastonia Gazette, in North Carolina, dated February 18, 1965, and hope that every Member of Congress will take time to read this editorial, including the President of the United States.

L.B.J. SHOULD SEEK ADVICE OF WHITENER ON CRIME

If President Johnson is sincere about wanting to launch a war against crime in the District of Columbia, he would do well to call for the file of Representative BASIL WHITENER on that subject.

The President said Monday that he plans to fight crime in Washington. He talked at length about a variety of experimental anti-crime proposals, ranging from the registration of pistols to an overhaul of the courts.

There was also indication that many of these recommendations would be included in another special message dealing with crime and juvenile delinquency on a national scale.

But, getting back to Representative WHITENER.

Crime in Washington has received as much or more of WHITENER's attention during his tenure in the capital as anything else. He served as chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings on the crime situation in the District of Columbia. He was the author of the omnibus crime bill which was approved in the House by a 2-to-1 vote but which failed to reach the Senate floor.

Mr. WHITENER, as a lawyer, is concerned, of course, about the judicial rights of a criminal. As a man who has watched the steady deterioration of justice in this country, he is equally concerned about the rights of the innocent.

He believes, with former Chief Judge Miller of the highest court of the District: "In our concern for criminals, we should not forget that nice people have some rights, too."

Why this concern over Washington? Is it any different from other cities?

It is our Nation's Capital. It is our showplace. And, as a showplace, it has brought forth many groans.

The record shows that Washington leads all other cities, regardless of size, in the number of aggravated assaults per 100,000 population.

It ranks second in the rate of robbery among all comparable cities with population of 1 million or less.

Washington is the only city in the Nation to which the Mallory rule applies in the prosecution of common-law crimes. This rule prohibits the detaining of a suspected criminal for longer than 6 hours without charging him.

WHITENER's omnibus bill would have made voluntary confessions admissible in evidence in criminal trials in Washington—the same as they have been and still are in North Carolina and all other States.

The bill restored to officers of the District the power to detain and question persons believed to have committed a crime, which is the same power used in all States.

Before the impact of the Mallory and Durham cases (the Durham rule relating to the use of a plea of insanity as a defense), crime decreased each year (1952–57) contrary to the national trend. But, since the Mallory case, crime has increased every year at a rate above the average national rate.

It is evident from the muggings, murderings, and general rapid increase of crime in Washington that the word has gotten around. And the word is this: That the law in Washington is hamstrung, that the courts are lenient, and that if you are going to commit a crime then go to the District of Columbia where you have a better chance of getting off scot free.

No matter how one would like to gloss over statistics, no matter how much the apologists point to crime in other cities, Washington has accumulated a national reputation for being crime riddled.

Therefore, it is good to see that the President is interested in this particular blemish on the face of our Nation's Capital.

It is even more heartening that he is interested in the heavy trend of crime all over the country.

Like we said in the beginning, if he is really sincere, he'll call in a man who has trod that path before and who could give him some real sound expert advice—Representative BASIL WHITENER.

Tribute to Chairman Mendel Rivers, of the House Armed Services Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, there is no item of more importance to the Nation and to the Congress than our Nation's defense; and there are no two men more dedicated to maintaining our Nation's military superiority than are our colleagues MENDEL RIVERS, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and BOB SIKES, an extremely influential member of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

On February 26, 1965, at the midwinter conference of the Reserve Officers Association here in Washington, Chairman RIVERS was named as the recipient of the "Minuteman of the Year Award." This award is the highest honor which can be conferred by the Reserve Officers Association and is annually awarded to the person most outstanding in service to the defense of America and to those who wear the uniform.

Congressman SIKES was chosen to present the Reserve Officers Association award to Chairman RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the speech and tribute to Chairman RIVERS delivered by our colleague, BOB SIKES:

We meet in an hour of serious import. I speak not of world problems, not of threat of war in southeast Asia, nor even of domestic problems which headline the front pages of the Nation. I speak of the claim of the Pentagon of its right to inflict its will on Congress in the matter of strength and makeup of the Armed Forces despite the Constitution and despite the statutes. I speak of the danger to the Nation from a rebirth of the theory that those in the Pentagon can read the future from crystal ball computers and determine how our enemies will fight, with what weapons, and upon what ground. We have made this mistake many times before—always with serious consequences to us. I speak of the danger which accompanies a

substitution of cold figures, for the judgment, experience and wisdom which are vested only in humans, never in machines. I would remind those in the high places that machines never won a war. It is the heart and spirit of the men behind the machines that make the difference. In so many battles and in so many wars fought by this country, it was reservists whose heart and spirit made the difference between defeat and victory.

We are now in a battle to preserve the historic concept of the Reserve Forces, without which no major war has been won in our time or no emergency overcome. It would be easy to be discouraged. The odds are crippling. As your distinguished executive director, Col. John T. Carlton, has stated, "Our association may not win in a power political struggle because we are neither equipped, manned, nor skilled in that field. We may not win a propaganda battle because news management and influence wielding are not within our capability." He could well have added, "The security of the Nation will suffer and our defenses will be weakened if we do not win." So, win we must.

There is much to be done. Time is running. The time of beginning is now; the place is here at this meeting. I would remind you there still is a Congress. That Congress can determine policy if it so chooses, and Congress has that responsibility. The final battle for the preservation of the reserve forces will be fought in Congress. Your Congressman will have a voice in what is done. He can decide between computers in the Pentagon or the reservists back home. We are not against change, not against progress, not against savings—but let's do it the right way.

We meet here tonight to honor a man whose voice has never been stilled by the power of the executive branch; a man whose voice reflects conscience, dedication and ability. He is the chairman of the powerful House Committee on Armed Services. That great committee reflects his leadership and is stronger because of his personality.

No one in Congress has done more to insure that the men and women of the Armed Forces and their families share in the benefits of the Nation's prosperity. He has been the leader in nearly every important aspect of improved military programs—pay and other personnel benefits, stronger reserve policies, airlift, hospital construction, and weapons procurement. He has figured in all the impressive lists of battles won in the Halls of Congress for the military in our time. He is credited with the startling pronouncement, too long delayed in recognition, that "the members of the Armed Forces are entitled to standards of living equal to the standards of living they are defending."

I came here with Mendel a long time ago. Like so many of us in Congress, I have grown accustomed to standing in his long shadow. There was a time when I, too, bucked the system, but I found it didn't pay. You don't swim upstream against this Rivers. Those were the times when I was competing for installations and facilities on which Mendel had his eye. Things are better now. If he puts anything else in Charleston, the whole place will sink completely from sight just from the sheer weight of military installations. That means some of the rest of us can get into the picture now and then.

MENDEL RIVERS is a leader whose leadership the Nation needs. He is a leader whose knowledge has brought and will continue to bring a strengthened defense, whose understanding will promote morale among military personnel—and the American people will benefit. I am proud to count him one of my best friends. I do not have to remind you that he is one of your best friends. He is very well chosen indeed for the honor which is paid to him tonight. There could not have been a better choice. And back of him is a lovely little lady whom we all honor and love—Margaret Rivers.

The Minuteman of the Year Award is the highest honor which can be conferred by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. It comes to very few people, each of whom was carefully chosen for outstanding achievement. In selecting MENDEL RIVERS to receive the Minuteman of the Year Award, our Association designates him as the person most outstanding in service to the defense of America and to those who wear the uniform. I take great pride in the name of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States in presenting this year's Minuteman of the Year Award to one of the great figures of the U.S. Congress, to you, MENDEL RIVERS, the citizen who has contributed most to national security.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following speech by Donald L. McCorkell, Jr., of Tulsa, Okla., who won first prize in the Voice of Democracy contest in Oklahoma sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Don McCorkell, Jr.)

Good citizenship is creative. Therein lies its challenge. The creative artist is challenged with a blank canvas, the creative writer with a clean sheet of paper, the creative citizen with an unmarked ballot. The challenge to each has three intrinsic characteristics—opportunity, right, and responsibility which exist implicitly in this order.

The artist has the opportunity to place on that blank canvas a picture of life as seen through his eyes. The writer has the opportunity to express on that clean sheet of paper the thoughts, the ideas, the emotions, and the convictions that are unique to him. The citizen has the opportunity in that ballot to choose his national leaders, to change old laws, and to have a part in planning the subsequent operations of his government. Herein lies the basic challenge of citizenship in a democracy. The citizen has the opportunity to think for himself, to mold his own government, and to choose his own destiny. The person who ignores the opportunities of citizenship destroys his freedoms of citizenship by this failure. When he says, "Let someone else do it," he justifies the dictator's view that the people either cannot or will not think for themselves. Passivity removes the citizen's opportunity; activity extends it. Thus, the first challenge of citizenship is opportunity.

As each has his opportunities, it follows that the artist, the writer, the citizen—each has his rights. The artist has the right to paint whatever he sees in the media he wishes. The writer has the right to express what he believes in the style he chooses. The citizen, however, has the most far-reaching right—the right of personal freedom. By upholding this right he becomes an architect of history. On July 4, 1776, several Americans declared their independence from England in order to protect what they considered their God-given right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Later after a long struggle and many personal sacrifices, these men—these men of courage and conviction—produced a bill of rights with safeguards for the rights of all citizens—the rich, the poor; the educated, the uneducated; the young, the old; the famous, the forgotten—all were included. Hence were provisions established for the protection of the individual's rights. These rights—these rights we so often indifferently accept today—freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly—constitute the very essence of effective democracy. For how can a government of the people function unless the people are free to exercise their right to govern? Thus the second challenge of citizenship is to uphold the rights of citizenship, to exercise them, and to retain them for posterity.

In addition to opportunities and rights, the artist, the writer, the citizen—each has responsibilities. The artist has the responsibility to create, not to initiate; the writer to write the truth. The citizen has the responsibility to avail himself of his apportunities and to be wise in the use of his rights. Frequently we hear, "I have the right," but too infrequently do we hear, "I have the responsibility." Yet every right has a parallel responsibility. We have the right to speak and the reesponsibility to speak truthfully. We have the right to assemble and the responsibility to do it peacefully. We have the right to vote and the responsibility to do it wisely. Thus, in a democracy, each citizen has the opportunity and the right to be a politician, but as a politician he has the responsibility to be a statesman. As citizens, when we ignore our responsibilities we destroy our opportunities and our rights.

Opportunity, right, and responsibility—in the creative exercise of these lies the real challenge of citizenship and in our acceptance of this challenge lies the destiny of our Nation.

VA Domiciliary at Thomasville, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution that was introduced in the Georgia Senate by the Honorable Culver Kidd, senator from the 25th District of Georgia. This resolution brings out some very strong reasons why this domiciliary should remain open. I believe the Members of the House will find it of interest.

SENATE RESOLUTION 50

Resolution concerning the need for the continuation of the Veterans' Administration domiciliary located in Thomasville, Ga.; and for other purposes.

(By Senator Kidd, of the 25th District)

Whereas it is evident that the true facts concerning the operation of the Veterans' Administration domiciliary, located in Thomasville, Ga., have not been brought to the attention of the President of the United States; and

Whereas members of the Georgia General Assembly have spent many arduous hours of study and factfinding in order to ascertain the true picture in regard to the above mentioned domiciliary; and

Whereas the President of the United States enjoys the reputation of being a great humanitarian and serves as the leader of this Nation, the richest and most powerful of any ever established; and

Whereas the reasons given for the proposed closing of this installation were low patient demand, difficulty in staffing and outmoded structure; and

Whereas this installation has been operating under full capacity for many years, showing a percentage of accomplishment equal to 102.9 percent; and

Whereas there are 15 million World War II veterans with an average age of 55, the majority of whom have no service-connected disability, but in the next 5 years, as they grow older and become subject to the diseases and infirmities of old age, numbers of them shall require domiciliary care and therefore, the demand for the services of the Thomasville domiciliary will increase; and

Whereas those buildings not now being utilized should be renovated with a view to the future needs of these veterans who answered their country's call when they were needed and, as a result of which, many years of their lives were spent in the service of their country resulting in lost earning power and an extreme change in their general well-being; and

Whereas it has never been difficult to staff this hospital, there being less turnover in the staff than possibly in any other under the Veterans' Administration, and there has always been a waiting list of competent doctors, nurses, and other personnel ready to go to work in this installation at any time; and

Whereas the facilities of said domiciliary have recently been inspected by two different teams from the Veterans' Administration and in each case found to be in good, serviceable condition; and

Whereas recent expenditures have resulted in replacing the entire heating system and many new additions have been planned so that in the next 3 years this installation would be in such condition that only a minimum amount of replacements would keep it in excellent operating condition for the next 25 years; and

Whereas on a comparison basis, the cost of operation of this facility is only $5.70 per day per patient, as compared to $6.41 in the like installation in White City, Oreg., $7.44 in Clinton, Iowa; and an average of more than $18 per day in most hospitals; and

Whereas at the present time the United States has an investment in this hospital and 264 acres of land of approximately $4 million; and

Whereas the climate and the terrain are ideal for the installation to take care of the aged; and

Whereas the recent installation of an emphysema ward, which started as an experiment, has enlarged to the extent where it now takes care of 22 patients and this service is not offered in any other domiciliary and it is doubtful that in the event this installation were to be closed that these men could go elsewhere and receive the same high-quality care since they are not classified as hospital patients; and

Whereas through excellent management and leadership a rehabilitation program has been carried on throughout the years whereby these patients have received instruction as hospital aids in plumbing work, electrical work, boiler repair, and many other fields, the result of which is that many of these patients have been placed in worthwhile jobs throughout Georgia and the United States; and

Whereas 25 percent of these 772 patients are classified as indigent and 144 of these patients who now work with the maintenance of the hospital would also fall into this category, if the hospital closes; and

Whereas the average income of all of these patients is less than $75 a month and would result in their being classified as becoming eligible to participate in the poverty program; and

Whereas it is well known that there is an acute shortage of vacant hospital beds throughout the country and to thrust this additional load upon other hospitals would result in those hospitals having to operate well over capacity, and cause them to expend much additional money for care and for the cost of reequipping them to meet this new burden; and

Whereas most physicians have observed that were these patients moved to a colder climate or to a hospital where they might be required to go outside for meals, medical care, and other necessities, a decrease in their life expectancy would result; and

Whereas despite statements by certain Federal officials that it is desirable to place all hospitals in cities having a population of more than 25,000, this is not true of domiciliary-type installations; and

Whereas in smaller communities such as Thomasville, the domiciliary patient becomes a member of the community, belongs to clubs and organizations, makes friends, has a purpose in life and a desire to live, all of which gives him spiritual, physical and mental encouragement; and

Whereas it has been proposed to open up nursing care beds in order to take care of this type patient but to do so would cost a great deal more than the present cost of this domiciliary care; and

Whereas the typical domiciliary patient is 68 years old, is disabled principally, has no family, has a low income and has lived in this facility from 4 to 15 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body urges the continuation of the Veterans' Administration domiciliary, located in Thomasville, Ga., and states that this installation is performing an excellent job for the United States and the State of Georgia at a cost far less than would be necessary elsewhere. This body further declares that the results of the operation of this domiciliary are such that it would not be economical to close this facility and attempt to begin another one which would not only be questionable as to its success but which would result in increased costs to the taxpayers of the United States and of this State; be it further

Resolved, That in order that the President of the United States be informed of the facts and information provided in this resolution, the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to submit an appropriate copy of this resolution to the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States.

The secretary is also instructed to submit a copy to the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH, chairman of the subcommitte of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, to the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Georgia congressional delegation.

Half Past a Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the members of the first class to be ordained to the priesthood at St. Francis Seminary, Loretto, Pa., on February 19, 1915, was Edward B. Daly, a native of Thorndike, Mass.

In tribute to his 50 years in the clergy, members of St. John's Gualbert's Co-Cathedral at Johnstown, Pa., will honor their pastor at a testimonial, and Father Daly will have the thoughts and prayers on that occasion of everyone who has had the good fortune to have made his acquaintance.

Except for a brief assignment in the early part of his priesthood, Father Daly has served constantly in the Altoona diocese. He baptized babies in the years gone by who aré parents and grandparents today. During two world wars and in the continuing struggle that plagues the world he blessed young men off to bear arms for their country, and he was there to welcome them when they returned. When they did not come back, he was at their home to console and grieve with their loved ones.

And by his devotion, his example, and his word, Father Daly has made better Christians and better citizens of countless thousands of men and women who were members of his parish or otherwise had the privilege of his acquaintanceship. His service to God has brought enrichment to generations.

We thank Father Daly for the 50 years he has given to us, and we look for his continued friendship and guidance long into the future.

Roelif Loveland, a Great Guy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer has lost one of the finest newspapermen in the business to the retirement ranks.

Roelif Loveland's reporting was classic, just about the finest anywhere, and readers felt the impact of the man's great personality in whatever he wrote, whether for the news pages, the editorial section, or the feature columns. His coverage of World War II was memorable and, as a matter of fact, it was early in the war that I first met him at 4 a.m. on a bitter-cold morning, when I was leaving Cleveland with the 107th Cavalry for Camp Forrest.

Cleveland readers will miss his byline. His colleagues on the Plain Dealer will miss him too. They make this abundantly clear in a recent edition of the paper, and I place the following articles in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Feb. 26, 1965]

ROELIF LOVELAND, A GREAT GUY

Roelif Loveland today closes an office door on the second floor of the Plain Dealer building and starts down the road to retirement.

The history of his accomplishments in the newspaper business is set down elsewhere in today's edition. It is the man with whom we are parting professional company that concerns us here.

Of sinew, mind and heart, "Lovey," as he is known to all of us, is a big man on every count.

He addresses his colleagues in the language of his beloved Marine Corps but he also

reads aloud from the Bible with a tenderness befitting a devout friar.

A reporter once told a newcomer to the staff, "If you ever see Lovey hit anyone, don't call an ambulance for the victim. Call the Bureau of Missing Persons."

As a wartime Marine and a war correspondent, he is dedicated to the preservation of the American way of life and his implicit faith in an omnipotent God is uncomplicated by denominational furbelows.

A man's man who enjoys all the pastimes of men from the smash off tackle to the blow for liberty, he can charm a girl of any age with the courtly manner of his massive presence.

At a farewell luncheon from him this noon, witty speakers will try to inject some laughter into the proceedings. It will not be easy. Saying goodby to a man as big of mind and heart as he is of body does not educe laughter.

PLAIN DEALER'S "LOVEY" WINDS UP 42 COLORFUL YEARS TODAY

(By Doris O'Donnell)

When a newspaper says goodby to one of its glittering stars, there are no tears.

That is the way it should be. After all, everyone knows newspaper people are hard-boiled, cynical, blase.

Besides, Roelif Loveland would not want his final day at the Plain Dealer spoiled.

Loveland would want the laughter geysering sky high from the retelling of hilarious tales about the old Champlain Street police station, where he broke in as a police reporter years ago, or simply the warmth in the handshakes of a colleague left behind.

Today is Loveland's last day. His last column has been in type for the past several days. His typewriter has been pushed aside, the desk drawers emptied.

This is how it is after more than 42 years of loving a profession which has in personal satisfaction richly rewarded the talents of a handsome, ruggedly masculine boy from Oberlin, Ohio.

To generations of Clevelanders and probably half the State of Ohio, the byline of Roelif A. Loveland over an article or column or underlining a poem has symbolized the Plain Dealer.

What makes a newspaperman such as Loveland?

The son of a smalltown banker, Loveland—born Roelif Arthur on August 31, 1899—attended Oberlin public schools and then joined the Marine Corps.

He served as a private in the 47th Company, 5th Regiment, 3d Battalion. He saw service at Chateau Thierry, Belleau Wood and the Argonne, experiences which honed his hatred for war.

Shedding the Marine uniform, Loveland enrolled in Oberlin College. His football career was more cherished, it developed, than his academic career. The vibrant undisciplined young man took off for Cleveland and a profession where his free-swinging, nonconformist expressions could be more appreciated.

Loveland was hired by the Plain Dealer in November 1922. He covered police and later had the school beat.

Lovey—as his colleagues know him—made no secret of his distaste for the regimen and sometimes boring monotony of beats.

Assigned to city hall in 1927 by the late Bill Raynolds, then city editor, Lovey, according to an eyewitness authority, "flew into a rage, slammed down the typewriter desk, let out a string of expletives a yard long and stomped out of the office.

"He didn't show up for 2 days," the source recalled. "His wife said he came home with a bad attack of nervous indigestion and she had to put him to bed."

He went to city hall—for a time.

Loveland then launched his career as one of the most extraordinary features writers in the newspaper's history.

Sometimes Lovey was given assignments, mostly the offbeat stuff, or he would assiduously develop an ordinary yarn into an offbeat story. He had the knack. And writing came easy.

"It always has," he admitted. "Sometimes it was almost automatic."

Lovey liked features.

"There are no rules for writing a feature," he said. "Break all rules. Use no formula."

Then came Hitler's armies and Loveland volunteered to go to war again.

In 1944 he was accredited as a war correspondent to Gen. George S. Patton Jr.'s 3d Army.

He flew on a bombing mission on D-day. His piece was one of the few to get back to the United States to be printed the day after the Normandy attack opened. This column was reprinted in "Treasury of Great Reporting."

Finally Lovey—after weeks of living with the foot-slogging GI's—had his "belly full," and he came home. But he told Ohioans what war was like.

While Lovey spoke of war, the elder of his two sons, Peter Graham Loveland, was inducted into service.

Those war years, Lovey, were you scared?

"Of course," he replied simply.

That is the other side of Lovey. No phony emotions. And that goes for his poetry as readers well know.

There were his rhymes about GI's and even on the Plain Dealer Building.

"A Cleveland sunset pretty is,
A sky that needs no gilding,
All shades of glowing red, I wis,
A glorious sight we always miss,
Inside a modern building."

In recent years, Loveland has been an associate editor and an editorial writer. The past 11 months he has written a column 3 times a week.

He plans to remain here with his wife, Wanda, a nurse at University hospitals. But he always has places to visit if he wants to get away.

His elder son, Peter G., and his wife and six children live in Peru, Ill., where Peter is an executive with W. H. Maze Nail Works. Another son, Capt. David G. Loveland, and his wife and family live in Mount Holly, N.J. Captain Loveland is with Military Air Transport Service and flies a big Hercules plane.

For Lovey, this is it. There is too little space to do his journalistic image justice.

So long, Lovey. Good luck.

Party and Policymaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues, congressional committee and staff personnel, and political scientists throughout the country will be very much interested in a book recently published by Rutgers University Press entitled "Party and Policymaking."

The author of this study of the House Republican Party policy committee is Dr. Charles O. Jones, who is presently associate professor of government at the University of Arizona. In preparing the material for his book, Dr. Jones interviewed Republican Congressmen, policy committee members, and staff members of the committee.

In his well-written, carefully documented study, Dr. Jones describes the origin, development, organization, and functions of the policy committee. By case studies, he analyzes the function of the committee in two settings—its relationship to the party and to public policymaking in the House.

I heartily recommend "Party and Policymaking" to all Members of Congress and others interested in the internal workings of the House.

Blair House—The Nation's Guesthouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take this opportunity to offer to my fellow colleagues this token of recognition of the efforts of Mrs. Angier Biddle Duke, wife of the Chief of Protocol of the United States, and Chairman of the Blair House Fine Arts Committee, for her dedicated and tireless work on the Blair House restoration. Mrs. Duke has been a devoted and imaginative leader in the restoration of Blair House, and the Members of Congress and the American people are in her debt for her devoted service to make Blair House the finest center of hospitality for foreign visitors which our country can bestow.

Mrs. Duke said at the time of the publication of her article on Blair House in the January issue of House & Garden magazine, that:

> The hospitality of Blair House is the hospitality of a whole nation. Blair House is a constructive working arm of American diplomacy. The remodeling and rejuvenation of the President's guesthouse in Washington is American in spirit, global in purpose. Now, through the efforts of many dedicated people, the Nation's guesthouse begins a new life.

Earlier this year, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege to receive from Mr. William Houseman, executive editor of the House & Garden magazine, a specially bound copy of the January issue of House & Garden, and to join with Mr. Houseman in giving recognition to Mrs. Duke on a radio program.

I am pleased to present to my colleagues in the House and the Senate this very fine article by Mrs. Duke in House & Garden magazine entitled "Blair House—The Nation's Guesthouse." In it, Mrs. Duke cites the highlights of the restoration work by the Blair House Fine Arts Committee, under her wise guidance and direction. The article follows:

BLAIR HOUSE

(By Mrs. Angier Biddle Duke)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—As the dedicated and tireless Chairman of the Blair House Fine Arts Committee, Mrs. Duke reports for House & Garden the highlights of the Blair House restoration. She is the wife of the Chief of Protocol of the United States and knows not only what was done but what the house stands for in our national life.)

The hospitality of Blair House is the hospitality of a whole nation. In full operation, Blair House is also a constructive working arm of American diplomacy. It is, first of all, the President's guesthouse. The State Department uses it in many ways that would be unfeasible in a Government office building, and the Office of the Chief of Protocol schedules its uses as though it were a transient foreign capitol (Pennsylvania Avenue branch). What Blair House represents is probably unique and it is known in every capital of every continent—or soon will be. Of the 109 world leaders who have conferred in Washington with our Presidents in the past 4 years, the majority have been guests of the Nation during their stay there. And while they have been our guests, Blair House has served as their home-away-from-home. This handsome but unpretentious house is really two houses, built separately, but with a party wall. The original house was first occupied by the Blair family in 1836, after its construction in 1824. A generation later, Francis Preston Blair built the adjoining house for his daughter when she married a cousin of Gen. Robert E. Lee. Sometimes designated, for convenience, the Blair and Blair-Lee houses, they are now unified under the Blair name. Blair House has belonged to the Nation for 20 years, and was lived in by President Truman while the White House across the way was being rebuilt. But Blair House itself was in sore need of modernization, too. It is this rebirth—structurally and esthetically—that is now being carried out. Joined on three floors and through the basement, but with separate entrances, the combined houses are now equipped with every facility for carrying out the business of the occupants in a variety of ways—affording them also a place for relaxation, according to both our standards of grace and comfort and their own, during what is often a taxing round of official ceremonies. Now, through the efforts of many dedicated people, the Nation's guesthouse begins a new life.

Only personal effort and loving good will could have accomplished the whole Blair-Lee restoration; mere official duty or Government directives would not have been enough. Personal tastes, private generosity and professional competence have made possible the collecting and arranging of not only original furnishings from the houses, but additional ones expressive of the American heritage. In its special function as a guest house for visitors to the Nation from any country in the world, Blair House today must be able to meet the needs—sometimes the whims—of kings and presidents at work (which means telephones that can reach any part of the globe at the lift of a receiver), of working diplomats (which means reception rooms, drawing rooms, sitting rooms, conference rooms), of vistors on holiday (which means instant hospitality of the highest order). Blair House may need to house 18 or contain, if that is the word, 200 guests at once. Under direct management of the State Department, through the imperturbable competence of Mrs. Mary Edith Wilroy, a small but variable staff runs the establishment with deceptive ease and precision. While most state visits last only 2 days, the pressure tends to mount with a new arrival every week for a month or more. But the staff functions around the clock and the visitor never knows.

One of the specifics of Blair House diplomacy is good eating, just as hospitality is one of the vital generalities. There are two beautifully appointed dining rooms in the recreated house, both served through pantries from new and superbly equipped kitchens in what formerly were coal bins on the ground floor. Highlight of the bigger Blair-Lee dining room is the needlepoint seat covers made by Cabinet wives and some of the committee members with their own hands. Many generous and willing people were responsible for individual gifts that supplement particularly fine parts of the original collections. As the house is arranged, the dining rooms may be used for separate functions at the same time, each accessible through separate street entrances. When need requires, the entire Blair-Lee first floor can be devoted to a single affair.

The second floor of the rebuilt and redecorated dwellings was planned as much for the private comfort and convenience of the guests as the accommodations downstairs were arranged for public hospitality. The sitting rooms and bedrooms on this floor may be variously interconnected, according to need, and are accessible from the entrance hall of either the original Blair House or the adjoining Blair-Lee. All the principal bedrooms have private baths, although not all are parts of suites. Yet each bedroom is equipped to serve almost any official needs of the aids and ministers who must inevitably accompany and assist their chiefs on missions of state. The two most important of these single rooms, apart from those of the heads of state, are known as the Lincoln bedroom and prime minister's bedroom. The upper floors are attractive enough for either monarch or equerry, each room has its own telephone and includes among its appointments specially embossed stationery, pens and pencils, smoking accessories as well as fresh fruit (a great favorite of all guests) and flowers appropriate to the room's use and decoration.

The Blair library, an enormous room that has retained all its original woodwork, ceiling ornamentation and principal furniture, dominates the king's and queen's suites, which also include two bedrooms each with a bath, and a sitting room (these pages and the two pages following). The core of the Blair House philosophy—that while a chief of state is our guest, this house is his home and seat of authority if he wishes—is expressed in this room. A large table in the center of the outer wall serves as a desk. Separate conferences can be carried on, if desired, at opposite ends of the room. And, in addition to three telephones, it contains a huge color television set, radio and a book collection from American publishers that roves over the world's letters, history and geography. The commemorative note is strong here, from a copy of Houdon's bust of Washington to the heads of later statesmen. Basically the room is less changed than most parts of the restored houses. Less formal quarters for the chief of state and his wife, as well as rooms for principal ministers and their aids, occupy the remainder of the second floor.

What's Happening to the Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I took the floor to outline the extremely poor postal service involving the general public. I cited instance and fact as to how our once proud postal service has deteriorated.

In my speech I outlined that it was top management policies that cause the postal service to suffer, and the people of the United States are the "goats." In spite of fancy gimmicks, press releases and new innovations, the service goes from bad to worse by the day.

The employee organizations and the employees themselves join with me in pointing out how bad our present-day postal service is. Below is an article from the March issue of the Postal Record, the official publication of the National Association of Letter Carriers, entitled, "What's Happening to the Mail Service."

I recommend that every Member of this body read the article as well as the remarks I made on the floor on March 2.

The article follows:

WHAT'S HAPPENING TO THE MAIL SERVICE—NATIONWIDE COMPLAINTS HIT DETERIORATING SERVICE

The National Association of Letter Carriers has always been devoted to the betterment of the postal service. At its founding convention, August 29, 1889, in Milwaukee, the first resolution passed by the delegates pledged the members of the National Association of Letter Carriers to the ideal of the good of the service. Article I of the national constitution of the association reiterates that pledge.

There have been times at national conventions of the NALC when a small minority has introduced a resolution which would make the job of a letter carrier less irksome, at the expense of the service. Such resolutions have invariably been hooted down. The NALC has never passed, or considered seriously, a resolution that would put the convenience of its members ahead of the welfare of the service.

Service is our business. Service is our goal. Because of this constant devotion to service, the National Association of Letter Carriers is not only the oldest and the largest of all organizations of postal or Federal employees, it is also the proudest.

In the past 15 years, however, that fierce pride has been taking a beating. Hardly a year has passed in which the service has not been seriously diminished in the interest of real or imaginary economies. Each time this has happened, the luster has dimmed off the letter carrier's pride. It's getting harder and harder to find anything in the postal service to be proud about.

During the past 15 years we have seen the following impairments in the postal service:

Reduction of deliveries by 50 percent.
Reduction of collections.
Reduction of parcel post service.
Abolition of directory service.
Withering of postal savings.
Reduction of window hours in post offices.

In addition there has been constant, continuing pressure on the users of the mails to do more and more of the work that the post office should be doing.

Each of these changes was announced by the administration in power at the time as being in the interest of economy without impairing the service. And yet, with each change the service has been impaired, and the economies have always proved to be less than had been anticipated. The service has taken major beatings to achieve minor savings.

Every new administration, when it has come into power, has issued a steady stream of press releases claiming that the service is far better than it had been under the previous administration. Unfortunately, press

releases merely clog the mails, they do not move them. The postal facts of life have rarely coincided with the glowing claims of the publicists.

The postal service today is worse than it was under Summerfield.

Under Summerfield it was worse than it had been under Donaldson.

Under Donaldson it was worse than it had been under Farley.

And under Farley, local service at least was worse than it had been under John Wanamaker, in 1889.

In 1889, it was common practice in all major cities to have four deliveries a day in residential areas and six deliveries a day in business areas. It was the prideful boast of the Post Office, that any letter mailed before noon would be delivered within that same community before sunset. In 1889 the New York newspapers were complaining bitterly because letters mailed there after 10 p.m. were not being delivered in Washington until the second delivery on the next day.

(If a letter mailed in New York after 10 p.m. today were delivered by the second delivery the next day, the incident would be written up in "Believe It or Not.")

Year after year the spiral staircase of postal reform has led steadily downward.

Not since Will H. Hays was Postmaster General in 1921 has a postal administration given primary consideration to service, and secondary consideration to economy. Unfortunately, Hays served only 1 year in office. Ever since, the phantasmagoria of a balanced postal budget has obsessed the managers of the Post Office to the serious detriment of the service.

If anyone doubts where the emphasis is placed today, let him cast an eye over the impressive list of incentive awards and suggestion awards which the Post Office Department gives out each year. Every award, almost without exception, is for some idea that will (purportedly) save the Department money. Never (or almost never) is an award given for an idea that will improve the service the Post Office Department is giving to the people of the United States.

As postal employees devoted to the ideal of service, the letter carriers of the Nation are deeply disturbed and disheartened by this monotonous pattern of decadence.

We also resent it.

Letter carriers are the representatives of the post office whom the public sees, and to whom it talks. When the mail is late and slow, the patron explodes his wrath on the carrier. Never does a patron put the blame on supervisors for disallowing overtime or auxiliary in the interest of false economy. Never does the patron blame the clerk, the postmaster, or the Postmaster General. No, it is the letter carrier—the innocent victim of the pattern of postal degradation—who bears the brunt of the public's disgruntlement.

We are, frankly, sick and tired of being made the whippingboy, the scapegoat for the wrongheaded and ill-advised philosophy of our bosses.

The effect of postal deterioration on employee morale is disastrous. Morale can be high only when the worker can take honest pride in his job. If a postal employee takes pride in the job the Post Office Department is doing today he is either gullible or uninformed, or both.

We want to make it perfectly clear that we like Postmaster General John A Gronouski very much. We admire him as a human being. We are grateful because of his enlightened personnel policies. We feel closer to him, and to his staff, than we have ever felt toward any other postal administration. We do not blame him for what has happened. We feel he has been victimized by the dead hand of tradition. We feel he has been overwhelmed by the sharp-pencil boys from the Bureau of the Budget, and from his own department who care little or nothing about the postal service, but who care for too much for sterile economies.

On the following pages of this issue of the Postal Record we are reprinting a number of articles concerning the plight of the postal service. They make lugubrious reading for anyone who has concern for the Post Office. We call special attention to the editorial written by Bob Walsh, of the Warren County, (Pa.) Observer.

Mr. Walsh says, among many other valuable things, the following:

"The postal situation reminds us of education. The tendency is to place the balancing of a budget ahead of the required quality. * * * We do not reduce our police department until it can be financed by the amount of fines collected. We do not establish a fire department budget on the basis of property values involved in the fires of the past year. * * * We couldn't care less whether or not the receipts from postage meet the cost of delivering mail. What we want is mail in our box or at our door in timely fashion and in good condition."

These words should be engraved on the office walls of every postal manager in the country.

Public indignation at the quality of the postal service has been endemic in this country ever since the Post Office started to come apart at the seams. However, in the last few years indignation has deepened and worsened into a combination of derision and disgust.

Among all the comments about the postal service that we have recently read, we have come across only one favorable reference. Ted Lewis, writing in the New York Daily News, complimented Postmaster General Gronouski for the excellent job the Post Office did during the Christmas rush. In all fairness, we reprint this column. However, also in all fairness, we must quote Jerome J. Keating, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, in the February 1965, Postal Record: "From our listening post, the 1964 Christmas season was not nearly as successful as the 1963 Christmas operation. * * * The volume was heavy and continued heavy through Christmas Eve, while last year routes were cleaned up early on Christmas Eve and most carriers did not work overtime on that day. In 1964, the carriers were working 12 or more hours on Christmas Eve. It is our opinion that a great deal of this could have been avoided if more manpower had been used around the 20th."

In other words, the Christmas operation bogged down in many places because postal management put economy above service.

We hear a lot these days about the Great Society.

The Great Society is a nonsense unless it provides an efficient and trustworthy postal service.

Ever since the first men pulled themselves up out of the primordial slime and decided to have a try at walking erect, for a change, every society has been judged by the efficiency of its system of communications. The swift couriers of Darius the Persian—the gallant runners of the Golden Age of Greece—the straight roads and efficient posts of the Roman Empire—the bands of postal horsemen who held ancient China together—the valiant riders of the pony express—these have all been ornaments of the civilization which they graced. They have helped make the benchmarks by which their nations have been judged in comparison with their contemporaries.

As we prepare to enter the last one-third of the 20th century, how can we claim to have a great society when our postal service is barely equivalent to that rendered in a second-class banana republic?

How can we claim to have a great society when first-class letters regularly take a full week to travel from Washington to San Francisco, and 3 days from Washington to New York? Or when the Post Office Department spends between $3 million to $8 million a year (they don't know exactly how much) just to rewrap parcels that have been damaged and defoliated in the mails? Or when packages hang around post offices for half a week awaiting delivery? Or when business firms hand-deliver their own mail because it is cheaper and faster that way? Or when mailtrucks must keep touring the city, because there is no place in the postal facilities to unload their cargoes of mail? Or when users of second- and third-class mail are required to presort, prepackage and pretie their mail before entrusting it to the post office? Or when builders are asked to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in erecting new office buildings just to lighten some of the burdens of the post office? Or—you name it. "Great Society?" Ha.

WHAT'S TO BE DONE?

What's to be done about this sorry mess we're in?

Several things.

1. Face the facts

First of all, postal management should face the facts and admit to themselves that the service is wretched and is growing worse every day. They should stop trying to kid themselves, and the public, through a series of therapeutic speeches and press releases claiming that everything is for the best in the best of all possible worlds. Just as alcholism is incurable unless the victim admits he's a drunk and needs help, so the postal service will never grow better unless its managers admit that it stinks.

2. A realistic budget

Second, go before the Appropriations Committee with a realistic budget. Tell the Congress that the service is awful and won't get any better unless sufficient funds are poured into it. Ask for enough money to do the job correctly, and don't cave in and whimper at the first suggestion that the request should be cut. Above all, don't go before Congress hat in hand. The postal service is essential to the economic, political, and social health of the country. It involves the well-being of every human being within our borders. Nothing on earth, short of eternal salvation, is more important. Congress shares the responsibility for this service just as much as does the Postmaster General and every postal executivce and employee. If Congress refuses to appropriate sufficient funds then, at least, the postal managers will know that they have done their patriotic best, and that the blame for failure must lie on congressional shoulders.

3. Think positively

Third, postal managers should learn to think positively. They should banish all the suffocating negative thinking about niggling little economies, and concentrate on developing ways to improve and refine and expand the service. They should set difficult goals and try to reach them. They might start by determining to give the United States as good a postal service as that enjoyed by almost every nation in Europe.

4. Encourage service suggestions

Fourth, they should encourage and solicit opinions from the employees in the field as to how the service can be improved, instead of asking them only for suggestions as to how they can pinch the pennies harder. The Department in Washington does not own any monopoly of postal brains. The post offices of America are filled with intelligent, imaginative people who yearn to improve the postal service to a point where they can be proud of it. Make use of these brains. Right now if a postal employee has an idea that would improve the service, even if it would cost a little more money, he is afraid to impart it to his supervisors lest he be branded as some kind of a nut. In the lexicon of too many supervisors, only nuts dream of

improving the service; the same thing only of saving a buck. This kind of thinking must be reversed.

There are other things that should be done, but these will do for starters.

Meanwhile, Generals, read in these pages what the people of America are thinking and saying. Read Bob Walsh's "Observations" in the Warren County Observer, read the letter to the editor reprinted here; take a look at the comic pages with strips missing because of delays in the mail; take a look at the apologies advertisers must print in the daily papers because of postal failures; read the Malden (Mass.) Evening News editorial on "Disappointing Mail Service"; read "The Prodigious Post Office" from Holiday; read the excoriating comments from the National Observer.

Read them all, Generals, and weep.

And, if you weep, your tears will join with those of the letter carriers of the Nation who grieve for what has happened to a once-proud postal service.

The FBI—Its Friends and Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, recently Ralph de Toledano wrote a column commending the Federal Bureau of Investigation, its dedicated and able Director, J. Edgar Hoover, and particularly David Sentner's "How the FBI Gets Its Man." He said many things that needed to be said and I suggest the Members of Congress pay heed.

The column follows:

THE FBI—ITS FRIENDS AND ITS CRITICS

For many Americans, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is a symbol of responsibility and integrity. To a handful, it is a target. With puzzling persistence, this second group has devoted thousands of hours and reams of paper in a failing attempt to show that the FBI is a blot on the Federal escutcheon. (Oddly enough, most of these critics take a highly tolerant view of such scandalous matters as the Bobby Baker case.)

Since those who attack the FBI are resourceful, shrewd, and unscrupulous, it is a wonder that their efforts have failed to do more than raise a few doubts among those disposed to doubt in the first place. The FBI remains untouched by calumny, going about its work with efficiency and dispatch. True, it has been hurt from time to time by such matters as the effort of former Attorney General ROBERT F. KENNEDY to use the FBI as a weapon. It was on Mr. KENNEDY's direct order, and against FBI protest, that agents were sent in the middle of the night to wake up newspapermen who had information of some use to the administration in its battle with American business.

For many years, I have watched the FBI resist attempts to politicalize. At firsthand, I have seen its agents at work on a number of touchy cases. There is not a single FBI agent whose path has crossed mine who has not been the very model of a conscientious investigator. Some have been my friends.

Those of us who have watched the dry rot that sets in where other law-enforcement agencies are concerned, who know that it is an unceasing battle to keep local police forces on their toes and honest, wonder at the freedom from taint of this kind that has marked the history of the FBI since John Edgar Hoover took over as its Director.

And those of us who watch a Government bureaucracy at work also wonder at the drive, the energy, and the devotion to work that mark every member of the FBI, from Mr. Hoover down to the lowliest clerk. We know that any agent can always quit for a job in private industry that will pay him far more than he can hope for in the Bureau. When the brickbats are flying and the muddy season of politics is on, I sometimes ask myself why they stay.

There must be many reasons, but the best of all is that they believe in what they are doing and like doing it.

All of this is preamble. What set me off is a fascinating paperback original, issued by Avon—"How the FBI Gets Its Man," by David Sentner.

I hope a good many people read Dave Sentner's book on the FBI. It is not a definitive study, not a sociological analysis of crime and punishment. But in its account of some of the FBI's most exciting cases, the book gives the feel and the atmosphere that surrounds the Bureau and its men. Sentner does this with a reporter's economy of language and with no bravura. I mean he tells the story straight—which is the way this kind of story has to be told.

A book of this kind helps counteract the poison that some of our intellectuals—ill informed and oddly motivated—have attempted to spread about the FBI. Given the number of men who have taken its training, done its work, and moved on to other spheres of activity, it is surprising that the anti-FBI brigade has not been able to turn up the kind of scandal it seeks.

Critics have therefore dealt in petty confusions, in blowing up minor human error, to make their point. A book like Dave Sentner's, in its unpretentious way, shows the positive side of FBI achievement and quietly underscores the fact that, in protecting us, the FBI agent risks his life. It is considered bad taste these days to pay tribute to this kind of dedication. David Sentner is not worried about this. I'm glad he wrote the book. As a writer of several books, I know that applying the seat of the pants to the seat of the chair, with a typewriter before you, is a tough job. "How the FBI Gets Its Man" was worth Dave Sentner's efforts.

Authorizing the Secretary of the Army To Establish a National Cemetery in Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to authorize the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Ohio.

Every veteran is entitled to burial in a national cemetery. Space available in the present national cemetery system is inadequate to accommodate more than a fraction of eligible veterans and their dependents, according to a recent survey by the DAV. The survey also indicated that this available space is so located as to favor certain veterans and to disfavor others and that therefore, certain veterans are much more likely to receive the benefit of national cemetery burial than others. There is no national cemetery in Ohio.

The veteran death rate in Ohio for fiscal year 1964 was 811 per month; in 1963 the State total was 770 per month; in 1962, 700 per month. It is obvious that the monthly rate of veteran deaths increases yearly, and will continue to do so. If we are to fulfill our obligation in having space available for the burial of our veterans in a location where their loved ones may visit their gravesite, action must be taken to establish additional cemeteries. It is hoped that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will give my bill favorable consideration.

Military Pay Must Be Boosted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, our wide ranging concern must very soon focus on the sad and inequitable military pay system existing here in the United States.

My colleagues will be appalled to learn that a person receiving unemployment compensation in New York City has a higher monthly income than a third class petty officer on a Polaris nuclear submarine who works 70 to 80 hours a week. The following article entitled "Military Pay Must Be Boosted" appeared in the San Diego Union on February 24 and I recommend that each of my colleagues takes time out from today's busy schedule to read it and to closely study the military pay bill which I jointly introduced today with Chairman MENDEL RIVERS and the members of our Armed Services Committee.

The article follows:

FAR BELOW CIVILIAN SCALE: MILITARY PAY MUST BE BOOSTED

A person receiving unemployment compensation in New York City has a higher monthly income than a third-class petty officer on a Polaris nuclear submarine who works 70 to 80 hours a week.

A babysitter in New York who earns $1.50 an hour, earns more per hour than does a Navy ensign on a ship at sea.

The director of laboratories at the New York Naval Shipyard, a Navy captain, has an annual salary that is less than half that of his civilian assistant and less than 15 other civil service employees under his command.

These disturbing facts are but few of the hundreds of examples of how the Nation is letting its servicemen down in times of peace.

As Rudyard Kipling put it: "In time of need, God and the military man are important indeed, but in times of peace, both are forgotten."

Educated and trained to serve efficiently and honorably, but silently, the people in our military services have not raised their voices loud enough to tell us of our oversight.

There is a chance to remedy the situation at this session of Congress. Bills to increase the pay, particularly in the lowest ranks, will be considered at this session. And Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, the

new chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, is a champion of equal pay for military men.

The case for higher pay is more than just fairness to the men and women who defend our Nation.

In the Navy the annual turnover of manpower is 30 percent a year—or about 130,000 men. Only 3,000 of each 13,000 ensigns who are commissioned each year make the Navy their career.

It costs taxpayers millions of dollars annually to recruit and retrain replacements for the officers and men leaving the services. A major reason many of the young men and women leave the service is the low pay which often is reflected in lower socal status and less public recognition.

The significance of the manpower loss is even greater, however. The time and personnel it takes to retrain new people detracts from the efficiency of our fighting forces and therefore from the defense posture.

Congress must not only raise military pay to comparable civil service levels, but it also must provide for annual salary reviews to assure that it remains comparable.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege for me to call your attention to the winning contestant of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy contest from my congressional district in the State of Rhode Island, Miss Susan E. Regan, of Warwick, and to include along with her excellent speech a very fine story about the young lady which was written by Joel H. Sekeres and appeared in the Providence Evening Bulletin on Monday, March 1, 1965:

SUSAN IS STATE'S DELEGATE

(By Joel H. Sekeres)

If Susan E. Regan, of Warwich, had her way, complacency would be as out of style as spats and zoot suits.

Good citizenship, she insists, means more than minding your own business, dutifully paying your taxes and staying out of trouble. It is both a vital privilege and responsibility not to be taken for granted.

Susan is a girl with convictions and, she laughingly admits, a gift for gab. She combined the two last month in a 5-minute speech that captured first place for her in the statewide Voice of Democracy contest.

The contest is designed to give high school students a chance to voice their opinions on patriotic themes and to convey them via the broadcasting media to the Nation. It is sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in cooperation with the National and State Associations of Broadcasters.

She received $100 in bonds for her State victory and will travel expense paid to Washington Friday to compete nationally as Rhode Island's representative for $12,500 in scholarships.

This year's topic is "The Challenge of Citizenship," and the vivacious 17-year-old Veterans Memorial High School senior is convinced it is a challenge avoided by too many people.

"The Nation depends on the will, determination, and judgment of all its people," she maintains. "These are the only things that can make it function. We merely can't rely on a few 'doers' to carry all the burdens of our own responsibilities."

Among her contemporaries, Susan clearly represents a minority that is somewhat aloof from the heart-throbbing Beatlemania which has captured most teenage imaginations.

Yet she is not an iconoclast. She is, however, a serious thinker who carefully arranges her thoughts in their proper perspective. Somewhere, in descending order of importance, there is even a place for the Beatles and other fads—but they are not predominant.

She is a girl who cares about the world her generation will soon inherit. "Good citizens are the essence of a good society," she said. "To improve society we must first improve ourselves in our homes, our jobs, and in our communities."

And she adds, "you don't have to be the President to play an important part. But you do have to try to fulfill every potential you possess."

She is irked by citizens who let others do their thinking and acting for them, and who prefer to rationalize the importance of their opinions.

"The individual citizen is a lot more important than he thinks he is," she observed. "Everyone fits in somewhere. Every idea, every word we utter helps form the public opinion that is the basis on which our Government works."

One area where a delinquent—or even negligent—attitude prevails is in voting, which Susan views as both a duty and a privilege.

"Some people don't vote because they feel millions of other voters make their ballots insignificant," Susan explained with some consternation. "They are wrong. First of all, every vote counts. And, second, those who vote set an example for younger people around them. If my father didn't vote, I'd certainly want an explanation."

Voting is a duty, she reasons, because a person has a responsibility to learn and evaluate the qualifications of prospective candidates. It is a privilege, she added, because "we are one of the relatively few nations that allows its people to choose the men and women who will be given the vast amount of power to represent us."

Susan affirmed that good citizenship is especially important to members of her generation because eventually they will be decisionmakers. She contends, however, that adults frequently belittle the actions of all teenagers because of the irresponsibility of a few wrongdoers.

"Everyone is worried that we're growing up too fast," she exclaimed. "In a sense, maybe these people are right. But in growing up fast our minds are open to ideas that never concerned generations before us. We're accepting this as our challenge—to become more aware now of the responsibilities we will face as adults."

Susan admits that there seems to be a general lack of interest in the process of government and in national and international affairs beyond the limits and requirements of the classroom. Although some time is allotted in high school history and civics classes to current events, she said, "many students leave it there."

Participation in extracurricular school activities helps make better citizens, she said. "You can voice your own opinions and weigh them against those of other people. But joining these organizations will only benefit you if you participate actively in them. Just being a member is not enough."

Susan apparently, has the strength of her own convictions. She is business manager of her school newspaper, the Hurricane Herald, a representative of the student council and a member both of the Model Legislature Club and of the school debating team.

The daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John P. Regan of 25 Colony Avenue, is 5 feet, 8 inches tall with brown hair done in a stylish "flip," sparkling brown eyes and rosy cheeks that dimple when she laughs.

She is no stranger to the speaker's rostrum. In March 1964, she was a finalist in a statewide American Legion oratorical contest and finished second in the Governor's annual Thanksgiving Day Proclamation contest.

This year she has already been chosen as one of four State finalists in the 28th National American Legion High School Oratorical contest. She will compete in the finals March 12 in East Providence.

Susan plans to be a biology major in college, but added that "I'll probably wind up as a history major." She said she would like to teach in secondary schools after college.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP, 1964–65

"You are free, and therefore responsible. From this moral liberty is derived your right to political liberty, your duty to conquer it for yourself and to keep it inviolate, and the duty of others not to limit it."

These stirring words were those of Giuseppe Mazzini, the philosopher who struggled for Italian unity and the republican movement throughout Europe. Although spoken in a foreign land over a century ago, they have the same powerful significance now as they did then.

We, in America, are a free people, united in a society to work for the betterment of all humanity. This is only possible through the fulfillment of each and every citizen's responsibility. We live in a nation where men may think and act according to their individual beliefs; where their hopes and dreams are not smothered by a class society; where they may attain any goal they wish if they are willing and able to work toward it.

The individual citizen is the center of American purpose and American hope. He is our Nation's strength or weakness. Each and every one of us has a vital part to play in our country's future. We have a voice in our Government; we are given certain duties in order to improve it. Our rights and our duties go hand in hand. We have the right to vote; to vote is also a duty. We have the right to equal protection of the law; we also have the duty to enforce our laws justly.

The citizen who takes advantage of his rights and fulfills his responsibilities exerts a tremendous influence on his government, and can ultimately affect world change. His every word; his every act; his every idea is important, for they form a mighty force called "public opinion." Without the understanding, the support, and the sacrifice of the public, our Nation could not progress. It is therefore the duty of all citizens to make sure that no one is deprived of his rights. True freedom cannot exist where men live for themselves alone. Good citizens are the essence of a good society, and in order to improve society, we must first improve ourselves—in our homes, in our jobs, and in our communities. We must work as individuals in a society united in a common cause—democracy. This, is "The Challenge of Citizenship."

We are indeed fortunate that ours is a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people"; that we, as free citizens can be an integral part of a living government. Yet, in many countries, oppressed by dictatorships, people are allowed no individualism; they are only significant insofar as they serve the state; they have no voice in their government. This form of government is, at present, the greatest threat to the "free world," and it is up to us to halt its progress before we, too, lose our most precious possession—freedom. Our forefathers fought and died to preserve this free-

dom. We must guard it well, so that future generations will enjoy true democracy.

Our country is now in the midst of a cold war. We are caught in a struggle of forces from outside as well as from inside the United States. These crises are testing our ability to carry out our responsibilities as citizens who are sincerely interested in the welfare of their country. Can we pass this test? We must. For, it is our generation which must cope with these problems. If our freedom is to survive, it is up to us.

In the words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

"To some generations, much is given. From some generations, much is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny."

The Nation's Traffic Toll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's traffic toll is certainly a concern of most Americans. Television station WTMJ in Milwaukee, Wis., has some interesting comments on this serious problem, which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues:

Many times simple devices have solved old and troublesome problems. Take the case of Oconomowoc with its many grade crossings and high-speed trains running through the center of the city. Fifty-one persons died and hundreds of others were injured in train-auto crashes in Oconomowoc since 1911. Several months ago the city installed stop signs at all its crossings. While this apparently has solved Oconomowoc's problem, the city is going even further by eliminating some of the crossings.

Nationwide, as in Wisconsin, the traffic safety record is a disgrace. That's why our stations are promoting a 10-point safety code for legislation designed to cope with the problem. Take another simple device, a seat belt. It gives an occupant of a car a five times better chance of escaping death in an accident than one who doesn't wear it. Yet many people who have belts in their cars don't use them.

It's a strange situation when most automobile buyers seem to be more interested in horsepower and body style than they are about safety factors. As a result, the Federal Government has found it necessary to act. Its General Services Administration, which buys 50,000 automobiles a year for Federal use, has set down some rugged safety features for the 1967 models it purchases.

On its own, the auto industry has brought about many safety innovations throughout the years. The Government is prodding it to do more. Only recently the industry announced its 1966 models would be equipped with rear as well as front seat belts. The Government is demanding the rear belts for its cars and lap and shoulder belts for the front seats, in addition to several other safety features.

Following last year's toll of 47,000 highway deaths, Congress is exhibiting even greater concern over the problem. Wisconsin's Senator NELSON not only has proposed that the devices demanded for Federal cars be built into autos purchased by the public, he also has urged that the Government develop a prototype safety car. One of the first things Governor Knowles did upon taking office was to pledge his administration to a concerted attack on the highway accident rate.

Despite all these efforts, there will still be a need for the drivers themselves to adopt an attitude which puts safety first.

America Afflicted by Poor Mouth Syndrome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on the day the House is rushing headlong into the so-called Appalachia panacea, I think Jenkin Lloyd Jones' column "America Afflicted by Poor Mouth Syndrome" is most appropriate.

The column follows:

AMERICA AFFLICTED BY POOR MOUTH SYNDROME

Like hogs grunting to the trough, Congressmen are clamoring to get their districts declared "Appalachias."

The President's original Appalachia uplift plan has called for an initial expenditure of a billion dollars in 11 States along the Appalachian Ridge.

Now Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN has come up with an amendment to the Appalachia bill to include 36 Missouri counties and 21 Arkansas counties. Senator FRED HARRIS wants to add 19 Oklahoma counties. Senator EDWARD KENNEDY says "We in New England must be ready to advise the President of our needs when this new legislation (Appalachia) becomes effective." Senator JOSEPH MONTOYA is insisting that the entire four corners country of New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, and Utah be Appalachianized. Who wants to bet that the Appalachians won't soon reach clear to Alaska?

In the old days it was the custom of American communities to boast of their wealth, or at least their bright prospects. The homestead dodgers glowed with promise. The railroad agents regaled immigrants with Utopian visions. The boom towns sent forth their bands and booster trains. And the chamber of commerce tradition, the think-big, can-do, talk-it-up brand of self-hypnotism started in America when Capt. John Smith described the miasmic swamps of Jamestown Island as a "faire and prettye land."

But while Charles Dickens saw only America's mud, bad table manners, and spittoons, and while Sinclair Lewis and H. L. Mencken hooted at our Babbittisms, this American habit of putting up a bold front and flashing a toothpaste smile paid fantastic dividends. The tent towns became shack towns and the shacks gave way to paint and trim. Your community was supposed to be a proud thing.

This pride made a great nation. The immigrant may have come from a Moldavian village that had drawn water from the same well for a thousand years, but 5 years after his arrival at a signpost along the Kansas railroad he was burning his fingers on skyrockets to celebrate the opening of the town waterworks.

But now we weep for Appalachia. A legend grows. Millions of Americans are allegedly held prisoners in accursed regions. They are, to use the euphemisms of the hour, "disadvantaged," "deprived," "underprivileged." They must be rescued by a vast and special outpouring of Federal funds.

So appealing is this myth of the trapped and downtrodden Appalachian that just before Christmas, when the Columbia Broadcasting System put out a heart-rending documentary on eastern Kentucky, 150 tons of goods and $57,000 in cash were rushed to the region by distressed Americans.

Now, maybe we ought to knock off some of the sentimental sobbing and political handwringing about America's Appalachias and ask ourselves how come.

Some regions are in trouble because coal loaders have replaced bituminous miners. Some are in a jam because oil and gas are better and cheaper fuels than anthracite. The miner who was thrown out of work after 40 needs special consideration. He must either be retrained into a marketable skill or supported in some degree for the rest of his life.

But there is usually a good economic reason why an industry has not hurried into Appalachia. And there must be a limit to the sympathy productive Americans should lavish on the able-bodied man who sits on his cabin porch year after year waiting for someone to bring him a job.

County Judge Willie Kirk, of Martin County, Ky., said last month: "You'll find about 80 percent of our people just looking for another handout." And he added that some local families have been unemployed for three generations.

If the roads through Appalachia are poor they are at least passable. A young man can get out. And in three generations someone else has built Houston, Phoenix, Los Angeles, Anchorage, and Honolulu.

Appalachia is no stranger to the Federal dollar. The entire TVA is in Appalachia. The gigantic $1.2 billion Arkansas River project will touch many of the counties which Senators MCCLELLAN and HARRIS would add to Appalachia. The Four Corners country is the home of some of our most expensive and most dubious reclamation schemes.

But worst of all is the Appalachia psychology. Is our famous local pride going to be replaced by poor-mouth contests? Are Americans going to put on their dirtiest shirts and raggedest fishing pants and go crying their deprivations and disadvantages to Washington?

That isn't the way this country was built and it will not be the formula for its preservation.

Obsolete and Duplicated Agricultural Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Daily News edition of Monday, March 1, there appeared an editorial which presented a thoughtful case for the administration's attempt to reduce or eliminate obsolete and duplicated agricultural research.

The editorial, entitled "Bamboozled," read as follows:

The administration makes a clear and sensible case in its proposal to reduce or eliminate obsolete, inefficient and duplicated agricultural research. It deserves the support of Congress and encouragement to act further.

Why, for example, should the taxpayers continue paying for research on bamboo,

which isn't even grown commercially in this country? They shouldn't.

What remains to be taught farmers about breeding of rabbits? Little, if anything.

What is left, after almost 60 years, to be learned about irrigation and dryland farming in certain areas? Very little.

Why shouldn't private industry take over research into fabrics, kitchen design and food wholesaling? It should.

As is already obvious, many Congressmen—economy- and efficiency-minded Congressmen, mind you—are screaming. They are alarmed at the loss of hometown, home-State boondoggling. But they are yelping up the wrong tree—bamboo or other—we think.

I commend this editorial to my fellow Members and urge that they give thought to its message.

Successful Flight of Ranger VIII Gives Space Program a Big Boost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Bill Gold which appeared in the February 20, 1965 edition of the Washington Post which to me conveys an atmosphere which I have found to exist in many people's minds, that they are now believing this country can put a man on the moon. At the very least, they believe we are now capable of doing it, which in my mind is more important than actually placing a man there.

DISTANT TOMORROW IS NEAR AT HAND

Ranger VIII was "right on the money" at last report. If all goes well, it will have landed on the moon by the time this newspaper is placed at your front door. Scientists hope to get 4,000 pictures from Ranger VIII, and they say that this batch may be better than the photographs produced by Ranger VII last July.

The pictures last summer stirred my imagination to unaccustomed levels of activity. If today's pictures are better, I may have to withdraw into a fanciful world of my own for a few days until the effect wears off.

Speculation about exploring the moon didn't excite me much at first because the idea seemed as farfetched as a science-fiction plot. This wasn't a project that I really expected to see undertaken in my time. It was a dream for some distant tomorrow—and I'm too preoccupied with trying to survive today to worry about distant tomorrows.

But here we are moving in for closeups already, and even my reactionary mind is willing to accept the likelihood that the next step will follow shortly: we will land a camera on the moon gently enough for it to continue to send back on-the-spot pictures.

Is it possible to contemplate this eventuality without tingling a bit at the prospect and wondering: "What will we see?"

The accuracy of the world's scientific community has been uncanny in recent years. Specialists in several fields have been able to foretell what would happen when we passed previously uncrossed boundaries. They've been able to predict much of what would be found in vast areas into which no man had ever ventured.

Yet there have also been surprises for our scientists—things they hadn't expected to encounter.

And one must now wonder what sorts of surprises the moon will hold for us, and what sorts of new vistas it will open.

People sometimes ask whether we're spending too much on our moon projects, but I've never been concerned over the question. I have the feeling that the times force decisions of this kind on people. The circumstances that prevail at historic moments produce reactions that move men inexorably in the only direction that seems natural under those circumstances.

When the Russians put up their first sputnik, our leaders spoke slightingly of the achievement. Emmet John Hughes says in "The Ordeal of Power": "Sherman Adams, in a rare display of shallow partisanship, disparaged all public concern with 'an outer space basketball game.'" Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, who had just retired from office, called it "a nice technical trick." President Eisenhower assured reporters that "the satellite itself * * * does not raise my apprehensions, not one iota."

But it seemed very plain to most people that a new door had been opened into the heavens, that others had already passed through that door for a glimpse of what lay on the other side, and that either we'd join the mass movement in that direction or we'd be left behind.

So we joined the mass movement. It seemed to me that there was never any doubt about what we'd do. There are strange and wonderful mysteries out there in the universe, and instinct tells us to pursue them.

It's hard to believe that we're now almost ready to take this next big step into space. The years ahead may turn out to be the most rewarding in history—especially if we don't blow ourselves up in an atomic war meantime.

We Set the Example in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dancey in his editorial of February 27, 1965, in the Peoria Journal Star points out that we must bear a heavy share of responsibility for so-called political events in Vietnam. I pointed out in my radio broadcast of February 18, 1965, that a dangerous school of thought prevailed within the administration at the time of the murder of Diem. When we proceeded on the assumption that political reform had to come before military victory, we were on dangerous ground. I have been told by one in good authority that to the chief of state of another country, friendly to the United States, the murder of Diem meant just three things: It is dangerous to be a friend of the United States; it pays to be a neutral; it sometimes helps to be an enemy.

Mr. Speaker, Charles Dancey points out as I did in my broadcast that this same deadly pattern seems to be engulfing some of our policy decisions in Vietnam today. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial at this point:

WE SET THE EXAMPLE IN VIETNAM

(By C. L. Dancey)

As the game of musical chairs continues in South Vietnam's Government, let us face the obvious truth that we bear a heavy share of responsibility for these political events.

It is all very well for Senator MANSFIELD to get up in the Senate and pronounce that we are getting tired of the jealous generals who are endangering the safety of South Vietnam by their endless coups.

It is all very well for our Government to complain bitterly about the failures to establish a civilian government.

But we only have to go back to where this whole series of military coups and military rule began to face the fact that we set the example, we started it, and we established the precedent.

We wanted to get rid of Diem, who we felt wasn't doing as good a job as could be done, and wasn't pushing the reforms we wanted in the civil life of the nation. All doubtless true and valid criticism.

And we got rid of him—but how?

We announced that we were dissatisfied with Diem. We announced that we didn't believe the military leaders supported some Diem actions—an announcement openly described at the time by all observers as a straight out invitation to the military to depose Diem.

Then we spelled it out further by leaking information that we expected him to be overthrown.

Finally, we spelled it out flatly by cutting off funds to Diem's personal troops and government and continuing funds to the army units under more or less independent commands. And who knows what else via our secret agents?

Diem's overthrow in the first of the military coups followed, amid considerable joy and self-congratulation in Washington, D.C.—dampened only by the sobering item that he was also assassinated.

We promptly endorsed the new military government.

Then, we started to talk about reforms and a civilian government.

But actions speak louder than words. Example is a more effective teacher than the finest of statements of principle.

The action was before them. The example was before them. The precedent was before them. The experience was before them, that the road to power is a military coup.

We thus established a climate in which every officer of rank could dream of being the head of the nation, and of achieving that position at a single stroke by the technique we had just taught them.

The coups have followed endlessly.

And now we throw up our hands in despair and contempt at those ungrateful, foolish, irresponsible, undemocratic, doublecrossing, jealous generals.

This is not the way we educated them to act, we say. It's hard to teach these people how to operate.

That excuse is not true. This may not be the way we educated them to act in our military classrooms for Vietnamese officers, but this is precisely the way we educated them to act in practice.

We cannot duck our full share of responsibility for the political mess in Vietnam.

We set it up.

We outsmarted ourselves.

We refused to recognize the practical and earthy effects of our own actions.

And it is with sadness and frustration, not with pride, that we at this newspaper add that we were close enough to the grassroots and far enough from the ivory tower to be fearful of just this sort of thing, and to have expressed our fear that our policy was setting off a chain political reaction at the outset.

Sad because of the consequences to our country and the cause of freedom.

Frustrated because if someone no closer to the scene than we could see this seemingly obvious down-to-earth result, somebody in the high council of this Nation ought to have seen it, certainly.

But we didn't see a single "liberal" voice raised against a military coup and a military dictatorship engineered by our liberal Government.

It struck us as just another example of how flexible the liberal moral principles and boasted high ideals are when it is a question of raw power used to further their own projects.

They only hate power when it is in someone else's hands, it seems, in far too many cases. And in such cases, the self-styled liberal is no liberal at all. He is a fake.

It's a distinction that needs to be made if we are to make sense out of our own politics here in the United States, as well as in places like South Vietnam.

San Diego Pilot Wins His 11th Air Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting in view of the great many dedicated Americans currently serving in Vietnam that I should call my colleagues attention to the exceptional service and dedication exemplified there by a fellow San Diego citizen, Capt. Howard Shook. Just recently he was awarded his 11th Air Medal because of his relentless and honorable service in our behalf. The following article appeared on February 24 in the San Diego Union and it speaks well of our pride in counting this brave man as a fellow citizen:

SAN DIEGO PILOT WINS HIS 11TH AIR MEDAL IN VIETNAMESE WAR

TAY NINH, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Capt. Howard Shook of San Diego waited a long time to fly. He was 13 when he soloed. Now he is a much-decorated U.S. Air Force pilot in strife-torn Vietnam—forward air controller with the 2d Air Division. He has won 11 Air Medals for his missions over Vietnam.

Shook began flying as a crop duster to pay his way through San Diego State. It paid off. He made it, with a few dollars to spare.

TO VIETNAM

The captain was assigned to Vietnam in February 1964. He was sent here to one of the most Vietcong-infested areas in the country.

"It was an interesting welcome I received at Tay Ninh Province," he grins. "The province chief assured me that 90 percent of the land here is owned by the Vietcong."

For 10 months Shook was the only U.S. Air Force officer in the Army compound at Tay Ninh.

While the forward air controller normally flies the O–1F, a single-engine light plane used for marking targets for the heavier bombers—the A–1E's and A–1H's—Shook also has worked with the ground troops.

In June, for example, Shook directed an air strike from the ground, working with Vietnamese troops. It turned out to be one of the largest air strikes of the Vietnamese conflict.

Shook recalls that there were 26 sorties of A–1E's and A–1H's in a 4-hour period. The ground count later confirmed more than 300 Vietcong were killed by fire from the air.

Groundwork is only part of Shook's mission. As forward air controller he has flown more than 500 sorties over Vietnam.

SEVEN PLANES USED

"Hits?" he laughs. "Yes, I've had my share. The O–1F is not armor plated, you know. It absorbs ground fire like a towed target on the gunnery range."

Shook says he used up seven airplanes in a year. Each received so much battle damage it had to be replaced.

Finally the law of averages caught up with Shook. He was wounded when a .30-caliber-machinegun bullet came up through the canopy, the windshield and the right window of his plane.

"The plexiglas seemed to explode," Shook said. "Although I was hit in the forehead and right arm with shrapnel from the blasted compass on the instrument panel, it really didn't amount to much. I flew the plane back and landed without any trouble."

Shook soon plans to return to his wife, Barbara, at 4530 37th Street, San Diego, for leave before reporting to Nellis Air Force Base, Nev. Then he'll be back in jet fighters again.

Iowa Strings Near Perfection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to commend the Iowa String Quartet of the University of Iowa and the players Allen Ohmes and John Ferrell, violins; William Pruecil, viola; and Joel Krosnick, cello; for an outstanding performance here in Washington, D.C.

These musicians are examples of the excellence which Iowans have attained in many areas. The southeast section of the great State of Iowa, particularly Iowa City is rapidly becoming the cultural center of the Midwest. I am proud to represent this district in Congress.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to the remarks made by Donald M. McCorkle, music critic, in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star of March 1, 1965. To allow my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the opportunity of learning more of these Iowa musicians, under unanimous consent I include the Star's statements in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

IOWA STRINGS NEAR PERFECTION

(By Donald M. McCorkle)

(Iowa String Quartet (Allen Ohmes and John Ferrell, violins; William Preucil, viola; Joel Krosnick, cello). At the Phillips Collection. Program: Quartet in A, K, 464, Mozart; String Quartet, Op. 3, Berg; Quartet in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2 Mendelssohn.)

The first thing one noticed at yesterday afternoon's concert at the Phillips Collection was the extraordinary fine quality of the program book, which was designed for the entire 1964–65 season of the Iowa String Quartet, both at home and on tour. The program notes by the University of Iowa's musicologist, E. Eugene Helm, are a model of brilliant annotation.

The second thing one noticed was the extraordinarily fine atmosphere and acoustics at the Phillips Collection recital hall, a combination offering perfect incentive for a perfect concert.

With these admirable requisites at hand, it was possibly inevitable that the performance by the Iowa String Quartet would be very near perfection, and it was. These four players played a brilliant performance of an extremely formidable program of Mozart, Berg, and Mendelssohn. Their playing was so secure and superb that one was able to concentrate entirely on the compositions themselves, rather than on the players' techniques which often obscure the music.

The Mozart A Major Quartet, K. 464 strikes the hearing as being among the most romantic pieces Mozart ever wrote. It combines exquisite contrapuntal, interweaving lines with a thick and rich texture rarely found in Mozart. The lovely Andante is a bitter-sweet masterpiece.

If the Mozart was golden, the Alban Berg was more nearly like stainless steel, with its sharp cutting edge, precision, and cold beauty. It's an early work, and so lacks the mature lyricism of the Violin Concerto. All in all, it's an almost oppressive quartet, for the two movements are long, thick, dissonant, contrapuntal, and of utmost melodic and rhythmic complexity.

In places there is some comic relief, as in the wonderful glissandos and sinister tremolos in the second movement.

After intermission the quartet shifted to the silver of Mendelssohn, for the exquisite E Minor Quartet. As with the rest of the program, this was magnificently performed, with each part perfectly blended and full-bodied, and the broad contours and details excellently sculpted.

The Iowa String Quartet played with superb precision, warmth, and artistry, and leaves little doubt that it is among the very first rank of American University string quartets.

Independence of Morocco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the ninth anniversary of the independence of Morocco. On this momentous occasion, we would like to extend warm felicitations to His Majesty King Hassan II; and to His Excellency Ali Bengelloun, the Moroccan Ambassador to the United States.

Independence days are of great significance to new members of the world's community of nations. We should, at the same time, not forget the opportunity they afford us of recalling the past and evaluating the present. This is the ninth anniversary of Morocco—a recently independent country, yet one of the oldest independent monarchies in the world.

The first recorded inhabitants of Morocco were the Berbers, whom all the civilizations of the ancient world fought in order to establish their outposts there. The Phoenicians and the Carthaginians established trading posts along both the Mediterranean and Atlantic coasts; following them came the Romans, who built cities at Tangier, Volubilis, and many other places, the ruins of which are still visible today. When the Roman Empire declined, the Vandal tribes crossed the straits and invaded the northern coast. By the middle of the seventh century

A.D., the only remnant of the glory of Rome was the city-state of Ceuta, governed in the name of the eastern Roman Empire.

In the latter half of the seventh century the Arab armies, sweeping out of the Arabian Peninsula to spread Islam to the world, entered Morocco. Nearly the entire population of the country, including the Berber tribesmen, were converted to the new faith, and the conquering armies of Islam moved in new directions—this time across the Straits of Gibralter into Spain and southern France.

The fierce independence of the Berbers, as well as the spread of heterodox ideas within the new religion, however, soon led to a rebellion in Morocco, which had as its consequence the rise of several small Muslim principalities. The first of the great Muslim dynasties to rule Morocco, the Idrisids, arose soon thereafter, attempting to unify the many smaller units into one whole. They founded the city of Fez, which became a notable center of Muslim life and civilization. And, they can be considered the founders of the first Moroccan state, indicating it might be more accurate for us today to be celebrating the 1,200th anniversary of that country's independence.

Over the years, other dynasties rose to take the place of previous ones when their energy and ability had waned. There were the famous Al-Moravids, who established Morocco as one of the great medieval powers. They extended their power and influence across North Africa and into Muslim Spain, thus bringing Morocco into the rich milieu of Andalusian civilization, which has left its indelible print on Moroccan life and culture. The Al-Moravids were replaced by the Al-Mohades, who kept Morocco as the greatest Muslim Empire of the West and led the country through one of its golden ages. They in turn were replaced by the Merinids and the Saadian Kings until the 17th century, when the family which guides the destiny of Morocco to the present day arose. Known usually as the Alawi House, and under their able rule, Morocco was thoroughly pacified and solidly united.

We as Americans have good reason to have friendly feelings toward this family, for Morocco under their rule was one of the first powers in the world to recognize our independence; the early treaties of friendship, trade, and good relations were drafted and signed by men such as Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and George Washington, who had reason to appreciate Morocco's recognition and assistance.

Were it not for the brief period of colonial rule between 1912 and 1956, we could even be celebrating the 306th anniversary of the accession of the present house, whose vigor and popularity is demonstrated by their leadership of Morocco in the 20th century in regaining independence. Under the present King, Hasan II, Morocco is making great strides in all fields of activity. Able, energetic, and democratic, he has given the country a new constitution, promoted foreign investment, and is determined to bring about the rapid economic development of his country.

On this anniversary of Morocco's independence, we salute that country's people, king, and the goals for which they strive together. We hope that together they will soon create in Morocco a new golden age for that historic country.

Julian "Pappy" Van Winkle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES P. FARNSLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, Kentucky lost a famous and highly regarded citizen on February 16 with the death of Julius P. Van Winkle, the dean of American bourbonmakers.

Mr. Van Winkle did much for Kentucky and for the industry of which his company is a respected member.

I wish to include at this point an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 18 and several other articles that appeared in other prominent publications in tribute to Mr. Van Winkle.

The articles follow:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Feb. 18, 1965]

HE WAS A GRAND OLD KENTUCKIAN

Julian "Pappy" Van Winkle, the grand old man of the Kentucky bourbon industry, is dead at 90, and with him died a little of the tradition, lore, and, yes, blarney, that have made Kentucky famous.

Van Winkle was old-fashioned, conservative, and opinionated, and he wanted everyone to know it. He was also a consummate salesman who knew that a Nation of gray-flannel conformists secretly admires the homespun virtues.

Legions of magazine readers will miss the stern yet kindly face that stared them right in the eye from the masthead of his advertisements. Indirectly, his promotions did much to benefit Kentucky. For instance, as the oldest active distilling company executive in the Nation until his retirement last October, he could make the unique claim that all 90 Kentucky Derbies were run in his lieftime.

His advice, like his marvelous stories about life in Danville, was worth listening to. He invited people to enjoy his product the same way he did—in moderation.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times Feb. 18, 1965]

JULIAN P. VAN WINKLE, 90, DIES—LONGTIME DISTILLER OF BOURBON

LOUISVILLE, KY.—Julian P. Van Winkle the dean of American bourbon makers, died at his home here last night. He was 90 years old.

Mr. Van Winkle had been ill for several months and had retired as president of Stitzel-Weller Distillery in October. He continued as honorary chairman of the board.

Mr. Van Winkle was in the distilling business for 71 years, starting as a salesman with W. L. Weller & Sons, wholesale whisky firm.

Mr. Van Winkle eventually became co-owner of the concern and then bought the Stizel Bros. distillery. He assumed the presidency of Stitzel-Weller in 1934 and held that post until he retired in October.

For Mr. Van Winkle, the old-fashioned way of making whisky was always the best way and he at one time noted:

"We have a sign on our distillery door saying 'no chemists are allowed on this place'."

One of his concern's most famous products was Old Fitzgerald and Mr. Van Winkle said the process he had not changed since he began making it.

Mr. Van Winkle, an 1894 graduate of Centre College, gained national notice with a series of advertisements in magazines that recounted homespun Kentucky anecdotes.

He is survived by his widow, the former Katie Smith; a son, Julian P., Jr., and a daughter, Mrs. Charles K. McClure.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 18, 1965]

"PAPPY" VAN WINKLE, 90, PUBLICIZED FIRM'S WHISKY

LOUISVILLE, KY.—Julian P. "Pappy" Van Winkle, 90, who publicized his firm's bourbon whisky in chatty advertisements filled with anecdotes from his own days as a salesman, died Monday at his home here.

Mr. Van Winkle, former president of the Stitzel-Weller distillery, was the oldest active distillery executive in the Nation until he retired last October.

As a 19-year-old he went to work as a salesman for the W. L. Weller & Sons wholesale whisky firm in Louisville, travelling through Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, and West Virginia.

Later he and another salesman bought the firm, then acquired Stitzel Bros. distillery. Mr. Van Winkle was president from 1934 until he stepped down in favor of his son, Julian, Jr., last year.

His personally written advertisements were classics, sliding in the selling message with gentile indirectness. He began one, "A northern visitor once came to our Kentucky town as usual, fell in love with its equable climate, its friendly people, its unhurried way of life. 'Ah, this is God's country,' he remarked one day, his nose deep in a leafy julep. 'Course it is,' agreed his Southern host. 'You didn't think God was a Yankee, did you?'"

And suddenly just as chattily, Mr. Van Winkle was selling bourbon. "Not least, among nature's bounties to Kentucky," the ad went on, "is the mellow bourbon which inspired our visitor's expansiveness."

[From the Tap & Tavern, Feb. 22, 1965]

INDUSTRY PAYS WARM TRIBUTE TO VAN WINKLE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Leaders of the distilling industry last week joined in paying tribute to Julian P. "Pappy" Van Winkle, 90, recently retired proprietor of Stitzel-Weller Distillery, who died at his home in Louisville, Ky., after an illness of a few months.

Robert W. Coyne, president of the Distilled Spirits Institute, described the far-famed Kentuckian as "a very real example of Americana."

Walter J. Devlin, chairman of the board of D.S.I. and vice president of the Fleischman Distilling Corp., described the dean of the industry as "a full-bodied legend in his own time."

Frederick J. Lind, vice president of Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc., who recently relinquished the D.S.I. board chairmanship to Devlin, said, "The alcoholic beverage industry would not have been the same without "Pappy" Van Winkle and his uncompromising faith and purpose."

Coyne's statement read:

"A very real example of Americana has departed the scene with the passing of the beloved 'Pappy' Van Winkle.

"This forthright Kentuckian was a champion of the free enterprise system and an advocate of quality first in his product. One of the few remaining preprohibition dis-

tillers, 'Pappy' was a source of inspiration to all of us in this industry.

"He was a founding member of Distilled Spirits Institute in 1933 and a leader in the formulation of its guiding principles. He remained as honorary lifetime member of the board of directors after his retirement from the active affairs of the institute."

Devlin's statement said:

"Julian P. 'Pappy' Van Winkle, Sr., was an individualist and a character who truly became a full-bodied legend in his own time. That legend was based on his unblemished career of militant integrity and pride in his product and the alcoholic beverage industry. It will live and flourish in the years ahead—nurtured by the fond memories of those who loved, admired, and respected the warmth and personality of the recognized dean of the distilling industry."

Lind voiced similar sentiments:

"The life of 'Pappy' Van Winkle, and his unswerving devotion to American principles as he saw, practiced, and preached them, are certain to serve as an inspiration and challenge to all industry men of good heart who survive him and who follow in his giant footsteps."

Spontaneous informal tributes piled up from other leaders of the distilling industry throughout the Nation—and even from foreign countries.

Alert and active until only a few months ago, Van Winkle, who would have been 91 on March 22, relinquished his title of proprietor to his son, Julian P. Van Winkle, Jr., last October.

His homespun philosophy was exemplified in a statement on his 90th birthday anniversary: "In case you're interested, I credit my long life to early rising, hard work, a daily dram or two of Old Fitzgerald, and a modest number of good cigars."

He hunted and played golf until about 6 years ago and he and a pet dog, which at times carried his golf bag, were familiar figures on his favorite Louisville course.

He was proud of the numberless friends he had cultivated among retailers over the country during a period of 70 years.

His Stitzel-Weller Co. was traditionall a family distillery and Van Winkle boasted that the plant had no chemist, only a whisky maker. He often declared that he would allow no compounders on the premises.

Typifying the family nature of the distillery, his daughter's husband, C. K. McClure, is secretary-treasurer of the Stitzel-Weller Co., and a former president and chairman of the board of the Distilled Spirits Institute.

Besides his son and daughter, he is survived by his widow, Kate Smith Van Winkle, and five grandchildren.

Getting to Work and Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the second article of Consumer Reports' timely and cogent series, "Getting to Work and Back." The second article deals with a subject of vital concern to us—how a good balanced transportation system can be financed and I am therefore entering the first half of this article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

GETTING TO WORK AND BACK, PART 2—HOW A GOOD, BALANCED SYSTEM CAN BE FINANCED

(By Ruth and Edward Brecher)

Monday, December 30, 1963, was a black day for Boston. Bruce Talford, who surveys Boston traffic conditions for radio station WHDH every afternoon from a helicopter, was among the first to note that something was seriously amiss.

"It was quite obvious when we took off from the heliport at 3:45 p.m.," he wrote the next morning in the Boston Traveler, "that we were in for an unusual afternoon. The northbound side of the central artery was already showing congested traffic at that early hour. We decided to track the congestion to its source and found traffic backed up through Leverett Circle underpass. * * * Then we swung over the Boston Public Garden and Boston Common. * * * Traffic was literally bumper to bumper and completely stalled. * * * At each of the intersections traffic looked like something you'd expect to see in a cartoon. * * * By 4:45 p.m. the entire downtown area * * * was completely snarled. We began to refer to [it] as an emergency area."

In Boston each afternoon, as in most other large American cities, drivers are accustomed to find the outbound lanes of their freeways clogged up as the peak hour approaches. But on this afternoon a relatively new phenomenon made its appearance. The ordinary downtown streets were so burdened by cars trying to get onto the new southeast expressway and other "fast" routes home that the relatively few cars coming into the city at that hour found it impossible to get off the expressways. Hence the inbound routes also clogged up. "It was then," Talford reported "that we started referring to our traffic jam as the biggest of them all."

WHAT CAUSED THE JAM

What caused this colossal snafu? Nothing very dramatic. Boston's traffic commissioner later told Consumer's Union that a somewhat greater number of shoppers than usual drove into town that day; street capacity was a little below normal owing to snow from a few days before; there was more double parking that afternoon in the financial district than was customary; and many cars started home earlier than usual because of the approaching New Year holiday.

Out of such commonplace factors the crisis rapidly burgeoned. At 7:40 p.m., Talford noted, downtown traffic was "still at a near standstill." At 8:10 p.m., "the downtown area looked like a typical 5 p.m. rush-hour period." Not until after 9 p.m., more than 5 hours after the emergency began, were near-normal conditions restored.

Reading of Boston's "happening," you may feel sorry for her sorely tried residents and suburbanites. But in point of fact, the events of December 30, 1963, marked a beneficient turning point in the city's transportation history. Bostonians rebelled. They demanded action, and in less than a year they got it. The State legislature increased cigarette taxes by 2 cents per pack and earmarked the proceeds for improvements in public transportation. Boston's Metropolitan Transit Authority, serving the city and 13 suburbs, was superseded by a new agency with responsibility for improving transit service for the city and 77 suburbs. Planning programs were launched to provide the entire metropolitan area with a high-quality, balanced rapid transit and freeway system.

Last month, in part 1 of this series, Consumer's Union documented the arguments for and against such a combination of (1) high-quality rapid transit for the bulk of the rush-hour trips to and from work in a heavily built-up central business district and (2) well-planned freeways for the many other errands that make up the modern American family's life. The evidence pointed to the conclusion that many if not most cities are in direct need of something on the order of San Francisco's Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) system to help unclog the vast system of federally financed urban freeways begun in 1956 and scheduled for completion in 1972. The BART system is slated to open in 1969, with stations and ample parking out in the country between suburbs, 80-mile-an-hour top speeds, average scheduled speeds of 50 miles an hour (including 20-second stops), average platform waits of only a minute or two between rush-hour trains, comfortable seats, good lighting, air conditioning, noise control, and other conveniences and amenities—all for a fare significantly less, and for some riders dramatically less, than the current cost of freeway commuting and parking.

A dozen other large North American cities, as Consumer's Union noted last month, have rapid transit plans in various stages of preparation—either for building new systems approaching San Francisco's in quality or for upgrading their existing systems. But most of these plans are today stymied by the same obstacle: tax subsidies are required for the construction of high-speed, high-quality transit systems—and except in San Francisco, Montreal, and Toronto the subsidies have not yet been secured.

All city and suburban residents should be directly concerned with these transit plans, whether or not they themselves commute on transit lines. For if urban transportation problems are not solved, their cities are likely to suffer traffic jams like Boston's; and if transit systems are subsidized, the money will have to come directly or indirectly out of their pockets. In many cases, moreover, referendums will be held at which residents will be asked to approve or disapprove transit subsidies. To vote wisely, an understanding of the alternatives is important.

WHY HIGH-QUALITY TRANSIT NEEDS A SUBSIDY

"Automobile commuters pay for the roads they use through gasoline and other taxes," opponents of transit subsidies insist. "Why shouldn't transit riders pay their own way, too? There must be something wrong with a transit system that can't finance itself out of the fares it collects."

This argument, however plausible superficially, is based on a widespread misunderstanding. At first blush it may appear that automobile commuters really are paying their own way. Under the Interstate System financing plan, for example, vehicle owners pay a billion dollars in gasoline and other taxes for every billion dollars' worth of Interstate System freeways built. But the fallacy becomes apparent if we take a closer look at a typical commuter route—the 15-mile Kennedy (Northwest) Expressway into downtown Chicago. Here is an analysis prepared by the New York engineering firm of Parsons, Brinckerhoff, Quade & Douglas, well-known transportation consultants:

"The Northwest Expressway was built at a cost of about $238 million. If placed on a financing basis equivalent to that presently typical for public transportation improvements, allowing interest at 4 percent and depreciation over about 50 years, capital charges can be said to amount to $11.1 million a year. It is estimated that fuel and other related taxes paid by vehicles operating over the expressway will amount to approximately $3.8 million per year."

Thus user taxes, the consulting firm concludes, cover only about one-third of the capital cost—and nothing is left over to cover the expressway maintenance costs, the operating costs, the costs of traffic control, and other annual charges. The automobile commuters who use the expressway are very heavily subsidized. Where does the money come from? "The balance of the capital, maintenance, and operation costs must be met," the P.B.Q. & D. analysis continues, "by

taxes on fuel consumed by vehicles operating over roads and streets already completed, some for decades."

Where a freeway built to handle peak-hour urban commuting costs $2 million per lane mile, Dr. Lyle C. Fitch of the Institute of Public Administration, estimates the tax on gasoline burned on the freeway at peak hours would have to be increased by 75 cents a gallon to cover the cost of the road.

An even higher estimate has been made by the Regional Plan Association for the Greater New York area, based on studies by Prof. William Vickrey of Columbia University:

"The subsidy to rush-hour motorists on typical urban expressways and streets is about 10 cents a mile per automobile. The person driving 25 miles to work during rush hours in a metropolitan area is subsidized about $5 a day (or perhaps 50 cents or $1 less if he passes toll gates) * * * if [commuter] railroad and subway riders received the same subsidy as automobile commuters, the Government would have to pay each rider handsomely to step onto a train."

Parking, too, is being subsidized. Free parking on streets, low-cost parking in city-owned or city-subsidized parking lots and garages, and parking provided free or at low cost by employers as an employee "fringe benefit," all reduce the out-of-pocket price of automobile commuting below the economic cost.

Against this background, the need for a transit subsidy becomes more understandable. A transit system, no matter how popular, how badly needed, or how well planned and operated, can hardly be expected to woo commuters off the freeways without a subsidy so long as the urban freeways themselves, and the parking at their downtown end, continue to be lavishly subsidized.

Another factor that tends to make a transit subsidy virtually necessary is the belief of many commuters that using their automobiles costs only as much as the transit fares do. These people tend to underestimate the latter.

When asked, some car owners set the cost of driving to work as low as 3 cents or 4 cents a mile. They are thinking, of course, of the day-to-day out-of-pocket cost of driving a car one additional mile—assuming that the car itself is already paid for, insured, garaged, and in good running condition. The full cost, in contrast, averages more than 10 cents per mile driven. (A detailed breakdown of this figure was included with part I of this series in last month's Consumer Reports.) "If commuters' cars came equipped with taximeters that ticked off 10 cents each mile to remind drivers of their actual costs," one expert has commented, "these people might adopt a more realistic attitude toward the relative costs of driving and public transportation—and it might then be possible to raise transit fares high enough to permit new high-quality construction without a subsidy."

Some economists oppose on principle raising transit fares to cover the full cost—even if it could be done without driving more commuters onto the highways. They argue that transportation is a public "good" like education, parks, and public health; and they therefore consider it sound public policy to make transportation available below cost, or even free of charge.

The fine points of all these ideas need not be argued here. For the blunt fact is that, whether warranted or not, subsidy to peak-hour commuting by car is far too deeply imbedded in the economics of our large cities to be wrenched out at this late date. And if freeway and parking subsidies continue, the corollary inevitably follows that high-quality rapid transit will also require a subsidy.

The following five proposals, accordingly, are all concerned with ways in which a transit subsidy might be secured.

PROPOSAL 1. HARVEST THE "UNEARNED INCREMENT"

When the city of Stockholm, Sweden, years ago forsaw the future need for new suburbs, it bought low-priced land beyond the city limits. Now it is extending high-speed modern rapid transit lines into these undeveloped areas and building carefully planned new communities along the routes. The rapid transit lines enormously increase the value of the outlying land, of course—and the income from this land can thus be tapped to help pay for the rapid transit. Stockholm in effect thus harvests the land-boom bonanza that the new transit lines create.

American cities experience the same enormous inflation of peripheral land values when improved transportation becomes available. Russell E. Singer, executive vice president of the American Automobile Association, cited some startling examples in Traffic Quarterly for April 1964:

"In Houston, during a 5-year period, land values along the Gulf Freeway increased 65 percent more in dollar value than land distant from the facility. A study by Texas A. & M. College of the Central Expressway in Dallas described the increase in tax valuation of abutting property as astounding—a gain of 544 percent in 14 years.

"Communities along the route of Boston's circumferential freeway report property value increases as high as 700 percent. In Atlanta, undeveloped land rose from $100–$400 per acre to $1,200–$1,400 per acre after the freeway was built. Along the Eastshore Freeway in California average raw land values soared from $500 to $21,000."

Similar land-value increases occur when new transit lines are built, as Toronto's experience has shown.

It is not necessary for a government body to buy land on the Swedish pattern in order to tap these unearned increments. Much the same result might be achieved by taxing the land-value increase that results when a freeway or rapid transit line is opened up, and using the proceeds to pay for the freeway or transit line.

PROPOSAL 2. SUBSIDIZE FROM LOCAL TAXES

The three North American cities that have to date committed tax funds for new rapid transit siystems are all financing them in large part out of local tax funds. The San Francisco BART system, for example, is being financed largely through a $792 million bond issue; interest and amortization will be paid by local taxpayers in San Francisco and the two neighboring counties served by the system. The bond issue was approved in a referendum by 61.2 percent of the area's voters, even though they knew it would increase the tax on a modest home by an estimated $27 a year for many years to come. (Even some precincts that will receive no service whatever from the new BART system voted in favor of the bond issue.) In Monteral a mayor who urged that a new city subway be dug at the expense of city taxpayers was overwhelmingly elected in 1962, and the subway is now being dug. Toronto's new subway system is similarily being financed in considerable part with local taxes.

Transit subsidies by local governments can be justified on the ground that the annual value of the benefits will exceed the annual cost of the subsidy—and that the benefits will accrue to the entire area rather than merely to those who commute on the transit system. Benefits to the San Francisco Bay area from the BART system, for example, have been estimated as follows:

Savings in travel time	$40,810,000
Savings in accident costs	630,000
Savings in automobile insurance	1,287,000
Savings in parking charges	5,850,000
Savings in freight handling costs	2,128,000
Savings in traffic control costs	242,000
Total	50,947,000

This total is greater than the annual cost of the system to the bay area's taxpayers.

It seems unlikely, however, that voters in the area were much swayed by such dollar estimates. Rather, local observers report, voters approved the bond issue because they loved their city and their suburbs and wanted to protect them from more freeways and parking lots.

The basic objection to subsidizing out of local taxes, of course, is that the burden falls squarely on shoulders already overburdened by real estate and sales taxes levied for other purposes. That San Francisco, Montreal, and Toronto residents were willing to shoulder the added tax load for transit says much for their love of their cities, but their precedent is one not likely to be enthusiastically adopted by many other cities.

Local tax subsidies are further blocked by the fact that the benefits of a modern high-speed transit system will be shared by a city and its dozens or scores of suburbs—more than 500 independent governmental units in the case of the Greater New York area, for example. This country lacks a pattern of metropolitan organization adequate to distribute the cost equitably among the local units and to persuade or require each of them to carry its proper share. However, San Francisco, Boston, Philadelphia, and Atlanta seem to be making some progress in this direction.

PROPOSAL 3. SUBSIDIZE FROM STATE TAXES

Here Massachusetts has taken the U.S. lead with its new 2-cent-per-pack cigarette tax increase earmarked for public transportation improvements. North of the border, legislators in the Province of Ontario are also alert to the general benefits provided throughout a region whose central city has good transportation. Though a portion of the cost of the new Toronto subways is being borne by city taxpayers, part has also been assumed by the Provincial government.

In many American States, however, State aid to metropolitan transit is unfeasible because the State legislatures are dominated by rural interests. The redistricting required by recent Supreme Court decisions may change this picture, but even so, most States are short of funds for such essential public functions as education. Like the cities, they would prefer to have some other agency supply the transit subsidy.

Economical Power and Inexpensive Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, California has been negotiating with the Atomic Energy Commission for construction of a State-owned nucler powerplant that will supply energy for the pumps of California's State water project. California will need a big power supply to operate its big project for conservation and distribution of water.

The State and its consultants have determined that a State-owned nuclear generator will produce electric power more economically than any other source. The Atomic Energy Commission's plan for cooperation with California provides for a seed-blanket reactor that could demonstrate a new technology that would multiply manifold the energy

potential locked in the U.S. reserves of uranium and thorium.

Director William E. Warne of the California State Department of Water Resources, a former Assistant Secretary of the Interior and a longtime resources administrator, has made a most significant statement about the AEC-California nuclear power plan. He makes plain the importance of the new nuclear reactor technology to the conservation of nuclear fuels and the extension of energy supplies.

His statement, presented before the California Power Users Conference meeting in Berkeley on February 27, 1965, follows:

ECONOMICAL POWER AND INEXPENSIVE WATER

There have been several versions of the title of my talk to you today. I have written it down as: "Economical Power and Inexpensive Water." I have seen a reference to it as "Cheap Power and Cheap Water."

It makes little difference what title is given to my remarks. I am going to talk about the use of economical power to help make inexpensive service possible from the State water project.

Atomic energy can produce inexpensive power and thus cut the cost of conserving and distributing water.

The nuclear powerplant we plan for the State water project will generate minimum-cost energy. This means economical transportation of project water over the miles and mountains between the areas of surplus and the regions of need.

Our plans for use of nuclear power for the State water project result from studies we began in 1960 to find the most economical power source for our considerable requirements.

The project's power needs will climb to more than 12 billion kilowatt-hours in 1991, when the pumps will be pushing and lifting the maximum deliveries to home, farm and factory users in many parts of the State. This is 2 billion kilowatt-hours more than was used by the city of Los Angeles to meet all of its needs in 1963.

You can see from the magnitude of the project power requirement how important it was to the water users and to the State department of water resources to find the lowest cost source of energy.

We employed a firm of consulting engineers, the Fluor Corp. of Los Angeles, to make an extensive energy source study to help us select the most economical and reliable source to power the pumps of the project. Fluor checked into 40 possible energy sources and combinations of sources. The engineers devoted 22 months to the investigation.

Fluor made its final report last October. The consultants advised us that the least expensive power for the State water project would come from a plan involving State-owned nuclear powerplants.

Using the data developed by Fluor, supplemented by more recent department studies, our engineers determined that the most favorable plan is for the State to build a nuclear powerplant in 1971 and a second a few years later.

While the Fluor study was nearing completion, the Atomic Energy Commission offerred California and the State water project an opportunity—an idea of a cooperative arrangement to build an advanced reactor of a seed-blanket type.

This concept is similar to the reactor the Atomic Energy Commission pioneered in the Shippingport plant of the Duquesne Light & Power Co., Pittsburgh. The important difference in the State's proposed nuclear plant is that the blanket material is thorium as compared to uranium in the Shippingport plant.

The Shippingport plant has been in operation since 1957. It was the first full-scale commercial nuclear powerplant placed in operation in the United States. It is smaller than our plant will be.

The Atomic Energy Commission sees real economies in power production with a reactor of the Shippingport type in the size planned for California. Moreover, the Atomic Energy Commission forecasts spectacular gains in energy conservation for the thorium seed-blanket concept of the State water project plant.

The department of water resources and the Atomic Energy Commission have a formal understanding for the building of a seed-blanket reactor of about 525,000 kilowatts capacity. We are continuing negotiations toward a contract.

The Atomic Energy Commission would provide $20 million of the estimated $100 million cost of the complete central station—the nuclear reactor and the electrical generating unit. The Atomic Energy Commission would do the engineering, design and construction of the nuclear portion of the plant. The State would design and construct the electrical generating portion of the plant and own the entire plant.

An imporant part of the financing understanding is that a ceiling of $39,800,000 is fixed on the State's cost of the nuclear steam supply system. This protects the State by requiring that the Atomic Energy Commission defray any costs over this sum.

The first fuel core for the reactor will be furnished by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Costs to the State under these financial arrangements will come to about 3.5 mills per kilowatt-hour for the power produced for the State water project by the nuclear plant. This estimate includes the capital investmen, operating costs and reimbursement for atomic fuel during the life of the first core, expected to be about 9 years.

The most significant promise of the State water project's nuclear reactor results from a new technology the Atomic Energy Commission expects to demonstrate with it.

The innovation can increase greatly the efficiency of the process by which we utilize the energy stored in atomic ores. Successful completion of the project will achieve an advance of unprecedented magnitude in the conservation of a limited natural resource—nuclear fuel.

The natural resources from which modern man obtains his energy are consumed as we get power from them. Nature does not replace them and man cannot.

We may heat our homes with gas only so long as the supply lasts. We may fill the gasoline tanks of our automobiles only as long as petroleum products continue to come from the ground.

Man's use of energy is increasing rapidly, and with it his consumption of limited natural resources. Population grows and our energy requirement per capita increases. The need for energy multiplies as we advance in civilization and comfort.

The supplies of oil and gas and coal are limited. And so we move ahead always closer to the time when the supplies will be gone if we continue using only that energy source.

The President of the United States was advised that this country will exhaust its readily available fossil fuels in 75 to 100 years if we do not utilize supplementary forms of energy. He was told that, without any supplement, we will exhaust our total supplies of fossil fuels, including the hard to find and expensive to supply, in 150 to 200 years.

We have begun to use nuclear energy and we will increase our use of it markedly in the coming decades. This will mean more and more consumption of the country's nuclear fuels. What sort of supply of nuclear fuels do we have? What promise do they hold, compared with fossil fuels?

The nuclear fuel reserves of the United States are enormous. They dwarf the fossil fuel supply. They can meet our energy needs for the indefinite future if we use them efficiently.

Our current use of atomic fuels is exceedingly inefficient. The generosity of the supply will not be meaningful until we improve our use of it.

Only a minute fraction of our nuclear fuel reserve is available to the nuclear powerplants now in operation. Natural uranium contains only seven-tenths of 1 percent of uranium 235, the naturally fissionable material that releases energy in today's nuclear powerplants.

There are vast amounts of energy locked in the other 99.3 percent of natural uranium and in thorium, a nuclear fuel material which is widely distributed throughout the United States. These two ores are the storehouse of energy that the Atomic Energy Commission calls enormous in the United States. They can be converted into fissionable material, into useful fuel for a nuclear powerplant, by conversion in a reactor.

This process takes on great significance when it can be carried out in such a way that the conversion produces more fuel than it consumes. It is then known as breeding.

Breeding has been successful in the laboratories of the nuclear scientists and now the Atomic Energy Commission is ready to demonstrate its practicality in large-scale operations in the field.

The Atomic Energy Commission is engineering the first core of the nuclear reactor for the California water project so that it can prove the concept of breeding new fuel at the same time that energy is released for electric generation.

The Atomic Energy Commission-California design puts the breeding capability demonstration in a part of the first core; all of the core will work in the usual way to produce heat through fission for the power generators.

The thorium seed-blanket concept is the only approach known for significantly increasing the efficiency of use of atomic fuel in water-cooled thermal reactors.

The California reactor will demonstrate technology which is expected to provide means for ultimately making available for power production about half the potential energy in the thorium atomic fuel reserves of the United States. That is something like 50 times the energy potential presently obtainable from uranium or thorium ore resources.

I want to phrase that another way to emphasize it. We now realize only about 1 percent of the energy potential obtainable from nuclear fuels. The Atomic Energy Commission expects to move that up to 50 percent realization of the potential by means stemming from the California atomic powerplant development.

The energy thus made available from nuclear sources is many times larger than the energy available from fossil fuel reserves.

Those who study energy use what they call a Q unit for measuring quantity. This is a billion billion British thermal units. It is equivalent to the energy in 40 billion tons of high-grade coal.

The United States consumed about one and a half Q units of energy in all the years of its history up to 1960. Virtually all of this came from fossil fuels.

There are several estimates of future energy requirements. A conservative one forecasts that by the year 2000 the country's cumulative energy consumption will have reached about 5 Q units, by 2050 it will approach 20 Q units, and by 2200 it will exceed 100 Q units.

Let me relate these projections of consumption to the estimates of energy potential. The energy potential in known fossil

fuel reserves in the United States was reported to the President by the Atomic Energy Commission to be about 50 Q units.

Nuclear fuels of the country have an energy potential of only about 5 Q units, figuring on present low-conversion reactor use of reasonable assured reserves costing less than $100 per pound to recover, the Atomic Energy Commission said.

But with the seed-blanket breeding capability—the technology to be demonstrated by the California nuclear plant—the nuclear fuel potential of the United States shoots up to greater than 250 Q units in the calculations of the Atomic Energy Commission.

No single undertaking that I am presently aware of, other than State water project requires a block of power of the magnitude that would easily justify a nuclear plant of the size of the seed-blanket project, so a unique opportunity to serve the public interest through this cooperative demonstration is here presented.

The State water project will be just one of many California users of electrical energy produced from nuclear plants.

The Federal Power Commission, in its latest national power survey, predicts that energy requirements in the State will increase sharply in the coming decades and that most of the new need will be met by power from nuclear plants.

The Federal Power Commission projection is that 5 years from now nuclear plants in California will generate 8 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. This amount is equal to one-eighth the total electric generation in California in 1960 from all sources, hydroelectric, gas, and oil.

By 1980, 15 years from now, the Federal Power Commission says that California's annual electric generation from nuclear plants will reach 119 billion kilowatt-hours. That amount is almost twice the State's total power generation from all sources in 1960.

Nuclear plants in 1980 will produce about 44 percent of California's total electrical generation. The nuclear share of the total will climb to nearly 80 percent by the year 2000, the Federal Power Commission predicted.

There is no doubt of the place of nuclear energy in the production of electric power in the future of California.

I have looked more deeply into nuclear power potentials in my talk today than my title suggested. I have gone into details behind the story of how we will provide economical power to achieve inexpensive service from the State water project.

The work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the State on our nuclear powerplant involves much more than just the State water project. It has more widespread importance than the fact it will mean savings for customers of the State water project and for their customers.

The State water project's nuclear powerplant promises to make significant contributions to energy development.

The demonstration of fuel-conserving technology in the California atomic powerplant can make important entries in the pages of history.

It can multiply many times the potential of the Nation's newest energy resource—nuclear fuel.

It can lead the Nation to heightened efficiency in releasing the energy stored in the U.S. reserves of uranium and thorium.

It can mean more to resource conservation in our country than any other technological advance I can think of.

It can be the most important advance in the nuclear field since man's discovery of how to harness the atom.

I am proud that our State water project can contribute broadly to national resource conservation, as well as particularly to California water service, flood control, hydroelectric power production and recreation development.

Now is the time for Californians to set aside emotionalism and fears and move forward with confidence into the nuclear power age. All of us power consumers have a stake in this, and our children and their children, as well.

Mystery in Drive for School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in the March 2 issue of the Washington Evening Star Mr. David Lawrence wrote a very good article in regard to the Federal aid to education bill which will be before the House shortly. Mr. Lawrence has developed some very interesting points regarding this legislation.

His article follows:

MYSTERY IN DRIVE FOR SCHOOL AID

There's a mystery behind the pressure for the appropriation by Congress of funds to help pay the cost of education in the United States. It is unexplained just why Federal funds should suddenly be channeled into States and cities and counties to help schools in so-called poverty-stricken districts. Yet these already are being financed by and constitute a continuing responsibility of the States, counties, and cities themselves.

Most people do not realize that total expenditures for elementary and secondary education in American public schools amounted to $18.3 billion in the 1961–62 school year, the latest for which detailed figures are available. State funds supplied 37 percent of the total, while local funds made up 58.8 percent. Thus, the Federal Government was paying only 4.2 percent of the total educational expense. If this was essential aid, it is being asked why the States or local units could not afford this small percentage of additional cost, which amounted to less than $1 billion a year.

Federal funds in relatively small amounts have been allotted heretofore to federally affected areas and for school-lunch and special milk programs. A Federal relationship to school problems has been recognized, for example, in areas where the families of persons in the military or civilian services of the National Government reside in large numbers.

No such limitation is applied now, however, in the proposed aid-to-education program. A UPI dispatch last Saturday said that the House Education and Labor Committee voted "to make an additional 237,000 needy children eligible for President Johnson's proposed school-aid plan to satisfy demands of legislators from big cities." This legislation could turn out to be a big boondoggle.

Now, for the first time, the Federal Government would be participating directly and in an unprecedented way in the educational process itself in elementary and secondary schools. The pending legislation calls for $1.2 billion to be distributed to State and local areas. Of this amount, $1 billion will go for grants to school districts allocated on the basis of the number of children from families having less than $2,000 a year income.

The obligation of State aid to the school districts, on the other hand, has been well established for many years, though the amounts and methods of allocation vary from State to State.

Virginia, for instance, granted to different localities in the State a total of $120.4 million during the school year 1962–63. Of this sum, 63.5 percent, or $76.5 million, went to pay teachers' salaries, and $27.6 million was supplied to local schools in order to bring expenditure levels up to $255 per pupil. The State, moreover, paid $6.5 million for pupil transportation, and there are State-grant programs for such things as sick leave for teachers, public school library funds, special funds hor handicapped children, and other needs of the local districts. So Johnson's program is apparently aimed at the same city and county services that the State governments have been helping for many years.

Why, therefore, should the States suddenly be subsidized and their educational systems subjected to any measure of Federal control? No convincing answer has been made as yet, though it is suspected that politics and the pressure of organized groups and unions seeking higher pay for teachers may be largely responsible. Members of Congress have always been anxious to get more money for their respective districts.

All this, however, can only lead to more and more Federal control of State functions, and in time it could transform the whole U.S. governmental system.

The theory now is that, since the money will be furnished for a worthy purpose like education, criticism will vanish, so that an abundance of Federal money will flow to States and cities. This could eventually relieve them in large part of their obligation to take care of additional expenses for education and enable them to turn their own funds to other uses. This can mean more and more money will be available for pork barrel purposes within the States.

Incidentially, the spending of money by all sections of the government—Federal, State, and local—is increasing at a rapid rate. It may exceed the $200 billion level by June 30, 1965, according to figures recently announced by Tax Foundation, Inc., a private, nonprofit research organization. It is estimated that this overall expenditure represents a burden of $3,336 per U.S. family.

The whole economic picture is growing more and more complex. Unfortunately, neither in Congress nor in the States and cities is there much attention being given to the impact of excessive spending and, particularly, to the increasing flow of Federal funds into States and cities that have hitherto financed their own local obligations.

Al Benesch Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is good to pause in our busy lives to pay tribute to those who have helped enrich the world in which we live. My good friend and, I am proud to say, my constituent, Alfred A. Benesch, was honored last week for his many years of devotion to the Greater Cleveland community.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer joined in editorial tribute to him and I now call the Plain Dealer's words of praise of one of our finest citizens to the attention of the House:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Mar. 1, 1965]

AL BENESCH DAY

Community and country made a small payment last night on its debt to Alfred A.

Benesch for his many contributions to making the world a little better place in which to live.

For his devotion to his ideals and for his deeds for humanity, Benesch was honored at the Cleveland Jewish National Fund Council's annual dinner.

Yesterday in Israel, an area of the John F. Kennedy Peace Forest was named after Benesch and in memory of his wife, the former Helen Newman.

Honors are not new to the veteran of 37 years as a member of the Cleveland Board of Education and yesterday's testimonials will not be the last.

He won't be 86 until March 7 and he is still in there battling for better government, improved health, and richer education for child and grownup.

Niagara Frontier's Need of Assistance in Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the February 26, 1965, edition of the Buffalo Courier Express, Buffalo, N.Y., concerning the Niagara Frontier's need of assistance in pollution control.

Mr. Stanley P. Spisiak, representing the New York State Conservation Council, appeared before the House Public Works Committee in support of Federal regulation of pollution, and he has written many articles on this subject.

The editorial, which follows, indicates very clearly the need of pollution control legislation which should be enacted in this session of Congress:

AREA NEEDS U.S. POLLUTION CONTROL

New York State's newly aroused interest in control of water pollution fortunately is echoing in Congress. Without Federal and interstate attention to the problem, western New York hardly can hope to see much improvement of the border waters of the Great Lakes system.

Governor Rockefeller's testimony before the House Public Works Committee Tuesday dealt with his plans for a $1 billion State bond issue for sewage-treatment facilities and pollution control. He wants the Federal Government to contribute another $513 million to be spent over 20 years. He proposed changes in the Water Pollution Control Act so that New York will be eligible for more Federal assistance than it can receive under present provisions.

These objectives of the Governor are all in the interest of the Empire State's pollution-control effort. Probably a large part of the money would be spent to clean up conditions in the eastern part of the State where they are especially bad. This still leaves western New York in the position of needing Federal and interstate action with respect to the Great Lakes more than it needs a State-centered program.

A Buffalonian, Stanley P. Spisiak, seems to have promoted this area's interests before the House Public Works Committee better than the Governor. Representing a private organization, the New York State Conservation Council, as chairman of its water resources committee, Mr. Spisiak argued in behalf of Federal regulation of pollution. The Governor said Federal standards should not be imposed on States having adequate laws. Mr. Spisiak insisted this State does not enforce its laws.

In any case, pollution control that is not broadly based on national and international programs will not be completely useful to communities hereabouts. Interest in the subject at Washington is more important here than attention given at Albany to a State program, helpful though the latter could be in relation to the whole struggle for pure water.

Tribute to the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, this month the Peace Corps is celebrating its fourth anniversary. I am honored to join my distinguished colleagues in paying tribute to this outstanding and dynamic agency. I feel especially close to this organization as I was privileged to help guide and develop it in its early days and served on its staff for over 3 years.

The Peace Corps has written a new chapter in the history of the United States, if not of the world. The men and women who are serving overseas are engaged in a new diplomacy—essentially a people-to-people diplomacy and the only U.S. program operating in the countryside with the peasants and in the slums of the cities. At the rate of 11 cents an hour, Peace Corps volunteers are living in areas of extreme poverty; are working 10 to 12 hours a day, 6 or 7 days a week; are living in unlighted, unheated shacks carrying water to their houses in buckets and having to boil it before use, being subject to strange tropical diseases and sure to get at least one case of dysentary; having to use primitive outside privies.

These men and women are not overseas as advisers or highly skilled and highly paid technicians. Rather, they are working side by side with their host country counterparts, sharing their goals and aspirations, working with them toward the same end, in essence, helping the peoples of the developing nations help themselves. The volunteers are participating in the formation of history.

Today there are almost 9,000 volunteers serving in 46 countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Near East. These volunteers are teachers, nurses, farmers, community development workers—men and women working in hundreds of different fields.

The Peace Corps has embarked on a program of educating, building and training the citizens of the developing nations in a multitude of ways—by teaching and demonstrating new methods, new skills which will assist them to be more productive, and better health to permit longer life, in essence—a raison d'etre. The Peace Corps is helping these people to write a guarantee that their children will not have to fear poverty, ignorance, and pestilence.

Of perhaps greater importance is that the Peace Corps Volunteers are providing a real and valid demonstration of typical U.S. citizens in action, a new breed of overseas workers coming to a foreign country to work with the people, not to direct or advise the top leaders. The example of the Peace Corps Volunteer teaching and working with his counterpart is creating a positive climate of opinion. He is encouraging and inspiring the growth of understanding among people in a direct and personal way. In addition, he can be an important force in setting the pattern and laying the foundation for economic growth. The volunteer is able to provide the desperately needed guidance, skill and training which are the foundations for progress—economically and socially.

The United States, rich in natural resources and technical development, rich in human resources and ideas, rich in an inheritance of Judeo-Christian culture, has taken the leadership in man's quest for peace with his neighbor. And who is that neighbor in this world of mass media, fast transportation and affluent societies? He is the rice farmer in Thailand, the tin miner in Bolivia, the child with the belly bloated from starvation dying in the streets of India, the confused man from the bush in Africa seeking work in the city—these are the neighbors. This is one of the great missions of the Peace Corps—to help the hungry learn to feed themselves, to help the naked produce clothing, to help develop a local crops to visit and treat the sick, to help develop an educational program to teach the illiterate—to help these people help themselves in their struggle for health, prosperity, knowledge, and physical and moral well being.

This is not, however, a one way media. By living and working with the people of other countries, by sharing their hardships, by learning their language and by understanding their institutions and cultures, the Peace Corps Volunteers are gaining an experience which will be an integral part of their lives, something which they will be able to impart to whatever they may do in the future. As Sir Francis Bacon once stated:

> And let it appear that he doth not change his country manners for those of foreign parts, but only prick in some flowers of that he hath learned abroad into the customs of his own country.

The work ahead of the Peace Corps is great and to accomplish this goal, it needs trained men and women to pick up the gauntlet which has been tossed. In its brief history, the Peace Corps has made a significant impact on the countries in which it has been operating. Every month new contingents of volunteers are departing to various countries throughout the developing areas of the free world to start or continue a job that has to be done in order to strengthen these nations and to help them take their rightful place in the world of today.

As one volunteer in Latin America said a few years ago:

No conclusions or summaries are possible. Like the campesinos themselves, we are just beginning.

Through the Peace Corps, the United States has been able to say to the world—judge us not by what we have, but by what we do. Judge us by our greatest resource, a free people—teaching, sharing, learning, living side by side.

To paraphrase Sir Winston Churchill, this is not the beginning of the end but it is the end of the beginning in assisting these developing countries to wipe out poverty, disease, illiteracy, and social inequities.

Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps has received virtually universal acclaim both at home and abroad for its great pioneer contributions. It is our only foreign program that sails through Congress without controversy. There are lessons to be learned from its operations which should be of value in our other overseas endeavors.

First, is the value of extensive training of our overseas personnel in the language, customs and culture of the country. Too often we have sent people overseas highly versed in their specialties but unable to communicate their skills or to understand how to fit them into a foreign environment. I think the Peace Corps has made a great contribution in demonstrating the value of this preparation to effective overseas operations and a warm reception abroad.

Second, is the value of living modestly abroad, within the host country community rather than in a U.S. ghetto, and receiving pay comparable to our foreign counterparts. Much of our difficulty last year in Panama was attributable to the fact that our people in the Canal Zone, working side by side with Panamanians, were getting paid many times the remuneration of the Panamanians and living high off the hog, conspicuously better than the Panamanians. The Peace Corps local-living approach, applied to staff and volunteers at their respective levels, has been most significant to the Peace Corps success.

Third, the Peace Corps has demonstrated that the average U.S. citizen has much to contribute to the development of an underdeveloped country. High levels of technical competency are not needed to help a primitive society—indeed they may lead to frustrations. We would do better to send less eminent people but rather those with higher motivation and better preparation for the job.

And a fourth major lesson from the Peace Corps experience is the efficacy of building from the grassroots. More can often be accomplished toward achievements of significant development programs from the bottom up than from the top down. Much more social change emanates from internal country pressures than we have ever been able to produce or can hope to produce by tying strings to our assistance endeavors. This is perhaps the most important lesson of all.

I hope these Peace Corps revelations may eventually have a profound influence on the conduct of our foreign affairs, on our foreign assistance endeavors, and in the conduct of our private endeavors overseas.

American men and women are not only accepting the challenge of oversea service but the great domestic challenge when they return as well. As Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver stated to a group of departing volunteers:

You will learn through firsthand experience something about the contemporary world.

Your experience will update our texts, inspire our children, and invigorate our communities with a concern for the new world and the great tasks we face.

Many former volunteers are using the experience they gained overseas in the war on poverty by acting as instructors in the Job Corps and VISTA. Many are working in specialized fields of education, such as the pilot teaching project in Washington's Cardozo High School. Many are teaching who would never have taught before and are equipped to teach subjects for which we had no adequately prepared teachers. They can speak from firsthand knowledge of the customs and cultures of the lands in which they served. They multiply hundredsfold our resources of people who can teach the exotic languages like Thai or Punjabi or Swahili. They enter every conceivable field of our foreign relations, public and private, with a unique, firsthand contribution to make.

Thus, while Peace Corps volunteers are making tremendous strides in hundreds of fields in their service overseas, they also promise to make significant domestic contributions upon their return.

Later this month, a special conference is being held of returned volunteers to discuss the returned volunteer and his new and dynamic role in American society. I am certain the results of this conference will not only be of great interest but will provide some new insight into the Peace Corps and the vital part it can play in the development of the free world and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is thus with profound pleasure that I take this opportunity to praise the Peace Corps and the tremendous work it has been doing over the past 4 years.

Need for Agricultural Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the reasons we face a continuing need for acreage and commodity diversion, price support, and other agricultural legislation can be found by looking at our own abilities as farmers, fertilizer producers, agronomists, mechanical engineers, soil scientists, and animal scientists. These abilities, developed through our programs of education and research give the American farmer the ability to produce much more from an acre of land than was possible just a few years ago.

The power of tractors on American farms has increased 40 percent in the last 10 years. Farmers now have over five times as much drawbar power now than they did in the 1920's using horses.

The use of commercial fertilizer has nearly doubled in the past 10 years and the use of nitrogen has more than doubled. Expenditures for farm pesticides have increased from two to three times over in the past 10 years.

Not only do we produce more on less land but we use what we produce much more efficiently. We now produce about 20 percent more live weight of grain-fattened cattle per 100 pounds of feed than we did 10 years ago. We produce 25 percent more live weight of broilers and 15 percent more live weight of turkeys than we did per unit of feed. Dairymen get 28 percent more milk per cow than they did 10 years ago.

As I have previously pointed out advancing technology continues to push production ahead of consumption, and is primarily responsible for the chronic economic problems of American agriculture. But more importantly, the ability of our farmers to produce abundantly is a primary reason our Nation is the strongest in the world.

A Bill To Designate the New Veterans' Administration Hospital in Washington, D.C., as the Major General Melvin J. Maas Veterans Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced H.R. 3615, which would designate the New Veterans' Administration hospital in Washington, D.C., as the Major General Melvin J. Maas Veterans Hospital. I am happy to note that this proposal to honor an outstanding man has been endorsed by the national convention of the Disabled American Veterans. The text of their resolution follows:

ENDORSES DESIGNATING THE NEW VA HOSPITAL AT WASHINGTON, D.C., AS THE MAJOR GENERAL MELVIN J. MAAS VETERANS HOSPITAL

(Legislative Resolution No. 367)

Whereas Major General Melvin J. Maas, U.S. Marine Corps, Reserve, and Chairman of the President's Committee of Employment of the Handicapped, was a past national commander of the Disabled American Veterans; and

Whereas General Maas was a resident of the area of the department of Maryland for more than 25 years and displayed continued interest in the activity and success of this department; and

Whereas it has been the practice of the Veterans' Administration to designate hospitals with name of an outstanding personality; and

Whereas it is the belief of many Disabled American Veterans that there was no more outstanding member of this organization than General Maas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Disabled American Veterans in national convention assembled at Phoenix, Ariz., August 17–21, 1964, That the DAV go on record as endorsing the plan to

have the new Washington area veterans hospital designated by the Veterans' Administration as the Major General Melvin J. Maas Veterans Hospital.

Press Release by Congressman L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an outstanding statement by our beloved friend and colleague, the able, distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, on the subject of a bill he introduced today to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

Chairman RIVERS, who is extremely knowledgeable on any and every aspect of armed services matters, has long been deeply concerned about the pay scales of the members of the Armed Forces, and more than that, he has been very active over a period of time now in pressing for equitable readjustment of their basic pay.

It has been a real pleasure and honor for me to file a companion bill to the one filed by Chairman RIVERS, and I may say that 33 other members of the House Armed Services Committee also filed companion bills, thus evidencing the virtually unanimous support of the distinguished chairman of the committee in these vital matters.

I take this opportunity to compliment Chairman RIVERS upon the introduction of the bill and his splendid, comprehensive statement and analysis of the measure. Naturally, being greatly concerned as I am about the need for providing adequate, fair, just, and comparable compensation for all members of the uniformed services, I will continue to cooperate with Chairman RIVERS, and members of the committee, as well as all interested persons and groups in pressing for favorable action on this very meritorious bill.

The statement follows:

PRESS RELEASE BY CONGRESSMAN L. MENDEL RIVERS, DEMOCRAT, SOUTH CAROLINA

Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, today announced that he has introduced legislation to provide a substantial increase in basic pay for all members of the uniformed services.

Mr. RIVERS said that the "enactment of this bill will enable Congress and the American people to insure that every military family will share equitably in America's prosperity. It will enable our military families to live as firstclass citizens. It is consistent with President Johnson's announced intention to 'take whatever steps both human equity and national defense require to enhance the standing and morale of those who defend us.'"

Mr. RIVERS further stated "This bill reflects the levels of compensation that I believe must be paid our uniformed personnel if we are to continue to maintain the finest military force in the world today."

RIVERS also said that, "If Congress and the American public fail to give their wholehearted support to this necessary adjustment in military compensation the results could be catastrophic since it could only be interpreted by America's fighting men as evidence of public indifference to the future of our national security."

Mr. RIVERS also pointed out that the introduction of this legislation would be helpful to the President's commission presently studying military and Federal pay since it reflected congressional recommendations on the subject, but he added "Why further study is necessary is beyond me—the justification for a military pay raise needs no study."

Mr. RIVERS said that his bill, if enacted, will provide an average increase of approximately 10.7 percent in basic pay for all members of the uniformed services with a total annual cost of approximately $1 billion.

The proposed pay increase would apply to all of the so-called uniformed services, consisting of 2,723,000 personnel on full-time active duty.

Mr. RIVERS said that present deficiencies in service pay are the "unfortunate result, in general, of inadequate adjustments in service pay during the 1950's.

"Since 1952, for example, increase in general military compensation have totalled about 34 percent, while pay increases during the same period for classified civil servants has averaged more than 46 percent—substantially higher pay increases have similarly been provided unclassified Department of Defense employees since 1952.

"As a consequence of the failure since 1952 of military pay to keep pace with the economy and pay adjustments provided other Federal workers, the comparability that formerly existed in these levels of compensation for Federal employees has now been lost."

Mr. RIVERS said, "If we fail to correct this inequitable condition in service pay we will develop a type of mediocrity in our Armed Forces that no American can accept. Second best, in this business," said Rivers, "means being last."

Mr. RIVERS further stated, "This action will reaffirm the intention of the Congress to fully discharge its responsibilities under article I section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that the Congress alone is empowered to determine the compensation to be received by members of the Armed Forces."

Congressman RIVERS added, "Unlike all other employees, the men and women of our armed services can neither bargain nor lobby for equitable adjustments in their pay scales. For practical purposes, they must stand mute on the question of military pay. It is the responsibility of the Congress to provide an equitable wage adjustment. Congress can not ignore this moral and constitutional responsibility.

"Military pay should not be based on how little we can pay, but in the American tradition of fairness and equity, on what level of compensation is just and adequate for service personnel when compared to prevailing wage scales in the civilian economy and among other Federal employees."

Under the bill, increases would be limited to basic monthly compensation; no changes or adjustments would be made in special pays and allowances.

The increases in basic pay for enlisted personnel with under 2 years of service range from 13 to 33 percent, or an average of $16 a month. For enlisted members with over 2 years of service, the average increase would be 11.2 percent, or $28 per month.

Officers with under 2 years of service would receive an average increase of 22 percent, or $55 per month. Officers with over 2 years of service would receive an average increase of 6.4 percent in basic pay, or $42 per month.

Chairman RIVERS emphasized that in developing the proposed new rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, he had fully taken into account and measured all other elements of service compensation, including the so-called major military fringe benefits.

The new rates of basic pay were arrived at by first attempting to develop a level of pay that would be equivalent to the total wages or salary paid a civilian Federal Government employee performing the same general type of duties and for the same general level of responsibility. Then, this level of pay was reduced to accommodate the appropriate amounts of allowances provided service personnel for quarters and subsistence; the estimated tax advantage which accrues on such allowances; and finally, the estimated contribution of 6½ percent that service personnel would have to pay toward their retirement if they were civilian Government employees.

"Thus, for the first time," said the new chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, "my bill attempts to link uniformed services pay levels to those provided Federal civilian employees and identifies in precise amounts the value of so-called major traditional military fringe benefits."

The bill makes no special provision for retired military personnel. Under existing law, adjustments in service retired pay are now geared to increases in the cost of living as reflected in the consumer price index and are effected by the Secretary of Defense without further action by the Congress.

In an unprecedented action for the committee, Mr. RIVERS stated that an overwhelming majority of the entire Committee on Armed Services had cosponsored the bill.

He concluded by saying, "Many months ago I promised the members of the uniformed services and their dependents that I would introduce what I considered to be an adequate pay bill. I have kept my promise. My conscience is clear. The fate of this bill is up to the Congress, the administration, and, above all, the attitude of the American people."

Tribute to 40th Anniversary of "Rambling With Gambling" Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, community service, which all of us strive for, is an important and integral part of our work as Members of Congress. Those of us who are fortunate to live in and represent districts in the New York metropolitan area and the suburban areas surrounding it have been the recipients of a standard of public service seldom equaled and certainly never surpassed. I address myself to the untiring efforts of WOR radio, in New York's "Rambling With Gambling" show, which celebrates its 40th anniversary of continuous broadcasting on March 8.

During these 40 years, John B. Gambling and his son John A. Gambling have provided a high standard of excellence in public affairs reporting and community service.

Millions of WOR listeners have long been accustomed to the reliable voice of

the "Rambling With Gambling" show, announcing the official word on school closings, or giving up-to-date reports on traffic conditions, or announcing civic, social, and community events.

The fabulous Fourth Congressional District of New York looks with pride on the marvelous series of accomplishments of John B. Gambling, his son John A. Gambling, and WOR radio. I am privileged to congratulate them on 40 years of progress and performance in serving their listeners, and I hope that we can look forward to many more years of "Rambling With Gambling."

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, every day we hear more and more about the youth of our country and the responsibilities of citizenship which they must bear in the future. Therefore, I am pleased to know that there are many fine organizations in our Nation who encourage our young men and women to seek a greater knowledge of these responsibilities.

Among these organizations is one whose members are fully aware of the responsibilities which freedom demands, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. In its endeavor to create an awareness in our young people of these duties it annually sponsors the "Voice of Democracy Contest".

In this year's contest more than 250,000 high school students participated. The winner of this contest in each State is invited to come to the Nation's Capital to compete for four scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes.

Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to announce to the House that the Washington State winner is a young man who is a resident of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. Stephen Bixby Parker, the Washington State winner has already proven his quality of citizenship by competing with many other young men in my district for an academy nomination and in this toughest of competition he has received a nomination.

Mr. Speaker, the fine presentation given by this young man is worth deep consideration by the Members of the House and indeed all Americans. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD at this point, "The Challenge of Citizenship," young Stephen Parker's entry in the Voice of Democracy contest:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

"The fate of the world will in no small degree depend upon the type of citizenship developed on this continent." These words, spoken by Theodore Roosevelt in 1905, state the full and ultimate challenge of U.S. citizenship.

The fate of the world, the fate of our civilization—that seems a little strong for the importance of citizenship. But the quality of a government is the quality of its people: its citizenship. A civilization is the sum of the qualities of the governments—the sum of the citizenship of the people.

Man is always faced with choices, often extreme choices. Everyday we choose between good and evil, action or inaction, stopping or continuing.

Today, the world is complicated by conflicting ideologies, and between them we must choose.

Development of responsible citizenship in our democracy is fundamental in choosing, preserving, and extending our way of life.

Responsible citizenship in a democracy does not come about by being a passive member of a society. Responsible citizenship comes by action on the part of the citizen. It means work, above and beyond that necessary to attain a mere living. It especially means working to increase one's knowledge of world affairs, government processes, and government organization. It means participation in community affairs. And it requires intelligent voting, using the knowledge obtained to elect competent officials.

But active citizenship is not enough. Responsible citizenship includes the developing of those individual virtues which have stood the test of time. These virtues, a challenge to attain, form an integral part of the attributes of good citizenship.

Honesty is the foundation, the building block of free government. It is a challenge to be honest, when it can be more materially profitable to be dishonest.

Courage, the ability to face what is right and work toward it, regardless of the consequences, will help us to meet all challenges.

Enthusiasm is a necessary part of good citizenship. It is contagious; it is respected. Nothing truly great can be obtained without it.

The virtue of loyalty has many facets. It involves a genuine attachment to our society at all levels. It begins with the family, extends through the community, to the national, and toward the world level.

Honesty, courage, enthusiasm, and loyalty are four fine traits of character, all contributing toward better citizenship. We are challenged to attain these virtues. We must develop them to meet the continuing challenge—the fate of a civilization, our civilization.

We can maintain our democracy, our freedoms, only through awareness and action.

This action must be taken now. Crises are building up—world nutrition and health, the population explosion, and nuclear proliferation. These problems are increasing in intensity and urgency.

We cannot be apathetic. We must work and be aware of the challenge facing us.

We are confronted with two extreme choices: a government of the people, or a government without the people. Through knowledge, we know which one is better. Through honestly and loyalty, we will support our choice. And through courage and enthusiasm, the proper government will dominate.

The golden hopes of freemen, of all men, rest upon the way we meet the challenge of citizenship.

We have that challenge. We know how to begin. Now let us meet that challenge.

Everyone's Duty To Help Someone in Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, it has been with distressing regularity that we have read in recent months of incidents where witnesses and passersby stood while an innocent person was being attacked. In contrast, I am proud to relate the details of an occurrence in my district on February 17 in which nine public-spirited gentlemen rushed to the rescue of a woman who was being assaulted.

These nine men worthy of our commendation are John Morton, Earnest Beemblossom, Charles Pfenning, Bill Thomas, Francis Luse, and Mel Meggars, of Marion, Iowa, and Richard Mishler, Larry Schatz, and Barry Christiansen, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a portion of the story printed in the Cedar Rapids Gazette describing the incident as follows:

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette, Feb. 19, 1965]

RESCUE BY PASSERSBY GIVEN LAVISH PRAISE

"What you fellows did makes a woman feel a lot safer."

"It's reassuring to know that there are people who care about the welfare of another."

"This proves that Cedar Rapids is a fine place to live."

These comments were among the many received by Francis Luse, 39, of 2105 Hillview Drive, Marion, one of nine men who came to the rescue of a 54-year-old Cedar Rapids woman being beaten by an intoxicated motorist Wednesday evening.

The words of praise were fairly typical of the deluge of plaudits and gratitude the Cedar Rapids and Marion men have been receiving from the public.

Early reports indicated that eight men had come to the rescue of Janette Hofferber, 2416 A Avenue NE. However, it was later disclosed that a ninth man, John Morton, 2660 17th Avenue, Marion, also had helped. In fact, Morton was the first man on the scene and had grabbed the berserk driver, Robert D. Hartley, 25, of Route No. 2, Vinton.

Police said the incident happened after Mrs. Hofferber pulled her car over to Hartley's and told him he was driving the wrong way on a one-way street. Hartley then became enraged and tried to pull Mrs. Hofferber from the car. Hartley had been involved in a hit-run accident moments before, police said.

Like his companions, Morton was a bit stunned by the incident.

"I'm just a small town farm boy," he said, "and this is the first time I've personally seen anything like this. I'm just happy I could be there to help."

The group of passersby who aided Mrs. Hofferber included two teachers, three scout leaders (all employed at Collins Radio Co.), one railroad executive, and three teenagers.

One of those helping pull Hartley away from the car was Charles R. Pfenning, 44, of 933 Eighth Avenue, Marion, vice president of the American Train Dispatchers Association. Pfenning recently had surgery on fractured discs in his back, yet he risked personal injury to join the rescue effort.

It was Pfenning, a former deputy sheriff from Sacramento, Calif., who got handcuffs from his car and clasped them on the struggling Hartley.

Like most of the other men, Pfenning initially thought that the Hofferber and Hartley cars had collided.

"It wasn't until I heard her scream that I realized the man was trying to beat her up," Pfenning said.

Another man joining the battle was Earnest Beemblossom, 30, of 1350 Maplecrest Drive, Marion, head football coach at Marion High School. The enraged assailant attacked Beemblossom at one point, but fared poorly against the 205-pound football coach.

Beemblossom said Friday that a student working in the Marion school office plans to send the Gazette story about the rescue to Mayor Robert Wagner of New York.

The Cedar Rapids rescue was in sharp contrast to recent crimes in New York where witnesses failed to help women being attacked.

Luse and the other men tended to downplay their efforts.

"It was something every simple," Luse said. "It's everyone's duty as a citizen to help someone in need."

Reserve Officer's Association Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening a colleague of ours, the Honorable ROBERT L. F. SIKES, of Florida, was chosen to introduce the principal speaker, another colleague, at a banquet of the Reserve Officers Association here in Washington. The man he introduced so eloquently was my own chairman, L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

At the organizational meeting of this committee, and again at the ROA banquet last Friday, MENDEL RIVERS reminded us all that Congress is not yet dead and that, indeed, it still has a lawmaking function, regardless of what others may think. That evening he received the 1965 Minuteman of the Year Award of the ROA.

It is not my intention to deal here with the masterful address delivered by my chairman on that occasion. That appears elsewhere in the RECORD. But the remarks made by BOB SIKES as he introduced MENDEL RIVERS that evening, are, I think, of such a nature that the Members of both bodies of the Congress should have the opportunity of reading them in the RECORD. I think all will agree that BOB SIKES knows his MENDEL RIVERS and is able to say so.

Under unanimous consent, I include his introduction in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

We meet in an hour of serious import. I speak not of world problems, not of threat of war in southeast Asia, nor even of domestic problems which headline the front pages of the Nation. I speak of the claim of the Pentagon of its right to inflict its will on Congress in the matter of strength and makeup of the Armed Forces despite the Constitution and despite the statutes. I speak of the danger to the Nation from a rebirth of the theory that those in the Pentagon can read the future from crystal ball computers and determine how our enemies will fight, with what weapons, and upon what ground. We have made this mistake many times before—always with serious consequences to us. I speak of the danger which accompanies a substitution of cold figures, for the judgment, experience, and wisdom which are vested only in humans, never in machines. I would remind those in the high places that machines never won a war. It is the heart and spirit of the men behind the machines that make the difference. In so many battles and in so many wars fought by this country, it was reservists whose heart and spirit made the difference between defeat and victory.

We are now in a battle to preserve the historic concept of the Reserve forces, without which no major war has been won in our time or no emergency overcome. It would be easy to be discouraged. The odds are crippling. As your distinguished executive director, Col. John T. Carlton, has stated, "Our association may not win in a power political struggle because we are neither equipped, manned, nor skilled in that field. We may not win a propaganda battle because news management and influence wielding are not within our capability." He could well have added, "The security of the Nation will suffer and our defenses will be weakened if we do not win." So, win we must.

There is much to be done. Time is running. The time of beginning is now; the place is here at this meeting. I would remind you there still is a Congress. That Congress can determine policy if it so chooses, and Congress has that responsibility. The final battle for the preservation of the Reserve Forces will be fought in Congress. Your Congressman will have a voice in what is done. He can decide between computers in the Pentagon or the reservists back home. We are not against change, not against progress, not against savings—but let's do it the right way.

We meet here tonight to honor a man whose voice has never been stilled by the power of the executive branch; a man whose voice reflects conscience, dedication, and ability. He is the chairman of the powerful House Committee on Armed Services. That great committee reflects his leadership and is stronger because of his personality.

No one in Congress has done more to insure that the men and women of the Armed Forces and their families share in the benefits of the Nation's prosperity. He has been the leader in nearly every important aspect of improved military programs—pay and other personnel benefits, stronger reserve policies, airlift, hospital construction, and weapons procurement. He has figured in all the impressive lists of battles won in the Halls of Congress for the military in our time. He is credited with the startling pronouncement, too long delayed in recognition, that "the members of the Armed Forces are entitled to standards of living equal to the standard of living they are defending."

I came here with MENDEL a long time ago. Like so many of us in Congress, I have grown accustomed to standing in his long shadow. There was a time when I, too, bucked the system, but I found it didn't pay. You don't swim upstream against this RIVERS. Those were the times when I was competing for installations and facilities on which MENDEL had his eye. Things are better now. If he puts anything else in Charleston, the whole place will sink completely from sight just from the sheer weight of military installations. That means some of the rest of us can get into the picture now and then.

MENDEL RIVERS is a leader whose leadership the Nation needs. He is a leader whose knowledge has brought and will continue to bring a strengthened defense, whose understanding will promote morale among military personnel—and the American people will benefit. I am proud to count him one of my best friends. I do not have to remind you that he is one of your best friends. He is very well chosen indeed for the honor which is paid to him tonight. There could not have been a better choice. And back of him is a lovely little lady whom we all honor and love—Margaret Rivers.

The Minuteman of the Year Award is the highest honor which can be conferred by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. It comes to very few people, each of whom was carefully chosen for outstanding achievement. In selecting MENDEL RIVERS to receive the Minuteman of the Year Award, our association designates him as the person most outstanding in service to the defense of America and to those who wear the uniform. I take great pride in the name of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States in presenting this year's Minuteman of the Year Award to one of the great figures of the U.S. Congress to you, MENDEL RIVERS, the citizen who has contributed most to national security.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a prize-winning speech which was recently delivered on "The Challenge of Citizenship" by Miss Julia Allene Meng, of Raton, N. Mex. Miss Meng delivered this speech during a statewide contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and was awarded first prize for the State of New Mexico. It is a wonderful thing to see that there are young people like Miss Meng who have such deep-seated personal feelings on the rights and privileges of citizenship in these United States.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP, 1964–65

(By Julia Allene Meng, New Mexico)

American citizenship is a brilliant gem, with many facets. In order to keep it sparkling and glowing, each of these facets must be kept highly polished by the gem's wearers—we, the American people.

Patriotism, respect, love, honor, integrity, the four freedoms—these are the facets of that gem. How many of those facets have you or I polished lately? Which facets will shine more brightly because of our efforts—tomorrow?

Let's take patriotism. Do your eyes become misty from the warm, secure feeling you have when the flag passes by, or when you hear our national anthem? Do you get that lump in your throat when you fervently make the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag? If having such feelings, and being unafraid to show them, brands you guilty of being "square," then, let me, also, be judged guilty.

Citizenship is not just an outward display. In our homes, schools, businesses, and churches, there is frequent temptation to veer from the ideals set down by those who founded our country—made its laws—and then died to make our democracy a living example before the entire world. We should do no less than they did—but each of us must do it in his own way.

Our citizenship often is challenged by false doctrines, and there are so-called Americans who listen to the enchanting promises of those doctrines—all the while enjoying the benefits of the very nation those doctrines seek to undermine. This is a terrific challenge that we can never ignore. We simply cannot take our liberty for granted—or someone will take our liberty.

We can't—even for one day—abdicate our responsibility by letting our country's honor become something to which we give lipservice, but no action. This holds true, even

down to the level of our possibly ignoring a stop sign just because no one is around to see us or arrest us.

To my contemporaries I say, though we must progress, let us not mar the beauty of the gem by defacing the proven truths that have come to us through our great good fortunes of birth or naturalization.

Because it is in God we trust to guide us, we young people can meet each challenge and carry on—and on—and on. But, we must fit ourselves to meet the goads and challenges that would subvert our thinking and the great American way of life.

And—fitting ourselves means absorbing many, many avenues of education, and then learning to evaluate their philosophies and practicalities; in becoming active participants in choosing our leaders—from school, to precinct, to President of the United States.

Voting is a privilege of citizenship—the privilege of letting our voices be heard on the rights and wrongs of issues and individuals. Any good citizen can polish this facet of the gem—and he'd better do it, or he or his children may find they have lost their rights to this claim of precious citizenship.

Responsibility, humility, and the God-given grace to stand up and speak for the fabulous trust fund given us by our forefathers—that is the challenge we young citizens of America must meet each hour, each day, each year of our lives.

Soon the administration of this trust fund will fall upon us, and, if we have polished each facet of our citizenship gem, we can meet the challenges which that citizenship demands—with alacrity, intelligence, and anticipation.

Lithuanian Community of Omaha Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Community of Omaha, February 21, 1965, on the occasion of the 47th anniversary of the commemoration of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. The resolution follows:

Having met to observe the 47th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, and view of the continuing Soviet Communist occupation and oppression of Lithuania, we, Americans of Lithuanian descent living in Omaha, in session on February 21, 1965, at St. Anthony's Parish Hall, hereby adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas Lithuania, the land of our ancestors, enjoyed a free and independent existence from 1918 until June 1940, when Communist Russia by chicanery, subversion, and force invaded and occupied the country, and still oppresses the Lithuanian nation to this day;

"Whereas with the attention of the world focused on the new African and Asian nations which were liberated from colonialism with the aid of the United Nations and have joined the community of free and independent states, the plight of Lithuania and the other Soviet-occupied nations has largely been neglected: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That we request and urge our Government to place the matter of the liberation of the world's newest colonies—occupied Lithuania and all the other Soviet captive countries—before the United Nations for full investigation and appropriate liberating action, using indisputable, firsthand evidence as basic material for presentation to the United Nations, and that our delegation to the United Nations be instructed to pursue this matter diligently; be it also

"*Resolved*, That we send this resolution to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, and copies thereof to the Senators and Members of Congress from our State.

"_____.
"*Chairman.*

"_____.
"*Secretary.*"

Francis Scott Key Nominated for Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a memorial addressed to the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University signed by my colleagues in the Maryland delegation and myself. In presenting our views to the hall of fame in this manner we seek to gain recognition for the author of "The Star-Spangled Banner" to which his memory is richly entitled:

A MEMORIAL TO THE HALL OF FAME FOR GREAT AMERICANS AT NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

(By the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives from the State of Maryland)

The Members of the U.S. House of Representatives from the State of Maryland, being proud of the distinguished history of our State and of its many contributions to the United States of America, have resolved that—

"Whereas Francis Scott Key was born in Frederick County in the State of Maryland on the 1st day of August 1779, and was educated at St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.; and

"Whereas Francis Scott Key throughout his entire life rendered outstanding public service as a patriotic citizen and as a distinguished member of the bar; and

"Whereas Francis Scott Key has provided lasting inspiration to the entire American people and has enshrined in patriotic verse the ideals of the American Republic by the composition of 'The Star-Spangled Banner'; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States by resolution dated March 3, 1931, has officially adopted 'The Star-Spangled Banner' as the national anthem of the United States of America.

"Now, therefore, we, believing that Francis Scott Key should be accorded a place in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University, recommend and request that Francis Scott Key, a famous son of Maryland, be granted this recognition which is well earned and fully deserved."

In witness whereof, we have affixed our signatures this 15th day of February 1965.

ROGERS C. B. MORTON.
EDWARD A. GARMATZ.
SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL.
HERVEY G. MACHEN.
GEORGE H. FALLON.
CARLTON R. SICKLES.
CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
CLARENCE D. LONG.

Cotton Forges Ahead Under New Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that the Agricultural Act of 1964 was not approved into law until after cotton farmers had made their plans and, in most cases, prepared and planted their lands, the participation under the cotton provisions of the act last year was not all that had been hoped.

However, 1965 is quite a different picture. Our farmers are entering under the cotton program in ever-increasing numbers, indicating the hearty accord of the growers for this cotton program. It is evidence that the cotton farmer understands the program, feels that the provisions will benefit him and his area and believes that the program is good for the country.

That is the growers' viewpoint. But, what is the attitude of the growers' best buyer—the domestic mills and the American textile manufacturers? The American Textile Manufacturers Institute, in a recent informational release, gives us the answer. Because the answer is factual and of vital importance to the grower, the ginner and all other segments of the trade as well as to the consumer, the release is incorporated as a part of these remarks:

TEXTILE INFORMATION: AMERICAN TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE

COTTON FORGES AHEAD UNDER NEW LAW

The objectives of the cotton provisions of the Agriculture Act of 1964 are being realized in keeping with the potential of the elapsed time. The prime purpose of the law was to increase the use of cotton.

Congressional direction for the Government to make cotton once again available to the U.S. mills at the same price at which it is available for sale to foreign mills has resulted in reduced cotton costs to domestic processors of American-grown cotton. This action has had the effect of sharpening cotton's ability to compete with other fibers and materials in this country. As a result, confidence in cotton as a textile fiber has been revived.

COTTON CONSUMPTION

The U.S. mill consumption of upland cotton for the current crop year—from August 1, 1964, through July 31, 1965, is estimated presently by the USDA to reach 9.7 million bales which, if realized, would be 1.1 million bales more than were consumed in the 1963–1964 year. During the months of August through December 1964 the daily consumption of cotton by American mills averaged 34,259 bales which represented an increase of 6 percent above the comparative period the previous year. This increasing fiber use by the textile industry reflects a reversal of a declining trend in the consumption of cotton and is attributed largely to legislation permitting cotton to once again become competitive under the Government's new cotton pricing policy.

COTTON COST EQUALIZATION

The Agriculture Act of 1964 provided for equalization of the domestic-export costs of U.S. cotton as of August 1, although it became law on April 11, 1964. Between April 11 and August 1, a payment program became

operative to account for 6½ cents a pound of the 8½-cent cost differential between domestic and export prices then in effect. The equalization payments made directly to the mills, in accordance with an administrative and not a congressional ruling, served to reimburse the mills for the original cost and partial devaluation of their stocks of unopened bales of cotton already purchased from cotton producers. The mills were not reimbursed for any loss in value of cotton yarn or cloth which was under processing or in inventory on the day the law became effective.

THE TEXTILE MARKET

The advent of the Government's one-price cotton system brought to an end a long period of uncertainty which had affected the market for cotton textile producers. Initial congressional hearings on proposed cotton legislation were held in December 1962. Then there were many months of discussion and anticipated action to return American raw cotton to a competitive price position in its own domestic market. This created a difficult marketing situation. Converters of cotton yarn and unfinished cotton cloth—the customers of cotton textile manufacturers—limited their purchases virtually to immediate or short-range needs and bought guardedly. The pipelines, from the mill level through the retail level, carried goods at a retarded flow. Likewise, many mills had slowed down their cotton yarn and cloth production or had concentrated on the production of synthetic fiber fabric or blends of cotton with man-made fibers. When Congress called for a one-price cotton system in April 1964, the uncertainty about the cost factor was virtually eliminated except for the working out of necessary administrative rules and regulations to implement the law.

The industry immediately by stepping up production of cotton textiles.

According to the Bureau of Census, total stocks of cotton cloth held or owned by mills, converters, and finishing plants, amounted to 2,255 million linear yards as of January 1, 1964, as compared with 2,351 million a year before.

There was a steady reduction of such stocks through 1964. The figure for November 1, 1964, was down to 2,037 million linear yards.

These figures reflect the increased demand for cotton cloth which mushroomed following the return to one-price cotton.

TEXTILE SALES

Consumer spending in 1964 was spurred by the Government's reduction in income tax rates and the textile mill products industry claimed its share.

Spending in 1964 jumped by $30 billion over 1963 and some $3 billion of this increase poured into the clothing and shoe market. This increased spending coupled with the removal of doubt about raw cotton pricing policy rejuvenated the entire textile marketing complex.

The demand for consumer goods caught cutters and converters short because of their cautious buying policies. The demand for goods taxed the short-run production schedules and capacity of the yarn and cloth mills and ran far ahead of short-run supplies with this development being reflected in prices. Cotton cost reductions were reflected immediately in cotton yarn prices, and price cuts were announced by weavers producing staple fabrics. The demand factor was of such magnitude in the competitive market that it governed pricing but did not prevent retail textile product sales from rising 9.4 percent in 1964 from the 1963 mark which was the third successive year of strongly rising general business. This sales increase, attributed to a greater volume of output rather than to higher prices, was the largest single year rise of textile demand ever experienced. Textile industry sales reported by the Securities and Exchange Commission-Federal Trade Commission during the first three quarters of 1964 amounted to $11.9 billion as compared with $11 billion a year earlier.

TEXTILE PRICES

Examination of the prices on 77 constructions of cotton cloth, as reported by the Daily News Record on January 1, 1964, July 1, 1964, and December 31, 1964, reveals there was a decline from 28.89 cents for an average linear yard to 27.74 cents and 27.98 cents. Of these 77 constructions, which weigh about one-third a pound a yard, price rises were noted for 18, reductions for 54, and no net change for 5 others. The short-term state of supply and demand dictated the variations.

At the same time the average per linear yard prices for 37 constructions of cloth made from manmade fibers rose from 31.57 cents on January 1 to 31.98 cents on July 1 and to 33.07 cents by December 31.

While cotton cloth prices for 77 constructions dropped nearly 1 cent a yard on average, manmade fiber fabric prices rose by an average of 1½ cents a yard—or at least 6 cents a pound.

Left to speculation is what the price situations would have been for cotton cloth and man-made fiber fabric if raw cotton costs had not been reduced on April 11, 1964.

Cloth prices and consumer prices for textile products are two different entities. Customers of cotton yarn and cloth manufacturers include finishers and apparel manufacturers. The latter segments add manufacturing value to the basic yarn and cloth and then employ their capabilities for design, style, promotion, advertising, and merchandising for delivery of products to the retail trade. Naturally, retail sales prices reflect all production and merchandising costs in addition to earnings for each handler.

The raw cotton cost factor diminishes as the labor cost factor rises when cloth moves through the complex process by which it is turned into a consumer product.

NEW PLANT INVESTMENTS

The reduction in raw cotton costs in 1964 was only one of a combination of factors that affected the cotton economy. The textile manufacturing industry plunged into a record high level of spending for new plants and equipment. Such investments were calculated by the Government to touch a $750 million mark, as compared with only $640 million the year previous. Most of the major textile concerns are now or have been building new plants, installing the most modern machinery, and increasing facilities for converting cotton into yarn and cloth.

During the last quarter of 1964 new plant and equipment expenditures were running at an annual rate of $900 million and the Commerce Department estimates an annual rate of $950 million in the first quarter of 1965. Textile capital outlays in 1964 were equivalent to nearly 13 percent of the industry's net worth, as compared with an average of 9 percent for other major industries. Obviously, the textile building boom had a favorable impact on suppliers of machinery and building materials and allied services.

EMPLOYMENT AND PAYROLLS

Expanded textile production has led to an arrest of the gradual annual decline of textile mill employment and created larger payrolls. Total textile employment increased by about 19,000 from December 1963 to the December 1964 total of 907,000. Two wage rises in the neighborhood of 5 percent were made by textile mills within a 12-month period, the first in anticipation of the Government's adoption of a one-price cotton system and the second after it became operative. The average textile industry workweek rose 0.4 hours from 40.6 hours in 1963 to 41 hours in 1964 while average weekly hours for all manufacturing industries increased only 0.2 hours from 40.5 to 40.7.

MILL EARNINGS

The textile industry, for the first time in many years, shared measurably in the rise of the Nation's economic activity in 1964. Many textile concerns reported dramatic improvements in their profit positions.

For the industry as a whole, the SEC reported profits as a percentage of sales, after taxes, at 2.9 percent for the first 9 months of 1964 and 3.7 percent for the third quarter alone.

These figures compare with 2.3 percent for 1963 which was off from the 1962 figure of 2.5 percent.

Textile mill performance in this regard, while improved, was still below the average for all manufacturing industries. The SEC reported that profits as a percentage of sales for all manufacturing industries during the first three quarters of 1964 at 5.2 percent, up from 4.6 percent a year earlier.

The improved profit position of the textile industry is attributed to a combination of developments—greater sales' volumes created by the reduction in taxes and increases in consumer spending, the growing population factor, the performance of new and more efficient equipment, improvements in management techniques, and lower cotton costs.

Many textile concerns reported dramatic improvements in their profit positions. Their reports, however, do not indicate a breakdown of profits attributed to the identity of fibers consumed.

One of the largest concerns, Burlington Industries, which recorded an increase of 25 percent in profit for a 53-week fiscal year ending October 3, 1964, as compared with a 52-week fiscal year in 1963, is a major producer of goods made from manmade fibers and blends. Only about 30 percent of Burlington's operations are reported to involve cotton consumption.

MILL MARGINS

The term "mill margin" is used by the Department of Agriculture to measure the difference between the monthly average price for various growths of cotton and the estimated value of cloth obtainable from a pound of cotton.

Cotton makes up only about 55 percent of the cost of manufacturing cloth. Therefore, the mill margin is composed also of wages, other raw material costs, overhead costs, insurance, taxes, and other expenses. To regard the mill margin as either gross or net profit is inaccurate.

Since August 1, 1964, the mill margin calculation has included the 6.5-cent-a-pound payment made to equalize the cost of cotton for domestic consumption with cost of cotton for export sales and increased wages.

Administrative Oppression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a recent National Labor Relations Board decision produced a most questionable interpretation of labor laws.

Under leave previously granted, I place in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Sun-Standard, Blue Island, Ill., commenting on that decision:

ADMINISTRATIVE OPPRESSION

The National Labor Relations Board has been handing down some decisions that, to put it mildly, are totally unprecedented. For

instance, in one case the Board's examiner held it to be an unfair labor practice for a father who was also a supervisor to advise his son who was also an employee to leave the union and hunt another job.

One commentator says: "This incident is not too important in its immediate consequences, because it was merely one element in a case with many elements * * *. But it does mark the first time we can remember that an agency of the Federal Government has asserted that it has the right to determine what members of a family may talk about to each other."

Administrative and regulatory agencies, and their officials often assert powers which were never intended by Congress. The remedy is for Congress to step in and make its real wishes crystal clear.

We Will Blast This Boycott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, my home State of Mississippi has recently been held up to ridicule and scorn by much of the leftwing press and the misinformed as a result of numerous groups of outsiders coming into the State under the guise, "Savior of the Negro people." The truth is that the real motive of these outsiders is to agitate and provoke our local citizens, both white and Negro, into a state of social unrest.

For many weeks, the duly elected Members of Congress from Mississippi have had to neglect their duties as Congressmen in order to return to their districts in order to see that witnesses were cross-examined at deposition hearings being held by the so-called Freedom Democratic Party. The deposition caravans are made up principally of a group of misfit lawyers and some 75 to 100 male beatniks, both white and Negro, ranging from 25 to 40 years in age, accompanied by a group of out-of-State white teenage girls.

While watching these so-called deposition hearings, I could not help but observe these people. It would have broken the hearts of any parent of teenage girls to see how ill clad and pale these girls were. Most of them had their hair tied behind their necks with an ordinary cloth string, and I feel sure that many were probably from broken or substandard homes since they seemed overly eager for affection and attention. Many were beatnik, pseudointellectuals, with their hair running down their backs or in their face so that you could seldom see more than one of their eyes.

All of these people were outsiders and incidentally, they were from the States that have ridiculed Mississippi the most in spite of the fact that their crime rate is three to five times as high as ours. It is my firm belief that these people are trying to focus the spotlight on Mississippi only to divert the attention of the American public from their leftwing activities elsewhere.

Many people throughout the country labor under the misconception that only the white people of Mississippi are opposed to the invasion of our State by these outside agitators. This is not true, and I believe that many will find the following article, "We Will Blast the Boycott," by a noted Mississippi Negro journalist, Joseph F. Albright, very interesting and informative.

The article follows:

WE WILL BLAST THIS BOYCOTT

(By Joseph F. Albright)

For almost 4 years now Mississippi has been invaded by a variety of benefactors whose announced intentions were to assauge the plight of us po downtrodden cullud folks. The questionable benevolence of these sociological sad sacks proved to be just about as ineffective as it was stupid.

The majority of Mississippi Negroes failed to bust out with enthusiasm over the programs of these strange Pied Pipers of Hamelin from outer space, and steadfastly refused to become stampeded over the cliffs of racial dissolution. Let this be recorded forever and commendably to their commonsense.

Any sane person would have thought that the passage by Congress of the civil rights law would have stilled the dubious actions of these invaders, who, had their intentions been as sincere as they loudly proclaimed, would have left all required adjustments in the hands of the courts and the citizens of goodwill of both races. However, this was far from the ensuing results.

When the Civil Rights Commission turned in its racial relations report on Mississippi some time ago, it included in its recommendations that Federal aid to the State be abolished until and unless Mississippi got in line (I am using the language of the streets). In comment on this ridiculous statement, the late President Kennedy bluntly pointed out that such an action would harm the welfare of Negroes more than any other group. Anyone with even imbecilic intelligence should have immediately recognized this inescapable fact.

But back to the current point. The great crusade having flopped, the saviors have now come up with another mess of pottage to cram down the throats of the citizens of the State. This new program takes the form of a nationwide boycott against the products made in Mississippi * * * the stated purpose of this virulent scheme being "to hit them where it hurts—in the pocketbook." In other words, to kick the props from under our economy.

And just how will Negroes profit by this assault? If industrial plants in this State are forced to curtail or cease their productivity, how will the saviors replace the thousands of jobs lost by Negroes in this shutdown or curtailment? And if this happens to our many food processing plants, where will the thousands of Negro farmers sell their agricultural crops? Will these bleeding hearts assume the care and day-to-day obligations of displaced Negro families? What kind of distorted reasoning could possibly justify the cruel results of this new crusade as they would affect the future of innocent Negro children? And how about our organizations—churches, lodges, businesses, civic welfare groups—that could suffer irreparable harm because of the drastic curtailment of our income?

Mississippi Negroes had better not take this lying down and be beaten to their economic knees by this onslaught. I, for one, intend to fight back with every resource at my command. My welfare is bound up inseparably in the economy of this State, as is that of every other citizen. I will not stand by idly and see the house of that economy burned down by those whose purpose is to do just that, my own well-being not mattering one whoop in hell to them.

Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much widespread interest in and support of legislation guaranteeing the public's right-to-know that I felt it appropriate to bring to the attention of my colleagues three recent editorials on this subject. These are indicative of the popular demand to make public records which do not disclose sensitive information.

Mr. George Beebe, president of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association and managing editor of the Miami Herald, is one of the foremost leaders in the fight for freedom of information. In a recent letter to me he stated:

There has never been a period in our history when it is so vital that the people know what is going on in their country and the world.

Disturbing indeed has been the trend to close more and more doors and records to the press, although there are few instances where this privilege has been abused.

There is not a responsible editor in the Nation who does not willingly practice self-censorship in matters of national security.

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Beebe's statements and commend to my colleagues the editorial from the February 22 edition of the Miami Herald:

A BILL TO LET THE PEOPLE KNOW

At a time when freedom of information seems of dubious worth to some organized lawyers it is refreshing to find a lawyer and a Congressman advocating its expansion by law.

The law is a bill to amend and enlarge section 161 of the Revised Statutes, dealing with the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and lock up the records. The author is Florida's Representative DANTE B. FASCELL, who introduced a similar bill in the last Congress.

Some bureaucrats regard the people's business as their own private preserves. Over the years it has been more and more difficult to pry loose information from Federal bureaus and agencies and publish it where no national security is involved.

Mr. FASCELL's bill, which passed the Senate last year but ran out of time in the House, would go far to correct a frustrating situation.

Government secrecy, you see, is not always a matter of national security. It can be used to cover up mistakes. It can be employed to augment the power of an agency or its head. And it can induce laziness in those among us who are supposed to peddle the facts to the public.

The Fascell bill specifically protects from disclosure all sensitive information, including records which can and should be withheld by Executive order.

But it frees the rest for public examination, placing the burden of proof on the Federal agency which refuses to open its files. As a clincher it vests district courts with the power to punish agency officials for contempt if they refuse to disclose records which are properly public.

If such a law had existed in the past it is possible that the occasional scandals which beset the Congress might have been avoided.

The same surmise could apply to Government agencies which are prey to light-fingered operators until some sweating reporter or some inquisitive Congressman digs into the record.

Letting the people know all about their own business is not going to hurt them. This is an article of faith in our way of life which Mr. FASCELL's bill happily affirms. It deserves the prompt approval of the 89th Congress.

On February 28, Mr. William Baggs editorialized in the Miami News on the public's right to know. He said:

The public's right to know is not a luxury in our country. It is essential to the democratic system. We don't think anyone would dare try to take it away in one bite, but an awful lot of people would like to nibble it to death.

He is absolutely right—and it is this "nibbling" we are trying to stop before someone decides to take a big bite.

The editorial follows:

GOVERNMENT BY SECRECY—THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW IS ESSENTIAL TO DEMOCRACY

Ralph Sewell, president of the national journalism society, Sigma Delta Chi, said a few days ago that bar associations and other special interest groups have "declared open season on the press."

Mr. Sewell was referring specifically to the rush in some quarters to impose restraints on pretrial publicity in criminal arrests.

This movement reached its height in New Jersey where the State supreme court issued an order prohibiting prejudicial statements by police officers, prosecutors, and defense lawyers.

Some Senators and Congressmen are said to be contemplating legislation which would impose similar restrictions. In Florida, we read that a bill is to be introduced in the legislature along the same line.

Another development in this direction is the order being drafted by Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach to regulate the flow of information about Federal trials.

Orders and legislation of this type are dangerous, not only to the press, but to the defendants whom the authorities are ostensibly trying to protect. In the last analysis, access by the press and public to police and court news is the best protection a defendant has against phony arrests and secret trials.

This is not to say that newspapers have been innocent of abusing their rights in the past, or that mistakes will not be made in the future. But we believe the press in this country has come a long way toward maturity under self-imposed standards of decency and fairplay, and we think this self-discipline will improve.

In Florida, we are less concerned with this problem for the moment than with a more immediate threat to press freedom in the form of secrecy in government.

The trend to government behind closed doors has been all the more marked since Gov. Haydon Burns assumed office in January and began barring the press from cabinet briefing sessions.

Since then, accounts of important conferences at which the press is excluded have become rather commonplace, and the secrecy philosophy is spreading.

Last week, House Speaker E. C. Rowell announced that a 3-day briefing session for 35 freshmen members of the legislature would be closed to the press and public on the flimsy grounds that some of the legislators might be inhibited about asking questions if observers were present.

These attempts at secrecy in government are not new, nor are they limited to any one section of the country. In Tennessee, the State senate barred from its floor all reporters from the Nashville Tennessean because a reporter from the paper had the temerity to remain in a committee meeting after the chairman declared it closed.

A Federal judge enjoined the legislature from enforcing this high-handed resolution, but alarmingly, the judge said merely that the senate had gone too far, that it could have ejected the reporter or held him in contempt.

At the Federal level, Representative DANTE FASCELL, of Miami, has been trying to get a bill passed for years which would curb the notorious and growing tendency toward secrecy in the executive bureaus. The bill is before the Congress again, hopefully, with a better chance of passage than it has had in the past.

Almost inevitably, complaints about government secrecy are answered with the contention that administrators and lawmakers can work much more efficiency without the press peeking over their shoulders. We concede this. But, as many thoughtful persons have pointed out, if efficiency were all we were concerned about, a dictatorship would be much preferable to a democracy.

Castro decided soon after taking Cuba that press freedom was incompatible with his government. Just last week, Sukarno said Indonesia could no longer afford the luxury of a free press.

The public's right to know is not a luxury in our country. It is essential to the democratic system. We don't think anyone would dare try to take it away in one bite, but an awful lot of people would like to nibble it to death.

On March 2, Jack Roberts, a well-known and respected writer for the Miami News devoted his column to the problems of the press in securing information on the national, as well as the local level. In referring to the local problem, he states:

There's a growing tendency * * * to adopt the Federal scaredy cat attitude—particularly in law enforcement. A majority of the police * * * treat all information like a Federal case. It's a sadistic little game they play with newsmen. The public ends up the loser.

Also on February 22, the Fort Lauderdale News carried an editorial by Mr. William A. Mullen expressing growing concern over the indiscriminate classification of material as secret by Government agencies. Mr. Mullen states:

To be sure, newsmen should not expect to invade offices and paw through records at random. But they should be permitted to get facts and figures on how the public's interest is being served and how its money is being spent or wasted.

It is not a privilege for a watchful press, it is a responsibility.

The Fort Lauderdale News editorial follows:

FASCELL BILL IN CONGRESS WOULD DEFINE INFORMATION IN PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

Nationally syndicated columnist David Lawrence commended on this page last Saturday on complaints of Washington newsmen that President Johnson does not hold an adequate number of press conferences so that reporters can keep the public informed on Federal affairs and planning.

It was Lawrence's contention that the President is under no compulsion to conduct regular meetings with the press; that in these days of instant news communication hesitancy in replying to a query on a delicate issue might convey the wrong meaning to a watching world, and that the real obligation of interrogating the chief executive rests with the Congress, anyway.

Well, since the Federal lawmakers, with a few exceptions, are falling down on a job of demanding more of a response from the White House on its fiscal maneuvering, its foreign aid operations, State Department security and a number of other points pertinent to the day-to-day administration of our Federal Government, the White House press corps is correct in its complaints.

In fact, with an administration that plays footsie with Russia and yet goes to the brink of war with Communists over Vietnam, and which has among its officials one who believes in the propriety of news management, it is all the more important that the press keep a watchful eye on the national scene.

To this effort, Representative DANTE FASCELL, of Miami, has submitted to the Congress a bill dealing with the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and to deny access of public records. The Fascell bill spells out the areas in which Federal officials could rightfully withhold information, such as national defense and foreign policy secrets; investigative information, personnel and medical files, privileged trade secrets, and a few others.

Whatever its chances for enactment, the Fascell proposal is a good one and a sound one, for it would as a law serve two very fundamental purposes: First, it would delineate for the press and for public officials those areas that are within the public's right to know, and those which are not.

Moreover, it would be a check on the proliferating tendency of bureaucrats and low echelon underlings to slap an arbitrary secret label on some of the most routine of matters.

In introducing his bill, FASCELL said:

"Freedom of information is a subject which has aroused increasing concern and interest during recent years. Protection of the people's right to be fully informed on all matters becomes increasingly difficult as government grows in size and the historic tendency of bureaucracies toward self-containment and repulsion of outside interference becomes entrenched.

"Not only will my bill insure freedom of information to the public on all matters of public interest, but it will also contribute to a more orderly, more efficient, and more economical governmental operation."

Perhaps that reference to the possibility of more economical operation of government is a little wishful thinking, but FASCELL is so right on his other points.

By some strange alchemy, far too many elected officials and bureaucrats seem to transform when they assume governmental duties into haughty desk jockeys who regard the public as an annoyance and newsmen as their archenemies whose main purpose is to stir up trouble. And this is not restricted to the national level.

While our own reporters have had difficulty in getting information from district offices of such units as the Federal Housing Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Agency, they also have had problems with some State and local agencies and city commissions who take it upon themselves to determine what information is in the public realm and what isn't.

To be sure, newsmen should not expect to invade offices and paw through records at random. But they should be permitted to get facts and figures on how the public's interest is being served and how its money is being spent or wasted.

This is not a privilege for a watchful press, it is a responsibility. Perhaps Congressman FASCELL's bill could serve as a guideline for defining that which is public information at the State and local levels.

A good way to keep a nation free is to keep it informed, from Presidential press conference to a road board meeting.

On February 25, another editorial on this same subject appeared in the Mobile Register. It states in part:

As government grows in size and cost, danger of secrecy also growing may be expected unless more is done by Congress to protect the people's right to know.

The Mobile Register editorial follows:

BILL TO BETTER PROTECT PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW

A bill to further loosen the lid on undue secrecy in Federal Government as a service to the people's right to know has been introduced in Congress by Representative DANTE B. FASCELL, of Florida, a member of the House Commitee on Government Operations.

Mr. FASCELL said in introducing his bill (H.R. 5013) that "We have submitted much too long to abuse of power by agencies in withholding information from the public. Continued acquiescence in this practice, or ineffectual protests against it, will seriously undermine the integrity of the democratic process."

His measure proposes to require Federal agencies to make their records available for public examination unless the information falls into categories expressly exempted.

The Florida Congressman made clear his disappointment over the results of a 1958 move by Congress to lessen secrecy in Government.

That action—a one sentence amendment of a statute—"forced the agencies to revise the verbalisms by which they decline to furnish information, but has had no perceptible effect in increasing the availability of information to the public," Mr. FASCELL said.

He added that the "discouraging results of this law have demonstrated that a much stronger positive measure must be enacted if the dangerous trend to more and more secrecy in Government is to be halted."

Indeed, complaints about secrecy appear to have become more pronounced instead of diminishing in recent years.

Congressman FASCELL's conclusion is that two steps are necessary to assure that the public "gets the information it is entitled to have about public business."

1. "Congress must affirm by statute the legal right of any member of the public to have access to all public records, unless they fall within carefully defined exceptions."

2. "A method of enforcing that right must be provided."

His bill, Mr. FASCELL commented, is "designed to meet both of these requirements."

He said further: "Because conditions of secrecy have been allowed to develop to an unhealthy degree, prompt and energetic measures are required to reverse this trend. Nothing less than a clear recognition of the public's interest in scrutinizing public records as a legal right, coupled with a judicial remedy to enforce that right, will suffice to accomplish this objective."

As often is said of proposals considered to be worthy, the Fascell bill gives the impression of being a step in the right direction.

Something more effective definitely should be done in behalf of the people's right to know about the public business, in this case meaning the affairs of Federal Government.

Even such a bill as the Congressman from Florida is sponsoring would cause surprise if it adequately met the need. But at least it carries the promise of progress against the practice of short-changing the people on information which should be available.

In a thoroughly justified slap at denying access to Government information without adequate reason, Mr. FASCELL told the House:

"Everyone pays lipservice to the principle that the people must be fully informed about the activities of the Federal Government if it is to remain their servant and not become their master.

"But no one in this House has to be reminded how wide is the gap between professed adherence to this principle and the actual practice of Government agencies.

"Repeated rebuffs suffered by Members of Congress, representatives of the press, and ordinary citizens in efforts to get information which there is no legitimate ground for keeping secret have made us all aware that it is becoming harder and harder to find out what goes on in the Government."

As Government grows in size and cost, danger of secrecy also growing may be expected unless more is done by Congress to protect the people's right to know.

Congress should have taken more positive action long before now to better protect the people in this important right.

Thomas Jefferson, in one of his many expressions of faith in the people, said "when the people are well informed, and things get so far wrong as to attract their notice, they may be relied on to set them to rights."

Their knowledge of what goes on in Government—of how the public business is handled—is seriously curtailed when undue secrecy is practiced widely and constantly.

True it is that Jefferson also said "all nations have found it necessary that for the advantageous conduct of their affairs some of their proceedings, at least, should remain known to their executive functionary only."

But Thomas Jefferson obviously had no intention of defending flagrant abuse of secrecy such as has come to be so unhealthy in Government and so unfair and offensive to the people in this age.

Representative Robison's Testimony Before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on Proposals of the Johnson Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, granted to me February 11, I include the following text of my testimony before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Wednesday, March 3, on the plan of the Johnson administration to close many facilities of the Veterans' Administration:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the announcement by the Veterans' Administration of its intent to close 11 veterans hospitals, 16 regional offices, and 4 domiciliaries throughout the country has not only brought a storm o. protests from irate citizens and groups from all corners of the land, but also has raised some interesting questions which, as yet, have gone unanswered. The State of New York seems to have been singularly honored in this announcement. Some 10 percent of this Nation's veteran population resides in the State of New York, yet almost 20 percent of the facilities to be eliminated under the present plan are also in New York.

Although none of these six facilities lies within my congressional district, of particular interest and concern to me are the hospital and domiciliary at Bath, and the regional office in Syracuse, both of which are on the list to be closed.

The effect of the closing of the regional office in Syracuse has been overshadowed by the strong emotional reaction to the announced closing of the variou hospitals and domiciliaries. Therefore, I should like to comment first on the closing of the Syracuse office.

In a letter to me dated January 13, 1965, Mr. Driver points out that one of the benefits of this proposed consolidation will be "increased effectiveness and efficiency that result from greater productivity * * * without impairing the quality of service * * *." He further states, "We considered especially the factors of communications and distance. In a recent analysis of regional offices, it was found that in fiscal year 1964 approximately 90 percent of contacts with regional offices were by mail and about 10 percent by personal contact or telephone."

Information available to me shows that, during calendar year 1964, the Syracuse regional office handled 16,085 personal visits, 21,318 phone interviews, and 1,020 personal visits by service officers. Using Mr. Driver's own formula then, some 380,000 total contacts of all types were seemingly processed by the Syracuse office last year. I seriously question whether the addition of this volume of business to that already handled in Buffalo will really result in "increased effectiveness and efficiency."

A county veterans' service officer from my district also points out that he can presently make a round trip to the Syracuse office in half a day and still put in a half day in his office. However, a trip to the Buffalo office for the same purpose will, at best, be an all-day proposition, perhaps even overnight. Since his annual budget, including travel, is limited to $1,000, this added time and expense will probably result in a reduction of service to the veterans in his area.

Finally, I would like to add that the Syracuse office has always afforded excellent service to me and the member of my staff; if this is an indication of the quality of the similar services rendered to the individual veteran, it is not something to be lightly tossed aside.

Now, as regards the closing of the center at Bath; the immediate adverse effect this closing will have on the local economy is obvious. There are presently over 600 people employed at the veterans' center in Bath; a figure which represents 10 percent of the entire population of the village, and 5 percent of that of the town. The dislocation of these employees will reduce the annual payroll to the community by some $3.7 million.

The side effects this closing would have on the economy are likewise evident. The parochial school in Bath, which has just completed an expensive expansion of its facilities, expects a reduction of about 25 percent in its student enrollment; a similar situation will probably exist in the public school system.

Many of the employees at the center in Bath are also homeowners. The resulting flooding of the market as these homes are put up for sale can cause the bottom to drop out of the market, and many will be forced to take considerable losses on their property—if they are able to sell at all.

I know full well that such economic considerations alone cannot and should not be advanced in support of an argument that such a Federal facility—or any Federal facility—should be continued. At the same time, however, these are appropriate matters to consider in connection with your decision as to whether or not this facility is needed from a service standpoint and whether or not its proposed closing—in the total context of the problem—represents true, as opposed to false, economy.

Returning, now, to Mr. Driver's letter, he tells me that among the reasons for closing Bath is the fact that several of the existing buildings are "in need of modernization or replacement, which would be too costly to modernize or replace." Yet, a brief glance at the VA budget for 1966 will reveal a $97 million item for construction of hospitals

and domiciliaries. Included in this figure is $15,109,000 for the first phase of replacement and modernization at North port, N.Y., and $1 million for site acquisition for a 1,000-bed hospital at Long Island, N.Y. Surely this is a contradictory policy to be pursuing.

Much has been made of the reported savings that will result from the closing of the target facilities—allegedly $23.5 million annually. While the Veterans' Administration has taken the stand that these facilities are no longer required nor necessary, not only do they see justification for the expenditure of the $97 million I mentioned before, but another look at the budget will show that the VA feels the need to maintain a staff of 500 permanent employees, at an annual cost to the taxpayer of more than $4.5 million, for "construction of hospital and domicilliary facilities." Again, a seeming contradiction.

Before the proposed closings were determined upon, every effort should have been made by the VA to find different uses for these operations which may be about to close their doors. It seems inconceivable to me that the VA would abandon the $20 million establishment at Bath completely when there is an admitted need for more psychiatric and neurological treatment facilities. Perhaps the Bath center could still be converted to this use, for surely it is more economical to modernize and utilize an existing facility than to replace it with new construction.

Mr. Driver claims, too, that because of the relatively small number of hospital beds at Bath, the wide range of clinical services required cannot be provided. This is perhaps true—the hospital may very well be too small to provide for every eventuality. However, I would like to quote from a letter received in my office from a doctor associated with the Guthrie Clinic in Sayre, Pa., who has been a consultant in internal medicine and gastroenterology to the Bath VA for approximately 16 years: "The problems of medicine are not the same in this institution (Bath) as they are in a private hospital, or clinic-hospital. * * * The age group is higher; the motivation of the patient to get back to a full occupation is not economic, and because of age, many limitations of rehabilitation are encountered. * * * Some specialized services of the Veterans' Administration are not available at the Bath Hospital, but these seem to be adequately covered in nearby institutions."

Again referring to Mr. Driver's letter, he states unequivocally: "It is no longer in the best interest of veterans for a domiciliary such as the one at Bath to be located in a rural area where the range of medical service, community, vocational, and social resources are limited." It is quite evident from the mail that has poured into my office that this decision was reached without consultation of those most affected—the veterans themselves. It has been brought to my attention time and again that the veterans in the Bath home are very happy where they are, and for the most part are not at all pleased with the prospect of leaving Bath to go to some other place, as yet unknown to most of them, but surely to be remote from their families and friends. This is the human side of the problem—the tragic side—which is also most worthy of your consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to express my views on this matter to this committee. I am sure you will hear far more expert testimony from both sides, and I am sure your committee will reach an equitable solution. But in doing so, please remember that our responsibility to care for the needs of our many veterans of World War II in their later years will soon be upon us. We must be prepared to meet those needs, but I doubt that the administration has taken the right road to permit us to do so.

Bring Back the Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Newsweek magazine has never been accused of being conservative, probusiness, antilabor, or anti-Democrat.

Therefore, the report in the March 8, 1965, issue of Newsweek is most interesting and heartening for the fruit and vegetable farmers, the harvesting of whose crops depends upon stoop labor.

Even Gov. Pat Brown, of California, who was one of the loudest opponents of the bracero law, Public Law 78, has now changed his mind, admitted that he was wrong and now has urgently petitioned the Secretary of Labor to admit Mexican nationals to prevent drastic crop spoilage in California.

Governor Brown has now recognized that the domestic labor supply is inadequate, in spite of paying a higher wage than the low-skilled workers can earn at any other work. He now sees California growers, processors, and shippers eyeing a better labor climate in Mexico where reliable labor is available in sufficient numbers. He now sees employment going down—not up—as a result of the exclusion of Mexican workers. He now sees taxes, badly needed for schools, highways, and mounting welfare, diminishing. He sees a general business recession in California unless California's No. 1 industry—agriculture—can be assured of adequate labor now.

Now that Governor Brown has seen enough to understand, I trust the Secretary of Labor and his staff will recognize and understand the principal contributing cause of chaos in California—insufficient assurance of adequate labor. The deficiency can be quickly corrected by certifying the admission of Mexican nationals under Public Law 414 where domestic labor is not available.

The Newsweek article follows:

CALIFORNIA: BRING BACK THE BRACEROS

As every California farmer knows, it still takes plenty of human hands to tend the cornucopia that spews forth nearly half the Nation's supply of vegetables, fruits, and nuts. And until last December, when U.S. Public Law 78 expired, most of the hands that brought in California's bounty belonged to Mexican braceros—or migrant farmworkers.

To California's Democrats in Congress, and to Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, logic was on the side of letting the bracero agreement lapse. Surely, they reasoned, most of the 70,000 harvesters required would come from the swelling ranks of California's own unemployed (now totaling 519,000, or 6 percent of the State's work force).

As it turned out, Brown was wrong, and Republicans like new Senator GEORGE MURPHY, who wanted to continue bracero labor, were right. Already California's farmers are in an acute bind. In coastal Ventura County, the lemon harvest is lagging because grove owners are short some 1,000 pickers. And in southern California's Imperial Valley, much of the date crop is spoiling on the trees because there simply aren't enough workers to go around.

Last week, Brown faced up to the hard fact that Americans, generally, are loath to do such squatting, back-tormenting stoop labor, even at the improved minimum State wage of $1.40 an hour. After an inspection tour of date groves near Indio, Brown sent off a letter to Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, most urgently asking him to allow Mexican laborers back over the border—this time under the Immigration Act (Public Law 414).

In Washington at the weekend, Wirtz huddled with California Congressmen, but refused to act on their request. He told the lawmakers he wasn't satisfied that California has done as much as it can to recruit domestic farmworkers—a stance that did nothing to reassure the farmers. Shutting down one of his three canneries, a big tomato grower said: "All we are seeking is assurance of an adequate labor supply so it is worth our while to risk planting."

Washington State Senate Resolution Petitions Congress To Protect North Pacific Salmon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1965, the Washington State Senate passed a resolution petitioning Congress to take all appropriate action necessary to preserve the North Pacific salmon industry.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of this resolution at this point:

SENATE RESOLUTION 1965-24

(By Senators Robert L. Charette, August P. Mardesich, R. Frank Atwood, and Ted G. Peterson)

Whereas in the words of the late Cordell Hull, issued in 1937, when he was Secretary of State: "Large bodies of American citizens are of the opinion that the salmon runs of Bristol Bay and elsewhere in Alaskan waters are an American resource; that the salmon fisheries relate to and are linked with the American Continent, particularly the Northwest area; and, that for all practical purposes, the salmon industry is in fact a part of the economic life of the Pacific Northwest coast. The fact that salmon taken from waters off the Alaskan coast are spawned and hatched in American waters, adds further to the conviction that there is in these waters a special and unmistakable American interest"; and

Whereas the North American salmon would cease to exist were it not for the continuing restrictions of the United States and Canadian conservation policies; and

Whereas the North Pacific salmon fisheries have a special importance to our coastal communities as a source of livelihood, and to the Nation as a food and industrial resource; and

Whereas it is vital to maintain these fisheries on a sustained yield basis; and

Whereas widespread Japanese fishing for salmon, using highly efficient new methods and techniques, seriously threatens the North American salmon fisheries with depletion if not destruction; and

Whereas the 1953 North Pacific Fisheries Treaty entered into between the United

States, Canada, and Japan is now in process of renegotiations; and

Whereas present Japanese fishing policies urgently require establishment of additional controls west of the present treaty line: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington, That we do respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to consider with the greatest care the value of our salmon fisheries to Alaska, to the Pacific Northwest, and to the Nation as a whole, and to take all appropriate action necessary to preserve this industry by insisting upon language in the revised treaty that will furnish adequate protection for it; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington, and to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

WARD BOWDEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest among the Nation's high school students. This year again more than 250,000 young Americans participated in the contest, submitting scripts on the subject of "The Challenge of Citizenship." The winning contestant from each State is brought to the Nation's Capital as guests of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the final judging when top awards of four scholarships are presented to the four national winners.

I am proud to advise that this year's winner from the State of Maryland is Paul R. Panitz, of Bethesda, in my congressional district. I include his script here and commend it to my colleagues as an outstanding example of the devotion and dedication and patriotism of our young people:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP, 1964–65

(By Paul R. Panitz)

I am a teenager. I am often represented as a reckless, wanton individual, with no concern for the future. My generation has been called lost and beat. And yet I am deeply concerned about my country and the responsibilities of my citizenship. I have never witnessed the horrors of a world war. Armed insurrection and guerrilla warfare are only words to me, because such things happen only in distant lands. But I realize that these are not the only threats to a free society. The real challenges to freedom are more subtle. They creep slowly but surely to undermine constitutional government and democratic heritage. What should I do? How can I help fight an unseen enemy? How can 1 of 200 million people make a real contribution? Or is it my destiny to fall back on the achievements of my predecessors and reap the fruits of their struggle for freedom?

In Genesis, when Cain is asked about his brother Abel, he replies, "Am I my brother's keeper?" I ask myself the same question. Is the man in Appalachia who has lost his job because the mines failed—is he my responsibility? Is the Negro in the South, without a job, unskilled and socially outcast, also my responsibility? Yes. They are my fellow citizens whose actions directly affect me, economically, politically, and socially. A democracy is only as strong as the rights possessed by its minority groups. In the quick time of the atom, anything that deprives any fellow citizen of even a portion of freedom, is catastrophic to me and to society as a whole. And my generation has truly been active; civil rights workers in Mississippi, rehabilitation volunteers in West Virginia, social workers in New York City, and now, a Domestic Peace Corps.

No citizen can fulfill his obligation to society by accepting new laws and regulations with a shrug, without considering their constitutionality and their conformity with the American philosophy of individual liberty. Laws are made to be obeyed; disregard for law is anarchy. But in a democracy it is recognized that laws will be challenged and tested, and it is only the citizen who can do this; only he can fight to preserve his rights. He cannot be satisfied with what others have done before him. To fight nonviolently, means that he must have a fund of facts and know them thoroughly, for the greatest weapon a citizen can wield is the invincible power of knowledge.

We have reached a point in history when the push of a button can send the entire world to destruction in a matter of minutes. This is hardly a neighborly thought, yet it is an inescapable fact that not only are the fortunes of all Americans irrevocably intertwined, but so also are the destinies of all men on our shrinking planet. We are responding to this togetherness with the Peace Corps, the symbol of the new generation. Young Americans are serving in the far reaches of the earth to mold the common aspirations of peoples everywhere into a bright destiny. There will always be young people with beards and fanatical beliefs, and those without any beliefs, letting the world pass them by. But let us take no notice of them. The rest of us have the desire and are striving to fulfill the responsibilities of our citizenship. Yes, I am brother's keeper, not only in my community, my State, my country, but in an international sense, aspiring to build a bright future on a bleak past.

Texas and Minnesota Receiving High Poverty Fund Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it was with sincere interest and deep concern that I recently read an enlightening article entitled, "Who's Favored With Poverty Dollars," from the Martinsburg, W. Va., Journal. The article clearly illustrates that President Johnson's home State of Texas and Vice President HUMPHREY's home State of Minnesota are receiving unusually high allocations of funds for the administration's so-called war on poverty program.

This body has been told time and time again of the intense and severe poverty existing in Appalachia in general and in the State of West Virginia in particular. From the Democratic primary campaigns of 1960 through today, the administrations of two Presidents of the United States have told us how much they are doing for this area.

According to this article, Texas is receiving 23 times as much money for their poverty programs than is West Virginia, and Minnesota is receiving 3 times as much money for its poverty program as is West Virginia.

Perhaps if Texas' and Minnesota's U.S. Senators had been representing the best interests of their respective States during the 1950's and in one instance during the early 1960's, then these States would not be needing money to combat poverty, but would instead have unparalleled prosperity.

Let me make one thing clear, I do not agree with these spend-now-pay-later poverty programs, but I do believe, in the best interests of Alabama and the Nation, that if funds are going to be spent for eliminating poverty, they should be spent on a basis of genuine need rather than for any possible political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this article in the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of every Member of this distinguished body:

WHO'S FAVORED WITH POVERTY DOLLARS?

West Virginians received some pre-Christmas news which should be counted among the good variety. After all of these years of the politicians telling us how poverty stricken we are here in West Virginia, we note that on the first tentative allocation of funds for President Johnson's "war on poverty," our State ranks 26th down the line in money to be spent.

We are to be allotted the grand sum of $423,811. This averages out to almost 25 cents per person. That really ought to wipe out our poverty in a hurry.

While West Virginia is to get $423,811 for the "war on poverty," guess how much is assigned to the fabulously wealthy State of Texas which just happens to be the home of President Johnson, $9,776,483. Admittedly, the population of Texas is almost 5 times that of West Virginia, but it is going to get 23 times as much as West Virginia for the "war on poverty."

Minnesota, which is the home of Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, has just about twice West Virginia's population but it is assigned $1,449,407, or more than three times as much as West Virginia.

New Jersey, which has always been regarded as one of our wealthier States, is being allocated the top amount of "war on poverty" money, $12,456,361. Kentucky, where a determined effort is being made to get rid of the two Republican senators, is to be the recipient of the second highest amount, $10,416,242.

President Johnson's own proud State of Texas ranks third with Oregon in fourth spot at $8,219,670. Oregon's population is just about the same as West Virginia's but they must be really hard up there financially to qualify for 20 times the amount set up for us.

We are not quarreling about the amount, but we are quarreling about West Virginia always being labeled among the poverty stricken. The next time President Johnson or Vice President HUMPHREY or even David and Chet come carpetbagging around West Virigina and expressing their sympathy over our sad plight, West Virginians can hold their heads high and tell these do-gooders to clean up their own backyards.

Their home State poverty is obviously worse than ours because we are sure these politi-

cians who were so solicitous in the pre-election days would not let us down after the election, particularly since the great majority of West Virginians dutifully voted the straight Democratic ticket.

The Acreage-Poundage Tobacco Bill, H.R. 5721

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Tobacco Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture today approved legislation providing for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for Flue-cured tobacco, beginning in 1965. The poundage quota program would supplant the present acreage allotment and marketing quota program, if two-thirds or more of the farmers vote for the change in a referendum.

I have called a meeting of the full Committee on Agriculture for next Tuesday, for the purpose of taking final committee action on the bill, H.R. 5721.

The Tobacco Subcommittee acted this morning after we received a letter from Secretary of Agriculture Freeman endorsing the bill as embracing the best plan yet presented for tobacco acreage-poundage quotas.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation reflects the determination of a substantial number of tobacco farmers to keep their production in line with their markets.

The tobacco program has been the most successful of all farm programs. In the 32 years we have been operating farm programs, the tobacco program has cost the Government only $38 million, and during that time the Federal and State Governments have collected $52 billion in taxes on tobacco and tobacco products.

In recent years, however, excessive supplies have accumulated because of substantial increases in per acre yields. Surpluses now endanger our tobacco program. Moreover, we have failed to share in the increase in the world tobacco trade.

In order to provide a more effective method of maintaining supplies in line with demand, to improve the quality of U.S. tobacco and to increase exports, many producers came forward with the suggestion that we supplement the present marketing quota program for tobacco, which is operated on an acreage basis, by the addition of farm poundage quotas.

On February 8, I introduced H.R. 4532, the acreage-poundage bill prepared by the Department at the request of a number of leading tobacco producers. Subsequently, our Tobacco Subcommittee held public hearings in Washington and in the Flue-cured tobacco producing area. We found that many farmers from the principal producing States—Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida—were not satisfied with the legislation. We received their suggestions, and now we have revised the legislation to make it more equitable for farmers.

It is our intention to complete action on the legislation as expeditiously as possible, so that the tobacco producers may have the opportunity to express themselves freely in a referendum on whether they want acreage-poundage quotas in 1965.

Mr. Speaker, when this proposal for acreage-poundage quotas first was submitted I said then it would be difficult to write a simple and equitable bill, even after our committee had done the very best it could do. The bill in its present draft is complicated, involved, and far from simple. It certainly is not perfect. Copies will be made available and I hope farmers and all others interested will study carefully all of the bill's provisions. We still are open to suggestions for any improvements in this bill that can be made prior to its final enactment.

I especially want to commend Chairman WATKINS M. ABBITT and all the members of the Tobacco Subcommittee for their dedicated work in improving and refining this acreage-poundage legislation.

Mr. Speaker, many of the Members of this body are not familiar with the acreage-poundage approach to adjusting the production of a crop to its markets. Therefore, with the indulgence of the Members, I shall discuss in some detail the provisions of the bill approved this morning by our Tobacco Subcommittee.

Under the proposed legislation, in addition to the acreage allotment, a poundage quota would be established for each farm. However, such poundage quotas would not become effective for any kind of tobacco unless they are approved by two-thirds or more of the farmers voting in a special referendum.

A preliminary farm yield, in the case of Flue-cured tobacco, would be established for each individual farm by averaging the yield per acre for that farm for the 3 highest years during the 5 years 1959–63.

A community average yield would be established for each community by averageing the yield per acre for the 3 highest years during the 5 years, 1959–1963. In counties having less than 500 acres allotted in 1964; the entire county would be considered as one community.

If the preliminary farm yield is as much as 80 percent but not more than 120 percent of the community yield, no adjustment would be made in the preliminary farm yield. This means that no adjustment will be made in the "preliminary farm yield" on more than 90 percent of the farms.

If the preliminary farm yield is less than 80 percent of the community yield, it will be adjusted upward to 80 percent of the community average yield.

If the preliminary farm yield exceeds 120 percent of the community yield, the preliminary farm yield will be adjusted downward by averaging: First, the 3-high-years' average of the farm's historical yield given a weighting of 3; second, the national average yield goal—1,854 pounds per acre—given a weighting of 1; but, third, the preliminary farm yield canont be adjusted below 120 percent of the community yield.

Under the proposed legislation, the Secretary would set a national marketing quota at about 1,125 million pounds. A quota in this amount, plus an additional quantity that may be marketed because farms would be allowed to market 10 percent over their quotas, might result in marketings in the neighborhood of 1,200 million pounds. But to the extent farms do market over their quotas in 1965, this overage will be compensated for next year by reductions in such farms' quotas next year. The expected levels of marketings under the acreage-poundage approach would allow for an orderly reduction in loan stocks.

This bill provides that the Secretary establish a national average yield goal which he determines will improve or insure the useability of the tobacco and increase the net returns per pound to the growers. On the basis of research data now available, it is estimated that the national average yield goal for Flue-cured tobacco would be 1,854 pounds per acre for 1965.

Preliminary farm yields for all farms will be weighted by the respective allotments to derive a national average yield. This weighted national average yield will be divided by the national average yield goal. The factor thus obtained will be applied uniformly to all preliminary farm yields to meet the national average yield goal. The Department estimates that this adjustment will reduce preliminary farm yields for Flue-cured tobacco from 7 to 8 percent.

A national acreage allotment will be determined by dividing the national marketing quota by the national average yield goal. This results in a national acreage allotment of 606,800 acres for flue-cured tobacco for 1965.

A national acreage factor will be determined by dividing the new 1965 national acreage allotment by the national acreage allotment currently in effect for the 1965 crop of Flue-cured tobacco—514,265 acres. This factor would be about 1.180 and would restore the 1965 farm acreage allotments to about 95 percent of the 1964 acreage allotments.

The farm acreage allotment multiplied by the farm yield gives the farm poundage quota.

The bill provides that a reserve not in excess of 1 percent of the national acreage allotment to be made available for the correction of errors, adjusting inequities and for allotment to new farms.

For future years, the bill provides that the national marketing quota will be established at an amount that is desirable to maintain an adequate supply or to affect an orderly reduction of excessive supplies.

The bill permits each farm to market 10 percent more than the farm's poundage quota without penalty, but any excess marketings will be deducted from the farm acreage allotment and poundage quota in subsequent years.

As at present, price support would be available for all farms that do not exceed their farm acreage allotments. Price support would cease to be avail-

able, however, when marketings exceed 110 percent of the poundage quota.

Mr. Speaker, I am receiving inquiries as to the principal revisions made by the Tobacco Subcommittee in the proposed legislation as originally introduced. These revisions are as follows:

The original bill provided for a county average yield, which was the simple average yield per acre in the county for the 5 years, 1959–63, for use in establishing ranges upon which adjustments would be made in preliminary farm yields. The revised bill provides for the establishment of a community average yield, which is determined by averaging the yield per acre in the community for the 3 highest years of the 5 years, 1959–63, for this purpose.

If the preliminary farm yield is as much as 80 percent and not in excess of 120 percent of the community average yield, no adjustment will be made in the preliminary farm yield. In the original bill, these limits were 70 and 130 percent of the county average yield.

If the preliminary farm yield is less than 80 percent of the community yield, it will be increased to 80 percent of the community average yield. The original bill provided that any preliminary farm yield below 70 percent of the county average yield would be increased to 70 percent of the county average yield.

If the preliminary farm yield exceeds 120 percent of the community average yield, it will be adjusted downward by averaging: First, the 3 high years' average of the farm's historical yield given a weighting of three; second, the national average yield goal—1,854 pounds per acre—given a weighting of one; but, third, the preliminary farm yield cannot be adjusted below 120 percent of the community average yield. The original bill provided that any preliminary farm yield above 120 percent of the county average yield would be reduced to 130 percent of the county average yield.

The original bill provided that each farmer could market 5 percent more than his poundage quota without penalty the first year the acreage-poundage program was in effect. Under the revised bill, each farmer can market 110 percent of his farm poundage quota in any year without penalty, but any such excess marketings will be deducted from the farm's quota for the following year.

As provided in the original bill, the acreage-poundage program could not be in effect for any kind of tobacco unless it is approved by two-thirds or more of the farmers voting in a special referendum. The Department of Agriculture has proposed that only a majority vote be required to make the acreage-poundage program effective.

Mr. Speaker, sponsors of the acreage-poundage marketing quota program for tobacco claim for it the following advantages:

First. Acreage allotments could be larger, as the poundage quotas would provide protection against excessive marketings.

Second. Each farmer could aim at producing high quality tobacco without losing part of his share in the market to other farmers who strive for the utmost production from their allotted acreages at the expense of quality.

Third. Farmers would have a new element of flexibility since they could carry over unused quotas from one year to the next.

Fourth. Sales and exports would be increased through improved quality.

Fifth. Producer income would be increased by increased sales, improved quality and lower production costs.

Sixth. Supplies of tobacco would be kept in better balance with demand with less cost to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am including with these remarks a copy of the letter I received from Secretary Freeman. The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 3, 1965.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been apprised of the modifications the Tobacco Subcommittee has made in the proposed legislation providing for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco as a result of its public hearings and deliberations in which officials of the Department participated.

The Department appreciates the careful consideration the subcommittee has given to the suggestions which have been made for improving the acreage-poundage approach, especially those provisions relating to the establishment of farm yields and farm poundage quotas on a fair and equitable basis. We appreciate also that officials of the Department were asked to participate in the subcommittee's deliberations.

In our letter of February 4, 1965, reporting on the proposed legislation, we advised that such legislation was in accord with the recommendation contained in the President's message on agriculture. At that time, we submitted a revised draft of the proposed legislation and advised that the Department would give you and the committee its full cooperation in obtaining legislation to provide tobacco growers the opportunity to decide for themselves the type of program they desire.

The proposed legislation may not be perfect in every respect, but it has been improved as a result of the subcommittee's hearings and deliberations. These hearings and deliberations have strengthened our convictions of the need for the enactment of legislation to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for the 1965 crop of Flue-cured tobacco.

The Department concurs in the modifications made by the Tobacco Subcommittee and again urges that legislation be enacted to permit growers an opportunity to decide for themselves the type of program they desire for the 1965 crop of Flue-cured tobacco.

Sincerely,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Improvement of Our Cities and Towns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, today in the midst of dynamic changes occuring in the structure of our society, we have before us a farsighted and imaginative outward thrust for conserving our neighborhoods.

Emphasizing man's total environment, the administration's proposal will bring together communities of interest—the centers for development of necessary ideas and enthusiasm vital to the molding of the Great Society.

Not only does this proposal call for expanding our existing community facility and housing programs, but it also presents new tools for eradicating the blight of the grey ghettos of sacked cities and towns. Extensive rehabilitation and rent-supplement programs for the low income represent a bold new approach for lifting the impoverished into new environments.

The Government can provide the vehicles for moving traffic forward; but we must have the cooperation and spirit of the pedestrians, if we are to succeed. I am confident that local initiative at the grassroots level will seize these tools with which to revitalize our main streets into lively, livable thoroughfares bordered by blossoming trees and flowers and verdant parks and playgrounds.

In his message on natural beauty, the President stated that our conservation must be the creative conservation of restoration and innovation concerned with the total relationship between man and the world around him. "Its object is not just man's welfare, but the dignity of man's spirit. In this conservation, the protection and enhancement of man's opportunity to be in contact with beauty must play a major role."

Mr. President, as we strive toward the realization of these goals for daily living, we need the mixture of ingredients which this sweeping approach can provide; and I look forward to studying the specific details of the proposed legislation for neighborhood conservation when it comes before the Housing Subcommittee.

I ask unanimous consent that the lead editorial and the article by Wolf Von Eckardt, in Wednesday's Washington Post, hailing the President's message, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post of Mar. 3, 1965]

THE CITIES AS CIVILIZATION

In 1890, within the memory of many Americans, among us, only one out of every three people in this country lived in towns of more than 4,000 inhabitants. Now more than two out of three of us live in the cities or their suburbs. Within the lifetime of our children, four out of five Americans will live in great metropolises. Rapid urbanization is changing every aspect of our lives, and not all of these changes are for the better.

In his powerful message on the cities, President Johnson demonstrates a clear and quick concern for the character of urban life evolving in America. We have crossed a watershed in Federal policy toward the cities. A year ago, in his message on housing, the President appeared to be chiefly concerned with the necessity of building houses fast enough for our population; that necessity has dominated Federal policy ever since World War II. But now President Johnson is reaching beyond the rates of construction to ask where the houses are to be built, for whom, in what surroundings.

Federal housing programs, like new drugs, have usually had unexpected side effects. Zoning has been used for ruthless economic segregation, mortgage insurance has laid waste the suburban countryside, slum clearance has brought atrocious overcrowding when the old tenements were not replaced with new homes for their tenants. We have been reckless builders.

Mr. Johnson proposes a commission to look closely at zoning practices, and financial inducements to suburban builders to put up whole communities rather than hasty subdivisions. Urban renewal is under severe challenge throughout the country; the President has returned precisely the right answer. He wants the renewal program expanded, concentrated chiefly on building homes, and designed to build neighborhoods of character and identity rather than mere barracks.

Three new ideas in his message deserve particular praise. He proposes rent subsidies for families with incomes below the average. "In the long run, President Johnson says, "this may prove the most effective instrument of our new housing policy." Rent subsidies are the solution to the many ugly dilemmas in conventional public housing and urban renewal.

The President, in another striking innovation, calls for state land development agencies to acquire land, build public facilities, and then sell the land to private builders for construction according to a firm plan. This mechanism offers the one real hope of controlling the pattern of metropolitan growth in the public interest.

To underscore the necessity of building coherent communities, the President asks for matching grants to help cities build neighborhood centers. He has seized the basic idea of new town architecture, and used it to combat the anonymity of life at the heart of the city

The seeds of some of these concepts were contained in the housing message of last year, but they were all briskly cut out by Congress. This year, to judge from his language, the President does not mean to have them disregarded again.

This sweeping message on the cities is the latest addition to a most extraordinary statement of this Nation's purposes and prospects. In its scale, its vision and its hopitality to new and unconventional ideas, this series of Presidential calls to action goes far beyond the tradition. It is now a great deal more than a campaign against poverty. It amounts to a program for the reform of American society.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 3, 1965]

A NEW APPROACH FOR THE CITIES DETERMINES QUALITY OF OUR CIVILIZATION

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

In his state of the Union message 2 months ago President Johnson called for breaking old patterns and important changes to bring our urban surroundings into better harmony with our hopes.

In his message on the cities, sent yesterday to Congress, the President sketched a new approach to help bring this about.

The message deals with housing, urban renewal, and many of the other means of Federal assistance in what the President called the heroic battles of our cities to improve the life of the people they serve.

He brings to this battle not merely an inventory of old and new tactics; he offers a strategy—a comprehensive approach to the staggering task of building and rebuilding as much again in one generation as we have built since the first colonists arrived on these shores.

This in itself is an important change. The President takes it for granted that a growing population and economy demands that we build more. His concern is how well we will build and rebuild to meet the needs not only of numbers but also of individuals.

To "reshape, at every level of government," our approach to downtown decay and congestion, slum ghettos, and urban sprawl, and all the misery, inefficiency, and ugliness these entail, the President proposes new and accelerated old programs that add up to:

Effective planning not just of projects but for the entire metropolitan area.

A shift in emphasis from the bulldozer to the rehabilitation of existing buildings.

Greater flexibility in providing decent housing for people of low and moderate income.

Comprehensively planned new communities or "new towns' 'to help "break the pattern of central city ghettos by providing low and moderate income housing."

The President's aim is "to build not just housing units, but neighborhoods; not just to construct schools, but to educate children; not just to raise income but to create beauty and end the poisoning of our environment."

The bulk of this effort is to be administered by a new Department of Housing and Urban Development, which President Kennedy also sought. The new Department would assist metropolitan planning through regional representatives. It would make sound planning a condition of Federal assistance. And it would help make sound planning possible with grants for basic facilities and loans to acquire land in advance of immediate need.

The Department would help improve, rebuild and rehabilitate existing homes by making both public housing and urban renewal funds available for the purpose. Greater use

of existing buildings also promises to help alleviate the desperate shortage of low income housing.

Even more promising in the effort to provide homes for low and moderate income families, however, is the proposed rent supplement. Under this program we would use more existing homes in all parts of the city, and suburbs for people who cannot now afford them and encourage private builders to construct more such housing.

Together with the proposed "new towns" this approach should go far toward breaking up the rigid segregation of neighborhoods not only by race but also by income groups.

President Johnson is fully aware that we do not "have all the answers" to the problems of the city. He sees the attack on our urban problems as a continuing process and he has called for more thinking, more research, more training and—vitally important—an evaluation of prevailing zoning and building codes.

He also reiterated his call for beauty and amenities and would offer the cities Federal assistance for them. He stressed the need for greater attention to good architectural design.

For as his message makes clear, in dealing with the city we are dealing with the environment in which 7 out of 10 Americans live. Its quality, in the end, determines the quality of our civilization.

Voice of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Miss Judith Kaye Dearborn, of Siloam Springs, Ark., in the district which I am honored to represent, recently delivered an address in the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Judith Kaye won for Arkansas, and we are very proud of her, indeed.

It is my great pleasure to insert her winning speech in the RECORD for all to read:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Judith Kaye Dearborn, Siloam Springs, Ark.)

Dr. Peter Marshall, former Chaplain to the U.S. Senate, in "The American Dream" said, "Challenge every true patriot and summon all who love America to roll up their sleeves and make this once again a government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Citizenship is more than a word, it is a deed; it is more than a deed, it is a duty. A duty to country, to friends, neighbors, family—to everyone in America—to yourself.

Citizenship is loyalty; loyalty which is stirred within the heart of each one of us when we hear "The Star-Spangled Banner" or "America the Beautiful." But this feeling, this challenge, must urge us on to accomplishment, or it is worthless.

We talk glibly about freedom and democracy; but as individual citizens of the United States, do we realize fully what priceless gifts we have in our possession? Do we appreciate this great heritage and strive to protect these principles? It is a sad, but true, fact that the majority of us seldom ever think of the tyranny in other countries that could possibly overtake our own land someday, if we, as thoughtful citizens, do not take up the challenge that is before us. For in a sense, if we are not fighting for freedom, we are against it.

How can we fight for freedom? How can we carry out the challenge of citizenship? If every American citizen would remember always that he is an ambassador for our democracy and America, and would live his life accordingly, the challenge would be met. It is true that no matter where you go there will be people who have different ideas as to how a government should be run; who are for socialism, or communism, or some other form of government. Nevertheless, it is our duty as U.S. citizens, devoted to the ideals of a free democracy, to uphold these ideals. To uphold them in our own hometown by voting and taking an active part in local and State elections; in our Nation by voting in our national elections; and also, as we travel over the United States, and into other countries, by presenting and practicing democracy in our lives.

We should be well informed as to the methods being used to overthrow democracy. In this way, we will then be able to combat them. We are able to obtain all types of information so there is no excuse for ignorance on the part of any American.

Let's stop taking our freedoms for granted and let's start doing something to make sure posterity has the same privileges we now enjoy. Let's make use of our freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, and become enthusiastic about what we have here in America.

It is said that the Communists have one thing that we seem to lack—dedication to a cause. They are willing to go to any length to promote this cause. But before you are willing to fight for something, you must believe in it. Do you believe in the cause of democracy? Are you willing to give of yourself to keep freedom alive? Or do you say, "Let the President, or Congress, the Governor, or the man next door do it?" People in other countries, some of our own soldiers, are dying every day because they are fighting for freedom.

Yes, the freedoms we have were dearly bought. When you think of the thousands of lives that were part of the price paid for the freedoms you enjoy today, how can you just sit by and say, "let someone else fight to preserve it?" No. This is the challenge, the duty and honor of every American citizen. For in the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson:

"Not gold, but only man can make,
A people great and strong,
Men who stand for truth and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long.
"Brave men who work while others sleep,
Who dare while others fly,
They build a nation's pillars deep,
And lift them to the sky."

Congress Could End Judicial Tyranny if It Wanted To

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the March 6, 1965, issue of Human Events contains an excellent article by Frederic Nelson, former chief editorial writer for the Saturday Evening Post. The article is entitled "Congress Could End Judicial Tyranny if It Wanted To." I commend this article to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS COULD END JUDICIAL TYRANNY IF IT WANTED TO!

(By Frederic Nelson)

Here it is 8 months after the Supreme Court's arrogant assumption of the power to compel our formerly sovereign States to retailor their legislative districts after a judge-made formula inaccurately described as "one man, one vote," and still Congress has failed to use the power is possesses to overrule this latest judicial excess.

Last year a weak resolution declaring the Court's action to be against the "sense of Congress" was kicked around. This year a constitutional amendment attempting to deal with the problem is proposed, but so far has not been acted on, much less passed on to the States for ratification.

The phrase "sense of Congress" in last year's resolution must have been the work of a real satirist, because the sole interest of the "Warren court" in the sense of Congress is to make sure it does not prevail.

This has been demonstrated in so many fields that it is amazing that Congress has not up to now reacted in some effective manner to protect its own prerogatives. Indeed, the first time Congress has shown any continued interest in the subject was when the Court moved in to threaten the system under which politicians get elected.

PLATONIC GUARDIANS

As Senator STROM THURMOND, Republican, of South Carolina, ably stated, the court has acted "to wipe out local self-government, effective law enforcement, internal security, the rights of the people and the States, and even the structure of the State governments." Nevertheless, this judicial putsch continues with no effective congressional resistance. Why?

I suppose one reason for this neglect of a real threat to the constitutionally democratic process, and its replacement by what the late Judge Learned Hand described as rule by nine "platonic guardians," is the fact that, until the antiprayer decision, popular resentment against judicial aggression had been virtually nil.

Certainly the reason cannot be lack of means. Congress has had adequate power to deal with most of these arrogant power grabs by the Court.

Many years ago then Justice Owen Roberts said: "I do not see any reason why Congress cannot, if it so decides, take away entirely the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court over State supreme court decisions. This jurisdiction is exercised now under the terms of the Judiciary Act. Suppose Congress should decide to let the decisions of States courts be final on constitutional questions. How could the Supreme Court assert a power to take these questions, notwithstanding the act of Congress, in view of the third article of the Constitution?" That article provides, inter alia, that the Supreme Court's jurisdiction over such cases is subject to "such exceptions and under such regulations as Congress may make."

COURT VETOES CONGRESS

To be sure, Justice Roberts was a member of a pre-Warren court and underestimated the capability of his successors to "modernize" the Constitution. Nevertheless, the adoption of Roberts' suggestion would have made it pretty difficult for the Court to hand down the opinion it did hand down in the Steve Nelson case—an opinion which deprives State courts of the right to deal with subversives, apparently on the ground that conspiracies against the United States were none of the several States' business.

Justice Roberts' suggestion would also have made it possible for State supreme courts to protect State statutes dealing with criminal procedure. This would prevent repetition of decisions like that in the Mallory case: that a miscreant must be presented before a magistrate so promptly that, in many cases, the

police have no time to work up a case worth presenting.

Surely also the Congress could, if it possessed the will, find a way to deal with the Court's veto of congressional efforts to compel Communist leaders to register under the Subversives Control Act, a reasonable security requirement three times nixed by the Court.

The effort to control the issue of passports to Communists, which had been upset by the Court, might have been renewed, but in the Senate the attempt to stop this loophole proved to be one occasion upon which the then Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson did not display his widely advertised ability to "get the last needed vote out of a rathole."

In fairness, it should be added that the House passed measures designed to end the chaos created by the Mallory and Steve Nelson decisions, but both failed in the Senate. A new attempt to mitigate the Mallory decision is being made in this session, but again it looks as though the Senate will put up a roadblock.

In another respect Congress has been less than vigilant. It is natural to blame the executive for poor selections of judicial appointees. Politics have figured in the appointments of men as eminent as Stone, Hughes, Holmes, Frankfurter, Roberts, Chase, Taft and McReynolds. Back in 1910 Woodrow Wilson, addressing the American Bar Association at Chattanooga, complained that "constitutional lawyers have fallen into the background. We have relegated them to the Supreme Court without asking ourselves where we are to find more of them when vacancies occur on that great tribunal."

Today constiutional lawyers remain in the background, emerging from time to time to write indignant letters to the New York Times, but no President since Hoover would think of naming one to the U.S. Supreme Court.

For one thing, vacancies usually occur at inconvenient times. Either the Justice who died or retired was a Jew or a Catholic and must ipso facto be replaced by one of the same religion. Or the Court is supposed to need a westerner, or maybe even a southerner. Or the President has to find some spot for the politician, with experience as a police magistrate, who delivered his State's delegation to the President at the decisive moment. Or somebody friendly to labor, or (give us time) a big-time woman.

Anyway, a President, assuming he knows any constitutional lawyers, seldom feels the time is propitious to make a Supreme Court Justice of one.

The country suffers from such jockeying at the White House. But the failure of Congress to take seriously its part in the proceedings is equally distressing.

In the 1930's, liberals in Congress took the matter of confirmation very seriously indeed. They defeated President Hoover's effort to place Judge John J. Parker, of North Carolina, on the Court, and they almost blocked the appointment of Justice Charles Evans Hughes. But when F.D.R. came up with Black and Douglas—who were, to say the least, not conspicuously more qualified than Hughes or Parker—the Senate went along.

Later, if anybody asked an uncivil question about the legal qualifications of Earl Warren for the highest judicial office in the land, it seems not to have mattered.

Perhaps the reason it hasn't mattered to Congress is that it hasn't mattered to the people of the United States. As a rule, Supreme Court decisions appear to the so-called man in the street to be remote from his concerns.

CASE FOR POLICE

Unfortunately also, liberals have had more success than conservatives in dramatizing the Court's activities. It has seemed easier to work up sympathy for a lonely Negro, held in durance vile for hours and perhaps manhandled by detectives, than to state the case for policemen, responsible for order in their communities but shackled by Pecksniffian restraints and regulations.

Senator Goldwater attempted to associate the Court's overconcern for the rights of malefactors with the rising rate of murders and other crimes of violence in our city streets, but few noticed. Just the same, the tolerant attitude of the Warren Court isn't just something to raise the blood pressure of crusty reactionaries. The thug saved by a liberal court may live to rape your daughter.

The difficulty with many critics of the Court is fear lest restraints imposed by the legislative branch cripple the necessary function of the Supreme Court as the umpire in a Federal system. There has to be an umpire. Chief Justice Marshall summed it up neatly: "The Constitution declares that 'no bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed.' If, however, such a bill should be passed, and a person should be prosecuted under it, must the Court condemn to death these victims whom the Constitution endeavors to preserve?"

He further inquired: "If an act of the legislature is void, does it, notwithstanding its invalidity, bind the courts and oblige them to enforce it?" That has always been a hard nut to crack. In the 1930's liberals would have none of Marshall's doctrine. Today, liberals regard even an effort by Congress to protect its own proper function as, in the language of the New York Times on the redistricting effort, an example of "legislative irresponsibility."

JUDICIAL UKASE

What it comes down to is that, when the Court was doing its best to restrain a New Deal Congress from passing measures of dubious constitutionality, liberals demanded that the Court be stripped of its powers, "packed," abolished, and treated with lofty contempt. But today, when the Court has extended its arbitrary power into every field, attributing to Congress intentions that Congress never had, and in general exercising an absolutism hardly distinguishable from dictatorship, liberals applaud the Court, and denounce even the feeblest legislative resistance as "hobbling the courts" and defying the "law of the land."

Inconsistency? There is none. Thirty years ago the liberals were whooping it up for legislative defiance of the Constitution; now they are all for judicial efforts to amend it. Whichever branch of the Government favors the dictatorial march to socialism, the liberals are for it.

Just possibly the Court itself has stubbed its toe and irked Congress too markedly with its redistricting decision, and upset the public by standing firmly against prayer in the schools. Grateful for small mercies, conservatives must press such advantages as exist.

Conceivably even a liberal Congress can be made to understand that Congress is not merely a debating club under the Great Society, but the sole, constitutionally created maker of laws for the country. To permit its proper function to be eroded by judicial ukase it the threaten the continued existence of our federal system.

The 217th Anniversary of the Birth of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today, March 4, is the 217th anniversary of the birth of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, a lifelong fighter against tyranny and a great hero of the American Revolution.

During the American war for independence, brave men from European nations inspired by our ideals of justice and liberty ventured forth to our continent and fought with dedication and bravery by our side. This day commemorates the anniversary of the birth of one such individual, Casimir Pulaski. General Pulaski stands as an example of the brave people of Poland who have inspired the world with their undying zeal for justice and liberty for all people.

After leading a heroic but unsuccessful effort to win Polish freedom against the coalition of Prussia, Russia, and Austria, General Pulaski was forced to flee Poland. He made his escape to France where he met Benjamin Franklin and offered his services to the cause of American independence.

In 1777, General Pulaski joined the main Army at Valley Forge and provided a struggling new Nation with brilliant military leadership during the remainder of the Revolutionary War. He distinguished himself in various engagements with the enemy and was rewarded by the Continental Congress with the rank of brigadier general. The American people feel deep gratitude to General Pulaski, to his countrymen, and to the many foreign patriots who fought and died for the cause of our freedom.

Today we face a world where tyranny and injustice still exist. Casimir Pulaski will always serve as an inspiration to these people who must continue their fight for freedom.

What the War on Poverty Has To Do With You and Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What the War on Poverty Has to Do With You and Me."

This eloquent and perceptive article, which first appeared in the Bulletin of Temple Beth El, of Detroit, which is Michigan's oldest Jewish congregation, was written by Dr. Richard C. Hertz, rabbi of Temple Beth El.

It is particularly timely, in view of the fact that we shall soon be considering a new authorization for the Economic Opportunity Act.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE WAR ON POVERTY HAS TO DO WITH YOU AND ME

(By Rabbi Richard C. Hertz)

Why are church and synagogue leaders being alerted to the poverty program?

On January 5–6, 1965, the Central Conference of American Rabbis arranged to have its executive board gather in Washington, D.C. We received a special briefing on the

President's poverty program. For 2 days, top economists from Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity, in addition to both public and private economists, gave us an intimate analysis of the dimensions of the poverty program. This detailed briefing gave us new insight into the vast magnitude of poverty. We gained a deeper understanding of the role that the forces of religion will be called upon to play in winning support for the President's poverty program.

What does the poverty program have to do with religion?

The poverty program appeals to the deepest instincts of all religions that dedicate themselves to aid the poor, care for the sick, teach the ignorant, and extend a helping hand to those who have lost their way in the world. Poverty is a religious concern. It is nondenominational, ecumenical, and unfortunately universal.

Judaism has had a long acquaintance with poverty. Since the days of Moses, we Jews have developed a concern for the widow and the orphaned, the poor and the humble, the stranger within our gates. We have been commanded in Scriptures never to forget that we once were bondsmen in Egypt and to remember what it was like to be disenfranchised and enslaved in poverty.

Our Hebrew prophets were the first to establish a religious relationship between ethics and economics, between justice and poverty. Amos and his successors ingrained into the Jewish consciousness a deep concern for the plight of the exploited. He taught it was morally wrong for men to praise God and gouge the poor. Religion demanded social justice.

So the war on poverty is nothing new to Judaism. Across the generations, Jews became experts in enduring poverty. With the prophets, we have helped to fight it. With oppression, we have learned how to endure it. With our Sholem Aleichem's, we have learned how to poke fun at it. But always it was poverty of material goods, never a poverty of the spirit. We never lost the love of learning. We never gave up hope that ultimately a new society of brotherhood and equality could be established. We became expert in a poverty program for our own people through the magic letters of JDC and UJA. We learned what it meant to care for the less fortunate.

The President's poverty program is enormously relevant to the prophetic insights of all historic faiths. Just as the civil rights revolution did not succeed until the churches and synagogues supplied the moral force to propel it forward, so the poverty program will never get off the ground until the religious forces of America stand united together and awaken the conscience of America to combat poverty, illiteracy, disease, and despair. But religious leaders must lead. They must translate the pulpit's religious idealism into moral concern on the part of the people.

How has the Central Conference of American Rabbis addressed itself in the past to the elimination of poverty?

Today's rabbis, who are the inheritors of the prophetic mantle, have instinctively been drawn to the war on poverty. Year after year, the Central Conference of American Rabbis has met in convention and passed resolutions on poverty, appointed committees on social justice, published position papers on economics and religion. The poverty program is a phase of religion in action, in applying the prophetic tradition and the principles of religion to social conditions. It has everything to do with religion—with all religions.

In 1960, the CCAR published a platform on the elimination of poverty and called for "a sustained attack upon all the social and economic conditions which make for poverty." Again in 1964, the CCAR spoke on this issue, "We pledge our support of the President and his advisers in the war on poverty.

Why is poverty a vicious circle?

Poverty breeds its own culture, its own way of life. Jammed in slums under unhygienic conditions and living on inadequate diets, the poor suffer more than other members of our society. When they become sick, they are sick longer and oftener and their recovery is slower. They find it difficult to hold a steady job. They lose wage benefits. As a result they cannot afford adequate housing or a nourishing diet or preventive medical care. When a major calamity overtakes a family—sickness, death, or jail—they move down another rung on the poverty ladder and start a downward cycle all over again.

Why is poverty social dynamite?

Poverty can blow up in any American community. We must not be complacent about those pockets of poverty that blight our inner cities. As a result of President Johnson's leadership, we now have the unique opportunity to banish blight and despair that darken the lives of one-fifth of the American people. We must take advantage of the President's program for the sake of our children.

The war on poverty is right, practical, necessary, and urgent.

What do statistics reveal about poverty?

A Gallup poll recently revealed that 51 percent of the American people think the poor are responsible for their own poverty. But this is not true. When a man who is on relief for the third generation, whose father was on relief, and whose grandfather was on relief before him, when that man tries to break out of the circle of the poverty culture, he finds it mighty difficult. That man never knew any other way of life than welfare relief. Go down to the Appalachian Mountain country, as I have, and you will understand this condition more vividly.

I know it is hard for us to visualize one-fifth of America as a simple statistic. Half of the people who never made it are Negro. More than half are over 65. More than 50 percent of all southerners or rural families headed by a woman are in this category of poverty. Three out of five never went beyond the eighth grade, and if they live in Alabama or Mississippi, 8 years of schooling are equivalent to 2 or 3 in Michigan.

The great bulk of the poor are born into poverty and never escape the culture of poverty, the illiteracy, the hopelessness, and general despair. Their children grow up in a house, not a home, where there is never a word of encouragement, a story read from a book, a record played, or a picture painted. This is the vicious circle of poverty. We have to start the day a child is born, or even before. The poverty program aims to help people prepare themselves for opportunity which is now, for the first time, knocking on their door.

We affluent Americans can no longer remain indifferent to the poverty-stricken. It is immoral to do so. Poverty must be exposed and wiped out. The human side of Government statistics show men out of work, children dropping out of school, families disrupted. The President's far-sighted poverty program can help future generations of poor lift themselves permanently from the bottom of the ladder.

If we can spend billions of dollars to send one man to the moon, we are certainly justified in spending millions of dollars to help millions of people.

Who are "the other America?"

One-fifth of America are aliens in their native land. They are "the other America," as Michael Harrington describes in his book of that title.

Millions of American families live in the subbasement of our social structure. They are America's "have not" people. They are the denied and the disadvantaged, the dispossessed and the discriminated against. They are the old and young, the Negroes and other minorities. They are the sick, the handicapped, the sharecroppers and migratory workers. They are the unemployed or underemployed or underprivileged. Each day they are taunted on TV by the commercials of abundance, urging them to buy, buy, buy—and always these symbols of the good life are just out of their reach.

Their poverty robs them of any sense of individual worth or human dignity. They are cut off, forced to live outside the rest of society, deprived of any sense of belonging except to other people like themselves; victims of a frustration so deep and so enveloping that the invitation to communism, or invitation to take to the streets to demonstrate their hopelessness, beckons to them. The rabble-rousers and demagogs are always anxious to exploit their despair.

In the American past, poverty was often unavoidable because economic resources were scarcer. But today, no nation in the world is blessed with the riches and wealth of America. The means are at hand to provide every American young and old, with a decent standard of living. Yet, one-fifth of America, the other America, continue to live in abject poverty; and the vicious cycle of poverty breeds more poverty.

Who are the other America—the one-fifth of the Nation who are poor?

They are the families of the large number of active breadwinners whose income is too small to provide himself and his family with minimum needs of shelter, food, clothing and medical care.

They are the young, the healthy, the able bodied for whom society has failed to provide jobs and who cannot find them for themselves.

They are the young between 16 and 21 who have dropped out of school, who are unemployed and actively seeking work, but who are untrained and cannot fulfill the requirements of skilled, technical work that may be available.

They are the old, the disabled who cannot work because they are not able to any longer.

They are the discouraged and the frustrated who have problems, personal and social, that add to their feeling of hopelessness.

They are the minorities against whom discrimination comes at every turn to compound the ugliness of their poverty.

What can be done specifically to wipe out poverty?

The President's war against poverty is both educational and catalytic. It seeks to inform and motivate people to assume some personal responsibility locally to eliminate poverty. It involves four things: (1) education of the Nation in comprehending the extent of poverty in America and understanding the dimensions of it. (2) It involves national action programs at the Federal level dealing with unemployment and underemployment, slums and inadequate housing, insufficient education. (3) It involves community action where at the local level—the State, the city, the neighborhood, the community—plans for projects are devised in carefully chosen areas. Concerned citizens and organizations in every section of the country will be drawn actively into the struggle and organized to work on a specific project in a specific area. (4) It aims at involvement of the poor themselves, particularly young people, in self-help activities, to reduce dependency and deprivation by involving them in activities on their own behalf and bringing the community services to them.

Such aspects of poverty reflect a whole network of social ills, like illiteracy, unemployment, poor health, dilapidated housing. To alleviate these problems requires a whole network of antipoverty attacks from many directions and against many targets, but all coordinated and fashioned by local talent and local leadership.

Specifically, remedial reading, literacy courses, job training, employment counseling, homemaking services, job development and training, vocational rehabilitation, are only some of the individual programs that are part of the local antipoverty program.

In all of these the key to the President's poverty program is local responsibility. To eliminate remote control from Washington, local committees have been given the basic responsibility for planning, developing, and administrating their own programs and to receive Federal funds for these purposes. In each area a community action committee made up of representative citizens from in and out of the Government is being formed.

Here in Michigan we already have 15 such committees formed on a county or multicounty basis.

In Detroit it is called TAAP—total action against poverty. Mayor Cavanaugh has won national recognition for his leadership in implementing the poverty program in Detroit. The TAAP committee has developed a communitywide, coordinated attack on poverty and designated a number of specific projects within four areas of the inner city. The program involves helping youth, aged, rehabilitation of the disadvantaged, an enrichment program in the public school system, and the voluntary social agencies like united community services with their great experience and know-how in dealing with these problems.

What dangers must we be aware of?

Waste in public spending must always be watched, whether in foreign aid, the Pentagon, the outer space and missile program, or the poverty program.

Issues involving clear separation of church and state are also involved in the poverty program. The Catholic Church, for example, with millions of really poor people in its ranks, is anxious to seek Federal funds for some of its programs. Clear guidelines need to be drawn so that the wall of separation between church and state is not breached, and long-range goals that preserve the first amendment are not lost through short-range expediency.

Automation is another difficulty compounding the poverty program, because it so deeply affects the employment picture, especially the young men still in their teens who join the job force every year. Technological progress as it affects unskilled workmen poses many moral and ethical decisions directly related to the poverty program.

How does the poverty program affect you and me?

The plight of the other America remains a challenge to the American people. The silence of the poor, the invisible poor, must be ended. No more burning moral issues exists in our affluent society than the elimination of the human suffering of those who live in poverty. What is needed is the full mobilization and the commitment of churches and synagogues, labor and industry, the civil rights movement, the farmers and veterans, and students and women's organizations, in an all-out alliance against poverty. This kind of moral crusade could achieve a national awakening of conscience.

We all know that once Americans became aroused in time of war, we can unite and act quickly and effectively. Needless poverty in the midst of plenty is a war that challenges the conscience of the Nation. Without this crusade against poverty, the Great Society cannot come into full realization.

This, then, is a profile of the President's poverty program compressed into a very narrow viewing. The downtrodden and the dispossessed weigh heavily on the moral conscience of the American people and they should. Huge unmet social needs remain to be fulfilled. The war on poverty is a gigantic bootstrap operation to bring up the standard of living of one-fifth of the Nation. It obviously can't and won't be done overnight.

The challenge before you and me in the 1960's and 1970's is to match our technical know-how with the problem of poverty and thus narrow the gap between the "have's" and the "have-not's."

President Lyndon B. Johnson has taken the first steps in mobilizing the Nation toward the goal of the Great Society. As he assumes the reins of office in his own right, our prayers are for the success of his administration. May the years ahead bring this Nation of abundance an abundance of blessing. Let there be a harvest of dignity not just for some Americans or even for the other Americans, but for all Americans.

The War in Vietnam, VII—100 Hold Redoubt Against 300 Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert another part in a series of the report by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on his recent observations in Vietnam. I recommend this informative report to all of my colleagues.

Part VII of this series, which appeared in the Courier-Express on February 27, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, VII—100 HOLD REDOUBT AGAINST 300 REDS

(NOTE.—Warfare in South Vietnam has many unorthodox aspects, thanks to modern weapons like the helicopter and ancient considerations like jungle and mountain terrain. Here, Lucian C. Warren, on his visit to the front, drops in on a government fortress—village well behind enemy siege lines, and finds it manned by Vietnamese of Cambodian descent.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

NUI BA DEN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—No better illustration of this odd-ball war is perhaps available than what's taking place at Nui Ba Den, which is translated: "Black Virgin Mountain."

Nui Ba Den is a peak near the Cambodian border, 35 miles southwest of Saigon. Its base is infested by Vietcong Communists. Neither side has the power, or at least has not amassed enough strength to date, to liquidate the opposing forces.

Atop this heavily fortified mountaintop, 3,200 feet above sea level, a good-looking Detroit officer, 1st Lt. John C. Sandlin, directs operations with a cool precision that belies the fact that he's sitting on a powder keg that might go off at anytime.

SURROUNDED

There are, of course, some formidable restraints that give the Vietcong pause. Sandlin can lob all kinds of shells, mortars, and rockets into any Vietcong detachment that attempts to storm the heights. And he's in close communication with substantial Vietnamese forces at Soui Da, a few miles from the base of the mountain.

Nevertheless, it is still a shocker for even the most blase war correspondent to be able to drop in on this mountain retreat by helicopter and realize that he's completely surrounded by probably a battalion of dedicated Vietcong, numbering between 300 and 400 men, at the base of the mountain, while his only visible protection is the Vietnamese force of about 100 men in possession of the top third of Nui Ba Den.

I voiced my awe over the fact that even Sandlin might at times go stir crazy and need to be ferried into Saigon for relaxation.

GARBLED

"You know," he confided, "I really feel safer here than I do in Saigon where a saboteur's bomb could go off anywhere and often does. I let my men go once in a while, but I like it here and rarely go in except for business."

His main business is to see to it that Black Virgin Mountain is kept safe as an important radio relay point for the communications system of the American and South Vietnamese military forces.

Communication is vitally important for the success of the war against the Vietcong. For the civilian, and even the military, in this underdeveloped country, the frustrations of trying to get through by phone to any party are formidable.

COMPLICATIONS

South Vietnam doesn't have a Bell Telephone system, but a series of independent phone companies whose names—Tiger, Puma, Snow Coke, etc.—are picturesque, but whose electronics are primitive.

Therefore, Sandlin's work atop Nui Ba Den is vitally important to strengthen the military communications network.

The Vietnamese with whom Sandlin is working are largely dedicated Buddhists. They have erected one pagoda at the top of the mountain which Sandlin shares with them.

"I have to negotiate with them even to drive a nail in the wall," Sandlin explains.

Many of the religious ceremonies are held in a shrine in another pagoda a few hundred feet down the mountain.

ENOUGH

My visit to Nui Ba Den is taking place in midafternoon, when the mountain peak presents an interesting contrast of much barbed wire, sandbags, and military equipment, in the midst of which Cambodian men, women, and children seem unconcerned at the danger all around them. At one point, a huge primitive kettle rests over a slow fire and I was told that this was community stew available to all the residents, and even to guests. I decided against a sampling.

There isn't a trace of military activity this afternoon, but then the Vietcong like to do their dirty work at night. This is why the special forces there are geared mainly for night activity.

A French correspondent who accompanied us to the mountain is staying overnight, but I have elected to return to Saigon to take my chance with the bombs.

I don't dig this crazy mixed-up war.

The Soviet Effort in Oceanography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last September and October Capt. T. K. Treadwell, U.S. Navy, toured oceanographic institutions and installations in Soviet Russia.

Captain Treadwell, who holds a masters degree in oceanography, was accompanied by five other scientists. As a submarine officer in both the Atlantic and

the Pacific during World War II, and as head of the Oceanographic Division of the U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office, Captain Treadwell is particularly well qualified to evaluate certain aspects of the Soviet oceanographic program. Both those in which the Russians are proficient and those in which they are deficient are stated in some detail.

I am particularly impressed by Captain Treadwell's report on the extensive Soviet activities in support of fisheries research, which includes the construction and operation by the Institute of Fisheries Research of ships up to 4,000 tons, the operation of a submarine to study fish behavior, and the employment of many vessels as ships of opportunity.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries apparently has had little success in recent years in impressing the authorities over it or the Bureau of the Budget of the need, in behalf of our own American fisheries industry, for modern, efficient U.S. exploratory and research vessels. The result is that the expansion of this field has been very, very limited.

Meanwhile, massive Russian fishing fleets haunt New England and Alaskan waters while Soviet research ships, equipped with advanced and sophisticated instruments and equipment, cruise the length of our Atlantic and Pacific Coasts and the Gulf of Mexico on exploratory missions that it is reasonable to believe are not limited to locating fishery resources.

Captain Treadwell reported highlights of his visit to the U.S.S.R. in the December 1964 issue of Navy, the magazine of sea-power. His article, entitled "The Soviet Effort in Oceanography," is proof, in my opinion, that we are engaged in a contest with the U.S.S.R. for the mastery of the oceans and their scientific secrets. This is a Soviet challenge, like that for supremacy in space, that the United States cannot afford to ignore.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Captain Treadwell's article, entitled "The Soviet Effort in Oceanography," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOVIET EFFORT IN OCEANOGRAPHY

(By Capt. T. K. Treadwell, Jr., U.S. Navy, Assistant Oceanographer of the Navy for Plans and Policies)

The Navy has always been interested in oceanography, particularly in its applied forms. Only within the last generation, however, have the needs been clearly identified and a systematic set of programs carried out to meet them. The fundamental problems are self-evident: A basic knowledge of the chemistry and physics of the sea; the effect of living organisms; the interplay between air and water and water on land. Given full answers to these fundamental questions, the effectiveness of naval operations could be increased severalfold.

Since oceanography is such a potent force, it obviously is of considerable interest to know how our competitors are doing.

A MONTH IN SOVIET UNION

During this past September and October, I was fortunate to be one of six U.S. oceanographers who spent a month visiting a variety of Soviet oceanographic institutions, on one of the State Department's technical exchange programs. While a full description of this tour is beyond the scope of this article, a brief look at some typical spots may be helpful; from it, some generalizations can be made.

Topping any list of Soviet oceanographic activities is the Institute of Oceanography, under the direction of Dr. V. G. Kort. Split among three locations in Moscow, it is undoubtedly the heart of general oceanographic research. It has more than 400 personnel, of which 110 are of graduate level or higher. The institute covers all the main oceanographic topics; dynamics of ocean circulation, air-sea interaction, geology and structure of the bottom, and biology. It is more concerned with fundamental research than with the development of applications. The research vessel *Vityaz* is available full time, plus at least five smaller vessels.

The Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute at Leningrad is typical of the opposite type; it is delivering high-quality products which are needed. Research is a secondary effort. It provides ice forecasts for the northern shipping lanes, and weather information from the Arctic Ocean. Directed by an experienced, rough, young scientist, Dr. A. F. Treshnikov, it will certainly continue to grow as the Soviet Union develops its northern coastline. The 200 personnel of the institute can draw on the *Ob* and *Lena*, 12,600-ton cargo-icebreaker hulls, as well as icebreakers and other ships on occasion.

SOME RESEARCH SHIPS

The Institute of Fisheries Research in Moscow and its six major area branches exist to support commercial fisheries and to all appearances are doing a good job of it. The institute has a new class of 4,000-ton research ships; the first, *Akademic Klepovich*, is in operation now, and the next, *Constantin Vedugin*, is almost completed. Others are on the way, to supplement 60 fisheries vessels which are used as ships of opportunity.

Fisheries Institute personnel accompany every major fishing group which sails and provide specific recommendations for the conduct of the operation. Additional to this capacity, each of the area branches have their own ships, laboratories, and personnel to support local fleets. The polar branch at Murmansk has the *Severyanka*, a converted submarine which is used to study fish behavior and the operation of fishing gear. As long as the fisheries researchers continue to deliver improved fish catches, they will remain a major force in Soviet oceanography.

The State Oceanographic Institute in Moscow, under the hydrometeorological directorate, is another organization oriented toward providing services. Their interests range widely: the study of currents; the prediction of wave effects on offshore structures; flooding in estuarine areas; and the interaction of the sea and atmosphere. To support this effort, there is an extensive network of marine hydrometeorological stations along almost the entire coastline of the country. The research ships *Voyekov* and *Shokalski*, 3,600 tons, are available for deep sea expeditions. Most of the work of this institute is consultative, providing the expertise necessary for other agencies to solve specific problems.

Moscow State University is the focal point of education in oceanography. Prof. A. D. Dobruvolski chairs the oceanographic group in the geography department. About 10 carefully selected students annually enter the 5-year course and the same number graduates; failures are almost unknown. Fieldwork and on-the-job training are a regular part of the curriculum, in additions to 3,500 hours of classroom work. Perhaps 10 percent of the graduates return later for another 3 years of study, leading to the equivalent of the doctorate.

In addition to Moscow State University, the Universities of Leningrad and Vladivostok also have chairs of oceanography; the Institute of Marine Engineering and the Hydrometeorological Institute of Leningrad also train oceanographers. In all, about 60 are graduated annually at the lower level and 5 at the doctoral level. In spite of this it is still necessary to draft oceanographers from other disciplines, especially in physics, chemistry and mathematics.

Based on this limited lifting of the curtain, several things seem clear. In overall size, the Soviet effort is probably the equal of any in the world. As in the United States, it is spread across many agencies, following different courses. Although the Soviets have two major coordinating committees (similar to our own Interagency Committee on Oceanography), it does not appear that their coordination, is any more effective than ours, and most likely less. On the other hand, much firmer direction can be exercised in the U.S.S.R. if and when it is considered necessary.

Evidently the number of personnel engaged in the marine sciences is larger than here. Further, their production of trained oceanographers is substantially higher than that of the United States. There is the added advantage of being able to detail personnel where needed, rather than rely on inefficient persuasion. Those scientists contacted seemed to be content and technically well-qualified. It does not appear, however, that man for man (or man for woman, since they use a far higher percentage of women scientists than do we) they are the equivalent of the U.S. scientists. The spark of enthusiasm was often lacking and individual productivity seemed low.

Soviet oceanographic ships have received considerable commendation and certainly much of it is merited. The only one visited seemed to be well designed for multipurpose cruises, although much more crowded than those of the Western World. The actual number of ships are almost impossible to compare. The Soviets have a far larger ship-of-opportunity program in operation and these are hard to identify and evaluate. It would seem that the two capabilities are, in balance, not significantly different.

SHORE FACILITIES SAD

The short facilities of the Soviet oceanographic institutions are surely the worst part of their program. Research centers are rusticated into rundown country palaces of the last century, or stuck into the basements of apartment houses. Crowding was the rule; lighting, heating and general office support equipment were ancient.

Instrumentation seemed to be adequate and rugged, although very few innovations were noted. Foreign sources formerly provided much technical equipment and a lot of it is still seen from East Germany, Poland, Britain, and the Scandinavian countries. Examples of quantity production by Soviet factories are increasingly seen, although these are frequently "Chinese copies" of foreign items. Automation was almost unheard of.

EMPHASIS ON PRACTICAL

The routine collection and processing of data is certainly a strong point of the Soviet program, although it is being carried out by brute force by large numbers of people. Only one computer and one electric desk calculator was seen; the standard mathematical tool is the abacus. It was further noted that limited runs of publications and periodicals made them hard to obtain, even in the Soviet Union, and almost impossible to find abroad. World Data Center B, the focal point of international data exchange, was a disappointment; it only had a few shelves of publications available and no data in the usual sense of the word.

The research programs were generally disappointing; most of those seen were unimaginative and showed few lines of work worth pursuing. In their applied programs, however, every effort is being made to get something useful for their money, and in

many areas, such as ice prediction, fisheries, engineering applications and coastal control, they are doing very well.

In summary, the Soviet oceanographic program is massive and slanted toward practical applications. It is being carried out by large numbers of average people, led by top-flight scientists, under the disadvantage of commonplace equipment and poor working conditions. Significant advances have been made in the last 20 years and the trend will doubtless continue.

Comparison of the Soviet and United States efforts is difficult, since basic differences exist. The Soviets stress applications and give research a back seat; we pour the bulk of our resources into research, and all too often pay only lipservice to useful products. At the present moment, it would seem that Russia is getting as much for their money as we are, in the form of practical applications. They seem to lack a strong program of fundamental research which is clearly necessary to provide the basis for achievements a decade or generation in the future. Their shortsightedness in this regard will sap their strength, surely and soon.

It would be equally shortsighted of the United States to neglect those phases of its own effort which are lagging, such as education, shipbuilding, and the development of practical applications. This visit provided the opportunity to see a part of the Soviet program. Perhaps even more important than that is the opportunity to see the U.S. program in a new context, so that we can correct our weaknesses and take advantage of our strengths.

The War in Vietnam, VIII—Rickshaw Ride Is No Bargain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the eighth in a series of the report by Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on his tour of Vietnam.

Part VIII, which appeared in the Courier-Express on Febraruy 28, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, VIII—RICKSHAW RIDE IS NO BARGAIN

(NOTE.—Saigon, command post of a thoroughly 20th century war, is an old city that retains many of its quaint Asian customs. One of these is the rickshaw, that ancient surrey with the fringe on top whose human "horse" have been swindling the gullible for centuries. Here Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, gets taken for a ride by one of these picturesque pirates.)

SAIGON.—Coverage of the war in Vietnam is strewn with obstacles, not all of the Vietcong making.

On a Sunday afternoon in Saigon, another Department of Defense-sponsored newsman Herbert Brubaker, and I decided that now would be a good time to get the Buddhist point of view. The Buddhists are thoroughly mixed up in Vietnamese politics and have contributed more than their share of instability to the government.

NOT DISSUADED

A U.S. Embassy man tried to dissuade us, saying that Sunday was just as much a day of rest for the Buddhist as it is for the Christian. But he said that with good luck we might find someone who would talk with us at the Buddhist Institute on Tran Quoc Toan Avenue.

We took a chance and set off on our mission.

It was a beautiful day and it seemed like a good idea at the time to hire two rickshaws to taxi us to our destination.

INSTRUCTIONS

A Saigon policeman who seemed to know a little English was told where we wanted to go and instructed the rickshaw operators. Asked how much we should pay our drivers, the policeman said 10 piastres apiece.

A piastre is worth about 14 cents, and the fare seemed reasonable.

So we set off on our merry way, up one street and down another, dallying not long on Dai Lo Le Lo Boulevard, or Gia Long Street, and not even getting hung up on Hong Thap Tu Road, despite fierce traffic.

TROUBLES START

We arrived soon at what we thought was the institute and our troubles began. The rickshaw drivers squealed their displeasure at the proffered 10 piasters, so reluctantly and foolishly we tossed them five more apiece —7 cents more to buy a little peace. It not only brought peace but the drivers amiably conducted us on a tour of the place.

It was a beautiful place. All the rich trappings of a pagoda—Buddha with the many arms, incense, teakwood, jade, and the kneeling devout—were on view.

Come to find out, however, it was a pagoda and not the Buddhist Institute. Laboriously we searched up and down for someone who could speak and read a little English, and after about 10 minutes found one who told our rickshaw friends that the place we wanted to go to was on Tran Quoc Toan Avenue.

OFF AGAIN

It's highly possible that those sly little rascals knew all along they had taken us to the wrong place, and it would have been well for us at this point to have hired one of the metered motorcabs.

But Confucius say there's no fool like an occidental fool, or he ought to have said it. Anyway, we clambered aboard again and were off.

As near as I could later make out from a map, we got to Tran Quoc Toan Avenue via Chua Huyen Tran, Ba Huyen Thank Quang, Phan Dinh Phung, and Phan Thank Giang Streets but I'm a little uncertain that was the precise route.

MORE DEMANDS

It is fair to State, I guess, that we planned out all over the city, so long did it take to arrive at our destination.

This time, it seems, we finally had arrived at the Buddhist Institute and now came a haggling by our rickshaw drivers that would have made Shylock green with envy.

Those oriental thieves wanted 50 piasters apiece. In vain we argued and shouted. The more we argued the greater grew the crowd.

It might well have turned into a street riot, hence we paid off.

It took 20 minutes to find someone who spoke English at the institute. At this point we learned that the U.S. Embassy man was right, no official at the institute was present.

"Come back last week," said a man in broken English, who was scornfully corrected by another who suggested we try in 2 days.

SWITCH TO CAB

We were, however, not so foolish as to play the rickshaw roulette game on the way back.

We hired a small metered cab and for a grand total of only 20 piasters, including tip, we were back in our hotel in nothing flat.

We had not gained the slightest knowledge of Buddhist politics and, considering our total outlay of time and money, the afternoon could only by considered as most piastrous.

Tribute to Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, First Woman Chief of Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with the proposed creation of a new Cabinet post in the field of housing and urban affairs, attention has been focused on the importance of having qualified, imaginative, and responsible authorities in the public housing field.

I wish to commend Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, our Nation's first woman chief of public housing, for her work and success in this field. Mrs. McGuire has a long history of accomplishments in public housing, which has earned her a citation from the American Institute of Architects.

As a tribute to this fine person, I ask unanimous consent that an article concerning her, from the Dallas Morning News of February 24, 1965, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Feb. 24, 1965]

HOUSING CHIEF BATTLES DRAB DESIGN—HAS GOOD WORD FOR DALLAS

(By Mary Brinkerhoff)

The Nation's first woman chief of public housing was back in Texas Tuesday, still a free-form, split-level, multi-purpose model built to stand out on Washington's official skyline.

Mrs. Marie C. McGuire walked off a Braniff Airways plane into Dallas' suddenly roaring winter and talked a while on everything from local housing proposals to her war against drab design.

Then she was off for several speaking engagements in Fort Worth with Thomas H. Callaham, the Public Housing Authority's regional director there, and his assistant, E. J. Haling.

She was shown a newspaper report of the recent Dallas Council of Social Agencies recommendation that at least 1,000 one-bedroom apartments for the elderly be built under Dallas Housing Authority auspices.

This kind of thing is her meat. When Mrs. McGuire was executive director of the San Antonio Housing Authority, her pioneering apartment project for older people won her fame and a Federal appointment.

For those who doubt the need of low income housing for the aged, she offers this thought: When such housing is built in a city of any size, applicants outnumber available units many times over.

Private "retirement villas" are fine, she believes, but they have little bearing on the problem which concerns her. "The difficulty is that they are not speaking to the majority's ability to pay."

Marie McGuire, famed as a redtape slasher during her nearly 4 years in Washington, never lost her concern for the individual, elderly or otherwise, who lives in public housing.

She hasn't been overawed by her responsibility for Federal participation in a program

which operates in more than 2,100 communities and represents a total investment running into billions.

And she retains a soft spot for her Victoria Plaza in San Antonio, still a showpiece. It was designed with thought for the occupants need for beauty, recreation, friendship—factors to make them feel that "life is not over; it may be just beginning."

Any resident of public housing, she's convinced, should be able to take pride in his home. And while "I'm all for economy," drabness and poor design are false economies to her.

"After all, we're building environments to last for the next 50 to 100 years."

A corollary is that public housing shouldn't be segregated in some grim location. "It should meld in with the community, not stand off in the backyards * * *. You have some good public housing sites in Dallas, in very pleasant parts of the city. This is not true of some cities."

Mrs. McGuire strongly opposes housing plans which segregate the handicapped, those of lowest income or any group as if they were "the dregs of society."

One way around such segregation was provided in the Housing Act of 1961: partnership between the Public Housing Authority and private enterprise.

An example is under construction in New York by the PHA and a foundation. Five hundred units will be reserved for "low-income" occupants, another 500 for those of "lower middle" income. The two kinds of tenants will be mixed throughout.

When an occupant's income rises or falls, he changes status—and, in a sense, landlords—through a mere bookkeeping switch. He doesn't have to move, and if the change is downward, he isn't stigmatized.

Mrs. McGuire's office receives many inquiries about this system, which has proved a boon to private builders as well as to tenants.

Also, she observed, the plan "takes a little of the sting off" for people who just can't swallow the concept of federally financed housing.

The PHA Commissioner reminds these people that her agency's participation in a housing project doesn't mean Federal supervision. "Congress is well aware of controls at the local level."

She explains the PHA's role this way: "We, in effect, are the bankers. And any prudent banker certainly watches his investment."

Home rule applies in the matter of design, unless a proposal is downright extravagant. "I'm running on a platform of design freedom. Truly, the area of housing is going to reflect what each city wants."

When a community needs help or advice on design, Mrs. McGuire can call on her blue-ribbon panel of professional consultants. She has set aside the agency's old design manuals as influences toward conformity.

For such measures and for her general attitude, she was cited by the American Institute of Architects.

When her powers of persuasion fail, local control sometimes pains her. She couldn't keep a certain city from building "one of those round, tubelike towers" with pie-slice efficiency apartments for the elderly.

"I lost that battle."

Lewis Deschler

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in extending warm congratulations to the Parliamentarian of the House, Lewis Deschler, on his birthday.

Lew Deschler has been a familiar figure in the Chamber of the House for almost 40 years. He had already earned the respect and high regard of all the Members when I first came to the House. Since that time his stature has continued to grow. As Parliamentarian he has exercised great objectivity and judgment in his advice to the Speaker on the numerous intricate problems of procedure that constantly arise in this body. During his tenure as Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler has rendered invaluable assistance to the Speaker, regardless of party affiliation, and to Members on both sides of the aisle.

I wish for Lew Deschler many happy returns of the day.

We Can Win in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the March 9, 1965, issue of National Review includes a very interesting article by a distinguished South Carolina newsman, Anthony Harrigan, of Charleston. The article, entitled "We Can Win in Southeast Asia," notes that this is a report from a firsthand observer who found that Americans fighting in southeast Asia do not agree with defeatists at home who say we must get out because we cannot win. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN WIN IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By Anthony Harrigan)

(A firsthand observer found that Americans fighting in southeast Asia do not agree with defeatists at home who say we must get out because we can't win).

As long ago as 1963, the New Republic was saying: "The war in South Vietnam cannot be won." More recently, Walter Lippmann, the oracle of retreat, solemnly declared: "Nobody in his right mind can imagine that this kind of war can be 'won'." Prof. Bernard B. Fall, author of "Ordeal at Dienbienphu," and "The Two Vietnams," lends his authority to the statement that "any lingering idea that the Vietnam war can be ended by the surrender of the Communists is totally unrealistic."

The chorus of defeatism is loud in the land. Bearded young beatniks march with signs asserting the hopelessness of the struggle against the Vietcong. Clergymen and teachers of internatioanl relations write letters to the editors of the New York Times, declaring how fortunate the United States will be if Ho Chi Minh agrees to negotiate the establishment of a Yugoslav-type Communist state in a united Vietnam.

On the south China Sea, in the rice paddies and mountains of Vietnam, and on the airfields of southeast Asia, there are strong views to the contrary. "We can win" is the overwhelming opinion of the Americans who are fighting the war in Vietnam. This confidence is shared by senior commanders at home and overseas. But the professional soldier no longer is free, as he was in the 1950's, to state his case to the Nation. Unfortunately, no Senator has been as busy and articulate in explaining why the United States can win in Asia as Senator WAYNE MORSE has been in stating the case for capitulation and withdrawal.

Nevertheless, the evidence exists to support those who believe that an American victory is possible in southeast Asia. We have the ships. We have the planes. We have the weapons. All that is required for victory is firm leadership, historical understanding, and a resolute people.

The U.S. public need pay no attention to the Lippmann nonsense that Americans can't win a war in Asia. Only 20 years ago the United States defeated a superbly organized, brilliantly led Asian adversary. There's nothing magical about the soil of Asia. If the United States has the right weapons, the proper strategy, and the will to win, it will triumph in Asia as it has elsewhere on the globe.

The truth is that we have hardly begun to fight in Asia. But fight we must or, in the fullness of time, Chinese-led guerrillas will be in Mexico's Yucatan Peninsula or across the Rio Grande.

An American victory in southeast Asia is a meaningless concept apart from a vision of history. The Vietcong is but an advanced guard of a resurgent Chinese Empire. In centuries past, the Vietnam region was one of China's tributary states. The Middle Kingdom's power extended to Java and to Ceylon, and the great eunuch admiral, Cheng Ho, had led fleets as far as east Africa in the 15th century. China's history was arrested by the European states, and its own inner decay. But with the failure of nerve on the part of many once great Western nations, China again is reaching out—pushing southward into Vietnam, with Australia as the ultimate goal to the south; aiming, with its nibbling at India's frontier, to reach the Bay of Bengal and the Indian Ocean, and planning to extend and deepen its influence from the Congo to Somalia and from the Yemen to Albania.

Such is the vast scope of the Chinese vision of conquest. If the United States is to prevent its fulfillment, the American people and Government must clearly understand the nature of the struggle in which they are involved and its long-term perspective. The struggle in Vietnam is not an isolated conflict, which can be settled by a tidy accord in which unpleasant truths can be brushed under a mass of legalistic documents. Vietnam is a key military campaign in the containment of Communist China and the reduction of its power. Our national purpose can be nothing less than that of suppressing China's warmaking capacity and, by the force of our retaliatory assaults, convincing Peiping that a southward course of empire is too costly and dangerous. If Communist China's leaders are compelled to look northward, toward the empty lands of the former Chinese Empire that now are in Soviet Russia's hands, all the better.

Obviously, a tit-for-tat policy of light retaliatory raids will not force Peiping to any fundamental change in its policies. A far more comprehensive and massive assault will be needed, over a long period of time.

The United States needs to recognize, to begin with, that the problems in southeast Asia are essentially military, not political. This conclusion is completely contrary to the ruling doctrine in the Department of State; but even the most deeply rooted doctrine can be altered by the facts. What makes the Vietcong a force in the countryside is not its doctrine, but the fact that its doctrine is supported by arms in the hands of terrorists. Mao Tse-tung once said that the gun is the ultimate political weapon. Only in this sense is the southeast Asian struggle basically political.

If the United States were activated by a conscious policy of reducing Chinese Communist power over a period of years and decades, many specific military measures could be ordered—measures short of nuclear bombardment. The spectrum of warfare is wide, and many areas on it have not even been touched by the United States.

In view of the lack of awareness in this country that the struggle with Red China may last well into the 21st century, it is unlikely that the administration—even if it were fully alert to the threat and determined to deal with it effectively—would be willing to shift overnight to the strongest techniques of dealing with the new Chinese Empire. We must assume, therefore, that the initial moves in the direction of a stronger response to China would have to be basically conventional in character. In time, air vehicles such as the Hovercraft, or air-cushion vehicles, will come into use, and add a new dimension to combat aviation and ground support. But such weaponry is not ready for field use in the near future—at least not on a large scale.

The prime area of military opportunity in South Vietnam is river warfare. Whereas roads are virtually nonexistent, or are in bad shape or dangerous for use by convoys, South Vietnam is laced with rivers. In the south, below Saigon, there is a vast network of canals built by the French. Seven river assault groups, operating small craft and armed with machineguns, automatic cannon, and a few heavy weapons, have been organized. But such groups have never received the attention they deserve. The Vietnam war effort could use many times this number of river combat groups, and the boats and weapons could be greatly improved. The Vietcong use the rivers and canals as a means of communication and supply. They terrorize the villagers who live along the streams. Yet these waterways also offer logical access to the Vietcong. They should be used to maximum advantage by the forces of freedom.

On land, Americans have become accustomed to the ways of guerrilla warfare. But we have yet, as a nation, to realize that guerrilla war can be waged on the water. The so-called junk fleet doesn't meet the need. What is required are fleets of fast small craft armed with automatic cannon, 40 mm. Befors weapons, heavy mortars, flamethrowers, and anti-mine equipment. The rivers, coastal waters and long seaward flank of southeast Asia afford a magnificent opportunity to exert expanding sea pressure against the Communists. Unfortunately, Americans have virtually forgotten about river warfare. They think of it as something out of the American Civil War or the old Yangtze patrol days in China. Yet river warfare is one of the military challenges of our time. Much of the fighting liable to take place in south Asia in the decade ahead may take place on the great rivers of the region—the Rajang in Borneo, the Salween and Irawaddy in Burma, and the Brahmaputra in India as well as the Mekong in the Indochinese successor states. It is on the rivers that anti-Communist forces may find their most secure operational bases.

BLOCKADE: WHY NOT?

The maritime means available to our country are not limited to river fighting, however. There is heavy coastal traffic along the North Vietnamese and Chinese coasts—traffic which is of major importance to these countries, since they lack good land communications. Interdiction and offensive operations against this traffic are good ways of applying pressure against the Communist regimes. Beyond this lies the instrument of the blockade—the next major means of seriously injuring the economy of either North Vietnam or Red China. If the United States seriously intends victory over the Vietcong, which is dependent on North Vietnam, then a blockade of North Vietnam's ports should be the next item of national business. The entire complex of plants and factories around Hanoi depend on electric power. That power, and transportation in North Vietnam, in turn depend on oil that arrives by tanker. In the 7th Fleet, the United States has the means of carrying out an effective blockade. Such an action is no more an act of war, certainly, than the bombing raids, and in the long run, a blockade would be even more effective than the raids. Aerial attack can hinder a country's military and industrial operations, but a blockade can completely paralyze a nation. If, therefore, the air raids do not deter the North Vietnamese from supporting the Vietcong, then clearly a blockade should be instituted. This, more than any other military measure, would help achieve victory in Vietnam.

The United States always has to consider the possibility of Red Chinese intervention, which would greatly alter the situation. The American estimate is that a Chinese attack, if it comes, will be a three-pronged assault, with drives along the Vietnamese coast, down through Laos, and deep into Thailand via eastern Burma. Even if such an offensive is not launched in 1965 or 1966, the probability of its taking place sometime in the future is high. In a direct military confrontation with China, the United States could use nuclear weapons. But even if the decision were against using such weapons, because of pressure at home or from friends abroad, other powerful weapons exist to halt Chinese aggression. To engage Red China in a massive conventional land war would be madness, of course, because of China's colossal population.

But if China begins a direct attack, the United States should immediately resort to anticrop chemicals. The great weakness of Communist China is its inability to feed its population adequately. Anticrop chemicals are perhaps the best means we possess of curbing Peiping's aggression. With superiority in airpower, the United States has the means of introducing over a large area of China those chemicals which reduce crop yields. In short, we have it within our power to impose famine upon the nation that seeks to engulf all its neighbors. Dr. Clifford F. Rassweiler, former president of the Industrial Research Institute, recently urged that the United States review the effectiveness of such weapons. Referring to Vietnam, he said: "But suppose we could destroy all vegetation and prevent regrowth for the crop years in the areas which form the hard core of Vietcong strength. The Vietcong installations and activity would be exposed. The Vietcong could no longer live on local crops."

Even so brief a survey shows that the United States has many options available in the military field, ranging from the orthodox to the unorthodox. Each and all of them, if exercised, would bring forth protests engineered by the Communists on a global scale. The domestic and foreign protests evoked by a few retaliatory air raids are evidence of what lies in the future if the administration presses for defeat of the Vietcong and a sharp cutback in Red China's power.

Inasmuch as the United States has refrained from many available military measures, it is clearly absurd for any responsible person to say, on the record up to now, that the United States cannot win in Vietnam. The United States, with its vast technological and military resources, cannot be defeated by weak Asian powers—not on the battlefield. If we are defeated in Vietnam and elsewhere in Asia, we will be defeated in our own minds. We will have allowed the Communists to break our will to win. If we possess the will to win, victory will follow on the battlefields and on the high seas.

The 100th Anniversary of the Committee on Appropriations

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Committee on Appropriations.

In his remarks he referred to his predecessors as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations collectively and to several of them individually and by name. It is my pleasure to refer to GEORGE MAHON by name and to add that the luster which was attached to those 23 chairmen who preceded him has been preserved and made brighter by the addition of him to that group.

When he became chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in May 1964, he succeeded to this position with a background of 29 years' experience and service in the House of Representatives, of which are included 26 years of service as a member of this committee.

He presides over this committee with dignity, fairness, and a deep sense of responsibility to the Congress and the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the Georgians who have served on this committee. During the first 100 years, 11 Representatives from Georgia have been elected to membership on the Committee on Appropriations.

The first Georgian to so serve was Representative James H. Blount, of Macon, who represented a part of the area which now comprises the Sixth District of Georgia. Representative Blount became a member of the Committee on Appropriations in 1875 and served until his voluntary retirement in 1881.

In this connection it is interesting to note that 4 of the 11 Georgians whose congressional service has included membership on the Committee on Appropriations represented all or part of the present Sixth District of Georgia. In addition to Representative Blount, these include Representative Charles L. Bartlett, of Macon, Representative William C. Wright, of Newnan, and the Member who now addresses the House.

The list of Georgia Representatives who have so served and the period of the respective service of each is as follows:

James H. Blount, Macon, 1875–81.

Judson C. Clements, Rome, 1887–91.

Leonidas F. Livingston, Kings, 1891–1911.

Charles L. Bartlett, Macon, 1911–15.

William Schley Howard, Kirkwood, 1915–19.

Gordon Lee, Chickamauga, 1921–27.
William C. Wright, Newnan, 1929–33.
Malcolm C. Tarver, Dalton, 1935–47.
Prince H. Preston, Statesboro, 1949–61.
Henderson Lanham, Rome, 1955–57.
JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr., Griffin, 1962.

Because of the unusually heavy volume of work of this committee, most of its work is performed in executive or closed sessions. This is not because of any desire on the part of the chairman and members of the committee to conduct hearings in secret since the proceedings of these hearings are printed in full and are made readily available to all members of the press and the public, but only because the work could not be concluded if continual public hearings were held.

Exceptions to this rule of executive sessions occur each year when each subcommittee opens its hearings to both the Congress and the public, at which times the representations and comments of the Members and of interested persons are welcomed and made a part of the records of the hearings of the respective subcommittees. In addition the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia also conducts some public hearings.

The Committee on Appropriations sometimes increases certain items contained in the budget. We like to think, when this is done, that it is the result of careful consideration and mature judgment in instances where a slightly larger amount for a given item could be more effectively and economically extended than could a small amount for a particular item.

There are many more occasions when the amount requested by a department or an agency is reduced by committee action. When this is done, it is the purpose of this committee to bring appropriations more closely into line with both requirements and justifications.

We do not use what is often referred to as a meat-ax approach. The Committee on Appropriations does not cut for the sake of cutting; rather it fulfills a responsibility and obligation to see that the people of the United States of America receive a dollar's value for a dollar spent. This is the objective which the Committee on Appropriations strives to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I was impressed with all of the contents of the remarks made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but the last paragraph of his remarks is especially fitting to this occasion and bears repeating:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the Committee on Appropriations sometimes performs unsatisfactorily. As in the past, we shall on occasion in the future be found to be wanting. Doubtless we shall sometimes be disappointing. We are in favor of improving ourselves. We are not insensitive to the soundness of the practice of periodic checkups even when feeling pretty fit. But being a creature of the House, and part of the House, we are somewhat like the House. We are, with abundant good reasons, if I may so express it, quick to adjust but slow to change. Human nature changeth not. So I predict it will be this way when the bicentennial comes on March 2, 2065.

Samuel H. Morgan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on the recent death of my warm friend and constituent, Samuel H. Morgan, of Savannah, Ga., the State of Georgia lost one of its most outstanding citizens.

Sam Morgan was widely loved and respected by his many friends and associates, and I am proud to be counted among them. He will be sorely missed by all who knew him.

Mr. President, a splendid tribute to Sam Morgan was written by John L. Sutlive, retired editor of the Savannah Evening Press; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAMUEL HUGHES MORGAN

Regrettably, and all too young, another member of the public-spirited Morgan family of Effingham and Chatham Counties has passed from the Georgia scene. He was Samuel H. Morgan, whose recent death at the age of 59 stopped a career that had followed the pattern set by his forebears.

This is a pattern of service to God, to country, to fellowmen. The saga of the Morgan family is inspiring. It runs back into early American history and in the more recent years has been carried on by the generations headed by the late Samuel H. Morgan, the senior. Mr. Morgan and his children had a tradition to live up to, and they heeded unhesitatingly the call of character and responsibility.

As is not unusual on a team, and we apply that term to the Morgan family in its best sense, there are members whose works are better known publicly than others, although each member of the team makes his valuable contribution to the whole. The senior Mr. Morgan served well in several public areas—his church, education, and the development of Georgia's economy. His sons and daughter had the benefit and the inspiration of sound paternal and maternal precept and example and in discharging the obligations of their generation they did not fail.

Samuel Hughes Morgan, who to countless friends was simply and affectionately "Sam," was the youngest of the Morgan brothers. As a lad he lived in the home place at Guyton but, following his graduation from high school there, spent most of his life in Savannah. The interests that had long stirred the family found active appreciation in him. He had served on the Georgia Forestry Commission and quietly associated himself with many altruistic community and individual efforts. His was the quiet way of service, sincere and effective.

Sam Morgan was the last of his generation in the family business, which now comes under the guidance of the third generation of kinsmen. If we were to sum up his philosophy of life, it would be to repeat his frequent greeting: "What can I do to help you?" There can be no finer motto.

One Hundred Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Joe Martin, who writes a column for Chicago community newspapers entitled "Vets Press," says things well, briefly, and to the point. As a commentator on matters of especial interest to war veterans and with deep patriotic undertones, he probably enjoys the largest reading audience in the Chicago area. His editorial commemorating the inauguration of the Great Emancipator appears in the Mount Greenwood Express, and other publications of the Southwest Messenger Press chain and is here reproduced:

VETS PRESS
(By Joe Martin)

One hundred years ago, an inauguration took place on the steps of the Nation's Capitol. The city of Washington shivered wet and cold that day in 1865. An equally tangible gloom was generated by the last months of the Civil War.

The President rose to speak, waves of cheering flooded the Capitol Plaza, and as if by prearrangement, the sun broke through the day-long overcast.

Abraham Lincoln, our 16the President, delivered his last address. Six weeks later he was dead, assassinated by a man who loved the Confederacy.

On this Inauguration Day he gave to us a timeless message, one that is well to recall today. It expresses the continuum of American Government and the responsible philosophy it embraces: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gave us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in."

We are inevitably struck by the solemn significances of those words. Our minds wander back over history, and we ponder the short but unwavering narrative of American Government.

Despite its youth, our political experience has drawn the respect of the major part of the world. Not because of military might, nor because of economic achievement; rather, we bear this international credit because of our democratic example before the world. It is a record that invites study.

It has been achieved by a united Nation perpetuated by a man whom the world generally reveres as one of the foremost of all Americans.

The Great Emancipator's uni-Americanism of a century ago continues into the future to give our Nation inspiration and guidance.

It was Lincoln's firm belief that the things for which he labored were achievable goals. One of these objectives, the most pressing of his era, was achieved—the goal of a united country where all men are free.

As citizens of this great State of Illinois, where Abraham Lincoln got his political start, we should all honor his birthday with appropriate observances and sentiment.

On February 12, 1965, the flag of the United States of America should fly from every home, factory, office, and civic building. Today Americans should honor and love Abe Lincoln for what he did 100 years ago.

Austin, Tex.: Historic Past, Dynamic Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Austin, Tex., my home city, the site of the State capital of Texas, has been, and is presently enjoying a physical, economic, and intellectual growth of phenomenal proportions.

The population of Austin, Tex., has doubled in the last 20 years; the enrollment at the University of Texas, located there, has tripled in the last 30 years; and the area of the city has almost doubled in the last 20 years.

To illustrate the tone of the city in combining the nostalgic, historical past and the dynamic facelifting of the present, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Dallas Morning News of Saturday, February 27, 1965, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSTIN: HISTORIC PAST, DYNAMIC PRESENT

(By Allen Duckworth)

AUSTIN, TEX.—This pearl of central Texas—the State's beautiful capital city—has a historic and dramatic past, a dynamic present, an exciting future.

Most every community in the world has an outstanding feature. But Austin has nearly everything you can think of except ocean steamers, an active volcano, and a glacier.

The phenomenal growth of Austin outstrips most of the State capitals of the Nation.

There are many reasons.

The State government has grown and will continue to grow.

Recreation and tourism are already big businesses. There are seven big, beautiful lakes on the Colorado River, created by a series of dams, and all within a few minutes or a few hours of downtown Austin. And the Austin Chamber of Commerce is coaxing tourists to "L.B.J. Land" with maps showing how to view the President's Texas White House, only 50 miles to the west. Of course, the chamber of commerce suggests spending the night at an Austin hotel or motel.

In education, Austin calls itself the brain center of the State. The University of Texas enrollment has risen from 7,000 to 24,000 in the last 30 years. There also are St. Edward's University, Concordia College, Huston-Tillotson College, and the Presbyterian Theological College.

Research centers, both government and private, are tied closely to the university. The Balcones Research Center has 22 labs in operation, some of them doing top-secret work. Want to know how to pack a heavy truck for parachuting to earth from an airplane? They can tell you. Really. This center occupies a 393-acre tract and 34 buildings.

A department of the university does research for various agencies of the U.S. Department of Defense. And a number of private research outfits are doing contract work for the Government. There's another lab that builds up evidence against law violators, such as folks who poison their mates.

Private research organizations include those specializing in business marketing, electronics, chemicals, petrochemicals, precision instruments, gravity meters, hydraulics—all postwar developments. Combined with the Government labs, this adds up to a major industry for Austin.

Bergstrom Field, a short expressway drive to the southeast, is a Strategic Air Command base. World leaders have landed there to be guests of President Johnson at his ranch. The President himself often arrives there en route to his Texas White House.

The capital city is wonderfully located. It is easy driving time to almost any spot in the State, with the exception of El Paso, 593 miles away. Austin is within 197 miles of Dallas, 190 of Fort Worth, 273 of Orange, 161 of Houston, 286 of Wichita Falls, 351 of Texarkana, 277 of Marshall, 139 of Corpus Christi, 76 of San Antonio, 231 of Laredo on the Mexican border, 329 of Brownsville, 351 of Odessa.

Since World War II, a new airport terminal has replaced the old wooden shack which once served the city. The thousand-acre airport with 12,500 yards of paved concrete ramp space has 24-hour service 7 days a week. Besides the more than 30 flights a day, there are 45 bus arrivals and departures, 8 trucklines in and out of the city, 3 freight railways.

Livability, says the Austin Chamber of Commerce, is a major attraction which contributes to the soaring population total. Many of those who come to Austin as public officials, from Governors to legislators, former military personnel, university graduates, decide to make Austin their home. Former Governors whose homes were in other cities before election now living in Austin are Dan Moody, Allan Shivers, Price Daniel.

Recreation facilities apparently are unlimited. The city government maintains 37 parks and playgrounds, 21 free neighborhood swimming pools, 5 municipal pools, 4 community recreation centers, 8 athletic fields, 2 municipal golf courses and a tennis center. And there's the beautiful Austin Country Club. Southwest Conference football is played in the university's Memorial Stadium.

The seven manmade lakes start at Austin's city limits and chain northward for 150 miles in the Colorado River's wonderland of hills and valleys. These lakes provide fishing, boating, water sports, hunting or just loafing in some of the luxury or rustic lodges. The dams also are for hydroelectric power and flood control.

Climate usually is ideal. The city's unique location on the Balcones Escarpment from the Edwards Plateau distinguishes it from the climate of the surrounding area. Normal temperature averages 68.2 degrees. Heating and cooling home expenses are reasonable because the city is protected to some extent from chill winds to the north and humidity from the south.

Those seeking a home or homesite have a variety of locations, ranging from grass-covered plains to tree-studded hills—new additions within the city, estates high in the hills or on a lakefront.

A cultural and entertainment atmosphere prevails. Locally, there is the Austin Symphony Orchestra, the civic theater, art exhibits, university lecture series. The cultural entertainment committee books operas, plays, concerts.

Fine churches are available for worship by those of most any faith in the land.

Austin has been a beautiful place from the beginning. There was a hamlet in the valley when they started building the first capitol there for the Republic of Texas in 1840. It was a two-room log building, surrounded by a 10-foot log stockade and a moat to discourage unfriendly Indians from disturbing the house and senate.

The early days of statehood were filled with romance. A German prince once arrived, in shining armor, to apply for public lands upon which to establish a colony. O. Henry worked in the old General Land Office Building, now a museum, patterned by a European architect in exile after a Rhine River castle.

Elisabet Ney, famous sculptor, had her studio in Austin and there created a masterpiece which can be seen in the State cemetery, resting place of hundreds of heroic Confederate dead and some of Texas' great, near-great, and not so great—the full-size supine statue of Gen. Albert Sidney Johnston on his bier.

The French Legation of Republic days is still there. The French Minister, Count Alphonse de Saligny, was quite a problem child in olden times. He complained about the pigs in his neighborhood, running at will over his garden.

Austin's growth has been steady from the beginning. But the near-sensational boom began after the end of World War II in 1945—20 years ago.

Some statistics:

The population of Austin in 1945 was estimated at 110,000. Today, the estimate of the metropolitan area is in excess of 250,000.

Bank deposits at the beginning of 1945 were $46,571,522. Last January 1 they were $430,701,650, or a 20-year increase of 824.8 percent.

In 1945, Austin city limits covered 36.10 square miles. Last figures (June 18, 1964) showed 59.02 square miles.

What was Austin like 20 years ago? And what are some comparisons?

I was assigned to help to report the goings-on of the legislature in 1945. Getting to Austin was a tedious drive from Dallas. The highway was just a plain two-way traffic deal, with slowdowns through many towns or villages. When you finally made the city limits, you had to negotiate around the north of town, past the State hospital (for mentally ill), down the university "drag." Today, the freeway is almost completed from Dallas to the capital. Already, you can take routes that bypass such towns as Waxahachie, Hillsboro, Waco, Temple, Belton, Round Rock. And when you get to Austin, in the event you are going on to San Antonio and do not desire to stop off, the freeway takes you—elevated part of the way—right on through the downtown and suburban area.

Parking was no problem in 1945. You just left your car for the night in front of your Austin hotel. Today, at noontime, you may find it difficult to enter a downtown parking station in the hotel area. And look out for women—today's Austin Police Department employs uniformed girls to put those parking violation notices under your windshield wiper. They do it without fear or favor of those having State official license plates, such as members of the legislature.

The capital had only two hotels which could be classified as of the first class, the historic Driskill and the late W. L. Moody's Stephen F. Austin. A favorite eating place was the Millett Mansion, an ancient native stone-and-timber two-story structure where you could get a good family-style lunch for 75 cents. Today, Austin has some of the Nation's finest accommodations for travelers. A new downtown hotel is the Commodore Perry. The Driskill and the Stephen F. Austin have modernized. Before war's end, there were no motels to speak of, just some "tourist courts." Today, Austin has some of the Nation's finest, chains and privately owned. There's a downtown motor hotel abuilding, just a slingshot from the capitol grounds—the Downtowner. Two of Austin's motor inns are unique. The Terrace, an early postwar project, was erected on the old San Antonio highway across the Colorado River to the south, on a hillside, with winding roads and paths. Opened only a few years ago is the Gondolier, on the beautified and parklike south banks of the Colorado.

Austin had no luxury clubs, of the cocktail-gourmet type, after the war. Today, the town has a club at about every turn of the corner, some good and some bad. The "goods" include the first and still most ornate, the Austin Club, in the Commodore Perry Hotel.

Also in the Perry is the Deck Club, where you can drink, dine, dance and swim, all in the same arena.

Most intimate of the nice clubs is the Headliners, a must membership for newspapermen, professional men, and politicians, in the Driskill. This hotel, which still displays the original Carlotta mirrors in its historic Maximilian Room, has its own private club—Driskill Club—with relics of the inn's original bar and murals designed with cigar bands.

The Stephen F. Austin has its Capital Club. There's the Forty Acres Club for faculty and wealthy ex-students on the university drag, with hotel and health club facilities. Many of the fancy motels have private clubs.

Austin's recreational facilities really got underway just before and after the war. The chain of lakes began with the building of Lake Buchanan in 1938 to harness the Lower Colorado River. Lake Inks was completed the same year. Lake Travis (near the city limits) was built as Mansfield Dam, in 1940, and Lake Austin (also near the city limits), as Tom Miller Dam (rebuilt) in 1941. Lake Granite Shoals (Alvin Wirtz Dam) was completed in 1951, and in the same year, Lake Marble Falls (Max Starcke Dam). Town Lake (Longhorn Dam) was dedicated in 1960.

Austin has, as of the present and looking into the future, an unlimited water and power supply.

In 1945, most of State government was centered in that classic architecture of the Texas capitol, built with 15,000 carloads of Texas red granite, with interiors of Texas limestone, wainscoting of ash, mahogany, oak, pine, and cherry woods, roof of 85,000 square feet of copper, clay tile flooring, terrazzo, Texas rock aggregate.

Most of the State government was in that great building 20 years ago—Governor, railroad commission, the two branches of the legislature, supreme court, court of criminals appeals, Austin Court of Civil Appeals. About the only ones not represented were the highway commission, in a separate building, the education agency, the land office, and part of the department of agriculture. In summertime, bees buzzed the near-lobby offices of the Confederate pensions office.

After the war, when State government expanded rapidly, agencies without room in the Capitol Building sprawled all over Austin, in rented, leased, or purchased quarters.

Today, things are being brought back together. In the Capitol Building itself, few agencies exist. Main offices there now are the State legislature—house and senate, and newly acquired private offices for senior members of the house; the Governor, with refurbished second-floor offices and a new private elevator to his secretary of state's office on the ground floor, the treasurer and his supervault, built by acid through solid rock, and the comptroller of public accounts, who soon may be moved to one of the new State office buildings.

A major postwar phenomenon in Austin, contributing to the hiring of hundreds of acres of office space, has been the proliferation of the so-called trade associations.

Time was when those with special interests in Austin legislation just hired cigar-smoking, whisky-and-steak-dispensing lobbyists of the old school. Now, it is more scientific.

Austin today has permanent offices for trade associations which total 193. There are 4 international groups, 9 national, 11 regional, 4 district, 165 State.

They include such groups as the American Legion, State bar, butane dealers, classroom teachers, council of churches, electric cooperatives, lumbermen, licensed nurses, physicians of many types, oil workers, piano teachers, plumbers, University of Texas dads, veterans, brewers, State banks, State college teachers, dairymen, high school coaches, city managers, insurancemen, fire chiefs and firefighters, florists, embalmers, drycleaners, grocers, cotton ginners, locomotive firemen, pharmacists, police chiefs, engineers, various church denominations, public employees, ready-mixed-concrete firms, sheriffs, cafe men, tobacco distributors—only a very few that make life nice and easy for leasing agents for Austin's office building space.

There is a lot of facelifting around old Austin, making it the new Austin. And there are those with nostalgic leanings who deplore it. Landmarks disappear, landmarks are restored, many old native-stone buildings remain, with new, modern faces. Yet, much of colonial Austin remains. There's the Greek Ionic style of the Governor's Mansion, frequently modernized since its erection in the last century. Out on Enfield Road, the old Governor Pease Mansion, which once had a wooden water tower, is now the home of former Gov. Allan Shivers, a man who needs no Care packages and who spent a fortune restoring, modernizing, and expanding it for his family home.

Governments, local, State, and Federal, have contributed to the change in Austin's face.

A new Federal center of two magnificent buildings, separated by a giant courtyard, is almost completed on the eastern side of the downtown area. President Johnson will have his Texas office there.

Austin, by the way, is blessed by a sort of municipal socialism. It has so many governmental properties—local, State, Federal, plus the usual school and church lands—that a bit more than an estimated 50 percent of property values are tax exempt on municipal rolls. But the city must furnish police and fire protection. This is offset, however, by the city ownership of the power and light plant. This facility transfers millions of dollars of profits each year to the city's general fund, thus lessening the threat of a tax rate increase, says Assistant City Manager James A. Wilson, a major contributor of facts for this article.

Most dramatic example of the expansion of State government is the complex built, and all after the war, north of the capitol grounds, leading eventually to the University of Texas campus.

These are the new State office buildings.

In appearance, they are modern, but in granite, first cousins to the great Capitol Building many of the agencies have left. The capitol itself is of rugged granite from the Marble Falls region. The same granite was used to build the new buildings, although this stone is polished. First is the supreme courts building, which houses not only the State's highest court but also the court of criminal appeals, the courts of civil appeals, the attorney general's department, all formerly in the capitol itself.

Perhaps the most beautiful building of the postwar complex is the Texas Archives, which protects State papers of historic interest. The general land office also is located there.

Other new buildings behind and to the east of the capitol are the John H. Reagan State Office Building, Sam Houston State Office Building, State Insurance Building. They all match generally in granite construction. Variations are former and still occupied State buildings built before the war—the old Land Office Building on the capitol grounds and now a museum, highway department building, Texas Education Agency. The old Walton Building, once the Travis County Courthouse and once occupied by the land office and part of the agriculture department, has been demolished in favor of a parking lot.

The only major State agency now without a home on or near the capitol grounds is the railroad commission. It has offices in the old Tribune Building, headquarters of a prewar and ill-fated newspaper venture, in downtown Austin.

News media have expanded with State government. Twenty years ago, a couple of small rooms were adequate in the capitol for news correspondents. Now there are four, with all major newspapers, many of the smaller papers on a pool basis, all the wire services, some radio-TV representatives, occupying space which takes up three big rooms on the south side of the capitol and overflows to two others on the north.

The Governor's office, which includes vast space on the ground floor and main quarters on the second, has gobbled up practically all of that formerly reserved for the railroad commissioner offices and hearing room.

Austin leaders are looking ahead with confidence. The most conservative of those predict a population of 328,000 10 years hence. Capital National Bank says that by 1974, there will be wholesale trade activity to employ 31,500, manufacturing employment past the 9,000 mark. The same institution predicts jobs in governmental activities in 1974 for some 45,000 Austin residents. Combined enrollment of the various colleges, says the bank, will pass 37,000 within 10 years.

PROJECTION SHOWS TEXAS THIRD IN POPULATION BY 1975

WASHINGTON.—Texas will be the third largest State in population by 1975, Bureau of the Census projections show.

The figures were released Friday and are based on four different "alternative assumptions as to future interstate migration and future fertility," the bureau announced.

At present, by 1964 preliminary estimates, Texas ranks fifth behind New York, California, Pennsylvania, and Illinois.

Projections for 1975 show Texas with 12,474,000 population following California's 24,748,000, and New York's 20,071,000.

The projections show Texas holding the No. 3 position through 1985.

One projection, based on continued interstate migration and a minor decline in fertility rates, shows Texas population as 11,481,000 in 1970, as 12,474,000 in 1975, as 13,583,000 in 1980, and as 14,749,000 in 1985.

In Vietnam—Induction Rites Fail To Impress Correspondents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., writes a weekly column for his newspaper. The latest one, dated February 25, 1965, contains some interesting information pertaining to the government situation in Vietnam which he gathered on his recent trip to that country.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to include Mr. Warren's column in the RECORD:

IN VIETNAM—INDUCTION RITES FAIL TO IMPRESS CORRESPONDENTS

(By Lucian C. Warren)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—The air was stifling in the so-called Gia Long Palace when the civilian government of Dr. Phan Huy Quat was formally presented to the chief of state, Suu.

Te event was hardly impressive to Western correspondents and the palace, by modern or even medieval standards, was certainly not palatial.

No air-conditioning helped to allay the sticky tropical heat of late afternoon. A few fans—swirled lazily overhead, but at the palace, in the room where the ceremony took place, the fan overhead had stopped.

LATE

True to oriental disdain of time, the ceremony had been scheduled for 3 p.m. but it was 5:30 p.m. before all the members of the new civilian Cabinet could begin.

It was not even known before the ceremony just who would be Phan Huy Quat's ministers. Apparently considerable last-minute dickering had been going on to get a representative government.

Knots of reporters gathered at various places in the room to compare notes on the new Cabinet. There was not the slightest sign of a press release that would list the names of the new Cabinet and their ministries. Nor was there a text of the remarks of the new Premier.

QUOTE

Later, we learned he had said, among other things, that "with sincerity and effort, a stable situation will begin that will lead to final victory and bring back security and happiness to our people."

The translation of his remarks was given me by a tiny Vietnamese woman who had originally approved my application for accreditation as a newsman, privileged to cover national, political and military events in South Vietnam.

After the translation, she added wistfully: "I am so hopeful this will provide the basis for a strong and stable government.

"We have suffered so much. After we have a strong government, the winning of the war and the unification of the country will be much easier."

REGARD

Checks with U.S. officials in Saigon revealed they had a high regard for the character of the new civilian government.

The premier, himself, had been a foreign minister in an earlier cabinet, and also had experience over the years as head of other ministers.

The new government was said to be acceptable to the Buddhist revolutionaries, who so frequently have been the catalysts that have topped the government here.

IMPRESSED

United States officials were impressed by the broad representation in the cabinet to various sections of the country and to various political followings.

But it was made clear we would have to keep our fingers crossed that such a government could survive in the volatile political atmosphere of Saigon, where the generals, the Buddhist and the politicians loved to play "musical chairs".

"You must remember," we were told, "that the South Vietnamese have no strong democratic traditions.

"And you must also remember that the peasants in the countryside don't care much who's in power, as long as their rice bowls are full and they have a certain amount of economic and physical security."

HOPEFUL

Only 3 days later, the military began playing "musical chairs" as first one set of military officials, then another took over in a series of coups.

The coups hardly contributed to the stability of the government so fervently wished for by our South Vietnamese woman informant.

Yet there are two hopeful things about the coups.

RELIEVED

Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh has been relieved as commander in chief of the South Vietnamese military forces and given a mission to the United Nations.

And the civilian government of Phan Huy Quat has been permitted to stay on.

General Khanh has been regarded as an unsettling force in the South Vietnamese political situation. He is cordially disliked by both U.S. officials and many of the South Vietnamese people of influence. His removal may give abler and less power hungry South Vietnamese a chance of building a solid government.

BASIS

The fact that Premier Quat remains head of the civilian government may provide the basis for a sturdy political leadership, so long missing in Saigon.

A government that is both strong and can command wide support among the South Vietnamese is the best contribution that could be made right now to winning the war against the Vietcong.

Montana's Indian Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, recently I was pleased to read about the progress of a select group of Indians—52, in all, from the 7 reservations in my State—who have been participating in a special rehabilitation project in Northern Montana College, in Havre, Mont.

The 3-year-old project—supported by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration—has made significant strides toward helping disabled Indians. There is a high incidence of disability among Montana Indians—from tuberculosis and from automobile accidents, occupational accidents, and so on.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, from the January–February 1965 issue of Rehabilitation Record, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA'S INDIAN PROJECT

(By Dorothy Rigdon)

Montana, known as the land of shining mountains is also the land of bleak acres on which are located seven Federal reservations where the Plains Indians live. There are many tribes of them—Blackfeet, Northern Cheyenne, Gros Ventre, Assiniboine, Sioux, Cree, Chippewa, Flathead, Salish, Kootenai, Pend Oreille, and Crow.

From these reservations have come Charles Gopher, Burton Bearchild, Donna Old Thunder, Joseph Raining Bird, and the 52 other disabled Indians who have thus far participated in a special rehabilitation project at Northern Montana College at Havre. I visited this project last fall, observed many of the clients on the college campus, traveled to some of the reservation territory, and discussed at length the workings of this unusual effort toward vocational rehabilitation with the five people who know most about it. They are: Glenn O. Lockwood, Montana's director of vocational rehabilitation; Wayne Fjosee, DVR counselor in a huge territory surrounding Havre; Mac Johnson, director of the project; and the project's two counselors, Leslie B. Davis, an anthropologist, and Ford Johnson, an ex-science teacher with special training and competence in guidance.

This VRA-supported research and demonstration project, which began in September 1961, is seeking ways of improving both the rate and the degree of rehabilitation of Montana's handicapped Indians. The other major objective of the 5-year project is to develop the special, sustained services which people from cultures unlike ours must have if they are to adapt from their own way of life to one which is new and very strange to them.

The need for rehabilitation of Montana Indians is especially pressing because of the high incidence of disability among them. Congenital defects and tuberculosis are common, as are automobile, occupational, and other accidents. Substandard living conditions over generations have increased susceptibility to many illnesses, and low level of education has meant few occupational skills.

The special Indian project has now run for 3 years. Quite naturally, its principals have not yet accomplished all they set out to do. I am reporting here on the things they have done so far, however, along with problems still to be solved and unusual experiences they have had along the way, because I believe this account will interest all who work with disabled persons and especially those whose clients have cultural, educational, or social backgrounds which set them apart from other people in our society.

This project begins with one of the things that is clearly imperative—a rather strenuous intake procedure. A counselor interviews most clients at their homes—usually crowded, inadequate huts—on the reservations. Here the disabled Indian learns what the project is about and what it can do for him. Also at this time the counselor does enough testing of achievement, interests, and aptitudes to make a preliminary prediction of a candidate's success in the project. Sometimes tests are administered to three or four people at once in the only unoccupied building there is—a schoolroom on the reservation during summer vacation; sometimes a candidate takes tests in the back seat of the counselor's automobile.

Last summer the two counselors traveled 1,600 miles in 1 week on the reservations as they followed leads on prospective clients. This effort, plus referrals from cooperating agencies, brought 26 clients into the project this quarter and provided information on 500 Indians with handicaps. Some of these may be found to be eligible for services in the future.

The information which the counselors assemble forms the basis for a conference on each likely prospect. At this conference are the three project staff members, a college faculty member from the department in which the client will probably study, and the client's DVR counselor. Also present is a representative of one or more of the local organizations which cooperate in this project—the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department of Public Welfare, the Bureau of Public Health, and the Montana State Employment Service.

Before they enter the project, all clients are required to have a medical examination at the Public Health Service hospital on their reservation and to take the general aptitude test battery at the local U.S. Employment Service Office. They are then notified of the day to report to the college campus, always just in advance of a school quarter.

After further testing and evaluation, each client is introduced to the campus and to the life he will lead there.

More than half of the Indians served by this project have been married; three-fourths of these have families ranging from one to seven children. The single men and women take up residence in the regular dormitories. The married men are installed with their families in married students' housing—a series of ground-floor apartments on the campus.

"We have found that most Indians have unusually close family ties," Mr. Johnson told me. "Keeping the families united, so that the wife and children share the problems of a new life, is an important ingredient of our project's effectiveness."

Getting the families established is not always easy. They often have almost no furniture, for example, so the project supplies a few necessities, such as beds, tables, and chairs, from furniture the college owns.

A home economist from the local agricultural extension office helps when she is needed, counseling the newly arrived wives on shopping, budgeting, preparing balanced meals, using the laundromat, and other household management matters. Despite the great differences between this housing and that which the family has previously occupied, the wives do very well in maintaining their new homes.

Northern Montana College is the vocational and technical unit of the State university system. It offers professional training and degree programs in education, but major emphasis is on the training of young men and women in a considerable range of practical occupations. The 56 Indian clients, a fourth of whom have been women, have trained in secondary education, electronics, auto mechanics, drafting, welding, distributive education, business administration, agricultural technology, fish and wildlife management, secretarial subjects, practical nursing, and cosmetology.

Clients enroll in the regular curriculum in whichever training area is selected. If they have finished high school, they are admitted as regular students on the same basis as the other 875 students who are studying on the campus this quarter. Under Montana law, special students who did not complete high school but who are over 21 years old may also enroll. In either case, the client takes the regular college courses.

For some, indeed for most, this means a real struggle to keep up with the rest of the class. But enrollment in the full curriculum has advantages. One is that the client gets a fairly broad education, rather than job training only.

Depending on his need, a client may be in training for varying lengths of time, ranging from a single quarter to 4 years. If he makes the required grades, he has gained both vocational and educational advantages. If he cannot meet academic standards, he must leave school but hopefully not until he has some useful skills and knowledge.

Enrollment on the same basis as other students also helps to make the Indian client feel he is a part of student life. Although some of the older, married clients prefer to remain rather aloof or to associate almost exclusively with other Indians, many of the others enter enthusiastically into school activities.

The chorus is popular with them, also the more sophisticated Northern Montana Singers. Some clients have belonged to the rodeo club, the school newspaper staff, the pep club, and study clubs. A number, especially the men, have taken part in athletics, wherever disability permits this. Last year one project member was the nonplaying manager of the intramural all-Indian basketball team. An attractive young woman client was named campus popularity queen.

This interest in extracurricular activity contributes to good personal adjustment, and Mr. Johnson and his staff encourage it.

It has been clearly demonstrated that most of the Indian clients cannot hold their own alongside their fellow students without continuing, intensive counseling, supplementary tutoring, and assistance of many other kinds. The project tries to provide that special help.

The offices of the Montana Indian project are on the main floor of a campus building which also houses electronics laboratories and classrooms. It lies between the dormitories and the central part of the campus and is in the clients' daily line of march. They take full advantage of this fact. If a welfare check has not arrived in time to buy milk for the children, they seek and get temporary help. If somebody is ill or in trouble on the campus or in town, he calls on the project staff. These are special support functions.

Regular support includes much guidance and counseling. A counselor, for example, does daily individual and group tutoring in arithmetic, English, science, and other basic subjects. More than half of the 56 Indian clients are high school graduates; more than two-thirds finished 10 or more grades. But client ages have ranged from 18 to 42, and many have been away from studies for many years. One entered the project 24 years after his last appearance in a classroom.

Tutoring is, therefore, badly needed. So is the supervised study which the project provides. Despite this help, some are not able to meet the college's academic standards. Some who are dropped for scholastic weakness have had enough training while on the campus to get jobs, however, so their work has paid off, at least to some degree.

Here is the "box score" for the special Indian project up to this time: 26 of the 56 clients are now in training on the campus. One client died before completing training. Of the remaining 29, 12 left before the end of training for medical or personal reasons. Three of these twelve are now employed.

Seventeen clients have finished their training. One of these, after 20 months in the project, is continuing further training elsewhere. Ten are employed; two were relocated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (one of these is employed); one has been involved in an accident and is temporarily unemployed. The remaining three are on the reservations, but their exact whereabouts are not known.

These are typical of the jobs they are filling:

A man with atrophied hand and arm overcame poor academic rating, matured socially, completed training, and is now a male nurse in the Public Health Hospital on his reservation.

A client with a severe hearing loss was trained in auto mechanics and welding, is working as a mechanic on the reservation.

Another trainee in auto mechanics was suspended for academic weakness but was relocated in Los Angeles and has a mechanic's job there.

A 2-year auto mechanics trainee is working in a Montana garage, making $350 a month, plus commission. He is 27, the father of 3, and suffers from tuberculosis of a knee joint.

After 2 years in drafting, one client moved to Massachusetts, where he is working as a draftsman.

A woman who was diagnosed as manic depressive at the start of training, studied nursing for 10 months. She now works as a practical nurse in a local hospital.

Montana's director of vocational rehabilitation, Glenn Lockwood, gave me his estimate of the sum and substance of this unique undertaking in these words:

"In 3 years of effort at Northern Montana College, we have discovered quite a few things that have been of special help to our clients in solving their problems and achieving satisfactory rehabilitation. I would list the following: (1) A personal interview and explanation of the rehabilitation process on the reservation; (2) enrollment of Indian trainees in the regular college curriculum; (3) encouragement of maximum participation in student life; (4) keeping the families informed and involved so that they understand and share in the client's change and growth; and (5) extensive and intensive counseling, tutoring, and guidance.

"These are some of our findings to date. As we have shown, these methods have worked well with our clients, at least with many of them. We believe we have proceeded a long way toward our goals. We are quite sure that when the final 2 years of the project have ended, we will have established some valuable guidelines for others who work with disadvantaged clients."

Golden Anniversary of the National Orange Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to invite the attention of the members of the House to the golden anniversary of the National Orange Show, an exposition for the display of citrus, which has been held annually for 50 years in San Bernardino, Calif.

The first Navel orange was brought from Brazil over a century ago and was planted in Riverside County, which is the neighboring district of my colleague Mr. JOHN TUNNEY. From that seedling came the tremendous orange crops which do so much for the economy of southern California.

The dates of the show this year are March 11 through March 21, and I would be honored to have any of the Members who will be in California at that time to be my guests at the show. The Citrus Institute, which is held during the exposition, has assisted the citrus growers of my State in the exploration of machines, the conquering of citrus diseases, and new packaging programs.

Just as no word rhymes with "orange" in the English language, so, likewise, there is nothing that equals this golden fruit. I trust that all of you will improve your physical condition by drinking an orange a day.

I have received the following communications from two distinguished citrus authorities in my district and I am inserting them in the RECORD:

GOLD BANNER ASSOCIATION,
Redlands, Calif., February 6, 1965.

Hon. KEN W. DYAL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

As you know, our area is primarily a Navel orange producing area and this variety ripens at a time when competition from the Mediterranean countries, including Israel, is very severe. For this reason we export very little to Europe during the winter months. The heavy export movement to Europe is during the late spring and summer months when Valencias are in season. While we do ship

some Valencias to Europe, most of this business goes to shippers in Orange and Ventura Counties which are the heavy Valencia producing districts.

During the past several years the Orient has become an increasingly important market for California oranges, both Navels and Valencias. Our volume of business in this part of the world has been increasing each year, although we are beginning to feel the effects of competition from Australia, South Africa and even more remote citrus producing countries. This association has done such a big business in Hong Kong, Manila and other important markets of the Far East that I made a trip to the Orient in September to call on our customers. I can say my trip has paid big dividends in increased business in these markets as well as in Japan. Our customers in Japan are limited by licenses in the amount they can purchase, otherwise our volume there would be much greater. Our business in Singapore has fallen off due to the upset political situation there.

Everywhere I went, there was a definite preference for California organges, however, competing countries are able to undersell us due to their cheap labor costs. How long we can maintain our position is problematical as our costs are mounting and I am fearful we may price ourselves out of these important markets. These markets are extremely important to us as they take small sizes that are practically unsalable in the domestic markets and we must try to maintain them at all costs. The same is true of the European markets, which are also a good outlet for sizes that are undesirable here in the United States.

We in the citrus industry of California feel we are contributing greatly toward a favorable balance of trade in this country's world commerce. Every dollar that comes back is new wealth and we must try to encourage this business in every possible way. I am sure you will give us every support possible and we are going to feel free to call on you whenever you can be of assistance.

Sincerely yours,

GOLD BANNER ASSOCIATION.
BILL BRUNTON, *Manager*.

REDLANDS-HIGHLANDS
FRUIT EXCHANGE,
Redlands, Calif.,
February 5, 1965.

Hon. KEN W. DYAL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR KEN: I am enclosing the counties latest figures compiled for last year. I would like to call your attention to the percentage of fruit that was processed on all varieties as this is very unusual. Normally we would expect that about 15 to 20 percent of the grapefruit, 35 percent of the lemons, not to exceed 10 percent of the navels and 25 to 30 percent of the valencias would be processed. This year just passed, as you will note, was much increased due to our extremely small sizes. This year, about the percentages that I have given you will be processed.

As you are well aware, the only fruit that is not sold fresh from this area is that fruit that will not qualify for fresh sales.

I was also asked how our fruit competes with Florida and with fruit from the Mediterranean areas and I presume other areas in the world. So far as Florida is concerned, we consistently get a premium over Florida fruit which we must have in order to exist. You understand, of course, that our costs of production are the highest of any citrus area in the world and I am sure you are also well aware that our labor costs are higher than any other place. We are also farther from the main centers of consumption so our freight rate is higher. Our valencias come at a season of the year when we are not highly competitive with Florida so we could not very well make a comparison on that variety. The only oranges that we attempt to export to Europe are summer valencias and over the years, they have done very well competitively.

We do not export our finest quality lemons to Europe, but we export a grade that is called SK grade which is just one cut below Sunkist and that compares very favorably with first grade Italian lemons.

Europe has been an excellent market for our small sized summer grapefruit particularly from the middle of April to the first of July.

So far, we have been able to harvest our navels with local labor and we are trying awfully hard to get through the season with all local labor if we can. I might say, however, Ken, that the lemon people both in the upland area and Ventura County are getting into serious trouble and I am afraid that if they don't get help shortly that they will face very serious losses.

Sincerely,

LLOYD YOUNT.

San Bernardino County citrus acreage, production, and value, 1964

Variety	Acreage		Production		Valuation
	Bearing	Nonbearing	Unit	Quantity	
Grapefruit	1,418	251	Packed carton	843,000	$1,797,000
			Processed carton	437,000	215,000
			Carton	1,280,000	2,012,000
Lemons	3,991	53	Packed carton	1,673,000	4,038,000
			Processed carton	1,387,000	1,495,000
			Carton	3,060,000	5,533,000
Navels	10,387	772	do	3,180,000	8,476,000
			Processed carton	1,129,000	1,172,000
			Carton	4,309,000	9,648,000
Valencias	5,266	999	Packed carton	981,000	3,181,000
			Processed carton	1,395,000	2,300,000
			Carton	2,376,000	5,481,000
Miscellaneous varieties	263	292	Packed carton	20,900	49,000
			Processed carton	12,800	13,000
			Carton	33,700	62,000
Total	21,325	2,367	do	11,058,700	22,736,000
Total, bearing and nonbearing	23,692				

The statement from these authorities concerning the importance of the citrus industry to the economy of our Nation in their oversea shipment is brought to your attention as well as the difficulties which they are experiencing pertaining to labor to harvest their fruit.

I do compliment the citrus industry in general for the effort they have been making over the last few years to train and qualify domestic labor.

Raymond Wood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of Senators an editorial—entitled "Thanks to a Cop"—from The State, of Columbia, S.C. The editorial commends Raymond Wood, a native of Chester, S.C., for the "excellent police work and personal courage" he demonstrated in foiling the plot to destroy several of our most cherished national shrines.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, from the February 19, 1965, issue of The State, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THANKS TO A COP

We join other South Carolinians in voicing both praise and appreciation for the excellent police work and personal courage shown by the former Chester resident who foiled a New York plot to bomb several of the Nation's shrines.

The fact that the dedicated policeman is a Negro adds to the sincerity of our commendation, for it has been too frequently the case that crime news from New York has cast the Negro in the role of culprit or criminal.

Raymond Wood, who did most of his "growing up" in Chester, has done credit to his people and rendered a service to the Nation by his diligence and devotion.

Paupers in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby commend to the attention of the Congress an article which spells out in detail the sad plight of our service personnel today.

The article follows:

PAUPERS IN UNIFORM

(By Francis and Katharine Drake)

(NOTE.—A job for Congress: revise the military pay scale upward. The present low-wage policy damages the morale and ef-

fectiveness of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen; it also causes constant turnover of personnel, thus wasting the taxpayers' money.)

The President's initiation of a crusade against poverty recently brought to light the plight of uncounted numbers of citizens who, at a time of unprecedented national prosperity, are unable to keep their heads above the financial disaster level. This spring the Nation is in for another shock, when the subject of military pay increases comes before Congress. The American people will then get a good hard look at a situation that must fill all but the thickest skinned citizen with a sense of shame: the financial plight of the men who protect our country.

The fact is that thousands of American enlisted men on active duty, skilled volunteers who wear their country's uniform with pride, are actually paupers in uniform. It is ironic that the Government, which established poverty levels, is itself paying many of its uniformed men below these levels. Some soldiers, sailors, and airmen and their families are even being forced to accept relief.

The Air Force, with 719,000 enlisted men and women, has just completed a survey and found (the figures can be tripled to get very rough totals for all services):

(a) 5,000 Air Force men have received relief benefits.

(b) 55,000 more are technically eligible for relief but too proud to accept it.

(c) 169,000 receive basic pay below the Government poverty levels.

(d) 148,000 men are moonlighting in their meager spare time.

(e) 180,000 Air Force wives work to support the family.

It is a fact that a jet pilot, master of the skills involved in maneuvering supersonic planes, actually draws less pay than a Pentagon messenger.

LOST INVESTMENT

Former Senator Kenneth Keating described the pay situation as "a disgraceful reward for those who have sworn to defend our country." More than this, the low pay scale represents a great waste of the taxpayers' money. When poverty forces the majority of highly skilled men out of the services after their first hitch, the result is a perpetual turnover. The Government is committed to the tremendous cost of training new men who, in turn, will walk out. The total investment cost of training just one Air Force radar electronic specialist is $23,000; a ballistic-missile launch officer, $49,140; a B-52 commander, $1,400,000; his crew, another $2 million. When these men quit, all that investment goes down the drain.

Between 60 and 70 percent of all Air Force skilled enlisted men leave at the end of their first 4-year enlistment. Also, an average of 54 percent of the officers separate at the earliest permitted date. In the past 5 years Army resignations have increased by more than 50 percent, Air Force by 137 percent.

IN THE RED

The case history of Joe Doakes, high school graduate, age 19, comes closer to the rule than to the exception. Joe, motivated by patriotism, challenge, the promise of a fine technical education, begins his 4-year hitch as airman basic—pay: $78 a month, living in barracks with no allowances. Three years later he is airman first class Doakes, now a skilled electronics specialist, earning $194 a month plus allowances, married, father of one child, expecting another—and in debt up to his ears. How, in three brief years, did Joe land himself in such a financial fix? The answer of course is: by marriage. (Our armed services today total 2,700,000 men in uniform; wives number about 1,500,000.)

Ineligible because of lack of rank for base housing, he now receives $83 quarters allowance from the Government. Cheapest off-base lodgings he can find cost $107 a month, not including utilities, which average $30 a month more. Furnishing the apartment sets him back nearly $1000. Commuting to base involves a secondhand car; repair and gas bills cost him $24 a month. During the last 3 years Joe has had to move twice—and pay the family transportation costs each time. Government food allowance is $31.50 a month, or roughly 10 cents per person per meal for the three Doakes. Total pay, including all allowances, is $308 a month.

It boils down to this: the Doakes' monthly budget invariably balances in the red. Whenever he can, Joe moonlights, but unpredictable duty hours make spare-time work irregular. The services, perpetually short of skilled men, are forced to hire civilian technical representatives from private industry. Joe works alongside one of these, performing a duplicate job. The technical representative earns $1,000 a month (plus generous overtime). Having spent $25,120 on Joe's training, the Air Force now presses him to reenlist, offering a $779 reup bonus. The technical representative tells him not to be a fool.

THOUSANDS OF JOES

This is the sort of choice faced by thousands of young service couples each year. On the one side, pride, patriotism, the hope of promotion; on the other, more money, shorter hours, higher living, the freedom to change jobs if opportunity beckons.

Joe's decision? "I'm quitting," he says. "Not because I want to, but because I just can't afford to stay in."

Multiply Joe by hundreds of thousands of men in each service: it adds up to billions of dollars a year wasted in unnecessary turnover—and a threat to our protective strength and the safety of our country. As Capt. William A. Golden states in the Naval Institute Proceedings: "It is now necessary to recognize objectively that officers (and enlisted men) cannot be paid like busboys, worked like field hands and released like old, slow halfbacks—it simply is not good business."

Today, our military are in danger of becoming forgotten men. The economy is leaving them so far behind that it is small wonder they are becoming disillusioned and embittered, unwilling to put up any longer with the status of second-class citizens. Many will settle for less pay than they can get in industry, for the privilege of serving their country—but not if they are going to be penalized for marrying young, and driven to live on charity handouts.

How can we make a military career attractive to the youth of America? The services, in mutual consultation, have defined the minimum improvements they believe necessary.

BASIC PAY

The study proposes an immediate pay increase of 16 percent for enlisted men with less than 2 years' service, 15 percent for officers with less than 2 years' service, plus increases for other officers and enlisted men, plus a redefinition of subsistence allowances for those who cannot eat on base. (There was a military pay raise only last year, but of only 2½ percent—of virtually no benefit to the lower ranks who needed it most.) The proposed increases would average from $12 to $44 a month for enlisted men, from $37 to $111 for officers. By contrast, raises granted last year to civilian Federal employees were five times as high.

PROMOTION

This is a major grievance among servicemen, since, at present, a promotion with accompanying pay increase is by no means automatically granted when a man becomes eligible. Restrictions on the services' authority to promote enlisted men deny deserved promotions. As a result, some highly qualified lower grade enlisted men are doing sergeants' work but receiving neither sergeants' stripes nor sergeants' pay.

QUARTERS

Housing has long been acknowledged by Congress to be part of military pay. Quarters, moreover, are supposed to be onbase, so that personnel are readily available in case of emergency. This commitment has never been properly honored. Below the rank of sergeant, virtually no serviceman is able to live onbase if he is married. Instead, like the Doakes, hundreds of thousands of young service families dwell in civilian quarters, some adequate, some miserably substandard. Rent gouging in the vicinity of military bases is commonplace.

The services' proposal is to adjust basic quarters allowances to a more realistic amount. This is a stopgap. What is really needed is adequate base housing—which would cost the Government less in the long run.

A cure lies in renewing the Capehart housing bill, which expired last year. That bill permitted the military to have houses built onbase, or next to it, by civilian contractors; to borrow the cost from private lenders on FHA-secured 20-year mortgages; and to pay these off out of congressional appropriations. The mortgage cost on a $17,500 unit is actually less than the average amount now paid out for serviceman's quarters allowance—and the Government ends by owning the house free and clear. While the Government cannot build all the 350,000 units needed, it can and should build more than the 3,000 at present under construction.

But even with adequate housing, military paychecks can never compete with the wages of private industry. A petty officer in charge of the reactor aboard the cruiser *Long Beach* earns $453 a month. His civilian counterpart aboard the *Savannah* rates $1,200.

PRIVILEGES

These represent the compensating factors that traditionally bridge the gaps. Among them—counted as a part of service pay for 99 years—is the right to shop in commissaries, where the military can buy food at cost plus a surcharge of 3 percent. Well stocked at one time, post stores nowadays have only a quarter of the items available at supermarkets, operate only 40 hours a week, carry no specials, no fancy items, and have long waiting lines; but savings amount roughly to $400 a year per family of four—a sum of critical importance.

A questionnaire recently circulated among 176,000 men in uniform reveals that 50 percent more enlisted men and 30 percent more officers would be obliged to leave the service if post shopping facilities were withdrawn and the $400 savings denied. Loss to the Government on commissary transactions amounts to roughly $40 a year per family, a sizable sum overall. But as Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, points out: an increase of one-tenth of 1 percent in the reenlistment rate would more than cancel out this Government red ink.

Also, the Department of Defense has acknowledged that any attempt to replace commissary savings with a pay raise would "greatly exceed the Government cost in operating base stores." Constant attacks on these and other privileges—base clubs, movies, etc., run by the men themselves at no cost to the Government—tend to make men quit in disgust. Anything that injures the military esprit de corps costs the Nation dearly.

NEEDED: GOOD MEN

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's determination to run his Department as efficiently as a business has been much in the headlines. He has shown courage and ingenuity in saving nearly $3 billion from our defense bill. Yet, in the words of Adm. David McDonald, the Chief of Naval Operations: "No other business in the world leans so heavily on manpower as does the military."

Good hardware is of little use without good men.

The cost of the raise in pay and allowances for all services, proposed in the military services' study, is $311 million a year. Against this, savings would be realized. Pay and maintenance of our 2,700,000 men is about $15 billion a year; if, by retention of experienced men, the total manpower requirement could be reduced by only 10 percent, the savings would exceed the pay raise by far.

In the last analysis, the hope for the military lies in the understanding and support of the public, whose welfare is directly concerned. To give servicemen the stepchild treatment is to tamper recklessly with the innermost fabric of military security. If through indifference we cast loose the ablest and most skilled fighting men in the world, our future is indeed in jeopardy.

Oceanography and the National Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the editors of Navy—the Magazine of Sea Powers, published by the Navy League of the United States, devoted the December 1964 issue to the broad field of oceanography.

The issue included numerous excellent articles on separate aspects or activities of the oceanographic program, prepared by knowledgeable officers and officials of the Government.

Rear Adm. Denys W. Knoll, U.S. Navy, oceanographer of the Navy and commander, U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office, wrote the lead article, which is entitled, "Oceanography and the National Welfare."

Admiral Knoll subtitled his article "A Vital New Field for Government-Industry Cooperation."

As the Oceanographer of the Navy points out, there are many significant major opportunities for industry in this new, broad field.

Many Senators are aware of this potential, a potential that calls for greater recognition by the Government and in my opinion, closer liaison between the Government and industry, so that the genius of our private enterprise system may contribute more effectively to our mastery of the secrets of the seas which surround us.

S. 944, the proposed National Oceanographic Act of 1965, which I and many Senators on both sides of the aisle have cosponsored, would, in my opinion, encourage and facilitate the expansion of industry's activities in this vital area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Rear Adm. Denys W. Knoll, which was published in the December 1964 issue of Navy, the magazine of seapower, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCEANOGRAPHY AND THE NATIONAL WELFARE: A VITAL NEW FIELD FOR GOVERNMENT—INDUSTRY COOPERATION

(By Rear Adm. Denys W. Knoll, U.S. Navy, Oceanographer of the Navy and Commander, U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office)

An accelerated national oceanographic program in recent years has paralleled an increasing public awareness of the military, political, and economic importance of the world's oceans.

The Navy has naturally been a leader in oceanography. From the annual funds provided by Congress the Navy receives about 50 percent of the national budget for this purpose. The urgent need for information about the sea, necessary for both the operation of our submarines and the detection of enemy submarines, and the efficient operation of our surface ships, requires the Navy to be the national focal point for improving knowledge of the ocean environment.

The Navy cannot do the job alone. As oceanographic programs expand and develop at the national level, it becomes increasingly evident that the exploitation of the world's oceans requires a massive effort with industry and Government working together with common goals.

THE COORDINATION

More than 20 Government agencies, whose work is coordinated by the Interagency Committee on Oceanography under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert W. Morse, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, are already conducting coordinated programs in every important area of ocean study. As this national program moves forward the need for industry participation in the field expands commensurately. We hope that American industry will eventually make expenditures for oceanographic projects at least equal to the annual expenditures of the Federal Government.

The sea has traditionally been an avenue for commerce, a source of food and an arena for war. It still is. We are working now to utilize the seas, including the ocean depths, to even greater advantage, both in the areas of national defense and the general public welfare. It is not too much to say that our preeminence as a world leader, even our very survival, depends upon the success of this effort.

Our ultimate goals are far reaching and constantly being extended for it is difficult to comprehend fully the ultimate potential of the world's oceans at this time. A significant breakthrough is imminent in the conversion of salt water to fresh water. Success in this area alone would help to relieve untold hardship in an increasingly water-starved world.

A handful of enterprising men have already begun to exploit the mining potentials of the sea. Exciting quantities of diamonds ($6 million worth in the first 7 months of 1964) are being taken from the ocean floor off the Atlantic coast of South Africa. A private shipyard has outfitted a ship that will experiment with the recovery of manganese nodules that lie in vast quantities on the floor of the Central Pacific.

SEALAB'S SUCCESS

The rich oil resources beneath the sea are spurring the oil industry to greater efforts in offshore drilling. The U.S. petroleum industry has invested an estimated $4 billion in the waters off Louisiana alone. About $1.5 billion of this investment has already been recovered. Drilling in deep water, where at least 50 percent of the world's known oil resources lie, is yet to come.

All this means that men will have to learn to live and work in the sea, often at great depths, if we are to effectively exploit these resources. The Navy's successful Project Sealab demonstrates the feasibility of these two goals. Four Navy aquanauts spent 10 days at 192 feet beneath the Atlantic surface in an experiment conducted southwest of Bermuda in August. They performed underwater work in scuba gear and ate, slept, and rested in a cylindrical device 40 feet long by 9 feet in diameter. The distinguished French oceanographer Capt. Jacques-Yves Cousteau and our own Edwin A. Link are also doing pioneer work in this area.

We know from the research and experiments already conducted that these objectives and many others related to the sea are realistic and obtainable.

The Navy is also interested in encouraging greater industrial activity, particularly in the areas of oceanographic instrumentation and the development and production of small submersible vehicles. Even vehicles of very limited capabilities can be useful in doing such things as examining the underwater seaworthiness of ocean structures such as a Texas tower, or a dozen other chores that ordinarily take hundreds of man-hours of hard and dangerous work by divers in hard-hat suits. Three such vehicles have been launched recently and are undergoing extensive tests. The *Alvin* designed for medium depth operations; the *Aluminaut*, which was designed for depths to 15,000 feet, and *Trieste II*, which can operate at any depth though its range and work capacity are limited.

OUR LACK OF INSTRUMENTS

Needed in the years ahead are manned submersibles that can work at great depth and for long periods on the ocean floor to salvage wrecks, to rescue personnel, and to carry on oceanographic survey work.

There is a general lack of oceanographic instruments that incorporate modern technological design. Some of our older measuring instruments still used daily for oceanographic work have had little improvement for 50 years. Initiative has been lacking in the development of more sophisticated instruments. Molecular electronic instrumentation can simplify the collection of vast quantities of valuable data. There is an immediate need for compact instrument packages designed as a system for specific purposes.

Underwater sensors should be small, light in weight, microminiaturized, susceptible of volume production, and adaptable for use by all nations that cooperate with us in the collection of data.

Cables for lowering instruments into the sea should eventually be plastic lines with copper cores and good tensile strength and about the same density as sea water.

Present equipment fails too quickly and too frequently because of the corrosive effects of sea water and the high pressures associated with great ocean depths. Effective instrumentation could permit better utilization of ships of opportunity such as merchant vessels and warships for the systematized collection of data to improve our knowledge of the dynamics of the oceans. A fully automated instrument package placed on these ships would yield thousands of observations and measurements without burdening the ship's complement or affecting its operational schedule.

PERSONNEL SHORTAGE

Oceanography also needs more trained individuals. There is about three times as much water as land on this earth and the oceans defy easy investigation. Thousands of scientists delve into the mysteries of the earth and space above it while a relative handful of oceanographers attempt to unlock the secrets of the ocean depths.

The business of collecting and analyzing data is arduous and time-consuming work. And it is unending, for the oceans are ever-changing. To the people in the field and in the laboratories, the work can be absorbing and rewarding. To some it can bring fame

and fortune and to all a sense of satisfaction in making a worthwhile contribution to the national defense and the public welfare.

Oceanography is an interdisciplinary science. The advances we make will follow from the application of all basic scientific disciplines to problems associated with the ocean environment as a whole.

Oceanography, as a collective term, is the science of the seas, their motions, their boundaries, and contents. Physical oceanography is the study of the motions of the sea, waves, and swell, tides, currents, and turbulence. Marine biology treats of plants and animals in the sea—from bacteria to whales—the life cycle, distribution and habits. Submarine geology is the science of the sea floor, its shape, composition and history. Finally, marine chemistry relates to the distribution of the chemicals in sea water and the study of chemical processes.

AFFECTS SONAR

The impact of oceanography on naval warfare, particularly submarine warfare, is profound. Many of the oceanographic problems related to submarine operations concern the use of sonar, the electronic blood hound employed to locate submarines beneath the surface.

For example, we have learned that changes in sound velocity can cause marked variations in detection zones and ranges. These changes cause the true position of a target and that shown by sonar to differ. Our limited knowledge about these changes makes the fire control problem for antisubmarine missiles very difficult. We require more understanding of the velocity and direction of sound through an entire water column.

It has been found that bottom slopes can deflect sound, causing range and bearing errors. It is, therefore, critical that we have more information about the topography of the sea floor—its plains, valleys, sea mounts, and other features. We also want to know the composition of the sea floor, because different compositions affect the reflection of sound. Clay does not reflect sound as well as sand, for example.

Marine biologists need more information on plankton—the tiny plants and animals of the sea which serve as the lowest link in the food chain—and their relation to sound transmission in the water. One phenomena of plankton stratification shows a rhythm in its movement, rising nearer the surface at nightfall and descending the next morning. This curious characteristic has long been observed on echo sounders and referred to as the deep scattering layer. Before, we could view the deep scattering layer as merely one of the curiosities of nature—now we must seriously assess its influence on long-range sonars.

NEED FOR NEW SHIPS

As I have said before, to understand ocean space we must continually observe and measure it. Our survey requirements in oceanography can only be met by modern ships designed for this purpose, such as our new oceanographic research ships the U.S.S. *Gilliss* and the U.S.S. *Davis*. Measurements below the surface must be made chiefly with remote self-operating instruments used from surface ships. In these new ships a real breakthrough has been made in digitized data collection and electronic processing.

In the past, results have been published 2 or 3 years following an expedition. Computers provide a major increase in our ability to assimilate and analyze vast quantities of oceanographic data. This advanced electronic treatment of data is possible only aboard our few modern ships where data can be digitized, electronically transmitted and analyzed ashore before the ship even returns to port.

The North Atlantic is an ocean space that requires priority attention. The Gulf Stream region along the east coast of the United States possesses many imperfectly understood phenomena that affect ASW operations. We must investigate these phenomena and exploit them intelligently in order that enemy missile launching submarines cannot use this highly complex ocean space with impunity.

The Mediterranean represents a unique array of various basins of sea water. The dynamics of the Mediterranean waters may well prove to be a miniature model of the circulation and mixing that occurs within and between the great seas. As in the western Atlantic, it is militarily desirable that we know the maximum possible concerning ocean phenomena, its geographical locations, and seasonal variations that affect ASW operations in the vital Mediterranean area.

SEEK REGULAR DATA

Our knowledge of the great currents and countercurrents at the surface, bottom, and at various intermediate depths in the ocean is limited. We know that many great submerged currents do exist, but very little about their daily, seasonal, and annual variations. Thes variations affect the reliability of sonar detection and the effectiveness of antisubmarine warfare (ASW) weapons systems. We also require more understanding of the relations between weather and the oceans, in order that an improvement in the accuracy of weather forecasting may result.

One of the Navy objectives in oceanography is to make regular collections of oceanographic data in order that synoptic analyses and forecasts of oceanographic factors may be available for fleet operations, particularly antisubmarine warfare, in the same way that weather phenomena is now analyzed and forecast for air operations. Many organizations, including, of course, the U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office, are working hard on the problems associated with providing the right kind of environmental information, in operational language, to the tactical commanders of task forces.

To support our ASW forces, experimental synoptic sea surface temperature and mixed-layer depth charts are currently prepared by the Naval Oceanographic Office and transmitted to the fleet via daily radio facsimile broadcasts.

The world weather maps that are now drawn at least four times daily are based upon representative data from no more than 25 percent of the earth's surface (limited to land areas) and a handful of ocean stations. As we develop more ships, buoys, small manned submersibles and various instruments to measure ocean parameters, it is imperative that we provide for the simultaneous collection of meteorological data as well.

NEW BUOY WORKS

Early this autumn, the Naval Oceanographic Office placed a NOMAD buoy (naval oceanographic-meteorological device) in the ocean east of Charleston, S.C. It is experimental—the first one equipped to provide simultaneous measurements of phenomena in the ocean depths and surface meteorological conditions. NOMAD recently survived its first hurricane and is sending back data daily to shore receiving stations. This prototype NOMAD is the first of a family of such recording devices that will be placed in the oceans as part of ASWEPS (antisubmarine warfare environmental prediction system). Ships, planes, buoys, stationary platforms and other measuring stations will eventually supply data for oceanographic analysis and both short- and long-range forecasts of environmental conditions.

The orderly collection of ocean-space weather data should immediately improve the quality of daily weather maps. Weather forecasting, leading eventually to some weather controls, may quickly evolve from the daily analysis of the interactions between the ocean environment and the earth's air envelope. Expeditious improvement in the collection of oceanic and weather data is certain to have an immediate long-range effect on all aspects of our economy.

Many nations are increasingly concerned with oceanography and have active programs in the field. One country could not, and should not, supply the human and financial resources to investigate successfully three-fourths of the surface of the earth. Cooperation among the scientists of the world and exchange of data are essential for conquest of the sea. Our National Oceanographic Data Center, one of two world clearinghouses for centralized storage of oceanographic information, is a positive contribution in this area.

NAVY READY

It is imperative that the United States, through its Navy, maintain the world leadership in oceanography. Our experiences in the exploration of outer space have shown us that it is easier and cheaper to stay in the lead than regain the initiative once we have lost it. Oceanspace research and the accumulation of new knowledge of the vast reaches of the oceans must be a matter of the highest priority for our Nation. It will profoundly influence our long-range posture both militarily and economically. Hence, a comprehensive and imaginative oceanographic program should be a cardinal peacetime mission.

Our country has prospered since the early years of its history by the effective use of the surface of the sea, characterized by dynamic leadership and vision. Now we are at another crossroad. The same qualities of leadership and imagination must be employed to exploit the length, breadth, and depth of the seven seas. The U.S. Navy is the appropriate agency for this awesome task.

Bonn Government To Halt Arms Shipments to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the decision by the Bonn government to halt arms shipments to Israel can only be interpreted as a capitulation to President Nasser of the United Arab Republic. I call the attention of the House to two recent editorials in the New York Times and Washington Post which put this decision in its proper perspective.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 15, 1965]

BOWING TO BLACKMAIL

Both as a political and symbolic matter, West Germany's decision to cancel arms shipments to Israel is highly unfortunate. President Nasser had threatened to recognize East Germany if Bonn did not terminate an arms agreement with Israel. With inglorious alacrity, West Germany collapsed before this blackmail threat and put herself in the wrong with a nation that above all others deserves sympathetic consideration from Germany.

The amount of money involved, was relatively modest. West Germany has never officially disclosed her arms agreement with Israel, but the total amount is believed to

be $60 million and it is estimated that 80 percent of the deliveries have already been made. But if the amount was small, the principle was large.

In diplomacy as in common crime, blackmailers have an insatiable thirst. Mr. Nasser was able to dictate Bonn's foreign policy by a verbal threat and by inviting Walter Ulbricht, head of the East German regime, to Cairo for a visit. Having surrendered once, West Germany may be asked to take other steps adverse to Israel in order to prevent possible recognition of East Germany.

As a symbolic matter, Bonn's position is an unhappy one. It may be that West Germany has done much to provide material compensation for wartime atrocities, and so doubt Bonn cannot be expected to condition every aspect of its foreign policy in the memory of a haunted past. Still, it is true that Germany is tailoring her policies to the demand of an Egyptian dictator who has sworn to destroy the nation of Israel. Such is the truth, no matter how it is rationalized in Germany.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 16, 1965]

BONN'S MIDEAST MUDDLE

The West Germans have made an almost incredible mess of the linked issues of arms to Israel and relations with Egypt. As a result, President Nasser has been greatly strengthened; tensions in the already tense Middle East have risen; West German relations with Israel, which had improved so greatly in recent years, have again sunk to a low of bitterness and anger; and Communist East Germany, Bonn's enemy, achieves a triumph.

It may have been an error on Chancellor Adenauer's part to make the $80 million arms agreement with Israel in 1960, but, once made, there was no excuse not to go through with it. Israel's perennially dangerous position, surrounded as she is by Arab nations determined to destroy her, meant that she needed arms to sustain what Prime Minister Eshkol of Israel yesterday called "a balance of deterrence." However, the arms could have been obtained elsewhere.

Another basic error has been Bonn's persistence in the "Hallstein Doctrine" of not dealing with any nation that recognizes East Germany. This has proved to be more of a nuisance in recent years than an asset, and it has by no means been strictly honored.

President Nasser all along demanded that Germany cease her arms shipments to Israel, but he got nowhere until he had the bold idea of inviting East Germany's President Ulbricht to Egypt as a state guest. Bonn objected that this was de facto recognition and made the egregious error of trying to buy off Mr. Nasser by halting the arms shipments to Israel. This crude maneuver had no effect on the Egyptians. President Ulbricht is going to Cairo anyway, and he will get red-carpet treatment.

Now Germany threatens to cut off economic aid to Egypt if the Ulbricht visit is carried out. Such aid amounted to nearly $200 million during the first 5-year plan. However, President Nasser has proved in the past that he is allergic to dictation based on aid.

Meanwhile, supplies of Russian arms to Egypt and the other Arab countries have been increasing. The Israelis have a right to be profoundly disturbed as well as angry by the loss of the remainder of the arms—some $20 million worth—which they expected from Germany.

The whole affair has been an ignominious defeat for West Germany, but it has also raised the danger level in the Middle East. Southeast Asia and the Congo are not the only parts of the world where war is possible.

Relief to the Harassed Sugarbeet Growers of State of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith House Joint Memorial 6, 38th session of the Idaho State Legislature, which calls upon the Congress to give much-needed relief to the harassed sugarbeet growers of the State of Idaho.

As the memorial points out, the U.S. domestic beet sugar industry is confronted with excessive inventories of sugar in relation to permitted marketings under the existing Sugar Act because the industry has increased its production at the request of the Department of Agriculture. It also states that unless the industry gets relief, with present inventories and production possibilities, the industry will face additional severe production cutbacks in 1966.

It then asks that the Congress enact legislation increasing the basic sugarbeet quota so as to allow the marketing of excess sugar produced at the request of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an exhorbitant request. Logic, reason, and fairness demand that it be granted. To reject this request would be to work an untold hardship on an important segment of our economy which asks nothing more than that it be allowed to operate under rules of the game established by the Department of Agriculture, and that these rules not be changed in the middle of the game.

Let me explain. In July of 1960 President Eisenhower banned the importation from Castro's Cuba of approximately 3 million tons of sugar per year. This ban, which is still in effect, resulted in the giving to other foreign producers the 3 million tons formerly allocated to Cuba.

In 1962 amendments to the Sugar Act resulted in a modest increase for domestic sugar growers. At the same time country quotas were increased, and the balance of about 1½ million tons was saved for allocation under the global quota system. However, world sugar prices were high in 1963 and again in 1964 and it was anticipated that the United States would have trouble purchasing enough foreign sugar at reasonable prices to meet our domestic needs.

Therefore, to meet these needs, on March 14, 1963, Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman announced that there would be no acreage restrictions—proportionate shares—on the 1964 crop of sugarbeets. Then, on May 6, 1963, Secretary Freeman announced that there would be no acreage restrictions on the 1965 crop of sugarbeets.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is what I mean by changing the rules in the middle of the game. Our sugarbeet growers responded admirably to the needs of our country and to the request of the Secretary of Agriculture. Now, having done what they had been asked to do, they are to be penalized with a reimposition of acreage restrictions—proportionate shares—which amounts to a 14-percent reduction in 1965 and a further severe cutback in 1966. I submit this is without logic, reason, or fairness.

On the first day of the 89th Congress I introduced a bill, H.R. 311, which would accomplish much of what the Idaho sugarbeet growers are asking through Idaho House Joint Memorial 6. It is not an elaborate bill. It is simple, and it is just. It would provide that, first, the quotas for domestic sugar-producing areas under section 202(a)(1) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, would be increased for the calendar years 1965 and 1966 by 1 million short tons, raw value; and second, that the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within 30 days after enactment of the bill, apportion to the domestic beet sugar area the increase in basic quotas provided for in section 202(a)(1) of the Sugar Act of 1948.

I therefore respectfully request, Mr. Speaker, that the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture call for immediate hearings on H.R. 311 and on other similar legislation pertaining to this pressing problem. I am firmly convinced that such hearngs would bring into sharp focus the merits of the relief requested in Idaho House Joint Memorial 6, and that the Congress would speedily grant such relief.

The memorial follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 6

Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the sugarbeet industry is a vital and integral part of the eocnomy of the State of Idaho and of the United States of America; and

Whereas the provisions of section 202(c) of the Sugar Act relating to foreign quotas are not effective after December 31, 1964; and

Whereas the U.S. domestic beet sugar growers and processors amply demonstrated their ability to produce sugar when it was needed for consumers in 1963 and 1964; and

Whereas the U.S. domestic beet sugar industry is now confronted with excessive inventories of sugar in relation to permitted marketings under the existing Sugar Act in that the industry has increased their production at the request of the Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas to avoid further increases in inventories which are now excessive it has been necessary to reduce the sugarbeet acreage to be grown in Idaho in 1965 by approximately 14 percent below 1964 acreage; and

Whereas unless the sugar industry gets relief, with present inventories and production possibilities, the industry will face additional severe production cutbacks in 1966: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America, in order to avoid drastic cuts in sugar production, to proceed at the earliest possible time to enact legislation increasing the basic sugarbeet quota to a minimum of the 1965 restricted acreage production so as to allow

the marketing of excess sugar produced at the request of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; be it further

Resolved, That the Sugar Act be extended so as to be effective until December 31, 1970; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congerss, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

PETER T. CENORRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. E. DRERLOW,
President of the Senate.

Do We Have a Government of Men, Rather Than of Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a constituent of mine, Mr. E. G. Spencer, of Mayesville, S.C., has written to the editor of the State, in Columbia, S.C., a letter expressing his concern that our Nation is becoming one of men, rather than law, for political purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAYESVILLE, S.C.,
February 10, 1965.

The Editors of The State, Columbia, S.C.

DEAR SIRS: Sunday the seventh had all the earmarks of Pearl Harbor as to day and date, also as to surprise attack of our bases in South Vietnam. Secretary of Defense, McNamara, admitted on TV that our Government could not provide any defense against these attacks, so American boys still lose their lives in an apparently useless effort.

The civil rights law is now the law of the land with provision by law for its compliance.

Is it possible that our Government and President are more concerned with politics and votes than the safety and welfare of this Nation? Do we now have a government of men rather than law? The last election was based upon trigger happy and minority group votes. Whose hand is now upon the trigger and permits demonstrations for the right to vote?

With a third world war in the making, it does seem that all our differences on domestic issues and the politics involved could be laid aside for the duration of this crisis. Thus leaving a nation, with all people and races working for the defense and survival of our country, giving the President and the administration only the task of policies and efforts for a sound and sane objective in order that the useless loss of lives may be ended. We all owe this effort to future generations, as those of past generations bore the brunt of two world wars during the last 50 years which seem vain and futile in the light of what has now happened in South Vietnam.

Let us be governed by laws and not men or pressure groups. As of now the President and the administration seem determined to take advantage of the above (laws, men, and pressure groups) as best suited to their political objectives.

Sincerely,

E. G. SPENCER.

James A. Bland, Composer of "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am privileged to include the text of an article on James A. Bland, the Negro composer of "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia," the official song of the Commonwealth of Virginia. It was adopted as such by the General Assembly of Virginia on February 22, 1940.

The article was written by Mr. Clinton A. McKinney, of Scottsburg, Va., and printed as a series in the Record-Advertiser, a newspaper published in my home city of South Boston, Va.

Mr. McKinney deserves praise for his painstaking efforts which resulted in the preparation of such interesting, informative and valuable data. The author of this article is a member of a prominent and substantial southside Virginia family. He has done much to enhance the civic and cultural development of our section.

I commend the article to everyone who has interest in American folklore music, not only in Virginia, but throughout the Nation.

The text of the article is as follows:

Any story of the life of James Bland must be a bit sketchy and a bit disconnected in spots; for, never before in all history has a man so talented been more neglected and completely forgotten as was the writer of our own beloved State song, "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia."

For 30 years after his passing even the burial place of this gifted composer was unknown, except to a few close friends and relatives. Finally, through exhaustive study, Dr. Francis Cooke, editor of the then Etude a music magazine, uncovered valuable information leading to more definite knowledge about the forgotten musician. From the fading memory of one of Bland's living sisters it was learned that he was buried in Merion Cemetery, a small Negro burial ground in Bala-Cynwyd, a suburb of Philadelphia. Later, Dr. Cooke learned from Dr. Kelly Miller (then a professor at Harvard University and a foremost scholar of his race) not only the cemetery where Bland was buried, but the exact location of the grave. The grave was overgrown with weeds and briars—in a complete state of neglect.

Contrary to the sentimental story held at one time, James Bland was not the son of a slave who was sold to a new landlord in New Orleans, and his song was not based on personal experience, nor upon the experiences of his father. It does express the nostalgia of someone else about whom we shall learn more further in our story.

James Bland, author of our beloved State song, was descended from a long line of freemen (known as "free issue" in the South before and during the war). His father, Allen Bland, was born and spent his youth in South Carolina where he attended a private school. Later, he moved to Flushing, N.Y., where his famous son, James, was born October 22, 1854.

Allen Bland, James' father, never knew the rigors of slavery, nor did his son ever experience servitude. Allen Bland, the father, attended Oberlin College and eventually received a degree from Howard University. Rather oddly, Allen Bland and his son, James, were students at Howard at the same time, but never were father and son so different. The father was a scholar; the son never distinguished himself at Howard. In fact, he later attended an all-Negro school, but even here he paid more attention to his music than to his studies. While at Howard he was a constant worry to the management—not because of misbehavior, but largely because of his banjo playing. He strummed his banjo in his room, to and from classes, and gave impromptu concerts on the campus for the students.

Bland's mother was also born free. Her birthplace was Wilmington, Del., and although she was not so highly educated as her husband, she possessed patience and understanding, and she greatly aided her prodigy son during his formative years.

Soon after the Civil War, Allen Bland moved to Washington and here James' boyhood was largely spent. Not long after moving to Washington, "a kindly Virginian" secured for James a place as page in the House of Representatives. He did not like this job—there was not enough action in it. Serving peppery Congressmen at intervals did not appeal to him, besides, it took too much time from his banjo playing. However, it may be said that Jimmy's first job was secured for him by a "kindly Virginian," and the address over this final monument was delivered by another Virginian, the Honorable William M. Tuck, then Governor of Virginia. It may be stated further that the Lions Clubs of Virignia still furnish funds for deserving and qualified colored boys and girls to further their musical education.

In the 1880's Bland was widely acclaimed all over America and in Europe. On one trip to England, while with Haverly's Minstrels, he became immensely popular in London. Here he played opposite end to Kersands, the most noted minstrel of his day.

In England, Bland had a difficult time establishing himself as a composer, for many people thought some of his greatest compositions were the work of Stephen Foster. Finally, however, he was recognized, and London "went overboard" for his music.

So well did he like London that when Colonel Haverly completed his tour of England, Bland chose to remain in London. No doubt, his long stay abroad played a major part in his loss of popularity and his being forgotten in his homeland.

At one time, while abroad, his salary was $10,000 a year, plus royalties from his songs—a princely sum in those days.

While living the life of a celebrity in England, a biographer tells us that Bland became careless—or shall we say sorrowfully—rather profligate in his daily living. He began drinking heavily, and as John L. Sullivan once said: "Nobody ever went in the ring with John Barleycorn and came out the winner."

The later years Bland spent in England are veiled in considerable mystery, but it is a certainty that his popularity waned and his fortune slipped from him, for he returned to America penniless. Once back home he found that minstrelsy, the type of entertainment that had brought him fame and fortune, had given way to a new type of show—

vaudeville, and Bland was not in tune with that form of entertainment. A new generation that knew not Bland had arisen in his homeland. Such was the fate of—next to Stephen Foster—the greatest troubadour America has ever known.

Let us not be too critical, however, for we all have weaknesses within us that have the power to destroy; and circumstances and conditions do often alter cases.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, says in the introduction of John J. Daly's "A Song in His Heart": "The story of James A. Bland is a testimonial to the greatness of America—a testimonial to the land in which an individual with ability and enterprise can make himself heard and his abilities recognized. May we pay tribute to a fellow American whose love of country gave us one of our best loved songs."

There is something appealing about "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia." There is something in its plaintive tune and nostalgic words that tug at the heart.

The appealing lilt of Bland's compositions have affected modern music; for instance, the opening notes of the chorus of "There's a Long, Long Trail," the No. 1 song hit of World War I, are precisely the same—every note—as those in "In the Evening by the Moonlight," a Bland hit. This is not plagiarism, for it is permissable for one composer to lift a certain number of consecutive bars from the work of another composer. However, it illustrates that the music of Bland does possess that something, that appeal, that makes a song live forever.

Bland's music is pure rhythm and melody. One of his critics said he was not so highly trained that the natural sweetness had been taken from his compositions. He was, as John J. Daly said: "A man with a song in his heart."

A student of Bland's life tells this story in essence: Jimmy, as a boy, heard an old colored man playing a banjo on the street and from that time, the idea of owning a banjo became an obsession. Not being able to buy one, nor was his father able (the one he wanted cost $6), he decided to make one. First he sawed out some strips and bent them into shape by steaming them over a teakettle; then he strung it with strings he found under a junk pile. Finally, his father became able to buy a good banjo for Jimmy—and the musical life of America's great minstrel was on its way. As Florence Nightingale was known as "the lady with the lamp," so Jimmy Bland became, no doubt, "the boy with the banjo." Anyway, from that time on, the banjo was his constant companion.

One of Bland's biographers tells us this story, and I give it in condensed form:

One day as Jimmy, then a student at Howard University, and about 20 years old, was walking home, as usual, strumming on his banjo and humming a tune. An old white-haired colored man, standing on the curb, heard him as he passed. Stepping briskly along, the old man fell in stride with Jimmy and began talking about Stephen Foster and about Foster's music. He asked Jimmy if he could transpose his music into written notes so it could be reproduced. Upon being told that he could not, that he simply played out of his heart, the old man introduced himself as a music teacher and offered to teach Jimmy how to form the music staff and how to place notes in it. Jimmy was delighted, for he had never before thought of his playing as the kind of music one found in music books. He studied hard under "Professor" White, as the old teacher was called, and thus soon became able to write down his own compositions.

A soul so filled with the emotions and feelings of his race, as was Bland, must, eventually, win recognition in the world of music. Every race, over the years, makes its contribution to music: The music of the Scots with its lilting, with its plaintive appeal; the German with its brusque and direct approach; the Italian with its gay and soft sweetness; the Mexican with its carefree and romantic touch; the French with its impulsive, dashing, and militant approach, and so on we might go—each depicting the innermost characteristics of its people, their aspirations and their disappointments; their joys and their sorrows. Yes, Bland forcefully brings out the sadness, the hardships, the memories, the ecstatic joys, and the emotions of his race. What an insight he had of the true nature of his people.

How strange it is that this man was for 30 years unhonored and forgotten.

While at Howard University, Bland met a classmate—a girl by the name of Mannie Friend, and her influence over the future troubadour was immense and good. They were constantly together during their stay at the university. Mannie was from a slave family in Virginia. She so often, in their walks along the Potomac, would gaze longingly across the river and tell Jimmy how happy her life was there as a child. One day she said, "Jimmy, it was wonderful. I'll never forget those evenings there by the moonlight." What wonder that almost immediately the song "In the Evening by the Moonlight," was composed.

Their friendship deepened. Mannie insisted that Jimmy visit her at her grandmother's home near Williamsburg, in Tidewater, Va. He did so, and they walked often along the banks of the James, Jimmy always carrying his banjo.

One day as they sat down under a tree to rest, Jimmy suddenly took a pencil and a piece of paper from his pocket, handed them to Mannie, and said: "You write down the words as I sing them." Here is what he sang:

"Carry me back to old Virginny,
There's where the cotton and the corn and taters grow,
There's where the birds warble sweet in the springtime,
There's where the old darkey's heart am long'd to go."

And thus, according to John Jay Daly, is how our beloved "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia" was born.

What if James Bland, upon the insistance of his girl friend, had never visited Virginia? Would we here in Virginia, in the Nation, or even the whole world, ever have had our appealing State song?

Bland's music not only pleased the general public, but it was in favor with celebrities as well. Victor Herbert, soon after his arrival in America, became extremely fond of Bland's music. He was charmed with "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia," although he thought for some time that Stephen Foster wrote it. (Foster had been dead 10 years or more when it was composed.)

Before Grover Cleveland became President—and perhaps after his election to the highest office—he heard Bland play his own compositions, and he became enthusiastic over Bland's musical talent.

At the inauguration of President Garfield in 1881, a colored band as it swung past the President's reviewing stand played "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia" in march time. Can you imagine it as a march?

While touring England when he was in his prime, Bland was heard by the Prince of Wales, later King Edward VII, who was so charmed by his music that Bland gave a command performance in Buckingham Palace before Queen Victoria.

John Philip Sousa, the great bandleader, often used Bland's melodies as encores.

He was also acclaimed by James Russell Lowell, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and P. T. Barnum as a great artist and performer.

Through a quirk of fortune in his youth, Bland became acquainted with John Ford, famed theater owner (it was in Ford's theater that Lincoln was shot in April 1865), who introduced him to George Primrose, the outstanding musical promoter and performer of his day. Primrose was fascinated by the new song Bland sang to him—"Carry Me Back to Old Virginia"—and gave him a place in his show. The premiere of our State song was held in Baltimore immediately after the meeting of Bland and Primrose which was in the middle or late 1870's (biographers differ slightly as to the exact date). The Oliver Ditson Music Publishers acquired the original copyrights in 1878.

Turning briefly to the banjo, James Bland felt that the regular 4-string banjo—known to banjo players as the tenor banjo—lacked something—something to add volume and fullness of tone, so he devised and added a fifth string, known as the thumb string, to his instrument; so, it is generally conceded that he was the originator of the now-used five-string instrument.

In the Code of Virginia, title 7—35 is found this paragraph:

"The song, 'Carry Me Back to Old Virginia,' by James A. Bland as set out in House Joint Resolution 10, adopted by the General Assembly of Virginia at the session of 1940, is declared to be the official song of the Commonwealth." February 22, 1940 (Washington's birthday) (1940, p. 942, Michie Code).

After some discussion it was decided to change the spelling Virginny to the more decorous Virginia, believing this to be the pronounciation used by by Virginians. So it is now officially V-i-r-g-i-n-i-a, not V-i-r-g-i-n-n-y.

In personal appearance, James Bland was athletic in build, though we have no record of his taking part in any games. He was never robust. A fellow student once said of him: "He looked as if he were always ready to go into his dance." He developed a grace of movement and a poise that went with him through his entire life. In college he was the Beau Brummel of the school, always popular with the coeds. "In color he was rather light." His weight was never more than 150 pounds.

James Bland is credited with having written around 700 songs, yet like John Howard Payne who composed many other songs and poems, his fame rests entirely on the authorship of one song, "Home, Sweet Home"; likewise, had James A. Bland never have written another line of music other than "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia," his niche in the music hall of fame would be secure for all time. Why is this? In the writer's opinion it is because both writer-composers had in them a divinely given spirit to understand the deepest feelings and longings into music, thus presenting them to their fellow man in the most touching and appealing way.

I rarely give advice, for it it is usually something that everybody gives—and nobody takes; but since I am an old high school history teacher, I am going to take a chance and say this to my present day high school friends: Boys and girls, stir up within yourselves, not only national pride but State pride as well. Be glad that you live in Virginia—cry "E Pluribus Unum" and "Sic Semper Tyrannis" all together and mean every word you say. Virginia is a great old State—The Old Dominion. The mother of Presidents, the cradle of the Nation. Help make it greater still. Study the lives of our eight Virginia-born Presidents; then add to these eight the names of Patrick Henry, Cyrus H. McCormick, Mathew F. Maury, Adm. Richard Byrd, Dr. Walter Reed, Booker T. Washington, George Rogers Clark, "Stonewall" Jackson, John Marshall, Capt. Sally Tompkins, the only woman to receive an officer's

commission in the Confederate Army; Gen. J. E. B. Stuart, and the immortal Robert E. Lee.

The writer truly hopes that our State song will be more frequently sung or played in our public schools, and that the same love of native State may be felt in the heart of every pupil that was felt in the heart of the young college girl—Mannie Friend—in those stirring days not so long after the Civil War.

I still thrill with pride when I stand on the battlefield of First Manassas and look up into the face of "Stonewall" Jackson as he sit there in bronze, then, my heart leaps with pride as I read on the pedestal below:

"There stands Jackson like a stone wall; rally behind the Virginians." (General Bee, July 21, 1861.)

Virginians do not live in the past as they are often accused of doing; they revere their past—it is an inspiration to younger people to move forward to greater things. True Virginians do not look backward all the time. They have their hats off to the past and their coats off for the future. They are, by nature, conservative. They are as former Vice President Thomas R. Marshall said of himself when asked if he were a progressive, replied: "Yes, I am a progressive, but I keep my brakes in order."

Though long delayed, recognition finally came to James Bland. In the spring and summer of 1946, the Lions Clubs of Virginia collected money for a handsome marker to be placed at Bland's grave in Merion Cemetery in Bala-Cynwyd, a suburb of Philadelphia. Gov. William M. Tuck gladly accepted the invitation to deliver the primary address at the unveiling of the marker.

The unveiling took place July 15, 1946, during the Lion's International in Philadelphia. Governor Tuck said in part:

"The history of people the world over is etched in the ballads they sing of their homes. And their songs afford a glimpse into the character and mode of life of the singers. James Bland has put into ever-ringing verse and rhyme an expression of the feeling which all Virginians have for their State.

"Carry Me Back to Old Virginny" tells an inspiring song the innate patriotism and love of native heath of all our people, white and Negro alike.

"To me, this occasion serves to refute the malicious charge against our fair Commonwealth and against others of the Southern States that there is no mutuality of understanding, no tolerance, no cooperation, and no love between the white and Negro races below the Mason-Dixon line. We, in Virginia, have a centuries-old tradition of respectful association between the races, dating back further than any other locality in the Western Hemisphere.

"We intend to keep this relationship of interracial harmony and we will be successful in our objective, unless the seeds of discontent, of mistrust, of misunderstanding, and even hate, sown by, perhaps well intentioned, but certainly misguided persons, alien to our Virginia and southern traditions and philosophy.

"James Bland was not a Virginian. He was born in Long Island. Yet his association with Virginia Negroes so impressed him with the affection that these people held for their homeland that he was inspired to write this lovely, nostalgic ballad. Let us hope that all races may continue to sing this song and mean the message that it contains."

Though Bland became wealthy and popular in England, upon his return to America, he found that he had been forgotten. Upon arriving in New York, he was penniless. All former friends and associates were scattered and he had none to call on for help. So low were his funds, and so discouraged was he, that he soon packed his few belongings and set out for Washington. We are told he arrived there "blind baggage"; that is, riding on the front end of the baggage car where there was no door. Here one could ride, sometimes long distances and not be seen. Here again, in Washington, his old friends were scattered. Mannie Friend, his erstwhile sweetheart, had died—friends said of a broken heart. Finally, a boyhood friend by the name of William Silence gave him deskroom in his office where he could work again on his music. He made several attempts to come back, but the old zip and zest were gone, and no show would take him on.

Finally he completed his last composition—"The Sporting Girl"—a comedy of 18 songs, which he sold for $250. A biographer states that Mannie Friend had outlined the work and she and Jimmy were to complete it when he came home but this work could not be done together for Mannie had passed on before Jimmy came back.

Thoroughly discouraged and heartbroken, Bland went to Philadelphia where the story was the same—no one would take him on. They were using his songs, but they did not want him.

It is said that the small income from "The Sporting Girl" was the last straw to Bland's strength and pride. His health rapidly failed, and finally, in the raw weather of spring, he contracted a deep cold, and this, coupled with a tubercular condition, was more than his physique could stand. On March 6, 1911, at the age of 57, as John Daly dramatically states it, "James Allen Bland took his last curtain call."

Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the American Medical Association claims that under a program of free hospitalization for the elderly, to be financed under the social security program, our hospitals would quickly be overcrowded and their efficiency dangerously lowered. That fear is fully justified by what has happened to the once fine hospitals of Great Britain under a program of socialized medicine.

The great English statesman, Edmund Burke, said, "Nations do not learn by experience." This Congress may calmly ignore what has happened under socialized medicine to the hospitals of Great Britain; however, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a current news item on that subject.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Queen Elizabeth's physician and seven other prominent British doctors said a majority of Britain's hospitals were a menace to health. More than 75 of the 87 they toured didn't sterilize surgical instruments correctly, they said, and many hospitals were crowded and improperly ventilated. This headache for the Labor Government's health ministry follows a pay dispute that enters a new phase today when the British Medical Association presents its full demands.

I Am America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, last week the Idaho Free Press of Nampa, Idaho, printed a prize-winning essay written by Mr. Clarence N. Shoemaker, Jr., a grade school principal in my congressional district entitled, "I Am America."

This essay, written on October 10, 1964, recently won an award from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

In order that my colleagues are given the opportunity to read this fine essay, I am including it in the RECORD today under leave to extend my remarks.

The essay follows:

I AM AMERICA

(By C. N. Shoemaker, Jr.)

My birth certificate is the Declaration of Independence and I was born on July 4, 1776. I am a fabulous country of many things and many people. I am the United States of America.

I am over 180 million living souls and the ghost of millions who have courageously lived and died for me.

I am William Penn and Paul Revere. I stood on the Lexington green and fired the shot heard around the world. I am Washington, Jefferson, Hale, and Patrick Henry. Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, and Yorktown are a part of my heritage. I am John Paul Jones, Daniel Boone, the Green Mountain Boys and Davy Crockett. I am Generals Lee, Grant, and MacArthur. I am Abraham Lincoln and the Gettysburg Address.

I remember the Alamo, the *Lusitania*, Pearl Harbor, and Iwo Jima. Whenever freedom called, I answered that call. I have left my heroic dead in the Argonne Forest, Flanders Field, on the rock of Corregidor, and on the cold bleak slopes of Korea.

I am the Golden Gate Bridge, the wheatlands of Kansas, the farmlands of Idaho, and the fabulous forests of the Northwest. I am the Grand Canyon and Old Faithful. I am a small village in the hills of New England, an open pit copper mine in Montana and a farm in South Dakota.

My Capital, Washington, D.C., is like no other American city. It is completely free from my State government and there are no factories or commerce here. It has but one business and that is government.

From the top of the Washington Monument you can look north to the White House and to the east you see the Capitol. To the west is the long reflecting pool and the memorial to Lincoln. Inside is the famous statue of him by Daniel Chester French. His face is compassionate, sad, and strong.

Looking south, you see the Tidal Basin, the famous cherry trees, and the memorial to Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, and our third President.

Across the Potomac River in Arlington, Va., in the huge national cemetery, is the tomb of the Unknown Soldier. All during the day and night, back and forth, paces an armed sentry in honor of those men who are known "but to God." There is no other memorial in my Capital which is quite so symbolic of our Republic as this one. There has always been the unknown Americans who have played a fundamental part in my progress, in addition to the famous men whose names have been known to all.

I am a Christian nation founded upon Christian principles. My people recognize God's power and authority and their responsibility to Him.

I am a nation that believes in the worth and dignity of the individual and his inability to solve his own problems without the help of God.

A sense of responsibility to God carries my people beyond the short-range view of what they can get for the moment. They consider the future benefits or damages as a result of their actions and conduct.

I am a government that is responsible to God and the people. Most of my organic documents of government—the Mayflower Compact of 1620; the Declaration of Independence of 1776; the Constitution of 1789—give recognition to God.

I am a nation of freedom-loving people. God created my citizens as free moral agents with the power to chose between right and wrong. Freedom is possible for those citizens who choose the right. Tyranny, suppression, and slavery is the lot for those who choose the wrong. William Penn, one of my great statesmen and patriots, summed it up accurately when he said: "If men will be governed by God, then they must be ruled by tyrants."

I am the front porch of a farmhouse in the Midwest. The front porch is associated with no other country. It is a place to sit and relax for a few moments before you finish the day's chores. It is a place to sit and read the paper or visit with your neighbors.

Political posters tacked on the country store near the crossroads down by the creek are a part of my heritage. The tiny country churches, roaring snows, howling winds, endless fields and crystal clear lakes are all a part of me.

I am big. I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific, more than 3½ million square miles of throbbing private enterprise. Within my boundaries lies a wonderous country. I am a land of fertile fields, country mailboxes and winding country lane. I am remote quiet villages and large metropolitan cities that never sleep.

I am a republican form of government with the Constitution as my cornerstone. It is the best plan ever devised by man to assure freedom and to release the creative powers of everyone. Its guarantees of life, liberty and property have made possible the great American way of life.

You can look at me and see Patrick Henry ending his fiery speech before the Virginia Convention with these defiant words: "I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." You can see the colonists discussing their problems at a town meeting, the building of the Wilderness Road and Lewis and Clark crossing the Continental Divide. You can see the multicolored lights of Christmas and hear the strains of "Auld Lang Syne" as the old year passes.

Yes, I am the United States of America and these are the things that I am. I was conceived in freedom and, God willing, in freedom I will spend the rest of my days.

May I always possess the integrity, moral courage and strength to keep myself unshackled, to remain a stronghold of freedom and a beacon of hope to all the oppressed throughout the world.

This is my prayer—my goal—my wish. May God be with me, always.

Greater Pittsburgh Career Exposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, KQV Radio in Pittsburgh has performed a great public service to my home city with its sponsorship of the Greater Pittsburgh Career Exposition. More than 36,000 persons attended the 3-day program at our beautiful Civic Arena—a program designed to showcase the many career and training opportunities available in the Pittsburgh area and to emphasize to citizens of that area the importance of continuing education and training.

The program was aimed not only at youths of the Pittsburgh area but to unemployed persons interested in retraining programs and to adults interested in self-improvement or further education. The Career Exposition, incidentally, broke a 3-year attendance record for a public exposition at our $22 million Civic Arena. Already several other cities are planning similar programs based on the success of this one. KQV Radio is to be highly commended for its sponsorship of this exposition as a major contribution to a healthy economy in the Pittsburgh area and as a pattern for other communities with similar problems.

I recommend to my colleagues in the House who represent such communities that they study this successful pattern.

A Bill To Amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to provide lump-sum payment for the unused sick leave to the credit of an officer or employee immediately prior to his separation from the service on retirement.

This bill is intended to straighten out a system that encourages unnecessary absence and deprives other employees of the fruits of their dedication.

This bill is intended to reward all employees—the sick and the healthy. Further, this bill would be an added incentive for many employees to use their sick leave more prudently because they would know that payments would be made for unused sick leave.

I urge this bill as one which would do a great deal to strengthen and develop our civil service system and treat all employees equally, fairly, and justly.

White Paper on Vietnam Says It Well, Says South Bend Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues and appropriate officials of the State Department a thoughtful editorial concerning the State Department white paper on Vietnam. The editorial appeared in the South Bend, Ind., Tribune on March 2. The editorial follows:

WHITE PAPER SAYS IT WELL

The State Department white paper on Vietnam is all the more useful because of its timing. For it comes when there is mounting pressure from various quarters to generate negotiations for ending the conflict. And it is highly important, as the State Department noted, "for freemen to know what has been happening in Vietnam, and how, and why."

In the circumstances, it is incumbent upon the United States to make clear to the world the reasons for its involvement in the struggle and to deal with the criticism of the American role.

The document, it seems to us, does an admirable job on both scores.

It refutes the Communist line that the conflict is a civil war and shows it for what it really is—a carefully planned and executed aggression from the north aided and abetted by Red China and others in the Communist camp.

The evidence is damning.

Another important reason for issuing the paper is the continuing need to keep the world informed of the reasons for the American presence in South Vietnam.

As the paper notes, we are there because our help has been requested by the duly constituted government. And it notes, the United States "will not abandon friends who want to remain free."

The paper says that the United States would be ready at once to reduce its military involvement if peace could be restored, but adds significantly "the choice now between peace and continued and increasingly destructive conflict is one for the authorities in Hanoi to make."

The document says it all and says it well.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bills on Goddard Day and Kaniksu National Forest.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 3971–4082

Bills Introduced: 60 bills and 4 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1336–1395; S.J. Res. 57–59; and S. Res. 84. Pages 3980–3982

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Report of Committee on Government Operations entitled "Activities of the Senate Committee on Government Operations" (S. Rept. 69), filed March 2 under prior authorization;

S. 435, extending the boundaries of Kaniksu National Forest, Idaho, with amendment (S. Rept. 70), filed March 3 under prior authorization;

S. Con. Res. 2, providing for the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, with minority views (S. Rept. 71); and

Report of Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of Committee on Government Operations entitled "Organized Crime and Illicit Traffic in Narcotics," with additional and individual views (S. Rept. 72).

Pages 3967, 3979–3980

Bills Referred: Two House-passed bills were referred to Committee on Public Works. Page 3971

President's Message—Cities: Message from President recommending legislation on the problems of cities and the establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development was received by Secretary of Senate while Senate was in adjournment on March 2—referred to Committee on Banking and Currency. Pages 3967–3971

President's Communication—Data Processing: President's communication transmitting report by Director of the Budget on management of automatic data processing in the Federal Government was received, ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 15, and was referred to Committee on Government Operations. Pages 3976, 4010

President's Communication—Rapid Transit: Communication from President transmitting draft of proposed legislation to authorize Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, was received—referred to Committee on Commerce. Page 3976

President's Communication—Oceanography: Communication from President transmitting his national oceanographic program for fiscal year 1966 (with an accompanying document) was received—referred to Committee on Commerce. Page 3976

Appointment to Board: It was announced that Vice President has appointed Senator Williams of New Jersey to the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy. Page 4010

Authority To Report: Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to file during adjournment until noon Monday, March 8, its report on H.R. 2998, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations, with individual views. All other committees likewise were authorized to file reports during adjournment.

Pages 4009–4010

Goddard Day: Senate concurred in House amendments to S. 301, to designate March 16 of each year as a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics, thus clearing the bill for President's signature. Pages 4015–4016

Kaniksu National Forest: Senate passed with committee amendment S. 435, extending the boundaries of Kaniksu National Forest, Idaho. Pages 4035–4038

Lincoln Inaugural Reenactment: Senate recessed while it attended on the east steps of the Capitol the reenactment of the Second Inaugural Address of Abraham Lincoln in observance of the centennial anniversary of its delivery. Page 4035

Messages From President and House: Secretary of Senate was authorized to receive messages from President and the House during adjournment of Senate until Monday, March 8. Page 4010

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that on Monday, March 8, Senate expects to consider conference report on H.R. 45, to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act, to be followed by H.R. 2998, continuation of the Disarmament Agency, and the confirmation of sundry nominations. Page 4095

Confirmation: The nomination of John W. Macy, Jr., of Connecticut, to be a Civil Service Commissioner, was confirmed. Page 4098

Nominations: One civilian and one Navy nomination were received, and one postmaster nomination was withdrawn. Page 4098

Appendix

Auburn-Folsom South: Its Proven Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the need for the Auburn-Folsom south project is great. I am very pleased to say that Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL, of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Chairman WALTER ROGERS, of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, have agreed to hold hearings on the proposed Auburn-Folsom South unit, Central Valley project, which would control for all time the water resources of the American River and put these resources to the beneficial use for which I believe firmly that they were placed on this earth.

A short time ago in Auburn, Calif., the local sponsors of this project had a meeting at which the regional engineer for the Bureau of Reclamation presented an excellent paper on this project. So that my colleagues may be familiar with the need for this project, I include in the RECORD the following remarks by Mr. Robert Pafford:

Thank you for inviting me and members of my staff to be here with you tonight to discuss the Auburn-Folsom South unit of the Central Valley project.

All of you here tonight have at least a general knowledge of how important the authorization and construction of Auburn-Folsom is: To your local area; to the Central Valley; to the State; and to the Nation. Most of you have been working many years, in close cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation, to make the Auburn-Folsom plan a reality.

Now it would seem, in view of recent actions and agreements announced in Washington, that your hopes and dreams may soon be realized. Bills have been introduced in both Houses of Congress which could lead to authorization of Auburn-Folsom during the present session.

If Auburn-Folsom is authorized during this session of Congress—and the necessary funds appropriated—it is not inconceivable that the first major contractor could be on the job within just 2 short years. Even before that, we would hope to be started on right-of-way acquisition and the relocation of highways, roads, and bridges.

The creation of the present favorable climate for passage of the necessary legislation did not come about by accident. It took a lot of hard work on your part and on the part of the Federal and State agencies involved.

I would like to offer my congratulations to Governor Brown, BIZ JOHNSON, and the entire California congressional delegation for their successful efforts in ironing out the differences which have been holding up consideration of the Auburn-Folsom South unit in Congress.

I'm sure BIZ will have more to say about this later—and about what you can do to help assure early passage of legislation authorizing Auburn-Folsom.

Let me just remind you that even after Auburn-Folsom is authorized, you cannot lessen your efforts. The next big hurdle will be getting the necessary appropriations to start construction as soon as possible.

Then, for 6 or 7 years after construction begins, your community will be faced with the problems—and the opportunities—connected with meeting the housing, food, and supply needs of the 2,000 Bureau of Reclamation and construction employees and their families who will become at least a temporary part of your community.

And you must be prepared also for those construction workers who will decide to stay on in your community after construction ends and the influx of new residents drawn to your communities by the completion of Auburn Dam and the Folsom South Canal.

Let me now briefly review for you the need for Auburn-Folsom South as an addition to the Central Valley project. After this short review, I will ask Vern Hansen, our regional project development engineer, to discuss the details of the plan, and J. A. Buchholz, our project construction engineer at San Luis, to discuss the probable impact of the construction of Auburn-Folsom on the local community.

As most of you know, the Central Valley project was authorized in 1935 primarily to control and store the surplus water in northern California and deliver it to drouth-stricken areas to the south.

As the project has been developed by the Bureau of Reclamation, it has accepted and met other obligations as well—the improvement of navigation in the rivers it controls, the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources, the provision of recreational opportunities for millions of Americans, the development of municipal and industrial water supplies, the generation of power for use in CVP facilities and for sale to preference customers, and the control of floods.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-five was a year of fantastic contrast in the operation of the Central Valley project. Within a period of 12 months, we were struck by one of the worst droughts in the recorded history of the valley, and then, at the close of the year, we were pounded by one of the worst rainstorms in history.

I am happy to say that Bureau of Reclamation facilities and the Bureau men who operate them made it possible to convert both of these potential disasters into only temporary inconveniences for most people in the Central Valley project.

During the months of drought, we were able to keep our rivers flowing at twice their natural rate; during the week of rain, at half their natural rate.

As you know, the flood protection operations directed by our Central Valley operations office in Sacramento during the Christmas-week storms, were a spectacular success. The combined operations of Shasta Dam and Folsom Dam and other Bureau facilities in the valley prevented approximately $100 million in flood damages.

Incidentally, I brought with me tonight several copies of a booklet which describes those operations and you are welcome to take one with you.

The title of the booklet is "One Day From Disaster." You'll understand the reason for the title once you realize just how close Folsom Lake came to reaching its maximum storage level during that storm.

On the afternoon of December 23, after more than 2 feet of water had fallen in 5 days at Blue Canyon above the Auburn Dam site, Folsom Lake was filling at the rate of 100,000 acre-feet every 12 hours—and there were only 100,000 acre-feet of storage space left in the lake.

If the storm had continued for 1 more day, and the runoff had persisted at its maximum rate, Folsom Dam would not have been able to contain the waters of the American River. The excess flow would have poured down into the American River channel until the runoff subsided and the level of the lake dropped below the maximum storage level again.

An uncontrolled spill could easily have overflowed and destroyed the levees through the Sacramento area, causing a major metropolitan flood disaster.

The damage from such a flood in a metropolitan area would be many times worse than the severe damage in rural areas which actually occurred last Christmas week, such as the Hoopa Valley in California and along the Truckee and Carson Rivers in Nevada where the Bureau is now rushing costly flood rehabilitation work for the Office of Emergency Planning.

I'm sure many of you saw the January 8 issue of Life magazine, the one which featured pictures of flood damage in northern California. One of the most dramatic pictures showed a trailer which somehow ended up on top of a Volkswagen; that picture was taken in the Hoopa Valley, where a Bureau of Reclamation crew is working right now to repair much of the flood damage.

We have two other crews working in Nevada. They are made up of trained, experienced men who can do and are doing a vital job. We're glad to be able to help the local people regain much of what they have lost in the floods—but I can't help thinking how wasteful it is when we allow floods to happen and then spend our time and money to repair the damage. These floods are now costing the Federal and State Governments millions of dollars in rehabilitation of physical facilities and in increased expenditures for welfare and unemployment benefits. In addition, millions of dollars in property and income taxes are being lost. And all for what? For bringing the flooded communities back to where they were before the last flood struck—and where they'll remain until the next flood strikes. How much better it is for all concerned when we devote our efforts to building dams—such as Auburn Dam—which can stop the floods before they start.

If Auburn Dam had been built and in operation during Christmas week, its flood control facilities would have greatly eased the strain on Folsom Dam. In addition to providing some sorely needed insurance against flooding, Auburn Dam, operated in conjunction with Folsom Dam, would have made it possible for the Bureau to have stored and saved for later beneficial use 400,000 acre-feet of the water which had to be wasted through Folsom Lake during and immediately after the storm.

Because of its flood control benefits alone, immediate construction of Auburn Dam

might easily be justified. But Auburn Dam is not a single-purpose project.

The Auburn-Folsom South unit will make possible the diversion of 713,000 acre-feet of water annually to irrigate 415,000 acres. The increased yield from these irrigated acres will result in total benefits of approximately $45 million a year. That includes not only the increased income to the farmers, but also the increased income to your local merchants who will be supplying the farmer with his seed and supplies and equipment, his gas and his oil; and to the processing plants which will be built—possibly in the local area—to handle the increased yield; and to the shippers and processors and manufacturers of farm equipment and supplies all over the United States.

Enough municipal and industrial water will be made available through Auburn-Folsom to provide for the needs of a community of more than half a million people.

The Auburn powerplant will contain three generators capable of producing 240,000 kilowatts of power. The addition of this power to the capacity of the Central Valley project system, together with the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest power intertie, will make possible a "banking" agreement between the Bureau and the Pacific Gas & Light Co. which will allow the Bureau to meet the needs of its preference customers up to their 1980 level of power consumption for the next 40 years—and I want to emphasize that it will take both Auburn and the intertie to realize this most worthwhile objective.

Auburn Reservoir will be able to hold 2.5 million acre-feet of water and will provide your community with an 8,700-acre lake which is expected to draw 2 million visitors during its first full year of operation, and 5 million a year by 1985.

It's not too early right now for your local merchants and businessmen to start planning how they intend to serve these millions of new customers every year.

All in all, the total annual equivalent benefits of the Auburn-Folsom South unit are $61.4 million against annual equivalent costs of $17.3 million. That is a benefit-cost ratio of 3.6 to 1, one of the most favorable cost ratios on any plan we have ever sent on to the Congress.

But I'm sure I don't have to convince anyone here of the need for Auburn-Folsom. Many of you know it as well or better than I. However, I think it is well for us to review these multiple benefits periodically to renew our enthusiasm for this most valuable addition to the Central Valley project, particularly at this time when a little extra effort on our part may be all that is needed to convert our hopes to reality.

Know How To Recognize Totem Poles?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on March 4 provides answers to questions frequently asked of me concerning the unique cedar tree carvings that signify Alaska—the totem poles. The meaning of symbols on the poles and the relationship of the poles to the ceremony known as the potlatch are concisely told by James H. Winchester in the article that follows:

How To Recognize Totem Poles

(By James H. Winchester)

The totem pole has its counterpart in the symbols of many nations. The American eagle, Great Britain's lion, and the arms of noble families are illustrations. The general idea behind the practice, which can be traced throughout all history, seems to be much the same wherever found. It is the recording of ideas.

Since as early as 1790, when totem poles were seen and drawn by English sailors visiting the region, Alaska's Indians, who had no written language, have used these cedar tree carvings to tell their stories in wood. Totem poles get their name because most designs, being in the nature of family clan or crest, usually contain a representation of the owner's guardian totemic animal and for this reason the memorial eventually was given the English name of totem pole. Actually, the Indian word for totem is ko-te-a, or ku-ti-ga, meaning image or likeness.

To properly understand the totem pole, it is essential to know about the "potlatch." This traditional ceremony of the Pacific coast Indian is no longer celebrated, but in times past it formed the basis of the tribe's social order and played an essential part in the natives' lives.

The custom began with the Haidas Indians on the Queen Charlotte Islands, off what is now British Columbia. The long northern winter was the time for the potlatch, or feast, which was given in honor of various occasions such as the completion of a new house, successful hunting expeditions or war parties, or a reconciliation between feuding tribes.

Beginning after sundown, they sometimes lasted for several days. After the guests were seated around the fire, friends and relatives of the host handed them. Gaily costumed dancers—usually men, but sometimes including women and children of the tribe—performed for hours. It became the custom then to erect a carved pole to commemorate some historical events or to establish lineal descent or display the family record in similar carvings. These ideas were executed in whatever way occurred to the artist carving the pole and their meaning was preserved by word of mouth. In fact, totem poles are not "read" but "recognized." The various figures are nothing but a series of memory devices, which taken in proper sequence recall a story—if the story is known. Such figure stories begin at the top and read down. A single pole can represent a simple, short tale or a whole series of events in history or legend.

Certain symbols do appear on almost all totems. Perhaps the most fascinating is the raven. This bird, in Indian legend, is said to have brought daylight and arranged the rivers and lakes. The raven, according to the Alaska Indians, could do anything. Traveling around the world he changed his form whenever the occasion demanded, and often appeared as a man to conceal his identity. Other times, he was a woman, or a hemlock needle.

The raven, then, on totems is depicted in each instance in the form that the legend illustrates. Whenever he appears as a bird, he is clearly identifiable by his straight beak, a special mark setting him aside from other birds. Other birds, animals and insects are also often depicted on totems.

Sometimes symbols alone signify what is intended. Sharp teeth and claws indicate a wolf. Fins or fluted tails are for fish or sea mammals. The beaver is often shown only as a large incisor teeth, or a stick held in a pair of paws. The eagle is shown with a large curved beak, always turned downward.

Typically, a small totem pole would have a beaver at the base, a halibut next above the beaver, and a man at the top. The story told here is that of a man—probably a Chief—who made his living catching halibut and trapping beaver. Another pole might carry a figure of a raven with a frog in its beak. This would show that the raven and the frog clans had had a war and that ravens had won.

Alaskan totems, found only in the southwestern peninsula section of the 49th State, stand up to 80 feet high. The carvings are covered with mineral paints according to age-old methods. In the old days, ochre furnished various shades of red, brown and yellow. Copper-impregnated clay yielded bluish green. Manganese derivatives and graphite provided black. Baked clam shells and burned limestone provided white.

As a means of storytelling or as a status symbol, totem pole carving is today an almost lost art. Some are still cut out for exhibition purposes, but most of the genuine old ones have been collected and placed in city, State or Federal parks in or near such Alaska cities at Ketchikan, Juneau, Sitka, Haines and Port Chilkoot. One of the largest collections is in the U.S. Forest Service's Saxman Park, just outside Ketchikan.

A Message to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, a 12-year-old constituent of mine, David W. Salvaggio of Tustin, Calif., has experienced frustrating difficulties in his efforts to deliver a message of great importance to him, as well as to his classmates, to the President, and to some Members of Congress. In an attempt to overcome this frustration, David has addressed an open letter to the Congress. I admire this young man's tenacity and charitable feeling toward his fellow man, in wanting to extend help to the distressed areas of Appalachia. A boy with this motivation and drive will go far in his chosen profession. The following is David's message to the Congress:

Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congress: My name is David Salvaggio. I am 12 years old. I wrote a letter to the President last May. This is the story.

Last year in fifth grade we were discussing the President's war on poverty deal in current events. On TV where he gave his first state of the Union message we heard him say: "Help the poor." Our class decided to do so. So we gathered up clothing, books, pencils, etc., and had them all ready to mail. There were four boxes full. When my teacher, Mrs. Crain went down to the post office to mail them she learned that it would cost $12.56. Mrs. Crain could have just handed the man a check but she didn't. And do you know why? Something was wrong. Here the President was saying help the poor and then he lets us (or makes us) pay $12.56 to send four boxes of goods to the mountains of Appalachia. I feel, and I'm sure those people in Appalachia do too, that postages rates should be reduced on this sort of matter. I hope Congress can make this law.

Anyway, I've written my fingers to the bone writing to everyone on this matter. Everyone else in my class has given up. But not me. I've written to Senator Kuchel and

President Johnson twice. Senator KUCHEL never did answer and the first time I wrote to the President I got a letter back from someone called Arthur Eden. Believe me, I was expecting a letter from the President personally. The second time I wrote to him and got a letter back from someone called Juanita D. Roberts. She said President Johnson couldn't answer all his child fan mail so she was writing back to me. I resent what she said. I never said I liked Johnson, but she took it for granted that I did. Both of those letters I wrote were manlike businessman letters. Not fan mail; I was for Goldwater. Both Eden and Roberts said I just should write to Congress, that they couldn't do a single thing about it. So I said to myself: "Heck, I'm gonna write one more letter, and that's to the Congress of the United States." So here I am. Please do something about my idea.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

DAVID SALVAGGIO.

P.S.—You know—to come to think about it, those boxes are still in that office rotting.

John F. Kennedy: "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a Jack Jurey WTOP editorial stating that radio and television's position on the showing in the United States of the Kennedy film entitled "John F. Kennedy: 'Years of Lightning, Day of Drums'."

My purpose in inserting this editorial is that I hope Members of Congress will take time to read it. Before too long the House will be called upon to vote on the question of breaking a precedent and congressional intent in using foreign propaganda material, produced at taxpayers expense, to influence the thinking and reactions of the American people.

The editorial follows:

From everything we've heard, the film prepared by the U.S. Information Agency paying tribute to the late President Kennedy is an excellent one. "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," has been praised by almost everyone who has seen it.

Indeed, the production has received such good reviews that a determined effort is now underway on Capitol Hill to make it available to American audiences. Ordinarily, any product of USIA would be reserved for foreign distribution only, on the well-founded theory that no government should be permitted to produce propaganda aimed at its own citizens. The present effort in Congress is to make an exception in the case of the John F. Kennedy documentary. A resolution to that effect already has been approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

We oppose this action, reluctantly but firmly. Our objection is based on the strongly held belief that there should be no exception to the ban on the distribution of USIA materials in this country. Granted that a showing of "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" would not, in itself, be harmful. But it would be a precedent which could have harmful consequences in the years ahead.

Government-sponsored propaganda is a clear and present danger. To avoid that danger in the United States, the U.S. Information Agency's output must be carefully circumscribed—a necessity which applies to all its output, including the John F. Kennedy film.

This was a WTOP editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

Getting to Work and Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the remainder of the second article in Consumer Reports' excellent series on metropolitan transportation called "Getting to Work and Back." The article follows:

GETTING BACK TO WORK

PROPOSAL 4. SUBSIDIZE FROM FEDERAL TAXES

The main justification for a Federal subsidy to local transit systems is the fact that the Federal Government is already providing a 90-percent subsidy in many cases, and a 50-percent subsidy in others, for urban expressways and freeways that compete with transit systems. As a result, cities and their suburbs in effect lose their freedom of choice. If they don't choose a freeway solution to their problems, a cry goes up from the automobile clubs and sometimes from other segments of the "highway lobby" that they are "throwing away money" by letting the preferred Federal freeway subsidy slip away to other cities that did choose to build freeways.

President Kennedy had this warping of urban transportation patterns very much in mind in 1963 when he urged Congress to provide Federal transit assistance so that urban areas might "freely decide for themselves the proper balance of local public investment in highways and in mass transportation systems." The Kennedy proposal suggested $500 million in Federal assistance as a "first installment" on a program for "revitalization and needed expansion of public mass transportation." Under the proposal the $500 million would have been available to pay up to two-thirds of the total subsidy required for each project; the remaining third would have been raised locally. This 2-to-1 ratio is smaller than the 9-to-1 ratio for Interstate System freeways, but more favorable than the 1-to-1 ratio for other freeways. A 2-to-1 ratio is preferable, in CU's opinion, to 9-to-1 because it is less likely to encourage overbuilding. To bring freeway and transit subsidies into balance, it may therefore be better to reduce the 9-to-1 Interstate System subsidy rather than match it with an excessive transit subsidy.

Congress passed the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, based on Kennedy's proposal, despite the fact that congressional districts have for decades been heavily weighted in favor of rural voters. Some farm Senators and Congressmen, eager for city support of their farm-aid programs, were willing to reciprocate to a degree by voting for the bill. But only $375 million in appropriation was authorized for the first 3 years—a meager drop in a very large bucket. As States revive their congressional district boundaries to secure more equitable urban representation, future Congresses are likely to view more favorably Federal transit subsidies comparable in scope to Federal freeway subsidies.

How much money will be needed? Estimates differ. In some cities, a part of the construction cost can no doubt be paid for out of the fare box without raising fares so high as to drive away too many pasengers. Some estimates suggest $10 billion as a reasonable subsidy for construction costs over and above those that can be covered out of the fare box. A more generous estimate would peg the mass transit subsidy at the same level Congress selected for urban Interstate System freeways: $18,500 million of which two-thirds would come from Federal taxes and the balance would be locally raised.

An $18,500 million subsidy in 1 year, of course, would be unthinkable—and unnecessary. Two ways might be considered for spreading the cost over a period of years. The first is a pay-as-you-go program similar to the Interstate System plan, with construction spread over a 16-year period. This could be done if Congress pledged $771 million a year for 16 years as the Federal two-thirds of the $18,500 million subsidy. The second alternative is patterned after the Federal public housing subsidy program, with some modifications. Local agencies might be authorized to issue 50-year tax-exempt bonds, and the Federal subsidy committed to pay the interest and amortization on these bonds. If this pattern were followed, the Federal two-thirds of the $18,500 million (assuming a 4-percent interest rate) would cost $493,200,000 a year. Though the annual cost of such a program would be low, the total cost over the 50 years would be double the pay-as-you-go cost because of the interest.

PROPOSAL 5. PROVIDE A COMBINED SUBSIDY

Another modified pay-as-you-go proposal is perhaps most sensible—though highly explosive politically. It would provide in effect that sums collected via gasoline, oil, and tire taxes, excise taxes on new cars, and car registration fees be devoted to improving transportation facilities generally—freeways and transit alike—instead of merely building new freeways.

Out in the country where new freeways are needed, they would be built, as they are at present, with these "highway user taxes." In the cities, too, some freeways could be built with these user funds, and modern computerized traffic-control systems could be installed to speed traffic through city streets. In cases where subsidy of parking makes sense, the funds could be used to expand parking facilities. For the peak-hour journeys to and from work in densely developed urban districts, however, the fund would be devoted primarily to rapid transit improvements.

This kind of proposal makes such good sense that, in isolated instances, it has been adopted without much opposition. San Francisco's Bay Bridge, for example, jams up severely every workday morning and evening. To lessen congestion, a new highway bridge could be built for an estimated $280 million. San Francisco has chosen instead to use $133 million of bridge tolls paid by drivers to help finance a new transit tunnel—a part of the Bart system. Fast, safe commuting at moderate cost on the new Bart system can help relieve the congestion on the Bay Bridge. Thus the diversion for transit construction of tolls paid by motorists will benefit all concerned. (Even the San Francisco automobile club supported such use of tolls.)

Consider, for another example, Chicago's Kennedy (Northwest) Expressway. Users of this $238 million road, as we have seen, pay only one-third of its capital cost and nothing toward its operation and maintenance. And this expressway also jams up each morning and evening.

A second freeway to eliminate congestion on this one would no doubt cost more than $238 million, since the least expensive right-of-way is already occupied. Thus users of other roads would have to provide an even lusher subsidy to unclog the Kennedy Expressway by building a new expressway. In contrast, a properly designed high-speed rapid transit system down the median of the Kennedy Expressway—which was built wide for this purpose—would cost much less and would accomplish as much or more toward decongesting the Kennedy Expressway at rush hours. Why not use the smaller amount out of highway funds to build the transit line? One answer is that the "highway lobby," and particularly the automobile clubs, fight such "tax diversion" proposals tooth and nail.

In 1959, the engineering firm of W. C. Gilman & Co. recommended for St. Louis a new busway rapid transit system that would cost $190 million. To finance it, the Gilman report proposed that the annual registration fee for automobiles be raised by $20 per year—but that automobile users who chose to use the new transit system be given a $24 annual credit toward the cost of transit passes. Thus carowners who changed over to the transit system would in effect gain $4 a year while those who continued to use the freeways would pay $20 a year, as their share of the cost of getting other drivers off their freeways and streets and out of their parking places.

The plan was brilliant in conception, but it was expected to arouse such intense opposition that this portion of the Gilman report was hardly even publicized. Few residents of St. Louis outside of official circles know of its existence.

Similarly in California, the State legislature in 1963 authorized county commissioners to levy an additional 0.5-percent tax on automobiles and to devote the proceeds to transit improvements—but automobile clubs and highway interests opposed the tax, which has never been levied.

In 27 States, the "highway lobby" has secured constitutional amendments prohibiting the use of motor vehicle or gasoline taxes for nonhighway purposes. That automobile dealers, gasoline and tire companies, highway contractors and other such interests should oppose using highway taxes for rapid transit is understandable. But why do the politically influential automobile clubs agree? Their members are not immune from the traffic jams that today clog the core of almost every large city each workday morning and evening. Their members have a deep interest in getting to work and back as quickly, as comfortably, and as safely as possible—whether by car or transit. In blindly opposing proposals to devote gasoline tax revenues for this purpose—unless the project calls for highway construction—the exeecutives who control our automobile clubs may be serving the goals of the other highway groups, with whom they have long cooperated, rather than their members' interests.

As of today, proposals to finance urban transportation on a coordinated basis, with highway user tax available for any project that will supply more and better transportation per tax dollar, are as politically explosive as proposals to raise the cost of using urban freeways so that drivers will really pay their own way. But political winds can shift. Automobile commuters themselves might approve the use of gasoline taxes for better transit if the advantages to drivers as well as to transit riders were fully publicized.

As a practical matter, of course, the five proposals reviewed above are not mutually exclusive. San Francisco's Bart system is being financed through a combination of proposals 2 and 5, Toronto's by means of 2 and 3. All five might be combined to spread the cost. The problem is to find a combination acceptable to your own community.

LET YOUR REPRESENTATIVES KNOW

Both the Johnson administration and Congress will be concerned with urban transportation problems in 1965. The administration has already established an interdepartmental committee to consider what policy should be recommended after the 90-percent subsidy for Interstate System freeways expires in 1972. No doubt equalization of subsidy for modern transit and for freeways will be one of the issues considered. It is not too early to express your views on it to the President and to Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor.

Congress will no doubt also consider increased appropriations for urban mass transportation during the next year or two. And it will have to consider whether to approve the increase in cost of the Interstate freeway system from $41 billion to the $46,800 million proposed by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads in January. Consumer's Union urges you to make your views of such appropriations known this year to your Senators and your Congressman.

Similarly, in many States, large cities, and suburbs, transportation will be an important issue in 1965 and 1966. Interest in your neighborhood may be focused on the cry, "Save our commuter railroads" (see last month's reports). It may take the form of neighborhood opposition to a proposed new freeway route. Or you may face a referendum on a new tax or bond issue to improve public transportation. Consumer's Union trusts that these articles will help you participate intelligently in such community debates and decisions.

Address of Representative John M. Murphy of New York to Manresa Council, Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address of February 26, 1965, before an open meeting of Manresa Council, Knights of Columbus, Staten Island, N.Y.

I want to extend my greetings to Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. McGowan; district deputy, Ross Calimano; grand knight, John McHugh; State auxiliary chairman for membership, Walter Lawler; council membership chairman, Bob Muller; and Silvie C. Luongo, chairman of the meeting.

The address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, just this week the 300th American serviceman was killed in Vietnam, a grim statistic that brings home better than anything else the quickening pace of the struggle against Communist encroachment in southeast Asia. The mounting casualty list will lend emphasis to the arguments of those who feel, and honestly, that the United States should either pull out of Vietnam or seek, by indirect negotiation with Red China, to arrive at an uneasy truce in which we could somehow bail ourselves out without loss of global prestige.

Tonight, I would like to examine these arguments. But first let me try to answer a question that is being asked more and more these days. Why did we become involved in Vietnam in the first place? The answer goes back a dozen years, when the French were locked in a losing battle against the forces of North Vietnam's Communist boss, Ho Chi Minh. This war, as you will remember, ended in the disastrous defeat of the French at Dienbienphu. We were heavily committed to aiding the French and, when they were driven out, we were left as the only Western Power able to provide a bulwark against further Communist infiltration in that troubled country. Our policy was then and is now to check Communist expansion wherever it might threaten the free world. It threatened South Vietnam, and we elected to check it there.

Thus we find ourselves today facing on the one hand mounting pressure from the Vietcong—backed and directed from Peiping—and on the other the instability of a series of ineffectual governments in South Vietnam. In plain English, a mess. Would it be better, then, to wash our hands of the whole affair, to pull out?

On the surface, this seems to be the simplest solution. But South Vietnam cannot be considered as an isolated battleground, of no strategic importance in the global conflict between the free world and the captive. For one thing, South Vietnam is a tremendously fertile land, traditionally the rice bowl of the continent. Peiping, confronted with a population explosion that staggers the imagination, desperately needs this granary to feed its teeming millions. To hand it over by default would be to present Red China the equivalent of a major military victory. In its long-range consequences, such a move would be as disastrous as permitting West Germany to fall into the hands of the Russians.

Furthermore, Vietnam is of vital military importance. It points like a finger toward the rich island chain of Indonesia, where Communist-oriented Sukarno holds sway and is already threatening another outpost of the free world, Malaysia. Dominated by Red China, Vietnam would be the springboard for an eventual hold over this entire area and the isolation, through control of the sea passages, of the subcontinent of Australia. Not a pleasant prospect.

Fed by Vietnam and free of U.S. interference, Red China could devote its full attention to its timetable for expansion. Thailand and Laos, already riddled by Communist infiltration, would fall like ripe plums. Malaysia could hardly escape the same fate and, in time, Peiping would look toward Burma, India, Taiwan, Japan, Okinawa and even the Philippines. To most Americans, it comes as a shock to think that the Philippines, so tied to us historically, could possibly fall into the Communist sphere, but anti-Americanism, skillfully fanned by Communist propaganda, has already infected the islands.

Make no mistake about it—Peiping does have a timetable. Mao Tse-tung himself has boasted that time is working for Red China, that his hit-and-run guerrilla tactics will wear out our patience, if not this month, then the next. He hopes that in our preoccupation with Vietnam we will overlook the all-important fact that it is the keystone to Peiping's hoped-for power structure in southeast Asia. If we pull out of Vietnam we must make a stand somewhere else eventually; and by pulling out we make the next stand even more difficult for ourselves and easier for Red China. And where do we finally draw the line? In Hawaii? In my view, it is far better to make the stand where it hurts Peiping the most—in Vietnam. By depriving Red China of this rice bowl, we hold a tremendous advantage. It would be folly to let it go by default.

The other argument, that we should negotiate a settlement, is more persuasive,

since—at first glance—it offers us a solution with honor and no loss of prestige. Even now, diplomatic feelers are out from London and Paris to gauge the reaction in Peiping. But Peiping has already reacted. On Wednesday, Premier Chou En-lai belligerently declared that Red China would consider no settlement at all until we withdrew our forces from South Vietnam, completely, immediately and unconditionally. Yet even in the face of this adamant stand there are voices in this country that tell us we can work out something called neutralization in Vietnam.

Now there are two glaring examples of the utter futility of trying to negotiate with the Red Chinese on any realistic basis. The first I will cite was in Warsaw where just this week our Ambassador, John Moors Cabot, sat down with Chinese envoy Wang Kuochuan in another effort to free U.S. citizens taken prisoner in the Korean war and still held in Red Chinese jails. These talks began in 1955, mind you, 10 years ago, and are still going on. They have been broadened to include other matters, but in 126 meetings not one thing has been accomplished. Our citizens are still imprisoned, and the Chinese envoy has never yet mentioned the word "peace."

The other example is in Korea. Not many Americans realize that we still have 55,000 U.S. troops in Korea, augmented by their South Korean comrades in arms, to hold back the North Korean hordes directed by Peiping. There is an armistice commission there, certainly, but the North Korean members have never deviated an inch from the Peiping hard line. They treat our members with arrogance and cold contempt, and studiedly frustrate our every effort to ease the tensions along the truce line. In fact, the North Koreans purposely violate the truce terms in an apparent effort to draw us into retaliation so that they can trumpet charges of aggression for the world to hear. There is one reason and one reason alone why the North Koreans do not control all of Korea—and that is the armed force we maintain to prevent it. This is what negotiation means to the Communists. To me, it is naive beyond belief to think that Peiping would honor for a second any agreement in Vietnam that we did not enforce with military power.

The Red Chinese respect only superior force. We have it—and they know it. In every instance in which we have met their power plays—and those of the Russians—the Communists have backed down. The late President Kennedy's confrontation of Khrushchev in the Cuban missile crisis seems to have been forgotten, as has President Truman's firm decision to keep Berlin open via airlift in the face of Moscow's dire threats.

More recently, there have been our reprisals against North Vietnam for its guerrilla raids on U.S. bases in South Vietnam. President Johnson's prompt retaliatory action quite obviously took Peiping by surprise. It seemed the "paper tiger" had claws, after all. There was the usual bluster, vague threats of massive Red attacks on South Vietnam, and the usual show of solidarity on the part of the Communist satellites. But nothing has happened. Again, firmness proved the only possible policy.

This recent history should make it crystal clear that there is no hope of negotiating any acceptable settlement of the Vietnam struggle with Peiping. "Neutralization" in their dictionary means surrender. They can be dealt with only from strength, and President Johnson has demonstrated that this is the administration's policy.

To sum up: We cannot pull out of South Vietnam without irreparable damage to our international prestige and erosion of our own national security. We canont negotiate except on the basis of armed force, as we did in Korea. That leaves us only one recourse—to stand our ground, to meet force with force until the Red Chinese understand that the American will is as firm as their own, that the American patience is as enduring as theirs, and that the American capacity for sacrifice is as deep as theirs. The Japanese and Nazis learned of American resoluteness in World War II, the Russians learned it in the Cuban crisis, and the Red Chinese must learn it in South Vietnam. Thank you.

A Letter From Vice Adm. Ruthven E. Libby, Retired, on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from Vice Adm. Ruthven E. Libby, U.S. Navy, retired, which appeared in the San Diego, Calif., Union on Sunday, February 28, 1965.

The letter was addressed to French Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville. Admiral Libby spent several months at the Panmunjom, Korea, truce negotiations. He witnessed the mistakes we made before, during and after these negotiations, and warns of a repetition of these mistakes by negotiating a peace in Vietnam under the conditions recommended by France, Red China, North Vietnam, and others.

I recommend the reading of Admiral Libby's letter.

CHER MONSIEUR: Inasmuch as you bear the heavy responsibility of representing your great country as its Foreign Minister, your pronouncements cannot be taken other than most seriously.

One cannot regard your recent statement that France believes it imperative that the United States negotiate with the Communists over Vietnam "for the peace of the world" as some mordant Gallic jest. In the same breath you propose another Geneva Conference similar to those of 1954 and 1961, the conferees to include the Soviet Union, Communist China, and North Vietnam.

Since neither of those conferences contributed very much to the peace of the world, it is hard for me to understand why you feel that a third one could do better. We know in advance that the Communists would ignore any terms of any agreement reached which were disadvantageous to them, just as they consistently and persistently have violated the 1954 and 1961 agreements.

France's earnest desire to preserve the peace of the world is admirable, and wholeheartedly indorsed by men of good will everywhere—but with two qualifications:

The peace must be long term and not another "peace in our time," a la Munich.

It must not conform to the well-known Communist definitions of peace as existing when the Communist takeover of the world is proceeding in orderly fashion, and lasting peace as having arrived when that takeover has been completed.

In your recent television interview, which you gave after 3 days of conferring with our President and our Secretary of State, you said: "What seems to me essential is that South Vietnam is given its freedom and independence and opportunity to decide its own future."

I think I can speak for many Americans when I say that we endorse this sentiment 100 percent. To achieve this happy situation is exactly why we are in South Vietnam today.

But then you also remarked: "The more we wait the more the situation deteriorates and the more difficult it will be to arrive at a satisfactory solution."

May I inquire "satisfactory to whom"?

And, would you agree that this holds only if we wait and do nothing, not if we vigorously seek a military solution to what most certainly is a military problem?

From observation and from the personal experience of several months as a United Nations Command delegate in the truce tent of Panmunjom, I have drawn the conclusion that Communists negotiate in earnest only when they are being hurt, and that the speed of their negotiating is directly proportional to the intensity with which they are being hurt.

I read a certain significance into the alacrity with which President Ho Chi Minh has reacted to your suggestion and called on France to act to bring about a negotiated settlement of the war, now that we have indulged in a little direct action against the Vietcong in retaliation for what they have been doing to us for many months.

In 1955, the Macmillan Co. published a book by Adm. Charles Turner Joy, U.S. Navy, retired, called "How Communists Negotiate."

It is a small book—only 178 pages—but into it the admiral has distilled all the knowledge acquired through 10½ frustrating, trying, exasperating, and wearying months during which he was the senior U.N. Command delegate to the Korean armistice conference.

This ordeal, by the way, cost the admiral his life just as surely as if he had been shot down in battle. If you have not seen this book, M. le Ministre, I most earnestly commend it to your attention. It is required reading for anyone who even contemplates negotiating with the Communists on any subject at any level, and particularly anyone brash enough to recommend such a course of action.

Now that the pressures for a negotiated settlement of the Vietnam problem are mounting, the free world can spare itself a major disaster and a lot of blood, sweat, and tears by reading and heeding the advice and warnings included in this book. Now is the time—because the overall setup is disturbingly reminiscent of the circumstances surrounding the kickoff of the Korean truce talks back in 1951.

If you are too busy to read the entire book, you owe it to yourself to read the last chapter at least. Fifteen pages long and called "From This Thorn, These Wounds, These Warnings," it constitutes a most timely blueprint of exactly what not to do under circumstances in which we seem about to find ourselves, for the reasons which you now seem to advocate that we ignore.

It enumerates a surprisingly long list of mistakes we made before and during these armistice negotiations, errors which we are, so help me, duplicating these days as we go along.

And, believe it or not, the supporting arguments for these mistakes are just about the same as they were 14 years ago.

Alain de Lyrot, chief of the Copley News Service bureau in Paris, feels that the arrogance of the Red Chinese may save us, for the time being at least, the necessity of deciding whether or not to accept your advice.

It appears that Mao Tse-tung has told your ambassador in Peiping that Red China would agree to participate in a peaceseeking conference, let alone to terms even remotely satisfactory to the West, only provided Mao were recognized as the legal ruler of all China, including Formosa.

He also would have the Chinese Nationalists excluded from the United Nations

until such time as he got around to liquidating them, and all the rest of it.

(By the way, does your ambassador in Peiping ever get homesick for Paris?)

The position of the new Soviet headmen on your proposals for a new conference has not yet been made known; but I think that it is safe to assume that neither Moscow nor Peiping would regard as satisfactory any terms that we would find we could live with.

It is probably too soon to assess the ultimate outcome of your suggestions; but if and when we do decide to enter into negotiations, I hope fervently that we will remember the lesson of 1951:

Let the enemy ask us for the armistice, and do not decrease the military pressure until armistice negotiations have been completed. For as Admiral Joy says in his concluding chapter: "Force is the decisive factor; the only logic the Communists truly understand."

Livestock Industry and What's Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in November 1964, a prominent Minnesotan, Mr. Norris K. Carnes, general manager of the Central Livestock Association, Inc., gave an address to a Minnesota business group about the problems of the livestock industry. A condensation of Mr. Carnes' remarks recently came to my attention which I believe will be of interest and benefit to my colleagues in Congress. I, therefore, under unanimous consent, insert the Carnes analysis in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY: 1964

(By Norris K. Carnes)

While the national industrial economy is booming with good profits and high wages, the farmers of this country are facing a decline in net income again this year. Preliminary estimates from the U.S. Department of Agriculture indicate that the 1964 net farm income may decline to $12 billion, compared to $12.6 billion in 1962.

The livestock industry in all its phases—production, marketing, processing, and distribution—is a gigantic industry which employs millions of our Nation's citizens. Livestock is produced today in every State of the Union; its revenues amounted to 53.8 percent of the entire cash income for agriculture this past year, and to 70 percent of the same income for agriculture in Minnesota for the same period.

This very important segment of the agricultural economy of our country has been confronted with numerous problems adversely affecting its income, including those caused by efficient production, large importation of red meat from foreign countries, and chain store activities, with the accompanying loss of bargaining power by cattlemen.

The demand for agricultural products has been growing at a rate of approximately 2 percent a year, while farm production has been increasing at a rate of 2.5 percent a year. Farm prices must decline approximately 10 percent to increase food consumption 2 percent. This is due to the relative inelasticity of demand for farm products.

In the past, cattle production in the United States appears to have followed fairly well defined cycles over periods of from 5 to 7 years. The buildup in cattle numbers in the current cattle cycle began in 1958 and seems to have topped out in 1964. A decline in numbers should ultimately lead to improvement in profits.

Consumer demand for meat products in recent years in the United States, which has encouraged the American producer, also stimulated interest among foreign exporters, with the result that Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, and Mexico exported into this country in 1963 a quantity of beef and veal equal to about 10 percent of our domestic production or about 1.7 billion pounds of imports, up from 393 million pounds in 1937. (Total importation of red meats in 1963 was 2.05 billion pounds.) An oversupply of beef for immediate consumption, and unsatisfactory prices, were inevitable—the cattlemen of this country were severely hurt. Many cattle feeders experienced losses ranging from $30 to as much as $70 per head.

While livestock men as a group have always opposed price supports and other types of Government intervention in their business, they have fought during the past year for legislation providing mandatory import quotas on red meat to curb the sizable inflow, which they regard as a real factor in depressing prices and lowering farm income.

In the last session of Congress, legislation providing mandatory import quotas was enacted into law, but to be invoked at the will of the President, or whenever they threaten to exceed the limits provided by a complex formula. Despite the new law covering imports, I predict that when the Argentine Republic has recovered from its present dilemma, resulting from drought and political and economic upheavals and European production has increased to normal proportions, the American livestock producer will again be in trouble and faced with an import problem. I see no permanent relief.

It is extremely important for the agricultural producers of this country to familiarize themselves with consumer needs and preferences, and adjust their production methods and practices to satisfy present-day demand. Breeders and feeders of the various species of livestock and all the processors must cooperate with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and all the institutions actively interested in research, education, and market promotion to produce dressed carcasses that will yield the kind of retail cuts in greatest demanded by the consuming public.

The National Live Stock and Meat Board is sponsoring and developing research and educational programs to promote the use of meat in the human diet. Industry-Government programs are also being pursued. I believe that increased sales of livestock and livestock products will be influenced by (1) how well we are able to determine what consumers want in their livestock product foods, (2) how successfully we service their wants, and (3) how successfully we are able to promote livestock product foods in competition with the many alternative demands on consumer spending. In recent years per capita consumption of meat has increased steadily to an estimated 212.9 pounds in 1964 from 182.8 pounds in 1954.

In 1964 the American Meat Institute entered into a project with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to promote and market American meat in Western Europe, using normal commercial channels. No Government sales or subsidies are planned. If this effort is successful, it should have a long-range beneficial effect upon the industry.

On the other hand, developments such as the centralization of the control of the food marketing business by chain stores, the decentralization of the meatpacking industry through direct-buying plants, the decentralization of livestock marketing by producers and feeders themselves, who patronize small direct-buying plants and buying points, and the partial elimination of individual livestock feeders by large commercial feedlots, are causing great concern among all persons sincerely interested in the future welfare of livestock producers.

The disastrous effects which this backward integration movement is having on the Nation's systems of livestock marketing, food processing, and merchandising, could, I believe, be terminated by modification of the packers consent decree of 1920, or by the enactment of new legislation which would require that specific fields of endeavor be reserved for specific groups—for example, chain stores in the retailing business, meatpackers in the processing and packing business, and livestock producers in the feeding business.

While we who are engaged in the livestock and meat industry prefer freedom of choice in our American society to Government regulation and control, Government regulation is already in the picture, and we believe that the inequities and inequalities which are threatening the existence of our farmer-producer and others, must be eliminated. We feel that this procedure which I have outlined is one that can be followed to assure that true and fair market values are reflected to livestock and dressed meat products and will result in the unrestricted operation of the forces of supply and demand.

I believe that most of the 7 million people still engaged in the business of farming can look hopefully ahead to the long pull in spite of present-day strains and dislocations. Farmers have major assets in a high level of efficiency, and in being a part of a growing and dynamic economy. A continued decrease in the number of farmers, accompanied by a substantial increase in demand for agricultural products, should mean increased profits to those remaining in the business.

It is my opinion that farm and ranch people, in planning for the future, should bear in mind that the primary functions of our Federal Government are those of defense, the preservation of law and order, and the limited regulation of industry and trade. If these duties are conscientiously performed, there should be little occasion for complaint about misuse of concentrated power and wrongful business and labor practices. We should not ask, or permit, the Federal Government to do for us the things that we can do for ourselves. If we do so, we are asking for a controlled and regimented society, and the loss of a free America.

Reduction in Funds for Operation of the Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been associated with legislation dealing with soil and water conservation, and those who have worked for years to advance the programs of the Soil Conservation Service have been deeply disturbed over the reductions in funds for the operation of this agency, as recommended by President Johnson.

The reductions requested by the President would be a "body blow" to progress of this important program. The following editorial by McDill Boyd, publisher of the Phillips County Review, Phillipsburg, Kans., points up the importance of its uninterrupted progress, and the concern over the President's recommendations:

Over the years, I have said repeatedly in this column that the future of this county depends upon the conservation of our soil and water. They are are capital assets with which we do business, and there simply is no other problem that is even a close second to this one.

At the same time, I have been almost equally vigorous in opposing the constant waste of the public's money at the Federal level. Our dollars have been frittered away on projects of no value; bemused dreamers in Washington have attempted to buy friendships with our money in far-flung corners of the world—areas which resent us and our money and tell us impolitely to go sit on a tack.

Now, one of the few Federal programs which directly benefit our area and its future is under attack. The Budget Department in Washington has proposed a cutback in the appropriation for soil and water conservation, the one area of potential return on investment of major importance to us.

And not only to us—in Phillips County, in Kansas—but across the Nation, for water problems are found everywhere, and unless more ways are found to hold the soil in place, to retard rapid runoff, to prevent siltation of ponds, lakes, and rivers, many areas in this country will experience real disaster.

I drove over the bridge at Alma Tuesday morning, and the dust was blowing off the silt deposits at the upper reaches of the Harlan Reservoir. During the first 3 years after the dam was closed at the Kirwin Reservoir, 14 feet of Phillips County topsoil was deposited in the form of silt.

Water tables are dropping all over the place. The demand for and the use of water is constantly increasing everywhere and until we can develop more conservation projects, do a better job of holding runoff near the point where it originates, river beds will continue to fill with silt, trees will continue to die along their banks, and the water people need will flood toward distant seas at an ever-increasing rate.

A reduction in this program would impede the attempt made to repair the ravages of man, would undermine a necessary and vital public service, and would reduce a wise, but still inadequate, investment in the future.

Conservation of soil and water should far outrank grandiose schemes to rebuild an unwilling world. The pruning shears should be put to work on other projects, and if there is any unallocated money left in the Federal budget, the appropriation for soil and water conservation should be increased.

Post Office Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, one of the great strengths of our American form of government is the quality of the civil service. As an independent group of dedicated individuals, Federal employees are charged with carrying out the administration's program as enacted by the Congress.

The ugly head of politics, unfortunately, has been raised on occasion in one or more of the executive departments. It usually takes the form of patronage pressure or requests for campaign contributions. I am saddened today to have to take the floor to bring to the attention of my colleagues a situation which raises serious questions—questions which must be answered.

On Tuesday of this week the postmaster of Chattanooga, Tenn., received a letter from the Post Office Department informing him of his dismissal. Postmaster O. M. Spence was appointed by President Eisenhower in 1957, and apparently the greatest case against him today is the fact he is a Republican. If so, Mr. Speaker, this would set a dangerous precedent for postmasters and civil servants across the country. If the penalties assessed in Chattanooga were based upon similar cases in the past, the result would have been perhaps a letter of reprimand or, at most, a short suspension.

Knowing the unusually severe result of this case, it becomes more than a mere possibility that political pressures by a U.S. Senator are involved. Senatorial prerogative as well as political realities justify the fact that the Senators of the President's political party are consulted on new appointments from their State. However, any action to create such an opening is an abuse of our system and its record of nonpartisanship. Playing politics with Federal jobs can only result in the deterioration of the career civil service.

The efficiency of the Chattanooga post office was not challenged in the charges. In fact, the office has been operating on about the same funds while the volume of mail has increased substantially. Receipts at the Chattanooga post office are up, and its operational efficiency is number three in its region.

Recently, the Post Office Department conducted a national contest on suggestions and awards. The Chattanooga post office was first in the region and sixth in the whole Nation. I am told the Chattanooga suggestion resulted in an $80,000 savings to the Department. This record certainly can be attributed to no single individual, but rather is due to an efficient team of men and women obviously dedicated to providing the best service possible to the citizens of our area. A special presentation was to have been made to the employees of the Chattanooga post office but was withheld. Perhaps, it would have been embarrassing to give an award in one hand and a firing order in the other. To their considerable credit, the National League of Postmasters came strongly to the defense of Mr. Spence. They, too, are concerned about the implications of removing postmasters without sufficient cause.

Mr. Speaker, Postmaster Spence will appeal the decision through the normal civil service procedure, as is his right. I am confident the case will be judged on its merits without regard to politics. But for us as legislators the challenge is clear; we cannot permit the Nation's civil service to become subject to political abuse for any reason, by any person. We must encourage qualified individuals to serve their country in the Federal employ; we must build a cadre of intelligent and dedicated public servants, divorced from the politics of the day.

I feel it incumbent upon me to call the House's attention to this matter in hopes my colleagues will be increasingly alert to the misuse of the civil service by those in positions of high authority. Only through constructive criticism can we improve our Federal Government.

Slow Flight in a Peace Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my own firm belief that aviation leaders in this country must concentrate more research and engineering on how to fly airplanes slower. I am also convinced that these smaller, slower aircraft can be a major tool in exporting American know-how and political stability to remote, developing areas of the world.

Detailed remarks were presented by me to the joint convention of several aviation associations in Long Beach, Calif., last December 3. Because of the great interest in these remarks, I include them in the official RECORD of this body so they may be easily available to all Members and the public:

During the last session of Congress, a veritable "bombshell" exploded with the Federal Aviation Agency directive to close a number of the flight service stations. This directive brought into action one of the best coordinated and most unified efforts on the part of the general aviation community that I have seen in a long time.

In a free society, it is always difficult to stir people into action and it is often said that few people get involved unless you tap their pocketbooks. Well, this directive must have hit the most sensitive nerve of the entire general aviation community because your response was tremendous.

Some of you have said you were pleased to see some Members of Congress with aviation backgrounds participating in the hearings. The success of our effort suggests that you have an increasing number of Congressmen and Senators who are pilots in their own right and a large group who find utilization of aircraft adds materially to the service of their districts. I only mention this to remind you there is an increasing awareness of the flexibility that only general aviation-type aircraft can provide.

Let me be the first to remind you, however, the responsibility for maintaining this capability must remain in your hands. You must continue to organize your legislative recommendations.

For years, the commercial and military aviation interests have been dominating the congressional scene and, I frankly submit, the considerations for general aviation demands have been totally inadequate in view of the rapid expansion and diversified use of this

type aircraft. This remark, of course, is not intended to discredit the commercial and military but simply to spell out some of the political facts of life.

The new, more flexible concept in flight service stations recommended by the FAA after the general aviation community objected, is a strong case in point. Flexibility in criteria to meet the rapidly changing general aviation needs has, in my judgment, been long overdue. Safety and service are almost synonymous, and maximum reliability of commercial schedules is entirely dependent upon adequate navigation and landing aids.

Now that our VOR installations—which were programed and justified on a basis of IFR needs—are nearly completed—I believe we should now direct our attention to programing navaids for VFR use, with emphasis on TVOR's and VHF/DF equipment appropriately installed throughout the country.

In planning criteria, the requirements for establishment of airport control towers should be more flexible so as to meet the safety needs of a specific airport without having to fight the numbers racket of 24,000 annual itinerant operations.

The combined station-tower is a good economic, effective facility that could be used to serve a lot of the smaller, less active airports. I also believe the criteria for putting in a combined station-tower, where we already have a manned station, should be something less demanding then the requirements for a new tower, where one has not been in operation before.

Further, I hope we can look forward to opening up our long-range radar systems to VFR general aviation use. With added communications provided, the direct radar steers from the center controller to a pilot in trouble could be a great boon to the safety in operations.

One of the major problems that must be resolved—if we are to expand general aviation—is to make it more desirable to retain and expand our community airport complex. Airports near communities are disappearing with increased land values and/or zoning restrictions. To protect airport operations so vitally necessary to our overall community growth, the general aviation community must organize a stronger effort to promote a well developed system of airports throughout our counties and States. Unless landing space is available, opportunities for industrial expansion will always be restricted. Further, we must look to the near future and the greatly expanded use of the helicopter for intracity, intercity commuter and commercial purposes.

The States working in cooperation with local units of government must exercise a role of leadership in developing an intrastate system of airports with an adequate program of finance—in addition to the national airport program—if we are to keep pace with the potential demands of the future.

These are but a few of the recommendations that I believe your organizations can make as we jointly work toward a more responsive balance in our aviation needs.

As we review the great technological and engineering achievements in the aviation and space programs over the past decade, we must applaud the great talents among the people responsible for these accomplishments. Also, we must recognize the tremendous contributions made to our communications and transportation systems throughout the world. The potential to benefit mankind is seemingly unlimited. Conversely, the potential to destroy mankind still remains as the most frightening thought of our time. It is to this end that I should like to address a few remarks.

Many of us in America with extensive aviation backgrounds have seen the general aviation fleet grow from a few small 40-horsepower Piper Cubs to our present-day equipment where business now recognizes the company aircraft as an indispensable tool in the promotion and expansion of their enterprises. The flexibility and general utility of nonscheduled aircraft has increased trade areas to be served and permits highly competent executives to expand their talents to regions heretofore considered to be inaccessible.

With this in mind and further recognizing the ultimate horizons available for development internationally, it would appear most appropriate that I challenge this great aviation organization to "take off your blinders" and recognize some of the international political facts of life. It is you who should reinventory your objectives and consider the current trends in directing our engineering talents, again, with a more realistic evaluation of the continuing political warfare throughout the world.

Every one of us in this room has a burning desire to achieve and maintain an everlasting peace, with justice under freedom in all corners of the globe. But who in the free world is naive enough to think we can expect to let down our guard with the constant threat of advancing subversive communism, a threat that demands our immediate and constant attention.

The moon shot, the astronauts' orbital flights, missiles, space weapons systems and platforms are programs familiar to all of us because they dominate the TV, radio, and news media as these programs and achievements are revealed to the public at large.

While these achievements are spectacular and worthy of the Nation's acclaim, I would like to reflect on a few thoughts that have come to my mind as I view the entire aviation picture. It is the duty and responsibility of those of us holding positions of political leadership to speak out if we feel a program is not sufficient or in keeping with the demands of the times.

I believe we are reaching a point in history where some serious questions need to be asked—questions relating to the proper development of aircraft and transportation systems designed to enhance our security posture in a troubled and rapidly changing world.

To illustrate my point, I will propound this question—hopefully to stimulate your thinking in the direction of the realistic political problems facing this Nation and our free world friends: Why are we spending so much time, money and talent heading for the moon and other planets when the major problems to be dealt with are here on earth and are primarily economic and political? The general response, obviously, would be to suggest that the moon project is an integral part of our defense effort, due to the engineering and technological advances associated with the program. No one chan argue this point.

For the past decade, there has been a predominence of concentration on programs to increase the speed of aircraft and space vehicles and now the FAA has under development the supersonic transport.

While I am not in disagreement with the need for maintaining our position of supersonic aeronautical leadership in the world, I am firmly convinced that not enough attention has been given to how slow we can fly an aircraft.

As interested participants of this convention, I think you should join me in calling for a complete reappraisal of our Nations' aeronautical objectives—strongly requesting that more research and engineering be concentrated in the slow-flight category.

As we look to improve the safety in operations of our aircraft what finer, more realistic program could be advocated?

Much has been done in this field but surely the surface has only been scratched. I recently visited the fine research program of Mississippi State University under the very capable direction of Dr. Joe Cornish. My friend and colleague, Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, has asked me to visit and evaluate their program. I became most enthusiastic over what I saw—concentrated research on slow flight. In discussing the progress of their program with Dr. Cornish, I asked, "What do you need to expedite the research effort?" He said, "Mr. CLAUSEN, we need brainpower and more engineering talents directed toward the slow-flight concept." He continued, "In this age of space and nuclear weaponry, all of the concentration of engineering talents are channeled toward the more spectacular defense and space requirements." In short, we cannot attract enough of our young engineers to enter the slow-flight field. Consequently, engineering breakthrough in this important field has not kept pace with other achievements."

Gentlemen, I believe this is a tragic mistake and must be corrected—not only because of our interests in safety, but also in the interest of our Nation's security. This brings me to my favorite topic of aviation education and the overwhelming demand to place a priority on including this important subject in our Nation's school systems.

We find ourselves firmly entrenched in the space age but a specific program to indoctrinate and orient our young people toward aviation at an early age is minimal to say the least. I have been told the Soviet Union far surpasses our efforts in this field.

I have long been an advocate of aviation education and flight training, where practicable in the schools of America. To this end, I have been working to establish programs for high schools and colleges in my congressional district and have formulated plans to expand this to schools in other parts of the country.

Under proper guidance and leadership, a program of this type could be the prime motivator for young students to direct, at an early age, their time, energies, and attention to the intrigue and fascinations of aeronautics and aeronautical enginering.

In order to accomplish this, however, I have concluded that a more dramatic demonstration of the need for concentration on slow flight is necessary. During my first term in the Congress, I have discussed my proposal with key members of the House Education and Aeronautics Subcommittees and have found them most receptive to the idea. In the coming session, I intend to ask the appropriate congressional subcommittee to consider aviation education as a part of our broad vocational education programs. We have driver training—why not flight training?

If I view the international situation in its proper perspective, I believe our greatest challenge lies in the earliest development of an economic, political, psychological and idealogical offensive that is designed to win the cold war and promote peace and freedom throughout the world. The United States must not only maintain her defense posture but must also implement her own peace offensive. In this rapidly changing world, a defense posture by itself is not enough. Many of you in this room, I am sure, are former athletes. Let me ask you, "How many ball games did you win by devoting all of your time and attention to defense strategy?" Let's face it, you didn't win unless you had a better offense.

The challenge to America and indeed the free world is really the development of an ideological offensive of our own. Some of this is already going on, but not enough.

Many of us in the Congress share this view and I predict you will see an implementation of this concept in the not too distant future.

One would ask, "What does slow flight and aviation safety have to do with the political problems of the world?" Again, I submit, the aircraft—rotary and fixed wing alike—

can potentially become our most effective vehicle as we move to establish our peace offensive. Why not load airplanes with Americans and other international advocates of freedom—all qualified and dedicated to the promotion of peace and freedom with justice, under law.

We need aircraft that will maximize the capabilities of these individuals and permit access to remote sections of the world. We must immediately export knowledge and know-how to the underdeveloped nations of the world.

With the overwhelming needs of the world and the staggering costs involved, it demands our consideration of the most effective and efficient means available, with prime emphasis on promoting self-sufficiency in the environment people live. The lack of adequate roads and tax sources or funds to build them, points to the need for expanded use of aircraft. But, financial restrictions also limit the size and quality of airports—pointing again clearly to the dramatic need for slow-flight aircraft.

We must continue to meet our military aviation needs, including the expanded requirement for guerrilla warfare and counter-insurgency, and we firmly agree that a totally superior military force is mandatory.

With this in mind, I would like to briefly present some of my ideas for meeting the Communist idealogical subversive forces in the many countries of the world. And, as well informed, dedicated aviation people, I am certain you will immediately see the exceptional role aircraft could play in expediting the basic objectives of my flying peace offensive.

During the past year, I have attended the regular State Department briefings available to Members of Congress. I studied all available material that I could get my hands on; I participated in study groups with some of my colleagues; I interviewed and exchanged ideas with people considered to be experts in their fields, including diplomats, ambassadors, military men, international lawyers, bankers, labor leaders, and economists, missionary volunteers as they returned from such stations as Laos, India, the Congo, Borneo, Brazil, Peru, Mexico, Central America—to name a few.

With this background, of information, I have joined some of my colleagues in promoting the Freedom Academy concept—a concept with a sole objective of winning the cold war—designed to take advantage of the unlimited material and human resource available in the private sector. A plan that places more emphasis in the private sector and less emphasis in the public sector as we advance this proven concept of foreign policy.

The U.S. Government, in its efforts to stem the Communist tide, has poured billions of dollars annually into military, economic, and technical aid to foreign nations.

Anyone who has followed international problems closely will immediately conclude that one of the fundamental problems is the absence of political stability. In my judgment, this is a result of an inadequate system of government. Compare any of these to the system of government we have been able to enjoy under this great Constitution of ours. A Federal system that provides a maximum opportunity for political participation by its electorate—a system that only functions at the will of the people or by consent of the governed.

Without question, these nations' greatest need is political aid—we must export knowledge and know-how in this vital field. This type of political aid could be made available to the present and future leaders of those nations who are currently living under the umbrella of our military and economic security.

A Freedom Academy could train such leaders in techniques for counteracting the propaganda of the Communists. These same leaders could be trained on how to transmit knowledge in behalf of legitimate constitutional government—freedom of thought, freedom of expression, freedom of economic opportunity, the right to assemble peaceably, full religious liberty, and other basics of a free society as opposed to a totalitarian state.

In California, the County Supervisors' Association has initiated an intern fellowship training program, financed through private capital, for young men interested in local government. With local government being virtually nonexistent in many countries, thereby restricting participation in a unit of government close to the people, I would urgently recommend that this program be expanded in our own country and further be included in the curriculum of the Freedom Academy. Consultation with city, county, and school district organizations throughout this great Nation would provide a large pool of information urgently needed in these developing nations.

Soviet trade and their tactics in political warfare is one of the chief weapons in the Communist arsenal. The Soviet economic offensive is being felt in all quarters of the world. The news is filled with rebellious activities—the most recent of which has been in Algeria, Egypt, Panama, Vietnam, the Congo, Laos, and Zanzibar. The Red Chinese are the instigators of much of this agitation.

We in America, must step up our offensive. The question arises—How? Should the Government do this? In my judgment, the Government is the least equipped to carry out a successful direct program because of limitations placed on it.

Government-to-government programs have failed miserably in foreign aid. The major talents of this country lie in the private sector.

In addition to current programs, I want to vigorously recommend that the leaders of our private enterprise system recognize a new responsibility of providing for our security. They must take the lead in projecting an idealogical offensive truly representative of our private enterprise system—it is they who are the most qualified to lead. The Congress might consider broadening the incentives to expedite the formation of such a program.

We must step up the people-to-people effort—an expansion designed to promote the joint venture concept between investors of our country and investors of interested developing nations.

We must rededicate ourselves to capitalist principles. Private enterprise is substantially better qualified than Government to sell capitalism abroad. Acts, not words, will counter communism. Many of our economic ideas and ideals can be exported.

One of our major problems is, of course, the problem of education. Many of our schools of business and public administration can help. The Agricultural Extension Service, which has worked so successfully in this country, could be implemented as we work to raise their educational facilities and their literacy rate.

The correspondence school idea should certainly be recommended as a program to promote worldwide education.

The many great service clubs operating internationally, such as the Rotary, Kiwanis, and Lions, can and must expand their sphere of influence.

The Boy and Girl Scouts of America, the 4-H Clubs, and the various church missionary volunteer programs are but a few of our great voluntary organizations dedicated to the improvement of our fellow men.

I spoke recently in Fort Worth, Tex., before the junior chamber of commerce. These young men can change the world if we have the program to properly channel their efforts.

Small business is a facet of American life that is devasting to the promoters of Soviet communism. The word "capitalism" is under worldwide attack. The words "small business" are the end of the rainbow for many millions of people. The fact that we, as a nation, have recognized small businesses as a vital part of our economic life and have shown governmental interest in them is revolutionary to the thinking of those who have condemned America as being materialistic and dominated by big business.

Nothing will appeal to people in distant lands more than to be brought face to face with the fact that small business is a vital part of America. We in the United States have a vast reservoir of ideas that for some reason have never really been tried. We must test and implement these ideas to find new solutions to old problems.

Voluntary agencies are as representative of American capitalism as any other contemporary institution. There are hundreds of trade associations here that might well apportion a part of their income to send businessmen abroad, without Government subsidy, to do a better job of interpreting and selling America.

There are many examples of voluntary agencies—from profit entity business, the supermarket organizations, nonprofit corporate associations, savings and loan associations, finance and managerial organizations are just a few examples of what can be done. If just a few more organizations would light their own candles, study the situation, and find where their members particular talents and resources fit, perhaps by their efforts world tensions could be considerably eased.

In the April 17 issue of Life magazine, former Ambassador to Vietnam, Henry Cabot Lodge, set forth, in a very forthright and provocative article, a detailed analysis of the problems facing the United States in southeast Asia.

Partially quoting Ambassador Lodge, he said, "We should be sure that we are making full use of the things in which we excel and in which the Communists are deficient.

"We cannot, as a general rule, surpass a young oriental guerrilla fighter, who doesn't mind the heat, who can get along on a daily handful of rice, and who can lie underwater for hours at a time, breathing through a straw.

"But we can do better in other things such as the use of airplanes, the art of medicine, improved farming and education, and the development of an energetic political system, based on justice."

It is to this end that I shall dedicate my efforts as I serve in the Congress of the United States.

The Great White Father Rides Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, with 3 days of top consideration on Appalachia it might be well at this time for Members to hear about another story of pockets of depression which have been in many respects created by the Federal Government and which, by and large, are now overlooked by the Federal Government because these people happen to be Indians and, because there are not too many Indians to vote in the United States, they are pushed aside by estab-

lishing another commission to study the problem.

I received a letter this week from Steve Quitta, of the Economic Development Committee of the Yankton Sioux Reservation, which, incidentally, is an open reservation in South Dakota and where there is a pocket of poverty that ARA started out to assist, but after having brought up their hopes and aspirations, dropped them like a hot potato.

I am placing this in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, because it is well written, it is interesting, and it paints a picture much more in need of attention than the Appalachian area, although it does not have the votes.

The letter dated February 24, 1965, is as follows:

THE GREAT WHITE FATHER RIDES AGAIN, OR WHAT'S ANOTHER BROKEN PROMISE TO THE REDSKINS

In the manner of the old "Wakakans'a" (Sioux Indian storyteller), in the "Moon of Planting" (May 1964), an invitation to attend a meeting of the tribal council, Bureau officials, State employment supervisors, and Area Redevelopment Administration officials was extended to those people interested in various training projects for the Yankton Sioux Indian people. Unemployment and industrial development were the main items of discussion. Since training programs for Indian arts and crafts were being conducted on many of the other reservations at this time, the possibility of such training for the Yankton Reservation was brought up. The point stressed most emphatically by the ARA representative was the necessity of economic justification for any training under this program. I could not be in more complete agreement with such a stipulation in any governmental program.

From May until July 9, justification of arts and crafts training for the Yankton Sioux Reservation was discussed and evaluated by the tribal authorities, local Indian people, businessmen, and trained crafts people in this area. During this time prototypes of craft items to be made in such a training program were constructed by competent craftsmen in our school shop department and by Indian sisters trained in beadwork and allied arts. An evaluative breakdown was made of each proposed article to be made and sold. Potential sales appeal, the cost of materials, packaging, overhead, labor, and suggested retail prices were factors figured. The fields of craft to be covered in this training would be beadwork, pottery, leather, weaving, and embroidery. The results of the study indicated that the needs of supplemental income for families on the reservation could be obtained through home-produced craft items if training could be had. This factor plus committed marketing outlets gave the green light to justification and the tribe made application for this program on July 9.

In order to further assist in the success of our program, a tour was made to various other reservations to observe their arts and crafts training classes. Allow me to comment on these:

Fort Thompson, S. Dak.: Training was being given in beadwork only. Marketing outlet: local people and tourists.

Wakpala, S. Dak.: The second training class was in progress and only beadwork was being taught. Marketing outlet: local people and the craft shop at Fort Yates.

Fort Yates, N. Dak.: Training had been given in beadwork only. Marketing outlet: the craft shop in the tribal building.

Fort Totten, N. Dak.: No craft training program at that time. ARA training had been given in carpentry. Craft shop maintained in the fort square. Ironically, the majority of Indian craft items for sale were made in Hong Kong.

Turtle Mountain Reservation, N. Dak.: The second class in progress for training in beadwork and other craft fields for Chippewayan Authentics production. It is rumored that the beadwork items planned are not salable and people trained in such could not be employed.

Fort Peck, Mont.: No training class but plans for building a $60,000 craft shop, museum, and restaurant using ARA funds was in progress.

Rocky Boy Reservation, Mont.: No training class. Beadwork marketed through the local Lutheran and Catholic missionary. Incidentally, the quality of beadwork by the Rocky Boy people was the best of such work seen.

Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak.: One training class in progress. Marketing outlet: the Lakota Craft Shop maintained by the tribe.

Examples of the items we planned to produce were taken along on this trip to determine the sales appeal and establish additional outlets for same. At present we have committed outlets at Pipestone, Minn.; Bismarck, N. Dak.; Aberdeen, Pierre, Rapid City, Pickstown, Marty, and Yankton, S. Dak. At this very moment a contract with Fort Yankton to sell all the Indian craft items we can produce is begging to be signed. The manager is emphatic in his desire to sell only Indian-made goods and not the imported variety and so it seems that another tourist season will pass and the profits of such trade will be taken from our Indians to be sent abroad to the needy of Hong Kong.

By the end of September, with not one word of action received on the tribe's application, inquiry was made to the South Dakota Department of Vocational Education for this agency was in authority over the training curriculum and it seems the bottleneck on approval rested here at this point. A budget and training outline was requested by this department and so this information was compiled and returned within a week's time.

The Moon of the Falling Leaf (October) passed with no word.

The Moon of the Beaver (November) passed with no word.

At this time an appeal was made to the Area Redevelopment Administration for information. The representative from Bismarck, N. Dak., informed us that a survey team was visiting various reservations to to evaluate the arts and crafts program, for it seems that too many programs had been held without justifiable results. This was good news and we informed the representative we would welcome such a survey and would be looking forward to meeting this team. Needless to say, no such evaluation committee ever came to the Yankton Reservation.

The Moon of the Long Night (December) was passing and on December 21 word was received from the State employment security department that our request for ARA training had passed the State requirements and a strong recomendation from that department, as well as the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Wagner, S. Dak., for approval and funds had been sent to Kansas City. A tentative starting date of February 1 had been set and we were informed that we could begin selection of trainees.

The day after this letter was received, December 22, the tribal council met and the decision was made to have a selection committee made up of one Indian representative from the five community districts that make up the reservation area. The news of the training program was publicized through the local papers and radio media. Application forms were made up by the committee and given or mailed to all interested persons. One of the questions on the application form was, "In your own words explain why you think this training will benefit you and your family?' Allow me to quote a few of the applicants' responses to this question.

"After finishing the training it would mean extra income in my spare time and also I could teach it to my children."

"I believe this type of training in an Indian family will be of great importance. It will enable me to make some money and most of all to know a trade of our first Americans."

"Due to my age and the size of my family I cannot take advantage of other opportunities such as vocational training and relocation, and a trade to me will help supplement my income, as I intend to make articles after my training to sell in support of my family."

"I think this training will benefit my family and I in the following ways. First, it is an opportunity for me to learn a skill in Indian crafts. Secondly, it will enable me to participate in a program which, I hope, will eventually develop a self-supporting Yankton Sioux Tribe. Also it will bring some income to my family."

After the deadline for applications had passed, the selection committee met, established a criteria for selecting the trainees and spent 3 full days fulfilling this difficult assignment. Please bear in mind that this hard problem of selection was done completely by Indians alone. Their dedication to this task, their thoroughness and fairness was very edifying.

After the selection was made, the trainees were called to a meeting to explain the details of the program to the extent of the information we possessed. All 20 trainees came to the meeting and their enthusiasm was gratifying. All were waiting in expectation of February.

Yes, February. Quite appropriately named the "Moon of Hunger." With each passing day I have been besieged by these Indian people with this one question, "Is this arts and crafts training program to be like so many of the other governmental benefits the Yanktons apply for but in time seem to vanish like the buffalo?" How can I answer these people? How would you answer these people?

From July until this very date there has been no individual, other than the personnel from the subagency in Wagner, from either the State or Federal level to come to Marty to observe and evaluate the products and planning that has gone into this particular training program. All correspondence, all personal contacts, all attempts to obtain information and action has originated from the reservation—never to the reservation.

The Area Redevelopment Administration was set up for a highly worthy purpose and is one of the major Government weapons in the war against poverty. We are in complete agreement with its principal precept of "economic justification" before funds may be appropriated. We are also aware of notable abuses of this precept in such cases as the ski resort at Sandpoint, Idaho, the resort at Lake Eufauls in Oklahoma, and the luxury motel at Woodville, Tex.

The Yankton Sioux Reservation is a small, but very real pocket of poverty. What the approval for this justifiable training would have meant for a people beaten down with the failure of repeated projects to materialize, I believe I can guess. It would have meant a rejuvenation of spirit and initiative. It would have meant a chance for the fruits of ancestral skills and arts to be brought back to life and placed before the eyes and in the homes of the American people who tend to so easily forget the "lost" but not "vanishing" first American. It could have meant a chance to keep faith with the Great White Father.

Will you keep faith with our Yankton Sioux and try to help us in whatever way your authority and your heart allows?

Under separate cover we are sending you one of the items we had planned to produce

in this training program. Please accept it as a gift of Indian labor and love.

Respectfully yours,

STEVE QUITTA.

AEC's Guaranteed Purchase Prices for Plutonium and Uranium 233

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report on actions taken recently by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am the chairman, with respect to guaranteed purchase prices for plutonium and uranium enriched in the isotope 233.

Under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended last summer by the Private Ownership of Special Nuclear Materials Act, the AEC is directed to establish guaranteed purchase prices for these materials. These prices, and the guaranteed purchase price period for U^{233}, cannot become effective until they have been submitted to the Joint Committee and have lain before it for a statutory 45-day waiting period while Congress is in session.

By letter dated January 18, 1965, the AEC submitted proposed guaranteed purchase prices for plutonium and U^{233}, a guaranteed purchase price period for U^{233}, and criteria for determining when these materials are "produced through the use of special nuclear material leased or sold" by AEC. The Joint Committee announced this submission on January 29, 1965, and stated that a public hearing would be held on it.

On February 10, 1965, the Joint Committee held an open hearing on AEC's proposal, at which the AEC testified and answered questions raised by the Joint Committee. At that hearing, it was announced that the Joint Committee wished to place as much evidence as possible concerning AEC's proposal in the public record early in the 45-day waiting period. We further announced that the record of the hearing would be held open for 2 weeks, until February 24, to give interested persons an opportunity to present comments. News of these actions was widely publicized in the trade press.

By February 24, the Joint Committee had received one comment, a letter dated February 23, 1965, from the General Atomic Division of General Dynamics Corp. This letter made suggestions concerning the U^{233} price, and was referred to the AEC for comment. The AEC replied by letter of March 2, 1965.

The 45-day waiting period required by the statute expired on March 4. During that period the Joint Committee reviewed AEC's proposal, and took the steps outlined above to promote adequate public awareness of this matter. On the basis of this review, we believe that AEC's proposal of January 18, 1965, appropriately implements the intent of Congress in passing the Private Ownership of Special Nuclear Materials Act.

California Legislature Speaks Out on Reapportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as we are all aware, many of the areas of our Nation are concerned greatly over the impact on our own State legislatures, as a result of the Supreme Court decision relative to apportionment, the so-called one-man, one-vote decision.

Along with several of my colleagues, I have introduced a House joint resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to permit the continuation of the federal system of government in our State legislatures by declaring that the equal representation provisions of the Constitution will be met if one house of a bicameral State legislature is apportioned on a population basis. As a member of the steering committee of the sponsors of this legislation, I am very pleased to have the full support of my own California State Legislature in this effort. The California State Legislature is apportioned in much the same manner as is the U.S. Congress with one house, the assembly, apportioned on the basis of population and the other house, the senate, on other factors, including geography, being considered as well as population.

I am very pleased to advise the Congress that last month the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California adopted by an overwhelming majority State Senate Joint Resolution 3, relative to legislative apportionment. This provides for a constitutional amendment, which I would fully endorse, much along the lines envisioned by those of us who have sponsored legislation and are advocating the approval of the discharge petition to bring to the floor of the House of Representatives the issue so that the Members of this body may have an opportunity to express their views on such a proposal in a timely fashion.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 3:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

Resolution relative to to legislative apportionment

Whereas the U.S. Supreme Court has held that both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population; and

Whereas it will now be totally impossible to apportion representation to reflect the diverse and conflicting interests within a State; and

Whereas, California's present apportionment unduly deprives urban areas of adequate representation in the State senate, nevertheless the Court's decision will enable heavily populated areas to dominate State legislatures, and will lead to a virtual loss of representation in all other areas of the State; and

Whereas in order to prevent this complete disruption of the legislative process in the States, and to preserve for each State the right to balance its representation in the manner best suited to its individual situation, it is essential that the Constitution of the United States be amended to enable the State to apportion one house of is legislature on factors other than population: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That they respectfully request the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in accordance with the provisions of article V thereof, to add an article providing that—

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Nothing in the Constitution of the United States shall prohibit any State, which has a bicameral legislature, from apportioning the membership of one house of its legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment be submitted to a vote of all of the people of the State at an election in which the franchise is not denied on the basis of race, creed, or color and resubmitted to a vote of all of the people of the State, prior to the implementation of the apportionment plan, and at regular intervals not to exceed 10 years."

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Retirement of Frank P. Briggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the retirement from this city of an outstanding and dedicated public servant.

When Frank P. Briggs left Washington once again to become a working member of the fourth estate on his newspaper at Macon, Mo., our Government lost a dedicated and capable leader. The former Assistant Secretary of the Interior will be missed by his fellow workers and all of us who knew him well and were aware of his diligent performance of his duties for our country.

Mr. Briggs is returning to the Macon Chronicle-Herald of which he has been publisher and owner since 1924. The name of Frank Briggs has long been synonymous with topflight journalism. His paper has always been a model by which others have been patterned down through the years.

Mr. Briggs has led a long and colorful political career. He served 2 years in the U.S. Senate, being appointed in January 1945, to fill the vacancy created when Senator Harry S. Truman resigned to become Vice President. He was mayor of the city of Macon from 1930 to 1933. A member of the Missouri State Senate from 1933 to 1945 and president of that body from 1941 to 1945. He has been Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife since March 1961. He formerly served as a member of the Missouri Conservation Commission.

The illustrious journalist is a graduate of Central College and the School of

Journalism at the University of Missouri. Before acquiring the Macon paper, he served as editor of papers in Fayette, Moberly, and Trenton, Mo.; and in Shawnee, Okla. In 1958, he received the Distinguished Public Service Award from Missouri University's School of Journalism; is a member of Sigma Delta Chi, journalism fraternity; was grand master of Missouri A.F. & A.M., 1957–58; and is a member of the Elks, Rotarians, and the National Press Club in Washington, D.C.

We may sincerely say that the Government's loss is journalism's gain.

District Home Rule Measures Proliferate—Study Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, all of us interested in the welfare and development of the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital, are aware some form of home rule is desirable not only for the people who live here but for the country as a whole. Nevertheless, the number of home rule bills introduced in this session indicates there is still no unified approach. There are still many legitimate questions needing to be answered before congressional action is taken.

We must be sure that the final home rule bill is one satisfactory to the people of Washington, to Congress, and in conformity with provisions laid down in our Constitution. For these reasons, I believe a further study is necessary and justified.

Therefore, I am today introducing a bill to set up a joint select committee to study the problem of local self-government for Washington, D.C. The committee, consisting of five Senators and Members of the House, would be authorized to determine a proper form of local self-government and report its findings to Congress by August 1. No more than three Members from either body would be of the same party.

I request that my bill, H.R. 5880, be inserted at this point in my remarks.

H.R. 5880

A bill authorizing an appropriation to provide for the expenses of a joint select committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to study the problem of local self-government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the sum of $50,000 is authorized to be appropriated out of the money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated in full for the following expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; namely:

That a joint select committee shall be appointed consisting of five Senators, no more than three of whom shall be of the same party, to be named by the Presiding Officer of the Senate and five Members of the House, no more than three of whom shall be of the same party, to be named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, whose duty it shall be to study the question of local self-government for the District of Columbia and to prepare and submit to Congress a statement of the proper form of local self-government for the District of Columbia, together with the reasons upon which their conclusions may be based, and, in discharge of the duty hereby imposed, said committee is authorized to employ such assistance as it may deem advisable at an expense not to exceed the sum of $50,000; and said sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be and the same is hereby authorized to be appropriated for that purpose: *Provided,* That the report of said committee shall be submitted to the Congress not later than the 1st day of August 1965.

Cotton and the U.S. Balance-of-Payments Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, the President of the United States submitted to the Congress a special message containing proposals for solution of our unfavorable balance-of-payments position. The balance-of-payments problem in the United States has been a persistent one. Although it has improved somewhat in the last 3 years, the deficit in 1964 stood at $3 billion and, because of developments in the last quarter of the year, was substantially above the anticipated level. The fourth quarter deficit alone was over $1.5 billion.

I do not propose in this statement to analyze our balance-of-payments problem or to discuss in detail various measures proposed by the President in his message to resolve it. I want rather to focus attention on one issue: the fact that our present Government programs for cotton have prevented us from inceasing our commercial exports of cotton and have, as a result, denied us an important and sizable contribution to the solution of our balance-of-payments problem. If solution of our balance-of-payments problem. If we had a cotton program attuned to economic realities, there is no reason in the world why we should not be exporting—for payment in dollars—$500 million more each year. This alone would make a contribution greater in size than a number of the proposals advanced in the President's message. Moreover, it would do so by expanding trade and would reduce the need to rely on measures that are restrictive.

If U.S. cotton could obtain a reasonable share of the world market—a share that we have traditionally supplied—we could in the case of this single key export commodity strike continuing and telling blows against our payments deficit. Unfortunately, the U.S. Government program for cotton drives it into storage at the taxpayer's expense instead of encouraging it into trade channels, including the all-important export market. This results from the fact that our program involves loans to producers at above-the-market prices. The effect, of course, is to peg our cotton at predictable prices. As long as prices are thus established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture instead of in the market, our cotton competitors abroad know in advance what our prices will be. The result has been that we have become residual suppliers in markets that have been growing and for which we were at one time the chief suppliers.

Foreign cotton production has more than doubled over the past 30 years while output in the United States has continued at about the same level. Production in foreign countries has been increasing year after year to meet rising demand abroad while we have continued actually to lose markets—markets in whose growth we formerly shared.

Our exports of cotton during the post-World War II years have averaged little more than half of what they were for the 20 years before the war.

Mr. M. K. Horne, Jr., chief economist of the National Cotton Council of America, recently summed up our cotton export position in an admirable paper delivered to delegate members of the council at Houston, Tex., on January 25. If we are serious about staying in cotton, says Mr. Horne, there has to be some kind of basic change for the better in the export market.

He points out that if we had shared in the growth of the free foreign world market for cotton since the late fifties, our exports would now be at 7 million bales instead of a prospective 4.2 million for the current marketing year which ends next July 31. By exporting 7 million instead of only 4.2 million bales in the current year, we could reduce our international payments deficit approximately $350 million.

There is only one way of getting our cotton back into competition, and that is by meeting competitive prices—which, as Mr. Horne points out, "only can be done in a free market."

There is the nub of the matter. We no longer have a free market in cotton despite the fact that it is historically our most important agricultural export. We have instead an above-the-market loan program which drives our cotton into Government warehouses. This is asking cotton to bear an unusual burden. We have a price-supporting producer's loan for feed grains, but it is well below the level of the market, and does not interfere with the movement of grains into the channels of trade. We sell many millions of bushels of corn, grain sorghum, barley, and oats around the world. The producer of feed grains is compensated, in addition to the loan, by direct payments to make up a total fair price for his labor and investment. We also have a price-supporting loan for soybeans, but it is well below the level at which our soybeans are being sold in great quantities around the world. Soybeans move freely in world markets and are being traded today on our commodity markets in the liveliest fashion. We have a special

wheat program with a price-support loan, but, again, it is a loan which is below the level of the world market. We do not allow the wheat loan to obstruct our exports, as in the case of cotton, and wheat growers realize fair prices through the certificate plan.

It is vitally important that we free the cotton market and get our fiber back into the channels of trade. As Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, then Senator HUMPHREY, said in the Senate last August 18:

Export markets are vital to the American farmer. * * * If we are going to maximize our exports—which is a matter of interest to our country—to the Common Market and to the other areas of the world, we must offer, as I have said, the best quality at competitive prices. There is no substitute for price and quality when it comes to competing for commercial markets abroad. Therefore, every policy that we pursue must be to try to strengthen what we call the operation of the market—including the market price.

Then Mr. HUMPHREY went on:

I want to make my position clear: I do not believe Government programs ought to supersede the operation of our normal markets. Government programs should be designed not to supplant but to supplement; not to take over but to assist; not to move in as a competitive force, but to make competition more just and to make it more effective for the farm producer and for the Nation.

What Mr. HUMPHREY said last August should not be done is precisely what our Government has been doing in the case of cotton for some 30 years—with the loss of exports and the mounting international payments difficulties that have been described. Although it was hard to conceive of the cotton mess becoming worse, that is exactly what has happened since the passage of the new cotton law which took effect last season and will continue in effect throughout the coming season—and perhaps will be extended beyond that, unless we take firm action to prevent it.

What has happened under the new law?

U.S. cotton exports are today running at a rate some 40 percent less than last year. Government stocks continue to accumulate and promise by next August 1 to approach the previous alltime high of some 14½ million bales—the equal of almost 1 year's production. Interest and warehouse charges alone on the Government's inventory and loan stocks of cotton are in excess of $100 million annually, or some $274,000 every day of the year.

When the current cotton program was authorized, Congress was told that its first-year cost would be $481 million. Instead, it now appears likely that the first-year cost will be between $850 million and $1 billion. Yet the total value of the annual American cotton crop, excluding seed products, is about $2.25 billion, so our current cotton legislation is costing more than one-third the value of the entire crop.

Meantime, our cotton exchanges are dying. The New Orleans exchange suspended operations last year. Trading volume on the New York Cotton Exchange last year reached the lowest point in the 94 years of its history: less than a million bales were traded. This year less than a quarter million bales will be traded, based on current estimates.

In his August 18 speech, Mr. HUMPHREY had this to say of the importance of commodity exchanges:

Futures trading on commodity exchanges developed as a highly effective form of free market trading and competitive pricing because it grew up with, and proved adaptable to, our other free institutions—

He said:

It became an integral part of agricultural marketing because it focused supply and demand forces into a central price picture for one and all to see, because trading was conducted openly, and because anyone with the wherewithal to trade could participate in the market, and in the pricemaking process.

Finally, Mr. HUMPHREY asked a key question concerning our agricultural programs generally that carries particular force in the case of cotton. After observing that the American people have a multibillion-dollar investment in inventories of a relatively few agricultural commodities, he said:

Fundamentally, we must ask ourselves whether the present programs boost our opportunities to increase efficient production and at the same time expand profitable markets here and abroad. We should reexamine our entire governmental control mechanism to see whether it is helping us to develop a rational agricultural policy. It is time the Congress asked for a complete examination of the commodity program structure.

I agree most heartily with Mr. HUMPHREY that it is time for Congress to examine the commodity program structure, and I suggest that cotton is the obvious place to begin. Among other reasons we should begin with cotton, it seems to me, is that it is the commodity with which we can move most quickly toward substantially larger markets abroad, and, therefore, toward an improved balance-of-payments position. Cotton is a volatile market that can expand or contract substantially in a short period of time. Cotton is not a product the importation of which is restricted by our major customers—if we do not export cotton, it is our own fault.

How, then, can we bring cotton back onto the world market? The solution is not difficult. The first requisite is to eliminate or reduce price-support loans to producers to levels that will restore cotton to the channels of trade, and allow it to compete freely with foreign fiber. Certainly, however, the producer should not be penalized. Consequently, a step to be taken simultaneously with reduction or elimination of the loan rate is to provide for direct or compensatory payments to producers that will bring them fair returns for their labor and investment. Compensatory payments, of course, do not interfere with the movement of cotton through trade channels and allow the market free play. Moreover, our cotton textile industry will continue to be able to buy cotton at world market prices.

If we enact legislation along these lines, the cotton futures markets will again perform their normal function, cotton will move in the channels of trade instead of into Government storage, and cotton stocks will be inventoried by merchants and mills rather than by the taxpayer. The overall cost of our cotton program will be reduced. Finally, cotton exports will increase and thus bolster our balance-of-payments position. With this program for cotton I think it is not too optimistic to suppose that additional exports of this one commodity could reduce our international payments deficit by some $500 million on an annual basis—and perhaps more than that.

A Tribute to the Leadership of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on Its 100th Anniversary

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the 100th anniversary of our Committee on Appropriations, which we are observing this year, is an appropriate occasion for some reflection on what has transpired in the past and what is involved in the congressional responsibility for funding Federal programs today and in the future.

A stimulating and enlightening source of reference on this subject is the speech that was given on this floor recently by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON, the gentleman from Texas.

Chairman MAHON's address not only contains an illuminating review of the history of the committee which he so ably heads but also provides wise counsel with respect to the appropriations function.

The text of this important speech will be found on pages 3863–3867 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 2, 1965. I commend it to the thoughtful reading of all Members of the Congress and others.

The Committee on Appropriations of the House has had 24 chairmen, including our present chairman, since it was established as a standing committee of the House on March 2, 1865. This list of chairmen is a roster of names that stand out in American history.

One of the famous men in this group was James A. Garfield, who went from his seat in the House to the office of President of the United States in 1881.

Another who served as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was Joseph Cannon, of Illinois, the powerful Speaker of the House early in this century.

My own State of Tennessee takes enduring pride in the fact that two of her illustrious sons served as chairman of this committee in the House—one in recent times and the other in the last century.

The late Joseph W. Byrns, of Nashville, served as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House in the 72d Congress. He was a Member of the House through 14 terms. He was the majority leader of the House in the 73d Congress, the Speaker of the House in the 74th Congress, and was standing for reelection to the House for the 75th Congress at the time of his death in 1936.

Another Tennessean, John D. C. Atkins, served as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations when the committee was in the second decade of its existence. He served one term in the House before the Civil War and returned in 1873 to serve five more terms.

The late Senator Kenneth D. McKellar, of Tennessee, who was a member of the House before his election to the U.S. Senate in 1916, served for many years as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

It has been my great privilege and honor to serve as a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House under the inspiring leadership of two of its ablest and most dedicated chairmen—the late Honorable Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, and Hon. GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, our present chairman.

In observing the centenary of this important committee, it is right and proper that we should pay particular tribute to the men who bear and have borne the principal responsibility for the success of the vital Federal funding process.

From my own experience as a member of this committee over the years, I know that the chairman deserves much more recognition and credit than he is ever likely to receive.

The Committee on Appropriations has the reputation of being the hardest working committee of the Congress. It must carefully screen every one of the countless items in our Government's voluminous money bills. This entails exhaustive studies, investigations, hearings, analyses, and reports. It involves work that is always exacting and can often be tedious. But the members of this committee serve with enthusiasm, and with pride and satisfaction in the knowledge that they are helping to strengthen, develop, and build up our country.

In this period, with annual Federal expenditures climbing ever closer to the $100 billion level, the burdens of the chairman of our Committee on Appropriations have been increasingly heavy.

We are in a time of unparalleled change and growth, with our domestic needs and foreign commitments placing unprecedented demands on our Federal Treasury.

Congress has provided the money needed for massive programs to assure our military superiority and our leadership in space and science, as well as the funds required for other essential services and programs for our rapidly expanding country.

This upward trend in Government costs increases the need for vigilance against waste and extravangance in Federal appropriations, and for the practice of true and sound economy.

The Committee on Appropriations, which is invested by the Constitution with the original responsibility for all Federal funding measures, has not neglected this aspect of its primary function. Millions and billions of dollars have been saved for the American taxpayers through budgetary cuts and mammoth economies effected by this committee in recent years.

The steadily mounting workload places greater demands on the chairman's skill and judgment, on his knowledge of men and institutions, on his energy and devotion, and on his patience and persistence.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is the man chiefly responsible for maintaining the committee's traditional hard-working habits and building up its esprit de corps.

His job requires heightened concentration on wise and prudent practices and measures, on teamwork, competence and dedication.

In short, the direction of this committee composed of 50 members and a dozen subcommittees, responsible for reporting the funding of all the vastly complex operations of our Federal Government while also fostering economies in Government, is a monumental task.

Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, managed this challenging job with notable success through nearly 19 years.

Chairman MAHON serves in the very highest traditions of the committee, the House, the Congress, and the Nation.

It is true that our appropriation system has been greatly improved by the changes in budgeting and funding practices that have been made in the 100 years since the Committee on Appropriations of the House was created.

While giving credit to ideas that have improved the appropriations process, let us also acknowledge the enormous contribution to American security and progress which has been made by the patriotic, knowledgeable and dedicated men mainly responsible for making this system work so well—our great chairman and the hard-working men of the Congress—my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations.

During this century, the House has evolved a system that has worked effectively under severe testing. "Contemporary arrangements for legislative disposition of the vital money function are as objective and unbiased as could be devised," as Chairman MAHON has stated.

Under the able leadership of our present chairman—Hon. GEORGE MAHON, the gentleman from Texas—our country can count on the appropriations decisions needed to keep this Nation strong, secure, and moving forward.

Urges U.S. Agency To Direct Oceanography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Coast Industry & Electronic News has published an article outlining the efforts being made by the gentleman from California, Congressman BOB WILSON, in behalf of streamlining and expediting the various aspects of oceanographic research by our Government.

BOB WILSON's approach to this matter is sound. He is quite familiar with the work being done in this area and is fortunate to represent a congressional district in which a great deal of oceanographic research is carried out.

I am including as part of my remarks the material from the Pacific Coast Industry & Electronic News:

WILSON URGES U.S. AGENCY TO DIRECT OCEANOGRAPHY

Representative BOB WILSON, Republican, of San Diego, has urged establishment of a National Oceanographic Agency and has introduced a bill calling for the formation of such a group.

"I am proposing," WILSON said in a recent talk on this subject, "that we set up a Federal agency to administer oceanography and related sciences, including meteorology. The Soviet Union is engaging in an intensive program of studying the undersea world. In the race for survival between communism and the free world, our future may well depend on our being the first to discover means of tapping the vast riches of the sea."

He pointed out that the Federal Council for Science and Technology has prepared a study of current Government oceanography efforts.

"There are eight Federal agencies involved in various aspects of oceanographic research. Their activities include development of new vessels, studies of undersea environment, currents, fish life, and a host of other related reesarch activities," he said.

"It is only logical and good sense to bring these activities together under a coordinated, less wasteful program. We will save money by avoiding duplication of effort. We will get a fine return for the taxpayers through the discovery of vast new sources of wealth. We will bolster national security by meeting the Soviet undersea military activity head on with full preparedness for underwater defense," Congressman WILSON added.

WILSON said that the proposed agency would function in much the same manner as the National Astronautics and Space Agency, or the Federal Aviation Agency.

"Space research," Congressman WILSON declared, "has been justified as being necessary for defense. The oceans are our present first line of defense. Polaris submarines prowl the seven seas as deterrents to aggression by sneak attack.

"We also need more knowledge about underesa currents. We need mapping of undersea hazards, and the location of undersea wealth. There is much to be done to assure an orderly maximum harvesting of the tremendous, renewable fisheries resources of the oceans. Our weather prognostication would benefit by full knowledge of oceanic effects on the climate of adjoining lands.

"We are working in various ways on oceanography. There are many private institutions and commercial interests who have discovered its importance and are devoting great efforts to unravel some of the mysteries of the sea.

"We in the Congress have the responsibility of seeing to it that the United States does not have an 'oceanography gap.' It is as important to our future welfare to advance this science as to conquer space. We are now in the field of oceanography where we were in space a decade ago. Much is being done, but the program lacks coordination and leadership."

Congressman WILSON pointed out that both Lockhead and Convair are interested in oceanography and have San Diego divisions active in this field.

"Many aircraft manufacturers recognize that oceanography is a new science, a new area that offers great potential for the aircraft industry," he continued, "I believe that increased activity in oceanography holds a great potential for the San Diego area. Certainly we are one of the leading oceanographical research areas in the nation today, through having Scripps, the Sonar School, NEL, the Mission Bay Research Foundation, and all our other oceanographic-oriented activities. I believe that creation of a National Oceanographic Agency will result in more jobs in the San Diego area, as well as more jobs for the entire Nation."

Pay Dirt for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in many cases we find the people are way out in front of Congress and political leaders in analyzing current issues. The proponents of the Great Society, the antipoverty program and the Appalachia bill would have you believe that the people in areas about to receive Federal funds are panting to have all the big spending programs adopted.

If you could read my mail, many of you would be surprised at the opposition to Federal programs from my district, which certainly has its share of poverty. The difference is that Alabamians are proud of their pioneer stock. We have built a great and wonderful State through the efforts of individuals and by the sweat and toil of our people doing their best to bequeath to their posterity a better State, a better Nation, a better world.

We will lick poverty in Alabama and we will continue to strive for a better standard of living for all our people and we will do it on our own if the rest of the States will also accept their responsibilities so that we can cut heavy Federal spending and leave more of the people's money in the States and in the pockets of the people.

Some idea of the feeling of the people of the Seventh District of Alabama may be had from the following editorial on the passing of the Appalachia bill. The editorial appeared in my hometown newspaper, the Gadsden Times on March 3, 1965. I proudly include it as a part of these remarks:

PAY DIRT FOR ALL

If the Federal Government must spend money just for the sake of spending, it would seem that Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida, has come up with a more sensible approach to President Johnson's $1.1 billion Appalachia bill.

His idea is to create machinery for Federal aid to impoverished regions anywhere in the country—not just the economically depressed area stretching through 11 States from Pennsylvania to Alabama.

As a matter of fact, there are certainly other empty-stomach regions in the United States than just the territory the President has singled out. If you're going to help some Americans what about the others? And that is the very thinking of some who want to spread the butter thinner. Representative ROBERT C. MCEWEN, of New York, for instance, has pressed for an amendment to name 11 New York eastern and northern counties for inclusion in the measure.

Of course, the Cramer amendment will be defeated, as it should be. But just as distasteful is the Appalachia proposal, if not more so.

It is a Johnson administration's political plum and there's every chance of its passing the House where it came following a favorable reception in the Senate.

Unfortunate as it may be, Uncle Sam and the Great Society are members of a big family, and from the way Government thinking is going—and how it is being received—it will no doubt be a growing family.

Attack on Water Pollution Is Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial on the need for a strong, Federal program for water pollution control that appeared in the March 5, 1965, issue of the New York Times:

NOR ANY DROP TO DRINK

The size and urgency of the need to clean up the Nation's rivers makes the pending antipollution bill obsolete before it is even enacted into law.

The bill passed by the Senate on January 28 and now under consideration in a House committee is all right as far as it goes—but it does not go nearly far enough. Reports by Gladwin Hill in this newspaper in recent days describe in vivid detail how the Nation's waters are already befouled. Rivers that were once clean and sparkling are stinking open sewers, unsafe for swimming, unfit for drinking, their natural biological balance destroyed, waterfoul vanished, fish dead or dying.

This bill as written has two gross defects. It does not lift the present scale of $100 million a year in Federal spending. Only the Federal Government has the tax resources to finance the massive cleanup operation that is now needed. A billion dollars, a tenfold increase, is required. Without dollars to back it up, much of the pending bill, like law already on the books, is dead verbiage.

Second, the bill empowers the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set water quality standards for interstate rivers, but it does not provide any important new enforcement powers. The present procedure, which would be continued, provides for study and research, a conference with the offending parties, a public hearing and, if necessary, a lawsuit to compel compliance. Leaving aside the time required for preliminary investigation—and some Public Health Service studies have taken several years—this procedure takes a minimum of 18 months. A lot of water can flow under the bridge in that time, most of it foul.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare needs authority to compel prompt compliance, and he needs it now. The country is weary of studies and hearings and conferences. It wants action.

The opposing complaint about the "invasion of States rights" has been heard too long. It is the rallying cry of the chemical, leather, paper, steel, power and other industrial firms which oppose Federal action because they find it much easier to put pressure on State and local governments. A town that is dependent upon a single company for its economic base is understandably reluctant to regulate that company's misuse of a neighboring river. In a great many communities, pollution spells payrolls and tax revenues.

Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota Democrat, and his colleagues on the House Public Works Committee have an opportunity now to overhaul and drastically to improve the Senate bill. A comprehensive and really effective antipollution program ought not to "wait 'til next year." It has already waited too long.

John Rohrbach Wins "What My Country Means to Me" Essay Contest at Emmett, Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, John Rohrbach, an eighth-grader at Parkview School at Emmett, Idaho, recently was named winner in a Jaycee-sponsored American heritage essay contest. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in today's RECORD his thoughts on "What My Country Means to Me."

The essay follows:

WHAT MY COUNTRY MEANS TO ME

(By John Rohrbach)

My country means a lot to me because in the Declaration of Independence it states "that all men are created equal" and that all of them are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights which no one can take away.

The most blessed of all these rights are my freedoms—freedom to worship as I please with no one like King Henry VIII to force me to go to his church. Freedom to own property, with no one to turn my land into a collective farm or to use it as a site for a new factory, or new buildings. Freedom to work where I wish with no one to place me in a big factory, or on a road-building and housebuilding committee. Freedom to say what I think about the government without having to whisper for fear of being heard by someone and then reported to the police. Freedom to attend any school which appeals to me, with no one to put me in some school which teaches that God is nonexistent, or does not teach all the things necessary for a good education. Without a good education I cannot hope to get a decent job.

This country also has one of the rights denied to millions of people in other nations, and that is the right to a trial by jury. Our country also has the best government in the world—a democratic government in which the President is the servant of the people and not the opposite as in so many Communist-controlled countries. All of these rights and freedoms which Americans enjoy make America a great nation. Because of these rights and freedoms we claim, some 35 million courageous pioneers left their homes in far-away countries and they have fled to America—land of opportunities—where they could begin life anew.

If America keeps these rights and freedoms sparkling she will always stay a great and

prosperous nation. But, the only way America can keep these rights and freedoms aglow is with the help of every American individual. The adults in this country can help by voting for the man best suited for the job of President, by being interested in State affairs, our national affairs, and foreign affairs, and by teaching their children the evils of communism.

We children of this country can help by obeying our parents in all that we are told to do, so that we will not become juvenile delinquents. We can also help by going to school until we have graduated from high school, or better still until we have completed college courses. Then, of course, there is the church which we will have to take part in to be successful in life. Then, and only then, will we be ready if our enemies decide to wage war on us. We will be ready with mental and spiritual strength. Since both of these things are stronger than are weapons, we will win, as did the faithful of God back in Biblical times.

The wealth of our country has given us modern hospitals, schools and other modern buildings. As a gift of our wealth we have television, cars, bicycles, planes, buses, trains, and hundreds of labor saving devices.

Maybe some other countries do envy our wealth, but if they do I think they are forgetting that this Nation was the poorest nation in the world when it was born and that our ancestors had to work hard to get this wealth. Since that time of poverty our forefathers have done backbreaking labor to get this country in shape for the millions of people who would follow after them. We should be very thankful to God that He, Creator of mankind, created such energetic and fearless forefathers who would want to risk their lives to found this great Nation in spite of the many hardships and dangers of those times. Still, no other countries can say we are selfish. Every year we give billions of dollars to foreign aid.

Beauty is another thing our country has plenty of. Just for our enjoyment the Government maintains national parks and monuments for us to visit. I have never been to any of these places of beauty, although I sincerely hope to.

All Americans, adults and children, must never give up on anything just because it seems too hard. We must remember American ends in I can.

Friendliness Wins Battles for Speaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with tremendous pride that I have the privilege to insert at this point in the RECORD the splendid article by our mutual friend, Cornelius Dalton, which appeared in the Boston Traveler of Tuesday, March 2.

"Connie" has truly captured in glowing tribute the heart and spirit not only of one of our greatest living Americans, but of the man who is so beloved by all of us who serve with him. I commend the following to the attention of my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives, for I know that they will find it as excellent as I did:

FRIENDLINESS WINS BATTLES FOR SPEAKER

(By Cornelius Dalton)

WASHINGTON.—In the old days of rough-and-tumble congressional debate, JOHN W. MCCORMACK was known as "the fighting Irishman from South Boston." He still is a fighting Irishman, when he has to be, but he learned long ago that in legislative combat a friendly pat on the back usually is more effective than a fast right to the jaw.

This is one reason why MCCORMACK is regarded as an extremely able successor to the fabulous Sam Rayburn as Speaker of the House of Representatives—the most powerful post in the Federal Government next to the Presidency.

It was MCCORMACK, for example, who steered through the House one of the most momentous measures of modern times—the civil rights bill. And he did it with such skill and tact that hardly a harsh word was exchanged by northerner or southerner in the 10 days of debate.

Speaker MCCORMACK applies the same tactics in maintaining control over his Democratic majority. "We Democrats have never followed what might be termed a punitive policy," he says. "We try to persuade through logical argument, as well as loyalty to party." And then he adds, with a smile: "Friendship plays an important part, too."

MCCORMACK's friendships encompass Republicans as well as Democrats, and members from all over the country. Some of his closest friends are southerners, although, as he says, "I don't like to refer to northerners and southerners—we're all Americans."

Another source of MCCORMACK's power is his extraordinary knowledge of congressional procedure and parliamentary strategy. One of the best read men in Congress, he concentrates on legislative, political, and historical subjects. And he is third in seniority of service, following EMANUEL CELLER of New York, and former Republican Speaker JOE MARTIN of North Attleboro.

MCCORMACK, whose two offices are the busiest on Capitol Hill, is backed up by an unusually able staff. His aids include Eugene T. Kinnaly, administrative assistant, who was secretary to Congressman Jim Gallivan, MCCORMACK's predecessor; Dr. Martin Sweig, chief secretary and legislative assistant, who has a Ph. D. and a remarkable talent for doing four or five jobs simultaneously; and John L. Monahan, personable assistant to the Speaker, whose father was a prominant Boston trial lawyer.

MCCORMACK's average day is hectic, but he somehow manages to keep serene. Besides running the House, he is almost constantly involved in conferences and is on the phone 40 or 50 times a day (the callers fange from President Johnson to "John Q. Constituent").

He often must attend evening functions but always has dinner with his wife at the Hotel Washington, where they live. They never have missed dinner together since their marriage in 1920, when Mrs. McCormack was a contralto with the Metropolitan Opera Co.

The Speaker confers with President Johnson about once a week, in addition to frequent telephone talks. They are old friends, having served together in Congress. (In former days, they called each other "Lyndon" and "JOHN." Now, it is "Mr. President" and "Mr. Speaker.")

The most dramatic change in Washington, MCCORMACK says, is that when he came here in 1928 "the big problems were economic—the depression was just around the corner." Today, he says, "Most of the important legislation concerns world affairs, including our military posture."

A tall, slim man (6 feet 2 inches, 163 pounds), MCCORMACK moves around the Capitol with a briskness that suggests he is much younger than 73. He is a lifelong teetotaler but a constant cigar smoker. Asked what he does for exercise, he says with mock seriousness: "I do a lot of reading."

Speaker MCCORMACK's basic political philosophy is to do what he thinks best for the people and the country. A strong supporter of social welfare legislation, he says: "I never felt that the trickle-down theory of our Republican friends trickled down very far."

University of Maryland Dental School—World's Oldest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, our great city of Baltimore has long been famous as being preeminent in the healing sciences with such fine institutions as Johns Hopkins Hospital and University and the University of Maryland.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the 125th anniversary of the founding of the Baltimore College of Dental Surgery of the University of Maryland, the first dental school in the world. We are celebrating this noteworthy event on March 4, 5, and 6.

This event has historical significance for the entire Nation because dental education is the only major branch of higher education that originated in America. Medicine and law, for example, were both imported from Europe.

The anniversary program will review the history of dentistry and contrast the crude practices that were possible before dentistry became a profession with modern equipment and techniques, new approaches to teaching dentistry, and research.

Last week the Baltimore Sun carried an excellent article about this justly renowned Baltimore College of Dental Surgery, written by John Dorsey. Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND DENTAL SCHOOL—WORLD'S OLDEST

(By John Dorsey)

Traditionally, anniversaries are occasions for summing up the past and looking forward to the future. And particularly is this so of the anniversary about to be celebrated at the University of Maryland's Dental School, for it comes at a point of departure, when a period of change and innovation is just beginning.

On Thursday about 300 alumni will gather in Baltimore to celebrate the 125th anniversary of the Baltimore College of Dental Surgery, Dental School, University of Maryland, the oldest dental school in the world.

During their 3-day convention they will hear Dr. Harold Hillenbrand, secretary of the American Dental Association, deliver the first Hayden-Harris memorial lecture in honor of the two founders of the school.

They will attend scientific discussion meetings and talk about trends and advances in dentistry. And there will also be much talk about the new building now being planned for the dental school and the new curriculum it is being designed to accommodate.

Together, building and curriculum will change the concept of dental education at the University of Maryland, and may affect the teaching of dentistry in general. Thus there is something of the same "embarking" spirit at the school these days that was there in the fall of 1840, when the Baltimore College opened and the history of modern dentistry began.

BARBER AS DENTIST

Through the early years of the 19th century, the practice of dentistry was primitive and unorganized. Often the local barber or blacksmith doubled as town dentist. Traveling dentists, with little or no training, made the rounds of country towns, advertising in advance.

The town square served as office for the traveling dentist, his chair was sometimes no more than a box or crate, and he pulled the first tooth free for anyone brave enough to be a demonstration case. A patient might suffer a broken jawbone, or find, to his horror, that the ache was still there because the dentist had pulled the wrong tooth.

There were responsible and competent dentists, of course, who had made a study of the mouth and teeth, who could fill teeth and make false teeth. George Washington had a set of ivory false teeth made for him by a New York dentist named John Greenwood. These now repose in the Maryland dental school's museum, along with antique dental tools, frightening reminders of the crude state of dentistry a century and a half ago.

Two leading dentists of the 1830's were Horace H. Hayden and Chapin A. Harris. Hayden had been practicing dentistry for over 30 years when Harris came to Baltimore in 1831 to study under him. From their continued association came the beginnings of dentistry as a recognized profession.

CHARTER FOR SCHOOL

Their most significant contribution was their founding of the Baltimore College of Dental Surgery in 1840. Due to their joint efforts the Maryland Legislature passed a charter for the school in February 1840, and the first class of students, numbering five, entered the next November to work for the degree of doctor of dental science. Hayden was its first president and Harris its first dean and second president.

It was the first dental school in the world. It set the pattern for all future dental schools and established Baltimore as the home of the profession of dentistry. Of all the professions, dentistry is the only one to have originated in the United States.

Over the past 125 years the school, as the profession it serves, has steadily grown and changed. In 1882 a department of dentistry was organized at the University of Maryland, and in 1923 the student bodies of the University of Maryland School of Dentistry and the Baltimore College of Dental Surgery were merged.

The name of the old Baltimore College is retained in the cumbersome title of the present school, a State institution, and the only dental school in Maryland.

Alumni of the Baltimore College and the Maryland school have made significant contributions to their profession, particularly in the areas of education and administration. Three hundred fifty-eight alumni have served as presidents of 34 State and 4 foreign dental associations. Perhaps even more significantly, 30 alumni have served as deans of dental schools.

CONTRIBUTION TO STATE

Today, the school makes a large and continuing contribution to its State. Each year's graduating class numbers about 95, and it is estimated that two-thirds of them later practice dentistry in Maryland. Of the 1,100 dentists in Maryland, about 75 percent are graduates of the university's dental school.

In recent years the school has enlarged its research facilities and programs and is constantly trying to improve its teaching methods. The school's growing concern with research and innovation reflects recent trends in dentistry, according to Dr. John J. Salley, dean of the dental school.

"Until not many years ago," he says, "dentists placed most emphasis on technical competence and on increasing manual skills—on what might be called the art of dentistry.

"But lately we have become more and more interested in dentistry as a science and in the whole man as a biological organism. Our graduates are now much more oriented toward the biological sciences."

DEGREE AFTER 5 MONTHS

The first students at the Baltimore college a century and a quarter ago had to fulfill no special educational requirements and were awarded a D.D.S. degree after 5 months of training. Today a student must complete at least 2 years of college and 4 years of dental school to earn the same degree. Along with his clinical training he is given courses in basic sciences such as anatomy, biochemistry, pathology, radiology, physiology, histology and microbiology. The dental school spends about $3,000 a year on each student, more than twice what the student himself pays for his education.

In addition to their teaching duties, many of the dental school's faculty of about 100 are at work on research projects which range from such basic investigations as a study of the embryology of the sea lamprey to projects clinical in nature, such as an analysis, using light cells, of the rest position of the lower jam in human subjects.

The University of Maryland has one of only a handful of dental schools in the country with an electron microscope. At present it is being used in several research projects, including an investigation of dentin and enamel in the teeth and a study of the oyster drill, the tiny snail that has been wreaking havoc upon the oyster population of the lower bay.

The school was the first dental school in the country to be given a grant from the Federal Government for a program to train electron microscope technicians.

Other research projects include investigations of oral cancer, all of the structure and mechanism of the skull muscle, of new adhesive materials that may be used in fillings, and of the possibility of tooth regeneration.

NEW TEACHING MACHINE

Recent innovations include a new teaching machine, developed in the department of oral surgery, which has been built to give a lecture, show slides and test students on what they see and hear. In the anatomy department, an attempt is being made to secure funds to put most of an anatomy course on video tape.

Next to the 64-chair main dental clinic in which, aided by their teachers, students can treat scores of dental patients a day, there is a new general practice clinic. The clinic has eight cubicles, each containing the latest dental equipment. Students assigned to the clinic are instructed by a team of teachers from all the main clinical departments. Such a system eliminates the need for a student, and sometimes a patient, to go from department to department depending on the kind of treatment required.

The experimental clinic, opened last November, will be the subject of a 3½-year study to determine whether such an approach improves treatment, teaching, and the attitudes of patients, students, and faculty members.

NEW BUILDING

Though always looking for ways to improve teaching and research in its present quarters at Lombard and Greene Streets, the faculty of the dental school look forward to the day, still a few years away, when a new building, tailored to a new curriculum, will be completed.

Still in the early planning stage, architects and a committee of the dental school faculty have been working on the design of the building since Dean Salley came to the University of Maryland from the University of Virginia last year.

To be built from Federal and State funds which are still to be appropriated, the building will cost about $9 million. It will be on a site bounded by Baltimore, Fayette, Pine and Arch Streets. It will be five stories high with a sixth, underground floor and a foundation constructed to support an additional two floors when they are needed. It will increase the total floorspace available to the dental school from 70,000 to 250,000 square feet.

The projected completion date for the building is 1968. When it is finished, the school will be able to admit classes of 128 students instead of the present limit of 100. This will help alleviate the present shortage of dentists in Maryland.

"While the national ratio is 1 dentist to 1,700 people," explains Dean Salley, "the Maryland average is 1 to 2,333, and the ratio will grow worse as the population grows faster and faster. It is up to us to do what we can about the problem, for 75 percent of all Marylanders who seek a dental education come to the University of Maryland.

"More important, though, than added space or facilities for more students, is the new curriculum that will be inaugurated when we move. Recently, dental school teaching concepts have been changing. At this school, we have been working on a complete revision of our curriculum, and we believe the new plan will be as modern and effective as that of any dental school.

"Best of all, the new building was not planned until we knew what our curriculum would be, so that it could be designed 'around' the curriculum. Other schools have erected new buildings and then had to fit teaching programs into them. But we have done the opposite.

DIAGONAL CURRICULUM

The proposed new diagonal curriculum is itself a sharp departure from the present. During the first 2 years of his training, today's student learns the basic sciences, such as anatomy and physiology, along with basic dental sciences, such as operative dentistry and dental materials.

Then in his third and fourth years the student enters the clinic, meets and treats patients, and applies his basic training. But as there is no training in basic science after the second year, he must apply his knowledge on his own. In short, there is a lack of continuity to his education.

When the new curriculum goes into effect the dental student will begin dealing with patients—learning to apply his basic knowledge in a clinical way—before the end of his first year. His time in the clinic will grow greater each year.

At the same time, though the major part of his basic science training will come in his first 2 years, he will also have basic science courses in his last 2 years. Thus he will be able to take what he sees in the clinic back to the classroom. "We feel that the student will gain a more integrated and therefore more useful education," says Dean Salley.

In addition, two new departments will be added to the school. One will be a department of conjoint sciences. Courses in the department will be in the form of conferences or seminars, and will center upon individual dental cases. The student will learn from specialists in several fields how a single case can involve not one but several specialties.

A cleft palate case, for instance, involves anatomy, speech pathology, plastic surgery, and social work. "A teacher in each field,"

explains Dean Salley, "will be brought in to explain how his specialty fits into the whole picture. In a sense, it will be committee teaching."

The other new department will be community dentistry, the newest area of dentistry. It will deal with public health methods. "We will be working with programs and facilities in the Baltimore area," says the dean, "such as the city hospitals' geriatrics program and the children's hospital."

TRAINING COURSES

"We are fortunate to be in Baltimore, not only because it is a large community but because it is a medically oriented community with an unusually large number of medical institutions and programs.

"The new curriculum will also include courses in the behavioral sciences, including social work, psychiatry and psychology. One of the most important facets of dentistry is the relationship between dentist and patient. If a patient won't cooperate you can't do anything for him, so it is essential to make him understand without being afraid."

After the school moves to its new quarters, new graduate and refresher courses will be offered for practicing dentists. And there will also be training courses for hygienists and dental assistants, aides essential to the modern dentist who must take care of a large number of people.

"We are coming to realize more and more the importance of preventive dentistry," says Dean Salley. "By that I mean not only such things as fluoridation of water and fluoride applications to the teeth, but also the business of educating the public—getting more people to take the proper care of their teeth.

"Only 40 percent of our population now seek regular dental service. It is a condition that must be remedied. But as more and more people seek the services of dentists the burdens upon our profession will be steadily increasing. Our whole new program is designed to deal with just that situation."

Rural Poverty and Rural Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, this last week I had the great privilege of participating in a stimulating conference on poverty in America, on the Berkeley campus of the University of California.

Of the many excellent addresses made at this conference, I would particularly like to call to our colleagues attention the thoughtful remarks of Prof. Varden Fuller of Berkeley. Dr. Fuller is a distinguished professor of agricultural economics and his discussion of rural poverty should be of interest to all who are concerned with this most difficult and challenging problem.

Professor Fuller's address follows:

RURAL POVERTY AND RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

(By Varden Fuller)

Rural poverty is intensive, extensive, and intractable. As elsewhere, being poor in the country is correlated with well-known factors—youth, advanced age, color of skin, technological impacts, poor education. In rural areas, these attributes come together in a maximum likelihood combination. Whether portrayed in photography or in statistical magnitudes, percentages, and index numbers, rural poverty is shocking. Yet, it is remote and obscure. The rural population—widely dispersed, racially and culturally heterogeneous, socially and politically incohesive—does not compete well for attention. Unemployment is easier to observe than is underemployment, and it is the latter which dominates the rural scene. Moreover, there is the widespread and mistaken notion that billions of agricultural subsidy dollars alleviate rural poverty.

As my interest is mainly in matters of policy, program, and organization in relation to rural poverty, I shall not dwell on statistical details beyond the mention of a few important magnitudes. Of 9.7 million families with less than $3,000 net cash income in 1959, 4.4 million, or two-fifths, were rural; one-third of the poor rural families were on farms and two-thirds were nonfarm. Over half of all rural poor are in the South.[1]

This Nation has long had an uneasiness about rural prosperity. Some were concerned for the welfare of farmers; others were apprehensive that farm depression might spread to the rest of the economy. All parties involved centered their views, arguments, or rationalizations upon a sort of homogeneous perception called the farmer whose situation could be found in a simple average. Thus perceived and measured, the farmer suffered from comparatively lower income. The sources of his adversity were believed to be environmental and attributable to inherent inequalities of economic power. Government response, particularly since 1933, has been sympathetic. Many governmental and quasi-governmental approaches toward a more favorable environment have been proposed and adopted—reclamation, soil conservation, cooperation, credit, research, extension. These make up a considerable constellation, of which price supports ultimately became the center.

For all of these programs, the farmer was an undifferentiated homogeneity. Not until the advent of the Farm Security Administration in 1937 did an explicit policy acknowledgement emerge that some farmers were poorer than others, that the poorest produced so little they could not earn a satisfactory income at any conceivable price; and, moreover, that hired farm laborers were also trying to earn a living in agriculture. In its short-lived career, Farm Security undertook through loans and grants, to improve the resource base and the equipment of poor farms, and to relieve some of the most urgent shelter and medical needs of migratory farmworkers. The demise of Farm Security, upon which comment will be made later, was from political assault.

Another Department of Agriculture program, contemporary with Farm Security and also short-lived, was State and local land use planning. While not intended to distinguish among economic classes of farmers, it sought through a grassroots democracy idea to involve all segments of agrarian society in a planning process similar to the present rural areas development. Its brief life and demise will also be the subject of a deferred comment.

The New Dealers did not again make any serious effort to distinguish levels of prosperity or need within agriculture. But the Eisenhower administration did. The President's message to the Congress in 1954 declared that "the chief beneficiaries of our price support policies have been the 2 million larger highly mechanized farming units which produce about 85 percent of our agricultural output. Special attention should be given to the problems peculiar to small farmers."

Footnotes at end of speech.

Thereafter, in 1955, Secretary Benson initiated a rural development program that had many of the features now found in ARA and RAD. His program depended upon local initiative and upon interagency response; it had no formal eligibility criteria but the concept was centered on pilot counties. Mr. Benson's five annual reports concluded in 1960 with the claim that: "This program is now widely accepted as a major national approach to helping rural people improve farming, obtain off-farm work, and build better, more prosperous communities." By 1960, participating counties had grown to 210. There were reported to be 2,000 projects underway "to improve farms, build new industries and expand existing ones, help both youth and adults to obtain the training they need, improve health, and accomplish other aims. New businesses and service activities have added nearly 18,000 full- or part-time jobs. These include a whole range of enterprises, wood products manufacture, clothing, metalworking, paper, chemicals, food processing, and many others."[2]

Nevertheless, the staff supplement to Mr. Benson's 1960 report leaves one to guess whether many of the activities claimed as rural development achievements were not actually on-trend occurrences.

Mr. Freeman built upon the rural development foundations laid by Mr. Benson. But not in candor or modesty, for the Freeman chronology of rural areas development has no entries prior to March 1961.[3] Yet, the most readily observable differences between Freeman's RAD and Benson's RD is accelerated committee proliferation and increased flamboyance of political rhetoric.

The current RAD program, now regarded as one of the major instrumentalities of the "rural renaissance" of the Great Society, does have some additional authority and resources. Part of these are derived from ARA, through specified eligibility of rural counties and through agency delegation of responsibility.[4] The other augmentation to RAD came in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, which, although mainly concerned with price supports, production controls, and surplus disposal, does provide small increments of authority for rural renewal, diversion of cropland into recreation facilities, and related activities. Other preexisting and general authorities are marshaled under the flag of RAD.

Within the Department of Agriculture, rural development is administered on a delegate-agency basis. General clientele, functional agencies only are involved—Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Federal Extension Service, Farmer Cooperative Service, Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service, etc. The only identity within Agriculture that is directly and exclusively concerned with rural development is the Office of Rural Areas Development. In 1964, it had an eight-man staff, whose duties are to provide leadership, initiative, coordination, expedition, and liaison. This took $120,000 of the Department's 1964 budget of $5.7 billion. Additionally, under delegate-agency agreement, Agriculture had $1.5 million from ARA in 1964, of which approximately one-fourth also went into coordination, exedition, liaison, etc., while the remainder was sliced thinly among several of the regular agricultural research and program agencies. Including their own appropriations and transfers from ARA, the agricultural agencies in 1964 apparently spent some $40 million and lent $18 million on purposes generally directed toward (or expected to trickle down to) the rural needy.[5] These fragmental activities are the realized magnitudes and proportions of a program that in 1962 had been promisingly announced as follows:

"The U.S. Department of Agriculture has directed that the combined resources of all its agencies be made available on a priority

basis and in one concerted effort to assist the people in rural areas and towns to analyze their problems and make plans to improve their economic and social conditions. The first step is to help local leaders from all segments of economic and social life in the respective economic development areas to formulate overall economic development programs for the use of available resources. This process of organizing, motivating, and servicing widely representative local committees in formulating and implementing overall economic development programs (OEDP's) is generally known as Rural Areas Development (RAD)."[6]

As a concept of public administration, this suggests the endless tossing of a ball between bureaucrats and grassrooters, and, moreover, that it may be a ball of loose string which is vulnerable to unravelling. Subsequent explanations of RAD give no assurance to the contrary. Last November, Assistant Secretary John Baker told the grange that:

"The rural renaissance is a local cooperative endeavor, or it is doomed to be nothing. How much progress is made depends upon the drive and determination of people at the grassroots level. The challenge indeed is yours. Our role in government is to help you make your contribution as effective as possible. We accept fully our responsibility to encourage local leadership and initiative as we do through the Office of Rural Areas Development and Extension Service, and through the farmer committee system and soil and water conservation districts, and to provide through the several agencies of the Department the research, educational, advisory, and financial assistance that will aid in the rural renaissance. We can achieve a rural renaissance of creative living that will be one of the vibrant, dynamic forces of the Great Society. In the bountiful resources of rural America we have the economic potential. In the people, we have the necessary leadership and initiative."[7]

One should be inspired by such fervent phrases. But if RAD were really going well, one would expect the language to be less hortatory.

RAD embraces concepts that one instinctively wishes to endorse—grassroots democracy, local self-help, indigenous leadership, community self-determination. Unfortunately, these splendid ideas can also be deluding.

As Vidich and Bensman found in their study of class, power, and religion in a rural community,[8] the instinctive political reflex of local leadership is to insulate from change rather than encourage it, especially if it portends alteration in the structure of privilege and power. Trying to avoid this by sponsoring a community initiative outside of the established power structure or one that attenuates the positions of established leaders, as was done in farm security and land use planning, offers no realistic prospect of success. Cooperation with the power structure offers more hope for acceptance but also imposes the obligation that benefit distribution must be in disproportion to need; that is, of the trickle-down variety.

The inherent difficulty underlying Government help to self-help in overcoming rural poverty is the lack of a cohesive, articulate clientele. As elsewhere, rural interest group organization and effectiveness is a correlate of affluence. New Dealers in 1937 tried to serve the rural needy by creating an agency for a clientele having neither affluence nor influence. It did not survive.[9] Land use planning in 1938 was initially directed to program coordination but it also had implications for allocation and proriety. Milton Eisenhower was among the prominent who in 1940 hailed local planning as "one of the momentous events in the history of agriculture in the United States—probably far more important than any single agricultural program."[10] Two years later it was dead—from political assault.

The episode of farm security suggests the political impracticality of a clientele agency for the needy. Land use planning initially was not so vulnerable. But when it began to appear that indigenous planning might go beyond colorings maps and preparing reports, the centers of power began to get nervous. Washington administrators and local well-established power groups reacted. Their collusion, though not flamboyant, was sufficient.[11]

I have other misgivings about local initiative as a satisfactory approach to poverty. They center in the OEDP. Levitan's examination of a sample of them indicated a substantial proportion to be only pro forma submissions and quite useless.[12] What else could be expected? Even formally organized and regularly constituted groups notoriously find great difficulty in making comprehensive, all-embracing plans. Needs of information and of conflict reconciliation are too great.[13] The overall development concept is another romantic, and impractical, idea. Is a disjointed, incrementalist decision for a road or a sewer worse than a synoptically made one if in fact the latter has to be compounded out of guesswork, supposition, and hypothecation? The OEDP idea rests upon three indefensible fundamentalisms: (1) suppositions of knowledge and community of interest beyond human capacities; (2) a philosophy of social and economic community microecology that ignores the realities of complex interarea and intergroup relationships; (3) the assumption that community needs and individual needs are one and the same.

Communities undeniably have needs—including the need to pleasant and rewarding places in which to live, as well as the need to be prosperous. However, in an attack on poverty, as possibly in most other contexts, community and individual needs are not wholly the same. There can be no guarantee that individual need will be met well or promptly if meeting it must depend upon achieving community concert and the filing of an OEDP.

I do not argue against community planning—it has its own merits. But if the war on poverty is to be more than a skirmish, opportunity must be available to the individual, regardless of what the community may or may not agree upon.

This argument implies direct access of individuals to program, which admittedly raises problems of public administration. Direct individual access need not require new agencies or programs wholly specialized to a needy clientele. Agencies and programs are probably best when specialized along functional lines. Since needs are multiple, it follows that agencies will be multiple. Overlapping, duplication, and interagency conflicts follow; coordination is called for. While coordination has its merits, it also has its price—and I believe the price can be too high. Isn't some degree of incoordination one of the luxuries an affluent society can afford?

Obviously, public administration founded on a Federal-State-local participatory system cannot be completely vertical. Nevertheless, there is latitude of choice as to whether responsibilities will be direct or delegated, and whether selectivity will maximize individual or community opinion. And wherever the choice can be made, direct responsibility is to be preferred over delegated; in selectivity the individual is to be preferred over the area. Bachmura has been thinking along these lines and has suggested the GI bill as a model,[14] which I believe is a fertile idea.

I would like to close by turning back to the rural community—as a community and not alone for the sake of its prosperity. Depopulation of the countryside raises problems that are the reciprocal of congestion in the cities. Yet the rural area as a place to live and to be provided with social services seems to lag sadly in getting attention. Perhaps this is attributable to the lack of any widely shared concept of direction and purpose. We have had a serviceable national philosophy about farmers and farming. In the past, when farming dominated the countryside, this served also as a rural philosophy. But as farming becomes ever more a minor proportion of rural life, agrarian philosophy no longer serves. National authorities are beginning to recognize this but the shadows of agrarian fundamentalism lie heavily upon their perceptions.

The President's farm message of February 4 incorporates the nuances of this ambivalence:

"I am determined that the farmers who have been efficient and successful in agriculture shall be fairly rewarded for their success. And I am equally determined that the rural community which has sustained the growth of agricultural shall have the chance to broaden its economic base and the range of opportunity which it can offer the children of its families."

As for rewarding the successful, the President's message is fulsome and fairly specific. For the more numerous others, including the agricultural poor and the three-fourths of rural Americans who are not farmers, the message is cryptic and sparse. The intent "to bring additional views to bear on the place of rural America" is mentioned. Incredibly, the President expects this to be done by his proposed new Commission on Food and Fiber.

Food, fiber, and successful farming are doubtless an appropriate set of trifocals for viewing the national interest in commercial agriculture. But lenses of that prescription do not focus effectively upon the less privileged, in and out of agriculture. Consequently, if their use is continued, the causes and remedies of rural poverty will remain blurred. It will take an entirely different set of lenses to see clearly and individual prospects and needs of the rural poor. And it will take still another set to see the future of the rural community in an age when farming has become an integral part of the industrial system and is no longer the rural way of life.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] There is considerable literature on low-income farming and rural levels of living; much less is known about low-income nonfarm people. A recent and useful source covering both is "Poverty in Rural Areas of the United States," Agricultural Economic Rept. No. 63, U.S. Department of Agriculture, November 1964.

[2] "Rural Development Program," Fifth Annual Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, September 1960, pp. 5, 7.

[3] Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1962, p. 40.

[4] Sar A. Levitan, "Federal Aid to Depressed Areas," pp. 42–43, 61–64.

[5] U.S. Congress, House Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, 88th Cong., 2d sess., Department of Agriculture Appropriations for 1965, pt. 4, pp. 343–356.

[6] U.S. Department of Agriculture, "Helping People To Help Themselves in Country and in Towns," September 1962, p. 1.

[7] Address by John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, before annual convention of National Grange, Atlantic City, N.J., Nov. 11, 1964.

[8] Arthur J. Vidich and Joseph Bensman, "Small Town in Mass Society," Doubleday Anchor (Princeton University Press), 1958.

[9] The rise and fall of Farm Security Administration is well analyzed by Grant McConnel in "The Decline of Agrarian Democracy," University of California Press, 1953.

[10] Yearbook of Agriculture, 1940, p. 1135.

[11] A detailed and penetrating analysis of land use planning and its termination is given by Charles M. Hardin, "The Bureau of Agricultural Economics Under Fire: A Study of Valuation Conflicts," Journal of Farm Economics, August 1946, pp. 635–668.

[12] Sar A. Levitan, op. cit., 195–200.

[13] David Braybrooke and Charles E. Lindblom, "A Strategy of Decision," the Free Press of Glencoe, 1963, pp. 61–143.

[14] Frank T. Bachmura, "Area Development: General and Selective Approaches," proceedings, Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Inc., Feb. 3–5, 1964, p. 18.

Goal Is Free Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives an outstanding editorial from the February 25, 1965, edition of the Am-Pol Eagle of Buffalo, N.Y.:

A FREE POLAND

With the recent visit of the Consul General of Poland Stanislaw Kopa to Buffalo and his remarks concernnig the achievements in Communist Poland and the "freedom" of criticism present in Poland, we can only take time out to take a long look at Poland today. However, let us look at Poland as it really is and not as presented by the Consul General, who speaks much of Poland's trade achievements and little of the Polish Government's relation to the people and the church.

When the Polish Consul General speaks of "constructive criticism" which is allowed in Poland today, we wonder just who is to determine whether the criticism is constructive or not. Furthermore we wonder just how many people in Poland are placed in confinement, due to their "criticism for the sake of criticism." We wonder if it is right for a government to confine its citizens to "constructive criticism" and punish all other forms.

And of course, we must also ask what of the church in Poland? Are we to believe that the people are free to practice their faith when we hear Stefan Wysyznski's countless attacks against the Government? How free is Poland when the Government does not allow building permits for churches and refuses to allow expansive religious education?

No, Poland is not free, even though its trade exports increase and its industry prospers, for Poland cannot be free until every Polo can go to the polls and show his choice in an election between two parties and not one. We wholeheartedly urge all Am-Pols in America not to give up hope for a Poland where self-determination and freedom shall thrive, where there is no need for bread riots such as the Poznan riot, where there is no persecution of the church and where the people can live in the true freedom and democracy that Chopin, Pulaski, Paderewski, and many more sought for their homeland.

This newspaper shall always stand for only one goal—a free and democratic Poland. We remind the Am-Pols in our community that "The hope of a free Poland shall live as long as we live."

A Testimonial to Peter Howard

SPEECH

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the death last week of Peter Howard who, in effect, gave himself to the people of the world through his leadership of moral rearmament, has brought from the world expressions of the most profound grief and loss.

Young, dynamic, and persuasive, he was an apostle of peace and freedom and unity, firmly grounded in the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. His tireless energy and deep devotion to his cause brought him to every corner of the globe where the sincerity and truth of his message swept aside the accidents of place and position and penetrated to the human core of all who heard him.

He saw in the Western Hemisphere, and especially in the United States, much of what he considered most hopeful for the future. But he was a man who shunned the limitations of nationalism and ideology to focus on the human considerations that unite man wherever he may be.

The tributes to his life and work and personal goodness which have poured in to Mrs. Howard since his death on February 25 in Lima, Peru, speak eloquently of the universal love and admiration Peter Howard was able to evoke. From Presidents and Prime Ministers and from the people to whom he spoke, of all races and religions, have come the proof that his words and his writings have taken root and will live and grow and flourish.

This was the purpose of his life, and as we grieve at his loss we give thanks that he lived among us and did the work of God.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

"Trends in Transportation"—Address by Hon. Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, Before Convention of National Limestone Institute, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and searching speech on the subject "Trends in Transportation" delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], before the 20th annual convention of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., held at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington, D.C., January 18, 1965.

Senators who have the honor to serve with the Senator from West Virginia on the Committee on Public Works, which has jurisdiction of the Federal-aid highway program, are aware that his views are of great interest to the committee and certainly to the millions of people throughout the country who are vitally interested in transportation.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"TRENDS IN TRANSPORTATION"—AN ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, BEFORE THE 20TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, INC., WASHINGTON, D.C., STATLER HILTON, JANUARY 18, 1965

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm very happy tonight to be with you, your president, Mr. Koch, the chairman of the board, Mr. Meshberger, Members of the Congress, and, of course, with all of you who are intensely interested in the future of America.

Sitting at my right is Richard Raese, of Morgantown, W. Va. I refer to Mr. Raese that I may in a sense refer to all of you who are the policymakers in this vital industry. He is a director of this effective organization and is one of the business leaders in our State, just as you are in your State, as well as in the Republic.

We were talking about the number of people who are employed in West Virginia directly in the limestone and associated industries. Mr. Raese told me that it was perhaps 4,000. And then we began to think of the processes in which lime participates, and we counted another 30,000 employees in our State. So approximately 34,000 or more persons, directly and indirectly, and their families are dependent, at least in large degree on this important enterprise in our State. Our State—and I must not be provincial—provides, of course, this product which goes into steel, into glass, into chemicals, into mining as rock dust, into cement, into agriculture, and importantly, into highways.

I remember some 30 years ago when I first came to the Congress, there was being conducted in the district I was privileged to represent, a survey on the so-called standard of living index. The interviews were concerned with such matters as the ownership of radios, bathtubs, and refrigerators, and the consumer plans in purchasing and acquiring these products in the future. One interviewer became puzzled when he encountered an elderly lady who, though she owned not one of these products, stated that she planned to buy an automobile. He questioned further: "Why would you buy an automobile, when you don't even own a bathtub?" "Sonny," she replied, "you can't go to town in a bathtub."

This incident reflects a fundamental fact about American society—that "going to town" when you choose and in the way you choose is as vital a part of our style of life as indoor plumbing. The right to select is an important right in our democratic society. This is a precious freedom. We must not lose it.

When I mention indoor plumbing, I recall that there are many areas in our country where the needs are still very intense, where the Congress regardless of political preferment is attempting, I hope validly and realistically, as I know it is, to contribute to programs that are not necessarily inspired from Washington, but are projects that spring from the heartbeats and the needs of the American people.

American people possess a mobility that is characteristic of this country and of our frontiers. There was the barrier, of course, of the Allegheny Mountains in the latter part of the 18th century. It was no rarity for the family records after that time to reveal that each child—in a family of seven or eight—was born in a different State. For as the frontier moved westward so did hundreds and thousands of families pack their belongings and move with it.

There are Members of Congress here as your guests who will recall, from a study of the history of legislation in this country, the enactment by the Congress of the Union Pacific bill in 1862. And then the Conestoga wagons began to give way to the railroads as the principal means of transporting the western settlers. Thus, before the end of the 19th century, the western frontier as we knew it—the physical frontier at least—had disappeared, and the railroad had become the chief instrument for extending American civilization and the scope of the U.S. Government—I would not call it power of the U.S. Government because I do not like that choice of language—the scope of the U.S. Government crossed the land to the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

In a like manner, ladies and gentlemen, the automobile and our Federal highway system have been the main forces in this century for breaking down regional barriers and consolidating the national unity for which the American people labored in the 18th and 19th centuries. The history of transportation in America—from the canals of the 18th century through the transcontinental railroads of the 19th century to the highways and air transport of the 20th century—is the parallel in the history of American civilization itself.

I do not have pat answers, and in the presence of my colleagues of the Congress, naturally, I speak not with authority but as a student of these trends of transportation.

We cannot be concerned, ladies and gentlemen, with only technical improvements in our transport system. On the contrary, future developments in transportation will be woven into the very fabric of our existence, and will, as in the past, have a fundamental and a positive influence on the tone and the lives of all the people of the United States, and even the people of the other parts of the world.

Now if we are to assure that our present and future transportation facilities truly serve the broader purposes of our society, actually in the breadth and scope of our future, we must perceive how new technologies permeate other aspects of our national life. Even today, for example, we have not fully corrected the early errors of omission in planning for the utilization of the automobile in our communities and cities.

Do you remember the early automobile? I recall in West Virginia we had a mountain called Tunnel Hill, and if you could go up in high gear it was an achievement. You remember some hills in your countryside, perhaps, where if you didn't have to throw the motor into second or low gear you came back home and boasted to your neighbors. And if you made a trip of 1 day without a puncture to a tire, didn't you talk about that? You certainly did.

But we do realize that the utilization of our automobiles into the community life—into the metropolitan life of America—is something that, very frankly, called for a belated effort—and it is that—in the development of the Interstate System of highways and defense roads in the United States.

We've had mistakes in our prior highway systems. But by 1972 we will have completed, we believe, a network of 41,000 miles in this Interstate System. In doing so we will have completed not only highways, but what I call "townless highways." And by the same time we shall be well along in the development of towns without highways. And certainly there is a distinct difference.

The cost of the national system of our interstate and defense highways will be at least $5.8 billion more than had previously been estimated. The anticipated total cost of the network will be $46.8 billion.

We're now beginning to digest these estimates of the able Highway Administrator of the United States, Rex M. Whitton. And I think it is important for us to realize one statement that he made. Mr. Whitton said "the largest part of the increased costs results from improvement in the Interstate System made to meet the public's need for safer and better highway transportation." I believe this is the essence of what the Congress itself has been doing.

Members of Congress here will recall that in 1963 we believed that we must project our traffic needs 20 years beyond the project approval date. And this was done. Prior to that time we had indicated that we were building our roads for the traffic of 1975. And so the Congress believed that we needed to build better highways—highways which more nearly serve the people of the United States.

Therefore, on the congressional agenda this year, I think, will be the question of providing for an increase through some type of taxes (I'll not attempt to be definitive tonight) to take care of the increased cost of the Interstate System. Of course, this will require extensive committee hearings, and I have a feeling that we may have raised deep-seated differences concerning methods of highway financing. Also, the Congress

must act this year or the next, and I believe the earlier the better, on recommended changes in weights and measures on trucks operating on the Interstate System. I hope we will explore what we conceive to be the purpose of this system and its increasing role in our overall economy. As Walter Belsen of the American Trucking Association recently remarked in a perceptive commentary on our highway program, "We have never in our history had a viewpoint such as that of the Romans." He was talking, of course, of the Romans who built the roads—the roads that as Rex Whitton today, in other language said, will meet increased needs and will have a longer and better life to serve a growing and developing America.

Senator KARL MUNDT—with us this evening—I remember so well when I had the privilege of being with you and your gracious wife at an interparliamentary union meeting in Paris. We were talking about roads even as we flew above the Atlantic. You told me about a constituent who had conceived a poem which told of the strength and the durability of those Roman roads. You repeated to me those lines:

"Great roads the Romans built that men might meet,
And walls to keep strong men apart—secure.
Now centuries have gone, and in defeat
The walls are fallen, but the roads endure."

And so, fellow builders of this era, in a very real way we cannot be frightened—although this is a problem and the members of the Congress recognize it and you recognize it—of how we shall meet the financing, the increased cost, of the construction of the Interstate System before 1972. We are building, not for a day or a year; we are building for the future.

Dramatic figures were recently released by our Bureau of Census. When I think of the Bureau of the Census I recall that today there are 50 statisticians in the Bureau of Census doing the job that 4,200 employees did 15 years ago. Senator FRANK CARLSON, my esteemed colleague of our Post Office and Civil Service Committee, has been studying with me some of the computer methods which have been brought into government itself. He knows, as well as others in this audience, that we are spending in this fiscal year in 1965, approximately $165 billion on computers for the U.S. Government. And so, this is a different time in which we are living—a time of dramatic transition.

The machine not only is a process of building or constructing, but the machine is a decisionmaker. That's why we realize that we are in this period of change. We cannot overlook it in the discussion of our highway system. A lady wrote me recently. She said simply this: "I don't want no change." But she, as well as all Americans, must accept change, and we will be the better if we understand it.

The Bureau of the Census has released figures for 100 standard metropolitan areas with over a 250,000 population. The data shows that slightly less than half the workers in a typical metropolitan area live and work in the central city. Approximately one-fourth vote, live, and work in the suburbs. Of the remainder who commute, 16 percent commute from the central city. This represents, in fact, a vastly different pattern of urban movement than that implied by what we've had as a traditional concept of our urban-suburban movement in the United States. President Lyndon Johnson recognizes this change and he has a new concept of the magnitude of the job to be done.

These centrifugal forces will continue to operate at an accelerated pace. The population in the central cities of the United States will increase by 58 million in 1960, to 78 million persons by 1980, and our suburban population during the same period will skyrocket from 55 to 105 million. And urban motor vehicle travel will disclose an even greater percentage increase—from 332 billion vehicle-miles in 1960 to 859 billion vehicle-miles in 1980.

Thus, a major challenge after completion of this system will be, I believe, the necessity to provide adequate facilities for the nonradial metropolitan automobile travel. This will require 16,000 miles of urban freeways, of which only slightly more than half will be provided by the present Interstate System.

Of the 41,000 miles of this network, we have already completed and opened to traffic approximately 19,000 miles. The other mileage is in the process of right-of-way, engineering, and construction. And so this program is not completed, and there is a very definite challenge and there are many problems arising almost daily, but we can complete the construction by the target date of the act of 1956.

I know there is a genuine desire in your business, and among roadbuilders and certainly in the State highway departments, for official congressional expression as to what direction our highway program is to take in 1972. Are we doing this job and then summarily drop it? This is something to ponder. I believe, of course, that we must move forward with the development not only in one sphere of our national life, but certainly in this sphere, though we must in no ways be timid. We must make an all-out continuing frontal attack on the problem of moving our people safely throughout America—for recreation, for jobs, for life itself.

My friend with whom I served in the House of Representatives, GEORGE FALLON, chairman of the Public Works Committee, is present. Mr. FALLON and an equally good Member of the Congress, Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan, who heads the Senate Public Works Committee, do not agree. Representative FALLON believes that we need Congress to spell out the intent of a study beyond 1972. Senator MCNAMARA is of the view that such legislation is unnecessary in light of the specific and general statutory authority of the Department of Commerce (Bureau of Public Roads) to conduct this type of cooperative study with the States.

Though I appreciate the psychological and symbolic significance of having the Congress on record in this matter, Senator MCNAMARA's view is sustained by a reading of title 23 of the United States Code.

A post-1972 study is being conducted and no doubt will be continued even though we have no congressional sanction for the study to go forward. I would further add that a congressional request, at least with respect to reporting deadlines for the executive branch, does not necessarily carry a magical effect.

In the 1956 Highway Act, for example, the Congress directed the Secretary of Commerce to report on vehicle weights and measures not later than March 1, 1959. Last August—five and a half years late—the Department of Commerce got around to reporting to the Hill. And so there's no magic, is there, in the Congress sanctioning the study, with a report to be made by a certain time?

The fact is—as I draw to a conclusion—the realities of the population growth and the economic and social needs of our Nation will largely govern our highway program after 1972. Congress will, I am convinced, meet responsibly this challenge in accordance with the national needs when the data are supplied.

We live in a world of mushrooming population. Communist China with 670 million persons; India with 430 million persons; Communist Russia with 235 million; the United States with 192 million persons; Indonesia with 175 million and on and on mount the figures. And the world rate of an increase in population moves ahead 65 million persons a year.

Yes, this is a world of people. We must accelerate, therefore, the rate of construction of the Interstate System of highways in the United States. We must give more attention to the impact on esthetic values and the conservation of land and water resources. And our cities of over 50,000 must, in accordance with this Highway Act of 1962, develop those continuous and comprehensive planning programs by the middle of 1965, if they are to receive Federal funds.

Our urban interstate program offers an unparalleled opportunity for remodeling large portions of our cities. The value of urban freeways in conjunction with slum clearance and urban renewal has already been demonstrated in Winston-Salem, N.C.; Jacksonville, Fla.; and Chattanooga, Tenn. There are other cities where the programs move forward as well.

Equally important, however, is our unfulfilled responsibility to stimulate low-income rental housing for slum residents displaced by urban renewal and freeway construction programs. It is my hope that the Members of Congress, in both House and Senate, will act affirmatively to meet this challenge in the present 89th Congress.

I am convinced that our national view, as presently expressed does not adequately embrace the full potentialities of the highway program and its impact on the economic, the social, the recreational, and the esthetic considerations which are so necessary in our times. As we study in committee how to meet the increased costs of the Interstate System we're going to come to grips with these needs which I have mentioned. And so in the light of the projected growth of our population, the constantly increasing standards of living in America, and the critical role that automotive transportation occupies in our national concept and in our national economy, it is imperative, I believe—and the Congress recognizes it—that there is an area of activity and leadership for the Federal Government—in cooperation with State governments and with many segments of private industry as well.

Now I close with this expression of thanks to Bob Koch and his staff. I think that you have to right to know, ladies and gentlemen, that the membership of the Congress of the United States is appreciative of the counsel of trained persons who understand your problems and the problems of other segments of industry and who come to the Congress and talk to us and counsel with us. I will say to you, President Koch, that you and your associates have never pressured the Congress of the United States.

Those of you in this industry—individually as well as through an excellent and adequate staff—come to your Congress. Let us hear from you. I think I have at least a right and responsibility tonight to say for all Members of Congress, that we want you to come to us before the fact, not after the fact. Give us the information which you have before hearings have gone too far—or at least until a bill has been reported from subcommittee or committee and then brought to the Senate or House floors for actual voting up or down—perhaps the adoption of sometimes hastily conceived amendments. You have done this, President Koch.

Chairman Meshberger, and to all you who are here, this isn't a pleasantry. I believe it's vitally important that you continue to give us earlier, rather than later, your counsel and guidance, as well as your support when you believe the cause is in the national interest.

As we move forward in these days and months and years ahead, workers in factory and field and farm—workers, yes, in Government—let us realize that tomorrow will be a good tomorrow as today has been a good today and yesterday was also good. And tomorrow will be a good tomorrow if we but know how to use it. And represented in this meeting are the leaders, as I have said, in

your industry who will help the Congress of the United States in its proper role to build a better America. Working together the task will be easier and surer of accomplishment.

The Crisis in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the problems within the United Nations—particularly the development of appropriate American attitudes toward this body and its future, were discussed recently by the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce, former Member of this House, former Ambassador to Italy, as well as a distinguished author and playwright. This address, entitled "The Crisis in the United Nations" was delivered before the Illinois Manufacturers' Association at its 71st annual meeting held in Chicago, Ill., on Thursday, December 10, 1964.

Feeling as I do that this subject is of particular significance to the Congress and to the Nation, I am appending here the text of Mrs. Luce's timely and significant remarks.

THE CRISIS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mattison, Mr. Donnelly, distinguished guests, members of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, and friends, I am honored indeed to address this association, which with other similar associations have been the hefty construction crews if not the ideological architects of America's prosperity. Ours may not be the Great Society of the utopian dreams, but where on earth is a better? And if this is so, you and other Americans like you deserve plenty of the credit.

I am not only honored, but a little scared to address you, knowing that I am the first woman you have ever trusted to do so. I confessed my fears to Mr. Shachan, the gracious gentleman you sent to greet me at the airport, and he seemed sympathetic. "It's true," he said, "Whatever a woman does, she's got to do twice as well as a man * * * but that's not difficult." Now, there's what I call a public relations genius. In any event, I pray for your sake, that he is right, and that I do right by you, and my own sex this evening.

My subject tonight is not, as announced, "What lies ahead for America in foreign affairs." It will, rather, concentrate on only one of the grave foreign agency questions that lost in the scuffle, muffle, and battle of the presidential campaign.

In passing, seldom in American history has the American public been less politically enlightened than during that election. This, let me say, is not a partisan view. Most of the editorialists and commentators were in agreement by the time the campaign ended that, for whatever reason, the debate between the presidential candidates did little, and in some times nothing, to clarify many of the crucial problems which our Nation must solve if peace and prosperity are to be maintained in the decade ahead.

During the campaign I saw a little cartoon that seemed to sum up the reaction of the average American to what the sophiscates called the Presidential dialog. It showed a Harris or Gallup pollster, pad in hand, pencil poised, looking expectantly at a shirt-sleeved householder who had just come to the door. "So you have the questions," the potential voted snaps. "Well, what I want are answers."

So tonight, with your kind permission, I intend to discuss one grave question which was swept under the rug during the months before the elections; namely, the crisis in the United Nations.

The United Nations crisis is double-barreled. It is both financial and political in nature. The failure of the 19th General Assembly to surmount this crisis threatens to collapse this 20-year-old institution.

Since the foundation of the United Nations in 1945, one nation, the United States, has borne almost 40 percent of all the expenses of an institution which now includes 115 members. Nevertheless, today more than half of the countries are in arrears on their financial contributions to the amount of about $120 million. But Soviet Russia is the offender who has now brought the United Nations to the verge of bankruptcy and thrown it into institutional confusion by refusing to pay its $52.6 million assessment for U.N. peace keeping operations in the Middle East and the Congo. Six Soviet satellites and France have taken the same stand, bringing the total sum of defaulted debt for these two operations alone to over $70 million.

As you all know, according to the terms of the Charter, the right to decide on peacekeeping operations, and to make assessments for them, originally rested with the Security Council. But when it became clear that the use of veto, especially Soviet's chronic use of it, was bound to prevent every effort of the Security Council's free world members to constitute police peace forces in international emergencies, a way out was found and, in 1950, the General Assembly overwhelmingly voted the so-called uniting for peace resolution. This permitted the Assembly to take action in the event of a Security Council stalemate. It was, consequently, the General Assembly which voted for the Suez and Congo peacekeeping operations, and made the assessments for them.

As you also know, under article 19 of the U.N. Charter, the penalty for any nation more than 2 years in arrears, which is now the case in respect of the U.S.S.R., and other members of the Russian bloc—is to lose its vote in the General Assembly.

For several years now the U.S.S.R. has adamantly taken the position that the Assembly, by bypassing the Security Council, violated the original terms of the Charter, and has threatened to walk out if the General Assembly dares to invoke article 19, and deprive it of its vote.

During the campaign, the United States, backed by a resolution in Congress, took a strong stand on the matter. It insisted that the Charter rules must be obeyed, and that the Soviets must either put up or shut up. In recent weeks, however, the U.S. position has weakened. It now seems willing to accept any formula which will avoid putting the U.S.S.R. on the spot by invoking article 19, but which will also collect Moscow's unpaid bill. But Russia, no doubt encouraged by this U.S. waffle, continued to insist that what matters is not the money, but the principle of the thing. It still refuses—under any formula—to pay any part of its arrears for the Congo and Suez operations.

Plainly this situation is fraught with peril for American prestige and the U.N. If article 19 is invoked, and if the majority of the members then condone Russia's deadbeat tactics by refusing to deprive Soviet bloc of their votes, the United States will lose incalculable face. But, by the same token, the General Assembly itself will also lose—if not face, power. For a vote to excuse Russia from its debts, on her own legalistic grounds—that the Assembly had no right in the first place to impose them—will mean that the Assembly accepts the Russian position that responsibility for peacekeeping operations must henceforth be returned to the Security Council, and put once again at the mercy of the veto power of the great powers.

On the other hand, if article 19 is invoked, and goes against Russia, and if the Soviet Union then makes good on its threat to walk out, it is certain that other nations sympathetic to the Soviet position will also stalk out. And this will mean that the U.N. is doomed to suffer the fate of the League of Nations which began to come apart at the seams when the first big power walked out of it.

But most serious of all, perhaps, is the question of who in the end will pick up Moscow's bills if it refuses to do so under any formula. Will they be picked up by the other 114 members of the United Nations? Many are themselves already in arrears on their normal dues. Or will you-know-who—the American taxpayer—bail out the U.N. and the Communists?

And there, for the moment, the matter seems to rest. How restful the question is we can surmise by the fact that the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant, has taken to his bed with a severe pepetic ulcer.

I am reminded here of a story told about a government character who went off his rocker and was sent to an asylum. But under psychiatry he seemed to cure rapidly. As the doctor handed him his discharge papers, he asked, "What are your plans now?" The discharged patient replied, "Well, I'm thinking of being an Ambassador to the U.N. Then, on the other hand, I may decide to remain a teakettle."

The second grave question that faces the U.N. is the admission of Red China. While most observers agree that the Assembly will not vote to seat Mao Tse-tung's government this year, they also agree that sooner rather than later this will happen.

Last January, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in an address at Columbia University, warned that the U.S. position in the U.N. has greatly changed since it was founded 19 years ago—and not for the better. Owing to the admission of scores of new Afro-Asian nations in the last decade, it has now become "theoretically possible," he said, "that a two-thirds" majority of the U.N. Assembly could be formed by countries which have only 10 percent of the world's population and contribute only 5 percent of the assessed U.N. budget, and could recommend courses of action for which other nations would bear primary responsibility and burden."

The crisis thus raises these portentous questions: How long should the United States consent to bear the moral responsibilities and financial burdens imposed on it by those who hold its rules in contempt, and who refuse to accept even their fair share of pursuing the policies they vote for? Has the time come for the United States to dump the U.N. by letting it go bankrupt? Should we withdraw now, before the admission of Red China is stuffed down our throats? But, if the answer to these questions is yes, then wither away the cause of peace when the United Nations collapses?

It seems to me that before we accept this answer we should first take a good hard look at the state of American public opinion about the U.N. The fate of the U.N. rests partly in the hands of a few men in Moscow. But to an even greater extent, it lies with American public opinion. What do most Americans think of the United Nations?

Generally speaking, there are three views held among Americans—starry-eyed view, the hard-eyed view, and the clear-eyed view.

The starry-eyed view is moralistic, idealistic, optimistic, and even evangelistic. This

view comes naturally, perhaps, to Americans. Morality, idealism, altruism, and the missionary and reformer spirit are wonderfully persistent strains in the American character, including the character of our political leaders. Inspired by this tradition, the initiatives for the League of Nations and the United Nations were taken, by President Wilson and President Roosevelt, respectively. I think we should be proud of the high-minded and generous instincts that inspire our people and their leaders. Also, let us recognize that in theory, if not in practice, the U.N. is indeed the noblest institution yet conceived by the mind of man. For the Charter of the U.N. dedicates that institution to the achievement of the four greatest human goals: the maintaining of international peace, the promotion of the self-determination of peoples, the promotion of social welfare, and the protection of human rights.

But the starry-eyed view of the U.N. holds tenaciously, mystically, and quite unrealistically, to the belief that simply because of its professed goals, it has the power to change the hearts and minds of its unruly members, and to convert them—somehow—sometime—into apostles of peace and universal brotherhood.

It is almost impossible to argue about the U.N. with its starry-eyed devotees. They are like the shirtmaker who went to a banker for a loan. When he was asked, "Can you give a statement?" he replied, "You bet. I am optimistic."

One is tempted to say that the faith, hope—and especially the charity—which a good many Americans show toward the U.N. verges on religious conviction. It has become to them a kind of secular temple of man.

I am myself struck by the number of Christmas cards I receive each year showing the tall austere slab of the U.N. building, windows all radiantly aglow, and hanging above it the bright star which we generally associate with the midnight sky over Bethlehem. Apparently its devotees are unaware that what goes on inside this building more often invokes the image of bedlam than Bethlehem.

Needless to say there is almost no resentment among U.N. worshipers, that the upkeep of their temple is being paid for in large part out of their own pockets. On the contrary, they seem to believe that the citizens of the richest nation on the earth should bear the brunt of the greatest secular missionary enterprise on earth. Strangely enough, the starry eyed are divided on the question of the admission of Red China. Some passionately believe that we should admit it because they feel that once the Red Chinese take their pew in the temple they must, sooner or later, be converted from their selfish, totalitarian political ways to the unselfish, democratic ways of world cooperation. Others feel that while the Temple of man, like all churches, should not cast into the outer darkness any of its born members—like the Soviets—it should not rush open armed to welcome defiant sinners and unbelievers like the Chinese Reds.

Many Americans also feel that there is something essentially wicked and dangerous about the possession of great national power. They feel uneasy and even a little guilty, when they contemplate the enormous military and economic strength the United States has so suddenly attained to in this century. They feel subconsciously, perhaps, that America's power may not have been altogether innocently acquired. They dread that in the absence of a higher restraining force—specifically the U.N.—the United States will be tempted to use its prodigious strength ignobly or aggressively. Especially they fear lest we ever use it against the underprivileged, little ones of the earth. They see America's presence in the U.N. and especially its tremendously generous financial support of it, as bearing witness to the entire world that the mightiest nation on earth will never, no never, become that thing which our whole political tradition has taught us to loathe; a greedy, aggressive, imperialistic nation.

A few Americans, though not nearly so many as are supposed, consider that national sovereignty, in and of itself, is a wicked and lawless thing, and that it lies at the root of all international disorder, and war. They do dream of the United Nations as the forerunner of the parliament of man and the matrix of eventual world government. This, let me say, is complete nonsense. If anything can be said about the U.N. without fear of contradiction, it is that it is decades away from becoming a supranational government.

To sum up, the starry-eyed are convinced that if the U.N. collapses world anarchy will result and that all hope of averting nuclear destruction will be gone. Consequently, faced with the present crisis, they feel that no sacrifice, either of money or prestige, is too great for the United States to pay for averting this universal calamity.

Before we condemn this somewhat less than realistic attitude, let us remind ourselves that it has been fostered by every one of America's Presidents since the U.N. was founded. One statement will serve as an example of many similar pronouncements made by Truman, Eisenhower, and now Johnson.

In President Kennedy's inaugural address he said that the United Nations is "our last best hope for peace in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace."

In passing, barely 8 months after Kennedy spoke these words, he found it necessary in the defense of our national security, to bypass the U.N. altogether. Kennedy's and Khrushchev's eyeball-to-eyeball Cuban missile confrontation found all the members of the U.N., for once, with their mouths shut and their eyes closed prayerfully. And, even the most starry-eyed Americans discovered that when the chips are down, the peace of the world does not lie in the hands of the U.N. It lies but where it always has—in the hands of the great powers.

And this brings us to the second—and other extremist view of the U.N.—the hot-eyed, suspicious, cynical, and pessimistic view. This has been best expounded perhaps, by those writers who claim that the U.N. can never succeed, principally because of the membership of the Soviet bloc. They note—and rightly—that Soviet ideology holds that all parliaments, bodies, and forums, which permit free discussion, are bourgeois institutions which must be destroyed. In the pessimistic view, the only reason that the Soviets remain in the U.N. is to undermine it by flagrantly flouting its charter goals and rules, while at the same time using it to subvert and convert its other members to communism.

They are particularly fond of telling this U.N. story: Four U.N. civil servants got into an argument over which profession was first established in the world. The British member, a lawyer attached to his mission, said, "Law, of course. Man could never have survived without a few simple laws to govern him." The Frenchman, a doctor working with UNICEF, replied "Gynecology. Or how could Cain and Abel have been born?" The American member, an architect on loan to the U.N. technological program, said, "Long before that, my friends, an architect was on hand to bring order out of chaos."

"Aha," beamed the Communist, who was the head of the U.S.S.R. Secretariat, "But who created the chaos?"

Long before Secretary Rusk issued his warning that the small nations were rapidly becoming the tails that would wag the big national dogs, U.N. critics were predicting this. In 1950, William Henry Chamberlain wrote, "The world organization that was supposed to assure peace and reign of law and justice has been proven impotent. By innumerable brawls, on issues large and small, the United Nations has proved themselves the divided nations." U.N. haters utter earsplitting ouches every time one of the little U.N. members sticks a verbal pin into Uncle Sam. They insist that the growing Afro-Asian bloc, either from conviction or fear of Communist repraisals, must more and more succeed in stultifying or scuttling U.S. policies, and that its one increasing purpose is to milk, bilk and jilt the free world nations. In proof, they point in disgust and fear to the growth of racialism in the U.N.

As long ago as 1955, the "Swiss Review of World Affairs" wrote "A point has now been reached at which racial discrimination is triumphant in the United Nations, in the sense that the representatives of white nations—unless they are Communist—are a priori held guilty of bad faith."

And truly enough, many of the Afro-Asian nations have used and abused this forum, dedicated to international peace and harmony, to whoop it up against their former colonial masters, seizing obsessively upon every action of the European powers raucously to air their grievances of the past and their fears of grievances yet to be suffered.

In recent days the U.N. critics have pointed to the savage charges of imperialism which some of the Afro-Asians have hurled against Great Britain, Belgium and the United States for their Congo rescue operations, and the way they have ignored the torture and butchery of white missionaries by the Congo rebels. I venture, however, to predict that when the debate on this rescue operation is over we will find that many African members will be on our side of the question.

Even before the present crisis developed, U.N. haters believed that the time had long since come for America either to call the tune or to quit paying the U.N. pipers whose tune has become noticeably, if not notoriously, anti-American. They insist—and today their voices are beginning to carry weight—that if other nations (principally the Soviets and the satellites) should continue to welch on their debts, we should, at the very least, retaliate by cutting our own contributions by the amounts defaulted. And if this brings about the financial bankruptcy of the U.N., these critics aver that it will only be the logical result of the U.N.'s moral bankruptcy.

Needless to say, they insist that the United States should withdraw from the U.N. the very day the Assembly votes to admit Red China.

They see the U.N. not only as a dire threat to the interest and the security of the United States, but as a breeding ground of national, and racial antagonisms, and the incubator of brush fire wars which will probably in the end escalate into nuclear war.

Dag Hammarskjold once made a comment about the U.N. that is worth bearing in mind:

"People who don't like the U.N.," he said, "don't like the world because the U.N. reflects the world as it is."

He might have added that many people who do like it, like it for this same reason. For truly enough, the U.N. is the very mirror of men and nations. It reflects both their good and evil, nobility and meanness, cruelty and generosity, savagery and civility. It shows forth the finest aspirations of nations as well as their lowest ambitions.

And this brings us to the third view of the United Nations—the dry-eyed, clear-eyed approach.

With all its faults, failures, gropings, confusions, mischiefs, errors, inadequacies, and shortcomings, the clear eyed see that the U.N. does represent a halting step forward in man's attempt to organize peace.

Above all, they understand what the U.N. can do, and what it can't do, what it is good for, and what it is no good for.

They know, and never forget, that the U.N. cannot be the substitute for any nation's state department, or the architect of its foreign policies. They know that Ambassador Adlai Stevenson's U.N. mission is—or should be—to reflect the policies of our State Department; that our foreign policies can be expounded and debated in the U.N., but cannot—or should not—be designed there.

While they feel that the prevalent starry-eyed view in America has indeed encouraged a dangerous degree of irresponsibility among its members, they also feel that so far—and I repeat so far—our Government has not permitted the U.N. either to shape, or to mis-shape, our foreign policies. And, indeed, clear-eyed U.N. observers know that such mistakes as we seem to have made in the U.N. were originally made in the State Department. They merely surfaced in the U.N.

For example, the failure of the Truman administration to make it quite clear to the Communist world that we would defend Korea is probably what led to that aggression. Similarly, the decision to stop the Reds in Korea was not then made by the members of the U.N. It was personally made by President Truman and his advisers before our representative decided to bring it to a vote in the Security Council. If, as a consequence of this, the Korean war was fought under the U.N. banner, was this a bad thing? Was our U.S. Korean war effort hurt in the eyes of the world for having got the moral imprimatur of most of the U.N. nations?

So far—and I repeat so far—the U.N. forum has provided the United States with a quick instrument for mobilizing world opinion behind its efforts—including the NATO effort—to protect the free world.

Indeed, so far—and I repeat so far—there has been no U.N. peacekeeping operation that was not initially discussed, planned and agreed to by our State Department before it was put to the vote in the U.N.

The real value to the United States—and to all nations of the U.N., is that in the formative stages of their foreign policies the U.N. provides them with a vast listening post, a barometer, a testing ground of the view and intentions other nations will be likely to take of their desired actions.

However tumultuous and disorderly its deliberations are on occasions, the U.N. is an utterly unique town meeting of the world.

To the very extent this is so, the U.N. helps to keep every nation, great and small, from going off halfcocked in its foreign policies. And it keeps all the nations, and all equally, not only mindful of the decent—and indecent—opinions of mankind, but more importantly, aware of which, among the nations, they can count on for material aid and moral support whenever some national military, political or economic showdown becomes inevitable.

The U.N. is also unique as an international decompression chamber. In 1960, for example, the Congo threatened to become another Korea. But for the intervention of U.N. peacekeeping forces, United States and Russian troops would probably be confronting one another today in the jungle cockpits of Africa. Granted, the U.N. Congo operation was badly botched. But again, the blame for this rests far more on the antecedent confusion in our State Department than on confusion in the U.N. And, botched, or not, U.N. intervention has succeeded—for the time being—in preventing the Communists from setting up an effective base in the heart of Africa.

Certainly U.N. peacekeeping operations in Suez, Cyprus, and the Congo have—so far—and I repeat so far helped to avert direct military United States-U.S.S.R. military confrontations. To this extent, the U.N. has performed, however, poorly, one of its major functions—to lessen the chances of a nuclear war.

There are two more dry-eyed, or realistic points, in favor of the U.N. The U.N. is the only kind of survival insurance that the small and middle powers have today. The weak, infant, struggling nations of the world see the U.N. as the midwife of their birth, and consider their membership in it as the very seal and warrant of their independence. It is not only their shield and shelter from their voracious neighbors—like Red China and Soviet Russia—but it provides many of them with the only place where they can make contact on an equal footing with the great powers. Most of the struggling new nations can not afford posts in all the capitals of the world. Their U.N. missions are in many cases, their only ones. And precisely because this is so today most great nations send the cream of their own diplomatic corps to the U.N. The U.S.S.R. is no exception. Our U.N. mission has, besides Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, four other Ambassadors (Plimpton, Yost, Tree, and Williams).

And finally, we must remember that below its peacekeeping level of operations the U.N. has generated a number of specialized agencies which are truly international in the best sense. They are of such mutual benefit to the nations that all would be losers, if, they had to be abandoned as a result of the U.N.'s collapse. To list a few, there are the Special Fund, the Program of Technical Assistance, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the World Health Organization, UNICEF, various postal, telecommunications, and meteorological bodies, refugee work groups, and so on.

Perhaps we should note one dubious exception—UNESCO. Even in the opinion of many stanch U.N. supporters, the United Nations Educational, Social and Cultural Organization, with headquarters in Paris, is a heavily Communist-dominated agency. It is the one U.N. agency which even strong friends of the U.N. feel that the United States should seek to disband or reform. This we could do in short order by cutting down or closing off our financial contribution—over 40 percent of the total—until such time as UNESCO would undertake to give the democratic nations a voice commensuarte with free world opinion and support.

And now I believe that we have provided a reasonable framework in which to confront the present crisis in the United Nations.

The essential facts are:

First, the U.N. is an organization which, with all its failures, faults, and follies is on the whole devoted to the maintenance of peace, the promotion of human welfare, the independence of all nations, and the fostering of human rights. Secondly, the majority of its members do realize that the Communists represent forces which threaten their own national independence. To the extent that the majority know this to be true, they are passionately desirous of keeping the U.N. a going democratic concern.

Conusequently, whenever the chips go down—which is to say, whenever the United States is prepared to put them down—the majoirty will go along, albeit with grumbles, moans, or wails on our side.

Second, through the power of the purse, the United States can discipline the U.N. whenever it threatens to act against the vital interests of the United States.

Whenever the White House and the State Department is prepared to take a clear, firm, and reasonable stand on any issue brewing or boiling in the U.N., the majority will vote with us especially if they are made to understand that a "nay" vote will be tantamount to a vote to scuttle the U.N.

Consequently, I believe that the present financial crisis can be overcome if the United States firmly demands that the other 114 members put their minds to work to find some formula which will permit the Soviet Union to make a financial contribution representing the $52.6 million it owes, without insisting that the Assembly invoke article 19. Any face-saving formula is, in my view, to be accepted. But what the United States cannot accept, both for its own sake, and the sake of the U.N. itself, is to permit the Soviets both to retain their vote and to welsh on their debts. This solution of the crisis would mean that henceforth every member of the U.N. would feel free to default with impunity, and that sooner rather than later, the entire financial burden of the U.N. would be transferred to America. The U.N. would then indeed become what its hot-eyed cynical critics already claim it is—an instrument of Soviet policy, subsidized by the U.S. Treasury.

And last, the question of the admission of Red China. Plainly, the pros and cons of this enormously complex question cannot be properly examined at this late hour. Red China's Mao Tse-tung has repeatedly insisted that all political power comes out of the barrel of a gun. The admission of Red China, smoking gun, and now nuclear bomb in hand, would be a mockery of all that the U.N. claims to stand for. Common sense should tell us that we cannot let this happen. It would be the tragic symbol of the moral collapse of the U.N. And worse, it would be the prologue to a third world war. Nevertheless, sooner or later, the United States must face the political reality that the position of the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa has steadily deteriorated throughout the world, and that this fact is being accurately reflected in the mirror of the U.N. The cold political truth is that the government of Peiping, representing 600 to 800 million mainland Chinese seems, for the foreseeable future, here to stay. And whether in hope or in fear, the overwhelming majority of the U.N. members would recognize it today, except for the strong stand the United States has up to now taken on the question. But despite this stand, most U.N. observers agree that the time is coming, if not this year, the next, or the year after, when the Assembly will certainly defy our wishes and vote Red China into that body.

This will be the most crucial vote ever cast in the U.N. If our stand does not change, the U.N. defiance of it will do irreparable damage to our international prestige. It will show that we have irretrieveably lost our predominate influence over that body. It will enhance the power and the reputation of the Red Chinese throughout the world. And this alone, will immeasurably compound our problems in maintaining peace and order in Africa and Asia.

What can we do to avert this calamity?

It seems to me that what is needed now, and most sorely, is a clear and firm statement by the President, explaining not only the conditions in which we will continue to resist Red China's admission but also the conditions in which we would be willing to agree to it. In my view, this means that we must insist that we will not vote to admit Mao Tse-tung's representative until:

(a) Red China publicly agrees to keep hands off Vietnam; (b) agrees to neutralize the Formosa Straits; (c) formally abandons her territorial claims on her southeast Asian neighbors and on India and Taiwan; (d) agrees that Taiwan China shall remain an independent nation, seated in the U.N., and (e) signs the test ban treaty, and following Moscow's ideological lead, renounces nuclear war as an instrument of national policy.

But we must at the same time make it plain, plain, plain, that if the Assembly votes to admit Red China before these conditions are fulfilled, the United States will be left with only one honorable recourse—to withdraw its support from the United Nations.

In conclusion, the surmounting of both the financial and political crisis in the U.N. must begin with the clear resolve of the

White House to bring that organization back to a sense of reality by reminding it that however desirable the U.N. is, its existence is not utterly necessary to the security of the United States or the peace of the world, and that the time has now come when the United States has begun to envisage withdrawing from it, if its members not only wantonly persist in violating their own rules, but in making a mockery of the noble purposes for which the U.N. was founded.

Especially, the President himself must now undertake to educate American public opinion. He must set both the starry-eyed U.N. lovers and its red-eyed haters straight. He must explain that further compromises on our part are dangerous to American prestige, and a betrayal of the U.N. itself. He must also explain that if the U.N. can be brought to a renewed awareness of its responsibilities for peace, all nations as well as the United States will be the gainers.

In short he must remind the free world that the last, best hope of the world is not the U.N. It is today, as yesterday, the generous but clear-eyed and firm leadership of the United States in world affairs, even though that leadership can be greatly sustained and strengthened through the United Nations.

The Natchez Trace Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, the National Park Service is in the process of planning the last segment of the Natchez Trace Parkway, between Nashville, Tenn., and Natchez, Miss. Apparently, there is unanimity of opinion among the local people that this route should follow the historic ridge route, rather than traverse a rich, productive valley, thereby tearing up farms and disrupting local living, including great damage to one of the community's finest recreational areas.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Nashville Tennessean of March 3, 1965, and an editorial from the Nashville Banner of the same date be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. They point out the reasons why the parkway should follow the ridge route, where it historically belongs.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Mar. 3, 1965]

NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAY BELONGS ON OLD NATCHEZ TRACE

Nashville long has looked forward to the approach of the Natchez Trace Parkway, but as the big day nears, the National Park Service is clouding the view with expensive impracticalities, impinging upon the county's much needed recreation areas, and threatening further to clutter traffic on the southern and western approaches to the downtown Nashville.

Here's the proposition: The Federal Government locates the route, the State government buys the 800-foot right-of-way and the United States builds the thoroughfare.

There are two ways—right and wrong—for the last leg of the project to enter and terminate in Davidson County.

Although the Park Service refuses to give the accurate location, there is every indication it has picked the "valley route" and it is wrong in every sense of the word.

In the first place the original Natchez Trace was not in the valley. Wild animals and Indians laid out the first trail and it was and is on Backbone Ridge west of the Big Harpeth lowlands.

Cut an 800-foot swath through the highly developed farmlands along Old Hillsboro Road coming north from Leiper's Fork, turn west at the Meeting of the Waters with the wide ribbon of parkway, come by Old Town and on up the Harpeth into the Vaughn's Road area to the steeplechase course in Warner Park and you will run into big money and confusion.

All the way the State will be forced to purchase or condemn potential subdivision land valued at from $500 to $1,000 or higher per acre. In construction the Federal Government would be forced to bridge the Harpeth and other streams, not to mention overpasses above local roads and highways.

Warner Park already is crowded. It's difficult to find an unoccupied picnic spot in the summertime. If the Natchez Trace terminal and visitors' center is located on the park property between Old Hickory Boulevard and Little Harpeth River, baseball diamonds and the model plane flying area will have to go. Where? Try and find the necessary space.

Suppose the U.S. Park Service decides to go through the Warner Parks, and turn the tourist traffic into the already heavily traveled streets of the city of Belle Meade. At best the out-of-State cars would be sent into Highway 190 and Hillsboro Road, adding to the growing traffic and increasing the difficulties of visitors who want to get through Nashville.

Why not avoid all this extra expense and urban complexity? Why bring a memorial to a wilderness trail into town when the real trail in its original wilderness setting is nearby?

Old Natchez Trace is on Backbone Ridge now. It can be traveled on foot or horseback or by jeep. The highland is forested and for the most part undeveloped. It would not be as expensive as that in the valley. The terrain is picturesque and offers overlooks and recreation areas.

The terminal could be in the Pasquo area, or the Trace parkway could stay on the ridge to McCrory Lane, where it could turn down to the Interstate Highway 40 interchange. On the interstate tourists could go west or they could swing into Nashville, take the expressway system and depart on interstate routes north, east, and south.

The ridge route is correct, practical, more beautiful, and costs less. The State, which will have to buy the right-of-way must get busy. The board of park commissioners should protect the Warner Parks. The city of Belle Meade and metropolitan governments cannot afford to waste time.

Let's locate Natchez Trace Parkway along old Natchez Trace.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Mar. 3, 1965]

TRACE VALLEY ROUTE PLANS PROTESTED

(By Ralph Dawson)

Groups of historians and engineers renewed protests yesterday to the U.S. Park Service over the routing of the final leg of the Natchez Trace Parkway into Nashville.

The Natchez Trace Association Committee on Location has mailed a petition urging the Service to consider the ridge route for the final 12 miles of the parkway, rather than the valley route being considered by the park board.

Albert Ganier, historian and retired engineer, said the main reasons the association opposed the valley route are:

Research has shown that it does not follow the route of the historic Trace.

It will cost almost seven times as much as the ridge route.

It will dead-end at the south end of Percy Warner Park at the east edge of Edwin Warner Park, creating a traffic problem into Nashville and possible damage to park facilities.

The Metro Park Board may become involved in the controversy because of the proposed entrance into Warner Parks.

B. R. Allison, a park board member, said last night he would try to bring the parkway routing before a meeting of the board today.

"I intend to discuss the subject as soon as possible. Possibly today if we have time on the agenda," Allison said.

"I don't want it misunderstood that I'm opposing the routing, but I am sure the park board would want to look at it real close if it infringes on the Warner Parks property," he said.

At least three middle Tennessee congressmen will meet with a Park Service committee soon to discuss the parkway routing.

Senator ROSS BASS, Democrat, of Tennessee, said yesterday he and Representatives WILLIAM ANDERSON and RICHARD FULTON will meet with representatives of the Service to discuss the Nashville route.

BASS said the Service is expected to announce the route for the parkway within the next few days.

Col. M. A. Mitchell, retired Army engineer, who is cochairman of the location committee, said the committee had been protesting the valley route for a year.

Mitchell said a petition opposing the route and signed by 77 persons was mailed to Tennessee Senator ALBERT GORE last year.

He said the association would continue to oppose the route through a campaign to Midsouth Congressmen.

Ganier, retired engineer of design for N.C. & St. L. Railway, who has studied the Natchez Trace for 10 years, said the routing disagreement begins at Duck River Ridge in Williamson County.

Ganier said the valley route follows closely the old Natchez Road, built in 1802, which failed as a substitute because traffic began to move through Franklin 3 miles to the east.

The valley route was apparently selected so it would pass near the old Montpier mansion, according to Ganier, who says the mansion was built in 1822, years after the Natchez Road had become obsolete.

Ganier said the valley route will cut through many large farms with excellent potential for suburban development and rights-of-way acquisition for this route will cost $635,000 compared to $92,800 for the ridge route.

Ganier contends that the valley route will dead-end into Old Hickory Boulevard in Warner Park, forcing motorists to travel a mile to the left or right to continue into Nashville.

"If the parkway is extended through Warner Park, it will damage the park and deflect foreign traffic through Belle Meade," Ganier said.

Ganier said the "ridge route" would follow Backbone Ridge, near the original Natchez Trace and end in the vicinity of Highway 100 near Pasquo.

"Any other route would not be historic," he said.

Ganier said his research of the route shows that the ridge route also provides the most scenic advantages besides eliminating the extra cost and traffic problem.

The Natchez Trace Parkway was authorized by Congress 15 years ago. Most of the work on the parkway has been in Mississippi with only one section of the route completed in Tennessee, Ganier said.

Medical Education—Its Meanings and Maladies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very interesting discussion by Dr. Henry J. L. Marriott, entitled "Medical Education—Its Meanings and Maladies." It was presented at the Fall Institute for the Directors of Medical Education.

MEDICAL EDUCATION—ITS MEANINGS AND MALADIES

(By Henry J. L. Marriott)

As your practical problems are all rapidly being solved by the experts, I am permitting myself the role of the nasty gadfly and the luxury of philosophizing.

Osler's sayings are full of wisdom, and one of his most valuable but little quoted pieces of advice was "acquire the art of detachment." [1] Whether you are criticizing the article you have just written, or appraising the woman you think you love, or merely evaluating the mess that medical education has gotten itself into, it is helpful to stand back and, if you can, review the subject with remote and neutral eyes. And another useful principle for critics is to be contrary—canvass popular opinion and then postulate the opposite. Some of you may subscribe to Humphrey Neill's "Letter of Contrary Opinion" in which he applies his theory to the stock market—if you do what everyone else is doing, you'll probably be wrong. How valid that is I am not qualified to say, but if you apply the principle to your thinking it's not only a lot of fun but it also gives you an excellent springboard for your critical plunge. Everyone says that American medical education is the best in the world—so it probably isn't. Now that's a great start. If you can thus in one mental swoop free yourself from the shackles of conformity, you have gone a long way toward the goal of detachment and therefore of clear thinking.

Let me invite you to retire with me to the crow's-nest—it will be a little crowded but we shall then all be able to look down with a bird's-eye detachment on the busy bustle below.

I am not going to talk about "programs," or foreign graduates, or the town-and-gown syndrome, or basic sciences, or programed instruction, or any of the other fashionable topics. These are fussy details of superstructure and there is little point in putting the modern finishing touches to the first-class staterooms on the sun deck if there are gaping holes beneath the waterline. Yet that is what we are doing to our expensive, wasteful, topheavy ship of education.

I am not alone in this jaundiced view, for instance, one of our articulate writers addresses interns in these words: "You have been told, quite correctly, that it is the most expensive medical education in the world. You have been exposed for 4 years to the best paid professors available anywhere and you have been trained in a physical plant beyond compare. * * * There is only one fault. Your education stinks." [2]

The problems we face are not of our own making. Our whole educational system lacks discipline and rigor. As an amiable outsider once remarked: "countries which, like the United States, have set up a considerable popular instruction without any serious education, will long have to expiate their error by their intellectual mediocrity, the vulgarity of their manners, their superficial spirit, their failure in general intelligence." [3] And one of our own most respected and outspoken educators, Hutchins, comments: "this seems true." [4] Now, if you're getting ruffled, please cultivate the art of detachment.

Let me digress for a moment while you cool down. There seems to be a prevalent misconception that medical education differs from other forms of education. The art of medical writing is often similarly vested with a "difference". The truth is that neither is different from other kinds of education or writing; and if the principles of good education or good writing are applied by the medical essayist, the result will be good medical education or good medical writing.

What is the meaning of education? It is not training—an infant can be trained to sit on its pot. It is not learning—a dog can learn to beg. It is not knowledge—everyone has knowledge of a sort. It is not teaching—a moron can be taught to ride a bicycle.

Education is more than all of these. As you know, it comes from the Latin educere, to lead forth, and it implies the bringing out and developing of the student's mind rather than the hammering of something into it. Since medicine is both art and science, it requires both education and training—training for the science and education for both. Unfortunately training is often emphasized at the expense of education and the mind is relegated to the "squirrel-like activity" of accumulating innumerable facts. Here in Florida, as those of you know who have visited Marineland, we train our physicians but we educate our porpoises.

A trained mind is one that knows the rules and acts upon them. An educated mind may or may not know a formula for the occasion. But it has learned the art and science of thinking, and how to adapt its knowledge to new circumstances. It is flexible and able to reason; and so it can range freely and broadly, at ease with the known and the unknown, because during its education it has learned to find its way among ideas. You can be well trained, knowledgeable and learned yet without the ability to reason. The homeliest definition of education was given us by a cook who, when the distinguished mistress of the house invaded the kitchen and baked a loaf of bread, said: "That's what education means—to be able to do what you've never done before." [5] And G. K. Chesterton's pithy comment on the aim of education was: "I do not * * * mind whether they can put two and two together in the mathematical sense: I am content if they can put two and two together in the metaphorical sense." [6]

So much for what education is or ought to be. Now what do we expect of it in medicine?

MAJOR MALADIES

When I compare the image of what I would like to find in my personal physician with what our educational system is producing, I find it disturbing, to say the least. Maybe you don't feel like this, but I am old-fashioned and humanly frail enough to want an intelligent man, with commonsense by the barrel. He must have time to talk to me or I shall lose confidence in him. He must be careful, considerate, conservative, and communicative. Not too scientific, but with enough sense and science to know when he needs help. He must be a critical thinker, impervious to the blandishments of those who have something to sell. I am still looking for him.

Obviously no system can produce nothing but paragons, but a good system ought to be able to produce a majority with most of the desirable physicianly qualities. A few days ago a friend of mine who has had a wide experience with doctors was giving vent to her feelings about them: "I can forgive their not knowing, but their not caring I cannot forgive." I asked her what she thought about the prospect of computer diagnosis. "People don't want to be diagnosed by a machine; but I must say, if I can get the same service from a machine, maybe quicker and cheaper, and without getting my feelings hurt, then I'll buy it."

I would say that the first major malady of medical education is loss of the human touch. This is a gaping hole beneath the waterline.

The idea that diagnosticians may be replaced by computers is no idle dream. The vanguard of such replacements are already in our camp. The scope and accuracy of a diagnosing computer is staggering when compared with the fumbling inadequacies of even the well-educated and well-informed mind. The only edge that we mortals have, and can always have, over these looming monsters in the human touch. But unless our doctors show real devotion to their patients, taking superhuman pains to understand and counsel them—and this is the real, almost lost, art of medicine—they will be decidedly inferior to their electronic rivals. So far as one can now see, it will not be possible to teach a machine culture, taste, discrimination, and the pursuit of excellence. If we are to preserve our place in the sun, we must hang on to these precious human qualities by which we can maintain at least a dwindling superiority over mechanical medicos.

The second major malady I would like to draw attention to is the prevalence of uncritical thinking which is presumably the direct result of faulty education. The motives, methods, and conclusions of even some of our biggest names in research are frequently open to question. Peter Salisbury, whom some of you probably know was a fine original thinker and researcher, puts it strongly: "Devastating overall effects are caused by the authoritarian, undisciplined, self-centered habits of thought which are inculcated into future doctors by many prominent teachers who have given up even the pretense of objective scientific standards." [7]

A scientist, who deserved the name, was being driven along a country road. By way of conversation his companion ventured: "I see Farmer Angus has shorn his sheep." "Yes," came the reply, "it does appear, from here, that those sheep have been shorn on this side." Nothing short of this degree of objectivity is scientific.

All around us are examples of uncritical thinking in the everyday practice of medicine. I shall be content to give but three of the most glaring and commonplace examples:

1. The pharmaceutical farce: We daily fall prey to Osler's "peripatetic sirens" who woo us with sugared tales of tablets. I conducted a little research into hospital prescriptions a few weeks ago. So far as I know, the digitalis glycosides have many vaunted but no proved therapeutic advantages over the leaf as an oral preparation. One-half milligram of digoxin—which seems now to be the prevailing fashion—costs 12 times as much as 0.1 gram digitalis leaf. At a hospital in Tampa that caters solely to indigent patients, $300 a year is spent on digoxin for outpatients; an equivalent amount of leaf would cost less than $70. If all their patients were maintained on the leaf instead of digoxin, we would save $730 a year. Suppose, conservatively, that 1,000 hospitals across the country had the same tale to tell: nearly three-quarter million dollars could be saved by using the equally effective leaf. Admittedly that is only peanuts.

I found that the same hospital was spending $22,000 a year on a certain tranquilizer for outpatients. Nationally, tranquilizers are second only to antibiotics in their volume of sales. Now let me read you a few

Footnotes at end of speech.

extracts from a recent critical appraisal of the tranquilizers: [8]

"In general, in sufficiently large doses—that is 600 milligrams of chlorpromazine a day—the phenothiazines have very modest detectable actions in quietening disturbed patients, to a greater extent than occurs with dummies. A very large part of any observed improvement occurs also in patients treated with dummies, and the main benefit appears to be attributable to therapeutic optimism, to the increased attention devoted to patients when a trial is in progress, and perhaps to interactions between patients. It is probably undesirable to give larger doses of the phenothiazines to outpatients than those that have been already tested, and on the evidence it looks as though their use for this purpose is a rather expensive and mildy poisonous way of administering a placebo. In contrast to the results on hospital inpatients, proper trials of phenothiazines on neurotic outpatients have often shown no greater benefit that with placebos. The evidence about the remaining tranquilizers is equally discouraging, except for those that are less than a year or two old and so are the subject only of enthusiastic and not yet of critical reports. The simplest conclusion from all the evidence is that barbiturates are better than any other drugs for the treatment of anxious patients, and as they have been used for much longer their possible dangers are happily much more likely to be fully known. Conclusions: in spite of much enthusiasm and propaganda tranquilizing drugs have very limited effects. * * *"

If I may paraphrase a sentiment of Oliver Wendell Homles: If all the tranquilizers in the world were dumped into the ocean, it would be as much better for the human race as it would be worse for the fishes.

To return to the Tampa hospital and its tranquilized patients you will agree that probably half of the patients needed no medication at all. But let's be charitable and assume that they all required something and were given phenobarbital instead in equivalent amounts at a cost of $1,500. Over $20,000 of our taxpayer's money would be saved and if this could be duplicated in 1,000 hospitals the saving would be over $20 million. This is but one drug; multiply the effects and it seems perfectly obvious that with educated prescribing and without tapping any other source of funds, we could build several medical schools every year with the resulting savings. One of the most important functions of a doctor is "to educate the masses not to take medicines." [9] We do just the opposite and the casualty rate is rising.

2. To hold a drowning man's head under water we all agree is un-Hippocratean and un-American. Yet the equivalent practice is rampant among our New World Hippocrateses. All over the country people with pulmonary edema are being put to bed. This may not finish them off, but it makes it a little harder for them to stay alive. All the instincts of patients with cleft heart failure, all the observations of observant physicians and all our knowledge of physiology tell us that the best position for such a patient is sitting bolt upright with feet on ground. Yet in every hospital you can see the incongruous sight of the dangerously dyspneic patient propped miserably in bed with trunk almost at right angles to horribly horizontal legs—a posture that a trained athlete with easy breathing would not tolerate for long.

3. We accept the word of milk manufacturers that bottles are as good as breasts. Yet it is high treason against nature to assume that the crinkled hemispheres of the frail human nutritionist's brain can concoct a food as whole and good for newborns as the two divinely smoother hemispheres created for the purpose. And this of course is quite apart from the physiologic, psychologic and probably cancer-avoiding benefits that the nursing mother derives. We are so uncritical and gullible that, when the manufacturers of syringes for artificial insemination assure us (with Madison Avenue zeal) that it is just as satisfying for the female and much healthier for the male to avoid intimate contact, it will really not surprise me if we cast aside the universal experience of our ancestry and the witness of our own senses, endorse the manufacturers' claim and forgo the natural climax of our passions.

I submit that any learned profession that permits such fundamental flaws in its collective thinking and practices to go virtually unchallenged while it pats itself on the back for its scientific achievements and giggles with glee at the advent of a gimmicklike programed instruction, is enjoying the precarious equilibrium of an elephant perched on a picket fence.

MINOR MALADIES

Now I shall briefly run through some relatively minor maladies which from my detachment in the Crow's Nest, have seemed to represent some of the more glaring inferiorities of our system.

The inadequate gradient

It is common practice to entrust much of the teaching of young medicos to their immediate seniors. The sophomore resident teaches the freshman intern; the junior attending teaches the resident. This is all right up to a point but, without belittling the admitted values of an almost contemporary preceptor, the practice is greatly overdone. Residents are not the best teachers for interns. For many reasons the bigger the gradient of wisdom between teacher and taught the better. You cannot expect the almost blind to keep the sightless out of the potholes. Unhappily one so often hears the physician in the prime of his forties or fifties, just when he has become old enough and experienced enough to have earned the privilege to teach, complain that he has had enough of it and wants to turn it over to the younger men. This abdication is bad for him as well as for everyone else.

One might remind these middle-aged would-be abdicants that the primary meaning of the title they bear, doctor, is teacher, not physician (from Latin docere, to teach); and that they have really just reached the prime point of their professional skill and experience that fits them for the privilege of educating their colleagues. Osler pointed out that "commonsense fibers are seldom medullated before 40." [10] Until the attitude is commonplace among our elder statesmen that the role of teacher is a privileged one, our system of education will continue to be second rate. In other educational systems, the brunt of the teaching of medical students falls upon the willing shoulders of the veterans who remember their Hippocratic obligations and jealously guard the prerogatives of their seniority.

Improper emphasis

In the gilded halls of our medical academe, laurels go to the researcher and writer, not the teacher. The excellent teacher, who engages in no research, is decidedly lower in the hierarchy than the successful researcher who has no teaching in him. Many such men have little knowledge of the practice of medicine and so our young aspirants are exposed to the ivory tower utterances of impractical impractitioners. If you want the best in teaching you must create a system which will reward the man who toils in the teaching vineyard as highly as the one who moves with princely tread among his bubbling vats and electronic recorders.[11]

Money, a visiting German said of us, is the most important thing in America medicine. The young doctors dream of making it, and the older ones have nightmares that they will lose it in lawsuits. Indeed money is often a positive obstacle to the pursuit of excellence in education because you can buy so much with it, including scientific integrity and bias, and because it is much more readily available for the researcher than the teacher. Academic promotion and size of salary for full-time teachers should be based, "not on published experimental work but on their scholarly knowledge and their ability to stimulate young minds to combine scientific knowledge and human understanding in the patient's care." [12]

Faculty onus

It is a mistake to penalize a conscientious faculty member for doing his job well. Yet this is what happens, with the result that the teachers are encouraged to turn in shoddier, less conscientious performance. I learned my lesson my first year of full-time teaching. In June I flunked an obviously inadequate student. What happened? Instead of his staying deservedly flunked, the dean sent the boy to me for a most uncomfortable interview to find out why I had flunked him; next I was requested by the dean to organize a summer refresher course for the boy so that his grades could be reconsidered in September. So, as a result of my appropriate and conscientious action, I suffered the discomfiture of an embarrassing interview and then forfeited many hours that summer to work with an inept student who hated my guts and who was unfit to become a practitioner.

The year-tight system

This overlaps with my last point. It is a much more serious thing to flunk a boy in this country because he has to repeat a whole year. In Europe, where flunking is commonplace, the student is delayed only 3 or at the most 6 months before he is entitled to another crack at the examination. Examinations are a necessary evil and should be kept to a minimum; but if they are to be administered they should be realistic and impartially graded by an extramural examiner. Further, all examinations aimed at assessing the candidate's clinical qualifications should include bedside exercises and should not be based on his ability or luck at putting crosses in the right squares.

Chickens in controversy

Frank and open criticism is healthy. It curbs extravagant claims and unsupported dogma. But we seem to be unduly timid about chastising each other in public, exposing faulty research, and otherwise taking our colleagues to task. What frank criticism is offered usually cowers behind the anonymity of editorial boards. A freer exchange of views and disagreements would further knowledge. In the absence of open dispute, it is amazing how long mistakes can be perpetuated. Aristotle's four-legged flies buzzed blissfully on into the 15th century A.D.

The proper remedy of our creeping ills must, however, begin before medical school. Wilder Penfield says:

"Allow me a sidelong glance at university education. The initial training of physicians is, all too often * * *, deficient on the side of the humanities. It is not enough for universities to train the medical students in basic science and in technique * * *. He should read foreign languages. He should be able to express himself in good English. He should read it and write it. He should learn to enjoy some aspect of literature, have some hobby in the arts. These are not undue requirements for a man who is to be spiritual counselor to educated men and women as well as the keeper of their bodies." [13]

As another increasingly prominent educator insists: "All universities should insist on one minimum standard for all their degrees * * * that the candidate should be able to write lucidly and grammatically in at

Footnotes at end of speech.

least one language, preferably his own."[14] Write indeed. At the end of 4 years at the university and as many in medical school they can't even spell. I found all these miscarriages in a single manuscript: effevescent, errythematosis, errythema nodosa, insiduous, tampanard, dilitation, proceedure, dicumeral, benifical.

This was a four-authored monster submitted in final form, impeccably typed, to one of our leading national journals. Admittedly four people can't write a paper any more than they can drive a car, but you might except one of the four members of the intelligensia with "arts" and medical degrees to spot and correct one or two of these howlers.

You may say impatiently that spelling doesn't matter * * * so long as the reader knows what you mean. But I would remind you that the three pillars of style are brevity, the accurate use of words, and accurate spelling. Style is worth cultivating and has properly been called the good manners of writing. To the educated reader, the misspeller appears gauche. Robert Louis Stevenson says that the difficulty in writing is "to affect (your reader) precisely as you wish." If he thinks you're gauche, that's probably not what you wish.

We cannot go on ignoring the rust and holes beneath the waterlines. Reforms must be inspired from the top but they must begin at the bottom and our whole educational system needs drastic revamping.

One of the most important things to attend to is the use and abuse of leisure at all ages. Two thousand years ago Virgil gave us the secret of leisure. Some of you may remember his happy shepherd, Tityrus, lying in the shade of a tree playing on his pastoral pipe. A passing friend asks him why he isn't working and he replies: "God gave me this leisure." Leisure is the most important time we have—and it is largely wasted. It is God given and then it is man spoiled. The way to enjoy time is to fill it, not kill it. We are a leisure-murdering people, and the alarming thing is that our leisure time has tripled in the last 75 years. More leisure, more murder.

Boredom is the stifling sin of so-called civilization. Most people are bored without realizing it. It is only when they have learned the exhilaration of flexing the sinews of their minds that they realize how dull life used to be. And how few learn this life-giving lesson. Most of our busy little people impress me that they are striving to achieve a vacuum.

If the situation is to be salvaged, there must be a lively renaissance. At present only 1 in 300 adult Americans ever reads a serious book and the average family leaves its television babbling for 38½ hours a week. A steady canned diet of newspapers, magazines, the unfunny funnies, radio and television lacks essential mental vitamins; minds that are fed on it inevitably suffer deficiency diseases and lose their ability to think and reason. Just as a trooper must be kept fit for the stresses of battle by field exercises, so our minds, if they are to function at their best when called upon, must be kept fit by strenuous exertion. Our muscles of thinking are atrophied from disuse. The only hope for our educational system, and indeed for our civilization, is to relearn the joy of using our own inner resources. People who ignore the lessons of history are forced to repeat them and we are drifting, or rather jetting, into a backwater of soft indolence, mental and physical, such as led to the downfall of previous great civilizations.

Some imperative reforms at the medical level seem obvious from the crow's nest. (1) Character, not grades, must be the touchstone of student selection (perhaps even more important is the selection of those who will judge their character). The characteristics that I would pay most attention to are: (a) personality, that indefinable quality that plays such an important role in relationships with others; (b) spirit of curiosity; (c) zeal for self-education; and (d) use of leisure. (2) The content of curricula should be cut down by unbiased selectivity. There is too much deadwood in the curriculum now and the information "explosion" leaves me undismayed. Additional facts will do us little good anyhow unless we learn the principles and attitudes that will make us better doctors. (3) Emphasis must be shifted from fact storing and placed on the science of logical unbiased thinking; and, by example and precept, doctors must be imbued with the priceless qualities of considerateness and gentleness which are the essence of good manners. (4) Physicians in the making must be exposed to the humanizing humanities in significant depth. (5) Money must be less available, since ideals are demonstrably choked with dollars. A few of the right men with a lot less dollars could do a far better educational job.

I have no enthusiasm for treating cancer of the lung with cough syrup. Nor am I in favor of treating the ills of medical education with sugared phrases. I believe the debilitating disease that has education in its malignant grasp must be exorcised with despatch or we will have a corpse on our hands. "Diseases desperate grown by desperate appliance are relieved, Or not at all."

The only hope for our patient is to realize what is happening, appreciate its importance, and get off our complacent fannies and do something about it.

---

[1] Osler, Sir William, "Aphorisms From His Bedside Teachings and Writings," Henry Schuman, Inc., New York, 1950, p. 68.

[2] Williamson, P., "Practice," Bellaire, Tex., May 15, 1964.

[3] Renan, quoted by Hutchins, p. 103.

[4] Hutchins, R. M., "Some Observations on American Education," Cambridge University Press, 1956, p. 103.

[5] Palmer, G. H., "Life of Alice Freeman Palmer."

[6] Chesterton, G. K., "All Things Considered."

[7] Salisbury, P. F., "Controversy: A New Medical Specialty," New Physician, 13: A-25, August 1964.

[8] Weatherall, M., "Tranquilizers," Brit. Med. J. 1: 1219, 1962.

[9] Reference 1, p. 101.

[10] Reference 1, p. 130.

[11] Modified from: Miller, G. E., et al., "Teaching and Learning in Medical School," Harvard University Press for the Commonwealth Fund, Cambridge, Mass., 1961.

[12] Modified from: Davidson, C. S., "On Teaching the care of the Patient," Arch. Int. Med. 101: 847, 1958.

[13] Penfield, W., "The Second Career: With Other Essays and addresses," Little Brown, Toronto, 1963.

[14] Pickering, G. W., "Language: The Lost Tool of Learning in Medicine and Science," Lancet 2: 115, 1961.

"The Water Poachers" in the Imperial Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the February 13, 1965, issue of America magazine contains an article entitled "The Water Poachers," by Father James Vizzard. The article concludes with the prophetic statement:

> It is not at all impossible that even the longstanding and flagrant violation of the law in the Imperial Valley will finally be resolved.

When Father Vizzard wrote this article in November 1964 there was scarcely a hint that the Department of the Interior was ready to move in on the Imperial Valley, Calif., excess-land owners. But on December 31, 1964, the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, approved and released a formal opinion by the Department's Solicitor, Frank J. Barry, which states that despite 30 years of nonenforcement, the reclamation law's 160-acre limitation does, indeed, apply to the privately owned lands in the Imperial Valley. On the same day, the Secretary instructed the Bureau of Reclamation to begin implementing the opinion.

It can hardly be expected that those whom Father Vizzard calls "the Imperial Valley land barons" will accept this ruling without a bitter and lengthy struggle, both in and out of the courts. Intense pressure undoubtedly will be placed on the Congress for legislation to reverse the Department's decision. Truly, the coalition of conscience and power of which Father Vizzard speaks has its work cut out for it.

I agree fully with the views expressed by Father Vizzard in "The Water Poachers," and I ask unanimous consent that his interesting and thought-provoking article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WATER POACHERS: LARGE LANDOWNERS IN WESTERN DESERT AREAS FIGHT TO KEEP SUBSIDIZED IRRIGATION

(By James L. Vizzard)

Irrigation and reclamation in the arid areas of the West are not of much interest to people in other parts of the country, but they should be. Over the 62 years since the passage of the Federal Reclamation Act, billions of dollars of tax money have been spent to build an impressive array of massive dams and wide-ranging canal systems, which have generated vast quantities of hydroelectric power and have provided irrigation water for millions of acres of parched land.

Anyone who has ever visited Hoover Dam on the Colorado River, Grand Coulee on the Columbia, and Shasta on the Sacramento knows the size—and can estimate the cost—of these projects. Anyone who has ever driven through the San Joaquin and Imperial Valleys of California, the Salt River Valley of Arizona, or the Columbia Basin of Washington has seen how publicly subsidized water has turned deserts into lush garden spots.

A farmer from Iowa, however, or a suburbanite from Connecticut might well wonder why the Federal Government should be involved in such activities. Why, they might ask, should all the Nation's taxpayers be required to pay for these vast facilities, which benefit primarily the people of limited areas of the West? Why should not the development of these resources be left to the States or to private enterprise?

The irrigation and reclamation program under the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior had its start in the Reclamation Act of 1902. The proponents of the legislation made it very clear why the

national interest justified Federal involvement in the development of land and water resources in the Western States. They pointed out that, in the 40 years between the passage of the Homestead Act of 1862 and the turn of the century, hundreds of millions of acres of federally owned land had been homesteaded to build the base of a productive farm economy and solid rural communities. The only public lands still available for preemption in 1902 were the desert and semiarid areas of the West, which were useless without an adequate and dependable water supply. It was in the national interest, they argued, to open up these potentially productive areas to settlement and development through federally financed irrigation projects.

The sponsors of the bill were also convinced that the Nation's economic, social, and political welfare would be enhanced by spreading the family-farm pattern to the privately held lands of the Western States. As any reader of "Westerns" knows, that area was then dominated by huge ranches built on old Spanish grants, on the consolidation of land grants to Civil War veterans, and on the millions of acres conceded to the builders of transcontinental railroads.

The framers of the Reclamation Act of 1902, backed by the vigorous support of President Theodore Roosevelt and the majority of Congress, quite deliberately intended to break up these vast estates, and to open up these new areas as well as public lands to a prosperous agriculture in the traditional American pattern. They explicitly stated this in the basic objectives of the reclamation law: the promotion of the family farm and the prevention of land and water monopoly. It was the overriding value to the Nation of these objectives, they felt, that justified the vast expenditures of Federal funds in the irrigation and reclamation projects of the West. The Reclamation Act of 1902 was, in a sense, a land reform law, a law intended both as a preventive and as a curative measure.

The specific requirement of the act that was expected to guarantee the achievement of its objectives was the so-called acreage limitation provision. Water from a federally financed project could be delivered to no more than 160 acres of land in a single ownership. If a private owner of land in excess of 160 acres within an irrigation project wished to receive water for all his land, he could do so by signing a recordable contract to dispose of the excess within a period designated by the Secretary of the Interior, usually 10 years. In that case, an antispeculation provision of the law required that the sale of such excess lands should be at a price that prescinded from the availability of publicly subsidized water. Of course, if the large landholder decided not to accept project water for more than the allowable 160 acres, he could continue to hold and use his excess lands as he chose. It was expected, however, that most excess landholders would sign recordable contracts and before the end of the 10 years dispose of their excess lands. Thus the opportunity would be created to establish what the law intended; namely, a pattern of properous family farms.

In its 62-year history, the reclamation program has developed and delivered water to approximately 8 million irrigated acres in 95 projects. In the Columbia Basin alone, the Grand Coulee provides subsidized water for half a million acres in family farms, and in future years, this benefit will be extended to another half million acres.

The program then, has created new and prosperous family farms where they did not formerly exist and has strengthened the family-farm pattern where it had been traditional but had been threatened by an inadequate water supply. Where before were only vast stretches of arid land, there are now tens of thousands of stable family farms, for the most part producing nonsurplus fruits and vegetables and adding immeasurably to the quality and quantity of the American diet.

Why then should the reclamation program be in trouble? The answer must be brief and blunt: it is because of the conduct of very large-scale landowners, who clearly recognize the bonanza in subsidized water and intend to have it for themselves despite the clear intent of law.

Project construction loans are interest free. As anyone knows who has financed a home, that waiving of interest over the usual 40-year payout period equals a grant of the original cost of the project (the interest, of course, is paid by the Federal Government, i.e., the taxpayers). Moreover, revenue from hydroelectric power generated by multipurpose dams carries a large part of repayment for the whole project, including irrigation water. Finally, a part of the cost of many projects is allocated to fish, wildlife, recreation, navigation, and flood control, and therefore is not repaid by water users. It has been calculated that in the semidesert areas of California and Arizona the subsidy amounts to about $1,000 an acre of irrigable land.

It is no wonder, then, that such large landowners as the Southern Pacific Railroad, with its hundreds of thousands of acres, are delighted at the prospect that the Nation's taxpayers will provide them with water.

It is nothing new, of course, for excess owners to attempt to circumvent and pervert the law. The Imperial Valley of California stands as a flagrant example of their success. This empire of some half-million acres, east of San Diego on the Mexican border, is the fief of a handful of baronial owners, many of whose holdings range in the thousands of acres.

These rugged individualists, who have profited so freely at the public expense, have for decades defied the acreage limitation of reclamation law. Beneficiaries of vast amounts of subsidized Colorado River water made available by public expenditure on the Boulder Canyon project and the All-American Canal (water that southern California cities would now dearly love to have for their expanding populations and industries), they have built an economy in the valley that takes continued violation for granted. This economy is one of absentee landlordism, ever-increasing size of operation, disappearance of smaller family-type farms and businesses, and ruthless exploitation of seasonal farm labor—in other words, the exact opposite of the result that Federal participation in the development of the western land and water resources was intended to produce.

Their case rests on the politically suspect and undoubtedly illegal administrative ruling given by the lame-duck Secretary of the Interior, Ray Lyman Wilbur, only a few days before he went out of office with Herbert Hoover in 1933. In one of his last official actions, Secretary Wilbur gladdened the hearts and fattened the pocketbooks of the Imperial Valley land barons by ignoring the clear intent of the law and declaring Imperial exempt from acreage limitation.

Since then, the inaction of subsequent administrations has been explained by rationalizations ranging from Interior Secretary Krug's statement of 1948: "We feel that we must allow that inconsistency * * * to continue," to Secretary Udall's 1962 admission: "The continuing press of other matters has caused us to defer current study of the Imperial situation."

The plain fact is that the Imperial excess landholders are wealthy and politically powerful, and, at least up until now, in the absence of organized and effective protests from concerned citizens, no Secretary of the Interior has felt strong enough to take them on. As is indicated later in this article, however, some action may be hoped for in the near future.

The Imperial Valley stands not as an isolated example but rather as a pattern and an inspiration encouraging excess owners in other projects to devise their own ways of circumventing reclamation law. Never have they mounted a direct assault on the principle of limitation—which would most certainly arouse sleeping public opinion. Rather they have learned to delay, to exploit carefully planted loopholes in the congressional acts authorizing their projects, to seek exemptions based usually on the purported inadequacy of a 160-acre holding (despite the fact that the capital value of such an irrigated unit in California may go as high as $300,000).

In the Central Valley of California, the scene of by far the most grandiose irrigation schemes, a convenient geological feature of the area is commonly utilized by the exceedingly large landowners to benefit from but evade the effects of the law.

Underlying millions of acres of this enormously fertile but semidesert land is a vast underground reservoir into which natural forces have poured water for countless centuries. In recent decades, however, thousands of irrigation pumps have been sucking this reservoir dry to such an extent that in many localities the overlying earth has subsided a dozen feet or more. As the underground water table has sunk ever deeper, the cost of pumping the diminishing water supply has become almost prohibitive.

In the face of such potential disaster, the large landholders of the area have not depended on their own well-publicized free enterprise, but rather have looked to the Federal Government for relief. What they have attempted in the Westlands Water District may serve as an example of their tactics.

This district, large though it is, is only a small part of the 4 million acres on the west and south sides of the San Joaquin Valley in central California, almost all of which is owned in exceedingly large private holdings. The following table lists the major ownerships in this area.

	Acres
Kern County Land Co.	348,026.46
Standard Oil Co. of California	218,485.48
Southern Pacific RR. Co.	201,851.00
Tejon Ranch	168,531.07
Boston Ranch	37,555.58
Other private holdings (over 1,000 acres each owner)	1,323,821.57

The Westlands District comprises 352,000 irrigable acres. The pattern of ownership is comparable to that of the area of which it is a part. The Southern Pacific Railroad, for instance, owns over 60,000 acres within the district and another 60,000 acres in the immediately adjacent West Plains District, which is expected soon to be incorporated into Westlands.

With consummate political skill, the powerful owners of these vast acreages have persuaded Congress to appropriate a half-billion dollars to construct the San Luis project, a combination of dams, canals, reservoirs, and distribution systems, to collect water in northern California and transport it to the parched land of the Central Valley. By legislation and administrative legerdemain, the large landowners were able to have half the San Luis area declared a "State" service area and therefore presumably exempt from the Federal 160-acre limitation. The other half, the Westlands "Federal" service area, required another device to achieve their objective of benefit without limitation. That device has been an apparently innocuous clause in the Westlands water service and distribution system contracts, a so-called "unavoidable" clause. Stripped of legal and geological complications, this clause asserts that if the underground water table should be improved through the operations of the San Luis project (this is a chief and explicit purpose of the project) whether through the seepage of surface water or through the cessation of

pumping by those who receive surface water, then this very sizable and clearly intended benefit to the excess-landowners would be considered "unavoidable" and therefore not in violation of reclamation law.

But for the alert, effective protest of a handful of concerned citizens and organizations, this maneuver most likely would have succeeded and the Southern Pacific and other corporate owners would have been enabled to euchre taxpayers out of hundreds of millions of dollars while destroying the very justification for Federal reclamation activities. Early in 1964, an informal coalition of conscience and power was formed, including the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, AFL-CIO, National Farmers Union, National Grange, National Rural Electric Co-operative Association, and others, all organizations that have a long-time commitment to the basic purpose of reclamation law. When the coalition's initial protests to the Department of the Interior were ignored, a Senate hearing was requested. Largely through the intervention of Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, the request was granted. Although the testimony before the Senate Interior Committee, chaired for this hearing by Senator NELSON, was overwhelmingly against the Westlands contract and focused particular criticism on the "unavoidable" clause, the Department of the Interior and the Westlands spokesmen kept insisting that everything was legal and proper.

Realizing, therefore, that this avenue of protest was a dead-end street, the coalition shifted its efforts to the White House. In addition to a flood of letters, personal visits on the issue were paid to the President by, among others, George Meany, Walter Reuther, Jim Patton, and Clyde Ellis. In blunt terms, these stanch allies of President Johnson told him that the whole reclamation program was in danger because of the Westlands contract. Each of the letters and visitors made it unmistakably clear that unless this circumvention of the law was rectified, the friendly and effective support of these organizations and others would be withdrawn from the reclamation program, which would thus almost surely be killed.

Sensitive as ever to opposition, particularly that of friends, President Johnson acted swiftly and decisively. He ordered Secretary Udall not to sign the Westlands contract until it had been renegotiated to satisfy the coalition's objections. As a result, over a period of several months, representatives of the interested organizations had frequent and extended discussions with Secretary Udall and his staff.

The coalition's efforts finally met with success when, on October 7, 1964, Secretary Udall approved a Department memorandum that laid down the lines along which the contract was to be renegotiated. By apparently unintended irony, the text of this memorandum was published as an appendix to the printed hearing on the Westlands contract, which the Senate Interior Committee issued in late October. Everything in the memorandum refutes and contradicts the testimony submitted by the Department at the hearing.

Thus, the Westlands conflict seems to have been solved. But the problem of a genuine and effective enforcement of reclamation law still persists. The stakes obviously are very high and the powerful excess landowners of the West don't give up easily. They can be expected on the San Luis and other projects to attempt to devise other means of circumventing the law.

There are, however, several reasons for hoping that the law's basic purpose, the promotion of the family farm and the prevention of land and water monopoly, will be better protected and enforced in the future. The first reason is the surprising power the coalition was able to exercise once it got organized and moving. A second reason is the apparently sincere conversion of the administrators of the Department of the Interior. Now that they know that anything less than full enforcement will receive massive and effective protest and that their attemtps to enforce the law and public policy will be backed by both conscience and power, they seem willing to move decisively in that direction—and to judge themselves capable of doing so. It is not at all impossible that even the longstanding and flagrant violation of the law in the Imperial Valley will finally be resolved.

A Great American and Newspaperman Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding newspapermen in the history of Indiana passed away last week in Rochester, Minn. Don F. Datisman, by reason of his ability and his capability to exercise commonsense and judgment on local, national and international problems, occupied a position high in the newspaper world.

The following editorial by H. B. Snyder, publisher of the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune, does ample justice to a great American:

DON F. DATISMAN—HE WAS A FAIR MAN

Don F. Datisman was a fair man. Let's put it this way—

A newspaper's editorial columns are customarily anonymous. They are not always impersonal.

For many years the personality of Don F. Datisman played a major role in shaping the Post-Tribune's editorial columns. It was a strong personality. Yet, in its editorial role, it was also as impersonal as a personality can be.

He was guided, in his very great help in shaping and expressing editorial opinion, by what he considered best for his community, and his community was a system of outward moving concentric circles—the newspaper, the city of Gary, the northwest Indiana area, the State, the Nation, and the world.

He was a deeply sympathetic man, but for one failing he could never show sympathy. He could not sympathize with any betrayal of a public trust. He was ruthless, and advocated ruthlessness, in attacks on corruption in public office, though he might later display a personal sympathy for the person involved.

He was a brother to his fellow man. His was the firm conviction that a man's color or a man's creed or a man's nationality should have no bearing on that man's chances. Don Datisman believed America was built on equality of opportunity and he pushed that as both his personal creed and as this newspaper's creed.

He was first of all a newspaperman, but in the finest sense of the word. He believed in crusading for the public good, but he was quick to discourage anyone who conceived a short-lived crusade built on sensationalism for the sake of selling papers. This was not a tendency to downgrade the newspaper's own interests, but one built on the belief that the newspaper could thrive only as the community thrived.

He was a believer in the social approach—quietly active in parole work, a leader in the YMCA, a counselor with directors of tax-supported and privately supported welfare agencies, a worker in his Episcopal Church—but he was a great believer, too, in the individual.

He was personally a Republican—once served as a Republican precinct committeeman because he conceived that as his civic responsibility. He was professionally nonpartisan. He could advocate in editorial conferences and write in his lucid English strong arguments for the Democrats when he thought the Democrats were right and the Republicans wrong on any particular issue or as represented in any particular candidate.

He was living proof of what an individual can do against difficulties. Stricken with polio as a child, he labored always under physical handicaps, but they only served to drive him to harder labor. He was impatient with those who sought to accord him special treatment, to baby his handicaps.

Dat was a worker. He lived by work, he died by work.

He gave of himself tirelessly, unselfishly. In the World War II years when all manpower was short he carried far more of a load on this newspaper than any man should be asked to carry. It was more than he was asked to carry, but the only thing Dat knew about a job was that it was something to get done, and if there was no one else to do it, then he would carry the load. Even in those almost impossibly arduous days he carried on also with civic duties, not because he had to, but because he believed they needed doing.

That same tirelessness carried on into years when his workload was theoretically eased. We say theoretically, because Dat could not understand, or accept an easy workload for himself.

As the accompanying cartoon, of which he was so proud, indicates he roamed the world much in these last few years. He spent 5 weeks in the rigors of the Antarctic. He went wherever he could where something new was developing in space—to watch and report the feats of the astronauts. He toured Europe, he toured Asia, he toured the U.S.S.R., he toured the United States.

He never drifted idly as a tourist, though. He insisted on writing, writing in his own impersonal but forceful style, because he believed that it was his duty to serve as the eyes of his newspaper's public back home.

Perhaps this devotion to work was Datisman's one major sin. He lived by work and very possibly it was work which has taken him away.

If that be true, it can be said as partial easing of our sorrow, that he died doing the work he loved.

He has left his fellow workers the challenge of courage, work, and a dedication to truth.

The entire Post-Tribune staff is saddened now, but it is proud, too. It is proud to have worked with Don F. Datisman.

He was a fair man.

American Bureau for Medical Aid to China, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the American Bureau for Medical Aid to China, Inc., the bureau's associate executive director, Allen Lau, delivered an informative and

provocative address which I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues. Entitle "Changing Conditions in Asia Today," the address by Mr. Lau enumerates a number of positive steps which the Government of the Republic of China is taking to meet the contingency arising from the termination of American economic assistance. Mr. Lau also propounds the warning that, "From those who came out of mainland China, one hears that 1965 will be the crucial year for the Communist offensive in southeast Asia—taking over South Vietnam and Laos, and helping Indonesia in their border warfare against Malaysia."

I request, Mr. President, that the address by Allen Lau be made a part of the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGING CONDITIONS IN ASIA TODAY

(By Allen Lau)

I wish first to deliver a message from our Honorary Chairman, Mme. Chiang Kaishek. She wants to convey to all of you her very best regards. I may add that both the President and the First Lady are in the very best of health.

From my recent tour of duty in free China and my visits to other southeast Asian countries, I must say that conditions over there on the whole are not as cheerful as during my visit in 1962.

Japan is still forging ahead with her industrial development and economic expansion. There is a rapid increase in the cost of labor and the cost of living. The Japanese Government has come out in the open with its policy of assuming leadership in the Far East through economic penetration, and is trying hard to create an image of independence from the United States in the eyes of the people of this area. They intend also to agitate more vigorously for the return of Okinawa to their possession.

In Hong Kong the area is actually going through a recession. Many of the tall and expensive buildings—there are many—are not selling well. Just before I left the Far East the Ming Tuck Bank in Hong Kong closed its doors. Without the continued inflow of substantial oversea Chinese remittance to Hong Kong this area could easily face a major economic crisis.

The Philippines has not quite caught up with Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Japan in terms of economic growth. While I was there thousands and thousands of Chinese doing retail business were literally driven out of their shops. Just before their President made his last trip to America, the Filipinos staged a demonstration against the United States. The underlying reason was that a demonstration manifesting resentment against the United States would fortify their President's bargaining power.

From those who came out of mainland China one hears that 1965 will be the crucial year for the Communist offensive in southeast Asia—taking over South Vietnam and Laos, and helping Indonesia in their border warfare against Malaysia.

The explosion of the Chinese A-bomb naturally arousned a good deal of attention. In Japan it immediately brought back the memory of Hiroshima. In Taiwan it hastened the desire of the government for an early invasion of the mainland. It has frightened everybody—particularly India. However, many of these people take the atom bomb more calmly than we do because they do not think they will be bombed. At this point the A-bomb has more psychological value. Some military experts predict that a hydrogen bomb will be set off within a year.

American economic aid to Far Eastern countries, it was pointed out to me, is no longer of significance. Indonesia, Cambodia, and Burma no longer want U.S. aid. The Philippines want it under another name. What remains of U.S. aid is very small. With the unhappy position we find ourselves in South Vietnam and the attempt of the present administration to work toward rapprochement with Communist Russia, the prestige of the United States in this area is at very low ebb.

An anecdote going around the Far East may depict the situation somewhat. While the Communists on the mainland were digging into the tombs of emperors for antiques and salable items to replenish their badly needed foreign exchange, they came across a time capsule dating back to the 18th century. This time capsule was quickly brought to Mao Tse-tung. When opened, it contained a large demonstration poster with these words, "Marco Polo, go home!"

The United States has one strong and dependable ally and friend in the Far East. That country is the Republic of China in Taiwan. The affairs of this country and its people and its relation to our program is what I want to report to you.

Taiwan, once predominantly agricultural, with the majority of its farmland owned by absentee landlords, is now turned into a country where landownership goes to the individual farmers. It has pulled itself rapidly out of an agricultural economy into an industrial one with an average annual economic growth of 7.3 percent since 1953.

The soundness and steady growth of the economy is due to close cooperation between the U.S. representatives and responsible Chinese Government officials working together harmoniously and efficiently. Equally important, I must say, is the deep sense of devotion and dedication of the many so-called mainlanders with managerial and administrative ability who have put the plans into high operational gear at great personal sacrifice by receiving only subsistence pay. It is due to stability in government and the industrious and likable people.

Out of this impressive economic growth emerge two things that seem palatable to the American mind:

First is the consistent policy of the Government of putting strong emphasis on private ownership of industry. Second are the significant steps that are being taken to improve Taiwan's foreign investment climate.

Since last year the U.S. Government has concluded that Taiwan has reached an economic level at which it can maintain its own rate of growth. At the end of 1964 no new AID program was initiated. By June 1965 all phases will be terminated.

What are the positive steps the Government of the Republic of China is taking to meet this contingency arising from the termination of economic aid? During the months I was there the following developments took place:

1. Eighteen industries, among them petrochemical, synthetic fiber, plastic, iron and steel, food processing, export processing and others, have been given top priority consideration. These industries have been chosen on the grounds that they are all useful in either earning or saving foreign exchange which the Government set as the primary objective for the island's economic development.

2. On January 26 of this year, the Government finally created a special industrial free duty zone in the port of Kaohsiung for export processing purposes complete with transportation, storage, and other facilities. While I was visiting Kaohsiung early last month, road and water lines and electricity were being laid.

3. The Government and private agencies have embarked upon a birth-control program aiming to reduce the birth rate in Taiwan to 2 percent per year. With an economic growth of 7 percent the island will have a chance for expansion.

Friends of free China wish her well on the road to economic independence. It gives Americans a sense of satisfaction that their foreign aid effort has brought such wonderful results. It gives the Chinese a sense of pride that by proper use and management of U.S. aid and their own resources they have created a nation which is a credit to its people and an asset to its ally.

This does not mean that free China has solved all her problems. She has a population growth of 3½ percent per year; a large standing army; a very large number of public servants who need better pay, better housing, and better medical care. As the AID officials admitted, the island has really only begun to grow.

During my stay in free China I learned the following things:

That practically all the health and medical work financed by AID has been terminated. Its support for medical institutions and nursing schools like the NDMC and TAITA has also been terminated. Projects like the health training station, which was built with AID funds, and similar worthwhile projects carried on in the Kohlberg Memorial Laboratory and other laboratories, will have to be supported from other sources.

I wish to report to you the very good news that the China International Foundation has granted a good sum of money to carry on the health training station at the NDMC.

With the termination of U.S. Government aid the Chinese Government certainly will not be able to find means to increase the subsistence pay of its civil servants. Thus ABMAC's subsidy program will become even more essential.

We need to give whatever medical aid we can to the frontline freedom fighters stationed on the offshore islands. These troops are keeping vigil day and night on that flank of the free world, thus pinning down more than a million Communist troops who otherwise would be free for other areas. With our confrontation in Vietnam today, which can turn into a shooting war any moment, having 600,000 well-trained, well-seasoned troops stationed within shouting distance of the Communist mainland makes a lot of sense.

The shifting from an agricultural to an industrial society brings along the same health, medical, and mental problems as it has brought to every country going through such a transformation. ABMAC has been alert to such needs and has been encouraging such work. ABMAC's supporting agencies have been working directly with industries to set up health and family welfare clinics. As a result of such activities, it is hoped that absenteeism will be reduced and efficiency will be increased.

Will the free Chinese economic progress be stymied by the stopping of the AID program? Will the Government's unceasing effort to promote and spur local industries, employment and foreign trade and investment be sufficiently successful to maintain the rate of growth? Will the birth control effort be effective? Will the medical and health standards of the people be maintained and further improved?

No one at this juncture can offer a definite answer. One thing is sure—in free China today there is but one thought from the people I talked to, from economic experts to people in high positions including Madame Chiang Kai-shek, "How can we collectively and individually help to sustain the well-being and health standards of the people?" My own immediate reaction is that we in ABMAC, as a people-to-people organization, as friends of the Chinese people, and even as business partners, should step up our part in the cause of the free Chinese. I do hope you share by feeling and will join us in this very worthwhile undertaking.

Severe Labor Shortage Develops at Many Firms as the Boom Rolls On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, despite persistently high levels of unemployment, an increasing number of jobs are going begging for want of personnel to fill them.

The March 4 issue of the Wall Street Journal reported that a recent survey of the hiring plans of more than 60 companies showed that the overall supply of labor is the tightest since the midfifties, with skilled help almost totally unavailable in some areas. At the same time, the December and January figures for help wanted ads, as computed by the National Industrial Conference Board, reached their highest levels since 1953.

The growing tightness of the labor market is resulting in increased overtime pay, higher training costs, and the rising cost of recruiting help.

Federal statistics indicate that some firms must rely on overtime to meet production needs. This is borne out by the fact that the average factory workweek in January came to 41.4 hours, its highest level since 1945. The inflationary potential in the current situation is obvious.

If we are to avoid inflation, restraint in Government fiscal and monetary policies is clearly called for, along with increased emphasis training and retraining programs, both as a remedy for unemployment as a means of speeding economic growth.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article from the Wall Street Journal in the RECORD at this point:

JOB ABUNDANCE: SEVERE LABOR SHORTAGE DEVELOPS AT MANY FIRMS AS THE BOOM ROLLS ON—KERR-MCGEE HUNTS SALESMEN—ATLAS VAN LOOKS FOR CLERKS—OVERTIME HITS POSTWAR HIGH—STRESS ON TRAINING PROGRAMS

The longest peacetime business boom in the Nation's history is creating severe labor shortages in many major industries.

A Wall Street Journal survey on hiring plans of more than 60 companies shows that the overall supply of labor is the tightest since the midfifties, with skilled help almost totally unavailable in some areas. There seems little chance of relief in the months ahead because most of the companies—with their backlogs bulging—will be trying to expand payrolls between now and next summer.

"We need everything—from unskilled laborers to salesmen with college degrees," says Ron Skinner, director of employment for Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc., an Oklahoma City-based oil and minerals producer. The hiring problem continues, he adds, even though the company has lowered its experience requirements in many classifications, sharply increased its help-wanted advertising, and started its first formal college recruiting program. A big reason for the employment pressure is that Kerr-McGee has been growing rapidly; in the past 8 months alone its employment has climbed more than 10 percent to a record 6,100.

MUST LOOK AHEAD

"The demand for help has shot way up in recent months and it isn't showing any signs of leveling off," says L. J. Stober, manager of an employment agency in Detroit. "Companies planning to add new help know they have to start looking at least 2 months in advance." He says employees are in demand for all types of jobs, but sales personnel—even those with little experience—are in particularly short supply.

Small towns as well as big ones, and even some communities fresh off the depressed areas list, are feeling the labor squeeze. In Evansville, Ind., John J. Thorne, sales manger for Atlas Van Lines, Inc., notes that the moving company has been advertising since January 1 for 20 clerk-typists to work in a reorganized oversea division but so far has managed to hire only 8. "In some cases we're offering double the wages we paid in 1960 and we still can't attract anyone—and Evansville got off the depressed list only a year ago," he declares.

The tightening labor situation is readily evident from Federal employment figures. Despite the much-publicized pockets of high unemployment in such areas as Appalachia, the number of workers without jobs fell to 4.8 percent of the labor force in January, the lowest rate since 1957. Unemployment figures for February are due today and, partly because of the lingering dock strike, Government officials say they may show a slight increase.

The heavy volume of help-wanted ads in newspapers also confirms the increase in job opportunities. For both December and January, the index on such advertising as computed by the National Industrial Conference Board reached the highest level since 1953.

RAISES INFLATION FEARS

The labor shortage is causing many problems in personnel offices and raising some fears the economy may be entering a new round of inflation. Last week Kermit Gordon, Director of the Budget Bureau and former member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, assured Congress that inflationary dangers wouldn't be worrisome until unemploymnet fell below 4 percent. Other administration officials have said this figure isn't likely to be reached this year.

But for some companies the higher costs brought on by a shortage of labor are already here in the form of increased overtime pay, higher training costs, and the rising cost of recruiting help.

"The furniture business is so good that overtime is normal around here," says a North Carolina furniture maker. "We consider 45 hours a common workweek but a third of our work force lately has been putting in at least 50 hours." The fast pace of orders has prompted the furniture maker to send recruiters into the nearby Appalachia hills for men to train, but so far the effort has proved largely unsuccessful. "We've brought a few men down but they are unhappy when you take them out of the hills. They'd rather be back home without a job."

The people of Appalachia, however, take to training well, the furniture firm reports, so it is exploring the possibility of constructing a plant in the hills as a solution to the company's employment problem.

PLENTY OF OVERTIME

The trend toward more overtime is one of the most striking features of the business boom. Though many firms limit overtime work to emergencies because they regard it as basically inefficient, Federal statistics show that an increasing number of companies are relying on it to meet production needs. The average factory workweek in January soared to 41.4 hours, the highest level since war year 1945.

In many instances companies are meeting the demand for labor by instituting training programs, some of them financed by Federal manpower development and training funds but most of them underwritten by the firms themselves. This is especially the case with machinists who, with engineers and salesmen, seem to be in shortest supply.

"Toolmakers and skilled machinists are just not available," asserts Fafnir Bearing Co., New Britain, Conn. "You just have to supply your own apprentice training programs."

At Cleveland's National Acme Co., "backlog has spurted 50 percent in the last year and we're not finding it easy to hire skilled lathe, grinding and milling machine operators to fill the gaps," says Raymond E. Channock, executive vice president. So the company has hired a training director. He regularly visits technical high schools to locate those interested in pursuing machinists' work and then sets about to train them. Some 200 men are in the training program, Mr. Channock reports.

Even so, it hasn't been successful in meeting all the company's need for trained help. "We're now hiring millhands with a year's experience for work that previously we had demanded at least 5 or 6 years' experience," the executive says. "However, this has boosted our wage rate by 10 to 20 percent."

Eastman Kodak Co. also finds that operating its own training program isn't enough. With business booming and skilled help hard to find, the company has augmented its training program with some hard-sell recruiting efforts. Among other things it watches for company closedowns or for defense cutbacks affecting firms in its area and then rushes in teams of recruiters to search for help. A few weeks ago it picked up some much-needed instrument makers this way when it discovered a soft labor market which had quickly developed in Elmira, N.Y., not too far from Kodak's big plants in Rochester.

Metal trades' employes are in great demand at Kodak. "If we could hire a couple of hundred it would greatly ease our situation," says a spokesman. He says the problem has become especially acute in the past 30 to 60 days because of heavy sales and plant expansions.

With plant building and expansion continuing at a fast pace, engineers, designers, and draftsmen have been big beneficiaries. They are in short supply in many areas, as evidenced by the recent experience of Carl Kuenzi, president of the Cleveland engineering firm of H. Fisher & Associates, Inc., when he tried to hire a construction designer for a 4-month job of redesigning several chemical processing towers in Norfolk, Va.

Relying on a card file of some 10,000 names it had built up in the past 5 years, Mr. Kuenzi made 40 unsuccessful calls before he found a designer in New York City who expressed some interest. "I had to fly to New York, wine and dine the fellow in a lavish restaurant and then had to pay him $4.50 an hour plus $100 a week for living expenses as well as pay his transportation to and from Norfolk," the executive complains. "And these designers aren't even college graduates—they're just glorified draftsmen and have to work under an engineer."

Mr. Kuenzi says most other designers wouldn't even talk to him unless they were offered contracts with guaranteed annual salaries of $20,000, no matter how many months they worked. "Such terms would ruin us since we hire strictly on a short-term basis for individual construction projects," he says.

Though the general employment picture is certainly one of tight supply, there are some exceptions. Perhaps most striking is southern California where heavy aerospace and defense industry layoffs in the last year have made it an "employers' market." When Genisco Technology Corp. recently advertised in Los Angeles for three senior structural design engineers it needed for a major Government contract, the company was deluged with 700 applications.

Altogether, the area's unemployment rate stands at a relatively high 5.8 percent.

Competitive One-Price Cotton: What It Has Already Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, since the enactment of cotton legislation in the 88th Congress, 2d session, the cotton industry has been bolstered stupendously by the creation of a greater domestic demand and a reduction of ruinous textile imports and the increasing of American plant investment by more than 50 percent. Cotton farmers are accelerating their efforts through the Cotton Producers Institute and National Cotton Council on promotion and research with the purpose in mind of lowering costs to the consumer, expanding consumption, and in turning out better cotton products. The National Cotton Council has recently issued a release entitled "Competitive One-Price Cotton—What It Has Already Done." This is a most informative and thought-provoking synopsis of cotton's progress since the enactment of the new law last year. I include this article herewith:

COMPETITIVE ONE-PRICE COTTON: WHAT IT HAS ALREADY DONE

FOR COTTON

Rayon's competitive gains have been checked and turned back. Cotton lost a 629,000-bale annual market to this fiber alone on the cotton spinning system during the 38 months ended March 1964. By December 1964 it had gained back 149,000 bales.

Cotton consumption has begun rising. In the first 5 months of the present crop year, mill consumption was up to a rate of 9.1 million bales, compared with 8.5 million a year earlier.

Cotton farmers, encouraged by a price which gives them a chance to compete for markets, are putting their own money into the Cotton Producers Institute. When combined with the funds which they and other groups are putting into the National Cotton Council, over $6 million in industry money is being spent this year on research and promotion to improve products, expand consumption, and lower costs.

The textile industry is investing in new plants and equipment at a record $950 million annual rate, compared with $600 million before the one-price law was passed.

Imports of cotton in the form of yarn and cloth are down 7 percent from last year.

FOR THE CONSUMER

The great upsurge of consumer spending in 1964 carried retail purchases of clothing up by 8.1 percent. This caused average prices to rise from 31.6 cents to 33.1 cents for the 37 manmade fiber fabrics quoted in the Daily News Record on the first and last business days of 1964. But for the 77 cotton fabrics quoted for the same days, the average price dropped from 28.9 to 28 cents. There were three times as many net declines as increases, although the latter cases were greatly publicized.

The competitive one-price system for cotton has revived a fiber which was rapidly disappearing from the market, and has kept it alive as a vigorous competitor for the consumer's business.

FOR THE ECONOMY

It brought a resurgence of production, employment, and investment in the cotton and textile economy. In a great area which embraces much of Appalachia and of the Nation's poverty problem, incomes improved as a result.

It gave desperately needed help on the balance-of-payments problem. Rayon staple imports, after rising from 37 million pounds in 1961 to 116 million in 1963, and after reaching 40 million pounds in the first 3 months of 1964, dropped off to only 18 million in the 3 latest reported months. Imports of cotton yarn and cloth have declined, as already noted. In a period when many industries are sending capital abroad, our textile industry has raised its rate of investment in American plants by more than 50 percent.

Public Issues Poll, Fourth District, Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, in February I polled the people of Michigan's Fourth Congressional District on several current issues, including medicare, Federal aid to education, the one-man, one-vote principle of apportionment, foreign aid, and our course in Vietnam. In round numbers, 140,000 questionnaires were distributed and 18,000 were returned—an unusually large percentage of response.

Replies were tabulated and compiled by an independent data processing firm in the Washington area. In order that the results may be known I include them at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Survey results

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No answer
1. Should Congress enact a compulsory system of hospital insurance (medicare) under the social security system?	25.2	71.9	2.9
2. Should the Federal Government furnish massive financial aid to primary and secondary schools?	33.2	63.4	3.4
3. If Federal aid to primary and secondary education is provided, do you feel that it should be given to parochial as well as public schools?	37.5	59.2	3.3
4. Do you favor repeal of excise taxes on furs, jewelry, and cosmetics?	32.2	64.6	3.2
5. Should the Federal excise tax on new cars (presently 10 percent of the purchase price) be repealed?	57.7	37.6	4.7
6. Due to the death of President Kennedy, the United States was without a Vice President from Nov. 22, 1963, to Jan. 20, 1965. Do you believe the President should be empowered to nominate a citizen to fill the vacancy, subject to approval of Congress?	69.9	26.9	3.2
7. After appointment by the President—and with approval of the Senate—Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court now serve "for good behavior"—in effect, a life term. In view of the increased political power being exercised by the Court, would you favor a constitutional change establishing a 12-year term for Justices?	77.6	19.5	2.9
8. In view of the present coin shortage and the comparative scarcity of silver, would you favor coinage of money from other metals, such as steel and aluminum?	34.2	59.9	5.9
9. Would you favor an increase in the Federal minimum wage (currently $1.25 per hour) to $2 per hour?	26.6	70.8	2.6
10. Would you favor a reduction in the standard workweek, from 40 to 35 hours?	26.7	70.7	2.6
11. Should the Federal Government require States to apportion both houses of their legislatures on a strict population basis?	32.2	62.3	5.5
12. Should the city and county governing boards (city councils and commissions, county boards of supervisors) be apportioned on the same, strict population basis?	33.3	58.9	7.8
13. Should our immigration laws be changed to provide for admission of aliens on the basis of their skills rather than the country from which they come?	51.2	40.6	8.4
14. In Vietnam which course do you advocate: *Percent*			
Withdrawal of present military support? 17.5			
Advise the South Vietnam Government to seek a negotiated peace with the Vietcong? 41.9			
Further commitment of American men and materiel to an all-out campaign to rid South Vietnam of Communists? 24.8			
No answer 15.8			
15. Would you favor elimination of gold backing for U.S. currency?	10.9	80.4	8.7
16. This year we will be spending about $3,250,000,000 on foreign aid. Do you feel this is—			
Too much? 78.6			
About right? 13.9			
Not enough? 1.3			
No answer 6.2			

Can't Please Everyone, L.B.J. Must Act Firmly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John S. Knight is one of the most knowledgeable writers in the United States. He has long since demonstrated that his only motivation in writing a column is to further the welfare and security of our Nation. This astute publisher has long since demonstrated his cool-headed rationality and his foresightedness.

Mr. Knight is from a very civic minded family. His late father, Charles Landon Knight, was a most distinguished Member of the House. He, too, was a most able editor and publisher.

The column, that I ask to place in the RECORD, not only appeared in the Knight newspapers in Akron, Ohio; Detroit, Mich.; Miami, Fla.; and Charlotte, N.C.; but also in over 100 of the greatest newspapers across the United States. Mr. Knight's fellow editors think so highly of his observations that they like to share them with their readers.

The column follows:

CAN'T PLEASE EVERYONE, L.B.J. MUST ACT FIRMLY

(By John S. Knight)

The stresses and strains of the White House are having a marked effect upon President Johnson. With rare exceptions, he is no longer the buoyant and confident leader of yesterday.

The President has little time for banter these days. The awful responsibilities of his office leave him subdued in manner. His speeches often fall to a whisper. He is not the vibrant warrior of election year.

Certainly, his countrymen can sympathize with the President. His problems are not only complex, some of them are insoluble. He needs our faith and prayers.

Let us remember that the mess in Vietnam, the crisis in our dwindling gold reserves and the weakening of the Western alliance did not have their origins in the Johnson administration.

These were inherited problems which have worsened with the passage of time. Mr. Johnson is today everywhere confronted with emotional and even muscular forms of nationalism which find expression in anti-American riots and demonstrations.

The President's advisers are divided on Vietnam. There are those who seek solution in massive attack, others who believe a full scale assault against the Vietcong could at best bring only temporary victory.

President Johnson is under some criticism for not clearly defining our aims in southeast Asia even though he has said repeatedly that we want only to protect South Vietnam against aggression and seek no wider war.

Unhappily, the Communists from the north have other ambitions and they appear to be succeeding in their objectives.

So the President's present position is satisfying neither the militant nor the wary.

During his comparatively brief tenure in the White House, President Johnson has endeavored to be the understanding compromiser.

He has turned the other cheek to the imperious De Gaulle who raids our gold reserves while France still owes the United States $6.3 billion of debts.

The President has said little about the looting of U.S. embassies nor has he replied to repeated insults heaped upon us by the Nassers and the Sukarnos.

Mr. Johnson is not addicted to invective. He believes that angry answers serve only to increase world tensions.

These are commendable traits but subject to misinterpretation by our adversaries as indicating timidity and even cowardice.

I fear that the President, who has enjoyed considerable success in bridging the gap between dissident elements at home, may be deceiving himself into believing that his remarkable powers of persuasion are applicable to the world at large.

Lyndon B. Johnson is a man who thrives upon adulation and popularity. He is also extremely sensitive to criticism, and shows it plainly in his intermittent press conferences.

In time Mr. Johnson will learn—as have all Presidents—that it is impossible to satisfy the critics or to appease his foes.

It is trite to say that a President is a lonely man, and especially so in the case of the gregarious L.B.J. who loves to mingle and mix with the multitude. But it is true, nevertheless.

Mr. Johnson is discovering that he—and he alone—must make the hard decisions which in time will comprise the cumulative record of his administration.

I believe that the President will feel better physically and mentally when he comes off the kindly kick and commands respect rather than applause.

He might begin by reversing our soft-headed policies on foreign aid. Why should we help Nassar who tells us to "go drink sea water" while he cuddles up with the Communists?

Why should aid be continued to the unspeakable Sukarno of Indonesia where a mob of 20,000 attempted to march upon the U.S. Embassy and burned President Johnson and Uncle Sam in effigy?

Or to Uganda where a jeering mob ripped the U.S. flag from the Embassy and tore it to shreds?

The list of nations which accept our largesse and defile our flag is long and sordid. So why do we help them? Why? Why?

There are indications, too, that President Johnson subjects himself to pressures under the roof of the White House. Organized groups go there with their "demands" and expect satisfaction.

Unless they come by invitation, the President of the United States should throw them out.

No President can please everyone, and Mr. Johnson is not an exception.

If a man is known by the enemies he makes, our President has not earned that distinction since taking office. Too many devious people not only like him, but hope to use him for their own purposes.

Mr. Johnson certainly understands the powers of the Presidency.

It is time for him to employ them in firm and resolute actions calculated to win respect wherever our flag may fly.

RANDOM NOTES

U.S. News & World Report quotes European sources as saying that the United States has only 6 months in which to convince the world that the dollar is still as good as gold.

The problem of our falling gold reserves, now the lowest since 1939, needs more than voluntary action. A good place to start is in foreign aid where, as Senator STUART SYMINGTON, (Democrat, of Missouri) says: "We continue to spend billions of dollars annually, defending many who in turn are now attempting to cripple our prosperity and therefore our security."

When the General Assembly of the United Nations adjourned without resolving the question of the assessments owed by Russia and France for peacekeeping forces, article 19 of the U.N. Charter became a dead letter.

This article says that a member nation in default of its assessments for more than 2 years loses its vote. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson first talked tough, then backed down on orders from Washington. That killed enforcement of article 19 for all time.

Another dear friend, Rear Adm. Sir George Pierie Thomson, Britain's chief press censor in World War II, died recently at the age of of 77. Admiral Thomson was universally respected by all war correspondents. In most unbureaucratic fashion, he always explained his reasons for objecting to passages in their dispatches which he though violated security. The goal of wartime censorship, the admiral once said, was cooperation, not prosecution.

Quote of the week from John M. Johnston's column in the Chicago Daily News: "Repeal of the right-to-work section of Taft-Hartley has gained agreement from some who recognize the infringement on individual liberty, but who consider that too few persons are affected for it to have great meaning. This is a curious concept of right which holds that since only a few people are injured, it makes no difference."

Felix Frankfurter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond, Ind., Palladium of March 2, which is a tribute to Justice Frankfurter, recently deceased:

FELIX FRANKFURTER

As an immigrant from Austria who at the age of 12 couldn't speak English, Felix Frankfurter rose to unusual heights of jurisprudence. He served 23 years as a Supreme Court Justice.

In his early years as a Harvard law professor and a writer of many New Deal programs, he was often tagged a leftist. But after his appointment to the High Court, Frankfurter led the conservative wing in opposing the decisions of "liberal" Justices Earl Warren, Hugo Black, and William O. Douglas.

Throughout his career he was an exponent of judicial restraint. He was a frequent critic of the Court's tendency to interpret the Constitution by "personal predilections" (personal prejudices). The Court's duty, he felt, was to "represent the impersonal authority of the law" and not become involved in political questions.

Asserting that reform and making of laws belong exclusively to the legislative branch, Frankfurter said in 1962, "There is not under our Constitution a judicial remedy for every political mischief. In a democratic society like ours, relief must come through an aroused popular conscience that sears the conscience of the people's representatives."

Recognizing that the Court's effectiveness depends upon the people's confidence in it, he said, "The Court's authority—possessed neither of purse nor the sword—ultimately rests on sustained public confidence in its moral sanction. Such feeling must be nourished by the Court's complete detach-

ment, in fact and in appearance, from political entanglements."

Chief Justice Earl Warren told Frankfurter at his retirement in 1962: "Few men in the life of the Supreme Court have made contributions to its jurisprudence equal to your own."

Several years ago, Judge Learned Hand said of Frankfurter:

"I regard him at the moment as the most important single figure in our whole judicial system."

The immigrant who became the conscience of the Supreme Court has left his mark on American jurisprudence.

Pegasus: Let There Be Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, we have many interesting discourses of literature called to our attention. Most are in the form of prose, but today I bring to you two free verse poems written by an Arkansas poet, Miss Murriel Alys Green. The poetry is unique and interesting. In view of their comparison with many of the problems being considered by Congress and facing the Nation in these uncertain and challenging times, under unanimous consent of the House I include them with these remarks in the RECORD.

The poems follow:

LET THERE BE PEACE

(By Murriel Alys Green)

Sheathe bayonets, O, nations,
Lay aside time-missled-bombs,
Shed the cloaks of armament,
Close the breach across the seas—
Let the age-worn, mold-covered,
Moth-eaten, vain Song of Hate,
Go to its eternal fall,
Beyond all reclamation—
O, nations, let there be peace.

Seal bonds of world-alliance,
Lift up voices in fellowship,
Bow heads in humble prayer,
Teach others the Christian way—
Let the age-old, hope-inspired,
Faith-borne, sacred Hymn of Love
Go to its ultimate rise
Before God bans salvation—
O, nations, let there be peace.

PEGASUS

(By Murriel Alys Green)

Mythical winged horse, off-spring of
Poseidon, blood of Medusa, charged forth,
To challenge life. Head flung high,
Mane and tail arched to wide-berth of
Freedom, neighed to his Greecian sires,
Sighed to the night-winds, in bold,
Rebellion against masked veils of reason.
Fleet-hoof sparked of unshaken resolve,
Struck ground of forebears, to print upon
Mount Helicon, the fabled spring,
Hippocrene, divine haunt of the muses.
Hail brightest star of Pegasus Square!

Immortal steed, today the golden-bridle of
Science captured your daring courage of old,
Charmed by your astral splendor, hurled
Gigantic spaceship "Pegasus" into orbit,
To explore the presence of harmful outer
Mysteries, beyond the Sea of Clouds.

Second-self gain fame—myth to reality—
What secrets hold the Sea of Tranquillity?

Retirement Village Developers Turn to Bella Vista

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, he was my law partner in Earle and West Memphis, Ark., back in 1931, and I wish you would listen to him now talking about a yearly payroll of $1,675,000. There used to be times when we could not scrape up enough to meet our weekly payroll of $15 for our lone secretary, and the monthly office rent of $35 was a constant problem.

Even then John Alfred Cooper was a real go-getter. He reminded me of the old saying, "Nothing ventured, nothing gained." He soon abandoned the law to move into bigger and bigger dreams until he has recently built a new 800-home community in the Ozark Mountains for resort lovers and retirees called Cherokee Village. The following newspaper article by Ernie Deane from the Little Rock, Ark., Gazette tells the story of John Cooper's latest intuition—to map a city of 25,000 citizens out of a tiny place named Bella Vista:

RETIREMENT VILLAGE DEVELOPERS TURN TO BELLA VISTA

The east Arkansas cotton planter who built a town in the hills of Sharp County, and named it for a tribe of Indians, now is setting out to build an even bigger one in Benton County. This time around he doesn't have to find a name, because the community already has one—Bella Vista.

John Cooper, Sr., is the founder of Cherokee Village, near Hardy, in which more than 800 homes have been erected in 10 years, and 9,000 lots sold to prospective builders.

For the past couple of years, Cooper and his associates have been working to acquire 56 pieces of property north of Bentonville, and up to the Missouri line, along both sides of U.S. Highway 71. They have bought 14,000 acres in all, and have put together plans for development of a new town of 25,000 population.

Construction is to start immediately, he told a group of press people from Arkansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas he invited to Bella Vista this past weekend.

While there, we got a look at his plans and at some of the landscape on which Bella Vista Village is being started.

By Arkansas standards, the project is so big and ambitious there might well be some skepticism concerning it—except for the fact that Cherokee Village has proved itself, 150 miles to the east of Bella Vista. Cherokee Village is open to inspection, and there's no denying what's been developed there.

Cooper held a press conference at which he called on several of his professional planners to explain what is in the making.

One of these men is Jim Hatcher, of Little Rock, a city planning consultant who has had a hand in urban renewal projects in Little Rock, Hot Springs, Fort Smith, and other Arkansas cities. He specializes in planning for cities, colleges, and schools.

Hatcher told of land studies made of the Bella Vista spread, of 100 homes and a shopping and service center that will soon be started, of five lakes to be created, of roads and streets, which will lace the area.

The town center, he said, will be north of the original Bella Vista resort site, where a lake, a few cottages, the old Sunset Lodge, and other landmarks remind visitors of the heyday of more than 30 years ago. It is in the town center where the first 100 houses will be built.

Joe Finger, of Houston, a widely known designer of golf courses, described the Bella Vista course that will be laid out along Sugar Creek and U.S. 71, near the town center. It will have 18 holes and be suitable for tournaments of national importance. The terrain, he declared, is ideal for a course of exceptional beauty.

A major part of the purpose in locating the course adjacent to the highway is to give motorists a striking impression of an Ozarks landscape put to recreational use.

For architectural planning, Cooper has engaged Fay Jones, of Fayetteville. Jones is a professor of architecture at the University of Arkansas, and a national award winner in home design competition.

His use of native wood and stone, and his blending of homes into the landscape in the Frank Lloyd Wright tradition, are to be seen in Fayetteville, Bentonville, and other places in northwest Arkansas. The visiting press was taken to two Jones-designed homes in Bentonville, one of which was a national winner.

Price ranges from the first 100 homes in Bella Vista Village, he predicted, will be from $12,500 to $20,000.

To keep construction crews in line, and to make certain that as much natural beauty will be preserved as is possible, Cooper has engaged, J. Duke Moody, of Memphis, a nationally known landscape architect.

Moody expressed pleasure at being assigned to the project at the beginning, rather than after the landscape has been scarred. His job will be, he explained, to protect and preserve natural features, such as rock formations and wooded glens. The tract, he added, is, with a few exceptions, virtually unscarred at present.

Cooper himself described the overall development as a $220 million one, involving an area five miles wide and four and a half miles long. A working force of more than 400 employees, drawing an annual payroll of $1,675,000, will be necessary, he said, to build Bella Vista Village.

He called attention to nearby facilities in Bentonville, such as a new hospital, as being of special advantage to those who will live in the new town. Educational and cultural advantages of the state university, only 30 miles away, will add substantially to attractions of life at Bella Vista, he also sad.

He declared mid-America to be growing at such a rate in population, and the amount of leisure time and early retirements to be increasing to such a degree, that there's no question of a market for property in such a community as planned for Bella Vista Village.

He summed up his philosophy about overall planning, and carrying out the plans, in these words: "When we sell a man a home, we want him happy." Let a developer get enough disgruntled buyers, he added, "he'll find he has built a ghost town."

Cooper announced that sale of lots will start not later than June 1. Meanwhile, his construction chief, Bill Orr, and heavy machinery and men to run it are already on the ground. It looks like the busiest doings that Bella Vista has seen in a long time are just ahead.

Friday Session

SPEECH

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I came in just in time to hear, I believe correctly, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], complaining about holding a session today. I have heard the gentleman from Iowa a good many times complaining about not holding a session on Friday, so this shows how difficult it is to please the gentleman.

Target: The Men Behind the Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleagues and my fellow Texan from Houston, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. BOB CASEY, recently introduced two bills designed to place the emphasis in firearms control legislation on the criminals themselves—not on the guns they employ. His bills, H.R. 5641 and H.R. 5642, the former applying only to the District of Columbia and the latter to the Nation as a whole, would make a 25-year penitentiary sentence mandatory for a person convicted of using or carrying firearms during any robbery, assault, murder, rape, burglary, or kidnaping.

An excellent article in support of this proposal was written by the outdoor editor of the Houston Chronicle, Bob Brister. His "Outdoors" column of Wednesday, March 3, was headlined, "A Gun Law That Makes Sense." The article is as follows:

A GUN LAW THAT MAKES SENSE

A gun is a chunk of cold steel.

It has no brain, no feelings, no conscience, and it can be neither blamed nor glorified, defended, nor criticized, compromised nor legislated. It is an object, as are automobiles, objects, and cigarettes, inanimate tubes of tobacco.

All three things kill people. Of the three, guns kill far the fewest.

Yet in this country there has been one of the most remarkable campaigns in history—to blame guns as objects for the misdeeds of the men behind them.

This campaign has many faces, many outlets, and a great many well-meaning citizens have taken up the cry against guns.

This is curious, in a way, because more lives might be saved if these crusaders sought to outlaw automobiles, cigarettes, or perhaps whiskey and wild women.

Statistics might prove that these kill more than guns, but statistics can be made to prove most anything. Considerably more important is what history proves and that is simply, that danger exists in the minds of men more than in the metal of the weapons they choose.

Laws have been suggested which would prohibit private gun ownership, some have been introduced which would require Federal registration of all firearms.

Such laws would cost a great deal of money to administer, would create a great deal of redtape for noncriminal gun owners, but more important, they simply would not do the job.

Registering guns could scarcely be expected to deter the crank or criminal because he simply would not register his.

And even if he did, registered guns kill as well as nonregistered ones.

The whole problem is in making the man behind the gun think before he pulls the trigger. Because somehow, some way, there will always be triggers to be pulled—there are already enough guns in circulation and in private ownership to provide murders and gun crimes for the next 100 years—if it is the guns which, in fact, commit the crimes.

THE REALISTIC APPROACH

It is fortunate that there is one man in Washington who believes the control of guns is, by commonsense, the control of the men behind them.

Representative BOB CASEY, of Houston, this week submitted to Congress a bill which puts the penalty for gun crimes where it can do some good, directly upon those who misuse guns.

More significantly, there is very good possibility that CASEY's law would work, which is more than can be said about any of the others.

This bill would put a mandatory Federal prison sentence of 25 years upon anyone convicted of committing a felony with the aid of firearms.

Think about that a moment, or think about the history of all laws. Those with the largest penalties invariably are the least violated; fear of punishment is still the biggest deterrent to crime.

Registering a gun may not halt a hood on his way to rob a supermarket; it isn't likely to deter a Don Juan from shooting his girlfriend's lover in a bar.

But 25 years in the pen—now that gives some pause to the trigger finger.

CHOPPING AT THE ROOTS

This is attacking the problems at the only place where problems can be solved, at the roots.

Say such a law were passed. A hood is preparing to hold up a service station. Under today's laws he would automatically reach for his pistol, that is the easy way to hold up a service station.

But with 25 years staring him in the face, the odds are he would think again. He might use instead a bluff—and automatically, the chief danger of a spur of the moment killing, would be eliminated.

There are those who would argue. They would say, "if there weren't so many guns, so easily bought, there wouldn't be so many beer joint murders, accidental killings, self-defense killings."

But is that true, really? Is the sort of person who kills another in a beer joint, or on the spur of the moment, going to have trouble finding a pistol, regardless of the law? Aren't there already laws against his carrying one?

There are, of course, but they often don't work simply because the laws are against the the pistol rather than against the man or the idea.

PENALTIES BEST PREVENTIVE

When people began slaughtering each other with automobiles, it was not suggested that cars be outlawed. They had to be registered, and they are. But that didn't stop the killing.

What did help, and is helping, is increased enforcement of severe penalties for such things as drunken driving murder by auto, etc.

The courts quickly proved that the way to the problem was through fear of punishment, in advance, rather than legislating against cold steel.

Prohibition of whiskey, or guns, will never work as well as prohibition of their misuse, through powerful penalties.

Most sportsmen quickly agree that such guns as mortars and marijuana, dope, and dynamite, military weapons, and sales of weapons through the mail, should be regulated.

But they cannot understand how their personal right to owning firearms should be questioned, because for one thing, their Constitution guarantees it, and for another, because changing that right could very well do more harm than good.

The private ownership of firearms, according to the testimony of many law enforcement officers in past hearings on the subject, is considered one of the major deterrants to such crimes as housebreaking, prowling, abduction, etc., simply because criminals fear the citizen with protection in his home.

And there is another thing all men fear; the confinement of a penitentiary.

Republican BOB CASEY has finally brought some good, old-fashioned commonsense into the firearms controversy. If his bill is passed, it is quite likely that America's gun problem will come the nearest ever to a sensible solution.

Your letters, to your Congressmen, might help pass it.

An Unjust Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, I introduced H.R. 5311 which would eliminate the Federal excise tax on telephone services over a 3-year period. My bill has the enthusiastic support of the telephone companies and, I am happy to report, the telephone employees.

The March issue of CWA News, official journal of the Communications Workers of America, contains an editorial calling for repeal of the excise tax on a necessity.

With unanimous consent I place this editorial, "An Unjust Burden," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to indicate the telephone industry's wholehearted support for repeal of the Federal excise tax on communication services.

AN UNJUST BURDEN

Americans for far too long have been paying a luxury tax on a necessity—their telephone. Three bills calling for the repeal of the 10 percent Federal excise tax on all telephone service have been introduced in the House of Representatives.

The telephone industry quite naturally supports such a move and, just as natnrally, CWA also urges the elimination of this unjust burden on telephone users. The 20-year-old tax originally had two purposes. One was to raise funds for the Nation's defense during World War II. The second was to discourage telephone use by raising the cost so that more circuits would be available for the military.

The telephone excise tax was part of a series of taxes on luxury items such as jewelry, furs, and liquor. We feel the telephone is more a necessity than a luxury. It is a further injustice that communications should be the only utility service taxed as a luxury by the Federal Government.

But in joining with the industry to urge repeal of this inequitable tax, we pause to raise a question. Should the tax be repealed, will this saving simply go to feed the already swollen profits of the industry? Or will the money made available through repeal of the tax make possible lower rates for customers and higher wages and benefits for

industry employees? We support repeal, but we also support the rights of the consumer and the needs of the worker.

Guam Collegian Serves as Governor for a Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, as you know, a great many city councils cooperate with high school and college student bodies by sharing their responsibilities for a day with carefully selected students. On Guam, a similar procedure was initiated this year but on the territorial rather than at the city level. In order to be a candidate for Acting Governor, each aspirant submitted an essay on the role of the Governor.

Albert T. San Agustin, sophomore at the College of Guam, was selected to share the office of Gov. Manuel F. Leon Guerrero on February 12, 1965. His essay, entitled "The Duties of Governor and Why I Would Like This Position" is presented to our colleagues:

THE DUTIES OF GOVERNOR AND WHY I WOULD LIKE THIS POSITION

According to the Organic Act of Guam, enacted by the U.S. Congress in 1950, of section 6(b), the duties of the Governor of Guam shall be of the following:

"The Governor shall have general supervision and control of all executive agencies and instrumentalities of the government of Guam. He shall faithfully execute the laws of the United States applicable to Guam, and the laws of Guam. He may grant pardons and reprieves and remit fines and forfeitures for offenses against the local laws, and may grant respite for all offenses against the applicable laws of the United States until the decision of the President can be ascertained. He may veto any legislation as provided in this act. He shall commission all officers that he may be authorized to appoint. He may call upon the commanders of the Armed Forces of the United States in Guam, or summon the posse comitatus, or call out the militia, to prevent or suppress violence, insurrection, or rebellion, invasion, or imminent danger thereof, when the public safety requires, suspend the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, or place Guam, or any part thereof, under martial law, until communication can be had with the President and the President's decision thereon communicated to the Governor. He shall annually, and at such other times as the President or the Congress may require, make official report of the transactions of the government of Guam to the head of the department or agency designated by the President under section 3 of this act, and his said annual report shall be transmitted by such department or agency to the Congress. He shall perform such additional duties and functions as may, in pursuance of law, be delegated to him by the President, or by the department or agency. He shall have the power to issue executive regulations not in conflict with any applicable law. The Governor may submit such recommendations for the enactment of legislation to the legislature as he shall consider to be in the people's interest."

But, what makes the governorship of Guam so unique and different from other Governors in the United States? First of all, the Governor of Guam is responsible only to the President of the United States by whom he is appointed, whereas, State Governors are responsible to their electorate.

Second, our Governor is both a Federal servant as well as a civil servant to the people of Guam. The fact that he does not necessarily represent the people's choice is a potential source of friction. The people may feel that they do not have a full voice in government. This makes the Governor's position a more difficult one.

Third, as a Governor of an island in the far Pacific, he must wear an extra hat; that of an official representative of the United States to our neighboring countries. His role of diplomacy is such that he must take extra precautions to eliminate or reduce international misunderstandings, especially to visiting representatives. The Governor of Guam is somewhat like an ambassador to the Pacific.

Lastly, he must assume the role of a "political businessman," who must keep the government unified by supplying sufficient legislation in order to satisfy the constant needs of the people; insofar as it does not conflict with existing Federal and civil laws.

My desire for wanting the governorship is primarily to use that office as a steppingstone toward expressing certain views depicting the trends on Guam. I speak as an individual and as such, represent my observations. The opinions expressed in this paper do not therefore, necessarily represent the will or the opinions of all the people.

The particular areas of concern that are pressing which the Governor must deal with today are:

GUAM'S POLITICAL DESTINY

Everyone has, no doubt, read the statements of the Secretary of Interior, Stewart Udall, concerning the possibility of Guam being politically attached to the State of Hawaii. That has caused two of our political leaders to respond.

Antonio B. Wonpat, the former speaker of the Seventh Guam Legislature, and leader of the Democratic Party of Guam, said: "The people of Guam have repeatedly manifested their political desires and aspirations for greater autonomy within the framework of our American political system without surrendering their rights to the type of self-determination they want * * *."

Carlos P. Taitano, who is at present, the speaker of the Eighth Guam Legislature, and leader of the Territorial Party of Guam, said: "Our principal concern at this time is to seek enactment of legislation granting us an elective Governor, representation in the U.S. Congress, and the right to vote in presidential elections."

The Governor of Guam, Manuel Leon Guerrero, said: "Perhaps the two-party results of this last election will help convince certain United Nations delegates that Guam is, and will always be American." * * * "United Nations subcommittees keep demanding a divorce for Guam and the United States of America. I trust that one act of this body will be a resolution reaffirming Guam's intent to stay a part of the United States."

If we were to become a part of Hawaii, all of the people's efforts toward political maturity and self-government would be in vain. To consider but a few of the possibilities of having Guam under the flag of Hawaii; I offer these:

1. Political:

(a) Guam would no longer be a territory of the United States but county under the State of Hawaii.

(b) Guam would no longer have a Governor but probably a mayor or a county administrator.

(c) Guam would no longer have a legislature but in its place, there would be the establishment of administrative agencies under the legislature and government of the State of Hawaii.

(d) Guam would have to send lobbyists to persuade the legislature of Hawaii to help the people of Guam.

2. Economic:

(a) The income tax revenue that is presently retained by Guam for its own maintenance would most likely be directed back to the Federal Government.

(b) A county or State tax would have to be imposed to sustain the new governmental apparatus. This of course, would directly affect the tax-paying citizens and any infant industries.

(c) The local businesses and work force would be overwhelmed by the influx of better skill labor, higher wages, international companies and in general, unfair competition.

3. Social:

(a) There would most likely arise the old byproduct of colonization; that of a two-class system perpetuated by economic advantage.

These few general considerations should be indicative of the unfeasibility of such a proposal. Guam must first develop an economy which is at least self-sustaining.

LABOR AND EDUCATION

Throughout the years, one constantly hears the platitude: "There is no unemployment on Guam." This statement may be true by virtue of positions available, but one thing is definite; we must thank the Armed Forces for taking our young citizenry into their arms for they have all the means to train and educate the youth for a new tomorrow. The Armed Forces is assuming the job that the civil government should be doing on an intensive level for their youths. If there were no outlet for the rapidly growing population, such as the Armed Forces, and no facilities for training and channeling their resources, where would Guam be?

If we are to live in a competitive world, we must first concentrate on our schools. Our schools must be of the best quality possible. The schools must produce graduates that would be a stimulant to competition. The College of Guam must expand its facilities and gear them toward meeting the needs of the community. Our trade schools must operate on a large scale, offering a variety of skills. If we are to invite business to establish industries, we must be able to train a stable work force of skilled men and women, to meet their needs.

COMMISSIONERSHIPS

Guam will, in the future, see no need for district commissioners. In its place will serve a board that will consist of voluntary residents of the city, without compensation; but the satisfaction of doing good for the community. This board will present their problems to the legislature. The board can serve as a potential force against the wishes of the legislature, with the cooperation of other city boards.

REPEAL OF SECTION 9(A)

According to section 9(a) of the Organic Act of Guam: "In making appointment and promotions, preference shall be given to qualified persons of Guamanian ancestry. With a view of insuring the fullest participation by Guamanians in the government of Guam, opportunities for higher education and in-service training, facilities shall be provided to qualified persons of Guamanian ancestry." Although the intent of this section is to foster the control of the government of Guam in the hands of qualified Guamanians; the Governor of Guam has stated that this section has served its purpose, probably due to recent civil rights legislations.

Also Guam has become the "United Nations" of the Pacific, because there is a substantial percentage of people from every nationality. If we are to be the showcase of American democracy, we must support the abolishment of section 9(a) of the Organic

Act of Guam as a direct expression of the people to live the American way. If this is accomplished, the United States can always point to the island of Guam as an example of what a democracy can be. We have outgrown the use of section 9(a) of the Organic Act of Guam which is most certainly an unconstitutional provision. This would help justify the slogan made by the Tourist Commission that "America starts its day on Guam."

GUAM'S REPRESENTATION IN THE U.S. CONGRESS

A true story was related to me a couple of years ago, that occurred in the House of Representatives that was concerned with the establishment of the Organic Act of Guam. It so happened that during one of the debates, one of the most honorable Congressmen stood up and questioned, "Why does the Governor of Guam need a car? After all, Guam is only 4 to 8 miles in width and 36 miles in length." Now, this question would certainly not have to be asked if we had good representation and if we were industrious enough to inform the United States of our intent and situation.

A similar incident occurred only a month ago, which is a clear indication that Guam has not expressed its view fully or perhaps was misunderstood by the Department of Interior.

If we had an individual, who reflected the wishes of the people, in the Nation's Capital, this issue of Guam's attachment to the State of Hawaii would never have been presented. Our reasons for wanting representation is very basic, just as the basis of democracy is equal representation of all its citizens:

1. To present first-hand information to the National Congress.

2. To act as a source of information to our national legislators.

3. To express, to the best of his ability, the will of the people.

4. To persuade Congress to include Guam in various Federal assistance that would be of great benefit to the people of Guam.

In order for an individual to qualify for this tremendous task, his intellectual abilities must be a reflection of Guam's present and potential growth and its educational achievement.

Powerless President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Don Peterson, editor of the Truman, Minn., Tribune, takes sharp issue with the view that the President's powers are curtailed by our Constitution and offers some compelling arguments in support of his case. Under unanimous consent I insert Mr. Peterson's editorial in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

POWERLESS PRESIDENT

Senator FULBRIGHT has said that our Constitution is an antiquated document that restricts the power of our President. He is badly mistaken on both counts. Our Constitution is the greatest document ever struck by the hand of man, and because our Congress is made up mostly of men without courage enough to enforce the Constitution, the power of our President has become greater than that of many dictators.

We are in a war that Congress has not declared although our Constitution provides that only Congress can declare war.

Silver certificates (dollar bills) are being replaced by interest-bearing Federal Reserve notes, although our Constitution provides that only Congress has the power to issue and regulate the value of our currency.

Most recently our President has proposed extension of the equalization tax on the purchase of new foreign securities. He proposes to reinforce this tax with a tax on bank loans. He has asked industry to curtail plant investment abroad. He suggests a tighter lid on duty-free goods. American tourists may bring back to the United States.

Each of these restrictions is appearing now as suggestions, but if there is any doubt as to how powerful the President is, see how long it takes for them to become law. If you blink, you will miss the entire transaction.

Why is it our great leaders of recent decades have had no reservations about placing restrictions on the American citizens, but have not seen fit to exercise their just power by placing some restrictions on Government giveaways? America is spending $8 billion abroad on our Armed Forces and on military and economic aid to foreign countries. The President, by exercising the power to which he is entitled, could make certain that not one more American son is killed in Vietnam.

The 25th Anniversary Ceremony of the Katyn Forest Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the New York City Division of the Polish American Congress, at a mass meeting at the Polish Veteran Hall, rendered a 25th anniversary ceremonial tribute to the Polish patriots who were massacred by the Soviet Communist in the Katyn Forest in the spring of 1940.

On September 18, 1951, in the 82d Congress, the House of Representatives unanimously adopted House Resolution 390 which established a select committee to conduct a full and complete investigation of an international crime committed against leaders, soldiers and citizens of Poland at the beginning of World War II.

Hearings were conducted by this special committee in this country, England and Europe. The final report was made to the Congress in December 1952, which unanimously condemned the Communist leaders of Russia for this greatest of all international crimes in world history.

Membership of the special congressional committee was as follows:

RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana, chairman; DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; Foster Furcolo, of Massachusetts; Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, of Michigan; George A. Dondero, of Michigan; ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin; and Timothy P. Sheehan, of Illinois.

Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, now one of our colleagues, contributed greatly to the success of this committee by serving as chief investigator.

I am hereby submitting remarks which I made at the memorial ceremony in New York City on yesterday:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN, BEFORE THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, NEW YORK DIVISION, NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 7, 1965, 25TH ANNIVERSARY—THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

I wish to commend the downstate New York Division of the Polish-American Congress for this 25th anniversary ceremonial remembrance in honor of the approximately 15,000 departed Polish leaders who were massacred and murdered by the Soviet Communist tyrants in the spring of 1940.

The Katyn massacre was, no doubt, one of the most barbarous international crimes in world history. Of the Polish leaders who were executed from 3 widely separated Soviet prison camps, the bodies of 4,253 were discovered in the mass graves of the Katyn Forest located near Smolensk, U.S.S.R., by the Nazi troops in April 1943. This was approximately 3 years after the Katyn massacre. The Stalin tyrants immediately blamed the Germans for the crime. They charged that the Polish prisoners fell into the Nazi hands when Germany invaded Russia in the summer of 1941. The medical commission investigation consisting of leading doctors from various European nations, including neutral Switzerland, met at Katyn in April of 1943, and unanimously determined that the Polish victims were massacred in the spring of 1940. At that time the Katyn area was under the complete domination of the Soviets.

KATYN DUPLICITY

The Katyn massacre cannot be classified as a world war atrocity. It will be recorded in history as one of the most malicious and brutal acts of genocide in the annals of international crime. The Katyn massacre has been the only international crime in the world's history where the leaders of one nation (the Soviets) accused the leaders of another nation (the German Nazis) of guilt in the commission thereof and vice versa. The Nazi leaders accused the Soviets of guilt for the identical crime.

For almost 10 years after the discovery of the Katyn bodies, the Soviets poured out misleading propaganda declaring their innocence of any connection with the Katyn massacre or the murder of 15-odd-thousand Polish leaders who disappeared from 3 Soviet prison camps in the spring of 1940.

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS

It was by reason of the concentrated efforts and insistence by the members and leaders of the Polish-American Congress of the United States that public opinion not only in America but throughout the globe, desired an official determination and investigation of the true facts concerning guilt of the Katyn murderers.

In 1951 I filed a resolution asking Congress to approve a special investigating committee to determine for posterity and future generations the guilt of the Katyn international crime. On September 18, 1951, House Resolution 390 was enacted by the Congress. This resolution called for a complete congressional investigation in order to determine officially the guilt for this atrocity against humanity.

HEARINGS AND TESTIMONY

Our committee held hearings not only in the United States but also in England and Europe. During the progress of these hearings, over 250 witnesses testified. This number included government officials of various nations, military leaders, physicians, international lawyers and persons from various nations, including Russia, who had direct and personal information on the international crime. Special invitations were sent to Stalin and other leaders of the Soviet Republic to appear at our hearings in Lon-

don or Frankfurt, Germany. The Soviet leaders ignored and failed to respond to our invitations to testify and clear up the misinformation concerning the Katyn murders. During our hearings in Europe, the Soviet leaders, through radio, television, Pravda and other propaganda sources, continued a barrage of lies and false charges against the work of our congressional committee. A group of European newspaper experts stated at the time of our Frankfurt, Germany hearings that the Katyn Congressional Committee for the first time placed the Soviet propaganda machine on the defensive. They had no answer to the testimony and the factual revelation of the evidence that the Soviet Communists were guilty of the Katyn Forest massacres.

STALIN, KHRUSHCHEV, HITLER, MUSSOLINI

Our committee publicly announced that the hearings should not take the spotlight away from the barbarous mass murders and pogroms committed by the Hitler Nazis during and before the period of World War II. Our committee found that the Communist atrocities committed on other captive nations such as Lithuania, Hungary, Rumania, the Balkan States, and Korea, all had a striking similarity to the crimes committed against the Poles at Katyn.

COMMUNIST BARBARITY NEVER CHANGES

Although the Katyn massacre occurred 25 years ago, the evidence obtained by our committee revealed that the methods followed by the Communists has not changed in violence or barbarity whether it is southeast Asia, Korea, Africa, or any locality on the globe where Communist aggression exists.

There is no doubt, in my mind, that the worldwide publicity given the testimony secured by our committee concerning the methods, strategy, and barbarity of the Communist tyrants alarmed millions of people of all nations as to the true facts of Communist enslavement. Our testimony, exhibits, and the facts and knowledge it gave the world contributed greatly to building up resistance by many nations and races against Communist aggression.

Since the congressional Katyn Committee filed its final report in December 1952, hundreds of thousands of copies of this factual verdict and our official Katyn report of Communist methods and criminal acts have been requested by all non-Communist nations on the face of the globe. Thousands of organizations and individuals all over the world have, during the last 13 years, written to Congress and my office for the facts on the Katyn massacre. Hardly a week passes but requests come to my office in Washington, up to the present time, from folks living in different parts of the world asking for information and copies of the final report of the congressional Katyn Forest Massacre Committee.

Oftentimes I think that it would be, indeed, a worthwhile and valuable project if our Government or the United Nations would foster the expense of reprinting the Katyn congressional report exposing the Communists brutality, barbarity, and methods of enslaving peoples under its domination. These reports could be printed in various languages and placed in the homes of all peoples in nations threatened with Communist domination and subjection.

SOVIETS COULD NOT HIDE GUILT

Throughout all our entire hearings proceedings there was not one scintilla of proof or even any subtantial evidence presented that could remotely indict any other nation but Soviet Russia for this deplorable international Katyn crime. The Soviets, in order to clear themselves in world opinion, refused to allow the International Committee of the Red Cross to make a neutral investigation of the Katyn massacre.

The overwhelming testimony of prisoners, formely interned at the slave camp near the Katyn Forest, and of medical experts who performed autopsies on the massacred bodies and also of observers taken at the scene of the crime, conclusively confirmed our committee findings. Stalin, Molotov, Beria (the NKVD chief) could not answer the Polish Government leaders and military men when in 1941 and 1942 they demanded the whereabout of the disappeared Polish prisoners. Complete proof was presented that the Soviets purposely misled the Poles in denying any knowledge of the whereabouts of their officers when, in fact, Stalin and his murderous conspirators already knew the Poles were buried in mass graves at Katyn.

SOVIET PROPAGANDA ON DEFENSIVE

The Soviet leaders made every effort through their highly organized propaganda machine to hide from the Polish people and the people of the world the real truth about Katyn. Evidence brought out by our investigation convinced the members of the committee that the Katyn massacre barely scratched the surface of the numerous crimes against humanity perpetrated by the totalitarian powers.

I know of no organization on either side of the Atlantic that has done more to keep the fight against aggression and expose Communist barbarity and enslavement more than the Polish-American Congress. Your great national organization was responsible for the Katyn congressional investigations in the 82d Congress. By reason of the work and great success of this special Katyn Committee, the following 83rd Congress, in 1953 and 1954, created a special congressional committee to investigate Communist aggression. I was appointed a member of this committee under the chairmanship of Congressman Kersten of Wisconsin. This committee held hearings not only in the United States but in Europe during the following 2 years and took testimony concerning Soviet crimes and Communist barbarity involving other captive countries including the Balkan nations. The evidence of Communist enslavement of captive nations through slave labor camps, mass murder, and tortures were recorded by this committee and testimonial reports sent throughout the world. There is no doubt that the creation of this second committee in the succeeding Congress was authorized because of the success of the Katyn Committee in exposing communism and its barbarous and tyrannical methods.

Vietnam, Korea, captive nations

If the free nations of the world would only join in concentrating the fight to expose the true facts against communism and educate the so-called backward nations concerning the criminality of Communist enslavement methods, and the true living conditions under their domination, there is no doubt but what the collapse of the Communist goal of world enslavement would take place in a short time. Too many of the new and backward nations have been victims of Communist misrepresentation and also of the false propaganda circulated concerning the government of the so-called free world.

Communism has been one of the greatest, most powerful, well organized international threats to human freedom in world history. Our Government has spent billions of dollars fighting this international menace. There is no doubt in my mind that the Communist threat today is not as dangerous and as imminent as it was 20 or 30 years ago. The greatest evidence of this fact is that their economic system has been a total failure.

Stalin's government was an economic failure and at his death great discontent was rampant in not only the Soviet realm but the satellite nations. He was succeeded by Khrushchev, and his economic government was a total failure as was evidenced by his overthrow and collapse from forces within his own government. If the present opposition to Communist aggression continues by the free nations, the rulers of today's Soviet tyranny will be overthrown and that will end the Communist myth of world domination. Communist China's economy has always been a failure and millions of its population are existing in starvation conditions at the present time. The free nations have the ability, the education, the defense machinery, and the assets to curtail the further spread of the Communist menace and we must continue our fight.

History has revealed over the centuries that dictators cannot stay in power long when they must rule their people by the sword, guns, slave-labor camps, and mass murders. The Communist dictators will meet the same end as Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, and their predecessors since time began.

Two generations have passed since Katyn and the many other organized mass murders, tortures, slave-labor camps, and organized starvation inflicted by Communist tyrants on helpless millions. The Communist youths who are attacking our Embassies in other nations, possess no knowledge of the methods used by their masters to take over free governments. Their education and information of outside world conditions is limited to such information as their dictators allow them to receive. These same Communist youths someday will rebel against their own enslavement and they will meet the same fate the Polish patriots met at Katyn 25 years ago.

Education and presentation of facts on Communist enslavement to the world's uninformed are the greatest weapons democracy possesses against the destruction of the Communist menace.

The free world must continue this fight. Someday this victory will be won and the Communist enslavers will become extinct. Poland and other captive nations will regain free and independent government.

Kansas State University Scientists See Great Promise for New Hybrid Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, typical of the research which is the hallmark of our land-grant colleges, scientists at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans., have developed a new hybrid wheat which holds considerable promise for the expansion of our agricultural economy.

The possibilities of this new wheat are spelled out in a news statement from the university which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the statement appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The statement follows:

MANHATTAN.—Kansas' economic development program will get a multimillion dollar boost from agriculture within the next 5 years if experimental hybrid wheat seeds planted in the State produce expected results.

Scientists of Kansas State University, Manhattan, the developers of hybrid wheat, not only believe it will succeed—they think it will create a tremendous expansion of the seed industry and should provide new full- and part-time jobs for several thousand persons.

The total seed processing industry in Kansas now does a $44 million a year business. The hybrid wheat seed industry, alone, could be expected to be worth $100 million annually. Its economic impact should be felt in all areas of the State, says Dr. Floyd W. Smith, associate director of the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station.

To commercially process the new hybrid wheat seeds at least 50 new industrial plants—an average of about 1 plant to every 2 Kansas counties—could be needed, Smith says. "These processing plants would be located in all parts of Kansas," the Kansas State scientists continues. He adds that his plant and job estimates are "ultraconservative."

The probability of hybrid wheat, which promises increases of 20 to 30 percent in yield, was revealed recently by Dr. Glenn H. Beck, dean of agriculture at Kansas State. Scientists largely responsible for the wheat hybrid breakthrough are Dr. R. W. Livers at the Fort Hays branch experiment station of Kansas State University; his predecessor, Dr. J. A. Wilson, now with a commercial seed company at Wichita; and their colleagues at Manhattan and Hays.

"If hybrid wheat is practical for field use, and we think it will be in 3 to 5 years," Smith says, "we may see a revolution in the manufacture of farm machinery." For example, he expains, a new type of grain drill will be needed. This, and other challenges to makers of farm equipment, will create new jobs in the agri-industries.

Because of hybrid wheat's probable success, Smith also anticipates increased use of fertilizer (already a $50 million industry in Kansas) and more farming by irrigation. This means additional employment for persons distributing fertilizer and irrigation equipment. There also will be a special need for more skilled workers such as trained inspectors of commercial seed fields.

Hybrid wheat is certain to be adopted by all progressive wheat farmers, Smith believes. However, it will present transportation problems not encountered by sorghum hybrid seed producers. Almost 10 times as much hybrid wheat seed as hybrid sorghum seed is required to plant 1 acre. To facilitate handling the vast bulk of the hybrid wheat seed is one important reason 50 or more processing plants will be needed throughout the State. Another significant reason is the short period (about 2½ months) between the time hybrid wheat seeds will be harvested and planted.

"Most of the hybrid wheat seed will be harvested by the commercial planters in late June or early July," Smith says. "It then must be processed at the various plants, distributed to the farmers and put into the ground by late September." Producers of corn and sorghum hybrid seeds have about an 8-month period between harvest and planting.

Kansas State University began research on hybrid wheat at its Fort Hays branch in 1957. Because wheat, unlike corn or sorghum, normally is self-pollinated, the scientists faced the task of developing wheat plants which would shed pollen more freely in order to achieve cross-pollination. They have been able to accomplish this under laboratory and experimental plot conditions.

Now the seed is being tested in open fields about the State. The researchers are watching closely to see if their "miracle" seed will come through this practical test. They are confident it will.

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Thursday, March 4, 1965, issue of the Los Angeles Times.

The Times appraises various of the objectives and the apparent potential results of the administration housing program and expresses deep concern.

I believe the Los Angeles Times appraisal of the housing proposal will be of interest to the Congress.

DOES DADDY ALWAYS KNOW BEST?

President Johnson's housing message to Congress calls for conceptual departures which can only be described as incredible.

Granted, his goal of encouraging better housing and more attractive cities is "lofty and humanitarian," as House Republican Leader GERALD FORD himself recognized.

However, Mr. Johnson's proposed methods betray an eyebrow-lifting assumption that local government as we have known it is obsolete, and must serve increasingly as a mere extension of Big Brother's long arm.

The President pays lipservice to local responsibility, vowing that the Federal Government can only "serve as a catalyst." His own words, however, show that considerably more is involved.

To encourage private construction of 500,000 dwelling units, Mr. Johnson proposes that Washington pay part of the rent for "families across a wide range of lower and moderate income brackets."

Some of these direct subsidies would go to families forced to move when their homes are demolished for community improvement projects.

The rental supplements also would go, however, to help families in the $4,000 to $6,500 income brackets move into better housing than they otherwise could afford.

This is a laudable objective at first sight. But the same logic could be argued for subsidies to buy better clothing, longer vacations and bigger cars.

Mr. Johnson bluntly explains, too, that the subsidies will enable "families of different income * * * to live together." In other words, he apparently has decided that it's somehow wrong for Americans to group themselves according to income, and that Washington has a responsibility to mix us all together.

This is a novel approach to Federal housing action, to say the least.

In addition, the President proposed $100 million in Federal matching grants to help cities build "basic community facilities." He wants, too, a new program of federally insured loans for development of entire planned communities and subdivisions.

Under both these proposals, Federal aid would be contingent upon the projects being part of areawide plans approved by Washington—specifically, by the new Department of Housing and Urban Development which the administration proposes to create.

This is a sensible safeguard for the taxpayers' money. But in practice it also would transfer effective control of basically local affairs to a body of all-knowing bureaucrats in Washington.

After all, what mayor could resist this juicy Federal carrot? What incentive would remain for communities to solve their own problems in their own way?

Aside from principle, the costs must be reckoned. Mr. Johnson has prudently left off the price tag for now, but his program clearly would run at least $500 million a year from the first—and would balloon higher in future years.

President Johnson has no visible mandate from the people for such a fundamental shift in the functions of the local and Federal Governments. Lawmakers of both parties should withhold endorsement until and unless they are very sure this is what the American people want.

The Sino-Soviet Conflict—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific, of which I am chairman, will begin hearings on the current conflict between the two major Communist powers, the Soviet Union and Red China.

The purpose of these hearings is to put together various points of view on the Sino-Soviet dispute—its causes, effects, implications for U.S. policy and prospects for settlement.

It has been my experience that there is surprisingly little information on the split at the congressional level. There also is a serious lack of understanding by the public of the impact which the dispute is having on U.S. policy.

The hearings will, it is hoped, bring the Sino-Soviet conflict into clearer focus for those of us in Congress who will be called upon to vote on legislation affecting East-West relationships.

Among the experts who will testify during the hearings, which begin Wednesday, March 10, are the Honorable George Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, and Dr. Donald Zagoria, a professor at Columbia University and the author of the recent book, "The Sino-Soviet Conflict, 1956–1961."

Last Sunday, in its editorial section, the Washington Post published articles by both of these gentlemen on the subject of the Sino-Soviet dispute. Their views differ in emphasis, particularly on the question of the effect which United States efforts in Vietnam are having on the Sino-Soviet split.

Ambassador Kennan, now a professor at the Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton University, believes that U.S. escalation of the conflict in southeast Asia could under certain circumstances force the Russians back into a closer relation to the Chinese.

Dr. Zagoria sees our actions in Vietnam as a cause of deepening tensions between Moscow and Peiping. Because of the pertinence of these viewpoints to recent world events and the upcoming congressional inquiry, with permission I

insert in the RECORD Dr. Zagoria's article of March 7.

Also with permission I make subsequent insertions of Ambassador Kennan's article and another Washington Post editorial piece by Dr. Zagoria, which was published January 31. It is my earnest hope that these articles will be given careful attention by my colleagues.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 7, 1965]

UNITED STATES BOMBS WIDEN SINO-SOVIET SPLIT—LIMITED ESCALATION IN VIETNAM COULD HELP CREATE CONDITIONS FOR NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT

(By Donald S. Zagoria)

The most significant consequence of the American bombings of North Vietnam is the widening of the Sino-Soviet split. Instead of bringing the two Communist giants closer together—the possibility feared by many Americans—the limited escalation of the war has so far produced precisely the opposite effect. History may thus be repeating itself.

The Cuban missile confrontation in 1962 also exacerbated the Sino-Soviet dispute and ended in Peiping's accusing Moscow of "capitulationism" while Moscow accused Peiping of "adventurism."

The evidence of the widening split on Vietnam is increasing. Chinese students demonstrating in Moscow a few days ago accused the Russians of collaborating with the "imperialists" in Vietnam by not taking stronger actions against American bombing.

Meanwhile, Soviet sources in southeast Asia are reportedly charging that the Vietcong attack on the American installation at Pleiku was a deliberate provocation designed to force an American response, which would in turn force the Soviet hand.

DIFFERENCE OF DEGREE

The immediate question at issue between Moscow and Peiping seems to be the preconditions for negotiation over Vietnam. During the past few weeks, Moscow and Peiping have voiced opposing views on this matter.

Moscow has not been as adamant as Peiping about the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam as a prerequisite for negotiations. While Peiping's Foreign Minister, Chen Yi, insisted that American withdrawal was necessary before a settlement was possible, Soviet Premier Kosygin said that only an end of American bombing attacks on North Vietnam was needed, first and foremost, to create conditions for negotiations.

NO BLANK CHECK

That there exists such a dispute between Peiping and Moscow is also suggested by the recent Albanian charge that Kosygin has advised the North Vietnamese to negotiate with the United States on the basis of the continued presence of the American forces in South Vietnam.

Finally, Peiping has indirectly warned against any negotiations that would give the outward appearance of fairplay and give the United States a breathing spell.

These differences between Moscow and Peiping clearly reflect a much broader disparity of interest. Russia cannot afford to appear impotent in the face of continued American attacks on a Communist state, but neither is it interested in giving a blank check to Peiping and Hanoi that would enable them to suck Moscow into a confrontation with the United States.

Peiping sees a golden opportunity to exploit the Soviet dilemma. Optimally, the Chinese would like to force Moscow into a confrontation with the United States in southeast Asia that would end the Soviet-American detente, a goal Peiping has sought consistently over the past 5 years. If this were to take place, and the United States backed down, there would be further proof of the correctness of Maoist revolutionary strategy.

If Moscow refuses to play this game, as it has so far, the Chinese will accuse the Russians of "capitulationism" and hope thereby to gain increased influence in the more revolutionary section of the international Communist movement.

The Chinese, in short, have much to gain by opposing negotiations at this point while the Russians would like to extricate themselves from the dilemma, and a negotiated settlement is the only way out. This is why Peiping insists on American withdrawal as indispensable to negotiations—terms which Peiping knows are unacceptable to Washington—while Moscow urges Hanoi to be more flexible.

This is not to say that the Russians are primarily interested in pulling American chstnuts out of the Vietnamese fire. Moscow has its own hand to play.

A RESTRAINT, AT LEAST

Nevertheless, the Russian desire to bring an end to the war before Moscow is forced to choose between equally unpalatable alternatives does provide the germ of a common American-Soviet interest. At the very least, it acts as a restraining factor on Hanoi.

This situation can be exploited by a subtle and flexible American policy. The U.S. objective should be to take advantage of the common interest emerging between Moscow and Washington in bringing the war to an end on terms acceptable to both sides and thereby help substitute Soviet for Chinese influence in Hanoi. We have contributed to this common interest by our limited escalation of the war, which has enabled the Russians to impress on Hanoi the desirability of early negotiations.

Thus, by continuing this limited escalation—but keeping it within well-defined limits for the time being so as not to push the Russians too hard—we would be giving them one of two kinds of arguments they need in Hanoi.

But at the same time that we provide the Russians with sticks to impress Hanoi, we must also provide them with carrots to enable them to sustain their difficult game. Peiping is undoubtedly now telling Hanoi that the Americans will not settle on any reasonable terms until they are decisively defeated and humiliated on the battlefield. For the Russians to counter this argument in Hanoi, they must know what terms are acceptable to us and these terms must be sufficiently realistic to tempt Hanoi to bargain.

HONEY ON THE STICK

In exchange for a cessation of infiltration of men and arms into South Vietnam, which we are now correctly insisting upon, we should at the same time hold out to Hanoi the future prospect of economic assistance, diplomatic recognition, and an eventual close association with a friendly, but, independent, South Vietnam.

We should also continue to hold out the prospect already suggested by Secretary of State Rusk of an international effort to assist the economic and social development of the entire Indochinese peninsula. We should, in effect, demonstrate our willingness to recognize the legitimacy of the North Vietnamese Government and to further its economic development. It was, in part at least, a desperate economic situation at home that led Hanoi into sponsoring an armed takeover of South Vietnam in the first place, beginning in 1958.

With the widening of the Sino-Soviet split, we have reached a dramatic new turn in events that could pave the way to a settlement between North and South Vietnam. This would take place in the broader context of a common interest between Moscow and Washington in not allowing Peiping to be the victor in Soviet-American confrontation in which both have much to lose and nothing to gain.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year, over a quarter of a million high school students participated in the contest, with the winning contestant from each State to be brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to submit the winning speech of Miss Barbara Jean Urso of Detroit, Mich., who is a resident of my congressional district:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP, 1964–65

(By Barbara Jean Urso, Detroit, Mich.)

I've been doing a great deal of thinking about this challenge of citizenship, and I've come to see citizenship as quite a bit more than paying your taxes, voting, reading the newspapers, and abiding by the laws. We can do all of these things out of habit, curiosity, or fear, and fail to find the true value of citizenship.

I feel that, in order for something to be really challenged, it must possess certain qualities which are, in reality, being challenged.

I think that, in order to be a real citizen, one must possess courage to defend one's convictions; love of family, of country, and most of all, of one's God. Thus, the challenge is not simply a threat to one's technical duties and privileges, but is, in fact, a direct questioning of one's courage and one's sense of morality.

I didn't realize this was so until late one night as I watched the 11 o'clock news. A Negro church in Alabama had been bombed. This was really nothing startling until I realized that four children had been murdered in a house of prayer. In the following months, in many places both North and South alike, life became such a harrowing experience that a man's right to walk a public street was being contested. His right of assembly, of worship, in short his right to exist was being challenged. He accepted the challenge, and he was not alone.

You see, in the North and South there were young people, like you and me, who were willing and eager to help him. I learned then of Andy Goodman, James Chaney, and Mickey Schwerner. To some people, they were "brash, young punks, meddling in affairs which were none of their business." To others, they were crusaders in a holy war, a moral war against terror and injustice.

Perhaps, as some people suggested, they were meddling. Perhaps these same people would be the type who bolted their doors, shut their lights, and peered cautiously from drawn shades while a woman, who was being attacked on their doorstep, screamed for help unheeded. The people who squirm and then turn their backs on involvement.

But when I think of citizenship now, and I think of it often, I think of Goodman, Chaney, and Schwerner, and I thank God that there are those who have accepted the challenge of citizenship and who commit themselves to the defense of human rights. For, after all, are we not all committed to

accept this challenge of citizenship—the daily defense of human rights—of yours, mine, and his?

John F. Kennedy once said, "There is, in addition to a courage by which men die, a courage by which men must live."

When we have this courage, and this commitment, then we will have accepted the challenge.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as you know each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. Oregon's winner this year is Miss Nancy C. Heriza. Nancy's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Heriza, are not only constituents of mine, but very dear friends as well. It is my great pleasure to insert Nancy's inspiring speech in the RECORD for all to enjoy.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP, 1964–65

(By Nancy C. Heriza, 17, Baker, Oreg.)

"The torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans." What do these words, spoken by our late President Kennedy from the inaugural platform on that cold January morning, mean to me? The torch of which he speaks is our American way of life—a way of life made up of responsibilities, problems, opportunities, freedoms. To accept this torch is to preserve our American heritage. This is our challenge, the challenge of citizenship.

In order for my generation to prepare itself for this commission, it is necessary that we realize what grave responsibilities face us. One of the most serious is that of preserving our democratic form of government. To do this we must be aware that although some of us will play the starring roles as future leaders of our Nation, most of us will be cast as the all-important "little" people, the everyday citizens who run stores, teach school, fly airplanes, and drive taxis. The housewife, the scientist, the philanthropist, the artist—everyone is important. The manner in which each one conducts his life influences the entire Nation in its struggle toward the goal.

To carry this torch we must be ideal citizens and citizens with ideals. For this it is essential that we possess knowledge of our country's background and heroes, respect for our flag and national anthem, love of our fellow men, gratitude for our privileges, understanding of our responsibilities, and a strong determination to do our part in upholding these ideals.

Although the torch is glowing with privileges, it is heavy with responsibilities. The luster of our freedom of speech must never be dimmed by the tarnish of speaking ill of others. We have the opportunity for education in any school and the duty to see that we are well educated. Freedom of religion brings with it the obligation to keep our own morals high and, thereby, to help raise those of the whole country. We have the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and the duty to see that this is provided for all men, regardless of race or religion. We are protected by laws, but we have the obligation to obey laws. We can and do enjoy all these rights and freedoms, but it is necessary that we be ready to protect them at any cost when the need arises.

The strength of the Nation depends on the strength of the individual. Let us begin with our own lives: develop our own character, be at peace with ourselves, take a deep interest in others and, through these efforts, cement the unity of our great land. Every person is important. Every man, woman, and child plays a vital part in the American way of life.

If we are firm in our resolve to protect and preserve our America, we must believe in our cause. We must have faith in the Constitution and pride in our American heritage. We must practice the virtues of our country's great leaders, keeping alive the spirit of dignity, integrity, generosity, and love that is so traditionally American.

This is our challenge: to accept the torch of citizenship and to keep the flame of liberty burning brightly—a challenge which we Americans are fortunate to have offered to us. My generation is proud to accept this challenge, and finds it fitting to do so with the words of our late, beloved President Kennedy, "I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it."

Tribute to Nathan Shapell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, next month, Temple Beth Am of Los Angeles will pay tribute to its president, Mr. Nathan Shapell, at a special dinner. It is an honor Mr. Shapell has earned as a master builder and developer in his community, as a generous contributor to every worthy appeal, as a hard-working president of Temple Beth Am, and as a loyal American. As his representative, I am pleased to join his many friends who will wish him well on April 10, and present herewith excerpts from an address by Rabbi Jacob Pressman extolling Mr. Shapell:

EXCERPTS FROM THE ADDRESS BY RABBI JACOB PRESSMAN TO THE THREE COMBINED BOARDS OF TEMPLE BETH AM, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1965

The noblest efforts of man are those in which he is motivated from within by faith and by love, and which he exercises voluntarily and at personal sacrifice. Such efforts have been demonstrated consistently by our president, Mr. Nathan Shapell, whom we shall honor at our annual dinner on April 10, 1965.

Mr. Shapell's argosy in life has taken him from the very depths of tragic oppression in the charnal house of Nazi persecution, where he lost home and family and everything but the most slender thread of life itself. That life spared, immediately he devoted himself to assuming a position of responsibility for the rehabilitation of the many displaced persons and in close cooperation with U.S. military personnel he headed the Jewish rehabilitation effort at Munchberg in Germany, throughout the late 1940's until his efforts were completed.

From Europe he came to these United States, settling here in California, and devoting himself with great energy to the building and development of this burgeoning area. The homes and communities his company has built are to be found across the face of southern California; but significantly, he built so that the occupants might be happy and comfortable and grateful for the thoughtfulness of the builder. That gratitude has been expressed in numerous citations and testimonials he has received from the home purchasers themselves—a most heartwarming experience.

Mr. Shapell has consecrated a very substantial proportion of his earnings to the alleviation of the suffering of his fellow man and the homelessness of his fellow Jews abroad. No worthy cause has ever been refused by this man, and where he recognized the need he never waited to be asked, but volunteered his help.

Here at Temple Beth Am, a congregation of over 1,000 families, of close to 4,000 individuals, we have been the beneficiaries of the energetic, systematic, and humane approach of Mr. Shapell through his duties. Under the leadership our sacred pulpit has been completed, a memorial established to those of our brethren who perished in Europe, and plans for creating new school facilities have been advanced. In reviewing his year in office we are overwhelmed by the amount of time and energy he has given voluntarily to his congregation and his community.

America grows great to the extent that we beautify its physical aspect and deepen its spiritual and religious roots. Not only our temple, but the community has been the beneficiary of the selfless dedication of Mr. Nathan Shapell and when he is honored on April 10 it will be one of those wonderful occasions where the guest of honor merits every accolade that can be expressed on his behalf.

I Feel Better Being President, Knowing That Speaker McCormack Is by My Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Texans celebrating the 129th anniversary of Texas independence on March 2, 1965, in Washington, honored Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, as a National leader whose career and steadfast adherence to the Democratic traditions and principles have helped make this a great nation.

The traditional observance was held in the National Press Club by the Washington chapter of the ex-students of the University of Texas. Speaker MCCORMACK in his speech commended "our courageous President, for the policies of President Johnson is the leadership for peace, the leadership of strength and not weakness or appeasement."

President Johnson, arriving unexpectedly at the affair paid high tribute to Speaker MCCORMACK in his remarks and in a short letter which read:

From the first time I entered the House of Representatives as a young Congressman to this very hour, I have known few men whose courage and compassion, decency of character, and honorable objectives matched those of Speaker MCCORMACK.

He is my friend and my counselor. I feel better being President, knowing that Speaker MCCORMACK is by my side.

Under unanimous consent, I include the speech of Speaker MCCORMACK herewith in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed and are as follows:

REMARKS OF SPEAKER MCCORMACK

Mrs. McCormack and I are deeply grateful for your invitation to be with you this evening at the annual dinner of the Washington chapter of the University of Texas Ex-Students Association, which is held this year in connection with the anniversary of Texas Independence Day.

I am particularly touched by the honor conferred upon me, which I understand has been reserved in the past for former students of your great university.

The University of Texas, established in 1883, is one of the great higher institutions of learning in the United States. Its graduates in all fields have, in time of war and peace, added to the prestige, glory and strength of your great State and our beloved country.

For whether we come from the South, the North, the East or the West—above all, we are Americans.

In my service in the House of Representatives, the two Members who played a very important part in my career are the former Vice President, John Nance Garner, and the late Speaker Sam Rayburn. For it was both of them who were instrumental in my being elected a member of the Ways and Means Committee after only 2 years of service in the House—the first time that any Democratic Member with only 2 years service was elected to this important committee. I have always been indebted to the both of them for what they did for me many years ago. As you know, Sam Rayburn and I occupied close leadership relationship in the Democratic Party in the House for many years. But above that, we were close friends to one another. The relationship that existed between the late speaker and myself is one that I shall always treasure.

And another friendship that developed a little over 30 years ago was between President Johnson and myself, starting from the time when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, and continuing throughout the years.

Our great Chief Executive, President Johnson, has coined the phrase, "From Austin to Boston." How true, in a few words, does this express the close ties that exist between the people of Texas and the people of Massachusets.

When the Texas Declaration of Independence was signed on March 2, 1836, a son of Massachusetts, Asa Brigham, was one of the signers. He was later named auditor by the interim President, David G. Burnet; and later Treasurer of the Republic by President Sam Houston. He was later reappointed by President Lamar, and holding at the same time the position of alderman of Houston, and later mayor of Austin.

There were at least four sons of Massachusetts at the Alamo: John Flanders, William D. Howell, William Linn, and Amos Pollard.

We are fortunate in having in the White House a great President, who is a son of Texas—but over and above, the leader of our country during this trying period of the world's history. President Johnson is seeking to unify our people in the eyes of the world, in which effort we should all cooperate.

President Johnson represents ability, vision, sound judgment, and above all, courage. He makes his own decisions as President, and will continue to do so.

President Johnson possesses all of the qualities necessary to fill that great office, and particularly during this period of crisis.

The Communist leaders and regimes must accept the fact that they do not scare or put fear into the mind of President Johnson, and the free world breaths easier because of this fact.

In their policies in the Communist part of the world, they would be wise to analyze President Johnson correctly.

He did not assume the office of President to have America and the free world be on the defensive, or through fear to be driven underground.

President Johnson is a man of peace—ardently seeking peace—but not peace at any price.

And the President knows that the calculated risk of inaction can be more dangerous at times than the calculated risk of action.

President Johnson served in both branches of the Congress before and after World War II, and he knows that fear or cowardice has brought about more wars than action well considered and well timed.

For President Johnson saw that appeasement before World War II was the road that led to that terrible conflict, and he knows that action at the right time by certain European nations might have stopped Hitler in his mad dreams, and thereby averted World War II.

There will be no appeasement under President Lyndon B. Johnson. For he knows that the dictator, meaning international communism, interprets appeasement as fear, inciting him to greater and greater demands.

President Johnson well knows by events of recent years that appeasement is the road to war.

And the leadership of and the actions by President Johnson is for future peace—of following the policy of peace through strength.

And I might observe that President Johnson well knows that he is the man whose judgment, policies, and leadership future historians will judge and interpret during his period as President of the United States.

And all Americans should rally around and support the leadership of our courageous President, for the policies of President Johnson are the leadership for peace; the leadership of strength and not weakness or appeasement.

It's Our Country—Let's Keep It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an important discussion of immigration laws by Jenkin Lloyd Jones entitled "It's Our Country—Let's Keep It," which appeared in the Washington Star on February 4, 1965. It deserves careful thought:

IT'S OUR COUNTRY—LET'S KEEP IT

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

President Johnson has called for a massive liberalization of our immigration laws and an end to the quota systems that have favored persons born in Western Europe over persons born elsewhere.

"The procedures we have followed," said the President, "imply that men and women from some countries are, just because of where they come from, more desirable citizens than others. Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition."

Now, at the risk of losing my Boy Scout merit badge for cosmic tolerance, I might suggest that if the majority of Americans had sprung, not from Western Europe, but from central Africa or southern Asia, we would have a vastly different country. There are, in all parts of the world, fine human beings, but peoples differ widely in their social habits, their levels of ambition, their mechanical aptitudes, their moral traditions and their capacities for maintaining stable, popular governments.

Why should the United States be the only advanced nation in the world to develop a guilt complex over selective immigration? Every other country that is attractive to immigrants selects baldly and without apology.

Trinidad is in the British Commonwealth. Yet under a new British law, immigration from Trinidad is closely restricted. But Johnson's proposed bill would make Trinidad quota-free.

The President has decried our present stringent quotas for Asiatic immigrants. Australia has no quota at all. It simply excludes anyone of non-European ancestry. And the Japanese Government discourages immigration from any country. A spokesman for the Japanese Embassy in Washington this month stated simply that the Japanese are of one race and proud of it.

Although any person may apply for immigration to Israel, that government frankly seeks only an "ingathering of the Jews." Last year a Jew who had become a Catholic was denied citizenship by an Israel court.

Each year, for 175 years, the United States has received more immigrants than any other nation in the world.

Johnson, in his immigration message, says that the current U.S. immigration quota is 158,361 annually, and that there are already substantially more immigrants than the quota figures indicate. There are no quotas for Latin America, nor for spouses and children of U.S. citizens. In addition, Congress keeps passing special bills to admit immigrants. According to the Population Reference Bureau the net immigration to the United States during the 10 years of the 1950s was 2.7 million.

Johnson claims that his proposed bill would make it easier for people of "special skills" to come and help the U.S. economy. Yet it would immediately double the quotas for such countries as Tanzia, Malawi, Yemen and Nepal, in which persons with special skills needed in the United States might be hard to find.

Unlike the immigration restrictions of almost every advanced country, the President's bill would admit persons suffering from feeblemindedness, insanity, and psychopathic personality, if their families promised to take care of them. The requirement that immigrants would have to have the promise of a job would be taken out.

Now, if the President's bill were passed, who would come? You can get some indication by the current backlog of unsatisfied visa applications. In Greece there are 350 current applications for every place under the present annual quotas. In India there are 150 such applications; in Israel, 150; in Portugal, 125; in Jamaica, 115; and in the United Arab Republic, 90. Is the President really going to try to satisfy these anxious-to-leave-home people in the interest of the success of our foreign policy?

Why haven't other advanced nations felt it in the interest of their own foreign policies to let down their immigration bars?

The plain fact is that nothing the United States could do without utterly destroying herself could measurably ease the population woes of a world in which 125,000 people are being added every day.

The plain fact is that as long as the United States remains prosperous, there will be cries of rage from people who would like to get in and can't. Even a well-heeled Korean coolie could live more comfortably on relief in a New York tenement.

And the plain fact is that the United States is not hurting for population or jobseekers. The United States now contains 193 million

people. Our current birthrate is more than twice our deathrate. By 1980, even without Johnson's new, liberal immigration law, we will have 240 million people.

Every other nation in the world writes its immigration laws to suit itself. Every other nation in the world says, "It is our country, and so what?"

Well, it's our country, too, and when we start writing immigration laws to suit the hungry cameldrivers of "Upper Malaria," old man history will bust his buttons laughing.

California: The Endless Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, no single speech nor any set of statistics can cover the problems of leadership in a great, expanding and ever-changing State like California.

However, those problems—many of them stemming from changing defense and space needs—were well summarized in an address delivered recently by our Governor, Edmund G. "Pat" Brown. His audience was an aerospace conference of the United Auto & Aerospace Workers, AFL-CIO, held in San Diego on February 26.

I am grateful for the opportunity of widening that audience by inserting the text of Governor Brown's remarks in the RECORD:

CALIFORNIA: THE ENDLESS FRONTIER

(An address by Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California, before UAW Aerospace Conference at the Stardust Hotel, San Diego, Calif., February 26, 1965)

I appreciate this opportunity to meet with you and discuss my views on the important issues facing your unions and this country and State.

Unemployment, education, retraining, economic conversion—those are the vital domestic issues of 1965. Nowhere are those issues in sharper focus than right here in California. And nowhere in California are they more compelling than in San Diego.

I need not remind many of you about what happened here in San Diego and in Los Angeles following World War II and the Korean war. We were hit with massive employment upheavals as the result of changes in defense spending and aircraft construction.

In the 5 years following 1957 some 100,000 aircraft jobs were eliminated. The new missile-space programs took up the slack but then the Navaho, Skybolt, and other projects were phased out. San Diego suffered other blows.

We still bear economic scars from those and other Defense Department decisions. A look at our current employment situation will give you an idea of the extent of the surgery.

On the plus side we have a record total of 6.6 million persons currently employed. Compared with a year ago total employment is up 171,000 jobs.

I stress "total" employment because in the area of concern to you and this conference—manufacturing—we have lost ground.

In the four major aerospace categories—electronics, aircraft, missiles, and instruments—we lost 26,300 jobs last year. Now, with an employment total of 6.6 million jobs 26,300 units is not a major problem taken alone. But in looking at the long-range employment prospects in aerospace and defense work they become more significant.

In general, we see a definite downturn and no immediate prospects for new weapons systems or space projects or the magnitude of Polaris and Apollo, for example.

It is to the problems relating to that decline I will address myself today.

First, let me make it clear that California does not intend to relinquish defense and space contracts to any other area without a fight. The work is here because we have the superior manpower, engineering, and scientific brains. We will continue to insist that contracts be awarded on the basis of merit.

More than that, we intend to take every action within our power and capability to improve our position in the defense and consumer markets in the country through an aggressive economic research and development program of our own.

Because I believe that our program may have national application, I would like to outline what we are doing. The program has two major objectives:

To make California the research and development center of the United States.

To make California the leading manufacturing State in the United States.

To accomplish those objectives we have recently embarked on a revolutionary project that will apply space age engineering techniques to solution of the social and economic problems of 20th century urban society.

Specifically, we have let four contracts to Lockheed, North American, Aerojet-General, and Space General—to make studies for the following:

A plan for an integrated statewide transportation network, including highway, rail, air, and ocean travel and transport.

An information and data recovery system to guide our policymakers and planners in both government and industry.

A comprehensive waste management system looking to this century's needs and beyond.

A new concept for the detection, care, and treatment of the criminally mentally ill.

We believe that the scientific and engineering brains which will put a man on the moon, which have created the Polaris, the Atlas, Saturn and hundreds of other projects can create new programs for the solution of earth's problems. From these studies will come blueprints for the Great Society—California blueprints for the future. From those blueprints will come new jobs for the men and women of your unions.

We have asked the aerospace industry to cast off the shackles of conventional wisdom in these study contracts. We have asked them to utilize the same systems engineering techniques they have applied in solving the mysteries of space travel.

And we believe, when the results are in, that California will have shown once again that it is the Nation's scientific and engineering center.

We have embarked on a new exploration which Vannevar Bush described as "the endless frontier."

The challenges of that endless frontier are staggering indeed. By the end of this century: There will be 150 million more Americans who will need two dwellings, two schools, two hospitals, and two of every other structure where today stands only one.

By the year 2000—only 35 short years away—we will need five times as much electricity as today. There will be 240 million cars on the roads and highways, enough to fill 700,000 miles of highway bumper-to-bumper.

Secretary McNamara has warned that to master those challenges we must "look for new, bold concepts without regard to traditional beliefs".

In California we are forging those new concepts in our classrooms, research laboratories, in our unions and in government.

First and foremost in the California plan—and let me stress again that what applies here can apply nationally—is education; education for every boy and girl based not on ability to pay but on ability to learn; free education, right through to the doctorate degree. That education system—74 junior colleges, 16 State colleges, and 7 university campuses—already has produced the greatest aggregate of scientific and engineering brains in the world and the finest skilled labor force in the Nation.

Education, first; economic development for jobs and income, second. To accomplish the latter we have taken the following actions:

Created an economic development agency, seeking new industry and encouraging the broadening of our present base.

Begun work on a revolutionary new State development plan. Economists and other consultants will apply advance computer techniques to provide us with plans and data on educational and job skill needs, employment, resources requirements and transportation.

The first phase of our economic model is already completed. When finished it will be one of the most sophisticated prediction and data devices in the Nation.

Launched a commission on manpower, automation and technology. Now in its second year of advanced studies of our economy and the effects of advanced technology, the commission will give us data and programs to meet the great economic changes ahead.

Created an advisory panel on aerospace and electronics industries.

Appointed export-import advisory committees of foreign trade experts to work with our World Trade Center Authority in creating more trade for our industries, agriculture and ports.

And at the current session of the legislature I am proposing creation of a new office of space and technology. Through that office, and a panel of scientific and technological experts from universities and industry, we will draw on the Nation's greatest scientific community for advice, counsel and planning.

By now some of you may be thinking that I am making a campaign speech for reelection. Nothing could be further from the truth, of course. The only campaigning here is by Ronald Reagan, whose manager appears to be Barry Goldwater; and George Murphy who is doing a new show from Washington called "Yesterday Is Too Late."

I am not making a campaign speech. But I am saying it might be useful to you to examine California's plans for their relevance in your local planning and as a source of thought for formulating your national legislative goals.

I am not suggesting here that this State—like others—is more than but a cog in the great economic wheel driven by the Federal budget. It is not.

Like it or not, the $100 billion Federal budget and related fiscal and monetary policies are the guidance system of our highly sophisticated economy. How that system is employed is really the main business of this conference and of every responsible citizen of the Nation.

We all have our own ideas of how Federal policy should be employed. Let me outline those of mine which apply to the problems I have mentioned today.

In general, let me say first that I do not see how we could spend less than we presently are and still meet our obligations in foreign aid, defense, education, public works, and health and welfare.

As a second principle, I believe that every penny which is cut from defense, foreign aid or other programs should be applied in

those vital areas of the public sector which have frozen during the long years of the cold war.

Those caveats aside, let me turn to some specific recommendations on bread-and-butter issues of interest to this conference.

First, I want to announce my full and wholehearted support of Senator McGovern's bill to create a national Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission.

This is an extraordinarily important proposal and I will ask the California congressional delegation to give it full support. Our experience in California with defense cutbacks has proved the need for such an agency. We urgently need to develop economic plans for assisting States and local communities in adjusting to situations produced by Federal policy changes.

I would like to propose to the commission and to this planning group the following six-point program for dealing specifically with problems of defense conversion:

1. An immediate expansion of the retraining programs of the Manpower Development and Training Act with special emphasis on those skills involved in defense industries and as a result of automation and other technological change.

2. Creation of a program to move displaced defense workers to areas where new jobs may be available.

3. A program for training and retraining on the job, encouraging defense manufacturers to convert to civilian production. Subsidies for one-the-job training and retraining might provide a margin of incentive for employers.

4. An early warning system and slow phase-out policy for obsolete defense programs, providing workers and employers with an opportunity to make adjustments without cruel hardship.

5. Standby plans for public works construction and other Federal programs to assist areas of persistent and high unemployment. These could include urban renewal, housing and hospital construction, and development of transit and transportation systems.

6. Strengthening of the U.S. Employment Service to include new automated reporting systems for regional and national service and more intensive counseling services coordinated with expanded retraining and educational opportunities.

There, along with Senator McGovern's commission, is a six-point peace planning program. It would go a long way toward providing a GI bill of rights for defense workers.

The need for planning now is urgent.

In California, there is special urgency. Some 34 of every 100 manufacturing workers are employed on defense or space projects. Four of the first five largest corporations are principally defense contractors. Still, it is a national problem, not local. Nationally, one-tenth of our labor force is directly or indirectly involved with defense work.

This immense and prolonged commitment of Federal funds to the nuclear-space race has produced two effects: malnutrition of the national public sector; and a shift of population growth problems to the States.

A look at Federal spending since 1947 reveals the pattern. Defense, military, and space budgets aside, per capita Federal spending has actually dropped. From $227 in 1947 it slid down to $150 in 1963 measured in terms of 1962 constant dollars.

In that same period, State and local budgets have increased by even greater rates than Federal spending declined.

And in that period, we have witnessed a gradual but inexorable decay of this Nation's public and private sector. Today some 10 to 15 million American homes are substandard. Pollution fouls the air and streams. Traffic clogs our cities. Industrialization and commercialization are ruining much of our countryside.

And there are unmet needs for human resources too. A new study by the Office of Education shows that 23 million Americans have never completed the eighth grade and 8 million have never reached the fifth grade and cannot even fill out an employment form.

Our huge commitments to defense have drained both our physical and human resources.

Today the aircraft-missile industrial complex employs more scientists and engineers on research and development than the combined total of the chemical, drug, petroleum, motor, vehicle, rubber, and machinery industries.

I submit to you that this depletion process, if not reversed, represents a dangerous trend for this country.

I believe President Johnson recognizes the dangers of this course. He has taken actions to change it. And we must support him in creating the new programs that will secure the lofty objectives of the Great Society.

They will not be achieved without a struggle. I do not believe for a moment that Goldwaterism is dead, the 1964 election notwithstanding.

The unions of this country have led the struggle for progress in the past. I ask you today to continue that good fight. I assure you, you will have my enthusiastic support.

The Challenge of American Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the congressionally chartered Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest each year in which high school students from throughout the United States participate. Four scholarships ranging from $5,000 to $1,500 are awarded to the national winners.

Final judging for this contest is held in Washington, D.C., where the winning contestant from each State is brought as a guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

On March 9, 1965, beginning at 6 p.m., many of us here today, including myself, will be privileged to attend the Veterans of Foreign Wars Annual Congressional Dinner. This dinner will be a doubly significant event for me because I shall have the high honor of presenting to Mr. Francis P. Shanahan of Kaneohe, Hawaii, a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, which congratulates him upon his being chosen the Hawaii State winner for the 18th annual Voice of Democracy contest.

Mr. Francis Shanahan in his winning essay entitled "The Challenge of American Citizenship," movingly and vividly reminds us of the grandeur and greatness that is America; the challenge and the responsibilities that we proudly face.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD Mr. Shanahan's winning essay and the resolution adopted by the Hawaii Legislature commending his achievement.

The article and resolution follow:

THE CHALLENGE OF AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

(By Francis Shanahan)

I live not in myself, but I become a portion of that around me, and being surrounded by American tradition, I cannot help but awaken to my responsibilities. I am an American citizen.

I live with freedom, I thrive in equality, and I balance on the reeds of liberty. I feed on the succulence of religious freedom and I quench my thirst with the nectars of free speech. By these very traits, I am an American citizen. Yet how many Americans are unaware of the challenge of American citizenship?

I grope for and desire the annuities of my American heritage and stand proudly defending them in my own menial way.

I stand at the portals of American citizenship and refuse entrance to none, but protect against violation of democratic concepts with my life. I am an American citizen.

I am somewhat aware of the challenge of American citizenship. It is upon the citizens, that a Government condescending over 190 million people is structured, whose financial influence is measured by a scale incremented in billions. Founded upon these citizens my country has become a leader among leaders and an object of hope to billions of struggling people all over the world. A country whose defense posture is one of the most intricate and expensive in the entire world and perhaps most important of all. On our rights as citizens pends the elements that make life worth living for every American.

Citizenship means more than defense postures and money and it is due time that Americans, young and old, from every walk of life awake to this reality and stop catering solely to the incessant wimpers and moans of society and personal desire. One's country and civic responsibility should always come first. The challenge of citizenship beckons to every American, however, Why is citizenship a challenge when I live in an environment in which, economic, domestic, and political stability enhance my daily life?

It is a challenge merely because I live in an abundance of luxuries and am surrounded with pleasures afforded few others. These virtues were fought and paid for, and I must do everything in my power, whatever it may be to insure that my rights and status of liberty are in no way infringed upon and stand undaunted. Not only must I defend these characteristics of our democracy, but I must forward guiding concepts upon which the American citizen is able to improve himself and his country. When citizenship must emerge victorious when in competition with so many diametrically opposed forces, the campaigns it launches and the battles it fights, both at home and abroad, can certainly be called challenges.

America has a strong and highly democratic system of government, founded on the very principles of good citizenship. Let us not build statues of snow and weap to see them melt, and melt they will if we ignore the call of better citizenship. We cannot let our America, in all of her majestic splendor and elegance deteriorate from within because of lack of proper civic guidance and neglect of civic responsibility. The crime, the discord, the discrimination put our country on a peculiar equipoise. Most of these problems can be resolved through good and effective citizenship, which we must strive for. This is why I feel that citizenship is a challenge in our American society today.

The same pride that makes us condemn the vices we think ourselves free, makes us belittle the virtues we know we lack. Let us not belittle the virtues we know we lack, but let us strive toward attaining them. The

challenge of citizenship lies directly ahead, how will you respond to its call?

HOUSE RESOLUTION 68

House resolution congratulating Francis P. Shanahan, State winner of the 18th Annual Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars

Whereas Francis P. Shanahan, a student at the Kamehameha School for Boys, was the State winner of the VFW 18th annual Voice of Democracy contest; and

Whereas Francis P. Shanahan thereby will receive an all-expense paid trip to Washington, D.C. to compete for the national awards in the Voice of Democracy contest; and

Whereas Francis P. Shanahan in his talk on active citizenship shows a deep awareness about our democratic system and the responsibilities of citizenship; and

Whereas Francis P. Shanahan, by his stirring example in thinking about citizenship in terms of his own life, has stimulated other students to think about what citizenship means to them and has brought great honor to his school and his family: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1965, That it extend its sincere congratulations to Francis P. Shanahan upon his winning the State finals of the VFW 18th annual Voice of Democracy contest, and its best wishes for continued success in the national finals to be held on March 5, 1965; and be it further

Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be transmitted to Francis P. Shanahan and to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Shanahan.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent article by the Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, Elliot L. Richardson, which appeared in the Boston Globe of February 28, 1965. I believe that the Lieutenant Governor's moving article touches with a sure hand on those qualities which we all admired and loved in the late Mr. Justice Frankfurter.

Lieutenant Governor Richardson's article follows:

AN INTIMATE PORTRAIT OF JUSTICE FRANKFURTER: HE DIED, AS HE LIVED, IN KINDNESS

(By Elliot Richardson, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts)

"I hope I don't spoil your Washington's Birthday." These were Mr. Justice Frankfurter's last words. They were spoken to Tom Beasley, for 25 years his court officer, chauffeur, companion, and friend. And then the Justice turned away his head, and so he died.

That, to the very end, was Felix Frankfurter. He had a talent—a genius, indeed, as others have remarked—for linking his own life with the lives of others.

The year I was his law clerk, I broke my ankle skiing in Vermont. Remembering this years later, he tore from the London Times, and sent me, a letter to the editor denouncing the perils of modern skiing.

Hundreds of others over the years have been the pleased recipients of similar communications conveying his extraordinary capacity for keeping in touch with their own very personal interests and concerns.

This sensitive awareness of the unique and special attributes of others was at the heart of his boundless capacity for friendship.

Nowhere was it more evident than in his relationships with his law clerks—those fortunate young men who, each year he was on the Court, came to Washington ostensibly to assist in the preparation of his opinions but in reality to absorb his love of the law and to revel in the excitement of his vibrant pers nality.

DETACHMENT—AFTER A FIGHT

He loved to talk about his law clerks, but he would never compare the strong points of one with the shortcomings of each.

Indeed, he was in all ways a passionate believer in the individual—his rights, his duties, his equal claim to justice under law.

And I say "passionate" advisedly. I remember a day early in my year with him when he was waiting for a citation or two to be added to a draft opinion he wanted to circulate among the other members of the Court before opposing views had a chance to solidify.

Bouncing with impatience—and I do mean bouncing—he said, "This is a war we're fighting. Don't you understand? A war."

At a Harvard Law Review banquet some years later he delivered an eloquent tribute to his great mentor and hero, Oliver Wendell Holmes, singing out for special praise the old Yankee's Olympian detachment from personal bias or prejudice.

Frankfurter himself achieved extraordinary detachment, in case after case subordinating his personal views to considerations he deemed vital to the Court's institutional integrity. But for Holmes detachment came easily—unlike Frankfurter, he had never been a crusader for social justice. Frankfurter had to fight to win detachment, and the praise he rendered to Holmes was his own juster due.

Like all of his law clerks and virtually every lawyer who argued a case before him—I was exposed to his unquenchable zest for teaching. He delighted in opening for others new doorways of the mind, and though he loved to argue, it was at least as much for the sake of stirring his antagonist to grapple with new ideas as for its own sake.

Truly it can be said of him, as Chaucer did of the clerk of Oxenford, "And gladly would he learn, and gladly teach."

Indeed, this line of Chaucer's has a felicity for Felix Frankfurter that just now struck me: he taught for a year at Oxford, the first American law professor to do so. The memories and the friendships he brought away from that year had a special place in his affections.

I've mentioned the Justice's zest for teaching. Learning was a rival enthusiasm. He read with enormous rapidity, casting his eyes on a page for only a few seconds before turning to the next.

Tearing out the entrails, he called it, and both his office and his study were piled high with disembowelled books. He delighted in hunting down obscure quotations, and the Supreme Court librarians joined the chase with almost equal relish.

WHERE IS THY VICTORY?

He loved the company of women, especially attractive women. But there was really only one woman in his life—Marian Denman Frankfurter, his wife. She has a rare, almost unearthly sensitivity—antennae attuned to the slightest vibrations of feeling and a poet's responsiveness to beauty.

The justice revered these qualities in her, thinking of himself, by contrast (though the contrast was far less sharp than he seemed to believe), as a more earthbound soul. Certain it is, at any rate, that the matching of their complementary qualities was extraordinarily happy. She was his best critic, and in his nonjudicial writings he relied on her for niceties of style.

At the service in the Justice's memory held in his Washington apartment last Wednesday, Prof. Paul Freund closed a poignant tribute to him with the words of Mr. Valiant-for-Truth in Pilgrim's Progress.

"When he understood it, he called for his friends, and told them of it. Then, said he, I am going to my Father's; and though, with great difficulty, I have got hither, yet now I do not regret me of all the trouble I have been at to arrive where I am. My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it. My marks and scars I carry with me, to be a witness for me that I have fought his battle who will now be my rewarder. When the day that he must go hence was come, many accompanied him to the riverside, into which, as he went, he said, 'Death, where is thy sting?' And as he went down deeper, he said, 'Grave, where is thy victory?' So he passed over, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side."

No more fitting epitaph could have been spoken.

Economic Progress in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the people of the free world should be pleased with the progress being made by our ally and cradle of civilization, the nation of Greece. In this regard, I am pleased to place in the RECORD an informative article by Mr. Bernard D. Nossiter, economics writer, which appeared in the Washington Post on February 28, 1965.

The article follows:

DOUGHTY GREEKS SPEED ECONOMIC ESCALATION—HELLENIC PROGRESS MORE SMOOTH THAN STARTLING, BUT PROSPECTS ARE DEFINITELY ENCOURAGING

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

ATHENS.—Modern Greece is a strange and uneven melange of old and new. Medieval strip farms, the beginnings of a petrochemical plant, an immature labor movement, a pioneering center for city planning are all features of the economic and social landscape.

In one office building, a trader-turned-manufacturer is figuring how to convert his 50-percent profit into a Swiss bank account. Next door, a second-generation industrialist reads Samuelson, Galbraith and Harvard Business School studies while he plans to plow back his profits into an expanded plant.

The all-inclusive percentages look impressive. In recent years, Greece has been enjoying one of the fastest growth rates in Western Europe, gaining more than 6 percent annually. In the past decade, total output has more than doubled, rising from $2.1 billion to above $4.5 billion.

The details are less impressive. The average income per person last year was estimated at $441. This is one of the lowest in non-Communist Europe and less than one-third that of Belgium, a country with roughly the same population.

Even this average is deceptive. Income per person in Athens is about $800 and in

an impoverished farm region like Epirus, $80. This gap is greater than that between the richest and poorest sections of the United States.

LAG IS IN INDUSTRY

All of these ill-assorted phenomena are typical of a country shrugging off a stagnant economic past and moving toward the contemporary affluence of Western Europe. Greece is a country in the process of development. In the words of one of her keenest economists, she is midway on the development scale.

To move up the scale faster, Greece must industrialize more rapidly. Economists, Government officials, businessmen, and farm labor leaders, as well as the unending stream of outside advisers, all agree on this.

The Greek economy is still too dependent on farming and such services as taking care of tourists. All forms of industry account for little more than a quarter of the total Greek output; services, for nearly 45 percent. Despite the rapid gains in gross national product, the share of industry has not been expanding.

Greece needs more industry for three principal reasons: to make her economy more productive so as to enable each worker to produce and thus earn more; to shore up an uncertain balance of payments that is now supported from such unpredictable sources as foreign aid, tourism, and the earnings that migrating workers send back from Germany and other labor-short areas in Europe, and to absorb the underemployed workers on farms and the unemployed city dwellers.

A HUMAN DEFICIENCY

What holds back a faster rate of industrialization? The casual visitor expects to hear that lack of capital is the chief problem. To his surprise, this is generally put at the bottom of any Greek observer's list.

The principal deficiency is human, the very resource with which ancient Greece was so richly endowed. Greece lacks sufficient entrepreneurs capable of gathering funds for productive enterprises. She lacks enough managers who can run modern plants. The University of Athens turns out plenty of lawyers and students of philosophy, but Greece needs more engineers, chemists, technicians, draftsmen, skilled workers, and even secretaries.

Perhaps the most encouraging feature on the Greek scene is the widespread awareness of this shortage of all kinds of trained persons.

Thus, at the center of economic planning and research, Director George Coutsoumaris is not only drawing up the next 5-year plan for the economy; he is also teaching Greek economists for tomorrow.

Similarly, Constantinos Doxiadis, an astonishingly fertile development planner with projects all over the globe, including Washington, follows a similar route. At his center he is training draftsmen as well as young development planners.

SKILLS FROM ABROAD

Again, Greek authorities encourage foreign investment not only because of the physical plant it will create. The government hopes that these newcomers will instruct Greeks in all the tasks required by modern industrial life.

At least one American investor has responded. He has set up his own school for secretaries, financed the engineering training abroad of several score young Greeks and promises to put potential Greek managers alongside his imported talent.

In the same vein, the reform that the current government points to most emphatically is in the field of education. The regime is in the process of freeing higher education from the charges that have made it too costly for too many.

It is not enough, however, merely to have trained persons, students of Greek affairs say. The principal actors in the modern economic drama must be moved by a spirit or attitude that favors industrial growth.

THE NARROW VIEW

Too many Greek industrialists are fresh from a world of small traders. Their notion of a proper business is one that yields a high profit on a low turnover, enjoys protection against competition through government favors and distributes its profits among speculative real estate ventures or foreign bank accounts. A new generation of manufacturers with more modern notions of investment and managerial technique is beginning to emerge, but this group is still far too small.

Greek labor leaders, too, for the most part, take a narrow and parochial view of their role. A visitor spent an afternoon talking to three of the most progressive union chiefs; only one felt able to talk about economic problems outside his own small sector.

To be sure, this is hardly surprising in a nation where the union movement is still struggling to rid itself of government-appointed officials and is painfully weakened by large numbers of unemployed. But all this underscores the need to cultivate a new outlook among workers' leaders, too.

One of the most sophisticated and highest ranking officials in the Greek Government agreed with a complaint voiced by businessmen that government itself sometimes stands in the way of development. He talked about officials tied to routines, enamored of the redtape that gives them power and suspicious of the entrepreneurs and managers whose success is closely bound up with that of the Greek economy.

There are, of course, farsighted and knowledgeable officials. But too often their plans are frustrated by a lack of systematic consultation with the other groups in the economy and by petty bureaucrats down the line.

NO GREAT LEAP

But despite these difficulties, the Greek economy appears to be moving on a steady upward course. Confidence both within and outside Greece has been strengthened by the strong performance of the past decade.

This Greek advance does not fit the theorists of the takeoff, those who believe that a developing country reaches a precise point at which it rapidly forges ahead under its own steam. The upward march of the Greek economy has followed a much smoother curve than that; outside support will clearly be needed for some time to come.

New institutions such as industrial banks to finance new plants are being put in place. A new perspective has been opened for Greece by her association with the Common Market, a perspective that offers a chance at a much greater market than exists in Greece proper.

Western civilization was born in Greece; it is a good bet that modern Greece will soon reap some of the bigger material dividends that now flow from this adventure.

The Spirit Is Still There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD six editorials written by Mr. Wayne Marshall, editorial writer for the Rochelle, Ill., News-Leader and the Mount Morris, Ill., Index. Believing that Mr. Marshall's observations on our Government and the American people are deserving of national coverage as well as providing a valuable insight into our way of life, I have wanted the other Members to have the opportunity of seeing at least some of his editorials.

It was pleasing to me to learn that one of Wayne Marshall's editorials, entitled, "Spirit Is Still There" which appeared in the Rochelle News and the Mount Morris Index this past July, has been singled out for recognition by the National Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa. Very shortly, Mr. Marshall is to receive a George Washington Honor Medal from the foundation for this rare tribute to the inherent patriotism of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, as long as there are still people like Wayne Marshall able to see and hear it—"The Spirit Is Still There."

The editorial follows:

SPIRIT IS STILL THERE

We recently published a letter from a high school graduate who expressed deep concern over the lack of respect for the flag. She asked: "How many people salute the flag when it passes in a parade? How many salute the flag during the National Anthem? How long will it be before people fail to salute the flag during the Pledge of Allegiance?"

We share her concern but are unable to give any easy answer to her questions. We, too, have noticed the lack of respect for the flag and are disturbed about it. We have also noticed that disrespect is evident in many other ways and toward many other things.

There is a steady erosion of respect for parents, teachers, the elderly, and the police. There is a lack of respect for our national traditions and heritages, for the men wearing our Nation's uniform, and those who occupy public office.

There is less respect for the teachings of the Bible, the customs of our community, for good manners and the rules of ethics that are the stabilizing influences of a worthwhile civilization.

There is a lessening of respect for the boss and for the company that gives us our jobs and pays our wages. There is too much of the attitude that patriotism, loyalty, courtesy, and a sense of duty are strictly for squares.

There are too many who consider a guy a jerk who, like Patrick Henry, would say, "Give me liberty or give me death" or like Nathan Hale, who went to his death saying, "I only regret that I have but one life to give for my country."

The men who fought at Bunker Hill, Gettysburg, San Juan Hill, the Argonne, Bastogne, Guadalcanal, and Pork Chop Hill now have descendants who would rather be Red than dead, who regard love of country and respect for the flag as forms of paganism and who would rather surrender to a wrong than fight to correct it.

Youths who risk their lives senselessly in fast, reckless driving on the highway shrink from the thought of risking danger in the defense of home and country.

Does all this mark the end of a great American era—the start of a period of decline and decay of the wonderful ideals that made up the American dream?

Yes, it could and it may. Great civilizations have risen and wasted away during the centuries of recorded history. But we are not yet ready to believe that we are headed for such a national fate.

The Nathan Hales, Patrick Henrys, John Paul Joneses, and Davy Crocketts of the past were exceptions in their own times. If

our history teaches us anything certain it teaches that this Nation has always produced men and women who could rise heroically in time of need.

Although most of us are more concerned with comfort and security than in the preservation of freedom and the glorification of our country we are not without our heroes.

Men still fight and even die for their country in Vietnam; young people volunteer to accept the hardships of primitive living to serve in the Peace Corps; men and women staff mission stations in areas where their lives are in constant danger.

Police and firemen face great danger to protect the lives and property of others. Rescuers will risk their own safety to go to the aid of miners trapped in the depths or seamen clinging to a stricken ship.

Men like Alan Shepard, Virgil Grissom, John Glenn, Scott Carpenter, Walter Schirra, and Gordon Cooper calmly and courageously risked danger and death to write America's name in flaming letters in the far reaches of space.

Too many of us today are glossed over with a slick coating of sophistication and cynicism and materialism. A whole generation has grown up that has been neither tempered in the flames of war nor hardened in an economic depression.

We have a whole generation that has never been challenged by a major crisis, so these young men and women often become rebels without a cause, seeking kicks as a substitute for the adventures of past generations.

But we suspect that underneath the gloss there is something substantial that would spring forth in typical American form if a crisis should arise.

The wild generation of the roaring twenties showed a grim and even humorous courage when it was tested by the great depression. A generation of Americans who were regarded as too soft to fight was welded into the greatest fighting machine in history after bombs fell on Pearl Harbor.

The world now hopes that great wars have become impossible and the United States has set up safeguards against great depressions. But the new generation has its challenges in space, in the war against disease and in improving man's relationship with man. This calls for a new type of hero and we believe the American soil still produces great people to meet great challenges.

Griggsville Builds Better Birdhouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the inventive genius and perseverance of a Griggsville, Ill., man, J. L. Wade—and the firm he heads—is receiving much-deserved recognition across the country. Thanks to the imagination and industry of Mr. Wade, his firm, known as Trio Manufacturing Co., is literally building a better birdhouse.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently published a full-page feature story and so did the Springfield, Ill., Sun. Both centered attention on the new houses designed especially for purple martins, which are proving to be a boon to man and a boom to Griggsville.

According to Mr. Wade the purple martin is rapidly becoming the Nation's No. 1 bird, and Griggsville is rightfully the capital thereof.

Here are excerpts from the Post-Dispatch story:

GRIGGSVILLE BUILDS BETTER BIRDHOUSE

(By Clarissa Start)

GRIGGSVILLE, ILL., February 20.—People here have built a better birdhouse, and both birds and people are flocking to its doors.

It is the boast of Griggsville, a town of 1,200 approximately 90 miles north of St. Louis, that it is the "purple martin capital of the Nation." The project of acquiring and defending this title has had the civic leadership of the junior chamber of commerce and the happy, if somewhat commercial, cooperation of the Trio Manufacturing Co., which manufactures birdhouses.

It also has had the full assistance of residents of the town who benefit both from the thriving industry and from the fact that a martin eats its weight in insects daily. Griggsville is no longer the mosquito haven it once was.

"We're located between two rivers," said J. L. Wade, president of the Trio Co. "We're 4 miles from the Illinois and 15 miles from the Mississippi. This is rolling area, with many creeks leading to both rivers. In addition, every farmer in recent years has built a large pond to water stock. The area is a natural haven for insects, especially mosquitoes."

"Four years ago, not 1 person in 10 in this town had heard of a purple martin," said Wayne Bradshaw, Trio salesmanager. "Today there are 150 houses and plans for more."

"One of our biggest plans," added Richard Curry, Jaycee president, "is for a martin tower of 500 apartments. It is now under construction in the center of town. We believe it will be the largest such tower in the world. It will be dedicated about the middle of March, and we're hoping to get Gov. Otto Kerner here for the event. He's a martin fancier himself, with a house for them in his own backyard."

Griggsville's bonanza in birds came, interestingly enough, out of a business that was going down instead of up.

"Seventeen years ago I got together with two friends and we formed the Trio Manufacturing Co. to build television antennas," said Wade. "We started out in one room over a grocery store, but it was such a fast-growing field that we soon had our own plant. But television sensitivity has now reached such a point that in many areas—around St. Louis, for instance—an antenna is no longer needed. It's still a good business, but not a growing one.

"We have five metalworking facilities, so we looked around for something to make. I've always been interested in nature and the out of doors. I used to spend time raising quail and pheasants and turning them loose to keep up the population. It occurred to me that we might build bird feeders. Next we tried wren houses and bluebird houses. And then this idea of the purple martin house occurred to me. I went to see Dr. T. E. Musselman of Quincy, Ill., who is a recognized authority on the purple martin.

"He gave me some ideas. We worked up a sample house, and then improved on it."

The most dramatic instance of insect control by the martins came last summer during the week of the Western Illinois Fair, an annual event in Griggsville. J. R. Skinner, representing the third generation of his family to serve as the fair's volunteer secretary, had found the pest control problem to be a real headache. The livestock on exhibit, the nearby fertilizer plant and the picnicking in the park adjoining the fairground combined to attract insects.

"Every year we tried the latest thing in insecticides, pesticides, sprays," Skinner said. "We ruined food by spraying. Horsemen complained that their animals became sick grazing in fields that had been sprayed by us. And the best result we got with insect sprays was a 4-day kill—provided we were lucky and it didn't rain.

"When we installed these birdhouses last summer, I was pretty skeptical about their improving the situation. We got our houses up late, on June 15, but even so we had about 80 percent occupancy by the time the fair opened the first week in July.

"When we started getting martins we quit having flies and mosquitoes. It came time to do our usual spraying before the fair, and we didn't have to do any. The martins were at work all over the ground."

After the fair came the real test. Ordinarily, when the tents come down the flies and mosquitoes really take over, and people complain that they cannot go to the parks in comfort. The fair committee had ordered $600 worth of pesticides. Something happened to the shipment; it was sidetracked at another town and didn't arrive. But the martins did arrive, not only the Griggsville resident martins but hundreds of others.

"One day I looked out the window and the place was loaded with martins," said Skinner. "They were on top of the grandstand, they were lined up along the wires. They were perched on an antenna as if it were a launching pad. It was unbelievable. They must have sent out the call to martins for miles around."

The result was that the flies and mosquitoes were cleaned out. When the chemical firm's troubleshooter arrived to explain the delay in shipment, the fair committee said they were sorry but they wouldn't need the sprays.

The South Bend, Ind., Tribune Endorses President Johnson's Elementary and Secondary School Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial published in the March 3, 1965, issue of the South Bend, Ind., Tribune analyzing President Johnson's elementary and secondary school proposal and concluding that, in the words of the editorial, "the education program of 1965, is deserving of passage."

I call to the attention of my colleagues this thoughtful editorial, which follows:

SOUND THEORY, EMBARRASSING QUESTION

In theory and in principle, the Johnson administration's proposals for selective Federal assistance to American education are worthwhile. The embarrassing question is: Can the principles survive the bureaucracy that must put them into practice?

The heart of the Johnson education package is a billion-dollar program of aid to public elementary and secondary schools serving low-income areas. Even though it is estimated that more than 80 percent of all school districts in the country will qualify for some of this aid, the program remains basically selective: It focuses on need and is not a general aid to education program of the sort many fear would lead to Federal control of teaching matter.

Another $150 million in the Johnson plan would be earmarked for preschool projects among disadvantaged children, primarily in the larger urban areas of the country. Such an approach seems justified by the well-documented theory that culturally deprived youngsters need special attention, not only during formal schooling but even before it, if they are to break out of the family web of disinterest that launches so many children toward ultimate dropout from school.

A controversial aspect of the Johnson plan is the proposal to use Federal money to make library books and textbooks available to schoolchildren who need them—both public and nonpublic school children. The latter also would be encouraged to share classrooms and other teaching aids and facilities.

There has been some static on these provisions from those who see a conflict of church-state separation under every bush. We do not believe the administration proposals would involve Federal support of religious teaching.

Even though Government must be cautious not to slip into state support of religion (as, we think, the Indiana proposal to share State school funds with parents of non-public-school children would do), there is no need to be so overcautious as to deprive youngsters attending schools meeting State requirements of assistance in achieving the secular goals of education.

Other aspects of the Johnson education program that are appealing are the provisions for improving teaching quality and for strengthening State educational agencies.

In theory, then, the program is sound. One need not be cynical to wonder how it would fare, if it passed Congress, at the hands of the Federal bureaucracy, to say nothing of various State bureaucracies.

Yet there is little Congress can do to guard against the inevitable problems at the administration level. When all is said and done, Congress job is to pass the laws. We think the education program of 1965 is deserving of passage, hopefully with safeguards to assure maximum local administration of the projects it will underwrite.

ACLU Helps Police Understand Background of Protest Demonstrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in Minneapolis the American Civil Liberties Union is helping the city police department with a training course on the constitutional rights of an individual to peaceably assemble and petition the government for a redress of grievances.

The purpose is to help the police officers understand their jobs in connection with picketing and protest demonstrations.

The Minneapolis Star, of February 16, printed an editorial complimenting the ACLU and the Minneapolis Police Department.

Because other cities might be interested in this training course, I have been granted unanimous consent to place the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MINNEAPOLIS POLICE AND ACLU

It is heartening to learn that the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has been drawn into a training course for Minneapolis policemen. This organization not only understands the importance of the Federal Constitution and the Bill of Rights; it has achieved a fine reputation for impartiality in the defense of individual freedoms.

Many persons mistakenly assume that the ACLU is associated only with leftwing causes. Actually it is as quick to defend the rights of a Klansman or an American Nazi as it is to champion those of a Socialist or Communist.

Lynn S. Castner, executive director of the Minnesota branch of the ACLU, is one of those who have been participating in a training course meant primarily for those taking promotional examinations but attended by many other members of the force.

It is to the credit of the department that some 160 police officers have been devoting 6 hours a week of their own time to this course. It reflects credit on the department, too, that Castner praised it for its fine work in connection with picketing and protest demonstrations.

This regard for "the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances" was conspicuously apparent at the time of the House Committee on Un-American Activities hearings in Minneapolis last year.

It is extremely important that law enforcement officers understand the individual's constitutional rights and that they go to great lengths to respect them. When there is no such understanding, the rights of minorities are often endangered. The Minneapolis Police Department, obviously, is being headed in the right direction.

The Sino-Soviet Conflict—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at this point I include an article by the Honorable George Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, and currently a professor at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton University.

Ambassador Kennan, who has been described as the Nation's top Kremlinologist, puts forth his views on the Sino-Soviet conflict and its implications for U.S. policy in the article, which appeared in the Sunday, March 7, Washington Post.

I direct the attention of my colleagues to Ambassador Kennan's views:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post Mar. 7, 1965]

A CASE FOR SPARING THE SPURS: FORCING RUSSIA'S HAND ON BIG ISSUES COULD PUSH KREMLIN INTO SIDING WITH CHINA ON VIETNAM

(By George F. Kennan)

Moscow is faced today with Chinese pressures of the heaviest possible sort which not only demand an immediate deterioration in Russia's relations with the West but obviously have as their concealed aim the provocation of actual hostilities between Russia and the West at the earliest possible moment.

The Soviet leaders are well aware of this. They understand its dangers. They propose, I am sure, to resist these pressures to the best of their ability. But there is one area of world affairs where they are extremely vulnerable, where the Chinese have important tactical advantages and where the Soviet leaders can be, and are being pressed constantly into positions and actions that compromise their relations with the United States in particular. This is the area of the so-called anti-imperialist movement.

What is involved here is the question of leadership among the various anti-Western and anti-American political forces now competing for ascendancy in the newer or less developed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. To the extent that these conflicts, these so-called anti-imperialist struggles, are highlighted before world opinion; to the extent that they engage the attention of the great powers and become theaters and testing grounds of greatpower rivalries; to the extent that it becomes impossible for the Soviet Union to ignore or remain aloof from them, Moscow sees no choice but to come down strongly on the anti-Western side, even at the cost of damage to its relations with leading Western countries.

ITS ONLY FUTURE

One may well ask why this should be so; what importance these new countries have for Moscow that could justify so costly a reaction. I can give you only a partial answer, because I myself believe this reaction to be exaggerated, oversensitive, and not fully warranted even by the political self-interest of the Soviet regime. Nevertheless, to a certain extent one can see and understand, if not approve, its rationale.

In Europe and North America, the Communist movement, as a dynamic advancing political force, is dead. If it has a future anywhere, it is in these developing areas and particularly in the new states, where firm political traditions and institutions have not yet formed; and here the possibilities, from Moscow's standpoint, lie less in the prospect of creating real Communist systems (for this, the prerequisites are lacking) than in the possibility of dominant influence being exerted from some Communist center over these inexperienced regimes; of their being developed as instruments of major Communist policy in the game of international policies.

Moscow believes—Moscow is almost obliged by doctrinal conviction to believe—that these anti-Western forces, euphonistically referred to as the anti-imperialist ones, are bound to be generally successful, politically, on the local scene, at least in the struggle against Western influences; and noting the fumbling, ineffective quality of our own response, I must say I think they have some reason for this belief, insofar as it is we Americans who are primarily involved at the Western end.

The great question, in their view, is: Which Communist center is to preside over these various victories and to reap the various fruits? To abandon this field of political contest, or even to neglect it, means, as they see it, to present it on a silver platter to the Chinese. For this, they are not prepared.

DANGEROUS INDIFFERENCE

Their foreign relations operate in three great areas: the world Communist movement, the underdeveloped and new nations, and the Western World. In the Communist movement, their position is already under heavy and effective Chinese attack. Their relations with the West, while valuable to them, cannot, at this historical juncture, at any rate, be expected to carry the entire burden of their international position. A Soviet foreign policy based exclusively on relations with the West would practically undermine the rationale for the maintenance of Soviet power in Russia itself.

Aside, therefore, from the fact that they regard the governments of the new nations as their natural and traditional clients, the Soviet leaders cannot afford, for wider reasons, to stand aside from the struggle for predominance over them. Any such passivity could easily be made to look like indifference to the prospering of the Com-

munist cause generally and would at once be exploited by the Chinese as a means of discrediting Soviet policy and completing the destruction of Moscow's influence and leadership in the world Communist movement.

And beyond that, it would risk the loss of access to this entire theater of international politics, where a continued Soviet presence could alone make the difference between effective Soviet participation in world affairs and a total and ruinous isolation.

In summary, then, we have before us, in the person of the Soviet leadership, a regime subject to strong compulsions toward better relations with the West, yet conscious of having an extremely sensitive flank in Asia and Africa which it can protect only at the expense of its relations with the West; walking a very narrow tightrope among these conflicting pressures; vacillating, weaving this way and that; responsive to the shifts in the world scene; its behavior, for this reason, in part the product of the way we ourselves play our hand and in this sense susceptible in some degree to our influence.

PEIPING'S DIRECTION

Two possibilities now present themselves. One is that our relationship with Moscow deteriorates; that Moscow, as a consequence, finds it necessary to hold more closely to Peiping in order to compensate for the loss of its Western card; that Moscow then throws itself even more frantically and, having little to lose, even more recklessly and wholeheartedly, into the anti-imperialist struggle, heedless of the effect on Soviet-American relations, coming to regard as its major objective not the preservation of an effective balance between the Chinese and ourselves as factors in Russia's external situation, but rather, successful competition with the Chinese for leadership in the political struggle for our destruction.

This alternative would not satisfy in all respects Chinese desiderata, for the Chinese-Soviet rivalry would continue to be operable in many forms. But it represents in general the direction in which the Chinese, as well as many neo-Stalinists in the Soviet Union, would like to see Soviet policy move.

It would militate for increased unity throughout the Communist bloc as well as for sharper and more uncompromising tactics toward the West. It would compound the effectiveness of the forces now marshaled against us. It is difficult to see what ultimate conclusion it could have other than a world war.

The other possibility is, of course, a continued improvement of Russia's relations with ourselves. This is one that would strengthen the hands of both powers with relation to the Chinese. The Russian hand, because the value of the Soviet alternative to the acceptance of Chinese pressures would be enhanced; our own hand, because the intensity of the forces ranged against us would be reduced and because Soviet interests might even work in many ways to reinforce our own position.

In drawing the picture of these alternatives. I should like to avoid the impression that they are absolutes. There is nothing I can conceive of, short of a world war, which could throw the Russians entirely into the Chinese camp. Conversely, any improvement in Russia's relations with the West should not be expected to go so far as to produce any total break with Peiping.

What I am talking about here are tendencies rather than finalities; but they are tendencies of great importance, and the fact that neither would be likely to be carried to a point of absolute finality does not obviate the enormous significance that attaches to the choice between them.

We should recall at this point that the present unhappy state of our relations with China, hopelessly anchored as it appears to be in the circumstances of the moment, should not and must not be regarded as a final and permanent state of affairs. The Chinese are one of the world's great peoples, intelligent and industrious, endowed with enormous civilizing power and with formidable talents, cultural and otherwise. It is wholly unnatural that the relations between such a people and our own should be as they are today.

Dismal as are the immediate prospects, we must look forward to the day when we come to terms in some way with the prevailing political forces on the Chinese mainland. This, however, like any other adjustment of international relations, will take bargaining and compromise; and if the final relationship is to be a sound one and to bear weight, both sides must have a reasonable bargaining power when they finally sit down to acommodate their differences.

Only if the Soviet Union is kept in the running as an independent force in the world affairs, enjoying and valuing a constructive relationship with the West and thus being not solely dependent on the Chinese connection and not helpless in the face of Chinese demands—only if these conditions prevail will we have a chance of working out our long-term relationship to China on a basis reasonably satisfactory to ourselves. A well-ordered relationship with Moscow is, in other words, essential to the constructive and healthy adjustment of our long-term relations with China.

If, in place of the preservation and encouragement of Russia's independent role, we force the Russians back into a closer relation with the Chinese, or even into an intense and exclusive competition with the Chinese for leadership in the destruction of our world position, we will not only intensify the effectiveness of the forces ranged against us at this particular moment but we will complicate greatly, and not to our own advantage, the problem of the eventual composition of our difference with both the Russians and the Chinese.

If this view be accepted, it becomes, as you see, an urgent requirement of American policy to ease in every proper and constructive way the relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States. This has nothing to do with fatuous one-sided concessions designed to win gratitude on the Soviet side. As one of my Foreign Service colleagues used to say, you can't bank goodwill in Moscow, and I would be the last to advocate anything of that sort.

But what you can do is to hold out to Moscow a plausible prospect of accommodation in those issues that are theoretically susceptible of solution in this way, and avoid the accenting of those that are not. This, as I see it, means serious effort on our part to provide a reasonable basis for accommodation in the great issues of Germany and of nuclear weapons control—in those issues, in other words, that affect primarily the European theater and are central problems of Russia's relationship with the West; and at the same time to deemphasize wherever possible conflicts that fall under the Communist category of the anti-imperialist struggle, conflicts in the face of which Moscow, when its hand is forced, is bound to come down formally on the anti-American, if not the pro-Chinese, side.

It does not appear to me that American policy of recent years stacks up very well in relation to this requirement. I have not seen the evidence that we have done all we could do to find agreement with the Soviet Union in matters of Germany and disarmament.

Needless irritations, such as the captive nations resolution and various antiquated trade restrictions, are still permitted to impede the development of Soviet-American relations. And our present involvement in Vietnam is a classic example of the sort of situation we ought to avoid if we do not wish to provoke in Moscow precisely those reactions that are most adverse to our interests. It is largely as a consequence of these strategic errors that we find ourselves in the dangerous and unpromising position we occupy today.

It will be asked, of course, particularly in connection with the problem we now have on our hands in Vietnam, what else we could do that what we have done in situations of this sort.

I would be the last to generalize about such situations, or to suggest that a hands-off policy is everywhere possible and desirable. But there is one thing we might usefully bear in mind. The surest way to invite a strong and effective Communist involvement in situations of this nature is to involve ourselves heavily, particularly in a military way.

Where we lay off, the road may be open, ostensibly, to Communist intrigue and penetration (it is usually open, no matter what we do) and there may well be takeovers by political forces that make a pretense of Marxist conviction and look to Moscow or Peiping for economic aid and political support. But this is not always so intolerable to our interests as we commonly suppose.

The less we are in the picture, the less is there any excuse for actual military intervention on the part of the Communist powers and the greater are the chances for rivalry between Moscow and Peiping for political predominance in the region concerned. But in the absence of a Communist military presence, and where this Chinese-Soviety rivalry exists, the local regimes, whether nominally Communist or otherwise, are almost bound to begin to act independently in many ways—to develop, in other words, Titoist tendencies.

And this is not always the worst solution, from our standpoint. It is harder for either Moscow or Peiping to interfere extensively with a regime that calls itself Communist than with one that does not. And since we have not engaged our prestige extensively, the situation affords to the Communist powers no such opportunities for political gains at our expense as those the Chinese and North Vietnamese Communists are now reappearing in Vietnam.

I can think of nothing we need more, at this stage, than a readiness to relax; not to worry so much about these remote countries scattered across the southern crescent, to let them go their own way, not to regard their fate as our exclusive responsibility, to wait for them to come to us rather than our fussing continually over them. The more we exert ourselves to protect them from communism, the less the exertion they are going to undertake themselves.

Why Is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Against Our Veterans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce sent telegrams to its members urging them to support the consolidation of VA regional offices in their areas. The telegram sent to the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce is as follows:

JOHN LATSHAW,
President, Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City, Care of E. F. Hutton & Co., Inc., Kansas City, Mo.:

In support of the national chamber's campaign for the prudent use of taxpayers' dollars and the efficient operations of government, I urge your most serious and favorable consideration of plans to consolidate regional veterans' administrative offices in your area. Political considerations should be secondary to governmental efficiency and economy. The business community can make a significant and statesmanlike contribution to sound governmental fiscal policies as well as to improved care of our war veterans by communicating such views to Members of the Congress.

WALTER F. CAREY,
President, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

One of the first inquiries that comes to mind is whether this might be an unauthorized, personal act of President Carey and whether the telegram would have actually gone forward if it had required prior approval from a majority of the membrship. Whether the telegram was issued under proper authority or not I am sure that many Members share my experience over the years that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has been notorious in favoring everything that will be for the benefit of big business and have found themselves too busy to do anything for small business or the individual. Most of us know that almost every Government expenditure has been at one time or another a target of our U.S. Chamber of Commerce. In the case of the present telegram, in their great zeal for economy, they decided to shoot from the hip without selection of a proper target.

Thousands of members of the chamber across the United States will be disappointed that their U.S. Chamber of Commerce had the audacity to cite "improved care to our war veterans" as a major reason why the local chambers should support the consolidations despite the public admission from VA officials that these consolidations will in fact run up the personal or individual expenses to thousands of deserving veterans. An equally great number of members of the chamber will be angered and embittered at the chamber's suggestion there are political considerations involved. Since when has adequate veterans' care become a political consideration?

The Johnson administration is deserving of commendation for its vigorous efforts to reduce unncessary Federal expenditures. No motto could be more appropriate for our President than his stated objective of receiving a full dollar for every dollar spent.

But because the ideal of economy and efficiency is so much with us, we must exercise particular care not to cheapen it by misapplying it for devious purposes. Perhaps the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has yielded to the temptation to charge that the veterans program is inefficient, when it really means it disapproves of the purposes of the program.

If the proposed closing of VA regional offices is typical of what the U.S. Chamber of Commerce chooses to label as "prudent use of the taxpayers' dollar," then I must dissent sharply from their position, despite my agreement with their professed objective. All we need are a few more economies such as this one and the chamber's program of efficiency will have the same effect as the controversial neutron bomb. It will only harm people, but obligingly leave property intact.

I do not recall hearing any repeated approval or sustained applause from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce during the past several years when billions of dollars were being saved through more efficient procurement procedures in the Department of Defense. Can it possible be that the philosophy of the U.S. chamber is that in the field of large-scale Government procurement of goods and services a penny not saved by the Government is a penny earned by business? Yet, when another area of Government spending not affecting the direct financial interests of big business is found such as the Government's program of special medical attention and care for millions of needy veterans, their widows, and their children, one hears a roar of applause that is almost deafening.

But thank goodness the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, through its president, could not stomach the telegram from Mr. Carey, and not only would not subscribe to his urgings, but in dissent fired back the following telegram:

Mr. WALTER F. CAREY,
President, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C.:

We are fully in accord with prudent use of taxpayers' dollars and efficient operation of Government. We wholeheartedly concur that political considerations should be secondary to governmental efficiency and economy. Our intensive studies show that Kansas City office of VA at present has higher operating efficiency and better economy rating than others. Such efficiency and economy would be enhanced by retention and consolidation of VA regional office here. We consider this a contribution to sound governmental fiscal policies and improved care of veterans. Such views with supporting data, have already been communicated to Members of Congress and are being mailed to you today.

JOHN LATSHAW,
President, Chamber of Commerce of Greater Kansas City.

The Kansas City Star, in commenting on Mr. Latshaw's telegram, pointed out that the local chamber had compiled a fact sheet supporting the view that the VA office should be retained in Kansas City because of a higher operating efficiency and a better economy rating than many others that were left open. Mr. Latshaw has furnished a valid and factual refutation to Mr. Carey's broadside or scattergun approach against all the veterans of America.

If the U.S. Chamber of Commerce wants to reduce the special consideration now given to veterans as a result of sacrifices made to this country in time of war, let them say so. But let us not let the chamber get away with a sneak attack on the welfare of veterans and their dependents in the disguise of economy and efficiency of Government and then have the gall and affrontry to suggest that the Veterans' closings all across the country will result in "improved care."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce declined the request of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to support the Government's plan to eliminate veterans' facilities. They have chosen to recognize as critically relevant the human values at stake in the closing of the VA regional office in Kansas City and to reject completely the pleas of its parent body. It recognized the premise of economy in Government, but rejected the false conclusion. Let us hope that other chambers across America will have similar fortitude and good judgment.

Soil Conservation Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of two letters I have recently received which deal with the budget for the Soil Conservation Service for the fiscal year 1966. One letter is from Commissioner Joseph N. Gill, of the Connecticut State Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources; the other is from Mrs. R. O. Erisman, secretary of the North Stonington Conservation Commission, North Stonington, Conn.

The Soil Conservation Service is providing valuable information and services to farmers, landowners, planning groups, and conservation commissions in Connecticut. A cut in the budget as recommended this year would particularly hurt the small farmers and landowners who cannot afford to pay for such services. Technical guidance and other assistance are needed to protect the land and water resources, and this assistance can best be rendered by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service which has three decades of experience in the field of soil and water conservation.

I believe that the cut suggested may in the long run prove much more costly and harmful to our natural resources. The services rendered by the Soil Conservation Service should be continued as in the past. The agency should be given adequate funds to enable it to continue its services for the protection and preservation of our Nation's natural resources, its soil surveys, watershed program, flood prevention projects, and other activities.

The two letters referred to above are as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES,
Hartford, Conn., February 16, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
U.S. Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: The activities of the soil conservation districts in Connecticut includes supplying technical information to farmers, other landowners, town planning groups, and

conservation commissions in the field of soil and water conservation. The principal source of the technical assistance to districts is from the Soil Conservation Service.

For over 25 years this service has been provided free to all landowners. The present budget submitted for the U.S. Department of Agriculture includes the following proposal:

"A reduction of $20 million is anticipated for 1966 under legislation being proposed to authorize the establishment of a public enterprise revolving fund to finance in part the cost of technical services provided to soil conservation districts and cooperating farmers, ranchers, and other landowners in the design, layout, and installation of planned soil and water conservation practices. The proposed legislation would require that cooperating soil conservation districts or landowners and operators pay to the service up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished to help install planned practices on their lands. Receipts derived from this source and deposited in the fund would be available in their entirety for installation services." (From "Appendix to the Budget for Fiscal Year 1966.")

The district supervisors are unanimously opposed to making charges for these services. They feel it would materially reduce the amount of conservation practices being applied on the land. By making charges for these services, the bulk of the conservation work would be done on the land of a few who could afford to pay for such services. The small landowner who is in greatest need of technical assistance could not afford to pay for the technical help. It would be difficult for this group of landowners to raise sufficient funds to pay for the installation of conservation practices.

The present workload in each district is greater than what can be serviced with the limited personnel now available.

The rapid change from farmland to other land uses has created a need for technical guidance to additional individuals and planning groups.

Advance planning is needed to adequately protect the land and avoid costly mistakes through improper water management.

One of the fine programs which was enacted by the Congress during the Roosevelt era was the establishment of this U.S. Soil Conservation Service. The technical excellence of their staff and the contribution that these staff members are now making to their various communities is irreplaceable.

President Johnson has placed a very high priority on the preservation of our country's natural resources and technical guidance that will be needed by our communities throughout the country can only be supplied by these Soil Conservation technicians. It would seem penny wise and pound foolish with the programs now starting and sponsored by the Federal Government in grant programs for natural resources to our States, to deprive them of this professional know-how that is presently available.

Your testimony before the appropriations committee in previous years, has been excellent and much appreciated by the people in Connecticut. After reviewing the current budget proposal, if you agree with the need for continuing free technical services to promote soil and water conservation, we would appreciate your support before appropriate congressional committees to make known the needs for conservation in Connecticut.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH N. GILL,
Commissioner.

NORTH STONINGTON
CONSERVATION COMMISSION,
North Stonington, Conn., February 8, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ST. ONGE: This commission has learned that the President's budget includes a recommendation to cut the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service by $10 million. We feel that this cut would virtually eradicate this agency, which was established by F.D.R., has operated with signal success and always on a meager budget.

In order to raise the necessary funds, the agency would have to charge fees for some of its services which it has been providing free for the past 30-odd years. The SCS has benefited small landowners and the general public, whose interests are always served by good land and water conservation practices.

The SCS has been performing in a new and vital area by cooperating with commissions like ours in supplying technical assistance which small towns could not afford to pay for and could not obtain elsewhere. Our commission works closely with our zoning board, which relies on SCS soil capability determinations to back up its decisions. The SCS provides us with detailed information on drainage conditions which play a vital role in proper zoning. The health officer relies on their findings also. Their maps have been used in conjunction with our open space recommendations for inclusion in our forthcoming town plan. SCS representatives have given unstintingly of their time and resources, sending representatives to evening and Sunday meetings. We could not function without them.

The President's conservation program would be a farce if it should allow crippling of this vital agency. Will you please use your good offices to keep the SCS functioning at top efficiency and try to increase, rather than cut, its modest budget.

Sincerely yours,

ADELE ERISMAN,
Secretary.

Urgent Second Look at Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Wednesday, March 3, 1965, issue of the Los Angeles Times.

The Times very appropriately points to the need for close inspection of proposed Government programs to avoid costly error. It underscores the call by Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, chairman of the House Republican conference, for a second look at Great Society proposals.

The editorial is as follows:

URGENT SECOND LOOK AT GREAT SOCIETY

Only an idiot steps deliberately in front of a steamroller, or sticks his finger into a buzzsaw, or tries singlehandedly to hold back a raging flood.

But this does not mean that it is idiotic to sound a warning when the steamroller rolls, or the buzzsaw buzzes, or the flood floods.

Thus we salute today the commendable realism, and practical approach, which is apparently being developed by the badly outnumbered GOP leadership in Congress.

As chairman of the policy-conscious House Republican conference, Representative MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, acknowledges the futility of trying to stem the expectable flow of Great Society legislation this year. After all, the lineup is 295 to 140 in favor of the Johnson administration.

Says LAIRD: "Though we do not win rollcall votes, we can win for America the all-important second look that may save us from blindly accepting a Great Society that might be just another great mistake, just another great scheme, just another great debt accepted without due consideration."

Now, this is not to say that all of President Johnson's vast blueprint is bad. Certainly a part of it, handled with prudence, may lead toward a better Nation. There are other disturbing aspects of the Great Society program, however, that contain proliferating seeds of costly growth, whose future no man can reckon with any accuracy.

These are the projects that need a "second look," and toward which responsible Republicans must address themselves either with compelling arguments or sensible alternatives.

Act I, the Funny Money Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial which appeared in the Phoenix, Ariz., Gazette of March 3, and which points up the dangers of—and the responsibility for—our current silver coinage problem. Since an inherently valuable coinage is historically necessary to the stability of America's economic system, it behooves all of us to think seriously and act wisely in an effort to alleviate the situation with which we are presently faced.

The editorial follows:

ACT I, THE FUNNY MONEY ERA

It requires something less than an advanced degree in economics to whet one's suspicions that something is seriously amiss when normally sedate banks in some American cities must exchange $1 in paper money and $1 in trading stamps for each $1 in silver turned in to them.

The sad fact of life is that we are rapidly running out of silver; that the time is imminent when the cost of using silver for coins will be prohibitive, anyway, and that we must either abandon silver as a coinage base entirely, or sharply reduce the silver content. At what cost to public confidence can only be guessed.

Both natural and unnatural causes are cited for this current kettle of fish that we are in—and they range all the way from the increase in the industrial use of silver and the growth of the vending machine business to the spreading popularity of coin collecting. The real nub, however, is to be found in the Federal Government's long-time preoccupation with playing fast and loose with our currency for political purposes, and with its more recent refusal to realize that Gresham's law—"bad money drives out good"—is still as valid now as it was in the 16th century.

To stimulate free world silver production, and to conserve our coinage, the late President Kennedy freed silver from its 90-cents-an-ounce pegged price and instituted a program of retiring our silver certificates—redeemable 100 percent in silver—and replacing them with Federal reserve notes, backed 25 percent by gold, but not redeemable. The move, unfortunately, flew directly in the face of Gresham's law. Immediately, the bad money, the Federal Reserve notes, drove out the good money, silver dollars. From a stockpile of more than 95 million cartwheels in December 1962 (which the Treasury billed

as a 25-year supply) the supply fell to 3 million in just 15 months and is now virtually nonexistent.

Even if the silver were available, which it is not, continued coinage is impossible since silver, now trading on the free market, has risen in price to $1.29 an ounce and has reached the point where it has become profitable to melt silver dollars down for their silver content. Once the price rises to $1.38 an ounce, which is inevitable, it will then be profitable to melt down lesser silver coins—quarters and dimes. The British went through this politically explosive upheaval in the 1920's, to their everlasting regret.

The upheaval we face in our currency is going to be chaotic, and the current Democratic administration has no choice but to accept responsibility for being the one that politicked silver coins out of existence * * * for being the administration that debased our currency and launched us on a funny money kick with ominous potentialities.

The Sino-Soviet Conflict—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert into the RECORD a second article by Dr. Donald A. Zagoria, a member of Columbia University's Research Institute on Communist Affairs and the author of the authoritative "The Sino-Soviet Conflict, 1956–61."

In this article, which appeared in the January 31, 1965, Washington Post editorial section, Dr. Zagoria assesses some of the probabilities and myths which surround the question of American withdrawal from southeast Asia and its effect on Russia and China.

The article follows:

(By Donald S. Zagoria)

What would be the effect of an American withdrawal from Vietnam? Is the domino theory valid? Would withdrawal set in motion a chain of forces that would ultimately spell the end of our position as a Pacific power and a retreat "back to Waikiki"? What would be the likely consequences elsewhere in Asia of an American defeat in Vietnam? What effect would it have on Russia and China?

None of these questions can be answered with certainty because they involve too many imponderables. But it may be worthwhile to try to assess some of the probabilities and to dispel some of the myths.

Defeat for the United States in Vietnam—no matter how it was disguised—would almost certainly encourage the Chinese and other Communist parties in underdeveloped areas to believe that the Chinese model of "liberation war" is neither so risky nor so pointless as the Russians have contended. Chinese prestige in the international Communist movement, particularly among those parties in the neutral camps, would be enhanced and the "paper tiger" thesis would probably be more widely accepted.

SEEK FERTILE SOIL

This does not mean that the Chinese or other Asian Communists would run amok. The Chinese would not necessarily encourage other Communist parties to emulate Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam unless conditions were deemed proper and unless there was a pro-Western government in power that Peiping wanted removed.

The Chinese are revolutionaries but they are aware that a successful revolution or "liberation war" must be carefully prepared and that it must take place in fertile soil. The ground for the Vietcong success today in South Vietnam was carefully prepared many years ago. Nor are the Chinese interested in indiscriminately promoting revolution. In countries such as Burma and Cambodia, which have moved away from the United States, Peiping shows little interest in sponsoring subversion.

China's major goal is to remove American influence from Asia. The promotion of "liberation wars" is only one of several ways to achieve that goal. What we can expect from China in the event of the loss of South Vietnam, then, is increased pressure on other pro-Western countries in Asia, such as Thailand and Malaysia.

Another important question concerns the relationship between China and other Asian Communist parties such as the Vietnamese. This relationship is often oversimplified in either of two ways. The first says that the North Vietnamese and all other Asian Communists are stooges or satellites of China. This is not the case. The North Vietnamese made their own revolution and have their own interests, some of which overlap with those of China and some of which conflict. For years Hanoi sought to steer a middle course between Moscow and Peiping. It finally landed in the Peiping camp not because of any blind loyalty to China but because it decided that alliance with Peiping would best promote the goal of unifying Vietnam under Hanoi's hegemony. Hanoi is now a firm ally of Peiping because it has little other choice, given its goal and U.S. opposition to it. If it should achieve its goal, however, a Titoist development would be quite likely in North Vietnam.

The other oversimplification—at the opposite extreme—maintains that North Vietnam is now or can be thoroughly independent of Peiping. For the foreseeable future, Peiping and Hanoi have certain overlapping interests, the most important of which is to eliminate American power and influence from southeast Asia. To achieve that goal, Hanoi needs Peiping's backing.

RUSSIAN MORAL SUPPORT

In the longer run, Chinese military power and the logic of geography will keep Hanoi in Peiping's sphere of influence, much as Rumania remains in the Soviet sphere despite her recent show of independence.

As to the Russians, an American defeat in Vietnam would not likely bring about any fundamental change in their interest in a detente. The Russians would continue to hesitate to risk any direct confrontation with the United States by sponsoring "liberation wars." But they would be more hard-pressed to refute the Peiping argument that the United States is a paper tiger and thus might give increased moral support to such wars.

The most difficult question in many respects is: What effect would American withdrawal from Vietnam have on other countries in south and southeast Asia that lie within the shadow of China?

The view of Peiping from Bangkok is different from the view from New Delhi, and even within one country there are great differences of opinion. Nevertheless, in a trip I made a year and a half ago through most of Asia, I gained the clear impression that Chinese power—even before Peiping's explosion of a nuclear device—was beginning to make itself felt as never before. I found what can only be called a preoccupation with, and growing respect for, China.

In Indonesia, both army leaders and members of the political elite seemed to feel that the mainland of southeast Asia will eventually be lost to China. General Nasution, chief of the armed forces, told me that there was no way to prevent this unless the smaller countries in the area acquired a sense of "national identity" such as Indonesia has. A high-ranking official in the Foreign Office said Indonesia would have good relations with China for the next 10 years but after that, when China had gained the mainland of southeast Asia, there would be a showdown at the water's edge.

In one small Asian country, a government official suggested only half jokingly that Russia and the United States ought to carve up China now before it is too late.

In Pakistan, a high-ranking official suggested that we ought to accept a neutralization of Indochina inasmuch as the French experience demonstrated that it is not possible to win a military victory. He made the further point that the Chinese and North Vietnamese might now be willing to negotiate a political settlement in return for certain quid pro quos, whereas in a few years they may well be strong enough to take what they want without negotiating.

These were opposing positions but they have a common denominator and one, I believe, that is widely shared in the area: the view that Chinese power is increasing and will have to be reckoned with by one means or another.

In regard to Cambodia, there is a popular aphorism: When China catches cold, Cambodia sneezes. Prince Sihanouk, the Cambodian leader, has been saying for some time that China represents the wave of the future in southeast Asia—a situation he ascribes largely to the failure of American policy—and he has been acting accordingly. Although there is a school of American opinion that attributes paranoid tendencies to all Asian leaders whom we find difficult to understand, there is no reason to believe that Sihanouk is acting out of anything but a realistic assesment of the balance of forces.

There was a paradox in all this, it seemed to me at the time. Communist China had recently encountered serious economic difficulties at home, and had separated itself from the Soviet Union. One might have thought that such developments would undermine China's prestige in the world at large. A common reaction in Asia to Peiping's domestic problems, however, when they were known about at all, was that they were merely temporary setbacks.

Chinese discipline and determination—these were the essential things that stood out in the minds of the majority of the people with whom I talked.

China's successful show of force against India certainly did nothing to detract from this image. Indeed, most Asians seemed to lack sympathy for India, and several officials were quick to say that India got just what she deserved.

The smaller countries around the perimeter of China stand in awe of her for many reasons. Sheer size and proximity are of course factors of great importance. If China rolls in her sleep, one official told me, his country might be crushed just by accident.

There are also important historical and cultural factors. Much of the area around China has at one time or another been under direct or indirect domination by the Chinese Empire. Some of the smaller countries paid tribute to Peiping. Chinese civilization spread to—or strongly influenced—Korea, Japan, the Ryukyus, and much of southeast Asia. In short, China—long before it was Communist—was accustomed to a dominant role in east Asia and many of the smaller countries in east and southeast Asia recognized her dominance.

There is another way in which Asian respect for Chinese power is nurtured: through the overseas Chinese, who economically dominate many of the southeast Asian countries. Particularly in countries that recognize Peiping, the Communist Embassy exerts a strong

influence on the local Chinese community. Those Chinese businessmen who do not cooperate with Peiping will often find more cooperative Chinese opening up businesses right across the street from them.

Even in such countries as Thailand, where there is a Nationalist embassy, many in the large Chinese community take considerable pride in the fact that there is a strong central government in China once again and that Peiping has been strong enough to defy the world's two great powers, Russia and the United States. It is this basic emontional bond—similar to that which ties most Jews throughout the world to Israel—that convinces many southeast Asian governments that the Chinese in their midst are a potential fifth column whether they are pro-Communist or pro-Nationalist.

Moreover, the 17 million Chinese overseas are the most industrious and talented people in southeast Asia. This is one of the reasons that there is a reluctance to assimilate them. One Indonesian official told me the Chinese in Indonesia, outnumbered 6 to 1, worked three times as hard as the Indonesians. Similarly, I asked the Cambodian Minister of Agriculture why the Cambodians did not try to assimilate the Chinese community. He said they couldn't afford to because the Cambodians would wake up one morning and find the whole National Assembly in the hands of the Chinese.

There is yet another factor reinforcing the respect for Chinese power. Some Asian countries have strong pro-Peiping Communist Parties. Their leaders hope to keep these parties at bay by being friendly to China. One of several reasons for the growing friendship of Indonesian President Sukarno with China is that he wants to keep his own pro-Peiping party in line.

In Burma, Premier Ne Win also faces a strong Communist Party that, unlike the Indonesian party, is engaged in armed struggle against the Government. But Ne Win nevertheless pursues a friendly policy toward China. His calculation may be that if he moved closer to the West, the Chinese would give substantial assistance to the Burmese Communists, something they have refrained from doing for the past decade.

In Cambodia, it is not an internal Communist Party which Sihanouk wishes to keep under control, but an external one, namely the North Vietnamese. The North Vietnamese represent to Cambodia both a hostile Communist state and, probably more importantly, a traditional enemy. To restrain the North Vietnamese and to guarantee his country's security, Sihanouk believes that he can rely upon China. Sihanouk probably believes that by moving closer to China and away from the West, he gives the Chinese little incentive to sponsor communism within Cambodia. And he is correct. Peiping does not seek to subvert him. Might not the Thais one day come to believe that a reapprochement with China would benefit them in the same manner by ending Chinese-supported attempts to subvert the pro-Western government.

Meanwhile in Cambodia and elsewhere, I found a lack of confidence in the United States. A senior American military officer in Phnom Penh told me—before the withdrawal of the American military mission—that several American officers had directly asked their Cambodian counterparts whether they felt that they could count on American support if the chips were down. The Cambodian officers replied that they had confidence in individual American officers but none in the American Government. The fact that the American aid program was only on a year-to-year basis was often cited as evidence of the ambiguity of U.S. support.

Communist China's explosion of a nuclear device has almost certainly increased the growing respect for China throughout Asia. Of the only two Asian powers that could possibly stand as a counterweight to China, India has been humbled and Japan seems ambivalent. There are powerful political forces in Japan whose pressures will set severe limits on Japan's ability to help the United States contain Chinese power.

Against this background, it seems reasonable to conclude that an American withdrawal from Vietnam would strengthen the view that is already widely held in much of Asia: That Chinese power is growing and there is little to stop it.

Sihanouk, who clearly distinguishes between Hanoi and Peiping—he has based his policy on an attempt to play one against the other—has nevertheless long recognized that whatever influence Peiping has over Hanoi, any extension of Communist power in Asia would change the balance of forces against the United States. This is a basic fact of life and Sihanouk has acted upon it. The more the Communists have been successful in South Vietnam, the more he has moved away from the United States and closer to China. A similar reaction will almost certainly take place elsewhere in Asia if the United States withdraws. And to this extent the domino theory works.

The problem of how to contain communism in Vietnam emerges inescapably as part of the much larger problem of how to contain Chinese power in Asia. While still in the minor leagues as a global power, China is now close to being the dominant regional power in Asia. We must either reconcile ourselves to this development or be prepared for a long and costly effort. There is no easier way.

Spangled Banner Deemed Worthy of Awe, Respect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Yazoo City, Miss., high school paper, the Yazooan, has again received an award from the Freedom Foundation.

The editorial entitled "Spangled Banner Deemed Worthy of Awe, Respect," and which appeared in the October 31, 1963, issue won the George Washington Honor Medal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this prize-winning editorial which was written by Miss Elizabeth Cooper, now a student at Baylor University.

The editorial follows:

Henry Bennett describes the patriotic feeling exhibited toward the American flag in "The Flag Goes By" when he pens "Hats Off: The Flag Is Passing By."

Every nation claims a national flag as its chief symbol, an image for the country's land, its people, its government, and its ideals. Men and women have died to protect their national flag from dishonor and disgrace.

To honor and respect this national emblem should not only be a responsibility, but a privilege and honor; for the American flag represents a heritage of toil, sweat, and tears for freedom.

Recognizing the civic duty high school students owe to their country, the student body pledges daily to "one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

U.S. Information Service Carries Our Message to the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the dedicated work of the U.S. Information Service has been evaluated carefully by the oversea staff of the Christian Science Monitor.

USIS is today frequently a target of political groups which abhor freedom. Nevertheless, the superb work of this cultural arm of the American Government has great impact on the search for democratic ways of solving problems.

I therefore commend to my colleagues the following report which appeared in the March 4, 1965, issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

THEY CARRY U.S. IMAGE TO THE WORLD, BUT—

The U.S. Information Service—USIS—speaks to the world for America and its policies. It attempts to project a rounded view of the United States. A survey by the Christian Science Monitor finds that USIS is more effective than is generally known. But the problems of USIS posts are many. Libraries are sometimes targets for angry protests against America foreign policy. USIS programs do not always fit the needs of local conditions. Monitor correspondents here discuss the impact of USIS in various parts of the world.

FAR EAST

HONG KONG.—The triumphs and failures of the U.S. Information Service in the Far East are perhaps best illustrated by two vignettes.

The setting for both is Djakarta, capital of Indonesia.

Scene of the first is a pleasant street where stands the American library operated by USIS. Suddenly a marching mob, thought to be heading for the American Embassy in another part of the city, swerves and changes course.

It rushes the library, smashes its way in, wrecks the reading room, tears down the American flag, and burns it.

The second vignette takes place a few days later.

The scene this time is the home of an American Foreign Service officer in Djakarta. Being shown there is the USIS film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," the film depicting President Kennedy's achievements and funeral procession. The film must be shown in a private house because American films of all kinds are barred from public viewing in Indonesia.

After 90 minutes of this moving record the lights are turned on and show Indonesian women in the audience sobbing, the Indonesian men grim and taut.

Perhaps the audience may not be pro-American. But for a few minutes at least this film has built a bridge of humanity between two peoples.

What propaganda specialist could ask for more?

Such anomalies—the sacking of a USIS library yet the brilliant success of a USIS film—in the same city just a few days apart, indicate the range of reaction to USIS in Asia.

Some old Far Eastern hands blast USIS for lack of sophistication. They say too much

of the propaganda program is packaged in bureaucratic Washington without consideration for local conditions.

Instead of some heavy tomes they would like to see in American libraries simple booklets on how to repair a bicycle or dig a well.

Instead of films on art galleries in Buffalo they would like to see animated cartoons angled specifically for local audiences.

They are critical of the act of Congress which bars USIS from competing with commercial publishing houses and which, they say, stultifies USIS publications.

Some are critical of the fact that non-American authors are barred from American library shelves.

But if USIS is criticized, it is also defended. Some point out that one of America's most successful propaganda displays—of the space program and equipment—was a packaged program from Washington.

It is argued that sackings of libraries do not always indicate defeat. Sometimes they are indications of the libraries' effectiveness, so much so that anti-American demonstrators desire to put them out of business.

Then again in one southeast Asian land where the local government is trying to improve its image in a remote and Communist-tainted region, the USIS is performing with subtlety and sophistication. Much of its effort is to bolster the government with improved propaganda techniques without ever thumping out the achievements of the United States.

And in Vietnam, although there are USIS officials of all calibers, there are men of courage, initiative, and brilliant improvisation working for the USIS in the provinces—all under the guns of the Vietcong.

"Maybe," says one American correspondent long in the Far East, "it all depends on the individual. The guy with enough dedication tempered with enough realism yet still with enough imagination and professionalism—that's the guy that seems to do a good job. But selling America in Asia is an uphill job.

"This is very professional business, and we can do without the amateurs, the bureaucrats, and the nuts."

JOHN HUGHES.

LATIN AMERICA

SANTIAGO.—On balance, U.S. Information Service activities in Latin America are toting up a number of solid achievements.

Surveying the hemisphere picture, correspondents of this newspaper around the hemisphere report that USIS operations spend less than their various Communist counterparts, but seem to be getting more for their money. A survey by the Christian Science Monitor shows:

USIS contributions to the press and to radio and television is reaching an ever-broadening spectrum of social classes in these countries.

Student and professional exchanges, as well as lending libraries, do undercut Communist influences in the academic circles.

Binational centers, where English is taught and special cultural programs are presented are growing popular whether in capital cities or in the countryside.

To be sure, not all USIS operations are equally successful. USIS personnel in the various cities surveyed are quick to admit their problems. Some of this trouble stems from personnel who are inadequately trained.

But the real problems which continue to defy solution result from the sudden nationalist- and Communist-inspired reaction to an international crisis, and also from the longstanding anti-Americanism based on nationalist distrust of U.S. motives in the area.

Marion Wilhelm, the Monitor's special correspondent in Mexico City, reports:

"U.S. films are getting the American image into every stratum of Mexican society from city labor unions to country teachers and municipal workers. This film audience was vastly broadened recently by organizing film clubs around the country and lending out projectors. The films are exchanged every week by mail."

Daily news reports are issued by USIS in most of the countries. They are used in varying degrees in the local newspapers. Where there are newspapers with substantial reputations, such as in Buenos Aires or Bogotá, these reports are less frequently used.

But in rural areas, they often reach a broad spectrum of provincial readers. Videotaped television programs and canned radio broadcasts also make their impact in these rural regions.

It may be that USIS operations in rural areas are more effective than in the cities. In Mexico City—and this would be true in any capital city—the Communist competition runs higher.

Another area which sometimes defies USIS treatment is the university campus. The Communists are highly active on these campuses. But every campus demonstration has its subtle checkmate in cultural inroads from USIS.

One of these is the free lending library set up in every large Latin American city, where university students may obtain books important for their course work.

USIS, through binational cultural centers in many of the countries, offers a variety of courses in English. Thousands receive such instruction in Argentina or Brazil, Colombia or Mexico, Peru, or Guatemala.

In final analysis, the success of USIS operations throughout the hemisphere, Monitor correspondents indicate, is in clear ratio to the type of personnel involved in operating the various USIS missions. The personnel has been good, often excellent, in most instances in the recent past.

Miss Wilhelm adds significantly from Mexico:

"The United States appears to be reaching more deeply into the national consciousness by the very fact that it does not subsidize its popularity."

She quotes a USIS officer in Mexico who says "Mexicans use our services because they want to, not because we pay them to do it."

This seems true throughout the hemisphere.

JAMES NELSON GOODSELL.

AFRICA

CAPE TOWN.—On one of Addis Ababa's main streets is a small office building whose ground floor does one of the best businesses in the Ethiopian capital. It houses the U.S. Information Service library.

When I visited it a few months ago it was crowded with Africans studying American newspapers, books, and magazines.

"It's like this all the time," said the young librarian in charge.

In many other African countries the picture is much the same.

This speaks of the African's hunger for knowledge and also of the limited facilities for study available to him. It is not necessarily therefore a simple gage of his friendliness toward the United States. Nor of his acceptance of American propaganda.

For when passions rise against U.S. policies—such as American aid to Premier Moise Tshombe of the Congo—libraries as the most obvious American facility make easy targets for protest and attack.

There is one rule of thumb that seems to be pretty useful in judging the effectiveness of USIS. The smaller and more underdeveloped a country, the more impact USIS activities appear to have.

The information services provide not just libraries but films, lectures, pamphlets on the American culture and way of life, material for use by newspapers, cultural exhibits. In the smaller countries the dearth of locally available books, teaching materials, films, and so on, makes USIS activities stand out.

In societies such as South Africa—with a more sophisticated population, its own libraries, a more developed economy, and better income even for Africans—the impact is less. Furthermore here no one is allowed to go out and proselytize in the African areas. Permits are required to enter them and the permits sometimes are not easy to get.

Also the effectiveness of the U.S. program depends on the attitude of the government involved. Some governments do not encourage widespread propoganda activities by foreign agencies.

Just down the street from the USIS library in Addis Ababa the Russians maintain a similar service. Some months ago it had pictures of Soviet industries and pastoral scenes in the window. It was not crowded inside.

Usually the U.S. information operation is by far the largest of its kind.

In a way it is hard for an impoverished African to relate himself to the "American way of life" depicted in USIS films, pamphlets, and books in which workers have cars and fine houses with modern equipment. It seems so far off and unattainable.

Some time ago a group of Africans were shown a film of life in an American city which happened to show white street cleaners and a white woman scrubbing floors.

"But," they said to the man showing the film, "do you really mean that white people clean their own streets and wash floors just like we do?"

Therefore there is a big gulf for USIS to bridge. It is not easy for Africans to understand that America is great not only because it is basically wealthy but because its people work hard to make it so.

This too is why Communist propaganda succeeds at times. It tells Africans that Americans are rich because they exploit other people.

To people with few worldly advantages, the call to socialism finds an answering ring. Capitalism to them means exploitation. And they equate the United States and capitalist exploitation, thanks to Communist propaganda.

But this does not mean that American propaganda goes unnoticed. For instance, large numbers of African youth want to go to the United States to study. Many more applications are received than can possibly be handled.

And there is a reservoir of goodwill in many African states for the United States. The free way of life is much admired. American power is respected.

All USIS activities are, of course, still just the matter of throwing small pebbles in a very big pond. But there is little doubt that despite setbacks information services make a contribution to a more accurate view of the United States by many Africans.

ROBERT M. HALLETT.

INDIA

NEW DELHI.—In India's deep south, in a region where every coconut tree then carried a Red flag, I once visited a USIS reading room. It was packed with Indians, many of them students. A majority said they were Communists.

I later twitted the Communist Chief Minister of Kerala State about the evident popularity of propaganda from the enemy camp. His reply: "Indian Communists enjoy wide horizons."

Through periods of evident tension and discord between the United States and India there has never been the slightest inclination anywhere to attack or burn a USIS library or abandon any one of the many

information programs in English, Hindi, or one of the many other Indian languages.

The sophisticated Indian many scoff at USIS literature. In days of paper shortage, he welcomes it only for its scrap value.

But it also is a fact that the American Reporter, the main USIS weekly publication in English, has to be held down to a certain number. And the pictorial Span has just won an Indian award for its technical excellence.

The overall USIS program in India is popular because it provides free technical information not otherwise available because it provides a variety of literature for a very poor but increasingly word-hungry people.

The image of America that all this projects to the recipient is almost a side issue. Therefore, it is difficult to describe this picture. The U.S. image is not of a collection of ordinary people still struggling to do better and better, but of a nation—mighty in its wealth and power—which has arrived.

Thus, when the USIS spreads information about a program to eradicate poverty in the United States, Indians are inclined to smile.

When it gives news, as it sometimes does, of problems concerning race, this seems to bring not so much new understanding as solace that there are other parts of the world struggling with similar or allied matters.

It is generally agreed that today there is in India a better understanding that ever before of the motive and purposes of U.S. assistance to this country.

In recent years, aid publicity, it is noticed, is more tightly worded, more pragmatic and factual. With a quieter tone, the impact vis-a-vis Soviet aid is all the greater.

Similarly, the USIS chore has grown lighter. It does not have to be quite so shrill as Indians receive practical proof of the aggressive content of world communism.

A favorite Indian question not so very long ago was: "Why does America always help dictators in Asia?" It is heard less often now.

Events also have helped an easier dissemination of information about military programs, about the help the United States provides in this sphere to safeguard freedom.

The whole USIS program produces a wealth of factual data for Indians to use as they like. The image projected is not always good because it is not one sided. Unlike the Russians, the Americans are willing to depict the bad as well as good aspects of life in their country.

In any case the USIS program reaches only a certain percentage of the Indian people, whereas the millions go regularly to the movies and get their image from this particular medium.

SHAROKH SABAVALA.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Target: The Men Behind the Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague and my fellow Texan from Houston, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. BOB CASEY, recently introduced two bills designed to place the emphasis in firearms control legislation on the criminals themselves—not on the guns they employ. His bills, H.R. 5641 and H.R. 5642, the former applying only to the District of Columbia and the latter to the Nation as a whole, would make a 25-year penitentiary sentence mandatory for a person convicted of using or carrying firearms during any robbery, assault, murder, rape, burglary, or kidnaping.

An excellent article in support of this proposal was written by the outdoor editor of the Houston Chronicle, Bob Brister. His "Outdoors" column of Wednesday, March 3, was headlined, "A Gun Law That Makes Sense." The article is as follows:

A GUN LAW THAT MAKES SENSE

A gun is a chunk of cold steel.

It has no brain, no feelings, no conscience, and it can be neither blamed nor glorified, defended, nor criticized, compromised nor legislated. It is an object, as are automobiles, objects, and cigarettes, inanimate tubes of tobacco.

All three things kill people. Of the three, guns kill far the fewest.

Yet in this country there has been one of the most remarkable campaigns in history—to blame guns as objects for the misdeeds of the men behind them.

This campaign has many faces, many outlets, and a great many well-meaning citizens have taken up the cry against guns.

This is curious, in a way, because more lives might be saved if these crusaders sought to outlaw automobiles, cigarettes, or perhaps whiskey and wild women.

Statistics might prove that these kill more than guns, but statistics can be made to prove most anything. Considerably more important is what history proves and that is simply, that danger exists in the minds of men more than in the metal of the weapons they choose.

Laws have been suggested which would prohibit private gun ownership, some have been introduced which would require Federal registration of all firearms.

Such laws would cost a great deal of money to administer, would create a great deal of redtape for noncriminal gun owners, but more important, they simply would not do the job.

Registering guns could scarcely be expected to deter the crank or criminal because he simply would not register his.

And even if he did, registered guns kill as well as nonregistered ones.

The whole problem is in making the man behind the gun think before he pulls the trigger. Because somehow, some way, there will always be triggers to be pulled—there are already enough guns in circulation and in private ownership to provide murders and gun crimes for the next 100 years—if it is the guns which, in fact, commit the crimes.

THE REALISTIC APPROACH

It is fortunate that there is one man in Washington who believes the control of guns is, by commonsense, the control of the men behind them.

Representative BOB CASEY, of Houston, this week submitted to Congress a bill which puts the penalty for gun crimes where it can do some good, directly upon those who misuse guns.

More significantly, there is very good possibility that CASEY's law would work, which is more than can be said about any of the others.

This bill would put a mandatory Federal prison sentence of 25 years upon anyone convicted of committing a felony with the aid of firearms.

Think about that a moment, or think about the history of all laws. Those with the largest penalties invariably are the least violated; fear of punishment is still the biggest deterrent to crime.

Registering a gun may not halt a hood on his way to rob a supermarket; it isn't likely to deter a Don Juan from shooting his girlfriend's lover in a bar.

But 25 years in the pen—now that gives some pause to the trigger finger.

CHOPPING AT THE ROOTS

This is attacking the problems at the only place where problems can be solved, at the roots.

Say such a law were passed. A hood is preparing to hold up a service station. Under today's laws he would automatically reach for his pistol, that is the easy way to hold up a service station.

But with 25 years staring him in the face, the odds are he would think again. He might use instead a bluff—and automatically, the chief danger of a spur of the moment killing, would be eliminated.

There are those who would argue. They would say, "if there weren't so many guns, so easily bought, there wouldn't be so many beer joint murders, accidental killings, self-defense killings."

But is that true, really? Is the sort of person who kills another in a beer joint, or on the spur of the moment, going to have trouble finding a pistol, regardless of the law? Aren't there already laws against his carrying one?

There are, of course, but they often don't work simply because the laws are against the the pistol rather than against the man or the idea.

PENALTIES BEST PREVENTIVE

When people began slaughtering each other with automobiles, it was not suggested that cars be outlawed. They had to be registered, and they are. But that didn't stop the killing.

What did help, and is helping, is increased enforcement of severe penalties for such things as drunken driving murder by auto, etc.

The courts quickly proved that the way to the problem was through fear of punishment, in advance, rather than legislating against cold steel.

Prohibition of whiskey, or guns, will never work as well as prohibition of their misuse, through powerful penalties.

Most sportsmen quickly agree that such guns as mortars and marijuana, dope, and dynamite, military weapons, and sales of weapons through the mail, should be regulated.

But they cannot understand how their personal right to owning firearms should be questioned, because for one thing, their Constitution guarantees it, and for another, because changing that right could very well do more harm than good.

The private ownership of firearms, according to the testimony of many law enforcement officers in past hearings on the subject, is considered one of the major deterrants to such crimes as housebreaking, prowling, abduction, etc., simply because criminals fear the citizen with protection in his home.

And there is another thing all men fear; the confinement of a penitentiary.

Representative BOB CASEY has finally brought some good, old-fashioned commonsense into the firearms controversy. If his bill is passed, it is quite likely that America's gun problem will come the nearest ever to a sensible solution.

Your letters, to your Congressmen, might help pass it.

Work of Graduates of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of Senators an article being prepared for future publication in the East-West Center News. It gives an excelent résumé of the very critical work being undertaken by the graduates of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West.

Questions have been raised in the past as to precisely what the graduates of the Center do after leaving the Center. I think this article gives an excellent answer.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In Philadelphia every Monday some 30 teachers from scattered schools brave the late-afternoon traffic to attend a 2-hour session in a course on "Asia * * * Past and Present." The teacher of other teachers is

Miss Claire L. Gilles, recent East-West Center grantee.

Almost any day in the Okayama City Family Court, youngsters in trouble and their families receive guidance from a social worker familiar with the traditional parent-child relationships of old Japan and the often bewildering influences of newer Western ways. The social worker is Juvenile Probation Officer Yasuyuki Suto, East-West Center alumnus.

Along a dusty road in rural Pakistan travels sociologist Khwaja Aziz, doing the background interviewing necessary to the cholera control work of the Pakistan-SEATO Cholera Research Laboratory in Dacca. Said former grantee Aziz when he returned to the laboratory after his East-West Center stay, "My assignment is now a much more responsible one."

In Burma, former grantee Tin Tun Myine, as a land use officer, is involved in experiments to grow legumes on the land areas exposed after flood waters recede.

The four are examples of the East-West Center alumni at work. None is "typical" for there are no "typical alumni." The men and women who have completed Center grants come from such varied cultural, geographic and economic backgrounds, that no alumnus fits into such a conveniently labeled pigeonhole. However, almost all Asian students and a good proportion of Americans share a common experience. They return home promptly and go to work with little delay.

To quote a few statistics: Of 287 Asian and Pacific area students who finished their grants, 86 percent returned home immediately. Twelve percent are taking further study for the Ph. D. degree. (This is done only with the wholehearted approval of the student's home country and often his employer.) Some of these scholars with large intellectual plans come from small countries. Bounnong Thipphawong, now working for his Ph. D. in agriculture at the Michigan State University, is from Laos. Jagadish Sharma, a Ph. D. candidate in political science at the University of Pennsylvania, is from Nepal.

Dr. John R. Hendrickson, vice-chancellor of the Institute for Student Interchange, believes this return-home statistic is one of the highest in any American interchange program. Center grantees are not "perpetual students." From the beginning of selection proceedings, both the Center and a student's home nation give importance to the motivation of a scholarship applicant. The Asian or Pacific area student must have a genuine desire to put his learning to use in his home country. The American grantee, in many instances, looks forward to working for the United States in an Asian or Pacific country.

As for the 86 percent—if we can apply cold statistical terms to flesh and blood young people—how are these Asian or Pacific area alumni applying the knowledge gained during their Center sponsored studies? Is there real evidence that each has broadened his outlook and deepened his cultural appreciation as a result of international living at the Center?

The answers to many of these questions are found in letters sent to Robert Aitken, recently appointed evaluation and alumni liaison officer, and letters to other staff members and friends. The highest proportion of alumni have returned to teaching (frequently with research) positions which are often government sponsored and the second highest number to government positions which may entail research work.

Examples, in the former grantee's own words, are:

"After I returned (July 1964), I worked in the Office of Student Personnel of the University of the Ryukyus. I am now assistant director of the welfare section * * * concerned with counseling students."

—CHOKO TAKAYAMA.

"* * * I teach two undergraduate courses in public administration, manage the Philippine Journal of Public Administration and do research for the Local Government Research Project * * * in addition I sit in thesis committees."

—LEDIVINA VIDALLON.

Graduate School of Public Administration, Manila.

"* * * I am leaving for an UNESCO seminar at Delhi (December 20, 1964). It is a postgraduate course in soil biology and Ceylon was asked to nominate two * * * the rubber research people recommended me and the Ceylon Government chose me to represent Ceylon. This is another recognition of the work that I did under Dr. Sherman (University of Hawaii)."

—CAMILLUS SILVA, *Ceylon*.

Many of the letters tell of work schedules that could be handled only by the young and genuinely enthusiastic.

Writes Jae-ho Lee of Korea: "Upon my returning home, I have had a pretty busy life teaching at three different schools, the military academy, Seoul Women's College, and the Language Training Center of Korea. * * * Besides teaching I've prepared two long research papers on language and language teaching to be published sometime next year."

Kui Lam Choong writes from Ipoh, Perak, Malaysia: "* * * I went back to my old job as a physics master in St. Michael's Institution * * * as from January (1965) I shall also work as part-time lecturer in education in a teacher-training program."

In Thailand, reports an American grantee on field studies, alumni Niramol Trianasar is teaching at a laboratory school at Chulalongkorn University and also supervising a private elementary school in Bangkok. In Chiayi City, Wan-Lai Chang reports: "After my return from the center I was appointed agronomist and head of the department of agriculture at Chiayi Agricultural Experiment Station * * * I owe my promotion to the center which provided the advanced training required. This I will never forget."

Many alumni return home to promotions that within a few months put them in posts of high responsibility for their countries. Soe Min was headmaster of a Rangoon high school before he earned his master's degree with honors under a center grant. He returned to Burma and became deputy administrative assistant of schools, a position that puts him in charge of all elementary, and junior high schools. Leo Falcam, a former teacher in the trust territory, studied sociology and administration as a grantee. Today he is assistant district administrator for Ponape, the highest position held by a Micronesian in the trust territory.

From the reports of returned grantees emerges much more than the mental image of an extremely busy young man or woman handling one or more jobs. A significant measurement of achievement is found in the activities the former grantee conducts after working hours. Juvenile Probation Officer Suto, of the Okayama Family Court, is leader of two study groups, one on sociology and delinquency and one on social casework and counseling. With alumnus Teruo Notohara, Suto has also organized the Okayama Hospitality Center to arrange home visits, dinners, and guides for visiting foreign students. Yoshio Ido, teaching in Niihama Technical College in Japan has been making talks on the United States at surrounding high schools. "I also organized American House and an English Speaking Society. I have been kept terribly busy, just like a bee," the former grantee writes. Soonshin Kim who teaches at Speer Girls High School, Kwangju, Korea, writes: "I am showing the '10,000 pieces' of my slides." The U.S. TIP (teacher interchange program) alumni take home tape recordings and slide films of Asian music, art, dance, and scenery for specific use in their classrooms; the Asian TIP students do the same recording of scenes and experiences on their U.S. mainland field studies.

When Frank Wray returned to his home in the Seattle area, he gave 25 talks based on new experiences and insights gained largely during his center field studies in Asia. Gertrude Selkowe, a school principal in New York City, has traveled to St. Louis to take part in seminars on Asian affairs.

The American student not only continues his concern for Asian affairs after he leaves the center, but may work in Asia. Miss Sheila Heyel, of New York State, is now with the U.S. Educational Foundation in Taipei where she counsels students planning to study in the Western World. Marie Monsen, of Pennsylvania, is putting her sociology background to use in the Peace Corps selection division. Russell Betts, an overseas operations major, wrote a paper that came to the attention of the Rand Corp., a private organization that does Government-contracted research. As a result he is now a Rand staff member.

Nearly a fifth of some 150 students returned to their home countries are teaching or doing research directly connected with that most basic of necessities—the food supply. In Indonesia, Aramdhy Siregar works to develop better poultry. Tiamjai Komkris teaches nutrition at Kasetsart University. From Taiwan, Y. W. Hwang writes:

"I am * * * working on the beach trying to make possible the artificial spawning of common mullet. (This is) sponsored by the fishery authority. Since I returned to Taiwan many research papers have been published by me."

If these former students, busy in laboratories, classroom or on experimental farms, take time for self-contemplation, they might well perceive themselves and their work as part of an effort to fill worldwide needs. Some of these needs have been clearly defined in publications of WHO, FAO, and UNESCO.

Reports the UNESCO Courier for October 1964: "UNESCO * * * is concerned with soil biology of tropical and subtropical regions where each year soils become increasingly impoverished."

"* * * Some 60 percent of people in the underdeveloped areas comprising some two-thirds of the world's population suffer from undernutrition or malnutrition or both," reads the Second World Food Survey.

As partial solutions for malnutrition, publications of these organizations suggest: "One aim * * * include nutrition in the curriculums of colleges and universities."—from WHO and UNICEF, "Progress of Nutrition and Nutrition Training." Says the 1962 World Fisheries Abstracts: "A good fish flour could be of real significance in helping to supply the protein needs of the world."

The mullet which Mr. Kwong and many other fish experts are trying to propagate artificially could well serve as finny focus of the importance of fish to food supplies and the need to grow fish as an easily available, close-to-market food. Mullet eggs, deposited naturally in ocean or lake are prey to many hungry predators. Mullet, artificially spawned, and thereby protected, would mean millions rather than thousands of young. This particular fish—and Mr. Kwong's particular project—are, of course, only one example of the new and necessary approach to fish culture, which states that "fish could be raised where needed, rather than transported * * * The aim * * * must be toward husbandry so that stocks of fish can be herded and grazed as a farmer herds cattle."

Are East-West Center alumni overly concerned wth the fish * * * the soybeans

* * * the farmlands and kitchens * * * that supply man with food? If they are, then the center has not reached its goal of furthering cultural understanding.

Letters from former grantees indicate that the meeting of minds at the center is an experience that has not been lost in the press of practicalities. Writes Miss Gilles, the grantee whose Philadelphia class is described earlier: "* * * My students are preparing for transmission to Japan and Korea papers on an ordinary Sunday in Philadelphia * * *to help the Asian students both with their English and with an interpretation of daily life in America as contrasted with that given by Hollywood * * * one group is writing book reports to be produced on tape and sent to Asia * * * the tape will help Asian youngsters hear and speak English * * * the books are to be reviewed from the point of view of explaining the Western way of life to an Asian counterpart."

From Ranchi University in India, alumnus Sushil M. Pathak writes: "* * * I have started teaching American history and propose to enlarge the scope of the teaching of American history in my department."

Saleem Ahmed, whose Ph. D. work stressed problems of soil salinity, gives this frank account of his feelings now that he has returned to Pakistan:

"Being a Pakistani, my feelings toward India were naturally quite negative. In Hawaii, I was able to befriend many Indian students, and through mutual discussions we came to respect each others' feelings. Now I have a number of very good friends in India and it is our sincere hope that relations between the two countries may improve * * * I think that it is only through such friendships that the poisonous atmosphere between us can be removed."

Almost at the same time, Diwakar Prasad Singh, alumnus returned to his position as history teacher at Bhagalpur University, India, wrote:

"* * * I have resumed association with social and cultural organizations in the community and my participation with the Indian National Congress * * *. I have also taken initial steps in the establishment of a branch of the Indo-American Friendship Association at Bhagalpur."

One American, given his personal introduction to the cultures of Asia during his TIP studies, sums up neatly the interests that continue after a grantee returns home. Writes Ray Grant of Madison, Wis., "The sponge is not yet saturated."

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, this week there arrived in Washington 50 winners of the Voice of Democracy contest—one from each State in the Nation. These young people have come as guests of the contest sponsor, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in acknowledgment of the excellence of their entries in this annual event.

Among these young people is Miss Virginia Mann Rohr, of Eielson Air Force Base, the Alaska winner of the Voice of Democracy contest. Miss Rohr's entry, "The Challenge of Citizenship," is a well-written and full-spirited call for all citizens to honor the "Pledge of Allegiance" in their daily lives. It is with pleasure and pride that I insert this fine speech into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all may have an opportunity to read it:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Virginia Mann Rohr)

Facing all Americans today is a tremendously important challenge that must be met with unfaltering determination—and it must be met now. That challenge is to keep America free.

No one sentence or lengthy paragraph can summarize the responsibilities of the citizen as well as our own "Pledge of Allegiance." Let us examine this oath phrase by phrase, word for word, and see just what message it holds for each of us as citizens.

With hand over heart we recite, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America." Just what is this allegiance that we so freely pledge? Webster's New World Dictionary describes it as "the duty of being loyal to one's ruler, government, or country." When we utter this pledge, we are promising our loyalty and devotion to our flag.

"Old Glory" symbolizes, in its kaleidoscope of stars and stripes and brilliant hues of red, white, and blue, the hardiness and courage of the men who fought and still continue to fight for our liberty; the purity and innocence of those men and their fellow countrymen; the vigilance, perseverance, and justice which have been recognized as trademarks of our country.

With due reverence we say, "One nation under God." In this modern era of technological wonders too many people become engulfed in the material aspects of life. As the prodrome warns the physician of the onset of a disease, so the symptoms of selfishness, prejudice, and greed warn us of the materialism which grips our society today. As Christians and as Americans, we must prevent this cancer of hatred from becoming malignant and destroying the very ideals for which this country stands.

The United States was originally founded for want of a place to worship God, so let us be ever mindful of his presence and act accordingly.

On our national currency is stamped the phrase "In God we trust." In respect to this phrase, may we look to Him for guidance and leadership in every decision we make—no matter how small or how momentous.

Then, with pride, we add, "indivisible." We remain undivided in the face of such political poison as communism. As a dose of arsenic, once administered into the body, will rapidly stiffen the joints and suffocate its victim, so, communism, equally lethal, administered into the free world can and does stifle the representative voice of the people in the government and eventually strangles democracy.

Even more startling, however, is the apathetic nature displayed by too many Americans toward this gradual pollution of free societies when they shirk the responsibilities of voting and obeying the law.

In conclusion, we say, "With liberty and justice for all." Is the liberty and justice that we as a nation share, equal for all? No, it is not. In our daily lives we must strive to extend the wonderful blessing of freedom to all peoples of the world. First, however, such good intentions must be met at home. Let us all, regardless of race, religion, or creed, join into a brotherhood that will keep us unified and strong.

Now I will join these vital words and phrases into their original form: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Are we as citizens strong enough to honor this pledge to the fullest? With an eye to God, who blessed us with the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and with a hand on the shoulder of our fellow man, we shall be.

The Vision of George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on February 17 of this year Pennsylvania State Representative Francis Worley, of York Springs, Pa., delivered what I consider to be a most excellent address on the ideals and vision of George Washington. Speaking on the floor of our State house of representatives in Harrisburg, Mr. Worley pointed out that today we are confronted not only with the problems of underdeveloped nations, but also with the problems of underdeveloped statesmen. I ask unanimous consent that this fine address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Francis Worley, in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, Feb. 17, 1965)

In our history we were most fortunate to have had such upright leaders at Washington, whose birthday we are about to observe. He gave us ideals which we are disregarding today to the harm and disadvantage of this Nation. He was a man of great vision who understood the needs of the New World. Owing to his creative work, he guided and developed an outstanding United States of America.

Let us not forget that the original thought for the United Nations even comes from the Father of our Country, the man who presided over our destiny, the man who even presided over the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. Yes, it was Washington himself who said in his farewell address:

"Observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be that providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue?"

Here Washington wanted to transplant the principle of decent living, the American living, into the area of international affairs.

Now with this background, let us see what we as the greatest nation of the world today, with our new international status and with all our international responsibilities, are confronted with. We began our international life by denouncing the holy alliance and its concepts that might makes right—we must not now go back on our own basic disciplines. Do not let us give any other nation the chance to take from us the peaceful leadership of the 20th century and to appear in the eyes of the whole world as the heroes who are destined to save mankind from the greatest calamity of this atomic

and nuclear age. This is the goal for U.S. leadership for brotherhood among all peoples. This is the goal for statesmenship by fully developed statesmen. In America we have been speaking about underdeveloped nations while we should, in fact, be speaking about underdeveloped statesmen. We must not have a rise and then start to decline. We must rise continuously toward peace and prosperity through the law just as Washington indicated in his farewell address.

The 511th Anniversary of the Birth of Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today, March 9, 1965, is the 511th anniversary of the birth of Amerigo Vespucci, a man who stands alone in having the honor of a hemisphere reserved in his name, and a man whose concepts of geography educated an ignorant Europe to the changing science of geography. As a seaman and navigator, Vespucci stands in comparison with such great men as Columbus.

Amerigo was born to the distinguished family of Vespucci, a family regarded as among the most cultured and widely respected aristocratic families of Florence. Amerigo's education was entrusted to his uncle, Giorgio Antonio, a renowned educator and intellectual whose wisdom was admired beyond the confines of Florence. Giorgio Antonio planted in Amerigo's mind a lust for travel, and from this incentive, Amerigo became aware of those seas and lands on which merchants had long voyaged, learned about unknown lands and acquired a humanist vision of the universe.

Out of Florence during this period of the Renaissance, came a new spirit of inquiry which demanded a definite knowledge concerning the habitable lands of the earth. From this atmosphere, Amerigo emerged as a man whose entire career was conditioned by two fundamental qualities—a passion for scientific inquiry and a deep admiration for honesty and truth.

Gaining the confidence of Lorenzo de Medici, Vespucci was sent to Seville where Medici had a business engaged chiefly in fitting out ships. In Seville Amerigo learned of an expedition sailing westward to find India headed by a fellow Italian, Christoforo Colombo. Later talks with Columbus had inspired Amerigo with a twofold capacity for exploration—to prove his theories of celestial navigation and also to prove his theories of geographic location.

Amerigo Vespucci made four voyages; the first in 1497 and the last in 1503. The first two voyages were for Spain and the remaining two for Portugal. After returning from his voyages to the Western Hemisphere Vespucci presented two important geographical innovations: the fact that there was a new continent and the concept of another ocean between that new continent and Asia. He was the first man to realize that sailing westward from Europe one must cross two oceans to reach Asia. The remainder of Amerigo's life was spent as astronomer for the King of Spain until he died in 1512.

Amerigo Vespucci is a representative of the contributions made by Renaissance Italy to Western civilization through their leadership in fields of art, geography, science, and commerce.

Eliot Janeway on Krupp's Polish Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the astute economic writer, Eliot Janeway, whose articles appear in the Chicago Tribune and other newspapers, in a recent article has laid bare some of the economic forces at work in Europe's booming economy which may have eventual serious implications for our own economy. Recently, he discussed the meaning of an agreement reached between the famed Krupp interests, with the blessing of Bonn, and the Polish Government, for a joint venture into machine tool production near Warsaw. Mr. Janeway points out that the consequences of too vigorous an American effort to bring our dollars back from Europe may result in a flood of "dumped" products.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Janeway's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 25, 1965]

JANEWAY'S VIEW: POLITICS, ECONOMICS BEHIND KRUPP DEAL

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, February 24.—Once again, the biggest businessman in Europe is Krupp. When the weapons of war were just bullets and bombs, Krupp was the armament king. Now that nuclear weapons have transformed the nature of war, the struggle for national power has moved from battlefield to marketplace. In today's economic warfare, Krupp is again proving itself preeminent.

Here's what Krupp is up to. This biggest of all private industrial empires, this personification of capitalism, this symbolic target of Russian propaganda, is going into partnership with the Polish Government.

Believe it or not, Krupp is putting its money into a joint venture to produce machine tools at a new plant to be put up near Warsaw. No question about it, this is not an essay in reparations or aid. It is a business proposition, and Krupp makes no bones about expecting to do well out of it. This projects a pretty high rate of return.

ALWAYS POLITICAL ANGLE

Not that there isn't a political angle to this latest move of Krupp's. The way things work in Europe, there always is when a major corporation makes a major move abroad—in Europe, foreign investment and foreign trade are extensions and expressions of foreign policy (a lesson which Americans heve yet to learn).

The main political purpose behind this economic move is a scissors play on East Germany, which will thus be caught between new enemy, West Germany, and old enemy, Poland. By extension, this serves a more general political purpose; namely, to intensify the competitive splits among the hungry satellite countries. Washington is for the first time alert to the opportunities arising from this competition and the economic and social unrest it reflects.

Here's the economic meaning of Krupp's (Bonn-blessed) partnership with Polish statism. Not merely West Germany, but all of Western Europe, simply has too much industrial capacity to earn its living by taking in its own washing—that is, by consuming what it is capable of producing.

CONTINUING TO EXPAND

Far from solving this problem of excess capacity, the Common Market has intensified it. For all of Western Europe is continuing to expand its productive capacities—and, be it noted, the business incentive to invest in expansion has increased even faster than Americanized living standards and the population growth have increased consumption.

More than ever, Europe must export to live. What's more, everyone in Europe knows it. Everyone in Europe also knows that there isn't going to be any unemployment in Western Europe. French President Charles de Gaulle may talk all he pleases about what is sound in finance but, if times get tough, France will follow the rest in subsidizing employment by dumping surplus production abroad.

Right now, Europe's money men have the jitters for fear that the United States may solve its supposed payments crisis by draining Europe of the dollars that have been lubricating her boom. Characteristically, Krupp is making a beeline for the closest dumping ground in sight.

But the biggest dumping ground for any European industrial surplus is the United States. If we try to look too good dollarwise, and in the process put too much of a squeeze on Western Europe moneywise, we are likely to find ourselves flooded with distressed European products dumped here at giveaway prices. Krupp's move into Poland is an early warning signal that its energetic salesmen must be expected here, too.

Patron of Mediocrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of March 8, 1965:

PATRONS OF MEDIOCRITY

In these enlightened days, anyone who questions the advisability of Federal subsidization of the arts is likely to be regarded as not only a reactionary but a philistine. Be that as it may, the questions are pertinent and important, particularly in light of the proposed legislation to create a National Humanities and Arts Foundation.

The plan, endorsed by President Johnson, calls for a humanities unit intended to improve university curriculums and encourage scholarly studies in such areas as literature,

history and philosophy. In addition, an arts unit would assist nonprofit theater groups, needy symphony orchestras, aspiring writers, painters, composers and others seeking artistic expression.

This morning's Rockefeller Panel report on the performing arts discusses similar schemes, and the group does have the courage to point to some of the dangers in Federal support of the arts. The panel believes, however, that "machinery" might be evolved to surmount the dangers. We doubt it, at least as far as the legislation now before Congress is concerned.

As Federal planners see it, the idea is to compensate for a culture lag into which the United States has supposedly fallen especially in the recent years of heavy concentration on science. Since the Federal Government is largely responsible for the scientific emphasis—it supports the bulk of the Nation's entire research and development effort—Washington is said to have a duty to come to the aid of the arts and humanities.

The stress on science may well be excessive; certainly much of the Government programing is wasteful, diffuse, and uncoordinated. There is little evidence, however, that esthetic pursuits have suffered proportionately; on the contrary, the Nation is in the midst of a cultural explosion of sorts. And by no means all of its offshoots are things of value.

In the universities, for example, a tremendous amount of useless work is being done in the humanities; all too often scholarship has become the sheerest pedantry. The trend is reflected in the reigning publish-or-perish doctrine whereby professors must pay more attention to getting their words, however meaningless, into print than to teaching. It is also reflected in the current student mania for graduate work, no matter how trivial, in many cases just to stay in school.

As for the arts, it is hard to estimate how much bad writing, painting, composing, and theater is being produced along with a respectable amount of excellence. The Rockefeller report devotes a substantial part of its bulk to the sad state of the arts.

For our part, we recognize that literary and artistic judgments are bound to be subjective and hence dangerous to advance as generalities. Yet any halfway reasonable standard, such as comparison with past works of greatness, will show that much of what appears on Broadway is inferior and much of what finds its way off Broadway is not only disgusting but intellectually fraudulent. The same defects are found in other arts.

It is all but axiomatic that Federal subsidization would intensify the tendencies toward mediocrity and phoniness. Why? One excellent reason is that otherwise the Government would have to set its own standards.

An extreme case of government standards was the Soviet trash produced as Socialist realism under Stalin, but even if our Government established what many experts might consider good standards it would still stand rightly accused of cultural dictatorship. Without standards, however, it would be providing a fresh field for the incompetents and the frauds.

That is the trap the private foundations long since plunged into. In their generous efforts to help science, art, and the universities, they have assisted many a deserving individual; unfortunately they have also, willy-nilly, fostered an abundance of mindless research and talentless artistics enterprise.

Another reason subsidization would be worse as a Federal than as a private project is that the Government is the epitome of the bureaucracy and politicking that exist in all organizations. Its officious interferences and political directions in the scientific field already worry a lot of educators; it would be the same for the arts and humanities. Thus some who dare to question the national foundation proposal scent in it a culture pork-barrel, with favors granted in places they were thought to do the most political good.

The basic misconception, of course, is that Federal money and concern can create a high cultural level, whereas the actual influence is likely to be negative when not baneful. The Renaissance did not burst on the world simply because there were princes to patronize; it emerged from a complex of profound reasons, and the princes had the judgment to perceive value while their individualistic and quarrelsome natures assured diversity.

If, despite some of the excellent work being done today, ours is not destined to be an age of artistic greatness, the Government cannot remedy it, for the springs of cultural vitality lie beyond the reach of any organization. Unless it be autocratic, the Government can at most become the sponsor of what exists. It would seem we have enough indifferent art without needing another patron for it.

Wallace Crosses The Rubicon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a well-reasoned editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 9, 1965, which, in commenting on the brutal actions of Governor Wallace, of Alabama, and of his State troopers, points up the need for Federal legislation to insure that every citizen of our country be given the opportunity to vote.

I ask that a bill to accomplish this be brought to the floor for action as soon as possible so that all the citizens of Alabama and of all our States can have a voice in selecting those whose responsibility it is to govern and to represent them.

The editorial follows:

WALLACE CROSSES THE RUBICON

The river was the Alabama and Governor Wallace was nowhere near. But it was in fact his Rubicon, and he crossed it. By the stupid brutality used to break up a peaceful march from Selma to the State capital, the voter registration practices of Alabama were indicted before the American people as they could have been in no other way, and the eventual end of those practices was assured.

Had there been even a modicum of good sense and good will in the Governor's office, the march on Montgomery could have been organized to insure a minimum of disruption of traffic—about which Mr. Wallace pretended to be so concerned. But had there been that much sense in Montgomery, the march from Selma need never have taken place.

What Governor Wallace did, by turning loose his State troopers on the marchers, was to provide an outlet for the frustrations of his more paleolithic followers. Many white Alabamans cheered the attack. And those cheers, no less than the club-swinging charge of the troopers, will convince the conscience of America that the law of Alabama, as administered by Governor Wallace, is not the law of the land, but club law, used against the disfranchised because they insist upon their constitutional right to enfranchisement.

The result—just as the troubles in Birmingham brought about the Civil Rights Act of 1964—is almost certain to bring about the Civil Rights Act of 1965. Such an act would give statutory backing to the general provisions of the 15th amendment; that is, it would give teeth to the requirement that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

It is an unhappy thing that a Federal law should be necessary for this purpose; it is always unfortunate when citizens have to turn to Washington for rights or privileges denied them by their native State. But Governor Wallace's resort to raw and wholly unnecessary violence demonstrates that there is no other course open. He has won the skirmish at the Pettus Bridge, but he has lost his war.

Win The War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the February 9 issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat points up the harsh alternatives we face in Vietnam. The only sensible course of action, as the editorial concludes, is to win. Here is the text:

[From the St. Louis, (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Feb. 9, 1965]

WIN THE WAR

The President acted with firmness and justice in the strikes against enemy targets in Communist North Vietnam. Official Washington now asks what the next step is to be. It seems entirely obvious—win the war.

There are three alternatives.

One is to win the war.

Another is to pull out, which, of course, means overwhelming political and moral defeat for us and victory for the Communists.

The third is a negotiated settlement, as in Laos, which is exactly the same as alternative two, except it takes a little longer. The effect is identical.

The commitment of the United States has ever been to freedom. Where those oppressed by tyranny have asked our aid, we have given it when we could, although notably not in the case of the Hungarian freedom fighters.

A decade ago, after the French had lost the war and Vietnam was partitioned, the South Vietnam Government under President Diem asked our aid to fill the vacuum caused by withdrawal of the French. This we did.

It is irrelevant to argue now that this was the wrong decision. We do not think it was, but even if it were, we crossed that bridge a decade ago. Now, thousands of lives and millions of dollars later, we are upon the final horns of the dilemma.

In the intervening decade we have tried to limit the conflict in South Vietnam, using persuasion and softness. This has simply emboldened the aggressor Communist, for they mistook—and not surprisingly—our peaceable protestations as weakness.

The Communists had before them President Kennedy's incredible weakness in Laos which led to a tripartite government, which is now a Communist takeover. They also took due note of President Kennedy's terrible weakness in dealing with the implanting of Communist missile bases in Cuba and his unwillingness to do more than make feeble protestations about this—90 miles away from home.

The Communists have always nurtured the idea that America is a paper tiger and, while we would flail feebly at weak targets, we no longer have the courage and resolution to fight for freedom. They say it is just a question of how quickly the Reds can nibble away southeast Asia and the rest of the world.

After President Truman's commendable decision to stand firm in Korea in 1950, his later refusal to allow General MacArthur to win the war gave them their cue.

Small wonder that the Communists have been pushing wars, until this week, virtually with impunity. Only a few strong stands, like Quemoy, Matsu, and Lebanon, are solitary beacons to light an otherwise dreary picture.

American stature has been crumbling throughout the world. Now no dictator is so lowly and so puny that he does not dare to pull the tail feathers of the American eagle.

Those two-bit tyrants—Nasser, Ben Bella, Sukarno, Nkrumah, and their like—have been bombing our Embassies, violating our ambassadorial and counselor staffs, defiling our flag and taunting us to do something about it. Sometimes we send mild protests. Mainly, we don't even bother with that meaningless gesture.

So long as we stand pusillanimously idle in Cuba and Vietnam, the outrages against this Nation will increase. They will continue to increase so long as we are too weak and effete to fight for what is right, for what is just and for what is honest.

The Johnson administration has apparently concluded that Cuba is down the drain. We wish it weren't so, and certainly strong measures could be exerted 90 miles from home with far greater ease than 7,000 miles away.

But at least it may be said in Cuba that Castro is the de facto government. Bad as it is, we can rationalize that no one has asked our intervention—because we have suppressed even the government in exile which might have called for help, and we have allowed the Monroe Doctrine to die.

In Vietnam it has been a different story. We were invited in by the legal Government. We have the moral responsibility of more than 1 million people whom we transported in the final days of the migration from North Vietnam to South Vietnam so they could live in a land of freedom.

If we abandon these and the South Vietnam Government to the mercies of the Communists, what will our few remaining allies in southeast Asia and other parts of the world—like the Governments of the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, and others—think?

Would they not do better, from their own point of view, to line up with the Reds as the sure, eventual winner now, on the best terms they can, rather than be conquered later because our Government is not interested any longer in helping those who would fight and live for freedom? Then we shall stand alone.

Certainly the risks are very great in South Vietnam. Unquestionably, if we push through to victory—as former Vice President Nixon and many of the military leaders have urged—we will lose some men, some planes, and perhaps some ships.

We can win, however, because the Communists are at the end of a long supply line and have great difficulty supplying a war from their own industrial plants and bases over secondary railroad lines and inferior jungle roads, compared to our control of the sea and air lanes.

We can win by attacking Communist supply lines, depots and staging areas, thus cutting off the Vietcong from their supplies and then mopping up the remnants.

If we pull out, or if we agree to a negotiated settlement—with which we suspect some of the President's advisers have been flirting—we risk enormous damage to the cause of freedom and to the position of the United States in southeast Asia and throughout the world. Who, then, will ever trust us or ally with us?

We end where we began—it may be expensive to win the war, but the risks in winning it are far less than those in losing it.

Frank G. Raichle Named to Panel for U.S. District Court Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our community is justifiably proud of Frank G. Raichle's appointment by Chief Justice Earl Warren to serve on a committee which will formulate rules of evidence for Federal district courts.

I have known Mr. Raichle for many years as a friend and a prominent attorney. He is able, and well deserves this recognition of his ability.

I compliment Justice Warren upon his selection and, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an item which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on March 8, 1965, relating to this appointment:

RAICHLE NAMED TO PANEL FOR U.S. DISTRICT COURT STUDY—COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY JUSTICE WARREN WILL FORMULATE UNIFORM RULES OF EVIDENCE

WASHINGTON, March 8.—Frank G. Raichle, Buffalo trial lawyer, today was named by Chief Justice Earl Warren to a committee to formulate uniform rules of evidence for U.S. district courts.

Mr. Raichle is a fellow and member of the Board of Regents of the American College of Trial Lawyers.

Justice Warren named Albert E. Jenner Jr., Chicago trial attorney and former president of the American College of Trial Lawyers, as chairman of the committee made up of Federal judges, legal scholars, and leading trial lawyers.

The rules to be studied govern the admissibility of evidence and the competency of witnesses in civil and criminal trials.

MAY SERVE AS A MODEL

"The task assigned to the committee is of the greatest importance in improving the administration of justice in the United States courts," said Justice Warren.

"Moreover, as has happened with respect to the Federal rules of civil and criminal procedure, the work of the evidence committee may well serve as a model for the States to follow."

There has been recognition for some time of the need for simplicity, clarity, and uniformity of application of rules of evidence in trying civil and criminal cases in the Federal courts.

FORMIDABLE TASK

At present, Federal courts follow the rules of evidence laid down by the State in which the court sits. The States have certain variations which can provide complications when Federal cases are appealed.

The task of formulating uniform rules of evidence has been considered the second phase of the modernization of the courts initiated by the Supreme Court in 1938 when it promulgated the Federal rules of civil procedure.

At that time, the adoption of modern and uniform rules of evidence was considered so formidable a task that it was postponed by the advisory committee appointed by the Supreme Court.

In appointing the committee, Justice Warren acted under a resolution of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

REPORTS MUST BE MADE

The uniform rules of evidence, when formulated by the advisory committee, will be reported first to the judicial conference, then to the Supreme Court, and ultimately to the Congress before they can be put into effect.

Freedom To Express Unpopular Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fred Cloud, associate editor of the editorial division of the board of education of the Methodist Church, has recently been honored by the Freedoms Foundation for his work.

The foundation awarded Mr. Cloud the honor certificate award for his editorial, appearing in Christian Action, July 1964, entitled "Freedom To Express Unpopular Opinions."

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent editorial. Its content is applicable to our entire society and it serves as a timely reminder to all of one of the most precious guarantees of our Constitution.

I commend Mr. Cloud's editorial to my colleagues for consideration and with unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD:

[From the Christian Action, July 1964]

FREEDOM TO EXPRESS UNPOPULAR OPINIONS

(By Fred Cloud)

Man is a being who thinks and who communicates his thoughts through speech, oral or written. Much of his freedom as a human being is dependent upon his right to express his thoughts freely. Dictators, whether of the left or of the right, know this; consequently, one of their chief tactics in their attempt to retain absolute power is to suppress freedom of speech.

One of America's glories, written into the very heart of her Constitution, is freedom of speech. This heritage of ours grew out of long centuries of struggle in Europe before the founding of the Colonies in the New World. The French philosopher Voltaire expressed it best, perhaps, when he said: "I may disagree with you completely, but I will fight to the death for your right to say what you think."

There are two glaring perils to freedom of speech in America today, it seems to us. The first is that of abuse of the freedom by the promulgation of lascivious, obscene, and hate-inspiring literature. We have laws, however, which can—and, in time, usually do—protect the public while protecting the freedom of writers and publishers.

The second peril is harder to cope with, more insidious because it cannot readily be contended with, in the courts or elsewhere. It is the peril of a closed mind that will not allow unpopular opinions to be expressed—or, if they are expressed, will brand them

with some derogatory labels such as radical, socialistic, un-American, subversive, and so on. Persons with such an attitude really betray the fact that they do not trust truth to win out in the free-for-all of public discussion. Perhaps they fear that their intellectual stance cannot be defended in open debate, and that opposing viewpoints must be destroyed by smearing the persons who express such views.

If America is to remain strong and preserve its democracy for future generations, we must guard vigilantly our freedom of speech—which, today, often means the freedom to express unpopular opinions.

Must Ask Question To Get the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal included on Wednesday, March 3, 1965, the editorial, "Must Ask Question To Get the Answer," posed the problem of using fighting men from several Asiatic nations on the firing line in Vietnam instead of a major buildup of American troops. This suggestion by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] makes enough sense to deserve an analysis and an answer by those in command of our Departments of State and Defense. It recognizes the need for stopping the flow of Communist troops into South Vietnam but also recognizes the fact that those nations with a vital interest in preserving freedom in southeast Asia have the responsibility to help shoulder the load rather than to sit on the sidelines indefinitely.

Representative FORD has here made a constructive suggestion which neither emphasizes the view of "get out and negotiate" nor the commitment of greater numbers of boys to the struggle in Vietnam. It deserves most serious consideration by the administration. With unanimous consent I submit the editorial for the RECORD:

MUST ASK QUESTION TO GET THE ANSWER

It wouldn't be surprising if the plan put forward by U.S. Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., of Grand Rapids, for winning the war in Vietnam without a major buildup of American troops were greeted by gloomy predictions that it wouldn't work.

The House Republican leader proposes that fighting men from several Asiatic nations be put on the firing line against the Communist Vietcong.

It wouldn't be a United Nations operation, but instead would call for the formation of a brandnew Asian-American task force.

In an interview with this newspaper, FORD listed South Korea, Formosa, the Philippines, and Australia as countries he feels could contribute substantial numbers of troops to the joint force assigned to the defense of freedom in South Vietnam.

"Those countries have just as big an interest as we do in keeping southeast Asia free," he said. "Maybe more so, since they are geographically closer to the war."

FORD views as unrealistic the ideas of two opposing schools of thought in Washington. One wants a negotiated settlement in Vietnam and withdrawal of all U.S. ground forces. The other favors sending as many as a million U.S. troops, if necessary, to hold South Vietnam against the Communist infiltrators from the north.

FORD said he cannot visualize sending a million Americans and asserted that "any substantial increase should come from our Asian allies."

On the other hand, he expressed belief "it would be catastrophic to withdraw now, either militarily or by some negotiated settlement that would be unworkable."

FORD said it should eventually be possible to withdraw U.S. ground forces unit by unit as pro-Western Asians move in to replace them, with America's contribution limited to air and sea power.

Of America's immediate objectives in the war, he said:

"First, we must stop the flow of Communist troops and armaments into South Vietnam.

"Second, Hanoi and Peiping must learn that they are wasting their time trying to overrun South Vietnam.

"Once those aims are achieved, then maybe we can talk about a negotiated peace."

Its obviously going to take a lot of doing to achieve these two goals, but we believe FORD's plan makes a lot of sense.

Of course, a big question is involved—whether the other Asian countries would cooperate in a joint effort in behalf of a cause that is an important, or more so, to them is as it is to the United States or whether they are determined to stay on the sidelines and let America continue to carry the whole burden.

The answer to the question cannot be obtained by taking the position that FORD's proposal wouldn't work and that there is no use in pursuing the course he has outlined.

The best way to get the answer is to ask the question in terms that make it unmistakably clear that the United States doesn't intend to continue indefinitely to carry on its own shoulders a load which others having a vital stake in preserving freedom in southeast Asia have a moral responsibility to share.

A Bill To Grant an Additional Tax Exemption for a Taxpayer Supporting a Dependent Who Has Attained Age 65 or Is Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to grant an additional tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who has attained age 65 or is blind.

Despite the recent tax cut, the burdens of taxation still lie heavily on those supporting elderly persons or blind persons. The expenses these supporting taxpayers must incur are severe, and they receive no tax break—apart from the medical expense deduction. I think it is time that we recognized the weight of this burden, and the need to lessen it.

A taxpayer supporting elderly or blind persons cannot now get the double deduction that the elderly or blind person can get for his or her income tax. As it is often the supporting taxpayer who is the only one paying the tax, things ought to be equalized by giving him the additional tax exemption. This would ease the heavy burden of caring for elderly and blind persons.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars conducts a Voice of Democracy contest for high school students across the Nation. The winner for the State of Montana this year is Miss Mary Margaret Blom of Havre, Mont. I would like to commend Miss Blom and, at this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert her essay:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Mary Margaret Blom)

During this past year, Americans have had more opportunity to voice their opinions, state their views, argue with opponents, and grow firmer in their political convictions than at any other time in communications history. Voters and politicians discuss, analyze, argue, present, and continually try to convince one another. Everybody has an idea about how our Government should be run. And yet, in spite of all the squabbling, this country grows and prospers, supplies good jobs to more people, has the best paid teachers in the best equipped schools in the world, feeds tens of thousands all over the earth, gives more to charity, spends more on education and research, takes better care of its old, sick, and orphans, and supports more generously more symphony orchestras, more artists and writers, and more good publications. And in what other nation on earth would you find the counterpart of Little League baseball?

So despite all the varied and oftspoken cures prescribed by American social doctors, America is today the greatest, most productive Nation on earth.

What is the reason that the United States has been able to progress and out-produce the rest of world? America is a democracy. America is based economically on free enterprise. These two reasons explain the position that the United States of America holds in this hemisphere and indeed in the world today.

American democracy is threefold—political, which is freedom of expression and vote; economic, which is freedom of investment and enterprise; and social, which is freedom of association and opportunity. Each of these forms of democracy has become vital to the American way of life. Each American holds his rights dear. And most Americans realize how important the duties that correspond to these privileges are. This growing realization among Americans—that citizenship implies active participation—is the reason, I believe, that more Americans are registering to vote, joining the Peace Corps, attending criminal trials, earnestly supporting political parties that express their views, and in general, showing increasing interest in the image and the reality of the American way of life—an American way of life that

every year expands itself by admitting into its privileged membership, thousands of foreign-born appreciators—people who in their dire need and love of freedom strive even to the point of risk of life to become recognized citizens of liberty's bulwark—the country that we are learning not to take for granted.

This then is the challenge of citizenship of this year and indeed of this decade: to continue, now that we have begun—to continue in our advancement, our progress, our prosperity. We are coming to grips with the challenge, but the struggle is far from won. We must continue our efforts, our loyalties, our hopes. And this way, America can reach new peaks, can ride to new crests on the tide of democratic principles. We must spread them abroad, and further them at home. We must build, and create and encourage. We must give to the youth of our land a whetted appetite, a hunger for justice and the American way.

Continued voter interest and even more of it must be the key phrase to insure that in the future of our America, right is might, not the opposite.

Grocery Store Bills Rise, but Not Because of Food Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday, March 7, issue of the New York Times carried an article entitled "Grocery Store Bills Rise, but Not Because of Food Costs." Unfortunately, this fine article was carried on the pages of the financial section and may have been missed by the housewives of the Nation. It is information that every grocery shopper should have, and it is a pleasure to incorporate the article into these remarks.

Mr. H. J. Maidenberg has presented a factual statement and the information indicates clearly that, despite the changing tastes of the American consumer, and while all other consumer prices have been going up and up, proportionately less is spent on food today by the housewife than was spent years ago.

Food is still the best bargain on the merchant's shelf.

The article follows:

GROCERYSTORE BILLS RISE, BUT NOT BECAUSE OF FOOD COSTS—NON-EDIBLES OUTDISTANCE GROWTH OF THE POPULATION

(By H. J. Maidenberg)

If you thought you spent a bit too much at the supermarket yesterday, you probably did—but not for food.

Chances are the shopping bag contained hair sprays, first-aid kits, bubble-bath soap, paper towles, patient medicines, and many other items formerly bought in drug stores.

As for food, much of the bill covered purchases of meat, soft drinks, frozen vegetables, beer, and prepared or semiprepared goods such as cake mixes, and other convenience foods that were rarely on shopping lists a dozen or so years ago.

In terms of percentage, food sales are not keeping pace with the rise in population, but nonfood sales in groceries are growing much faster than the population.

Like as not the shopping list showed few, if any, of the little snacks or candies bought on impulse just before the checkout counter was reached.

All in all, surveys by the Government and the food industry note that despite the changing tastes of the American consumer, he spends proportionally less on food today than he did years ago.

SALES FIGURES REPORTED

The Government has estimated that food sales this year will total $82 billion, or $2 billion above 1964. This increase of about 3 percent, however, is the same as the rate of population growth.

According to the Grocery Manufacturers' Association, the consumer spent 19 percent of his disposable income on food in 1964. This compared with 26 percent about 15 years ago. During this time, the 1,500 items he had to choose from on the grocer's shelves has grown to 8,000.

The Food Field Reporter, a trade paper and statistical organization, said that total grocery sales rose 2.8 percent in 1963, to $53,920 million. In the same period, the latest for which figures are available, nonfood items in these shops and markets jumped 12.5 percent to $4,327,550,000.

Is it concern over waistlines that is keeping expenditures for food down in relation to disposable income?

The answer is elusive.

The largest gain in sales in 1963 was in dietetic soft drinks, up 52.3 percent from the year before; and the largest decline of any grocery line was in metered-calorie products, down 30.1 percent.

One theory that food executives dismiss is about the less arduous work Americans do nowadays. They point out that people spend more time at home than they did years ago, and consequently are closer to the refrigerator.

Increased incomes are also translated into a rising demand for meat as well as beer and snacks, such as potato chips. Market research men are particularly interested in the increased consumption of beer by teenagers.

This has helped move beer sales from fifth to fourth position in volume leadership. Only fresh beef, cured pork products and fresh vegetables top beer in grocery stores.

As for keeping busy, food men are one in declaring that housewives, especially those in the suburbs, are more active than ever. As one executive noted:

"Kids are rarely left alone today, whether in the city or suburbs. They are driven from pillar to post by parents obsessed with 'attainment.' This means less time to prepare meals and hence the fantastic growth of convenience foods."

OTHER FACTORS

The extra housework required of housewives in the suburban home and the growing number of married women who work also contribute to the sharp sales rise of cake mixes, boil-in-the-bag foods, frozen dinners and other convenience items.

Commenting on taste, one executive of a large food concern said that vast improvements in the manufacture of convenience foods had overcome initial resistance to many of these products.

"Take instant potatoes, for example," he said. "They don't taste like mashed potatoes, they're better tasting."

One reason given for the slow rise in grocery sales of food products is the strength of specialty stores, particularly in the city.

While the city is often called an impersonal place, shoppers there are far more personal in their tastes and less bound by conformity than those in the suburbs.

The specialty stores usually carry grocery staples, but depend heavily on "ethnic foods" and gourmet items. Their sales show a steady rise from year to year, and in 1963 totaled $5.57 billion.

Part of the success, or at least the ability to withstand competition from supermarkets, stems from the pockets of ethnic groups that remain in the cities. This factor has had a profound effect on food store management.

"Ethnic or specialty foods are so important," one chain store executive declared, "that they have set 'headquarters buying' back. One large national chain that did its buying with a computer failed to allow for special preferences in various neighborhoods and wound up selling its Eastern stores."

The speciality stores also perform services that the large chains find impossible. For instance, many grant credit or permit customers to buy items on sale by the box and then allow the buyer to draw from this carton over a period of time.

ONE FAMILY'S PATTERN

Recently, one family on the West Side bought several cases of canned vegetables at a sale, which were put aside by the grocer. The housewife then picked up several cans each day and it saved space in her home.

Large supermarkets, on the other hand, depend on low prices and variety to draw customers. This has led to the stocking of many nonfood items, which have higher profit margins than most edibles.

The drug stores, now losing their toiletries customers to supermarkets, have in many instances installed food departments serving ice cream and confectionery items. Loft's Candy Co. has been particularly active in placing their agencies in drug stores.

Probably the biggest gainer in the drug store-supermarket competition for the consumer dollar is the packaging industry. Last year, an estimated $23 billion was spent on packaging materials for food and drug items. That more toothpaste is sold in supermarkets than drug stores is immaterial to this industry.

PILLSBURY'S FORMAT

Another beneficiary is the grocery manufacturer. A case in point is the Pillsbury Co.

Some 20 years ago, Pillsbury was mainly concerned with producing flour. It then began making cake mixes, processed potatoes, frozen foods and other convenience foods.

One result has been a 93-percent rise in profit on a 40-percent increase in sales in the last 7 years.

About the only loser in the food industry has been the farmer. The Department of Agriculture has reported that the retail cost of all food consumed or exported in 1953 totaled $1,003 million. Of this, the farmer received $445 million, or 44 percent.

In 1963, this same food basket cost $1,078 million and the farm value was $394 million, or 37 percent.

War in Vietnam—IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., visited Vietnam recently and has been writing a series of articles for his newspaper on his observations there.

Part IX, which appeared in the Courier-Express on March 1, 1965, follows:

FLARE PLANES HELP TO SPOT VIETCONG

(NOTE.—Vietcong guerrillas are nightfighters, so Vietnamese forces and their American advisers have countered with planes

carrying flares. Here Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, rides a flare-carrying C–123.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

PHUOC HOA, SOUTH VIETNAM.—It is midnight, and the big C–123 Air Force cargo plane is slowly circling over this area miles north of Saigon and at an altitude of about 4,000 feet.

A moon that is nearly full casts a ghostly light on the plain below, and the eerie effect is heightened by a crescent-shaped grass fire blazing in this vicinity.

"The fires could be the work of farmers who use this method to prepare the soil for planting, or they could have been lit by the Vietcong Commies to provide a smoke cover for their activities."

U.S. PILOTS

The comment was from the plane's Air Force pilot, Maj. M. R. Richardson, a native of Bay St. Louis, Miss., with whom we were chatting over the plane's intercom system.

Beside him sat his copilot, Capt. James M. Dillard, a Negro from West Virginia, and behind them in the navigator's chair was a young Vietnamese Air Force man, who was in constant touch by radio with South Vietnamese forces below.

"Looks very much like you're not going to see our fireworks tonight," drawled Dillard. "Guess you should have taken the Smoky Blue run. They dropped plenty of flares there just a little while ago at Soc Trang in the delta country south of Saigon. But it appears that Smoky Red just isn't going to get the word."

FLARE NICKNAMES

Earlier we had learned that Smoky Red and Smoky Blue were the nicknames for the aircraft parachute flare operations that are available nightly to the South Vietnamese ground forces if they need illumination to thwart the Vietcong.

Smoky Red is the first to become airborne every night at dusk. At about 7 we had boarded the C–123 and took off with a crew of 8, also including the flight mechanic, a "loadmaster" in charge of the 180 flares abroad, and 3 "kickers" trained in dropping the million-candlepower oversize roman candles with maximum efficiency.

CALL TO PHUOC HOA

For more than an hour the Smoky Red plane had described an arc around Saigon, waiting a call. At 8:15 p.m. it came and the plane took off for Phuoc Hoa.

This automatically set in operation Smoky Blue, another similarly equipped C–124 plane, which circled Saigon until it got its call for Soc Trang. This was the signal for Smoky Green to become airborne, and if it had become necessary a Smoky Brown was on tap.

It took only about 15 minutes for Smoky Red to arrive at its destination. The time was utilized by the loadmaster and the kickers to shuck some of their flares from metal containers. Four were then placed on a flair chute, their "safety pins" (tiny screws which make the flare inoperable until pulled) removed and timers adjusted.

IGNITE AT 1,500 FEET

The loadmaster, S. Sgt. Harley W. Nelson of Minneapolis, Minn., told me that the timers had been set for the flares to go off 1,500 feet above the ground, after being dropped at about 3,000 feet.

Anticipating quite a show, I watched the busy crew which was ready to kick off the first 2 flares upon arrival at the directed spot.

Five, ten, fifteen minutes went by and nothing happened. One of the kickers sat on the rear cargo door, elevated just enough to let the flares be dropped. His feet were on the 4 readied flares, while 10 more were lined up behind, ready for the chute.

NO DROP

But the call did not come. Nelson said it sometimes happens that the flare plane will get a call for the target, but for some reason the ground forces failed to notify the plane after it arrived that the flares should be dropped.

"Sometimes the Vietnamese navigator just can't contact the ground forces," he explained, "and he is not supposed to give the go-ahead until he does."

A check with Major Richardson, however, produced the information that nothing was amiss, that contact had been established with the ground but they didn't want the flares dropped at that time.

"Sometimes," he said, "the flares might help the Vietcong and hurt our forces. The very fact that the Vietcong can hear us circling above them may have had a restraining influence in their planned dirty work for the night."

TEAMWORK

It is now 12:30 a.m. and Smoky Red, running low on fuel, has been ordered to return to Tan Son Nhut Airport at Saigon. As the plane turns south, I can hear the Mississippian bantering goodnaturedly with his Negro copilot.

Major Richardson had told us earlier: "He's one of the finest guys I have ever known. We get along just great."

I am not destined to see the flares dropped tonight, but the example of teamwork of a Mississippian and a Negro and their crew working valiantly to protect the interest of the freedom-loving South Vietnamese is, in its very special way, highly illuminating.

Girl, 14, Saves Drowning Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to an act of heroism on the part of a 14-year-old girl in my home city of Laconia, N.H., on Wednesday last.

Barbara Michaud, 14, of Gilford, N.H., a ninth-grade student of Laconia Memorial Junior High School, jumped into 15 feet of frigid water, in a swift current in the Winnepesaukee River to save 10-year-old Anthony Glidden, of Laconia, who had fallen through the ice and drifted into open water. This Friday the Laconia Police Department is sponsoring a "Heroine Day" in honor of Barbara's courage and heroism.

It is indeed heartwarming to be able to relate such acts of heroism in view of the increasing publicity given to our mounting crime rate and juvenile delinquency. Barbara's selflessness should remind us all of the uprightness and courage of the great majority of America's youthful population. Perhaps if we looked to the motivations of the many young people like Barbara we could learn better how to cope with juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the further attention of my distinguished colleagues, an article by Mr. Earl O. Anderson of Laconia, which appeared in the Manchester Union Leader of Thursday, March 4, and part of an editorial which appeared in the Laconia Evening Citizen of the same date.

[From the Laconia Evening Citizen, Mar. 4, 1965]

EDITORIAL COMMENTS—WHAT GOES THROUGH YOUR MIND BEFORE YOU JUMP INTO ICY WATER TO SAVE A STRANGER FROM DROWNING?

Plucky Barbara Michaud, 14, of Gilford, did not stop to consider the consequences to herself yesterday, and as a result, a 10-year-old Lakeport boy, Tony Glidden, is very much alive today.

In an era when people many years older than Barbara have adopted an attitude of not becoming involved as fellow humans are fatally beaten almost in their dooryards, the Gilford girl's deed of valor stands out as a shining star.

Gilford neighbors who know the Michaud family and Barbara as a competent babysitter felt that she had what it takes. Now they are positive.

[From the Manchester Union-Leader, Mar. 4, 1965]

GIRL, 14, SAVES DROWNING BOY

(By Earl O. Anderson)

LACONIA.—Quick thinking of a 14-year-old Gilford girl, coupled with prompt action, was credited with saving a 10-year-old Lakeport boy from drowning here late yesterday afternoon.

Anthony "Tony" Glidden, oldest of eight children of Mr. and Mrs. William Glidden, 7 Hill Street, had gone down twice before Barbara Michaud reached him, in the middle of the Winnepesaukee River, just above the Lakeport Dam.

The water was an estimated 15 feet deep and near freezing temperature, firemen said.

The girl grabbed Tony by the collar of his jacket and the back of the head and brought him ashore, and had started artificial respiration when the firemen arrived.

Barbara, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Michaud, Cherry Valley Road, Gilford, said later that she was attracted by Tony's cries for help, and then saw him go under, as she was walking across Elm Street Bridge, en route to Our Lady of the Lakes Church.

"I cried 'O my God,' and started running toward him as fast as I could," the plucky girl said later.

"It was perhaps 50 yards, and as I got to the bank of the river I tossed down my schoolbooks and tore off my coat and plunged in.

"I saw Tony go down a second time just before I reached him.

"I just did what I had to, that's all."

Firemen who responded with resuscitation equipment and a boat used the inhalator on Tony for a few minutes, and he was administered oxygen in the Robichaud ambulance during his ride to the Laconia Hospital.

He was attended by Dr. Harry E. Trapp, who said the boy appeared a little blue from the cold, but responded well to treatment. He was released later last evening. Barbara did not appear to have suffered any ill effects from her unexpected swim in the icy water.

The physician was high in his praise of Barbara's action, and said there was no question but that she had saved Tony's life.

Tony's father, as he thanked Barbara, said, "Thank you so much. I wish that you were my own daughter. I am going to try and see that you get a medal for this, even if I have to write President Johnson, and it takes every cent I have. For if it hadn't been for you, we wouldn't have had Tony tonight."

SWIMMER SINCE 6

Barbara said she had been able to swim since about 6, and was taught by her father, a disabled World War II veteran, who has shown all the Michaud children how to swim.

She is a former Girl Scout, a 9th grade student at Memorial Junior High School, and the second youngest of five children.

Tony told, when asked later, that he was headed to the Lakeport library when he saw a bright object on the ice near the shore. He walked out on the ice to pick up the object, when the ice broke and he fell into the water.

Firemen said the boy was about 10 feet out in open water in the swift current when he was rescued.

The scene was near the control station for Lakeport Dam.

Firemen answering the accident call were telephoned by a woman who saw Tony in the water at the same time Barbara spotted the boy, were Capt. W. Donald McAllister, Howard Marden, and Charles Stuart.

Southeastern Ohio Applauds Appalachian Development Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, passage of the Appalachian regional development program by Congress has been greeted with widespread approval and enthusiasm in my 10th Congressional District of Ohio.

I have received a floodtide of letters and communications from representatives of practically every segment of our population in southeast Ohio. They have come from community leaders, educators, conservancy districts, farm groups and from individuals who want to leave for their sons and daughters greater opportunities than they themselves inherited from the last generation.

As coauthor of this vital legislation, I am, of course, glad that it does have the active, vigorous support of the people whom I represent in Congress. More importantly, I am proud that they are willing to roll up their sleeves and go to work now, without delay, to help translate into reality the bright promise of the Appalachian program. My people realize that this is not a "handout," that its benefits can be earned only through self-reliance and initiative at the local and State levels of government.

This point was best summed up, perhaps, by the Logan Daily News, which is one of the most forward-looking newspapers in southeast Ohio. In a front page editorial on March 4, the Daily News said that the Appalachian program assures that "our chances for real and permanent progress in the building of modern highways, access roads, flood control dams, parks and recreation facilities are certainly brighter than ever before. Though a stubborn few will always say otherwise, this is not a partisan matter. The problems of Appalachia are real, and those who deny them show only the kind of selfish partisanship that has crippled this area for so many years."

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I insert the full text of this especially perceptive editorial, which is entitled "Appalachia Program Will Test the Quality of Local Leadership."

The editorial follows:

APPALACHIA PROGRAM WILL TEST THE QUALITY OF LOCAL LEADERSHIP

Final approval of the Appalachia Region Development Act by Congress signals an important beginning for the hill country of southeast Ohio, and especially Hocking County.

Years of patient effort have gone into the bootstrap development of this community, which has made important strides forward in the past decade. Logan's name is a byword all over Ohio because of the pioneering work done here to rebuild a faltering economy.

Now a massive Federal program has been activated to bolster our community efforts. Our chances for real and permanent progress in the building of modern highways, access roads, flood control dams, parks and recreational facilities are certainly brighter than ever before.

Now comes the real test of local leadership and the staying power of our effort. Neither Federal nor State support will mean anything unless we can spark the needed action right here in our own community.

Only our own citizens can produce the answers to local problems. What is needed now is concerted effort, general agreement that improvements are needed and possible, and willingness to sacrifice time, effort, talent, and money to get things done.

Though a stubborn few will always say otherwise, this is not a partisan matter. The problems of Appalachia are real, and those who deny them show only the kind of selfish partisanship that has crippled this area for so many years.

The problems we now seek to solve are not found on Logan's Main Street. They are on our back roads, in the crumbling mine towns all around us, on the hills that one visiting reporter called "dusty and desolate" with some cause. Life magazine calls southeast Ohio "Nowheresville" and, for most of the world, that is just what we have been.

All the resources of Federal and State Governments are now pledged in support of any constructive move we make to better our own community.

The cards are dealt, and the stakes are high. Do we play out our hand, or do we fold, rejecting once more the dream of greatness that has always been inherent in every segment of the American society?

I also include an assessment of the Appalachian program by Dr. Vernon Alden, president of Ohio University at Athens and one of the truly outstanding educators and civic leaders in all of Ohio. Dr. Alden's statement was contained in an article published March 4 by the Pomeroy Sentinel under the headline "Alden Sees Benefits Coming to Southeast Ohio From Appalachian Act: Should Open Major Markets Through Road Development."

The article follows:

ALDEN SEES BENEFITS COMING TO SOUTHEASTERN OHIO FROM APPALACHIA ACT—SHOULD OPEN MAJOR MARKETS THROUGH ROAD DEVELOPMENT

ATHENS, OHIO.—Vernon R. Alden, president of Ohio University, Wednesday praised passage of the Appalachia Region Development Act which he hopes will provide long overdue capital improvements considered basic to economic activity.

Alden has been a leader in the drive to develop the economy of southeastern Ohio and serve as head of President Johnson's Domestic Job Corps.

Alden said the act's broad scale developmental approach will open the Appalachia area to the major markets of our national thriving economy.

He noted that the act considers four major development areas involving joint Federal-State action; access to and from and within the region; water resources development including flood control; upgrading of the use of natural resources and development of human resources.

Alden noted that the Federal Government realizes the limitations of the bill and its experimental nature. In a region populated by more than 15 million persons, there is a limit to how far $1.1 billion can be stretched, he said.

Recognizing this, designers of the Appalachia program planned to compensate on areas showing the greatest potential for future growth.

Since the lack of major highways has restricted the economic growth of southeastern Ohio, the act will help elevate this critical lack of access to the market areas.

This act will build a developmental east-west major highway and adequate access to it and to the present interstate system.

Alden also praised the water control and conservation provisions of the measure "Construction of flood control projects on the major rivers and streams and the further development of water impoundment structures and related tourism and recreational facilities now will be possible in a short period of time instead enduring many damaging years through waiting for the normal processes to be effective," he said.

He added that Appalachia funds would make adequate sewage treatment facilities a reality for many southeastern Ohio communities which are restricted by lack of such basic health needs.

Referring to the need for good planning for health facilities and health training programs in his region, Alden said, "The Appalachia Act will give impetus to the development of multicounty regional health centers, and it is my opinion that parallel to the development of these centers and the servicing of all health facilities is the development of paramedic training programs to meet staff and service needs."

He said other phases of the act, such as erosion control of hill country, improving timber resources and providing vocational education, "will add greatly to the economic base of the area and to the welfare of its people."

The 28 Ohio counties included in the Appalachia program are: Clermont, Brown, Adams, Highland, Ross, Pike, Scioto, Lawrence, Jackson, Vinton, Hocking, Perry, Gallia, Meigs, Athens, Morgan, Muskingum, Coshocton, Holmes, Tuscarawas, Guernsey, Noble, Washinngton, Monroe, Belmont, Harrison, Jefferson, and Carroll.

Wyoming Will Miss Great Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the State of Wyoming, as well as those nationally, have lost a most dedicated, knowledgeable, and outstanding leader in the field of highway construction and management through the retirement of Mr. J. R. Bromley, superintendent and chief engineer of the Wyoming State Highway Department.

Mr. Bromley began his long tenure in the summer of 1917, in fact, just 3 months after the Wyoming Highway Department was created by the State legislature.

Checking old records, it is interesting to note that between April of 1917 and November of 1918 the department expended $49,598.33 and this included such things as salaries, autos and expenses, surveying equipment, camping equipment and the necessary expenditures for office furniture required for a new department.

It was also found in 1917 that none of the counties had ever made surveys or plans for highway construction and, in fact, some did not even possess right-of-way records.

During the construction season of 1917 surveys were done on 330 miles of Federal aid projects and 72 miles of State aid projects.

Mr. Bromley worked in the summer of 1917 and joined the department full time in 1918 as a rodman at Lusk after having completed 3 years study in civil engineering at the University of Utah.

From this beginning Mr. Bromley rose through the ranks, having served in numerous assignments and at virtually every location throughout the State of Wyoming. In his 45 years of service to the people of Wyoming, the last 21 have been served as superintendent and chief engineer.

Also during this time, the department has risen to a State highway system comprising nearly 5,500 miles and an employee force of 1,500 and an annual expenditure of nearly $50 million per year.

Since the placement of the first oil surfacing in 1925, the department has presently $361 million invested in highways and structures and an additional $132 million of highway construction and progress. In highway administration and management circles, J. R. Bromley and the Wyoming Highway Department have jointly acquired a record of accomplishment which is envied throughout the land.

Mr. Bromley has served as vice president for the Rocky Mountain region for American Association of State Highway Officials and also as vice president and president of the Western Association of State Highway Officials. He is a registered land surveyor and professional engineer in the State of Wyoming.

I join other officials of the State and his many friends who are legion throughout Wyoming in wishing Mr. Bromley every happiness upon his retirement from a career of dedicated public service to the interest of every citizen of America who will have occasion to use Wyoming's great highways and roads in the generations to come.

War in Vietnam—X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the 10th part of a series by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., covering his trip to Vietnam.

Part X, which was printed in the Courier-Express on March 2, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, X—OLEAN MAN RISKS LIFE AS CIVILIAN

(NOTE.—Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, writes about a western New Yorker who is risking his life every day to promote South Vietnamese agriculture.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"So sorry I didn't see you when you were in Danang," said Francis J. "Bud" Savage, formerly of Olean, N.Y. "But you see the situation where I was at Quang Tri is No. 10, an expression that means very, very bad.

"In fact," he explained, "it was so No. 10 that I am not being permitted to return because of the danger. I guess maybe they're right. When you have been shot at three times and ambushed once by the Vietcong, perhaps it's best not to press your luck by staying."

Bud Savage, whose mother lives at 311½ South Second Street, Olean, is one of the representatives of the U.S. Operations Mission (USOM) of the Agency for International Development (AID). He's a part of USOM's counterinsurgency team that directly supports the South Vietnamese war efforts in the rural areas. USOM seeks to provide a new life for hamlet dwellers and refugees from the Vietcong Communists by helping them construct schools, health stations, rural water supply facilities and hamlet defenses.

AGRICULTURAL AID

The USOM crew is equipped to provide seed, fertilizer, and rat poison, help establish a hog-raising industry and grow better corn and sweet potatoes. And for good measure, they equip villages and hamlets with two-way alarm radios and provide radio receivers for key residents among the South Vietnamese.

In the area where Savage has been working, the Vietcong had made sharp inroads, as my own trip near his hamlet had attested a few days ago. I had visited Thanh Quit with a U.S. Army major only a few hours after the Vietcong had been on a rampage and destroyed the hamlet's barbed wire and bamboo fortifications.

"You were only about 6 miles north of where I was stationed," Savage declared. "The whole area is becoming reinfested with Vietcong and it will take strong measures to push them back again. Aside from those shootings and ambush, I underwent two substantial mortar attacks. And to add to my troubles, I experienced two typhoons and a flood. And yet I like my work and intend to go back to another assignment in a different area."

OVERSEAS FOR 15 YEARS

The Olean man has served his Government overseas for 15 years since World War II. In his earlier foreign service work he was stationed at such places as Reykjavik, Iceland; Marseilles, France; Athens and Salonika, Greece, Trinidad, and Tripoli.

Once he joined the Foreign Aid program and worked in Mongadiscio, Somalia, East Africa, before volunteering for the Vietnam USOM staff. He has been here 6 months and present plans are for him to continue here until at least October before reassignment.

"All my friends in the States think I'm nuts to do this," he said, "but I frankly like it. Besides, I firmly believe that the United States just can't pull out of here. It's got to stick it out and win, and if I can be of some small help, I'm happy."

BOOST IN FORCES' MORALE

Savage says that morale among U.S. and South Vietnamese forces got a big shot in the arm with the bombing of North Vietnam military installations.

"It brought the war home to those who are responsible for it, and it should help in turning the tables," he declared.

Not long ago, Savage was one of the 70 to receive the South Vietnamese Medeal of Merit for one of his USOM missions. The medal was presented in recognition of tireless and devoted work of these men during the critical days of the flood.

NEW ASSIGNMENT

My interview with Savage occurred on the day of his return to the Danang area, not far from the border of North Vietnam. His new assignment will be in the Tan Ky area, south from Danang, but some miles away from his old hot spot. The South China Sea is only about 12 miles away, but he'll be in hill country where the going may be almost as rough as the post he vacated.

"Probably about No. 8 there," he grinned. "Maybe I can help make it No. 1."

World Peace Through Rule of International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Cecil J. Olmstead on behalf of Rule of Law Committee:

"MAKING PERMANENT THE RULE OF LAW AMENDMENT IN THE PRIVATE INVESTMENT PROTECTION PROVISIONS OF THE U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT (SEC. 620(e)(2))"—STATEMENT OF CECIL J. OLMSTEAD ON BEHALF OF RULE OF LAW COMMITTEE

I

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Cecil J. Olmstead. I serve as assistant to the chairman of the board of Texaco, Inc. I am appearing today not only in that capacity but also as a representative of a group of companies who have formed a committee called the Rule of Law Committee. By way of background, I am a professor of international law at New York University School of Law and serve as president of the American Branch of the International Law Association. The Rule of Law Committee last year supported in the Senate the Rule of Law or "Sabbatino" amendment which was cosponsored by Senators SPARKMAN and HICKENLOOPER and adopted by a large bipartisan majority in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The amendment, the text of which appears on the last page of this statement, was ultimately adopted as section 620(e)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act with the understanding that it be further considered this year before being made permanent. I am here this year to urge with all the force at my command that the rule of law amendment be made permanent. The recent expropriations in Indonesia and in Syria serve to emphasize the urgency of the situation.

The membership of the Rule of Law Committee represents a significant part of American business abroad and includes:

Aluminum Co. of America; American & Foreign Power Co., Inc.; American Metal Climax, Inc.; Anaconda Co.; Bethlehem Steel; Chase Manhattan Bank; Ford Motor Co.;

Gulf Oil Corp.; International Telephone & Telegraph Corp.; Kennecott Copper Corp.; North American Sugar Industries; Republic Steel Corp.; Socony Mobile Oil Co., Inc.; Standard Oil Co. of California; Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey); Texaco, Inc.; United Fruit Co.; United States Steel Corp.; and Pan-American Life Insurance Co.

All these companies have a common interest in the protection of oversea investment. This common concern for the protection of oversea investment accounts for the fact that the members of the Rule of Law Committee were deeply disturbed by the Supreme Court decision of last March in the Sabbatino case. (*Banco Nacional de Cuba* v. *Sabbatino*, 376 U.S. 398 (1964)). The impact of that decision could have very adverse effects indeed upon the protection and encouragement of oversea investment, particularly in the less developed countries.

In the Sabbatino case, the Castro government of Cuba sued in New York to recover the sales proceeds of a shipment of sugar which it had confiscated in Cuba as part of its 1960 program to expropriate U.S. interests. The proceeds of the sale had come into possession of a U.S. sugar broker in New York and been put in receivership pending judicial determination of ownership. The lower courts gave judgment for the expropriated American owners of the sugar on the ground that the Cuban taking, although an "act of state," was in violation of international law and hence not entitled to the recognition ordinarily given in U.S. courts to the acts of a foreign state. The Supreme Court reversed, holding that there should be no inquiry in U.S. courts into the legality of the Cuban expropriation and therefore that the Cuban Government was entitled to the sales proceeds in New York of the expropriated sugar.

Thus, in its simplest terms the Supreme Court decision in the Sabbatino case stands for the proposition that if American property is expropriated abroad and thereafter brought within U.S. territory, courts in the United States are precluded from making any inquiry into the matter including whether that property was taken in violation of international law. The consequence of this proposition is that if the former American owners of property expropriated abroad seek to recover that property when it turns up within the United States, they are denied any kind of recourse to U.S. courts, both State and Federal, even in cases in which the expropriation is uncompensated or otherwise is in violation of international law. Specifically, this means that the fruits of such illegal expropriations could be marketed with impunity in the United States.

As one commentator has put it, the Court's decision was generally received with "dismay and consternation by those members of the legal profession concerned with the protection of foreign investment."

The reasons for this dismay and consternation may be itemized as follows:

1. The highest court in the United States adopted a position in the Sabbatino case which permitted the Castro government of Cuba to invoke the legal sanctions of U.S. domestic courts to enforce its claim to the proceeds of the sale of goods expropriated in Cuba from the American owners without payment of compensation and otherwise in violation of international law including admitted discrimination against our nationals.

2. At the same time an American litigant in a U.S. court was denied the protection which international law, if applied, would have afforded to his property interests.

3. The Supreme Court for the first time in its history declared that domestic courts, which traditionally have applied international law as a part of the law of the United States, are not obliged to apply that law where the application might result in a holding that the act of a foreign state taken within its own territory had been in violation of international law.

4. The Supreme Court refused to permit domestic courts in the United States either to make a determination on the merits or to inquire into the validity of confiscatory acts of a foreign state even where the courts had complete jurisdiction by every conventional test of jurisdiction.

5. Unnecessarily and without weighing the practical consequences of their words, the Supreme Court majority appeared to endorse the attack made by Castro's lawyer on the international law standard of "prompt, adequate and effective" compensation.

6. The Supreme Court adopted a more extreme application of the act of State doctrine than any other country whose courts have passed upon this problem and in doing so set a precedent which, if not modified, may unfortunately be adopted by other countries all over the world.

The practical threat to U.S. foreign investment posed by the majority opinion in the Sabbatino case was threefold:

(a) U.S. owners of foreign investment would be denied the protection against expropriation of being able to attach their former property if it were seized in violation of international law and later came within the jurisdiction of American courts.

(b) The willingness of courts in other countries to permit U.S. investors to attach their expropriated property if it was imported into those countries was undermined.

(c) The Communist and Nationalist enemies of U.S. foreign investment were given encouragement by the suggestion that the international law standard of "prompt, adequate and effective" compensation for expropriations could not be enforced by American courts in the absence of a treaty. In Chile, the unsuccessful presidential candidate Allende in advocating expropriation of the U.S. copper companies commented that the Sabbatino ruling meant that he would not have to compensate the American companies if he took them over.

II

The Supreme Court's opinion in Sabbatino, however, made it clear that the problems created could be corrected by legislation. In its opinion the Supreme Court had stated that its decision was not required by any provision of the U.S. Constitution or by any rule of customary international law. Instead, it is clear that the Court's decision was based upon the belief that in this particular area of international law the Supreme Court should defer to the political branches of the Government who are expressly charged with the formulation of the foreign policy of the United States. It should be emphasized that the Supreme Court's expressed deference was not to the executive branch alone but rather to both the executive branch and the legislative branch—and properly so. At the time of its decision, however, the Court had only the State Department's expression of preference before it and acted without the benefit of any expression of congressional policy. It is therefore clear from the text of the Sabbatino opinion that the Supreme Court recognizes that the Congress is perfectly free to participate in the formulation of U.S. policy in this area under its traditional constitutional powers, among others, the power to regulate foreign commerce and to define offenses against the law of nations. In actual litigation in which the rule of law amendment has been sought to be applied, the Justice Department has stated that it found "no constitutional prohibition" to the amendment's application.

The purpose of last year's rule of law amendment was to modify the Supreme Court decision only in part and to strike a reasonable balance between the interests of private parties in the protection of their oversea investment under international law and the interests of the Government in the conduct of foreign relations. This was accomplished chiefly by a simple reversal of presumptions. Under the law as it stood immediately after the Supreme Court's decision in the Sabbatino case, every court in the United States was then required to presume that any inquiry by it into the validity under international law of the act of a foreign state respecting matters within its own territory would be a matter of embarrassment to State Department in the conduct of foreign policy and therefore no such inquiry should be initiated unless the State Department by affirmative act indicated that it had no objection to such a judicial inquiry. The rule of law amendment reverses this presumption so that the courts now are to presume that they may make a determination on the merits in every case in which it is asserted that international law has been violated unless the President, or his designee, advises the court that such a determination would be a source of embarrassment in the conduct of foreign policy. In addition, the amendment permits application of the "prompt, adequate and effective compensation" rule as already set out in section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act without the requirement that this be agreed to by treaty.

Under the amendment, the litigant is granted his day in court on the basis of a statutory presumption of nonembarrassment, unless the President intervenes to rebut that presumption. Thus the litigant may be denied a consideration of his case on the merits only after the President, or the State Department on his behalf, has actually weighed the public interest of the Government in avoiding embarrassment against the private interests of the litigant in having his property dealt with under the rule of the law and has affirmatively found that in the particular case the public interest must override the private interest.

Another consequence of the statutory reversal of presumptions is that international law with respect to expropriations will be applied in U.S. courts as a matter of course, as it is applied in all other cases where it is relevant, unless the President intervenes. In the absence of such intervention the amendment assures that international law will be applied and that the private litigant will be accorded his day in court. It is for these reasons that we speak of it as the "rule of law" amendment.

III

It will be recalled that the conference committee last year accepted the principle of the amendment but made it applicable only to cases commenced prior to January 1, 1966. The conference report makes it clear that the only reason for the time limitation was to permit the Congress to hold hearings on the question before taking the decision that the rule of law amendment be made permanent legislation. I am here to urge with all the strength I can bring to bear the amendment be made permanent. Specifically, we urge that the third proviso in section 620(e)(2) of the act be deleted. You will see this proviso bracketed in the text of the amendment appearing at the end of my statement.

It should be noted that the position urged by companies that make up the Rule of Law Committee enjoys wide support among bar associations, trade organizations, and members of the academic community who have no commercial connection whatsoever. The proposal for the principle embodied in the rule of law amendment was originally put forward in 1959 by the International Law Committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and was later adopted as a matter of policy by that asso-

ciation. I offer for the record a copy of the recommendations of this distinguished committee to which is appended a list of its members, many of whom have served or are presently serving in high positions in the State Department.

In 1964, the rule of law amendment received the support of the National Foreign Trade Council and the National Association of Manufacturers. I understand that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, perhaps the broadest based of the business associations, this year has testified before this committee urging that the amendment be made permanent as a means of protecting and stimulating private investment in the less developed countries.

It should also be noted that the American Journal of International Law in its editorial columns (see July 1964 issue) pointed out that the Supreme Court opinion in the Sabbatino case invited congressional action to establish the policy and indicated that such action was desirable to clarify the application of international law in U.S. courts. A copy of this article is offered for the record. In addition, well known and leading professors of international law at a number of American law schools including Harvard, Michigan, and Yale Law Schools wrote last year to committees of the Congress recommending favorable action on the rule of law amendment. I also offer for the record an excerpt from an address which was delivered by the Honorable Arthur Dean in Dallas last July which endorses the amendment. I also submit the text of an address by Mr. Robert Jennings, professor of international law at Cambridge University, delivered to the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and published in the February issue of that association's journal. The Jennings talk deals with some of the inconsistencies of the Supreme Court's dicta on the prompt, adequate, and effective standard of compensation.

IV

Before closing, I would like to refer briefly to the reasons supporting inclusion of the rule of law amendment in the Foreign Assistance Act. Speaking generally, that act has for its purpose the economic and social development of the emerging nations in an overall context of freedom. To that end, the act enlists the support and resources of the American free enterprise community. Indeed, it is recognized on all sides that private investment funds are essential to the success of the overall policy and that public funds themselves are inadequate for the purpose. Accordingly, the act contains a variety of aids, inducements, and guarantees to encourage U.S. private investment in the developing nations. One such aid to the protection and encouragement of private investment is the series of amendments which have been added since 1962 to section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act.

The rule of law amendment is designed as a logical extension of these recent expressions of policy and law as to the protection of existing investment abroad and the encouragement of further investment. Our committee believes strongly that this amendment will improve the oversea investment climate in the developing countries by constituting a further deterrent against illegal expropriation and a further compulsion toward compliance with international law.

In order to save the time of the committee, I will not go into further detail unless the committee has specific questions. I would like to conclude my presentation by offering for the record a list of 10 questions and answers which will cover many of the points of detail, a memorandum expanding on Justice White's point that the majority in the Sabbatino case were taking a rigid view of the act of state doctrine not followed by other trading nations, and a copy of the Supreme Court opinions in the Sabbatino case itself.

LANGUAGE OF RULE OF LAW AMENDMENT TO SECTION 620(e) OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

(Third proviso to be deleted in brackets)

Section 620(e)(2). "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no court in the United States shall decline on the ground of the Federal act of state doctrine to make a determination on the merits giving effect to the principles of international law in a case in which a claim of title or other right is asserted by any party including a foreign state (or a party claiming through such state) based upon (or traced through) a confiscation or other taking after January 1, 1959, by an act of that state in violation of the principles of international law, including the principles of compensation and the other standards set out in this subsection: *Provided*, That this subparagraph shall not be applicable (1) in any case in which an act of a foreign state is not contrary to international law or with respect to a claim of title or other right acquired pursuant to an irrevocable letter of credit of not more than one hundred and eighty days' duration issued in good faith prior to the time of the confiscation or other taking, or (2) in any case with respect to which the President determines that application of the act of state doctrine is required in that particular case by the foreign interests of the United States and a suggestion to this effect is filed on his behalf in that case with the court, [or (3) in any case in which the proceedings are commenced after January 1, 1966."]

Federal Excise Tax on Communication Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan Public Service Commission has unanimously passed a resolution calling for the repeal of the Federal excise tax on communication services.

Since the commission has urgently requested the Congress to repeal this excise tax, and since I share this view and have joined many of my colleagues by introducing legislation to accomplish this, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the entire resolution of the Michigan Public Service Commission:

RESOLUTION BY STATE OF MICHIGAN BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Whereas a Federal excise tax has been and is still being imposed on the users of communication services, including local and toll telephone services; and

Whereas such tax was levied during World War II as a wartime emergency tax to help defray war costs and discourage unnecessary use of communication services; and

Whereas the wartime emergency has expired and justification no longer exists for continuing the imposition of this tax for the purpose for which it was initially levied; and

Whereas the tax on communication services imposes an undue hardship upon millions of individuals and businesses in this country and is discriminatory in that no other household utility service is taxed in like manner; and

Whereas telephone and telegraph services are a necessity in our modern society and should not be taxed as luxuries; and

Whereas removal of this tax will greatly benefit all users of communication services: Therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Michigan Public Service Commission, That it urgently requests the Congress of the United States to repeal the excise tax on communication services; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the members of the congressional delegation from Michigan; to the members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives; to the members of the Senate Finance Committee; to the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners; to the several State regulatory commissions; to the Michigan Independent Telephone Association; to the United States Independent Telephone Association; and to Michigan Bell Telephone Co.

PETER B. SPIVAK,
Chairman.
JOHN E. TORMEY,
Commissioner.
GEORGE WASHINGTON,
Commissioner.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION NEWS RELEASE

More than $38 million in telephone costs would be saved by Michigan users, Peter B. Spivak, chairman of the State public service commission, said today, if the Federal excise tax on phone use were removed.

Spivak said the PSC has forwarded a resolution to Congress requesting removal of the special tax on communication services.

He said the tax was levied during World War II as a wartime emergency measure to help defray war costs and discourage unnecessary use of communication services. These reasons obviously no longer exist.

Spivak said no similar tax exists on other household utility services.

The PSC, in requesting removal of the special charge on telephone use, stated that telephone and telegraph services are a necessity in our modern society and should not be taxed as luxuries.

Minnesota Telephone Industry Urges Repeal of Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a resolution from Mr. Keith W. Vogt, of St. Paul, Minn., on behalf of the Minnesota telephone industry, urging repeal of Federal excise taxes on communication services. I agree with the industry that these unfair taxes ought to be removed, and have already introduced a bill, H.R. 3398, which would do the job. However, I would like the industry's well-documented resolution made a matter of record. Under leave to extend my remarks, I place it in the Appendix today:

RESOLUTION BY THE STATE OF MINNESOTA TELEPHONE INDUSTRY URGING REPEAL OF FEDERAL EXCISE TAXES ON COMMUNICATION SERVICES

"Whereas the Federal excise tax was a wartime measure enlarged to include local tele-

phone service in October 1941, and the tax on all other telephone service substantially increased to produce additional emergency revenues; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has failed to repeal this tax and has continued to consider telephone service in the luxury class of jewelry, furs, luggage, cosmetics, perfumes, and other nonessential items, even though telephones have become a necessary and a vital part of every taxpayer's home and business; and

"Whereas the Federal excise tax has resulted in unfair discrimination as between telephone service and other household utility services not so taxed; and

"Whereas the Federal excise tax on telephone services forces telephone companies to collect for the Federal Government a tax which can be justified only as a revenue producer for general government operations, and this tax does not meet the usual requirements of ability to pay as a great part of the tax is derived from lower and middle income people and the 10-percent tax is imposed on all telephone users; and

"Whereas this tax is a consumer tax assessed directly against the telephone users and if repealed, no part of the tax saving could be retained by the telephone companies, but would inure to the benefit of all telephone subscribers, and, therefore, benefit the public at large; and

"Whereas the discrimination brought about by this tax has been recognized by the public at large, and numerous elected officials, civic organizations, many of the State regulatory commissions including the Minnesota commission, and the National Association of Railroad and Public Utility Commissioners have repeatedly urged Congress to repeal this tax and eliminated the existing discrimination; and

"Whereas a proposal has been made by a joint committee of State Governors and Federal officials that a portion of the 10 percent tax on telephone service be transferred to the States to help defray the cost of certain programs carried on by the States and now supported by Federal grants, thereby decreasing the Federal Government's outlay; and

"Whereas this proposal to transfer a portion of the 10 percent tax on local telephone service to the States would not eliminate the present inequities of the excise tax on telephone service, but would, in fact, foster and perpetuate the discrimination now existing: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Minnesota Telephone Association, Inc.*, That the Federal excise tax on communication services constitutes a discrimination against an essential utility service and its continuance is not in the best interest of the people and accordingly should be repealed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Telephone Association, Inc., is opposed to and urges defeat of the proposed suggestion of continuing the tax and transferring part of the revenue to the States to defray cost of certain programs, the cost of which is now being defrayed by the Federal Government, since this procedure would not eliminate the existing discrimination; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of this association is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each of the Minnesota Senators and Representatives in Congress and said secretary is further authorized and directed to urge said Senators and Representatives to support any legislation looking toward a repeal of the highly discriminatory excise tax now imposed on telephone service."

Resolution publicly read and unanimously adopted at the fifth general session of the 56th Annual Telephone Convention, held at the Radisson Hotel, Minneapolis, Minn., February 24, 1965.

Attest:

KEITH W. VOGT,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

Clausen Reports on December 1964–January 1965 Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have asked me what is being done regarding the devastating floods that hit northern California last December and January. This afternoon, I made a detailed report to the Public Works Committee's Subcommittee on Flood Control. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues and other interested parties, I am placing in the RECORD a copy of the report that I presented to this vital subcommittee:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN DON H. CLAUSEN, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL, HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, MARCH 9, 1965, ON H.R. 5478, OMNIBUS FLOOD ASSISTANCE AND RECONSTRUCTION BILL AND RELATED MATTERS

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, gentlemen, I am grateful for the opportunity of being heard on the seriousness of the many and varied problems we, and other northwest flood areas, face in recovering from the utter chaos of the rampaging December river floods. Mother nature really cut loose and the toll has been heavy in land, property, livestock and yes, even human lives. In the midst of this heartbreaking act-of-God catastrophe, I am grateful for the immediate forming of a Special Flood Control Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee to fly out and inspect the damage firsthand to get an idea of the remedial measures which might be necessary to facilitate recovery. This inspection trip was a tremendous morale booster to people who had suffered cruelly in losing their homes and property, and also, many, their very livelihood, but who despite all this adversity, were demonstrating a shadness and courageousness of spirit, that makes me proud I represent them here in the Congress. The gentlemen who were there do not have to be shown the devastating damage resulting from these unleashed floodwaters. They have an all too-vivid picture painted in their minds, as I have. They say, "seeing is believing," gentlemen, so I am going to pass around some of the pictures of the damage caused by these headlong, runaway floodwaters. The rest of you can then visualize the serious impact to the economy of our area. I might mention in passing that some of these pictures were taken from a plane that I flew over the area. We felt the trip was an essential one. There was no one else available who wanted to fly the area, so I did.

One of the first casualties of the December storm and flood was the flood warning system itself, the very piece of equipment that should have been operating full tilt to warn people to evacuate their homes and their livestock to higher ground. The storm disrupted power and telephone lines, thus cutting off communications from warning stations. No station from the more important headquarter areas was able to get through consistently throughout the storm. Of the 14 river gages used for primary forecast points, 4 were destroyed and 7 others so badly damaged no report could be made from them. To bring about the necessary expansion and improvement in the Weather Bureau's flood warning system, which experience has taught us is essential, will cost in the neighborhood of $250,000. At this point I would like to request that the full Weather Bureau report be included in the committee testimony if this has not already been done.

I have introduced three bills aimed at speeding the physical and economic recovery of the flood-torn Western States. These bills, drafted to supplement flood recovery legislation, represent nothing more than artificial respiration to a critically injured section of our Nation. The very least we must do is to breathe life into these areas. I would like to call the attention of the committee members to the fact that the people are still homeless and jobless, commerce is crippled and farms, homes and small businesses are still covered by several feet of mud and debris in areas hit by the December and January record floods.

My bill, H.R. 5478, is basically the same as the one introduced by Congressman HAROLD T. (BIZZ) JOHNSON, and that of Senator WAYNE MORSE, among others, with the addition of a number of provisions which I discovered necessary as a result of 2 months' work to help the recovery of my stricken district under present law, which would affect changes in highway repair, timber sales, aid to small businesses and farmers.

Provisions covered in my bill are:

Full repair and reconstruction of all highways and roads under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Public Roads, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including access roads under construction pursuant to agency contracts, and authority to expend up to $200 million for such repairs.

For the record, I would like to ask permission to include as a part of my testimony, letters and reports bearing on the need for this item from the following: Sam Helwer, district highway engineer, resolution of the California State Board of Forestry, the California Forest Protective Association, W. W. Spinney, Forest Supervisor of the Six Rivers National Forest, Mr. George A. Craig, secretary-manager of the Western Lumber Manufacturers, Inc.

Restoration of the forest access road system in the three Pacific Coast States and Idaho is desperately needed to minimize the effect of the recent disastrous floods on our economy. As W. D. Hagenstein, executive vice president of the Industrial Forestry Association said, "More than 400,000 people depend upon the forest industry for their livelihood in these States, and to the extent that access has been impaired, it lessens our chances of keeping people on their jobs. In this disaster, we need the same kind of support that we in the Northwest gave to the people of Alaska during their tragedy of last year."

Grant B. Potter, chairman of the California Forest Practice Committee, covers the problem we encountered very well when he stated, "When floods occurred, hundreds of timber sale operators on Federal lands had roads in various stages of construction. Hundreds of miles of such roads, as well as existing roads were damaged. Under Government timber sale contracts and cooperative road agreements, timber operators ordinarily have the responsibility for repair of winter damage. Unlike contractors for other Federal projects such as highways and bridges, timber purchasers are not protected from catastrophic damages. They cannot afford nor should they be required to insure the Federal Government in its operations against overwhelming losses due to an act of God. Therefore, the proposed legislation authorizes the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to repair the damaged roads to the extent they consider appropriate."

At this point, I would like to insert for the record, a copy of a communication just received from the Forest Service attesting to the fact that the new timber sale contract forms provide for the contingency outlined

above. Apparently this new agreement more equitably resolves the problem we ran into at present, with the purchaser forced to reconstruct whole new roads, otherwise I would have included an appropriate amendment to my bill to take care of this situation.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1965.

Hon. DON H. CLAUSEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CLAUSEN: This is in reply to your letter of March 4 in which you raise questions on contractual relationships with national forest timber purchasers in respect to purchaser-built roads under construction which were damaged by the severe floods at Christmastime on the Pacific coast.

The timber sale purchaser has the responsibility of constructing the roads essential for logging operations which are not in place at the time the sale is made. Allowance for the cost of these purchaser-built roads must necessarily be made in the timber appraisal. Thus, the price paid for the timber is adjusted for the estimated cost of the purchaser road construction.

The timber sale contract now in use makes no provision for adjustment for additional road construction work a timber purchaser must undertake as the result of floods, slides, or other comparable acts of God.

The Forest Service and timber industry representatives have been working for more than a year on the development of a revised timber sale contract form. Agreement on the revised terms has been reached and the new form will be put into use as standard procedure on July 1, 1965. One of the important revisions of contractual relationship in the new contract form is provision for adjustment of purchaser road costs resulting from a major physical change such as a slide, washout, landslip, or fire. This adjustment is applicable to roads under construction which have not yet been approved as completed. In order to be recognized, the additional work required by the purchaser must be (1) more than $1,000 for sales under 1 million board feet, (2) more than $1 per thousand board feet for sales of 1 to 3 million board feet, or (3) more than $3,000 for sales of more than 3 million board feet. The estimated additional construction costs which meet these qualifications are recognized in a manner which results in a corresponding reduction in the amount of stumpage payments due from the purchaser, subject to payment at all times of certain base stumpage rates specified in the contract.

Under this revised contractual relationship, any stumpage value in excess of base rates is available to bear the risk of cost of overcoming a major physical change during the time a purchaser-built road is under process of construction.

If there should be need for further information on this matter, we shall be glad to supply it.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD P. CLIFF, *Chief.*
By M. M. Nelson.

I have already brought this proposed amendment to the attention of the committee chairman, but I will cite it briefly at this point for the benefit of the committee members, for their later consideration:

"The subcommittee recognizes that the transportation system on the national forests will not be repaired in time to be usable during the 1965 fire season in many areas. This could cause great losses from forest fires. The Forest Service should consider alternative methods of offsetting the normal fire protection. Such items as additional helicopter crews, chemical fire retardant planes, and supplemental fire prevention and detection might be used."

If the committee does not have for their files a report from the American Forest Products Industries and the American Plywood Association indicating the effects of the flood on their industries, and a report from Fred Landenberger, of the North Coast Timber Association at Eureka, I would like to include them for the record.

Quoting in part from a letter report on the problem of repair to roads damaged on the Hoopa Indian Reservation by the recent catastrophic floods, for the committee's information, "* * * a number of these roads are needed for the protection and management of the timber and other resources on the reservation. They are of long-term value * * *." The complete text will be inserted later in the RECORD.

While on the subject of flood damage to the Indians, I am going to digress from my bill for a moment, and bring to the attention of the committee members the need for supplemental funds for the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the amount of $1.5 million to replace 107 Indian homes lost in the flood and to rehabilitate 43 damaged ones in 11 northern areas. Here I would earnestly recommend that in the matter of the site location for the Indian homes at the Resighini Rancheria that the Bureau of Indian Affairs cooperate with the local Indian community, and if possible acquire lands from private ownership at a level above the flood plain for the permanent relocation of houses that are currently underway by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. If supplemental appropriations are further required for this purpose, it would appear to be a wise investment in providing an elimination of this recurring home structure problem. This same thing would hold true on up the Klamath River, wherever Indian homes were located. There are many Indian homes located on the Indian lands in close proximity to the river from the mouth of the Klamath to above the Hoopa Reservation of Humboldt County on the Klamath and Trinity Rivers, that need attention. Many Indian families were affected that do not live on the so-called rancheria or reservation, and are sometimes overlooked.

Authority to the Government to compromise, release, or refinance loans made by the Farmers Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Administration to borrowers stricken by the recent floods.

Here, the amendments speak for themselves. The need is apparent. It's up to us to provide the remedy for curing the ailment—a dose of longer credit, reduced payments, etc., for curing an affliction created by circumstances beyond man's control.

Small Business Administration loans of up to 30 years, instead of 20, for flood victims and a $200 million fund (H.R. 5507) for such disaster loans in place of the present all-purpose fund "which went broke last November, a month before our flood disaster."

Again, the need for a longer loan period when one's resources are drained away is all too evident. The property damage runs up into hundreds of millions of dollars. There is now a supplemental appropriations request to Congress for $100 million to replace the SBA loan fund, depleted since last November 15. My aim is to urge the Appropriations Committee to process this, as well as a fund request for $25 million to the Office of Emergency Planning as rapidly as possible, so that these funds will be available for recovery purposes.

In addition, for the benefit of the committee members, even though the bill will not be considered here, but before the House Banking and Currency Committee, I thought I should apprise you of the fact that I am sponsoring a bill to provide a $200 million Small Business Administration disaster loan fund. This would be a separate disaster fund, apart from other SBA loan funds, so that funds will be available now and for future disasters.

One of our major problems has been the lack of funds available to the SBA for loans. We had to make arrangements with the private banks who responded very commendably to guarantee SBA loans, pending the receipt of funds.

Permission to the Secretary of Agriculture to make new timber sales to private bidders with only 10 days public notice to replace sales in remote areas now inaccessible because of road damage.

I am informed through a Forest Service survey that a total of 155 sales on 9 national forests were affected by the flood to an important extent. These sales include about 1½ billion board feet of timber that was scheduled to go to 72 mills which annually process 2,650 million board feet and employ 10,950 workers in the mills and woods. There were 1,429 miles of roadwork specified for construction under the 155 timber sale contracts, and 993 miles of the construction work has been accepted as completed. The 436 miles not accepted as completed have an estimated cost of $5,188,000. Some of this work was either not done or not damaged, but there was about $2,895,000 damage to roadwork that had been partially completed. Although the roads are built as part of the transportation system of the national forests, the timber purchasers would be subject to this $2.9 million loss unless the proposed legislation is enacted and funded.

Because of access problems caused by lost bridges and slides, many mills will need alternate sources of timber immediately, if they are to continue operations and provide employment. This is why it is so important to get this ruling into effect, and the Department says they need authorizing legislation to do so.

Amending Federal disaster legislation to include assistance to privately owned railroad facilities and also authorizes grants to them to compensate them for the difference between the cost of restoration of facilities damaged or destroyed in a major disaster on a normal, prudent business basis, and such cost on an expedited basis.

It would appear to be very much in the public interest to initiate a "crash" repair program, requiring larger crews, more equipment, and overtime work to put the railroads back into the business of carrying the economic lifeline of the various communities along the north coast area. At the present time the commerce of the north coast area is suffering at the rate of approximately $1 million a day, in counting some $700,000 per week in local jobs and payrolls lost. The railroad has already committed itself to repairing its Northwestern Pacific line, which received flood damage estimated at $12 million between Longvale in Mendocino County and Arcata, over 100 miles of track, and contracts already have been let to conduct the repairs according to normal, prudent business practices. This is estimated to require 6 to 7 months. It would seem to be pound wise and penny foolish if the Government doesn't authorize and finance this crash repair in addition to the normal repair process now being conducted by the railroad. The estimated cost is $3 million. I hope the committee will see its way clear to recommend that this legislation be enacted. To further substantiate the need for keeping traffic and freight moving, and increasing employment at the same time, I'm attaching several reports to be included as a part of the record; one from Dave James, Simpson Timber, and the other by Frank Blagen, of the Georgia-Pacific Corp. There will be representatives of the line to tell their story here, so I won't go into more detail at this time. I might add that the railroad and the ICC cooperated fully in reducing rail rates from Grants Pass, Oreg., to Coos Bay, as well as earlier putting into effect lower rail rates from Redding and Anderson for products trucked to and from the Humboldt County area and from Ukiah and Willits for commerce involving the Humboldt and Men-

docino County areas. These moves are doing much to help restore industry and jobs to the flood devastated north coast area.

While I'm on the subject of transportation, although there is nothing in my bill pertaining to it, I would like to bring to the committee's attention the major role the aviation segment of the transportation industry played in the rescue, recovery, and rehabilitation program. Additional emergency landing aids and services were put into action to act as a supplement to local navigational and landing aids. It would appear that the Federal Aviation Agency would be well advised to carefully evaluate this disaster with a view toward early improvement of the landing aid systems, as our experiences showed this was an area requiring attention.

The recurring and prevalent storm conditions on the north coast of California, Oregon and Washington would suggest the possible annual need of equipment and would provide the maximum reliability of schedules for commercial airline and general aviation users during periods of emergency. The Federal Government recognized the problem by directing the aircraft carrier *Bennington* to the area to assist. Many of the communities were totally isolated until some of the highways were converted to airstrips, thereby permitting the transportation of people and goods to isolated sections of the counties. With this in mind, and considering other possible disasters throughout the Nation, the Roads Subcommittee and the FAA might consider acquiring additional rights-of-way along the Interstate Highway System to permit the construction of flight strips to be used under similar emergencies.

One-year credit at interest of 3 percent for farmers purchasing surplus grain stocks from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

This provision would permit farmers to buy surplus Government grain on short-term credit to help replace their lost cattle feed supplies. Up to now, Department of Agriculture officials have interpreted the law to require cash on such sales. Under present law, they are permitted to grant credit of up to 20 years for sales of surplus U.S. grain made to foreign countries. My bill would permit credit of up to 1 year at 3 percent interest (similar to rate of interest extended through the Farmers Home Administration).

While I have requested an official departmental ruling as to whether the Commodity Credit Corporation may grant credit to farmers for the purchase of surplus feed grains for livestock, this has not yet been forthcoming. I have therefore drawn up the necessary legislative language to accomplish this purpose, since they did not believe they had the necessary authority to do so under present law.

I think it's in order at this time for me to make a few candid, frank comments on the amount of paperwork, etc., that it takes to attempt to get some surplus grain into the hands of some of our needy farmers. There should be some way to eliminate what is, in effect, a ridiculous situation, or at least simplifying the whole procedure to a considerable degree. For the record, I am enclosing a report from a constituent of my district, indicating the absurdity of the situation. Surely this can be reasoned out so that we aren't paying to keep a surplus on hand that we're supposedly trying our best to get off our backs. It's almost like a dog chasing its own tail.

Insofar as other farm aid is concerned, President Johnson has a request before the Congress for supplemental appropriations of $10 million for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service to pay 80 percent of the cost of restoring flood damaged farmlands. Presently available funds for this purpose amount to less than 15 percent of the need, which is expected to be $585,000 in Humboldt County, and $300,000 in Del Norte County. I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in asking for rapid approval of the $10 million supplemental appropriation so that reseeding of heavily silted farmlands and other farm conservation works can be started immediately.

The problem of long-term credit of up to 3 years on Farmers Home Administration loans was also brought to our attention. Some Humboldt County farmers, particularly grade b dairymen, could use a 3-year payback on FHA loans because of their monumental task of rebuilding their farms and the relatively narrow margin of profit involved. This hasn't been completely resolved yet.

There are several other areas which may require attention; one, the schools damaged in the disaster may require additional funding. Federal agencies are assisting in cooperating with local officials to iron out some of the problems. The committee has before it the full details of the damage to the Klamath Union School District.

Another are which conceivably could require supplemental funds is the area of sewage and water systems. We have a number of these in our flood disaster area which have been badly damaged, or even completely demolished—some privately owned; others, city works. At present, we have several agencies involved in resolving repairs and improvements—Housing and Home Finance, Community Facilities, etc.

A study by the Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA) to determine alternate disaster insurance and other methods of providing assistance to victims of future natural disaster.

The losses incurred by the ravages of the flood disaster stretch into the millions of dollars, presenting an almost insurmountable and unpredictable burden for the private citizen and industry to rebuild. There should be some type of a coordinated approach to provide protection against these losses and I am hopeful that a broad-based hazard insurance program in this field could feasibly be set up through present private insurer procedures if coupled with a federally underwritten reinsurance program somewhat like the Federal Reserve bank program in the banking field.

I have received numerous letters asking if there isn't some type of help available for private property owners. Many of them are really caught in a bind in a natural disaster situation like this—out of a job, their homes and property lost. This measure would provide an answer, worthy of further exploration and study.

While we have recovery and rehabilitation measures that are occupying most of our time and attention now, I do want to stress to the committee the continuing threat to these communities until such time as we can contract adequate flood control projects; therefore, I cannot overemphasize the importance of the Congress doing everything possible to encourage the agencies of the Federal Government to cooperate with the State of California in providing on a "crash" basis, the earliest possible flood control relief programs.

Attention must be given to the need for expediting flood control in the Del Norte County area. I would urge the committee to request the Corps of Engineers to concentrate their energies on the flood control protective study of the Smith River in the delta.

Of equally great importance, too, would be adequate watershed protective measures. This whole problem should be thoroughly evaluated and considered, taking the type of terrain into consideration.

It would be advisable that the Corps of Engineers give adequate consideration to the drift into Crescent City Harbor and devise recommendations for harbor protection for the fishing fleet, tugs and barges, and other users of shipping for maximum protection against restriction of navigation in and out of the harbor. One of the pictures which I passed amongst you gives you a fair idea of the debris completely surrounding our fishing fleet.

Consideration should be given to the tsunami study on the Crescent City Harbor, to supplement the model study on Crescent City Harbor. I believe the committee should recognize among other things, that Crescent City was the recipient of wave action created by the Alaskan earthquake that caused major damage to the downtown section of Crescent City, either destroying completely or extensively damaging business buildings to such an extent that a complete redevelopment project is now underway, in cooperation with the Urban Renewal Agency. However, with the continuing threat of tidal wave action, a cloud continues to hang over the finance capabilities for redevelopment of the community and will continue to be a problem until such time as adequate protective works for tidal wave action is recommended and constructed. A similar situation exists in Hilo, Hawaii. It is possible that much of the information gained from the model study to Hilo could be appropriately applied to the Crescent City configuration.

High priority should be given to the Klamath relocation. The people of the community have recommended a site location to the Corps of Engineers. The corps is presently studing the feasibility of the project, which should be developed jointly with the Division of Highways of the State of California. The division of highways currently has planned for construction a bridge and freeway near the community of Klamath that will require flood protective works of its own. Again, it would appear to be in the best interests of the people of Klamath of the State of California and of the Federal Government to expedite a cooperative relocation project and to encourage the business community of Klamath to only build temporary business facilities until such time as a complete recommendation can be prepared.

The levee breakage at Blue Lake, a recently completed Corps of Engineers project on the Mad River, indicates that a more comprehensive study of flood control recommendations is necessary on the entire Mad River complex. The Corps of Engineers recently held public hearings in Humboldt County and recommendations are forthcoming.

I would wholeheartedly urge that there be full interagency cooperation to facilitate multiple-purpose development of the Eel River complex. The Chief of the Corps of Engineers, when visiting in the area, very strongly recommended this, as did Commissioner Floyd Dominy of the Bureau of Reclamation.

It would certainly appear that the State and Federal agencies would be well advised to cooperate with local sponsoring political subdivisions in establishing early priority for watershed development and flood control development projects in the entire Eel River complex.

I have a number of resolutions from local and county governmental bodies, urging that prompt action be taken to implement this project, and I would like to include them in the record of committee testimony. Attached are resolutions from the city council of the city of Ferndale, the board of supervisors of the county of Humboldt, the board of supervisors of the county of Marin, and the Sonoma County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Other supporting resolutions include: Hon. Fred F. Thevenin, mayor of Eureka, Calif.; Mrs. Anna L. Myers, city clerk, Trinidad, Calif.; Mr. William E. Duncan, chairman of the board of supervisors of the county of Yolo, Calif.; Mr. Robert E. Hannon, chairman of the board of supervisors of the county of Alameda, Calif.; Mr. Earle W. Wrieden, chairman of the board of supervisors of the county of Lake, Calif.; Mr. E. T. Johnson, clerk of the board of

supervisors of the county of Merced, Calif.; Mrs. Florence Davis, deputy clerk of the board of supervisors of the county of Santa Cruz, Calif.; and the chairman and members of the board of supervisors of the county of Trinity, Calif.

The severity of the damage brings home to us, all too vividly, the imperative need to harness the killer eel, as it has been called.

I firmly believe that the entire cost-benefit ratio criteria should be carefully evaluated. It would appear there is a strong need to change the present ratio. Consideration should be given to more recognition of future economic development potential, rather than after the fact. Currently, the cost-benefit ratio, as I understand it, is based upon protection to existing buildings and property. By changing the cost-benefit ratio, protective works can be built as security against floods, thus encouraging economic development.

This committee is certainly familiar with the growth factors in areas where flood control works have been constructed or completed. Some more study must be given to this for overall economic justification of future projects. Consideration of these established growth factors should be given.

The Corps of Engineers, I believe, has expressed their hope for a liberalization of the criteria of costs and benefits used in deciding whether a project is feasible or not, and also mentioned the benefits of the 1958 Water Supply Act in easing local burdens.

During a recent meeting with the Eel River Flood Control and Conservation Association, Assemblywoman Pauline Davis, coauthor of the well-known Davis-Grunsky Water Projects Act in California, alluded to the fact that the State of California was going to have to give similar consideration to this approach, and indicated her desire to provide the legislative leadership to bring this about.

I would sincerely hope that the committee would be so inclined, and I feel well advised, to recommend to our full Public Works Committee an early study and evaluation of this "new concept."

The presently authorized levee construction project on Redwood Creek near Orick in Humboldt County appears to be adequate and all that is required is the necessary financing to complete the construction at the earliest possible date, thereby saving many millions in property damage.

For the record, I would like to enclose some pictures and clippings, substantiating some of the statements I have made.

I am asking the corps to make a comprehensive study of bank protection in the Rio Dell area.

Frankly, I could write a book on the specific damage to the many sections of Humboldt, which was the hardest hit of all the areas visited during the committee visit to California, Oregon, and Washington.

The overwhelming problem, of course, has been the restriction on transportation, truck, rail, and barge. This restriction limits the ability of the economy to give impetus to the recovery and will leave its mark on this region of northern California for many years to come. People and businesses all over the Nation are affected because of their inability to receive the forest industry products through normal transportation means.

Certainly, we in the Congress have a stake in the outcome.

The communities of Pepperwood, Shively, Holmes, Weott, and Myers Flat were nearly all wiped out and we have underway a recommendation to assist in relocating these people and their buildings to higher ground. The water and sewage systems of Rio Dell, Alderpoint, Redway, Rhonerville, Hydesville, and others have all been lost or damaged. Garberville was totally isolated.

Our most pressing problem is the health hazards and the potential fire hazard to communities.

The Redwood Memorial Hospital had a fund drive underway to finance the local sponsorship requirement under Hill-Burton. This obviously was brought to a screeching halt.

While the heaviest amount of damage actually occurred in Humbolt and Del Norte Counties of my districts, there was also extraordinary damage in Mendocino, Sonoma, and Marin Counties. Though less spectacular and less publicized, let me assure the committee that by normal standards, the overall losses would be shocking.

The usual debris problem has clogged creeks and rivers, bridges and roads were knocked out resulting in the restriction to normal traffic. As in the Covelo section, the damage is beyond the local people's ability to repair. The Corps of Engineers and the OEP are alerted to this need.

The roads connecting Covelo, Willits, Fort Bragg, and Ukiah were all severely gutted placing an impossible financial and work load on the county of Mendocino and its crews.

The Geysersville, Guerneville, and Sebastopol sections were hit hardest in Sonoma County. It is generally agreed by the people and flood control officials of Sonoma that the overall damage would have been greatly minimized if the authorized Warm Springs-Dry Creek Dam was built so I cannot urge too strongly the earliest appropriation of funds to complete this vital project.

The spawning beds of the streams have been destroyed so we must develop a program of fishery enhancement to restore this valuable resource.

At this point, I would like to insert a copy of a speech I delivered to the Eel River Flood Control and Water Conservation Association on October 9, 1964—about 2 months before the flood disaster.

I believe some of the comments and recommendations made in the speech would be of appropriate interest and benefit to the committee and other Members of Congress in light of what has happened. Also an excellent editorial in the San Rafael Independent Journal inserted following the speech, clearly spells out the local action that is taking place.

"REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN DON H. CLAUSEN, EEL RIVER FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION MEETING, UKIAH, CALIF., OCTOBER 9, 1964

"Gentlemen and water experts, it is a real pleasure to meet again with the Eel River Flood Control and Water Conservation Association. All of us have become friends as well as working partners over a number of years. This close working relationship is exceptionally good because I happen to feel that this organization has to carry the bulk of the load in putting forth a unified effort toward proper development of the water resources of the north coast on behalf of its people. And, so, you have seen a great deal of me in the past and you will see a great deal more in the future.

"The intensified unified effort I mention is mandatory right now. The reasons are simple. You already know, but it won't hurt to repeat for general edification, that the north coast contains 41 percent of the water in the State of California. It also contains almost all of the uncommitted water rights in the State of California. The north coast has approximately 30 million acre-feet of water—a fact that amazed key Congressmen in Washington.

"We already have the massive Eel River complex under intensive study by the Government at the State and Federal levels. Other interests are giving an immediate and long look at other major watersheds on the north coast.

"For instance, people along the Klamath River have expressed concern to me that Hoopa Valley may, in the future, be flooded by a giant reservoir. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the U.S. Department of Interior is conducting right now a study of the possibility of placing 12 major rivers—including the Klamath—into a wild river system to preserve them in their natural free-flowing state.

"There appears to be a great body of support for the wild river concept, which, I am frank to admit, is very appealing to me. This proposal, of course, will require careful study to determine the exact extent of Government controls the Department of Interior would want to place on the area—not only on the river itself but on its watershed. Any Government program of this sort will naturally recommend a certain amount of restrictions or controls. It is important that these controls be evaluated to determine whether they would be more far reaching than the people would want to accept.

"Then there is the Knights Valley project and the studies underway. Decisions are being made right now on whether Eel River water should be transported east into the Sacramento Valley or whether it should be sent south via the Russian River to Knights Valley for the North Bay area and via Clear Lake-Berryessa to the Delta. Such decisions are critical to the southern counties of the north coast.

"While it is probably true that in order to meet the needs of southern California the northern streams will ultimately have to be transported to the southern part of California, but prior to this time considerable thought and study must be given to the various alternate programs that are being proposed in order that local areas and, in general, northern California is adequately protected. It is not only necessary that they be protected from a total water quantity standpoint, but they should also be protected from a 'water quality' standpoint.

"As an example, what I am referring to is the idea of the State to move Eel River water over into the Sacramento River and by so doing take a good, clear, Eel River water, mix it with a contaminated Sacramento River water and then propose to transport water from the Sacramento River back into Marin, Sonoma, and Napa by the proposed North Bay aqueduct. A far more logical procedure would be to transport the estimated amount of water for southern California by diversion to the Sacramento, but diverting the water required for the aforementioned counties through inland streams where it can be protected and maintained in its pure and wholesome state. This is not only an esthetic situation but also one of economics, as once you take a good, pure water and contaminate it the cost is considerably more to make it potable again.

"With the interest in West Marin County it is becoming apparent that this territory is not going to remain a "sleeping dog" settlement, but with the coming of Point Reyes National Park the population is going to move out into that area. This then brings into focus the proposed State study of north coast streams in which we are particularly interested. Whether it be the State or Federal agencies that make these studies, it is extremely important that they be made and with as little delay as possible.

"The point I am making is this. We have major developments that call for immediate and full-scale attention. We have major projects—such as the Eel River complex—that affect development in several counties. We have major diversionary works and other projects which likewise cover several counties.

"It behooves us to pool our efforts so that we can do a more complete job of gathering information on these developments—thereby minimizing duplications and promoting efficiency.

"We must unify strongly so that the decisions on how to handle the development of the north coast represent the total thinking of all of the counties affected without jeopardizing individual county water development project objectives. And, third, so

that these decisions will be backed by the unified political strength of all of the counties together. This simply means that our voice will be stronger and our effect greater in the State and Federal Governments and in their legislative bodies. The vital protection for the areas of origin will be greatly enhanced.

"I would cite the results of my constituent poll to show that the people of this area are strongly in favor of such action. I asked voters all over my district—and received some 20,000 answers to this question:

"Do you favor north coast counties entering into intercounty agreements to guarantee their own future water supplies than interagency (local, State, Federal) agreements for project development of the surplus? The answers were 78.8 percent in favor of this concept, 6.6 percent against and 14.7 percent no opinion.

"Of all of the questions asked, I consider this one to have been the most significant. It certainly indicates strong backing for this organizational approach and can well serve to suggest the people are behind us.

"For these reasons, I fully support the proposals to provide a full-time staff to perform the necessary research and correlating activities of an intensified effort. I further would strongly urge the adoption of a 'joint exercise of powers agreement' between the counties of this organization so that its work can be better coordinated and expedited for the benefit of all. This would bind the counties together by formal agreement so that the organization's bargaining power and guarantee of continuity will be greatly strengthened. This is certainly in keping with our home rule theme.

"The Eel River diversion works, especially, create an immediate problem because of the State's apparent inclination to transport the water to the east into the Sacramento Valley. My own feeling is that it would be of special benefit to the North Bay counties to have a southerly diversion so that their immediate needs could be met and they would be in a better physical position to recapture any water that is needed in the future.

"Not only is your unified strength needed on this problem, but it also is needed to achieve a just and practical solution to the immediate problem of water shortage in the Napa Valley. We already have the Corps of Engineers Knights Valley project which will be ready for authorization by the Congress next year. With minor adjustments, this project can be tailored to meet Napa County's water shortage and still provide municipal and industrial water to Sonoma County and its customers at no greater price.

"This, I think, must be done. Accordingly, my major announcement to you today is this:

"I have asked the staff of my Public Works Committee to conduct research, with the purpose of drafting legislation, for separate consideration or inclusion in the omnibus public works bill of 1965.

"Pending confirmation and agreement from the counties involved, I hope to work toward the common objective of:

"1. Authorizing the Corps of Engineers to build the project.

"2. Recognize the advantages, under reclamation law, and permit the Bureau of Reclamation to handle the distribution of water for Napa County.

"This arrangement, which at present appears to have the broadest areawide support, would place Napa County in a position to receive water from the Knights Valley Reservoir.

"Calistoga, in particular, and Napa County generally are in desperate need of water resources. Further, this feature will provide agricultural water to the Napa Valley at a price farmers can afford to pay.

"The details, of course, will have to be worked out by the agencies and counties involved. However, I am sure you all will agree that our major purposes will be served by leaving the door open for joint efforts on the project by the Bureau and the corps.

"Officials of both of these agencies have assured me that they will cooperate fully on a joint effort. Naturally, since the Bureau of Reclamation has not yet completed its feasibility studies, the language of the bill will have to be couched so as to leave the door wide open for the Bureau's participation.

"For the gratification of Sonoma County, I might point out that Mr. N. B. Bennett, Jr., Acting Commissioner of the Bureau in the absence of Commissioner Floyd Dominy, recently assured me 'unequivocally' that the cost of water to Sonoma County would be no higher under a joint development. 'In fact,' he said, 'the economies inherent in multiple-purpose development may result in a lesser cost being allocated to those (the corps') purposes.'

"Now, to get back to the Eel River complex, the benefits of such a project will be far-reaching and highly desirable. For instance, Commissioner Dominy reports to me that the coast area north of the Russian River basin produces some 25 million acre-feet of runoff each year. At the same time, current water use in the same area amounts to about 76,000 acre-feet per year. Far into the future, the north area will need at least another million acre-feet plus water needed for fish protection and enhancement. That means something over 20 million acre-feet will be left—so I guess everyone can appreciate why we have a monstrous flood problem up north.

"I might say also that key Members of Congress are deeply interested in these facts. I might mention Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, who is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and my good friend Congressman JOHN RHODES, also of Arizona, who is a ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee. However, there is a great demand for our surplus water not only from the dry areas of the southwest but from California itself, and the needs ranging from the delta south should be met first.

"The point I am making is this. The future of the north coast lies in exporting its excess water after our own future needs are guaranteed. Not only will the Eel River complex and others promote fish and wildlife enhancement, boating, camping, touring and other recreation, it will provide the major flood control relief which is so sorely needed.

"Recreation and fish and wildlife are major factors in the economic potential of northwest California. Stream flows often are so low during summer months that they are not suitable for fishery or recreation. Extreme flood flows also are detrimental to these functions. Large reservoirs constructed on the upper reaches of the streams would provide important economic benefits through enhancement of recreation, fish and wildlife and water quantity and quality control.

"Flood control is very important. For instance, Commissioner Dominy says three dams on the upper Eel River would be in a position to control about 26 percent of the total Eel River runoff. Studies show that nearly all of the December 1955 flood originating above the damsites would have been caught in the reservoirs. This means, of course, that the reservoirs would have to be regulated so that there is storage space. Such flood control, combined with the Corps of Engineers modified flood control plan for the Eel River Delta, could provide almost 100 percent flood control on the Eel.

"With the mounting support for the wild river concept adoption on the Klamath River, increased attention should be given to the Eel River development.

"It becomes increasingly evident that interagency cooperation (local, State and Federal) for the construction of multiple-purpose reservoirs and diversion systems that will provide downstream flood control relief has the enthusiastic support of an overwhelming majority of my constituency. So, I believe we should jointly promote the earliest concentration on the Eel River complex."

"[From the San Rafael (Calif.) Independent Journal, Feb. 23, 1965]

"MARIN NEEDS TO JOIN IN EEL RIVER WATER PLAN

"The Eel River Association, now an informal group embracing nine north coast counties, plans to hire a full-time secretary-manager and set up permanent headquarters.

"It's going to cost each member county some $5,000 annually to set up an office and send a full-time representative to fight for north coast water interests in Sacramento and in Washington.

"On first thought, you wonder why Marin County enters the picture at all. In fact, some of the Marin supervisors are privately expressing doubts that they can justify spending that kind of money when Marin gets no immediate and direct benefit.

"But there is a broader view they should consider.

"Even now, the North Marin Water District is receiving water via pipeline from the Russian River, which in turn is fed partially from the Eel.

"Both William Seeger of Marin Municipal Water District and Jerome Gilbert of North Marin Water District foresee that by the turn of the century (that's only 35 years from now), Marin will have to turn to the Eel River for water supply.

"Development of dams on the Eel River is already in the works. The principal aim of the State-authorized Middle Fork project on the Eel is to pipe water to southern California.

"North coast counties need an effective voice now while the Eel water projects are in the planning stage and before the project is frozen, to the benefit of other areas like Southern California and to our exclusion.

"This is where a full-time secretary-manager of the Eel River Association, call him a lobbyist if you will, enters the picture.

"How could this man, getting a salary of $15,000 per year or more, lobby for Marin's interests?

"Take the Middle Fork project on the Eel. The State has authorized the project, and the next step is to get appropriations.

"The Eel River secretary-manager, with the north coast counties united behind him, could urge that the appropriations be stepped up. He could keep in constant touch with the State legisature and with Congress, and with planners working on the location of dams and pipelines to make sure that the primary aim of the project will be to assure water to the north coast counties at least possible cost.

"The Eel River "watchdog" could also fight for recreation and fishing areas to be developed along with the dams so that northern California will get the maximum benefit in water supply and in recreation.

"In statewide projects such as water development, Marin or Sonoma County cannot 'go it alone.'

"If the Eel is to be the ultimate source of water for Marin, the most effective way to protect that interest is to step in during the planning stage—now—with an effective voice. At the moment, providing the Eel River Association with a paid staff appears to be the best way to give the north coast counties that effective voice.

"We hope that the supervisors of the north coast counties, including Marin, will look to our long-range interest when the Eel River Association asks them to join in the joint-powers agreement."

The Petaluma River, Sonoma Creek, Napa River all were damaged and will require the attention of our Public Works Committee as we consider the omnibus public works bill.

In Marin County, the Novato Creek and other streams did their share of damage but the Corte Madera Creek damage appears to be the most extensive. Inasmuch as the College of Marin has extensive expansion programs underway, it becomes increasingly urgent to step-up the construction of the project. Again an editorial by the Independent Journal succinctly expresses the sentiments of the people of Marin County.

"[From the San Rafael (Calif.) Independent Journal, Feb. 22, 1965]

"TIME IS NOW FOR WORK ON FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

"Marin County got off relatively unscathed in last December's devastating floods that hit the northern counties.

"But we can't afford to keep pushing our luck indefinitely.

"The Corte Madera flood control project is a must. The Marin County Board of Supervisors have asked for immediate construction of the downstream portion of Corte Madera Creek, from the Granton Park area in Kentfield to the bay.

"While the December floods are still fresh in mind, this is a good time to give the Corte Madera flood control project a big push.

"We are aware that residents in the upstream area, from San Anselmo to Fairfax, are concerned about preserving some of the esthetic beauty of the natural creek setting. They don't want a solid mass of concrete cutting through the center of town.

"But this should not be allowed to interfere with immediate construction of the downstream half of the creek, where much of the damage occurs in flood years.

"In the lower portion, the need to protect lives and property will have to take precedence over aesthetic considerations.

"The extent of the flood problem in the lower half of Corte, Madera Creek is pointed up in a report prepared by the College of Marin.

"The college is directly concerned because a portion of the creek runs through the campus, and the college area is hardest hit by flood waters. During severe flooding, as much as two-thirds of the campus area is under water. You probably recall pictures of students water-skiing on the inundated athletic field.

" 'Damage caused by flooding of the Corte Madera Creek amounts to an average of more than a quarter million dollars yearly,' the college report points out. And the bulk of that damage occurs in the downstream half of the creek, including the college area.

"Most of the cost of the $6.8 million project will come from Federal funds, and some from the State. The local share will amount to only about $26,000 annually for maintenance, operation and repair, a small price to pay for the tremendous benefits that will be forthcoming.

"The flood plan, as worked out by the Army Corps of Engineers, calls for an earth-banked channel from the bay to a point just downstream of College Avenue, then a concrete lined channel through the college area and upstream.

"Upstream communities like Ross, San Anselmo, and Fairfax may be able to afford thinking in terms of balancing flood control with aesthetic beauty.

"But the downstream areas, particularly College of Marin and Kentfield, need immediate flood protection, even at the possible sacrifice of some esthetics."

I might add here that we have done much work with the staff of this committee to assist them in seeing that most of the problems that have currently been brought to our attention will be included in the final report, but it should be pointed out further that with the overall devastation of the area, it is possible for new problems to crop up in the future, and we would appreciate the committee keeping the record open for a reasonable time should later requests be brought to our attention.

In closing, may I commend the armed services—Army, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard, for their wonderful help which they gave so willingly and without reservation. The American Red Cross, Salvation Army, church organizations and a multitude of volunteer groups gave unselfishly of their aid. There are so many who put their "shoulders to the wheel" and worked side by side from the board of supervisors, city, civil defense and county officials, farmers, townspeople, to the Federal agencies giving disaster assistance. However, I cannot adequately express my appreciation to the chairman and members of this committee for visiting the area personally to view the extent of the damage. I am sure you will all agree that one has to see it, to believe the total devastation of the region. This you have done and the people of my congressional district shall remain forever grateful.

War in Vietnam—XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include part XI of a report by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for The Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on his recent trip to Vietnam.

Part XI, which appeared in this newspaper on March 3, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, XI—SKY RAIDERS BLAST VIETCONG HIDEOUT

(NOTE.—Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, tells of riding in a single-engined Sky Raider during an Air Force attack on a Vietcong hideout.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

BIEN HOA AIRBASE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"It was," said Air Force Capt. Charles C. Vasiliadi of Huntington, Long Island upon return to 34th Tactical Group headquarters, "a very fine job. Twenty-nine hooches and there's plenty of those Vietcong dead over there now."

Even in my benumbed state after going along on a Sky Raider (A1E) fighter-bomber mission and my amazement at finding myself all in one piece, I managed to ask, "What's a hooch?"

The captain explained that it wasn't whisky cellars that were being destroyed at the Vietcong village 55 miles southwest of Saigon, but native huts of the Communists.

DESTRUCTION

I can personally testify that all of the huts I saw riddled by bombs, napalm and cannon fire, were indeed in the process of destruction, but I will confess that I didn't find time to count them, even though the chase plane in which I was permitted to ride, made five passes over the area, two at 20 feet off the ground.

I guess I was just too busy recovering from the approximately 4 g.'s (pull of gravity) when our plane pulled out of its 5,000-foot dive on the first three passes, and too preoccupied with my morbid curiosity as to whether Vietcong fire might abruptly end my correspondent's career on the last two skim-throughs.

Actually, as our pilot, Lt. Col. Garth L. Reynolds, deputy commander for operations of the 34th Group, assured me over the intercom, flying low is the safest way to do it because the plane roars over the area too close and too fast for the enemy to take effective aim.

UNSETTLING

But an awareness that there still might be some Vietcong hiding in foxholes or nearby trees was somewhat unsettling. However, perhaps my greatest shock had come moments earlier when on the fourth pass on nearing the ground I heard a loud burst of cannon fire and wondered whether my number was up.

Actually, the noise came from our own 22-millimeter cannons, two protruding from each wing, as the colonel strafed the ground for the Vietcong, who had earlier, I was told, opened fire on our craft. I had missed this fire, but the colonel said some of the bullets came over our canopy, entitling him to return the fire.

Because this is a civil war, the South Vietnamese insist that on any bombing raids each Sky Raider have one of their countrymen along on each plane.

SHOOT BACK

The chase plane was not so equipped, but the rules of the games permit such planes to shoot back if first fired upon.

The bombing and strafing took only a few minutes of an afternoon I shall not soon forget.

For a half hour, Captain Vasiliadi briefed three other American pilots upon their mission of interdiction, or wiping out of an enemy village. Soon after they equipped me with a parachute, Mae West life preserver and even a .38 caliber revolver just in case.

By 1:35 p.m., the five single-engine Sky Raiders were warming up and not long after "Beaver 83," as the mission was called, was airborne.

MARK TARGET

At 2 p.m., a small air controller plane joined the group. Its responsibility is to lead the way to the target and mark it.

At 2:15 p.m., the air controller laid down two smoke grenades on the ground, perhaps 1,000 feet apart, indicating the direction of the bomb run.

Less than a minute later, the No. 1 plane, piloted by Captain Vasiliadi, peeled off for the kill. He was followed in quick succession by Sky Raiders piloted by Capt. William J. Richardson of Gilbert, Mass., Capt. Richard H. Head of Lexington, N.H., and Capt. Richard H. Head of Des Moines, Iowa. Our plane peeled off closely behind.

SMOKE VISIBLE

The ground rose up swiftly as our plane streaked toward the Vietcong village. Before it leveled and our plane pulled sharply up, I could see that the first batch of 500 pound general purpose bombs, two with VT fuses that made them burst with shrapnel just above the ground, had done their deadly work and thick, dark smoke was billowing upward.

The dive-bombing was repeated until some 9,000 pounds of bombs, including seven 500-pound general purpose ones, four 270-pound fragmentation ones, four 125-pound fragmentary clusters and six 20-pound fragmentation bombs, had been dropped.

Then the planes headed back to the base with no casualties and not the slightest nick on any of the Sky Raiders.

SUPREMACY

Although our forces do have complete air supremacy in South Vietnam, a Skyraider mission is always not quite that easy. Sometimes the ground fire is deadlier, as I learned that afternoon at the officers' club. I talked with Lt. Kemp P. "Buddy" Roedema of Gar-

field, N.J., whose Skyraider had been so badly damaged by Vietcong ground fire that he had to bail out over enemy territory.

While bullets whined around him, he ran for cover and hid under a log. The Vietcong searched diligently for him and came within 20 feet, but couldn't find him.

Meanwhile, armed U.S. helicopters winged their way to the area and hovered in the area of the downed craft. For a while, Roedema dared not stir despite the nearness of the whirlybirds, for fear of getting shot if he made a break for it.

RESCUE CRAFT

One of the choppers left and the other was about to pull out, too, when Roedema made his break. Apparently out of respect for the cannon and rocket power of the helicopter, the Reds retired and the lieutenant made it safely to the rescue plane.

For those who think that we are not winning and cannot win this war, there is a great object lesson in the way our mission was pulled off. The estimates of the killed enemy were not available, but it is reasonable to assume that more than 100 of the Vietcong were killed in their mooches and foxholes, while not a single casualty was inflicted on our side.

OPERATIONS

As Colonel Reynolds had told me in an earlier briefing, the Vietcong enemy losses from the 34th Tactical Group operations in December had been in excess of 2,600 and the indications were that the January toll will be even higher.

Compare this with only 59 airmen from our side killed since the war began, and the lesson becomes obvious. It is not unreasonable to assume that this tremendous disparity in losses may eventually jolt Ho Chi Minh and the North Vietnamese guerrilla war leaders into calling off their war.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that an able and articulate young constituent of mine, Mr. Peter De Rose, has been selected as New York State's winner in the Veterans of Foreign Wars' Voice of Democracy contest. Mr. De Rose won this honor with his fine essay "The Challenge of Citizenship," which I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD.

The essay follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Peter De Rose, Bronx, N.Y.)

According to popular repute, the role of the 20th century citizen is insignificant, as small as a drop of water in the ocean, which seeking to find its fellow drop loses itself in the wide sea. According to this source, the citizen of today has no control over the problems arising from the atomic bomb or automation; his own personal ideas and reflections are tossed aside when matters such as Berlin and birth control are discussed; and, according to this same popular opinion, he is never consulted when policies concerning communism, the Congo, and Cuba are at stake. To some extent, this belief does contain a certain degree of truth. But I do not completely agree with all of its implications. In short, I do not believe that the role of the 20th century citizen has been weakened so much as to render it ineffective. I know there are those who will disagree with me, those who will object that because the population of America and of the world has spiraled so rapidly the views of one are inconsequential to the government of the masses. I am cognizant of this objection, but I refute it, and I challenge those who undermine the worth of the individual to prove their citizenship.

I am a sovereign citizen of the United States. I am the source of the authority of the Government. I have upon my shoulders the preservation of this great boon of freedom and opportunity for which others in the past have paid so dearly. It is my responsibility to inform myself; I owe it to myself and to my county to formulate my own conclusions on vital national issues as carefully as if I were actually sitting in the President's chair. It is my responsibility to learn to think clearly, to collect and evaluate evidence, to learn to distinguish between propaganda and truth. It is my responsibility to read and scrutinize the news, to understand the nature of the news, to extract and prescind the facts from the editorial bias that often distorts its objectivity, and to make due allowances for my own self-interests and prejudices. But knowledge is not enough; I must be able to express myself, to share my information with others publicly and privately; to that end I was given the right to vote, to privately manifest my own wishes to the public. I must be conscious, too, that I ought not to hold fast to my opinions as though they were political dogmas, that I should not hesitate to change my mind when stronger arguments supersede them, that I should not be embarrassed when introduced to new ideas. I must be tolerant of opposing viewpoints, to have an independent conclusion by the best light I have but with a certain respect for the person whose viewpoint I do not share. I must be loath to impugn motives or to engage in personality attacks; I must recognize that difference of opinion in a democracy is wholesome. Finally, if this is truly to be one nation under God, I must seek and listen for divine guidance, to join with others in the infinite fellowship of a small group for discussion and prayer and find that great increase of power and strength in such fellowship, to live totally and to live every moment.

Again, I repeat: I am a sovereign citizen of the United States. I am the source of the authority of the Government. I do not agree with those who underestimate the awesome power of the individual and, in turn, neglect their own personal responsibilities on the grounds of a false assumption—and a foolish assumption at that—who, by their own apathy, ignorance, and confusion conclude that the role of the 20th century citizen is insignificant, and I challenge them to prove their citizenship.

American Tourism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, the term "American Tourism" can no longer be classified as a minor segment of our Nation's economy. Recent problems and statistics have now placed American tourism in the realm of big business with all the incentive and motivation that apply to the multibillion-dollar industry of today.

One of the major problems facing our Nation in this era of rapid transportation is that the United States, through its tourists, spend more money in foreign countries than foreign visitors spend in the United States. Recent figures indicate that over 2 million Americans traveled abroad last year and spent $3 billion in foreign markets. In contrast, foreign visitors to the U.S. number approximately 900,000 and they spent about $1½ billion. Obviously, these figures place Americans in an unfavorable position of losing approximately $1½ billion each year.

The Government and people of the United States are well aware of this pressing problem. Americans have been motivated to become more familiar with their own country and to visit the historic and scenic areas of our land.

According to the Automobile Association of America, approximately 8 million Americans visited the State of New Hampshire in 1964. Each year, the number of visitors to New Hampshire has increased by one-half million. Thus, New Hampshire is doing its part in attracting visitors to the Granite State who otherwise might travel abroad.

I believe we must now work even harder to balance the monetary imbalance that still exists.

New Hampshire is a prime example of an excellent reason why tourists find comfort and enjoyment in American travel.

From the White Mountains to the seacoast and from the Monadnock to Coos, millions of American citizens have enjoyed their vacations in New Hampshire. For those who seek beauty, the White Mountain Region, with the formidable Mount Washington and the majestic Mount Chocorua, is a foremost vacationland, famous for its scenic beauty and its many natural and manmade attractions. For those who seek relaxation and enjoyment, Lake Winnipesaukee and Hampton Beach offer the ultimate of fresh water sailing and swimming or salt water surfing and comfort. For those who seek sporting, good roads and an abundant choice of wildlife combine to offer the best in hunting and the finest in salt and fresh water fishing. New Hampshire has pioneered many modern ski devices and today offers more than 60 major ski lifts, many of them brandnew and many operating for summer sightseers. In the sport of horseracing, Rochingham Park features harness racing and is the home of the richest race in the world—the New Hampshire Sweepstakes.

The history and tradition of the unique New Hampshire countryside are being preserved for the future. The famous Strawberry Banke Colonial restoration project in Portsmouth will be completed within the next few years, and will serve students and educators with the history of the old Portsmouth of Revolutionary times.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a presentation in capsule form, of what New Hampshire has offered in the attempt to alleviate America's problem of gold outflow.

However, we will not cease at this point. New Hampshire will continue to enlarge its recreational and development programs to offer the American people more diversified relaxation and enjoyment.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 250,000 high school students have participated in the contest—42,000 of whom participated in my State of Pennsylvania.

I am happy and proud to say that Brian Douglas McClelland, a student at Rocky Grove High School in Franklin, Pa., in my district, won out over 22 other finalists from senior high schools across Pennsylvania.

Brian will now represent Pennsylvania in the national finals to be held here in Washington this month.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD this young man's winning script, "The Challenge of Citizenship—Our Worst Enemy":

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP—OUR WORST ENEMY

The worst enemy this country has is your neighbor. It might even be your neighbor's neighbor—you. The name is not important, but the actions are. We all know the face; we see it every day—at the bus stop, in the office, at the newsstand—even in the mirror.

We all know how this individual operates: He's the life of every party, the guy who loans you his lawnmower, the fellow who sent flowers to your aunt's funeral.

But while he's capitivating our hearts, he's alienating our precious heritage. He likes freedom but he doesn't want to work for it. It isn't what he does, but what he doesn't do that makes him a liability. And what we need are assets.

Our gentleman never complains about high taxes. As a matter of fact, he doesn't know anything about taxes except how to pay them. He rarely has a gripe about how Uncle Sam is running things. He figures that peace and Russia and the bomb are their problems down in Washington and not his to worry about. He doesn't vote. He reasons that his one little vote is insignificant in the final outcome. Perhaps he never heard that President Johnson's political career was launched by the slim margine of 87 votes.

Once in a while our friend does have an idea of his own, but he won't discuss it or write a letter to the editor or ask his friends what they think because he doesn't want to differ with the majority. Why, if he complained, or voiced a few opinions no one liked, he might be considered a radical.

Our subject reads the newspapers, though. If you don't believe me, ask him. He knows the batting averages of every player on the all-star team, but don't ask for the latest unemployment figures. He is familiar with the daily testimony of the current Senate investigations but is ignorant of the results of the recent negotiations between General Taylor and Premier Huong in Vietnam.

He can excitedly relate Li'l Abner's harrowing escape on Sadie Hawkins' Day but the escape mission of the United States-Belgian paratroopers in the Congo leaves him with an empty gaze.

Rightly speaking, our citizen is failing himself as well as his country. He, like many others, finds it easier to let his duties as a citizen slip into the hands of the Federal Government, finds it easier not to vote than to carefully choose responsible leaders, finds it easier once the leaders are in office to ignore them instead of telling them how he feels on national issues.

Yes, he and millions like him have found the easy road. But the easy road is not the road to liberty. The road to liberty is not a superhighway. It is a difficult terrain, masked by a heavy fog of indifference, which only the individual citizen can dispel for himself.

The fog will lift when each citizen cares. This Nation was built by men who cared. A responsible citizen has the foresight to realize that what happens in one corner of our land today will resound throughout it tomorrow. Wherever injustices are allowed to continue within our borders, wherever there are church bombings, wherever the Senate must investigate indiscretions, wherever Neshoba County, Miss., murderers roam free to kill again, wherever these injustices exist in our land—we cannot hope to deal successfully with international inequities that plague us. To be specific: The Berlin wall separating brother from brother, the ruthless murder of Dr. Carlson in the Congo, and the American library burned in Indonesia.

If our citizen runs true to form, he doesn't know about these occurrences and if he did, he wouldn't care. But our road to liberty starts with knowledge. Knowledge of the facts dispels the fog of indifference. With knowledge you can take a stand, you will become involved—an active citizen who cares.

Then our country will no longer have to face the enemy within, but instead can present a strong united front to cope with dangers threatening from without.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a "Voice of Democracy" contest. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the four scholarships which are awarded as the top prize.

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I am sure all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in saluting this fine program.

I submit for the RECORD the winning speech by Mr. Robert LaVerne Kloppenburg, of Davenport, Iowa, who is a resident of my district. I am sure all of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives will find the essay most interesting:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP, 1964–65

(By Robert LaVerne Kloppenburg, Davenport, Iowa)

Sir Edmund Hillary, when asked what inspired him to climb Mount Everest, replied "It was a challenge." And when asked what made it so challenging, he said, "It was there." A very noble attitude. A little strange, perhaps. But only when you don't stop to think about it. For when you do think of it, you realize that everything is "there"; and, because it is there, it presents a challenge. The American frontier was there. The challenge of that vast wilderness was so great that it appeared to an entire colony of people. Appealed so greatly, in fact, that it, like Everest, was quickly conquered. And space, the more modern challenge. It, too, is quickly being conquered. You might even say, "Progress itself is a challenge that was met and conquered."

Yes, when you really think about it, a lot of people have recognized a lot of challenges, and a lot has been accomplished. Americans really love a challenge.

But what about the areas in which interest lags? Areas such as citizenship, for example. Why does interest in citizenship lag? True, maybe it isn't the most fascinating subject to which we could devote our time. Or is it? Maybe there just isn't enough challenge to arouse any interest. Or is there?

I feel, and I'm sure you would too, with a little thought, that there is a challenge to citizenship. Only, maybe this challenge is too obvious, too common, too much "there." So much that it becomes so everyday that people no longer think about it. It is taken too much for granted. You see posters proclaiming "Let's put life back in our country," and "Let's put the action back in politics." I say, "Let's put the challenge back in citizenship." Let's get enough people aroused to do something. But How? Just exactly what is the challenge of citizenship?

Basically, the challenges of citizenship are the same as those you meet in everyday life.

The challenge of choice. Which political party has the soundest foundation and principles? Which set of ideas seem to be the best both for us and for our country? Which candidate is best qualified for office?

There is the challenge of knowledge. The challenge to inform yourself of your duties, your rights, and your privileges. Learn what such words as "liberty," "freedom," and "justice" mean.

There is the challenge of your civic obligation. Get out and contribute something, however insignificant. Do something, anything, that will in some way benefit your community.

And perhaps most important, there is the challenge of respect. And respect is a challenge, although it is one that most people seem to ignore rather than just fail to recognize. Respect the law. Respect the flag. Respect the government. But most of all, respect what these things stand for, and respect their purpose.

These are the challenges of citizenship. Choose your attitude of allegiance. Know why you chose it. Support that attitude. But whatever you do, respect it.

Citizenship most certainly is there, as are the challenges. And by living up to the name "American" you will be meeting the challenges. You will be contributing to the growth of the greatest nation in history. And you will be fulfilling the role of the true American citizen.

Former Congressman Explains Views on Gold Reserve Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Times:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 5, 1965]

FORMER CONGRESSMAN EXPLAINS VIEWS ON GOLD RESERVE SITUATION

Our gold reserve, easy to understand, is little understood. But it is extremely, almost vitally, important.

The President is vigorously advocating the removal of the gold reserve for bank deposits, explaining that this is "in order to strengthen the dollar in international exchange."

This is completely inaccurate. The removal of the gold backing weakens the dollar, seriously.

The proponents of the removal of gold backing are the same people who advocated the removal of all gold reserve requirements including currency. This would throw us into a flat money system, the weakest and most dangerous type of money known to man. Lenin said the way to destroy a nation is to debauch its currency.

In the opinion of many of the best economic authorities, the relatively low ratio of our monetary gold stock to our currency and bank deposits and the fears of other nations regarding the future value of our dollar arise from the profligate, extravagant, and reckless expansion of our nongold dollars, and also, of course, the widespread contention that gold is an unimportant or unnecessary element in a good monetary system. To weaken still further the quality of our dollar is to make even more dangerous the position in which our country now finds itself.

The dollar will become stronger only if we provide the basis for confidence in it. It must have the quality of integrity. To provide this quality, the convertible gold standard should be reinstituted at the present statutory rate of $35 per fine ounce of gold. Such action would cause the Government and banks to exercise greater restraint in the use of credit and other nongold substitutes, should induce the release, and addition to our monetary gold stock, of a large portion of the $12 billion of gold presently earmarked for foreign account. Then gold would flow back into the United States.

The solution to our balance-of-payments problem lies not in such temporary palliatives and minor considerations as the limitation of imports by tourists, or the discouragement of voluntary capital investments abroad.

The solution to the problem of restoring confidence in the dollar lies first in the balancing of our Federal budget, a vitally important matter; and second, the elimination or heavy reduction of foreign aid.

Holding our spending to our income, thus balancing the budget, would restore the confidence of foreign bankers in the soundness of the dollar and they would cease to demand gold.

Because foreign aid dollars are mostly spent here, some people claim that foreign aid is not a factor in our unfavorable balance of trade and the outflow of gold.

This also is completely inaccurate. Although most of the dollars are spent here, goods and services are sent overseas without any dollar return. This tremendously decreases our supply of goods and services (production) without decreasing the demand therefor. Thus it's highly inflationary. The free shipping out of our country of billions of dollars of production is the major cause of our unfavorable balance of payments.

EDGAR W. HIESTAND,
Former U.S. Representative.

Plight of the American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have received a splendid letter from a valued constituent, Marvin Smith, of Route 3, Paducah, Tex., which expresses in detail the plight of the American farmer and the need for action by the Congress of the United States.

I think I would like to share this bit of information with other Members of Congress, as well as the rest of the people in our great country. Hence I include a copy of the letter to which I refer:

PADUCAH, TEX.,
February 22, 1965.

Congressman WALTER ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROGERS: This letter is written in direct protest of the plans of this administration being made for the farmer. As long as I can remember and from the things my father and his father have said of the past, it has always been the Democratic administration which has gone to bat for the farmers and seen to it that they get a fair shake. They have given the farmers a fighting chance to survive the many obstacles, price squeezes, and various obstructions thrown at them by the Republicans (particularly Mr. Ezra Taft Benson).

The gradual reduction of prices in the past 2 years on cotton and wheat will take under many good farmers. These, though not wheeler-dealers, in my opinion are the cream of the crop and truly the backbone of our Nation. They, under great pressure, are trying to raise a family, pay off land debts (some paying on debts incurred during drouth years past), and fighting the battle of increased prices of the equipment they need. The cattle-raising farmers are fighting the battle of trying to get as much as two-thirds the price for their cattle as they were getting when Mr. Benson was trying to help them go under. Meanwhile, they must sit back and watch all the beef being imported to drive prices down even farther.

These people I'm speaking of are not the type people who would ask for or accept charity. They are simply asking for a fair price for what they have to sell. Their selling prices are all out of proportion to what they must pay for what they buy. They are asking for the opportunity to continue in the only occupation they know that they may raise their children in Christian homes and give them the education necessary to meet the demands of our changing world.

It seems that it would be better to help these farmers obtain higher parity (100 percent wouldn't be out of line) for their products than to push 2½ million farmers off the land and into breadlines in the cities—cities already overrun with unemployment, idleness, juvenile delinquency, and racial strife. These cities are burdened enough without such a migration as has never been seen before in this great country of ours.

The true farmers, family sized and larger would like to have the prices of their products at a fair parity and their farm acres controlled to meet the needs of the U.S. and world markets. If it is necessary for farmers to sell their products at world market prices, the manufacturers products should be included at this same level.

I farm (own and rent) 691 acres in Cottle County and have an investment of $52,000 with 19 years of farming. With the present price reductions and those of the last 2 years in cotton, wheat, and cattle prices it will not be long until it will be impossible for me to break even.

Your consideration, help, and support of the true, American farmers in this, their fight for survival, will be greatly appreciated. Without your help, it will just be a matter of time until the big combines, syndicates, and corporations will take over and the American farmer will be a thing of the past.

Please let me know if there is anything I and my family can do at the local level.

Sincerely,

MARVIN SMITH.

Studies in Humanities Deserve Broader Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, there follows a fine statement of the necessity for a greater recognition of the field of humanities. I had introduced legislation on the first day of this session to bolster Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD's fine efforts in this vital area.

I feel that this editorial illustrates the fine efforts to advance the horizons of the creative arts, languages, literature, history, and others, that have been made by the Iowa City Press-Citizen and the University of Iowa community.

I applaud these efforts and am sure all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and others who read the RECORD will read this editorial with great interest.

[From the Iowa City Press-Citizen, Feb. 25, 1965]

STUDIES IN HUMANITIES DESERVE BROADER SUPPORT

America's fascination with the scientific has opened a widening gap between financial support for scholarly endeavor in these disciplines and that available for the arts and humanities. This imbalance has affected all aspects of the academic undertaking, funds to aid students in their graduate studies, support for established scholars pursuing a particular and promising line of inquiry into the unknown, grants for such facilities as libraries.

To redress this imbalance, an effort now is being made through the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, similar to the National Science Foundation which plays so large a part today in advancing horizons of the natural and physical sciences. Such a humanities foundation would extend to such areas as the creative arts, languages, literature, philosophy, history, law, and others the kind of governmental aid that for many years has gone to the sciences. It would recognize the involvement of the entire na-

tional community in increasing the store of knowledge and the transmitting of it in these areas in which man ponders himself as man.

In this effort, a University of Iowa committee is seeking to enlist the backing of other members of the faculty and that of other colleges and universities of the State. In a letter to the faculty, the committee points out that "the propriety and need for strong support, both promotional and financial for education, research, and creative production in the humanities and the arts hardly need to be pressed upon a university such as ours." It is fitting, too, that this university with particularly strong programs in the creative arts and English should take a leading role in the effort to further understandings in these fields.

The proposal as it exists now would provide $5 million for the foundation's first year of operation, surely a small sum by present-day Federal standards, although one which presumably would be increased. The foundation would be able to award scholarships and fellowships for graduate and postdoctoral studies, grants for research, support for publications, and sums for improving such facilities as libraries.

James A. Van Allen, the university's noted physicist, once raised the question, as others have, of what we would say to another intelligent life on some far-off star if communication were established. A national humanities foundation does not deny the importance of science, of learning how to communicate with that galaxy beyond our own, it just affirms the importance of knowing, too, what we are going to say when we do.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in this worthwhile contest.

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as a guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I am proud to place, in the RECORD, a copy of the winning speech from Florida's winner, Miss Maria Richmond, a student at Dunedin High School, Dunedin, Fla., and a resident of my district.

The speech follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Maria Richmond, Dunedin High School, Dunedin, Fla.)

Noah Webster defines citizenship as "the status of being a citizen." Status implies an elevated position, and being a citizen of the United States is an elevated position. But this is about the only general statement that can be made. Attempts to define citizenship specifically are made, but few are adequate, because it means many different things to many different people, and who is to judge which interpretation is all inclusive?

To the masses of people in socialistic countries, American citizenship is an enigma producing countless questions which are never answered. To the Communist leaders it is a stumbling block to world domination. To the foreign refugee it is a coveted state, difficult for an outsider to attain. To the peasant of an underdeveloped country it is "that helping hand across the sea." But to too many Americans, it is too little. They seem to say citizenship is sending your child to a public school, getting your income tax in by April 15, and maybe 1 day a year giving some thought to the old war heroes. They are right, but there is more. You will hear citizenship is serving on the jury willingly, voting intelligently, being a good ambassador wherever you are; and this is even more right. But there is more.

It is up to us to give citizenship a real meaning, not by being able to give the well-turned phrase of some particularly eloquent statesman, but an individual meaning.

There are many ways to do this. Learn about your America in your own way. Forget for a minute the spacious skies, the amber waves of grain. Find your own particular beauty, and you will appreciate the beauty of your land. Forget for a minute the war heroes and learn of the unsung common man who went willingly into battle, and you will appreciate the spirit of America. Forget the mighty anthems and learn a simple song of the countryside, and you will understand the voice of America.

Find something that is yours, yours to appreciate, yours to build upon, and you will discover the pride of citizenship: the pride of being an enigma, a stumbling block, a friendly hand across the sea.

Find this land, this song, this common man; and you will have more than a social security number, more than even status. You will have a true citizenship in a great nation.

PGA Tournament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, Westmoreland County, Pa., is looking forward to the coming August 12–15, when Laurel Valley Golf Club will be host to the Professional Golfers' Association tournament. I hope that many of my colleagues will be able to visit us at that time and that you will have an opportunity to have a good look at our county and its diversified topography and scenic beauty.

In recent years Westmoreland County has become the winter sports center of Pennsylvania, and we have always had a reputation as an outstanding summer vacation area. There are ample recreation spots, good fishing, and modern hotels and motels high in the mountains and along our beautiful valleys.

For the businessman who attends the PGA, here is a fine opportunity to consider sites in Westmoreland County for industrial development. Large parts of the county are underlain with rich bituminous coal reserves, there are ample water resources, and we are within proximity of some of the region's largest consuming centers. A vigorous labor force, including workers with a wide variety of skills, completes the pattern which makes Westmoreland County so very attractive to processing and manufacturing industries.

Mr. Speaker, it is our understanding that Congress will try for an early August adjournment. If any added incentive be needed, then I commend your attention to the PGA at Laurel Valley. Members of the Congress from the Middle West and Far West should plan on making the Ligonier area their first stop. It is less than a 5-hour drive via the Pennsylvania Turnpike or Lincoln Highway.

Tribute to Samuel C. Bernstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, labor, business, and government leaders meet in Chicago this week to honor one of our State's most distinguished public servants, Mr. Samuel C. Bernstein. I am privileged to pay tribute to his 30 years of service to the State. Because of him, Illinois is a better place to live and a better place to work.

He is best known to us as the father of the Illinois Unemployment Compensation Act, a feat that he accomplished while he was in his twenties. But that was only the beginning of his noteworthy career. He began as an expert in the field of employment security. However, his expertise was soon expanded to embrace the wide spectrum of labor-management relations and the constantly changing demands of our economy. He has ably served the Nation as well as the State.

After achieving honors at the University of Illinois, Mr. Bernstein joined the Legislative Reference Bureau in the State capital at Springfield. There he drafted the Unemployment Compensation Act, which became law in 1937. Upon passage of the law he became general counsel and rules and regulations officer of the division organized to administer it. After serving as assistant to the Commissioner of Placement and Unemployment Compensation, he acceded to that post in 1942. He is now employment security administrator for the State, where he is responsible for the division of unemployment compensation, the Illinois State Employment Service, and the manpower development and training programs in Illinois.

Mr. Bernstein has brought to his tasks a thorough understanding of the problems of both labor and management. He has through he years consistently sought to improve services to both worker and employer. His humane approach to labor, coupled with his understanding of business requirements and his knowledge in the field of unemployment compensation, have made Illinois a leader among States in this complicated area.

His work has gained him recognition beyond the confines of our State. He was president of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies and has served as a consultant to the U.S. Department of Labor on manpower programs. In 1960 he was called to Washington as an advisor to the President

and to the executive committee of the Governor's Conference in the matter of unemployment benefits. He is a member of the Loyola University and University of Illinois advisory boards for their Institutes of Labor and Industrial Relations. He has contributed many articles on the subject of employment security. And the State of Illinois has drawn on his talents for service as assistant director and acting director of labor.

Joining in the testimonial to Mr. Bernstein's service of the past 30 years will be Gov. Otto Kerner; Mayor Richard J. Daley; Reuben G. Soderstrom, president of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO; Edwin C. Berry, executive director of Chicago's Urban League; Thomas Ayers, president, Commonwealth Edison Co.; and Marshall Korshak, trustee of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, the Illinois General Assembly has seen fit to commend Mr. Bernstein. I submit its House Joint Resolution 11, passed unanimously by the house last February 3 and the senate on February 9, as a fitting worthy tribute to an outstanding public servant, Samuel C. Bernstein.

House Joint Resolution 11 follows:

ILLINOIS HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 11

Whereas for many years this State has benefited from the manifold contributions of Samuel C. Bernstein who presently serves as Administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security in the Illinois Department of Labor and as Manpower Development and Training Coordinator; and

Whereas in 1937, he drafted the Unemployment Compensation Act and was instrumental in securing its passage, an effort which required tact, finesse and thorough mastery of a little understood subject; and

Whereas Samuel C. Bernstein, as "father of the Unemployment Compensation Act" and commissioner of the division of unemployment compensation from 1942 to 1963 worked ceaselessly to keep the division abreast of changing times and striking proof of his foresight and sagacity was shown during the recessions of 1957–58 and 1960–61 when Illinois took these crises in stride while other States found themselves inadequately prepared; and

Whereas his intellectual prowess coupled with a prevasive humaneness has gained for him the deep respect of his colleagues and this high regard is attested to by the profusion of honors he has received including election to the presidency of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies; and

Whereas his prodigious talents have been recognized and drawn upon by the President of the United States for whom he served as advisor in 1960 and by the executive committee of the Governor's Conference for which he served in the same capacity; and

Whereas it is the policy of the general assembly to praise public officials from time to time so that the citizenry may be informed of their exemplary conduct and draw inspiration therefrom and Sam Bernstein throughout his life has represented all that is noble in personal, professional, and public conduct: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That Samuel C. Bernstein be given our highest commendation for his laudable work in the field of employment security and that a copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded to Mr. Bernstein.

CHAS. F. KERVIN,
Clerk of the House.

A Job Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is often drab and dry in its official publications, but sometimes it is not. Today I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an outstanding, colorful, and lively publication being distributed by the General Services Administration to offer for sale a petrochemical plant in Muskogee, Okla.

The brochure GSA has prepared to offer this plant is imaginative in its design and use of color and pictures. It is full of accurate information well presented. It is an attractive publication which is sure to arouse interest in the plant wherever it is distributed. This is not a drab announcement of an official Government action, but an honest attempt to sell a quality facility at a good price. Any first-rate industrial real estate firm could be proud of this brochure, any top-flight chamber of commerce would admire its presentation of the State of Oklahoma and the city of Muskogee.

The plant being sold was operated by the Callery Chemical Co. for the U.S. Navy, and later the Air Force, to produce high-energy boronhydride liquid fuels. It was in production for about 2 years, and since then has been maintained in like-new condition by a staff of maintenance workers. It consists of modern, efficient equipment for the production of gaseous ethylene, hydrogen, nitrogen, and carbon dioxide, set on a 250-acre site on the Arkansas River, where commercial navigation will be available by 1970. Another 420 acres of adjoining, unimproved land will be sold separately.

The plant, like the GSA brochure offering it for sale, is not drab. It consists of attractive, landscaped buildings on an Arkansas River bottomland site, fenced, and brightly lighted with perimeter and street lights.

It is served by a rail spur connecting with the St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad with six loading and unloading points within the plant. Electric power—12,500 kilovolt-amperes—is provided directly to the plant by the Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co., and up to 2,600 gallons per minute of water are supplied by the city of Muskogee through a 12-inch pipeline. A nearly unlimited supply of natural gas comes to the plant through a special Oklahoma Natural Gas Co. metering station on the site.

The plant is located in an area which is rapidly developing into a major industrial center, and that development will be accelerated when the Arkansas River becomes navigable. The climate is mild, that city progressive, the labor supply abundant and willing, and the Oklahoma tax structure is tailored to the needs of new industry.

All this information and much more is presented in the GSA brochure announcing the offering of the plant for sale. The brochure is attractive and well done, and it is an honest effort to sell a good property at a good price; an effort to retrieve for the Federal Government as much as possible of its investment in the plant.

Teamwork Erases Keapuka's Flood Scars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the sources of the strength and vitality of our great State of Hawaii, is and has been, the willingness of us all to assist one another, especially in times of chaos and disaster. That this great tradition has been upheld during the recent floods at Keapuka makes me feel that much prouder to be from Hawaii.

Those individuals and organizations that unselfishly gave of their time and effort to help their neighbors in the restoration of Keapuka are to be commended for their concern and devotion. Communities throughout our country could do well to follow our example.

With unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of February 10, which calls attention to the teamwork which was exhibited on that occasion:

TEAMWORK ERASES KEAPUKA'S FLOOD SCARS
(By Joe Arakaki)

Only 6 days ago, a sudden storm dumped more than 12 inches of rain in the Koolau Mountains, unleashing a flash flood which took two lives and damaged 43 homes and 30 automobiles in Kaneohe's Keapuka subdivision.

The flood inflicted more than $300,000 damage in the subdivision alone.

A giant tree floating down Waikalua Stream past the subdivision caught on Luluku Road bridge and turned it into a dam.

Residents of the 3-year-old subdivision, developed by Blackfield Enterprises, were shocked and in despair after the devastation.

They had no flood insurance.

Early Thursday, the fleeing flood victims were evacuated by Hawaii National Guard and Kaneohe Marine Air Station vehicles.

Keapuka was in a pitiful mess that day with debris, mud, and wreckage scattered throughout the Apapane Street area.

You would never know there was a flood there if you should visit Keapuka today.

Within 2 days after the 50-mile-an-hour flood, most of the debris, mud, and wreckage were cleared away by volunteer workers, city and county crews, and firemen.

Help to the distressed area poured in from many areas.

William Blackfield, president of Blackfield Enterprises, went into the scene Friday, surveyed damage in each home and explored avenues of relief.

He had no legal responsibility, he said, but felt the homes should be repaired as soon as possible.

Blackfield quickly organized and coordinated the work of restoring the flood ravaged community.

Construction firms and labor unions joined hands in a massive volunteer effort Saturday.

By Sunday afternoon, all of the damaged homes, except the one of a houseowner who refused assistance, were repaired.

More than 250 volunteers assisted in the repair and cleanup project.

Blackfield Enterprises, American Factors, and the AFL–CIO Building and Trades Council joined forces to repair the 43 water-wrecked homes.

American Factors supplied building materials, the unions provided the labor force, and Blackfield supplied equipment and men to supervise the repair work.

Precut materials on hand to build the last 50 units of the 800-unit Keapuka tract facilitated repair work.

By Saturday morning, packets of needed materials were in front of each damaged home. Some 30 work crews were organized with Blackfield's men, who were familiar with the tract, serving on each, and helping direct volunteer tradesmen from other firms and projects.

All this work was done at no cost to the homeowners.

Blackfield said today that "all structural damages" have been repaired.

"We finished the repair work within 17 hours after we started work early Saturday," he said.

While volunteers were busy at work, the Red Cross and Salvation Army manned disaster headquarters to feed the army of volunteers.

The Salvation Army also conducted a drive and collected bedding and mattresses for the flood-stricken residents.

The Keapuka Community Association responded in numbers, with over 100 members, to assist their grief-stricken neighbors.

But the Keapuka story is not yet over.

The repaired homes need painting and lawns must be restored.

Some of the painting work was done by 18 of Blackfield's men Sunday.

Blackfield said that painting of the repaired homes and landscape work will begin Saturday with some 200 volunteers turning out.

The Painting Contractors Association of Hawaii and the Paint Lacquer and Varnish Association jointly will carry out the painting job.

The Outdoor Circle will make 150 trees available to the Keapuka residents to restore their damaged lawns and this job will be handled by volunteers from the community association.

Blackfield added that J. A. Thompson and Son will furnish trucks and hauling equipment to transport topsoil into the subdivision.

Centex Trousdale and Kaneohe Ranch Co. will provide the topsoil, according to Blackfield.

His own employees will supervise the soil restoration project.

Blackfield commented, "The damaged homes will be restored to a better condition than their original State when all work has been completed."

Of the joint efforts, Blackfield observed, "I have never in my life seen such a tremendous response and demonstration of the aloha spirit in all of my travels.

"One house victim told me 'I never thought I could rebuild my house in a year.' "

He said off-duty policemen will handle traffic during the painting and landscaping work.

City Engineer Yoshio Kunimoto said that he had about 150 city and county workers in the Keapuka area to assist in the cleanup work.

He reported that if the tree had caught in the Likelike Highway culvert, the damage to the subdivision would have been worse.

He feels the Luluku Road culvert was big enough to handle the floodwaters if it had not been blocked by the big tree.

"The volunteers did a tremendous job of restoring the damaged homes," he noted.

Meanwhile, the Red Cross reported that 25 Keapuka families so far have applied for Red Cross rehabilitation assistance.

The Red Cross also provided food, shelter, clothing, household items and medical attention to flood victims during the emergency.

Its disaster headquarters at Blackfield's model home in Keapuka will be open from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily except Saturdays and Sundays.

Also offering free medical care to flood victims were physicians belonging to the Honolulu County Medical Society.

In other developments, the Keapuka Community Association thus far has collected about $3,000 in contributions to aid the disaster victims. Half of this amount came from the association itself.

COMMUNITY RESPONSE

Keapuka flood victims say they are overwhelmed by the community response and aid offered them.

Mrs. Helen Kosaka, whose home was one of the most severely damaged, said she is beyond words to express her deep appreciation.

"I just want to let everyone know how grateful I am for the help rendered," she said.

She is now staying with her niece and expects to move back into her home as soon as she can replace damaged furnishings.

Another flood victim, Aquilino Santos, said he moved to Keapuka from Kalihi last April.

"We are proud to live in this community," he said. "The community association members, who were complete strangers to us, came and offered all the help we needed.

"You bet we will join the association," he said.

Santos also praised the work of the Red Cross, which he described as a "great organization."

Another Apapane Street resident, Raymond Hee, said, "It was tremendous. Everyone helped."

ALSO GIVE AID

Flood victims also received aid from the Hawaiian Electric Co., which repaired all electrical appliances up to $100 per family, and Ramsay, which repaired General Electric appliances damaged by the floods.

Ramsay's men spent all night Saturday repairing them and had them returned to the owners Sunday.

Realty Mortgage Co., a Blackfield subsidiary, agreed to waive house payments to owners of damaged homes for several months, depending on individual family requirements.

There were many other community and church groups assisting the flood victims. "My faith in mankind has been rekindled," summed up Blackfield.

Outrage at Selma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in this Congress of the United States nauseated with a profound sense of shame and outrage over the recent events in Selma, Ala.

I concur with sentiments expressed this day by the Washington Post in an editorial entitled "Outrage at Selma."

So that none of my colleagues will miss the opportunity of reading this editorial, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

OUTRAGE AT SELMA

The news from Selma, Ala., where police beat and mauled and gassed unarmed, helpless and unoffending citizens will shock and alarm the whole Nation. It is simply inconceivable that in this day and age, the police who have sworn to uphold the law and protect the citizenry could resort, instead, to violent attacks upon them.

Decent citizens will weep for the wronged and persecuted demonstrators, for the decent citizens of Alabama who must recoil in horror from the spectacle of sadism, for the good name of the Nation before the world. This brutality is the inevitable result of the intolerance fostered by an infamous State government that is without conscience or morals.

The situation calls for more than mere reproach and anguish, but it is not easy to say what can be done to prevent the repetition of this scandalous misuse of police power. Congress, as a beginning, must promptly pass legislation that will put into Federal hands the registration of voters that the Alabama authorities will continue to obstruct as long as they have any discretion. At least, such legislation will put beyond contest the rights that the Negro citizens have been trying to gain by demonstration.

Extremist Groups: A Clear and Present Danger to Freedom and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers has recently published a booklet entitled "Extremist Groups: A Clear and Present Danger to Freedom and Democracy."

The danger of extremism from the left and right is ever present in this Nation. These groups pose a serious threat to our liberty and democratic institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this booklet in the RECORD and commend it to the consideration of my colleagues:

THE PTA WHERE DEMCORACY PREVAILS—OPEN MEMBERSHIP

PTA memberships, now about 12 million, represent a fair cross section of America.

Membership is open to all who want to work for children and youth. There are no barriers of color, creed, occupation, or income.

The PTA is nonsectarian and nonpartisan. No one is asked what his religious and political beliefs and affiliations are.

The PTA is an educational organization dedicated to promoting the welfare of children through home, school, church, and community. It welcomes all who want to learn more about children and act on their behalf.

Procedures: The PTA practices democracy. It welcomes dissent as well as assent. It does not impose conformity to any doctrine or dogma except democracy.

In the national organization, the State organization, and the local association, the rule

is to abide by majority decisions and to respect the right of the minority to disagree and work for change.

Unity and diversity: What brings us together in the PTA—our common concern for children—is greater than anything that can divide us. Although there are bound to be differences of opinion where children and schools are concerned, PTA members are not youngsters who pick up their marbles and go home when they cannot have their way.

PTA members can tolerate diversity and act with unity and enthusiasm on majority decisions. This is the democratic way, the PTA way.

EXTREMIST GROUPS—BOTH OF THE RIGHT AND OF THE LEFT

Most of us believe in the right of others to hold and to express views, even extreme ones, that differ from our own.

Extremist groups try to stifle free expression of views opposed to their own.

Most of us believe that free access to information and a diversity of opinions are essential in a democracy.

Extremist groups try to purge school and public libraries of publications that are objectionable to them.

Most of us believe the public schools should not indoctrinate students in the political, economic, religious, or social views of any group.

Extremist groups put pressures on schools to adopt courses and textbooks that reflect their views.

Most of us believe that criticism of public institutions and officials is healthy, but that criticism should be informed, constructive, and based on facts.

Extremist groups make irresponsible, venomous, and near-libelous attacks on individuals, institutions, and organizations that disagree with them.

Most of us believe that political, social, and economic change should be brought about by legal, democratic procedures.

Extremist groups use coercion, intimidation, and even violence to prevent or force change.

Most of us believe that patience, good will, and intelligent, cooperative effort are needed to deal with complicated issues and problems.

Extremist groups are likely to believe there are easy, simple, fast solutions to complex problems and to advocate oversimplified, very often dangerous measures.

Most of us believe in rule by the majority, subject to criticism by a loyal opposition.

Extremist groups believe in rule by their own minority and label any opposition as disloyal.

TACTIC OF EXTREMIST GROUPS

Front groups: Extremist groups set up front organizations with high-sounding, patriotic names to promote their views.

Free speakers: They offer to provide free speakers in order to spread their propaganda.

Infiltration: They infiltrate democratic organizations like the PTA and try to capture key positions like the program chairmanship.

They send representatives to meetings with prepared, loaded, unanswerable questions to harass speakers whose views differ from theirs. They prolong meetings so they can make minority decisions after the wornout majority has gone home.

"Divide and conquer": They try to discredit State and national organizations and create distrust of their leadership in order to isolate local associations and capture control of them.

They encourage irrelevant programs and debates over organizational details to disrupt the work of an organization and divert it from its own productive activities.

Blacklisting and labeling: They probe into the personal history and political affiliations of educators, clergymen, and authors and label as "subversive," "un-American," "radical" those whose beliefs and affiliations differ from theirs.

Hysteria and fear: They create fear and insecurity by highly emotional, inflammatory charges of subversive influences in schools, government, and community organizations.

Coercion and intimidation: They threaten investigations of school administrators, teachers, librarians, and members of school and library boards who resist pressures for conformity to their views.

Some groups use social ostracism, economic pressures, and even violence to silence disagreement and impose their views on a community.

Misrepresentation: They make false charges and use quotations taken out of context.

They distribute smear literature and poison-pen pamphlets, usually imported from outside the community.

WAYS TO COMBAT UNDEMOCRATIC PRESSURES ON PTA'S, SCHOOLS, AND LIBRARIES

In the PTA appoint a committee to become informed on extremist groups, their front organizations, and their tactics.

Devote a meeting to a factual report by the committee on extremist groups; their efforts to infiltrate PTA's and influence them to withdraw from the State and national organizations; and their undemocratic pressures on schools and libraries.

Establish the policy that resolutions and motions on controversial issues will not be voted on until the meeting following their introduction. This assures that the membership can be alerted and all views on an issue can be fairly represented and heard.

If someone comes up with a loaded, unanswerable question, ask him to rephrase it. Usually he cannot, because it is a canned question.

Never mislay your sense of humor. A humorous remark has more than once pricked an inflated ballon.

Set a definite, reasonable time for adjournment. This assures that decisions will not be made by an extremist minority that outstays the moderate majority.

Look gift speakers in the mouth. Find out why they want to speak and whom they represent.

Keep the community and the press supplied with facts about PTA purposes and projects.

Schools urge school boards to do the following:

Have written statements of policy placing responsibility for curriculum decisions and selection of textbooks, films, pamphlets, and other teaching materials with teachers and educational administrative officials.

Have an information program to sustain community understanding of these policies.

Have clearly defined procedures for dealing with complaints on curriculum, books, and teachers. For example, require that charges and complaints be made in writing and signed by the complainant, referred to a special committee, and so on.

Libraries urge library boards also to have written policies on book selection; a public education program; and definite procedures for handling complaints.

Prepare in advance. Invite representatives from schools, churches, libraries, labor, industry, press, radio, and TV to a meeting to consider sound, democratic ways of dealing with extremist pressures.

Establish a joint committee for a continuing exchange of information and ideas.

Conduct a joint, vigorous education campaign to make the community aware of the importance of freedom of speech and freedom to read, to teach, and to learn.

If an attack comes. Bring it out in the open.

Insist that charges and complaints be specific, written, documented, and signed.

Ask the school board or library board to hold public hearings.

Get full press, radio, and TV coverage.

Seek advice and help from the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, your State congress, and from such groups as the State education association, the National Education Association, the American Library Association, the National Council for Civic Responsibility, the National Council of Teachers of English, the National Council of Teachers of Social Studies, and local and State colleges and universities.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest.

This contest has become an American tradition for it perpetuates two of our proudest characteristics: patriotism and competiveness. It provides the young people of this country with an opportunity to express their ideas and ideals of what democracy is and should continue to mean to the citizens of the United States of America.

This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the four scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. First prize is a $5,000 scholarship, second prize is $3,500, third prize is $2,500, and the fourth prize is $1,500. The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as a guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Miss Mary Barbara Benedetto of Macon, Ga., who is a resident of our district, was the winner in the State of Georgia.

The subject of Miss Benedetto's speech, "The Challenge of Citizenship," sets forth justice as the ideal which best expresses the essence of what a good citizen should be. She explains that justice is more than an ideal: it is also a clear guide to how we may practice good citizenship by keeping "a proper balance between rights and duties, cherishing the rights, performing the duties, seeing the necessity of both for the good of society as a whole." Setting aside abstract considerations, she goes straight to the practical message of her speech. We must, as good citizens, vote for men worthy of public office and participate fully in that occupation, however humdrum it may seem, which best serves the good of the country.

It is with pleasure that I include herewith Miss Benedetto's winning speech:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP, 1964–65

(By Mary Barbara Benedetto, Macon, Ga.)

Since the scale is a means of judging the equality of two things weight, it is a rather universal custom to show justice as a balance—equality of men before God and before country.

Justice is one of the greatest challenges of citizenship. In fact, it goes beyond all other ideals in expressing the essence of what a good citizen is.

To be a good citizen is to keep a proper balance between rights and duties, cherishing the rights, performing the duties, seeing the necessity of both for the good of society as a whole.

What is this balance of rights and duties if not a clear example of how justice should be practiced?

If we vote for a certain man only because we know he won't forget our vote when future appropriations are made, where is our justice? However, we contend, a more honest vote might mean some loss to me, great or small, a more conscientious vote might be the deciding factor buying a house, trading in a car, getting Tommy that electric train. But only a vote which helps put a worthy man in office is worth my while if I understand what it means to be a citizen of my country.

But this is hard, we protest.

When someone appeals to us for justice we are unashamedly callous. Should his plea be answered with tolerance and pity because we wish to preserve peace on the home front or have face on the foreign scene? Yes, assuredly, but more essential, his appeal should be answered with real understanding and sincere concern because we are citizens of our country, a country which was founded and still survives only because of man's belief in the duty of brotherhood, not at all incompatible with his right to freedom, but rather a necessary consequence of it.

But this is hard, we protest.

We protest that it is hard. But should it be easy? Should we be content to take everything our country has to offer without giving in return? Should we be protected, educated, and inspired without protecting, educating, and inspiring in turn? Can we be satisfied with just living in our country at this time without living for our country particularly at this time.

If I am a capable engineer, my job is to build that bridge. If I am qualified to fill some public office, my job is to try to win that office and do my best to fulfill it. If I have the tremendous ability to get a point across, my job is to teach. If I am accomplished in painting, writing, or music, my job is to show others the beauty and goodness of these worthwhile endeavors. If personality is my best talent, my job is to bring about harmony in the daily affairs of men.

Where can the valor be found that Plutarch spoke of when he said: "If all the world were just, there would be no need of valor." It can be found on the battlefield, certainly, but in the course of human affairs relatively few even see the battlefield at all. It is in the regular, daily doing, the perhaps humdrum activities on which our country depends, that each of us shows whether or not he has the necessary stamina and courage to keep our country as strong and good as God intends it to be and as we wish it to be.

How shall I, in justice, respond to God's gift of my country if not with a wholehearted effort to make use of this gift to the best of my ability?

Youngsters With a Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years there has been so much written and said on the subject of juvenile delinquency and crime that it is easy to lose sight of the fact that the vast majority of our young people are decent, sensible, and thoroughly admirable.

For this reason I read with special enjoyment an article in the "This Week" magazine of the Indianapolis Star for Sunday, March 7, 1965, recounting some of the remarkable activities of the 97 percent of our young people who lead productive, interesting, and worthwhile lives.

The article follows:

YOUNGSTERS WITH A CAUSE

(By Jean Libman Block)

What do teenagers do for kicks? The ones you read about in screaming headlines steal cars, sniff glue, shoplift, smash plate-glass windows, smoke marihuana, and indulge in promiscuous sex play. These are the delinquents, yet they represent less than 3 percent of all young people in their teens.

What of the other 97 percent who rarely make the front page? They aren't news at all. Yet if you were to dig, as I did over the past weeks, into the interests and activities of the livelier members of the anti-delinquency or nondelinquency set (there isn't even a word to describe the good kids); you would be atingle with excitement.

They are involved in everything—rockets, cancer research, their own hometown Peace Corps, organizing conferences on human rights, getting out the vote, rescuing flood victims, winning Olympic medals and singing on a good-will tour of Europe. They do these things on their own or through organizations. For example, over 18 million boys and girls in all 50 States are American Red Cross Youth Volunteers. These teens help in hospitals and orphanages, work with underprivileged and retarded children and participate in many other Red Cross activities. But look at lots of others:

Teen circus: Take the Wenatchee Youth Circus in Wenatchee, Wash., with high-wire acts, acrobats, and clowns, though no wild animals. "We can't get parents to house pythons and tigers over the winter," says Paul Pugh regretfully. He is both a local junior high principal and the impressario of the circus with a changing cast each year of 80 boys and girls, mostly in their lower teens. The troupe, which has amassed $50,000 worth of equipment in the dozen years of its life, hits the road every summer to play at hospitals, fairs, and service organizations up and down the west coast and into Alaska. The show is nonprofit, but self-supporting. The youngsters' reward is the thrill of training that gives them lithe, disciplined bodies that can soar through space 50 feet up in the great tent amid crescendos of applause from enthralled spectators.

Cancer researcher: Other youngsters look down instead of up. Rhea Keller spent part of her high school years in Fort Wayne, Ind., looking into a microscope. She was searching for cancer cells in the tissues of hamsters which she had treated with viruses. Because Rhea found what she was looking for and brought us all a tiny step closer to a cancer breakthrough, she was named a winner in the 1964 Westinghouse science talent search, a nationwide competition in which 23,000 high school students took part.

Science champs: In the same competition an Arizona boy tried to teach a rat to hibernate. (What if hibernation could be induced in man to increase his lifespan and get him through space travel?) A 17-year-old Nevada boy devised an entirely new chemical method for recovering precious silver from certain ores. And a 17-year-old New Jersey girl figured out how to induce sleep in a cat by beaming an electrical wave pattern at a particular part of its brain.

Indian volunteers: Now, let's meet some of the least privileged of all our young people—American Indians. In Arizona the Papagos, known as the Desert People, live in primitive conditions on an arid rangeland where summer temperatures reach 120°. Girls at the reservation school happened to read a novel called "Candy Stripers" which describes in fictional form the real work of the 200,000 girls in 2,000 hospitals throughout the Nation who act as hospital volunteer workers.

The Papagos girls decided they wanted to be candy stripers. This was an astonishing decision because (a) Indian girls had never done service of this kind and (b) the tribal medicine man is held in higher regard by many of their families than the white man's doctor. With help from the Save the Children Foundation, 16 Papago girls sewed their own uniforms (turquoise instead of the usual pink to emphasize their Indian identity) and today are a familiar, friendly sight in the Indian hospital at Sells. As an extra dividend, the proud families of the girls have lessened their suspicion of modern medicine.

Teen blood bank: A student at the West Morris Regional High School in New Jersey was seriously injured in a football accident and needed 14 pints of blood. There was no blood bank in the area. A panicky rush for last-minute donors went on while the boy's life hung in the balance. He was saved, but his classmates vowed, "Never again." After school and on weekends they organized a program for blood collection in conjunction with the American Red Cross, set a blood-donor day, lined up donors, worked as escorts and aids on the day of the collection, and used a staff and bloodmobile from the Red Cross in New York City. Now the whole community can breathe easier, with blood available on a few minutes' notice.

Hurricane helpers: In the wake of a 100-mile-an-hour hurricane in Lake Charles, La., members of the La Grange Senior High Key Club—the services club for boys that is sponsored by the Kiwanis International—manned several small boats to fight their way through almost 30 miles of debris-laden waters to bring supplies to survivors.

Authors: Junior high school Camp Fire Girls in Fayetteville, N.Y., created a tactile book of "The Three Bears" for blind children. They made paste-on bears from fur and forests from cedar sticks. "Invaluable," reported teachers of the blind at Syracuse University.

Babysitters: One Girl Scout troop in Mobile, Ala., trained its members to sit for physically and mentally handicapped children. Scout Leader Mrs. Shepard Jerome, a registered nurse, sparked this program. Word spread, and 30 more girls trained to become REBS—Reliable Exceptional Babysitting Scouts.

Singers: The Frankford, Pa., High School A Cappella Choir toured Scandinavia last summer. The 80 members each raised $275 in cash but that was far short of the needed sum, so they collected 5,500 S&H Green Stamps books and were off.

Show biz: 20 members of Fides Neighborhood House, located in a Washington, D.C., neighborhood where most families receive welfare, staged the musical show, "The Boy Friend." It is hard for youngsters for whom responsibility and promptness have little meaning to submit to stagecraft discipline. But these boys and girls were so good they made request appearances at area hospitals.

In July 1962, Clairol, Inc., offered a course in grooming to a small group of girls invited by the Recreation Department in Washington, D.C. Since then 2,000 girls in 17 cities have gone through its program in teenage leadership. Recently, as I watched the graduates of the course in East Harlem

stage a musical review and fashion show, I felt these girls had had a glimpse of wider horizons.

Volunteers: Last summer, in 168 of the Nation's veterans' hospitals, hundreds of boys and girls gave up thousands of vacation hours to work in pharmacies and laboratories and act as escorts in nursing service. "Without them, we'd have a terrible time scheduling summer vacations," reported a hospital director.

Job front: Youthpower, Inc., a group of some 87 youngsters, lined up 1,300 summer jobs for fellow teenagers in the Milwaukee area. The energetic youngsters founded a sales clinic and made 95 placements after one clinic. The idea for Youthpower was put forth by Elmer L. Winter, president of Manpower, Inc., when he heard predictions that 14,000 local young people would be unemployed during the summer.

Boy of the Year: The Boys' Clubs of America, with over 600,000 members, send a Boy of the Year to the White House annually. Last year's winner was Mike Rapinchuk, from Phoenix, Ariz., who climbs mountains, swims a mile each day, skindives, and has a straight A average. His father died when he was a baby, and he has had part-time jobs to help his working mother since he was old enough to run errands. "Young people must learn to get along with one another," Mike told a reporter. "After all, we're the ones who are going to live in this world."

And many more: Then, there are the thousands of newspaper carrier boys who help support their families or earn college money, the 4-H'ers who raise cattle and crops, the Junior Achievers, the Future Nurses, the young people in church and mission work. Also the young civil rightists, the high school senior girls who participate in General Mills' annual search for the Betty Crocker All-American Homemaker of Tomorrow, the exuberant ballplayers in all the youthful leagues and the individual sports stars, like 17-year-old Donna de Varona, winner of two gold medals for swimming in this year's Olympics.

These teenagers are the ones the Reverend William H. Miller of the national missions of the United Presbyterian Church, calls the "rebels with a cause."

These boys and girls find adventure and excitement in what they're doing. They lose themselves so completely in their projects that it takes strong parental effort to get them home to dinner or settled down to homework. The problem of these good kids is not enough time for all they want to do.

Remarks Made by Mrs. Mae Gurevich, Vice Chairman, New York Democratic State Committee, March 1, 1965, at 14th Annual Political Conference, Albany, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1965, I had the pleasure of participating in the 14th Annual Political Conference of the New York Democratic State Committee sponsored by the women's division, Democratic State Committee, Mrs. Mae Gurevich, vice chairman, addressed the conference on March 1 and under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include her address:

REMARKS MADE BY MRS. MAE GUREVICH, VICE CHAIRMAN NEW YORK DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE, 14TH ANNUAL POLITICAL CONFERENCE

The opportunity to come before you at this time and at this place each year is one of the most pleasurable and rewarding of the many responsibilities related to my office. The occasion of our annual conference affords me the privilege of renewing old friendships, making new ones, and thanking all of you who serve so well the Democratic Party and, thereby, the public good. In this singular year of Democratic triumphs, it is appropriate that I not only repeat my expressions of gratitude, but extend to you my warmest congratulations for a job well done—for by your efforts as women and your participation as Democrats, you have helped to bring about the political climate essential to effect the changes vital to the needs of our State and to pace New York to the tempo of the Nation.

The rising tide of party fortunes in this State is a tremendous satisfaction to us as leaders; the humanitarian considerations of the Democratic successes are the incentives to us as women. Throughout its long, turbulent history, the Democratic Party has concerned itself with humanity. With very few exceptions, all of our great Presidents have been Democrats. Although each one has left his own special impression on the Nation and the party, each was guided by the patterns of the past in meeting the needs of his own era and of the future. The continuity of Democratic purpose for a better, healthier, happier life for everyone has resulted in the economic and political reforms, and social, educational, and scientific progress in the United States.

The Great Society has been building for 173 years—ever since the Democratic Party came into being.

The beneficence of the Democratic Party to the people of New York State is marked on the statutes. Some of the most enlightened social and economic laws of this State were passed through the vision and courage of our Democratic greats. These reforms were accomplished in the face of the most difficult reactionary resistance. How many New Yorkers remember that a Republican-dominated assembly refused to join in the new nationwide system of social security? Gov. Herbert Lehman took his battle directly to the people. The social security law of this State was passed during his second administration. This is one of the many conspicuous examples of the consistent stifling of growth and development in New York State by Republican-controlled legislatures. It is also a conspicuous example of the imagination and the spirit of our Democratic leadership.

This concern for the dignity of the individual, this belief that each human life is important, is fundamental Democratic principle and the basis for its deep appeal to women, for we sought the ballot not only to secure the elective franchise, but to use it as an instrument to improve life for ourselves and our families. The goals of the Great Society are bold, ambitious and challenging. As women and as Democrats, we accept those challenges. We will endeavor to maintain the favorable atmosphere necessary to keep New York in uninterrupted step with the Nation. We have much to do and far to go—we must not fall back.

We women face other challenges, challenges that have not been listed on the conference program, challenges for which we cannot call in Washington experts, but which we must and do meet ourselves, in our own way. Fortunately, we have very powerful and sympathetic friends: Our best friends have all been in Washington—in the White House.

Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed Frances Perkins the first woman to become a member of the President's Cabinet. John F. Kennedy established the Commission on the Statutes of Women; and Lyndon B. Johnson called for an end to stag government.

Suiting his deeds to his words, he placed women in some of the highest paid and most important jobs in Government. He told his Cabinet: "Providence has distributed brains and skills pretty evenly over our people. To conclude that women are unfitted to the risks of our historic society seems to me the equivalent of closing male eyes to female facts."

The facts are that we have been moving away from the genteel position usually accorded the lady politician. Our usefulness in politics is no longer a debatable question. We have been publicly acclaimed on both sides of the aisle. When our late beloved President Kennedy defeated Henry Cabot Lodge in the race for his senatorial seat in 1957, Lodge blamed it all "on those damned teas." President Kennedy told an audience in 1960, that 1 woman is worth 10 men in a campaign.

We are very flattered and very proud of this acknowledgment. But, we have been apprentices for 45 years, since the passage of the 19th amendment. We have learned our craft well and we are ready to sit in the council halls, the statehouses and the Congress. Our ability to face facts, our capacity for hard work, our great talents for compromise, our intelligence and our dreams of a world at peace make us eminently suited to design the laws of this State and of this Nation.

I want to see more women candidates for public office—I want to see more women making party policy.

I leave you now with a quote from St. Augustine: "If God had designed woman as man's master, He would have taken her from his head. * * * If, as his slave, He would have taken her from his feet * * *. But He designed her for his companion and equal—He took her from his side."

Iowa Doctor Compares Medicare and Eldercare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, it has become quite apparent that the American public recognizes that many of our elder citizens are deprived of the security and peace of mind that should be their due after a lifetime of work. With great anxiety these elder citizens face the prospect of a long illness which could easily wipe out their savings of a lifetime and force them into a life of poverty. There has developed a great demand on the part of the American public for a sound program which will meet this pressing need.

For a considerable length of time I have been carefully studying the problem and the various proposals which have been offered as solutions. I have been most gratified that so many of my constituents in the First District of Iowa have taken the time to write and inform me of their views on this matter. These letters have been very helpful and informative. I would like to call to the attention of my fellow colleagues in the House of Representatives a particularly thoughtful letter which I have received

from a distinguished member of the medical profession, Dr. George Bedell.

I believe consideration of this analysis by Dr. Bedell will assist those in and out of Congress in evaluating specific legislative proposals and help calm appraisal of this most important public policy matter.

The letter follows:

Hon. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER,
Congress, First District of Iowa,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHMIDHAUSER: I have had an opportunity to review the medicare bill and the eldercare bill and have the following comments.

Medicare provides inpatient hospital benefits, nursing home benefits and outpatient diagnostic benefits for all persons age 65 and over. It recognizes the fact that people in this age range have large medical problems and limited ability to pay for these problems. It is a limited medical program, but it is deliberately so because it is designed to complement available medical programs. Medically indigent people have an opportunity to receive the rest of their medical care through local or State welfare programs or through the Kerr-Mills program which is primarily a program for the medically indigent. Middle class people will have an opportunity to provide the rest of their medical care either from their own financial resources or from a combination of their own financial resources and insurance. If medicare were to pass, the insurance companies would be able to write health insurance for people age 65 and over which would cover the medical services not provided for by the medicare bill, mainly doctors' fees, outpatient drugs, catastrophic hospitalization expense, and others at a cost which older people could afford to pay.

The eldercare bill is designed to provide more extensive services than the medicare bill, but it is designed to provide these services to the medically indigent. There would be considerable duplication because most of these patients now being taken care of by county or State welfare or by Kerr-Mills would be eligible for benefits under the eldercare plan. The definition of medical indigency is relaxed slightly in that a patient's total resources are not taken into account in determining eligibility; only his income. However, from past experience the income at which an individual becomes eligible is usually defined too narrowly. For example, in Iowa to qualify a single person must have an income of less than $1,500 per year. A married couple must have an income of less than $2,200 per year or $183 per month. The eldercare bill provides that eligible people mail in a certificate indicating that their income falls in this range. They will then be sent an insurance policy, either a Blue Cross-Blue Shield policy or a similar commercial policy which will provide for hospitalization, nursing home care, and physician's fee. The AMA is claiming that eldercare will pay for drugs and that medicare won't, but I believe that this is a false claim. Both plans would pay for inpatient drugs; neither plan would pay for drugs when the patient is an outpatient.

The effect on free choice of physicians: Both plans allow the patient free choice of physician and the physician free choice of hospitals. There is absolutely no difference between the two plans in this regard. The AMA is strongly insinuating that under medicare the patient will not have free choice of physicians, but this claim is absolutely false.

Effect on the patient: Medicare program is a program for all of the people. It will be particularly useful for middle-class people who live on limited income who have always been self-supporting, who have never accepted welfare payments and who, because of ill health find themselves unable to buy adequate hospitalization insurance at age 65. The eldercare proposal is designed and tailored mainly for the medically indigent person. Several programs are already operating for these people. It provides nothing for the middle-class citizen. There is a proposal in the bill that part of an insurance policy will be paid for people who have an income of more than the minimum limits at which a full insurance policy would be available. Exactly how this will work will vary considerably between States. As a general rule, the poorer States have the largest medical problems and they will not be in a position to meet the full needs since under eldercare part of the funds will come from the State and the program will be State administered.

Methods of financing: Medicare bill will be financed by an increase in social security taxes. After it has been in effect for sometime, it will operate much as a prepaid insurance plan, everyone pays the same taxes and everyone receives the same benefits. This is a perfectly reasonable way to finance this sort of benefit. We have experience in this type of financing through the social security program generally. The eldercare bill will be financed out of general tax revenues. It will operate as a Federal-State matching program. It will be up to the States to initiate legislation and to make appropriations before the program can go into effect. Experience with Kerr-Mills has shown that States are slow to implement the program and that in many States the program is still inadequately implemented.

Effect on the national economy: The medicare program will have a positive effect on the national economy. It should give help to the States that need help the most by providing adequate hospitalization for sick, older people in some of our poorer States. Jobs will be provided for ancillary personnel and the national economy will be benefited. The eldercare program would have the same type of effect on the economy if it were adequately implemented. The problem is that in many States it will be inadequately implemented and since State appropriations will be needed in order to initiate the program and since State appropriations will govern the adequacy of the program it can be expected to lag in many States on both of these counts.

Payment of physician's fees: The proponents of the eldercare bill claims that it is superior to medicare because it will pay physician's fees. It will pay physicians for caring for medically indigent individuals. These individuals are taken care of now by city, county, and State hospitals. No charge is made for their medical care which is some of the best in the Nation. Therefore, it can be argued that payment is being urged for a service which is already provided and adequately financed. I believe that the medically indigent in Iowa are receiving adequate physician's services at the present time. The eldercare bill which provides that the physicians be paid for these services will not render the services any better. On the other hand, the medicare bill which will pay hospital charges for a middle class individual will enable him to pay his doctor bills by himself. I feel that it is preferable that reimbursement of physician's services be left out of the medicare bill insofar as possible. The bill does provide that radiologists, pathologists and anesthesiologists who regularly bill through the hospital be paid. This is perfectly reasonable.

Outpatient drugs: One serious deficiency of both bills is that patients who are taking expensive drugs as an outpatient have no coverage. Current insurance policies do not cover this medical expense. The patient is left to his own resources. I feel it would be wise to study a plan of providing outpatient drugs at a minimal cost to the patient over 65 with Federal money used to subsidize this expense.

The American Medical Association position: The American Medical Association until approximately January 1, 1965, has argued that there is no need for this type of legislation. Within 1 week they did a complete turnabout and now admit that this type of legislation is needed, but they favor the eldercare plan over the medicare plan. At the present time the AMA is conducting an extensive advertising campaign. Although there are some valid arguments for eldercare it is unfortunate that the AMA is using deliberate distortions. For example, they claim the eldercare program will pay for drug bills and that medicare will not. In actuality there is no great difference between the two plans. The AMA implies that the quality of medical care will deteriorate under the medicare plan. I would quote from an article by Donavon F. Ward, president of the American Medical Association entitled "How Eldercare Protects the Elderly in Need of Medical Care," which appeared in the March 1965 Today's Health. Dr. Ward says, "Now what about the quality of care? As far as most physicians are concerned, this is the primary consideration. Doctors are convinced that the medicare tax bill, if passed into law, would have most serious effects. The quality of care is based primarily on the personal relationship between the patient and the doctor. The patient selects the physician he likes to care for his health needs. The physicians know this, and this sharpens his feeling of personal responsibility to the patient who has sought him out.

"It is this bond between patient and physician that is the core of quality care. Doctors believe that Federal intervention, through the medicare proposal, would be the initial step in weakening this personal relationship." This is a deliberate attempt to make people believe that under medicare the patient does not have free choice of physicians whereas under eldercare he does. This is false. Under both programs the patient has free choice of physicians and the physician has free choice of the hospital in which he wishes to place his patient.

Deductibles: The medicare bill provides that hospital services will be provided to the patient after he has paid for 1 day of hospitalization. It also provides that outpatient diagnostic services will be provided to the patient after he has paid $25. I feel that it is extremely important that the deductible portion be kept in the bill. It allows the patient to contribute to his medical expenses. I believe that Blue Cross has made a serious error in going to a full coverage policy. Full coverage implies that the patient can be admitted to the hospital and never pay a cent himself. This is the wrong principle. This is the principle that would be endorsed if the eldercare bill were passed. The American free enterprise system is served much better by having a deductible clause so that every time the patient incurs medical expenses he shares in the cost.

Responsible legislation: Responsible legislation provides a service, but it also recognizes that to provide a service there must be a collection of tax money. The medicare proposal provides for services and it provides for the obtaining of tax revenue for these services. The eldercare proposal is a promise of service with no provision for where the tax money will be found. Since much of the tax money will need to come from State taxes the AMA can be quite sure that in many States the eldercare bill will be very inadequately financed or will go into effect in name only. Because of this I believe it is fair to label this legislation as irresponsible. It puts a burden on the State governments and on the Federal Government without making available to these governments increased revenues to provide these services.

I believe this sums up many of the differences between the two bills and gives you a clear impression of why I strongly support the medicare bill.

Very sincerely,

GEORGE N. BEDELL, M.D.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, as you know each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United Stats conducts a Voice of Democrarcy contest. Vermont's winner this year is Miss Suzanna C. Shields, of Rutland. I am doubly proud in Suzanna's accomplishment in that not only does she represent the great State of Vermont, but she also hails from my own hometown. It is my pleasure and honor to insert Suzanna's fine inspirational speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

[By Suzanne C. Shields, Rutland, Vt.]

I am a citizen. I am a citizen of the United States of America. I am proud of my citizenship yet I have done nothing to earn it. It became mine at birth, yet I wonder if I have met the challenge of citizenship enough to deserve this privilege.

I have never fought for our country during it's darkest hour in a war. I have never helped with writing a passage of our government documents, or with writing one of our important or minor laws. I wasn't with Ben Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, and the others in Philadelphia for the writing and signing of the Declaration of Independence; I wasn't among the Minute Men at Lexington Green; I didn't fight under George Washington at Valley Forge; I couldn't even help when the great men of our country drew up the Constitution. I didn't do battle for North or South during the terrible war that tore across the middle of our country and then united it again, stronger and more peaceful. I wasn't aboard the *Lusitania*. I didn't have to live in trenches at the Marne River for months. I wasn't at Pearl Harbor; and I never knew of D-Day until I was old enough to read about it for myself. I've done nothing to help in the Cuban crisis, and I'm not in Berlin helping refugees escape through the wall, or in Vietnam fighting for freedom and peace.

Perhaps my life is not worth while and I don't deserve to be so proud of this citizenship. But I have almost all the rights of a full citizen. If I want to say that I think one man would have made a better president than another, I may do so, because I have the freedom of speech. If I want to write a letter to the editor of the local newspaper denouncing what is being done in some particular situation, I may do so, because I have the freedom of the press. If I want to go to church on Saturday and follow a religion slightly different from others, I may, because I have the freedom of religion. I would still have the right to do all these things even if I were a minority of one.

You have these rights, too. You have them and I have them because we live in a free and democratic society. Yet in some parts of the world these freedoms are unheard of. And I realize now that that is why I must try to be a good and loyal citizen. I can appreciate and value my life under democracy when I realize how oppressed others around the world are.

I know now why I must go to school and become educated, for only if I am learned can I become wise, and democracy is upheld be wise people. I know now why I must become familiar with our Government and all its functions, for only if I know its ways can I understand it and use it for myself and others. I know now why I must respect the rights, privileges, and properties of others for it is the only way to receive their respect in return. I know now why I must not be lazy or procrastinate, for a strong country is built by people who are willing to work and fight for what they believe. And when I become of age I will know why I must always try to select and vote for the most capable and most reliable man for the job. It is because only a strong, wise, and uncorrupt government headed by men and women with these characteristics, can function freely and properly for its people. And above all, I know why I must try to follow what I believe—it is because only then will I have the faith, strength, and courage we all need to become better citizens. Now I know, I am ready to become a worthwhile member of my society, and in the best ways I can, deserve and meet the challenge of citizenship.

Paupers in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, recently many members of the House Committee on Armed Services introduced legislation to increase the pay of our uniformed services. If there are those who question the urgent necessity for such legislation, I would refer them to the March 1965 Reader's Digest and the article, "Paupers in Uniform," written by Francis and Katharine Drake.

At a time when we are engaged in military operations in Vietnam, and when the entire world is filled with trouble spots, any one of which might erupt at any time, the posture of our military services is vital to every American. This article points out that "good hardware is of little use without good men," and continued inadequate pay standards may cause us to lose our ablest and most skilled fighting men in the Nation. We cannot allow that to happen. Because of the significance of this problem, I include "Paupers in Uniform" in the RECORD so that all can have a better understanding of the problem at which military pay increases are aimed.

The article follows:

PAUPERS IN UNIFORM

(By Francis and Katharine Drake)

(NOTE.—A job for Congress: revise the military pay scale upward. The present low-wage policy damages the morale and effectiveness of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen; it also causes constant turnover of personnel, thus wasting the taxpayers' money.)

The President's initiation of a crusade against poverty recently brought to light the plight of uncounted numbers of citizens who, at a time of unprecedented national prosperity, are unable to keep their heads above the financial disaster level. This spring the Nation is in for another shock, when the subject of military pay increases comes before Congress. The American people will then get a good hard look at a situation that must fill all but the thickest-skinned citizen with a sense of shame: the financial plight of the men who protect our country.

The fact is that thousands of American enlisted men on active duty, skilled volunteers who wear their country's uniform with pride, are actually paupers in uniform. It is ironic that the Government, which established poverty levels, is itself paying many of its uniformed men below these levels. Some soldiers, sailors, and airmen and their families are even being forced to accept relief.

The Air Force, with 719,000 enlisted men and women, has just completed a survey and found (the figures can be tripled to get very rough totals for all services): (a) 5,000 Air Force men have received relief benefits; (b) 55,000 more are technically eligible for relief but too proud to accept it; (c) 169,000 receive basic pay below the Government poverty levels; (d) 148,000 men are moonlighting in their meager spare time; and (e) 180,000 Air Force wives work to support the family.

It is a fact that a jet pilot, master of the skills involved in maneuvering supersonic planes, actually draws less pay than a Pentagon messenger.

LOST INVESTMENT

Former Senator Kenneth Keating described the pay situation as "a disgraceful reward for those who have sworn to defend our country." More than this, the low pay scale represents a great waste of the taxpayers' money. When poverty forces the majority of highly skilled men out of the services after their first hitch, the result is a perpetual turnover. The Government is committed to the tremendous cost of training new men who, in turn, will walk out. The total investment cost of training just one Air Force radar electronics specialist is $23,000; a ballistic-missile launch officer, $49,140; a B-52 commander, $1,400,000; his crew, another $2 million. When these men quit, all that investment goes down the drain.

Between 60 and 70 percent of all Air Force skilled enlisted men leave at the end of their first 4-year enlistment. Also, an average of 54 percent of the officers separate at the earliest permitted date. In the past 5 years Army resignations have increased by more than 50 percent, Air Force by 137 percent.

IN THE RED

The case history of Joe Doakes, high-school graduate, age 19, comes closer to the rule than to the exception. Joe, motivated by patriotism, challenge, the promise of a fine technical education, begins his 4-year hitch as airman basic—pay: $78 a month, living in barracks with no allowances. Three years later he is Airman First Class Doakes, now a skilled electronics specialist, earning $194 a month plus allowances, married, father of one child, expecting another—and in debt up to his ears. How, in 3 brief years, did Joe land himself in such a financial fix? The answer of course is: by marriage. (Our armed services today total 2,700,000 men in uniform; wives number about 1,500,000.)

Ineligible because of lack of rank for base housing, he now receives $83 quarters allowance from the Government. Cheapest off-base lodgings he can find cost $107 a month, not including utilities, which average $30 a month more. Furnishing the apartment sets him back nearly $1,000. Commuting to base involves a secondhand car; repair and gas bills cost him $24 a month. During the last 3 years Joe has had to move twice—and pay the family transporstation costs each time.

Government food allowance is $31.50 a month or roughly 10 cents per person per meal for the three Doakes. Total pay, including all allowances, is $308 a month.

It boils down to this: the Doakes' monthly budget invariably balances in the red. Whenever he can, Joe moonlights, but unpredictable duty hours make spare-time work irregular. The services, perpetually short of skilled men, are forced to hire civilian technical representatives from private industry. Joe works alongside one of these, performing a duplicate job. The technical representative earns $1,000 a month (plus generous overtime). Having spent $25,120 on Joe's training, the Air Force now presses him to reenlist, offering a $779 re-up bonus. The technical representative tells him not to be a fool.

THOUSANDS OF JOES

This is the sort of choice faced by thousands of young service couples each year. On the one side, pride, patriotism, the hope of promotion; on the other, more money, shorter hours, higher living, the freedom to change jobs if opportunity beckons.

Joes decision? "I'm quitting," he says. "Not because I want to, but because I just can't afford to stay in."

Multiply Joe by hundreds of thousands of men in each service: it adds up to billions of dollars a year wasted in unnecessary turnover—and a threat to our protective strength and the safety of our country. As Capt. William A. Golden states in the Naval Institute Proceedings: "It is now necessary to recognize objectively that officers (and enlisted men) cannnot be paid like busboys, worked like fieldhands and released like old, slow halfbacks—it simply is not good business."

Today, our military are in danger of becoming forgotten men. The economy is leaving them so far behind that it is small wonder they are becoming disillusioned and embittered, unwilling to put up any longer with the status of second-class citizens. Many will settle for less pay than they can get in industry, for the privilege of serving their country—but not if they going to be penalized for marrying young, and driven to live on charity handouts.

How can we make a military career attractive to the youth of America? The services, in mutual consultation, have defined the minimum improvements they believe necessary.

BASIC PAY

The study proposes an immediate pay increase of 16 percent for enlisted men with less than 2 years' service, 15 percent for officers with less than 2 years' service. plus increases for other officers and enlisted men, plus a redefinition of subsistence allowances for those who cannot eat on base. (There was a military pay raise only last year, but of only 2½ percent—of virtually no benefit to the lower ranks who needed it most.) The proposed increases would average from $12 to $44 a month for enlisted men, from $37 to $111 for officers. By contrast, raises granted last year to civilian Federal employees were five times as high.

PROMOTIONS

This is a major grievance among servicemen, since, at present, a promotion with accompanying pay increase is by no means automatically granted when a man becomes eligible. Restrictions on the services' authority to promote enlisted men deny deserved promotions. As a result, some highly qualified lower-grade enlisted men are doing sergeants' work but receiving neither sergeants' stripes nor sergeants' pay.

QUARTERS

Housing has long been acknowledged by Congress to be part of military pay. Quarters, moreover, are supposed to be on base, so that personnel are readily available in case of emergency, this commitment has never been properly honored. Below the rank of sergeant, virtually no serviceman is able to live on base if he is married. Instead, like the Doakes, hundreds of thousands of young service families dwell in civilian quarters, some adequate, some miserably substandard. Rent gouging in the vicinity of military bases is commonplace.

The services' proposal is to adjust basic quarters allowances to a more realistic amount. This is a stopgap. What is really needed is adequate base housing—which would cost the Government less in the long run.

A cure lies in renewing the Capehart Housing bill, which expired last year. That bill permitted the military to have houses built on base, or next to it, by civilian contractors; to borow the cost from private lenders on FHA-secured 20-year mortgages; and pay these off out of congressional appropriations. The mortgage cost on a $17,500 unit is actually less than the average amount now paid out for a serviceman's quarters allowance—and the Government ends by owning the house free and clear. While the government cannot build all the 350,000 units needed, it can and should build more than the 3,000 at present under construction.

But even with adequate housing, military paychecks can never compete with the wages of private industry. A petty officer in charge of the reactor aboard the cruiser *Long Beach* earns $453 a month. His civilian counterpart aboard the *Savannah* rates $1,200.

PRIVILEGES

These represent the compensating factors that traditionally bridge the gaps. Among them—counted as a part of service pay for 99 years—is the right to shop in commissaries, where the military can buy food at cost plus a surcharge of three percent. Well stocked at one time, post stores nowadays have only a quarter of the items available at supermarkets, operate only 40 hours a week, carry no specials, no fancy items, and have long waiting lines; but savings amount roughly to $400 a year per family of four—a sum of critical importance.

A questionnaire recently circulated among 176,000 men in uniform reveals that 50 percent more enlisted men and 30 percent more officers would be obliged to leave the service if post shopping facilities were withdrawn and the $400 savings denied. Loss to the Government on commissary transactions amounts to roughly $40 a year per family, a sizable sum overall. But as Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, points out: an increase of one-tenth of 1 percent in the reenlistment rate would more than cancel out this Government red ink.

Also, the Department of Defense has acknowledged that any attempt to replace commissary savings with a pay raise would greatly exceed the Government cost in operating base stores. Constant attacks on these and other privileges—base clubs, movies, etc., run by the men themselves at no cost to the Government—tend to make men quite in disgust. Anything that injures the military esprit de corps costs the Nation dearly.

NEEDED: GOOD MEN

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's determination to run his Department as efficiently as a business has been much in the headlines. He has shown courage and ingenuity in saving nearly $3 billion from our defense bill. Yet, in the words of Adm. David McDonald, the Chief of Naval Operations: "No other business in the world leans so heavily on manpower as does the military." Good hardware is of little use without good men.

The cost of the raise in pay and allowances for all services, proposed in the military services' study, is $811 million a year. Against this, savings would be realized. Pay and maintenance of our 2,700,000 men is about $15 billion a year; if, by retention of experienced men, the total manpower requirement could be reduced by only 10 percent, the savings would exceed the pay raise by far.

In the last analysis, the hope for the military lies in the understanding and support of the public, whose welfare is directly concerned. To give servicemen the stepchild treatment is to tamper recklessly with the innermost fabric of military security. If through indifference we cast loose the ablest and most skilled fighting men in the world, our future is indeed in jeopardy.

Fred Rosenberg Dies on His 79th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age where people are constantly turning to the Government to assist in resolving some of the community problems, I believe Mr. Fred Rosenberg of Santa Rosa, Calif., will stand as a symbol of what an energetic and dedicated individual can provide in the way of a stimulating influence for motivating people into action in a given community. In paraphrasing the late President Kennedy, it is not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country. Fred Rosenberg will always stand out as a living example of this credence.

Fred Rosenberg has left an indelible mark on the Santa Rosa community with many unselfish philanthropic donations that have accrued to the benefit of many people—young and old. In most instances his donations and contributions were totally without publicity and in keeping with the great character of this fine country gentleman.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I want to present for the benefit of my colleagues a recent article in the Santa Rosa Press Democrat eulogizing Fred Rosenberg more adequately that I could possibly describe. In presenting this written testimonial to Members of Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would hope that the Fred Rosenberg story could serve as a motivation for other people through the Nation similarly situated. Many communities throughout the country desperately need this type of leadership as we seek means to advance social progress in the traditional American way.

The article follows:

FRED ROSENBERG DIES ON HIS 79TH BIRTHDAY

Fred S. Rosenberg, Santa Rosa's biggest taxpayer and a dominant figure in the development of Santa Rosa's downtown area, died last night at a Santa Rosa hospital on his 79th birthday.

Mr. Rosenberg had been hospitalized off and on since November.

Mr. Rosenberg served two terms as president of the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce; 5 years on the Santa Rosa Board of Public Utilities, and also served on Sonoma County grand juries. At the time of his death he was a member of the Bank of

America's advisory committee in Santa Rosa and vice president of the Santa Rosa Foundation under the Howarth Trust, which is responsible for the development of the Lake Ralphine and Howarth Park area.

In World War II Mr. Rosenberg served 2 years on the State war chest committee.

Mr. Rosenberg and his family have been generous to Santa Rosa. In 1948 they donated land valued at $15,000 to Santa Rosa's Memorial Hospital. On the left of the sidewalk at the main entrance to the hospital from Montgomery Drive can be seen the drinking fountain and plaque memorialized to Max and Emilia Rosenberg.

The Rosenberg family also donated $5,000 to the Santa Rosa Foundation for Santa Rosa Junior College scholarships, and last year Mr. and Mrs. Rosenberg donated the $100,000 Tower Theater property adjacent to the old library to the city to extend the new library site.

During the postwar years Mr. and Mrs. Rosenberg did some traveling. Following a trip to Europe where they were particularly impressed with city beautification accomplished through tree plantings, they decided that Santa Rosa too would benefit if trees were planted alongside downtown streets.

Mr. Rosenberg himself persuaded the city government to adopt a tree-planting program leading to the tree that are now on Fourth and Fifth Streets.

TRIBUTES

Today Santa Rosa leaders paid tribute to the role fo Mr. Rosenberg in the development of the community.

"I learned with great sadness this morning of the death of my friend and highly respected fellow citizen, Fred Rosenberg," said retired Sonoma County Superior Court Judge Hilliard Comstock.

"For many years I have been intimately associated with him, socially, professionally, and in many civic activities. I can thank of no one in our community who has throughout the years contributed more to Santa Rosa's growth and progress.

"The same should be said of his father, the late Max Rosenberg, the other members of the Rosenberg family, and particularly his loyal and beloved wife, Jessie, who has been quietly by his side furnishing the motivation for so many fine things that have been done for our community such as the donation for the library site, the purchase of the original Santa Rosa Memorial Hospital site, the tree planting in the downtown area and countless other acts of unselfish activity for the city they loved so well. The community has suffered a great loss.

"I share Santa Rosa's sadness and grief at the passing of one of our most outstanding citizens," said Mayor Dr. Robert Tuttle. "Mr. Rosenberg was a personal friend as well as one upon whom all Santa Rosans could rely. His innumerable contributions to the welfare and betterment of the people of the city of Santa Rosa will stand as a living testimony to his generous character.

"It is rare that a community is fortunate enough to have had the benefit of a business leader as civic minded as Mr. Rosenberg. His wise counsel will be particularly missed by all of us in the city's legislative body.

"I know I speak for all of my fellow citizens in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Rosenberg and her family for their loss," he concluded.

"Fred Rosenberg's passing means that another of our great merchants who helped develop Santa Rosa as a trading center has completed his work," said Colin E. Campbell, manager of the Santa Rosa Downtown Development Association.

"Had it not been for the experience and judgment forged by these men through good years, and depressions, Santa Rosa could be just another little town. Instead we have a fine city surrounded by fine shopping centers.

"I was privileged to know him as a friend and fellow merchant and to respect him for what he has done for Santa Rosa in many ways not generally known."

OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTION

Robert Bishop, another civic leader, noted that Mr. Rosenberg and his father were the builders of downtown Santa Rosa, and made an outstanding contribution to early Santa Rosa.

"He was basically a very modest man and in his actions he did what he thought was right," Mr. Bishop said. "I had the privilege of knowing him for some 20 years, and found that he gave generously—without any publicity to charities and good causes."

"As I knew him," said Thomas Cox, manager of the Greater Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce, "Fred Rosenberg was what I would call a real old conservative businessman. He did much for people without any fanfare or publicity, and our minutes show that both he and his father, Max, were good chamber of commerce people.

"He was often misunderstood, but as a fellow Rotarian I got to know him quite well in the last few years and I liked him. His favorite story to me was about the chamber secretary who had to go out and collect his own salary. One day I found in the minutes the man he was talking about was my friend, Walter Nagle, who was secretary in 1917."

Mr. Cox said that he hopes that Santa Rosa citizens "will see fit to place a plaque to his memory in the new public library" in recognition of Mr. and Mrs. Rosenberg's generous gift (the Tower Theater property) last year.

"His part in helping the chamber of commerce to raise funds for the Santa Rosa Memorial Hospital when the chamber people undertook that fundraising campaign is well known. He was one of the few men who was president of the chamber twice." Mr. Cox said that included among these was Frank P. Doyle, father of the Golden Gate Bridge. "These men worked together to accomplish much for Santa Rosa."

LONG HISTORY

The Rosenberg family history stretches back to Santa Rosa's pioneer era prior to the turn of the century.

Max Rosenberg—Fred's father—was a native of Poland and traveled alone from Germany to California in 1885, joining his uncle, Wolf Rosenberg, who was running a clothing store in Healdsburg. This firm, which is still in business, now goes under the name of Rosenberg & Bush and is owned by second generation family members, Ira and Garrett Rosenberg, both of Healdsburg.

After working with his uncle for 2 years, Max sent for his wife, the former Emilia Silberstein and their infant son Fred, who had been living with her parents in Gollup, Germany. Then in 1887 Max left his uncle's Healdsburg business and in partnership with his younger brother, Isadore, opened a store at the corner of Third and Market Streets in San Francisco under the name of Rosenberg Bros.

The brothers were successful and branches were opened at Woodland and St. Helena. It was in 1895, while he was visiting Santa Rosa's Rose Carnival—the last occasion when there were horse-drawn floats—that Max recognized the advantages of Santa Rosa's climate, as he had experienced health problems in San Francisco's fog.

The following year he returned to Santa Rosa and opened a store known at the time as the Red Front. The San Francisco and St. Helena stores were discontinued, and his brother, Isadore, took over the Woodland business.

Then came the earthquake and the fire of April 18, 1906, reducing the store to rubble. Temporary quarters were located on Mendocino Avenue. Then the store was moved to the corner of Fifth and B Streets, the site of the Roxy Theater.

When the Overton Hotel Building was erected at Fourth and B Streets, Max took over the corner store. He was compelled to take over the entire ground floor of what is now the Santa Rosa Hotel. There was fierce competition with Roher & Einhorn, a department store on the site of Hardesty's, Keegan Bros., and the White House.

As for Fred Rosenberg's early life, he attended the old Fourth Street Elementary School at North and Fourth Streets, then Santa Rosa High School and finally Sweet's Business College. In his early teens he started his career in his father's store—first as an errand boy, then successively as apprentice salesman, salesman, buyer, and finally as manager. He was admitted as partner to the business which was operated under the name of Rosenberg & Son.

He was married 45 years ago to a San Francisco girl, the former Jesse Fox. They made their first home at Rose Court before moving to 824 Mendocino Avenue.

The story is told that when Fred and his wife decided to move to their Mendocino Avenue property, his father shook his head, and said: "I think you're proposing to build too far away from the business."

In 1924 the Rosenbergs decided to invest in an office building, although they recognized that it would be unprofitable at that time. This project was the Rosenberg Building. Max explained their motive in this venture: They wanted to do something for Santa Rosa which had been so good to them.

In the late twenties, with funds derived from their thriving business, they stepped up their real estate operations. The formula was to buy a good piece of business property, develop it, hold it on the basis of a good return on the investment and then sell at a substantial profit.

Using these techniques the team built up substantial real estate holdings in the Santa Rosa area. In the late twenties they acquired the land between D and E Streets going all the way back to Third St. and built Rosenberg's Department Store.

They also acquired property along the south side of Fifth Street, including the old city firehouse, east of the White House's toy store entrance.

On May 8, 1936, the store at Fifth and B Streets was destroyed by fire. It was following this disaster that the Rosenbergs decided to acquire as much property as possible on both sides of Fourth Street to Third Street and east to E Street. They were succesaful and on October 20, 1937, the present store at Fourth and D Streets was completed.

The Rosenbergs were also active in real estate purchases in San Francisco. One of their major buys was the Chancellor Hotel, opposite the St. Francis at Powell and Post.

Max Rosenberg, who had been in retirement since his wife's death in 1931, died October 1, 1944, at the age of 84. In the inventory and appraisement filed in Sonoma County Superior Court in May 1947, his estate was valued at $1,336,872.86 in the probate department.

In December 1950, Fred Rosenberg purchased the Food City Market at 180 Sebastopol Road for $50,000 which he described as an investment because of the rapid growth in the Roseland district and also the opening of an Exchange Bank office in that area. At that time he also owned two other grocery store sites in downtown Santa Rosa.

On May 14, 1951, Mr. Rosenberg sold Rosenberg's Department Store which had contributed so much to the family fortune for a reported $1.5 million, but he retained ownership of the building which is now leased to the McNeany interests.

When he handed over the keys of the store to the new owner, he commented: "Don't think you're going to lose me. I'm going to hang around a long, long time."

Then in November the same year he announced that he had purchased the 150-room

Occidental Hotel from the heirs of millionaire-philanthropist Leonard Howarth.

"My decision to buy the Occidental Hotel is a measure of my faith in the continuing progress and future of our Santa Rosa," he explained.

"As a community we have not scratched the surface. I venture to predict that in the next 10 years Santa Rosa's population will double."

In August of 1952, when he announced another of his continuing acquisitions—a property at 913 Fourth Street, which involved tearing down an old house and constructing a modern office building in its place—he observed that stores "should make their own provisions for parking," despite the city's off-street parking program.

On May 14, 1951, Fred Rosenberg sold Rosenberg's Department Store to Joseph E. McNeany for $1,500,000. However, Mr. Rosenberg retained ownership of the building which is now leased to the McNeany interests.

Mr. Rosenberg was trustee of the Max Rosenberg estate, and he and his wife, Jessie, were shareholders in Fred S. Enterprises and Occidental Hotel Properties.

In addition he was past president of B'nai B'rith Lodge 846, and member for more than 46 years; a member of Santa Rosa Masonic Lodge 57; a 50-year member of Santa Rosa Bodies Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite; the Aahmes Temple Shrine; Commonwealth Club of California; Santa Rosa Rotary Club; Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce; California State Chamber of Commerce; first president (1944) Santa Rosa Jewish Community Center; vice president Santa Rosa Foundation; California Retailers Association; California War Chest, Inc. (1943–46).

Chairman of Santa Rosa Citizens Committee on Revenue and Finance (1946); Santa Rosa Memorial Hospital Drive Committee (1949); Sonoma County Hospital Advisory Commission chairman (1952); Advisory Board for Registrants in the Selective Service System of the United States, October 1940–March 1947.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following speech on "The Challenge of Citizenship," prepared and delivered by Mr. Charles H. Goodrich, of Huntington, W. Va., which is being actively considered as the national winner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars' annual contest on this subject.

All of West Virginia is proud of Mr. Goodrich's accomplishment.

His speech follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Charles H. Goodrich, Huntington, W. Va.)

Citizenship, unfortunately, does not mean the same thing the world over. When I say "citizenship," we, in this country, are naturally reminded of freedom, for the brand of citizenship which each of us should live is founded on and cannot exist without freedom. In other parts of the world, where freedom is restricted or even withheld, citizenship loses its meaning and we might as well give it the name "existanceship" or "ownership."

The benefits of our type of citizenship are well known. Among the many blessings our country offers are freedom to order our lives, freedom to form and hold our own opinions, freedom to worship as we please, and many, many more. We are constantly reminded that along with the pleasure of these gifts goes a responsibility and a duty to preserve them. How can these responsibilities be carried out? How can we safeguard our freedom? This is the challenge of citizenship.

People who have accepted this challenge in the past are familiar to all of us. Among them are the freethinking nobles who dared defy tradition and force King John to sign Magna Carta. There was also a small group of plain, proud farmers who stood in the way of British regulars on Concord Bridge, and a devoted group of 55 men who risked their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, by signing the Declaration of Independence.

Today, it is easy to forget what an advantage freethinking and free enterprise gives us over nations where freedom is compromised. It is likewise easy to recount the men of the past who have met freedom's challenges. Many citizens, however, which to know what we can do for our country now, what the challenge of citizenship is today. To gain appreciation of our freedoms, the formula is simply to enjoy them and to use them. We should take every opportunity to use our freedom not as a license, but as a liberty to be enjoyed. The danger in keeping our freedoms in reserve (something to fall back on) is that one day, when we need freedom most, we may find nothing there. For instance, we should constantly and conscientiously form opinions and express them at every opportunity. The only time many Americans bother to form opinions on public issues is a few weeks before election day in November. Even then, they merely vote and never bother to discuss the issues. I am not condemning this system; however, if the only way people express their opinions is by pulling a voting lever, this is keeping up on freedom of speech about as well as we would keep up on world events by reading a newspaper every 4 years.

At the same time, we make and express our conscientious opinions, we should listen to what other people have to say. By listening to others, our opinions become tempered with a sense of tolerance and understanding that comes from looking at all sides of a problem. Of course, the finest and most high minded of ideas do no good unless they are backed with action. For instance, if our State needs revenue to raise the quality of our schools, we should take action by working for candidates who will support education, or better yet, run for office ourselves.

Along with people who may temper our opinions, there are always those with whom we disagree completely. Since it is important that the rights of a minority be protected, we might well adopt the attitude of Voltaire when he said: "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." This type of chivalrous feeling, championing the rights of others, is the principle on which our country was founded.

In closing, I would like to say that freedom today depends on our willingness to keep using our freedoms, not to hold them in reserve. It depends on our ability to look at all sides of a problem and let our opinions be tempered by those of others. Finally, it rests with our concern, not merely for our own rights, but for the rights of people who disagree with us. This is the challenge of citizenship. Keep our freedom from rusting with neglect. It is one of the few things that will never wear out with use.

Dutch Statement for Atlantic Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 2 a remarkable nonpartisan statement was issued by 28 leading statesmen, business leaders, and professors of the Netherlands. It took the form of an open letter to Dutch Foreign Secretary Luns in which the Dutch Government was urged to give highest priority to strengthening the Atlantic community. It opposed political union of the six Common Market nations, basing opposition mainly on the attitude of President de Gaulle of France as regards the United States.

This statement makes it clear there is substantial support in the Netherlands for the development of an Atlantic community and concern over the present tendency to develop a United States of Europe as a third force between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Here is the full text of the statement:

OPEN LETTER TO THE NETHERLANDS MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The maintenance and strengthening of the Atlantic Alliance has been the cornerstone of Netherlands foreign policy since the North Atlantic Treaty Organization came into being.

This alliance is now being undermined and threatened owing to the direction in which the Europe of the Six is developing.

The integration of Europe is also an essential element of our foreign policy, but because our country has always taken the position that this integration should actually strengthen the Atlantic Alliance, Holland is now faced with a serious choice between priorities.

Holland has always striven to insure that the Brussels communities should be open to other nations.

In the sphere of economic integration, which Holland has always regarded as of particular importance for the realization of the ideal of a united Europe, our country has always endeavored to insure that the process of integration should not be limited to the Six, but that England and other European countries should also be brought into it.

Likewise in the political sphere Holland strives to bring these countries into the integration of Europe to insure the democratic character and the political stability of the Europe of the future.

As regards defense and the most important issues of international policy, on which depend the peace of the world, the basic conception of our policy has always been that our country, indeed the whole of Western Europe, can only be secure and strong inside an Atlantic organization in which the full power of the United States of America comes into play.

Holland has always rejected as disastrous the concept of a united Europe as a third power between American and the Soviet Union.

The undersigned fully suport the objectives of Netherlands policy, but they consider its realization to be in danger.

The efforts to give the communities an open character received a heavy blow from the French veto of January 1963 against the

admission of the United Kingdom. It is clear that this veto was not exercised for economic, but exclusively for political reasons.

The admission of the United Kingdom would certainly have constituted a guarantee for an Atlantic orientation of the process of European integration.

The current French efforts to organize Europe in the sphere of defense and foreign policy are, on the contrary, aimed at loosening the links with the Anglo-Saxon countries and at pursuing a policy that is independent of the United States and the United Kingdom. Moreover, this continental European policy is being pursued on the basis of the continuing sovereignty of the participating countries. Such a policy, which leads to the estrangement of the remaining NATO partners, represents a serious threat to the essential cohesion of the West. It leads to a revival of nationalism. It would seriously affect the ability of Europe to defend itself. It threatens the achievements of postwar Western cooperation.

The process of erosion has already begun. A solution of the nuclear problem on an Atlantic basis has been postponed and, if appearances are not deceptive, unhealthy ideas are spreading on an increasing scale about the role of Europe in Western cooperation.

The positive results which are being achieved in the economic communities and which, as such, must be accounted very favorable, are no adequate compensation for this.

In the actual situation of today the undersigned urge that at the earliest possible point in any eventual discussion over political union a renewed demand should be made for the participation of the United Kingdom. Without wishing to underwrite the policy which United Kingdom governments have followed since 1945 with regard to European integration, they are convinced that it is in the interests of Europe that the United Kingdom should be brought into the process of European integration.

The United Kingdom Government has stated with all clarity that it wishes to take part in this political discussion. Moreover, as to all appearances this discussion will be conducted on a purely intergovernmental basis, the undersigned see in the noninclusion of the United Kingdom a fresh proof of the disturbing development of events in Europe. For such a discussion, moreover, the Western European union would be the indicated forum.

They entirely reject the setting up of a political union of the six on the basis of a treaty, if only because there is no agreement between the six over the fundamental objectives of foreign policy, specifically as regards the attitude toward the United States.

For the same reasons they have grave misgivings about an institutionalized examination of this subject between the Six.

They regard as unsound the argument that such an examination would offer a good opportunity to expound the standpoint of the Five in relation to France. The events of recent years have sufficiently shown that the Five are not able to adopt a common standpoint. Fresh discussions by the Six would only lead to further concessions to France and a continuing cleavage of the Atlantic world. They likewise reject the inclusion of defense in such a discussion. Here also there is no identity of view regarding the foundations of a common policy, beside which the military potential is lacking for an independent European defense system.

The undersigned do not hesitate to affirm that the Europe of the Six cannot develop into an entity which can even get near to guaranteeing our security.

Only NATO can do that, for thanks to the participation of the United States it forms the only framework within which defense can be effectively organized, and therefore the only one deserving consideration.

The attempt to detach defense policy from NATO and to bring it over into a continental European context would eventually cause the splitting up of the Western World, with all the resulting dangers both for our national and personal survival. The undersigned are in favor of a further development of military integration—also in the field of nuclear weapons—in an Atlantic context.

The undersigned make an urgent appeal to the Government that in these coming months, in which such an important and perhaps decisive choice is to be made, it should hold with all its might to the basic principles of its policy and not allow itself to be dragged along, under the label of European union, on a course which would cause irreparable damage to European integration and to the cohesion of the Atlantic world.

A strengthening of the links between Europe and America and concerted action by the countries joined together in NATO deserve both now and in the future to retain the highest priority in Netherlands policy.

The undersigned act in individual capacity.

Prof. Dr. A. H. M. Albregts, Jhr. Dr. Fr. A. M. Alting von Geusau, S. J. van den Bergh, Prof. Dr. P. P. van Berkum, Drs. E. H. van der Beugel, Mr. P. M. H. van Boven, Jhr. Mr. M. L. de Brauw, Mr. D. A. Delprat, Mr. Dr. J. Donner, Dr. W. Drees, Mr. C. L. W. Fock, Prof. Mr. W. F. de Gaay Fortman, Jhr. Mr. L. E. de Geer van Gudegein, Prof. Dr. P. Geyl, Drs. G. J. H. de Graaff, Dr. C. F. Karsten, Dr. L. de Jong, H. J. de Koster, Prof. Dr. J. Kymmell, C. J. van Mastrigt, Mr. W. Baron Michiels van Kessenich, J. A. Middelhuis, Mr. J. J. Oyevaar, Dr. L. J. Pieters, Prof. Mr. C. H. F. Polak, C. van de Poll, Drs. J. W. de Pous, Prof. Dr. J. E. de Quay, Dr. P. Rykens, Ir. K. Scholtens, Ir. C. StafMr. M. P. L. Steenberghe, Prof. Dr. J. Tinbergen, Jhr. Mr. A. W. L. Tjarda van Starkenborch, Drs. B. J. Udink, Mr. G. B. van Walsum, H. H. Wemmers, and Prof. Dr. J. Zijlstra.

Medical Chief Describes Expanding VA Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the recent article appearing in the February 1 issue of U.S. Medicine by the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, Dr. Joseph H. McNinch, in which he describes in some detail the medical program of the VA. I think the Members will find it of interest.

MEDICAL CHIEF DESCRIBES EXPANDING VA PROGRAMS

(By Joseph H. McNinch, M.D., Chief Medical Director, Veterans' Administration)

Since joining the VA in June 1963, I have become aware of the fact that many people in and out of Government know very little about the VA medical program. This brief review will give some insight into what has been called the largest civilian medical service in the world.

The U.S. Government has always assumed the responsibility for the medical care of service-connected disabilities of its veterans. The various laws relating to the veteran benefits are consolidated under title 38 of the U.S. Code. Under the law the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, within limits of Veterans' Administration facilities, may furnish such medical service as he finds to be reasonably necessary to any veteran for service-connected disabilities.

This medical care for service-connected disabilities may be on either an inpatient basis or outpatient basis. The law also authorizes the Administrator to furnish hospital care which he determines is needed to any veteran of any war for a non-service-connected disability if the veteran is unable to defray the expenses of necessary hospital care. This authority again is "within the limits of Veterans' Administration facilities."

The Administrator is also, within the limits of the VA facilities, authorized to furnish medical care to peacetime veterans whose discharge or release from military, naval or air service was for a disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty.

Legislation recently enacted, Public Law 88-450, also authorizes the VA to operate not less than 4,000 nursing home beds and, under certain conditions, to pay private nursing homes for the care of veterans discharged from VA hospitals.

You may have noted that I have used the phrase, "within the limits of Veterans' Administration facilities," several times. There is no legal limit to the number of hospital beds the VA may construct or operate; however, there has been established a presidential ceiling of 125,000 hospital beds. Currently, the agency is operating approximately 121,000 such beds.

The full-time employees of the department of medicine and surgery, which number approximately 130,000, are for the most employed under the civil service system. However, in 1946, the Congress enacted a law which removed physicians, dentists, and nurses from the classified system of the civil service. We in the VA commonly refer to them as title 38 personnel.

A major reason for this action was the concept that the employment limitations of civil service, that is, a limited worksheet with additional pay for overtime was not conducive to a good medical service. Under title 38, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has great authority in terms of appointment, promotion, and separation from employment, of physicians, dentists, and nurses.

The grades of these personnel are established by law and the salaries for each grade, minimum and maximum, where applicable are likewise established by law.

However, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines the qualifications required for appointment in any grade and for promotion. Separation from employment is determined under regulations promulgated by the Administrator. His decision in each case is final.

The law also authorizes the Administrator to employ interns, residents, trainees, and students in the medical support programs either on a temporary full-time or part-time basis.

The Chief Medical Director with the approval of the Administrator (unless specifically otherwise provided), promulgates all regulations necessary to the administration of the Department of Medicine and Surgery. Also, consistent with existing law, these regulations include those relating to travel, transportation of household goods and effects, deductions from pay for quarters and subsistence, and the custody, use and preservation of records, papers, and property of the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

FACTS AND FIGURES

A few facts and figures extracted from our 1964 fiscal year experience may be of interest. During the year we received 985,300 applications for hospitalization.

This was 23,200 more than fiscal year 1963 and 48,300 more than fiscal year 1962. Of the number applying in 1964, 634,300 were admitted to hospitals or about 65 percent. The remainder were found to be either ineligible for or not requiring hospital care.

During the year we operated 168 hospitals and a number of independent outpatient clinics. The number of independent outpatient clinics is gradually decreasing due to our present policy of consolidating these clinics with hospitals in the belief that the medical care provided improves in quality and operating economies are realized.

The average number of patients treated daily in VA hospitals was approximately 110,000, of which better than 50 percent were psychiatric patients, the reminder equally divided between medicare and surgical patients.

I feel it necessary to point out that although more than half of our beds at any one time were occupied by patients with psychiatric problems, only 15 percent of the patients treated in any one year are classified as psychiatric. The more rapid turnover of medical and surgical patients accounts for this statistical result.

I have mentioned previously that outpatient care is limited to treatment of service-connected disabilities. Although this is technically true, the VA has been authorized to work up patients scheduled for admission to hospitals on an outpatient basis and to follow up patients discharged from hospitals on a similar basis as a means of decreasing the length of hospitalization.

To care for this patient load the VA had on duty as of June 30, 1964, 5,034 full-time physicians, 2,707 noncareer residents, and 384 career residents. I will mention residents again later on. Our nursing staff is approximately 15,000 in number. Altogether our total full time employment in the medical program is approximately 130,000, of which 3,000 are engaged in research activities.

As many of you know, in 1946 the Veterans' Administration began a program of affiliation with medical schools under the concept that such affiliation would, through the introduction of teaching programs and research, result in a high quality of medical care in VA hospitals. This concept has proven to be correct.

We currently have some 88 hospitals which are affiliated with 78 medical schools.

These affiliations range from those which are very close to those which are only loose in nature. The degree of affiliation depends upon the need of the school for clinical material and research facilities, upon the degree of physical proximity between the school and the VA hospital, and upon personal attitudes of faculty members and VA staffs.

We also have affiliation with dental schools, schools of nursing, and with colleges which are graduating other health sciences personnel.

The original concept of affiliation and training in 1946 related primarily to postgraduate training of physicians in the various specialties as residents. The degree to which this program expanded is indicated by the following list. In 1964 the following personnel had some or all of their training in VA hospitals:

Physician residents	3,023
Dental residents	37
Medical interns	162
Dental interns	58
Medical students:	
3d- and 4th-year clinical clerks	6,598
1st- and 2d-year students	1,872
Student nurses (basic training)	4,010
Registered nurses (advanced training)	347
Clinical and counseling psychologists	700
Social work masters degree candidates	498
Dietetic interns	193
Pharmacy interns	23
Medical technologists	57
Rehabilitation therapists	1,104
Residents in hospital administration	6
Hospital librarians	13
Nurse anesthetists	15
Dental hygienists	60
Dental assistants	25
Total	18,801

This list shows that the Veterans' Administration, indeed, is participating in the training of a large segment of health sciences personnel of the Nation.

Discussion about educational programs in the VA naturally brings up its corollary, medical research. Medical research in the VA is a mission-oriented program that is responsive to the needs of the veteran population.

A large proportion of patients presently being serviced in VA hospitals and clinics are in the age group most affected by chronic diseases: cancer, emphysema, heart disease, stroke, diabetes, rheumatism, mental illness, and so on. This circumstance will be magnified as the veteran population continues to become older. We believe ourselves obligated to intensify our efforts to acquire more extensive knowledge of the causes of these diseases, their successful treatment, the reduction of ensuing disability and, hopefully, their prevention.

RESEARCH HAZARDS

We recognize full well that direct research involves some hazards. However, as we pointed out in a presentation to the Commission on Heart Disease, Stroke and Cancer, we believe it possible to orient our research problem within reasonable limits so that we do not sacrifice the creativity of the investigator or the quality of the research efforts. We have been able to attract investigators because of the unique opportunities we provide.

Because a large number of our VA hospitals are located adjacent to medical colleges they are staffed with competent full-time personnel in most of the physician and nonphysician specialties. Many of these professional people hold medical college facility appointments and are able to practice and teach without the diversion of outside demands and presures. VA hospitals have a wide variety of clinical material, medical records, and unexcelled facilities for long-range followup.

An important part of our research effort is the training of personnel in research. In our Department of Medicine and Surgery we have two training programs, the clinical investigator program and the research associate program.

The clinical investigator program established in 1956 has the objective of encouraging talented young physicians to supplement their knowledge and skills in clinical medicine or surgery with an equal competence in the science and technology from which medical practice is developed.

It provides an opportunity for physicians who have completed their residency training and have demonstrated their researchability to spend the major portion of the next 3-year period in research while they receive additional professional, academic, and investigator training. At the conclusion of this assignment the physician has reached a level of accomplishment as an independent investigator and is qualified as an able teacher and clinician.

SUCCESS DEMONSTRATED

The success of this program is demonstrated by the fact that 78 percent of the graduates have remained in either the VA or an affiliated medical school with the greater number remaining in the VA. At present there are 74 clinical investigators working in 37 different VA hospitals.

The Research Associate program was established in those professional areas where there is a shortage of qualified personnel and an accompanying limitation of research interest. We place selected individuals in a research environment conducive to stimulating their professional and scientific growth. At present we are supporting Research Associate programs in the field of psychiatry, psychology, oral diseases, and pathology.

In fiscal year 1964 our research effort was directed to 6,805 projects. Although classification of systemwide research projects is difficult the diagnostic breakdown which follows may be of interest:

Infectious diseases (other than tuberculosis)	206
Cancer and allied diseases	501
Disorders (endocrine, metabolic, nutritional)	550
Diseases of blood and blood-forming organs	289
Mental, psychoneurotic, and behavioral disorders	1,412
Nervous system and sense organs	443
Cardiovascular diseases	767
Respiratory diseases (TB and other)	602
Gastrointestinal tract diseases	529
Genitourinary diseases (genital disorders, kidney, ureter, bladder, diseases)	303
Skin and connective tissue disorders	103
Musculoskeletal diseases	160
Oral diseases	122
Miscellaneous (anesthesia, surgery, medicine, toxicity, and poisoning, other)	403
Basic sciences	298
Radiation usage and effects	117
Total	6,805

A fledgling effort in which I am especially interested is a program which we have called administrative research but which is closely allied to research and development activities in other agencies. It is conducted with a view of acquiring new knowledge in the field of hospital and hospital administration practices where remunerative results, both short and long term, can be considered probable in such fields as better patient care, improved utilization of resources and monetary savings. The program is carried out primarily by VA personnel such as management analysts, industrial engineers and statisticians often in participation with universities, private institutions, and other Federal agencies.

Some of the studies currently underway include the automated laboratory, the intensive care unit, a mechanized system for conveying and filing outpatient records, and the use of nonprofessional assistants to supplement the personnel shortage in the social work field.

DISABLED VETERANS

The VA, of course, is well known for the contributions it has made in the field of caring for the disabled. Only a brief discussion of two important areas, paraplegia and prosthetic and sensory aids, is possible in this paper. The VA program for the management of paraplegics had its inception at the end of World War II when an estimated 2,000 veterans were discharged from the Armed Forces to our hospitals.

We now have eight centers for the care of paraplegics and quadraplegics although a small number of paraplegics are cared for in many other hospitals. The management of these patients is twofold: definitive therapy and rehabilitation. The doctor (he may be an internist, physiatrist, or surgeon) serves as the captain of a team. Through this procedure of bringing many disciplines to the veteran patient remarkable progress has been made. We have found, for instance, that seven out of every eight veterans can be restored to an existence outside the hospital.

Significant improvement has been made in the management of the urinary tract complications, decubiti and muscular spasms and contractures—to mention a few—so that mortality rates have fallen remarkably.

The Veterans' Administration continues to provide the leadership in prosthetics and sensory aids for which it has received worldwide acclaim since World War II.

Prosthetics research continues in an effort to make available better hydraulic knee mechanisms for improvement in the gait of above-knee amputees. One such mechanism has already become available and is in wide use, with gratifying results reported by amputees.

In fiscal year 1964, clinical studies of amputees using two additional types of hydraulic systems were undertaken. While these activities have been carried on to improve the gait pattern of amputees during the swing phrase of walking, research efforts have also been undertaken on the problems in stance phase.

Progress continued on the development of hydraulic unit which will not only improve the swing phase of gait but will permit control during stance phase by providing stability and minimizing knee buckling .

Research has begun during fiscal year 1964 on the desirability of immediate post-surgical fitting of protheses. The technique appears to have several major physiological and psychological advantages. A significant outcome of this technique may be the almost immediate ambulation of the amputee, resulting in considerably shorter periods of hospitalization. The Veterans' Administration is sponsoring research to develop and evaluate procedures and devices for use with the immediate post-operative fitting approach.

Studies have been continued by the VA Prosthetics Center on the use of a below-knee weight-bearing brace for unweighting the leg in cases of malunions of the tibia and fibula, partially ankylosed ankles, and arthritic ankles and feet.

The Center has also developed a single-bar brace which has been used with reasonable success in fitting multiple sclerosis, paraplegia, and hemiplegia patients. By eliminating the medial bar, the weight and bulk of the brace are reduced. The bilateral brace wearer benefits particularly from the reduction in bulk since he may often need to wear other devices, such as urinary appliances along the medial aspect of his leg.

The contributions to medical knowledge which have been made in prosthetics, medical research and administrative research have been enhanced by a system of annual conferences in the various specialities to which clinicians and investigators, both inside and outside VA, are regularly invited. For many of our programs it serves as a major mechanism for exchange of information and plans for future progress on a VA-wide cooperative basis.

TRIPARTITE CARE

Paramount in accomplishing our tripartite role of patient care, research and education, is a modern hospital system. Following the establishment of a 125,000 bed ceiling the VA embarked upon a long range plan for replacement of our outmoded hospitals. The LRP takes into account both the migration trend of the veteran population, and the need for enhanced working relationships with teaching installations in our urban medical centers. In cities such as Atlanta, Chicago, Miami (Fla.), Los Angeles, and Memphis, new hospitals in either the planning or construction stage will be located near medical schools, thereby providing for greater cooperation in clinical practice, investigation, and education.

Selected hospitals will have linear accelerators, renal dialysis for chronic kidney disease, special inhalation therapy for pulmonary emphysema, and open heart surgery programs.

Our new hospital at Columbia, Missouri, will have specialized teaching facilities for medical students and house officers.

The new Washington, D.C., hospital, scheduled to be activated in the next few months, has a special wing to study and evaluate new advances in hospital construction and systems management in a medical atmosphere.

From 1946 until 1960 the Veterans' Administration was exempted from the dual offices' law which prohibited the employment of retired officers of the regular military services, except under certain conditions. Employment by the VA was authorized, subject to the provisions of the dual compensation law however.

This year the 88th Congress amended these laws and retired military personnel can be employed by the VA as well as by other government agencies. Those of the regular services are authorized to receive some portion of their retired pay as well as their normal Federal salary.

During the period following World War II, retired military medical officers played an important role in the development of the present VA medical service program.

It is as yet too early to evaluate the impact of the new law which not only authorizes employment but in addition authorizes the receipt of some retired pay as well as normal salary.

This brief description will give you some idea of the medical service provided for the veterans of wartime service.

Association of U.S. Army Supports Armed Services Committee Military Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the position of the Association of the U.S. Army in support of the military pay bill which 34 member of the Armed Services Committee introduced last week:

RIVERS' PAY BILL INTRODUCED

Chairman L. MENDEL RIVERS of the House Armed Services Committee, and 38 other Representatives, including 33 of his committee members, have introduced identical bills to increase the basic pay of all active duty military personnel by an average of 10.7 percent at an annual cost of about $1 billion.

Representative RIVERS and his colleagues took their action without waiting for the recommendations of the special panel, appointed early this year by President Johnson to study military and Federal civilian pay problems. The Panel is scheduled to report its findings April 1. "Why further study is necessary is beyond me," Mr. RIVERS explained. "The justification for a military pay raise needs no study."

Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, U.S. Army retired, president of AUSA, made it clear that the association was most gratified by this congressional support for a military pay raise. "If enacted, the Rivers bill would be a major step forward toward our objective on military pay and benefits as spelled out in Resolution 11 adopted at our 1964 annual meeting," Gavin said. "It is most encouraging to see such widespread recognition of the services' need for early action to improve the pay of our service people."

The bill calls for increases ranging from 13 to 33 percent for enlisted personnel with less than 2 years' service, or an average of $16 a month. For more than 2 years' enlisted service, the average increase would be 11.2 percent or $28 a month. Officers with less than 2 years' service would get 22 percent more on the average, or $55 a month, and officers with more than 2 years' service would receive an average increase of 6.4 percent or $42 a month. The increases in the bill are limited to basic pay. No changes are provided in special pays and allowances, nor in retired service pay which under existing law is now tied to increases in cost of living as reported in the Consumer Price Index.

In calculating his schedule of proposed new pay scales, Chairman RIVERS said he took into consideration all elements of service compensation including major fringe benefits. He determined the total wages paid Federal Government employees performing the same general type of duties and with about the same level of responsibility as military personnel, adjusted these amounts to accommodate quarters and subsistence allowances, and the tax advantages they entail, and reduced the final amounts by the 6½ percent contribution that service personnel would have to pay toward retirement if they were civilian employees.

Two other bills affecting military pay scales are also pending in Congress. One, introduced by Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, would raise the subsistence allowances of both officers and enlisted men to $75 a month. Officers now receive $47.88 a month and enlisted men—when rations in kind are not available—$2.67 a day, or $3.42 a day when no Government messing facilities are available.

The other pending pay bill applies only to enlisted men with under 2 years service and was introduced by Senator GAYLORD NELSON. It would benefit an estimated 888,000 men in the first 2-year category and would increase their initial pay from $78 a month to $117 a month with graduated increases for higher grades on a percentage basis equal to the increases granted those with more than 2 years service in the pay raises of 1963 and 1964.

Proposed military pay raises gained further support at a public panel discussion arranged by a national publication in connection with a current article on the same subject. Composed of retired members of the three services, the panel found unanimous agreement that immediate pay boosts are necessary in the interests of national security. Brig Gen. S. L. A. Marshall, U.S. Army, retired, military writer and historian, was the moderator, and the Army members were Gen. George H. Decker, former Army Chief of Staff, who advocated a 10 percent increase, and Maj. Gen. John B. Medaris, former Chief of the Army's Ordnance Missile Command, who estimated that an increase of about 16 percent would be necessary.

ARTHUR SYMONS,
Colonel, U.S. Army, Retired, Secretary.

Comprehensive Medical Program Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, substantial changes to broaden coverage and

simplify administration of the Kerr-Mills medical care program are proposed in a bill H.R. 3803 I have introduced. Although fundamentally an improvement of Kerr-Mills, it is referred to as eldercare.

The bill would authorize Federal grants to the States on a matching basis to help persons 65 years of age and older pay the cost of minimum-standard health insurance if they cannot afford it otherwise. It would utilize private insurance companies.

Full medical expenses, hospital, nursing, and doctor, would be covered. States would have discretion in choosing the type insurance desired, but the bill would require that each policy be noncancelable.

To hold down cost and discourage abuse, I recommend that the States specify policies which cover expenses exceeding $350 and with a top limit of $10,000. first $350 of cost, or expenses exceeding

Persons financially unable to meet the first $350 of cost, or expenses exceeding $10,000, would be eligible to have these costs met by the States under present Kerr-Mills authority.

My bill eliminates family responsibility and the complicated formula now used in Illinois to determine eligibility under Kerr-Mills, and would substitute a simple certificate of income.

Cost of insurance would be borne entirely by the Government for those elderly individuals whose income falls below limits set by each State. For individuals with incomes between the minimum and a maximum, the Government would pay a part of the cost on a sliding scale according to income.

Individuals with income above the maximum would pay the entire cost, but they would have the benefit of an income tax deduction for such payments, as well as statewide bargaining for the noncancellable health care policies.

Under my bill, each State would have wide latitude, but I recommend that the States contract with private companies for insurance with a $350 deductible feature. This figure is about the average annual cost of medical care for those over 65.

My bill would provide that the insurance must be noncancellable. Several private companies already offer policies with a similar deductible feature at an annual cost of about $140 and the broad character of this program would probably result in premiums of still lower cost.

My proposal would provide complete medical care coverage for those over 65, in contrast with the limited scope of the administration's medical care proposal. It would accomplish the complete coverage at about half the cost of the administration plan.

If utilized by all citizens over 65, I estimate the total combined cost to State and Federal Governments would be $2.1 billion a year. Administration officials have estimated that their proposal, which is limited to hospital and some nursing services, would cost $3.7 billion by 1975.

My proposal could be fully implemented and placed in operation this year, while the administration proposal would not start until June 1966 and would not be fully operative until 1967.

The administration proposal would be financed under social security payroll taxes, which hit low-income people hard. My proposal would be financed by general revenues, whose main source is progressive income taxes.

The administration proposal would cause such heavy new burdens as to threaten the solvency of the social security fund. My bill would avoid this hazard.

In order to eliminate completely the possibility that elderly people might become impoverished as the result of a long and expensive illness, I recommend that the State governments give consideration to a requirement that each citizen over 65 be covered by a private policy of minimum standard. This could be accomplished through certification of coverage on State tax returns. If an individual over 65 did not certify coverage, the State could buy a policy for him and tax him for the premium cost or whatever part of it, if any, his income level would indicate.

This would meet problems caused by people who, through oversight or neglect, did not take out coverage themselves.

My proposal would eliminate the family-responsibility requirement which has, I believe, proved to be a handicap under the present Kerr-Mills program.

My proposal reflects a long period of study, analysis of health care problems of my own constituents, and consultation with officials of the public welfare services in Illinois and members of the medical profession.

For more than a year, I have conducted my own medical care referral service for the benefit of my constituents. During that time I have invited constituents to contact me if they know of anyone who is not getting proper medical care.

This invitation has been publicized widely and has been repeated several times. From February 26, 1964, to January 5, 1965, I received 341 letters. Only 10 of these mentioned cases where a lack of medical care might exist. Through the cooperation of local doctors, these cases were checked out immediately. Only two were found to have substance, and care in those cases was provided.

One hundred and three of the letters asked for general information about existing health care services without stating specific problems. Twenty-four took the opportunity to criticize a variety of things, such as social security, public aid, hospital costs, and doctor fees.

The rest of the letters were from people who seemed to be receiving adequate medical care but were struggling to pay hospital and doctor bills or were trying to pay their parents' bills while supporting their own family.

As the result of my referral service, a number of people became eligible for Kerr-Mills who were previously unaware of its existence.

Information gained from the service convinced me that the present Kerr-Mills program is not adequate.

First of all, the eligibility rules are too complicated and undoubtedly frighten many applicants.

Second, the requirement of family responsibility, while a fine moral objective, causes the program to break down in many cases.

Third, the fact that the program is handled through the Public Aid Commission, commonly known as the relief office, keeps some citizens from applying. Kerr-Mills was intended to keep people from going on relief because of medical costs, but it is handled by the same staff that handles relief cases.

Text of H.R. 3803 follows:

H.R. 3803

A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Eldercare Act of 1965".

SECTION 1. (a) Title I of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED UNDER VOLUNTARY PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS

"SEC. 7. (a)(1) A State plan approved under this title which includes medical assistance for the aged may, in the discretion of the State, provide such assistance in the form of premium payments made in accordance with subsection (c) for health insurance coverage under guaranteed renewable voluntary private health insurance plans in addition to providing such assistance in the manner otherwise specified in this title. For this purpose the State agency shall enter into such contracts and other arrangements with private insurance carriers as it deems appropriate.

"(2) The contracts entered into pursuant to paragraph (1) shall make available such benefits (which, together with medical assistance for the aged made available under the other provisions of this title, shall meet the requirements of section 2(a)(11)(A)), established such periods or times (not less often than once each year) for enrollment, and contain or be subject to such other provisions as in the judgment of the State agency are necessary to carry out the purpose of this section.

"(b) If a State plan provides medical assistance for the aged in the form of coverage under a health insurance plan under this section, it must make the same coverage available to all individuals who reside in the State and satisfy the age requirement referred to in section 2(b)(1). In the case of individuals who are recipients of old-age assistance under the State plan, such coverage may be in lieu of or in addition to any such assistance provided for such recipients in the form of medical or remedial care under the other provisions of this title, in the discretion of the State; and the premium payments made by the State agency in accordance with subsection (c) for such coverage shall constitute old-age assistance (in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care) for all the purposes of this title.

"(c)(1) The premiums applicable with respect to the coverage of any individual under an insurance plan described in subsection (a) shall, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, be paid by the State agency.

"(2) The State agency may establish a maximum income level, at least equal to the highest level at which an individual may qualify for medical assistance for the aged under the State plan, for the application of paragraph (1). The premiums applicable with respect to the coverage of any individual whose income is above the level so established shall be paid in part by such individual and in part by the State agency, in such proportions (based on such individual's income) as the State agency may determine, up to such higher level as the State agency may consider appropriate; and the premiums applicable with respect to the coverage of any individual whose income is above such higher level shall be paid in full by such individual.

"(3) For purposes of this section, the term 'income' means gross income as defined in section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and in addition includes any interest, rents, annuities, and other retirement payments from any source which are not includible in gross income as so defined. Each individual covered under an insurance plan described in subsection (a) shall certify his income to the State agency under oath in such manner and at such times (not less often than once each year) as the State agency may require; and any such certification shall be accepted by the State agency (subject to section 1107(a), relating to penalty for fraud) as conclusive with respect to such individual's income.

"(d) All individuals covered under an insurance plan described in subsection (a) shall be regarded as applicants for or recipients of assistance under the State plan for purposes of paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 3(a) (relating to administrative expenses), regardless of the manner in which the premiums applicable with respect to such coverage are payable under subsection (c)."

(b) Clause (b) of section 1 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "whose income and resources are" and inserting in lieu thereof "whose income is"; and

(2) by inserting after "necessary medical services" the following: ", and encouraging each State to provide this medical assistance for all aged individuals through utilization of insurance provided by private insurance carriers".

(c) Section 2(a)(11)(B) of such Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", except to the extent provided in section 7 with respect to assistance furnished in the form of health insurance coverage".

(d) Section 2(a)(11)(D) of such Act is amended by inserting "income" after "reasonable", and by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", and provide that a statement of income furnished by or on behalf of the applicant or recipient, under oath and in the manner and form required by the State agency, shall be accepted by the State agency (subject to section 1107(a), relating to penalty for fraud) as conclusive with respect to his income".

(e)(1) Section 2(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof (after and below paragraph (11)) the following new sentence:

"Notwithstanding paragraph (3), if the State plan includes both old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged, there may be established or designated one State agency to administer or supervise the administration of the portion of the plan which relates to old-age assistance and a separate State agency to administer or supervise the administration of the portion of the plan which relates to medical assistance for the aged; and in such case the part of the plan which each such agency administers, or the administration of which each such agency supervises, shall be regarded as a separate plan for purposes of this title."

(2) Section 2(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "Nothing" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to the last sentence of subsection (a), nothing".

(f) Section 6(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting after "sixty-five years of age or older" the following: "(including assistance provided to such individuals under section 7(b))"; and

(2) by striking out "include" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof "include any such payments to or care in behalf of any individual who is an inmate of a public institution (except as a patient in a medical institution)."

(g) Section 6(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "except that" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and such term also includes assistance provided under section 7(a); but such term does not include any such payments with respect to care or services for any individual who is an inmate of a public institution (except as a patient in a medical institution)."

(h) The first sentence of section 6(c) of such Act is amended by inserting "(A)" before "(1)", and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and (B) the Federal medical percentage as determined under the preceding provisions of this sentence (including clause (A)) shall be increased by 5 per centum when applied to amounts expended as medical assistance for the aged in the form of health insurance coverage under section 7 (or section 1606)".

(i) Section 1101(a)(8)(A) of such Act is amended by inserting "(i)" after "except that", and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "and (ii) the Federal percentage as determined under the preceding provisions of this subparagraph (including clause (i)) shall be increased by 5 per centum when applied to old-age assistance or aid to the aged, blind, or disabled in the form of health insurance coverage under section 7 or section 1606".

SEC. 2. (a) Title XVI of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED UNDER VOLUNTARY PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS

"SEC. 1606. (a)(1) A State plan approved under this title which includes medical assistance for the aged may, in the discretion of the State, provide such assistance in the form of premium payments made in accordance with subsection (c) for health insurance coverage under guaranteed renewable voluntary private health insurance plans in addition to providing such assistance in the manner otherwise specified in this title. For this purpose the State agency shall enter into such contracts and other arrangements with private insurance carriers as it deems appropriate.

"(2) The contracts entered into pursuant to paragraph (1) shall make available such benefits (which, together with medical assistance for the aged made available under the other provisions of this title, shall meet the requirements of section 1602(a)(15)(A)), establish such periods or times (not less often than once each year) for enrollment, and contain or be subject to such other provisions as in the judgment of the State agency are necessary to carry out the purpose of this section.

"(b) If a State plan provides medical assistance for the aged in the form of coverage under a health insurance plan under this section, it must make the same coverage available to all individuals who reside in the State and satisfy the age requirement referred to in section 1602(b)(1). In the case of individuals who are recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled under the State plan, such coverage may be in lieu of or in addition to any such aid provided for such recipients in the form of medical or remedial care under the other provisions of this title, in the discretion of the State; and the premium payments made by the State agency in accordance with subsection (c) for such coverage shall constitute aid to the aged, blind, or disabled (in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care) for all the purposes of this title.

"(c) (1) The premiums applicable with respect to the coverage of any individual under an insurance plan described in subsection (a) shall, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, be paid by the State agency.

"(2) The State agency may establish a maximum income level, at least equal to the highest level at which an individual may qualify for medical assistance for the aged under the State plan, for the application of paragraph (1). The premiums applicable with respect to the coverage of any individual whose income is above the level so established shall be paid in part by such individual and in part by the State agency, in such proportions (based on such individual's income) as the State agency may determine, up to such higher level as the State agency may consider appropriate; and the premiums applicable with respect to the coverage of any individual whose income is above such higher level shall be paid in full by such individual.

"(3) For purposes of this section, the term 'income' means gross income as defined in section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and in addition includes any interest, rents, annuities, and other retirement payments from any source which are not includible in gross income as so defined. Each individual covered under an insurance plan described in subsection (a) shall certify his income to the State agency under oath in such manner and at such times (not less often than once each year) as the State agency may require; and any such certification shall be accepted by the State agency (subject to section 1107(a), relating to penalty for fraud) as conclusive with respect to such individual's income.

"(d) All individuals covered under an insurance plan described in subsection (a) shall be regarded as applicants for or recipients of aid or assistance under the State plan for purposes of paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 1603(a) (relating to administrative expenses), regardless of the manner in which the premiums applicable with respect to such coverage are payable under subsection (c)."

(b) Clause (b) of section 1601 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "whose income and resources are" and inserting in lieu thereof "whose income is"; and

(2) by inserting after "necessary medical services" the following: ", and encouraging each State to provide this medical assistance for all aged individuals through utilization of insurance provided by private insurance carriers".

(c) Section 1602(a)(15)(B) of such Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", except to the extent provided in section 1606 with respect to assistance furnished in the form of health insurance coverage".

(d)(1) Section 1602(a)(13) of such Act is amended by striking out "aid or assistance" and inserting in lieu thereof "aid to the aged, blind, or disabled".

(2) Section 1602(a)(15) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (C),

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E), and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) include reasonable income standards, consistent with the objectives of this title, for determining eligibility for and the extent of such assistance, and provide that

a statement of income furnished by or on behalf of the applicant or recipient, under oath and in the manner and form required by the State agency, shall be accepted by the State agency (subject to section 1107(a), relating to penalty for fraud) as conclusive with respect to his income; and".

(e)(1) Section 1602(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding paragraph (3) and the preceding sentence, if the State plan includes both aid to the aged, blind, or disabled and medical assistance for the aged, there may be established or designated one State agency (or two State agencies if the preceding sentence applies) to administer or supervise the administration of the portion of the plan which relates to aid to the aged, blind, or disabled and a separate State agency to administer or supervise the administration of the portion of the plan which relates to medical assistance for the aged; and in such case the part of the plan which each such agency administers, or the administration of which each such agency supervises, shall be regarded as a separate plan for purposes of this title."

(2) Section 1602(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "the last sentence of subsection (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "the last two sentences of subsection (a)".

(f) Section 1605(a) of such Act is amended by striking out ", but does not include" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof "(including assistance provided to such individuals under section 1606(b)), but does not include—

"(1) in the case of any individual, any such payments to or care in behalf of any individual who is an inmate of a public institution (except as a patient in a medical institution); or

"(2) in the case of any individual who has not attained 65 years of age, any such payments to or care in behalf of any individuals who is a patient in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases."

(g) Section 1605(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "except that" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and such term also includes assistance provided under section 7(a); but such term does not include any such payments with respect to care or services for any individual who is an inmate of a public institution (except as a patient in a medical institution)."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 213(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deductions for medical, dental, etc., expenses) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—There shall be allowed as a deduction the following amounts of the expenses paid during the taxable year, not compensated for by insurance or otherwise, for medical care of the taxpayer, his spouse, or a dependent (as defined in subsection (e)(3) of this section):

"(1) If neither the taxpayer nor his spouse has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year—

"(A) the amount of such expenses for the care of any dependent who has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year,

"(B) the amount paid for accident or health insurance for the taxpayer or his spouse which by its terms will become effective when either has attained the age of 65 or over, and

"(C) the amount by which such expenses for the care of the taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents (other than any dependent described in subparagraph (A)) exceed 3 percent of the adjusted gross income.

"(2) If either the taxpayer or his spouse has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year—

"(A) the amount of such expenses for the care of the taxpayer and his spouse,

"(B) the amount of such expenses for the care of any dependent described in paragraph (1)(A), and

"(C) the amount by which such expenses for the care of dependents other than those described in paragraph (1)(A) exceed 3 percent of the adjusted gross income."

(b) Section 213(e) of such Code (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) The term 'dependent' with respect to a taxpayer means any individual who is related to such taxpayer in one of the ways specified in paragraphs (1) through (10) of section 152(a), regardless of the amount of support received by such individual from such taxpayer."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by the first two sections of this Act shall become effective July 1, 1966 (and may be made effective in any State on the first day of any calendar quarter which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act and before July 1, 1966). The amendments made by section 3 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Clearing of Skies in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Voice, the weekly publication of the diocese of Miami, contains a very interesting editorial comment on a meeting of the Catholic inter-American cooperation program (Cicop), held in Chicago during the early part of February. In addition to describing the enthusiastic mood and the accomplishments of this meeting, the Voice addressed itself to the revolution in social reforms, currently in progress in most of Latin America. This latter subject should be of special interest to all Members of Congress. Consequently, with unanimous consent I insert the article entitled "Conference Notes Clearing of Skies in Latin America" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that Latin America is undergoing a tremendous upheaval. Awakened from its slumber by the concurrent revolutions of the 20th century—in science, communications, technology and popular expectations—threatened by the subversive activities of the international Communist movement, and stimulated to action by the manifold undertakings of the Alliance for Progress, the entire continent is experiencing the ordeal of change. From the north to the south, from east to west, a new type of war is being waged in Latin America—a war, in the words of the Voice, "against the very evils that communism thrives on." In particular:

Against hunger, poverty, illiteracy, lack of opportunity, unemployment, and a host of other evils that have festered in most of the countries and drained the spirit of many oppressed.

It is significant, in my opinion, that this war is not being waged by governments alone. As a matter of fact, a large part of the impetus for this effort comes from private sources—from trade unions and cooperatives, from church-related groups and universities, from industry and from a multitude of other private organizations, both in and outside Latin America. The people conducting these efforts realize, as the Voice pointed out:

This war must be waged, and won, among the masses of the people in the barren farmlands, in the teeming cities, and the blighted towns—at the grassroot levels where the people involved are to be found in all their misery and want.

The private effort in this war against conditions which breed communism has been of particular interest to me personally and, as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

For the past 2 years, my subcommittee has been studying this private effort—its scope, its direction, its effectiveness, and its relationship to the basic objectives which our Government is pursuing through such undertakings as the Alliance for Progress.

As a matter of fact, we hope to publish some of the results of our study within the next few weeks. We plan to issue a compendium describing the broad outlines of the private American effort in foreign aid, its significance, and its contribution to the betterment of the human condition not only in Latin America but wherever hunger, disease, poverty, illiteracy, and social injustice prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I was impressed with the article in the Voice—partly because it reflects growing recognition of the need for private involvement in the task of winning this all-out war, and partly because it confirms my own findings with respect to the signs which are developing in Latin America. These signs are encouraging. Our neighbors to the south, aided by the American people, are facing up to their problems and are trying to bring about changes which are desperately needed in their countries. And, to an encouraging extent, the results of their efforts are beginning to show. The skies over Latin America are beginning to clear.

The article follows:

CONFERENCE NOTES CLEARING OF SKIES IN LATIN AMERICA

A brief editorial could not hope to do justice to the significance of the Convention of the Catholic Inter-American Cooperation Program (CICOP) held in Chicago last week, which was attended by Bishop Coleman F. Carroll and priests and laymen of the diocese who are involved in United States-Latin American problems.

In speaking to some of those present for 3-day meeting, we noticed a solid note of optimism in their comments on South America. This is not to say that the problems are no longer overwhelmingly grave south of the border or that easy solutions have been discovered.

One priest, experienced in Latin American affairs, declared that the leaders of both continents were emphasizing that the evermore intense battle is not against communism primarily. It is against social injustice in general—and in particular against hunger, poverty, illiteracy, lack of opportunity, unemployment, and a host of other evils that have festered in most of the coun-

tries and drained the spirit of many oppressed.

The new all-out war is against the very evils that communism thrives on. It is clear now that even if communism did not pose the grave threat that it does, the revolution in social reforms would be demanded by every law of justice and every claim of decency.

Hence many emphasized the need for the church, as it were, to go into partnership with trade unions, cooperative, community, and slum organizations. This is not a job obviously that will be accomplished in the neat classrooms and laboratories of universities, but in the barren farmlands, in the teeming cities, and the blighted towns—at the grassroot levels where the people involved are to be found in all their misery and want.

How to get down to the grassroot level preoccupied the minds of North and South Americans throughout this exciting meeting. Ideas were not lacking. Some had already proved startlingly successful. For instance, an organization known as DESAL in Chile has conducted an intensive program of study and research on 600 proposed projects for Latin men and women. It has also full-time, professionally trained technicians putting these plans into practice in the field—founding training centers for local leaders, explaining the value of cooperatives in farming, publishing pamphlets and magazines with know-how information so that people can help themselves in countless ways.

Another remarkable venture is known as the movement for popular education. The key word here is radio. Educators knew that it was impossible to travel the length and breadth of South America and to attempt in a hurry to establish schools to end illiteracy and ignorance. But many were convinced that the radio could cross the mountains and country boundaries and enter into homes that were almost inaccessible.

The idea was launched with king-size hopes and objectives. It was not merely the intention to teach men and women and children how to read and write. This was indeed a praiseworthy objective. But the radio-education program has effetcively attempted to establish broader objectives, such as teaching the people of a community how to improve themselves and their way of life.

The radio pours out lessons daily on how men and women can be not only Christian, but social-minded Christians. They are taught to respect the dignity of other human beings, to take legitimate pride in their own destiny as children of God, to assume responsibilities as members of a community, to learn to do for others, and to improve their own minds and souls and physical welfare.

On the practical side, the radio gives instructions on how to build a bridge over a small river to aid transportation, how to get the most out of a farm, how to use electricity and produce refrigeration so that precious food can be preserved.

An indication of the enormous work being done by many is found in the fact that already over 150 radio stations have been established by Catholic groups to carry on this mass program of education. The United Nations has recognized it as a potentially powerful force and has offered aid. Private groups are becoming interested because they see in it one of the most effective immediate means of enabling people to better themselves and their communities.

All in all, Cicop last week struck an optimistic note. Perhaps this, more than the dismal alarms of the past, will help awaken us to assume our own responsibilities in this social revolution in Latin America and to become personally invloved in doing a share for the cause of justice among our brothers to the south.

Policy Statement by the General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ on Drug Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the first murders committed in the United States this year took place just off Times Square in New York City a few minutes after midnight on New Year's Day. Not surprisingly, the victim was a known user of narcotics.

Homicide is the most spectacular symptom of the malignant drug traffic that infects our society. Not so well publicized are the thousands of robberies, burglaries, and assaults perpetrated as a direct result of the heinous misuse of narcotics. Moreover, very little attention is paid to the more subtle manifestations of the disintegration of self through drugs—the addicted father, the addicted daughter, the addicted wife.

According to the Federal Bureau of Narcotics there are almost 50,000 known users of narcotics in this country. About 45 percent of them live in New York City. For too long, these unfortunates have been dealt with almost exclusively by the police, the courts, and the prisons. It is encouraging, therefore, that churches and other groups at the highest levels of the community are showing an increased interest in this most serious problem.

A case in point is a recent policy statement by the general board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States, which declares in part:

In our day, narcotics addiction is a tragic form of disease in which an increasingly large outcast group finds itself enslaved. Seeing these addicts, therefore, as essentially the sick in need of the physician rather than as criminals in need of judgment, it is the churches' task to seek to serve the addict in his need. Even in his tragic predicament, he remains a morally accountable person who is intended to grow into the likeness and image of God. He cannot fulfill his purpose as God's creation unless he is liberated from the influence of addicting drugs that rob him of the spiritual endowment of reason and conscience.

The statement goes on to urge member communions, among other measures, to work for a Federal civil commitment statute for drug abusers. I have favored this approach to the narcotics problem for some time. Existing Federal law provides severe prison penalties for pushers and sellers of narcotics, and rightfully so. The addict, however, is subject to approximately the same penalties. To my mind, this procedure has little efficacy. The solution to drug addiction—as opposed to the exploitation of the addict—will not be found in the prisons. It will be found in the hospitals. For while the narcotics user may become a criminal because of his addiction, he fundamentally is a sick person and should be treated as such.

I might point out that almost 5,000 persons are currently serving time in Federal prisons alone—at an annual cost of about $10 million—for narcotics law violations and yet there has been no marked reduction in the illegal drug trade in recent years. What should concern us is not punishment, but the far more difficult process of ending the user's dependence on drugs. In this work, our churches can play a much-needed role, particularly in helping the addict to assume a place in society after his compulsion to turn to drugs has been removed through treatment.

I commend this praiseworthy statement to my colleagues in the House.

The article follows:

"DRUG ABUSE"—A POLICY STATEMENT ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL BOARD OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A., FEBRUARY 25, 1965

SOME ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM

The use of addicting drugs has become a serious problem in our Nation, especially, though by no means exclusively, among the youth of the deprived areas of our largest cities.

The destructive hold of addicting drugs upon persons can prevent their victims from achieving the fulfillment of life and contribution to the world that God intends for His children.

The use of addicting drugs characteristically leads to frustration and misery for the addict, his family and friends, and is so closely associated with criminal activities to finance the addiction that in many jails and prisons the majority of inmates are addicts.

Addiction so totally affects its victims' lives that its treatment calls not only for application of all the helping disciplines—medicine, psychiatry, social work, education, guidance, and so on—but also for the disciplines of faithfulness that deal with purpose, meaning, and commitment in human living.

Despite recent progress toward humaneness in treatment of addicts, public policy continues to be ambivalent on whether the addict is to be considered criminal and an outcast or ill and in need of treatment.

Public and private resources for dealing with the problem of addiction are severely limited.

A large proportion of organized efforts to work with addicts, particularly in neighborhood and noninstitutional settings, have been initiated either directly or indirectly by churches or clergymen who recognized a human need for which no other agency or group in society was prepared to assume responsibility.

A PARTIAL DESCRIPTION OF THE LEGAL SITUATION

The Harrison Act of 1914, aimed at controlling the traffic in narcotic drugs, is still the law of the land, somewhat amended. A Senate subcommittee reviewed the act in 1955 and recommended even more severe legislation raising mandatory minimum penalties and including the death penalty for certain offenses. The Customs Bureau and the Narcotics Bureau, both under the Treasury Department, administer the act. In theory it is a regulatory measure, not a criminal statute, but violations carry criminal penalties.

The President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse has recommended that functions of the Bureau of Narcotics relating to the investigation of illicit manufacture, sale, distribution or possession of

narcotic drugs and marijuana be transferred from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of Justice and functions relating to regulation of the legitimate import, export, manufacture and distribution of such drugs be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The same Commission has made a number of other recommendations for more effective action by the Federal government and its agencies in the field of narcotics and drug abuse. These recommendations stress the need to use the full power of government to attack the illegal traffic in drugs, but at the same time to use every resource of Federal, State and local government and local communities to rehabilitate the individual drug abuser, while not exempting him from penalties demanded by the law when he breaks it.

Virtually all States license the manufacture and sale of narcotics. Narcotics, for the purposes of most laws, include heroin, morphine, cocaine and marijuana and similar substances. Possession or sale of a narcotic substance in violation of the State license law is illegal. An illegal sale of narcotics is a felony (punishable by more than a year in prison), and a sale to a minor is generally a more serious felony.

Some States provide minimum sentences or 5 to 7 years for a sale to a minor and 3 to 5 years for a sale to an adult. Some laws provide that possession of a designated quantity of a narcotic is presumptive evidence of intent to sell and therefore is punishable more severely. Possession of not more than a small designated quantity of a narcotic is generally a misdemeanor (punishable by not more than a year in prison).

Many States provide that unauthorized possession of hypodermic syringes, needles and other articles used in administering narcotics and their sale by unauthorized persons is a crime.

An important development in the law is the recent statute enacted in New York permitting the civil commitment of addicts who are charged with the violation of the criminal laws relating to narcotics. If such persons meet the requirements of the statute they can be committed to a State institution as addicts and the criminal charges can be dropped.

A THEOLOGICAL BASIS OF TREATMENT SERVICES

Just as Jesus Christ went to the outcasts of the human community of His day—to those alienated because of bodily disease, mental disease, moral disease—treating them not as criminals to be cured by law but as the sick to be offered the healing power of His servant love, so the churches are continually called to witness in word and deed to this redeeming concern of Christ for the outcasts of every age.

In our day, narcotics addiction is a tragic form of disease in which an increasingly large outcast group finds itself enslaved. Seeing these addicts, therefore, as essentially the sick in need of the physician rather than as criminals in need of judgment, it is the churches' task to seek to serve the addict in his need. Even in his tragic predicament he remains a morally accountable person who is intended to grow into the likeness and image of God. He cannot fulfill his purpose as God's creation unless he is liberated from the influence of addicting drugs that rob him of the spiritual endowment of reason and conscience. Working through the best treatment and rehabilitation services available, the churches must seek to provide the occasions for the addicts to recognize their illness and to reach out to the healing power by which alone they can be made whole. So also the churches must seek to help government and other voluntary agencies to foster appropriate laws and treatment so that the afflicted can be helped to find freedom—not only from his own addiction but from the bondages too often laid upon him by society.

CALL TO MINISTRY

The General Board of the National Council of Churches calls upon its member communions to:

(a) Inform themselves as fully as possible about drug abuses and the complex nature of narcotic addiction.

(b) Present information about narcotic addiction to their constituencies through all the means of communication available to them.

(c) Seek to gain an understanding of those who have become addicted.

(d) Develop and offer testimony supporting public policies that (1) recognize the dimension of illness, among other forces, in the problem of addiction, (2) provide for discretion on the part of judges rather than mandatory sentences in cases of conviction for violations of statutes pertaining to narcotics, (3) permit the processes of parole and probation to be applied to convicted prisoners when the appropriate officials feel it wise, (4) permit the medical profession to determine the appropriate medical use of drugs in the treatment of addicts, (5) provide a Federal civil commitment statute for drug abusers, and (6) assign regulatory powers concerning the legitimate use of narcotic drugs to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the Federal power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce rather than the tax powers administered through the Treasury Department, and (7) assign investigatory responsibilities relating to illegal traffic in dangerous drugs to the Department of Justice.

(e) Encourage State councils of churches to support a public policy to curb the abuse of drugs and rehabilitate the drug abusers in keeping with policies set forth above.

(f) Initiate and support rehabilitative services under public and community auspices, that will help restore the addict to a useful place in society.

(g) Recognize the important ministry which the churches can render to addicts, to their families, and to the neighborhoods where addiction is a serious problem and encourage them to minister.

The General Board of the National Council of Churches authorizes the Division of Christian Life and Mission to assume responsibility within the council for the implementation of this action including the authority for appropriate representatives of the National Council of Churches to consult with Government officials and agencies, to provide information that might contribute to ending illicit traffic in drugs, and to testify before congressional committees on the basis of the official policies of the National Council of Churches concerning drug abuse.

Putnam, Conn., Comes Back to Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker almost 10 years ago, in 1955, the town of Putnam, located in the northeastern part of Connecticut, suffered a disastrous flood with substantial property damage. Putnam is my hometown, which has a population of about 8,400. As I look back now upon those dark days of 1955 after the flood, we had the feeling then that Putnam was doomed and that only a miracle could bring it back to life.

Well, that miracle has happened. Much of Putnam has since been rebuilt. New industries have been established. A redevelopment program is well underway. Instead of running away, the people have remained to rebuild the community. Today, Putnam is not only a flourishing community but one that is on the move to greater and bigger accomplishments.

For several years after the flood I had the honor of serving as executive director of the redevelopment agency of the city of Putnam, and in 1962 I served as mayor of the city. Its problems and its achievements to date are well known to me. I was therefore pleased to read an article, entitled "Putnam: A Vision Come True," published in the March 1965 issue of Connecticut Industry, a monthly publication of the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, Inc., which discusses the revival of Putnam in recent years.

The article is written by Dr. William T. Fisher of the University of Connecticut. Dr. Fisher was recently appointed to the Connecticut State Small Business Advisory Council. He is secretary of the State insurance commission and vice president of the Connecticut Association of Municipal Development Commissions. The article is as follows:

PUTNAM: A VISION COME TRUE

(By William T. Fisher, the University of Connecticut)

Man's struggle toward the good society is rooted in dreams that come before we have shuffled off this mortal coil.

Thomas Hooker's "government by consent of the governed"; Jefferson's self-evident truth that "all men are created equal"; the concept that every American boy and girl is entitled to educational opportunity—all signify the reach of American idealism. All have inspired men to bring ideals within their grasp.

Likewise, two men in Putnam, Conn., had a great dream for their community. They proved that our reach must be higher than our grasp. Gov. John N. Dempsey, then mayor of the city of Putnam, and Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, who served as the first executive director of the Putnam Redevelopment Agency, were jointly instrumental in launching the city on an ambitious redevelopment program after the disastrous flood of 1955.

In line with this dream, the Integral Motor Pump Corp., a wholly owned subsidiary of Pall Corp., relocated in Putnam on September 5, 1964, with the purchase, on June 29, of the York Research Corp.'s relatively new plant in the city's industrial redevelopment area. Pall Corp., located at Glen Cove, Long Island, is a worldwide producer of engineered products for the control of fluids and environments. Integral Motor Pump, acquired by Pall about a year ago, has since more than doubled its sales and is a leading producer of zero-leakage or canned pumps used by the process and nuclear industries.

President of the corporation, Dr. David B. Pall, said, "This move will enable us to expand greatly our pump manufacturing and engineering facilities and consequently to provide more efficiently for rapidly expanding sales volume." Within a few months of the purchase, employment had reached 50 persons. It is expected to climb to 250 to 300 employees during the next couple of years.

Sale of the 32,500-square-foot factory, one of the most modern in Connecticut, was made possible through joint efforts of the city of Putnam, the Putnam Area Industrial Foundation, and four local banking institu-

tions: Citizens National Bank, Cargill Trust Co., Putnam Savings Bank, and the Putnam Savings & Loan Association. It was another example of Putnam's community effort to bring one of its ideals within grasp.

Products now being turned out by the company are comparatively new—highly specialized pumps that are 100 percent leakproof and complete within a single casing. Used principally in the chemical processing industry, new markets have appeared recently in the nuclear field for the handling of radioactive fluids.

A partial list of Integral's customers reads like Who's Who of Industry. They include such well-known names as American Cyanamid, Argonne National Laboratory, Atlantic Refining, Carrier Corp., Dow Chemical, Firestone, DuPont, General Electric, Monsanto Chemical, Reynolds Metals, Rohm & Haas Co., and Texaco.

Joseph P. Andrews, president of Integral, who originally founded the company some 7 years ago, says that applications for the pumps are virtually unlimited in industry, with more and more uses being discovered as time goes on. Charles Wilson, vice president, heads the company's marketing program, Joseph Campalong, formerly with the parent company, is chief engineer.

The concept of canned pumps is relatively new and Integral is in a strong position in this field, through patents on its principal design features. Basically, the pumps are used wherever leakage would be expensive or hazardous, as in the case of high temperature or toxic fluids, and in high vacuum situations such as the transfer of fluids from stills to tanks.

Integral products are sold exclusively to industry throughout the world. Although there are some stock items, the majority are made to customers' specifications, prices ranging from $450 to $9,000 for a single unit. Volume of fluids that can be handled range from 1 to 1,000 gallons a minute. The smallest pump weighs 80 pounds; the largest a half-ton. Temperature of fluids pumped may be as high as 1,000° F.

Motors are purchased complete and run from three-fourths to 50 horsepower. All other components are fabricated in the Putnam plant from raw castings, sheet metal and metal stock. Depending upon the chemical application of the pump, materials used include stainless steel, Monel, Hastelloy (a steel-nickel alloy highly resistant to corrosion), cast iron and nickel. Integral pumps bear the Underwriters' Laboratory label for use in hazardous locations.

Integral Motor Pump Corp., established in 1959 in Penndel, Pa., was purchased by Pall Corp. in September 1963, to add a new product line in the field of industrial fluid handling. Pallflex Products Corp., another division, moved from Springdale, Conn., to Putnam more recently. Pallflex, of which Dr. Joseph Adiletta is president, produces electrical and thermal insulation, filter media, and specialty mesh and fabric.

In the past, the Integral line was restricted to pumps for handling clear fluids. Integral's 9,000 series now permits use of zero-leakage pumps on high vapor pressure, high temperature, or abrasive fluids, previously beyond the scope of this type of pump. The Putnam-made pumps may be repaired in the field in case of electrical difficulties whereas a breakdown normally meant returning the pump to the factory for unsealing. Integral also produces a pump which can run dry without burning out.

ARA LOAN

On December 8, 1964, Congressman ST. ONGE received notification from the Area Redevelopment Agency that it had approved a $407,000 industrial loan for the Pall Fluid Equipment Corp., of Putnam. The loan is to establish facilities for design and manufacture of filters and metering pumps for the food and chemical processing industries.

The funds will be used for purchase of land, construction of building, and procurement of machinery and equipment. Total project cost is $626,444. The ARA loan of $407,000 will extend for 20 years at an annual interest rate of 4 percent. In addition, the four local banking institutions participated in a $125,000 loan for the project. The Putnam Area Industrial Foundation supplied $62,644, and the Pall Corp., $31,800.

SHOPPING CENTER

Gov. John N. Dempsey officially opened Putnam's million-dollar shopping center on December 16, 1964. After the ruinous flood of 1955, the city acquired 208 parcels of land covering 87 acres in the heart of the city and 269 homes and commercial buildings were leveled. Dempsey, then Putnam's mayor, and St. Onge placed their political futures on the line with this ambitious plan for redevelopment. For several years, during which a developer was unsuccessful in securing funds necessary for construction, there was some criticism.

Eight years after the flood and 5 years after the actual start of the program, the Housing and Home Finance Agency approved a proposal by Putnam Shopping Center, Inc. to develop a shopping plaza on a ten-acre tract. The land was purchased in April of 1964 for $167,022 and construction began immediately.

The overall program has touched off the greatest building boom in the history of Putnam, with three other commercial buildings and three industrial buildings either under construction or completed, in addition to the shopping center. Within a year, Putnam will begin to reap the harvest with an estimated grand list increase of more than $3 million in buildings and inventories.

DIVERSE INDUSTRIES

Putnam's long history of industrial development dates back to the cotton mill of Osias Wilkinson & Sons, established at the Great Falls of the Quinebaug in 1806. Presently, there are more than 24 manufacturing establishments employing 1,848 workers with an annual payroll of over $7½ million. Principal products include thread, curtains, iron castings, phonograph needles, optical devices, and buttons.

A partial list of Putnam industries—all of which are affiliated with the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut—includes, in addition to the Pall Corp.:

Belding Heminway Co.; Hale Manufacturing Co.: Woodstock Line Co.; Wellington Curtain Co., Inc.; Windham Container Corp.; Union Textile Engraving Corp.; Wyckoff Steel Co.; National Chromium Co.; John M. Dean, Inc.; Winterburn Manufacturing Co.; American Optical Co.; and Frank Parizek Manufacturing Co.

The years 1964 and 1965 will go down in the history of the Greater Putnam area as years which witnessed the first really significant breakthrough in development and employment problems that have prevailed since 1955. Putnam now has a statewide reputation for solving difficult problems.

If the rising tide of the new generation of hope can have the foresight of present leaders, northeastern Connecticut and the State will continue with well-planned growth in the years ahead.

Senator Murphy and the Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Senator MURPHY is from the big city of Los Angeles. He has an impressive background of labor-management experience and success. He probably represents more city people than country people. He represents the most populous State of the Union.

Senator MURPHY understands the multiple aspects of the farm labor chaos which is expanding from California until it is adversely affecting all citizens of the United States.

For those who may have missed Senator MURPHY's famous maiden speech in the Senate, John Chamberlain has an interesting column in the Washington Post of March 9, 1965.

With unanimous consent, I insert the column for the benefit of Members and interested citizens:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 9, 1965]

SENATOR MURPHY AND THE BRACEROS

(By John Chamberlain)

LOS ANGELES.—The day of the shrinking violet freshman U.S. Senator is apparently over. Democrat BOBBY KENNEDY of New York, hardly waited to be seated before issuing a broadside calling for the inclusion of a few New York hill counties in the Appalachia program.

The same pattern has been followed by the new Republican Senator GEORGE MURPHY, of California. He plunged into congressional battle with a serious and devastating maiden speech which should have curled the hair of Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz for depriving California farmers of their traditional source of labor, the so-called braceros from neighboring Mexico.

The Murphy speech has great local significance for California, Arizona, Florida, and other States that have depended on seasonal importation of foreign labor to harvest such perishable and unsubsidized crops as oranges, lemons, dates, lettuce, and tomatoes, all of which require special handling. But beyond the significance to agriculture Senator MURPHY's speech constituted an attack on the whole idea of trying to solve any and all national problems along preconceived ideological lines.

The banishment of the braceros from the California and Arizona agricultural scenes, and of Caribbean workers from Florida, proceeded from the knee-jerk liberal's abstract desire to make jobs for unemployed U.S. citizens.

Since the State employment agencies had had plenty of warning about the crackdown on the braceros, Democratic Gov. Pat Brown anticipated little threat to California's $3.5-billion agricultural industry.

As things turned out, however, the pieces of the puzzle didn't match when the ideologues tried to put them together. At Tulare in the San Joaquin Valley a year of recruitment did turn up enough domestic citizen workers to end dependence on the braceros for harvesting the citrus crop. But in Ventura County, close to the metropolian beguilements of Los Angeles, it has proved extremely difficult to hold native workers. The result is that Ventura has been lagging way behind on harvesting its lemon crop.

Around Palm Desert in the Coachella Valley, where former President Eisenhower has been communing between golf matches with Ray Bliss in hopes of refurbishing the Republican image, there is a desperate need both for date harvesters and experts in date palm pollination. Some citybred workers were recruited for date palm work, and they quit after a single day.

The ironies attendant upon the whole fight against knee-jerk liberalism to save California agriculture are almost too numerous to mention. By banishing Mexican labor and letting the crops rot, the jobs of 80,000 mem-

bers of the Teamsters Union who transport California fruits and vegetables are jeopardized.

Meanwhile the Mexicans have recently planted 7 million competitive orange trees in the State of Nuevo Leon. And big U.S. packing companies—Campbell Soup, Heinz, Del Monte, Minute Maid, Tropicana—have been building packing plants in Mexico, thus carrying precious dollars—and jobs—out of the country.

Senator MURPHY really has grasped something important by the tail. And President Johnson, who is neither a knee-jerk liberal nor a knee-jerk conservative, is certainly bound to listen.

Father of Jobless Pay—A Tribute to Sam Bernstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to call to the attention of my colleagues an interesting article by Mr. Robert M. Lewin, labor editor of the Chicago Daily News.

It fittingly pays tribute to Sam Bernstein, father of the Illinois State unemployment compensation law, who will be honored at a special luncheon in Chicago this Thursday.

It is indeed an exciting coincidence that the legislation which Sam Bernstein wrote back in 1937 was introduced in the Illinois Legislature by the then State Senator Richard J. Daley, today, as mayor of Chicago, acclaimed as America's most outstanding municipal administrator.

At Thursday's luncheon, more than 1,600 of Illinois' leaders of industry, labor, and government will assemble to pay tribute to Sam Bernstein—a tribute well earned.

The following story by Mr. Lewin describes Sam Bernstein's impressive background.

Mr. Lewin's article follows:

FATHER OF JOBLESS PAY: SAM BERNSTEIN TO BE HONORED BY STATE'S LEADERS

(By Robert M. Lewin)

Samuel Carol Bernstein was asked why he stuck with the State government for 30 years when he could have done better elsewhere.

Bernstein, Illinois employment security administrator, answered with surprise:

"If you knew the satisfaction I've derived from the work in which I've been engaged, from the people I've met, from the friends I've made, you'd never have asked the question."

At noon Thursday, 1,650 of the State's most important industralists, businessmen, union, political, civic, and religious leaders will take Sam Bernstein to lunch.

There would be more at the testimonial, honoring him for 30 years "of outstanding public service to the State and Nation," but that's all they can seat in the Palmer House's Grand Ballroom.

Bernstein's boss, John E. Cullerton, State labor director, thought up the idea of the testimonial. Cullerton is chairman of the affair.

Bernstein was born July 27, 1909, on Chicago's Near West Side (West 12th Street and South Throop).

After 6 years at the University of Illinois and graduation from its law school with the scholastic honor of Order of the Coif, Bernstein was hired by the law firm of Soble, Spira and Langeluttig, 176 West Adams.

His pay was $5 a week.

"A lot of law school graduates went to work for nothing at that time," Bernstein recalled. "I earned enough for lunch and carfare. I lived at home."

His father, Jacob, was a tailor. Bernstein's brother, Louis, 10 years older than he, works in the chief engineer's office of the Chicago & North Western Railway.

A year after Bernstein was graduated from Illinois, Dean Albert J. Harno and Prof. Svenbjorn Johnson of the law school recommended him for a 6-month job in the legislative reference bureau in Springfield .

His pay for drafting laws for action by the general assembly was $175 a month.

Bernstein jumped at the job offer.

His appointment created a buzz among La Salle Street lawyers, and some looked at him enviously as if he had been appointed to the Supreme Court.

"Here I was out of school for a year and my professors remembered me," he said, seated in his office at 165 N. Canal.

In Springfield, Gov. Henry Horner assigned Bernstein to develop and implement the State legislation required by congressional passage of the Social Security Act of 1935.

Bernstein wrote the State unemployment compensation law.

An energetic State senator, Richard J. Daley, now Chicago's mayor, maneuvered it through the general assembly.

It was enacted June 30, 1937, final day of the session—and Illinois became the last State to pass an unemployment compensation law.

While at the university, Bernstein helped to earn his way by waiting on tables at the Alpha Epsilon Pi fraternity house.

The boys invited a group of coeds to dinner one Sunday and, at first sight, Bernstein was smitten by a beauty he served, Dena Lois Feldman of Oak Park.

He learned her name and dated her. He married her Christmas Eve, 1934.

"It was the $175-a-month job for 6 months that precipitated the marriage," said Bernstein.

Horner kept Bernstein on the job while the law survived tests in the Illinois and U.S. Supreme Courts.

In 1937, the Governor asked him to be general counsel of the division of placement and unemployment compensation. Five years later, Bernstein became commissioner of the division.

"If I only knew I would have been involved in the administration of the law, I never would have written it the way I did," he said, in jest.

In 1961, he became assistant labor director in addition to unemployment compensation commissioner. For 3 months that year he held the three jobs of acting director, assistant director, and commissioner.

June 1, 1963, Gov. Otto Kerner appointed Bernstein the State's employment security administrator.

Bernstein supervises the Illinois State Employment Service and division of unemployment compensation, and coordinates Illinois participation in the Federal manpower development and training program.

Bernstein's longtime assistant, Jacob R. Cohen, advanced to unemployment compensation commissioner.

Bernstein is called Sam by nearly everybody except his secretary, Mrs. Genevieve St. Clair, who always refers to him formally as "Mister."

The Bernsteins and their son, Victor, 16, a junior in New Trier High School, live at 335 Brookside Lane, Glencoe.

They have two daughters, Mrs. Carol Anne Acosta of Columbus, Ohio, and Mrs. Bonnie Lou Petriach of 584 Sumac Lane, Highland Park, and two grandchildren.

At the luncheon, Bernstein will be given a resolution adopted by the legislature that calls him the "Father of the Unemployment Compensation Act" and praises him for representing "all that is noble in personal, professional, and public conduct."

Foreign Aid in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the annual debate on foreign aid all too frequently produces more heat than enlightenment. This year a new ingredient has added further fuel to the fire: Should economic and military assistance be considered jointly, as they have in the past, or separate, as has been advocated by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT?

In the context of this controversy I commend the thoughtful article by Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Washington Post this morning to our colleagues' attention:

TODAY AND TOMORROW: MONEY AND FOREIGN POLICY

(By Walter Lippmann)

The annual hassle about what is known as foreign aid is now beginning, and if what happened last year repeats itself, the Senate will deal with the proposal in committee for 14 days and will debate the bill for 28 days; the House committee will work on it for 26 days and the House will debate the bill for 2 days. Then the conference committee will meet for 4 days. In 1964 the bill first proposed on March 19 was passed with its amendments not quite 7 months later.

During this long period the officials who have to shape policy and administer the whole business will have to spend a very considerable part of their time and energy being cross-questioned, writing memorandums, lobby, and worrying. We are bound to ask ourselves whether such a prolonged expenditure of time and energy each year is really necessary, and if not, how it could be reduced. I hasten to say that it is easier to ask these questions than it is to answer them.

For we must remember that the foreign aid bill marks a radical innovation in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. It is only in the past 25 years that we have used our economic resources as an avowed instrument of our foreign policy. Until the Lend-Lease Act of 1940, which provided economic aid to the hard-pressed British Government, the President had rarely, if ever, asked Congress to appropriate money to be used as an instrument in the conduct of foreign affairs.

In the American age of innocence before the United States recognized itself as a great power in the world, our national purposes abroad were served by diplomacy and arms. Only since we have adopted the role of a great power have we done what great powers have always done. We have added money and propaganda to diplomacy and arms. This innovation, which began with the Lend-Lease Act, was carried on by aiding our allies during the war, by UNRRA and other relief

after the war, and by the Marshall plan, by NATO and the like.

The result is a very important change in the conduct of foreign affairs. Previously, the House of Representatives had no significant part to play, except of course in the case of a declaration of war. For the most part congressional power in foreign affairs was lodged in the Senate, which ratified treaties and passed on diplomatic appointments. But when the appropriation of money for aid and for propoganda became involved, the House, which under the Constitution must initiate money bills, suddenly had great power over U.S. foreign policy. In the postwar period the President and the State Department have had to accommodate two legislative bodies, not only one as was formerly the case. The Congress often acted as if it could and should conduct the foreign policy itself and has studded the eventual bill with prohibitions, injunctions, and admonitions, which are supposed to please hyphenated groups among some of their constituents.

This is the context in which to place Senator FULBRIGHT's refusal to introduce and manage the old type of omnibus bill for foreign aid. The issue is not between him and the administration or the AID. On the contrary, as long ago as 1961 the Kennedy administration proposed doing exactly what Senator Fulbright is now demanding—putting the supply of civilian and military aid into two separate measures. The Kennedy administration had to retreat then because Speaker Sam Rayburn insisted on one bill covering all kinds of foreign aid. The issue today is really between Mr. FULBRIGHT, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and Mr. MORGAN, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

If there is an issue between Senator FULBRIGHT and President Johnson, it is not primarily about whether there should be two separate bills. There are certain differences of opinion between Senator FULBRIGHT and the administration on some of his other proposals—differences of emphasis and timing rather than of principle and substance. The real question is whether the President could, with any hope of success, ask the House to pass two separate bills. Experienced observers say that the House would pass the military bill with a whoop, and almost without look at it. The House would then chew the civilian economic assistance bill to bits on the ground that it would spend abroad American money that could be spent better at home.

The essential difficulty lies in the fact that during the whole 25 years of the new policy of using money for foreign affairs, the argument for appropriating the money has invariably been that it was necessary to do this for our own military security. In 1940 the Lend-Lease Act was squeezed through Congress with the cry that we needed "to defend America by aiding the Allies." The Marshall plan was carried through Congress on the argument that without it, Stalin would overrun Western Europe. With the Truman Doctrine of 1948, our commitments became global, and money was scattered all over the non-Communist world on the claim that it would repel our great adversary and would win us the confidence of trusted allies.

As a result of this quarter of a century of experience, the House, which reflects popular opinion, can see little good in spending money abroad unless it is directly connected with some military consideration. This is one reason why it is so difficult to achieve the appropriation of money to be used for civilian development abroad, though such development is in the larger interests of the United States.

In the present case, Senator FULBRIGHT, as he has so often been in the past, is a pathbreaker. He does have a curious complex about France. But apart from that he is doing wonders to make the country and the Congress begin to reexamine the encrusted deposit of ideas and ideology and prejudices under which our foreign policy labors and groans.

Save Your Vision Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the President has proclaimed the week of March 7, 1965, as "Save Your Vision Week," to call to the attention of all Americans the importance of our eyesight. The observance is sponsored annually by the American Optometric Association since 1927, and has been declared as a national observance by joint resolution of Congress.

Because of the great importance of the preservation of vision to all of us, I place the President's proclamation in the RECORD:

"SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK, 1965"—BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

"Whereas preservation of vision is of the utmost importance to each individual and to the Nation as a whole; and

"Whereas cataracts, glaucoma, and other chronic diseases continue to be the major causes of visual impairments and blindness; and

"Whereas both children and adults are frequently threatened with blindness because visual abnormalities which were present at birth go undetected until irreversible vision loss has occurred; and

"Whereas blindness or serious visual loss is often preventable through early eye examinations of preschool age and school age children and through the early detection of visual deficiencies among the chronically ill and aging; and

"Whereas effective vision preservation will be achieved only if all our people are aware of the need for proper vision care, and take advantage of all means available to them to conserve their sight; and

"Whereas the Congress, by a joint resolution apporved December 30, 1963 (77 Stat. 629), has requested the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as Save Your Vision Week:

"Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week beginning March 7, 1965, as Save Your Vision Week; and I invite the Governors of the States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and officials of other areas subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to issue similar proclamations.

"I also call upon the communications media, the medical and health care professions, and all other agencies concerned with programs for the improvement and preservation of vision to unit in public activities to impress upon the people of the United States the importance of vision to their own welfare and that of our country, and to urge their participation in programs to improve and protect the vision of our people.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed."

Done at the city of Washington this 24th day of February in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-five, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-ninth.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Housing for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in a time when we are beset by fiscal problems and at the same time facing mounting demands for added services and considerations from deserving segments of society, we should look carefully at all alternatives which suggest savings. We are currently engaged in studies and programs for better housing for the elderly. This is a most admirable and necessary pursuit and one I personally support.

I bring to the attention of the House in general and to the Subcommittee on Housing in particular an article recently printed in the Hotel Herald, an industry organ published in Pennsylvania. The article interestingly suggests that we might well consider the usefulness in a program for elderly housing of some of the substantial structures within the hub of our larger cities which now stand as unproductive hotel units. Some study of the convertibility of these structures and their compatibility with the desired concepts in elderly housing is strongly indicated. With unanimous consent of the House the article appears immediately below:

VIEWS FROM A MOUNTAIN TOP

(By E. S. Shuck, past president, Pennsylvania Hotel Motor Inn Association)

(NOTE.—The greatest security a person can have comes from within himself. Nothing anyone else can do for you can begin to match what you can do for yourself.—Samuel Goldwyn.)

Without question, the most crucial problem facing the hotel industry today is what to do with the Nation's hundreds of finely constructed, large and small hotels which are being forced to the wall—and bankruptcy—by the rapidly growing modern type of motor hotel construction.

The big motor-hotel and motel chains, as well as certain individuals, are expanding into almost every city, town and resort area in the country, at a much more rapid rate than the also-growing national tourist and commercial business. The natural result is that this newer type accommodation has to draw the bulk of its patronage from the older properties, thus leaving these wonderful, splendidly built older hotels faced with oblivion—unless some type of conversion can be accomplished.

For the past 5 years we have made an intensive on-the-ground survey of this tragic problem, and believe, in the majority of cases, the most profitable solution is the conversion of these properties into homes for the aged.

Not satisfied with just a one-sided survey of hotel needs only we have also delved deeply into the needs and desires of the millions of older people who are waiting—many of them

dying while they wait—to get into a home for the aged—a tragedy in itself.

In every case studied, we have found hundreds on the waiting list of filled-up homes, which means that none will get in until someone in the home passes away, thus creating a vacancy. And all this goes on while thousands upon thousands upon thousands of hotel rooms lie vacant.

One of the most stupid errors church and other groups make in their analysis of what is needed for the aged, is that they must be pushed out into the country somewhere "where they can enjoy trees, grass, flowers, etc." We say this is stupid because in our conversations with many, many older people, we have not found a single elderly person who wants to be relegated to some woodsy spot—flowers or no flowers. Without exception, every elderly person we talked to said practically the same thing: "We don't want to be put on the shelf. While our bodies may have slowed down a bit, our minds haven't. We want to see life in action—to be around where younger people are, and where things are happening. We want to be where we can watch the world go by, and especially where we can walk to church—look into the bright store windows—see and talk to other people, rather than be cooped up together as though we were in a prison, regardless of how nice the furniture and everything is."

The planners also cite traffic as a problem, but almost every oldster said, "Traffic? The more the better. They have lights at every corner, don't they? We can manage—we're not afraid."

Well, we are convinced, and it has been proven in many cases that the elderly who have been housed in converted hotels in the very center of town, are the happiest of all. As an added proof, these converted hotels have the longest waiting lists.

An illustration of the stupid thinking of some of these planners for the aged was expressed by a bishop while sitting in the beautiful main dining room of a hotel that was being considered by his church for conversion into a home for their long waiting list of older people. Said he to me, "We couldn't use a room like this; not with that carpet on the floor and all these drapes and things. We would have to remove all these trappings, lay down plastic tile, etc."

I was stunned, but observed pleasantly. "You have carpet and drapes in your home, don't you? So why do we have to treat the elderly—most of whom have lived in attractive homes all their lives—as though they are a different breed of human beings?" He scowled and made no reply.

Of course a converted hotel should have a space—maybe a whole floor, for an antiseptic infirmary for the small percentage who are ill, but why penalize the majority of well guests by making the whole place look like a hospital? One of the most noted hospitals—Clifton Springs in northern New York State, catering to a most affluent and discriminating class of people, is operated like a luxury hotel—and how about the luxurious suite occupied by the Duke and Duchess of Windsor in a Texas hospital?

Finally, look at the cost of converting a hotel versus building a new rest home at today's prices. In the cases we have investigated, the minimum cost of building a new home has actually been four times as much as the hotel-conversion job—and in every instance the capacity for housing guests in the new homes averaged less than half the number that could be accommodated in a converted hotel—which again quadruples the cost per guest for the housing of the elderly.

It's high time the planners took a completely new look at the needs and desires of older people and how to provide for them at about one-fourth of the cost of new construction—not to mention the speed with which such a conversion can be accomplished, bringing great relief to the thousands of tired, distraught, dying waiters on numerous home lists.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6815 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C* — 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*
Grider, George W., *Tenn*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. *Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, W. *Va* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

Floyd M. Patterson, Chaplain of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Reserve Officers Association, at its midwinter banquet recently, rendered a significant service to the welfare and spiritual well-being of the men and women in the armed services by awarding to a representative member of the Chaplain Corps its annual award of "Chaplain of the Year."

This award serves as an inspiration and encouragement to all chaplains, to the men and women who work with them, and to the concept that these programs are worthwhile parts of our pattern of national defense.

The recipient of this award this year was Chaplain Floyd M. Patterson, a native Oklahoman. Chaplain Patterson has engaged in a significant career as a citizen-soldier, and we are proud of his accomplishments.

He has spent a good portion of his life in Missouri. The presentation to him of the "Chaplain of the Year" award was made by another Missourian, Brig. Gen. Donald S. Dawson, national vice president for air of the Reserve Officers Association, and an outstanding air officer and Washington attorney, who formerly served on the staff of President Harry Truman.

I ask unanimous consent that the Reserve Officers Association press release announcing Chaplain Patterson's recognition, the remarks of General Dawson, and the resolution of the Reserve Officers Association be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am sure they will be of significant interest to the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the release, the statement, and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION NEWS RELEASE

Lt. Col. Floyd M. Patterson, a Methodist chaplain in the Air Force, has been selected by the Reserve Officers Association to receive ROA's Armed Forces Chaplain of the Year Award for 1965.

Chaplain Patterson is assistant command chaplain of the Air Training Command with headquarters at Randolph Air Force Base, Tex.

He will receive the award at a banquet in Washington, D.C., February 26, which climaxes ROA's midwinter meeting, a 3-day military conference. The only other award to be presented that evening will be the association's 1965 Minute Man of the Year Award which goes to Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services.

The citation accompanying the Chaplain of the Year Award attests that Chaplain Patterson "has at personal sacrifice and with exemplary devotion to duty, given unselfishly of himself, his talents, and his energies, to provide meaningful spiritual development in the Armed Forces and has contributed substantially to the welfare of personnel, both by precept and example."

A native Oklahoman, Chaplain Patterson was commissioned in the Corps of Chaplains in 1943 and served with the then Army Air Corps until 1946 when he was appointed associate professor of philosophy and religion at Central College, Fayette, Mo.

Recalled to active duty in 1951, he served in Korea and in subsequent assignments at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., at Madrid, Spain, where he was assistant command chaplain for Spain and Morocco, and at Andrews AFB, Md.

He has been a member of the North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Church since his ordination in 1938, is a graduate of Southern Methodist University at Dallas, and received his divinity degree from Duke University at Durham, N.C. Further graduate study was conducted at Columbia University and Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Chaplain Patterson is married to the former Netta Robertson of Burlington, N.C. They have two sons, William, a graduate student at Virginia Tech, and David, a student at Duke.

REMARKS OF BRIG. GEN. DONALD S. DAWSON, AIR FORCE RESERVE, RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. President, distinguished guests, fellow members of the ROA, and ladies, it is our association's privilege each year to bring to our Mid-Winter meeting an officer of the Armed Forces and to honor him for what he represents in the development of the whole man devoted to defense of freedom.

This is our chaplain of the year award. It is one which we do not casually bestow, nor is it to be lightly regarded. Many fine members of the Chaplains Corps have been so honored, both in that they received the ROA Chaplain of the Year award, or that their work in this spiritual field was advanced by this public recognition.

He who is to receive the award tonight—and therefore will be known as the Chaplain of the Armed Forces of 1965—represents the highest of accomplishments and ideals in spiritual service. A native of Oklahoma, he was commissioned in 1943, and served in the Army Air Corps until the conclusion of World War II, when he accepted an associated professorship at Central College, Fayette, Mo. He was recalled to active duty in 1951—serving in Korea, and subsequently in other overseas and stateside posts. He is the husband of a lovely lady who shares his honors tonight, and the father of two sons now in college. It is my privilege and personal pleasure, on behalf of ROA to present to you the ROA chaplain of the year, a fellow reserve officer, now serving on active duty in the Air Force as assistant command chaplain of the Air Training Command at Randolph Air Force Base, Tex.—Lt. Col. Floyd M. Patterson.

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES RESOLUTION WITH RESPECT TO THE SERVICE OF CHAPLAIN, LT. COL., FLOYD M. PATTERSON

Whereas Floyd M. Patterson, an officer and leader in the Chaplain Corps in the Military Forces of the United States, has at personal sacrifice and with exemplary devotion to duty, given unselfishly of himself, his talents and his energies, to provide meaningful spiritual development in the Armed Forces and has contributed substantially to the welfare of personnel, both by precept and example: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association award to him, in meaningful recognition and sincere gratitude to him as representative of the Corps, this citation as Chaplain of the Year 1965.

For the association, the national council, February 26, 1965:

EDGAR H. REEDER,
Rear Admiral, USNR, President of the Council.

JOHN T. CARLTON,
Colonel, USAR, Secretary of the Council.

Capitol Punishment: President Goldwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the attached article by Columnist Art Buchwald appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, March 9. It is one of the cleverest pieces of satire that I have read in many a moon.

CAPITOL PUNISHMENT: PRESIDENT GOLDWATER

(By Art Buchwald)

Every once in a while, when I have nothing better to do, I wonder what the country would be like if Barry M. Goldwater had been elected President of the United States. Based on his campaign and his speeches, it is a frightening thing to imagine.

The mind boggles when you think of it. For one thing, we would probably be bombing North Vietnam now if Goldwater were in office.

As I see it, this is what would have happened.

The Vietcong would have blown up an American barracks. Using this as an excuse, Goldwater would immediately call for a strike on military bases in North Vietnam and announced a new tit-for-tat policy. Democrats would be horrified and they would make speeches that Goldwater was trigger happy and was trying to get us into a war with Red China.

But Goldwater would ignore the criticism, and to show he meant business, he would continue the raids, using not only Air Force bombers, but also jets from the U.S. fleet. As time went on, the country would be shaken at the recklessness of Goldwater's plan, but he would explain through his Secretary of State that, instead of a tit-for-tat policy,

we now intended to bomb North Vietnam in order to let Hanoi know that they could not support the Vietcong without expecting retaliation.

Senators would get up in Congress and call for some sort of negotiations. But Goldwater, with his lack of restraint, would retort that there is nothing to negotiate and we would only be selling out southeast Asia if we sat down at a table with the North Vietnamese and Red China.

The Soviet Union and France would call for a Geneva Conference, but Goldwater would reject it.

Instead, he would recklessly announce that he was sending in a battalion of Marines with Hawk missiles to protect our airfields. His critics would claim he was escalating the war, but Goldwater would deny it. Instead, he would bomb supply routes in Laos and Cambodia.

To explain these desperate actions, Goldwater would have the Defense and State Departments produce a white paper justifying the attacks and proving that Hanoi was responsible for the revolution in South Vietnam. He would insist we had to support the Saigon generals, no matter how shaky they were.

The paper would be followed by more air strikes using South Vietnamese planes as well as American B-57's.

The people who voted for Johnson would scream at their Republican friends, "I told you if Goldwater became President he'd get us into a war." But the Republicans would claim that Goldwater had no choice, that he, in fact, inherited the Vietnamese problem from the Democrats and, if he didn't take a strong stand now, America would be considered a paper tiger.

It all seems farfetched when you read it and I may have let my imagination run away with itself, because even Barry Goldwater, had he become President, wouldn't have gone so far.

But fortunately, with President Johnson at the helm, we don't even have to think about it.

Policy and the A-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a University of South Carolina student, David J. Allen, has written an outstanding article on the question of the search for the ultimate weapon for our defense posture. The article, entitled "Policy and A-Bomb: Is It Ultimate Weapon?" was published in the February 21, 1965, issue of the State and the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C.

This article is not only a sound one, but it indicates a most unusual understanding of this important question for a college student.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY AND A-BOMB: IS IT ULTIMATE WEAPON?

(By David J. Allen)

The January 15 violation of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty by the Soviet Union in which an underground nuclear detonation vented, causing radioactive materials to be carried into the atmosphere and subsequently beyond the national boundaries, again points out the magnitude and complexity of the problems involved with the development and testing of nuclear weapons.

Apart from the procedural aspects of the actual handling and detonation of these devices, we are once again reminded of how much the nature of the relationship between this country and the Soviet Union has changed since that fateful day in August 1945.

Wartime allies then, we now find ourselves directly opposed by a hostile power, whose totalitarian ideology knows no fulfillment save world domination, in the achievement of which, the Communists say, they will bury us.

This threat has become more poignant with Russia's acquisition of atomic weapons, and a means for their rapid delivery to any place in the free world. Fortunately, the United States has been able to keep abreast in weaponry, compensating for its lag in megatonnage delivery capability with both a greater number of missiles and such technological sophistication as the Polaris submarine. But the race is very close.

This competition for technological and quantitative superiority in armaments is dangerous. Aside from the remote possibility of the occurrance of the new dimension in today's world of instant strike, the inadvertant war, it is argued that any undue provocations or firmness on an issue, any miscalculation or military action against the Communists in support of this country's interest, will almost assuredly result in a thermonuclear holocaust. Such a prospect is indeed a grim one, and effective measures should be taken to avoid such an occurrence.

At the same time, however, and contrary to those who argue that all preatomic policy is outdated and now useless, the new nuclear-oriented strategy should be formulated in such a way as to not lose sight of the lessons which history has afforded regarding the relations among nations. To completely discard as worthless the previous experiences of men, not only makes their efforts appear futile, but is also a very dangerous policy to follow.

It is dangerous because elementary logic and human nature, along with the very essence of science—discovery—deny the notion that the nuclear weapon is the ultimate.

The idea of the ultimate weapon finds no solid foundation in reality, for the very fact that man has developed an instrument of destruction indicates that someone will develop a countering device capable of negating the effectiveness of that weapon.

Man invented the spear. He also produced the shield as protection against it. He developed the gun, and also armor plating and the bulletproof vest. He developed gas for use in war, and before he could use it to any great extent, the gas mask was perfected. Because he has invented the hydrogen bomb, he will, given time, develop the antinuclear weapon. Be it electronics—some sort of radar—or a death ray, or even something so ominous as weather control and production, such an instrument, an antiweapon, seems more than probable. The present rate of scientific advance is so great that one can only wonder at what the future may hold in this regard.

When such an antiweapon exists, the threat of the nuclear weapon, if not completely done away with, will be greatly diminished to a point where the world is no longer faced with self-destruction, even accidentally.

True, there will be weapons to replace the nuclear bomb, but following the trend of thought set down above, these weapons will also spawn counterweapons, as surely as humans generate antibodies to disease.

This constant parity in power between states, then, with one never being able to completely destroy the other or the world, will demand that nations formulate their ever-changing new policy along lines which take into account that which has already been experienced.

It would indeed be unfortunate if mankind were forced to relive the hardships of the past as a result of self-committal to a narrow strategy designed to cope only with a specific temporary problem, such as nuclear weapons, while losing sight of the general guidelines already forged by human experience.

Health Care a Political Football

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the quality of American medicine is surely too important to become a political football, yet that apparently is what we are witnessing. A keen analysis of the present situation is contained in the attached editorial from the Joplin, Mo., Globe of February 28, 1965. I commend it to your attention:

HEALTH CARE A POLITICAL FOOTBALL

The issue of medical care for the elderly has become such a prejudicial partisan political football that there is a real danger we will wind up with a bill tailored to suit the ambitions of politicians rather than the humanitarian needs of people.

We have what they call a "Democratic plan," a "Republican plan," and the presently advertised eldercare plan of the American Medical Association, with each label tending to stir arbitrary prejudices.

We have the administration apparently uncompromisingly committed to its medicare program that would blanket the country under a compulsory program tied to social security regardless of individual need, and supported by a new payroll deduction tax. Shamefully, some are even talking about making its adoption a test of party loyalty, a face-saving issue.

The so-called Republican plan would make the program voluntary, outside social security, and financed by the Treasury, the States, and individuals according to their capacities to pay low premiums, with Government paying total benefits for those in need and unable to pay anything.

The eldercare plan of the AMA also would keep the program outside social security, financed by Federal and State governments and low-cost premiums based on ability to pay. It clearly provides the largest real benefits of all, covering medical and surgical care and medicines, in addition to hospitalization, at costs ranging from nothing on up, depending upon ability to pay by those electing to come under it.

But, oddly enough, we see a political prejudice being built up against the doctors, even though it is a fact that success of any program of medical and hospital attention for the elderly or anyone else must rely heavily upon the Nation's physicians and surgeons. And they should be in the best position to know the needs and how to prescribe the best remedies.

Congress owes it to the country to approach this problem dispassionately, putting aside political prejudices and arriving at a solution based on needs, not votes.

One thing the people had better bear in mind is that if the program is placed under

social security the country is stuck with it permanently. And, based on past experience, costs and taxes will soar as succeeding politically minded Congresses broaden the base of coverage until we have total federalized medicine, which other countries have found to be their most costly welfare tax. This should concern everyone, regardless of politics.

This whole matter is approaching a showdown and it deserves the commonsense attention of the people.

We Should Ratify the Genocide Convention—Article by Senator Scott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which urges ratification of the Genocide Convention. I wrote the article for the current issue of American Judaism.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MORAL FAILURE: THIS NATION'S SPIRITUAL LEADERS MUST URGE RATIFICATION OF THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

(By Senator HUGH SCOTT, U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania)

In an age when humanity cries out for social justice and compassion for the weak, when the brutality of the Nazi regime stands before the West German bar and world opinion, it is ironic that our Government has failed to ratify the Genocide Convention.

How bitter is the irony when one knows the vital role the U.S. Government played in the drafting of the document 16 years ago, a government that stands for the rule of law in international relations, and now stands aloof.

The term "genocide" was coined by the late, brilliant, Prof. Raphael Lemkin, noted international law scholar. It was compounded from the Greek "genos," meaning race or tribe, and the Latin-derived "cide," signifying killing.

Genocide could be carried out in two ways:

1. Physical and mental: Subjecting people to conditions which lead to death of mutilation, e.g., putting people in concentration camps, placing them under slave labor conditions, or subjecting them to harmful drugs.

2. Biological: Prevention of reproduction through sterilization, compulsory abortion, and similar violent means. The stealing of children is included. These methods, which serve to destroy by delayed action, are as effective as outright murder.

In essence, the Genocide Convention will achieve the following: The nation in which the crime takes place is obliged to try the offender. The government will have enacted legislation to prevent and punish the crime. The acts punishable under the convention are genocide, conspiracy to commit genocide, attempt to commit genocide, complicity in genocide, direct and public incitement to commit genocide.

What is more, the convention provides that all guilty individuals are punishable, even if they happen to be public officers or heads of state.

While there is no international penal court and genocidists can be tried only in the country where the crime is committed, the convention does suggest the possibility of a new international court being set up in the future, which would have direct jurisdiction over genocidal acts. However, a separate treaty would be required to establish such a court and to determine the scope of its authority.

Former Assistant Secretary of State Ernest A. Gross, standing before the United Nations General Assembly on December 9, 1949, remarked:

"It seems to the U.S. delegation that, in a world beset by many problems and great difficulties, we should proceed with this convention before the memory of horrifying genocidal acts (the Nazi regime) has faded from the minds and conscience of man. Positive action must be taken now. My government is eager to see a Genocide Convention adopted at this convention of the Assembly and signed by all member states before we quit our labors here."

For the first time since the dawn of history, the criminal nature of genocide—the destruction of nations, races, ethnic groups, and religious bodies—was deemed a legal crime. The Genocide Convention established an essential principle of contemporary civilization.

The United States was among the first 20 countries to sign the document, only 2 days after its adoption. It remained for the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate present and voting for ratification. But advice and consent are still buried in committee.

Sixty-six nations have ratified the convention, including the Soviet Government. And 16 years later, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has not reported the Genocide Convention out of committee. It still languishes, and this failure has exposed the United States to Communist allegations of insincerity, embarrassed our friends abroad and has seriously weakened the convention's effectiveness as an international instrument.

The vital question is posed: Why the failure of the United States to act on a humanitarian principle despite the all-embracing support and constant pleas by more than 50 major American Jewish organizations, labor, education, civic, and from the leaders of the 3 major faiths?

Why this failure to act when time and again we have risen, and through the force of arms, have thwarted despots and tyrants? Why? When an enlightened United States knows that through the millenia masses of innocent people have been destroyed because their only crime was being a member of some ethnic, racial, or religious group?

Some 20 million people have perished through genocide in the first half of this century—and we have still to put savagery behind us.

There are answers, pitiful in logic, which account for our failure to act. One can think of at least four general reasons.

There is the misconception in the minds of some that it might be applied to lynching. Lynching, of course, involves the murder of an individual as opposed to mass murder, and therefore genocide would not apply to it.

More realistically, the country's honeymoon with the United Nations was ending, and this meant that we tended to withdraw from any involvement in any further United Nations controversies.

The doctrine of States rights was also applied in opposition. That is, many were purported to believe that under our Federal system, approval of such a treaty might jeopardize or overrule a State law. Nothing could be more in error. One cannot imagine a State passing such law dealing with a crime that involved large masses.

Finally the argument was advanced that the Genocide Convention might result in American citizens being brought for trial in foreign countries for crimes committed in the United States.

But article V of the Genocide Convention clearly states that ratifying nations will enact "in accordance with their respective constitutions," necessary legislation and "effective penalties."

Back in January of 1950, leaders of more than 50 organizations, representing millions of American citizens, appeared before a special genocide subcommittee under the chairmanship of the late Senator Brien McMahon of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, urging ratification.

The special subcommittee recommended ratification, urging the inclusion of four reservations. That was 1950, and ratification remains secluded in a dark recess.

Louis Schecter, of the American Jewish Congress, who has toiled valiantly and unceasingly for the ratification of the Genocide Convention, time and again has stressed that there was no chance for its approval unless the executive branch exercised its approval. Last July, I saw what seemed to be an opportunity for a final push. President Johnson let it be known that the White House wanted Senate ratification.

I enlisted the aid of 10 other Senators and wrote President Johnson asking for support in the matter, saying "it is generally recognized that only a strong appeal from the President will bring this measure to debate and a vote in the Senate."

The course of legislative-executive communication still runs in strange directions. Back came a reply—not from the President—but from Frederick Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, saying "It is the intention of the administration to ratify the Genocide Convention upon receiving the advice and consent of the Senate." Again "advice and consent."

Unquestionably, the President never saw the letter and this appeal for human lives was possibly given the same treatment as letters that request the President to accept a can of oil or to crown a beauty queen.

But more serious was the letter Senator FULBRIGHT wrote Mr. Schecter, "It is my impression at the moment * * * that the situation in the Senate has not yet developed to a point where a two-thirds vote is likely. Under these circumstances there is serious doubt whether the national interest would be served by promoting a debate at this time which might lead to a defeat of the Genocide Convention on grounds quite extraneous to the subject matter."

Succinctly, Jessie Halpern, Washington correspondent of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, expressed the entire matter:

"Why, then, should the White House suddenly appear as a partner in 'buckpassing' when appealed to for leadership in the convention ratification? One certainly must hope that the reasons are not tied with the need for Southern democratic support in the administration's forthcoming campaign, President Johnson has given his unequivocal support to the civil rights bill. This has, of course, called for the wrath of southern politicians. And it is many of these same politicians who are afraid that U.S. ratification of the Genocide Convention will make it applicable under domestic law to the civil rights issue. It is also significant that while Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman FULBRIGHT supports aspects of international cooperation, his record on domestic civil rights leaves much to be desired.

"Beyond the current White House-Senate confusion, remains a consideration of undoubtedly great importance. This is the question of active moral commitment by the United States to the ratification. Until the issue is stripped of its political implications and brought entirely into a realm of moral consideration, it appears that the U.S. rati-

fication of the Genocide Convention will continue on its way into unhealthy oblivion."

Here, one notes the recent editorial in the New York Times:

"The Genocide Convention deserves approval. It does not take away any sovereignty; it does advance the principles of the United Nations and the United States. Most of all, it is a moral commitment to international decency on a matter that has immediacy for many people around the world. It would be a bitter irony if in 1964, when the Auschwitz killers are on trial, the United States permitted the Genocide Convention to fade into oblivion."

If ever the religious forces of our Nation were needed to exercise their influence on the White House—it is now. The Genocide Convention is needed not only as an act of humanitarianism but for the specific purpose of giving religious groups protection against tyrants—protection which they sorely needed but have not had in the past. Through the ages, religious groups have known unparalleled and uninterrupted persecution—the desecration, the destruction of their houses of prayer which strikes at the very roots of a civilized society.

The Nazi slaughter of 6 million Jewish men, women, and children is unique in history because of its magnitude, but through the centuries, tyrants, with varying degrees of success, have destroyed populations of innocent people.

In this century of turmoil, confusion, and cruelty, the world must be equipped with an international document. Only our ratification can justify our position of moral leadership in the world.

This Nation's spiritual leaders of all faiths must accelerate, to the point of justifiable demand, that the Genocide Convention be approved by the U.S. Senate. More than legal arguments are needed. There must be a voicing of conscience on this matter, from those who speak in the name of faith. And the tide of public opinion must be stirred to a swell.

Time to Retire, Mr. Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, a committee of six members in the eighth grade at Reynoldsburg Junior High School, Reynoldsburg, Ohio, submitted a suggestion relative to retirement of Members of the House and Senate.

This program is as follows:

RETIREMENT OF U.S. SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES

The purpose of this plan is to better the ability of the U.S. Congress.

The retirement plan is as follows:

1. Senators must retire from the Senate at the age of 70 or at the end of five terms, whichever comes first, unless age 70 is acquired during a term in office. He must then retire from his tenure as a Senator at the end of that term.

2. Representatives must retire from the House at the age of 65, or at the end of that particular term if age is acquired at any time in that term.

3. We want to encourage the Members of the House of Representatives to move up to the Senate earlier than they do at present time.

4. We believe that Congress would be better able to serve the people with this plan. A younger Congress would react better to the growing pressures of today's Government.

5. A plan whereby retired Members of Congress may become honorary Members of their respective House. The retired Congressman shall be allowed to attend any session of Congress. They would have a voice in concerning affairs, but no vote. (These Congressman are only ones who have retired from Congress because of this law, no other exceptions would be accepted.)

We hope these proposals will be carefully considered.

DAN HEISCHMAN,
President.
ELOISE WRIGHT,
Vice President.
MARSHA PASQUINE,
Secretary.
IAHRIS ZORICH.
DALE HOSTINSKE.
JOHN F. MCNAMARA.
L. A. MYERS,
Adviser.

Obviously, these young people have been doing some thinking, and their adviser, L. A. Myers, should be complimented for stimulating their interest in the operation of their Government, and qualifications of officeholders.

Manpower Retraining: Proposed Reduction of State Contributions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the need for continued Federal support for manpower retraining is a matter of great interest and concern in my State. Unfortunately, there has been delay in the enactment by a number of States of appropriations required for their share of the cost assigned under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

In order to lessen the chances of endangering the existence of ongoing programs, Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, has introduced H.R. 5275, which proposes to reduce the proportionate amount which must be contributed by the State governments. The significance of this bill has been well stated by the South Bend Tribune, Mr. President; and I ask unanimous consent that its analysis be printed in the Appendix, and thus brought to the attention of Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APATHY: A CASE HISTORY

A bill in the congressional hopper that would allow the Federal Government to continue picking up most of the tab for manpower retraining projects is, unfortunately, must legislation. And therein lies the tale of the current crisis in Federal-State relations.

In passing the original Manpower Development and Training Act, Congress tried manfully to cast the law in what has become the traditional American mold of Federal-State coresponsibility: The Federal Government and the State governments were to share the cost after a short initial period when Washington would carry the full load to get the program going.

It quickly became clear that the States weren't going to pick up their share as quickly as Congress thought they should. So the period of full Federal underwriting for manpower training was extended, to give State legislatures time to pass participating legislation.

Still the States dragged their feet. And each day it became clearer that State governments, by and large, were apathetic toward the best tool yet devised for reducing unemployment.

Even in Indiana, where the earliest and most successful retraining projects were undertaken, it is requiring all the efforts a few St. Joseph County legislators can muster to convince the general assembly of the wisdom of participating in Manpower Development Training Act.

As the Federal law now stands, the States must start paying a third of the total costs of retraining after June 30. Fewer than 10 States are prepared to do that. Hence the new bill, introduced in the present Congress by Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, of South Bend, with the support of the Johnson administration: It would reduce the State's share from a third to a tenth of the cost, letting the Federal Government pick up 90 percent. (There is another move in the House of Representatives to make the Federal Government permanently responsible for 100 percent of the cost, but this lacks administration support.)

Even if the Brademas bill passes Congress in time to take effect before the June 30 deadline, it is still very much up in the air whether the Indiana General Assembly, already looking toward adjournment until January of 1967, will respond to the pleas of men like Senators Leonard Opperman and Donald Yeagley of South Bend, and pass a law providing any sort of State matching funds.

Incredibly, then, there is at least a possibility that manpower training projects in Indiana will have to phase out after June 30. For South Bend alone, that would mean snatching hope away from 600 jobless men and women who are participating in training projects that offer them their only chance of getting off relief.

Manpower training is a discouraging case history of State apathy—apathy that threatens a program under which 300,000 Americans have already been given new job skills to make them productive members of society and taxpayers.

Our Military Mail Facility at Frankfurt, Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last summer while in Europe I made an official call on behalf of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to our military mail facility at Frankfurt, Germany. This facility is our primary distribution point for the entire European theater. It not only distributes personal mail to the members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, but it handles a tre-

mendous volume of official military mail and during recent years the service has been expanded to include many critical parts for our complex communications and weapons systems. I gained the impression that beause of the efficiency with which the installation is operated that our military forces abroad are enjoying a better mail service than many of us here at home.

Upon my return to Washington I wrote a letter to Gen. G. P. Disosway commending him upon the efficiency of the installation which is operated under the direction of Lt. Col. James K. Adcock. In my letter I pointed out that I was greatly impressed with Colonel Adcock's administrative ability and the contribution that he was making to the morale of our Armed Forces in Europe and to the overall accomplishment of our objectives abroad.

This morning I happened to be reading the Stars and Stripes of Monday, March 1, and was delighted to note on page 8 that the postal facility of Frankfurt, under the direction of Colonel Adcock has been awarded the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award at ceremonies recently held in Wiesbaden. Based on my personal observation, it is my view that this award is richly deserved. I congratulate the Air Force on recognizing the efficiency and work of the unit and I congratulate Colonel Adcock and his unit upon receiving the award and General Disosway for having presented it.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is most appropriate that the article referred to be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

POSTAL GROUP GIVEN AIR FORCE OUTSTANDING UNIT AWARD

WIESBADEN.—The 7025th Air Postal Group has been awarded the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award at ceremonies here.

Gen. G. P. Disosway, USAFE commander in chief, presented the scroll, which cited the group's achievements, to Lt. Col. James K. Adcock, 7025th commander.

Basis for the award was the unit's exceptionally meritorious service in support of USAFE during the period July 15, 1962, through May 31, 1964.

During this period, the 7025th, serving USAFE personnel in every corner of the command, significantly influenced morale at remote locations. The group overcame complex problems to support widely scattered A.C. & W. sites, munitions storage sites, and operational sites of the Air Force Security Service and Air Force Communications Service.

It provided USAFE with transmission lifelines and played a key role in logistical support of the command's first line weapons' systems through the use of weapons system pouches (WSPS).

These pouches are used to move high priority spare parts by registered mail from USAF depots and contractors in the United States to USAFE bases. Similar fast mail service was provided for the return of supply items distributed throughout the command.

More than 27,000 WSPS were delivered to weapon systems in Europe and the Middle East, with an average transit time of only 48 hours to cover a distance of more than 4,000 miles.

To speed up movement of mail, the 7025th instituted Project Road Runner in 1962. Under this concept, the following improvements were made throughout the USAFE system:

Seven new mail terminals were established at Frankfurt, Madrid, Rome, Karachi, Istanbul, Adana, and Milan, to serve as key mail regulating points.

Major changes were made in mailtruck routing and scheduling between terminals and APO's to provide the fastest straightline movement between commercial airports and field APO's.

Consolidated mail rooms remained open on a 24-hour basis to provide around-the-clock delivery service.

Additional mail collection boxes were installed at all bases to provide more frequent mail collections.

Window service hours were extended for added customer convenience.

Special mail messenger service was established to expedite the transmission of command pouches between USAF headquarters and subordinate units.

Expanded use of foreign commercial airlines to increase the frequency of mail movement to points where U.S. commercial and military aircraft were inadequate.

A direct pouch system was established between AFEX depots and retail points to expedite movements of AFEX merchandise.

Processing time of movie and TV film was expedited by establishing mail service between USAFE base theaters and TV stations.

In addition, consolidated mailrooms were programed throughout the command.

More than 85,000 individual post office boxes are now installed at USAFE locations. Major savings have been made in unit mailroom manpower, equipment, facilities, and transportation.

Apart from its postal service mission, the group operated courier service and transfer stations which served as key links in the worldwide Armed Forces Courier Service network.

The Change From Decentralized Power to Centralized Power in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the March 15, 1965, issue of U.S. News & World Report contains a most important editorial which I feel merits the attention of all of the Members of this body. It is entitled "The Big Change," and points out very clearly how we are changing from a nation of decentralized power in the hands of the people to centralized powers in the hands of the Government and the ruling elite.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial, by David Lawrence, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIG CHANGE

(By David Lawrence)

The whole system of government in the United States of America is undergoing a profound change. This hasn't developed overnight. Once upon a time we believed that the States and cities should govern themselves. But apparently this concept has grown obsolete. For a centralized government has now come into being as population has steadily increased.

Scarcely a month goes by that the Federal Government doesn't try to usurp the functions of the States and even to subsidize many of their projects, especially in what are termed "poverty-stricken" areas—from the 11-State Appalachia to the slums of big cities in all parts of the country.

Has the American system of government been found wanting? Is there a weakness in the artificial drawing of geographical lines? Is this because population has failed to distribute itself equally in different sections?

Within another 60 years, the inhabitants of the United States may exceed 500 million, and in a shorter span of time thereafter, the total could reach a billion.

Shall we eventually be presented with a choice between a centralized government and a regional system? Should the States be grouped into perhaps 10 or 12 regions to preserve a degree of local control?

The emphasis today, however, is on centralization rather than decentralization. The Constitution has been amended or interpreted through the courts to permit the Federal Government to exercise more and more control over the States. The phrase "interstate commerce" first got national prominence 78 years ago, when a law was enacted which established the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate railway traffic. We had at that time only 50 million people.

Interstate commerce has since been broadened considerably. Whether the interstate commerce concept has been wisely or equitably developed is not so relevant today as the emergence of a centralized government in Washington.

The Federal Government now asserts the right to regulate not only labor-management relations and the size and scope of businesses, but also civil rights and other factors closely identified with what used to be regarded as self-government and community life.

More and more Federal subsidies are being granted to take care of everything from public roads to education, and from farm price supports to the rebuilding of American cities. Just a few days ago, President Johnson, in a message to Congress on the subject of urban development, said:

"Our cities are making a valiant effort to combat the mounting dangers to the good life. Between 1954 and 1963 per capita municipal tax revenues increased by 43 percent, and local government indebtedness increased by 119 percent. City officials with inadequate resources, limited authority, too few trained people, and often with too little public support, have, in many cases, waged a heroic battle to improve the life of the people they serve. * * *

"Whatever the scale of its programs, the Federal Government will only be able to do a small part of what is required. The vast bulk of resources and energy, of talent and toil, will have to come from State and local governments, private interests and individual citizens. But the Federal Government does have a responsibility. It must help to meet the most urgent national needs; in housing, in education, in health, and many other areas. It must also be sure that its efforts serve as a catalyst and as a lever to help and guide State and local governments toward meeting their problems."

This is but another indication that the Federal Government, in guiding the States and the cities, is to become the master and supervisor of them all.

We are today in the midst of a debate in Congress on the subject of Federal aid to education, and it looks as if the National Government will definitely participate in the educational process. As this happens, more and more control of what is taught in the classrooms will be assumed by Washington. For, while the Federal Government may not have any constitutional power to tell States what to do in the field of education, it now assumes the right to refuse funds unless its wishes are obeyed by local governments.

This is the big change which the United States is undergoing. Such a trend is not toward more democracy but toward autocracy.

Are we drifting into the kind of government that we have seen in powerful countries abroad, where freedom has been superseded by bureaucratic tyranny, where conformity by coercion is the order of the day, and where individual liberty has been absorbed by a government-controlled life?

Maybe in the forthcoming decades these dangers will be met by effective limitations on Federal power. But there are no signs as yet of such a restraining hand. A majority of the people's representatives are unfortunately indifferent to the big change which is underway in America today.

Senator Murphy and the Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to the following excellent article by John Chamberlain, entitled, "These Days: Senator MURPHY and the Braceros," which appeared in the Tuesday, March 9, 1965, issue of the Washington Post:

THESE DAYS: SENATOR MURPHY AND THE BRACEROS

(By John Chamberlain)

LOS ANGELES.—The day of the shrinking violet freshman U.S. Senator is apparently over. Democrat BOBBY KENNEDY, of New York, hardly waited to be seated before issuing a broadside calling for the inclusion of a few New York hill counties in the Appalachia program.

The same pattern has been followed by the new Republican Senator GEORGE MURPHY, of California. He plunged into congressional battle with a serious and devastating maiden speech which should have curled the hair of Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz for depriving California farmers of their traditional source of labor, the so-called braceros from neighboring Mexico.

The Murphy speech has great local significance for California, Arizona, Florida, and other States that have depended on seasonal importation of foreign labor to harvest such perishable and unsubsidized crops as oranges, lemons, dates, lettuce, and tomatoes, all of which require special handling. But beyond the significance to agriculture, Senator MURPHY's speech constituted an attack on the whole idea of trying to solve any and all national problems along preconceived ideological lines.

The banishment of the braceros from the California and Arizona agricultural scenes, and of Caribbean workers from Florida, proceeded from the knee-jerk liberal's abstract desire to make jobs for unemployed U.S. citizens.

Since the State employment agencies had had plenty of warning about the crackdown on the braceros, Democratic Governor Pat Brown anticipated little threat to California's $3.5 billion agricultural industry.

As things turned out, however, the pieces of the puzzle didn't match when the ideologs tried to put them together. At Tulare in the San Joaquin Valley a year of recruitment did turn up enough domestic citizen workers to end dependence on the braceros for harvesting the citrus crop. But in Ventura County, close to the metropolitan beguilements of Los Angeles, it has proved extremely difficult to hold native workers. The result is that Ventura has been lagging way behind on harvesting its lemon crop.

Around Palm Desert in the Coachella Valley, where former President Eisenhower has been communing between golf matches with Ray Bliss in hopes of refurbishing the Republican image, there is a desperate need both for date harvesters and experts in date palm pollination. Some city-bred workers were recruited for date palm work, and they quit after a single day.

The ironies attendant upon the whole fight against knee-jerk liberalism to save California agriculture are almost too numerous to mention. By banishing Mexican labor and letting the crops rot, the jobs of 80,000 members of the Teamster's union who transport California fruits and vegetables are jeopardized.

Meanwhile the Mexicans have recently planted 7 million competitive orange trees in the state of Nuevo Leon. And big U.S. packing companies—Campbell Soup, Heinz, Del Monte, Minute Maid, Tropicana—have been building packing plants in Mexico, thus carrying precious U.S. dollars—and jobs—out of the country.

Senator MURPHY really has grasped something important by the tail. And President Johnson, who is neither a knee-jack liberal nor a knee-jerk conservative, is certainly bound to listen.

National Service by Former Peace Corps Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the past weekend about 850 former Peace Corps volunteers participated in a conference on the goals of returned volunteers.

The purpose of the conference was set by its theme: "Citizen in a Time of Change." These young men and young women, who have made brilliant and valuable contributions to the peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, as ambassadors of good will, now earnestly desire to make an equally significant contribution at home.

In a preconference report, prepared by Neil A. Boyer, a former volunteer in Ethiopia, an excellent portrayal is made of the Peace Corpsman, his reasons for joining, his experience as a volunteer, and his uneasy adjustment as a Peace Corps returnee to America.

I think Mr. Boyer captures the feelings of many when he stresses the need of a volunteer to continue his dedicated service by helping to build a better America:

Now home again, the volunteer has a greater commitment to what he wants for America, and the ability to view the country's problems with detachment, but is less sure where he can personally participate. Full of energy and imagination, he hopes that he can put to use some of his skill in causing change, either in established activities or in those now getting underway.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, this report, entitled "The Returned Volunteer: Who Is He?"

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RETURNED VOLUNTEER: WHO IS HE?

President Johnson has called him a "major new national resource." Critics have called him "unstable." High school students admire him. Prospective employers consider him "restless." And he views himself as one possessed of great energies in a society that does not yet know how to use them.

He is, of course, the returned Peace Corps volunteer. At the moment there are 4,000 people like him—4,000 men and women, average age 26, who have spent 2 years living and working on the world's frontiers of development. By the end of 1965, there will be another 3,000 of them. By 1970, probably 50,000. By the year 2000, who knows?

Most of them are young enough to be active participants in the life of America well into the next century. This is a broad span of time, a period in which many significant changes will be taking place. And without a doubt these people are going to be influential—influential because of their experience as "agents of change," because of their common hopes and ideals, and because they know, if they care to seek support, that they can form a quick alliance in almost every area of American society.

Generalizations, of course, are necessary in the examination of such a large group, and volunteers are, first of all, individuals. Not all will fit the descriptions here, but it is the one in the vast majority who concerns us. What led him to the Peace Corps in the first place? What is the society he believes in? And how has his 2-year experience in a developing area of the world given him new insight, taught him new methods and new skills, and built up the energy he now seeks to employ in his own country?

The Peace Corps volunteers that we can identify—the 4,000 at home and the 10,000 overseas—have no real common origins. About 80 percent have completed college, and about a tenth have graduate degrees. Some were exceptional students, while most received "B's" and "C's"; the large majority were liberal arts majors. But they came from all ethnic groups and all classes of life, from the wealthy to the poor.

Despite the diversity, they came to the Peace Corps with many common characteristics. In general, the volunteer was distraught at the "supermarket" image of American life, with the growing suburban society that concentrates on material things and on appearance, and not so much on the things that "really matter." He read Vance Packard and David Riesman and Kenneth Galbraith, and liked what they said about American society.

He was upset by widespread antiintelleotualism, by lack of respect for new ideas, by general toleration of mediocrity. He was concerned about the lack of equality in application of the law, and specifically about the discrimination he encountered so frequently—as much in personal feelings as in the laws of many States and the regulations of business.

He was repelled by the thought of going to work for business and becoming the "organization man" he had read about, locked in conformity, forced to work with unimaginative people in concentrating on higher and higher profits. He considered giving his enthusiasm for new ideas to government, but frequently reversed himself in the face of a massive bureaucracy. Outmoded systems of teaching and an impatience with the need to "do something" kept him away from the schools.

Then suddenly there was John F. Kennedy, a New Frontier, and a Peace Corps. The Nation's interests were focused on foreign affairs, on the attainment of peace, and on the poverty, ignorance, and disease that were holding back the nations of the Southern Hemisphere. Several years later America would concentrate more on its own problems, but now there was at least an opportunity to get out and "do something" and do something that was vital and important.

Many, but not all of those who entered the Peace Corps described themselves as "idealists." Very few who come home 2 years later would use that word. If they had idealism, they ran headlong into a thing called reality. For some there was a violent crash.

The one thing most every volunteer can tell you is that he learned how to be patient. He learned not to expect quick action—or even any action—when he broached an idea. Instead he learned how to plant seeds, and he learned when to water them, and he learned to wait until the harvest, and he learned not to expect anyone to tell him the produce was good.

Sometimes he was thrown into small villages, vastly different from anything he had known at home. He had to learn the local language so he could buy his food in the marketplace and bargain for the rental price on his home. He learned to correct his school papers before the electricity went off at 8 o'clock each evening.

Frequently the tools he needed—whether books for school or shovels for road building—were sorely inadequate. He learned to compensate for things like this, just as he learned to make his own plumbing and electrical and carpentry repairs. He objected to the glamorous reports that said he was possessed of great ingenuity, the the description often fit him well.

He learned to be observant. He met and got to know many new people—peasant, high government officials and royalty, and expatriates from many different lands (many people, incidentally, who share his sympathies and ideals, and who will be influential in their own areas). He watched with awe as young people struggled to become more westernized while at the same time trying to keep pace with their tradition-minded elders. Often he saw true poverty for the first time in his life.

He saw his own country in a new light too. Frequently he found himself backed against the wall while he tried to explain something his Government had done, often something with which he personally disagreed. Sometimes the candor he had developed with his new friends allowed him to admit his disagreement.

He came to know and appreciate more his own country's strengths, and its history, and the foundation of its Government. But he also saw the deficiencies of American operations in his adopted country, and the massive opportunities for American business. He realized too the many inadequacies of the American press when he saw its distorted stories on his country; indeed, soemtimes he had to defend Time magazine by explaining that it was not really insulting a foreign society but only seeking to amuse its American readers.

The volunteer also learned to be observed. For the first time, he often found himself a member of a minority group—an attractor of the curious—and he came to better understand the way minorities feel in the United States. At the same time he was forced to explain that race relations at home were not really so bad as the exaggerations in the local press made them seem.

If you ask a volunteer what he accomplished in 2 years overseas, he probably won't be able to tell you in very concrete terms. It isn't easy to prove that people in a remote village of South America are now eating more food, or that they have less disease, or that they now understand that the world actually extends beyond a 20-mile radius from their home. The volunteer might point to a road or a school he helped build, or to a larger graduating class (which is what the American press usually did). But his real accomplishments were in the more elusive realm of establishing a basis of understanding, of being able to urge others to help themselves, of broadening horizons.

Of course, he often went through periods of depression and loneliness and great frustration, despite the fascinating new places and peoples. As one volunteer put it, "If someone had told me I'd be very bored sitting at the foot of Kilimanjaro with elands galloping around me, I would have said 'You're out of your mind.' But I was, and reading has been my salvation."

The psychologists who have interviewed the returning volunteer say the Peace Corps experience has produced a person who is more mature, more sensitive, more flexible, and who understands himself much better. The time to think, and the stress of new situations have given him real awareness of his own strengths and weaknesses.

Now home again, the volunteer has a greater commitment to what he wants for America, and the ability to view the country's problems with detachment, but is less sure where he can personally participate. Full of energy and imagination, he hopes that he can put to use some of his skill in causing change, either in established activities or in those now getting underway.

Frequently he has been disappointed by what he's found at home. People ask him, to the point of cliché, whether his experience was "challenging and rewarding" (just as they asked 2 years before why he was joining the Peace Corps), but he finds they really aren't very interested in the foreign lands he has come to know and love. He thinks them still too much concerned with themselves and their own vested interests, and not enough with understanding and accepting others—whether across the world or across the street. Yet he can be realistic and cautions himself about an attitude of being "more aware than thou."

He also finds discomfort in having his situation suddenly reversed upon his return to the highly organized society that is America. He no longer lives in a goldfish bowl, no longer is accorded great respect as he passes down the street, and no longer has the great responsibilities he often had overseas. Now he tends to be lost in the crowd. If he does receive special treatment, it usually comes in the snide comment, "Oh, you were one of those."

The volunteer, of course is vociferous in saying he doesn't want special treatment, yet at the same time he thinks he has something unique to offer and doesn't want to be underrated. He is learning to apply the patience he acquired overseas and to work actively within the existing systems, while at the same time seeking new and better outlets.

He wants America to have better education, better cities, more appreciation of the arts, more imagination in business, more concern for others, and more real interest in world events. More importantly, he thinks he, and the thousands of others coming behind him, can help. What he seeks now is the opportunity.

Mobile Recognizes the Nation's Outstanding Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Mobile, Ala., and our junior chamber of commerce, working with civic groups throughout the Nation, will honor our Nation's high school senior girls March 13–20 when Mobile hosts the national finals of the America's Junior Miss Pageant.

This program has rapidly grown into the outstanding event in the Nation for young ladies between the ages of 16 and 18. Over $150,000 in college scholarships and other awards will be given to local, State, and National participants in this year's pageant. Finals will be nationally telecast on NBC, Friday, March 19, in color.

The purpose of the America's Junior Miss Pageant is to honor each year the Nation's ideal high school senior girl. Through hundreds of local contests, followed by a thrilling pageant in each State, thousands of contestants are carefully narrowed to a select group of 50 outstanding young ladies. The culmination of this activity is the America's Junior Miss Pageant each spring in beautiful, gracious Mobile, Ala. Through generous scholarships to the winner and four runner-ups, the educational goals of the pageant are emphasized. Crowning of the winner thus becomes a distinct tribute to all young American womanhood as each new America's Junior Miss steps forward as a shining symbol of the Nation's best. Last year, over 40,000 high school seniors sought titles in 900 State and local contests.

The Pageant Scholarship Foundation is a nonprofit foundation in Mobile administering funds to provide educational grants for the winner and four runners-up of each year's national pageant. In addition, substantial scholarship awards are made during the many local and State Junior Miss selections throughout the Nation.

The America's Junior Miss Pageant, presened by the Mobile Junior Chamber of Commerce and prominent Mobilians, has set exceptionally high standards for contestants—standards which have won high praise from parents and educators. From the start of the activity in 1958, the typical bathing suit competition was omitted as having no place in the selection of the young lady truly representative of her classmates in every American community. Special emphasis is placed, instead, on these important qualities—character, scholarship, ambition, leadership, religious interest, and ladylike poise and demeanor.

The judges are outstanding men and women, selected to obtain the widest possible variety, both geographic and occupational. They spend many hours with the contestants, individually in private interviews, and as a group at informal social occasions. In addition, they judge onstage competition in evening dress, sports attire and talent appearances. As a result, judging is in depth. Evidence of the success of this approach is that past winners have used their pageant scholarships to prepare for many praiseworthy occupations.

The national sponsors share the interest of the pageant in maintaining high standards for all who compete at every level—local, State, or National—and in encouraging contestants to continue their education. Sponsoring the program nationally are Eastman Kodak Co., the John H. Breck Co., and Scott Paper Co.

About the You in You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, our distinguished and respected Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, is not only an outstanding chaplain; he is also one of the best newspaper columnists in this country. I enjoy reading his articles, "Spires of the Spirit," in the Sunday Star. I was particularly impressed with his article of March 7, 1965, entitled "About the You in You," pointing out the importance of the individual and individual responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 7, 1965]

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—ABOUT THE YOU IN YOU

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

Perhaps the most used word in our contemporary vocabulary is "problem." In any survey of human affairs problems loom to the right and left and ahead. In this midyear of the 1960's television and radio dump earth's remotest frontiers into our living rooms. There it all is in daily reports for us to behold and appraise. The most deluding psychological trick of our volcanic times is to pile up world problems in such a way as to make the one thus deluged with question marks oblivious to the fact that wrapped within his own skin is his chief problem. Always your main problem is you.

It is that startling revelation that Ibsen, the dramatist, was endeavoring to make clear to a youth to whom he wrote with deep solicitude. In a letter to the boy were words which in wisdom are more golden than gold. Here they are, "There is no way in which you can benefit society more than by coining the metal in yourself." That suggests the paramount question for every individual—what are you doing about coining the metal from the mine that is inside you?

It is disregard of that one thing that matters supremely which is an ominous symptom of this glittering gadget era. There is a lack of personal honor to a degree that is positively appalling. Everywhere are evidences of character erosion, of individual corruption seeping into public life, sports life, student life, and commercial life. It is sadly true of 1965, as Edmund Burke said of the mad days of the French Revolution, "Gone is that sensibility of principle, that chastity of honor, which once felt a stain like a wound."

The great fallacy and heresy of the 20th century is the notion that without primary attention to the caliber of individuals glowing social goals can be reached simply by the impetus of mass movements. The kingdom of human betterment is to come by changing maps rather than by changing men. Even in our enlightened capitalism often sorry attempts are made with legislative bricks to build an altruistic edifice on the sinking sands of unchanged individuals. To advocate radical social changes and disturbing readjustments in human relationships without taking into consideration what sort of individuals are to run the proposed new machinery is to miss the one essential thing. An adage has come down the long years which is the quintessence of the wisdom of the centuries, "You cannot make a silk purse out of sow's ears."

This mistaken emphasis on causes and enterprises and social crusades entirely concerned with the outer world to the neglect of any consideration of inner resources, of coining the metal inside, is indicated in many urgent pronouncements for social action in these days. The keynote seems to be, not regeneration, but acceptation. This attempt to disregard the you in you is illustrated in the present propaganda, even over television and radio, to stop even in decent society what is called discrimination of sex deviates and perverts who are addicted to disgusting practices which are not only degrading to those guilty, but whose abnormal debaucheries so often blight the lives of youth lured as sacrifices to such degenerate lust. Such people, we are blandly told, comprise a large minority of the total population.

The present propaganda regarding this nauseating matter is not to rehabilitate such moral lepers, but to integrate them, to accept them without question with practices of which the so-called lower animals are never guilty. Those who advocate such an attitude seem more concerned with discrimination than with contamination. It all falls in with the debasing credo that it doesn't really matter what you are inside—just fall in line and take your place in humanity's "upward" climb—which may really be a descent to catastrophe.

Even the church is not exempt to the temptation to ignore the fundamental insight of the New Testament that out of the heart are the issues of life. In a recent issue of one of the best-known religious journals there is this advice calculated to lure men into the ministry, "Encourage your pastor to exercise a prophetic ministry concerning the great social issues of our time, suggested by the newspaper headlines which make clear that automation, civil rights, poverty, etc., are the hot issues and that people are not interested in sterile, puritan moralities, and incessant carping against smoking, drinking, and swearing." All that is irrelevant. The article virtually says that successful pastors in our day are not to be greatly concerned about the you in you. The whole tenor of this appeal regarding the modern pulpit seems to be to assume that it is morbid to bother about the heart—it's the hands and feet that are to be set acting and marching. All this is celestial hailing distances from the message of that glorious little book, the New Testament.

A famous evangelist who was the instrument for the cleansing and empowering of untold thousands of lives used to tell his great audiences, "Start by drawing a circle and then standing in the center of it, offer this prayer, 'Lord, bring Thy renewal to all the world, and begin the change by changing me. Amen'."

Caterpillar's Contribution Toward a Favorable Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to receive a letter and news release recently from Mr. Clay E. Murray, manager, Caterpillar Tractor Co., Davenport, Iowa, and I would like to call this letter and news release to the attention of my colleagues here in the Congress:

Caterpillar Tractor Co. contributed $373 million to the flow of international payments into the United States in 1964, President William Blackie said today.

The company will exert every effort to cooperate with President Johnson in his goal of improving the Nation's balance of payments in 1965, he said.

Mr. Blackie reported that Caterpillar's net contribution toward a favorable balance of payments for the 10 years 1955–64, was $2.6 billion. He said the company's contribution will continue to increase as its exports increase, and as its foreign investments mature and become more profitable.

The complete statement follows:

Caterpillar Tractor Co. is cooperating with the Federal Government in its request for voluntary cooperation from industrial firms that have substantial investments abroad or that export large amounts of product from the United States.

In this effort, the Government seeks to have such firms improve their net contributions to a more favorable balance of payments.

Caterpillar already is one of the Nation's major net contributors to this cause. For the 10 years, 1955–64, its net contribution to the flow of international payments into the United States was $2.6 billion. For 1964 alone, its net contribution was $373 million.

Caterpillar's contribution will continue to increase as the parent company's exports increase and as its foreign investments mature and become more profitable.

Caterpillar's foreign manufacturing subsidiaries obtain from its U.S. plants substantial amounts of components for assembly into machines and engines produced abroad. As a result, these foreign investments contribute materially and directly to an increase in exports from the United States.

Furthermore, its exports of finished machines and parts have increased to those countries in which Caterpillar has made investments. None of the subsidiary companies manufactures the complete line of Caterpillar products but they actively promote the sale of the complete line and their presence within the host countries has produced important increases in exports of U.S.-manufactured products to those countries.

Despite the very substantial contribution already being made by Caterpillar toward improvement of the balance of payments, it is finding new ways to help the U.S. Government solve one of its most serious problems.

For 1965, the company will exert every effort to meet the President's goal of an increase of about 20 percent in its net contribution—the excess of exports, dividends, and license fees over such overseas investment as may be required to preserve and expand a fully competitive position.

Mr. Speaker, as Congressman from the First District of Iowa, I want to personally applaud this generous action on the part of Caterpillar Tractor. These actions illustrate the type of enlightened and generous attitude that has contributed so much to the strength and well-being of this great Nation. It is another vindication of the firm faith which all of us, as devoted Americans, have in our great competitive free enterprise economy.

Farm Income Too Low

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last week the very reliable Minnesota poll of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune indicated that more than 6 out of every 10 Minnesotans feel that the farmers in the United States do not get a fair return on their products.

This poll echoes, I think, the sentiments of all citizens in the Midwest and farm States, and I think it deserves much wider attention.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that an article describing the results of the poll be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA POLL: 62 PERCENT CALL FARM INCOME TOO LOW

U.S. farmers generally do not get a fair return on their products, in the opinion of more than 6 out of every 10 Minnesotans (62 percent) questioned in a statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll.

Among farm residents themselves the feeling is almost unanimous; more than 9 out of every 10 persons living on farms think farmers fail to get properly reimbursed for their work.

In the words of a Bloomington housewife, 28, who once lived on a farm: "You can not possibly make any money considering the work that goes into farming. If they got paid by the hour, farmers would be rich compared with the workingman in town."

Out of the wide variety of explanations offered as to why farmers do not get their fair share, the middleman most often is singled out as a cause.

There are just too many middlemen in our marketing system, at St. Paul man said.

The question put to a balanced sampling of Minnesota men and women living in all parts of the State:

As things stand today, would you say that farmers in the United States generally do or do not get a fair return on their products?

The replies:

[In percent]

	All adults	Farm residents
Farmers do get a fair return	28	8
Do not	62	92
Other answers	2	---
No opinion	8	---
Total	100	100

A farmer's wife from Clay County said: "The prices we get for our crops aren't high enough. We should have 100 percent parity."

Another farm homemaker (Otter Tail County) who feels farmers should be left alone and allowed to handle their own problems puts the blame on bigness. "We used to raise turkeys and made out OK until the big companies sold feed," she said. "Too many big businessmen invest in farming as a sideline and that hurts us, like the chicken farms that are run by the big food chains."

A Stillwater man who teaches typing and stenography thinks "It's just the way our economy operates. Nobody wishes it on them, but as a whole our farmers don't have much of a chance to raise their standard of living," he said.

"We've tampered with supply and demand through subsidies and it hasn't worked," a Coon Rapids woman declared.

After sorting the answers into broad categories, the explanations are found in these numbers:

	Percent
Middleman takes too much, too many middlemen	43
Lack of organization, no bargaining power, can't control prices	17
Cost of farm operation too high in relation to return on products	12
Overproduction, products wasted	7
Government regulations, too much Government control	5
Too many imports	2
Other reasons	19
Don't know	8
Total	113

The above column adds to more than 100 percent because some respondents who thought farmers did not get a fair return supplied more than one reason.

"The farm problem" has been a source of vexation to White House administrations before and after the great depression of the 1930's. "It's going to take some smart cookie to figure it out," one farmer mused.

Medicare Plan of AMA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, medicare is a most controversial subject and I think that all views should certainly be expressed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and various news media.

The Honorable Chester A. Williams, Jr., coroner of the East Baton Rouge Parish, who is an outstanding and distinguished doctor of Baton Rouge, La., requested that I include in the RECORD the following article, which appeared in the Catholic publication, The Commentator.

The article is as follows:

MEDICARE PLAN OF AMA

(By Father John Doran)

It would seem to me that the medicare plan proposed by the American Medical Association is really closer to the thought of the Papal Encyclicals than the social security plans of the administration. Let me tell you why.

At the beginning of his famous encyclical "Mater et Magistra," Pope John restated the usual papal thought on the principle of subsidiarity. He said, quoting Pius XI in "Quadregsismo Anno," "It is a fundamental principle of social philosophy, fixed and unchangeable, that one should not withdraw from individuals and commit to the Community what they can accomplish by their own enterprise and industry. So, too, it is an injustice and at the same time a grave evil and a disturbance of right order, to transfer to the larger and higher collectivity functions which can be performed and provided for by lesser and subordinate bodies. Inasmuch as every social activity should, by its very nature, prove a help to members of the body social, it should never destroy or absorb them" (pt. 11, No. 53).

Basically, the social security approach to medicare is this: the Government will enforce by taxation a withdrawal from the pay of the individual and his employer a sum of money each month in order to provide for this employee hospital care in his later years. In this part of the program one finds an insurance plan forced upon the employee by the Government. But, when one considers all those already over 65, or soon to pass that age, one sees the Government plan as an outright grant of hospital costs (with certain limitations, of course) to every one who is of the required age, whether that person needs the assistance or not.

There is, let me say at once, a real need for some sort of medical care for those who cannot provide it for themselves. This country of ours is too rich in material wealth to allow the poor within it to be deprived of medical care. It can and should be provided. There is no argument here. What is argued, and of vital concern, is whether this assistance shall be provided broadcast, or as needed.

You see, the elderly as such are not necessarily indigent, not necessarily in need. A visit to retirement communities can show one that. The aged of this country represent 9 percent of the population, and control 8 percent of the country's income. Ninety-six percent of these oldsters owe, according to the University of Michigan survey, no bills for doctor, dentist, or hospital. As a class our elderly people are not a poor people.

However, and this is a big however, an individual in need is not going to be much helped, by the simple fact that he is of a class not in need. There are, and there will be, elderly people who do need assistance in order to meet medical bills, hospital, doctor, and drug. For them provision must be made.

The AMA plan recognizes this need, but proposes that the need shall be met where the need exists, not on an overall basis of establishing medicare for all, whether they need it or not. The AMA plan envisions the use of private insurance, and would function through the Kerr-Mills Act, already implemented in some 40 States. "Under the new program, an over-65 citizen would purchase through the private insurance firms a wide spectrum of medical, surgical, and hospital benefits, and would pay all, part, or none

of the costs of the policy, depending on his income.

For individuals with income under the specified minimums, the State agency, using Federal-State funds, would pay the entire costs. * * * Aid would consist of comprehensive health-care benefits, rather than being limited to hospital and nursing home care, which are the only benefits under the presently proposed Government plan. Eligibility for assistance would be determined on the basis of a "simple income statement."

The reason why I think the AMA plan fits into the principle of subsidiarity better than does the Government plan is this: the AMA plan leaves to the individual the provision for himself and family, if he is able.

If the individual cannot provide personally, he can turn to the next upward grouping, the insurance plan; if he is unable to use this next step, then he turns to the State-Federal plan. The social security plan takes away from the individual his freedom for, and obligation to, provide for himself, and enforces an immediate Federal plan provided by taxation. The Government thereby does for people what most of them can do for themselves, which is the reversal of the principle of subsidiarity.

You might express my thinking on the subject of medicare this way: let those who can provide for themselves by their own funds and insurance do so; let the State step in to help those who cannot provide for themselves. Our own individual dignity demands that we take care of ourselves if we can; human dignity demands that society care for those who cannot provide for themselves.

Closing of Olmsted Air Force Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the closing of Olmsted Air Force Base, at Middletown, Pa., is creating grave problems for central Pennsylvania. Twelve thousand families will be seriously affected, and great damage will be done to central Pennsylvania's overall economy. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution, adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania, urging Secretary of Defense McNamara to rescind the order directing the phasing out of Olmsted Air Force Base.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA RESOLUTION, FEBRUARY 26, 1965

"The closing of the Olmsted Air Force Base at Middletown, Pa., will add to the unemployed of central Pennsylvania about one-fourth of the total to be made unemployed by the recent order of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara closing certain installations throughout the United States. About 12,000 families will be seriously affected by the order.

"In addition to the economic suffering of the unemployed the Commonwealth and the political subdivisions of the area will be adversely affected by the resultant additions of poverty stricken families to relief rolls, etc., and the economy of central Pennsylvania will grind to a low point in the years to come because of the loss of the annual $73 million payroll of the base.

"National defense expenditures in Pennsylvania constitute only one-third of the amount spent in New York and only one-eighth of that spent in California. The phasing out of the Olmsted Base will lower the share of the Commonwealth to less than 3½ cents of each national defense dollar.

"Olmsted Air Force Base is the only base operated by the Air Force in Pennsylvania. Its closing may result in inadequate protection for Pennsylvania and northeastern United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara be urged to rescind the order directing the phasing out of the Olmsted Air Force Base at Middletown; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of senate resolution, serial No. 11, introduced by Senators William B. Lentz, Richard A. Snyder, George N. Wade, and Robert O. Beers, and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the second day of March 1965.

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

Dropout Likes Job Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of the Johnson administration to get the Job Corps into full operation is to be commended. Already reports of the value of this move to assist our untrained young people are coming to us.

An article that appeared in the Shenandoah, Iowa, Evening Sentinel on February 15 points up the enthusiasm that has greeted this program. I commend it to my colleagues attention:

DROPOUT LIKES JOB TRAINING

ASTORIA, OREG.—George Howard, 18, got through the 10th grade at Butler, Ill., then quit school because "me and the teachers didn't get along." He gets along fine, though, with teachers at the Job Corps training center at the old Tongue Point Naval Station here.

James Miles, 18, of Oakland, Calif., says this is because the teachers "really want to help. They could make a lot more money other places, but they came here because they want to help us."

What they are helping George and James to do—and ultimately an enrollment of 1,250 as well—is to learn a skill and hold down a job. This is part of President Johnson's war on poverty program and it is one of the first urban training centers where classroom work will be combined with vocational training.

The University of Oregon is running it. Philco Corp. has the contract for job training. And Douglas Olds, a veteran Oregon school administrator is directing a reading, writing, and arithmetic program along with job training.

Most of the youngsters have had a job or two, briefly, after dropping out of school. Louis Mendoza, 17, of Denver, Colo., says all he could get in 2 years were dishwashing or busboy jobs. Now he is studying electronics.

"I'll work on color TV and things like that," he says. "The classes are fun. They don't treat you like a 2-year-old."

Olds says that in both the academic and vocational classes, instructors aim at providing individual attention.

They are getting it and although the school has been open less than 2 weeks, the enthusiasm is evident.

"I'm going to graduate," says Carl Nickels, 17, of Redding, Calif. "I'm going to get a high school diploma. And then I'm going to go to college—maybe UCLA, I hope—and study electronics."

Stand Firm in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed with an article, in the March 15, 1965, issue of U.S. News & World Report, containing an interview with the Foreign Minister of Thailand on the question of our stand in South Vietnam. The article is entitled "To the United States From an Ally: Stand Firm."

I commend this article to the attention of all Senators; and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE UNITED STATES FROM AN ALLY: STAND FIRM

BANGKOK, THAILAND.—Talk with Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman, of Thailand—a country directly menaced by the war in southeast Asia—and you get some strong answers.

Question: Is a negotiated peace possible in South Vietnam?

Mr. Thanat's answer: "Who is asking for negotiations? South Vietnam has not asked for talks. Red China and North Vietnam are not interested. Their position is perfectly clear. They want control of South Vietnam and complete and unconditional withdrawal by the United States.

"What do you negotiate? Complete surrender of South Vietnam to the Communists? If that is your intention, then do not waste money and time negotiating.

"When one is willing to surrender, then surrender. It is very easy.

"The United States must continue to support South Vietnam or withdraw. Talk of a negotiated peace is irrelevant."

Mr. Thanat gives a flat and emphatic "no" to any idea that another Geneva Conference with the Communists could produce a settlement in southeast Asia.

"Communist countries signed Geneva agreements in 1954 and 1962, guaranteeing respect for the unity, neutrality, independence, and freedom of Laos and Vietnam. North Vietnam and China signed those agreements. But they are the countries causing all the trouble now.

"Outsiders tell us, 'Go back to Geneva and try again.' But isn't twice in a lifetime enough? How many times do we have to try?

"We do not have the right to treat Laotians and South Vietnamese as cattle and dispose of them as at an auction.

"If you (Americans) want to try to dispose of people in Europe—in Berlin—that is OK. But do not experiment with the freedom of people in Asia. We will not accept it. We are not interested in experiments."

The Foreign Minister, once considered a potential neutralist, now has nothing but scorn for the idea of neutralism as a safe haven for those who want to avoid domination by the Communists:

"We might consider neutralism as a refuge if we could be convinced that the Communists would let us remain free and independent. But we saw what happened to Laos and India. They were both neutralists.

"The Chinese have no intention of letting us be neutral.

"They want to take over Thailand.

"Red China's Foreign Minister, Chen Yi, made it clear the Chinese would send cadres and material to help 'liberate' Thailand, just as the Chinese and North Vietnam helped the Pathet Lao to 'liberate' Laos. We do not take the Chinese as a joke."

IF UNITED STATES WITHDRAWS

What happens to Thailand if the United States withdraws from Vietnam?

"I cannot envisage withdrawal from Vietnam. But, if it happens, we will have to strengthen our defenses."

In 1962, after the Geneva conference which was supposed to have neutralized Laos, Mr. Thanat charged that the United States "which claimed to be our great friend likes its foes better than its friends." Later, he signed an agreement with Secretary of State Dean Rusk in which the United States agreed to defend Thailand against aggression, even if the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization powers did not act together.

Mr. Thanat was asked if he considers this agreement as binding as a mutual-defense treaty. His reply:

"We believes in that agreement.

"We are certain the United States will honor its obligations, even though there are dissenting noises from some Americans, such as we have heard in the last few weeks over the U.S. position in South Vietnam. But the agreement was signed by Secretary Rusk with the concurrence of President Kennedy. We have no doubt about its validity."

AN ANTI-WEST CAMPAIGN?

The Foreign Minister was asked if he believed Indonesia and Communist China were working together in a campaign to drive the West out of Asia. His reply:

"The Chinese have made it clear they want all Western bases removed from southeast Asia. Indonesia's intentions are much less clear. They may want the British bases dismantled so as to strengthen Indonesia's position. But the Indonesians are not as clear as the Chinese on this point."

Would the dismantling of British bases at Singapore and in Malaysia affect Thailand's security?

"As long as Britain intends to fulfill its role as a partner in SEATO, it must have bases in Malaysia. If those bases were removed, it would weaken SEATO. And when SEATO is weakened, we are weakened.

"But this is not just the problem of one country, Thailand. It is a problem that affects the entire region."

The way things are going, is there any hope for peace between Indonesia and the new country of Malaysia?

"We are trying to facilitate contact between the countries. We hope to keep the conflict in bounds. Both sides seem to be trying to settle the problem. But we are not mediating—only encouraging them to explore the situation. Our capability of helping is limited."

Selma, Ala., and the Man Who Knows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, satire and wit can be most effective in fighting injustice and evil. In this regard, Dick Schaap of the New York Herald Tribune, with a wit that brightens, has illuminated the grim situation in Selma, Ala., with his column of March 9, 1965. He stings with the truth. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the article follows:

THE MAN WHO KNOWS

(By Dick Schaap)

The trouble with Gov. George C. Wallace is that he is too soft. He could have used mustard gas. Or machineguns. But he grew up with Negroes and he knows those people and he understands them, so he figured tear gas and clubs would do the job. He is nothing if not a humanitarian.

His work for human rights has already been recognized. Just last year, he won the Nobel Prize for Martin Luther King. He had help from people like Bull Connor and Al Lingo and Jim Clark, but if you had to stop and pick out the one man who did the most for King, it would be George Wallace. He stood up when he was inaugurated in 1963 and he said, "Segregation now, segregation tomorrow, segregation forever." Ever since then, he has been presiding over the integration of his State.

Wallace said he would stand in the doorways of the schools, and he guaranteed that the University of Alabama would be integrated. He said that Alabama would never tolerate the mixing of the races in public places, and he guaranteed that the civil rights law would be passed. He swore that Negroes would not march from Selma to Montgomery, and he practically guaranteed that the Federal Government will move into Alabama. Give Wallace half a chance, and he will have Martin Luther King elected President of the United States.

It is very subtle the way Wallace works, but if the voter registration drive succeeds, and a substantial number of Negroes do register in Alabama, he will undoubtedly bid for their votes by pointing out how much he has done for them. He is a man of great principle.

DESERVES A PLAQUE

Today Rev. Martin Luther King will try to lead a new march from Selma to Montgomery. The smartest thing King can do is announce that the purpose of the march is to present a plaque to George Wallace in appreciation for all he has done for the civil rights movement. This is the most powerful weapon that could be used against Wallace. In 1958, he ran for Governor of Alabama and he lost to John Patterson because the people of Alabama suspected that Wallace hated Negroes less than Patterson did. It was a terrible thing to say about Wallace. But ever since then students at Harvard and Yale and Dartmouth have been waving placards saying that Wallace is a racist, and this has reassured the citizens of Alabama. They respect the opinions of Ivy Leaguers.

Wallace would be very upset if the Negroes came out openly for him. He is a political man, and it would kill him politically. His term of office expires next year, and he is already thinking about changing the State law that says a Governor and may not succeed himself. It is too good a job to give up after only one term. The Governor of Alabama is responsible each year for the purchase of $200 million worth of liquor for the State liquor stores. It is the kind of responsibility that makes all the headaches of freedom marches and sit-ins worth while.

It is very important to Wallace that the Negroes continue hating him—almost as important as it is to the Negroes that Wallace continue hating them. Wallace's storm troopers strengthen the civil rights movement, and King's marches strengthen Wallace in office. It is all crazy, which makes it perfectly logical for the whole situation.

A CHAMPION

The truth is that Wallace has no real hatred for Negroes. He likes them. He simply thinks they should be kept separate, and it is easy to see, from his background, how Wallace developed this thinking. In the 1930's, he was a Golden Gloves boxing champion in Alabama. There were not too many good fighters in Alabama then, but there was a young man who had left Alabama named Joseph Louis Barrow. He was fighting out of Detroit, but Joe Louis would have been happy to come back to Alabama to fight George Wallace. The law in Alabama said firmly that white fighters could not fight Negro fighters, and this law probably saved George Wallace's life.

Wallace grew up in the Black Belt of Alabama, in a county where roughly half the population was Negro. It hurts him just as much as anybody else to see Negroes beaten with whips and clubbed over the head and sprayed with tear gas. It probably hurts him more because he really knows Negroes. In Alabama, they say you're not a man unless you really know Negroes.

The Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is necessary that the Congress take another look at the voting rights provision in civil rights laws so that the right to vote not be denied any qualified citizen.

I certainly hope when the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate look into this very necessary area, they will take steps to guarantee the vote to Negroes in the South and give necessary attention to the abuse of voting rights in eastern and midwestern cities controlled by corrupt political machines.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a most timely letter that appeared in the Harvey Tribune, an independent publication serving the suburbs of Cook County, Ill.:

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The right of every qualified citizen to vote is one which should not be denied and there is no argument to the contrary. It can be said that citizens must be qualified as the Constitution of the United States states and the qualifications should be applied equally to all and should be reasonable.

There are few places in the Nation where voting rights are intentionally denied but, of course, there are some—not only in the South, because elsewhere powerful political machines steal votes and hoodlums in metro-

politan areas do the same by intimidation, all of which equals denying the citizen his fundamental right.

The right to vote is a part of the American heritage and what was fought for in the Revolution.

There may be differences of opinion about various human rights by conscientious people of good faith on both sides of various issues, but on the question of the right to vote there is only one side—and that is that every American, if qualified, should have the right to make his choices in the voting booth.

How To Write Letters to Your Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, each Member of Congress is called upon to answer literally thousands of cards and letters from the residents of his State or district. Most of us feel at one time or another that this mountain of correspondence could be much more profitably used, if someone would give assistance to the writers in giving guidelines on how to write about legitimate concerns.

The Council Bluffs Nonpareil in its March 1 lead editorial has performed this singular service for its readers. Not only do I personally appreciate this, but I feel it may be of assistance to other Congressmen who may want to use it in giving help to those in their districts who would benefit from it.

HOW TO WRITE LETTERS TO YOUR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Have you ever written a letter to your Member of the House of Representatives, or either of the U.S. Senators from Iowa?

As you are probably aware your Senators are BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, of Cedar Rapids, and JACK MILLER, of Sioux City. They are Republicans.

Our new Representative from the Seventh District is a Democrat, JOHN R. HANSEN, of Manning.

We frequently receive letters asking how to address them in Washington. The simplest way is to address the Senators. "U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C." and Representatives, "House of Representatives, Washington, D.C." Their mail will be delivered directly to their offices.

Many voters fail to communicate their views on governmental affairs and pending legislation because they think their Congressmen are too busy to pay any attention to a lone voter. Just the opposite is true. Your Representative and your Senators want to get mail from home. They want to hear from you.

Because you may belong to a different political party, don't think your Representative or your Senators will ignore your opinions.

They want to vote as they believe a majority of their constituents would like to have them vote. They know their continuance in office depends upon the support of the voters back home.

It is not unusual for a Representative or a Senator to say that he would have voted differently on some measure if he had realized how the people in his State or district felt.

Write on your personal or business letterhead, or use plain stationary and envelope. Sign your name legibly or type it at the bottom of your letter. Congressmen seldom take the time to read unsigned letters.

Know your subject, and name the House or Senate bill you are writing about. Express your thoughts and conclusions in your own words.

State your reason for writing. Tell him how you think the proposed legislation or action of the Government would affect you, your family, business or profession—or its effect on your State or community.

Do not use phrases and sentences from form letters. They will have little or no effect.

Be reasonable. Don't ask for impossible things. Don't threaten, or say you will never vote for him again if he doesn't do certain things or vote a certain way.

After you have told him where you stand, ask him to state his position in a reply.

If his vote or action on any issue pleases you, write and tell him so. Much of the mail received by Congressmen is from people who are displeased with their actions. When your Senator or Representative receives a letter of commendation he will remember it.

Timing of your letter is important. Try to write when the legislation is pending in committee. The place to get approval or disapproval of a bill, or get it amended is in committee. Congress seldom passes a measure without the prior approval of a majority of the committees to which it is referred.

As we said in the beginning your Senators and Representatives will give more attention to your suggestions if they know you are keeping in touch with legislative issues, and write them occasionally.

Crime Detection Society Supports L.B.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the Society for Scientific Detection of Crime of Columbus, Ohio, recognizing the seriousness of the increase in crime across this Nation, directed a letter to President Johnson on March 5, as follows:

MARCH 5, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: Our organization, the Society for Scientific Detection of Crime, Columbus, Ohio, has noted with great interest the concern you have shown over the increasing rate of crime throughout the country. We would appreciate being able to add our support in this concern.

Our society, in this location, has been in existence for 21 years and is composed of many of our leading criminal investigators in the legal, medical, scientific, and police investigational fields and many ancillary areas. One member, now honorary, Hon. SAMUEL L. DEVINE, Member of Congress, was most active in our society during his years as prosecuting attorney of our county.

Mr. President, we would urge you to proceed, with all reasonable haste, to establish a type of National Crime Commission to concern itself wtih all phases of evaluation of prevention, detection, and elimination of crime. Our hope would be that through knowledge, improvement in communication, understanding, and recommendations, such a commission would assist every community in controlling, if not eliminating, much of the crime in their midst.

If our organization can be of any service, please feel free to call upon us, and we shall try to serve in any manner we can.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN W. MONTAG,
President.

This nonpartisan organization has devoted years in objective study of problems of crime, and meets each month to exchange valuable information on helpful analysis and possible solutions.

They can be of help to the President.

Drifting and to Where?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by former Congressman B. T. Castellow, of Cuthbert, Ga. This speech was delivered in this very Chamber on February 6, 1936.

The Honorable B. T. Castellow represented the Third Congressional District in the U.S. House of Representatives at a time when Cuthbert, Ga., was a part of the Third Congressional District. However, since his tenure of office, Cuthbert has been placed within the bounds of the Second Congressional District, which district it is my privilege and pleasure to now represent in the House of Representatives.

I would like to mention that the Honorable B. T. Castellow served as solicitor general of the Pataula Judicial Circuit for many years, and in a most efficient and honorable manner. I served as solicitor general, for 23½ years, of the adjoining Alabany Judicial Circuit of Georgia, and I quite naturally feel a very close bond to the memory of one who has had years of the same kind of service as solicitor general.

Mrs. B. T. Castellow, the widow of the late Congressman Castellow, has kindly and most graciously furnished me with a copy of the above mentioned speech. I, therefore, with permission, include the speech as it was reproduced in the Cuthbert Times on November 5, 1964. The title of the speech is "Drifting and to Where"?

SPEECH OF THE LATE B. T. CASTELLOW IN 1936

Mr. CASTELLOW. Mr. Chairman, there has been much discussion during general debate this session of a purely political nature. I am taking little part in these discussions, as I do not claim to be or hope to become distinguished as a politician. In fact, I do not and have never liked politics, though I fully realize that it is becoming more and more interwoven with our every activity and legislative uncertainty supplements the normal uncertainties of every business venture.

As I see it, the welfare of the masses is far more important than the political preferment of any man or the promotion of the

selfish ambitions of any class. To me it seems most unfortunate that our great country, so rich in natural resources and replete with inspiring traditions, might be blighted and have its future endangered by the organization of groups, political or otherwise, striving only for individual advantage.

That spirit is sometimes manifested on the floor of this House in acrimonious debate. Unquestionably, this country was confronted with great difficulties when the electorate, by an overwhelming vote, deliver the helm of state into the hands of the Democratic Party. In common with every loyal Democrat, and I believe every truly loyal citizen, I hope that results will demonstrate beyond question the wisdom of that choice. If, however, we would make good this hope, it behooves us to avoid that most dangerous of all pitfalls, the error of relying too greatly upon numerical strength. Why in the past have great majorities faded so quickly into pitiful minorities? For the same reason that great armies have suffered ignoble defeat at the hands of an adversary discounted by reason of its numerical weakness. For the same reason that Goliath fell an easy victim at the hands of an unpretentious youth—the possession of superior physical strength rendered unnecessary, as he believed, caution or thought. So let us beware, I warn you my fellow Democrats, lest we rely too greatly upon the strength of our numbers to put over, whether right or wrong, policies and legislation which may prove detrimental to the ultimate welfare of our Nation as a whole and which may rise as a ghost in the future to haunt us and those who follow. The effect of legislation upon posterity is of even greater importance than its present effect. Those stalwart patriots who laid in a wilderness the foundation upon which was to be built the greatest civilization of all time, those far-sighted statesmen who constructed for its guidance the greatest governmental document yet known to man, evidently realized that there was land beyond their horizon and unnumbered citizens yet to be born. I apprehend that it was for posterity they felt the greatest concern.

We worry, work, and plan over the various crops of the soil, but just here I would like to impress upon this Congress that in reality there is one crop which stands out in importance preeminently above all others, and that is the crop of citizens we are growing for the future. Historians, if they are wise, will not judge our success by the contents of our barns, by the height of our buildings, nor the precious metal in our vaults. By the moral and intellectual worth of its citizenship only can a nation's greatness be measured. Whoever contributes thereto becomes mankind's greatest benefactor. If we would that our labors avail the most, then let us apply ourselves assiduously to a proper instruction and direction of the youths of America.

At a time when the world is full of false propaganda, when error parades in the guise of truth, and deception flows with the freedom of the winds, even wisdom itself is subjected to a crucial test. It has been suggested that a spirit of agnosticism pervades many of our higher institutions of learning; that socialistic and communistic seed are sown in the receptive minds of the young. Against these insidious doctrines let every true citizen be warned. Never did a ship need a rudder as human beings need a God, and communistic doctrines breathe defiance to the wisdom of the ages, and set at naught the teachings of our fathers. With a proper and due regard for the State, let us cherish and preserve to the utmost our individual and inalienable rights as citizens. There are certain limits which no wise government will undertake to transcend. Tyranny within, a tyranny from without. It behooves us to be ever watchful lest the weakness of our natures tempt us to yield to the Egyptians in the wilderness who were almost persuaded upon the appearance of hardships and the thoughts of the fleshpots of Egypt, to return to bondage. That was not the spirit of those bold men of colonial days, who, though facing starvation while leaving their footprints in blood upon the frozen ground, yielded never an inch from their determination to be free. Shall we exchange for a mess of porridge the birthright which through such travail those bold patriots have left us? Let us all be warned, in the light of history, against becoming too dependent for guidance or otherwise upon the Government. Relying too greatly upon any source other than one's self produces weakness.

I heartily approve of a favorite saying of the Norsemen:

I trust my sword, I trust my steed, but I trust myself in time of need.

It is impossible for anyone to learn this lesson too soon. Remember that by exercise is strength obtained. This is true of the body, and likewise true of the mind and will. To avoid responsibility is to invite weakness, which can easily develop into social and political slavery. If the recorded pages of history are not deceptive, strong but ambitious men have in the past secured a throttle grip upon millions of their fellow beings by inviting and encouraging their dependence. It may be accomplished much in the same way as man, mentally stronger than his brother animals, has domesticated and rendered them submissive to his will. Have you ever analyzed the process of domesticating an animal? If not, let us take a cursory glance at the subject—by way of illustrating may we select the pig? In his wild state he depends entirely upon his own resources. He knows where the blackberries grow in their season. He knows where the persimmons are to be found in the fall. He learns where the early settler plants his patch of corn and even takes cognizance of his habits, depredating on his corn patch only during such hours as the farmer sleeps, then hies himself back to the cover of the forest. When all these sources of supply are exhausted he knows where the worms and mussels are to be found. To be sure, he is constantly exposed to the weather and usually short of rations, but this is the price of freedom. He has not been domesticated, and not being subject to the will of man, is reasonably safe in his jungle retreat from roasting oven and frying pan. For this very reason man may consider it desirable to domesticate him. By what process can this be most easily accomplished? The farmer becomes acquainted with his range, places a goodly supply of corn where the hog easily finds it. When this is consumed more is replaced. The pig, not suspecting the motive, is delighted and soon forms the habit of visiting this spot. Finally one day he finds a few rails, not many, around the corn. While at first a little suspicious, his fears by the enticing appearance of the core, are soon dispelled, and he climbs over the rails and out again; no harm done. The next day the rails are too many and high for him to climb over, but, strange to relate, a convenient opening is accessible, and through this he goes, unmindful of the trap door which descends and incarcerates him as soon as he has entered. At the early appearance of the farmer the pig is greatly alarmed, and almost commits suicide in his efforts to escape, but the farmer only replenishes the supply of corn and departs.

These visits being repeated day by day the pig soon concludes that instead of being his enemy the farmer is really his friend. So when he is removed to the barn he quickly forgets his old range and instead of being frightened by the farmer's visits he grunts with delight at his approach. Food, nice soaked corn, is placed in abundance in his trough and plenty of water always accessible. If a pig could visualize a paradise, this pig fancies he has found it—and the farmer, what a friend indeed. What a contrast between these luxuries and the hardships of the woods. What a fortunate pig he fancies himself until a certain frosty morning which stimulates in the farmer an appetite for backbone, spareribs, and bacon. The pig does not understand the significance of the boiling kettle, the sharpened knife, and the approach of his erstwhile friend with an ax. Payday has come, as paydays will, and the deep forests which he once knew will protect him in his freedom no more; such is the story of the pig; a simple story and not of Aesop's making, but possibly illustrative of a great principle.

Differentiate, if you can, between an aggregation of human beings absolutely dependent for direction and subservient to the wishes of a man or set of men, driven to the field, the workshop, or slaughter at the will of their masters, and a herd of dumb cattle, ready alike for the pasture or the butcher. What difference, I ask, is there between domesticated animals and domestically regimented men? It occurs to me that completely domesticated men are more pitiful but deserving of less pity than their unthinking brothers. Observe the plight of some of the great nations of Europe today, as thoroughly regimented as any bunch of pigs that ever graced a sty. Why repeat the folly of others by thinking that we can travel the road that has proven fatal to them and yet avoid its hazards. The true test of wisdom is the ability to profit by the experience of others which few, indeed, have ever seemed able to understand. Would that we might now ascend those distant heights over which the slow train of humanity is destined to move, and with farseeing wisdom look into the future as far as eye can see, take a vision of the world and what the world will be.

Some years ago upon my return from abroad I remarked that I had visited the real national cemetery—not such as we so designate here, but that really great national cemetery, the cemetery in which nations are buried, and that I had read upon their tombs the history of the diseases from which they died—that their experiences were wonderfully similar—a struggle through many years of adversity and poverty, followed by wealth and power, during which the citizenship grew soft, unwilling to endure hardships, and given to pleasure and dissipation, which inevitably resulted in weakness and decay. Under such conditions ambitious and unscrupulous men appeared and, by regimenting the masses, centralized government and secured for themselves despotic power. Those master minds who formulated power through centralized government, undertook to protect us by preserving certain rights to the States; being jealous of our liberty, let us zealously preserve these, our richest heritage, and vouchsafe to posterity the blessings and privileges of a great and free Government.

A Bill To Repeal the Excise Tax on Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduced my bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to repeal the excise tax on communications.

The excise tax on communications was initially a wartime measure intended to

discourage use of the telephone. It survives still, along with numerous luxury excise taxes. This is unnecessary.

There is no reason for this tax. Telephone service is not a luxury like jewelry or furs. Telephone service is a business and household necessity like gas, water, and electricity.

The excise tax on communications is burdensome and discriminatory. It ought to be repealed.

Oldtimers Will Not Be Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of the Appalachia bill is neither an end nor a beginning, but it is another step in the long struggle against the forces of adversity that have beset an important part of America. The editors of the New York Times have called attention to the plight of the oldtimers in Appalachia whose lot will not be materially changed by many of the programs contemplated by the new law. It is our continuing responsibility to be concerned about all of our people, and the oldtimers will not be forgotten.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1965]

APPALACHIA'S FORGOTTEN

The Appalachia program, which President Johnson signed into law yesterday, is a significant forward step; but the passage of this law must not obscure the plight of certain forgotten people whom the program will not help.

If the road building, timber development, land restoration and health and education projects are successful, Appalachia twenty years from now will be a happier and more prosperous place. Children today and in the future will have more opportunities than their fathers had. Adults still young enough to learn new skills and try new ventures will also benefit from this long-term redevelopment program.

But what of the old-timers? Scattered through the hills and hollows of Appalachia there are thousands of ex-coal miners who went into the mines as boys thirty years ago and are now too old, too lacking in basic education, to be retrained and reemployed. There are also the dirt farmers scratching away at patchy little farms too uneconomic to compete.

Roads or retraining or reforestation projects are not going to do anything for these people in their remaining lifetimes. There are many people across the country in the same difficult position. Of the 9 million families in the United States with incomes under $3,000, more than 3 million are headed by persons over 65. To their number must be added the many who are statistically still in middle age but are virtually unemployable.

Are these older people to receive nothing more than Government-surplus salt pork and dried beans while waiting for the end? The Federal Government might well consider making supplementary welfare payments to those who are deemed unemployable but who are not quite old enough to receive social security or whose social security benefits are too small to enable them to live on a decent minimum standard. The size of these payments could only be determined on a local or regional basis since $3,000 of annual income, although useful as a nationwide criterion, would not represent poverty in some rural communities.

These payments could be linked with what might be called an "Experience Corps" which would enlist the energies of those 55 or over who could not find regular gainful employment but could still do much useful work in community paint-up-and-clean-up campaigns, tree planting and road beautification, and other projects.

The size of the payments and the nature of the work are less important than the recognition that a problem exists. Government is wise to stress programs for youth because they represent an investment in the future; but this is no excuse to let older people rot in idleness and neglect.

Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, last night I had the privilege of attending the annual dinner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, honoring Members of Congress who have served in the armed services. Without question, a highlight of the evening was the opportunity to see the outstanding young men and women representing their respective States as winners of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 250,000 high school students participated and the winning contestant from each State came to Washington, D.C., as a guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to vie for the top awards.

All Kansans are proud of James R. Tanner, from St. John, our State's winning contestant. While not a winner of one of the top four prizes, he has had an invaluable and an unforgettable experience in competing with winners from other States as well as a thoroughly interesting and informative visit to our Nation's Capital.

His success in the Kansas contest was the result of hard work, initiative, and a sincere interest in the challenge of citizenship. James is an outstanding young man and a real credit to his State and community and his winning remarks will be an inspiration to all. With permission granted I insert them in the RECORD:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

When founded, America was a nation of men who felt a grave responsibility for the plight of their fellow men in times of crises. Now, almost three centuries later, man is living in a world which has produced more inventions in the last half century than were produced in the period of time since the caveman saw his first fire; a world in which over half of the people my age are committed to goals and dreams directly opposite to mine; a world at the crossroads, pondering which move to take next; a world in which the attitudes toward my fellow man and the values of life are no longer as prominent to my generation as they were to my forefathers. This is a world of crises; a China with an A bomb; India and her hungry masses; the degrading slums of Harlem, the poverty pockets of the Appalachia; a 10-percent crime increase within the last 12 months; an increasing apathy in our society, which is illustrated by the stabbing of a New York woman for a period of 35 minutes while 38 neighbors peeked out of their windows and went back to bed. Many problems have developed as our way of life has gradually grown more complex.

How can a mere citizen bring his influence to bear upon these problems? William Jennings Bryan spoke of America as the place where "Every citizen is a sovereign, but none seeks to wear a crown". Each citizen is the building block of this democracy, and his actions and thoughts influence it. John Fitzgerald Kennedy stated in his inaugural address on January 20, 1961, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country". Not only can I develop to my fullest capacity for my country, but I can also share my talents with my fellow man. For I am convinced that the greatest possessions I have, multiply when shared.

Today, man is in the process of conquering the heavens. He has reached the highest mountain summits; he has explored the floors of the deepest oceans. I feel it is now time for man to really conquer himself.

There are many seemingly insurmountable problems in this world of ours to be sure, but as I study history, I have found that all great men have been chiefly concerned with their objectives, not their obstacles. Many military generals have illustrated this throughout history. When Alexander the Great went to India, he saw its wealth and spices, not the warlike nations standing between him and India. Ceasar saw Britain, not the grueling marshes and warlike tribes standing between him and his goal. Nepoleon saw Italy and not the Alps, and General Washington saw the Hessian soldiers at Trenton and not the Delaware River filled with ice.

Like these great men, we too, can consider our problems as challenges. The challenge of citizenship is great, certainly this is good for man needs great challenges. I have observed that following the course of least resistance makes the crooked rivers and crooked men.

Almost twenty-one centuries ago Aristotle told us, "If liberty and equality are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost."

Today in this democracy of ours, each citizen must develop to his fullest capacity and share to his greatest ability.

Lilies of the Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press recently carried the following article about the efforts of one Salinas, Calif., packer, the Mann Packing Co., to induce U.S. citizens to perform labor in the broccoli harvest:

THE LILIES OF THE FIELD

SALINAS.—Women are riding through the Salinas Valley broccoli harvest in contour

chairs, doing the backbreaking fieldwork formerly done by Mexican braceros.

The women ride, sitting down, through the fields. They work to the accompaniment of radio music. Four drinking fountains travel with them.

And, of course, they get coffee breaks. Two a day, with doughnuts.

So far there is just one crew of 25 women on the job for the Mann Packing Co. The company is trying to recruit another feminine crew.

It is an experimental approach in the hunt by California farmers for replacements for Mexican workers formerly imported under the bracero program. That program was discontinued December 31.

Mann once employed 150 braceros, as the imported workers are called, at the season peak.

Can any other industry anywhere claim to have done so much in an effort to make work easy for their employees?

Does anyone know any amateur truck gardener who would provide even for himself traveling chairs, radio music, and refreshment to reduce the rigors of cultivation and harvest?

Every suggested proposal to attract farm labor—fantastic and practicable—is being tried. Do the experiments attract more domestic labor? Practically none.

Temporary, supplemental farm labor is desperately needed in the vegetable growing areas of California.

Injustice in Selma, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States and of the world have witnessed with horror and disbelief the grossly deplorable and inhuman acts which have been taking place in Selma, Ala. For the past several days, American citizens have been denied some of the most basic and fundamental rights afforded them under our Constitution—the rights of assembly and petition.

I ask my distinguished colleagues what type of justice condones the treatment of men, women, and even children as animals? What type of justice denies respect to the clergy and subjects them to violence? What has happened to Governor Wallace's call for an end to violence?

The men and women who are attempting the march from Selma to Montgomery are not armed with riot guns, dogs, or tear gas. They are, instead, armed with a faith in their fellow man, with a faith that justice will one day prevail in Alabama, with a faith that their cause is just and that in the near future they will be able to exercise their rights under the law.

We have seen the continued use of brutal and despicable acts committed against people whose sole desire is to take their rightful place in the functioning of the Government of their State and country. They have been joined by other men and women of good will who wish to peacefully express their sympathy for this cause and for the cause of human rights and dignity.

I am extremely fearful for the lives and safety of those who are demonstrating in Selma. This applies particularly to Rabbi Murray Saltzman, the spiritual leader of a congregation that serves my district. Rabbi Saltzman has joined other Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Protestant clergymen to make known their support for this cause by going to Selma and joining the demonstrators.

In view of my deep concern for the safety of those in Selma, I have written the Attorney General and have requested the Department of Justice to intervene in the civil rights demonstrations in Selma. The text of this letter follows:

MARCH 10, 1965.

Hon. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am writing to ask that the Justice Department take action to insure that there will be no more bloody Sundays in Selma, Ala.

State and local law enforcement officers have failed completely in their responsibilities to protect citizens, Negro and white, in the exercise of their rights of assembly and petition. The Federal Government has a responsibility to insure that citizens are permitted to exercise these rights.

It has been clearly demonstrated that in Selma, nothing short of Federal intervention, including, if necessary, the use of armed troops, will guarantee safety to citizens in the exercise of their constitutional rights. I urge the Justice Department to take such steps before further bloodshed occurs and Alabama officials disgrace our Nation even more.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
Member of Congress.

Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. Introduces $1.5 Million Assistance Grants to Education—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, last autumn the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., of St. Paul, announced an initial grant of $1.5 million to provide each of 500 schools across the country with $3,000 worth of visual aids.

In a new assistance grants to education II program the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.'s visual products department now plans to award yet another $1.5 million in equipment, materials, and supplies to the more than 700 teacher training institutions in order to expose their students to the latest techniques in the use of visual aids.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by R. H. Herzog, vice president of the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. when he announced the AGE II program in New York City on March 4, 1965.

The remarks follow:

MINNESOTA MINING & MANUFACTURING CO. INTRODUCES $1.5 MILLION ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO EDUCATION—II

(By R. H. Herzog, vice president, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.)

The word "explosion" in describing social, political, economic change is peculiarly characteristic of our times. Momentous changes are in motion that will affect the lives of all of us.

We have all become aware of the fact that the human species is reproducing itself at a seemingly limitless rate. That the world may double its population in the next 50 years is a realization certainly deserving the description "explosion."

A simultaneous explosion, one whose portent is similarly shaping the future, must bear equal attention. This is the knowledge explosion. We are discovering new knowledge at a breathtaking rate. The availability of new knowledge means that all of us—businessmen, professional men, educators, must constantly be relearning, rethinking, readjusting. We must all learn to absorb and apply new knowledge or be left behind by the jet age passing parade.

Never before in man's history has a greater premium been placed upon brainpower. This is true for nearly every walk of human endeavor.

In its penetrating study of the knowledge industry, Fortune magazine declared that "knowledge is no longer a thing apart from life."

"Knowledge and education," the article goes on, "are today a means to an end, which is the enhanced understanding of everything in life. In order to adjust to the rapid changes of this technical age, people need to absorb the values that only a good deal of schooling can give them," the article concludes.

It becomes transparently clear that the responsibility of our nation's teachers is greater than ever before. For our teachers must prepare their students to live in a world where their success will largely be dependent upon their ability to absorb knowledge and apply it to practical problems.

It is the teacher that must inbue her students with a profound respect for the human capacity to think and create. It is imperative that teachers make learning matter to her students, so that they will be prepared to contribute to our national well being rather than become a drain upon it.

It is significant that President Johnson lists as one of the major educational tasks confronting us, "advancing the technology of teaching and the training of teachers."

This is one vital area which is all too often neglected by those who seek to analyze and improve our schools. The teacher training institutions of the U.S. are the first step in the creation of a better educated society. Our education level is dependent upon the effectiveness of our teachers, and the teacher is most certainly the product of her training.

Therefore, it is essential that the teacher's colleges and the education schools of our universities be equipped as never before to turn out teachers with the ability to teach more material more effectively to more students than ever before. Just as the subject matter is changing with the discovery of new knowledge, methods of teaching are changing rapidly as we learn more about the science of communication. It is contingent upon our teacher training institutions to expose our future teachers with modern techniques of communication and tools that will enable them to better communicate with their students.

A teacher who can communicate effectively will not only fire the imaginations of her brighter students, she will be able to main-

tain enough interest among the less gifted students to at least keep them in school.

In his education message to Congress, the President pointed to nearly a million young people who will continue to drop out of school annually "if our schools fail to stimulate their desire to learn."

Whereas it was once quite possible to quit school and still get ahead in life, today the odds are very much against it. The young person who drops out of school at a time when education is a virtual prerequisite to success is a person at odds with his environment. By his own choice, he is making himself an outcast to the mainstream of our national life. His choice means that it will be difficult for him to get any kind of a job.

Unemployment offers the dropout an unhappy choice between living off of the taxpayers' dollars or turning to delinquency and crime to make an easy buck. I might point out here that it costs the taxpayers $2,500 to keep a family on relief for a year, but only $450 to keep a student in school for a year.

Thus the dropout problem affects each of us and the Nation as a whole. A great deal rides on the ability of teachers to keep these young people in school.

The President has said that "Every child must be encouraged to get as much education as he has the ability to take. Nothing matters more to the future of our country—not our military preparedness, for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace; not our productive economy, for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; nor our democratic system of government, for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant. We must demand that our schools increase not only the quantity but the quality of America's education."

This puts the responsibility squarely up to the teachers of America. From our involvement with teachers over the past 2 years, I know that the teachers will not shirk from their responsibility. They understand the job to be done and they are as dedicated a group as are to be found in any aspect of our society.

But the teacher cannot do it alone. She needs the support of all of us. As taxpayers, we will be assuming a greater responsibility for this support. As citizens, we must devote our time and energies to improve the schools in our local communities. And as corporate citizens, I think we must devise intelligent means of supporting our schools and our teachers.

The Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. feels strongly that the business community has a very real stake in our educational system. In the largest sense, our national well-being is dependent upon the effectiveness of the schools in turning out an educated citizenry. But I think we must also recognize that our free enterprise system cannot flourish unless our people are educated. People who learn more earn more and are therefore able to buy more of the products of American industry.

A rising standard of living goes hand in hand with a rising standard of education.

Our great corporations know only too well that they cannot grow and prosper without an abundant supply of superior, well-trained, well-educated executives. The days of the intuitive, self-educated entrepreneur are passing. The age of the professional manager is here.

A good education may not make a good manager but it is difficult to conceive of an effective manager today who is not well educated. The successful manager of today must be a man who can recognize, absorb, and apply knowledge. This is something that can—and indeed must—be taught in schools.

A good educational background is important at every level of business. As Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, said recently, "We can well foresee the time when, unless an employee is well educated and has a sound basic academic training, industries will have no place for him."

As businessmen, we are asking a great deal from our schools. We feel it is important to give something in return.

The program we are announcing here today is an attempt in that direction. It is a plan which evolved from our 1963 assistance grants to education.

That program, designed to encourage creative teaching in our schools, met with a degree of response which none of us could foresee. More than one out of every 10 eligible schools in the United States participated in this program. Of 150,000 schools—private, public, and parochial, on all levels from kindergarten through graduate school, 500 were selected to receive equipment grants worth $3,000 each. These schools were selected to receive equipment grants worth $3,000 each. These schools were selected on the basis of written proposals describing how the school would use the equipment if they were to receive it.

Frankly, we were astonished at not only the quantity of proposals we received but at their quality. Schools went to great lengths to analyze the content of particular subjects and how they could be taught better using the equipment we were making available.

Our new Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. assistance grants program is designed to reach the teachers of tomorrow—the students now enrolled in the education schools or teachers colleges of the United States. It is especially important that these future teachers carry with them the knowledge of modern teaching techniques. That is why we have directed the second Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co./AGE program to teacher training institutions. It is an ambitious program in that it encompasses virtually every such institution in the country.

In announcing a $1.5 million education program, we recognize full well that no corporation can compete with the grandiose plans of Federal Government to insure every American child the fullest development of his mind and skills.

We can, however, spend millions where the government proposes billions, in creating specific programs directed to meet specific needs in the educational system. New classrooms, libraries, scholarships—these are indeed important, but so are the techniques and tools that teachers need to do a better job.

We see an increasingly greater importance for teacher-oriented visual aids—tools that enable the teacher to present up-to-the-moment information in a graphic, memorable manner. We know that these tools will give the teacher greater flexibility and greater opportunity to creatively approach the teaching of her subject. And the more effective the teacher's presentation, the more students will be motivated to learn and make a further investment in learning.

I would emphasize that I have been discussing tools, not so-called teaching machines. As we have often said, we believe the best teaching machine ever devised is the teacher. It is to that end that we dedicate the second Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. assistance grants to education.

Agriculture Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to consider the effects on American agriculture should price support and acreage diversion programs be discontinued.

There would be two major developments in agriculture. First, farm income would drop drastically and, second, land values would decrease.

A number of studies indicate that farm prices would probably have to drop about 20 percent in order for farm output to clear the market after from 3 to 5 years of adjustment after the discontinuance of the farm programs. Because of the high level of farm expenses per $100 of income from farm marketings, a drop of more than 20 percent in farm prices would probably reduce net farm income by more than 50 percent.

This means that, in the years 1961–63 for example, it is expected that farm income would have averaged $6 billion instead of the $12.6 billion it actually averaged.

This represents a drop of 52 percent, but during the 3 to 5 years of adjustment without transitory legislation, an even greater decline in prices—and therefore net income—would occur because it would take that long to make the adjustment to free market conditions.

No responsible individual advocates the sudden termination of all agricultural programs but the simple facts are that agriculture, as we know it today, could not exist after a drop in net income of 50 percent.

In the last 4 years farm real estate values increased by about $21 billion. Should farm income decline to $6 billion, earnings available as a return on farm real estate investment would be about $1 billion a year. If the American farmers expected this $1 billion to represent a return of 4 percent on their investment, they could reasonably have only about $25 billion invested in land instead of the $151 billion at present. The losses in farm real estate values would be huge, not to mention the foreclosures which would take place where real estate debts are owned under installment contracts.

The American farmer cannot afford to face ending farm programs.

Products of Progress Exposition To Be Held in South Bend, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Council of Engineering and Technical Services of St. Joseph Valley in my Indiana congressional district for its initiative in sponsoring an exhibition of our local products and services.

The Products of Progress Exposition, to be held from March 12 to 14, represents an effort to promote a greater awareness of the technical excellence of industries and organizations in north central In-

diana and southwestern Michigan. The exposition will feature exhibits by local firms and will emphasize the vast scope of engineering and technical activity in that area of the country. The exposition, which will be held on the campus of the University of Notre Dame, is expected to attract from 25,000 to 30,000 people.

In addition to displays of products manufactured by and technical services available from individual firms and organizations, the exposition will offer exhibits by technical societies and educational institutions. Products of Progress will thus present a concentrated picture of the range and excellence of local technical and engineering skills and products.

The Council of Engineering and Technical Services was established last summer as a nonprofit organization. Its stated purpose is "to promote the effectiveness of member societies and to serve the community as a united technical group." By offering area firms and organizations an opportunity to display their industrial-technical achievements, and by providing the public with the opportunity to learn more about science and technology in our area, the council is capably fulfilling both its objectives.

Open Letter on Supreme Court's Decision on Public Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was so impressed by the open letter prepared by one of my constituents, Mrs. James S. Brophy, of Rockford, Ill., for inclusion in a major newspaper in our State that I felt compelled to bring this letter to the attention of the Members. Mrs. Brophy has presented a most compelling argument in repudiation of the Supreme Court's decision with respect to the reading of the Bible and the utterance of prayers in public places.

The letter follows:

Since Supreme Court Justice Earl Warren cast the deciding vote to abolish prayer in public schools I have been very confused with the hypocrisy of the actions of the five Supreme Court Justices who saw fit to interpret the laws of our land in this way. Their decision came after due deliberation of a petition from an atheistic couple who did not want their child exposed to prayer to God in school. Their rights were being violated under the separation of church and state sections of the Constitution.

The atheists number less than 1 percent of our population from any church affiliation graphs I have been able to find. It does not seem to me their rights are being protected as a minority, but, rather, the vast majority of God-loving Americans' basic rights are being scuttled. This country was settled by Puritans and Pilgrims for the express purpose of freedom to worship. Worship who? Worship what? Worship when? Worship how? To worship God. To worship freedom. To worship 24 hours a day, if they chose. To worship any way they pleased. So we have established that the very foundation of our country was built on love of God.

The first public display of worship outside the settlers' little churches was in the little colony of Plymouth, in 1621, when Governor Bradford invited the Indians to join them in a harvest feast of Thanksgiving. Thanksgiving for bountiful harvests. Thanksgiving to whom? Thanksgiving to God. So now, of course, to conform with the Supreme Court Justices thinking on the separation of church and state, we must abolish this custom because the children across the land are excused from school to celebrate this acknowledgment of the providence of Almighty God. The atheistic child is bound to ask his parents why he is being taught this story in school in November every year, and to protect his and their rights we must abolish Mr. Washington's Thanksgiving Proclamation of 1789, must we not?

And then there is that long vacation we give them in December. How can these sensitive parents allow this obviously Christian holiday? Their children's minds are filled with "Peace on earth, good will toward men"; the birthday of the infant Jesus called nativity; the Virgin birth; the star in the east; and so forth. Is not this an affront to their denial of the existence of God in their teachings to their children in our schools? If they feel so strongly about prayer in school, why have they allowed these other infringements on their rights? On the other hand, how can the learned men of the Supreme Court—the five who voted for the abolishment of prayer in our schools—hand down such a decision without carrying out their interpretation all of the way?

My other unanswered question is what is wrong with a little prayer every school day in a land developed under His divine providence in a world that is daily worsening under the godlessness of communism? I am tired of the passiveness of the God loving and the boldness of the God denying. Thousands of children are ignorant of prayer of any kind. Not because their parents do not believe in God, but because their parents just do not bother to expose them to God. Why? Probably because their parents did the same thing. We have got to start somewhere to get back on the right track. There is a religious upheaval in Rome, so to speak. Modernization, or as beloved Pope John XXIII put it, to let a breath of air into the church, is exactly what the United States needs, not to shut more windows, as the Justices have done.

As a God-loving Christian I petition the Supreme Court of the United States to reverse their decision and allow the schools to say a simple, nondenominational prayer in school, if they so choose. The daily prayers of little children may be one way to save our country from the creeping cancer of communism. If there is an outside chance this could be true, I, for one, feel we cannot afford to ignore it.

Where do I start? What can I do? Better yet, what are all of the believers of both Testaments going to do about it? It is our country, too. Today.

MRS. JAMES S. BROPHY.

Anniversary of Yalta Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I directed the attention of the House to the aniversary of the tragedy of Yalta at which President Roosevelt in his deal with Stalin consigned the peoples of Eastern Europe to communism.

A most timely column written by Ed Delaney appeared in the March 1 edition of the Citizen-News of Los Angeles, Calif. I place this pertinent article in the RECORD at this point:

(By Ed Delaney)

Nationwide attention should be focused on this date—March 1, 1965. It is the 20th anniversary of a deplorable and almost incrédible episode in American history. For partisan political reasons, the present majority in Congress obdurately endeavors to bypass this anniversary without comment. For that very reason the Republican minority in that body has an obligation to bring the pertinent facts to the attention of the younger voters who, for the most part, may not be familiar with the page of history that was indelibly written just 20 years ago.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt had recently returned from the Yalta Conference. At that conference, on February 11, 1945, he signed an agreement with Josef Stalin, to which Winston Churchchill unwillingly appended his signature, which was the enslavement order for millions of people in Central and Eastern Europe. The world is haunted today by the ghost of Yalta. For it was there that Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic and Balkan nations, Rumania, Hungary and part of Germany were grafted onto the Communists combine and Nationalist China wantonly betrayed to the Soviet Union. It was illegal, immoral, in violation of every lofty sounding slogan that was uttered during World War II besides being an abrogation of the pious pledges and promises of self determination that had been made to those nations we said were to be liberated. They were freed from Nazism and fettered by communism, which in most instances has been far more terrible.

On March 1, 1945, Roosevelt addressed a joint session of the Congress. In rambling circumlocution he referred to the Polish problem and a solution of it which he said had been "agreed to by Russia, by Britain and by me." Although the phrase "by me" is expurgated in the official texts of Roosevelt's speech, it is in the March 2 newspapers of New York and San Francisco, so we may accept their report. Those two words "and me" are irrefutable proof of the omnipotent posture that Roosevelt arrogated to himself by entering into an executive agreement with Stalin, which does not require Senate approval.

The Members of the Senate and the House were then told by Roosevelt: "This (Yalta) conference concerned itself only with the European war and the political problems of Europe and not with the Pacific war." That was a deliberate lie. Never in the history of this nation has a chief executive stood before the representatives of the people and brazenly lied to them. He knew that in his private safe was the secret agreement made with Stalin. By the disgraceful terms of that agreement, F.D.R. betrayed Chiang Kai-shek by consenting to the plunder of Manchuria by Stalin's bandits, that he should have the "use" of Port Arthur and Dairen, also possession of South Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands, then belonging to Japan. But these grabs of territory and facilities were not to be told Chiang Kai-shek until Stalin instructed Roosevelt to do so.

William Bullitt, our former Ambassador to Russia and also to France, said, "No more unnecessary, disgraceful and potentially dangerous document was ever signed by a President of the United States." Thousands of others concur in that indictment of F.D.R.

National Peanut Week Set for March 7–13

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to submit the following article titled "National Peanut Week Set for March 7–13." This very informative article was written by my good friend, George Donaldson, of Tifton. "Mr. Pete," as he is affectionately known, is a well known and much respected former educator. Upon retiring as president of Abraham Baldwin Agriculture College at Tifton, Ga., he became Executive Secretary to the Georgia Agricultural Commodity Commission for Peanuts.

"Mr. Pete" Donaldson is doing much for the peanut industry. I believe that anyone who reads the article will find it most interesting:

NATIONAL PEANUT WEEK SET FOR MARCH 7–13

(By George Donaldson, Georgia Peanut Commission)

The purpose of the Georgia Peanut Commission is to do research, promotion, and education which will help Georgia peanut farmers and the entire economy of the State.

We use the name peanut commission when we talk about the Georgia Agricultural Commodity Commission for Peanuts, because sometimes we can't get out all those words in one breath.

In the months ahead, we will report on progress made in all of the Commission's areas of activity. These include: developments in quality control, reports from manufacturers, new peanut and peanut butter products, and special events of interest, such as putting our Peanut Princess on national television.

Speaking of special events, there is one coming up shortly. National Peanut Week, March 7–13, will be sponsored by the growers, shellers, and manufacturers who are members of the National Peanut Council. As an associate member of the council, the Georgia Peanut Commission helps to support continued work in research and promotion of peanuts.

Peanut Week offers many possibilities for promotion. Just recently, the peanut council completed arrangements with several important groups to attract support from related industries for Peanut Week this year.

Among these are the Super Market Institute, whose members operate stores doing a $23 billion business in the grocery industry; the National Association of Retail Grocers, comprising State associations of independent grocers throughout the country; the Cooperative Food Distributors Association, which is the chief spokesman for the 77,000 voluntary and cooperative stores; and the Independent Grocers Alliance, whose 70 wholesalers service thousands of stores.

Each of these groups is requesting full support for its members for Peanut Week promotion, and grocers are being directed to contact their suppliers for promotional materials. The rest is up to the peanut industry. Peanut product salesmen will take advantage of this opportunity to tie their sales efforts to the nationwide attention generated by National Peanut Week.

Since we are the largest peanut-producing State in the Nation, this kind of activity means better markets, bigger sales, and more revenue for Georgia peanut producers.

Publicity kits were sent out recently to food editors and broadcasters, and the peanut council reports that response to Peanut Week by the press is already exceptionally good. This special Peanut Week promotion is in addition to our own national promotion which continues all year round.

There is much more activity underway, all of it promising good things for peanuts and peanutgrowers.

We have the second largest cash row crop in our State, and our job at the peanut commission is to help this fine crop contribute even more to the well-being of our farmers, and thus to the entire State.

Stop Criticizing America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, there are very few persons in the Greater New Orleans area who don't know Mel Leavitt.

Whether or not they have met Mel in person, New Orleanians know him from their television screens. Polls and surveys have attested to his popularity, and this is understandable when one sees one program featuring Mel Leavitt. Mel can be witty, urbane, erudite—and nearly always provocative. When he says something, a lot of people know it is worth listening to.

In addition to his television appearances, Mel now writes a column for the New Orleans Clarion-Herald, the official publication of the Catholic archdiocese of New Orleans.

Mel's column in the March 4 issue of the Clarion-Herald was entitled "Stop Criticizing America." I found it to be a thoughtful summation of symptoms we all recognize. It is a pleasure to include that article into the RECORD, and I recommend its contents to my colleagues:

STOP CRITICIZING AMERICA

(By Mel Leavitt)

I think it's time somebody said something positive about America for a change without indulging in either an orgy of self-righteousnes, self-criticism, or self-pity.

What is needed most is to reawaken in Americans some of the pride, sense of principle, individual courage, initiative, and above all idealism that made this country great.

It is going to be a difficult job.

Never in history have so many people in one Nation had it so good, materially. Too good perhaps. For while there are pockets of poverty reflecting lack of physical well-being, there are many more abscesses on the mind and spirit of our so-called Great Society.

We have begun to take for granted our rights while overlooking, too often, their foundation in responsibility. We have come so far, so fast, we sometimes seem to feel America owes us everything materially, and no one owes America anything spiritually except lipservice to its liberties.

As a result, not only do many of our own Americans believe, but much of the world is beginning to accept, that we are nothing but: meddlers in Vietnam, muddlers in Harlem and Selma, chiselers on Wall Street, cheaters in Colorado Springs, and corruptors along Madison Avenue.

In the eyes of many foreigners America, sweet land of liberty, has become the sour citadel of corruption.

Our attempts to defend freedom and resist tyranny in Koera and Vietnam are condemned as examples of Yankee imperialism or just plain stupidity masquerading as idealism. Sometimes it seems a tossup whether we are resented more by the people we are fighting or those we defend.

Our painful struggle to reach a solution in the field of civil rights, at home, is looked upon by some as symptomatic of how undemocratic this democracy has become. Overlooked abroad is the fact that virulent prejudice and hate, much more deeply rooted and indefensible, exist in virtually every other nation, civilized or otherwise, and has existed for centuries unsolved.

Meanwhile Yankee dollars roll out endlessly to Zambazambaland and TimbucOne and anti-Yankee mobs, whipped up by anti-Yankee agitators, yell on and on: "Yankee, go home."

Any indication that America might get tough where its property or citizens are threatened brings down the self-righteous wrath of a dozen smaller, corrupt, dictator-ridden and impoverished nations. Phoney neutrals, Communist patsies, and two-bit dictators seize any pretext to make the world, and their own weary citizens, forget they have a million times worse problems at home which they carefully submerge or ignore.

Obviously, we have more dramatic Negro problems, more publicized general problems than anyone else because no one else ever has attempted to assimilate on such a grand scale not just black and white but every other race, culture, and creed in what we call our melting pot.

Nothing melts in a melting pot without heat.

Certainly, we have Negroes and whites searching, struggling, advancing, and retreating—but at the same time, engaged in painful progress, if sometimes bitterly. The point is: progress is our objective, not stalemate and subjugation.

Everywhere outside the United States we see other bitter groups engaged only in ceaseless conflict. Buddhist and Catholic, Communist and anti-Communist, Occidental and Oriental in Vietnam, Arab and Jew in the Middle East, Hindu and Moslem in India, Negro and West Indian in British Guiana, Greek and Turk in Cyprus, Negro and white in South Africa, anybody and everybody it seems in the Congo.

In few places on this imperfect planet has anyone reached a point of mere tolerance, much less understanding and equality. But we try, because democracy is committed to struggle, morally, for all humanity—not just one group's interests of fancies. And yet America, because it has achieved more understanding than anywhere else, is the whipping boy for every downtrodden, indigent or resentful sufferer, yearning to be free.

The have-nots are hostile toward those who have. And since they vastly outnumber those with freedom, resentment (as well as social justice) fuels the fires of communism and hate.

Many foreigners, who really know and appreciate America's commitments, are alarmed by our own creeping cynicism and self-doubt. A visitor from India recently told me:

"Why do you Americans criticize and condemn yourselves so violently? If you're not complaining about what's wrong, you're apologizing for what's right. You have the highest standard of living in the world—the envy of the world—and yet you moan eternally about how corrupt you are. You have the highest level of literacy and the most amazing spread of literature and the arts. And yet you feel uncultured and uncouth.

"You have subsidized half the world, given away billions of dollars in food, medicine, and technical assistance—defended freedom anywhere and everywhere it was threatened—and yet some of you worry about being loved and appreciated.

"Stop apologizing" he said. "Believe me, if half the foreigners who grumble about America had half a chance to come to America, they'd give up everything for the opportunity.

"You seem not to believe in yourselves anymore. Not just to criticize specific problems, but to doubt yourself generally. I have met some people who seemed embarrassed at being Americans. How sad, how strange. They should be proud. Critical, yes—but proud."

Woodrow Wilson once summed up his feeling of America this way: "Sometimes people call me an idealist. Well, that is the way I know I am an American. America is the only idealistic nation in the world."

He also said: "The interesting and inspiring thought about America is that * * * she asks nothing for herself except what she has a right to ask for humanity."

Perhaps, one of America's troubles is that she is not asking enough either for or of herself anymore—except her own prosperity. And humanity, impoverished itself, sees her only as a symbol of prosperity.

We have apologized so often for our motives, analyzed so thoroughly our defects, exported so little of our virtues except dollar values, the world may soon see us chiefly as a dollar sign, rather than a liberty symbol. In our attempts to be both loved and respected—despite our money—we are frequently despised because of it.

Thus Sukarno can tell us to take our aid, after he has taken us for millions, and go to hell. Thus Communists can preach that America, the world's most religiously inspired nation, has already gone to hell.

A nation is like an individual. It is difficult to command love and respect, unless one has love and respect for one's self.

Vice President Humphrey Addresses Pacem in Terris Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Pacem in Terris conference held in New York City last month was honored to have Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY as one of its main speakers. This conference, dedicated to the late Pope John XXIII and centering upon his historic encyclical, was addressed by outstanding theologians, philosophers, statesmen, political scientists, and scientists.

The Vice President headed that list. His comments upon the significance of Pacem in Terris were an inspiration to all present.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice President's remarks can be an inspiration to all of us as well as to those who were fortunate to hear them in person. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the full text of Vice President HUMPHREY's speech in the RECORD:

"PEACE ON EARTH"—REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE "PACEM IN TERRIS" CONFERENCE, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 17, 1965

The Scripture tells us to "pursue peace"—and mankind has since the beginning of time condemned the horrors of war. If discord and strife, wars and the threat of wars have persisted throughout history, it is perhaps as St. Augustine says: "that men make war not because they love peace the less, but rather because they love their own kind of peace the more." Yet men of peace of every kind and every land remember well the year 1963. For in that fateful year a venerable apostle of peace left our world, leaving behind a legacy which will endure for years to come. Generations of men—young and old alike—will remember the final testament of that gentle peasant Pope, Pope John XXIII, the encyclical "Pacem in Terris," in which he left to men of all faiths, to men holding many concepts of peace, an outline for peace in our world which can be accepted by all men of good will.

And if our generation can heed the parting plea of the man whose work we honor at this conference, generations yet to come may hope to live in a world where in the words of the late President Kennedy "the strong are just, the weak secure, and the peace preserved."

It is a privilege and an honor to participate in this conference dedicated to exploring the meaning and the message of "Pacem in Terris." It is particularly fitting that this convocation meet at the beginning of International Cooperation Year. I am confident that your deliberations here will advance our world along the road to "peace on earth" as described by Pope John.

The encyclical John XXIII presented to the world was a public philosophy for a nuclear era. Comprehensive in scope, his message expounded a political philosophy governing relations between the individual and the state, relations between states, and relations between an individual state and the world organizations.

"Pacem in Terris" continues and completes the social philosophy which the Pope had begun a year earlier in his encyclical "Mater et Magistra," in which he elaborated the principles of social justice which should guide the social order. In "Pacem in Terris," he extended this philosophy to the world, concentrating now on relations between states and the role of the world community.

This encyclical represents not a utopian blueprint for world peace, presupposing a sudden change in the nature of men. Rather, it represents a call to action to leaders of nations, presupposing only a gradual change in human institutions. It is not confined to elaborating the abstract virtues of peace but looks to the building of a world community governed by institutions capable of preserving peace.

The Pope outlined principles which can guide the actions of men—all men regardless of color, creed, or political affiliation—but it is up to statesmen to decide how these principles are to be applied. The challenge to this conference is to provide statesmen with further guidelines for applying the philosophy of "Pacem in Terris" to the problems confronting our world in 1965.

I would like to direct my remarks principally to the questions of relations between states and to that of a world community. Pope John's preoccupation—and our preoccupation today—is with an amelioration of international relations in the light of the dangers to mankind posed by the existence of modern nuclear weapons. The leaders of the world must understand—as he understood—that since that day at Alamogordo when man acquired the power to obliterate himself from the face of the earth, war has worn a new face. And the vision of it has sobered all men and demanded of them a keener perception of mutual interests and a higher order of responsibility. Under these conditions mankind must concentrate on the problems that unite us rather than on those which divide us.

Pope John proclaimed that the issues of war and peace are the concern of all. Statesmen—who bear a heavier responsibility than others—cannot ignore the implications for the survival of mankind of new discoveries in technology, biology, nuclear physics, and space. In this nuclear age the deliberate initiation of full-scale war as an instrument of national policy has become folly.

Originally a means to protect national interests, war today can assure the death of a Nation, the decimation of a continent.

Nuclear power has placed into the hands of men the power to destroy all that man has created. Only responsible statesmen—who perceive that perseverance in the pursuit of peace is not cowardice, but courage, that restraint in the use of forces is not weakness, but wisdom—can prevent present international rivalries from leading to an incinerated world.

The confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union over Cuba in the autumn of 1962 undoubtedly weighed heavily in the Pope's thinking and lent urgency to his concern to halt the nuclear arms race. Addressing the leaders of the world, he stated:

"Justice, right, reason, and humanity urgently demand that the arms race should cease; that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned; that nuclear weapons should be banned; and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of control."

This plea had special pertinence for the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union, the principal nuclear powers.

A few months later, President Kennedy demonstrated the U.S. commitment to the goal of peace. In a speech at American University in June of 1963, he called for renewed efforts toward a "more practical, more attainable peace—based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned."

The leaders of the Soviet Union responded favorably. In October 1963, the United States and Soviet governments signed a treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water. This treaty won respect throughout the world for the United States and the Soviet Union—indeed for all nations who signed it. It has inspired hope for the future of mankind on this planet. And members of this audience will recall that the man who first proposed a test ban treaty way back in 1956—and who shares in the credit for its accomplishment—is the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson.

The nuclear test ban was the first step in the path toward a more enduring peace. "The longest journey begins with a single step," President Johnson has said—and that single step has been taken.

Other steps have followed.

We have resolved not to station weapons of mass destruction in space. A United Nations resolution, jointly sponsored by the United States and the Soviet Union, called on all countries to refrain from such action. It was adopted by acclamation—without a single dissenting vote.

This was a vital step toward preventing the extension of the arms race into outer space.

This year the United States is cutting back on the production of fissionable materials. Great Britain and the Soviet Union have announced cutbacks in their planned production of fissionable materials for use in weapons. As President Johnson has stated, the race for large nuclear stockpiles can be provocative as well as wasteful.

The need for instant communication between the United States and the Soviet Union—to avoid the miscalculation which might lead to nuclear war—was proven during the Cuban missile crisis. Since that time, we have established a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow to avoid such miscalculation.

The agenda for the future remains long. Among the measures needed to limit the dangers of the nuclear age are measures designed to prevent war by miscalculation or accident.

We must seek agreements to obtain safeguards against surprise attacks, including a network of selected observation points. We must seek to restrict the nuclear arms race by preventing the transfer of nuclear weapons to the control of nonnuclear nations; transferring fissionable materials from military to peaceful purposes, and by outlawing underground tests, with adequate inspection and enforcement. The United States has offered a freeze on the production of aircraft and missiles used for delivering nuclear weapons. Such a freeze might open the door to reductions in nuclear strategic delivery vehicles.

It is the intention of the U.S. Government to pursue every reasonable avenue toward agreement with the Soviet Union in limiting the nuclear arms race. And the President has made it clear that he will leave nothing undone, no mile untraveled to further the pursuit of peace.

Today in the year 1965 we must recognize that the next major step in controlling the nuclear arms race may require us to look beyond the narrow United States-Soviet competition to the past. For the explosion of a nuclear device by Communist China in 1964 has impressed upon us once again that the world of today is no longer the bipolar world of an earlier decade. Nuclear competition is no longer limited to two superpowers.

The efforts of the United States and Europe to enable the nations of Europe to have a greater share in nuclear defense policy—without encouraging the development of independent national nuclear deterrents—constitute a recognition of this.

In addition to Europe, we now have the problem of finding ways of preventing the further proliferation of nuclear weapons in Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East.

With the explosion of the Chinese nuclear device several months ago—and the prospect of others to follow—it may be that the most immediate next step in controlling the nuclear arms race is the prevention of further proliferation of nuclear weapons in Asia.

In view of the evident determination of the present Communist government of mainland China to use its limited nuclear capability it hopes to develop for maximum political and propaganda benefit, it is not surprising that other modern Asian nations are tempted to build their own nuclear deterrent.

But the nations on the perimeter of Communist China are not alone. As President Johnson has stated, "The nations that do not seek national nuclear weapons can be sure that if they need our strong support against some threat of nuclear blackmail, then they will have it."

If the need for preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons is more immediate in Asia today, it is no less important in Latin America, Africa and the Near East. All of these areas are ripe for regional arms pacts which would prevent these countries from developing nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons would serve no useful purpose in preserving their security. The introduction of these weapons would provoke a rivalry that would imperil the peace of Latin America and Africa and intensify the present rivalries in the Near East. It would endanger the precarious economies of countries which already possess military forces too large for their security needs and too expensive to be maintained without outside assistance.

Such nuclear arms control agreements should naturally be initiated by the nations of the area. In Latin America, such an agreement has already been proposed. Should the nations of Latin America, of Africa and the Near East through their own institutions or through the United Nations, take the initiative in establishing nuclear free zones, they will earn the appreciation of all nations of the world. Containment in these areas would represent a major step toward world peace.

II

If nuclear rivalry is an obstacle to peace today, it is not the only one.

In Pacem in Terris, John XXIII returned to a theme he had discussed in Mater et Magistra when he stated: "Given the growing interdependence among peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic inequality among them persists." If control of nuclear weapons is a central issue in improving relations between East and West, accelerating the economic development of new nations is essential to harmony between North and South.

In Latin America, in Asia, and Africa, another threat to peace lies in the shocking inequality between privileged and impoverished, between glittering capitals and festering slums, between booming industrial regions and primitive rural areas. A real threat to peace in these areas is the revolutionary challenge of an unjust social order in which true peace—peace based on justice—is impossible.

Those who have been "more blessed with this world's goods" must heed the Pope's plea to assist "those political communities whose citizens suffer from poverty, misery and hunger and who lack even the elementary rights of the human person."

We must do this out of compassion—for we are our brother's keeper. And we also do it out of self-interest as well—for our lot is their lot, our future their future, our peace their peace. This planet is simply too small for the insulation of the rich against turbulence bred of injustice in any part of the world.

The flow of foreign aid—both capital and technical assistance—is indispensable to the narrowing of the gap between rich nations and poor. Much has been done by individual nations and by international organization. But more must be done—both through foreign aid and by enlarging their opportunities for trade—to assist those developing nations which are striving to bring to their people the economic and social benefits of modern civilization. The exact dimensions of the task and the most effective way of fulfilling it are questions which deserve further attention by the United Nations.

If the arms race is a strain on the economy of rich nations, it is an intolerable burden on that of poor nations. For developing nations with a rapidly expanding population, primitive economic institutions, and little capital development, participation in a nuclear arms race is indefensible.

A pioneer statesman of the nuclear era, the late Senator Brien McMahon, proposed almost two decades age that resources diverted from the arms race could be set aside to meet the unmet social and economic needs of mankind. His counsel remains valid today.

III

The man whom we honor today—like his predecessors—recognized that a secure peace depends on a stable world community. And a stable world community requires a viable international organization.

The strengthening of the existing world organization—the United Nations—is one of our most urgent tasks.

Today we hear voices advocating abandonment of the United Nations, withdrawal from the United Nations. They are misguided. They would abandon an imperfect instrument for preserving world peace because they dislike our imperfect world. To abandon the U.N.—or to immobilize it through crippling restrictions or failure to support it—would only prove that our generation had forgotten the lessons of half a century of nationalism and isolationism. Let those who would destroy the United Nations recall the international anarchy that followed the demise of the League of Nations. In a nuclear era when anarchy can lead to annihilation, the United Nations deserves the support of all nations—large and small, rich and poor. The heroes of the world community are not those who withdraw when difficulties ensue—not those who can envision neither the prospect of success nor the consequence of failure—but those who stand the heat of the battle—the fight for world peace through the United Nations.

As everyone knows, the General Assembly has felt obliged to go into recess while negotiations proceed in search of a solution to the present constitutional impasse.

This is not a happy situation and it raises some political and legal problems for the U.N.'s largest contributor as I am sure it does for other members. There are several things to be noted about this crisis.

First, the United Nations will continue even though the General Assembly has been deadlocked by a refusal of certain members to meet their obligations. The Security Council is not affected—nor are the operations of that diversified family of affiliated agencies in the U.N. system.

Second, the membership includes nations with radically different ideas about the proper role of international organizations in world affairs; yet none denies they have a role. The argument is not whether the General Assembly should continue to function but under what ground rules it should carry on.

Third, the United Nations has expanded rapidly and almost continuously for two decades now—and in the course of it the membership has more than doubled. In the meantime, the world environment in which it operates has undergone pervasive change. Under the circumstances, it would be surprising if the organization did not face some awkward adjustments to new realities.

It may take time and patience and a high capacity to absorb frustration before the General Assembly gets back on the track or selects a somewhat different road ahead. But I am confident we meet in the hall of an institution which is in the throes of growing pains—not in the grip of a fatal disease.

Another aspect of the world organization that requires immediate strengthening is the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations. Given the scope and the scale of major power interests and commitments around the world—we are required to assume that any armed conflict may bear within it the seeds of a nuclear disaster.

So a workable peace system must be able to resolve by nonviolent means the kinds of disputes which in the past have led to wars—and to keep disruptive change in nonviolent channels.

Here we can begin to see just how operational a peace system must be—to visualize peacekeeping machinery in being and in action.

In its most operational and visible form, peacekeeping in action is an armed patrol of soldiers of peace in blue berets—standing between warring ethnic groups in Cyprus * * * men who patrol the Gaza Strip 24 hours a day for the 8th year running, those who jump in to repair breaches of the peace along the other frontiers of Israel, others who still stand watch along the 15-year-old truce line in Kashmir, and still others who keep tabs on the armistice line along the 38th parallel in Korea.

These units of operational peacekeeping machinery were in place and in action when we arose this morning and they will be there when we go to bed tonight because there was an international organization to deal with threats to the peace; because there were established rules and procedures for conducting the business of peacekeeping; because there was a way to finance peacekeeping missions; and because members made available personnel and equipment and transport and other goods and services.

But the machinery of peace is much more than keeping an uneasy truce: it is the Security Council and the General Assembly and the Secretariat; it is conference machinery and voting procedures and resolutions and assessments; it is a mission of inquiry or observation—and a single civilian moving anonymously from private meeting to private meeting on a conciliation assignment.

Peacekeeping machinery is organization—plus people and resources—designed and operated to sustain a secure world order.

What we have so far is rudimentary—even primitive—machinery. It is not as extensive as it should be. It is not as versatile as it should be. It is not as reliable as it should be.

But it is machinery. It has proved to be workable in practice when enough members in practice wanted it to work.

Clearly one of the requirements of a workable peace system is to supplement and complement and improve the operational peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations.

Eventually we would hope that this machinery would be in a position to seek the peaceful resolution of disputes and incipient conflicts—ideally by quiet conciliation—if need be by verbal confrontation before the bar of world opinion—and in extremes by placing whatever kind of peacekeeping force is needed in a position between antagonists—so that no sovereignty is without potential international protection and no nation need call upon other nations to help protect them from predatory neighbors. Today we recognize that this is not possible.

In 1954 the Geneva accords were ratified guaranteeing the independent status of South Vietnam. Today in Vietnam that freedom is endangered by the systematic attempt of foreign backed subversives to win control of the country. Today peace in southeast Asia can be obtained if the violators will cease their aggression.

Our policy is clear. We will continue to seek a return to the essentials of the Geneva accords of 1954. We will resist aggression. We will be faithful to a friend. We seek no wider war. We seek no dominion. Our goal in southeast Asia is today what it was in 1954—what it was in 1962. Our goal is peace and freedom for the people of Vietnam.

An essential step for the strengthening of peacekeeping is the establishment of a flexible troop callup system for future emergencies. The U.N. cannot do its peacekeeping job if there are long delays in getting its forces to world trouble spots.

The Secretary General's request that members maintain special U.N. peacekeeping contingents deserves the support of all, and I rejoice that some members have already responded—Canada, the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, and Iran.

The United States will assist in this strengthening of the peacekeeping capacity by helping to train and equip contingents of other nations earmarked for U.N. use—by transporting these units when necessary—and by paying their fair share of the cost of peacekeeping operations. We hope others will do the same.

It is, of course, the smaller countries which stand in the greatest need of international protection. But the great powers have an equal interest in effective peacekeeping machinery.

For a nation like the United States, the investment in U.N. peacekeeping is one of the best we can make. We do not aspire to any Pax Americana. We have no desire to play the role of global gendarme. Although we shall honor our commitments to assist friendly nations in preserving their freedom, we have no desire to interject American troops into explosive local disputes.

But disputes do occur; and if hostilities are to be ended and the peace preserved, there must be some outside force available to intervene. In many cases—though not in all—a stable professional U.N. force can play that role.

Therefore both the large powers and the small powers have a common interest—if for different reasons—in effective international peacekeeping machinery.

This is why the current impasse in the General Assembly—and the consequent paralysis in its ability to rise to an emergency if need be—is to be so deeply regretted.

IV

I have dwelt briefly this evening on but three of the foremost problems of peace—nuclear competition, the gap between rich nations and poor, and the need for building a world community through the United Nations. In this Conference you will explore others.

A year ago in addressing the United Nations, President Johnson stated: "All that we have built in the wealth of nations, and all that we plan to do toward a better life for all, will be in vain if our feet should slip, or our vision falter, and our hopes ended in another worldwide war. If there is one commitment more than any other that I would like to leave with you today, it is my unswerving commitment to the keeping and to the strengthening of the peace."

Our commitment to strengthening the peace has not weakened. We seek a peace that is more than a pause between wars. But our knowledge of ourselves tells us that we can expect no sudden epidemic of peace, that we have far to go before as President Johnson says the "greatness of our institutions" matches the "grandeur of our intentions." The pursuit of peace is a gradual process.

Peace is too important to be the exclusive concern of the great powers. It requires the attention of all—small nations and large, old nations and new.

The pursuit of peace resembles the building of a great cathedral. It is the work of generations. In concept it requires a master architect; in execution, the labors of many.

The pursuit of peace requires time—but we use time as a tool and not as a couch. We must be prepared to profit from the vision of peace left by great men who came our way.

We honor Pope John XXIII on this occasion not because he demonstrated that perfect peace can be achieved in a short time. We honor him because he raised our hopes and exalted our vision.

He realized that the hopes and expectations aroused could not all be satisfied in the immediate future. What can be accomplished in a limited time will always fall short of expectations.

This should not discourage us. What is important is that we be prepared to give some evidence that progress toward peace is being made, that some of the unsolved problems of peace can be met in the future.

This is the vision which Pope John left us in his encyclical "Pacem in Terris."

"Without vision the people perish," says the Scripture.

It is the duty of our generation to convert this vision of peace into reality.

We Hope So, Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville, Ind., News, March 2, 1965:

WE HOPE SO, SENATOR

Indiana's Senator BIRCH BAYH yesterday released a partial list of witnesses who will testify at hearings starting Wednesday in Washington on proposed plans for the reapportionment of State legislatures.

There will be a great deal of interest in those hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, of which BAYH is chairman, and the interest ranges far and wide both within the Congress and without and among both Democrats and Republicans.

The committee will receive testimony on proposed amendments sponsored by Senators EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, and JACOB JAVITS, Republican, of New York.

The amendments propose means by which one house of bicameral legislatures could be apportioned based on factors other than population. A recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling held that under the Constitution State legislatures must be apportioned on the basis of population only.

BAYH, who is not sponsoring any legislation on reapportionment, said he believes "there can be some accommodation whereby the majority can be properly represented without destroying reasonable autonomy of the States to determine their own method of apportionment."

We hope so, Senator.

Insofar as Indiana is concerned, the question involved is whether we are to have a permanent method of apportionment which permits domination of the general assembly in both houses by a handful of the largest counties—or whether the legislature is going to be authorized if it so desires to give residents of the less-populous areas some measure of defensive power against having their representatives overridden on all issues in which conflicts of interest may arise.

Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren, in his now well-publicized remarks as Governor of California in 1948, gave one of the best endorsements for balanced legislative representation when he said: "Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting the representation in the Senate to a strictly population basis * * *. Moves have been made to upset the balanced representation in our State, even though it has served us well and is strictly in accord with the American tradition and the pattern of our National Government."

We do not repeat this statement as a means of accusing Justice Warren of inconsistency. In 1948, he was presenting views on what he considered best for his State. Federal courts at that time had declined to intervene in State legislative matters. When he wrote the Court majority opinion last

June, he was speaking as a judge interpreting what he felt the Federal Constitution today requires of State legislatures.

But what Mr. Warren stated back in 1948 expresses, we believe, what the great majority of Americans feel is still valid today with reference to all State bicameral legislatures. Here in Indiana, the so-called Federal plan in which representation in the House of Representatives is based more closely on population and the Senate more closely on geography, has served the best interests of the whole State very well.

Education for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a speech recently made before the Veterans of Foreign Wars at its meeting here in Washington on the subject of "National Americanism and National Loyalty Day Committees," by the Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS, of Louisiana.

As chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities and a distinguished lawyer, Mr. WILLIS is especially fitted to make such an outstanding talk as this. His thoughts are soundly developed and express the sort of logic that should appeal to every American, regardless of his station in life.

I should like to call this address to the attention of my colleagues. It is as follows:

EDUCATION FOR SURVIVAL

Mr. Commander, officers, and members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I was very pleased to accept the invitation of your National Commander, Buck Jenkins, to address this meeting today. I have long been familiar with the outstanding work the VFW has done both in the area of fighting communism and promoting Americanism; hence my pleasure in being here.

I am going to speak about a subject you men are greatly interested in—education, and I am going to talk not about education in general, about the teaching of mathematics or science, languages or such, but about a much more important type of education, education for the very survival of our country.

We are at war again today—in Vietnam. In this war, communism is again showing its face very clearly—so clearly that no person of intelligence and integrity can mistake its true nature and the seriousness of the challenge it presents to us. The war in Vietnam reminds us of another war we fought in Asia not long ago, a war in which some of you probably served, the Korean war. We lost 33,000 of the flower of American youth in that war. In toto, we suffered over 150,000 casualties.

More than one political writer has commetned recently on certain of the similarities between the war in Vietnam and that in Korea. Their comments have caused me to think back to some of the major developments in the Korean war, some of the things that war revealed about the greatness of America—and also about our weaknesses.

All of you, I am sure, recall the shock that hit our country when, at the end of hostilities, 21 members of our armed services who had been taken prisoners of war refused repatriation. Instead of coming back to their native land, they chose to go over to the enemy, the same enemy that had visited horrible atrocities on thousands of American soldiers, in addition to causing the casualties I have just mentioned.

Twenty-one men, of course, were no more than a miniscule percentage of the total number of men who served in Korea and who served bravely and with unswerving loyalty. But nothing like this had ever happened before in the history of the United States. It was something that hit hard and is hard to forget. It is also something I believe we should not forget—for reasons I will discuss later.

The war in Vietnam reminds me of one of the defectors I have referred to, a man named Scott Rush, who lived in Red China for 10 years after the Korean war had ended and then returned to this country in September 1963. No one would say that this man deserves any great glory, but at the same time, when he finally returned home, he made some statements which indicate that he learned a lot during the time he was held prisoner and during the 10 years he lived in Red China. Although he is a relatively uneducated man, he learned, perhaps, a lesson which some of our intellectuals have not learned.

Before going into that, however, I would like to review certain recent developments in this country—developments which highlight the importance and the truth of what he had to say when he did come home.

Just a few days ago, five persons, three of them American citizens—and all relatively young—were arrested for a conspiracy to bomb and destroy the Washington Monument, the Liberty Bell, and the Statue of Liberty in New York City, three of America's most cherished memorials.

Within the last year and a half, approximately 130 young Americans, the great majority of them college students or graduates, have traveled to Cuba in flagrant violation of the laws of the United States. While there, many of them have made statements viciously attacking their native land. They watched a moving picture produced by the Vietcong in North Vietnam and cheered when, in it, they saw an American plane shot down.

The leaders of this group have stated that they next plan to defy their country by organizing groups of young Americans to travel to Red China, North Vietnam and Albania—countries where travel by all U.S. citizens is banned without special permission.

Less than a year ago, a Communist propaganda film on Vietnam—possibly the same one I have just mentioned—was shown to an audience of about 350 persons at a major university in New York City. The showing was sponsored by the new, ultrarevolutionary Communist organization, the progressive labor movement. There was loud applause when the film showed a Vietcong leader embracing Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Red China.

During the question-and-answer period at the end of the showing of this film, one student stood up and said, "Let's have a round of applause for the Americans fighting and dying in Vietnam."

The New York Times reported that only about 15 students in the audience applauded. All the others turned their backs on this plea.

At a conference on socialism in America, held at a famous and very old New England university in February 1964, attended by 400 students, the so-called May Second Committee was formed. The original purpose of this organization was to stage demonstrations in various parts of the country on May 2, 1964, protesting the action this country was taking to prevent still another nation—South Vietnam—from being enslaved by communism. The organization not only staged a number of demonstrations last May 2, but has since staged several others and has been doing everything it can to sabotage the U.S. effort in Vietnam.

One of the members of this organization has also set up an organization called the Student Committee To Send Medical Aid to the Front of National Liberation of South Vietnam. This organization would aid the enemies of our country—the Vietcong—even while they are killing American soldiers.

Last spring about 150 colleage students signed an ad stating that, if called, they would refuse to fight for the United States in Vietnam.

During the past month or so, some students at several of the major universities here in Washington and also students in some of the Washington high schools had engaged in fasts to protest the U.S. policy of fighting communism in Vietnam. One wonders if they really know what they stand for and what other policy they would have our country follow.

Last June, in San Francisco, almost 400 young people attended the founding convention of a new national Communist youth organization—the W. E. B. Du Bois Clubs of America. Since early 1957, when the Labor Youth League disbanded, the Communists have been without a national youth organization. In the intervening years, they have made several unsuccessful attempts to establish one. Today, the climate in this country is such that they have finally succeeded.

Just about a year ago, 200 high school students in Scarsdale, N.Y., protested the fact that they were obliged to pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States each day. They said this was an infringement on their freedom.

I could go on citing other incidents—such as that of 12,000 students turning out to hear Communist Party leader, Gus Hall, speak at the University of Oregon a few years ago—but I think that what I have said already is sufficient to indicate that something is wrong.

I have complete faith in the great majority of our youth. They are sound and solid. They have demonstrated over and over again that their patriotism is beyond questioning. We can be very proud of them. Despite this, there is evidence that a significant number are becoming, in effect, alienated from their country. They lack proper loyalty and devotion to it.

And this brings me back to the defector of 10 years ago, the Korean war turncoat, Scott Rush, whom I mentioned before.

When he returned to the United States in September 1963, he urged that every Army recruit be taught about the American form of government and why he should support it. "Such knowledge could prevent them making the dreadful mistake I made—the worst mistake of my life," he added.

He also stated:

"I knew nothing about the American background. When I was in school I read the comics and the sports pages. No one—in school or anywhere else—had told me about the importance of politics. I had no background when I needed it.

"Believe me, when you are a prison of war for more than 3 years like I was, you need such knowledge to sustain you.

"A knowledge of the political background of the United States and what it stands for could be almost as important to a young American soldier going overseas as a knowledge of his rifle."

Having heard those words, you can understand, I believe, why I said earlier that Rush has learned a lesson some other Americans still have to learn. And despite his past record, I believe that some Americans could well listen to what he had to say.

The truth of the matter is that it is not so much the young people of today, those who are alienated from the United States, who are to be blamed. Rather it is we adults. Too often in the past, we and those of the generation which preceded us, have failed in our obligations to watch closely over the education of the youth of America, what they were being taught, and how they were being taught it.

You will recall that when the Korean war ended, there was grave concern here in the United States, and particularly in the armed services, not only about the 21 defectors to Red China, but also about the conduct of a large number of American soldiers who were taken prisoner by the Reds during the war. There was so much concern that President Eisenhower established a Defense Advisory Committee on Prisoners of War to study the conduct of American POW's, to try to find out what brought about that conduct, and also what might be done to prevent its ever happening again.

The Committee made an intense study of the subject. Educators, psychologists, authorities on communism, military leaders, and others served on it. As a result of this study, "The U.S. Fighting-Man's Code" was proclaimed by Executive Order 10631 on August 17, 1955. I will not quote the findings and statements of this Defense Advisory Committee at length but I think this excerpt is important:

"The Committee heard evidence which revealed that many of the POW's knew too little about the United States and its ideals and traditions. So the Chinese indoctrinators had the advantage.

"The uninformed POW's were up against it. They couldn't answer arguments in favor of communism with arguments in favor of Americanism, because they knew very little about their America."

During the Korean war, we captured some enemy intelligence documents. I would like to read for you now just one sentence from a statement made by one of our military services about these documents. It reveals what the Communist enemy thought of our troops in Korea, based on their experience with our POW's:

"They [the Chinese Communists] obviously believed that the average American soldier was poorly informed to an extreme degree about his own country, his own economic and political system."

So, this is why I say that all too often it is the adult American citizen, rather than the youngster, who has failed. They, the youth, are the victims of inadequate education of the most vital type in this day and age.

Since the beginning of the "cold war," as it is called, millions of dollars in Federal funds have been made available for advanced study, and to improve teaching, in the fields of science and languages, for example, because it is believed that this will improve our chances for ultimate victory over communism.

I certainly believe that increased knowledge in these and other fields will help us achieve the victory we seek. This money is well spent.

But I also believe that we have to start giving more attention to inspiring and teaching the virtues of patriotism and loyalty. I believe that every single American citizen should be making a contribution to this effort.

If we don't, we will find that the alienation of our youth which I have referred to is growing rather than decreasing. And, for this reason, we will find our national security getting weaker and weaker, no matter how many billions we pour into weapons.

In the final analysis, the security of all nations depends on the devotion and loyalty of their citizens, in other words, on patriotism. And what is patriotism? It is simply love of country. And what does love of country depend on? It depends, presuming the country is worthy of love—as ours certainly is—on knowledge of the country; knowledge of its history, its institutions, its heroes, its accomplishments. It is from this knowledge that understanding of our country's place in history, pride in it, love of it, flows.

We cannot expect our youth to love this country, to have faith in it, to be willing to defend, fight, and die for it if they are ignorant about it and know none of these things. We cannot expect this any more than we can expect them to be enthusiastic about a sport they have never played or seen anyone else play, or to appreciate the catchiness of a song they have never heard. You cannot appreciate something you don't know.

I am very glad to say that in a considerable number of States, action is being taken to close the dangerous educational gap that has existed. Courses on both Americanism and communism are being given. Our youth are being taught not only about our enemy, his aims, and his tactics, but also about their own country. When they have completed their education they will not, I hope, suffer from the ignorance of our America that plagued Scott Rush and many of the other POW's of the Korean war, the kind of ignorance—and therefore the lack of loyalty—exhibited by our Cuban travelers and some other young Americans.

Our country today faces a more serious challenge than it has ever faced before. For this reason, it needs the loyalty of all its citizens more than ever before. Not only the youth, but all of the people of our country, must understand what America means because, if they don't, they cannot appreciate what a terrible loss it would be if our cause should fail. And not understanding this, they will not make the sacrifices required to see that it does not fail—and those sacrifices, I believe, will be many and great before this contest is ended.

The front in the war we are now fighting with communism is not limited to Vietnam. It is everywhere—in other countries of Asia, in Africa, in Latin America, in Europe, and, yes, here within our own borders, in the streets of our cities and towns, in our homes, our churches, and particularly our schools.

The combatants in this war are not only the men wearing the uniform of the United States in Vietnam and in other trouble spots of the world. This is a total war in which everyone is involved—all the people here at home, old, and young, as well as those in our armed services.

I have no doubt about what the final outcome of this struggle will be. But though I have no doubt on that score, I am not so naive as to think that it won't be a long struggle and a hard one—demanding of all of us all that we can give.

You men of the VFW have done outstanding work for years in the educational area I have talked about today. You have had an excellent Americanism program and, at the same time, an effective anti-Communist one. Through your Loyalty Day program, you have been instrumental in killing May Day as a Communist holiday, in driving the Red paraders off the streets of our cities where they used to flaunt their devotion to Moscow on that day.

I commend you for all you have done. I urge you to keep at it. By all pulling together, we will all pull through. Some day, though it may be far off, the specter of communism will no longer haunt the earth, and we will be able to devote full time to realizing the American dream—real peace for all men everywhere.

The Magical World of George Hedley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, throughout our society there are rare individuals whose brilliance, background, and innate sensibility help to mold the lives of others and influence their well-being for the better. One of these individuals I am proud to call a close personal friend. He is Dr. George Hedley, professor and chaplain at Mills College in Oakland, Calif.

He has not only been a backbone counselor to his students, but he has always been a guiding light within his local community helping us strive toward a better way of life. I know that with his impending retirement, he will be just beginning his efforts to increase the knowledge of those of us who still have so much to learn about life.

The Oakland Tribune ran a special article about this great person, and I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD:

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Feb. 21, 1965]

THE MAGICAL WORLD OF GEORGE HEDLEY

(By Bill Strobel)

Not all institutions crumble away. Some of them light their pipes, climb on their bikes and pedal off into retirement.

Dr. George Hedley, who will conclude 25 years as a professor and chaplain at Mills College in June, is one of them.

He has been an institution since 1940 when he arrived on campus with his wife Helen and some assorted cats in a 1927 Franklin, which the students promptly dubbed "Old Ironsides."

By any measure, he is a remarkable man. He is a Methodist minister and an Episcopal priest who has on occasion hoisted a cup or two with some of the boys in San Francisco's Bohemian bistros.

He is a professor of sociology and economics who has removed his glasses, taken out his false teeth, pulled on a dirty shirt and gone to work in the fields with fruitpickers.

He is a prolific writer whose works have included everything from serious studies of religion and sociology to the sprightly limericks that have become a tradition of "the magical madness of Mills" at the annual fall college picnic.

He has dug up Biblical artifacts as an archeologist with an expedition in the Holy Land and he has piloted toy trains in the basement of his home on the Mills campus.

"I have deliberately cut any lines that could have led to administrative posts," he said. "And in fact, the only job I ever wanted and didn't get was that of a night switchboard operator in a Los Angeles creamery. They thought I wasn't husky enough to handle the drivers."

As he approaches retirement, Dr. Hedley has a couple of unfinished tasks and few regrets. Retirement isn't one of them.

LOOKING AHEAD

"I'm all for the mandatory retirement age," he said. "If you made exceptions, all the wrong people would want to stay on."

One of the things he wants to get out of his system is a book on the church in rela-

tion to social issues, which he'll get around to writing after he leaves Mills.

Another is the projected Inter-Faith Chapel on the campus which has special appeal to a man of the cloth who is ordained as a Methodist minister and holds the orders of an Episcopal priest.

"Our chapel is quite interesting," he said. "The Catholics and the Jews help carry out each other's gear."

In his years of cycling around the campus—he got rid of "Old Ironsides" in 1950 when it broke down in front of a post office—Dr. Hedley was bound to form some opinions about life in general and life on a girl's college campus in particular.

He discussed some of them in the large, book-lined living room of his campus home which he calls Ruddigore, after the Gilbert and Sullivan operetta.

In the musical, Ruddigore is a home where a crime a day must be committed because of a witch's curse.

It's doubtful that any crimes have been committed in Hedley's Ruddigore and only heaven knows how many have been prevented.

The comfortable room and a crackling fire have led many a student to reveal her own problems and find the answer to them with a few words from the little man with the big pipe.

PROUD OF GIRLS

Dr. Hedley was born in Tientsen, China, of English missionary parents, received his early education in England and didn't get "the call" until he was a swivel chair soldier in World War I.

But that's all part of the past and he makes it a practice never to look back.

When he retires he'll look back only to recall some of the girls who have sought his counsel and take a quiet pride in the fact that they have grown up to become meaningful people.

TOUGH QUESTIONS

"These dear girls do have a way of cluttering up one's life," he admitted. "They get married and manage to take care of your weekends by asking you to perform the service."

But he is fond of them and among the reasons are the subjects they throw at him as sermon topics, including "Is There A life Hereafter?" "Race and Religion," and "Morals and the College Girl."

"Some of the questions are thunderingly difficult to answer," he said. "They take a lot of thought and a lot of digging."

NOT DIFFERENT

What about today's college girl and her morals?

"The girls today aren't really much different than their mothers and their grandmothers," he said. "They are just more frank about things."

He lit his pipe and recalled a recent bull session at Ruddigore after the morning service.

"The conversation got around to morality and one of our more attractive young ladies pointed out that a girl her age should have had several affairs by now," he said. "Then she smiled and said, 'I guess I've been gypped.'"

When Dr. Hedley leaves Mills he hopes to do some traveling and pursue his favorite hobby—people watching.

"I like to know what people are thinking and the only way to find out is to talk with them," he explained. His factfinding expeditions may find him dressed in the dark costume of a cleric or the shabby garb of a fruitpicker.

Both modes of dress lead to interesting situations, he said.

"The collar leads many people to seek help from a stranger when they won't confide in their best friends or their own clergymen. Somehow, it is easier to speak to a stranger."

Private Industry Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, enlightened Americans have always recognized the need for and importance of education in a free republic. It was James Russell Lowell, distinguished American writer, who once said:

It was in making education not only common to all, but in some sense compulsory on all, that the destiny of the free republics of America was practically settled.

That destiny continues. So does the sense of responsibility and commitment to provide adequate education for all, which dwells not primarily in the minds and hearts of government planners, but in the inherent and compelling sense of duty felt by individual Americans of many backgrounds and many social levels.

It has recently come to my attention that Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. of my State of Minnesota, has allocated its second assistance grant to education in the past 3 years. This $1.5 million grant to provide the most modern audiovisual materials existent available to teacher training institutions brings to $3 million the amount the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. has spent on this project.

Why does an American corporation spend such a vast amount of money on an educational project? I believe that it is because Mr. Bert S. Cross, president of the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., and his associates truly believe in the typically American sense of responsibility and conscience toward education.

In announcing the assistance grant, Mr. Cross made the following statement, which I now share with my colleagues:

To Our Friends in Education:

The challenge of educating record numbers of young people is putting increased responsibility upon the teachers of America. Not only do they have more students, but they have much more information to impart than ever before.

We are witnessing a knowledge explosion where new "facts" may become obsolete overnight. Material which has been taught for generations must be reevaluated in terms of recent findings in many fields. Students must be taught in the thinking and the language of today if they are to have a hand in making the breakthroughs of tomorrow.

Thus, the role of the teachers' schools or colleges is changing. These training grounds must make every effort to provide their students with not only facts and theory, but with modern techniques of teaching.

The teacher of today and tomorrow should be familiar with modern methods that will help to present material in a way that will stimulate the interest and fire the imaginations of her students. And one of the most effective ways of doing this is through the use of the latest equipment to make classroom presentations more dramatic.

It is with this in mind that the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. has established its second assistance grant to education. We hope that this program will help the teacher training institutions of the United States acquaint their students with these modern teaching tools.

This program answers some of the requests from many of you in education who have asked us for special support. We have carefully evaluated these requests and have developed the new Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing grants program to enable us to concentrate our effort in a coordinated and balanced plan that will provide many lasting benefits to our education system.

Through our first assistance grant program, we came to know thousands of teachers throughout the country. We were much encouraged by their eagerness to improve teaching techniques, and by their interest in the program. We hope that AGE–II will further stimulate teachers to develop their own creative approaches to teaching.

I take great personal satisfaction in announcing this program which reflects our overall company philosophy that private industry can—and should assume an ever increasing responsibility in assisting educators to fulfill their important assignment in today's society.

Sincerely,

BERT S. CROSS, *President.*

Right To Work: An Industrialist's View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, organized labor's is not the only voice calling for repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This is the long-disputed section which permits individual shops to enact laws banning union-shop labor agreements.

Many of our leading industrialists who have found that the course of labor-management relations runs more smoothly when they deal with strong and responsible unions, under union-shop agreements, also favor repeal of 14(b).

One of these is Henry L. Nunn, founder and long-time president of the Nunn-Bush Shoe Co., who now makes his home in La Jolla, Calif. The Nunn-Bush Co. has operated more than a half century without a strike. Much of this has been due to Mr. Nunn's zealous interest in the welfare of his employees, and his enlightened efforts in their behalf. The company has operated under union security agreements since 1919. In 1935, Mr. Nunn established a system of profit sharing with his employees known as the share production plan. Worker representatives, chosen by themselves, are on the company board of directors.

This enlightened industrialist believes in collective bargaining, and in an identity of interest between management and labor, working together for the common good. He believes that section 14(b) should be repealed in the best interest of both management and labor.

"For a long time," Mr. Nunn told me, "I have believed the so-called right-to-

work laws are not only most unfair in their operation, but badly misunderstood by many fairminded people."

Mr. Nunn, still vigorous in mind and body though in his late eighties, recently submitted his views on this subject in a memorandum to the executive branch. Feeling that it will interest all Members as Congress approaches consideration of repeal legislation, I am happy to submit Mr. Nunn's memorandum for inclusion in the RECORD:

MEMORANDUM ON RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

I wish to submit my views on the advisability of the Congress repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

This section is generally favored by industry and opposed by organized labor. Even though as early as 1913, the Clayton Act stated "the labor of a human being is not a commodity or an article of commerce" both industrial management and labor leadership, unfortunately, generally consider labor a commodity to be bought and sold with the price determined through a bargaining process.

While there are some industrial leaders who accept in good faith the need and right, and indeed the advantage to capital of labor's unity, and who are increasingly removing obstacles in the path, the large majority give only lip service and prefer to bargain with a weak individual rather than with a strong unified organization. Consequently, they favor any law that practically tends to prevent labor's unity.

By a similar logic the leader of labor in turn opposes section 14(b) since anything that prevents the unification of labor materially impairs his strength at the bargaining table. Labor also believes that all who benefit from collective action should participate in sharing the cost.

Capital already has unity of action through the process of forming stock companies. The minority stockholder feels no injustice in being bound by the will of the majority. This is democracy in action. By the same token it is democracy, not injustice, when the worker is expected to join the organization of labor in an industrial plant and also be bound, as is the minority stockholder, to the will of the majority.

While I believe the time has come for us to realize that industry should be a common enterprise, with labor an integral, unified part of the production process, sharing equally with capital the fruits of production, the facts are that for the present, management and labor will continue to insist upon "collective bargaining" rather than collective cooperation.

Men and women need not the right to work; they need the right to unify. The reason they need the right to unify is not necessarily to raise wage rates; it is because only by unification can they or industrial management have assurance that agreements made between them will always be honored. It is only when labor is unified that "wildcat" minorities are shorn of power to upset agreements made in good faith.

Repeal of section 14(b) will aid in preparing the groundwork for improved relations between capital and labor. Our system of capitalism is not perfect as it now operates. It can be improved. Production does depend equally on capital and labor. There is a mutuality of interest. Capital and labor are truly partners in production.

We can have all the advantages of capitalism with its resulting economy in the field of technology, mass production, purchasing and distribution, without the waste of management-labor discord.

With both management and labor conscious of a mutuality of interest, with the utmost security for all who give their loyalty to the business, with recognition by the head of the enterprise that each worker has the same desire to be important that he himself has, we can look forward with confidence to a future enterprise system invulnerable to enemies abroad or within our borders—a common enterprise in which each beneficiary, stockholder, management, worker, and consumer can participate with pride.

HENRY L. NUNN.

JANUARY 21, 1965.

The Alabama Situation

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, since Sunday night, the people of America have been shocked by treatment given to American citizens, many of whom are war veterans, women, and children, by the law enforcement agencies in the town of Selma, as well as by State officials of the State of Alabama.

Accordingly I have sent the following telegram to the President:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In brutally breaking up a peaceable march of Negroes, guilty only of demanding their right to vote, the Alabama State Police and the civilians who abetted them have outraged the Nation and badly distorted its image abroad. How can we hope to convince the world that we are fighting to preserve democracy in South Vietnam when we are unable to protect it in Selma? If the totally unwarranted violence of the troopers in Selma reflect the official attitude of the State of Alabama, as it surely must, then it is crystal clear that the intervention of Federal marshals is not only proper, but urgently necessary.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN M. MURPHY,
Member of Congress.

The Federal Government cannot stand idly by and permit constitutional rights to be denied qualified American voters. Time undoubtedly will solve the problem. However, the time for strong legislative remedies is now. In retrospect, we will find that the strongest force in bringing about these reforms was the precipitous action of the Chief Executive of the State of Alabama. The New York Daily News editorial which follows, sums up his contribution to the civil rights movement in America:

THE SHAME OF ALABAMA

Last Sunday, some 600 Negroes attempted a right-to-vote march, from Selma, Ala., to the State capital, Montgomery, 50 miles away. Before they had gone a mile, local police and Gov. George Wallace's State troopers assailed the peaceful demonstrators with clubs, whips, ropes, and tear gas.

The resultant reports and pictures, read and viewed by a shocked nation, alienated whatever sympathy Governor Wallace's fanatic segregationist stand might have been drawing.

Wallace's almost unbelievable explanation—"It has always been my policy to use the least force possible in these situations. I'm always sorry when anybody gets hurt"—could only elicit added shudders.

So why, with everything going his way, Dr. Martin Luther King decided yesterday to gamble immediately on a new march, defying not only a Federal court but a Presidential plea for restraint, passive understanding. Perhaps so many sympathetic VIP's, black and white, were on hand and eager to march that Dr. King felt he just had to put on a modest show.

Actually, Gov. George Wallace, left to himself, has emerged as the most effective helper the civil rights movement ever had. If Dr. King will just let Wallace do what comes naturally, meanwhile protecting his own followers from unnecessary danger, the battle should soon be history.

Tribute to Nathan Shapell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in the March 8 edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California, JAMES ROOSEVELT, brought to the attention of this House the similar honor which is to be accorded Mr. Nathan Shapell. Mr. Shapell has been selected by the officers and board of trustees of Temple Beth Am, one of the largest conservative congregations in southern California, as the recipient of honor and testimony at their annual presidents ball.

We should like to join Representative ROOSEVELT in paying special attention to the honor extended to Nathan Shapell because although he is a resident of Beverly Hills he is also a very active builder and developer in Garden Grove and Seal Beach within my own district. We have, therefore, come to have a personal knowledge and appreciation for his contributions to the building industry and his wide interest in community and civic affairs, not only in the area where he lives but that area in which he works and derives profit and gain.

We can appreciate from our personal knowledge that this recognition is being tendered not only for his untiring efforts and devotion to all projects concerning Temple Beth Am, but for his unfailing willingness to participate generously and personally in innumerable charitable and civic organizations for the betterment of his fellow citizens and especially those projects devoted to the welfare, education, and care of children of all races, denominations, and creeds.

We, too, know Mr. Shapell as a prominent southern California builder. He is currently serving on the board of the Vista del Mar Child-Care Service, is a member of the Patrons Society of the University of Judaism, and formerly served on the board of the Cedars-Sinai Hospitals and Project Hope and continues to participate in and support their work as well as the work of a number of other most worthwhile causes. He has also lent his support to such community projects as the music center, Boy Scouts of America, YMCA, and has served as chairman of the Builders Division of the United Jewish Welfare Fund. This year Mr. Shapell has been active in fundraising in the campaign of the united

crusade as well. His reputation in the business, financial, and civic community has been marked by the same high caliber of personal integrity and sense of responsibility to others.

So we take pride in joining, Mr. Speaker, with those others who will in a formal way applaud his record of achievement. It is fitting and proper that we do so from this national forum. It is in the fine record of our individual citizens for exemplary craftsmanship in their respective callings and in their individual readiness to give of their time, talent, and substance to the worthy causes of our day that the great strength of this land ultimately derives. We can cite Nathan Chapell as an example of good citizenry and say to ourselves and others, "go thou and do likewise."

New York Drinking Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been written concerning the difference in legal drinking ages between New York State and her sister States. New York has repeatedly claimed that her law of allowing youngsters to drink at the age of 18 is more valid than the laws of the other 49 States of the Nation, including the 5 States which immediately adjoin New York.

Feeling in these States has been rising in the past few years as newspapers time and again have carried news reports of deaths and crippling caused when teenagers who have driven to New York State for purposes of obtaining liquor have caused accidents which injured not only themselves, but others who were innocent travelers and bystanders.

Reflecting this feeling about the ridiculous attitude of New York's power group about the laws is an editorial which appeared in the February 27, 1965, issue of the Bridgeport, Conn., Post. With the permission of the House, I wish to insert this fine editorial in the RECORD at this point:

SEVENTEEN NEW VOICES RAISED

Earlier this week New York State officials declared the State had the ideal age at which youths should be permitted to drink, legally, 18 years. It was suggested that youngsters drive at 18, serve in the Armed Forces, etc., so by that logic they should be allowed to drink intoxicating beverages at 18.

It was also suggested that neighboring States raise their driving age to 21, the same as the drinking age to keep the youngsters of 18 from driving to New York for liquid refreshments.

All that nonsense was clearly answered by 17 Members of Congress from Connecticut, New Jersey, Vermont and Pennsylvania, joining Representative FLORENCE P. DWYER, New Jersey Republican, in her long campaign to get New York State to change its legal drinking age from 18 to 21.

Mrs. DWYER holds that since New York has failed to listen to the pleas of neighboring States to revise its law, Congress has a responsibility to add its weight to the proposal in the interest of harmony and cooperation between States. New York's attractive nuisance, seriously impairs law enforcement in neighboring States, she told the House citing instances of many teenage deaths of youngsters who crossed State borders to get liquor.

"I find nothing in the record," Representative DWYER declared, "of this lengthy controversy which suggests that New York is right and its 49 sister States are wrong." She has been fighting for an improvement in New York's law the last 10 years. In 1962 she had the support of 26 Representatives and Senators from six States in a similar plea to New York.

Representative ROBERT N. GIAIMO, New Haven Democrat; Representative BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI, Bristol Democrat; Representative EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Hartford Democrat, introduced resolutions, similar to Representative DWYER's, asking the New York Assembly and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller to take appropriate action—at congressional request—to raise the State's legal age.

It is to be universally hoped that the New York lawmakers will see the great advantages to be had by taking appropriate action at once.

Top-Level Space Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the growth and capability of our space program has been well summarized by Mr. William J. Coughlin in his recent editorial of March 8, 1965, in Missiles and Rockets magazine. Mr. Coughlin clearly identifies the overwhelming support of our President and Vice President for this major national effort and goes on to describe the current achievements, both military and civilian, in the space program. He also well describes the basis that is being built for future space effort that will benefit this country here on earth as well as in building our preeminence in space. I commend Mr. Coughlin's editorial to your reading:

TOP-LEVEL SPACE SUPPORT

(By William J. Coughlin)

President Johnson's recent surprise visit to National Aeronautics and Space Administration headquarters in Washington was a welcome affirmation of his strong interest in the Nation's space program.

The President, after a Mariner briefing, bestowed lavish praise on the Mariner team, the space agency, and Administrator James Webb.

He also recalled that he had been the author of the 1958 Space Act establishing NASA, terming it "one of my proudest legislative accomplishments in 25 years in Congress."

"I feel somewhat close to this agency," the President declared.

This was the second strong display of administration interest in the space program within a few days. Earlier, Vice President Humphrey visited Cape Kennedy for comprehensive briefings on the NASA and Air Force programs underway there. The Vice President, who by statute is also Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, still has a lot to learn about space. Understandably, he is not yet familiar with the complex terminology of the space age.

The Vice President, however, has tackled his homework with characteristic vigor and bounce. He took in the MILA complex on Merritt Island, the Air Force's new Titan III complex and a number of blockhouses. He examined the Gemini spacecraft which now is mated to its Titan II launch vehicle for the manned GT-3 flight. He listened attentively to detailed briefings.

The Vice President left the Cape admittedly awed by what he had seen there. He could not have chosen a better place to start his space education. The Cape today, with the Titan III complex nearing completion and the MILA construction well along, is enough to impress even the most experienced space experts.

The scale of the MILA complex, with its giant crawlers and mobile launch towers for Saturn, is unbelievable. Its sheer size seems almost a concrete expression of our determination to conquer space.

There is, at the same time, the sobering realization that we have gone just about as far up the scale of earthbound facilities as we can go. Anything larger will be almost technically impossible. The route for the future probably will be to assemble in orbit anything larger than can be handled in the Saturn V/Apollo facilities.

The MILA complex, nevertheless, is a good measure of the technological progress of this Nation. A few years ago, for example, construction of the crawlers alone would have been beyond the bounds of the possible. Today, these mammoth objects fall into the role of support equipment for something that will be even more stupendous.

The Air Force's Titan III complex, while on a smaller scale than MILA, is impressive both from the standpoint of size and for the logic of its planning. But, once again, it is concrete evidence that there must be a limit to the size of practical launch vehicles.

It is perhaps worth while in this context to reexamine what the President told Congress about future manned missions in his recent report on 1964 space activities.

"Studies of possible advanced manned missions conducted in 1964 gave increased evidence of the advisability of basing plans for the immediate future on the exploitation of the capabilities being created in the Apollo program," President Johnson said. He noted that beyond the Gemini and Apollo programs, three broad possibilities are being examined.

First, alternate and growth concepts within the present scope of these programs are being studied, looking among other things at use of the Apollo spacecraft for other earth-orbital and lunar missions.

Second, those modifications of in-development hardware which appear logical are being examined. Apollo, for example, is capable of very long earth-orbit missions if sufficient modification is provided.

Finally, studies are being carried on of those manned mission concepts which would require major new development areas.

The President noted that studies of future mission possibilities fall into three broad areas—earth-orbital, lunar, and planetary operations. He pointed out that in the area of lunar operations, possible activities identified beyond the basic Apollo mission include: exploration of the lunar surface in detail from lunar orbit or on the surface; establishment of semipermanent or permanent bases and outposts for observations of the universe; and use of the resources of the moon itself. In the area of planetary operations, mission analyses are being conducted to define an exploration program and to specify the early research and development needed for later systems.

In regard to launch vehicles, the President noted that it may be possible to provide even greater payload capability for the advanced

missions by uprating the Saturn I-B and Saturn V in a number of ways. In addition, there is study of the possibility that newer and more powerful launch vehicles may have to be developed for some of the advanced missions under consideration.

The President's future look at manned missions is a sensible one and an approach that the industry can support. Backed up by the interest he and his Vice President have recently displayed, it bodes well for U.S. goals in space.

Hard Choices at the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, for several months, the General Assembly of the United Nations has been in the throes of a crisis. This crisis is financial as well as political in nature, and it has disrupted the operations of the Assembly.

A very clear and cogent explanation of the difficulties confronting the United Nations at this juncture of its history was given on February 27 of this year by Mr. Joseph J. Sisco, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, at the Dallas Regional Foreign Policy Conference at Southern Methodist University.

In his speech, Mr. Sisco presented the current disability of the United Nations General Assembly in the perspective of the continuing effort of mankind, working through international arrangements to advance the cause of peace, and justice, and order in the world. He also pointed out that while the General Assembly has thus far refused to face up to its current problem, the failure to resolve the constitutional issue confronting the organization has not rendered the U.N. impotent—that, as a matter of fact, the Security Council has been very active last year, that the peacekeeping operations of the U.N. continue, and that the great work of economic, social, and technical improvement carried on by the U.N. and its specialized agencies has not been disrupted.

But Mr. Sisco did not stop there. He went on to outline the issues involved in the constitutional crisis of the U.N. and the position of the U.S. Government with respect to those issues.

Mr. Speaker, because the subject matter of Mr. Sisco's speech is so timely, and because his presentation is of high quality, I believe that the membership of the House will be interested in the full text of the speech. For this reason, I have received unanimous consent for Mr. Sisco's speech to be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

HARD CHOICES AT THE U.N.

I happen to be married to a Texan and I find she appreciates plain talk. So do I. So I am going to do some plain talking about the U.N. here today.

For weeks the newspapers have been reporting on the latest crisis at the U.N. Just last week the 114-nation General Assembly adjourned until September without dealing with its annual agenda—an agenda loaded with new issues and hardy perennials. The news weeklies and cartoonists have had time to size up the situation and again raise the question: Will the U.N. survive?

This is not the first time this question has been asked in the 20-year history of the United Nations. And it won't be the last. Just the other night, for example, I was checking something in the 1948 volume of "United States and World Affairs," published annually by the Council on Foreign Affairs. Chapter 10 was entitled "Crisis at the U.N." That was after the first 2 years of the life of the organization.

Since then the United Nations has been sanctified and buried more times than any institution in history. Somehow we Americans seem to have an affinity for characterizing problems as crises. At the same time, we tend to expect each problem and crisis to be resolved by some single convulsive act—a summit meeting—some kind of a showdown with a yes-or-no, fish-or-cut-bait answer. We tend to expect the U.N. to usher in perpetual peace or collapse to the ground. We oversold the U.N. at its birth; and today we tend to underestimate its resilience and adaptability as it faces new problems.

But usually the world doesn't work that way. The showdown doesn't necessarily come. The fish-or-cut-bait situation does not too often arise. We keep saying that this or that situation can't continue any longer—and somehow it manages to continue for quite a bit longer. The U.N. neither rises to heights of greatness nor crumbles to ashes. In other words, it's a political organization.

In the past 20 years the United Nations has faced a whole series of external and internal crises. It is a reflection of our times. In one way or another, it has survived them all. And in the process we have learned that neither the U.N. nor any other instrument of diplomacy can provide a quickie answer to our international problems. The job of peace is a hard day-by-day nuts and bolts process that requires patience and prudence, firmness and resolve.

None of this is meant to deprecate the fact that the United Nations is, in fact, in the throes of a constitutional crisis. Critical decisions lie ahead for the United Nations. The mere fact that it has survived crises in the past does not in itself prove that the present issue will be resolved in a satisfactory way.

Obviously the United Nations could falter—could slip back on the road toward a workable system of world order which we and most of the members have been trying to construct out of the concepts and principles of the charter and out of the institutional framework if established. This would not be in our national interest. So plain talk requires us to say that the United Nations is once again in trouble.

NOT A LIFE-OR-DEATH ISSUE

But the point I want to make here is that the present crisis at the United Nations is not presently and need not be a life-or-death affair for the Organization.

Twenty years after World War I the League of Nations was dead. Twenty years after World War II the U.N. is in difficulty but from from dead.

I believe we have learned the lesson of the failure of the League of Nations. But it is well to remind ourselves that this lesson must be constantly relearned—it must be nurtured by the day-to-day effectiveness of the Organization or the U.N. may well become less relevant to our times.

The disability at the U.N. today is in the General Assembly. The Assembly is an important but by no means all of the Organization.

The Security Council, which the charter says is the "primary" organ for dealing with peace and security problems, is still functioning. As a matter of fact, the Council had one of its busiest years in the life of the U.N. in 1964. In those 12 months, it had over 100 meetings, about 1 for every 3 days in the year.

It successfully organized the difficult peacekeeping operation in Cyprus. As a result, we have avoided, for the time being at least, a direct military confrontation between two of our closest NATO allies, Greece and Turkey.

The Security Council gave the Secretary General a mandate to assist the United Kingdom and Yemen to resolve their differences over the Yemen-Aden border.

It sent a commission to look into the Cambodian-South Vietnam situation.

It recently called for a stop to outside interference in the Congo and is trying to help promote a peaceful solution there.

It let some steam out of the Kashmir dispute and the question of apartheid in South Africa by handling two new rounds in these bitter disputes.

Meanwhile, those U.N. soldiers of peace in the blue berets are on duty right now between warring ethnic communities in Cyprus—and on the truce line in the Gaza Strip—and on the borders between Israel and its Arab neighbors—and in Kashmir between India and Pakistan—and on the armistice line at the 38th parallel in Korea. These important field operations of the U.N. remain largely unaffected by the U.N. crisis. And we can all sleep more securely tonight because they are there.

What's more, about 80 percent of all the personnel of the U.N. and its affiliated agencies are working in the economic and social and technical fields in a range of specialized agencies and commissions and projects in over a hundred countries and territories.

Many of these agencies are deeply involved in the long-term task of helping the lesser developed nations move toward modern societies—by surveying resources, developing teaching skills, and transferring technology and know-how in agriculture, fishing, industry, transportation, public health, education, administration and other fields.

And still others are engaged in operations and regulatory work which is either done at the international level or not at all—like creating safety standards for international aviation and allocating radio frequencies for international use—like the global elimination of malaria and the design of a world weather watch.

However, the General Assembly sorts out its present problems, these extensive parts of the United Nations system are going on without interruption.

In an interdependent world in which peace—politically, economically and socially—is indivisible, such activities continue to serve the national interest of the United States. An inactive Assembly does not mean the end of such activities.

So in plain fact the United Nations is not dead. And its demise is not in our interest.

What, then, is going on?

A PERIOD OF PAUSE

On the surface, the crisis in the United Nations is about money. But only on the surface. Arrearages up to $133 million, of which the Soviet Union owes $62 million, are nothing to be sneezed at.

But the issue is primarily political. It's been our view, not entirely shared by a number of other U.N. members, that the issue is not primarily between the Soviet Union and the United States. It is an issue between the Soviet Union, France, and a few other countries on one side, and the rest of the members who have shared a general view about world order and the role of the United Nations in creating and sustaining a system of world order.

At first blush the problem is as simple as this:

One: The Charter says in perfectly plain language, in Article 17, that "the expenses of the organization shall be borne by the Members as apportioned by the General Assembly".

Two: The charter says in perfectly plain language in article 19 that any member more than 2 years in arrears in its assessments "shall have no vote in the General Assembly."

Three: For several years the Soviet Union has refused to pay for the Middle East or the Congo peacekeeping operations. Later the Soviets said they did not have to pay because peacekeeping expenses are not proper expenses of the organization and therefore the Assembly does not have the authority to levy assessments to pay for them. Thus they raised a constitutional issue—a question of law.

Four: This constitutional question was put to the constitutional court of the United Nations—the International Court of Justice: the question was asked whether costs of peacekeeping in the Middle East and the Congo were "expenses of the organization" within the meaning of the article 17 of the Charter? The Court said yes: these peacekeeping expenses are expenses of the organization within the meaning of the Charter.

Five: By an overwhelming majority, the General Assembly formally accepted the opinion of the Court—thus explicitly making the statement of law the policy of the Assembly as well.

Most members who were within the reach of article 19 accepted this and paid up their back assessments—or at least enough to remove them from the penalty of losing their votes in the Assembly. But not the Soviet bloc, France, and a very few others.

It was up to the General Assembly to decide whether to apply the loss of vote sanction of article 19 against the delinquents or whether to abandon the sanction and thus undermine the authority of its own assessment function.

Yet this is precisely what the General Assembly declined to do. The General Assembly decided not to decide—at least for the time being.

Clearly the General Assembly did face a fork in the road. If the Assembly moved down one branch and applied article 19 to the delinquents, two major powers might get up and walk out of the Assembly with unforeseeable consequences and possible damage to the organization. Looking down this road, it seems fair to say that a number of members did not like what they saw ahead.

If the Assembly moved down the other road and set aside article 19 to allow the delinquents to vote, this would undermine its assessment authority. Looking down this road, it seems fair to say that most members did not like what they saw in that direction either.

It was a disagreeable, hard choice, like so many in international politics today. No one interested in the future of the Assembly could face it with any relish.

The Assembly could not bring itself to make a choice. It neither applied article 19 nor relinquished it. It was neither willing to enforce the concept of collective financial responsibility in practice nor abandon it in principle. While the Assembly retains its residual right under the charter to organize and finance peacekeeping operations, it has not been willing to date to force two major powers to pay for peacekeeping operations which these powers disapprove. It did what limited business it could without taking a vote. Then it decided to put the Assembly on ice for the time being—to recess, to buy more time for further negotiations.

So, the plain fact is that there is now a period of pause in the affairs of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

A pause is not a retreat—nor yet an advance. It is time—time that has to be used well if it is not going to work against the building of an effective, operational United Nations. What Emerson said about saving money can be adapted to the pause in the U.N.'s affairs: "Economy does not consist in saving the coal, but in using the time while it burns."

SOME HARD DECISIONS ABOUT CONFLICTING PRINCIPLES

Yet the issue remains. Some time has been gained to work on the critical constitutional and financial problems but the shape of the problem is unchanged.

Both sides of this dispute insist that they stand on principle. And this is important to understand because the conflicting principles involved stem from conflicting views about the United Nations—which is to say conflicting views about the elements of international order.

The U.S. view is that the Charter of the United Nations is a treaty obligation and affords the framework for an evolving system of international law and order which should be upheld and expanded by custom and by extension as world conditions permit. Our view is that while the Security Council is the primary organ for keeping the peace, this overriding duty of the Organization must not be limited to occasions when unanimity prevails among the five major powers and that the General Assembly therefore must be free to exercise its residual rights in the peacekeeping field in emergency situations when the Security Council is unable to act because of the veto. In our view, the charter did not intend to have the veto inhibit voluntary peacekeeping operations of the kind of the U.N. undertook in the Congo and in the Middle East—where troops were supplied by members voluntarily and deployed on the territory of a member with its consent.

Our view is that the road to a workable system of world order is lined with international institutions with independent executive capacities for carrying out operations authorized by their memberships according to their own agreed procedures. Our view is that in any healthy international institution all the members must be willing to apply the ground rules—whatever they may be—consistently and impartially to all.

The Soviet view is, and has been, quite different. It contends the United Nations should act to keep the peace only when the five major powers agree on what to do and how to do it and how to pay for it; that the Security Council therefore has exclusive authority in the peacekeeping field, that the function of the General Assembly should be limited to the role of static conference machinery; and that the rest of the U.N. system should do very little by way of operational programs or acquire executive capacity.

For 20 years the United States and the Soviet Union and the United Nations and its members have been able, one way or another, to live with conflicting views and conflicting principles about the proper role of international organization in creating and maintaining a system of world order. The issue has been circumvented or submerged or put off during all this time; now it has been joined in a serious way.

If there was only one principle involved, it wouldn't be such a difficult problem—but then it wouldn't be world politics either. But there is another problem—how to reconcile the almost sacred principle of one nation, one vote with the earthly reality of vastly unequal resources and responsibility for what happens in the world. As a prominent statesman from a small country said recently, "arithmetic power must not be mistaken for actual power."

The United States is continuing throughout the entire U.N. system to seek ways to assure that the major supporters have a comparable voice in the management of its operations, whether they are political or economic in nature.

We have suggested, for example, that a finance committee be established by the Assembly on which the major resource contributors would have a greater proportionate representation than they have in the Assembly as a whole. Under this plan, the Assembly could decide how to apportion expenses for future U.N. peacekeeping operations only upon the recommendation of this committee.

The Soviets have been unwilling to accept this. They continue to insist on the Security Council's exclusive role. We cannot accept this negation of the Assembly's power. The Assembly's escape hatch must be available if the Council is hamstrung by the Soviet veto. On the contrary, our aim is not to cancel the Assembly's power but to work for procedures which will promote the must responsible exercise of that power.

For this reason, also, we welcome the action recently taken by the Assembly which encourages the new U.N. trade machinery, whose job will be to deal the trade problems of the less-developed countries, to proceed by conciliation rather than by voting on issues dividing advanced newly emergent countries.

If used in good faith, this procedure should further the interests of both the advanced and developing countries. For the resolutions of the new trade machinery will be recommendations only. And it serves nobody's interest to pass resolutions by a majority of less-developed countries addressed to a defeated minority with the real economic power which is not prepared to carry them out.

So in plain fact the U.N. is faced with a double constitutional problem. One involves the principle of collective financial responsibility. The other is an apportionment problem: how nations with highly unequal capabilities for dealing with world problems can effectively work together on those problems on the basis of sovereign equality.

In any event, the General Assembly cannot stand for ever—or for long—at this complex intersection looking at the road signs. Perhaps negotiations will show the road to take. For its part, our Government stands ready—as it has for months—to work toward an acceptable solution of the issue.

THE UNITED NATIONS IN TRANSITION

This rather painful but professionally fascinating exercise is forcing a lot of people to think hard about the system of world order we have been trying to create—about the role of the United Nations and the meaning of its Charter—and about how well this organization has served the fundamental aims of our foreign policy as it was rushed into the danger spots to put the lid on explosive conflicts, as it has begun to work at the job of knitting together the developed and underdeveloped areas of the world in constructive and common enterprise, as it has performed essential international functions in an age made international by our science and technology.

And as we ponder all this, let us remember that the United Nations system of agencies, like national societies and institutions, inevitably is caught up in a process of transition—the main question being the direction in which it is going to evolve in the near future.

Remember, if you will, that the United Nations has taken on unprecedented tasks—and that many of them represent the most difficult and intractable problems which the world has inherited over centuries of less than perfect management.

Remember, if you will, that the United Nations and its family of agencies has for 20

years been in the process of very rapid and sustained growth—an experience which often leads to periods of pause for reassessment and adjustment.

Remember, too, that the United Nations includes within its membership an extremely disparate range of societies—disparate in power and wealth—in size and experience—in political, social, and economic systems—in cultural heritage and the value systems by which they live. This is inevitable in a near universal organization and it just makes life that much more difficult in it.

Finally, remember that this organization is not a world government. It is an organization of governments participating by consent. It can move forward only as fast as its members want it to move. It can move only in the direction in which its members want it to move.

So the plainest thing I can say to you about the United Nations is that it is in another crisis; that the stakes are important; that the General Assembly is now in a period of self-imposed pause; that hard choices may still have to be made between conflicting principles; that the organization is somehow involved in a process of transition; and that we cannot know at this point how fast or in what direction it will move in the near future but the pace and the direction will be limited and controlled by a will of its members.

It is too early to draw any stark conclusions. Both the overzealous admirers and critics of the U.N. tend to state their conclusions in boldface type. One group regards any criticism of the U.N. as desecration of a religious shrine; the other never fails to point out the yawning chasm between aspirations and accomplishments. Neither group looks at the U.N. for what it is—a reflection of a turbulent and divided world, an arena for the interplay of national power and national interests.

We have been the firmest supporters of the United Nations because, whatever its weaknesses, it has promoted our interests and the cause of peace. Two world wars, I hope, have taught all of us that world organization is a vital imperative. Peace—political, economic, and social—is too interconnected to do away with international machinery. The problems are worldwide. They require a worldwide attack.

Our influence in the U.N. will be exerted on the side of steady progress within the framework of the charter—under a single set of ground rules impartially applied—by reasonably orderly procedures—and in the direction of workable agencies with reliable capacity to act; for this is the way to promote and protect our national interests, to move toward world order and the world peace which President Johnson has characterized as the "assignment of the century."

A Great Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1965, a young constituent of mine, Pfc. James Rory Cook, U.S. Marine Corps, died tragically at the young age of 19 as result of an automobile accident near North Tarrytown, N.Y., and is now buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

On January 6, 1965, he had graduated from the U.S. Marine Corps boot camp at Parris Island, S.C., where he was a member of an honor platoon and had qualified as an expert marksman, and also had been promoted to the rank of private first class.

His parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Cook, and his sister, Rua Cook, all of 31 Bayside Avenue, Port Washington, N.Y., were justifiably proud of this young marine, who had determined to dedicate his entire career to the service of his country with the Marine Corps. On the day of graduation from boot camp he said to his parents:

> I have learned something of great importance in the Marine Corps * * * unless you are willing to try 100 percent, you might as well not try at all.

Rory tried 100 percent. He gave of himself completely as his short-lived record as a marine indicates only too well.

Rory resided in the Third Congressional District of New York for 12 years. He graduated with the class of 1963 of the Paul D. Schreiber High School in Port Washington, where he was a member of the varsity lacrosse team.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to extend my deepest heartfelt sympathy to Mr. and Mrs. Cook and family on this great loss they and the Marine Corps have suffered.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Agnes E. Meyer, Author and Humanitarian, Is Honored by National Conference of Christians and Jews at 16th Annual Brotherhood Dinner—Ambassador Adlai Stevenson Lauds Recipient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer is one of these rare individuals who has combined talent, energy, and purpose in a lifetime of service to her fellow man. She has campaigned for better education, for young people, for women's rights, for improved labor practices and enlightened management programs, and against ignorance and ill-health, which contribute to poverty. She remains a forthright fighter for a wholesome way of life for all Americans.

In her own words, Agnes E. Meyer states her philosophy:

Democracy is not only service, action, brotherhood—it is spirit—spirit free, indefinable, all pervasive, that holds us to its revelations even when we seek to escape them.

Mr. President, last night it was my privilege to be present at the 16th annual brotherhood dinner of the Washington region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, honoring Mrs. Meyer for her significant efforts in the field of human relations. In recognition of her militant career of crusading she was awarded a citation which reads as follows:

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS ACCLAIMS AGNES E. MEYER

For her great service to her community and her Nation.

For her passionate devotion to truth, morality, and justice.

For her love of freedom, her bravery, her dedication to order and her purposefulness.

For her hard work, tolerance, and unremitting effort to reconcile opposing views.

For her realistic belief in the influence of the public schools of the country as one of the most important assets of a democratic society.

For her tenacious faith in the value of the individual and in the power of organized human efforts.

For her love of God above all else, and for a spirit freed from prejudice as guide to life and human relationships.

LEWIS WEBSTER JONES,
President.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *March 10, 1965.*

The Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, paid tribute to Mrs. Meyer and presented her with the NCCJ national award. In commending Mrs. Meyer, Ambassador Stevenson said:

It is fitting that she should be honored by this group which believes as she does, that "ethics has its roots in man's relation to the universe, that morality comes into being through honest, clear cut human relationships, and cannot endure unless it is reflected in the pattern of daily life."

Perhaps that is why Eleanor Roosevelt—another fearless, tireless, and incorrupted spirit—and Agnes Meyer respected and admired each other so much.

Dinner chairman, Lewellyn A. Jennings, presided over this memorable event held at the Sheraton Park Hotel, and attended by more than 1,300 persons. The national anthem led by Walter F. McArdle. The invocation was given by Dr. Duncan Howlett, pastor, All Souls' Unitarian Church, and the benediction by Dr. Charles E. Berger, rector, All Saints' Episcopal Church.

Also in attendance at the banquet were: the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Earl Warren and Associate Justices William O. Douglas and Potter Stewart, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, members of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Government officials, clergy, educators, and business and civic leaders.

The National Conference of Christians and Jews is an organization comprised of religiously motivated people "seeking through education and discussion to promote civic cooperation and mutual understanding among men of good will of all religious and ethnic groups without compromise of religious beliefs."

Mr. President, in America, unity and nonconformity are not in conflict. We here are unified in certain fundamental goals and aspirations. Yet every one of us is either a nonconformist or a descendant of nonconformists. And every one of us, whether Catholic, Jew, or Protestant, is, in this sense, a child of the Reformation. For the Reformation is not merely a former era in history. It continues in America and flowers daily through the principle of the absolute inviolability of the individual conscience.

This principle offers no hazard to national or religious unity. For just as all streams flow to the ocean, and all waters are ultimately mingled in the eternal cycles of the ocean, sun, sky, and rain, so also are the individual expressions of faith united in the contemplation and worship of a supreme being and in the acknowledgement of the brotherhood of all men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the remarks by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson and Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer at the 16th Annual Brotherhood Dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY HON. ADLAI E. STEVENSON, AGNES MEYER TESTIMONIAL DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 10, 1965

Robert Benchley once said:

"There may be said to be two classes of people in the world: Those who constantly divide the people of the world into two classes, and those who do not."

I might be tempted to divide the world into two classes—Agnes Meyer, and the rest of us, but I know she would not like it, for her entire life has been proof of what one person can do to create a better society for one class, her fellow man.

In her autobiography she quotes St. Paul: "I have learned in whatsoever state I am therewith to be content. I know both how to be abased and I know how to abound."

I suspect that there are few who could match the abundance of her interests and knowledge.

For who could simultaneously write a book on Chinese art, translate Thomas Mann from German, and raise a large family.

During the war she walked where lesser mortals feared to tread in searching out and exposing racketeering and corruption wherever it occurred on the vast domestic front. Always her concern has been the fulfillment of the lives of individual men and women. She has been untiring in her pursuit of better education long before most of us realized that the quality of our education must be raised to meet the challenges science has set before us.

It is fitting that she should be honored by this group which believes as she does, that "ethics has its roots in man's relation to the universe, that morality comes into being through honest clear-cut human relationships, and cannot endure unless it is reflected in the pattern of daily life."

Perhaps that is why Eleanor Roosevelt—another fearless, tireless and incorrupted spirit—and Agnes Meyer respected and admired each other so much.

And perhaps, in passing, I had better pause a moment to note that once more the death of the U.N. is being widely reported, and to tell you that, as in the past, these reports are highly exaggerated.

The simple truth is that as long as the world is in crisis, the U.N. will be in crisis. That's what it is there for. As long as there is global tension—and there surely is—there will be tension at the U.N. When it ceases to reflect the troubles of the world, you can then start worrying about its demise.

The latest crisis at the U.N. over peacekeeping is a perfect example of this. The only reason this conflict arose is because the U.N. has been doing not too little, but, perhaps, too much—at least in the eyes of some members, of which the United States is not one.

I understand some of you are going from here to a gathering commemorating International Cooperation Year—I hope you will believe that this is not a meaningless phrase, but an attempt to bring into the limelight that great substrata of the work of the United Nations which goes its quiet and bloodless way to better the lives of mankind throughout the world.

I do not consider this a digression, for few here know better than Agnes Meyer the heat engendered in many quarters in an attempt to bring light into the world. She has withstood the heat of a turbulent century, and brought light in many dark corners.

EXCERPTS FROM "A CALL FOR LAW AND ORDER"—REMARKS BY MRS. AGNES E. MEYER UPON ACCEPTING THE NATIONAL AWARD OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 10, 1965

No freedom is more precious than religious freedom; so also no work of the Supreme Court is nobler than its concern that though there shall be no "establishment" of religion, there must be free exercise of religion.

I accepted the great honor you have done me, because I am convinced that the greatest single service your interfaith organization can render the Nation today is to educate the mind and conscience of our Nation as to the importance of the decisions which the Supreme Court has made for the past 20 years or more on the separation of church and state.

Most of the vociferous enemies of the Court have not even read its decisions on the meaning of the first amendment which have been handed down for the past 25 years—nor can they have studied the last notable judicial pronouncements in the Murray Schempp case on school prayer and Bible reading.

This is the great difficulty which the Supreme Court confronts in this emotional and irrational era, that the majority of Americans respond to its historical and lucid explanations of the importance and significance of the first amendment without having studied its pronouncements. They react like the fellow who said, "Don't give me any facts. I've made up my mind."

The National Conference of Christians and Jews is presented with a solemn responsibility if you are seriously interested in furthering the stability of our social structure and mutual understanding between our numerous religious sects. If more thinking people merely read the opinion of the Court in the Murray Schempp case as rendered by Mr. Justice Clark, a Presbyterian, and the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Brennan, a Catholic, much of the careless abuse heaped upon our highest Court would disappear.

I suggest concentrating your efforts on publicizing these two decisions because that of Mr. Justice Clark gives a history of the first amendment beginning with its roots in our colonial era when Roger Williams fought for religious liberty and the revolutionary era when the great words of Madison and Jefferson came to be incorporated not only in the Federal Constitution but subsequently in most of our State constitutions. Thereafter Justice Clark outlines the principal decisions on the subject for the past hundred years quoting paragraphs from many of the most salient decisions made by distinguished members of the Court in the past.

Mr. Justice Brennan in his concurring decision supplements the historical approach of Justice Clark in many important ways. He meets tactfully the argument whether the architects of the first amendment understood the prohibition against "any law respecting an establishment of religion" to teach devotional exercises in the public schools. Instead of getting embroiled in the question of what Madison and Jefferson had in mind, he states, "A more fruitful inquiry is whether the practices (Bible reading and prayers) here challenged threaten those consequences which the framers deeply feared, whether in short they tend to promote that type of interdependence between religion and state which the first amendment was designed to prevent." "Our task," he says, "is to translate the majestic generalities of the Bill of Rights, conceived as part of the pattern of liberal government in the 18th century, into concrete restraints on officials dealing with the problems of the 20th century."

The two major opinions by Justices Clark and Brennan taken together are a masterly and comprehensive review of the whole problem as to why church and state must be kept apart by a "wall of separation." They are indeed statesmanlike utterances of the first magnitude with which all Americans interested in the national welfare should be acquainted.

I feel justified in asking the National Conference of Christians and Jews to give widespread publicity to these historical documents because they are as truly a protection of religious liberty as they are a protection of the State from religious domination. Mr. Justice Brennan makes very clear, "What the Court has consistently sought to expound are the religious guarantees of the first amendment." Thus an interfaith group such as yours should have a primary interest in making this clear to your coreligionists and to the American people as a whole.

Address by Gloria Jean Winfield on the Presentation of the 23d Annual Bellamy Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of an address delivered by Miss Gloria Jean Winfield, a student at Pantego High School, Pantego, N.C., in my congressional district, at the presentation of the 23d annual Bellamy Award to Wausau Senior High School in Wisconsin. Pantego High School was the recipient of the 15th annual Bellamy Award.

ADDRESS BY MISS GLORIA JEAN WINFIELD, PANTEGO HIGH SCHOOL, PANTEGO, N.C.

I bring you greetings from my native State, North Carolina, and my school, Pantego High School.

Pantego is the infant in our family of Bellamy Award schools with an enrollment this year of 166. Pantego High was established in 1876 as a boarding school called "Ye Olde Academie." Each year the senior class publishes our yearbook named in its honor. Last year's graduating class of 22 was the smallest in the history of the school. This year's class will be the largest with approximately 52 graduates.

Our school is very proud of its record in sports. We have won the county basketball tournament for six out of eight years and have entered State competition twice. We bought our third trophy case this year to hold our district runner-up trophy. Our girls lost their 1st game after 55 wins, Pantego also has a fine baseball team. We do not show interest in football due to the danger involved in this sport. Last year, along with Pantego's sports interest, we had a representative from Pantego High to win the Beaufort County Tournament Beauty Contest.

Pantego is located in a crescent of history and active present in the eastern part of the State. Roanoke Island is the birthplace of the first white child born in America and the present site of the "Lost Colony," a drama depicting our Nation's first settlement by the English. In New Bern, first colonial capital of North Carolina, is beautiful Tryon's Palace, an authentic 18th century restoration. The palace was burned in a patriotic revolt against Governor Tryon's reign. One of our greatest inventions was tested and successfully flown on our coast. I am speaking of the flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright at Kitty Hawk. The tallest lighthouse on the Atlantic coast is located at Cape Hatteras. The pirate "Blackbeard" roamed the waters of our coast and left evidence in historic Bath. This is only an introduction to the heritage of our part of the State of North Carolina.

Now, to you, Wausau Senior High School, recipient of the 23d annual Bellamy Award, go heartiest congratulations from North Carolina and your baby sister, Pantego High School.

Debtors Lead Dollar Raid on Dwindling U.S. Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, from the March 10, 1965, issue of the Nashville Banner, entitled "Debtors Lead Dollar Raid on Dwindling U.S. Gold."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILL FREELOADING THEM—DEBTORS LEAD DOLLAR RAID ON DWINDLING U.S. GOLD

Scatter the chickenfeed around in an area unfenced and your neighbor's fowls will make a run on it. That is bad enough, and expensive enough, even when you have plenty. It is worse when your supply nears the vanishing point; and still worse when you suddenly remember that you set him up in the chicken business in the first place.

Monetary gold reserves are not chickenfeed, and it isn't poultry scratching there. It is the aggregation of freeloader nations, presenting dollars they have accumulated to exchange for gold from a dwindling U.S. reserve.

France is one of them. The prospect is that before the end of this year the De Gaulle government will have cashed out $800 million. And five other of the European Common Market countries indicate an intention of following suit. Let's see; that would include Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, and West Germany, if the trend were ECM-wide.

We have been, so to speak, feeding these chickens. They are among the more than 100 nations to which our "foreign aid"—in excess of $100 billion—has gone.

Further, as this newspaper has pointed out a number of times, at least three of them owe the United States unpaid debts from money lent them in World War I. France alone owes us in excess of $6 billion in those accounts—to say nothing of the additional billions advanced to put her back in business after World War II.

By present estimate the Italian debt, still unpaid after almost 50 years, runs to $2.245 billion, and that of Belgium to $665 million.

Nevertheless, De Gaulle has been cashing out his dollars and is leading the pack with gestures of cashing out more.

Total debts owed the United States, from Warld War I to and through World War II, run to $37 billion. If they were paid, troubles of the dollar would disappear overnight, and the gold flow now draining America's reserves to the peril point would be reversed.

It is estimated that between these six countries they hold more than $13 billion in gold, much of it derived from us; compared with something under $15 billion remaining in our stockpile—the bulk of the latter already hypothecated.

Still, if you examine the foreign aid prospectus for the present year and the coming fiscal year, you will find they are down on the list for more handouts.

That doesn't make sense in any particular; and it makes even less sense, if possible, to go on cashing dollars with no reference whatever to the debts on which they are in default.

Why not present them a dun? Why not take them off the freeloader list?

When you're down to the bottom of the chickenfeed barrel, it is in order to do some fencing.

It also is in order to make some desperately needed fiscal policy repairs at home—for retrenchment to salvage both gold and the sagging dollar. The opposite of that would be continued squanderbund as a Federal way of life, expanding the gap between income and outgo, perpetual deficit, and worsening inflation.

Coordination of Farm Programs With Wildlife Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the morning of March 8, members of the Minnesota congressional delegation enjoyed a very special treat at a breakfast sponsored by the Minnesota Conservation Federation headed by Mr. Emil Wiese, Lakefield, Minn., who is the very able, dedicated president of the organization.

Attending the conference with Mr. Wiese were other conservation leaders from Minnesota including Mr. Shields, the director of game and fish, and Mr. Maynard Nelson, biologist, Minnesota Conservation Department, and Jim Kimball, formerly with the Minnesota Conservation Department and presently associated with the Minneapolis papers.

Oftentimes, we are faced with many perplexing problems, and at this time one that all Minnesota sportsmen must recognize is the constant decline of our pheasant population. Sportsmen's clubs in meeting after meeting have been trying to find remedies to combat this problem, sometimes with little result, but we keep searching.

This breakfast meeting under the sponsorship of Emil Wiese and the Minnestota Conservation Federation presented a plan that has without doubt boundless potential and certainly a sensible and likely answer to the problem we face.

Farm folks actively improving their land resources have constantly intensely cultivated their land and little cover remains for nesting. As pointed out by Mr. Wiese, there appears to be a great area of possibilities in proper coordination of conservation objectives for game cover with the farm program.

Under farm programs with land retirement features, compliance provisions could easily be outlined that would contribute greatly to cover, particularly if planting and mowing practices were geared to hatching seasons and more particularly, if long rangeland retirement with legume cover crops were to be encouraged.

Mr. Wiese and his group should be highly complimented for their efforts, and I wish the Members of Congress to be advised of this proposal. We need to have these things in mind when farm legislation is being considered.

I place the Federation proposed Resolution 18A in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

PROPOSED RESOLUTION 18A: IMPROVED COVER CROPS ON DIVERTED ACRES

(Submitted by Minnesota Conservation Federation, January 15, 1965)

Whereas fertile soils are essential to the well-being of our people; and

Whereas agricultural land retired from production under the feed grain program during the past 4 years has commonly lacked ground cover of the quality needed to enrich the soil and protect it from erosion; and

Whereas the pheasant is the most important upland game bird in the Midwest; and,

Whereas research has demonstrated that good quality nesting cover is the primary need of pheasants in the intensively farmed regions of the Midwest; and

Whereas the steady decline in acreages of small grains and other grassy types of cover since the 1940's has resulted in a decline in pheasant hatching success and pheasant numbers; and

Whereas improved ground cover on diverted acres would serve a dual purpose by enriching and protecting the soil while at the same time improving habitat for pheasants, cottontails, Hungarian partridges, and other wildlife, and quail and jackrabbits; and

Whereas legumes provide excellent perennial ground cover for enriching and protecting the soil and are also highly attractive to wildlife; and

Whereas a land retirement program based upon 2- to 4-year contracts would provide the greatest benefits to both agriculture and wildlife per dollar invested, and the total cost would be no larger: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved, That the Congress consider for endorsement one of the two following sets of regulations for land diverted under any Federal program of land retirement in the intensively farmed regions of the Midwest, beginning in 1966. Proposed specifications are presented for programs involving 2- to 4-year contracts with landowners and also for 1-year contracts, the first being preferred. Following are proposed specifications for a program based upon 2- to 4-year contracts with farm operators.

PREFERRED PROGRAM

First year

1. Diverted acres must have a cover crop of small grains, legumes or grasses. Established legumes or grasses may be put into the program without further planting.

2. New seedings must include small grains seeded at a rate of not less than 1½ bushels per acre and a perennial or a biennial cover crop consisting of legumes, grasses, or others of this nature.

3. It is recommended that small grain seed be of varieties that are of short or medium straw strength to reduce the danger of lodging.

4. Where alfalfa, red clover or sweet clover are planted the minimum seeding rate must be no less than 8 pounds per acre. Perennial grasses must be seeded at a rate no lower than the minimum rate recommended by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

5. Seeding must be completed by May 7 unless approval has been granted by the county committee of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for a 10-day period due to adverse weather or a family emergency.

6. Spraying to control noxious weeds is permitted whenever the need occurs.

7. Clipping is recommended only if shading by the nurse crop endangers the survival of the legume or grass or if weeds cannot be controlled by spraying. Clipping of the retired acres as a whole is not permitted prior to July 30. However, where scattered patches of noxious weeds are a problem, spot clipping may be done as needed.

8. The same payment per year be made to farmers as is now extent by the contract to cover the entire period.

Second and subsequent years

1. Clipping, if necessary to control noxious weeds, is permitted on the retired acres as a whole after July 30. However, where scattered patches of noxious weeds are a problem, spot slipping may be done as needed.

2. The cover crop may be plowed down any time after July 30 of the last contract year.

ALTERNATE PROGRAM

Following are recommendations in the event contracts of 2- to 4-year duration are not acceptable to the Congress and a program is adopted which provides for 1-year contracts.

1. Diverted acres must have a cover crop of small grains, legumes, or grasses. Established legumes or grasses may be put into the program without further planting.

2. New seedings must include small grains seeded at a rate of not less than 2 bushels per acre. In addition, legumes, grasses, and others of this nature may be seeded if desired.

3. Seeding must be completed by May 7 unless approval has been granted by the county committee of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for a 10-day grace period due to adverse weather or a family emergency.

4. Spraying to control noxious weeds is permitted whenever the need occurs.

5. Clipping is recommended only if shading by the nurse crop endangers the survival of the legume or grass or if weeds cannot be controlled by spraying. Clipping of the retired acres as a whole is not permitted prior to July 30. However, where scattered patches of noxious weeds are a problem, spot clipping may be done as needed.

Representative Powell, Education and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the New York Times, in its News of the Week section for February 28, 1965, published an article of interest, by Warren Weaver, Jr., concerning a colleague in the other House, Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. All of us are deeply concerned with the future of education in the United States, and, more specifically, with the results of the work done

by the House Labor and Education Committee, of which Representative POWELL is chairman. I recommend the article as a valuable insight for anyone who is interested in educational and labor matters in this country, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWELL: MAN AND IMAGE

(By Warren Weaver, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—ADAM CLAYTON POWELL is an ordained Baptist minister, a Congressman, a Negro, a civil rights agitator, a Harlem folk-hero, and a politician.

If the last of these roles has seemed to overshadow the others from time to time in the past 30 years, it is not surprising, for Mr. POWELL has proved himself one of the most adept contemporary employers of pressure, propaganda, and timing.

Even his public image as a politician has more than one side. Most New Yorkers outside his district tend to regard him as an irresponsible rogue careless of his Congressional duties and living high off public and parish. Yet in Washington, particularly in the last 2 or 3 years, he has begun to win a grudging respect from his colleagues for more serious performance.

TWO SIDES

The latest POWELL episode on Capitol Hill illuminates the 56-year-old New York City Democrat from both sides: at once unscrupulous in his manipulation of personal power, while galvanizing the effective congressional action when it suits his purpose. The story revolves around his role as chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee.

President Johnson had made approval of his $1.25 billion school aid bill a top priority item on his legislative calendar for the session. The measure was cleared by one of Mr. POWELL's subcommittees in record time, but then its progress through Congress ground to a sudden halt.

This happened because the committee chairman failed to call a meeting on the bill. This was no inadvertency, it soon become clear. Mr. POWELL felt that his labor committee budget was in some difficulty, that the $440,000 he had requested might be cut back in an effort to trim the chairman's wings a little.

Mr. POWELL does not take kindly to trimming. He made it known that until he had the committee budget he wanted, the school aid bill would sit on dead center. And so it did, while President Johnson was described as deeply concerned about the absence of action.

Then last Wednesday afternoon, the House shouted approval of the Powell committee's appropriation—which, incidently, is almost twice as large as the year before—and the Congressman promptly announced, without the least embarrassment, that he would get the President's education bill moving again and at once.

He called the full committee into session on Thursday and Friday, with the announced goal of completing action in an unusual Saturday session to push the bill to the House floor as rapidly as possible.

Taken all together, it was an illuminating example of Mr. POWELL in operation—using personal power with the greatest assurance to achieve an end he considered important, without the slightest concern for what others might regard as improper methods.

The incident also illustrates what many Congressmen see as one of the Representative's chief redeeming virtues: his ability to run the committee efficiently, processing large amounts of significant and complicated legislation—except, of course, when a tactical slowdown suits his purpose.

As a Member of the House, Mr. POWELL is mercurial to the extreme. For weeks, even months, his name and face may vanish from the news and the corridors, then, suddenly has dramatically reemerged in the center of a bitter controversy.

Except for his periodic sorties into the spotlight, Mr. POWELL is a secretive man. He does not list either a Washington or a New York address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and is totally inaccessible after dark. In response to telephone calls, his Capitol Hill staff regularly pleads a complete ignorance of whether their employer is even in the city.

GOOD HOST

On the rare occasion when a reporter corners Mr. POWELL in his office, he is graciousness personified. Proffering cigars and drinks, he fairly boils over with facts about city legislation, civil rights, and the New York political scene. He is a congenial exagerator and not all his news tips hold up, but he can be a very informative man.

The most common criticism that his colleagues have of Mr. POWELL is that he has given the House a bad name. A frankly flamboyant figure, he has attracted national attention by his absenteeism, wild charges on the floor, and junketing abroad at public expense.

The standard POWELL reply is that he has never engaged in any activities that were not common among white Congressmen.

He is certainly the most articulate voice of Negro rights on Capitol Hill, although the outspoken harshness of his judgments have, on occasion, provoked some of his nonsouthern colleagues and probably hurt rather than advanced his cause.

His powers of elocution have won unabashed admiration, even from his detractors. When he made a floor speech on his long entanglements with the libel laws recently, about 50 of his colleagues stayed on in the Chamber in the late afternoon to listen, an unusual tribute even if tinged with curiosity.

Mr. POWELL renders services to his constituents in the broad and dramatic rather than small and unobtrusive way. He is not one of those Congressmen who keep their district happy by answering all letters, mailing out Federal publications, arranging emergency leave for servicemen, and getting sons into West Point.

WITH A FLOURISH

But when a major Federal grant is made in Harlem its Congressman makes the announcement and with a flourish. When a new Federal program, such as the antipoverty campaign, is under discussion he either obtains substantial commitments for his district in advance or makes loud angry public noises until the commitments are finally made.

Over the years, Mr. POWELL has spent less and less time in his district. His wife and principal residence are in Puerto Rico. During 2 years of libel litigation, he has only been able to visit New York City on Sundays, preaching in the Abyssinian Baptist Church, when he was free from process servers.

His political power in Harlem has remained strong, however, but not because of the traditional sort of big-city Democratic ward organization. He doesn't have any real core of active political professionals working at home; what he has is a popularity among the voters that enables him to withstand any challenge.

His reputation in his district goes back to the depression when he headed the welfare program of his father's church. It was built through the thirties and forties by his militant leadership of boycotts and picket lines aimed at opening up jobs for Negroes.

Last fall, he virtually did not campaign at all and won handily. Although his personal popularity may have edged past its peak, Harlem political leaders do not see any possibility of his being defeated in the foreseeable future. Whatever his failing, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL'S people are not about to desert him, and Congress may as well adjust itself to the fact.

A Bill To Permit an Orderly Changeover to the ZIP Code System of Addressing Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I introduced yesterday a bill which will permit a more orderly changeover to the ZIP code system of addressing mail desired by our very able Postmaster General John A. Gronouski. Along with other Members of Congress, I have been receiving letters from mailers who contend that the Department is moving too quickly on this service. From all I can gather, the more than one-quarter of a million bulk third-class permit holders will find it very difficult—if not impossible—to add ZIP code numbers to all their address plates by January 1, 1967, the date on which the Postmaster General has made ZIP coding a mandatory requirement.

The bill I have introduced is identical to that introduced by our colleague, ARNOLD OLSEN, of Montana, H.R. 5180. I am also informed that a similar bill has been introduced by Congressman JOHN LINDSAY, of New York. These bills will become the subject of public hearings before the House Post Office Committee beginning March 24.

Our colleague, ARNOLD OLSEN, is anxious that every interested citizen have an opportunity to testify. There is a good chance that his subcommittee will go to other cities to gather testimony. I heartily recommend that this be done. Every citizen is affected by the postal service and will welcome the appearance of the subcommittee in his own community. I would recommend that the subcommittee include a Texas city in its itinerary.

There is undoubtedly a need for the use of five-digit numbers as a part of the address on U.S. mail. But the transition to such a revolutionary principle should be accomplished in a judicious way. The cost of conversion is great. Mailers will be far better able to amortize their costs over a 5-year period. The bills which Congressmen OLSEN and LINDSAY and I have introduced will provide incentives in the form of rate reductions for those mailers who voluntarily ZIP code and presort their mail. I think we should be ever aware that as private mailers undertake the task of presorting the mail—a function always performed by postal employees in the past—there will be a reduction in the post office work force. I am not certain

whether it is desirable to take these jobs away from our loyal postal clerks by forcing private mailers to perform the mail sorting function. I would be hopeful that the postal unions will let us have their views on this subject.

If it is inevitable that the American postal system is to become computerized, we must be extremely cautious that automation will not outlaw the human factor. There is no substitute for the loyal postman. More often than not, he is the closest link citizens have with their Government. He should not be replaced by a machine.

I am hopeful that the Postmaster General will withdraw the regulation which would require the sacking of certain bulk second- and third-class mail by ZIP code sectional centers beginning July 1 of this year. Merchants and business firms which use the mails to conduct their affairs simply are not ready for this complex requirement. Mr. Gronouski should withhold all orders of this kind until Congress has had a chance to gather and weigh evidence.

Snuffboxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, since snuffboxes and the quality of the snuff, as it used to be found in the Senate, has been the subject of some discussion in and out of the press, and since our old friend and former colleague, Ralph Flanders, was the Senate's foremost expert on snuffboxes and the quality of the snuff, in order to try to clear up the situation—although probably it never can be cleared up satisfactorily to everyone—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column which appears in News and Notes, a publication of the Vermont Historical Society, issue of March 1965, the title of which is "Not up to Snuff."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT UP TO SNUFF

As reported in a recent Washington newspaper the furnishings of the U.S. Senate Chamber includes two snuffboxes. It appears that the last user thereof was none other than our former Senator, Ralph E. Flanders. That gentleman, after 7 years' absence, returned to the Senate, not to view any legislation but to check on the snuffboxes. He was mortified to find that the snuff was not fresh but dry and old. Feeling that the Senate Members had drifted away from more elegant habits, he stomped out declaring, "Tradition is tradition."

This note was contributed by tongue-in-cheek Charles Morrissey of the J. F. Kennedy Library. The above is substantially the version by Mr. George Dixon in the Washington Post. Below is the episode as recounted by Senator Flanders in a letter to Mr. Dixon:

"DEAR FRIEND DIXON: I was much amused by your reference to the snuffboxes and myself in your Saturday column. It seems to me that you ought to know a little more of the history of this subject which until now has been kept a secret from the west side of the aisle of the Senate Chamber.

"After I had been in the Senate long enough to feel at home, the thought occurred to me that all new Republican Senators should be ceremonially indoctrinated with the principles of the Founding Fathers. What better ceremony could be devised than that of taking snuff as they did so habitually? With this thought in mind I led each new arriving Republican Senator to the snuffbox and with him took a ceremonial pinch of the nose-tickling stuff, at the same time ceremonially impressing on him the duty of following the principles of those for whom the stuff was originally provided.

"Indoctrination was successful in every case except one. Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, refused to sneeze. No matter how much snuff he sniffed he either would not or could not sneeze. Just what this means doctrinally I have never been able to find out. Physically it is unique.

"When I left I draped the shoulders of Senator Keating with the mantle of freshman Republican indoctrination but learned to my sorrow that he had not at all times and with all candidates fulfilled his responsibilities. He, alas, no longer is to be seen on the Senate floor except as a privileged ex-Senator like myself.

"This is the full story of the senatorial snuffboxes so far as I am concerned, though you are right in saying that I insisted on the material being kept fresh and snuffable.

"Sincerely yours,

"RALPH E. FLANDERS."

Why Are We in Southeast Asia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have just received an editorial from Mr. Harry F. Guggenheim, president and publisher of Newsday, one of the Nation's leading dailies, which I should like to call to the attention of this august body. Newsday's position is in consonance with mine and I am happy to see the leadership they have displayed in bringing our aims in southeast Asia to the attention of the people of Long Island.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial:

WHY ARE WE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA?

Recently a highly respected and patriotic Senator, ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, said: "All of southeast Asia is not worth the life of one American boy." The life of an American boy is precious; so is the life of any boy the world over.

From the beginning of time animals, including humans, have destroyed each other. The futility of such destruction is apparent, especially to such enlightened human beings as Senator GRUENING. He, however, qualifies his position by implying that there may be places where Americans should fight—but not in southeast Asia. There are some who believe that life is so precious that it must never be subjected to loss in battle. Others believe that there is one cause worth fighting for, and that is to preserve existence as freemen. Most Americans are willing and ready to fight for their freedom.

Are we fighting for freedom in Vietnam? The world today is half slave under the tyranny of dominating war lords preaching communism. It is free only in the democracies of free enterprise. The material and spiritual wealth of the world lies outside communism's domain.

The dictators who dominate the lands of communism exhort and drive their people to plunder the free world. They want to communize the entire world—"a demand by the sick that the healthy be cured." Khrushchev once said: "We shall bury you." China's Mao holds: "There is no such thing as peaceful coexistence."

Assuming that Communist world leaders would destroy us if they could, how does that justify our fighting in Vietnam 8,000 miles from our homeland?

To preserve our continental United States we need allies and strong military bases for our survival. We have protection for our Atlantic coast washed by a great ocean whose waters join us with our allies in the free world. Our Pacific coast is washed by waters joined to our enemies of the Communist world. In these waters we have strong advance island bases and allies for the protection of the Pacific frontier. Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Japan, and Nationalist China are at our side. Their goodwill and their lands are available for our common defenses.

The Future of Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, problems facing the west coast lumber industry were analyzed in an article published in the monthly review of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco. Although our domestic lumber industry is faced with severe competitive pressures, the Federal Reserve bank analysis does not discount its future prospects for growth and expansion. The article emphasizes that efficient elements in the western lumber industry promise to maintain a healthy position, through better utilization and increased processing of timber.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LUMBER: OUT ON A LIMB?

The West long has been the dominant lumber-producing region in the Nation. Nowhere in the world is there concentrated on such a relatively small area of forest land such a rich reservoir of old-growth timber. Yet, despite its wealth in raw material and its strong production record, the western lumber industry has faced a number of severe challenges over the last decade. Beset by strong and growing competition from other producers (foreign and domestic) and from other building materials (wood and nonwood), the industry has seen prices fall, employment decline, and hundreds of small mills go out of business. But current efforts to improve lumber's position—along with the trend toward greater integration with the pulp and paper and plywood industries—offer hope that the western forest products complex will yet reach new heights of production

and profit. (The lumber industry, the sector emphasized in the following discussion, is composed of those firms engaged in converting logs into rough and finished lumber.)

FROM MAINE TO PUGET SOUND

The birth of the western lumber industry came on the heels of the eastern industry's decline. Lumbering grew up with the country, naturally reaching its first peak of activity in the populous colonies along the Atlantic coast (particularly Maine) and then spreading inward as settlements moved back from the coastline. By 1870, the Lake States (with Michigan in the forefront) replaced the Northeast as the leading producing region.

Yet, by the turn of the century, Great Lakes lumbermen had almost depleted the stands in that region and had begun searching for new forest reserves. The Southern States constituted the next obvious target for development, but lumbermen also began to turn toward the vast frontiers of virgin timber in the Pacific Northwest. Of course, they had heard about big stands of timber that would cut 300,000 feet to the tree, but they had set them aside as bunkhouse myths. But one look was sufficient to dispel the myths, and soon the lumbering families whose names had become famous in Maine and in the Saginaw and on the upper Mississippi were establishing saw and planing mills on Puget Sound, in Grays Harbor, and along the Columbia River.

The Census of 1910 impressively demonstrated the rising importance of both the South and the West. But while the South's relative position has since declined, the West has achieved a position of dominance. Twelfth District States, which accounted for 17 percent of a record national production of 45 billion board feet in 1910, raised their share to 55 percent of total production of 33 billion board feet in 1962. (The western industry is a softwoods industry; in fact, district States accounted for over 68 percent of the Nation's softwoods production in 1962.)

The relative positions of the major producing States shifted after the region's rise to prominence. In 1938, Oregon moved ahead of Washington to become the Nation's leading producer; today, it accounts for nearly one-fourth of the industry's total output. California surpassed Washington during the 1940's to become the second highest producer, and it presently accounts for about 15 percent of national production. Washington's output has declined drastically over the past quarter-century, so that it now supplies only 11 percent of the national total. Idaho, meanwhile, has moved steadily up to fourth position, with about 5 percent of the total.

TIMBER AND MORE TIMBER

The district's dominant position, not only as a producer of lumber but as a producer of other forest products as well, is based on its great reservoir of virgin timber. Although the region embraces only 17 percent, or some 87,250 acres, of total U.S. commercial forest land, it holds 55 percent of the Nation's total footage of sawtimber. The heaviest part of this stand is located in Oregon and Washington, which in themselves contain 35 percent of the Nation's sawtimber—primarily in the Douglas-fir region west of the Cascade Mountains and the ponderosa pine region east of the Cascades.

This heavy density of sawtimber is attributable to the concentration of old-growth timber in district States. The mammoth size of western trees, in turn, helps the regional industry utilize larger sawmills and more modern equipment than are in operation elsewhere. In 1962, about 72 percent of western production was supplied by 373 mills, each producing 15 million board feet or more. In the East, a similar percentage of output was supplied by 30,300 mills, each producing less than 5 million board feet annually.

On the other hand, a substantial part of the district's sawtimber is not immediately available for conversion into forest products because of forest management policies. Almost 60 percent of the forest area is owned and managed by the Federal Government, about 5 percent by State and local jurisdictions, and most of the remainder by commercial forest interests. Much of the publicly owned timberland is operated on a sustained-yield basis, in which the annual allowable harvest and sale of timber is limited to an amount roughly equivalent to the annual growth. Thus, a more or less even flow of timber is available for marketing from public lands each year.

PROBLEMS IN BUNYAN LAND

On the basis of that resource foundation, western lumbermen have amassed a substantial record of growth, but their record nonetheless has masked a number of problems that have arisen in the last decade. During the first 50 years of its history, the district lumber industry registered tremendous gains in production—gains which contrasted markedly with the one-fifth decline in national production during that period. But district production later began to taper off; in fact, despite the record level achieved in 1959, annual district output in the last half decade has failed to exceed the 18 billion board feet average recorded in the preceding 5-year period. This performance, and declining output elsewhere, depressed national output by 10 percent over the decade, to 34 billion board feet in 1963. (Lumber output and consumption both increased in 1964, but still remained below most earlier postwar peaks.)

This disappointing production record has reflected postwar developments in the residential construction field. Housing, after all, normally accounts for 40 percent of lumber consumption, while other construction accounts for almost as great a share of the total.

As construction rose in the early postwar period to meet the pent-up housing demand, the number of nonfarm starts rose to 1.4 million in 1950—50 percent above the peak rate attained in the 1920's—and lumber consumption rose correspondingly. But in 1963, when housing starts rose to a new peak of 1.6 million, lumber consumption remained below all its earlier postwar peaks.

Part of the explanation for this sluggishness lies in the changing character of the housing market. In particular, the quantity of lumber consumed at a given level of construction has been declining because of the increasing importance of multifamily dwelling units—which utilize only about one-third as much lumber per unit as single-family dwellings—and because of the increasing use of substitute materials for lumber. To aggravate the situation, the decline in consumption of domestically produced lumber has been even more severe than the decline in total consumption because of the rising portion of the market supplied by foreign (mostly Canadian) producers. Over the last dozen years, imports have risen steadily from 5 to 16 percent of the market, and consumption of domestic lumber in 1963 consequently was 14 percent below the 1950 level and 10 percent less than in 1959. Prices meanwhile have reflected these downward pressures; in 1963, the wholesale price index for lumber stood 3 percent below its 1951 level and 6 percent below the 1959 figure.

NEW HOUSING, NEW MATERIALS

The extensive displacement of lumber by substitute materials undoubtedly has become a crucial problem. Plywood, hardboard, particleboard, insulation board, and certain paperboards—along with nonwood products such as metals, plastics, and brick—compete with softwood in many of its important uses. The contrast between the trend in lumber production and the trend in these other sheet materials dramatically illustrates the changing product mix. While lumber production declined 9 percent between 1950 and 1963, softwood plywood shot up by an explosive 272 percent, hardboard by 157 percent, and insulating board by 23 percent.

Lumber has declined in the forest products mix despite an improvement in its price position relative to all of its major competitors except plywood. Substantial production increases and consequent downward price pressures have been evident in the plywood industry—and have contributed to plywood's inroads into lumber's traditional markets. This price situation, however, has been unique. Prices of construction materials generally have moved upward; such competing materials as structural steel, brick, portland cement, building board, gypsum products, and metal sash all have risen relative to lumber.

Obviously, then, raw material prices alone cannot fully explain lumber's displacement. Comparative costs of installation also have been an important consideration. Most notably, lumber has found it difficult to compete in view of the labor savings made possible by plywood, gypsum board, sheetrock, and other sheet materials for wall sheathing and subflooring.

Noncost considerations have also played an important part in lumber's competitive problems. Other industries have tended to develop stronger programs in the fields of research, development, trade promotion, and marketing. For one reason, lumber is far less concentrated than any other major industry—its 20 largest firms account for a smaller share of total shipments than the top 4 in each of the other major industrial categories—and thus it encounters difficulties in marshaling resources for developmental and promotional work.

For the same reason, lumber enterprises are commonly in no position to maintain large-scale research facilities. About half of the research undertaken today in lumber and lumber products is financed by a handful of large firms, and most of the remainder is spent by associations and the Federal Government. Firms engaged in producing plywood, pulp and paper, and various building boards have a much stronger record in research and development and in trade promotion, largely because of the very large size of a number of corporations in those competing fields.

CANADA RULES THE WAVES

Rising imports pose perhaps an even greater problem for the industry today. Lumber imports expanded fivefold between 1947 and 1963, and now account for almost 16 percent of the U.S. market. Canada has accounted for more than 95 percent of total imports over the past decade; the remainder, almost entirely pine, has come from Mexico and South America.

In recent years, this country has taken at least three-fourths of Canada's lumber exports. Since 1959, in fact, Canada has sold more south of the border than in its own home market. Most of these shipments have been common construction grades of spruce, Douglas-fir, and hemlock from the coastal and interior regions of British Columbia, which in effect are northern extensions of producing regions lying in the United States. For the most part, British Columbia producers are as favorably located with respect to U.S. markets as are their competitors in the Pacific Northwest.

One segment of the Canadian trade has grown extremely rapidly—waterborne shipments from British Columbia to the Atlantic Coast. These imports compete directly with water shipments from west coast mills. A decade ago, about three-quarters of this trade originated in Washington, Oregon, and

California, and about one-quarter in British Columbia; by 1963 these proportions were almost reversed. This significant turnabout can be traced to several cost disadvantages faced by district mills: first, substantially higher costs of loading and water transport; second, higher stumpage prices as a result of a complex timber-supply situation existing here; and third, a marketing disadvantage resulting from the devaluation of the Canadian dollar.

JONES ACT AND DEVALUATION

A major cost differential has developed on waterborne cargo shipments. Under provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920—the Jones Act—intercoastal shipments of U.S. lumber must move in American-flag vessels. Canadian lumber, on the other hand, may be shipped to this country in foreign-flag vessels—and, since 1957, charter rates paid by Canadians have been some $5.50 to $12 lower per thousand board feet than the conference rate established by domestic carriers. Moreover, loading charges for lumber at Pacific Northwest ports have recently run about $3 per thousand board feet higher than at British Columbia ports.

Domestic mills have also been hampered by the considerable premium which they must pay for public sawtimber. The supply of available public sawtimber in this country is less than half that in British Columbia; in addition, this supply is inelastic in that it is limited basically to the allowable cut and thus fails to respond to higher offered prices. Demand for public sawtimber meanwhile has risen rapidly, partly as a result of diminished private supplies and partly as a result of nonlumber utilization by other forest industries. Not surprisingly, then, domestic mills pay an average of $23 per thousand board feet of stumpage, while mills in British Columbia pay only one-third this amount.

The devaluation of the Canadian dollar has also stimulated lumber shipments into this country. The Canadian exchange rate, which declined from $1.04 to $0.95 between 1959 and early 1962, was eventually pegged at $0.925 in May 1962. This devaluation has meant a substantial drop in the price of Canadian lumber—a reduction of about $7 per thousand board feet of lumber, in terms of American dollars.

DECLINING INDUSTRY?

In sum, the housing market has shifted and domestic lumber has been increasingly displaced by competitive materials and Canadian imports. Consequently, the lumber industry's position in the Western economy has suffered a substantial decline. Between 1929 and 1947, for example, value added by sawmills and planing mills more than doubled in dollar terms, but the industry's share of total manufacturing value added still declined from 17 to 12 percent. Then, in the postwar period, the industrys position declined even more; in 1962, lumber accounted for only 3 percent of value added in manufacturing.

A similar decline has occurred in terms of employment. Between 1929 and 1962, the number of production workers in Western sawmills and planing mills dropped steadily from 129,000 to 68,000, thereby reducing the industry's contribution to total manufacturing employment from 25 to 6 percent.

The seriousness of the problem has varied from State to State. Front-running Oregon, for instance, has been able to cushion the decline by virtue of the diversification of its forest economy. Oregon ranks first in the Nation not only in lumber but also in logs, plywood, and particleboard; about two-thirds of the Nation's plywood and more than one-fourth of its hardboard emanate from this State. It stands high and is still climbing in the output of pulp and paper, poles and piling, fiberboard, and an imposing array of other forest products. The rapid expansion of other forest industries thus has been a tremendous boon to Oregon, to some extent offsetting the decline in her lumber industry. Between 1929 and 1962, Oregon's forest-products industries as a group increased their share of all manufacturing value added from 52 to 56 percent and increased their share of total employment from 55 to 58 percent, despite lumber's decline.

Washington's lumber industry meanwhile has suffered a more substantial decline. In 1929, the industry occupied about the same position in that State's economy as it did in Oregon, accounting for roughly half of all manufacturing value added and employment. By 1962, its share had receded to only 5 percent of value added and 10 percent of employment. Washington's plywood and pulp and paper industries grew in relative importance between 1929 and 1947, but each has since experienced a relative (although not absolute) decline. As a result, the contribution of all forest products industries to total value added in manufacturing dropped from 40 percent in 1947 to 20 percent in 1962.

The lumber decline has been felt in other district States also. In fourth-ranking Idaho, where lumbering ranks second only to agriculture and where lumber's share of total manufacturing value added still exceeds 30 percent, the impact has been widely felt. But in third-ranking California, where all forest products account only for 4 percent of manufacturing value added, the impact—while substantial—has been less widespread.

The western industry's adaptation to increasingly competitive market conditions has been marked by the elimination of smaller units and the increasing importance of larger, more efficient units. Between 1939 and 1947, the number of western sawmills jumped from 450 to 4,961, as small operators responded to higher prices resulting from the postwar housing demand for lumber and the removal of wartime price controls. But most of the newcomers failed to survive the postwar period.

Between 1947 and 1962, the total number of mills declined by more than one-half, to 2,214. Most of the dropouts were small mills producing less than 3 million board feet annually. In contrast, the number of mills with over 10 million board feet capacity actually increased, so that their share of the region's output rose from 66 to 81 percent. This drastic redistribution of production from small to larger, more modern, and more efficient mills reduced considerably the labor required for equivalent outputs of lumber, and it thus contributed substantially to the severity of the decline in mill employment compared with production.

ANOTHER PART OF THE FOREST

Looking towards the future, most observers anticipate an expansion in lumber production as well as other forest products to meet the needs of a larger and more affluent population.[1] One recent study—that of Guthrie and Armstrong—places national production in 1975 between 41 and 47 billion board feet, with Western production accounting for 28 billion board feet, or 40 percent more than in 1960.

Industry experts expect that expanding timber demand will result in increased stumpage prices, in higher lumber prices, and in continued substitution of competing materials. Lumber's competitive position can be protected to some extent, however, through expansion and revamping of existing facilities, expenditures for research and development, and massive advertising and field promotion. For example, lumber sizes and grades could be tailored to the requirements of the industrialized house, made from factory machined and fitted parts.

The possibilities of increasing the sale of northwest paper and paperboard in the western market are particularly promising, since this region (especially California) is deficient in its paper and board requirements and relies heavily on foreign imports. In one recent study, the West's consumption of paper and paperboard was projected to rise 85 percent between 1961 and 1975.[2] Prospects for pulp are somewhat less ebullient but still favorable. Western sales of pulp are made primarily to nonintegrated paper mills and converters in the Northeast and Lake States, with smaller amounts going to the Southern States and California. The Pacific Northwest pulp mills are at a competitive disadvantage compared with Canadian and southern mills, because of higher transportation costs to the principal centers of consumption. The prospects for increasing exports are considered favorable, however, particularly to such countries as Japan, Korea, and Australia.

Plywood, the forest industry which has shown the most spectacular recent growth—a fivefold gain since 1950—may not be able to sustain such a rapid pace in future years. Among other reasons, plywood's favorable price situation may not long continue, in view of upward pressures on the costs of peeler logs, labor, and equipment. On balance, however, plywood's future looks quite bright.

THE KEY TO GROWTH?

If the projected growth of these other forest industries is realized, lumber could face a tight supply squeeze. There need be no conflict, however, if the trend toward integration of lumber, pulp and paper, and plywood operations continues. "Integrated utilization," the use of a common log supply for producing two or more separate products, is part of the sweeping adjustment which the Western forest industries are undergoing to obtain economies in timber usage. In these operations, the plywood mills utilize high-grade Douglas-fir peelers, the sawmills obtain the bulk of the better grade logs, and pulp and paper mills utilize hemlock and other species, the smaller stems, and the residues from plywood and lumber mill operations.

The successful lumber mills of the future are likely to be characterized not only by integrated operations but also by better quality control, extensive use of chemical impregnation for preservation, and increased processing and finishing operations. In this way, the efficient elements in the western lumber industry promise to maintain a healthy position in the Nation's overall economy.

---

[1] John A. Guthrie and George R. Armstrong, "Western Forest Industry, an Economic Outlook" (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1961).

Stanford Research Institute, "America's Demand for Wood, 1925–75" (Washington: Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., 1954).

U.S. Forest Service, "Timber Resources for America's Future" (Washington: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Research Rept. No. 14, 1958).

[2] John A. Guthrie and William Julo, "Some Economic Aspects of the Pulp and Paper Industry." (Washington: Northwest Pulp and Paper Association, 1963).

Freedoms Foundation Honors Memphians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa.,

recently honored several individuals and institutions for their work on behalf of patriotism.

Many of those honored were from Memphis, and I am happy to call the attention of the House to their worthwhile efforts. In these days when overzealous flag waving is all too common among some of our citizens, it is good to see an emphasis on the historical perspective of our American way of life.

One of the truly great success stories of our times is the phenomenal growth of a Memphis-based chain of motels known as Holiday Inns. This great business enterprise started just a few years ago when two Memphis men—Kemmons Wilson and Wallace E. Johnson—had an idea and did something about it.

From their one motel in Memphis, the firm is now the largest of its type in the world.

Last year the president of the firm, Wallace Johnson, instituted a campaign throughout the motel chain to promote democracy. Since more than 50,000 guests spend an average of 12 hours in Holiday Inns each night, he had an opportunity to reach a huge audience through the firm's magazine.

Readers were asked to tell, in 50 words or less, just what freedom meant to them. The patriotic theme was carried out in the first prize—a trip to Washington, D.C.

The winning entry was written by Miss Mary Carr of Enid, Okla. She wrote:

To protect our freedoms, we must speak against injustice lest we lose the right of free speech, uphold the law lest we lose our rights under it, oppose violence lest we lose the right to assemble peaceably, and respect the beliefs of others lest we lose the right to believe as we wish.

For sponsoring this program Holiday Inns received a principal award in the general Americana category of the Freedoms Foundation competition.

Four Memphis schools were also honored. Manassas High School received a principal school award. George Washington Honor Medals were awarded to Carver High School, St. Agnes Academy, and Trezevant High School. The Daily News, Memphis newspaper of business and legal news, received an honor certificate award for its Law Day edition.

The Commercial Appeal had four members of its staff honored with George Washington Honor Medals. The award winners were Calvin Alley for his cartoon, "For the Love of God, Wake Up"; Barney Sellers, for a photograph entitled "Flag Care"; Robert Williams, for a photograph entitled "On His Mind"; and Guy Northrop, for an editorial entitled "The People, 1787–1964."

This fine editorial, published on the 177th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution, is just as timely today. I would like to recommend it to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

THE PEOPLE, 1787-1964

One hundred and seventy-seven years ago today the Constitution of the United States was signed. From its birth in agony it has led a life of struggle and pain. But the Constitution has survived.

The independence of the original American Colonies did not bring security. Economic and international problems were enormous. Governments of the individual States were threatened with insurrections.

But this country, like no other venturing out on the journey into nationhood, had great and wise men to lead it. They were men of fine education, men of means, men of vision and faith, and, most of all, men of almost limitless political skill.

Yet being wise men, with the wit to acknowledge human frailty, they saw the need for a government that could embrace persons of all the levels in society without, in the process, leveling them all. They constructed, therefore, a nation of law, not of men. They avoided the excesses of democracy by forming a republic. They carefully separated the powers of government into three divisions—legislative, executive, and judicial—and so limited the powers of each that it could not usurp the powers of the others.

Those men who signed the document on September 17, 1787, were not satisfied with it. Each of them had compromised his beliefs in some way. In secret session at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, they had argued and debated for 3½ months before reaching tenuous agreement.

Mere hours before the ceremony of signing, words and phrases were being rewritten.

But when all was said and done, the Delegates signed. In a message addressed to George Washington, President of the Convention, Dr. Benjamin Franklin spoke what must be represented the feeling of most of the Delegates.

"I confess," said Franklin, "there are several parts of this Constitution which I do not at present approve, but I am not sure I shall never approve them: For having lived long I have experienced many instances of being obliged by better information or fuller consideration, to change opinions even on important subjects, which I once thought right but found to be otherwise. In these sentiments, sir, I agree to this Constitution with all its faults, if they are such; because I think a general government necessary for us, and there is no form of government but what may be a blessing to the people if well administered * * * I doubt too whether any other convention we can obtain will be able to make a better Constitution."

In the autumn of that year 1787 General Washington wrote a letter to a friend in which he said: "The Constitution that is submitted (to the States for ratification) is not free from imperfections—but there are as few radical defects in it as could well be expected, considering the heterogeneous mass of which the Convention was composed, and the diversity of interests that are to be attended to. As a constitutional door is opened for future amendments and alterations, I think it would be wise in the people to accept what is offered to them."

So it was written, "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union."

Union was necessary. The Articles of Confederation had been too weak, too imperfect, to accomplish a national purpose. The 13 States were jealous of one another. The common men threatened to overthrow the men of estate who constituted the various State governments. These leaders, State loyalists all, drew together and built a rock on which to stand in strength.

By their signing of this Constitution 177 years ago a revolution was changed into a Federal Government. And because Federal power was feared by the very men who ordained it, they wrote into the Constitution the safeguards, the checks and balances, which have permitted it to survive years of attack, corrosion and erosion, a civil war, and human deceit.

This Constitution, a covenant among the various States, is the base on which stands the most powerful nation in the world today. True, its battles are not done. The struggle to centralize power and make men supreme over law goes on. But the Nation resists. The people fight back—because they have something to fight for.

The mighty pursuit of "a more perfect Union" has become a battle to preserve the original meaning and purpose of the Constitution, for its enemies are many and they reside in high places.

Like Washington, Franklin, Hamilton, Mason, Randolph, Morris, Pinckney, Paterson, Gerry, Dickinson, and the other Delegates who framed the Constitution, Americans today cry out loud and clear against the excesses which would destroy what made a nation.

In an urgent voice, the people insist on a Federal Government that rejects tyranny, and separates power. And this must be, to safeguard justice and tranquility, to provide common defense, to promote general welfare, and to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Eighteen Years of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in approaching the subject of new foreign aid authorizations and appropriations, it will be well for the Members of the House of Representatives to give close attention and due respect to the most thoughtful advice available. My attention has been called to a significant editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily News issue of Monday, February 22, 1965. I am inserting this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the hope that it will evoke the careful consideration of the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee as well as the entire House membership.

The editorial follows:

EIGHTEEN YEARS OF FOREIGN AID

Congress is about to get down to critical consideration of President Johnson's $3.4 billion foreign aid request. Listening to the mutterings around the world, one might almost conclude that whatever we proffer to our friends and neighbors will be accepted as insulting, demeaning, and bullying.

Item: In Uganda a jeering mob last week ripped the U.S. flag from the Embassy and tore it to shreds.

Item: In Kenya demonstrators milled through the streets with banners reading: "The best Yankee is a dead one."

Item: Tanzania charged the United States with being a bully and expelled two U.S. diplomats for subversive activities.

Item: A mob of 20,000 Indonesians tried to march on the U.S. Embassy in Djakarta. They burned President Johnson and Uncle Sam in effigy.

Item: Malagasy's President charged the United States with "stinginess and lack of foresight" in its aid program to Malagasy and other African states.

And this, of course, is not to mention President Nasser's recent invitation to take our aid and go jump in the lake, or for that matter little Panama's 1964 charge of aggression based partly on the fact that the United States had suspended its aid payments.

Perhaps the classic instance of the deflection of our assistance from its intended pur-

pose was cited recently by Senator FULBRIGHT, who pointed to the billion and more dollars sent South Vietnam as a "pretty horrible example" of foreign aid getting out of control and being squandered.

The evidence suggests overwhelmingly that a turning point is at hand in our role as universal benefactor; that after almost 18 years in that role, a comprehensive reexamination is in order.

The fact is the United States has bought neither friendship nor allegiance with its aid money—and our main mistake was probably in ever supposing that these were purchasable. We have reaped instead the instinctive resentment of debtors toward creditors, poor toward rich, plus the abiding suspicion that we were plotting (in the time-honored manner of white people) to enmesh them in some grand imperialistic scheme. Lately, a touch of frosting has been added to the cake: the habit-born attitude that helping the poorer nations was our duty and that we really had no choice in the matter.

Probably a good case can be made for this duty concept. But surely a parallel duty is to husband our strength and apply it for what we conceive to be in the best interests of the purposes we deem to be paramount.

One way of bringing this about, as suggested by FULBRIGHT, is to separate economic from military aid. The effectiveness of the latter can be best judged by the Defense Department; the Secretary of State is surely not the best judge of how many guns or bombing planes are needed in a given place at a given time.

As for economic aid, the Government might take a leaf from Hans J. Morgenthau's book. "Why should we not admit," he demands, "that American foreign policy has been generally hardheaded and practical, and at times ruthless?" That has been the way with all nations, and it is still the way. "As there are bums and beggars," he continues, "so are there bum and beggar nations." Why not treat them as such, doling out our aid when it will help achieve a specific objective, withholding our aid when there is scant prospect of such achievement, withdrawing our aid when that purpose is achieved?

Perhaps Morgenthau's philosophy would have precluded the Marshall plan itself, with its undeniably rich yield; perhaps not.

But the Marshall plan is long past, and the world has emerged into a new era of many rich nations and many poor ones, and of many currents of global policy running in many directions. The United States can still be imaginative and generous, aware that allies who serve us best are not necessarily those who slavishly follow our policies and example.

But we serve no good purpose by pouring money down a hundred global ratholes. We will serve a far better purpose by deciding in each case what we want to accomplish and whether, in normal course, it can be accomplished with what we're willing to spend. If that yardstick is applied to Mr. Johnson's current aid proposals, it may be just possible to lop a few hundred million off the barebones budget and still sacrifice nothing important.

Attacking the Problems of the Spanish-Speaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, during this time when we are making great strides toward the Great Society I feel that it is incumbent upon me to bring to the attention of this body the problems and the aspirations of the Spanish-speaking population in our country, not only because of my own heritage, but because as a Member of Congress it is my duty to be aware and cause others to be aware of all peoples throughout our land.

The U.S. Senate is blessed with having as a Member a man who symbolizes the pinnacle of success and achievement to the Spanish-speaking citizen in the United States. He is the Honorable JOSEPH M. MONTOYA.

Because of his keen awareness and ability to articulate about the need to attack the problems of the Spanish-speaking, I would like to share with you the remarks that Senator MONTOYA made before the San Francisco Press Club, Friday, March 5, 1965.

His remarks follow:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, BEFORE THE SAN FRANCISCO PRESS CLUB, FRIDAY, MARCH 5, 1965

Ladies and gentlemen; I am delighted to be here with you tonight in this beautiful old city with the beautiful Spanish name and Spanish traditions. It makes me feel at home.

I am grateful to the Spanish-Speaking Citizens' Foundation for inviting me to come and to tell you of some of the problems which beset your fellow Americans whose native tongue is Spanish.

The Citizens' Foundation has joined with similar groups throughout the Southwest in an effort to raise the cultural level and the standard of living of my fellow Spanish-speaking Americans, and I am delighted to lend their cause all the help that I can.

So let us put away the black cat for tonight because this is a story which needs to be told. You of the press, radio, and television can render a great service, for the Spanish-speaking citizens of this country are truly a forgotten minority.

The press can help us in our efforts by alerting the community at large to the need for uncovering the great human resources which are going to waste. Help us to help those of the Spanish tongue to stop eroding their talents.

The press has always taken up the cudgels for the underprivileged and the economically deprived. I hope that when I finish tonight, you will see that here is a cause which merits your crusading zeal.

Without your help, the work of the Spanish-Speaking Foundation cannot succeed. Without your help, they cannot rebuild the confidence of Spanish-speaking citizens nor will they be able to draw forth the new leaders who are so necessary for a harvest of better citizenship.

My purpose tonight is to outline some of the problems which beset the Spanish language minority in this country, and to suggest some solutions. Many of the solutions, I may add, are embodied in the program of your own citizens' foundation under the leadership of Judge Ames and President Sante.

Public recognition of the severe handicaps of the Spanish-speaking American minorities in this country is long overdue.

Just why the great problems of this group should be so invisible to the Anglo majority is an intriguing mystery which need not concern us too much here. Perhaps it is simply that we have always been here, and have blended too thoroughly into the landscape.

We of Spanish blood were settling New Mexico a generation before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock.

Every schoolboy in California knows your own great State was discovered by the Spaniard Cabrillo only 50 years after Columbus discovered America.

The historic debt of California—like every other State in the Southwest—to the early Spanish adventurers and settlers is shown in the place names which cover your State.

(And I must say in passing that I am pleased that the Spanish pronunciation has survived so well in California. No one here says San Joes, unless he has just arrived, and San Jacinto has never become San Jacinto.)

But in spite of all the manifestations of Spanish culture, the present-day Spanish-speaking American citizens of this region are the most disadvantaged minority to be found anywhere in the 50 States. Governor Brown has done a tremendous job in alleviating some of the conditions.

Let me describe the picture for you statistically.

First of all, this is primarily an urban problem. Like all other groups in the United States, the Spanish-speaking Americans are more and more becoming city dwellers, and that means that the major attack on their problems must be urban oriented. The 1960 census counted almost 3½ million Spanish and Mexican Americans in California, Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas.

Of that total, only about one-quarter lived in the countryside. The rest were classified as urban. California has the largest Spanish-speaking American population—1,426,000—and almost all of these people live in cities. Just a little over 200,000 are classified as rural.

Texas is close behind in the total, with 1,418,000, and surprising though it may seem, theirs is largely an urban population also.

Even my own State of New Mexico has more city dwelling Spanish-speaking Americans, 155,000 to 99,000, though as you can see the percentages are much closer to even.

An important indicator of the standard of living is housing, so let us examine some of the Census Bureau's housing statistics. In San Francisco, 10 percent of the Spanish-speaking Americans' housing was classed as "deteriorated," compared to 6.3 percent of that of the so-called Anglos.

In Santa Barbara, 35 percent was deteriorated, against 5 percent for the Anglos.

And so it goes, in city after city throughout the Southwest.

Most shocking are the statistics on educational attainment.

In Bakersfield, almost 36 percent of the Spanish-speaking population over 25 years of age has less than 4 years of schooling. Only 17 percent finished high school.

The figures are similar for Stockton, Fresno, El Paso, Galveston, and Pueblo, Colo.

Spanish-speaking Americans have less education than any other ethnic group. In Texas, 52 percent have less than a fourth grade education.

Here in California, a State which rightly claims one of the best educational systems in the country, one-fourth of your Spanish-speaking citizens have less than a fourth grade education.

Until very recently, there was little sign that the situation was improving.

Dropout rates were going up instead of down. In 1 year, from 1960 to 1961, the dropout rate at one high school in Los Angeles increased by 2½ percent—to the point where 20 percent of the youngsters were quitting school before they finished.

There are a number of reasons for this tragic educational picture, but the biggest one is language. We Spanish-speaking Americans are rightfully proud of our language, and most of us want to preserve it along with the rest of our Latin culture.

But there can be no doubt that it has created barriers which so far we have not been able to cross successfully.

Teachers don't understand how hard it is to try to learn both a new language and new ideas at the same time.

It has been an article of faith among most educators that there should be no other basic language in our schools but English. Many schools had rules against Spanish-speaking children speaking Spanish on the school grounds.

About 6 years ago, a woman social scientist named Margaret Clark did a remarkable study of the Spanish-speaking Americans in a section of San Jose known as Sal si Puedes.

And incidentally, if you don't think Spanish-speaking Americans have a sense of humor, let me translate Sal si Puedes:

It means, "Get out if you can."

In one section of the book she wrote about these people, Dr. Clark described the problems of a boy named Frank, a student in San Jose. It is so clear a picture of what can happen that I want to read it to you:

"During his first year in school, Frank had difficulties with English. He found it very hard to learn both a new language and the things his teacher tried to teach him.

"He spoke English fairly well at the end of his first year in school, but had not learned his lessons well enough to be passed to the second grade.

"Frank was discouraged * * *. Things and people and stories that Anglo children had learned about before they started to school, Frank knew nothing about it. It was a long time before he could figure out what a jack-o'-lantern was and what it had to do with the Feast of All Saints.

"Although Frank had heard his parents and grandparents discuss the way the holiday was celebrated in Mexico, never once had anyone mentioned a pumpkin cut to resemble a face.

"The American cultural tradition was so much a part of life for Frank's Anglo teacher and fellow students that they scarcely thought of it, but it was a vast store of knowledge that Frank had to learn slowly and by inference.

"But somehow he completed junior high school and entered James Lick High. Many of his friends had become discouraged and dropped out.

"In high school, Frank discovered for the first time what it meant to be a Mexican-American boy in a school society dominated by Anglo students and teachers. Anglo students of his age often drove cars, wore good clothes, had spending money, and were a year or two ahead of him in school.

"Now 16 and in his first year of high school, Frank wants nothing so much as to quit school and go to work. He see no future for him in school, and is not convinced that graduating from high school will help him to get a better job.

"It seems likely that this will be Frank's last year of formal schooling."

And so ends Dr. Clark's little story of one boy and his education.

I think she makes it very plain that the language barrier is at the root of Frank's problem. There are other factors, of course, but it began with language, the key to all understanding.

And at long last, our educational system is beginning to realize that people whose native tongue is Spanish cannot learn by the same methods as those who grow up speaking English.

English is now being taught in many schools in the first grade as a foreign language. As more and more teachers come to recognize the special problems of Spanish-speaking youngsters, I am sure the level of scholastic achievement by this group will also increase.

New Mexico is the one State in the Southwest which has always had a large number of teachers whose native language was Spanish, and the teaching of English is much easier there.

Another promising new approach to this problem was described in a recent issue of the Federal Office of Education's journal.

Maybe I shouldn't say new because the system was worked out during World War II to train translators, but it is only now sifting down to public education.

This is the system known as audiolingual, and the idea is simply this:

The Spanish-speaking youngster is first taught to speak English, not to write it. Audiolingists believe that language is first of all for spoken communication.

Once the student has mastered the spoken tongue, he can easily learn to read and write it.

As the author of this article points out, "The modern linguist does not reject the native tongue or dialect of his students. We should leave the student's language alone and teach him a second idiom as if it were a foreign tongue.

"But his native language is vitally important to him in maintaining social acceptability.

"Certain of our young men need to be able to communicate properly in the employment office without losing their status in the poolroom."

This story points up one of the most interesting things about Spanish-speaking Americans. I believe that we are unique among all the ethnic groups which make up this Nation in being able to preserve so much of our old ways.

Clinging exclusively to Spanish as our native tongue has been a disadvantage to us, as I have shown, but I believe that better times are head.

There is, I hope and believe, growing acceptance for the concept of a pluralistic society. I believe there is a chance that we Spanish-speaking Americans will be able to save the best from our old ways and blend it with the best from the Anglo way of life.

Earlier in this discussion, I singled out Texas as doing a particularly bad educational job among its Spanish-American youth.

Now I'd like to tell you the other side. Texas has developed what I believe is a really fresh approach to the problem of educating the children of migrant farmworkers.

Once again, we are talking largely about Spanish-speaking children.

Several districts in the Rio Grande Valley with large migrant populations are trying out this new system. Essentially, it proceeds on the theory that a short, crammed course is better than none at all.

Children get 9 months of school in 6 months. They start school at 8 and go until 5, from November to May, with no vacations.

Texas school officials admit that this is no solution to the problems of migrant workers—as such—but they feel they've found a way to give the children a chance. Mechanization of agriculture is increasing at a rapid rate, and "Today's migrant child will be tomorrow's displaced person because of mechanization unless something is done now."

Here on the west coast, there are many new programs planned or starting.

I can tell you that the Office of Economic Opportunity will soon make grants of over $1 million to local agencies in California and other States for new services to migrant workers. In addition to education, there will be programs for job retraining and better health.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is also having considerable success in its efforts to reverse the school dropout trend through the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs. The Stockton school district is sponsoring one such program.

One of the biggest programs of this kind in the country is in Los Angeles, where the Youth Opportunity Board was given a grant of $2.7 million to encourage the retraining and further education of disadvantaged teenage boys.

So you can see that we are making progress. Politically, Spanish-speaking Americans are finally awakening to the power of the ballot in asserting their rights.

My own State of New Mexico was for many years the only one where Spanish-speaking Americans had real political influence. But great strides have been made in both California and Texas in recent years.

Here in San Francisco, your citizen's foundation—and other groups, I am sure—are attacking the problems of the Spanish-speaking American on many fronts.

Night schools to teach English to adults have been established, and a free job service has been founded. The foundation is working with dropouts and in education of youth.

I commend their programs to your attention and your support. They are moving ahead in the finest tradition of American social action. With your support, they will show the way to a better life for many of your fellow citizens.

I thank you.

Need for Immigration Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the resolution on immigration, adopted by the National Lutheran Council at its 47th annual meeting, deserves the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives. It indicates a clear understanding of the need for immigration reform and the need for a law which is based on justice and humanitarianism, as well as a complete awarenesss of how the administration bill would attain those ends.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION

Whereas the National Lutheran Council has consistently expressed hope that Congress will establish immigration laws "just to all and ministering most truly to the public welfare," and

Whereas the National Lutheran Council has stated its "firm conviction that the existing immigration legislation has severe shortcomings, as a result of which neither traditional Christian humanitarianism nor enlightened self-interest are adequately exhibited," and has expressed hope that Congress will "seek a just and workable substitute for the national origins quota system," and

Whereas the statement "Immigration Policy: Moral Issues and the National Interest," endorsed by the National Lutheran Council at its meeting on February 4, 1960, commended for study and consideration the following five possible objectives as the basis of a revised U.S. immigration law:

1. To supply our permanent population with a steady proportion of newcomers who have chosen the United States as their new homeland and who can impart to their American neighbors an understanding of the cultures, attitudes, and interests of other races and peoples of the world.

2. To assume the U.S. proper share of international responsibility for the resettlement of refugees and of other persons urgently in need of the compassionate haven of a new homeland.

3. To facilitate the reuniting of families.

4. To facilitate the entry of persons possessing special skills or other capacities needed by the American economy and culture.

5. To admit annually a reasonable number of the persons described above on an objective basis of selection which, while discriminating, will not be discriminatory with respect to race, national origin, color, or religion, testifying thereby to the U.S. recognition of the interlocking and mutual interests of all nations with regard to the migration of people, the interaction of cultures and respect of universal human rights; and

Whereas the proposed legislation submitted to Congress by President Johnson on January 13, 1965, represents substantial progress toward the fulfillment of the basic hopes and objectives expressed in prior National Lutheran Council resolutions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Luthern Council reaffirm its concern for a fair and just immigration law, and express its hope that Congress will enact into law the principles and objectives contained in the President's proposal now before Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the congregations of the member bodies of the National Lutheran Council be encouraged to welcome immigrants into their fellowship and to assist them in continuing integration into community life.

House Joint Resolution 225, House Joint Resolution 226; Shevchenko, the Soviet Russian Empire, and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, each year in the month of March, Americans in communities throughout the Nation observe and celebrate the anniversary of the birth and death of Taras Shevchenko, the poet laureate of Ukraine, national hero, and an early world freedom fighter. This heroic figure and patriotic nationalist was born on March 9, 1814, and died on March 10, 1861. It is most fitting that we in America pay tribute to this living symbol of freedom and national independence on these significant anniversary dates.

SHEVCHENKO: SECOND STATUE OF LIBERTY

Ever since the erection of the Shevchenko statue in our Nation's Capital, as a second Statue of Liberty, most informed Americans are well aware of the powerful symbolism represented by this memorial. It will be recalled how colonialist Moscow hastily imitated our Congress in 1960 to honor Shevchenko by setting up a statue for him in Moscow, the capitol of Red imperio-colonialism, and how in June 1964 Khrushchev timed the unveiling before that of the freedom statue here, we had the Russians on a psychopolitical propaganda run. What's more, our Shevchenko statue is far more beautiful and impressive than the contrived Russian one, and the Ukrainian people themselves know it.

Mr. Speaker, the interest in this whole historic event has by no means subsided. On the contrary, it has been steadily on the increase since last year, particularly with reference to the captive nations and the book burning in the national library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev on May 24, 1964. The text of the inscription on the Shevchenko monument has been extensively quoted here and abroad and has inspired a tremendous interest in the plight of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

The text reads as follows:

Dedicated to the liberation, freedom, and independence of all captive nations this monument of Taras Shevchenko, 19th century Ukrainian poet and fighter for the independence of Ukraine and the freedom of all mankind, who under foreign Russian imperialist tyranny and colonial rule appealed for "The new and righteous law of Washington," was unveiled on June 27, 1964. This historic event commemorated the 150th anniversary of Shevchenko's birth. The memorial was authorized by the 86th Congress of the United States of America on August 31, 1960, and signed into Public Law 86–749 by Dwight D. Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States of America on September 13, 1960. The statue was erected by Americans of Ukrainian ancestry and friends.

ON OCCASION OF POHRUZHALSKY'S TRIAL

The unprecedented book burning that occurred in the National Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences last May is something we shall hear more and more about. A clandestine pamphlet, entitled "On Occasion of Pohruzhalsky's Trial," has circulated throughout the U.S.S.R., and a copy has recently reached these shores. It should serve to open the eyes of those who glibly talk about Khrushchev's liberalization in the U.S.S.R.

The pamphlet exposes the threats made by the Communist Party and police to students who planned to convene at the grave of Taras Shevchenko according to an annual custom. The ceremony near the grave did occur; 2 days later the disastrous book-burning took place. It also points out that "Russian chauvinism, like anti-Semitism, has been rehabilitated long ago in the colonial empire called the U.S.S.R." The pamphlet makes reference to two other fires in the national libraries of Turkestan, in Turkemenistan and Uzbekistan. The cost to the cultural treasures of these nations is incalculable.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 225, AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 226

Mr. Speaker, on the appropriate occasion I shall introduce the highly significant contents of this short pamphlet into the RECORD. What is so amazing is that so little, if anything, has been reported in the press about this apparently deliberate destruction of historical archives, rare books by classical Ukrainian writers, and other cultural riches. It is reported that some 600,000 invaluable books were destroyed.

These events are sufficient to underscore the need for a Shevchenko Freedom Library in our Library of Congress. Human culture will be served greatly by such a section in our library. House Joint Resolution 225, which I am sponsoring, calls for its establishment. I hope that this resolution, as well as House Joint Resolution 226, which seeks the creation of a captive nations freedom series of postage stamps in honor of national heroes of freedom, commencing with a Taras Shevchenko freedom stamp, will receive early consideration. On this March Scevchenko anniversary occasion, a no finer dedication of effort could be made than to realize the objectives of these resolutions.

Let's Unclutter Our Voting Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long been interested in the problems relating to voter registration and residency laws, I was very pleased to read an excellent article on this subject in the March issue of Solidarity. I would like to submit this fine essay by Frank Wallick of the UAW Citizenship Department for the benefit of my colleagues.

When we realize that one of five Americans old enough to vote did not do so in 1964, I believe it reveals that it is time this problem is resolved. I am preparing proposals based on an article which I recently wrote for the Michigan Law Review which I believe will greatly alleviate this problem.

The article follows:

LET'S UNCLUTTER OUR VOTING LAWS

(By Frank Wallick of the UAW Citizenship Department)

That landslide vote for President Johnson was wonderful—but not so wonderful are the many barricades which make registration and voting difficult for millions.

One of every five Americans old enough to vote did not vote in 1964—even though an amazing 70.6 million of us did so.

Is it because people are lazy or indifferent? Some conservative editorial writers have said so. But most of these critics of easy registration laws have never looked squarely at the facts to see how rough we make it on the average vote.

Take Italy, for instance. Over 92 percent of the people there voted at their last national election. Every citizen by virtue of his citizenship, is placed automatically on the voter registration list.

And Italian election day is held on a Sunday and continues over until Monday noon—so Italy puts everybody on the list and gives people more time to vote.

The record of almost every other Western democracy is the same. Where the laws are liberal, the voter turnout is high. Where laws are restrictive, voter turnout is poor.

Americans move around a lot. We are a growing nation. If you move from Michigan to Iowa in a presidential election year, you can lose your right to vote for everything from President on down.

Yet the U.S. Census figures show that 20 million adults changed their residence in 1961—nearly one of every five Americans in a single year. Most had their right to vote wiped out the minute the moving van pulled away from the house.

Is that fair? A Presidential Commission on Registration and Voting Participation says it isn't and proposes some 20 ideas to straighten it out.

Such things as making it easier to register. Sounds simple, but it isn't.

We live in the age of the shopping center and urban sprawl but our voting laws were written in the age of the streetcar and smalltown.

"It's easier to get a hunting or fishing license than it is to register to vote," says Roy Reuther, director of the UAW's Citizenship Department, a member of the Presidential commission and one of the Nation's experts on voter participation. He served as director of the AFL–CIO's registration program last year and drew praise for quarterbacking the registration of organized workers.

The American Heritage Foundation estimates that millions are kept from the polls on election day because local election laws are made deliberately restrictive.

If democracy is to work, voting laws should not be a partisan issue.

Nor should voting laws be as they are in Mississippi, weighted as to race.

In 1960, 68.8 million Americans voted while last year 70.6 million voted. But there were more Americans of voting age who should have voted. In fact, there was a 1.8 percentage drop in voter turnout last year from 4 years ago.

As our cities become more congested, if nothing is done to make voting easier, this picture will get worse despite all the noise we make about getting out to vote.

There are no major elections on the immediate horizon—so now's the time UAW members should get behind campaigns to have their State legislatures and city councils make democracy work: at the ballot box.

It's better than waiting, then finding out too late you're one of the newest victims of slipshod voting rules.

"Why I Love America," by Ed Gresham, Cub Scout Award Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1965, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, chairman of the Freedom Foundation Award, announced Ed Gresham, 10-year-old Cub Scout, a winner to receive the George Washington Honor Medal Award, for his essay on "Why I Love America." Ed is the only member of the Georgia-Carolina Council of Boy Scouts, with headquarters in Augusta, Ga., to receive the Freedom Foundation Award. He was chosen as council winner in competition that included the best patriotic thoughts from tens of thousands of Cubs, Scouts, and Explorers from every State as well as American Scouts in Europe and Asia. Presentation was made by Whitlaw Hunt, president of the Georgia-Carolina Council of Boy Scouts.

Only 9 years old at the time he submitted his essay, Ed, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Marion E. Gresham of Belvedere, S.C., wrote a 56-word statement.

With great pride, I ask that it be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHY I LOVE AMERICA

I love America because it is a beautiful and free land. It is all we would want. We are showing progress. We have good industry. We have laws based on the Constitution. We have a great history. We have the armed forces to protect us. I am proud of my country and I think any other person would also be.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the forensic talents and accomplishments of a very bright and able young man from Nashville, Tenn., Mr. John W. Preston.

Mr. Preston recently won statewide forensic competition among high school students from across Tennessee.

In addition, Mr. Preston placed first in the annual "I Speak for Democracy" contest sponsored by the Tennessee Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Preston is the very talented and able son of a talented and able father, Mr. Bill Preston, award-winning news photographer for the Nashville Tennessean.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place Mr. John Preston's prize-winning speech, "The Challenge of Citizenship," in the RECORD:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Bill Preston, of Nashville, Tenn.)

It has been said, that all nations and empires must rise and fall, live and die. Throughout all history the greatest of civilizations have fallen from the crest of wisdom and power to the depths of decay and degeneracy—the Egypt of the Pharoahs, Alexander and Macedonia that ruled the world, the culture and learning centers of Greece and Rome whose collapse plunged the world into the hideous dark ages, and more recently, Austria-Hungary and the Turkish empire. Yes, these occurences seem to bear out the fact that countries and people must rise and fall, but, it also raises the eternal question, why?

All these nations, in their years of conquest and in the height of their influence, power, and wisdom, lost a feeling; they lost their energy, they were supreme, no one really challenged them, they lay back and rested on past achievements.

It is said that in the year 1965 there is another such nation that is becoming weak and decadent, a nation that has lost its drive, its energy, and its sense of direction. You may know the Nation of which I speak, it is called the United States of America. It is the Nation where the people are the best clothed, the best fed, the best housed, and the best cared for when sick. It is the land where there are more automobiles and swimming pools, washing machines, and electric lamps. It is a nation that is militarily the strongest on earth. The people think they are not really challenged or crowded by their adversaries, and when any problems arise, the people say, "Just let some bureaucrat in Washington take care of them, or they will work themselves out, or so what."

It is the same as in Greece or Rome, in Egypt or Macedonia.

Some centuries ago as the philosopher Alcaeus said, "Not houses finely roofed or the stones of walls well builded, nay nor canals and dockyards make the city, but men able to use their opportunity." But once again the question is raised, Why? Why are these people of the United States so unaware and seemingly unconcerned about their decline. Are all of the citizens of America so laissez faire about their Nation's destiny?

No.

There are, in the United States, a great number of citizens that are concerned about and are willing to work for their country. But they do not.

Why?

Because they do not have a realistic plan of action.

What can be done?

How can it be done?

America has the tools for action, a democratic form of government, a large population, and a booming economic system. The only thing that is lacking is participation by each and every citizen to express his views on all matters of public responsibility.

Americans must engage in all decisions that shape policy, on the National, State, and local levels. They must promote the work of civic clubs and charitable organizations in their quest to end human suffering, Americans must give the greatest possible support to the education of our Nation's youth, and the furtherance of higher education, for as the late President John F. Kennedy said, "We must remember that liberty without learning is always in peril and learning without liberty is always in vain."

In short, all Americans must once more grasp for the starting spirit of our forebearers to meet the challenge of citizenship, and pray, in the words of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, "May we be worthy, of the unlimited opportunities that God has given us."

Do Not Free the Monsters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I would urge Members of this honorable body who have not already done so to sign the petition suggesting to the Federal Republic of Germany that a legal device not be permitted to give freedom to unpunished Nazi war criminals.

This rather unusual action, designed to encourage members of the German Parliament to carry through a bill to achieve this end, is warranted, I believe, by most unusual circumstances.

Reports are current that mass murderers wait patiently for the day when the statute of limitations will allow them to crawl out of their hiding places to taunt decency with their public presence.

Ordinarily, I believe in the end sought by the statute of limitations. But there is nothing ordinary about mass murder, about human torture, about degradation of human beings, about fiendish experiments conducted for sadistic pleasure.

All with a shred of decency must cry out for punishment for the fiends and monsters responsible.

As noted, unusual circumstances excuse unusual actions, and I wish to commend to others the action I have taken in signing the petition now being circulated among us.

Sixty-three Congressmen Urge Full Use of Federal Powers To Prevent Further Violence in Selma, Ala., and Call for Legislation Protecting the Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, 63 Members of the House of Representatives, 52 Democrats and 11 Republicans, joined on March 10, 1965, in sending a telegram to President Johnson urging him to use the full powers of his office to prevent further violence in Selma, Ala. The 63 Congressmen also supported additional legislation which will provide Federal remedies to those citizens of Alabama and elsewhere in America who are being denied the right to vote by discriminatory and arbitrary methods.

I am using this previously granted permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to express my great admiration and respect for these 63 colleagues—and the many other Members who have sent similar messages to the President—for expressing their feeling that the recent events in Selma, Ala., have been so serious that Federal action is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, if you will excuse me a certain amount of parochial pride, I would like to point out that all the members of the Michigan delegation, Democrats and Republicans, joined in a separate telegram to President Johnson urging the maximum use of Federal power to prevent further violence and to protect constitutional rights in Selma, Ala. I am particularly proud to serve with a State delegation that is so concerned about finally winning the struggle to achieve human dignity for every American citizen.

I also want to express my admiration for those Members who made such cogent and eloquent remarks here on the floor of the House about the responsibility of the Federal Government to protect Americans using their constitutional rights from the brutal use of power by local police officials. I noted with great interest that so many Members have pointed out that the events in Selma illustrated the critical need for Federal legislation authorizing Federal voting registrars in those areas where local officials refuse to register qualified American citizens. Many Members have also discussed the need to eliminate the use of literacy tests as a means of arbitrarily discriminating against Negro Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the telegram to President Johnson and the list of 63 Congressmen who signed it be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

We Members of the House of Representatives urge you to use the full powers of your office to prevent further violence in Selma, Ala., against Negro Americans striving to gain their right to register and vote who are relying on the first amendment's guarantee of "The right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the Government for redress of grievances."

We feel that local law and order has broken down in Selma, Ala., just as it did in Little Rock, Ark., on September 24, 1957, Oxford, Miss., on September 30, 1962, and various Alabama communities on June 11 and September 10, 1963, when two of your predecessors, one a Democrat and one a Republican, relied on their powers under sections 332, 333, 334, title 10, United States Code, to suppress domestic violence, unlawful combinations, conspiracies depriving American citizens of rights secured to them by the U.S. Constitution and Federal law.

The disgraceful and arbitrary exercise of the State police powers in Selma, Ala., on Sunday, March 8. 1965, dramatically demonstrated that State and local officials not only permitted but participated in an illegal and brutal suppression of a peaceful assembly by Negro citizens protesting the denial of their right to vote.

We feel confident that you will utilize all the resources of your office, both moral suasion and any Federal troops or marshals that might be needed, to remedy the violation of the Bill of Rights in Selma, Ala.

We further urge you to endorse additional legislation which will provide Federal remedies to those citizens of Alabama and elsewhere in America who are being denied their right to vote by discriminatory and arbitrary methods.

THOMAS S. ASHLEY, Democrat, of Ohio; JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, Democrat, of New York; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota; RICHARD BOLLING, Democrat, of Missouri; JOHN BRADEMAS, Democrat, of Indiana; GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., Democrat, of California; HUGH L. CAREY, Democrat, of New York; ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, Republican, of Michigan; JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire; RAYMOND F. CLEVENGER, Democrat, of Michigan; JEFFERY COHELAN, Democrat, of California; JOHN CONYERS, JR., Democrat, of Michigan; JAMES C. CORMAN, Democrat, of California; EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Democrat, of Connecticut; CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Democrat, of Michigan; JOHN C. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan.

JOHN G. DOW, Democrat, of New York; KEN W. DYAL, Democrat, of California; DON EDWARDS, Democrat, of California; LEONARD FARBSTEIN, Democrat, of New York; BILLIE S. FARNUM, Democrat, of Michigan; PAUL A. FINO, Republican, of New York; JACOB H. GILBERT, Democrat, of New York; EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon; SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican, of New York; JAMES HARVEY, Republican, of Michigan; AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, Democrat, of California; WAYNE L. HAYS, Democrat, of Ohio; FRANK J. HORTON, Republican, of New York; ANDREW JACOBS, JR., Democrat, of Indiana; ROBERT W. KASTERMEIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

PAUL J. KREBS, Democrat, of New Jersey; JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican, of New York; JOHN C. MACKIE, Democrat, of Michigan; RAY J. MADDEN, Democrat, of Indiana; RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of New York; ROBERT MCCLORY, Republican, of Illinois; CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., Republican, of Maryland; SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Democrat, of Hawaii; PATSY MINK, Democrat, of Hawaii; WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; F. BRADFORD MORSE, Republican, of Massachusetts; LUCIEN N. NEDZI, Democrat, of Michigan; ROBERT N. C. NIX, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; JAMES G. O'HARA, Democrat, of Michigan; THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Democrat, of Massachusetts; ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York.

OGDEN R. REID, Republican, of New York; JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, Democrat, of New York; HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin; TENO RONCALIO, Democrat, of Wyoming; JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California; BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of New York; EDWARD R. ROYBAL, Democrat, of California; WILLIAM F. RYAN, Democrat, of New York; JAMES H. SCHEUER, Democrat, of New York; WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, Democrat, of Connecticut; SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat, of New York; HERBERT TENZER, Democrat, of New York; FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey; PAUL H. TODD, JR., Democrat, of Michigan; CHARLES A. VANIK, Democrat, of Ohio; WESTON E. VIVIAN, Democrat, of Michigan.

Happy Birthday Wish to Mr. Broadway-55th

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a sincere pleasure for me today to call the attention of my colleagues in tribute to a man who has made himsef a legend in his hometown and who is affectionately known there as "Mr. Broadway-55th," my friend, Mr. Charlie Hronek, of Cleveland, Ohio.

The fine editorial in the Cleveland Press under date of February 17, 1965, by its editor, Louis B. Seltzer, gives expression to the warm feelings of the many people of Cleveland who know Charlie and have been inspired by his dedication to his community and his neighbors.

With your permission, I include the editorial as follows:

It was something like 45 years ago and this was the first time he had ever presided at a meeting where there was an "imported" speaker.

And it was the first time that I have ever spoken formally before any public group.

We were both about the same height, and weight, and age—and, as it turned out in noon-hour conversation, of the same temperament, and enjoyed the same interests. We became friends.

"I will never leave Broadway and 55th," he told me. "This is where I will make my entire life. I love this 'Zizkov' area and want more than anything else to help build it along with the rest of the city."

I confided in him my own love for Greater Cleveland.

"Like yourself, Charlie, I have determined never to leave Cleveland, my native city," I said. "Only the other day I was invited to go to Washington. It was an attractive offer. Marion and I decided against it.

"We want to stay here. You came to the Broadway-55th area almost before you could either walk or talk. You love it. The people love you. Your work and interests will keep you here. We both can make careers in our own community—and let us keep in touch with each other."

Charlie Hronek gave me a better introduction than my first speech deserved. Nevertheless, it was one of the most enjoyable experiences of my life. And I had made a new friend—one who was to be a friend all of our mutual lives.

That friendship has now lasted more than 45 years. We have met many times. We have reminisced many times. We have talked glowingly about the future many times. With Charlie Hronek it was always about his beloved Broadway-55th area, and with an affectionate intensity that multiplied with the passing years.

The other Sunday night we were once more together, at a church meeting (in the church, Our Lady of Lourdes, over which our mutual friend, the late Monsignor Oldrich Zlamal, presided for so many years).

Once again I was the scheduled speaker. Once again—as many years before—Charlie Hronek was at the speaker's table. And once again two friends reviewed the past and attempted to visualize the future.

After I had talked, "Mr. Broadway-55th" slyly remarked:

"Louie, you've improved after 45 years."

"Charlie," I replied, "I had to—there was a long way to go after that first one."

The other day Charlie Hronek had a birthday. Broadway-55th turned out for it. The immigrant boy from Bohemia who has dedicated his whole life to the vast neighborhood he loves expressed its affection and regard for him.

The people in the Broadway-55th area remember the endless list of things Charlie Hronek has done. They remember how Charlie and Leonard Smith organized the Broadway-55th Association. How they helped the churches, the businesses, the public problems, inspired others to love and affection for Broadway-55th—stimulated a pride which has ruggedly reflected itself in the way homes and businesses and family gathering places have been maintained and protected.

For 46 years Charlie Hronek has participated in virtually every important civic, religious and cultural event in the old Broadway area. He has been a friend to all of the old and new leaders there for a half century.

People in old Broadway still talk about Charlie Hronek's valiant efforts to make sure no depositor in the old Atlas Savings & Loan Association was hurt when it closed during the depression of the 1930's, along with other banks and savings and loan companies.

Honors have been reciprocally bestowed upon Charlie by "his people"—president of St. Joseph Society No. 156, Czech Catholic Union; vice president of the National Czech Catholic Union; president of the District Alliance of Czech Catholics; past president of Ceska Sin Carlin Hall; president of the St. Wenceslas Day Committee, and a director of the National Alliance of Czech Nationals.

He is recognized as one of the foremost Czech leaders in America. Whenever the subject of Bohemian culture is discussed the conversation usually turns toward the great Bohemian band organized by the young, dedicated, and enthusiastic Charlie Hronek 46 years ago.

Perhaps one of the foremost recollections of the people in old Broadway—and in all of Greater Cleveland, for that matter—is how Charlie Hronek conceived the original idea for the great annual Czech pilgrimage to St. Anthony's Shrine in Chatham, Canada. They also talk about how Charlie went on the pilgrimage this past year and returned a well man.

Out in the old Broadway area they do a great deal of talking about Charlie Hronek—the boy who came there, stayed, and gave his heart, and life, and devotion to the Broadway-55th area he has made so extricable a part of his whole being.

Some of us who have watched Charlie Hronek in his lifelong dedication and ceaseless effort to make his beloved Broadway-55th area good in both the sight of men and God not only respect and admire him for it, but venerate him, also, as does everybody in the whole old Broadway area.

He truly is "Mr. Broadway-55th" in every sense of the phrase—in every part of his being. As a lifelong friend I join in wishing Charlie Hronek a belated but earnest happy birthday—and many more in the future.

The War in Vietnam—XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the 12th in a series of a report on Vietnam by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y. Mr. Warren recently returned from Vietnam and part XII, which appeared in the Courier-Express, on March 4, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, XII—VICTORY POSSIBLE STILWELL ASSERTS

(By Lucian C. Warren)

(NOTE.—Maj. Gen. Richard G. Stilwell, who grew up in Buffalo and was graduated from Bennett High School, ranks third in command of the U.S. forces which are helping South Vietnam in its fight against Communism infiltrators. Here General Stilwell, a member of the 1933 class at West Point, discusses with Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, the complicated military and political problems facing the Saigon Government.)

SAIGON.—Buffalo's Maj. Gen. Richard G. Stilwell feels that victory is possible in southeast Asia.

"I say the war can be won," the chief of staff of the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, declared in an exclusive interview. "It can be lost, too, but there's no damn reason why it should."

However, there are numerous pitfalls and obstacles that in some ways make this a war harder to fight than World War II and Korea, the general asserted in two sessions with this correspondent, lasting well over an hour. The main problems, he indicated, were the sanctuary from which the North Vietnamese has operated to export supplies and men to subvert the independent nation to the south, and the political problems of a still unstable South Vietnamese Government.

STAFF CHIEF

General Stilwell is the third highest ranking officer with the U.S. military forces here, serving directly under the overall commander, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, and his deputy commander, Lt. Gen. John L. Throckmorton. He has been in South Vietnam for nearly 2 years, serving as assistant chief of staff for operations until last April, when he became chief of staff.

He is the son of the late William G. Stilwell and of Mrs. Mina Stilwell Hamilton, of 352 Parkridge Avenue, Buffalo. His wife is the former Alice K. Simpson of Buffalo. Mrs. Stilwell and their three younger children, acting under orders from President Johnson directing all military men's dependents in South Vietnam to be evacuated, recently left for temporary residence in Honolulu.

IN THREE MAJOR WARS

An active participant in the three major wars which the United States has fought in the last 25 years, General Stilwell declines to say that this one is nastier than the other two.

There were plenty of atrocities in the earlier wars, he said.

Nevertheless, the present ground rules under which the war in South Vietnam is being fought complicates the task of winning it, he maintains.

World War II, in which he was an operations officer for a tough hombres division and a later assistant chief of staff for G-3 of the 22d Army Corps, was described by Stilwell as a total engagement where our combat forces could be fully utilized in the simple objective of annihilating the enemy.

KOREAN STRUGGLE

Korea, where the Buffalo military man led the 15th Infantry Regiment of the 3d Infantry Division in combat and later was a senior adviser to the Korean Army Corps, was not a total engagement of the enemy forces, Stilwell points out. Because of the sanctuary the Chinese Reds enjoyed north of the Yalu River, the war in Korea was limited as to battleground and weapons and on terms of overall forces engaged.

"But even in Korea," he explained, "there was no limitation on the employment of weapons in the hands of the U.S. forces."

Incidentally, the general feels that the United States might have gotten away with bombing north of the Yalu River as far as the Korean war was concerned, but there might have been repercussions by Russian military threats in Europe, where NATO was still weak.

VIEW ON MAC ARTHUR CASE

General Stilwell also believes that President Truman had no alternative in firing Gen. Douglas MacArthur for insubordination, even though General Stilwell has the greatest respect for MacArthur as a "soldier, a commander, a war strategist, and a dedicated patriot."

Continuing with his war comparisons, Stilwell noted that even in Korea "we still were fighting a conventional war, with an identifiable enemy organization. It was a war where we could plot our positions on the map and prepare strong defenses on the ground."

The general paused, shook his head sadly, then commented:

"But we do not have this situation in South Vietnam. We are not directly confronting the enemy on the ground. And we are providing operational support assistance in this battle, rather than directly engaging the enemy."

COMPLICATED TASK

The task is immensely complicated, the general declared, because the objective to knock out the enemy's armed capability is proving extremely difficult without the destruction also of his political organization.

As long as the North Vietnamese have their sanctuary north of the 17th parallel, the enemy's political organization cannot be destroyed.

"Probably," Stilwell reflected, "the maximum we can expect in this war is to force the enemy to suspend action if he finds the engagement has become too costly. However, I do not see how we can force him to demobilize under the present ground rules."

Frustrated by limitations on annihilating the enemy, the United States is also frustrated by the nature of its relations with its ally, South Vietnam.

PROBLEMS

The United States cannot exercise full control over the military or "pacification" operations of the South Vietnamese Government. A language barrier and differing cultural and political traditions are also obstacles to a smooth joint conduct of the war against the Vietcong.

Stilwell suggests the successful conduct of the war against the Vietcong is directly related to the stability of the South Vietnamese Government. He pointed out that the war was going relatively well until the Diem government was overthrown in May 1963, after which there was a serious deterioration of the South Vietnamese-United States military position and a resulting buildup of Vietcong strength.

VITAL FACTOR

"I feel very strongly that one of the indispensable conditions for an upward trend in our fight against the Vietcong is a stable and strong government apparatus at the national and provincial level," he maintains. "In the long run, we cannot have an effective military machine without a viable political framework in which to operate."

The general is in agreement with an assessment of the current military situation in South Vietnam that over the last year the United States-Vietnamese military political efforts have gone downhill in relation to the area and population under control by the Vietcong.

HOPEFUL

But he made it clear that the United States military strength has also increased and he has hopes that if the new civilian South Vietnamese Government becomes strong and stable, the military tide can well turn against the Vietcong.

"The National Government must provide the resources with which to provide a good framework of Government if successful military operations are to be achieved," he insists. And by a strong government, he doesn't mean one controlled by the military.

"I feel very strongly that the chief executive must be a civilian," he said.

Given a strong government, Stilwell sees the possibility of a stepped-up political-military offensive against the Hanoi-directed war of subversion that might well force the main bulk of the enemy to withdraw, leaving only the so-called national liberation front to operate on a small, easily contained scale.

SUMMARY OF VIEWS

"This contest," says the general in summary, "can be resolved in a manner compatible with U.S. objectives and compatible with the desires of the local populace.

"It can be, but whether it will be or not, depends on the collective will and determination and the energetic action of the people of South Vietnam and America.

"Yes, the condition could arise where we would have to pull out of South Vietnam in defeat. But this will only happen if we are weak and stupid in the execution of our policies."

Not all the interview was about war.

The general spoke with great affection about his Buffalo background.

RECALLS SCHOOL CHUMS

A graduate of Bennett High School in 1933, he recalled that he was chummy with a group there that included Paul J. Keeler, son of City Judge Patrick Keeler, Clarence Buchwald and John Sheldon. Keeler is now a New York City attorney, Buchwald a Seneca Falls businessman, and Sheldon an executive of the Hewitt Rubber Co. in the Philadephia area.

He also got to know his future wife at Bennett and she was graduated there the same year.

"But I really didn't have a chance with her until I got my uniform," he said smilingly. Their romance was carried on while she was a student at Beaver College, Jenkintown, Pa., and he was at West Point, and they were married soon after his graduation from the Military Academy in 1938. The general is proud that he later became commandant at West Point.

ATHLETE

The general remembers that he went out for track at Bennett, but won no great distinction as a high school athlete. He did enjoy, however, being a member of the West Side Rowing Club crew. And he's grateful to the late Representative Walter G. Andrews of Buffalo, for his West Point appointment after he had been recommended by a selection board consisting of the principals of Buffalo area schools.

General Stilwell was last in Buffalo in January 1963, when he made the principal speech at the Eagle Scout recognition ceremony.

An insight into the love the general has for Buffalo is provided in the opening remarks of this talk.

REMARKS CITED

He said then:

"It is a great personal honor to participate in this ceremony. It is an honor because my roots are in this, the Queen City of the Great Lakes.

"It is here that I, like you, participated in the wonderful world of scouting; attended elementary and then high school; was a member of a church and drew sustenance from its activities; experienced all the challenges and delights of youth, and, above all, was molded by a Christian home environment and guided by the love and devotion of my two parents.

"Through 5 years of college at Brown and West Point, and 25 years of Government service all over the world, I have become increasingly conscious that the cumulative intakes from my Buffalo boyhood have provided the mental, physical, and moral foundations which have sustained me in hours of crisis."

Illusions and False Analogies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, much thought is being given to our policy in South Vietnam and many arguments are being offered almost daily in the editorial pages of the great newspapers of this country. I found the thoughtful analysis of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial which was reprinted in the Madison Capital Times on February 26, 1965, realistic and helpful to me in evaluating our policy in southeast Asia. I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD so that others can have the opportunity to study it:

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, Feb. 26, 1965]

ILLUSIONS AND FALSE ANALOGIES

Assuming that there is still time to think about Vietnam—that the deadly cycle of military escalation is not yet irreversible—Americans should examine the validity of the official rationale for the "reprisal" bombings of North Vietnam.

The rationale is that attacks on South Vietnamese and American bases are planned, armed, and supplied predominantly from the north, and that the attacks will stop if we hit the north hard enough.

The fatal flaw in this theory is that the major portion of the weapons used by the Vietcong are American weapons, captured, and turned against us. While supplies from the north undoubtedly help the Vietcong, there is little basis for supposing that they are indispenable, or that the Vietcong would fade away if supply lines could be cut—even if the lines could be cut by air action alone, which is most improbable.

Should it not be clear by now that we are not dealing with a simple case of external aggression, as the official policy of our Government assumes? If after 10 years of steadily increasing American aid the South Vietnamese Government is weaker than it was before, then something other than externally supported subversion must be involved.

All the evidence points to a high degree of local sympathy or outright support for the Vietcong as a major element in its success. The bombing of North Vietnam does not touch this source of conflict and probably strengthens it.

The false assumption of external aggression as the essential element in the situation is strategic as well as tactical. It is one of the major reasons our forces are in Vietnam.

Apologists for official policy are fond of quoting Churchill's warning after the partition of Czechoslovakia in 1938—"The belief that security can be obtained by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion."

Czechoslovakia, however, was a victim of direct external aggression. What we face in Vietnam is the quite different problem of an indigenous revolution, 25 years in the making, which has succeeded in ending French colonialism and withstanding 10 years of American intervention.

In such a situation even our great military strength does not give us power to decide, by a simple deicsion to fight, that a small state shall be "saved." It is one thing to go to the aid of a nation under overt attack, and another to interfere in a local revolution, in which the essential element is not external aid but the people themselves. Only they can "win the war," and after 10 years of not winning, South Vietnam's will and capacity to do so must now be doubted.

Some Americans, of course, believe that it is our national mission to police the world, particularly to police it against revolution. That belief, in our view, is as immature as isolationism was, and indeed may well be an overreaction to isolationism.

The United States tried to turn its back on the world, and failed; participation in the second world war established firmly the commonsense proposition that for America involvement in international affairs is unavoidable.

But what is involvement? Some Americans evidently swung so far from their isolationist past that they regard involvement as deciding everything for everybody, and particularly deciding the nature and scope of social revolution anywhere.

A role in world leadership certainly is the American mission, but we need a more sensible view of what world leadership really is.

The truth is that Vietnam does not present a simple case of external aggression, direct, or indirect, and a policy based on that false assumption is bound to fail, as ours has failed for 10 years. No matter how strenuously we may justify the bombing of North Vietnam to ourselves, and no matter how well it might be defended as pure reprisal or revenge, the fact remains that there is no military solution to the problem so far as the United States is concerned.

If we step up our attacks and the degree of our involvement, and even if we do not provoke Chinese or Russian intervention, all we can really expect is to take over the whole war from the South Vietnamese—in other words, to occupy and govern South Vietnam indefinitely.

What would such an occupation gain for us? It would not serve our true national interests, it would poison our relations with half the world, and it would hamper our freedom of maneuver in more important areas of conflict.

Our Vietnam policy is at a dead end. Our interests can now be served only by a political rather than a military solution, one that will enable us ultimately to end a profitless involvement in a profitless Asian land war. Unless President Johnson is seeking a political solution, he is not only risking nuclear war but basing national policy on dangerous illusions.

Housing for the Elderly, Quincy, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure, on March 6, 1965, to be the principal speaker at the ground breaking ceremonies of the housing for the elderly in Quincy, Mass.

A new, multistory apartment building for senior citizens is to be constructed with a $2,583,000 senior citizens housing loan under Public Law 88–372 from the Community Facilities Administration. The project is being sponsored by the Quincy Point Congregational Church through the Quincy Point Congregational Church Homes. The Reverend Bedras Baharian is the president of the corporation. This is the second such loan in Massachusetts under Public Law 88–372 and is to serve primarily the Quincy, Weymouth, and Braintree areas in Norfolk County. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Quincy, Mass., on March 8, 1965, relating to this event:

GROUND BROKEN FOR ELDERLY HOUSING

QUINCY.—Ground was broken Saturday for the 216-apartment building for the elderly which will be built at 100 Southern Artery by the Quincy Point Congregational Church Homes Co., a nonprofit corporation.

READY NEXT YEAR

Tenants in the new building, which will be ready for occupancy by April 1, 1966, will be from the middle-lower income group with weekly pay of less than $100. Guest speaker Congressman JAMES A. BURKE, Democrat, of Milton, said that this group comprises 16 percent of Quincy's population. Residents from Weymouth and Braintree also will live in the new apartments.

Congressman BURKE noted that the building will be the largest direct-loan housing for elderly in the State. He added that special technology will be used to make the apartment suited to the elderly, such as omitting steep stairways, narrow halls and polished floors.

Apartment trustees were called builders with real roots in the business and community service units by Mr. BURKE. He also credited the Quincy Development Commission and the Patriot Ledger with encouragement in the project.

Other speakers at the groundbreaking were Quincy City Councilor President Joseph LaRaia; Robert Fitzgerald, who represented his cousin, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY; and William A. O'Connell, executive vice president of the Quincy-South Shore Chamber of Commerce. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL sent greetings by wire.

Mrs. Carl E. Magnuson, who applied for the first apartment 2 years ago, turned the first sod at the ceremonies. Taking part in the ceremonies were the Reverend Bedros Baharain, pastor of the Quincy Point Congregational Church; Herbert Hendry, treasurer; Everett Besse, clerk; and the Reverend Elden Zuern, associate pastor. The invocation was given by the Reverend John D. Banks, pastor of Bethany Congregational Church; and the Reverend Albert J. Penner of the Massachusetts Congregational Society gave the benediction.

Among the 150 guests at the groundbreaking ceremonies were city councilors and representatives of local civic groups, as well as State representatives.

Work on the apartment project is expected to begin this month by the Tornabene Bros., of Newton, who bid $2,162,800. The total cost of the project, including land, will be $2,583,000.

My remarks at the ceremony follow:

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, ladies and gentlemen, it is a genuine pleasure to participate with you today, in these groundbreaking ceremonies that I know mean so much to you. On this site, you are about to build the largest direct-loan-housing-for-the-elderly project in this State. Of course, it is fitting, that with large problems, there arise large solutions.

The Massachusetts study of our problems, presented to the White House Conference on Aging, said, and I quote:

"The physical nature of many modern American homes and apartments is such that they are not appropriate dwelling units for older persons. There are steep and narrow stairways, narrow halls, highly polished floors, weak and flimsy bathroom accessories, etc. A special technology has developed around the most suitable physical standards for housing for older persons."

The report went on to suggest that there was an immediate need in Massachusetts for 8,000 to 10,000 apartments for older persons in the low-income group, and approximately the same for those in the middle-income brackets.

This project we are dedicating today makes a dent in the need for those in the lower-middle income group, those in the under-$5,000 bracket. I would only hope that those listening and watching this event will take a lesson and imitate the concept, if not the details, of what is being created here.

There are so many fine things to point out in this project, that I shall only remark on a few that strike me as an example of local wisdom and thoughtfulness, in the preparation of this program. For one, it is located right where people live, not far out in the country, away from the general community. You may be insulating your elderly, away from some of the noises, by putting them in one building, but they are not isolated, away from everyone else. In that, you have shown foresight and understanding of their real needs.

You have planned an activity center that can absorb many of the elderly both in the building and in the surrounding neighborhood as well. I would hope that some of the four Golden Age Clubs that meet in this area will consider sharing your facilities and services and possibly even provide tenants.

I would hope that some of the displacees from the Quarry Street project will find their way here to help resume their interrupted lives in a congenial atmosphere.

You have organized a fine board of trustees, building from strength, with real roots in your business and service community. When I look around and see sales managers, engineers, accountants, manufacturers, electrical contractors, insurance men, ministers, and volunteers and service leaders of every sort, I am reassured, since I know that the strength of our community is represented in the project leadership.

You have powerful encouragement from the Quincy Development Commission and the Patriot Ledger to further underline the extent of your roots.

You are exploring relationships with a host of local service agencies to help provide the residents with the personal services that they will need in their daily lives, without turning the project into an all-encompassing home for the aged. Rather, you are directing social and medical services into the project to meet individual need, instead of managing their lives for them.

You have chosen your ground well, since this particular area of Quincy has one of the highest percentages of elderly in the State, 16.4 percent over 60, as of the 1960 census. Yet you have planned large enough to help serve the needs of Braintree and Weymouth, as well.

In the building, your efficiencies and one-bedroom apartments will help to satisfy the need for efficient, safe, and sanitary housing, far better adapted to the needs of older persons.

You have turned to the Federal Government for financing, but this is no dole. Rather, the elderly residents themselves will be repaying the loan over a term of 50 years in their rent, paying taxes and contributing to improving their neighborhood, while, at the same time, helping to meet their own housing needs. This, to me, is the ideal partnership of people in a community, working together toward a noble social goal, yet helping themselves at the same time.

In particular, I want to commend your leadership, especially Rev. Bedros Baharian, for his inspiration, persistence, and understanding, in helping to make this project a reality.

When this building is finished and ready to open, I want you to invite me back again, so that I can see for myself what you have created.

May Almighty God shower His blessings on your good works.

National Council of Churches Supports Immigration Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the National Council of Churches has long been an advocate of immigration reform and in this regard the council on February 24, 1965, adopted a resolution reiterating this historic concern of the churches and a reaffirmation that essential change in our immigration policy is vitally important to our national well-being. In order that the Members of this House can be kept abreast of the general feeling on immigration policy I am proud to include this resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON THE CHURCHES AND U.S. IMMIGRATION POLICY, ADOPTED FEBRUARY 24, 1965

Whereas insights from Christian faith and from the nature of a free society suggest that people should be afforded the opportunities to move voluntarily for economic and social reasons, for reuniting their families, or for availing themselves and their loved ones of greater opportunities; to seek asylum from religious, social, political, and racial persecution; and to find sanctuary from natural calamities or oppressive occupation; the National Council of Churches in light of current governmental developments deems it timely to reiterate this historic concern of the churches and reaffirm its belief that the United States should make essential changes in its immigration law which will provide the opportunities here listed.

Whereas the National Council of Churches and constituent communions have repeatedly stated that the immigration policy of our land raises inequitable racial and na-

tional barriers, unfairly restricts the movement of peoples into our country on the basis of place of birth, and unjustly discriminates against refugees and naturalized citizens, and

Whereas the President of the United States called upon the country in his state of the Union address on January 4, 1965, and in his message to the Congress on January 13, 1965, to consider basic revisions to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, along the same lines that the National Council of Churches and constituent communions have consistently called for: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the general board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. once again call upon the churches to promote study and encourage action which will lead to legislation to improve the immigration statutes of the United States, so that their provisions will be more in accord with Christian and humanitarian principles recognizing the inherent worth and dignity of the individual, a concept upon which our country is founded and to which it is dedicated; and so that their provisions will promote the national interest of our own and other countries as well as the welfare of the individuals who may benefit by migration; be it further

Resolved, That the general board of the National Council of Churches call upon the constituent membership of the National Council of Churches to note and study further in more specific terms the problems and new opportunities in the field of immigration and refugee policy and take considered and prayerful action to the end that barriers shall be removed within the limits of national and community responsibility by:

1. Using the latest census of the total population as the basis for determining the number of quota immigrants to be admitted;
2. The elimination of the national origins quota system;
3. The abolition of the Asia-Pacific triangle;
4. The admission of persons whose skills would be advantageous to the United States;
5. The facilitating of family reunions;
6. The implementation of a program of refugee admission, under established visa procedures, so that our country would accept its fair share of the world's refugees;
7. The enabling of persons with physical and mental disabilities to join their families, provided adequate safeguards are maintained to prevent their becoming public charges;
8. The provision of more equitable and just methods in deportation proceedings, under due process of the law; and
9. The provision for naturalized citizens to receive equal treatment in every respect with natural-born citizens; be it further

Resolved, That authorization be hereby granted for appropriate representatives of the National Council of Churches to consult with Government officials and agencies and to testify before congressional committees on the basis of official policies of the National Council of Churches concerning immigration and refugees—policies which seek the good of persons, the higher interest of the nations, and more peace, justice, and freedom in the world.

Eulogy to Frank X. Cull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened today to learn of the passing of one of Cleveland's fine citizens, Frank X. Cull, a celebrated civil trial lawyer for more than 50 years, who at the age of 77 had achieved the highest respect of his colleagues and of the citizens of Cleveland, Ohio.

Early in his career, Frank X. Cull served on the Hill as secretary to former U.S. Senator Robert J. Bulkley before returning to Cleveland to build an enviable record in a profession that is careful with its accolades.

Frank X. Cull will be sincerely missed by the entire membership of the Ohio bar, and most particularly by his professional associates in the firm of Hauxhurst, Sharp, Cull & Kellogg, with whom he has been in practice over a long period of years.

Rescuing the New Haven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, there have been many arguments and formulas advanced in the effort to "rescue" the New Haven Railroad and to safeguard against the inconvenience to commuters that would result from the proposed abandonment of commuter service.

There has come to me today an editorial which appeared in the March 8 edition of the Meriden, Conn., Morning Record which contains recommendations that I find interesting and which, I believe, are deserving of thorough study.

With permission to extend my remarks, I include at this point the editorial, "Rescuing the New Haven":

RESCUING THE NEW HAVEN

In Hartford and in Washington, hearings are open and arguments are being heard on how to rescue the New Haven Railroad. The bankrupt line has been losing money steadily under its trusteeship management; it has petitioned the ICC to allow a curtailment of commuter service close to New York, and the shape of things to come clearly indicates a gradual closing down of all passenger service unless something is done. What are the alternatives, and how would they affect Connecticut and the whole area served by the New Haven?

LET IT DIE?

What would happen if no subsidies were were provided, no help were given, the railroad were allowed to go on its way downhill? We could expect continuation of freight service with gradual elimination of passenger service as equipment deteriorated and income continued to fall. Eventually we would be forced to see takeover by the Government or sale as distressed assets to the highest bidder. At worst, we could expect complete collapse of all service with virtual disintegration of stock and real estate; at best, minimal operation after a period of standstill.

New England can't afford this solution; on this there is general agreement. Our highways can't stand the load that a dying railroad would shift to them, our people can't stand the loss of public transportation, our businesses can't stand the attrition that poor railroad service would force on the whole northeast corner of the country. The New Haven has got to be rescued.

THE RIBICOFF APPROACH

Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, has proposed a rescue operation through a $100 million fund to be voted by Congress. It would be administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission which could use it to help the New Haven and other commuter lines which are in difficulty. The figure of $10 million has been used hopefully as the New Haven's probable Federal share, to be matched by Connecticut and New York which would each put in $5 million, to make a $20 million rescue subsidy.

Subsidies are necessary to keep the road running, and they must be provided. But the Ribicoff bill by itself is not enough. We are against any simple subsidy that will keep the road running on its present inefficient system without moving toward a constructive permanent cure for the things that cause the need for subsidy—it's just prolonging the agony.

We also question the appropriation of $100 million on a nationwide basis to cure ills that are basically regional—again on a simple subsidy-to-deficit pattern. The New Haven is the sickest of several railroads in many parts of the country which aren't as healthy as they should be. Will the subsidy encourage them to sit back and wait for help, instead of seeking more constructive ways to compete?

MERGER

The New York Central and the Pennsylvania Railroads would like to merge. Both moneymakers at present, they aren't eager to include the losing New Haven in their plans, but they might be interested in buying the freight operation. Pressure could be brought through Congress, the ICC, and State agencies for an inclusion either of the New Haven freight operation or the whole railroad.

In effect, this would be a forced marriage; if it were carried out, the New Haven, and especially its passenger service, shouldn't expect to get favored treatment in the new combine. For a while, the big merged line would absorb the losses on the New Haven passenger runs. But considering the problem, it could hardly be expected to sink the necessary massive amounts of capital on a permanent basis into new equipment and improved service; more likely would be a continuation of the present gradual deterioration and a renewed petitioning for permission to curtail passenger service.

THE NEW YORK PLAN

New York is going to be squeezed the most and the tightest by any cutback. If commuter service is phased out, the traffic problem is going to turn New York City into a shambles. For this reason, Governor Rockefeller came up recently with a bold new plan for a takeover of dying railroads, beginning with the Long Island Railroad, under a new State metropolitan commuter authority which would undertake a $200 million modernization program. There would be room for other railroads and other States in a tri-state commuter system, which would be eligible for Federal aid under Washington's urban transportation program.

It may be a fine plan for New York and the LIRR. But it begins by regarding the railroad as a commuter line, which is only part of its value to Connecticut. This State should be careful not to join in too quickly to provide funds and backing to solve problems which are essentially those of New York City.

REGIONAL APPROACH

New York has done a disservice to her neighbors and the New Haven by emphasizing the commuter aspects of the New Haven. Not just New York and Connecticut but Rhode Island and Massachusetts—and Maine and New Jersey, too—are concerned with the flow of goods and people which the New Haven can and should strengthen. The whole northeast corner of

the country will be made anemic if these vital arteries of travel and commerce are allowed to disintegrate or to bypass us. With increasing congestion over the decades ahead, our loss will become geometrically more serious.

The long-term solution of New Haven's problems, and the long-term health of New England and New York, depend on the creation of a cooperative agency or authority including at least the four States served by the New Haven. It should be a suprastate agency, quasi-public in nature, empowered to own and operate the railroad and to sell bonds to the public to finance the purchase and improvements, these bonds to be underwritten by Federal funds. The States and Washington should undertake to underwrite operating deficits on a fair formula for a temporary transition period only. The Port Authority of New York could serve to some extent as a model.

Such an authority could, as part of its plan, sell the freight operation, or lease trackage and equipment to one or another railroad. It could undertake the expensive modernization and improvement program which alone will enable the railroad to compete with other methods of transportation. With money and imaginative management it could stand a good chance of making the New Haven again New England's main artery—and a profitable one.

This is the direction in which our legislators and officials in Hartford and Washington must turn if they are to rescue the New Haven. This is the package of temporary subsidy plus long-term planning which they must put together for the good of the railroad and even more for the good of the States it serves.

The War in Vietnam—XIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., has been writing a report on Vietnam for his newspaper. Under unanimous consent, I include part XIII of this series which appeared in the Courier-Express on March 5, 1965:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, XIII—STABLE GOVERNMENT IS KEY TO VICTORY

(NOTE.—Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for The Courier-Express, after a visit to the combat zones in South Vietnam gives a closeup look at the war there which has left him with decided convictions about U.S. political strategy in that far-off unhappy land.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—It is popular here and elsewhere to be critical of the way the war against the Vietcong Communists is being run.

Hugh Campbell, for 2 years a Canadian delegate on the three-nation International Control Commission that has tried unsuccessfully to make the 1954 Vietnam partition agreement work, is openly scornful of the American military effort. In a recent article he even took out after the average serviceman's wife in Saigon, saying that "she takes the fur-lined mug" for "boorishness, offensiveness and condescension toward her 'inferiors,'" meaning the South Vietnamese.

In Congress, rarely a day goes by that some Senator, such as Senator WAYNE MORSE or Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, doesn't grab a headline by saying, "we're fighting the wrong war at the wrong time and had best negotiate some deal with the North Vietnamese."

CRITICISM

The constant barrage of criticism had reminded one briefing officer here of what Titus Livius (Livy), who died in A.D. 17, recorded in his history of Rome volume 7, about a Roman consul's attitude toward his armchair military critics.

According to Livy, Lucius Aemilus Paulus, who conducted the war against the Macedonians in 168 B.C., sarcastically commented that in every circle and, truly, at every table, there are people who lead armies into Macedonia, who know where the camps ought to be placed, when and through what pass that territory should be entered, when it is proper to engage the enemy and when to lie quiet.

OPPORTUNITY

The Roman consul ended his diatribe by suggesting that if anyone was well qualified to give advice on the Macedonia war, let him come to Macedonia at public expense, where he shall be furnished with a ship, a horse, a tent—even his traveling charges shall be defrayed.

But, Lucius Paulus concluded, according to Livy, if he thinks this too much trouble, and prefers the repose of city life to the toils of war, let him not, on land, assume the office of a pilot.

In other words, this was the angered put-up-or-shut-up attitude of a criticism-stung general 2,000 years ago.

The observations: Any war that is taking a toll in casualities among the enemy in the ratio of nearly 3 to 1 of the United States-South Vietnamese forces is not a failure. It can and should be higher if the right side is to win eventually, but the United States and its ally are learning much about guerrilla warfare and captured Vietcong documents and prisoners show recognition that they are up against tough adversaries.

As to the Campbell criticism of servicemen's wives, we share with Buffalo's Maj. Gen. Richard G. Stilwell, Army Chief of Staff here, resentment at an unfair comment. Mrs. Stilwell herself until her recent departure worked as a Gray Lady in the local hospital and as a volunteer helper in an orphanage.

DEDICATED

"The wives of career officers, be they embassy or military, are every bit as dedicated and hard working as their spouses," says Stilwell, and I'm sure he's right.

The war is by no means won or nearly won and our forces on the scene would be the first to admit this. In fact, there is general acknowledgement that even within the last year the Vietcong have gained in both population and area under their control.

And the ratio of the enemy's casualties to ours is dwindling from 4.3 to 1 in 1962, to 3.7 to 1 in 1963, to 2.4 to 1 in 1964. Furthermore, the enemy's weapons are becoming more sophisticated every day. The day of handmade weapons among the Vietcong seems to be over, and these days the Vietcong are being supplied with some of the best Chinese and Russian military weapons available, including 60- and 80-pound mortars and 59-millimeter cannons.

IMPROVING

Meanwhile our weaponry is improving, too, but notwithstanding the fact that the United States-Vietnamese forces have total air superiority over the enemy, the war on the ground is a hard-fought, close contest.

And the U.S. casualties, while still small, are rising. Figures for a recent week's toll showed more than 200 U.S. killed or wounded, highest of any week in the war.

The political situation in South Vietnam is still unstable and the Government still weak. As this was written, a new civilian government had been in office only a few days when the military started its favorite pastime of initiating coups.

The U.S. Embassy and soldiers here are guardedly optimistic, at least to the extent that the new Premier, Phan Huy Quat, foreign minister in a former government, is considered an able man and his cabinet shows a good balance in representation from various sections of the country and ethnic and political shadings.

ACCEPTABLE

The new civilian Government has been reported acceptable to Buddhist leader Tri Quang, whose displeasure has been a major factor in toppling earlier governments, including that of President Diem. But Tri Quang is unpredictable, is definitely neutralist in sentiment and thinks the United States should negotiate with North Vietnam.

If—and this is a big if—at long last Premier Quat is allowed by the military and Tri Quang to stay in office for a sufficient time to develop stability and strength, this will be reflected in a much stronger political front, against the dedicated Vietcong.

This is the hope both of intelligent South Vietnamese and United States forces. Then when effective military action rolls back the Vietcong, strong local governments can be formed under direction from Saigon to keep the acquired territory safe for democratic government.

BOMBING

Along with a strong and stable civilian government, U.S. bombing of North Vietnam must continue, whether under the pretext of retaliation for Vietcong attacks or in support of outright military goals.

From the U.S. Ambassador down, top ranking U.S. civil and military officials bend over backward not to criticize past U.S. hesitancy on this score, but once in a while a remark like "it should have been started 2 years ago" slips out. And all the military analyses of eventual victory hint broadly that continued bombings of North Vietnam territory are a patr of the recipe for triumph.

It is unthinkable that the United States should pull out, nor can it be a party to any negotiated truce that will let the Vietcong takeover as soon as U.S. forces are removed. Perhaps, if the United States and South Vietnam get stronger in a combined military political way and if the toll becomes increasingly hard for Hanoi to bear, then it is possible negotiations from strength might produce a settlement with sufficient safeguards to maintain a democratic government in South Vietnam.

WATCHING

But until that time, the war must go on. The world is watching to see whether the United States is the paper tiger the Communist claim. If it becomes convinced, then it will be Indonesia, and Thailand, perhaps Malaya, to fall next. Communist takeovers in Africa and Latin America would be encouraged.

A defeat for the Vietcong would immensely simplify the problem of the free world. Victory is possible with stronger U.S. military and South Vietnamese political offensives. It may take 5 to 10 years, but when the stakes are so high, there is no substitute for victory.

Legislative Program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 9, 1965, the Com-

mittee on Veterans' Affairs was privileged to hear the exceedingly timely address of Mr. John A. Jenkins, commander in chief, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Under leave to extend my remarks I include his statement before our committee:

STATEMENT OF JOHN A. JENKINS, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, permit me to express my deep appreciation for the privilege of appearing before this most distinguished committee.

You will have noticed that I am accompanied by a large number of VFW members. They comprise the cream of our organization. All serve in leadership capacities on either the National or State level in offices to which they have either been elected or appointed by other elected officers. Most of these men are moving toward the top. Some have already held the highest positions in the organization but are continuing to give it their time and energy in an unofficial way.

Also with me this morning are a number of young people. They are the 53 Voice of Democracy contest winners and they have come here from the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Korea, and the Canal Zone. The Voice of Democracy program, sponsored by the VFW is a broadcast script writing contest on the subject, "The Challenge of Citizenship." It is open to all high school students and is aimed at nourishing American institutions by bringing to the serious attention of the leaders of tomorrow, the great principles upon which this Nation was founded.

The first place winner will be announced tonight at our annual dinner and presented a $5,000 scholarship award. The second place winner will receive a $3,500 scholarship. To the third place winner will go a $2,500 scholarship, and the fourth place winner will get a $1,500 scholarship award.

Before proceeding with an outline of our legislative goals for the coming year, may I take a moment to review the history and function of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

It was founded in 1899 by a small group of veterans who had just returned from combat in the Spanish-American War. Some had fought in Cuba, some in the Philippine Islands. This group agreed to limit membership to those men who had served overseas in engagements for which a campaign badge or medal was authorized.

This has continued to be the prerequisite for membership and from the slim ranks of that humble beginning, the organization's membership roster has grown to 1,300,000. These members are distributed through 10,000 posts, the majority of which are in the United States, but located also in territories and foreign countries from Okinawa in the Far East to Paris, France in Europe. Aiding these posts are their Ladies Auxiliaries with a total membership of 400,000.

It is a matter of great pride, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, to point out that the Veterans of Foreign Wars has enjoyed an increase in membership for ten successive years. I believe that this testifies to the high worth of our objectives and the effectiveness of our methods used in achieving them. On this date we are about 100,000 members ahead of the number we had last year at this time.

One program of which the VFW is especially proud is our national rehabilitation service. For many years it has furnished without charge, counsel and assistance to millions of veterans and their dependents who were eligible for benefits provided by Congress. This service has been made available to all veterans regardless of whether or not they were VFW members or even eligible for membership. It is this kind of activity that sets our veterans organizations apart from other merely fraternal orders.

The year-by-year policies of the VFW are propounded at our National Conventions. Delegates to these conventions usually pass some 300 resolutions on various matters relating to veterans and their families. The resolutions are, each year, reviewed by our National Legislative Committee and arranged in a priority list which we call our legislative program. This committee is made up of outstanding Americans from all parts of the country, and incidentally, is headed by one of your former colleagues, James E. Van Zandt, of Pennsylvania, who has also served three terms as Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

It has grouped our legislative goals for 1965 into six categories, and with your permission Mr. Chairman, I would like to enumerate them:

No. 1. For the service connected disabled:

(a) A 15-percent increase in compensation payments.

We believe this is more merited considering the continued rise in the cost of living. A totally disabled veteran is entitled at present to only $250 per month or $3,000 a year and that has been defined by the President as poverty level. The average American family has an income of $6,000 a year and the starting classification for a Federal employee, GS-1, is $3,360 per year. Using these as points of comparison, compensation rates have fallen behind at least 15 percent over the past three decades. Simple justice requires an upward adjustment.

(b) A review of dependency and indemnity compensation for the surviving widows, children and dependent parents of veterans.

All factors having a relationship to the hardships imposed upon these survivors by the service connected death of veterans should be weighed and evaluated.

No. 2. For continuing the best hospital and medical care:

(a) Maintenance of the Veterans' Administration hospital system with no reduction in authorized and operating beds.

The war veterans of this Nation have made sacrifices for the national interest beyond those of other citizens. Therefore, we believe that they are entitled to separate hospital treatment when they become sick and are unable to pay for such treatment.

(b) Immediate implementation of President John F. Kennedy's memorandum of August 12, 1963, and Public Law 88-450 (H.R. 8009).

These documents authorize additional nursing care beds in VA and State facilities and private homes.

(c) Priority admission to VA hospitals for veterans of wartime oversea service.

No. 3. For the dignity and security of older veterans:

(a) Liberalize the pension program for aged and disabled veterans.

(b) Deduct amounts paid for medical expenses of veterans, their wives and children from income limitations on pension entitlement. Exclude an additional 10 percent of all other retirement income.

(c) Increase all pension rates by 10 percent for veterans of oversea combat.

(d) Provide outpatient treatment for all veterans suffering permanent and total disability.

No. 4. For the maintenance of job security:

(a) Oppose vigorously any efforts to weaken or eliminate veterans' preference in Government civil service.

(b) Provide adequate funds for the operation of Veterans' Employment Service and the Bureau of Reemployment Rights of the Department of Labor.

(c) Oppose all attempts to circumvent the Veterans' Preference Act through reorganization, consolidation or otherwise, of governmental agencies and functions.

No. 5. For more effective service to veterans and their survivors:

(a) Establish a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the Senate.

(b) Elevate the position of Veterans' Administrator to Cabinet rank.

(c) Continue the Veterans' Administration as a one-stop agency for all veterans' programs and oppose any moves to transfer them to other agencies.

No. 6. For a well-rounded and up-to-date benefit program:

(a) Continue and enlarge the national cemetery system for burial of war veterans.

(b) Increase the burial allowance for war veterans.

(c) Restore the larger burial flag which was provided to drape the caskets of war veterans.

(d) Reopen the national service life insurance program for a limited period to all veterans.

(e) Provide cold war GI bill benefits to all post-Korean veterans with campaign or combat service for which a medal has been authorized.

Those are the legislative goals of the Veterans of Foreign Wars as set forth by our members. We hope this committee will consider them on their merits as they are embodied in specific pieces of legislation and advance them on to the full Congress with recommendations for favorable action.

Now Mr. Chairman, I would like to return to item number two on our list of legislative goals. We don't ever expect Congress to give us the world on a half shell but we do expect to make some progress toward our objectives each year. This year, however, while we have been formulating the steps that would bring us that new inch of progress, much of what we thought we had won is in danger of being snatched away. In today's military parlance we have been infiltrated and are now under enfilade fire. We find ourselves having to defend goals that we thought were safely won.

I refer, of course, to the administrative order closing 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals, four domiciliaries, and 17 regional offices. This order constitutes a major victory for those who have contended that veterans should not receive any special consideration from the country they defended on the battlefield. The VFW has always held the opposite—that the Federal Government should provide hospital treatment and care for veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities, and for impoverished veterans unable to pay for treatment in private hospitals.

Few men profess a desire for war. We all search for peace yet despite this, the history of man is the history of bloody combat. Because of that unhappy fact we establish and maintain a professional military force; however, American wars have been won by civilians whose ambitions and interests were completely alien to the ways of the soldier. Nonetheless, these young men have gone into battle without a thought of shirking their duty. They have returned after victory as changed men, forced to start life over. The cost of their rehabilitation, of their medical and hospital care, is the obligation of the people as a whole just as it was their obligation to maintain the Military Establishment. It is not charity. It is not public welfare.

But the memory of war fades and this just obligation is in danger of being swept aside by newer and more romantic concepts such as a war on poverty and the Great Society. Not only are veterans installations to be closed but there has been lagging implementation of the authorizations for some 4,000 nursing care beds mentioned in (b) under point two above. The heavy hand of the Budget Bureau has been on the Veterans' Administration preventing it from going ahead with this badly needed improvement. I understand at this late date only 46 of these nursing care beds are in actual opera-

tion and the VA plans only 2,000 more by the end of next fiscal year.

Perhaps you can follow the reasoning of the budget planners that some VA hospitals must be closed because of the authorization of additional nursing care beds under Public Law 88–450. I cannot. To me it seems a manifest absurdity to think that Congress intended such a result. Still that is one of the arguments being advanced to justify some of these hospital shutdowns.

The permanent closing of the 4 domiciliaries containing 3,200 beds is the cruelest effect of the entire order. It strikes at veterans who, by any standard, are at the bottom of the barrel and deserve more compassion than those in other categories. A recent study reveals that most of them are entirely without income except for VA pension payments. They are poorly educated, without families and suffering serious health problems such as arthritis, cancer, and heart impairment. These conditions make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to relocate them outside the domiciliary.

While the Veterans' Administration deserves much credit for its efforts to restore and rehabilitate veterans, it is obvious that domiciliary patients are in such poor physical condition that any effort to rehabilitate them would prove futile.

Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars find the decision to close these domiciliaries baffling, to say the least. Since one of the avowed goals of the Great Society is to find a more meaningful life for our elderly citizens we have begun to wonder if veterans are to be excluded from its benison. I ask, are veterans to be the first casualty in the war on poverty?

Similarly, we are confused by the obscure reasoning that led to the decision to close active treatment hospitals with 3,000 operating beds. Projecting the results of the present hospital construction program it appears that some 600 new beds will be put into use in the future but that still leaves a total reduction of 2,400 beds available for sick veterans. The Va has stated that it intends to maintain the same number of authorized beds but, in the past, we have found this to be a largely meaningless phrase. The number of operating beds has always been considerably less than the number of authorized beds.

No one can try to salve his conscience by contending that the only veterans to suffer will be those whose illness has nothing to do with their wartime service. This reduction in facilities will affect those with service-connected disabilities just as severely as it does those with non-service-connected disabilities. The closing order flies in the face of statistics that demonstrate beyond any doubt that the need of veterans for hospital treatment is mounting rapidly. World War II veterans are now arriving at an age where they are more susceptible to ill health and our Government should be making plans to enlarge and improve veterans hospitals rather than close them down.

And may I point out that the administration has strongly opposed the use of a pauper's oath as a qualification for medical care benefits. The necessity for its elimination is one of the most frequently used arguments for the administration backed medical care bill now before Congress. Yet veterans with non-service-connected health disorders are still required to take this pauper's oath before gaining admission to a VA hospital.

The shutdown of hospitals in some areas will force veterans both service connected and nonservice connected to travel long distances to obtain treatment and for many with reduced means will constitute a denial of treatment. The President himself said in his January 7, 1965, health care message to Congress:

"In our urbanized society today, the availability of health care depends uniquely upon the availability and accessibility of modern facilities, located in convenient and efficient places, and on well-organized and adequately-supported services. The lack of such facilities and services is, of itself, a barrier to good health care."

Veterans residing in rural and smalltown areas like upstate New York, eastern Montana, and western Colorado, and southern New Mexico could not agree more heartily. The hospitals where they have received treatment are among those that will be closed.

Mr. Chairman, the VFW is just as vigorously opposed to the closing of 17 VA regional offices. Again, it seems to us that the Government has two standards, one for veterans and one for nonveterans, and the veterans are being handed the short end of the stick. Eight States will no longer have a VA regional office and the case files of veterans residing in them will be transferred to other States where all decisions concerning them will be made. The reason offered for closing them is that a large percentage of all contacts are made by mail anyway. Again this leaves out human consideration for we all know how important personal contact is when pursuing a claim with the powerful and impersonal Federal Government.

The Social Security Administration, on the other hand has found it necessary to increase the number of its contact offices. Even if all the VA regional offices that have been ordered closed were to remain open, veterans would not have the convenience afforded to social security claimants.

Another development has taken place, Mr. Chairman, that may seem at first to have nothing to do with the shutdown of Veterans' Administration installations. Merchant seamen formerly cared for in Public Health hospitals, under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, are now being taken care of in Veterans' Administration hospitals. Just as we are opposed to the transferral to other agencies of the responsibilities of the VA, so we are opposed to bringing their responsibilities to the VA. For many decades the VA has successfully operated the national program for veterans and veterans alone. It appears to us that the closing of some VA hospitals and the transfer of Public Health patients into others may be the camel's nose under the tent and before long HEW will move in bodily and take control of the hospital program for veterans. The Veterans of Foreign Wars will fight against any such encroachment to the last ditch.

These, Mr. Chairman, are our views on what we consider a most alarming administrative action. The balance of our program does not fall within the purview of this committee; however, I ask your permission at this time to include in the record as part of my statement a digest of all resolutions passed by our 65th national convention.

Let me close by thanking this committee for the vital role it has played in establishing the fine system of health care and compensation benefits now enjoyed by veterans. You took the lead in putting into motion the 15-year $1.3 billion renovation, modernization, and construction program that has produced such fine results. We note that this year's budget has in it over $97 million as the fifth step of this program and the VFW wants this committee to know of its deep appreciation for its continued leadership in keeping the program going forward as planned. You also guided H.R. 8009 to final approval as Public Law 88–450 providing badly needed nursing care facilities.

For these and many other accomplishments each of you has the heartfelt thanks of the Nation's veterans.

Finally, let me remind you and the committee that our annual dinner honoring Members of Congress who served in the Armed Forces will be held at the Sheraton Park Hotel tonight. More than 400 Members of Congress have accepted our invitation to attend.

The reception will begin at 6 p.m. and the dinner will be served at 7 p.m. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, has been selected to receive our annual Veterans of Foreign Wars Congressional Award for his outstanding service to this Nation. We are looking forward to having you with us.

Thank you again for your kindness in permitting me to appear before you this morning.

Can This Be Anarchy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues of the reason for formation of this Government of the United States of America by quoting from the Declaration of Independence.

We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men.

Mr. Speaker, governments are instituted among men to preserve the rights of all the people through law. Without the rule of law, there is no legitmate function for a government and only those individuals would survive who could successfully take from their fellowman whatever their needs and desires demanded.

I would also like to quote the definition of "anarchy" according to Webster's Dictionary:

Anarchy: (a) absence of government (b) a state of lawlessness or political disorder due to the absence of governmental authority—absence or denial of authority.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is going on in Selma? Certainly there is a denial of authority, certainly there is a state of lawlessness and political disorder in revolt against governmental authority. In other words, Mr. Speaker, what we have today in Selma is anarchy and unless we return to the rule of reason, return to the respect for law and obey the rules of duly constituted law enforcement agencies, the anarchy being encouraged in Selma, may well consume the fires of freedom of this Nation and the rights of all the people will perish, including the minority with which we are presently concerned.

There is no reason for the demonstrations in Selma; no reason for the illegal sitins in the Justice Department and the White House; no reason for the marching and disruption of civil life in Detroit and Chicago and New York and Los Angeles. The Negroes in Selma have the right to register and vote and they are registering. I am told 350 were registered in that little community

within the past weeks. The President of the United States promised Martin Luther King that the voting bill he wanted passed would be sent to the Congress and even now, members of both political parties are drafting legislation. The demands of the leaders of the so-called civil rights movement have been met and are being met. So why the demonstrations? Why the resort to anarchy?

A month ago I appealed to the President and to the Members of this body to use whatever influence they had to bring a halt to these demonstrations and return to the rule of law and order. I warned them that continued defiance of the law could only lead to tragedy and it has. I am sorry for it. Now we must bring an end to these disorders and we must demand that all people obey the law of the land. To make exceptions, for whatever excuse, can only lead to further anarchy, further violence, further tragedy.

In a column in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, March 10, David Lawrence makes an eloquent case for bringing about a return to law and order. I include this column as a part of these remarks:

THE LAW OF THE LAND TODAY

(By David Lawrence)

Once upon a time the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed that "freedom of speech" does not include the right to cry "Fire" in a crowded theater.

Today the principle is being tested in Alabama, where the right to demonstrate has been insisted upon even in the face of the fact that street parades in a tense situation can incite to violence.

Plainly there is among the people a lack of understanding of fundamental constitutional principles. These give every citizen the right to express himself freely, though his views may be unpalatable to others, but the moment the actual utterance of such views occurs under conditions that inflame people to violence, the law steps in and applies a restraining hand.

After a Federal judge had issued a ruling yesterday ordering the parade from Selma to Montgomery to be deferred at least until Thursday, when a hearing would be held on the subject, the demonstrators insisted on going ahead anyhow in defiance of the court order.

Yet these same demonstrators argue that they are being deprived of their civil rights, and they evidently feel this gives them unlimited privilege to disturb the peace. When the police attempted a few days ago to break up the mob in Selma and took stern measures to do so, the officers were charged with brutality. Accusations were then voiced on the floor of Congress against the police, and demands were made for this dispatch of Federal troops to Alabama. Most of those who spoke on the subject ignored the fundamental fact that the right to demonstrate does not include the right to incite anybody to violence.

But Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, in a question-and-answer period after a speech at the Women's National Press Club yesterday, rightly explained that the Federal Government does not have the constitutional power to send troops into any State unless there is a "total breakdown" of law and order and a "total unwillingness" by State officials to maintain order. He said that the primary responsibility for keeping the peace rests with the local authorities.

In the instances when the Kennedy administration sent troops to Alabama and Mississippi, the respective Governors of those States were at least accused of having defied Federal court orders on school integration. In the present case, the Governor of the State warned against the march from Selma to Montgomery and sent State troopers to the scene to prevent disorder.

Basically, the Governor of Alabama was taking the same position President Kennedy took when he sent troops to restrain potential violence and enforce a Federal court order. The purpose of the Alabama Governor was to prevent violence, and he had urged that the march on Montgomery be abandoned for the time being as a measure of safety.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., on the other hand, insisted upon leading the demonstrators for a brief march notwithstanding a Federal judge's order that it be deferred until the case went through the normal judicial process. The presence of State troopers prevented any disturbance of the peace yesterday. The Negro leader, in authorizing the march, said:

"We have the right to walk the highways; we have the right to walk to Montgomery if our feet will get us there. I have no alternative, and I ask you to come with me. This was a difficult and painful decision to make. I know not what lies ahead. There may be beatings, and there may be tear gas."

But it is precisely the incitement to a situation requiring such measures that always has been recognized as being within the province of State or city police to deal with, even to the point of dispersing a nonviolent demonstration that has proved dangerous to the peace of the community.

President Johnson issued a statement regretting the violence that occurred in Selma on Sunday. He declared that "Americans everywhere join in deploring the brutality with which a number of Negro citizens of Alabama were treated when they sought to dramatize their deep and sincere interest in attaining the precious right to vote."

But the President guardedly omitted any criticism of the acts of the demonstrators who defied the police and caused the latter to use force. While Johnson defended the right to demonstrate, he failed to express any concern over the kind of disturbances of the peace that can and often do result from street demonstrations.

Many of the pressure groups claim that they are engaged in nonviolent demonstrations. But, while this may be their intent and objective, their manner of conducting demonstrations often leads to violence. The States have a constitutional right and obligation then to step in and order the dispersal of the demonstrators. This is the true law of the land today.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times published an editorial on March 10, 1965, regarding the reaction to Secretary General Thant's suggestion about negotiations in Vietnam. The Times observes, "This futile game of diplomatic chess thus remains in stalemate while the war itself escalates." I recommend that my colleagues read the following editorial from the New York Times:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1965]

A NEGOTIATION IS A NEGOTIATION

The words were hardly out of Secretary General Thant's mouth when the United States rejected his proposal. He had recommended a seven-power conference on the Vietnamese conflict.

The State Department spokesman gave the same old reply. "We still await some indication that the aggressors are prepared to talk about stopping the aggression," he said, adding that Washington would require advance evidence that negotiations would produce an agreement acceptable to the United States in Vietnam. In other words, the United States will negotiate if our terms are accepted before negotiations begin. So why negotiate?

This futile game of diplomatic chess thus remains in stalemate while the war itself escalates. Yet all wars, including the Vietnamese type, must end in some form of parley. The questions are when and how? President Johnson and his chief advisers believe the time is not ripe and that present circumstances find the United States—strong as it is—in an unfavorable position. American policy therefore is to improve the position and then consider negotiation from a vantage point where terms can be extracted to fit American demands.

On both sides the game is being played as if it can be won or lost. In reality, there can be no "victory" except at a shattering cost in lives and treasure.

President Kennedy put the problem accurately in a speech he made on September 2, 1963. "In the final analysis," he said, "it is their [the South Vietnamese] war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them; we can give them equipment; we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists."

President Johnson, on the contrary, has now changed this policy and is trying to win the war with American arms and American forces on behalf of the South Vietnamese. This is impossible because, as Mr. Kennedy said, "it is their war"—although it is of course also true that the North Vietnamese are supplying increasing help to one side, as the United States is to the other.

The conference that Secretary Thant has recommended may or may not be an answer. It certainly deserves a more sympathetic exploration than it is getting from Washington.

There must be many Congressmen who are unhappy but reluctant to say so, and many, if not most, of the American people who would surely opt for negotiation if the issues—all the issues—were made clear to them. The American public has not been sufficiently informed and it cannot be until President Johnson speaks to the Nation.

No one can ask that he tell exactly what he plans to do, or that he divulge military secrets, or say just what terms would be acceptable, but when the President does not speak the people lack leadership. They have become confused while the Vietnamese conflict has become crucial and dangerous.

Flood Damage Report for County Hits $5,597,426

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the record of damages to the Northwest continues to be compiled as Oregon and the

other States, involved in the record December–January flood, work toward completion of assessment and plans for rehabilitation.

Currently the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Committee on Public Works, is considering means of legislative relief for our disaster stricken part of the Nation. It is altogether timely, therefore, to include in the RECORD the latest damage assessment of only 1 of the 18 counties in my Second District of Oregon. This report of Grant County damages was ably reported in the Blue Mountain Eagle:

[From the Blue Mountain Eagle, John Day, Oreg., Feb. 25, 1965]

FLOOD DAMAGE REPORT FOR COUNTY HITS $5,597,426

Damages caused by the recent floods total $5,597,426 for Grant County. River and agriculture repair costs and flood loss amounts to $4,879,547.

Home damage in Grant County is $222,372.90; business damage stands at $557,069. Damages represents nearly one-tenth of the true cash value of $60,727,124 for the county.

The cash value of the county will be less for the next fiscal year due to the flood loss, says James Allen, county assessor. Reduced livestock valuation and the loss of two mills in Mount Vernon will lower the cash value of Grant County for next year.

An extensive survey compiled by Tom Bunch, county agent at large, revealed heaviest damages were inflicted on the streambanks of the John Day River and its tributaries. An estimated $2,413,256 is needed for new work for the streams. So far, $15,365 has been spent on channel work.

The report has been used to acquire additional Office of Emergency Planning (OEP) and Agriculture Conservation Program (ACP) funds.

Replacing the washed out riprap and levees that were installed prior to the recent flood will cost $165,740. To repair damaged levees and dikes, to clean debris from the river and to reshape the channels will cost at least $628,329.

Land eroded away or damaged by sheet erosion was valued at $249,053. To fill in the newly created gullys across fields will cost $29,048.

Another $217,440 will be needed to clean up debris and to smooth out the silt and gravel deposits on the crop lands.

Cost to replace and rebuild washed-out private irrigation ditches is $29,894. To clean the ditches that are repairable will cost $59,888.

Company ditches damage figure is estimated at $100,000 to replace destroyed ditches and to repair damaged ditches.

Work needed to meet the potential weed infestation in areas covered with silt or gravel deposits or that have been scoured will cost $185,000. This is the latest estimate as many people did not report potential weed infestation on their land.

Stock water damage report may be low but the report indicates that it will cost $1,590 to replace irrigation and stock water ponds. To clean up and repair the ponds will cost $21,591.

Damage to private roads will cost $23,471 to repair. Replacement cost of the washed-out roads is estimated at $7,237.

A total of $165,099 is necessary to replace private bridges in Grant County. An additional $63,251 is needed to repair the partially damaged bridges and to reshape crossings. As of last week when the damage reports were filed $4,490 was already spent on bridge repair. Part of this figure includes work done following the Christmas flood.

The cost to replace washed-out bridges was calculated at $6 per square foot.

An estimated $15,440 worth of livestock was lost in the flood in the county.

It will cost $19,260 to replace destroyed buildings and another $11,777 to repair the damaged structures.

Machinery lost during the flood or rendered useless because of water damage totals $5,035. Repairing damaged machinery will cost $3,953. As of a week ago $170 has been spent on machinery repairs.

To replace washed-out fences in the county, $47,828 is needed. Another $28,332 is required for repair work. So far only $150 has been spent on fence repairs.

The estimated crop loss for Grant County totals $235,846. Hay lost is reported at $119,322. This estimated crop loss and loss of aftermath grazing and permanent pasture is for 1965 only. Hay loss was figured at $30 per ton and grazing loss at $4.50 per animal unit per month. Nearly 4,000 tons of hay was lost during the flood.

Inconvenience cost amounted to $71,499. This cost is associated with flood fighting, loss of livestock weight, housing and feeding people during the flood and general inconvenience associated with or because of the flood. Most people would not put a dollar value on this type of an item for the report.

Loss of supplies such as lumber, fence posts, spools of wire, and firewood was estimated at $27,873.

Bunch, former assistant county agent for Grant County, and who has recently completed his masters degree requirements at Oregon State University, headed the damage report project. Ray Brisbois handled much of the home and business damage survey.

The county agent at large made up the report forms and arranged the numerous meetings throughout the county to help ranchers to complete the reports.

County agent Bill Farrell served as a coordinator between the project report and the county Emergency Action Committee (EAC). The EAC was headed by cochairmen C. L. (Buck) Smith and Jim Maple. Larry Williams was also active in the project.

Heading the subcommittees of the EAC were: Erving Stanbro of Prairie City; Bob Sproul of Mount Vernon; Alvin Brown of Daytonville; Joe Officer of Izee; Rho Bleakman of Monument, and Tom Colvin of Ritter.

Another Citizen Does His Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the Members' attention to an editorial which appeared in the Rockford Morning Star, Rockford, Ill., on July 26, 1964. This editorial was written by Hal Nelson, associate editor of the Rockford Morning Star, who was just named as the recipient of a Freedoms Foundation medal.

In recent weeks we have heard several reports of witnesses refusing to become involved in arrests because of the "inconveniences" that might result for themselves. Thus this story of a citizen going out of his way to aid in the arrest and conviction of persons involved in a robbery even though it meant considerable expense and personal hardship affords a lesson for all who consider themselves good citizens.

ANOTHER CITIZEN DOES HIS DUTY

(By Hal Nelson)

Almost a year ago, on August 10, 1963, Joe Nash's curiosity was aroused by suspicious actions of a man in a telephone booth on Seventh Street.

The next morning, when he saw newspaper stories about two Indianapolis men arrested on charges of robbing a North Second Street phone booth, Joe realized that one of the suspects might have been the man he had seen on Seventh Street.

Joe was in Rockford at the time on a vacation from Mexico City where he is travel editor of the English-language Mexico City News.

It would have been easy for Joe to have decided that the arrest of the two men with $2,376 in nickels, dimes, and quarters in their Indiana-licensed car was none of his business. In these days of apathy and fear of involvement in police matters, many a good citizen would have taken this course.

But Joe has a strongly developed sense of citizen responsibility. Rockford remains his hometown, his legal residence even though he has worked in Mexico City for many years.

He felt he should report what he had seen to police. He made a positive identification of one of the suspects, gave police a statement, promised the State attorney's staff that he would return to testify if needed.

The two suspects were indicted. A trial date was set. Joe arranged to leave his job in Mexico City long enough to fly to Rockford to testify. But he learned the trial had been delayed when he arrived here. Another trial date was set. Before he could be notified, Joe had left on a 2-week trip into sections of Mexico where primitive communication made it impossible to reach him.

The case finally came to trial last week. Joe had extended his vacation 3 days in order to testify. He told his story in circuit court after spending hours in the stifling witness room.

Defense attorneys objected to Nash's testimony—and the judge ordered most of it stricken.

The jury deliberated 6 hours; then returned a verdict of guilty.

Was it worthwhile, this expenditure of time, effort, nerve energy on the part of a private citizen in a matter which did not personally concern him in anyway?

We didn't ask Joe this question. His actions revealed his answer.

But what about the rest of us? Would we have done it?

That's a question we all should ask ourselves. It's much easier to close our eyes and ears and stay out of such matters.

Yet, if we want to live in a country of law and order, of freedom from fear, of liberty to move about without restraint, it's time that more of us follow the course that Joe did.

Selma Now Joins List Headed by Little Rock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, we have all been dismayed and shocked by the barbaric attack upon peaceful demonstrators in Alabama on Sunday. Sunday's brutality poses a threat to all Americans. I wish to bring to the attention of the Members, the comments of the editors of a newspaper in my district—the Ann

Arbor News—regarding the regime now in control in Alabama. I am pleased to insert this editorial in the RECORD:

SELMA NOW JOINS LIST HEADED BY LITTLE ROCK

Thanks chiefly to Alabama's Gov. George A. Wallace, the United States now has another Little Rock, another Oxford. In a sense, Selma is the worst of all.

Wallace was not satisfied simply to emulate Arkansas' Governor Faubus and Mississippi's former Governor Barnett. They used National Guard troops and State police in a negative way, to withhold protection from Negroes attempting to exercise constitutional rights.

Wallace went even further, by having Alabama State troopers attack Negroes walking along a highway. Rarely has any public official in this country gone to such an extreme to demonstrate his unfitness for office.

This is not to suggest that anyone should be surprised by the officially-sanctioned savagery at Selma last Sunday.

Starting before he became Governor, Wallace has demonstrated both in words and in various grotesque actions—such as blocking a school doorway—that he is prepared to do literally anything except treat Negro Alabamians as citizens. The police action at Selma differed in degree, not in kind, from what has happened before during his administration.

The depth of the problem was illustrated by reports that crowds of white Selma residents cheered the State troopers as they chased and beat unarmed Negroes.

While there are no rational excuses or justifications for the situation, explanations are possible.

In the Deep South, the easiest route to political popularity, for nearly a century, has been to resurrect and exploit memories of injustices suffered by the region during Reconstruction. That is what Wallace is doing—very possibly with an eye toward seeking election to the U.S. Senate next year.

The day when racial demagoguery was the complete formula for political success in Dixie seems to be passing. Southerners are not incapable of responding to constructive leadership—a fact ably demonstrated by the Tennessee and Georgia Congressmen reelected last fall after voting for the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

But there is nothing automatic about this evolution. Efforts to hem in men of Wallace's caliber with court injunctions and other legal measures are necessary. A need is also evident for more legislation to assure all citizens an equal opportunity to vote.

No American can be certain his own rights are secure so long as hundreds of citizens feel compelled to demonstrate publicly to draw attention to their inability to exercise this most basic of constitutional rights.

Britain Shifts to Means Test for Medicare Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, can we not profit from the experience of others? Surely we can learn a thing or two from the experience of Britain in experimenting with across-the-board medical care programs unrelated to means.

It is notable that on the eve of action by the U.S. House of Representatives on a proposal which would establish a medical care program without regard to financial need, Great Britain's Labor government has shifted its approach to a means test.

The following article which appeared in the AMA News, a publication of the American Medical Association, recounts what is happening in Britain. It should be "must" reading—and is important reference material for those who will soon vote on the administration's medicare proposal:

SOCIAL SECURITY PROBLEMS—IN BRITAIN: MEANS TEST

Great Britain's Labor government has accepted the doctrine that social security benefits must be directed toward those people who most need them and denied to those who do not, according to the London Times.

The Times, in a story bylined "From Our Political Correspondent," reported that Labor Party leaders are now searching for an acceptable means test—the kind of test the party has traditionally and bitterly opposed.

Nine million pensioners: "Social security studies have shown," the Times reported, "that by the mid-1970's there will be 9 million retirement pensioners, compared with about 6 million today."

"If there is then no means test operating," the story continued, "the burden of fulfilling the Labor manifesto pledge to provide an incomes guarantee for those already retired or widowed will be intolerable."

The Times noted that with a means test, a guaranteed income for everybody would be possible and "account could be taken both of rising standards of living and of inflation.

"It is the logic of the Government's position," the story continued, "that any more increases across the board, from which all benefit equally irrespective of need, should be avoided."

Education needed: The Labor government, the newspaper pointed out, has also recognized a need to educate Labor Party members to the fact that social security is not insurance.

"In the next decade, on the basis of Government studies," the Times said, "there will have to be a clear movement away from the pretense of an insurance basis, so that contributions (to social security) do not necessarily carry the right to benefit without regard to means."

While Labor leaders accept the fact that the country's social security system must be recast in the next decade, they face the need of a "process of education about the realities of social security if they are to carry the country—especially the organized workers—in the radical changes that are foreseen," the Times said.

The 1946 Insurance Act: Great Britain's present system of old-age pensions, and sickness and unemployment benefits is a result of the 1946 National Insurance Act, which provided for uniform cash benefits for all people in specific classes, without regard to income they earned while still working, explained the American Medical Association's Department of Economics.

These uniform benefits were purposely made moderate to avoid the possible problem of malingering and abuse, but the result was that many aged, ill, or unemployed persons got benefits which were not sufficient for a minimum standard of living.

The 1946 act was amended in 1961 to include a supplementary program of benefits. This amendment applied only to those workers whose incomes were above a minimum level, and the amount of the additional benefit was determined by the amount of a worker's income.

Employees, employers pay: The social security program is financed by contributions from employees and employers, plus a flat grant from the Central Government.

Old-age pension benefits amount to approximately $9.50 a week, plus an additional $5.80 a week for pensioners with a dependent wife over the age of 60. This flat pension is supplemented by a benefit which amounts to about 6 cents a week for every $22 a week the pensioner earned during his working days.

This flat rate benefit has, in many instances, proven insufficient to allow pensioners to maintain themselves without added assistance, the AMA department said. Today, approximately two-thirds of the country's aged pensioners are receiving that additional assistance from the Government.

Increases rejected: Suggestions that the pension benefit be raised have been rejected because the cost of the program would be raised beyond a level which the Government feels it and the economy could bear.

Instead, the Government has in the past expanded the assistance program to bring the needy up to a certain minimum standard of living. This, too, has proven costly and it now appears to the Labor government, according to the London Times, that a means test will need to be applied to all benefits for the aged rather than permit receipt of any pensions as a right.

The Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the recent events in Selma, Ala., highlight the imperative need for effective voting rights legislation. The New York Times in an editorial of February 28, 1965, recognized this need and accurately stated, "The most conspicuous weakness of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was it failure to provide adequate protection for Negro voting rights in the South." The Times goes on to state that in order to have effective civil rights legislation it is necessary to obviate the obstruction of southern district courts. The editorial points out that one of our most energetic and dedicated colleagues, WILLIAM F. RYAN, has proposed using the Commission on Civil Rights as the agency to initiate proceedings for the appointment of Federal registrars. James Farmer, the national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, has urged the administration to support the Ryan bill, H.R. 6023.

I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1965]

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The most conspicuous weakness of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was its failure to provide adequate protection for Negro voting rights in the South. The danger implicit in some of the remedial bills now under discussion in the Justice Department and in Congress is that they, too, will fail to meet this issue in a permanent and satisfactory way.

On the Justice Department's recommendation, last year's law approached the voting problem solely through the courts with charges of voting bias to be adjudicated on a

case-by-case basis. But experience has amply demonstrated that in many areas discrimination against Negroes seeking to register or vote is not on any individual basis but represents a persistent, flagrant, widespread pattern.

The Justice Department has now filed 51 suits against registrars and other officials in the South. Four of these suits are intended to prove that a statewide pattern of discrimination exists. But it is likely to be 3 years or more before final decision.

Rather than wait all that time, the White House has announced that it intends to ask Congress for additional legislation this year. Last week 31 Republican leaders demanded prompt administration action on this pledge. Representative WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, Manhattan Democrat, and others in the majority party have also been pressing for early action.

Several broad considerations need recognition if the Federal Government is to end the wholesale disenfranchisement of the southern Negro. Remedy should be sought through a statute, rather than a constitutional amendment. The 15th amendment, ratified 95 years ago, made the Nation's intent in this field clear and comprehensive. The statute should cover State and local as well as Federal elections. It should set up standards of the utmost simplicity.

It is also important that, if a pattern of discrimination exists, an avenue of correction exist outside the Federal district courts. Too many Federal judges in Mississippi and elsewhere have demonstrated overt hostility to the active enforcement of Negro rights. The President, as Congressman RYAN has suggested, might well act upon a finding by the Civil Rights Commission and appoint a Federal voting registrar where systematic discrimination exists.

The disenfranchisement of millions of Negro citizens in the South has besmirched the good name of American democracy for almost a century. Congress must rectify this ancient injustice this year.

A New Lincoln Portrait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, in connection with the reenactment of the second Lincoln Inaugural, it was my pleasure to participate in the unveiling of a newly discovered and restored portrait of Abraham Lincoln.

As we all well know, a Congressman wears many hats, one of the most important of which is to perform various errands connected with the Federal Government for our constituents. About a year ago, I was asked by an official of the Tioga County Historical Society—located in my hometown of Owego, N.Y.—to bring the portrait in question from Owego to Washington for the inspection and advice of Miss Josephine Cobb, a specialist in iconography at the National Archives, and a Lincoln scholar in her own right.

Miss Cobb assured me and the historical society that we undoubtedly had not only a portrait well worth restoring but one which would be an outstanding addition to existing Lincoln memorabilia. The portrait then was returned by me to the society and eventually carried to the Pierpont-Morgan Library in New York City where the necessary work to conserve and restore it was completed.

Thus, finally, what began as a rather routine errand for me in behalf of the society culminated in the return of the portrait to Washington, and to the Capitol, where it was unveiled for the benefit of Lincoln scholars in Statuary Hall—the former House of Representatives Chamber in which Lincoln sat as a Member from Illinois in 1847–48—the actual unveiling taking place, as I have noted on the 100th anniversary of Mr. Lincoln's 2d inaugural.

Mrs. Dorothy Meserve Kunhardt, of New York City, whose knowledge of Lincoln photographs and other Civil War illustrations is extensive and who is publishing, this year, a new book written in collaboration with her son, Philip Kunhardt, on the assassination and funeral of President Lincoln, performed the actual unveiling at a ceremony over which our former colleague, the Honorable Fred Schwengel, of Iowa, presided. Among the special guests who had been invited to the affair were Mrs. Minna Nagel, of the Pierpont-Morgan Library of New York, who had worked on the restoration of the portrait, Mr. Roscoe Geller, president of the Tioga County Historical Society, Mr. and Mrs. Lewis B. Parmerton, of Owego, N.Y., also representing the society, as well as Mr. Elden Billings, president, and other officers and members of the Lincoln group of the District of Columbia who had helped to arrange the unveiling ceremony, and who had obtained the participation of the uniformed men and fife and drum corps of the North-South Skirmish Association.

Later in the day, the portrait was taken to the Smithsonian Institution where it will remain on exhibit for several weeks. Perhaps the best way of describing the portrait to those Lincoln scholars who will not have an opportunity to see it here in Washington, or later on in the Tioga County Historical Society's museum where it will be kept on permanent exhibit, would be to insert Miss Cobb's own description and explanation of it as stated by her during the unveiling ceremony.

Under leave to extend my remarks that explanation follows:

The photographer, Mathew B. Brady, had a photographic art gallery here in Washington, D.C., and he had one also in New York City all during the Civil War and for many years thereafter. Although he is best known for his photographs of battlefields, he was actually a portrait photographer and made his living by taking pictures of people in all walks of life.

In making pictures of prominent people or wealthy people who could afford to pay for such a work, he commissioned artists to finish his camera studies in oil on canvas or on paper. He sold these works as oil paintings and charged $750 apiece for them. During the Civil War period, Brady made oil portraits in this fashion of such notables as General McClellan, Secretary of State Seward, Secretary of the Navy Wells, Abraham Lincoln, Mrs. Lincoln, and many others. Each one was beautifully framed in gold. Among the artists whom he commissioned to do the work in oil were George Peter Alexander Healy, George Story, Henry Ulke, John F. Neagle, Henry F. Darby, Siegfried Hirsch, Anton Berger, and several others. As you know, the works of these artists hang in well-known galleries and all of them are recognized as outstanding American artists of the period.

The method followed by Mathew B. Brady in making a likeness such as this one of Mr. Lincoln was to take a likeness of the subject with a large camera. He then projected the image onto a piece of canvas or a piece of paper in a faint photographic outline. The artist then worked from this outline and completed the portrait in oil. This work was so skillfully done that no trace of the outline can be seen by merely looking at the portrait. But, if the portrait is subjected to an X-ray spectrographic analysis, the presence of a photographic emulsion on the support can be detected. In this way, the beautiful likeness of Mr. Lincoln that we are soon to see was made. We do not yet know for a certainty which of the artists who worked for Mr. Brady made this painting but we know that his was indeed a skillful hand. We are grateful to the Tioga Historical Society for providing the best conservator that could be found to work on this portrait and for making it possible for us to have the painting here for unveiling today.

Mr. Lewis B. Parmerton, of Owego, a director of the Tioga County Historical Society, responding in behalf thereof, also made the following remarks which, under my leave to extend, are now set forth:

Mr. Chairman, guests and other students of Abraham Lincoln, as you know, we are here not only to witness the reenactment of the second inauguration of the 16th President of our country, but also to unveil a painting of Mr. Lincoln, which was recently restored, as near as possible to its original condition, by Mrs. Minna Horwitz Nagel, who is associated with Pierpont Morgan Library and who is a skilled conservator.

We have this painting today because the people of Tioga County, in the State of New York, have been proud of their history and their famous forebears. It was this pride and their interest in history which moved them to form the Tioga County Historical Society 51 years ago for the purpose of preserving historical, cultural, and educational articles of interest.

Over the years, many gifts have been made to its collection. In addition the society was fortunate in receiving a large bequest, with part of which it was able to erect and dedicate a museum in 1960.

It was slightly more than a year after the dedication, that our then new president, R. G. Geller, who is here today, was attracted to the painting of Abraham Lincoln. The portrait was covered with a film of grime, its edges were curled and broken and generally it was in poor condition. He recognized a beauty in Mr. Lincoln's face that warranted investigation, which has resulted in the painting as you will see it today.

This likeness was one a number of pictures and paintings bequeathed to the society in 1925 by Eudora Tiffany Burgess who was the widow of Andrew Burgess. Mr. Burgess was not only a famed gunsmith, but was an excellent photographer who had been associated with Mathew Brady.

Had there been no historical society in 1925, I fear that this painting would have been lost, destroyed or ruined for lack of care, interest, or knowledge.

So it is, ladies and gentlemen, that the Tioga County Historical Society is pleased and happy to have had the help, advice, and encouragement of Miss Josephine Cobb in the restoring and preserving of this rare and unique portrait. I say unique, because there appears in the upper right hand corner a painting of a Zouave soldier. It is believed that this is symbolic of Lincoln's friendship with Elmer Ellsworth, who was one of the

first soldiers killed in the Civil War and was buried from the White House. We hope that you will find the painting and its restoration as beautiful as we believe it to be.

Resources and Conservation Council Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post for Friday, March 5, President Johnson was quoted as telling the Cabinet that there are entirely too many interagency committees. I endorse the President's objectives of correcting this situation.

Of particular concern to me has been the proliferation of interagency activity in the field of natural resource administration. According to my research with the four major natural resource agencies—Interior, Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Commerce—and the Bureau of the Budget, there are over 50 major interdepartmental or interagency committees dealing with natural resources and literally hundreds of special committees and task forces concerned with regional, river basin, or special-subject resource areas.

I realize, of course, that many of these are necessary to coordinate Federal action, but I suggest to the President and the Members of the Congress that a great many of these—particularly in the policy area—would be unnecessary if there were established a Resources and Conservation Council within the executive office of the President focusing its attention upon the integration, development, promotion, and utilization of our natural resources in the national interest.

I have introduced legislation to accomplish this objective in H.R. 4430. In the other body, a similar measure has been introduced by Senator McGOVERN, S. 938.

In behalf of this legislation I have furnished the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], the following statement which outlines my views on this important subject.

The text of this statement follows:

STATEMENT OF AL ULLMAN, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE SECOND DISTRICT OF OREGON, WITH REFERENCE TO H.R. 4430, FEBRUARY 24, 1965

The Nation has striven for over three decades to find the leadership and coordination required for its proliferated natural resource policies and programs. In this time the need for leadership has never diminished only increased as a more complex life and ever burdgeoning population has demanded more and more of our national, natural resource base.

A historic review of the efforts to develop a national resource and conseravtion policy and, or the machinery to implement such policy is not necessary here. We are all familiar with such valiant, albeit frequently segmented, efforts as the Natural Resources Planning Board in the early years of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission and Material Policy Commission, the Second Hoover Commission, President Eisenhower's Cabinet Committee on Water Resources Policy, the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and others.

All these efforts have been merely partial reflections of our country's continued search for natural resource leadership.

Finally in recent years we have seen high support given to the thesis that a real need exists for natural resource leadership. The report of the Kennedy-Johnson Natural Resources Advisory Committee, approved January 17, 1961 took the position:

"Existing Federal agencies can do the necessary work for a meaningful conservation program. But conflicts between agencies can only serve to delay and defeat achievement of natural resources programs. Policy guidance can come from the President and a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers in the Office of the President."

Most important of all endorsements for resource leadership and the need for executive coordination of Federal resource programs came from President Kennedy himself, both before and after the 1960 election. In his Helena, Mont., address of June 27, 1960, he said:

"We need a whole new concept of resource development. The days when our natural wealth was so plentiful that a little effort brought great rewards—those days have passed. Nor can we any longer look upon each resource need as a separate and individual item, requiring separate planning and separate administration.

"Today's resource needs are closely interrelated. The development of our water supplies affects the irrigation of our land and even our stocks of fish. Forest development influences power development, and our power development can only be carried out with a careful eye to the need for flood protection and the needs of navigation. Soil conservation affects water supply, game supplies for our hunters, as well as our continued ability to meet our food and fiber needs.

"As our needs mount and our population grows, it will become increasingly essential that we consider all our resources in light of their relationship to each other—as well as to the economy as a whole, and the needs of our people.

"That is why I support efforts to establish a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers in the Office of the President—a council which will engage in overall resources planning and policy, which will assess our national needs, and recommend national programs to meet them.

"With such a Council, working in cooperation with a joint congressional committee, we can have a continuous appraisal of our resource needs, an up to date inventory of our resource potential, and a resource development program which can be shaped to fit all the needs of a growing economy and an expanding population."

Senator Kennedy repeated these ideas several times during the campaign.

At Redding, Calif., on September 8, he said:

"I think it would be most useful to establish for the Office of the President himself a Council of Resources and Conservation. Advisers to survey the whole scope of our natural resources for 1970 and 1980."

Then at the Western Water and Power Consumers Conference at Billings, Mont., on September 23, he again proclaimed:

"We will establish a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers in the Office of the President to coordinate planning in this field. We have had many short-term, limited, piecemeal studies. We have not had enough long-range continuing and comprehensive surveys to determine the needs of our country, the increases in our population, the available resources and how they can be fitted together to build a strong and vital country. We need a permanent inventory of where we stand now and where we want to be tomorrow in water, power, timber, recreation, and other resources."

And at Phoenix, Ariz., on November 3, he said:

"We must recognize the increasing interdependence of all of our resource needs by establishing in the Office of the President a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers, to conduct a continuous appraisal of resource needs, inventory our resource potential, and formulate a resources program to meet the needs of a growing population and an expanding economy."

Finally in his great natural resources message to the Congress on February 23, 1961, President Kennedy presented a stirring challenge to the people and to the Congress. He said:

"This statement is designed to bring together in one message the widely scattered resource policies of the Federal Government. In the past these policies have overlapped and often conflicted. Funds were wasted on competing efforts. Widely differing standards were applied to measure the Federal contribution to similar projects. Funds and attention devoted to annual appropriation or immediate pressures diverted energies away from long-range planning for national economic growth."

The President thus pointed out that all of our divergent programs, involving numerous Federal agencies, require coordination by the Executive. To this, I subscribe most heartily and to accomplish this end emphasize that the President needs high-level professional assistance.

The 88th Congress brought to fruition natural resource legislation of great magnitude. The work of this historic "Conservation Congress" is now being boldly advanced in the 89th Congress as both the Congress and President Johnson further the ideals of a Great Society founded on fundamental environmental precepts of: pollutant control in the air, water, and soil—the restoration of beauty, tranquillity, and space to city and countryside—the preservation of wilderness and scenic and historic sites and waterways—the enhancement of recreational opportunity on public lands and the encouragement of State, local, and private recreational resource effort and the transformation of depressed regional areas into productive economic assets.

These great and important programs for America must go forward—but they bring into even greater focus than ever before the tremendous proliferation of new and existing resource programs in the Executive agencies and the competition of the agencies for their place in the favored light. This is obvious in water pollution control, pesticide review, recreational enhancement, rural water development, river basin planning, water storage for flood control, power and irrigation, the dedication of our public lands, urban land planning and development, and regional economic and resource development efforts.

Beyond these individual or group program areas, I am deeply concerned with their interrelations and the priority of Federal fund allocations for resource projects.

In this latter aspect I am particularly concerned with budgetary denials to natural resource needs predicated not on resource or economic evaluation but rather upon arbitrary agency ceilings and pressures favoring particular units of the executive branch.

The Bureau of the Budget has not acted on resource appropriations with a view to coordinating and furthering the Nation's future economic well-being by considering the relationship between this desirable objective and the development of our natural resources. The record is replete with hundreds of examples to prove this assertion. Further it is obvious that the Bureau of the Budget is incapable of changing its' role as an integrating force whose main concern is bookkeeping and budget to one of resource development. It should be equally apparent that the many agencies in the resource field will continue to follow Parkinson's law and that the Council of Economic Advisers is without expertise in the resource area.

Thus, I find invalid arguments advanced to the effect that the Bureau of the Budget, with the several resource agencies, and an occasional review by the Council of Economic Advisers can in themselves coordinate and further natural resource policy.

To me the only way we may proceed with practicality is to have a resource advisory council directly responsible to the President—which is focused on one thing and one thing only—the integration, development, promotion, and utilization of our natural resources in the national interest.

The bill I have introduced H.R. 4430 is identical with S. 938 introduced by Senator McGovern. It is similar to S. 2549 of the 86th Congress and S. 239 and S. 1415 of the 87th Congress upon which the Senate held lengthy hearings.

My intent in introducing this measure in the House in this session is to focus the attention of this body and its' deliberations on this matter. This, I regard, as most important. The House should not sidestep the issue of natural resource leadership by leaving it up to Senate resolution first or to possible Executive action which may or may not develop.

In examining this measure, and indeed this entire thesis, one cannot escape several facts. First, that Presidential prerogative is involved to a high degree in the establishment of any White House Advisory Council. It is obvious that the President's position must be ascertained. This, I suggest, might well be done by the Members of the House most deeply concerned with natural resource matters.

Second, this bill concerns itself with an annual "Resources and Conservation Report of the President." The intent here is not to secure a voluminous annual report covering every facet of natural resources endeaver each year. Rather, it is to focus the detailed analysis and professional thought of the Council and the President's recommendations on the saliant resource problems of priority concern to the Nation. I would envision a report one year perhaps emphasizing water development needs, development criteria and legislative and administrative implementation, another year a report centering on irrigation policy with regard to surplus crop production or public land user policy, etc.

Third, that the establishment of any special committees in the Congress such as this bill proposes namely the "Conference Committee on the Resources and Conservation Report" is a delicate undertaking at best and perhaps not the most workable solution particularly within the House of Representatives. Nevertheless, again the Congress must come to grips with the problem within the legislative sphere just as we must expect the Executive to face up to the Nations needs for natural resource leadership.

Finally in closing let me only emphasize again that proliferation of our natural resource effort grows greater across a broad sphere despite such excellent efforts as H.R. 1111, the Water Resources Planning Act—that piecemeal solutions are simply not enough—that a progressive natural resource policy predicated on development and wise use is the foundation for our future national growth and that all of us concerned with these problems must act in concert, with provincial views set aside, for the national good.

Immigration Is a Matter of People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD the following statement of the Most Reverend John J. Krol, which appeared in the U.S. Catholic magazine March 1965 issue:

IMMIGRATION IS A MATTER OF PEOPLE

(By the Most Reverend John J. Krol)

In the Providence of God, all men created to His image and likeness are bound by a solidarity which transcends national, political, geographic, and racial barriers. All men are members of the same human family. All have a right to the riches of this earth and the responsibility of making these riches available to all members of the huge human family.

The phenomenon of migration is an historical fact and a natural law. The physical world is subject to a law which stirs and mixes the elements of life without destroying them. Organisms born in a certain spot are transported and scattered from place to place. Seeds migrate on the swirling winds. Fish, birds, and animals migrate as a means of self-preservation. In like manner, man migrates to escape want or political, religious, or racial persecution.

Migration is a natural inalienable human right which the State, or rather the States, are obliged to recognize, respect, and protect. However, this fact does not prevent, but emphasizes the necessity of human action regulating and guiding emigration, so that it may fulfill its natural object which Pope Pius XII described as "the more advantageous distribution of humanity on the surface of the earth."

A passage from the profound social document of our late beloved Pope John, Pacem in Terris, summarizes these truths: "Among the rights of a human person there must be included the one by which a man may enter a political community where he hopes he can more fittingly provide a future for himself and his dependents. Wherefore, as far as the common good rightly understood permits, it is the duty of the state to accept such immigrants, and to help integrate them into itself as new members."

Political, social, and economic, considerations are factors in the determination of a nation's immigration policy. However, a nation's moral sense, its values and traditions, its attitude toward the realization of the common good, the very way in which it looks upon itself, these also are inseparable from the way it treats strangers desiring to dwell within its confines.

No one seriously proposes that unrestricted immigration be restored by the United States. But even so, is it not true that we experience a sense of pride when we hear the words inscribed on the Statute of Liberty.

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shores.
Send them, the homeless, tempest lost, to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Maintain the national interest, yes; but is not the preservation of these sentiments and ideals a deep and integral part of our national interest?

The national and international implications of immigration policies have grown increasingly more complex and sensitive. Someone has aptly described our time as the era of the dispossessed, a time of upheaval and mass shifting of people. Populations are rapidly increasing. Automation is changing the structure of industry and business, while the labor force grows but cannot adapt quickly to automation, since the labor force is people not machines. Any attempt to enact a new set of immigration laws in the changing context of the present-day world would be fraught with problems, and rightly should be subject to critical analysis.

As a matter of fact, many persons have strongly criticized the current immigration law. Last summer, former Attorney General ROBERT F. KENNEDY said that the present law is "a standing affront to millions of our citizens and our friends abroad." Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson have all said that new immigration legislation is a necessity. Countless articles, speeches, and group proposals have given insistent expression to that judgment; yet despite this concerted effort, the 1952 law remains.

This has been a source of discouragement and frustration to many. But it only serves to demonstrate that laws are enacted or changed only where there is a demand for action. The call has not been long, loud, or clear enough to prompt the people in large numbers to recognize that a change in the immigration policy is for the national interest. Voters are not easily aroused to consider issues which do not touch upon their immediate concerns.

It is not necessary to review here the history of the immigration policy of America, nor to speak about the statistics of population projections, shifts in the labor force, or the other factors which condition the standard of living. These are matters for the experts to study and debate. But the recommendations resulting from these studies should reflect the confident optimism of the American people. The immigration policy of a nation mirrors its image of itself. Is it our wish to advertise America to the world as a nation whose dynamism is grinding to a halt and whose genius to absorb and become enriched by diverse elements is beginning to ebb?

Many call for a change in our immigration policy to improve America's image abroad. This is indeed a valid concern. We do live in a community of nations and we wish to leave to future generations an America which enjoys good relations with other peoples. This is surely a part of our national interest. But even more important than how other people see us, is how we see ourselves. We must be true to ourselves as a nation, to the traditions and principles which have given growth to America. Fear, overcautiousness, national selfishness should not form the basis of any American policy.

A revision or modernization of the immigration policy to be realistic needs restrictions and controls, quantitatively first of all, to determine an annual quota consistent with the needs and capacities of America; but also qualitatively to guard against the entry of subversives and criminals and to encourage the coming of the especially skilled and the talented. An honest appraisal of the national interest, an honest appraisal, not nearsighted, gloomy, or complacent, should be the basis of the law; but let the law also be enlivened by the spirit of justice and compassion which reflects the heart of America.

You are all familiar with the evolution and present provisions of the national origins quota system. Prescinding from the motives of those who enacted this system into law, it must be stated that the practical con-

sequences of it are a matter of deep concern. May I just say that, for very personal reasons, I am happy that it was not in effect at the turn of the century. For perhaps if it were, two young people from Eastern Europe might not have been able to come to this country, settle here, marry and raise eight children to enjoy America's blessings and in some measure, I trust, bring credit to her good name.

Immigration is a matter of law—of natural law and positive law. Just as the Constitution gives expression to the natural rights of man; so also should the immigration law be in accord with the inalienable human right of migration. It is within the framework of law that the phenomenon of immigration has to take place. If the law is not flexible enough to allow the problems of immigration to be faced on the human level in a just and compassionate way, then the law should be modified.

But immigration is not only a matter of law; it is far more poignantly a matter of people. The most direct problems that are faced are neither political nor technical; but questions which the human and social actuality pose. As Pope John said elsewhere in Pacem in Terris:

"The sentiment of universal fatherhood which the Lord has placed in our heart makes us feel profound sadness in considering the phenomenon of political refugees, a phenomenon which has assumed large proportions and which always hides numberless acute sufferings."

We may say the same regarding all persons who have been uprooted, who have to be resettled and readjusted to a new way of life. This pastoral solicitude accounts for the efforts of the Catholic Church to form and maintain national parishes to meet the needs of immigrant peoples. These parishes enable these people to preserve and strengthen their religious life and customs, and to enjoy the great consolation of worshiping and confessing in their mother tongue. They have provided in the course of time for the transition of the children of these people into the more general American way of life which has thereby been greatly enriched.

The physical, psychological and spiritual well-being of immigrants, whether voluntary or refugees, should concern all of us. Experience has shown that even so human a thing as having a familiar meal may be a matter of great importance to a recent arrival. Far more important are his family ties, his manner of worship, his loneliness and heartaches of separation, and his feelings of inferiority.

Let us accept the reality of immigration and the responsibilities that it brings taking as our counsel the words of Isaiah the prophet (Isaiah 58: 7, 8):

"Share thy bread with the hungry, and bring the needy and the harborless into thy house. When thou shalt see one naked, cover him and despise not thy own flesh. Then shall thy light break forth as the morning * * * and thy justice shall go before thy face and the glory of the Lord shall gather thee up."

Protection of Voting Rights

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, the news of the past few days in Selma, Ala., where police have beaten, mauled, and gassed unarmed and unoffending citizens has been a cause for grave alarm for our Nation. Had it not just happened, it would be unthinkable in this day and age that police who have sworn to uphold the law and protect the citizenry could turn on them with a violent attack.

The right of citizens to assemble peacefully and to petition their elected officials for redress of their grievances is as old as free government and as plain as the Constitution. The State of Alabama has the responsibility to protect its citizens, both Negro and white, in the exercise of that right.

But Gov. George C. Wallace has instead chosen to meet peaceful protest with armed force, and by so doing has brought shame to his State and to our Nation.

With the enactment of the civil rights law of 1964, the perpetrators of bigotry and discrimination should have recognized the end of a shameful era and the beginning of a new era in which all citizens shall enjoy the rights and privileges granted them under the Constitution. The consensus of responsible Americans is denouncing racial prejudice; the clergy who went to Selma and the white citizens of Alabama who protested the recent infamous events speak for the great majority, who will no longer tolerate discrimination and violence.

Unless the State of Alabama recognizes that the tide is turning against bigotry, and unless the Negroes living in Alabama be given their right to vote, then there is no other course of action left to the Congress but to enact strong voting rights legislation, providing for whatever is necessary to insure that Negroes be given the unqualified right to vote. And I hasten to add that I would be a strong supporter of this action.

Selma Demonstrations Proceeding According to Blueprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, no right thinking American can be happy with what is going on in Selma, Ala. We are witnessing a complete breakdown of law and order. We witnessed open defiance of a Federal court order and total disregard of a plea by the President of the United States to halt further marches. For what? To gain the right to vote for Negroes?

I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, this is not the objective of the Selma demonstrations and never has been the objective. Before these demonstrations ever started, Negroes in Alabama had the right to vote. The registrars of the city of Selma were making every effort to comply with the voting provisions of the civil rights law which Congress passed so overwhelmingly last year. The increase in Negro registrations in Selma and throughout Alabama almost without exception compared most favorably with the increase in Negro registrations in other sections of the Nation including New York, Michigan, and California.

What then is the purpose of these continuing demonstrations in Selma? The purpose was well set out and a blueprint drawn for the demonstrations, a blueprint which included plans to provoke the arrest of the civil rights leader and to incite violence. The purpose was to arouse public opinion in support of a Federal election law. The blueprint was set forth in the National Observer of last Monday, March 8, and I include the article at this point as a part of these remarks:

A CHANGE IN TACTICS: A MASTER PLAN GUIDES NEGROES IN ALABAMA, SETS NEXT MOVES

Leaders of the Negro voting drive in Alabama are nearing a decision on whether to employ their most dramatic strategy: An all-Negro election of legislators to challenge the seating of the State's regularly elected lawmakers.

The strategy is embodied in an elaborate blueprint, titled project for Alabama, that was drawn up last year. A copy of the document obtained by the National Observer shows that the current voter-registration drive in Selma and nearby communities is following the blueprint closely.

The election strategy calls for Negroes to challenge the seating of white legislators when the legislature convenes May 4.

THE NEGRO STRATEGY

The idea is to rally the State's Negroes—most of them are not registered to vote in Alabama's official elections—for a Negro-sponsored election. Civil rights leaders hope enough Negroes would vote to give each legislator they choose more votes unofficially than the regularly elected legislator got in the same district. Rights leaders would then argue that the regularly elected legislators were not duly elected because Negroes, who could have outvoted the registered voters, were denied the ballot.

The blueprint specifies that "quotas that must be met should be set for each district with the idea of topping the number of votes gotten by the white representative or senator in that district." The blueprint calls this the freedom vote campaign.

If the legislators elected by Negroes are not seated, the blueprint declares that "demonstrations should ensue until legislatures elected by the freedom vote attain their rightful seats, or until people can freely register."

Thus the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., and those leading the voter-registration campaign with him would introduce a new tactic in the racial struggle. The Reverend James Bevel, director of the Alabama project for Dr. King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, acknowledges the plan. But he told the National Observer that if Congress passes legislation now being drafted to remove barriers to Negro registration and voting, the freedom vote plan may not be used.

CONFERENCE IN WASHINGTON

Dr. King was in Washington at week's end to discuss the proposed legislation with President Johnson. Before the meeting, the White House announced that the legislation is "still being checked out" by the Justice Department before the President sends it to Congress in a special message.

The legislation is expected to place a moratorium on the use of literacy tests and provide, as a last resort, Federal registrars to register Negroes where local officials won't.

Such a bill has a good chance in Congress. RUSSELL LONG, the Democrat's assistant floor leader in the Senate and a southerner him-

self (Louisiana), indicates he'll support new voting legislation. And EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, Republican Senate leader, declares his support. True, a Senate filibuster by southerners still is possible; the Senate Rules Committee in a 5-to-4 vote last week, defeated a proposal to make it easier to cut off Senate debate. Presently, a two-thirds majority vote is required to shut off Senate debate.

Alabama civil rights leaders are eager for assurance on the legislation. There is little time remaining before May 4 to get candidates picked and the freedom vote machinery in operation, should they go ahead with the plan. The blueprint calls for a state convention of Alabama Negroes to select candidates. Then posters and handbills are to be distributed advertising the candidates, 10,000 "Freedom Army Handbooks" are to be distributed, and Negroes are to be registered for the unofficial vote.

HEADQUARTERS IN MONTGOMERY

The project would be coordinated through a project office in Montgomery. The office would dispense money, cars, and buses, registration forms, press releases, and campaign materials for the freedom vote.

It also would provide speakers and formats for mass meetings. In addition, according to the blueprint: "All legal and medical help can be secured through the project office; this includes bonds, payment of fines caused by harassment, and doctor bills."

Harassment not only is expected; it is counted upon in the project for Alabama blueprint. The freedom vote section of the document is preceded by a freedom registration section, outlining the part of the overall movement that has been underway in the Selma area. "Arrests should continue over months," says the blueprint, "to create interest in the freedom registration and freedom vote." The plan specifies that "arrests and violence should be interpreted as an abridgment of freedoms fought for and won in the Revolutionary War, but able to exist today because officials are not responsible to citizens of the State, those citizens not having the right to equal representation or the right to vote."

ARREST ACCORDING TO PLAN

The blueprint even includes the assumption that Dr. King would be jailed—as he was. The blueprint declares: "After Dr. King is in jail, a letter dealing with bombings, violence, not being represented, etc., should be widely distributed to Negroes in Alabama (letter from the Selma jail). At the proper time, the advisory board and project leaders shall formally declare that the problems of Selma and other similar Black Belt areas will only be resolved when Negroes participate in the government of Alabama."

But Dr. King did not write the letter from the Selma jail. According to the Reverend Mr. Bevel, it and some other publicity plans contained in the blueprint, such as the purchase of newspaper ads in 21 heavily Negro counties, were dropped because the movement got better press coverage in Alabama than expected. Admits the Reverend Mr. Bevel: "Alabama newspapers have been very decent in reporting what is going on and defining our aims to the people." He mentioned the Birmingham News in particular. But he adds, "If the papers fail to clarify our positions or carry our statements, then we will have to do it (purchase ads)."

DECLARATION OF FREEDOM

Other parts of the blueprint, however, are being carried out as specified. The "Declaration of Freedom" that the blueprint says the advisory board should draft and present to Gov. George Wallace is ready. Negroes from throughout the State will got to the statehouse in Montgomery Wednesday to present the declaration, which will ask that Governor Wallace "immediately remove all barriers that keep Negroes from full participation in the government."

Also, the King-Douglass workshops provided for in the blueprint are being organized. This, the Reverend Mr. Bevel declares, will be the beginning of a "different movement" in the racial struggle. It will "combine the nonviolent philosophy of Dr. King with the political philosophy of Frederick Douglass" in preparing Negroes to lead integration activities in Alabama. Frederick Douglass was the escaped Negro slave who won historical fame in the Civil War and Reconstruction eras for his speaking and writing on behalf of the Abolitionist cause. His political philosophy, according to the Reverend Mr. Bevel, was that racial problems in the South never would be solved until Negroes had Federal protection.

A LACK OF LEADERS

A major hindrance in carrying out all of the blueprint has been a lack of sufficient numbers of trained leaders. The problem is the staff people we would use for some of these things are tied up with other things going on now," says the Reverend Mr. Bevel.

Leadership and organization called for in the blueprint are extensive. There are to be "precinct workers, block captains, and block workers" to rally Negro voters throughout the State. The blueprint calls for an "Operation Dialog," through which Negro leaders communicate "with the white communities, informing them of our frustrations and objectives in going to jail and conducting freedom registration." There is to be a speakers' bureau to conduct mass meetings "to make crystal clear the objectives of the statewide project." There are to be film showings and nonviolent workshops. Field offices are to be established. Maps showing Negro precinct divisions for the elections are to be prepared. A newspaper, the Alabama Citizen, is called for. A list of 22 key staff positions is in the blueprint, in addition to a special provision for 20 "volunteer workers that will receive $10 a week."

BOYCOTT IDEA STUDIED

Much of this remains to be carried out, but it is being done. Six counties now have nonviolent training workshops; these eventually are to exist throughout the State. And research is underway on one of the most potentially effective weapons indicated in the blueprint: An economic boycott, aimed particularly at "new and expanding industries" in Alabama. The blueprint calls for "an analysis of the economic situation of Alabama * * * searching out the point where a boycott would be most devastating."

Some white leaders in Alabama have obtained copies of the blueprint, studied it, and cited it as evidence that there is nothing spontaneous about the Negro activities. But Negro leaders see such extensive organization as necessary for those activities to get results. Declares the blueprint unequivocally: "The Negroes of Alabama will be organized into a unit that can effectively carry out a statewide nonviolent campaign."

The blueprint was drawn up by Negro leaders last September immediately after a Negro church was bombed in Birmingham. The Reverend Mr. Bevel relates: "We asked ourselves, what can we do about Alabama?"

The blueprint is their answer.

GERALD GEORGE.

The Vietnam White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New Republic magazine of March 13, 1965, published an article on the State Department's white paper on Vietnam which deserves careful attention. The article follows:

THE WHITE PAPER

The best that can be said about the State Department's white paper on Vietnam is that it is entirely unconvincing. The worst is that it is contradictory, illogical, and misleading. It has a desperate purpose: to prepare the moral platform for widening the war. The bombs which United States and South Vietnamese attackers hurled at North Vietnam last week were probably being loaded as the white paper was distributed in Washington. Still, American sensibilities demand some small assurance that precipitous acts of war spring not from blind frustration but from considered judgment. The white paper attempts to prove that escalation is the only reasonable response to a war which is quite simply a case of flagrant aggression by North Vietnam.

Not even the North Vietnamese would deny that they have given the Communist Vietcong in the south some measure of military aid and moral support. It is hard enough to find a purely civil war in history, and increasingly in this century internal conflicts are attended by international kibitzers on all sides—in the Congo, the Yemen, and Cuba no less than in Vietnam. But the State Department is out to prove much more than meddling: North Vietnam, it says, "has used every resource of its own government to carry out its carefully planned program of concealed aggression. North Vietnam's commitment to seize control of the south is no less total (equally total? or more total?) than was the commitment of the regime in North Korea in 1950." Then begins a "summary of the massive evidence of North Vietnamese aggression," in 64 chart-filled and picture-padded pages.

All the State Department's Himalayan labor has brought forth a mouse of an argument. The first conclusion made is that North Vietnamese infiltrators make up the bulk of the Vietcong forces, and 19 cases are cited as proof, complete with photographs of the men, their military history and dramatic narrative, "Then the more than 300 men began walking to the south. * * * They marched by day, rested at night." But of the 19 infiltrators, 16 are South Vietnamese natives who were returning to their homeland, 1 is unidentified by place of birth, and only 2 are North Vietnamese. All were captured in either 1962 or 1963, although the white paper can't be that outdated; it contains other material about 3 weeks old. In a very short section which appears to be an afterthought, six more infiltrators of North Vietnamese origin are named, without photographs or military history. They provide the only evidence for the paper's contention that "as many as 75 percent of the more than 4,400 Vietcong who are known to have entered the South in the first 8 months of 1964 were natives of North Vietnam."

Figures are given to support the State Deaprtment's claim that infiltrators from the North—allowing for casualties—make up the majority of the so-called hard-core Vietcong. But the white paper conspicuously ignores its own advice; it does not allow for casualties among the 19,500 confirmed and 17,550 estimated infiltrators of the past 5 years. Allowing for the generally accepted Vietcong casualty rate of 50 percent, half of the infiltrators must be removed from battle each year. In the hard-core Vietcong force of 35,000 and the full army of 115,000, that leaves a current total of only 4,200 confirmed and perhaps 3,300 more estimated infiltrators—of whom perhaps fewer than half are native North Vietnamese.

But the State Department would have it both ways: even if careful readers of the white paper should discover that North Vietnamese aid the Vietcong in roughly the same

proportion that Americans aid the government troops, they are assured that mere numbers are unimportant. The infiltrators are as tough as tigers, and 10 feet tall. "The infiltration of 5,000 guerrilla fighters in a given year is the equivalent of marching perhaps 50,000 regular troops across the border," cautions the State Department. Though the Vietcong fights against all the State Department holds dear, neither napalm in the south nor bombs in the north seem to shake its determination. What the white paper does not explain is the stubborn courage and tenacity of the Vietcong of whatever provenance or hardness of core, year after year, for none of the usual rewards and against staggering odds of survival.

The second conclusion the white paper draws is that war materiel from North Vietnam and its Communist-bloc allies is pouring into the south. The paper is crowded with photographs of weapons, like a mail-order catalog, to bring home the full impact. But the long inventory of all Communist-made weapons captured from the Vietcong in an 18-month period from June 1962, to January 29, 1964, includes only 22 crew-served weapons (mortars, recoilless rifles, etc.) and 155 smaller arms, hardly enough to equip 1 of the 139 Vietcong companies. These weapons could have come from anywhere, including Alexandria, Va., where a private arms supplier lists almost all of the items mentioned. Communist weapons captured from the Egyptians by Israeli soldiers in 1956 turn up regularly on the open market, in enough quantities to allow any government to prove Communist involvement in the rebellion of its choice.

Before it became necessary to deny the existence of a civil war in South Vietnam, American military men admitted that about 80 percent of the Vietcong's weapons were unwittingly supplied by the United States by loss, theft, or sale by enterprising South Vietnamese. It now appears that the experts were wrong; if only 177 foreign weapons could be found in Vietcong hands in 18 months, the enemy must be 99 percent equipped with American materiel. Obviously no believable case for a claim of massive arms infiltration could be built on the official list in the white paper, even stretched as it is by the inclusion of every bullet, messkit, and pair of socks. And so, quite providentially, a larger supply of infiltrated arms was found in a sunken North Vietnamese junk in a southern harbor, just as the white paper was being prepared. In the annals of mystery ships, this one poses a fine puzzle. Perhaps the combined United States and South Vietnamese naval patrols are more inefficient than is usually conceded, but the ship was the first encountered in the history of the war. In any case, it hardly merits the full-throated treatment afforded by the white paper. The ship was about the size of a Coast Guard cutter, or slightly larger than the original *Santa Maria*, carrying about one-seventieth of the tonnage of a standard World War II Liberty ship. In relation to the amount of arms supplied regularly to the South Vietnamese by the United States, its supply was insignificant.

The white paper fails to sustain its two major contentions, that there is a large, militarily crucial infiltration of both men and materiel from Hanoi. It also fails to make its political points. The State Department claims that hostilities in South Vietnam began in 1959, as "a brutal campaign of terror and armed attack inspired, directed, supplied, and controlled by the Communist regime in Hanoi." But it was the late President Diem's abolition of the elected village councils in 1956 which made South Vietnam a true dictatorship and alienated a sizable proportion of the population. In response, the rebellion began early in 1957. It is still an ugly war. According to the white paper, the Vietcong killed 1,359 civilians last year. According to our allies the South Vietnamese, and not reported in the white paper, the United States kills about 20,000 villagers and volunteers every year, largely by napalm bombing. The white paper cites as evidence of North Vietnamese involvement a report of the International Control Commission for Vietnam, which criticized Hanoi's activities in June 1962. The paper does not include item 20 of the Commission's report, however, which charges both the United States and South Vietnam with violating the 1954 Geneva Agreement on Indochina. Nor does it mention the Commission's reported criticism on February 13 of American attacks on North Vietnam, which were called unjustified. The paper destroys all credibility when it selects those findings of the Commission which seem to help its case, and then ignores those which contradict it.

To misunderstand the war in Vietnam is to condemn the United States to dishonor, defeat, or worse. The white paper repeats the misunderstandings of the last 6 years, and compounds them with deception. It is no good pretending that there is no civil war in progress in South Vietnam, and that the whole bloody business would end if North Vietnam would "leave its neighbor alone." There is no point in maintaining the fiction that the United States is involved "at the request of the people of South Vietnam," as the white paper does. There is no democratic way for the people of South Vietnam to express themselves—Diem and his successors have seen to that. If asked, and they will not be, the people of South Vietnam would doubtless want to send everyone away, Americans, Vietcong regulars, and North Vietnamese. The white paper says that this war is not like any others; that is true, and banal. Like all of the guerrilla wars of our generation, this one cannot be settled one way or the other by military action. The white paper cannot change a complex political conflict into a simple case of aggression over a border.

Mayor Robert F. Wagner Discusses the Problems of Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, few problems presently confronting the country exceed in seriousness and importance those that must be dealt with and solved in the area of urban renewal.

To some extent, every metropolitan area in the United States is faced with challenges of a rising population and industrial development. New York City is confronted with a highly unique problem in that it is one of the few major cities in the country where the movement of middle-class families back to metropolitan area exceeds the counter imigration toward the outlying suburbs. The problems we face, therefore, require immediate and effective solutions.

The office of the mayor of New York has frequently been characterized as carrying responsibilities second only to those of the President of the United States. Certainly, in the area of urban renewal, no public official is better qualified to speak with authority than the mayor of our city.

Mr. Speaker, on March 5, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York gave an address at the Third Annual Intercollegiate Urban Affairs Conference at Long Island University in which he discussed urban renewal problems in New York and other cities and some of the solutions required to meet present and future challenges.

I include the mayor's remarks below so that everyone concerned with urban renewal may benefit from his wisdom and insight into the subject:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY—THIRD ANNUAL INTERCOLLEGIATE URBAN AFFAIRS CONFERENCE

Not so long ago cities were considered the proudest product of civilization. They were, in fact, its birthplace. In ancient times, Babylon, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Athens, Rome, and in later times, Constantinople, Paris, London, Budapest, Warsaw, and finally, San Francisco and New York were jewels in the crown of civilization.

A hundred years ago, the American theologian, Theodore Parker, wrote: "Cities have always been fireplaces of civilization, whence light and heat radiated out into the dark, cold world."

James Guthrie, the Scottish theologian, wrote: "I bless God for cities. They have been His lamps of life along the pathways of humanity and religion. Within them science has given birth to her noblest discoveries. Behind their walls freedom has fought her noblest battles. They have stood on the surface of the earth like great breakwaters rolling back or turning aside the swelling tide of oppression. Cities, indeed, have been the cradles of human liberty."

In recent years however, cities have become the chief problem and challenge of civilization. The question today is, can they survive the problems of their populations?

Almost all cities are faced with critical problems today. This is not only a nationwide, but also a worldwide, phenomenon.

Within the past 20 years millions of people have streamed into the cities from the countryside and villages. In the Western countries, hundreds of thousands of people have simultaneously moved out of the cities into the suburbs. The people moving into the cities have been, for the most part, the poor and the largely dispossessed. Those moving out of the cities have been the emerging and the emergent middle class.

This phenomenon has occurred and is occurring on every continent, in every latitude. As a matter of fact, it has been proceeding at a greater rate in Japan and the Soviet Union, for instance, than anywhere in Western Europe or North America.

In the first 50 years of this century, the total population living in Asian cities of 100,000 or more increased from 19.4 million to 105.6 million, a gain of 444 percent. In Africa, the population living in cities of 100,000 or more increased from 1.1 million to 10.2 million, a gain of 827 percent.

Only 50 years ago, in the United States, 50 percent of the people lived in cities. Today that figure is creeping toward 80 percent. By 1980, only 15 years from now, it is reliably estimated that 90 percent of all the inhabitants of the United States will be living in urban areas.

Turning again to the worldwide urbanized picture, the projection is that during the 1960's, 200 million people will move into the cities of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The rate of urban growth in Asia today is 400 percent higher than in the West, and the movement to the cities there is only beginning.

What do all these figures mean for us in the United States, and especially for us here in New York City?

They mean that the United States has been touched by a worldwide tidal wave of

population movement, impelled by worldwide forces.

Professor Banfield, of Harvard, one of the most provocative of our present-day thinkers on the subject of urbanization, has suggested that the movement of poor people into the central cities has been due to the availability of housing abandoned by the exodus of middle-class families into the suburbs. I seriously question the order in this causal relationship.

As a matter of fact, I have read many explanations of the worldwide population movement, but we can overlook for the moment why it happened. It has happened.

In New York City, the crest of both the outgoing and the incoming movement seems to have passed. By building more and more Government-subsidized middle-income housing at reasonable rates, we are inducing more and more middle-class people to move back from the suburbs into the city.

There is substantial evidence that at the present time more middle-class families are moving back into the city from the suburbs, than the other way around. New York City is one of the few major cities in which this seems to be true.

There are several factors contributing to the movement of the middle-class people back into the cities. One is that we are building middle-class housing. Another is that suburban problems in some suburbs have become worse than city problems. The mushrooming growth of the suburbs has presented them with shortages of community facilities with which they cannot cope. Moreover, many of the more adventurous of the poor have been moving into suburbia, too—adding to the problems of already overburdened suburban governments. Today, suburbanization is as much a problem to the suburbanites as urbanization is to the urbanites. Indeed, these two phenomena are approaching the point of merger.

The cost of government has zoomed upward. The demand for additional city services has multiplied many times. The need for vastly expanded and radically new approaches to the problems of education, housing, traffic and crime, for instance, involve costs which are reaching beyond present tax and revenue resources available to many local governments.

Actually, New York City is ahead of most other cities both in the size of its tax base and in the extent, variety and quality of services offered, compared to those in other major cities.

In New York City our economy is a dynamic and pulsating one—full of vigor and growing power.

Last year employment topped the 1963 mark for every single month from January through November, which is the latest month for which data are available. Unemployment fell half a percentage point.

In 1964, the value of new building construction declined from 1963. But the estimated construction cost of building plans filed last year—which is the real indicator for the future—was up from $598.2 to $693.4 million, an increase of more than 16 percent.

Last year's retail sales totaled $12.2 billion dollars. Our wholesale houses marketed $45 billion worth of goods. We are incomparably the largest single manufacturing center in America. We produced 11 percent of the national total last year. In the past 10 years we have built 1,500 new factory buildings. We have over 33,000 manufacturers in New York City today, a payroll of $5.3 billion.

New York City throbs with cultural vitality, and with social and political vitality, too. There is no city whose population groups are more self-assertive and aggressive in support of their rights—and no city with as many channels for public expressions of viewpoint, protest, or demand. There is no city whose governmental operations are more open and available for inquiry, comment, and criticism.

The city government of New York is the second largest governmental enterprise in our country. The only larger one is the Government of the United States. Our annual budget is $3½ billion, larger than the budgets of all but a very few countries in the world today.

I would not be so brash as to describe the city government or its services as having attained the pinnacle of perfection. We have far, far to go to reach that point. And I doubt if this government or any government made up of human beings ever will. But that is neither an excuse nor a justification for relaxing in our efforts to improve and secure improvements. There are many improvements which can and should be made. Many improvements are in the process of being made—all the time.

We in New York City and all cities are confronted with an explosion of problems. One of these is the problem of crime. Crime rates have been rising in almost every country in the world. The United States is no exception to this trend. Moreover, in the United States, the upward crime rate has occurred not only in all of the cities and suburbs, but also in the rural areas, too.

Interestingly enough, among the cities, the increase in the crime rate has been less in New York City than in most other cities. It has been going up here, too—but at a significantly lesser rate than in Los Angeles, for instance, or in Washington, D.C.

I take little comfort from relative statistics in this regard. New Yorkers are interested not in the statistics from other cities, but in the actual conditions of safety and security in the streets and subways. We are doing everything in our power and shall continue to do everything in our power in this city to grapple with this problem—with both its root causes and its manifestations.

However, the universality of the increasing crime rate must be kept in mind in our approaches to this problem as well as to other aspects of the problems of urbanization.

In New York City, our problems fall into a number of categories which include intergroup tensions; family and community disorganization; neighborhood blight—including blight of housing and neighborhood facilities; hard-core unemployment; illiteracy and lack of skills; lack of jobs for the unskilled; de facto school segregation based on de facto housing segregation; and, finally, inadequacies and shortcomings in the educational system to meet the current challenge.

This is quite an array of problems, and I haven't listed them all. Nor in this listing have I mentioned, as I did earlier, the skyrocketing cost of government.

I wonder who, in all honesty, would say that these problems are susceptible of solution by any collection by simple formulas. It is clear that since the problems originated outside the borders of the cities, the city governments cannot be expected to cope with them unaided. Indeed, the Federal Government is finally asserting its intention of coming to the aid of the cities in significant ways on a significant scale. This, I believe, is the trend of the future.

It is clear that action must be taken. The order of the day must be to attack these problems. There can be no dallying with them. Indeed, they must be attacked comprehensively and in a coordinated manner. That is one of the meanings of the war on poverty.

To meet these problems a mobilization of research, study, and scholarship has been going on for some time. I know that Long Island University has been in the forefront of these endeavors.

Study, discussion, and research into these problems must be intensified. Demonstration and pilot projects need to be expanded and increased in numbers, and the results broadly applied.

We are far from having definitive solutions to our problems. As far as the war on poverty is concerned, its overall purposes are true and clear, but its strategy and tactics remain to be fashioned and tested.

The housing problem is a critical aspect of urbanization. In New York City, the housing problem is indeed severe and critical by our own standards. Yet we in New York have shown the way to the Nation in housing—certainly in public-aided housing. Enough new housing has been constructed in New York City within the past 10 years to house the entire city of Baltimore. Today, we have substantially less substandard housing, in total number of units, than we had 10 years ago. It is still a fact, however, that 1 million New Yorkers live in substandard housing accommodations. Some of these are slums, but some are not. Nevertheless, we cannot be satisfied until there are no more slums, and no New Yorker needs to live in substandard housing.

In general, I would say that we in New York City are on top of our problems, in the sense that we are actively coping with them. We are overcoming some of them. This is neither the place nor the occasion for me to go into further detail. I would say, however, that I would be glad to have New York City's record in this regard compared with that of any other major city in the United States or in the world.

In addition to having more of almost everything than any other city, including problems, we also have more critics—and they have incomparable facilities for expressing themselves.

Let me turn from the negative to the positive, and from New York City to all cities—from the particular to the general.

The challenge to find the answers posed by urbanization is a universal one. Urbanization is probably the greatest revolution of our era. It is closely related to the worldwide social revolution in which we are gripped. It reflects, as I said before, a great world tidal wave. The World Health Organization calls it the population imposion. It is a bursting inward, rather than outward. This implies that a force has been released. Indeed it has. The problem is to capture and manage that force, and to channel it into constructive purposes.

It has been said that the city is the mirror of civilization. The writer Wolf Schneider in his book "The City as Man's Fate," wrote recently: "Man has built the city as a tremendously enlarged image of himself. The city is as good and as bad as he is."

The city is still the meeting place for minds and ideas. It is the radiation post for most communications—mass and nonmass.

The description given our cities by some critics is one of decay, crime and poverty—conformity on the one hand and misery on the other. Actually, this is a distorted image—more of a caricature than a characterization.

Of course, the cities are overwhelmed with new problems. But solutions will be found. Progress will be made. I wouldn't be trying to stretch 12 years as Mayor of New York into 16 years if I weren't full of hope and resolve that this would be so.

An old friend of mine, Charles Abrams, in a recent book entitled, "Man's Struggle for Shelter In An Urbanizing World," put it rather well. I quote his paragraph:

"The city that cradled freedom in the older industrial areas may yet cradle it in the new. But the city with its privations, its poverty, homelessness, and overcrowding also offers more dangers today than in the past. Time is essential if the institutions which the city reinforces are not to weaken, and if today's masses are not to become tomorrow's mobs.

At stake are the fate of the emerging societies, the freedoms they might help nourish and sustain, and the peaceful progress of nations within their own borders."

Five hundred years ago, William Shakespeare wrote, "The people are the city." Yes, they are. In undertaking to resolve the problems of the city, we need to resolve the problems of the people.

This is our supreme challenge and our purpose.

Our Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in November 1963, the city of Rockford, Ill., held a communitywide Thanksgiving program. To see a large city and its residents joined in a public display of thanksgiving was indeed an inspiration for all who participated and observed the program.

Mr. John W. Grimes, then editor of the Rockford Morning Star newspaper, now retired, wrote the narrative for a dramatic and musical production entitled "Our Heritage," which set the tone for the program. Over 500 persons were involved in this single production.

Mr. Grimes' narrative has just been awarded a 1964 Freedoms Foundation Medal. Therefore, it is indeed a privilege, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Members to read and contemplate this moving review of our history and the promise it holds for our future.

The narrative follows:

OUR HERITAGE

In the bone-chilling cold of a winter dawn, a little ship stood at anchor off the New England coast. Its patched sails drooped in their rigging like the wings of a tired bird. It was not a pretty ship nor a romantic ship as it rode into the slow swell of the ocean, utterly weary from the long voyage.

It was not a ship of discovery nor a ship of conquest. No flags or pennons greeted the sunrise. It was solitary in these uncharted waters. Behind it were leagues of wintry sea; before it lay a cold and unknown land.

But had you been able to listen, you would have heard from the cramped and dingy space below decks the plaintive tune of a thanksgiving hymn. And you would have heard a prayer of thankfulness uttered over a table sparsely laid with food: "For these mercies, Lord, we thank Thee."

Though weathered by the long and dangerous voyage, its sails discolored by salt and storm, its rigging raveled, the *Mayflower* was a beautiful ship that morning, glorified by those prayers of thanksgiving that rose from devout hearts.

And the *Mayflower* became a beautiful ship in our national story, white of wing, and fleet on the water, a symbol of people voyaging to a new land, a free land, a fair land, and raising their voices to God for His mercies and bounties.

Countless *Mayflowers* have made their voyages to America's shores and anchored in myriad ports. Across the centuries, countless pilgrims, seeking freedom and opportunity and the right to worship according to conscience, have seen breaking day reveal a new land—this beautiful America. And countless hearts have raised prayers of thanksgiving for a safe passage and the promise held out by America.

Whether the date of its sailing from an old world be remote or recent, a *Mayflower*, a Pilgrim ship, a ship with its bow set toward freedom, is in the heritage of each of us. So we are all joined together in a congregation of thanksgiving, a thankful and devout nation, remembering alike the mercies of God and the sacred place our forefathers gave to the worship of God.

Speaking of his nation, in Bible times, the Psalmist wrote, "God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved."

From America's earliest history, God has been in our midst. Our greatest leaders have prayed to Him for guidance. General Washington, in the snow at Valley Forge, prayed in anguish when the fortunes of a new republic were at ebb. Lincoln, in the long night vigils, prayed when he awaited dispatches from the battlefields. As a Nation, in the torture of Pearl Harbor, we prayed.

In our charters of Government, in our State papers, in the proclamations of our statesmen, we recognize the presence of God in our nationhood.

Each November, we set aside a day of Thanksgiving. There is no conflict here between church and State. By common consent, our Nation offers its thanks to God for His Goodness. As a Nation, we "enter into His gates with thanksgiving and into His courts with praise." Thanksgiving Day is an observance not of victories, not of proud events in our history, but of that sacred tie to God's providence which has been part of our national life from the beginning of our history.

"God is in the midst of us," in our churches, our cathedrals, our temples; God is in the midst of us in our striving to make ours a better land.

Our country won its political freedom in a long and cruel war, the American Revolution. Fifes shrilled and drums beat as the continentals, in nondescript garb, assembled to learn the rudiments of military skill to give battle for liberty. But hunger, anguishing cold, division, frustration, even treachery, marked the course of these long years of war. Human fortitude needed the sustaining power of God's hand; human sorrow needed His comfort. Men prayed, and it was as if their words addressed to God became the building blocks of a great temple memorializing our faith in God.

It was not poetic fancy that had inscribed on the Liberty Bell a verse from the Bible, "Proclaim Liberty." That verse from Leviticus was in the deep music of the bell as it spoke in courageous challenge when the Declaration of Independence was signed, and spoke again in solemn triumph after the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown.

The sacrifices and suffering of that war had deepened America's faith in God, and at a divinely propitious time. The statesmen of a young Nation were meeting in convention to give constitutional form to the kind of government we should have. And the pioneers were already on the march across the mountains to lay claim to the fair land that was now our heritage and our responsibility.

Our deepened faith made us a God-fearing country. That faith worked in the convention to give us a constitution that made our government of the people, by the people, for the people. It worked in the westward march of a young Nation to make our goal more than the appeasing of hunger for land and wealth; to make our goal the creation of an American civilization.

In the halls where our charters of government were written, in the little wagon trains crossing the eastern mountains, we learned that freedom under God has responsibilities. Because we were a God-fearing people, neither the oligarch in government nor the marauder on the frontier took command of our fortunes. Our land, our future, our destiny lay before us to be trusted wisely or to be wasted. We learned restraint, and we learned that true democracy of working together.

The pioneers who marched westward sought farms and homes and shops. They brought their skills, their inventions, their diligence. Their homespun goal was an orderly and productive life. Their dream was a culture available to all men. They built schools and academies for their children and laid deep and lasting foundations for education. Scholarship flowed westward in an increasing stream. Libraries and lyceums flourished. And colleges to which unsung and dedicated scholars gave their lives sprang up in such numbers that no ambitious youth was more than a day's horseback ride from academic groves.

But always, there were churches, rude and humble in their beginnings, but rising in a thousand spires as men paid their tithe to God. They were the symbols of God in the midst of us.

But there grew up a great division among the States. Debate became more angry. A solution in debate failed and our Nation was involved in civil war.

Our very nationhood was put to the test. There were prayerful men and God-fearing men on each side of the battle line. We look back on that cruel war from the vantage point of a hundred years, and we have occasion to give thanks that the wounds were bound up. Because there were God-fearing men on both sides, we were spared the horror of a war without conscience. Out of the crucible of civil war, war between brothers, came the word of Lincoln's Second Inaugural address: "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

Those words carried us through the chaotic Reconstruction days. God was still in the midst of us, giving vision to those who sought His guidance. What Lincoln gave us in those words was a new theme of social righteousness. Not social justice, which smacks of legalism, nor a social gospel which seeks to impose its dictate, but social righteousness which wells up in the God-fearing individual when he seeks God's guidance and fits his life to that inner chart.

Lincoln's words are with us today as we face new problems which cannot be solved by compulsion or in anger, but as we are firm in the right as God gives us to see the right.

The Prophet Micah said that God's requirements were these: that we deal justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with our God.

Our great thanksgiving in this year and hour must be for that precious heritage of a God-fearing land. And our great avowal must be that we continue as a God-fearing people.

We are all voyagers, pilgrims, explorers, looking to the future. As the mists rise, we see revealed the shores of a great land. The once bleak coast now rises in towers. Inland, a fair country stretches away rich with churches, homes, farmsteads, schools, industrial plants, railroads, and highways. There are myriad cities with parks and playgrounds—and great halls of culture and the arts.

This is our land; the land God-fearing people built by keeping their faces turned toward the light. This is the heritage courage and toil and prayer and self-discipline have given us.

Our prayer of thanksgiving should be joined to a prayer of new dedication. Our heritage shall not be lost. This faith that God will stand in the midst of us, as we meet new problems, shall not be abandoned.

God guided us as a nation toward ideals of education and culture and for that concord of high purpose which alone can make us act as good citizens for the common good.

Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget, lest we forget.

We offer our thanks and we make our avowal. Our land shall not be less beautiful for our having lived in it. Its dream shall not be less because we fail to have vision. Its faith in God shall not diminish because we abandon faith. God is in the midst of us. We shall not be moved.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article on the recently published State Department white paper on Vietnam.

The following article appeared in the I. F. Stone's Weekly for March 9, 1965:

[From I. F. Stone's Weekly, Mar. 9, 1965]

A REPLY TO THE WHITE PAPER

That North Vietnam supports the guerrillas in South Vietnam is no more a secret than that the United States supports the South Vietnamese Government against them. The striking thing about the State Department's new white paper is how little support it can prove. "Incontrovertible evidence of Hanoi's elaborate program to supply its forces in the south with weapons, ammunition, and other supplies," the white paper says, "has accumulated over the years." A detailed presentation of this evidence is in appendix D; unfortunately few will see the appendixes since even the New York Times did not reprint them, though these are more revealing than the report. Appendix D provides a list of weapons, ammunition, and other supplies of Chinese Communist, Soviet, Czechaslovak, and North Vietnamese manufacture, with the dates and place of capture from the Vietcong guerrillas, over the 18-month period from June 1962 to January 29 last year when it was presented to the International Control Commission. The Commission was set up by the Geneva agreement of 1954. This list provides a good point at which to begin an analysis of the white paper.

THE PENTAGON FIGURES

To put the figures in perspective, we called the Pentagon press office and obtained some figures the white paper does not supply—the number of weapons captured from the guerrillas and the number lost to them in recent years:

	Captured from guerrillas	*Lost to them*
Year 1962	4,800	5,200
Year 1963	5,400	8,500
Year 1964	4,900	13,700
3-year total	15,100	27,400

In 3 years, the guerrillas captured from our side 12,300 more weapons than they lost to us.

What interests us at the moment is not this favorable balance but the number of guerrilla weapons our side captured during the past 3 years. The grand total was 15,100. If Hanoi has indeed engaged in an "elaborate program" to supply the Vietcong, one would expect a substantial number of enemy-produced weapons to turn up. Here is the sum total of enemy-produced weapons and supplies in that 18-month tally to the Control Commission: 72 rifles (46 Soviet, 26 Czech); 64 submachineguns (40 Czech, 24 French but "modified" in North Vietnam); 15 carbines (Soviet); 8 machineguns (6 Chinese, 2 North Vietnamese); 5 pistols (4 Soviet, 1 Czech); 4 mortars (Chinese); 3 recoilless 75-millimeter rifles (Chinese); 3 recoilless 57-millimeter guns (Chinese); 2 bazookas (1 Chinese, 1 Czech); 2 rocket launchers (Chinese); and 1 grenade launcher (Czech) for a total of 179.

This is not a very impressive total. According to the Pentagon figures, we captured on the average 7,500 weapons each 18 months in the past 3 years. If only 179 Communist-made weapons turned up in 18 months, that is less than 2½ percent of the total. Judging by these white paper figures, our military are wrong in estimating, as they have in recent months, that 80 percent of the weapons used by the guerrillas are captured from us. It looks as if the proportion is considerably higher. The material of North Vietnamese origin included only those 24 French submachineguns "modified" in North Vietnam, 2 machineguns made in North Vietnam, 16 helmets, a uniform, and an undisclosed number of mess kits, belts, sweaters, and socks. Judging by this tally, the main retaliatory blow should be at North Vietnam's clothing factories.

NOT ENOUGH FOR A BATTALION

There is another way to judge this tally of captured Communist weapons. A Communist battalion has about 450 men. It needs 500 rifles, four 80-millimeter mortars, eight 60-millimeter mortars, and at least 4 recoilless rifles. The weapons of Communist origin captured in 18 months would not adequately outfit one battalion. The figures in the appendix on ammunition captured provides another index. We captured 183 (Chinese) shells for a 60-millimeter mortar. This fires about 20 shells a minute, so that was hardly enough ammunition for 10 minutes of firing. There were 100,000 (Chinese) cartridges for 7.26-millimeter machineguns. That looks impressive until one discovers on checking with knowledgeable military sources that these machineguns fire 600 rounds a minute. A machinegun platoon normally has four machineguns. This was enough ammunition for about 40 minutes of firing by one platoon. Indeed, if the ratio of Communist-made weapons captured is the same for weapons used, then only 12½ days of those 18 months were fought by the guerrillas on the basis of Communist-made supplies.

If these figures were being presented in a court of law, they would run up against a further difficulty: one would have to prove the arms actually came from the Communist side. There is a worldwide market in second-hand weapons. One can buy Soviet, Czech, and Chinese Communist weapons of all kinds only 2 miles or so from the Pentagon at Interarmco, Ltd., 7 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va. Interarmco, one of the world's foremost dealers, can provide more Communist weapons than we picked up in 18 months on Vietnamese battlefields. Interarmco's East European Communist weapons come in large part from the huge stocks of Soviet and Czech arms captured by the Israelis in the Suez campaign. It has Chinese Communist weapons captured by our side in the Korean war. It also has, of course, a wide selection of our own military surplus. This has turned up in strange places.

For example, a book on the Algerian war, "Les Algeriens en guerre," by Dominique Darbois and Phillippe Vingneau, was published in Milan in 1960 by Feltrinelli. It shows pictures of FLN (National Liberation Front) Algerian rebels wearing U.S. Marine Corps uniforms from which the "USM" and the eagle and globe insignia have not even been removed. It shows Algerians carrying U.S. 80-millimeter mortars and U.S. .50-caliber machineguns. Such photos could have been used by France to accuse the United States of supplying the Algerian rebels.

The State Department's white paper says "dramatic new proof was exposed just as this report was being completed" in the discovery of a suspected Vietcong arms cargo ship on February 16. The New York Times commented astringently on this in an editorial February 28:

"Apparently, the major new evidence of a need for escalating the war, with all the hazard that this entails, was provided by the sinking in a South Vietnamese cove earlier this month of a 100-ton cargo ship loaded with Communist-made small arms and ammunition. A ship of that size is not much above the oriental junk class. The standard Liberty or Victory ship of World War II had a capacity of 7,150 to 7,650 tons."

The affair of the cargoship is curious. Until now there has been little evidence of arms coming in by ship. A huge fleet of small vessels patrols the coast and there have been glowing stories in the past of its efficiency. "About 12,000 vessels," the AP reported from Saigon (New York Times, Feb. 22) "are searched each month by the South Vietnamese coastal junk patrol force but arrests are rare and no significant amounts of incriminating goods or weapons ever have been found." This lone case of a whole shipload of arms is puzzling.

NEW NORTHERN INFILTREES CITED

The white paper's story on the influx of men from the north also deserves a closer analysis than the newspapers have given it. Appendix C provides an elaborate table from 1959–60 to 1964 inclusive, showing the number of "confirmed military infiltrees per year from the north. The total is given as 19,550. One way to measure this number is against that of the military we have assigned to South Vietnam in the same years. These now total 23,500, or 25 percent more, and 1,000 are to be added in the near future. The number of North Vietnamese infiltrees is "based on information * * * from at least two independent sources." Nowhere are we told how many men who infiltrated from the North have actually been captured. There is reason to wonder whether the count of infiltrees may be as bloated as the count of Vietcong dead; in both cases the numbers used are estimates rather than actual bodies.

The white paper calls the war an invasion and claims "that as many as 75 percent of the more than 4,400 Vietcong who are known to have entered the South in the first 8 months of 1964 were natives of North Vietnam. But a careful reading of the text and the appendixes turns up the names of only six North Vietnamese infiltrees. In part I of the white paper, section B gives "individual case histories of North Vietnamese soldiers sent south by Hanoi but all nine of these are of South Vietnamese origin. The next section, C, is headed "Infiltration of Native North Vietnamese." It names five infiltrees but one of these is also from the south. That leaves four North Vietnamese natives. Then, in appendix C, we are given the case histories and photographs of nine other Vietcong sent south by Hanoi. The report does not explain which ones were originally from the South but it does give the names of Provinces in which they were born. When these are checked, it turns out that only two of the nine were born in North Vietnam. This gives us a total of six northern infiltrees. It is strange that after 5 years of fighting, the white paper can cite so few.

None of this is dicussed frankly in the white paper. To do so would be to bring the war into focus as a rebellion in the South, which may owe some men and materiel to the North but is largely dependent on popular indigenous support for its manpower, as it is on captured U.S. weapons for its supply. The white paper withholds all evidence which points to a civil war. It also fails to tell the full story of the July 1962 special report by the International Control Commission. Appendix A quotes that portion in which the Commission, 2 to 1 (Poland dis-

senting) declared that the North had in specific instances sent men and material south in violation of the Geneva accords. But nowhere does the State Department mention that the same report also condemned South Vietnam and the United States, delcaring that they had entered into a military alliance in violation of the Geneva agreements. The United States was criticized because it then had about 5,000 military advisers in South Vietnam. The Geneva accords limited the United States military mission to the 684 in Vietnam at the time of the 1954 cease-fire. The United States and South Vietnam were also criticized by the ICC for hamstringing the Commission's efforts to check on imports of arms in violation of the Geneva accords.

The reader would never guess from the white paper that the Geneva accords promised that elections would be held in 1956 to reunify the country. The 1961 blue book at least mentioned the elections, though somehow managing to make them seem a plot. "It was the Communists' calculation," the blue book put it, "that nationwide elections scheduled in the accords for 1956 would turn all of South Vietnam over to them. The authorities in South Vietnam refused to fall into this well-laid trap." The white paper omits mention of the elections altogether and says, "South Vietnam's refusal to fall in with Hanoi's scheme for peaceful takeover came as a heavy blow to the Communists." This is not the most candid and objective presentation. From the Viet Minh point of view, the failure to hold the elections promised them when they laid down their arms was the second broken promise of the West. The earlier one was in 1946 when they made an agreement to accept limited autonomy within the French union, and welcomed the returning French troops as comrades of the liberation. Most of the French military did not want to recognize even this limited form of independence, and chose instead the road which led after 8 years of war to Dienbienphu.

THAT ECONOMIC MIRACLE AGAIN

The most disingenuous part of the white paper is that in which it discusses the origins of the present war. It pictures the war as an attack from the north, launched in desperation because the "economic miracle" in the south under Diem had destroyed Communist hopes of a peaceful takeover from within. Even the strategic hamlets are described as "designed to improve the peasant's livelihood" and we are asked to believe that for the first time in history a guerrilla war spread not because the people were discontented but because their lot was improving.

The true story is a story of lost opportunities. The Communist countries acquiesced in the failure to hold elections. Diem had a chance to make his part of the country a democratic showcase. The year 1956 was a bad one in the north. There was a peasant uprising and widespread resentment among the intellectuals over the Communist Party's heavyhanded thought control. But Diem on the other side of the 17th parallel was busy erecting a dictatorship of his own. In 1956 he abolished elections even for village councils. In 1957 his mobs smashed the press of the one legal opposition, the Democratic Bloc, when it dared criticize the Government. That was the beginning of a campaign to wipe out every form of opposition. It was this campaign and the oppressive exactions imposed on the peasantry, the fake land reform, and the concentration camps Diem set up for political opponents of all kinds, which stirred ever-wider rebellion from 1958 onward in the grassroots before North Vietnam gave support. It was this which drove oppositionists of all kinds into alliance with the Communists in the national liberation front.

Long before the north was accused of interference, its Government was complaining to the Control Commission of "border and airspace violations by the south and infringements of the Geneva agreement by the introduction of arms and U.S. servicemen." For 4 years after Geneva, both North Vietnam and China followed the "peaceful coexistence" policy while the United States turned South Vietnam into a military base and a military dictatorship. It is in this story the white paper does not tell, and the popular discontent it does not mention, that the rebellion and the aid from the north had their origins.

Speech Delivered by the Honorable Sylvester J. Garamella, National President of the Italian Executives of America, Inc., on the Occasion of the Anniversary of the Birth of Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening, March 9, 1965, I had the great honor of being the guest of the Italian Executives of America, Inc., at a dinner commemorating the 511th anniversary of the birth of the great hero and explorer, Amerigo Vespucci.

A very interesting and stirring speech was delivered at the dinner by the Honorable Sylvester J. Garamella, national president of the Italian Executives of America, Inc. Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include herewith Commissioner Garamella's remarks:

ADDRESS OF HON. SYLVESTER J. GARAMELLA

As national president of the Italian Executives of America, I want, at the very outset, to congratulate Elio Grande, who has so capably spearheaded the organization of the District of Columbia chapter information of the "Executives"—and arranged this fine dinner tonight. To you, and to your fine membership, Elio, I say "Benvenuti." I know that you will lend great credit to us all and that your chapter will grow in numbers, and that it will become one of the bulwarks of our organization—helping us to carry out our aim to "present the true image of 22 million Italo-Americans in the United States to the public through all media of communication."

Our organization is a nonpartisan one, comprised of executives, whose membership is open to anyone, Italian or not, of any political persuasion, who is interested in helping us communicate this true image to the American public.

In considering what I would say this evening, I thought of many topics and subjects. Somehow one kept predominating in my mind. I certainly wanted to talk about our "Executives," but I kept seeing the panorama of our President's program for the creation of our Great Society—I remembered the Renaissance and began comparing it to the Great Society—I will now, therefore, for just a few moments, discuss with you "Lyndon Baines Johnson—the master architect of the Renaissance in the 20th century."

As you know, the Renaissance was the rebirth of the Golden Age of humanism and the arts. It began in Italy, the cradle of civilization and the seat of the Old Roman Empire. It then spread throughout all of Europe. A spirit of general elevation and enlightenment was created and a happier era resulted, productive of such great personalities, as Leonardo Da Vinci, Buonarroti Michelangelo, Nicolo Macchiavelli, Della Robbia, Raphael, Francesco Petrarca, Benvenuto Cellini, Gallieo, Pope Julius II, and many, many others.

It was a rich period which influenced art, philosophy, science, government, the professions, religion and ecclesiastical law. Great changes in the mode of living and civilization were brought about in all of Europe. The best thoughts were produced—learning was respected, commerce flourished, many wonderful books were written, and great art masterpieces were created. Creative skill indeed marched forward.

The Renaissance began by looking backward into the past and before long it was looking forward into the future. A bridge was created between the Middle Ages and modern times.

How do we now compare all of this to the present-day efforts of our President—Lyndon Baines Johnson—who has looked into our present and is creating a bridge to our future?

Just as a new Christian civilization resulted from the pioneering spirit of the Renaissance, so will the pioneering spirit of the Chief Executive—the architect of the Renaissance of the 20th century—lead us to a better way of life—with a distinct difference, however.

The Renaissance did not touch the common people, the working masses, the poor and the needy. It considered only the nobility and the aristocracy.

On the other hand the Great Society touches everyone—the rich and the poor alike, the lowly, the uneducated, the ill housed, the sick, and those at the very top of the ladder of success.

It is the first truly Great Society—complete society—touching the lives of the most humble and of the greatest—with opportunity for everyone—the right to a job, to a decent living wage, to proper medical care, to assistance in old age, to comfortable housing—where the children of the poorest artisans have an opportunity for education—where all of society is enriched without regard to race, color, or creed—where we will enjoy a fluorescence in art, literature, music, and the sciences.

Where do the Italian executives of America now fit into this panorama of the Great Society? We are, if you will, a segment, a symbol of the 22 million Americans of Italian heritage in the United States—the largest ethnic minority in our country—a minority which has helped to build our railroads, mined our coal for industry, and helped in so many ways to bring this land to the status it enjoys today—which has produced men in government of whom we can all be proud—men such as we honored today at the Italian Embassy when the executives presented this tablet to His Excellency, Ambassador Sergio Fenoaltea—39 Italian-American Congressmen, living and dead, representing all political parties since Frances B. Spinola who served from 1887–91—all men of distinction and dedicated to service who discharged their stewardship in office with credit to themselves and their heritage. Leading the list is Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, U.S. Senator from Rhode Island, who only recently distinguished himself as the keynote speaker at a national convention, who electrified the country with his dynamic oratory before the television cameras in that jampacked auditorium—I would like to read the names on this tablet:

JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island; JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, of New York; Hugh J. Addonizio, of New Jersey; Victor L. Anfuso, of New York; F. ANNUNZIO, of Illinois; Anthony Caminetti of California; Louis J. Capozzoli, of New York; Anthony Cavalcante, of Pennsylvania; Peter A. Cavicchia, of New Jersey; Louis Gary Clemente, of New York; SILVIO O. CONTE, of Massachusetts; Albert Cretella, of Connecti-

cut; EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut; Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., of Maryland; DOMINICK V. DANIELS, of New Jersey; JOHN H. DENT, of Pennsylvania; George A. Dondero, of Michigan; DANTE B. FASCELL, of Florida; PAUL A. FINO, of New York; and Foster Furcolo, of Massachusetts.

ROBERT N. GIAIMO, of Connecticut; Peter C. Granata, of Illinois; Fiorello La Guardia, of New York; James J. Lanzetta, of New York; ROBERT LEGGETT, of California; Roland V. Libonati, of Illinois; Vito Marcantonio, of New York; GEORGE P. MILLER, of California; JOSEPH G. MINISH, of New Jersey; Albert P. Morano, of Connecticut; Vincent L. Palmisano, of Maryland; PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey; TENO RONCALIO, of Wyoming; Alfred E. Santangelo, of New York; James P. Scoblick, of Pennsylvania; CARLTON J. SICKLES, of Maryland; Francis P. Spinola, of New York; Anthony F. Tauriello, of New York; and J. V. VIGORITO, of Pennsylvania.

Today is the 511th anniversary of the birth of a great Italian—Amerigo Vespucci—who was the first to sight Cape Canaveral—now Cape Kennedy, from which our space explorations are so successfully being conducted—under the aegis of our National Aeronautical Space Administration and the guidance of our President, and where new horizons are constantly being achieved.

The Great Society will, also under the guidance of Lyndon Baines Johnson, carry us to new horizons in living—the master architect of this Renaissance in our century can expect to find support, inspiration, and cooperation from Italo-Americans throughout the country and from organizations such as ours.

I am sure that when the story of our future is eventually written in the pages of history, that the Italian-Americans will have acquitted themselves with honor, ability, and dedication.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Jack Reese, Shawnee, Okla., Wins National Editorial Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa., has cited Jack A. Reese, managing editor of the Shawnee, Okla., News-Star, for a national editorial award for a significant contribution in the area of responsible citizenship.

It is good to see this citation go to an outstandingly capable editor in my home community.

Ross U. Porter, editor and general manager of the News-Star, described the citation in the following article:

REESE WINS NATIONAL AWARD FOR EDITORIAL

Jack Reese, News-Star managing editor, has won a national editorial award, the George Washington Honor Medal, for a significant contribution in the area of responsible citizenship.

Announcement of the award was made Monday by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, which is headed by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower as chairman, and the Honorable James A. Farley, vice chairman.

Reese's prize-winning editorial, "The Magnificence of the Ballot Box," published May 3, 1964, was a dramatic appeal for Pottawatomie County citizens to exercise their right to vote.

Date for regional award presentations for State winners will be announced at a later date.

The News-Star managing editor is one of 21 individuals and organizations in Oklahoma to win citations from the national organization and the only Oklahoma newspaper editorial writer to be honored.

The George Washington Honor Medal Award is reserved for individuals who display "outstanding accomplishment in helping to achieve a better understanding of the American way of life."

Reese, who joined the News-Star as a reporter in 1951, was cited by the American Political Science Association in May 1964, for excellence in reporting public affairs. He received as a prize a week-long, all-expense seminar which dealt exclusively with current political problems. In 1963, he received the Marshall Gregory Award for reporting, an honor given by the Oklahoma Education Association.

His series, "This Business of Education," formed the basis for both the American Political Science Association and Oklahoma Education Association honors.

He is twice winner of the William Allen White top news story award, given by Stauffer Publications, in 1954 and 1955. In 1954, he and Truman Richardson, now administrative assistant to Congressman TOM STEED, were nominated for the Pulitzer Prize for local reporting.

Reese is currently enrolled at the University of Oklahoma in two government courses, working in his spare time on a master's degree. His wife, Dr. Virginia Denyer Reese, OBU professor of music (organ), received her Ph. D. last summer from OU.

A graduate of the University of Oklahoma School of Journalism, Reese was active in campus activities, serving as president of the OU Sigma Delta Chi, national journalism fraternity.

The Reese family lives at 2705 Frank Buck Drive.

The prize-winning editorial, "The Magnificence of the Ballot Box," follows:

THE MAGNIFICENCE OF THE BALLOT BOX

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Jack Reese, News-Star managing editor, wrote this editorial for publication May 3, 1964, urging Pottawatomie County voters to cast their ballots in the May 5 primary election. The editorial won a George Washington Honor Medal from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.)

Oklahomans—1,224,410 strong—could vote Tuesday if they wanted to do it, but chances are they won't. Not all of them, at least.

Instead, some 600,000—maybe a few more—will take the time to exercise a privilege, revered across the world as the stirring symbol of a free society.

All 1,224,410 of them should vote Tuesday.

Few people will argue about the vote, but any poll taker of political sentiments in preelection days will tell you that he encounters a lot of apathy on the part of the voter.

Some will even brag about their lack of interest, or shrug their voices over a telephone that they "never bother about things like that." Sometimes there is an irksome smugness to their tone.

Basically, though, they don't mean to be negligent. They just never get around to calling one of the telephone numbers listed in innumerable ads offering free rides to the polls or they let minor interruptions deter them from a vital duty. There is no one there to push or coax.

The ballot box doesn't beg anyone.

It's there in the same place every election to be used—or not used—by any man or woman who has any feeling at all about being free.

The ballot box—plus the laws which stem from its powerful force—is about the only "sure-fire" protection in the world for freedom.

Freedom demands concern, vigil, intelligence and use. As with most things, if it isn't used, it tends to wither, becomes almost innocuous. Luckily for the apathetic ones, there are enough concerned still around to "lift the roof" occasionally.

The voter decision can be felt literally around the world via the ballot box. Americans have had the destiny of freedom hoisted atop their shoulders as a beacon for all men who yearn for the right to live unmolested by tyranny.

From the Nation's inception, its citizens have battled, bled, and died for the right to choose their own government. Their fledgling efforts provide for today's youth a storybook of courage, carved of flesh, blood and ideas. They have never failed yet to protect that heritage gained on the battlefields of the world from the stinking, swampy wasteland of some far-off island to the bitter cold frustration of a Germany, or a Korea.

Any hamlet in America has its rollcall of those who gave the sacrifice; thousands of homes have pictures of fresh-faced youths in uniform who never came back. Sometimes their names are emblazoned in stone across the broad base of some memorial shaft, which stands as a silent challenge to those who live.

At any election time, Americans should be given an awesome reminder that even today only a small percentage of the world's population lives in a democratic republic. Only a small portion of the world is free for a lifetime from the terrible onslaught of totalitarian oppression.

In America, no one will ever shove a gun at you to effect his will or tell you for whom to vote. Few will even tell you that you must vote.

But you should.

There are a total of 24,376 voters in Pottawatomie County. The rollcall includes 22,115 Democrats, 2,203 Republicans, and 58 independents.

J. T. Weedman, secretary of the county election board, is enthusiastic about an expected voter turnout of 14,000, a little over 50 percent of the potential.

If you have any concern at all about the county in which you live, the State or Nation in which you seek your own personal pursuit of happiness, do something about that concern Tuesday—spend a few minutes in the cause of liberty in the quiet sanctity of a voting booth, the basic symbol of the democratic process.

A Tribute to Postmaster J. F. Grimes, of De Soto, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the most inspiring stories of devotion to post office service was recently printed in the Dallas Morning News, about the postmaster in De Soto, Tex., Mr. J. F. Grimes. To illustrate the personal interest, pride, and contributions which Mr. Grimes has made to the Post Office, I request unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEEN FUN, MR. GRIMES

(By Kent Biffle)

The De Soto Post Office is a little stack of bricks, 20 by 20 feet. "That's the whole shebang," Postmaster J. F. Grimes allowed Wednesday.

Nodding at a fetching girl who had come to fetch the mail, he said, "Howdy, Margaret."

Grimes, 52, De Soto Postmaster since 1959, is anxiously patting a cowboy-booted foot these days, waiting to move into a spanking

new 52 by 52-foot Federal building down the street.

As Postmaster, he has seen the town grow from a crossroads of 1,500 to a budding city of 5,200.

"Kind of hate to see De Soto grow, in a way," he mused, "Can't accommodate folks in a big town the way you can in a little town.

"Hi there, Leon.

"You know what I mean? You can't find the time to, say, call up Aunt Hattie and tell her she's got that letter she's been waiting for.

"How you been, Edith?

"And you can't always stick stamps on for people who forget to put postage on the letters they mail. Things like that."

But Postmaster Grimes finds time to do more than he lets on. Often, he gives lollipops to the kids so they can lick them while their elders lick stamps. Sometimes it's bubblegum.

And people who know Grimes say he has never refused to come down after hours or on Sunday to hand over a package to a customer who has found a parcel card in his box and phoned the Postmaster at home.

" 'Whatcha' say, Charlie?"

On Christmas Day, Grimes is up at first light, delivering by auto, parcels to folks without phones.

He winced. "Never will forget last Christmas. I phoned a fellow, got him out of bed to come down and get a parcel. Turned out, it was for another man with the same name."

That may have spelled the beginning of the end of personalized mail service in De Soto.

"Hi, Lee.

"A lot of the oldtimers still refuse to use proper addresses. They think you ought to know who they are.

"Well, I know them. I've lived here all my life. And improper addresses were OK when I was the only one working in the post office.

"But now I've got four employees plus a letter carrier from Dallas and a rural carrier from Lancaster. They can't be expected to know everybody. And I don't handle all the letters nowadays."

Grimes has torn out windows and doors and stunted his already dwarfed post office lobby making room for an added 262 boxes. What's left is a space barely big enough for a poster saying a man named Maps is wanted for crossing a State line to avoid prosecution.

What's the address of the De Soto Post Office?

"Well, now, let's see."

What was that Grimes had said about proper addresses?

"That'd be about 100 North Hampton, I believe."

The roomier, new building is at 110 North Hampton in De Soto. It'll be dedicated with dignitaries and speeches and all later this month.

"How're you, Mrs. Darby?"

Charles H. Goodrich, Huntington, W. Va., Wins the VFW "Voice of Democracy" Contest for 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars sponsors a contest among high-school students throughout our country in which the boys and girls must write and submit to a national panel a script on citizenship. It is known as the "Voice of Democracy" contest. The State winners are brought to Washington to attend the annual congressional banquet of the VFW, and they have always been one of the finest groups of boys and girls I have seen.

This year the national winner was Mr. Charles Goodrich, of West Virginia, and his theme was "The Challenge of Citizenship." It gives me great pleasure to insert this script in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP, 1964–65

(By Charles H. Goodrich, Huntington, W. Va., first place winner, "Voice of Democracy" scriptwriting contest)

Citizenship, unfortunately, does not mean the same thing the world over. When I say citizenship, we, in this country, are naturally reminded of freedom, for the brand of citizenship which each of us should live is founded on and cannot exist without freedom. In other parts of the world, where freedom is restricted or even withheld, citizenship loses its meaning and we might as well give it the name existenceship or ownership.

The benefits of our type of citizenship are well known. Among the many blessings our country offers are freedom to order our lives, freedom to form and hold our own opinions, freedom to worship as we please, and many, many more. We are constantly reminded that along with the pleasure of these gifts goes a responsibility and a duty to preserve them. How can these responsibilities be carried out? How can we safeguard our freedom? This is the challenge of citizenship.

People who have accepted this challenge in the past are familiar to all of us. Among them are the freethinking nobles who dared defy tradition and forced King John to sign the Magna Carta. There was also a small group of plain, proud farmers who stood in the way of British regulars on Concord Bridge, and a devoted group of 55 men who risked their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, by signing the Declaration of Independence.

Today, it is easy to forget what an advantage free thinking and free enterprise gives us over nations where freedom is compromised. It is likewise easy to recount the men of the past who have met freedom's challenges. Many citizens, however, wish to know what we can do for our country now, what the challenge of citizenship is today. To gain appreciation of our freedoms, the formula is simply to enjoy them and to use them. We should take every opportunity to use our freedom not as a license, but as a liberty to be enjoyed. The danger in keeping our freedoms in reserve (something to fall back on) is that one day, when we need freedom most, we may find nothing there. For instance, we should constantly and conscientiously form opinions and express them at every opportunity. The only time many Americans bother to form opinions on public issues is a few weeks before election day in November. Even then, they merely vote and never bother to discuss the issues. I am not condemning this system; however, if the only way people express their opinions is by pulling a voting lever, this is keeping up on freedom of speech about as well as we would keep up on world events by reading a newspaper every 4 years.

At the same time we make and express our conscientious opinions, we should listen to what people have to say. By listening to others, our opinions become tempered with a sense of tolerence and understanding that comes from looking at all sides of a problem. Of course, the finest and most high minded of ideas do no good unless they are backed with action. For instance, if our State needs revenue to raise the quality of our schools, we should take action by working for candidates who will support education, or better yet, run for office ourselves.

Along with people who may temper our opinions, there are always those with whom we disagree completely. Since it is important that the rights of a minority be protected, we might well adopt the attitude of Voltaire when he said: "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." This type of chivalrous feeling, championing the rights of others, is the principle on which our country was founded.

In closing, I would like to say that freedom today depends on our willingness to keep using our freedoms, not to hold them in reserve. It depends on our ability to look at all sides of a problem and let our opinions be tempered by those of others. Finally, it rests with our concern, not merely for our own rights, but for the rights of people who disagree with us. This is the challenge of citizenship. Keep our freedom from rusting with neglect. It is one of the few things that will never wear out with use.

Art and the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Friday, March 12, issue of the Washington Daily News contains an editorial entitled "Art and the Government." The editorial is particularly noteworthy, in that it points out a major area of concern in connection with the proposed legislation calling for subsidies to the arts and humanities. The editorial deserves the attention and consideration of every Member of this body, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ART AND THE GOVERNMENT

"Speakin' of art," the Indiana poet, James Whitcomb Riley, is said to have remarked during a boring symphony concert, "I know a man in Terre Haute that can spit clean over a boxcar."

That is precisely the problem raised by President Johnson's proposal of a Federal program to subsidize the arts and humanities. What is art? What are the humanities? And who is to decide which of them are worthy of being nourished by the taxpayers?

The bill accompanying Mr. Johnson's message defines the "arts" as including music, dance, drama, folk art, creative writing, architecture, painting, motion pictures, photography, craft arts, television, and radio. The word "humanities" covers projects in language, literature, history, philosophy, and other aspects of the social sciences.

These would be fostered by creation of a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, and by up to $15 million a year in Federal grants and fellowships. Government officials would keep hands off subject matter, the measure stipulates.

But the very nature of the project carries assumptions which many thoughtful stu-

dents of the arts and humanities would be bound to challenge. Is jazz any less an art form than much of serious modern music? Should cubists be subsidized and comic strip artists ignored? Would Riley, if he were living today, be a fit subject for a Government grant, or would the money go to some long-hair poet?

And who is better advancing the humanities—the graduate student working on a subsidized thesis or the young writer learning the hard way what humanity is all about?

The bill states in its preamble that "democracy demands wisdom and vision in its citizens," and the President in his accompanying message says "freedom is an essential condition for the artist."

Those are two of the best arguments we know for finding other methods than Government subsidies to encourage the arts and humanities.

The Challenge of Citizenship

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the recent "Voice of Democracy" contest conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, an outstanding young student from the Fourth District of Illinois, Harry Wayne Simmon, represented the State of Illinois.

Harry is an outstanding student at Lyons Township High School in La Grange, Ill. He and the other young men and women who participated in this year's "Voice of Democracy" contest are outstanding examples of the talented and dedicated young generation who will mature to accept positions of responsibility in our society.

I am pleased to insert into the RECORD at this point the winning speech of Harry Simmon's in the Illinois Voice of Democracy competition:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP, 1964–65

(By Harry Wayne Simmon, La Grange, Ill.)

You've heard how Americans have 50 percent of the world's wealth and 7 percent of its people. We're lucky to be Americans, aren't we? It seems we were born into a rose colored world. Right now we're proud of our country and our heritage.

To this kind of talk I say, "Save it." I'm tired of listening to eulogies and pride boasting speeches. Let men rest on the past, let them lean against the accomplishments of their grandfathers and fall asleep. In this changing world, not advancing is, in effect, falling backward. The freshness and vitality of America, those qualities which drove men to make us free, lie dormant, shut up behind social whims, cynicism, and selfishness.

You know people who are talented and industrious, but if they do anything at all with these attributes, it's only to gain financial security, power, or self-enjoyment. This is apparent in recent political scandals and campaign mudslinging.

Adult America has a sense of values brainwashed by the corruption and greed of a few. If there is a chance to save the freshness of America, it lies with her youth. Herein is the challenge of citizenship. America's youth cannot be carbon copies of her adults. America's youth are willing and wanting right now to give and to create for something they can call their own, and what better to call your own than your country. But if their willingness is stifled, they turn delinquent or withdraw into themselves or set up false senses of values. Just by using all his resources, without slighting ingenuity and imagination, an American can advance the welfare and prestige of his country most. The highly developed minds and bodies of American youth deteriorate in waiting for a chance to exploit their talents for a worthwhile goal. Give youth a chance; give them freedom; challenge them with something worthwhile and they'll make America a hundred times greater than she already is.

Perhaps you say that they have chances to work off exuberance for their country. Maybe they do. but it is not the accepted thing in their society because it is not the accepted thing in adult society. When you hear a siren on the streets, how many cars actually pull to the side of the road, much less come to a halt? What percentage of your adult friends really know the issues of politics and have formulated their own answers? How many times have you heard adults complain about taxes? Moreover, how much are the letters "U.S.A." a part of your everyday vocabulary?

Take stock, friend. Look at the problem. Behold America. Is she really progressing in spirit as she is in automation, economy, and population? Her youth can and shall carry on the spirit of America.

This, then, is the challenge of citizenship for all Americans: for adults it is to set an example by laying cynicism aside and picking up the banner of vitality and plain, honest drive; for youth it is to follow the example and exploit their natural freshness and naive courage.

There is a bond between men which Emerson called "the nimble air benign." It is the universality of man, his need for love, for self-pride, for identity, maybe it's just conscience; but whatever it is, we can use it as a connecting agent to help us all know how to use our talents. But talent is nothing without courage and imagination to put these natural qualities to work—to work for America.

The Symphony Comes to Middletown, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a prime objective of my bill, Senate bill 310, the National Arts Foundation Act of 1965, is to encourage the living arts in communities which otherwise would not have opportunities to benefit from them. The bill seeks to do this through State art councils and other nonprofit means. New York has had such a council since 1960; and it has succeeded admirably in working with such communities within the State. One such effort came to realization recently when the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra came to Middletown, N.Y., and presented a concert, sponsored by the Greater Middletown Arts Council, in cooperation with other community agencies and the New York State Council on the Arts.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article—from the February 23 issue of the Middletown Times-Herald Record—describing this achievement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SYMPHONY COMES TO TOWN

(By Marian Feman)

MIDDLETOWN.—"Let's book a symphony this season. Let's bring a topflight symphony orchestra to Middletown. There's nothing quite like the big, full, thrilling sound of live music."

One enthusiastic member of the Greater Middletown Arts Council convinced the other directors that a symphony concert would add to the life of the area.

The concert by the Minneapolis Symphony which will take place at Middletown High School this Sunday afternoon at 2:30 was planned almost a year ago.

But the price was high for a small city. Art, like other commodities in demand, costs money.

The State arts council came to the rescue with a sizable grant. The local arts council paid its share of more than half the guarantee, which was several thousand dollars. One hundred and 50 patrons gave additional support. Finally the contract was signed.

Next came the job of filling those 1,600 seats at Middletown High School.

The three arts council sponsors—the Middletown school system, Orange County Community College, and the Times-Herald Record went to work.

Schools in three counties were contacted and students invited to attend for only $1.50. Music teachers talked up the value of hearing a live symphony orchestra. Four hundred student tickets, the maximum at this price, were reserved almost immediately.

The press, radio stations, bill boards, organizations, supermarkets, the libraries, and even city buses carried the musical message—"the symphony is coming to town."

Adult tickets were scaled at $3 and $4.50. Soon the arts council's box office headquarters, at the Record's switchboard, began to buzz with activity. Mail orders were received within a 40-mile radius.

The program was chosen—Brahms' "First Symphony," Prokofiev's "Classical Symphony," and a contemporary work by Gunther Schuller "Seven Studies on Themes of Paul Klee."

Another artistic cover for Sunday's program was created by the arts council's artist, Dr. Fritz Blumenthal. His graphic designs are frequently offbeat and provocative.

Ushers were recruited from the high school and from Orange County Community College. Those lucky enough to be selected will attend the concert free of charge.

The time is drawing near for Sunday's concert. Last minute details must still be taken care of. Dressing rooms for the conductor and the performers must be arranged for. One hundred chairs must be set up. The piano must be tuned. Lighting must be just right, with no glare to disturb the musicians.

Early Sunday morning a truck will pull up to the high school, carrying 70 trunks of valuable instruments. These will be carefully unloaded by professional stagehands.

At 12:30 the orchestra members will arrive, and 2 hours later young Polish director, Stanislaw Skrowaczewski, will raise his baton and give the cue opening the program.

The artistic success of Sunday's concert, of course, depends upon the Minneapolis Symphony's performance. Behind the performance is months of diligent preparation by a large number of people—in the school system, in business, on the arts council—who have volunteered their services to bring more life, more culture, and more spark to the place where they live.

New Castro Fortifications Ring U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been concerned about the lack of information on Cuba. I have made inquiry of the State Department only to be assured by the Assistant Secretary of State that Cuba is in a mess and that communism has been proven undesirable for the American States. Only yesterday I heard the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate state that Castro had been cut down to size, so it is really with great interest that I read James D. Hittle's article in the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., of March 14.

It seems to me that we are paying too little attention to what is going on in the Russian colony which lies within 90 miles of our shore.

NEW CASTRO FORTIFICATIONS RING U.S. NAVAL BASE AT GUANTANAMO

(By James D. Hittle)

(NOTE.—James D. Hittle, a retired Marine Corps brigadier general, who is director of national security and foreign affairs for the VFW, recently visited the Naval Base at Guantanamo.)

In spite of the wishful thinking that Castro-land is too expensive for Moscow's budget, the Kremlin is not pulling out of Cuba.

Instead, communism is digging in for what looks like a long and troublesome stay. That is what I concluded during a recent tour of strategically placed Guantanamo Bay Naval Base on the southern tip of Cuba.

Since last August, the Reds have been fortifying the high ground surrounding the naval base boundary. And this is not any amateur pick-and-shovel trench digging. It is a highly professional job, reflecting an unusual degree of skill in the military organization of critical ground.

As a result of a tremendous engineering effort the Reds have cleared and smoothed a 300- to 500-yard wide belt about 15 miles long—completely around the land boundary of the base. Jungle, rocks, and cactus have been cleared. This provides a typical communist-style death strip like those with which the Reds have scarred the dividing line between freedom and oppression in Europe. One of its purposes is to prevent freedom-loving Cubans from seeking sanctuary in the naval base. To make the flight to freedom more difficult, the Reds have erected a wall of barbed wire down the middle of the strip. It is about 7 feet high and three rows wide. In itself it represents a heavy investment of money, material, and labor. But this is only part of the Red effort to seal off Guantanamo Bay. Behind the wire are the fortifications. These, in turn, consist of a series of deeply embedded firing positions. Each pillbox is carefully located, taking full advantage of terrain, most of which is higher than the base area.

TRENCHES SKILLFULLY LOCATED

One highly organized strongpoint consists of more than 20 separate firing positions. All the positions are placed to support each other with shields of fire that cover approaches to adjacent positions. Connecting these firing positions are skillfully located trenches. These not only run along the front, generally parallel to the base boundary, but also extend from the rear of the line, thus giving covered routes of approach for troops and supplies.

Probably the most surprising and significant aspect of these fortifications is their heavy construction. Each firing point (pillbox) is constructed with prefabricated concrete, estimated to vary from 3 to 6 inches thick. When embedded in the ground, only the gun port and low rounded roof protrude above the surface.

With glasses I could clearly see the prefabricated concrete roof slabs being put in place. These are then covered by layers of poured concrete and earth, in a short time fast-growing vegetation will give hard-to-discern camouflage.

Far to the rear of the fortified line, land is being cleared for barracks construction. Cost of this hostile fortification around our base is estimated at close to $15 million. When complete it will be one of the most intensively fortified positions in the world. I doubt that there is anyone in Castro's forces capable of planning and building such a skillfull and massive network. The type of fortification, use of terrain-covered trenches and emphasis on fields of fire conform to Soviet military doctrine.

REMEMBER MISSILE CRISIS

Why this vast and surprising Red buildup? There is no one pat answer. Communist strategy is based on flexibility, the choice of methods—everything from propaganda to raw military power. It appears that the following factors are involved in the Moscow-Havana decision to ring our base with fortifications.

Moscow wants Guantanamo Bay. The Russian general staff knows full well, even if some Americans do not, that our base is the strategic key to the Caribbean, the approaches to Panama and the protection of sea lanes essential to economic and military integrity of South America. Let us not forget that one of the most consistent themes of Kremlin propaganda is "kick the United States out of Guantanamo."

Neither Cuban Premier Fidel Castro nor Moscow has forgotten their scare during the 1962 missile crisis when they were so vulnerable to U.S. military action. An attack from Guantanamo Bay combined with air and sea assault from the Florida area, would have broken the Red grip on Cuba. Russian military thought always has been extremely sensitive to an exposed flank.

OFFENSIVE ROLE POSSIBLE

If another threat of U.S. retaliation should develop, Castro and his Kremlin overlords want to prevent the possibility that U.S. units from Guantanamo Bay might link up with other forces and Cuban freedom fighters.

Also, the new fortifications could perform a dual offensive-defensive role. If the Reds ever decided to attack the base, their best corridor of attack would be down the long and broad plain of the Guantanamo River, which rises in the mountains in the northwest and flows in a southeasterly direction into the bay.

In such a tactical situation, Red gunfire from the fortifications, supplemented by artillery in the hills to the northwest, would try to immobilize our forces in the base in order to assist the armored attack down the plain. This would be in accord with the tactical doctrine for holding forces and maneuver force.

But the Soviet tacticians must realize it would not be a walk-in for them. Navy and Marine units at the base, backed by carrier aviation and naval gunfire, would be doing something, too.

SERVE PROPAGANDA PURPOSE

It is probable, though, that the fortifications are intended to serve a more immediate propaganda role.

Taking advantage of our well-known desire for peace, the Reds could deliberately create a war-threatening crisis. Then, to the tune of worldwide propaganda, they could offer to negotiate. When the timing is right from their standpoint they can increase tension by firing a few shots and publicly reenforcing troops in the fortifications. Their investment in these new fortifications will pay dividends in military credibility. This, in turn, they expect, will give added leverage in negotiations.

Tribute to John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an excellent tribute to the new Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., appeared in the March 10, 1965, issue of the Government Employees' Exchange.

Because of Mr. Macy's most remarkable accomplishments, ability, and vigorous talent, I request that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACY'S REAPPOINTMENT AS CSC CHIEF APPLAUDED BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Federal employees everywhere in the world are commending President Johnson for reappointing John W. Macy, Jr., to the chairmanship of the Civil Service Commission for a 6-year term. Members of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, in confirming him for the post on March 4, made audible the expressions of pleasure felt by Federal careerists, male and female alike, physically able and partially disabled alike, by majority and minority groups alike.

Readers of this newspaper if they haven't, by this time, become intimately acquainted with Mr. Macy, his personality, and his remarkable work history, with the inspiration he inculcated in every Federal department and agency in the Government, with the vigor he has supplied every one of the talented careerists in the Federal service, together with his tireless energy to attract the talented into the Federal service, then this newspaper has not done a good job. At 47, his career has just begun. When this remarkable man sleeps no one will ever know. Those who know him never cease to wonder where he unearths his drive, how he amasses his wisdom for fair play, when he gets the time not only to perform his responsibilities but to express himself in the many professional personnel journals, which this newspaper has been fortunate to accumulate. He arrives at his office in the wee hours of the morning and leaves it with a bulging briefcase at night. Members of the Civil Service Commission staff having business with him one day not so long ago said "you have to catch him on the run. He's on the move practically all of the time." The Exchange, in 1961, recorded for its readers just prior to his confirmation, that he "would go anywhere and do anything" to improve the lot of Federal employees. As careerists well know, he has demonstrated that he meant those words, and is daily continuing to do so.

Several months ago, this newspaper speculated to itself if the unsupported rumors that

President Johnson would appoint him to a higher Cabinet post were true. Well, in a way they came true. After Mr. Johnson's election, he became the President's chief body-snatcher for talent to man the Cabinet posts of the Federal Government, in addition to discharging his functions as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. It is suspected he will continue to serve the President in these capacities. President Johnson's esteem of Mr. Macy is expressed in his recommendation.

Mr. Macy's achievements for Federal employees are mountainous. He is regarded as the architect of the Federal Employees Salary Reform Act of 1962, the act that provides for Federal employees to receive compensation comparable to their brothers in private industry for performing comparable functions. He is regarded as the mastermind behind the Executive order issued by President Kennedy that won recognition for Federal employee unions. He is regarded as the prime stimulant that removed discrimination for the fair sex, the discrimination of minority groups, and the increasing employment of the physically handicapped and the mentally retarded in the Federal service. He is still, untiringly leading the "quest for quality" talent in the Federal service inaugurated under President Kennedy.

The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission wasn't born with "a silver spoon in his mouth." His life's story is an example of the American dream come true. Born at Winnetka, Ill., he worked after school, worked his way, together with a scholarship, through college at all sorts of jobs, including a job as a stringer on a newspaper. He started in the Federal service as a intern, in 1938, and quickly rose on the career ladder to become the Executive Director of the Civil Service Commission by 1953, a post he resigned from in 1958 to become the executive vice president of Wesleyan University, at Middletown, Conn., his alma mater. Along the way—and purely by chance—he met, in 1942, and successfully wooed the former Joyce Hagen, who came to the Nation's Capital with her classmates at Smith College for a visit. Today she's Mrs. Macy, and together they are rearing four children. Along the way, after his honorable discharge from the Army after World War II as a captain—he entered as a private and rose to a captain in 3 years—he became the special assistant to the then Under Secretary of the Army, Frank Pace. Along the way, after President Eisenhower's election, he was requested by the then Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Philip Young, to become its Executive Director.

While serving as executive vice president at Wesleyan, where, incidentally, he also served as an instructor, Mr. Macy, on January 3, 1961, at 4:30 p.m., received a call from the then newly elected President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, requesting him to accept the appointment of Chairman of the Civil Service Commission which he did. Before his confirmation by the Senate, on March 6, 1961, he was guest of honor at a banquet given by the citizens of Middletown, Conn., attended by more than 700 guests, for leading a drive that gathered more than $1,300,000 to erect a much-needed hospital there.

A quick-moving, 6-footer, Mr. Macy enjoys a swim in his pool on the grounds of his home at McLean, Va. Ruddy of face, his lithe figure, about 170 pounds, is usually seen around the Commission and the White House in a gray suit and a white shirt, wearing a dark tie, which sets out his face, over which can be seen his closely cropped prematurely gray hair. He now drives a 1962 automobile, the successor to a 1947 one that got "more beaten up than it was" after an accident in Connecticut 2 years ago.

If one were to assess the Chairman's previous activities in the post to which he has been reappointed by President Johnson, he would be prompted to say that he successfully attacked the inequities that existed in the Federal service almost since its inception, created a new image of the Federal employee in the public domain and succeeded in making the Federal workforce of a composition that could be described as a "cross section of these United States." If one were to predict the course up which the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission will take to continue to improve and update the Federal service it is assumed he will not only continue his programs of the past but strive vigorously to stir the mightly Federal operating human machine into sterling accomplishments for designated agency missions.

Paul H. Tidwell, of Tennessee, Is New President of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the new president of the National Electric Cooperative Association, Mr. Paul H. Tidwell, is a native of Tennessee who has demonstrated his outstanding qualifications for this important post through a career covering 25 years in the electric field.

In this connection, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a biographical sketch of Mr. Tidwell that was published in the current issue of the Tennessee magazine.

The article follows:

TENNESSEAN TIDWELL HEADS NRECA

(By John E. Stanford)

A native Tennessean who has dedicated more than a quarter century of his life to the cause of cooperative rural electrification is the new president of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

He is Paul H. Tidwell, Centerville, who has served as manager of Meriwether Lewis Electric Co-op since its inception in 1939. As the elected head of NRECA, Tidwell will preside over an organization comprised of nearly 1,000 rural electric co-ops, public power districts and public utility districts in 46 States which electricially serve, at cost, approximately 20 million Americans. Tidwell is not only the first Tennessean but the first resident of the Tennessee Valley to be elected to this high honor and position.

Tidwell, a native of Dickson, Tenn., has spent virtually all of his adult life in the electric business. Following his education in the Dickson public schools and at Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, he began his career in the electric field in 1928 with a 32-customer system at Burns, Tenn., which was owned by the Suburban Power Co. and which was later purchased by the Tennessee Power Co. Tidwell remained with Tepco and served as district manager at Dickson from 1930 until 1936 and at Waverly from 1936 until 1939 when he was employed by Meriwether Lewis Electric Co-op as its first manager. Still in his fifties, Tidwell this year will complete 37 years in the electric business, more than two-thirds of which has been in cooperative rural electrification.

Under Tidwell's management, Meriwether Lewis Electric Co-op has grown from an initial system of 132 miles of line serving 1,619 members and a plant investment of $400,000 to a present system of 1,878 miles of line serving 14,000 members and a plant investment of more than $6½ million. Meriwether Lewis' service area includes Lewis, Perry, and Humphreys Counties and most of Houston and Hickman Counties.

One of the most dedicated persons to the cooperative rural electrification program to be found anywhere, Tidwell is in his 16th year as Tennessee's representative on the board of directors of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. During this time he has served for several years as NRECA's District Three executive committeeman, district three being comprised of the States of Tennessee, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Alabama. He served as secretary-treasurer of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association from 1961–63, as vice president of this national organization from 1963–65, and was elected to the presidency of NRECA during the course of its 23d annual meeting at Miami Beach, Fla., in late January of this year.

Gifted with a fine balance of diplomacy and straightforwardness, Paul Tidwell is known as a mover, a man who gets things done. His ascendency to the presidency of NRECA is well timed, for the rural electrification program is on the threshold of attempting some of its most progressive steps while at the same time fighting off some of the most bitter attacks ever mounted by the private power and other selfish and vested interests.

A congenial, likable but basically a serious-minded man, Tidwell is very adept at cutting through the fat to the muscle of a problem. And he doesn't for long tolerate problems that stand in the way of the good operation and welfare of his co-op, community, region, State, or the rural electrification program at any level. He sets example by deeds rather than words and swift is the step of the follower who can keep up his pace.

Tidwell has served on the board of trustees of the Tennessee Rural Electric Cooperative Association and on numerous of its committees, as a member of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, as secretary of the Middle Tennessee Industrial Development Association, as president of the Middle Tennessee Electric Managers' Association, as president and secretary of the Centerville Lions Club, as director and president of the Central Services Association, as president of the Exchange Club of Waverly, as an alderman on the city board of Centerville, as fundraising chairman of the County Heart Association, and as a director of the Middle Tennessee Heart Association. He is a Mason and has served in a number of important positions in the Centerville Methodist Church, including the chairmanship of the official board.

Tidwell pays much more than lipservice to the often misplaced belief in the dignity of man. He believes that dignity should not be confined to the more economically aggressive countries. Two years ago he spent several months in Peru studying the feasibility of establishing rural electric co-ops in that part of South America in connection with NRECA's effort to give assistance to the Alliance for Progress.

Tidwell was married in 1932 to the former Miss Hazel Youree, also a native of Dickson. They have one son, Clark, a graduate of Vanderbilt University who served a tour of duty as an officer in the Marine Corps following graduation and who is now a law student at the same university.

Soon after his election to the presidency of NRECA, Paul and Mrs. Tidwell received word that they had become grandparents for the first time, a grandson. This raised a question of pride—whether the Tidwells were

prouder of their grandson, or whether he, at a later date, will be prouder of his grandparents, including a grandfather who in 1965 became the first Tennessean to be elected to the presidency of a national organization representing 20 million Americans.

Is Another Depression Inevitable?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. News & World Report magazine of December 21, 1964, had an astounding article on why industries from the North were going into right-to-work States. The principal reason was low wages. In the State of Indiana, including my congressional district, many factories and mills have moved into right-to-work States under the provision of 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. The Indiana Legislature last month, repealed its right-to-work laws which were enacted by the State legislature several years ago.

Businessmen, industrial leaders, economists and others are gradually learning that the low wage of factory and industry workers in the right-to-work States does not permit the worker to buy $3,000- and $4,000-priced automobiles or $300 or $400 refrigerators, modern-priced furniture, high-priced food products and thousands of other products which are manufactured in States that maintain a wage scale that insures American buying power. One nationally known economist stated recently that American buying power is gradually drying up on account of low wages being paid in the so-called right-to-work States. These employees are practically out of the market for products manufactured in States where a living wage is being paid under our American economic system.

In his article he said that unless runaway industry is estopped from escaping to low-wage States, and the phony-named right-to-work laws and section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law are repealed, we will have an economic depression that will rival the early thirties.

The following resolution was forwarded to me today by John Truchan, president; and E. B. Lawbaugh, financial secretary, of the Lake County AFL–CIO Central Labor Union in the industrial Calumet region of Indiana:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ENACT LEGISLATION TO RESTORE FULL FREEDOM OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AS UNIFORM NATIONAL LABOR POLICY AND PRACTICE THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES, BY REPEALING EXISTING SANCTIONS OF STATE RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS CONTAINED IN SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED, AND SECTION 705 (b) OF THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959, AND BY OTHER APPROPRIATE ACTION

Whereas section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 sanction the enactment of State right-to-work laws prohibiting the negotiation of agreements between unions and employers assuring union security during the term of such agreement; and

Whereas by constitutional provision or statute 19 States have such right-to-work laws in effect, and by ordinance or other enactment numerous municipalities, counties, and other local bodies have adopted and put such laws into effect; and

Whereas such laws are contrary to and in derogation of provisions of Federal law contained in sections 8(a), (3) and 8(f) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, which in the absence of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, permit under specified conditions the negotiation of agreements between unions and employers assuring union security during the term of such agreements; and

Whereas State right-to-work laws undermine union organization and interfere with full freedom of collective bargaining between unions and employers; tend to depress wages and working conditions and to promote strikes and instability and antagonism in labor-management relations; and unfairly compel unions to represent and bargain for workers who are unwilling to bear the cost and responsibility of participation in union organization and collective bargaining; and

Whereas State right-to-work laws are unfair and antilabor in their effects and are designed to weaken and harass labor unions in their organization efforts and in representing workers in bargaining with their employers; and

Whereas labor unions are generally rendered less effective in promoting the welfare of wage earners and wages and working conditions are generally lower in States having right-to-work laws than in States where such laws do not exist; and

Whereas successful implementation of the national labor policy in support of union organization and collective bargaining is not possible unless unions and union security are accepted by management as desirable forms of industrial dealings: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States enact such legislation as may be necessary and appropriate to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, which sanction State right-to-work laws, and to restore full freedom of collective bargaining as uniform national labor policy and practice throughout the United States.

Mr. Joad Reports From the Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, some of the best satire written recently has had to do with the so-called war on poverty and I think one of the best pieces was written by columnist Arthur Hoppe, published in the San Francisco Chronicle of March 3, which I am pleased to insert in the RECORD.

OUR MAN HOPPE: MR. JOAD REPORTS FROM THE FRONT

(By Arthur Hoppe)

I have another progress report from the front lines in the war on poverty. My correspondent is Mr. Jud Joad of Appalachia Corners, the veteran poverty fighter. Mr. Joad and his wife, Maude, are experts, having been fighting poverty all their lives. The report follows:

Well, things have been sure hopping down here ever since Mr. Johnson announced his war on poverty. Hardly a week goes by without some magazine photographer coming around to take pictures of Maude and me and our cabin. "Look grim," they say. And that we do.

But, to tell the truth, just knowing we are doing our part in this war has made us mighty proud and happy. I guess it started with Mr. Johnson saying he wanted everybody to be in his Great Society. "Oh, Jud," says Maude, doing a little dance, her old eyes all a-sparkling like, "he's including us. He's going to see we get into society."

"Now, now, Maude," I say, squeezing her hand, "don't you go getting your hopes up. You don't know whether we're fit to get in." But she pats me on the shoulder and says, "Don't fret. We were part and parcel of the Square Deal, the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the Great Crusade and the New Frontier. Sure enough, they're not going to leave us out of the Great Society."

And sure enough, a month later this young fellow in a town suit comes up the dirt road. "Hello there, folks," he says, "I'm in poverty."

"We haven't got much," says Maude, apologizing, "but we'd be glad to share a cup of collard greens with you."

"No," he says, "I'm in the poverty corps and I'm here to help you folks lead better lives." And he pulls out a bunch of long application forms and a sharp yellow pencil.

"Oh, Jud," says Maude, "it's our invite into the Great Society. Do I look all right?"

So he asks us a lot of questions and finally he gets down to what kind of skills I got. I says that 50 years ago I was a pretty fair stepper and I could most likely still pick out "Big Rock Candy Mountain" on the guitar. If I had a guitar. But he says no, he means what kind of work was I good for. And I says, well, I know chopping cotton, hoeing corn, and the like.

At that, he shakes his head and puts his pencil away. "I'll send your application through to data processing," he says.

"But, frankly, it sounds to me as though you're unemployable, untrainable, uneducated, and penniless. And naturally, if we want this program to be a success, we have to screen out the bums."

"Naturally," says I. "When," says Maude hopefully, "do you think we'll be invited to our first White House ball? And if I get a new dress, can I have one with roses on it?"

"Don't forget," says the young man grimly, "there's a war on. And they also serve who stand and wait."

So we're proudly doing our part in the war on poverty. We're standing and waiting. Meantime, do you think they may increase the surplus lard ration? What with all these folks coming around, I can't find much time for my farming chores. And we're running low on vittles.

Remarks of Speaker John W. McCormack at Veterans of Foreign Wars Banquet at Sheraton Park Hotel, March 9, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I wish to include your speech at the annual banquet of the VFW held on March 9, 1965, upon acceptance of their annual Congressional Award:

REMARKS OF SPEAKER JOHN W. MCCORMACK AT VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS BANQUET AT SHERATON PARK HOTEL, MARCH 9, 1965

I am highly honored and deeply touched by being selected as the recipient of the 1965 Veterans of Foreign Wars Congressional Award. I shall always treasure this honor conferred upon me by your great American organization.

For your organization stands for the highest ideals of Americanism, which your members have manifested by outstanding service in time of war, as well as dedicated service in time of peace.

While I am the direct recipient tonight of this significant award, I feel that I am receiving and accepting the same in the name of the House of Representatives, for its entire membership.

In confining my remarks to the House, which I love, I am proud of its actions in this period of world tension, of its contribution to a powerful national defense, and a strong and firm foreign policy.

This award brings back extraordinary remembrances.

Remembrances of battlefields in far countries.

Remembrances of fallen comrades in fierce fighting.

Remembrances of basic privations, of utter exhaustion, of discomforts almost beyond endurance.

Remembrances of perils shared—of heroism involving even the peril of life itself.

I know that you regard those experiences among the greatest, the most cherished, and the most precious of your lives, and which tie you in forever with the destiny of our beloved country.

But, unfortunately, war has never ceased.

The world is now undergoing a period of great strain.

Peace does not exist.

The very greatness we have achieved, so much through your direct services, has placed upon our country, whether or not we like it, the responsibility of the leadership of the free world.

And we have the responsibility of doing those things that are essential in the national interest of our country.

Sometimes those decisions are hard ones to make and to execute.

But above all, we must keep uppermost in our minds the national interest of the United States.

History has shown that our country and our people want world peace.

But not peace at any price.

If a climate favorable to progress toward peace exists, we should and will negotiate.

But we will not capitulate.

And the threats from Moscow or Peiping will not create fear in our minds.

For history has shown that America, when necessary, will fight—not for imperialism but for justice, freedom, and peace. And we Americans are fighters.

And the present membership of both political parties, under the leadership of President Johnson, will not tolerate appeasement.

For we know that the fears of the leaders of certain European nations before World War II lead to appeasement.

And we know that appeasement is the road to war.

We are aware when action is taken, such as Cuba, Tonkin Bay, and now Vietnam, that there are certain calculated risks involved.

But we are also aware that there is the other side of the coin—the calculated risks of inaction.

And in the life of a nation, and in the making of history, inaction can be more harmful at times than action.

For the basic policy of the United States of peace through strength is not only sound but is necessary.

And it is well that America is strong.

The price we pay for national defense is wise and necessary.

And as a legislator, if I am going to err in the field of national defense, particularly in the world of today, I prefer to err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness.

For the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear. And that is greater military strength on our part than possessed by the Communist part of the world.

For we cannot negotiate or deal with them on a moral level for they have no moral origin.

And for the same reason we cannot do so on the level of idealism. But there is one thing that the Communists cannot deny, and that is that the law of self-preservation applies to the people of the Soviet Union as it does to our people or the people of any other country.

And the price we pay for national defense is the premium we pay for the preservation of independence and liberty, and a marked contribution toward ultimate world peace.

And fortunately we now have, and in the past have had, Presidents who recognize the importance and the necessity of a powerful national defense, with the courage to make decisions and to take action when necessary.

And equally fortunate we now have and have had both branches of the Congress who, with vision and judgment, have voted for strong military strength.

And the world, particularly in the Communist part, is served with notice that there is complete unity between our executive and legislative branches, for a powerful national defense and a firm foreign policy.

And this unity, and more broadly the unity of our people in all respects, is a matter of great importance and strength in the eyes of the rest of the world.

With the deep religious convictions of our people; with the unity that exists among all our people and with our great military strength, we can look forward in the years that lie ahead with confidence to the ultimate success of our aims and to a world of peace. It is in this spirit that I accept this significant award from your great organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America.

In my remarks to you at this point I'd like to emphasize my respect for one of the most astute and one of the most patriotically acceptable items in the long catalog of the achievements of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This is your brilliant and honorable technique for drawing into the orbit of your influence as a veteran and a patriotic organization the youths of America. This is why I look with pride and hope at the young people here who are the winners in the essay contest entitled "Voice of America." For these young folk are indeed the breadth and the spirit of our country and the repository of its dreams and its destiny.

And you, the VFW, are their guide and their mentors.

May I put in here humbly as one who has struggled for almost a half century to focus the attention of our people everywhere on the legacy and the ideals and goals of our country that in my judgment no work is greater than this mass educational effort in 50 States and our territories that you call Voice of America. It is in the field of education—inspired education—that we have the heartbeat and the life's blood of democracy. But before we can have democracy you and I know that it must be learned, and understood. And the earlier we teach and inculcate it into the hearts and the minds of America's youth the greater is the force it promises to be for the future.

To project this teaching on the competitive plane and make it a contest to see who can think the best and write and speak the best for the ideals of our country is a tribute to the principle of enlightened incentive which the VFW so wisely employs in this instance.

I congratulate the winners of this noble contest and I salute its sponsors, the VFW, and its leadership. It is through contests exactly like this that you, the VFW, are giving our people one of the dramatic, exciting, and affirmative antidotes to juvenile shortcomings and failure and an avenue for uplift that—as we see here—has its obvious and heartening success.

Commemorative Postal Card To Salute the 175th Anniversary of the First Taking of the Federal Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, those of us serving on the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service were delighted to learn that Postmaster General John A. Gronouski plans to issue a Bureau of the Census commemorative postal card in honor of the 175th aniversary of the taking of the first Federal census. To my knowledge, this is the first time that the U.S. Census has been honored by a commemorative stamp, although many other countries have issued stamps saluting the census and the census taker.

The history of our Nation is intimately united with and recorded by the decennial census, begining with the first census in 1790, which enumerated only 4 million persons, to the last census in 1960, when 183 million persons were enumerated.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Philatelic Release No. 13 of the Post Office Department, dated March 7, 1965:

Postmaster General John A. Gronouski yesterday announced plans to issue a Bureau of the Census commemorative postal card to salute the 175th anniversary of the taking of the first Federal census.

"The development of our Nation into greatness is told tersely, but dramatically in census reports," Mr. Gronouski said. "Over the years, the Bureau has admirably fulfilled this important mission of keeping a finger on the pulsebeat of America."

Date and place of first-day issue ceremonies for the 5-cent postal card will be announced later.

Today the Bureau of the Census is a vast repository for facts and figures, a far cry from the initial census of 1790 when a small group of Federal marshals supervised the first national headcount tallying 3,929,214 persons. The first census report was 56 pages. In contrast, the 1960 census required a task force of some 180,000 enumerators to count 179,323,175 people. Reports of this census fill some 100,000 pages.

In 1789, the United States became the first Nation in modern times to provide for a census by law, although the ancient Romans took censuses, and in the New World the Peruvians were counting heads in pre-Columbus days.

The basic purpose of the census is to provide equitable State representation in the House of Representatives, as required by the Constitution, but over the years functions of the census have widely expanded.

The census of 1810 began to collect some business statistics but these were uneven and inaccurate. In 1840, figures on illiteracy and insanity were compiled. Ten years later the census began to tally newspapers, libraries, criminals, and mortality figures.

U.S. marshals were responsible for census taking until 1880, when a field force under the superintendent of the census was established. After taking a census, the organization disbanded for 10 years, to be re-formed.

By act of 1902 Congress created a permanent Bureau of the Census, placed under the Interior Department. A year later, it was moved to the Department of Commerce and Labor. When Labor was severed from Commerce in 1913, Census remained with Commerce.

The Bureau of the Census has expanded its services so that it now touches almost every economic, political, and social aspect of the national picture. Census makes periodic studies on housing, agriculture, irrigation and drainage, manufacturers, the mineral industry, business and transportation, and State and local governments.

Confronted with a deluge of statistics, the Bureau of the Census in the 1950's installed the first electronic data processing computer ever manufactured. Univac was capable of tabulating 30,000 items a minute, but this is much too slow for the jet age and Univac has been retired as a relic to the Smithsonian Institution. The two modern computers the Bureau of the Census added in 1963 and 1964 are capable of tabulating 3 million items a minute—100 times the rate of the original Univac.

Time for Action on Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the right of every adult American to vote is so fundamental that every constitutional assistance should be given to protect and insure this right. I sincerely hope that Federal legislation can be worked out which will do this job properly and constitutionally, and, if so I plan to support it actively and enthusiastically.

Violence and brutality have no place in America and both sides in the present controversy should cease making a spectacle of our beloved country. Local police officers and volunteer citizens should be careful to evade any action that is inconsistent with the health and safety of the general public and even of those who seek to provoke difficulties. The time is overdue for forbearance by everyone. The point has already been well made: Federal legislation is needed immediately.

We should all rejoice that it is now politically possible to find prompt and adequate answers to the challenge of assuring basic voting rights in the localities where there have been unjust restrictions. However, it is regrettable that local government has not handled the matter and that the methods of pointing up the need for national action have skirted the fringes of anarchy. Frankly, there has been a deplorable lack of respect for authority, which the local governments have encouraged by a failure to make local government fulfill its responsibilities. In a thoughtful question and answer article by Dr. Robert E. Fitch in the March 8, 1965, edition of U.S. News & World Report, Dr. Fitch said as follows:

Question. Where have we lost ground?

Answer. I would put this under three headings: First, the breakdown of authority in this country—the annihilation of authority, the abdication from authority on the part of those who ought to be exercising it.

Of course, I have in mind primarily moral authority, because if you don't have moral authority—whether you're a business executive or a teacher, or a pastor of a church, or a political leader—the other authorities are no good at all. They disintegrate very rapidly. There has to be an acceptance of this moral authority.

The erosion of this authority has taken place partly under allegedly democratic and egalitarian theories that we're all equal and nobody's any better than anybody else, partly under the impact of relativistic teachings in history, anthropology and philosophy that say everything is relative to the culture and there's no objective standard of right and wrong, truth and falsehood.

This erosion has been going on quite a while. And you end up with the only authority left being "me," the isolated individual. And for a while that seems fine. I do as I feel, and I do as I wish. But naturally I'm going to bump into another "me" who doesn't think and feel the way I do, and there's going to be a little clash, and then we're up against trouble.

This erosion of authority, I think, is very widespread today, and alarms me.

Linked with that would be a second problem, a phenomenon that Glenn Tinder (associate professor of government at the University of Massachusetts) mentions—the illusion of the isolated individual, that he can exist in a little vacuum all by himself.

When I talk to college students about sexual morality today, the one thing that they pretty universally believe in is something they call intimacy. This is that part of sex that is private, strictly private. The idea that sexual behavior should have public consequences in the way of babies and families and property and income taxes and buying groceries and civic responsibilities doesn't seem to enter their heads. It's just this private intimacy.

That desire for isolation extends even to religion. To my surprise, I run again and again into a group which will say, "Well, we don't like churches. We don't like worship. After all, religion is a very private and personal matter. It's nobody else's business. It's just between me and God."

Well, of course, religion ought to be personal, but if it's nothing but personal, it's something brand new in history. There never was any purely personal religion, in the whole history of the world, except for a few isolated mystics.

Today, isolation is becoming the fashion even on the dance floor. You don't dance with a partner any more. Everyone gets off by himself to do the twist or the watusi. It doesn't matter whether anyone else is around or not.

So privacy in sex, in property, in religion, in dancing—this is part of the pathos of modern man, hugging his own little isolated ego.

This brings me to a third element of decline that I find of little help if we're going after a "Great Society," namely, a growing caricature of liberty, because people live in this isolated way without any feeling for a moral context or a social structure. They make a fetish of liberty. It hit me with great force when I read Barry Goldwater's statement: "Extremism in defense of liberty is no vice."

And I could find the same viewpoint in still greater abundance on the existentialist left. Any number of "liberals" and "radicals" believe passionately in this same proposition, because it runs across the whole spectrum of American society—this inordinate love of liberty apart from law, apart from social structure and order, which is not the classical pattern of liberty in either England or America. So you have a kind of individualistic, egotistic liberty that destroys itself.

Question. Can you have a good society without good people?

Answer. I'm quite sure you cannot. And that's why this particular crisis, this spiritual crisis of the American people, disturbs me profoundly.

The 46th Anniversary of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, 46 years ago this month, the American Legion was founded in Paris by 20 officers who served in the American Expeditionary Force in France during World War I. A temporary committee was formed and they selected several hundred officers for membership who had the confidence and respect of the whole Army.

This group brought with them the raw material with which to build an association of veterans whose primary dedication was to God and country, to the child and to the veteran. Over the course of nearly half a century, the Legion has grown into the world's largest veterans organization with approximately 2.6 million members in about 16,500 posts in the United States and some foreign countries.

One of the areas in which the Legion has made its greatest contribution to American life is in the work it has done to develop a greater awareness of the importance of education to the Nation's welfare. As early as 1921, the Legion embarked on a determined campaign to improve the quality of our country's schools. They recognized that national greatness could only be achieved and maintained by a people trained to meet the challenges of the modern world. And toward that end they have supported countless programs to insure that American children are educated in quality schools manned by qualified instructors.

National Education Week, established to focus public attention to our schools, was a brainchild of early thinking by concerned Legionnaires. The Legion con-

tinues today as a cosponsor of this observance.

The Legion has also been in the forefront of those who are concerned with the need to foster patriotism. They do it directly through their National High School Oratorical contests which promote a knowledge and an understanding of the U.S. Constitution. They do it indirectly through the American Legion baseball program—a training ground for sound bodies, sound minds, and good sportsmanship.

These are wonderful examples of the actions taken by the American Legion to meet the challenge of its heritage—a heritage we must all strive to keep shining—a heritage that must be carried into the future by vigorous and selfless service at the community, State, and National level.

The American Legion looks forward to continuous useful contributions to American life. It will continue to shape its plans and adhere to principles set forth in the preamble to the National Constitution to the end that the American Legion always may be rightfully known as the best insurance policy a country ever had.

I am proud to salute the American Legion on the occasion of its 46th birthday.

Communist Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter subscribed by a number of my constituents in Blacksburg, Va., the contents of which I feel should be made available to the people of the United States at large.

Accordingly, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote herewith the body of the letter, excluding for obvious reasons the names of those who signed it:

The Government of Communist Rumania is making an all-out effort to look respectable and get all the help they can get from the West. At the same time, neglecting the elementary rules of civilized behavior, they are pursuing a policy toward the Hungarian minority which has only one goal: Ruthless extermination. This cynical and preposterous attitude is based on the assumption, that the desire of America for better relations with the Soviet bloc is stronger, then the contempt and wrath of the American people concerning everything which is undemocratic, evil, and violates the elementary rules of human conduct. The article of the "Reporter" enclosed is just one evidence from the great many of them that the martyrdom of almost 2 million Hungarian minority living in Rumania in general, and in Transylvania in particular, is crying for justice. Volumes could be filled with similar facts gathered from personal experiences of our relatives, statements from Congressmen and Senators of the United States, and from the documented facts of Hungarian emigrant organizations in the United States.

We, residents of Blacksburg, Va., citizens or permanent residents of the United States, request you to tell everybody concerned that this intolerable situation cannot exist forever. If the Rumanian Government wants material help and moral recognition they should pay for it. If they want equal rights for the colored Americans as in the schools, they should allow for every Hungarian in Rumania to be able to go to Hungarian schools, to speak Hungarian, and express their thoughts freely. They should know that the improving of relations with the West is a give-and-take bargain, not just take and not give. They should know that not only big brother is watching the helpless victims, but the American people are watching and listening very, very carefully.

Thank you very much for your kind help in this matter.

No Funds for a Portable Bathroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I draw the attention of my colleagues to a letter from my constituent, Mr. H. S. Bowser of Santa Barbara, Calif. Mr. Bowser has designed a portable bathroom at a very low cost, which should be of interest to the administration in view of its expressed concern about raising the standard of living of our less fortunate Americans, underdeveloped countries overseas, and the small businessman:

To: Congressman CHARLES M. TEAGUE.
cc: Senators GEORGE MURPHY, and THOMAS H. KUCHEL.
Subject: Message on the Cities.

GENTLEMEN: After reading press reports of the President's latest message presented to Members of Congress, I am prompted to make the following suggestion:

Inasmuch as the State of California is the leading State in the Nation, and inasmuch as our own Governor Brown has been reported as stating that 53 percent of the people in California can't afford a decent home in which to live, why wouldn't it be proper, beneficial, informative for your respective individual and combined congressional legislative activities to send one of your selected aids to Santa Barbara for the specific purpose of discerning some naked truths about housing and Federal related activities, as evidence by the project which I have nurtured here? A project, strangely, which has ballooned to nation-international status even prior to production of the second unit?

As a reminder, I put an American style three-fourth bath in simple, economical, totally versatile applicance form—and have amassed leading expert approvals in all categories, plus some 10,000-plus signed order leads, franchise requests coast to coast, and consumer approval for some 12 countries on 5 continents, but, for production I haven't been able to find a single properly priced dime.

Not from President Johnson himself, not from HUBERT HUMPHREY, not from the Office of Economic Opportunity, not from the Small Business Administration, not from a basketful of other Federal national-international agencies.

And all of them are asking for, obtaining, millions—billions of people funds from you gentlemen in Congress.

(Signed) H. S. BOWSER.

Is Our Youth Unfit for a New Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the President's concern for our jobless youth and the mounting problems of juvenile delinquency, I recommend to the Congress words of one of my most respected and revered constituents, Rabbi Gerald Kaplan.

On the 12th of March, his sermon, "Is Our Youth Unfit for a New Era" was heard by his synogogue. I think it is most fitting and appropriate. I recommend it for the reading of my respected colleagues:

IS OUR YOUTH UNFIT FOR A NEW ERA

(By Rabbi Gerald Kaplan)

My dear friends, life plus the world that we live in equals problems. There are the problems of world peace, poverty, the conquest of ignorance, the fear of heart disease and strokes which are our No. 1 killers in these United States and the teenage youth.

Recently the solid upper middle class homes along the east coast of the United States have been shook up by the revelation of teenage drinking in Darien, Conn. A Darien judge jolted this community and the suburbanities and urbanites for miles around when he invoked an obscure law forbidding adults to serve liquor to minors other than their own children. This step was the byproduct of an investigation of charges against a 19-year-old alleged to have been the driver of a vehicle in which a 17-year-old girl was killed. This event and the continuous happenings of gang looting along the broadways of the United States, thievery by children from respectable suburban homes—all have flashed a moral message to parents everywhere. The message urges concern about juvenile tragedies and misfortunes.

Now some claim that we are too worried about juvenile delinquency. Television, the radio, the newspapers, and the motion picture industry are at fault in their opinion. These people claim that the newspapers and magazines overstate the faults and failures of our young people and neglect their virtue and vision.

There are perhaps, 500,000 disturbed and disturbing delinquents in the United States. Their delinquencies face our Nation with a serious problem of public safety and rehabilitation. But there are at the same time 31½ million teenagers who are decent who are struggling to become adult in a dignified way, and who are the most forgotten generation of all. They never make the headlines. We see them, but we take them for granted.

Others, with an eye to the Bible, also maintain that we need not worry about our youngsters because the passage from youth to maturity is seldom navigated smoothly. Think of young David, who sacrificed a safe and secure future on his father's farm for the glory of wearing a uniform. One could almost see Jessie shaking his head at the foolishness of his young son who would sacrifice all that his father had planned for him, for a medal in a moment of military glory. We read in the Bible of young Joseph, pampered, overprotected, bitter tongued, whose pestulance and selfishness brought heartache to his parents and ruined the entire blend of harmony which Jacob had built. And there was Moses, adopted to the plantation,

In 1789, the United States became the first Nation in modern times to provide for a census by law, although the ancient Romans took censuses, and in the New World the Peruvians were counting heads in pre-Columbus days.

The basic purpose of the census is to provide equitable State representation in the House of Representatives, as required by the Constitution, but over the years functions of the census have widely expanded.

The census of 1810 began to collect some business statistics but these were uneven and inaccurate. In 1840, figures on illiteracy and insanity were compiled. Ten years later the census began to tally newspapers, libraries, criminals, and mortality figures.

U.S. marshals were responsible for census taking until 1880, when a field force under the superintendent of the census was established. After taking a census, the organization disbanded for 10 years, to be re-formed.

By act of 1902 Congress created a permanent Bureau of the Census, placed under the Interior Department. A year later, it was moved to the Department of Commerce and Labor. When Labor was severed from Commerce in 1913, Census remained with Commerce.

The Bureau of the Census has expanded its services so that it now touches almost every economic, political, and social aspect of the national picture. Census makes periodic studies on housing, agriculture, irrigation and drainage, manufacturers, the mineral industry, business and transportation, and State and local governments.

Confronted with a deluge of statistics, the Bureau of the Census in the 1950's installed the first electronic data processing computer ever manufactured. Univac was capable of tabulating 30,000 items a minute, but this is much too slow for the jet age and Univac has been retired as a relic to the Smithsonian Institution. The two modern computers the Bureau of the Census added in 1963 and 1964 are capable of tabulating 3 million items a minute—100 times the rate of the original Univac.

Time for Action on Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the right of every adult American to vote is so fundamental that every constitutional assistance should be given to protect and insure this right. I sincerely hope that Federal legislation can be worked out which will do this job properly and constitutionally, and, if so I plan to support it actively and enthusiastically.

Violence and brutality have no place in America and both sides in the present controversy should cease making a spectacle of our beloved country. Local police officers and volunteer citizens should be careful to evade any action that is inconsistent with the health and safety of the general public and even of those who seek to provoke difficulties. The time is overdue for forbearance by everyone. The point has already been well made: Federal legislation is needed immediately.

We should all rejoice that it is now politically possible to find prompt and adequate answers to the challenge of assuring basic voting rights in the localities where there have been unjust restrictions. However, it is regrettable that local government has not handled the matter and that the methods of pointing up the need for national action have skirted the fringes of anarchy. Frankly, there has been a deplorable lack of respect for authority, which the local governments have encouraged by a failure to make local government fulfill its responsibilities. In a thoughtful question and answer article by Dr. Robert E. Fitch in the March 8, 1965, edition of U.S. News & World Report, Dr. Fitch said as follows:

Question. Where have we lost ground?

Answer. I would put this under three headings: First, the breakdown of authority in this country—the annihilation of authority, the abdication from authority on the part of those who ought to be exercising it.

Of course, I have in mind primarily moral authority, because if you don't have moral authority—whether you're a business executive or a teacher, or a pastor of a church, or a political leader—the other authorities are no good at all. They disintegrate very rapidly. There has to be an acceptance of this moral authority.

The erosion of this authority has taken place partly under allegedly democratic and egalitarian theories that we're all equal and nobody's any better than anybody else, partly under the impact of relativistic teachings in history, anthropology and philosophy that say everything is relative to the culture and there's no objective standard of right and wrong, truth and falsehood.

This erosion has been going on quite a while. And you end up with the only authority left being "me," the isolated individual. And for a while that seems fine. I do as I feel, and I do as I wish. But naturally I'm going to bump into another "me" who doesn't think and feel the way I do, and there's going to be a little clash, and then we're up against trouble.

This erosion of authority, I think, is very widespread today, and alarms me.

Linked with that would be a second problem, a phenomenon that Glenn Tinder (associate professor of government at the University of Massachusetts) mentions—the illusion of the isolated individual, that he can exist in a little vacuum all by himself.

When I talk to college students about sexual morality today, the one thing that they pretty universally believe in is something they call intimacy. This is that part of sex that is private, strictly private. The idea that sexual behavior should have public consequences in the way of babies and families and property and income taxes and buying groceries and civic responsibilities doesn't seem to enter their heads. It's just this private intimacy.

That desire for isolation extends even to religion. To my surprise, I run again and again into a group which will say, "Well, we don't like churches. We don't like worship. After all, religion is a very private and personal matter. It's nobody else's business. It's just between me and God."

Well, of course, religion ought to be personal, but if it's nothing but personal, it's something brand new in history. There never was any purely personal religion, in the whole history of the world, except for a few isolated mystics.

Today, isolation is becoming the fashion even on the dance floor. You don't dance with a partner any more. Everyone gets off by himself to do the twist or the watusi. It doesn't matter whether anyone else is around or not.

So privacy in sex, in property, in religion, in dancing—this is part of the pathos of modern man, hugging his own little isolated ego.

This brings me to a third element of decline that I find of little help if we're going after a "Great Society," namely, a growing caricature of liberty, because people live in this isolated way without any feeling for a moral context or a social structure. They make a fetish of liberty. It hit me with great force when I read Barry Goldwater's statement: "Extremism in defense of liberty is no vice."

And I could find the same viewpoint in still greater abundance on the existentialist left. Any number of "liberals" and "radicals" believe passionately in this same proposition, because it runs across the whole spectrum of American society—this inordinate love of liberty apart from law, apart from social structure and order, which is not the classical pattern of liberty in either England or America. So you have a kind of individualistic, egotistic liberty that destroys itself.

Question. Can you have a good society without good people?

Answer. I'm quite sure you cannot. And that's why this particular crisis, this spiritual crisis of the American people, disturbs me profoundly.

The 46th Anniversary of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, 46 years ago this month, the American Legion was founded in Paris by 20 officers who served in the American Expeditionary Force in France during World War I. A temporary committee was formed and they selected several hundred officers for membership who had the confidence and respect of the whole Army.

This group brought with them the raw material with which to build an association of veterans whose primary dedication was to God and country, to the child and to the veteran. Over the course of nearly half a century, the Legion has grown into the world's largest veterans organization with approximately 2.6 million members in about 16,500 posts in the United States and some foreign countries.

One of the areas in which the Legion has made its greatest contribution to American life is in the work it has done to develop a greater awareness of the importance of education to the Nation's welfare. As early as 1921, the Legion embarked on a determined campaign to improve the quality of our country's schools. They recognized that national greatness could only be achieved and maintained by a people trained to meet the challenges of the modern world. And toward that end they have supported countless programs to insure that American children are educated in quality schools manned by qualified instructors.

National Education Week, established to focus public attention to our schools, was a brainchild of early thinking by concerned Legionnaires. The Legion con-

tinues today as a cosponsor of this observance.

The Legion has also been in the forefront of those who are concerned with the need to foster patriotism. They do it directly through their National High School Oratorical contests which promote a knowledge and an understanding of the U.S. Constitution. They do it indirectly through the American Legion baseball program—a training ground for sound bodies, sound minds, and good sportsmanship.

These are wonderful examples of the actions taken by the American Legion to meet the challenge of its heritage—a heritage we must all strive to keep shining—a heritage that must be carried into the future by vigorous and selfless service at the community, State, and National level.

The American Legion looks forward to continuous useful contributions to American life. It will continue to shape its plans and adhere to principles set forth in the preamble to the National Constitution to the end that the American Legion always may be rightfully known as the best insurance policy a country ever had.

I am proud to salute the American Legion on the occasion of its 46th birthday.

Communist Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter subscribed by a number of my constituents in Blacksburg, Va., the contents of which I feel should be made available to the people of the United States at large.

Accordingly, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote herewith the body of the letter, excluding for obvious reasons the names of those who signed it:

The Government of Communist Rumania is making an all-out effort to look respectable and get all the help they can get from the West. At the same time, neglecting the elementary rules of civilized behavior, they are pursuing a policy toward the Hungarian minority which has only one goal: Ruthless extermination. This cynical and preposterous attitude is based on the assumption, that the desire of America for better relations with the Soviet bloc is stronger, then the contempt and wrath of the American people concerning everything which is undemocratic, evil, and violates the elementary rules of human conduct. The article of the "Reporter" enclosed is just one evidence from the great many of them that the martyrdom of almost 2 million Hungarian minority living in Rumania in general, and in Transylvania in particular, is crying for justice. Volumes could be filled with similar facts gathered from personal experiences of our relatives, statements from Congressmen and Senators of the United States, and from the documented facts of Hungarian emigrant organizations in the United States.

We, residents of Blacksburg, Va., citizens or permanent residents of the United States, request you to tell everybody concerned that this intolerable situation cannot exist forever. If the Rumanian Government wants material help and moral recognition they should pay for it. If they want equal rights for the colored Americans as in the schools, they should allow for every Hungarian in Rumania to be able to go to Hungarian schools, to speak Hungarian, and express their thoughts freely. They should know that the improving of relations with the West is a give-and-take bargain, not just take and not give. They should know that not only big brother is watching the helpless victims, but the American people are watching and listening very, very carefully.

Thank you very much for your kind help in this matter.

No Funds for a Portable Bathroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I draw the attention of my colleagues to a letter from my constituent, Mr. H. S. Bowser of Santa Barbara, Calif. Mr. Bowser has designed a portable bathroom at a very low cost, which should be of interest to the administration in view of its expressed concern about raising the standard of living of our less fortunate Americans, underdeveloped countries overseas, and the small businessman:

To: Congressman CHARLES M. TEAGUE.

cc: Senators GEORGE MURPHY, and THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

Subject: Message on the Cities.

GENTLEMEN: After reading press reports of the President's latest message presented to Members of Congress, I am prompted to make the following suggestion:

Inasmuch as the State of California is the leading State in the Nation, and inasmuch as our own Governor Brown has been reported as stating that 53 percent of the people in California can't afford a decent home in which to live, why wouldn't it be proper, beneficial, informative for your respective individual and combined congressional legislative activities to send one of your selected aids to Santa Barbara for the specific purpose of discerning some naked truths about housing and Federal related activities, as evidence by the project which I have nurtured here? A project, strangely, which has ballooned to nation-international status even prior to production of the second unit?

As a reminder, I put an American style three-fourth bath in simple, economical, totally versatile applicance form—and have amassed leading expert approvals in all categories, plus some 10,000-plus signed order leads, franchise requests coast to coast, and consumer approval for some 12 countries on 5 continents, but, for production I haven't been able to find a single properly priced dime.

Not from President Johnson himself, not from HUBERT HUMPHREY, not from the Office of Economic Opportunity, not from the Small Business Administration, not from a basketful of other Federal national-international agencies.

And all of them are asking for, obtaining, millions—billions of people funds from you gentlemen in Congress.

(Signed) H. S. BOWSER.

Is Our Youth Unfit for a New Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the President's concern for our jobless youth and the mounting problems of juvenile delinquency, I recommend to the Congress words of one of my most respected and revered constituents, Rabbi Gerald Kaplan.

On the 12th of March, his sermon, "Is Our Youth Unfit for a New Era" was heard by his synogogue. I think it is most fitting and appropriate. I recommend it for the reading of my respected colleagues:

IS OUR YOUTH UNFIT FOR A NEW ERA

(By Rabbi Gerald Kaplan)

My dear friends, life plus the world that we live in equals problems. There are the problems of world peace, poverty, the conquest of ignorance, the fear of heart disease and strokes which are our No. 1 killers in these United States and the teenage youth.

Recently the solid upper middle class homes along the east coast of the United States have been shook up by the revelation of teenage drinking in Darien, Conn. A Darien judge jolted this community and the suburbanities and urbanites for miles around when he invoked an obscure law forbidding adults to serve liquor to minors other than their own children. This step was the byproduct of an investigation of charges against a 19-year-old alleged to have been the driver of a vehicle in which a 17-year-old girl was killed. This event and the continuous happenings of gang looting along the broadways of the United States, thievery by children from respectable suburban homes—all have flashed a moral message to parents everywhere. The message urges concern about juvenile tragedies and misfortunes.

Now some claim that we are too worried about juvenile delinquency. Television, the radio, the newspapers, and the motion picture industry are at fault in their opinion. These people claim that the newspapers and magazines overstate the faults and failures of our young people and neglect their virtue and vision.

There are perhaps, 500,000 disturbed and disturbing delinquents in the United States. Their delinquencies face our Nation with a serious problem of public safety and rehabilitation. But there are at the same time 31½ million teenagers who are decent who are struggling to become adult in a dignified way, and who are the most forgotten generation of all. They never make the headlines. We see them, but we take them for granted.

Others, with an eye to the Bible, also maintain that we need not worry about our youngsters because the passage from youth to maturity is seldom navigated smoothly. Think of young David, who sacrificed a safe and secure future on his father's farm for the glory of wearing a uniform. One could almost see Jessie shaking his head at the foolishness of his young son who would sacrifice all that his father had planned for him, for a medal in a moment of military glory. We read in the Bible of young Joseph, pampered, overprotected, bitter tongued, whose pestulance and selfishness brought heartache to his parents and ruined the entire blend of harmony which Jacob had built. And there was Moses, adopted to the plantation,

who threw away his privileges to be one of the original freedom riders. I can just imagine the embarrassment of his princess stepmother as she whined to her courtier friends that her darling had disgraced her by throwing in his lot with the Hebrew slaves.

Still others maintain that our interest in our teenagers is the result of the maturity of social sciences and the need of social scientists to study every culture and subculture. After all, these people say, it's cheaper and easier to study the adolescent subculture of New York City or Detroit than a remote tribe in the upper Amazon or pygmies in the subcontinent of Australia.

Most of the studies of teenagers intend to be objective. Despite this, their conclusions are often critical. The young generation is denounced for its shortcomings. They are physically weak, emotionally immature, politically indifferent and much more. If we rabbis who teach children agreed with this analysis, we could not in good conscience accept such an assortment of defects. We have gotten to know our adolescents and feel quite differently about them. There are weaknesses, but the good of this generation far outweighs the evil.

Yet our youngsters have problems, and at least two of these problems are unique to our society, and it is of these which I will speak. The first issue touches the problem of job opportunities in a highly industrialized society. The second rests on the confusion of contemporary moral standards.

We read in our Bible, "When thou shalt eat of the labor of thy hands, happy shalt thou be." That the joyous life requires an honorable occupation, which is respectable in the eyes of society and satisfying to the person so engaged is an aged truth. Those who have retired without making plans now know full well how empty days can become nightmare wakings and life itself a hapless burden. Life today is not without its opportunities. For those who are academically able, the question of adult employment is largely a problem of choice. Though we have 5 million unemployed, there are 5 million-and-more jobs now going begging. Teaching, nursing, social work, recreation, medicine, and the clergy. All the vocations which requires a high degree of intellectual skill are understaffed. The young person who can compete in a society of specialization has only the problem of choosing his trade. The best adjusted teenager remains the one who, from early age on, selects the interest which will be his and busies himself with the test tube or library book preparing himself for that future.

But, what of those whose skills are mechanical and manual rather than academic? I am disturbed by some facts. Twenty-seven percent of our 18 and 19 year-olds were enrolled in college last year. In the Jewish community the figure is considerable higher. Nearly 80 percent of our young people were enrolled in college last year. If we assume that another 20 percent were qualified for such training, but disqualified by poverty or environment, there still remains a sizable block of our young people, 45 or 50 percent, who cannot compete in an intellectual atmosphere. What is their future? A hundred years ago the industrial revolution did away with the craftsman.

Today the marvel of automation is making manual labor, the assembly line and bookkeeping obsolete. What is to happen to the young people who can qualify only for such jobs? Our schools do not know what to teach them. Guidance counselors do not know where to direct them. A partial solution, the vocational high school, was adopted 40 years ago to prepare apprentices for various craft unions. Today by and large union rolls are closed. Unions are having difficulty finding a full day's employment for those already on their rosters.

What would be your feelings if you were growing up in a society which had already said to you, "We have no place for you." What if your tomorrow was a weekly visit to the unemployment compensation bureau? Many of these children are fully aware of the grayness which is their future. They live in homes where their father pounds the pavements and knocks on doors which never open; 10, 15, 20 weeks each year. They know that he wants to support his family. They know that he wants to earn the bread and the shelter and the clothing that they require, but they know that society has said to him "You lack the skills for which we can pay."

I lay a great deal of the unrest and restlessness of our younger generation to their recognition that society is not prepared to accept them. They have built a counterworld, full of antisocial standards, because they know that they must live in that world the rest of their lives.

What's for it? I am afraid that the only solution available is one that runs counter to every prejudice of our free market philosophy. The only realistic solution would be the creation of massive, expensive, and permanent public work's authority, a massive peace corps or conservation corps which would guarantee to these young men dignified employment in forestry and conservation, in recreation and humanitarian service, in art and handcrafts; in all of those areas which cannot show a profit per se, but which would add to the beauty of our surrounding, the wholesomeness of our cities, and the health and well-being of our Nation. Such a program will be attacked by the taxpayer as boondoggling. The unions will denounce it as an invasion of their prerogatives. It is a program which is part and parcel of a philosophy of a welfare state and which will attract therefore the bitter opposition of a political doctrinaire. But what are the solutions available? How many hundreds of thousands can we support in semipermanent idleness? How many correctional and psychiatric institutions can we create and staff to treat the addictions and illnesses of those who reject us and reject life because they are not wanted? Is not the growing legion of the bitter, the angry and the rejected a force in being for every demagogue who will come along? What of the future of our democratic way of life. I'm afraid that we must be prepared to accept such a work and welfare program as a price of technological advance. How else will we make any headway against the hurt, the psychological damage, and the alienation of those who cannot now compete because their genetic endowments are not adequate to the complicated marketplace in which they have been born.

The second issue on which I will touch this evening affects each and every one of our teenagers. Those who have studied the adolescent world tell us that a self-enforced quarantine is its most disturbing characteristic. They are dismayed by the inability of teenagers to relate to adult life. The sociologist uses the term "alienation." The term that youngsters use is "cool." The highest praise that one youngster can accord another is to label him a "cool customer" which translates to mean that this lad has the sense not to be taken in by the blandishments of parents and teachers, or by the promises and hopes of adult society. He holds himself aloof and above. He will not be taken in, because he refuses to be let down. Yet, what is life without passion? What is there for us if we are not heated up for political ideals or to fulfill ourselves in our professions or to find strength and love and decency for ourselves and for our families? There is no life—only gray routine—for those who hide themselves in an emotional and spiritual deep freeze.

Why are our young people so eager to be alien? We have let them down too often. They are cold to the adult world because the adult world is cold to the values which it creates. We encourage the young Scouts to pledge honesty, but boast around the dinner table about the quick bucks we have earned. We talk of peace, and extoll the Peace Corps, and spend $50 billion a year on armaments.

How can a youngster be committed to the crucial importance of political life when his Nation must mount national publicity campaigns simply to get out the vote? How can a young person be committed to business integrity when he sees that when the giant corporations are accused of conspiracy, their boards of directors sacrifice a few scapegoats but find no one guilty in their own souls? We talk to them about continence in sex and loyalty in marriage, but gossip gaily about the impromptu arrangements of our friends. Promiscuity is glorified in film and novel. The church and synagogue may thunder against it but the children know that their parents and their parents' friends treat infidelity lightly and pay their admission to every public display of notoriety. If we are concerned that our young people are getting out of hand, I submit to you this evening, that it is largely because we do not have ourselves in hand. We are as permissive with ourselves as we are with our youngsters. We give into and rationalize our whims and impulses. The pleasure principle has become a dominant statement of our national purpose. We have broken down the discipline of manner and of dress and of speech, and we wonder why the young are not deeply committed to the disciplines which we do not insist upon for ourselves. Believe me, they see the hollowness of our preaching far more clearly than we see it ourselves.

Now, it is difficult for those who are morally committed, for you and your families, to maintain that their decencies in a world gone half mad in a pathetic search for pleasure. It is hard, I know, to maintain the integrity of your family life when television and the movies and the newspapers constantly bleat that licentiousness is a normal way of life, and, indeed not without moral credibility as a statement of independence.

Unfortunately there is no national consensus as to moral standards. In earlier societies, when religion and culture were intermixed, the child had a clear model set for him of what was expected. There were, to be sure, selfish and greedy individuals, but the group did not condone their excesses, and made quite explicit the behavior expected of a good boy and the well-brought-up young lady. These expectations are no longer clear. The image is blurred. We speak in a straightlaced manner from the pulpit. We speak with a permissive tolerance in our homes. The schools encourage citizenship. The mass media glorifies crime. "Where there is no vision, a nation perishes."

If we expect our young people to grow up, we will have to grow up ourselves, and become morally and spiritually of one faith. If we expect to aid our youngsters to chose the good not the evil, in the language of the scripture to choose life not death, then let us be prepared to take ourselves, and our marriages, and our families, and our businesses in hand so that we can give again to our teenagers a clear example of what we expect of them because we expect it in ourselves.

Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is not only the American farmer that cannot

afford to have farm programs ended. The American economy and the public which it supports can afford it even less than the farmers.

Farmowners and operators hold about $216 billion in assets which is approximately 40 percent of all capital investment in the United States today. Farmers annually spend about $29 billion in production expenses and have about $16 billion invested in cars, trucks, and farm machinery. Should farm programs be terminated and farm income fall, one of the first expenditures to be cut would be investment in machinery and equipment.

The cost to the Federal budget for maintaining these expenditures at about the present production rate is $12.8 billion a year which is what the Commodity Credit Corporation spent in price supports and acreage diversion programs.

These programs maintained farm income $6.6 billion a year higher than it would have been without them. Each $100 of expenditures by the Commodity Credit Corporation, therefore, increased farm income by $236.

The American farmers of today contribute a great deal to the economy. Farmers now have engines which produce more horsepower than the combined power of engines and turbines of all the Nation's factories, private and commercial aircraft, railroads, merchant ships, and mines together.

American farms now annually use about 3.4 billion gallons of fuel, 28 billion kilowatt hours of electricity, about 7 percent of the Nation's steel production, 320 million pounds of rubber which is about 9 percent of that used in the country, and $1.7 billion for dwellings and service buildings.

The economy of this country can well afford to support agricultural programs. If we are to maintain job opportunities and economic growth, we cannot afford to overlook the contributions of American agriculture. Money spent in raising farm income reflects back into the economy of America at a ratio of 2 to 1.

President's Johnson's Actions in Vietnam Speak Louder Than Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Congress has declared, by concurrent resolution, its overwhelming support of the American policy of firmness and strength in southeast Asia.

Our Government's actions in the Vietnam crisis are making it increasingly clear that President Johnson is vigorously carrying out this policy.

This fact is underlined in an analysis of U.S. policy by the distinguished Washington correspondent, Mr. Roscoe Drummond. His comments are included in the Appendix of the RECORD under unanimous consent.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 14, 1965]

AMERICAN POLICY IS CLEAR: PRESIDENT'S ACTIONS ARE SPEAKING LOUDER THAN ANY WORDS ON VIETNAM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Every once in a while somebody wrings his hands and pleads that President Johnson speak out on Vietnam.

He is. On the premise that actions speak louder than words, the President is properly letting events tell their own story to the American people and deliver their own message to the aggressor. Right now it is actions, not words, which are most needed.

From every action the United States has taken in the past 6 weeks, President Johnson's keep-up-the-pressure, no-yield military policy emerges crystal clear. There will be an ascending scale of air attacks deeper into North Vietnam until Hanoi calls off the aggression. This decision has been firmly made. Its execution is its best announcement.

Diplomatically, the United States is prepared to go to the conference table the minute the Communists cease their aggression, but there will be no negotiation as long as aggression continues.

We seek no territory, no bases, no permanent military establishment in South Vietnam. But we know from experience that a paper agreement guaranteeing the independence of South Vietnam is not self-enforcing. Such an agreement was signed in 1954—and torn up by North Vietnam. An American presence in southeast Asia will be maintained so that the United States can join in guarding against future aggression.

Because this no-yield policy was slow in coming, it is understandable that many Americans—and the Asian Communists, too—were uncertain that the President really meant it.

The President has made his decision—to raise the controlled military pressure on North Vietnam steadily until it achieves its end.

This policy is visible in Vietnam—North and South. There can be no turning back. It is visible in the air raids over North Vietnam—and there will be more. It is visible in related actions: the deployment of 3,500 Marines, the very elite of our fighting forces; more air raids on Communist lines of infiltration through Laos; enlarging the 7th Fleet and strengthening U.S. naval patrols against North Vietnamese gunrunning; notice to Peiping that there will be no priviledged sanctuary if Red Chinese forces join the aggression.

These measures have long been a part of Washington planning. They were delayed because of the exigencies of the presidential election and because some high officials were fearful that mounting military pressure against North Vietnam would massively alienate world opinion and would throw Red China and the Soviet Union back into each other's arms. It has done neither.

There are, however, two immediate uncertainties:

The rate of the infiltration by North Vietnamese guerrilla forces is still going up. This means that the balance of forces on the ground is more adverse to the South Vietnamese that it has ever been.

So far the mounting military pressure against North Vietnam has yielded no sign from Hanoi that it has any intention to end the aggression. Far more pressure will be needed. Whether the timetable for acceleration is fast enough remains to be seen, but purpose and policy are now clear beyond all doubt.

Sad Day for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the March 12 edition of the Catholic Standard, Washington's Archdiocesan newspaper, carried an editorial on the events in Selma, Ala., which occurred on March 7, 1965. Under unanimous consent I wish to include this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SAD DAY FOR AMERICA

The police action against the civil rights marchers in Selma, Ala., last Sunday has painted a sad and sickening scene in the pages of American history. Millions of Americans have viewed with horror the picture of helmeted policemen beating defenseless Negroes with sticks and whips. What were the Negroes doing? They were committing the severe crime of traveling to the State capital to petition peacefully the Governor for their right to vote.

No justification can be found for the brutal police actions. The Negroes were seeking the right to vote—a right which though guaranteed by the Constitution, has been traditionally denied them in Alabama. They were not blocking or even crowding the highway on which they were walking. Their march was in no way a "clear and present danger" to the citizens of Alabama. This was no disorderly and wild mob. It was a good, orderly group going to ask for the right which most Americans take for granted.

Speaker of the House JOHN W. MCCORMACK has called the police action "a disgraceful exercise of arbitrary power." We agree wholeheartedly with the Speaker. The police action has done nothing but bring shame to Alabama and the man who ordered the police action, Gov. George Wallace.

The police action in Selma affects every American not only because of the brutality toward fellow American citizens, which is of great consequence to all. Such an action also seriously diminishes respect for law. A misapplication of law and abuse of law-enforcement power seriously damages respect for law. The purpose of law is to secure justice for all—not to inflict injustice on a group or an individual. Respect for and compliance with law are the basis of our national life. Respect for law is anchored, finally, in the conscience of man, and if the application of law finds no approval in conscience, then respect for law is lost.

Respect for law is indivisible. It is almost impossible, psychologically, to teach a distinction between the misapplication of a law and the law itself. All law gets tarred with the brush of misapplication and abuse of law. Those who tolerate such an abuse of law will find that ultimately they are picking the mortar out of the building stones of our whole civilization. They may also find that they are destroying the law that now protects them.

Perhaps this incident will bring home to all Americans the discrimination that still affects many Negroes. Discrimination is an ugly word, but it is an even uglier fact of life as seen in the Selma incident.

As Americans and as Christians we cannot stand idly by and watch our fellow humans, our brothers in Christ, suffer. The Negroes in Alabama need our prayers. They need our encouragement—in whatever manner we can give it to them. Last Sunday in Selma was

a sad day for us all. Let it become for all Americans—white and Negro—a means of understanding, cooperation, and love for the good of all.

Sam Geddes: A Man of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the people of California have lost an outstanding State legislator. Samuel R. Geddes, State senator from Napa, died in his home on March 5. He was 65.

Sam will best be remember for his tenacity and courage in dealing with the State's monumental water problems as well as his attempt to help stay the Supreme Court's decision on reapportionment. Until the very day of his death, Sam was one of the most outspoken advocates of a constitutional amendment permitting States to apportion one house of their legislature on a basis other than population. We held many sessions in my Washington office discussing the affect on Napa and the State of California. His advice and counsel were of immeasurable value as we developed legislative strategy to oppose the Supreme Court's decision in reapportionment.

It was my good fortune to work very closely with Senator Sam on many problems of mutual concern to our beloved Napa County. The meeting we jointly held to hear from the people of Napa on their water problems was highly productive and will in by judgment be recognized in the future as one of the most constructive held in many years. The interest Senator Geddes demonstrated in this and other matters has earned him the respect of Republicans and Democrats alike. He was one of the most nonpartisan members of the California legislature—completely objective to needs of his people.

A very fine editorial in the Napa Register expresses the true sentiments of the community of Napa. Senator Sam retained the uncanny ability of communicating with his constituency—an ability that consistently reflected the warmth and understanding of this great man—an ability that has earned him the title as included in the following editorial:

SAM GEDDES: A MAN OF THE PEOPLE

A friend of the people is dead.

Samuel R. Geddes—known only as Sam to his friends—died last night minutes after suffering a heart attack. The senator succumbed at his home, where his beloved wife, Loraine, had died about 20 months earlier—also from a heart attack.

Sam Geddes had been elected to his second term in the senate last November by the largest majority received by anyone seeking public office in this area. Prior to being named to the senate in 1960 he was an assemblyman four terms.

For about 37 years he had been a building contractor.

Although Sam Geddes was a Democrat, he would on occasion receive criticism from members of his own party because of his desire to work with Republican legislators. To these critics, the senator would reply, "Well, I don't just represent Democrats in Sacramento, I represent all the people."

Mr. Geddes had literally thousands of friends. It was not at all uncommon for people to shout "Hi, Sam," as he would walk down the street or attend a public meeting.

Last year, as he attended the opening session of the Yolo County Fair, he was introduced at a small dinner at the fairgrounds, and an official said, "This fair just wouldn't be the same without Sam Geddes' presence."

The senator enjoyed being with people. At times he maintained a schedule which would have stopped many men a good many years younger. It was not uncommon for Mr Geddes to attend two or three public functions a night. Once when asked why he maintained such a heated schedule, he replied, with a smile, "Because I enjoy it and I like people."

Sam Geddes was ever aware of the public pulse. He made every effort to represent the wishes of the people in the legislature. He had a deep desire to aid the cause of senior citizens. He favored the cause for greater recreational facilities for all Californians. He was a constant fighter for economy in State government and recently pledged to battle against increased taxes.

But, most of all, Sam Geddes was a man of the people. He gave his all in the name of public service. He was highly respected. He was beloved by many. The deeds of Sam Geddes, and Sam Geddes as a warm individual, will long be remembered.

President's Anticrime Message Outlines Worthy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, all Americans should be aware of the announcement Tuesday by J. Edgar Hoover that the serious crime rate in the United States increased 13 percent in 1964 over 1963.

This is compared to an increase of 10 percent over the previous year, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It means an increase of more than 250,000 serious offenses last year, including murder, up 9 percent; forcible rape, up 19 percent; aggravated assault, up 18 percent, and robbery, up 12 percent.

These are shocking figures, and need to be brought to the attention of all of our citizens.

President Johnson has made a strong effort to halt this rise in crime in the United States by his message to Congress last Monday, suggesting positive legislation to combat crime and juvenile delinquency. He has a worthy program, and I am hopeful that Congress will enact proper and substantial legislation in this field.

Believing that the problems of crime and juvenile delinquency—FBI's Director Hoover reports that there was a 13-percent jump in arrests of persons under 18 years of age in his recent survey, while the juvenile population aged 10 through 17 increased by only 4 percent—are critical problems, I have introduced three bills, which follow the President's outline. My bill, H.R. 4937, would provide for Federal assistance for programs of research and experimentation in crime prevention and detection, and for the training of law enforcement personnel. H.R. 4938 would establish a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime, and H.J. Res. 321 would provide for a White House Conference on Crime Prevention and Juvenile Delinquency.

Crime is a national problem, although it is the direct responsibility of our local and State governments. The responsibility extends to all of our citizens, and we must do all we can to reverse these drastic increases in crime rates.

Love Drew a Circle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following, interesting, and well-written article by a distinguished writer, John Herling, and which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, March 9, 1965:

LOVE DREW A CIRCLE

(By John Herling)

Maybe it's premature, like just one swallow does not make it spring—but hope for comprehensive medical care is now busting out all over Washington. WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, grinds slowly, also exceedingly fine. But once he really starts to grind, the legislative dance goes faster and faster. He no longer cares about what the boys in the backroom will have. He comes out front and center and gives the paying customers what they want.

For this week, after nearly a decade of waiting, panting, frustrating, swearing, the advocates of medical care for older Americans are about to get themselves a bill. For about that many years the bump of reluctance was centered in WILBUR MILLS, the gentleman from Arkansas, perhaps—next to the Speaker of the House of Representatives—the most powerful legislator in the United States. If WILBUR was not willin', a bill could never get out of the Ways and Means Committee, and it didn't. In addition to all that, he and the American Medical Association were going steady.

Suddenly came November 1964, and the election. The structure of Congress underwent not only a numercial but a chemical change. No longer could the joint Dixiecrat and Republican operation head off legislation at the pass. Congress had changed too much. In Arkansas, the clever, responsive Mr. MILLS, a product of the Arkansas school system and the Harvard Law School, finally decided that this was the time for him to move back into a larger arena. Intellectually, temperamentally, he considered himself a national American, not only the Congressman from Little Rock.

So, last December, he announced in a speech to his Arkansas constituents that the time had come to reconsider past positions on medicare. In effect, he said he wouldn't be surprised that the time for a bill had come.

This week the House Ways and Means Committee, under Mr. MILLS, has begun to unveil a new bill to cover the medical needs of older Americans. Instead of only a single legislative layer, which the advocates of hospital medicare—a watered-down compromise—had agreed to be content with, as introduced by Congressman CECIL KING, Democrat, of California, and Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, Mr. MILLS has piled in additional coverage. Cleverly, he has also embraced the component of doctor's care—adapting parts of the bill proposed by ranking Republican Congressman JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin. This would satisfy some opponents of medicare who began to argue that it was mislabeled, that, in fact, it didn't go far enough. In short, displaying considerable poise under pressure, Mr. MILLS seems to have taken the opposition into camp.

By gesture, as well as deed, he has gone even further to prove that when WILBUR MILLS gives, he gives all the way. Several weeks ago, the Senior Citizens Golden Ring Council of New York, an organization of retired union members, mainly former garment workers, had decided to give a luncheon in honor of their congressional friends. Year after year, they said they had come demanding, now they want to do a little thanking. Through Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, they invited Congressman KING and—Congressman MILLS.

"Why not," said Mr. MILLS, "hold the luncheon in the House Ways and Means committeeroom? The room's never before been used for an occasion of this sort. But there's always a first time. And by the way, I suggest you hold it March 10." What's so magic about March 10? It is the precise day that Mr. MILLS had decided to make history by letting medical care happen.

With a grand gesture, the all-embracing Mr. MILLS, the new Olympian, paraphrases the poet, Edwin Markham:

"Love drew a circle and shut me out;
I drew a circle and took Love in."

The History and Craft of Lettering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, much is heard these days of the need for publishing by college professors and for the constant requirement that they participate in the intellectual pursuit of their specialties. Prof. Thomas D. Greenley of Amityville, Long Island, in my congressional district, is a scholar who has done just that. He has recently completed a booklet called "The Descendants of Alpha Beta—A Brief Guide to the History and Craft of Lettering." I call the attention of my colleagues to this scholarly treatise because it greatly and fascinatingly describes how lettering has affected the art of commmunication of mankind.

Professor Greenley has most lucidly explained how lettering is truly the product of international cooperation. Nearly every great nationality of the world has made a contribution. Every nation in its own way has helped develop this most needed art called communication. It is a pleasure for me, as the Congressman from the Second Congressional District of New York, to have as one of my constituents such an outstanding scholar as Prof. Thomas D. Greenley, professor of art at the State university agricultural and technical institute at Farmingdale.

Development of the Chalmette National Historical Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have previously called attention in the RECORD to the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration held earlier this year.

Perhaps one of the most felicitous adjuncts to this historic celebration was the renewal of national interest in the Plains of Chalmette, the site of the great victory in 1815. This site is now preserved for all time in the Chalmette National Historical Park.

As is the case with almost all preservation projects, this beautiful park developed slowly, painfully, and almost heartbreakingly. Had it not been for the patriotic spirit of a small number of citizens over the years, there would be no lasting monument today to Andrew Jackson's incredible victory.

One of the citizens who has unselfishly given of his time and his talents to the preservation of Chalmette is Maj. Gen. Edward S. Bres, retired.

In connection with his work as chairman of the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission, General Bres compiled an excellent résumé of the development and significance of Chalmette National Historical Park.

I believe this document well merits inclusion into the RECORD, which I am pleased to do herewith:

FOREWORD

On January 8, 1840, Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson, ex-President of the United States, visited Chalmette Battlefield to participate in the 25th anniversary celebration of the victory of the Battle of New Orleans.

The visit of General Jackson imbued in his veterans and the people of New Orleans the desire to appropriately commemorate this victory and honor those who had fought and died to save the city from the British. A site on the battlefield was selected by General Jackson for the erection of a monument.

During the 125 years that have intervened since the visit of General Jackson, the development of the battlefield befitting the glory of the victory has been the objective of the people of New Orleans and patriotic organizations. With the completion of the restoration of the battlefield fortifications of 1815, now in progress, the objective will be realized.

There were times during the past 125 years when the successful establishment of the park seemed doubtful. And during these same years, progress was impaired by the lack of funds for battlefield restoration on the small area then constituting the park and for the purchase of additional lands for a suitable park.

The sale in 1952 of these additional lands, the 66 acres comprising the battlefield area, to the Kaiser Corp., could have doomed the park. But through the untiring efforts of Mrs. Martha G. Robinson, who organized and directed a campaign, Mr. Henry G. Kaiser was prevailed upon to donate this area to the park.

Had Mrs. Robinson failed in her plea, the establishment of the eagerly sought park, too, would have failed, as the Chalmette area then owned by the Federal Government was not large enough to be developed as a national historical park. Therefore, the project would necessarily have been reclassified and qualified for development in a lower grade as a memorial area.

The events since 1960 reveal the continuing support of Senators ALLEN J. ELLENDER and RUSSELL B. LONG, and Congressmen F. EDWARD HÉBERT and HALE BOGGS, and show that close attention and firm action were necessary to bring about the satisfactory development of the program and its completion in 1964.

Those who have been active in sponsoring the reconstruction of Chalmette National Park have learned of the high ideals of the able officials of the National Park Service and have received insight into the very constructive nationwide program they are accomplishing.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHALMETTE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The establishment and development of Chalmette National Historical Park has been accomplished because of the perseverence of the civic-minded people of New Orleans over a continuing period of 125 years.

The greatest progress has been effected during the final 30 years. This progress can be attributed to the preparation of an authentic map of the area, on which the presentation to Congress was based; the very vital procurement, through the efforts of Mrs. Martha G. Robinson, of the 66 acres of land, donated by the Henry J. Kaiser Corp.; and, during the last 7 years, the close work with officials of the National Park Service in determining an acceptable program of period reconstruction and in placing this work under contract.

Unfortunately, the Battle of New Orleans has never received the national recognition it warrants. This might be attributed to our American histories and historians who dismiss the victory as of little importance because of the constant cry that the battle was fought after the Treaty of Ghent was signed. Maybe these historians were not familiar with the articles of the treaty and were not aware that in the Treaty of Ghent, it was specifically provided that the treaty would not be binding until ratified by both nations; this ratification did not occur until 40 days after the battle of January 8, 1815. They also overlooked the important fact that while negotiations, which lasted 5 months, were pending between the Ministers of the United States and Great Britain, an expedition to invade New Orleans was in preparation under the command of General Pakenham.

We can reasonably assume, with all due deference to the friendly relationship existing today between America and England, that if England had been successful and had defeated General Jackson and his troops at New Orleans, she would not have relinquished her possession of New Orleans and the Louisiana Territory. There was no obligation on her part to do so, nor were there any provisions in the Treaty of Ghent that would have justified England's releasing the Louisiana Territory. The contrary was the case. Spain had protested and claimed that the transfer of the Louisiana Territory by Bonaparte was invalid and was in violation of the San Ildefonso Treaty.

Those who have studied and have become familiar with the international situation at the time of the battle readily understand how important the success of the American troops on January 8 was to this country. It is not difficult to visualize what might have occurred had Jackson and his troops been defeated. Would the United States, as then constituted, have been able to survive the British attacks from the interior—with the Mississippi Valley, extending from the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian border, in the possession of the British whose fleet threatened the security of the Atlantic seaboard?

The Battle of New Orleans was not a local battle as many of our present-day, intelligent, well-educated Americans are of the opinion. It was one of the most important military engagements in the history of this country and secured and preserved for us the independence gained at Yorktown. Many Americans have never heard of the Hartford Convention, the political unrest of the Union and the possible secession of the Northeastern States which would have disrupted our country, or of the financial difficulties our Treasury was facing. The victory of General Jackson immediately eliminated these hazards.

The origin of the blemish that demeans the glory of the victory of General Jackson on January 8, 1815, by stating that the battle was fought after the treaty had been signed, is not known; and certainly it was not in evidence in Washington on February 4, 1814. Quoting from page 42, et seq. National Park Service Historical Handbook, No. 29:

"In January 1815, people in the cities of the East knew only that a large British force had landed and that fighting was going on. An editor of Niles Register, a Baltimore newspaper, wrote that great interests in all the Nation were anxiously awaiting news. Some leaders of the New England States, meeting in Hartford, were strongly suspected of planning to secede from the Union. The Capitol in Washington was in ruins. The Federal Government was in bad financial condition. Men feared that the negotiations at Ghent would fail or that the resulting treaty would not be ratified. It was possible that one of these outcomes, coupled with probable defeat at New Orleans, could have broken up the Union.

"The relief of the Government was extreme when the news of victory at New Orleans finally reached Washington on February 4. The National Intelligencer used its largest type for the headline: 'Almost Incredible Victory.' People went wild with delight. A heavy fall of snow did not dampen the celebration in Philadelphia. All over the East the fireworks and rejoicing were greater than for any other victory of the War of 1812.

"Nine days later, news of the signing of the peace treaty at Ghent completed the people's happiness. The envoys to Washington from the Hartford Convention were glad to slip back to their own States without presenting their demands to the Federal Government. Even the Massachusetts Legislature gave thanks for the victory—to God if not to Andrew Jackson.

"WHAT THE VICTORY MEANT TO THE UNITED STATES

"The Battle of New Orleans was fought between the signing and the ratification of the Treaty of Ghent, ending the War of 1812—because of the American victory in Louisiana, the treaty was promptly ratified by both sides.

"Much of the significance of the Battle of New Orleans is found in its effect on political thinking. From its founding, many men doubted that the new United States could endure. We have seen that news of the British defeat helped to end a secession movement in New England. Partly because of the victory's unifying effect, the United States endured as a republic. Its success belied the prophesies of the skeptics, and its form of government became a model for the new nations of Latin America.

"The victory meant much to the people of the United States as a nation. It helped them to forget earlier defeats in the War of 1812—such as Detroit, Niagara, and the burning of Washington—and it helped them to feel pride in their country as a whole. This national feeling was shown in the following years by the establishment of the Second Bank of the United States, protective tariffs, increased Army appropriations, and acceptance of the nationalizing opinions of Chief Justice John Marshall.

"Before 1815, American leaders had watched with anxiety every political and military move in Europe. After the New Orleans victory they stood on their own feet."

(NOTE.—A conversation between President Jackson and William Allen, Member of Congress, from Ohio, quoted from White House secret files, gives President Jackson's summation of the Treaty of Ghent. This conversation was cited during congressional hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs. "Hearing Before the Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives on H.R. 4820 and H.R. 4869, 1st sess., 68th Cong., Mar. 27, 1924," pp. 13–15.)

Events which have led to the present development of Chalmette National Historical Park may be chronologically listed:

January 8, 1840: Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson, ex-President of the United States, visited New Orleans to participate in the 25th anniversary ceremonies of the Battle of New Orleans. At that time, he laid the cornerstone of the monument to him in Jackson Square (Place D'Armes). He also visited the battlefield and selected the location for the erection of Chalmette Monument, honoring those who gave their lives in the battle.

January 13, 1840: The cornerstone was laid for a battlefield monument.

February 1852: The Legislature of Louisiana passed an act appropriating $5,000 for the purchase of a tract of land in St. Bernard Parish known as "Chalmette Plains" for the purpose of erecting a monument on the battlefield of January 8, 1815. This purchase was made in 1855 and a committee consisting of Newton Richards, architect; John Stroud, contractor; and D. D. d'Hemecourt, surveyor, after due consideration, fixed the exact site for the monument.

Following the laying of the cornerstone on January 13, 1840, nothing was accomplished on the construction until the project was revived and promoted by the Jackson Day Monument Association and the State of Louisiana started work in 1855. Over a period of years, the monument rose to a height of 55 feet before work ceased because of the lack of funds and the approaching war.

May 1864: The War Department established Chalmette National Cemetery for the Civil War Dead.

1888: The Louisiana Legislature (by act III, No. 84, 1888) ceded the Chalmette National Monument property to the U.S. War Department. No work was done by the War Department to complete the monument from 1888 to 1893.

January 11, 1893: The Louisiana Society of the United States Daughters 1776–1812 (U.S.D. 1776–1812) was organized; incorporated, January 17, 1894.

January 17, 1894: The Louisiana Legislature placed Chalmette Monument and grounds under the care of U.S.D. 1776–1812. This was effected by act No. 6: "That the Chalmette Monument and ground upon which it is located * * * sold by Pierre Bachelot to the State of Louisiana in act before Theo Guyol, notary public * * * Signed Murphy J. Foster, Governor."

The State of Louisiana gave to the U.S.D. 1776–1812 two donations of $1,000 each. With these funds, the grounds were cleared; an iron fence and gate erected across the front of the grounds; a mound built for the monument and cap on top; a 21-step, iron stairway constructed inside the monument; walks paved in front; a keeper's lodge built; new fences erected and old ones repaired; and the area was drained.

July 19, 1902: At the request of the U.S.D. 1776–1812, the responsibility for the care and maintenance of Chalmette Park Monument was transferred back to the State of Louisiana with the proviso that the State could complete the monument and return it to the society in 5 years. This was accomplished by legislative act No. 41.

March 4, 1907: $25,000 was appropriated to complete the construction of the monument when the 59th Congress enacted Public Law 263 (34 Stat. 1411). This law—which was enacted largely through the efforts of W. O. Hart, an attorney from New Orleans, and Adolph Meyer, Member of Congress, of Louisiana—also carried the provisions: that the State of Louisiana cede and transfer the monument property to the Federal Government, and that the U.S.D. 1776–1812 assume the entire responsibility for the care and maintenance of the monument grounds.

August 25, 1916: The National Park Service of the Department of the Interior was established by Public Law 235 (H.R. 15522), enacted by the 64th Congress, 1st session.

June 16, 1919: H.R. 5918—that the Secretary of War be directed to investigate the feasibility of establishing a national military park on the Plains of Chalmette and to prepare plans and estimates of cost to enable Congress to act—was introduced to the 66th Congress, 1st session, by James O'Connor, Member of Congress, of Louisiana. This bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

October 24, 1919: In accordance with H.R. 5918, the Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. William M. Black, directed Lt. Col. Herbert Deakyne, district engineer, New Orleans, to investigate and report on the feasibility of establishing a national military park on the Plains of Chalmette.

November 1, 1919: Colonel Deakyne reported the project feasible and recommended the acquisition of the land between Chalmette Monument and the National Cemetery and east of the cemetery to include British battery positions, Pakenham headquarters, and the waterfront. The total area was estimated at 226 acres, of which 166 acres would have to be purchased at an estimated cost of $2,000 per acre. The total cost of land acquisition, parking area, and the development of roadways was estimated at $500,000.

November 1, 1919: In forwarding the above report, Col. Mason M. Patrick stated that the report and cost estimate had been hastily prepared and that more careful study was advisable.

November 7, 1919: Col. Frederic V. Abbot, Acting Chief of Engineers, forwarded Colonel Deakyne's report to the Adjutant General, concurring with Colonel Patrick.

April 11, 1921: H.R. 2232, which was exactly the same as H.R. 5918, was introduced in the 76th Congress, 1st session, by James O'Connor, Member of Congress, of Louisiana.

November 21, 1921: H.R. 2232 was enacted as Public Law 94 by the 67th Congress.

January 17, 1922: Brig. Gen. H. Taylor, Assistant Chief of Engineers, directed by Lt. Col. E. J. Dent, district engineer, New Orleans, to carry out the provisions of Public Law 94 by holding hearings to ascertain from interested persons their ideas of the scope of the project, and by preparing the necessary maps, work proposals, cost estimates, etc.

March 8, 1922: Lt Col. E. J. Dent held a conference. Those present included: Lt. Col. E. J. Dent, district engineer; O. O. Melancon, U.S. district engineer's office; E. K. Ross; and A. B. Booth, State adjutant general. Attending from Arabi, La., were: A. S. Nunez, Sebastian Roy, A. P. Perrin, A. S.

Livaudais, Albert Laburre, Sheriff Albert Estopinal, Jr., and J. C. Bourg, parish treasurer. From New Orleans came: Sidney F. Lewis and Gervais Lombard, board of State engineers; Dr. W. C. Stubbs, E. L. Gladney, J. E. Kell, engineer, American Sugar Refinery; J. Wilfred Gaidry, Col. Allison Owen, and Gen. J. B. Levert, sugar exchange.

Mrs. H. D. Bruns of New Orleans, who was active in promoting this project for many years, had suggested taking lands north of the public road which were of some sentimental value, but of relatively small cash value. Many at the hearing agreed with Mrs. Bruns. Speakers during the meeting were: Colonel Owen, General Booth, Messrs. Roy, Lombard, Livaudais; A. P. Perrin, Mr. Gaidry, Sheriff Estopinal, and Mr. Ross.

Colonel Dent asked Colonel Owen to present the consensus of views about location and what the park should include. Colonel Owen stated that the area should include the sites of all principal events connected with the occupation by the British from December 23 to January 8.

Colonel Owen said that the area should be bounded upstream on the line of the erected monument extending downstream to Paris Road and from the river bank to the 40 arpent line. The area would include 1,760 square arpents or 1,325 acres.

It was agreed by those present that the area described by Colonel Owen represented their views.

March 14, 1922: Colonel Dent approved Colonel Deakyne's proposal for the acquisition of land (of November 1, 1919) and some small additions of undeveloped lands.

March 16, 1922: Col. H. C. Newcomer, division engineer, concurred with Lt. Col. Dent and forwarded his opinion to the Chief of Engineers.

March 29, 1922: Maj. Gen. Lansing H. Beach, the Chief of Engineers, recommended to the Secretary of War a survey of the site recommended by Colonel Owen from the monument to Paris Road and from the river bank to the 40 arpent line with estimates of the cost covering both projects of the 1st Indorsement.

May 1, 1922: Major General Beach directed Colonel Dent, the district engineer, to make a survey and report.

July 13, 1923: Colonel Dent, district engineer, reported on the proposed site, submitting a map in five sheets. The area included was that from the Chalmette Monument to Paris Road and from the Mississippi River to the 40 arpent line, and was divided into the southern section of 630 acres and the northern section of 975 acres. The estimated cost of acquiring these 1,605 acres and the required improvements was given as:

630 acres at $5,000 per acre (southern section)	$3,150,000	
975 acres at $600 per acre (northern		$3,735,000
Roads, fencing, clearing (southern section)	175,000	
Roads, fencing, clearing (northern section)	340,000	
		515,000
Total		$4,350,000

Colonel Dent did not give the project a favorable recommendation; he felt that it was not feasible because of the excessive cost.

July 17, 1923: Col. G. M. Hoffman, division engineer, concurred in the unfavorable recommendation of Colonel Dent.

September 4, 1923: Maj. Gen. Lansing H. Beach, Chief of Engineers, reported to the Secretary of War that interest had waned, property values were high, and—although a worthwhile project—the establishment of a park was not feasible because of excessive cost.

January 7, 1924: H.R. 4869—to establish a national military park to commemorate the Battle of New Orleans, to be known as the Chalmette National Military Park—was introduced in the 68th Congress, 1st session, by James O'Connor, Member of Congress, of Louisiana.

This resolution called for the acquisition of the areas from the monument at Paris Road and the riverbank to the 40 arpent line and authorized an appropriation of $4,500,000.

The resolution was defeated largely because of the unfavorable report of the Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. Lansing H. Beach.

By the act of April 19, 1890, Congress provided for the establishment of national military parks. In the years between 1890 and 1925, communities frequently requested the establishment of a national park, the placing of a monument, tablet, or other form of recognition for the particular area. When these requests were introduced as resolutions in Congress, an individual study had to be made for each one. This procedure proved unsatisfactory because it caused duplication of work which resulted in an unnecessary expenditure of funds. Moreover, the relative historical importance of the projects could not be adequately evaluated because historical comparisons with other areas had not been developed.

Because of the number of increasing requests and the need to establish standard procedures, the Congress requested the War Department through the Army War College to make a study of the records and data pertaining to certain wars in which the military forces of the United States had been engaged. Excerpts of this study—dated May 28, 1925, submitted by Lt. Col. C. A. Bach, cavalry, Chief, Historical Section, Army War College, and approved, June 16, 1925, by Dwight F. Davis, Acting Secretary of War—follow:

"The object of the study will be the compilation of two lists of such battles arranged in order of priority under the following heads:

"1. Those battles of such great importance and far-reaching effect as to warrant commemoration by the establishment of national military parks.

"2. Those battles sufficiently important to warrant commemoration by the acquisition of some land and the placing of a limited number of markers or monuments and the designation of the sites so obtained as national monuments.

"It is the view of the War Department that national military parks should as a general thing cover a comparatively large area of ground, probably some thousands of acres, and so marked and improved as to make them into real parks available for detailed study by military authorities, the battle lines and operations being clearly indicated on the ground.

"Appropriations for monuments in which the National Government contributed show:

"WAR OF 1812

"New Orleans battlefield monument, to complete, United States, $25,000."

(NOTE.—This is the only battlefield listed for the War of 1812.)

The policy as thus outlined by acts of Congress gives an appropriate scheme for the commemoration of the battles in which the military forces of the United States have been engaged:

Class I: Battles worthy of commemoration by the establishment of national military parks. These should be battles of exceptional political and military importance and interest, whose effects were far reaching, whose fields are worthy of preservation for detailed military and historical study, and which are suitable to serve as memorials to the armies engaged.

Class II: Battles of sufficient importance to warrant the designation of their sites as national monuments. The action of Congress and the great difference in the importance of these battles give reason for the subdivision under this class into:

Class IIa: Battles of such great military and historic interest as to warrant locating and indicating the battle lines of the forces engaged by a series of markers or tablets, but not necessarily by memorial monuments.

Class IIb: Battles of sufficient historic interest to be worthy of some form of monument, tablet, or marker to indicate the location of the battlefield.

II. List of battles

1. REVOLUTIONARY WAR

2. WAR OF 1812

In the War of 1812 the principal actions, within the limits of the United States, in which the military forces were engaged, were of a defensive character.

No battle of this war is placed in class I.

"(a) *Battle of IIa*

"Battle of New Orleans, January 18, 1815: The Battle of New Orleans is the best known of the battles of this war and more troops were engaged on that field than on any other. It was a brilliant defense by raw troops against the attack of a much larger force of highly trained troops with war experience and led by well-known British generals. As it was fought after the treaty of peace had been signed, though not confirmed, it had no effect on the general conduct or outcome of the war or on the terms of the treaty of peace. Its immediate effect was to protect New Orleans from capture and perhaps from the experience of the National Capital.

"In honor of this victory a monument has been erected: It was completed under the act of March 4, 1907, which appropriated $25,000 for this purpose. In view of the unique character of this battle, it is believed that the line of defense should be located and properly marked; the battle is therefore listed in Class IIa.

"(b) *Battles of IIb*

"1. Battle of Black Rock, N.Y., December 30, 1813.

"2. Fort Meigs, Ohio, April 28–May 9, 1813.

"3. Frenchtown, Mich., January 18, 1813 and January 22, 1813.

"4. North Point, Md. (Long Log Lane), September 12, 1814.

"5. Plattsburg, N.Y., September 6–11, 1814.

"6. Sacketts Harbor, N.Y., May 29, 1813."

(NOTE.—Colonel Bach evidently had little knowledge of the Battle of New Orleans, and it would seem that his research was rather superficial. A bill should be introduced to change this battle to class I. It certainly qualifies from the criteria of political, military importance and far-reaching national effects.)

Twenty-eight bills were introduced in the 69th Congress, 1st session for the recognition and commemoration of national military areas. Fourteen of these were for the establishment of national military parks, requesting appropriations approximating $6 million. The other 14 were for smaller memorials and requested appropriations of a lesser amount.

February 25, 1926: H.R. 9765—proposing the creation of a seven-member, National Military Park Commission, which would make a study of all the battlefields of the various wars in which the United States and its colonies have been engaged, with a view to marking and commemorating every battlefield within the United States—was introduced in the 69th Congress, 1st session by Noble Johnson, Member of Congress of Indiana.

March 11, 1926: Congressman Johnson requested Dwight F. Davis, Acting Secretary of War, to submit a report on H.R. 9765.

Secretary Davis stated that H.R. 9765 was objectionable and unnecessary for these reasons: It created additional agencies, and it would cause unnecessary hearings, travel, and expense; moreover, the Secretary of War should be authorized to make studies from

both the military and historical points of view, to undertake surveys, and to compare and evaluate areas, reporting annually to Congress, etc.

April 8, 1926: Congressman Johnson asked Secretary Davis to submit his views regarding the provisions of an acceptable law; and in response, Secretary Davis submitted a draft of H.R. 11613.

June 11, 1926: H.R. 11613 was enacted as Public Law 372 by the 69th Congress. This law provides for an Advisory Board of three officers—one each, representing: the Quartermaster General, the Chief of Engineers, and the Historical Section of the Army War College—as advisory to the Secretary of War in making studies of the commemoration of battlefields. The Board was directed to prepare a general plan of all projects, including the costs of surveying and carrying out the projects, and annually submit plans and a progress report through the President to Congress. It was specifically stated that no real estate could be purchased for military park purposes by the Government unless a report thereon had been made by the Secretary of War through the President to Congress.

March 3, 1927: A congressional appropriation of $15,000 for the construction of a highway from the main highway to and around the monument was secured by James O'Connor, Member of Congress, of Louisiana.

In 1927, the U.S.D. 1776—1812 requested that they be relieved of the responsibility of maintaining the Chalmette Monument and keeping the grounds surrounding it and that custody and all expenses be taken over by the U.S. Government.

June 2, 1930: Public Law 293 authorized the Secretary of War to assume care, custody, and control of the Chalmette and grounds—taking over this responsibility and relieving the U.S.D. 1776—1812. This was introduced in the 71st Congress, 2d session as H.R. 6151 by J. O. Fernandez, Member of Congress, of Louisiana.

January 31, 1931: Public Law 869 appropriated the sum of $300 for the study, investigation, and survey for commemorating purposes, of the battlefield of Chalmette, to be made during the fiscal years 1931–32; this was introduced in the 71st Congress by J. O. Fernandez, Member of Congress, of Louisiana. (46 Stat. 1045). The study to be financed by this appropriation was recommended by the Advisory Board established under Public Law 372, and the procedures were in compliance with Public Law 372. (Doc. 27, Senate, 72d Cong., 1st session; read to the Committee on Military Affairs Dec. 19, 1931; ordered printed Dec. 21, 1931; signed by Patrick J. Hurley, Secretary of War Dec. 16, 1931, and delivered to the President.)

June 10, 1933: The War Department transferred to the Department of the Interior:

	Acres
Chalmette National Cemetery original plat (donated to War Department by city of New Orleans, May 26, 1868. Approved by Congress and established as a National Cemetery Sept. 16, 1868)	13.60
Extension	3.73
Total	17.33
Chalmette National Monument, original plat	15.92
Total	33.25

January 9, 1935: By a resolution of the National Defense Committee, New Orleans Association of Commerce, Col. Edward S. Bres, chairman of the Historical Memorials Committee, was authorized to sponsor the application to the Works Progress Administration, requesting a survey and the preparation of a map of the Chalmette Battlefield on which the battle of New Orleans was fought January 8, 1815. In 1913, Colonel Bres had conducted some research concerned with the coordination of the township corners established by the Federal surveys of the 1825 period. With these maps and other data, and with the procurement of additional field notes, maps and other information, he directed the survey and the preparation of a map. The project was fortunate in being able to secure the services of D. W. G. Ricketts, a surveyor of outstanding ability, to make the survey and prepare the map. He was meticulous in his studies, research, and field work. This comprehensive study and preparation of the map under the direction of Colonel Bres made it possible to locate and establish on the map the bank line of the Mississippi River which had existed in 1815, but had subsequently been eroded, by projection from the existing corners and landmarks. The WPA policy was to bear the expense of salaries and wages for the work and for office space. Therefore, other expenses—such as enlargements, prints, supplies required, field notes, township plats and reproductions—had to be borne by the sponsor or others; these expenses were personally assumed by Colonel Bres. The attest as shown on the map reads:

"This survey has been made, the map compiled and prepared and the area monumented at the request and in accordance with the suggestions of Col. Edward S. Bres, chairman, Historical Memorials Committee of the National Defense Committee, New Orleans Association of Commerce, for the purpose of accurately locating and delineating for perpetuation the battlefield area and historical features of the Battle of New Orleans, January 8, 1815.

"Approved:

"EDWARD S. BRES,
"Chairman.

"Submitted to National Defense Committee, New Orleans Association of Commerce, December 10, 1935, in accordance of authority of January 9, 1935.

"EDWARD S. BRES,
"Chairman, Historical Memorials Committee.

"Approved:

"A. R. BROUSSEAU,
"State Project Director, WPA."

The need for this map was evidenced in the hearing conducted May 23, 1935, when a series of maps provided only a fragmentary presentation. The new map which was available for the hearing of March 12, 1936, served to portray the area as of 1815 and 1936, and therefore, was of much assistance in the presentation. The map has served for basic use by the National Park Service in its studies for the restoration of the area. Copies are on exhibit in the Cabildo and in the Visitor Center of the park.

In 1935 an allotment of $43,068.60 was secured from the National Park Service for the construction, reconditioning, and improvement of roads and walks, and for ground improvement, a comfort station, water and sewerage, and building repair by J. O. Fernandez, Member of Congress of Louisiana.

February 5, 1935: H.R. 5368—"A bill to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Chalmette National Monument, etc."—was introduced by J. O. Fernandez in the 74th Congress, 1st session.

March 14, 1935: Chairman Rene L. De Rouen, Member of Congress, of Louisiana, wrote to Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, requesting a report on H.R. 5368.

April 26, 1935: Secretary Ickes replied:

"This proposed legislation would authorize the extension of the Chalmette National Monument by the acquisition of lands for that purpose, and include the present national monument, together with the additions and the Chalmette National Cemetery, in the proposed Chalmette National Historical Park * * *.

"The purpose of changing the name of the Chalmette National Monument to Chalmette National Historical Park is to recognize definitely its great historical importance.

"The authority for the acquisition of lands for the inclusion in the proposed national historical park should be confined to such funds as may be secured by public or private donation, rather than by appropriation of Federal funds. I, therefore, recommend that the bill be amended as follows * * * eliminate the words, 'funds allotted and made available for this project by proper authority,' and insert the words, 'donated funds.'

"If amended as indicated above, I recommend that H.R. 5368 receive favorable consideration by the Congress."

May 23, 1935: A hearing on H.R. 5368 was held before the Committee on the Public Lands, House of Representatives, Rene L. De Rouen, Member of Congress, of Louisiana, chairman; and the amendment proposed by Secretary Ickes was discussed. Appearing and giving statements were: Joachim O. Fernandez, Member of Congress, of Louisiana; Paul H. Maloney, Member of Congress, of Louisiana; A. Sidney Nunez, St. Bernard Parish; Mrs. Henry Dickson Bruns, president, Colonial Dames of Louisiana; Col. Edward S. Bres, Col. Bennet A. Molter, and Mrs. O. W. McNeese of New Orleans.

August 8, 1935: A hearing on H.R. 5368 was held before the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of the U.S. Senate (74th Cong., 1st sess.), Senator Robert E. Wagner, of New York, chairman. Appearing and giving statments were: Senator John Overton, of Louisiana; Colonel Harris, Office of Quartermaster General, U.S. Army; and Bennett A. Molter, of New Orleans. The hearing was called to hear the objections of Senator Overton to the amendment recommended by Secretary Ickes, and specifically to the elimination of appropriated funds and the substitution of "donated funds" which Secretary Ickes had suggested, in his letter of April 26, 1935. Senator Key Pittman, of Nevada, was in favor of the bill but stated that if the amendment as suggested by Secretary Ickes was no included, and if an appropriation was included, the bill would not pass. On the other hand, if the amendment was included, the status as the Chalmette National Historical Park would be establised and a future Congress might secure appropriations. With this idea in view, it was decided to include the amendment of Secretary Ickes.

March 12, 1936: A hearing on H.R. 5368 was held before the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, U.S. Senate (74th Cong., 2d sess.), Senator Robert F. Wagner, chairman. Appearing and giving statements were: Senators John H. Overton, and Rose McConnell Long, of Louisiana, Senator Nathan L. Bachman, of Tennessee, Congressmen J. O. Fernandez, and Paul H. Maloney, of Louisiana; and William C. Holmes, Esq., and Col. Edward S. Bres, of New Orleans.

The general discussion centered on the need and desire of establishing the Chalmette National Park and the selection by the Department of the Interior of approximately 200 acres for the project with the understanding that the lands required be paid for by a Federal appropriation. Senator Overton suggested that the amendment proposed by Secretary Ickes and adopted by the House be changed to read, "appropriated or alloted and made available by proper authority." The chairman closed the hearing with the statement that he would confer with the two Senators from Louisiana on the wording of the amendment.

The final H.R. 5368 carried an appropriation of $300,000 for the acquisition of lands. This bill was passed by the House and the Senate and died by pocket veto of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In 1938 those who had sponsored H.R. 5368 had a resolution for an appropriation of $300,000 to purchase lands for the park introduced in the Louisiana State Legislature. This bill was passed and the appropriation

was to be made from the general fund. This fund had served as the cushion for the department of education and had been used only by that department. It was thought that if an appropriation of $300,000 was taken from the fund to purchase lands for the park, although the fund was well able to take care of that amount, a precedent would be established and the department of education might suffer in future years. For this reason, Gov. Oscar K. Allen was persuaded by many requests to veto the bill.

March 3, 1939: H.R. 4742—to establish the Chalmette National Historical Park in the memory of the soldiers who fell in the Battle of New Orleans in the War of 1812—was introduced by J. O. Fernandez, Member of Congress of Louisiana.

August 10, 1939: The Chalmette National Historical Park was established when H.R. 4742 was enacted into Public Law 368 during the 1st session of the 76th Congress. The park, which was to inculde Chalmette Cemetery and the area formerly known as Chalmette Park, was designated as the Chalmette National Historical Park. The law provided that the total area of the enlarged park should not exceed 500 acres; that payment for lands should be made solely from donated funds; and that the administration, protection, and development of the park should be by the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

June 30, 1945: Chalmette National Cemetery was closed for burials.

November 22, 1946: Gov. James H. Davis, of Louisiana, appointed a committee to look into the matter of Chalmette National Historical Park and advise the State park commission on the purchase of lands for the park, as provided by Act 138 of the Louisiana Legislature of 1946. (As reported in New Orleans States, Nov. 22, 1946.)

January 27, 1947: H.R. 1324—to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire, by purchase or condemnation, land not to exceed the value of $200,000 for the extension of Chalmette National Historical Park, all within the boundaries approved for the park by the Secretary of the Interior, February 26, 1946—was introduced in the 80th Congress, 1st session by F. Edward Hébert, Member of Congress of Louisiana.

March 14, 1949: The New Orleans Terminal Co. transferred to the State park commission 36.4 acres of land which were, in turn, transferred to the U.S. Government on November 28, 1949 (recorded at St. Bernard courthouse).

In 1950: The Louisiana Legislature appropriated $100,000 to remiburse the New Orleans Terminal Co. for the 36.4 acres which included the Beauregard House and grounds. This was accomplished during the administration of Gov. James H. Davis by the passage of House bill 917.

April 8, 1952: The Henry J. Kaiser & Aluminum Corp. purchased 66 acres of land between the park property and Chalmette Cemetery, which comprise the battlefield area of 1815, from the Southern Railway System for $66,000.

In May 1952: H.B. 62—requesting an appropriation of $66,000 to purchase 66 acres of land between the park property and Chalmette Cemetery—was sponsored by the Louisiana Landmarks Society and other patriotic groups, under the leadership of Mrs. Martha G. Robinson, and was introduced in the Louisiana Legislature by George Tessier from New Orleans. This project had been substantially approved by the Association of Commerce and the New Orleans newspapers who, overnight, became persuaded that the land should be sold to the Henry J. Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. for the extension of the plant. The bill was defeated. The land had already been acquired by the Kaiser Corp.

June 1952: Mrs. Martha G. Robinson, president, Louisiana Landmarks Society, organized the patriotic societies of the State in an effort to persuade Henry J. Kaiser to donate the 66 acres of land to the National Park Service.

May 16, 1956: The National Park Service in its summary of objectives and program stated:

"DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION PROBLEM

"The development and interpretation of Chalmette National Historical Park, as planned by the National Park Service, requires the acquisition of tracts of land situated between the present holdings contained within the park. This land, owned primarily by the Kaiser Co., contains approximately 65 acres. If this cannot be done, the proposed plan must be abandoned and the area made a memorial only. Every effort will be made to acquire the land."

July 3, 1956: Dr. Edward C. Morse and Maj. Gen. Edward S. Bres discussed with Mr. Richard E. Parsons, British Embassy, the erection in Chalmette National Historical Park of a memorial to the British who lose their lives in the Battle of New Orleans. Dr. Morse, who was married to the former Miss Alice Beauregard, had heard that the British Government would be interested and arranged for the conference. The Beauregard Home, which was then being restored on the battlefield, was Miss Beauregard's birthplace. Mr. Parsons was apparently interested in investigating the project of locating the gravesite and erecting a monument, but stated that the British Government had no funds for the undertaking. Mr. Parsons also stated that he would write to Mr. D. V. Lawford, British Consulate General in New Orleans, and asked General Bres to confer with Mr. Lawford on his next trip to New Orleans. Later, Mr. Parsons received the map of the battlefield area compiled by General Bres.

March 18, 1957: A telegram from Mrs. Martha G. Robinson said that the St. Bernard Police Jury planned to build a sewage disposal plant in the battlefield area.

March 19, 1957: Mr. E. T. Scoyan, associate director, NPS, sent three prints of the map of Chalmette National Historical Park, showing the proposed restoration, to General Bres. At the same time, Mr. Scoyan stated that the policy of the National Park Service was restrictive regarding plaques and asked that any plans for memorials to the British be checked with the Park Service.

April 2, 1957: General Bres conferred with Mr. D. L. Benest, British Embassy. Mr. Benest said he was in consultation with the British Consulate in New Orleans about the best way to proceed with the memorial project. Later, additional maps were sent to Mr. Benest.

April 27, 1957: Mr. D. L. Benest, British Embassy, wrote to General Bres, saying that he had heard from the Consul General in New Orleans and asking that General Bres contact Mr. Lawford when in New Orleans.

May 15, 1957: General Bres visited Chalmette National Historical Park and discussed with Lyle K. Linch, superintendent, and Frank L. Ahern, chief safety engineer, NPS, the proposed improvements, etc. General Bres later conferred with R. G. Dundas, British Consulate General, who was interested but indefinite. Mr. Dundas was informed that General Bres would confer with Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director, NPS, on his return to Washington and advise him about details, etc.

May 23, 1957: Mr. D. L. Benest, British Embassy, telephoned General Bres to say that both he and Mr. Dundas were interested and optimistic regarding the memorial for the British dead. Mr. Benest was advised that formal sketches would be submitted to him.

May 29, 1957: The Kaiser Corp. agreed to sell 1½ acres of land on the river end of the Fazendville Road to the St. Bernard Police Jury for the construction of a sewage disposal plant.

June 10, 1957: Concurrent Resolution No. 59—"That the State take necessary steps to acquire 66 acres of land on the designated site of the Battle of New Orleans"—was passed by the Louisiana Legislature.

June 25, 1957: General Bres conferred with officials of the National Park Service. During this conference it was stated that Mission 66 had been adopted and that the detailed development of the park was outlined therein. It was stated that funds were available for the completion of the project if and when the required area, being the absolute minimum that would be considered, for the park was secured. The area designated was that between the present park and the National Cemetery.

Mission 66, conceived by Conrad L. Wirth, Director, to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the National Park Service, had as its objective the completion of all parks, monuments, and other areas of the National Park Service program by August 25, 1966.

The announcement of Mission 66 had been made at a staff meeting on February 8, 1955, and was immediately set into motion by a directive of February 18, 1955, to all field offices requesting suggestions and recommendations for the ultimate completion of the project. It was directed that imagination and vision were to be used in making the analyses which had to be submitted by March 10, 1955.

August 2, 1957: Congressman HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, sent General Bres a copy of a letter that he had received from William Marks, vice president of the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. This letter, addressed to Roger Ernst, Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, stated that the corporation had made available to the sewage district 1½ acres of land for sewage treatment plant and that it could not sell or donate 66 acres of land as requested for the park. However, the company would be willing to exchange the 66-acre tract for other suitable riverfront property in the vicinity of its plant.

October 14, 1957: General Bres conferred with NPS Assistant Directors Hillory A. Tolson and Jackson E. Price regarding the status of the development of the park. During this conference, it was announced that Messers. Price, Diederich, and Cox would visit the park and that on October 28, 1957, they would confer with General Fleming and E. M. Roy about a possible trade of lands with the Kaiser Corp.

October 24, 1957: A conference was held in the office of E. T. Scoyan, Associate Director, NPS. Other National Park Service officials attending were: Director, Conrad L. Wirth; Assistant Directors, Tolson and Price; planning, Diederich; historians, Lee and Kahler; and Regional Director, Elbert Cox. Mrs. Martha G. Robinson and Gen. Edward S. Bres also attended. There was a general discussion of the park and the possible trade of lands with the Kaiser Corp.

March 20, 1958: NHP-CHAL drawing No. 7008, showing the boundaries as approved by Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, was officially adopted pursuant to the act of August 10, 1939. The official boundaries were declared to include the land from the cemetery to the eastern boundary of the present park.

April 15, 1958: H.R. 11910—to authorize the acquisition of lands for Chalmette National Historical Park to provide for the enlargment of the cemetery, etc.—was introduced in the 85th Congress, 2d session by Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana.

(NOTE.—This would provide for the purchase of lands to trade with the Kaiser Corp.)

May 18, 1958: The visitor center (Rene Beauregard home) was formally opened.

In 1958 the booklet, "Chalmette National Historical Park," by J. Fred Routh, was published as National Park Historical Handbook, series No. 29, Washington, D.C.

January 7, 1959: H.R. 790, which was essentially the same as H.R. 11910, was introduced by F. EDWARD HÉBERT. The Superintendent of Chalmette National Historical Park, Lyle K. Linch, stated that this bill had been approved by the Department of the Interior.

April 8, 1959: A letter from Chad F. Calhoun, vice president, Kaiser Corp., addressed to Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service, officially advised of the proposed donation of 66 acres to the park. That same day, F. EDWARD HÉBERT telephoned Mrs. Martha G. Robinson to let her know that the donation had been officially proposed.

April 27, 1959: Mrs. Martha G. Robinson wrote to General Bres, saying that he had been the first to suggest a sesquicentennial celebration for 1965 and that action toward the planning of the celebration should be undertaken immediately.

April 6, 1960: General Bres discussed the possible contour survey of the Chalmette battlefield area with New Orleans District Engineering officials and was advised that the survey could be made.

June 24, 1960: General Bres conferred at great length with Herbert E. Kahler, Chief Historian, National Park Service and Assistant Director, Jackson Price about the joint resolution to be introduced in Congress for the sesquicentennial. Mr. Price said that he would be sending General Bres laws on the other celebrations that had been held in the past.

July 21, 1960: General Bres forwarded suggestions for the sequicentennial planning to Elbert Cox, Regional Director, southeast region, National Park Service.

August 29, 1960: General Bres discussed with Bob Hunter, Administrative Assistant to Senator Long, a request to be made to the National Park Service for the preparation of a joint bill for the sesquicentennial that would be introduced by Senator Long and Congressman HÉBERT.

September 1, 1960: In a letter to General Bres, Elbert Cox stated that he would have the draft of the bill prepared by the National Park Service.

September 19, 1960: The Kaiser Corp., announced the donation of lands for the park, and the ceremonies of transfer were held in the office of George W. Abbot, Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Mr. Chad F. Calhoun, vice president, acted for the Kaiser Corp. and General Bres represented Senators ELLENDER and LONG at the ceremony. The first donation was 13¾ acres—the remainder to be given yearly.

Following the ceremony of donation, General Bres remained and conferred with Secretary Abbot and Mssrs. Scoyan and Price of the National Park Service about the early development of the project.

October 17, 1960: A letter from Assistant Secretary George W. Abbot to Senator LONG stated that the project would cost $187,000 and that hopefully, it would be completed by December 1964. The letter also stated that the development would keep pace with land acquisition and the availability of funds.

October 19, 1960: A letter from Chalmette National Historical Park, superintendent, to General Bres mentioned a rumor about enlarging Highway No. 39 (the Arabi to Paris road) to six lanes. The letter also said the Highway No. 39 is 225 feet from the park's north right-of-way line. Mr. Linch mentioned that railroad traffic on the Louisiana Southern Railroad is six large trains daily and that one track carries a train, with no passenger service or definite schedule, to Violet, La.

October 26, 1960: Because of his extreme concern about the delays on the Chalmette battlefield reconstruction project. General Bres wrote to Mrs. Martha G. Robinson and to Senators ELLENDER and LONG.

October 27, 1960: General Bres talked with Mssrs. Price and Kahler by telephone. Later, Mr. Rogers Young telephoned General Bres to say that the Park Service had contracted for the casting of fortifications for a sum of $10,600. Superintendent Linch advised that the present trend of visitors would exceed 500,000 by the end of 1960.

(NOTE.—In 1963, it was 518,000.)

November 8, 1960: Mr. E. T. Scoyan, Acting Director, NPS, forwarded to General Bres the drafts of the bills pertaining to the other sesquicentennial celebrations that he had requested. It was stated that this preparation carried no commitment. The drafts were patterned on the Jamestown law.

November 14, 1960: General Bres forwarded to Senator RUSSELL B. LONG and Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, the copies of the drafts of bills that he had received from Mr. Scoyan; and General Bres suggested that a joint bill, sponsored by Senators ELLENDER and LONG and by Congressmen HÉBERT and BOGGS, be introduced.

November 21, 1960: General Bres was advised by Senator LONG and Congressman HÉBERT that the drafts of the bills had been received and that a bill for the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial was being prepared for introduction in the next session.

November 25, 1960: Senator LONG was advised by George W. Abbot, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, that General Bres had been in touch with the National Park Service by telephone and that General Bres had been informed that the Interior records indicate that the restoration of the mud rampart was completed in June 1958 and that cannons for the rampart were included in the cost estimate given in Mr. Abbot's letter of October 17.

February 3, 1961: A letter from John A. Carver, Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, advised Senator LONG, that in 1958, a sample ditch; 400 feet long had been constructed; and in the opinion of the Interior Department, it was thought that this sample ditch, with the addition of two or more cannons, would answer the request for the restoration of the mud rampart. On February 24, General Bres received a similar letter from Mr. Scoyan.

February 17, 1961: Replying to an inquiry from Mr. Cox, General Bres advised Mr. COX that Senator LONG and Congressman HÉBERT would confer on the sesquicentennial bill on February 21.

February 20, 1961: Congressman HÉBERT advised General Bres that he would introduce the sesquicentennial bill.

February 27, 1961: General Bres gave detailed reasons to Senators ELLENDER and LONG and to Mr. E. T. Scoyan of the National Park Service why the plan of Assistant Secretary Carver was unsatisfactory.

February 27, 1961: House Joint Resolution 261—to establish a Sesquicentennial Commission for the Battle of New Orleans—was introduced in the 87th Congress, 1st session, by Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana.

March 1, 1961: General Bres received a joint letter from Senators ELLENDER and LONG and Congressmen HÉBERT and BOGGS stating that the Secretary of the Interior had been requested to reconsider the plan and reproduce the total line of defense of 2,500 feet.

March 2, 1961: Senate Joint Resolution 60—to establish the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Commission—was introduced by Senator LONG, for himself and Senator ELLENDER, in the 87th Congress, 1st session.

March 15, 1961: Mr. Scoyan advised Senators ELLENDER and LONG and Congressmen HÉBERT and BOGGS that a review of the plans was being made, with special attention to the reasons detailed by General Bres.

May 31, 1961: General Bres was advised by Senators ELLENDER and LONG and Congressmen HÉBERT and BOGGS of the proposed study and amended plan.

July 25, 1961: A letter from Hillory A. Tolson, Assistant Director, NPS, to Senator LONG stated that the approved drawing NHP-CHAL 3012A should be examined by his constituent, General Bres, and suggested a conference with Elbert Cox, regional director, southeast region, for that purpose.

August 3, 1961: A conference was held in Senator LONG's office. Attending were: Elbert Cox, General Bres, Mario J. Fellom from Senator ELLENDER's office, Richard Dashbach from Senator LONG's office, and Pen Wilson from Congressman HÉBERT's office. Mr. Cox agreed to construct 2,000 feet of mud rampart, 400 feet of a double log wall, gun emplacements, etc.

August 16, 1961: The details of the August 3 conference were explained in two letters to General Bres from Elbert Cox.

September 8, 1961: A proposed plan to develop the land donated by the Kaiser Corp., was outlined in a letter from Elbert Cox to General Bres.

September 27, 1961: General Bres wrote Elbert Cox regarding details of reconstruction.

November 10, 1961: General Bres sent excerpts from the reports of Vincent Nolte and Major Latour to Elbert Cox.

February 27, 1962: House Joint Resolution 643—to acquire the Fazendville property—was introduced in the 87th Congress, 2d session by F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana. This resolution was later included in H.R. 261.

April 11, 1962: Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service, sent a cost estimate of $50,000 to cover operating expenses for the Sesquicentennial Celebration to Senator ALAN BIBLE, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands (Interior and Insular Affairs). This estimate was in response to a request by the committee.

April 12, 1962: Congressman HÉBERT, of Louisiana, and General Bres appeared before the House Judiciary Committee in support of H.R. 643. Congressman JOHN H. RAY, of New York, opposed the bill, saying that it was a "local affair."

Later that day, Senator BIBLE was advised that the letter and estimate sent by Mr. Wirth were withdrawn because of Congressman HÉBERT's testimony that the entire celebration expense would be borne by private donation.

April 16, 1962: Congressman HÉBERT received a letter from George W. Weingart, Jr., 1524 Harmony Street, New Orleans, starting that Mr. Weingart's ancestor Juan Cueras, who had been a resident of Cat Island, delayed the British ships carrying Marines to support General Pakenham by withholding information and refusing to reveal the location of Rigolets. Cueras was placed in irons by the British and later rewarded by President Jackson when he was given Cat Island for his heroic deed.

May 3, 1962: A letter from F. EDWARD HÉBERT to Mrs. Martha G. Robinson stated that a request for an appropriation of Federal funds would be fatal in the passage of legislation for the Sesquicentennial Celebration. Congressman HÉBERT said that funds must be obtained through public contributions.

May 17, 1962: Senate Joint Resolution 60 was passed by the Senate, with the amendment that all expenditures of the Commission would be made from donated funds.

September 4, 1962: Senate Joint Resolution 60 was passed by the House.

September 25, 1962: Senate Joint Resolution 60 was enacted as Public Law 87-759 by Congress and was sent to the President to be signed.

October 9, 1962: The Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission was officially created when the President signed Public Law 87-759, which had been passed by the 87th Congress.

Shortly thereafter, the President of the Senate appointed the following senatorial Members to the Commission: ALLEN J. ELLENDER and RUSSELL B. LONG from Louisiana, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and THRUSTON B. MORTON from Kentucky, JAMES O. EASTLAND and JOHN STENNIS from Mississippi, and ALBERT GORE and Estes Kefauver from Tennessee; and the Speaker of the House appointed the following congressional Members: F. EDWARD HÉBERT and HALE BOGGS from

Louisiana, WILLIAM H. NATCHER and Eugene Siler from Kentucky, WILLIAM M. COLMER and THOMAS G. ABERNETHY from Mississippi, and ROBERT A. EVERETT and JAMES H. QUILLEN from Tennessee.

February 28, 1963: President Kennedy appointed Maj. Gen. Edward S. Bres as Chairman of the Commission and the following as members of the Commission: Robert E. LeCorgne, Jr., Raphael H. Morvant, Mrs. Martha G. Robinson, Edwin M. Roy, and Hugh M. Wilkinson of New Orleans and Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service.

May 17, 1963: A letter to General Bres from Elbert Cox suggested a meeting to resolve reconstruction and development details. Enclosed with the letter was a report on the Jackson line by James Holland, Regional Historian, southeast region, NPS.

May 18, 1963: General Bres was advised by a letter from Elbert Cox that Battery 8 was to be included in the restoration of fortifications. Mr. Cox had also enclosed a review by former park historian, Milton E. Thompson.

March 26, 1963: General Bres wrote to Elbert Cox concerning the "Ritchie report."

October 11, 1963: A conference was held in the office of Mr. Herbert E. Kahler, Chief, Division of History and Archeology, NPS, to finalize the design of the cotton bales for the battery emplacements in the line of fortifications. Elbert Cox, regional director, southeast region, NPS, and General Bres were also present. Because there was some difficulty in reaching a decision about the interpretation of the Latour and Vincent Nolte statements, Mr. Harold Peterson, staff historian, NPS, was invited to join the discussion. Mr. Peterson, who reads both German and French, was asked to make interpretations from the original works of Nolte and Latour, since there was a possibility that the meaning could have been distorted during the translation into English.

October 29, 1963: A series of discussions between Mr. Peterson and General Bres resulted in a complete and satisfactory understanding of the use of cotton bales and the design of the gun platforms in General Jackson's line, and Mr. Peterson submitted his technical study which was approved by Mr. Kahler.

December 2, 1963: Elbert Cox sent General Bres copies of the plan, section, data sheet, and memorandum comprising the study by Harold L. Peterson and stated that Mr. Peterson's study would be used as the basic planning document for the restoration of the batteries at Chalmette.

March 27, 1964: General Bres wrote Elbert Cox regarding the location of Tour Road.

March 30, 1964: General Bres wrote to Elbert Cox seeking information about the location of the burial site of the British dead.

April 6, 1964: Elbert Cox submitted a sketch of the proposed monument to the British dead to Mrs. Martha G. Robinson. This sketch was not found acceptable.

April 9, 1964: Elbert Cox wrote to General Bres saying that he hoped to get the work under contract as soon as funds became available.

April 27, 1964: A letter from General Bres to Elbert Cox complained of delay and the possibility of not completing the reconstruction in time for the celebration. Copies of this letter were sent to Senators ELLENDER and LONG and Congressmen HÉBERT and BOGGS, requesting the assistance of the legislators.

May 6, 1964: Bob Hunter from Senator LONG's office called General Bres to say that A. Clark Stratton, Associate Director, NPS, had called Senator LONG's office to arrange a conference about the completion of the Chalmette Park reconstruction. Mr. Stratton stated that $250,000 had been transferred from other projects; that bids would be requested June 12; contracts would be awarded July 12; and fortifications and landscaping would be completed by October 20, 1964. General Bres advised Mr. Hunter that no conference would be necessary since this schedule was satisfactory.

May 8, 1964: General Bres was called in to discuss the reconstruction of Chalmette with William C. Everhart, Chief, Division of Interpretation and Visitor Services, NPS. Mr. Everhart said that he had reviewed the files and was embarrassed to find that Chalmette had been so neglected, but that the work would be completed in October.

May 12, 1964: Mr. Stratton submitted the program for the reconstruction of the Chalmette fortifications to Senator LONG.

May 12, 1964: Mr. Everhart asked General Bres to attend a conference with Donald Nutt, Coordination Architect, from Philadelphia; Lee Wallace, Eastern Museum Laboratory; and Kenneth Anderson, Acting Chief Architect, NPS. The interpretation of the design was discussed and mutually agreed upon.

May 13, 1964: A conference was held to discuss the roads and walks for the park. Attending were: Mr. Nutt; Mr. Wallace; Mr. Anderson; General Bres; Henry Stengel, landscape architect; and Ben L. Breeze, chief of design and construction.

May 19, 1964: Elbert Cox replied to General Bres' letter of April 27. Mr. Cox stated that he had been absent from his office, and in his letter of April 9, he should have written, "We expect to get the work under contract," instead of, "We hope * * *." It was fortunate that, in Mr. Cox' absence, prompt action had been taken thus assuring the completion of the battlefield reconstruction by November 1964.

June 29, 1964: The Department of the Interior awarded the contract for the reconstruction of the mud embankment for Chalmette National Historical Park in the amount of $49,692.

With this award of the first contract for the program, the reconstruction of the battlefield in time for the 1965 celebration became assured.

Since September 19, 1960, with the first donation of land by the Kaiser Corp., the reconstruction of the battlefield has been greatly assisted by the officials of the National Park Service. Particularly helpful were: Herbert E. Kahler, Chief, Division of History and Archeology Studies; Elbert Cox, regional director, southeast region; Harold L. Peterson, staff historian—and since May 1964, William C. Everhart, Chief, Division of Interpretation and Visitor Services, who accelerated the awarding of the construction contracts to assure completion by November 1964.

Much credit is due to the superintendent of Chalmette National Historical Park, Lyle K. Linch, for his efficient and enthusiastic development of the park, especially since the opening of the visitor center. The features of the park that he has stressed have increased the number of visitors from 53,543 in 1955 to over 519,000 in 1963. With the completion of the present program, the number of visitors will constantly increase.

The planning, development, and reconstruction of the park, now nearing completion, could not have been accomplished without the support of Senators ALLEN J. ELLENDER and RUSSELL B. LONG and Congressmen F. EDWARD HÉBERT and HALE BOGGS, who were always firm and prompt in supporting presentations to governmental agencies. The staff members of Senator LONG's office—Robert E. Hunter, administrative assistant, and William E. Leonard, secretary—who prepared and so loyally followed through on joint presentations, were of incalcuable assistance.

Harvest of Sham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, the State of California's agricultural industry is approaching a severe crisis—a crisis which could amount to a three-quarter of a billion dollar loss in 1965.

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, whose membership is composed of commercial and industrial firms doing business throughout the entire southern California area, has published a front page editorial in its weekly publication, Southern California Business, outlining the problem faced by our agricultural industry, its title—"Harvest of Sham," which appeared in the March 8, 1965, issue.

To better acquaint Members of Congress with the grave situation in California, I submit for the RECORD, "Harvest of Sham":

HARVEST OF SHAM

California growers of fruits and vegetables requiring stoop labor for harvest and preharvest have recently joined a select group of farmers across the Nation who are no longer considered by the Federal Government competent to make basic management decisions.

On Saturday, December 19, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz announced regulations governing the use of foreign contract workers to do temporary agricultural work under Public Law 414, the Immigration and Nationality Act.

These regulations were set forth in anticipation of the end of the bracero program which did, in fact pass out of existence on December 31. The Secretary's regulations covered housing, transportation costs, work guarantees, written contracts, and wages.

Since that time, California growers and anyone else who cared to watch have witnessed the most blatant examples of pettifoggery and harassment displayed by bureaucratic agencies, both State and national, in quite some time.

AN INDEPENDENT INDUSTRY

Let us point out that before this "bracero" dispute came up, California for many years was the Nation's leading agricultural State. "Soil banks" and other devices for Government subsidy which so riddled farm areas in other States were practically nonexistent here. California farmers produced more quality items, sold them at an equitable price, and in general paid their fieldworkers higher wages than any other State.

But what has appeared to be an efficient agricultural complex is being doomed by individuals and groups which at best are misinformed and at worst are motivated by special interests.

Under Public Law 78, which completely and equitably covered the bracero program, the Secretary of Labor was empowered to determine minimum adverse affect wages which must be paid to foreign contract work and domestic workers alike.

Apparently the Secretary assumes that he has the same rights under Public Law 414 if it should be implemented for States which

had previously had used Mexican national workers.

Since the first of the year employment offered to domestic workers must provide for wage payment rates "which are no less than the applicable amount on schedule B for the State in which the work is being performed, except that with the prevailing rate for the crop activity in the area is higher, then the higher rate shall be paid.

"These rates shall be designed to produce hourly earnings at least equivalent to the prescribed hourly rates and in no event shall the worker be paid less than the prescribed hourly rate," according to the regulation.

THE "RICH" CALIFORNIA FARMER

Effective April 1, California agriculture will be forced to pay $1.40 per hour as a minimum wage, regardless of the quality of work performed by an individual.

Our neighboring State, Arizona, which competes with California in the production of citrus, grapes, cabbage, melons, and lettuce, will pay $1.25 per hour.

Florida, which is a major competitor in avocadoes, all types of citrus except lemons, lima beans, snap beans, cabbage, melons, celery, lettuce, and tomatoes, almost all of which compete directly with California for the early spring, late fall, and winter markets, will have to pay a wage rate of only $1.15.

The list continues with Michigan, $1.25; Texas, $1.15; and Virginia, $1.15.

These different rates openly discriminate against California agricultural products.

In defense of such flamboyant discrimination, the Office of the Secretary claims that the method determining the rates is based on the cost of living and standard of living in given States.

If California agriculture is to continue to produce fruits and vegetables at competitive prices, which it must do to survive and if the State's large canning and food processing industries are to survive, it must not be compelled to pay higher wage rates than other States.

However, the new regulations as established by the Secretary of Labor do not allow competitive wage rates.

In the past, California farmers have met many challenges, and with new technology developed by the local agricultural experiment stations and research specialists, they have been able to compete favorably with other States and nations.

At the present time, California is producing 43 percent of the entire Nation's supply of fruits and vegetables.

However, if high wage rates and other meddling by the Secretary of Labor result in California agricultural products no longer being comparable in price with products of other States, it could mean the end of agriculture and related industries, severely affecting the economy of our entire State.

Since January 1, the cost of harvesting our crops has risen considerably, and in some cases has doubled. In addition, the supply of some crops and their quality have been greatly reduced as a result of inexperienced and unqualified labor.

Trucks which once hauled lemons from the orchards to packing plants now stand idle in parking lots. In the San Joaquin Valley one cannery has already discontinued its tomato canning operations, which will result in a $2 million loss to that community.

This is only the beginning, for the peak demand for supplemental labor will not occur until summer and fall of this year. Since many businesses, and persons once employed in agricultural related industries are now suffering, what will happen during the peak season?

We find it amazing that attacks on California's largest economic bloc have met until recently with only halfhearted resistance from State agencies and no resistance from the business community.

Those of us who do not fight for California agriculture, who are blinded by false reports of bracero exploitation, who believe that inexperienced and lackadaisical domestics can truly do an adequate harvesting task, or who realize the dangers but expect someone else to become informed and do the fighting, will deserve the higher prices, higher taxes and huge wave of unemployment to come.

Office of Community Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist, Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, has offered some very salient and noteworthy comment concerning the administration's recent message on the cities.

As Mr. Krock so astutely points out, the objectives of the administration's message are admirable. But this vast proposal for the improvement of urban living would require a great increase in the powers of the Central Government over State and local governments.

I believe the Republican bill for creation of an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President is a much more practical and palatable means for assisting our burgeoning urban-suburban centers. I believe this proposal, of which I am a sponsor, will serve to eliminate the problems which Mr. Krock refers to in his column of March 5, 1965.

Basically, the bill for establishment of an Office of Community Development, provides for a catalytic agent to coordinate existing Federal programs operating in the areas of housing, transportation, air and water pollution, juvenile delinquency, education, and others. The Republican proposal does not authorize control by the Federal Government, nor does it recommend the spending of millions of dollars to do the job for the cities and suburbs. The Republican measure would require a thorough study of the 60 or so Federal programs in operation today, with a report being made to the President on changes and/or reorganization which may be affected in order to improve the programing. Simply, the Republican proposal requires that we stop for a moment to determine where we are headed. It then proposes that we proceed in a direction of helping the metropolitan centers to help themselves.

The Republican proposal for creation of an Office of Community Development is a positive, moderate approach to helping solve the many problems of the Nation's metropolitan centers. This proposal, I am sure, would avoid some of the pitfalls of Federal control which Mr. Krock so eloquetly discusses. Furthermore, the Republican proposal would not stifle local community initiative and incentive to solve their local problems at the local level.

I include Mr. Krock's column in the RECORD so that my colleagues and the American people may examine it fully.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Mar. 5, 1965]

CITIES WOULD YIELD TO FEDERAL CONTROL

(By Arthur Krock, New York Times Service)

WASHINGTON.—The objectives of President Johnson's "cities" message, like previous statements of his activist vision of the Great Society, are desirable and admirable.

But also like the others, his program for the improvement of urban living requires a vast increase in the already vast powers of the Central Government to mold American civilization into a uniform pattern of its choice by giving and withholding the money it collects from the people of the States and local communities.

This is plainly foreshadowed throughout the message. For example, after asserting that the Federal Government "cannot and should not" enforce its solutions of urban problems on dissenting communities, the President proposed the very means by which this enforcement would become implicit.

"We can offer incentives," he said, "to metropolitan area planning and cooperation." And these incentives, ranging from grants of money to the supply of trained personnel, have proved themselves to be the most effective persuaders on local government to cede its responsibilities to Washington.

It is true, as the President told Congress, that most local governments are hampered by "inadequate resources, limited authority, too few trained people and often too little public support." But the deficiencies have risen in proportion to the steady rate at which the Central Government has absorbed these local resources.

The flow of all these to the executive departments in Washington and their regional offices is certain to be augmented by the President's proposal to add still another—a Department of Housing and Public Development.

The six executive agencies now separately concerned with housing and other aspects of urban renewal, rehabilitation and development already have great influence over the policy decisions of private enterprise in their field. Merged—and, of course, enlarged by more units—under a representative operating at "the highest level and front rank of Government" (the Cabinet) this influence will inevitably move toward control in its operating areas.

If Congress legislates the President's program, the Secretary of Housing and Public Development will have the power to give or withhold the following incentives on his determination whether local projects are consistent with his concept of what comprehensive, areawide planning for future growth in a national pattern should be.

Matching grants to local governments building new basic community facilities.

Paying the 5-year interest on loans made by local government to construct these facilities.

Federally insured private loans to finance the acquisition and development by State and local authorities of new land for entire new communities and planned subdivisions.

Supervision over the drafting of urban building codes that will be uniform across the country.

Fixing standards for private builders, to the end that suburban housing will henceforth be economically feasible and livable for all, regardless of their earning capacity. This goal is to be advanced by provision of direct (Federal) payment of a portion of the rent of needy individuals and families, whatever may be the deficiencies of character that account for the need.

There is much more of the welfare state concept in the President's program which, when, if, and as legislated, will be directed by an additional member of the Cabinet. But no further citation is required to illustrate the scope of its federalism than this:

A temporary national commission would draw up a blueprint by which even the zoning systems of metropolitan areas would be imposed on inhabitants and officials according to the political, social, and economic considerations prevalent in Washington.

The President supplied no cost figures for these increases in the functions and powers of the Central Government.

Montana Inter-Tribal Policy Board Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased that the Montana Inter-Tribal Policy Board has joined the many thousands of veterans and their families and the people in Montana in protesting the harsh decision to close the veterans hospital at Miles City, Mont. In order to express the official policy of the Montana Inter-Tribal Policy Board, I am submitting the attached resolution for your attention:

MONTANA INTER-TRIBAL POLICY BOARD RESOLUTION

Whereas the Montana Inter-Tribal Policy Board, consisting of delegates from tribal councils on seven Montana Indian Reservations and the Landless Indians, Inc., have been sitting in an official session, February 5 and 6, in the area office assembly room at 804 North 29th Street, Billings, Mont., has adopted this resolution; and

Whereas this intertribal policy board is empowered by its constitution to adopt resolutions: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Montana Inter-Tribal Policy Board of Montana, hereby, puts wholehearted and sincere support behind the concerted endeavors of the Montana congressional delegation in their adamant objections to the closure of the veterans hospital at Miles City, Mont., and all other veterans hospitals scheduled for closing. The gross and unnecessary hardship that is the ultimate result would have a terrible effect upon the Indian veterans of this State and make it necessary to travel many hundreds of miles when hospitalization is needed. The expense of such travel must be assumed by the Veterans' Administration. The economy move so strongly voiced by the Veterans' Administration is a sham and can only be at the expense of all veterans which include the Indian veteran and that is the main objection of the Montana Inter-Tribal Policy Board; and be it further

Resolved, That the officials of the intertribal policy board send copies of this resolution to the Montana congressional delegation and officers of the Veterans' Administration.

JOHN CUMMINS,
Chairman, Montana Inter-Tribal Policy Board.

NORMAN HOLLOW,
Secretary, Montana Inter-Tribal Policy Board.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress Should Consider an Administrative Counsel or "American Ombudsman"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced a bill, H.R. 4273, to establish an Administrative Counsel of the Congress.

The Administrative Counsel would help Congressmen help their constituents, without interfering with the traditional congressional-constituent relationships.

The results would be:

First. Better protection of citizens' rights and interests in their dealings with the large and remote Federal bureaucracy.

Second. An opportunity for Congressmen to be more thoughtful and better-advised legislators through the removal of a significant part of the burden of dealing with constituents' problems with administrative agencies.

Establishment of the Administrative Counsel would allow Congress to operate more efficiently and more effectively.

The Administrative Counsel would provide the same sort of valuable assistance in fulfilling our representational function that the Legislative Counsel has given for legislative drafting and the Legislative Reference Service for research.

I intend to propose the Administrative Counsel to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, with the hope that it will be considered fully and recommended to the House and to the other body.

The Administrative Counsel is an adaptation to American Government and politics of the Ombudsman, an institution which has been highly successful in its native Sweden and in other countries.

I have recently written an article entitled, "We Need an American Ombudsman," which was published in the March 3, 1965, issue of the Christian Century. The article follows:

WE NEED AN AMERICAN OMBUDSMAN: AN OFFICIAL GRIEVANCE MAN WOULD PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS IN TODAY'S BUREAUCRACY

(By Hon. HENRY S. REUSS)

A fascinating Swedish institution with an outlandish-sounding name has aroused interest in many Western democracies. Since the end of World War II, political, legal and administrative experts in almost a dozen countries have been studying and often urging importation of the ombudsman.

The Swedes established their first ombudsman in 1809 and for more than 100 years the institution was confined to that country. The idea was first exported when Finland established an ombudsman after gaining her independence from Russia. Ombudsmen became increasingly popular and in 1955 Denmark adopted the institution, followed by New Zealand in 1962 and Norway in 1963.

On July 16, 1964, I introduced a bill in Congress to establish an American ombudsman, to whom I gave the more prosaic and pronounceable title of "administrative counsel of the Congress." Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, and I have reintroduced the bill in the present Congress. Legislation for a State ombudsman was considered in the 1963 session of the Connecticut General Assembly. A bill to set up an ombudsman has been introduced in the current session of the Utah Legislature. And in the wake of last summer's riots and the accompanying allegations of police and administrative injustice, several cities are contemplating the appointment of ombudsmen.

Establishment of an ombudsman was a campaign pledge of British Prime Minister Harold Wilson. Ireland, the Netherlands, Australia and Canada are studying proposals for ombudsmen. In fact, a generous-sized book entitled "The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender" is due to be published by the University of Toronto Press this spring. Edited by Prof. D. C. Rowat, the book tells of existing and proposed ombudsmen around the world.

REMEDYING ABUSES AND ERRORS

So what is this ombudsman and why is there so much interest in him?

The ombudsman is an official grievance man who can look into and remedy abuses and errors of government administrators. An agent of the legislative body, his job is to insure fair administration of the law. Any citizen may approach the ombudsman to complain about illegal, unfair or even impolite administration. The ombudsman may make random inspections to look for administrative abuses or an investigation may be instigated by a newspaper account indicating bureaucratic injustice.

With the assistance of his staff, the ombudsman looks into any case that seems to have merit. He may ask an administrator to correct a wrong decision, may chastise an errant official or make public recommendations and criticisms. And he makes reports to the legislature. When appropriate he may uphold an official and explain the propriety of the action to the complaining citizen.

The remarkable attractiveness of the institution of the ombudsman lies in its ability to solve one of the major problems confronting all modern democratic governments: how government can give administrators the power and discretion they need to act effectively and at the same time protect civil liberties by giving citizens a practical means of correcting abuses and errors by administrators.

If there are no avenues for correcting maladministration, programs for the general welfare, such as social security, public housing and veterans' benefits, are full of possibilities for individual injustice.

Thus far we Americans have met this problem by making our Congressmen mediators between the citizen and the bureaucracy. When an American encounters undue delay or redtape or does not get what he is entitled to from the Federal Government, he is likely to take pen in hand and write his Congressman. He may also make an administrative and a judicial appeal, but both tend to be slow and costly. The judicial process, moreover, is designed primarily for settling constitutional questions.

Thousands of citizens' complaints and problems flow into congressional offices every year. Two examples will show the nature of these problems. A man recently complained to me that he was being turned down for a temporary post office job because of unsatisfactory performance in 1961 when, in fact, he declared he had not worked for the post Office that year. At first the Department persisted in its position. Not until I asked to be shown the man's 1961 appointment papers did the Office check its records and learn

that the man's contention was right and that he was eligible for the job.

Another man appealed to me when his social security payments that were to have started 3 months previously had not yet begun to arrive. He had filed an application for disability benefits but had withdrawn it later and sought old-age benefits instead. I discovered that the withdrawal form was following the original application through the lengthy administrative process, always one step behind. While the application for disability benefits was pending, old-age benefits could not be started. The hapless applicant was feeling the pinch. I was able to get this snafu straightened out promptly.

Legislators and their staffs spend a large part of their time investigating such problems, urging correction of apparent injustices and errors and explaining to the citizens a bureaucracy that is often too wrapped up in jargon to explain itself.

This congressional role has been important in humanizing the bureaucracy and in making it responsible. After all, the appointed civil servants who run the vast, impersonal Federal machinery are remote from the will of the people. Even the best administrators do not always handle public business with the realization that it involves the needs, hopes, and fears of their fellow citizens. It helps to have their actions watched by a Members of Congress who has to answer to the people every two or six years; he is sure to prod them toward the best possible administration of the laws.

CONGRESSMEN'S INCREASING CASEWORK

So the United States, in a sense, already has not only one but 535 ombudsmen in its 100 Senators and 435 Representatives. And Congressmen, on the whole, do a good job in this role. They recognize that helping a voter in his problems with the Government may win not only his vote but that of his family and friends as well.

But here is the rub: there are just not enough hours in the day for Congressmen to be both ombudsmen and effective legislators. The volume of constituent problems—called "casework" in Capitol Hill parlance—increases continuously.

As Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY said recently, "Many Members of the Senate and the House spend up to 90 percent of their time—and the time of their staffs—answering mail, meeting with constituents, and handling individual constituent complaints or requests." "I thought I was going to be Daniel Webster," remarked another Member, "and I found that most of my work consisted of personal work for constituents."

Yet at the same time the legislative problems coming before Congress have become more numerous and more complex. In the new Congress we will be considering further major changes in taxation, the controversial proposal for hospital care for the aged, the complicated questions of foreign and military policies, and a host of other difficult problems. Members need more time to study thoughtfully, debate, and vote on the great issues that confront us, yet the press of casework gives them less time. Thus Congress is caught in a squeeze between multitudinous demands and an inadequate amount of time for them.

A better solution is needed than just another increase in congressional office staffs; House Members already have approximately 10 staff members each and Senators have 30 or more.

HOW THE OMBUDSMAN WOULD OPERATE

I think the best solution is to adapt the excellent ombudsman idea to the American system of government. My proposal is to create an administrative counsel of the Congress to whom Members could refer problems arising between citizens and the Federal Government. The counsel, appointed by the House Speaker and the Senate President pro tempore, would be paid the same salary as a Congressman. Aided by a staff initially numbering only 100, he would review cases on the basis of material submitted to him by the legislators or he would make his own investigations. He would have the same investigatory power as a congressional committee, far more than any individual Congressman. Government officials would be required to give him the information he requested and to open their records to him.

The counsel would report his conclusions and recommendations back to the legislator who had referred the matter to him. In routine cases of administrative error or misjudgment, the investigation itself would probably bring corrective action. In other cases the counsel's recommendation, which would be referred informally to the Administrator, might well lead to a remedy.

In more stubborn cases the counsel would make a public report to Congress. In other countries the sanction of public opinion has proved powerful in correcting maladministration exposed by ombudsmen. The ultimate resort would, of course, be to the legislative power of Congress.

Freeing Congressmen, Senators, and their staffs from a large part of the time-consuming effort now devoted to casework would be one big advantage of the administrative counsel. Every hour saved from wrangling with the Veterans' Administration or the Social Security Administration could well be used to study legislation. The final result would be sounder, wiser laws.

In addition, the ombudsman proposal would have other significant advantages:

Constituents' rights would be better protected because the counsel's staff would include experts in various categories of casework. Congressional staffs, which are not large enough to have experts trained in such matters as the social security system, military allotments, and the like; often find themselves at the mercy of more knowledgeable administrators.

Use of the counsel could avoid wasteful duplication. As it is now, an energetic constituent may write to his Representative and both Senators, each of whom may take separate action.

The counsel would be able to see the board pattern of constituent complaints and spot continuing sources of trouble, such as surly or incompetent officials or ill-considered procedures. In doing this he would assist the work of the administrative conference which Congress established last year as a permanent organization.

Specialization in the counsel's office would make casework more efficient and hold down increases in congressional office staffs.

FILTERING THE COMPLAINTS

Like his Nordic and New Zealander models, the American ombudsman would deal with maladministration through investigation, recommendation, criticism, and publicity. Unlike the other ombudsmen, the administrative counsel would receive citizens' complaints through Members of Congress rather than directly. Several good reasons are behind this provision: the tradition of turning to one's Congressman for help is already well established; Members would probably continue to get such appeals even if there were direct access to an ombudsman; Congressmen might also be loath to risk losing a function which is a major source of strength at the polls; a proposal which provides indirect access to the ombudsman through the Congressman stands a better chance of passage; many Congressmen consider casework an important source of ideas for new legislation; and, in a large country, as New Zealand Ombudsman Sir Guy Powles recently noted, "One good method of filtering a flow of complaints to the 'grievance man' would be to have them come through elected representatives." In little New Zealand this filtering is not so necessary although Sir Guy reported that he receives many cases through Members of Parliament.

Congressmen would not have to use the counsel, just as they do not have to use the legislative counsel for the drafting of legislation or the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for research. But in practice heavy use is made of both. Last year the Legislative Reference Service handled more than 105,000 congressional inquiries. I believe the administrative counsel would win similar acceptance.

I hope that the new Congress will give serious consideration to our bill. Establishment of an administrative counsel or an American ombudsman would be a significant innovation but not a radical one. It would increase the effectiveness of the presently sound but overburdened arrangement for handling complaints. By helping Congressmen help their constituents, the Amercian ombudsman, like his Swedish prototype, would be an important factor in the protection of individual rights against the bureaucracy.

Tribute to George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that recently the president of Civitan International, J. Hall LeBlanc of Alexandria, La., paid high tribute to our first President, George Washington, while placing a wreath on his grave at Mount Vernon. I was extremely impressed with Mr. LaBlanc's remarks and I am honored to commend them to my colleagues in the U.S. Congress:

For me to place this wreath here today is only a small and formal salute to a man so dedicated and so courageous that every generation hence has been indebted to him. The real tribute to George Washington is to employ and enjoy the good laws under a free Government and to pass on to each succeeding generation the love of country and dedication of spirit that embodied the life of this great man.

On April 30, 1789, George Washington took the oath of office as the first President of the United States, and the new Constitution took effect. Washington served as President of the Constitutional Convention which adopted a constitution embodying his essential ideas—a Federal Government vested with powers adequate for managing the common affairs of the Union while leaving to the States control over their own interest.

He condemned government by force and intimidation and believed the public should have a voice—be it soft or loud, friendly or angry—in its Nation. "If men," he wrote, "are to be precluded from offering their sentiments on a matter which may involve the most serious consequences, reason is of no use, the freedom of speech may be taken away, and dumb and silent, we may be led like sheep to the slaughter."

Of Washington, his political opponent, Thomas Jefferson said, "His integrity was the most pure, his justice the most flexible I have even known. He was indeed, in every sense of the word, a wise, a good, and a great man."

One of his prayers after his inauguration reads, "Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States

in Thy holy protection, that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government; to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States."

If Washington thought himself unprepared for the Presidency, there was little evidence that anyone agreed with him as he rode northward through the beautiful April countryside. He was feasted and feted in Alexandria, Georgetown, Baltimore, Wilmington, Chester, Philadelphia, Trenton, Princeton, New Brunswick and Elizabeth Town. Many of these municipalities were associated with far grimmer occasions in his mind. Gentlemen escorts on horseback accompanied him from one town to the next. Salutes were fired from cannon. Speeches were made and toasts lifted in his honor. Bridges were garlanded with green leaves, and girls strewed flowers before him, singing songs composed for the occasion. Washington has been pictured as a stony-faced hero on horseback. But sometimes on this journey tears came to his eyes.

At Elizabeth Town Point, a newly constructed and beautifully decorated barge was awaiting to take him by water to New York City. As he came up the harbor toward the Battery, flags of all nations broke out from the ships at mooring, cannon roared their welcome and boatloads of singers came out to greet him.

There ahead of him lay the waiting throngs; the dignitaries; the ceremonies. Soon he would be taking the awe-inspiring oath of office as the first President of the United States of America. Ahead lay the great challenge and responsibility of making that office an honorable one. Washington had made his contribution in war—now he would make his even greater contribution to the Nation he had done so much to create.

The voices came out to him over the water. The guns reverberated across the harbor. Every church bell on the island was ringing its welcome.

He would try, as he had always tried, to merit the trust and love of his countrymen, and to be worthy of those words yet to be spoken—first in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen.

George Washington was a giant among men in more ways than one. Physically he was huge for his day, standing 6 feet, 2 inches. He was broad-shouldered, muscular, and had enormous hands and feet. In the prime of life he weighed 200 pounds. Always he possessed an indefinable grace which impressed all men who knew him.

Decades of training prepared Washington for his leadership in the Revolution and the establishment of the new Republic. Born in 1732 into a planter family in Virginia, Washington received from his parents and half brothers schooling in the morals, manners, and the body of knowledge requisite for an 18th century Virginia gentleman. His birthplace at Wakefield is commemorated with a reconstructed brick mansion on the original plantation site in Westmoreland County. It is now a national monument.

There can be no greater tribute to this man than the repetition of his own thought and words as he expressed them in his Farewell Address, September 17, 1796, when he began: "Friends and fellow citizens:" * * * "Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of "American," which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils and joint efforts, of common dangers and successes." * * *

"Though, in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am, nevertheless, too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence, and that, after 45 years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion * * *"

As he left public office to retire into private life at Mount Vernon, he expressed the desire "to realize without alloy the sweet enjoyment of partaking in the midst of my fellow citizens the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever-favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors, and dangers."

We must now leave this peaceful place where we have come to honor a man whose principles we have followed throughout the years—the father of our country.

Deteriorated Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I have fought long and hard for improvement of mail service in the United States. In a speech recently before this body I called for new congressional hearings and legislative action regarding the poor and deteriorating mail service. At that time I submitted a number of letters from persons complaining of poor mail service.

Since then I have received literally hundreds of additional complaints from postal patrons in every part of this Nation. At this time I would like to include some of these letters for the information of my colleagues. I think these complaints speak much louder than I can. They constitute overwhelming evidence that our present postal service is wretched and is growing worse every day.

FEBRUARY 23, 1965.

Mr. GLENN C. CUNNINGHAM,
U.S. Congressman, Second District, Nebraska, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I was reading the article in Sunday's World-Herald newspaper about postal mail gripes—I too would like to add to your collection of "you-don't-know-the-half-of-it category."

Enclosed please find a 35 millimeter slide of picture taken of just one of the deliveries made here, so you can see what it looks like. We took this picture and sent to the main office of my employer so they could see what the packages look like upon arrival in Omaha.

These are report sheets, the wrapping was cardboard, heavy wrapping paper secured with heavy duty tape. The string you see was added somewhere between original starting point and delivery (Omaha, Nebr.). As you can see, all that is left of the original wrapping is address with small amount of the wrapping paper. The cost for sending this package runs from 75 cents to 85 cents (package of 1,000 tissue sheets, 8½ by 11 and 2 inches deep). Needless to say this was a total loss—until we changed delivery point about 4 months ago, one-third would be unusable. Now this has been cut to about 15 to 25 sheets for loss.

Mere words are useless, this picture speaks for itself.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ——— ———.

MARCH 5, 1965.

Mr. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: We note from the papers that you are trying to do something about the poor Post Office service. You will be doing a wonderful service if you can get some sense and service back into the Post Office.

We take particular exception to the nondelivery of packages on Tuesday.

It is simply idiotic for the Post Office to refuse these deliveries here as it actually takes more time to alibi why a package sitting in the file cannot be delivered than to pick up the package and deliver it.

There is absolutely no savings of money involved. It is simply a bureaucratic dream and no ordinary person would have the guts to make such ridiculous regulations, which of course does not add up either for the local post office employees.

We hope you do get something done.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

MARCH 5, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is inspired by your insertions of complaints against the Post Office Department in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 2, 1965, and also the 17 pages of complaints in the RECORD last year.

During a period last year the condition in which our mail arrived—especially packages, and even material from Government departments—was so horrible we began to save the multilated envelopes and sent them as exhibits to the Postmaster. We wrote to our local postmaster and to the Postmaster General in Washington. We received no answer from either of them.

The general tenor of your letters inserted in the RECORD of March 2 seemed to claim that machines tore up the mail. However, after our complaint, the mutilation of our mail suddenly ceased. We still receive mail that seems inexcusably mutilated, but nothing like on the scale it was mutilated at the time of our complaint.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. and Mrs. ——— ———.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Congress of the United States of America, Washington, D.C.

MARCH 5, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In last night's paper I saw an article, wherein you stated that the present postal service in our United States "stinks". When I read this I am sure that you had ——— and the rest of the Northwest in mind, for your remark on the subject really fits the service rendered here.

Recently, I received a letter from Senator ———, which took 7 days to reach me after mailing, as proven by the postmark. Often it takes 3 or 4 days for a letter mailed in the downtown area to reach me just a scant mile and a half away. One living in this zone cannot tell within 3 hours the time of delivery of our mail.

A few years ago I lived in Seattle for several months. The hotel where I was living was but six blocks from the post office. I received a special delivery letter, 12 hours after the postmark showed it arrived in Seat-

tle. This is not service. And any complaint one makes at the local office never amounts to any improvement.

Our new main post office has about ——— windows, of which only four are ever open—one for stamps, one for parcel post, one for general delivery, and one for registered. Nearly always there are lines waiting for service. Especially when a stamp collector comes along. Why, even backward India has a special window for stamp collectors and people buying wholesale. Most countries of Europe and Asia have an early morning delivery which reaches homes before breakfast. We here in ——— are very lucky if our mail gets here before supper. Please do something.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

MARCH 4, 1965.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This morning's Post carried an article (buried on page 21—and it should have been on front page) in which you stated that the "service given today by our Post Office stinks." I want you to know that I agree wholeheartedly and hope your hearings, chairmaned by T. J. DULSKI, will be resumed and pressure will be brought to bear on the postal department to correct the poor service.

On March 1 I mailed an air mail special delivery letter to my son. I took it directly to the post office at 10 in the morning. He is at ———, ———, 2½ hours away by jet. In this letter I asked him to telephone us immediately. When he had not called us by 9 o'clock on March 3, I gave up and called his base—and he still had not received the letter. Evidently "special delivery" means absolutely nothing.

In another case, I sent a package containing a vase to ———. It was insured for $10. This package was left on the front porch of the home to which is was addressed. No one signed for it—it looked as though it had been smashed from a heavy weight dropping on it. The vase inside in a heavy carton and packed with lots of shredded paper—was in a 100 pieces. When I tried to collect on it here I was told I would have to send the insurance slip to ——— and the addressees would have to take the vase, box, and all to the Post Office Department and make an adjustment there. This they did and were told they would have to send it back to me to get an adjustment here. We gave up, as no doubt the post office hoped we would.

A substitute postal employee once told me, "If it is marked 'fragile' we only throw it 40 feet." He thought it hilarious—but I did not. I think it is true.

If letters from voters help to prod this thing along to a satisfactory shaking up of the postal department, please let me know, as this is something a number of us have been griping about for a long time and I will have others write you.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

MARCH 5, 1965.

DEAR SIR: There was an article in the ——— ——— last night saying you think the mail service "stinks."

We say good for you and we sincerely hope you will be able to do something to improve it.

Our daughter lives in Salt Lake City, Utah, and it takes a first-class letter 4 days to get here and sometimes even 5. We have already received mail dated or rather postmarked 2 days apart but we receive them the same day. One took 3 days (unusual) but the other took 5 days (usual).

This poor service has become a family joke and we say the mail goes by way of Pony Express.

Thank you so much for expressing our opinion of the Post Office Department and their first-class mail. We think it "stinks" also.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. ——— ———.

MARCH 4, 1965.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: Since I am in complete sympathy with your attempts to spur the Post Office Department into greater care with the mail, I am enclosing the paper from around the last issue of our National Geographic. This is an expensive magazine and one we like to keep on the shelf. The back which lists the contents has been destroyed and the cover mutilated. I know that the publisher is powerless to do much and I do feel that our service is suffering.

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a ———, have been for the last 19 years, most of the time worked at Fort ———. My problem is the postal system. I send my grandchild a small package every week, and did you know, sir, that it takes from Saturday till Thursday to have the package delivered. Surely in this great country of ours the postal service has really deteriorated. The package was addressed to ———. The postal service has been very poor, but lately what type of clerks do the postal system hire? At Xmas time I wrapped a package here in the mail room, by experts at wrapping. It took exactly 2 weeks to be delivered in ———, ———. Where did it lay, what happened to the "efficiency" of our postal system?

What use is the ZIP, DIP, etc. system when the conscientious postal clerk seems to be lost forever in the dazzle, razzle machine age, etc.

Please keep up your efforts with reference to careless handling of mail and by the way, please help the post office stay financially out of the "red" because its system sure is in the "mud" according to the taxpayers of America.

Very sincerely yours,

——— ———.

MARCH 4, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I have read in ——— that you said the postal service stinks. I agree with that 100 percent. I have also read that the post office has become a super duper snooping agency.

The postmaster is a political appointee. The postmaster should be chosen from the ranks of the postal service.

When I was a kid we had three deliveries a day. Now we are paying more and getting less. It won't be long before we will have to go to the post office to collect our mail like they do out in the rural sections.

I agree Congress ought to investigate the postal service from top to bottom and that the postal service should be taken out of politics.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

Please, No More Big Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article from the publication of the Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc. of Grand Forks, N. Dak. This article is interesting because it points out a great truth—that the millions and millions of tons of lignite coal in North and South Dakota can be transported more cheaply by conversion into power, in fact, more cheaply than power can be generated through these massive dams. The article follows:

PLEASE, NO MORE BIG DAMS

"Please, no more big dams," the Bismarck (N. Dak.), Tribune said in noting that the Army Engineers have embryo plans for two more dams in the upper Missouri River valley, both in Montana above Fort Peck Dam and Reservoir.

"The purpose of these big, and very expensive, installations would be, it is alleged, to store water and generate electricity * * *. Proper management of existing main-stem reservoirs, which are far from filled to minimum capacities, should surely serve all flood control and storage needs. If more storage is needed, perhaps the way to do it would be with smaller dams on tributaries.

"As to future power needs, the Heskett plant of Montana-Dakota Utilities Co., at Mandan, and the new plants now going up in the Stanton area, prove the economic feasibility of lignite-burning generating plants. Here is where the cheapest electricity of the future will be generated, not in costly Federal hydroelectric plants at dams which flood tens of thousands of acres of land for all time to come.

"Congress should kill the idea of more big dams on the Missouri before it gets any more encouragement."

National Wildlife Federation Award Presentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement from the National Wildlife Federation, an outstanding conservation organization dedicated to the preservation of our vital natural resources: fish, wildlife, soil, timber, and air. I also insert a speech by Mr. Walter Mims, vice president of that splendid organization, announcing the winners of the Conservationist of the Year Award, based on performances in 1964, to two distinguished Members of this body and two outstanding conservationists, our friends and colleagues, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL and the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, who have given so much of themselves to conservation and the preservation of our precious outdoor heritage.

CONGRESSMEN ASPINALL AND SAYLOR HONORED BY WILDLIFE FEDERATION

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congressmen WAYNE N. ASPINALL, (Colorado), and JOHN P. SAYLOR, (Pennsylvania), were named today as joint winners of the National Wildlife Federation's "Conservationist of the Year" Award for 1964. Their selection as recipients of the federation's top honor was announced at the organization's 29th annual meeting being held at

the Statler-Hilton Hotel in the Nation's Capital. Both Members of the House of Representatives were presented the award during the President's luncheon and were introduced to convention delegates by Walter L. Mims, of Birmingham, Ala., a member of the federation's board of directors.

In making its highest award, the federation cited the two congressional leaders for their efforts in the 88th Congress to enact landmark conservation legislation. Mr. ASPINALL was chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs while Mr. SAYLOR was the ranking minority member. Among other accomplishments, both Congressmen were instrumental in the passage of such historic legislation as the Wilderness Act, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

Their committee made additional contributions to the wise use and conservation of the Nation's natural resources including passage of a bill to protect waterfowl in the Tule Lake-Klamath region of California and Oregon, establishment of the Canyonlands National Park, the Ozark National Scenic Riverway, Fire Island National Seashore, the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in Wisconsin, and the adoption of the Water Resources Research Act. The committee also laid important groundwork for significant future decisions on water resources planning, administration of public lands, and the inclusion of fish, wildlife and recreational benefits at Federal reservoirs.

The "Conservationist of the Year" award was first presented by the National Wildlife Federation in 1962 when they honored the late Rachel Carson, biologist and author of several outstanding books in the conservation field, particularly "Silent Spring." The award winner for 1963 was Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

The award for 1964 is in the form of a unique statuette of the whooping crane, one of the country's most endangered species of wildlife. The miniature replica was molded in natural color, one-seventh life size, from an original model created by sculptor Norman N. Deaton, of Newton, Iowa.

WALTER MIMS' SPEECH FOR PRESENTATION OF AWARD TO CONGRESSMEN SAYLOR AND ASPINALL LUNCHEON, MARCH 6, 1965

It gives me particular pleasure today to be able to announce the winners of the "Conservationist of the Year" award, based upon performances in 1964.

You will note that I used the plural tense in making that opening remark because, for the first time, this is a joint award.

Today the National Wildlife Federation names two Congressmen, Mr. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado, and Mr. JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, as joint winners of the Conservationist of the Year Award. Most observers have recorded 1964 as the year in which more significant, landmark conservation legislation was enacted than at any other time in the history of our Nation and a major part of the credit for these accomplishments must go to Congressmen ASPINALL and SAYLOR. I would point to the following measures as being among the outstanding contributions of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the 88th Congress: passage of a bill to protect waterfowl in the Tule Lake-Klamath region of California and Oregon; establishment of the Canyonlands National Park, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, the Fire Island National Seashore, and the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve; and adoption of the Water Resources Research Act. The committee also laid important groundwork for significant future decisions on water resources planning, the administration of public lands, and the inclusion of fish and wildlife and recreational benefits at Federal reservoirs.

The committee, however, probably made its most outstanding contributions in the development and enactment of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and the Wilderness Act. I do not have to tell this group here today that both of these bills were exceedingly controversial. They have been under development for several months and years and competent observers tell us that only the tireless efforts and determination of these two men to resolve serious conflicts of interests made it possible for these proposals to be enacted into law.

Mr. ASPINALL, of course, is chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, while Mr. SAYLOR is the ranking minority member. Representing parties with different political persuasions, these gentlemen have not always seen eye to eye about items of conservation legislation.

However, these men do have the demonstrated ability to work together and with other members of the committee to resolve differences in a mutually acceptable fashion. Once differences were resolved, these men worked together to insure that committee-endorsed proposals received the maximum treatment within the House itself. And it is for this reason that the National Wildlife Federation honors them here today.

It is not my intent here to detail the biographies of these gentlemen. Suffice it to say, however, that both are attorneys who have had prominent military careers and are recognized as outstanding leaders in their own communities.

Medicare Under Social Security Is Very Unpopular at Grassroots Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will soon be called upon to vote for or against a highly controversial proposal to provide hospital and nursing care aid for elderly people, to be financed by an increase in social security taxes.

There is good reason to believe this is a dreamchild of politicians and selfish interests. It would not accomplish what the people have been led to believe. And it would be very burdensome by increasing the taxload our citizens have to pay.

The people at the grassroots level are becoming aware of this, and vast numbers of them want no part of it. I recently sent a questionnaire to every registered voter in the district I represent. One question submitted was as follows:

Do you favor the President's compulsory plan for hospital and nursing home care for persons 65 or older, to be financed by an increase in tax on payrolls, under the social security system, at a cost of $2 billion the first year?

The responses to the questionnaire have been tremendous, and this provides a fairly accurate cross section of public opinion on the issues covered. On this medicare question, 83 out of every 100 are opposed to the compulsory approach of financing under social security. Another question was submitted on Kerr-Mills, and 80 percent favored that approach over the administration's proposal.

Mr. Speaker, before Members of Congress act hastily on this medicare issue, they would be well advised to consult with their constituents. We already have, in operation in many States, a workable, feasible program under the Kerr-Mills plan. In Texas it has been implemented and is working out very well. It can be made to work in any State that really wants it to work.

The Freedom Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, of the millions of words that have poured forth from shocked and grieving Americans since "bloody Sunday" in Selma, Ala., just a week ago, not any are more stirring, impassioned, and inspiring than those uttered by the Suffragan Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Washington, the Right Reverened Paul Moore, Jr., as he addressed over 15,000 citizens at a civil rights rally in Lafayette Square this past weekend.

These are not mere words, but an expression of hurt and anger by one who has seen with his own eyes, and heard with his own ears, the torture, the terror, the degradation of the human spirit of those who seek freedom. He calls upon us to translate our "shame and anquish into action." I am proud to place his remarks in the RECORD and to join in his fervent plea:

ADDRESS AT CIVIL RIGHTS RALLY, LAFAYETTE SQUARE, MARCH 14, 1964, BY THE RIGHT REVEREND PAUL MOORE, JR., SUFFRAGAN BISHOP, EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF WASHINGTON

We gather here today to do honor to the martyrs of Selma. We gather as a city to express the concern of Washington and the Nation over the tragic events of the last few days. We gather to urge, with every means at our command, the backing of the President of the United States in his determination that such brutality shall never again occur within our land.

For we petition not only for Selma and protection for the march to Montgomery, we petition for every southern and every northern town and city, that fear because of color be removed and that every man and women have a vote.

This great convocation is part of the freedom movement, as was the march on Washington before the freedom movement is often criticized, usually by those who do not fully understand its dynamic.

It is criticized for its attitude toward the law and its very occasional civil disobedience. Now I ask you, What is the law? Is it to obstruct justice or to fulfill it? If it is to fulfill justice, this is the law which we demand. However, if law exists without equal protection, it becomes sanction for tyranny. I know this Nation's authority is delicately balanced between the State and the Nation. The original intent of this balance was to protect individual human beings from domination by the Federal Government. However, States rights have been twisted to block human beings from the protection of the Federal Government.

The freedom movement is for law and order, the law which gives equal protection and due process to every man.

The movement is criticized for going too fast, the most incredible comment of all to men who have waited for 300 years. Three hundred years is, by any standard a long time to wait. But time is not only made up of years; time is events. Nat Turner's Revolt, Harper's Ferry, Gettysburg, these are ancient names. Birmingham, Cicero, Mississippi, St. Augustine's, and now Selma. These events and many others mark the waiting. Selma also marks the 10th civil rights death in Alabama.

But the waiting is almost over now, thank God, because the great heart of America has finally begun to feel the suffering in her midst. The television pictures of Selma brought into every American living room for 5 minutes the fear, the terror, that has been in every Negro living room in the South and parts of the North for 300 years.

And so I ask you, my friends, if 5 minutes exposure has so aroused the Nation, can you not sense what 300 years would do? Can you not realize the hurt and the anger in the heart of the Negroes?

I have felt this fear in Mississippi walking down a lonely road. I have seen its traces in loaded guns resting on the walls of a shack. I have seen it in the eyes of a Negro child within a northern slum, I have smelt panic as policemen's pistols cracked across a city street.

If I who must call myself a white man felt this, what of the black man? I will never forget an elderly Negro couple in Mississippi whom I visited. They had a beautiful new house with wall to wall carpets and lovely furniture. We talked about the freedom movement the old man said with a sigh, "Whenever I see a white man's car coming down the road, I feel like a rabbit without a briar patch to run into."

But, my friends, there is a glory springing up out of the fifth, and shame, and terror, and degradation. Those names, Nat Turner, Harper's Ferry, Gettysburg, are soaked in ancient glory. But the other names, Birmingham, Cicero, Mississippi, St. Augustine's, and now Selma, these names are clothed with fresh glory. And it is a glory, which, though given birth by a few, all may now proudly share.

The Nation has joined the freedom movement. In the freedom movement, God has given us a great gift. He has given a comfortable nation, which had almost forgotten what the birth of freedom looked like, an opportunity to see it. None of us saw George Washington march his broken troops to Valley Forge, but all of us have seen the freedom marchers, marching for the same cause, wearing the same tattered clothes, only different in that they do not bear arms. You have had the privilege of seeing freedom for yourself.

The freedom movement is not fighting for freedom alone, it is freedom. The bodies of white men may be at liberty, but to the extent of their prejudice their souls are in chains. The bodies of Negro Americans are in chains, but those who are in the movement are the freest men in all the world, for their souls are free.

These men, these women, these children offer America the cup of freedom. I say to you and to all this land drink deep, drink deep for the good of your soul. Drink it, bathe in it, until this whole land is free in body and soul.

What is it this movement wants? It is very simple. We want equal protection under the law and due process for every citizen. I cannot believe that our Nation before whose strength the world trembles cannot provide this. And I cannot believe that our heart is so hard or our will so weak that we will not.

This is a job for the whole Nation: (1) We thank the President for his forthright words yesterday and call upon the Nation to support him in the carrying out of his promise of protection. (2) We call on the citizens to translate their shame and anguish into action, short term and long term. (a) By urging the Congress to unseat unrepresentative elected officials, and to pass the strong voter rights legislation before them. These two actions together will help insure protection on a local level by local authorities. (b) By continuing work toward community organization in the North, so that the franchise where available will be effective. (3) As the horror of the country at the kidnapping of the Lindbergh baby made kidnaping a Federal offense, we call on Congress to make murder in connection with civil rights a major Federal offense.

Go forth, each to his own job with courage, with patience, and with strength.

Lewis Deschler—Buckeye Boy From Chillicothe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago we in the House greeted our invaluable friend, Lew Deschler, on his birthday anniversary. In my remarks at that time I pointed with unabashed pride to the fact that Lew not only comes from the great State of Ohio, but from Chillicothe where the Minshall family was active in public life for nearly a century.

Another good friend of mine, the Plain Dealer's amiable, talented Ed Kernan, has written a most interesting profile of Lew in his "Private Wire" column, a weekly feature enjoyed by Cleveland readers.

I know all of Lew's friends—and that includes the entire membership of the House—will enjoy sharing it:

PRIVATE WIRE—DESCHLER: A HOUSE POWER

(By Edward Kernan)

WASHINGTON.—Few persons across the country—or in his home State of Ohio, for that matter—will recognize the name.

But Lew Deschler, a Buckeye boy from Chillicothe, who made good on Capitol Hill, is one of the most influential men in Congress.

He's, the House Parliamentarian—has been for more than 37 of his 60 years. He was appointed by Speaker Nicholas Longworth, an Ohio Republican.

A big man physically as well as influentially. Deschler goes about his job in a systematic manner. He avoids newspaper interviews and, indeed, publicity—when he can.

Lately, however, it's been a little tough.

One day in the fall of 1963, when House Members woke up to the fact that Lew Deschler had been with them as Parliamentarian more than a third of a century, a deluge of tributes flooded the floor.

Lew was in all the papers.

Helping to jazz up the publicity was a "Dear Lew" letter from President John F. Kennedy who told Deschler that he had played a unique and vital role in the life and work of the House.

Words of praise also came from Republican and Democratic legislators alike. There were speeches by Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, former GOP floor leader; Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Blanchester, then Ohio Republican national committeeman, Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Massachusetts Democrat.

Deschler received more publicity a short time later when members of the Ohio Society of Washington threw Deschler a dignified bash. Halleck was one of the principal speakers.

"A lot is said about indispensable people, and I've been around long enough to know that none of us is it," the Hoosier told his Buckeye hosts.

"But Lew comes about as close to that as anybody I know. Let's face it: we wouldn't dare fire him—either side."

Deschler is back in the papers again these days as a result of a new book, "House Out of Order," by Representative RICHARD BOLLING, a Missouri Democrat.

BOLLING was close to the late Speaker Sam Rayburn. Some say BOLLING was Mr. Sam's protege. Others insist he was just an errand boy.

No matter.

BOLLING's book, in a section devoted to Deschler, says that the Ohioan is one of those certain unpublicized individuals in the House who exercise a special kind of influence that accompanies nonelective anonymous responsibility.

BOLLING, who views Deschler as a second most influential man in the House, next to the Speaker, attributes this, at least partly, to the Ohioan's "encyclopedic knowledge."

"He cultivates anonymity," the Missourian writes. "He never speaks to the press for quotation. There is little written about him."

BOLLING recalls that he once cautiously raised with Rayburn the question of whose purpose Deschler might be serving inasmuch as a Republican (Longworth) appointed him and other Republicans were so frequently singing his praises.

Rayburn was silent for a moment and then, gruffly, replied: "We will not discuss it further. He is loyal to me."

Anyone who knew Mr. Sam, the strict disciplinarian, knows that that was that.

Importance of Agriculture to the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, no group seriously recommends that the Congress end all farm programs and leave the farmer to his own individual devices to cope with the chaotic market which would result. But there are people who seriously advocate that the Congress drastically curtail acreage diversion and price support programs. At this point, with American agriculture having the potential to produce far beyond any reasonable demand, we must be very careful in what we do to, and for, this important segment of our economy.

It is clear that one of the root causes of the great depression of 1929 was a persistent sickness in the economy of agriculture in the years preceding the crash. It has already been shown that a reduction of $1 in expenditures for agricultural programs results in a decline in farm income of $2. Any substantial decline in farm income must, of necessity, bring with it a decline in the buying power of the farmers.

In the past several years, the President has recommended, and the Congress has passed, legislation to cut taxes as a device to stimulate the economic growth of this country. The fact that the farmers of this country buy an important part of all the goods and services produced in America seems to me to mean that we must protect the buying power of the American farmer.

It makes anything but good sense to pass tax cuts on the one hand, and turn around and injure the economic health of one very important segment of the economy by curtailing farm programs when these programs produce so much in increased economic activity.

Resolution of Morrison, Ill., City Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have already earlier this week expressed publicly my shock and horror at the events that took place in Selma, Ala., a few days ago. Since I delivered my remarks on this subject, I have received a great many letters and communications from my constituents expressing similar feelings of disbelief that men and women should be brutally assaulted in the streets merely for attempting to exercise their constitutional rights of peaceable assembly and petition. I have been deeply touched to realize the extent to which the events that the President described 2 days ago as "an American tragedy" made a deep impact upon the minds and hearts of middle westerners. Although the Negro population in our area is comparatively small, this does not mean that we consider ourselves insulated from the shamefulness of what has taken place in the streets of one small southern town. As Americans all, we must share in the responsibility for the lack of brotherhood that has brought this to pass. Likewise, we must all now unite with the common purpose to remedy the wrongs that have been committed and to assure equal voting rights to every American citizen.

I am particularly pleased today, Mr. Speaker, to incorporate with these remarks the text of a resolution recently adopted by the City Council of Morrison, Ill., which is located within my constituency. The language of this resolution, representing as it does the sentiments of the elected representatives of the people of the city of Morrison, Ill., is an eloquent example of the sense of outrage that is felt by my fellow Illinois citizens, and their determination to wholeheartedly support corrective and remedial legislation. As their Representative to the Congress of the United States, I once again publicly pledge to them my support of this endeavor:

Whereas it is the belief of the members of this city council that:

1. We recognize the dignity and worth of all mankind without regard to race or creed.

2. And do deplore the obscene and brutal treatment by city and State officers of U.S. citizens in their efforts to be registered as voters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Morrison, Ill., That the city council does urge the Congress of the United States to speedily implement passage of legistion according to all citizens fair and equal treatment in their qualification as voters.

And upon its passage a copy of this resolution be sent to U.S. Senators EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and PAUL H. DOUGLAS and U.S. Representative JOHN ANDERSON.

Passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Morrison, Ill., and approved by the mayor thereof this 10th day of March A.D. 1965.

ANDREW BRANDS, *City Clerk.*
R. K. TRACY, *Mayor.*

"Lament for the Molly Maguires" by Arthur H. Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Wilkes-Barre Record of Tuesday, February 23, 1965, a morning newspaper in my congressional district, carried a critique by Mr. Charles A. McCarthy, a historian of Pittston, Pa., on a new book by Mr. Arthur H. Lewis, entitled "Lament for the Molly Maguires." Mr. McCarthy feels quite strongly that Mr. Lewis' book adds little, if anything, new in the way of information on the Molly Maguires and supports this position in some historic detail gleaned from vast knowledge of the entire history of the anthracite region of Pennsylvania. As part of my remarks today I would like to include the aforementioned critique which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record on February 23.

The article follows:

MCCARTHY LAMENTS "LAMENT FOR THE MOLLY MAGUIRES"

The "Lament for the Molly Maguires," a new book on individuals of anthracite mining, has drawn a lament from Charles McCarthy, Pittston historian.

McCarthy accuses the author, Arthur H. Lewis, of superficial research and says the book has little if anything, new to offer in the way of information.

McCarthy said:

"To those of us grew up in the anthracite region and heard about the Molly Maguires from the lips of our elders, this is a disappointing book. Since the mass hangings of 'Black Thursday,' June 21, 1877, which marked the doom of the Molly Maguires, perhaps a dozen books have been published on the subject, not to mention innumerable magazines and newspaper articles.

"The only excuse for the publication of a brandnew book on this controversial subject might be to introduce a substantial amount of fresh material not heretofore available to historians and other scholars. In this respect Mr. Lewis's volume fails us. There is precious little in 'Lament for the Molly Maguires' that is not already in print. His appeal is to a popular audience more interested in entertainment than in learning the truth about the Molly Maguires.

"Persons with a broad knowledge of Pennsylvania's history are appalled at Mr. Lewis's lack of research in depth, the hallmark of a true historian. An example of his sloppy research is noted in his placing Avondale between Wilkes-Barre and Scranton, when it is actually near Plymouth, south of Wilkes-Barre.

"A glaring weakness in the book is its lack of an index and bibliography. Inasmuch as the Molly Maguires are controversial, Mr. Lewis owed it to his readers to reveal the sources of his information. The only authorities he cited are those quoted in the body of the book.

"Many of the quotations are from newspapers published in the time of the Molly Maguires. In those days of primitive journalism, the margin for error was much greater than it is today when mechanical and electronic devices speed the news from source to reader with incredible accuracy.

"Nor can we overlook the bias with which the news was often dished up in that period. Not only the Molly Maguires, but even those Irish who had nothing to do with the secret society were made the target of attack by the press and by people on the streets, as Lewis points out on page 43. While the author himself seems free from personal bias, nevertheless his treatment of the subject inevitably colors his viewpoint. McParlan, the Pinkerton detective who exposed the Molly Maguires and whose testimony later helped send some to the gallows, emerges from these pages as a hero.

"Franklin B. Gowen, president of the Philadelphia & Reading, who held the whole anthracite industry in his grip in the post-Civil War era, comes out as a good guy. His real interest was in breaking up John Siney's miners' union, called the Workingmen's Benevolent Association. Chartered in 1868, the so-called WBA was destroyed after a long strike in 1875. Gowen tried in vain to tar the union with the Molly Maguire brush. Even McParlan failed to turn up a connection between organized labor and the secret society. It was Gowen who had hired the Pinkerton detective.

"One cannot condone the Molly Maguires' crimes, which were condemned by the Catholic Church. At the same time we must not overlook official crimes committed in the name of justice. Marvin W. Schlegel, Gowen's biographer, has this to say in 'Ruler of the Reading,' published at Harrisburg in 1947 (p. 290):

"'His (Gowen's) dramatic address to the jury in the Munley trial fixed the outlines of the story for posterity and forever identified him with the Molly Maguires. The romantic appeal of McParlan's adventures has kept Gowen's name alive more than anything else. Yet the Molly trials and their aftermath of the regin of the coal and iron police were among the least creditable incidents of his life. His campaign for law and order pushed justice to its furthest limits and even beyond. Jack Kehoe, however bloodstained his hands may have been, was almost certainly innocent of the crimes for which he was hanged. Tom Duffy and Jim Carroll died for a murder with which they had little to do. While Jimmy Kerrigan and Kelly the Bum suffered not at all for their notorious crimes. Kerrigan and Kelly were informers.'

"Throughout the years historians have sought to have a look at the documents bearing on the Molly Maguires which were locked up by the Reading Railroad in its Philadelphia vaults. There is no evidence in 'Lament for the Molly Maguires,' that Mr. Lewis had the opportunity or the desire to consult these documents. It may be he had never heard of them.

"Seventy years after the mass hangings, the Reading Co. opened its vaults to a small group of historians.

"'The newly discovered evidence,' stated the New York Times of December 7, 1947, 'tends to show that the "Molly Maguires" were considerably less black than painted.' The Times report bore a Philadelphia dateline.

"Every writer has his own idea as to how to proceed, but had Mr. Lewis been determined to write something more than a superficial approach to this subject and thereby prevent it from becoming known for its mediocrity, he might have made some effort to arrange meetings with recognized authorities on this specific and highly volatile period of history, or at least have scanned the works of persons who achieved eminence because of their writings in this field.

"Had Mr. Lewis wished to, he might have counseled with Wayne G. Broehl, Dartmouth professor whose book on the Molly Maguires, published by Harvard University Press, will soon be made into a movie by Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. Though he culled some lines from the series on the Molly Maguires penned by James J. Corrigan of Wilkes-Barre which commenced in Tri-District News of the United Mine Workers of America on June 8, 1951, I am certain a personal meeting with Mr. Corrigan would have been beneficial in setting guidelines for his book.

"Apparently Mr. Lewis didn't bother to read the chapter titled: 'The Detective and the Molly Maguires,' by Paul Trescott of Bloomsburg, editorial and feature writer for the Philadelphia Bulletin, which appeared in Carl Cramer's 48th volume on 'Rivers of America,' pages 305–312, labeled 'The Susquehanna.' Too, Mr. Lewis would have gained some knowledge by reading J. Walter Coleman's 'The Molly Maguire Riots,' published in Richmond in 1936. Mr. Lewis certainly erred in not contacting Maj. Owen B. Hurt of Philadelphia, former insurance commissioner in the cabinet of Governor George Earle, a widely known authority on this subject.

"But, most of all, Mr. Lewis literally missed the boat by not writing or at least devoting 3 minutes on a phone call to George G. Korson, former Wilkes-Barre Record reporter, now of Washington, D.C., a recognized world authority on the history and folklore of mining. Korson's 'Black Rock,' published in 1960 by Johns Hopkins Press, and his 'Minstrels of the Mine Patch,' now in its third printing, published by Folklore Associates of Hatboro in 1964, are among the most widely read and discussed works in this field. Both books contain well-researched chapters which are regarded as benchmarks in the history of the Molly Maguires."

GOP Talk of Other Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], recently set forth his views on the future of the Republican Party in a speech to this House. Wisconsin's largest newspaper has commented favorably on his thoughtful and forceful message. I commend it to my colleagues.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal Mar. 7, 1965]

GOP TALK OF OTHER ROADS

The call for strong opposition to "one party government," sounded last week by Representative LAIRD, Republican of Wisconsin, is being labeled as "the Republican state of the Union message."

That may be overstating the case. However, this was the strongest and best organized Republican criticism of the Johnson administration since last fall's campaign. Coming from LAIRD, a respected spokesman, it was much more than the voice of one lone Congressman wailing against the opposition.

The significance of LAIRD's remarks seems to be that the party has finally regrouped after last November's debacle and is setting about its vital task of providing effective opposition. Its elected Members in the Congress naturally will assume most of this burden and national policy will be made in Washington.

The party's principal function now, as LAIRD suggested, is to "speak of what other roads are available to the American people." Though specific alternatives were conspicuously missing from the address, Laird promised that these would be coming along soon. Considering the need of a vigorous second party in our system of government, this was a constructive statement from a responsible Republican source.

Veterans Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, after the 88th Congress had adjourned it came to my attention that Mr. Waldron E. Leonard, Director, Department of Veterans' Affairs of the District of Columbia government had made an excellent address before the Civitan Club of Washington, D.C., on November 10, 1964. Mr. Leonard's address concerns itself with the real meaning of Veterans Day. I was so favorably impressed by his remarks that I commend it to my colleagues in the Congress by hereby inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

VETERANS DAY

In our late President's words spoken in Arlington in 1961, he stated, and I quote: "In a world tormented by tension and the possibilities of conflict, we meet in a quiet commemoration of a historic day of peace in an age that threatens the survival of freedom. We join together to honor those who have made our freedom possible."

At the American Legion National Convention of September 23, 1964, a resolution was adopted unanimously that stated in part: "Veterans Day should be observed to perpetuate the memory of our veterans' sacrifices and to instill and encourage in our people, and especially our children and future leaders, a sense of loyalty and devotion to America." This resolution further recommended that all primary and secondary schools be urged to convene suitable student assemblies in observance of Veterans Day—and gentlemen, I would like to discuss with you the possibilities of carrying out these suggestions, as well as similar suggestions of other great Americans and other veterans' organizations.

As you know, the armistice came on the 11th hour, of the 11th day of the 11th month in 1918. This was a day of celebration by singing, laughing, and a ticker tape parade down the New York streets. I remember at the time the many celebrities that were in the reviewing stands as the GI's marched by and the papers referred to them being honored on this particular ticker tape parade, but Will Rogers stated that the proper way to have paid respect to these heroes would have been to permit them to sit in the stands and the celebrities of New York parade by.

As you know, on April 9, 1942, a simple designed marble monument, mined in Colorado and taken to Vermont where the rough shaping was done and fine carving completed, was placed in Arlington Cemetery commemorating the spirit of the Allies in World War I with the 12-word inscription on the side facing the amphitheater, which reads: "Here rests in honored glory the American soldier known but to God."

At the time the Unknown Soldier was buried on November 11, 1921, President Harding officiated at the ceremonies. Presidents, kings, queens, celebrities, patriotic and service organizations have placed countless wreaths at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in recognition of the sacrifices of the American serviceman.

You are familiar with the selection on October 24, 1921, by Sgt. Edward Younger, U.S. Army, of the veteran who was placed in Arlington. The World War II interment was approved June 24, 1946, and was selected from 13 unknown Americans who lost their lives while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II, the selection being made by General O'Neill of the U.S. Army, May 12, 1958, and Public Law 975, 84th Congress, approved August 3, 1956, the burial of the Unknown Soldier of the Korean conflict, who was selected by M. Sgt. Ned Lyles of the U.S. Army. On May 28, 1958, the Unknowns were taken to the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol to rest until Memorial Day, May 30, 1958. They were then removed to the Memorial Amphitheater in Arlington National Cemetery and their before distinguished guests the President awarded the Medal of Honor to each. After the religious ceremony they received a 21 gun salute and the service was concluded with the firing of three volleys and the sounding of taps. These three Unknown Soldiers, 1917–19, 1941–45, and 1950–53, became a monument to all Americans.

Until 1954, when President Eisenhower signed the act of Congress changing the name of Armistice Day to Veterans Day, the observance on November 11, was a simple salute to those millions of Americans of all wars who defended their country in time of peril. Prior to this time, you in Washington will remember after visiting Arlington on Armistice Day that the program was under the sponsorship of the veterans' organizations. The solemn significance of this tribute was such that our citizens packed the amphitheater and standing room only prevailed. At no time was there less than 100 sets of colors of religious, patriotic and veterans' organizations properly presented before the beginning of the ceremonies. Wreaths were laid representing every State in the Union by the veterans' groups and other organizations. It seemed appropriate on this occasion that in Arlington it was fitting and proper to pay our respects to those who had sacrificed their lives for our country.

The act of Congress of 1954 changing the name from Armistice Day to Veterans Day stated: "A day dedicated to world peace. It is the only day of the year in which the Nation salutes its living as well as the dead veterans."

Now, gentlemen, I yield to no one in saluting our living veterans who serve in the Armed Forces to preserve our way of life, but it seems to me the proper way to offer appreciation for their services and thanks for their patriotism is in the Halls of Congress with a sufficient appropriation for a decent standard of living for our military, as well as fair retirement pay to those who have left the service due to their age.

While it is proper that we pray for peace in Arlington on November 11 when paying tribute to those who have made the supreme sacrifice, certainly it is a veterans' memorial day, principally for the purpose of all citizens to honor our dead. I say this because I do not believe proper observance is being given on Veterans Day honoring either our military or those buried in our national cemeteries.

The veterans' organizations in the metropolitan area have tried unsuccessfully since 1954, when the law changed the title from Armistice Day to Veterans Day, to receive the cooperation of the businessmen in not using this day as an advertising campaign to get rid of a lot of their distressed merchandise, instead of paying homage to our dead and our military personnel. The occasion is used to pay tribute to some merchant who will use as a "come-on" a 99-cent typewriter or a 99-cent television. We have even attempted to have the merchants in the District of Columbia postpone opening their doors until 1 minute after 11 a.m. on November 11, or after the wreath laying ceremonies at Arlington. We have asked and are asking the newspapers to support us in the delay of the store openings until after that hour.

The veterans organizations, I feel, would also welcome the support of the civic, fraternal, and religious organizations in requesting the school boards to instruct the administrative officers that the schools be closed on this date. This should be especially significant in the metropolitan area where our largest national cemetery is located and the remains of our unknown soldiers of the three wars are buried, representing all of our unknown dead.

Now, in line with this, I would like to suggest to you gentlemen a Veterans Day program that I think is somewhat in line with the various resolutions of national veterans organizations, as far as young people's participation. I think it would be nice if we would first cooperate in requesting that the schools be closed on this date.

This is not an easy assignment because as a former school board member in Fairfax County, I found that teachers' workshop, snow days, election days, and some others are not viewed with alarm to the handicap of the children's education as when the suggestion is made that the schools be closed on Veterans Day.

I would then suggest that 300 to 500 young people, divided or in turns, from the metropolitan area be taken by bus to Arlington Cemetery to lay a chrysanthemum on each of the graves. The allied florists would cooperate in this, as well as Mr. Metzler and other officials of Arlington Cemetery. At 10:30 these young people would have reserved seats in the amphitheater for the program.

I would also suggest that instead of the military choruses from Annapolis or West Point that this portion of the program be carried out by combined choruses of perhaps five high schools. A few years ago at Mount Vernon, I arranged for such a chorus from various high schools who had practiced together to present their program on February 22. I will assure you it was very impressive.

Not only would this give an opportunity for other young groups of students to be present and understand the importance of our observing Veterans Day, but would create an interest among parents and other people to be present as well. The theme of this program could be the tribute to our honored dead, the military, Americanism, and peace.

Certainly, these are our dead whose crosses mark them from row to row and we should pause on this type of what I think is an appropriate program to murmur a prayer for those who have made this sacrifice for us.

An American Tragedy: Martyrdom in Alabama and Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, nothing that has happened in America in this century has more dramatically demonstrated the tragic consequences of bigotry and hatred than what has happened in Selma, Ala.

In this armed camp of fear and brutality, the hopes of American citizens for first-class citizenship have been crystallized.

Tonight the President of the United States will come before a joint session of this Congress to state the case for Federal laws guaranteeing every citizen, regardless of race or color, the free exercise of the voting privilege. The President comes here at the invitation of the leadership of both bodies of the Congress. He comes as a spokesman for all decent Americans, not just a few.

Although countless words have been written about the situation in Selma, Ala., and in neighboring Mississippi, few have been more impressive than the words in an editorial which appeared in the Easton, Pa., Express last Saturday, March 13.

I call the editorial to the attention of my colleagues in the hope that they, too, will find it persuasive and memorable. The complete text of the column follows:

HOW MANY MARTYRS?

The American people are losing patience with southern racism, with the tactics of repression, terrorism, and murder which are public policy in Alabama and Mississippi, and nothing more dramatically demonstrates the national temper than the meeting of more than 4,000 U.S. clergymen in Washington on Friday.

This interfaith rally was called by the Commission on Religion and Race of the National Council of Churches to express religious leadership's revulsion against the bloody and tyrannical conduct of the racists, and to articulate support for the Negro's crusade for social justice. The clergymen applauded Methodist Bishop John Wesley Lord, of Washington, when he suggested that a Presidential visit to Selma—scene of repeated police and white civilian atrocities against Negroes and rights workers—would do much to lift the repressed Negroes from their state of despair.

The clergymen, from every sector of the Nation, including the Lehigh Valley, demanded strong new measures to guarantee voting rights for Negroes in the South. Unquestionably current law is wholly inadequate. It permits racists to establish and maintain voter registration policies which preclude the possibility of any meaningful or representative political expression by the Negro population. And it does little to inhibit or punish acts of terror and violence against Negroes and white supporters seeking to implement the Negro right to vote.

It is certain, nevertheless, that forces in Congress, part of and controlled by the racist system, will mount an obstinate defense against enactment of such legislation. The filibuster's use by southern politicians is foreseen in the Senate, and, as a result of such obstructionism, the Nation may be facing another "long, hot summer" of interracial unrest.

The stupiditiy of the racially extremist forces in the South, as well as their penchant for animal brutality, was mirrored once more for all of the Nation and the world to see in the politically condoned vicious police attack on Selma marchers, including aged persons and children beaten and gassed, and in the white hoodlum murder of the Rev. James J. Reeb.

Such incidents, clearly a part of the pattern of the closed racist society of the South, rather than serving the racist ends are shocking the Nation into demands for effective new Federal laws and policies to deal with the hate forces' mutilation of people and the ideals of liberty and human dignity.

There is no question that the racists ultimately will be shorn of their power to deny the Negro his rights as an American citizen. The only question is how many more martyrs, white and black, will be made before the cause of justice and decency is served?

As We Look in African Eyes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would invite the attention of the House to two unusually interesting articles by Bruce Biossat on how the Africans think we are missing our mark in Africa. The first is titled, "The Africans Look at Our People There," and the second, "The Africans Share Our Dreams." Both are based on an extensive interview with what is described as a friendly African diplomat who purports to speak for other Africans as well.

This diplomat reports that while America's relations with that vast continent and its many countries are sincere and well motivated, we are still in many ways inept. He says that this is because we do not yet know enough about these countries, because we have what appears to them to be an air of superiority, and because we are still inclined—or so it seems to them—to take the advice of our European friends who used to have African colonies. Especially, our Government officials in the field are criticized for "lacking knowledge and experience vital to their tasks." With this, I am not in agreement. Some of the ablest and most dedicated Americans in the foreign service are stationed in Africa. But I am pleased to extend my remarks to include Mr. Biossat's articles because they bespeak a well of great good will on the part of the unidentified African who is quoted and his suggestions to us are well intentioned and thoughtful.

It has been said that as Africa goes, so goes the world. Even if this is only partially so, it behooves us to be familiar with what is being said of us on that continent, and to do what we can about it.

I commend the columnist for the Newspaper Enterprise Association for recognizing the importance of the sub-

ject and for his reporting. I commend the unidentified diplomat for being willing to speak out frankly. It is always good to hear what the other fellow thinks. Since this columnist is distributed in nearly 600 newspapers throughout the United States, many million Americans will have a chance through these two excellent articles to learn of the viewpoint of many Africans. I think my colleagues in the House, with our responsibility for keeping informed on such matters, will be doubly interested.

The article follows:

HOW AFRICA LOOKS AT OUR PEOPLE THERE

(By Bruce Biossat)

An African diplomat from a friendly nation asserts bluntly that too many American officials working among the emerging peoples of Africa come with a superiority complex yet actually lack knowledge and experience vital to their tasks.

This same diplomat scoffs, moreover, at the fears expressed here that some of the new African lands, having just shaken off colonialism, are in imminent danger of falling under the Russian or Red Chinese yoke.

The African spoke freely in a long interview only upon the assurance that he would not be identified.

This particular official's frankly personal judgments are tempered, too, with warm praise of America's motives and with the optimistic assertion that things are getting steadily better.

But he says that the average U.S. bureaucrat serving in the field is not a very competent fellow. The complaint clearly is directed both against our regular Foreign Service personnel and AID program specialists.

He argues that our people are generally too ready to decide highhandedly what specific kinds of help should be tendered, with too little grasp of real needs. We are charged with being impatient toward alternative methods and objectives.

A fundamental criticism is that we rely too heavily upon veteran oversea Europeans for our knowledge of African peoples and problems. The diplomat adds:

"If a Belgian has been in the Congo for 50 years, you accept him as knowledgable about the country. You forget that he has brought a piece of Brussels there with him."

We would do better, he suggests, to eliminate the European middleman and gather our knowledge and experience directly from the emerging Africans themselves.

He declares further that even the friendliest African nations are skeptical when the United States tells them that it is walking a tightrope between its established European allies—the colonial powers—and its tradition of lending a hand to the struggling peoples.

They do not believe that serious rupture in U.S. ties with Britain, France, Belgium, or anybody else would follow if we plunged more vigorously into assisting some of the lands only recently vacated by the colonial authorities.

And we are advised by this friendly source not to worry so much about Communist penetration of the African continent. Says this man:

"It's going to be very difficult, really impossible, for Red China or Russia to make lackeys out of the countries in Africa.

"These people have been downgraded, insulted, denied every possible respect due to men. Suddenly they have emerged. Do you think they'd trade this for money?

"No, it won't happen. The only way Africa would go Communist would be if the Communists first won America."

The clear import of this comment is that this African, for one, sees America's great defenses as a shield for Africa.

Knowing the shield is there, Africans do not fret over the reported designs of Moscow and Peiping upon their new-won freedom. Never having experienced Red tyranny firsthand, it seems unreal to them anyway in contrast to the known humiliations of Western colonial rule.

Knowledgeable Africans, it is argued, do not really bracket America with the resented colonial powers. They see a separation. But they want it more sharply defined in on-the-scene performance among them. The diplomat sums it up:

"We accept the idea that the American people are dedicated to freedom. But it is confusing to see how they serve it."

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 12, 1965]

THE AFRICANS SHARE OUR DREAMS

(By Bruce Biossat)

Many African leaders who complain about us "know how generous Americans are" and often indicate privately among themselves that there is much in American life they wish their own nations would copy.

This is the report of a friendly African diplomat here who asked not to be identified so he might speak with more than ordinary frankness about America's image in Africa. Says he:

"In a way, the great American dream hurts you in Africa. It pushes us even harder than otherwise. For this is what we want, too.

"Some Africans who represent countries that have been the most critical of the United States are highly impressed by what they see here."

This diplomat, himself critical of what he considers the "superior airs" and yet the lack of knowledge exhibited by American officials in Africa, believes the outlook for better understanding on both sides is improving all the time. He adds:

"There is already a definite turn, a great change in the last 3 or 4 years.

"You are getting to know Africans better. The people here in the top echelons are okay. But the change really hasn't filtered down yet to your bureaucrats in the field."

This African, in his candid interview, laid particular stress upon what he sees as the more understanding and cooperative attitude offered by U.S. businessmen interested in foreign investment.

"In the old days, the American businessman never ceased telling you he didn't have to do it, to make the investment. He let you think he was doing you a big favor. And he wanted everything in his own hands.

"Now he is encouraging local people in the developing countries to join him in his enterprises. Some even arrange means by which local people can take part in the financing. Men with management possibilities are searched for, and not discriminated against when they are found.

"All this," he suggests, "is mutually beneficial.

"There are a lot of bright young men in America who want to go to Africa," he adds, "and they should be encouraged to do so under arrangements that permit them to get close to the Africans themselves and avoid going through the veteran European colonialists who now are so mistrusted."

He offers this further caution: "Those who go should not, in the name of 'getting close to the African,' assume that the rural villages are the key places to work."

Though the Peace Corps is generally much admired in Africa, he says, "some Corpsmen have made this mistake in their zeal to bypass government-to-government channels."

Much help is needed in the already fairly developed African cities, where the new nations must train cadres of civil servants, health workers, agricultural specialists, and other scientists who then can go into the villages to lift the rural populations to higher levels of living.

Such considerations do not, however, diminish African appreciation of the Peace Corps or any other evidences of this country's basic generosity of spirit. The diplomat says it plainly:

"We are all well aware of your great outpouring of help, which comes from the bottom of your heart, with no ulterior motive at all."

Veterans' Administration Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter from W. J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in which he clarifies some of the pertinent questions being asked by my colleagues with reference to the closing of hospital facilities and the opening of other facilities. I feel that this letter is informative, especially to the veterans' organizations in the State of Illinois. The letter follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR
OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1965.

Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANNUNZIO: I appreciate your thoughtful inquiry concerning the plans of the Veterans' Administration to build two new hospitals in Illinois, one to replace our present hospital at Hines, and the Chicago (south side) hospital, which will be located adjacent to the University of Chicago School of Medicine. Your inquiry is particularly appreciated since I feel that all who share your concern that we continue to maintain a healthy, vigorous, and effective program of veterans medicine should know of the philosophy behind the hospital construction program currently being undertaken by the Veterans' Administration.

The essence of this philosophy can be simply stated: just as a recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court indicated that representation in State legislatures should be based not on trees or acres, but on people, the deployment of the medical resources of the Veterans' Administration should be based on its ability to aid the maximum number of sick and disabled veterans with the maximum effectiveness, and not on any extraneous considerations.

The medical program of the Veterans' Administration looms large in America's total medical effort. For example, it employs approximately 4 percent of the Nation's physicians; and 15,000 of the Nation's nurses. The Veterans' Administration is the Nation's largest single employer of a number of medically oriented or medically allied professions, including clinical and counseling psychologists, dietitians, medical and psychiatric social workers, physical therapists, and occupational therapists. It contains almost 8 percent of the Nation's hospital beds. And, it has actually spent since 1950 the sum of $1,040 million on hospital construction or renovation, and is presently engaged in an additional $645 million worth of hospital construction.

In Illinois, the Veterans' Administration hospitals at Downey and Danville have been extensively modernized. Modernization of

the Marion hospital has been authorized and is in the design stage. In the Chicago area, from a postwar beginning of one hospital, Hines, several miles removed from the medical schools, we are moving towards a situation, unparalleled in any other city in the Nation, where we will have four new, functionally efficient hospitals, located immediately adjacent to the medical schools with which they are now or will be affiliated:

Veterans' Administration Hospital (West Side), University of Illinois and Chicago Medical College; Veterans' Administration Hospital, Chicago (Research), Northwestern University; Veterans' Administration Hospital, Hines, Loyola University; Veterans' Administration Hospital, Chicago (South Side), University of Chicago.

Medical facilities and personnel are, of course, in critically short supply nationally. Therefore, any organization such as the Veterans' Administration that controls a significant proportion of such facilities and personnel bears the heavy responsibility, in fact the moral duty, of employing them to their maximum potential. Certainly, beds cannot be permitted to lie comparatively fallow in some areas, while other areas suffer from an inordinate shortage of VA hospital beds.

I believe this preamble points to the obvious reply to your letter: that the decision to close hospitals in areas where demand is not great will have absolutely no adverse effect on new hospitals planned for Illinois, and this most definitely includes construction at the Chicago (South Side) and Hines hospitals, which will go forward at optimum speed. In fact, since the VA operates within a ceiling of 125,000 beds, the closing of marginal hospitals will simply permit us to transfer capacity to areas which have insufficient beds.

Finally, I hope that you will feel free at any time to inquire about the progress of the VA medical program in Illinois or on other matters affecting your constituents.

Sincerely,

W. J. DRIVER, *Administrator.*

Reader's Digest Publishers Receive Freedom Foundation Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, early last week at Valley Forge, one great American institution honored another. The Freedoms Foundation annual George Washington award was presented to the publishers and editors of the Reader's Digest, Mr. and Mrs. DeWitt Wallace.

The Freedoms Foundation for 16 years has been making annual awards to those organizations, schools, and individuals who have made contributions toward a better understanding and a greater appreciation of the American way of life.

The enormous popularity of the Reader's Digest, measured by the most indicative yardstick, is sufficient testimony to this publication's acceptance and impact.

In an era when to criticize and lambast the American traditions and ideals seems to be the fashion, I am comforted in the knowledge that at least one widely read periodical is still carrying the banner of free enterprise and individual liberties.

The George Washington award citation to the Wallaces follows:

For epitomizing responsible citizenship, for excellence in civic affairs, for aggressive leadership in the propagation of American fundamentals during more than a quarter of a century of outstanding service to God and country through the domestic and foreign editions of Reader's Digest, Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge salutes these exemplars of steadfast faith in free enterprise who have built, from small beginnings to international leadership, a mighty enterprise invaluable in the continuing fight for freedom and dignity of every individual.

Professor Supports President in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, some of the paid advertisements in a few of our newspapers give the impression that the academic community is highly critical of President Johnson's Vietnam policy. It is interesting to note that the professional qualifications listed in some of these paid advertisements include "psychology," "microbiology," "chemistry," and the like. But the American people should note that such paid advertisements hardly represent the majority of the academic community. This is especially true of university professors in the field of international relations.

Yesterday Prof. James A. Atkinson, of Georgetown University, a well-known analyst of military and foreign affairs, appeared on "Georgetown University Forum" in support of President Lyndon B. Johnson's foreign policy in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that a vast majority of the professors and ministers of the Gospel are supporting the President in Vietnam despite recent paid advertisements to the contrary. Incidentally, one advertisement alone in the New York Times, signed by a group of professors advocating withdrawal from South Vietnam, cost in the neighborhood of $10,000. It might be proper to ask who is supplying these fantastic sums of money advocating a policy of appeasement and retreat?

Mr. Speaker, recently Dr. Atkinson wrote a brilliant defense of President Johnson's Vietnam policy. Writing in the Washington Report of the American Security Council, Professor Atkinson pointed out that the President's wise and firm policy was based on the clear lesson that our own security as a nation is intimately related to the peace of Asia. President Johnson's position is that America dare not ignore the commitment that three Presidents have made to support our friends against Communist aggression. In doing this, says Atkinson, the President is supplying the kind of vigorous leadership for a firm policy in Vietnam today which is the best guarantee of avoiding a general war tomorrow.

Faith in American Teenagers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, the teenager of America has been pictured as irresponsible, reckless, and wild. Unfortunately, the few who deserve this description frequently overshadow the majority of our young people who are, in a quiet way, striving to live equitably in the world which surrounds them. I have great faith in our young people and I am always pleased when an opportunity arises which allows me to restate this faith and to share it with others.

Such an opportunity has just been brought to my attention by Mr. Allen J. Dennis, foreman of the Bibb County grand jury, who lives in Macon, Ga.

The interschool student council, an organization composed of representatives from the Macon, Bibb County, public high schools, has adopted a resolution opposing the availability of vulgar and obscene publications on newsstands and in the stores of Macon.

That these young people are striving to constructively mold their environment proves that they are willing and eager to assume responsibility. They go further than merely accepting responsibility; they seek to lead others by recommending "to each student council of Bibb County high schools that they instigate a campaign urging students of their schools boycott all such publications—salicious literature—and request newsdealers to remove these publications from their shelves."

The members of the Inter-School Student Council of Bibb County are to be commended for the stand they have taken. Their action is the result of careful and conscientious consideration and, I believe, deserves, in turn, the attention of us adults whose duty it must be to lend them support.

I herewith submit the letter Mr. Allen J. Dennis wrote to me, Mr. Dennis' letter of congratulations to the council, and the resolution of the Inter-School Student Council of Bibb County:

MARCH 2, 1965.

Hon. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLYNT: Because I think it is noteworthy and will be of interest to you, I am enclosing a copy of a resolution adopted by the Inter-School Student Council, an organization composed of representatives from the Macon, Bibb County, public high schools, concerning salacious literature. This resolution came to the attention of the Bibb County Grand Jury in their meeting today. As foreman of the grand jury, I wrote a letter to the president of the Inter-School Student Council to compliment them on the stand they had taken and I am attaching copy of this letter also.

If you agree that this is a noteworthy and commendable stand these youngsters have taken, you may want to have it carried in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN J. DENNIS.

MARCH 2, 1965.

Mr. STEVE JOHNSON,
President, Inter-School Student Council,
Macon, Ga.

DEAR STEVE: This morning at the meeting of the grand jury of Bibb County reference was made to the resolution adopted by the student council concerning the increasing availability of vulgar and obscene publications on the newsstands and in the stores of Macon.

As foreman of the grand jury, I want to compliment and congratulate the student council on the stand they have taken.

It will be of interest to you to know that the grand jury has a committee on subversive activities, pornography, and obscene literature. It may be that the chairman or a member of the committee will want to discuss this with you in more detail for it is an area of much concern to the grand jury.

As a result of high court rulings, very little can be expected now through legal action. It is an area that was formerly influenced by legal discipline but no longer is this the case. Henceforth, it must be controlled by individual moral discipline, religious influence, and an atmosphere or climate or community conscience that is rather loosely referred to as public opinion.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN J. DENNIS,
Forman, Bibb County Grand Jury.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY INTERSCHOOL STUDENT COUNCIL OF MACON, BIBB COUNTY, GA.

Whereas the members of the interschool student council of Bibb County are deeply concerned with the increasing availability of vulgar and obscene publications on newstands and in the stores of Macon; and

Whereas the interschool student council believes that such publications create an atmosphere in the community that is not conducive to clean living; and

Whereas the interschool student council feels that such publications have a demoralizing effect on the youth of Macon; and

Whereas the interschool student council believes that such publications contribute to delinquency in Macon; and

Whereas the interschool student council feels that Macon youth need to be encouraged in and guided to high ideals; Therefore be it

Resolved, That interschool student council of Bibb County does hereby recommend to each student council of Bibb County high schools that they instigate a campaign urging students of their schools boycott all such publications and request local newsdealers to remove these publications from their shelves.

Backing Given to U.S. Position in Vietnam War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is the last in a series of 14 articles and 2 side columns written by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, chief of the Washington bureau of the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., in which he has reported on his recent trip to South Vietnam and to Hong Kong.

I have commended this series to my colleagues as a firsthand report of an able and experienced newspaperman who talked to many people in Asia, and who also participated in various war missions conducted by United States and South Vietnam forces.

His observations should be carefully noted by those in Congress and elsewhere who are wondering about the effectiveness of our policies there, and whether or not there is a chance of winning this conflict.

Mr. Warren is a former president of the National Press Club of Washington, and has been a Washington correspondent for the past 20 years.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his column which appeared in the Courier-Express on March 5, 1965:

IN WASHINGTON: BACKING GIVEN TO U.S. POSITION IN VIETNAM WAR

(By Lucian C. Warren)

WASHINGTON.—The series of stories this correspondent wrote in Vietnam concludes Saturday. They were written on the scene in Vietnam and airmailed to Buffalo. Meanwhile, we have returned to Washington before completion of the series. We have had a chance to see and hear various viewpoints about the war, this time, from the homefront. It is to these viewpoints we address ourselves now.

DIFFERENCE

There is considerable difference of opinion at home, much more so than among the Americans serving in Vietnam, about the advisability of continuing the war there and of negotiating with the Communists for a settlement.

Certain columnists, led by Drew Pearson and Walter Lippmann, and certain newspapers, led by the New York Times and the St. Louis Post Dispatch, appear to think it is evil to continue the war there and that negotiations with the Communists are highly overdue.

On Capitol Hill, there are also influential voices raised in doubt over the U.S. course in Vietnam, Senators WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, and GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, are among those who have denounced present policy there.

TREND

While there are varying shades of opinion, we would like to summarize the main trends, along with our own comments, in defense—in the main—of the U.S. conduct of the war and its refusal thus far to enter into negotiations.

These opinions were formed without pressure from the U.S. Government and with the benefit of some 2 weeks of on-the-scene observations in the wide Vietnamese warfront.

Our summary follows:

Thesis

The Vietcong are ruthless and dedicated warriors who are winning the guerrilla war, while the South Vietnamese are ineffective soldiers, operating under poor military advice from the United States.

Comment

Not so. While some of the Vietcong are dedicated and ruthless and good at guerrilla warfare, this is not the universal truth.

For instance, many at the front said the Vietcong were poor shots and the State Department's recent White Paper cited the many Vietcong defections.

Conversely, there are many examples of brave and able military actions by the South Vietnamese. The United States is amassing experience in fighting guerrilla-style and it has total air and naval superiority.

RATIO

On the ground, the ratio of Vietcong killed to the freedom forces is still in the nature of 3 to 1 in our favor.

The war has not yet been won, but it is far from being lost and on balance this correspondent believes we have the edge, a condition which should improve in the months to come—especially with restrictions being removed on bombing raids into North Vietnam.

Thesis

The United States is conducting its war on a unilateral basis, whereas it would be better if the United Nations were brought into the struggle, as it was in Korea.

Comment

This would be fine—but there is no chance for another Korea-type war being waged by the U.N.

That conflict was allowed only because the Soviet Union, to its later sorrow, had boycotted the Security Council at the time. The peacekeeping operations of the U.N. in the Congo and elsewhere have been less than successful. Considering the present state of relations between the Communists and free world and the disagreement over the Vietnamese situation, U.N. effective action is impossible.

As to the unilateral charge, the United States is in Vietnam with the approval of certain other nations in southeast Asia and elsewhere.

Thesis

Increasing boldness by the U.S. units, bombing missions, and its positive refusal to negotiate may escalate the war.

Comment

Possible, but not probable.

President John F. Kennedy's firm stand on Soviet missiles in Cuba did not lead to war there, nor did the earlier firmness of a previous administration in defying the Berlin blockade with an airlift.

The Korean resistance did escalate that war in the sense that it brought Red Chinese troops into the battle. However, it is considered unlikely the Soviet Union will risk nuclear war over a southeast Asia conflict, and Hanoi is said not to want the Chinese troops in their territory for fear they would never leave.

In any event, certain risks must be taken in an effort to have to stop Communist expansion in Asia, rather than have to fight eventually in Manila, Hawaii, and perhaps even the Western Hemisphere.

SUMMARY

It is this correspondent's personal opinion that the U.S. conduct of the war in South Vietnam is proper and effective and that, at this time, talks would only damage our just cause there.

What Selma Is All About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the New York Sunday Times of March 14 a dispatch by Mr. Guy Talese entitled "Selma: Bitter City in the Eye of a Storm." In describing the attitudes of the city's white community, Mr. Talese quotes an unidentified salesclerk as asking: "What do those niggers want?" For the benefit of that salesclerk, and all who share her puzzlement, I submit the following article which appeared in the New York Sunday Times Magazine of the same date. It is entitled "Civil Right No. 1—The Right To Vote." The author is Mar-

tin Luther King, Jr. If ever it can truly be said that any writing speaks for itself, this does.

Dr. King's article follows:

CIVIL RIGHT NO. 1—THE RIGHT TO VOTE

(By Martin Luther King, Jr.)

Few people in America realize the seriousness of the burden imposed upon our democracy by the disfranchisement of Negroes in the Deep South. In Mississippi only about 26,000 out of a voting-age population of some 450,000 Negroes have been allowed to register. The situation in Alabama and Louisiana is almost as bad, though previous State administrations of a more liberal inclination did permit the registration of approximately 150,000 Negro voters in Louisiana and 111,000 in Alabama. In recent years, however, under Wallace in Alabama and former Gov. Jimmy Davis, of Louisiana, the plan has been to freeze Negro registration at a level which can be successfully negated by sure segregationist voting strength.

This has led to a crisis not only for the Negro in the South but for Negroes in the swollen ghettos of the North. Northern cities are inheriting the results of northern indifference to southern racism and exploitation as the victims of oppression migrate there in search of freedom. If they had had the ballot, Negroes might have had a chance to lead a decent life in their southern homelands, where many owned small plots of land and participated in a stable pattern of community life that at least promised survival and a minimum of emotional security. This is more than is promised by the slums of New York, Chicago, and other cities, which are already teeming with bitterness and constantly kept at boiling point by the misery of rats, filth, unemployment, and de facto segregation.

But the evils of disfranchisement burden our cities in other ways as well as by mass migration. Southern seniority in Congress, resting as it does on the "whites only" ballot box, maintains power in the hands of our Nation's most reactionary politicians. Bills providing for the welfare of our Nation, from medicare to education, must run the gantlet of southern power before they are enacted—and many never are.

Voting as a badge of full citizenship has always had a special meaning to the Negro, but in 1965 the denial of the right to vote cuts painfully and deeply into his new sense of personal dignity. It is salt on his wounded pride. For today he looks beyond the borders of his own land and sees the decolonization and liberation of Africa and Asia; he sees colored peoples, yellow, black, and brown, ruling over their own new nations. He sees colored statesmen voting on vital issues of war and peace at the United Nations at a time when he is not even permitted to vote for the office of sheriff in his local county.

In 1964, however, the Negro voter participated as a significant partner in a ballot landslide that repudiated a Republican Party which had allowed itself to be captured by racism and reaction. He was the key to the Democratic victory in several Southern States, and he thereby proved that voting is more than a badge of citizenship and dignity—it is an effective tool for change.

Voting is the foundation stone for political action. With it the Negro can eventually vote out of office public officials who bar the doorway to decent housing, public safety, jobs, and decent integrated education. It is now obvious that the basic elements so vital to Negro advancement can only be achieved by seeking redress from government at local, State, and Federal levels. To do this the vote is essential.

When the full power of the ballot is available to my people, it will not be exercised merely to advance our cause alone. We have learned in the course of our freedom struggle that the needs of 20 million Negroes are not truly separable from those of the nearly 200 million whites and Negroes in America, all of whom will benefit from a colorblind land of plenty that provides for the nourishment of each man's body, mind, and spirit. Our vote would place in Congress true representatives of the people who would legislate for the medicare, housing, schools, and jobs required by all men of any color.

In Selma, Ala., thousands of Negroes are courageously providing dramatic witness to the evil forces that bar our way to the all-important ballot box. They are laying bare for all the Nation to see, for all the world to know, the nature of segregationist resistance. The ugly pattern of denial flourishes with insignificant differences in thousands of Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and other southern communities. Once it is exposed, and challenged by the marching feet of Negro citizens, the Nation will take action to cure this cancerous sore. What is malignant in Selma must be removed by congressional surgery so that all citizens may freely exercise their right to vote without delays, harassment, economic intimidation, and police brutality. Selma is to 1965 what Birmingham was to 1963.

The pattern of denial depends upon four main roadblocks. First, there is the Gestapo-like control of county and local government in the South by the likes of Sheriff Jim Clark of Selma, Ala., and Sheriff Rainey of Philadelphia, Miss. There is a carefully cultivated mystique behind the power and brutality of these men. The gun, the club, and the cattle prod reinforce the fear that is the main barrier to voting—a barrier erected by 345 years' exposure to the psychology and brutality of slavery and legal segregation. It is a fear rooted in feelings of inferiority.

But the fear is also real, as the broken bodies and bloody heads of citizens in Selma and Marion bear witness. And the snakes placed on people standing in line were not hallucinations, as hundreds, including the press, can testify. Nor was it a sick imagination that conjured up the vision of a public official, sworn to uphold the law, who forced an inhuman march upon hundreds of Negro children; who ordered the Reverend James Bevel to be chained to his sickbed; who clubbed a Negro woman registrant, and who callously inflicted repeated brutalities and indignities upon nonviolent Negroes peacefully petitioning for their constitutional right to vote.

Would a fiction writer have the temerity to invent a character wearing a sheriff's badge at the head of a helmeted posse who punched a clergyman in the mouth and then proudly boasted: "If I hit him, I don't know it. One of the first things I ever learned was not to hit a nigger with your fist because his head is too hard. Of course, the camera might make me out to be a liar. I do have a sore finger"?

Yet such a man actually exists in Sheriff Clark. He was voted into office in Dallas County by an electorate that includes only 335 out of 15,000 Negroes of voting age. In contrast, out of 14,400 whites of voting age, 9,543 have been registered. So far, 3,400 Negroes have been arrested in Selma, placing 10 times as many in Selma jails as are on the voters' roll.

The second factor in the pattern of Negro disfranchisement is the abuse of local and State laws to impede the exercise of suffrage rights. Southern officials, knowing they cannot jail citizens for seeking the right to vote, instead claim that Negroes are guilty of other offenses. In Selma, for instance, more than 3,000 arrests have been made on such charges as "breach of peace," "contempt of court," "disorderly conduct," "unlawful assembly," "contributing to the delinquency of minors," and "criminal provocation."

Aside from the obvious intimidation involved in arrest and jail, 3,000 Negro citizens now face years of expensive and frustrating litigation before these charges are defeated and their right to vote vindicated.

After so many years of intimidation, the Negro community has learned that its salvation lies in united action. When one Negro stands up, he is run out of town. But when a thousand stand up together the situation is drastically altered. Abuse of the law by local police power is expressly designed to frustrate such united action, and so long as these mass arrests are made on trumped-up charges the path to the registrar's office is obstructed.

The third factor in abridging Negro voting rights is the registrar himself, administering complex registration procedures designed specifically to slow up and frustrate Negro applicants. As Burke Marshall, former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division, has pointed out:

"The Negro voting problem * * * is more than a legal issue. For it takes courage, patience and massive effort before a significant number of Negro residents are ready to break the pattern of their lives by attempting to register to vote, and when the effort is unsuccessful because of discrimination, delay, intimidation or of the failure of Negro applicants themselves, the promised Federal rights again become illusory."

Where the will to keep Negro registration to a minimum is strong, Mr. Marshall said, "The latitude for discrimination is almost endless. The delaying practices that can be used are virtually infinite."

Using them, the white hierarchy of Selma has succeeded in limiting Negro registration to the snail's pace of about 145 persons a year. At this rate it would take about 103 years to register the 15,000 eligible Negro voters of Dallas County—not counting those who will reach voting age in that period or who may move into the county. A weapon for delay is the decision to open the registration office on only 2 days per month. Long lines of Negroes have waited without success merely to enter the office to apply for registration.

After 13 private and Government lawsuits were instituted, however, minimal corrective measures were ordered by Judge Daniel H. Thomas of the Federal District Court of Mobile. Although he found a "pattern of discrimination," he refused to order the registrar's office to open more frequently. Instead, he set up a new procedure containing many of the same seeds of discouragement and frustration. Negroes seeking to register may sign up on a public appearance sheet, and a Federal voting referee has now been appointed to process the applications. In the meantime every Negro who has signed the appearance sheet must be ready to endure an ordeal by economic retaliation and personal intimidation perfected by racists over many decades.

It is a shining tribute to Negro determination, therefore, that despite this harassment, including being made to wait in the pouring rain, 266 persons—most of them Negroes—completed their registration applications in Selma on March 1, an alltime record for the county.

But it must also be said that the concept of a Federal referee appointed by the court looks good only on the surface.

We happen to know something, for instance, about the referee appointed for adjacent Perry County. He has just about as discriminatory a record as the county-appointed registrar and we are already contesting his pattern of misconduct. He is a native of Greene County, which is also in the "black belt" and has as bitter a heritage of segregation as Perry and Dallas Counties, with even fewer Negroes registered.

Moreover, the appointment of a voting referee provides no assurance of speedy processing for the thousands of applications that will flood his office. The act of 1960 that permitted the courts to appoint referees al-

lows for a legal challenge to each person registered by the referee and thus offers ample opportunities for delay, which is the key to southern tactics.

Delays feed the dangers that beset Negroes. Every day means more murder and brutality, more suffering from inferior education, more dreary hours in the long night of economic exploitation and more of the deadly despair brought on by personal humiliation.

The whole program of delay can be appreciated if one recognizes that the white community is almost 100 percent registered and eligible to vote, whereas Negro voters are added almost one by one to the voters' roll. If it takes a century more to redeem the 15th amendment's promise, the white southern official could not care less.

The fourth roadblock on the way to Negro suffrage is the literacy test, administered by the registrars and designed to be difficult. The Justice Department has been able to establish in hundreds of counties that these tests are not administered fairly. There are many instances of "fair-skinned" Negroes and white persons being helped to register, while in Selma ministers and teachers have been rejected six and seven times. (An interesting sidelight on this is that Selma's deputy registrar handed out 20 or more vouchers for prospective voters on which the word was spelled "vocher.") Although a Federal court has now ordered Selma to scrap a most technical and difficult literacy test, the order applies only to Selma, so that the legal battle will have to be waged county by county. Again, time is the enemy operating on the side of the "white only" ballot box.

It is surely ironical that the States which have labored so diligently to keep the Negro masses ignorant through inferior segregated education now require literacy as a prerequisite for voting. You hardly need much formal training to know who as sheriff will treat you like a human being and who will crack your skull.

The deliberate nature of our legal process is being abused. Legal redress for Negroes entails expensive court actions whose victories are the signal not for the capitulation of segregationists but rather for further bouts with new delaying tactics. Even the recent action of the Attorney General in Alabama to strike at statewide measures, while welcome, cannot bring redress here and now. The delays inherent in test cases, where the U.S. Supreme Court must ultimately rule, make sadly pertinent the comment of Chief Justice Earl Warren in the school desegregation cases: "Justice delayed is justice denied."

Clearly, the heart of the voting problem lies in the fact that the machinery for enforcing this basic right is in the hands of State-appointed officials answerable to the very people who believe they can continue to wield power in the South only so long as the Negro is disfranchised. No matter how many loopholes are plugged, no matter how many irregularities are exposed, it is plain that the Federal Government must withdraw this control from the States or else set up machinery for policing it effectively.

The patchwork reforms brought about by the laws of 1957, 1960, and 1964 have helped, but the denial of suffrage has gone on too long, has caused too deep a hurt for Negroes to wait out the time required by slow, piecemeal enforcement procedures. What is needed is the new voting-rights legislation promised for this session of Congress.

As I told our people in Dallas County 2 weeks ago, "We are going to bring a voting bill into being in the streets of Selma. President Johnson has a mandate from the American people. He must go out and get a voting bill this time that will end the necessity for any more voting bills."

Certainly, no community in the history of the Negro struggle has responded with the enthusiasm of Selma and her neighboring town of Marion, Ala. Where Birmingham depended largely upon students and unemployed adults, Selma has involved fully 40 percent of the Negro population in active demonstrations, and at least half of the Negro population of Marion was arrested on one day.

Seldom has there been so complete a representation of every facet of community life. Teachers and students, clergy and laity—all joined the long march of freedom. This is significant because it means that, once the demonstrations are over, a united political organization will be left in being to direct the drive for votes and other rights. This could well be the pattern of the future, for it is plain that the 1964 Civil Rights Act has given new confidence to the nonviolent movement.

But it is also clear that the voting sections of the existing act are inadequate, as I have stressed in my recent meetings with President Johnson. I urge Congress to enact a voting-rights bill including these basic principles:

1. Registration machinery so automatic that it eliminates varying standards and undue discretion on the part of the hostile State registrars, and requires only elementary biographical details from applicants. This was recommended by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission after it completed its studies in Alabama, Louisiana, and the black belt.

2. The abolition of literacy tests in those areas where Negroes have been disadvantaged by generations of inferior, segregated education.

3. Application of the law to all elections, Federal and State, and especially to local elections for sheriff, school boards, etc.

4. Enforcement of the law by Federal registrars appointed by and responsible to the President.

5. Such legislation, while directed against oppressive areas like Selma, must be verastile enough to overcome more sophisticated resistance in cities like New Orleans, Chicago, New York, or Miami.

One of the difficult lessons we have learned is that you cannot depend upon American institutions to function without pressure. Any real change in the status quo depends on continued creative action to sharpen the conscience of the Nation and establish a climate in which even the most recalcitrant elements are forced to admit that change is necessary.

To this end, we are committed to keep up the pressure for the adoption of a civil rights act of 1965. We know that Americans of goodwill have learned that no nation can long continue to flourish or to find its way to a better society while it allows any one of its citizens, let alone vast numbers in 11 Southern States, to be denied the right to participate in the most fundamental of all privileges of democracy—the right to vote.

At a time when the Supreme Court has said that the law of the land demands "one man, one vote," so that all State legislatures may be democratically structured, it would be a mockery indeed if this were not followed without delay by an insistence upon "one vote for every man."

Religious Freedom in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 10 here in Washington, D.C., one of America's most distinguished women, Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, was presented with the 1965 National Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Mrs. Meyer is the chairman of the national committee for the support of the public schools and is the widow of Eugene Meyer, who was chairman of the board of the Washington Post.

The presentation was made by Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz. A tribute to Mrs. Meyer was given by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson.

Mrs. Meyer was honored "for her numerous contributions to the Nation and to all communities in which she has lived," and for her work in the fields of arts and letters, education, recreation, housing, and medical care and her efforts in behalf of young people.

Mrs. Meyer's remarks on the occasion of the award, a lucid and penetrating review of the historical and ethical foundations of religious freedom in the United States, are reprinted herewith:

A CALL FOR LAW AND ORDER

(By Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer)

I realize how difficult it is when one foreign crisis succeeds another to devote our attention to even the most acute domestic questions. And yet the Great Society which we want to build deserves our attention, if only so that we may be strong enough to carry out our heavy international commitments.

If I have any criticism to make of your various efforts to achieve better mutual understanding between religious and racial groups, it is a feeling that you are not sufficiently involved in the acute, bitter, and irrational conflicts of our chaotic society. I am thinking only of such conflicts which concern you directly; namely, those which involve the preservation of the freedom of religion. For I see in the vicious criticisms of the Supreme Court for its recent decisions keeping prayers and Bible reading out of our public school system not so much a threat to the Court as to religion itself.

No freedom is more precious than religious freedom; so also no work of the Supreme Court is nobler than its concern that though there shall be no establishment of religion, there must be free exercise of religion.

I accepted the great honor you have done me, because I am convinced that the greatest single service your interfaith organization can render the Nation today is to educate the mind and conscience of our Nation as to the importance of the decisions which the Supreme Court has made for the past 20 years or more on the separation of church and state. The National Conference of Christians and Jews can play an educational role of lasting value by doing even more to explain and publicize the Court decisions. Moreover, yours is so respected a nationwide organization that you could be more effective than any other voluntary group in seeing to it that these Court decisions are obeyed throughout the land.

There is one major reason why the Court has been attacked with such frenzy and bigotry for its decisions to keep the clergy out of our public schools and to forbid religious ceremonies in the classrooms.

The attacks reflect the insecurity of life today; they are manifestations of deep-seated fears. This is understandable when even strong, well-integrated personalities are disturbed not only by the threat of Communist aggression but by the social revolution that is daily transforming our life here at home. As the average individual looks about for some kind of moral support he clings to religion, frequently of a very superficial nature; indeed, many Americans behave as if God were an America firster who is sure to protect His chosen people if only

we invoke His name often enough, preferably in public. The tendency of Americans to see religion in this primitive and practical manner is by no means a new manifestation. Bryce, the historian, said long ago. "They [the Americans] deem the general acceptance of Christianity to be one main source of their national prosperity, and their nation as a special object of the Divine favor."

People who have such a naive concept of religion take out their emotional response to the recent prayer and Bible reading decisions of the Supreme Court by shouting that the Court has become atheistic, by throwing things at the Chief Justice, or by introducing in the Congress a constitutional amendment permitting prayers and Bible reading in the public schools. But whether these people are just crackpots or honorable Senators, their violent reactions are due primarily to the fact that they do not know the long history of separation of church and state nor its significance to the freedom of religion and the unity of a country with many creeds, races, and languages. Moreover, most of these vociferious enemies of the Court have not even read its decisions on the meaning of the first amendment which have been handed down for the past 25 years—nor can they have studied the last notable judicial pronouncements in the Murray Schempp case on school prayer and Bible reading.

This is the great difficulty which the Supreme Court confronts in this emotional and irrational era, that the majority of Americans respond to its historical and lucid explanations of the importance and signficance of the first amendment without having studied its pronouncements. They react like the fellow who said, "Don't give me any facts. I've made up my mind." And at that point, precisely, the National Conference of Christians and Jews is presented with a solemn responsibility if you are seriously interested in furthering the stability of our social structure and mutual understanding between our numerous religious sects. If more thinking people merely read the opinion of the Court in the Murray-Schempp case as rendered by Mr. Justice Clark, a Presbyterian, and the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Brennan, a Catholic, much of the careless abuse heaped upon our highest court would disappear. To be sure, a short summary of these decisions appeared in the press the day after they were handed down—just enough information to arouse the ire of our religious fanatics but not sufficient to educate the rational people on the important contributions the Court is making to the welfare of our Nation.

I suggest concentrating your efforts on publicizing these two decisions because that of Mr. Justice Clark gives a history of the first amendment beginning with its roots in our colonial era when Roger Williams fought for religious liberty and the revolutionary era when the great words of Madison and Jefferson came to be incorporated not only in the Federal Constitution but subsequently in most of our State constitutions. Thereafter Justice Clark outlines the principal decisions on the subject for the past hundred years quoting paragraphs from many of the most salient decisions made by distinguished members of the Court in the past. Set in that illuminating and persuasive background, his final argument cannot be resisted when he concludes concerning Bible reading in the schools: "In the light of the history of the first amendment and of our cases interpreting and applying its requirements, we hold that the practices at issue and the laws requiring them are unconstitutional."

Very important in the Clark opinion was the fact that the Justice, speaking for the Court, said: "This Court has rejected unequivocally the contention that the establishment clause forbids only governmental preference of one religion over another." In support of this contention Justice Clark quotes Justice Jackson and accepts the historical interpretation of the meaning of religious establishment laid down by the late great Justice Rutledge in his dissenting opinion in the Everson bus case. Justice Rutledge, with the approval of Justices Frankfurter, Jackson, and Burton, firmly rejected the view, which previously had been gaining headway, that the first amendment was designed only to prevent the establishment of a single church but not to prevent tax support to religion if all churches were treated alike.

In the words of Justice Rutledge: "The first amendment's purpose was * * * to create a complete and permanent separation of the sphere of religious activity and civil authority by comprehensively forbidding every form of public aid or support for religion." This quotation asumes a new dignity now that it has been given the approval of the whole Court.

Mr. Justice Brennan in his concurring decision supplements the historical approach of Justice Clark in many important ways. He meets tactfully the argument whether the architects of the first amendment understood the prohibition against "any law respecting an establishment of religion" to teach devotional exercises in the public schools. Instead of getting embroield in the question of what Madison and Jefferson had in mind, he states, "A more fruitful inquiry is whether the practices (Bible reading and prayers) here challenged threaten those consequences which the Framers deeply feared, whether in short they tend to promote that type of interdependence between religion and state which the first amendment was designed to prevent." "Our task," he says, "is to translate the majestic generalities of the Bill of Rights, conceived as part of the pattern of liberal government in the 18th century, into concrete restraints on officials dealing with the problems of the 20th century."

Justice Brennan carefully analyzes the great changes which have taken place in our public schools and the diverse religious composition of the country. In the face of such profound changes, practices which may have been objectionable to no one in the time of Madison and Jefferson, he says, may today be highly offensive to many persons, the deeply devout and the nonbelievables alike. In the Justice's words, "Our use of the history of their times must limit itself to broad purposes not specific practices."

Then he defines the meaning of the public schools as a unique public function which all Americans cherish:

"The training of American citizens in an atmosphere free of parochial, divisive, or separatist influences of any sort—an atmosphere in which children may assimilate a heritage common to all American groups and religions. This is a heritage neither theistic nor atheistic but simply civic and patriotic."

These are noble words, my friends, and it makes me especially happy that they were pronounced by a Catholic jurist.

After a brilliant analysis of every aspect of the controversy over religion in the public schools, Justice Brennan points out: "Thus the basic principle upon which our decision last year in *Engel* v. *Vitale* (the New York regents prayer) necessarily rested and which we reaffirm today, can hardly be thought to be novel or radical." And finally after a careful review of opposing arguments, Justice Brennan reiterates arguments that the principles the Court affirms in the Murray Schempp decision are neither novel nor radical. "They are in truth," he says, "as old as the Republic itself."

The two major opinions by Justices Clark and Brennan taken together are a masterly and comprehensive review of the whole problem as to why church and state must be kept apart by a "wall of separation." They are indeed statesmanlike utterances of the first magnitude with which all Americans interested in the national welfare should be acquainted.

I feel justified in asking the National Conference of Christians and Jews to give widespread publicity to these historical documents because they are as truly a protection of religious liberty as they are a protection of the state from religious domination. Mr. Justice Brennan makes very clear, "What the Court has consistently sought to expound are the religious guarantees of the first amendment.". Thus an interfaith group such as yours should have a primary interest in making this clear to your coreligionists and to the American people as a whole.

Then this all-prevailing ignorant, rabble-rousing nonsense that we have a godless "atheistic" Supreme Court would cease. That in itself seems to me a matter of grave importance for it is antisocial propaganda of a dangerous nature. Every citizen has the right to criticize the Government, including the courts, if it is done on a rational basis. But in these hysterical attacks upon our highest Court, religious leaders should bear in mind that disrespect for the law leads to anarchy.

We must also face the fact that opposition to the orders of the Court will continue although its mandate to keep religion out of the public schools has been reinforced by many State supreme court decisions to the same effect, the latest very notable case being that of the Florida court which is very similar to the Murray Schempp case. Obviously the decisions of the Supreme Court and the State courts will not implement themselves. Widespread hostile reactions have occurred in certain sections of our country even from high officials. They will have to be reminded that they have taken an oath of office to uphold the Constitution and that the Supreme Court has spoken and ordered genuine neutrality in respect to religion in every American public school throughout the land. Who can do this more legitimately than an interfaith group such as yours?

Since the National Conference of Christions and Jews is a nationwide organization it can render an immense service to law and order if your local members are willing to confront any offending school board with the printed ruling of the Court.

There are also powerful rightwing organizations whose evil machinations you will have to oppose. The Supreme Court has often been criticized before but always on a high plane. It has remained for our violent era to produce so scurrilous a campaign as the billboards of the Birchites denouncing the Chief Justice and calling for his impeachment. Such behavior is unworthy of Americans, a disgrace to our whole nation. Since the Court has no police power to defend itself it must rely on public opinion, on the positive action of self-respecting citizens who will not tolerate attacks which, though they cannot hurt the Court, do irreparable damage to the quality of American thought and life. We have been boasting of late of our cultural progress. A nation which tolerates these benighted manifestations reveals that it is not even civilized much less cultured. It is for you to raise the high wind of public indignation which will blow these disgraceful billboards off the Nation's landscape.

Not as vicious but equally insidious is the influence of many honest but thoughtless citizens who say, "What's the fuss all about? It can't hurt the children to say prayers in the public schools, and it might do some good. And after all they don't have to pray if they don't want to."

To this superficiality of thinking you need only quote the Court which here as so often relies heavily on Madison's bill of remonstrance, "It is no defense to urge that the religious practices may be relatively minor encroachments on the first amendment." The breach of neutrality that is today a

trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent and, in the words of Madison, "It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties."

There, my friends, lies the great opportunity of the National Conference of Christians and Jews—to elucidate for the public that the Supreme Court decisions of church and state are not an invention of the recent Justices, but, instead, breathe new life into the wisdom of our forefathers. And no less important, we must prevent breaches of the law in the local public schools of all communities in order that these trickling streams of opposition do not gather force and become a raging torrent.

If you do not act—who will?

What the People Are Thinking—Answers to a Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent questionnaires to every registered voter in the district I represent, covering nine important current issues. The responses were tremendous, and furnish a dependable and accurate cross section of public opinion on the subjects included, in the 27-county Texas district.

It is believed this represents the first complete poll of a district this year. Tabulation of the returns has now been completed. The results should, under the circumstances, be of particular interest as an indicator of public opinion at the grassroots level.

It is significant, for example, that in that 27-county district 83 out of every 100 are opposed to a medicare program to be financed by an increase in social security taxes.

Eighty-six out of every one hundred in that large district oppose repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, thus favoring right-to-work laws.

Another interesting reaction relates to the President's proposed changes in our immigration laws. By an overwhelming majority of 78 percent the people in that area oppose scrapping our traditional national origins quota system, and the other proposed changes.

Had the people in the 21st District of Texas had their way about it the mammoth Appalachia aid project would have been soundly defeated. They oppose it by a ratio of 67 to 23, with 10 percent undecided.

The people down there want no part of additional Federal aid to education, as shown by the tabulation.

Sixty-nine percent of them think the Federal Government should do more research in the field of birth control, and the dissemination of such knowledge to those who desire it.

I am indebted to my constituents for their cooperation in making this survey such a success. The returns include thousands of comments on various topics, such as foreign aid—which they think should be reduced, and I think correctly so. These people are understandably concerned about the mounting public debt, so much deficit spending, and the constant growth of big Government in Washington at the expense of local self-government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, and all others, to heed the views thus expressed by a constituency that is aroused and concerned about their Government and the future of our country.

The questions and the results of the tabulation follow:

1. Right-to-work laws: Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permits States to enact laws prohibiting compulsory unionism as a condition for employment (right-to-work laws). Nineteen States, including Texas, now have such laws. The President has asked the Congress to repeal section 14(b), the purpose of which would be to invalidate the States' right-to-work laws.

Are you in favor of repealing section 14 (b)?

	Percent
Yes	11
No	86
Undecided	3

2. Aid to Appalachia: In addition to the antipoverty and other programs now in effect, the President has asked the Congress to authorize a special Federal aid program for Appalachia (consisting of 11 States—Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North and South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama), at a Federal cost of about $1 billion the first year. The program calls for additional highway construction, more hospitals, public works, agriculture and mining assistance, etc.

Are you in favor of this?

	Percent
Yes	23
No	67
Undecided	10

3. Immigration: The President has called for the repeal of our 40-year-old national origins quota system which fixes limited quotas of immigrants from European countries at one-sixth of 1 percent of people in each national origins group, as of 1920; and for nonquota admissions of people from Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago.

Are you in favor of this?

	Percent
Yes	13
No	78
Undecided	9

4. Local aid: Do you believe the Federal Government should spend more or less money to aid local problems of transportation, welfare, housing, etc.?

	Percent
More	14
Less	66
Present level	53

(NOTE.—A number of these answers were qualified.)

5. Aid to education: The President has proposed a 5-year Federal aid plan for public and private schools and colleges, costing $1.2 billion the first year. This would include teacher salary and classroom construction for some elementary and secondary public schools; aid for nurseries and kindergartens; aid for upgrading school libraries; aid to finance supplemental centers; aid for colleges, including scholarships and loans for needy students; aid for buying books, operating workshops, science labs, and participation in "supplemental" centers for public, church-supported and other private schools.

Do you favor Federal aid for teachers' salaries?

	Percent
Yes	25
No	69
Undecided	6

Are you in favor of Federal aid for school construction?

	Percent
Yes	39
No	54
Undecided	7

Do you favor Federal aid for church-supported and other private schools?

	Percent
Yes	11
No	84
Undecided	5

6. Medicare: Do you favor the President's compulsory plan for hospital and nursing home care for persons 65 or older, to be financed by an increase in tax on payrolls, under the social security system, at a cost of $2 billion the first year?

	Percent
Yes	13
No	83
Undecided	4

7. Kerr-Mills medicare: Six years ago the Congress authorized a joint Federal-State plan to help finance the cost of both hospital and medical bills for the needy over 65, administered by the States. Many States, including Texas, has adopted this plan.

Do you prefer the Kerr-Mills plan over the President's plan as set forth in question 6?

	Percent
Yes	80
No	12
Undecided	8

Do you favor both plans?

	Percent
Yes	8
No	71
Undecided	21

8. Do you think Federal expenditures during a fiscal year should be limited to Federal revenues collected for that period?

	Percent
Yes	84
No	9
Undecided	7

9. Birth control: Having in mind the problem posed by population explosion, do you think the Federal Government should do more in scientific research for birth control techniques, with results to be made available to those who seek more knowledge on the subject?

	Percent
Yes	69
No	22
Undecided	9

Free Port Advocated for Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and who have watched the territory of Guam develop particularly since the enactment of the Organic Act in 1950 are always interested in ways in which the island's economic conditions may be improved.

A few days ago Rear Adm. Horace V. Bird, USN, Commander, Naval Forces Marianas, addressed members of the Guam Chamber of Commerce and urged them to take full advantage of the island's free port status and to meet the present competitive prices of business in such places as Japan, Hong Kong, and

Manila. Excerpts from Admiral Bird's address as recorded in the February 25, 1965, issue of the Guam Daily News are as follows:

TAKE FULL ADVANTAGE OF FREE PORT—BIRD

Rear Adm. Horace V. Bird yesterday urged Guam's merchants to take full advantage of the island's remarkable free port status and meet the present competitive prices of businesses in such places as Japan, Hong Kong, and the Philippines.

He told the chamber of commerce in a speech at the Surf Club that there is a tremendous military payroll here and any local shop that "honestly meets Japan, Hong Kong, or Philippine prices" would find the military consumer beating a path to its door.

BROADER SCALE

On a broader scale, he said, "suppose that to 180 million Americans, Guam establishes a reputation of selling imported goods, oriental and otherwise, at prices that compare to Djakarta, Bangkok, Manila, Hong Kong, Naha, or Tokyo. The American housewife will be boarding those Pan Am planes in great numbers to Guam," as they do now to Gander, Newfoundland; Shannon, Ireland; Tijuana, Mexico; and Panama City, "all of which are free ports."

"Think this over carefully, particularly you merchants sitting here," he said.

In a 15-page address—"the longest I have ever made"—the commander, Naval Forces, Marianas gave his views, as an individual citizen and as a military commander, on Guam's economic potential. He touched on a number of development possibilities for the territory, including tourism, trade, agriculture, transportation, and commerce, and their relationships to the military here.

DAILY SPENDING

Bird said the Navy's "daily disbursement which goes into the hands of the local citizenry, civilian and military, here is $266,000," or $97,100,000 a year. He said he recently conducted a poll on what the average military family in Guam spends on a typical flight to Hong Kong or Japan, and added:

"My findings were astonishing: The average military family on a 4-day trip to Hong Kong spends in the neighborhood of $800. Why does this money not flow into Guam's economy?

"Some of your stores are air conditioned and strictly modern. They have an interesting range of items on sale from Hong Kong tailoring to assorted china from Japan. Souvenirs from the island and other lands of Micronesia are also available. But we need more of this, lots more. And, as I mentioned before, your retail prices must be in line with or comparable with prices in Japan, Hong Kong, and the Philippines."

OPEN AREA

Prefacing his discussion on tourism, Bird noted that Guam was a restricted area 2 years ago, "but no more, thank goodness."

"It is as open as Texas, and the tourists are soon going to find this out," he said.

He said although Typhoon Karen retarded progress considerably, "the pathways are wide open for taking many giant steps toward creating a booming tourist industry. Moves are now underway to provide adequate hotel and transportation and accommodations. Distance is no longer a barrier as it was a few decades ago. Guam is within hours by air to any point in the Western Hemisphere."

BARELY TAPPED

But the island's recreational potential "has barely been tapped," Bird said, and there are many beauty spots and beaches that are natural tourist attractions. He mentioned Talofofo Falls, Umatac Bay and Cocos Island where he said a recreation center could be developed "when the Coast Guard leaves."

He commended the efforts of the local tourist bureau, adding that "I have pledged the Navy's fullest support and we are working with the bureau daily."

On other topics, Bird had this to say:

Transportation

Guam now is on a major airline route from east to west, and could be the central hub of a north-south airline between Tokyo and Australia. The new civilian air terminal to be erected on land recently turned over to the government of Guam by the Federal Government will be a million-dollar project.

Seawise, there has been a buildup in shipping with four scheduled shipping lines serving the territory, and it will continue to increase because commerce will come to Guam.

Agriculture

Once the backbone of island economy, it was submerged by a military economy during World War II, and is emerging slowly. "In order to exchange farm produce with other nations, our agricultural experiments presently underway should be stepped up."

Recreation

"For our military community alone, Guam needs many more recreation facilities and I mean all kinds." He suggested an amusement park, a marina, charter boats for fishing and shelling, more conducted tours.

"Any kind of good recreation facilities will do well because, gentleman, here is my big point—I have been talking about tourism primarily as we customarily think of it—people from the States coming through Guam. But did you ever stop to realize that Guam has a built-in tourist population of over 20,000 in the military alone? I'm a tourist, General Ohlke is a tourist. And the military people have ready money in their pocket which they would love to spend in your shops and in your recreation facilities. And I would prefer they spend it here than in Hong Kong."

DEFENSE ROLE

Turning to Guam's defense role, Admiral Bird said the island "is of utmost importance as a military base between the continental United States and the Far East," with its strategic location—"only 1,500 miles from our operating bases on the western rim of the Pacific, Japan, Okinawa and the Philippines."

"Available here are all the natural assets and facilities needed to make up a complete naval complex," he said. "Guam is the one piece of American soil in the Western Pacific with a good deepwater harbor, sufficient land for air bases, and the repair and storage facilities that would be needed to support a fleet operation * * *."

Bird said the Navy also is assisting in the construction of the commercial port project. He said the ammunition wharf is being moved to the outer part of the breakwater and the Coast Guard is vacating Cabras Island.

"By relocating the ammunition wharf, a two million dollar project on the Navy's part, the commercial port will be given necessary ammunition clearance distances," he said.

Bird also listed a number of school programs negotiated by OICC contractors, and added:

"All in all, gentlemen, our active construction outlay amounts to $62.9 million and future proposed construction amounts to $42.7 million, for a total figure of $105.6 million."

HOUSING NEEDS

Bird stressed in his speech the Navy's housing needs which he termed "most urgent," and which has "become critical" within the past few months. He said the situation was the result of recent arrival of 260 new families of *Proteus* personnel, and 75 more families are waiting in the mainland for accommodations to become available here.

He said it is the Navy's policy to rely on the civilian community for family housing "and I call on you * * * to fulfill our requirements. I also promise you that if enough satisfactory housing is provided for use by military families at a reasonable cost, additional Government-owned housing will not be required.

On the military's food requirements, he said most of the Navy's needs are brought in from the mainland or Hawaii.

"The majority of our needs," he said, "such as milk, fresh vegetables, and meat, could be, and should be, produced locally. This is an area in which your agriculture experts are vitally important. If the farmers here could produce enough quality food to stock our messes and commissaries, I dare say the agriculture economy would expand.

MARGIN IN PRICES

"But until such time as you can produce enough food to fulfill military requirements, and as long as there exists such a large margin in prices, the military will naturally be compelled to continue its present system of food acquisition."

Answering what he termed "rumors of questions such as 'Why is the admiral sticking his nose into Guam's economic development'?" Bird said his "honest answer is very simple. Any expansion of Guam is good for emergency expansion of the military."

"It has been, and will continue to (be), the Navy's job to not only defend our Nation but to also take every possible measure in supporting the success of Guam as an economic and commerce trading point as well as a tourist attraction in the Pacific."

Resolution Adopted by Nationalities Coordinating Committee of Detroit, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted by the Nationalities Coordinating Committee of Detroit, Mich., on February 7, 1965. The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION BY NATIONALITIES COORDINATING COMMITTEE OF DETROIT, MICH.

Whereas only a small number of the persons who participated in the genocidal war crimes committed by the Nazis have been brought to trial; and

Whereas West German Prosecutor Hans-Joachim Kugler has estimated that it would take 100 specialists a year to search through just the U.S. Army's archives of Nazi German documents at Alexandria, Va.; and

Whereas there are immense repositories of incriminating documents in Israel, Poland, the Soviet Union, and other countries still to be examined; and

Whereas there would not be sufficient time to examine these archives before May 8, 1965, when the statute of limitations is to go into effect; and

Whereas, under articles 25 and 139 of the West German Federal Constitution, the principles of international law are to take precedence over the laws of the German Federal Republic; and

Whereas international law holds that war crimes against humanity, genocidal acts and

such, cannot be regarded in the category of ordinary crimes and are not subject to a statute of limitations; and

Whereas this principle was affirmed at the Nuremberg trials, and by the Potsdam agreement of August 2, 1945, in which it was pledged that war criminals and all those who took part in the planning and carrying out of Nazi measures which involved or resulted in war crimes were to be arrested and brought to justice; and

Whereas other nations, among them France, Belgium, Poland, Hungary, the Soviet Union, and Israel, have eliminated the statute of limitations on war crimes; and

Whereas West Germany can also eliminate the statute of limitations on Nazi war crimes without conflict with its Constitution; and

Whereas West Germany has a moral responsibility to do everything in its power to bring every Nazi war criminal to trial and justice; and

Whereas world public opinion has urged the elimination of the statute of limitations by West Germany: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we go on record as endorsing this sentiment and alining ourselves with it; and further be it

Resolved, That we urge the West German Government to rescind its decision to apply a statute of limitations on Nazi war crimes effective May 8, 1965, and that instead it extend the period for at least 10 years or without limitation; and further be it

Resolved, That we call upon the President of the United States to use his good offices in this regard and upon Congress to act also; and further be it

Resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to the Ambassador of the German Federal Republic, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and Congressmen.

The War in Asia—XIV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, before returning to the United States from his trip to Vietnam, Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., stopped at Hong Kong.

Part XIV of his report, covering his observations in this city which appeared in the Courier-Express on March 6, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN ASIA, XIV—TRAFFIC IS BRISK AT CHINA BORDER

(By Lucian C. Warren)

(NOTE.—Lucian C. Warren, Courier-Express Washington correspondent, stopped in Hong Kong on his way home from the war zones of South Vietnam. Here he tells of the things he saw and heard in the British crown colony on the edge of Red China.)

HONG KONG.—I have stood eyeball to eyeball with the Red Chinese—well, almost.

Actually, I was only 50 feet away from the Red Chinese border guards at Lu Wu, in the outermost British sector of the Hong Kong area at a point where the Kowloon-Canton Railway crosses into Communist China.

There they were—about a half-dozen khaki-clad soldiers, rifles slung over their shoulders watchful and suspicious of anything coming over that bridge from the free world. And well they might for only 2 years ago, someone had smuggled a home-made bomb into a suitcase that went off in the customshouse on the Red Chinese side of the border.

BANNED

As I stood there at the entrance to the covered railroad bridge, one of the soldiers whipped out a camera and began "shooting" me.

The British Information Service officer who accompanied me to the border said this is a favorite pastime of the Red border guards and that undoubtedly my picture will be filed in their police records.

There were no exchange photographic privileges at the border point. A sign proclaimed: "Taking of photographs in this particular area is prohibited."

I was told that the British once permitted picturetaking from their side, but the Communists complained so bitterly that the practice was stopped. Instead, the British have sought not to offend their truculent neighbors, even to the point of setting up a checkpoint about a mile from the border, beyond which the casual visitor is not allowed.

PASS

I was allowed beyond the checkpoint only after the British Information Service had taken considerable time and trouble to get me a pass.

The border scene on this bright morning brought to mind the famous ad of an eastern railroad in the United States in an effort to provide cross-country passenger travel without changing trains in Chicago.

The ad showed a pig lolling smugly in a livestock railroad car and the caption was: "A pig can travel cross country by rail without changing, but you can't."

Well, that's what happens at Lu Wu. The Communist-operated portion of the Canton-Kowloon railroad will bring passengers permitted to enter Hong Kong to the Red Chinese side of the Lu Wu border point, where they must disembark with their luggage.

PEDESTRIANS

If their papers are in order, they are then permitted to cross the bridge on foot, and if their papers are in order on the other side, they board the British-operated portion of the railroad and complete their journey. The situation is the same in reverse for the Honk Kong passengers wishing to enter Red China.

But the porkers have it much easier. On the morning of our visit, the Commies permitted a British diesel engine to cross the border and pick up 47 freight cars, at least half of which were filled with Communist-raised pigs and the balance with poultry and and other agricultural products. Markings on the cars showed that the freight was originating as far away as Shanghai, Hunnan, Honan Hopei, and Canton.

It came as somewhat of a shock to this correspondent fresh from the Communist battlegrounds in Vietnam to note the considerable traffic both in persons and goods between the free and Communist worlds at this border point.

SYMPATHY

There is no doubt that the British world at Hong Kong is in complete sympathy with our efforts to stem the Communist expansion at Vietnam. On the other hand, they have a cozy working arrangement with the Commies in this part of the world that they defend as only common sense and as of great value to the free world as a listening post. I gather they look forward to the possibility of the day when the Red Chinese aggressive expansionist policies might become softened, even as the Russians have softened up, and at that time Hong Kong will become an important cog in the process of lessening world tensions.

Indeed the tensions and bitterness of the East-West struggle, so sharply in focus in Vietnam, seem almost totally absent here.

On the evening before, we were drinking some local Hong Kong beer in the company of Buffalo's Neal T. Donnelly and his wife, the former Jean McGowan of Buffalo.

A member of the U.S. Information Service group in Hong Kong, Donnelly remarked casually: "That beer you're drinking is made in part with Communist water."

The British have worked out elaborate arrangements with the Communists to supply water to their colony. Eventually, the Commies will be supplying up to a third of the colony's water supply.

USEFUL

The British do not seem worried about the fact that the Red Chinese could pull a Castro and shut off the spigot, as the Cuban dictator did at the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba.

The British are gambling that it is to the Red Chinese interests to continue to permit this tiny outpost of the free world to operate in its own capitalistic way. After all, the Commies do get foreign exchange from the goods they supply the British and perhaps they find the port useful, too, for listening post purposes.

The island of Hong Kong and the city across the harbor, Kowloon, were ceded to the British in pre-Commie days in perpetuity. In addition, about 400 miles of so-called new territory surrounding Kowloon was deeded over to the British on a 99-year lease, on which there is still 35 years to run.

TRAFFIC

The traffic of both persons and goods is quite considerable both ways. In 1962, the flow of Chinese into Hong Kong assumed tremendous proportions when for some reason the Communists allowed their starving to enter the British colony in droves. At the peak of the influx, some 200,000 disenchanted Chinese attempted to cross the border and approximately 140,000 made it.

This created tremendous assimilation problems for the British, where the availability of land for housing, water for drinking and food grown locally are inadequate. The British have shown considerable ingenuity in acquiring extra land by leveling off hills into the sea, by ambitious water-supply projects and by tremendous housing projects, geared to the varying income patterns of the Chinese immigrants.

SLOWER

The flow of Chinese immigrants has leveled off to no more than 50 each day of legal entries—comprising mostly the old and sick the Commies are willing to wish off on the British—and perhaps up to 250 a month of illegal immigrants.

The British consider that the dropoff is attributable to better economic conditions in Red China. Since the Chinese abandoned their great leap forward—the means by which they hoped to catch up with the industrial nations of the world at the expense of the consumer goods and amount of food for distribution—of the consumer goods and amount of food for distribution—agricultural production is up and the economic situation has in general improved.

Just returned from a month's visit to Red China, Harry F. Stanley, executive director of the Hong Kong Tourist Association, told this correspondent that he found conditions in Red China much better than he expected.

CLEAN

Stanley said he was surprised to note in Canton, Hangchow, Shanghai, and Peiping that they were among the cleanest cities he has seen in the Orient.

"The Government wages a constant propaganda drive on keeping clean," he said, "so much so that when I dropped a cigar on the street, I was tapped politely on the shoulder and told to put it in a nearby trash receptacle."

Trains arrive and depart on time in Red China, he said, and while the clothing is simple and inexpensive looking, it is by no means drab and dirty.

FREEDOM

Stanley was given freedom to come and go as he chose and the Chinese Reds even asked

him how to attract more tourists there. Although at present the Chinese Reds lack sufficient hotel accommodations and interpreters, they expect to have both in sufficient supply in the future and then make a strong bid for the world tourist trade.

They have already started in that direction by printing the finest quality travel brochures Stanley has seen in any country.

Stanley in his travels did not hear much anti-American comment, but he did hear anti-Russian diatribes, in which the Soviets were accused of walking out on their Chinese brothers. Stanley noted a lack of adequite transportation facilities in the motor line and in one city—Shanghai—there was a glumness over hard times and the fact that the people there were being ordered to other cities.

GAY

In Peiping, the atmosphere was gayer, especially when a foreign dignitary the Red Chinese wanted to impress was present. The Stanley visit coincided with the visit of the Deputy Prime Minister of Zanzibar, for which a full morning of parading Communist bands and marching units were staged.

While Stanley was impressed with what he saw, he thinks in the long run the Chinese Communists will not succeed in their desire to dominate the world. The Chinese are much too individualistic, he feels, to have the overall discipline to support world conquest.

In other words, Stanley seemed to think that in the short run the Chinese Communists were doing rather well, but that in the long run they will fail.

DIFFER

The American colony here seems to be in disagreement even with this short-run analysis.

This correspondent was told that while agricultural production is indeed higher than in the famine years, it has only risen to about the point it was in 1957. In order to feed its masses, the Red Chinese are having to buy heavily abroad, about 6 million tons a year, largely from Canada and Australia.

This represents about 30 percent of China's grain supply and the Chinese are having to use their foreign exchange in great quantities. The more they have to buy food, the less they have to acquire foreign hardware to help in their expansions drive.

The Americans hear that the Red Communist leadership is as militant as ever in wanting to chase American influence out of the Far East. The Vietcong war against the Americans in South Vietnam is heavily supported by Mao Tse-tung, chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, Chou En-lai, premier, and Liu Shao-chi, vice chairman of the Chinese Communist Party.

HATRED

There is not the slightest desire on the part of this leadership to have any truck with the hated Americans. Mao in recent years has developed a fanantic hatred for the Americans, stemming in part from the fact that his son was killed in the Korean war in part from the frustration of seeing the Americans thwart his expansionist policies around the world.

If left up to Mao and his cronies, the drive to expel the American from a dominating position in non-Communist Asia, Africa and Latin America will go relentlessly forward in savage fashion.

STRENGTH

In Hong Kong, a lessening of world tensions through a curbing of the Chinese desire to subvert the world is not seen possible in the foreseeable future. Only if the Mao leadership is inherited by younger, more flexible Communist leaders might a turning point be reached.

It is the opinion here that the drive against the Asian Reds in Vietnam and elsewhere must be resolutely carried on.

The only thing American the Mao crew respects is armed strength. Any weakness shown by the Americans in Vietnam and elsewhere will be exploited to the hilt by the Red Chinese.

It boils down to a war of survival between the two systems.

We Want for Every Family a Sense of Identification With Middle-Class America—Address to National Housing Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed for the past 10 years the privilege of serving on the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and the opportunity to help write laws which now provide so much help to the average American family—and to all families—to achieve better living conditions in our expanding cities and suburban areas, and in rural areas, too. Since the end of World War II, America has become a Nation of homeowners. But slums remain unconquered and the problems of assuring decent housing for low-income families still persist.

This morning, on the invitation of Mr. Nathaniel S. Keith, president of the National Housing Conference, I participated in a general session of the 34th annual convention of this outstanding organization and discussed some of the many problems we are facing and trying to solve in the field of housing and community development. The National Housing Conference has contributed tremendous leadership and imagination to the solution of these problems ever since it was organized during the depths of the great depression in 1931.

The point I tried to stress in my address, Mr. Speaker, was the need for the instilling of motivation and responsibility in the families we are trying to help most—motivation to want to improve their living standards and a sense of responsibility for the programs geared to help them. As I see it, we should try to encourage every family needing assistance in the achievement of better housing to identify itself with middle-class America and seek to become a part of it.

Years ago, the Communists—and some non-Communist intellectuals—sneered at middle-class standards and middle-class goals. But today, I think most American families are "middle class," and proud of it, and I think it is a mighty good group to be part of. Every American family should be helped to reach that level; and that means not only the achievement of more comforts of living, but also of the sense of responsibility and morality which traditionally go with "middle class" standards.

My remarks, Mr. Speaker, were as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSOURI, AT 34TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 15, 1965

It would be impossible for a longtime member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency not to feel completely at home at a convention session of the National Housing Conference, particularly with my former colleague in the House, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, sharing the speaking program today and with "Mr. Housing and Redevelopment" of my hometown of St. Louis, Charlie Farris, serving as chairman of this meeting.

I am delighted to be able to join you this morning to discuss some of our mutual problems in this great work of remaking our cities into a proper environment for the Great Society.

We still have a long, long, road to travel to reach that destination.

But I do not say that in despair, or even in discouragement; and certainly not in disparagement, either. Looking back on the long road we have already traveled in pursuit of the goal of good housing and adequate community facilities for our expanding population, I sincerely believe we have much to be proud of, even though our cities are no Eden, by any means. If we want to comfort ourselves further, we need only remember that—speaking of our cities and their failure to approach Eden—there was sin in Eden, too.

The National Housing Conference was formed at a time when only idiots and visionaries saw any horizon of hope for the future of America and her cities. In 1931, the goal of a decent home for every American was realistic only in terms of getting people in out of the rain—and for many Americans, an abandoned coke oven or a packing box under a bridge abutment fulfilled this minimum ambition.

THE CHALLENGES TO OUR CITIES

In the 34 years in which your organization has been in existence, our Nation has been transformed from a miserably poor to an affluent population, and from a nation of renters and transients into one of homeowners. Nevertheless, there is still at least as much need now for the continued efforts and drive of this organization as there was before the Federal Housing Act made homeownership a practical reality, or the Housing Act of 1937 established the principle of public housing, or the Housing Act of 1949 accomplished the great breakthrough of urban renewal. For, despite the rows of ramblers marching across suburbia, and the high-rise apartments—public or private—co-op or condominiums—dotting our cities, and rising particularly in the expanses of empty land in urban renewal areas, we all know very well that the vigorous running we have done since 1937 to try to eradicate slums and replace them with good housing has hardly done more than keep us even—as if we were on a treadmill.

The cities have been magnets for the disadvantaged and dispossessed from rural areas all over America; they have come to settle alongside of, or in the same buildings or even the same dwelling units with, our hard-luck urban families. We shuffle them around from time to time as new structures are erected on the sites where they had lived, but in a great many cases they do not find themselves in any better environment and often it is worse. The cities have made a remarkable comeback since President Truman put through the 1949 act, but many of the people in the cities, no matter how good their housing, are trapped in giant spider webs of congested, dirty streets, and a miasma of environmental pollution of every kind, not to mention a crime problem which sends shivers through us every time we read a newspaper or hear a newscast of the latest

beatings, knifings, shootings, robberies, and vandalism.

IMPERFECT COMMUNICATION

If I may say so, the troubles in our cities today are to a certain extent, your fault. I mean that seriously. I know you are decent, hard-working, upstanding people—that you are dedicated to the cause of good housing in communities where people can live together in comfort and contentment. But with all you have accomplished in these past 34 years as an organization, you have nevertheless failed.

You have failed not because of lack of hard work on your own part; but you have failed because you haven't imparted to enough of your neighbors in your own communities the excitement which you yourselves have felt in tackling this great challenge.

In other words, too much of the housing and community development effort of the past 34 years has been the dedicated effort of a few, rather than the mass effort of the whole community.

Let me give the perfect example. In my own city, the fruits of urban renewal are beginning to appear in great clusters. A tour through the renewal areas is a thrilling experience, particularly for those who remember the forbidding slums and ugly warehouses and rundown industrial plants and pot-holed streets and the other eye-sores which used to occupy the same land. But in the years in which these marvels of redevelopments were being planned, the empty land, to thousands of impatient St. Louisians, was an eloquent testimonial to public waste and planned chaos.

Southwest Washington for years presented a similiar picture of a war-ravaged wasteland before the new buildings began to rise and the surge of revitalization began.

Artists' renditions of how something is going to look years hence are seldom convincing to the people who see a teeming area of a city turned into a vast and silent cemetery for rubble and fill. Critical citizens add on to the proposed resale subsidy of a redevelopment area the total of taxes lost during the period the land lies fallow, and what apepars sometimes to be a top-heavy bureaucracy of planners, architects, administrators and real estate lawyers, and come to the conclusion that urban renewal is going to destroy the city's solvency—and that of Uncle Sam as well. Farsighted elective officials go down to defeat as bumblers and wasters. Then, years later, when the spectacular results are clearly visible, no one even bothers to remember the identities of the officials who sacrificed their careers for what seemed to be a giant boondoggle.

I use urban renewal as an example of poor comunication to the public, only because it is such a glaringly obvious one. On a less spectacular level, however, everything about community development, and particularly public housing, suffers from the same lag in community understanding and effective communication.

PROBLEMS IN PUBLIC HOUSING

I have served on the Housing Subcommittee since it was established by Brent Spence in 1955, with Albert Rains as our first and, until this year, only chairman. During all of that time, and for years before that, public housing has been the whipping boy in all of the housing bills and in all of the appropriation bills which included funds for housing programs. Yet without public housing, we could never have begun to carry out our relocation programs, and without substantially more public housing—or the alternative of rent subsidies proposed by the President—we will find it more and more difficult to clear the sites for further civic improvements.

There are many reasons why public housing has suffered so consistently from attack. And I don't think we have faced up to the criticisms with sufficient courage or candor. I can illustrate that best, I believe, with a personal recollection.

Several years ago, during our subcommittee hearings on an omnibus housing bill, I raised a lot of questions about the law and the practices under which public housing operates. I always raise such questions whenever I have an opportunity to discuss this matter with informed people. I have done so in all of our hearings over the years. I have bitterly condemned the restrictions which make it necessary—or seemingly necessary—to build high-rise apartment structures for low-income families with young children. I know there are dollar limitations on dwelling unit costs under public housing. I know that land in our central cities is terribly expensive, and that a high-rise is much more economical to build than a similar number of units in garden-type buildings. But until we get out of this format for family dwelling units, I will continue to be critical.

I constantly raised questions about the pay scales for the people who do the actual interviewing of prospective tenants. I feel that we need our very best staff people in those jobs—these are the critical points of contact with people who will make or break a public housing project.

I urged an opening up of the projects to intensive community education and social rehabilitation work—such as we are doing in St. Louis through the University of Missouri Extension Service and trained social workers on an experimental basis.

WE MUST NEVER CLOSE OUR EYES TO PROGRAM FAULTS

I wanted to know how urgently the housing authorities were tackling the project crime problem—using our own diligent efforts in this direction in St. Louis as a yardstick. I pressed for information on the methods used to impart a higher sense of responsibility among the tenants for protection of the property and to help through example and interest to raise standards all along the line.

Certainly these were critical questions and were based on a conviction that all in public housing was far from well.

But imagine my complete surprise one day when a good friend came to see me—one who knew my record over the years on housing legislation and who knew I was a friend of good housing for all Americans—and reported to me that the word had gotten around that I was going to oppose new funds for public housing.

Had I changed my mind—done a flip-flop—run out on my own voting record?

I was flabbergasted. I find it somewhat amusing now to look back on the experience, but I was not amused at the time. Together, my friend and I went through the transcript of the most recent hearing in which I had raised so many questions. When we finished, my visitor said:

"If everyone were as much an 'enemy' of public housing as you are we'd have the most successful public housing program in the world for it is obvious you want the program to succeed, not fail."

I believe that with the help and assistance of the antipoverty program, we are now getting down to essentials. We are going to work much more with people, instead of just bricks and mortar, in making public housing more effective as an instrument of social progress.

PROJECT DESIGNED FOR GENERATIONS AGO

It is just too bad that much of this could not have been accomplished long before now, without waiting for the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. We have had a golden opportunity in the public housing program for 28 years to do the things we are now going to do.

Everyone in this room, I am sure, is an enthusiastic supporter of the goals of the antipoverty program. Most of you have been trying to achieve these same goals for as long as you have been identified with or interested in public policy. But housing people have not always had community support for these goals, and sometimes it was necessary to go along with community attitudes rather than to try to overcome them.

When public housing first came in, a generation and a half ago, the projects were plain, raw, far from luxurious, but were heaven for the people who moved into them from festering slums. Practically everyone was poor in the thirties, and the slum-dwellers eligible for public housing were a pretty good cross section of urban America. For those with motivation, and some education, the housing projects were a welcome way station on the way to a better life. The tenants took fierce pride in their new homes, and in the neighborly life of the new community. The public housing we have today, however, is largely designed for that urban life of a generation ago. In the meantime, as wage levels rose, and employment opportunities expanded, the income limitations more and more tended to restrict public housing to disadvantaged families which made the projects their permanent residences.

GETTING MORE FAMILIES OUT OF PUBLIC HOUSING

Now we have got to work at getting more families out of public housing by helping them to train for better employment opportunities. We have got to help get the children into college—if they have the capacity—or into vocational classes which can train them in today's technical skills. The housing project, in my opinion, is a perfect battleground for one of the most important engagements of the war on poverty. Thanks to President Johnson's multiweapon attack on poverty, we have many new tools we can use. The important thing, however, must be personal motivation.

We can't do the job which must be done with our impoverished families merely by providing a clean apartment in a building equipped with all modern improvements. In addition to AMI, we need AOM—all out motivation. There is no reason whatsoever—with the opportunities which now exist for any youngster to get a good education—for project kids to be dropouts because of a sense of what's the use. There is a use. If their families won't or can't get on the tails of these youngsters to push them into the path of their beckoning opportunities, then society has got to provide that push. Those who run our public housing programs have a magnificent opportunity to provide some of that inspiration—and there are countless community organizations, from the Cub Scouts on up to an urban equivalent of the 4-H Clubs, to provide know-how and active assistance.

We constantly hear, in the Subcommittee on Housing, that public housing has limitations; that it can't provide the complete answer to the housing needs of the Nation, that it has been undernourished in terms of congressional support and community acceptance, and so on and so on. All of us know those statements to be true.

RESPONSIBILITY ON TENANTS

But I feel that we have not accomplished nearly as much as we could have accomplished with the public housing program we already have. And because we haven't done more than has been done, the necessary public and congressional support to accomplish the necessary expansion of public housing has been denied to us. Thus, after a good fast start in the late thirties, and again after World War II, public housing became almost a bad word on the Hill, and in countless communities, and at one point we had to fight merely to keep the program from being abandoned. The advocates of public hous-

ing went on the defensive then and have remained there ever since.

I believe in the principle of a good home for every American family willing to try to do its share toward maintaining or improving the environment in which it lives. There are exciting opportunities open to us now to make this idea into a reality. But the days are past when we can afford the philosophic luxury of believing the apartment itself upgrades the people in it. Many families must learn how to live in today's society. They just don't know how. We want for every family a sense of identification with middle-class America. How do we go about imparting middle-class values to those who never were exposed to them? This, I believe, is our main challenge in the war on poverty. Middle-class standards impose such things as good manners, consideration for others, respect for morality and decency—in effect, the Ten Commandments written into daily living. Most of America is middle class. Everyone should be helped to aspire to at least that level.

The families which live in public housing came there originally out of desire for better living conditions. We have tried hard to make them feel that they are not charity cases—that they deserve decent housing and that the community and the Federal Government are more than willing to help them achieve this goal. Somewhere along the line, however, many families have lost sight of the fact that their fellow citizens have made sacrifices—perhaps not great sacrifices, but some sacrifice—to make these new homes possible. When a community builds a public housing project and relegates the people in it to an isolated life out of the community mainstream, there is hardly much room among the tenants for a great surge of gratefulness for living in what amounts to a ghetto. On the other hand, when the community approaches public housing with a sincere desire to help the tenants make a better life in the American tradition, there is a tremendous responsibility on the tenants—all of them—to rise to the opportunities. But we are dealing with people, not abstract concepts. And I don't think—by and large—we have worked hard enough, or with sufficient hardheadedness, to extract as much responsibility from public housing tenants as we could, or to inspire them sufficiently with the opportunities open to them, or at least to their children.

WE MUST FIGHT HARDER FOR HOUSING GOALS DESPITE ATTACKS

Marie McGuire has been doing an outstanding job—I want to make that clear. I am with her in what she is trying to do. This organization has also done an outstanding job of providing leadership in the whole field of housing, and I salute you for it—as a friend who perhaps speaks to friends too frankly. But my purpose is to encourage you to fight harder for what we all believe in—and never mind the attacks from those who have always opposed our housing programs. We will never win over the anti's, no matter what we do. We have the strength now, I believe, to push ahead decisively. This is a good Congress, and the Banking and Currency Committee in the House, under WRIGHT PATMAN'S chairmanship, will almost certainly recommend a good housing bill. We will miss Al Rains in managing the bill on the floor but I have no doubt that the bill will again be well-managed nonetheless.

If what I have said today touches on any sensitive nerves—and I hope it does not—I apologize for hurt feelings, but I think this issue is too important to be allowed to suffer from lack of complete candor among the friends of housing legislation. I am reminded of a news article which appeared recently discussing some of the tough consumer legislation I have introduced in the field of Food, Drug, and Cosmetic safety, and the belligerence of some of my statements about the need for long overdue reform. An enthusiastic reporter referred to Congresswoman SULLIVAN "getting her Irish up."

Apparently, he was not aware of the fact that my maiden name was KRETZER, from the ethnic background known in St. Louis as 'Southside Dutch." Perhaps, if covering this meeting today, he might refer to me talking to the friends of housing, including public housing, as a "Dutch Aunt." In any event, I want you to know that with its faults—and it has many—our housing program developed over the years is as good as it is—and it is mighty good, taken on balance—only because the National Housing Conference 34 years ago, in the depths of the depression, decided that visionaries, as well as idiots, could be hopeful about the future of this country and the people in it, and has worked with dedication and great effectiveness for all of those 34 years to achieve miracles in the improvement of living conditions for our citizens. For that, I thank you from the bottom of my heart, and, as a Dutch Aunt might do, I summon you to do the much, much more which it is within your enormous capabilities to achieve.

International Longshoremen's Association Refuses To Load Red Cargo Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was revealed last week that one of the free world ships which has engaged in trade with Communist North Vietnam was in New York harbor loading American cargo. Thus the vessel, *Severn River*, is able to profit from transporting Communist goods and American cargos as well. This ship is a good example of a situation which exists at a time when the U.S. merchant marine has slipped to the point where it now carries less than 10 percent of American sea trade.

Russia, by contrast, carries over 75 percent of her ocean trade in Soviet hulls. Yet countries the United States calls allies are free to come and go from our harbors hauling goods in the same hulls the Communists use for goods going to North Vietnam and Communist Cuba, to name but a few Red nations.

Resistance to this situation is building, and the International Longshoremen's Association announced Saturday that it would refuse to load the *Severn River* and ships like her flying the allied flag in the North Vietnamese trade.

The ILA president Thomas Gleason has also urged that an American vessel loaded with codfish caught by Soviet fishing trawlers off the New England coast not be worked by ILA crews. The ship was still unloaded as of yesterday.

And the ILA has also refused to unload vessels which have engaged in trade with Communist Cuba.

This refusal to handle cargos carried in hulls serving the Communists is a clear example of the growing discontent Americans are showing for those who patronize the Communists. With similar actions recurring elsewhere across this Nation perhaps those now trading with communism will reassess their policies. Certainly such actions as those taken last week by the ILA are in keeping with the commonsense ideal of putting America first.

The Appalachia Bill: A Classic Example of Executive-Legislative Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 10 an extremely informative article on the Appalachia bill, which points out that the bill "is being regarded as a classic example of executive-legislative relations." The article was written by Max Freedman, whose perceptive analyses of the national and international scenes are widely read throughout the country.

Mr. Freedman notes that the bill was passed by an unexpectedly "resounding majority," and that "a large part of the credit for this surprising victory belongs to Representative ROBERT E. JONES, JR., chairman of the Subcommittee on Appalachia of the House Committee on Public Works."

I thoroughly agree that our distinguished colleague, BOB JONES, deserves great credit for his deft handling of this important legislation. I also think that Members of Congress will want to read Mr. Freedman's excellent analysis of relations between the legislative and the executive branches of our Government in the passage of the Appalachia bill. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

IN PERSPECTIVE: THE FIRST VICTORY

(By MAX Freedman)

In the White House there is a quiet exultation at the passage of the Appalachia bill by so resounding a majority. The fate of this antipoverty program was never really in doubt. What was surprising was the ease with which the House endorsed the bill as passed earlier by the Senate.

A different result would have been an ugly omen for the rest of the President's program. By the same token the large majority obtained for this first major bill strengthens the President's hope that he will be able to establish an impressive legislative record in this Congress.

In retrospect the handling of the Appalachia bill is being regarded as a classic example of executive-legislative relations. As such, it deserves more detailed analysis, quite apart from its merits or defects as a bill.

In the Senate there was considerable opposition to the bill on the ground that it brought aid to one region while proposing no similar help for other States in need of this antipoverty program. This criticism was carefully weighed in the White House

which acknowledged its force. But the administration also knew that it was impossible at this stage to pass a broader bill.

Continued opposition might merely have wrecked or diluted the Appalachia program without producing a more general approach. Once this fact became clear, the Democratic Senators who sought to widen the bill withdrew their amendments and proposals, while reserving the right to return to these themes next year.

In the House the request for a larger program or a difference program came from the Republicans. They were not content with mere opposition. They wanted to bring their own version of the bill before the House.

This aim deserves praise but the actual tactics followed by the Republican Party were unsatisfactory. In part these defects were probably unavoidable, since Representative GERALD R. FORD is still trying to consolidate his authority as the new Republican leader. But the Republicans committed a serious tactical blunder when they decided to support a number of amendments moved by Representative CRAMER, of Florida. That was an unwise and unfortunate decision, for there was a widespread conviction in the House that CRAMER was not interested in improving the antipoverty program. The Democrats profited from this feeling in beating back a succession of Republican amendments.

From the outset the administration had feared not the defeat of the bill in the House but its passage by a small majority. After all, the bill was in truth a regional bill, and it was uncertain whether the Democrats would turn out in large numbers to vote for a program which limited its aid to a few States. In the end of the turnout was much larger than anyone had anticipated. There was more general interest and support than there had been last year on major measures like civil rights or the tax bill.

A large part of the credit for this surprising result belongs to Representative ROBERT E. JONES, Jr., chairman of the Subcommittee on Appalachia of the House Committee on Public Works. He coveted no special place in the debate. Instead, he enlisted the full resources of the committee in making certain that the bill would be presented most effectively to the House. In addition, he worked in the closest cooperation with the Democratic leadership. This strategy produced the decisive majority.

This is the story as seen from the legislative side. There is also an executive side.

The administration presented a documented and weighty case to Congress. Then it remained in constant touch with the Members of Congress to insure the widest measure of support for the bill. The administration was the beneficiary of the cordial relations with Congress built up since 1961 by Larry O'Brien and his staff in the White House. The victory on this bill is being seen not as an isolated triumph nor as the inevitable result of the huge Democratic majority. Rather it is regarded as a vindication of sound legislative leadership working in partnership with the executive branch. It is easy to understand why President Johnson is so grateful to O'Brien, one of the first Kennedy men, for agreeing to stay on in the White House during these months.

In reality, the legislative relationship over which O'Brien has presided with skill and distinction is now so deep and pervasive that it has left its mark on the entire range of legislative affairs. Without invasion of the rights and powers of the legislative branch, the administration is now in closer and more responsible contact with Congress than at anytime since the early years of President Franklin Roosevelt. The swift and spectacular passage of the antipoverty program is simply the first dramatic proof of that cooperation in this session.

The New Los Angeles VA Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, in order to answer many questions that have come up regarding the current construction plans of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the new Los Angeles VA hospital to be located on the site of Hazard Park in East Los Angeles, I have inquired of and received a full answer from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. W. J. Driver.

In summary, Mr. Driver has informed me that, in view of the urgent need for additional hospital capacity in California, the VA intends to "go forward with optimum speed" with its plans to build at the Hazard Park location, and that recent economy moves "will have absolutely no adverse effect" on this project.

I would like to take this opportunity to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of Mr. Driver's letter, as well as an article entitled, "VA Hospitals: Quality or Convenience?" which appeared in the March 6, 1965, edition of the Denver, Colo., Rocky Mountain News:

MARCH 9, 1965.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYBAL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROYBAL: I appreciate your thoughtful inquiry concerning the plans of the Veterans' Administration for the new Los Angeles Veterans' Administration hospital, particularly since I feel that all who share your concern that we continue to maintain a healthy, vigorous, and effective program of veterans medicine should know of the philosophy behind the hospital construction program currently being undertaken by the Veterans' Administration.

The essence of the philosophy can be simply stated: just as a recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court indicated that representation in State legislatures should be based not on trees or acres, but on people, the deployment of the medical resources of the Veterans' Administration should be based on its ability to aid the maximum number of sick and disabled veterans with the maximum effectiveness, and not on any extraneous considerations.

The medical program of the Veterans' Administration looms large in America's total medical efforts. For example, it employs approximately 4 percent of the Nation's physicians; and 15,000 of the Nation's nurses. The Veterans' Administration is the Nation's largest single employer of a number of medically oriented or medically allied professions, including clinical and counseling psychologists, dietitians, medical and psychiatric social workers, physical therapists, and occupational therapists. It contains almost eight percent of the Nation's hospital beds. And, it has actually spent since 1950 the sum of $1,040 million on hospital construction or renovation, and is presently engaged in an additional $645 million worth of hospital construction.

Medical facilities and personnel are, of course, in critically short supply nationally. Therefore, any organization such as the Veterans' Administration that controls a significant proportion of such facilities and personnel bears the heavy responsibility, in fact the moral duty, of employing them to their maximum potential. Certainly, beds cannot be permitted to lie comparatively fallow in some areas, while others, such as the States of Florida, California, and Arizona, suffer as a result of an inordinate shortage of VA hospital beds.

I believe this preamble points to the obvious reply to your letter: that the decision to close hospitals in other parts of the country will have absolutely no adverse effect on new hospitals planned for California, and this most definitely includes construction at the Los Angeles and San Diego hospitals, which will go forward at optimum speed. In fact, since the VA operates within a ceiling of 125,000 beds, the closing of marginal hospitals in other parts of the country will simply permit us to transfer capacity to areas such as California which have insufficient beds.

Finally, I hope that you will feel free at any time to inquire about the progress of the Los Angeles hospital or on other matters affecting your constituents.

Sincerely,

W. J. DRIVER,
Administrator.

VA HOSPITALS: QUALITY OR CONVENIENCE?

(By John Troan)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—If you should need hospital care, would you rather have quality or convenience?

To the Veterans' Administration's advisers who have endorsed closing of 11 VA hospitals, this is a key question.

And as far as they're concerned: "Convenience of care is a poor substitute for quality and completeness."

"We do not believe," says Dr. Thomas H. Brem, chairman of the advisory group, "that it serves the best interest of our veterans to provide incomplete or less effective care to those who live in out-of-the-way places when modern and comprehensive care can be provided within a reasonable distance."

SOME INSTANCES

Dr. Brem says the closing of the 11 hospitals is bound to produce "instances of inconvenience—even hardship."

But, he adds, the VA advisers are "convinced that there will be many more instances of hardship relieved than created and that the overall medical program of the VA will be rendered much more effective."

The new VA chief, William J. Driver, has pointed out to a Senate committee that the planned shutdown of 11 of the VA's 168 hospitals will not inconvenience veterans with service-connected ailments.

The reason: "If it is not feasible because of distance or emergency" to place such a vet in a VA facility, the agency can "contract for his care locally" in a non-VA hospital.

The VA, however, cannot do this for veterans with nonservice ailments. They can get VA care only in VA hospitals.

But, Driver says, "unless quality is sacrificed to convenience we cannot always provide this care in or close to the veteran's home locality."

MORE THAN 21.9 MILLION

In fact, the VA can't possibly put a hospital on every veteran's doorstep because the United States has more than 21.9 million ex-servicemen.

To complicate matters, these veterans are moving around. Census bureau studies show many are migrating from rural to urban areas and from colder to warmer climates.

"This means," Driver says, "that we cannot remain static in the existing locations of our hospitals and that we must plan for the future in the light of these shifts in veteran population."

Above all, Dr. Brem says, "the maintenance of small hospitals in remote regions makes it

difficult to provide the type of comprehensive medical care to which our veterans are entitled."

Why? "Sufficient highly trained and skilled professional personnel cannot be persuaded to accept positions in these areas, nor is the provision of expensive facilities and equipment feasible."

The VA has drawn a list of what it regards as 19 "essential professional services" which should be "reasonably available" to hospitalized vets. Such as radiation treatment, heart surgery, and psychiatric services.

ESSENTIAL SERVICES

Of the hospitals slated for closing, it says, the one in Fort Bayard, N. Mex., is able to provide only one of these services; Dwight, Ill., and the Broadview Heights Division of the Brecksville, Ohio, hospital, three; Miles City, Mont., four; Grand Junction, Colo., six; Bath, N.Y., seven; Rutland Heights, Mass., eight; and Cedar Point, N.Y., McKinney, Tex., and Sunmount, N.Y., nine.

Only the VA hospital in Lincoln, Nebr., rates high on this score. It can provide 14 of the 19 essential services. But the VA wants to close the Lincoln facility on grounds there already are 350 excess beds in the area—due chiefly to the fact that so many vets are moving away.

Dr. Brem, a professor of medicine at the University of Southern California, says the VA's 23-member Special Medical Advisory Group which he heads has expressed strong support for the changes proposed.

The group is made up of 16 physicians, a social worker, a dentist, a psychologist, a nurse, a sociologist, a hospital director, and a nutritionist.

NOTE.—Dr. Thomas H. Brem, professor of medicine at the University of Southern California's School of Medicine and chairman of the VA's Special Medical Advisory Group, a body of outside medical experts established by law to advise the VA on the treatment of sick and disabled veterans.

Immigration Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the March 11, 1965, issue of the Washington Post contains a fine editorial calling attention to the excellent testimony which Attorney General Katzenbach presented last week in support of the immigration revision legislation now under consideration by our Judiciary Committee. The editorial clearly and concisely points out the central purpose of the legislation and the benefits, both actual and intangible, which it will bring to the Nation. It deserves consideration by all Members of Congress and I am pleased to have the editorial included in the RECORD:

IMMIGRATION CHANGES

If you want to know precisely what changes would be made in American immigration policy by the immigration bill which President Kennedy sent to Congress, read the Attorney General's statement of last Wednesday to the House Judiciary Committee. It sets forth in simple, lucid, nonrhetorical terms just what the bill would do and what it would not do. In view of some of the nonsense that has been uttered recently about opening the floodgates to immigrant hordes, Mr. Katzenbach's straightforward, down-to-earth analysis is most salutary.

Immigration proposals always open the door to the bogeyman of unemployment. The administration bill would permit the admission of only 7,700 more immigrants than are authorized under existing law. But because of the way in which immigration quotas are currently rigged—so that many go unused because assigned to countries whose citizens have no desire to come here—there would be an actual increase of approximately 60,000 immigrants over the number now admitted each year. As Mr. Katzenbach pointed out, this would amount, in relation to the American internal population growth of nearly 3 million each year, to 2 percent. He refers to this as "an infinitesimal price to pay for our own advancement and advantage." In simple truth, it should be reckoned not as a "price" at all but as an enrichment.

The simple, central point about the proposed changes in immigration policy is that they would do away with the national origins quota system—a meanly racist basis of selection—and put in its place a selection on the basis of skills useful to the United States. The old system, as the Attorney General said, "ought to be intolerable on principle alone. We must be concerned with the quality of persons, not of pedigrees." Immigrants with skills to contribute to the American economy will, as producers and consumers, help to keep that economy in high gear.

Rev. John J. Reeb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I suggested that American flags be flown at half-mast to express the Nation's sorrow over the death of the Reverend John J. Reeb in Alabama, who gave his life in the cause of human rights, dignity, and freedom.

Lowering the flag would also be an expression of shame for the events in Alabama, where the courageous clergyman was a victim of ignorance, bigotry, and hate, a natural reaction to the breakdown of civilized government in that State, where the murder of innocent men and the killing and crippling of little girls goes unpunished.

The Governor of Alabama and his police-state tactics have seriously damaged the image of the United States in the free world and have given the Communists a powerful propaganda weapon.

Our Nation mourns today with a widowed mother and her four fatherless children. Let us hope that the recent brutal killing will encourage the good citizens of Alabama to cleanse their State of official lawlessness, brutality, and national shame.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, Alabama has been represented in both Houses of Congress by dedicated Representatives, of whom the people of that State and the Nation are mighty proud.

Let us give encouragement to the decent white citizens of that State who last week marched to the courthouse in Selma to express a sense of outrage at official misconduct, police brutality, and suppression of the rights of citizens.

The leader of the group of 72 white citizens which made the courageous march was Joseph Ellwanger, chairman of the Concerned White Citizens of Alabama.

As white citizens of Alabama—Ellwanger said:

We have come to tell the Nation that there are white people in Alabama who will speak out against the events which have recently occurred. By our presence we affirm our faith in the abiding principles upon which our Nation is founded—a nation under God with liberty and justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, if the recent tragic event in Selma will awaken the consciences of Alabama citizens, Reverend Reeb will not have died in vain.

We Must Not Forget Red Cuba While We Worry About Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, while the American people have their attentions focused on the conflicts building up in Vietnam, and pressure builds as international news dispatches carry developments as they occur by the hour, the problem of communism in Cuba continues to plague the stability and security of this hemisphere.

We cannot allow our national attentions to be diverted from one Communist-initiated crisis to another, to be drawn into the position of constantly reacting. In Cuba, for example, while authorities ponder solutions to Vietnam, Fidel Castro has been readying a new wave of subversion and terrorism in Latin America. This is typical of the tactics which the Communists employ as they attempt to further their purposes throughout the world.

Americans must not relent in their efforts to replace liberty where it has been deprived through communism. Americans must dedicate themselves to the constant effort of effecting the downfall of Communist Castro and the denial of rights he has placed on the island of Cuba. The risks are too great to overlook the fact that Cuba is of vital strategic importance to communism. We need only to recall the events of October 1962, when the world looked on while the United States held to demands that missiles be removed from this hemisphere, to know the treachery of communism.

One of Florida's leading newspapers, the Miami Herald, which certainly ranks as a distinguished authority on events in the Caribbean and Latin America, articulated the problem of overlooking Cuba in the face of Red-inspired pressures elsewhere in a very succinct manner on March 5. I include the Herald editorial of that day in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TO SEE CUBA, LET'S FACE IT

For the past few days Herald readers have been getting a close inside look at Communist Cuba.

Our Latin American editor, Al Burt, spent 3 weeks on the shuttered island, the longest stay of any nonresident American correspondent since the Castro takeover. His dispatches, which will continue to appear for some time, are detailed and revealing.

The picture is grim.

Cuba is a total police state. Controls are more severe than in any other Communist country. The block warden system has the entire populace spying on one another.

The penalty for dissent is drastic. A recent OAS report said one-sixth of all Cubans have seen the inside of a Castro jail since 1959. An estimated 94,000 political prisoners are now in custody.

There is no visible external or internal force that seems likely to bring about Castro's abrupt downfall.

The whole Cuban nation is transformed into an instrument of Communist policy. Its meaning for the United States and the free world is alarming.

Cuba is available to Russian military power, to strike at the United States from the rear in any world confrontation.

It is the dagger of subversion aimed at Latin America, a clear and ever-present danger to every democratic government in the hemisphere.

But more sinister and subtle is the indoctrination of a generation of Cubans with a hate-America virus. The entire police state, reports Mr. Burt, is dedicated to the destruction of American ideals.

The threat from the Red island makes it hard to understand how a well-known American newspaper can look with complacency, as it did this week, on what it considers the forward thrust of the Cuban revolution.

It puts a strange cast on the willingness of anti-Communist Spain to put profit above principle and become Cuba's chief supplier outside the Red bloc.

The administration in Washington shows a tendency to shove the Cuban problem into the back drawer and hope for the best while giving top priority to other foreign crises to the point of risking war.

The plain fact is that Red Cuba is part of a single problem that must be faced in the Caribbean as in southeast Asia.

Mr. Burt's dispatches show that Cuba is not a side issue of the cold war but a star act in communism's three-ring circus. To ignore that is a risk we cannot afford.

There may never be a free Cuba again unless we face that fact and act on it.

Great Falls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, an excellent poem written by Mrs. Marlene Latimer Bondurant of Alexandria, Va., has been called to my attention as it was published in the Falls Church (Va.) Sun-Echo in the editor's words and I quote:

Mrs. Bondurant's poem about Fairfax Countys beautiful Great Falls is indeed timely what with President Johnson's avowal to preserve the historic Potomac River valley's natural beauty and grandeur.

I commend this work to my colleagues in the Congress of the United States.

GREAT FALLS

(By Marlene Latimer Bondurant)

Along the Potomac Palisades
With endless surge all night and day
The misty-eyed river cascades
Splashing midst snow-white foam and spray
While in the sun pink dogwoods bask,
Creating a scene so picturesque.

Art and Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in the last 5 months I have addressed a number of gatherings of professional practitioners of the arts and humanities in various parts of the country. To each of these gatherings I have stressed my belief that there is a fundamental change developing in the attitude toward intellectual and cultural life in the United States and that the time is right for the Federal Government to take steps to encourage this changing attitude. This has been one of my arguments for establishment of a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, as proposed in the modified Moorhead bill, H.R. 6051, introduced in the House last week. In a recent editorial, the Christian Science Monitor made the point that the artist needs to be honored in his own land. This is true, of course, for the humanist too, and for all teachers. I think the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities would point us in that direction. I include the Monitor editorial of March 2, 1965, at this point in the Appendix:

ART AND AID

While the British Government is raising its support of the arts by 30 percent, the American Government remains virtually at the beginning of doing anything for them at all.

We welcome the burst of activity bespeaking Congress belated concern for the arts and the whole field of humanities.

Government patronage in the realm of humane values may have more pitfalls than its already substantial patronage of the sciences. But, in a society changing under the ministrations of the scientist, the insights of the artist and the scholar have become more necessary than ever. The time is overdue for the American Government to define its role in developing a climate for excellence in artistic as well as technological fields.

In legislation for education and research, the humanities should not be penalized because their benefits may be less tangible than the visible achievements of science. Among nonprofit institutions such as museums, theaters, and symphony orchestras, there could well be Government support as expenses rise in proportion to what the public can be expected to pay. The splendid achievements of private initiative must not be allowed to dwindle for lack of the necessary boost as economic conditions change.

The problems of administration would be difficult. How to separate the worthy from the unworthy on artistic rather than political grounds? How to keep the scholar or institution from tempering the work to what it imagines to be acceptable at a given moment instead of striking out in directions that may be more important in the future?

The United States would certainly not go the way of the Soviet Union where Government support and control go together. It would go in the direction of those European nations that have managed, to a large degree, to keep support and control separate. In Britain, for example, the newly allocated funds will go to the Arts Council, which provides a kind of buffer between the arts and political influence.

Some such body would presumably be created in the United States if Federal aid to the arts goes ahead. Indeed, President Johnson has already appointed an Advisory Council on the Arts. It is an estimable group, but stronger on what might be called establishment names than those further out, where new ideas, good and bad, often arise. It hints at the problem of creating an administering body that would not inhibit the very creativity it was set up to foster. And, with constituents' money involved, does anyone doubt that Congressmen would be looking over the shoulders of an avant-garde that might seem to be involved in things even less probable than going to the moon?

Such questions would become more urgent if Federal aid should extend to individual artists. The great ones will survive in spite of Government as well as because of it. Others might forgo the potential breakthrough in favor of the project thought more likely to get a grant.

Indeed, if Government patronage is added to that of the foundations and the universities, some artists might be cut off from the human experience that gives substance to art.

Against such considerations must be placed the possibilities of enriching the public with more works and performances freed of commercial limitations. Ironically, as Congress awakes to the arts, the country is in the midst of a "cultural explosion" without congressional patronage.

Judiciously administered aid is necessary. But its effect will be diminished if the Government fails to show a sensitivity toward the differences between the arts and other things. More than money, what the Government needs to give the artist is a sense of being honored in his own land.

Pacific Northwest Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the major concerns throughout the flood-damaged regions of the Pacific Northwest is for the immediate repair or reconstruction of forest access roads. Timber processing is the leading provider of industrial payrolls in the region, and it is of the utmost urgency that authority and funds be granted to complete the job on federally managed forest areas.

The following resolution by the Oregon Logging Conference emphasizes the importance of this problem:

OREGON LOGGING CONFERENCE,
Eugene, Oreg., March 8, 1965.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ULLMAN: The 27th annual session of the Oregon Logging Confer-

ence, membership in excess of 1,850, in meeting on February 26, 1965, at Eugene, Oreg., unanimously passed the following resolution:

FLOOD DAMAGE

Whereas the December 1964 flood damaged forest access roads in excess of $100 million in Oregon and the President of the United States declared this a disaster area;

Whereas it is vital, to insure a continuous healthy economy in the State, that the damaged roads be repaired immediately to facilitate the transportation of logs to the processing centers;

Whereas it is essential these damaged roads be immediately repaired to provide adequate fire protection during the 1965 fire season: Be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Logging Conference urge the Oregon congressional delegation to press for quick passage of S. 327 and H.R. 798, with amendments to include lands administration under the Bureau of Land Management.

Very truly yours,
OREGON LOGGING CONFERENCE,
ROBERT CROSS,
Secretary-Manager.

One-Hundred-Dollar Head Tax on Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am bringing to the attention of my colleagues the following interesting article relative to $100 head tax on travel.

The article is from the February 1965 issue of Travel News, the official publication of the American Society of Travel Agents.

The editorial follows:

ONE-HUNDRED-DOLLAR HEAD TAX ON TRAVEL

If such honors are in order, ASTA herewith enters as its nomination for the "Numbskull Award of 1965" those uninformed and economically ignorant officials who dreamed up their latest ourtage to commonsense.

Substituting hysteria for constructive planning in an attempt to find a solution to this country's chronic balance-of-payments deficit, these frantic bureaucrats are currently pressuring the administration to promote a witless plan that would effectively curtail the foreign travel of Americans.

Nucleus of this imbecility is a $100 penalty tax on every American who leaves these shores—for business or pleasure—to be levied each time he does.

Its supporters—reportedly Treasury Department and Federal Reserve System officials—fondly hope that such a penalty will stop many tourists from leaving the United States—and at the same time reduce by $100 the potential overseas spending of those who do go.

Just how stupid can we be?

Set aside for the moment such self interests as the irreparable damage to a currently prosperous industry, or the inalienable right of Americans to travel in the free world unhampered by government restriction. Instead, consider the dangerous effect of such infantile interference with delicately balanced economic forces—both domestic and international.

How blind can we be to such practical considerations as the fact that billions of these travel dollars have been turned back into our own economy by providing foreign nations with the cash they need to pay for U.S. products and services?

How can we be so shortsighted as to disregard the disastrous setback to our own economy of thousands of additional jobless created by such a plan?

Are we so idiotic that we can ignore the less of the millions of dollars that are currently being poured into this country by foreign nations eager to advertise, promote, and service their travel attractions?

Aren't we sufficiently intelligent to wonder how we could continue to support a longstanding policy of world trade expansion and

Haven't we the ordinary horsesense restrictive measures without courting ridicule?

Haven't we the ordinary horse sense required to foresee the inevitable retaliation that such a protectionist measure would provoke on the part of other nations—that the balance of trade, now substantially in our favor, could turn against us with disastrous effects?

Our continuing gold drain is without doubt a serious problem. But no lasting solution will be found in making travel the scapegoat for the cumulative result of all our multiple international monetary transactions.

ASTA strenuously opposes this ridiculous plan and calls upon its total membership, representing every facet of the travel industry, to present a united front in defeating this inane political expedient.

There is a positive approach to the problem of lessening this so-called travel gap—and it's the American way. In it's short existence and with an unrealistic budget, the U.S. Travel Service has already proved that it can bring more foreign visitors to these shores.

Instead of restricting the vital force of travel, let us advocate the encouragement and full Government support of USTS in its task of building a greater volume of travel to this country. Given additional funds, and a wholehearted cooperation that has been lacking, there is every reason to believe that this alleged travel deficit can be reduced tremendously.

Let's stop trying to destroy an industry that has contributed so much good to the world—culturally, economically, and politically.

If by some miracle this addlepated proposal to restrict travel is seriously advanced, we call upon the Congress for a total, vigorous rejection.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northw st unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak.*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn.*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McCarthy, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Smathers, Clark, Pell, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit. Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming

Appendix

Nations Can Commit Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, it is a strange and baffling phenomenon in this atomic age where chain reaction can generate enormous wealth—or annihilation—that the free world should be as blind as it is to the damaging chain reactions that have taken place in monetary, diplomatic, and economic affairs, in the past few years.

This is the essence of an editorial advertisement by Mr. A. N. Spanel, the founder-chairman of International Latex Corp., entitled, "Nations Can Commit Suicide." It appeared in paid space, in the public interest, in the Washington Post February 19, 1965. International Latex Corp., I might add, is based in Dover, Del.

Using as an example the recent public proposal for the return to the gold standard, the merits of which Mr. Spanel does not argue, he questions the wisdom of making public an overture of this dimension and portent without France first having privately explored it with the United States, England, and Germany.

While Mr. Spanel maintains that international and domestic monetary reforms are clearly needed in most nations of the world, the United States included, he emphasizes that these vital objectives can only be achieved in the West in a spirit of dedicated unity and nothing less.

Mr. Spanel has given a great deal of thought to these questions and his observations are worthy of close attention. I ask unanimous consent that his ediorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONS CAN COMMIT SUICIDE

(By A. N. Spanel, founder-chairman, International Latex Corp.)

A new isolationism is rearing its head in the United States. We dealt with this alarming development in a recent article in which we emphasized its far-reaching dangers to the free world and to Europe in particular.

Since then, unfortunately, the situation has been enormously aggravated by what, from the American view, looks like a deliberate drive to weaken the dollar in world markets. After an interval of approaching stability, the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit is again growing, and measures to stop this drain of dollars and gold are being shaped up.

There has been a sharp rise in foreign demands for gold in exchange for dollars. This lack of confidence is utterly unjustified by the realities of American wealth, productivity and foreign trade. The United States today has a favorable balance in world trade of some $6 billion. American assets abroad—in shares, investments, factories and other property, have been estimated at $88 billion. The gross national product of the United States is twice that of all European countries combined.

Moreover, the stability of the dollar is best demonstrated by the hard fact that in the period from 1953 to 1963 the cost of living in the United States rose only 1.4 percent per year, during which time the French people suffered a 4.6-percent increase per year in their cost of living.

The doubts raised about the American dollar are thus wholly unwarranted. The deficits in international settlements are due not to America's industrial weakness or inability to pay on demand, but to the colossal American contributions to the economic health and to the common defense of the free world, and to such other factors as investments abroad and massive tourism.

DAMAGING TACTICS

Along with the doubts came the vague but disquieting recent proposal for a return to the gold standard. Without arguing its merits, a move of this dimension and gravity should have been explored privately by France, Great Britain, Germany and the United States. Its injection suddenly and publicly, without a prior meeting of minds among the major free nations, seems to us unwise, unworthy and damaging. In terms of American opinion, it was a flaming torch tossed into the piled-up combustibles of neo-isolationist sentiment.

The gold issue in the manner presented, is a political-economic gift to Soviet Russia, sitting on great hoards of gold, mined with slave labor over a period of 40 years. It amounts to an international game of Russian roulette in which only Russia is immune to the deadly bullets.

Responsible Europeans would be making a grievous mistake if they underestimated the effects of such seemingly anti-American actions and failed to appraise the possible consequences. They should know that the reactions here have been highly disturbing, in that they threaten to further undermine the remaining ramparts of free world unity.

MONETARY REFORMS NEEDED

This is not to say that international and domestic monetary reforms are unnecessary; for these needs do exist and beyond question in most nations of the world, the United States included. But sudden Western assaults on American financial vitality without prior consultations, is naked folly. Influential quarters here are puzzled and angered. Worst of all, this folly drives even those who recognize the evils of the new isolationism and resist its spread, to consider seriously a step-by-step withdrawal of the United States from costly commitments to the common cause in Europe and the rest of the world.

President Johnson, though he is, above all, opposed to isolationist policies, has indicated protective measures such as restrictions on U.S. investments abroad and curbs on American tourism. But other important spokesmen now talk of reducing our military responsibilities in Europe, which estimatedly cost the American taxpayers from $6 to $8 billion a year. More and more Americans are beginning to ask: "Why not collect unpaid European World War I debts?" They refer to the $6.3 billion owed by France, for example, among others.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, a former professor of economics, is an outstanding liberal and rightly rated as international minded politically. Yet he recently pointed out that foreign pressures on the dollar include American purchases in France to the tune of about $300 million a year "for the purpose of providing troops to defend our friends against possibly being overrun by the Communists." France could ease these burdens in various ways, he indicated—for example, through long-term, low-interest loans in local currency for military expenditures. Should France refuse to cooperate and "use our very assistance to wreck us," he said, "then we should reinstate the World War I debts claims."

The evidence is clear that the majority of free nations of Europe do not want the United States to withdraw its military forces from the Continent, or to reopen the issue of old war debts, or to curtail pollinating American investments or throttle the profitable flow of tourists to Europe. But these are the very things that the new American isolationism, now further provoked by ill-considered attacks on the dollar, seems likely to lead to.

PANDORA'S BOX

Those European nations which are bent on opening a Pandora's box of worsened divisiveness would do well to see the picture through American eyes. The rockbottom historical reality is that the United States financed the recovery and the defense of postwar Europe and others parts of the globe. It continues to carry disproportionately heavy financial burdens in the common interest. This, after all, is the primary cause of the U.S. embarrassment even though the sums involved, international settlements included, are minor in relation to the country's total economic strength. Now that some West European economies have become relatively affluent, they appear to find strange satisfaction in attempting to weaken the American dollar.

It may be naive to expect gratitude on the lofty levels of "modern" international relations; and knowledgeable Americans are not naive. But unnecessary and mutually damaging tactics do seem to carry cynicism to the boomerang point. That, at any rate, is how it looks to many Americans. In the struggle for indispensable unity—the primary guarantee against the continuing Communist bid for world dominion—free world nations on both sides of the Atlantic, cannot with wisdom place short sighted self-interest ahead of sound long-term common interests. This surely includes mutually formulated monetary and trade policies even as much as diplomatic and military.

RESISTING ISOLATIONISM

Let those who make the vital decisions of this challenging time never forget that the overriding objective of world communism as been, and remains, to drive the United States to isolationism. "Yankees go home," has been the principal slogan of the Kremlin-Peiping axis—and it is an axis where their common hatred of the "capitalist" world is concerned.

On both sides of the Iron Curtain we have witnessed systematic attacks, organized and led by Communists, against American embassies, libraries, property, and nationals. What is the purpose of this Red war of nerves? It is a continuing conspiracy to force Americans, in sheer disgust, to withdraw economic and military aid; to induce them to renounce their concern for the fate of freedom on this earth and retire in isolation to fortress America. Such a fortress makes no strategic sense under modern conditions, yet the temptation may become irresistible, when the provocations come from friends, allies.

Surely it should be obvious to every European country that it has everything to lose and nothing to gain when it supports, however unwittingly, the Communist dream of American isolationism. In this menaced nuclear age, unity of the free world spells life, disunity spells death. In the measure that the economic vitality and political authority of any one of the major free nations is willfully diminished by allies, the aggregate capacity of the free world to survive and ultimately to prevail is imperiled. Our common civilization cannot be easily destroyed—but it is in danger of committing suicide.

Mr. Juan Terry Trippe Honored for Outstanding Service to Commercial Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday night, March 5, the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce paid fitting tribute to a man who has significantly distinguished himself in his contributions to aviation progress.

It was my pleasure to be present when Mr. Juan Terry Trippe, chairman of the board of Pan American Airways, became the recipient of the 1965 Tony Jannus Award for outstanding service to commercial aviation.

It is sometimes overlooked by those who chronicle great occurrences in this field, that Tampa saw the start of scheduled airline service in 1914, well before the pioneering operations between cities like New York and Chicago and Denver and San Francisco in the late 1920's and the early 1930's.

The first scheduled airline flight in the United States occurred on January 1, 1914, when Tony Jannus flew his Benoist flying boat between St. Petersburg and Tampa. The first passenger on this trip was the mayor of St. Petersburg, Mr. Phile. The second passenger was Walter J. Bennett, the father of my distinguished colleague, Congressman CHARLES E. BENNETT, of Jacksonville, Fla. This scheduled overwater operation continued for 3 months, but came to a conclusion when Mr. Jannus and his flying boat moved on to another location.

Today, we accept as matter of fact swift airline service to all parts of the globe in sleek, 600-mile-an-hour jet aircraft. But Mr. Trippe remembers the old days, as his fascinating talk to the 500 guests at the dinner so aptly proves.

In addition, we were privileged to hear introductory remarks from Assistant Postmaster General William J. Hartigan.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce saw fit to give its first Tony Jannus Award to the Honorable A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, senior U.S. Senator from the State of Oklahoma, and the chairman of the Senate Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee. Now that Mr. Trippe has been properly honored, it will be difficult for our Tampa people to keep pace. But I have a feeling that they will be able to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I do not have a copy of Mr. Trippe's speech for it was an interesting, inspiring message about the history and the future of this great American enterprise that we call commercial aviation.

Mr. Trippe spoke without a prepared text and without a note, therefore I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a typical wire service story of this historic event.

TRIPPE PREDICTS AIR TRANSPORT'S GREATEST GROWTH IN NEXT 10 YEARS

TAMPA, FLA.—A coming decade of achievement in air transportation that will more than match the past 51-year history of scheduled airline service is the confident prediction of Juan T. Trippe, chairman of the board of Pan American Airways.

"More people are going to be flying at lower cost to more places than ever before," declared the distinguished gray-haired dean of world aviation leaders.

Trippe, who pioneered international air routes around the world, received a full minute's standing ovation from an audience of 500 government, aviation, and business leaders as he received the 1965 Jannus Award commemorating the 51st anniversary of scheduled air service.

In accepting the award, Trippe pointed out that the aviation industry which was born in Tampa only five decades ago became an industry that is "larger than the railroad industry, larger than the steel industry, larger even than the automobile industry."

But, looking ahead to the progress "this great new force" can expect in the next 10 years, Trippe foresees:

Supersonic airliners that will be even larger and will fly higher than those now being discussed.

New metals that will bring down the weight of both aircraft and engines of the future.

Helicopters twice as large and more efficient than those today, which will cut operating costs in half.

Short range, fixed wing aircraft taking off and landing on oversized tennis courts.

Travel time between midcity and airports cut to a fraction by these helicopters and short takeoff aircraft, freeing highways for other traffic.

All weather landings for airliners and helicopters, achieving complete schedule reliability.

Trippe, who founded the first U.S. international airline in 1927 with a 90-mile route between Key West, Fla., and Havana, Cuba, and pioneered international air service across the Pacific, across the Atlantic and around the world, paid tribute to the early day pilots who flew mail, passengers, and freight. He recalled the early air mail flights operated by the U.S. Post Office Department.

"Half a dozen fires lighted on the Appalachian Mountains was all there was to guide those first air mail pilots," Trippe said.

Some of the early-day operations of Trippe's company in Alaska had some interesting overtones, too.

"We were soliciting mail business in competition with dog sled teams," he recalled. "We were even bidding for passengers in competition with dog teams."

Hardy Alaska travelers at that time were paying 10 cents a mile for the privilege of walking beside a dog team sled and spending about 2 cold weeks on a trip from Nome to Fairbanks. Passengers got cold, too, in the open cockpits of the early airliners, Trippe agreed, but the planes could make the trip in about 6 hours, compared to 2 weeks with the dog sleds.

Trippe recalled, too, that the Caribbean Sea was the training cockpit that enabled his company to pioneer over-ocean flying across the Pacific, Atlantic and around the world. It was on the "tremendous" 500-mile overwater flight between Kingston, Jamaica and Panama that ocean-flying pilots were trained, multiple crews developed and radio navigation aids perfected.

The Jannus Award was presented to Trippe by Assistant Postmaster General William J. Hartigan of the Department's Bureau of Transportation and International Services.

The comparatively youthful Hartigan recalled his boyhood when "Mr. Trippe was a hero in the eyes of all youngsters interested in aviation."

"We are fortunate to have among us, and still active, many of the leaders and founders of the aviation industry—Mr. Trippe being one of the foremost of these leaders," Hartigan declared.

The flights which inaugurated the world's first scheduled airline service were launched between Tampa and St. Petersburg, Fla., on January 1, 1914.

For 3 months, pilot Jannus flew the 20-mile rout in a tiny Benoist flying boat that weighed 1,250 pounds and carried one passenger at about 60 miles an hour.

Mail-Order Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, there is urgent need for enactment of legislation which would effectively curb the interstate shipment and sale of firearms to irresponsible or incapable persons. Too often, juveniles, felons, or others have been able to obtain mail-order rifles or revolvers which are used to commit acts of violence, or which accidentally have caused deaths or serious injuries.

No man has done more to call attention to the need for corrective legislation than the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. Senator DODD has introduced in both the 88th and the 89th Congresses bills designed to limit unlawful traffic in guns, and he has written and spoken extensively on this subject.

The March 1965 issue of the Ladies' Home Journal includes an article by Senator DODD which tells in dramatic terms the dangers presently confronting our society in the absence of adequate control over the purchase and shipment of deadly weapons. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent analysis be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAIL-ORDER GUNS: A SENATOR BATTLES TO STEM THE DEADLY TIDE

(By Senator THOMAS J. DODD)

The United States in 1965 is a nation in which deadly weapons are easily available and ineffectively controlled. Not only that, but our country is the major retail market for the new and used guns of the entire civilized world.

This vast arsenal includes millions of cheaply made, small-caliber foreign pistols, almost all of the rifles and handguns that armed both sides in World War II, and much of that war's heavier armaments, including bazookas, antitank weapons, and machine-guns.

Most of the traffic in these weapons is by mail order, and in the United States there is little to prevent or regulate it. Abroad, Japan bars handguns to all but police. Strict registration of weapons is required in Canada, Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Sweden, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, Austria, Rumania, Spain, and India. In our country the people's right to bear arms is guaranteed not only by the Federal Constitution but by the constitutions of 35 States. Furthermore, United States firearms laws are less stringent than those of most civilized countries. There are only nine States that require a permit or its equivalent to purchase firearms.

To complicate matters further, the Iron Curtain countries are becoming a major source of mail-order weapons. This was discovered recently when a company actually applied to the State Department for a permit to import the Soviet bloc's entire supply of World War II small arms—enough to put several weapons into the hands of each of the 2 million persons who the National Institute of Mental Health says are walking the streets in dire need of psychiatric treatment.

When the import attempt was blocked by our Government, a central repository was set up in Bulgaria, to which the Communists are now shipping all of their surplus military weapons. Subsequently, dummy corporations were established in Western Europe to handle the sale of these weapons in smaller, less conspicuous quantities, and the United States became a dumping ground for them too.

All of these weapons—and the total now includes those from the slave world as well as those from the free world—are being peddled in America to anyone who has the price, and the price is often surprisingly low. The advertising for such deadly items is an eye opener.

"Submachinegun for Father's Day?" asks one; ".32 automatic," says another, "Now within the grasp of everyone. The moment you've been longing for. Give those cheap, fake, crude imitations a well-deserved sniveling sneer—give those inflated prices the horse-laugh of the century. Order yours this very day. Tens of thousands in stock so be sure to order all you need on the very first go-around." Price: $29.95.

Or "Seaport's war-surplus bonanza. Antitank rifles $99.85. Now you can get that maneating jackrabbit with the first shot (or even near miss) with this fantastically accurate semiautomatic weapon. This superpower Finnish 20-mm. antitank rifle is mounted on special sleds so that you can drag it anywhere in any weather. The ultimate in big bore perfection, guaranteed NRA very good or better. Only $99.95 complete with wooden case, tool and repair kit, muzzle cover, eight extra magazines, four magazine carrying cases."

Our committee files are filled with hundreds of similar advertisements. The content of these ads gives a clear picture of the type of mentality to which the gun shippers are trying to appeal.

Millions of weapons are sold by mail order in complete defiance of local and State gun laws. The procedure is simple. A magazine or newspaper advertisement is answered through the mail and the gun is shipped to the purchaser by common carrier. This is the way to buy a gun secretly, whether you are a teenager, and don't want your parents to know, or a felon, and don't want the police to know. The anonymity of the mails and a common carrier circumvents local and State laws designed to keep guns out of the hands of juveniles, felons, drug addicts, psychotics, and assassins.

There has been a large traffic in mail-order guns to these people. Some indication of the scope of the problem is offered by the last FBI Uniform Crime Report, which revealed the fact that there was a gun-murder every 2 hours in this country in 1963. But local police have no way of knowing whether a convicted burglar or murderer has purchased a gun through the mails. And even if the violator is caught, it is next to impossible for the police to prosecute the mail-order house that sold it to him. The firm is usually in another State, and therefore outside of local police jurisdiction.

For example, a high-powered pistol was taken from a felon on the streets of Washington, D.C. The man had a record of assault and drunkenness convictions five pages long, but successful prosecution of the mail-order firm that sold him the gun was out of the question. That particular pistol sold for only $14.95, and its owner bought it through the mails because he could not legally purchase it in the District of Columbia. A large proportion of mail-order-gun customers are just this sort of person. Our investigation showed that at least 25 percent of the mail-order sales of concealable weapons into metropolitan areas were to persons with police records, barred from purchasing a weapon locally.

The prices of such guns are exceptionally low. Some cost only $5 or $6, plus shipping costs—and the price usually includes a holster and a box of ammunition. It is the low cost of these weapons that appeals to teenage delinquents. Why fool around with a homemade zip gun when you can easily obtain the real thing for the price of a phonograph record? It was the increased arrests of juveniles carrying these weapons and using them in assaults that first called attention to this problem.

The files of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee contain records of children 10 and 11 years old who have ordered and received delivery of mail-order guns. With the savings from their piggy banks and the ability to fill out a simple form, they have bought guns that were on a par with those used by their local police departments, and in some cases superior.

It was with these things in mind that the subcommittee, early in 1961, began a detailed investigation of the mail-order gun business. From the very beginning we drew upon the vast knowledge and resources of the Nation's gun industry; organized sportsmen's groups, such as the National Rifle Association and the National Shooting Sports Foundation; law-enforcement organizations; the Justice and Treasury Departments and others who could make a significant contribution to the solution of the problem. In short, I sought and received the help of those, legitimately involved with firearms, who were most affected by the gunrunners' inroads into the industry.

We examined the facts methodically and prepared a profile of a multimillion-dollar gunrunning operation that has provided a mother lode of pistols, rifles, bazookas, antitank guns, knives, sabers, ammunition, and bombs, a readymade arsenal for extremists of all kinds—the Minutemen, the Black Muslims, the Rangers, and the sick and twisted of the Nation.

On January 29, 1963, we opened our public hearings, and the American people had their first glimpse of this traffic.

Ten months later, three of the firms we pinpointed during these hearings were to play important roles in the crime of the century—the assassination of the President of the United States.

Successive subcommittee hearings during 1963 outlined the activities of these three mail-order houses. The first was Seaport Traders, a firm operating out of Los Angeles, Calif. We traced a .38-caliber revolver that was sent to a 16-year-old boy who used it to kill his 14-year-old friend. We revealed how this gun came through the mails to an immature, disturbed youth who had falsified his age. Subcommittee investigators who interrogated Mr. George Rose, the owner of Seaport Traders, testified that he said, "I didn't break the law, did I? If they have the money, I sell them the gun."

This weapon was identical to the one that Seaport Traders sold to Lee Harvey Oswald on March 20, 1963; the gun he used to kill Officer Tippit.

Next we turned the spotlight on the case of a man who decided to rob the Lehigh Valley Trust Co., of Allentown, Pa. Knowing that under Pennsylvania's Uniform Firearms Act he would have to report any over-the-counter gun purchase to the local police, he used the anonymity of the mails and ordered his gun from Klein's Sporting Goods in Chicago, Ill.

One month later, Lee Harvey Oswald covered his identity in a smiliar manner and ordered, from this same firm, the Italian Carcano with which he murdered President Kennedy.

Another of the major Los Angeles mail-order gun dealers is Martin B. Retting, president of Weapons, Inc. According to Chicago police, 27 percent of the weapons Retting sent to Chicago customers in 1961, 1962, and 1963, were sent to persons with criminal records. Chicago requires a permit to buy a gun, but Mr. Retting sold 2,964 guns to people who had no such permits. He also produces, in Japan, a telescopic "sniperscope" which he imports into the United States and sells by mail order.

One of Mr. Retting's sniperscopes, sold to Klein's Sporting Goods, was attached to the gun with which Lee Harvey Oswald murdered President Kennedy and severely wounded Governor Connally.

The result of more than 2 years of effort by the subcommittee and the legitimate elements of the gun industry was a piece of legislation I proposed to Congess on August 2, 1963. It became known as Senate bill 1975.

The bill, designed to amend the Federal Firearms Act, would:

1. Prevent the shipment in interstate commerce and delivery by common carrier of mail-order firearms to persons under the age of 18.

2. Increase the fee for a federally required dealer's license from $1 to $10.

3. Require that an applicant for a Federal dealer's license be at least 21 years old.

4. Provide that manufacturers and dealers give common and contract carriers written notice that firearms are being shipped.

5. Provide that a purchaser of a mail-order gun enclose, with his purchase order, a notarized affidavit establishing his bona fide age, name, address, felony convictions and the fact that he has complied with local and State firearm laws. This was a key provision.

Later, the bill was amended to cover all firearms, regardless of shape, size, or description, and to require that the purchaser's affidavit must contain the name and address of the principal law-enforcement official in

his community. The amendment would also require the seller to forward, by registered letter, a copy of the purchaser's affidavit and a description of the gun to the law-enforcement official named in the affidavit.

It is a fair and reasonable bill that has the official support of the National Rifle Association and all the principals in the gun industry. It was supported, and indeed sought, by law-enforcement groups at all levels.

The public, fearful of this arsenal being shoveled out to juveniles, troublemakers, drug addicts and convicts gave strong support to the proposal. My mail reflected that.

After its introduction, however, the bill came under heavy fire. Pressure against it and, indeed, against any legislation that appears to pose a threat to the right "to keep and bear arms" guaranteed in the second amendment to the Constitution, came from:

A sizable number of the estimated 20,000,000 hunters and trapshooters in the United States; the Minutemen, an anti-Communist guerrilla organization, claiming 25,000 members and obtaining much of its armament through members who are also members of the National Rifle Association; publications serving the gun industry, sportsmen and gun enthusiasts; a number of wildlife groups that are linked in one way or another with the gun industry.

Politically influential sportsmen; a small but loud and well-organized minority consisting of legitimate sportsmen; decent people who were misled and misinformed; crackpots and vigilantes; and the hard core—those with a vested interest in gunrunning.

The extremists (some of whom said I and the committee were Communist dupes), and a group of lobbyists with their own financial interests at heart, campaigned to discredit the law.

To date, their efforts have succeeded, and the mail-order gun bill has still not become law.

One hundred and twelve days after I introduced this law, the crime of the century was committed in Dallas, Tex., with a mail-order gun. An hour later Oswald committed a second murder, this time with another mail-order gun. Both guns were purchased under cover of a false name and a false address by a known malcontent with a long history of emotional instability. Oswald was a man who had been discharged from the Marine Corps because of his quirks; who had twice attempted to give up his birthright as an American citizen; who could not hold a job, and was under investigation by the FBI. Yet, under the laws of this country, he could purchase deadly weapons as easily as tickets to a ball game.

The law I proposed to keep guns out of the hands of the Oswalds of the world has yet to be adopted. The gunrunners and lobbyists have had their day. By distorting the issue, confusing the public about the intent of the bill and contriving emotional but illogical interpretations of the Bill of Rights, the gunrunners have maintained their wide-open American market for untold millions of the world's surplus guns.

On January 6 of this year, I reintroduced my original bill, now known as Senate bill 14. I will ask the 89th Congress for the authority to conduct a deep investigation of the entire firearms problem. I will look for answers to such questions as:

Why is the United States the dumping ground for 75 percent of the world's surplus military weapons?

Why is there such a flood of surplus Soviet-bloc military weapons being peddled via the mail-order route in the United States?

Why are extremist groups able to obtain free ammunition under the Federal Government's program to support civilian interest in marksmanship?

In addition, I intend to identify and expose activities of the powerful lobbyists who have stopped gun legislation from being passed in every Congress.

We are planning a detailed inquiry into the activities of the major firms which import foreign weapons into the United States; and an investigation of the mail-order firms which traffic in these weapons in violation of State laws.

I am sure the Congress will give us the tools to expose this situation and that, at length, Congress will act to remedy it.

The American people will not forget the assassination of President Kennedy with a weapon fraudulently obtained through the mails, nor can they forget needless tragedies that they read about every day, inflicted by the millions of mail-order weapons that are sold each year to all comers, sight unseen.

The bill that I propose is only a beginning. It must be followed by appropriate laws and regulations in our States and in our communities.

It is time for a sane, civilized approach to the control of firearms in this country.

It is time for America to wake up.

Judges of U.S. District Court of Puerto Rico

SPEECH

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the proponent of the bill or a member of the committee how many years of the incumbent judge's 8-year term remain to be served; and also whether or not they are now elected officials in Puerto Rico?

Mr. CELLER. They are not elected officials, they are appointed. This applies only to the judges in Puerto Rico. I am informed that there is now only one judge involved.

Mr. HALL. There is one now, but there is a vacancy to be filled as a result of our last Judicial Increment Act, is that correct?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell me how many years of the 8-year term of the present judge remains to be served?

Mr. CELLER. I thank the judge there has served pretty much a full term.

Mr. HALL. Can the gentleman advise me whether or not this judge has now the same independence, security, and retirement benefits to which other Federal judges are entitled?

Mr. CELLER. He has everything you suggest except he does not have the independence that comes from a life tenure. That, of course, is a very precious right to all judges, an absolute independence. It is supposed to give him independence from every conceivable pressure.

Mr. HALL. What is the amount of the annual salary paid to the incumbent at this time?

Mr. CELLER. This judge is paid the same salary as other U.S. district court judges, $30,000.

Mr. HALL. What is the reason for the delay, if the gentleman has that within his knowledge, in appointing a second judge in Puerto Rico? Is the work load so small that we really do not need a second judge?

Mr. CELLER. I do not know the reason for the delay. That is a matter for the White House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York a question. Can he tell me why the other body has consistently opposed this legislation, and has refused to approve it?

Mr. CELLER. I wish I knew, but I cannot give the answer to that question; I do not know.

The Pennsylvania Welfare Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in its issue of March 11, the Wall Street Journal published an informative report on the progressive welfare program that has been developed in Pennsylvania by the Scranton administration, under the outstanding direction of its secretary of public welfare, the Honorable Arlin M. Adams. The Pennsylvania story exemplifies enlightened and compassionate leadership at its best by Republicans. I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUTTING RELIEF ROLLS: HOW ONE STATE EXPANDS WELFARE NOW IN HOPES OF LONG-RANGE SAVINGS—PENNSYLVANIA STEPS UP JOB TRAINING AND PLACEMENT, LIFTS SOCIAL WORKERS' PAY—LURING ILLITERATES TO SCHOOL

(By John F. Lawrence)

PITTSBURGH.—Alarmed by a spectacular near doubling of welfare rolls in 6 years, Pennsylvania is pushing, with some success, an intensive program to hold down relief costs.

Though it requires the scrapping of many of the practices and guidelines which long have governed relief programs, the effort is being watched closely by other States worried about soaring relief costs.

As the backbone of its drive, Pennsylvania decided to sharply increase its monthly payments to welfare families, raise the salaries and educational support of its caseworkers, contract for special help from private relief agencies at State expense and spend record sums on efforts to get jobs for those on relief. Soon, in a bid to wipe out the illiteracy which State officials think is keeping some relief recipients out of work, the State will begin paying them a cash bonus to go to school.

CUT IN RELIEF ROLLS

Though the decision to step up spending almost completely across the board might seem a strange way to cut costs, Pennsylvania welfare officials say they are simply following the oft-propounded theory that it's sometimes necessary to spend money to save money. They contend the spending program could well bring a long-range reduction in relief costs.

Significantly, since the approach was adopted 2 years ago Pennsylvania has become one of the few States to reverse the rapid postwar expansion of relief rolls. While the number of welfare recipients climbed 3 percent nationally in the fiscal year ended last June, the Keystone State cut its rolls by 3.5 percent to 432,000; it projects a further decline to 395,000 this year. Ended—for the moment at least—is the rise in relief which saw its welfare rolls expand by 87 percent from 1957 to 1963.

This dramatic turnabout would have been impossible, of course, without the improved employment climate created by the Nation's economic boom. Pennsylvania's key industries, such as steel and machinery, have shared in this boom more than some others. While the State's unemployment rate is still above the 5-percent national average, it has dropped nearly 50 percent since 1961 while the national rate has declined 30 percent.

BUT COSTS STILL RISE

The State hasn't succeeded yet in lowering its welfare costs, though the fiscal 1964 total of $263 million was only 1 percent above the 1963 outlay. The higher support payments to each family, better medical care, and an increase in welfare staff and salaries offset the saving resulting from the caseload decline. But State officials believe these cost boosts now may pay dividends.

"My feeling is you spend more and you save money in the long run," says Arlin M. Adams, the lean 43-year-old lawyer Gov. William Scranton lured from a top Philadelphia law firm to become welfare secretary when he took office in 1963. "By raising the grants to relief cases we'll eventually get more people off public assistance. You give them too little and they can't afford to send their kids to school, for example."

This new attitude in Pennsylvania is showing up in other States as well, according to Federal welfare officials. For instance, New York's Nassau County on Long Island has rented a house trailer that rolls to plant gates and shopping centers to recruit foster parents to take infants of unwed mothers off the State's hands. The State of Washington has broadened a job training program to include potential as well as actual welfare cases—a form of preventive welfare. At San Rafael, Calif., the Marin County Welfare Department is using a team of lower paid clerks to handle most of the paperwork that previously tied up scarce social workers as much as a day a week.

POINTING UP OBSTACLES

Pennsylvania's welfare innovations cut across a number of these major problem areas and provide an especially comprehensive look at the new approaches being developed around the country. They also point up some of the biggest obstacles to cutting the welfare load.

To many, the State's most impressive program so far is Project Independence, which Mr. Adams started shortly after becoming welfare secretary. Welfare recipients have long been required to keep their names on file at State employment security offices but little was being done to spur their job-finding efforts, says Mr. Adams. Under Project Independence, welfare workers regularly visit employment service offices, study job or training program openings and comb welfare rolls for likely candidates. They then press these individuals to apply.

Philadelphia County welfare officials placed 693 relief recipients in jobs in this way last year, 50 percent more than in 1963 and several times more than the department was able to place in 1962. In Pittsburgh's Allegheny County only 766 employable reliefers are without jobs, thanks to such efforts. There were 3,268 such people on the rolls 2 years ago. (Nonemployables include the the aged, totally handicapped or ill, and mothers tied to the home by small children.)

Including other job-finding efforts, State welfare officials have placed some 5,200 relief recipients in jobs in the past 2 years. This took some 21,000 off the rolls, including those the jobholders now support, Mr. Adams estimates.

Typical of just how far the welfare department is going in this job quest, it recently located a job for a painter who had been unemployed for 2 years and had held only part-time jobs before that. A welfare worker spotted an opening on a bridge painting project and then quickly solved a transportation problem by getting the man a special $90 assistance grant to buy a used car. The man now earns $40 a day.

To help win more jobs for relief cases, the State has lowered the sights of some of its training programs, taking less-educated individuals and training them for less-skilled jobs. For instance, it now trains mechanic helpers as well as mechanics. As a result of such changes, half the persons taking State-run training courses in Allegheny County now are relief recipients; only 10 percent came from the relief rolls before the switch last year. The State has also encouraged reliefers to accept part-time jobs by raising to $20 a week the amount they can earn while receiving welfare payments.

To help convert more welfare recipients into potential job holders, Pennsylvania plans to contract with private agencies in Philadelphia to set up special training workshops for elderly relief cases with some sickness or handicap, including alcoholism. The hope is to give them some special skill they can use to support themselves, and to establish a daily work habit. While they learn they will be given special medical attenion.

"It's easier for the private agencies to gear up—it always takes any public agency so long and we want to open the throttle on these new programs," explains Stanley J. Brody, regional welfare director for Philadelphia.

JOBS WITH WELFARE DEPARTMENT

Pennsylvania is even taking people off relief by using them to fill jobs within the welfare program itself. Faced with a shortage of orderlies in several of its mental hospitals, the department called for volunteers among relief recipients in the Philadelphia area and so far has trained and given $3,000-a-year jobs to 34. Another 11 are in training.

In its drive against illiteracy, the State plans to hire 1 out of every 15 reliefers as monitors in charge of seeing that the rest of the group attends classes. These monitors will thus be temporarily removed from the rolls.

But State officials concede that job training programs just crack the surface of the job problem for reliefers since it mainly benefits only those people who are already literate and healthy enough to work. "If they can read or write they are the cream of the crop," says Mr. Brody. Though only 2 percent of Pennsylvania's population over 13 years old are illiterate, almost 50 percent of those receiving welfare payments are unable to read or write. "This is our biggest problem," says one welfare official.

BOOSTING CASEWORKER STAFF

With literacy such an important element in winning a job, the State expects to push the effort—called Operation Alphabet—as its main new antipoverty program. If the test, to be held in Philadelphia later this year, proves as successful as expected it will be expanded to other major cities.

Pennsylvania also is intensifying its work with the worst welfare cases by continuing to increase its social service staff.

Despite the caseload decline, Pennsylvania has added about 200 new caseworkers in the past 2 years, raising its staff to 2,100. It also is experimenting by varying the caseload according to the talents of the workers and the needs of the welfare families. It is giving some social workers as few as 25 cases instead of the average of 100 to 120. This helps meet the objections of many social workers that they are required to handle too many cases to do an effective job.

This, along with higher salaries and more educational support, is part of a program to reduce the heavy turnover of caseworkers that damages the effectiveness of relief efforts. The pay of an experienced social worker was boosted to $9,011 in 1963 from $7,047 previously. A starting caseworker now gets $4,773, up from $4,551.

The State now pays full tuition plus all but 10 percent of normal pay to caseworkers who go back to school full time for graduate degrees. After graduating, they are required to work for the State for 1 year for each year of such support. Previous to this change in 1962 caseworkers were given 2 days a week off without pay and no tuition support for their studies.

Figures on whether the State has solved the turnover problem are still lacking, but George Mills, who heads the Allegheny County Board of Assistance, says a once steady climb in the yearly turnover rate has been halted at about 40 to 45 percent in the last year or so.

Greater Jacksonville Open: A Community Effort for Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, community efforts should always be applauded, especially when they are directed to the betterment of all citizens. Such a community effort is taking place in my hometown of Jacksonville, Fla., where the Greater Jacksonville Open tees off this week. The great golfing names in the world are gathered at Selva Marina Country Club at Atlantic Beach, and while they will be playing for the honors and the emoluments that go with a championship golf tournament, they will also be playing for the needy of our area. All proceeds go to charity, and when pleasure and enjoyment produce good things for the less fortunate, then this type of community effort makes for a better place in which to live and raise our children. The sponsors of the Greater Jacksonville Open—the Florida Publishing Co., the Jacksonville Junior League, and the Sales Marketing Executives of Jacksonville—are to be congratulated.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a fine editorial on this civic contribution from the Florida Times-Union of Sunday, March 14, 1965:

GREATER OPEN BUILDS COMMUNITY PRIDE

As the tabloid supplement to this issue of the Florida Times-Union illustrates in a graphic way, the $50,000 Greater Jacksonville Open, which will begin tomorrow and continue through next Sunday at Selva Marina Country Club, is a community venture into which a broad segment of the population here is pouring its energies and talents.

The Florida Publishing Co., publisher of the Florida Times-Union and the Jacksonville Journal, is sponsoring the tournament in cooperation with the Jacksonville Junior League and the Sales Marketing Executives of Jacksonville. The publishing company is underwriting the cost of the tournament, with the net proceeds to go to charity. The charities which will receive the proceeds will be determined through the Community Trust fund of the Jacksonville Junior League.

Apart from the more obvious benefits from the sports event, there will be more subtle influences at work in making the tournament the success that it is sure to be which defy measurement with any ordinary yardstick. Just as human beings have that indefinable something known as personality, cities also become identified with those forces which are a part of their character. The Greater Jacksonville area tomorrow will begin adding another facet to its personality with an annual golf classic. Every city in the United States that has any real stature as a major metropolitan center is associated with some idea or moving force that has made it great. It is synonymous with an idea or an ideal.

With Jacksonville growing apace industrially, culturally, and spiritually, the golf tournament is being staged at a psychological moment which dramatizes what a tremendous motivating factor community effort can become in community growth. With the sports event being undertaken to the extent that it is as a community venture, the cooperative effort that has gone into arrangements has built a rallying force that will become a priceless asset to Jacksonville.

Spelled out another way, the week of championship golf that lies ahead of Jacksonville is the kind of event that becomes the sparkplug of community pride. It is the type of influences that will spur people here on to ever higher goals and provide them with the will to achieve them. This is the fountainhead of progress.

The Greater Jacksonville Open will combine with the Gator Bowl, in the realm of sports, and with a wide spectrum of educational and cultural activity, to give local residents an increased feeling of pride and community spirit when they speak of being Jacksonville citizens.

North Texas State University Choir Represents United States Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a recent publication by the Advisory Committee on the Arts is basically a report on the first full year of the operation of the cultural presentations program. Through this wonderful exchange of talent, by the presentation of our flourishing national culture, this program served as a powerful force to bring together the peoples of the many countries throughout the world.

To represent the United States in Europe, in 1964, the North Texas State University Choir was chosen, in an intercollegiate competition. I request unanimous consent that the portion of this report, beginning on page 50 and ending on page 53, which describes the success and excellence of the North Texas State University Choir be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY CHOIR

The North Texas State University Choir was selected to represent the United States in Europe in 1964 because its musical excellence had been demonstrated in intercollegiate competition with other university choirs and on tours within the United States and had been recognized by leaders in the academic musical world. The university is a State institution with some 11,000 students, situated in Denton, Tex., several miles north of Dallas. Its school of music is the third largest in the country, and its choir and other musical organizations are representative of what the larger, musical-oriented universities are doing in the United States today. The geographic area from which the school of music draws most of its students, Texas and nearby States, is one characterized by the number and strength of school and church choirs, and where choir activities attract much popular attention and support.

The 40 members of the choir (20 men and 20 women) ranged in age from 18 to 28 and from freshmen to holders of M.A. degrees. Thirty-six were music majors; most of them plan to teach in public schools. Many choir members earn part or all of their support through extracurricular music activities.

The choir toured from January 30 to April 26, 1964, giving formal concerts in 32 cities in Portugal, Spain, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Iceland, Luxembourg, Belgium, and Switzerland. Estimated attendance at formal concerts was 25,000. In addition, the choir gave an even larger number of informal performances for universities, schools, churches, hospitals, and civic, professional and social organizations. Audiences at these less formal performances ranged from 20, in a school music class, to 1,500 at a student-union social gathering. A greater number of people were reached by TV and radio appearances and recordings. The choir members participated in social and representational activities, ranging from embassy receptions to student get-togethers. Offstage activities stressed educational institutions where, in addition to performances and social activities, the choir members participated individually in classroom discussions and workshops. In some places it was possible for students to live in private homes or to visit homes for meals.

A typical concert program of the choir included compositions from sacred and classical music, compositions by contemporary American and European composers, American folk songs and Negro spirituals, and informal presentations of excerpts from American musical comedies. In general, the earlier numbers in the program served to demonstrate to professional music critics and knowledgeable musicians the technical and artistic competence of the choir, the high quality of the voices, and the precision and discipline of the choir's singing.

The university rectors and faculties treated the choir as honored guests, and the students responded with the warmth of natural student-to-student affection. At the University of Barcelona, for example, the concert hall, the Parininfo, was packed by students, with the rector and faculty members also present. After the concert the university's choral group, the Schola Cantorum Universitaria, responded with a musical salute to the Americans, following which the rector gave a reception for both choral groups. The student audience at the Coimbra University, Portugal, displayed enthusiasm to a high degree, bringing the group back again and again for encores until midnight and near exhaustion ended the performance. Then as the choir left the theater to enter their buses, students crowded around and serenaded them with Iberian versions of "Clementine" and "Dixie."

Critical tribute to the near professionalism of the choir was significant since it occurred in the European cities of rich musical traditions. In Brussels the choir rehearsed and performed jointly with the Belgian chorus, "Cantores de Bruges." Two performances of Verdi's Requiem were given by the joint chorus, with full orchestra, before audiences totaling 2,000. Tribute expressed by Le Soir included:

"Where the American choir was really outstanding was in the Sanctus part because of the excellence of its diction, its phraseology, its perfect articulation, its tonal quality, and singing skill."

After hearing the first concert in Madrid, attended by over 900, including 8 ambassadors, prominent musicians, and critics, Jose Maria Franco of YA wrote:

"The work that is being down in American universities is admirable. It implies an enormous diffusion of encouragement for culture as well as for the formation of groups which, like this one, have great artistic value."

Likewise, Padre Federico Sopena, of ABC wrote:

"The music endeavor on the part of American universities is admirable. * * * For some time now, especially in the past few years, truly live music, music produced by the students themselves and music which is not normally included in concert repertoires is being cultivated with extraordinary intensity."

The choir members started their tour inexperienced in offstage representation work and with little prior exposure to people and customs of other nations. As they accumulated experience, their interests grew and so did their responsiveness as oversea representatives of the United States. This evolvement is noted in the report of the Cultural Attaché at Bern who marveled that a group of young university students at the near close of a grueling 3 months of travel and concerts could continue "working hard, with eternal cheerfulness, at their social and representational obligations."

CAB Should Review Decision To Halt Airline Service to Big Rapids-Reed City, Mich., Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the protests of the citizens of the Reed City-Big Rapids, Mich., area and the Michigan Department of Aeronautics against the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board in halting airline service to the Reed City-Cadillac-Big Rapids communities. This service has been in operation for the last 5 years

from the splendid airport at Reed City, but the Civil Aeronautics Board has ordered it discontinued under its "use it or lose it" formula. We do not believe the ruling is based on a true picture of the situation. I believe CAB should review this case, meanwhile delaying the effective date of its order.

An editorial in the Big Rapids, Mich., Pioneer explains the situation. It follows:

NOT A FAIR TEST

The ruling this past week by the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) halting airline service to Reed City-Cadillac-Big Rapids communities at Miller Airfield in Reed City by North Central Airlines was not made, in our concept, after a fair test.

Some 5 years ago North Central began air service to people of this area at Miller Airfield on what CAB called a "use it or lose it" method of test. CAB set a mandatory five passenger embarkation average per day for continuance of the air service.

We believe Reed City and the area served here by North Central would produce the required number of passengers should CAB have insisted and North Central provided two round trip daily flights instead of its one round trip flight plan.

With the southbound flight leaving Reed City at 7:01 a.m. and the evening return flight arriving at 8:14 p.m. salesmen and businessmen from Chicago and other points would necessarily have to stop overnight in Reed City and pursue their business obligations the following day. Then they would have to remain over the second night to board the following morning's plane for Chicago.

We think that Joseph Lynch, attorney for the chamber of commerce's aeronautical committee, has a strong point in either requesting a rehearing or appealing the stop ruling of CAB.

Lynch reports a survey last spring disclosed that almost 50 area residents drove to Grand Rapids to board airlines each week to be certain of reaching their destinations. Otherwise many were "bumped" from planes to Chicago because of previous bookings of passengers on the Benton Harbor-Chicago leg of the flight.

Also by virtue of the North Central flight schedule the planes no longer carry airmail and but little freight to and from this area.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I was honored to be one of the sponsors of the recently enacted Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. The Harrisburg, Pa., Patriot of March 9 published an excellent editorial on this law, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

APPALACHIA BILL: IT'S ONLY A START

In mid-January the chief Senate sponsor of the Johnson administration's Appalachia bill, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, predicted that it would be enacted by April 1. Congress beat that deadline by nearly a month. The House, accepting the Senate version of the bill without change, has sent the $1.1 billion measure to the White House where the President is to sign it today, and thus the first and one of the most important of the Administration's war-on-poverty programs is on its way.

But passing a bill is only the first step. The 11-State Appalachia region, which extends from the northern border of Pennsylvania to central Alabama, has a long way to go to catch up with the rest of the country.

One comparison illustrates the gap: Average annual income per person in Appalachia is $1,400; average annual income per person in the United States is $1,900. Closing that gap—the product of years of neglect, of geographical isolation, and technological change—will not be an overnight miracle, and it will take the combined efforts of National and State Governments and of the people on the spot to do the job.

The bulk of the money—about four-fifths—is to be spent on roads, which, it is hoped, will help end the isolation of much of the region and encourage industry to settle there and tourists to visit. Other funds are scheduled for education, health facilities, and land development.

Pennsylvanians have a special interest in the provision—which was included in the measure largely through the joint efforts of Governor Scranton, Senator SCOTT, and Senator CLARK—for rehabilitation of abandoned strip-mine areas. There are, according to a recent Forest Service estimate, approximately a million acres of such land in the Commonwealth alone. These mines help to pollute our streams, including the Susquehanna, blight our environment, and scar our countryside.

The bill's provisions here could be better. Funds are limited to the redevelopment of publicly owned lands, with privately owned lands to be covered only after a survey by the Department of Interior.

Critics of the Appalachia bill declare that it won't produce any miracles. And they're right. It won't. We can't expect miracles on this earth, but we can expect progress, and the Appalachia Act should do much to assure that progress will be made.

Duval's Solon Is a Man With Head and Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member of this body has been saddened at the injuries sustained by our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT.

Suffering a badly broken leg in slipping on ice a few days ago, he showed the same courage and determination which has marked his service to his country as a serviceman and as a legislator when he came to the House floor in a wheelchair to cast his vote.

This action preserved his perfect voting record, longest in the House of Representatives.

His determination to overcome handicaps and serve his Nation are well known among his constituents and friends. He is an example and I count it a rare privilege to serve this Nation with a man like CHARLEY BENNETT.

I would like to insert herewith a copy of an editorial which appeared in the March 12, 1965, issue of the Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla.

I think it expresses our sentiment if we add but one paragraph, that is to say that the people of the United States are fortunate to have the head and heart of a man like CHARLES E. BENNETT in the Halls of Congress.

The editorial follows:

DUVAL'S SOLON IS A MAN WITH HEAD AND HEART

Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, of Jacksonville, expects to leave Walter Reed Hospital early next week and return to his home in Falls Church, Va., for the rest of the period during which he will be recuperating from the broken leg he suffered the other day when he slipped and fell on the ice.

The Jacksonville solon made that announcement Wednesday when he went by ambulance and wheelchair to the Capitol to register his affirmative vote in the House on the pending legislation to regulate the distribution of pep pills.

In overcoming his present handicap to cast the ballot, CHARLEY kept his perfect voting record intact in the House of Representatives, and though he declared the road ahead will be rough for some weeks to come, he added the belief that he would make the grade.

He is a phlegmatic person indeed who doesn't gain inspiration from the indomitable spirit that BENNETT is showing in the midst of an adversity that would immobilize a person of less stature. This, however, is the mettle of the man who represents the people of Jacksonville in Congress. To have known CHARLEY for any length of time is to have been aware of the stern stuff of which he is made. Already handicapped with lameness which was an aftereffect of polio which he contracted while fighting the guerrilla forces in the Philippines, BENNETT has never allowed that disability to lessen his vigor as a man who can stand on his own two feet.

The story of the way BENNETT went off to war is in itself a saga of spirit and courageous achievement. Having already won the spring primary, which is tantamount to election in Florida, CHARLEY stepped down and went into the Army as a private in World War II, won the right to attend officers' candidate school, and later was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action.

BENNETT's record as a citizen, a soldier, and a public servant is reminiscent of a story Dwight D. Eisenhower once told. Asking by name for a man whose services he wanted, the supreme allied commander in Europe was told that he was in the hospital with arthritic knees.

"It is the head and the heart of the man I want, not his knees," General Eisenhower replied. "I'll carry him into battle on a litter if necessary."

The citizens of Jacksonville and Duval County are fortunate to have the head and heart of a man like CHARLES E. BENNETT in the Halls of Congress.

A Firm Foundation—The Holy Bible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, my good friend, Wilmer C. Tolleson, chap-

lain of the Morningside Lodge No. 295, F. & A.M., has written for the Masonic Messenger magazine an excellent devotional pointing to the great truth that man and government can be based on no firmer nor greater foundation than the Holy Bible.

In view of the current state of the world and certain events both at home and abroad, I find this message particularly timely and appropriate.

I ask unanimous consent that this devotional be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the devotional was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

"HOW FIRM A FOUNDATION YE SAINTS OF THE LORD"

(By Wilmer C. Tolleson, chaplain, Morningside Lodge No. 295, F. & A.M.)

How firm a foundation ye saints of the Lord is laid in your faith in His excellent word. The builder always seeks a firm foundation. The Rock of Gibraltar is indeed a firm foundation. But the greatest of all foundations is the Holy Bible and His excellent word which is found throughout the Old Testament and the New Testament. You are the builder in Masonry. If you would be a great builder in your own life, hold fast and build on the teachings of the Holy Bible. In the erection of any great building the architect and the engineer seek solid rock for a firm foundation.

To quote in part the seventh chapter of Matthew: "A wise man built his house upon a rock: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not; for it was founded upon a rock. The foolish man built his house upon the sand. And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall of it." (Reading from the 24th to 27th verses.)

My Brothers, your trust is in God. Be ever mindful of that trust and be faithful to it, giving thanks daily for your daily bread and your life and its creation. Be thankful unto Him and He will will bless you.

It is said of Stone Mountain, located a few miles east of Atlanta, that solid rock extends under the ground from that mountain to the heart of Atlanta at Five Points. So the great and tall buildings at Five Points have a solid rock foundation underneath them. Who could have created all of this but Almighty God? We find much beauty in the beautiful hymn that is sung by many congregations: "How Firm a Foundation Ye Saints of the Lord." No Mason claims to be a saint. But he is mindful of the teachings of the Ten Commandments that have been given to us by Almighty God in His holy word. If we will ever walk in that Light, which is spiritual, we will ever be guided in the paths that lead to a fuller and more beautiful life.

Thomas Jefferson was asked for the richest passage in literature, and he said it was the first 16 verses of the 5th chapter of Mathew.

Daniel Webster was questioned as to what he considered the greatest legal digest; his reply was the sermon on the mount.

No one has equaled David for poetry, nor Isaiah for wisdom; nor Jesus for his moral and ethical teachings, nor Peter for his holy zeal, nor Paul for his logic, nor John's statement of sanctified love.

God's word is the greatest of all books. Its author the greatest of all teachers. We do well to stay close to its pages. It is The Books (Extracts from Square and Compass).

The Holy Bible is truly the great light of Masonry and the comment of great men in history indicates their reverence for it and the reliance they placed in it for guidance in their daily lives.

In commenting on the Holy Bible, George Washington said: "It's impossible to govern the world without the Bible."

In the present day and time the atheists have been successful in throwing out the reading of the Holy Bible and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in certain places. Almighty God's words will endure forever and forever and great will be the fall, should we ever turn away from the Holy Bible and its teachings. Masonry will ever and shall ever abide with its teachings and its blessed assurance.

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form and void: And darkness was upon the face of the deep: and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. And God saw the light that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness.

This is the Masonic light which forever puts its trust in God and His teachings. Let us as Masons forever walk uprightly before God and man in that light, and study and obey the laws He has given us in his holy word.

No greater or firmer foundation can be founded than the Holy Bible. Build upon that foundation and you have a foundation that is even stronger than the Rock of Gibraltar.

Selma, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is a moment in history when the whole Nation and, indeed, the entire world is focusing its attention on Selma, Ala. As one who personally visited Selma, Ala., and who spoke with persons intimately involved in the struggle for full and free voting opportunity, I am aware of the fact that we are not dealing with two groups of citizens of different races, poised at each other's throats.

Within the white community of Selma, and of Alabama generally, there are individuals who disagree sharply with the policies and practices which have served to discriminate against Negro citizens. There are white citizens in Birmingham who have publicly spoken out in favor of Negro voting rights. These, indeed, are heroes without equal. I think it important that those who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD bear in mind the fact that there are forces within the South that cherish the principle of freedom even at personal risk. I have recently exchanged letters with such a group of white citizens in Alabama, and I would like to insert, at this point in the RECORD, the text of that exchange:

MARCH 7, 1965.

To: The Governor and legislators of Alabama; the President of the United States; the Congressmen of the United States; the mayor and officials of Selma, Ala.; the major newspapers of Alabama and the United States; the human relations organizations of the United States; the presidents of the districts and colleges of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod.

Subject: Interpretation of March 6, 1965, demonstration by 72 Alabama whites in Selma.

DEAR SIR: On Saturday, March 6, 1965, 72 white Alabamians walked to the Dallas County Courthouse in Selma, Ala., read a statement protesting voter registration intimidation, police brutality, and suppression of dissent, sang "America," and then returned to their starting point holding signs with messages like: "Democracy is Government by all the People," "Police Brutality Enslaves Us All," and "Votelessness—Hopelessness."

The 72 persons included ministers, teachers, business men, housewives and college students from Birmingham, Huntsville, Montgomery, Auburn, and Tuscaloosa.

The big question is: "Why? Why did they do it?"

We would like to interpret what we did:

1. We wanted to express our outrage at the continued denial to register to vote, police brutality and suppression of dissent.

2. We did it via a dramatic demonstration because we felt frustrated by the use of letters and personal conferences with individuals and realized that deep injustices require radical measures before they are removed.

3. We hoped to encourage whites in Alabama to speak and act against the entrenched injustices.

4. We hoped to bring an end to foot-dragging, to the elimination of voter registration intimidation in Alabama and to bring in Federal assistance if drastic changes are not forthcoming immediately.

5. We intended to reaffirm the position that the demonstration technique is a solid, American tradition used by responsible, thinking citizens.

6. Although I cannot speak for anyone but myself, I know there were many in the group who share my Christian motivation. I participated because in the spirit of the incarnation of my Lord I felt constrained to identify myself with people who have been unjustly treated and to bring about justice—out of love for my fellow man, and to show forth Christ's love to the world.

Enclosed is a copy of the statement read on the courthouse steps.

In the interest of "liberty and justice for all,"

JOSEPH ELLWANGER,
Chairman, Concerned White Citizens of Alabama, Birmingham, Ala.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

(Read on the Dallas County Courthouse steps in Selma, Ala., March 6, 1965, by Joseph Ellwanger, chairman, Concerned White Citizens of Alabama, Birmingham, Ala.)

We as white citizens of Alabama have come to Selma today to tell the Nation that there are white people in Alabama who will speak out against the events which have recently occurred in this and neighboring counties and towns.

We consider it a shocking injustice that there are still counties in Alabama where there are no Negroes registered to vote and where Negroes have reason to fear the hostility and harassment of public officials when they do try to register.

We deem it a tragic retreat from the American principle of "no taxation without representation" when citizens of Alabama, Negro and white, must undergo a college examination to be able to exercise their right as responsible, law-abiding taxpaying citizens, to vote.

We are horrified at the brutal way in which the police at times have attempted to break up peaceful assemblies and demonstrations by American citizens who are exercising their constitutional right to protest injustice. And we, are shocked at the inhuman way American citizens of Dallas and other counties in Alabama have been treated when taken prisoner in the recent demonstrations.

We are sickened by the totalitarian atmosphere of intimidation and fear officials have purposefully created and maintained to dis-

courage lawful assembly and peaceful expression of grievances against the existing conditions.

Therefore, as citizens of the United States of America and of this State of Alabama we do by our presence here affirm our faith in the abiding principles upon which our Nation and our State is founded and for which our forefathers died. We are immovable in our determination that this be a "Nation under God with liberty and justice for all."

We urge that the Governor of our State and all elected officials—State and local—use their power and prestige to see to it that all open and subtly intimidation of persons seeking to register to vote be removed.

We request that, since many citizens have for so long been given the clear picture that they are not wanted in the registrar's office, the State and local officials owe it to these citizens systematically to inform them that they are welcome and that they are encouraged to register and vote. We ask that not only the Federal Government, but our own State legislature, go on record against the current college test type of registration form and favor a simple information blank and that assistance be made available for white and Negro citizens who are not able to fully understand or fill out the form.

We finally plead for Federal help in terms of laws and registrars, if these injustices are not removed forthrightly.

MARCH 15, 1965.

Mr. JOSEPH ELLWANGER,
Chairman, Concerned White Citizens of Alabama, Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR MR. ELLWANGER: I have received a copy of your open letter and statement of purpose to those individuals and groups interested in the events in Selma, Ala. I salute your principles and your courage. Such devotion to justice and truth gives the lie to any who suggest that the white citizenry in the Deep South is a monolith of savage oppression of fellow citizens.

I have taken the liberty of inserting a copy of your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I think that it provides information and inspiration to many who will read it.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

Tribute to Pascoag Council, Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at the 64th anniversary dinner of the Pascoag Council, Knights of Columbus, on January 30, 1965:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY

Those of us who are being honored here tonight are deeply grateful, not only for this occasion but even more for the privilege of having had 25 years of association with this great Pascoag Council, which tonight marks its 64th anniversary of continuous service to God and country. I know that for myself, I can honestly say that I count my membership in Pascoag Council as one of the most rewarding experiences of my life. Membership in the Knights of Columbus is something more than belonging to a social club. It means a dedication to high principles and an association with men who take seriously the obligations of their Catholic faith and their citizenship in this great Nation.

Looking back over the years the members of our organization can take justifiable pride in their contributions to this community and to the church in Rhode Island. Looking back over the years, we can also thank God that a new feeling of good will has come into the hearts and minds of many so that old ethnic and group prejudices are passing away. Looking to the future, we can have confidence that the Columbian spirit will continue its good work among us.

As Catholics and as Americans we have always found inspiration in the name of Columbus. That great explorer and navigator is for each one of us Knights an outstanding example of the kind of Christian courage needed in the world today. Standing on his tiny ship, sustained by his faith in God, he faced the enormous, unknown dangers of the ocean that lay before him. More than that, he did not even have the consolation of loyal shipmates. Faced with discouragement and mutiny in his crew, he continued to believe in his cause and in the ability of the human mind to master the problems and the mysteries of nature. The spirit of Columbus was bigger than all the power of the Atlantic Ocean, which he conquered. The faith of Columbus was stronger than all the ignorance and fear of those who surrounded him with doubts and discouragement. The manhood of Columbus was equal to the size of the job he set himself to do. Above his head, painted on the spread mainsail of his ship, was the conquering Sign of the Cross. And by that Sign he conquered the obstacles on his ocean voyage. He was worthy of his name—Christopher, the Christbearer. For he brought not only the light of civilization but also the light of Christian faith to the new world of America.

Like Columbus, we live in a time of discovery and exploration—a time that is filled with all the excitement, the anxiety, the danger, and the promise of the world of science. In our own country we face enormous new possibilities of hope and progress in overcoming the ancient problems of poverty, ignorence and prejudice. In the life of the church, too, we see that this is an era when men of faith are exploring how they may break down the barriers of misunderstanding, so that all who follow the teachings of Christ may be united.

So too, we see that this is a time when both clergy and laity are exploring new ways in which they may cooperate for the purpose of advancing the kingdom of God among all men of good will. Inspired by the great example of Pope John XXIII, and guided by his outstanding insights into the social and religious problems of the 20th century, we are called upon to explore our own responsibilities as Catholic laymen in general and as Knights of Columbus in particular.

Now a single day does not go by without its news of some advance in our exploration of outer space or in our discovery of the cause and cure of disease. The vast universe which was first opened up to our knowledge by the telescope is quite as much the realm of the modern scientific explorer as is the world of tiny organisms revealed to us through the microscope. And in the field of mental health, we continue to penetrate into the deep world of the mind and of man's inner life. We are approaching important breakthroughs in the conquest of such diseases as cancer as scientists pursue viruslike particles with atomic equipment that was once being used only for military purposes.

There is no doubt that the exploring and adventurous spirit symbolized by Columbus is very much alive in our world today. In scientific work we see the most spectacular examples of what this spirit can accomplish. But as Pope Pius XII pointed out in one of his memorable Christmas messages, there is a depressing contradiction in the modern world between what we have been able to do in conquering the problems of our physical environment and what we have not been able to do in dealing with the problems of society and international peace. As our beloved late President Kennedy so often and so forcefully stated, it is clearly wrong that in a land of great wealth, there are so many who live in great poverty. And it is equally wrong that in an age of such great medical knowledge, there should be so many sick who do not benefit from it. When we think of the educational resources of this great country and realize how many of our youth do not now receive the kind of education they need to make their way in the modern world, we must also recognize a challenge that is quite as important as any offered to us by outer space. In fact, if we do not solve the problem of giving equal educational opportunities to all our youth we will fall behind in the exploration of space and be unable to meet most of the great issues which confront us in our times.

As Catholics and as Americans, the Knights of Columbus have always been very much interested in the progress of education. The work of the Knights which made possible the microfilming of the priceless treasures of the Vatican Library for St. Louis University is an outstanding example of this very interest. I think it is worthy of very special mention and of particular personal interest and justifiable pride for us to recall that Rhode Island's own James W. McCormick, of Narragansett council, in Westerly was a member of the supreme board of directors at this time. Jim McCormick played an active role in the supreme board's decision to microfilm the priceless and invaluable Vatican documents.

This action is one of the many monuments to the memory of this outstanding number of our order who was recently called to his eternal reward and whose funeral took place just 2 weeks ago today. So also are the thousands of people who have made use of the correspondence courses in the Catholic religion that have been sponsored through the generosity of the Knights of Columbus all over America. Indeed, we may justly claim that the decline of religious prejudice in this country has been in no small measure the result of this very important educational activity.

I personally believe that the key to the solution of most of the great social problems of our times lies with education. This belief is an essential part of the Catholic religion as I understand it, for Christ himself said: "And you shall know the truth; and the truth shall make you free." Education means learning the truth about ourselves and our world. Without such knowledge we cannot be free men and women. Just take the problem of automation in industry. Workers who have not learned the skills required cannot hope to find or to fill jobs in modern industry. Labor that requires no skills is fast becoming a thing of the past. And with automation, there is more leisure time. Those who have not learned how to use their leisure in personally satisfying and constructive ways will be more and more lost in the world of tomorrow. Furthermore, both the problem of poverty and the problem of the various prejudices which afflict this Nation may be said to have their deepest roots in ignorance. Consequently, the war on poverty, the struggle for equal opportunity, and other issues, like the fight against juvenile delinquency, cannot be won unless our educational problems are solved.

In the past, the efforts of the Federal Government to do its part in improving the

educational opportunities of all our people have been frustrated partly because of confusions arising from debates about relations between church and state. Now I believe that we are beginning to see a new consensus of American opinion which views our schools not as agents of the State or agents of the church but as agents of our democratic, free society.

In this free society we live as one people under God, but we express our religious values in various ways, exercising our democratic rights to the freedom of our consciences. This is as it should be, and American Catholics would not have it otherwise, as the action of our American bishops at the last session of the Vatican Council made it plain to see. We believe, as Father John Courtney Murray, S.J. has said, in "the validity of religious freedom as a human right of man today." And our schools, as the agents of American society, should reflect in their diversity those religious values which are expressed in the free life of our American society. None of our people should be subjected to the injustice of competing with their own tax money in order to make this possible.

The educational aid proposals which will be considered in the present Congress offer hope that we have finally found a way to give Federal aid to all of our varied schools without becoming imbroiled in arguments about church and state. For many years, I have felt that such aid should be made available to families and to the individual students. That is why I have promoted legislation to give tax relief for educational expenses.

Now that we see aid to education as a part of the war on poverty, now that poverty-impacted areas are seen as the special areas in need of improved educational services, there is hope that textbooks and other educational materials can be made available on an equitable basis to children in public and nonpublic schools. This help should, as I see it, at least become available to all children in the areas of greatest economic need.

Under the proposed program for aid to education, we are no longer dealing with the idea of large grants to the States to strengthen public educational systems, mainly by construction and increases in salaries. Title 2 of the bill would allot Federal money in proportion to each State's total school enrollment. Such money must be spent in accordance with a State plan which would provide assurance that, to the extent authorized by law, textbooks and other materials would be provided on an equitable basis to children in public and nonpublic schools that satisfy the State's compulsory education laws. Title 3 calls for supplementary educational centers and services to make available the results of educational research, such as remedial reading, counseling, testing programs, educational television, teaching machines, and taped lessons. Project grants for these services would be made to representative groups in local school districts, and these groups would include all interested agencies, such as parochial schools and public libraries.

The last Congress passed a bill granting substantial aid to all colleges and universities, and the present program calls for university grants for educational research, work-study programs, and further student financial aid in the form of scholarships.

As Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt of the National Catholic Welfare Conference has said, the President is calling for cooperation between the Nation's public and private schools. That is a principle which we in the Knights of Columbus should support and promote. And I can assure you that I will do everything in my power to see to it that as this legislation goes through Congress the ways in which nonpublic school children and their families can benefit from it are expanded and fully clarified.

In 1964 the several States spent about $30 billion on education. In the same year, Congress appropriated about $6 billion for all Federal education programs. This differential will probably continue, for American education is, and should be, primarily a State and local enterprise, as well as an independent and private one. The practical job of achieving equal educational opportunities for all children must necessarily be done on the State and local levels.

But if the Federal Government is a minor partner in American education, it should recognize and carry out its responsibilities in this area in the most efficient manner possible. That is why I have proposed to the President that we should have a Federal Department of Education headed by a Secretary of Education with Cabinet rank. The future of our young people is too important for anything less. Let's show the world that we in America value education for its true importance by giving it a voice of authority in the top echelon of the executive branch of our Government. Let's stop making education look like a second-rate concern by relegating it to a second-rate status in our governmental structure.

Brother Knights, I earnestly believe that in this matter of education, as in everything which touches the public welfare, the Catholic layman has an opportunity to respond to the call of the church for an active laity. The mission of the church concerns the welfare of all. It is for every person who lives in the community whether Catholic, Protestant, Jew, or member of no religion. And the mission of the church is to every human activity. It is in our worldly responsibilities—in our jobs and in our family life—that we of the laity can best participate in the mission of Christianity. We must study and heed the teaching of the great social encyclicals. We must be guided by those wise words of Pope Pius XII to the Second World Congress of the Lay Apostolate: "Today more than ever, laymen must cooperate in all forms of the apostolate, especially by making the Christian spirit penetrate all family, social, economic, and political life."

And what is the Christian spirit if it is not the spirit of redemptive charity, the spirit which, like that of Columbus, dares the unknown and ventures courageously to widen the horizons of life for all mankind? Living in that spirit we will be true Knights of Columbus, true Catholics, and men whom posterity will remember as true Christophers—true bearers of Christ. Such men are the greatest need of the world today. And I count it an honor to be numbered among you here tonight.

Events in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter to the President from the Young Democrats of the University of Bridgeport. These fine young college students have become greatly concerned, like millions of other Americans, over the deplorable events in Alabama and the denial of voting rights to a segment of their fellow citizens. The President's moving address to the joint session of Congress last night is a magnificent response to the need. I am sure these students applaud the President's speech and his recommendations. Here is their letter:

MARCH 10, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: In view of the tragic situation in Selma, Ala., we urge you to use all Federal resources in your power to stop the violence and bloodshed there.

It shocks one's conscience that such acts may happen under the eyes of the Federal Government.

We urge you to protect our fellow Americans there and to help them secure their fundamental rights as American citizens such as registering and voting for which they have been bravely fighting.

It is only when these rights are secured that we may be proud of a truly democratic Nation.

Yours very truly,

BURT LEPOW,
Young Democrats,
University of Bridgeport.

Who Will Feed Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I received in my office today a copy of an ad which the Chicago board of trade has been running in several Midwest newspapers. Because the subject matter of the ad is of such critical interest, I feel that more Americans should be made aware of what is probably the world's No. 1 area of concern:

WHO WILL FEED THEM?

Hunger is probably the world's No. 1 problem. Half of the world's 3 billion people suffer chronically from undernourishment and malnutrition.

Starvation now kills approximately 10,000 people every day. With each day the situation grows worse—world population is increasing by more than 70 million each year. At this rate the world population will be 6 billion people by the year 2000.

Hunger's unrest feeds communism. However, the Communists cannot feed the hungry. They actually have trouble feeding themselves.

American agriculture, on the other hand, can feed many more than our own people; in a recent year, nearly 20 million tons of foodstuffs were provided to other countries. Our productivity is an asset of incalculable value.

The world's largest grain market urges that we:

Increase agricultural exports as an instrument of foreign policy;

Study food reserves needed to meet drought and other disaster conditions;

Help countries outside the Iron Curtain develop their own modern, efficient agriculture; and

Inform the American people of the significance and value of American agriculture.

For years controversies over details of farm programs have obscured the American farmer's remarkable contribution toward national well-being, security, and stability. Sound, new farm policies that take the broad view of the great contribution will make better use of our extremely valuable agricultural resources and will advance American principles abroad.

This advertisement is a part of a continuing program by the Chicago Board of Trade to acquaint the public with the strength of American agriculture, the most remarkable production system the world has ever seen. It is indeed an asset of incalculable value. Let's use it as such.

St. Patrick's Day Celebration in Bay City, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday my hometown of Bay City, Mich., will be the scene of one of the largest and finest St. Patrick's Day parades in the Midwest. Americans of all backgrounds feel a kinship in the spirit of the Irish and join with them in celebrating this, the most Irish of an Irish holiday. I would like to pause on this occasion and call the attention of my colleagues to that first St. Patrick's Day parade in Bay City.

The idea for Bay City's St. Patrick's Day parade had its birth on a cold February 9, 1955, as three members of the Bay City Lion's Club were en route to their weekly luncheon meeting. The trio consisted of James H. Gates, city clerk, C. A. Kindermann, and the late John B. O'Shea. One of them had read in the newspaper of plans for the New York City parade of the Irish that year and commented that since Bay City had so many Irish he did not see why our area, too, could not have something similar. New York City did not have a monopoly on St. Patrick's Day parades. Bay City had a sizable Irish population: why not a parade? This time, the idea was translated into action as long dormant ambitions blossomed into a flurry of activity in mid-February.

Men from the newspaper, the radio, and the television stations, the fire department, and many dyed-in-the-wool Irish were quickly enlisted for the occasion. A queen's contest was organized and a parade committee was picked just a month before the event. What began as an Irish undertaking quickly turned into a city drive as French, German, Polish, and other neighbors caught up the spirit of St. Patrick.

Early apprehensions of the few were soon drowned by the spirit of festivity. Various organizations and businesses joined the fray. By parade time, a half-dozen bands and more floats, hundreds of cars, and over 1,000 marchers awaited the signal.

Over 10,000 people stood and stomped in the 20° weather to watch Bay City's first St. Patrick's Day parade. It was the best parade that Bay City had seen in a long time. This was a parade to warm any Irish heart. And to make others wish they were Irishmen, at least for the day.

The Bay City Irish had the only St. Patrick's queen in Michigan and the only parade in the State that day. The parade has grown steadily since 1955. There is now a St. Patrick's Day Parade Association to plan and conduct the parade each year. The event has grown larger each year and last year some 70,000 people turned out to see the Irish and would-be-Irish parade through the heart of Bay City.

I expect to leave Washington later this week to be in my hometown, and O'Cederberg and other Irish-for-a-day will join the true sons of the Emerald Isle in another mammoth St. Patrick's Day event.

Office of Community Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have joined in introducing legislation which calls for establishment of an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President.

It is important that we take this time to delineate the differences between this measure and the President's proposal for a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development. I am urging the establishment of an office in the executive branch of the Federal Government which will coordinate all programs that affect the metropolitan centers of this Nation.

The administration, on the other hand, has proposed the creation of a new bureaucracy. The President in his message on cities sent to Congress on March 2 which recommended the new Cabinet-level Department stated:

> The new Department will consist of all the present programs of HHFA. In addition it will be primarily responsible for Federal participation in metropolitan area thinking and planning.

Local and State governments today are seeking coordination and assistance from the Federal Government. They do not want Federal domination. The Office of Community Development, as proposed in this legislation today, would not discourage local and State initiative.

Mr. Speaker, in 1962 the Democrat administration proposed the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. That proposal was rejected by the House of Representatives by a vote of 264 to 150.

This year the administration has changed the name of the proposed Department; but the major weaknesses in the proposal still exist.

For example, there are many Federal programs involving our urban and metropolitan areas which do not come under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. A multitude of Federal functions would remain where they are now even if Congress were to approve the administration's request for a new Department of Housing and Urban Development. Let me cite just a few:

The Federal highway program affecting access to municipalities and expressways through cities as well as city streets would remain in the Department of Commerce.

Water pollution and sewage disposal programs would remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare where they are now.

Vocational education funds, social security activities, welfare and poverty programs, Hill-Burton funds for hospitals, assistance to schools in federally impacted areas, activities designed to promote public health, all of these would remain right where they are now.

Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Congress over 4 years ago, I had the privilege of serving as chairman of the Committee on Municipalities in the Kansas Legislature for 10 years. I believe I am well aware of the complex problems faced by metropolitan areas. During my service in the U.S. House of Representatives, I have worked closely with local and State officials on many problems of Federal concern.

The real need as I see it is to provide coordination, to offer technical assistance and counsel from the Federal level to local and State officials.

The proposal I have offered represents an economical and practical approach toward developing a coordinated national policy which will benefit urban and metropolitan areas across the United States. I urge early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

California Industry's Contribution Toward Easing Gold Flow Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert F. Six, president of Continental Airlines, which has its headquarters in Los Angeles, Calif., announced today that he had signed a letter of intent to buy 12 Douglas DC–9 twin jet airliners and had taken an option for another 6 DC–9's.

This action by Continental Airlines will represent an investment of more than $40 million. I would like to point out that these are American dollars which could have gone overseas if Mr. Six and his company had elected to buy the chief competitor of the DC–9, the British Aircraft Co.'s BAC–111.

There are many, many factors which any airline must consider in placing such a large order for any new aircraft. Nevertheless, I am confident that one of those factors was Continental Airlines' desire to, wherever possible, purchase American-built aircraft in order to support our President's program to help ease the U.S. gold flow problem.

I am very pleased to bring this action by a California-based company to the attention of my colleagues.

The Survey Ship "Explorer"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years the Coast and Geodetic Survey, an agency of the U.S. Department of Commerce, has been surveying the waters surrounding Puerto Rico. These surveys by the Nation's oldest scientific body, whose beginning goes back to the days of Thomas Jefferson, are essential to the safety of the seagoing commerce in the Caribbean Sea.

This year, the ocean survey ship *Explorer* has arrived again to continue the survey it began in 1962. The work it is doing is not only of interest to Puerto Ricans, but also, I believe, to all our citizens because similar work is being carried out elsewhere, along the coasts of the United States, by other vessels of the "white fleet" of this agency.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I therefore submit, for inclusion in the Appendix, a news article and editorial from the San Juan Star on the arrival of the *Explorer:*

[From the San Juan (P.R.) Star, Feb. 13, 1965]

"EXPLORER" HERE TO CONTINUE MAPPING OF THE OCEAN FLOOR

(By Frank Ramos)

The ocean survey ship *Explorer*—armed with fathometers instead of guns and staffed by 15 officer engineers—arrived here yesterday to resume the task of mapping the ocean floor off the Puerto Rican coast.

The ship, which sailed here from its home base in Norfolk, Va., is operated by the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The survey is being conducted as part of a program which began in 1962 and whose overall purpose is to revise nautical charts for the Puerto Rico-Virgin Islands area. The present charts are based on surveys made in the early 1900's.

The *Explorer* will spend approximately 4 months in the Caribbean area mapping the ocean bottom around San Juan Harbor, off the east coast of Puerto Rico, in Vieques Sound and possibly Charlotte Amalie Harbor in St. Thomas.

Captain of the 1,900-ton vessel is Cmdr. Marvin T. Paulson, of Hatton, N. Dak., a civil engineer by profession.

MEASURES DEPTH

Paulson said yesterday that the *Explorer* measures the ocean depth by using a fathometer to bounce sound waves off the ocean bottom. Depth is indicated by the amount of time it takes the signal to strike bottom and return, he added.

Paulson said that by taking soundings at periodic intervals—perhaps as close as every 30 seconds—scientists can form a general idea of the contour of the ocean floor.

NAUTICAL CHARTS

The depth readings, which are automatically recorded by the fathometer, are later used by cartographers to draw nautical charts.

"These nautical charts warn navigators of shallow waters where a ship might easily be grounded," Paulson said.

Paulson said that in addition to mapping the ocean floor the *Explorer* will also take samples of sea water in different locations and at various depths. This water will be tested to determine temperature, salt and oxygen content.

The ship's commander said that knowledge of the oxygen content of the water could prove a major aid for fishermen, since it revealed the amount of biological life in the area.

Paulson said the *Explorer* will also set out buoys to measure the direction and speed of ocean currents in San Juan Harbor and other areas. The buoys contain instruments which signal their readings back to the ship.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey is the Nation's oldest scientific body. It was established in 1807 during the administration of President Thomas Jefferson.

[From the San Juan (P.R.) Star, Feb. 13, 1965]

THE SILENT SERVICE

There are so many services of immeasurable importance being carried on by government that rarely come to mind until they show up in our own front yard. Such a silent service is the survey being made by the Coast and Geodetic Survey ship *Explorer* which is mapping the ocean bottom off the east coast of Puerto Rico.

The scientific charting of the ocean floor around us is indispensable to ocean commerce, warning navigators of shallow waters and providing the scientists with information valuable in studying everything from earthquakes to erosion.

This silent service that means so much to men who live on, under, and by the sea is the Nation's oldest scientific body. It was established in 1807 but, as we said earlier, you'd hardly know it was around because it never brags about its contributions to our daily lives.

Portrait of Our American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, no month in the entire year possesses more historical significance than does the month of February.

In that month we celebrate the birthdays of three distinguished Americans, each of whom had a distinct bearing on the future of our Nation. George Washington was the Father of Our Country; Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator; Thomas Edison, the inventor, who demonstrated that through the American way of life a poor boy can attain success.

It is thus appropriate that we celebrate February as American History Month and bring to the attention of our citizens the importance of having a full knowledge of our American history.

In bringing to the attention the courage, strength and determination of past years through the observance of a national history month, we would help to underscore the greatness of our Nation.

The State fo New Jersey, through its State legislature and by a Proclamation by its Governor called upon all its citizens to celebrate February as "American History Month." In connection with this celebration, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in this House the remarks made by Mrs. Geraldine Earlin, a resident of my congressional district, at a student assembly program in the school auditorium of A. J. Demarest Junior High School in Hoboken, N.J.

Mrs. Earlin has an extensive background in civic affairs and is widely known as an author and lecturer. Her present dissertation on our American history should have widespread distribution, and, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by Mrs. Earlin, entitled "Portrait of Our American Heritage:"

PORTRAIT OF OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE—WASHINGTON, LINCOLN, EDISON

(By Geraldine Earlin)

Thank you, Mr. Stickel. It is, indeed, an honor and a privilege to address this student body and faculty of the A. J. Demarest Junior High School of Hoboken, N.J., on such a vital issue as our American heritage.

For the past few years, many Governors, State legislatures, boards of freeholders, and mayors have proclaimed February as "American History Month," calling upon our citizenry to plan appropriate programs in commemoration of George Washington, the Father of Our Country; Abraham Lincoln, the Emancipator; and Thomas Edison, the inventor, whose birthdays we celebrate during the month of February.

We must all realize that we do enjoy the blessings of this free land due to the hardships endured by the Father of our Country, George Washington, and those men who felt that personal liberty was to be placed above all their worldly possessions. We know that when the hour arrived that someone must rise up to preserve this Union that the weight of that burden lay on the shoulders of Abraham Lincoln. We also should realize that the life of Thomas Edison shows us what can be accomplished under our capitalistic or free enterprise system which is truly American; for where else in the world could a poor boy like Edison have risen to be the wealthy man that he was?

I have with me a copy of the resolution as it is passed each year by the New Jersey State Legislature and Governor Hughes' proclamation calling upon all New Jersey citizens to celebrate February as "American History Month" in honor of these three great Americans. I want to read the resolution for it is beautifully worded:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2, STATE OF NEW JERSEY

"Concurrent resolution to declare the month of February as 'American History Month' in the State of New Jersey and for a proclamation thereof by the Governor

"(Introduced January 12, 1965, by Senator Deamer, without reference)

"Whereas under our Federal Constitution, liberty for the first time in history became an actuality—'Liberty is not a heritage but a conquest to be achieved by each generation'; and

"Whereas the American serviceman of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war fought for and offered their lives to stop tyranny and totalitarianism and to preserve the American ideals of individual freedom as embodied in the most permanent Constitution in the history of Government; and

"Whereas our country, born in the travail of tyranny, must remain under God's providence forever free and independent and alien ideologies must never be permitted to reach out and choke God-given liberty; and

"Whereas the best protection of our American heritage must always be in the hearts and minds of our people; and

"Whereas in February we observe the birthdays of three great Americans, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Thomas Edison, who symbolize in their divergent achievements American's immortal heritage, and are representative of the great men who toiled and died to develop our resources and to win and maintain the freedom necessary for the pursuit of happiness: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the general assembly concurring): That the month of February shall be known in New Jersey as 'American History Month,' and the citizens thereof are urged to formulate and sponsor appropriate programs in commemoration of the achievements of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Thomas Edison.

"That the Governor is requested by appropriate proclamation to set aside the said month of February as 'American History Month' in New Jersey.

"That this resolution shall take effect immediately. (Resolution passed.)"

"PROCLAMATION FROM OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR, JANUARY 14, 1965

"Whereas the month of February is an important month in American history, marking the birth of two of its great Presidents, George Washington and Abraham Lincoln; and

"Whereas the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution is sponsoring February as American History Month; and

"Whereas knowledge of American history is the basis for outstanding achievements by our citizens;

"Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Hughes, Governor of the State of New Jersey, do hereby proclaim the month of February 1965 as American History Month in New Jersey and call upon all organizations and public and private schools to encourage the study of American history during this month so that all citizens may be fully aware of their good fortune to live in a country dedicated to self-government and personal freedom.

"Given, under my hand and the great seal of the State of New Jersey, this 14th day of January in the year of Our Lord 1965 and in the independence of the United States the 189th.

"[SEAL] RICHARD J. HUGHES,
"Governor.

"By the Governor:
"ROBERT M. FALCEY,
"Acting Secretary of State."

One of our great generals, Gen. Mark Clark, has said that he believes most of our people would be better Americans if they were more demonstrative and sentimental in the performance of their patriotic duties. He suggests that observance of such patriotic days gives all our people higher concepts of loyalty.

The fundamentals of good Americanism, said General Clark, are faith in our country, its Constitution, its laws and history, and its spiritual and religious dedication. Teach these fundamentals to young Americans, and they in their turn and time will keep America great.

This is the challenge to you boys and girls, today, for you are only a few years away from the task of shouldering the responsibilities of our great country. You must avoid the errors of historical miscalculations, in the future, made by recent generations which have been so costly.

The New York State Board of Regents' statement March 28, 1955, on "America's Moral and Spiritual Heritage" reiterates the principles that "Belief in and dependence on God is the very cornerstone upon which our Founding Fathers builded" and they cite the Declaration of Independence, the pronouncements of Washington, Franklin, Lincoln, and Jefferson as proofs.

The regents call on schools to stress spiritual heritage; to have the children inspired by the example of their ancestors; to be guided by the faith and love of their parents; to be encouraged by their spiritually sensitive teachers, so that there will be renewed in their daily lives America's moral and spiritual heritage: "Liberty under God—respect for the dignity and rights of each individual—devotion to freedom."

Throughout our entire history as a nation, these fundamental beliefs have been our guiding star and compass in time of storm and trouble.

In all American history no other man has merited and received such universal respect and honor as George Washington. The greatness of Washington lies in the fact that he overcame tremendous obstacles and accomplished his purpose through sheer force of character and perseverance.

Great as were Washington's achievements as a soldier, far greater were his achievements as a statesman and a citizen. As the first President of the United States, he was confronted by problems never faced by any other man. Through his wisdom, patience, and persistence, he was able to place our young country upon a solid foundation for future growth.

His military career began when he was but 19, with the rank of major in the Virginia Militia; organized to protect the frontiers from French and Indian encroachments.

His name does not appear on the Declaration of Independence because, as commander in chief of the Continental Army, he was far away on the field of battle. Already he was fighting the cause of independence before these others had pondered the terms in which that cause should be proclaimed to the world.

Later as commander in chief of the Colonial Army he carried the American Revolutionary War for independence to a victorious close at Yorktown, Va. Washington was master of the battleground chessboard after trapping Cornwallis, using time-honored British tactics. His brilliance as a general had been demonstrated time and again as he made retreat after retreat across New York and New Jersey and now he had caught Cornwallis in the very trap that had been set for him in New Jersey, when Washington was all but trapped between the Hackensack and Passaic Rivers.

The glory of that surrender scene at Yorktown, that 19th day of October 1781 can best be realized through the following description:

"Halfheartedly they marched, eyes to the ground, their once proud crimson jackets rumpled, and shouldered muskets pointed aimlessly to the sky. Halfheartedly they marched between the tattered ranks of the American and French, toward the gleaming white steed, standing stonelike at the head of the column. Halfheartedly they marched, to lay down their arms at the feet of the American Commander in Chief, General of the Army George Washington, sitting proudly atop the noble courser which had seen him through a revolution that was to implant upon this continent a form of thought which makes men yearn to be free." (From "Yorktown, Va., Where Washington Slept, Fought, and Won," an article I wrote for Trailer Topics magazine, March 1962.)

We must, however, be mindful of the awful suffering which took place before that glorious victory. It was at Valley Forge, the winter of 1777–78 that Washington is portrayed, in that famous painting, kneeling in prayer in the snow and he certainly had true cause to seek the help of God, for Congress seemed unaware of its responsibility to clothe and maintain the army which was fighting for the freedom of the country. His ragged forces bled, starved, and froze during that unforgettable winter. In fact, Washington wrote to Congress, "Their marches might be traced by the blood of their feet"; for the most part they had no shoes, and were clothed in tatters and rags. Of the 9,000 men he had under his command, 3,000 had deserted to the British before the winter was over; the British were warm, well fed, and well clothed, and "holed up" in Philadelphia, only a few miles away. The rigors and hardships of Valley Forge would have vanquished any other man but Washington.

You children must realize that the personal liberty which you now enjoy under our form of government is due to this great suffering which led to the winning of the war of independence.

We know that upon the ratification of the Constitution of the United States, after much debate and discussion, George Washington was unanimously elected our first President; in fact they would entrust no other with the reins of government. Because of his noble deeds he is always thought of as: "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Abraham Lincoln is best remembered brooding over a broken Nation at a time in our history when brother fought against brother over the question of slavery.

While Washington had warned, in his Farewell Address, that we should "steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world * * * to have with them as little political connection as possible," we find that we have strayed afar from that advice and, now, even have our soldiers in practically every corner of the globe. We find that Lincoln warned us that other nations had risen through love of liberty, but had also fallen, not through war and defeat, but through a quiet and gradual and peaceful betrayal by the citizenry of their rights. Lincoln said, "At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it? * * * If it ever reach us, it must spring up among us. * * * If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time, or die by suicide."

Lincoln also said, "As the patriots of '76 did to the support of the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and laws let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor—let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father, and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty." (This regardless of race, religion, or color.)

Edison's story is the story of America. It is the saga of free men inspired to greatness by the challenge of work to be done, of needs to be met. His legacy exemplifies America's true strength—that hard work under conditions of freedom serves all the people and the Nation.

The minds and hearts of you young people must be stirred to rise to the great traditions which are your heritage, as you study the life of Thomas Edison.

Anecdotes of Edison's childhood include his trying to hatch a basket of eggs with the warmth of his body, at the age of 7. At 8, he stuffed two little boys with seidlitz powder, hoping the gas would make them fly. At 15 he rescued a Michigan stationmaster's son from death. The grateful father taught Edison telegraphy. The next year, when the cable between Ontario and Port Huron broke, young Tom used a locomotive whistle to telegraph across the river.

From his curiosity, imagination, and tenacity came a creative wealth, much too long to list. While he probably is best known for inventing the electric light, phonograph, and motion picture camera, he also was responsible for hundreds of new instruments for mankind's knowledge, pleasure, and use. His works launched industries, sped communication, enriched comfort, and advanced culture.

While he was a man of few words his following bit of advice is excellent: "The main

quality for success in life in my estimation is ambition with a will to work."

"American History Month" not only gives us the chance to honor these three great men whose birthdays fall in February but it gives us the opportunity to rededicate our belief in our American form of government, as it was intended by those patriots who suffered so much in order to hand us this great country.

Let us reevaluate all that the United States has stood for—for only this knowledge and the determination to fight for it will halt the advance of foreign ideologies in our country.

Now, I would like to show you a very beautiful film which I know you will enjoy: "Flags of American Liberty."

The Problem Faced by American Wheatgrowers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, if there is doubt in the minds of any of our colleagues about the serious problem faced by American wheatgrowers after many years of below-parity income, I am sure that some of the mail that comes across my desk would help convince them.

Two very articulate and knowledgeable spokesmen for the wheat producers of Oregon are my good friend Al Lamb, manager of the Morrow County Grain Growers, and John Welbes, executive vice president of the Oregon Wheat League. For timely comments on proposals to extend the certificate program for wheat to 100 percent of parity, I recommend the following letters most highly:

MORROW COUNTY GRAIN GROWERS, INC.,
Lexington, Oreg., March 8, 1965.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: I am pleased to learn, although not surprised, that you are a supporter of the proposal to give 100 percent of parity support to that portion of the wheat crop which goes for domestic use other than for feed. I understand the proposal calls for a raising of the value of domestic production certificates to accomplish this.

This method can accomplish a raise in wheat farmers income without an increase in cost to the Government. It is estimated that the maximum raise in the price of a loaf of bread will not exceed 1 cent per loaf. This does not appear to create a hardship on consumers and it would insure a fair price being received by our wheat growers. It hardly seems fair to oppose this result, on the basis of higher consumer costs, and expect wheat farmers to continue this involuntary subsidy to the consumer section of the economy. The cry of a bread tax smacks of politics.

Some have advocated forcing the smaller farmers out of existence and onto the labor market on the grounds that they are inefficient. This is ridiculous. Our Nation already has several million unemployed and has a war on poverty underway. Why not take the easy way and assure them the possibility of earning their way as farmers through fair prices for their produce? Already a small depression is getting underway in our rural areas. Why allow it to grow and wreck the whole economy?

I would like to point out that no farmer either large or small can be expected to make a living if the price he receives is less than parity. The income of even our large wheat farmers are not at all high enough to make a profit on their investments. Many will face ruin unless some method of increasing farm income is devised. This will result in unemployment and loss of markets to others in the cities, etc. Not just the wheat farmers will suffer.

Wheat income has been steadily declining since 1962 while taxes, supplies, and labor have increased. An increase to full parity on domestic consumption would increase the food costs of an average family of five by not over $8 annually. This seems like a small price to pay for getting our wheat farmers on fair return again.

Along with a domestic price equaling parity I would hope that every effort be made to keep a fair share of world markets and that no more acreage reductions be attempted or urged as long as other wheat exporting nations keep present acreages or allow increases. I would hope that all restrictions on export selling of wheat to any nation with the money to pay for it would be lifted.

Sincerely,

AL LAMB, *Manager.*

OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE,
March 8, 1965.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: In our recent letters to you, we stressed the urgent need for a substantial increase in wheat grower income. We referred to resolutions passed in this regard by both the Oregon Wheat League and the national association. You will remember that it is strongly recommended that this be accomplished through providing full parity on the portion of production used for domestic food consumption.

This could be achieved by raising the value of the domestic certificate under the present law. Both Senators MCGOVERN and YOUNG, who have introduced bills for extension of the present legislation, proposed this method of improving income. Undoubtedly this approach is chosen because most knowledgeable people on this subject, including the President, agree that increased income should come from the market place rather than from the Federal Treasury.

We believe that you already know that this method will immediate raise the hue and cry of "bread tax." Senator MCGOVERN has stated that the increase of the wheat in a loaf of bread, if his proposal is passed, will result in a 1 cent raise in cost per loaf. This is based on the fact that it takes approximately a 60 cent rise in the per bushel price of wheat to raise the cost of bread by 1 cent per loaf.

The grower believes he is justified in supporting proposals to get increased income from the consumer inasmuch as the nation as a whole is experiencing one of the most prosperous periods in history. Wages in industry are at an all time high. Cooperative profits have exceeded all previous levels. Even though food costs have risen in recent years, the percentage of gross income paid by the American consumer for food is at an all time low, 18.8 percent of total income compared to 30 to 52 percent in other nations. The quality and selection of food stuffs available, as well as convenience and size of packaging is by far the best obtainable anywhere.

The producer believes that American buyers can well afford an increase of $5 to $8 per year in the cost of bread. As a matter of comparison, if grower income were to be supplemented by the use of compensatory payments coming directly from the Treasury, it is estimated that taxpayer costs would amount to $50 to $60 annually.

The present price of wheat, market price plus certificates, averages nationally at a level of approximately $1.72 per bushel income to the producer. It doesn't have to be pointed out to you that this is a substantial reduction from prices paid for wheat in 1947, while prices generally for industrial production are two and a half to three times 1947 levels. Objections to increased domestic wheat prices on the part of those who benefit from low raw material prices are subterfuges and should be disregarded.

Objections from the consumer cannot be justified when food prices require so little of his income compared to what he pays for a new automobile, refrigerator or television set.

We sincerely hope that when you hear objections to raising producer income through market channels, you will be able to say that this is the most logical method of approaching a solution to a serious imbalance of income to an important segment of the general economy of the Nation.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. WELBES,
Executive Vice President.

Voice of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the four scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. One student was selected from each State and the District of Columbia to compete as finalists in this worthy contest.

The finalist from the District of Columbia, Miss Elizabeth Marie Howard, has written a thoughtful, intelligent essay on the lesson the Union of the United States has for the modern world. I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this fine essay:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

(By Elizabeth Marie Howard)

One hundred eighty years ago in America, there was a weak, loose-knit Union of States which had rendered very few powers to the Central Government. Today, on an international plane, there is a weak, loose-knit union of nations which have not yet taken advantage of the lesson learned by those American States in the 18th century.

When the colonists gained their independence, they made America a confederation of States. The States were related to one another only as trade partners, and the Central Government was little more than a name.

Times started to change, however; the westward expansion began, and the New World was being fully discovered. In order that this new country be able to take her place among the nations of the world, her people had to draw the individual States together in a strong union, and they had to increase the power of the Central Government. In order to make America the great Nation she is today, her people had to start thinking of

themselves as citizens of the United States, rather than just as citizens of the State of New York, or of the State of Georgia.

Today, we are faced with a similar situation. Times are changing again; travel into outer space is more than a distant dream, and access to new planets and even new civilization may possibly be realized in the foreseeable future. In order to insure against our destruction, either by external or by internal forces, nations of the earth must bind themselves together in a union of peace and understanding. In order to preserve the power and greatness of this earth, people everywhere must learn to think of themselves as citizens of the world, rather than as citizens of Russia, or of France, or of the United States of America. Just as our forefathers had the responsibility to expand their loyalties from State to Nation, we, their sons and daughters, have the responsibility to expand our loyalties from Nation to world.

Looking back into the annals of time, the modern citizen can find many examples of nations which have crumbled because the individually strong units which they were made of refused to forefit any of their powers to a central ruling body, or to unite in any way.

The Greeks are the prime example. They reufsed to listen to Socrates and others like him who knew that they must be neither Athenian nor Grecian, but csitizens of the world. And so it followed that the small, ununited city-states fell before the hosts of Philip of Macedon.

Another example is the Gallic Tribes, who discovered too late that they must fight Caesar as a unified body, and who were defeated by the strength of his empire. In like manner, had the American Indian tribes combined forces against the white man, they might today have been a proud and a great nation.

Anyone who ponders these facts of history will realize that the security and the very existence of the world depends on the unity of all nations. The achievement of such a unity demands mutual sacrifice and patient forebearance. Just as the citizens of the Thirteen Colonies gradually did away with their religious prejudices, as citizens of the world, it is our responsibility to do away with racial prejudices of all sorts. Just as the citizens of Massachusetts and Virginia abandoned their suspicions of one another and joined in a union of States, so must citizens of France and England, for example, join in a trust of friendship and unity. As the Northern and Southern States learned to live together despite differing opinions on the slave issue, so must the East and West strive to find some common ground for union despite their opposing views on communism and capitalism. But most important of all, as William Lloyd Garrison, a citizen of 19th century America paraphrased Socrates, we must also say: "My country is the world and my countrymen are mankind."

Some Reflections on Current U.S. Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I request to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of the Honorable True Davis who serves as our Ambassador to Switzerland. It is not surprising that Ambassador Davis made this address—entitled, "Some Reflections on Current U.S. Economic Policy"—before the Swiss-American Society for Cultural Relations in Lausanne, Switzerland, a country so well known for its financial interests. Ambassador Davis is well known for his vast knowledge in the banking and economic field.

I am delighted and proud to state to my colleague that Ambassador Davis is a friend of long duration and is one of the "greats" in American foreign service.

His address follows:

SOME REFLECTIONS ON CURRENT U.S. ECONOMIC POLICY

(By Ambassador True Davis)

Your invitation to speak to you in Lausanne tonight was triply pleasing to me. First, because it gives me an opportunity to visit your beautiful city again and to get together again with some of the distinguished people I have had the pleasure of meeting here; second, because it gives me an opportunity to present the views of the United States on some international economic questions which have recently been very much in the public eye; and, third, because now that the mayor of your fine city, Mr. Chevallaz, has become an honorary citizen of Kansas City, in my own home State of Missouri, it is a little like coming home to have a reunion with a fellow citizen.

In my remarks to you tonight I shall try to emphasize those aspects of American economic policy which affect not only the United States, but also our trading partners and the leading international financial centers, of which Switzerland is a very important one. In view of the great degree of economic interdependence in the world of today, a subject of obvious interest to many countries is the state of the American economy. Europeans, and others, have good reasons for wanting to know whether the American economy is continuing its expansion or whether expansion will always be followed by a recession every 3 or 4 years. They are also interested in the relationship between the American domestic economy and the balance-of-payments deficit, and the relationship between the balance-of-payments deficit and America's international obligations. This leads naturally to the question of whether the economic problems of the United States detract from its willingness or ability to carry out its international responsibilities. Our friends abroad also have a legitimate interest in how well the dollar is performing its important role in the international payments system. I hope that my following remarks will help to clarify the views of the United States on these matters.

Under the administration of President Johnson the U.S. Government has undertaken a number of important new domestic economic programs. The national economy has been given an important stimulus by the tax cut. New and improved training programs are helping to combat the problem of unemployment. A bold new program has been instituted to help those people who for one reason or another have not been caught up in the mainstream of economic progress. The first bill placed before the new Congress would vastly extend the medical care available to the aged. The amount of public attention directed to these new domestic programs, together with a tactical flexibility shown by the United States in certain recent international negotiations, has led some foreign observers to jump to the conclusion that the United States is withdrawing in its shell—that it is becoming so concerned with its domestic affairs that it is losing its interest in its international responsibilities. I hope to be able to demonstrate to you tonight that this is not so. I hope to be able to convince you—or in case there are no doubters among you anyway, to strengthen your belief—that the United States, although it may change its tactics as conditions change, has not lessened its willingness to face up to its international responsibilities; and that the United States continues to consider Western Europe crucial to the military defense, the political stability, and the economic progress of the free world as a whole. The importance we attach to our new domestic policies is not inconsistent with this. Continuing economic growth at home will make it easier for the United States to carry out its responsibilities abroad. Conversely, our acceptance of obligations to help defend the free world and to assist of the less developed nations has had a significant effect on our domestic economy. Developments in the European Economic Community, in EFTA, and in GATT, may well make great impressions in the interior of the North American Continent. Americans have come to accept this interrelationship between America and Europe—between America and the world—as a permanent part of their national political picture. The Americans of today have accepted, in fact if not in law, a limitation on their freedom of national action which would have been inconceivable to the generation of Americans which rejected the League of Nations.

THE CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

At present the United States is experiencing a remarkable economic expansion. It is not remarkable so much for the rate of growth, which has been exceeded in a number of other countries and has been exceeded in other periods in the United States, but for two other features—the duration of the period of expansion, and the stability of prices. After the 1953–54 recession we had a 35-month period of expansion before the 1957–58 recession set in. This was followed only by 24 months of recovery before the 1960–61 recession. The current period of expansion has already surpassed that of 1954–56 in duration and within a few months will have surpassed any other peacetime American expansion on record. Economists are agreed that current forces can be depended to carry the expansion on through 1965, and the U.S. Government is determined to see that it continues after that. As President Johnson said in his annual economic report to the Congress last month: "I do not believe recessions are inevitable. Up to now, every past expansion has ended in recession or depression—usually within 3 years from its start. But the vulnerability of an expansion cannot be determined by the calendar. Imbalance—not old age—is the threat to sustained advance."

The second remarkable feature of our current period of expansion is that a substantial expansion of the economy, with increase in the gross national product from $503 billion in 1960 to $622 billion in 1964, was not accompanied by the usual inflationary trends. Wholesale prices in 1964 were practically the same as in 1960, and consumer prices rose only 1.2 percent per year. Since it is reasonable to assume that there has been an improvement in the quality of goods, of which the price index cannot take account, it is fair to say that the purchasing power of the dollar is no less today than it was in 1960. This has been made possible by the increase in productivity, which has averaged 3.5 percent a year, and thus permitted wages to rise without an increase in unit labor costs. I, of course, don't need to tell you about all the dangers of inflation. I would like to point out, however, that one important effect of America's ability to avoid inflation, while prices in most other coun-

tries rose, was to make American goods more competitive on international markets. Thus U.S. exports have been increasing more rapidly than imports in recent years, giving us an ever increasing foreign trade surplus. This, of course, has made a significant contribution to the improvement in our balance-of-payments situation.

THE 1964 TAX REDUCTION

I do not intend to try to discuss all the factors which have contributed to the current economic expansion in the United States. I would like to say something, however, about the role of the 1964 tax reduction in furthering economic growth, because of the change it represents from traditional American economic policy. This was the first time in history that the U.S. Government has cut taxes for the stated purpose of stimulating the economy. It is also interesting to note that the 1965 budget, based on a reduced tax rate, foresees an increase in Government spending but a decrease in the deficit. I think it may also be interesting to note that our Federal Government budget has been increasing at a slower rate than the gross national product. In the last 5 years our gross national product has increased by 27 percent, while the Federal budget expenditures have increased by only 23 percent.

It has been the American experience that in an economy with substantial unemployment and with productive capacity not fully used the ups and downs in business activity are caused not by changes in the buying habits of consumers who always spend about 93 percent of their disposable income, but by fluctuations in the volume of disposal income in their hands. Thus, the idea behind the tax cut was simply that if more money were put into the hands of consumers they would buy more, production would rise, employment would rise, investment would rise, and, as incomes and profits rose, tax receipts would rise, even under a lower tax rate. Events so far seem to have proven this reasoning valid. The tax cut directly added $7.7 billion to disposable income in 1964 and is estimated to have caused consumer spending to increase by $9 billion. The increased demand resulting from the tax cut also spurred an increase in business investment. In view of the timelag between stimulus and investment, we may assume that a good part of the investment stimulated by the tax cut is still ahead of us. This investment, in turn, will add to income and thus create additional demand, in what is customarily referred to as a "vicious circle," although in this instance we are inclined to think of it as a "virtuous circle" instead.

UNEMPLOYMENT

In spite of the progress we have made since the last recession, there are still a number of economic tasks which the United States has to perform. In the international area, the two most important tasks are to solve our balance-of-payments problem, and to assist the developing countries to raise their standards of living and to assume roles of greater importance in world trade. In the domestic sphere, our most urgent task is to abolish unemployment. The social and political reasons for setting up this goal are obvious. There are economic reasons, too. Our national product is less than it would be if those who are now unemployed were producing. If they were working they would also be earning and spending more, and would thus increase demand and add another stimulus to the upward movement of the economy.

The Western Europeans accustomed to worrying about a shortage of labor, it may seem strange to think of a country so rich and productive as the United States as plagued by unemployment. An important reason for the continued existence of unemployment in the midst of plenty is the fact that American industry has prepared for the future, by finding ways to reduce the need for unskilled labor, better than American society in general has done by training workers in the skills needed in the future.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The second unfinished economic task, and the most urgent one in the international fields, is to correct our balance-of-payments situation. Much progress has already been made. Our balance-of-payments deficit has been reduced from over $4 billion in 1959 to $3.3 billion in 1963 and $3 billion in 1964. Furthermore, if we excluded from the calculation of our deficit, as many other countries do, the increased holdings of dollars by private firms and individuals abroad, our deficit in 1964 would have amounted to only $1.3 billion. This way of looking at the matter still does not do away with our need for further action, but it does give some indication of the confidence which private individuals throughout the world have in the dollar. Still more needs to be done if we are to maintain confidence in the dollar to keep it indispensable to the international payments system.

Before going into a discussion of the components of our balance-of-payments problem and how we expect to solve the problem, I would like to stress two general points about the balance of payments of the United States. The first is that there is a profound difference between the American payments problem and the payments problems which various other countries have had in recent years. In the common type of case, the balance-of-payments deficit results from structural weaknesses in the economy of the country which lead to deficits in the current account. This is another way of saying that the country is living beyond its means. This is not so in the case of the United States. Ever since the end of World War II we have had a surplus in our balance of goods and services, and in the last 2 years this surplus has risen at a rapid rate. This shows that the U.S. economy is basically healthy and competitive. We, of course, have a deficit in the capital account which outweighs the surplus on goods and services and thus causes an overall deficit. This is not a sign of economic weakness, either. American investments in foreign countries today will bring about increased earnings tomorrow. Thus the outflow of investment capital, even though it gives us concern today, will in the long run contribute to an improvement in our balance-of-payments situation.

The second point I wanted to make is that the private sector of the U.S. balance of payments has traditionally recorded a surplus, even including the deficitary capital account. If it were not for the dollars sent abroad for military expenditures and foreign aid, the United States would not have a balance-of-payments deficit. These items once represented a greater part of our balance-of-payments deficit than they do today, but measures instituted by President Kennedy reduced the dollar outflow for these programs, chiefly by tying most military and economic aid to the procurement of goods from the United States. We have not terminated our commitments for the defense of our allies or escaped our duty of extending assistance to the developing countries. Nor would we wish to unless a greater willingness by others to shoulder a fair share of the burden makes it possible for us to reduce our contribution even without jeopardizing the goals. Thus we still have to maintain large numbers of men abroad, military personnel, aid technicians, etc., together with their wives and children who alone total over 800,000. The cost of housing and feeding all these people constitutes a significant drain on our foreign exchange—as does that part of their salaries which they spend abroad (and from my observation I would say they spend most of their salaries abroad).

Now, as you are undoubtedly aware, the greatest part of our military expenditures are in Europe, and will continue to be so in the foreseeable future. While most of our foreign aid expenditures are in the other continents, it is Western Europe that is best able to share the aid burden with us. I think, therefore, that it is fair to consider the question of how great America's foreign expenditures for defense, and aid must be, to be a question falling within the realm of American-European relations. We have not sought the responsibilities which we now bear. We have not coveted foreign territory, nor have we sought political or economic privileges. We have only sought to help preserve the independence of countries threatened by military aggression and to help needy countries get onto the road to economic progress. Only with political stability and a leveling of economic disparities can the world as a whole move toward a better future.

When most of the countries of Western Europe were left prostrate at the end of World War II and were threatened with military aggression, economic chaos, and in some cases political turmoil, we willingly came to their aid. We extended a total of almost $40 billion in aid to Western Europe, most of which was in the form of grants. In addition, we accepted the main responsibility for the defense of Western Europe and stationed large numbers of troops here. When Europe had sufficiently recovered, we turned our attention to the underdeveloped countries of the world, where poverty and lack of technical skills frustrated attempts to better the conditions of life. For years we were practically the only source of aid to those nations. Now that Western Europe has not only recovered from the ravages of war, but has attained a degree of prosperity undreamed of when the Marshall plan began, it is appropriate to ask whether Western Europe should not bear an even greater part of the military and foreign aid burdens which we took up when Europe was not able to do so.

It is clear that economically Western Europe is able to play an even greater role in its own defense than it now does. In the political field, however, European preparedness is weaker. For Europe to achieve greater effectiveness in the military field, it must be prepared to subordinate national aspirations to the common good. It was in such a spirit that during the First World War we were proud to have our troops serve under the command of Marshal Foch, because we recognized that France was bearing the burden of responsibility for the success of the Allied cause. Responsibility and influence inevitably go hand in hand. Thus, those who say they would like to see a lessening of American influence might consider offering to assume part of America's responsibilities.

Before leaving the balance-of-payments question I would like to say a few words about the measures announced by President Johnson on February 10 for the purpose of slowing down the excessive outflow of capital. As I mentioned before, if we could dispense with our military and aid expenditures abroad we would not have a balance-of-payments deficit. We have no thought, however, of shirking our international responsibilities. Thus we have had to see where a reduction of the dollar outflow would do the least harm. To place any restrictions on imports would have been so contrary to our basic foreign trade policy as to be out of the question. This left private capital transactions as the only area in which reductions of any great size might be effected.

As you know, in order to counter a sharp rise in sales of foreign securities in the United States the interest equalization tax was applied to such sales effective July 19, 1963. When the decline in sales of foreign securi-

ties was followed by an increase in bank loans and other credits, it was a logical step to apply the tax to them as well. The most controversial parts of the program announced by President Johnson this month have been the voluntary programs to restrain direct investment and short-term loans, and the omission of any reference to plans to increase the interest rate. With reference to the suggestion, made principally by bankers, that an increase in interest rates would be the only correct solution to our problem, I would only like to say that such a step would be less difficult in Western Europe, where full employment is the rule, than in the United States, any step which might slow down the economic expansion might intensify our unemployment problem.

I have heard suggestions, both in America and abroad, that our voluntary programs for the restraint of loans under 1 year and of direct investment are unrealistic, and that we should have imposed formal controls in these fields, too. The reason we did not, is that we do not wish to discourage all transactions in these fields to the same degree. Many of the short-term credits serve useful and desirable purposes, such as the furtherance of international trade. Direct investments, too, vary considerably in their usefulness and in their importance to the companies concerned. Some of them invite not dollars, but profits earned abroad. These funds would be difficult to bring under U.S. Government formal control, but we might, by informal consultation, have some of them repatriated to the United States. Another reason for our reluctance to impose a rigid hindrance on direct investment is that experience has shown such investment to be a powerful stimulant to American exports. In fact, almost one-fourth of American exports are brought by foreign subsidiaries of American firms. A simple tax would not permit the desired flexibility of treatment. Some type of foreign exchange licensing system would be required. This would involve a more direct Government intervention in private enterprise than we would like to see.

With respect to the idea that the voluntary programs are unrealistic, I would like to say that we are not naive about such matters, but believe we have solid reasons for our optimism. One is that the number of large firms engaged in direct investment abroad and large-scale lending abroad is relatively small. This greatly reduces the problem of insuring uniform action. Another is that the program was formulated after consultation with the banks, who promised their full support. In the short 2 weeks since the program was announced we have already seen some striking evidence that American banks and corporations intend to support it in good faith. On the day the program was announced the president of a large American corporation called the Secretary of Commerce to inform him that his firm had planned a $72 million direct investment abroad, but that he now planned to reduce it to $60 million and would explore the possibility of cutting out another $15 million. A few days later we learned that a European consortium had approached some American banks to request a loan of $200 million for a period of 11 months—just under the year which would have made the loan subject to the tax. The Europeans requested a "gentlemen's agreement" that at the end of the 11 months the loan would be "rolled over" for an additional 11 months. The American banks refused the proposal as contrary to the spirit of the new program, and reported the offer to the Treasury Department. Of course, a voluntary program always entails a certain risk. But we are not going to be panicked into imposing more controls than the situation clearly makes necessary.

I should like to make one last comment on the subject of American direct investment abroad. A good number of countries, including some which express concern at the volume of American investment, still have in effect measures which tend to encourage foreign investment in their countries or which discourage their own citizens from investing abroad. It seems to us that there should be no place for such measures in countries which are not suffering from balance-of-payments deficits. Another factor which should not be overlooked, is that a very large part of American direct investment abroad was stimulated by the formation of the European Economic Community. As international tariffs among the six EEC member countries have been reduced exports from the United States to the Common Market have become subject to an increasing competitive disadvantage. Many American firms have attempted to overcome this disadvantage by setting up plants within the Common Market itself. It was this discrimination against American goods which prompted the United States to take the initiative in bringing into being the Kennedy round in GATT. If the EEC and all the other participants cooperate in good faith to bring about the greatest possible reduction of trade barriers in the Kennedy round, the incentive to American manufacturers to get over the Common External Tariff by establishing plants within the Common Market, will be greatly reduced.

Let those who point at our balance-of-payments deficit as a sign of weakness, or who criticize us for our handling of it ask themselves whether they are doing all they might do to contribute to the defense of the free world and to assist less privileged nations to improve their standards of living. Let them ask themselves whether they are doing all they could to prevent the creation of artificial conditions which stimulate unnatural flows of capital. Let them ask themselves whether they are keeping in effect unnecessary measures to attract foreign capital and to hinder their citizens from investing abroad.

THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM

There are those who argue that the persistence of U.S. balance-of-payments deficits indicates a weakness in the dollar which should be a warning against continued reliance on the dollar as one of the most important media of international exchange. President Johnson flatly challenged this line of thought in his report to the Congress on February 10, when he said:

"The state of the dollar in the world today is strong—far stronger than 3 or 4 years ago * * *. The strength of our dollar is backed by: The world's most productive and efficient economy * * *; the world's largest supply of gold * * *; the world's strongest creditor position based on $88 billion of public and private claims against foreigners, $37 billion greater than their claims against us * * *—the world's most favorable trade position * * *.

"Clearly, those who fear for the dollar are needlessly afraid. Those who hope for its weakness, hope in vain. A country which exports far more than it imports and whose net asset position abroad is great and growing is not living beyond its means. The dollar is, and will remain, as good as gold, freely convertible at $35 an ounce."

Now, as you are all aware, President Charles de Gaulle has recently made a proposal that the present gold exchange system of international payments be abandoned and that all countries return to the full gold standard, which collapsed in 1931 after bringing us all to disaster. Quite aside from the practical objections to this proposal, it is contrary to the trend of monetary theory and practice in all countries. As an economic writer observed recently, the entire history of money consists of a ceaseless search for more and better ways of avoiding cash payments. In trade between nations, as well as in trade between private parties, it is necessary to create instruments providing sufficient flexibility so that temporary imbalances do not disrupt the orderly progress of commerce. A payments system based on gold alone would not have the needed flexibility.

We must assume that the French proposal envisages a substantial increase in the price of gold, since otherwise, the sponsors of the proposal surely recognize, it would result in such a contraction of international liquidity as to have disastrous effects on world trade. Now, the United States would receive certain benefits from an increase in the price of gold. Since we have the world's greatest gold stock, we would benefit more than any other country from the increase in value of that stock. Also, the United States is still an important producer of gold, although not nearly so important as it once was. In the second half of the 19th century we were the world's greatest gold producer, and as late as the 1920's we were second only to South Africa. Our gold deposits are still far from depleted, although the richest ones were naturally exploited first. But the determination of the U.S. Government to prevent a rise in the price of gold, while mining costs increased steadily, drove many of our gold producers to suspend operations. I myself have toured Alaska, where I have seen some 20 placer mining installations, now standing idle with their machinery rusting. An increase in the price of gold would call these installations back into life overnight.

However, there are much stronger reasons for our refusing to increase the price of gold. In dealings between nations, as in dealings between private persons, successful permanent relationships must be based on mutual trust. Each partner's actions must be based on a sense of honor. For us to raise the price of gold would mean a cheapening of the dollar. It would mean, in effect, refusing to pay our debts in full. This would, quite naturally and properly, destroy faith in the United States and in its dollar. Thus one of the principle supports of the present international monetary system would crumble. We cannot and will not allow this to happen.

In any case, to increase the price of gold would not solve anyone's problems in the long run. It would confer an immediate one-time benefit on those who have been hoarding gold, and it would confer a permanent benefit on those who produce gold—principally the Soviet Union and South Africa—but all countries would still have to make the same efforts to keep their international payments in balance and arrangements would still have to be made to bridge over temporary imbalances. Instead of revoting thousands of men, and millions of dollars to digging more yellow metal out of the ground just to be put back into the ground in bank vaults, it would perhaps be more economical to devote a few dozen financial experts to the study of how to improve and expand our present international payments system.

For these reasons the United States is determined to maintain the price of gold at the present level of $35 per ounce. I think it is well for all to realize, too, that as things are in the world today, neither France nor anyone else can bring about an increase in the price of gold in the face of American determination to keep the price unchanged. Only the United States could change the price of gold, and the United States will not do so.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion I would like to reiterate that the U.S. economy has been growing in strength and will continue to grow. The dollar has been getting stronger every year and will get even stronger in the years to come. The strains that had been placed on the dollar would not have come about if the United States had not accepted the responsibilities which were thrust upon it to look after the economic well-being, and the military defense, of its friends in the free

world. In its foreign affairs the United States will continue to center its attention on Europe. We have invested more in the economic recovery and the military defense of Western Europe than of any area of the world. We consider that these investments have paid off well. Europe has now achieved unprecedented prosperity and is more secure in its defenses than at any other time since the end of the war. However, now that Europe is fully able to do so, it is time for Europe to accept a greater share of the responsibility for the security and progress of the free world. And I mean not only financial responsibility, but also moral responsibility. For without moral responsibility, particular interests may impede the kind of sincere cooperation which alone will advance the interests of the free community of nations as a whole.

Whitebreast Lake Association Seeks Outdoor Recreation Area in Clark County, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the efforts being made by the Whitebreast Lake Association, of Osceola, Iowa, to provide modern outdoor recreation facilities for south-central Iowa. The association, a nonprofit organization of about 500 members, has plans to convert about 9,000 acres of relatively unproductive farmland in Clarke County into a recreation area that would include a lake of more than 2,000 surface acres.

The Whitebreast Lake Association has worked long and hard on the local level to make this project a reality. Since the association was formed in July 1964 it has held meetings, gained widespread public support for the project, and drafted detailed plans. The group has worked closely with local, State, and Federal officials.

The people of Clarke County, as well as the Whitebreast Lake Association, clearly recognize the need for rural outdoor recreation and water conservation, and I think financial assistance for such a project would be an excellent investment.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include an editorial from the Des Moines Sunday Register of December 27, 1964, describing the efforts and plans of the Whitebreast Lake Association:

WHITEBREAST LAKE PROJECT

The proposal to establish a 9,000-acre recreational center near Osceola is a splendid example of a local attempt, with the assistance of the Federal Government, to revive the economy of a southern Iowa county (Clarke) which has suffered a decline in population and prosperity because of decreasing agricultural employment.

We hope this project succeeds, and there is every reason to believe that it will.

The proposal is to buy 9,000 acres of unproductive farm land—options have been taken on most of the land at an average price of $97 an acre—and then develop the area for recreation purposes. A 2,700-acre lake is planned, which will be the major attraction of the area. Plans also call for a golf course, an airport, a convention motel, a nature museum and ski runs.

A project of this size is beyond the ability of taxpayers in a small county. It also is the kind of venture that doesn't appeal to private investors, because it is unlikely to yield substantial profit. It holds sufficient possibilities of reviving the economy of an area that Government encouragement and assistance is warranted, in our opinion.

The Whitebreast Lake project resulted from initiative of the Rural Area Development Committee organized in 1962 to study problems of Clarke County. The RAD committee chairman appointed a committee to study possibilities for recreational development, and the committee suggested this project.

The engineering work to determine location of the proposed dam was done by the U.S. Corps of Engineers, with Federal money. The Whitebreast Lake Association was formed to carry on the project. Its membership consists mostly of local people, who paid a fee of $3 a family to support the organization.

The lake association has applied for a million-dollar loan, to acquire the land, from the Farmers Home Administration. This kind of project is more deserving of a Federal loan than some of the smaller projects that have received Federal loans, because its benefits would extend to a larger area and to more people, including people from outside Clarke County who would enjoy the availability of additional recreational opportunities.

Clarke County support for the project was shown at an election this year in which voters approved, by a 2,323 to 1,373 vote, establishing a Clarke County Conservation Board. Four years ago, before the Whitebreast Lake project was proposed, voters defeated a proposal to set up a conservation board. The lake association is proposing that Conservation Board administer the public recreational facilities when the lake project becomes a reality.

The lake association recognizes that the project can't be successful unless it can attract visitors from other areas than Clarke County. We predict that the project will attract many visitors from Des Moines and other parts of the State if a good recreational center is developed. Many Des Moines residents now spend their summer weekends at State parks or other recreational centers from 50 to 150 miles from home. They will welcome another recreational center, especially if it has better facilities and greater recreational opportunities than available at existing State parks.

Gables Dentist Has Right Medicine To Beat Big Latin Ailment—Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, for many years, private American initiative and good will have played an important role in the task which confronts us on the world scene—the task of building the foundations of a stable and just world order.

One of the finest examples of such private initiative and generosity is the doctor-to-doctor project conducted by a group of 25 physicians and dentists in Coral Gables, Fla.

Led by Dr. Robert Cherry, this outgrowth of the Coral Gables-Cartagena people-to-people program has brought American medical and dental know-how, and sizable supplies of valuable drugs, to thousands of needy people in Latin America.

In so doing, this project has contributed to the well-being of the people of Ecuador, Costa Rica, and Colombia. It also has given them a much better understanding and appreciation of the people of the United States—of what we stand for, and what we seek to achieve not only for ourselves but for all those who are willing to help themselves and desire to remain free.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent obtained earlier, I wish to place in the RECORD an article from the February 25, 1965, edition of the Coral Gables Times, written by Mr. Raymond Lang, and entitled "Gables Dentist Has Right Medicine To Beat Big Latin Ailment—Communism." This article describes better than I could the work being done by Dr. Cherry and his group. In addition, I would like to include a fine atricle entitled "The Doctors' Do-It-Yourself Alianza" from the Miami Herald of March 13, 1965.

I take this opportunity to express my sincere congratulations to Dr. Cherry and his partners in this very worthy undertaking. Their initiative, generosity, and sacrifice are doing much to make this a better world for our children. They also help in the attainment of the goals pursued by the U.S. Government through its Alliance for Progress undertakings.

I should also like to mention that for the past 2 years, a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee of which I am chairman, has been studying the relationship of private American undertakings abroad to our Government's foreign policy.

This is a fascinating and vital subject. We hope to shed some light on the scope and contribution of these private programs. We are almost ready to publish some of the results of our study. I am certain that our findings—the findings of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements—will prove of considerable interest to people involved in the Gables doctor-to-doctor project, and to many others who either are or would like to be engaged in similar worthwhile undertakings.

Mr. Speaker, the articles mentioned earlier follow:

[From the Coral Gables (Fla.) Times, Feb. 25, 1965]

GABLES DENTIST HAS RIGHT MEDICINE TO BEAT BIG LATIN AILMENT—COMMUNISM

(By Raymond Lang)

How do you measure the happiness of the human heart?

Simple.

Stretch out your hand to help your fellowman.

That's the answer brought back this week by Dr. Robert Cherry, a Coral Gables dentist, along with 11 other dentists and 13 physicians.

For, while Uncle Sam is fence straddling thousands of miles away and pouring millions of dollars into nations ripped by strife,

these 25 men of medicine looked in their own backyard.

And they wound up in Quito, Ecuador, with 1,200 pounds of desperately needed medical supplies—valued at more than $25,000—for charity hospitals.

Gables mayor, Joe Murphy, accompanied the group as Dr. Cherry's guest.

At 1 a.m. Wednesday of last week, while most were climbing into bed for a good night's sleep, these men stepped into an Ecuatoriana Airlines plane that carried them and the drugs to the mountaintop city. They returned Saturday.

Four years ago, Dr. Cherry started the doctor-to-doctor program in which Greater Miami physicians each year exchange ideas and techniques with their Latin American counterparts and donate much-needed supplies.

"They need help. They need drugs and they need surgical supplies," said Dr. Cherry Tuesday, reflecting on the trip that took him and his fellow practitioners to Quito, a quaint city perched 10,000 feet high atop the Andes.

"And if only the United States would help them to build hospitals and schools it would be the best thing in the world.

"We go down more as a good will mission," Dr. Cherry explained. "Politics has nothing to do with this. This is strictly between the doctors of the two countries."

The invitation was extended by Dr. Enrique Ripalda, dean of the dental department at the University of Quito, and Dr. Carlos Andrada Marlin, a prominent Ecuadoran physician.

Dr. Cherry conceived the doctor program several years ago when he was a member of the city of Coral Gables people-to-people program. This is where the Gables exchanges visits with its sister city, Cartagena Colombia.

Since then, Dr. Cherry, with other local dentists and physicians, have taken time out from their private practices to take sorely sought drugs each year to Cartagena, San Jose, Costa Rica, and Cali, Com Colombia. He's received similar invitations from physicians in India and the Philippines.

"Did you ever hear of communism," said Dr. Cherry, leveling his eyes. "Know where it starts? Among the poor.

"That's why the supplies were taken down and given to the hospitals treating the poor, to let them know the United States is thinking of them * * * and to let them know we want to help them.

"It actually brought tears to your eyes. These are proud people. They don't want charity.

"But those drugs, being donations, touched them very deeply."

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 13, 1965]

THE DOCTORS' DO-IT-YOURSELF ALIANZA: FROM FLORIDA TO ECUADOR—AS A START

(By Bert Collier)

A group of Dade County physicians and dentists have just returned from Quito, Ecuador, with a gleam in their eye.

They believe they have discovered a form of foreign aid that doesn't cost the taxpayers a penny, that goes directly to those who need it and pays rich dividends in human health and happiness.

As a result they are chartering an organization to be known as Doctor to Doctor International. It will have chapters in as many cities as wish them, consisting of doctors and dentists who will adopt their colleagues in a Latin American city.

They will exchange visits, give lectures, and arrange brush-up courses in newer health techniques.

Most important of all, they will find ways to get equipment and drugs to their adopted brothers of the medical and dental profession.

"This work will be personal, private, and informal," says Dr. Robert L. Cherry, a Coral Gables oral surgeon who serves as president. "Every member pays his own way and takes time from his own busy practice to visit the adopted city. He not only has the personal satisfaction of helping others less able to help themselves but of spreading understanding of our country in areas where this has been sadly lacking."

These precepts of Doctor to Doctor International were well illustrated in Quito where 24 Dade Countians, with Coral Gables Mayor Joseph H. Murphy as their guest, spent several days.

They met with Ecuadoran doctors and dentists, visited hospitals and clinics where they exchanged ideas with members of the staffs, and donated drugs worth thousands of dollars.

Typical reaction was expressed by Dr. Guillermo Acosta Velasquez, director of the Eugenio Espejo Hospital in Quito as he accepted a gift of medicines and hospital supplies:

"In the past great nations have usually conquered smaller nations. But this is not the way of the United States, which sets an example of liberty and justice for all.

"This donation of drugs demonstrates the North American spirit. It is that of the big brother who has much and uses it to help his little brother."

In addition to Dr. Cherry and Mayor Murphy, the Dade party included Dr. W. D. Bieser, Dr. L. L. Lund, Dr. A. E. Akers, Dr. B. L. Wilkerson, Dr. C. D. Hall, Dr. L. F. Jourdain, Dr. W. H. Fountain, Dr. Henry Renedo, Jr., Dr. W. F. Briggle, and Dr. H. V. Briggle, dentists.

The physicians were Dr. R. F. Dickey, Dr. J. W. Dix, Dr. J. B. Liebler, Dr. H. E. Danielson, Dr. J. J. Groom, Dr. M. A. Larkin, Dr. George Williams, Dr. B. G. Lary, Dr. R. K. Acton, Dr. R. L. Smith, and Dr. C. S. Kellogg.

Jacksonville was represented by Dr. Roger M. Hehn, dentist, and Dr. Emmett Ferguson, physician.

The trip to Quito was not the first and will not be the last for the Dade doctors. The idea began years ago as an outgrowth of the sister city program between Coral Gables and Cartagena, Colombia.

In an exchange of visits the special need for help in meeting health problems was discovered. Dr. Cherry and some of his colleagues responded with exchanges of ideas and donations of drugs.

The result was so constructive that annual visits have continued to cities in Colombia, Costa Rica, and now Ecuador.

Previous visits have won commendations from Congress and from the White House.

"We found an amazing reservoir of friendship for the United States, but an almost total lack of communication on the personal level," Dr. Cherry said. "Ordinary people in these cities do not know of the aid that flows between governments. They do not understand that the American people want to help them improve their own standards of daily living and have no ulterior motives in doing so."

Before going to Quito the Dade Countians collected hundreds of pounds of drugs, antibiotics, special baby food, and other items.

To make sure that these got in the proper hands and that the recipients knew where they came from, Dr. Cherry and the others rode in delivery trucks and personally handed the boxes to staff members at the hospitals.

"These people aren't looking for a handout," said Dr. Cherry. "They are proud, dedicated professional men and they ask only for the tools with which to serve their patients better.

"We hope to expand until the doctors and dentists of every major Latin American city have colleagues in a North American city to help them.

"When that is accomplished we believe we will have formed a bond that is deep and lasting on both sides."

The Metric System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement, recently issued by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, on the proposal to adopt the metric system for stating sizes, modules, designs, and ratings.

I believe the society has taken a reasonable approach on this matter and their statement follows:

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERS CLARIFIES ACTION OF METRIC SYSTEM

(NOTE.—In response to many requests for supporting information, the following statement has been issued by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers on the metric system.)

The American Society of Mechanical Engineers, favoring evolution rather than economically disastrous revolution, adopted the following resolution at its December 1964 winter annual meeting:

"The American Society of Mechanical Engineers, in the interest of national economy and industrial efficiency, advocates the continued use of the existing American, British, and Canadian sizes, modules, designs, and ratings. Further, the society is of the opinion that legislative action directed to an alternate system of dimensional standards, such as the metric, will be at this time confusing and disturbing to the productive capacity of the United States and is not, therefore, in the best of public interest."

This resolution recognizes the use of some metric sizes and modules in the American, British, and Canadian countries, as well as some inch modules in European industrial nations. Throughout the world, the United States included, automotive spark plugs are produced in millimeters; whereas, world users of tractor and automotive tires, including those countries using the metric system, produce these items in inch sizes. Pharmaceuticals and medicinal chemicals go by metric measure in the United States, but most other liquids go by American measure. Obviously the continued use of any measurement system depends upon its convenience for its purpose.

America's mass production techniques are the secret of her success. The entire American system is based on the A-B-C sizes, modules, designs, and ratings. Their continued use, in such a vast scale, has resulted in even, accepted increments of sizes, like the 6-inch pipe, the 12-inch I beam, the 120-pound-per-yard steel rail, and the A-B-C unified screw thread family, used interchangeably wherever found. These billions of products upon which our entire industry depends, would be immediately useless and the hard won international standardizations would be lost, should we change from inches to meters by statutory fiat.

Not one single bolt in America today could be used in tapped holes made to the metric system tomorrow. The tremendous dollar cost involved in replacing the plant hardware now used to turn out our industrial products would be only the beginning. Unless all our industries undertook the astronomical expense of keeping huge inventories of the present inch modules, while they added the galactic expense of retooling to metric measures, none of us would be able to replace parts of furnaces, stoves, dishwashers, auto-

mobiles, lawn mowers, tractors, or anything else we might have. For want of a bolt, a nation could be lost.

Increased ability to compete in the European markets is the main reason for the metric system agitation. Europe, in entering our markets, does things differently. From 20 to 50 percent of her production is in our inch system, depending on what and how much she wants to try to export to us. If, as in the case of the Volkswagen, she exports and stays metric, she ships over sufficient metric replacement parts—a little more wise exporting. As our companies increase their invasion of the European market, they will use one or the other, or both techniques. If the metric measuring system turns out to be the more practical system from a competitive standpoint, evolutionary change, without disastrous revolution by legal fiat, will bring it about. If our inch system seems better, Europe will evolve to it.

The ASME resolution reflects the fact that statutory change in our system of measurements will result in confusion and disturbance in the productive capacity of this Nation, and "is not therefore in the best of public interest" at this time. Evolutionary change rising out of a truly competitive system is something else again, and should be allowed to take place without interference. To do otherwise could well ruin our economic structure and destroy our strength.

Francis Scott Key Foundation Wins Freedom Foundations Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Francis Scott Key Memorial Foundation conducted an intensive campaign last year in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of Francis Scott Key's composition of "The Star Spangled Banner," which became our national anthem. Their efforts were rewarded recently when the foundation received the George Washington Honor Medal and a cash award of $100 from the Freedoms Foundation.

C. Lease Bussard of Frederick, Md., president of the Francis Scott Key Foundation, revealed that the award was based on a brochure prepared by the Key group and entered in the community services division of the annual competition sponsored by the Freedoms Foundation.

According to Mr. Bussard, the brochure presented in the competition included "all aspects of our work in Frederick. It included the organizational structure, aims and purposes, newspaper, radio, and TV coverage, during our first year of operations, medal presentations, and efforts of the foundation to develop during the anniversary years great appreciation of our national anthem and its writer, a native son of Frederick. The cover of the brochure was designed by James Pearl, an area artist, who also designed the Key medal which, in addition to being the official medallion of the Maryland pavilion at the New York World's Fair, is on sale at over 600 locations in this and other countries."

All Americans should take pride in this recognition by the Freedoms Foundation, and particularly the citizens of my home town of Frederick who have worked so diligently to bring proper recognition to the author of our national anthem and to place the name of Francis Scott Key in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans.

Local Funds Help To Build School in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, it is such a standard thing here in America to have a school available for our children, that we sometimes forget that in other ports of the world a school is a luxury. I am proud to report that in my district this is not forgotten. Under the inspired leadership of a fine young woman, Mrs. Pat Young, a group of people in the city of Scranton decided to do something about the need of a new nation. Through the cooperation of the Madison School Parent-Teachers Association, the superintendent of schools, and thousands of little children throughout the city of Scranton, the money was raised to help build a school in far away Africa. It is being built in the village of Kakoukro in the Republic of the Ivory Coast. It is, I think, a heartwarming story, and I am happy at this time to insert in the RECORD the story of that work as it appeared in the Scranton Times, written, I am informed, by Joseph Flannery:

LOCAL FUNDS HELPING BUILD SCHOOL IN AFRICA: CITY STUDENTS CONTRIBUTE $1,667

A school is being constructed in the village of Kakoukro in the Republic of the Ivory Coast—thanks to the funds donated last fall by Scranton public school students.

Mrs. Joseph Young, 811 Olive Street, the originator of the idea, has been given details about the project during a visit to Peace Corps Headquarters in Washington.

The school in the former French colony will be erected with the help of the $1,667.77 donated by Scranton school children under the Peace Corps school-to-school project.

By U.S. standards, the school will not be anything elaborate, but in the Ivory Coast Republic, it will represent a big step forward in the massive job of overcoming illiteracy.

The Ivory Coast, which became an independent nation on August 7, 1960, is a land of 3.5 million persons on Africa's west coast. Its government, which maintains close ties with France, has indicated a complete willingness to cooperate with the school-to-school undertaking.

Thus, in the village of Kakoukro, in the Sous-Prefecture of Adiake, the government has joined hands with villagers to erect the three-room primary school with the help of the nickles, dimes, quarters, and dollars from Scranton.

While the figures may not seem impressive by U.S. standards, the school will involve an expenditure of $2,540 in cash. By Ivory Coast standards, this will be a substantial structure which will replace a thatched-roof building.

CONSTRUCTION COSTS

This is the way that the Peace Corps has broken down the costs for the new structure. The land is free, having been donated by the Government, and the land clearing and site preparation is being donated by villagers.

Cement is the most expensive item, totaling $640, with the villagers manufacturing their own blocks and the Government and the village donating workers for the cement construction.

Another major item is $600 for steel reinforcing rods, with another $475 being used for corrugated metal roofing. The wood for the ceiling, doors, and windows will cost another $250.

The total cost for a carpenter has been set at $75 with the painting to be done free by the villagers. Other materials will include $75 for the hardware, $200 for paint and $200 for electric wiring. Miscellaneous costs are put at $225.

Thus, the school will cost $2,540, with the village contributing the difference between the funds raised in Scranton and the total price. The percentage of participation is 36 percent by the village and 64 percent by the school-to-school administration.

There are all sorts of safeguards built into the project, including constant supervision by Peace Corps personnel. The money is turned over gradually as the work is carried on and materials are needed.

Gene Bradley, the director of the school-to-school project since its inception, has told Mrs. Young that the village selected for the Scranton project has a population of about 27,000 persons and the school will accommodate about 150 boys and girls.

The school will have the first six grades, based upon the French school system, and students will be in the 7- to 17-year age group.

To qualify, Kakoukro had to meet several standards set by the Peace Corps, including certifying that teachers will be locally provided and that the villagers would put up part of the cost and much of the labor. Another requirement is that the school be erected in an area of stable political and social conditions.

Mr. Bradley, a General Electric Co. official who set up the program on loan to the Peace Corps, has written to Mrs. Young that in Kakoukro, "the people are serious about the drive for education."

He continued: "Just one example is the clean, orderly appearance and conduct of the children themselves who wear bright, clean uniforms, not for religious or tribal reasons, but to instill a sense of pride and discipline.

"The President of Ivory Coast—and equally the préfets and sous préfets—are serious. The President wants construction that will last. The people of Adiake are raising what they can; but without some source such as school-to-school to help match their funding, it is difficult to see how they can make it."

The Scranton school district has the distinction of being the first in the Nation in which the schoolchildren themselves contributed to such a project.

The story began last year when Mrs. Young read a column by Roscoe Drummond in the Scranton Times telling of the origins of the school-to-school project with a Parent-Teacher Association project in Niskayuna, N.Y. Active in the James Madison School PTA here, Mrs. Young proposed it as a PTA project.

However with Superintendent of Schools Richard F. McNichols blessing to the undertaking, the collection was begun.

At the time it appeared that the money would be used to construct a school in some village in Brazil. However, the Peace Corps decided on the Ivory Coast site as being more urgent.

The money raised by the Scanton schoolchildren was given to Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, when he came to the University of Scanton last September 18 to accept an honorary degree.

Mr. Bradley, who returned to his GE position just last week after meeting with Mrs. Young, is the one man most responsible for the program. It was he, as president of the Hosendale PTA in Niskayuna, near Schenectady, who first proposed the idea of raising funds to build a school in Latin America. The PTA raised $750 and, with the help of the Peace Corps, Casa Blanca, Colombia, was picked as the site of the project.

As a result of this experiment in international cooperation, Mr. Shriver asked Mr. Bradley to organize the new school-to-school project.

At the outset, the plan was to have PTA groups, chambers of commerce, service clubs and other such units sponsor the projects. But the Scanton project has given the Peace Corps officials new ideas in this direction, with more emphasis to be placed on the student-to-student approach in the future.

The long-range aim of the project is to create some 3,000 schools in all parts of the world. The only one actually in operation is the pilot school in Colombia, but 20 projects have now been approved in 7 countries—with 12 in progress.

Eventually, the Peace Corps hopes to have schools erected in 46 countries and in some places, such as Colombia, Mr. Bradley has estimated that the Peace Corps project could double the number of existing rural schools now in existence.

Look Who's Buying Our Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the continuation of our aid to Nasser has been of deep concern to me and to many thoughtful Americans who find it difficult to understand how we can justify assistance to a government that denounces us and aids our enemies. Now comes the Treasury Department report that last year the U.A.R. had enough dollars to purchase $11 million of our gold. The question posed in the following Chicago Tribune editorial certainly demands an answer:

LOOK WHO'S BUYING OUR GOLD

The Treasury has released an accounting of its gold transactions for 1964.

We received about $957 million in gold by purchase, chiefly as follows: from domestic producers, $50 million; from Britain, $618 million; from Italy, $200 million; from Brazil, $54 million; and from the Philippine Islands, $20 million.

The figure for Britain presumably includes about $300 million received as our share of the London gold pool's purchases. This, in turn, includes a good deal of new gold produced in South Africa. The purpose of the gold pool is to stabilize the price of gold by buying it when the market is slow and selling it when nervous speculators start bidding the price up.

During the year we sold about $1,062 million in gold as follows: To domestic industrial users, including makers of jewelry, electrical equipment, and false teeth (or fillings), $130 million; to France, $405 million; to Germany, $225 million; to Switzerland, $81 million; and to at least 12 other countries, chiefly in the final quarter of the year, about $232 million.

Certain domestic industries are permitted to buy treasury gold because their use of it is considered justifiable and because if they were to buy it abroad—which is the only place they could buy it other than through the Government—the foreign sellers would probably replace their supply from the Treasury's stock anyway.

The overall loss of Treasury gold was thus $125 million (in 2 months of 1965, it is already more than three times that amount).

The list of "other countries" which joined the rush for our gold yields some unexpected names: Lebanon, Syria, Chile, and Yugoslavia, and one startling name: the United Arab Republic, which bought nearly $11 million of our gold.

This took place while Nasser was begging more aid from us with one hand and pushing supplies with the other to the Congo rebels, who were massacring American and European citizens. Just how Nasser obtained enough spare dollars to relieve us of gold while proclaiming his dire need and at the same time telling us to go jump in the lake is something we would like to have explained.

Admission of Official Observers to Communist-Occupied Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to advise the House that I have today introduced a joint resolution urging the admission of official observers into Communist-occupied Poland for the purpose of reporting to the entire world the circumstances surrounding the forthcoming trials of the patriots of the Poznan uprising, the validity of the charges, the trial proceedings, and the justice of the verdicts.

This resolution is identical to one introduced by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and by Congressman DODD, of Connecticut. These resolutions seek to make it possible for official observers of the free world to be admitted to Communist-occupied Poland in order to be present at all trials of persons involved in the uprising of the Polish patriots at Poznan. These official observers could provide the people of the world with a complete and factual report of the circumstances surrounding such trials, the validity of the charges, the fairness of the trial proceedings, and the justice of the verdicts which may be made.

The Communist regime now in control of Poland has announced that well over 300 persons may be brought to trial for taking part in the recent Polish workers "bread and freedom" riots in Poznan.

Unless such official observers are admitted to Communist-occupied Poland, the people of the world will never know the full facts and circumstances of the uprisings or of the Communist trials of those brave people who took part in them.

Certainly those in control of the Government of Poland who claim to want justice cannot disregard this request by the Government of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is further called to my attention that the bishops of Poland have asked the Communist government to "show restraint and wisdom" in the wake of the uprising of workers in Poznan.

The Polish bishops, in appealing for just treatment of persons arrested following the Poznan uprising, also renewed their request for an end to the manacling of the church.

Despite the hardships of the people of Poland more than 10 years after the war's end, the Communist government continues to refuse to allow America to send food to the Poles. It refuses to recognize that Poland, the former breadbasket of Europe, is unable to feed herself. This is the result of an unbalanced economic system. Polish Communist pride compels the Polish people to suffer the miseries of her bankrupted economic system.

Nor Any Drop To Drink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the editorial column of the New York Times, Friday, March 5, 1965, entitled "Nor Any Drop To Drink." This editorial points out the need for vigorous Federal legislation to abate water pollution through expenditure of additional sums for a massive attack on water pollution and urges additional and more stringent enforcement powers in the Federal Government to clean up the frightful situation of water pollution which so desperately affects industry, agriculture and the municipal use of water.

This is a disgraceful situation which affects everyone of us and destroys the long-term interest of the Nation in every field, including conservation of natural resources and fish and wildlife.

The editorial follows:

NOR ANY DROP TO DRINK

The size and urgency of the need to clean up the Nation's rivers makes the pending antipollution bill obsolete before it is even enacted into law.

The bill pased by the Senate on January 28 and now under consideration in a House committee is all right as far as it goes—but it does not go nearly far enough. Reports by Gladwin Hill in this newspaper in recent days describe in vivid detail how the Nation's waters are already befouled. Rivers that were once clean and sparkling are stinking open sewers, unsafe for swimming, unfit for drinking, their natural biological balance

destroyed, waterfowl vanished, fish dead or dying.

This bill as written has two gross defects. It does not lift the present scale of $100 million a year in Federal spending. Only the Federal Government has the tax resources to finance the massive clean-up operation that is now needed. A million dollars, a tenfold increase, is required. Without dollars to back it up, much of the pending bill, like law already on the books, is dead verbiage.

Second, the bill empowers the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set water quality standards for interstate rivers, but it does not provide any important new enforcement powers. The present procedure, which would be continued, provides for study and research, a conference with the offending parties, a public hearing, and, if necessary, a lawsuit to compel compliance. Leaving aside the time required for preliminary investigation—and some Public Health Service studies have taken several years—this procedure takes a minimum of 18 months. A lot of water can flow under the bridge in that time, most of it foul.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare needs authority to compel prompt compliance, and he needs it now. The country is weary of studies and hearings and conferences. It wants action.

The opposing complaint about the invasion of States' rights has been heard too long. It is the rallying cry of the chemical, leather, paper, steel, power and other industrial firms that oppose Federal action because they find it much easier to put pressure on State and local governments. A town that is dependent upon a single company for its economic base is understandably reluctant to regulate that company's misuse of a neighboring river. In a great many communities, pollution spells payrolls and tax revenues.

Representative JOHN A. BLATNICK, Minnesota Democrat, and his colleagues on the House Public Works Committee have an opportunity now to overhaul and drastically to improve the Senate bill. A comprehensive and really effective antipollution program ought not to wait 'til next year. It has already waited too long.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on the glorious feast of St. Patrick every Irish heart rejoices, and even many who can claim no drop of Irish blood turn in affectionate sympathy to the land and people of Ireland, and to Irish friends and acquaintances. As a Flannery by birth and a Kelly by marriage, I take pride in my Irish heritage, and treasure the land from which my Irish ancestors came. St. Patrick is a saint of the universal Catholic Church, and the observance of his feast is by no means to be confined to any narrow national or racial boundaries, but the thought of the great saint is necessarily and inextricably associated with the thought of the land in which he spent most of his life, and the people for whom he gave his labors and his prayers through so many years. Catholic Ireland owes her existence to the work of her great missionary apostle, and honor paid to the saint inevitably reflects credit upon the country and its people. Today, as Ireland celebrates her national holiday, we feel anew the ancient charm of the Emerald Isle, and even the least romantic and poetic among us hears an echo in his heart of the closing lines of A. E.'s beautiful poem, "Carrowmore":

Oh! the great gates of the mountain have opened once again,
And the sound of song and dancing falls upon the ears of men,
And the land of youth lies gleaming, flushed with rainbow light and mirth,
And the old enchantment lingers in the honeyheart of earth.

Tragedy and Outrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government can no longer tolerate open defiance and contempt of the Constitution. Not only must Congress pass effective legislation, but there must be a Federal presence in Alabama to protect American citizens from further bloodshed and murder.

Walter Lippmann's column in today's Washington Post should leave no doubt about the urgent need for Congress to act to protect the right to vote. In the words of Walter Lippmann Selma must be "expunged by a mighty national act of repentance and reparation." His column follows:

TRAGEDY AND OUTRAGE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The State of Alabama as ruled by Governor Wallace is in open defiance and contempt of the Constitution of the United States. There is no possible doubt that a large part of the Negro citizens of Alabama are deliberately denied the right to vote. In Selma, with the connivance of the Governor and by the brutal actions of the State troopers, American citizens have been denied their constitutional right to assemble and their constitutional right to petition and protest against the denial of the right to vote.

The issue between the State of Alabama and the United States is clearly and sharply drawn. Shall the law be defied? No one, no leader of either political party, is raising the question of whether the decision to compel the State of Alabama to obey the law is an invasion of the rights of the State. For it is evident and obvious to all that there can be no right of any State to nullify the Constitution of the Union to which it belongs, or to abrogate the Bill of Rights. There is no doubt that the Congress will support overwhelmingly the President's call for legislation to put an end to the widespread disfranchisement of Negro citizens. What is more, the country will support overwhelmingly the enforcement of that law. For the enforcement of that law will be equivalent to putting down a rebellion against the United States.

This time and in this case the issue of civil rights is clear as crystal. There are no fuzzy edges as there were and are on the problem of the desegregation of the schools and of public accommodations. On the question of the right to vote, all the leading Republicans, including Mr. Goldwater, are against Governor Wallace. Today he stands alone. Only the unabashed white supremacists even profess to support him.

Because the basic issue is so clear cut, the human reaction of the American people to the outrage in Selma is not slicklied o'er with any pale cast of intellectual doubt. Selma is not only an American tragedy. It is an American disgrace and a profound humiliation. Selma is what happened in a country which is engaged in defending freedom throughout the world. Selma is what has happened in a country which is talking about freedom in Asia and Africa and the Americas. Unless Selma is expunged by a might national act of repentance and reparation, how shall Ameircans look themselves in the face when they get up in the morning?

Illinois-Indiana Conference on Water Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois-Indiana Interstate Water Pollution Conference called by the Honorable Anthony Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was held on March 2, 1965 at McCormick Place, Chicago, Ill. The conference was held to discuss the concerning problem of water pollution especially at the southern basin of Lake Michigan.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to include the statements of the Honorable Richard J. Daley, mayor of the city of Chicago, and the Honorable Frank W. Chesrow, president, Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, who appeared at the conference to support a program to abate the pollution of water:

ILLINOIS-INDIANA CONFERENCE ON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

(By Richard J. Daley, mayor, city of Chicago)

As mayor of Chicago, I wish to welcome all of the people who are participating here today. The problem of water pollution is of the deepest concern to all of our citizens, wherever they may live, regardless of their economic status.

This meeting in which we are all participating can be a tremendous first step in initiating a program that will do much to abate the pollution of our most precious resource. I wish to express my appreciation to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service for this opportunity to testify on this critical issue of water pollution control and abatement.

Present here today are public officials and engineers from the city who will testify and will be happy to answer any questions. In September of 1963 we testified before the House Subcommittee on Natural Resources on the identical subject matter we are addressing ourselves to here today. I stated then it was our general philosophy to try to solve our local problems of lake pollution originating from our own and neighboring communities and industries by active and friendly cooperative efforts with them as well as with the State health agencies in Illinois and Indiana.

I still believe that we should explore every avenue of cooperation, but the publication

since then of the report by the division of water supply and pollution control has made it apparent that cooperation alone is not sufficient to meet the critical threat to Lake Michigan and other bodies of water supply and recreation.

I will leave it to the engineers and technicians to discuss the scientific results of the survey, but the conclusion of this report is inescapable. That conclusion is that at present there exists a greater amount of pollution than should be permitted—that the pollution is on the increase—and is showing definite signs of causing degradation of the lake.

The problem of water pollution has always been with us. Its emergence as a definite threat to the health and welfare of our people has risen from the urbanization of our area—the increase of population—the expansion of industry—and the development of new products which may bring new and unknown pollutants.

History will show that Chicago has been in the forefront in recognizing that bold and drastic measures are often necessary to solve pollution problems. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by the citizens of the Chicago area in reversing the flow of the river and establishing a sewage disposal system that is recognized as one of the engineering wonders of the world. But we have not rested on these accomplishments. In order to maintain the quality of our water in the last 12 years alone, we have spent $250 million for capital improvements to insure the purity of our water and the adequacy of its use for fire protection for our citizens and industries in 63 suburbs in the metropolitan area.

We appreciate that there have been voluntary efforts made and substantial sums of money spent to meet the threat of water pollution, but the people of this area are now demanding that bold and drastic measures be taken to solve our pollution problems.

Our 1965–69 5-year water works capital improvement program calls for an additional expenditure of approximately $69 million.

I also take pride in the fact that in 1961 a survey to determine the adequacy for firefighting of the Chicago water system, made by the National Board of Fire Underwriters, resulted in the water system being graded class 1. Chicago is the only city with a population of over 1 million to receive this distinction. The standard of our drinking water has always been considered among the highest in the Nation. The absolute necessity for maintaining the purity of our water resources is obvious, but is worth repetition.

Of the highest priority, of course, is that the health of our people depends on the purity of our water. There can be no excuse, we cannot tolerate even a remote possibility that the waters of Lake Michigan shall become defiled and that the life of this living lake be imperiled.

Lake Michigan has not only provided the residents of the metropolitan area with unparalleled recreational facilities, but also to millions of people throughout the Nation and the world. With the growth of our population and the utilization of land for residential and industrial purposes the recreational facilities we do have must be highly treasured. We cannot permit any spoliation of this great resource.

Another highly important factor is the esthetic contribution. The shoreline of Lake Michigan is our front yard and it is considered one of the most fabulous and beautiful front yards in the world. Unlike any other of our Great Lake cities you cannot only go swimming in Lake Michigan, but you can breathe air unspoiled by foul odors.

The Federal pollution report has spelled out the pollution problems facing us now and the dangers that are ahead unless prompt control measures are initiated.

I am confident that all of the parties involved, the States, the counties, local governments, and private industries will cooperate fully with the Federal Government in meeting the serious challenge that faces all of us.

I pledge the full support and cooperation of the city of Chicago.

In the words of President Johnson: "It is true that we have often been careless with our natural bounty. At times we have paid a heavy price for this neglect. But once our people were aroused to the danger, we have acted to preserve our resources for the enrichment of our country and the enjoyment of future generations."

THE ILLINOIS-INDIANA INTERSTATE WATER POLLUTION CONFERENCE

(By Frank W. Chesrow, president, Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago)

Our deliberations of the last few days concerning the pollution of the southern basin of Lake Michigan have offered a penetrating picture of the abuse of one of man's most precious possessions; namely, what might well be a limitless source of fresh water. These same deliberations have conclusively revealed that man is bent on dissipating this God-given treasure and that unless we take drastic action, the lake waters and beaches will be lost to us forever.

We have learned that the people of Indiana, as well as those inhabitants of Illinois, are equally concerned over the future of this great body of water; that officials representing these people are determined to put an end to this desecration of one of nature's proudest possessions, and the inhuman obliteration by poisoning, of our waterfowl, fish and plant life.

Now, first, let us consider who or what is responsible for this outrage that is proving so costly to us.

Let me say at the outset that the metropolitan sanitary district of greater Chicago has been fighting pollution of Lake Michigan for three-quarters of a century and has pioneered many engineering feats resulting in many major victories in the war against contamination. We have made outstanding progress up to the existing limits of the science of sanitary engineering, but, even this, leaves much to be desired, and is still not sufficient.

The cities and towns bordering on the lake are not doing a good job. State agencies are unable to cope satisfactorily with the issues because of the interstate problems involved, much as these agencies would want to meet their responsibilities.

It has been pointed out in this conference that among the offenders are many large and distinguished industries that have contributed much to the development and welfare of this great area. I am confident that their officials and directors are men of understanding and good will, and will want to do as many have already done, join with us in meeting our responsibility to our neighbors and to the generations to come. Working together as a team, without recrimination and petty bickering, we can assure the residents of Illinois and Indiana a plentiful supply of pure water to which they are entitled.

The HEW and the supporting data from the U.S. PHS and the other agencies is a conscientious approach, long awaited. It recognizes the population and industrial factors and the complexity of the situation. It recognizes also that the waters in question know no boundaries.

This conference has very pointedly borne out that the facts here are very real and very dangerous and that we are on the very brink of destroying our lake forever.

If we are to protect Lake Michigan, this God-given resource, which is ours to enjoy and not destroy, immediate steps must be taken to achieve this end, and so I would ask:

1. That the Federal Government which called this conference following a 4-year study, immediately take action to enforce compliance with antipollution controls under authority granted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by Congress.

2. That HEW "recommendations for corrective action needed" to be acted upon before adjournment. The residents of this area have already waited too long, they are tired of surveys, studies, and conferences and want action now; not after all our waterfowl, fish, plant life, beaches, and, most important of all, the source of our drinking water are lost to us forever.

3. In addition to the HEW recommendations, we should recognize that uniform standards setting up maximum limits of pollution are needed and must be established by Federal authority, including regulatory controls of sewage treatment plants to curtail the discharge of untreated sewage into Lake Michigan and our waterways.

4. We realize that with all the means at our command, complete treatment is still insufficient; we have every right to expect the highest degree of secondary treatment of sewage, measuring up to such standards as the Federal Government may set forth for both private industry and public agencies.

We have no other choice at this time. We must obtain action now and we must obtain it through Federal channels by enforcement through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The HEW recommendation that, "all waste be disinfected before discharge," is personally a welcome one, because it substantiates a second recommendation made by me in a paper to the board of trustees of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago in 1952. The first was on the need for an industrial waste ordinance which I was glad to sign, as president, 10 years later, in July 1962.

President Johnson recently asked us all, "to organize for action and rebuild and reclaim the beauty we inherited."

As president of the metropolitan sanitary district, I will do everything within my power and use every means to make sure that we keep our lake water free of pollution.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us put aside petty differences and personal gain, and rebuild and reclaim our waters for a more beautiful and more healthful tomorrow.

A Congressman Looks at the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the social, moral, and esthetic development of our country has lagged far behind our advances in science, technology and other material endeavors. Democracy demands wisdom and vision in its citizens and we must foster and support a form of education designed to make men masters of their technology and not its unthinking servants.

I am pleased to see that at long last the administration has made definitive proposals with respect to the arts. I, along with many of my colleagues, have suggested a national foundation be established which would concentrate on the great branches of man's scholarly, literary, and artistic activity bringing them into balance with our efforts in science and technology.

One of our colleagues, Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York, has been a leader in this field. Together with Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Mr. LINDSAY succeeded in getting the Arts Council bill through the House last year. Recently he testified before both the Senate and House Committees on the subject of the Arts Foundation, and just recently, before President Johnson's message on the arts, Mr. LINDSAY published an important article on this whole subject of the arts in the March 13 issue of the Saturday Review.

I found this article both interesting and enlightening and I would encourage my colleagues in the House to read and enjoy it as I have.

The article follows:

A CONGRESSMAN LOOKS AT THE ARTS

(By JOHN V. LINDSAY, U.S. Representative, 17th District, New York)

Increasingly it seems to be an accepted fact that the arts, and especially the performing arts, are a "good thing" for the community and the country. Four years ago Congressman FRANK THOMPSON and I were defeated on the floor of the House of Representatives in our attempt to put through a simple National Arts Council bill—a nonmoney bill that one would have thought generally noncontroversial. We were defeated on the grounds that the arts and their general condition is no business of any government. One powerful Congressman denounced the bill as the opening wedge toward subsidy of poker games.

Only 3 years later, however, in 1964, we put the National Arts Council bill through the House of Representatives by an astonishingly large majority. It must also have surprised the administration, for it took the President 6 months to appoint the Council.

The Council's main job, of course, is to make a determination of where we go from here. What is the role of Government in the arts? Is it possible to create a national goal to which the country will aspire? If organized society has an obligation to do something about the health of its people, or their education, cannot the same be said of the country's cultural resources? If the arts are one of the central elements of a good society and an important part of an individual's betterment, a source of strength to him, his family, and his community, is it not true that the health of the arts should be of concern to the elected and appointed representatives of that society?

The subject is considered important today where it was not 4 years ago. Something has happened to the politicians since that first unsuccessful foray. I suspect that they have been hearing from the housewives in their constituencies, who, happily, are beginning to become as excited about the condition of the local drama society as they are about the price of butter. More than 100 bills have been introduced in this 89th Congress for the purpose of supplying a small measure of Federal financial support for the arts (unheard of), on a matching basis, to States and localities.

At the recent congressional hearings on the subject all kinds of testimony was presented in support of a Federal foundation on the arts; even Congressmen who would have left the floor in dismay 4 years ago were now declaring themselves in favor of it. Then, too, there has been a spate of State arts councils modeled after the pioneers in the field—New York, North Carolina, and Louisiana.

I'm still wondering, however, exactly where we go from here. We are dealing with an area so highly personal and individual and unorganized (fortunately), so experimental (again fortunately), and sensitive, that one trends cautiously where Government involvement is concerned. But granted the sensitive and personal nature of creativity, there are nevertheless some nasty unsolved problems of bricks and mortar and boilerplate that make creativity unnecessarily more difficult. In the performing arts especially, all kinds of problems of business and administration, taxes and real estate, wage scales and other union requirements, foreign competition and costs in general are involved. There is no reason why these problems cannot be lessened, but any progress will require a very exact knowledge of the industry.

I have discovered, in researching this subject, that knowledge is hard to come by, that the discovery of facts and full information is most difficult. That is one of the several reasons that I am excited by the new Rockefeller panel report, The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects. This was a blue-ribbon panel, so good and so responsible that I could not mention some of its members without calamitous omission; let me only say that John D. Rockefeller III, who has given luster and strength to the performing arts in New York City, was its chairman.

Fascinating stuff in this report. Did you know, for example, that in 1963, of the $10 billion that was contributed by Americans to all charities, 78.6 percent was contributed by individuals, as opposed to 8.2 percent by foundations, 7.9 percent by wills and last testaments, and 5.3 percent by business corporations? I had begun to think that the foundations were the source of all nongovernmental beneficence in this area. "Nothing could be further from the truth," concludes the panel. "For arts organizations to turn to foundations, large or small, in hope that their needs will be swiftly satisfied, is almost certain to lead to disappointment." Many of my constituents who have come to me for an introduction to a foundation, hoping for financial support for a worthy artistic endeavor, will sadly bear out the point.

And did you know that of the $7.8 billion in individual contributions, more than 50 percent comes from those with adjusted gross incomes below $10,000, and that those in the lower income brackets give higher proportions of their incomes than all taxpayers except those in the very high brackets? There have been some shifts in recent years that are interesting, too. For example, in the 5-year period from 1958 to 1963, individual giving to charities increased by 39 percent, foundation giving by 62 percent, and bequests by 77 percent, while corporate contributions rose by only 2 percent, despite the fact that over the 5-year period corporate income before taxes increased by approximately one-third.

The beneficiaries of these sums are just as important to one's understanding as are the sources. In 1963 the $10 billion received from all sources, including the $7.8 billion from individuals, was distributed as follows: religion, 49 percent; education, 17 percent; welfare, 15 percent; health, 12 percent; paid into foundations, 4 percent; and all other, including civic and cultural, 3 percent.

Lest anyone still think that we are in good shape, however, one need only take a look at a few other figures. The average salary in orchestras in the United States ranges from $2,000 to $9,000. Actor's Equity estimated in a survey taken for the years 1957–58 that of nearly 7,000 members of its association employed as performers, the average actor's annual income approximated $2,000. Clearly, salaries have advanced since those years, but they remain indecently low. They are, however, still ahead of salaries in the dance, where it is estimated that $3,000 to $3,500 a year is the average income for a professional dancer (and he would be fortunate if this were steady from year to year). A prima ballerina can today hope for little more than $10,000 a year. The prodigious cost of the opera is well known. The outpouring of money for 1964–65 for the New York Metropolitan Opera was over $9 million, and the end is not in sight.

Cost is, of course, the continuing crisis for all of the performing arts. The theater is the only one that has survived as a commercial enterprise and has been thought capable of self-support, and yet about 75 percent of all Broadway productions fail to make money, and Broadway's output has dwindled from an average of 142 productions per year during the thirties to a mere 63 in 1963–64. No new theater has been built on Broadway since 1938.

There is, of course, the cultural explosion that one hears is going on in the small towns of America. The Rockefeller Bros. panel report finds that it is real and good and healthy, but it concludes that the explosion is largely amateur. It needs professionalism and management and money if there is to be a higher appreciation and a wider understanding and enjoyment of the performing arts at their best.

The Rockefeller Bros. panel makes the finding that one of the shortages has been information itself. This report supplies a good deal of information that has been lacking and for that reason alone is worthy of wide notice.

The final conclusion of the distinguished panelists is that even though so much new interest in the performing arts has been shown in America, it is surprising and shocking that the lag in artistic excellence and the commitment of our people to its betterment remains so great. There are increasing initiatives by universities, communities, choral groups, and amateur undertakings, and there are great efforts by foundations and men and women of wonderful good will in every community who give of themselves and their resources for the construction of a local music, drama, or dance center. But still there is a colossal gap between what there is and what there should be.

What can be done about it? The panelists find that the energy must come from every direction. Most especially it must come from private sources and private initiatives. And it must come from States and municipalities, which must do much more than they have been willing to do to date. Lastly, the Federal Government has a limited but important role to play; this role will include financial giving, preferably on a matching basis, and tax relief. At all times, of course, the independence of the arts, their freedom of choice and decision, must be maintained. And there is the rub. But it can be done; it's been done elsewhere and there's no reason why it can't be done here.

With great increases in leisure time, and pressure on all sides to make room for an expanding population, it seems more important than ever to take a look at the needs of the inner man, his outward well-being having been generally accepted as a social goal.

It is almost trite to suggest that the mark of a civilization is the state of its culture, but unless the point is carefully understood there will be no advance. It seems beyond further doubt that society cannot ignore its cultural well-being any more than it can the condition of its health or education. Any course of conduct to the contrary is sheer folly and will show up as such by the example of other civilizations and countries, to our ultimate shock and loss. Therefore it is incumbent upon us to get on with the job; to beef up our municipal, State, and local are centers and advisory councils; to give proper national recognition by appropriate and additional national legislation; to strip away the tax, real estate, and other barriers that stand in the way of artistic growth; to advance our copyright laws and other protections for creative artists and authors; to encourage our schools and colleges to begin early and complete training in the performing arts; and to encourage and make possible the widest possible enjoyment of the performing arts in every community.

Future of Excise Tax Hazy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation calling for the repeal of excise tax on communication services. I am greatly disturbed by the continuance of this nuisance tax and its repeal is long overdue.

In my congressional district alone more than $2,356,000 has been paid in communications excise tax. I am sure if my colleagues from both sides of the aisle were to look into the amount their constituents are paying out, their alarm would equal mine. The March 10 issue of Tele-Digest, the Pacific Telephone's southern counties newsletter carries a most interesting and revealing editorial which I include here for my colleagues review.

FUTURE OF EXCISE TAX HAZY

While President Johnson in his budget message to Congress asked for a $1.75 billion reduction in excise taxes—somewhat less than has been anticipated—the outlook for excises on telephone service is still hazy.

There is a good deal of speculation in Washington that Congress may authorize a substantially larger cut in excise taxes than recommended by President Johnson. Financial Writer Sylvia Porter has estimated it will be "closer to $4 billion." The Wall Street Jornal reports: "Congress is sure to want to make the cut bigger * * * and the administration may put only token opposition as long as the reduction doesn't threaten to go much beyond $2.5 billion."

Administration representatives have already given some indication of how they will react to larger reductions, if they are voted by Congress. Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon told a news conference that a $5 billion cut would have a definitely inflationary effect on the economy; however, a $2 billion reduction would not. He declined to predict the effect of a $3 billion cut.

TWENTY-SIX BILLS TO REPEAL COMMUNICATIONS EXCISE TAXES INTRODUCED

Details have not been revealed on how excise tax reductions would be distributed. However, there appears to be substantial support for revision of the tax on telephone services. By February 15 Congress had received 26 bills calling for repeal of the telephone tax. The 2d, 10th, 12th, and 23d bills were introduced by HOSMER, Republican; SMITH, Republican; TEAGUE, Republican; and REINECKE, Republican, respectively, all from California.

Of course, bills are being introduced urging repeal or reduction of many other excises. Congress will be under heavy pressure from the proponents of reduction as it allocates the dollar values of the cut among the dozens of items now subject to excise tax. Among the items now taxed are cosmetics, gasoline, automobiles, jewelry, luggage and handbags, tires, liquor, theater tickets, furs, tobacco and many household appliances.

TELEPHONE EXCISE TAXES WILL EXCEED $1 BILLION

Many individuals and groups are particularly opposed to the Federal excise tax on telephone service, which the U.S. Treasury Department estimates will pass the $1 billion mark in the current fiscal year. The Bell System and such industry groups as the United States Independent Telephone Association, National Association of Railroad & Utility Commissioners, and Communications Workers of America, have emphasized to Congress that telephone service is the only household necessity so taxed.

Supporters of its repeal have also stressed that the tax is discriminatory, bears most heavily on lower income groups, and restricts the use of telephone service. In addition, repeal would directly benefit telephone customers and the national economy.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION DUE IN LATE MAY OR JUNE

Telephone customers probably won't know how their tax situation will be affected until late May or early June. It doesn't look likely that the House Ways and Means Committee will send a bill to the floor before that since drafting won't begin until the committee finishes preparing the medicare legislation—probably in March. Action on the bill will probably be fairly swift since many of the excise taxes expire June 30.

Robert H. Goddard: Pioneer to the Stars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today has been proclaimed Robert Hutchings Goddard Day and it is with a deep sense of pride and satisfaction that I join with the President and my fellow countryment in commenorating the historic achievements and contributions of this pioneering man of science. I am proud of Robert Hutchings Goddard, both as an American and a citizen of Massachusetts. For it was at Clark University in Worcester, Mass., that Robert Goddard conducted his pioneering research and, indeed, built the first successful liquid fueled rocket motor in history.

Dr. Goddard's work has come to be widely known, as it inevitably would with men ever seeking new frontiers and new worlds to explore. But it was not always so. It is a curious fact that, while Americans have pioneered so many of the fantastic inventions and developments which today we regard as commonplace, many of these American geniuses have labored in obscurity, poverty, and even ridicule during their most productive years.

It is not to our credit that we, as Americans, failed to match the wisdom and vision of Robert Goddard. For, like the Wright brothers, Dr. Goddard found more receptive ears in Europe than in America. The Wrights took their flying machine to France where it was hailed for the truly revolutionary device that it was, while Americans scoffed and called it a contraption and plaything. Robert Goddard's work found a parallel course among the Germans. The developments in rocktry by the Germans during the Hitler years and World War II provided a frightful lesson for us.

It is regrettable that much of the recognition due this great man was not forthcoming during his lifetime. It is only since his untimely death in 1945 that many Americans have even heard of him. This is no doubt due in large measure to the fact that it is only since his death that we have been able to grasp the universal significance of his discoveries and achievements. For it is only within the last decade or so that men have begun truly to flex their fingers at the stars. We are beginning to see in the work of Dr. Robert Goddard the means to bring reality to the dreams of the ancients.

It is fitting and proper that we commemorate this man by setting aside a day in his name. I proudly join my countrymen in commemorating today, Tuesday, March 16, as Robert Hutchings Goddard Day.

Last fall, a commemorative postage stamp was issued by the U.S. Post Office Department in honor of Dr. Goddard. During a special ceremony marking that event on the campus of Clark University in Worcester, on September 27, Postmaster General John A. Gronouski delivered a notable speech recalling some of the achievements of the space age pioneer. I ask leave to include excerpts of Mr. Gronouski's remarks at this point:

ROBERT H. GODDARD: PIONEER TO THE STARS

(By Hon. John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General, United States of America)

It is a pleasure to be present on the Clark University campus today to take part in this ceremony that honors Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the man who helped to lift mens' eyes above the horizon.

Our national heroes invariably are honored on our postage stamps—and properly so. Less frequently do we honor the quiet men of genius. So the Robert H. Goddard commemorative stamp we are issuing is particularly gratifying to me. I hope this stamp will emphasize Dr. Goddard's place in history: Today every adventure in space springs from the 214 patents of rockets and rocket apparatus that were granted to Dr. Goddard beginning in 1914. These are the bases from which the space age evolved.

In more contemporary history, the late President John F. Kennedy, in May 1961 announced his decision to move the U.S. space program forward. He declared, "Control of space will be decided in the next decade. If the Soviets control space, they can control earth. We cannot run second in this vital race."

In the little more than 3 years since that fateful decision, the United States has completed the Mercury program with six successful manned orbital flights, made the world's first successful Venus shot, launched the world's first nuclear-powered satellites, set up a private corporation to establish a communications satellite system, placed more than 100 payloads into earth orbit, attained the world's weight-lifting record on a test shot, accomplished a photo survey of lunar topography.

Just as in Robert Goddard's time, however, the critics question the value of space exploration—and heap scorn on the lunar project. President Johnson has replied: "I do not believe that this generation of Americans is willing to resign itself to going to bed each night by the light of the Communist moon."

Here at Clark University you know the Goddard story—his birth in Worcester, October 5, 1882; undergraduate studies at Worcester Polytechnic; a master's degree from Clark in 1910; his doctorate a year later. In 1914, he joined the faculty, and in the physics building did his early work in conquering space.

From his Aunt Effie's farm on March 16, 1926, Dr. Goddard launched the world's first

liquid-propellant rocket. It stood 10 feet high, and built up a speed of 60 miles an hour, and came back to earth 184 feet away. This historic event stands beside a great undertaking 23 years earlier when Orville Wright first coaxed an airplane into the skies above Kitty Hawk for 12 seconds. The Wright brothers reduced the size of the world; Dr. Goddard reduced the size of the universe.

For his work, Dr. Goddard needed some wide open spaces, which he found in the desert near Roswell, N. Mex. His earlier experiments had been assisted by small grants from the Smithsonian Institution. Then the Guggenheims came to his aid, the result of a recommendation by Charles A. Lindbergh, and he was able to devote full time to his experiments. But progress was interrupted by the depression, and Dr. Goddard had to close down shop at Roswell and return to Clark.

He was back on the desert in 1934, and the culmination of his work there was a rocket that made an altitude shot of some 9,000 feet. This rocket contained almost all of the features later to appear in the German V-2 rockets which rained on England.

This remarkable man died August 10, 1945, at the age of 63. Honors and recognition came late to Dr. Robert H. Goddard. These range from a posthumous Congressional Gold Medal of Honor in 1960 to the decision of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency to name its new complex of buildings in Greenbelt, Md., "The Goddard Space Center." But even more eloquent and meaningful honors accrue to Dr. Goddard each day at Cape Kennedy, where the giant rockets point skyward—just as he knew they one day would.

Farmers Would Change Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Monday, March 8, issue of the Rockford Register-Republic contains an article based on a poll taken by Farm Journal, national farm magazine.

I would hope that the administration will take note of these opinions by farmers rather than relying exclusively on some of the theorists in the U.S. Department of Agriculture when they get ready to frame their recommendations with regard to current farm programs.

The article follows:

MAGAZINE POLLS AGRICULTURE: FARMERS WOULD CHANGE PROGRAMS

If the Nation's farmers were given the choice of writing a farm program for the future, they would make some big changes.

Most would scrap the present wheat, feed grain, and dairy programs. On these they'd lower support prices; move away from present Government controls, and would use the open market to guide farm production more than present programs do.

These are some of the suggested changes that come to light in a poll taken by Farm Journal, national farm magazine. Results are from a regionally balanced sample of 5,000 returns from the first 25,000 replies.

The poll was conducted as a backdrop to the current congressional consideration of a number of commodity farm programs which expire with next year's crop.

Many voted against "more Government" in farm programs. Four of the questions gave them an opportunity to vote for considerably stronger Government programs. Yet only 3 percent voted for compulsory compliance with feed grain programs; only 14 percent voted to give all dairymen a production base with direct Government payments for reducing production below that base; only 18 percent voted for more direct Government payments in general; and only 22 percent voted for quotas on poultry production.

Where questions gave a choice of moving away from present programs to other choices, only 23 percent preferred the present wheat program; 26 percent the present direct payment provisions; 28 percent, the present feed grain program; 30 percent, the present dairy program; 35 percent, the present program on reselling surplus farm stocks; and 35 percent preferred the present land retirement program.

The most popular program for feed grains and dairy would be to lower supports to 90 percent of the 3-year average market price; the most popular wheat program would drop supports to 90 percent of the world market price for wheat.

More than 4 out of 10 (43 percent) would eliminate direct cash payments to farmers where the Government pays farmers for the difference between the market price and a Government support level.

Surprisingly, votes by size showed that the largest farm operators were more content with present programs than smaller farmers who raise some of the commodities. Smaller operators were more in favor of reducing cotton and dairy price supports and more of the smaller growers voted to do away with all wheat programs.

Poll results show that farmers would establish a fair practices law that would permit farmers to negotiate prices and contracts directly with processors—without fear of reprisal.

Farmers are dissatisfied with the meat import agreements that the present political administration drew up with Australia and New Zealand last year. Farmers think that the terms were too liberal; and 85 percent voted to tighten meat import regulations.

The question of State reapportionment brought an overwhelming 96 percent response in favor of permitting each State to determine for itself whether it would apportion its State legislature by population alone or whether it would apportion one house partly by area or other factors.

HOW MIDWESTERN FARMERS BALLOTED

Reapportionment: Let Court decision stand, 5 percent; let the States decide, 95 percent.

Land retirement: Present program, 39 percent: long-term retirement; 61 percent.

Direct payments: More direct payments, 21 percent; fewer direct payments, 13 percent; what we have now, 29 percent; none at all, 37 percent.

CCC stock resale: Present 105 percent resale, 35 percent; raise to 115–125 percent, 65 percent.

Fair practices: Get a law passed, 67 percent; no law needed, 33 percent.

Meat imports: Present import rules, 14 percent; tighten import rules, 83 percent; drop all regulations, 3 percent.

Wheat: Extend present law (a), 28 percent; 90 percent of world price (b), 40 percent; no program at all (c), 32 percent.

Feed grains: Present program (a), 35 percent; compulsory compliance (b), 3 percent; 90 percent 3-year market price (c), 35 percent; no program at all (d), 27 percent.

Poultry: Quotas on farm output, 17 percent; quotas on eggs set, 11 percent; no program at all, 72 percent.

Dairy: Present program (a), 32 percent; Federal order bases (b), 8 percent; everyone a base (c), 17 percent; 90 percent 3-year market price (d), 43 percent.

HOW FARMERS VOTED

Here's how some 5,000 farmers voted in a magazine poll to determine their stand on such issues as crop supports and reapportionment.

State reapportionment: Allow Supreme Court decision to stand; this would reapportion both houses of State legislatures on the basis of equal population, 4 percent; get a constitutional amendment letting each State decide for itself whether to apportion one house on population; and the other house partially by area or other factors, as now, 98 percent.

Land retirement: Keep present program of paying to divert acreage from wheat, feed grain, and cotton allotments and bases each year, and allow conservation reserve to expire, 35 percent; offer long-term land retirement payments to retire large amounts of crop land nationally; rely less on crop bases and allotments, 65 percent.

Direct payments: (With direct payments market prices seek their own level and the Government pays the difference between the market and a certain support level as a direct Government cash payment to farmers): Do you want more direct payment plans? 18 percent; fewer direct payment plans? 13 percent; about what we have now, 26 percent; none at all, 43 percent.

CCC stock resale: Allow resale of CCC stocks on the market at present 105 percent of loan level plus carrying charges for cotton, wheat, and grain, 35 percent; raise CCC resale level to 115 to 125 percent of loan level plus carrying charges, 65 percent.

Fair practices: Pass a "fair practice" law protecting farmers from retaliation from processors—such as being cut off contract markets for joining a bargaining group, 70 percent; no law needed, 30 percent.

Meat imports: Keep present meat import regulations, 12 percent; tighten meat import regulations, 85 percent; drop all meat import regulations, 3 percent.

Wheat: Extend present law, keep allotments; pay cash on certificates as now, 28 percent; 39 percent support prices at 90 percent of world market price, drop allotments; use a land retirement program with rental payments to retire acres no program at all 38 percent;

Feed grains: Extend present program with present loan and support levels, and cash payments 28 percent; make compliance with feed grain program compulsory, with penalties for overplanting 3 percent; set supports at 90 percent of the average 3-year market price; eliminate base acreages; use a land retirement program with rental payments to retire excess acres 34 percent; no program at all 35 percent.

Poultry: Set quotas on broiler and turkey farm production through market orders 14 percent; set quotas on the number of broiler and turkey eggs that can be set 8 percent; no program at all 78 percent.

Dairy: Keep present program of price support purchases at 75 to 90 percent of parity 30 percent; give Federal order dairymen a base on which class I prices will be paid—even though they may cut class II production 10 percent; give all dairymen a base; make direct Government cash payments for cutting production below that base 14 percent; set supports at 90 percent of the 3-year average market price; no bases or quotas 46 percent.

Tobacco: Keep present program of price supports with Government setting the allotment 64 percent; start acreage-poundage controls 36 percent.

Cotton: Extend present program with domestic allotments, present supports, direct payments, 50 percent; lower supports 1 cent per year for the next 2 years, then set supports at 90 percent of the average market price; lower mill subsidies, 50 percent.

How farmers voted by size

[Letters refer to chart above]

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
WHEAT GROWERS	*Per-cent*	*Per-cent*	*Per-cent*	*Per-cent*
1 to 49 acres	21	38	41	------
50 to 99 acres	27	39	34	------
100 to 199 acres	30	44	26	------
20 plus acres	37	44	19	------
DAIRYMEN				
1 to 19 cows	33	3	15	49
20 to 49 cows	29	20	16	35
50 to 99 cows	31	27	11	31
100 plus cows	32	27	9	32
FEED GRAIN GROWERS				
All sizes	29	3	34	34

Miguel A. Tellez,, Artist of the Southwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the foremost artists of Texas and the Southwest is Miguel A. Tellez, a native of my hometown, San Antonio, Tex. His commercial and fine art talents have been known for several years in San Antonio, where Mr. Tellez conducts a successful business, and throughout the rest of the State of Texas as well as Arizona, New Mexico, and California, where he has exhibited his paintings. He has also received national attention through stories about him in magazines and other publications. One of these, Signs of the Times, carried a feature story on Mr. Tellez describing his activities in its May 1964 issue. With unanimous consent, I am inserting a copy of the article from the Signs of the Times, entitled "Signman and Portrait Painter":

SIGNMAN AND PORTRAIT PAINTER

Among sign people who have developed their pictorial talents into the field of portrait painting is Miguel A. Tellez, Tellez Signs, San Antonio, Tex.

How did he first get into the sign business and also get involved in portrait painting? His father, Jose Leon Tellez, was a popular fine art painter who traveled extensively in the United States and Europe. "He taught me everything he knew about lettering, portraits, painting, sketching and signs," Miguel Tellez comments.

In 1936, Miguel Tellez did some work for sign companies in the San Antonio area, but that was a time of economic depression, so that steady employment was difficult to maintain. To help out young men who were having such difficulties, the Federal Government had established the Civilian Conservation Corps, and it was with the CCC that the aspiring signman and artist found an opportunity to develop his talents. His lettering, sign painting, sketching and pictorial abilities were utilized in his work with the CCC camps of the area.

In 1951 he established Tellez Signs, featuring commercial art, label designing, screen process, real estate signs, outdoor advertising, truck lettering, window and wall signs. A truck he laid out and which he lettered together with Bruce A. Kissinger was chosen as one of the "Trucks of the Month" of the February 1964, issue of Signs of the Times (p. 89).

He has done design work for some national sales firms which manufacture stationery for colleges and universities across the country and for the Army, Air Force, and Navy post exchanges. All of this is especially designed for the branch of service, university or college, etc. Also, he has designed some phonograph record album covers and has done design work for the Columbia Bowling Ball Co.

Through the years that he has been making his living through his signwork and designing, he has been developing his fine art talents as a recreational sideline. He has exhibited his paintings at major exhibitions in Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California. He is a member of the Artist and Designers Society of San Antonio.

One of his most recent activities has been a series of portraits and illustrations significant in the life of the late President John F. Kennedy. Ten of these, a velvet, and nine charcoal sketches on halftone paper, have been reproduced in black and white offset printing in "The John F. Kennedy Historical Scrapbook" (copyright 1964), which he and some associates of Henderson-Bain-Tellez Enterprises have produce and are distributing.

Agricultural Economics and Farm Programs—Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, as the U.S. farmer faces the future, he must know that his livelihood and his family's depends on increasing the productiveness of his farm to the fullest extent possible. And from all indications, he will find this not only possible but profitable.

The increases in production and efficiency in the use of farm products which have contributed to our farm problems of the past have by no means reached their ultimate. Reports indicate that the rapid expansion of the fertilizer industry which has marked the immediate past will continue and intensify in the foreseeable future. This will be true because the farmers in the Midwest have not nearly reached the point of diminishing returns in the use of fertilizers, and other techniques of production will continue to improve.

If, as is entirely possible, farmers in the corn-producing areas increased their use of fertilizer by two-thirds, they would probably increase their output by one-third. An increase of this percentage in the production of corn could be done with a cost of from 40 to 70 cents a bushel, which is well below present prices.

The breeding of better varieties of corn and other grains will continue to improve as will tilling techniques, irrigation practices, and farm equipment design.

It is estimated that, without further reductions in corn acreage, production could increase by 30 percent in the next 5 to 10 years. The potential for increasing the amounts of harvested grains other than corn are of smaller, but still significant, magnitudes.

Should the restrictions on corn acreage be lifted, it would be possible to increase production by 60 percent in the next decade with average fertilizer costs of less than 70 cents a bushel. The total production of feed grains without acreage limitations at all could be increased by 50 percent.

I believe these facts further point up the necessity now, and in the future, for sound agricultural programs. We have not yet reached the end of the road in our farm problem.

Who Can Pass Stiff Alabama Voting Test?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, we all have been appalled by the recent incidents of brutality and murder in the State of Alabama which have occurred as Negro Americans in that State attempt to exercise their constitutional right to vote. We have seen pictures and read accounts of how these citizens have been halted on the streets and beaten down as they try to reach the courthouse to register to vote.

Equally shocking and unjust is the obstacle they face once they get there, for the State of Alabama imposes a voting test which even students of government have difficulty passing. A provocative comment on this outrageous test appeared on the editorial pages of one of the very fine newspapers in my district, the San Fernando Valley Sun, on February 25, 1965. A copy of that editorial follows:

WHO CAN PASS STIFF ALABAMA VOTING TEST?

How many votes must a person receive in order to become President if the election is decided by the U.S. House of Representatives?

Congress passes laws regulating cases which are included in those over which the United States has * * * jurisdiction.

The Constitution limits the size of the District of Columbia * * *.

An appropriate title for this essay on the rights of man might properly be called "How to disenfranchise 99 percent of the voters of the United States."

The above questions are no joke, neither in conception nor in their Machiavellian application. They are samples of questions asked prospective voters in Alabama by registrars, whose use of the test is so deviously successful that an estimated 96 percent of eligible Negro voters in that Southern State are denied a basic right of American citizenship.

The evil beauty of the test is that not all of the questions are as obscure as those mentioned. Southern thoroughness dictates that a few easy ones be thrown in the hopper, so that the white voters can pass the test. Which questions and how many to ask a citizen is left to the discretion of the registrar.

Assuming that the test were applied equally to all citizens, how many Alabamans,

or Californians for that matter, could pass it? Not very many, according to an experiment conducted by an authority on constitutional law.

Michael Lofchie, assistant professor of political science at UCLA, gave the 68-question exercise to 36 upper division and graduate political science students. Each of the three highest scorers missed 16—16 reasons for denial of voting by the State of Alabama.

Computerized Typewriter Leads Schizoid Children Toward Normal Life by Helping Them To Read

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article from the March 12, 1965, issue of the New York Times which describes a remarkable computerized typewriter which has been used to improve the condition of a number of children who have suffered from an extremely severe form of childhood schizophrenia.

The article follows:

COMPUTERIZED TYPEWRITER LEADS SCHIZOID CHILDREN TOWARD NORMAL LIFE BY HELPING THEM TO READ

(By Ronald Sullivan)

COOPERSTOWN, March 10.—A computerized typewriter has been credited with remarkable success at a hospital here in radically improving the condition of several children suffering an extremely severe form of childhood schizophrenia.

No one has fully explained or accounted for the change in the children's condition. No one ever mentions the word cure. Nor does anyone say that a machine has succeeded where psychiatry apparently has not.

All that is said is that one of the children, who was on his way to a State mental institution, is now going to public school after having been given up as a hopeless case 1 year ago. Several other children have shown similar progress.

What has particularly amazed a number of psychiatrists is that the children's improvement occurred without psychotherapy; only the machine was involved.

MACHINE ALMOST HUMAN

It is almost as much human as it is machine. It talks, it listens, it responds to being touched, it makes pictures or charts, it comments and explains, it gives information and can be set up to do all this in any order.

In short, the machine attempts to combine in a sort of science-fiction instrument all the best of two worlds—human and machine. It is called an Edison Responsive Environment Learning System. It is an extremely sophisticated "talking" typewriter (a cross between an analog, and digital computer) that can teach children how to read and write.

The instrument has been used successfully in teaching 5-year-old kindergarten children how to read after only 30 hours at the typewriter over a 5-month period, without any formal instruction from teachers.

HOW IT WORKS

The computerized typewriter allows its user to explore freely. It has infinite patience. There are no punishments when a wrong key is punched. There is no competition. It has inflexible logic. It never varies. It never, never makes a mistake.

The machine consists of a computer about the size of a small, upright piano with a typewriter keyboard in front. It has a speaker and a frame above the typewriter for printed matter.

The first thing a child does is press one of the standard typewriter keys. This prints the character in large type. At the same time, a soft voice automatically identifies it through the speaker.

The computer can be programed vocally and visually, or both together. When a letter is selected by a recorded voice, all the remaining keys are locked. The machine waits indefinitely while the child punches away until the right key is hit before it calls automatically for the next one.

Then letters lead to words and words to sentences. Sentences lead to stories.

IN RURAL HOSPITAL

The machine was conceived by Dr. Omar Khayyam Moore, a behavioral scientist and a professor of psychology at Rutgers University, and developed by Richard Kobler of the Thomas A. Edison Laboratory, West Orange, N.J.

It was installed here inside a soundproof booth at the Mary Imogene Bassett Hospital, long considered one of the best rural hospitals in the country.

The two persons who are responsible for getting it here are two staff members, Dr. T. Campbell Goodwin, head of pediatrics, and his wife, Mary, who also is a pediatrician.

A number of the children who have used the machine since it was installed a year ago have been diagnosed as suffering from autism, a baffling and distressing form of childhood schizophrenia that thus far has defied any kind of psychiatric treatment. There is no known cause or cure.

Autism is generally described as a severe emotional disturbance marked by such pronounced symptoms as profound withdrawal, mutism, strange language behavior, uncontrolled weeping and rage, violent tantrums, wild fear, trancelike fixations of inanimate objects, animallike behavior and several patterns associated with mental retardation.

Dr. Mary Goodwin is a handsome woman, who, with her husband, has been fighting for nearly 20 years to improve rural treatment facilities for handicapped and retarded children.

Although she believes that what has happened to the autistic children has been extraordinary, she is extremely wary of drawing any medical or psychological conclusions from her success.

With the winter hills south of Otsego Lake behind her, she said the other day: "All I can tell is what I have seen. We're not sure what has happened. We have a vague idea, a guess. We do know what these children were like when they began coming here last year. We do know what they are like now. The important thing is that this be followed up."

Dr. Goodwin has been specializing in remedial reading and therapy for handicapped children in a special wing developed in the rear of Bassett Hall, a large, Tudor building near the hospital that used to be a nurses' home.

She first learned of Dr. Moore's work with the machine in 1961 when he was on the faculty of Yale University. At Hamden Hall Day School near New Haven, Dr. Moore demonstrated that very young children, when placed in a "responsive environment," were capable of extraordinary degrees of reasoning.

AVOIDS MISTAKES

Many times, this capacity seems to break down in adult communication with a small child. Thus, Dr. Moore conceived of a machine and an environment that could not make the mistakes adults did when dealing with children.

With her husband's encouragement and with funds made available by the hospitals, Dr. Goodwin purchased a machine for $30,000 a year ago February. She reasoned that if it helped bright children, it might very well help handicapped and retarded children, too.

But she also had another idea. She had noted that one symptom of autistic children is a highly abnormal preoccupation with inanimate objects, particularly with anything mechanical. She thought that this preoccupation might be exploited with a machine.

The first autistic child to use the machine was a highly unmanageable, 6-year-old boy who had never communicated with anyone, including his family.

He was frightened, unkempt, wild, and occasionally vicious. He was so disturbed that several psychiatrists had given up any hope for him and advised that he be sent to a State mental hospital.

The boy had never spoken to anyone and he never had been to school. Nevertheless, when Dr. Goodwin placed him inside the small room with the typewriter last May, he gingerly approached it and began to peck out a jumble of commercial brand names advertised on television.

He has since used the typewriter nearly three times a week. Gradually he has begun to respond. Robert D. Seaver, a former teacher with five children of his own and who now works with Dr. Goodwin, said:

"The boy sees me now. He never did before. He responds to me. He responds to others. We know he is far from cured. But his parents are now thinking in terms of school for him instead of custodial care by the State."

Mr. Seaver described another boy who was 6 years old like the first and who likewise was diagnosed as autistic. He had been removed from kindergarten because he had become a menace to himself and to other children. He was extremely disturbed and his condition was getting worse when he began using the machine.

Now, after nearly a year with the typewriter, he is back in school.

A BOY'S PROGRESS

Another boy who was nine could only make infantile sounds when he began punching out gibberish on the machine last April. Now he can read sentences. He speaks, plays, and continues to make progress. He had been considered a virtually hopeless case.

A small group of boys were taken from a State mental institution last summer and began using their arms, elbows, and noses on the machine. They were considered representative of the most severely disturbed in their institutions.

One was a 14-year-old who had not spoken since he was 3 or 4 years old. Despite intensive psychiatric care and extensive psychotherapy, he had deteriorated to the point of being catatonic.

By last November, the boy had begun to initiate simple activities, express himself vocally where he had only made infantile expressions before. He can now pronounce and write his name.

Other children made similar advances.

All the while, Dr. Goodwin and her staff became tantalized with the progress they saw even though they could not explain it. They guardedly and tentatively attribute it to the fact that the machine has removed the human factor in communications.

UNLOCKING THE MIND

Dr. Campbell Goodwin speculates that the machine was able to bring the autistic children to respond because it eliminated humans as communication factors. Once the children were able to communicate, something seemed to unlock in their minds, apparently enabling them to carry out further, normal mental activities that had eluded them earlier.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a promising young man from my district won the VFW Voice of Democracy contest in the State of Mississippi.

It is a pleasure to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the winning speech of Lonnie Paul LeBlanc of Jackson, a student at St. Joseph High School. It follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Lonnie Paul LeBlanc, Jackson, Miss.)

Adlai Stevenson once said that no government can be stronger, more inflexibly committed, or wiser than its people. We are the people, you and I; and we must be strong, wise, and committed if our country is to survive. Neither the city nor the world can be strong if we are not. Mr. Stevenson spoke of the role of the individual. He spoke not of the goal of government but of the challenge of citizenship.

Civic challenge is something that confronts each of us during our lives. It may come as a campaign to have the leaves removed from Maple Street, or it may arise as a controversy over a proposed $20 million air terminal. Whatever the challenge, we must face it squarely without flinching. We must face it as men, not half-men whom society casts aside. We cannot habitually grumble in our beards, when with a little positive action we could correct problems we feel exist.

Each of us, it seems, is the best dinner table politician in the neighborhood. The local barber and his customer find the solution to a current world crisis, yet neither of these men will take the time to head a campaign to halt pollution of the local reservoir. A community may lack water hydrants for emergency use; but instead of bringing this to the attention of the city officials, the citizens argue with one another as to who will do what in case of fire.

We detest nuclear war, yet we dare our Government to negotiate peace with anyone. We ask, "Why is that crooked politician holding office?" but we don't have enough initiative to vote the scoundrel out and put a man of integrity in his place.

Shall we continue to whimper and pout in our little cell of egotism, or will we stand and be counted among those willing to help better ourselves and our world community? When we fail to stand firm and speak out for right against wrong, we show our weakness. If we are aware of the problem but never concerned with it, if we fail to call the shots to rectify it, then we prove how dormant the seed of citizenship lies within us.

This is our challenge: to become aware of and concerned with our society; as Adlai Stevenson puts it—to be strong, wise, and committed. Since we have the power to think, to reason, and to improve ourselves, we have an advantage, a superiority over all God's creatures.

That 12-year-old who assembles model aircraft may one day pilot a rocket to Mars. Or that young freshman who delights in his study of civics, may help bring prosperity to underdeveloped nations of the world. Yes, the advantages are there for all of us, but they will never benefit us if we do not exercise the privilege of using them.

And we do have a right to use these privileges. Every individual possesses an inherent dignity. This personal dignity has been acknowledged by civic-minded men throughout the ages of history, men who fought to preserve that dignity and thereby maintain man's unalienable rights. Our rights as men, however, will only exist as long as we profit by our advantages. If our positive action falters in a given situation, if our rights become commonplace to us, to the point where we ignore them, then we have already begun the journey down the short road to decay and finally extinction.

Our first duty then is to become conscious of and concerned with these rights so as to improve ourselves, for then only can we hope to become aware of and concerned with the improvement of others in society. I must respect myself. Once I have gained respect of myself, I can respect my family, my fellow man, and my country.

What is civic challenge? To accept one's duties, thereby maintaining the inherent dignity of society and the self-determination of the whole world. To use the advantages, to exercise the rights—in the words of the late John F. Kennedy, to ask not what our country can do for us but to ask what we can do for our country. This is the real challenge of citizenship.

Clean Air Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial broadcast by station WINS in New York on February 16 and 17, 1965.

It is hoped that this disgraceful and dangerous situation can be dealt with constructively by New York City's administration in the near future.

The editorial follows:

CLEAN AIR CAMPAIGN

(By Joel Chaseman, WINS general manager)

New York City dwellers made 5,000 more complaints about dirty air in 1964 than they did in 1963. Air Pollution Control Commissioner Arthur J. Benline says this means we are aware of the city's dirty air, but still have not gotten excited enough to do anything about it.

The commissioner warns that, until the city puts up money for enough field inspectors and additional dirty air testing equipment, the air New Yorkers breathe may get worse before it gets better.

Can you imagine what 60 tons of soot looks like? Every month last year 60 tons of soot fell on the average square mile of New York City * * * 60 tons per square mile per month. No expert knows what kind of lasting harm this does to the human body, especially young, growing ones.

We at WINS continue to be seriously concerned with this menace, and we shall continue to recommend ways to deal with it. In addition, beginning this week, we will broadcast the official Air Pollution Control Index five times each day so you will know just how dirty the air is on any given day.

We hope this helps you judge for yourself the problem faced by Commissioner Benline and his inspectors. The polluted, filthy air over New York last year dropped an average of 60 tons of soot every month on every square mile of the city—eight times the weight of an average family—every day of the year. It takes money, men, and material to end this deadly rain. Only with your help will the job be done.

Thank you.

The Need for Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, the right of a citizen to vote, when qualified, lies at the very heart and core of all civil rights issues. Honest, intelligent American citizens may, and frequently do, disagree on the extent to which legislation should affect property rights while providing equality of opportunity. But there should be no disagreement concerning the right of every qualified American citizen to vote.

Recent events in Selma, Ala., show clearly that as long as one segment of our population is constantly denied their constitutional right to vote, racial strife in this Nation will continue.

The 15th amendment, which was adopted in 1870, provides that the right of American citizens to vote shall not be abridged by any State because of race or color. It further states that Congress shall have the power to enforce this provision "by appropriate legislation."

We now have the opportunity to remove the fundamental cause of the civil rights conflict. That cause is denying qualified citizens the right to vote, which is a basic civil right in any democracy.

Once all Americans, Negro and white, are assured of this right, the way will be open to a peaceful and orderly resolution of the civil rights issue. When the ballot box is open to everyone, grievances can be registered there.

I think the vast majority of Americans realize the necessity for voting rights legislation. In this connection, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members a recent editorial from the Centerville Iowegian of Centerville, Iowa. The editorial wisely warns against extremism in a highly emotional situation and, in the days and weeks ahead, I hope all Americans will remember the need for moderation and restraint.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the editorial:

NEGRO RIGHTS

No true-blooded American can approve of Governor Wallace, of Alabama, and his strongarm tactics. The Selma beatings are neither American nor just.

The Negro citizen is entitled to vote, and eventually, he will win that right. It may be a long, tedious, and occasionally bloody road but it is an inherent citizenship right.

The Negro is in a revolutionary upheaval in this country. He feels oppressed and is desperately searching for his freedom and full rights.

The big danger, of course, is that in a period of unrest like this the hotheads take charge. That is often the case. The hotheads may not accomplish much, but a lot of unpleasant violence can result.

We like the approach taken by Dr. Martin Luther King. He is persistent. To a point he is unyielding. He has a certain firmness, yet he avoids violence and ill-considered actions.

In the end the Negro will gain his rights if for no other reason than right is on his side.

Improving the Nation's Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Caterpillar Tractor Co., which originated in San Leandro, Calif., and has its corporate offices there, has made a substantial contribution to the economy of this country by causing a flow of gold into the United States.

I am very happy to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a release made by President William Blackie, of Caterpillar, which shows what this contribution has been and demonstrates Caterpillar's cooperation with President Johnson in stemming the outflow of gold from this country:

IMPROVING THE NATION'S BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Caterpillar Tractor Co. contributed $373 million to the flow of international payments into the United States in 1964, President William Blackie said today.

The company will exert every effort to cooperate with President Johnson in his goal of improving the Nation's balance of payments in 1965, he said.

Mr. Blackie reported that Caterpillar's net contribution toward a favorable balance of payments for the 10 years 1955–64, was $2.6 billion. He said the company's contribution will continue to increase as its exports increase, and as its foreign investments mature and become more profitable.

The complete statement follows:

Caterpillar Tractor Co. is cooperating with the Federal Government in its request for voluntary cooperation from industrial firms that have substantial investments abroad or that export large amounts of product from the United States.

In this effort, the Government seeks to have such firms improve their net contributions to a more favorable balance of payments.

Caterpillar already is one of the Nation's major net contributors to this cause. For the 10 years 1955–64, its net contribution to the flow of international payments into the United States was $2.6 billion. For 1964 alone, its net contribution was $373 million.

Caterpillar's contribution will continue to increase as the parent company's exports increase and as its foreign investments mature and become more profitable.

Caterpillar's foreign manufacturing subsidiaries obtain from its U.S. plants substantial amounts of components for assembly into machines and engines produced abroad. As a result, these foreign investments contribute materially and directly to an increase in exports from the United States.

Furthermore, its exports of finished machines and parts have increased to those countries in which Caterpillar has made investments. None of the subsidiary companies manufactures the complete line of Caterpillar products but they actively promote the sale of the complete line and their presence within the host countries has produced important increases in exports of U.S.-manufactured products to those countries.

Despite the very substantial contribution already being made by Caterpillar toward improvement of the balance of payments, it is finding new ways to help the U.S. Government solve one of its most serious problems.

For 1965, the company will exert every effort to meet the President's goal of an increase of about 20 percent in its net contribution—the excess of exports, dividends, and license fees over such oversea investment as may be required to preserve and expand a fully competitive position.

An Equal Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as the House of Representatives today considers legislation relating to equal representation, I include a recent editorial on this vital matter in the RECORD:

[From the Palm Beach (Fla.) Post, Mar. 3, 1965]

AN EQUAL VOICE

The consciences of some legislators—both State and national—come alive only when stimulated by court orders.

Under this stimulus, the U.S. House Judiciary Committee last week approved a bill that would require congressional districts to be equal in population, compact, and composed of contiguous territory.

It is proposed that no congressional district in any State be allowed to have a population varying more than 12.5 percent from the average population of all the districts in the State.

The bill is aimed at States with fantastically-shaped, gerrymandered ditsricts; and those which have wide variations in district populations, thus giving extra weight to some votes, usually in rural areas.

Florida is one of the latter—one of the worst of the latter, in fact.

If States were actually limited to a variation of 12.5 percent from average in their U.S. House districts, the current districts of 35 States would be illegal.

Florida is one of four States in the Union having more than a 60-percent variation—the Sixth District, of which Palm Beach County is a part, varies by 60.3 percent. This district has more than twice the population of the Ninth District in north Florida.

It was the 1961 legislature which perpetrated this political mayhem on Florida. It was argued by proponents that "population certainly is a factor in redistricting, but it is not the only factor. Other factors include the number of governmental units such as county commissions and the number of cities with which the Congressman has to deal."

The argument does not hold water. Congressional seats are allocated to the States strictly on the basis of population, and there is no reason other than political expediency why they should not be allocated within the States on the same basis.

Basic theory is that every citizen shall have an equal voice in his government. This is an ideal never completely achieved, but it could be nearly so if an honest effort were made.

House bill 970, which would make fair representation in Congress a legal requirement, should be passed and strictly enforced.

Accomplishments of the United States Information Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, too often the work of individuals or organizations becomes known to the public only when there is criticism of that work. Reports of solid, professional accomplishment would appear, unfortunately, to be less newsworthy than the occasional mistake. For that reason, I was particularly pleased to note that a Miami Herald editorial of Saturday, March 6, took the time and space to praise the accomplishments of the U.S. Information Agency.

I am also pleased about my hometown newspaper's findings since they confirm my judgment of that Agency's work. During the past few years the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, of which I am honored to be the Chairman, has conducted hearings and research into the ideological and psychological aspects of this Nation's formulation and execution of foreign policy. While there is much more our country should be doing in this area, I have been continually impressed with the caliber and impact of USIA's work.

On March 4, the widely read and respected international daily, the Christian Science Monitor, carried a story on USIA's impact in various parts of the world. A survey conducted by the Monitor found this organization to be more effective than is generally known.

I commend to my colleagues the Miami Herald editorial and the Christian Science Monitor story on USIA, which follow:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 6, 1965]

FYI, THE USIA IS OK

Indonesia's message to Washington finally got through. And so the United States will close its libraries and reading rooms there and halt the activities of the U.S. Information Service.

It is hoped, although it is not assumed, that the pipeline of foreign aid will be cut off as promptly. If the Sukarno dictatorship wants neither our information nor our dollars, let it wend its way to whatever Red hell it wishes.

Due historic note ought to be taken, however, of the circumstances. It is to the credit of the USIS (known at home as the USIA—A for Agency) rather than to its disgrace that the mob said it with stones.

Some critics of the USIA would have it otherwise. The Agency is denounced as a tax-eater, when in fact its budget has risen by only half in the last decade. Its beginnings more than 20 years ago were humble and tentative.

It is charged also with failing to induce foreigners to love us. The fact is that in Indonesia and other incipent areas of communism it has gotten under the skin of the political mobsters. For its purpose, as a former Director once defined it, is to "keep the world honestly informed." Of course,

the truth that Indonesia got was the kind that hurt.

Under a law which seems unfair to the USIA but which wisely keeps it out of domestic controversy, the Agency cannot defend itself at home.

Thus its good works, which we have observed in quantity, are largely unknown to the American public.

The USIA mans 239 posts in 106 countries. It supports more than 150 "binational" centers, which means it is working with the cooperation of friendly governments—a fact drowned in the sound of breaking glass elsewhere. It sponsors thousands of oversea radio and TV broadcasts. It files 10,000 words a day to newspapers. It distributes some 8 million books a year in many languages.

In some instances there has been competition with private means of information but this is a minor imperfection. The USIA effort is, quite frankly, the projection of U.S. propaganda, but in the best sense.

In the world of today this is an indispensable enterprise at which other nations make a far greater exertion.

The USIA is supported by an appropriation roughly the size of what it takes to build and arm one combat Polaris submarine.

This is a small sum in a war which musters the pen as well as the sword. In our view it is a bargain.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 4, 1965]

HOW WELL DOES USIS DO JOB?

(NOTE.—The U.S. Information Service—USIS—speaks to the world for America and its policies. It attempts to project a rounded view of the United States. A survey by the Christian Science Monitor finds that USIS is more effective than is generally known. But the problems of USIS posts are many. Libraries are sometimes targets for angry protests against American foreign policy. USIS programs do not always fit the needs of local conditions. Monitor correspondents here discuss the impact of USIS in various parts of the world.)

Explaining America to the world—this is the job of the U.S. Information Service.

How well is it doing it?

Is the USIS putting across America's message to the Pakistani, the Nigerian, the Tunisian?

These questions were put to Monitor correspondents around the world. Their conclusion is this:

On balance, USIS activities are making a good impact. They have notable successes to their credit in many areas.

But local reaction to USIS activities varies widely.

In the Malaysian capital of Kuala Lumpur, for instance, a Chinese crowd a few weeks ago hurled a bicycle through the USIS library window. Then it screamed "Yankees, go home."

Such scenes are enacted in other capitals, too, where the plate glass windows of the American libraries offer targets for demonstrators.

ELECTION FOLLOWED

Yet in the USIS auditorium in Saigon last November, Vietnamese sat engrossed, shoulder to shoulder with Americans, as the presidential election results poured in. The show was a huge success as an American Embassy official interpreted the mysteries of American politics.

One problem which confronts USIS officials in Asia is that they do not always have an easily salable product. American foreign policies are not always liked.

United States nonrecognition of Communist China, for example, has met with little enthusiasm among many Asians.

But in the underdeveloped lands of Africa, where there is yearning for knowledge and limited facilities for study, USIS libraries are crowded with Africans poring over newspapers and books. Films and lectures are well attended.

Other countries, including Communist China and the Soviet Union, maintain similar services abroad, but the USIS programs usually are the largest and most used.

SURVEY CONDUCTED

The USIS conducted a survey among Swaziland high school students recently to determine the effect of its program. The students had been exposed to the usual USIS fare.

There was some confusion in the replies. Some students mixed up socialism and democracy. But the survey showed some basic understanding of the United States.

In Latin America, USIS centers are reaching a wider spectrum of social classes. Student exchanges and lending libraries are undercutting Communist influences. English-teaching centers are growing in popularity in the cities and rural areas.

Here again there are harassing problems for USIS personnel. They stem primarily from nationalist distrust of U.S. motives.

Says one correspondent in Brazil:

"My estimate is that the hardest nut to crack is the widespread conviction among nationalist, non-Communist circles here from archbishops down that Brazil suffers exploitation from American business interests."

FAR EAST

HONG KONG.—The triumphs and failures of the U.S. Information Service in the Far East are perhaps best illustrated by two vignettes.

The setting for both is Djakarta, capital of Indonesia.

Scene of the first is a pleasant street where stands the American library operated by USIS. Suddenly a marching mob, thought to be heading for the American Embassy in another part of the city, swerves and changes course.

It rushes the library, smashes its way in, wrecks the reading room, tears down the American flag, and burns it.

The second vignette takes place a few days later.

The scene this time is the home of an American foreign service officer in Djakarta. Being shown there is the USIS film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," the film depicting President Kennedy's achievements and funeral procession. The film must be shown in a private house because American films of all kinds are barred from public viewing in Indonesia.

After 90 minutes of this moving record the lights are turned on and show Indonesian women in the audience sobbing, the Indonesian men grim and taut.

Perhaps the audience may not be pro-American. But for a few minutes at least this film has built a bridge of humanity between two peoples.

What propaganda specialist could ask for more?

Such anomalies—the sacking of a USIS library yet the brilliant success of a USIS film—in the same city just a few days apart, indicate the range of reaction to USIS in Asia.

Some old Far Eastern hands blast USIS for lack of sophistication. They say too much of the propaganda program is packaged in bureaucratic Washington without consideration for local conditions.

Instead of some heavy tomes they would like to see in American libraries simple booklets on how to repair a bicycle or dig a well.

Instead of films on art galleries in Buffalo they would like to see animated cartoons angled specifically for local audiences.

They are critical of the act of Congress which bars USIS from competing with commercial publishing houses and which, they say, stultifies USIS publications.

Some are critical of the fact that non-American authors are barred from American library shelves.

But if USIS is criticized, it is also defended. Some point out that one of America's most successful propaganda displays—of the space program and equipment—was a packaged program from Washington.

It is argued that sackings of libraries do not always indicate defeat. Sometimes they are indications of the libraries' effectiveness, so much so that anti-American demonstrators desire to put them out of business.

Then again in one southeast Asian land where the local government is trying to improve its image in a remote and Communist tainted region, the USIS is performing with subtlety and sophistication. Much of its effort is to bolster the government with improved propaganda techniques without ever thumping out the achievements of the United States.

And in Vietnam, although there are USIS officials of all calibers, there are men of courage, initiative, and brilliant improvisation working for the USIS in the provinces—all under the guns of the Vietcong

"Maybe," says one American correspondent long in the Far East, "it all depends on the individual. The guy with enough dedication tempered with enough realism yet still with enough imagination and professionalism—that's the guy that seems to do a good job. But selling America in Asia is an uphill job.

"This is a very professional business. And we can do without the amateurs, the bureaucrats, and the nuts."

JOHN HUGHES.

LATIN AMERICA

SANTIAGO.—On balance, U.S. Information Service activities in Latin America are toting up a number of solid achievements.

Surveying the hemisphere picture, correspondents of this newspaper around the hemisphere report that USIS operations spend less than their various Communist counterparts, but seem to be getting more for their money.

A survey by the Christian Science Monitor shows:

USIS contributions to the press and to radio and television is reaching an ever-broadening spectrum of social classes in these countries.

Student and professional exchanges, as well as lending libraries, do undercut Communist influences in the academic circles.

Binational centers, where English is taught and special cultural programs are presented, are growing popular whether in capital cities or in the countryside.

To be sure, not all USIS operations are equally successful. USIS personnel in the various cities surveyed are quick to admit their problems. Some of their trouble stems from personnel who are inadequately trained.

But the real problems which continue to defy solution result from the sudden nationalist- and Communist-inspired reaction to an international crisis, and also from the longstanding anti-Americanism based on nationalist distrust of U.S. motives in the area.

Marion Wilhelm, the Monitor's special correspondent in Mexico City, reports:

"U.S. films are getting the American image into every stratum of Mexican society from city labor unions to country teachers and municipal workers. This film audience was vastly broadened recently by organizing film clubs around the country and lending out projectors. The films are exchanged every week by mail."

Daily news reports are issued by USIS in most of the countries. They are used in varying degrees in the local newspapers. Where there are newspapers with substantial

reputations, such as in Buenos Aires or Bogotá, these reports are less frequently used.

But in rural areas, they often reach a broad spectrum of provincial readers. Videotaped television programs and canned radio broadcasts also make their impact in these rural regions.

It may be that USIS operations in rural areas are more effective than in the cities. In Mexico City—and this would be true in any capital city—the Communist competition runs higher.

Another area which sometimes defies USIS treatment is the university campus. The Communists are highly active on these campuses. But every campus demonstration has its subtle checkmate in cultural inroads from USIS.

One of these is the free lending library set up in every large Latin American city, where university students may obtain books important for their course work.

USIS, through binational cultural centers in many of the countries, offers a variety of courses in English. Thousands receive such instruction in Argentina or Brazil, Colombia or Mexico, Peru or Guatemala.

In final analysis, the success of USIS operations throughout the hemisphere, Monitor correspondents indicate, is in clear ratio to the type of personnel involved in operating the various USIS missions. The personnel has been good, often excellent, in most instances in the recent past.

Miss Wilhelm adds significantly from Mexico:

"The United States appears to be reaching more deeply into the national consciousness by the very fact that it does not subsidize its popularity."

She quotes a USIS officer in Mexico who says "Mexicans use our services because they want to, not because we pay them to do it."

This seems true throughout the hemisphere.

JAMES NELSON GOODSELL.

AFRICA

CAPE TOWN.—On one of Addis Ababa's main streets is a small office building whose ground floor does one of the best "businesses" in the Ethiopian capital. It houses the U.S. Information Service library.

When I visited it a few months ago it was crowded with Africans studying American newspapers, books, and magazines.

"It's like this all the time," said the young librarian in charge.

In many other African countries the picture is much the same.

This speaks of the African's hunger for knowledge and also of the limited facilities for study available to him. It is not necessarily therefore a simple gage of his friendliness toward the United States. Nor of his acceptance of American "propaganda."

For when passions rise against U.S. policies—such as American aid to Premier Moise Tshombe of the Congo—libraries as the most obvious American facility make easy targets for protest and attack.

There is one rule of thumb that seems to be pretty useful in judging the effectiveness of USIS. The smaller and more underdeveloped a country, the more impact USIS activities appear to have.

The information services provided not just libraries but films, lectures, pamphlets on the American culture and way of life, material for use by newspapers, cultural exhibits. In the smaller countries the dearth of locally available books, teaching materials, films, and so on, makes USIS activities stand out.

In societies such as South Africa—with a more sophisticated popuation, its own libraries, a more developed economy, and better income even for Africans—the impact is less. Furthermore, here no one is allowed to go out and proselytize in the African areas. Permits are required to enter them and the permits sometimes are not easy to get.

Also the effectiveness of the U.S. program depends on the attitude of the government involved. Some governments do not encourage widespread "propaganda activities" by foreign agencies.

Just down the street from the USIS library in Addis Ababa, the Russians maintain a similar service. Some months ago it had pictures of Soviet industries and pastoral scenes in the window. It was not crowded inside.

Usually the U.S. information operation is by far the largest of its kind.

In a way it is hard for an impoverished African to relate himself to the "American way of life" depicted in USIS films, pamphlets, and books in which workers have cars and fine houses with modern equipment. It seems so far off and unattainable.

Some time ago a group of Africans were shown a film of life in an American city which happened to show white street cleaners and a white woman scrubbing floors.

"But," they said to the man showing the film, "do you really mean that white people clean their own streets and wash floors just like we do?"

Therefore there is a big gulf for USIS to bridge. It is not easy for Africans to understand that America is great not only because it is basically wealthy but because its people work hard to make it so.

This too is why Communist propaganda succeeds at times. It tells Africans that Americans are rich because they exploit other people.

To people with few worldly advantages, the call to socialism finds an answering ring. Capitalism to them means exploitation. And they equate the United States and capitalist exploitation, thanks to Communist propaganda.

But this does not mean that American propaganda goes unnoticed. For instance large numbers of African youth want to go to the United States to study. Many more applications are received than can possibly be handled.

And there is a reservoir of goodwill in many African states for the United States. The free way of life is much admired. American power is respected.

All USIS activities are, of course, still just the matter of throwing small pebbles in a very big pond. But there is little doubt that despite setbacks information services make a contribution to a more accurate view of the United States by many Africans.

ROBERT M. HALLETT.

INDIA

NEW DELHI.—In India's deep south, in a region where every coconut tree then carried a Red flag, I once visited a USIS reading room. It was packed with Indians, many of them students. A majority said they were Communists.

I later twitted the Communist Chief Minister of Kerala state about the evident popularity of "propaganda from the enemy camp." His reply: "Indian Communists enjoy wide horizons."

Through periods of evident tension and discord between the United States and India there has never been the slightest inclination anywhere to attack or burn a USIS library or abandon any one of the many information programs in English, Hindi, or one of the many other Indian languages.

The sophisticated Indian may scoff at USIS literature. In days of paper shortage, he welcomes it only for its scrap value.

But it also is a fact that the American Reporter, the main USIS weekly publication in English, has to be held down to a certain number. And the pictorial "Span" has just won an Indian award for its technical excellence.

The overall USIS program in India is popular because it provides free technical information not otherwise available, because it provides a variety of literature for a very poor but increasingly word-hungry people.

The image of America that all this projects to the recipient is almost a side issue. Therefore, it is difficult to describe this picture. The U.S. image is not of a collection of ordinary people still struggling to do better and better, but of a nation—mighty in its wealth and power—which has arrived.

Thus, when the USIS spreads information about a program to eradicate poverty in the United States, Indians are inclined to smile.

When it gives news, as it sometimes does, of problems concerning race, this seems to bring not so much new understanding as solace that there are other parts of the world struggling with similar or allied matters.

It is generally agreed that today there is in India a better understanding than ever before of the motive and purposes of U.S. assistance to this country.

In recent years, aid publicity, it is noticed, is more tightly worded, more pragmatic and factual. With a quieter tone, the impact vis-a-vis Soviet aid is all the greater.

Similarly, the USIS chore has grown lighter. It does not have to be quite so shrill as Indians receive practical proof of the aggressive content of world communism.

A favorite Indian question not so very long ago was: "Why does America always help dictators in Asia?" It is heard less often now.

Events also have helped an easier dissemination of information about military programs, about the help the United States provides in this sphere to safeguard freedom.

The whole USIS program produces a wealth of factual data for Indians to use as they like. The image projected is not always good because it is not one sided. Unlike the Russians, the Americans are willing to depict the bad as well as good aspects of life in their country.

In any case the USIS program reaches only a certain percentage of the Indian people, whereas the millions go regularly to the movies and get their image from this particular medium.

SHAROKH SABAVALA.

Father Duffy and the Fighting Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the magazine section of the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, March 14, there appears an article by Jimmy Breslin entitled "The Earning of the Green."

This article indiscriminately heaps abuse on Americans of Irish descent. While most of us in public life, be we Irish or of some other ancestry, are accustomed to fairly heavy doses of criticism, and while on occasion we may individually deserve it, it seems to me that articles derogatory to whole segments of our population are in extremely bad taste and render disservice to our community. It is a pity that some of our mass media of communication allow themselves to be used at times for such unworthy purposes.

As a American, I am proud of my country, but I also respect the heritage of my ancestors. I want to ask my colleagues to reflect on what all of us in the United States owe to the cultures and traditions

of our forefathers. We would be a poorer country, indeed, without this heritage—and we demean ourselves when we attempt to disavow this debt.

Since I am on this subject, and since this is the 16th of March, the eve of the feast of St. Patrick, I would like to express my personal hope that places like Duffy Square will long bear their proud names and that we will not forget what they stand for. Duffy Square, located in that section of New York which is the crossroads of the world—42d Street and Broadway—is known to millions of Americans. And it owes its name to Father Duffy, the chaplain of the Old 69th, the Fighting Irish, also known as the Rainbow Division. It may be enlightening for some article writers to go back into the history of our Nation and learn something about Father Duffy and the Fighting Irish.

The Unwanted Rider

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues an editorial opinion on the drastic commuter situation developing in New York.

As WABC–TV states, something must be done before its too late.

The editorial was broadcast on February 13, 14, and 15, 1965, and follows:

THE UNWANTED RIDER

Is the railroad commuter becoming obsolete? You would think so, to hear some railroad owners talk. The New Haven says it is losing so much money transporting passengers in and out of New York City that it wants to abandon commuter service altogether. The Erie-Lackawanna line says it may be forced to do the same thing. Other lines serving the metropolitan region are in similar financial straits. Meanwhile the fares keep going up and the service keeps going down. And the hundreds of thousands of suburbanites who everyday depend on this vital commuter service are left with the disturbing thought that one day the trains will stop running. These commuter lines carry millions of passengers a year. These passengers and the railroads that carry them are vital to the economy of the metropolitan region. If the commuter trains can't continue to operate, even with their much-too-frequent fare increases, then vigorous government intervention seems the only way out. There must be a master plan, and large amounts of money, to save the commuter lines. But to date we've gotten more talk than action from the Governors of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut and from Federal and local officials.

We've seen emergency efforts to shore up these railroads, but that's not enough. If you don't believe that government officials would allow commuter railroads to go out of business, we call your attention to the situation in Chicago where a major commuter line actually did go out of business. WABC–TV believes that you can help avert a similar situation here. You can pressure State, local, and Federal officials to devise a comprehensive plan to save the railroads, and the commuters, from extinction.

Take 5 minutes to write the Governor of your State, the mayor of your city, your county officials, your Congressman. Tell them the time to act is now—before it is too late.

Thank you.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 6433. A bill to provide for a flat fee for services performed in connection with the arrival in, or departure from, the United States of a private aircraft or private vessel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 6434. A bill to strengthen the financial condition of the employees' life insurance fund created by the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 6435. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 6436. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6437. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 6438. A bill to authorize any executive department or independent establishment of the Government, or any bureau or office thereof, to make appropriate reimbursement between the respective appropriations available to such departments and establishments, or any bureau or office thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HARVEY or Indiana:

H.J. Res. 387. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.J. Res. 388. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through 21, 1966; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.J. Res. 389. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 355. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the State of New York should raise its legal drinking age to 21; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

118. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to proposing abolition of futures trading of potatoes on the New York Mercantile Exchange, and requesting support for the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

119. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to exercising their powers to assure the citizens of Alabama their constitutionally guaranteed franchise and civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GLENN ANDREWS:

H.R. 6439. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eusthathia Demopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6440. A bill for the relief of John Raymond Witt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 6441. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 6442. A bill for the relief of Rocky River Co. and Macy Land Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 6443. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio U. Catasus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6444. A bill for the relief of Antonios Stamatios Stampelos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 6445. A bill for the relief of Shahin Hakim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6446. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Khatchadourian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6447. A bill for the relief of Juan J. Narango; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6448. A bill for the relief of Wilma Wilkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 6449. A bill for the relief of Miss Desanka Curcic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 6450. A bill for the relief of Florence McKennis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 6451. A bill for the relief of Abraham Bataan and his wife, Helena Bataan, and their minor children, Mordechai Bataan and Mira Bataan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 6452. A bill for the relief of James (Demetrios) Baciliss Dovas (Ntovas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

131. By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of the Auburn Aerie No. 96, Fraternal Order of Eagles requesting Members of Congress to adopt legislation outlawing discrimination in employment based on age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

132. Also, petition of the Village Board of Trustees of Penn Yan, N.Y., opposing the closing of the Veterans' Administration Center at Bath, N.Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

133. By the SPEAKER: Petition of president, Club for Preservation U.S.A., Blanchester, Ohio, petitioning consideration of resolution with reference to favoring the prohibition of the sale of any scrap metal to any country that might convert same to war materials for use against America, and comments on other legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Appendix

An American Genius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of the House of Representatives today to Mr. Sanford L. Cluett, now 90 years old, a resident of my district and the holder of many patents, including one for the manufacture of Clupak extensible paper.

Mr. Cluett, also the man behind the "Sanforized" trademark, was over 70 years old when he completed research and development of this remarkable paper with the built-in stretch.

So successful has Clupak extensible paper proved in world markets, Clupak, Inc.—which carries the first three letters of Mr. Cluett's name—recently received the President's "E" Award for contributing importantly to America's export expansion program.

Clupak, Inc., is owned jointly by Cluett, Peabody & Co.—of which Mr. Cluett is vice president and research consultant—and by West Virginia Pulp & Paper.

Clupak, Inc., licenses patents and trademarks for the production of Clupak extensible paper to mills and paper machinery manufacturers throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, Culpak, Inc., has its headquarters in New York City and laboratory facilities in Troy, N.Y.

Mr. Cluett first made Clupak extensible paper on a small, hand crank, laboratory model in Troy about the end of World War II.

To this inventive spark was added the fuel of modern engineering development and teamwork in a much larger laboratory and backed by $2½ million supplied by West Virginia Pulp & Paper—which believed completely in Mr. Cluett's inventive genius.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Clupak has 44 licensees producing Clupak extensible paper in the United States and 15 countries in Europe, Africa, South America, and Asia.

Licensees of Clupak, Inc., serve worldwide markets from Argentina, Canada, Chile, China—Taiwan—Colombia, England, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, Norway, Peru, South Africa, Sweden, and Yugoslavia.

Since Clupak extensible paper first was produced commercially by West Virginia Pulp & Paper in January 1958, it has been used widely throughout the world for multiwall bags and for industrial wrapping paper.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the Reader's Digest—an esteemed publication—recently recognized Mr. Clutt's inventive genius in the following excerpts from an article entitled "Mr. Shrink and Stretch."

It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to salute this great American genius:

Most of us today take nonshrinking fabrics for granted. We know that our shirts, cotton dresses, slipcovers—if they bear the tag "Sanforized"—won't shrink despite repeated trips to the washing machine or laundry.

Now the inventive genius that made "Sanforized" a household word has added another word to our language: "Clupak"—paper that stretches, that gives before it breaks. At supermarkets, groceries are packed in bags that carry heavy loads without bursting. Magazines and mail-order catalogs are delivered in wrappers made of this stretchable paper. It is used for wrapping mattresses, furniture, tires, and meats for locker storage. And it is opening a whole new world of disposable nonwoven fabrics that are cheaper to throw away than to launder. A pillowcase made of this paper can be marketed profitably for 10 cents; men's shorts can be sold for 15 cents.

These revolutions in two industries have been brought about by a short, wiry man who, until he was 45, had never had any contact with either the textile or paper industry. Though portions of his name have been carried all over the world in the trademarks "Sanforized" and more recently, "Clupak," Sanford L. Cluett, now 90, is one of the least known of our important inventors.

Cluett once said, "If more people would get curious and open their eyes and ears and minds, they would be much happier and, incidentally, more successful." His own curiosity, nurtured in the Florida wilds, continued when he entered prep school. After a teacher explained how the muscles of the esophagus force food and liquid into the stomach, Sandy wanted to know whether this would work if a person was standing on his head.

For a time he considered being a doctor, read medical books, watched operations. Then he dropped this to study engineering at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. There his curiosity led him to make original investigations in ballistics. He also invented a bubble sextant for use in celestial navigation when the horizon is invisible, later became an expert navigator.

Graduating from college, he went into the Spanish-American War as a lieutenant in the Engineering Corps and was sent to Puerto Rico to work on military construction. There he put his schoolboy medical gleanings to good use, serving as battalion "doctor" when the outfit was without a surgeon. (To make sure he sewed up flesh wounds correctly, he took practice stitches in his own arm.)

In Puerto Rico, he became curious about the tides, set about making observations which provided the first correct information ever recorded on the tidal phenomena of the northern Caribbean Sea. Two years later, at 26, he was asked to be assistant engineer on the Government's Big Sandy River Dam project in Kentucky. When a civil-service regulation prevented his getting the position, he took a job on the project as a $2 a day rodman. He designed the steel work for the locks and invented a self-operating valve—the first of some 200 patents issued in his name.

At 27 he became chief engineer of an upstate New York harvesting machine company with 1,200 employees and began turning out inventions and modifications which drastically changed the design of mowing and reaping machines. But he had business talents, too; soon he became vice president and general superintendent.

In 1919, at 45, Cluett made the change in careers that revolutionized the textile business—he moved from mowing machines to collars; specifically, to Arrow collars, made by Cluett, Peabody & Co., a firm started by three of his uncles. At that time the Arrow collar, a stiff, detachable collar, was as well known as the Ford car; it came in 400 different models, was popularized by the Arrow Collar Man, whose handsome face drew a sustained flow of fan mail and marriage proposals. The factory in Troy had 6,000 employees turning out 3 million collars a week.

But American men coming out of World War I service had grown accustomed to a soft collar-attached shirt and refused to wear a stiff collar. In 1921 Arrow-collar sales dropped drastically. The company vainly tried to stem the tide with a detachable soft collar, then with one called semisoft. But it was too late; the detached collar was on its way out. In desperation the company turned to collar-attached shirts, which had the defect of shrinking when they were laundered. Collars could be washed and shrunk before they were sold, but customers would not buy prewashed shirts. How to shrink the cloth without washing it?

Sanford Cluett found the solution in 1928 after asking himself two questions: First, "What makes fabrics shrink?" The answer was that, during weaving and finishing, fabrics were continuously pulled and stretched. When the fabrics were later laundered, their fibers reverted to normal small dimensions. Second, "What is the exact opposite of pull?" Push, said Cluett.

He took a piece of fabric, laid it on his desk, and tried to push it together. It buckled. So he fashioned a semicircular piece of wood, measured off a 6-inch strip of fabric, dampened it, laid it over the curved surface of the wood. Then he took a rubber band as wide as the strip of fabric, stretched it out, laid it stretched upon the fabric and held it down tight. He let the band contract, then peeled it off, measured the fabric. It measured only 5½ inches. It had shrunk and was perfectly smooth—there were no wrinkles.

The perfected process, technically known as compressive shrinkage, soon was recognized as the greatest development in cotton textiles since the coming of fast dyes in 1905. Through a licensing system, Cluett, Peabody & Co. made it available to the entire textile industry. The trademark "Sanforized" signifies that a licensee's fabrics have been preshrunk to certain standards. Today there are 415 licensees in 49 countries. They include almost all of the major textile mills of the free world, with a total "Sanforized" labeled production of 3 billion yards a year.

At 75, when men a decade younger than he were retiring, Cluett became interested in an entirely new field—stretchable paper. He had a hunch that the principles used to take the stretch out of textiles might be employed to put stretch into paper, thereby strengthening it.

He built a small laboratory machine using the same type of heated steel rolls and rub-

ber blanket as those in his textile-shrinking equipment. Then he put dampened strips of kraft paper through the machine and pushed the fibers together while exposing them to the heated rolls. When this paper dried, Cluett pulled it—and it stretched. By adjusting his small machine, he found he could put about as much or as little stretch into paper as he wished. It turned out inch-wide strips remarkably tough, yet smooth as regular kraft.

Then, nearing 80, Cluett went out to peddle his discovery. Four paper manufacturers were not interested in developing the invention. But in May 1954, he went to see David L. Luke, then president of the West Virginia Pulp and Paper Co. Luke was amazed when the aged little man shoved a strip of paper into his hands and ordered him to pull it. Luke pulled—and the paper stretched instead of breaking. The result was that West Virginia and Cluett, Peabody formed a new company to license the development to the paper industry.

In January 1958, the first smooth-surfaced stretchable paper in history was produced for commercial use at the company's Charleston, S.C., mill—a 20-foot-wide sheet, rolling out at half a mile a minute. Since then virtually all major kraft paper firms in the United States and a majority of the leading ones in other free countries have taken out licenses to manufacture Clupak paper.

All this is impressive—but not more so than the 90-year-old man himself, sitting at his desk, puffing on a cigar and saying, "I think I have had more pleasure in the world than anyone I know."

White Water Weekend Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article which appeared on March 12 in the Outdoors Section of the Washington Post.

The White Water Weekend Festival to be held in Petersburg, W. Va., April 2–4, will feature kayak and canoe competitions on April 2 and 3, with the canoe races on April 3 constituting the first national downriver event ever held east of the Rocky Mountains. This is but one of many events which are attracting increasing numbers of sportsmen and nature lovers to the Mountain State of West Virginia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POTOMAC'S NORTH FORK IS LOCALE OF CHAMPIONSHIP CANOE RACES

The Nation's No. 1 downriver "white water" race for the national canoe championships will be held Saturday, April 3, beginning at 1 p.m. on the turbulent North Fork of the Potomac River as part of the Petersburg, W. Va., annual White Water Weekend Festival.

The eastern kayak downriver championships will be held at the same time.

Leading racing canoeists from all sections of the country are expected to take part in the national events which are being organized and sponsored jointly by the Canoe Cruisers Association of Washington, D.C., and the citizens of Petersburg.

The dangerous and exhausting races through the foaming, rock-studded rapids of the North Fork will include national championship competition for one and two-man canoes and mixed races for couples.

Paddling singly against time, the canoeists will speed through a 15-mile stretch of turbulence which experts call one of the finest white water rivers in the country.

Immediately following the canoe races on Saturday afternoon, the kayak enthusiasts will take over for the annual running of the eastern salom championships. They, too, will race against time over a special course, laid out to test the maximum in skill, control, and stamina. There will be classes for both men and women.

The gala weekend will include other events for less-advanced canoeists, and on both Saturday and Sunday tourists and spectators along the ruggedly beautiful mountain stream will be treated to thrills as some of the most daring and experienced paddlers in the United States compete.

Other activities include a dinner, presentation of trophies and a dance on Saturday night, all scheduled for Petersburg. During the weekend there will also be a sports show with an opportunity to see the latest in canoes, kayaks, and camping equipment.

The racing course, starting at the highway bridge at Mouth of Seneca and finishing at the bridge crossing the North Fork at Smoke Hole Caverns, parallels Route 28 for 15 miles. The scenic mountain highway will give motorists and spectators a closeup view.

Longview, Tex.: Red-Letter Day for City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most progressive cities in Texas and the Southwest is Longview, Tex. The officials and the people of this fine city and area look into the future and try to prepare for it. I include an editorial and a news item which appeared March 3, 1965, in the Longview Daily News:

RED-LETTER DAY FOR CITY

Progress begets progress, and Longview demonstrated Tuesday in no uncertain terms it plans to continue to move forward at an accelerated pace when it placed its stamp of approval on the $6,655,000 bond issues for water, sewer, and street improvements.

The overwhelming margin of victory, approximately 11 to 1, was by far the biggest ever given to a bond issue in Longview or elsewhere in east Texas. This certainly speaks well for our city. It means we can proceed with a program of orderly growth that will keep us at the forefront of the parade of progress in Texas.

Since the beginning of heavy industry development after the war ended in 1945, Longview has commanded a strong and enviable position on the State's business map. It is a bright spot on the economic horizon and its importance in the industrial field has attracted nationwide attention, not only because of new plants but because of large expansions of existing operations.

All of this has not just happened. There had to be a plan. There had to be vision. There had to be faith and desire. There had to be a lot of hard work. There had to be sacrifice.

The resounding victory of the bond issue Tuesday is concrete evidence that the big majority of our people are proud of what already has been accomplished, and want to have a part in future progress industrially. They know that our growth has been on a sound, solid foundation. They are mindful of the fact that during the last two decades we have had conscientious, capable and dedicated men at the helm of our city government. They know that Longview is setting the pace in east Texas. They want to have a part and are giving of themselves and their means to make this a better community, not only for themselves but for others who decide to make their home here. And in doing so, they are building something which will be a great heritage for those who come after them.

It is very gratifying to note the splendid spirit of cooperation and understanding that is created by achievement. The progress our city is enjoying has drawn all of us closer together in an appreciation for what we have. Fires of ambition and courage are being rekindled. There's more optimism, more enthusiasm, more desire to be useful.

A city with the progressive spirit of Longview can move in only one direction—straight ahead.

What we did at the polls Tuesday can be described as one of the finest and most attractive invitations we could extend industry. It was more than just a substantial vote for a bond election—it was a manifestation of spirit, the kind of spirit that the majority of people, no matter where they live or work, like and admire.

March 2, 1965, Texas Independence Day, will go down as a red-letter day in Longview's history.

CARL L. ESTES.

BIGGEST VICTORY MARGIN IN EAST TEXAS

Longview voters went to the polls in record numbers Tuesday to give better than 11 to 1 approval of the bond issue for $6,655,000 improvements in water, sewer, and street facilities, and to insure the progress of the city for years to come. This was the biggest margin of victory ever given a bond issue election in Longview and east Texas.

A total of 1,175 votes were cast during the day and Election Judge Walter Cunningham and City Secretary L. W. Summers agreed that this was a heavy vote for a bond election.

The Tuesday vote was another manifestation of the way Longview gets things done and why blue chip industries have located in the city.

A breakdown of the voting showed that on the street bond issue the voting was recorded at 1,048 for and 92 against.

Water bonds were approved to the tune of 1,051 for, to 82 against, and the sewer bonds 1,046 for, to 82 against.

Passage of the bond election will enable the city to step ahead with its needed water, sewer, and street improvements, which had been outlined by the city's master planners and consulting engineers, Forrest & Cotton, of Dallas.

A new 36-inch raw water line will be constructed parallel to the present 24-inch line from the lake to the filtration plant and new pump facilities will be installed at the lake to service the new line.

Plans call for immediate start of construction of an additional sewerage disposal plant to relieve the already overburdened plant that has been in operation for nearly 20 years.

A new filtration plant will be constructed to supplement the present water plant on 16th Street, and to increase the water supply from its present 15 million gallons a day to 36 million gallons daily.

Numerous improvements are planned in streets and the opening of several new streets are planned. One of the important improvements already earmarked is the widening and straightening of McCann Road, to a four-lane width, the completion of the West Cotton Street extension to the Harmon Road and the opening of a new street connecting West Marshall Avenue and FM 1845 in the west section of the city.

Buford Ellington, Director of Office of Emergency Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, last week a distinguished Tennessean, the Honorable Buford Ellington, was sworn into office as Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. On that occasion, the President indicated that, in addition to normal duties involved with that Office, he also intended to utilize the considerable talents of Governor Ellington in a number of other capacities, one of which will be to assist in establishing better communications and stronger working relationships between the Federal Government and the States and local communities. On February 24, 1965, the Jackson Sun, of Jackson, Tenn., had an excellent editorial concerning the duties of this Office. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jackson (Tenn.) Sun, Feb. 24, 1965]

OEP DIRECTOR'S DUTIES IMPORTANT IN WAR, PEACE

What, some have asked, is embraced in the duties and authority of the Office of Emergency Planning?

This question is prompted in Tennessee by the President's appointment of former Gov. Buford Ellington to the post of OEP Director, and by the Senate's confirmation of Ellington's appointment.

The Office of Emergency Planning is a staff arm of the President, and by law its Director is a member of the National Security Council.

National headquarters are located in the Executive Office of the President in Washington. There are eight regional offices of which one is at Thomasville, Ga.

The Director of the OEP advises the President on the mobilization and management of the Nation's resources in the interest of national security.

In wartime, the OEP would be the nucleus of an overall resource control agency. In peacetime it has the following tasks:

It determines the kinds of strategic materials to be acquired or disposed of and the objectives which govern quantities to be held in reserve.

It develops a "comprehensive program for survival of Government and management of resources" which would prepare the Nation for the possibility of a temporary breakdown in Federal direction in the event of a nuclear emergency.

It coordinates Federal assistance to States in coping with major disasters. President Johnson declared 24 major disasters in 1964. The Director of OEP administers the President's Disaster Fund under which allocations are made to the States.

It coordinates the Nation's National Defense Executive Reserve program established in 1955. Under this program executive talent in all fields is recruited from industry, labor, agriculture, and other areas of the private economy.

It investigates allegations that articles entering the United States threaten to impair the national security.

It assigns frequencies to Government radio stations, coordinates the Nation's telecommunications resources, assists the Department of State in negotiating telecommunications treaties, and assists the Department of Defense in developing a national communications system.

As you may see from this, Director Ellington is going to be a busy man.

Keene Sentinel Memo on "See America First" Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Keene Evening Sentinel, one of the outstanding newspapers in New Hampshire, recently discussed the administration's "See America First" campaign in an excellent editorial. The editor has done some interesting research and finds that it costs more to fly to parts of this country than it does to go to many places overseas. I offer the editorial for the RECORD and at the same time suggest that travelers wishing to join the see America campaign, can do no better than to relax in beautiful New Hampshire, a land of scenic splendor and unsurpassed recreational facilities.

[From the Keene, (N.H.) Evening Sentinel, Mar. 4, 1965]

MEMO TO DREW AND L.B.J.

A couple of weeks ago, Washington columnist Drew Pearson wrote a piece in which he announced that he was going to start a crusade in support of President Lyndon Johnson's suggestion that Americans "see America first."

He quoted the President as having said: "I wish the American people would see more of America instead of Europe. Every year thousands of Americans save up their money and go off to Europe to drink French wine and see Italian ruins when they could spend part of that money here."

Commenting wryly on the drain of American dollars, the President continued: "We are losing around $1.7 billion a year. You can't blame them for wanting to go abroad, but I just wish they'd see some of their own country."

He then challenged Pearson to tell the American people through his column how beautiful their country is and to start a campaign aimed at encouraging domestic travel.

Pearson accepted the challenge and took off for California.

We're not suggesting that a newspaperman such as Pearson, whose reporting abilities have been widely known to American newspaper readers for more than a quarter of a century, was unaware of it when he booked a flight to Los Angeles, but the fact is, he could have flown to London for less money, and could have visited Dublin, Glasgow, and Edinborough on the way.

The fact that it costs more to travel domestically than it does to travel abroad may be one of the several reasons why American tourists are flying all over the world instead of all over the United States.

A round trip flight from Boston to London, including the stops in Ireland and Scotland, costs $293.

A round trip flight to the west coast costs $319, and if a traveler stops over for more than 3 hours in any city en route, the fare is increased by each stop.

A few more comparisons of international and domestic air-travel fares:

If one of those money saving Americans the President mentioned wanted to visit one of his country's newest States, he could fly round trip from New York to Anchorage, Alaska, for $498. On the other hand, he could save some of the money he'd budgeted for traveling, by taking a round-trip flight from Boston to Madrid for $341.80.

Or let's take the case of the American who decides he'd like to see one of our newer but warmer States. He could fly round trip from Boston to Hawaii for $519.

If he wanted to spend only $16 more than the Hawaii trip would cost him, he could make it all the way to Israel and back for $535.

The almost ridiculous difference in plane fares is not, by any means, the only reason why so many Americans are flying abroad instead of flying around the United States.

Foreign agencies are spending bundles of money luring Americans to their countries. Meantime, American efforts to lure foreign visitors to our own country are woefully inadequate—and we still have to contend with the problem of the high cost of living in the United States after they get here.

Further incentives for foreign travel are the facts that a travel agency's commission is 40 percent higher on international fares than on domestic ones, and there is a 5-percent tax on domestic fares and none on international.

At the risk of sounding as though we were second-guessing both the President and Drew Pearson, instead of taking his domestic-travel case to the people, perhaps L.B.J. should take it to the CAB.

Whatever the immediate outcome, probably he would reach the conclusion that it's a bootless operation trying to keep Americans and their money at home, so perhaps the United States should concentrate its efforts, in all the various ways possible on attracting more foreign visitors to the United States. With adequate funds and sustained effort, there's no reason why America cannot attract as many foreigners here as Americans who go abroad.

With the President worrying about all that money he knows is being spent abroad, however, we might add a happy postscript by suggesting to him that not all Americans can afford to see their country from the air, anyway; therefore, he might be cheered somewhat if he were to visit a west coast camping site this summer and count all the east coast license plates, then visit a family camping area on the eastern seaboard and check out all the license plates from California and parts west.

Disability Insurance for the Blind: H.R. 6426

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, for all the years I have been a Member of

this Chamber, I have worked with blind people to improve the lot and life of the blind.

Learning of the normality of men and women without sight by my association with them, learning of the ability of men and women without sight to function successfully in competition with their sighted fellows from my acquaintance with blind men and women who are engaged in every imaginable economic activity and endeavor, I have worked with them to improve Federal laws in order to assist the blind in their determination to help themselves.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, have the blind of the Nation lacked champions in the other Chamber, and HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, has long been foremost among them.

Recognizing in 1959 that the Federal disability insurance law failed to alleviate the disastrous economic consequences of blindness, the then senior Senator from Minnesota introduced a measure to liberalize the Federal disability insurance law for blind people.

In Congress after Congress the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY reintroduced his proposal to provide a floor of financial security against the disadvantages of functioning without sight in a sight-dominated society.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, on September 3, 1964, Senator HUMPHREY offered his disability insurance for the blind bill as an amendment to the pending social security bill (H.R. 11865) and the Senate adopted the Humphrey amendment.

You will recall, however, that H.R. 11865 failed to gain approval in the Senate-House conference and was not adopted by the 88th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice President has honored me by asking me to carry on his effort to better the disability insurance law for blind people, which I am pleased indeed to do, therefore I am today introducing H.R. 6426.

Rather than describe the provisions of the Humphrey amendment, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I reprint herewith the address delivered by HUBERT HUMPHREY on the floor of the U.S. Senate on September 3, 1964, in explanation of this bill to liberalize the Federal disability insurance law for our country's blind:

DISABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE BLIND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my amendment would liberalize the Federal disability insurance program for persons who are now blind—and, perhaps even of greater importance—it would make disability insurance payments more readily available to more persons who become blind at the time when blindness occurs.

My amendment would do the following:

First. It would incorporate the generally recognized and widely used definition of blindness into the provisions of the disability insurance law; that is, blindness is central visional acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the field of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20 degrees.

Second. It would allow any person who meets this definition in visual loss, and who has worked in social security covered employment for a year and a half—six quarters—to qualify for disability cash benefits.

Third. It would allow persons who meet the above requirements in measurable sightlessness and length of time in covered employment to draw disability benefits, and to continue to draw them, so long as they remain blind—and irrespective of their income or earnings, if they are fortunate enough to be employed.

This amendment seeks to make the disability insurance program a true insurance program against the economic catastrophe of blindness, against the economic disadvantages which result when blindness occurs in the life of a workingman.

Under present law, a person who is blind and unable to secure social security covered work for 5 years, cannot qualify for disability insurance payments. Reducing the present requirement from 20 to 6 quarters would be a much more reasonable and realistic requirement for people who, though oftentimes well qualified for gainful work, still encounter much difficulty in obtaining any work at all.

Under existing law, a worker who becomes blind but has not worked for 5 years in covered employment is denied the sustaining support of disability insurance payments at a time when his whole world has collapsed, when disaster has terminated his earnings and diminished his earning power, and he is faced with surrendering dignity and self-pride and applying for public or private charity—hardly a sound basis upon which to rebuild a shattered life; hardly the basis for instilling self-confidence and reviving hope—so essential as the first step in rehabilitation and restoration to normal life and productive livelihood.

Under existing law, a person who is blind and earns but the meagerest of income, is denied disability insurance payments on the ground that even the meagerest earnings indicate such person is not disabled—or sufficiently disabled in the eyes of the law—to qualify for disability payments.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the economic consequences of blindness exist, and they continue to exist, even though a blind person is employed and earning, and these economic consequences are expensive to the blind person who has the will and the courage to compete in a profession or a business with sighted people, who must live and work in a society structured for sighted people.

Adoption of this amendment would provide a minimum floor of financial security to the person who must live and work without sight, who must pay a price in dollars and cents for wanting and daring to function in equality with sighted men.

Great Society Going for Broke?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this Chamber is called on to pass judgment on a host of programs and experiments designed to meet real and imagined needs of the people. Too often, there is little concern for who must pay the bills resulting from the many various Federal expenditures.

A provocative article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones recently appeared in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star criticizing the "Great Society's" practice of spending today and letting future generations worry about paying for our excesses. Believing Members of Congress will profit from reading and rereading this article, under unanimous consent I place it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star Mar. 13, 1965]

"GREAT SOCIETY" GOING FOR BROKE?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Can a Nation that boasts about its prosperity tolerate endless deficits?

Can a "Great Society" go bust and remain great? Can it continue to deliver more education, more social services, more pensions, more job security by out-shoveling baloney dollars?

Or is all the talk about a richer and fuller life for the common man meaningless without a high degree of fiscal honesty and integrity?

Last month Senators ROMAN HRUSKA and CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska, introduced a snowball-in-hell bill. It calls for a constitutional amendment that would require Congress each year to collect as much money as it appropriates, except in case of war or other dire emergency.

In addition, the Senators want half a billion dollars in collections over expenditures so that it may be applied to the national debt. At the rate of half a billion dollars a year the national debt could be paid off in some 540 years.

This bill will be lucky if it even gets a laugh. The "new think" has it that the national debt may be ignored, that "controlled inflation" is necessary to provide maximum employment, and that as long as the gross national product in terms of dollars keeps rising everything in hunky-dory.

There is, fortunately, a brave minority of Congressmen who doubt this. Obviously, they are out of the "mainstream," but they subbornly wonder if the economic laws that have busted every other nation that practiced perpetual deficit financing have been repealed.

In a Senate debate, last month on the deepening crisis over the American balance of payments, caused by our continued insistence on spending more abroad than we earn abroad, Senator PETER DOMINICK, of Colorado, called attention to a speech by Prof. Karl Brandt, economist of Stanford University.

Professor Brandt asserted that if we eliminate the last of the gold backing for the dollar, which has been seriously proposed, we will buy a little time, but unless we return to a balanced budget, devaluation of the dollar will be inevitable. He said:

"What is needed is a sober, deadly, earnest, and courageous weighing of the moral issues that are at stake when inflation moves continually and persistently.

"Inflation is one of the serious social and political diseases of the human economy. Its causes have their roots in human nature. The appetite for substantial benefits without a share in the costs is a human trait which is being exploited by politicians everywhere."

In time of war, man can hardly be blamed for borrowing against his future in an effort to save his skin. But what can we say about a nation borrowing against its future at a time when its political leaders are pointing with pride to unexampled prosperity?

The last American balanced budget occurred in the final fiscal year of the Eisenhower administration—a surplus of $1.2 billion in 1960. Since then the annual deficits have run $3.8 billion, $6.3 billion, $6.2 billion and, last year, $8.2 billion.

Each additional billion adds to the debt service, the amount of money that must be allocated to the interest on Government obligations before a penny can be spent for the operation of the Government, national defense and additional social services and public works.

Down this line, where do we go? Where has every other country gone that took this road?

An ever-easier money supply, created by an outpouring of public funds unrelated to the ingathering of taxes, creates a boom cycle. Powerful pressure by business and labor joins the overwhelming inclination of politicians to fuel the roaring flames. The cry arises that "deflation," meaning debt reduction or even a balanced budget, would create unemployment and misery.

At the point of no return things begin to happen fast. Prices rise faster than wages. Investors flee from bonds or demand fantastic interest rates. Common stock prices go into orbit and people rush to buy tangible things like land and jewels. All who lent money in good faith are ruined.

Citizens holding Government securities, or life insurance policies, and those who depend on fixed pensions and annuities find themselves holding nothing. The Government, unable to finance itself through the sale of low-interest obligations, is forced to resort to seizure and confiscation.

There goes the "Great Society," the "war on poverty," "the New Frontiers." All that's left is the last chapter of borrow, boom, and bust.

No promised land will be reached by broken promises. No security is to be achieved by national dishonesty. No man's future is safe in the hands of a political philosophy that is willing to buy today's popularity with tomorrow's agony.

In Memoriam, James Reeb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us were stirred Monday evening by the President's address requesting a voting rights bill to insure that every American has the right and the opportunity to vote. This bill—the fourth major piece of civil rights legislation with which Lyndon Johnson has been associated—will be a fitting memorial to the Reverend James Reeb who gave his life for the principles enunciated by our President.

Some of the background to this proposal is detailed in the following article by the distinguished columnist, Joseph Alsop, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on March 15, 1965:

IN MEMORIAM, JAMES REEB

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—No verse written in this country has been more often or more fatuously quoted than "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." But in memory of James Reeb, the young clergyman murdered in Selma, it is entirely appropriate to recall the lines:

"As He died to make men holy,
Let us die to make men free."

For James Reeb did in fact die to make men free, much more consciously indeed than most of those who fell to save the Union at Bull Run and Gettysburg, at Cold Harbor and the Wilderness. He joins the Union dead, and like the Union dead, thank God, he has not fallen in vain.

His martyrdom—for that is the right word, for once in a way—was not of course anything more than the climatic episode. Martin Luther King and the others who have been symbolically hammering on the closed doors of the Selma registrar's office had their own very major role to play, and they played it to the hilt.

The result has been one of the most rapid, hopeful chains of cause and effect that has been seen in American public life for a great many years. Until the events in Selma jogged the memory and pricked the conscience of political Washington, it was by no means clear that a Negro registration bill would be given a high priority this year.

The President, who is sensibly eager for a reasonably short congressional session, was reluctant to add to the must-list a measure that is bound to take much time to write into law. The constitutional problems were numerous, delicate and complex. There was a wide division of opinion about what ought to be done. For all these reasons, the prospects for action were misty, to say the least.

Then came the events in Selma. By midweek, the wise old bellwether, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, was telling his Republican flock that he thought "major action" ought to be taken in the civil rights field this year. And about the denial of Negro voting rights, he was saying, "We cannot have this problem coming before us year after year; we must now pass a law that is easily enforcible and will get results."

On Thursday, President Johnson briefly hesitated before ejecting sitdown strikers from the White House itself. And on Friday, the President, Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach and most of the more important members of the White House staff spent almost the whole day canvassing the possible courses of action, in order to find the right one.

The right course is clearly indicated by Senator DIRKSEN's phrase—"A law that is easily enforcible and will get results." Each of the civil rights bills has had something to say about voting rights, but in practice none of the voting provisions has been enforcible. Hence they have got almost no results.

In 1961, a Federal suit charging denial of voting rights was filed against the registrar of Dallas County, and this suit was won. Three additional suits were also filed by the Justice Department, to halt the intimidation of the Selma Negroes by Sheriff James Clark and the local citizens council.

The decision in the 1961 Dallas County voting suit was effectively ignored, and relitigation was begun. Whereupon the State of Alabama changed the law, setting a test for new registrants which Sheriff Clark himself would be most unlikely to pass. This is a general pattern. Suits have been filed to cover 60 of the 82 counties in Mississippi, but in only one county has any appreciable number of Negroes been allowed to register.

The local climate that must be contended with is also worth noting. It is richly suggested by the argument that has been made by Dallas County's circuit court judge, James Hare, to show why the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments should not apply in Dallas County. The judge alleges that the slave traders were scraping the bottom of the barrel by the time they got around to supply the county's needs. Therefore, according to the judge, "the blue-gummed Ibos" who were supplied to Dallas are not a tribe for whom the Constitution's writ should run.

If the temper of this city means anything, however, Judge Hare's hour has struck. Patience is exhausted, just as litigation has been exhausted. One may now predict with some confidence that an effective voting rights bill will be passed this year. And that means a bill which permits a Federal registrar or referee to step in, whenever voting rights are obstinately, massively, and persistently denied.

The details of the bill, the nature of the constitutional derivation, basically from the 15th amendment of course, the devices to be used for enforcement—all these problems are secondary. Senator DIRKSEN has summed up what needs doing. One way or another, it will almost certainly be done.

Salute to St. Patrick and the American Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following salute to St. Patrick and to the American Irish.

It was all of 2,000 years ago that Cato the Elder said:

The Celts devote themselves mainly to two things: Fighting and talking.

Now I do not know if Cato was the noblest Roman of them all, but the old boy had to be one of the smartest. Yet, he neglected to mention one thing: The Irish will fight with or for almost anybody, but their talking is chiefly about their land.

On this glorious St. Patrick's Day, can we not be forgiven for dwelling upon Ireland just a bit? It has been said that blessed is he who tooteth his own horn; if so, we Irish are thrice blessed. Anyway, I am not like one of our notable countrymen, writer and scholar George Moore, who once said that his only claim to originality among Irishmen was that he never made a speech. I have made a number, and if the voters are willing, I hope to make a lot more.

The salute to St. Patrick follows:

SALUTE TO ST. PATRICK

It is common knowledge that during the Irish potato famine the population of Ireland dropped from 8 to 6 million people in a 2-year period; that the Irish were totally illiterate due to a 100-year restriction of no Irishman being able to read or write—imposed by the British. They owned no land and paid rent to British landlords and had such small plots of land that a small potato harvest, a mud shack, and maybe a pig and two or three chickens represented their entire stake in life. The Irish came to this country and were given hope for a decent life and if not for themselves, at least for their children, the opportunity to work.

Well now, what is the other side of the coin? What have we Irish done for this country? Have we paid something on account on this enormous debt we owe? As one of our own was fond of saying, "Let's look at the record."

Oddly, even the Irish tend to date their participation in the affairs of this country from the years immediately following the great famine. True, better than a million and a half Irish emigrated in the decade after 1845, mostly to New York and Boston, and millions more followed them up to the early 1900's—so many that there was a saying, "The Statue of Liberty was sculpted by an Italian and donated by the French to welcome the Irish to the Dutch city of New York."

But the Irish were here merely from the start. It is known that some Irish and

Scotch settled along the Merrimack River as early as 1634, and in 1654 the ship *Good Fellow* arrived in Boston with 400-odd Irishmen—and even as early as that the Irish were accused of trying to take over the country. They were being accused of it as late as 1960 also.

The part of the Irish in the American Revolution has, for reasons unknown, received little attention. Historically, the Revolution has remained almost the exclusive property of the English-descended American. Yet this is by no means justified. The Irish have a very solid claim to a share in that fight. How could history ignore the propensity of the Irish for a rebellion, particularly against the Sassenach? In the general population of the Colonies, the feeling was pretty well divided, Troy and Rebel, but among the Irish, who were especially numerous in Pennsylvania, the sympathy was Rebel to a man. In the Irish Parliament, to which only members of the Church of Ireland could belong, one legislator replied to a Crown question on sympathy with the Americans by saying: "Where Irish hearts are, their hands are also."

At that time, some 35,000 Irish were arriving on these shores annually, and a good many got here just in time to pick up a musket in anger against the minions of bullheaded George III.

Some estimates say that fully a third of Washington's troops were Irish, old or new generation, and out of 731 foreign born in the Pennsylvania Line of Ireland Regiment, 361 hailed from the "ould" sod. And to anyone who might say, "True, perhaps, but no doubt they were all privates," you can firmly point out that 16 of Washington's general officers were Irishmen, most of them members of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, an open-handed group which donated the then enormous sum of 150,000 pounds to the Revolutionary cause. And among the illustrious Sons of St. Patrick in those brave days were John Barry, generally called the father of the U.S. Navy, and Gen. Mad Anthony Wayne, a broth of a boy and a fighter beyond compare. And let me here inject a word for the Kellys—are there any Kellys in the house?—who, I must say, led all the rest of the Revolution's muster rolls with 695 stalwart souls.

And what about the Sullivans, a proud clan to be sure? Well, five of them were officers in Washington's army, one—John Sullivan, wrote that part of the Declaration of Independence listing the wrongs of the British, and among them were a future Governor, judge, and attorney general of New Hampshire, and a future Governor of Massachusetts. Incidentally, three Irish-born Americans; namely, James Smith, Matthew Thornton, and George Taylor, were signers of the Declaration of Independence. Naturally, I could go on about the deeds of the clan Murphy also, but modesty forbids me.

But being that contradiction in terms, an honest politician, I will add that not every page in the Irish chapters of the Revolution was one of glory. In all candor, the Pennsylvania Line Regiment did engage in a bit of a donnybrook with the authorities, provoked by what was then called barrel fever. They rebelled against their officers, but not against the Government. The British heard about it, and being British, concluded to capitalize on the Irish disaffection in the ranks. So, they sent two emissaries into the rebel camp with a suggestion that they go over to the British. The Irish promptly hanged them as spies. (Somehow, the English never, never understood the Irish.) And, their frustrations happily removed, returned vigorously to the fray.

Nor should we overlook the contributions of two unsung heroes of Irish extraction, Patrick O'Flynn, of Wilmington, Del., and Hercules Mulligan—now there's a name for you—of New York. Patrick was a captain in Washington's army and afterward a tavern-keeper in the manner of tavernkeepers of every era. He became a confidant of the first President, who was not averse to a dram or two on a wintry night. Hercules Mulligan was Washington's confidential agent, and in 1781 furnished a tip that helped prevent the general's capture by the British on a trip to Newport.

In the early years of this Republic, the Irish were on every level of society—in the professions, in business, and in agriculture, and in one notable instance, in inventive science. It was the son of poor Irish parents, Robert Fulton, who astonished all New York back in 1807 by setting forth on the Hudson River in a steamboat that sped along at the frightening rate of 5 miles per hour. There were slurs at the time that, of course, the Irish invented the steamboat—because they so abhored undiluted water that they wished to cross it in the least possible time. (English spite, undoubtedly, but it is a criticism that has been leveled at the Irish for these many years.)

Tis true the Irish will take a drink now and then, but only if they are alone or with somebody—and then solely for medicinal purposes. As Mark Twain once said, "Give an Irishman lager for a month and he's a dead man. An Irishman is lined with copper, and beer corrodes it. But whisky polishes the copper and is the saving of him." Nothing like going home with a high polish, either. (And there was the proper Irish lady who was asked at customs if she had anything to declare. "Nivir a bit," said she. "Then, old girl," demanded the customs inspector, "just what's in this bottle?" "Holy water," she said, "and bad cess to ye." "Holy water, eh?" sneered the inspector, sniffing the contents. "Why this is whisky." "Faith, an' it's a miracle," cried the lady.

Of course, many people overlook the fact that the Irish took the whisky because their wages included whisky as part of the payment. This was all included in the labor contractors' scheme to keep the Irish in subservience. The abject poverty in which they lived also made whisky a way of helping the dreary living conditions and a future which to them seemed nonexistent. It also was a solace for a man who worked 17 hours to soothe his aching muscles with a drink or two of the hard stuff.

And there's truth too in the old Irish adage that drink is the good man's vice: some of the more notable tyrants of history—Cromwell and Hitler are two that come to mind, were teetotalers. An Irishman's instinct tells him never to trust a man who'll not take a social drink; and, as we know, an Irishman's instinct is well-nigh infallible in all important matters.

The Irish affinity to politics, of course, is closely associated with the name Tammany Hall. It seems incongruous that Tammany Hall and New York City were dead set against the Irish in the early 1800's, however, after Gov. De Witt Clinton, of New York, realized it was the Irish affinity for hard work that made it possible for him to build his canal, and further realizing that a drastic change had to be made in the voting eligibility requirements to make this a truly great America, he initiated the movement to bring the Irish immigrants into the Democratic Party. At the outset the Irish were not eligible to vote because of the requirement that a voter be a landowner and also have 14 years' residence in this country. Tammany changed this and made the Irishman of the streets an eligible voter.

The swift and total identity of the Irish with America was marked by many and marveled at, particularly by the Englishmen. One, a J. Kent, who traveled here just after the Revolution, had this to say: "An Irishman, the instant he sets foot on American ground, becomes ipso facto an American; this was uniformly the case during the whole of the late war. Whilst Englishmen and Scotsmen were regarded with jealousy and distrust, even with the best recommendation of zeal and attachment to the cause, a native of Ireland stood in need of no other certificate than his brogue—indeed, Their conduct in the late revolution amply justified this favorable opinion, for whilst the Irish emigrant was fighting the battles of America by sea and land, the Irish merchants labored to increase the wealth and maintain the credit of the country."

By the time of the Civil War the Irish were not only established in America but in some parts of it, notably in the cities of the North and East, they were becoming a power. New York, of course, was and is the capital of the Irish in the United States, with Boston perhaps a close second and Chicago running third. But contrary to popular belief there were many Irish in the South even before the Civil War, principally in New Orleans, Mobile, Galveston, Savannah, and Charleston. Quite a number of them were wealthy and, as improbable as it seems in the light of Irish history, they were represented among the slaveholding class in coastal Maryland, South Carolina, and Georgia. This can be explained by pointing out that the position of the Catholic Church then was that slavery was a natural disaster, akin to war and pestilence, and beyond human ability to eradicate wholly. However, in 1839 Pope Gregory declared slavery as being immoral.

Thus was it that in the South, as well as in the North, the Irish flocked to the colors when the cannon boomed at Sumter. There were upward of 400,000 in the Union Army, some 85,000 in the Confederate. And among them were figures who will always live in American history—Phil Sheridan, the peerless cavalry leader who conquered the Shenandoah Valley for the North; George G. Meade, victor at Gettysburg; Thomas Francis Meagher, the exiled Irish patriot who led the Union's famous Irish Brigade, and the war's most colorful general, the incomparable Phil Kearny, who, in the opinion of high southern officers, would have won the war early for the North had it not been for his untimely death.

Kearny, I might add, was the very epitome of the Irish hero—brave to an incredible degree, as handsome as he was dashing, a scholar of high attainment, a noted wit, and something of a poet. Quite a man with the ladies, too. The town of Kearny, N.J., is named after him and it is a shame that some of our Irish historical societies haven't done more to keep his name alive.

The Irish attitude toward war is neatly summed up in an incident that involved Stonewall Jackson, a very flinty type, and one of his subordinate commanders, General Taylor, son of old Zachary Taylor. Taylor, a Louisianian, reported to Jackson one day with his troops, among whom were a bunch of pellmell New Orleans Irishmen. Their discipline in camp left something to be desired; namely, discipline, and Stonewall was unimpressed. "Rather frivolous fellows for serious work," he grunted. Next day after the Hibernians distinguished themselves when the shooting started, Stonewall sought out Taylor. "I was wrong," he grunted, and rode off.

"The mad gaels of Ireland
Are a race that God made mad
For all their wars are merry
And all their songs are sad."
—C. K. CHESTERTON.

Really, however, the role of the Irish in American military history needs no reciting; it is inscribed on thousands of monuments, in cemeteries across this wide country as well as in foreign lands. Nor do I need to dwell on the Irish preeminence in the clergy, their lustrous part in the professions, particularly in the law, their contribution to

letters and to education, and their bent for business. Irish success in these fields has already been acclaimed.

The Irish have always been known for their religiousness and I don't want to confuse this with devoutness. The Irish record in politics and in business has always been characterized by the purest of motives. However, the Irish devotion to God and gift of faith has been the greatest factor in bringing him through the great suffering that he was subjected to, both in his native land and this one. The story of the Molly Maguires in the Pennsylvania coalfields who righted the slave conditions and injustices to not only the Irish but to the English, Welch and Germans, is a controversial page in American history. True, the Molly Maguires murdered some company men, but it was through their efforts that minimum wages, decent working hours, and safe conditions in the mines and factories emanated.

But to me, the greatest contribution we Irish have made to America is in politics. Over the years the profession, or art, of politics has been derided, unjustly, in my opinion. Politics is the management of public affairs, and the only alternative to it is anarchy. To be a successful practitioner requires flexibility, compassion, a genuine liking for people and an understanding of their imperfections, all qualities that go into the Irish character. From the start, it was apparent that the American system of politics was tailored to the Irish and they to it.

Basically, politics is people, and the Irish have a winning way with people, as even their enemies will agree.

The Irish soon discovered that, on election day, one man was every bit as good as another and maybe even a little bit better. The thoughtful among them realized, particularly during the big waves of immigration, when anti-Irish feeling ran high, that only by participation in politics could the opportunity for self-improvement be obtained. They knew, too, that commiserating among themselves was self-defeating. The signs that read "No Irish Need Apply" would not be taken down for the asking nor would the stereotype of the comic Irishman vanish unless a truer image supplanted it. So, these politicians went to work in the wards, persuading, cajoling, and on occasion, using a little muscle to get out the vote.

From the first the Irish were attracted to the Democratic Party, the party of the people from Andrew Jackson's day to this—and I like to think that, in large measure, they are the Democratic Party. No other ethnic group in this country has remained as steadfastly loyal to it for so long. Others have joined for a time, then drifted away when the candidate or a particular stand was not to their liking. However, in 1920 Irish sentiment in this country ran so high against Woodrow Wilson because of his refusal to assist Ireland in her independence movement from Great Britain, particularly the bloodshed of the Irish War of Independence of 1916, that the Irish voted unanimously for a Republican President, Warren G. Harding, to the overwhelming defeat of James M. Cox, of Ohio. The British realized the American sentiments expressed in this election and in 1921 set Ireland free.

Nor have the bulk of the Irish been deluded by the spurious logic of the "best man" argument. They vote for principle, not personality; for people, not private interests.

In the framework of the Democratic Party the Irish swiftly challenged the old-line Republican power structure and, over the years, began to make their influence felt. It was a struggle, there were discouraging setbacks, and at times it seemed as if the task was hopeless. But as Irish names began to appear on the ballots in important elections, the mass of the Irish began to lift their heads in new self-respect. If it could be done in politics, it could be done in other fields, and now they had friends in fairly high places to help them fight the battle. The Irish could apply.

Today, we seldom think of the time when the Irish were the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. The ditchdigger's shovel has been forgotten; some of the Irish have so far forgotten it that they are Republicans. Most think the battle for recognition was won long ago. In fact, it was not. One door remained closed to the Irish, and even they felt it might never open. Again, it was the politician, often damned, seldom appreciated, who eyed the door from the standpoint of the possible.

The young, vigorous man who chose to storm this door was told that he was facing certain defeat, that he was stirring up prejudice dormant for decades, that he was chancing the destruction of his party. His instinct told him the cassandras were wrong. With charm, wit, disarming candor, and a masterful grasp of practical politics, the heritage of those ward-pounding pioneers of a century ago, John Fitzgerald Kennedy removed from the White House the last sign that read: "No Irish Need Apply."

In removing it, he dramatized, to my mind, the coming of age of both this country and the Irish in it. He was the symbol of the immigrant—a symbol not exclusively reserved for the Irish.

I think that Leonard Patrick O'Connor Wibberley in a summation of his book, "The Coming of the Green," tells us the Irish contribution not only to America, but to the world:

"The Irish immigrants did what every foreign group must do to win the name American. They fought with an unrelenting courage in the economic, political, and military battles of the country. They would not give an inch. They were despised and rejected and discriminated against, but they did not make this an occasion for wailing, but only fought the harder.

"They did not desert their faith, once so unpopular, in order to gain acceptance. Nor did they forget their homeland, for though they believed that freedom began with the American coastline, they saw no reason why it should also end there. They voted in the United States with an eye to the effect on the freedom of Ireland, and in so doing they broadened the scope of American political thinking.

"The slums did not hold them. The mines did not break them. They were not lost building roads and canals in the wilderness. They were not defeated at the foot of Marye's Heights.

"It was a grand battle, indeed."

They Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that the first Minuteman missile has been shot from its implacement in a silo in the Middle West and because of the fact that it was a complete success, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Black Hills, S. Dak., Press revealing the entire proceedings and the success of the test which I am sure will be of interest to every Member.

The editorial follows:

THEY WORK

Missilemen of Ellsworth Air Force Base can be justifiably proud of the historic Minuteman test which took place Monday north of Newell. It was a complete success.

It was the first test of the missile in an operational environment. What this means is that it was fired in trial just as it would be in anger—if that time ever comes—with a few essential changes. The changes were termed a "special configuration" by the Air Force. They consisted of replacing the nuclear warhead with a dummy, a rather important change; deactivating the missile's second and third stages, and changing the target.

The Minuteman fired Monday, like the 149 remaining buried in western South Dakota silos, was zeroed in on an unidentified target in an unidentified country until it was specially configured for the test. Its specific original target may have been a military base, an industrial center, or a command post. There's less doubt about the specific country involved in the original target.

The Minuteman has a reported range of about 6,300 miles. But the Air Force wanted the test shot to end about 6,300 feet from the launch silo. So the missile's guidance instruments were calibrated for 1 foot per mile of the weapon's range. That's getting pretty precise with complicated instruments. The missile, incidentally, was directed before it left its underground silo and there was no guidance control once it was airborne. The test shot landed just where it was directed.

There were several unique features of the test flight conducted here. Prior to Monday, the Minuteman had been fired only from especially prepared silos at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California and at Cape Kennedy in Florida. These shots were made in test rather than operational environments. They landed in the ocean and the impact areas were not inspected. Of course, there was little significance to the information gleaned from inspecting the impact site of Monday's shot here. Damage to the ground and the missile itself was the same as it would have been with any 65,000 pound object falling from an altitude of 1 mile.

There wouldn't have been anything to inspect at the impact site if the missile had been armed with its usual warhead and if its first and second stage segments had fallen off in flight as they normally would do. Nuclear radiation would have kept inspectors out of the impact site for quite some time. They wouldn't have found anybody alive in the immediate vicinity. The test missile, unarmed, left a trench about 6 feet deep and 30 feet long in the Butte County landscape.

Air Force officials said the test here had three objectives—to test the missile in an operational environment, to give the crews experience in firing procedures under simulated combat conditions, and to determine the cost of repair to the silo after an actual firing. The first two objectives were immediately successful, but it will probably be some time before the cost of repairing the test silo is fully known. Chances are, if the cost isn't prohibitive, the silo will be rearmed with an improved Minuteman.

It was comforting to learn that it is impossible to fire any of the missiles accidentally under the cautious procedures established by the Air Force. It took the crews in two control centers, operating in unison and functioning as cross-checks to each other, to fire the missile. The shot would not have fired if there had been a misstep anywhere along the line of the complicated command pattern.

There was a good reason for setting a short range target for the test shot and for fueling for only 7 seconds of powered flight. The Air Force naturally wanted the missile to

fall so nobody would get hurt and no property would be damaged. If it was targeted to fall in the ocean, for instance, the first and second stage segments may have fallen in a populated area while the reentry dummy continued toward its impact destination. The test provided for controlled safety measures and they worked extremely well. It is probable that future test flights in this area will also be short ranged.

The test flight received national publicity because it was the first in the country's interior. We wouldn't be surprised if the national newsmen covering the event dateline their stories, "Boondocks, U.S.A." Most of the newsmen came from the metropolitan centers and many of them expressed amazement at the wide open spaces of the test area. Their opinion of the region's isolation wasn't enhanced, either, by an Air Forces spokesman's announcement that "you can't find any telephones in Newell." But Lyn Gladstone of the Valley Irrigator promptly corrected the statement and distributed a Newell brochure to the press trailers at the test site.

Western South Dakota may be the boondocks to some, but area newsmen at the launch site left no doubt in the minds of their big city colleagues that they prefer it here. They were a pretty congenial group of fellows and we believe that most of them left with the feeling that people in the boondocks, at least, are mighty fine folks. We heard no complaints about the steaks produced in this wide open country.

The test flight, while expensive, was an impressive demonstration of the missile capability of the Air Force. It was certainly worthwhile to learn that the missiles in place here work and they will go where they are directed. The Air Force can be congratulated for successfully accomplishing its mission, and the taxpayers can be assured that the money spent on missiles hasn't been wasted here.

Honors for Longview: Dr. Charles F. Mathews and Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding schoolmen in Texas is Dr. Charles F. Mathews, superintendent of the Longview public schools.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Longview Daily News, March 9, 1965, in regard to Dr. Mathews and others of Longview.

I congratulate Miss Kay Talley, Mr. Joe Hendrix, and Mr. Ronnie Bishop as well as Superintendent Mathews on their very high attainments.

The editorial follows:

HONORS FOR LONGVIEW

Representatives of Longview High School brought a series of honors to the Longview public schools and to the city of Longview this past weekend when they attended the 19th Annual Youth Leadership Conference, Texas Association, Distributive Education Clubs of America, held in Houston.

Dr. Charles F. Mathews, superintendent of Longview public schools, was signally honored by the Texas Association of the Distributive Education Clubs of America for his contribution to the growth and development of distributive education programs in Texas.

This organization has as its primary aim the development of a high degree of leadership and citizenship consistent with American ideals of private enterprise and competition.

The award presented to Dr. Mathews is a coveted honor, recognizing as it does the leadership of the Longview superintendent in this important and most worthwhile phase of youth education and training.

Miss Kay Talley, Longview High School senior, was chosen the outstanding distributive education student in Texas. As student of the year, she won over four other finalists from different areas of the State.

Judges who interviewed Kay at the convention graded her on scholarship, school and job attendance, citizenship, honors, extracurricular activities, achievement of vocational objective, and promotion of distributive education principles and objectives.

Miss Talley's distributive education coordinator at Longview High School is Joe Hendrix, who is doing a constructive job in instruction and leadership in this important field. As part of Kay's studies, she is employed part time at the LeTourneau Credit Union in Longview. She is a member of the National Honor Society and belongs to the Pan Am Club, the student council, and the pep squad.

Ronnie Bishop, of Longview High School, served as parliamentarian at the State meeting. He received a standing ovation when introduced as the national president of Distributive Education clubs.

The Longview Distributive Education chapter also was honored at the State convention. Its chapter activities notebook, an 8-inch volume with the theme "The Pine Tree," was selected as best in Texas.

Longview distributive education student, Miss Sandra Wagster, also was a winner, placing third in the State in sales demonstration using a doll as her product.

Convention events, workshops, and contests were planned to cover the fields of retail, wholesale, and service selling—any of which a distributive education student may be considering as a career. Delegates at the convention, like all such students in Texas, receive classroom instruction from their coordinators in retail merchandising, personal administration, basket selling, and other topics recommended by businessmen. The students have an opportunity to apply their classroom learning to the business world by working several hours each day for merchants, in cooperation with the distributive education program.

Congratulations, Dr. Mathews, on the high honor accorded you and Longview's commendations for the wonderful distributive education program in the Longview schools—as demonstrated by the results shown at Houston. And congratulations to the Longview students and the Longview club for your outstanding work in the State. Longview is proud of you.

Leon M. Huntress, New Hampshire Writer, Stimulates Thoughts on Freedom and Individual Duty in Contemporary America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is well to be reminded from time to time that our society, composed of individuals exercising free choices, can never be any better than the best of the sum total of all these myriad choices. And that, therefore, the majority of these individual decisions must be based on standards of mutual respect for each other and for each other's tastes and wishes, if the country itself is to keep to its ideals. Too many people abuse freedom by using it as a license.

I am drawn to this comment by a striking column written by Mr. Leon M. Huntress and published recently in the Plymouth, N.H., Record. It is good writing and makes good reading. We should not forget the words of Lord Acton. I offer it for the RECORD with my highest recommendation:

FROM THE SIDE OF THE ROAD

(By Leon M. Huntress)

At about the time of life when his observer was beginning to take notice of some of the things about him, there passed into eternity a most unusual individual. He was contemporary with our age, then and now. His name was Lord Acton, an English historian, who was one of the most deeply learned men of his time, and he has long been remembered for his influence upon others. A devout member of the Roman Church, he appeared at the Ecumenical Congress in 1870, when a great crisis arose over the promulgation by Pius IX of the dogma of papal infallibility. Lord Acton opposed the proposition with considerable vigor, but lost.

He was possessed of great ability in teaching history, with a remarkable capacity to study. Yet he was a man of the world, a man affairs, not a bookworm. Little came from the pen of Lord Acton; his very learning seems to have stood in the way. He knew too much, and his literary conscience was too acute for him to write easily. His copiousness of information overloaded his literary style. He devoted most of his life to the preparation of writing the history of freedom, accumulating over 25,000 note cards of materials. The work never appeared in print—it has been called the greatest book never written.

However, Lord Acton made his mark upon his time with his concept of freedom. There are problems confronting a writer of any degree who seeks to discourse upon the subject. Some call it "peace of mind," if only for the common tendency to identify "true" freedom with wisdom, virtue, holiness, and other spiritual goods. Conditions of life in a free society by no means guarantee such peace of mind, any more than they do goodness or happiness. The freedom to pursue our own good in our own way implies the constant possibility of lazy, unintelligent, evil, or fatal choices.

Lord Acton saw freedom of conscience as the very essence of freedom, which in his well-known definition, he summed up as "the assurance that every man shall be protected in doing that which he believes to be his duty against the influence of authority and majorities, custom and opinion." That is a very large area in which to operate, and there are many calculated risks. Innumerable individuals substitute the word "privilege" for the word "duty" in Lord Acton's aphorism, and thereby we acquire problems. Occasionally, we hear a citizen declaim about his constitutional rights let the chips fall where they may: never mind other people. It is, of course, a man's right to make a fool of himself in public but others have a similar guarantee or protection that their rights shall not be destroyed in the process. The bystanders need not be annoyed by the unseemly behavior of the freedom lover.

Others spend much time and effort seeking to improve the status of freedom in others. Crusaders espouse campaigns to

emancipate their brothers from the domination of tyranny. Senator Goldwater, within recent memory, promised his countrymen an existence free from interference by their Government. Taken in or out of context, the kids at Hampton Beach last Labor Day seemed to take him at his word. By the way, whatever happened to all those youngsters who became heroic martyrs by receiving fines and jail sentences, which they promptly appealed? One has not heard if justice was actually meted out to them in finality. Presumably, they are proudly displaying their service stripes and polishing up for next Labor Day.

These guarantees of freedom from restraint held out before people are attractive, but there are dangerous aspects involved. Some 30 years ago, when the Japanese invaded China, they paid special attention to the opium traffic, legalizing and encouraging it throughout the occupied areas, making it as easy as possible for their subjects to become addicts. The Germans did the same thing with vodka in occupied Poland. During recent distatorships in Cuba, whenever the secret police foresee an uprising, any expression of protest or cry of independent will, there are announced programs of indecent films in the Havana theaters, to turn men's minds to other things.

It is possible to corrupt the majority of a nation, perhaps of a whole region; to demoralize millions of people by making life easy for them, so that they forget to use their brains. The emperors of Rome needed no secret police, because they supplied the populace with free meals, frequent gifts of money, and great spectacles in the Colosseum.

A subject which has consumed the attention of thinkers for centuries has been that of the nature and limits of the power which can be legitimately exercised by society over the individual. The struggle between liberty and authority is the most conspicuous feature in the portions of history with which we are earliest familiar, particularly in Greece, Rome, and England. In those olden times, this contest was between subjects, or some classes of subjects, and the Government.

In the evolution of our present state of society, we regretfully observe a widely held notion that the people have no need to limit their power over themselves. It seems to have a considerable vogue these days, but in philosophical theories, as well as in persons, success discloses faults and infirmitie which failure might have concealed from observation. The low estate of private and public morals, disrespect for constituted authority, weakening of the family structure, the elevation of sex as a subject of visual and audio communications, the trend in women's attire, the degeneration of popular music, and the dance—to mention but a few factors—have produced a strange set of standards in the name of liberty and freedom.

Not the least doubtful is any American of the prospects for continued material success of this great Nation. But our democracy can never prove itself beyond critical censure until its citizens improve the moral atmosphere by positive action, after carefully reexamining the basic principles upon which our liberties and freedoms were established.

FEBRUARY 25, 1965.

Mr. LEON M. HUNTRESS,
Plymouth Record,
Plymouth, N.H.

DEAR MR. HUNTRESS: As you know, I am a regular reader of your column, and I always enjoy it. Particularly enjoyed the one on February 4, discussing Lord Acton. I frequently quote him on the point that "all power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

The more I serve here in Washington, the more I am convinced that this concept is true. There is today, in my opinion, a dangerous lack of appreciation of the rapidity with which we are losing individual freedom. Your comments on some of the reasons for this are percentive and ones with which I am in agreement.

You are to be congratulated on your excellent essay.

Regards and best wishes,

JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Member of Congress.

Guthrie, at Cherokee, Iowa, Finds Arts Thrive in a Town of 8,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY L. GREIGG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, recently, I had an opportunity to participate in the dedication of a new community center in Cherokee, Iowa. This rural oriented community of 8,000 citizens has exemplified a spirit and enthusiasm for cultural achievement which is indeed outstanding. I think my colleagues, particularly from rural areas, will be interested in the accomplishments of Cherokee, and its future aspirations, as discussed in the following article from the New York Times of March 15:

GUTHRIE, AT CHEROKEE, IOWA, FINDS ARTS THRIVE IN A TOWN OF 8,000

(By Donald Janson)

CHEROKEE, IOWA, March 14.—Sir Tyrone Guthrie paid a visit to this community of 8,000 persons today and expressed amazement at its cultural vitality.

The artistic director of the Guthrie Theater in Minneapolis came to dedicate an impressive $225,000 community center and pay his compliments to a community spirit that has propelled Cherokee ahead—in cultural assets—of cities 10 times its size.

"I am full of admiration for the drive, the spirit and the guts that are accomplishing what is being accomplished here," he told Cherokee citizens who honored him at a dinner.

"One of the ways of saving the rural communities is for the leisure time of all who live in them to be made more profitable. That is what is happening here."

THEATER GROUPS ACTIVE

Unlike most small farming communities, Cherokee has a thriving local theater group that has been producing four plays a season for 7 years.

The new community center will provide, among other things, an attractive auditorium and spacious stage for its productions, which include the classics and avant-garde as well as the frothy.

Cherokee also has a symphony composed of musicians living within a 90-mile radius of this humming county seat. It presents free concerts annually.

For more than a decade the town also has had a museum of fine arts and natural history. Adjacent to it is a small planetarium that was the first in Iowa.

The museum, gift to the Cherokee citizens, circulates exhibits throughout the country and abroad. A new show is hung in its gallaries each month. Its director, John R. Vincent, conducts classes in sculpture. His wife, Loretta, an artist, teaches painting.

Sir Tyrone said at the dedication of the community center that Cherokee's cultural climate and achievements were probably "unique in the world's history" for such a small town.

He credited them to leadership of a small number of citizens in creating an awareness of culture.

"These things don't happen spontaneously," he said, "Good taste is not inborn. It takes tactful, intelligent pressure over many years."

In Cherokee, nestled in the fertile valley of northwest Iowa's Little Sioux River, the leadership has sprung from many segments of the population.

MANY PROFESSIONAL MEN

While there is no college, there are more business and professional people here than in most towns of similar size. A state mental health institute employs psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers. A dozen doctors use the handsome new community hospital dedicated in January.

An active city development committee, using the town's cultural assets as one means of interesting businessmen, has attracted several small industries.

But the spark has not been provided by business and professional people alone. A farmer, Myron Bushlow, and his wife left Cherokee $125,000 in their wills for the community center. The amount was matched locally by a bond issue. James Sivinski who has 360 acres in corn and livestock, will play Biff in "Death of a Salesman" next month.

Dr. Richard Fienniken, a psychiatrist at the institute, directs most of the plays. In the cast of the next one he will have a farmer, a doctor, a nurse, a housewife, an accountant, a radio announcer, a teacher and a chamber of commerce official.

"If it were not for the cultural climate," Dr. Fienniken, said, "I wouldn't have stayed here this long. Now I don't even think about leaving. It's a swinging town."

Eire's British Saint: Patricius Magonus Sucatus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, on one of my favorite days of the year, St. Patrick's Day, when half the Nation seems Irish and the other half wishes it were, it is fitting that we honor a Roman citizen who became the patron saint of Ireland.

Said St. Patrick in the hope that the bond between the Irish people and the Catholic religion might be indissoluble:

May God never permit it to happen to me that I should lose His people which He purchased in the utmost parts of the world.

It is a beautiful and moving story, the story of St. Patrick, and today, when bits of green and shamrock give fresh evidence that Ireland's patron saint and the Emerald Isle are one, it is only fitting that we recall the story of St. Patrick, which the New York Times has told so well in its today's editions:

EIRE'S BRITISH SAINT: PATRICIUS MAGONUS SUCATUS

For a Briton with a name like Patricius Magonus Sucatus, the middle-aged priest did rather well in Ireland.

By the time of his death about 1,500 years ago today, he had been credited with consecrating 350 bishops, popularizing the shamrock, taking Roman Christian culture to the people he called "barbarous heathens," and winning the right to judge all Irishmen on the world's last day. Oceans of spirits that keep off the chill have been consumed in the name of the Apostle of Ireland and patron of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York, thousands of "Kiss me, I'm Irish" lapel buttons have been sold, millions of Irishmen both real and imagined have marched in his honor, and the surf off Asbury Park has been tinted green.

Some people believe that there were two saints named Patrick whose deeds have been combined in legend, others believe that the man we know as St. Patrick never existed, and still others accept all aspects of the Patrician story down to the two immortal salmon he is supposed to have released in a well at Aghagower.

A TOUCH OF BLARNEY?

Many agree generally on the outline of his life derived from his writings and early records, but all accounts might contain the phrase that Irish storytellers use to end their tales: "There, now ye have it as I got it, and if ye don't like it add to it your complaints."

St. Patrick was proof of George Moore's observation that Irishmen never do well in Ireland. He was born at a place called Bannavem Taberniae, somewhere in western Britain, about A.D. 389. His father, Calpurnius, was a Catholic deacon and official in the Roman government. His grandfather was a priest in the days when celibacy of the clergy was not a strict rule.

His upbringing was Christian, although he acknowledges in his spiritual autobiography that he did not at first adhere to it. He introduces himself as "a sinner, the most rustic, and the least of all the faithful, and in the estimation of very many deemed contemptible." An unnamed sin he committed at 15 was later to delay his consecration as a bishop.

When Patrick was 16 and Niall of the Nine Hostages was High King of Ireland, Irish raiders captured the youth at his father's farm and took him back a slave. He was bound out as a swineherd in the forests and mountains near Ballymena.

At this time the youth experienced a spiritual conversion. "Constantly I used to pray in the daytime and at night," he writes, "in snow and frost and rain." After 6 years a voice came to him in his sleep and told him to escape.

EXHORTED IN DREAM

After an adventurous voyage on a ship exporting Irish wolfhounds and 28 days in an uninhabited area of France, he returned home. Soon, however, the voices of his fellow slaves in Ireland came to him in a dream: "We beseech thee, holy youth, to come and walk among us once more."

According to legend, he spent the next 20 years in southern France studying for the priesthood. Some scholars suspect, however, that this period of study was added to his biography by later authors to give him a learning he did not have.

He began his work in Ireland by overthrowing native idols and replacing them with churches. It is often said that St. Patrick "brought Christianity to Ireland," but actually there were a number of Christian communities in the southern part of the island before his arrival.

One of his first missions was to the court of High King Laoghaire at Tara. There he preached the Gospel, confounded the native Druid priests with "great signs and miracles," and won over many men of Erin. It is said he converted Laoghaire's daughters, Ethne and Fedelm, by using the shamrock as an illustration of the Trinity.

In 444 he founded a church at Armagh, the primatial see of Ireland. He wore a hairshirt and slept on rocks, and in the following years converted thousands and founded a number of churches. Tales of the saint's exploits, such as expelling the reptiles from Ireland, do not appear until much later.

A 40-DAY FAST

At one point, it is said, he fasted 40 days and 40 nights on a mountain called Crough Patrick in western County Mayo to win certain concessions from God.

In the end it was granted that 7 years before the last judgment the sea would spread over Ireland to save its people from the terrors of the end of the world. St. Patrick also won the right to judge the Irish on the last day.

St. Patrick always considered himself an expatriated Briton. Near the end of his life he wrote, "And so I dwell in the midst of barbarous heathens, a stranger and exile for the love of God." The story that he returned to Britain to die, however, is dismissed as a canard by almost all scholars.

St. Patrick died about A.D. 461. He was probably buried at Saul on Strangford Lough where he founded his first church. After his death, the people say, there was no night in Ireland for 12 days.

Formula for George Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, fair-minded citizens of this Nation continue to be shocked by scenes of police brutality and aggression against the voting rights of Alabama citizens. An editorial which appeared March 15, 1965, in the Indianapolis Times, points out with particular insight that the present crisis over voting rights is an issue of morals. The editorial correctly observes that it is clearly wrong to deny to Americans the most precious right of citizenship—the right to vote.

Accordingly, under unanimous consent, I include the Indianapolis Times editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FORMULA FOR GEORGE WALLACE

George Wallace, the Governor of Alabama, says he favors letting Negroes register to vote in his State. But the record denies this.

He says he is against police brutality and doesn't want any demonstrators to "get hurt." But the record refutes this.

He says he gave orders to his clubswinging State troopers to use a "minimum amount of force" against the civil rights marchers of Sunday, March 7. But 60 were injured, some severely.

In Federal court last week, a Negro dishwasher testified he was followed a quarter mile by troopers and beaten, although he had no part in any demonstration.

In the same court, a Negro woman testified she had to apply for voter registration 10 or 12 times before she was enrolled, although she is a high school teacher.

Wallace blames all of Alabama's racial troubles on outside agitators, the protest demonstrations, news reports, and "Communist infiltration." He blames nothing on a main cause of the trouble—himself.

When he met Saturday with Wallace, President Johnson said he urged the Governor to take three steps: Publicly declare his support for voting rights for all Alabama citizens, assure the right to "peaceful" assembly, call a biracial meeting to seek greater cooperation between the races.

"It is wrong," the President said, "to do violence to peaceful citizens in the streets of their towns. It is wrong to deny Americans the right to vote. It is wrong to deny any person full equality because of the color of his skin."

The civil rights demonstrations in Alabama, or elsewhere, in some instances may be misdirected, they may be a public nuisance, they may invite trouble. But the root of the problem is the denial of basic rights to American citizens. In Alabama, Wallace could help remove those barriers by accepting the President's formula.

Since he will not, he is confronted with President Johnson's avowal that "whether the Governor agrees or not" law and order will prevail in Alabama and constitutional rights will be protected. It is a confrontation that should have been unnecessary, because the essence of the issue is moral.

Famous Last Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks prior to the last election, President Johnson wrote the following letter to all members of the Army Reserve:

[From the Army Reserve magazine, November]

Defense of our great Nation is every American's business. We rely heavily on the Army Reserve as a significant part of our country's defense team.

In his dual role the civilian soldier contributes substantially both to his community and to the defense of our land. For your selfless devotion I commend each one of you. I appreciate also the remarkable way in which your families share in your contribution with their support and understanding.

I am confident that the Nation can rely upon the Army Reserve today and in the future as it has so often in the past.

Seven weeks later, Mr. Johnson approved a Pentagon recommendation that would scuttle the Army Reserve.

I am greatly appalled at the President's about-face—and his decision to support this deplorable proposal.

Historically, the Army Reserve has been the peacetime skeletal force of the Army, and the eliminating of this auxiliary body seems incongruous in the light of history and current world events. There are units and personnel in the U.S. Army Reserve which have no counterparts in the Regular Army or in the National Guard—which elements meant the difference between almost immediate aggressive action and random recruiting after Pearl Harbor 1941.

In President Johnson's attempt to establish a one-branch Government, he has forgotten that Congress is charged with the responsibility for raising and supporting armies, not the Secretary of De-

fense. This country is in great trouble when one man can dictate such a sweeping change in our defense policy and position.

It would appear to me that the administration is attempting to reduce our Nation's defense appropriations in order that the Great Society can be provided more funds for additional welfare programs.

I believe the decision to return the Army Reserve to the status it held in the early 1920's and to put all of the Army's Reserve defense eggs into the National Guard basket under State training and supervision is fraught with danger and should be rejected.

The Greatest Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, Walter W. Seifert, associate professor, School of Journalism, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, an outstanding educator with considerable business experience, has prepared the following material which is most thought provoking, as well as valuable to those persons interested in true freedoms in this land of opportunity.

The article follows:

THE GREATEST SOCIETY

"America is another name for opportunity. Our whole history appears like a last effort of divine providence in behalf of the human race."

—RALPH WALDO EMERSON.

U.S. living standard highest for any people anytime [1]

	GNP per capita	Autos per 1,000	Phones per 1,000	Radios per 1,000	Annual mail per person
United States	$3,100	342	395	900	344
Canada	2,100	238	309	424	196
United Kingdom	1,500	120	150	285	187
France	1,450	150	91	276	163
U.S.S.R.	1,100	3	19	196	17
Brazil	375	10	15	60	45
India	80	1	1	5	8

[1] Nation's Business, May-September 1964.

The average American family has more food, clothing and shelter than the average family anywhere else. It has more freedom, too. Although no people are equal in their physical-mental-emotional structure, America says each should have an equal opportunity to prove his worth. Our Nation became strong and free by individual initiative under the competitive free-enterprise profit system. This has brought greater good to a greater number than any other system yet devised by man. Those who enjoy the privileges of life in the greatest society have a moral responsibility to improve it, expand it, and vigorously oppose those who threaten to destroy it at home or abroad.

Americans get more food for less work [1]

[Minutes required]

	United States	France	Moscow, U.S.S.R.
Bread, pound	5	11	36
Beef, sirloin, 1 pound	28	148	143
Eggs, dozen	13	88	128
Sugar, 10 pounds	30	149	533

[1] Nation's Business, May-September 1964.

America's massive appetite for necessities and luxuries is fed by mass production and mass distribution. Neither could exist without mass demand—people from coast to coast wanting the same things at the same time—products that can be mass made at low cost, shipped economically, and sold profitably to all concerned.

U.S. workers' buying power increases [1]

[Work minutes]

	Bacon, pound	Butter, pound	Eggs, dozen	Sugar, 10 pounds
1912	70	107	97	180
1942	28	33	34	48
1964	17	18	13	34

[1] Nation's Business, May-September 1964.

Mass demand does not just happen. It is mass motivated by skilled professional promoters of new products such as color TV, electric watches, and fiber glass boats. These give millions of Americans extra pleasure and provide millions of additional jobs.

Freedom of the press and free speech would mean little without advertising dollars. (The Sunday New York Times would cost over $6 per copy.) If TV and radio stations did not have commercials each would have to receive a huge tax-paid subsidy.

Mass motivators, through relatively few in number, are "prime movers" in our uniquely productive society. They help start the business cycle and keep it going. Without their catalytic effect the American economy would shrivel. What people want determines what is made.

These countries spend the most for product advertising

[1965 per capita [1]]

United States of America	$67
Canada	34
Sweden	32
Switzerland	26
Great Britain	25
West Germany	21

[1] Advertising Age, June 8, 1964.

These people have high economic, social and political values.

The road to oblivion is paved with the bones of companies and countries that did not relate to their environments.

Build a better mousetrap than your neighbor and nobody will beat a path to your door—unless you advert eyes.

A TRAGIC PARADOX

The greatest society seems unable to use its persuasive powers in the global struggle for the minds of men. (Fighting the giant Communist propaganda machine with the Peace Corps and USIA is like aiming bean blowers at armored tanks.) Unless we use advertising/public relations techniques at Cabinet level, we're doomed to keep losing the cold war.

We don't need more scientists to compound the horrors they have created. Our best chance of survival is to train more people to tell and sell freedom's story to masses everywhere. From now on it's "communicate, cooperate, or be cremated equal."

These countries spend the least for product advertising

[1963 per capita [1]]

Mexico	$3
Brazil	2
Spain	1
Egypt	1
U.S.S.R. (less than)	1
East Germany	1

[1] Advertising Age, June 8, 1964.

These people have low economic, social, and political values.

White House Reception Big Moment for the McCarthys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on March 15, 1965, written by the wife of one of my colleagues from Buffalo, Mrs. Richard D. McCarthy.

Congressman and Mrs. McCarthy were recent guests at the White House. As a freshman Member, this was their first invitation to a congressional reception, and Mrs. McCarthy's comments are most noteworthy. She gives a very interesting account of the evening they spent at the White House. The warmth and friendliness of our First Family is also vividly portrayed in this article, which follows:

WHITE HOUSE RECEPTION BIG MOMENT FOR THE MCCARTHYS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Representative and Mrs. Richard D. McCarthy, of Buffalo, and Representative and Mrs. Henry P. Smith III, of North Tonawanda, were among the 100 guests at the White House Thursday night at a congressional reception. Here Mrs. McCarthy, in an exclusive account written for the Courier-Express, recalls her impressions of an evening at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.)

(By Gail McCarthy)

WASHINGTON.—When we drove into the southwest gate of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, we were not alone. The sidewalks outside rang with civil rights songs and the tempo of the demonstrators could be traced by their bobbing placards over the fence. The white-pillarded mansion at the apex of the drive was an unreal vision to me. But as the doorman admitted us to the marble foyer, the fantasy vanished, and the Richard McCarthys entered the White House as guests of the President for the last of 10 congressional receptions.

The upper hall rang with waltz music and the Blue Room was filled with dark-suited Congressmen and their wide-eyed wives. The most dignified of waiters bore silver trays, and as we waited to be received by the President and Mrs. Johnson, I watched the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General quietly slip in.

THE BIG TEXAN

Just then our names were announced and I found myself being gently propelled toward a mighty Texan handshake and a sly wink from a very big President.

We wives and one of the most forebearing husbands in all Washington, Mr. Mink, spouse of Congresswoman PATSY MINK, of Hawaii, were then adroitly ushered into a small theater to watch a new film on White House art.

While this was going on, our husbands were being briefed by the President, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, and Budget Director Kermit Gordon.

MAMA JOHNSON

While the room was still in darkness I noticed a small silhouette in bobby socks hesitating at the door. The First Lady instantly became "Luci's mother" and instinctively drew her into a corner for a very secret chat.

Mrs. Johnson invited us "up to our part of the house" which fairly caused a stampede of delighted women. We were whisked in the elevator into the intimacy of the "families" rooms, and saw in the west hall the dusky, inscrutable Indian portraits hanging high on the towering ivory walls.

We were graciously admitted to all the rooms except the family's bedrooms and kitchen. I believe there exists in feminine nature a large measure of domestic curiosity, which was eminently satisfied Thursday evening.

NOTHING MISSED

The ladies peeked into closets, went through the photo collections, opened draperies to see the balcony where young John-John had marched with imaginary sabers and rifles while his father reviewed troop units below.

The Lincoln Room overpowered some of the ladies with its massive mahogany bed. We learned that women guests never use this room but distinguished gentlemen often do.

MORE TO MY SIZE

One of the smallest rooms had walls exquisitely covered in blue and white fabric. The delicate furniture was upholstered in the same print. A free-standing full length oval Hitchcock mirror crowned this little blue jewel and many of us felt a sense of relief in simply being in a room scaled more to our mere human proportions.

THE WOMAN IN US

Not that there were no critics among us, in almost every period room, there were those women "who couldn't imagine how anyone could live in so much blue" and were busily rehanging pictures and moving furniture, all mentally, of course, and with best of intentions.

As meaningful and beautiful as the guest quarters were, with their treasures and ingrained spirit of great and colorful people, the living substance of my remarkable introduction to the White House culminates in the family room.

This was obviously where the pulse of the Lyndon Johnson family generated. The hi-fi with some slick albums peeking out, some dog-eared fashion magazines, king-sized ashtrays, many scratch pads, and less elegant but more comfortable Texas-sized easy chairs. I wasn't sure my feet were going to reach the floor.

A glimpse of a tall serious girl with a quiet perceptive countenance, who was leaning against a doorway as an almost invisible observer, was most telling.

It was here that I shared a sofa with Mrs. Robert McNamara and sat across the coffee table from the First Lady. We talked about her sentimental favorite—a Sully portrait of the most evanescent woman, Fanny Kemble.

She abruptly ended my reverie by pointing out that the furniture arrangement here was partly for comfort and partly to disguise the holes in the rug.

OFFICIAL ESCORTS

I noticed that on the fringe of every group there was at least one elegantly-uniformed young man wearing white gloves. On our way down the oval staircase to the State dining room I questioned my discreet escort and learned that he and 90 other bachelors are social aides to the President.

They are all Armed Service officers. He was a lieutenant commander in the Air Force and admitted that his role here as a volunteer often become more challenging than flying jets. To earn the security clearance necessary to become a social aide it takes the most unblemished young man at least 2 years.

Gaiety and lightheartedness flowered in the State dining room as we women awaited our husbands, and nibbled on the rare roast beef, shrimp and turkey and homemade sugar cookies.

WITH LONG FACES

When the men did appear, a sober heaviness leavened the atmosphere and many of the congressmen stood apart from the chatter with deep and brooding faces. My husband, Max, was one of these, and without any privileged information it was apparent to me that the briefing with President and Cabinet members shared the grave responsibilities of this Nation with our men who must know and must profoundly decide.

The word was skillfully passed that the President and his lady had retired and we quietly thanked the enduring Vice President and Mrs. Humphrey.

I recall with disturbing clarity their faces—beyond their warmth and cordiality was the indelible image of the massive weight they carry so well.

A great experience for the McCarthys.

California Farmers Facing Labor Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, California, the No. 1 agriculture State, is facing serious problems resulting from the shortage of farm labor.

This problem has resulted from the ending of the bracero program and the failure of the Department of Labor to take effective, meaningful action to certify the admission of temporary farmworkers under the immigration statutes.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from the Wednesday, March 10, 1965, Alhambra, Calif., Post-Advocate, discussing the farm labor crisis and the need for immediate action:

SHORTAGE OF WORKERS: FARMERS FACING LABOR CRISIS

The continuing obstinacy of the U.S. Labor Department about use of migrant labor on farms in the face of the approaching agricultural crisis is hard to understand.

Farmers from California to Florida have given the Department clear evidence there is a critical shortage of help for harvesting that will get worse as the season continues. The number of American workers looking for the farm jobs is inadequate.

As a result, some crops have spoiled in the fields, others are endangered and farmers face severe economic problems. Uncertain about next year's labor supply, many farmers are planning to plant reduced acreages. Processors and other complementary industries are beginning to feel the pinch.

The agricultural plight has been admitted by the State administration, which is now seeking permission for California farmers to use migrant help in the March through September harvest season.

Gov. Edmund G. Brown has mistakenly opposed the bracero program originally, but deserves commendation for reversing himself after honestly examining new facts in the crisis.

Albert B. Tieburg, State employment chief, was in Washington this week urging the Labor Department to change its mind about use of braceros. Before leaving, he said, "it is obvious now that we cannot recruit enough farmworkers for peak harvests" and "growers are against the gun."

The Labor Department, however, is apparently still insisting Americans can fill the gap if the minimum wage is raised to $1.40 an hour by April 1.

Mr. Tieburg said this bill will "hopefully" attract more American workers for stoop labor, but doubted it would solve "an impending labor shortage crisis."

His doubts are well founded. The wages paid by California farmers are on the average about $1.25 an hour, not too much below the proposed minimum. Date growers paid $1.83 to $3.30 an hour on a piecework basis and could not recruit enough help. Hope is not enough. As Senator GEORGE MURPHY has said, the agriculture industry is so important it needs an assured labor supply.

That labor supply during harvest seasons must come mainly from Mexico at the present time. Twenty-one U.S. Members of Congress learned in Mexico City this week that the Mexican Government is interested in revival of the bracero program. Its withdrawal created an unemployment problem and resulted in a $30 million annual income loss to the Nation.

Some form of a migrant labor program must be enacted immediately to take care of the harvest crisis.

On a long-range basis, Congress must give all proposals to modify it thorough analysis so the unnecessary farm harvest crises do not arise.

Negroes and the Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are many who apparently believe this Congress will repeal section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to enact right-to-work laws. These laws make it possible for anyone to get a job without being forced to join a union. The ramifications to Negroes of these repeal efforts would appear to be considerable, judging by a recent column written by Victor Riesel, the noted labor analyst. I request inclusion of his column in the RECORD.

INSIDE LABOR—DISCRIMINATION IN THE CRAFTS

(By Victor Riesel)

CLEVELAND.—The Negroes' summer of discontent will begin here a little early this year for all the colored workers of the land.

Thousands may hit the streets in mass demonstrations on March 22. There is no magic to the date. That is the deadline the NAACP whirlwindish National Labor Secretary Herb Hill has set for the hiring of Negroes on a huge construction project.

This lakeside city has become the Negroes' emotional focal point—in the words of one of America's highest Government men—because

of the erection of a $32 million Federal office building.

In the five craft unions whose members will man the works at high rates of pay there are five Negro card holders. The plumbers have three apprentices, and the electrical workers two—despite all the proclamations signed and public pledges made.

And the unions don't appear to be in any hurry to throw open their brotherhoods.

If the Negroes mass in Cleveland's streets, it will be the unspoken signal for Negroes to demonstrate everywhere there is similar Federal instruction. Naturally this worries the Government's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, now headed by Vice President HUMPHREY. Cleveland's craft unions are especially worrisome. They've been virtually closed, non-Negro and in a feud with the NAACP since 1934.

Right now, there's little the Government can do with the unions but argue with them. Even under the Civil Rights Act, the United States can't force a union to take a Negro or other minority groups.

However, somebody had to be pressured. Early in February the committee summoned the five contractors who are responsible for the actual work. They were directed to make it possible for qualified Negroes to work on the rising Federal Building here.

The contractors protested that they must get their workers from the unions and there are mighty few Negroe cardholders. In effect, they were told that this is the contractors' problem. Jobs must be made available to Negro workers and apprentices.

Committee spokesmen said this is the law and if the building firms don't obey it their contracts will be voided. The law says that there must be equal employment opportunity on federally financed projects—and $32 million is a lot of financing.

But, complained the contractors, they must go through the special union-controlled hiring halls to get their manpower. The committee, in effect, said that's against the law, because it creates a closed shop and closed shops are illegal.

But, protested the contractors, the National Labor Relations Board has ruled that the builders must negotiate with the unions over creation of preferential hiring halls. And, on the local level, the contractors might as well go out of business if they don't yield to the craft unions.

The Federal equal opportunity committee people were adamant. Executive Orders 11114 and 10925 say that there shall be discrimination in hiring on Federal projects.

Then the committee notified the General Services Administration, which hands out all Government contracts, that no more Federal work was to go to these contracts without the committee's approval.

In turn, the committee warned the contractors there would be no such approval until they got Negroes into the project and into the apprenticeship stream so they could eventually qualify for skilled work.

Obviously the contractors were in the middle. The Government, unable to get at the unions, was using the building firms to pressure the local labor leaders.

In a week the contractors returned with a plan for compliance. They were taken off the suspended list. Work on the Federal building had started. But they were—and still are—mighty few Negroes on the job. They are far outnumbered by the constant pledges of the union chiefs.

Herb Hill and the NAACP are agitated by all this. They want action. So does the Government. But the key is in the unions' hands.

So Herb Hill has set March 22 for a mass demonstration in front of the old Federal building. He'll demand open hiring by the contractors at the plant gate—hiring of union or nonunion Negro workers.

If this happens the old craft labor men will shut down the project with a strike that will be heard throughout the land. The crisis will be repeated wherever the situation is paralleled.

It looks like a very hot summer.

Rampart Dam, Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the capability of the Rampart hydropower project in Alaska when constructed to provide the only truly cheap power for Alaska and the west coast is well established in official reports. Even occasional critics of Rampart Dam rarely question this conclusion.

It was in response to a critic, Mr. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, that I rose on March 11 to point to the importance of the potential hydropower of the Yukon River to America's power needs. I also reminded my colleagues that Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall had appointed a six-man task force to analyze and evaluate the massive field report of agencies of the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

My colleague's remarks were occasioned by an editorial in the New York Times of March 8, entitled "World's Biggest Boondoggle."

The editorial comments of the New York Times were answered directly today by an Alaskan whose efforts to provide low-cost hydropower for America through Rampart Dam have been outstanding, Alaska's distinguished junior Senator ERNEST GRUENING. In his letter to the editor, the Senator wrote:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES: GRUENING BACKS HYDROPOWER FOR RAMPART

To the EDITOR:

As your March 8 editorial on Rampart Dam refers to me by name as one who cheered a recently released Interior Department report, I hope you will give me an opportunity to comment.

The only possible explanation for your characterization of Rampart Dam as the "world's biggest boondoggle" is that the Times has not attempted to get the facts.

Would the Times have described Grand Coulee as a boondoggle? Or Boulder Dam? Or the Tennessee Valley Authority? Your disdainful dismissal of the importance to consumers of low-cost power from Rampart completely ignores advances in economic progress and standards of living accompanying successful development of hydropower for public benefit.

BENEFIT TO NATION

Not only Alaska, but the Nation as a whole will benefit from low-cost power from Rampart. The Federal Power Commission predicts that power needs of the American people in 1980 will be 2½ times the amount required in 1964. To meet this onrushing increase in demand, Rampart's 5 million kilowatts will supply less than 1 percent of the total. Although Rampart is big, it is also necessary.

Four years of intensive study by the Corps of Engineers and other agencies, public and private, have brought Rampart to the point where a definite report should be available later this year.

You refer to the analysis now being made by the Natural Resources Council. Why not wait before jumping to half-baked conclusions?

Your reference to Rampart as "the world's biggest sinkhole for public funds" ignores that all these great hydro projects are fully amortized, principal and interest from the revenues for the power generated. The billion dollars which you italicize in your horror is an investment which will be more than repaid, for in addition to repayment of funds advanced is the income from taxable industries and taxable employees.

The answer to the question of marketability of Rampart's power has been given not only by Development and Resources Corporation under supervision of the respected David Lilienthal in a study for the Corps of Engineers, and by private consultants, but now by the Department of the Interior. That answer is "yes."

As to supposed superiority of alternative sources of power, the same studies lead to the same conclusion that Rampart power will be cheaper than nuclear energy, coal-fired steam plants, natural gas or oil or any other Alaskan hydro project. If resource conservation and low power costs are important, Rampart is incomparably better than the widespread destruction and excessive costs of suggested alternatives.

Construction of Rampart can be expected to result in significant increases in production of migratory fowl, fur-bearing animals, and fish, as has happened at other projects. The Times estimates of losses of migratory fowl, animals, and salmon appear to be those calculated by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. The people of Alaska have suffered too often from egregious errors of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Our once great salmon fishery resources declined so that in 1959, the last year of Fish and Wildlife control, it had reached the lowest point in 60 years. Under State management the salmon runs have improved substantially, a difficult task after the Fish and Wildlife mismanagement.

GROUPS IN OPPOSITION

Again, the Fish and Wildlife Service, followed by the Wildlife Management Institute and the National Wildlife Federation, would have performed a grave disservice to Alaska when, in 1957, these groups opposed development of oil and gas resources of the Kenai moose range. Fortunately they did not succeed. These organizations then sounded alarms about the damage and destruction this would visit upon the moose, in the same vein as the cacophony now heard against Rampart.

When, over these protests, but with approval of the Izaak Walton League, the moose range was partially opened to leasing, the moose flourished. Far from damaging the habitat for moose, the incidental lumber clearing enhanced it.

Rampart will bring wildlife resource increases, and we rejoice that this can occur simultaneously with increased prosperity for the people of Alaska and the Nation.

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator From Alaska.

WASHINGTON, *March 12, 1965.*

Tax Cut and Utility Rate Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the annual report of the Southern New

England Telephone Co. for 1964 points out that in November 1964 the company was able to announce a rate reduction totaling $2 million. This rate cut, the third in slightly over 2 years, was credited by the President of the company, Ellis C. Maxcy, to the Federal income tax reduction enacted by Congress in 1964. The annual report of the Connecticut Light & Power Co. shows a comparable rate reduction due to the tax revision.

It is encouraging to know that the tax cut had such a direct influence in reducing rates, thereby freeing more funds of individuals and corporations for general use in the economy.

Outrage in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the March 9 issue of the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., entitled "Outrage in Alabama."

This editorial expresses the feelings of most Americans, and I am hopeful that President Johnson's proposal guaranteeing equal voting rights for every American will be enacted into law without delay.

OUTRAGE IN ALABAMA

It is hard to imagine a much worse stigma for Alabama in the eyes of the Nation, or for all America before a critical world, than Sunday's savage police assault on 600 Negro freedom marchers in Selma, Ala. Shocking as this incident is to our national image, however, it should be even more so to our national conscience.

For once again, Gov. George B. Wallace of Alabama seems bent, as on so many previous occasions, on forcing a new showdown of State versus Federal authority on the elemental issue of protecting U.S. citizens in the exercise of their constitutional rights.

For the victims of this inexcusably brutal attack, let no one forget, were citizens of America as well as of Alabama. And the errand they were engaged upon, when the police not only ordered them to disperse but assailed them with tear gas, clubs, bull whips, and ropes, was an apparently peaceful exercise of their right to assemble and to petition their Government for a redress of grievances. And the grievance for which they sought redress was the persistent denial of an equally basic and even more elemental right, that to vote.

That the method they had chosen—a 40-mile demonstration walk for freedom from Selma to the State capital of Montgomery—was distasteful to the public authorities is perfectly true. But the rights of the demonstrators to assemble and to walk together to advertise their grievance—provided they did so peaceably—were basic.

Whether Governor Wallace's order to the State troopers to halt the march could have withstood a court test is a question for lawyers. He was acting, ostensibly, under a State law vaguely providing for the public welfare and the protection of the people. Had his police simply commanded the crowd to disperse, then arrested some of the leaders when the command was disobeyed, that might at least have provided a test case.

What was revolting and inexcusable, however, was the viciousness—ask anyone who saw the films—of the police attacks on the marchers when they stood, apparently docile but unmoving, after being ordered to disperse.

If this is Governor Wallace's conception of law and order in Alabama—if he has no higher sense of his oath-bound duty to defend the rights of U.S. citizens against such flagrant police brutality as this—then once again he is doing his State the terrible harm he has done it several times before. He is inciting and inviting a reluctant Federal Government, under the prod of an outraged national public opinion, to protect the rights of U.S. citizens against a State that is either in default or is actually arrayed against them.

The Wrong Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, editor, U.S. News & World Report, submitted a most thought provoking editorial in the March 22, 1965, edition.

In order to properly weigh the many aspects of our present day problems, all Americans should have the benefit of Mr. Lawrence's views:

THE WRONG WAY

(By David Lawrence)

There is a right way and a wrong way to try to achieve reform, whether it be in the realm of government or in the social life of our Nation.

We pride ourselves on a belief in democracy—on the exercise of a rule of reason in our national life.

We have rejected mobocracy as the manifestation of anger, of bitterness, and of unwillingness to let the rule of reason and the processes of law prevail.

The American people have been witnessing in recent events in Alabama a failure to rely on the normal functioning of a democracy.

Whatever the provocation, the fact is that passion and threats of physical force have never bred a spirit of confidence in any constitutional system.

Unfortunately, the "demonstrations" have been led by men who should know better. The leaders have included not merely protagonists for meritorious causes, but clergymen who, while preaching nonviolence, have closed their eyes to the incitement to violence, which results from street "demonstrations" and, in some cases, from defiance of the law itself.

It has been argued that the police in the South are prejudiced. But how can we explain the outbreaks in cities like Chicago and New York, where the officers of the law have been attacked and, indeed, where the cry of police "brutality" has been raised? Yet the handling of disorders and incidents that may lead to violence is the duty of the local police. We cannot delegate it to a national police force.

Understandably, "demonstrations" get publicity from coast to coast and are designed to mobilize public opinion behind worthy causes. But does this mean that we cannot utilize effectively the public forum, the printed word of the press, and the spoken word of radio and television? Cannot a righteous cause be successfully or persuasively espoused except by mobs in street "demonstrations" or by fanatics who have carried their campaign of intimidation even to the inside of the White House, only to be dragged out by police and arrested when they ignored requests to leave.

Have we had a dispassionate discussion of the race problem itself? Have we endeavored to make people on both sides of the controversy in other sections of the country, as well as in the South, aware of the complex nature of a social problem of this kind?

Essentially, the prejudices that are expressed on racial issues are not really based upon ethnic differences. They are based on the differences between man and man. Segregation has reflected a custom—a habit of our epople—not merely in the South but also in the North. Gradually, the laws have decreed that the principle of segregation is invalid.

But can the principle of integration be applied by law to the satisfaction of all who have felt the sting of discrimination? Isn't there also a problem in human relationships, in educating individuals, and in paving the way for better understanding between all groups in the Nation? And can this be accomplished better by mob violence than by the processes of reason?

Does anyone who is familiar with life in a southern community believe that there is hate in the hearts of a preponderant number of the citizens toward any race or poulation group? Even in the days of rigid segregation, whether in railroad stations or in hotels or in restaurants or in schools, the relations between whites and Negroes were far better in many parts of the South than they have become in recent years in the North.

The key to a solution of the racial problem in community life lies in a better understand ing of human nature. Does anyone who has studied this problem in the South or elsewhere think for a moment that white people who have known Negroes over the years and have had personal and business relations with them are bent on inflicting hardships upon them, such as a denial of facilities for travel or of hotel accommodations or of an opportunity to get a job?

One finds that the responsible individual, irrespective of race, who is able to conduct himself or herself honestly and with due regard for the rights of others invariably wins friends who remain true to that friendship, not for just a few years but throughout their lives. Why is it that we cannot widen this relationship to that of a community? Ministers of the Gospel might better devote themselves to this task than to participation in street riots.

The race question will never be solved with a policeman's club any more than by "sit-ins" or other incitement to disorder and mob violence.

We are dealing with the facts of life. Some of the "demonstrations" have turned out to be a form of organized tragedy—a way of inflaming rather than cooling passions. If this is continued, the end result can only be a retrogression, an emergence of hate and bitterness on a wide scale, with the ultimate loss of the objective itself.

There is a right way and a wrong way. The rule of reason is the right way. "Demonstrations" provocative of violence are the wrong way.

Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to authorize the

President to allow individuals otherwise eligible to retire with full social security benefits at age 60 when acute unemployment in the Nation so warranted.

My bill would give the President the authority to allow workers to voluntarily retire at an earlier age during periods of acute unemployment, thus creating new job opportunities for younger workers. This discretionary device would be a very useful tool in combating recessions through reduction of unemployment.

This bill would not permanently reduce the retirement age to 60—it would simply authorize the President to use such a reduction, at different times and in different places, as an economic tool with which to combat unemployment and recession.

Tribute to Oscar G. Mayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I note with sadness the passing March 5 of Mr. Oscar G. Mayer, one of Chicago's most dynamic business leaders and one of our city's most public-spirited citizens.

Over a span of half a century, Mr. Mayer proved himself an innovator in industry, a friend of the consumer, and a benefactor of the public.

Under his leadership, Oscar Mayer & Co. revolutionized the marketing of meat products. Mr. Mayer was a pioneer in the packaging of processed meats and introduced modern methods that ushered in the age of self-service meat purchasing.

At the time of his death at age 76, Mr. Mayer maintained his office at 1241 Sedgwick Street on Chicago's near North Side. He was born in an apartment at that address in 1888. Downstairs, his father, the late Oscar F. Mayer, an immigrant from Bavaria, and two uncles, Gottfried and Max, operated a small sausage business.

Following his graduation from Harvard University, with honors, in 1909, Oscar G. Mayer returned to join the growing family business. As processing plant superintendent, vice president of operations, president, and chairman of the board in later years, Mr. Mayer inspired the dramatic growth of that tiny neighborhood sausage market into one of the nation's leading meat processing firms.

He was regarded in the industry as an early and tireless advocate of research and development, before that term was generally accepted in management circles. He served as president of the American Meat Institute from 1924 to 1928.

Mr. Mayer was named one of Chicago's "Outstanding 100 Citizens." In a pamphlet titled "A Plan for Living," he summed up his philosophy: "Life long personal development, generous consideration for others, due service to society."

As a servant of society, he lent his talents to civic improvement programs and to education. He was president of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry from 1938 to 1940. He served as a trustee of the University of Illinois for 6 years, including 2 years as board president. He was a trustee of Beloit College for 9 years, and a life trustee of that institution since 1953. His contributions to education were recognized with his receipt of honorary degrees from the University of Wisconsin, St. Ambrose College and Beloit College, and a Centennial Award from Northwestern University.

As an industrialist and as a citizen, Mr. Mayer gave richly to his century. His was a full and fruitful life. As an innovator and as an educator, he also left a generous endowment to the future. I extend heartfelt sympathy to his grieving family, knowing that their loss will be shared by the many friends and associates and citizens who knew him and his work.

Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is faced with many issues of great importance that demand prompt action but none is more imperative than the legislation that the President is submitting today to eliminate the widespread disfranchisement of Negro citizens. The tragic events in Selma and now in Montgomery underscore the urgency of fully insuring to all our people the human rights due them as American citizens. Our democracy was founded upon the principles of freedom and equality, the affirmation of human dignity, the divine worth of the individual. We cannot permit Governor Wallace and his brutal henchmen to make a mockery of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

It is the duty of Congress to carry out the will of the vast majority of Americans for speedy legislative action to halt the undermining of our constitutional guarantees by arrogant and ruthless State and local officials. America has been shamed and humiliated by the terroristic actions of the State of Alabama. Let Governor Wallace and his racist cohorts know that America is determined to overcome the forces of bigotry, of racism, of ignorance, and to translate the American dream into a living reality for every citizen irrespective of race, color, religion, or place of birth.

The Fifth Ward Democratic and Civic Association of East Orange, N.J., at a meeting on March 15 unanimously approved a resolution that voices the sentiments of their fellow citizens throughout the Nation. I am pleased to insert the association's letter at this point in the RECORD:

FIFTH WARD DEMOCRATIC AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION OF EAST ORANGE, N.J.,
March 15, 1965.

Congressman JOSEPH G. MINISH,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MINISH: Whereas the entire world will remember Sunday, March 7, 1965, as "Bloody Sunday in Selma" due to the outrageous acts of violence committed by Gov. George Wallace's Alabama State Troopers, and whereas all men everywhere in this great land, regardless of their race, color, or creed, should be free to exercise both the inalienable right of suffrage and also the right to petition their government for a redress of grievances through the medium of a reasonable and peaceful demonstration.

The members of the Fith Ward Democratic and Civic Association at our March 15, 1965, meeting unanimously approved the following resolution:

"*Be it resolved,* That we the members of the Fifth Ward Democratic and Civic Association believe that there is a pressing need for the immediate passage of the following legislation.

"First. A Federal Suffrage Rights Act providing for the establishment of objective standards in all votes registration qualification tests.

"Second. A provision in this act for the immediate appointment of Federal registrars in southern counties where Negroes are currently being deprived of the right to register and vote, either through official malfeasance, or private intimidation.

"Third. This Federal Suffrage Rights Act should be applicable to local and State elections as well as Federal elections.

"Fourth. In this act, criminal penalties, including prison terms, should be provided, for persons who interfere, either as private individuals, or as public officials, with any citizen's lawful right to register and vote.

"Fifth. This act should be enacted as soon as possible to prevent another 'Bloody Sunday in Selma.'

"EDWARD LYNCH,
"President.
"MODJESKA LYONS,
"Secretary."

GPO Platform Still Points Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the March 9 San Diego Union carried an interesting editorial illustrating the fact that the Republican Party platform developed in November of 1964 has been proven realistically constructive.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take time out from their many and varied concerns to give the article their attention:

PRISONER OR MASTER OF FATE?—GOP PLATFORM STILL POINTS WAY

Now that the present Democrat administration is getting into full swing, the Republican platform of 1964 every day looks better and better.

We agree with the comments of Representative MELVIN LAIRD, Republican, of Wisconsin, chairman of the House Republican conference, who was chairman of the platform committee at the National Republican Convention.

LAIRD has called the platform "one of the most widely misrepresented and least-read documents in political history" and it contained "a comprehensive and well-thought-out and realistic program."

Memories of the campaign may have faded, but who can forget the sly and deceptive comments about the eagerness of Republican candidates to take us into war and to deprive Americans of secure lives at home?

Well, let's take a look backward.

In domestic affairs, the platform, among other things, pledged the Republican Party to protect the dynamo of economic growth, the free competitive enterprise system; resist concentrated economic power, whether public or private; to enact constitutional amendments permitting States to apportion one house of their legislatures to include factors other than population, and permitting the free exercise of religion in public places without violating separation of church and state; and to support a sound system of social security and full medical and hospital care for needy elderly persons.

Certainly, as LAIRD contends, the American people did not reject such a program. It simply was not fairly and adequately presented, and as a result we have come to the dangerous brink of one-party government.

In foreign affairs, the platform charged the Democrat administration as follows:

1. That it has permitted an erosion of NATO force and unity, and alienated most of its members by negotiating with the common foe behind their backs.

2. That is has alienated proved allies by opening a "hot line" first with a sworn enemy rather than a proved friend.

3. It has abetted the Communist takeover in Laos and encouraged aggression in South Vietnam by appearing to set limits on America's willingness to act.

4. It has turned its back on the captive peoples of Eastern Europe, abandoning their cause in the United Nations and in the official utterances of our Government.

5. It has permitted disarmament negotiations to proceed without adequate consideration of military judgment and has failed to originate a single new major strategic weapons system, after inheriting from a Republican administration the most powerful military force of all times.

These hit home. They were the truth and remain the truth.

The new Democratic administration must move into these situations, regardless of the soothing but dishonest inferences of the campaign, as it is doing in regard to South Vietnam.

If it does not, it will, as the GOP charged, be a prisoner more than a master of the events which will determine the fate of the free world.

Minnesotans React to Farm Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, representative of the reaction among Minnesotans to the administration's disturbing position on the farm problem and how to go about solving it is an editorial which recently appeared in the Appleton, Minn., Press. This editorial was reprinted by Don Peterson in the Springfield, Minn., Advance Press, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in today's RECORD:

THE FARM MESSAGE

President L. B. Johnson's farm message is not receiving the applause that might be expected from some liberals.

In Minnesota, liberal Representative Martin McGowan, editor of the Appleton Press, says:

"Farm message of President Johnson only partly alleviated the fear and indignation that gripped rural America after presentation of his budget message. The President urged continuance and expansion of present farm price programs but at the same time indicated his intention to turn away from these programs in the future.

"The language used and the remedies proposed in the farm message were vague and general in tone. They didn't indicate in any concrete fashion how the plight of the farmer is to be eased.

"'The President spoke of 'parity of opportunity for all rural people:' What does that mean? This recalls the parity that Dwight Eisenhower promised at Plowville at Kasson in 1952. What he meant by that was argued all during his administration.

"Parity of income can be understood. That is what is needed. Parity of opportunity sounds like it means something but it really means nothing.

"The remedies proposed by the president also seems to say something but really don't. Consider these:

The President has asked each department and agency administering a program which can benefit the rural people to assure that its benefits go equally to rural and urban areas. That's just bureaucratic paper shuffling.

"The President has asked the Secretary of Agriculture and Director of the Budget—what's he doing in this proposal?—to review with the head of each department or bureau involved the obstacles which may stand in the way of such equal distribution. That's just gobbledy gook for a top-level bull session.

"The President has asked the Secretary of Agriculture to put the facilities of his field offices at the disposal of all Federal agencies to assist them in making their programs effective in rural areas. Well, if the Secretary of Agriculture has not been doing this all the time then he has been derelict in his duties.

"In the way of legislation the President has recommended to Congress that it enact legislation to equalize the availability of home mortgage credit in rural areas. The rural areas do not need more mortgages; they already have too many. The rural areas need income through fair prices for farmers.

"The President also asked for an increase in the Department of Agriculture's loan program on farm ownership loans and loans for community development. Here again there would be no need for loans if the income was there.

"The President also seemed to hint at a massive land retirement program, a doubling of the old soil bank. He contends there are 50 million acres of land that should be taken out of production gradually. If it is done gradually it might work. But when it was done by previous administrations it had the effect of taking whole farms out of production and the people off the land. This adversely affected the rural communities dependent on the farm economy for support.

"In addition the President wants some of this land taken out of production to be put to nonfarm and recreational uses. This might assist in some measure to keep people on the land. Some such projects have been introduced here and have kept a few people on their land. They would rather farm, however, than operate recreational projects.

"On the whole the message must be rated a disappointement. What the farmers want and need is a fair price for their products. If this were possible everything else would fall into place and all the other fancy programs would not be needed. Nothing was said of any specific nature in the message on this subject."

Fourth Annual Governmental Affairs Seminar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the recent fourth annual Governmental Affairs Seminar, sponsored by the Capitol Hill chapter of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, proved once again to be a fine success this year.

Some 150 Jaycee delegates—many of them winners of governmental affairs contests in their own States—came to our Capital from 44 States to learn firsthand some of the operations of the three branches of our National Government. This is a fine way to provide young leaders in communities throughout the United States with the opportunity to participate, with Members and with officials of various executive departments, in discussions on the pros and cons of major legislation and other vital issues now facing the people of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure for me to join with Congressman CHARLES JOELSON, of New Jersey, THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, and BARBER CONABLE, JR., of New York, on a panel to discuss the merits of the economic opportunity program. Panels such as this and others on crucial subjects gave Jaycees an insight into the complexity of major problems, enabling them to impart what they have learned to fellow members in Jaycee chapters around the country.

Some of the highlights of this weeklong seminar were panels on medicare and related medical assistance legislation; the general aid to education bill; the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; reapportionment of State legislatures and congressional districts; the war in Vietnam, and others.

Among other features of this program was a briefing on foreign affairs by Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Mr. George Ball, and Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Mr. Thomas Mann; addresses by Senator JOSEPH MONTOYA, of New Mexico, by Dr. Wilbur Cohen, Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Senator BIRCH BAYH, of Indiana; Senater PETER DOMINICK, of Colorado, at the Annual Awards Night banquet, and a special question and answer session with Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate the Capitol Hill Jaycees on their enlightening seminar and to commend particularly John V. "Skip" Maraney, the chapter's president; Mike Vandeveer, the seminar's general chairman; and Argyll Campbell, press secretary to the Democratic whip the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] for their outstanding efforts to make this fine program a continuing success.

In addition, I commend my constitutent, H. Oliver Welch, of Atlanta, assistant national chairman of the Governmental Affairs Seminar, for his contribution.

Tribute to Leo Lerner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, last week I informed the House of the sad news of the death of one of Chicago's most distinguished citizens, Leo Lerner. Leo was one of my best friends. He was a great human being and a courageous and dynamic force for good in our community.

The memorial service was conducted by Leo's rabbi and lifelong friend, Dr. Henry Fisher. His address which I am appending to my remarks, was one of the most sensitive and inspiring eulogies I have ever heard:

TRIBUTE TO LEO LERNER

George Eliot once wrote these lines:

"Oh may I join the choir invisible
Of those immortal dead who live again
In minds made better by their presence live
In pulses stirred to generosity,
In deeds of daring rectitude, in scorn
Of miserable aims that end with self,
In thoughts sublime that pierce the night like stars,
And with the mild persistence urge man's search
To vaster issues.

"May I reach
That purest heaven—be to other souls
The cup of strength in some great agony,
Enkindle generous ardor, feed pure love,
Beget the smiles that have no cruelty
Be the sweet presence of a good diffused,
And in diffusion ever more intense.
So small I join the choir invisible,
Whose music is the gladness of the world."

It is of music that I want to speak to you at this moment, a specific work in music, "Shubert's Eighth Symphony." This work has a special name; it is called the "Unfinished Symphony," and for a very good reason—Shubert never finished it. A conventional symphony in his day had at least three movements, sometimes four or five. The "Eighth" has only two. Shubert died before he could complete it. The pen fell from the lifeless hand of the composer.

I have been thinking of this symphony since I heard that Leo had passed away, for this is the heart of our sorrow this noon. It is not that Leo died, but when he died. All of us must die, but Leo died before his work was done; the allotted threescore and ten were not his. He left us in the very midst of a creative life. And even though we try to find solace in the thought that he is at peace, that the shadow of death that has lingered these past years has been dispelled, that the anxieties and the fears are gone, yet it is but little comfort when we realize that there is so much that was left undone—so much love to be given—so much work to be done—so many fruits still to be harvested. For these unrealized years we weep.

But, I think of it more because this symphony is also the source of our strength, because it impresses us too with the truths that we need know at this hour. And the first is that it is still better to have the two movements than none at all, and that even though we couldn't have the whole of Leo's life, we are grateful for that part of life that was given to him. For this is the basic question that faces all of us: "Is it better to have loved and lost than never to have loved at all?" Living is hazardous; in every relationship we enter we face danger of loss. Life gives no guarantees. A man and a woman marry, they hope for a lifetime together, and yet, they never know when the best of marriages may be severed by death. We cement friendships and yet none knows when they will be broken. In all of life we face the possibility of loss and losing is very painful. And, if we cannot accept the pain, there is only one experience we cannot help; we don't ask to be born. But once we are born, we can choose. We can choose when we grow up to abandon our families; never marry and in consequence never beget children; live as a hermit, never make friends; and we can be sure there will never be the pain of loss. But, there will never be the joy of having; and this is the answer of the poet when he said: "It is better to love and lose than never to have loved at all." And I say it is better to have loved Leo, even though we have lost him than never to have loved him at all. It is better to have had these two segments of his life than none at all. And, I am sure that if we had gone to Deena many years ago when she first met Leo and said to her, "This is the man with whom you will share life and love and create a beautiful marriage, but you will only have him for so many years," she would have said, "Give him to me for whatever years we may have, for every moment is precious." And I am sure that in turn each of us, who in any way stood in any relationship with him—his mother, children, brothers and sisters, and all of his friends, we would all say the same. And even as we weep for the years that were taken from him, we thank God for the life that was given to him.

There is a second truth in this symphony. I wish I could play it for you now, but we can't, and I hope that if you don't know it you will play it when you get home. You will discover that it is a delightful work, that Shubert managed to crowd into these two movements much more sweet melody than many a composer has done in a complete work.

We realize that man has created false barometers—that we tend to measure life in one dimension—length, without realizing that there is more to life than mere quantity; that life is qualitative; that just as the value of a book is determined by its content rather than by the number of its pages, or a symphony by its music rather than by the number of its parts, so it is with a man's life. Life is a work of art and what makes a great painting alive is not the single dimension of length, it is the dimensions of depth and breadth. And when we think of Leo's life, we must think not in the number of his years, but what he has done with these years, what he has achieved.

Leo led a full life. In a sense, he lived more than one lifetime. Every day was filled with a sense of excitement and all of his days were spent in realizing every element that gives meaning to life and makes it worthwhile. First of all, Leo loved life; every facet of it. He loved the streams and the mountains. He loved the city and the country. He loved the stars and he loved the earth. He loved trees and flowers and birds and animals; he loved books and music and art and the dance; and he loved good food. His eyes could never see enough and his ears never hear enough. To him, life was a joyous experience. He was not a hedonist. He did not live on the pleasure principle, but rather in the feeling that this world that God created was a wonderful world and offered so much in terms of its beauty that he could not get enough of it. Leo never lost the sense of wonder about life. We may say that in that area Leo never abandoned the delights that he found as a child when the world first opened up for him. And he always stood with a sense of great reverence for everything that marked this world about him.

But life was not merely full of sight and sound, it was full of people, and Leo loved people. He knew more people than anyone I have ever known. And he loved them as people, as human beings. He built no barriers between himself and his fellow man. He walked with princes and paupers. He knew the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the industrialists and the laborers. He never viewed men in terms of their purse or their status, or their color or their creed. He never saw a man as a Catholic, or Protestant, or Jew. He never saw white or black. What he saw was a human being; and to that human being he left instinctively drawn. And the range of his human interest is evidenced in what happened yesterday; when on the one hand two little urchins who worked as newsboys delivering the Booster came in weeping for him and on the same day, a telegram arrived from the President of the United States expressing his sympathies. And to each, he was a friend, as he was to all of us who are here today.

But more than that, Leo's life was filled with the creative efforts of the mind. This man could think clearly and lucidly. His mind encompassed the universe. It was capable of getting to the core of any problem. It was constantly seeking answers to questions, and with amazing skill could get to the heart of any problem. It seemed as if he knew everything, particularly gifted in the field of political science. He knew so much more in other fields as well: the arts, music, literature. And it was not only through his heart but through his mind that he expressed himself. The columns which he wrote, the books which he published, all reflect this amazing insight into the world about him. How often it has happened to us that my wife and I would be discussing a problem and the answer would elude us and we would say: "Let us call Leo," and when we did, he knew the answer.

And most important of all, Leo's life was filled with ideals. This was a soul that was dedicated. There was a burning passion within him to make this world that he loved so much a better place, not for himself, but for his fellow man. It is as if Leo felt that all the joys he received from life should belong to everyone and no human being should be denied the opportunities to experience these same joys. No man should be compelled to forfeit the freedoms essential to living. No man should have to lose the privileges of our society. He thought first of his neighbor. He recognized that the world begins with a small community, that if he could get men to be better neighbors they would be better citizens, that if you create better neighborhoods, you will create better cities. And it is interesting that this was his field of endeavor, publishing these many neighborhood newspapers. He loved this city, this city of Chicago, where he was born and grew up and was educated and found love. He wanted to be proud of this city, that it should be more than just an industrial center, more than the city which Carl Sand-

burg described as the "hog butcher" of the world. He wanted it to be a city that had good government, good schools, good libraries, a city that would be a center of art, music, literature, and culture, and give every man an opportunity to achieve his purpose in life. And that is why he worked in so many agencies and in so many organizations; and in all of these, he was the moving spirit. He was responsible for Roosevelt University, for he believed that there should be no discrimination of color or religion in any college.

He was on the board of education, on the library association, on a variety of councils and committees. He worked with the IVI. He was in the forefront of every movement that would make this a good city. In the last years, he served on the parole board and took on many onerous burdens, even though he had already begun to feel the heavy weight of illness. He resisted the pleas of his friends that he become less active. He loved his country, he loved America, for this country had done so much for him; it gave him all that he wanted out of life. Here in America he was able, despite economic burdens to achieve an education, the opportunity to create a neighborhood newspaper empire, to discover life and love, and this was the expression of his gratitude; to labor for a greater and more democratic America. He was anxious always to work in behalf of those who would lead our Nation to see that they represent the best of American democracy. He was the one who brought Adlai Stevenson into the focus of political life, and many a man now in public office—in city and State and national legislatures who was inspired and stimulated by Leo's great passion for democracy. Democracy to him was truth and human rights, and for that he fought vigorously with his pen and with his speech, and he was afraid of no man in his championing of the truth; he risked approbrium, he received threatening letters, but nothing would stay his hand. This man was a fighter in great causes.

How can we say that this life was short. Leo was the embodiment of George Eliot's poem that I read to you at the beginning. In a sense, he was a musicmaker; and he wrote "the music that was the greatness of the word." He wanted the world to be a happier place. He began with his own little world, the world of his immediate family, and then moved on to his neighborhood, his city, his State, his country, and all of his fellow men. How grateful we are that he lived to see some of the fruits of his labor, to have had all these years with Deena, years in which a man and woman establish a real marriage, based not only on love, but on sharing, on communication; that he saw his children grow up, find love, and to have grandchildren come. To develop a great host of friends. Above all, to see the transformation in the world about him, to see the better which he helped to usher in.

We are sorry that he is gone, but I am sure Leo would not want us to grieve for him. He loved life so much and brought so much to it, and received so much from it that death could hold no sorrows for him. These words of the poet describe Leo's feelings:

"Because I have loved life,
I shall have no sorrow to die,
I have sent up my gladness on wings,
To be lost in the blue of the sky.
I have struck my hand like a seal,
In the loyal hand of a friend.
I have known the peace of heaven,
The comfort of work well done.
"And now—I give a share of my soul,
To the world where my course is run.
I know that others shall finish,
The work I have left undone.
Because I have loved life.
I shall have no sorrow to die."

A composer dies, but the music lingers on. It is a long time since Shubert died, but every time we play his symphony, we know that he still lives. The music may stop, but the melody lingers on. This is, of course, the essence of immortality, that men who live in the very elements of life that brought them joy and in the very areas where they labored. And I must convey to you that I can never see a bird or a tree without thinking of Leo and how he loved them. And whenever a man reaches out a hand to his fellow men, somewhere in his midst Leo will be found. And whenever men ponder great thoughts and seek answers to the challenging questions, Leo will be among them. And whenever men fight for truth and rights, Leo's spirit will march with them; in truth, the melody of his life lingers in our midst, and it will continue to delight us. How often does it happen that you are walking along the street, and the leitmotif of an opera you may have heard months before suddenly runs through your mind, and it gives you as great a sense of joy as when you first heard it; so it will be of Leo. Whenever we shall think of him, it will be with the same affection, with the same love, and with the same feeling of exhilaration that we experienced when he was alive.

I would like to close with these lines; I would like to think of Deena saying them to Leo and then his children, his mother, brothers and sisters, and then all of us who were privileged to share life with him:

"Music I heard with you was more than music,
And bread I broke with you was more than bread,
Now that I am without you, all is desolate,
All that was once so beautiful is dead.
"Your hands once touched this table and this silver,
And I have seen your fingers hold this glass.
These things do not remember you, beloved:
And yet your touch upon them will not pass.
"For it was in my heart you moved among them,
And blessed them with your hands and with your eyes.
And in my heart they will remember always:
They knew you once, O beautiful and wise."

I last saw Leo a year ago. I spoke to him 2 months ago. But I somehow feel that I have always been in his presence. For just Friday, I received his little book on Hawaii, and just yesterday I read his latest column. And during all this time, I felt even as you did that we were in touch with him. I have traveled a long way from Los Angeles and this is my first visit back to Chicago. I am sorry that it had to be for a moment such as this. I recall some 18 years ago when Leo was honored at a dinner. There were about a dozen people from different walks of life and each paid him tribute from the vantage point of his relationship to Leo. I then spoke as his rabbi. And now, 18 years later, I come again to speak of him, but I did not come as a rabbi. I came as a friend—and I speak as a friend and for all of us who are here and for the others throughout this country who cannot be here—for all who were his friends ,I say: "Goodby, dear friend. We shall miss you; but we shall always be grateful that your life touched ours. And in our hearts you will live and we shall remember. And we know that your memory will be an inspiration to all of us."

Rumania Versus Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Eliot Janeway, the distinguished economist, in his column "Janeway's View" in the Chicago Tribune of February 18, 1965, has pointed out with great clarity a new reaction to the discriminatory trading practices that have hitherto prevailed within the Communist bloc and he has indicated the degree to which the increasing dissatisfaction of the former Russian satellites with these practices may provide opportunities for the exercise of American foreign policy. I am happy to append Mr. Janeway's column "Trading With Reds Could Split Up Bloc" to these remarks:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 18, 1965]

JANEWAY'S VIEW: TRADING WITH REDS COULD SPLIT UP BLOC

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, February 17.—Doing business with the Russians has been a much debated question for more than 30 years. Doing business with their satellites is a newer question and a different one. It calls for assessment on a different basis.

The complex of controversy over trading with Russia involves a series of interrelated strategic considerations. Will our resources be used to build up a potential enemy which, with its limited resources, has already proven itself a shrewd and ruthless competitor? Can we trust Moscow to grow up to the code of world commerce and to deal on the assumption that the U.S.S.R. will do well to forget the old talk about burying the United States?

SPLIT HELP WEST

But since the falling out between Russia and China, the most pressing and critical of these questions is whether the moves we make on the economic front of the cold war will tend to firm up a new Soviet unity; or whether, instead, we can help along the splitting process. After all, each new split in the Communist camp makes the balance of power in the world more favorable to us than it already is—if only we'll take advantage of it.

It is this payoff question of unity or disunity within the Soviet world which is riding on the way we play our hand with the satellites. To be realistic about it, there's no such thing as a "satellite bloc" constituting a homogeneous entity. The countries that lie between Russia and West Germany are all individuals, and differ from one an-

other as to their potential for giving Moscow political headaches and for doing themselves economic good.

A good analogy is with Latin America. The Kennedy administration did poorly there because it treated Latin America as if its various political economies formed a homogeneous entity. The Johnson administration has been doing so well because Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Mann—the President's top man in charge—operates with a country-by-country, problem-by-problem approach. The way we're succeeding in keeping Chile on our side, as we are, is altogether different from the way we're keeping Brazil on our side, as we also are.

HELPS IN LONG RUN

Just so, the way to drive wedges in between Russia and her postwar satellites is country by country and situation by situation. It's to our interest to do so even though we may never see a complete schism between these various nationalistic Communist powers and their former big brother. Every time a satellite develops its own resources for its own purposes, and not simply as part of Moscow's overall plan, it strengthen its bargaining power against Moscow and forces the Kremlin to divert more resources for buying back the satellite, and, therefore, to budget less resources for selling against us.

Right now, Rumania is the "sleeper" problem for Russia and the "sleeper" opportunity for us. The main reason why Rumania has chips to trade with in her argument with Russia is oil. Rumania has lots of it; and, in fact, it's Rumania's oil which Russia has mainly relied on in her cold war oil offensive (whose most startling victory was won in Cuba).

Rumania is fed up with Russia's habit of preempting Rumanian natural resources for Russian purposes. Rumania has ended with her rich natural resources depleted; she is loaded with worthless currencies that she's been forced to accept in payment; her own industrialization has been retarded; and Russia has hogged all the economic rewards and political fringe benefits. Now Rumania wants to trade her way onto the economic map, and she's reaching out for a trading deal with the United States.

She's developed an interesting new approach to the problem of economic development: To stop shipping out her own natural resources, and to build up industrial capacities for export to pay for raw material imports instead. This hardheaded approach to conservation and to "value added" is making her a major export customer for U.S. chemical and oil process equipment. Just as Mexico, which is also a factor on the oil map, is the No. 1 "semideveloped" country on our side, so Rumania is the satellite country to watch in this year of takeoff for the "semideveloped" economies.

A Priest Marches in Selma—"We Won the Day but Saw the Hatred"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the courageous members of the clergy from Massachusetts who went to Selma, Ala., on Tuesday, March 10, to join with the people of that troubled city and their friends was the Reverend Walter M. McDonough of St. Charles Parish in Woburn, Mass.

Father McDonough has written a moving account of his day in Selma that conveys both the tragic causes of the situation there and the tremendous spirit of brotherhood that existed on that day.

His report appeared on page 1 of the Boston Herald on Thursday, March 11, and I would like to share it with my colleagues by inserting it in the RECORD.

A PRIEST MARCHES IN SELMA—"WE WON THE DAY BUT SAW THE HATRED"

(By the Reverend Walter M. McDonough, St. Charles Parish, Woburn, Mass.)

A television crew worked its way through the crowd in front of Brown's Chapel Church, and the reporter stopped to ask each clergyman if this were his first time participating in a civil rights activity.

MET AT AIRPORT

He wanted to interview a novice and get his reactions but he was having difficulty finding someone who had not demonstrated before, had not been arrested, or had not taken part in some demonstration. I did not qualify because I had been on the "March on Washington." But even then, early in the day in Selma, I knew I had never been involved in anything like this before.

I started out from Boston as one individual, answering the call of my own conscience and the call of my persecuted brothers in Selma. At Logan Airport it was obvious I was one among many on the same journey.

I met friends, Father Thomas Carroll of Newton, the director of the Catholic Guild for All the Blind and Father Francis McDonald, pastor of Sacred Heart Church, Lynn. This was the beginning of a group that would continue growing on the way to Selma. I was invited to sit with two Episcopal clergymen from New Hampshire, Rev. Parkman Howe, Jr., of Concord, and Rev. Samuel McCain, of Newport. Father Carroll had met up with an old friend, Dr. Samuel Bachrach, M.D., of Worcester, who was going down as a representative of the Medical Commission on Human Rights, Massachusetts chapter.

This made up the group of 11 who arrived at Atlanta and agreed to make their way to Selma together by chartered plane.

Once in Selma the time spent standing and waiting was far from boring. Ministers, rabbis, and priests from all over the United States met and introduced themselves to each other. Lunch was long overdue, so we asked seven or eight Selma Negroes where we could eat. All agreed Walkers on Washington Street, five blocks away, was fine.

Three of us walked the distance—walked part of the way down a street with whites on both sides hurling obscenities and threats.

Perhaps the greatest moment of humility for me was when three Negro men came over to our tables and asked us to autograph their NAACP membership cards. These three men came from the beach areas of Florida and had driven up through Alabama in the dark of night—knowing well the risk they took—to be in Selma for the march. Yet they wanted our autographs, and we were risking so little by comparison.

The early afternoon brought a new tension. There were rumors about a Federal injunction. No one was sure of what was true. Among the hundreds of clergymen the sentiment was "We'll go with King," we had come there in response to the appeal of Rev. Martin Luther King, we couldn't get certain knowledge of what was going on. At this point we had to rely on his position and his judgment. We would follow him.

Finally the definite and authorative word came—Reverend King said we would march. We moved over to the playground. Lines were formed and the young march organizers carefully blended the white clergymen and the older Negroes among the younger Negroes of Selma—many of whom were veterans of last Sunday's violence.

NEW ATMOSPHERE

Now there was a new atmosphere. The question in our minds was no longer what we would do—we knew that. The question now was what they—the troopers, the deputies, the police—would do to us. But nobody wanted to talk much about it. There was a restlessness, a spirit of "let's get on with it."

An older Negro in front of me identified himself as an undertaker—there was a quiet chuckle, but no one was in the mood to laugh. Beside me was Barbara Cort, a Newton, Mass., high school student, whose father, John Cort, is director of the Commonwealth Service Corps.

Behind us were two young Negro boys—high school students in Selma. They told us about last Sunday. They told it simply. Then they told us about their continuing work in Selma, how they went from house to house after school each day talking to people about voter registration.

Rev. Martin Luther King appeared from the parsonage between the church and the playground. With him were James Farmer, Rev. Ralph Abernathy and others. There was a delay while he was introduced to some of the notable clergymen present and pictures were taken. Then the line began to move out onto the street.

FOUR ABREAST

As we reached the entrance to the playground we were told to march four abreast. A few yards farther on another young Negro instructed the men to take the outside positions. Everyone was quiet, no singing and very little talking. We joined hands, but there were four white people in our rank and four Negroes in the rank ahead.

This didn't please young Barbara Cort and she insisted we change places with two from the rank in front.

State troopers, deputy sheriffs, and city policemen were grouped along the line of march. They stood silent and staring, spread-legged and holding their large clubs in front of them. Police cars were parked across intersections, and practically the only sound was the squawking from their radios.

A number of times the line stopped and started. At one point, two-thirds of the way back along the line—we didn't know why—we became more and more tense, and held tighter to each other with our sweating hands.

We took the final turn onto the bridge. Even more quiet, more tense, a young Negro organizer at the curb saying in a quiet voice "Close it up. Keep it close." Up the long bridge, no one was talking.

From the top of the bridge, we could see the long line snaking down before us. Along each side of the road State troopers, deputies, and police stood 10 feet apart. We could see the front of the line had almost reached the intersection ahead, and there was the blue of the massed State troopers. We continued down the bridge, the line closed up, and we stopped.

HELD AX HANDLES

We heard the unintelligible sound of a loudspeaker. Those in the line in front of us knelt, and we knelt, too. The line of troopers, deputies and police next to us were within 6 feet. Those across the street were about 30 feet away.

Behind these lines some white men sat on top of cars and trucks in parking lots, and some of these weighed ax handles in their hands.

I knelt on the outside of the line, holding the hand of young Barbara Cort. It was hard to pray. I had one line of thought—"What's expected of me now?"

I was sure a whistle would blow and they would move in. Should I fall on the road and stay? Would tear gas cause us to run? What could I do to protect Barbara Cort and the other women and girls? I didn't have any answers.

Along the line in front of us the people stood up and we stood too. The march organizers came back along the line. "We're turning around" was their message. "That's all we know, we're turning around." They, and many in the march, were members of SNEC. They had left no doubt during the day that they wanted to go on to Montgomery.

Here was the discipline of the march—no one questioned the decision. Rev. Martin Luther King said turn around, and we would turn around. The line moved down toward the intersection made the turn, and started back up over the bridge.

Before we thought we had read hatred in the eyes of the State troopers and sheriff's deputies as they ran their hands back and forth along their smooth clubs. Now, as we turned and headed back, there was no doubt about the reality of their silent hatred. No one has told me what had happened at the head of the line, but now I knew we had won the day.

Actions Speak Louder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks now we have heard continuing criticism of the administration's policy in Vietnam. There have even been those who contend that there has been no policy.

If the pundits would pay more attention to the facts and less attention to their hope that the administration would fall on its face, they would realize that not only do we have a policy, but we have a firm policy, based on action and not words.

One of the best statements of that policy was made by the eminent columnist, Roscoe Drummond, in an article which appeared in the March 14, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune. I commend it to the attention of our colleages:

ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Every once in a while somebody wrings his hands and pleads that President Johnson speak out on Vietnam.

He is.

He is telling exactly what we are doing and why.

On the premise that actions speak louder than words, the President is properly letting events tell their own story to the American people and deliver their own message to the aggressor.

These actions are telling more than all the set speeches could tell.

Right now it is actions, not words, which are most needed.

That's what we are getting. And from every action the United States has taken in the last 6 weeks President Johnson's keep-up-the-pressure, no-yield policy emerges crystal clear.

The crystal clear military policy is: there will be an ascending scale of air attacks deeper into North Vietnam until Hanoi calls off the aggression. This decision has been firmly made. Its execution is its best announcement.

The crystal clear diplomatic policy is: the United States is prepared to go to the conference table the minute the Communists cease and desist. There will be no negotiations as long as the aggression continues. There will be no unwillingness to negotiate the minute the aggression is ended.

The crystal clear political policy is: we seek no territory, no bases, no permanent military establishment in South Vietnam. But we know from experience that a paper agreement guaranteeing the independence of South Vietnam is not self-enforcing. Such an agreement was signed in 1954—and torn up by North Vietnam. An American presence in southeast Asia will be maintained so that the United States can join in guarding against future aggression.

Because this no-yield U.S. policy was slow in coming, it is understandable that many Americans—and the Asian Communists, too—were uncertain that the President really meant it.

The President has made his decision—to raise the controlled military pressure on North Vietnam steadily until it achieves its end. This policy is visible in Vietnam—North and South. There can be no turning back. It is visible in the air raids over North Vietnam—and there will be more. It is visible in related actions: the deployment of 3,500 marines, the very elite of U.S. fighting forces; more air raids on Communist infiltration lines in Laos; enlarging the 7th Fleet and strengthening U.S. naval patrols against North Vietnamese gun-running; notice to Peiping that there will be no "privileged sanctuary" if Red Chinese forces join the aggression.

These measures have long been a part of Washington planning. They were delayed because of the exigencies of the presidential election. They were delayed because some high officials were fearful that mounting military pressure against North Vietnam would massively alienate world opinion and would throw Red China and the Soviet Union back into each other's arms.

It has done neither.

There are, however, two immediate uncertainties.

The rate of the infiltration by North Vietnamese guerrilla forces is still going up. This means that the balance of forces on the ground is more adverse to the South Vietnamese than it has ever been.

So far the mounting military pressure against North Vietnam has yielded no sign from Hanoi that it has any intention to end the aggression. Far more pressure will be needed. Whether the timetable for acceleration is fast enough remains to be seen.

But purpose and policy are now clear beyond all doubt.

Mrs. Harold Ickes' Account of Freedom March in Selma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Jane Ickes, the widow of former Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, has written a particularly sensitive and moving article on one of the recent civil rights marches in Selma, Ala., in which she participated. Her account, which I commend to the House, follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Mar. 14, 1965]

MRS. ICKES: CRUSADER IN SELMA

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author, Mrs. Jane Ickes, is the widow of Harold Ickes, who held the post of Secretary of the Interior longer than anyone in history (1933 to 1946). She is the former Jane Dahlman of Milwaukee. The civil rights march she describes took place Tuesday.)

SELMA, ALA.—I also went to Selma, Ala., Why? I had to, frightened as I was. Last summer, as he was departing for Mississippi, my son said: "Ma, there has been too much talking about civil rights and too little doing." So, I could do no less than to associate myself with those men and women distinguished by their courage, who journeyed from all over the United States to Selma. I went to Selma with Mrs. Paul Douglas, wife of the senior Senator from Illinois and herself a former congresswoman, and Mrs. Charles Tobey, whose late husband was a senator from New Hampshire. Mrs. Tobey's daughter, Dr. Belinda Straight (Mrs. Michael Straight) had preceded us to Selma to care for those who had been beaten, gassed, ridden down during the Sunday march.

Selma is a small, unpretentious agricultural community. We easily found the large church where Negroes were meeting: The streets, heavily policed, were lined for blocks with cars.

We went to a small house at the side of the church, a sort of rectory. Some of the Negro leadership was there, a number of Selma and out of State clergymen, reporters. We were welcomed cordially. There was tension, of course; but no fear or bitterness, only quiet determination.

CROWD TOLD NOT TO PANIC

The next day, we went to the large church where we remained until the line of march formed, shortly after 2 p.m. The vast crowd, mostly Negro, interspersed with white clergymen and those few others of us—jammed the church and spilled out onto the street.

When we arrived, two very young men—seasoned veterans of the Sunday march—were instructing the crowd as to how to protect themselves from the blinding tear gas, how to crouch and cover the head from the blows from the billy clubs, and, no matter what: "Don't break, run, and panic."

Soon, the Negro leadership began to speak—the local preachers, members of King's staff, representatives of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Two themes were repeated over and over again:

"Millions, munitions, men to protect the South Vietnamese; nothing to protect us as, peacefully, we attempt to exercise our constitutional right to assemble and petition for redress of grievances."

"The white man can't know how we feel. He can't know what it is like to wake up every morning and wonder: What will they do to me today?"

WHITE MINISTERS SPEAK

A number of white ministers, a superb group of men, spoke briefly. One, especially, tore at one's heart: Tall, thin, blond, bespectacled. He said, in effect: "I can no longer regard myself as a follower of Christ and remain silent." As we turned away, someone told me that his was a Birmingham congregation. That is the stuff of saints and martyrs.

At last, there was bustling and calling out in the wings; cameramen and reporters shoved themselves through ranks of standing people. King had come. Everyone stood, some of us on the pews. In the excitement, I cannot remember whether we called out or clapped—probably both.

"Fellow clergymen, brothers, sisters. * * * We have the right to walk the highways.

We have the right to walk to Montgomery, if our feet will take us there. I would rather die on the highways of Alabama than make a butchery of my conscience. William Cullen Bryant is right: "Truth pressed to earth shall rise again.' The Bible is right: 'Ye shall reap what ye shall sow.'

"* * * As long as one black man is in bondage, no white man can be free."

And then we marched—the papers say, 2,000 strong—young and old, Negro and white, Christian and Jew, to say that this injustice must end. Down to the main street to the bloody bridge we walked, four abreast, at the left side of the road. We three were toward the rear. As we rounded one corner, we could see the long line marching up and across the bridge—across the bloody bridge, bloodlessly.

OFFICERS OMINOUSLY SILENT

The white business community watched silently from their shops. Heavily armed police, troopers, possemen lined the streets in massive, unbelievable concentration. They were silent too, ominously so, it seemed. At the bridge, I and some others stepped out of line. I felt, rightly or wrongly, that this Federal court order should be heeded. The line went on to confront the solid wall of State troopers where the marchers knelt in prayer and then turned back.

Again, I felt, King had decided rightly. He is a leader of great stature; a man of tempered wisdom and serene courage. His people—and America—are fortunate to have him.

Let us northerners not be complacent. We have not been birthmarked by prejudice, perhaps; yet, prejudiced many of us are. The sickness of hate, spawned by fear, invades the Nation. In our Southland, decent people are in thrall to terror. Those of great courage who have already spoken must not remain lonely beleaguered bastions, their careers—indeed, possibly even their lives—in jeopardy. The social climate will change profoundly only when this miasma of evil is dispelled, when the moderates can move.

I am American to the bone marrow and proud of it. I want to be proud—always.

Selma, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in my home city of Utica, N.Y., a prayer rally was held last Sunday, sponsored by the Inter-Religious Commission on Religion and Race of the Greater Utica Area. Several thousand persons gathered quietly and reverently in a public square to pledge their devotion to the cause of freedom. Their assembly was prompted by the tragedy of Selma but the purpose was really an appeal to the conscience of the community. The principal speaker was Rev. John J. Stack, the Catholic chaplain of Utica State Hospital. His words, delivered with dignity and feeling, left a great impact upon the crowd. He sought not to influence, but to inspire, not to breed hate, but to create sympathetic understanding. I am privileged to share his remarks with you:

"He couldn't stay home and do nothing." This proud epithet was spoken by the grieving widow of the Reverend James J. Reeb, Unitarian minister of Boston, who marched the last mile in Selma, Ala., Thursday night.

Today, we have taken together the first step of that long mile. We have marched here because we are in sympathy with Selma. We have rallied here, because we are brothers and call one God our Father. We have come together, here, because we couldn't stay home and do nothing.

Selma is an appeal to the conscience of America, and the response we make will determine the shape of America for our generation and generations to come. We must do more than march and pray. For Selma, Ala., and Selma anyplace, U.S.A., must be guaranteed the constitutional rights of peaceful assembly and petition, the full implementation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the liberalization of voting registration laws. Anything less is a mockery of the America we love. Anything less is a danger to you and to me. For if one group of our citizens can be denied their rights, then who is to say that we will not be next.

President Johnson will ask, tomorrow, for new voting rights legislation designed to provide a simple and uniform voting standard for all our States and for Federal registrars where such standards are not applied equally to all citizens.

This is a large step forward and taken in a way that is fruitful and lasting. For we must never forget that ours is a nation under law and the due process of law must prevail in establishing, amending, and repealing the laws by which we live.

The men who represent us in Congress are enlightened men, but they cannot go it alone. They need our support and approval. One well-reasoned letter to Representative PIRNIE, to Senator JAVITS and Senator KENNEDY is worth 1,000 unheard protests. In Washington, I will tell these good men of your concern and of your presence here today. I will tell them that we want voting legislation, that we want a strong and liberal bill, and that we want it now.

But you must write so our Inter-Religious Commission does not stand alone. You must write because Selma cannot stand alone, you must write to remind one and all that freedom under law must return to Selma, U.S.A., now.

Police-state tactics must end and the state of siege must be lifted. The march must go on. God grant that the good people of that community find strength through us and through others who march and pray with them today to bring this American tragedy to an end. God forbid that an army of occupation will be needed in Selma now or ever. But if so, let it be sent—and may God help us all.

Selma is an appeal to the conscience of America and the response we make will determine the shape of the Utica area for generations to come. We must do more than march and pray. In Selma there is confrontation, but in Utica there is hardly heard a whisper of communication. In Selma the vote is the thing, but in the Utica area too few ever ask, "What is the matter? What troubles your heart?"

If you dare ask, you will find dissatisfaction with the degree of progress which has been ours in the vital areas of race relations, housing and education, job opportunity, and community cooperation. No one group, no one people has the total answer, but when joined together this community can work toward finding the answers.

Your Inter-Religious Commission on Religion and Race offers Operation Brotherhood as a step forward in this direction and is inviting 5 to 10 delegates from each religious congregation of greater Utica to participate in a "training-for-action program."

But this is only one step and new and bolder dimensions in human understanding must be explored. For in a community where religion is faithful to its trust and people are true to God, there is no problem of race, but in a community where racial tensions exists, then religion has not completed its mission and people have failed their God.

This mission of our churches must be completed and this failure of our people must be corrected. A broader dialog among the faith groups of our community must be established if we are ever to get off center and move our community forward. We have waited too long now, but the time is not too late. So let us begin.

Yes, Selma is an appeal to the conscience of America. For in Selma are the clasped hands of brotherhood, the marching feet of the Saints, and the echoing of the chant over and over again, "We shall overcome, we shall overcome. We shall overcome someday soon," the clenched fists of hate, the tight ranks of brute force, the weapons of the police state. Deep in my heart I do believe, we shall overcome someday soon."

There are prophets abroad in Selma. Are there any left in Utica, any of whom it will be written, "He couldn't stay home and do nothing?"

National Wildlife Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, this week, March 14–20 is National Wildlife Week, an annual project of the National Wildlife Federation to focus attention on the broad and pressing conservation problems confronting this country.

Each year since 1938 National Wildlife Week has brought to the attention of the American people many important conservation problems, including the plight of endangered species of wildlife, the importance of conservation education, the wise use of our soils, waters, and woodlots, the dangers of chemical poisons, and the need for outdoor recreation for the future.

This year the federation has chosen pollution as the theme for this week with the slogan "Fight Dirty Water." Certainly this is a subject of vital interest and importance to every one of us. With the increasing demand for fresh water, we will need to reuse our water six times by 1980. In just 15 years it is estimated that America will need 600 billion gallons of water each day and by the year 2000 we will need a trillion gallons daily. Unless we can find a cheap way to convert salt water to fresh, hydrologists tell us that our maximum fresh water supply will be only 650 billion gallons a day. This is why water pollution control is one of the most important conservation programs in America today, and why we should all put the National Wildlife Federation's slogan of "Fight Dirty Water" into practice. Wastes from our homes, factories, farms, boats, and numerous other sources are reducing our supplies of usable water. Our city and industrial water-treatment plants must be improved. We need more research to discover better methods of treating water so it can be reused again and again to meet our growing needs. We must seek

good antipollution laws for our rivers, streams, and lakes, and we must insure adequate, clean water supplies so necessary to America's growth and prosperity. Of all our natural resources, clean water is the most important and the most vital asset to every human being. Without it, there would be no life on this planet, and there is no synthetic substitute for water.

The Sixth Congressional District of Maryland, which I represent, is particularly interested in the National Wildlife Federation's campaign against polluted waters, since the Potomac River lies totally within our district from the time it rises until it reaches Great Falls near the border of the District of Columbia. Its watershed serves millions of people including the Capital City of the United States. Its recorded history, begun by Capt. John Smith, in the year 1608, is a part of the warp and woof of all American history.

On Friday of this week I have called a Potomac River Conference to be attended by officials of the Federal Government, officials of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia, and by representatives of various conservation, sportsmen's and other interested organizations for the purpose of discussing programs of conservation, wildlife preservation, and water pollution.

Resolution in Memory of Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1965, the Massachusetts House of Representatives adopted a resolution memorializing Congress to draft appropriate resolutions of condolences in the memory of Sir Winston Churchill.

In that resolution the House pointed out that "the memory of this great statesman should be perpetuated in the hearts and minds of the people of the free world and particularly of the United States where he was held in such high regard and esteem."

I would like to make this resolution available to all Members of the House and under unanimous consent I include the text of the resolution of the Massachusetts House of Representatives in the RECORD following my remarks:

"MASSACHUSETTS RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO DRAFT APPROPRIATE RESOLUTIONS OF CONDOLENCES IN MEMORY OF SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

"Whereas it was with great sorrow that the people of the United States learned of the death of Sir Winston Churchill; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States granted him a most unusual honor in 1963 when he was made on honorary U.S. citizen, which citizenship was conferred upon him in absentia by President Kennedy in April of that year; and

"Whereas the memory of this great statesman should be perpetuated in the hearts and minds of the people of the free world and particularly of the United States where he was held in such high regard and esteem: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully requests that the Congress of the United States draft appropriate resolutions of condolences in memory of Sir Winston Churchill; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

House of representatives, adopted, January 27, 1965.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

A true copy.
Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The Threshold of Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on crime is before us. It is up to us to enact legislation to attack the causes of crime, poverty, and ignorance and to enact legislation to deal with the defects in our laws which make crime easier, such as the ready availability of firearms. For some years I have sponsored legislation to control the sale of firearms and in this Congress I have sponsored H.R. 1110, which would amend the Firearms Act. H.R. 1110 is pending before the House Ways and Means Committee.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the eminent commentator, Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 11, 1965:

THE THRESHOLD OF VIOLENCE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The deep lawlessness of the Alabama authorities in Selma, has provided a lurid background to the opening of the President's campaign against crime. A society in which the legally constituted authorities use violence to deprive citizens of their lawful rights of assembly and petition is not likely to make much headway against private crime. For the indispensable condition of law and order is that law and order prevail, and in Alabama be restored, within the lawful government.

In his message to Congress the President pointed out that in the last 25 years the crime rate in this country has doubled. In the last 7 years the crime rate has increased 5 times as fast as the population.

In trying to make up our minds what to do about the rising tide of crime, we have to begin by realizing that there is no one thing that can be done about it. Indeed, it would be nearer to the truth to say that everything has to be done about it. For lawbreaking is so widespread in our society, it is so persistent and so aggravated, that we cannot point to one cause and to one remedy. Such a criminal infection implicates American civilization and its institutions: the family, the schools, the communities, the churches, the courts, the police, and last but not least, indeed above all, the prevailing popular standards of value as regards violence, greed, lust, indulgence, and addiction.

For humane people, an understanding of the complexity of the problem of crime can, if we are not on guard, lead to a paralysis of will. Men find themselves saying that since there is so much that needs to be done, what good is it to do any one thing. The way out of the indecision is not to confuse a compassionate understanding of the many and obscure causes which make a criminal with the necessity of effective defense against his criminal act.

A certain confusion of this kind exists and will have to be cleared away if we are to do something about the crime wave. To deal with the causes which produce criminals, we have to make all the efforts to improve the worst conditions of our society, syndicated crime, the slums, broken families, the school dropouts, the wild birth rate among the disinherited, ignorance, incompetence, disincentives to honest work—as well as the atmosphere of brutality and violence created by yellow journalism, yellow literature, yellow movies, yellow television, especially among people where the family is broken and the church is lame.

This is a long, hard business, and we must not allow it to blind us to the urgency of a practical defense against the criminals in action. The fact of the matter is, I think, that the balance of power within our society has turned dangerously against the peace forces—against Governors and mayors and legislatures, against the police and the courts. The righting of this balance is the primary business of each community and of the Nation. Thus, there are not nearly enough well-trained policemen, detectives, magistrates, and judges. Our courts have been so overburdened and so entangled with legalisms that nobody expects a criminal to receive a quick, just, effective trial. The law's delays which intervene between the crime and the verdict deprive the law of its majesty and rob punishment of a very great part of its deterrence.

The task of the peace forces in our society is directly complicated by the licentious freedom with which anyone can buy arms and by the loss of control over exciting and narcotic drugs. The President's campaign will, we may hope, make a modest beginnning in the control of the traffic in arms and in drugs. But we must have no illusions. There is a low threshold of violence in American society, and we shall not soon see any effective disarmament of criminals.

The raising of the threshold of violence is one essential aspect of the task, which will never be finished, of civilizing ourselves.

Resolution Regarding Selma, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Detroit regarding Selma, Ala.:

CITY OF DETROIT,
March 10, 1965.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Pursuant to action of the Common Council of the City of Detroit, the following self-explanatory resolution

adopted by that body on March 9, 1965, concerning the Selma, Ala., situation, is hereby forwarded to you:

"RESOLUTION BY ALL MEMBERS OF THE COMMON COUNCIL

"Whereas the right to vote and the right to assemble peacefully are both basic rights guaranteed to all Americans by the Federal Constitution; and

"Whereas the Negro citizens of Selma, Ala., having been denied the right to register to vote and having sought peacefully to assemble to protest that fundamental denial were recently savagely beaten and flogged and gassed by the local and State police of that city and State; and

"Whereas such barbaric behavior as was recently practiced in Alabama is an affront to every decent American of whatever race, religion, or nationality, as well as a pertinent measure of the distance we have yet to travel to approach the Great Society; and

"Whereas the great sin of our day and of our land is silence and indifference in the face of evil action: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Comon Council of the City of Detroit, on behalf of its citizens of many races, religions, and nationalities joins fairminded Americans everywhere in deploring the vicious spectacle of Selma and in offering its hope and its compassion to all the people of Alabama that they may desist from violence and accept and support the law of the land; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Detroit Common Council call on President Johnson to review the situation in Selma, which is symbolic of some other sections of the South as well, and to take appropriate executive actions to assure to the citizens of Alabama, white and Negro alike, the full protection of the law, including the right to assemble peaceably and the right to register to vote without harassment, and the right to vote, which are rights to which every American is entitled; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Johnson, members of the Michigan Congressional delegation, Gov. George Wallace, to the Mayor of Selma, Ala., and to Dr. Martin Luther King.

"Adopted as follows:

"Yeas—Councilmen Brickley, Connor, Ravitz, Rogell, Van Antwerp, Wierzbicki and President Carey—7.

"Nays—Councilman Poindexter—1."

Respectfully yours,

ERNEST JONES,
Deputy City Clerk.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, because of the enthusiasm with which my constituents greeted my newsletter format in the last Congress, I am going to pursue the same procedure during the current session. My periodic reports will continue to provide voters with a rundown on each rollcall and quorum call. I shall continue tabulating the yeas and nays on every proposal which comes before us, including how I voted on the particular bill. On those measures of greatest significance, without regard to controversy, I shall continue to explain why I voted as I did.

My first rollcall report of the 89th Congress therefore contains commentary on the seating of the Mississippi delegation, revision of House rules, supplying surplus agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic, U.S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank, public hearings on appropriations for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the Appalachia redevelopment bill.

ROLLCALL NO. 3—MISSISSIPPI DELEGATION

On opening day an attempt was made to block the seating of five Mississippi Congressmen on grounds that the right to vote in that unfortunate State is systematically denied to Negroes by discriminatory registration laws. Impetus for challenging the Mississippi delegation came from the Freedom Democratic Party which last year held its own congressional election and elected three candidates whose names did not appear on the State's regular November 4 ballot.

Before voting on the seating issue I paused for considerable introspection and careful examination of the arguments presented by both sides. Because I could not in good conscience follow the dictates of my heart instead of my head, I voted to seat the members who had been elected under constitutional provisions—the regular Mississippi delegation. It was a difficult decision to reach. I have great sympathy for the cause of civil and human rights. I revere and will fight for the right of free men to exercise their political judgment at the ballot box. There is today no question that many free men in Mississippi and other States are being denied this right by discriminatory registration procedures.

But the fact that Mississippi has abused the Constitution by not complying with the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and the entire 15th amendment is not, in my judgment, the failing of the five Congressmen elected under Mississippi law. Rather, it points to the failure of Congress and the courts to insure that provisions of the 14th and 15th amendments were not abridged by the Mississippi legislature and other State officials.

EX POST FACTO

Another consideration which influenced my vote: The Constitution provides that "No * * * ex post facto law shall be passed." In other words, a person may not be convicted of an offense committed prior to passage of a law that made such an act an offense. Certainly, there was no precedent for denying the Mississippi congressmen-elect—duly certified under Mississippi law—their seats on the basis of undocumented voter discrimination charges. To do so, in my opinion, would have been tantamount to the Congress itself denying constitutional guarantees to its members-elect via an ex post facto law.

Following its failure to oust the Mississippi delegation, the Freedom Democrats wisely and properly began building a legal case by gathering factual evidence and relegating emotions to a secondary position. Bringing in civil rights lawyers to assist them, they found an 1851 Federal statute to require testimony from witnesses in support of their challenge. This left such officials as the attorney general, the secretary of state and the head of the Mississippi highway patrol no choice but to answer summons to give depositions regarding voter discrimination. So far about 30 volumes of testimony from Mississippi voting and voter intimidation cases have been compiled for submission to the House if and when the Freedom Democrats again attempt to unseat the present delegation. It should also be noted that all of Mississippi's voting statutes and three constitutional provisions on voting are up for a test before the U.S. Supreme Court.

VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mississippi is not the only State accused of discriminatory registration procedures. Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Virginia must stand and face the same charge. It is because voter discrimination is widespread in the South that the President this week sent Congress a bill to guarantee voting rights to all Americans. I echo the President's sentiments when he said:

> The challenge facing us is clear and immediate—it is also profound.
>
> The Constitution is being flouted.
>
> The intent of Congress expressed three times in the last 7 years is being frustrated.
>
> The national will is being denied.
>
> The integrity of our federal system is in contest.
>
> Unless we act anew, with dispatch and resolution, we shall sanction a sad and sorrowful course for the future. For if the 15th amendment is successfully flouted today, tomorrow the first amendment, the fourth amendment, the fifth amendment, the sixth and eighth—indeed all the provisions of the Constitution on which our system stands—will be subject to disregard and erosion.

It is for these reasons that the President has asked the Congress, under power granted to it by the 15th amendment, to enact his voting rights proposal. As I indicated in my remarks a moment ago, failure to act in the past has not been the failing of the members from Mississippi alone. It has been a failing of the Congress. But I am confident that in the days ahead it will act with vigor and dispatch to meet its commitments, not only to itself, but to all Americans.

ROLLCALL NO. 4—RULES CHANGES

The permanent rules changes adopted by the House on opening day were aimed at sharply curtailing the Committee on Rules' ability to block the flow of legislation to the floor. For years this committee, dominated by an ultraconservative coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats, has been a graveyard for progressive proposals which cleared the committee of origin. Without a rule a bill cannot move to the floor. Without a rule there can be no debate. Without a rule there can be no vote. Without a rule the democratic process cannot function in the greatest democracy the world has ever known.

There were three rules changes. One reinstituted—on a permanent basis—the 21-day rule. It permits the Speaker to recognize a committee chairman who wants to bring up a measure which has cleared his committee but has been bottled up by the Committee on Rules for 21 days.

Another change permits the Speaker to recognize a motion which would allow a bill to go to conference by simple majority vote. Previously the objection of only one member to a conference was enough to require routing a conference request to the Committee on Rules, or else obtaining a two-thirds majority vote on the motion. The history of the Congress shows that many measures, passed in varying forms by both Houses, failed of enactment because the Rules Committee refused to permit compromise discussions between both bodies.

The third change was designed to circumvent a delaying tactic sometimes used to stall final voting for a brief period, usually overnight. A member no longer has the right to demand a final copy of a bill, with the text as amended by the House and certified by the Clerk, before it is considered for final passage.

I voted for all three changes with the conviction that they will do much to facilitate majority rule in the House.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 7 AND 10—AID TO EGYPT

When the House first voted on the resolution to ban further commodity shipments to the United Arab Republic, I was in California to fulfill a speech commitment. Had I been present, I would have voted for the amendment cutting off aid to Nasser. I had the opportunity to do so when several days later I voted for House conferees to hold firm and reject the Senate's position of giving aid to the United Arab Republic under title I of Public Law 480, the Food for Peace program.

By word and action, Mr. Speaker, the record shows that I am a strong supporter of foreign aid, but only when the program is formulated and implemented along lines of enlightened self-interest. I believe the U.S. aid program should be designed to achieve economic and social goals which will make freedom more attractive than communism to the underdeveloped and emerging nations of the world. For more than a decade we have moved in this direction and in so doing we have achieved worthwhile political ends.

Heretofore we have practiced selectivity in dispensing aid. We have denied assistance to such blatantly hostile, although underdeveloped, nations as Cuba, Communist China, and Albania. On the other hand, we have given limited assistance to such Communist countries as Yugoslavia and Poland because we believed it in our interest to lessen their dependence on the Soviet Union. We attempted to crack the "monolith" and have had some measure of success.

GAMAL NASSER

For many years we have given aid to the United Arab Republic, not only to further the economic and social progress of the Egyptian people but also to exert some political influence over their dictator, Gamal Nasser. The record shows that our policy has failed on both counts. I regret that it has failed, but the fact remains.

It has failed because of only one person—Gamal Nasser. He has taken our aid only to divert Egypt's own resources to military adventurism inimical to world peace. Mainly for this reason the United Arab Republic has not achieved the economic and social stability for which we had hoped.

Nasser has kept the pot boiling in the Middle East for many years. Almost daily he threatens Israel with destruction. Border clashes have become commonplace. He has devoted substantial resources and energy to the development of a missile capability which we must presume would be used against Israel. He has plotted and promoted a scheme to deprive Israel of its fair share of Jordan waters. He has been the aggressor in Yemen and has boasted of his active support of the Congolese rebels. He has tacitly permitted and encouraged mob attacks on U.S. property in Egypt. Gamal Nasser has become synonymous with agitation, subversion, and unrest.

Mr. Speaker, there is a limit to how far the American people can go in assisting a regime that constantly works to promote unrest in the world instead of peace and stability. Nasser's insults are not nearly as important as his actions, but his words too are worth considering. Since he has so forcefully stated his willingness to get along without further American aid, I think the time has come to let him do just that.

I regret the House's original position on this vital issue was not sustained, but I trust it has given an accurate sounding of American public opinion to those who carry out our foreign policy.

Rollcall No.	Date	H.R. No.	Vote				Brief description
			R.B.C.	Yea	Nay	Not voting	
1	Jan. 4		Present				Rollcall by States of Representatives-elect.
2	Jan. 4		McCormack				Election of Speaker—straight partisan vote: McCormack, 289; Ford, 139.
*3	Jan. 4	H. Res. 1	Yea	276	149	0	Authorizing Members-elect from Mississippi to be sworn into office.
*4	Jan. 4	H. Res. 8	Yea	224	201	6	Revision of House rules to expedite flow of legislation.
5	Jan. 19		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, of Illinois. (99 Members absent.)
6	Jan. 19	H. Res. 126	Yea	245	102	84	To dismiss contest on seating of Representative Ottinger, Democrat, of New York.
*7	Jan. 26	H.J. Res. 234	Not voting	204	177	53	Amendment to agriculture appropriation bill which precludes shipment of surplus commodities to Egypt (R.B.C. in California).
8	Feb. 4		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Flynt, Democrat, of Georgia. (80 Members absent.)
9	Feb. 8		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (46 Members absent.)
*10	Feb. 8	H.J. Res. 234	Yea	161	241	29	Motion that House sustain original position (Rollcall No. 7) and instruct conferees to disagree with Senate position which would permit shipment of surplus commodities to Egypt.
11	Feb. 9		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida. (69 Members absent.)
12	Feb. 9	3818	Nay	93	289	51	Motion to recommit bill to eliminate requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities.
13	Feb. 9	3818	Yea	300	82	51	On passage of bill to eliminate certain Federal Reserve requirements.
14	Feb. 10		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Fuqua, Democrat, of Florida. (98 Members absent.)
15–18	Feb. 17–18		Absent				During this period R.B.C. was an official delegate to the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference; there was 1 rollcall on the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency authorization bill and 3 quorum calls.
*19	Feb. 18	45	Nay	142	237	54	Motion to recommit bill authorizing U.S. participation in resources of Inter-American Development Bank.
*20	Feb. 18	45	Yea	288	93	52	On passage of bill authorizing U.S. participation in resources of Inter-American Development Bank.
21	Feb. 24		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Baldwin, Republican, California. (55 Members absent.)
22	Feb. 25		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Broomfield, Republican, of Michigan. (50 Members absent.)
*23	Feb. 25	H. Res. 188	Yea	58	332	43	Motion to recommit HCUA appropriation bill with instructions that public hearings be held on justification for funds.
*24	Feb. 25	H. Res. 188	Yea	350	29	45	On passage of HCUA appropriations.
25	Mar. 1		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Aspinall, Democrat, of Colorado. (51 Members absent.)
26	Mar. 1		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Cederberg, Republican, of Michigan. (24 Members absent.)
27	Mar. 3		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Baldwin, Republican, of California. (27 Members absent.)
*28	Mar. 3	S. 3	Nay	100	323	10	Motion to recommit Appalachian redevelopment bill.
*29	Mar. 3	S. 3	Yea	257	165	11	On passage of Appalachian redevelopment bill.
30	Mar. 9		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hays, Democrat, of Ohio. (42 Members absent.)
31	Mar. 10	2	Yea	402	0	31	Amending Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs.
32	Mar. 11		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (42 Members absent.)
33	Mar. 15	4714	Yea	217	113	103	To amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act to correct a legislative oversight (⅔ vote needed for passage; measure defeated).

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance, and a brief explanation is included herein.

Reverend Kaitschuk Leaving Bethel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. RONAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, March 21, the Bethel Lutheran Church of Chicago is giving a farewell dinner in honor of its retiring pastor, the Reverend Oscar C. Kaitschuk, who has served his congregation and church for the past 35 years. Reverend Kaitschuk is leaving Bethel to accept an assignment in California where he will be close to the homes of his two sons.

The 35 years which Reverend Kaitschuk has been pastor of Bethel is but a few months more in time than the tenure of his father, the late Reverend Albert A. Kaitschuk, who preceded his son as pastor of Bethel Lutheran Church. This remarkable record of 70 years of continuous and faithful service from father and son is indeed an outstanding achievement and I am pleased to add my encomium to the tributes that Reverend Kaitschuk will most deservedly receive this Sunday.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article from the Garfielden newspaper noting Reverend Kaitschuk's departure from Bethel Lutheran Church:

REVEREND KAITSCHUK LEAVING BETHEL

Celebration of the 75th anniversary of Bethel Lutheran Church, 130 North Keeler, March 29, will be mingled with sadness for many longtime members of the congregation.

Their pastor for 35 years, the Reverend Oscar Kaitschuk, will preach his last sermon to the congregation March 28, thus ending a 70-year period of service to the local church by the Kaitschuk family.

His father, the late Reverend Albert A. Kaitschuk, came to the church June 5, 1895, when it was only 5 years old, remaining until his death, October 14, 1929, at which time the post was assumed by his son.

A brother, Walter E., served for a month after the death of the elder Kaitschuk and before Oscar was installed.

In the 5 years prior to the assignment of the elder Kaitschuk, Bethel Lutheran had four pastors whose terms of service ranged from 5 to 23 months.

Reverend Kaitschuk, 62, announced this week that he has accepted an assignment to the Redeemer Lutheran Church of Elmonte, Calif., where he and his wife, Victoria, will be close to the homes of their two sons.

William Kaitschuk, manager of the marketing division of the W. R. Grace Co., lives in Granada Hills, Calif., and Robert is a high school teacher in Anaheim, Calif.

Bethel Lutheran was first organized March 29, 1890, and the following year its first building was constructed at 4329 Carroll where the elder Reverend Kaitschuk first preached.

The present building at 139 North Keeler was dedicated in 1911 and 2 years later the parsonage at 4211 West End was built when young Oscar was 10 years old.

Reverend Kaitschuk will preach his first sermon at his new church in California on April 4, the week after his last at Bethel.

A new pastor has not yet been assigned to the local church.

In Tribute to Peter Howard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the death of Peter Howard was a great loss to the people of the United States and to many peoples throughout the world. As the international head of Moral Re-Armament his life was one of accomplishment and dedication. Since his death tributes have been arriving from all parts of the world. Prime ministers, presidents, members of Parliament, students, labor leaders, and many individual citizens have expressed their gratitude for the work of Peter Howard in their countries.

The messages received by Mrs. Howard and the response in the press supplied by Mrs. Adolphus Staton who traveled with Mr. Howard this winter in South America attest to the international character of his witness. I include these tributes here to call them to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, and I add my own word of thanks and farewell:

MESSAGES ALREADY RECEIVED BY MRS. PETER HOWARD ON THE DEATH OF HER HUSBAND

Prime Minister Eisaku Sato, of Japan: "We have a great respect for his distinguished career. Please accept my deep sympathy."

Other Japanese messages include cables from Adm. Ichizo Sugie, chairman of the joint staff council, and former Prime Minister Nobusuke Kishi.

The President of Nigeria, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, and his wife: "We were greatly saddened to learn of the passing of Peter Howard. The ranks may be thinned but the indomitable spirit of Frank Buchman and the eternal truths manifested in his teachings shall continue to be a beacon to guide humanity."

Prime Minister Holyoake, of New Zealand: "I am distressed to learn that Peter Howard passed away. This is a terrible blow. Please convey my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Howard and the family."

The President of the Republic of the Lebanon, Charles Helou: "Having learned of the death of your husband, His Excellency President Charles Helou shares your sorrow and sends you his most sincere sympathy."

The Foreign Minister of the Argentine, Miguel Angel Zavala Ortiz: "Receive my profound sorrow at the death of so worthy a peacemaker."

Former Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, of Germany: "The news of the unexpected homegoing of your husband has moved me very much. I must express to you my heartfelt sympathy. In this confused world Peter Howard has won great benefits for millions of people. They will all honor his memory."

President Chiang Kai-shek, of Taiwan, and Madame Chiang: "We are exceedingly sorry to learn of Mr. Howard's sudden death in South America. He made invaluable contributions to MRA during all these years. Please accept our heartfelt condolences."

RIO DE JANEIRO, February 26.—Cardinal Angelo Rossi, Archbishop of São Paulo, released to the press a copy of his telegram to Mrs. Peter Howard:

"I had the pleasure of knowing your husband personally. When he visited Brazil he spoke and held conferences in our country, and we learned much from him. He left a profound impression. When he visited me I gave him with my whole heart my benediction. I thank God for his marvelous spirit, and to you and your family I extend my deepest compassion for the pain of his loss, which is a universal loss."

Eleven Rio and São Paulo newspapers, eight with front-page pictures and stories, together with the principal papers of the whole country, carry the news of Peter Howard's death.

O Jornal, leader of the Chateaubriand chain, has a second article in 2 days with a bold headline: "Peter Howard Left a Consciousness and Conscience of Moral Rearmament in Brazil." The article continues:

"Peter Howard gave the answer to evil, not just as an internal problem of Brazil, but as the step destined to put the whole of humanity on a new road. A revolution which satisfies the hunger in the spirit of man as well as the hunger in his belly."

O Globo, the paper with the widest national distribution, reports the statement of Gov. Adhemar Barros, of São Paulo State, and the statement of Air Marshal Guedes Muniz under the headline: "Peter Howard Left in Latin America the Torch of His Ideals."

Father Henrique Otte, Rio port chaplain, celebrated mass for Peter Howard at the request of the dockers. He said in his address: "God called him so he could intercede for all the human family for whom he has battled and whom he loved so that moral rearmament can continue in this immaculate spirit."

Meeting above the church after the mass, dockers and their wives committed themselves to raise a thousand portworkers to fight Peter Howard's battle. Taking money from their own pockets, they launched a Peter Howard Memorial Fund for training the young leadership of South America.

Among cables already received are messages from a group of workers at the National Steel Corp., Volta Redonda, and from Sra. Amelia Alves Bastos, president, and other directors, of the Camde Women's Organization which played a central part in the March revolution.

PRESS RESPONSE IN LIMA, PERU, FEBRUARY 25, 1965

All nine papers of Lima carried Peter Howard's death as front page news today.

La Prensa devotes a whole page to Howard with three pictures and an extensive feature article. Extracts follow:

"The death of Peter Howard is a harsh blow for thousands of men and women all over the world who, like himself, believed and expressed forcefully the need for a peaceful revolution which could engulf the five continents.

"He is the second world leader of MRA the world has lot in less than 3 years. In 1961, the founder of Moral Re-Armament, Dr. Frank Buchman died in Europe at a time when a party of 60 men and women were in Lima with the play, 'The Tiger,' which was performed at the National Stadium. Now Peter Howard dies when he was in Latin America for the second time and for the first time in Peru. He was able only to hold a press conference in Lima. Previously he had spoken to crowds in Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina. He was invited to Colombia.

"He believed it was possible to achieve without bloodshed a better world, without poverty, without wars, in which Communists and non-Communists could live in peace. This was the message he was bringing to Peru and which he was hoping to convey to the students, the professionals, and statesmen as he did in the other countries he visited.

"LEADERS OF THE WORLD WERE HIS FRIENDS

"Peter Howard was a personal friend to the leaders of many nations. He had held

important conferences with Chancellor Adenauer, President Saragat, Prime Minister Kishi and Prime Minister Sato, of Japan, Nehru and Shastri of India, Kenyatta of Kenya. He traveled all over the world and was 10 times in Asia. He was a personal friend of Churchill. During a tour through the United States he met with Kennedy.

"To them all he spoke as he did in Lima in his first and only press conference of important political, ideological, and social questions in today's world. He declared himself in favor of 'legislation which puts an end to injustices of all kinds but which also could face the steely selfishness and flames of hate which are destroying humanity.'

"Tall, lean with an impressive square jaw, he had great vitality and convincing power. Even the night before his death, when nothing foreshadowed the end, he talked with the doctors who were looking after him. His body will be taken to London where the funeral service will be held, then buried near his farm in Suffolk.

"But Peter Howard, a man who always said that as a good player he had played all out up to the last minute of the game, played his last match in Lima, and though it was brief, he played it well."

LIMA, PERU, February 26.—Peter Howard today continued in death the battle to which his life was given. His body lay in state for 13 hours in Lima City Hall, where a uniformed civic guard was placed on special duty.

At 8:30 a.m. crowds gathered at the main entrance, which is used only for special occasions, to see the black mahogany casket carried in and up the marble staircase by eight men representing several Latin American countries and including former Communist students of San Marcos University. Ahead of the casket marched Piper Sandy Gordon playing the Scottish laments, "The Death of the Chief" and "Loch Aber No More."

The casket was placed in the Salon Atahualpa, flanked by six tall silver candlesticks and a 10-foot crucifix. Sunshine flooded in through windows overlooking the tree-lined Plaza de Armas, the cathedral, and the Presidential Palace.

The casket was covered with the Union Jack and surrounded by banks of floral tributes from the people of Lima. Nearby was a leatherbound book bearing the arms of Peru, for the signatures of the hundreds of visitors who filed by all day long. The Peruvian flag was displayed in the room by special permission of the Foreign Office.

Commenting on the way the Peruvian Government and the city of Lima were honoring Mr. Howard, a foreign diplomat said, "This has never happened before."

In the course of the morning a requiem Mass of the third day was sung in the Church of San Francisco by Father Jose Mojica, who is known throughout Latin America.

USIA's Kennedy Film

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have made my views known on the matter of releasing the USIA film about the late President Kennedy, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums." I am asking that the attached editorial from the Rocky Mountain News, Denver, Colo., of March 14, 1965, be placed in the RECORD so that the Members may have another opinion on this matter:

USIA'S KENNEDY FILM

A basic tenet on which the U.S. Information Agency operates is that its work stops at the water's edge. None of its products is supposed to be used in any way to influence public opinion in the United States.

This was a wise decision by Congress. As an independent agency, the USIA operates entirely at the direction of the President. Its head is a Presidential appointee. Its policy is the policy of the administration in power. For obvious reasons, it must be kept out of the domestic political arena in fairness to both sides.

But now some Congressmen want to make an exception to this rule by releasing a USIA film about the late President Kennedy, subtitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," for commercial showing in U.S. theaters. The House Foreign Affairs Committee, on a party-line vote, has approved the idea.

Republicans, in their minority report, pointed out that many Kennedy policies still are under debate and charged that showing the film could "inject a large emotional content into the consideration of basic public policies that should be judged only on their merits."

The Republicans have a valid point. Not because the late President Kennedy's name should be kept out of political debates—but because the USIA film was made at public expense for the avowed purpose of stirring sympathy for the martyred President and his policies overseas.

The fact that it is excellent makes no difference. The USIA is to be congratulated on doing its job so well that "Years of Lightning" is drawing huge crowds in foreign theaters. That does not alter the main point at issue, however.

Congress should reject the request. One exception would set the stage for others, until eventually USIA propaganda products might be used domestically whenever the majority party thought it wou.d produce votes for them.

Why We Need a National Humanities Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, no member of the academic community deserves higher praise for building support among professional practitioners of the arts and humanities for a national foundation to promote them than does Dr. Barnaby Keeney, the distinguished president of Brown University. He was chairman of the Commission on the Humanities whose report stirred my own interest in this field. Dr. Keeney has written a most persuasive article, "Why We Need a Humanities Foundation," in the March 20 issue of Saturday Review. I conmend it to the attention of Members of this House:

WHY WE NEED A NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

(By Barnaby C. Keeney, president of Brown University, and chairman of the Commission on the Humanities)

"The humanities are the study of that which is most human. * * * They not only record our lives; our lives are the very substance they are made of. Their subject is every man. We propose, therefore, a program for all people, a program to meet a need no less serious than that for national defense. We speak, in truth, for what is being defended—our beliefs, our ideals, our highest achievements."

With these words we opened the report of the Commission on the Humanities, the first detailed proposal to establish a National Foundation for the Humanities. The report calls for a foundation to provide the kind of support for the humanities and the arts that the National Science Foundation has given the sciences and mathematics. It is the product of 2 years of the commission's work.

The commission—established by the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa—met frequently during 1963 and 1964. Its members are humanists, scientists, educators and educational administrators, and business and professional men.

We very quickly agreed upon the principal recommendations and thus had ample time to discuss the illiteracy and folly of the several successive members who attempted to draft the report. We defined the humanities as the study of languages, literature, history, and philosophy; the history, criticism, and theory of art and music; and the history and comparison of religion and law. We placed the creative and performing arts within the scope of the foundation on the grounds that they are the very substance of the humanities and embrace a major part of the imaginative and creative activities of mankind. We proposed that a national foundation, supported largely but not entirely by Federal appropriations, be established to promote the development of these activities, but by no means to control them. We proposed that the foundation be authorized to support humane studies and artistic activities through the whole of our national life—in the schools, in the colleges and universities, in the libraries, museums, art galleries, and in the theater and the concert hall. In short, we envisaged the foundation, not entirely or even primarily as an academic enterprise, but rather as one that would attempt to touch every facet of American life. We proposed that the foundation be empowered to help institutions and organizations develop their programs and to help individuals develop their scholarly and creative competence, and to provide facilities where each might function. So much for the proposals.

The proposals were received with unbounded enthusiasm in some quarters, limited approval in others, and silence in some. As expected, most humanists favored the proposals, although some felt that it was more in their interest and in the interest of scholarship to remain aloof from Federal support. It was not surprising that scientists endorsed the proposals (particularly through an editorial in the influential publication Science) for perceptive scientists have long realized that their work is best carried on in a humane environment. In December 1964, the directors of the American Association for the Advancement of Science endorsed a program of Federal support for the humanities.

Two important questions recur in the discussion: the first, Should Federal funds

be used for the humanities and arts? and the second, Should an independent foundation be established or should a program be carried on through existing governmental agencies? I propose to concentrate on these two fundamental questions.

Should Federal funds be used for the humanities and arts? This is, of course, the question that must be answered first. The arguments that Federal funds should not be so used are based on grounds that run from principle through economics to tactics and expediency. The basic fear is that the use of Federal funds in these sensitive areas will lead to control of thought in science and technology. There are good grounds for such a fear. The painting and sculpture aproved by the Soviet Union do not inspire the same admiration as Soviet achievements in physics and in space. On the other hand, however, art subsidized by the French Government has in our times occupied a more important place than science subsidized from the same source. One may suspect that the nature and purpose of the government doing the subsidizing will have something to do with the degree and the effect of control. I myself feel that if the Federal Government in this country ever takes control of the humanities, the arts, and the social studies—or the sciences themselves—it will not be primarily because the Government has spent money on them; it will be because the people of the United States tell their representatives that they wish control to be exercised. If the people make that decision, there will be control whether funds are expended or not. I do not believe they will wish to reach such a decision.

It is sometimes asserted that funds should not be expended on the humanities because we have problems of higher priority and limited funds. The amount that could prudently be expended in a decade would not exceed the amount necessary to get a man on the moon a year earlier than we otherwise might.

The Los Angeles Times approves the humanities, but questions the needs of additional expenditures for them on the grounds that an appropriate number of students study them. This conclusion may have been based upon statistics published by the U.S. Office of Education on earned degrees conferred. In 1962–63 some 88,000 bachelor's degrees were conferred in the arts and humanities, including arts education, whereas 140,000 odd were conferred in the social sciences, mathematics, engineering, the physical sciences, and the biological and health sciences. This would seem to be an appropriate distribution. However, it is a splendid illustration of the danger in reading only the first column of the statistics. Over in the fourth column one finds that only some 1,800 doctorates were conferred in the humanities, while about 7,000 were conferred in the other fields, a most inappropriate distribution of an inadequate total. One must conclude from these data, that the undergraduates studying the humanities a decade from now will be less well taught than students in the other fields, and that the numbers of their teachers will exceed their training.

An argument of expediency is that Federal expenditures in the humanities will discourage private, and particularly foundation, giving. The record, however, shows that private foundations have expended more money and a greater percentage of their funds on the sciences and engineering since the establishment of the National Science Foundation than before. Anyone who has raised money knows that money goes where money is, and he is likely to suspect that abundance of funds, from whatever source, will increase rather than decrease the flow of additional funds.

One of the tactical arguments is based upon the fear that a new foundation will make blunders in its initial gifts, will become the target of congressional criticism and the laughingstock of the public, will quickly disappear and set back rather than advance the cause of the humanities and arts. I see no reason to believe that the sort of board and director proposed for the Foundation would make any more stupid mistakes than any other board and director, and I suspect that they would be able to defend themselves and their decisions.

Finally, some mature humanists have argued that funds are not necessary at all, that they themselves starved in their youth and it was good for them, and that their intellectual offspring should starve as well. Poverty is a virtue greatly overrated by those who no longer practice it.

The arguments for the use of Federal funds to support the humanities range likewise from principle to expedience, and even to nonsense. I shall start with the last. Some humanists are likely to say in private and in public: "I am a humanist. I like doing my research. I am as important as the scientist. Do not ask me what my research is good for, because any consideration of utility would destroy its purity. Just give me some money." The more often this argument is asserted, the less likely is the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, because our Congress has no right to spend Federal funds for anything that does not offer some promise of advancing the national interest.

Then it is argued that the development of technology and automation and a greatly increased national product will reduce the labor force, and the working day of those who remain in it, to the point where the use of leisure will become an increasingly serious problem. Therefore, we must educate ourselves and our children to use leisure properly and profitably, particularly through the improvement of our minds, and we must provide greater opportunities for study of the humanities and artistic appreciation. This is an important argument, but perhaps a second-rate one. The real problem is not the utilization of leisure, important as that may be, but rather the development of an ethic and an outlook appropriate to new circumstances. We have now an ethic in which work is equated with virtue. Before long we shall have to develop one in which not to work very long for a living and to be content in leisure is as virtuous as labor itself. This will require hard thinking by some well-trained philosophers who have competence outside the area of symbolic logic. We are going to need those philosophers very badly. The use of the freed time is more important than its existence. We can employ it trivially or constructively. Despite the interesting work of intellectual primitives, most enduring literature and art are the product of individuals who possess a body of humane knowledge about which to think, write, or paint, and most social advance is accomplished by persons who know the society and its background.

Then it is argued that history will judge us by our culture rather than by our material accomplishments; therefore, we must polish up our image for the greater edification of future generations and also for the admiration of the underdeveloped nations that are alleged to have great respect for culture and none at all for bathtubs. It is probably a sound rule to believe that one's image will take care of itself if one does what he should—provided always that he has a good public relations man. This argument, therefore, is at best peripheral. Let us instead concentrate on what we should do.

The humanities and arts are of central importance to our society and to ourselves as individuals. They at once express and shape our thoughts. They give us the beautiful to see and teach us what to look for. The development of thought undoubtedly reflects institutions and circumstances, but these are shaped by ideas. The two are, in fact, inseparable. Our relations to one another as individuals and to our society are formed and determined by what we know and think. Our use of knowledge is inseparable from our ability to express it in words or in shapes. Only through the best ideas and the best teaching can we cope with the problems that surround us and the opportunities that lie beyond these problems. Our fulfillment as a nation depends upon the development of our minds, and our relations to one another and to our society depend upon our understanding of one another and of our society. The humanities and the arts, therefore, are at the center of our lives and are of prime importance to the nation and to ourselves. Simply stated, it is in the national interest that the humanities and arts develop exceedingly well.

Finally, an argument of expediency: as in all matters relating to education and our development as a nation, we must move rapidly. We cannot postpone the solution of central problems. We must, therefore, produce massive support quickly. The most likely source of massive support today is the Federal Government.

Now the second question is: Should there be an independent foundation or should the humanities and the arts be supported through an existing agency? Congressmen have a natural disinclination to proliferate the already large number of independent executive agencies. It has been proposed, therefore, that support of the humanities be achieved through the enlargement of the charter of the National Science Foundation, or by an increased appropriation to the U.S. Office of Education, or through the Smithsonian Institution. It has been alleged, and with good reason, that those agencies with which a Cabinet officer is directly concerned are more likely to flourish, year in and year out, than those that depend directly upon the President. The past 2 years have been more abundant for the National Institutes of Health, under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, than for the National Science Foundation, responsible directly to the President.

The National Science Foundation has done a remarkable job and has plenty to do. Its board and its staff are oriented toward science, although many of them have a humane outlook as broad as most humanists and broader than some. The Commission believed that it would distract the National Science Foundation from its primary aims to have its task enlarged and diversified, and that its work might thereby be hampered. It is quite true, however, that the sciences and humanities can be, and for many years have been, developed together in our universities. As for the Office of Education, it has long been associated with secondary and primary education, but in recent years, particularly since the passage of the National Defense Education Act, it has concerned itself increasingly with higher education and has served it very well. It now has power and funds to conduct limited activity in the humanities, and should be encouraged to do so. Were the Commissioner of Education a Cabinet officer instead of a second-echelon officer in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there would be greater validity in the argument that no foundation is needed, and that all that is necessary can be done by the Office of Education. (In January 1965, bills were introduced into the Senate by Senator RIBICOFF and into the House by Representative FOGARTY to raise the Commissioner of Education to Cabinet rank.) Moreover, the Office of Education is intended to be concerned exclusively with education. We envisage the National Humanities Foundation as having a much broader charter in activities extending into other facets of public and private life. Therefore, the Commission on the Humanities believed that it

would be best to advocate a separate foundation.

How shall one proceed from this time on? When the Commission wrote its report, it seemed unlikely that any powerful member of the executive branch would advocate the establishment of a Foundation for the Humanities in an election year. However, President Johnson in an address at Brown University on September 28, 1964, said: "The values of our free and compassionate society are as vital to our national success as the skills of our technical and scientific age. And I look with the greatest of favor upon the proposal by President Keeney's Commission for a National Foundation for the Humanities." It did not seem probable that legislators seeking reelection would feel it timely to make a very strong case, but Representative MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, introduced legislation to establish a Humanities Foundation and the proposal of Senator PELL, of Rhode Island, to establish an Arts Commission and Foundation was enacted, but inadequately funded.

In the 89th Congress, there was an immediate growth of support. Sixty-three Representatives introduced a revised version of Representative MOORHEAD's bill. Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, on behalf of himself and 29 other Senators, introduced substantially the same bill into the Senate. On behalf of himself and nine other Senators, Senator PELL introduced a considerably expanded proposal, giving more prominence to the arts, and establishing two divisions, one for the humanities and one for the arts. The same bill was introduced into the House by Representative FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, and others. By January 13, 83 Congressmen had introduced or endorsed one bill or the other and 35 Senators had endorsed one or both. Each bill has great merit. Representative MOORHEAD's is simpler; Senator PELL's is more comprehensive.

Considerable public support has been marshaled, and more is being sought. The Association of American Universities has endorsed the establishment of a foundation for the humanities, as have other educational associations. Numerous learned societies have done the same. On December 16 the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois voted "to support the action of the Association of American Universities endorsing the idea" of the foundation. Members of Phi Beta Kappa, including many Members of Congress, have been active. Advocates of the legislation are seeking the support of the alumni of colleges and universities, and of the even more numerous alumni of schools. Teachers in schools and colleges are working together to develop a climate of opinion favorable to support of the humanities and the arts.

As the developments occur, it is essential that humanists and artists and amateurs believe and act as if we believed that what we study, write, create, and advocate is relevant to our whole society. We shall not go far unless we do, and, we shall be misrepresenting what we do unless we realize and proclaim that the humanities and the arts are as important as men's minds and souls, and must be nourished as they are.

Rev. James Reeb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, no one in America could fail to be moved and shocked by the tragic death of Rev. James Reeb. For those of us in Massachusetts his passing came as a double blow—not only did it shame our conscience that such a thing could happen in our country, but it took from us a tremendous force for good and hope for the people of the Commonwealth.

From the small child who said, "Jim was my friend," to the colleagues who praised Reverend Reeb as a man of peace, everyone has spoken well of this fine man of God.

On Sunday, March 14, the Boston Globe published two thoughtful studies of Reverend Reeb. One, by Brendan Malin, concerns the comments of those with and among whom he worked. The other, by Gloria Negri, tells us of Reverend Reeb's preparation for the outstanding work he did here in Washington and then in Boston.

I include both of these articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks:

ROXBURY REMEMBERS MARTYRED CLERIC: 'JIM WAS MY FRIEND,' SAYS BOY OF 8

(By Brendan Malin)

The boy's eyes were a cloud of grief as he asked:

"Think Jim will be all right?"

You couldn't answer the question then because the news said that Rev. James J. Reeb—"Jim" to this Roxbury Negro youngster of 8—was on the fringe of death in a Birmingham, Ala., hospital.

And Billy Golson, one of a family of eight, crowded into a beat-up Blue Hill Avenue apartment, wanted desperately to know just what was going on in that hospital.

Because, as Billy put it in a wisper, "Jim was my friend" as the Universalist-Unitarian minister has been to scores of low-income families in the same district.

"He used to come to our home often," said Billy Golson "to talk to my father and mother about the house and things. And he was real funny, Jim took our photographs—and he had a wire recorder. He'd play it for us. Jim was great, great."

Mrs. Walter Golson's children range in age from 2 to 13 and "since this thing happened in Alabama," she can't get them to bed nights.

"They just sit there watching the TV—and listening."

"He was such a kind man," says Mrs. Golson, "always trying to help with better housing and asking how the kids were making out. He was our friend all right."

As director of the low-income housing project sponsored by the American Friends Service Committee in Metropolitan Boston, Reverend Reeb was a welcome visitor in the dreary beehive of congested apartments where hundreds of Negro families try to reach maturity.

Tirelessly he led the crusade for community action to improve living conditions.

In his Blue Hill Avenue office of the service committee he had assembled a seemingly endless list of families who needed rescue from the depression of dilapidated surroundings. He was crusader and comrade at the same time.

Bob Gustafson, community fieldworker with the service committee, analyzed him this way:

"Above all, Jim Reeb wanted to give the people confidence in themselves. He was warmhearted and frank and he sought to imbue the spirit of determination."

After a disastrous fire evicted 25 families from Hammond Street, Roxbury, last December, Reverend Reeb worked around the clock for their resettlement.

"And it did not end there," says Bob Gustafson. "He followd through to insure that the uprooted families were properly cared for. Time after time, he would call at their new homes, noting complaints and working tirelessly to put them right."

One of the families so relocated, the Claytons with six children, moved into a nice apartment in Annunciation Road, Dorchester, last January. "His work helped us to come here," said Mrs. Clayton.

The Zollarcoffers, of Lorne Street, have eight children and soon after they moved in last December, Reverend Reeb checked on their problems.

"Only today did I realize that this kind man was the victim of the Alabama attack," said Mrs. Edna Zollarcoffer.

"He was with us about a month ago and I was telling him about the improvements which we had carried out in our apartment. He was so happy about it. But at Christmas time the heat wasn't coming through and there was a short in the electricity; it looked like no Christmas tree. He worked on all these complaints for us. We loved to see him coming into the house because he was the kindest man I have ever met."

Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, minister of Arlington Street Unitarian-Universalist Church, has been a close friend of Reverend Reeb since he became associate minister in Washington, D.C.

"He left Washington," said Reverend Mendelsohn, "because Boston provided a full-time opportunity to engage in the type of community work dear to his heart.

"And he brought a new sense of hope to the Roxbury area," he added. "He encouraged downtrodden people to think more hopefully, to realize that they could do a good deal about their own problems, once they were shown the way."

"His primary interest was in housing, education, and recreational facilities. He was an exceptionally able promotor of the community spirit, and he succeeded in coordinating the work of many organizations—religious and nonreligious—to this end."

Reverend Reeb, his wife and family of four children, were members of the Arlington Street Church congregation.

"All four children attended Sunday school here," said Reverend Mendelsohn, "and were extremely bright and warmhearted, like their father."

George Ray, assistant executive secretary, of the American Friends Service Committee, told the Globe that the organization was set up by the Society of Friends (Quakers) and provided scope for members of all religions to engage in community work.

"It was through this organization," said Ray, "that Reverend Reeb came to Boston. His work on low-income housing only began here in October but he had already many achievements to his credit. He moved among the people and no trouble was too great for him in searching out and solving their problems."

In the committee's Blue Hill avenue office over the weekend, Reverend Reeb's desk was vacant.

By its side, a prayer reads:

"Grant us peace fearlessly to contend against evil and to make no peace with oppression and, that we may reverently use our freedom, help us to employ it in the maintenance of justice among men and nations."

Occasionally, a staff member would call Selma to ask about Rev. Jim Reeb. The answer Thursday evening was tragedy.

REV. JAMES REEB COMMITTED TO OTHERS EARLY: FROM RIGHT SIDE OF TRACKS, HE SAW OTHER SIDE

(By Gloria Negri)

For Rev. James J. Reeb, the road to Selma, Ala., began years ago on the "wrong side" of the tracks in Casper, Wyo.

He was only a junior at Natrona County Memorial High School at the time, but the stirrings that were to make him a martyr

in the cause of brotherhood already had begun.

"I had just taken my first pulpit at Our Savior's Lutheran Church, and Jim came to me about helping out at the local boys' club," Rev. Griffith Williams, now pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Master outside Minneapolis, recalled.

That was in 1944 when Jim Reeb, the only child of Harry and Mae Reeb was living on "the right side" of the tracks in Casper.

The Reebs were not wealthy, but lived comfortably on the elder Reeb's salary as manager of the Western Oil Tool Co. in Casper, where Harry and Mae Reeb still live.

Reverend Williams recalled, "Jim was doing volunteer work at the boys' club when I arrived in Casper. The club was located in the poor north section of town and it was for both Negro and white grade school kids.

"Jim was a Presbyterian at the time, and the only church in the north area was a Presbyterian one, but it did not have a full-time minister, or a program.

"Jim and I worked at the club—working up a sports and team program and teaching religion—until he graduated from high school and went away.

"It was because of what Jim had started that we were able to continue the program after he left and that the Presbyterian Church in the north area has a full-time minister now."

Jim Reeb was born in Wichita, Kans., January 1, 1927. Later, the family moved to Casper. The Reebs still are active in the Presbyterian Church in Casper, and the fact that their son later changed his creed from Presbyterian to Unitarian never has affected their own church work or their relationship with their son.

At Natrona High, Jim was an excellent student and was selected lieutenant colonel in the school's military unit, which made him its commanding officer. He was graduated from Natrona in 1945.

Sometime before he left Casper, Jim met Marie Helen Deason, who also attended Natrona and later Casper Junior College. They were married in August 1950 and had four children, John David, 13; Karen Ruth, 6; Anne Elizabeth, 5, and Steven Douglas, 3.

After he graduated from high school, Jim Reeb spent 2½ years in the Army, serving some time in Alaska. In the fall of 1947, he enrolled at St. Olaf's College, a Lutheran-affiliated college in Northfield, Minn., largely on the recommendation of Reverend Williams, himself an alumnus of St. Olaf's.

"Jim Reeb came to us with an enviable reputation and he left in the same fashion," recalled Mark Almli, dean of men at St. Olaf's.

A history major, Jim Reeb left St. Olaf's cum laude and an honor student.

Dr. Agnes R. Larson, who was head of the history department when Jim was at St. Olaf's, recalled him as "a good serious student, a very fine boy, and very quiet. He was recognized as a serious-minded student and was no troublemaker.

"When Jim expressed an opinion, it was worth hearing. His opinion carried weight among his fellow students," Dr. Larson said.

He graduated from St. Olaf's in midyear 1950 and entered Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J., to prepare for the ministry. "I guess Jim had religion on his mind way back before I met him in 1944," Reverend Williams said.

At Princeton, he was A's and B's all the way, a good student.

James Andrews, assistant to the president of the theological school, who went down for the Selma march, himself, recalled that Jim Reeb had entered Princeton "very highly rated by his references on such things as religious convictions, intelligence and motivation to be of service to other people."

It was while at Princeton that Jim Reeb put his feelings about people—the sick and the underprivileged—to use.

Under a student internship, he served as Presbyterian chaplain at Philadelphia and continued that work there after graduation and during his studies at Conwell School of Theology at Temple University in Philadelphia.

While still at Princeton, Jim Reeb was acting chaplain at Willow Grove Naval Air Station, outside Philadelphia.

A professor at Princeton recalled that Jim Reeb in his hospital chaplaincy, "never went in to a patient with the attitude, 'Well, here I've come to pray with you,' but rather with the approach, 'What are your needs? Let us see what we can do about them.'"

Another recalled, "Jim Reeb was more interested in pastoral work than in preaching. Because of this, he was more than just a student to us."

Dr. W. J. Beeners, professor of speech at Princeton, described Jim Reeb as "a delightful student * * * mild mannered the last kind of person who'd provoke an attack of which he was the victim.

"Jim was greatly concerned about people and their problems. He was interested in psychology and its contributions to the ministry," Dr. Beeners said.

Both Dr. Beeners and Princeton's James Andrews agreed that "whatever Jim did, he did only after deep, careful thought."

This applied to his doctrinal change in 1959 from the Presbyterian Church, into which he had been ordained in 1953, to the Unitarian Universalist Church.

"A man doesn't make these kind of decisions lightly," Andrews said.

"Things that you once viewed important no longer seem important. In such a severe doctrinal change, a man must look at this carefully. It is much to Jim Reeb's credit that he had the courage of his convictions."

While in Philadelphia, Reverend Reeb also worked as youth director at the West Branch YMCA. That was just prior to going to Washington, D.C., as assistant at All Souls (Unitarian) Church.

All Souls is also in a heavily Negro, though integrated, section.

Rev. Duncan Howlett, pastor of All Souls, described his young former assistant as "a man singularly dedicated to high principles . . . with a high concern for all people from all walks of life.

"This concern expressed itself among the poor living near the church, most of whom were Negro. Reverend Reeb took part in community activities with Howard (Negro) University. He had a great feeling for the needs of others.

"This feeling to help doubtlessly is what motivated him to go to Selma, for there, people he could help were suffering. This was a man with fresh ideas, bright intelligence, original and with an extraordinary amount of modesty," Reverend Howlett said.

Jim Reeb came to Boston in September of 1964 to work on low-income housing for the Quaker-sponsored American Friends Service Committee.

His work here already is legendary. How he went into the slums and tried to get landlords to improve living conditions, even in small, minor ways.

But, most of all, he gave the slum-dwellers hope and the knowledge they had a friend in Jim Reeb.

"He loved his work in Boston. He was really in his element," one minister said.

"Jim Reeb," another said, "really practiced what we ministers preach. He lived it every day."

Citizen Support for Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, frequently one hears that our foreign assistance programs are unpopular and that our people are getting tired of paying to keep other nations.

It is often said that no one should overestimate the level of information which the public possesses, nor should one ever underestimate the soundness of their judgment once they know the facts.

U.S. programs of assistance to other nations embrace many kinds of aid, and our aid policies are complex. Yet most people today support the basic concept that we need to help other nations.

This public support is borne out in a recent Minnesota poll conducted by the Minneapolis Tribune. I think that many of my colleagues could take heart from the results of this poll and, for that reason, I am inserting it in the RECORD:

MINNESOTANS DIVIDED ON 1966 FOREIGN AID

Minnesotans take a divided view of how much money the United States should spend on foreign aid during the next fiscal year, the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll finds.

Forty-nine percent of a statewide sampling of voting-age residents would prefer that Congress at least vote as much money as President Johnson requested for foreign aid ($3.38 billion).

Nearly as many State residents (44 percent) think there should be a substantial pruning in the appropriation for foreign assistance. Seven percent are noncommittal.

At the same time, two out of three opinion givers believe the United States has benefited over the long run by having a foreign aid program.

The question was:

"Ever since World War II, the United States has been carrying on a foreign aid program, giving economic and military help to many countries. Do you think our foreign aid program has or has not benefited the United States?"

The replies:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Foreign aid has benefited the United States	66	67	65
Has not	27	29	25
Other answers	4	3	5
No opinion	3	1	5
Total	100	100	100

In a comparable survey taken about a year ago, Minnesotans showed less appreciation for the foreign aid program. Opinions then divided 57 percent that it had benefited the United States and 31 percent that it had not.

In the current survey, farm residents and people in their twenties and thirties are more likely to think the United States has gained by assisting other countries than are other Minnesotans.

Those people who consider the program to be beneficial to the Nation break down into 20 percent who think we have benefited a great deal, 20 percent a fair amount, 24 percent not too much, and 2 percent with no opinion. Total: 66 percent.

Survey respondents next were asked:

"Suppose for a moment that the United States stopped foreign aid altogether; what do you think might happen as a result?"

The answers:

	Percent
Communism would spread, countries would turn to Communist bloc for help	29
United States would lose friends, prestige would suffer	16
War would break out	10
People would starve or suffer	9
Other answers	40
Nothing would happen	7
Don't know	13
Total	124

The column totals to more than 100 percent because many persons supplied more than one answer.

These are some of the miscellaneous explanations given: the countries then would learn to stand on their own feet; it would mean chaos for us; it would upset the world economy; we would have a surplus of food and manufactured goods, and lose foreign trade; U.S. prestige would rise; we could help our own country more; we should be selective about giving aid; we should not stop the aid program, it wouldn't be right.

The final question dealt with the decision before Congress this year:

"Congress provided $3¼ billion in foreign aid this year and is considering a similar request for 1966. Which would you prefer, that Congress vote about as much money as was requested, substantially more, or substantially less?"

The responses:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Prefer Congress vote:			
Substantially more	3	3	2
About as much money as requested	46	43	48
Substantially less	44	49	39
Other answers	2	2	3
No opinion	5	3	8
Total	100	100	100

The above opinions closely match those recorded last year, even though the 1964 survey did not have a question which speculated about doing away with the foreign aid program.

Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution of the membership of the Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center, 15756 Lesure, Detroit, Mich., on the 714th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian state and the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania.

This important resolution deserves careful consideration by all who are interested in the freedom of the United States and the restoration of liberty to captive nations behind the Iron Curtain.

The resolution follows:

"Whereas this year we are making the 714th anniversary since the founding of the Lithuanian State, and the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania; and

"Whereas this year also marks the 25th year of Soviet occupation and subjugation of Lithuania and oppression and exploitation of the Lithuanians residing in their homeland; and

"Whereas during this past quarter of a century the Soviets have continuously strived to obtain recognition by the free world for their forcible annexation and colonialization of Lithuania, and her Baltic sister States of Latvia and Estonia; and

"Whereas the liberation of former colonies continues at a rapid pace, which the Soviet Union ardently 'champions' said liberations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America; that same Soviet Union has denationalized, russified and exploited Lithuania and her people; and

"Whereas the opinion of the free nations and free people of the world is to eliminate any kind of colonialism and imperialism: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, we, the Americans of Lithuanian descent living in the greater metropolitan area of Detroit, in the State of Michigan, gathered at Cobo Hall, Detroit, Mich., to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the February 16, 1918, Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, at a rally sponsored by the Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center, hereby firmly resolve to reaffirm our belief in the democratic principles of our Government and pledge our unstinted support to our President and the Congress of the United States to attain lasting peace, freedom, and justice throughout the world.

"We urge the President to raise in all high-level conferences with the rulers of the Soviet Union the issue of the restoration of the right of self-determination to the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and other captive nations.

"We urge our Government to counter Soviet demands on Berlin with the plan for an overall peace settlement based on the right of self-determination and designed to solve all the unresolved consequences of the Second World War in Europe.

"We urge the President to instruct the Ambassador to the United Nations to inscribe the question of the denial of self-determination to the nations of east-central Europe on the agenda of the United Nations. To insist that the United Nations declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples is of universal scope and validity and; accordingly, oppose the double standard gaining ground in the U.N. on self-determination, and to urge the Special Committee of 24 Nations, charged with the implementation of the above declaration, to extend its concern and investigation to the peoples and countries subjected to Soviet colonial rule.

"We urge that our Government maintain carefully the policy of nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

"We urge our Government to be always mindful in their trading policies, of the fact that the interests of the welfare of the captive peoples and of the security of the West are both adversely affected by the preferential treatment given by the Communist regimes in east-central Europe to the development of heavy and armament industries at the expense of the needs of the people concerned. Similarly, to take advantage of trade negotiations in order to press for the suppression of existing prohibitive duties on individual food, medicine and clothing packages from the free world to individuals in the captive countries.

"We further urge that this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Ambassador to the U.N., to the Senators and Congressmen representing Michigan in the U.S. Congress, to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, and to the press, radio, and television media."

Unanimously accepted and adopted at Detroit, Mich., this 14th day of February, in the year of our Lord, A.D. 1965.

RALPH J. VALATA,
Chairman.

MISS DANGUOLE MAJAUSKAS,
Secretary.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 5085–5113

Bills Introduced: 17 bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1547–1563. Page 5086

Authority To Meet: Subcommittee on Investigations of Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet while Senate is in session on Thursday, March 18. Page 5085

Confirmations: The following nominations were confirmed: Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to Iran; Dwight J. Porter, of Nebraska, to be Ambassador to Lebanon; Andrew F. Brimmer, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce; Mary Gardiner Jones, of New York, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner; 1 to a U.N. group; 2 Coast Guard; and 55 Coast and Geodetic Survey. Page 5114

Nominations: One Navy and four Marine Corps nominations were received. Pages 5113–5114

Program for Thursday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 12:47 p.m. until noon Thursday, March 18, when no legislative business is scheduled. Page 5113

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Committee on Banking and Currency: Subcommittee on International Finance continued its hearings on the subject of balance of payments, having as its witnesses Stephen S. Halsey, American Express Co.; Prof. Fritz Machlup, Princeton University; and Prof. Charles Kindleberger, MIT.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

EXPORT EXPANSION

Committee on Commerce: Committee began hearings on S. 558, proposed Export Expansion Act of 1965, with testimony from Representative Adams; Miner H. Baker, president of the Port of Seattle Commission, and vice president of the First National Bank of Seattle; and Frank X. Scafuro, Bank of America, New York City.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

STOCK DIVESTITURE

Committee on Finance: Committee met to receive testimony on the effects of Du Pont-Christiana's divestiture of General Motors stock. Witnesses heard were Sheldon S. Cohen, Commissioner of Internal Revenue Service; and Robert H. Knight, of New York City, formerly General Counsel of the Treasury Department.

Hearings continue on Wednesday, March 24.

FOREIGN AID

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee continued its hearings on S. 1367, fiscal 1966 authorizations for the foreign aid program, with testimony from Senator Proxmire; Jerry Voorhis, the Cooperative League of the USA; Dr. Kenneth L. Maxwell, International Affairs Commission, National Council of Churches; Lois Van Valkenburgh, UNICEF; A. A. Bailey, representing J. Orrin Shipe, Credit Union National Association; Mrs. Thomas Kouzes, National Congress of Parents & Teachers; Dr. N. R. Danielian, International Economic Policy Association; W. B. Hicks, Liberty Lobby; Mrs. Donald Brown, National Council of Jewish Women; Dr. Elgin Groseclose and Gen. Bonner Fellers, Citizens Foreign Aid Committee; and John O. Teeter, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Committee will meet tomorrow in executive session to discuss procedure for consideration of this proposed legislation.

BANK CLOSURES

Committee on Government Operations: The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations continued its hearings to inquire into certain practices which led to the closing of several federally insured banks within the past year, having as its witnesses A. L. Larsen, Regional Comptroller, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, San Francisco; Charles H. McEnerny, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Washington, D.C.; Bradford H. McNutt, a general contractor of San Francisco; and several officials of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

Appendix

A Challenge to American Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with the tremendous population explosion, as well as the trend of living in our large metropolitan areas, many problems have descended upon our cities. We can no longer assume that our cities will grow and prosper naturally; but programs must be proposed, with imagination and foresight, to plan the progress of the future. A step in this direction has recently been taken with the President's proposal for an urban development program.

Recently, the General Electric Forum, a publication of the General Electric Co., devoted an entire issue—that for January-March 1965—to the challenge facing our cities. Because of its interest and timeliness, I ask that the article, on pages 25 through 28, entitled "The Self-Renewing City," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SELF-RENEWING CITY

(By J. Stanford Smith, vice president, marketing and public relations services, General Electric Co.)

Lewis Mumford (in his book, "The City in History") says flatly that the city is civilization. Civilization began with the rise of cities in the valleys of the Euphrates, the Nile, the Indus, and the Yellow Rivers. For 70 centuries—while the great majority of mankind continued to live and labor in small farming villages whose habits even now are little changed from Neolithic times—the cities have provided the propulsive moral and intellectual energies that have carried forward this irrepressible human adventure we call civilization.

It is impossible to conceive of civilization without the great cities—Sumer, Babylon, Jerusalem, Athens, Alexandria, Rome, Constantinople, Venice, Paris, London, New York. And yet it is mystifying to consider the fate of cities. Some, like Sumer and Babylon, flourished for a while, then disappeared. Some, like Alexandria and Constantinople, had great moments, then stagnated. And some, most prominently Rome, seem to be eternal cities, repeatedly energizing new societies to replace those that die out.

Here in the United States, all cities are new by the standards of Europe and Asia. Yet even here, in so short a time, we see the mystery of cities—some flourishing for a while, then dying out, while others seem capable of perpetual self-renewal.

Chicago and San Francisco—like London, Tokyo, and ancient Rome—were once practically wiped out in disastrous fires, yet they rose again like phoenix from the ashes. All of our cities and towns have had to face swift and merciless change as this continent was civilized. Some cities have drawn their energy from change. Others seem unable to absorb change. They decline, become "depressed areas" in the modern term, and seem destined for the scrap heap of history unless they can once more restore their appeal as exciting places to live and earn a living.

For this is the truth that every city must face. No amount of outside aid, from Government or from private philanthropy, can make a city vital. This must come from within, from its own citizens, from the people who care enough for their city to keep it perpetually renewed in the face of every change and challenge.

SELF-RENEWING CITIES

No one would claim to know precisely what it is that gives a city this capacity for self-renewal, but it appears that the communities which thrive through every change have a certain vitality:

Economic vitality. They are good places to earn a living and run a business.

Cultural vitality. They are stimulating places to live and stretch your capacities.

Municipal vitality. They have well-managed municipal services and modern facilities, whether provided by private or public agencies.

Civic leadership. They have citizens who care about their community, and take the initiatives—private and public—to keep the city strong.

1. ECONOMIC VITALITY

A city that has economic vitality is a good place to earn a living and run a business. Private enterprise, in the United States, not only provides over 80 percent of the employment; it also provides the economic base which supports the other institutions that are vital to the community—government, education, religion, health and welfare, and the arts.

The ghost towns, the depressed areas now receiving so much attention in the press, are largely those in which business can no longer do business at a profit. There can be many causes for a depressed business climate—changing technology, exhausted resources, short-sighted management, restrictive labor practices, wasteful government, lethargic civic leadership, and especially failure to stay competitive with other regions or other nations. When the climate for business goes sour, the whole region suffers as its business firms stagnate, or even fail.

This does not mean that businessmen expect special favors from the rest of the community, for business needs good government and education and churches—just as they need profitable income-producing businesses. What is needed, and what the thriving cities have, is a mutual respect and helpfulness between the different elements of the community—each mindful of the needs and contributions of the others.

Recently, Gov. James A. Rhodes, of Ohio, placed some advertisements in the Wall Street Journal that make good sense to businessmen. The ads say, "Profit is not a dirty word in Ohio." Profit is a good word, because it is the incentive and the reward for the enterprises that give any region its economic vitality. Profit means business health; it means staying competitive.

Today, every American city is in direct economic competition with cities in Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, and many other nations. American industry cannot flourish and provide such things as increased jobs in the face of such world competition unless it has the business climate that stimulates economic vitality through profit opportunity.

2. CULTURAL VITALITY

In addition to economic vitality, the self-renewing city has cultural vitality. Its intellectual and artistic communities are joyously alive. Its educational institutions are determined to stretch the capacities of people. Press and pulpit are both responsible and independent. Politics is vigorous, concerned with issues as well as party machinery. The minds and sensibilities of the citizens are stirred with fresh experiences. In short, the self-renewing city is one in which the people themselves feel perpetually challenged to self-renewal.

The greatest resource of any nation is the resourcefulness of its people. Unleashing this great resource is the secret strength of the free society. We can do it by helping each person develop to his full usefulness in accord with his personal interests, abilities, and willingness to work—regardless of race, creed, or color. Education and job opportunities are interrelated at every point in this development process.

BUSINESS AND EDUCATION

Today, on every hand, we can see the interests of businessmen in educational progress. Untold thousands of businessmen serve on local school boards throughout the Nation. The commissioner of education for one of the Nation's most populous States said recently that businessmen, more than any other group, are providing local leadership in getting needed classrooms and higher levels of excellence in public instruction.

Training within industry is also receiving ever-increasing emphasis. In General Electric, for example, one out of every eight employees is—at any one time—taking some company course. That adds up to about 35,000 employee-students at any given time. This number refers to formal course work and is in addition to the normal learning on the job that results in promotions for scores of thousands of employees each year.

Companies are also finding other ways to help the community educational progress. At many General Electric plants, managers work with high school guidance counselors to help students become acquainted with the jobs available in industry. This is proving particularly effective with students of minority groups who may not have motivation for staying in school because they lack confidence that good jobs are available to all who qualify.

Business likewise has an interest and stake in the colleges and universities. Corporate contributions to higher education have risen about 16 percent a year compounded over the past 10 years.

All of us applaud this increased recognition of the common interest of the business and academic worlds. Yet, the facts of life which we must all face are that industry has no support funds except those it collects from customers for products and services—a sobering thought in these days of international competition.

CORPORATE GIFT MATCHING

It seems important that each company should develop its own long-range educa-

tional support program. At General Electric we attempt to make corporate giving a sound business investment. Our program for educational support tries to satisfy the following criteria:

Will it stimulate educational innovation and improvements? Will it help spread benefits beyond the immediate recipients? Will it act as seed money, growing other types of support?

Will it encourage higher levels of excellence in both school and student? Will it help develop a better geographical balance of educational resources?

Guided by these criteria, we have found that corporate support can stimulate fresh aid from many sources. For example, gift-matching, in which alumni contributions are matched in whole or in part, was started by the General Electric Foundation 10 years ago and is now done by 250 corporations or foundations.

Obviously a close relationship between education and business is needed, if our cities are to have the economic and cultural vitality they need. One of the toughest obstacles confronting many companies, according to a recent Wall Street Journal report, is "a general atmosphere of scorn for business among college graduates." Students frequently are taught to believe, says the reporter, that business is intellectually unstimulating, and offers no opportunity to be of service to your fellow man.

These things simply are not true. But if they did represent a trend, the effects on our economy, and on the vitality of our cities, could be disastrous. We must find ways to increase not only the dialogue, but also the mutual understanding and respect between business and education.

3. MUNICIPAL VITALITY

In addition to economic and cultural vitality, the self-renewing city has what I call municipal vitality—well-managed municipal services and modern physical plant and equipment.

There is nothing less attractive than a rundown city—rundown buildings, rundown equipment, rundown services, and usually rundown people. The effect is contagious. The self-renewing city keeps its physical plant and equipment up to date.

Since most of this equipment and many of the services are provided by business enterprises, here is a clear case where civic progress coincides with business opportunity—provided the profit incentive is allowed to operate.

For example, the electrical industry is deeply involved in the movement to improve and renew America's cities—electric power supply, increased electrification in industry, street and highway lighting, water supply and sewage treatment, equipment for schools, hospitals and commercial buildings, all-electric homes and apartments, electric heating and cooling, and rapid transit equipment.

Take just one of these urgent needs: To clean up traffic congestion and move people more swiftly, efficiently, and comfortably in the large metropolitan areas. This simply cannot be done by building more and larger highways into, over, under, and through the cities. And it cannot be done simply by ingenious traffic routing systems.

The real key is a balanced transportation system. By "balanced," I mean a combination of autos on expressways, feeder buses, outlying parking, and high-speed electric transit—each used to its best advantage to enhance the value of the others.

Many of the problems of the city can be solved or alleviated by modern facilities built by industry. And solutions to these problems will come faster if we can bring the profit incentive to bear as we have in upgrading the Nation's living standards and industrial equipment.

INCENTIVE TO INNOVATE

There is a problem here for which I do not know the solution. Over the years, public policy has developed the sealed-bid approach for the purchase of municipal equipment. The public official puts out specifications and the private contractors submit sealed bids. The business almost always goes to the lowest bidder.

Such a purchasing approach gives private enterprise little opportunity to invest in developing the "engineered systems" required by the scope of the problems facing the city today, because the businessman will rarely get paid for his effort. The sealed-bid approach, unfortunately, favors the minimum product that barely meets the specifications, regardless of application or service backup.

Let me cite a typical example. A manufacturer (not General Electric) decided that the cost of educational facilities could be reduced by the module approach. So he developed a system of ingeniously engineered classrooms with standardized equipment to get maximum value for minimum cost. These module classrooms could be combined to produce a school of any size. Then he persuaded a State educational system to try out the idea.

But did the business go to the company that developed the concept and invested in the engineering and demonstration equipment? No; the purchaser bought all equipment piecemeal by means of sealed bids. The business went to companies that had not invested a nickel in developing the new approach. That manufacturer is forced to think twice before he will again invest money in such a venture. There is simply no incentive and no reward for creative innovation under such a purchasing approach. The major losers in such a case are the citizens of our communities. I don't know the answer to this problem. But surely cities that retain their municipal vitality must adopt the best solutions to problems without penalizing the innovator.

4. CIVIC LEADERSHIP

Perhaps the most important characteristic of the self-renewing city is civic leadership. In the cities that thrive, you will always find a body of citizens who care, citizens who are willing to devote some part of their time and energy to the needs of their city. The genius of the American system is that there are millions of free and voluntary centers of initiative.

In the United States, there are nearly 5 million private and competing business firms, each a lively center of initiative, with their results subject to the discipline of profit and loss. There are churches, private schools, colleges, and universities, plus the PTA's and alumni associations that keep the educational pot boiling. There are trade, professional and fraternal associations, labor associations, chambers of commerce, service clubs, conservation leagues, and associations to advance civil rights, veterans' rights, medical care, and a thousand other issues. There are philanthropic foundations, charitable agencies, youth groups, old-age groups, middle-age groups, barbershop singing groups, chamber music groups, and groups dedicated to the development of groups.

We joke about it, but this is the genius of the American system—voluntary action by the citizens to solve their own problems, advance their own causes, and get fun out of doing it. What exuberance. What ferment. What perpetual self-renewal.

None of us can foretell the course of history. Our Nation is young, and our cities are young. But when the long course is run, when representatives of future generations recite the litany of eternal cities, I feel sure that some of the exuberant cities of America will be among them. Which ones? That is for us, the living, to decide.

Patent Office Fees

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House will recall that this is virtually the same bill that was reported and which we debated the better part of one afternoon a year ago last January. I should perhaps correct that statement to say that it does contain one change in that instead of a blanket provision for maintenance fees, there is an optional arrangement whereby the grantee of a patent could by payment of a $75 alternative fee gain a complete remission of the maintenance fees that are otherwise ordered in this bill.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that no hearings have been conducted during this session of the Congress on this bill. My objection to the legislation, just as it was last year, is because of the maintenance fees that this proposal would seek to incorporate into our patent system.

I would certainly say at the outset, I have great sympathy for the objectives of the subcommittee chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, [Mr. WILLIS]. I have great sympathy for the objective they are seeking to attain, namely, increasing the ratio between fee income of the patent office and the operating expenses of that office. But likewise I have great sympathy for those who urge, as I think they did last year, that this is not in line with section 5 of the independent offices appropriation bill of, I believe, 1954, that where there are beneficiaries under our federal system and they can be especially identified as recipients of special services on the part of the Federal Government insofar as possible, they ought to pay for the services that are rendered. I am not adverse to the implementation of that principle.

I would point out that with the introduction of the maintenance fee, however, we will be injecting something entirely new and something entirely different into our patent system and it is something that has not met by and large, as I understand it, and as my communications would indicate, with the approval of the patent bar of this country.

I am informed, for example, that the American Patent Law Association which is a group of more than 2,500 lawyers, took a referendum on this very subject as to whether or not maintenance fees ought to be charged. They found that their members were opposed to maintenance fees and the vote was 948 to 157.

Just this morning before coming here to the floor of the House, and this might be of particular interest to my colleagues

from Illinois whom I see here on the floor of the House, I received a wire from the acting president of the Patent Law Association of the city of Chicago which is composed of approximately 500 Illinois patent attorneys.

That wire reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL.,
March 16, 1965.

ILLINOIS DELEGATION,
Care of Hon. JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Because it imposes hardships on individual inventors and for reasons stated in resolutions relating to Willis bill, H.R. 8190, submitted to the Patents Committee last year the Chicago Patent Law Association composed of approximately 500 Illinois attorneys opposes passage of Willis bill, H.R. 4185.

SIDNEY NEUMAN,
Acting President.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that this bill has not found favor among the patent bar of this country.

It is said, of course, that this maintenance fee is going to accomplish some useful purposes, that it is going to help clear out the files. I believe that is the expression used. It is said there is some deadwood in the form of patents which are on file but yet are not used for any particular purpose.

On the other hand, we find that the associations representing industry in this country are opposed to maintenance fees in principle. At least I have been so informed, and I believe the record will bear me out.

Some Members who perhaps are not familiar with this objection I am raising will ask: What is a maintenance fee? What difference does it make?

Very simply stated, a maintenance fee would provide that an inventor, on the fifth anniversary of the issuance of his patent, would have to pay a fee of $50 to the U.S. Patent Office to keep that patent in full force and effect. If he did not pay the fee within the 6-month grace period, the patent would lapse. After 9 years had gone by, on the ninth anniversary of the issuance of the patent another fee would become due and payable. Then he would have to pay $100 to keep the patent in full force and effect. After 13 years had gone by, a third maintenance fee of $150 would become due and payable or else he would lose his patent rights which otherwise, of course, exist under our law for 17 years.

So there is a total of $300 which would be charged to the inventor under the maintenance-fee system to keep his patent in full force and effect. This, I remind Members, would be in addition to the increased fees both for the issuance of the patent and for the initiation of the application under H.R. 4185.

Mr. Speaker, it can be shown that this proposal will work to the disadvantage of the small inventor. The big business corporation can afford to pay such maintenance fees. It will not make any difference to them to pay $50, $100, or $150. But the small inventor or the small businessman is going to have some difficulty.

I do not see present on the floor at this time the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], but the gentleman from New York pointed out in the debate last year—and this was not refuted in the RECORD—there was a small corporation in his district, with something like 375 plant patents, which would, by the end of 13 years, have to pay more than $100,000 in maintenance fees under the language of the bill we had before us last year.

I submit that this will be a hardship on the small businessman or the small inventor.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WILLIS. We must face the fact that the purpose of the bill is to capture more funds for the operation of the Patent Office. There is no doubt about that.

The maintenance fee is a novel approach, but the purpose of the maintenance fee, I must say to the gentleman, is the exact reverse of what he has said.

Granted that we must have more revenues for the Patent Office, then the question is at what point to impose a charge. It is clear that the rich or the powerful, the corporate patent applicant, would indeed have the money to pay an additional charge from the word "go" upon the issuance of the patent. The idea of imposing the maintenance fee was to favor the small patent applicant. In other words, instead of having to pay an additional sum at the beginning, he would have 5 years in which to make up his mind whether his patent was profitable, and he could drop it. If he wanted to keep it, at that point he would pay $50 additional, and then another amount at the end of the 9th year, and another amount at the end of 13 years. The idea of that was to give a small patent owner an opportunity to make up his mind whether it was worth while to keep his patent, not imposing the additional fee to begin with.

Now, however, in order to overcome objections to the deferred payment or maintenance fee, in order to meet this very point, this should remove the objection of the gentleman: This year the bill provides that a patent applicant has an option. In other words, he can pay $75 at the time of notice of allowance in lieu of all maintenance fees. That should satisfy, I submit, most of the objections to the deferred payment. Or, at his option, the patentee can wait and pay the additional fees after 5, 9, and 13 years. This should dispose of the entire objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from Louisiana and the fact that this year he has, so to speak, thrown us a bone in the form of this $75 optional payment. I would prefer to have a flat payment of $75 in the bill and forget about maintenance fees.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois yield at that point?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois is familiar with how much it presently costs to print one of these patents at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am familiar with the total cost of the operation of the office. It is something like $26 million a year, I believe.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman is talking about the $75 fee. I would just like to call his attention to the fact that before my subcommittee on appropriations for the Patent Office in the past few days we had testimony from the Commissioner of Patents that it cost $79 merely for the paper and printing costs to print a patent at the Government Printing Office. I should like to call the gentleman's attention also to further testimony to the effect that 75 percent of the patent applicants and those to whom patents are granted are substantial corporations rather than the little inventor to which he has made reference.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I have no objection, in reply to the gentleman from New York, to increasing the fees under this bill. As matter of fact, when the bill is read for amendment under the 5-minute rule I would propose to go the subcommittee one better and instead of an increase from $50 on the initial issuance fee to $75, to cover the very point you make, I would propose to increase the issuance fee to $100 rather than $75 and eliminate the maintenance fee. Let me point out to the gentleman this is originally in the European concept the idea that you should have a maintenance fee which is in effect a tax on an inventor. I have been told, for example, in Germany over the lifetime of the patent a man can be compelled to pay as much as $2,400 in order to maintain his patent in force. This is what I am afraid can grow out of a maintenance fee system. I am very, very desirous of keeping that principle out of our patent system. I have no objection to raising some of these fees to make the Office more self-supporting than it is at the present time. I do recognize the point that the gentleman makes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman kindly yield to me further?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should also like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in connection with this matter of patent fees the appropriations for the Patent Office have tripled between fiscal year 1956 and the coming year, fiscal year 1966.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I think the gentleman is correct. As a matter of fact, I thought it had gone up something like five times, according to the committee report, since 1932 and the ratio of fee income to operating expenses has gone down. I am in favor, as is the gentleman from New York, of doing something about it and in revising the fees now, but my objection is in principle and in fact to the maintenance fee system. That is what I propose to cut out at the appropriate time by offering an amendment to this bill.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. May I say I recognize the utter sincerity of the comments that the gentleman has made. I know his motives are entirely worthy. I must say, however, as one of the members of the subcommittee which brought this legislation to the floor, that our purpose was, as stated by the gentleman from Louisiana in incorporating the maintenance fee system. Now, if we have failed to achieve that purpose, it is because we did not understand we would fail by the method we employed. May I inquire if the gentleman agrees with me that it should be the policy of our patent laws to stimulate and encourage inventive genius in this country?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I think under the Constitution the Congress of the United States is enjoined to do the very thing that the gentleman from Virginia mentions.

Mr. POFF. Yes. I thank the gentleman. If that be true—and it is true—does the gentleman feel conceptually this policy would be better carried out by increasing the initial issuance fee rather than installing a maintenance fee system?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Of course, in answer to the gentleman from Virginia, you have already done that in the committee bill. The present issuance fee is about $30 and you would propose under the bill as it is now written to increase that to $50. I would say just increase it another $25, and increase the final issuance fee another $25. I do not think this is going to be a disincentive to even the young and struggling and poor inventor. But once we incorporate and engraft onto our patent system this maintenance fee which is, after all, a tax on inventors, this is going to be a convenient tool and a vehicle in succeeding Congresses to raise these maintenance fees and we may get to the point where they have gotten in Germany, as I have been told, where a man may have to pay as much as $2,400 during the lifetime of his patent in order to keep it valid.

Mr. POFF. If the actuaries felt that the additional increase which the gentleman would sponsor in lieu of the maintenance fee system would not improve the fiscal posture of the Office sufficiently, would the gentleman be willing to accept the maintenance fee system?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. No, I would not. I think that even more important than this matter of revenue is the principle that is involved. Let me say in further answer to the gentleman from Virginia that I have a statement from one responsible member of the Patent Bar that if we would eliminate the maintenance fees altogether under this bill and add $75 to the final issuance fee, instead of raising only $2.8 million initially, as you do under this bill, and another $4 million in 9 years when these maintenance fees are collected, you would raise $3.9 million from the very beginning and at the same time you would have these other advantages accruing, that you would eliminate what I think is a very bad principle, you would eliminate all of the added expense.

I should have mentioned, too, that in Europe, for example, patent lawyers collect some rather sizable fees from inventors just for taking care of their patents, notifying them of these maintenance fees, and taking care of the actual payment of them. So that by the time you get through, the average inventor is going to have to pay a lot more than just the payment of a simple maintenance fee. He is going to be asking for legal advice and legal counsel.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to mention one other thing. Under the bill we are told he can waive the fee; the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] mentioned that. He can waive the fee if during the preceding 5-year period he has not had any gross benefit. What does gross benefit mean? He probably would have to do what the average small inventor would do; he would run to a lawyer to find out what it meant and then he would be charged a fee for that advice. So he is not going to save any money under this bill.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is making a very important statement and a very valid criticism of this legislation. I do not know whether the gentleman has brought out the point that after a patent is granted and after licenses are granted under a patent there are substantial amounts of Federal income taxes which result from the exercise of rights under the patent. These go into the general revenue till and are expended for General Government purposes.

The Patent Office, of course, does not get credit for that revenue which is produced from the granting of a patent. This is an aspect of the entire institution of patents which should certainly be considered; that is, the revenue which enters the private economy and in the form of general taxes that is produced from the granting of patents under our existing laws.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to consume this much time under the rule. I wanted to give the committee what time it has under the rule to discuss the bill. But I merely wanted to alert Members of the House, as we did a year ago, that at the appropriate time we shall offer and amendment to eliminate these maintenance fees and even as we had the support, and I might say the very considerable support of Members on both sides of the aisle for that proposition a year ago, I should hope that even so this afternoon we may be successful in striking that portion of the bill and then go on to pass what I think would be a good bill.

Demonstrators Win Biggest Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed with an article written by the distinguished news analyst and columnist, David Lawrence, and published in the March 17, 1965, issue of the Evening Star. The article is entitled "Demonstrators Win Biggest Victory." In the article, Mr. Lawrence penetrates through the fog emanating from the President's address to Congress on the subject of voting rights, to make some important points which need to be considered by Congress before acting on the President's proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have Mr. Lawrence's excellent article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 17, 1965]

DEMONSTRATORS WIN BIGGEST VICTORY

(By David Lawrence)

Street demonstrations and marches, "sit-ins" and "lie-ins"—whether violent or nonviolent—have won their biggest victory. Although President Johnson said last Friday that he would not be "blackjacked" into action by the pressure of demonstrations, he championed in his message to a joint session of Congress on Monday night many of the very things that the Negro and white demonstrators have been pressing him to support.

The President praised the American Negro as a hero and said that "his actions and protests, his courage to risk safety and even to risk his life, have awakened the conscience of this Nation." Johnson added that the "demonstrations have been designed to call attention to injustice, designed to provoke change, designed to stir reform."

Although Johnson was careful to insert a few sentences warning demonstrators against extremes, he did not denounce those who have been carrying on "sit-ins" in Federal buildings in the last few days and even in the Capitol and the White House. Nor did he reprove the leaders of the demonstrations who are predicting publicly more and more violence and who are stirring up the passions of the people.

Never in the memory of this correspondent moreover, has any President of the United States delivered a speech to both Houses of Congress containing such mandatory, if not dictatorial, phrases, virtually ordering Congress to pass certain legislation in a given time, and including certain basic commands.

There isn't any appreciable dissent today anywhere in the country on the right of every qualified person to vote, and it is shamefully true that discrimination because of race or color has sometimes been practiced. But what the President failed to tell his nationwide audience over television and radio was that the Constitution has stipulated the right of the States to determine the qualifi-

cations of voters and that this cannot be brushed aside and superseded by a decree of the National Government setting up a system of Federal registrars.

Reform, to be sure, has long been overdue, but the President's message goes beyond any such measure. It would limit the power of the States to determine qualifications of voters and leave the Federal Government as the final judge.

Certain States have literacy or other tests. But Johnson brushes all these aside, and apparently it is to be required that a voter only has to be able to fill out a form giving his name, age, and residence, provided he has not been convicted of a felony or is not in a mental institution. It will be relatively easy for illiterates to carry with them the written information they must provide. This would mean that millions of persons who are really not educated and do not understand even the fundamentals of public questions will be permitted to vote, outnumbering in some areas those who do have the education and do understand.

The net result could be a mobocracy instead of a democracy. To take away from the States the right to qualify voters, with the Federal Government removing tests that are designed to indicate the intelligence of the voter, is to weaken the whole fabric of responsible government.

Johnson's address at times seemed to be an exercise in demagoguery—an awareness of the political currents that could affect the next elections. He repeated the words of the song that has been a part of many of the demonstrations—"We Shall Overcome." The President, of course, has an overwhelming majority in both Houses of Congress, and that's why there was so much applause and standing ovations.

Some Republicans from populous districts where Negroes are numerous also were seen applauding vigorously. But it was surprising to observe the members of the Supreme Court of the United States, seated in the front row near the rostrum where the President spoke, joining in the applause. This same Supreme Court is supposed to be free from political influence and to avoid any entanglements in the domestic politics of the Nation. These judges have the solemn duty of interpreting any statute passed by Congress.

Soil Conservation in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the President of the United States by the Governor of Arkansas, together with a resolution adopted by the 65th Arkansas General Assembly:

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Little Rock, Ark., March 8, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I attach for your information a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 64, the 65th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas. The resolution passed both houses without a dissenting vote and I approved the measure on March 8, 1965.

The resolution opposes the fiscal year 1966 budget proposal for the Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, wherein a $20 million reduction would be made in assisting soil conservation districts and cooperating landowners in applying conservation practices, such reduction to be offset by charging program cooperators for part of the cost of technical services furnished to them.

During my several years as Governor of the State of Arkansas, I have had occasion to become very well acquainted with the work of soil conservation districts and of the Soil Conservation Service. I have consistently supported the Federal-State-local teamwork arrangement in the district program. My experience indicates that the demand for soil conservation and watershed work cannot be satisfied by the present soil conservation staff. It is evident that more, not fewer, technicians are needed.

I take pride that during my administration the State of Arkansas, for the first time, provided operations funds to districts in the amount of $152,000 per year and a $100,000 annual appropriation to speed up planning under the Small Watershed Act. Moreover, in the current session of the general assembly, I have requested a $25,000 increase for the Arkansas Soil and Water Conservation Commission budget and I have approved amendments to the parent Soil Conservation Districts Act of 1937 which will broaden and strengthen district authorities to carry out and maintain watershed and other project activities. I think it well to point out, too, that the majority of Arkansas counties also make contributions to soil conservation districts to augment their programs.

I am well aware that great strides have been made in the conservation field in Arkansas as elsewhere. However, I am informed that little more than half of the job has been finished. The better educated and the better financed more quickly recognized the wisdom and the advantages of this work. Much of the remaining task is with the less well educated and the economically distressed—the very persons that would experience the greatest difficulty in paying.

I am convinced that the proposal to charge landowners for technical services would result in a major setback to conservation progress and would have detrimental effects on rural and urban areas alike. Accordingly, I respectfully suggest that the proposed $20 million reduction in the Soil Conservation appropriation request be considered and that a new request be submitted to the Congress eliminating the provision for charges for technical services.

Respectfully yours,

ORVAL E. FAUBUS.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64

Resolution urging Arkansas delegates in Congress to oppose certain legislation

Whereas soil and water are the most valuable assets of Arkansas and conservation of these natural resources is essential to the present and future prosperity of the State;

Whereas soil and water conservation districts are entities of State government organized and operated by local leaders under the provision of State laws to provide landowners technical and other assistance associated with conservation of natural resources;

Whereas Arkansas was the first State to pass an enabling soil and water conservation district law and the program has grown to cover the entire State involving 380 soil and water conservation district supervisors and over 82,000 cooperating landowners who are applying conservation measures on their farms;

Whereas the State and certain county governments in Arkansas have been helping speed up the conservation of natural resources for several years by making appropriations and other contributions to soil and water conservation districts, thereby forming a Federal, State, and county team arrangement to fight this national menace of soil and water waste;

Whereas soil and water conservation districts in Arkansas have had memorandums of understanding (agreements) with USDA for more than 25 years and technical assistance has been provided landowners by the Soil Conservation Service without charge; and

Whereas provisions in the recommended U.S. Department of Agriculture budget for 1966 require that local soil and water conservation districts establish a revolving fund by charging landowners for needed assistance to reimburse the Federal Government for up to one-half the cost of technical assistance provided farmers and others applying conservation practices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved that the house of representatives of the 65th general assembly (the senate concurring therein), That the Arkansas General Assembly hereby expresses its opposition to the provision in the USDA recommended budget that landowners be charged for technical assistance provided by local soil and water conservation districts to individual farmers and others for conserving soil and water and urges members of the Arkansas delegation in the National Congress to oppose this concept with full effort; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the membership of the Arkansas congressional delegation in Washington and the President of the United States.

Financing of Commercial Supersonic Transport Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, one of the critical-problem areas in connection with the development of a commercial supersonic transport aircraft is the question of how to finance the undertaking.

An article in the February 8, 1965, issue of the magazine Aviation Week deals with an interesting proposal for the use of private capital, rather than appropriated public funds, for this purpose.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Aviation Week and Space Technology, Feb. 8, 1965]

PUBLIC-PRIVATE FUNDING FOR SST POSSIBLE IF CONGRESS CUTS REQUEST

(By James R. Ashlock)

WASHINGTON.—Financial interests across the Nation are remaining alert to any possibility that the U.S. supersonic transport program might be opened for investment of private capital, a situation that could emerge if congressional opposition blocks the appropriation of public funds to develop the aircraft.

Persistent impression among both Government and industry sources has been that only the Federal Government could afford the anticipated $1 billion development cost. But this has not altered the conviction of

some financial authorities that the program can be covered by private capital, and holds the promise of a substantial return on investment.

The amount of support for supersonic transport funding in Congress probably will not be known until a formal request for development money comes from the White House, Government spokesmen said. But some of those who would attack it, like Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, are making no secret of their intentions.

"I cannot, of course, forecast what the Congress will do by way of appropriating funds for this aircraft," Senator PROXMIRE said. "I certainly, however, intend to continue my opposition to the appropriation of funds."

The primary theme of those private financing plans which have been drawn involves cooperation between the Government and private investment sources. This, it is believed, would be an acceptable alternative to outright spending of taxpayer money for a specific industrial item.

Those Government offices involved in the supersonic transport program have expressed interest in private financing. One plan, prepared and sponsored over the past 18 months by Ives, Whitehead & Co., Inc., of Washington, has been the subject of presentations to all interested Government agencies, Congress, and industry.

The Ives, Whitehead proposal is aimed directly at the development cost of the supersonic transport. Its main features are:

Congress take action to create a Government-owned Transport Development Corporation, or similar organization, which would be authorized to obtain capital funds through established nongovernmental investment media.

Exact types of issues, respective amounts, maturities, and rates of the obligations would be fixed by Congress. The corporation would be authorized to solicit and obtain competitive purchase prices for the sale of the obligations.

The corporation would be authorized to sell, dispose, and distribute in usual and accepted public and private investment channels, with or without the services of underwriters.

Outstanding obligations would be redeemed proportionally each year through application of royalty and travel tax.

In the event that $1.25 billion is required to develop a supersonic transport, and the completed aircraft is not commercially developed until 1970, then a 25-year amortization plan might prove practical.

Such a program fits, generally, the recommendation of the original Black-Osborne proposal for a supersonic transport development program, in which it was suggested that a separate Government agency be formed to direct the project.

Among the benefits envisioned by Ives, Whitehead are elimination of a large initial appropriation of taxpayer funds, spreading of the development costs over a lengthy period, and the relative freedom of Congress to support the program with a minimum of political implications.

"Industry's predetermined share of the project's total costs can be computed and assumed by it as each block of serial obligations is determined and offered for sale," Ives, Whitehead spokesmen said.

The plan amounts to the issuance of bonds backed by Government guarantee. The Government, consequently, bears much of the risk. But proponents of private financing emphasize that the burden on the national treasury would be eased, and even eliminated if the supersonic transport proves a commercial success.

Ives, Whitehead officials admit that their plan is a general outline to which specific details must be added. But it is viewed by them as a start toward something that could prove an attractive "additional outlet for excess institutional and personal funds."

Such a program differs from the Communications Satellite Corp. in that it does not involve the issuance of stockholder shares. But the success of Comsat is being listed by supporters of private finance as evidence that the investing public will support—and is anxious to—such Government-backed ventures.

Considering the growth of airline traffic, and the expanding confidence of the Boeing Co. and Lockheed Aircraft Corp. that a profitable supersonic transport can be built, the private financing scheme likely would find a ready reception from those looking for long-term growth investment, spokesmen said.

Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, said recently that the Government should concern itself only with the financing aspects of the supersonic transport and leave design to the industry and airlines (A.W. & S.T., Feb. 1, p. 34). This being interpreted by some industry sources as evidence that Congress would like to see the program remain as much as possible within the realm of free enterprise. Opening it to participation by private finance would help assure this, source said.

Vertical and Short Takeoff and Landing Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, last year the Special Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Committee on Armed Services under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] held comprehensive hearings on the subject of the progress and shortcomings of the American defense and industrial effort in developing operational aircraft capable of vertical and short takeoff and landing. The report of that subcommittee has been in great demand and the original printing is now exhausted. In an effort to give both greater coverage to that report, both for the benefit of interested persons and the defense industry and for the military, I believe it is worthwhile taking the space in the Appendix of the RECORD to print it in full:

VERTICAL AND SHORT TAKEOFF AND LANDING (V/STOL) AIRCRAFT

BACKGROUND

During the committee's consideration of the legislation to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, several members questioned the adequacy of effort being expended on the development of aircraft capable of vertical and short takeoff and landing (V/STOL). Questions were raised also on the development efforts for engines to propel such aircraft and the U.S. contribution and support of V/STOL developments by our NATO allies.

To focus new attention on these potential weapons systems and to answer the questions raised, the Subcommittee on Research and Development announced plans to review in detail the programs of the Department of Defense for the development and testing of V/STOL aircraft systems.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The subcommittee began its hearings on May 13, 1964. It held 14 formal meetings, and received testimony from the following witnesses:

Barrett, Hill, Wright Aeronautical Division, Curtiss-Wright Corp.

Bergen, William B., president, Martin Co.

Booth, Rear Adm. C. T., Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Development).

Bowman, Richard, manager, Aircraft & Vehicle Division, Republic Aviation Corp.

Brown, Dr. Harold, director, Defense Research and Engineering.

Clark, J. R., vice president and general manager, Vought Aeronautics Division, Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc.

Deckman, E. M., manager of sales, contracts, and service, Allison Division, General Motors Corp.

Dick, Lt. Gen. W. W., Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army.

Famme, Joseph H., president, Convair Division, General Dynamics Corp.

Favorite, Lt. Col. Walter B., Office of Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Development, Department of the Air Force.

Fawkes, Rear Adm. E. E., Assistant Chief, Bureau of Naval Weapons for R.D.T. & E.

Fink, Frank, vice president, research and engineering, Ryan Aeronautical Co.

Frick, Charles, vice president of engineering, Convair Division, General Dynamics Corp.

Gisel, William G., president, Bell Aerosystems, Bell Aerospace Corp.

Hawkins, Hon. Willis M., Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research and Development).

Hoeper, Col. Paul E., Office of Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Development, Department of the Air Force.

Hiller, Stanley, Jr., president, Hiller Aircraft Co.

Jacobson, D. H., section chief, design studies, Allison Division, General Motors Co.

Johnson, L. S., president, Sikorsky Co.

Kossar, A. F., director of corporate planning, Curtiss-Wright Corp.

Krebs, James, manager, advanced products planning, General Electric Co.

Mergen, J. M., general manager, V/TOL Division, Curtiss-Wright Corp.

Nichol, Ira W., engineering manager, Turbine Division, Continental Aviation & Engineering Corp.

O'Malley, James, manager, aircraft and missile marketing section, Bell Aerosystems, Bell Aerospace Corp.

Orr, William K., marketing manager, aircraft system, Ryan Aeronautical Co.

Peterson, John, chief of advanced design, Ryan Aeronautical Co.

Rodenbaugh, William L., Flight Propulsion Division, General Electric Co.

Robertshaw, Maj. Gen. L. B., Deputy Chief of Staff for Air, U.S. Marine Corps.

Sens, William, assistant chief engineer, Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division, United Aircraft Corp.

Stack, John, vice president, Republic Aviation Corp.

Stewart, Brig. Gen. James T., Director of Science and Technology, Office of Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Development, Department of the Air Force.

Wareing, Lt. Col. Joel T., Office of Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Development, Department of the Air Force.

Wild, A., executive vice president, Continental Aviation & Engineering Corp.

Wood, C. C., vice president, engineering, Sikorsky Co.

INTRODUCTION

From the first flight of the Wright brothers to the hypersonic flight of modern jet aircraft, advances in aeronautics have usually

been associated with increases in speed. Faster and higher flight has been the goal of the military design engineer. However, in the last decade another significant trend has been developing. In addition to the precept of flying higher and faster, there has been a growing interest in the ability to achieve takeoff and landing in shorter distances. The ultimate in this direction is, of course, a zero length runway, which results in an airplane that can takeoff and land vertically. This new class of aircraft is now called V/STOL aircraft.

Within this document, V/STOL is referred to as: "The ability of an aircraft to takeoff and land vertically or with a short ground roll, as desired, with a speed capability far in excess of rotor craft (helicopers)."

The principle of vertical takeoff and landing is not a recent discovery. Records of VTOL devices date from an early Chinese toy, called the Chinese top, through Leonardo da Vinci's serial screw, to the early helicopter designs. Due to the recent emphasis placed on V/STOL, one could easily assume that the current effort represents new technology. Nothing could be further from the truth. Even current history provides a list of 30 V/STOL aircraft which have, or are in the process of being designed, fabricated, and flight tested. V/STOL technology now is said to be a well-developed, straightforward engineering task.

It is generally agreed that the advent of operational V/STOL aircraft is probably closer now than ever before due to the significant growth of suitable gas turbine propulsion systems. A second important stimulus to work on V/STOL aircraft was the success of the helicopter, which has demonstrated the varied usefulness of a vertical takeoff and landing capability for both a military and commercial operation. Actually, the basic limitation to the helicopter is the driving interest behind V/STOL aircraft. The helicopter, which is basically a hovering machine, is much less efficient in cruising flight than a conventional airplane. One logical approach to this problem, therefore, was to build a machine that would be essentially a conventional airplane, but with the added capability to takeoff and land vertically.

Currently, a truly operational V/STOL aircraft is nonexistent in the free world today. The ways in which V/STOL aircraft can be effectively utilized in warfare as well as their possible inherent advantageous characteristics as related to mobility and flexibility of operation have been broadly theorized over the years but have never been put to test. Probably the most significant factor in the lack of V/STOL development in the United States is that the time, money, and effort required to build and test operational aircraft have never been expended. This means that any attributes of V/STOL aircraft, from an operational standpoint, remain in the area of conjecture.

During the time period 1950 through 1961, some 18 V/STOL programs were initiated by the military services. All of these have been canceled as research and development programs after an expenditure of funds exceeding $100 million. In almost all of these programs, only one or two research vehicles were to be built. In several instances the programs progressed only to the point of a paper feasibility study. However, one research vehicle did emerge from this mass which still is used today by NASA for familiarization and indoctrination of V/STOL pilots and study of stability and control problems, the X-14, which uses the jet-deflected-thrust principle.

Another aircraft under development during this time period which deserves mentioning was the XF-109, also known as the Bell D-188A. This aircraft was to obtain vertical lift by rotating the entire engines, which were housed in swiveling pods mounted on the wing tips. The program was started by the Navy in June of 1957 and became a joint Air Force-Navy program in December 1957. The program was terminated in February 1959 after inspection of the mockup. The reasons given for the termination were that the engines were not yet completely developed and the aircraft appeared to have a very low payload for its rather large gross weight.

It is interesting to note that subsequent to the termination of this development program the Federal Republic of Germany has picked up the basic design and proceeded with further development to the point that a prototype is now flying, the VJ-101-C. This aircraft will be discussed further in a later section of the report.

A notable exception in the field of operational evaluation aircraft is the triservice V/STOL transport, the XC-142A, which is funded and programed to become the first U.S. operational evaluation aircraft.

Currently within the U.S. military services there are five different V/STOL aircraft under development. Three of these aircraft are in the triservice V/STOL development program and the other two aircraft are separate developments. A résumé of the current development status of each program is as follows:

TRI-SERVICE PROGRAMS

The three military services under Department of Defense sponsorship entered into a program for V/STOL transport type aircraft in July 1960. This program was formulated to develop and test experimental-type aircraft for the purpose of investigating V/STOL flight concepts and evaluating the operational suitability of this type of aircraft for service use.

The triservice V/STOL transport program has evolved into three basic tasks. The first is the development of a tilt-wing V/STOL transport, called the XC-142, with executive management assigned to the Air Force. The second is the development of a tandem tilt-propeller V/STOL research aircraft, called the X-19, with executive management assigned to the Air Force. The third is the development of a tandem tilt-duct V/STOL research aircraft, called the X-22A, with executive management assigned to the Navy.

A description and status of these aircraft follows:

XC-142

The XC-142 is a 37,000-pound gross weight transport aircraft. Five aircraft are being fabricated by the combined team of Vought-Hiller-Ryan. In this design, the wing is tilted to the vertical position to obtain lift from the four propellers. The propellers are powered by four GE T-64 engines and have a cross-shafting transmission system to provide flight safety in the case of an engine failure. The aircraft will have a cruising speed of 250 knots and a maximum speed of 400 knots. The combat radius (from a vertical takeoff) will be 200 nautical miles and the ferry range will be 2,600 nautical miles. The combat payload will be 8,000 pounds or 32 fully equipped combat troops.

The 50-hour tiedown test, started on July 28, 1964, was completed the week of the 21st of September. Following an inspection of the aircraft, the first conventional flight of the XC-142A took place at the Chance Vought flight test center in Dallas, Tex., on September 29, 1964.

Through fiscal year 1965, approximately $115 million has been invested in this program.

X-19

The X-19 is a 13,000-pound research aircraft that is configured as a utility transport. Two aircraft are being built by the Curtiss-Wright Corp., at a cost of $11.6 million. In this design the four propellers, which are mounted in nacelles at the tips of the tandem wings, are tilted to a horizontal position to obtain vertical lift. The propellers are driven by a shaft transmission system powered by two interconnected Lycoming T-55 engines located high in the aft fuselage. The aircraft will have a cruising speed of 300 knots and a maximum speed of 400 knots. The range with the design payload of 2,000 pounds will be 425 nautical miles. The ferry range is 1,740 nautical miles. The X-19 has completed the first phase of the category I test program. This first phase concerned the hover flight mode of the aircraft. The X-19 has made 22 flights with 57 effective liftoffs for a total flight time of 1 hour 37 minutes. The X-19 was grounded until the latter part of September for installation of the following items:

(a) Retractable landing gear.

(b) New propeller coordinator for the control system.

(c) Fully qualified propeller gearcase gearing.

(d) Fully qualified transmission shafting.

It is reported that the installation of these items will then qualify the aircraft for unlimited flight. The flight test of the X-19 is currently scheduled to commence again in the last part of October at the Curtiss-Wright plant in Caldwell, N.J.

X-22

The X-22 is a 15,000-pound research airplane. Two aircraft are being fabricated by the Bell Aerosystems Co. In this design the four shrouded propellers, which are mounted at the tips of the tandem wings, are tilted to a horizontal position to obtain vertical lift. The shrouded propellers are driven by a shaft transmission system powered by four interconnected engines located on the aft wing. The aircraft will have a cruising speed of 250 knots and will maintain 2 hours' flight endurance at sea level. The X-22A will be able to hover at sea level on three engines in order to give a single-engine-out reliability. One of the prime features of the X-22A will be the inclusion of a variable stability system in the aircraft so that various flight characteristics may be investigated.

The first flight of the X-22A is now currently scheduled for the month of April 1965. Through fiscal year 1965, approximately $26 million has been invested in this aircraft by the Defense Department.

XV-4A

Two XV-4A aircraft have been fabricated on a fixed-price contract of $2.3 million which included approximately 50 hours of contractor flight test and demonstration of transition from vertical to horizontal fight and back to a vertical landing. The aircraft first flew conventionally in July 1962, hovered in June 1963 and transitioned in November 1963. Approximately $3.8 million have been expended on the program as of January 1, 1964, and an additional $0.4 million estimated for completing the task through fiscal year 1965, for a total of $4.2 million Army funds in the project. It is estimated that Lockheed has contributed at least an additional $5 million to the program under the original fixed-price contract.

The XV-4A is one of three hardware approaches being taken to investigate lift-propulsion concepts suitable for V/STOL operation in an Army field environment. The design is based on a jet pump principle which was demonstrated on a test rig by Lockheed. Through high-speed jet efflux, entrainment of ambient air increases mass airflow sufficiently in a vertical direction to provide augmentation of primary power by a theoretical value of 40 percent. An augmentation of less than 30 percent has been attained resulting in an underpowered condition for operational vertical flying. Reportedly the program has slipped from the original schedule by approximately 18 months and the contractor is making modi-

fications to the jet nozzle assembly in hopes of improving inlet airflow and increasing augmentation. Initial contractor demonstration has been completed and selected Army personnel are being trained to conduct approximately 100 hours of research and engineering flight tests with contractor and FAA support.

On June 10, 1964, one of the aircraft was lost in a conversion from conventional to vertical flight. The aircraft was undergoing deceleration test at altitude and reportedly went into violent pitching oscillations from which the pilot was unable to recover.

XV-5A

The XV-5A fan-in-wing is another one of three approaches being taken to determine the technical and operational feasibility of a radically new lift and propulsion system to obtain vertical takeoff and landing for a new surveillance aircraft.

This task was initiated through a fixed-price contract with General Electric, Cincinnati, Ohio, to initiate design and fabrication of two new research aircraft. Ryan Aeronautical Co. is subcontractor for the airframe.

The XV-5A uses two General Electric J-85 engines to drive a submerged fan in both wings, obtaining thrust augmentation of approximately three times the normal rated thrust of 2,600 pounds for each of the two engines. The aircraft is a two-place side-by-side VTOL aircraft with a design gross weight of 9,200 pounds and a maximum gross weight of 12,300 pounds, and is capable of speeds up to 450 knots. These two research aircraft are being used to determine, by technical evaluation, the characteristics, and limitations of a fan-in-wing, V/STOL aircraft as compared to jet ejector, direct lift, and turbofan diverted lift thrust system aircraft.

For hovering flight, the XV-5A uses the gas efflux of two J-85 engines, which is channeled through a ducting system to the aircraft's two tip-driven fans and a tip-driven nose fan, which is used for longitudinal control. The fans submerged in the wings and nose, by drawing atmospheric air through the wing, augment the engine thrust by nearly 300 percent for vertical takeoff, hovering, and landing. This alleged advantage is said to make possible important savings in fuel consumption and logistics support, and provide greater range and payload capabilities for the aircraft.

The two XV-5A's made its first conventional flight on May 25, 1964, hovered first on July 16, 1964, and transitioned in flight during October 1964. The contractor flight test program is reported to be progressing satisfactorily, and close correlation is being obtained with wind tunnel data.

By the end of fiscal year 1965 the Army will have invested approximately $16.5 million in this airplane.

EUROPEAN PROGRAMS

P-1127 (XV-6A)

The XV-6A (P-1127) project was initiated by OSD through defense representative to North Atlantic and Mediterranean areas (DEFREPNAMA) under Army management, but with triservice funding. The project involves a trilaterial agreement among the United States, United Kingdom, and Federal Republic of Germany to develop and conduct a joint operational evaluation of the V/STOL concept using the Hawker-Siddeley P-1127 aircraft and Bristol-Siddeley 53 Pegasus 5 engine. The program is funded approximately equally by each of three countries with the United States and United Kingdom shares being approximately $35.9 million and the Federal Republic of Germany share being $32.3 million. In prior years the Army provided 50 percent and the U.S. Navy and U.S. Air Force 25 percent each of the U.S. portion. To simplify current policy, the Army, by direction of D.D.R. & E. (April 28, 1964), will be responsible for funding the program in future years. The program will continue on a triservice basis. At the present time, the United States does not plan to procure the P-1127 aircraft.

Characteristics and performance: The P-1127 is designed as a lightweight V/STOL strike reconnaissance aircraft. It is a single place with a high wing having a swept leading edge; bicycle landing gear with wingtip outrigger gear; a single lift thrust, high bypass, high compression ratio engine; and employs the diverted thrust principle through four rotatable cascaded nozzles. The BS 53/5 engine is rated at 15,200 pounds static thrust and will provide for vertical takeoff at a gross weight of 12,400 pounds or STOL at up to 15,500 pounds. In its evaluation configuration the aircraft will take off and land vertically, cruise at mach 0.85, with a dash speed of mach 0.87, and have a limited flight duration of about one-half hour at sea level. Endurance and payload is greatly increased by STOL operations.

Thirteen aircraft and 18 engines are included in the program. Four of the aircraft are developmental and nine are for operational evaluation.

The program is divided into five phases: Development, qualification trials, pilot and mechanic training, joint operational evaluation, and national test programs. On October 15, 1964, an evaluation squadron consisting of pilots and technical personnel from the three participating countries was activated. The U.S. contribution to this squadron is 5 officers and 35 enlisted men. The evaluation squadron will be based at West Raynham, England. These trials are scheduled to last approximately 6 months during which time the squadron will be making an operational evaluation of the V/STOL concept using the P-1127 aircraft.

The original agreement provided that upon completion of the operational evaluation trials, that all airframes, engines, equipment, and spares used in the tripartite program would be divided equally among the participating governments, and that the fifth and last phase of the program (national trials) would be conducted independently by each country according to their desires.

P-1154

The P-1154 was one of the ranking contenders in the NATO V/STOL aircraft evaluation conducted in 1962. This supersonic aircraft development retains all the fundamental features of the Hawker-Siddeley P-1127. The design incorporates a single engine for lift and cruise in a rugged airframe of light weight. The design gross weight is to be about 27,000 pounds for a vertical takoff. The P-1154 production program is geared to the development of the BS-100 vectored thrust engine, which is an outgrowth of the Bristol-Siddeley BS-53 engine. The BS-53 engine development was largely funded by U.S. dollars under the mutual weapons development programs. The BS-100 will use plenum chamber burning (PCB) in the front or cold nozzles, which is similar to afterburning except that cold fan air is involved, to provide a thrust boost for VTOL and to give high supersonic speed in normal flight. The PCB increases the thrust of the normal engine up to about 30,000 pounds. The basic principle of PCB has been shown to work on a modified BS-53 engine in a joint United States-United Kingdom program monitored by the U.S. Air Force. The British are currently funding development of both the engine and airframe. It is said to be extremely doubtful that the desired operational date of 1968 will be met.

Balzac

The first generation V/STOL aircraft in France is the Balzac V-001 which is an adaptation of the original Mirage III prototype airframe. The Dassault Co. modified the central fuselage of the prototype to hold eight 2,200-pound-thrust Rolls Royce RB-108 turbojets, mounted in coupled pairs fore and aft of the main wheel recesses and pointing slightly aft and outward from the vertical. The high velocity and high temperatures efflux from the lift engines originally required that the Balzac be operated from a grill over a pit to avoid erosion and reingestion problems. To eliminate these disadvantages and also to make some of the thrust from the lift engines available for horizontal acceleration, the Balzac has been fitted with forward-hinged deflector doors. These doors will deflect the exhaust from the RB-108 engines aft during runup, then will open fully when full engine power is applied for vertical takeoff. The Balzac project was started in early 1961 and the first hovering flights were made in October 1962, with the first transitions the following March. After many successful flights the airplane crashed during a hovering test flight. The Balzac is being repaired and should reenter the test program in 1966. The main function of the Balzac is said to be that of a research vehicle or the second-generation mach 2 Mirage III-V.

Mirage III-V

The Mirage III-V was one of the ranking competitors in the NATO V/STOL evaluation in 1962. After this competition the French proceeded with a national program to develop this aircraft. The design concept of the airframe-propulsion system for the aircraft was based on the experience gained in the design and test of the prototype Balzac airplane. The first single-seat prototype Mirage III-V is now at the G.A.M. Dassault's flight test center, where its eight 4,400-pound-thrust, RB 162-2 lift engines are being installed. The main propulsion unit is to be a French derivative of the Pratt & Whitney TF-30 engine. The gross weight of the airplane is expected to be about 30,000 pounds. Its speed is to be about mach 1.15 at low altitude and above mach 2 at high altitude.

VJ-101 C and D

The VJ-101C is a research airplane program for two jet lift V/STOL machines. The VJ-101C, built by Entwicklungsring Sud, was designed as a replacement for the F-104G in the German Air Force. The design was based on the Bell D-188 (XF-109) which was canceled by the U.S. Air Force in 1958. There have been two prototypes authorized. The first of these, the X-1, has flown successfully as a V/STOL machine on the power of its six, 2,750-pound-thrust RB-145 engines. Four of the engines are mounted in swiveling wingtip pods to form a triangulated group with the remaining pair of engines mounted immediately behind the pilot's cockpit. This first prototype was intended to prove out the design concept, while the second prototype, the X-2, with afterburning RB-145 engines in the wingtip pods, will have sufficient power to attain supersonic speed.

The VJ-101D is a completely redesigned version of a V/STOL fighter in the VJ-101 series of aircraft. This later airplane completely abandons the swiveling tip-pod principle and employs five fuselage mounted RB162-31 direct lift engines and two Rolls Royce/MAN RB153-61 lift-cruise engines. The program as planned calls for the construction of two prototype aircraft.

VAK-191B

The German Air Force has been undertaking a series of studies based upon a program designated the VAK-191 V/STOL reconnaissance-strike aircraft. The German Defense Ministry has made this program an international undertaking by securing Italian participation. Two aircraft designs were considered in competition for this program. Focke-Wulf (now merged into Vereinigte Flustechnische Werke VFW) submitted its FW-1262 project and Fiat of Italy submitted

the G-95/4. The two countries have jointly agreed to select the Focke-Wulf design to meet the requirements of the program. The VAK-191B, as the FW-1262 is now designated, is to be a subsonic tactical fighter powered by a vectored thrust Rolls Royce RB-153 engine and the vertical lift is supplemented by two Rolls Royce RB-162 direct lift jet engines in the fuselage. This program is said to be the No. 1 priority in the German Air Force. The first flight of the VAK-191B is presently targeted for 1968.

DO-31 Dornier

The German Government's contribution to the V/STOL transport field is the Dornier DO-31 jet-lift V/STOL cargo aircraft. The DO-31 is a compact high-wing monoplane, powered by two Bristol-Siddeley BS-53, Pegasus 5, vectored thrust engines and eight Rolls Royce RB-162 direct lift jet engines, mounted four each in wing pods. The specification for the aircraft requires a three-fourths-ton payload for a range of 320 nautical miles at a cruising speed of 405 knots. The DO-31 will have a wing with double slotted flaps and without the lift jet pods will be capable of operating as a STOL airplane. Two DO-31 prototypes are now in construction and the first flight is now scheduled for the spring of 1965.

PROPULSION SYSTEMS

The propulsion system of aircraft is today the most important single component influencing airframe configuration. This appears especially so with V/STOL aircraft where a wide variety of basic types are possible due to the various means of propulsion now available. In developing propulsion systems for V/STOL aircraft, the problem of integration of the engine with the airframe is said to be of unprecedented importance. In V/STOL aircraft some propulsion systems are more closely integrated into the airframe than on conventional aircraft. Therefore, power producing sources particularly adapted to V/STOL aircraft technology are required. Particular emphasis should be addressed to those powerplant development areas differing materially from conventional systems.

The first of these systems is the lift engine which is here defined as a specialized type designed to take advantage of the fact that it operates only for short duration and only over a very limited range of speeds and altitudes to achieve high thrust-weight ratios with reasonable fuel consumption in its limited operating regime. The second of these systems is the lift-cruise engine which is here defined as a device designed to provide vectored thrust for takeoff and landing and matched cruise thrust for conventional flight after transition.

At present, a very modest effort is being expanded in this country in carrying out the development of direct lift engines and lift fans. The military services have provided limited funding support to these efforts. However, it is evident that insufficient effort has been applied to another key element of V/STOL propulsion; the lift-cruise engine.

The lift-cruise propulsion powerplant does not have unique characteristics. As the main propulsion unit, this engine must have a high thrust-to-weight ratio to make lightweight aircraft possible, high cruise performance for maximum range, high thrust for good acceleration and supersonic performance, and low fuel consumption during loiter and other offspeed conditions. Durability, high reliability, and ease of maintenance are also vital factors, especially in view of field operational requirements of V/STOL systems. In addition, thrust vectoring for the vertical takeoff and landing modes is probably necessary and will place additional demands on the powerplant. Many of thes above-mentioned characteristics are available in hardware existing today. However, a powerplant combining all of these charactristics does not exist in the U.S. inventory today.

Advanced component technology is available for the lift-cruise powerplant. According to testimony received, no component technological breakthroughs are needed to bring about the necessary propulsion. As a result of previous and presently funded propulsion technology programs, the state-of-the-art has been developed to a point that permits advanced V/STOL systems in initial configurations. However, additional effort is required to put this component technology to use in an integrated, efficient lift-cruise propulsion system.

REQUIREMENTS FOR V/STOL AIRCRAFT

The potential value of aircraft with a vertical takeoff and landing capability has long been recognized by planners in all branches of the military services. The question has always been as to whether a V/STOL capability could be built into an aircraft without overly compromising its payload, speed, and range capabilities. For many missions, a V/STOL capability may be important enough to justify a degradation in some aspect of performance to meet the military requirement.

Military requirements and the technical advances necessary to support such requirements are in many instances a chicken and egg proposition—which comes first, the requirement or the technology. The expression "military requirements" is in itself ambiguous, meaning many different things to many different people. To the military operator it is a statement of a desire or a need for a new capability which will enhance his probability of success in old ways of conducting military operations and perhaps make possible some entirely new ways of conducting such operations. To the developer of military hardware, military requirements are to a great extent the beacons which guide his efforts.

Military requirements cover the full spectrum of what is considered desirable and what is considered possible. It is not always possible to separate desirability and possibility. The urgency of a need may stimulate technical invention or make the military user willing to accept equipment which is highly specialized, costly, and difficult to operate. The combinations of needs and feasibility are almost infinite. To clarify this discussion, a differentiation is necessary between military needs and military requirements. Military needs are said to be those capabilities which are desired but for which the technical feasibility and cost in a given time period has yet not been validated. Military requirements are considered to be those military needs which have been formally stated and presumably are supported as reasonably within technical attainment at reasonable cost in a specific time period.

The helicopter will not be discussed as a separate entity in the VTOL area. Admittedly, the helicopter is to some degree in competition with the V/STOL at one end of the spectrum of application. On the other hand, the helicopter is well established in the operational inventory for specific applications at the present time, and it will be regarded as understood that unless a V/STOL aircraft offers substantial advantages over the helicopter, it cannot really take its place in the operational force. It is clear that if the requirement for hovering flight becomes so large as to constitute a substantial proportion of the total flying time, a machine such as the helicopter becomes a necessity and the kinds of V/STOL aircraft being discussed have limited applicability. On the other hand, as the radius of action requirement goes up relative to the hovering time, the helicopter becomes increasingly inefficient. The cost and tradeoffs between the V/STOL and the helicopter will obviously have to be made for any low-speed, short-range application. On the other hand, for most of the applications to be discussed, the emphasis will lay on the comparison as between V/STOL and STOL aircraft rather than between V/STOL and helicopters.

In the United States, the military departments have been intrigued with the military possibilities inherent in V/STOL. Over the past 12 years, the military departments have expended close to one-quarter of a billion dollars in programs directed toward V/STOL prototype aircraft. If the cost of all the exploratory and advanced development programs associated with V/STOL were added, the total costs of these efforts would be much higher. These moneys allegedly were spent in search for proper approaches, consistent with the available technology, which would permit the practical exploitation of the V/STOL concept. The military departments have developed, tested, or evaluated over 30 different configurations of V/STOL aircraft and propulsion systems. These past programs and the programs in NATO Europe have demonstrated beyond doubt that V/STOL is technically feasible. However, they apparently have not, as yet, been able to demonstrate conclusively to the Department of Defense that with current technology V/STOL is operationally practical.

Two ad hoc groups, the first headed by Dr. James E. Lipp in 1956 and the second headed by Prof. Courtland D. Perkins in 1960, have recommended to the Department of Defense that aggressive action be taken in the overall field of V/STOL technology. The major conclusion reached by the Perkins ad hoc group in 1960 was that: The state of the art in V/STOL technology has advanced to the point where V/STOL aircraft capable of meeting operational requirements can be developed. The full military usefulness of V/STOL must be demonstrated through operational evaluation. Unless a program for operational suitability is initiated, the state of uncertainty that exists today will continue.

In establishing operational requirements for V/STOL aircraft, it appears that there is still much room for arbitrary decision. The requirement for hovering flight, which has been discussed, is certainly one important factor. Other important factors have to do with high-altitude and hot-day takeoff performance, requirements for carriage of external stores and the need for subsonic versus supersonic performance. The penalty to be paid for V/STOL in an aircraft whose performance is subsonic only is considerably less than the penalties for aircraft having supersonic performance. The reason for this is that in a subsonic aircraft the V/STOL penalty is assoicated mainly with the increase in weight of propulsion system and airframe. In a supersonic aircraft, the volume required for a combination of lifting propulsion systems is said to be much more critical; in addition, the adaptation of the propulsion system to operation under the wide range of operating conditions from hovering to supersonic velocity necessarily imposes compromises and penalties over the entire performance spectrum.

With respect to transports, the helicopter itself has proven V/STOL can be highly useful for transportation of men and supplies to ground forces in the front line. Yet there is a desire for transports with somewhat greater range than the helicopter and with better performance en route over this longer range. The cost and effectiveness comparison is not being made with highly efficient transport aircraft, but with the far less efficient helicopter in which it is admitted at the beginning that a high price is to be paid for the one characteristic of vertical flight. Further, in highly fluid situations, inability to constantly provide new runways, however short, in close proximity to moving ground forces argues in favor of V/STOL capability. There is little doubt of the existence of a need and, again, only the multitudinous variety of types which can perform this mission and their merits relative to each other and to helicopters pose a problem in the orderly sequence of development. The current triservice V/STOL transport programs—

the X-19, the X-22, and XC-142 appear to represent a reasonable approach to this class of aircraft in the lower speed range appropriate to the use of turbine-propeller propulsion systems.

With respect to V/STOL fighter aircraft, the situation is somewhat different in that there are still many uncertainties concerning the utility of and the need for V/STOL fighter aircraft.

From an operations research standpoint, it is said that the crucial factor of either combat airplanes or transports relates to assumptions as to the availability of runways. Availability includes not only the question of existence of runways at the beginning of any military operations but also includes the survivability of runways during the course of military operations. The results of operational research on the relative merits of V/STOL and STOL aircraft inevitably depend to a major degree on this question. The validity of any assumptions made depends not only on the preference of the organization making the study (and this is not an inconsiderable factor) but also upon the type of warfare and the theaters of operation which are considered. It is in this respect that U.S. operations necessarily differ from those of our European allies. The United States is either actually or potentially committed to support of free governments over the entire world. The military services must consider operations in the vast underdeveloped areas of the world, as well as in the sophisticated environment of Europe. In the European theater of operations, it is clear that large numbers of short runways are available—not only those which are presently employed by the allied tactical air forces, but numerous others which could be employed should the need arise. The situation is obviously quite different when considering operations in some regions of Asia and Africa. With regard to the survivability of runways, the situation reverses itself. It is more likely that the originally available runways with a low-intensity operation in remote regions of the world will continue to be available, and it is less likely that in any major operation in Europe the originally available runways will be immediately, and certainly not continuously, available. Again, there is a vast latitude for assumptions in any operational analyses or requirements studies.

But even aside from the question of runway availability, allegedly there are many operational questions which must be answered before the military services can fully determine the military worth of V/STOL fighters and other combat aircraft, including such factors as field maintenance, supply and command, and control. We believe that sufficiently valid data on this subject can only be obtained by conducting tests with V/STOL fighter-type aircraft in an environment which simulates the operational condition which would be expected. At present it is said to be difficult to demonstrate the full potential of this concept with many of the current configurations because of limitations of propulsion systems. Nevertheless, it appears possible with existing propulsion systems or those nearing the final stages of development to plan on V/STOL fighter-type aircraft with which to gain such a meaningful operational assessment. But, in every case, the very propulsion system development that makes V/STOL attractive would also enable one to design new, more conventional fighter aircraft with greater range and payload if the requirement of vertical takeoff and landing is removed. For the same weights and mission profiles the V/STOL aircraft is heavier in gross weight than a corresponding STOL (2,000-3,000-foot takeoff and landing runs). As lightweight propulsion components are further refined and developed the point may be reached where the cost, performance, and complexity associated with vertical takeoff and landing becomes small enough that even an occasional military need for such capabilities over the entire mission spectrum and life of a fighter aircraft would justify its inclusion.

It is clear that whether our future fighter is to have a true vertical takeoff and landing capability or only an improved short takeoff and landing capability, progress in the tactical fighter field will depend on developments in lightweight turbojet and turbofan engines. Although the military services have had exploratory development and advanced development underway in this area for several years, and have participated in foreign developments in this field, it appears that the United States is now at the point where engine technology will permit development of jet engines useful in operational aircraft having performance characteristics satisfactory in terms of meeting U.S. requirements.

CONCLUSIONS

Approximately $50 million of U.S. funds have been invested in support of the British P-1127 aircraft and its related engine, the BS-53. Undoubtedly this contribution has been of great assistance to the British in gaining the leadership in V/STOL aircraft and engines. It has been said that the British are 2 years ahead of the rest of the free world in the development and production of lift and lift/cruise engines.

Over the past 14 years the Department of Defense has expended over $300 million in V/STOL aircraft programs and has yet to obtain any prototype in sufficient quantities to conduct an operational suitability evaluation.

Two Department of Defense ad hoc groups in the last 8 years have recommended that aggressive action be taken in the overall field of V/STOL technology. As late as 1960, the Perkins ad hoc group concluded that "the state of the art in V/STOL technology has advanced to the point where V/STOL aircraft capable of meeting operational requirements can be developed. The full military usefulness of V/STOL must be demonstrated through operational evaluation. Unless a program for operational suitability is initiated, the state of uncertainty that exists today will continue." Only one of the U.S. V/STOL programs is scheduled to provide a minimum number of aircraft for such a test, the XC-142, and the five programed is a very modest number for such an evaluation.

The technical feasibility of V/STOL fighter and transport type aircraft has been clearly demonstrated. A technological breakthrough in propulsion or aerodynamics is not required for the development of V/STOL aircraft with useful payload and range capabilities.

An analysis of the data presented indicates that there are valid military requirements for V/STOL transport and tactical fighter aircraft. The triservice V/STOL development program, encompassing the XC-142A, the X-19A, and the X-22A, appear to satisfy the immediate needs for aircraft to investigate the operational suitability of the transport aircraft. However, it is the subcommittee's judgment that none of the programs presently being supported by the Department of Defense are adequate to determine the operational suitability of a V/STOL fighter aircraft for close tactical support.

RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) Our primary recommendations is for the Department of Defense to proceed with the implementation of a program to develop and acquire sufficient quantities of V/STOL tactical fighter aircraft to determine the operational suitability of this type of aircraft for application to the tactical air missions of the military services.

(2) Our second recommendation, if the Department of Defense is to proceed in the direction of V/STOL implementation, is associated with the recognition that the propulsion system paces the overall V/STOL program. If V/STOL has a place in the military mission, it is imperative that development be vigorously accelerated on both a lift-cruise and a direct lift jet engine.

(3) Our third recommendation is that the military services do not overcommit themselves to the helicopter to the detriment and interests of V/STOL transport aircraft when they become available. Transport aircraft such as those being developed in the triservice V/STOL development program, if proven successful, should be considered for the forward supply mission as well as improved helicopters now under development.

Participation by New Jersey Citizens in Inspection Tour at Alagoas, Brazil, in the Partners for the Alliance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on January 10, a representative team of New Jerseyites flew to Alagoas, Brazil, for an on-the-spot inspection tour sponsored by the Partners for the Alliance program, a part of the Agency for International Development. The purpose of this visit was to explore the needs of the people in Alagoas, and then, upon return, to inform various organizations, such as service clubs, about the needs, and to encourage programs to meet these needs.

The objective of the partners' concept is to help those in Latin American rural and slum areas who are striving to obtain a better life. The Alliance for Progress seeks to utilize the energies of the peoples of the Americas for hemispheric development.

These projects are limited in objective. It may be to fill the need for a gasoline generator for a night literacy class, for a blackboard or pencils and papers for a rural school, for tools or equipment for agricultural projects involving irrigation, or for the provision of funds for the purchase of drugs and medicines for mobile health units or health centers.

At the 28th annual congressional dinner of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, held here in Washington on February 4, Fred H. Groel, president of the New Jersey State chamber, delivered an address, part of which was devoted to the efforts of the New Jersey team in connection with their recent visit to Alagoas. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Groel's remarks at the dinner be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH MADE BY FREDERICK H. GROEL, PRESIDENT, NEW JERSEY STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AT ITS 28TH ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL DINNER

There is one small group of men who are here tonight as guests of the chamber whom I would like to recognize at this time. They have just undertaken an unusual responsibility for citizens of our State, and before

I ask them to rise for a bow, let me tell you a little bit about what they have done.

As you are all keenly aware, one of the grave dangers the free world has been facing is the invidious infiltration of Communist subversives into neutral and peaceful nations. Cuba, of course, is the extreme example in this hemisphere. But few, if any nations in Central or South America, are immune to this disruptive and demoralizing force.

It was to demonstrate to the people of these nations our genuine concern for their well-being that the Alliance for Progress came into being in 1961. Under the Alliance program, Latin America's hopes and aspirations in the free world were given new encouragement by means of assistance in self-help projects initiated by these nations for their own advancement.

On January 10, a "team" of five New Jerseyites—a doctor, an educator, an agriculturalist, an engineer and a businessman—flew to Brazil to establish contacts in Maceio, the capital city of Alagoas whereby this voluntary exchange program can be activated with a counterpart group of citizens of Alagoas.

The five members of New Jersey's visitation team were hardly on a junket. They flew economy class and, once in Brazil, they often traveled by jeep. They spent much of their time in primitive, rural areas at the front lines, so to speak, where the free world is battling a cunning opponent for the minds and the hearts of Brazilian people. Incidentally, the team members report nothing but praise for the dedication and effectiveness they saw of American Peace Corpsmen in action.

Not all of the team members could be here tonight, but I want you to know them by name and to meet those that are with us.

Not present: Jesse B. Aronson, M.D., director, Division of Local Health Services, New Jersey Department of Health; Everett C. Curry, president, New Jersey Education Association; Louis J. Fontenelli, engineer (retired), the Fibro Corp., division of the Drackett Co.

Present: Frank A. Soraci, director, Division of Plant Industry, New Jersey Department of Agriculture; Charles C. Phillips, president, Edgar Phillips & Son, Inc., and also temporary chairman of the Partners of the Alliance for Progress; Wade B. Fleetwood, special assistant, State and local partnership program, Partners of the Alliance for Progress, Washington, D.C.

Incidentally, the State chamber has been pleased to lend its support to the organizational work of the New Jersey "Partners" committee. Mr. Phillips, as I mentioned, has been acting as temporary chairman pending formal organization of the New Jersey "Partners" committee. And while I know both men would prefer to remain in the background, I must mention, too, that Art Cox, the chamber's public relations director, and Al Acken, our executive vice president, have put quite a bit of their time into this program. Art has been acting as secretary of the committee. Al is chairman of the nominating committee, responsible both for the selection of the visitation team and for the creation of a permanent committee organization to implement the many details of this program.

We must also acknowledge here the leadership of Senators CLIFFORD P. CASE and HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., as well as Congressmen PETER W. RODINO, JR., and PETER FRELINGHUYSEN in getting New Jersey citizens started in this worthwhile undertaking. As you can see, this is a matter that completely transcends partisan considerations. We hope everyone here will soon be taking part in the "partners" program.

Prayer in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, learning more about government and how it works is of the utmost importance to our young people.

A group of students at Glenridge Junior High School in my home city of Winter Park, Fla., have exhibited a high degree of interest in a matter close to all our hearts, the right to offer prayer to our Creator during morning classes.

When I say these young people have shown a great deal of interest in this matter, I mean just that, and I think my colleagues should be aware of their efforts in this direction. In all the debate I have heard on this topic and in all the hundreds of pages which I have read on the same subject, I do not believe I have ever had such a poignant reminder of the real need for a constitutional amendment that will allow a simple Bible reading to be voluntarily offered at the start of each school day.

I place the following petition from the students at Glenridge Junior High School in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I hope that speedy and favorable action can be had on such an amendment.

Mrs. Marcia J. Howe, 2831 Leon Hart Road, Winter Park, was kind enough to bring this matter to my attention. I wish especially to commend her teenagers, Dave and Deb, who helped draft the petition and all the fine students at Glenridge Junior High who signed the petition, as well as their teachers who guided these students in this interest in government.

The petition follows:

Hon. EDWARD J. GURNEY:

We, the undersigned, students and teachers at Glenridge Junior High, desire your attention to the following petition:

We desire an amendment that will permit us to legally have a simple Bible reading to start our day.

We clearly understand and want separation of church and state.

We wish no compulsory prayer.

We condemn no one not wishing to participate.

We realize moral and religious training should come from home, but,

We fear faith in the "Almighty" will be eliminated from our Government.

We want to be sure our President always holds his hand on the Bible when taking the oath.

We want judicial courts always to require the oath.

We do not want "Under God" taken from the pledge to the flag.

We feel our founders based our democracy on trust in God.

The Declaration of Independence states: "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. When any form of government becomes destructive to these ends it is the right of the people to alter it."

We, therefore, feel that all people should be able to vote on this issue.

Steve Callahan, Barbara Bremer, Charles, Drawdy, Bob Kelley, Denis Hall, Susan Raymond, Jim Carroll, Casey J. Fisher, Debbie Howe, Jane Frash, John Martin, Paul Fasolas.

Pat Powers, Michael Haddad, Kathy Royal, Paul Brown, Brian LeHemp, Beth Bauman, Steve Lytle, Mark Johnson, Clifford Russell, Shelly Barber, Bob Duniho.

Michele Anderson, Joe Westbury, Jr., Smokey Hardison, Tom O'Keefe, Chuck Kilgore, Marianne Draper, Helen Delgado, Chris Steele, Ellen Marie Sewell, Judy Stephenson, Sharon Barder, Kathy Rogers.

Pam Lab, Dianne Ward, Daryl Jackson, Sybil Kane, Frances Bohn, Cathy Clements, Barbara Ferris, Dianne Driver, Donna Barker, Janice Amos, Judy Olsen, Carol Dominick.

Martha Felshaw, Paul Yotter, Peggy Mitchell, Linda Benton, Gail Balderson, Richard Talton, Lynn Van Scoyoc, Windy Ellington, Karyn Jones, Jodie Albright, Ellyn Jones, Gwynn Gullickson.

Fay Sander, Debra Kiessling, Janet Duome, Linda Dicks, teacher, Janet Fischer, Debbie Berkey, Phyllis Hughes, Phyllis Buchanan, Judy Cook, Loretta Mock, Nancy E. Kropp, teacher, Dale Lee.

John H. McLeaish III, Eddie Butler, Betty Johnson, Jeff Herbert, Liza Birdwell, Sue Coushars, Khaki Graeme, Diane Beeler, Paula McBane, Robin Martens, Linda Greene, Bruce Parker.

Ginny Dales, Brenda Keener, Melanie Jones, Melinda Tetreault, Nancy Brut, Sue Crozier, Sherry Broadwell, Albert Richard Boesch, David Allen Howe, Deborah Jean Howe.

The Great Risk of the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the March 1965, issue of Nation's Business contains an article which merits the attention of all Members of Congress as we consider all the legislation being proposed under the Great Society. The article was written by Dr. Felix Morley, a Pulitzer Prize-winning former newspaper editor and college president. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article, entitled "The Great Risk of the Great Society," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Nation's Business for March 1965]

THE GREAT RISK OF THE GREAT SOCIETY

(By Felix Morley)

Just as pertinent as the cost of the Great Society, though much less discussed, is the question of whether it can, in practice, be attained by governmental action. One fears that the answer must be: Only under a much more authoritarian rule than the American people have ever, as yet, been willing to accept.

The basic problem of unemployment helps to illustrate. Communism has undoubtedly solved that problem, after a fashion. An unskilled Russian, whether displaced by automation or otherwise out of a job, is simply drafted into the army or ordered to some menial civilian occupation. Whether he or she enjoys the work assigned is wholly immaterial. Because of this dictatorial procedure the Soviet Government can, and does compare its full employment with scornful reference to the persistent 5 percent out of work reported by the United States.

But if we look closely into the actual character of our unemployment quite a different picture emerges. The statistics include housewives who have held remunerative jobs in the past and are willing to work again, at hours and in places of their own choosing. They include youngsters who have given up schooling in search of income which will get them a hot rod, a weekly hairdo or other enticing pleasures. The unemployment statistics include older people unwilling to leave the depressed areas where work is scarce. And they include not a few who would rather live on relief than accept a disagreeable job. In Russia all such people would be hard at work, at wages they would not be entitled to question.

This is not to assert that all the unemployed in this country are voluntarily in that condition, nor to suggest that there is no misery and suffering from involuntary unemployment. Nevertheless it is true that the American way is not to make work legally obligatory, except for the relatively few who are called into military service. And as long as that free system prevails, human nature being what it is, we shall have the unemployment which slavery so easily eradicates.

Between the relief of unemployment and its elimination there is, unfortunately, an inherent contradiction. The more adequate the support provided for the workless, the less will be their incentive to support themselves. Often this sociological law works out fortunately for mankind. The great artist, Vincent van Gogh, in his lifetime never sold even one of his now almost priceless paintings. He was enabled to stick to his unprofitable easel by the faith and charity of his brother. Today the museum that possesses even a single van Gogh is by that fact alone distinguished.

There is, of course, inefficiency in a system which maintains that individuals should have the right to choose just how and when and where they exercise a lawful talent. For every unemployed Van Gogh, or Poe, or Mozart, there are doubtless thousands of drones who will never produce anything of beauty or value. But the emphasis on freedom pays off with sufficient frequency to justify some subsidization on other than humanitarian grounds, even at public expense.

A new concept in subsidization is, however, apparent in President Johnson's visualization of the Great Society. Evidently it is his belief that by pouring out billions, improvement of many kinds will come as an almost automatic result. The greater the expenditure, he suggests, the greater will be the accomplishment. That belief ignores the contradictions inherent in the planning of any representative Government.

These contradictions are already disconcerting enough, even while the concept of a Great Society is no more than a political talking point. Beautification of our cities is one of its worthy objectives, involving expansion of the Federal urban renewal program. Unfortunately this has demonstrated that wholesale elimination of slums tends not only to create new blighted areas, but also to increase unemployment.

In his well-documented book, "The Federal Bulldozer," Prof. Martin Anderson of Columbia University has collected evidence of both these defects which is as yet uncontroverted. Researchers at Brown University, he tells us, "found that 40 percent of the businesses in the urban renewal areas of Providence, R.I., had to go out of business." In many cities adjacent districts have deteriorated as old ones were improved.

In other fields of potential improvement the right hand of the planners also works to obstruct what the left hand is doing. A major objective of the Great Society, as stated, is to insure that no worthy American youth shall be denied college training through lack of financial means. Scholarships are to be made freely available at Government expense. Yet simultaneously other governmental agencies are draining away from the colleges a large proportion of the better teachers who alone can make higher education worthwhile.

The president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington tells us, in his current annual report, that of all the qualified scientists in the country "nearly three in every five were (in 1963) engaged in projects supported or sponsored by the Federal Government, or located within the Government itself." A sister foundation, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, is deeply worried by this professorial flight from the campus to Government jobs.

Better transportation is another objective of the Great Society and experimental high-speed trains, shuttling swiftly from Boston to Washington and back, are promised as an initial rail improvement. The development is heralded, ironically enough, just as the bankrupt New Haven, dragged down by stifling regulations, humbly petitions for the right to abandon all passenger service over a part of this very route.

Indeed, one cannot examine any aspect of the Great Society without turning up existing inconsistencies which cast grave doubt on the possibility of attaining utopia by governmental action. In the field of public health the Surgeon General warns us against smoking. But even as he does so the Department of Agriculture goes on paying what are in effect substantial subsidies to tobacco growers. If the one position is well taken, obviously the other is not.

Some of the contradictions are, even for a patient people, scarcely tolerable. Illegitimacy and juvenile delinquency are frequently related problems. Yet relief programs pay a bonus for illegitimate children as delinquency mounts. A variant of this problem is the case of those elderly couples now living together out of wedlock, so that a widow need not lose the social security benefit which she would forfeit with remarriage. The practice is scarcely compatible with the ideals of the Great Society, as promoted.

If these conflicts in policy were merely a result of bureaucratic bungling, they would be less serious. Inconsistencies could be removed as they became apparent, as is done arbitrarily in Russia.

But in a democratic society, pledged to the principle of "one man, one vote," contradictions are a built-in hazard. Voters form into conflicting groups and the lawmakers must lend an attentive ear to their lobbyists, or else risk repudiation at the polls. Consequently, with a few courageous exceptions, Congress tends to favor all strongly urged expenditures, regardless of whether or not the objectives harmonize. Then multitudinous Federal agencies are set up to administer conflicting policies and happily go their various ways, regardless of cross-purposes.

What causes concern is the certainty of increase in these stultifying inconsistencies, assuming that the contemplated Great Society is to remain a free society, as President Johnson surely hopes. Under our system it can be very difficult to put an end to unworkable governmental policies, even if no well entrenched interest seeks their continuance. The prohibition era should have taught us that.

Dillusion is therefore the foreshadowed end of effort to produce this Great Society by legislative action. The more grandiose the effort, the greater the eventual confusion and frustration is sure to be. Conceivably utopia could be attained by the well-planned methods of a ruthless dictatorship. Fantasies have been written on that assumption and hard-core Communists, in spite of dreadful failures, still believe it possible. But utopia for a Marxist would be far from that to a thoroughly regimented America. He would more likely call it Hell.

A Great Society, directed by governmental agencies, implies centralized controls over every part and aspect of the society. Such a concept is directly at variance with the theory of a federal republic, under which the function and power of centralized government are sharply limited. From the constitutional viewpoint even the phrase is objectionable. A great society would necessarily be standardized and regimented, with spontaneous local effort subordinated to the assumed good of the whole. It would mean, in economic terms, the enlargement of centralized planning at the expense of the free market.

Yet it is the vitality of the free market more than any other factor, which has brought the United States to the stage where a Great Society can be discussed as something other than an idle dream.

What Americans have accomplished is in large measure due to faith in spiritual rather than in political leadership. To turn from the former to the latter could mean that we have already reached our summit and are starting downhill. It could mean that instead of perfecting our society we are proposing to forget the elemental virtues which have already made it great.

Demonstrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the whole country is swept up in the violence of demonstrations and such pressure has been condoned by the President, it may be well to pause and contemplate what Thomas Merton, outstanding Catholic writer and philosopher, who has dedicated his life to God as a member of the Trappist Order, had to say about demonstrations. I include here an excerpt from Thomas Merton's "The Seeds of Contemplation":

DEMONSTRATIONS FROM "THE SEEDS OF CONTEMPLATION

(By Thomas Merton)

This is not communion, only immersion in the general meaningless of countless slogans and cliches repeated over and over again so that in the end one listens without hearing and responds without thinking. The constant din of empty words and machine noises, the endless booming of loudspeakers and by making true communication and true communion almost impossible. Each individual in the mass is insulated by thick layers of insensibility. He doesn't care, he doesn't hear, he doesn't think. He does not act; he is pushed. He does not talk; he produces conventional sounds when stimulated by the appropriate noises. He does not think; he secretes cliches.

He is not a person, not an individual, only an atom. This atomized existence is some-

times praised as humility or as self-sacrifice; sometimes it is called obedience, sometimes it is devotion to the dialectic of class war. It produces a kind of peace which is not peace, but only the escape from an immediately urgent sense of conflict. It is a flight into irresponsibility.

"The Phony Peace Drive"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, Mr. Thurman Sensing, writes a very interesting and informative weekly column entitled "Sensing the News." In his column for March 11, 1965, Mr. Sensing has focused attention on "The Phony Peace Drive." I ask unanimous consent that this important article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE PHONY PEACE DRIVE"

(By Thurman Sensing, executive vice president, Southern States Industrial Council)

It is amazing and deeply disturbing to note the speed and efficiency with which a nationwide campaign has been launched to bring pressure on the U.S. Government to abandon South Vietnam to the Communists.

In the last few weeks the New York Times has contained a number of advertisements in which professors from eastern colleges have portrayed the United States as an aggressor in Vietnam, as a nation guilty of barbarous and inhumane practices. These advertisements completely ignore the fact that the United States is fighting communism across the Pacific.

The scope of the appeasement effort may be gaged from the fact that one group—the Universities Committee on the Problems of Peace and War—says it speaks for 10,000 faculty members at 282 American colleges. It is truly alarming to think that there are that many college teachers who have been duped into supporting the surrender cause in Vietnam.

Joining in the clamor are the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches, who urge an immediate negotiated settlement in Vietnam. Here again, they ignore the fact that the Communists have been on the offensive from the very beginning, that as long as they are on the attack there is nothing to negotiate.

Isn't it strange that these groups did not agitate until we started hitting back? All these people are the kind that Stalin once very aptly described as "useful idiots"—not Communists, but pursuing the Communist line.

Fortunately, in the Congress, the appeasers are failing to make gains. The Nation's legislators apparently see through the phony peace campaign. But the Congress should take a much more active part in tearing the mask off the organizers of the "get out of Vietnam" effort. The House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, for example, should summon the leaders of the "peace" drive and learn their organization connections and financing.

The Congress, unfortunately, has been slow to expose the activities of radical groups. The Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which Lee Oswald—the assassin of President Kennedy—supported, was investigated only reluctantly and without any great thoroughness or promptness. The Congress should look into the groups trying to hurt the Nation's war effort in Vietnam. They may move to more dangerous activities than issuing statements. At least one group has urged that young Americans not serve in Vietnam and that citizens try to block the flow of munitions overseas. Such appeals unquestionably are a violation of the law.

It is hard to believe that the signers of the anti-Vietnam petitions are sincere. If they are so concerned about the people of Vietnam, why is it they have not been issuing petitions against the terrorism of the Viet Cong? Why didn't they express shock at the bombing of U.S. billets in Saigon? Why haven't they protested all the varied aggressive moves and schemes of Red China? The truth is that they are strangely disinterested in protesting any actions taken by the Communists.

Then, too, it is worth bearing in mind past campaigns against book burnings. Every time a town or State censors a book, there has been a nationwide uproar from liberal elements. But in the last few months the Indonesians, who work closely with Red China, have been turning mobs loose on U.S. libraries in Indonesia. But there has not been a squeak of protest from the liberal element.

The fact is that the domestic radicals, who are strongly entrenched in a number of colleges and universities, have a double standard. If an anti-Communist government makes any move to assure its security, a global propaganda drive is begun against it. Thus the liberal-leftists are going all out in their propaganda drive that virtually stabs in the back American servicemen in Vietnam. Yet these same liberal-leftists, many of them in university ivory towers, or clerical robes, can find all manner of excuses for pro-Communist governments that injure our citizens, destroy our property, or otherwise do damage to American rights and interests.

CATV—Past, Present, Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a lot of attention is being given to the problems of Community Antenna Television of CATV throughout the broadcasting community and in enumerable cities, towns, communities and the wide-open areas of the country.

This type of service was initiated years ago to supplement TV broadcasting to several areas that found it difficult to bring television in homes located in these areas. We have seen this new technique of broadcasting innovation develop, grow, and expand rapidly over the last several years. There has been much discussion of CATV. There have been many specifications made on the subject. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House has given this problem a great deal of thought and consideration. The Federal Communications Commission has given it years of consideration and is now considering the extension of its jurisdiction over this phase of the television industry.

Mr. Milton J. Shapp, president of the Jerrold Corp., Philadelphia, Pa., addressed the Federal Communications Bar Association at the National Press Club here in Washington on December 8, 1964, in which he discussed CATV—past, present, future. In view of the fact that the Jerrold Corp. pioneered in the CATV industry and engineered and installed the first commercially successful system in Lansford, Pa., in 1950, and since this corporation has supplied service and equipment to enumerable installations throughout the Nation, I would like to call to the attention of the House the speech of Mr. Shapp and therefore ask the unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD.

Mr. Shapp has been active in the Federal Government in addition to his business activity for some years. He has served as consultant to the Secretary of Commerce, Director of the Peace Corps, and Vice Chairman of the Citizens Advisory Committee of the Area Redevelopment Administration.

With this background and experience, I commend his thought-provoking discussion for your consideration:

CATV—PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE

(By Milton J. Shapp, president, Jerrold Corp.)

Community antenna television (CATV) is 14 years old this month. It has come a long way since the first commercially successful system was installed in Lansford, Pa., back in 1950.

The period of infancy is well behind. CATV has many adolescent problems, but being well fed and healthy, it is looking forward to continued and rapid growth. Some day soon it will mature and take its place as one of America's truly great industries.

It is normal for adolescents to be in conflict with entrenched authority. When youth gets a chance to try out new ideas, finds out they work and then proceeds to move forward on its own, the adult world can neither wish nor wash away these innovations.

Like many adolescents, CATV is misunderstood and misjudged by its elders. It is misunderstood by many of those who presently rule the roost in the broadcasting industry. It is misjudged by some officials who are supposed to rule over these TV roosters in the interest of the public.

Nonetheless, once launched, the next generation cannot be held back.

The day is not too far distant when almost all American cities—small and large—will be wired for television; and when rural dwellers in almost all the sparsely settled areas of the Nation will enjoy multiple-channel TV reception via cable in their homes.

That this development will have tremendous impact upon the broadcast industry is undeniable. That the TV broadcast industry will adjust to these changes and continue to grow is also undeniable. One has only to analyze the growth of radio broadcasting and of the movie industry, since they were presumably pushed into oblivion by Milton Berle on television, to recognize this basic truth. In a growing America, where free choice is the accepted mode, there is a need and scope for all kinds and types of industries to serve the entertainment demands of the public.

There is no holding back the growth of CATV. The evidence is overwhelming that the public wants TV service that only cable systems can bring and is willing to pay for it. Further, the record is clear that no seg-

ment of the public has yet been harmed by CATV, nor will it be harmed by its continued expansion.

The problems created by the growth of CATV are more confusing than need be. Indeed, they are more confusing than they are complex. Perhaps, therefore, a clarification of CATV—a review of its history and present operations and a glance at its future potential—will serve to resolve this confusion.

GROWTH OF CATV

Community antenna systems were spawned in the mountainous regions of eastern Pennsylvania.

The first commercially successful CATV system was installed in Lansford in late 1950. Then, in rapid order installations were made in Mahanoy City, Pottsville, Tamaqua, and many other cities. It soon became apparent that just as neither sleet nor rain could hold back the postman, mountains could not prevent TV signals from getting into the homes of people living in isolated communities.

The first systems were capable of carrying only three channels. However, customers stood in line to pay from $100 to $150 to connect and to sign contracts for continuing service at rates that varied between $3 to $6 per month.

At that time it was an extremely high risk business. Entrepreneurs concentrated their efforts to obtain as rapid return on investment as possible, for it was felt that when the freeze on new television stations was lifted, CATV would die.

However, during the period of 1953, 1954 and 1955, as new stations came on the air, it became apparent that the public was still willing to pay for the added services offered by wired television. In the mid-1950's engineering innovations enlarged the capacity of CATV systems so they could handle five channels. However, in areas where broadcast signals could be received on home antennas it was no longer possible to collect $100 to $150 for a connection charge. After much experimentation, it was discovered that under these conditions people were willing to pay $10 or $20 to connect to a CATV system, and $4 to $5 per month to receive more channels than individual antennas could pull in.

As the industry grew, it changed its patterns of operation. Instead of system owners seeking rapid return on investment from high connection charges, investors attempted to attract large number of subscribers at low connection charges; and operated profitable businesses deriving regular income from monthly service charges.

In the late 1950's new services were added to CATV systems. FM signals were supplied on the cable. System operators experimented with their own closed circuit originations and some provided a channel for time, weather and news information. Many systems offered channels to school districts for educational TV.

The CATV industry entered another phase in the early 1960's with the development of 12-channel systems. For the first time it became possible to install a CATV system in a town that could receive all three networks on home antennas. By means of elaborate antenna relays and microwave, the CATV system could bring in many additional programs not received clearly via rooftop antennas, and by virtue of greater capacity, offer other programs and services of local interest.

Now, as the CATV industry moves into larger cities, systems capable of handling at least 20 channels are being designed. They are on the drawing boards. If the need arises, it will be possible in the future to install CATV systems capable of delivering 40 or 50 channels of TV, plus an almost unlimited number of FM stations on a single cable.

CATV PROVIDES A PUBLIC SERVICE

The true reason for the remarkable growth of CATV, despite all the technical and marketing problems that this young industry has faced, is generally overlooked.

CATV provides the lowest cost method by which a TV setowner can enjoy the highest quality reception from all the stations he wishes to receive. In short—CATV offers the setowner a way to obtain maximum value from his television receiver. If this were not true, CATV would lose its financial base of support and would cease to grow.

To understand fully the importance of this statement, two other concepts must be clarified.

First, CATV is but one form of wired television, for all television reception—without exception—is wired TV.

Second, there is no such thing as "free television."

Once these basic concepts are understood, then much of the mystery surrounding CATV evaporates.

ALL TV IS WIRED TV

Consider the statement that all TV, without exception, is wired TV. A television receiver is nothing more than an electronic device that produces pictures on a screen when a certain sequence of impulses (signals) are fed into its circuits.

The starting place for these signals is the tuner of the TV set. No matter how good or expensive the receiver may be—whether it be for black and white or for color—a TV set does not generate a picture by itself. Nor can it develop a clear, steady picture on its screen unless noise-free—or essentially noise-free—signals are fed into its tuner.

Here's where wire comes to play. Broadcast TV signals—of any frequency, VHF or UHF—must first be collected on an antenna and then fed into the tuner of the TV set. To do this a wire must be connected between the antenna and tuner. This is true for every set, everywhere, at all times.

Now let's ask a basic question. How long need this wire be? The answer, of course, depends upon how far the TV set is located from the antenna that picks up the signals of all the stations that the TV setowner wishes to receive.

The setowner may be very lucky. With rabbit ears on top of his set he may receive enough stations, bright and clear, to satisfy him. In this case, the wire connecting antenna to tuner need be only a few inches long.

Perhaps, though, the signals in his living room are weak or bounce around and cause ghosts. In this case, the set owner may put the antenna on his roof. Now he gets better pictures, but needs a longer wire to connect the antenna to the tuner of his set.

If the TV set owner lives in a fringe area, the signals on his rooftop may not be strong enough for clear reception. In this case, he can erect a tower on his roof or on his barn or silo, or perhaps, rent some road-building equipment and build a mountain outside his home. In any event, the wire between antenna and tuner becomes longer.

Some people living in city apartments have greater difficulty obtaining clear television reception than do fringe area dwellers. Rabbit ears don't work and a tenant may not be allowed to install a rooftop antenna. But again, there is a practical solution. The modern landlord installs a master antenna to provide service to all residents of the building. Now, in addition to the long cables, all kinds of electronic equipment is installed in the system to amplify signals, filter out interference, split signals, etc.

There is no basic difference between the operation of a simple apartment house or hotel master antenna system and a CATV system.

A CATV system is merely a large master antenna that furnishes TV signals to residential and commercial areas as well as to apartment houses and hotels.

Whether connected to a building system or a CATV system, the TV set owner now finds it to his advantage to pay for antenna service rather than to erect his own antenna.

All TV reception is wired TV reception—whether the viewer uses his own antenna or a master system.

"FREE TELEVISION" IS NOT FREE

This takes me to the next basic point. There is no such thing as "free television." The only thing free about TV is the right given to a broadcaster to use the public spectrum for the operation of his private business. Everything else costs money—and and plenty of it.

The broadcaster buys programs, which in turn are purchased by advertisers. Individuals buy TV sets—black and white or color, portable or console—to suit their taste and purse. Setowners buy antennas and pay to have them erected or they pay a fee to have an antenna service furnished.

The sum total of all these purchases, at either the broadcasting or receiving end, make so-called free television one of the largest industries in America. Every phase of this industry is interrelated and important. Make no mistake about this. If pictures could not be received clearly on TV sets, broadcasters would not sell much time to as many advertisers and would not need to buy and many programs.

Costs for high-gain antennas, towers, and boosters run into many hundreds of dollars. Salt air at the shore, high winds and sleet on the plains and in mountain areas ruin antennas and make periodic and costly replacements mandatory. Insurance rates to cover property, particularly against roof damage, are rising constantly.

I repeat for emphasis—CATV offers the individual setowner the lowest cost method of wiring the best antenna to his receiver and therefore the least expensive method for receiving all the stations he wishes to view with maximum clarity.

It is important to observe that many of the most successful CATV systems are located in towns where subscribers can receive pictures with their own antennas. However, they get clearer pictures at lower cost from the CATV system.

Let me emphasize in another way that the phrase "free television" is fallacious. In addition to CATV equipment, Jerrold makes all kinds of gear to help any TV set owner resolve his individual reception problems.

Jerrold makes antennas, transistorized boosters, splitters, couplers, amplifiers, preamplifiers, etc., etc., etc. This year we will sell about $7 million worth of this equipment to help individual set owners obtain better pictures.

THE OPPOSITION OF TAME

Some of my friends and competitiors in the television accessory manufacturing business have formed an organization called TAME. The manufacturers in this organization sell close to $100 million worth of equipment each year to people they claim must be protected to preserve "free television." It is easy to understand why TAME, "in the public interest,"—of course—is so violent in its opposition to CATV.

I agree that any manufacturer or assocaition has the right to fight to protect its market. But TAME's claim that it is trying to protect the public through its oppostiion to CATV is as brazen as movie exhibitors fighting pay-TV under the pretext that they are trying to preserve "free television."

The members of TAME also overlook the fact that because CATV systems enable television set owners to get greater value from their sets, greater numbers of receivers are purchased, and dealers and servicemen in CATV areas more than make up for the loss of individual antenna sales by increased set sales and services. In actuality, as long as the operators of CATV systems do not sell or service TV sets, it has been proven, there is a net gain for TV dealers and servicemen.

This is particularly true now that color TV is rapidly becoming of major importance.

More sets sold also means higher advertising rates and greater profits for broadcasters.

If, as I claim, CATV is so good for everyone, except perhaps members of TAME (and there's nothing to stop them from making CATV equipment), why is such a fuss being stirred up these days by the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) and a certain network which proudly claims it is not an Avis when competing with the two other grants of broadcasting?

It's clear, neither the NAB nor this network seems to understand the ABC's of CATV.

CONFUSION AT THE NAB

The NAB should hang its head in shame for endorsing the Fisher report and for continuing to repeat the erroneous dire predictions of the 6-year-old Cox report.

The National Community Television Association (NCTA) is conducting an economic study that will show the inaccuracy of the data and conclusions presented by Dr. Franklin M. Fisher. Suffice it to say that the same issue of Broadcasting Magazine that commented on the Fisher report also carried two other stories. One dealt with the growth of CATV and the other stated that this is the most profitable year in the history of TV broadcasting. It's obvious that Dr. Fisher must have made his study in a vacuum, otherwise these conditions could not exist side-by-side.

Even if one were to assume that Dr. Fisher's conclusions on economic impact are correct (and I do not), all that he showed was that a TV broadcaster who operated without competition could make more money than if he had competition. I am sure that movie exhibitors could be found to testify they could make more money if there were no TV. Surely a Chevrolet dealer in any U.S. town would have higher profits if Ford and Plymouth didn't have local dealerships. Everyone in this room knows that shortly after World War II, radio stations all over the country advised the FCC that they would go out of business if additional AM stations were licensed in their cities.

If there were only two TV networks today, they would battle just as furiously to prevent a third from becoming organized as the three of them maneuver today to prevent a fourth from developing.

In this great free enterprise system of ours, competition is something we accept and learn to cope with, after we explore all avenues of preventing it from becoming established.

The issue that Dr. Fisher did not and could not prove in his lengthy report is that CATV creates competition that is harmful to the public. Nor has the NAB developed any proof of this contention.

A LOOK AT THE RECORD

Let's take a good look at this crucial point. In 1958 and 1959 the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce conducted hearings on the problem of television service for smaller communities under the direction of special counsel, Kenneth Cox. Then in May 1960, a bill to regulate CATV (Senate bill 2653) was debated on the floor of the Senate.

When one reads all the testimony submitted by witnesses at the hearings, as well as the remarks made by the Senators during the floor debate, it is discovered that only two concepts were developed that could be considered determinants as to whether the operation of CATV was inimical to the public interest.

First, it was pointed out that if CATV brought signals of outside stations into a town where a local television station was operating and by so doing created sufficient economic hardship so that the local station was forced to discontinue broadcasting, then in this case the people living in the area surrounding this town who were not being served by the CATV system and those who lived in the area of the CATV system who could not afford to pay the monthly service charges, would be denied local television reception.

Second, the spread of CATV might prevent the construction of new television stations in small population centers, and this would be contrary to the public interest, convenience and necessity.

These are the only two questions concerning CATV and its possible adverse impact on the public interest that appears anywhere in the record.

It has been 6½ years since the fear-of-economic-impact issue was first raised by a group of TV broadcasters in the Senate committee hearings. What has happened since that date?

CATV has more than doubled in number of systems and subscribers. One hundred and eleven new commercial and 65 new educational broadcasters have commenced operation, with 33 of these stations being constructed in towns already being served by CATV systems, including Durango, Colo.; Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; Coos Bay and Eugene, Oreg.; San Angelo, Tex.; and Richland, Wash.

More significant, at no time since the Senate hearings has any TV station left the air because of CATV competition.

During the 1958–59 hearings, the Senate committee heard testimony from licensees of the following 12 small-market television stations:

KXLF–TV, Butte, Mont.
KYLF–TV, Helena, Mont. (semisatellite of KXLF—sold in combination).
KMSO–TV, Missoula, Mont.
KGEZ–TV, Kalispell, Mont.
KLIX–TV, Twin Falls, Idaho.
KID–TV, Idaho Falls, Idaho.
KLEW–TV, Lewiston, Idaho (satellite of KIMA, Yakima, Wash.—sold in combination).
KFBC–TV, Cheyenne, Wyo.
KWRB–TV, Riverton, Wyo.
KLTV, Tyler, Tex.
WBOY–TV, Clarksburg, W. Va.
WJPB–TV, Fairmont, W. Va.

Among other allegations, all of these stations charged that CATV operations would drive television stations in small communities off the air by dividing the available audience to such a point that their economic base would be destroyed.

KGEZ–TV, Kalispell, Mont., had ceased operation prior to the 1958 Senate hearings, claiming that CATV competition was the cause. However, the facts revealed a different situation. The total area served by KGEZ–TV contained only 17,700 homes, of which number 6,000 were already served by CATV before KGEZ–TV went on the air. A letter from NBC prior to the construction of KGEZ–TV advised the would-be station operators that the market was too small to support the operation of a TV station and suggested that they build a CATV system instead.

THE COX REPORT

While the report issued by this committee, commonly known as the Cox report, recognized quite properly that it was "difficult" to pass on conflicting factual claims as to economic injury, it leaped to the unwarranted conclusion that many of the charges of economic injury seemed "self-evident" with regard to small-market stations. In these situations the Cox report concluded that "the introduction of CATV competition, which inevitably divides the audience, would seem likely to doom the station to extinction." The report stated that this conclusion followed "of necessity" since:

"The station will either (1) be unable to attract advertisers because its declining audience makes its cost per thousand still less favorable, or (2) be forced to reduce its time charges still further in order to hold any of its advertising business."

The Cox report continued with other dire predictions of small-market station demise:

"If a broadcaster operating in a smaller community, and therefore starting with a limited capacity in this regard, has his ability to provide what advertisers want further impaired by community antenna competition, the usefulness of his station as an advertising medium is likely to be completely destroyed. When that happens, it is simply a question of time until the station will be required to leave the air?

"Certainly the broadcasters who have appeared before the committee have presented a prima facie case as to the serious consequences which are likely to flow from the permission of the invasion of their primary markets by any of the means of extending television service discussed in this report."

PREDICTION VERSUS PERFORMANCE

But let's look at what has actually happended in the past 6½ years.

None of these small stations have discontinued operation since their 1958 testimony. On the contrary, all but two have increased their rates substantially since that time, an activity directly at variance with the Cox report predictions and hardly indicative of serious economic difficulty. These increases are as follows:

KFBC, Cheyenne, Wyo., increased rates 11-1/9 percent.

KLTV, Tyler, Tex., increased rates 16⅔ percent.

WJPB–TV, Fairmont, W. Va., increased rates 25 percent.

KMSO–TV, Missoula, Mont., increased rates 25 percent.

KID–TV, Idaho Falls, Idaho, increased rates 32 percent.

KLXF–TV, Butte, Mont., increased rates 32 percent.

KXLJ–TV, Helena, Mont., increased rates 32 percent.

WBOY–TV, Clarksburg, W. Va., same rate.

KIMA–TV, Yakima, Wash., increased rates 16⅔ percent.

KLEW–TV, Lewiston, Idaho, increased rates 16⅔ percent.

KMVT (formerly KLIX), Twin Falls, Idaho, increased rates 42 percent.

KWRB–TV, Riverton, Wyo., same rate.

In addition to the almost unanimous rate increases of these complaining stations, other occurrences since 1958–59 with regard to these licenses are significant and militate against their dire predictions.

KID–TV, Idaho Falls, Idaho, testified concerning the adverse economic effect of CATV in its area of operation. The Cox report reflected its agreement with that argument. However, so intense has been the impact of CATV in the Idaho Falls area that a second VHF television station, KIFI–TV, went on the air in 1961.

Further, two of the complaining stations have been since sold for prices which hardly reflect a sorry financial statement. Eighty percent of the KIMA–TV, Yakima, Wash. (and satellites) group sold for over $900,000, while WBOY–TV, Clarksburg, W. Va., recently brought a price of $950,000.

It is clear that the predictions made in 1958–59, supported in the Cox report and repeated ad nauseum since by the NAB and other opponents of CATV have not come to pass. By this time the reason must be obvious: There has been no significant economic impact of CATV systems on television station operation as to adversely affect the latter's continued operation.

Community antenna systems have not created the conditions of hardship for broadcasting that would make CATV operation inimical to the public interest. On the other hand, during the past 14 years it has demonstrated, in well over 1,500 systems, that the public wants and is willing to pay for this service.

CATV DESERVES FCC SUPPORT

It's about time that the FCC either stopped writing letters like those sent to Tifton, Ga., Salinas, Calif., and Bakersfield, Calif., raising issues about CATV that don't exist and casting doubt on the value of CATV service, or find evidence to support the issues it raises. The insinuations contained in these FCC letters place the CATV industry in the awkward position of either attacking the Commission for its actions, or remaining silent, and by this silence acquiescing to the accuracy of the statements.

It might be well, instead, for the FCC to advise city councils in one-station TV areas, that CATV, rather than bringing harm to the public, has, in fact, forced many broadcasters to improve programing, in order to maintain their share of the cable-viewing audience. A review of programing offered by stations in CATV areas before and after the cable was installed proves this point conclusively. The data is in the FCC files.

TV ALLOCATIONS AND MARKET AREAS

Now let me turn to the subject of market areas. Back in 1948, the FCC established its first television allocations program. At that time, engineers predicted that TV signals would not travel more than 35 miles.

Therefore, with 13 VHF channels available, it was possible to allocate five stations in the Albany-Schenectady-Troy area, five in Boston, four in Detroit, four in Jackson, Miss., etc. After the first stations began televising, it was discovered that someone had goofed. The frequencies assigned to channel 1 proved unsatisfactory. Stations had been spaced too close, because TV signals carried greater distances than anticipated. To prevent chaos, a freeze on new allocations was imposed by the FCC.

In 1952, when the new allocations program was adopted, only 12 VHF channels were assigned and spacing between stations on the same frequencies was increased. Now only 1 VHF channel was assigned to Albany-Schenectady-Troy; 4 to Boston; 3 to Detroit; 1 to Jackson. VHF allocations for Pennsylvania cities such as Easton, Harrisburg, Reading, Scranton-Wilkes Barre and York were dropped completely, and UHF channels substituted.

The assignment of TV channels took into account population densities, but did not follow a pattern for establishing market areas. For example, the only logical reason for moving Harrisburg's oroginal allocation of channel 8 to Lancaster, was the fact that Lancaster was on the air with channel 4 before the freeze was imposed. No one seriously contends that by allocating a UHF channel instead of a VHF this represented an equivalent market area for a broadcaster.

THE MARKET AREA TWIST

Time passes on. The reasons for the adoption of a particular policy are often forgotten or overlooked. Worse, they are sometimes twisted to suit one's convenience. Now, arguments are being raised by learned people, who should know better, that market areas of TV stations as allocated by the FCC must be protected from invasion by outside signals.

By what stretch of the imagination—other than to establish an unwarranted monopoly—can any TV broadcaster claim the rights to a market area?

In establishing radio allocations, the FCC deliberately assigned clear channels to some high-power stations whose programs, heard in every market in the Nation, carry advertising in direct competition with local radio stations.

No FCC or court decision has ever held that a radio or TV station is licensed to serve an area as an economic unit.

A TV broadcaster has no more right to have his market protected from competition than does a newspaper, a movie house, or a corner drugstore, unless it can be shown that this protection serves the public interest—not merely the broadcaster's desire for increased profits.

Any TV set owner has the right to pick up any television signals that are broadcast anywhere. The fact that he lives too far from a particular station to pick up the signals on his own antenna is no reason to deny him the right to receive these signals through other means.

For example, what legal authority exists to deny a resident of Chicago the right to watch WOR–TV when he can easily tune in WOR radio?

Nonetheless, this authority has been assumed by the FCC simply by controlling grants of microwave licenses.

Technically, microwave is nothing more than an invisible cable that in many cases is easier, and less costly, to install and maintain than regular cable.

That microwave is considered in the same category as wire by the FCC is shown by the tariffs which permit a common carrier to charge for the use of microwave on a mileage basis despite the fact that often the capital and operating costs for supplying service for 5- 10- or 20-mile hops are identical.

Granted, the FCC has the authority to establish rules for the use of microwave since this service utilizes the public spectrum. But, is the public in Chicago being protected if a CATV system is denied the use of microwave to bring in TV programs from New York that are desired, but not now available, in Chicago?

Is the public anywhere being harmed if this is done?

Is it not time that the FCC enforce the time-honored phrase "public interest, convenience, and necessity" as it has been enforced so often in the past, and assist rather than impede the progress of CATV where public interest considerations are clear?

PROPOSED REGULATIONS OF CATV

The FCC seeks regulations to guide the growth of CATV. I do not find this objectionable; providing the purpose is indeed to guide the growth of CATV and not to control or throttle its growth.

However, regulation won't solve the CATV controversy. It will merely introduce a new set of ground rules around which the battle will rage.

In this regard, it must be kept in mind that broadcasting is regulated solely because it uses public spectrum, whereas, CATV systems use private cables. It does not follow that CATV should be regulated because it purportedly competes with broadcasting, any more than companies that sell fuel oil should be regulated because they compete with gas and electric companies in supplying home heating materials.

In determining the type of regulation that is acceptable, the question must be asked: Who is to benefit from the regulations? The television accessory manufacturers? The networks? The FCC? CATV operators? The public? Or who else?

Let's not bandy words. For pocketbook reasons, TAME would like to control the growth of CATV. So would ABC and the NAB. The type of regulation they have suggested in documents submitted to the FCC is punitive, and they know it.

Nonetheless, speaking on behalf of my company, and not for the CATV industry, here is a program for regulation of CATV that would be acceptable.

1. Simultaneous nonduplication of programs in cities where there is only one TV broadcaster. The operation of two TV stations in a city should make nonduplication of programs unnecessary to protect the public from loss of local broadcasting.

2. The signals of all local stations, UHF and VHF, should be carried on the CATV system without degradation of picture quality.

3. In the spirit of the proposals advanced by Commissioner Ford last June, the FCC should relax its requirements for operation of UHF stations and adjust its allocation plan so that a CATV operator in a small town, not now served by a local broadcaster, can construct and operate a UHF station.

4. CATV systems should not insert advertising of any nature into the broadcast program it picks up and distributes to its subscribers.

5. There should be no holdback of microwave for CATV use and no relegation of CATV microwave to second-class status.

LEGISLATION TO HELP RURAL TV

In addition to the suggested program for regulation, one piece of legislation is urgently needed to permit CATV to provide a truly remarkable service in rural areas.

The REA law should be amended by Congress to permit companies similar to rural electric and rural telephone companies to borrow funds to install cable systems for distribution of television signals on the same basis that money is now borrowed for installation and modernization of power and telephone systems.

It would then be economically feasible in rural areas to install CATV systems that would not only bring multichannel television into all farm homes, but in addition, special educational programs, weather, and crop reports could be provided via closed circuit at very little additional cost.

To my way of thinking, this is even a more thrilling frontier for CATV to cross in the near future than the wiring of major cities. I hope that those who have shed so many tears on behalf of the rights of rural dwellers to enjoy television will join the fight to implement this program.

CONCLUSION

The future of all TV is very bright, but CATV can well be a star unto itself.

Most of the homes in this country will be wired for television before the industry reaches a point of saturation.

CATV, along with low-priced home video tape recorders, will revolutionize concepts for television programing.

You, the members of the Federal Communications Bar Association will make lots of money if you represent clients who oppose the expansion of CATV.

Your clients, though, will lose lots of money trying to stem the tide, for I give you odds that Congress, when it assembles all the facts, will not halt it.

Thanks for inviting me to speak to your group. I am sorry my speech has been so long, but I figured that I'd better get everything off my chest for the first time. Who knows—I might not be permitted back again.

John W. Rine, of Weston, W.Va., Is One of the Mountain State's Most Dedicated Promoters of Tourism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the citizens and leaders of West Virginia are keenly aware of the potential of tourism as a source of employment and revenue. The State officials have instituted comprehensive programs in order to realize the full benefits of this resource. With the continued affluence of our society, and the resultant leisure and travel time, formal advertising is being utilized to in-

crease tourist interest in the beauties and recreation facilities offered by the Mountain State. We know, however, that still another method of effectively selling a product or an idea is person to person contact.

A stanch advocate of this latter approach is John W. Rine, a resident of Weston, W. Va. Without compensation and through his personal finances this gentleman has been waging a one-man publicity campaign on behalf of tourism in our area. To gain a true appreciation of Mr. Rine's endeavors, I quote from an article which appeared in the Clarksburg Exponent of January 29:

In 1964, Rine distributed 17,197 brochures to some 38 States; he has prepared and distributed 12,000-plus pieces of literature; he has sent 3,070 postcards and pictures to 30 States and he has put out 127 copies of a book, "West Virginia in Color." These figures alone constitute an impressive record of advertisement, when one considers that Mr. Rine's sole helper is his wife, Edna, equally dedicated to tourist promotion. Yet this is only one facet of his efforts. He periodically contributes newspaper articles and very recently completed a 20-page study on the "Value of the Tourist Dollar in West Virginia."

Mr. Rine's positions as land and tax agent for the Central Midland Coal Co. and tax assessment agent for West Virginia Properties of the Ohio River Co. require considerable travel. During these trips, he dispenses supplies of literature concerning our State and then follows it up with an intensive sales talk.

His enthusiasm for tourist trade is evidenced in a personal philosophy on the subject. Mr. Rine has said:

We do not realize its present value and haven't begun to realize its vast potential. It is true our State government is constantly expanding its advertising budget and these efforts are bearing fruit. We need to have more individual salesmen spread the gospel of West Virginia as a total vacationland. More contact and cooperation between State agencies and individual citizens would be most helpful.

Not long ago Mr. Rine learned, through a friend, that two of the pictures in the reception room to my offices did not portray West Virginia in its full grandeur. He immediately forwarded to me two 20- by 24-inch photographs. We now have excellent scenes of Hawk's Nest in Fayette County; Black Water Falls in Tucker County; and the State Capitol in Charleston; which, without fail, attract the eye and arouse the curiosity of every visitor to my offices. This is a typical example of Mr. Rine's attunement to the benefits of good advertising.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Clarksburg Exponent of January 29, 1965, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Clarksburg (W. Va.) Exponent, Jan. 29, 1965]

WESTON MAN IS STATE'S MOST DEDICATED TOURIST PROMOTER

It seems prophetic that the State's most dedicated tourist promoter was born in Welcome, W. Va. John W. Rine, of Weston, has had an amazing record of success in welcoming and luring tourists to the State according to his past year's record.

The former Marshall County man first realized in 1924 there was going to be a decline in the timber, coal, and farming business. Something would be needed to take up this slack. Promotion of tourism seemed to be one of the answers.

Rine's efforts over the years have been mighty effective in the hand distribution of literature and pictures. Typical of his work is the report issued through December of the past year.

In 1964, Rine has distributed 17,197 brochures to some 38 States; he has prepared and distributed 12,000 plus pieces of literature; he has sent 3,070 postcards and pictures to 30 States and he has put out 127 copies of the book "West Virginia in Color."

Nor does John Rine's efforts stop here.

Just a short time ago, he visited the well-known Cass Railroad and became so intrigued he wrote a story for children entitled. "The Little Old Train That Talks to Boys and Girls."

By scrounging some pictures wherever he could and taking several himself he had an initial printing of 1,550 copies made and immediately distributed. A second printing of 2,500 copies was recently completed and 260 have been distributed already. These have gone to 37 States, 6 foreign countries and 270 towns and cities.

Rine is a great believer in the value of pictures. He has obtained 20 by 24 inch pictures which have gone into numerous locations throughout West Virginia and adjacent States. In his opinion, these four-colored photographs are 24-hour workmen constantly reminding people of good places to travel and see. They are pictures of Hawks' Nest, Blackwater Falls and the State Capitol Building.

In order to defray the cost of these pictures he makes a minimum, no-profit charge. "I have almost created a landslide business in picture frames," he says. Over 580 of these pictures have been distributed, he reports.

Rine is not doing this as a means of making a living. He finances his own efforts. Other than materials he obtains from the various State departments devoted to promoting tourism, he begs, borrows, buys, or writes the brochures or pieces he needs.

As the land and tax agent for the Central Midland Coal Co., and the tax and assessment agent for the West Virginia properties of the Ohio River Co., he has many opportunities to travel. He spends considerable time investigating the habits and wants of tourists and talking with them.

While on these travels Rine makes a strong and deliberate effort to dispense the huge supplies of tourism literature he carries with him. In most instances he attempts to make a personal pitch with each piece of material he puts out to sell that individual on the merits and advantages of West Virginia travel.

Naturally, he couldn't have done this by visit, so he has had to depend upon the U.S. mails to be his messenger boy. In fact, it was a stint as a prolific letterwriter to servicemen during World War II which sparked his early efforts.

His breezy, humorous, and real life letters received such satisfying comments, he enlarged upon them and eventually turned his subject matter to tourism. Starting in early 1943 and for an extended period of 30 months he wrote thousands of letters to men and women in the Armed Forces from Randolph County. As a result he made many acquaintances. He found that servicemen were most interested in his light quips and nostalgic memories of things and places around home. This served to set his writing style which hasn't changed to this day.

Then in the 1950's Rine began his tourist efforts again through letterwriting. As additional tourist material became available he started enclosing them in his letters. When it was necessary to send out checks or acknowledgments from his company, he adopted the practice of enclosing or mailing a picture postcard or brochure of a West Virginia attraction.

Complimentary letters in return spurred on to further efforts. As he found servicemen, teachers, and businessmen traveling, he induced them to become ambassadors to promote tourism in West Virginia and supplied them with materials to pass along to their out-of-State acquaintances.

John Wesley Rine has lived in Philippi, Elkins, Belington, Cincinnati, Ohio, and Weston most of his 62 years. His office in Weston is well equipped with tourist materials, a duplicating machine, and many files. His wife, Edna, oversees and tolerates his voluminous files and supplies at home. In fact, she is his attractive and hard-working secretary. She, too, is dedicated to tourist promotion.

The Rines have a son, William, who is a first lieutenant in the USAF stationed in England. A daughter, Mary Margaret Simmons, lives in Elkins and has four daughters.

Rine recognizes tourism as probably being the No. 2 business in the State saying, "We do not realize its present value and have not begun to realize its vast potential. It is true, our State government is constantly expanding its advertising budget and these efforts are bearing fruit.

"We need to have more individual salesmen spread the gospel of West Virginia as a total vacation land. More contact and cooperation between State agencies and individual citizens would be most helpful."

It goes without saying that John Rine's efforts are worth while and are proving fruitful. Unselfishly he minimizes his work but feels strongly that more can be done by dedicated West Virginians.

The Upper Monongahela Valley Association recognized that John Rine and men of his caliber are to be commended for their foresight and action. His effort is statewide in scope and should be lauded by all—more importantly, it should be emulated by others.

Something Rotten in Academe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of March 12, 1965:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 12, 1965]

SOMETHING ROTTEN IN ACADEME

Although the student rebellions and demonstrations at various universities around the country are swept with confusing crosscurrents, at least a few significant points stand out. The lessons are not all, we think, as devoid of hope as they might at first appear.

In part the eruptions seem to reflect the current worldwide passion for demonstrating against anything, and disregarding any law, that anyone doesn't happen to like. California's Governor Brown, decrying the announced resignation of University of California President Clark Kerr, blames "thoughtless students led by a handful of troublemakers."

The troublemakers, in the latest Berkeley incident, were asserting their "freedoms" and their "rights" by flaunting placards adorned with four-letter words. These students apparently were only a handful, but thousands participated in last fall's more serious demonstrations, and there were indications, or at least allegations, of extreme-leftist influence.

To the extent the disturbances represent rebellion against authority, they are hardly a new phenomenon. And to the extent that they are puerile, Communist inspired or just Cain raising for its own sake, the university authorities, like other authorities confronted with comparable problems, have to do the best they can to maintain order and discipline. They must stop, in President Kerr's words, "the continuing and destructive degradation of freedom into license."

Yet Mr. Kerr and other educators realize there is more than that to today's student troubles. In part at least there is revolt against the vast, overbureaucratized, overpopulated, undertaught, impersonal, factory-like institution that is so often the contemporary university.

Before World War II even many of the larger universities were places where the academic life could be enjoyed by students and faculty in relative peace and comfort; nowadays they are bursting their seams. While many small, and good, colleges remain, the California syndrome of giantism epitomizes the present university trend.

It would be a mistake, we believe, to attribute the remarkable growth merely to population growth in general. It is also a result of affluence and of the status symbol a college education has come to be. As a nation we have become so obsessed with the desirability of college that we have reflected too little on the suitability of many youngsters for higher learning; whether it is always in their own or anyone else's interest.

The not wholly necessary expansion has taxed the patience, ingenuity and good will of all concerned, including the numerous students who feel neglected and cut off from all but routine association with the faculty. As the same time the students are aware of a long-standing faculty trend which, in the crowded new circumstances, has conspired to exacerbate their grievances.

This, in oversimplified terms, is the "publish or perish" doctrine. Referring to "something rotten in the state of academe," the Columbia Teachers College Record notes that "with almost half our high school graduates—about 5.2 million of them—presently in college and nearly 7 million expected by 1970, teaching has become the least fashionable of the activities engaged in by college professors:

"With these hordes of students expecting to be taught, those expected to do the job are, in the main, much more interested in research and consultantships than in the enterprise of the classroom."

Increasingly faculty research and publication, often enough of little or no value, have been divorced from their once-close relationship to the teaching function. Like other undertakings sound in moderation, research and publication have been carried to excess, and the professor who doesn't conform may feel the lash of dismissal. The professors who do conform can give too little time to their over-abundant students.

So we find rebelling students taking the sides of professors they consider victimized by the system, as well as the other way around. That happened at California last fall; at Yale the other day students were demonstrating against the refusal to grant tenure—permanency of position—to a professor regarded as guilty of insufficient publication. In demanding a reassessment of student-faculty channels of communication, the Yale students showed the connection between "publish or perish" and their own "alienation."

Now what, in such a scholastic jumble, could possibly be called hopeful?

For one thing, it seems to us the fact that at least some of the students are addressing real rather than imaginary problems is an encouraging sign. It may even suggest to them that in other spheres of life as well, gargantuan size, over-bureaucratization and incipient regimentation are afflictions requiring attention.

Beyond that, the problems themselves, and their inter-relation, are coming into clearer focus. A few years ago not many people outside the academic life knew or cared about the publish-or-perish doctrine; today it is a matter of widespread conversation and concern. Similarly the student demonstrations, whatever other elements are mixed in with them and however out of hand some of them may get, are helping bring awareness of the problems.

We repeat that indiscipline for its own or pornography's or communism's sake cannot be condoned, and it is not easy to separate the wheat from the chaff. One way or another, however, society needs to be reminded that it has been somewhat heedless about education, including its attempts to cram a college degree into practically every youngster's hand if not an education into his head.

Improved understanding alone is plainly not enough to bring correctives, and we have no idea when or whether solutions will be forthcoming. But only with the beginning of an understanding of the troubled and changing campus can the search for any solutions begin.

Legislative Authority for Senate Select Committee on Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have just received the results of a nationwide poll of the membership of the National Federation of Independent Business on Senate Resolution 30, on January 15, 1965.

The results are both stimulating and encouraging. I know that Senators, especially those who have an interest in the small business community, will find it of interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter informing me of the results of the poll be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION ON INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., March 1, 1965.

Re Senate Resolution No. 30.

Hon. WINSTON PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR PROUTY: We have just completed a nationwide poll of our membership on your resolution, Senate Resolution 30, that would provide legislative authority for the present Senate Small Business Committee.

Having been very active with this committee from its inception these past 25 years, it is self-evident if there is any relief going to be forthcoming to small business it will have to come through the Small Business Committee of the Senate having the same legislative authority as Education and Labor and Agriculture.

The poll reached 200,345 Federation members in the 50 States, all individual members comprising independent business and professional men. The result of the poll was 76 percent for, 18 percent against, 6 percent no vote.

It would be my belief that the result of this poll should be of considerable importance to your colleagues and you might find it appropriate to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,,
Vice President.

Julia Acker: Lady of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there can never be too much praise given to my beloved friend, Mrs. Julia S. Acker, of Longview, Tex. She is one of the most outstanding women I have ever known. I include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared March 7, 1965, in the Longview Morning Journal about her. The editorial was written by her longtime employer, Publisher Carl Estes. Julia, before she married, was a Shaw. No families have contributed more to the betterment of our area than the Shaws and Ackers.

The editorial follows:

LADY OF THE PRESS

Mrs. Julia S. Acker, a grand and gracious lady of the press, has made known her decision to retire as women's editor of the Longview News and Journal, after 32 years of distinguished service with these newspapers. It was with mixed emotions that we considered her request, which was based on the advice of her physicians.

Happily, we have met her wishes for complete freedom to rest and relax, to visit and travel, and enjoy the leisure which she has so fully earned. We are happy that she is making a good recovery from an illness.

Reluctantly, we have given her up in the role of her official duties and responsibilities—a role in which she was inimitable in thoroughness and unsurpassed in faithfulness.

Pointedly, we have not and shall not give up her friendship and the warm personal understanding and mutual trust which we have enjoyed with her over all these years.

Naturally, all of us here at the News and Journal appreciate and love her very much. We shall miss her tremendously, for her continuing example of devotion to duty and dedication to community service through the newspapers was both challenging and inspiring to us all.

Julia, across the years of her professional career, set a pattern of helpfulness and loyalty that was as unmatched as was her capability in her chosen field of service. She was as much a part of the News and Journal as the mastheads, and always was at the center of activity and interest in any group of the newspaper family.

In doing such a magnificent job for the newspapers and the community, she has made an indelible personal imprint on the civic and social, the cultural and religious life of Longview and the east Texas area.

Her acquaintance list undoubtedly is the largest anyone enjoys in the Longview area—and all of them are her warm friends. There is scarcely a family, or an institution, or a community organization that she hasn't helped in a special way. Her talents, indeed, are many.

All of us here at the News and Journal long ago came to realize that there was only one Julia Acker, for none other could match her warm sympathy and understanding heart and her ability and willingness to make a useful contribution to numberless worthy causes.

We count ourselves blessed to have had her as a news associate and honored to have had her as a close friend across the years—a friendship forged under the common stress of duty and service and polished by appreciation and understanding to an everlasting brightness.

Julia Acker in retirement is as welcome at the News and Journal as she always has been. We want her and her family and friends to know there will forever be a place for her in our hearts. We sincerely invite her to come "home" at any time, and we shall be greatly disappointed if she does not come often.

We extend our most heartfelt best wishes to Julia Acker, now private citizen, but in our hearts always a grand lady of the press.

CARL L. ESTES.

Participation of Clergy in Demonstrations at Selma, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed, and I am confident that the other Members of this body will also be impressed, with the views of a young minister who has expressed concern about the influx of members of the clergy into Alabama, for the purpose of participating in the current demonstrations at Selma. In the March 12, 1965, issue of the Light, the publication of the Plymouth Haven Baptist Church, near Mount Vernon, Va., Rev. Charles B. Nunn, Jr., has set forth in a very eloquent fashion his concern about the ministerial visits to Selma. His views are expressed in his weekly "Pastor's Corner," under the title "Does the End Justify the Means?"

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this excellent article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Light, Plymouth Haven Baptist Church, Mar. 12, 1965]

DOES THE END JUSTIFY THE MEANS?

This week's events in Selma, Ala., create many different feelings within each of us—disgust, sympathy, fear, admiration. In times of extreme emotion, the call of God is for men and women to use the God-given sense of reason given to them. History reveals too plainly the tragic story of adults and children that have been caught up in the emotional surge of their times and though well meaning, accomplished little of ultimate good through their efforts. On the contrary the opposite has been the effect far too often. For example, the thousands of adults as well as children that needlessly lost their lives in the crusades of the 11th–13th century in an effort to free the holy land from the Moslems; the many times during the frontier days when innocent men were hanged because justice had to be carried out—and men speaking in a logical way made it seem right. And should we so soon forget the shameful slaughter that took place during World War II because Adolf Hitler said, "The end justifies the means for the survival of the state and the betterment of mankind."

The Kingdom of God goes forth borne by men whose reason controls their emotions. The Apostle Paul is a good example of one who reasoned a course of spiritual revival toward social change, rather than encouraging by his action, revolution and the possible death of innocent men, women, and children.

In times like these we must always ask several questions. Does the end justify the means? Will the means really accomplish the kind of goals we desire? What are the real motives in these freedom marches and in the men who share in them? Tragically enough, we see emerging on every hand the shadow of a Messiah compulsion or the determinism of a dictator. The temptation has its appeal for every man regardless of who he is, what his religious expression, or color of skin. The sickness of today is not only missiles but misguided men.

My conviction is this: The rights of men are found and expressed basically in the salvation of Christ Jesus and the progressive unfolding of that freedom in a society of spiritual dignity and good will. Every man's worth then is measured in the fact that "for you, Christ died."

This briefly is the objective of the Christian as I understand it. I am basically opposed to pressure groups for the evidence is abundant in the past as well as present that they breed resentment and hatred. And the last condition can be worse than the first.

I wish no bus or plane ticket to participate in any march—anywhere. I am persuaded that the advancement of the Kingdom of God can best be served by other means. Lest we forget—"Fools rush in where angels fear to tread."

Your pastor,

CHARLES NUNN, Jr.

User Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the AOPA Pilot magazine of March 1965, has been called to my attention by Mr. Richard F. Bidwell of Annandale, Va. I herewith commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress:

USER CHARGES

You are an identifiable recipient, receiving a service or privilege from the U.S. Government which provides special benefits above and beyond those which accrue to the public at large. According to the Bureau of the Budget, that is the description to be applied to you as an aircraft owner or pilot. Having placed that arbitrary label on you, the Bureau of the Budget (which is accountable only to the President) added this significant language, in its Circular A-25 dated September 23, 1959, to the heads of all Government agencies: "* * * A charge should be imposed to recover the full cost to the Federal Government of rendering that service." Note particularly the words "full cost."

This language is quoted from a document that may well prove to be one of the most significant bureaucratic edicts of this decade, for it establishes what is rapidly taking on the complexion of a whole new form of taxation. Circular A-25 is a five-page single-spaced document that has the effect of declaring vast numbers of American citizens to be members of minority groups, the privileged recipients of special benefits, with everything from a visit to the Smithsonian Institution to the flying of a plane from Loco to Jolly, Tex., being declared arbitrarily to be a "special benefit."

Circular A-25 goes on at great length to show how the Government now can construe almost any citizen not actually on relief to be receiving some benefit or service above and beyond the public interest. The farmer, for example, should be ripe picking, according to this document. Applying this principle to the farm support program, for example, would make it a special benefit, hence the farmer apparently might be expected to pay the full cost back to the Government. And the farmer should be required to pay a user charge for any technical assistance he gets from the Government.

The national parks had nearly 95 million visitors in 1963, who accounted for $6,451,000 in receipts to that Government agency. But the agency spent $132,610,000 more than it took in during that same year—and the policy now is to seek recovery of the full cost, because people who visit those parks also are considered to be receiving special benefits. This should price a national park out of existance.

Civil aviation, and particularly general aviation, faces one of the most serious problems of all affected users. Only a comparative handful of Goevrnment officials realize that many of the FAA expenditures for what general aviation now is to be charged a yet unknown series of fees are of little or no use to general aviation. To a very large extent, these expenditures have been undertaken arbitrarily by the FAA without reference to those of us now being asked to pay for them.

Many questions must be answered. Robert Monroe raises one of the most basic ones, in his article in the February Pilot: are user charges constitutional?

Is the airplane merely the plaything of a small group of beneficiaries, or is it a vital link in the country's transportation and communications system? Is it a special benefit for general aviation to have to comply with some of the most bizarre and oppressive rules, regulations, and procedures imposed on any American citizens in any walk of life—then have to pay for them?

The whole problem raises some philosophical points as to the attitude of the U.S. Government toward its constituents. Although civil aviation was long ago declared to be an overall system of transportation and communications in the public interest, the user-charge concept diffuses the term "public interest" to the point of bewilderment. For the purposes of the user-charge program, almost everyone has been declared to be a member of a minority. People who fly represent only a small percentage of the total population. So do boatowners, citizens who visit national parks, people who deal with officers of the Customs, Immigration, and Public Health services; others who deal with the Government's prison and parole system, the Bureau of Mines, the Department of Agriculture, all of the many special bureaus of the Department of Commerce—and dozens of other examples throughout the Government.

Thus, for purposes of this new concept of disguised taxation, everyone becomes a member of a minority. AOPA thinks this one of the most far-reaching and dangerous concepts in recent years. It is contrary to the fundamental principles of the U.S. Government, that the Government should only provide facilities and services that are essential, and that the people cannot provide for themselves. Now, however, the bureaucrats are in a situation where, in the interest of their own perpetuation, they have literally invented thousands of services and benefits that the taxpayers neither need nor have had a voice in, and now want to force these same people to pay the full cost of that folly.

If, as the Government now contends, all these many minority groups must pay the full cost for their services and benefits, why is the Government dabbling in these many fields at all? If the user can pay the full cost, which presumably is no longer in the public interest, then why shouldn't the user be buying only those services he actually wants from private industry? Instead of being forced to foot the bill for a vast unrealistic FAA system, for example, why couldn't the various segments of civil aviation pay that "full cost" to, say, the telephone company for only those services they actually need?

Conversely, if we in civil aviation now are expected to pay the full cost for the FAA, then why should any other taxpayers pay anything for the support of that agency? At the present time, the FAA alone costs every individual taxpayer in the country about $12.

The user charge is a complex and serious threat to general aviation. It will come in various forms: increased fuel taxes, and charges for virtually every type of certificate or other document you must get from the FAA. The actual bill has yet to be added up, but it's certain to be high. There is only one recourse: Congress—which represents the will of the people.

Profiles in Manhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there have been many news stories recently in which people have completely ignored the plight of another person attacked by thugs. It has reached the point where we wonder what has happened to America. Are we really so callous in our disregard of the well-being of others?

A recent incident in Indianapolis demonstrated that there still are many Americans willing to come to the rescue of another in need. At this point I insert an editorial from the March 15 issue of the Indianapolis Star.

PROFILES IN MANHOOD

A mugger attacked a 22-year-old woman in the parking lot behind her apartment house on North Pennsylvania Street a few days ago and threatened to kill her if she did not give him money. It was night. They scuffled. She cried out.

This caught the ear of a construction worker relaxing in his apartment. He pulled on his shoes and hurried to the young woman's help. Then a salesman living in the same building drove up. The attacker released his victim and ran, with them in pursuit. Later, with a detective's help, they caught a youthful suspect in an alley nearby. He was held for grand jury action.

The two men may have saved the young woman's life. In the same neighborhood, several years ago, a retired schoolteacher was beaten fatally by a young thug. Neither man had to go to the young woman's aid. But something made them do it.

The construction worker, L. H. (Irish) McClure, explained: "It made me mad when I looked out the window and saw the man knock her down. I've got a wife and I like for her to go to the parking lot without any trouble. * * * This 'none-of-my-business' attitude that some people have isn't any good. If everybody would come to the help of others there would be fewer people getting held up." The salesman, Harry Gardiner, said that if his wife had been attacked, "I'd appreciate people helping her."

In a Philadelphia subway the same weekend, six grown men stood and watched as eight teenagers attacked a 16-year-old girl and dragged her, screaming and struggling, down the tracks. A seventh man acted—a 23-year-old naval air reservist from Atlanta, Ga., on his way back to his base after visiting the city's historical shrines. He hurried to help the girl. He was beaten savagely. He broke away, ran to the street and called to a policeman who brought reinforcements. The eight attackers were caught.

These acts of gallantry are a bright contrasts to the cowardly apathy of 38 residents of a middle-class New York neighborhood who watched but did not even call the police during a knife-armed rapist's 30-minute attack some months ago on a young woman which ended in her death. They contrast to the 22 who watched without trying to rescue a Dayton woman atop her car which plunged into a river and slowly sank; the crowd on a busy Bronx street blandly ignoring a rapist attacking a young secretary in broad daylight.

Those who have seen action on the field of battle know that courage breeds courage, while fear breeds fear.

May the personal courage of the two Indianapolis men and the young Atlanta reservist inspire others to act with gallantry when situations call for it and reverse a trend that has threatened to become a national shame. They are the kind who can strike fear into the hearts of the punks and hoodlums who pollute so many American cities. At the same time, they give dignity and meaning to the word "man."

More on Poor Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as many of the Members of this distinguished body are well aware, I recently requested new congressional hearings in regard to the deterioration of mail service in the United States. I am most gratified to report that the chairman of the House Postal Operations Subcommittee, the honorable Mr. DULSKI, of New York, and the members of that subcommittee, have agreed to hold hearings on this matter sometime in the near future.

Judging from the hundreds of complaints I have received from persons in every part of the country our present postal service is not what it ought to be nor what it could be. I firmly believe it is getting worse every day.

If anyone doubts the condition of our mail service I would call his or her attention to the following sample complaints that I have received from postal patrons. I am sure many of my colleagues have received similar letters and agree with me that it is time some concrete action be taken to try and correct this deplorable situation:

——, NEBRASKA,
March 9, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

YOUR HONOR: I saw your article in the World Herald. It is true, we receive packages at our post office that have been mutilated by the machines. I am glad you are informing the public what does it.

I am eligible for retirement, but hate to retire because it will put a load on the other regular clerk. I hope you can force the Post Office Department to promote subclerks to regular clerks, as temporary clerks wouldn't get to work enough to know how to do the the work.

The Post Office Department tries to make the public think they are saving money, but they (the people) would be amazed at the way money is wasted on other things.

Yours truly,

—— ——.

HUNTINGTON, W. Va.,
March 12, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear CONGRESSMAN: I certainly agree with you thoroughly that the Post Office Department stinks. It should be sold back to Wells Fargo.

When a letter is mailed, today, you have no idea when it is going to reach its destination.

Yours very truly,

—— ——.

DAINGERFIELD, TEX.,
March 10, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In reading today's article in the Longview (Tex.) Journal by Fulton Lewis, Jr., relative to the mail service today, I thought you might be interested in my views on the subject as I note you intend to probe the mailing system.

Quoting the letter carrier's statement that the Post Office operation "stinks", this is a very mild description as my personal opinion is that it is "rotten". I have today received a package of yarn from Sears Roebuck, Dallas, 120 miles away, postage cost 42 cents. It was well packed at Sears, heavily wrapped with paper and enclosed in a cardboard box. When the mailman delivered it, the package was torn open and the yarn was exposed. I sent it back, and the assistant postmaster told me they had received a sack of mail from Dallas containing nine parcels and every one was damaged very badly. He thought the sack could have been caught in a conveyor. He was in the process of shipping it back (the packages).

I have just sent my third saucepan back to the Mirro Co. in Manitowoc for replacement. Each time I have asked for a refund on my mailing charges and they have paid me 62 cents.

I could go on but you probably know that first-class-letter service is the worst that it has been to my knowledge for 50 years. To-

day a letter from Pittsburgh to here takes an average of 5 days. Same from Binghamton, N.Y.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
March 10, 1965.

Congressman GUNNINGHAM
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is to congratulate you on your attack on the postal service. It has never been so bad.

Respectfully yours,

——— ———.

———, NEW JERSEY,
March 12, 1965.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: I noticed that you have said of the Post Office Department, "The service given today by our post office stinks."

I heartily agree with you and only this past week I had an occasion to complain bitterly of the service. For this reason I have decided to send on to you the evidence of extremely poor service to add to your other collection.

Some time during the week of the first of March I bought some jewelry from Gerald Sears Co., Inc., to sell at a meeting. I asked Gerald Sears to send the package to me special delivery so that it would be there in time for the meeting. You will see by the enclosed box top that on March 5, 1965, Mr. Sears paid 75 cents postage to send me this package special delivery. You will also see that it was received at the Red Bank Post Office at 7 a.m. on March 9. Red Bank is 47 miles from New York City and it took 4 days for this package to come special delivery. I will say that after it was received at 7 a.m. by the Red Bank Post Office that it arrived at my house at 8 a.m. the same day so the fault must lie with the New York City Post Office which for some unknown reason kept it sitting there all that time.

It would seem to me that there is no excuse for such poor service. I have in the past sent packages 1,000 miles and without sending them special delivery they have taken half the time that this package did.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

N. TAZEWELL, VA.,
March 15, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: Although I live 2,000 miles from your district, I want to send you the attached editorial from the Bluefield Daily Telegraph, Bluefield, W. Va.

I should like to say, more power to you in your demand for a congressional investigation of the way that the mail is being handled. From my own mail it is obvious that mail is getting abusive treatment and in many cases being torn open either accidentally or intentionally.

I would like to offer a suggestion for what it is worth: I would imagine that somewhere we must have a few postal inspectors who are overpaid and underworked, so why not assign a few postal inspectors to mail trains, planes, and highway post offices around the country, under the guise of temporary help, or trainees as postal clerks, to determine why mail is being crushed, broken open or pryed open as the case may be.

Best wishes to you for success in your efforts, and thank you for having the nerve to call to the attention of the Congress a situation which has "bugged" millions of ordinary Americans for a long, long time.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

ATLANTA, GA.,
March 13, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Subject: Postal System

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I recently read in a newspaper column by Fulton Lewis, Jr., that you were initiating a thorough probe of the "poor and deteriorating mail service."

As I am a businessman and this is a "sore" subject with me, I wish to acknowledge my appreciation for a man who is interested enough to investigate this inexcusable situation.

The postal system has reached an alltime low, and it is time someone took a clear look at the situation and recommended something to correct it.

Although I am not one of your constituents, I feel your efforts deserve a few minutes of my time to write this letter of thanks.

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

BRAZIL, IND.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Fulton Lewis, Jr., writes of your efforts to establish a House investigating committee to investigate the low state of the postal service.

I have written to both of my Senators about the very things that Mr. Lewis enumerates but they are not inclined to answer.

I can only say that I have experienced the same things mentioned in his column and even more.

——— ———.

Impeded Churchman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the administration continues its propaganda to establish trade subsidies and even aid to Communist governments, it is practical for us to review the exact conditions they have and continue to exist in the captive nations of Eastern Europe.

The Chicago Tribune printed a most timely editorial Monday, March 15, describing the imprisonment and denial of religious freedom through which Archbishop Beran of Czechoslovakia suffered.

I would like to place this editorial in the RECORD with the wishful hope that it will be carefully read in the State Department:

IMPEDED CHURCHMAN

The Most Reverend Josef Beran, Roman Catholic primate of Czechoslovakia and a cardinal designate, has arrived in Rome after spending more than 15 years under varying degrees of restraint by the Communist government of his home country. He is not expected ever to return to Czechoslovakia. His story provides an instructive instance of the contrasting values and practices of totalitarian and free societies.

In June 1949 Archbishop Beran was placed under house arrest. He was never brought to trial; in 1963, when his confinement was briefly eased enough to permit an Italian reporter to interview him, the archbishop said, "They never justified anything—they took me away, and that is all." However, in 1951 a ruling party publication had said that Beran had deserved punishment because of "his negative stand toward the church laws," and that "no state would permit a man having a negative attitude toward the state administration" to fulfill so high a function as an archbishop's. In Czechoslovakia, the Government requires a special oath of allegiance from church officials it permits to function, and insists on having a voice in church appointments.

Archbishop Beran, now 77 years old, can recall the happier years, before Czechoslovakia had been subjugated by either the Nazis or the Communists, when giving supreme loyalty to God and church did not commit a man to a collision course with totalitarian government.

It is hard for us Americans, with a government that does not try to dictate to churches and with churches that depend on voluntary support by their members rather than on government taxes, to understand how horribly tangled church-state relationships become in totalitarian states. An independence of political dictation that is taken for granted in the United States can in Czechoslovakia condemn a man to indeterminate imprisonment or exile.

The Christian in America knows pressures and temptations that tend to move him out of full discipleship. But the impeded status [to quote the Catholic church's eloquent understatement for Archbishop Beran's situation these weary years] imposed on religious men and women by Communists is not among our hardships. Archbishop Beran's reappearance in the news reminds us of one of our most important—and sometimes undervalued—blessings as a free people.

Dr. Norbert Wiener—1894–1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, today, March 18, 1965, marks the first anniversary of the death of Dr. Norbert Wiener, a great American mathematician and teacher, whose brilliant and creative achievements earn for him the respect and admiration of his contemporaries. Much of his work has had a direct impact upon the national defense and upon the science and technology of this Nation. Shortly before his death the President conferred on him the National Medal of Science for his work in biology, mathematics and engineering. I think it is most appropriate to recall, on the first anniversary of his death, the notable contributions he made in these fields which earned for him the outstanding recognition he received.

Dr. Wiener was born in Columbia, Mo., in 1894. He completed the cycle of formal education from college freshman to Ph. D. when he was 18 years of age. He was a member of the faculty of the department of mathematics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology for 42 years.

He won international renown as an original and creative mathematician and exerted great influence on developments in pure and applied mathematics as well as in engineering. One of his

earliest contributions was the development of a mathematical theory of Brownian motion, a contribution which put the subject on a firm foundation and developed the notion of randomness. Soon after, he developed the theory of generalized harmonic analysis which has had decisive influence in the fields of communications and control.

Many of Dr. Wiener's discoveries in pure mathematics have had application to diverse subjects such as the scattering of electromagnetic waves, atomic fission, radiative equilibrium of the stars, and prediction theory. It was as a consequence of his theory of prediction that he developed the comprehensive notion of cybernetics.

On January 14, 1964, in ceremonies at the White House, President Johnson presented the National Medal of Science to Dr. Wiener. The Presidential citation reads "For marvelously versatile contributions, profoundly original, ranging within pure and applied mathematics, and penetrating boldly into the engineering and biological sciences."

Last week Dr. Wiener was further honored at the 16th annual National Book Award ceremonies for his book "God and Golem, Incorporated" for science, philosophy, and religion. Mrs. Wiener accepted the posthumous prize for her late husband.

It is a distinct honor for me to remind my colleagues of this man's great contribution to society. His genius will long be remembered.

The Value of Education in the Eldercare Versus Medicare Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, in the last several weeks the American Medical Association, seeking to gain public support for the eldercare bill, has spent a good deal of money on what the AMA calls a "national educational program."

Iowa has not been excluded from this program. Many newspapers in my home State have carried advertisements explaining, in somewhat limited detail, the provisions of the eldercare and the administration-sponsored medicare bills.

These advertisements, as one might expect, state that the eldercare bill is far superior to the medicare bill. The reader is then asked to clip out a coupon at the bottom of the advertisement, fill in his name and address and, by mailing it to his Congressman, register his support for the eldercare proposal.

Since I believe in the value of education, I have been mailing out two items in response to the coupons.

One item is a reprint from the March 1, 1965, issue of Modern Medicine magazine, which offers a factual, objective comparison of the eldercare and medicare bills. This comparison, which may be of interest to some of my fellow Members, can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, on pages 4391–4392.

The other item is a copy of a letter I wrote, outlining some of the features I feel are important in connection with medical care to the aged legislation.

I am happy to report that my faith in the value of education has, in part at least, been vindicated with the arrival yesterday of a letter from a constituent, which I hereby include:

MARCH 14, 1965.

Hon. BERT BANDSTRA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for your enlightening comparison of medicare versus eldercare. There is much more to this than the average public citizen realizes.

Since we do seem to need something done, I am 100 percent in agreement with the three points covered in your letter.

Please disregard that AMA coupon I signed and sent to you and register me as for medicare.

I am definitely against deficit spending whenever it can be avoided. I am definitely for every American citizen paying his own way as nearly as possible. I am not much worried about our social security setup. I believe it can and will always be self-supporting, which is good.

Maybe it would be good if medicare had a "crash advertising" campaign to combat this eldercare "crash campaign."

Yours truly,

REX H. RYAN,

BLOOMFIELD, IOWA.

Risking and Winning: The Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us applaud the efforts of our President to stop the advance of the Vietcong in Vietnam. The question of whether or not our commitment in southeast Asia is worth it is best answered by a look at the record.

Roscoe Drummond recounts that record for us in the following column from the February 21, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

RISKING AND WINNING: THE RECORD

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Was President Johnson giving the Nation a meaningless pep talk or was he drawing on his deep instinct of what the American people really believe and will do in the showdown, when he made this statement in a Lincoln Day address almost as brief as the one at Gettysburg:

"No other people in no other time has had so great an opportunity to work and risk for the peace and the freedom of all mankind.

"It is not a burden, it is a privilege to be able to give so much for what we really believe in."

While some Democratic Senators are wringing their hands over the news from Vietnam, Mr. Johnson appears to be calling for fearlessness and fortitude on the ground that the risk is worth it.

Because there are grave uncertainties—as there were grave uncertainties when Winston Churchill took over the losing battle against the Nazis—it is not an easy choice. But I suspect the American people will choose the leadership of the President, if he gives it boldly, not the scuttle-and-run counsel of the timid.

Is a decision to win the war in Vietnam worth the risk and the sacrifice? That is the question—and a fair question. I think the answer will become clearer if we look at how far we have come and how much we have risked and won since the Communists began their effort to pick up every undefended piece of real estate.

Here is the record:

President Truman faced Stalin down in Iran and forced him to withdraw Soviet troops.

The United States saved Greece from being dragged behind the Iron Curtain.

The Marshall plan rescued the entire continent of Western Europe from the overhanging threat of communism.

The United States-British airlift prevented West Berlin from the Soviet effort to starve its 2½ million people into submission.

The United States defeated the armed Communist aggression in Korea.

President Kennedy struck from the hands of Nikita Khrushchev the instrument of nuclear blackmail in Cuba.

I am not suggesting that all is well in this turbulent world. It isn't. But everything has not gone wrong by any means. We tend to forget how much has gone right. This is a tremendous record of risking and winning. It has a direct bearing on the stake we have in preventing the Communists from unhinging the Vietnamese gate to all southeast Asia.

What does it mean?

It means that the free world has defeated every form of Communist aggression—military, economic, political, and nuclear—except one.

It means that in Vietnam the United States may well be dealing with the last means of aggression which the Communists have open to them. I refer to aggression by guerilla warfare and subversion across an open frontier.

In Vietnam the free world may well be confronting the ultimate test and last instrument of Communist agression. Some will say that it comes in a bad place for us and under the most adverse circumstances. The Communists do not choose to attack where it is easy to defend.

Some will say that it is better to let South Vietnam go to the Communists and wait for a better time and a better place to make the stand. Churchill said: "One cannot expect security by throwing small nations to the wolves."

Will there ever be a better place? Next time—and there will be a next time—the Communist aggressor will be stronger and the circumstances more adverse.

This is why President Johnson is not talking about giving up.

Colgate Shows the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Colgate University, from which I graduated and at which I also enjoy the honor of serving as a trustee, recently completed an important experiment. This was to

test what would happen if students were freed from prescribed curriculums for a period of time and left free to determine and follow their own investigations. The results are described in the following editorial from the Pawtucket, R.I., Times. I commend this interesting and complimentary commentary to my colleagues:

[From the Pawtucket (R.I.) Times, Feb. 22, 1965]

COLGATE TRIES A "DO AS YOU WILL" PLAN

Does the average 4-year college course hamstring the student, and stifle his initiative by prescribing just what he is to do each hour of the day? Colgate University in Hamilton, N.Y., has just completed a "special studies" experiment under which every one of its 1,389 students, freshmen through seniors, was put on his own and told to do anything he wanted to do. It lasted a full month. These independent-study projects ranged from studying Black Muslims and Florida web-weaving spiders to tutoring dropouts, analyzing race relations, and in learning about nuclear medicine in Bellevue Hospital in New York.

One junior chopped down a huge elm tree, dragged it to the campus and fashioned his first wood sculpture.

As might be expected, not every student benefited by the venture, but faculty members termed it a general success. Many students toiled into the early morning hours and some worked weekends. One sophomore spent the time with extensive interviews with chemistry professors and chemistry majors, and said that as a result he dispelled previous doubts as to whether to make a career in chemistry.

No liberal arts college would ever revert to an excessively selective system, such as Harvard offered during the presidency of Charles W. Eliot. But 4 weeks out of a college year is a relatively brief period, provided the results derived are worthwhile. The Colgate innovation has much to commend itself, and if in ensuing years the good is found to outweigh the unfavorable, the "special studies" idea might well be emulated. After all, the day will come after graduation when students will be thrown on their own to make independent decisions. A "Colgate" experience may be excellent preparation.

Have We Lost Our Pride?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the following column from the Cleveland Plain Dealer has aroused much favorable comment from readers and gives rise to the wish that there were a few Philip Porters giving orders in the executive branch of the Government. I commend his excellent remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

HAVE WE LOST OUR PRIDE?

(By Philip W. Porter)

What exactly to do in Vietnam is a real five-star toughie, and President Johnson needs the services of not only regular advisers, but seventh sons of seventh sons, complete with crystal balls. I don't blame him for keeping a poker face and a closed mouth. And while he's sweating out his decisions, the ignorance and apathy of the ordinary Joe Blow will not help him.

But what has happened to Joe's capacity to get sore about calculated insults, synthetic riots, and deliberate destruction of American embassies and libraries all over the globe? Have we, softhanded, weak-spined children of the handout state, so completely lost our national pride that mobs of "students" can break windows, spit on the American flag, burn up libraries, vilify the President, and in every conceivable boorish way insult us without anybody resenting it and demanding something be done in retaliation?

Is there no national capacity for anger anymore? Or is it always directed at something evil within our society instead of outside it? Does our State Department invariably content itself with a mild protest to the offending foreign office, and a request for money payment for property damage? What's happened to our self-respect?

I'm not saying we should immediately send out the Marines, or declare war at the breaking of a window. I do say our Government should retaliate firmly at once against countries where such senseless propagandist and obviously contrived hooliganism takes place, that Congressmen should demand action, and citizens should demand action of Congress and the State Department.

These riots by "students" are turned on like a faucet by the international Communist apparatus, the minute they resent and try to defeat some policy of our (such as the extension of bombing to North Vietnam). You can count on it as surely as death and taxes; students who haven't cracked a book in 10 years will suddenly emerge, complete with prepared signs, bricks, and paint and start parading and throwing things. Immediately after our latest show of strength in Vietnam, they turned on such contrived sabotage in Moscow, Buenos Aires, Santiago, Nairobi, Djakarta. (A coincidence?)

Did we announce at once a suspension of foreign aid? (Well, in Indonesia, we finally said we were going to close the library, which was already partially destroyed.) Did we bounce some diplomats of the offending countries, living it up in the lush climate of Washington? Not so you could notice it.

No wonder that Chinese Communists keep telling themselves the United States is a paper tiger, that De Gaulle plays games with our gold standard, that Nasser tells us to jump in the lake. We are so eager to be loved that we have forgotten how to command respect.

Such a flabby posture is ridiculous in a nation that has paid out billions of its citizens' taxes to help other countries get on their feet, to defend those who don't want to pay for the cost of their own defense. The Quaker principle of nonresistance to insult may be admirable in a private citizen, but it doesn't work for nations. Have we lost our moxie, and are so intent on adding to our pleasure and improving our standard of living that we don't stand up for our citizens and their property in far corners of the world? Has the flaming idealism of the forties and fifties degenerated into a cynical shrug at calculated insults?

The governments of other countries are responsible for these cooked-up riots. It's high time we got sore and show we resent it.

Supreme Court Salaries

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5374) relating to the salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to deplore the defeat of legislation which would have provided salary increases for the Justices of the Supreme Court consonant with those granted all other Federal employees last year. This legislation was actually approved by this body last year.

One of the cornerstones of our American democracy is an independent and impartial judiciary. The Supreme Court of the United States is the highest court in our judicial system, and it is a hallowed and respected institution. It should not be subject to the shifting tides of politics.

Although many of our colleagues assert that they want an independent judiciary, it is apparent from the debate that what they want is a judiciary that agrees with them.

This was not the first time the Supreme Court has been attacked by Members of Congress, and it undoubtedly will not be the last. But to attempt to punish the Court by denying its Justices a salary increase afforded all other Federal employees not only is a petty, vindictive gesture, but an act which impairs the dignity of this House.

Fox River, Highway of Yesterday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD the excellent essay by Mary Sue DeLong, of Clinton, Wis., on "The Fox River, Highway of Yesterday." Miss DeLong was honored by the Wisconsin State DAR for her study of the historical importance of this famous Wisconsin river.

The essay follows:

FOX RIVER, HIGHWAY OF YESTERDAY

Before roads and railroads, the rivers of our country were the fastest and easiest means of transportation. As I sat on the porch of my grandfather's cabin, overlooking the peaceful, slow moving river, my thoughts went back to the importance of this very river, over the years. So many important things in the history of our State and country, had their beginnings right here on the Fox River in central Wisconsin.

Father Marquette and Joliet passed this very spot in 1673, on their voyage from Green Bay, that eventually lead to the discovery of the Mississippi River. About 3 miles from here, they were forced to ask help of friendly Indians, to guide them through the marshes and swamps, that form the headwaters of the Fox River near Portage.

These many marshes and swamps that hindered Marquette and Joliet, were the very things that made the river so important to the Indians. To them, this was a wonderful hunting ground. The swamps provided them with wild rice and all kinds of birds and animals and, of course, fish from the river.

After the Revolutionary War, the United States received the territory from the British. A very good fur trading business was established with the Wisconsin Indians. Forts were built at Green Bay and Prairie du Chein. The distance between these two forts was too great, to have good control over the Indians, so another fort was needed. The place was found at Portage, high on a hill overlooking the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers.

In 1828, Fort Winnebago was built. One of the young officers who helped with the construction was Jefferson Davis, who was later made President of the Confederacy. This garrison was needed to protect the fur traders and early settlers from Indian attack. I have walked through the buildings that remain at the fort, and although they are crude compared to today, they must have been very comfortable, so long ago.

A short distance away from the fort, a beautiful home was built in 1832, for the Indian agent and his wife. Lumber for the house came down the Fox River from Green Bay, and carpenters came all the way from St. Louis, to work on the house. Mr. and Mrs. Kinzie only lived in the house for 2 years before they moved to Chicago.

By 1845, the Indians had sold most of their lands near the river and had moved west, across the Mississippi River. The fort and Indian agency house were abandoned.

Because of the 1½-mile portage that was needed, to get from the Fox to the Wisconsin River, only very small boats used the river. In 1851, a canal was dug, joining the two rivers at Portage. As the railroads expanded across the State, the canal was no longer needed.

Only a short distance from my grandfather's cabin, is a farm where the great naturalist, John Muir, lived as a boy. It is located high above the Fox River, and is one of the prettiest spots in our State. It is such a pretty spot, it is no wonder John Muir grew up to love nature.

In such a small area of our great State, it hardly seems possible that all of these great events and famous people could have been so closely associated with the Fox River.

New York State Legislature Calls for Federal Action To Preserve Beauty of Niagara Falls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I view with growing concern the steadily deteriorating condition of America's most beautiful scenic wonder—the American Falls at Niagara. Newspapers throughout the country have carried editorials describing the disaster that threatens our American Falls. It is reassuring indeed that the people of this Nation are intensely interested in preserving the grandeur and the majesty of the falls.

On February 25, in an effort to initiate action on the urgently needed remedial works on the American Falls, I requested Secretary of State Rusk to take the matter up with the appropriate Canadian officials, with a view toward having our two Governments refer the problem to the International Joint Commission for study and recommendations as to the works required and the costs involved.

On March 17, I was informed by the Department of State that it would initiate consultation with other interested agencies of the Federal Government which would be involved in a proposed International Joint Commission study of my proposal for remedial works on the American Falls.

I was further advised by the Department of State that my proposals had already been brought "to the attention of the Canadian Department of External Affairs."

I fully expect that the results of any study conducted by the International Joint Commission will warrant the introduction of legislation to authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to undertake this project.

Recently, the Legislature of the State of New York joined in this worthy endeavor. In a concurrent resolution the legislature called upon the Federal Government to take appropriate action to preserve the beauty of the American Falls. I wish to take this opportunity to personally commend the members of the New York State Legislature for their united and farsighted effort in this regard. I feel certain that the many Members of this House whose constituents have enjoyed the magnificent splendor of the falls will want to support this proposed action.

The text of the concurrent resolution follows:

NEW YORK SENATE RESOLUTION 91

Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, requesting the Federal Government to initiate and effectuate studies and measures to restore and preserve the scenic beauty of the American Falls of the Niagara River

Whereas the American Falls at Niagara stands as an integral part of a majestic phenomenon which is one of the natural wonders of the world; and

Whereas the gradual erosion of the cliff of the American Falls has, in recent years, resulted in rock slides which have produced a mounting pile of rocky debris reaching halfway up the cataract, and has partially destroyed the scenic beauty of the 182-foot high American Falls; and

Whereas the continued destruction of the grandeur of the American Falls may seriously deprive New York State and this Nation of one of its preeminent attractions for both residents and visitors to this State; and

Whereas the desirability of clearing away this debris and of taking appropriate measures to arrest the further erosion of the cliff of the American Falls is a matter of deep concern to the people and the legislature of this State; and

Whereas remedial measures have proven successful in preserving and guaranteeing the beauty of the Horseshoe Falls at Niagara Falls; and

Whereas the national administration has urged the Federal Congress to enact measures to preserve this Nation's natural attractions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That since the Federal Government, jointly with Canada, has jurisdiction over the international waters of the Niagara River, the Federal Congress and appropriate officers of the Federal Government are respectfully urged to initiate, and to follow up with such action as may be indicated thereby, relevant studies aimed at keeping the American Falls from becoming a series of rapids and to stabilize the cataract in its approximate present location; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Representatives of the State of New York in the Federal Congress, as well as to the chairman of the U.S. section of the International Joint Commission.

By order of the senate,

GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,
Secretary.

The Whirl of Bureaucracy's Wonderful Wheels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Concord Monitor, Concord, N.H., recently described what happened to a friend who started out with the best of intentions to save his country a little money. The following editorial describes with whimsy and wit what happens when an ordinary citizen gets caught in the wonderful wheels of the bureaucratic whirl:

CURB THOSE DO-GOODER IMPULSES

A friend ordered two pamphlets from the U.S. Government Printing Office. Together, they cost 85 cents. Our friend enclosed a dollar bill, with instructions that the balance of 15 cents be applied to balancing the Federal budget.

After a lapse of time the pamphlets were received. But with them came our friend's original letter, now tattooed with the hieroglyphics of no less than half a dozen rubber stamps. Enclosed was a kraft envelope, with a printed message thereon which began: "This envelope contains your refund."

Inside were three coupons, each bearing the date 1965, and a serial number. Each read: "This coupon will be received in lieu of 5 cents in exchange for public documents, only by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office."

Our friend, who had hoped he could help reduce the national debt by 15 cents, had by this time begun to lose patience. Before he went berserk, however, he read some smaller print on the 5½- by 9-inch kraft paper envelope which contained the three tiny coupons. This was the message he got:

"Because of the cost of writing Government checks for small sums, it is the policy of this Office to make all refunds of less than $1 in the form of special coupons having a face value of 5 cents each, which may be used as the equivalent of cash in making future purchases of publications sold by the Division of Public Documents. These coupons are good until used, and have been found highly satisfactory by thousands of users of Government publications each year. However, if you do not anticipate purchasing publications in the future, these coupons will be promptly redeemed upon request."

We visited our friend at the State hospital the other day. He was beginning to recover from the incoherency and violence which had led to his commitment. His wife had consulted the family doctor when he came home and started breaking up the living room furniture. At first he had been confined to a padded cell at the hospital,

but was now in a private room under heavy sedation. We were the first visitor permitted to call upon him. (There were sheets upon the bed.)

Our friend was simpering. Between sobs he protested his innocence. "I only wanted to help reduce the national debt," he muttered. "All I accomplished was multiplication of bureaucratic waste. My letter bounced around 10 days, between at least six employees, according to the stamped dates and comments upon it, and it will cost more than the coupons are worth to redeem them."

We tried to console our friend, without success, until we recalled President Kennedy's inaugural address, and its admonition: "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

"That's it," our friend shouted, his eyes drying and almost a smile spreading over his face. "I'll never again ask the Government to do anything for me—not even to sell me a pamphlet. Then it won't need any help because there won't be any national debt."

An attendant indicated our time was up and we bade our friend farewell. "Boy, is he nuts," the attendant said as we walked down the corridor together. "Who does he think is going to pay for his care and treatment while he's here?"

Sleeping Bear Dunes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Michigan Department of Conservation signed by its director, Dr. Ralph A. MacMullan, and an official endorsement of legislation to establish Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, S. 936, sponsored by the Honorable PHILIP HART.

The documents follow:

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT
OF CONSERVATION,
Lansing, Mich., March 12, 1965.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Enclosed is a copy of a statement on the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore which I am sure will be of interest to you. Our commission approved this statement on March 12, 1965.

Copies are being sent to other members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

Sincerely,

RALPH A. MACMULLAN,
Director.

MICHIGAN CONSERVATION COMMISSION STATEMENT CONCERNING THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE, MARCH 12, 1965

This commission endorses U.S. Senate bill 936 to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore and urges that Congress pass it during this session.

This bill has evolved over a period of several years, during which its sponsors have made many modifications and compromises to improve its acceptability to State and local interests. We believe that Senate bill 936 is acceptable and therefore deserves the support of this commission and the people of Michigan.

In making this firm endorsement we are mindful of at least two sections of the bill which we feel should have corrective amendments:

1. The bill does not provide for payment in lieu of taxes to school districts in the area to be incorporated into the lakeshore. The districts concerned have heavy bonded indebtedness and could well be in serious financial difficulty through loss of tax base as lands are purchased for the lakeshore.

2. The condemnation procedures still appear to leave open the possibility that an individual landowner could suffer loss and hardship.

We single these two points out for the attention of Congress and express our confidence that it will make any amendments necessary to protect the legitimate rights and interests of the citizens in the lakeshore area.

We have heard suggestions that preservation of the Sleeping Bear Dunes area for public use should be a State rather than a Federal project. While we have every confidence in the ability of the department of conservation staff to plan and develop such a project, we must view the situation realistically. At the February meeting of this commission, the department's parks and recreation section presented a long-range program statement calling for the expenditure of $133 million during the next 10 years to meet State-level park and recreation needs by 1975. Even with the help of Federal Land and Water Conservation Act grants, it will be a real challenge for the State to finance this program. Money for additional expenditures of the magnitude needed to acquire and develop the Sleeping Bear Dunes as a State recreation area simply does not seem to be in sight.

Furthermore, we agree with those who have pointed out that a Sleeping Bear Dunes Lakeshore will be a significantly greater tourist attraction as a Federal installation, rather then as a State facility. Michigan presently has only one national park, Isle Royale, which by its nature and location is limited as a tourist magnet. Creation of a large, easily accessible national recreation area in Michigan will do much to enhance its image as a vacation State.

A Case for Antitrust Overhaul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago Congress passed our basic antitrust law, the Sherman Act. A confusing patchwork of additions and amendments has followed, some of which may now be aimed more at destroying market freedom than promoting it. It has been my feeling for some time that a thorough study of the operation and effect of existing antitrust statutes upon competition, price levels, employment, profits, production, consumption, and the capability of the economy to best sustain the Nation at home and abroad, is urgently needed. For this reason I introduced a bill H.R. 5303 in this Congress to establish a conference on the antitrust laws as a necessary first step in developing a consistent antitrust policy.

Substantiating the need for a thorough study by such a conference is "A Case for Antitrust Overhaul" which appeared in the March 15 issue of the Wall Street Journal. I include the item here and suggest that my colleagues in the House will find it contains some very interesting subject matter:

A CASE FOR ANTITRUST OVERHAUL

When a Federal judge held last week that New York's Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. had been formed by an illegal merger, the decision obviously was disheartening to the officials and stockholders of that institution. But it also ought to be educational for everybody.

In the long, tangled history of antitrust laws and their enforcement, few cases have so illuminated the inconsistencies and outright absurdities that so often infect this legal area. The court could hardly have built up a better argument for a thorough legislative overhaul if that had been what it set out to do.

The case shows, for one thing, the need for clearer assignment of antitrust enforcement powers. With the powers now dispersed among often-overlapping Federal agencies, the agencies frequently disagree, catching confused businessmen in a crossfire. In this case, Manufacturers Trust Co. and Hanover Bank got the Federal Reserve Board to approve their merger in 1961, only to have the Justice Department rush in with the suit that led, more than 3 years later, to last week's decision.

Once the jurisdictional rights of Federal agencies were firmly established, there still would be a need for a better definition of the competition the laws should protect. As things stand now, it often seems that the aim is to ban all mergers between companies of any size, whatever the degree of competition between them and whatever the broad effect on competition within their industry.

In the New York bank case, the merger was ruled illegal because there had been a little competition between the two institutions. There had been mighty little, since Manufacturers Trust had been serving mainly consumers and smaller businessmen, while Hanover concentrated chiefly on much larger customers. The banks, in other words, were far more complementary than competitive.

Moreover, the main aim of the merger, it's safe to say, was not to acquire a "monopoly." The idea instead was to furnish much stiffer competition for the city's two larger banks, First National City and Chase Manhattan, both of which had long dealt with a broad range of customers.

Even if the merger had been aimed at monopoly, the experience of the past 3 years surely has shown that the bank lacked the power to achieve it. Since the end of 1961, the year of the merger, the assets of Manufacturers Hanover have grown by only 11 percent, compared with gains of around 30 percent for each of its two bigger rivals. What happens in the real world, however, often seems of no interest to antitrust enforcement agencies.

In the real world, the true monopoly power in banking, as in other tightly regulated industries, is held by the governmental agencies which control or oversee almost every phase of operations. No matter how large a bank becomes, furthermore, it will continue to face incessant competition from outside its industry—from insurance companies, savings and loan associations, finance companies, and other firms.

Perhaps the most important point that should be made in an antitrust overhaul is a reaffirmation of the original purpose of the laws: To serve the public's interest. Ironically, the New York court agreed that the Manufacturers-Hanover merger benefited the public, but it went on to say that, under current law, that simply doesn't matter.

All that mattered in this case, as in so many others, was that the total number of

banks had been reduced by one. Beyond that, the court saw no reason to go, "no matter how beneficent" the merger may have been. The Justice Department similarly shows no interest in what happens to the merger's public benefits when it dismembers a $7 billion institution, a task which it seems to think is as simple as splitting up a small bank in Kentucky.

Not every merger proposal is a good idea, either from the standpoint of the public or the companies involved. For that reason and others, the Nation must have a sound system of antitrust law, sensibly enforced. But, as the New York court makes abundantly plain, the system should be antitrust, not antibusiness and antipublic.

Iowa Newspapers Comment on the Struggle for Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, few events have so aroused the moral conscience of this Nation as the struggle for voting rights legislation. It is indeed tragic that violence, and even murder, have been employed against those seeking to insure that all qualified American citizens may exercise their constitutional right of suffrage.

I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members an editorial from the March 15, 1965, issue of the Creston News Advertiser of Creston, Iowa. It offers a fine tribute to the Reverend James Reeb, whose death shocked the country.

I sincerely hope, as the Congress acts on voting rights legislation, that moderation and restraint will prevail, and that further violence can be avoided.

On this point, I would also like to call attention to an editorial from the Record-Herald and Indianola Tribune of Indianola, Iowa. The editorial, from the March 15, 1965, issue, points out how emotional the voting rights struggle has become.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include these editorials:

[From the Creston (Iowa) News Advertiser, Mar. 15, 1965]

REVEREND REEB BREAKS BALLOT LINE

It is a tragic commentary on things—but it does appear that the major breakthrough in the Selma, Ala., Negro vote registration effort came with the fatal beating of Rev. James Reeb. Reeb was a white minister from Boston, Mass., who came south to assist in the vote registration effort.

Things had been more or less at a standstill. Selma officials were circumventing the Negro attempts at registration. It was slow going. And the general public was only moderately interested. Negro marches and demonstrations had become rather commonplace things, perhaps.

Then came the night of terror and Reverend Mr. Reeb was viciously beaten. He died a few days later. Public apathy evaporated.

What had been considered a rather routine thing became a cause for national concern and shame.

A man killed trying to help a neighbor register to vote in the United States of America.

All reservations about mass demonstrations, continuous demonstrations, about getting in such a hurry on this race thing, etc., went out the window. Speedup of the registration may have had some bearing. But the really important thing was to make clear once and for all that all American citizens are entitled to the right to vote, without any ifs and ands.

And this weekend Governor Wallace, the Alabama Governor who has been battling this Federal "interference business," as he calls it, announced that if the courts ruled the Negroes could march, he would not intervene.

Governor Wallace had heard the public outcry against what had happened that night in Selma.

Thus Rev. James Reeb, a martyr to freemen, in tragic death writes a chapter that has taken 100 years to achieve—the right of Negroes to be free and equal in all parts of the United States at the ballot box.

[From the Record-Herald and Indianola (Ind.) Tribune, Mar. 15, 1965]

CAN EXTREME VIOLENCE BE AVOIDED?

(By Earl Godwin)

It is now apparent that a complete breakdown of law and order in a large area of the South is a distinct possibility. Until very recently, most persons did not believe this could ever happen except in isolated local situations. If the tragic events of Selma, Ala., are allowed to continue to grow and compound, and if similar events happen elsewhere in the South, we can expect violent Negro reaction.

Our country has been most fortunate that the most respected Negro leaders have been persons like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who favor peaceful methods of attaining their goal of equal rights. Even these nonviolent demonstrations have not always been without problems. There is now evidence that a large segment of the Negro population, especially the younger persons, are dissatisfied with the speed of progress of their struggle. They favor more violent action.

Consider the situation we would be facing today if leaders like Malcolm X had commanded the following of Dr. King. Unless the Negro sees more progress toward freedom and equality as the white man enjoys them, he is liable to turn away from leaders like Dr. King and toward those who have picked up the hate chant of the late Malcolm X. This would be a sad turn of events for our country.

Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, the Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training observed ORT day in honor of the work conducted by the organization for Jews all over the world. In Massachusetts ORT day was celebrated at the New England Life Hall in Boston under the sponsorship of the Eastern Massachusetts Region of Women's American ORT.

For the past 85 years, the organization has conducted vocational programs. At present there are 600 ORT vocational training installations in 22 countries offering practical and technological training.

In addition to providing the traditional skills, ORT has recognized the growing need for training in specialized technical fields and even in the growing field of space technology.

One of the most important tributes to the work of ORT is the continual growth of its membership. There are about 100,000 U.S. members, of whom some 60,000 are in the Women's American ORT.

I congratulate this group on their good work and wish them every success in the years to come.

Senator Fulbright on "Meet the Press"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette of March 16, discussing the appearance last Sunday of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT on the television program, "Meet the Press," emphasizes the respect for knowledge and fine impartiality of judgment for which the Senator is well known in Congress, and I take this opportunity to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

SENATOR FULBRIGHT STUBBORN, SMART

How refreshing it is to listen to a man like Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, discuss delicate matters of foreign policy presently perplexing the Nation's leaders.

Sunday evening on "Meet the Press" we had the privilege—no better or more appropriate word can describe the experience—of watching Senator FULBRIGHT field questions from a news panel.

Whether one agrees or disagrees with the views of the Senator from Arkansas, one cannot help but be impressed by the tremendous amount of knowledge he possesses, the care with which he imparts this knowledge to an audience, the choice of words (he articulates beautifully), the conscious effort to see all sides of a problem, the stubborn, yet polite, refusal to be pushed into an opinion or an ill-considered statement, the responsible restraint he exercises in espousing a particular proposal, advocating a specific policy, and advancing a line of argument.

Earlier the same Sunday we had watched Gov. George Wallace of Alabama rant and rave for the benefit of the camera.

Although the two men spoke primarily on unrelated subjects, the difference in approach, in disposition, and in presentation couldn't help but be noted by those listening to both. It was light versus shadow, enlightenment over ignorance, culture against barbarism, caution opposed to recklessness, and calm versus bluster.

Thank you, Senator FULBRIGHT, for a delightful, informative 20 minutes, unfortunately abbreviated from the usual half hour on the station we were watching by the necessity of showing the finish of some golf

tournament. It's a shame the latter had to preempt the wisdom of a dedicated, thoughtful public official.

Emily Taft Douglas Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Emily Taft Douglas is the daughter of one of the world's great sculptors and the wife of one of the alltime greats of the U.S. Senate. Herself a former Representative at Large from the State of Illinois, she served with outstanding distinction on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in the 79th Congress. By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following article written by Mrs. Douglas for the North American Newspaper Alliance and appearing in today's Washington Star:

SENATE WIFE SPEAKS OUT

(By Emily Taft Douglas)

SELMA, ALA.—"What right have northerners," ask many southerners, "to invade our towns and stir up the Negroes? If everyone stayed home, minding his own business, there would be no cracked heads."

Since I was one of those who went to Selma, I know this is the local view. I marched with the others through the lines of husky, helmeted police who 2 days earlier had bludgeoned dozens of people.

Some of the officers looked tempted to try our heads. One of them, pointing to Monsignor Egan of Chicago, said quite audibly, "I'd like to sink my stick into his skull."

I watched the whites staring from their doorways and once I waved. A woman thumbed her nose for answer.

Most of us were busy people with pleasanter things to do than to go where we were not wanted. It was the events of the past Sunday which had brought us. This was the climax of a long campaign for Negro registration. Although the 14th and 15th constitutional amendments, passed a century ago, banning racial discrimination in voting, thousands had been arrested for trying to take the first step.

On March 7, 500 peaceful, unarmed, hymn-singing Negroes assembled to petition for their rights. The police dispelled them with tear gas and with blows. Mounted police trampled on women and children, as the doctors who gave first aid have testified. There were more than 80 casualties.

To protest this brutality, thousands of Americans—the majority priests and ministers—converged on Selma.

LOCAL COURAGE

It did not take much courage for outsiders to visit the city for a few days, although one minister paid with his life for the privilege. It took real courage to be a local participant. One white Lutheran minister spoke for the first time at the morning rally. Two white women carried banners, saying, "White Alabamans Support Civil Rights for All." They stayed behind to face the anger of their peers. So did the Negroes staying behind.

Many had been gassed on Sunday and some still wore bandages, but with steady courage they returned on Tuesday. In this area the beating of Negroes is seldom recorded and no white man has ever been convicted for killing a Negro.

Some of us had visited police states and we felt again the same atmosphere charged with hate. Racism had been exalted to a way of life. Although this is the "Bible Belt," the leaders had subverted their Christian faith, as well as American institutions, to deny brotherhood and the right to equal opportunity.

The law enforcement officers, who even look like storm troopers, are used to thwart the basic national laws. For their own safety, most whites, like Germans under Hitler, will not admit the brutalities of their system.

The tensions of Selma were so great that although we marched only a few blocks and the official confrontation was brief, we felt emotionally drained. Many of us were on our way home when we heard of the evening tragedy, the deadly attack on James Reeb and two colleagues.

I had talked to Reeb a few hours earlier—the young minister and father of four children. In his unassuming way he was the embodiment of active good will. The random act of hate which felled him was the natural fruit of Selma's way of life.

ALIEN PHILOSOPHY

Looking back seems like looking at another country and almost in another age. The one thing which promised a better future were the faces of some young people. Northern youth—white as well as black—could learn from these purposefully disciplined boys and girls who live with danger and indignities, but somehow keep sweet inside.

In parting with a few outstanding leaders, I urged them to get a good education. They smiled wryly, and one of them replied, "but that is just what we can't get."

I had no answer, but I know that our country needs their gifts as much as they need those rights which are denied them.

So why did we go to Selma? Because we are citizens not only of the communities in which we live, but of the United States. That is our first loyalty and it is our business when any American town blots out human rights.

The perpetrators of injustice debase themselves along with their victims. Beyond that, in our cold war with the Communists, we are the champions of human rights and personal dignity.

Events like those of Selma betray our principles and deface the image of America before the whole world. Just as the Nobel Prize Award to Dr. Martin Luther King showed the world's respect for him and his nonviolent civil rights campaign, so the convergence of thousands in Selma showed national concern for this movement and abhorrence for the tactics used against it.

Leftwing Extremists Guiding Demonstrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, any mention of Communist influence in the riots and mob action in Selma have been decried as rightwing extremist propaganda. The records prove and the public statements of many of the leaders of the demonstrations and riots in Selma, in Harlem, in Rochester, and other places do have a close affinity with Communist organizations and Communist causes, but they have been excused from responsibility and have been called heroes even as late as last Monday evening in this Chamber.

Lest you believe that only a few southern Congressmen are concerned with the type of leadership of the demonstrations and who are now dictating the writing of the law you are told you must pass, I include a column by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak from this morning's edition of the Washington Post as a part of these remarks.

Certainly there are none who would call these two columnists conservatives nor in any way connected with rightwing extremists, so I ask that you think carefully about what kind of a law we are told we must pass and what kind of people are forcing the President to demand such a law of the Congress of the United States.

The Evans-Novak column follows:

DANGER FROM THE LEFT

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

While successfully forcing an emergency voting rights bill, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., surrendered valuable ground to leftist extremists in their drive for control of the civil rights movement.

The sad truth is that Dr. King at times abdicated command of the Selma, Ala., demonstrations to John Lewis and James Foreman, the two hothead extremists who lead the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (usally called SNCC). And there is no doubt whatever that SNCC is substantially infiltrated by beatnik leftwing revolutionaries and—worst of all—by Communists.

This means the civil rights movement faces an agonizing internal crisis at the hour of its greatest triumph. Unless Dr. King breaks with the SNCC extremists, liberal whites may no longer follow his leadership, and even if he does, SNCC can create no end of trouble for the cause of Negro rights.

That's because SNCC and its leaders aren't really interested in the right to vote or any attainable goal, but in demanding the unattainable as a means of provoking social turmoil. As revolutionaries, they aren't about to stop demonstrating and pitch into the hard task of actually registering voters.

SNCC's tactics and the way Dr. King has knuckled under to them were illustrated painfully in Selma on March 9.

Acknowledging that the Federal courts have been the salvation of the civil rights movement, moderates wanted to obey a Federal court ordered banning a march from Selma to Montgomery. So did Dr. King.

But Foreman and Lewis handed the Nobel Peace Prize winner an ultimatum. Either Dr. King would lead the march or they would ignore him and lead it themselves. Rather than see leadership pulled from him, Dr. King capitulated—giving Gov. George Wallace an opening to brand the civil rights movement as contemptuous of the courts.

Dr. King had capitulated 2 weeks earlier in permitting his name to be used on a February 27 memorandum by the extremist leadership of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (which is really an offshoot of SNCC).

Implicitly referring to past civil rights legislation as "fraudulently ineffectual," the February 27 memorandum is a thinly disguised attack on moderate civil rights leadership of the kind provided by the NAACP and on the overall legislative approach to Negro rights.

The tipoff was the memorandum's demand for a voting rights bill "which will say that Federal registration will occur in any community, county, or State where the people

who are not free to register request it." Such a bill without any standard for Federal intervention could not possibly be passed.

This technique of seeking turmoil rather than progress also was found in SNCC's marching orders given its followers in Washington last week—given by example when SNCC leaders lay down in the Selma streets.

The order: "Lay down."

They did so inside the White House. They did so on Pennsylvania Avenue, blocking traffic in front of the White House. They did so on Capitol Hill outside Speaker McCormack's office.

Actually, Dr. King earlier this year risked incurring the wrath of SNCC extremists during the fight to unseat the Mississippi congressional delegation. Dr. King supported the position of civil rights moderates in opposing the unattainable demands that three members of the SNCC-backed Mississippi Freedom Party be arbitrarily seated in Congress.

Moreover, there is a chance Dr. King may make a clearer break with SNCC. At this writing, civil rights moderates are hoping for a statement from him renouncing the extremist memorandum of February 27.

Yet, Dr. King cannot be blamed in full for the extremists' success in the civil rights movement. In a kind of reverse McCarthyism, moderate Negro leaders, white liberals, and Government officials have feared to point out the degree of Communist infiltration. Their silence in the past may make it all the more difficult to expel extremists from the civil rights movement in the critical future.

South Africa's Selma Recalled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been shocked into a new sense of urgency about the Negro's quest for first-class citizenship by the brutal events in Selma, Ala. I am proud of the way in which my fellow Americans have responded to this national shame. President Johnson's speech to the Nation this week has provided a new consensus on the issue of voting rights for all citizens, black and white, and I feel sure that we Americans "shall overcome" the blight of racism in our generation.

It was nearly 5 years ago that South Africa experienced a "Selma" which resulted in the death of 298 black people who were peacefully assembled in Sharpesville, South Africa.

The conscience of humanity cannot forget this horrible massacre, any more than we can forget what has been happening in some of our Southern States where the Negro is denied the basic right of franchise.

The problems of South Africa may seem several thousand miles away, but in the age of supersonic jets and rockets, they are only a few hours distant from us. The institutionalized racism of South Africa is a world problem, and we cannot afford to turn our faces away from it and act as though it does not exist.

If the Government of South Africa persists in driving in a collision course with the aspirations of 235 million black Africans, sooner or later the American people will face the consequences of this blind and foolish policy.

It is not for us in the Congress to tell South Africa what it must do. But it is our duty to let the Government of South Africa knows that its policies offend the conscience of the Western World and the United States of America, and we cannot and will not sit idly by and do nothing about them.

Next week, Mr. Speaker, a group of distinguished citizens from all parts of the Nation will be in Washington attending a conference on American responsibility in South Africa. The Right Reverend James A. Pike of Los Angeles, Calif., will be the conference chairman, which convenes Sunday night, March 21, at the Willard Hotel at 8 p.m. The distinguished Senator from Utah, Frank Moss, will speak on Tuesday, at the concluding session. I invite as many of my colleagues as may wish, to attend all or part of this conference.

Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of this 3-day conference on U.S. policy toward South Africa, under unanimous consent, I include the conference call and the list of sponsoring organizations at this point in the Record:

Call to the National Conference on South African Crisis and American Action

Recognizing that South Africa's increasing repression of its voteless African majority could trigger an international conflict along racial lines, a growing number of American organizations and citizens desire to take effective action before it is too late. Therefore:

To examine South African apartheid, its practice and psychology.

To assess how we as Americans are strengthening the South African Government and its economy, thus helping to perpetuate racism.

To work out feasible programs of action for ourselves and suggestions to our Government to strengthen forces for change inside South Africa.

The sponsoring organizations are calling this conference—the first national gathering in the United States convened specifically to face the issue of apartheid. We wish to assist South Africans to end racism there. We hope that with international help change can be initiated before there is mass bloodshed. The problem is: How.

Sponsors of the conference believe:

1. That we as Americans must share in responsibility for meeting the crisis in South Africa; and

2. That the U.S. Government must initiate a more vigorous policy in opposing apartheid.

Alan Paton has said: "The Afrikaner nationalist * * * will change only when the pressure inside and outside the country become unendurable. * * * What he needs * * * is a decisive order from the outside world.

We call upon individuals and organizations sharing these views to participate in this conference, and to join in explaining not only the "why" and the "what" of action against racism in South Africa, but also the difficult question: "How?" Let us help build this "decisive order from the outside world."

SPONSORS

A.M.E. Church, A.M.E. Zion Church (Foreign Mission Department), Amalgamated Clothing Workers, American Committee on Africa, American Jewish Congress, American Society of African Culture, American Student Movement Against Apartheid, Americans for Democratic Action, Americans for Democratic Action (Campus Division), Association of Artists for Freedom, Catholic Interracial Council, Collegiate Council for the U.N., Congress of Racial Equality, Episcopal Church (Division of Christian Citizenship), Friends Peace Committee.

Industrial Union Department AFL–CIO, International Union of Electrical Workers, Methodist Church (Board of Christian Social Concerns), National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, National Council of Churches (Commission on Religion and Race), National Federation of Catholic College Students, National Newman Club Federation, National Student Christian Federation, Negro American Labor Council.

RWDSU (District 65), Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Students for a Democratic Society, United Automobile Workers, United Church of Christ (Council for Christian Social Action, United Federation of Teachers, United Presbyterian Church (Office of International Affairs and Commission on Religion and Race), United States National Student Association, United States Youth Council, United World Federalists, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World University Service, YWCA (National Student YWCA).

Profiles in Manhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, concerned citizens have been deeply disturbed during the past year by a series of incidents in which appeals for help from victims of criminals and from police dealing with criminals have been ignored by spectators or passersby.

President Johnson, in a recent message to Congress, emphasized one aspect of the national crime problem. The President declared that the starting point for dealing effectively with crime is the individual citizen. He said:

Law enforcement cannot succeed without the sustained—and informed—interest of all citizens.

Solon, the Athenian lawgiver, said it a little differently. He stated:

That city is the best to live in, in which those who are not wronged, no less than those who are wronged, exert themselves to punish the wrongdoers.

In this connection, I place the editorial which appeared March 15, 1965, in the Indianapolis Star, in the Appendix of the Record:

Profiles in Manhood

A mugger attacked a 22-year-old woman in the parking lot behind her apartment house on North Pennsylvania Street a few days ago and threatened to kill her if she did not give him money. It was night. They scuffled. She cried out.

This caught the ear of a construction worker relaxing in his apartment. He pulled on his shoes and hurried to the young woman's help. Then a salesman living in the same building drove up. The attacker

released his victim and ran, with them in pursuit. Later, with a detective's help, they caught a youthful suspect in an alley nearby. He was held for grand jury action.

The two men may have saved the young woman's life. In the same neighborhood, several years ago, a retired school teacher was beaten fatally by a young thug. Neither man had to go the young woman's aid. But something made them do it.

The construction worker, L. H. (Irish) McClure, explained: "It made me mad when I looked out the window and saw the man knock her down. I've got a wife and I like for her to go to the parking lot without any trouble. This none-of-my-business attitude that some people have isn't any good. If everybody would come to the help of others there would be fewer people getting held up." The salesman, Harry Gardiner, said that if his wife had been attacked, "I'd appreciate people helping her."

In a Philadelphia subway the same weekend, six grown men stood and watched as eight teenagers attacked a 16-year-old girl and dragged her, screaming and struggling, down the tracks. A seventh man acted, a 23-year-old Naval Air Reservist from Atlanta, Ga., on his way back to his base after visiting the city's historical shrines. He hurried to help the girl. He was beaten savagely. He broke away, ran to the street and called to a policeman who brought reinforcements. The eight attackers were caught.

These acts of gallantry are a bright contrast to the cowardly apathy of 38 residents of a middle class New York neighborhood who watched but did not even call the police during a knife-armed rapist's 30-minute attack some months ago on a young woman which ended in her death. They contrast to the 22 who watched without trying to rescue a Dayton woman stop her car which plunged into a river and slowly sank, the crowd on a busy Bronx street blandly ignoring a rapist attacking a young secretary in broad daylight.

Those who have seen action on the field of battle know that courage breeds courage, while fear breeds fear.

May the personal courage of the two Indianapolis men and the young Atlanta reservist inspire others to act with gallantry when situations call for it and reverse a trend that has threatened to become a national shame. They are the kind who can strike fear into the hearts of the punks and hoodlums who pollute so many American cities. At the same time, they give dignity and meaning to the word "man."

Strength in Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of America's distinguished newspapers, the Arizona Republic, recently published an editorial of great significance. It appeared March 11 under the title "Strength in Union," and it reviewed the relationship of the gathering crisis in international monetary affairs with a proposal for free world federation made 26 years ago by Clarence K. Streit of Washington, D.C.

Here is the text of the editorial:

[From the Arizona Republic, Mar. 11, 1965]

STRENGTH IN UNION

Nearly 18 months ago, Clarence Streit, chief promoter of the idea of an Atlantic Union, wrote a thoughtful and convincing paper on the economic advantages of federating the United States, Canada, Great Britain, and Western Europe into one powerful union.

The spur behind Mr. Streit's plan was the increasingly dangerous position of the American dollar. Since this position has grown steadily worse, his arguments are even more valid today than in November 1963, when he published them in the magazine Freedom & Union.

There is undoubtedly a parallel between the present world economic situation and the one prevailing in 1931, which led to the crash of the gold exchange standard and the British pound." Although Mr. Streit concedes that the parallel is not exact, there are enough similarities to cause grave concern over a possible run on the dollar which would result in another great depression.

The cause of this concern, of course, is the fact foreign governments and bankers now hold $27.4 billion in short-term American credits redeemable in gold. The United States simply does not have sufficient gold (our present holdings are on the order of $15 billion) to redeem these credits if the foreign interests should suddenly decide to cash them in. The situation was eased by Congress last month, when it voted to lift the requirement of 25 percent gold backing for Federal Reserve bank deposits, thus freeing about $5 billion in American gold holdings for support of dollars held abroad. While some large holders of dollar credits, including Britain and West Germany, are not likely to demand gold, both France and Spain have cashed in sizable amounts of dollars recently and Swiss bankers could join the parade at any time. When a run starts, it's too late to do anything.

Mr. Streit bases much of his case on the determination of President de Gaulle to make France a great nuclear power. He believes a federal union, in which the United States and France were partners, would give De Gaulle his proper share of nuclear control and make economic competition between the two powers less likely.

At the heart of his argument, however, is the fact that American policy has failed to create a third force in the European Common Market, an effort which he dubs "Operation Dumbbell." The very concept is wrong, Mr. Streit believes, because it would set up two great competitive forces in what are now the NATO nations. The result would be a ruinous race between the Common Market and the so-called Anglo-Saxon nations to shore up national economies by increasing individual gold holdings.

If all of these countries were in one federated union, a community of nations called Atlantica, it would have "a common currency, a common market, a common defense force, and a common foreign policy." The monetary result would be a gold holding so large that it would be invulnerable to foreign attack.

Mr. Streit's concept of transforming NATO into a full-fledged federal Atlantic union is both vast and imaginative, but probably no more so today than was the union of 13 struggling eastern seabord colonies into the United States of America some 175 years ago. In the quest for economic stability for the free world, a federal union deserves the studied attention of the statesmen in Washington who have failed, by less spectacular methods, to strengthen the dollar in the face of what could be a disastrous foreign run.

[From the Freedom & Union]

CLARENCE STREIT'S RARE KNOWLEDGE OF THE WORLD MONETARY DANGER

Leon Fraser, when Alternate President of the World Bank in Basel, Switzerland, nominated Clarence Streit for the 1932 Pulitzer Prize because of his reports in the New York Times on the international monetary crash of 1931, which transformed the depression into the great depression. Mr. Fraser played a key role in the many private meetings of leading central bankers and others at the World Bank during that panicky summer. In nominating Streit for his coverage of these highly controversial events—which was often front-paged by the Times, Mr. Frazer wrote:

"I have found that he has reported what I saw happen, with thorough accuracy, without bias, with terseness and fidelity. He then translates what he has discovered, just as it in truth was * * *. In reporting international news, no single attribute is so vital as the power to see realities, to sift the facts from nationalistic propaganda * * * and then report the results in such a balanced way as not to stir up chauvinism, or misrepresent any party. Mr. Streit achieves these desiderata."

Streit was the only correspondent of any newspaper in the world, in fact, who regularly covered not only monetary news through the world clearinghouse for it in Basel, but also world political; disarmament and economic affairs centered at the League of Nations in Geneva. He thus witnessed daily the intricate intrerelations of the political, military, economic and monetary arms of national sovereignty. In this "graduate school" he learned the complex chain reaction that can run through such diverse factors as the limitation of naval arms, a customs union between a small landlocked nation and a disarmed power, short-term debt between nations and gold reserves to dictatorship and war. This helped lead him to propose Atlantic federation in "Union Now," first written in 1933–34 but published only in early 1939.

Union Now's original edition included an annex, "How National Sovereignty Wrecked the Gold Standard" in 1931. It gave a play-by-play account of the devious road by which the North Atlantic democracies, by their disunion, unwittingly wrecked the world monetary system and, through the resulting unemployment, brought Hitler to power in 1933.

Streit found in 1963 "Current conditions are ominously similar in some basic respects" to those he saw bring on the 1931 crash. He then reprinted the above annex in our October issue under the title, "How Atlantic Disunion Broke the Gold Exchange Standard Before," as a prelude to his 12-page article in our November 1963 number—"The Danger to the Dollar—And How To End It."

It forecast that President de Gaulle "will wait at least until after the next U.S. presidential election"—as he has done—"before giving the White House too risky a monetary rap." The politicomonetary peril which this article spelled out in 1963 has since worsened, and led Streit to write the article featured in our March 1965 issue—"The Monetary Menace—And Opportunity." For a better understanding of this explosive but neglected subject, one should read all three articles—reprints are now available—and follow coming developments in Freedom & Union.

The Quality of the Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us mourn those who have lost their lives in the struggle for human rights. The New York Herald Tribune of March 13, 1965, expresses in an editorial the senti-

ments that all of us felt in the death of the Reverend James J. Reeb last week.

I commend that editorial to the attention of our colleagues:

THE QUALITY OF THE CRIME

The Reverend James J. Reeb was a good man. He sought to serve his God by serving the unfortunate here on earth. He went to Selma form his work in a low-income housing program near Boston to join in the protest against the violence with which the efforts to secure equal voting rights for Negroes had been met by Alabama authorities. And he, too, met violence, ugly, brutal violence on a Selma street.

Too many have died in the course of the massive movement to enable the Negro to take his rightful place in American society. None of these deaths, none of the maimings that accompanied them, can really be weighed in different scales. Yet the characteristics of James Reeb and the subhuman nature of the attack on him have given a special quality to the crime. It brought into juxtaposition two extremes of our America; of mankind. Good will, informed and committed, was done to death by ignorant hatred; the future was killed by the past.

Yet what James Reeb stood for cannot be killed. Rather his death, the death of a good man, will haunt the society that created his killers, the society that holds itself to be a superior race, endowed by God with the right to rule over its inferiors and to defend that rule by any means. That society has arrested the alleged murderers of James Reeb; it may even punish them. Certainly it must deplore their act. Yet the act sprang from the climate, from the false pride and exaggerated fears, from the contempt and the hatred, that has poisoned all levels of American life—and not in Alabama alone.

Americans must continue to work for justice to the Negro in all that law and organized effort can achieve. But more, Americans must search their own hearts and consider what careless word, what vicious joke, what apathy, of their own could have helped spark that tragedy in Selma. In the death of James Reeb—painfully classic in showing the conflict between the best and the worst of us—every American can find cause to question his conscience, and to strive to meet its challenge.

A Statement in Defense of the State of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, we in the Congress joined the Nation in commemoration of one of our Nation's greatest documents—the second inaugural address of President Abraham Lincoln. That address contains some remarkable language. Mr. Lincoln said, "Let us judge not that we be not judged." And he also urged that we "bind up the Nation's wounds."

This theme has been much on the mind of Alabama citizens these last few weeks. Whatever we may have felt about events in our State and around the country, most of us have thought that protestations and explanations might only serve to further arouse emotion and contribute to further violence. We have sought to act in the spirit of conciliation and reasonable understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I have sat here for some days listening to my colleagues belittle my State and accuse the good people of my State of all manner of evil. It seems imperative, therefore, that some statement in the defense of the great State of Alabama be made.

I want to make it clear from the very beginning that I believe wholeheartedly in the right of all qualified citizens, not only to register, but also to cast a vote on election day. This right is basic to the freedom that we enjoy in this Nation, and anything less than a full and equal right to vote by all qualified citizens cannot be tolerated.

Yes, I support the right of qualified American citizens to vote. If that right is not otherwise clear, it is unmistakably stated as the 15th amendment to the Constitution which says, "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Furthermore, I consider it deplorable that in some States, due to various but real conditions, this right has been slow to develop into fruition. More of our people should qualify as voters. I make no defense of every personal action in Alabama over the past few days. Violence in whatever form should not be tolerated in this country. And I join with other concerned citizens everywhere in calling for an end to violence.

From this point, then, there are two matters to consider: First, what do we in Alabama wish to say to the Nation at this particular time; and second, how do we best proceed from here to assure that American citizens have the right to vote.

Lincoln told us: "Let us judge not that we be not judged." Let us be careful that in our eagerness to see a better application of what we consider to be justice for citizens, we avoid using a different set of standards according to our special purposes of the moment. Let us be careful, before we react emotionally to newspaper headlines, that we are in possession of factual knowledge, and that we find in our hearts the appropriate mixing of understanding and indignation.

On Monday evening of this week, as the President of the United States spoke to the Nation on this very issue, a group of demonstrators, most of whom came from outside the State, congregated in the capital city of Alabama on a major street and caused a delay in the transit of an ambulance with red light flashing which was at that time on an emergency mission. I do not prefer to think that the responsible citizens of this country want to dismiss this incident, and others like it, for the reason that it occurs in Alabama, while these same citizens might feel differently if the same kind of event should occur in the capital city of some other State. What, for example, might be the reaction of responsible citizens if outside street demonstrators, for whatever cause, might stop an ambulance on a major street in St. Paul, Minn., or Albany, N.Y., or Salt Lake City, Utah? I believe that is a fair and reasonable question which Americans might ask of themselves.

We might also ask where were the cries of indignation when police in this city of Washington found it necessary to bodily remove demonstrators from the middle of Pennsylvania Avenue on Saturday, or from the Capitol Building on Monday of this week, or from the Attorney General's office last week? Can it be that we have unknowingly set up one set of values for one area of our country and quite another for the remainder?

All of us will agree that the key to the American right to peaceful demonstration and protest is responsibility. Reasonable men assume that a responsible demonstration by individuals acting responsibly is to be honored. But how easy it is to lose sight of the distinction between responsibility and irresponsibility, when we are far from the scene. And how quickly the distinction becomes clear when one's own freedom to move through a hallway, or along Pennsylvania Avenue, is affected.

The cause of citizen rights is an honorable cause. When this cause is adulterated by the irresponsible behavior of persons who come as strangers, it does not seem too much to ask that this be recognized for what it is. The hearts of Americans are given over to the redresss of grievances, wherever the need may arise. This is as it should be. But Alabama asks today that the country try to look beyond the emotion of the newspaper headlines and try to recognize irresponsibility from a distance, and not be too quick to judge Alabama from afar by one standard, waiting to recognize irresponsibility only when it arrives on Pennsylvania Avenue so that it may be judged by another standard there.

The city of Selma in Alabama is not a part of the congressional district which I have been elected to represent. Included in the six counties which I do represent are some in which many citizens have not so far registered to vote. This condition has been considered unfortunate by many citizens of both races, and procedures have been established to correct the problem. More persons are new registering in all six counties of Alabama's First Congressional District. I hope it will continue. And I believe it will continue if those who are truly concerned act in good faith. The danger of today is that emotions are running too high. Just as the emotions in Cook County, Ill., might run high if persons from Alabama should demonstrate in the streets to enforce fair election procedures and an honest count of the votes, persons in Alabama react with emotion when they find that people come in from other States to do everything they can to provoke violence under the protection of national sympathy and nuder the cloak of "nonviolence." Mr. Speaker, a person cannot understand until he has stood in a policeman's shoes and been spat upon and cursed in undertones by a "nonviolent" demonstrator.

If the scars of these past few weeks are not too deep, if the wounds can be bound up, Alabama will continue its progress in expanding the right to vote. I wish very much that I might have the

honor to act as host for many Americans who could in good faith undertake to visit Alabama. There they will find persons who also feel concern, people who think, act, and behave very much like the concerned, honest, and responsible folks of Omaha, Nebr., Scranton, Pa., and thousands of other American communities.

What, then, was the problem? The problem is the heat of emotion brought upon us by the two extremes—those who believe that any action can be excused in the advancement of an objective or in the prevention of it.

We ask for your understanding, my colleagues; we ask you to read the fine print as well as the headlines. We ask you to consider the action of wave upon wave of demonstrators in the light of advances made in our State; we ask you to consider who the people are who have used moderation in their approach to the problems confronting this Nation of ours today. For the courts had ruled in favor of the demands of the Negroes, registration was proceeding, there was good communication between the races. But still the hordes of demonstrators came.

How long must a people bear the continued abuse and insults? Having made their point they were unwilling to withdraw. They have found a good horse and they are riding it to death, no matter what the consequences.

Judge Learned Hand wrote:

> What is the spirit of moderation? It is the temper which does not press a partisan advantage to its bitter end, which can understand and will respect the other side, which feels a unity between all citizens—real and not the fictitious product of propaganda, which recognizes their common fate and their common aspirations—in a word, which has faith in the sacredness of the individual.

Having stated what I, as an Alabamian, want to say to the Nation today, let us turn now to the question of how we might best proceed from here so as to assure more American citizens of the right to vote.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 became law on July 2, 1964, just a little over 9 months ago. As we all know, the debate over the legislation raged across the Nation for many months. In every congressional district of the land, there were protagonists and antagonists. Some, in their strong feeling, said that this legislation would solve our problems, that it would bring the matter off the streets and into the courts. Others, including many in the South, felt that many sections of the bill may have been unconstitutional.

But, in any case, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 became law, and though many in the South found serious fault with it, efforts began in good faith to comply with its provisions.

Specifically with regard to voting rights, a Federal judge in Mobile, Ala., on February 4 of this year ordered under the new law that all persons in Dallas County in which Selma is located, who could read and write should be given the opportunity to register and to vote by the next election. The court order also stipulated that if all who wished to register by July 1965, were not registered, the court would proceed to do it.

Furthermore, the people of Dallas County were prepared to proceed with compliance, and in fact, went to some pains to call attention to their situation as a demonstration of good faith, and as an effort at the kind of communication which might have averted subsequent problems.

But for purposes which I will leave for others to determine, groups outside Alabama proceeded with 6 weeks of irresponsible and well publicized demonstrations which have resulted in tragedy, death, and greater frictions than existed before.

The emotional strength of these events has been so considerable, that the President of the United States, who we are told ordinarily seeks to "reason together" with people in search of a consensus, told the Nation on Monday night this week that there must be "no compromise." Forsaking the spirit of moderation of which Judge Hand so effectively wrote, the President has evidently joined those who feel that extremism in this case is a virtue.

Mr. Johnson has proposed new legislation to set up Federal registrars for voting in all elections.

The question all Americans, not just those of us from Southern States, should ask themselves, is twofold: first, is it now time to strike off again in this direction; and second, if so, how far do we go? How far can we go in centralization of Government authority under conditions of emotionalism? And how much unemotional restraint might be wise?

Let me express my feeling that at this point, 9 months after enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and 6 weeks after an Alabama judge has issued orders which would redress the grievances of Dallas County Negroes, it is far too early to act, based on emotionalism arising out of those grievances, in a way which might be considered unwise in the afterlight of calm consideration.

We respect the law. In fact, I cannot put it too strongly, that I believe the whole key to the civil rights situation is respect for the law. Street demonstrations have, as their underlying element, an unhealthy disrespect for law. Surely to rush into the enactment of new law, under the pressure of emotion surrounding the disrespect for existing law, cannot bring about a real solution.

The heart of the President's proposal on voting rights is enforcement by direct Federal action, a more rigid Federal enforcement than eixsts under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Since Alabama is already in the midst of compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in a way which would seem to assure full voting rights, American citizens should ask themselves if the price for the new law might be too high.

If, as the President says, we should act in this matter with no hesitation and no compromise, then we should at least consider that we may be paying a price approximately equivalent to our Federal system of Government for a new law which may be unnecessary.

If it is thought to be necessary to give this kind of enforcement power to the National Government, enforcement which would involve local elections, then what stands in the way of similar National Government enforcement of any other aspect of our lives whether it be the operation of our schools, the maintenance of local streets, or the choice of books for our libraries?

Apparently, my view represents a minority so far as the Nation is concerned. A voting law will surely be approved with an overyhelming majority. And as before, Alabama and the South will make every effort to comply.

But I want to express my feeling that our country may be in trouble. If there is any lesson of history worth giving our attention, it is that when any nation stands up to applaud, again and again, the giving over of greater and greater centralized authority to its national government, and when with every passing month the people of a free nation seem more and more eager to take responsibility out of their own hands and give it over to the federal government, paying less and less heed to words of caution and restraint from a shrinking minority, then that free nation has trouble lurking on the horizon.

Thoughtful people might say, "Well, State and local responsibility must be superseded when it fails to meet its reasonable obligations, if justice is to be done."

Let me contend that there is another alternative. And that is to work ever more to develop and foster local responsibility; to recognize the need for leadership, and to build it—in this case, to stimulate the spirit of moderation instead of to stifle it; to recognize progress where it exists, and encourage it rather than penalize it as we are about to do.

The headlong rush to establish Federal enforcers is an irreversible act. This authority, once established, will not be revoked. It can only be expanded.

The trend, however, appears inevitable, and is due in large part to an emotional public misreading of the signs and to a departure from Abraham Lincoln's wise caution to which we gave great honor at the Capitol Building only a few short days ago: "Let us judge not that we be not judged."

Viet Rhymes With Nyet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, firm support across the country has developed behind President Johnson's conduct of the Vietnamese situation. I have been especially pleased to note that the outstanding publications of the country have recognized that the President must take a firm stand in Vietnam. It has been also interesting to note that local community newspapers who as a rule do not editorialize on international affairs recognize the tremendous importance on the stand now being taken in Vietnam.

One such publication is the Park

Forest Reporter, Park Forest, Ill., whose editorial of Wednesday, March 3, I insert in the RECORD as evidence of nationwide support for a strong Vietnam policy.

VIET RHYMES WITH NYET

The firmness with which President Johnson conducts the Vietnamese and southeast Asia problem is worthy of more than casual mention. Although the instinct to negotiate is strong, it is more important, particularly for a lasting peace, not to abdicate our role of protector. A firm nyet has met all offers to negotiate.

The United States was called in by a nation forced to defend itself from a foreign foe. This was not a civil war. The South Vietnamese have had no designs on the territory of their northern neighbor. They wish to be freed of the menace guerrila tactics have inflicted on them. We are not trying to assess their valor or lack of it. Suffice it to say, despite serious political considerations which hamper normal military operations, representatives of the Saigon government under arms have given a good accounting of themselves in a very frustrating situation where it is difficult on sight at least, to distinguish friend from foe.

Our Government's refusal to join a negotiating seance is well taken. One doesn't need a long memory to recall that a treaty at Geneva, which sought to remedy the Laotian problem, did exactly the opposite. Communists, particularly the ruthless Red Chinese variety, do not know or practice the tenets of honor. Even the Soviets, who show halfhearted signs of supporting the Chinese in southeast Asia, recognize that their oriental comrades cannot be trusted, therefore, despite a change in the ruling Russ hierarchy, the schism between the two nations remains ruptured.

Although Moscow utters shallow defiances at the white paper our Government recently released as incontrovertible evidence of Red Chinese aims, we agree with the State and Defense Departments' evaluation that the red bear isn't spoiling for a fight * * * to protect Red China's hand. If there's any merit to the presence of prestige, our international stock has zoomed, despite De Gaulle's mutterings or Britain's eagerness to pave the way to the conference table.

A show of strength is the only way to deal with a Communist power. This is one of the few times when the sword is mightier than the word.

The Sabine River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we in east Texas are very interested in the total and complete development of the Sabine River so that it may benefit to the fullest our great area of east Texas. I include articles that appeared in the Longview Daily News March 10, 1965, and March 11, 1965.

I commend all who have shown interest in the development of this great river and trust that rapid progress will be made in its development:

[From the Longview (Tex.) Daily News, Mar. 10, 1965]

LONGVIEW CANAL

(NOTE.—The following editorial, under the above heading, is reproduced from the great Dallas Morning News of Wednesday.)

Unanimous action by the house at Austin in approving the bill to create the Sabine River Navigation District speaks well for the prospect of barge navigation between Longview and the gulf.

This is a wise addition of water transportation to other purposes embodied in the vast improvement program now underway on this major Texas river at a total cost in excess of $100 million.

The Sabine River Authority's Lake Tawakoni on the upper reaches of the stream near Greenville, built at a cost of $25 million, is now the largest single source of water supply for Dallas. It is also one of the finest recreation centers in Texas.

The largest single item in the Sabine program is construction of the Toledo Bend Dam and Reservoir now in progress near Newton at a cost of $60 million. The States of Texas and Louisiana are sharing $30 million of this cost by cash advances to the project. Private power companies of the two States separated by the river are underwriting another $30 million in revenue bonds by contracts to buy $2 million a year from the hydroelectric generating plant at Toledo Bend.

The barge canal to Longview calls for the building of three locks on the stream above Toledo Bend Reservoir at an outlay of only $15 million, which the new navigation district would be empowered to finance by revenue bonds based on toll charges. It would be a splendid rounding out of the multiple-purpose nature of the Sabine River program and would afford immense economic benefits to all of east Texas and western Louisiana. Business and civic spokesmen for Longview and other affected areas are to be congratulated upon their vision for low-cost water transportation.

[From the Longview (Tex.) Daily News, Mar. 10, 1965]

BILL NOW READY FOR SIGNATURE OF GOVERNOR

(By Dick Sands)

The Middle Sabine Navigation District bill which envisions eventual waterborne traffic between Longview and the gulf coast moved a step nearer reality Wednesday when the Texas Senate passed the measure without opposition.

Senator Jack Strong of Longview, notified the News and Journal of the bill's passage shortly after noon.

All that is required now is the Governor's signature for the bill to become law. Gov. John Connally is in Washington testifying on oil imports and it will be early next week before he sees the bill. He studied the proposal before it ever was introduced.

The bill, received from the house Tuesday at 10:30 a.m., had cleared the senate water committee in special session and, with rules suspended, drew a 29 to 0 vote in the senate at 11:50 a.m. Wednesday.

It took the bill just 25 hours, 20 minutes to go through the senate, a record.

The Sabine navigation bill envisions construction of three locks on the river between Longview and Toledo Bend Lake headwaters at Logansport, La. Construction would be financed by $15 million in revenue bonds, to be repaid from toll charges from barge traffic.

The locks would permit barges to travel 75 miles upstream beyond the Toledo Bend 65-mile-long reservoir now under construction by Sabine River authorities of Texas and Louisiana. With locks at Toledo Bend Dam, waterborne traffic could travel 200 miles direct between Longview and the Gulf of Mexico.

The bill was passed by a 142-to-0 unanimous vote of the house Monday. After obtaining permission to bring the measure up under a calendar permitting suspension of rules requiring it be read on 3 separate days

"This is a fabulous bill. It involves no local tax money, no State tax money, no Federal money." His fellow legislators applauded the statement.

Legislators from the four counties directly affected by the bill were agreeable to it, Representative Allen reported. Even the railroad lobbyists, who traditionally oppose legislation to promote traffic on water, highway or air, did not actively oppose the bill.

One railroad spokesman said they took that stand because the plan did not involve taxing them to benefit a competitor.

The bill authorizes creation of the Middle Sabine River Navigation District, for conservation and reclamation purposes, and with authority "to promote, construct, maintain and operate * * * navigable canals or waterways and all navigational systems of facilities auxiliary thereto * * *."

The district also is empowered to acquire ports, levees, wharves, docks, locks, warehouses, grain elevators, belt railways and other aids consistent to the operation of ports or waterways within its area.

It also is authorized to issue revenue bonds and to be governed by a board of eight directors, two from each county in the district. They shall serve without pay during 2-year terms of office, and actual expenses incurred by a director in the discharge of his official duties may be reimbursed, but only from funds raised in the county from which he is a member.

The district officials are directed to work in coordination with the Sabine River Authority of Texas, which is developing the entire river basin and is currently building the $60 million Toledo Bend Dam and Reservoir jointly with the Sabine River Authority, State of Louisiana, under a two-State compact and without Federal funds.

[From the Longview (Tex.) Daily News, Mar. 11, 1965]

SABINE PROGRESS

Under the inspired and masterful leadership of Representative John Allen of Gregg County and Senator Jack Strong of this district, the Middle Sabine Navigation District bill has sailed through the legislature with unanimous votes of approval and is headed for the Governor's desk for his signature.

We of the Longview News and Journal extend public commendation on behalf of the people of east Texas to Representative Allen and Senator Strong for the statesmanship they have demonstrated in getting this important legislation approved in record time.

Legislators Strong and Allen were joined by others from the east Texas area in helping push the bill through. Included were Representative John Mobley, of Kilgore, of the Gregg-Smith Flotorial district; Representative Nelson Cowles, of Harrison County; Representative Steve Burgess, of Nacogdoches County; Representative Guy McDonald, of Panola and Rusk Counties; Representative J. E. Miller, Jr., of Newton County, and others.

For the general information of all those east Texas people who are interested in the matter, we believe it would be helpful to present this project in proper perspective as it relates to the longtime plan for development of the Sabine River and its watershed for all the people of Texas and Louisiana.

Some have asked if this navigation project was not a brand new idea. The excellent work of the two fine young legislators from Longview who carried the bill through the house and senate certainly turned the spotlight of public attention to this area. This project, however, is one of a series of major steps in the overall master plan for Sabine development.

The publisher of the Longview News and Journal, his newspapers and staff, have been working closely with the development of the Sabine for more than a decade and a half. This first came to public attention when in the house, Representative Allen told his colleagues:

Publisher Carl Estes, as president of the Sabine Watershed Association, joined forces some 15 years ago with John W. Simmons, executive vice president and general manager of the Sabine River Authority of Texas, in public projection of that agency's master plan for reservoirs on the Sabine that ultimately would lead to barge transportation for this inland empire.

Bound volumes of the News and Journal show that on January 26, 1953, the Longview publisher took part with Mr. Simmons and other officials in the ceremony when the compact between the States of Texas and Louisiana was signed, approving joint participation of the two States in building the Toledo Bend Reservoir. The key to the present legislative development, it can be seen, was set back there long ago when plans for locks were included in the Toledo Bend Dam project.

The Sabine River Authority's master plan was first given wide public attention in the January 1, 1956, east Texas industrial progress edition of the News and Journal. A map showing location of proposed reservoirs was published on the front page, and a special six-page section explained the plan in detail. Copies were supplied to members of the legislature and to all water agencies in Austin.

In each succeeding year, the annual east Texas industrial progress edition of the Longview News and Journal has carried a special supplement devoted to Sabine River development, with material supplied by John Simmons and prepared by the staff of the News and Journal. Copies of these sections were furnished to the Sabine River Authority of Louisiana, as well as the Texas authority, to members of the legislatures and other governmental agencies of the two States.

From the outset, it was planned to include locks in Toledo Bend Dam to make future navigation possible. Early this year, a committee working under the guidance of John Simmons and headed by Robert Cargill of Longview and composed of representatives from Gregg, Rusk, Harrison, and Panola Counties proposed creation of a Sabine River navigation district. Approval of the four counties was secured and Henry Harbour, Longview attorney, was instructed to draw up a bill. This measure, with minor changes, became the bill which has cleared the legislature.

Two records perhaps were set in handling this necessary legislation. First was the 100-percent endorsement. Second was the speed in passing. Some observers have expressed amazement. Actually, there has been long-time and careful planning and preparation. The lion's share of the credit for the planned progress of Sabine's developfment is readily given by the publisher to John Simmons: "It was he who has led this master plan from its inception and who has had a major role in every phase of the development."

It should be pointed out that from the original Sabine Watershed Association and the Sabine River Authorities of Texas and Louisiana right down to the county and local level in the Sabine area, there has been a spirit of dedicated leadership and interested cooperation on the part of all concerned people.

This newspaper salutes the Texas Legislature for its alert and wise approval of enabling legislation, and commends all those who are contributing to this great master plan of regional development and progress.

ELLIE HOPKINS,
Editor in Chief.

[From the Longview Daily News, Mar. 11, 1965]

SABINE RIVER BILL ACTION IS PRAISED

(By S. A. Parker)

Longview business and civic leaders expressed great satisfaction and enthusiasm Wednesday over the unanimous vote given by both houses of the Texas Legislature to the bill which authorizes the creation of the Middle Sabine River Navigation District.

Publisher Carl Estes, well-known industrial developer who as president of the Sabine River Watershed Association worked for many years with John W. Simmons, executive vice president and general manager of the Sabine River Authority of Texas in the development of the river's resources, predicted that when barge transportation is made available, this area will enjoy an unprecedented growth. "This could easily be the biggest thing that has happened to east Texas since the discovery of oil," he said.

The publisher described the performance of Senator Jack Strong and Representative John Allen, who presented the bill in the senate and house, as brilliant. "These two are to be commended for the outstanding manner in which they handled this legislation from the time it was introduced until it received unanimous approval."

The Longview newspaper publisher has been active in the Sabine River development program approximately 15 years. He has worked closely with Simmons and others.

He took part in the ceremony on January 26, 1953, when a compact was signed between the States of Texas and Louisiana for the building and joint operation of Toledo Bend Reservoir. Original plans for this project included locks, which would make possible navigation of the stream by barges.

"If one man were to be singled out as the biggest factor in what already has been accomplished on the Sabine, the honor in all fairness would go to John Simmons," the publisher said.

Jasper Allbright, executive vice president of the Longview National Bank and a director of the navigation district, said of the legislative action: "Naturally, I think it is one of the finest things that could have happened to our part of the country, and I want to thank and commend our senator and the representatives of the area for the splendid manner in which they steered the bill through the legislature without opposition."

The president of Longview Industrial Districts, Inc., Robert Cargill, who was chairman of a committee that worked with Simmons several months ago in devising plans for the navigation district, labeled the measure "the greatest thing that has happened to northeast Texas in the 20th century and will be a great factor in the future economic and industrial growth of this area."

Simmons, in a telephone conversation with the Longview newapapers, said he was very gratified with the way the legislation had been handled and the short time that was required in securing its passage. "There are many people to be commended," he said, "and to be thanked. Especially is this true of Carl Estes, who has been a loyal and devoted supporter of the SRA's master plan for many years. He has been a strong and stanch ally."

Jim Molpus, vice president of production, R. G. LeTourneau, Inc., expressed the opinion that barge transportation would result in greater industrial development in this area.

V. A. Clements, president of the Longview National Bank, predicted navigation on the Sabine would greatly stimulate the growth of this area.

Pat H. Holmes, executive vice president of the Longview Bank & Trust Co. and president of the chamber of commerce, said "this is the dawn of a great era for Longview and the area."

Gene Faires, vice president of the First National Bank, described the project as "great."

F. L. Sartain, president of the East Texas Bank & Trust Co., said "It is one of the finest things that has ever happened for Longview."

Firearms Ownership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial in support of the Nation Rifle Association and in opposition to some of the careless comments that have been made about that great and outstanding organization.

The article from the Trenton Times of Wednesday, March 10, 1965, is calm and reasoned and should be required reading for anyone interested in one of the outstanding sporting and conservation organizations of this Nation.

The fine editor of the Trenton Times, Mr. Ken Weidner, a remarkable and able publisher of one of our fine newspapers deserves the commendation of all for his excellent commentary.

The article follows:

[From the Trenton Times, Mar. 10, 1965]

FIREARMS OWNERSHIP

Members of the National Rifle Association of America and other reputable gun owners are being maligned by sensational reporting on the part of some writers.

The time has come to make a positive effort to overcome the ignorance and misunderstanding about firearms and the people who use them. Those who appreciate and enjoy guns and shooting must share their knowledge and their beliefs with others in their home communities. They must emphasize to public officials and people in general the importance of firearms in America; the positive values of shooting and hunting; the necessity for firearms safety programs and marksmanship training activities of the National Rifle Association, and the contribution of these programs to the American way of life.

Those who have most to gain, and most to lose, must convince their friends and associates that guns and shooting are an essential part of our priceless heritage which must be cherished and encouraged. They must make known facts about the National Rifle Association, its affiliated shooting organizations, and its members in every State of the Union.

The National Rifle Association, more than any other organization, promotes the best interests of gun owners and shooters. As a public service, it is dedicated to firearms safety education, marksmanship training, and shooting for recreation.

It stands squarely behind the premise that the lawful ownership of firearms must not be denied American citizens of good repute so long as they continue to use them for lawful purposes.

The NRA is recognized as the leading authority in the field of firearms safety education and marksmanship training because of its nationwide programs for the youth of America.

It has demonstrated the soundness of the theory that the educational approach is the most effective method of avoiding gun accidents in the home and in the field. It has developed shooting activities for young people which bring out the qualities of sportsmanship, fair play, self-control, and cooperation so essential to responsible citizenship and to success in life.

Its instruction guides and training courses have been prepared as aids for teaching proper gun handling in local communities. The program is conducted on a volunteer basis by thousands of NRA certified instructors in schools, summer camps, shooting clubs, and other youth groups, in cooperation with State agencies and local organizations.

The NRA is the governing body of competitive rifle and pistol shooting in the United States and, in this capacity, establishes rules and regulations, sanctions tournaments, recognizes national champions, and maintains official records. It represents the shooters of America in the U.S. Olympic Committee and the International Shooting Union.

The strength of the NRA and, therefore, the ability to accomplish its objects and purposes, depends entirely upon the support of loyal Americans who believe in the right to "keep and bear arms."

Development of Community Mental Health Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Martin A. Janis, director of the Department of Mental Health and Correction for the State of Ohio, was in Washington recently and testified before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in support of H.R. 2985, to provide staffing assistance to communities in the development of the community mental health centers established by the Congress in the last session.

The position held by Mr. Janis is one of the most important Cabinet positions in the State of Ohio. It was also my honor to have been offered this same position by a previous Governor. But, irrespective of political considerations, Mr. Janis has filled the position with distinction and I feel his remarks in support of H.R. 2985 are worthy of insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT OF MR. MARTIN A. JANIS, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HYGIENE AND CORRECTION, STATE OF OHIO

Mr. Chairman and committee members, it is a privilege to appear before you to speak in support of H.R. 2985. I am Martin A. Janis, director of the Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction for the State of Ohio.

I am here today representing the Governor of Ohio and the Department of State that is charged with providing the care and treatment for the mentally ill of Ohio.

As a businessman, I have learned that an expenditure of money can either be an investment or a cost. For this reason to me, this is a vital piece of legislation. In my opinion your approval of this proposed legislation will insure that the investment the Congress has already made in its planning grants to the States and its construction assistance to the communities will bring a fuller return.

As you have gathered, I am not a doctor, nor a psychologist, nor a social worker, but a businessman serving by reason of the decision of the Governor of Ohio that a layman should be the director of this department in the State of Ohio.

The decision whether or not to accept this position was one that I weighed very carefully. The question was, in essence, what could I, as an individual and a businessman, bring to this important task. This Department is the largest and perhaps the most complex in the State. It is also the one department that offers direct service to the people of Ohio—the mentally ill, the mentally retarded and the inmates of our adult penal institutions. To be perfectly frank, I accepted the appointment because of the challenge it offered—the challenge of being of service to my fellow man. Through my business enterprises, I have been able to participate in a wide variety of civic activities in my home city of Toledo, Ohio. Serving for many years as president of a number of different civic organizations has been a rewarding experience as was my opportunity to serve as a member of the Ohio legislature. The directorship of this department offered a new and rewarding opportunity for public service.

In this new position, there were two types of experience that I felt I could bring to bear on the demands of the department. Experience in business and that of working with thousands of persons with varied interests and backgrounds in a variety of civic activities. Although different, in both the application of management principles is a necessity. I felt then, as I do now, that management principles can as well be applied to the operation of a large department of State, yes, even one serving human needs, as to a business or any civic effort. In each you aspire to an objective. In each you are required to obtain maximum benefit from the available dollar. In mental health and mental retardation the dollars are limited and the need is great. Every available dollar must be carefully used—to do otherwise is to deny a measure of help to people who are unable to help themselves.

There is another facet of this problem of mental illness to which I wanted to give my attention. It was a strong personal feeling of the lack of public attention, the lack of understanding by our society of the nature of mental illness. As you very well know in any effort where you must reach the people whether it is politics, civic affairs or business, the image you create wil be the most important factor in the success you achieve. The image of mental illness has been a poor one—one that has hindered the development of the needed public support of programs to deal with the problems of mental illness. Many, if not most people, still look at mental illness as something incurable, as evidence of lack of willpower, as punishment for some wrongdoing, as something to whisper and to joke about. I have tried, through my position as director of the Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction, to deal with this problem of the image—or, if you will, the lack of understanding concerning the mentally ill.

We in Ohio were enthusiastic when the Federal Congress determined to encourage and support long-range and comprehensive mental health planning. Planning is an essential element in any management practice. It should not be any less essential in providing mental health services. In addition, it gave us an opportunity to seek changes in public attitudes about the mentally ill—if you will, to change the public image of the mentally ill.

Likewise, when the Federal Congress enacted Public Law 88-164, a vehicle was provided to usher in a new era of patient care—the era of comprehensive comunity services. In our State we had begun to develop a community emphasis for mental health services.

The 105th Ohio General Assembly in 1963 enacted legislation making it possible for the State hospital to provide outpatient mental health services as well as the traditional inpatient services. Under this new authority, our hospitals instituted what we refer to as hospital community service units which can and are offering comprehensive psychiatric outpatient services, as well as day-care, night-care, and other forms of therapy. This has been a fast growing program—one that is focused on keeping the patient in his community and, whenever possible, on his job—as a useful and contributing member of society. Although the hospital community service unit program is just developing, last year alone we were able to treat 13,062 patients. Compare this with the 18,563 patients treated in our inpatient services last year and you can understand our optimism that we feel that within 3 years we will be treating more patients in our outpatient clinics than in our inpatient programs.

Particularly noteworthy is the fact that were it not for these hospital community service units, many patients would have required resident admission to our hospitals. Gratifying as the results have been, our concern is that we are not able to provide these comprehensive services to all communities as we are limited to those communities in which our hospitals are located.

The comprehensive mental health planning program has provided the opportunity to enlarge on this concept of patient care. We now look forward to the provision of comprehensive mental health programs under a variety of auspices in Ohio.

Speaking of comprehensive mental health planning, it was a privilege to attend the National Conference on Mental Health under the sponsorship of the American Psychiatric Association held in Washington recently. There I learned that about 30,000 persons in the Nation were involved in mental health planning. In Ohio, we have over 3,000. Every one of our 88 counties has a representative group of citizens now completing plans for the development of community-based services for their mentally ill and mentally retarded.

For example, nine applicants have already filed letters of intent for assistance to construct comprehensive mental health centers under Public Law 88-164. These requests have come from private nonprofit psychiatric hospitals, universities, general hospitals, and from community mental health clinics.

The total construction cost will be approximately $8 million. Several of these applicants should be able to make use of the construction assistance available this fiscal year. Others are planning to use only their own resources. In Ohio, the moneys available under title II of Public Law 88-164 will be expended this first year, but will not meet the need that exists for such facilities.

Under title I, part C, of Public Law 88-164, 12 letters of intent for the construction of facilities for the retarded have been received. This construction is estimated to be in excess of $10 million. We will again use all of the funds available under this title, but the need far exceeds the available assistance.

I believe, in some small measure, this suggests the level of interest and acceptance of this approach in Ohio. In many ways the construction assistance has moved closer to reality the dreams of many of our communities to provide badly needed facilities and services for the mentally ill—programs that are truly community oriented, programs that the community has a hand in financing as well as directing.

Our communities are faced with the hard problem of financing the operation of these new and expanded programs. The State of Ohio stands ready to assist them through our support of their community mental health clinics. We have 37 such clinics offering outpatient diagnostic treatment and consultative services. We expect that many of these clinics will be the hub for the development of comprehensive mental health centers. Many will add day-care services and contract with hospitals for their inpatient services. Unlike many States

that offer just 50-percent support for these clinics, Ohio supports them with up to two-thirds of their operating costs. Nevertheless, the addition of new services together with other expenses for an expanded operation will pose some very difficult problems to our communities in securing the necessary additional financing in the early years of their operation. In many communities it will be impossible to think of comprehensive services without some additional assistance.

May I bring to your attention our experience in Ohio in using Federal assistance in developing community mental health programs. It has been indicated that once operational money has been provided it will continue without either the community or the State assuming an increased portion of the total cost. Originally in Ohio, the Federal Government assumed the total cost of the development of the community mental health clinic program. From 1948 through 1950 the Federal funds provided 100 percent support in amounts ranging from $35,943 one year to $115,702 the last year. As the clinic program progressed to its present number of 37, State and local fund participation increased and the Federal contribution decreased. In fiscal year 1964 the total expenditure of our community mental health clinic program was $2,743,818 with Federal participation totaling $189,992 or approximately 7 percent. From full participation of 100 percent to approximately 7 percent of an ever-increasing program proves the wisdom of Congress in providing this "seed" money for the development of this program in the Mental Health Act of 1946.

I firmly believe that Federal assistance in meeting the initial cost of operations is a must—a must if we are going to capitalize on the momentum that has been developed.

Such support would give our community and financial leaders a breathing spell—a period of time—in which they can adapt their traditional public and private funding patterns to the needs of our fast changing, automated communities. As you gentlemen know, traditions of governmental responsibilities, adminstration and financing die hard and are slow to change, at any level of government. But they do change when it becomes apparent that such a change is necessary to meet a public demand. The proposal before you would make possible the gradual, sound and long-range development of our mental health preventive and treatment program, without requiring indefinite Federal commitment to the support of the program.

Yes, gentlemen, your approval of this bill will provide that necessary incentive communities must have if we are to fully realize the benefits so desperately needed. I know that many of my colleagues in business and labor feel as I do. Last Friday, when I learned that I would have the opportunity of speaking as a proponent of this bill, I asked a member of my staff to check with some of our business and labor officials around the State as to their position on this bill. By Monday, I had a desk piled high with letters endorsing the need for this investment of Federal funds. I have brought a few that I would like to submit with this prepared statement.

Another example of the concensus of the need for Federal assistance in meeting the initial operating cost of comprehensive mental health centers is the action taken by our Citizens' Committee on Comprehensive Mental Health Planning. On March 22, 1965, the Citizens' committee will submit an interim report to the Governor of Ohio. In this report they recommend that Federal funds should be made available to assist communities in the operation of comprehensive centers serving the mentally ill and mentally retarded. They, too, feel that if the job is to be done, the community, the State and the Federal Government must join hands in behalf of improved programs for the mentally ill.

I could cite you additional statistics on the dimensions of the mental health problem as it is being measured in Ohio. There will be many cited to you in the course of your hearings by people better qualified than I. There is just one measure that I would like to bring to your attention, it results from the comprehensive mental health study in one of our regions in Ohio. This special study was on the origin of patients being served by different types of mental health facilities. The study which was conducted in Cincinnati, Ohio, showed that patients from the poor areas of Cincinnati used our State hospitals up to 14 times as frequently as patients from more prosperous areas of that city. In my opinion, this highlights our problem. Our greatest unsolved mental health problem remains with the poor—the aged and the very young—the people who can't afford to purchase their own mental health care. The proposed comprehensive mental health centers offer a hope for the future. The services to these people will have to be at public expense and they should be for our society has the need of everyone of its citizens. This again illustrates the investment quality of this bill—an investment in human values.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank you and the members of the committee for allowing me to present my views on the proposal before you. We can turn the flow of mental health services dollars to better use if, through passage of this bill, we are given the necessary aid that will permit immediate development of the community comprehensive mental health center. At the same time, I pledge to you that in our State as I am sure in all of the others, as in the instance of Federal "seed" money provided for community mental health clinics which I cited previously, Federal support need not continue indefinitely but only for the period as provided in this bill, so that we will have the neecssary time to assemble the resources that we will need.

Reasonable Restriction on the Sale of Firearms Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have urged the enactment of legislation for both the District of Columbia and the Nation to regulate the sale of firearms.

In the 89th Congress my bill to regulate the sale of the firearms in the District of Columbia is H.R. 637 and my bill to regulate firearms nationally is H.R. 1110. The increasing use of firearms for the commission of crimes, particularly among juveniles, has become an intolerable situation and I believe the Congress should act now to stop it.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following WMAL editorial broadcast during the week of February 28, 1965, urging such legislation:

GUN LAWS

We advocate sensible gun sale restrictions. We do not propose that all guns be abolished.

The varied ideas on what constitutes a reasonable restriction can be satisfactorily resolved. There are many bills before Congress. The Commissioners have prepared a special bill to limit the sale of pistols in the District.

The measure would prohibit the sale of pistols to those with criminal records, mental or personality disorders, and those under 18 years of age, unless a member of an approved gun club. The bill also strengthens weak points in previous regulations.

Restrictions on the sale of pistols can no longer be delayed. Congress should enact reasonable restrictions for the District.

The Need for an American Ombudsman, or Administrative Counsel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the challenges facing modern democracies is to provide easy and effective means for citizens to obtain redress of their legitimate grievances with government bureaucracies.

In an excellent article published in the March 12, 1965, issue of the Kansas City Times, Sidney L. Willens, a Kansas City attorney, has described very convincingly the deficiencies of the avenues of redress now open to Americans. And he sets forth the solution to this problem of protecting citizens' rights against bureaucratic abuse and error achieved by the Swedes through their ombudsman.

I have proposed adapting the ombudsman idea to American government and politics by creating an administrative counsel of the Congress. The administrative counsel would help Congressmen protect the rights of their constituents in the constituents' dealings with the Federal bureaucracy and, at the same time, increase the effectiveness of Congress as a legislature by lightening the workload of Members.

I commend Mr. Willens' article to the House as an excellent brief statement of the need for an American ombudsman—or, perhaps, ombudsmen, since the principle could be applied also at the State and local levels.

The article follows:

[From the Kansas City Times, Mar. 12, 1965]

PEOPLE VERSUS BUREAUCRACY: LITTLE MAN HAS DEFENDER IN THE OMBUDSMAN

(NOTE.—Recently American attention has been drawn to a 156-year-old Swedish institution designed to protect citizens against abuses by ever-expanding bureaucracy in government affairs. In the following article a Kansas City lawyer describes it and suggests the time may be ripe for Missouri to accept it.)

(By Sidney L. Willens)

In Kansas City, or for that matter, anywhere in the United States if you feel that a policeman, building commissioner, tax board, license bureau, or any public agency has treated you rudely, unfairly, or illegally, you have a choice: Complain to a superior, write a letter to an editor, scribble a message to your legislator, or—go to a lawyer.

If you choose a lawyer he will advise you that the law doesn't prescribe remedies for rudeness or unfairness in day-to-day dealings with public officials—only for illegality.

To prove illegality, the lawyer will say, you must seek a hearing before the official or his superiors and, if necessary, appeal to the courts, a costly, tedious, and lengthy process.

ONLY SLIM CHANCE

If you favor an appeal the lawyer hits you with a fundamental rule of administrative law—that the courts seldom overturn an administrative decision. And if they do, it must be clearly wrong, or, in legal terms, "not supported by the evidence."

Furthermore, the lawyer says, you're stuck with the evidence heard by the administrative official who is usually the prosecutor, judge, and jury rolled into one.

"But I want a regular trial in a courtroom," you insist.

"Sorry, you've had your day in 'court' when you testified at the original hearing," your lawyer replies. "You're lucky the statute gave you the right to appeal. Sometimes you're stopped dead with the agency."

TRANSCRIPT KEY EVIDENCE

"Even if you appeal its the cold print that gets the 'hearing'" the lawyer adds. "Your appeal consists of forwarding the stenographer's transcript of the administrative proceedings to a court which determines if the evidence is sufficient."

What's your remedy for bureaucratic rudeness or unfairness?

Your Congressman, State legislator, or city councilman, burdened by ever-increasing duties involved in lawmaking, probably will answer your plight with a letter or call of sympathy.

And your lawyer already has said he's sorry—that he's handcuffed by the law.

"But the inspector is enforcing a regulation against me and not the others and it's killing me," you say bewilderedly.

"It's unfortunate," your lawyer answers ruefully, "but I can only complain for you. Administrative agencies are a sort of law to themselves."

Your lawyer's answer is the same whether a policeman held you too long in jail, red-tape continually delayed your welfare check or license, a traffic patrolman gave you a ticket wrongly, or a Government regulation seemed arbitrary.

RECOURSE IN SWEDEN

Now if you were a Swedish citizen you would simply head for the ombudsman (pronounced A A M-boodsmahn). He's been around Sweden since 1809 when Parliament appointed an agent ("umboo" in Swedish) to keep an eye on the king and his henchmen and the courts of law.

His job: To ferret out injustice and pettifoggery in government affairs so a citizen's rights won't be accidentally crushed in the vast juggernaut of bureaucratic machinery.

Today the Swedish ombudsman is Alfred Bexelius, the country's 31st. He is called by the initials, J.O., an abbreviation for justiteombudsman, meaning the power to act in justice for another.

Presently, the J.O. heads a staff of nine lawyers and three secretaries. It's small on purpose—to avoid criticism that it, too, is bureaucratic. It serves Sweden's 7½ million persons.

ANSWERS TO PUBLIC

Bexelius was hired, as were his predecessors, by a special committee of Parliament. But neither it nor anybody else tells him what to do. The public is his master. Nobody fires a J.O. Parliament can but never has.

Bexelius is a former judge (most J.O.'s are), a topnotch administrator with diplomatic savoir faire, and an older man uninspired by new job opportunities.

In his 10 years in office Bexelius has established a reputation as a kind of Missouri nonpartisan court plan all wrapped into one. Uninfluenced by political considerations he's a one-man complaint bureau accepting—and deciding—controversies on the merits.

LIMITS HIS SCOPE

How does the ombudsman idea work? First, he receives a complaint. It must be in writing and signed. The J.O. is the sole judge of whether he wants to act upon it. On 90 percent of the complaints he doesn't.

If he believes a complaint is justified, Bexelius requests the official to explain his action. In 85 percent of the cases the official's reply closes the file after the J.O. writes the complainant supplying him a reason why—and agreeing with it.

The complainant is satisfied. The official is too. He's been cleared. But in the future the official had better give reasons for his decisions.

In the remaining 15 percent of the cases pursued, the J.O. goes to work. He may visit the official, subpena information, or attend the agency's hearings and deliberations.

NO LEGAL POWER

But the J.O. can't interfere with decision-making. Although he has broad discretion to investigate agencies under his jurisdiction he can only suggest and persuade. He's not a court of appeals.

What's his weapon? It's the prestige of his employer, Parliament, the dignity and impeccable honesty which Swedish citizens attach to the office—and publicity. A recalcitrant administrator doesn't want his name in the newspaper.

Frequently newspapers sniff out injustices for the public watchdog. If no action is forthcoming soon the newspapers ask in headlines, "Is the J.O. asleep?"

The J.O.'s biggest weapon is a book—his annual report to Parliament. Each year he lists all important cases and their disposition. He may propose new legislation or changes in administrative regulations to cure injustices he's come across during the year. The book is distributed to all courts and government agencies.

PLEAS FROM JAIL CELLS

Twenty percent of the complaints originate from inmates of mental and penal institutions alleging unlawful commitment or improper treatment. Usually, the J.O. secures the patient's history, reviews it, and advises him the law has been complied with. If it's improper treatment, the J.O. may visit the institution to size up the situation. His visit isn't taken lightly by administrators. The J.O. himself initiates some complaints.

The Swedish J.O. exercises jurisdiction over the courts (in no other country does he have that right) but not over the armed services. Parliament created an M.O. (military ombudsman) in 1915.

In 1919 Finland adopted the ombudsman idea. Surprisingly, it stopped there until after World War II. During Nazi occupation of Norway, Norwegian army officers sheltered in Sweden were favorably impressed by the Swedish M.O. They carried it back to Norway. In 1952 the Norwegian Parliament accepted it. In 1962 it added an ombudsman for civil affairs. Denmark included a provision for an ombudsman in its new Constitution adopted in 1953. In 1956, West Germany appointed a military ombudsman.

SPREADING THE WORD

Perhaps he greatest impetus to the ombudsman idea has come from Bexelius and his Danish counterpart, Dr. Stephan Hurwitz, a former professor of criminal law at the University of Copenhagen.

The two men are writing and lecturing widely to spread the ombudsman gospel around the world—for all levels of government—Federal, State, and municipal. Through their efforts a commonwealth country, New Zealand, adopted the institution in 1962. England and Canada are studying it.

In the United States Representative HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, last month introduced the concept in the House of Representatives in a bill calling for an "administrative counsel" which he describes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an "American ombudsman." Connecticut and California Legislatures are now debating a State ombudsman.

NEED IS INDICATED

Is America ripe for an ombudsman operating perhaps regional offices in the larger cities? The statistics seem to say "yes."

They reveal that government has grown a "fourth branch"—administrative agencies—exclusive of the other three with its "checks and balances" called for by Montesquieu, eminent French philosopher, and expressly written into the Constitution.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

ROLLCALLS NOS. 19 AND 20—INTER-AMERICAN BANK

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, as an advocate of multilateral aid programs I gave my full support to the bill authorizing increased U.S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank. The Bank is the financial arm of the Alliance for Progress and insists on self-help by the nations of Latin America. U.S. participation in the IDB was originally approved in 1959 and subsequent support has always been bipartisan. I am pleased this was again the case in 1965.

H.R. 45 authorizes the United States to contribute $750 million over a 3-year period to the IDB's Fund for Special Operations. The Latin American countries as a group will contribute $150 million in their own currencies over the same period. The Fund for Special Operations provides loans on easy repayment terms where lending on conventional terms is inappropriate. I am sure most Americans would prefer a loan program to one of outright grants.

There are several important points which should be brought out concerning this program:

Increased U.S. participation in FSO will be in lieu of any further contributions to the Social Progress Trust Fund.

Funds previously provided entirely by the United States will hereafter be provided in part by the Latin American countries.

Loans made by the FSO must meet the criteria of the Alliance for Progress.

No funds provided to the FSO will be available to Communist-bloc countries. Cuba has never joined the Bank and is no longer eligible for membership.

The vote of the United States is necessary to obtain the two-thirds majority needed for favorable consideration of any

FSO loan. In other words, the United States holds a strong veto power.

The impact of our contribution on our balance of payments will be slight because more than 80 percent of the expenditures from the U.S. contribution will be made in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I supported this bill because I believe in the Alliance for Progress and I believe the vast majority of the American people believe in it. The Inter-American Development Bank lies at the very heart of Latin America's economic progress, and by strengthening the Bank we are making more secure not only American investments in the Southern Hemisphere, but the governments of our sister republics as well.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 23 AND 24—HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Speaker, the basic issue involved in the recommittal vote on House Resolution 188 has, whether by accident or intent, been grossly distorted by various extremist pamphleteers and at this time I want to make my position unmistakably clear regarding the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

I have received many letters calling for abolition of the committee from constituents and organizations in and outside my district. And I have received many communications asking for continuation of the committee and providing more funds for its operation. There is no question that the committee is highly controversial, but to its friends and foes alike I have consistently restated my position: At this time I am opposed to abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities unless its lawful functions are transferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

That is why I voted in favor of House Resolution 188 after I and 57 of my colleagues were defeated on the previous motion to recommit the resolution for public hearings. I could not vote to cut off funds to a standing committee of the House and render it unable to fulfill its legislative mandate without that mandate first being rescinded by the House.

HEARINGS NEEDED

I favored a public hearing on the resolution because I believe that free and open debate on controversial issues lies at the very heart of our form of government. It is incredible to me that inferences are being made by some that those members who favored public hearings are sympathetic to the Communists, the Nazis, the Minutemen, the Ku Klux Klan, and other extremist groups.

It was only a few weeks ago that I called on the chairman of HCUA to investigate the American Nazi Party and the Minutemen because I believe these organizations are engaged in un-American activities. I also made clear at that time that I would not endorse any such investigation if the civil rights or civil liberties of any witnesses were denied, or if there was any infringement of their constitutional right of free speech.

Of all the standing committees of the Congress, only HCUA has generated widespread controversy which frequently borders on emotional hysteria. Since passions run hot on both sides of the issue it seems to me appropriate that they be calmly ventilated through fair and open hearings by a committee of the Congress. In my judgment it would be a healthy development if all Members and the American people knew what the justification for the HCUA fund request is and how the funds authorized by the House are expended.

CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE

There are many controversial facets to the HCUA issue. Does the committee, standing as an arm of the Congress, perform a legislative function? Does it aid the Congress in implementing legislation? Does it deprive witnesses of their constitutional guarantees? Is the term "un-American" being too broadly interpreted? Was I in error in calling on the committee to investigate the Nazis and the minutemen? I do not think I was but there are some who have so charged.

An even more basic point regarding the House Committee on Un-American Activities goes back 20 years when in this very chamber its creation as a standing committee was vigorously debated. Let me briefly review what happened at that time:

In 1945 the mandate of the Dies committee, HCUA's forerunner, had expired. It had been established as a temporary investigative committee and would have needed new authorization and appropriation in the 79th Congress. An amendment was presented which would make HCUA a permanent standing committee. Debate developed and during its course the then majority leader, now our distinguished Speaker, opposed the amendment on these grounds:

> I do not know when in the history of our country the National House of Representatives has ever provided by rule for a permanent investigating committee. Mark what we are doing. This is not a question of establishing an investigative committee to investigate conditions that arise from time to time; it is a question of amending the rules of the House to provide for a permanent standing committee that does not consider legislation, but has one subject, one field, the field of investigating and making a report. There is a big difference between establishing a standing committee to investigate and establishing a special investigating committee for a particular Congress. If this amendment is adopted, as far as I know, it will be the first time in the history of this body that a committee of this kind was ever established as a permanent or standing committee.

The amendment was voted on and adopted, 208–186. It was a close vote and I think it important to point out some of the fine Americans who voted against adoption: Mr. McCormack; Mr. Francis Walter, who was to become HCUA chairman; Mr. Mike Mansfield, now Senate majority leader; Mr. Everett Dirksen, now Senate minority leader; Mr. Mike Monroney, now the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma; Mr. Clyde Doyle, who later served on HCUA; Mr. Carl Vinson, who just last year retired after a half century of exemplary service in this House; and Mr. Lyndon Baines Johnson, our widely acclaimed and respected President. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that even the most vociferous supporters of the House Committee on Un-American Activities would charge that any of these fine, distinguished public servants are or have been sympathetic to communism.

Nor do I think any HCUA supporters would charge that the distinguished and capable Republican Representative from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] is a Communist sympathizer. Yet it was the gentleman from Missouri who in an address to the House on February 8 said:

> I think it would be helpful if the House Administration Committee would hold public hearings at the time the budget of the House Un-American Activities Committee is under consideration and invite the critics of the House Un-American Activities Committee to be heard in full. If the critics have a case that can be made, let us have it presented under circumstances which permit cross-examination of the witnesses who level the charges and testimony in rebuttal to be presented by those who disagree with them. The Congress of the United States is the proper forum in which to present the pros and cons of controversial issues of a political nature. The Congress constantly fulfills this function through public hearings by its standing committees. Utilizing the Congress in this fashion is the best way to resolve matters where grave differences of opinion exist on subjects of a political nature, such as this one.

My vote on the motion to recommit, Mr. Speaker, was an accurate reflection of the gentleman from Missouri's perceptive analysis on the need for public hearings regarding HCUA. He made an excellent statement and I concur with it.

BUDGETARY ISSUE

But I voted to recommit not only because this controversial political issue merits a public airing. Irrespective of politics, in terms only of efficiency and economy in the Congress, there have been legitimate questions raised as to the need for a $370,000 budget for a nine-member committee. Permit me to briefly point out some pertinent comparisons regarding various committees of the House:

In this Congress, my committee, Foreign Affairs, which handles important legislation in complex areas ranging from the Peace Corps to military assistance, has 37 members and a budget of $118,250. This averages out to $3,195 per member.

The $370,000 budgeted to the Committee on Un-American Activities breaks down to $41,111 per member, or 13 times the sum per member of my committee.

Examine the HCUA budget in relation to another committee, Interior and Insular Affairs, one of the busiest in the House. Interior's budget is $100,000. It has 34 members, for an average of $2,941. This is $38,159 less than the per member figure for HCUA.

And yet, in the 88th Congress, only 29 measures were referred to HCUA, while 850 went to Interior. One HCUA bill was enacted into law. Interior enacted 149. Comparing legislation considered and passed, the ratio is about 400 to 1.

What of HCUA's budget when compared to one of the House's most vital committees in terms of national security, Armed Services? Armed Services has 37 members operating on a $150,000 budget. This makes for a per-member figure of $4,054 or a sum more than 10 times below that of HCUA.

The discrepancy in budgets goes on and on for committee after committee. I would think that if the House Committee on Un-American Activities can indeed justify its budget—if only to satisfy the concern expressed by fiscal conservatives in this body—it would welcome the opportunity to do so in public hearings.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker, since entering public service I have always been a strong and unflinching advocate of conducting the public's business in public. The people have a right to know what we in government do with their money, how we vote, how we represent them. It is this philosophy of government which I brought to the Congress and which I will fight for every day that I am here. And I will not be swayed from this course by veiled and unveiled threats or outright fraudulent charges made by extremist who would again plunge this Nation into the dark ages of McCarthyism.

When I came to the Congress more than 2 years ago I was told by cynics that my rollcall reports, the very type which I am presenting today, was a mistake. Why? Because I laid my record out for all to see, unafraid to mirror myself to my constituents, confident that they did not suffer from political myopia or distorted vision. The people of my district have proven the cynics and the secretists wrong, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud of the honor to represent them if for no other reason than that they, too, believe in conducting the public's business in public. I could not have remained true to myself, or to them, had I not, when the request was made, voted to recommit for public hearings the appropriations bill for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. And when this request was defeated I believe I again accurately reflected the views of the citizens of my district when I voted to appropriate the $370,000 requested by the committee.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 28 AND 29—APPALACHIAN REDEVELOPMENT

At stake on these votes was a program which over the next 6 years will initiate the redevelopment and return to prosperity of the 360 counties which stretch from New York to Alabama along the Appalachian Range.

This region has for many years been an extremely depressed area. Its nearly 16 million people have consistently had one of the lowest per capita income figures in the United States. The decline of native industries and the inability of the area to attract new industries because of poor transportation facilities rendered the people unable to help themselves. They have lived for many years in a poverty of both body and spirit, a poverty which is difficult to comprehend in this affluent Nation. Appalachia has become a backwash, out of the mainstream of our great prosperity.

I voted for the redevelopment bill because I believe it will in a variety of ways help wipe out the stagnation which has existed there for so long. The bill's provisions will help the people of the region to help themselves.

PROVISIONS

The measure provides almost $1.1 billion for development programs over a 2-year period. Most of it will go for thousands of miles of roads and highways to ease the acute transportation problem and thus help to attract badly needed industry. The remaining funds will be used to provide vocational training for the many unemployed people of the area, to provide badly needed hospitals to upgrade generally low health standards, and to finance programs of water, soil, and forest conservation as well as programs for better utilization of the area's vast mineral resources.

During debate on this measure, Republicans attempted to attach a series of crippling amendments, claiming that the bill, in aiding only one area—even an area so badly in need as Appalachia—discriminates against the rest of the country. They failed to realize that every American has a stake in the prosperity of the Appalachian area, not only as a matter of social conscience, but as a matter of practical economics. The increased prosperity of these 16 million people will stimulate the entire economy, from the large industries of steel, autos, rubber, and petroleum down to the smallest consumer goods industries. The increased prosperity of Appalachia will eventually reach into and stimulate the economy of every town in America.

Having failed to gut this badly needed legislation by amendment, the Republicans moved to recommit it to committee with instructions to substitute an entirely different bill. I voted against the motion to recommit because the substitute bill, made a shotgun approach to the situation and would have diluted funds to such an extent as to make the bill nothing more than another "pork barrel" measure which would have failed to help any area in a substantial way. S. 3 on the other hand, is a carefully directed, coordinated bill which should help an entire region to lift itself up by its own boot straps and benefit the entire Nation in the process.

The Appalachian Redevelopment Act has the additional feature of reenforcing the Federal-State relationship which has been the great strength of this Nation. To administer the program it provides for a joint commission made up of one representative from the Federal Government plus one representative from each of the 11 States directly involved in the redevelopment effort. The Federal Government will delegate its decisionmaking to the Governors, and the States and communities will do the planning and for all practical purposes run the program. As President Johnson said upon signing the bill into law, it is one of the best examples of creative federalism in our time.

Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, next week the House Ways and Means Committee is expected to produce a so-called medicare bill. It is an open secret in the House that the bill will be a product of a determined bit of arm twisting by the executive branch.

The Palos Regional, a dedicated community newspaper in the Fourth Congressional District, carried a hard-hitting editorial on the subject of medicare. In view of its timely nature and the penetrating style, I believe it warrants the attention of the Members, and I include it herewith:

THIRTEEN STRIKES AGAINST MEDICARE

(By Charles Richards)

Although currently proposed Federal Government health care programs enjoy extensive political popularity, the mass of evidence shows that they are not needed, not practical, and most important, not fair to the American taxpayer.

The following are only a few of the reasons, both from principle and past experience, why such Government welfare schemes follow the wrong road to the goal we are all seeking—adequate medical care for those who, at this time, can't afford it.

However, criticism by itself is of little value. Therefore several suggestions are offered as more effective methods of handling the medical bills of the poor.

1. On what basis does every American have the right to get free the best and most complete medical care any more than the best food, best clothes, or best home? Why is the Federal Government obligated to provide medical services to all at the cost of the American taxpayer? Americans are not all equal "per se," as some suggest. Native ability, education and training, and productivity obviously vary from person to person.

2. Shouldn't a person's medical expenses be paid with his own income or savings, resources of relatives, or through private insurance? If a person is too poor to pay his medical expenses, he might get direct charity from doctors, clinics, neighbors, or community civic organizations. If these resources fail, then local and State governments are best equipped to handle the problem.

3. And surely it is not unfair to expect a person to prove financial need before he is given aid.

4. If the billions of dollars needed to finance Federal medicare programs are taken from general income taxes in the tradition of the "great leveling" now being forced on Americans, then persons who work harder and make more money are penalized by having to pay a portion of the medical bills of those less productive individuals.

5. If the programs get money from social security taxes, they will unfairly penalize the low income worker, the very person they attempt to help.

6. The proposed medical care programs are not true insurance plans. They are nothing more than Government subsidies which are

involuntary redistributions of the nation's wealth from more productive individuals to less productive persons.

7. More concrete than principle, past experience in other countries should also be our guide. France's medicare system is bankrupt. Britain's costs have soared, services have been cut, doctors have left the country and those remaining have threatened to strike. In Canada, costs have far exceeded estimates and income, and doctors actually did go on strike. Yet, in the face of these failures, the voters in each country demand more and more services.

8. U.S. Government officials admit that even our present social security system is not self-supporting but utilizes funds from general taxes also.

9. Fraud has plagued foreign medicare plans. Also the strain on medical personnel and facilities has vastly increased, with some cases of persons even seeking unneeded medical care.

10. Doctors are burdened with paperwork, requiring as much as 4 hours a day in some countries.

11. The proposed King-Anderson bill is just a foot in the door for the entrance of complete socialized medicine, one proponent of the measure admitted.

12. Private insurance companies and programs will be hurt by the Government operated service. In the past we have seen the inefficiency of Government when it enters business. The Government will become the impersonal third party looming between the doctor and his patient.

13. The need for compulsory Government insurance programs is actually decreasing since the proportion of people covered by private, cooperative, and local public programs is increasing yearly.

As with any problem, it is best to apply corrective measures to the source, not the symptoms of the dilemma. Therefore, several remedies suggest themselves.

The first and most important goal should be to cut the high costs of medical care. The way to do this is to eliminate or limit the causes of the soaring expenses. Two such causes are inflation and the population explosion. Solutions to these problems are too complex for this discussion.

Yet some immediate steps can be taken to halt the price spiral in the medical care field. Instead of pouring money into medicare programs, the Government should do more to encourage the training of more doctors and nurses and the construction of additional medical facilities. Admittedly, this is Government intervention, but it is more limited and much less costly than medicare.

Hospital management should be improved. Automation should be employed in hospitals and nursing homes wherever practical. Doctors should encourage home care for patients with completely incurable diseases.

Of course, there will always be a few people who can't afford their medical bills no matter how small. For these there is local charity.

It will cost less in the long run to be more practical to end the need for a Federal medicare program. This is better than installing a compulsory, mushrooming medicare plan which, like cancer, just grows and grows until it kills the very person that gives it sustenance.

Restricted News in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks I have been disturbed over reports which have been filtering through from newsmen who are covering the war in Vietnam, over alleged restrictions on news coverage in that area. Evidently there have been some instances where the press has been barred, and while I do not question the necessity for certain security requirements, I am concerned about the possibility that the American public might not be getting a true and clear picture of what is happening in southeast Asia.

I have today written to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, and am setting forth herewith the text of that letter, for the benefit of my colleagues:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1965.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to express my deepest concern over recent reports of official restrictions on news coverage in Vietnam. Responsible journalists seem increasingly disturbed by the number of incidents where newsmen are being barred from covering many important aspects of our action in southeast Asia. Many members of the press have suggested that present official policy represents a departure from traditional conventions of war coverage. Apparently the problem is sufficiently serious to prompt public statements such as that made by Wes Gallagher, general manager of the Associated Press, which appeared in the New York Times of March 18, 1965:

"News restrictions imposed by the Pentagon raise serious questions as to whether the American people will be able to get a true picture of the war in Vietnam."

My own concern over this matter is increased by persisting speculation by such international leaders as the Secretary General of the United Nations, suggesting that the American people are not "learning all the facts about Vietnam." I am sure you agree that we cannot afford to give any such speculations credibility.

I am certain you feel strongly, as do I, that a fundamental democratic right is the right to know. On many occasions you have expressed your commitment to this right, despite the security requirements implicit in the conduct of modern foreign policy. Let me say that I appreciate the constant difficulty of determining exactly where security requirements necessitate some formal censorship. I am sure this matter is given continuing attention by you and other Government officials.

However, I do feel that this country cannot profit by ambiguities in official policy toward newspaper coverage in southeast Asia. If, as the reports of prudent and responsible newspapermen suggest, such ambiguities do exist, I would welcome any explanation of their cause and character.

Thank you for your consideration, and with my best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
Member of Congress.

Official Opening of the Washington Hilton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, since the city of Washington was founded a century and a half ago it has been the host to the Nation. Since America obtained the pinnacle of world leadership Washington has received guests from all parts of the world. It is not unusual that the hotels and restaurants of the National Capital have been more significant than those of any other American city.

It was my pleasure to be present today at the official opening of the Washington Hilton, a great new hotel to accommodate visitors in the Federal City. I was glad to join the distinguished Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, many of our colleagues in the Congress, and Government and community leaders in hailing the completion and dedication of a great new facility.

Very properly the host on this occasion was Mr. Conrad N. Hilton, chairman of the Hilton Hotels Corp. Mr. Hilton's remarks describe a significant event and it is my pleasure to insert them in the RECORD at this point:

"THE UNOFFICIAL PALACE"—REMARKS BY CONRAD N. HILTON, CHAIRMAN, HILTON HOTELS CORP., CHAIRMAN AND PRESIDENT, HILTON INTERNATIONAL CO., AT THE DEDICATION LUNCHEON, THE WASHINGTON HILTON, WASHINGTON, D.C., THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 1965

For a great many years we have had the honor and pleasure of opening hotels across the continent, from Texas to Montreal, from New York to Los Angeles, from Portland to New Orleans. In each I made some brief dedicatory remarks. In New York I discussed its challenging millions; in San Francisco its lovely hills and the promise of the Orient; In Denver the Rockies; in Pittsburgh the Golden Triangle. But what is to be said of Washington, a city possessing within itself such sophistication and at the same time such innocence? The city's only purpose—

as is the purpose of all government—is to make people happy. The lives of your more than a million population revolve around Metropolitan Washington's two major industries—government and politics—the pursuit of happiness. Or is that one industry?

Four years ago Percy and Harold Uris, and we of the Hilton Corp., set out to build a hotel that would serve as an "unofficial palace" for our Nation's Capital, much as the Waldorf-Astoria has been for New York City over the years. To do that we had first to study and capture the mood of the city. We found very early that that mood is a unique and evanescent one. We knew that to capture the Washington spirit we had to build a hotel that was at once proudly American, yet distinctively cosmopolitan, befitting a city that is both a world capital and the Capital of the United States of America. It had to be big enough for the statesmen of the world, yet small enough, comfortable enough, for the simplest citizen who comes to see his Government in action.

The frame, the setting of the hotel, had been designed in splendor 170 years before by the great French engineer, Pierre Charles L'Enfant, master planner for one of the most beautiful cities of the world. And if Bill Tabler, our architect here today, thinks that he sometimes has trouble with owners, corporation officers, and city officials around the country, let him count his blessings. Imagine having for your bosses, as did L'Enfant, George Washington, James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams and Dolly Madison.

Three years ago it was Bill Tabler's task to catch and cage this spirit of the city of Washington in concrete and glass. The result, as you see today, is a unique "bull wing" design that is both fluid and elegant. The Washington Hilton, we believe, is an eminent interpretation of the mood and spirit of a great city, a great nation. Here is a hotel that will complement and accent that mood.

All of us who have shared in the Washington Hilton's conception and construction—the Uris Buildings Corp. who built the hotel and the Hilton Hotels Corp. who will operate it, are proud of this new "unofficial palace" for official Washington. Seeing the hotel and utilizing its many attractive features is much more exciting than hearing about it. We do hope that you will all take the opportunity after lunch to inspect at your leisure the elegant, elliptical lobbies and public rooms, the spacious grounds and sports facilities.

There are several unique and imaginative features of the hotel which are not immediately apparent, and of which we are particularly proud. A special entrance, to accommodate heads of state and important visitors, has been designed which will allow convenient access by private elevator to a splendid private reception room adjacent to the International Ballroom where we are today. This great ballroom, in which you are the first to lunch, is the hotel's tour-de-force of interior design. Besides today's luncheon, state banquets, inaugural balls, formal dinners, and debutante cotillions will all find their place in this red-and-white elegance that will accommodate, without—as you see—a single interior supporting column, more than 4,200 persons.

In the gardens are a modern tennis club, complete with full locker facilities, cocktail lounge and dining room, and a large swimming pool. Elegant dining has always been an integral part of Hilton hotels. With a special emphasis on soft lighting, food of traditional excellence, and a cellar well stocked with vintage wines, the restaurants of your new hotel will emulate this proud tradition.

Because I have had very little to do with it, I may brag that the architecture of your new hotel will contribute to the city's beauty. You who have watched it in construction, know better than I that it has a dozen significant and far-reaching architectural innovations. Its interiors are authentic reproductions of period or contemporary art, decor, and furnishings. The most modern and efficient equipment and facilities dramatically exemplify American life and its achievements, and a warm culture borrowed from across the world.

As the "unofficial palace" for the Nation's Capital, your new hotel will typify and carry within itself a cross section of everything that goes on in Washington. Men and women of a hundred nations, of all races and creeds, guests and staff, will participate in a thousand activities of international and national, social, economic and political, religious and artistic significance. As residents of Washington and its metropolitan area, you indeed have something to be proud of.

A hotel in Washington, D.C., today holds such a position in the community and in the Nation that it must be manned, managed, and staffed by men and women of greater vision, broader cultural horizons, and deeper instincts of leadership than any hotelmen in the world, than any in history. I assure you that our managers and staff here in your new hotel have that vision, that culture, that sense of leadership.

I feel that you have already been sufficiently generous with your time and with your kind attention. It has been an honor to speak with you this afternoon. It is with a feeling of gratitude that Percy and Harold Uris and we of the Hilton Corp. have come to dedicate your new hotel. I know that all of you join us in the fervent wish that this hotel will fulfill the expectations of its founders.

I wish to extend the personal thanks of Mr. Williford, our new president, and myself, as chairman of Hilton Hotels Corp., and of all the Hilton family around the world, to the Uris brothers for their fine cooperation and teamplay. Gratitude also to all who helped to make this project possible, the architects who used their knowledge to convert the dreams of art and architecture into this structure; to the workmen, skilled and unskilled, who with hearts and able hands translated the sketches of the designers, the mathematics of the engineers into a building of beauty. To all of them, for generations to come, this hotel will be a monument to their energy and enterprise. I would be remiss at this time if I failed to refer to the splendid cooperation extended by public officials during the past 3 years of planning and construction. Without their help this hotel would never have been built.

On a March day in 1791—a day much like this—the great Frenchman who laid out your city, stopped his horse on the muddy bank of the Potomac and looked across the wilderness and tall grasses to the rolling hills beyond. Which would be Capitol Hill? Which be crowned by the home of the Presidents? His eye must have caught the splendid site where our hotel now stands—and passed on. For that we are grateful.

Today we give to L'Enfant, to you, and to the Nation, Washington's unofficial palace.

Opposition to Closing of Veterans' Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked to learn of the proposed closing of so many of the veterans' facilities. While none in my State of Maryland are included in the list, they will feel the effect of the closing of facilities in nearby States. Therefore, I registered my protests with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the following statement, which I repeat for the RECORD.

With respect to the projected closing of the Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, homes, and regional offices, I wonder if the Veterans' Administrator has thought this proposal through from the viewpoint of human relations.

Economy in the operation of any Government activity is desirable, of course, possibly more important today than ever before. As a country, we are living far beyond our means. The only way to correct such a dangerous situation is to cut back Government spending wherever such cuts are reasonably possible. But it is important that these cuts be reasonably possible. Just because we are not engaged at the moment in a major war should not make us forgetful of what the veterans suffered and many are still suffering, to save this country and the world from chaos. Perhaps the proposed closing would save the few millions claimed, perhaps not. There is not a shadow of a doubt, that the effects of such closings would be reduced medical services and great inconvenience to thousands of veterans whose need for these services stems directly or indirectly from war-incurred ills or injuries.

From experience in my own State, I know that there is always a long waiting period for beds in the veterans hospitals. The closing of facilities in nearby States would undoubtedly mean that many veterans normally using them, would be sent to Maryland hospitals, causing even greater problems than now exist.

We have lavished billions of dollars on peoples everywhere whose only claim on our generosity was their need. Do not let us, as a nation, turn our backs on these veterans who served us so well when we needed them so desperately.

Minnesota State Senate Resolution on Civil Rights in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the State Senate of Minnesota passed an important resolution on March 10 calling for protection of citizens in securing the rights of Americans to their basic freedoms in Alabama.

This measure of the concern of people throughout the Nation about recent acts of violence deserves the attention of all the Congress.

The resolution follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 5

Resolution urging the President, Vice President, and Attorney General of the United States and the Governor of Alabama to protect the rights of citizens of Alabama to assemble and to vote

Whereas the constitutional rights of certain citizens of Alabama to vote and to peaceably assemble are being forcibly repressed by that State, in a violent manner intolerable to freemen; and

Whereas such forcible repression is in violation of the oaths of office of the Governor of that State, and the public officials acting under him, to support and defend the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas it is the duty of government to protect the rights of the citizen against abuse and oppression, no matter what its source; and

Whereas the public authorities of Alabama have been unwilling to assume that duty, and instead appear to be harassing and injuring those who assert their rights, in a manner befitting a totalitarian police state; and

Whereas the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 makes it clear that the voting rights of our people and their freedom to assemble peaceably shall not be abridged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota, That the public authorities of Alabama be urged to recognize the civil rights of all their citizens, that they subordinate their fears and intolerance to the truth of Judeo-Christian ethics and precepts and that they take the steps necessary to protect their citizens and preserve their rights before it becomes immediately necessary to interpose further Federal force, and lacking immediate State action, that the President be urged to instruct the Attorney General to take immediate steps to implement the powers of the Federal Government to protect the rights of American citizens, through the use of U.S. marshals and such other law-enforcement agents as are legally and properly required to carry out the law and to secure the rights of Americans who find themselves deprived of their basic freedom; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Nicholas Katzenbach, the Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable George C. Wallace, the Governor of Alabama, and Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Adopted by the Senate, State of Minnesota.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *March 10, 1965.*

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6815 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C* — 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*
Grider, George W., *Tenn*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

Address by Hon. Daniel J. Flood Before the American Bandmasters' Association, in Convention at Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the speech made before the American Bandmasters' Association's annual convention at the Mayflower Hotel on March 6 by the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania.

Our Nation's Capital is renowned for its excellent band music. As an encouragement, however, for other areas, the cultural significance of fine music has been well given by the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The speech follows:

Bands and band music are subjects that are very near and dear to my heart. Therefore it is with special pleasure that I salute the American Bandmasters' Association. From the very outset of your organization musicians from both the United States and Canada have united in mutual helpfulness and for the promotion of better music through the instrumentality of the band.

My research informs me that your organization formally began almost 36 years ago—in July 1929, to be exact. The founder, Edwin Franko Goldman, had an enviable reputation as organizer and conductor of the Goldman Band Concerts in New York and made him the ideal person to launch such a movement. After talking with Victor J. Grabel of Chicago, William J. Stannard of Washington, and, later, with John Philip Sousa, all of whom favored the idea of organization, Mr. Goldman finally invited a representative number of prominent bandmasters of the United States and Canada to be his guests at a luncheon in New York on July 5, 1929. At this meeting the American Bandmasters' Association was definitely organized. Mr. Goldman was your first president. On March 13, 1930, the American Bandmasters' Association was incorporated under the laws of New York State.

The story of band music in our hemisphere—and in fact throughout the world—is a fascinating one.

We recall that in about 1250 B.C. Gideon prepared for his battle with the Midianites. "And he divided the 300 men into three companies, and he put a trumpet in every man's hand * * * and he said * * * when I blow with a trumpet * * * then blow ye the trumpets also." Perhaps that was the first massing of hornblowers in history.

We can be certain that the occasional massing of instrumentalists is an ancient and noble practice.

The forerunner of the massed band as we know it today might well have been the mammoth band which played on May 12, 1838. A fete was being given at Berlin to the Emperor Nicholas of Russia who was in Germany on a visit to the King of Prussia. One of the great bandmasters was to conduct that day. His name was Wieprecht.

Wieprecht, we are told, had been making band history. He was only an amateur—and being a civilian he met with great and determined opposition from the military authorities and professional musicians. But his ideas were sound. In brief he proposed to modernize the band both as regards the use of valve instruments and in assembling instruments which would play better together. By perseverance he finally interested the commander of a cavalry band so thoroughly that the latter paid out of his own pocket to have his band refashioned along lines laid down by the civilian. Wieprecht's plan called for the use of high trumpets, key bugles, alto trumpets, tenor horns, bass horns—all having two or three valves—and slide trombones. He also used flutes, oboes, and bassoons not commonly found in the bands of that time.

The innovation was so successful that Wieprecht was asked to come and do the same modernization work for the bands of the Prussian Life Guards, which presently blossomed out as musical organizations. In 1838 Wieprecht was appointed director of all the guards' bands, and every military band in Germany was remodeled to accord with his recommendations.

Then came the decision to bring together a monster performance of bandsmen which he would conduct. Sixteen cavalry bands and 16 infantry bands were assembled. In all there were 1,000 wind instrument players, and 200 side drummers. But one thing about the concert shocked the King of Prussia. Wieprecht appeared before the brilliantly uniformed bandsmen in his civilian street clothing. What the Emperor of Russia thought of that no one knows. But something had to be done about it. The King hastily ordered a splendid uniform for the conductor and it was put together fast enough so that 4 days later he could appear clad in this unaccustomed regalia for a repeat performance before the tsar and the nobility. Let us hope they were duly impressed.

We leap across the years and recall that during numerous historical events of our own country that band music has inspired and led. The recent presidential inauguration parade in Washington, D.C., is an ample reminder of the importance of bands and band music in moments of great national interest.

Grover Cleveland's first inaugural had the U.S. Marine Band, led by John Philip Sousa. An exotic element was introduced at the inauguration of William Howard Taft. The Philippine Constabulary Band from Manila was brought to the United States in order to perform at two of six concerts. The six concerts were in honor of the Army, the Navy, Congress as a whole, the Governors of the States, the Senate and House, and the American people.

History is replete with stories of the power and majesty of band music.

It was Dr. Walter Damrosch who said some years ago: "What America needs is a band in every community."

There is a mountain of evidence that music satisfies the most deep seated human needs—mental, physical, and spiritual.

Dr. Charles W. Eliot, for many years president of Harvard University, once said, "Music rightly taught is the best mind trainer on the list." And we cannot forget the bandmasters are also teachers and that bands become valuable agencies in the progress of education for both of our countries.

The bands of today are in good hands. You, the bandmasters, know the fine art of conducting, of teaching, you are sincere musicians, and know that showmanship is important.

I cannot refrain from quoting the great John Philip Sousa. His words are exceedingly flowery, but said with the heart, I am certain.

"Why does the world need bands? Why does the world need laughter of children, moonrise in the mountains, great masterpieces of art? Why, indeed? Because the world has a soul, a spirit, which is hungry for beauty and inspiration."

I fully agree with Mr. Sousa. The band holds an entirely distinctive place in the world of music. It affords a means of stimulation that cannot be acquired in any other way. The bands of today, my friends, can boast the most ancient ancestry in music.

The Remarkable McDevitts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it is indeed gratifying when outstanding Americans receive recognition for their achievements. When one is honored not only by his country, but also by his church, this is doubly true. We in Idaho are thus doubly fortunate and share in the honor which has been bestowed upon one of our most illustrious sons by His Holiness Pope Paul VI.

Mr. B. A. McDevitt has spent his life in the service of his church, his country, and his State and community. His personal services as a public servant are legend in Idaho, and are being enlarged and extended by his 12 wonderful children.

Now Mr. McDevitt has been named a Knight of St. Sylvester of the Roman Catholic Church. He is the second lay person in the history of Idaho to be thus singled out by the Vatican for high honor.

This memorable event was the subject of an editorial published in the Idaho State Journal, of Pocatello, on March 11, 1965, and also of an article published in the same newspaper on March 15. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Idaho State Journal, of Pocatello, Idaho, Mar. 11, 1965]

THE REMARKABLE MCDEVITTS

Pocatello Attorney B. A. McDevitt will become a Knight of St. Sylvester here Sunday at the direction of Pope Paul VI. It is only the second time in Idaho Catholic history that such a ceremony has taken place. Still, it is not entirely unexpected in view of McDevitt's record in the community, and especially in view of his devotion to church and family.

McDevitt is a former Bannock County prosecuting attorney and a veteran of the higher councils of Idaho politics. His office walls are covered with autographed pictures of former Presidents, ranking political leaders, and other testimonials to his civic service.

He has been a devoted supporter of his church for years, and one of the mainstays in its growth as a denomination and its orderly provision for facilities.

But to those who know him, perhaps his greatest accomplishment is the one he shares with Mrs. McDevitt—the rearing of a large and extremely accomplished flock of children.

Among the 12 McDevitt children are 2 attorneys (both of whom serve in the State legislature), a doctor, a consulting engineer, 3 nurses, a speech therapist, and 3 housewives married to men who have been equally successful. Eleven of the twelve children have been to college. The youngest, now in the Air Force, plans to enter college when he is discharged.

It's a remarkable family, headed by a remarkable man.—B.H.

[From the Idaho State Journal, Pocatello, Idaho, Mar. 15, 1965]

MCDEVITT HONORED AS CHURCH KNIGHT

Attorney B. A. McDevitt was praised as a distinguished churchman, a devoted father, and a good citizen Sunday as he was invested a Knight of St. Sylvester.

The honor was conferred on McDevitt in the name of Pope Paul VI and the Bishop of Boise at an impressive ceremony at St. Anthony Church, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Nicholas Hughes, chancellor of the diocese of Boise, acted for Bishop Sylverster Treinen, who is ill.

Rev. Donald Wassmuth, assistant pastor at St. Anthony, celebrated the mass, and members of the Bishop Daniel M. Gorman Assembly, Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus, formed an honor guard for the ceremony.

Only once before has an Idaho layman been named a Knight of Sylvester. Previouly honored was the late E. W. Fanning, mayor of Idaho Falls.

Monsignor Hughes noted that the honor is "rarely given and is indicative of the high esteem in which Mr. McDevitt is held by his pastor (Rev. L. M. Doughtery) his bishop and His Holiness Pope Paul VI."

Being named a Knight of St. Sylvester "not only redounds to Mr. McDevitt's honor, but also to the honor of the church in Idaho and Pocatello in particular," Monsignor Hughes said.

During the investiture, McDevit was presented a sword and a medal signifying the honor, and a crown was placed upon the head of Mrs. McDevitt, who witnessed the ceremony from a wheel chair. Mrs. McDevitt was injured in an auto accident several years ago.

Monsignor Hughes praised McDevitt as "a devoted husband, a loving father, an exemplary lawyer, a true friend, and a zealous Christian * * *. Your love, loyalty, and devotion to the church are tonight recognized." Monsignor Hughes said to McDevitt, "and it is in appreciation for your unstinting service for many years that His Holiness Pope Paul has raised you to the dignity of the coveted reward as a Knight of St. Sylvester. May you continue to serve your God, your church, and your country for many years to come."

McDevitt was born in Burke, Idaho, attended schools there and graduated from the University of Idaho in 1920. Later that year, he was admitted to the Idaho State bar.

He has served as Bannock County prosecutor, county chairman of the Red Cross and the national foundation; State committeeman of the Democratic Party; chairman of the Bannock County Democratic Central Committee, and coordinator for the Democratic Party in southeastern Idaho.

He was chairman of St. Anthony's parish building committee from 1940–42 and has served on various bishop's committees. He is also a member of the American Legion, a former Grand Knight of the Knights of Columbus, and a member of the Phi Alpha Delta law fraternity, the Gridiron Club, and the University of Idaho Alumni Association. He is vice president of the Consumer's Paper Co., and holds directorates in the Montpelier Tri-State National Bank and the Bear Lake Holding Co.

In June 1926, he married Margaret Herman, and they had 12 children, 9 of whom attended the ceremony.

At a dinner afterward in Kennedy Memorial Hall, one of the couple's five sons, State Representative Charles McDevitt, Republican, of Ada, acted as master of ceremonies. Other McDevitt children there were State Representative Herman, Democrat, of Bannock; Barney, who is being sent to Panama by the Army; twins Sheila, a speech therapist in Salt Lake City, and Sharon, a nurse at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Salt Lake City; Mrs. John (Margaret) Dominick, a student at Idaho State University; Mrs. James (Joan) Carney, a nurse, who lives in Pocatello; Mrs. Leonard (Pat) Mallea, Caldwell, a housewife; and Mrs. Dave (Janet) Boone, who is working as a secretary in Moscow.

Unable to attend were Dan McDevitt, Tulsa, Okla.; Mrs. Colleen Moening, Fairbanks, Alaska; and Dr. Tom McDevitt, Los Angeles.

Rev. Colman King, former pastor of St. Anthony, and now of Kellogg, recalled that McDevitt was "one of my greatest supporters during my years here." Al Rosa, grand knight of the Knights of Columbus, presented McDevitt a plaque. Reverend Dougherty said McDevitt was "thoroughly deserving" of the honor conferred upon him.

In response, McDevitt paid tribute to his wife, and said that she, his family and his friends "had just as much to do with this honor as I did."

A Shipper Looks at Foreign Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I have received a large volume of mail during recent weeks—primarily from farmers and shippers—urging a reinstatement of the foreign farm labor program that terminated when the bracero program ran its allotted time.

Yet not all farmers agree. There are some who even contend that the domestic labor supply is sufficient unto the need.

I believe my colleagues will find the statement made by one of Arizona's larger farmers on this subject to be quite interesting.

Whichever side of the issue one happens to take, I think no one can question Mr. Bodine's dedication to principle or the honesty of his convictions.

The statement follows:

MARCH 8, 1965.

To the EDITOR OF THE PACKER:

It must be rather embarrassing to many of the so-called leaders in our industry, to find that there is plenty of labor available for harvesting all of the crops that have been planted for harvesting. And the final result is that the industry still has "glutted markets" in various commodities.

I can remember that on the 2d day of January of this year, many people in and out of the trade were screaming that the lettuce market was going to $6 per carton free on board. I'll bet that today there are a lot of shippers who wish that this had been true. Yes, the same cry went up about carrots, cabbage and citrus fruits. The only cry now is that cabbage and carrots are the most overproduced crops (items) we have, and that 50 percent or more of these crops are rotting in the fields.

Oranges and grapefruit are so badly overproduced that mature fruit is hanging on the trees, not due to a shortage of labor for harvesting, but just a good case of overproduction with a resulting low market. If the growers and shippers of citrus fruits think this season is bad, just wait 5 years and see the fruit production at that time if there is no damage due to weather hazards or other reasons, then we will all wish for a labor shortage at that time.

It is certainly gratifying to me to be able to know I can harvest what vegetables and fruits that I can sell, and do this with the labor of American citizens, who pay a tax on their income like the rest of us do, instead of sending all of it to Mexico.

I get sick in my stomach listening to all of the problems that we shippers create over local or domestic labor. It's too bad that a so-called shipper hasn't got enough guts to fire people if they can't perform the work properly, instead of letting the help run the business.

We have turned our produce business into one of the most disastrous businesses in the world and it is in a chaotic condition. No one has to accept anything; no one has to pay their invoices on time or promptly; bankruptcies are increasing every year. But still we go on and on planting more and more and more each year, thus creating more problems for ourselves.

We in the Phoenix spring lettuce deal will see a good market—and people ask why? The answer is very simple—our acreage is down 25 to 28 percent from last spring's planting. This reduction in acreage is not due to a shortage of labor. It was caused by too much rain at planting time and we were not able to plant on schedule. It's just too bad the "Good Man" upstairs can't solve all of our problems.

We ask "Him" all the time to freeze out other districts. All winter long we ask "Him" not to hurt us but to destroy our competitors. This is a real nice business, isn't it?

Let's all be fair with ourselves and each other and quit bellyaching and use commonsense where and when it should be used.

I say thank you to Mr. Wirtz for his decisions regarding importation of farm labor. I hope that he makes it all stick until we get our own houses in order and we quit feeding each other all the "bull" that the produce people are the only people who do not ask the Government for subsidies. If this foreign labor isn't the biggest subsidy that anyone could ask for, I would like to know what is?

I like to run my own business and it has been a pleasure to operate this way since

January of this year. Here's hoping it never changes again.

I will use common sense and plant what I can harvest and sell at a reasonable profit. If everyone else would do this, the vegetable business wouldn't be a bad business to be in.

BODINE PRODUCE CO.,
A. W. BODINE.

Appointment of Henry H. Fowler as Secretary of the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Secretary of the Treasury," from the March 20 edition of the New York Times, commending the nomination and the abilities and the public service of the Honorable Henry H. Fowler.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed an editorial on the same subject appearing in the Washington Post of Saturday, March 20, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 20, 1965]

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

President Johnson's surprise appointment of Henry H. Fowler gives assurance that the Treasury Department will be headed by a man who recognizes the vital importance of restoring its influence and prestige in economic affairs.

The Treasury's position has been on the wane ever since it became known that Secretary Douglas Dillon would be leaving the post he served with such distinction. In finally choosing Mr. Fowler, the President settled on a candidate with reliable assets.

Mr. Fowler has the President's confidence, which is indispensable in serving as the Nation's chief financial officer. He is experienced in dealing with Congress, a talent he demonstrated in winning support for tax reductions. And the fact that he is an old Treasury hand, who served under Mr. Dillon, will bolster confidence in the present Treasury staff and help him to recruit new men for the serious challenges he will have to face.

These are very real. Mr. Fowler's most urgent problem is elimination of the deficit in the Nation's balance of payments, a goal that eluded the best efforts of Mr. Dillon, sophisticated as he was in the mysteries of international finance.

The financial community, whose cooperation Mr. Fowler will need, may be disappointed that the new Secretary is not one of their own. The tradition of having a banker at the Treasury has often been broken, however, and some of Mr. Fowler's most distinguished predecessors have had less experience in financial problems than he possesses.

In his new post Mr. Fowler will have to resist the temptation that has plagued the administration; namely, a tendency to succumb to excessive optimism about its attempts to curb the outflow of dollars. Euphoria has been in the air again since Washington announced its new program of voluntary restraint. Mr. Fowler cannot afford to be complacent, nor to take any action that would invite a relaxation of the self-discipline now being exercised by businessmen and bankers. To a very great extent, his success at the Treasury depends on the progress he can make in strengthening the position of the dollar.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 20, 1965]

CHANGING GUARD AT TREASURY

With the nomination of Henry H. Fowler for the Secretaryship, President Johnson dispelled the uncertainty that was beginning to pall the Treasury Department. A worthy success for Douglas Dillon has been found. But the Treasury's prestige in the years ahead may well hings on the choices that are made in filling posts at the second level of command.

In his choice of Mr. Fowler, President Johnson broke with a practice sanctioned more by time and custom than good sense. Instead of reserving the Treasury post for a banker, an industrialist or a prominent political figure, the President turned to a respected attorney who as Under Secretary gained vast experience in administering the affairs of the Treasury Department and advancing its legislation on Capitol Hill.

Administrators are ultimately judged by performance, not by the putative talents that they bring to high office. Mr. Fowler can be an outstanding Treasury Secretary, but his record will depend to a considerable degree on the care which he and President Johnson exercise in filling department vacancies. They include the post of Under Secretary, that of General Counsel and the Assistant Secretaryship for International Monetary Affairs. All are important, but in view of the uncertainties surrounding the dollar as an international reserve currency, it is essential that a strong, technically competent candidate be found for the last position.

In embracing the modern theory of fiscal policy, in reforming the depreciation guidelines, in dealing vigorously and imaginatively with vexing balance-of-payments deficits, Douglas Dillon wrote a brilliant record at the Treasury. He was by far the best Treasury Secretary of the postwar period, and it is, indeed, doubtful whether he has a peer in this century. But he is leaving the Treasury at a time when it lacks men of proven ability on the second and third rungs of responsibility. If the prestige of the second oldest executive department is to be maintained, his successor must fill the talent gaps.

Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking minority member of the House Postal Operations Subcommittee I have long been an advocate of better mail service. To this end I requested that Congress take a long look at our present poor postal service. The members of the subcommittee have agreed to hold hearings within the near future.

Since submitting my request for hearings I have received hundreds of letters from postal patrons complaining of the mail service. I have also received complaints from many of the postal employees who actually handle the mail.

In this regard I am gratified to learn that I have the wholehearted support, not only of the postal employees, but of many of the unions which represent them. One of the examples of this support appeared in an article in the January-February 1965, issue of the Nebraska Postal Clerk:

CUNNINGHAM LASHES OUT AT WORK MEASUREMENT SYSTEM

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Congressman from the Second Congressional District of Nebraska in an article in the February 1 Sunday World Herald lashed out at the Department's work measurement system. Many of you probably saw the article. Congressman CUNNINGHAM received a properly packed picture through the mail from an Omaha firm that was pretty well beaten up and had probably been run over by some vehicle or something. The package had been prepared for mailing properly, and properly marked. He felt that the "speedup" caused by the work measurement system was to blame. Clerks are forced to work so fast that they don't have time to examine or handle the parcels properly. He is right. We as postal clerks know that this is true. Clerks know that "speedup" and "higher production" seem to be more important to the supervisors and postmasters than anything else. The World Herald article said "They're working these fellows to the point of exhaustion," he said of postal workers. "The whole thing is the result of top management, in my opinion. They're trying to run the postal system by gimmicks, numbers and alphabetical gimcrackery." We as postal clerks have known this for some time and now apparently some of the Congressmen are trying to do something about it. When the public gets more riled up perhaps something will be done. Congressman CUNNINGHAM has done a great many things for not only the clerks in Nebraska, but clerks all over the United States. I believe he should receive national recognition for taking the stand that he has and paying tribute to the "rank and file" employees. I'm hoping that perhaps he shall be recognized in either the FNS bulletin or our national magazine. In any event he is welcoming your letters to him, and just keep writing to him. He needs our support—let's give it to him.

I would call attention to one sentence in this article: "When the public gets more riled up perhaps something will be done." I firmly believe the American public is already riled up about our poor postal service.

Speech by Miss Virginia Mathison at Presentation of Francis Bellamy Flag Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech by Miss Virginia Mathison, of Cradock High School, in Portsmouth, Va., delivered on October 9, 1964, on the occasion of the presentation of the Francis Bellamy Flag Award to the Wausau, Wis., senior high school, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY MISS VIRGINIA MATHISON, CRADOCK HIGH SCHOOL, PORTSMOUTH, VA.

When I think of Wisconsin, one of the first things that comes to mind is the booming industries it houses. Industrially, it stands among the leading States in the manufacture of paper, wood pulp, and agricultural implements.

Virginia is also an industrial State but it is best known as the peanut capital of the world. Our world-famous Smithfield hams come from hogs that are peanut-fed.

All of you must be partially familiar with Virginia's history, as it involves the birth of our Nation. The first permanent English colony began in 1607 at Jamestown.

Cradock is a nautical community named after Sir Christopher Cradock, an admiral in the British Navy during World War I, who went down with his ship off the coast of South America. The Cradock streets are laid out to form an anchor and bear names of naval heroes such as John Paul Jones and Admiral Farragut.

Cradock High School also follows this nautical theme. Our athletic teams are the Admirals; our school newspaper, the Shipmate; our magazine, the Log; our handbook, the Quartermaster; and our yearbook is the Admiral.

The bell of the U.S.S. *Gettysburg*, a World War II reservist training ship, is now used as a victory bell for Cradock High School. After a victory, it is rung seven times—once for each of Cradock's sports.

Members of our student body excelled in various fields this year. Our national honors were an NCTE winner for the English department and a seventh-place winner in public speaking in national competition for the distributive education department. Our State honors include: In forensics, first place in poetry reading and girls' public speaking, and a superior-plus rating in the one-act play festival. State officers for the year were boys State Governor and two senators, girls State treasurer, and this year we have the presidents of the Future Teachers and Diversified Occupations Club. A Cradock student is State SCA secretary.

I, Virginia, from the State of Virginia, would like to congratulate Wausau High School and welcome you into the Bellamy Award family of schools.

International Monetary System Preserved at Risk of Reducing World Trade and Capital Flows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, recent efforts to preserve the international monetary system in the face of severe strains have led to proposals which would seriously inhibit the international movement of goods and capital. An article in the Wall Street Journal of February 17, 1965, summarizes the irony of this situation with the statement of a National Bureau of Economic Research analyst:

We may kill the patient (the goals of the monetary system) in our efforts to control the disease (the system itself).

A further comment on this problem comes from Richard N. Cooper, a Yale University economist.

At the very time negotiators are attempting to free the flow of international commerce, monetary considerations are forcing many nations to adopt measures calculated to produce just the opposite effect.

Mr. Cooper's contentions are amply supported by President Johnson's recent proposals designed to restrict the movement of private capital from the United States. Not only do such restrictions reduce the level of trade and impede the flow of international capital, but they compromise this Nation's basic philosophy of freedom to lend and invest abroad.

Although world trade has grown by nearly 25 percent since 1962, many economists are predicting a slowdown in the near future, and some maintain it is already underway. The Journal article points out that through the third quarter of last year world trade climbed 9 percent, 2 percentage points less than in the corresponding 1962–63 period. In addition, certain analysts maintain these figures are inflated in view of the tremendous trade growth experienced by the six European Common Market countries.

Under unanimous consent I place this article in the RECORD at this point:

WORLD MONEY ILLS—WIDE EFFORTS TO BOLSTER CURRENCIES CLASH WITH GOALS OF FREE TRADE—SQUEEZE ON RESERVES LEADS TO TAX CHANGES AND PLANS TO CURB THE FLOW OF CAPITAL—DANGER OF KILLING THE PATIENT

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—Efforts to preserve the international monetary system are producing a grim irony. The system survives, but in the process two of its key goals—the free movement of goods and capital across borders—are slowly receding.

Such, at least, is the considered conclusion of an increasing number of economists who specialize in international monetary affairs. A typical comment comes from Richard N. Cooper, a Yale University economist: "At the very time negotiators are attempting to free the flow of international commerce, monetary considerations are forcing many nations to adopt measures calculated to produce just the opposite effect."

To back up this contention, these analysts cite an imposing list of recent events. They note that a few days ago President Johnson sent Congress a series of measures designed to restrict the movement of private capital from the United States. Late last year, to cite another outstanding example, the British Government, in violation of international trade agreements, clamped a 15 percent tax surcharge on goods entering the United Kingdom.

SOME SUBTLE OBSTACLES

The impediments being thrown up against the free flow of capital and trade are often very subtle.

One device used increasingly involves altering a country's domestic tax structures. Trade agreements normally do not permit the rebate of direct taxes, such as income taxes, on exports. But they do not rule out the rebate of indirect taxes, such as sales levies.

Many countries are taking advantage of this loophole in the rules to stimulate their exports and impede imports. This is accomplished by switching from direct to indirect levies. Such a change serves to bring down export prices, because indirect taxes may be remitted to exporters, or imposed so as not to cover exports, without violating trade agreements. At the same time, the price of imports will tend to rise, because indirect levies may be applied to incoming merchandise.

Among countries that have moved in this direction recently are Sweden, which has reduced its personal income tax rate and imposed a general sales tax, and Italy, which in mid-1964 cut certain payroll taxes and increased sales-type levies. In addition, West Germany is contemplating a measure to alter its indirect tax system in a manner likely to result in higher levies on goods coming into the country.

"THWARTING MARKETPLACE OBJECTIVES"

"We want healthy competition in the international marketplace, because, among other things, we believe it will lead to the most efficient allocation of resources," says Yale's Mr. Cooper. "But in these recent tax maneuvers we have a different kind of competition; it is among governments, and it is thwarting many of our marketplace objectives."

The international movement of capital and goods, to be sure, is not about to come to a standstill. Just since 1962, world trade has swelled nearly 25 percent, to about $150 billion. Nonetheless, many economists claim they see a slowdown immediately ahead, and some maintain it already is under way.

It is noted, for instance, that in the latest 12 months for which detailed figures are available (through the third quarter of last year) world trade climbed to 9 percent, 2 percentage points less than in the corresponding 1962–63 period. And of course these statistics don't take into account the effects of the recent British import surcharge, which has already caused a slight decline in United Kingdom imports. In an attempt to conciliate Britain's trading partners, it is understood that United Kingdom officials shortly will announce a token cut of from 2½ to 5 percentage points in the surcharge; earlier, some officials had held out the hope the measure soon would be removed entirely.

Many analysts contend that recent world trade figures are "inflated" by the growth of trade among the six European Common Market countries—West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg. Trade among these nations is soaring at a rate of roughly 20 percent a year.

NO BASIS FOR OPTIMISM

"Technically, trade within the Common Market classifies as part of world trade," says a First National City Bank of New York analyst. "But such intrabloc trade hardly constitutes a basis for optimism that world trade generally is increasing substantially."

The nub of the problem, as many economists see it, lies in the makeup of the present international monetary system.

By international agreements and long practice, gold, dollars, and the pound sterling normally are held as monetary reserves to settle international transactions. For this reason the present system is called a "gold-exchange" system; it is based on reserves of gold plus such foreign exchange as the dollar and the pound.

These reserves rise when nations collect more than they pay out and fall when the opposite occurs. When a decline in reserves takes place, the nation involved should voluntarily take steps to bring its international payments back into balance.

In a typical situation, a nation imports consistently more goods than its sells abroad, and subsequently depletes its reserves. When this happens, the nation is expected to adopt stringent domestic policies aimed at improving the competitive position of its goods. This should be done without recourse to artificial restrictive measures, such as the recent United Kingdom surcharge.

Implicit in all this is the assumption that nations have the gumption to take basic steps necessary to make their position competitive—holding down labor costs is an example.

It's further assumed that there are sufficient reserves in the international monetary system to provide a nation with a cushion during period when efforts are under way to improve its competitiveness—and ultimately its balance of payments. The theory is that by the time a nation nears the point of running out of reserves it will have had sufficient time to improve its competitiveness, and its balance of payments will no longer be in deficit.

ARE RESERVES ADEQUATE?

Though doubts are often voiced about the validity of even the first premise, it is the second assumption that evokes the most outspoken concern among many economists. They fear the present total of reserves in the international monetary system is indeed not adequate. As a consequence, they contend, nations with balance-of-payments problems frequently begin to run out of reserves long before they are able to improve their competitiveness without resorting to superficial expedients.

The sort of statistical evidence most often supplied is that while world trade has increased nearly 25 percent since 1962, for example, international reserves used in transacting this trade have risen only about 6 percent in the same span. These reserves amount to about $70 billion at present, less than half the annual total of world trade.

Many analysts contend the worsening squeeze on reserves that results from this disparity, in large measure underlies the recent spate of steps, legal and illegal, aimed at restricting the free flow of capital and trade.

As long as the disparity continues, these economists say, the prospect is for an increasing array of expedients. Ultimately, in the view of a National Bureau of Economic Research analyst, "we may kill the patient (the goals of the monetary system) in our efforts to control the disease (the system itself)."

What should be done?

Here the consensus is overwhelming: Increase the supply of reserves. But how? On this point the experts go off in six dozen different directions.

One of many problems is that nobody knows precisely what level of reserves is sufficient to cushion adverse swings in a nation's balance of payments. Some analysts believe only a slight increase in reserves would be sufficient. Others, such as Yale's Mr. Cooper, say a much larger increase is needed. Mr. Cooper, who served as an expert on international economics for President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisors, suggests international reserves should very probably rise even faster than world trade.

On one point there is wide if not unanimous agreement: The dollar, whose value is fixed at a ratio of $35 to an ounce of gold, should not be devalued.

Raising the price of gold, say to $70 an ounce, with one stroke would sharply increase the nominal value of world monetary reserves, two-thirds of which are in gold. But such a move would also greatly benefit Russia, which is the world's second largest gold producer after South Africa. Devaluation of the dollar also would hurt friendly nations, such as Canada and Japan, which in cooperation with the United States have maintained large portions of their reserves in dollars.

In theory, dollars are as good as gold in international transactions because of the U.S. Government's pledge to buy and sell gold at approximately $35 an ounce. The theory, however, doesn't take into account what happens if the United States runs out of gold; the U.S. gold supply stands just under $15 billion, more than $1 billion less than at the end of 1962, because of the chronic U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

At the same time, few experts advocate complete abandonment of a gold-based monetary system. "We could kill off gold tomorrow by agreeing only to sell it," says a former member of the President's Council of Economic Advisors. "But the world has become so accustomed to using gold as an international monetary base that I'm afraid such a move would cause confusion, and possibly chaos, in international financial dealings. For this reason, the idea has never been seriously broached, so far as I know, in administration discussions."

Rather, most analysts plug for an enlargement of the existing gold-exchange system. The most frequent suggestion: Some arrangement to turn the International Monetary Fund into a sort of world central bank in which nations would be obliged to keep as much as 50 or 75 percent of their reserves; International Monetary Fund members must currently maintain deposits of gold and their own currencies at the International Monetary Fund, but these deposits are relatively small and are not pegged to the size of a nation's reserves.

STUDY LAUNCHED

In addition, currencies of other major nations, besides the United States and United Kingdom, would be employed as internationally acceptable reserves. Technically, this is now the case. But in practice only dollars and pounds are normally held as reserves. This practice, like the use of gold itself, is largely a matter of long-standing custom.

At present, the International Monetary Fund serves primarily as a sort of lending agency from which countries can borrow limited amounts of other currencies while trying to set their international payments straight.

Well aware of growing concern over the present monetary system, officials of the free world's chief trading nations recently launched a study aimed at improving the system.

Some analysts glumly note, however, that in the less than 6 months since the study was launched there has been little sign of progress toward an improved system. In fact, there are indications that at least one prominent conferee—France—has little interest in expanding reserves at all, and instead may actually favor a shrinkage.

This obviously would take place if a so-called gold standard system were adopted, without devaluation. The gold standard idea—in which gold would be the only international monetary reserve—was sounded at a recent press conference of French President de Gaulle. As noted above, only about two-thirds of the world's monetary reserves are in gold. Thus, the level of reserves would be cut by a third.

"Partners of the Alliance"—Address by James H. Boren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, one of the most encouraging features of the Alliance for Progress has been the success of the Partners of the Alliance program. In recent months the Indiana Partners of the Alliance has been organized, to establish relationships between associations in Indiana and counterparts in the Brazilian State of Rio Grande do Sul. A team representing five major organizations in Indiana has already visited Brazil, and has brought back a number of ideas on how this program may be implemented.

Recently, Mr. James H. Boren, Director of the Partners of the Alliance, made an important address, in Indianapolis, describing the operation of this program. Because of its national significance, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Boren's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF JAMES H. BOREN, DIRECTOR, PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE, ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS, AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE INDIANAPOLIS STATEWIDE RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MARCH 11, 1965

It is a particular pleasure to discuss with you the Partners of the Alliance, for here in Indiana, the "crossroads of America," you have assumed the responsibility and leadership in a program that involves the citizens of all of the Americas in one of the most important struggles of our time. I am talking about the bold endeavor of the Alliance for Progress—the economic and social development program affecting the lives of 200 million people. And I am talking about a great revolutionary partnership in which you are now involved.

Working together within the spirit of the Alliance for Progress, we can—and we must—prove that representative democracy and the free economic institutions of the West can indeed respond to the demands for economic and social progress.

We know from our own experience in the United States that progress requires a constant battle against poverty and injustice, ignorance, and disease. We also know that we cannot live in isolation—no nation can live of itself, and by itself. And, as we recount our own aspirations, our own experiences, and our own struggles for development from colonial states to our present enviable but difficult position as leader of the free world, we know that we must recognize that the hopes and dreams of the countless numbers of slum dwellers in the cities of Latin America or the campesinos in the Andean highlands are important to our own future.

It is about this hemispheric struggle that I wish to think together with you tonight—not in generalities but in specifics—specifics as to your role as citizens of Indiana and as members of the action-oriented Indiana Statewide Rural Electric Cooperative.

The Indiana Partners of the Alliance is a private sector program through which direct relationships can be established between groups in Indiana and counterpart groups in the great Brazilian State of Rio Grande do Sul. This is a program in which any business, agricultural, professional, educational, labor, or service organization—and even an individual—who is concerned about the future in Latin America can translate that concern into action. The Partners of the Alliance is not a program of "pink teas"; it is not a program of charity; it is not a program in which Indiana is "adopting" the State of Rio Grande do Sul. It is a partnership in which the citizens of two important areas of the world can work together toward common goals.

I would like to pay particular tribute to your own Indiana Statewide Rural Electric Cooperative for you are known for your ability to get the job done. The contribution of time and energy of your general manager,

David Mueller, has been important in the early development of the Indiana partnership. He went to Rio Grande do Sul as a member of the program development team, and he has returned with specific proposals for projects.

I should also like to thank the rest of a splendid group of men, who are leaders in the Indiana Partners, for their part in putting together a most promising program with their partner in Brazil. I am speaking of:

Dr. Robert Carmin, chairman of the Indiana Partners of the Alliance, and dean of the division of science and humanities at Ball State; Mr. Walter Walb, president of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce; Mr. John Norris, administrative assistant to the president, Indiana AFL-CIO; Mr. Glenn W. Sample, vice president of the Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperative Association; and Dr. Robert Yoho, director of Bureau of Health Education, Indiana State Health Commission.

This team has returned to Indiana with specific projects to be implemented, and you will be hearing more about them soon.

Let me outline for you some of the specific partnership activities which are being carried out in some of the States already at the operational level.

Less than 48 hours ago, 11 young Bolivian 4-H Club students returned to Bolivia after having been in Utah, where for 2 months they had been participating in activities with the Utah 4-H organization. This was a learning experience for Utah as well as for these young boys and girls from Bolivia. Years ago, incidentally, the tomato industry in Utah was saved by the introduction of new varieties of tomatoes from Bolivia. The people of Utah remember this.

Three weeks ago, 12 educators from Costa Rica returned home after having lived in Oregon where they worked as resource specialists with 12 different school districts for a period of 2 months. They helped to upgrade the teaching of Spanish and history as professional people, and they provided much enrichment to the educational program. They received half salary, lived with teacher families, and received some professional training in the development of teaching materials and the use of new teaching techniques. The important thing about this effort is that it was a partnership. Actually Costa Rica contributed more than it received. Forty Oregon school districts have indicated an interest in this program for next year.

Less than 2 months ago, a representative of the Oakland County Parents of the Alliance (Oakland County, Mich.) returned after spending 10 months in Colombia on various programs. Student exchanges have been established. A union leader in Michigan accepted an invitation to participate in a regional seminar in Cali, Colombia. Commercial contacts are being established and other activities planned.

The Alabama Partners of the Alliance, sparked initially by the Mobile Junior Chamber of Commerce, have provided assistance to a number of projects in Guatemala.

The State of Rio de Janeiro has an effective partners program developing with the State of Maryland. When the Maryland team was in Niteroi, the capital of the State, the group assisted a school which had been built by university students who accepted their responsibility as young leaders in the area. This was actually a shack of a school—but it was a school—and it was a school built in one of the worst slums of Niteroi. The university students themselves arranged their schedules so that they could serve as teachers until a permanent teacher could be assigned. On their initiative they then contacted our food-for-peace officer to obtain some assistance in the form of powdered milk and corn meal. The Governor of the State, who has been working under great financial limitations, helped them with a water supply. But the students themselves accepted their responsibilities and provided the spark which is giving hope to the people of that favela. The people of the favela (slum) are doing their part in the improvement program. The Maryland Partners of the Alliance arranged for a $1,000 contribution to respond to this initiative and self-help. With it, and the labor of the people, a new school is now being built. A week from tomorrow, the leader of that group of Brazilian students and one of his coworkers will be arriving in Maryland where new and broader statewide activities will be planned—including plans for projects which will benefit the people of Maryland.

A partnership is now moving forward involving the State of Colorado and the Brazilian State of Minas Gerais. At this minute the Junior Chambers of Commerce of Denver and Boulder are working on community health center projects. A shipment of medical journals and related materials has been received by the medical school in Minas Gerais. In keeping with the partnership concept, the Minas Gerais partners group is in the process of collecting mineral samples which will be used in the high school science classes in Colorado. Thirty-one projects should have been completed in mid-May.

Florida is working in a partnership program in a major area of Colombia. The Florida-Colombia Alliance is currently working out a proposal which will ultimately, it is hoped, involve all of the State's 29 junior colleges. Each institution will establish a number of tuition- and fee-free scholarships for Colombia students. The dollars and cents value of such a program should amount to some $80,000. Two-way exchanges are being explored. Some students are already attending classes.

The Idaho Partners of the Alliance is working with the Pelileo area of Ecuador. Pelileo is an Andean town which was totally destroyed by an earthquake in 1940; not a stone was standing on a stone. The survivors moved some 3 miles away and began to rebuild their town. Through the years they have been working to complete what they now call their town plan. They have laid out the dusty streets in an orderly pattern; they have built two schools; they have built a four-room adobe hospital; they have completed 90 percent of a potable water system; they have completed 85 percent of a simple irrigation system. The Idaho Partners are helping them complete the water and irrigation projects. The medical auxiliary is helping with hospital equipment; educational material and equipment is being sent to the schools; other activities are being developed. Idaho responded to the self-help efforts of the citizens of Pelileo.

The Texas Partners of the Alliance, under the leadership of Edward Marcus of Dallas, is doing an excellent job in a partnership program with Peru. Tomorrow, in Austin, Tex., approximately 1,500 high school students will be meeting in their State convention of the Pan American Student Forum which is sponsored by the Texas Good Neighbor Commission. They will hear Robert E. Culbertson, the Director of the AID Mission to Peru, describe the importance of the help which a number of the high school units have already given the rural and slum area projects in Peru. The theme of the year's program for this organization has been the Texas partnership with Peru. They have helped with handtools for rural training schools, chain saws for an Andean village cooperative, funds for materials for roofs, doors, and windows for village-built adobe schools, pressure lanterns and some small generators for night literacy classes in rural areas, sets of new books (in Spanish) for village libraries. Many more projects are "in the mill."

The Texas AFL-CIO provided wheelbarrows, picks, and shovels to a village which was working to convert a mountain trail into a farm-to-market road. The Texas Rehabilitation Institute and the owner of a radio school provided equipment for two rehabilitation programs in Peru. Business relationships are being explored as are other partnership activities.

The Texas Rural Electric Cooperatives are presently considering a 5-year program which would provide over 30 scholarships per year for rural youth in Peru to attend a practical 4-month training program. This would enable young boys and girls to receive simple but important training in home economics and animal and crop production.

The rural electric cooperatives in Kentucky have provided the base upon which a Partners of the Alliance program is developing with an area of western Ecuador. The Kentucky cooperatives provided transformers, wire, and other equipment to the first rural electric cooperative in Ecuador, located at Santo Domingo de los Colorados. The equipment made it possible for the cooperative to double its hours of operation and increase the number of customers served by one-third. This has had tremendous impact in Ecuador as you can well understand. Not only can I testify to the effectiveness of this type of rural electric assistance in Latin America, but, if you will permit a personal reference, I can well recall from my own experience my days on the Oran Weems farm along the Oklahoma-Texas Red River Valley. It was with a great sense of progress that we shifted from the kerosene lamp, the Aladdin lamp, and the not too dependable wind charger to the service of a rural electric cooperative. Whenever and wherever the event may take place, the introduction of electric energy opens the way not only to an immediate improvement in life, but, also of great importance it provides new hope and new incentives for the future. Kentucky, through its rural electric cooperative organization, has already demonstrated by deeds that it is ready to accept its reponsibility as a hemispheric partner. Within 2 weeks a program development team will travel to western Ecuador to expand the base already built by the Kentucky cooperatives.

The Wisconsin Electric Cooperatives have been laying the groundwork for what is now emerging as a Wisconsin partnership with Nicaragua. Bill Thomas, the general manager of the Wisconsin organization, has been serving as the planning coordinator of the program. Other partnerships are being explored in which the rural electric cooperatives will be playing an important role—Minnesota, Tennessee, Arkansas, and others.

Some of the Latin American Partners committees are now developing special collections of art, historical material, and handicraft items which will travel on a special schedule through the partner state in the United States. Arrangements are being made to exchange educational materials. The doors are wide open—the range of activities are unlimited.

By developing a direct partnership at the grassroots level, by helping people help themselves, and by tapping the imagination, the drive, and the initiative of the private sector, you can play a major role in the most dramatic undertaking in the history of hemispheric relations. In the government-to-government programs, we are assisting the Latin American nations as they develop their own institutions with which to attack their own long-range problems. The Alliance for Progress, however, is an Alliance of the private sector—and individuals—as well as an alliance of governments. The Partners of the Alliance is a channel through which you can develop your own direct alliance with the citizens of Rio Grande do Sul.

The focus of this program is partnership, not adoption—self-help with dignity, not charity. And we must put into actual practice the stated principle that we can receive and learn as well as assist and teach.

To you of the Indiana Statewide Electric Cooperative, to the members of the Indiana Partners of the Alliance Committee, to Senator VANCE HARTKE who has given helpful support to the partners' concept, to Senator BIRCH BAYH who has personally participated in the conferences and other sessions leading to the establishment of the Indiana program, and to all of the members of your congressional delegation with whom I have had the privilege of discussing the program, I wish to say, "Thanks and congratulations—thanks for your help in launching the program and congratulations on the vision and dedication to the cause of freedom and progress in the hemisphere."

President Johnson said, in speaking of the Alliance for Progress, "The foundations have been laid. The time calls for more action not more words." It is in this spirit that I issue to you the challenge to become increasingly involved as a partner of the Alliance.

Braceros Vital to State Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with the rapid ripening of California crops the urgency for resolving the bracero farm labor problem heightens. With apparent total disregard of congressional opinion, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, has turned a deaf ear on California's needs for harvest assistance from across the Mexican border.

I want to ask my colleagues here in the Congress to carefully review the excellent summary of the problem we face in California as illustrated by the San Diego Union last Saturday, March 13, in an editorial entitled "Braceros Vital to State Crops":

BRACEROS VITAL TO STATE CROPS—$500 MILLION LOSS FACED

California may suffer a $500 million economic loss if farmers are not assured of a labor supply to harvest the ripening crops, the U.S. Senate has been told.

A growing number of experts, farmers, and officials including Gov. Edmund G. Brown are telling Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz that the domestic labor supply cannot and is not filling the agricultural labor needs. They can be met only through a bracero type of program, using foreign nationals in the fields.

In spite of the mounting evidence from authoritative sources, Mr. Wirtz remains adamant in his stand that domestic workers can fill the need.

Among the latest officials urging the Secretary of Labor to change his mind is Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, the Senate majority leader.

Then Labor Department's proposal to exclude foreign workers "is an experiment * * * which is going to bring about the ruin of a major industry," Senator MANSFIELD warned.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL told the Senate the total damage to California's economy will be between $500 and $700 million if foreign workers are not available for the fields. Senator MURPHY and the 14 California Republican Members of the House have long been champions of an extension of the bracero program.

If the workers are not available the direct damage will be to the $3.5 billion annual California farm output. Also threatened with economic loss are such California industries as trucking, food processing, the container industry including glass, metal and plastic, and the printing and advertising trades.

The final victim will be the housewife, who will discover the adamant stand of the Labor Department will take more of her money for food.

California is only a part of the agricultural economy that is suffering from termination of the bracero program. Florida, for example, reports about $6 million worth of citrus has rotted and cane growers have lost $1.7 million because there was no help. Some dependent workers, like truckers, may have to go on relief.

If enough labor to harvest the California crops through September is to be obtained, the planning and agreements for an outside labor supply must begin now.

The alternative is rotting crops, a blow to the economy, more unemployment, and higher prices for food.

New York State's Wine Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we in New York State are very proud of our grape and wine industry, one of the oldest and most important industries in the State, concentrated generally in the picturesque Finger Lakes region of upstate New York.

In recent years, this industry has become increasingly recognized for its high standards of quality. It is represented by four major firms: Gold Seal Vineyards, Taylor Wine Co., Great Western Producers, and Widmer's Vineyards.

One of these firms, Gold Seal Vineyards, is celebrating its 100th anniversary. I take this occasion to salute this firm during its centennial celebration, as well as its enterprising chairman of the board, Paul M. Schlem. In doing so, I am also saluting New York State's century-old tradition in quality winemaking.

I ask unanimous consent that articles published in the Penn Yan Chronicle and Beverage News magazine be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Penn Yan (N.Y.) Chronicle, Dec. 10, 1964]

GOLD SEAL VINEYARDS CELEBRATES 100TH YEAR

The year 1965 will mark the 100th anniversary of Gold Seal Vineyards, Inc. As a beginning of this milestone in the company's history, a special celebration will be held. On Saturday, December 12, all of the employees of the winery will attend a special birthday party which will be held at the American Legion Hall in Penn Yan. Each of the company employees will be presented with a special memento of the company's centennial celebration.

Gold Seal Vineyards, holder of bonded winery license No. 2, was started in 1865. At that time, it was known as the Urbana Wine Co. Charles LeBreton, a native of Nantes, France, and associate of the Hillside Cellars at Rheims and the world renowned Roederer Cellars, was hired as winemaker.

Sixteen years later another outstanding French winemaker joined the company, Jules Crance. Crance was born in the champagne district of France and worked for Moet et Chandon.

From that time to the present four generations of Crance's family have been associated with the Gold Seal winery operations.

In 1934 Charles Fournier came to the United States from Rheims, France, where he had served as production manager of Veuve Cliquot Ponsardin. He was appointed winemaker and production manager of the company. Fournier is now president of Gold Seal.

In 1957 the name of the company was changed to its present name, Gold Seal Vineyards, Inc. The company produces New York State table, dessert and appetizer wines under the "Gold Seal" label, and New York State naturally fermented in the bottle champagnes under the "Gold Seal" and "Charles Fournier" labels.

In 1960 Gold Seal entered the field of imported wines with the Maxim's label. This division of the company is under the supervision of group Capt. Peter Townsend.

Today the company enjoys the unique distinction of having in its employ three European winemakers, Alexander Brailow and Guy Devaux along with Charles Fournier, who supervise and control the complete preparation and production of its products. It enjoys distribution in virtually all the 50 States through franchised distributors. Its products are widely advertised on radio and television and in magazines and newspapers.

GOLD SEAL VINEYARDS

(By Paul M. Schlem, board chairman)

The grape and wine industry is today one of America's most important agricultural enterprises as well as one of the oldest. Some idea of its age can be gained from the fact that Gold Seal Vineyards, Inc., the company that makes a fine line of New York State wines and champagnes, is celebrating its 100th anniversary this year. Gold Seal's winery is located in the Finger Lakes region of New York State on Lake Keuka. Its vineyards total 500 acres.

Heading Gold Seal Vineyards is Paul M. Schlem, the company's youthful chairman of the board. Backing up Schlem's modern business know-how is the firm's century-old tradition in winemaking. The two seem to go together in the Finger Lakes region—youth and age—with youth driving the Gold Seal products to greater consumer acceptance, and the old way assuring the consumer of the quality he is paying for.

Legend has it that the first grape wines in the Finger Lakes district (other than wild species) were planted by a minister, who had taken his vines from a Hudson Valley acreage. Out of that rectory garden came vines that delighted the neighbors, and gave birth to an industry. By the time of the Civil War the bubbly vintage from the Finger Lakes had made a hit in such cosmopolitan centers as New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. Well forward in the developing industry was Gold Seal, gathering in the first of its 100 years, and looking forward to the day when Gold Seal products could be suitably commemorated.

Early this year Gold Seal Vineyards started releasing its "100 Vintage Years" anniversary film, which shows the step-by-step process on the making of wine, and is available to trade and consumer groups at no charge.

The film tells a great deal about the vintner's art, but it hardly touches the life and career of Paul Schlem, an oversight, for without Schlem's direction for the past 4 years it somehow seems doubtful whether there would have been a gilt-edged, Gold Seal anniversary celebration today.

Schlem was named to the chairman of the board post at Gold Seal Vineyards in 1961.

Schlem immediately proved to be an ambitious young man, who, backed up by an excellent product in the bottle, and a loyal and capable sales organization, has brought Gold Seal to its present popularity and demand throughout 50 States. He has lived in every country of Europe with the exceptions of Scandinavia and Russia.

During World War II, he became a member of a U.S. Military Government team covering France and Germany. He was the only member of this team speaking French and German, and was entrusted with the selection of new mayors for each of some 150 communities in Germany, thus replacing the deposed Nazi leaders.

His first contact with wines began during one exciting year spent in France—shortly before the breakthrough at the Siegfried line. In all the regions of France he found the little peasant growers only too anxious to toast the victorious GI's who could speak at least some French. They always found some long-forgotten bottle of good red wine which had eluded the plundering Nazis. After crossing the Rhine, he was introduced to the pleasures of German wines. He ended his Army career in Bavaria, where for 9 months his small military government detachment governed three counties and restored some form of democratic order to the occupied area.

After World War II, Schlem settled down to domesticity with his wife, Anita, and two children, and is presently residing in Roslyn, Long Island, N.Y.

Since its inception Gold Seal has been proud to have in its employ outstanding French winemakers. In 1865, Charles LeBreton, a native of Nantes, France, and associate of the Hillsdale Cellars at Rheims, and te world renowned Roederer Cellars, was hired as winemaker. Sixteen years later another outstanding French winemaker joined the company, Jules Crance. Crance was born in the champagne district of France and worked for Moet et Chandon. From that time to the present four generations of Crance's family have been associated with the Gold Seal winery operations.

In 1934 Charles Fournier came to the United States from Rheims, France, where he had served as production manager at Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin. He was appointed winemaker and production manager of the company. Fournier is now president of Gold Seal. Today the company enjoys the unique distinction of having in its employ three French winemakers, Guy Deveaux and Alex Brailow, along with Charles Fournier, who supervises and controls the complete preparation and production of its products.

Gold Seal produces a full line of New York State table and dessert wines under the "Gold Seal" label and naturally fermented champagnes under the "Gold Seal," "Charles Fournier," and "Henri Marchant" labels. Its largest selling item is the nationally famous Pink Catawba Wine.

In addition to being makers of New York State's fine wines and champagnes, Gold Seal Vineyards is also the sole importer of Maxim's of Paris French wines and champagnes. It entered into this operation in 1960.

Gold Seal is constantly expanding. From a concept of a national sales manager, it now has a sales organization headed by 10 division managers who hold full, sales executive positions. Their responsibility is directly to the chairman of the board. Another example of its expansion, is Gold Seal's national advertising schedule. From 10 full-page color advertisements in the New York Times Sunday supplement, it has branched out into television advertising with considerable success. Gold Seal is proud to be the first company of the New York State wineries to enter into television advertising.

The makeup of winemaking executive leadership does not lend itself to popularization of individual company heads, and thus the fact of the label and the character of the product stands out, whereas the men behind the scene hardly ever come to the fore. But Gold Seal's fast-paced march toward greater consumer acceptance cannot help but make the name Paul M. Schlem an industry byword in the years to come. That is why the man on our cover this month is an industry figure to watch.

In the Kansas and Oklahoma sales territory, Gold Seal Wines are given their work-a-day administration by both Connie Nicholas, central division manager, operating out of St. Louis, and by Jerry White, who administers the on-the-spot needs of Oklahoma retailers and secondary suppliers from his headquarters in Tulsa. Both Connie and Jerry are relatively young with the Gold Seal organization, but in the Gold Seal sales arm youth is always in style, just as age, dedication, and art are prized possessions of all those in production.

New York's Finger Lakes district wines have much to gain, should the antibubble tax crusade being led by Richard Calvert, Sr., come to fruition. Some of the finest champagnes in the world are New York champagnes, and Gold Seal vineyard's figures prominently in their production.

That production, when funneled down to the midland sales territory, is translated into such entries as Gold Seal Champagne, brut, extra dry, pink, sparkling burgundy, and also entries such as Henri Marchant, available in the same shades of taste. But the Gold Seal sales story does not stop there.

The line of imports handled by the New York firm is the same line that Board Chairman Schlem encountered in his many travels throughout Europe. And so, today, doing an excellent business among wine lovers are Maxim's labels, with such names as Graves Superieurs Vintage, Beaujolais, St. Amour, Chassagne, Montrachet, Chateauneuf du Pape, Rose Cote de Provence, not to mention Maxim's sparkling wines in the vintage years that have meaning for those who follow the grape, full circle.

What America Means To Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a promising young lady, Miss Miryam Choca, who resides in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois, has won the coveted first prize in the Wilmette, Illinois Jaycees' essay contest on "What America Means to Me." I wish to call attention to this thoughtful essay which is of particular importance and interest since Miss Choca is a Cuban, and I take pleasure in inserting it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

I am a Cuban and I love my land very much. Yet, now I have only memories to remind me of what my country was once like. Now there is chaos, disbelief, and hate. It is my land though, and I love it for what it was. I am fiercely proud of it, too. Perhaps there is much reason for pride, even though it is fallen pride.

America welcomed us when we came. She gave us a home when we had none. Someday I hope to make her proud of me. Now, I have nothing to give but myself.

To me, America is the dream of long ago. Always men have dreamed of freedom such as this. That is why we came. Blood has been spilled and tears have been shed to purchase it. A high price indeed, but America is much more than blood and tears.

Is she a field of young wheat stretching as far as the eye can see? Or is she a church steeple climbing into the sky? Perhaps America is the proud skyscrapers or the humbled dwellings of the poor. Maybe she is all of these, but I think most of all she is her people. America is a brotherhood stretching across a continent uniting men of different backgrounds and social classes, drawing together the rich and the poor.

America is generosity and friendliness. I see America in an outstretched hand or a firm handclasp. It means much to be welcomed, helped, and befriended, especially when you are lonely.

America is honor. When I look at the flag I know that the stars are untarnished by shame and I am proud of this country that I have adopted, or rather, that has adopted me.

When I think about America I think of all the men that have died so that we, their children, might enjoy the freedom, the unity, the honor, and the beauty found only here. I think of all those who have worked to make this country what it is. I think of all the soldiers lying unremembered beneath foreign skies. Was it worth it? Was their sacrifice too high a price? I think they know it wasn't. No price is too high for freedom. These people are what America means to me. They are the ones who made her great.

American is the glory of the past, the dignity of the present, and the hope of the future.

Because she is composed of people of different creeds, races, and nationalities, America has often been called a mosaic. I am very grateful to my parents who made all the sacrifices so that we, too, could be a small piece in this great American mosaic, and, of course, I am thankful to you who accepted and befriended us. You are America.

Roscoe C. Tartar, Judge of Pulaski-Rockcastle County Circuit, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Joe Creason which appeared in the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., on March 14, 1965. I am glad that the article is about my uncle, Judge R. C. E. Tartar, who has been honored five times by the people of the 28th Judicial District of Kentucky by election as their circuit judge, last being elected in 1963 for another 6-year term. In 1960, he was named by the Kentucky State Bar Association as Kentucky's outstanding circuit court judge. A lifelong Republican—and chairman for many years of

the old 9th Congressional District, the second strongest Republican district in the United States. He still looks back with nostalgia to his one defection—to 1912 when as a delegate to the convention of the Progressive Party, he followed his ideal, Theodore Roosevelt.

I think he would be disappointed if I did not say he is not 87 years old, but only 82.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOE CREASON'S KENTUCKY

Roscoe C. Tartar, judge of the Pulaski-Rockcastle County circuit, is unusual for more reasons than the mere fact that at age 87 he is the oldest active judge in Kentucky. He also is one of the last of the great Kentucky free-style political orators, a gregarious man who never sidesteps the chance to make a speech or shake a voter's hand.

During the more than 44 years he has presided over county and circuit courts, Judge Tartar has dispensed a personalized brand of justice. He follows courtroom developments closely, and isn't reluctant to interrupt an attorney to suggest he try a particular line of questioning.

Like the day in Somerset when a lawyer in his court was quoting at length from the Bible, and doing it poorly. Finally, Judge Tartar could stand the butchery no longer.

"If you're going to quote from the Bible," he said, "then do it right." He then recited the passage correctly and court resumed.

Judge Tartar first became Pulaski County judge in 1909 and served five terms. In 1927, he was elected circuit judge, but retired to private law practice after 6 years. However, in 1947, he was named to the circuit bench to fill an unexpired term when his nephew, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, was elected to the Senate. He has held the post ever since.

A stanch Republican, Judge Tartar was holding court at Mount Vernon a few years back when the late Senator Alben W. Barkley came to town to make a reelection campaign speech. It had been decided to hold the speaking in the circuit courtroom, and Barkley was elated to find it filled to overflowing with people.

"Don't get excited, Alben," Judge Tartar said, "these people aren't here to hear you talk—they're witnesses I've subpenaed for a moonshine case I'm going to hear as soon as you finish."

Solution Seen to Local Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Mobile Register of March 18 has significance to all Americans and I include it here. Bishop Toolen's diocese covers the entire State of Alabama and northwest Florida. He is truly a man of God and he knows whereof he speaks:

SOLUTION SEEN TO LOCAL PROBLEM—BISHOP CHARGES KING TRYING TO DIVIDE PEOPLE OF ALABAMA

(By John Will)

The Most Reverend Thomas J. Toolen, D.D., archbishop-bishop of the Mobile-Birmingham Catholic diocese, spoke out Wednesday night about crusaders coming into Alabama from other States in the racial situation.

He made it clear that he does not approve of priests and nuns coming from other States and even from Canada to participate in racial demonstrations.

He declared that "these demonstrations are not helping things at all."

He charged Dr. Martin Luther King with "trying to divide our people."

He voiced his feeling that "a great injustice is being done to the State of Alabama."

Speaking at a St. Patrick's Day banquet at the Hotel Admiral Semmes, the archbishop said that he has sought to promote just and equitable treatment for Negroes and has made special efforts to help them.

RACE HARMONY PRAISED

He praised the racial harmony that has prevailed in Mobile and said he felt credit should be given our religious and political leaders.

But he told some 400 men at the banquet that "many who condemn us do not realize the real obstacles we are facing in our State."

Turning to the question of priests and nuns coming from outside the State to join the demonstrators at Selma, the archbishop remarked that we are living in a strange age.

"They ask me," he said, "why do the priests and sisters come from other States and Canada to take part in these demonstrations. Certainly the sisters are out of place in these demonstrations; their place is at home, doing God's work. I would say the same thing is true of the priests.

"As to whether they have permission to come in," he continued, "they haven't asked for it. It is customary to ask permission in such cases.

"What do they know about conditions in the South?" the archbishop asked. "I am afraid they are only 'eager beavers' who feel there is a holy cause."

Archbishop Toolen said he had been informed that at one time there were as many as 200 priests and 50 nuns from outside the State at Selma. He stated that he had instructed priests and nuns resident at Selma not to take part in the demonstrations.

Referring to voter registration questions which have been objected to, the archbishop gave his opinion that they should be simplified and he remarked that "if I took one of the examinations, I probably would fail."

"We need some corrections in our attitude toward the Negro people," he told his hearers. "Here in Mobile, where the problem has been handled sensibly, we have had no trouble. Sane and sensible Negroes realize we are trying to bring them up to the standards they should have.

"But," he went on, "do we need crusaders coming in from other States to tell us how to run the State of Alabama? There are certainly things that need correcting but with the sane help of our people, they will be corrected in time. But the demonstrations are not helping.

"And," he added, "I do not believe priests are equipped to lead groups in disobedience to the laws of this State. The need is for the people in this State to face this crisis together."

Concerning Dr. Martin Luther King, the archbishop said he respected him as a man of religion but he criticized him for "taking children out of school to demonstrate on the streets."

And he contended that Dr. King is "hurting the cause of the Negro rather than helping it."

"There is too much politics in this whole thing," he asserted. "The question seems to be: Who will get the Negro vote?"

"I feel that a great injustice is being done to the State of Alabama," Archbishop Toolen said. "We are pilloried before the world as savages. No thought is given to those in this State who are really trying to work out a solution. No credit is given to people who are trying to solve the question.

"I will say that there are no more loyal citizens in this country than the people of Alabama. They have led in defending their country in its wars. And they are ready to go to their country's defense in any future war."

"Let us be sensible," was his concluding plea. "We know that all men, regardless of race or color, are made after the image of God. We know that all are redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ. All citizens are entitled to equal rights and privileges under the Constitution. But these problems must be solved in a lawful way.

"There are crazy people on both sides," he said. "As good citizens of Alabama, we should try to control them."

A System To Provide and Teach Comprehensive Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Dr. Winston R. Miller, who is medical director of the St. Paul Medical Center and clinical instructor in the Department of Internal Medicine at the University of Minnesota College of Medicine. In view of the current debate on the administration's medicare proposal, I think my colleagues will find Dr. Miller's article of great interest, as it points to the successful operation of a system to provide and teach comprehensive medical care, developed within the framework of a large cooperative outpatient department for medically indigent patients, and at the same time protects personal pride, independence, and responsibility.

The article follows:

A SYSTEM TO PROVIDE AND TEACH COMPREHENSIVE MEDICAL CARE

(By Winston R. Miller, M.D., St. Paul)

A system to provide and teach comprehensive medical care, developed within the framework of a large cooperative outpatient department for medically indigent patients, has been in operation since September 1, 1962. The system, built on high ideals of medical practice and education, has been well received by staff physicians, interns, residents, nurses, patients, hospitals, and community agencies. This pioneering demonstration project, incorporating the most specialized health services in a modern community, may provide a pattern for development of similar programs in other localities.

The scales of progress in modern medicine are unblanced. Near-miraculous advances have occurred in medical knowledge and techniques, together with constantly increasing public demand for the benefits of these advances. Yet, there is little action, or at best wholly inadequate action, to provide and/or teach continuing comprehensive health care.[1]

Specialized medical and health-related facilities have increased tremendously in number as well as in individual size and achieve-

Footnotes at end of speech.

ment. However, public recognition and support of specialism is directed toward the height of achievement. In an effort to achieve perfection, breadth of service is constricted and wide empty gaps exist among the tall narrow ivory towers of specialism. Much of the current public unrest regarding health services stems from the difficulty experienced in bridging gaps among the many pinnacles of specialism when trying to obtain total health services. Some of the gargantuan public support and enthusiasm for medical research which have resulted in brilliant specialist achievements should be shifted back to the more fundamental duty of medicine: to provide and teach continuing total health care for each patient according to his broad individual needs.[23] The need to teach comprehensive medical care has been emphasized at a few medical schools where various kinds of comprehensive clinics have been developed,[4 5 6 7] and by various leaders in public health.[1 2 8]

Individual hospitals with outpatient departments, indigent services, and postgraduate medical-education programs are encountering increasing hardships in upgrading their programs to conform to modern standards. In a progressive approach to the solution of these difficulties, five private St. Paul hospitals cooperatively incorporated the St. Paul Medical Center and developed a system of truly comprehensive medical care.

The system is presented with the hope that it will stimulate enthusiasm for development of similar cooperative systems elsewhere.

ORGANIZATION

The St. Paul Medical Center was formed in 1960 by five private hospitals (Charles T. Miller, Children's, Riverview Memorial, St. Joseph's, and St. Luke's) and their medical staffs, with support of two private foundations (Amherst H. Wilder, and Louis W. and Maud Hill Family). The basic goals are superior medical service, education, research, and interhospital cooperation. One leading lay board member and one leading staff physician from each hospital form the board of directors. Administrative, medical faculty, and research laboratory committees are appointed from leading administrative and medical personnel. Five full- and two half-time directors of education in the major specialties are chiefs of their respective clinics in the outpatient department, directors of intern and resident training, and organizational directors of medical education in participating hospitals. In addition, volunteer practicing physicians and dentists accept clinic assignments so that clinic sessions are supervised by specialist staff physicians.

TABLE 1.—*Fee schedules*

Service	Group A	Group F
Doctor visit	$2.00	$0.75
X-ray and laboratory (private fee, 100 percent)	30	10
Prescriptions (private fee, 100 percent)	82	40
Hospitalizations:		
1st 10 days (daily rate)	$9.00	$3.00
Next 10 days (daily rate)	5.00	1.00
After 20 days (daily rate)	2.50	Free
Maximum per family per year	480.00	120.00
Maternity care	161.00	80.00

The main offices of the center are in the separate outpatient department building. The outpatient department, research laboratory, and participating hospitals are all close to one another, and near leading community health service agencies in the city-center.

PATIENTS

The center serves medically indigent citizens of this community—individuals or families who are capable of maintaining themselves independently except for medical and dental expenses. They are medically indigent because of large families, chronic illness or old age, and relatively low income. They have retained their personal pride, self-esteem, and independence, and are often adamant in refusal to request public assistance. Currently 8,000 people are active and visits total about 50,000 per year.

The social service department evaluates family socioeconomic and hardship factors in detail, explains various services potentially helpful to the family, explains illustrated information brochures prepared especially for patient education, and arranges appropriate initial appointments in the clinics. Each family is classified under one of six groups (A to F) according to gross income, number of dependents, and financial hardship. Gross monthly incomes of potentially eligible families at upper and lower margins of eligibility are as follows:

Family size	Group A	Group F
1	$210	$50
12	732	400

Part-pay fee schedules are established for all services for each patient group. Charges for A and F groups are shown in table 1.

COMPONENTS OF COMPREHENSIVE MEDICAL CARE

In developing a carefully organized system, each of the components listed below was scrutinized and revised, to bring performance up to modern standards. The broadend concepts of preventive medicine are emphasized—in early detection of disease, in prevention of disability, in rehabilitation, and in education for preservation of health and productivity.

1. Preventive medicine
a. Health education for sick and well patients
b. Periodic diagnostic examinations for asymptomatic patients
c. Annual diagnostic examinations for chronic-disease patients
d. Prophylaxis (immunizations and antimicrobials)
2. Early diagnosis
a. Cancer detection
b. Detection of other asymptomatic disease
c. Use of specialties, subspecialties, and laboratories
3. Intensive therapy
a. Technically competent inpatient care
b. Complete outpatient care
c. Emergency care 24 hours per day
4. Long-term guidance
a. Acute and chronic ambulatory care
b. Bedside nursing, health education, and physical therapy in the home
c. Social service assistance and guidance
d. Family counseling
5. Rehabilitation
a. Physical and mental rehabilitation
b. Occupational therapy, workshops, and reemployment assistance
6. Medical records
a. Complete reporting of all services in outpatient medical charts
b. Organization of charts to facilitate rapid appraisal

BASIC PRINCIPLES AND PHILOSOPHIES

The key to efficient provision of continuing comprehensive medical care is education. Patients must be educated and gently coerced into wanting, and paying for, all proved measures necessary for preservation and restoration of maximum health and productivity. Ideal use of health services cannot be forced—it must be taught. The "art of medicine," like brotherly love, defies scientific analysis. But this does not abrogate the responsibility to provide and teach it.

All personnel in the health-care system must be trained in their respective responsibilities and oriented to the whole system.

The general specialist physician should be a doctor first and a specialist second. Since the majority of all medical graduates take specialty training there will be an increasing dearth of general practitioners and progressively greater amounts of total health care will be provided by general specialists. All general specialist physicians and clinics should provide general diagnostic services and continuing comprehensive medical care. Subspecialist physicians and clinics should be closely allied with general specialty clinics.

All aspects of comprehensive medical care should be under competent medical direction. The physician must continue to be the chief of the constantly expanding health-care team. The system must be fully organized for his maximum efficiency, and he must not be required to do anything that can be done equally well by persons with less training. In the training center, interns and residents are taught to carry the responsibility of the chief of the health-care team—providing continuing comprehensive medical care.

The registered nurse is second only to the physician in responsibility for patient services. The charge nurse is the executive officer in the health-care team, and successful execution of comprehensive medical care rests heavily on her shoulders.

The social service worker is a vital team member. Medical care aimed at preservation and/or restoration of maximum health and productivity requires organized and integrated social services.

TABLE 2.—*Ancillary health services*

Problem or need	Resource agency or contact
Alcoholism	St. Paul Family Service, information and referral resource for problem drinkers.
Appliance loan services	SPMC[1] Social Service Department.
Bedside nursing care (baths, injections, irrigations, dressings, passive exercises, etc).	Family Nursing Service, Washington County Nursing Service.
Health supervision in the home, (newborn, children, adults, diets, allergy, diabetes, etc).	Family Nursing Service, county nursing services (Ramsey, Washington, Dakota).
Casework services (marital or parent-child problems, debt adjustment, home management).	St. Paul Family Service, Bureau of Catholic charities, Jewish Family Service.
Diet instruction	Dietician, Miller Hospital (clinic teaching); Family Nursing Service (at home teaching).
Financial assistance	SPMC Social Service Department.
Homemaker services	St. Paul Family Service.
Nursing home placement	SPMC Social Service Department.
Optician	SPMC Eye Clinic.
Occupational thereapy	St. Paul Rehabilitation Center.
Physical therapy and reeducation.	Do.
Physical therapy at home (where transportation is difficult because of wheelchair, costs, etc.).	St. Paul Rehabilitation Center (supervised by Family Nursing Service), Arthritis and Rheumatism Association (arthritics only).
Psychiatric outpatient treatment.	Hamm Memorial Psychiatric Clinic, Community Mental Health Center, Wilder Child Guidance Clinic (up to age 18).
Special diseases services (epilepsy, cancer, diabetes, etc.).	SPMC Social Service Department.
Speech therapy	St. Paul Rehabilitation Center.
Transportation	Volunteer Bureau, Inc., St. Paul Rehabilitation Center.
Vocational rehabilitation (testing, guidance counseling, special training, placement, followup).	St. Paul Rehabilitation Center, State division of vocational rehabilitation and special education.

[1] SPMC Indicates St. Paul Medical Center.

Footnotes at end of speech.

OUTPATIENT DEPARTMENT SERVICES

Registration and medical records: These departments were reorganized to remove common "roadblocks" to efficient services. Receptionist and business functions were oriented toward improved patient-clinic-doctor relationships. Medical records and filing methods were streamlined. The revised outpatient medical record has labeled, color-coded sections containing records of all clinical, laboratory, X-ray, pharmaceutical, hospital, social, and ancillary services. Under this system, a physician seeing an "old" patient for the first time can quickly appraise his medical condition and all previous services.

The biostatistician conducts all statistical analyses, utilizing a system of composite visit forms, punchcards, and computers for accurate data processing. Cooperative assistance is provided by the research department of one of the supporting foundations and by a health-insurance corporation.

Clinics: Twenty-five specialty and subspecialty clinics are scheduled at specific times, varying from daily to once a month. Intern and resident physicians are primarily responsible for the care of patients. Appointment systems and integration of various clinics are arranged so that each physician has adequate time for each patient and cross-consultations between clinics are easily obtained.

Diagnostic examinations: At the first visit in any general clinic, for other than an obviously minor illness, a general diagnostic history and physical examination is performed. Established routines for component parts of comprehensive medical care are supervised by clinic nurses. Patient instruction, immunizations, Mantoux tests, routine laboratory and chest X-ray examinations, electrocardiograms, smears for Papanicolaou staining, and the first page of the history-and-physical-examination form (including measurements, family history, past illness, and personal habits) are performed or obtained by nurses. This detailed contact by the nurse assures her optimum participation in patient understanding and instruction, and in physician assistance. In patients with chronic disease, the routine annual complete examinations are scheduled by the charge nurse.

Laboratory and X-ray examinations: The outpatient department is organized as a diagnostic and treatment center where all consultations, tests and treatments can be completed on an outpatient basis. Laboratory examinations too complicated for the outpatient laboratory, and all radiological services are obtained from adjacent hospitals. Supervising physicians donate interpretation services.

Prescriptions: A pharmacy is operated in conjunction with the pharmacy of one of the five cooperating hospitals for maximum service and economy. Detailed regulations and records allow wide latitude of freedom for interns and junior residents, and still control improprieties of immature judgment.

Emergency care is provided in modern emergency rooms of participating hospitals when the outpatient department is closed.

Ancillary health services: There are 123 different health, welfare, and recreational agencies in greater St. Paul and Ramsey County, both private and tax-supported. Their services represent a coordinated community effort for the welfare of the entire community. It is manifestly impossible for physicians and nurses to be thoroughly informed about all ancillary health services. The social service department takes this responsibility and has developed a concise system for easy referral. Social service workers provide counseling for physicians, nurses, and patients regarding social problems related to patient's illnesses; handle all referrals to community agencies; and consult with patients prior to every hospital admission. A table listing the most commonly needed ancillary health services and where they may be obtained is located under the glass tops of physicians' desks in all clinics (table 2).

Coordination of extensive home-care services by two or more service agencies is directed by the Information and Referral Service for the Aged, Disabled, and Chronically Ill, operated by the St. Paul Public Health Center.

HOSPITALIZATION SERVICES

The intern or resident who sees the patient in the clinic hospitalizes the patient in his own hospital on his own service, and subsequently observes the patient again in the clinic after hospital discharge. Continuity of care is thereby provided. Hospital care is supervised by directors of medical education and volunteer teaching staff physicians. Center patients have equal priority with private patients for hospital admission, and there is no discrimination, separation, or double standard of care. The community-service-bed fund of each hospital covers the deficit between the cost and the relatively small payments received from part-pay patients.

EDUCATION IN COMPREHENSIVE MEDICAL CARE

Medical, paramedical, and patient education are fundamental goals, and prerequisites for successful, continued performance of total health care. The health services coordinator (a public health nurse with public relations experience) has developed many aspects of the coordinated system and carries a heavy load of continuing education for employees, patients, and community agency workers.

Interns and residents are taught comprehensive medical care as they practice and learn the art and science of medicine. In a stimulating environment with well-directed teachers and medical assistants, "education by doing" comes easily. Carefully prepared brochures, policies, and regulations provide educational direction. Free-association group discussions, and informal discussions with teaching staff physicians experienced in the practice of medicine fortify the educational experience.

Student nurses learn community health nursing in the clinic getting, in the classroom, and in one or more of the community agencies. They share in the teaching of individual patients. Under direction of the director of nursing education and the nursing supervisor, they present special classes to certain groups of patients. Each year 180 student nurses from 4 schools of nursing in the Twin Cities come to the outpatient department on 6-week affiliation services for education in community health nursing.

Student laboratory technicians learn both technical proficiency and patient-teaching skills, so that patients will acquire a greater understanding of, and confidence in laboratory examinations.

Patients learn about the multiple services available to them principally by personal instruction—from the social service worker, the nurse, and the physician. Patients receive a liberally illustrated information booklet at the time of admission to the center and illustrated quarterly health bulletins by mail. Special classes are held regularly for patients of the diabetic, maternity, allergy and well-child clinics. As a part of their educational experience, each group of student nurses designs and makes 15 to 20 health education posters which are placed in clinic areas. Health education pamphlets supplied by the cancer, diabetes, heart, and tuberculosis societies and by the American Medical Association and Minnesota Department of Health are made freely available.

COMMENT

Although the individual components are well known and readily recognized, development of this system designed to provide and teach continuing comprehensive medical care was an arduous task, fraught with numerous difficulties. Extensive revisions of old methods required organized salesmanship, diplomacy, and persuasion. It was difficult to overcome the traditional but insidious concept that the responsibilities of physician and nurse in outpatient clinics are limited to cursory treatment of remedial disease at convenient times. Outpatient departments have often been crowded accessories, adapted neither to comfort and welfare of patients nor to effective teaching of students.[8] Proponents of increased use of outpatient educational assignments must scrutinize the content and quality of the experience so as not to be good salesmen for poor merchandise.[9] Care must be taken to make the experience enjoyable and rewarding. The need for broader education of the physician (and vide infra, all health personnel), so that he will serve the patient as a human being and not as a case of a particular disease, cannot be stressed too much.[10] Effective comprehensive medical care requires an attitude of personal concern for the total health needs of each patient as thought he were a close blood relative (the Greek idea of virtue[11]). In contrast is the impersonal attitude commonly observed, in which the patient is coldly regarded as an incidental carrier of "St. John's disease" (the Roman idea of morality[11]). The generally high morale of patients, nurses, staff psyhicians, interns, and residents at the St. Paul Medical Center suggests that the virtuous goal of comprehensive medical care makes outpatient services more enjoyable and rewarding. Physicians who have served a rotating internship or a portion of their residency in a system which provides and teaches comprehensive medical care cannot but be better qualified to meet public demands for total health services, in whatever branch of medicine they choose to serve.

The medically indigent socioeconomic segment of our population provides a largely untapped reservoir of clinical material that can be used in medical education to replace rapidly dwindling ranks of the totally indigent. They need and want more and better medical services. They are educable regarding their health. Caring for them in a respectful manner is gratifying, partly because they have retained their pride and independence. They provide ideal patients for medical students, interns, and residents because they are very much like the patients in the private practice of medicine.

The magnitude of the cooperative effort is a most significant aspect of this system. Five strong private hospitals have buried the proverbial hatchet and cooperatively striven to produce a stronger program of medical service and postgraduate medical education based upon exemplary medical ideals. Community agencies have joined in the cooperative effort to fulfill their ideals of broadening the coverage of health-related services. The system has neither bypassed specialization nor tended to discredit or weaken it. Instead, it was built on the best characteristics of the specialties of this modern community. It is appropriate that private hospitals, private physicians, and private community agencies—all exquisitely sensitive to public demands concerning health services—should pioneer in this type of program. Working together they are doing what none of them could do individually. Some of the concepts of coordinated community planning are being demonstrated, and the Metropolitan St. Paul Hospital Planning Council gains support in developing greater interhospital cooperation. The research laboratory has grown and received wider sup-

Footnotes at end of speech.

port. The precedent established has helped to stimulate interhospital cooperation in avoiding unnecessary duplication of other kinds of expensive services.

Solutions to many problems of hospital medical staffs are foreseen by cooperative programs of this type. Most physicians belong to the medical staffs of several community hospitals. The required duplication of effort by leaders of the profession dilutes their efforts and weakens their effectiveness. This is an imponderable basic problem in intern-residency programs and in continuing medical-staff education programs of many hospitals. The challenge is to make the participating hospitals learning hospitals for the medical staff as well as teaching hospitals,[13] and to do this within practical capabilities of busy practicing physicians. Comprehensive application of recent expansions of medical knowledge is a logical and practical goal.

Adequate assistance for physicians is a constantly growing problem. At the St. Paul Medical Center, nurses function extremely well as assistants to physicians in the clinics. However, nurses have so many responsibilities that it seems reasonable that another type of personnel might be trained for the specific purpose of being the physician's assistant. With the anticipated relative reduction in practicing physicians and increased needs for services for an older population, provision of comprehensive medical care will require that paramedical personnel function as assistant physicians. The author shares the wish of many other former Navy medical officers that we could have physician assistants analogous to the pharmacist mates of the Navy Hospital Corps in civilian medical practice.

This presentation is limited to the description of a system of comprehensive medical care. Studies are underway to define the medically indigent more adequately and to evaluate the cardinal values of the system objectively.

279 Rice Street, St. Paul 55102: "Development of this system was supported in part by Community Health Services Grant No. CH-25-3 A62 from the Bureau of State Services of the Public Health Service.

"Advice and assistance in the development of this system was provided by Drs. Robert N. Barr, secretary and executive officer, and Helen Knutson, director of the Division of Hospital Services, Minnesota Department of Health; William N. Wallace, administrator of the Charles T. Miller Hospital; and many laymen and physicians of St. Paul."

[1] Dearing, W. P.: "Challenge of Comprehensive Health Care," American Journal of Public Health, 52: 2071–2079, December 1962.

[2] Rosen, G.: "Health Needs and Resources in United States," New England Journal of Medicine, 270:81–88, Jan. 9, 1964.

[3] Darley, W.: "Family Physician of Future: Fact or Fiction," Journal of Medical Education, 36: 142–149, December 1961.

[4] Magraw, R. M.: "How Trends in Medical Education Are Affecting Medicine and Hospitals," Hospitals, 37: 54–67, Oct. 1, 1963.

[5] Karen, F., Jr.: "General Medical Clinic of University of Colorado: Experiment in Medical Education and Medical Care," American Journal of Public Health, 45: 47–52, January 1955.

[6] Cornfeld, D., and others: "Outpatient Oriented Pediatric Residency, American Journal of Diseases of Children, 103: 116–119, February 1962.

[7] Reader, G. G.: "Organization and Development of Comprehensive Care Program," American Journal of Public Health, 44: 760–765, June 1954.

[8] Colmore, J. P., and Wolf, S.: "New Design for Services and Teaching in Outpatient Department," Journal of the American Medical Association, 156: 830–833, Oct. 30, 1954.

[9] Korsch, B. M.: "Unique Potential of Outpatient Experiences for Pediatricians in Training," American Journal of Diseases of Children, 103: 111–114, February 1962.

[10] Zappfe, F. K.: "Relation of General Education to Professional Education," Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges, 15: 228–234, July 1940.

[11] Goerke, L. S.; Lembcke, P. A.; and Roener, M. I.: "Medical Education and Community Needs," Journal of Medical Education, 38–858–864, October 1963.

[13] Creditor, M. C.: "Role of Teaching Hospital in Goal of Community," read before the annual meeting of the Association of Hospital Directors of Medical Education, Chicago, Feb. 8, 1964; to be published.

Hon. Champ Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of the column by Joe Creason, a very able writer for the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., regarding the former Speaker of the House, the Honorable Champ Clark, who was born in Lawrenceburg, Ky.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOE CREASON'S KENTUCKY

Some day soon the Anderson County birthplace of Champ Clark, who came within a whisper of being the third Kentuckian to be President, finally will be marked with a historical plaque. The plaque has been prepared by the Kentucky Historical Society and within a few weeks it should be placed near the 150-year-old stone house 2 miles south of Lawrenceburg where Clark was born in 1850.

Ironically, at the time he made his bid, Clark had better political credentials than either Abraham Lincoln or Zachary Taylor when those Kentuckians sought and won the White House.

After having taught school at Lawrenceburg and Glensboro, Clark moved to West Virginia, studied law and then migrated to Missouri. There he was elected to Congress in 1893, a post he held except for 2 years until 1920, the year before his death. From 1911 on he was Speaker of the House, an honor he held longer than any other man in history.

Clark scored his near miss on the presidency at the 1912 Democratic convention. He, Woodrow Wilson, and Oscar Underwood were contenders for the nomination, and Clark led on the first 27 ballots, receiving a clear majority on nine ballots (but not the required two-thirds). Finally, William Jennings Bryan and Underwood switched to Wilson, and the New Jersey governor won on the 46th ballot.

They tell many Clark stories in Anderson County, including the time he boarded with "Aunt" Betsy Stephens while he taught at Glensboro. One day she asked him to draw a bucket of water from the well. When the rope caught half way up, Clark addressed some salty remarks at the balky contraption. Aunt Betsy was horrified and told him so.

"Well," he apologized, "if you tried to draw water out of this well, you'd think damn too."

Margaret Moore Is Mother of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Margaret Moore, of Indianapolis, has been selected as "Mother of the Year" for Indiana and will represent nearly 1 million Hoosier mothers in New York City, May 3 to 6.

On the public relations staff of the Indianapolis News for the past 14 years, Mrs. Moore has compiled a distinguished career in teaching, journalism, and public relations.

Mrs. Moore is also noted for her contribution in the fields of community service, writing, and education.

All Hoosiers are proud of the achievements of this fine lady, and extend sincere congratulations upon the occasion of her recognition.

In order that all Members of Congress be apprised of Mrs. Moore's achievements, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following story from the March 16, 1965, edition of the Indianapolis News in the RECORD:

MARGARET MOORE IS "MOTHER OF YEAR"

Margaret Moore, 5610 Skyridge Drive, has been named "Indiana Mother of the Year" for 1965.

She is coordinator of the anticrime crusade, sponsored by the News, which has won seven national and five local awards. She has been on the public relations staff of the News for 14 years.

At a meeting of the American Mothers Association in New York City, May 3 to 6, Mrs. Moore will represent nearly 1 million Hoosier mothers.

She has two daughters, both Indiana University graduates and former teachers. Mrs. David E. Long is wife of the dean of students at MacMurray College, Jacksonville, Ill., and Mrs. M. Stanton Evans is wife of the editor of the News.

According to Irene Gerard, chairman of the "Indiana Mother of the Year" selection, Mrs. Moore was cited for her work in community service, writing, education and as coordinator of the anticrime crusade in which 50,000 women participated.

Mrs. Moore attended the University of Michigan and was graduated from the school of journalism at Louisiana State University. She and her husband, the late Everett L. Moore, were publishers of the Mooresville Times. Mrs. Moore covered the John Dillinger story in his hometown for the Indianapolis Star, North American Newspaper Alliance, news services, national magazines and London newspapers.

In the educational field, Mrs. Moore has taught at Franklin College, Indiana University's Indianapolis campus, and North Central High School evening division.

While at Franklin, she founded Alpha Omega Chapter of Theta Sigma Phi, national professional fraternity for women in journalism. She served 6 years as national secretary of Theta Sigma Phi. In 1948 she was the first recipient of the Frances Wright award for distinguished service in journalism.

Active in many organizations, Mrs. Moore is on the board of directors of Concord Center Association, United Cerebral Palsy of Central Indiana, the Indiana Society for the Prevention of Blindness and Settlements

Camping, Inc. She is a past president of the Woman's Press Club of Indiana and of the Indiana University Delta Gamma Sorority Mothers Club.

Liquidation Ahead for 2.4 Million Farmers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. News & World Report, which is one of the Nation's leading news magazines, carried a frightening article on the farm situation in its March 22, 1965, issue. Because South Dakota and all rural America is so deeply concerned with the future of agriculture I feel this article should have wide circulation and careful consideration. The article follows:

LIQUIDATION AHEAD FOR 2.4 MILLION FARMERS?

(NOTE.—Too many farmers? That's what President Johnson says, and one of his top aids has spelled out just what should be done about the surplus. L.B.J.'s plan would remake U.S. agriculture, and it has put Democrats in Congress on the spot.)

The No. 1 U.S. farm problem: how to liquidate some 2.4 million American farmers.

In 20 past years, even with all the Government help for agriculture, there has been liquidation of 2.6 million farmers—that is, these farmers have left the land.

But the exodus from farms, it appears, is only half completed at this point.

The White House takes the view that only 1 million efficient farmers could produce all U.S. farm needs. Today, there are 3.4 million farmers. Thus, according to the White House, there are 2.4 million unneeded farmers.

President Johnson and his Budget Director, Kermit Gordon, both have spelled out the administration's goal in dealing with farm problems.

Said Mr. Johnson in his budget message to Congress on January 25:

"In view of the market outlook for farm commodities at home and abroad, farming alone cannot be expected to provide a decent living in the future for more than about 1 million farm families, even with continued Government assistance. Many low-income farm families will have to find other ways of earning a living, or other sources of income to supplement * * * farm earnings."

PAINFUL TRANSITION

Earlier, Mr. Gordon had said that the top 1 million farmers in America "could produce all of the Nation's farm needs, including our large commercial exports."

Mr. Gordon, writing in the January 9 issue of Saturday Review, outlined this future for the remaining 2.4 million: "They require assistance in the painful transition to nonfarm jobs, to which most of them or their children will certainly have to move."

Less aid should go to the million top farmers, said Mr. Gordon, and more to the 2.4 million lower income farmers to help them move to other jobs.

Such talk from the White House jolted farming interests from Washington to the grassroots. The kind of cut indicated would do away with two out of three farmers.

In Congress, where a big battle over renewing price-support programs for major farm crops is soon to begin, Democratic farm leaders say the White House has put them on the spot.

The Democrats are recalling that the mere hint that a reduction in the number of farmers was needed lay at the bottom of many of the troubles of Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture in the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. Benson had said that it was inevitable that many farmers would have to leave the land. Republican Congressmen now are pointing out, however, that Mr. Benson had never advocated uprooting two out of three farmers.

BIG PRODUCERS ONLY?

One Democratic farm leader, speaking out against the White House proposals, asked what would happen if U.S. farm production became concentrated in the hands of relatively few farmers. "Would the American public then be at the mercy of a few giant producers who would control their very sustenance?" Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, asked in the House.

"Or," added Mr. COOLEY, "would the American people take it upon themselves to regulate food production * * * as they regulate any other public utility controlling the Nation's lifeline?"

EFFECT ON FOOD PRICES

Many Congressmen are asking how food prices would be affected if farmers were able to organize successfully into commodity groups to control output and marketing.

Official figures show this: If farmers—in the past decade—had been able to keep their prices rising at the same rate as the prices of other wholesale commodities, housewives now would have to spend an additional $4 billion a year for food. And, says an official of the Agriculture Department, "that * * * would be $4 billion that now is going for cars and clothes and homes and furnishings and appliances."

WHO GETS HURT

The White House suggestion that only 1 million farmers are needed is bringing "hundreds of letters" from complaining voters, according to farm State Congressmen. They report that many of the letters come from smalltown businessmen who see a grim future if nearly 2½ million farmers are "liquidated."

The rural businessmen say that grocery stores, clothing stores, furniture stores, automobile agencies, and other businesses would be wiped out by the thousands. They warn, too, that the small towns would wither.

Said a rural banker: "Every time we lose 10 or 12 farmers from our community, we lose the people who would spend the income to sustain 1 average-sized, smalltown business—a matter of roughly $100,000."

Farm experts say that the liquidation of 2.4 million farms would remake the face of U.S. agriculture in this way:

The South: This area of the United States would be hardest hit by the mass exodus from the land. In the Southern States are hundreds of thousands of small farms raising cotton, tobacco, peanuts, chickens, or a few milk cows. All told, an estimated 1,180,000 farms in the South—79 percent of those now in business—would have to go.

The Midwest: This region, which includes the Corn Belt and much of the Wheat Belt, would lose 65 percent of its farmers, or 860,000. Farm economists say that most of those liquidated probably would be in poorer farming areas, such as the hills of southern Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and the cutover land of northern Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

The Northeast: From Maine to Maryland, 150,000 farmers, or 2 out of 3, would have to leave the land. Many of those eliminated would be small dairy, chicken, and fruit farmers.

The West: These States would lose 210,000—or 66 percent of the region's farms and ranches. In the range country, where it takes extensive landholdings to support even a small herd of cattle or sheep, many ranches with as much as 2,000 to 3,000 acres probably would be eliminated.

Department of Agriculture economists say that Budget Director Gordon overlooked some basic facts when he said that 2.4 million farmers would have to go to nonfarm jobs if only 1 million were to produce all of U.S. farm needs. Statistics show that about half of the lower-income farmers actually are retired now, or farm on the side and earn most of their living in town.

Still, that would leave 1.2 million full-time farmers to be liquidated under the White House proposal.

Heart Award to Miss Chloe Gifford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the February 17, 1965, issue of the Evening Star regarding the presentation, by Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, of the Distinguished Volunteer Service Award of the American Heart Association to Miss Chloe Gifford, of Lexington, Ky. Miss Gifford, a former president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, is director of special activities at the University of Kentucky, in Lexington, and one of Kentucky's most distinguished citizens.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST LADY TURNS OVER HEART AWARD TO MISS GIFFORD

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson yesterday received the first distinguished Volunteer Service Award of the American Heart Association. She promptly gave it away.

The First Lady passed on the award to Miss Chloe Gifford, director of special activities at the University of Kentucky, at Lexington, and a former president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

The relay ceremony was held in the White House movie theater.

SECOND YEAR

Mrs. Johnson in serving her second year as national honorary heart Sunday chairman for the 1965 heart fund campaign. The award she received yesterday was conceived originally as a tribute to her in recognition of her interest and service in the heart campaign.

But Mrs. Johnson told the Heart Association she would like to reconfer it on the person the organization regards as the outstanding heart volunteer in the country.

Miss Gifford was the unanimous choice. And Mrs. Johnson, in a speech, called her the ideal volunteer who is willing to tackle the biggest or smallest job, from organizing a campaign to ringing doorbells in person.

"The heartbeat of her service," Mrs. Johnson said "starts in Lexington, Ky., but it is felt around the world."

The First Lady said it is still the individual, the mind and heart of each person, which can spell success or failure in any undertaking.

"Chloe Gifford is such an individual," she said. "Her determined devotion and her infectious enthusiasm has tallied up a long list of hours and deeds to this cause."

Miss Gifford has put in 15 years of heart fund volunteer activity. She is a member of the association's national board.

MEDALLION AND PLAQUE

The award is a bronze medallion portraying a doctor and a family symbolically receiving the benefits of medical research and development. It is accompanied by a plaque noting that the award was conferred on Mrs. Johnson and presented by her to Miss Gifford.

The medallion and plaque are surrounded by red velvet and enclosed in a red leather case.

In accepting her honor, Miss Gifford said she was symbolic of all 2 million volunteers and that a little bit of the award belonged to each of them.

"I hope that after this there'll be about 4 million," she said.

Nineteen Dollars a Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and constituent, A. F. (Frank) MacGillivray, was kind enough to send me the following article which appeared in the Boston Globe on March 6, 1965.

I wish to go on record as being in favor of correcting the injustices that are being perpetrated upon more than 3 million of our senior citizens. And I commend this article to my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

NINETEEN DOLLARS A WEEK

The average monthly pension under social security, says a congressman, is $76.

That's $19 a week.

The President has declared war on poverty. In this effort everybody professes to be behind him. There is no peace party.

Experts have made surveys, counts, studies and examinations of incomes and costs. They come to the conclusion that somewhere around $4,000 a year is the cutoff line between a fairly decent subsistence level and what must be considered a less than adequate faimly income.

Four thousand a year amounts to a bit less than $77 a week.

Some weeks ago there was an editorial in this space, pointing out the injustice of the rule which prevents a person receiving a social security pension from earning more than $1,200 a year.

Readers who took the trouble to comment reported many cases of hardship related to the law.

For example, take the couple with a house on which the annual tax bill is $500, and a pension which barely cover the cost of groceries.

Or the man of 67 with a pension of $100 a month, or less than $25 a week. He could have a parttime job at $40 a week, but if he took it he would forefeit his pension, for which he has already paid and not be much better off.

This provision of the law, forbidding older persons to work to their capacity, was described recently by a Congressman as "a real injustice."

Here we have an unreasonable situation in which an administration dedicated to the abolition of poverty maintains a set of rules forbidding people, older ones at that, to have the best incomes possible.

Here is also the zany provision which limits this prohibition to the ages between 65 and 72. After 72, when presumably the earning capacity is getting to be less than it was earlier, the restrictions are removed. What are those in the 7 dismal years in between? Juvenile delinquents?

This is not to knock social security. It is one of the best and most practical institutions for human welfare in the country. The complaint here is that this one quirk in the system hurts many persons, and that it should be changed.

Fortunately, sentiment for such change is growing.

In the present Congress dozens of bills have been introduced to this end. Some call for raising the earned income exemption to $1,800, some to $2,400 or $3,600, and some call for wiping it out entirely. These bills are now in the congressional mill, and it is to be hoped that from all of them will come some measure to alleviate the situation.

Here, surely, is an opportunity for New England Senators and Representatives to assume leadership in a good cause.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Iowa Health Care Survey Shows Strong Support for Principles of Eldercare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a survey conducted by the firm of Batten, Hudson & Swab, Inc., Des Moines, Iowa, has shown that a large majority of the people of Iowa, regardless of age, income, or political affiliation, oppose the principles of the Johnson administration's medicare plan and favor the principles of the eldercare bill, of which I am a cosponsor.

I commend the survey results to the attention of my colleagues:

BATTEN, HUDSON & SWAB, INC.,
March 17, 1965.

IOWA MEDICAL SOCIETY,
Des Moines, Iowa.

GENTLEMEN: A summary of the Iowa health care survey conducted by our firm accompanies this letter. The purpose of this survey was twofold:

1. To determine the degree of understanding of the people of Iowa concerning the proposed Fderal plan (medicare) for providing health care for people over 65 years of age and

2. To determine what features the people of Iowa want in a health care plan for the aged.

A total of 608 adults were interviewed in 79 different localities within 36 counties of the State of Iowa. The interviews were completed between March 3 and 8, 1965, by experienced and competent interviewers.

The sample was a multistage area probability sample of all adults (persons 21 years of age or older) in the State of Iowa, that were heads of households or spouses of heads of households. Not included in the study are adults living in institutions, transients, permanent hotel or motel residents, rest home occupants, or adults living in households without telephones.

The principle characteristic of this sample is:

1. Each adult (with exceptions noted above) had an equal chance of being selected as a respondent; and

2. Selection of the respondents was at random chance and not left to the whim or convenience of the interviewer.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. SWAB,
Vice President.

SUMMARY OF IOWA HEALTH CARE SURVEY CONDUCTED BY THE FIRM OF BATTEN, HUDSON & SWAB, INC.

In a statewide survey conducted by our firm it was significantly shown that the features and principles of a Government health care program preferred by the people of Iowa are not to be found in the administration's medicare program.

The respondence in contrast favored the major principles of eldercare—local administration, confining public assistance to people with low or moderate incomes who need help, providing most of the help they need and financing it through general taxes instead of increased social security payroll taxes.

During the interview without identifying the question either with medicare or eldercare the following direct comparisons were made between the essential parts of the two proposals.

1. Quantity of benefits: 80 percent of all Iowans interviewed preferred a plan that provides most health care benefits for those who cannot afford them (eldercare); 18 percent prefer a plan that provides some health care benefits for everyone (medicare).

2. Degree of participation: 77 percent of all Iowans interviewed preferred a plan that provides help to all people over 65 who cannot afford health care services (eldercare); 20 percent prefer a plan which provides health care benefits to all people over 65 (medicare).

3. Financial need: 78 percent prefer a plan that gives health care services only to persons with moderate or low incomes (eldercare); 19 percent prefer a plan that gives health services to persons of all income levels (medicare).

4. Income disclosure: 64 percent prefer a plan that would require a person to sign a simple statement of income (eldercare); 33 percent prefer a plan that would not require any signed statement of income (medicare).

5. Choice of facilities: 80 percent prefer a plan that allows people over 65 to enter the hospital or nursing home they choose (eldercare); 16 percent prefer a plan that allows people over 65 services only in hospitals which have contracts with the Federal Government (medicare).

6. Source of taxes: 56 percent prefer a plan paid from a general tax such as income or sales taxes (eldercare); 35 percent prefer a plan paid for by a special additional tax similar to social security (medicare).

7. Administration: 73 percent prefer a health care plan financed by both Federal and State funds and run by the State (eldercare); 20 percent prefer a health care plan financed and run entirely by the Federal Government (medicare).

After the preceding information was obtained, respondents were asked a series of questions about the Government-sponsored health care program—medicare.

These responses developed a second important finding of the survey; namely, that a high percentage of Iowans are misinformed about the provisions in medicare. For example, 58 percent thought medicare would provide for most of the expenses of major illnesses, including doctors' fees, hospital bills, and drugs. Of course, this is not true.

Also there was substantial misunderstanding about other major parts of medicare such as:

1. 45 percent thought erroneously that low wage earners would not pay as much tax as those with high income.

2. 46 percent thought erroneously that people with high incomes would not be entitled to help.

3. 56 percent thought erroneously that a person under medicare would be required to show that he has a financial need.

CONCLUSION

Based on this scientific sample we are able to conclude that a large majority of the people of Iowa, regardless of age, income, political affiliation or labor union association, oppose the principles of medicare and favor the principles of eldercare.

Save Your Vision Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the American Optometric Association recently gave a Distinguished Service Award to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States.

At the presentation, remarks were made by leaders in this movement to save your vision. Under unanimous consent I place their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The remarks are as follows:

SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK

REMARKS OF DR. ROBERT KRASKIN

This is Save Your Vision Week, a period proclaimed and set aside by the President of the United States and the American Optometric Association to call the public's attention to the importance of proper vision care.

Save Your Vision Week has been sponsored annually by the American Optometric Association since 1927. In 1963, the U.S. Congress, through the efforts of then Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and 20 cosponsors in the Senate and Representative BYRON G. ROGERS and 21 other sponsors in the House, authorized the President to annually proclaim the first week in March of each year as Save Your Vision Week.

On February 25, President Lyndon B. Johnson proclaimed the week beginning March 7 as Save Your Vision Week. The President in his official proclamation called upon the Nation to participate in public activities and programs to improve and protect the vision of the American people.

As a practicing optometrist and as an American I can think of no more meaningful answer to the President's challenge than helping our children and youth to have adequate vision. Our actions today will put real meaning behind this objective.

The President stressed in his proclamation the importance of vision not only for the welfare of individual citizens but also to that of the Nation. Our goal will be achieved only if enough people are aware of the need for proper vision care.

As major reasons for focusing public attention to the need for good vision, the President cited the fact that "blindness or a serious visual loss is often preventable through early eye examinations of preschool age and school age children and through the early detection of visual deficiencies among the chronically ill and aging."

In addition, the President stated that good vision will be achieved "only if enough people are aware of the need for proper vision care and take advantage of all means available to them to conserve their sight."

The theme for Save Your Vision Week this year, "It's a Big World—With a Lot To See and Do," introduced the important message: "Get More Out of Life With Good Vision." The purpose of our observance this year is to increase public understanding for the meaning and importance of the need for good vision in modern space age living which demands maximum visual performance; stressing the urgent need of having a professional vision examination once a year; and the recognition of the contributions of optometry as a source of continuing services in preventative and corrective eye care on behalf of the vision welfare of the American public.

We are joining today with thousands of communities all over America in the observation of "Save Your Vision Week."

REMARKS OF HAYVIS WOOLF, O.D., CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES OF THE AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION

The American Optometric Association has, in the past week, officially notified the Office of Economic Opportunity of the offering of the services of the optometric profession to assist in fulfilling the provisions of Title I, Part A: Job Corps of Public Law 88–452 of the 88th Congress.

In the declaration of the Economic Opportunity Act, it goes on to say that "although the economic well being and prosperity of the United States have progressed to a level surpassing any, achieved in world history, poverty continues to be the lot of a substantial number of our people." The declaration further states that "to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty, everyone must have the opportunity to work, live in decency and dignity."

Optometrists and optometry is willing and is possessive of the resources to assist in achieving the objectives of this declaration of the Economic Opportunity Act, especially as concerns the participants of the Job Corps.

If these young people aged 16 to 21 are to succeed in any job, they should be healthy in every respect. They must be able to concentrate and comprehend the tasks they are required to persue and undertake.

It is well known that 70 percent of the learning process is visual, therefore the visual level of the student must be the highest possible from kindergarten on through the formative educational years.

The Job Corps will consist of a variety of programs of which three will be outstanding.

The first of these will be the organization of conservation centers that will serve between 100 and 200 men. The conservation centers will be entirely Government operated and will be located in areas where conservation of the land will be carried on away from cities.

A second type of center will be known as an Urban Center consisting of approximately 2,500 men and will be operated by contracted private concerns located in cities or metropolitan areas.

A third type center, somewhere in between the above two, will be organized to serve about 250 women of the Job Corps. It is anticipated that there will be about 20 centers to serve women for many training phases.

It is felt that the many and varied needs of youth is far greater with those eligible for the Job Corps then the average American youngster. To the profession of Optometry, past experience proves that economically depressed and underprivileged school dropouts have a relatively higher degree of uncorrected refractive errors as compared with average children of the same age group.

In the East Los Angeles Youth Opportunities Center, it has been found that as high as 25 percent of the young people served required visual corrections immediately and were classified as emergency visual problems.

A great many of the young people who enroll in the Job Corps program are school dropouts. Statistics show, many of these educationally deprived youngsters have had visual defects of many years standing. These visual defects, by not being corrected, are often the cause of lack of interest and comprehension in many cases, creating a ready reason for leaving school. If a young person cannot see properly, he is not able to keep up with his classmates. A simple school eye test is not enough for testing a young person's vision. If he is to meet the highly competitive conditions required by our complex society, there is a need for a much more comprehensive vision examination and care by vision specialists.

Optometry has offered its services to the Job Corps for complete testing procedures, professional visual screening, and care of enrollees. Not only is this offer made in the greater District of Columbia area but throughout the 50 States of our Nation.

Optometrists are willing to help in making these young people able to take their place in our society and to be useful and productive citizens in our communities.

REMARKS OF MRS. FLORENCE HICKS, PROJECT NURSE, NEIGHBORHOOD HEALTH AID PROGRAM OF THE HEALTH AND WELFARE COUNCIL OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA

The Health and Welfare Council has long been known and respected as the voluntary planning and coordinating body of health and social service in the Washington metropolitan area. In helping the communities to plan for these services, the Council sponsors various demonstration projects aimed at improving the quality and quantity of services. The Neighborhood Health Aid program of the Neighborhood Service project is such an example. The objectives of the Neighborhood Health Aid program are:

1. To increase the utilization of existing health facilities and services.

2. To channel simple health information to those persons most in need and most often missed by traditional methods.

Essentially, the Health Aid program works with low-income, culturally deprived families who are frequently referred to as the hard to reach. The area we serve contains 101,000 poulation and is known as the Capitol Hill area. Approximately 6,000 of our clients are public housing residents. We were quite forunate that office space was provided in the Aruthur Capper dwellings by the National Capital Housing Authority and we have been operating for a period of 18 months with the support of a U.S. Public Health Service grant administered by the Council.

Eye care for all age groups has been observed as an urgent need among the people we serve. In particular, the need is quite great among elementary school children.

As part of the school health program, yearly eye screening is done for all elementary school children. First the teacher does the screening, and all failures are rescreened by the Public Health nurse from the District of Columbia Department of Public Health. At the Van Ness Elementary School the Health Aid assists the Public Health nurse in the rescreening of failures. At this particular school alone there were 175 children found to have abnormal vision who had not had eye care. Fifty-five of these have severe eye problems or vision of 20/50 or less. Three of these had vision of 20/200 or, in other words, are legally blind. So, one can readily see that many of our elementary school children are functioning on a very low level. If you apply these results to the 9 other elementary schools in the area, one could estimate that there are approximately 1,500 children in the Capitol Hill area who need eye examinations and approximately 600 children who have unattended, serious eye handicaps.

So, you see, we were very much delighted when the optometrists from the American Optometric Association approached us in regard to a joint effort to provide eye care services for the needy.

National Football Clinic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, today in Atlantic City's Convention Hall, the 18th annual National Football Clinic is convening, with hundreds of collegiate, prep school and high school coaches from all over the United States attending.

The National Football Clinic was inaugurated in 1948 by Dr. Harry G. Scott, a Coatesville, Pa., dentist then serving as a director of his local school board, to offer football coaches an opportunity to keep up to date with the progress of the game and with the improving techniques of conditioning and safety. Another of its original goals was to foster mutual help among coaches in solving problems involved in the worthy leadership of young people.

The first of Dr. Scott's coaching schools met in a high school gymnasium in Coatesville during a midwinter vacation, attended by 47 coaches. Through 1951, meeting in that gymnasium, the number of attendees grew to such an extent that when, in 1952, the city of Atlantic City extended to Dr. Scott an invitation to move his clinic there, the offer was accepted.

Since 1952, Atlantic City has been the site of the annual clinic sessions, and the number of coaches attending has now passed 1,000 with professional and Armed Forces football mentors joining the school and college coaches.

It is altogether fitting that the National Football Clinic holds forth in Atlantic City's Convention Hall—the same auditorium in which the 1964 Democratic National Convention was held. Convention Hall was the first building in the United States which could accommodate a regulation gridiron indoors. Its construction permits 12,000 spectators to watch games without obstructions of any kind.

Last December, the Liberty Bowl game, the first post-season bowl game ever played indoors, was contested on the Hall's grassy indoor gridiron and was watched by additional millions over a nationwide television network. Indeed, football has been played under its roof since 1934, when Washington and Jefferson and Lafayette College teams participated in the first indoor collegiate football game in history. More than a few of the coaches who have attended and lectured at clinic sessions in the hall have led teams in games played there.

Coaches from 30 States, including Hawaii, and Canada, and Mexico have been among "students" at the 4-day coaching school in recent years. The National Football Clinic is the largest 4-day football clinic held anywhere, and the results it has achieved in recent years have far surpassed the original purpose of improving football techniques.

With President Johnson giving increased attention to the physical fitness of our youth, it has been found that inspiring our youngsters to pursue physical fitness is a basic necessity of such a program. The clinic has consistently included on its faculty the outstanding football coaches in the Nation, and these men have inspired coaches attending the clinic to such a degree that it has been demonstrated that their subsequent attempts to inspire their own students have been greatly enhanced.

Among the lecturers at the 18th annual clinic are Notre Dame's Ara Parseghian, Ohio State's W. W. "Woody" Hayes, Yale's John Pont, the University of Florida's Ray Graves, University of Washington's Jim Owens, Arkansas' Frank Broyles, Nebraska's Robert S. Devaney, Delaware's David M. Nelson, Banquet Speaker Herbert "Fritz" Crisler, Michigan athletic director and former coach, and Conditioning Experts Dean Miller, of San Jose State College, who oversees conditioning of America's astronauts, and Princeton's trainer, Edward Zanfrini. For demonstration purposes, uniformed players from the University of Delaware, Temple University and Atlantic City High School football squads will aid in clinic lectures.

But, in addition to the football know-how the coaches attending this year's 4-day clinic will receive, the youth of our Nation will benefit from the attention which will again be paid the safety aspects of this body-contact sport. And perhaps most important, some 1,000 new physical fitness missionaries will return to their schools, colleges, and service teams eager and equipped to inspire American youngsters to further improvement of their bodies.

Making in Order the Consideration of H.R. 4527, Authorization of Funds for the U.S. Coast Guard

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the minority, the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4527 to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

The resolution, as indicated by the Clerk's reading, provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rather simple bill. It speaks for itself. It authorizes the construction over a period of time of needed vessels in this important department of our Government, the Coast Guard, which renders such valiant and substantial service to the protection of lives and property.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a good bill. I hope the resolution and the bill will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Secretary of the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of considerable pride to the State of Virginia and particularly to the people of Roanoke in Virginia's Sixth Congressional District that one of our own has been selected by the President to be Secretary of the Treasury.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote herewith the contents of an article which appeared in the Roanoke Times and which gives a capsule biography with an interesting human touch:

ROANOKE BOY A GOOD MAN

Henry Hamill Fowler is a man who President Johnson chose Thursday to be Secretary of the Treasury.

He used to be a boy who rode his bicycle down Roanoke Patterson Avenue SW., every morning to West End School.

He used to be a youth who was president of almost every organization at Jefferson High School and graduated with the school's first class in 1925. "Oh, Henry!" they wrote under his yearbook photo 40 years ago.

He used to be a young man who attended Roanoke College and graduated in 1929. Then he went to Yale to become a lawyer and got his law degree in 1932 and a graduate degree in 1933.

Then he moved to Washington and began a career in Government under President Roosevelt.

Henry Fowler's high school buddies used to say he would become a Methodist preacher or President of the United States.

"He didn't make President, but he's smart enough to help them out over there in Washington.

"He was an outstanding student, endowed with an excellent mind, steadfast character and always cooperative and interested in doing things well," said a Roanoke College professor who knew him as a student.

Fowler is a member of the Shenandoah Club of Roanoke and a member of the board of trustees of Roanoke College, a position that brings him back to Roanoke often.

He used to live at 1327 Patterson Avenue, SW. His mother, Mrs. Bertha Fowler, lived there until she died 6 years ago. His aunt, Mrs. Edith Bell, lives at 1115 Patterson Avenue.

Thursday President Johnson called Fowler "a good friend, a wise and trusted counselor and said Fowler should be the next Secretary of Treasury.

Fowler, 56, a quiet, soft-spoken man dressed in a dark blue suit, sat a few feet away as the President spoke. He was smiling.

When Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, was asked what he thinks of Fowler's appointment to the Treasury post, he said:

"I am very much in favor of it. He's a good man."

Expansion Cramps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the March 9 issue of the Wall Street Journal, entitled "Expansion Cramps," showed how the capital spending boom is incurring costly delays in deliveries of new machinery and completion of construction work and thus leading to a build-up of inflationary pressures. Suppliers are unable to meet the rising demand for capital goods, forcing some companies into continued and costly reliance on existing plants and machines, while waiting for new ones.

At the same time increased demand for capital goods is causing delays, it is also raising its costs. Companies must pay extra for overtime, for rush deliveries, and for other steps to speed up programs. Long-depressed prices of industrial equipment are moving up fast in many areas.

Arnold M. Soloway, a Cambridge, Mass. economist, has warned that bottleneck inflation, such as we are beginning to experience, can become a serious danger when a tight capital goods market pushes up prices and pay of engineers and construction workers.

Under unanimous consent, I include the Journal article in the RECORD at this point:

EXPANSION CRAMPS: MANY FACTORY-BUILDING, MODERNIZING PROGRAMS RUN INTO COSTLY DELAYS—LATE MACHINERY SHIPMENTS, SKILLED WORKER SHORTAGE HIT STEEL, CHEMICAL FIRMS—PROLONGING THE BOOM, TOO?

(By Albert R. Karr)

PITTSBURGH.—The U.S. capital-spending boom is beginning to strain industry's capacity for handling factory-building and modernization projects.

Companies are being forced to wait far longer than expected for new machinery, and for completion of construction work, because of an order jam up on the books of their suppliers, a growing shortage of skilled workers, and delivery delays on some key materials. This is beginning to stretch out expansion programs at a time when such key industries as paper, chemicals, steel, and railroads are pressing to boost capacity to keep up with rising demand.

Equally important, the trend is sharply boosting the cost of new plants and equipment. Companies are paying extra for overtime, for rush deliveries, and for other steps to speed up programs. Long depressed prices of industrial equipment are moving up fast in many lines, reflecting the hot demand. And project delays are forcing some companies into costly attempts to squeeze more production out of existing plants and machinery while waiting for new ones.

A BLESSING IN DISGUISE?

Frustrating as these trends are to the companies involved, they could, in one way, be good for the national economy. As projects are delayed and the cost of finishing them mounts, many companies are raising their capital spending budgets for future months to get them completed. So, say many executives, national spending for new plant and equipment will run higher than expected late this year and perhaps into 1966. Since capital outlays have been a major prop under the country's record 4-year peacetime business advance, such a step-up in spending could well help avert the second-half slowdown in the economy that some economists have feared.

At Koppers Co., a Pittsburgh engineering, construction, and manufacturing concern, for instance, 1964 capital spending of $15 million fell below forecasts, "largely due to delays in the delivery of major pieces of equipment for current expansion programs." But as these programs are finished, says Koppers, 1965 spending will climb significantly over 1964.

The steel industry in 1964 spent $1.6 billion on new plant and equipment, down from the $1.8 billion that had been forecast, says the American Iron & Steel Institute, apparently reflecting mill-building delays. But 1965 spending, the AISI predicts, will leap to a record $1.9 billion.

GOVERNMENT PROJECTIONS

Nationwide, the Government last December estimated U.S. industry's capital spending in the fourth quarter of 1964 would hit an annual rate of $46.7 billion, up from an earlier forecast of less than $46.2 billion. One reason: Some paper, petroleum, and chemical companies expected to finish in the fourth quarter expansion projects they originally planned to complete in the third quarter, but didn't.

The same Government report estimated capital spending in the first half of 1965 would rise to an annual rate of $48.2 billion, an 8-percent increase over the record full-year 1964 figure. A new estimate is due out this week, and indications are it will show a still greater increase in spending plans. In a speech last month, Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, said the Government now expects for all 1965 "a further increase of 10 to 12 percent over 1964 in the building of new plants and the purchase of new business equipment," and added "we think that the second half should sustain that growth of capital investment."

But the expansion delays could have bad effects, too, economists warn. Some fear that companies expecting trouble will rush to get all possible projects started now, and build overcapacity that could become a burden in a future downturn—especially if delayed projects finally come "on stream" just as demand is starting to falter. This happened when the 1955–57 boom gave way to the 1957–58 recession, and it helped make that downturn the worst in the United States since World War II.

Arnold M. Soloway, a Cambridge, Mass., economist, further cautions that "bottleneck" inflation becomes a serious danger when a tight capital goods market pushes up prices and the pay of engineers and construction workers. Government measures to fight such an inflation, he adds, can easily set off a downturn in the economy.

BAD TO WORSE

So far, the current problems don't appear to have reached quite that proportion. Several companies say they are only beginning to get serious—though these concerns fully expect they will grow steadily worse. But at other companies, the delays already are quite severe.

Monsanto Co., St. Louis chemical maker, says a noticeable stretchout on equipment delivery times will delay by about 3 months expansion of Monsanto's output of one type of synthetic fiber. The production increase had been scheduled for early in this year's third quarter, but won't come until early in the fourth quarter, says A. W. Lucas, vice president. But "the market needs is there now," he complains.

Armco Steel Corp. is experiencing equipment delivery delays of up to 4 or 5 months, says D. E. Reichelderfer, executive vice president. "With the increased demand on mill builders and other capital goods producers, there may be more of this kind of problem in the future," he adds.

Railroads, already plagued by a persistent freight-car shortage, say delays are getting worse as they deluge car builders with new orders. The Pennsylvania Railroad, which recently announced a major car-buying program, says orders now being placed for freight cars will take 3 months longer to fill than they would have a year ago. This year 85 percent of the Pennsy's capital outlays will go to expand freight-hauling capacity, and only 15 percent to repair existing equipment, against a 57–43 percent expansion-repair ratio 2 years ago.

In some cases, such delays are not only holding up expansion, but cutting into current production. Late equipment deliveries to suppliers of American Motors Corp.—the only auto maker to show a decline in sales this year—caused an engine shortage and lost production of Ramblers at the start of the 1965 model run, says one official. Most equipment deliveries still are taking 10 to 20 percent longer than promised, he adds.

Inland Steel Co. was supposed to begin operating last December a new rolling mill that will increase its capacity to make hot-rolled sheet by 70 percent, but a shortage of skilled workers will delay completion of the mill until late this month or early April. Meanwhile, since Inland had booked first-quarter orders on the assumption that the new mill would be operating, it is falling behind on its own delivery promises for hot-rolled sheet and related products.

COMES THE VICIOUS CIRCLE

There are signs of a vicious circle developing, too. As delays in steel mill expansion cause the mills to fall behind on steel shipments, the delays in getting steel needed for construction further hinder plant builders. A big factory building firm says late deliveries of steel plates are delaying erection of some new plants.

This construction firm also is being hurt by delayed arrivals of such other things as welding wire, pumps, compressors, motors and generators. An official of General Electric Co. adds that a growing copper shortage has pushed delivery times on that metal to 18 to 24 weeks from receipt of the order, up from 9 to 14 weeks on previous orders.

To break out of the vicious circle, companies are trying various strategies—all expensive. Overtime, usually avoided on factory-building projects because construction laborers typically get around $5 an hour straight-time pay, and 50 or 100 percent more for extra hours, is becoming increasingly common. The added cost this tacks on to building expenses usually is passed on to the buyer of the new facility.

PAYMENT FOR FAST DELIVERY

One steel maker is paying nearly $1 million in field and shop overtime on top of the $20 million basic cost of a major installation, to get the project finished in its originally scheduled 15 months, a supplier says. Otherwise, the supplier states, the installation would take an extra 2 to 3 months.

Many customers of GE's switchgear department are paying extra for rush deliveries of electrical equipment that otherwise would not be delivered until 9 to 30 weeks after order, says Howard D. Kurt, marketing manager. A year ago, the switchgear department was promising regular deliveries 8 to 24 weeks after order.

"All our customers are placing a premium on getting their new facilities into operation fast; this past 9 months we've had one request for early shipment a week," says Mr. Kurt. Such pleas, which usually involve payment by the customer for special handling, overtime by GE employees, or air freight, seldom occurred a year ago, he says. Among customers who have paid extra to GE for rush delivery are General Motors Corp., U.S. Steel Corp., Owens-Illinois Glass Co. and Corning Glass Works, he says.

Even without extra payments by customers for quick delivery, say Mr. Kurt, vigorous demand pulled average 1964 prices for GE's

electrical switching and power conversion equipment 10 to 12 percent ahead of 1963. By the end of this month, he adds, "we might be pretty close to the 1960 level" of prices. Switchgear prices dropped sharply between 1960 and 1963.

OTHER PRICE BOOSTS

Prices of many other types of equipment ordered for new or expanded factories are shooting up during the current delivery squeeze, too. One auto maker says prices of stamping presses that turn out auto body parts have risen as much as 10 percent in the past year.

A machine tool builder adds that prices on half his industry's products have risen 4 to 7 percent just since January 1, on top of similar increases a year before. Heavy orders and a critical shortage of skilled workers have caused particularly long waits for deliveries of machine tools. New Britain Machine Tool Co., New Britain, Conn., is delivering machine tools 10 or more months after booking the orders, against a 4- or 5-month leadtime a year ago.

While waiting for new plants or machinery, many companies are taking unusual—and costly—steps to wring the last drop of production from the facilities they have now. Wheeling Steel Corp., like Inland, expected to have a new mill to roll sheet steel finished late last year, but the inability of contractors to find skilled help first caused the completion date to be postponed until May. Now, Wheeling says the mill won't be finished until September 1.

Meanwhile, Wheeling is shipping about 10,000 tons of steel slabs a month to other mills, which roll it into hot-rolled sheet and ship it back to Wheeling for further processing into finished mill products. "Most of your profit is used up" by the expense of such "conversion deals," a Wheeling official grumbles.

Capital goods suppliers, not surprisingly, are becoming increasingly concerned about the effects of their growing inability to provide speedy delivery of machinery, and many are launching their own expansion programs. "I strongly expect that the whole heavy goods industry will shortly require a full-scale facility expansion," says one executive. However, by increasing the demand for construction steel, skilled construction labor, and other things, such expansion could further intensify the squeeze on plant-building projects, giving the vicious circle another turn.

Robbing the Young To Pay the Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Frank G. Dickinson, professor of economics at Northern Illinois University, De Kalb, Ill., has been greatly and justly concerned for some time over the almost unbearable burden being placed on our young people through increased social security taxes.

I share Dr. Dickinson's concern—and feel that this matter should be given particular attention as we consider the administration's proposal to place medicare for the aged under social security. I invite the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial appearing to the March issue of Nation's Agriculture:

ROBBING THE YOUNG TO PAY THE OLD

(By Charles B. Shuman, president, American Farm Bureau Federation)

The welfare state has been described as a Robin Hood society—or robbing Peter to pay Paul. Modern-day applications of this socialistic concept are the several devices to transfer the costs of Government programs from this generation to our children and our grandchildren.

The Federal Government deficit is in excess of $300 billion and each year we add from $5 to $10 billion of unpaid bills for later payment. One distinguished economist has described this as an era of big spenders "burying their deficits in the backs of the stupid young." How long will the younger people who are struggling to feed, clothe, and educate their children be willing to pick up the unpaid bills of the older generation? How long before they revolt against this refusal to pay the bills, even during relatively prosperous times?

Perhaps the reason this deception of the young has continued unchallenged is that the average age of the voters has been increasing during the last 30 years. This cycle is turning and a new day is dawning. Our Nation is now growing younger. An individual cannot grow young again, but the tremendous increase in the birth rate is more than offsetting the trend of older people living longer.

There are other ways in which we have been robbing the young to pay the old. Social security was established originally as an old-age insurance plan. Congress has long since abandoned the insurance reserve features and converted the old age and survivors' insurance (OASI) to a direct-payment program financed by current tax receipts. It is presently estimated that more than 90 percent of the social security benefits fall as a direct tax on wage earners and their employers. The combined tax rate is now 7¼ percent and another increase is scheduled for 1966, but the cost of new and enlarged benefits continues to exceed receipts. Social security is a bargain for older workers but those under 25 years of age could probably buy the same protection for a lower cost from a private insurance company.

Now the Congress is debating Medicare, another Federal program that would further increase the tax load of the younger people for the benefit of both the rich and the poor oldsters. Most young people would gladly pick up their share of the tax load required to pay the hospital and medical bills of older people who are in need of assistance. However, this is not the plan. Medicare is designed as the first step to socialized medicine and thus all over 65, regardless of need, are included. It is surely a "foot in the door," since the benefits to be paid are severely limited—not enough to eliminate the need for other assistance from individual savings, welfare, or relatives. But the principle of taxing the young to pay the old is to be firmly established.

It is time for young people to speak out. It is not necessary to rob the young to be fair to older people.

What Does a College Education Cost?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, with an education bill coming before this body in a few days, the information below is especially timely. It deals with a subject of much concern among American parents—and children—that is, the cost of a college education.

Blackburn College of Carlinville, Ill., has a unique work-study program, under which students meet part of college costs by working on campus. Average costs per year at Blackburn come to about $1,400.

Charles O. Gordon, dean of students and registrar at the college, has put together this data and comment:

SCHOLARS AND DOLLARS

Much is said these days about the high cost of attending college. One sees in the advertisements the prospective college freshman with his coat draped over his shoulder, saying, "Dad, can I have $10,000 for college?" Another advertisement, of the Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada, indicates that college costs in the 1970's will total $11,684. Some time ago a faculty member showed me an article from a Chicago newspaper entitled, "The Mortarboard Was Solid Gold." Apparently it was written by a mother who had kept detailed expense records of the cost involved in her son's 4 years at a not very large, private, liberal arts college in the Midwest. His expenditures totaled more than $13,000 and, although she shed a tear as he received his diploma, she felt that she was the only one in the audience who knew that the mortarboard he wore so proudly was solid gold.

About a year ago authorities of Cornell University announced that tuition and fees would be $1,800 a year, and that the cost to a student, counting tuition and fees, room and board, books, and a small personal allowance would be $3,350 for freshmen. The announcement said that costs at the other Ivy League schools would be about the same.

COSTS INCREASING EVERYWHERE

And so it goes: College costs are on the increase all across the country. Opposing factions argue whether students should be charged a tuition large enough to cover the full cost of a college education. To have tuition cover the full costs might be referred to as the Robin Hood approach, because in fact it results in having students who can afford it pay the full cost, plus an amount which provides tuition reduction for students with academic ability but not the ability to pay the high costs. No one, as far as I know, is advocating that the talented student with limited funds should be excluded from a college education.

There are others, such as Dr. Ludlum, president of Blackburn College, and Dr. John D. Millett, until recently president of Miami University in Ohio, who argue that no substantial changes should be made in traditional methods of financing higher education. Dr. Millett questions the wisdom of student borrowing, particularly borrowing by women. In an article published some time ago he wrote: "Indeed, it is not clear that students should be encouraged to think of higher education only as a personal investment from which they should strive to obtain the greatest possible return. It is not clear that we want students channeled into high-salary professions rather than into important public service. It is not clear that we should adopt Russian methods of influencing individual behavior."

COSTS AT BLACKBURN

Obviously, it takes a great many dollars these days to be a scholar. For some time now, many of us have been trying to learn the amount of money a student actually spends at Blackburn. We find that different agencies list different total amounts to represent what they expect will generally be

spent per year by a student at Blackburn. The college scholarship service uses one figure; the Illinois State Scholarship Commission uses another; the Blackburn admissions office suggests another. In reality, I suppose there is no one at the college spending the average amount because we firmly hold to the conviction that we have no average students at Blackburn.

The official charges to students at present are $1,000 for tuition, board, room, and fees. From the forms completed by students applying for scholarship assistance, we have a general idea of the additional amounts spent by students. We hold to the belief that Blackburn students spend less for incidentals than do students in most other colleges. The amounts for board vary a great deal from institution to institution, depending for one thing upon the number of meals served to students each week. We serve 21 meals.

AND INCIDENTAL EXPENSES

At my request, some students kept detailed expense accounts during their trips home at Christmas vacation. Forty-three students returned their expense account sheets. Multiplying the total expenses by four (for the number of round trips generally made during the academic year) we arrived at the average travel expenditure for the year, which came to $109.46. The amount varies a great deal, of course, from individual to individual because of the various distances students live from the college and the modes of transportation they use.

Although there is no average Blackburnian, I shall outline a budget for such a person if there were one. Tuition and fees, $700; room and board, $300; travel, $110; clothing, $75; books and supplies, $60; personal, $40; laundry and cleaning, $35; coffee and cokes, $30; recreation, $30; incidentals, $20. The total, therefore, for all expenses, is $1,400.

Does America Need and Want More Federal Aid to Education?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon be called upon to vote on a mammoth Federal aid to education bill. Cost for the first year will exceed $1 billion, the downpayment. This money would go to public, private, and church-supported schools at all levels, from kindergarten to and through college and postgraduate work.

An analysis of this legislation reveals that while it provides some special type aid for certain areas, it is essentially a general Federal aid to education program, including Federal funds for classroom construction, teacher salaries, and it extends limited aid to nonpublic schools.

Thus, the Congress is again called upon to decide whether there is to be a general Federal aid program. And this decision will include the matter of Federal control. There is admittedly an overtone of federalization throughout the pending bill. There is no doubt but that the grant of so much in benefits to so many areas invites Federal control with respect to how and under what conditions this money is to be spent. This is simply a part of the price the recipients must pay for this new outlay of Federal funds.

In considering this new thrust of Federal activity into local affairs, it would seem appropriate that the Congress think in terms of how much, if any, net gain each State would actually get. Undoubtedly most of the States would lose money in the transaction. That is, the local dollars that are sent to Washington as taxes, there repackaged and sent back as Federal aid inevitably loses up to a third of the original amount in the transaction. All is not gold that glitters.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of local opposition to this proposal. That fact was recently indicated in the district I represent by answers to questions which I submitted to every registered voter in that district. The returns were tremendous, the results have been tabulated, and are listed below as an indicator of the thinking on the grassroots level. The questions and answers with respect to education, follow:

Do you favor Federal aid for teachers' salaries?

	Percent
Yes	25
No	69
Undecided	6

Are you in favor of Federal aid for school construction?

	Percent
Yes	39
No	54
Undecided	7

Do you favor Federal aid for church-supported and other private schools?

	Percent
Yes	11
No	84
Undecided	5

The Death Penalty as a Deterrent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have advocated the abolition of the death penalty in all Federal jurisdictions except under the Uniform Code of Military Justice and except for treason. In the 89th Congress my bill to abolish the death penalty is H.R. 848, which is currently pending before the House Judiciary Committee.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter to the editor which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on March 3, 1965 . The point of this letter is obvious.

The letter follows:

DEATH PENALTY AS A DETERRENT

To the HERALD TRIBUNE:

The case of Detective Sgt. William J. Mulrine III, of Wilmington, Del., is a classic example of why there is no deterrent value in the death penalty. Delaware abolished the death penalty in 1958 but restored it in 1961, after two murders and over the veto of the Governor and opposition of the State bar. In the year prior to abolition there had been seven murders. In the following year, without the death penalty, only one.

Detective Mulrine was a vociferous advocate of restoration on the ground that it was "for the safety of the police to have capital punishment as a deterrent." But 10 days after the death penalty was reinstated, he shot and killed his wife. Thus, he became the first candidate for the noose, a classic repudiation of the main argument of defenders of the death penalty.

He was white, 49, and not a youthful or indigent offender. He hired good lawyers and on the third day of his trial (the trial judge acidly commented on the failure of the police to extract the usual confession) he pleaded guilty to manslaughter. He received 5 years, later reduced, making him eligible for parole within 2 years.

Capital punishment as a deterrence to crime is for the other fellow, not to say the birds.

J. L. BERNSTEIN,
Editor, New Jersey State Bar Journal.
PATERSON, N.J.

Zero Defects Program: An Objective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, the zero defects program is being promoted by the Department of Defense and the U.S. Air Force. It is a grassroots program aimed at inspiring each individual to strive toward producing defect-free work the first time. It puts the responsibility for quality performance squarely on the shoulders of the individual, making each man his own critic. It is based on the principle of prevention, rather than detection of errors. It stresses the importance of good workmanship and professionalism, in which the individual can take pride and receive due recognition. This program recognizes that the individual wants to do good work and can achieve a high degree of perfection in what he does, if properly motivated.

Anyone who has sought to create perfection knows as one of the most obstinate facts of life that it is never achievable. What is sometimes achieved is one's best, if he has suffered and striven long and hard enough. The odd truth is that one's best is even better than perfection, because it is achievable.

During the week of March 8–12, each of the officers and airmen of the Aeronautical Systems Command at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, were asked to voluntarily support this program. Opening day for this effort was designated "Zero Defects Day," at which I had the honor to participate in the program attended by over 6,000 employees of the Aeronautical Systems Command along with the Honorable James A. Rhodes, Governor of the State of Ohio; the Honorable George E. Fouch, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense; Maj. Gen. Charles H. Terhune, Jr., commander, Aeronautical Systems Division; Maj. Gen. Fred J. Ascani, commander,

Systems Engineering Group; and Mr. Edward Woll of the General Electric Co.

I believe my colleagues, and others, would be interested in the purpose and objectives of the zero defects program and I submit the remarks made on opening day for their attention:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. CHARLES H. TERHUNE, JR., COMMANDER, AERONAUTICAL SYSTEMS DIVISION, WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

Thank you Colonel Wittbrodt. Ladies and gentlemen, before getting on with the formal program I would like to take a couple of minutes to briefly introduce our honored guests who will speak to you today: Congressman Rodney Love, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense George Fouch, Mr. Edward Woll of General Electric.

If you looked at your program you undoubtedly noticed that Governor Rhodes is also scheduled to speak. Governor Rhodes has been delayed—but he assured me that he will be here to say a few words a little later in the program.

I asked you to come here today so that I could personally discuss with you the purpose and objectives of the zero defects program. I am sure many of you wonder why we didn't just send you a letter rather than take you away from your work? Then answer to this question rests in the underlying philosophy of the program—and that is this—a personal appeal to every individual to do the job right the first time. I know of no better method of making such an appeal than talking to you as I do now. Yes, ladies and gentlemen, I am making a personal appeal to you—an appeal to dedicate yourselves to performing each task to the very best of your ability—to do the job right the first time—to change the attitude that mistakes are as natural as humanity itself.

I am sure that each one of us can think of something we have done in the recent past, which if we had to do over again we could do better. If this is so, and I am sure it is, we have been engaged in zero defects right along, at least in a limited way—certainly we won't or at least shouldn't make the same mistake again. What then are we talking about—basically we want you to take that second look first—and then do the job right.

Why do mistakes happen? You can get almost as many answers to this question as there are people in this fieldhouse. However, a careful analysis will show that most mistakes are a result of lack of attention. This is an outgrowth of the inbred philosophy that "to err is human," and therefore, if you're human you'll make mistakes. But is it ordained that people must make mistakes? And more importantly—do people always make the same percentage of errors in everything they do? The answer to both of these questions is no.

A man may make an error in 5 percent of the work he starts or processes on his job—but you can bet that he will not get short changed on his pay check 5 percent of the time. He certainly will not go home to the wrong house or forget to pay his taxes 5 percent of the time. What accounts for this? Do people have two standards of performance—one for the job, and another for other important matters? Does he vary these standards according to the importance he attaches to the thing he is doing? For the most part the answer is yes. This then is the problem and where zero defects comes in—through the zero defects program we hope to convince you that your job—whatever it may be—the source of your livelihood—is every bit as important as anything you do. And in our particular case it is important not only to you—but to the defense of our Nation. As former President Eisenhower once put it, "We must somehow get it through our heads that this is a Nation defending itself, and not a professional soldier defending someone else."

If we can do this, and I firmly believe we can, we all stand to benefit in at least two ways: (1) we accomplish our mission more efficiently, or to put it another way—we minimize our manpower shortages; and (2) we all have the satisfaction of knowing we have done our individual jobs well.

"Zero defects" is more than a catchword or slogan. It is an integral part of successful management at every level. Many of you already perform your work with a high degree of accuracy and efficiency. The objective of zero defects is to increase the number of people who do so, and to extend standards to work which normally cannot be measured or inspected by establishing every employee, from clerk to scientist, as his or her own critic.

I want to assure you that this program is not going to be one of those where the commander assembles his work force, calls for a crash of drums and blare of bugles, and announces that "Zero defects is the new game and you will all play it." Then the commander promptly forgets the program and leaves everyone to wonder privately, (a) what happened; (b) how long will they have to put up with this new silliness before management allows it to fade and the workers can go back to their comfortable old ruts.

I am personally conviced that the zero defects program is an extremely worthwhile effort—so I will not allow it to fade—in fact I have plans underway at the present time for sustention of the program into the future—I want the zero defects philosophy and objectives kept in the forefront from this day forward or at least until such time as zero defects becomes second nature or "the new way of life." Furthermore, I have personally asked each of the firstline supervisors to conscientiously support this program—and I am confident that they will. Management at all levels, from DOD and Headquarters, U.S. Air Force on down is dedicated to attaining the objectives of the zero defects program. We fully realize the important part management must play in this program and we ledge our unqualified support.

I ask each and everyone of you today to join me in this pledge.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN RODNEY M. LOVE, AT ZERO DEFECTS RALLY, MARCH 8, 1965

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. At the outset I want to say that I am most happy to be here—I also want to take this opportunity to publicly thank General Terhune for inviting me to participate in your program. I understand that Mayor Sommers has just recently renamed Dayton the "Birthplace of Aviation" instead of the "Home of Aviation." I heartily agree with Mayor Sommers. This is the one thing that we Daytonians are most proud of. We have another claim to fame that some of us may have taken for granted. That is Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. If Dayton is the birthplace of aviation, and it is, then Wright-Patterson is most assuredly the home of aviation. I am very proud of your installation and I know you—you who perform the myriad tasks associated with the design, development, and acquisition of the world's finest manned aircraft systems—are justifiably even more proud of its rich heritage. When General Terhune first invited me to speak to you about zero defects, I wondered what in the world was happening back in the old hometown. As you must realize, the first months of a freshman Congressman's life is little short of frantic. If you sometimes think your world is a madhouse you have a vague idea of what I have been through. Anyhow, I must admit to you that I was less than conversant with the subject. So I decided to do a little research to make certain I wouldn't be required to kiss the tail end of a B-52 or become the first Congressman ejected from a supersonic fighter 10 feet off the ground. I certainly intend to serve my constituents well, but I also intend to complete my first term in office.

The Constitution of the United States places on Congress the responsibility of providing and maintaining the Armed Forces needed for our national defense; it also makes Congress responsible for the general welfare of the Nation. It is from the standpoint of meeting these responsibilities that I will talk for a few minutes on the congressional interest in the zero defects program.

While we are a rich country, we all know that there are practical limits as to how much we can ask the taxpayer to pay to support our Federal programs while still maintaining a health economy.

The first priority, of course, is national defense, for without our freedom the other programs would not have much meaning. So, out of a Federal budget of nearly $100 billion, we find that we must spend about half for national defense. That leaves the other half to meet fixed charges, such as interest on the national debt and care of veterans, and the multitude of programs designed to make this a better country in which to live and bring up our children. We have urgent needs for more schools, better urban transportation systems, slum clearance programs with which to combat crime and juvenile delinquency, equitable support for farmers, and many other programs designed to make it possible for all people in this great Nation to live in a manner which befits the dignity of a human being.

Congress has the responsibility of determining how the national revenues shall be divided in order that worthwhile programs will be as fully supported as possible. Obviously, if we can save some of the $50 billion we spend on national defense without in any way diminishing the effectiveness of our Armed Forces, these savings can be used to build more and better schools and highways, and to do the many other things we need to do to bring about a better balance in our national standard of living. And this is where the zero defects program is so timely and helpful in the accomplishment of our aims.

One of the things which made the United States a great nation was its mastery of the mass production techniques. By producing good automobiles and other consumer goods at prices within reach of the average man, Americans have been able to support a standard of living far beyond that of most other countries. Mass production, admittedly, does not usually produce workmanship of the same level as that used in custom-made articles, but it is generally adequate and it brings the car, the TV, and the dishwasher within reach of millions who otherwise could not afford them. When a malfunction develops, we can get it repaired and the worst that usually happens is the inconvenience of being without the machine for a day or two.

When we tried to apply these mass production techniques to the manufacture of modern, highly complex and costly weapon systems, we got into trouble. If a worker made a faulty electrical connection in our car and ignition trouble developed, a few hours in a garage would correct the matter. But if the same kind of mistake is made in assembling a missile, the result will probably mean the loss of a multimillion dollar weapon. What is worse than the waste involved, if it were in time of war, the malfunction of the weapon could mean irreparable losses. In these days when we are asking our Armed Forces to risk their lives hourly on so many fronts, the least we can do is to make sure that the weapons we give them won't let them down when their lives are at stake.

As a Member of Congress assigned to the House Committee on Armed Services, I feel my part of the congressional responsibility for national security very deeply. That is why I am particularly pleased to see the steps which are being taken to rectify the evils of careless, slipshod workmanship in the defense industry. I was asked by our chairman, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, to represent the Armed Services Committee. I am sure that my colleagues on the committee are as interested as I am in the success of the zero defects program and join me in congratulating this Command in putting it into effect. What the worker has lacked sometimes has been a sense of pride in participating in the building of the finished product. The workman who installs a 25-cent fuze in a million dollar rocket or an $8 million airplane has to realize that he is not dealing with just a 25-cent fuze. He is dealing not only with a multimillion-dollar machine but with men's lives.

The awakening of pride of workmanship in the individual will pay many dividends. The military will get more dependable weapons and equipment. Costs will be lower because wastage will be much less. Deliveries will be faster because there will be fewer faulty jobs to be done over. And the worker will probably be the biggest gainer. He will have the personal satisfaction that comes with having participated in a great project; of knowing that his part of the operation, though it may have been small, was necessary and, without it, the product would have been incomplete. Best of all, he will be able to sleep with a clear conscience knowing that no man will die in a flaming wreck because he, the workman, made a faulty connection or tightened a nut one twist too many.

While I understand that this program is being extended throughout the defense industry, I am particularly pleased to know that the Air Force is applying the same principles to its own "in-house" operations, especially here in my hometown. I look upon you and myself as neighbors who are coworkers in this great field of national defense. I shall be doing my best to see that you get the funds you need to do your job, knowing that when you get this money you will do your best to see that the American citizen will get an honest dollar's worth of defense for every dollar he contributes.

ADDRESS BY MR. GEORGE E. FOUCH, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY (EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE AND READINESS), OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (INSTALLATIONS AND LOGISTICS), AT AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND, WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO, MARCH 8, 1965

Governor Rhodes, Congressman LOVE, General Terhune, ladies, and gentlemen, it has often been said that the greatness of our country—its historic dedication to human rights, its industrial supremacy and military might—reflect the collective genius of its people.

Today we are discussing a movement that has had its roots among the people—the people who design, manufacture, distribute, maintain and use the goods and services on which we all depend for our well-being. This movement goes under various titles—more commonly, zero defects. Looking back over my years of experience in both Government and industry, I can't recall any movement that overnight has awakened and marshalled the support and enthusiasm of so many people, from so many diverse elements of industrial life.

The Department of Defense did not originate zero defects. But, without equivocation, it endorses and encourages zero defects programs because they serve the national interest. Why? Because the Department of Defense—and our country as a whole—simply cannot afford the waste that goes with work that is less than the best.

It is a particular pleasure for me to be in Dayton—the birthplace of the aerospace industry—and to have the honor of sharing this platform with Governor Rhodes, Congressmen BROWN and LOVE, and General Terhune. I am deeply conscious that I am addressing a distinguished audience of scientists, engineers, and administrators and their staffs, who are contributing immensely to our national well-being. Your role in the management of the F-111 and C-141 are indicators of the pivotal role the people of the Air Force Systems Command play in national defense.

I am also aware that this audience is probably more concerned with design, development, and administration, than with production, maintenance, and similar operational or shop activities. It is widely assumed that zero defects is addressed primarily to shop personnel—that is, to the machinists, tool men, and operators on the floors of large maintenance and production activities. It is true that zero defects is highly effective in preventing and eliminating defects in those areas.

However, the Department of Defense is equally concerned with improving precision, accuracy, and workmanship upstream—in design, and in the various forms of communication by which engineering requirements are defined, described, and made known to industry. It may well be that the upstream areas of systems management can benefit more from zero defects than the downstream.

A few years ago my office, in cooperation with the Army, Navy, and Air Force, made an on-site survey of quality and reliability of various types of equipment used by the Army, Navy, and Air Force. This survey was by teams who went aboard ships, visited SAV and other commands—talked with the officers and men who use the equipment—and reported back to me the deficiencies they found.

Three types of material were surveyed—electronic items, aircraft spare parts, and tank and automotive equipment. An analysis of all deficiencies shows that at least approximately 50 percent of failures might be ascribed to what I have identified as the "upstream" phase of materiel generation—that is, design and technical data preparation. Production and maintenance processes can downgrade design quality. But we can hardly expect a product to be better than the quality designed into it.

I am sure you will all gree with me that failures and defects do not have their origin in any single element of the military-industry complex. Rather, all elements must do their job right—right the first time. Reliable equipment reflects the continuing and relentless exactitude of engineers, technicians, administrators, as well as production and maintenance.

Zero defect programs accentuate the vital importance of exactitude. It reminds—and keeps reminding—each of us that each job we do must be done right. Doing a job right serves the national interest.

However, zero defect programs also serve the enlightened self-interest of each one of us who earn our bread and butter as employees of the U.S. Government. We live in a competitive world, and it's getting more competitive. Competition exists not only on the international level. It exists among the in-house activities of the Department of Defense. Strict standards of effectiveness and efficiency are applicable to all Defense activities. Survival of these activities depends not only on fulfilling real needs, but on achieving and maintaining a high level of competitive efficiency.

There never was a time when Government activities have been so intensively under public scrutiny as today. We well know that there is a tendency to assume that large in-house military-industrial operations are less efficient than they might be—that Government employees are less attentive to detail—less dollar-conscious—than their counterparts in private industry. Zero defects helps to erase this suspicion—whether this suspicion has any basis in fact or not. It helps make Government organizations competitive and thus continue to play their proper role in their respective communities.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is a major component of the economy of Ohio. What you do, and how well you do it, therefore, contributes vitally to the economic health of the community where you live—where you raise your families—where your children go to school—where, in general, you live out your life.

At previous meetings on zero defects—usually in corridor conversations, so to speak—one question is repeatedly raised: Is zero defects here to stay or is it simply a flash in the pan?

I can assure you that so far as the Department of Defense is concerned, this is not a passing fad—a Madison Avenue "gimmick"—something here today and gone tomorrow.

President Johnson and Secretary McNamara have stated again and again their determination to achieve greater efficiency and to reduce the cost of national defense—without compromising the striking power of our Armed Forces.

Zero defects is a major weapon in this relentless and continuing drive to realize maximum defense from every tax dollar.

To make sure that it is a way of life, Department of Defense "in-house" activities have not only instituted zero defects programs, they are also establishing procedures to measure the results of these programs and to give recognition to those who deserve it.

Zero defects symbolizes a ground swell of public opinion that says waste shall not be accepted as a part of the American way of life. The Department of Defense is concerned not only with preventing waste, but with protecting the lives and security of all our people by providing our Armed Forces with safe and reliable equipment. There can hardly be more compelling reasons why you should join your coworkers in perpetuating the zero defects program of the Air Force Systems Command. In this way you serve your country as well as yourself.

Thank you for this opportunity to join my distinguished colleagues on this platform in endorsing this program.

I appreciate very much your cooperation and hospitality.

REMARKS OF MAJ. GEN. FRED J. ASCANI, COMMANDER, SYSTEMS ENGINEERING GROUP, RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY DIVISION, WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

There is very little in substance that I can add to the remarks made by General Terhune and our honored guests—however, I want to emphasize that we are very serious about the zero defects program and its effective implementation. In the next few days you will all be asked by your supervisors to sign a card pledging your personal support to the objectives of the zero defects program—this pledge card states the basic concept of the program. Each individual will strive to do every task right the first time. The pledge symbolizes your acceptance of the program.

Although participation in the zero defects program is strictly voluntary, we are dedicated to a goal of 100 percent participation. It is clear that the participation level of zero defects is purposely high and, although absolute perfection must remain a goal, the potential exists for great improvement in our efforts to reach a new and much higher plateau of reliability in our modern, more complex, and more costly weapon systems.

The zero defects program is the vehicle by which we can achieve this improvement—it crosses all functional areas—and, more importantly, it recognizes all individuals as vital elements in our mission effectiveness equation. It is the medium that speaks directly to all individuals involved in our efforts—whether they are clerks, engineers, managers, or scientists. Your enthusiastic support of, and participation in, this important program will substantially aid our combined endeavors to meet the exacting demands imposed upon us by the increasing challenges of our modern weapon systems. The payoff will be more efficient operations within the organization—a higher state of readiness within the Air Force—and a feeling of great satisfaction within each individual in knowing that their job was done well. In a short simple statement what we want you to do is this—identify yourself with improvement by participating in the zero defects program. I challenge you to prove to your Government and yourself that you are capable of doing better work.

On behalf of General Terhune, I want to thank you for attending the rally today—we hope you "got the message." I also want to publicly thank Governor Rhodes, Congressman Love, Mr. George Fouch, and Mr. Ed Woll for taking time out of their busy schedules to help us launch this program—your assist was A-OK in every respect. Thank you again.

Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Galveston, Tex., Barracks No. 1447, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., I insert the following resolution adopted by that organization:

RESOLUTION BY GALVESTON BARRACKS No. 1447, VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE U.S.A.

Resolution was adopted on March 11, 1965, by Galveston (Tex.) Barracks No. 1447, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.

Whereas existing legislation (section 503 of title 38, United States Code) sets limits on war veterans' incomes for eligibility to draw the veterans' pension well below the poverty level now recognized as a basis for economic opportunity needs; and

Whereas many pensioners and annuitants, because of the poverty income level set by existing law, are not eligible to enjoy the benefits of cost-of-living increases granted to an individual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment or similar type plans or programs, and some veterans must either forego or waive such paid-in benefits as those offered under certain public or private retirement plans; and

Whereas veterans with only the small pension for support find themselves in utterly dire circumstances and are all but humiliated by a Government pledged to give reasonable recognition for services rendered in the interest of national security: Be it

Resolved, That either the aforementioned income limitations be raised to more reasonable levels, so as to remove the "poverty" penalty and stigma, or that a law be enacted by the Congress to amend Section 503 of Title 38 of the United States Code to exclude from consideration as income for the purpose of determining pension eligibility, all amounts paid to an individual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar type plans or programs. (Attention is invited to H.R. 5677, already offered and scheduled for study by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It is recommended that this bill be amended to afford relief for veterans who are ineligible for retirement pay under programs other than the pension legislation.)

MORRIS H. MILLER,
Commander.
DONALD J. NELSON,
Adjutant.

New Medical Facilities Planned by the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of interest in the plans of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration regarding the construction of new hospitals and the closing of certain older ones. Mr. John Troan, Scripps-Howard science writer, has been doing a series of articles on this subject. He has recently written an article outlining the new facilities and the expansion of services planned by the Veterans' Administration. I believe this article will be of interest to many Members:

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 4, 1965]

MORE MEDICAL AID FOR VETS DUE

(By John Troan)

Despite its plans to close 11 hospitals, by June 30, the Veterans' Administration expects to spend more money than ever next year to provide tax-paid medical care for ex-servicemen.

Contrary to charges that the VA hospital program is being whittled down, President Johnson has budgeted almost $1.2 billion for medical care of veterans during the fiscal year starting July 1.

With money saved by this action and extra funds budgeted by President Johnson, the VA says it plans in the next year to:

Open a 727-bed hospital here, to replace a 335-bed structure built in 1901 as a school.

Open a 587-bed hospital in Atlanta, to replace a 300-bed facility the VA took over from the U.S. Public Health Service 43 years ago.

Open a 500-bed hospital in Charleston, S.C.

Spend more than $97 million to build additional medical facilities in areas where they are needed.

Put up the "sixth increment" in a 15-year $1.2-billion hospital-renovation program started by President Eisenhower.

Provide a record $40.8 million for medical research, eight times more than VA spent for this 10 years ago.

Establish 13 special centers for major "open heart" surgery.

Set up special "treatment units" in 26 VA hospitals for patients with emphysema, a chronic lung ailment.

Increase from 4 to 11 the special centers the VA operates for veterans with chronic kidney disease who must periodically be hooked up to artificial-kidney machines to stay alive.

Implement a major expansion of VA nursing homes which would accommodate 4,000 veterans by mid-1967. (The VA now has only 2 nursing homes, with 42 "members," although it also cares for 15,000 veterans in 18 domiciliaries.)

Add 2 mental hygiene clinics to the 66 now treating 65,000 vets with emotional problems on a nonhospitalized basis.

Add 2 "day treatment centers" to the 24 now handling mental patients on a go-home-every-night basis.

Open a "blind rehabilitation center" at Palo Alto, Calif., similar to the one at the VA hospital in Hines, Ill.

Staff 20 more VA hospitals with speech therapists needed to treat veterans recovering from strokes.

Bolster the staffs of VA hospital laboratories which now do 40 million tests a year on patients and perform 30,000 autopsies.

A Statement on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, recently, a thoughtful statement was made on the subject of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by a distinguished New York attorney, Mr. Frank E. Karelsen. Mr. Karelsen has been actively interested in the support of public education for over 30 years. He is vice president of the Child Study Association of America, vice president of the Public Education Association, a member of the board of the Community Mental Health Board of the city of New York, a member of the education committee of the American Jewish Committee, and numerous other educational organizations interested in education and children.

I commend Mr. Karelsen's presentation to my colleagues and to all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a fine statement in support of the bill by a public-spirited citizen who has a long and distinguished record as a fighter for public education.

STATEMENT OF FRANK E. KARELSEN

At this point in history, the key hope for the success of democracy is critically woven in with a need to raise the economic standing of all our people. "Good education provides our major hope for breaking the poverty cycle." The only possible way to do this is to educate all our children. President Kennedy's formulation was clear and precise: "Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education." The Public Education Association has long realized that the only way to finance this education is through Federal aid. "Quality education will only be assured for every pupil in New York City and other cities in the United States when the Federal Government accepts responsibility for financing substantial improvement in public schools." (From Public Education Association booklet, "Educating All Our Children.")

The Nation's needs are staggering. To achieve the optimum class size of 25 elementary school pupils and 20 secondary pupils we would need 275,000 classrooms. In New York City alone, proposed construction costs

over the next 5 years will aggregate more than $2 billion.

Federal aid to education has been defeated for many, many years despite the resolutions passed at the White House Conference on Education and enthusiastic support from responsible Senators and Congressmen. The bills have not made progress because of the church and state issue.

The urgency of Federal aid has become so important that in 1965, an education bill cannot be allowed to fail. The ideological sacrifice on the separation of church-and-state issue in the current bill is not a great one. We should be ready, at last, to say that we believe we need education so badly that we must make some small compromise. As desirable as it might be not to compromise, history has proved that without it Federal aid is not obtainable.

We cannot isolate ignorance. The ill-educated child, whether from a public school or a parochial school, who becomes a dropout or delinquent costs society more in the long run than we must pay for educating that same person to be a useful taxpaying citizen.

Let us examine this bill to see how much of a compromise is needed. Even now, a part of the regular curriculum of parochial schools is provided through the use of public facilities. Should we deny the use of Central Park to parochial school children because their school regularly conducts its physical education classes in it thus reducing the costs of gymnasium and physical education facilities to that school? Should we deny the use of the public libraries to parochial school children who regularly borrow books for their classroom assignments thus reducing the cost of those books to parochial schools? Surely the answer is "No." Largely because there is no added burden or expense to the public school system, and at the same time, we are helping to educate children.

Nothing in title I would require school districts to establish dual enrollment or other specific programs for children in nonpublic schools. The provisions of title I in this regard are confused at best, but it does not appear that the language is mandatory. It is hoped that the language will be cleared up in the Senate.

The question of where title will lie in library resources and textbooks is, of course, a technicality. It has, however, become a public issue. What would be remembered here is the following: First, the books in question are books approved by the local school board for public school use. We are not buying religious tracts. Second, the materials provided are materials that the children would not otherwise have. Third, as mentioned before, it is important that the parochial school students have the advantage of using the same books as are supplied to public schools, again this throws no burden on the public school.

On the financial level, Congressman LINDSAY has estimated that this bill will bring $91,800,000 for fiscal 1965 to the State of New York.

There are faults in this legislation, but they can be cured, either by the courts or by the watchdog committee.

This bill has already been improved by the inclusion of provisions for a watchdog committee to be appointed by the President with responsibility for making certain that the spirit of separation of church and state is not violated. Another improvement was the change in the grant allocation formula to recognize that a low-income family receiving Government assistance that takes it over the $2,000 level should be counted in computing the grant to be made to a local educational agency.

If this bill is a slight compromise, that does not call for its defeat. Writing in School and Society for February 20, professor of religion, J. Paul Williams, put it very well:

"The battle around the wall of separation promises to continue for years to come. If either extreme in the conflict wins a clear-cut victory, the residue of bitterness will disfigure the national scene. In such a situation, the man of good will will labor to achieve a compromise solution which preserves as many as possible of the values sought by both sides.

"A number of organizations with a long history of opposition to aid to parochial schools are supporting this bill because it is aimed at helping children. Included among these organizations are the American Jewish Committee, Americans for Democratic Action and the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools headed by Agnes Meyer.

This legislation should be the first important step in a program of massive help to education. A 5-year program aggregating some $50 billion is necessary. A number of Senators and Members of the House have indicated general agreement with this need, and the President himself has said that expenditure on education will be a major commitment of his administration and that next year he will ask the Congress for a substantially increased sum.

"Therefore, in view of the above, an organization interested in public schools and children should support the bill and fight hard, now and after it has been passed both in the courts and before the watchdog committee for such safeguards as are desirable and possible.

Water Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, this country faces ever greater problems than ever before in meeting its needs for water. About one-fourth of the population of this country is troubled with water shortage, poor water or both. And the problems will increase as our population increases and the demand for pure water rises.

The projections for this increased demand for water can be seen in our past history. From 1900 to 1950, while the population of the United States doubled, total water use, other than for power, increased fourfold. By 1960, total water use was up 59 percent from 1950. In 1900 we used an average of 600 gallons of water per capita for all uses every day. By 1950, this figure had increased to 1,100 gallons and by 1960, it has grown to 1,500.

The future can hold nothing but increased demand for water. It is estimated that by 1980, the demand for water will double over the demand in 1960 and we will be using 2,300 gallons of water a day for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

The huge amounts of water which we use now and will use in the future will be obtained either from wells—ground water—or rivers, streams, and lakes. About 60 percent of all the water distributed by municipal water systems is taken from lakes and streams and it is this water which is most easily polluted.

Water is one of this Nation's most valuable resources and as this Government faces the prospect of spending increasing funds to investigate desalinization of sea water, we must also turn every attention to conserving and making the best use of water available now.

City Council of San Jose Condemns Police Brutality in Selma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of my home city, San Jose, Calif. It has undergone rapid population expansion and urbanization and endured the stresses and strains that accompany that process with a spirit of challenge and good will. The people of San Jose have met their civic responsibilities. They have worked at making San Jose a good place to live and to work, and they have elected to office fine and dedicated people to govern the city. I do not know when, however, I have been prouder of my city than when I received the resolution of the city council which I respectfully request be reprinted in the RECORD. The concern of the city of San Jose for the citizens of Selma, Ala., who are not allowed to vote or to peaceably assemble is evidence of the growing awareness in this country that racial prejudice and hate are a disease which must be conquered.

The City Council of San Jose not only passed the resolution which I commend to you, but sent the mayor, the distinguished Dr. Joseph Pace, to Washington to hand deliver it to Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY. Dr. Pace conveyed the deep concern of the city of San Jose to the Vice President, and then journeyed to Selma to observe the situation there at firsthand so that he could give a full report to the council and the citizens of San Jose.

The resolution follows:

"RESOLUTION 27090

"Whereas the citizens of the city of San Jose, Calif., have been alarmed and deeply concerned by the brutal and senseless police action against certain other American citizens in the city of Selma, Ala., and

"Whereas there is existing Federal legislation which could be enforced to insure our fellow countrymen the right of peaceable assembly and the right to participate in self-government and the power to vote: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of San Jose, That the President of the United States be requested to take action to stop the outrageous mistreatment of American citizens by the misguided local and State officials in the State of Alabama and to assure that the constitutional rights of all citizens in all States are protected at all times."

Adopted the 8th day of March 1965.

Voting aye: Doer, Fisher, Hathaway, Shaffer, Solari, Pace. No's: None. Absent: Welsh.

Clearly Out of Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have shared with many others high hopes for the Peace Corps.

To my way of understanding, it was based upon a sound American principle of helping others to help themselves.

I have seen many fine accomplishments of the Peace Corps in foreign lands, and I have been proud to relate these accomplishments to other Americans.

Consequently, the following editorial from the Marth 19 issue of th Indianapolis News was very distressing to me. I hope it does not report a typical group of Peace Corps returnees. It would be a very unhappy paradox if the young people we send abroad to represent America should return cynical about our purposes, defeatist about our foreign policy, and advocates of the goals of our enemies.

The editorial follows:

CLEARLY OUT OF LINE

More than 850 returning Peace Corps veterans recently held a 3-day conference at the State Department. The goings on, not generally reported in the Nation's press, suggest an incredible disregard for the purposes of the United States around the world.

Astoundingly, Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver arranged to let one returning corpsman, student George Johnson of the Yale Law School, address the conference on why the United States should halt its military effort in Vietnam. Said Johnson to the assembly: "It is clear that not all the obstacles to a peaceful world are in the Communist bloc. Some are ideas and attitudes held by America."

What such remarks have to do with the operations of the Peace Corps is difficult to understand. Corpsman Johnson later revealed Shriver knew in advance what the temper of his remarks would be, but wanted him to speak anyway.

At the end of the first evening, Shriver decided the session should close with a song. Says a conference participant: "I expected the 'Star-Spangled Banner,' 'My Country 'Tis of Thee' or something appropriate. Instead, Harry Belafonte ended the meeting by leading the 850 corpsmen in a rousing rendition of 'We Shall Overcome,' the theme song of the civil right militants."

Even more surprising, during the session returning Peace Corps volunteers circulated petitions concerning such issues as U.S. involvement in South Vietnam. Large posters advocating negotiations on Vietnam—a proposal at odds with current U.S. policy—were also prominently displayed in the State Department Building by some corpsmen.

The materials, said one petition circulator, came from the Peace Corps and the petitions were run off on a State Department mimeograph machine. A Peace Corps official said all these activities were initially approved by the Peace Corps and the State Department.

The episode should give pause. The Peace Corps was originally hailed as a way of extending American purpose. It has become clear that many of those involved in the program vigorously oppose American policy—and during the session agitated in behalf of their views with the aid of two agencies supposedly implementing U.S. policy.

Address of Administrator Eugene P. Foley, of the Small Business Administration, at the Bluefield, W. Va., 25th Annual Greater Bluefield Jaycees, Inc., "Bosses' Night" Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday night, March 19, the Jaycees of my home city of Bluefield, under the able leadership of President Richard W. Wilkinson, held the 25th annual "Bosses' Night" dinner.

This organization selected Mr. Hugh Shott, editor of the Bluefield Daily Telegraph and president of the Daily Telegraph Printing Co., for the "Man of the Year Award" because of his outstanding and unselfish community service during the past years.

The Jaycee of the Year Award was presented to Mr. Ernest Deane, Jr., for his valued contribution to Jaycee activities during 1964.

In this connection, I was especially pleased that U.S. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH made a special trip from Washington to Bluefield with the Administrator. Senator RANDOLPH gave a most interesting and informative address in which he praised the accomplishments of the Small Business Administration in West Virginia. Also, before introducing Administrator Foley, Senator RANDOLPH noted the effective and rapid advancement of the Urban Renewal Clearance program in Bluefield, which he observed "was one more example of the benefits of Federal aid."

Because my home city is located in the Appalachian region, I am delighted to have this opportunity to include for the RECORD a copy of the address by Mr. Foley. He clearly points out that the citizens of Bluefield "have set an example for communities across this Nation." The community has responded magnificently to the realization that success or failure is in local hands. Bluefield has caught the secret of community progress.

Other communities throughout the Nation can profit by this achievement outlined by the principal speaker.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY EUGENE P. FOLEY, ADMINISTRATOR OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, AT THE ANNUAL "BOSSES' NIGHT" DINNER OF THE BLUEFIELD, W. VA., JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, EVENING OF MARCH 19, 1965

The junior chamber here in Bluefield has one of the most active civic programs I have found anywhere—especially in the promotion of projects to challenge and occupy the youth of the community.

These projects—I understand—range from the soap box derby to Student Government Day when students for 1 day a year take over the government. And the Jaycees sponsor Little League baseball, junior gold and tennis tournaments, a traffic safety program, a swimming meet, and a beauty pageant. In addition to that they sponsor the Christmas shopping tour for deprived youngsters and they direct the commercial solicitations for the United Fund Drive.

And so I would say that the young men and women in the Jaycees are carrying out the obligations of community responsibility that goes with being a part of business.

And I must say that I am not surprised that Bluefield is one of the finalists in the All America City contest in view of the demonstrated energies of its leadership. But I must say I am surprised at the breadth of its accomplishments.

I am very much impressed by the way this community mobilized its resources to counterattack against adverse economic forces that challenged its functions and its spirit. I refer, of course, to the reduction of employment in such basic industries as railroads and mining with the resulting failure of businesses and the increase in outmigraton of young people in search of jobs.

I am impressed by the way citizens stepped up to invest in community projects. I understand that community improvements during this resurgence total $10½ million And major private investments by the business and industrial segment exceeded $7 million.

All told, more than $20 million went into citizen action programs, in industrial and commercial investment and in community improvement projects.

And the telling point to me in this vast program of improvement is the fact that more than 12,000 citizens have participated directly. When you consider the fact that Bluefield has a population of 19,000 this is an incredible record.

I want to say to you very frankly that you have set an example for communities across this Nation. You have caught the secret of community progress. The Federal Government can provide resources and programs, the State government can lend a hand—but in the final analysis—to paraphrase the late President—the success or failure of your community is in your hands.

You realize that. And you have responded to that realization magnificently and I am delighted to have the opportunity to come here and congratulate you.

The pattern of your development in diversified and sound. It ranges from recreation facilities, like the Ridge Runner, your interstate scenic railroad, to the Bluefield Area Development Corp., which raised $750,000 from almost 4,000 contributors to build the plant for a textile firm. This firm now employs 240 persons and has already expanded.

Your city administration, your city manager and your capable board of directors, have provided strong leadership and the results are apparent for all to see. The fact that unemployment has been cut to almost a third of its peak point is a testimonial to their ability and dedication.

I could stand here and talk for hours on what you have done because I am impressed by the ingenuity and hard work that went into every project.

But you know that there is still much to be done. There are still vast undeveloped areas in West Virginia where economic development must come. Unemployment is still too high. There are still deprived families and children who are denied the educational facilities available to children in other sections of the Nation. The natural resources are here, available for development. The manpower is here to help in development and in the processing and manufacturing of the raw materials.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act just enacted by the Congress has as its purpose the development of these resources—development of a skilled work force, development of a highway network to provide access to natural resources, development of needed community facilities, development of improved health facilities. And there is much emphasis on reclamation and conservation.

As President Johnson said recently: "Rural Appalachia lags behind rural America. Urban Appalachia lags behind urban America, and metropolitan Appalachia lags behind metropolitan America."

The plight of many families in West Virginia made a lasting impression on Vice President HUMPHREY during the campaign of 1960 when he spent so much time here. In his recent book War on Poverty he recalled how a desperate man approached him in a small town where a coal mine—the town's only source of income—had been shut down.

"I need a job, any kind of a job" the man said, "I've got three kids and they're hungry. Is there something you can do about that?"

A West Virginia sheriff testified before a Senate committee that honest men would come to his office and tell him bluntly that he would not let his children starve even if he had to steal.

"They don't want a handout," the sheriff said. "They want an honest living. It is up to the people in government to try and help us do something in my county."

Senator RANDOLPH chaired the Senate Public Works Subcommittee which held hearings on the Appalachia bill in the U.S. Senate. He directed the bill's course through the Senate when it reached the floor. He eloquently outlined its need and its purpose and what it will accomplish.

It is legislation in response to the man who wants an honest living and can't find it, to the hungry child whose father would steal if necessary, to the deprived child whose education is skimpy and limited.

As Senator RANDOLPH said during the debate, "the purpose of the bill is to open up the area and bring it into the mainstream of America."

The bill comes at an opportune time in history because Governor Barron worked closely with West Virginia communities and with the Federal Government during the past 4 years in a program of general rebuilding and improvement of the State.

And his successor Gov. Hulett C. Smith is continuing this fine leadership. He was in Washington recently to present his testimony on behalf of the Appalachian Act.

Virtually every economic indicator has shown substantial improvement. At least 14 new economic records were established in 1964. Business volume, for example, increased $89 million.

Unemployment compensation benefits hit their lowest annual total since 1957. There was a 17-percent reduction in the average monthly unemployment total.

As Governor Barron told the West Virginia Legislature last January in summing up the past 4 years: "Recession was reversed and the economy turned into the greatest prosperity West Virginia has ever known."

But, he emphasized, there can be no letup, no resting on laurels, no complacency because the job to be done is tough and hard and basic.

The State's first objective, he said, must continue to be the creation of jobs.

The Appalachia bill is basically a resource development bill. It does not provide for creation of production facilities.

But I want to assure you that the Small Business Administration will move in with its programs as Appalachia progresses. We are working now to iron out the details of our approach, to determine pricesly how our programs will be dovetailed with Appalachia regional development.

Actually, we have been working with communities in West Virginia in diversifying their economies since President Kennedy pledged his administration to the economic resurgence of West Virginia in 1960.

Our community development program at SBA has helped to create 1,200 jobs in the State in 18 projects since 1960. SBA has made loans totaling more than $2½ million in that program in West Virginia during the past 4 years. This is a program keyed to community action.

Loans are made to community development corporations on specific small business projects. They can be repaid in terms up to 25 years and the ceiling on each loan is $350,000. The interest rate in areas of substantial unemployment is 4 percent. In other areas it is 5½ percent.

The development corporation is required to put up $2 for every $8 we lend. Actually, we prefer that local banks make the loans. We will guarantee 90 percent of the loan if they will participate. If they decline, of course, then we make the loan directly.

Another of our programs that has been used in West Virginia to good advantage is our assortment of regular small business loans. We have made 320 loans totaling almost $19 million to West Virginia concerns under these programs during the past 4 years.

We have assisted West Virginia firms in the efforts to get contracts with the Federal Government to supply goods or services. Under our "set aside" procurement program, 357 Government purchases set aside for exclusive small business bidding went to West Virginia firms. They amounted to more than $25 million.

But we can do more—and we will do more. As the Appalachian Regional Development Act opens up the State and makes its resources available and provides skilled labor, we will be ready and willing to work with business and industry that needs help in financing or expanding facilities in West Virginia.

Under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, SBA is authorized to make loans of as much as $25,000 for as long as 15 years in deprived areas to create jobs and opportunities.

Under our community development program we have helped to build tourist courts and motels, private hospitals, clothing manufacturing plants, veneer and plywood plants, recreational facilities, and a variety of manufacturing facilities in West Virginia.

We will be available where and when you need us. We want to work with progressive communities like Bluefield in any way that the communities desire. Our job is to strengthen the free enterprise system and it is the free enterprise system that will provide the jobs and opportunities needed in West Virginia.

"Loyal West Virginians"—Senator RANDOLPH said in the debate on the Appalachian bill—"will cooperate in the renaissance for which we are all striving."

Progressive Americans everywhere are behind this program because its purpose is to correct a basic economic imbalance between Appalachia and the rest of the country.

It is the fair thing to do and the right thing to do and it will be done.

Thank you for this opportunity to come here tonight.

I would like to close by recalling a recent statement President Johnson made to a group of small businessmen in the White House.

"Today—in this land of yours and mine—" he said—"the future of our system and our society is being determined not here in this city, not here in this house, not on Capitol Hill.

"The quality of America your children and mine will know is being determined in the communities where Americans live and where you lead."

Thank you.

Atlanta's War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I have noted the difficulties of some sections of our country in implementing the economic opportunity program.

I am happy to report that this is not the case in the Atlanta-Fulton County area. The leadership of our State long ago recognized the great potential this program holds for our people, and began preparations prior to passage of the bill. Because of excellent groundwork, we have been able to apply the programs of the Economic Opportunity Act to the immediate benefit of our citizens, with encouraging initial results.

I am attaching a copy of a letter from Mr. C. O. Emmerich, executive director of the Atlanta-Fulton County Economic Opportunity Authority, to the mayor of Atlanta, the Honorable Ivan Allen, Jr., outlining what has been done and what is now underway.

Mr. Speaker, we in Fulton County are intensely proud of the progress we have made in many fields. Here is further justification.

The letter follows:

ATLANTA-FULTON COUNTY
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AUTHORITY,
ATLANTA, GA., *March 16, 1965.*

Hon. IVAN ALLEN, Jr.,
Mayor of the City of Atlanta,
Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR MAYOR ALLEN: During the first 60 days of our operations, we have learned a great deal about our economic opportunity possibilities of Atlanta. While we have not made all the progress anticipated, we have accomplished a number of things which I think should be brought to your attention.

The following is a condensed report about Atlanta's war on poverty.

1. A series of applications have been placed in the Washington OEO office, and grants have been received which has allowed us to establish our central headquarters in the 101 Marietta Street Building. A small staff has been employed, and we are now working with many organizations and many citizens of our community. We are receiving hundreds of phone calls and applications.

2. We have also received a grant which has allowed us to begin employing staff and locating our four neighborhood centers which will be established in the following areas: West End neighborhood, Washington-Nash neighborhood, South Fulton High School neighborhood, and Price High School neighborhood. These centers are strategically located to bring together all agencies interested in combating poverty at the local level under the direction of EOA. These agencies will meet urgent needs in the areas of manpower, education, and social services.

3. We are now recruiting for the men's Job Corps. Twenty-three hundred applications have been received, 32 boys have been sent to 6 States, 35 applications have been completed and are now in Washington for assignment, and 50 more are being screened as requested by Washington.

4. Project Uplift, 707 Atlanta National Bank Building, 50 Whitehall Street, SW., Atlanta, Ga., is a job training program for unemployed parents of dependent children and is now in operation. This project was approved by EOA and sponsored by the Fulton County Department of Family and Children Services and is getting off to a good start.

5. A request is being submitted to Washington for 25 VISTA Volunteers—15 to serve in the Fulton County Department of Family and Children Services and 10 to serve in our neighborhood service centers.

6. Four work study programs have been approved for the following colleges: Emory University, Morehouse College, Morris Brown College, and Spelman College. This will allow the students to work 15 hours per week for an income of $1.25 per hour.

7. Reproductive care for indigent women project has been approved for Grady Hospital. This is not an official EOA program but a part of our overall community action program in our war on poverty. This project is designed to decrease morbidity and mortality among babies born to indigent families.

8. A youth opportunity center has been established at 522 West Peachtree Street, and they are now interviewing daily. This project is part of our total community action effort which is operated by our employment service. It is financed through a poverty grant fund.

We also have applications in Washington for the following:

1. An evaluation and diagnostic center, sponsored by the State vocational rehabilitation administration, for communitywide testing and evaluation service for difficult cases.

2. Neighborhood services aids training program for training end employment for 171 men and women, ages 22 through 65, recruited from the neighborhoods in which EOA is operating.

3. In-school work-training program for training and employment of 1,500 high school youths in the Atlanta-Fulton County school system to enable them to get work experience and to earn money in order to remain in school.

4. A small business development center to seek and screen prospective loan applications for the poverty areas and to provide assistance in management and development of small businesses.

We are also preparing five other applications which we will report to you at a later date. In the very near future I plan to spell out these programs in detail and start releasing some of this information to our local papers.

If there is special information you would like to have about these projects, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

C. O. EMMERICH.

An Unspoiled Community: The Kings Highway Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to represent a number of fine communities in Brooklyn. One of the finest is known as Kings Highway, a community which expresses the best of New York and balances somewhat the unfortunate problems faced by so many areas in this great city. Many of those problems are detailed in the series of articles from the New York Herald Tribune on New York City in crisis that I have been placing in the RECORD.

Kings Highway has, however, no major complaints and I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following articles which appeared in the February 21, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

KINGS HIGHWAY: FOR SATISFIED LIVING

(By Francis Sugrue)

Ask historians "What is this Kings Highway in Brooklyn?" and they may go on about a trail for the Canarsie and other Indians, reel off the names of the Dutch families who farmed this land, tell of its being a royal mail route with milestones along the way, and how segments of British troops under General Howe marched this way and took over the farmhouses in the Battle of Long Island.

Now mention Kings Highway to a businessman and the name will trigger him to say something like this: "One of the prime retail shopping areas in Brooklyn, if not the city. It runs from ocean to ocean—I mean Ocean Avenue to Ocean Parkway—and it has quality goods and quality merchants. You can buy an $8 housedress or a $1,000 gown on Kings Highway."

When Representative ABRAHAM MULTER hears the name Kings Highway, he terms it the heart of a fine residential area, which has not deteriorated a bit during the recent flight to the suburbs, and where the normal turnover has brought in families that are as good or perhaps better than often in a higher earning group. So it has remained a neighborhood of good schools, both public and private, of busy libraries, and thriving community centers and churches. For Representative MULTER it is not only the center of the second assembly district, one of the largest assembly districts in the State, but a community with no major complaints about living conditions and no perennial clamoring of why does not someone do something about this or that.

Kings Highway means something to Mrs. Mary Brennan Purcell who now lives with her brothers in the house at 2202 Avenue N which has been in the family for more than 100 years. She speaks of the 28 years she worked in the film studios of Vitagraph and Warner Brothers and Ace Films over near Avenue M, and she remembers with special fondness the days of the silent movies when Lillian Walker, Maurice Costello, Laura Finch, Francis X. Bushman, Clara Williams and others lived right in the community and there was even an apartment house called Vitagraph.

Make the inquiry "What was Kings Highway like?" and Mrs. Purcell's brother, Tom Brennan, may very well take out the tax receipts of Thomas O'Donnell, a grandfather who lived right across the street. He has saved the bills with the fine handwritten notations turning a honey-brown color at the edges.

One is dated 1886 and shows the real estate tax to be $4.86, with a 5-cent collector's fee, and the property assessed at $445. By 1892 taxes have jumped to $13.20 and in 1894 Mr. O'Donnell is paying $15.75. "Taxes were going up in the 1890's," commented Mr. Brennan, "and they are still going up."

And when you go to Irving Rader, a Brooklyn lawyer, who grew up in this section, and want to know: "How are things on Kings Highway today?" you get an immediate response: "We have some wonderful people who take pride in living here. There are about 125,000 in the section. Of course, most of the landmarks are gone now. Most of the tremendous houses that people lived in have been torn down. People came out this way in the old days for their entertainment. There was not only Coney Island with its bands, nightclubs and restaurants. We had race tracks, both the trotters and flats. I can remember the trolleys running along Coney Island Avenue, with the grass growing underneath. But this neighborhood isn't looking back. Values have gone up over the years. Houses assessed 20 years ago at $10,000 are now up to $20,000. Two and three-family houses are worth $40,000. People who left for the island came back because of the inconvenience of traveling, the jet noises and the traffic. This is still one of the best residential areas in the city. We have good churches and good synagogues. We have Jewish and Catholic private schools and there is a Greek Orthodox school within our boundaries. I would say the neighborhood could be described as high middle class, with lawyers, doctors, dentists, stockbrokers, storekeepers, executives from the garment district and other professional people living here."

Suppose we give you some material that tends to illustrate something of the stability of Kings Highway.

It was back in 1835—give or take a year—when Cornelius W. Bennett decided his future was to the east in the Kings Highway area and moved his family from Gowanus, where the first Bennett settled in 1636. Cornelius purchased the Wyckoff farm, consisting of the house, standing at least since 1766, and 100 acres "more or less and certain meadow and woodland as well as pew 62 in the old Gravesend Dutch Reformed Church." The Bennetts liked their new home and have been living there even to this day.

And today, the great granddaughter of Cornelius, Gertrude Ryder Bennett, wife of the Reverend Frank Curtis Williams, has a definite feeling for the modern Kings Highway: "We have gone from the country to the city while living in the same place. Oh, we miss the farm and all the land, but we still love it here. The neighbors are still so nice. We like everyone so much. I don't know where we'd go if we didn't live here, because I don't know where we'd find better people."

So it would seem that when so many New York neighborhoods are being torn apart, Kings Highway remains almost serene in its stability. This spirit seems to affect the merchants, because Charles Flayton, a former president of the board of trade, who has a woman's specialty shop on the highway, likes to impress you with this sense of permanence.

"Merchants have been here for 10 to 40 years. I've been here since 1931. This is one of the things that attracts shoppers. We are reputable merchants. We are not fly-by-nights. In this we are like the people who live here. This is an A-1 neighborhood as far as I'm concerned or I wouldn't be in business since 1931. The shopping and the community must be A-1 as far as the residents are concerned or they wouldn't have stayed here to keep men like me in business. We have good bus transportation running into the community and two municipal parking lots for 155 cars and parking meters on the street. You can do so much right on this street. There are several banks which give excellent service. All the utilities are here—Consolidated Edison, Brooklyn Union Gas Co., the New York Telephone Co.—so you can pay your bills. And then there is shopping, with prices to fit every purse. This is not a street that is always running sales. We have two sales a year, one in October, and one now in the Washington Birthday season. We keep pushcarts, hucksters, and custom peddlers off the street. We work with the community and for the community. And the people who moved away learn all these things and move back."

In the community profile published last week on Stewart Manor, in Nassau County, it was reported that the volunteer fire department was a very big thing and every male in the community either had already been the fire chief or else had definitely made up his mind to become the fire chief. Along Kings Highway it would seem that every merchant and businessman has served as president of its board of trade—a sort of chamber of commerce—or is waiting for his turn to be elected.

(Six officers of the Kings Highway Savings Bank have already served as president of the board, including the man now in charge, Ruben A. Lamarque, a vice president of the bank.)

Before we go on, certain notes that are peculiar to Kings Highway should be put down before they are forgotten.

The ride between Kings Highway Station and Times Square on the Brighton Line of the BMT is supposed to be 45 minutes. (If you disagree, please call the transit authority, not this section of the newspaper.)

This was once very good potato farmland. The Brooklyn potato was to be reckoned with.

People in the community are always busy modernizing. Both the storekeepers and the homeowners show a compulsive renovation pattern. "Mark the date," said Mr. Flayton. "It is February. Come back in August and half-a-dozen stores will have new fronts and alterations inside." And the residents are of the same temper when it comes to changing things. Perhaps it is because they have so little grass and shrubbery to fuss over and show to the world, so they take it out on their house, doing it over in different fashions.

For some Kings Highway not only seems to be a good place to be born, but a place to grow up and go on living in because there are not many better places to be found around the city. Representative MULTER was one of eight children and only one of his brothers and sisters has left the area.

The board of trade has made a kind of trademark of the expression "ocean to ocean," meaning the shopping district runs from Ocean Avenue to Ocean Parkway on Kings Highway.

Going back to the Bennetts a minute. The land was farmed by Mrs. Williams' grandfather, William Bennett, who lived from 1823 to 1903, and her father, Edward Bennett. First, the main crop was wheat, which was taken to the Dutch mill at Gerritsen with payment being made with part of the produce. Later, when it was easier to get to New York, they raised potatoes and transported them to the Washington Market by wagon, taking the ferry to Manhattan. There were years when the Bennetts' soil yielded 10,000 bushels of potatoes annually.

By the turn of the century the area apparently was ripe for an orderly development as a residential section. Mr. Bennett must have seen the handwriting, for he sold a large portion if his farm to the Wood Harmon Co., and streets were put through and houses erected. And Edward Bennett changed occupations. He became a real estate and insurance man.

The Brennans also remember the farms, when they had four horses in their own stables, and there were pigs, chickens and cows all about the yard, when there were three streets—more lanes than streets—from Ocean to Flatbush, and when they walked one-and-a-half miles to school until a stage was used to take the children to school (the first school bus?). Then, the real estate people came in and Louis H. Pound, who later was borough president of Brooklyn, opened a development and Tom Brennan can still see his father still planting the maple shade trees for this project.

Dominick Cisternino does not remember it, but the event is now a part of the history of the Kings Highway he does know. Back in 1905, his father, the late Andrea Cisternino, who had a fruit and vegetable market of quality, was one of 16 men who attended a meeting at the law office of Netling, Raymond & Co. at East 15th Street to do something about getting a public library to serve the neighborhood.

This was the first meeting of the board of trade. Then, as now, if you desired something for your community, you ran an affair. The men of Kings Highway organized a "public entertainment" at the Pabst Loop Hotel in Coney Island and collected more than $100, "this," according to the secretary's report, "being sufficient to operate the library for over 18 months."

And so the first project of the board of trade was a success. A library was born. True, it didn't have a home of its own, finding it necessary to share C. E. Kenble's drugstore, 1402 Kings Highway, but there was a paid librarian and a circulation of about 150 books. It was one of those happy accidents of timing, but the board didn't see any reason why it shouldn't consider the $800,000 Kings Highway Library that was dedicated in the board's 50th year as a kind of anniversary gift. This event did make the members realize the strength of continuity.

One good project deserves another and over the years the Kings Highway Board of Trade has had plenty of them. There was the "first safe and sane Independence Day in Brooklyn," which became an annual event, and in 1913 was held in the grove and meadow of John Gerken at Kings Highway and Coney Island Avenue.

In Kings Highway, the Democrats have about a 3-to-1 margin, and that is why the Kings Highway Democratic Club has 2,000 members and considers itself in some ways a civic organization. Every Monday and Thursday nights when he can possibly be in town, Representative MULTER is at the clubhouse on East 15th Street, off the highway, to hear complaints and listen to individual petitions. No two of these get-me requests are alike.

One kid wants to get into a particular branch of the armed services; the family of another wants to get him out. Other requests: Get a relative into a hospital; get someone into a home for the aged; get me a temporary job to help me through college; get me a permanent job somewhere; get me into a medical college; get more traffic lights and parking space, etc.

Can there be any doubt that the people of Kings Highway feel they have something of value in Brooklyn? And that they intend to hold on to it? Meanwhile, they would like some alternate-street parking to allow the sanitation men to clean where cars are usually parked; more parking space, of course, and longer platforms at the BMT Kings Highway stop so that it can take care of more cars per train. One of the loudest unanswered complaints is that by the time Manhattan-bound trains reach Kings Highway there are no longer any seats available.

ANCIENT HOME AND POESY

(By Francis Sugrue)

"KINGS HIGHWAY

("By Gertrude Ryder Bennett)

"A footpath, nothing more, it wound its way
Past farms and meadows, basking in the sun—
A dreamy path where lovers chanced to stray
And farmers drove their cows when day was done.
The footpath grew and widened to a lane,
A highway then, to let the king's troops pass,
And still a farmhouse holds a window pane
Where Hessians scratched their names upon the glass.
Each homestead holds its legends—love or war—
And guards some relic, crumbling, crude, time-worn,
An old brass knocker on a Dutch farm door,
A romance woven round a powder horn.
The rambling homesteads blink like aged seers
And watch their narrow, winding highway grow;
They see a boulevard, the pride of years,
That was just a dusty footpath long ago."

Traffic and congestion of modern Brooklyn were right outside the door. But it seemed miles and a century away. We were sitting in a dining room of warmth and character that was right off the kitchen in the 200-year-old house. Mrs. Frank Williams, who uses her maiden name, Gertrude Ryder Bennett, when she writes poetry, was pouring the tea and her guests were eating chocolate pudding and cookies.

She began to explain about the house and how it came into the family. It goes back to William Adrianne Bennett, who came to Brooklyn in 1636 and purchased 930 acres of land from the Indians—the property was called Gowanus. And Henry Stiles' History, which is considered the authority on early Brooklyn, states that there was no knowledge of any earlier settlement.

"My father thought that William Adrianne Bennett may have gone from England to Holland during the religious persecutions," Mrs. Williams said "I have nothing to show this, but when he came to Brooklyn he married a Dutch woman and from that time on the family was Dutch. Everyone spoke Dutch. I can recite nursery rhymes in Dutch. My great-grandfather—Cornelius Bennett—bought this house. It was built by Henry and Abraham Wyckoff, and an inscription on a beam in the old barn (since torn down) said the farmhouse was standing in 1766, so it could have been built a good many years earlier. The farm used to run from Kings Highway to Avenue U, and between East 19th Street and East 24th Street."

At the turn of the century Edward Bennett, who lived until 1951, when he was 91, sold a good portion of his farm for a real estate development.

The house has 12 rooms and now sits on a fine piece of land measuring 100 by 220 feet, and with its great split doors it gives one a sense of strength and security. You are protected. No one from the outside world can come in and hurt you. But the Hessian soldiers did come in 1776 and did take the place over. It would seem the troops were rather thoughtful for an occupying army, because, Mrs. Williams said, they always looked for houses with two chimneys so the family could remain and live on one side of the house while they made their quarters in the other.

Coming into the living room, Mrs. Williams showed us two panes, once part of a window in the house, now framed and hanging on the wall because they had historical significance. Scratched on one pane was the name "Toepfer Captain of Regt. de Ditfurth," and "M Bach Lieutenant v Hessen Hanau Artillerie."

We Shall Overcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading, most aggressive chains of local newspapers in the country is Community Newspapers of Long Island. This chain has taken a leadership position in promoting activities of community better-

ment that has become a beacon toward enlightenment and understanding for the residents of Long Island.

Last week the Port Washington News, under the able leadership of Joy Mayes Brown, published the following editorial. Although Alabama is far removed from the shores of Long Island, the initiative displayed by the Port Washington News in making our people aware of a problem that affects all Americans is to be highly commended.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial:

WE SHALL OVERCOME

The plight of the Negro in Alabama has been brought home visually to all of us during the past 2 tragic weeks. Commentators and editorial writers throughout our Nation have picked up angry pens to decry the outrage and our small voice of despair can only join them in their indignation.

Selma seems far away but is close, indeed, to those who feel the problems of the Negro are the problems of all America. The Reverend J. Harold Hadley of the North Shore Unitarian Church has made those problems his and this week joined hundreds of other clergymen in marching in the ranks of protest. Through his act he brings home a personal message against the bigotry and hate that erodes the hearts of many.

We salute the courage of Mr. Hadley and all the others who have jeopardized their very lives to fight for the cause of freedom. Their example encourages and leads us to inspiring heights of human morality.

Memphis Fire Department Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, a general alert was sounded in Memphis fire stations last week but it was no cause for alarm. It was to make an announcement that the city of Memphis has been awarded a class I rating by the national board of fire underwriters. The only other city in the Nation under 1 million population with such a rating is Washington, D.C.

For the citizens of my district, it means they now have the lowest fire insurance rates available. But it is also a tribute to Fire and Police Commissioner Claude A. Armour and Fire Chief E. A. Eddie Hamilton and the 985 men of the Memphis Fire Department. And it reflects favorably on our city of good abode.

The rating is the result of a team from the national board spending 2 weeks in Memphis making a survey of the fire department and its operations.

The city was graded on its overall department, its fire alarm system, fire prevention program, water supply, structural conditions of buildings, equipment, manpower training, administration, records, maintenance, reserve equipment, housing, alarm response, and testing programs.

I am especially pleased to inform my colleagues of this event because this week Memphis plays host to 4,000 members of the Nation's fire departments. Firemen from practically every congressional district in the country will be attending the annual Fire Department Instructors Conference.

We bid them welcome, and I am sure it will be an informative session that will benefit all our communities.

An Airman's Thoughts on Far East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an excellent analysis of the military situation on the Far East came to my desk from an airman, first class, stationed in Michigan.

His letter is so well constructed and presents the alternatives and opportunities in the Far East for U.S. efforts so ably that I am presenting it herewith in full:

I am not from Illinois, but I am writing to you as a fellow member of Federal Union. I would like to comment on the situation in Vietnam. I think we must step up our effort and see to it that we are not defeated. As things are going now, the completion of the Communist conquest of South Vietnam is only a matter of time. I believe we should bomb North Vietnam, not two or three times, but repeatedly until nothing of value to the Communist war effort is left standing. We should not use atomic weapons of any kind. And we should not do any saturation bombing (indiscriminate bombing of whole cities and populations). But we should destroy every target of military value: all facilities for aviation or shipping, whether directly military or not; all bridges; railroads, dams, power stations, factories, and of course the directly military installations. We should start doing this immediately, without slackening our efforts within South Vietnam.

If we do this, it will not end the war. Ho Chi Minh will not surrender; the world has never known a more tenacious fighter than Ho Chi Minh. I do not propose bombing as a panacea. I propose it as one contribution to the war. Bombing would not win the war, but it would turn the tide. We would no longer be on a sure course to defeat; that is, to seeing the Communists complete their conquest of South Vietnam. With the destruction of North Vietnam's ability to wage war, the situation would become one requiring pacification. Pacification as in Malaya and the Philippines after World War II. In those two countries, a long effort finally succeeded in reducing the Communist guerilla movement to minuscule proportions where, although a remnant continued to hide out for years, they were no longer a serious threat. This can be the situation in South Vietnam; a guerilla insurgency can be successfully dealt with, if it is only a guerrilla movement, a movement without full-fledged military capability. So let us destroy the military capability of the North Vietnamese base.

This brings up the question of Chinese intervention. If the Chinese do intervene, it is customarily assumed that this would be catastrophic for us. I think it would be catastrophic for China. We are in a position to reduce China to rubble. I do not propose doing this, if China stays out of the war. But if our bombing of North Vietnam is followed by direct Chinese involvement in the war, I think we should then start exactly the same kind of bombing of China as of North Vietnam.

Mao Tse-tung is a man of some caution and I believe he does not intend to get directly involved, as long as we do not invade North Vietnam; but if we do, he will send an army to invade South Vietnam as he invaded South Korea after we invaded North Korea. Whether this guess about his intentions is correct or not, I believe we should bomb North Vietnam without invading it; and then, if China intervenes, we should bomb China without invading it.

What kind of peace could we then hope for? I believe we must be careful in using the terms victory and defeat, and should not use them at all unless we know exactly what we mean by them in the given context. So also, we must know what we mean by peace and war. Whether Malaya and the Philippines were at peace or at war after World War II depends on the definition of the terms. And we should beware of seeking or expecting any final, permanent solution to any problem.

I do not know how to guess at the situation in Vietnam and China after these bombing campaigns. I do know that we are in for a long involvement in the affairs of Asia, whether we like it or not. I believe we should now take the initiative.

Year 1965 Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am announcing the results of my annual questionnaire which has been widely distributed throughout the Sixth District of Michigan. This information has been tabulated by Data Management, Inc., of Washington, D.C.

As I review the results, there are certain points that stand out clearly. Interests in legislation to provide medical care for the elderly continues very high, with few people with uncertain attitudes. Most significant were the hundreds of "write-in" preferences for the eldercare plan which—because it was suggested just about printing time—was not one of the stated options. For not being on the ballot, eldercare ran a most impressive race. Continued foreign aid brought an emphatic response with 79 percent stating that it should be reduced or discontinued. Another strong expression was reflected by the 78 percent who felt genuine concern over current fiscal policies of the Federal Government.

In addition, in view of the industrial complexion of the District which I am privileged to represent, I feel the response to the question regarding the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is of more than passing interest and call attention to the fact that 53 percent of those responding opposed such a change.

Knowing that the interest in such polls transcends the boundaries of congressional districts, with unanimous consent I place the results of my 1965 questionnaire in the RECORD:

1965 questionnaire results, Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN *(6th District, Michigan)*

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Not sure
Do you favor—			
1. Federal regulation of cigarette advertising and labeling to warn smokers of potential health hazards?	69	24	7
2. Fair-trade legislation to let manufacturers fix minimum retail prices for nationally branded goods?	29	58	13
3. Repeal of sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits states to enact right-to-work laws?	31	53	16
4. Providing for an economic development program for the 11-state Appalachian region?	46	30	24
5. Providing medical care for the elderly by— (*Percent*)			
Increasing social security taxes to finance hospital and nursing home costs for those over 65 (King-Anderson approach)? 23			
A tax credit or Federal financing for private insurance for both medical and hospital care for those over 65 (Bow bill)? 33			
No Federal participation in this field 24			
Other 10			
No answer 10			
6. A voluntary cropland retirement program to aid in adjusting agricultural production to market needs?	44	25	31
7. Last year the House increased social security benefits 5 percent, but the bill died in conference. Do you favor such an increase now?	59	31	10
8. Now that excise tax revisions on jewelry, furs, cosmetics, luggage, and handbags are being considered, should the 10-percent excise tax on automobiles also be reduced or repealed?	77	16	7
9. The administration's education proposals, among other things, would extend Federal aid to (*a*) preschool projects, (*b*) children from low-income families, (*c*) purchase of textbooks, and (*d*) State education departments. Do you believe that these are now areas where Federal action has become necessary?	34	54	12
10. Do you believe the current fiscal policies of unbalanced budgets, deficit spending, and borrowing to finance the Federal Government are any real cause for concern?	78	13	9
11. What is your opinion of the President's antipoverty program (no answer, 12 percent):			
Needs expansion (*Percent*) 17; Good as is 21; Goes too far (*Percent*) 23; Unnecessary 27			
12. The administration has requested $3,400,000,000 for foreign aid next year. Should this program be (no answer, 4 percent):			
Increased? (*Percent*) 3; About this level? 14; Decreased? (*Percent*) 51; Discontinued? 28			

Reapportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, most of the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Kansas believe strongly in our federal system of government. They were understandably disturbed by the U.S. Supreme Court ruling on apportionment of State legislatures, and I think the following editorial from the Independence Daily News is a fair summary of their views.

Under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this excellent editorial:

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment, an issue which used to confront the people of Kansas and the United States once in about every 25 years, now seems to come up every other year. This is due in some part to our rapidly changing, greatly mobile population.

Our all too powerful supreme courts, on the National and State levels, are legislating by interpretation. They are using their judicial powers to demand that our representative government be based solely upon the head, thus leaving areas out of representational part of government.

If they continue to follow this formula, then all the laws governing this land will be made by politicians living in the big cities. Should this situation materialize, what would keep these politicians and judges from centralizing our representative government even more. Operating on a larger scale, they could combine States rather than counties in one district. Some say that this is beyond the realm of possibility, but in this modern, liberal thinking world with the radical do-gooders and spenders on the loose nothing is impossible.

Our biggest problems to date have been caused by too much centralization of people lured to the big cities by big money created by deficit spending and a massive system of tax collection bureaus. Plus the fact that the supreme courts have so liberalized their interpretation of the Constitution that trespassing, carpetbagging and unlawful assemblies have come to mean freedom and the right of assembly, that brotherly love has come to mean you must accept another whether you want to or not, that any criminal acts and violations of the laws have come to mean freedom, that private enterprise means a business that is forced to be open to the public even if no public tax money is involved, that people vote on an issue and their vote is soon nullified by court action.

We could name other interpretations which have placed this Nation in jeopardy of becoming a divided country.

In our opinion, representative government should be a balanced system between the area and the people. One or the other of our legislative bodies should be based upon the land, or area, while the other should be based upon the people. We question too, whether the issue of reapportionment should come up any oftener than every decade. After all, the census is taken only every 10 years.

Before a fine, sturdy plant becomes a reality, the little seed must be sown in the soil. Fine plants do not develop from concrete city streets. Will fine government?

Uninsured Motorists in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored a bill, H.R. 634, to provide protection against the thousands of uninsured motorists operating in the District of Columbia.

It is my sincere hope that this year we will be able to get some action on this bill. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following WMAL editorial which was broadcast during the week of February 21, 1965:

UNINSURED DISTRICT MOTORISTS

District residents suffer unnecessary financial losses every day the city goes without adequate uninsured motorist protection. It is estimated that there are more than 35,000 uninsured cars operating in the city. The Commissioners must direct local efforts to have Congress correct this situation.

Last year a measure drafted by the Commissioners died when Congress adjourned. A new measure to establish an unsatisfied judgment fund to pay for damages caused by uninsured District motorists has been sent to Congress. But merely sending a bill to Congress is not enough. The Commissioners and citizen's groups must exert pressure for enactment. After all these years, the District deserves adequate protection against irresponsible uninsured motorists.

Philadelphia Apparel Manufacturers Concerned Over Shortage of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article which appeared in the Sunday Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., on Sunday, March 14, 1965, entitled "Apparel Firms Note Labor Shortage Here." It is noted that reference is made to the fact that:

> The apparel trades provided a good living for thousands of immigrants * * * but this source of manpower has dried up.

The situation referred to in the article underscores, I believe, the need for speedy enactment by the Congress of new immigration legislation. As a sponsor of one pending reform immigration proposal, H.R. 4522, I very much hope that the Congress will see fit to take early action on immigration reform.

The article follows:

APPAREL FIRMS NOTE LABOR SHORTAGE HERE

(By Douglas Bedell)

Philadelphia apparel manufacturers are complaining of a chronic labor shortage in their shops.

They are alarmed that the clothing industry, the city's largest industry, hasn't been attracting enough new workers despite substantial unemployment here.

They see their shops as sources of fairly well-paying jobs open to anyone who can develop dexterity at a sewing machine, but complain there aren't nearly enough properly motivated applicants to keep up with the industry's turnover rate.

JOBS FOR IMMIGRANTS

The apparel trades provided a start and a good living for thousands of immigrants, spokesmen for the industry note, but this source of manpower has dried up.

"Parents no longer want their kids to go into the industry," Miss Katherine Grant, assistant director of vocational education for the Philadelphia schools, said.

"Those who do apply have no preliminary experience in sewing. We're expected to turn out a finished operator in 180 hours. It can't be done.

NEED 250 OPERATORS

Men's wear plants here could use 250 more sewing-machine operators tomorrow, William B. Flickstein, secretary of the Philadelphia Clothing Manufacturers' Association, said in an interview.

Eugene Springer, executive director of the Women's Fashion Apparel Manufacturers Association, said makers of women's clothing probably need 300 more operators.

Three training programs run by the Board of Education—one each in the women's, men's, and knit-goods fields—turn out about 1,000 graduates a year, but about 2,300 employees leave the industry each year.

Some retire and a considerable number of women marry or leave to raise children.

In all its phases, the clothing industry provides employment, most of it highly specialized and to some degree seasonal, for 50,000 workers here.

The Southeastern Pennsylvania Economic Development Corp. is beginning a study to see what might be done to preserve and strengthen the industry as an important source of employment here.

The three training programs are financed with State funds under a long-standing State law providing for training of the unemployed through the school districts. Trainees receive no allowances.

The Opportunities Industrialization Center, 19th and Oxford Streets, also can train 180 operators a year.

UNITED STATES STOPS CLASSES

Even if enough promising trainees were available, additional classes under the Federal manpower law are out. The U.S. Labor Department, under pressure from the garment unions and apparently with the approval of some nothern employers, has renewed a freeze on sewing-machine training under the Manpower Act.

The fear is that southern communities would use the federaly-financed training programs as added inducements to lure garment plants from the North.

Labor shortages are a problem in apparel centers other than Philadelphia.

"I've had men interested in opening a plant here up to the point of 'Where can I get a labor supply?' " Springer said.

"WILL LOSE WORK

"We don't have a trained labor supply in a field we're expert in. If no one is available to contract work to in Philadelphia, dress manufacturers are going to send the work out of town."

Labor gaps, Flickstein said, result in production losses and heavy overtime, added cost burdens in a highly competitive industry.

Both Springer and Flickstein conceded that their industry has an image problem, and that not enough is being done to meet it. Tales of apparel "sweatshops" die hard.

Both men said there have been notable changes in working conditions in the shops and that opportunities for advancement to supervisor and manager, particularly for young men, are good.

The piece-rate system of pay still puts a premium on speed, but most shops today are clean and brightly lighted and some are air-conditioned, the spokesman said.

Pay starts at the equivalent of $1.25 an hour and goes to $2 to $2.50 an hour in ladies' garments, $2.30 to $3 in men's wear.

American Cooperatives: Human Resources and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, recently, the House Foreign Affairs Committee was fortunate to hear the testimony of Dwight D. Townsend, director of the Washington Cooperative League of U.S.A.

Mr. Townsend's remarks underline for us again the value of combining human resources with monetary foreign aid.

The cooperative league is one of the growing number of private agencies in the United States which are making more effective the U.S. efforts to assist other nations. American cooperatives are drawing on the vast knowledge and experience which they have gained over the years in this country to assist the people of the developing countries to form, and eventually run, their own cooperatives. This training takes place both in the countries involved and here in the United States.

I second Mr. Townsend's suggestion that the Congress consider assisting the building of fertilizer plants, financed in part through the funds generated by Public Law 380, and I commend his remarks to the Members of the House as an example of the contribution of American cooperatives and the importance of the people-to-people approach.

STATEMENT OF DWIGHT D. TOWNSEND, DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON OFFICE, COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF U.S.A., TO THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

As spokesman for the Cooperative League of the U.S.A.—an organization which has had much direct experience in the foreign aid program—I thank the committee, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity of being heard again.

The latest credentials for my appearance before you today were provided by the recent 24th biennial Congress of the Cooperative League which met in Chicago. In a formal resolution that body said: "[W]e commend the Congress, the President, the Peace Corps, the Department of State, and the Agency for International Development, and cooperative organizational for their efforts to bring an understanding to people of the developing countries of what people who are free can do through their mutual efforts to raise their level of living to achieve a full measure of human dignity."

To this you may say, "Fine words, but what has been done that makes them pertinent to your testimony?" And that is what I have come to tell you, Mr. Chairman, as quickly and completely as time will allow.

Our league, which is a national federation of cooperative businesses of all types, has been working directly with the Agency for International Development, with the Peace Corps, and with other instrumentalities of our government, for several years. This experience has convinced us that the President was right in 1964 when he called for a better organized foreign aid budget that would not only make possible, but would compel, greater and more imaginative use not only of our money but of our human resources.

When we speak of human resources we must include both the human resources of the recipient countries and our human resources—leaders in all the forms of community action needed by the economies of the new and developing countries. These include self-help projects, person-to-person encounters, and all those ingredients of commitment and involvement which are the social mortar to give permanence and durability to our efforts.

As the President reminded us only 2 months ago, the interdependence of nations is no longer a remote goal or a ringing slogan—but a fact of life which we neglect at our own peril.

It must be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that many of these nations we try to help are in the stage of threshing out from under a blanket of colonialism just to achieve a political identity of their own. We have only to look at our history to realize why for them this is a period of turmoil and uncertainty. For them, as it was for us, it will not begin to calm down and promise continuity until each small freeholder, each family head, knows that in the new society he will have a personal stake to call his own. As with our frontier farmers, having something to defend and conserve must precede—only then will he feel a reason to become politically discreet and conservative.

It is at this point that organized cooperatives have sought to make their contribution to our foreign aid efforts. We want to get the landless worker to feel he has a stake in life now and a better chance in the future.

Among the specific areas where our league has been at work are: (1) The training of Peace Corps volunteers for service in Latin America and Africa; (2) assisting with the school for cooperative leaders who come from many countries to study on the campus of the University of Wisconsin; (3) through organizing a cooperative marketing agency which enables the village artisans in the Andean regions of several South American countries to realize a much larger return for their handicraft work—items they once sacrificed for a pittance to local buyers but are now producing for a more decent return; and (4) through our global contract with AID people from the cooperative leadership of developing countries are being brought into meaningful contact with their counterparts in this country. Many of the best qualified cooperative leaders in America, at personal sacrifice, are spending months and even years to help the infant cooperative in these other countries to get on their feet.

All these things are possible because the foreign aid program is increasingly designed to give cooperatives and other segments of our private enterprise system a fruitful role to play in foreign-assistance efforts. The history of U.S. cooperatives, and indeed the history of our country generally, illustrates

that it is the people's private institutions, which they organize themselves, which they operate themselves, and which they control themselves, that are the keystones of the unique economic and political democracy we have forged for ourselves over the years. A century and a quarter ago the French traveler, De Tocqueville, noted and commented on this while traveling here. What the perceptive Frenchman saw and wrote about takes on added significance when we recall that—except in the cities—the new countries we are trying to help have about the same amenities, or lack of them, which the frontiersmen of early 19th century America had. If through cooperative organization we can give a coherent social pattern to the efforts of these emerging people at the community level, a dollar of foreign aid can be made to do the work of 10. This multiple effect is achieved because we will be creating the social mechanisms to channel aid out of the capital cities and into the hands of a locally involved leadership known and trusted by those people we most want to help.

The amount of money appropriated for foreign aid is a subject of annual debate. But it is our opinion that the difficulty of getting an adequate level of support will begin to solve itself when we as a people come up with the right "mix" of human and monetary resources and the right "mix" of energies from the public and the private sectors of our economy. The human resources are useless, of course, without financial support, but assuredly the financial outlay is wasted unless enough wisely directed human energy is used to insure that it is spent effectively.

Anyone who has listened year after year to the debate over how much to appropriate for foreign aid must realize by now that this uncertainty, in large measure, is not over the precise amount to spend so much as it is an expression of uncertainty over whether we are doing it right. Success in the program, and adequate support for it, in truth depend on the same thing. This is to convince the American people that we have found the answer to "How?" one they will trust, and then you will hear less, we feel, about the question of "How much?"

American history is replete in war and peace with stirring examples of how our people will pay whatever it takes to do a job which it has been demonstrated is essential to our national well-being. It is nonsense to say they will not do so again, in the case of helping insure a political and social equilibrium for those restless new nations which threaten anarchy and chaos not only for themselves but for the whole world if their legitimate human aspirations are stifled. Our people will respond to this problem when its urgency is demonstrated and—equally important—it can be shown that we have devised a technique that will cope with it in all its complexity and diversity.

This is where the cooperative presence is of greatest importance. The cooperative technique seeks to keep alive a human involvement with the people being assisted.

A particular achievement of American cooperatives for which they are understandably proud—one that has now proved itself beyond debate—is in the State of Wisconsin. I refer to the International Cooperative Training Center on the campus of the University of Wisconsin at Madison. This increasingly well-known center is the product of the dedication, the devotion, the resources, and the hard work of literally scores of the leadership in cooperatives in our country.

It has made the Wisconsin campus in one sense the hub of world cooperative development because a steady stream of students from dozens of the new, young countries are coming there to learn how to become leaders or become better leaders of the cooperatives in their homelands. Here they study intensively in one of the most pleasant academic settings in our country. They not only study but get a chance to see at first hand how cooperatives work in the United States.

These young Africans, Latin Americans, and Asians (and some of more mature years) go back to form the nucleus of leadership in their countries. We do not speculate on this point. It is already happening, although the training center is only a few years old.

In the testimony of our recently retired president, Murray D. Lincoln, in 1963, he touched upon a point about all this which is frequently overlooked or insufficiently appreciated. He did this when he said that when we use the road of self-help and the building of people's institutions at the local level, we are thus providing the means for our own graceful disengagement when our role is finished. In more earthy language he meant when we have done our part we can get out and leave the job to the people we are helping. Then it becomes truly their project, their cooperative bank, their credit union. Not only must we go in upon the showing of a need for our help expressed by the people themselves, but we must provide in our planning to withdraw as quickly as possible and leave the responsibility to them as they develop the leadership and know-how to run these things by themselves.

Mr. Lincoln also characterized these projects as "small proving grounds" for the membership to practice democracy—to see democracy functioning on a stage small enough for the least sophisticated member to understand." He is saying that it is a way to move this concept from the capital city to the village square and countryside, out of the hands of government functionaries however capable, and right into the hands of the rank and file of people—the only place where this method can have reality—in the lives of ordinary men.

Some but not all the members of this committee are old enough to remember when America began its program of taking its expertise to our own rural people. You remember the arrival of the extension workers, the county agents, the demonstration workers among the womenfolk, and the 4-H and Future Farmer organizations for young people. All these were forerunners to the exploding productivity of America's farms which ensued. The rural people in the developing countries present in their plight striking similarities to the plight of the farmer here at the turn of the century.

With the same elements present, and with the benefit of the experience we have had in the past decade on several continents, we know these homegrown techniques of the extension worker have not lost their validity—and evidence indicates that it is one of the finest of our exports in the whole foreign aid program. It is measured not primarily in dollars but in the willingness of people here who know about cooperatives to go out to some difficult post and serve for months and years at considerable sacrifice, but supported by the knowledge that they are helping people who need them, and at the same time helping their country carry out its foreign policy to achieve a more stable world.

A cooperative league director, Mr. Howard Cowden, of Kansas City, is author of an idea, in this context, which deserves close study by Congress and the administrators of the foreign aid program. In his fruitful career Mr. Cowden has helped half a million farm families build their own great economic institutions in the Midwest. Now he proposes that $100 million in loans or stock investments be made available through AID for the building of fertilizer plants in the developing countries. The criteria for feasibility he outlines are (1) need; (2) available raw material; and (3) that a large share of labor costs be through funds available from local capital generated through the workings of Public Law 480. He estimates that $100 million would build at least 10 new plants which would produce 3,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia per day. Agronomists say $1 worth of nitrogen, applied where absence of nitrogen is a limiting factor, will produce $4 in additional crops. Interpreted in the light of this specific suggestion, the fertilizer under this program with a value of $270,000 per day could produce new foodstuffs totaling $1,080,000 per day—or about $345 million in 1 year on a $100 million investment. Furthermore, these plants would yield about 30 percent on their sales, and would therefore pay for themselves in a little over 3 years.

In closing it needs to be said that the interest of the Cooperative League of the United States in the foreign aid program is the interest of a nonprofit organization—with this added dimension. The members of the organizations which make up the League now have their own program to give direct financial impetus to the achievement of foreign aid objectives. They call it "Worldwide Co-op Partners." Through it, using the League as their clearinghouse, members are giving individually thousands of dollars annually of their own money. This money is used particularly in doing those things out of reach of AID efforts for administrative or other reasons having to do with expenditure of public funds. But American cooperators do not limit their contribution to money. It is a constantly inspiring experience for the League staff to see how the members of U.S. cooperatives give of their time, travel, long distances, and open up their homes to further the program of getting visitors from abroad acquainted with what it all means. Our files bulge with letters of appreciation from abroad that come from people who have been touched by one of the many aspects of this people-to-people activity among cooperators here and in the new countries.

We come here today to urge this committee to insure for our efforts sufficient support to let us plan ahead with confidence; sufficient support to broaden and intensify efforts which are already paying off; to make our short hesitant steps now the longer, bolder ones tomorrow.

For they are steps on a road we have already traveled far enough to see is the right one.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Reapportionment Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Kansas Farm Organizations on March 17 passed a resolution pertaining to the Supreme Court's reapportionment decision. I have today received a letter from Mr. Walter C. Peirce, president of the committee, conveying the text of the resolution. Under unanimous consent I insert this resolution in the RECORD:

Members of the Committee of Kansas Farm Organizations believe that one of the most important issues facing all Kansans and certainly an issue most vital to the future of Kansas agriculture is the U.S. Supreme Court decision to force reapportionment of our State legislature. The system of having one

house based on a factor other than population was established by our Federal Constitution. This is a part of our Kansas constitution and both of these provisions are now in jeopardy.

We believe that you are in agreement with the principle of amending the Federal Constitution to permit retention of one house based on factors other than population. The committee trusts that you will not only support this amendment but will speak out in favor of it at every opportunity and do everything possible to get it passed in this session of Congress. Early action is imperative as this is the last chance we will have.

The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and recent rulings by our own Kansas Supreme Court mean we must get this amendment ratified if we are to stop further court action.

Johnson's Campaign To Beautify Nation Hits First Snag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, farmers, conservationists, and legislators in Missouri have been greatly concerned about the proposal to require farmers and landowners to pay for technical services provided by the Soil Conservation Service in the field of soil and water conservation.

Under leave previously granted, I insert House Resolution 113 recently passed by the Missouri House of Representatives petitioning Congress not to concur in the reduction or elimination of these technical services and the following article from the St. Louis Globe Democrat of March 3, pointing out the false economies of the proposal.

The resolution and article follow:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 113 BY MISSOURI GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Whereas the house of representatives of the 73d general assembly resolves that the Missouri General Assembly strongly protest to the Congress of the United States, the proposed cut in funds for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget; and

Whereas the present agricultural budget for soil and water conservation has remained the same for several years while costs have been increased; and

Whereas good progress has been made in Missouri in the past 30 years, but much work is yet to be done; and

Whereas 11 million acres of cropland is subject to erosion and 4 million acres of flatland have a drainage problem; and

Whereas Missouri has 18 million acres of cropland making it one of the outstanding agricultural States in the country; and

Whereas soil and water are without a doubt the most important resources in Missouri affecting both family farms, rural communities, and urban areas; and

Whereas the reduction of funds by $20 million as recommended to be paid by landowners for technical assistance in applying practices would retard and delay the progress of soil and water conservation which is, as stated, national concern, affecting the welfare of all citizens of our State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress be encouraged to restore the proposed $20 million cut in appropriations for the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in order that Missouri may continue to provide technical assistance to landowners in installing planned conservation on their lands; and be it further

Resolved, That we also urge a continuation and expansion of this effective program which we believe is essential for maintenance of the family farm, the economic stability of the rural community and the preservation of our water resources, food supply, and recreational opportunities for both rural and urban communities; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, President of the Senate, and to each member of the Missouri delegation in the Congress of the United States.

JOHNSON'S CAMPAIGN TO BEAUTIFY NATION HITS FIRST SNAG

(By Wil Lepkowski)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson's campaign to beautify America is running into its first big snag—right in his own budget.

Buried in President Johnson's fiscal 1966 spending program is a cost-cutting scheme that would require farmers, ranchers, and other landowners to pay the Government for help in preserving their land.

Such help has been given free of charge by the Soil Conservation Service since 1935.

But the Budget Bureau, which is reversing the policy, thinks landowners and the Government should share equally in the cost of designing and installing layouts which prevent soil erosion and conserve water.

WON'T CLEAN UP JUNK

The effect of such a step, if it is adopted, would run counter to President Johnson's own goal of cleaning up the countryside, conservationists contend. For there are many landowners who either can't or won't pay the money to keep up their property.

The Budget Bureau's proposal lay almost unnoticed in the budget, which went to Congress January 25, until after President Johnson sent his beauty message to Capitol Hill on February 8.

The President said in the beauty message that he was asking Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman to work out a cooperative State and local program "for improving the beauty of privately owned rural lands."

He added: "Much can be done within existing Department of Agriculture programs without adding to cost."

In view of the proposed cutback on Soil Conservation Service activities, conservationists think this strikes a particularly poignant note.

The Budget Bureau says $20 million will be saved under the change. A spokesman explained that since farmers benefit from the service, they should pay part of the cost. He said the change is in line with other austerity proposals such as one requiring meatpackers to pay the cost of Government inspection.

MILLION FARMERS GET SUBSIDY

But conservationists say meatpackers will pass the extra expense on to the public. Farmers can't, because antierosion measures are usually applied to retired cropland.

More than 1 million landowners received Government help last year, when about 2,500,000 acres of former cropland were converted to grass and tree production. Agriculture officials estimate that 97 percent of all privately owned land is eligible.

To get help, a landowner takes his problem to the local soil conservation district council which then passes the request to the Federal area office. Soil scientists and land engineers then visit the owner to survey his property and draw us a program of improvement. Materials and muscle are supplied by the landowner. Supervision is free.

One of the most frequently seen results of such work are the millions of farm ponds that dot the rural countryside. More fish are caught from such ponds than from any other source.

"We believe future generations would suffer most if the soil and water conservation effort of the Nation is slowed down and dissipated," says the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts in opposing the proposal.

"Gullied fields and muddy streams detract from the beauty of America as much as auto graveyards."

Our Rising Mobocracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial entitled "Our Rising Mobocracy" which appeared in the Albany Herald, Albany, Ga., dated March 18, 1965. This editorial was written by James H. Gray, a widely read and much respected Georgia editor.

It seems to me that this is timely and contains inescapable logic.

When will the Nation wake up and realize that the mobs have been screawing "fire" in a crowded country and for the purpose of dividing us?

Mr. Speaker, one reason I believe this article is timely and that it should be widely read is because apparently there are very few influential daily papers left in this country which will print the other side of the question. I, for one, am thankful that we still have an editor left on the eastern seaboard who will call a spade a spade, as has the inestimable Jimmy Gray.

The editorial follows:

OUR RISING MOBOCRACY

One of the most compelling arguments of supporters of the 1964 civil rights bill was that, when enacted into law, it would remove the major causes of the so-called Negro revolution and shift the remaining controversy, if any, from the streets into the courts.

The bill became law last July. But has it accomplished this purpose? It has not.

Aside from a moratorium of about 6 months, in which the Negro militant organizations decreed a truce for the presidential election campaign in order to minimize an anticipated "white backlash" vote that never developed, the street demonstrations by the followers of Martin Luther King, Jr., and other aspirants for the laurel wreath of leadership among Negroes have been renewed and widened.

Today's primary target is Selma, Ala. But sympathy marches and caterwaulings have sprung up across the face of the land, all for the expressed purpose of arousing the white conscience to the condition by which the Negro is denied the undisputedly constitutional right to register and vote in a few scattered localities.

But is this the real purpose of their demonstrations? Frequently, we wonder. Why do not the aggrieved Negroes address their

petitions for remedy to the courts which are readily willing and able to render them injunctive and other forms of relief from disdiscriminatory registrars applying restrictive and therefore unconstitutional laws? "Too slow," say the Negroes, "too expensive." Instead, they follow the siren call of the leaders into the streets.

There, unfortunately, they have found the political remedy far swifter than the orderly operations of the judiciary. The equation is simple enough: Demonstrations spell trouble, trouble spells publicity, publicity spells political pressure, political pressure spells political action, political action spells laws cynically engineered to assure votes. Sum. Happiness.

But is it? The record clearly shows that, in the area of Negro demands, one leads merely to another. Was there peace after enactment of the Civil Rights Bill of 1957, the first since the Reconstruction era? No. Or after the civil rights bill of 1960? No. Or after the civil rights bill of 1964? No.

Will Lyndon Johnson's voting guarantee bill of 1965, which aims to bypass the stringent requirements for a constitutional amendment with a simple statute, bring peace to the racial scene? That has not been the national experience. Instead, we anticipate that the demonstrations will continue—before, during, and after the expected passage of Mr. Johnson's new bill.

We have reached this conclusion for two fundamental reasons: First, in adopting the civil disobedience technique of the late Mohandas K. Gandhi, Martin Luther King has unbottled a genie which he probably will not be able to cork at will. Second, the Reverend Doctor would virtually cease to exist as a national figure were he to abandon the program he has set in motion. Can anyone imagine, even remotely, his docile return to an obscure fundamentalist church in Atlanta after a decade of activity which resulted in his award of the Nobel Peace Prize?

As was the case in the national experiment with prohibition, so it is with so-called civil rights. Whereas the former gave rise to syndicated racketeering in the land, the latter undeniably is fostering mobocracy, as opposed to democracy, as a way of life. One entire generation now has been nurtured upon this witch's brew and cannot be expected to abandon its waywardness to embrace the orderly processes of self-government fashioned so patiently over 185 years of our national experience.

For all of his impassioned oratory on the issue of Negro voting rights the President felt it necessary to affirm that freedom of speech under the Holmesian dictum does not mean the right to scream "fire" in a crowded theater, and freedom of assembly does not guarantee a right to block public traffic. And yet, the mobs grow both larger and bolder. By Mr. Johnson's own admission, they apply pressure upon the President and the Congress. They flout the public peace and good order. They defy all authority, frequently that of their own leaders. They bid fair to become a law unto themselves. And all, mind you, all this in the name of such hallowed catch phrases as "human rights" and "human dignity" and "civil rights."

What a mockery of democracy.

The Test of Previous Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on H.R. 5374, a bill which would have corrected the cuts in Supreme Court salary made by the other body last year, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] provided a most interesting analysis in which he recited the prior judicial experience of members of the Supreme Court. The gentleman from Missouri found that the Supreme Court has failed the Ichord test of prior experience.

I was most intrigued by Mr. ICHORD's test. I suspected that perhaps we had finally discovered a reliable test which the public might use to assess the value of public servants including Members of the House of Representatives. This is a subject of continuing controversy and, in fact, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] brought a survey of competence of the Members of the House to our attention at the beginning of this session. The gentleman from Ohio had protested this previous test of competence, which was based upon an alleged survey of the press and the Members of this House, and I had hoped that the test of previous experience might prove to be a suitable alternative.

I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a concrete example of this test when it is applied to this House. On the one hand, I chose six outstanding leaders from the ranks of the House. An examination of the biographies of the Speaker, the majority leader, the majority whip, the minority leader, the minority whip, and the dean of the House—the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee—revealed that their combined legislative experience, prior to service in this House, totaled 7 years. Incidentally, that total is entirely due to the service of our Speaker in the Massachusetts Legislature. My record revealed 3½ years experience in the Los Angeles City Council. The gentleman from Missouri has had 9 years of service in his State legislature before election to Congress. The combined total of 12½ years clearly outnumbered the aforementioned total of 7 years and yet it is hard to believe that the latter two Members make a contribution to this House which exceeds that of the Speaker, the majority leader, the majority whip, the minority leader, the minority whip, and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. On this basis, and with regret, I must discard the test of previous experience and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The U.N. Sits One Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial of March 3, 1965, the Miami Herald reminded us that—

> The world would be much more dangerous than it is without the United Nations. In fact, if we did not have such an agency, imperfect as it is, we would have to create one.

This is a very timely reminder—for in the course of the public discussion of the crisis in the U.N. General Assembly, many participants seem to have lost sight of the fact that the U.N. is not paralyzed—that thousands of men operating under its flag are daily keeping peace in distant parts of the world—that additional thousands of men and women, working through the U.N. and its specialized agencies, are fighting hunger, poverty, disease, and illiteracy on many continents—that still others working through various U.N. programs, are aiding in the task of economic development of the underdeveloped areas—that, in brief, the U.N. continues to be a living and vital force in international affairs.

What, then, can and should be said of the state of affairs in the U.N. General Assembly?

As we all know, the immediate aspect of the controversy which has immobilized the General Assembly during recent months is the refusal of a number of U.N. members to pay up the assessments for certain peacekeeping operations.

Their refusal has impaired the financial integrity of the organization. To put it bluntly, until the members who are delinquent in their payments discharge their financial obligations to the organization, the U.N. is unable to pay some of its outstanding bills.

But the issue cuts deeper than that. At the heart of the problem confronting the U.N. is a very vital and far-reaching political question—the question whether the General Assembly should continue, within the scope of its powers, to be able to deal, free of a veto, with problems of peace and security in the world.

By challenging the General Assembly's power to assess for peacekeeping operations, some of its members have confronted the entire U.N. membership with what is, perhaps, the most serious decision ever to confront the United Nations. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson described this decision in addressing the General Assembly on January 26, 1965, in the following words:

> It is, in essence, whether or not we intend to preserve the effective capacity of this organization to keep the peace. It is whether to continue the difficult but practical and hopeful process of realizing in action the potential of the Charter for growth through collective responsibility, or turn toward a weaker concept and a different system.

To date, the General Assembly has not made its choice. But the soul-searching and the discussions among the U.N. membership continue. This, in itself, is an encouraging sign. For the General Assembly has not turned its back on the record of progress the orgaization has achieved in the past 20 years. And as the Miami Herald editorial stated recently:

> The U.N. can still function as it was intended if its members allow it to do so. It is still the vehicle for a system of world order based on common interests. It is still the forum where the nightmare of nuclear holocaust can be dispelled.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted earlier, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point the full text of the editorial from the Miami Herald of March 3, and to commend it to the attention of the membership of this House:

THE U.N. SITS ONE OUT

The seeds of war sprout relentlessly in Vietnam where yesterday the heaviest air raids yet pounded Communist targets north of the 17th parallel.

With escalation no longer a threat but a reality, where is the United Nations?

For the first time in the 20 years of its existence the agency founded to guard the peace and cherish human dignity is on the sidelines.

In every previous crisis the U.N. acted with various degrees of decisiveness. In Korea, the battle against aggression was fought under its blue and white banner. In the Congo the U.N. forces kept a new nation intact and prevented chaos, although that battle is not yet won. In the Near East, the U.N. has guarded a precarious truce for a decade.

Where is it in the Vietnamese crisis, which may be the most deadly of all?

Secretary General U Thant has called for negotiations to end the fighting, but in terms the U.S. considered critical. The U.N. official wants a way for the United States to withdraw gracefully—an outcome that would leave aggressors free to continue their probes.

U Thant is hampered by lack of a power base. The U.N. General Assembly has ended its annual session in deep frustration, unable to take a single vote. The argument over nonpayment of peace-keeping assessments has paralyzed the machinery of reason.

The illness of the U.N. is deeper than this. Only part of the blame lies with the Soviet Union and France, the principal financial delinquents. The multiplying young nations who use this as a rostrum for racism and nationalism must share the responsibility. The rising criticism in this country of the U.N.'s ineffectiveness, which fails to get at the cause, contributes to further deterioration.

The U.N. can still function as it was intended if its members allow it to do so. It is still the vehicle for a system of world order based on common interests. It is still the forum where the nightmare of nuclear holacaust can be dispelled.

The nations of the world must find a way to work together to avoid poverty, conformity by force and war. This is what the United Nations was created for 20 years ago and it is still the only alternative to a struggle between rival power blocs.

The world would be much more dangerous than it is without the United Nations. In fact, if we did not have such an agency, imperfect as it is, we would have to create one.

The Montgomery Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, two of my constituents, Rabbi Allan Levine, of Temple Emanu-El of Irondequoit, and Prof. Lewis Lansky, of Monroe Community College, recently were in Montgomery, Ala., and while there were eyewitnessess to the terror which was visited on Negro and white citizens who were petitioning for the constitutional rights of citizens of that community.

These gentlemen, both of whom are highly respected in my home community of Rochester, N.Y., thoughtfully shared with me their joint account of "Terrible Tuesday"—March 16—in Montgomery. This narrative is frightening almost beyond belief. Yet, news reports from the scene corroborate the conditions described by Rabbi Levine and Professor Lansky.

So that my colleagues may be made further aware of the need for additional Federal measures to deal with such situations, I commend to their serious study the following unedited report by Rabbi Levine and Professor Lansky:

THE MONTGOMERY REPORT

At 1:10 p.m. on Tuesday, March 16, 1965, Prof. Lewis Lansky, Rabbi Alan Levine, and Rabbi Sidney Axelrod, of Palo Alto, Calif., were driving in a cab to the Alabama State capital in Montgomery. As we were driving, we saw a large group of people lined up on one side of Decatur Street. They were sitting and singing. Police were standing around leisurely. This was a group of students led by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. They had been peacefully marching to the State capital to demonstrate the right of peaceful protest. The group was primarily composed of elementary, high school, and college students, ages ranging from 14 to 21. There were also clergymen and college professors present. We got out of the cab and joined this group. At the beckoning on the part of the police, the leader of the group, James Foreman, had us get up and start across the street. Half of the group did this without difficulty. Rabbi Levine and Professor Lansky had stepped off the curb when suddenly police moved in and stopped this. There was no prior warning. The group now being split into two parts began singing and shouting, "Freedom."

All this while, police photographers with movie and still cameras were photographing the people involved. Suddenly a group of 15 mounted men, some wearing plain clothes with arm bands, some wearing uniforms, some wearing helmets, others cowboy hats, all swinging clubs and canes and swishing whips, came at the group across the street. They especially went for James Foreman who was standing on the corner. They clubbed him on the head and he fled. At this point, people began screaming and shrieking on both sides as the horsemen moved into the midst of the group, brutally pounding people over the heads with the clubs and canes, trampling them down with horses, and whipping them. People were crying out, "They are going to kill us." "Oh, my God." At that point, I saw a young girl with glasses across the street in the midst of three horses being bumped from behind and on the side by the horses and being clubbed.

There had been no order given by any police agency present for us to disperse. There was no loudspeaker system being used for this purpose.

Next we saw a Japanese student pinned up against the brick wall of the building across the street; he was clubbed over the head; he was trampled down by the horses, further clubbed on the head and the back until he lapsed into a state of unconsciousness. He woke up shortly after in a pool of blood. A policeman came up to him and he thought that the policeman was going to help him and he tried to get up, but instead the policeman kicked him in the genitals and in the stomach a number of times. Then, policemen picked him up by the seat of the pants and the back of his shirt, hauled him to a car, and threw him into the back of the car on the floor. He was then taken to a hospital.

In the meantime, the other half of the sheriff's posse on horseback charged into our group swinging clubs and canes and whips and pushing people with horses. They did this indiscriminately, and this, of course, included young elementary and high school children. People were screaming and crying out. The group started moving for cover and then began to run. Rabbi Levine ran onto the porch of a house with about 30 other people. The horsemen pursued them, one riding onto the porch of the house, swinging his cane. Rabbi Levine tried to protect himself behind a pole. The horses head was bumping into him while its rider was swinging the cane in an attempt to bring it down on his head. There was a group of children who tried to escape down an alley alongside of this house. They were terrified and screaming. Along the other side of the alley there was a housing development. White women appeared on the doorsteps preventing the children from seeking refuge. One of them, an older woman, had a large dagger. While they were running down the alley, one girl fell and about 20 children fell on top of her. They eventually got up and started running once again, but this girl was left on the ground. In the meantime, the police on foot and horseback pursued the children down the alley. Therefore, it became obvious to them that they were not safe even there and they became fearful of being trapped. Some of the children crawled underneath the houses at which point the white women who were older people in their sixties or seventies, shouted to the police, "they are under my house."

The police shouted, "let's get them," and they crawled underneath and started flailing the children. In the meantime, Rabbi Levine had spotted the girl lying on the ground. She was totally unconscious. He also saw a man lying prostrate on his back in a pool of blood with a handkerchief over his head. This was Professor Hope of Juniata College. There was a deep gash on his head. The police were still in the alley whipping people.

Then he noticed the Japanese student lying on the sidewalk across the street. He shouted for a doctor and an ambulance. "People are hurt, call an ambulance." Nearby, there was a girl who was crying, "Oh, my Lord," who had been trampled on the ground by one of the horses in front of a house. A woman came out and shouted, "nigger get off my grass," at which point she picked up a brick and threw it at the girl hitting her in the head. The officers were getting the biggest kick out of this laughing and smiling the whole while.

Then two ambulances came and took Professor Hope and the girl to the hospital. Rabbi Levine helped carry the stretchers. He asked Professor Hope if he wanted him to go along with him and Hope replied, "Yes, please."

He got to the ambulance and a policeman asked him where he was going. He answered, "I am going with him (Hope)." The policeman said, "No, you are not. Are you his minister?" The rabbi replied, "No, I am not, but I am one of the ministers with the movement."

The policeman said, "Then, you cannot go." Levine replied, "I am going anyway and you or no one is going to stop me." With that he grabbed the door, got into the ambulance, and slammed the door in the policeman's face.

In the hospital, Hope was taken to the surgical room. Levine wanted to call the Justice Department. He did not have enough change and no one around would help him. At that time, a doctor passed by and noticed that Levine was a clergyman. Levine told him what he had seen. The doctor was flabbergasted. The doctor gave him one dollar in change and he made the call to the Justice Department asking for the Attorney General Katzenbach. Katzenbach was not in, but the call was transferred to Reese. Levine told him the story and asked for help.

Reese replied that he had John Doar of the Justice Department there. Levine replied that this was not enough because Doar was not there had not seen the incident.

People in the hospital who had heard what had happened became solicitious. A Dr. Seligman begged him not to go back saying that he would be killed.

Levine went back to the waiting room.

A girl who had been kicked in the stomach by a policeman was released and went to pay her bill. The first girl who had been trampled was released a few minutes later. She did not recognize Levine because she had been totally unconscious when he found her. She said to him, "I'm scared." Levine said, "that is perfectly understandable." But the girl replied, on the contrary, that she was scared of what her mother would say about her losing her shoe. And she wanted to go back to the scene in order to look for the shoe and was eager to rejoin the marchers.

Shortly after this, Hope was released from the hospital.

Levine went to see Steven Kiyoshi Kuromiya, the Japanese student. Kuromiya told him what had happened to him. Levine wrote an affidavit of Kuromiya's story, signed it, and turned it over later to the FBI. Nurses that were standing close by were laughing throughout and remarked that if the doctor ever heard him tell that story, he would have kicked him out.

At this point, Levine left the hospital and walked back to the Jackson Street area where the marchers had been herded. He was approached by members of the FBI and the Justice Department who had been looking for him and asked him to explain what had happened. They also said that five FBI agents had witnessed the whole thing. Later on that evening, an announcement was made that anyone who had been injured in any way by the policemen, regardless of degree, was to report this to the FBI.

Levine presently was approached by the police captain who asked him to wait and talk to him. He said that he did not have anything to do with this. He did not want this to happen. He did not call for the sheriff's posse. But he knew he was going to share the responsibility for this. He said, "as far as I am concerned, this was worse than Selma." Levine said that the man's voice was shaking and he was almost in tears.

During the time that Levine was caring for Professor Hope and the girl, the crowd, pursued by the men on horseback and prodded by men on foot with billy-clubs, started moving down the street. Lansky was at the end of the crowd. Everyone was pressed up against everyone else. He was not able to move on his own accord. The press of the crowd pushed him along. People were screaming, "Oh, my God." "They're going to kill us." At that point, a young girl crying hysterically, grabbed his arm and held on tight. The horsemen were in back of us and on the side swinging their canes and whips. A number of people were yelling that whoever got hurt should go to room 303 in the Benmore Hotel on Jackson Street where an infirmary had been set up.

At the same time, policemen all along the line were jabbing people with clubs and yelling at them, "get moving, get moving." Lansky was hit in the side by a man with a club. We reached the corner of Decatur and Highland Avenues where there was an empty lot. We were herded into this field with bushes that we had to crawl through; some of the horsemen came up from the rear onto the other side and started whipping and beating. One man fell in the field and was further beaten and whipped. Two others picked him up and carried him along. Lansky happened to get a look at him. His whole head was covered with blood. There were deep gashes on the side and back of his head. He helped carry him to the Jackson Street area. At that point, a whistle blew and the horses went away. Apparently this was a signal for the posse to regroup. The crowd kept moving down the street. There were SNCC runners with helmets and arm bands running along side trying to keep people as calm as possible under the circumstances. There were many people who wanted to hit back. Some picked up rocks to throw at the police, but they did not. People were yelling, "don't throw anything." We continued to walk down Highland Avenue a long distance to a gas station on the corner of Jackson Street. All this time the SNCC leaders showed amazing leadership capability and responsibility.

All this time, Lansky kept looking for Rabbi Levine and Rabbi Axelrod. He had not seen them since the beginning. He thought that either they had gotten away somehow, or they had been hurt. He did not see either one of them for the next hour and a half.

He felt trapped, that the chasing and the beating would never come to an end. He did not know where we were going. No one else seemed to know either. He kept asking, "Have we been arrested?" No one knew. He continued on to the Jackson Street area and looked all over the street and in the church and was satisfied that the two rabbis were not there.

Shortly after, however, he noticed Rabbi Axelrod going into a house next to the church. He went into the house and saw Axelrod on the telephone calling the San Francisco newspaper, telling the man on the other end about what had happened. When he was through, he took the phone and requested that the man call the Gannett News Service for the Democrat and Chronicle and relay this information to them. He replied that he would try to do this and said that he would notify Associated Press and United Press International. Axelrod, in talking on the telephone, was kneeling on the floor, his whole body shaking. He had been knocked down by one of the horses, tried to get up again, and was knocked down again. When he saw him, his whole body was shaking as if he was having an epileptic fit.

At that point, policemen on motorcycles came down Jackson Street at high speed and ran into the group of people who were milling around in the street; one of the cycles ran over a man who was in the way. People began screaming and crying once again and running in all directions. We feared that the horses were coming back. A young girl next to Lansky began weeping hysterically. The policemen were getting off of the motorcycle. There was the fear that they would come into the houses. The SNCC leaders asked the motorcycle policemen to stay and block both ends of Jackson Street to keep the people inside and prevent hostile white people from coming in. This was done. Lansky found out later that the policeman who had run over the man was taken off duty and reprimanded.

Presently, someone came in and said that the President should be called. Lansky called the White House and asked for a Presidential assistant. A Presidential assistant said, "Well, what can we do?" Our reply was, "Send down Federal troops or something, but help us." He replied, "You knew what you would be in for when you went down to Alabama in the first place."

Then the man hung up. A girl from Michigan called up Governor Romney. The man who answered said that Romney was at a conference and was belligerent and hung up. A little later she called back and received satisfaction. The message would be delivered to him.

In the meantime the leaders of SNCC were making speeches and leading singing out on the street which served to hold people's attention aid give them an opportunity to vent their emotions.

At about 4 o'clock, Rev. Martin Luther King came into the Jackson Street area. People began to shout, "Here comes King." "Come on, King, join our line." There ain't nothin' they can do to us now." People were running toward him from all directions as if the Messiah had come. He presently closeted himself with the SNCC leadership for the purpose of figuring out what to do next. It would be King's function to lend prestige to their efforts and serve to prevent more violence and brutality on the part of the police.

There was continued singing in the street. Someone suggested sleeping in the street all night as a sign of determination to keep going in the face of any odds. Presently girls came around with sandwiches that had been made by people in the neighborhood and passed them around to us. An announcement was made that there would be a mass meeting in the church at which King would discuss what the next move would be. We were not able to stay for this, however, as we had reservations on a plane and had decided to leave. At the time that we left, the spirits of the people were very high. They were extremely frustrated, especially in comparing the happenings of the day with the words of President Johnson the night before.

Before we left a boy came up to Rabbi Levine and apologized saying, "Rabbi, please forgive me, you probably got beaten because I was holding on to you." Levine didn't remember the incident at all.

The President's Speech and an Immoral Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials which appeared in the March 17, 1965, and the March 22, 1965, Wall Street Journal. They raise interesting questions regarding the President's speech to the joint session on Monday, March 15, 1965, and the voting rights bill he has submitted to the Congress. Many of the points raised in these articles were touched upon in my remarks to the House on Thursday, March 18, 1965.

I feel that these editorials should have the careful attention of all the Members.

The editorials follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 17, 1965]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

For a long time now, so impassioned are the feelings and so violent men's actions, it has been difficult to disentangle the mind from the emotions in the civil rights issue. So it was the other evening when the President spoke to the Congress.

When President Johnson said that a Negro's right to vote on a parity with his neighbor is the most fundamental of his rights he spoke only the simple truth. He did also when he said that there was no cause for pride in the recent events in Selma, Ala. Or when he said that in divers other places too men have been denied their right to vote for no other reason than that their skin was black.

And for men of good will there should be only shame at the ingenuity with which this has been done. Even Mr. Johnson's catalog did not do full justice to that ingenuity—the absent registrar, the web of bureaucratic forms, the arrogance of officials left to form their own peculiar tests, the constitutional questioninga which even highest judges cannot answer to every man's satisfaction. No man, indeed, can count the ways of discrimination by the determined and the sly.

Surely no man of good will, listening to the President last Monday, could help but share his wish that by some means the lawmakers can put an end to that.

The moral issue is indisputable. And the Constitution, that document behind which some men hide, and others honor only when it suits their purpose, is quite clear upon the matter.

The rights of the citizens of the United States, it says, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." It plainly says the Congress shall have the power to enforce this principle by appropriate legislation.

So of the need for remedies, and of the propriety of action, there can be no doubt.

Yet for all of that, there came a point in the President's speech when his words which had been clear, forceful, and concise began to ramble. It was evident, looking down at the floor of the House, that the riveted attention of those assembled had been lost. And at this point some other thoughts began to intrude the mind.

For one thing, here was the President of the United States asking—nay, demanding—that the Congress promptly enact a bill which he himself had not yet put words to. Speaking on a Monday night he said the details would be worked out on the morrow, and that on Wednesday the Congress might know more exactly what was asked of them.

And here was the Congress of the United States, with some few exceptions of mixed motives, caught up in the mood to enact a law which they had not yet seen. In the press gallery, from which reporters scurried to talk with Senators and Congressmen, the word came back that all would be speedily done.

By yesterday the outlines were somewhat clearer. But as this is being written, the party leaders in Congress are still meeting with administration officials trying to decide exactly what law it is the President asked for the evening before.

Consequently, none of us can at the moment have any reasoned judgment on the proposed law itself; nor is it easy to see how the Congress can either. For there is a great difference between virtues of a heart's intent and the provisions of a law which would put that intent in coercive form.

But we can hope that the law as finally enacted will not embrace all of the thoughts embodied in the President's rhetoric. For in the emotion of the moment Mr. Johnson did not stop with asking a law to see that all citizens—white, black, brown, or yellow—be treated alike or content himself with asking Federal authority to see that this be done.

He said, for example, that the law should strike down all restrictions to voting in all elections whichever have been used to deny Negroes their vote. This new law, he said, must protect the right of "every American to vote in every election" that he may "desire" to participate in.

This is a wholly different thing. At some time and in some places every rule—restriction, if you prefer—has been abused to discriminate against a Negro voter. But it does not at all follow that every such rule, or restriction, is unwise or improper in itself.

Age limitations, residence requirements, the ability to read and to write the language in which society's affairs are carried on, all these things have much to commend them. In any event, a Federal law to sweep them away would violate that selfsame Constitution which the President asks us not to flout with prejudice. In two separate places, in identical language, the Constitution gives to the States the right to set such standards.

The essence here, the thing that both heart and mind demand, is that when they walk toward the voting booth all citizens shall be treated alike. This is, first of all, the responsibility of each community, but if they abrogate it then justice asks that all of us do what is necessary to see that some do not do injustice.

For our own part, we doubt not this will be done. Yet if it is to be well done, it ought not to be done until what is done is carefully thought upon so that we see what we do. Sometimes, sad to say, it takes emotion to move men to act, but those swept by emotions must take care lest they sweep away the good with the bad.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 22, 1965]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—AN IMMORAL LAW

When President Johnson last Monday asked Congress for a new law to safeguard the voting rights of Negro citizens he rested his case on the Constitution and on a basic principle of morality.

What he has now proposed that the Congress do is enact a law which would violate that Constitution he asks us not to flout and, more, which is itself immoral.

If you think not so, consider:

The administration bill offers a formula—a complicated one, which we will come to in a moment—to prohibit certain States from using any test of a citizen's ability to read and write our language as a qualification for voting.

The argument for doing this is the 15th amendment to the Constitution which provides, clearly enough, that neither the Federal Government nor any State shall deprive a citizen of his vote "on account of" his race or color.

But the proposed bill does not stop with providing means against the violation of the 15th amendment. It does not aim at insuring that any such State literacy test shall be fairly drawn and impartially administered so that it may not be used as an excuse to deprive anyone of his vote "on account of" his race.

The effect—and indeed the purpose—would be to abolish such tests entirely in the affected States. And that flies squarely in the face of this self-same Constitution which the President professes to uphold.

The very first article of that Constitution authorizes the individual States to decide the qualifications of voters in both Federal and State elections, subject only to the proviso that whoever is deemed qualified to vote for "the most numerous branch of the State legislature" is automatically qualified to vote in Federal elections.

Making this a State function was no casual decision. It was reaffirmed in identical language in the 17th amendment—adopted, incidentally, more than 40 years after the 15th amendment, which provided that all such qualifications should be impartially applied among all citizens.

This principle in the Constitution has been repeatedly upheld and affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, not merely in dusty antiquity but as recently as 1959 by Judges presently sitting upon that Bench.

Now we are well aware that there are a good many people, and perhaps the President is included, who oppose any literacy requirement. They say that a man's illiteracy is irrelevant to the question of having his judgment counted in public affairs. No man can quarrel with the right of such people to argue their case and, if persuasive, to alter the Constitution so as to prohibit them.

But the requirement that voters be able to read and write is by no means restricted to those Southern States now the object of this special legislation. Many others—including New York State—require that qualification, as the Constitution entitles them to do.

If it is immoral, as the President says, to deprive a qualified citizen of his right to vote "under color of a literacy test," is it moral to violate one part of the Constitution under the color of upholding another which is in no wise in conflict?

Nor does the question end there, for what this bill proposes to do is to set up a double standard. Some States would be permitted to keep their literacy requirement. Others would not.

The formula prescribed is that of a ratio between the number of persons of voting age within a State and the number of voters in an election. If 50 percent or more of the voting age inhabitants do vote, then the State is absolved. The Federal authorities will keep out, and the State may set its own qualifications for voters, including literacy tests. Otherwise, no.

This formula has been carefully devised so that in practice it is expected to apply only to six States, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia. In these States the Federal authorities would not only have the right to supervise voter registration but to abolish the voter qualifications they don't like.

A few moments reflection on this formula will suggest such weird paradoxes, and the possibility of such strange discriminations, as to stagger the mind.

A minor one is that a strict application of the formula would probably make it applicable to Alaska. However, a way has been devised to exempt it, which as much as anything suggests that the intent is not to write a general rule of law but to subject certain States to special laws.

Not so minor, but certainly weird, is the provision that a person once registered as a voter by the Federal authorities will be stricken from the list if he fails to vote "at least once during 3 consecutive years while listed." In short, you have to vote or you cannot.

Of more consequences is the fact that if we have this law a citizen, white or Negro, can be entitled to a vote in Alabama no matter how illiterate he is, or for that matter even if he is a moron. But if the same citizen, white or Negro, lives in New York State he will not be entitled to vote.

This would create a truly ingenious paradox. The illiterate citizen, Negro or otherwise, would find himself with more "rights" in Alabama and her five outcast sister States than in the great State of New York. More, the educational level of the voting citizens of Alabama, the low level of which is part of the general complaint against it by civil rights leaders, would be further reduced. And this by Federal sanction.

Unfortunately, the irony is not funny. Beneath the paradox lies a serious question. Is it moral that our national laws should apply one rule to one State and another to another, requiring that the people of one State abolish qualifications for voters while the people of another State may uphold their standards?

Nor is that the end of the consequences of that weird formula. Recall that it permits the Federal Government to put all this machinery in motion, the takeover of the whole voting procedure by Federal authorities, only when the voting percentage of a State falls below 50 percent of the voting age population. If there was ever a device open to what President Johnson calls manipulation, this is it.

So long as a State contrives that one-half of its adults vote, it is free of the formula. This will not be overlooked by ingenious men who can contrive many things when justice is measured by percentages.

And this brings us to what we think is the fundamental immorality of this proposed law, unintentioned though it may be, by those who drew it.

Any citizen, white or Negro, has the right to be treated by the law like all other citizens. If he has to meet qualifications to vote—age or any other—they must be only the qualifications asked of all. If he qualifies like any other he has the right to vote, and to deny him that right is to deny him what is inalienably his.

It makes no difference whether 99 percent of his neighbors vote or whether only 20 percent do. It makes no difference whether he has voted in the last three elections, or in none at all before he presents himself at the polls. His right is to vote or not vote as he pleases.

That is the whole of the moral issue. And the whole duty of government, insofar as it touches this matter, is to see that all equally can exercise this right.

The constitutional duty of the Federal Government is to see that this right is not abridged—anywhere, populous States or sparse States, Northern States or Southern States, where many go to the polls or where few take the trouble to. The means of assuring this—everywhere—is what any Federal voting law ought to do, and all it ought to do.

To play with complicated formulas, to measure justice by percentages, and to aim punitive laws at some States, not only violates both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution but buries the real moral question in sophistry.

A Sober Appraisal of Voter Registration Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, what is believed to be the most reasoned and objective editorial analysis yet made of the proposed voter registration proposal is contained in the March 22 issue of the Wall Street Journal. Regardless of how one may feel on this subject, the reading of this editorial should be considered a must.

The editorial follows:

AN IMMORAL LAW

When President Johnson last Monday asked Congress for a new law to safeguard the voting rights of Negro citizens he rested his case on the Constitution and on a basic principle of morality.

What he has now proposed that the Congress do is enact a law which would violate that Constitution he asks us not to flout and, more, which is itself immoral.

If you think not so, consider:

The administration bill offers a formula—a complicated one, which we will come to in a moment—to prohibit certain States from using any test of a citizen's ability to read and write our language as a qualification for voting.

The argument for doing this is the 15th amendment to the Constitution which provides, clearly enough, that neither the Federal Government nor any State shall deprive a citizen of his vote "on account of" his race or color.

But the proposed bill does not stop with providing means against the violation of the 15th amendment. It does not aim at insuring that any such State literacy test shall be fairly drawn and impartially administered so that it may not be used as an excuse to deprive anyone of his vote "on account of" his race.

The effect—and indeed the purpose—would be to abolish such test entirely in the affected States. And that flies squarely in the face of this selfsame Constitution which the President professes to uphold.

The very first article of that Constitution authorizes the individual States to decide the qualifications of voters in both Federal and State elections, subject only to the proviso that whoever is deemed qualified to vote for "the most numerous branch of the State legislature" is automatically qualified to vote in Federal elections.

Making this a State function was no casual decision. It was reaffirmed in identical language in the 17th admendment—adopted, incidentally, more than 40 years after the 15th amendment, which provided that all such qualifications should be impartially applied among all citizens.

This principle in the Constitution has been repeatedly upheld and affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, not merely in dusty antiquity but as recently as 1959 by judges presently sitting upon that bench.

Now we are well aware that there are a good many people, and perhaps the President is included, who oppose any literacy requirement. They say that a man's illiteracy is irrelevant to the question of having his judgment counted in public affairs. No man can quarrel with the right of such people to argue their case and, if persuasive, to alter the Constitution so as to prohibit them.

But the requirement that voters be able to read and write is by no means restricted to those Southern States now the object of this special legislation. Many others—including New York State—require that qualification, as the Constitution entitles them to do.

If it is immoral, as the President says, to deprive a qualified citizen of his right to vote "under color of a literacy test," is it moral to violate one part of the Constitution under the color of upholding another which is in no wise in conflict?

Nor does the question end there, for what this bill proposes to do is to set up a double standard. Some States would be permitted to keep their literacy requirement. Others would not.

The formula prescribed is that of a ratio between the number of persons of voting age within a State and the number of voters in an election. If 50 percent or more of the voting age inhabitants do vote, then the State is absolved. The Federal authorities will keep out, and the State may set its own qualifications for voters, including literacy tests. Otherwise, no.

This formula has been carefully devised so that in practice it is expected to apply only to six States, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina and Virginia. In these States the Federal authorities would not only have the right to supervise voter registration but to abolish the voter qualifications they don't like.

A few moments reflection on this formula will suggest such weird paradoxes, and the possibility of such strange discriminations, as to stagger the mind.

A minor one is that a strict application of the formula would probably make it applicable to Alaska. However, a way has been devised to exempt it, which as much as anything suggests that the intent is not to write a general rule of law but to subject certain States to special laws.

Not so minor, but certainly weird, is the provision that a person once registered as a voter by the Federal authorities will be stricken from the list if he fails to vote "at least once during 3 consecutive years while listed." In short, you have to vote or you can't.

Of more consequence is the fact that if we have this law a citizen, white or Negro, can be entitled to a vote in Alabama no matter how illiterate he is, or for that matter even if he is a moron. But if the same citizen, white or Negro, lives in New York State he will not be entitled to vote.

This would create a truly ingenious paradox. The illiterate citizen, Negro or otherwise, would find himself with more "rights" in Alabama and her five outcast sister States than in the great State of New York. More, the educational level of the voting citizens of Alabama, the low level of which is part of the general complaint against it by civil rights leaders, would be further reduced. And this by Federal sanction.

Unfortunately, the irony is not funny. Beneath the paradox lies a serious question. Is it moral that our national laws should apply one rule to one State and another to another, requiring that the people of one State abolish qualifications for voters while the people of another State may uphold their standards?

Nor is that the end of the consequences of that weird formula. Recall that it permits the Federal Government to put all this machinery in motion, the takeover of the whole voting procedure by Federal authorities, only when the voting percentage of a State falls below 50 percent of the voting age population. If there was ever a device open to what President Johnson calls manipulation, this is it.

So long as a State contrives that one-half of its adults vote, it is free of the formula. This will not be overlooked by ingenious men who can contrive many things when justice is measured by percentages.

And this brings us to what we think is the fundamental immorality of this proposed law, unintentioned though it may be by those who drew it.

Any citizen, white or Negro, has the right to be treated by the law like all other citizens. If he has to meet qualifications to vote—age or any other—they must be only the qualifications asked of all. If he qualifies like any other he has the right to vote, and to deny him that right is to deny him what is inalienably his.

It makes no difference whether 99 percent of his neighbors vote or whether only 20 percent do. It makes no difference whether he has voted in the last three elections, or in none at all before he presents himself at the polls. His right is to vote or not vote as he pleases.

That is the whole of the moral issue. And the whole duty of government, insofar as it touches this matter, is to see that all equally can exercise this right.

The constitutional duty of the Federal Government is to see that this right is not abridged—anywhere, populous States or sparse States, Northern States or Southern States, where many go to the polls or where few take the trouble to. The means of assuring this—everywhere—is what any Federal voting law ought to do, and all it ought to do.

To play with complicated formulas, to measure justice by percentages, and to aim punitive laws at some States, not only violates both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution but buries the real moral question in sophistry.

Scholars of the Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific last week ended a 2-week series of public hearings into the Sino-Soviet dispute.

During those hearings, it was the privilege of the subcommittee members to hear testimony from a distinguished group of American scholars, specialists and experts on international affairs. Among them were those who keep close watch on the activities and trends inside Russia and the Eastern European bloc countries, often called Kremlinologists.

Four of the witnesses who appeared before the committee were featured in an article on Kremlin experts which appeared in the March 15, 1965, issue of the National Observer. They were Ambassador George Kennan, Dr. Alexander Dallin, Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Dr. Richard Lowenthal.

In order to acquaint my colleagues with the views of these experts—as well as Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupe and Dr. Merle Fainsod—I am inserting the article, by Mark R. Arnold, in the RECORD at this point:

SCHOLARLY FINGERS ON THE COMMUNIST PULSE: KREMLINOLOGISTS: WHO THEY ARE, WHAT THEY BELIEVE

(By Mark R. Arnold)

"The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. granted the request of Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev to be relieved of his duties as Chairman of the Council of Ministers * * * (and) appointed Comrade Alexei Nikolayevich Kosygin as Chairman."

To most Americans, this passage from that Kremlin announcement of last October 15 might have meant just what it said: Premier Khrushchev had resigned voluntarily. But to a few specialists, trained in the subtleties of Soviet politics, it aroused immediate suspicions, subsequently vindicated, of a dismissal in disgrace. The one tip-off: Kosygin is referred to as Comrade. Khrushchev is not.

Second guessing the Kremlin is the special province of a small group of diplomats, scholars, researchers, and journalists who call themselves Kremlinologists. These modern crystal-ball-gazers engage in a constant search for clues to changes in Kremlin policy and personnel. Two events last week focused new attention on their work. In Washington, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific heard several Kremlinologists as it opened 6 days of hearings on the Sino-Soviet conflict. In Moscow, a communique issued by the 19 Communist Parties that had met earlier this month called for an 81-nation Communist summit meeting, but only with the cooperation and approval of Red China. The 1,200-word communique should give Kremlinologists some new hints about Soviet policy under the new Russian leadership.

Sometimes the Kremlinologists' searching efforts are rewarded: Experts detected the seeds of the Sino-Soviet breach long before it came out into the open. More often, though, as in the ouster of Khrushchev, they're caught off guard. Wryly notes one Kremlinologist in self-defense: "Of course, Khrushchev was caught off guard too."

Kremlinologists are the first to admit they labor under great handicaps. "We're privy to damn few Kremlin secrets," remarks one. Too, the job is just too big for any group of men. "In Stalin's day you could read between the lines of Pravda and know as much as you were going to know," says a Soviet analyst whose desk is stacked with unread Russian periodicals. "Nowadays there are just too many lines to read, let alone read between."

Reading the Soviet press is one way the experts assess developments in the Soviet Union. There are many more. Some analysts trace the daily movements of Russia's leaders to find who is missing from diplomatic receptions and public events, who is in Moscow and who is away when important decisions are made. Others sift through the annual slogans on May Day and the anniversary of the October (1917) Revolution in search of clues to policy changes. Still others consider the level of official tolerance toward intellectual dissent as the most accurate gauge of Kremlin attitudes.

Who are these Kremlinologists? What are their views on Russia? The following men are among the leaders in the field, selected here as much for the spread of opinion they represent as for their prominence. They are quite divided on the significance of the changes in the Communist world since the death of Stalin in 1953, and the implications of those changes for American policy.

ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPE

On the one hand are the hardliners, who regard Russia as an implacable enemy committed to world domination by every means at its disposal. Many of them have been associated with the University of Pennsylvania's Foreign Policy Research Institute headed by Robert Strausz-Hupe, 61, a slight bespectacled Austrian emigrant whose manners are impeccable and whose distrust of communism is complete.

Mr. Strausz-Hupe (pronounced Straus-Hew-Pay) came to the United States in the 1920's, and has taught at Penn since his graduate school days there in the mid-1940's. In recent years, he has also served as a consultant on military strategy to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Army and Air Force war colleges, the Department of the Navy, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) War College.

"Of course there have been significant changes in the Communist world," says Professor Strausz-Hupe as he steers his black Rover 100 over the narrow cobblestone streets of West Philadelphia on the way to his office. "What has happened is that they have gone from 1984 to the brave new world. Communism has conditioned people to such an extent that coercion is no longer necessary."

Later, over a cup of tea in his spacious office, Professor Strausz-Hupe explains what he means by protracted conflict, which is both the title of his best known book and the key to his thinking. "None of the changes in Russia have any bearing whatsoever on the power-political orientation of the Soviet regime. Peaceful coexistence and all the current talk of a detente—they are just tactical devices intended to destroy the West's sense of urgency, to lull is into a false sense of complacency. And as such, they are working."

Because he considers communism unalterably hostile to Western interests, Professor Strausz-Hupe attaches little importance to the conflict between China and Russia. Nor does he take satisfaction in the signs of waning Soviet control in Eastern Europe, though he admits both developments. "To say that this Communist country or that Communist country is more liberal and hence susceptible to our influence," he says, "is just so much coffeehouse talk. Leninism is thicker than water. Hungary proved that."

In Professor Strausz-Hupe's view, the basic goal of Soviet foreign policy is to destroy the Western alliance—"to draw the United States away from its European commitments and to divide the Western Europeans from each other." To frustrate this design, he argues, U.S. policymakers should give urgent attention to healing the cracks in NATO, "not spend their time gloating over obscure intrigues within Communist ranks."

GEORGE KENNAN

On the other end of the Kremlinology spectrum are those who regard Russia's internal reforms and the movement toward "polycentrism" in the Communist bloc as developments of overriding importance. One of them is 61-year-old George Kennan. Indeed, in his latest book, "On Dealing With the Communist World," diplomat-historian Kennan goes so far as to suggest a ban on the word communism in view of the variety of forms the movement has taken. Such a ban, he says, would force us to treat the regimes and peoples of each of these countries specifically for what they are.

Few Kremlinologists can match George Kennan's knowledge of developments behind the Iron Curtain. In his 30-year career with the Foreign Service he held a succession of important diplomatic posts in the Communist world, including U.S. ambassadorships to Belgrade and Moscow. Among his historical works are a prize-winning, three-volume history of early Soviet-American relations.

Ironically, less than 20 years ago Mr. Kennan was considered a hard-liner. As the State Department's top planner in the late 1940's, he enunciated the containment thesis for combating Communist expansion that became a basic plank of American foreign policy. Now a professor at Princeton's prestigious Institute for Advanced Studies, Mr. Kennan argues that the United States should reject the containment thesis in favor of a policy of offering Russia cautious incentives to accommodation.

The change in Mr. Kennan's view is a reflection of his concept of Russian history. He considers the liberal tradition of pre-Bolshevik Russia the dominant historical trend. The repressionist course the Bolshevik revolution took, to him, is thus an aberration. And the reforms of the post-Stalin era, in his view, are a movement back toward the mainstream of Russian development.

The West, Mr. Kennan believes, can play a crucial role in furthering this liberal trend. Its policies can serve to embolden the forces of reform within the Soviet Union in their perpetual argument against doctrinaire Stalinists, who favor a return to the techniques of terror and ideological uniformity.

Mr. Kennan is a firm believer in expanded trade with the Communist world (though not on strategic items). But he told House Members last week he doubts that trade with the United States would slacken Red China's anti-Western feelings. "I can see no reason why we should go ahead and further economic relations with Communist China," he said.

He also is distressed that the United States has not given more serious consideration to such steps as recognizing the Oder-Neisse line between Poland and Germany, signing a NATO-Warsaw Pact nonaggression treaty, and exploring ways to achieve a military disengagement in Europe. The unwillingness of the West to consider such steps, says Mr. Kennan, "may eventually enforce upon the (Communist) bloc a measure of unity which, by their own unaided effort, they could never have achieved."

Mr. Kennan is not as impressed with the scope of the post-Stalin changes as a few Kremlinologists like Harrison Salisbury of the New York Times, who wrote 2 years ago that the Soviet leadership had established "a new reign of law." But he does see in

Russia today the beginnings of "a crude but genuine parliamentarianism" that can be nurtured by careful Western initiatives.

MERLE FAINSOD

Between those who regard Russia as a long-term adversary and those who consider her a potential friend lie the bulk of other analysts. One is 57-year-old Merle Fainsod, who was director of Harvard's Russian Research Center until last July.

Mr. Fainsod is wary about talking to reporters. "I shun publicity," he tells an interviewer who has flown to Boston and trudged across a snow-covered Harvard Yard to see him. "Besides, I'm no longer active in the field." He explains that his new job as custodian of Harvard's 93 libraries throughout the world leaves little time for a comprehensive study of Soviet developments.

But the views of Mr. Fainsod are still important. He has trained a generation of younger Kremlinologists at Harvard. And wide use of his textbook, "How Russia Is Ruled," assure that his influence will be felt at colleges and universities for years.

Mr. Fainsod sees more continuity than change in Soviet development of the past decade. He credits Khrushchev with correcting some of the gross abuses of the Stalinist period, but insists that the basic institutions of totalitarian rule have not been modified. It is true, he says, that the Russian masses now feel a sense of participation in their country's development, but they are still denied the opportunity of choosing alternatives to the roles in life assigned to them by their leaders. If there is discontent, the regime has a powerful armory of instruments calculated to enforce compliance with the system.

Nor does Professor Fainsod subscribe to the theory that a rising standard of living will deter Russia from pursuing an expansionist foreign policy. "The gratitude," he has written, "which the leadership wins by taking steps to improve the welfare of its own people * * * (may result in) widening the (Communist) party's field of maneuver and encouraging it to embark on adventures precisely because it thinks it can count on popular support."

Professor Fainsod's belief that peaceful coexistence is a mere Soviet tactical device in the struggle for world domination recalls the views of Professor Strausz-Hupe. But the Harvard scholar differs from Mr. Strausz-Hupe in several respects. Professor Fainsod does not foreclose the possibility of fundamental changes in the Soviet system; he says only that they have not yet occurred. And he believes that limited accommodations between East and West can benefit both sides equally and should be pursued.

ALEXANDER DALLIN

One of the most eminent of the post-war crop of Soviet experts is Alexander Dallin, a round-faced, genial scholar who has produced several books on Russian foreign policy in the past decade. Son of the late David Dallin, a leading Kremlinologist in his own right, Alexander Dallin was born in Germany, where his family had fled after the Russian Revolution, and grew up conversant in Soviet affairs. He is a graduate of Columbia University's Russian Institute, and today, at 40, is the institute's director.

Professor Dallin believes there have been fundamental changes in Russia since the death of Stalin, and he talked about some of them recently while nursing a head cold with the aid of a box of tissues on his cluttered desk. "Most notable is the decline in the role of ideology," he said. "In a sense, the Russians are emancipating themselves from ideology. It can be seen in their recognition that war is not inevitable, in their recognition of neutralism, in their innovations with the profit motives in industry."

Moreover, says Professor Dallin, for the first time in Soviet history social pressures are beginning to impinge on policy. He explains:

"Forty-five years of industrialization under Soviet rule have created special-interest groups in the bureaucracy. There are the scientists, the military, the secret police, the industrial managers, the state administration, the party workers, all of whom have an influence on decisionmaking. The perennial argument over resource allocation—how much for butter, how much for guns and what kind of guns—is the best example. You might say these pressures are a crude substitute for public opinion. The emergence of these forces may become the most important internal development of the next few years."

The Sino-Soviet split has served as a catalyst for change within Russia, Professor Dallin told House Members last week. "It has promoted a more realistic perception of the outside world, including some incipient elements of identification with the West," he said.

Professor Dallin does not believe Russia is evolving toward democracy. And he thinks the Soviet and American Governments will continue to have conflicting objectives. But he credits the Communists with a sophisticated understanding of the realities of the nuclear era.

ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI

Polish-born Zbigniew Brzezinski (pronounced Zzz-Beeg-knee-ef Brizhe-Zeen-skee) has the distinction of being the only Kremlinologist ever named as 1 of America's 10 outstanding young men by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. Youthful and clean-cut Mr. Brzezinski is an activist who writes continually, not only for scholarly journals but also for newspapers like the Washington Post and such magazines as the New Republic and the New Leader.

A dynamic speaker ("Just put him on a podium and the words pour out," says a friend), 36-year-old Mr. Brzezinski is a consultant to the State Department, and in the past 10 years has produced a half dozen books on Soviet ideology, the nature of totalitarianism, Russian politics, and Soviet relations with Eastern Europe. He is director of Columbia's Research Institute on Communist Affairs. The institute sponsors research on international communism.

Like Mr. Kennan, Mr. Brzezinski argues for more contacts between the United States and the Soviet bloc. But he sees no change in Russia's basic hostility to the West. In his opinion, therefore, American initiatives should be framed with a view to exploiting the strains in the Communist alliance.

Fingering a paper clip in his fourth-floor office at Columbia, Mr. Brzezinski sounds like Mr. Dallin as he says we're witnessing an erosion of Communist ideology, not primarily because of economic development, but because of the emergence of a new professional bureaucracy. "Russia is moving from a stage in which Stalinism was the issue," he says, "to a stage in which Leninism is the issue. The basic assumptions of Communist control are now being questioned."

Mr. Brzezinski doesn't assume that the modernization of Soviet society will bring liberalization or democracy. In fact, in "Political Power: USA/USSR," published in 1963, he and coauthor Samuel P. Huntington argue that the result may be the opposite. They believe that the technological revolution and the complexities of long-range planning are pushing decisionmaking into fewer hands, thus retarding any impetus toward democracy.

RICHARD LOWENTHAL

A slightly stopped man with a partly bald head and a gracious smile answers a knock at the door of his office in Columbia's modern law school building. He is Richard Lowenthal, 56 whom an admiring colleague describes as "unequaled for lucidity and profundity of analysis" among Kremlinologists. A Communist in pre-Nazi Germany ("I was expelled from the party for rightist deviation"), Mr. Lowenthal fled to England in 1935, and spent several years as a correspondent and political analyst for the London Observer. He is currently on leave from his teaching post at the Free University of Berlin to do research at Columbia.

"What are the changes since Stalin?" he asks in accented English. Then he answers his question.

"Under Stalin, society was an inert object. Stalin could perform open-heart surgery any time he wanted and call on his terrorist apparatus to insure that the patient stayed still. But what is efficient for a country entering industrialization is not efficient for a mature industrial country, where you need workers with skill, education, and a sense of responsibility. What you need then are incentives. Under Khrushchev the levers of state control shifted from coercion to incentives. This is the basic meaning of de-Stalinization, and it is irreversible."

Like Mr. Dallin and Mr. Brzezinski, Mr. Lowenthal believes that ideology is a declining force in Soviet policy. Economic planners, he notes, increasingly take their cues from the West in their efforts to solve pressing problems.

In foreign affairs, he says, the failures of the underdeveloped world to embrace Moscow's example, and continued stalemates over Berlin and elsewhere, have tarnished the once-gleaming vision of communism as the wave of the future."

"What of the future?" Professor Lowenthal asks himself. "The new Russian leadership is cautious and uninspired, self-conscious and uncertain. It is a good time for Western initiatives to probe their intentions and seek to influence their course of action.

"A detente? It depends as much on the Western posture as on the Eastern. And it won't be easy. Perhaps one day, yes. In the long run, there may be no further need, for example, for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."

But he adds a note of caution: "The disruption of the Congress of Vienna allowed Napoleon to return from Elba triumphantly. It is a warning of what happens when alliances disintegrate before their time."

Statement by Mr. Poffinberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, last Friday at my office in Pittsburgh, I had the privilege of meeting with a delegation representing Neighborhood Centers Association, a United Fund-Community Chest-sponsored neighborhood service agency in Pittsburgh. Mr. Judd N. Poffinberger, Jr., Mrs. Marvin J. Smith, and Mr. William G. Woodruff, members of the board of directors, and Mr. Ralph D. Meister, executive director of the association, presented a resolution to me in support of legislation to assure our Negro citizens their right to register and vote. I should like to include at this point in my remarks, a statement made to me by Mr. Poffinberger, and the text of the resolution:

STATEMENT BY MR. POFFINBERGER

Neighborhood Centers Association has for many years been devoted to the advancement

of equal opportunity for all people. The members of our board are deeply concerned about the attitude of many local officials and the restrictions imposed in many parts of the country which threaten the basic principles of liberty and freedom which are the bulwark of a democratic society.

We are here to add our voices in protest and to join with the majority of other right-thinking Americans in speaking out against injustice.

The attached resolution was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the association's board of directors on March 17, 1965. It is submitted in evidence of our deep feelings in this matter.

We urge you to support legislation which will assure our Negro citizens their right to register and to vote. Further, we ask that you transmit our resolution to such other officials in Washington as should be made aware of our stand in this matter.

RESOLUTION ON VOTING RIGHTS BY NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS ASSOCIATION

Whereas we as a society and individuals aspire to create wider participation in basic and inalienable rights; and

Whereas it is the intent of the Bill of Rights that there be universal suffrage; and

Whereas legislation has been passed including the 1964 Civil Rights Act to implement the intention of the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas Negro Americans in Selma, Ala., and other places still encounter difficulties in registering to vote;

We support President Johnson and call on the Congress to develop and pass new legislation that is aimed at meeting the practical problems that are still being encountered by Negro Americans who desire to become full first-class citizens by participation in the electoral process.

Mr. Speaker, I am sending the statement and the resolution to Attorney General Katzenbach and to the Judiciary Committee of the House with my own endorsement. I hope the Congress will act promptly to enact the voting rights legislation requested by President Johnson and my own bill to enforce the 14th amendment to the Constitution, by decreasing the representation of States in Congress in proportion to their denial of citizen voting rights.

Mrs. Hazel Bergstrom: An Invaluable Aid to Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, each of us in the House and Senate from time to time requires additional staff members for our offices in Washington.

Those of us who hire new people to fill existing vacancies for specialized jobs know how tremendously important it is to find the right person to blend in with the office operation smoothly, efficiently, and effectively.

Hill veterans on the House and Senate sides of the Capitol know they can rely on Mrs. Hazel Bergstrom of the U.S. Employment Service office to send us the best qualified, most competent, and compatible people to fill these vacancies.

Because Mrs. Bergstrom and her small staff have assisted us so readily for so many years, it is particularly regrettable to learn of their lack of adequate office space to attend to the full scope of the demands upon the time of the USES office.

Mrs. Bergstrom has become something of an institution. It would be difficult indeed to replace her. She is more than a highly skilled professional personnel expert, she is a veteran of Capitol Hill who has contributed immeasurably to the continued and increased efficiency of the offices on the Hill. By helping us to become more efficient, she assist us to help our constituents with the best possible service.

Recently, Roll Call printed an article describing Mrs. Bergstrom's critical need for additional office space to handle the flow of applicants for jobs on Capitol Hill.

It would be my hope that we in Congress could do what is necessary to assist Mrs. Bergstrom to acquire the space she needs. She has done so much for the Congress and the country, I believe it is now time we returned the favor and supplied her and her staff with larger quarters. In the event my colleagues might not have seen the article, I am including it in the RECORD today.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

EMPLOYMENT CHIEF OUTLINES JOB SITUATION IN THE CONGRESS

(By Doree Lovell)

It's job changeover time on the Hill. Congressmen are reviewing their initial staff choices after a month's trial, and the annual turnover is beginning. In many cases, Hill vets who've been sitting on the sidelines will be called in to take over from backhome neophytes who didn't quite make it, got homesick, or are disillusioned with Congress.

In the midst of all the activity is Hazel Bergstrom, Hill director of the U.S. Employment Service.

In her basement office in the Old Senate Office Building, Hazel told how the whole idea of a branch office for USES on the Hill was started. She suggested to her boss in 1957 that it would be a good idea to move up to the Hill, since there was so much traffic from out-of-town constituents who were sent downtown by Congressmen and "always seemed to get lost on the way."

Members also were always wanting people for their own staffs, so there was quite a bit of traffic going the other way, back up the Hill, too.

For 3 years she worked in an office along with Lacey Sharpe, who helped her set up the pilot program. Hazel did a lot of public relations work in those days, visiting offices, talking to Congressmen, sizing up their needs "so that we could best serve them."

The project kept "growing and growing and growing" until it grew into a full-time operation for her and an assistant in 1960.

Now it's SRO in the small one-room office, and what space is not taken up by equipment is covered (almost) with wall-to-wall people.

"We're booked up a month ahead right now," Hazel said, gesturing toward her desk calendar. "And we open before 9 a.m. usually winding up later than 6."

You name the job and chances are that they can fill it, or it has been filled many times over. "We don't have any trouble filling jobs," she emphasized. The office fills from 10 to 20 jobs per week, from applicants numbering upward of 50 per day.

"We find jobs for constituents referred by Congressmen and from people coming from off the Hill. Most want to work on Capitol Hill," she says, "We get very few job requests for openings off the Hill."

The office handles everything from "file clerks starting around $3,600 to administrative assistant's at about $21,000. We get many professional people, public relations men, etc., and we're loaded with lawyers' applications."

"Most all have college degrees," she says of applicants. "About 90 percent major in political science and history. These people quite often don't have the office skills necessary to working in the versatile capacity most Congressmen need.

"A lot of them aren't interested in business skills either, and feel their education is enough to get a good job working in Congress," she continued.

What Congressmen ask for the most, Hazel points out, is an English major with a year of business school or office experience.

"That includes typing, about 60 words per minute, and shorthand; especially the girls. Most Congressmen need those skills in a staffer for emergencies—Congressmen have many of them—to type, take dictation, help with newsletters, correspondence, and so forth."

"With male applicants, there's not such a set pattern of qualifications, but most men type," she emphasized, noting that the two-finger speed of the self-styled male typists is amazing.

Basic requirements still include "being from the same State and most require the same party."

"But it's so frustrating," she said, "we're desperately in need of space." The space problem in B-46 thwarts the job getters from handling all the work that should be handled efficiently and quickly.

"We could get all the staff we need from USES, but we don't have anywhere to put them," she moaned. "Members are astounded when they call and have to wait weeks before getting someone an appointment."

"We used to try to visit each new Member, talk to him about his needs, our services, but we can't do that now that we're so swamped," she went on.

Her office gives typing tests to job applicants. Members hire on their own, too, she explained, and "many used to use our office for interviewing prospective personnel, but we don't have private space for them now."

What Hazel and her staff do have now and will give to Members is an understanding and an experienced evaluation of their personnel needs.

"It's like every one of the independent rooms in the building is a separate, private business," she says, explaining the uniqueness of each congressional office. "They run it to suit themselves, in their own way."

Hillites agree that each office is its own world, revolving its own way. The USES staff is kept busy helping out those people who want to enter these worlds. To them a job on the Hill is not just a job, it's the job.

The Great Society Is Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, while visiting in my district a week ago, I made a discovery that so impressed me that I feel I must bring it to the attention of my colleagues here in the Congress and

the President of the United States. I discovered the Great Society is already here.

The occasion for this discovery was the dedication of a community center of the West End Branch of the YMCA in the city of Willoughby, Ohio. Its purpose is to serve families of Willoughby, Willowick, Wickliffe, Eastlake, Willoughby Hills, Kirtland, Waite Hill, Timberlake, and Lakeline.

I realize the names of these communities are not important to this Congress, Mr. Speaker, but I hope that how the people of these communities built this beautiful $450,000 facility will make all of us stop and think for just a moment.

The dedication of this building culminated 11 years of planning and financing by the officials of the West End Branch of the YMCA. It will serve more than 2,360 persons a year and will eventually be part of a $750,000 facility to serve the families of the area.

Industry and special gifts accounted for 52 percent of the total funds; 20 percent came from general gifts by residents of the area; 17 percent from business and 11 percent from a $50,000 bank mortgage. Not a single penny came from the Federal Government.

When it was decided to paint certain areas not in the original contract, the local Kiwanis Club worked with the Lads Without Dads Club to do the painting. A local paint company donated the material.

A group of youngsters in the Leader's Club of the YMCA raised $500 for the center by selling hotdogs, magazine subscriptions, and so forth, for over 2 years.

The group could not afford both a swimming pool and gymnasium so the YMCA built the pool and then made an arrangement with a local school to let the school use the pool and the school will let the YMCA children use their gym.

The people who built this community center—the union men, the leaders of industry, the housewives, and last but not least the children themselves—are truly the Great Society.

This Great Society, Mr. President, asked me a lot of questions when I was at the dedication which I found hard to answer. They are people whose Christian conscience makes the problems of our country their problems. They want to face their responsibility to the less fortunate among themselves as well as the rest of the country, and yet their confidence in your programs has been shaken.

For example, they wanted to help the people who really need a fresh start in the area called Appalachia, but when they heard that some 76 counties out of the 350 in the bill are as well off as they are, their confidence in your program was shaken.

They want to help educate the children of the poor school districts of the county despite the fact that their own real estate taxes are almost overwhelming them in support of their own schools. But when they heard that the 10 richest counties in the country would receive as much money as the 10 poorest counties under the new education bill, their confidence in your education program was shaken.

They want to help the elderly among them who need hospital care and who cannot afford it, but when they learned that your program really does not take care of their No. 1 concern—a prolonged illness that could destroy their life's savings—their confidence in your medical program was shaken.

I did not mention to this Great Society, Mr. President, about your proposed plan in the 1965 housing bill to allocate their money to families of middle income in the form of rent supplements because when they do hear more about the 1965 housing bill their confidence in your program will really be shaken.

Mr. President, these people sympathize with you and share with you our problems in Vietnam, Selma, Ala., and around the world. But they are losing confidence in your programs because you have not been honest with them. On the excuse of using the emotional appeal of doing something for the poor and needy you have presented, and insist on having passed, legislation that helps the rich as well as the poor. Think about it, Mr. President, because if their confidence continues to be shaken the people of this Great Society composed of the party of Abraham Lincoln and the party of John F. Kennedy just might find another leader.

The Case of Low Interest Rates Versus Viable Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the issue of high interest rates versus low interest rates—easy money versus tight money—has provoked controversy since the founding of our Republic and is again in the foreground of public debate.

Two of our colleagues who are distinguished advocates of opposite viewpoints on this question are Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee and chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, and Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican of Missouri, a senior minority member of the Joint Economic Committee and a ranking Republican Member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

In recent articles written for the United Press International, Representative PATMAN and Representative CURTIS cogently present their respected views concerning this great economic controversy.

I believe their remarks would be of interest to the Members of Congress and others. Under unanimous consent I place the articles in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The articles follow:

THE CASE FOR LOW INTEREST RATES

(By Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas)

America's public and private debt today adds up to the fantastic total of $1.3 trillion.

A raise of but one percentage point in interest charges on this incredible sum would add $13 billion a year to the already extravagant aggregate of more than $75 billion that Americans are now paying as interest.

Since Biblical days, interest charges—then called usury—have frequently meant woe for the borrower and joy for the lender. Governments have passed laws to protect the borrower from extortionate rates and inhuman foreclosures.

More than five centuries before Christ, the great Athenian lawmaker, Solon, forbade men being sold into slavery because of unpaid interest charges.

In the year 1545, England removed the prohibition on the lending of money and fixed a legal maximum interest rate. Many continental nations soon followed suit.

Today, it is imperative, as never before, that Americans center their attention on interest charges.

For many months, bankers have been propagandizing to raise the amount of interest Americans are taxed by the private lending institutions. There has been a concerted effort to raise interest rates and to get public acceptance by one pretext or another. This despite pleas from President Johnson to hold the rates down.

There mere fact that bank profits are higher than ever before in history has made no difference. Many independent bankers are willing to let well enough alone. But few dare openly buck the banking establishment which sets policy.

According to a bit of facetious testimony by John Galbraith, the great economist, before the Joint Economic Committee recently: "Interest rates are the only price that is never raised in order to give the recipient a greater return." They're always increased "as a somber act of national policy."

One day interest rates must go up because of inflationary threats; then, the excuse is unfavorable balance of payments. Last November 23, which I called the day of financial infamy, our Federal Reserve System raised our discount rate one-half percent when the British raised theirs 2 percent. The excuse offered was to keep our investors from sending their money overseas. The very next day, our Government put a billion dollars into a $3 billion fund to support the British pound. If ever a financial policy was working at cross purposes, this was it.

We still get a lot of chatter from the bankers' lobby about unfavorable balance of payments forcing interest rates up. Corporate investments abroad, vast defense expenditures and foreign aid are ignored as causes for our imbalance of payments. Only higher interest rates will correct the imbalance. To this we say "Hogwash."

Within a day of Galbraith's testimony, William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, told the Joint Economic Committee that he thought it may be necessary to tighten credit and raise interest rates. When I asked him if he would agree to a 6-percent interest on Government bonds, he didn't bat an eye. Such a raise would lead to a national debt of $600 billion within 15 years, and mean that the American people would pay upward of $36 billion a year on the public debt.

As of now, they are paying $5.5 billion more than they should (over $11 billion instead of $5.5 billion), thanks to the precipitous increases brought about during the Dwight D. Eisenhower regime.

The tragedy of tight money and high interest rates is that ultimately they bring about economic disaster. In tandem they

cause a slackening of our economic growth; the net result—more unemployment.

It would be perfectly absurd for America to pursue monetary policies that have invariably brought disaster in the past.

We had three manmade depressions under Eisenhower. President John F. Kennedy brought the United States out of the last of these in 1961, and there were no recessions during his administration. There is no need to have any under Lyndon Johnson.

To avert disaster, we need adequate credit for the small and large businessman, at reasonable interest charges.

We need a sound money policy so that the farmer won't be soaked on his mortgage, the new homeowner on his split level. Our school systems should not have to pay unconscionably high rates to private lenders.

Our municipalities are feeling the pinch of high interest rates, as are our county and State governments. Despite denials, interest charges are going up all along the line and money is harder to come by.

I never could understand why it was necessary for Uncle Sam to advance credit to private banking institutions which enables them to purchase Government securities at high interest rates. When interest on Government securities goes up, all types of borrowing costs more to the consumer. A raise of only 1 percent on a 20-year, $10,000 mortgage will cost the home purchaser an additional $2,000.

A raise of but a quarter of 1 percent on the national debt will cost all Americans more than $800 million a year additional.

I say it's time to reverse the trend. It's time for interest rates to come down and for money to be available to the legitimate borrower for legitimate business or personal reasons at fair rates. If bankers want to maintain a respectable public image, it would be wise for them to reconsider their drive for a pound of flesh.

THE CASE FOR VIABLE INTEREST RATES

(By Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, Missouri)

Baron Rothschild, the great international banker, once observed that there were only three people who really understood the meaning of money and none of them had very much of it.

Money to people in developed economics is a medium of exchange. Yet there are millions of people throughout the world who are outside a money economy. When exchange of goods or services occurs in such countries, it is by barter. Unlike many other advanced economies at their present stage of development in the United States, money goes beyond present wealth to cover future earning power.

As the economy of a nation becomes more sophisticated, the problems involved in the power "to coin money, regulate the value thereof" become inextricably interwoven with the companion power "to borrow money on the credit of the Government." The quotes are from the U.S. Constitution.

In the United States, the problems involved in maintaining money as an accurate weight and measure for the marketplace exchange of services, goods, and savings became too cumbersome to handle through the routine congressional machinery. Accordingly, in 1913 the power to regulate the value of money (now including credit) was vested in a newly created arm of the Congress, the Federal Reserve System.

After World War II, the problems involved in borrowing money on the credit of the United States to finance the war were so great that large sums had to be sold directly to the Federal Reserve System. As a result, the value of money seriously deteriorated. In 1951 the Treasury Department, which is responsible for marketing the Federal debt, reached an accord with the Federal Reserve System which freed the Federal Reserve from the obligation to absorb additional bonds. This to some degree separated fiscal power from monetary power. The cost of using credit instead of money (borrowing) went up, and the value of money, as evidenced by the rising price level, ceased its rapid decline.

If someone else's money is used, there must be some motivation to that person to save (not spend) his money and invest (let someone else spend) his money at the risk of not getting it back.

The economic incentives to save and to risk savings are called interest, dividends and capital gains. The rate of return on money lent determines whether a person will save and at what risk he is willing to assume in lending his savings.

Government can alter the marketplace demand for and the price of credit by changing the value of money. It does this by creating more of it or withdrawing some of it, by its own borrowings or by directly lending money itself at certain rates.

The Federal Reserve System has considerable power to alter the market demand by creating both money and credit. The Treasury Department by itself or working through the Federal Reserve has power to alter the market demand through its management of the Federal debt.

However, there are two disciplines outside the Government which limit both monetary and fiscal policy:

1. The actual amount of savings in the society and the willingness to risk the savings in the economic climate prevailing.

2. The impact on our economy of economies abroad.

Both outside disciplines are strongly affected by the size of Government borrowings (the Federal debt). They also are affected by the amount of private borrowings against assets and future earning power, and the maintenance of money as a stable measure of the value of services, goods, and savings.

It is argued by some that easy credit and cheap money are necessary to promote maximum employment and economic growth. This is putting the effect in place of the cause. Maximum employment and economic growth will produce easy credit and cheap money but not vice versa. By trying to use the effect to produce the cause, we may damage both.

Maximum employment and economic growth are basically produced by intelligent spending. We must always be able to distinguish the real from the sham. The expenditure of the savings of people to create new wealth and to increase purchasing power is, of course, stimulated by consumer spending in the first place. However, if there is insufficient incentive to save and then to invest at a risk, the cycle is broken. Here is where the interference of Government to produce artificially low rates of return for investment or to produce cheaper money defeats its objectives.

Only by the exercise of self-discipline can we maintain correct monetary and fiscal policy. That discipline is to balance our Federal budget and our international payments over the life of the business cycle.

The Passing of Roy Wilkinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened when I learned of the passing of Roy Wilkinson who for 22 years had been the faithful employee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Roy was a friend of my father who served on Interstate before I did and he was held in high regard by him as well.

I wish to extend my sympathies to his family who I know will miss him greatly. Roy Wilkinson was a friend of all the members of our committee and I know they join me in paying tribute to him.

Banking and Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I noted with an enthusiasm I am sure was shared by a substantial number of the Members of Congress the two excellent presentations of our eminent colleagues, Mr. PATMAN and Mr. CURTIS, on the important subject of interest rates in Sunday's Post. The appearance of the opposite points of view on interest rates set forth by these gentlemen highlights the rising community of concern in economic matters of our day. It is well that we cultivate that concern abroad in our land. More and more it must be evident that the judgments and decisions we make as individuals, as bankers, as administrators, and as legislators are really the motivating force of change and direction for our economy. These judgments and decisions will be only as good as the facts behind them.

It is our observation that there is much to be learned about the economic facts of our times and those who are equipped to present valid and valuable information and material should be given a broad market and an honest assessment. We need not be, and probably will not be, in full accord and agreement on what constitutes the facts. But let us seriously set about evaluating the best offerings and judge these on their merit. It is not of importance who is right. It is of paramount importance to determine what is right.

It is refreshing, Mr. Speaker, to find in the conservative Banking and Finance publication of the Burroughs Co., a featured article on the general field of banking and the specific subject of interest rates. It is entitled "PATMAN Versus Organized Banking." Because of the current concern in this subject matter, I believe this article of several months ago will bring thoughtful contribution to a controversial subject.

I understand from Chairman PATMAN that there has been a great and recent increase in the number on his steering committee on interest rates. The work that these men have been doing, in support of Chairman PATMAN to hold basic interest rates down on long-term Government securities, is not generally appreciated by the public.

There is an organized effort to up interest rates on long-term governments, which would mean a greater levy on the American people's pocketbooks, on all types of loans, personal and business—for house and farm, for automobile, and other matters that require credit.

The article by Mr. Ephraim Kahn also discusses a pair of phenomena—the fact that publications such as "A Primer on Money" authored by Chairman PATMAN, has become a bestseller at the Government Printing Office, and the incredible success of his speech, "The ABC's of America's Money System," which is being read and discussed in the 50 States. The article notes that "some 300,000 copies have been printed and distributed, and there is no sign that the presses are exhausted." I have learned that the figure quoted by Mr. Kahn is too modest—actually, counting publications that have run the speech in full, there have been over a million reprints.

As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, we are working diligently to bring about banking practices that will benefit not alone the American, but the banker's public as well, if they only knew it. I am happy to place in the RECORD Mr. Kahn's article.

[From the Burroughs Clearing House, January 1965]

PATMAN VERSUS ORGANIZED BANKING

Readers interested in monetary policy have in recent months been afforded new opportunities to enlarge their knowledge. Some may find their thirst for information assuaged by the August 1964 speech by House Banking Committee Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. Called "The ABC's of America's Money System," some 300,000 copies have been printed and distributed, and there is no sign that the presses are exhausted. Those who wish to pursue Mr. PATMAN's interest and controversial views at greater length can go to his "Primer on Money," a 144-page document (available from the committee) with a foreword by Prof. Seymour E. Harris entitled "The Patman Crusade." Students whose intellectual curiosity impels them to seek a divergent view can find it in the American Banker's Association respectful "Comments" on Representative PATMAN's speech.

The ABA's "Comments," which are essentially intended to rebut Representative PATMAN, actually are believed to have pleased him. As he sees the "Comments," they afford additional opportunities for readers who do not have direct access to his talk to get acquainted with the thrust of his arguments.

Clearly, there are honest differences of opinion between Representative PATMAN and the ABA. One might go so far as to say that each thinks the other is wrong. There is nothing new about this, and it would be neither possible nor appropriate to attempt to resolve this disagreement between well-informed and thoughtful men here.

The basic material summarizing the issues and the viewpoints is readily available. Financial professionals owe it to themselves and to their industry to be well informed. Indications are that controversy about the proper role, functions, and organization of the Federal Reserve and the Nation's other financial institutions is not going to die down. On the contrary, it is almost certain to increase.

Banks and other financial institutions have important strategic and tactical roles to play in the national economy. They must do their parts—and seek to achieve their long- and short-term goals—under the strictures of regulation, both Federal and State. In a government of laws, men remain keystones, for they not only write the law but apply it, enforce it, and interpret it. The diligent advocate best serves his cause when he is aware of the beliefs, actions, and likely reactions of these men. This in no way implies that a policy of obsequiousness toward a lawmaker or regulator is either desirable or effective. But neither is an approach of rashness or bravado, or one that is based on dealing in personalities.

Many clues to conventional wisdom are to be found in proverb, adage, and aphorism. These signs are so diverse and contradictory as to necessarily leave the reasonable man in a quandary. "A soft answer turneth away wrath," for example, is met head-on by "the best defense is a good offense." Both of these courses are presumably avoided by those who believe that "one must cut one's coat to fit one's cloth" (a middle ground that may represent intelligent compromise rather than simple expediency) as much as by those who "walk softly but carry a big stick."

Dealing with Congress and the regulatory agencies is generally taken to be a game for the wary, something akin to diplomacy. Tempers may be quick to flare, off-the-cuff remarks may be taken as serious challenges and may have unforeseen consequences. In the banking and financial fields, Representative PATMAN—whose 36 years in Congress have accustomed, but not inured, him to attack—has never been known to shrink from replying. He has consistently taken the position that his views are based on fact, and he has never been reluctant to engage in discussions concerning differing interpretations of fact, or the validity of the alleged facts themselves.

He is a well-organized man and a prodigious worker, with infinite devotion to the things he believes to be right. His planning is generally long-term, and he prefers to have his conclusions stand or fall on the soundness of the arguments that underlie them. But it is certain that though he seeks drastic changes in the organization and policies of the Nation's financial institutions, he does not in any way think of himself as an enemy of the banking system. If he were, it would be well-nigh hopeless to expect any constructive banking legislation in the foreseeable future.

As the man who controls the flow of legislation through the House Banking Committee he has at times shown sympathy, and customarily an open mind, to legislation sought by banks and other financial institutions. However, he would be less than human if he chose to act affirmatively on legislation actively supported by someone who had issued a challenge to him on personal grounds, particularly if this legislation is opposed by other segments of the financial community.

Congress has traditionally taken the view that there are few matters of such urgency as to require immediate action. Proposed laws which might facilitate the operations of one group—or which stymie the ambitions of another—generally can be postponed. And simple advocacy by the wrong person can be ample justification for this.

It must be recognized that Representative PATMAN's plans for reform of the Federal Reserve System are necessarily long term. He believes that he has much work to do before his proposed reforms can successfully be presented to the House. The Senate (and first its Banking Committee) will present further high hurdles. More immediately, the financial issues to come before Congress soon will include the revenue bond bill, the secondary mortgage market proposal, the increase in deposit insurance, expanding the lending authority of savings and loan associations, and perhaps a broadening of the affinity concept for credit unions. These are important measures. Their fates will influence the strategy and tactics of all financial institutions, and they are not linked to the long-term question of FRS reorganization.

Representative PATMAN believes that the changes he seeks in the Federal Reserve are of great importance. His pattern of activity has been to kindle controversy so as to build support for his views both in Congress and among the people. The broad dissemination of his "ABC" speech has had its expected desult: Congressmen who are not on the Banking Committee and whose interest in financial matters is slight are getting letters from their constituents asking questions and demanding action along the lines proposed by Mr. PATMAN.

It is understood that this activity will be spurred by the organization of a group of business, labor, finance, farm cooperative, and consumer leaders who will call for a thorough review of the Nation's monetary and fiscal policies. Its composition will be diversified and it will have a balanced grassroots aspect. The political impact of such an organization cannot be underestimated—particularly when it will be able to work in conjunction with an existing group of 44 Congressman who are already committed to at least one phase of Representative PATMAN's program: holding the interest rate on long-term Government securities to no more than 4.25 percent. It is understood that this congressional steering committee is to be enlarged in the new Congress.

This group of Congressmen can represent a "swing bloc"—the crucial votes that actually determine whether the House will go for or against a measure. Its members can, if they wish, try to influence the votes of uncommitted Congressmen—if need be on a "you vote for my bill and I'll vote for yours" basis. In a Congress as unevenly divided as this one, where a change in the balance of power may take place because there are now fewer members of the conservative Democrat-Republican coalition, it is quite possible for 50-odd determined Members to make or break a bill. In the circumstances, there appear to be compelling reasons why discretion should, indeed, be the better part of valor.

Create New Jobs With Tax Relief for Businesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is making a determined effort to do something about the unemployment rate in the United States. Currently, the unemployment rate hovers around the 5 percent mark of the labor force which now numbers 70 million American workers. Through various Government-directed methods we have created many jobs in the last year or so through adoption of the tax reduction program, a continuation of the Manpower Development and Training Act, and an increased emphasis on college and vocational education programs. The administration has proposed other programs in hopes that they will cut further into the unemployment rate, and I speak specifically about the Economic Oppor-

tunity Act and Federal aid to elementary and secondary education.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation in the 89th Congress which I believe will help fill the gap in the unemployment ranks of our country. The idea of my bill, H.R. 271, which I also introduced in the 88th Congress, came to me from a distinguished Jacksonville, Fla., citizen, Reid W. Digges. Mr. Digges proposed that an employer be given tax relief for every job he creates, and this suggestion has been incorporated into my bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The legislation would provide deductions for persons engaged in trade or business who provide new jobs for the skilled and for all persons who provide new jobs for domestics and the unskilled. Training and educating the unemployed do not create jobs, but businesses can, and I believe that H.R. 271 is an important private enterprise challenge and the Congress can help solve unemployment through this vehicle by passing this legislation.

Salary Increase for Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a letter and resolution adopted by the Eastern Connecticut Council of the Navy League of the United States calling for an increase in salaries in all branches of the armed services. I heartily endorse this request.

I want to call particular attention to the following statement in the letter by Edward C. Ball, secretary of the Eastern Connecticut Council of the Navy League, where he states: "Far too many young officers and enlisted men of our personal acquaintance are leaving the service, that is, the submarine service, after completing an expensive training program, because their future in the service is so far from being economically acceptable."

This is a matter which deserves early and serious consideration. I do hope that Congress will soon adopt the necessary legislation to provide an adequate increase in salaries for our military personnel. The letter and resolution referred to above are as follows:

NAVY LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES,
EASTERN CONNECTICUT COUNCIL,
March 12, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
The House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ST. ONGE: At a membership meeting of the Eastern Connecticut Council, Navy League of the United States, on March 9, 1965, the attached resolution was unanimously approved. This resolution is the consensus of the more than 300 members of our council.

We, in this area, are extremely conscious of the difficulties being experienced by the Navy in manning submarines with capable and dedicated personnel. Far too many young officers and enlisted men of our personal acquaintance are leaving the service, after completing an expensive training program, because their future in the service is so far from being economically acceptable.

The Eastern Connecticut Council urges you to actively and enthusiastically promote and support the legislation necessary to correct the present unrealistic salary levels of service personnel in all branches.

Respectfully,

EDWARD C. BALL, *Secretary.*

EASTERN CONNECTICUT COUNCIL NAVY LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES—RESOLUTION

We, the members of the Navy League of Eastern Connecticut, wish to go on record as protesting the substandard salaries now prevailing through all levels of all branches of the armed services of the United States. We believe that they represent inadequate recompense to our servicemen for competent, loyal, and often heroic service. Furthermore, we believe that these salary levels represent shortsighted, uneconomic administration, inasmuch as they result in a high turnover rate among expensively trained personnel. In our opinion, simple gratitude to our servicemen and economic administration of the Armed Forces dictate a substantial increase in the present salary scales.

We therefore endorse the efforts currently underway in the Congress to make significant increases in these salaries, and we request the support of all Senators and Congressmen from Connecticut in achieving this goal.

Education Yesterday in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, last fall former State Superintendent of Education W. F. Bond addressed the Mississippi Association of School Administrators on the subject, "Education Yesterday in Mississippi."

Dr. Bond has devoted a lifetime to helping his fellow citizens. At 88 years of age, he still takes an active interest in public affairs, and is widely recognized as one of our most productive citizens.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Dr. Bond's address. It follows:

"EDUCATION YESTERDAY IN MISSISSIPPI"—ADDRESS BY DR. W. F. BOND, STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION, 1916–36, TO THE MISSISSIPPI ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, JACKSON, MISS., OCTOBER 20, 1964

Our State public school system, established 53 years after the State was admitted to the Union in 1817, was 6 years old when I was born 88 years ago. A fellow by the name of Cordoza (who was impeached) was then State superintendent of education, the second of 15 men who have had the honor of holding that responsible position to date.

The first, H. R. Rease (1869–73), left a complete report showing at that time (1871) there were 3,450 public schools, 100 graded schools, a few Peabody schools, and 80 high schools, with a combined enrollment of 117,000 pupils; and 460 private schools with an enrollment of 7,050. There was an average school term of 5 months and 10 days. He deplored dishonesty in handling 16th section school funds, including that part of the fund belonging to the 22 Chickasaw counties.

Cordoza left no official records. The next two, Gathright and Bardwell, left meager reports, but the next, J. A. Smith (1878–85), did better. He closes one of his reports made 86 years ago with this statement: "Public education in the State is in a healthier condition than ever before, and the complicated machinery of the State department of education is working smoothly. The only trouble is, improper handling of school funds, poor county supervision, inefficient teachers, and a short school term of 4 months."

It was during Smith's term of office 81 years ago, that I first became connected with the school system of the State by enrolling in a one-teacher school for a 2 months' summer term. I didn't like anything about the school, especially the teacher. To get to this school I was carried on horseback, riding behind, 10 miles through the piney woods from my foster home in South Mississippi to stay at the home of one of our nearest neighbors, so that I would have to walk only 3 miles to school.

The first good picture we get of our educational system in those early years is found in State Superintendent J. R. Preston's (1885–95) report of 1888. There were then, according to Preston, several hundred small rural schools, 34 graded schools in separate school districts, 150 high schools, 90 academies, and 6 State-supported colleges: University of Mississippi (1848), A. & M. College (1878), I. & C. (1884), Alcorn A. & M. College, Holly Springs, and Tougaloo, with a combined enrollment of approximately 1,500 students.

As time passed, Holly Springs and Tougaloo Colleges were dropped from the State-supported list and Mississippi Normal College (1912), Delta State College (1925), Jackson State College (1940), and Mississippi Valley State College (1950) were added. The enrollment of these schools at the present time is 22,500.

Governors Paul Johnson, Sr. and Tom Bailey, and their respective legislatures rendered a great service to higher education in Mississippi when they helped to put an amendment in the Constitution taking control of the colleges out of the Governor's office and putting them in charge of a nonpolitical board of 12 members named by the Governor for 12-year terms, no one Governor to name over 4 members.

There are some who would like to take this amendment out of the Constitution, but I do not believe the people will ever vote to put control of the colleges again in the Governor's office. Mississippi College, Blue Mountain College, and Millsaps College because of their long period of fruitful service have made a great contribution to our educational welfare. The same may be said of other nonpublic schools and colleges.

During Governor Noel's administration (1908–12), while J. N. Powers was State Superintendent and W. H. Smith, Rural School Supervisor laws were enacted authorizing (1) establishment of a Normal College for the training of teachers for the rural schools, (2) creation of a statewide system of county agricultural high schools supported jointly by the State and respective counties, and (3) combining small schools into larger units called consolidated schools, with authority to pay for transportation of students out of public funds.

These laws were to have a far-reaching effect on our educational progress. In my opinion, Governor Noel was never given credit due for his good administration.

The Normal College was located at Hattiesburg and is now the University of Southern Mississippi.

When I became State superintendent of education by appointement of Governor Bilbo, September 1916, the consolidated school movement and the AHS program were just getting started. There was another problem demanding solution—a satisfactory

way to distribute State public school funds. To meet this problem we realized we would have to organize our potential forces for education, and have more administrative help in the State Department of Education.

Since a majority of the county superintendents had never been present at their State meeting held every other year, we started our organizational effort by holding district meetings before we called a statewide meeting at Jackson. The district meetings were most successful.

About this time a friend of the better school movement, J. T. Thomas, a banker of Grenada, gave $2,000 a year for several years to pay expenses of county superintendents to their annual meeting, held in or out of the State.

Next was the organization of trustees of the schools of the respective counties. These meetings, held generally at the county site, were not always harmonious. After the new compulsory school law was explained to the trustees of Lafayette County in Oxford, one said he would move out of the county rather than be governed by such a law. When told the law was for the State, he said he hated to do it, but would move out of the State. When informed thta Mississippi was the last State to have such a law, with considerable emotion, he said he would go to hell before he would put up with it.

With forces organized and an increased number of supervisors in our State office, we were ready to make real progress. We made surveys of most of the county school systems, beginning in Yazoo County where Pete Clark was county superintendent, so that we would have a guide as we moved along with our better school program.

We also made a survey of the school system of Vicksburg, and submitted at invitation of the trustees, names of six men who might be interested in succeeding Superintendent J. P. Carr, who was retiring after many years of faithful service. H. V. Cooper was elected and stayed there 30 years.

There were two periods of school consolidation, the voluntary or optional plan beginning with the passage of the law in 1910, and the minimum school program in 1953 when consolidation was made compulsory by law.

The agriculture high school, with its 20 acres of land and boarding facilities for at least 40 students, proved to be a key institution in educational progress. It gave students a chance to get a high school education at cost, with emphasis on agriculture and homemaking, with an opportunity to pay part or all of their expenses by working on the school farm and in the dormitories; it encouraged the consolidated school idea; and it made possible the establishing of our fine system of public junior colleges.

The makers of the constitution of 1890 thought they had solved the public school financial problem by providing a common school fund made up of a $2 poll tax, to be paid by voters otherwise eligible to vote, to be retained in the respective counties and separate school district where it was paid, and a State appropriation to be disbursed on an educable per capita basis to the counties and separate districts. It was soon apparent that this was not a satisfactory way to disburse a State school fund for it created a surplus of school money in some counties and deficits in others.

When the State was admitted to the Union in 1817, it retained the 16th section in every township for support of free schools in that particular township. But through the years income from these 661,000 acres of school lands, on account of ignorance, negligence, mismanagement, and downright dishonesty, has been disappointing. Total annual income now, including $62,000 interest paid by the State of the Chickasaw School fund, is less than $2 million.

For 30 years after the 1890 Constitutional Convention all attempts to change the method for distributing a State school fund met with failure. The breakthrough came October 23, 1922, 6 years after I came into office, by a 4-to-2 decision of the Supreme Court that the legislature had authority under the Constitution of 1890 to appropriate a State equalization school fund to be disbursed by the State board of education. Had it not been for three lawyers, Fred Lotterhos, Sr., Judge J. Morgan Stephens, and Francis Harmon, who volunteered to take the matter to court as a friendly suit, we might have failed again. We first took the matter to the people for a vote on the question and won, but the court ruled the method was illegal. It was then the lawyers came to our rescue.

As one looks back over the active years of his life he can see where he made some failures and mistakes, but he can also see some things he helped to do of which he is proud. During the years I tried to direct the public school program of Mississippi, I did a lot of traveling and speechmaking.

A preacher in his pulpit, a lawyer before a jury, a candidate for office before the voters, and other speakers, have one objective in mind—to influence those to whom he is speaking. For 20 years as State superintendent of education, I traveled over Mississippi speaking for better schools for all children, sometimes to hostile audiences.

In making a plea for consolidation, I had a dual problem—to get people to give up the little schools that had been good enough for them and their fathers, and to put a tax on their property to support better schools.

I found the following statement most effective: "At the supper table tonight, when you look at your children, I want you to know that you are looking at children in whose veins there flows as good blood as has ever coursed the veins of any child ever born in the world since the beginning of time; and they are your children. They believe now you are the finest daddies in the world, which is as it should be. But some day, if they live, they are going to have the minds of men and women, and will know whether or not you, because of the love of a few cold dollars, or other reasons, failed to give them the chance to get the preparation they would need to get on in the world in which they would have to live after you are dead and gone."

Probably the one thing I helped do, to which I "point with pride" was building of a State department of education.

* * * * *

For the last few years every speech I have made I thought might well be my last. I can't think of a more suitable occasion to make my last speech than now. I have had on my heart something I wanted to say sometime to somebody before I passed out of the picture. I believe you are that "somebody."

Formerly, when I looked at a little girl, innocent, lovely, beautiful, the finest of all creations, I rejoiced in the thought that as she grew up she would bring great joy to her parents and friends and become a lovable, influential young woman who would help make the world a safer and better place in which to live.

Now when I see a little girl I feel sorry for her when I think of what a ruthless society is likely to do to her in her maturing years. I know that a majority of our young people are fine and wholesome, but this majority is decreasing every year. FBI reports show that crime among teenagers has increased four times as fast as with adults in the past 2 years. We are losing our young people to such evils as strong drink, stealing, gambling, promiscuity, vandalism, narcotics, including cigarette smoking.

Every day our children see pictures showing how beautiful the landscape is when you are smoking a cigarette. I would like to write on that picture: "Tomorrow this will be lung-cancer country and that husky fellow smoking the cigarette will likely be in his grave from a heart attack, or ill with lung cancer."

It is said that one girl out of every five is pregnant when she gets married, that the number of girls finishing high school and college with a clean record is decreasing relatively every year. Children are marrying too young, the divorce rate is rising rapidly and the number of illegitimate children is on the increase. This situation is true, not only in Mississippi and the rest of the Nation, but all over the world. Young people are losing respect for law and order and violating all codes supposed to govern moral conduct.

The time has come to bring this in the open so that the public may see and know what is happening to our children. I can't say that young people are to blame for this unwholesome situation, for they are creatures of our society, and they therefore need help more than criticism. The question, then, is where is this help to come from?

The home, church, and school are largely responsible for the kind of society we have. If any help is to be given, it will have to come from one or all three of these institutions.

For several years in lower- and middle-income homes, both parents have had to work to have sufficient income for the family. Not many children have responsibilities when not in school, and family meals together are largely a thing of the past. This leaves children to look after themselves.

Too many well-to-do parents turn their children over to babysitters and servants and indulge in pleasures of their own. Many well-meaning parents do not know how to bring up their children. They need help, so I don't see much help from the home. This is unfortunate, for a child should get fundamentals of a good life, such as respect for authority, honesty, unselfishness, etc. in his earlier years.

The church, our greatest possible force for good, becoming fixed in its pattern of activities and service years ago, is not as effective, with few exceptions, in its work and has less influence on people than at any time in the past, in my opinion, and will continue to lose influence unless it adjusts to meet the needs of the times. This likely will have to begin in seminaries where ministers are trained. I love the church. I am sure we have as good churches in Mississippi as you will find anywhere, but it seems the church has not given effective help in solution of our problems. Every institution should be its own fairest and most intelligent critic, and should remember that our best friend is one who tells us what he actually thinks and not what he thinks we would like to hear.

The home is giving far less help to children than formerly, and the church has not kept pace. The school is now the most effective force on the lives of children, but it must do a great deal more to meet the needs of this complicated age. Fortunately, the school is in position to give that extra help children need to survive in a society that sorely besets them.

If my diagnosis is correct, you, your respective staffs, and faculties are the ones to initiate and carry out measures that will stop the inroads of evil into the lives of our students. Before this can be done, however, many will have to get a new concept of what schools and colleges are supposed to do. Many seem to believe that when the student has mastered the course of study so that he can be given a passing grade the school has fulfilled its obligation. In my opinion this is far from correct. The main purpose of the school is to train students for citizenship of the highest order. Schol-

arship is necessary and good only as far as it goes. Solomon said, "Knowledge is power." To give young people power without training them how to use that power is like placing a loaded shotgun in the hands of a child. Thus a school or college training only the head and not the heart, may be doing more harm than good to the community and State.

The question then is, What are the characteristics of a good citizen? A good citizen is honest, unselfish, well informed, industrious, respects authority, appreciative, patriotic, clean in his life, loves people and has faith in God. The school should be so operated that a student's every contact with it would help to train and encourage him to be a good citizen.

A student should be so taught that he will want to be the captain of his own soul, rather than a slave to the evils of our times.

I believe the school that accepts this idea as its real responsibility and will bring into the open the evils that are hurting many of our children will soon have wholehearted support of its students and their parents. This united effort can drive evil things out of our schools, even as Christ drove moneychangers out of the temple.

In conclusion, I want to pay tribute to that departed host of dedicated educators who, during the last 100 years, served as leaders of our great State to provide educational advantages for our children that would enable them to take their places as good citizens, not only in their native State, but in the Nation, and throughout the world. They fought the good fight and kept the faith. I call the names of a few who are truly representative of that group:

Chancellor Alfred Hume, connected with University of Mississippi, 58 years; J. R. Preston, State superintendent of education, 10 years (1885–1895); E. E. Bass, superintendent, Greenville Schools, 49 years; H. B. Heidelberg, superintendent, Clarksdale Schools, 50 years; Jno. Rundle, superintendent, Grenada Schools, 26 years; J. W. Provine, connected with Mississippi College, 37 years, 26 as president; Ed Brown, founder and head of Mississippi Heights Academy, nearly 40 years; Superintendent L. S. Rogers, Leflore County Schools, 36 years without opposition; W. H. Braden, superintendent, Natchez Schools, nearly 30 years; M. P. Bush, A.H.S., superintendent and junior college president, 27 years.

Thank you for your most cordial and generous reception.

May Father Time and the Fates be as good to you as they have been to me.

The Supreme Court Needs No Defense

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5374) relating to the salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is incumbent upon me to address myself to the disturbing remarks relating to the U.S. Supreme Court made on the floor of the House today. It has become all too commonplace to scoff at the High Court and at its distinguished and dedicated members in certain places but I did not expect to hear what I heard on the floor today.

The House Judiciary Committee, of which I am proud to be a member, reported H.R. 5347, authorizing a salary increase of $3,000 per annum for the Justices of the Supreme Court. The bill was defeated by a vote of 203 to 177. I of course, respect the right of each of my colleagues to vote in accordance with his best judgment and as his conscience dictates. The outcome of the vote, though personally disappointing because of the injustice of last year's action, does not disturb me. What is disturbing was the tone of the debate—a tone not in keeping with the prestige of the House and the respect due the High Tribunal.

I do not quarrel with those whose argument during debate was addressed to the questions of economics or comparative salaries. But as a member of the bar, I am shocked at the lack of respect for the Court as an institution of our constitutional democracy.

When we entered upon our duties as Members of the House, an oath was administered—and we solemnly swore to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

The Constitution provides for three distinct branches of government and defines the powers of each branch—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. Like a three legged stool they support the structure of our democracy. We all know what happens if we remove one leg of a three legged stool. So it is with our Government. Each branch must respect the rights and powers of the other two, without which, the structure of our democracy is weakened. It is all well and good to disagree—but, why can we not agree—to disagree—agreeably.

The Supreme Court has a responsibility to judge questions of Constitutional law without regard to political or other pressures. For this very reason, the members of the Court are appointed for life so as to insure their independence.

Much of the criticism leveled against the Court during the past few years has been the result of a lack of understanding of its decisions.

The statements on the House floor, which implied that those Members who are attorneys had a special interest in the passage of H.R. 5347, were unfair and such statements were made without justification. Those who spoke irreverently of their colleagues, perhaps do not know that most lawyers never have the privilege of litigating or have proceedings before the Supreme Court. I have been a practicing attorney for 35 years and except for the occasion on which I was admitted to practice before that High Tribunal, I never had and do not now have any business before the Court.

As a new Member I prepared myself for the discharge of my duties and responsibilities by reading the Rules of the House and Cannon's Procedure, including the rules relating to relevency in debate. Today the Rules were honored in the breach. Speaker Henderson on February 1, 1900, said:

Precedents should be followed where possible.

I suggest to my colleagues not to look to this debate for precedents, on how to conduct ourselves toward the other two branches of the Government, and toward our fellow Members of the House.

Those on the outside who oversimplify and pervert the decisions of the Court do so for a purpose—a purpose which is not in the best interests of our society. Those who cry out against the Court as being "soft on communism" or "For taking God out of the schools" or for protecting civil and human rights, have in most cases failed to read the decisions or tried to understand their full significance.

I urge my colleagues to serve our democracy by suggesting to their constituents that a visit to the Supreme Court when in session will be both beneficial and a rewarding experience. Many attorneys across the country may be interested in and should be informed of the procedures for admission to the Supreme Court. By so doing Members of Congress will be rendering a great service to the people who want to learn more and more about our democracy.

I congratulate and commend the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York, for his untiring efforts in behalf of justice. I regret that the majority of the House did not vote favorably on H.R. 5347 but to him I say, may the Almighty bless you with many years of good health so that you may carry on with your mission, that of the strengthening of our democracy.

Right To Vote for Puerto Ricans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is in the midst of one of the most important deliberations in its history—the hearings on the voting rights bill. Congress must not forget the plight of our Puerto Rican citizens. In New York State many Spanish-speaking citizens have been denied the right to vote because of the English language literacy test. Ever since I have been in Congress, I have introduced legislation to abolish the literacy test. On March 17, 1965, El Diario-La Prensa published an editorial by its publisher, O. Roy Chalk, concerning the right to vote for Puerto Ricans. I strongly urge my colleagues to read the following editorial:

BARRIERS TO THE RIGHT TO VOTE

(By O. Roy Chalk)

"Wednesday (today)," the President said Monday night to the Congress, "I will send to Congress a law designed to eliminate illegal barriers to the right to vote." Even though the President specifically mentioned the Negroes, both in his speech and message to Congress, he implied that his words were directed to all citizens or groups of citizens who are impeded by barriers from the right to vote, barriers such as the color

of skin, religion, or the language spoken by any citizen.

In this respect Lyndon B. Johnson stated emphatically: "We cannot, we must not, refuse to protect the right of every American to vote in every election that he may desire to participate in." The literacy test in English is a barrier which obstructs all those citizens by birth, such as the Puerto Ricans, from voting "in any election in which they wish to participate." That barrier is not imposed by the Constitution of the United States. If this were so, it would be common to the 50 States of the Union. Yet it is a requirement of less than half of the States.

President Johnson gave no room for doubt in his message as to which were the inalienable rights granted by our Constitution. "This was the first nation," the President said, "in the history of the world to be founded with a purpose. The great phrases of that purpose still sound in every American heart, North and South: 'All men are created equal'; 'government by consent of the governed'; 'give me liberty or give me death.'"

Every practice or requirement which tries to destroy those goals must fail of its own accord. In the words of the President, "There is no constitutional issue here. The command of the Constitution is plain. There is no moral issue. It is wrong—deadly wrong—to deny any of your fellow Americans the right to vote in this country. There is no issue of States rights or national rights. There is only the struggle for human rights."

The enactment of the Federal law proposed by President Johnson will make it difficult for certain sectors of New York State to sustain or defend the position that this question is solely a matter of State legislation. On the other hand, to maintain that the necessary readjustment of State laws to Federal laws which would result from the bill presented by the President today would be a constitutional reform represents an anachronistic and dangerous trend.

"This time," Johnson warned, "on this issue, there must be no delay, or no hesitation, or no compromise with our purpose."

It is most urgent that all the citizens of this great country be truly equal, not only in theory but in practice; not only in the basic structure of the law but in its implementation. One can have the right to vote. If one cannot exercise that right because of "barriers" then that right is meaningless.

The most obvious "barriers" that exist and stand in the way of granting a true right to vote for American citizens of Puerto Rican birth is the elimination of the literacy test. El Diario-La Prensa and the community it represents have fought long and hard for many years for this goal. Neither Negroes nor Puerto Ricans nor any other group of American citizens have the right to vote unless all artificial "barriers" are removed on a practical and realistic basis. Puerto Ricans are citizens by birth regardless of the language they may speak. They should not be made "citizens of convenience" to suit the purposes of political or other pressure groups.

Straws in the Wind From Hanoi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during the recent hearings of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific, experts testified on the Sino-Soviet split and its implications for American policy in Vietnam.

Among them were Dr. Donald Zagoria of Columbia University and Dr. Bernard Fall of Howard University. Their testimony provided many valuable facts and ideas for the subcommittee members.

Among them was a hint of a relaxed stand by North Vietnam on establishing negotiations which Dr. Fall called to the attention of the subcommittee during his testimony.

In an article for the Washington Post on Sunday, March 21, Dr. Zagoria pointed to this information as one of several significant "straws in the wind" in the Vietnam situation. Dr. Zagoria believes that this new stand by Hanoi may be the result of pressure from U.S. bombings.

Because of the possible importance of this and other recent developments in Hanoi, I am inserting Dr. Zagoria's article in the RECORD at this point, and urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1965]

HANOI MAY BE RELAXING TERMS FOR NEGOTIATIONS

(By Donald H. Zagoria)

There are two straws in the wind from Vietnam that could prove to be of considerable political significance.

First, the South Vietnamese Communists have launched a violent attack on a new Buddhist neutralist movement in Saigon which has called for the withdrawal both of American military advisers and Communist guerrillas from South Vietnam.

Second, Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, North Vietnam's powerful Minister of Defense, appears to have provided the first sign that North Vietnam is relaxing its conditions for negotiating an end to the war in the south.

The Buddhist group, the Movement for the Preservation of Peace and People's Happiness is led by an influential American-educated monk, Thich Quang Lien. Lien's goal is clearly to create the conditions for a genuinely neutralist Vietnam.

In statements made in Saigon earlier this month, he called for the dissolution of the Vientcong armed forces, the withdrawal to North Vietnam of the Communists in the South Vietnamese Liberation Front, the elimination of Soviet and Chinese influence in North Vietnam and an end to the war in the south.

VIETCONG ENRAGED

This program has so enraged the Vietcong that, in a number of recent statements broadcast over their clandestine radio station, they have attacked Lien for betraying the Nation and Buddhism, for being a "mouthpiece of the White House" and for building a "fake peace organization."

The intensity of the attacks on Lien and his followers seems to reflect Communist fear that a genuinely neutralist Buddhist movement, capable of rallying the South Vietnamese masses, could provide a political counterweight to the Vietcong and thus deprive them of the final victory they seem to believe is close at hand.

Therefore the Communists seek to nip this development in the bud by portraying Lien as an American puppet.

Perhaps equally important, however, the Communist attack on Lien indicates clearly that there are Buddhist leaders who might, if given proper American support and understanding, provide a popular nationalist alternative to communism. The Buddhist leaders are by no means united behind Lien.

HELD INCOMPATIBLE

Some are against the formation of any political movement on the grounds that politics and Buddhism are incompatible. Some are sympathetic to the Communists. Others are politically naive. Nevertheless, Lien appears to have a substantial following among the monks. If he did not, the Communists would hardly direct so much of their fire against him.

It is difficult to understand why the American Government has not called attention to the Communist attack on the Buddhist neutralists.

It would tend to support the American Government's position that the Communists do not want genuine neutralization; and it would undercut Communist claims to represent the broad masses of the people in South Vietnam.

General Giap's hint of a relaxed North Vietnamese stand on negotiations came in an interview given to a Japanese television delegation on March 10.

Prof. Bernard Fall of Howard University, an authority on North Vietnam, called this hint to the attention of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives last week while giving testimony on the Chinese-Soviet conflict.

KEY CONCESSION

The key concession apparently made by Giap was an abandonment of earlier insistence that the Americans withdraw from South Vietnam before negotiations begin. While insisting that the United States must stop at once its bombing of North Vietnam and must end immediately the war in South Vietnam, Giap did not put a similar urgent requirement on the demand to withdraw U.S. troops and weapons.

Such an omission is not likely to have been accidental. Moreover, in the same interview, Giap pointedly said that the American Government as well as the governments of all other countries participating in the 1954 Geneva conference must implement the Geneva agreements.

This, Fall pointed out, could have been intended as a signal to indicate that North Vietnam—which was one of the participating countries—would stop intervening in South Vietnam if the United States did so, too. It is such a signal that the American Government has insisted upon as a prerequisite for negotiation.

The use of such esoteric signals is not without precedent in the Communist world. One could not, of course, be certain about North Vietnamese intent unless these apparent signals were explored through diplomatic channels.

Taken together, the Vietcong attack on the Buddhist neutralists and Giap's hint of concession both point toward a more hopeful outlook for negotiations.

Giap's apparent signal must certainly be read against the background of American air attacks on North Vietnam and the growing Chinese-Soviet split. The North Vietnamese are extremely fearful of enlarged American attacks.

The Vietcong-Buddhist confrontation means that in any future negotiations an important political asset for the south could be the existence of an independent and anti-Communist Buddhist political force.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6815 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C* — 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*
Grider, George W., *Tenn*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

Whiskeytown Memorial Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess it was my privilege to assist in ceremonies marking the location of President Kennedy's last visit to California at Whiskeytown Dam, a part of the Central Valley project. It is located 10 miles west of Redding, Calif.

Mr. James Kennedy Carr, the former Under Secretary of the Interior and a native of Redding gave the principal address.

One associate of the former President commented that it was high fidelity. I agree. I ask unanimous consent to place this address in the RECORD to record this important occasion and to make available Mr. Carr's remarks to the Members of Congress as well as the many others who cherish the memory of John F. Kennedy.

REMARKS OF JAMES K. CARR, GENERAL MANAGER OF PUBLIC UTILITIES, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,[1] AT THE DEDICATION OF THE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY MEMORIAL, WHISKEYTOWN DAM, SHASTA COUNTY, CALIF., OCTOBER 11, 1964

Only a little more than a year ago on that beautiful 28th day of September in this superb setting of mountains and a man-made lake he helped create, President John F. Kennedy dedicated Whiskeytown Dam, a part of the Central Valley project. The people of this, my native county, and their neighbors far and near were gripped with excitement. It was a charged atmosphere that lasted long after the moment you thrilled at the takeoff of Air Force One from the Redding Airport which took him out of your midst—a departure that for most of you was his last—for it was here that he paid his last visit to California.

That awful day—November 22, 1963—had not arrived a year ago. That day when in a split second a shot shattered the dreams of millions—and the world wept. That dreadful day when the senseless act of a demented mind wrought desolation on a global scale in the minds of men. I recall the weeping woman who was standing alone in the rain in Lafayette Square the next morning facing the White House. When questioned, she said, "Even the heavens are weeping. I think this is the least I can do."

As with so many others, I have been asked countless times, "Where were you when you heard the news?" If I live to be a hundred, the memory of that afternoon and night will always be indelibly etched in my memory and yours.

I had just finished lunch with Under Secretary of Labor John Henning at a downtown restaurant. We left immediately. Six Cabinet officers were out of the country and we both were the Acting Secretary. When I reached the White House a few minutes later the guard put down the phone as I entered the basement door and said, "He's gone." It was more than a half hour later that the TV news destroyed the hope that the first report was wrong. The Secretary to the Cabinet asked me to call the others and tell them to come to the White House. Then there was that saddest of all helicopter flights from the lawn to Andrews Field. How the world had changed in those 4 hours.

You know the rest of the story. There were many of us that felt as did one of my colleagues who said, "We may smile again, but we will never be young again." It was the weekend that lasted a year.

But John F. Kennedy lived a lot of other days than November 22, and a thousand days as the 35th President of the greatest Nation on earth. That is the way we should remember him in all his bright and buoyant spirit. This is the theme of your living memorial to a smiling, confident President.

You asked me to come here as one of you, a native son of Shasta County; as one who had the great privilege and high honor of serving him, through no great merits of mine, to tell you about John F. Kennedy as I knew him. I will not try to compete with the millions of words that have been spoken or written about him so brilliantly.

I was not close to President Kennedy in the sense that many were. I do not want to falsely draw his cloak about me, personally, simply because I was one of his appointees. He wouldn't approve of that. It is not because he was aloof. Rather it was because he was always dignified and more often reserved in his official capacity. He knew there is a proper time for everything. He once said that the Presidency was not the best place to make friends. Our first casual acquaintance was when he was in the House of Representatives. Later I saw him a few times as a Senator and briefly during the campaign.

Many of you have asked me, "What kind of a man was he?" In a limited way I will attempt a response to that question.

I said he was reserved. He was. But he was capable of great warmth. No President gave the people he met more individual attention. The conversation might only last for seconds, but to him you were the only person in the world. The speed with which he could grasp facts and digest them was marvelous. His concentration on the person with whom he was speaking was a clue to his phenomenal memory. "Elbow grabbers" were ignored.

One time as he arrived in the State Department Building he asked Secretary Udall and me to step into a side room just prior to speaking at the White House Conference on Conservation. He had a draft of a speech. We were asked what we thought were the really significant points to be made because he really didn't like to follow a written text. Within less than 5 minutes he was going on stage and he didn't miss a point. In the course of our conversation, he, as an aside, mentioned how much his sister, Mrs. Sargent Shriver, enjoyed speaking at the University of Santa Clara, my alma mater. He didn't miss much with that fantastic memory. He had tremendous self-discipline and his associates marveled at his sharp, keen encyclopedic mind.

President Kennedy was that very rare and precious combination—a man of profound reflection and a man of action. He was also a man of courage, compassion and culture; and a man of peace, wisdom and wit.

I shall not repeat the stories of his courage. He wrote a book about it and the record of the way in which he discharged his globe encircling, awesome responsibilities under relentless pressure is another book about courage. I shall not forget that fearsome Saturday during the Cuban crisis when the ships steamed toward each other as we stayed glued to the radio at our desks. It was possible at any time to have received orders to proceed to our respective headquarters for war. That day and night the President with his tremendous, calm courage, personally displayed America's strength and courage to the world.

He was a man of compassion. He was greatly concerned about men with families without jobs and people without sufficient food in many parts of the world. President Kennedy was personally involved in fighting for economic opportunity in Appalachia and particularly in areas such as exist in the declining job areas of West Virginia. He was a man of great personal wealth but he did not parade it. He was greatly concerned about the poor and now the world is immeasurably poorer without him.

John F. Kennedy was a man of culture. He and the gracious, charming Mrs. Kennedy set a new standard for American culture that will not fade away. The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts will be a constant reminder of their cultural accomplishments.

He was a man of wisdom who sought world peace as the key to everything else. On that memorable, bleak, terrible cold, icy day in January 1961, in his inaugural address he served notice on the world that here was a President from a new generation, a man young in years, a man old in wisdom. Now that we read and reread his prophetic remarks and admonitions we acknowledge his great grasp of history that comes from intense study.

As the Honorable ROBERT E. JONES, Congressman from Alabama, said, "He first told us of his dream and then he took us by the hand and at the time of his death he was guiding us, inch by inch, toward a new and glorious day in world history * * *. Now this man of peace is gone."

Any comment on John F. Kennedy would be incomplete if I did not mention his wit. I said he was reserved, and he was at the proper time, but in a flash he was capable of remarkable, contagious good humor.

Early in his administration he quipped, "When we got into office, the thing that surprised me most was to find that things were just as bad as we'd been saying they were."

You women would appreciate the remarks when he was with his sister, Pat Lawford, several years his junior. He told the crowd, "I want you to meet my sister, Patricia Lawford, from California. Somebody asked her last week if I was her kid brother, so she knew it was time this campaign came to an end."

And the world enjoyed the humor when he said: "I do not think it altogether inappropriate to introduce myself to this audience. I am the man who accompanied Jacqueline Kennedy to Paris, and I have enjoyed it."

Perhaps it was a measure of the man that he could tell jokes on himself. In North Carolina, shortly after he took office he said,

[1] U.S. Under Secretary of the Interior—January 1961–July 1964.

"Those of you who regard my profession of political life with some disdain should remember that it made it possible for me to move from being an obscure lieutenant in the U.S. Navy to Commander in Chief in 14 years with very little technical competence."

But for all his wit and promise, how little did we know and did he know when he remarked: "It has recently been suggested that whether I serve one or two terms in the Presidency, I will find myself at what might be called the awkward age, too old to begin a new career and too young to write my memoirs."

If there is anything that the life of President Kennedy suggests it is a youthful approach, which he symbolized in the Peace Corps. It is high hopes for America and the world and it is a plea for excellence. The day before he died, at Brooks Air Force Base in Texas, he commented on a story that Frank O'Connor, the Irish writer, tells in one of his books, how as a boy he and his friends would make their way across the countryside. When they came to an orchard wall that seemed too high to scale, and too doubtful to try, and too difficult to permit them to continue, they took off their caps and tossed them over the wall and then they had no choice but to follow them. In his incomparable intense quest for knowledge he always wanted to explore the wonders on the other side, and he approached them in high hopes, and it is in this spirit that it is may honor today to dedicate this living memorial to John F. Kennedy.

Other Septembers and Novembers will come and go. On the nearby mountain 6,000 feet high that looks down on this lake he helped create, each fall the forested slopes will turn color and people will be reminded of his visit here, his last to California.

As we ponder his life and the misshapen events that have engulfed us, we ask with the psalmist, what is man, created a little less than the angels, crowned with honor and glory, and given rule over the works of God's hands.

In the exercise of that rule by John F. Kennedy, we are reminded of the parable and the man with five talents. As we dedicate this memorial we cannot help but mourn him, but he waits for us in another place and just as the man with the five talents, he too has merited the commendation, "Well done, my good and faithful servant."

Foreign Aid and the Balance of Payments

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there has been no deficit of spoken and written comment on the U.S. balance-of-payments problem and what to do about it. It is fitting that many remedies to correct the imbalance should be suggested and considered, because the causes are many. We are dealing with a delicate and complex set of economic forces, and it is important that in our urgent desire to correct the imbalance we avoid curative measures which would have no effect on the disease—or be worse than the disease.

One of the most durable myths of recent time is the belief that cuts in the foreign aid program would have an important effect on the existing imbalance. AID has not seriously affected our balance-of-payments position since 1961, when it was tied tightly to U.S. purchases.

As long ago as early 1963 the House Committee on Foreign Affairs concluded that—

Although the U.S. gold supply continues to decline and the U.S. balance of payments remains unfavorable, it is clear that factors other than foreign aid are primarily and directly responsible and that the elimination of the foreign aid program would neither balance U.S. payments nor have a significant bearing on the underlying causes.

In the crescendo of comment on the payments problem, it is good to hear the calm and reasoned analysis of Mr. David Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, who recently appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. His statement shows that the current adverse impact on our balance of payments of foreign aid expenditures is surprisingly small, and that this relatively small and declining remaining element of offshore expenditure under the aid program is a cost to our country which is far outweighed by the benefits to our own interests that result from economic and social progress in the less developed countries.

Under permission granted, I insert in the RECORD the statement made by the Honorable David E. Bell before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on March 9, 1965:

STATEMENT BY MR. BELL

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the privilege of appearing before this committee. As Administrator of the Agency for International Development, I am particularly pleased that these hearings are being held, for they present an excellent opportunity to give the facts to the Congress, and to attempt to clear up some of the misconceptions surrounding the relation of aid to our balance of payments.

Foreign aid is by its very nature closely involved with the flow of payments. Thus each action and step taken by AID is and must be evaluated from the point of view of our balance of payments situation.

The foreign aid program provides goods and services to other countries which they cannot obtain through normal means—through their export earnings and through obtaining capital on commercial terms and by private investment. A successful aid program is one which enables the recipient country to strengthen its economy to the point where it can obtain goods and services it needs for steady expansion and growth by normal trade and normal capital movements—and without further need for aid grants and soft loans. This is what was achieved in Western Europe under the Marshall plan, and has since been achieved in Japan, Spain, Greece, Taiwan, and other countries.

It is plainly important to seek to carry out this important national program, like any other, at minimum cost to the United States.

In the first years of the U.S. foreign aid program after World War II, during the Marshall plan and most of the 1950's, our aid appropriations were, in general, spent wherever in the world prices were lowest. During the Marshall plan period, of course, the United States was the only major source in the world for most of the goods those countries needed. Therefore most of the aid dollars, although not tied to U.S. procurement, were spent in this country. Later in the 1950's the revived European economies became increasingly effective competitors for U.S. aid purchases.

Beginning in 1959, in response to the changed situation of the U.S. balance of payments, our policy respecting aid purchases were changed. Today, with small exceptions, aid appropriations can only be spent in the United States, for goods and services produced in this country. This has undoubtedly raised the cost to the Federal budget of providing a given amount of goods and services under the aid program, since some items are being purchased with aid appropriations in the United States which could be bought more cheaply in other countries. But our present policies are intended to minimize the adverse effect of the aid program on the balance of payments, even if that results in some increased cost to the budget.

I

There are two approaches to measuring the impact of AID's expenditures on the balance of payments The first, which might be called the accounting approach, measures the direct result of the AID spending: are the dollars appropriated by the Congress spent directly in this country or are they spent abroad or transferred to another country or to an international organization.

Under this method of measurement, which is similar to the Department of Commerce figures on the balance of payments, during fiscal year 1964—the latest data available—the gross adverse effect on the U.S. balance of payments of AID's economic assistance programs was about $513 million.

We have now received preliminary estimates for the calendar year 1964 which show substantial further improvement. The payments abroad dropped to about $400 million. This is offset by repayments of past assistance extended by AID and predecessor agencies of over $150 million, making a net effect of about $250 million.

The current expenditure rate under our economic assistance program is almost exactly $2 billion per year. Thus in 1964, for every dollar of economic aid extended, 20 cents showed as a current adverse impact in our balance of payments—not considering current or future receipts.

Put the other way round, 80 percent of AID's expenditures last year represented not dollars going abroad, but steel, machinery, fertilizer, and other goods and services purchased in the United States.

Under these circumstances, of course, a cut in AID appropriations would primarily reduce U.S. exports, and would have only a very small effect on the balance of payments.

Moreover, the proportion of appropriations spent in the United States is rising. Eighty-five percent of new obligations are being committed for direct expenditure in the United States.

The $400 million of AID offshore payments in calendar 1964 is made up of the following major elements:

One hundred and twenty million dollars representing payments of U.S. voluntary contributions to international organizations, such as U.N. agencies, the Indus River project administered by the IBRD, and the Social Progress Trust Fund:

Seventy-eight million dollars for commodity purchases in other less developed countries—cases where, for example, required goods are unavailable in the United States or shipping costs are too high; $19 million for commodity purchases in other developed countries.

These are either tag-end expenditures of major projects approved before aid was tied in 1959 or items unavailable from any other source, approved on a case-by-case waiver basis.

Sixty-six million dollars in cash transfers—transfers of funds made in a very few cases where normal procedures for providing assistance are not feasible or made in small amounts to cover local costs of technical

assistance projects. The amount of such transfers has been reduced sharply in recent years and is expected to be only $40 million in calendar 1965.

Thirty million dollars for local expenses of AID direct hire personnel stationed abroad. This represents the local expenses which could not be met by use of Treasury-owned local currencies.

Eighty-seven million dollars for other expenditures outside the United States. This includes payments by U.S. contractors for such necessary items as wages. It also includes payments to schools and hospitals abroad, disaster relief expenditures, offshore expenses of participants, and other project costs.

As indicated above, this $400 million was offset by about $150 million in repayments of principal and interest on loans extended by AID and its predecessor agencies.

II

This then is the accounting measure of the direct flow of dollars abroad resulting from our economic aid program.

The true net economic effect of foreign assistance on our balance of payments cannot be measured so simply. This is because there are indirect effects not revealed by the direct accounts. A substantial portion of the dollars that go out under our aid program, to the United Nations, for example, comes back through regular commercial channels for purchases of U.S. goods.

Dollars which go out and enter the economy of a less developed country may be used later by that country to buy needed goods in the U.S. market or may go through trade channels to a third country, which will use the dollars for purchase of goods in the U.S. market.

These are examples of the so-called feedback effect, which means that the effect of aid outflows on the U.S. balance of payments is overstated, because dollar outflows to a considerable extent are immediately reflected in increased U.S. export sales for dollars.

But there is another indirect effect in the opposite direction. When an aid recipient is able to buy U.S. imports under a tied loan—that is, has a letter of credit opened in a U.S. bank which can only be spent in the United States—then that country may use the tied dollars to buy goods that it would have otherwise bought with dollars it already owns.

These other dollars—free exchange—are thus available for other purchases either in the United States or elsewhere. This is the so-called substitution effect, meaning that to some extent aid-financed imports are substituted for imports that would have been bought with free dollars, and to this extent the effect of tied aid on the U.S. balance of payments is understated.

There are no good estimates of the size of the feedback and substitution effects. Only indirect evidence is available. With respect to the question of how much substitution occurs, for example, it is clear that most of the less developed countries have severe shortages of dollars, and need more goods from the United States than they can afford, even with the addition of aid. Furthermore, statistics do not indicate that a dropoff in commercial trade occurs when there is an increase in aid. Quite the opposite. The most frequently cited example is Latin America. While expenditures under the Alliance for Progress have been increasing over the past 3 years, so have Latin American purchases from the United States through regular commercial channels. In fact, according to preliminary estimates, commercial U.S. exports to Latin America increased by $500 million in 1964 alone. Thus it is the best guess of the economists who have studied these matters that the amount of substitution is relatively small.

Overall, it is our conclusion that the indirect economic effects of aid on our balance of payments roughly balance each other, and even allowing for some variation from time to time, the true effect of aid on our balance of payments would not differ very much in either direction from the figures shown by the accounting estimates referred to earlier.

To sum up, our balance-of-payments figures show, by the accounting measure, the share of our expenditures made directly for U.S. goods and services is 80 percent and rising, and the share paid to foreigners and international organizations is 20 percent and falling. These figures do not take into account indirect effects, but it is our best guess that they would be little different if they did. AID dollars spent abroad which return quickly in payment for commercial exports roughly offset the amount of AID financing for goods that would have been exported anyway. As nearly as we can tell these two imperfections roughly cancel each other out and 15 to 20 percent is a valid indication of the real adverse impact of aid on the U.S. balance of payments.

III

I should like to say a word about the relationship of U.S. aid and holdings of U.S. gold.

Some aid recipients have bought gold from the United States in the past few years, mostly to finance their gold subscription to the International Monetary Fund.

In the main, however, gold transactions between the United States and aid recipients result in a net gain in U.S. holdings. During 1964, for example, less-developed countries purchased $28 million worth of gold from the United States (of which all but $3 million was subscribed to the IMF), but they sold $89 million worth of gold to us for dollars in the same period.

There is thus no direct relation between aid and an outflow of gold to aid recipients. In fact, the reverse is true. The U.S. gold problem lies with the industrial countries of Europe, not in our relations with the aid recipient nations.

IV

I have been speaking thus far of AID expenditures. There are other U.S. programs which can properly be referred to as foreign aid in a broad sense. I should like to mention these briefly, with a word about their balance-of-payments impact.

Military assistance consists principally of the provision of U.S.-produced military equipment. Taking into account the costs of U.S. personnel overseas to administer the program, some oversea training costs, and other oversea expenditures, the estimates are that over 85 percent of military assistance expenditures are made directly in the United States, and the remainder are made offshore.

The Public Law 480 program provides U.S. surplus agricultural commodities by sale and donation to other countries. In view of the nature of the program, virtually all of the expenditures under it are made directly in the United States, with only minor and unavoidable offshore costs in foreign ports. The same is true of expenditures under the Export-Import Bank loans.

The Peace Corps expenditures are almost entirely for the living expenses of the volunteers abroad, and for their training and supervision in the United States. It is estimated that about 75 percent of the Peace Corps expenditures are made in the United States and about 25 percent offshore.

Finally, U.S. contributions to international agencies such as the International Development Association are paid in dollars and are shown in the Department of Commerce statistics as 100-percent outflows. In fact, however, a substantial share of the total expenditures of these international organizations is made in the United States. Consequently, the accounting estimate of balance-of-payments impact in this case overstates the true effect.

I should also like to stress that we are seeking in every way we can devices to use local currencies, owned by the United States as a result of food for peace sales or other U.S. assistance, to meet the local costs of our aid missions. The net effect of this policy is to enable us in many countries to substitute U.S. produced commodities for what would otherwise be dollars used to purchase local currencies to cover the local costs of U.S. Government activities.

V

President Johnson's message of February 10 said, "Until we master our balance-of-payments problem AID officials will send no aid dollars abroad that can be sent instead in the form of U.S. goods and services." We are doing just that. I have asked that every project and every commodity order be closely examined. Waiver of tied procurement regulations will be allowed only when it is clearly justified in the U.S. interest. Local costs will be paid for out of U.S. local currency holdings wherever possible.

We expect, as I have indicated, to see some further increase in tied purchases and expenditures in the United States, but we are close to the limit. Some minimum offshore expenditures will remain—principally the local expenditures of our employees and those of our contractors who are stationed overseas, the contributions of the United States to international organizations, and a few special cases where tying to U.S. procurement is unfeasible or unwise.

The President, advised by his Cabinet Committee on the Balance of Payments, has concluded that this small remaining element of offshore expenditures under the aid program is a cost to our country which is far outweighed by the benefits to our own interests that will accrue from the achievement of economic and social progress in the less developed countries.

A similar judgment underlay the distinction drawn by the President in his recent balance-of-payments message between U.S. private investment abroad in advanced countries—which for the time being is to be discouraged—and U.S. private investment abroad in less-developed countries, which the U.S. Government is continuing strongly to encourage.

VI

Looking beyond the immediate present, the foreign aid program has a number of effects which are positively beneficial to our balance of payments.

First, our aid today is overwhelmingly in the form of dollar-repayable loans—unlike the situation under the Marshall plan, when 90 percent of our aid was in the form of grants. Future repayments of interest and principal on today's loans will be a positive factor in our balance of payments.

Second, the evidence is plain that countries which with our aid achieve steady economic growth become increasingly better markets for U.S. exports and more attractive places for U.S. investment abroad. Over the last 15 years our exports to Europe have doubled and our exports to Japan have tripled. As other countries—Spain, Greece, Taiwan, and so on—gain economic momentum and our aid comes to an end the same kind of result is evident.

Moreover, the aid program in case after case has directly led to the introduction of American products and services in other countries, and to follow-on markets unrelated to the aid program. Aid has in fact been one of our best export promotion mechanisms.

VII

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to report that since 1961 we have steadily reduced the effect of foreign aid on our balance of payments. We are continuing the

efforts to minimize the effect as part of the action program announced by President Johnson last month.

We will do more. But the upper limit may soon be reached, as the adverse impact has already been reduced to $400 million, not including repayments.

In addition, it is important to recognize that a continuation of the present program will have a long-range positive impact on our balance of payments as a result of a dollar repayment flow, expanding markets for our exports, and improving opportunities for our private investment abroad.

The Electric Boat Yard at Fore River, Quincy, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride and satisfaction that I point to a potential labor-management impasse that was settled without the dire consequences which so commonly attend labor disputes.

Such was the situation that recently faced the owners and employees of the Fore River Shipyard in Quincy, Mass. In late 1963 this once flourishing shipyard was shut down by its former owners, the Bethlehem Steel Co., because of the inability to operate competitively and efficiently. This not only eliminated thousands of jobs, but contributed strongly to an economic depression in the entire southern Massachusetts area.

The Fore River Yard was purchased by General Dynamics, Electric Boat Division and reopened in February 1964. Since then, at a time when private shipyards and the shipbuilding trade itself are rapidly diminishing resources, enlightened management and dedicated employees have worked together to put the yard back on the road to stability and profitability. From this once closed and important shipyard, where now more than 5,000 men and women are hard at work, General Dynamics competed vigorously for contracts on the national marketplace and won the first rounds.

Then the specter of unrest and dissatisfaction arose. Fortunately, men with patience and foresight were on hand to guide both management and labor through the tortuous waters of contract negotiations. J. William Jones, president of the Electric Boat Division; Robert Laney, manager of the Fore River Yard; John J. Grogan, president of the Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America; Andrew A. Pettis, vice president of the UMSWA; a committee representing Locals 5 and 90 of the IUMSWA; and William E. Simkin, Director and Robert Moore, Deputy Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service put together an unprecedented 4-year contract.

This agreement strengthens the yard with the kind of labor-management foundation that promises a new kind of stability and a shining economic future for the people of the South Shore and Greater Boston area.

There is still much to be done. The yard must continue to grow, must go on to win more business before it finally realizes its bright future. But this has been an auspicious beginning.

This unprecedented contract is a monument to the good faith of both parties. It heralds a new era in which labor accepts its responsibilities as management's partner. It also demonstrates management's increased awareness of the rights and needs of employees, and its willingness to negotiate for a fair and just contract that will contribute to a peaceful labor climate for years to come.

Of course a great deal must be done by our local community. Any business organization today must have the fullest cooperation from local and State officials. It is my belief that this cooperation will be forthcoming from the public officials of the city of Quincy and those charged with the responsibility of conducting our State government.

Local business organizations through the South Shore Chamber of Commerce have already indicated a real desire to be of service toward promoting good will and understanding of the great problems faced by this firm.

All of these factors point toward an era of good will by all parties concerned and if everyone does their part—management, labor, public officials, and the business community—it is my opinion that the Electric Boat Yard at Fore River, Quincy, Mass., will, within a 2-year period, reach an employment level of 10,000 persons.

Mr. Speaker, a 4-year contract for employees of General Dynamics' Electric Boat Division was reported in the Quincy Patriot Ledger of March 19, 1965, as follows:

ELECTRIC BOAT, UNION SIGN 4-YEAR CONTRACT

BOSTON.—The first 4-year labor contract in the history of the shipbuilding industry was signed at 1:30 a.m. today.

APPROXIMATELY 3,800 AFFECTED

It affects approximately 3,800 members of the Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America employed at the General Dynamics Electric Boat Division at Fore River Shipyard.

Before the contract expires, it is expected that at least twice as many employees will be under its terms due to substantially increased employment at the yard.

The tentative agreement ratified last Friday by the memberships of locals 5 and 90 was described at that time as "98 percent complete."

Sessions this week worked out the remaining details of the contract. It was described as "mainly a matter of dotting the i's and crossing the t's." No matters of substance were changed from the ratified agreement, both union and company spokesmen said today.

The final session began at 10 p.m. last night and the contract was signed at 1:30 a.m. by J. William Jones, Jr., president of the Electric Boat Division, John J. Grogan, national president of IUMSWA, and the negotiators.

A spokesman for the Electric Boat Division said the agreement is "the first 4-year labor contract ever negotiated in the Nation's shipbuilding industry."

The officers of local 5 issued a flyer today to workers at the yard. It thanked them for supporting their officers during the contract talks and notified them that their pay raises under the new contract started Monday, March 15.

The contract calls for a 5-cent-per-hour across-the-board raise for all employees as of that date. Other raises totaling 32 cents over 4 years are also in the contract.

The contract also makes Washington's Birthday a paid holiday, bringing the total to nine, and provides for 2-week vacations for all present employees at the completion of a year at the yard.

The agreement includes sizable boosts in hospital insurance benefits, credit for past shipyard experience in figuring seniority and layoff protection for present employees based on seniority.

Jones said: "The Quincy Yard can now look forward to long-term stability and I commend the union and its members for recognizing the importance of this, because the job of rebuilding the yard to make it a leading competitor has just begun.

"We must strive constantly to do the best possible job at the lowest possible cost and in the shortest possible time."

Grogan, who canceled an appearance in the New York St. Patrick's Day parade to attend the Wednesday session, said: "Speaking for the officers and negotiators and more important, for the members of the union and the community, we pledge our complete cooperation with management to work for the best interests of making this one of the best shipbuilding yards in the United States.

"Although it was 15 long months of negotiations, we now look forward to peace and we are very proud that we were able to bring the benefits to our members that are contained in this agreement. We will do everything to make our contribution to good relations and support all programs for the benefit of the community."

Resolution on Voting Rights Adopted by the Erie County Board of Supervisors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support President Johnson's proposal guaranteeing equal voting rights for all Americans. Last week the Erie County Board of Supervisors at Buffalo, N.Y., adopted a resolution that the Congress immediately pass necessary legislation to provide and insure this right. Under unanimous consent, I wish to include this resolution below:

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
March 18, 1965.

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify, that at a session of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, held in the county hall, in the city of Buffalo, on the 16th day of March A.D., 1965, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

"Whereas article XV, section 1 of the U.S. Constitutioin guarantee that no person shall be denied the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and

"Whereas there are citizens of these United States who are being denied this right, and

"Whereas this board is a firm believer in the principles of freedom, equality, and justice and is utterly opposed to the violation of the rights of any citizen of this great country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Executive Department of the U.S. Government utilize its plenary powers and that the Congress of the United States immediately pass necessary additional legislation to provide and insure the right of every citizen to be enrolled as a voter in each of the States of the United States and to protect and guarantee his right to vote in local, State, and national elections, and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress representing this area and to the President of these United States appealing to them that they use the powers of their offices to bring about justice."

Attest:

WALTER G. HOLZ,
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.

Outflows of U.S. Funds Encourged by Easy Money Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an article by Henry Hazlitt in the March 15 edition of Newsweek discusses the effects of present easy money policies on U.S. capital outflows. Mr. Hazlitt points out that the U.S. interest rates are lower than those in any other leading country. Low interest rates have encouraged U.S. investors to seek opportunities for foreign investment and lending. The balance of payments has consequently suffered and the administration has taken steps to curb private outflows, while continuing its own foreign expenditures programs. To quote Mr. Hazlitt:

The Government picks on foreign investment as the marginal culprit causing the deficit in our balance of payments. But instead of abandoning its own cheap money policies, it starts lecturing, penalizing, and policing private investors.

Under unanimous consent I place this Newsweek article in the RECORD at this point:

BUSINESS TIDES—MANIPULATING INTEREST

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Since the end of 1957, the Government has become increasingly involved in economic policies that must have increasingly harmful results.

On the one hand it has been undermining the value of the dollar by progressively expanding the money supply to hold down interest rates. This has made it less attractive for either Americans or foreigners to lend or invest in the United States, and comparatively more attractive for them to lend or invest abroad.

But then the Government, ignoring its own clear responsibility for this result, is determined to find the culprits among American private citizens. It has chosen for its chief whipping boys those American individuals, banks, or corporations attracted by the higher interest rates abroad.

In brief, in order to maintain its own cheap-money policy at home, the Government has launched a series of what must be progressively tighter controls on investment, lending, and the foreign exchanges. As long as the Government maintains its cheap-money policies, these penalty taxes and surveillance of loans and investments will be futile in their intended purpose of curing the balance-of-payments deficit. These remedies will prove, at best, short lived. In the long run they can only restrict our export trade, and set back both American and world development.

HIGH-POWERED MONEY

Let us examine this process in detail. Since the end of 1957 the country's active money supply (currency plus demand bank deposits) has been increased by 17 percent. Total money supply (including time deposits) has been increased by 48 percent. But if we direct our attention to the way in which the Federal Reserve authorities, egged on by the politicians, have been increasing the high-powered reserve money supply on which the inverted pyramid of our total money and credit supply is built, we get an even more striking set of comparisons.

The Federal Reserve banks, which are bankers' banks, can create reserves for the member banks (the banks with which the public deals) against which the latter can in turn, by making loans and investments, create about six times as much deposit "money." The Fed creates these reserves mainly by buying Government securities from the member banks or the open market, and then "monetizing" them.

At the end of 1957 the amount of Federal Reserve credit outstanding was $26.2 billion ($1.1 billion less than at the end of 1952). In 1958 this outstanding credit was increased by $2.2 billion, and in 1959 by another $1 billion. In 1960 it was reduced by $375 million. Then the Fed, under the new Democratic regime, began to inflate in earnest. In 1961 it increased Federal Reserve bank credit by $2.2 billion; in 1962 by $2 billion more; in 1963 by $3.4 billion more; and in 1964 by $3.3 billion more. At the end of 1964 the total stood at $39.9 billion, an increase in seven years of 52 percent. (Federal Reserve credit went up $13.7 billion though our gold stocks went down $7.4 billion.)

RATES LOWEST HERE

The intention and effect of this increase of credit was to hold down U.S. interest rates. In its February letter the First National City Bank of New York presents a table comparing short-term lending rates in some 60 countries. (The interest rates compared are "the lowest at which business firms of the highest standing can obtain credit on an unsecured, single-name basis.") The comparisons show that U.S. rates at 4½ percent are lower than in any leading country. The Canadian rate is 5¾ percent. The rates in France, Germany, Belgium, and Japan are above 6 percent. The range in Sweden, Italy, and Britain is around 7 and 8 percent. International comparisons of long-term rates would show a similar difference.

The situation, in brief, is this. The Government, by its monetary policies, has brought about artificially low interest rates here. The result has been to divert lending and investment into foreign countries. The Government then picks on this foreign investment as the marginal culprit causing the deficit in our balance of payments. But instead of abandoning its own cheap-money policies, it starts lecturing, penalizing, and policing private investors.

Helicopter Service Warranted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, recently I was honored to represent several of my colleagues in the California delegation in this House at hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate on the importance of continued development of passenger helicopter service.

From personal experience, I know the importance of this service. My constituency, including both the city and county of San Bernardino, is as large as the city of Seattle. Our only air connection with Los Angeles International Airport is the Los Angeles Helicopter Airways. In common with many other parts of the country, we are experiencing rapid urban growth and mounting surface traffic congestion. The problem of moving people within urban complexes is becoming one of the most serious in our society. The solution requires effective new tools of transport. One new tool of short-haul transport which has already proved itself is the scheduled passenger helicopter. In the metropolitan areas of Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, and New York, passenger helicopter operators have recently made new technological strides. They will soon be able to operate as economic self-sufficient businesses if the Federal subsidy which helped them develop to the present state of their art can be continued, on a reducing basis, for the next 5 years.

It would be a tragic mistake to cut off subsidy now when helicopter service shows such promise for metropolitan areas all over the country.

The following editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Times, on March 17, presents very well the case for continuing the pace of helicopter service development. I place the editorial in the RECORD and I commend it to my colleagues:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Mar. 17, 1965]

HELICOPTER SERVICE SUPPORT WARRANTED

Budget cuts now under consideration by Congress may deprive the Nation's three largest cities of scheduled helicopter service.

Ironically, the threat comes just as the helicopter airlines—including Los Angeles Airways—have begun phasing out the Federal subsidies that permitted them to conduct the expensive experiment of providing scheduled service.

The Civil Aeronautics Board and the helicopter airlines in Los Angeles, New York, and Chicago have agreed that the subsidies will decline annually during the next 5 years. After 1970 all Federal support would be terminated.

For some reason, however, the administration and certain influential Members of Congress want to cut off the subsidies this year. And although the CAB is defending its phase-out program, heavy financial weather lies ahead on Capitol Hill.

At issue is a total of $13.5 million, a relatively modest sum by Federal standards, but essential to the continuation of what has been a marginal operation by the helicopter lines.

Testimony at committee hearings thus far leaves no doubt that helicopters have provided a highly valuable service in such sprawling urban areas as New York and Los Angeles. "The investment of public money has been a sound one," said Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California, in support of the CAB proposal, and Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Republican, of California, concurred.

The Nation's airline industry also has strongly urged the orderly phaseout of the helicopter service subsidies, for it recognizes that such service is a significant supplement to major airline operations. The industry re-

calls that Federal subsidies were needed to get it off the ground in the 1930's.

Subsidies should always be granted sparingly and only after a clear determination that they are essential to the public interest. Limited and decreasing Federal help to the scheduled helicopter airlines meets that test.

It would be false economy to end so promising an experiment when success is almost in sight.

No Answers From Emotion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, there are serious questions revolving around the proposed bill which Congress is now considering with almost unprecedented haste.

We believe in the right of American citizens to vote. We also believe in laws which are just, and a careful consideration of all of the ramifications of such laws.

Passing basic laws in haste and the heat of emotion is not the proper approach.

I think the editorial in the Tallahassee Democrat of Tuesday, March 16, 1965, bears reading by the Members of this body, and I urge that you carefully consider the thoughts it presents:

NO ANSWERS FROM EMOTION

The ugly business at Selma has reached the point of common comment, and most that we hear or read is based more on emotion than on facts and logic. We must look more closely at the background, recall more events we've forgotten or overlooked.

James J. Kilpatrick discusses this situation in the light of truth and reason in his column adjacent to this today; and we'd like to contribute our 2 cents worth for emphasis and addenda.

This is billed as a fight for the Negro's right to vote, although we know that if it ever was confined to that point it soon broadened into this year's cause celebre for agitators who last year picked out St. Augustine for a whipping boy, and before long will choose another town.

Now, there isn't a southern white man, who won't admit Negroes aren't able to vote in anywhere near their strength. In some rural counties they have been voting for years (and often in purchaseable blocs), while next door counties have almost no Negro voters—sometimes because of disinterest, sometimes because of outright denial, more often because of intimidation, either expressed or implied. Every fair southerner agrees that every Negro should be allowed to vote if he meets precisely the same qualifications and tests of white voters. Congress passed a law in 1957 which is supposed to have assured this right to vote. It passed another law in 1964 which strengthened it. This was supposed to do the job. What new Federal laws can do more?

ABOUT SELMA

From watching TV and reading reports, you would think that Negroes were trying right now to get up to a polling place and cast ballots, and that urgent action is needed to keep them from losing their franchise.

The fact is that no election is scheduled in Alabama until May 1966—so, if a Negro were registered today in Selma, he would still have to wait 13½ months for an election in which to vote. In the meantime, Negroes are being registered at Selma on the days prescribed by State law for registering all voters. The Federal court has refused to order more days for registration than the law provides, but the judge has directed registration boards to handle at least 100 registration applications each day it meets (twice a month regularly, 10 extra days in January and 5 extra days in July). He also has directed that a waiting list be established, and he has ordered that after July 1 the board may not take more than 5 days to process any name left on the list or added to it. After 5 days, the court will put the registration in the hands of a Federal registrar who already has been appointed under authority of the 1957 U.S. voting rights law.

Thus, if voting is the issue, it seems that there is plenty of time, and plenty of court action underway or completed to assure registration of almost any qualified Negro before the next election.

But the issue has been turned into a great national demonstration against brutality and maltreatment of Negroes and their sympathizers who poured into this little city, half the size of Tallahassee, and have put the place in a tumult.

From all accounts, some police officers have been too rough. The highly sensationalized attack on demonstrators by State troopers a week ago sent 83 people to the hospital, 21 with injuries severe enough to require admission, but none as serious as a bad auto accident inflicts. Most of them were suffering from the effects of tear gas, nausea gas, and smoke bombs. This sounds horrible, and it is unpleasant, but the effects are temporary. It is one of the milder standard means of restraining crowds.

A white minister from the North was beaten and died. It was an irrational and vicious attack by a group of white men that cannot be excused. The officials and citizens of Selma are not trying to excuse it. They quickly arrested the men accused of the beating, and have charged them with murder, to be tried by due process of law in the criminal courts.

But this crime, though growing out of the presence of demonstrators in the community, was isolated from any demonstration and from the central issue of voting rights. As such, it should be no more on the conscience of Selma and the Nation than the murder of a white boy by two swaggering Negroes on a New York subway train, nor the heart-stabbing of a white boy in Detroit by Negroes whose team had just lost a basketball game. Were they any less martyrs than the Reverend Mr. Reeb because they were cut down while they were minding their own business in their hometowns, while he placed himself in a highly dangerous position by traveling a thousand miles to take part in a clearly provocative demonstration? Does this crime demand Federal troops for Selma more than those others do for Detroit and New York? Do the families of those two boys need mass prayers and fund solicitations any less than the family of the Reverend Mr. Reeb?

The answers lie in the field of fact and reason, not in emotion and politics.

Amend the Hatch Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to amend the Hatch Act to allow all officers and employees of the Government to take a full part in the political life of the United States.

I urge the Congress to take this opportunity to remove the restrictions which keep Federal Government employees from being able to exercise the full responsibilities of citizenship. Our States and municipalities do not deprive their employees of the chance to play a part in politics to anywhere near the same degree as the Federal Government. The need to guard against abuses of the civil servant's position is greatly diminished—the rights we ought to be concerned with today are those of all our citizens to fully express themselves politically.

America's New Junior Miss a 3.7 Scholar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, Michigan, the Great Lake State, is blessed with an abundance of natural resources and scenic beauty, but we now have a new honor recently to come our way.

As Representative of the Fourth District, which includes the home county of America's new Junior Miss, I would like to tell you something about this fine young girl.

Patrice Gaunder lives in the community of Lakeshore, near St. Joseph, in Berrien County, Mich. Last Friday evening in Mobile, Ala., she was selected as the Nation's new ideal teenage girl. She was chosen from 50 high school senior girls representing all of the States. Prior to the final selection, I am told that more than 50,000 girls competed in some 900 State and local contests for the right to enter the national judging.

It is worthy of mention that the Junior Miss title is not awarded on the basis of beauty alone. Special emphasis is placed on character, scholarship, ambition, leadership, religious interest, poise and demeanor.

I would say that the wisdom of the judges' choice last Friday night is demonstrated by the answer Miss Gaunder gave to reporters when she was asked if she had any advice to give other teenagers.

She said:

We shouldn't try to grow up too fast. There's a lot of time and so much for us to do.

Patrice is an outstanding student who maintains a 3.7 grade average at Lakeshore High School. The $6,000 scholarship she will receive as the 1965 America's Junior Miss will help her fulfill her plans to major in education at Michigan State University. She also hopes someday to serve in the Peace Corps.

I am sure that all of Michigan shares with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Gaunder and her four brothers and sisters, a feeling of real pride in Patrice's accomplishment.

A Constituent Requests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents from the Seventh District of Minnesota has requested that I call his special problem to the attention of the Congress. Therefore, I am including his entire letter, which is self-explanatory, for the benefit of my colleagues:

A MESSAGE TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES BY A FORMER AREA VETERINARIAN OF NORTHERN MINNESOTA

BAGLEY, MINN.,
March 20, 1965.

Mr. ODIN LANGEN:

I practiced an open and above board successful veterinary medicine in Minnesota for a period of 41 years. Then the State examining board placed a restraining order on my practice because I did not have a license. This restraining order was requested by two graduate men who said that I was getting 75 percent of all area practice, leaving them only 25 percent.

Many men of State have tried and tried hard to induce the State officials to see the folly of not giving me a special license based upon my 41-year record. I have contributed $150,000 annually to the economic welfare of people and State. But the graduate profession who wish to protect their system of making money oppose this. One such man who interceded for my practicing right is Dr. W. T. S. Thorpe, dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine, St. Paul, Minn. He appeared before the State veterinary medical association in January 1965 with an appeal for consideration in my case, but the delegates to this association refused to budge.

The reason for this is because the existing profession no doubt wishes to protect a graft such as the following case which was related to me by a former client.

This client had a sow which needed two stitches placed in the vaginal labia to control a vaginal prolapse, for this procedure my former client tells me the veterinarian charged him $42.

I could have placed these two stitches in the sow for a fee of $5 and made $3.50 as clear profit.

I am pointing these things out to the Members of the Congress of the United States not only because members of the veterinary profession are becoming exploiters of the people, but this is becoming increasingly true with the human medical profession.

I see now that the medical profession is somewhat fearful that some act in Congress is going to infringe on their practices. If Congress does this, it is because the medical profession both human and veterinary have become so selfish and unscrupulous that a certain class of people who work hard and earn little can no longer afford to go to the doctor when they become ill. This is my case right now. I am ill, I need medical care, but I am not going to consult the physicians because their fees are prohibitive. If socialized medicine comes to the United States it is because the doctors themselves asked for it.

A doctor, whether he is an animal doctor or a human doctor, should look primarily upon what he can do to alleviate illness and death, without considering money as the key to whether or not this shall be possible. A man who has not a cent to pay with is entitled to have the skill of the physician or veterinarian applied, this is my theory and I believe I am right in saying that, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you; do ye even so to them likewise." I practiced this kind of veterinary medicine from 1922 to 1962 in five counties in Minnesota and then—comes the State and tells me that my practice constituted "a public nuisance, threat, and danger to the health of the people of the State and to its government." (Excerpt from summons by Dingle and Kreiger, attorneys for plaintiff, Rochester, Minn., July 1962.)

As a result of this restraining order, the people of the five-county area have and are constantly losing, losing money and livestock because they cannot afford to call the veterinarian who charges them $30, $40, $50 for a case that should cost them only $10.

And, so the State says that these men are guardians of the well-being of the people, and that the people must be protected from malefactors and charlatans such as I was labeled, though I had proven my skill and ability for four decades except I did not charge the high fees. But I did have compassion on the needy.

Therefore, I want this read before Congress and ask, Where is justice? Can you help me and my cause?

Yours sincerely,

CONRAD BERGLUND,
Former Area Veterinarian, 1922–62.

Responsibility of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that a voting rights bill will soon be before the House. I am sure the final product will be a reasonable, constitutional, and effective instrument designed to correct a shameful, long standing injustice.

There is need for speed, but not undue haste, however, in our deliberations, and I think an editorial in Newsday, one of our country's leading daily newspapers, succinctly states the issues involved.

The editorial follows:

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

A sweeping bill they called it and a sweeping bill it is, this historic voting rights measure which President Johnson sent up to Capitol Hill Wednesday. So all-encompassing is the bill, in fact, that we believe Congress should examine all its provisions with extreme care before enacting it.

That a strong law is necessary there can be no doubt after the brutalities inflicted at Selma. The new legislation is aimed principally at the six Southern States of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Virginia, and South Carolina—the very States that provoked the bill they abhor by failing to live up to their responsibility to guarantee the right to vote to all their citizens.

As precious as that right is, however, Congress must not abdicate its responsibility to pass on the President's proposal dispassionately and deliberately in the cold, hard light of constitutional law. No ambiguities can be tolerated in the new law. Yet one that stands out in the new bill in its present form is the question of whether Federal examiners will be empowered to register prospective voters who are complete illiterates.

Literacy tests as used by many Southern registrars have been nothing more than thinly disguished legal devices to deny the franchise to Negroes. But this does not mean that the Federal Government should go to the other extreme and register persons to vote who can neither read nor write, whether they be Negro, Puerto Rican or white. An informed electorate is one of the foundations on which a democracy rests. In its haste to pass the new voting rights bill, Congress must not fail to insure the inclusion of some elementary test of literacy that can be fairly administered to prospective voters either by Federal or State examiners.

Loyalty and Ethics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered at Fox College of Chicago, Ill., on February 3, 1965, by Dr. Thaddeus J. Lubera, associate superintendent of the Chicago public schools.

I firmly believe my colleagues will find Dr. Lubera's talk of great interest as it appeals to personal pride, loyalty, independence, and responsibility.

The speech follows:

THE ART OF LIVING

It is a pleasure to come back to Fox College and share with Mr. Fox, Mr. Moleski, and the teachers and students my feeling about loyalty. Ladies and gentlemen, this concept of loyalty is one of great importance to all of us living, to all of us who hope to achieve success in life; and I shall speak to you about four areas of loyalty—four avenues for the expression of loyalty.

First, loyalty to your faith. No one lives by bread alone. We live by faith in God. Since we live by faith in God, we must be loyal to whatever way we express this faith. Unless we are loyal to it—sincerely loyal to it, implicitly loyal to it—we cannot as good citizens, as students, as men and women—attain our worth. Our first loyalty belongs to our Maker. Whatever your faith, whatever your belief, whatever way you have to express your faith in the Dear Lord, be loyal to it. Without this expression, without this faith, without this feeling, I don't think we are worth too much. So men can't live by bread alone. If you study the Gospels, if you read any kind of history—ancient history or medieval history—you will soon see why this is necessary.

I think the next loyalty that we owe is to our family—to our moms and dads, our brothers and sisters, our cousins, and the others. Why? They brought us here; they nurtured us; they helped us. I see this every day. I just came from a school where I saw little children coming in, little kindergarten youngsters. I thought about them. They are very loyal to their parents because they are, what?—just being nurtured in growing, in thinking, in reacting, and in feeling for parents. Loyalty to one's family—we must bring a good name to our family. This is so important; our name is so important—first name and last name. Our family quarters and our family feelings are exceedingly important to a very happy life. The lack of family loyalty can bring on a crisis. I see this almost every day in visit-

ing some 11,000 teachers, nearly a quarter of a million students in 250 schools, where you have people at a crossroads in battle with their own ideas. Loyalty to one's family is very important; with it, we promote the welfare of our family.

President Johnson is trying to promote this whole concept known as the Great Society. All right, who is going to make the Great Society? You and I—you, the young people; we, the teachers and the mothers and fathers; and next, a very important next, the people who conduct services in our churches. We are going to promote the Great Society; the businessman is going to promote the Great Society; the employer, the student, everybody concerned. But it is at home, where boys and girls are brought up, where foundations are set for ideals and ideas for good living, for good life, here, the Great Society begins. The Great Society concept is a very interesting one; it not a new one, but what is great about it? People—the way people live, the way people relate to each other. I think the No. 1 concept is loyalty to everything that we believe is good. The No. 2 concept in the Great Society is relation to one's own family—loyalty to our parents, and loyalty to everything that stands for that which is good.

Loyalty to our country is the next and very important concept. Certainly, now, we should never be apologetic for the United States. We have a great Constitution, a great Bill of Rights, a great ideal, a great educational system—in truth a great and a very compassionate, charitable people. We need not be on the defensive. We make mistakes—and since there are a hundred and ninety-three million of us—we are bound to make some mistakes. But on the whole, the complete idea of democratic living is a great concept; nowhere else will you find such a concept on the face of the earth! So we can be loyal to our country. Never be apologetic; always be loyal to its ideals—to the promotion of democratic ideals. We hate nobody—you and I, as students, as human beings, as children of God—we dignify all people. We may differ with people. We are loyal to our spiritual values here. But in a Great Society, promotion of ideals is absolutely necessary in terms of looking and thinking in the whole perspective. We must consider all the people—the panorama, a State in which there are a hundred and ninety-three million people solving problems, some of whom are poor, some very poor. I just came from a neighborhood where people have many kinds of crises and problems; but they are working, and solving, and living, and praying to be better, and hoping for a better tomorrow.

We have loyalty to our employer. Now with this we have a number of concepts that we should practice. We should be very sincere in our work for our employer. We should always believe that we are here to produce something. If we are on the job, we are to produce good work through sincere effort. This is loyalty No. 1 to our employer. We are interested in making a record for ourselves through honest and sincere effort to be a good worker. That's one aspect of loyalty to our employer. Then we have a second part of our loyalty to our employer—enthusiasm for whatever we do. You are enthusiastic about this lovely school, the people here. You are enthusiastic about your family, about your friends. We are enthusiastic about our employer's business, his goal, and his promotion; with this enthusiasm, we exude effort, a little more of it, and we succeed with the employer—his success is our success.

Enthusiasm for the kinds of things that our employer stands for or the kinds of things that he produces is a No. 1 requirement in this whole business of loyalty. The support of his policies—maybe we don't agree with what the policies are at the moment, with the office people or with the managers, or with those who formulate these policies; but we don't make the policies, we support these policies. Frequently I find people who differ about policies, but they are supporting them. We may differ with President Johnson on a lot of things, but we support our President; we support our ideals; we support the policies pertaining to the way business is run. We support them because we are loyal to an enterprise, to a company, to an individual, to a group of workers, and to the whole ideal for which this company stands; and we produce promotion of his program—the employer's program. Every office, every factory, every firm, every business, produces something. In this production we must promote a program of information, promote understanding, and promote action—the employer will like that. We should understand why industry makes tractors—tractors are important. We should understand why a firm makes cars; then we can promote this market, we can promote this plan, we can promote everything they do because it is not only to the best interest of our own being, but also to the best interest of the man who has employed us and who is giving us an opportunity to grow in his business.

Honesty in all your dealings with employers—that is one of the most important concepts in our successful living in a business world—honesty. We are honest with our work; we are honest with the responsibility that is given to us. I have young men and young women who are working in banks today, who graduated from our schools, and who handle thousands of dollars in banks every day—honest boys and girls; God bless them. They resist temptations, and wish only to serve, only to give their best. So, honesty in all of our dealings; we don't cheat—ever. We are always filled with nobility of character in this respect. We are always filled with the whole conception that we are doing something so worth while for our employer that we shall succeed with him as he succeeds with his policies. Thus, we shall maintain honor and dignity in all our relations with employers.

Ethical behavior simply means that in everything we do, we do it with honor. We don't criticize unless we have facts. We don't diminish the importance of anybody's business or personality, or individuality. We are dignified in our deportment. Our word is good, our signature is good, about all, our promise is good to our employer and to everybody concerned. This is loyalty of the highest order—ethical behavior. We are important because we are behaving in this manner and this is noticed very quickly in business—very quickly. We are willing to face adversity with the employer; things don't always go the way we planned. Sometimes there is an adversity; there is a diminishing return in our business. Do we criticize people for this? No, we are loyal—come adversity, come success. We are always loyal. It is so easy to give flowers when we are successful, but it is not so easy to give flowers when we are not—when it is perhaps more important to do so. By this, I mean, we always support this employer because he is our friend, our partner; we are his partners—really. So in adversity, we stand honorably, and we say, tomorrow may be a better day, and it is most of the time.

Helpfulness to success: Everybody working everywhere as a valuable unit—that adds to success. My young friends, you are not lost in any office. I worked in offices for the Continental Can Co., and I know—I was not merely a number, but I was an important payroll clerk. You will be an important stenographer, a secretary, or even a vice president. Surely, you will help to build success; you will add through your intelligence, through your effort, through your planning, through your ingenuity; yes, you will add to the building of a structure called business—good business, much business, great business—and in this way, you will make the Great Society. We are not just a cog; we are an important wheel. Make yourself feel that you are important, really, because you are loyal and because you are honorable in any endeavor with your employer.

And so with this, we have pride. With all honest and sincere loyalty to our God, to our parents, to our teachers, to our friends, to our employers—we have pride. You feel that you count; you feel that you are important. You feel that you are honorable; and because you are always better, you should never be the same as you grow. You come here because you want to be better. Pride, the right kind of pride, follows achievement. Whatever you achieve, you are proud of it. You type a nice letter; you should be proud of it. You talk to the vice president of a firm and he appreciates it; you are proud of it. You read a good book and you give a fine report; you are proud of it. Pride used in a positive way is a very important attribute of an intelligent person.

I hesitate to stop talking to you young people today. I am well aware of the high and honorable goals of this school; I have read your "Careers Scrapbook" that was produced in your creative writing class. I believe it to be the best careers project book ever produced. Frequently, I quote from it. I am mindful that a number of you, each and every year, go out from Fox College as office instructors. I know the rest of you will go out as executive assistants. Certainly, in these high-level positions you can do good on a wholesale level, not just for individuals, but, also, for whole groups of people. It is for this reason that my duty commands me to make these supplementary remarks.

You people who are going out in high-level positions in business must understand the dynamics and the democracy of the American private enterprise system. You must understand that every business organization is subservient to the wishes of the American people. Every purchase from any business house is an endorsement of the policies and a vote for the principles of that organization. It is a definite vote against the inefficiency and the ineffectiveness of other organizations. There have been 812 makes of automobiles produced during my lifetime; only 17 are now being produced by 5 companies. Eight hundred and seven companies out of 812 have been voted out of business by the American people through the democratic process of freedom of choice.

I will ask you all to remember please that we're living during the finest time in the history of mankind, and certainly in the finest country the world has ever known. I have little patience with those who refer to these times as terrible conditions, or discouraging times. May I ask all those to raise their hands who can select a period in world history in which they would prefer to live than now? Of course, there are no takers. How fortunate we all are that through the aeons of time and through the galaxies of space we have been reserved to be called forth now for service in the greatest period of world history—and to render that service in the finest country the world has ever known.

I am told that there are well over 100 million sets of fingerprints in the FBI office in Washington, D.C. How many duplications? That is right, there are none. The pattern that is you was never produced before, nor will you be duplicated—ever. What is the connotation? Could it possibly be that we have been reserved to be called forth now for failure or for mediocrity? Of course not. There is only one answer that squares with the facts. We have been reserved and called forth now for only one purpose; for high service and great success. It was Emerson who said:

"What will you have? quoth God; pay for it and take it. All things are double, one

against another. Tit for tat; an eye for an eye; a tooth for a tooth; blood for blood; measure for measure; love for love. Give and it shall be given you. Give nothing, have nothing. Thou shalt be paid exactly for what thou hast done, no more, no less."

Edward Bok's father told his son that his first duty was to leave the world a more beautiful place than he found it. No one can stand on the highest point in Florida and hear the chimes of Bok's singing tower without fully appreciating that truly Edward Bok left the world a more beautiful place. What will you do to make the world a more beautiful place?

So today I salute you future business executives, and with humbleness I pray that you future leaders in industry will enter the office with the prayer of St. Francis of Assisi in your heart:

"Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace. Where there is hatred, let me sow love. Where there is doubt, faith. Where there is despair, hope. Where there is darkness, light. And where there is sadness, joy. Grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood as to understand; to be loved as to love; for it is in giving that we receive."

I prayerfully ask that all you future supervisors will recognize that every one of your employees is made in the image of God; and with constant and continued determination that you will pledge yourselves to take care that this image will not deteriorate into a mirage.

Please remember that these are days of destiny, not despair. Please don't be too concerned with security, but rather aspire to the challenge of opportunity. Seek personal responsibilities and duties, not rights and privileges. Teach by example the value of character, the honor of loyalty and citizenship, and the satisfaction of service and sacrifice. Then, truly, your life will be an inspiration and a benediction for you have practiced the art of living.

These are some of the concepts of loyalty which you and I can practice, which you and I cannot live without as successful people. My young ladies and gentlemen, I wish you well and hope that in the future, somewhere, we may meet again and you will tell me that by thinking and feeling some of these concepts I have mentioned to you today, that you have become successful. I wish for you two things, always: That each of you be a great success; that you will be happy always. These two things are important. Happiness and success depend on our own feelings, our own attitudes, and our own personal development—all of these—and our prayers to God.

More Support for Shorter Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am continuing to receive endorsements of my proposal to limit presidential election campaigns to 60 days, and I have recently received a communication from Mr. Leonard H. Goldenson, president of the American Broadcasting Co., who shares my belief that all parties concerned, including the public, will benefit by shortening the campaign period.

I believe that Mr. Goldenson's comments should be read by all who are interested in this legislation, and with your permission I include his communication herewith:

AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.,
March 15, 1965.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: I note, with considerable interest, your introduction of House Joint Resolution 16 proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to qualifications to election for offices of President and Vice President of the United States. As I understand it, its effect, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, would be to limit the presidential campaign to 60 days.

I share your view that the shortening of political campaigns is a highly desirable objective from the point of view of the political parties and the public. The cost factor of lengthy campaigns has been of continuing concern. The physical effect on the candidates themselves has also been a matter of deep concern.

In my judgment, the public will benefit by shortening the campaign period as a result of the concentration of discussion during this campaign period.

I congratulate you on your efforts and am taking this opportunity to advise you of our support.

Sincerely,

LEONARD H. GOLDENSON.

Veterans' Administration Center at Bath, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to adopt legislation necessary to continue the Center operated by the Veterans' Administration at Bath, N.Y.

I concur with this resolution which follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 18—MARCH 2, 1965

Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation necessary to continue the center operated by the Veterans' Administration at Bath, N.Y.

(By Mr. Henderson)

Whereas in a supposed economy move by the Secretary of Defense, it is planned to abondon the Veterans' Administration Center at Bath, N.Y.; and

Whereas these facilities have been in operation either by our own great State or the Federal Government since 1877 to give medical treatment, care and comfort for our deserving war heroes; especially the aged veterans; and

Whereas these veterans who have been cared for in the past and those now being aided at Bath were willing, when our great Nation was endangered by the foe, to make the supreme sacrifice, it is only just that we demonstrate some sacrifice on all our parts at this time; and

Whereas it seems justifiable at this time, in making sacrifices, that our war veterans be first considered rather than last; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration at Bath is the only home for aged veterans in the Northeastern United States and its location is excellent, geographically, from a civilian defense standpoint; and

Whereas to abandon these facilities at this time would do great hardship to our veterans and prove economically unsound: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully memorialized to enact legislation with convenient speed, that will prevent the Secretary of Defense from pursuing his course to abandon the Veterans' Administration Center at Bath, N.Y.; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

By order of the assembly:

JOHN T. MCKENNAN,
Clerk.

Concurred in with amendments March 3, 1965.

By order of the senate:

GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

Senate amendments concurred in March 8, 1965.

By order of the assembly:

JOHN T. MCKENNAN,
Clerk.

Medicare and Eldercare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution adopted by the public affairs luncheon club of Dallas, Tex., setting forth their reasons for strong support of the eldercare bill H.R. 3727:

STATEMENT TO THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MARCH 15, 1965: Re Medicare Bill H.R. 1

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee, it is the considered opinion of the some 500 members of the Public Affairs Luncheon Club of Dallas that there are grave dangers and inadequacies in a medical care program for the aged financed through the social security system. We, therefore, find the eldercare bill H.R. 3727 highly preferable over the medicare bill H.R. 1, which latter bill is compulsory, aiding all those covered by social security, even the wealthy, but making no provision for those ineligible for social security.

The enormous cost of such a program could well jeopardize the whole social security system and increase the payroll tax to a figure that would place a staggering and intolerable burden, first, upon our youth coming into maturity and a debt-laden existence, and secondly, upon both employer and employees. Your attention is respectfully directed to the experience in Great Britain, France, and Sweden where government-controlled medical and hospital care have proven extremely costly and far from satisfactory.

Eldercare would be a voluntary program financed through an existing Federal pro-

gram for matching State and Federal funds, and private insurance companies would provide the protective insurance. Far greater benefits for the needy would be provided under eldercare because drugs, surgical costs and physicians' care would be included while medicare would only pay limited hospital and nursing charges. Eldercare, and the resulting taxation burden, would not be extended to those able to provide the service for themselves.

We earnestly urge that you and your committee give careful consideration to eldercare bill H.R. 3727 which not only affords far greater protection to our elderly needy citizens but also would not imperil the American system of free enterprise which has produced the most unparalleled advancement in medical science and research the world has ever known.

MRS. CHARLES E. TURNER,
President, Public Affairs Luncheon Club.
MRS. JOHN BOOKHOUT,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.
DALLAS, TEX., *March 15, 1965.*

Medicare Bill Is Expensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the administration's proposals for a medical care program for the aged, I call attention to the following significant editorial which appeared in the March 22 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times:

MEDICARE BILL IS EXPENSIVE

The administration's bill to provide medical care for the aged is now being readied for presentation by the House Ways and Means Committee. It promises to be more expensive than anticipated.

The new medicare bill could more than double the social security taxes of many employers and employees.

The social security tax increases specified in the administration's medicare bill would come in two forms, in an increase in the tax rate and an increase in the tax base on which the tax rate is computed. The increases would be staggered in seven steps over the next 21 years. After the final increase an employee earning $6,600 a year, and his employer, would each pay a social security tax of $369.90.

In 1965 the same employee and employer will each pay a social security tax of $174.

The administration's medicare bill is a pig in a poke, as we have noted on this page in the past. The benefits offered are limited. It is almost certain that there will be strong pressure brought to bear to increase those benefits once the bill is passed. The proposed increases in the social security tax base and tax rate needed to finance the bill, as proposed, would not take care of any increases in benefits. More money would have to be found. The most likely way of raising that extra money would doubtless be even more increases in social security taxes.

Alternative bills have been offered the committee. One is sponsored by the American Medical Association, called the "Eldercare" bill.

The AMA bill proposes that the government make full coverage health insurance available from private health insurance companies to those over 65 on the basis of need. The Government would pay all or part of the premiums with local authorities setting the level at which federal assistance in meeting premium costs would be granted.

The AMA estimates its program would cost $1.5 billion annually.

The cost of the administration's medicare bill has not been accurately set. Reliable estimators set the figure from $1.5 billion to $6 billion annually.

The House should carefully consider all the alternative bills offered to the administration's medicare bill.

There is no necessity to rush legislation through that might fall short of the needs it is supposed to remedy and be expensive as well.

Alaska: Anglers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, Alaska's fame as a must-destination for sport fishermen is so widely recognized that no broadcasting of the fact is required. Salt water or fresh water—Alaska's sport fisheries are abundant.

Although Alaska's sport fisheries are famed, less well known are the best locations, the times of greatest abundance, and the baits and lures that are most effective. Thanks, however, to a fine publication of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, one does not have to be a longtime Alaskan to know where and when to find the species sought, and to know what baits and lures work best. This publication, issued by the department's Commissioner Walter Kirkness, is entitled "Anglers' Sport Fishing Predictions for 1965."

Here are a few samples of the advice contained in this handbook by experts:

SOUTHEASTERN ALASKA

Silver salmon: Available from July to September. The best month is August, with herring and large spoons for bait. Don't worry about the best location; they are everywhere and strike readily.

Halibut: Abundant throughout the entire area from May to September. Beach the large ones; they exceed 100 pounds and can be dangerous in a small boat.

COPPER RIVER—PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND

Lake trout: The mackinaw, or lake trout, provides good fishing all year. The best catches are made just after ice-breakup and just prior to freezing. The predictions are good for Louise, Crosswind, Paxson, Summit, Tannada, Copper, Ducky, and Susitna Lakes.

COOK INLET—MATANUSKA LAKES

Grayling: This cold water beauty can be found during late May and early June in the Deshka and Taluchulitna Rivers. Other streams which may reward the fly-rod enthusiast are Lake, Willow, and Little Willow Creeks. Irene and Long Lake (Mile 86) are also predicted to be good.

KENAI PENINSULA

Dolly varden: Dollies occur in most of the coastal streams from July through November. They are also present in many of the lakes on the Peninsula. These char are captured readily on salmon eggs and are especially abundant in August and September in Salmon Creek, Anchor River, Deep Creek; Ninilchik River, Quartz Creek and Ptarmigan Creek. Some particularly large dollies have been taken from the Kenai River. "Goldenfins," which are a small landlocked variety, are abundant in Upper and Lower Summit Lakes and the stream between them.

FAIRBANKS AND NORTHERN ALASKA

Grayling: May 1 to September 30, larger fish available to the angler early and late in the season. All clear flowing streams are considered as suitable grayling habitat. Tangle Lake system, Delta-Clearwater, Goodpaster, Salcha, Chena, and Chatanika are top grayling streams.

KODIAK ISLAND

Steelhead: Karluk River, in September and October is unsurpassed anywhere. Marka, Saltery, and Buskin Rivers also have runs of steelhead. They may also be taken in late April and May, but are not as bright this time of year. Try fresh eggs on a small treble hook fished delicately just above the bottom.

BRISTOL BAY

Arctic-char: The hottest spot anywhere for these fine fish is at the mouth of the Agulowak River in Lake Aleknagik during June and July, but they are concentrated at the outlet of all of the major lakes at this time. This is fishing that is fast and furious.

BERING SEA

Silver salmon: Coastal areas June 15 to August 30, peaking in August. Interior water, August 15 to November 1, peaking in September. Excellent silver salmon fishery during mid-August on the lower Nome River.

These samples, I hope, will be adequate to stimulate a lively interest in the sports fishing opportunities within the great 49th State. I will be glad to procure for any of my colleagues upon request a full copy of the referenced publication.

Hero James R. George, First Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Miami Herald on March 10, 1965, and points out the crime situation today in our country and the desperate need for legislation to correct many of these tragedies. This article was brought to my attention by a very dear friend of mine and one of the outstanding citizens of my district in Dade County, Fla., Mrs. Irma Baker, and relates to James R. George, 23, from Atlanta, and an airman, first class, in the Navy. The article refers to an incident which occurred in Philadelphia where six other men, names and ages not available, stood by on a Philadelphia subway platform while a gang of 15- to 20-year-old punks tried to attack a teenage girl. Said George:

> I wanted to get help, I started toward the men, but before I reached them, some of the boys jumped me, beat me. I tried to do all I could, but I was only one person. None of the six men offered any help.

George managed to summon a policeman who rescued the girl. There is a se-

quel that may be a bit refreshing Eight youths were arrested within 24 hours after the attack, and a Judge Stout sent them directly to jail. No delays, no legal lollygagging.

This was a savage case and justice must be swift—

Said Judge Stout. We say thanks to the judge, and thanks to George. And we will not say what we could do to the six who let George do it.

Although George may not have been severely hurt, his picture did appear in the paper showing a black eye and perhaps bruises. This young man is indeed a hero and I feel he is certainly deserving of every commendation.

More on Poor Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, recently I requested congressional hearings into what I termed the wretched mail service in the United States. The House Postal Operations Subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be the ranking minority member, has agreed to schedule postal hearings in an effort to get to the bottom of the problem.

Since I first made the request for new hearings, my office has been literally flooded with letters from postal patrons complaining about the present day service. I think these people are justified in these complaints.

Many of the letters I have received from postal patrons contain examples of mail that has been delayed for weeks, mail that has been lost or misrouted, or examples of packages and magazines that were crushed or mutilated in the mails. I recently received an air mail letter at my home in Arlington, Va., that was mailed in Omaha, Nebr., February 15 and postmarked February 16. I received it March 17—1 month later. I ask the Members of this distinguished body, if this is what the people of this country are paying high postal rates for?

I would like to take this opportunity to submit additional examples of the type of complaints that I have received from postal patrons in every part of the Nation. I think my colleagues will be interested in these complaints because you and I represent the people who are making them:

ETOWAH, TENN.,
March 11, 1965.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: After reading the enclosed newspaper clipping, I decided to write you concerning the rotten mail service I have been receiving since the ZIP code was put into operation. A short time back, my son, who lives in Cedartown, Ga., 111 miles south of Etowah, mailed me an important letter and this letter was on the road 6 days, traveling a distance of only 111 miles. This letter zipped from Cedartown down through the State of Georgia and halfway through Florida, stopping at Tarpon Springs, Fla., before it started toward Etowah, Tenn. I checked the mileage and this letter traveled about 1,300 miles before reaching Etowah.

A short time back I mailed a roll of Kodak film to Dayton, Ohio, exactly 411 miles north of Etowah, and my finished pictures were on the road 8 days before ever reaching Etowah, and a small package mailed to me from New York was on the road exactly 12 days, traveling a 15-hour run by rail. I also ordered a small Bible booklet from Dayton, Tenn., only about 40 miles from Etowah, and this small book was on the road exactly 10 days traveling only 40 miles. There are many more incidents that I could write about but this is enough to show you how rotten the mail service has become. I'll be 75 years of age in August and I have never experienced anything like the mail service we are having since the ZIP code was installed. I trust that after you read the enclosed clipping you may pass it on to Mr. Gronouski. I wrote to him some time back concerning the no-good mail service and he never did answer my letter.

Thanking you for your time in reading this letter, I await your comment.

Yours very truly,

_____ _____.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
March 12, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: Your succinct comment on the service given today by our Post Office Department, which was recently quoted in the press, echoes the sentiments of the suffering public.

The postal service in this country has deteriorated to an alarming degree. First-class mail from New York to Philadelphia on occasion takes 10 days for delivery time. First-class airmail has been delivered to the wrong office and left to lie undelivered to the correct addressee for days on end. Parcel post packages containing important printed matter is delivered either in such a battered condition, rendering the contents useless, or not delivered at all, for what reason no one seems to know.

A recent sad experience we had was parcel post shipment of three identical packages by our printer here in Philadelphia, to one of our advertisers in New York. One package was received in normal time—the other two seemed to have gone by the wayside. The addressee waited, made inquiries, made about four phone calls to us and we as many to him, but no success. Upshot was we had to have the material reprinted. Then, after 2 weeks' delay, the missing two packages were delivered—seems they were stashed away in some corner of a post office.

You may rest assured, Mr. Congressman, that you will have the support of every responsible citizen of the United States in connection with your recommendation of a congressional investigation into the carelessness and inefficiency of the working force of our Post Office Department.

Respectfully,

_____ _____.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
March 8, 1965.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: We noticed your article in the Omaha World Herald with regard to postal operations.

We thought you might appreciate some specific examples of the postal service in this area.

We are enclosing several samples. For example, the first sample shows 8 days mail service from Omaha to Sioux Falls, S. Dak., which is approximately 200 miles. Also a sample shows mail service from Omaha to Sioux Falls of 11 days service.

The next sample shows 9 days service from Omaha to York, Nebr., which is a distance of about 125 miles.

Other samples enclosed are as follows:

	Days
Omaha to York, Nebr.	8
New York to Greeley, Colo.	16
New York to Douglas, Wyo.	14
New York to Alamosa, Colo.	21
Omaha to Alamosa, Colo.	15

These are merely samples, and we could enumerate hundreds of these within our own company if it would be helpful.

No doubt other companies in this area have supplied you with sufficient information in an effort to be helpful to you on the House Postal Operations Subcommittee.

We hope you are successful in your work toward improving the postal service in this area.

Sincerely yours,

_____ _____.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
March 3, 1965.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM.

SIR: Mail service does indeed stink, steadily worse and worse. My pay check used to come (from Manhattan to Brooklyn) overnight; now it always takes at least 2 days, often 3.

Today seven pieces of first class mail addressed to other businesses were delivered to the small office where I worked today; two of the wrongly delivered letters were addressed to a bank.

And, also today, I finally got from Maine, February 20 mail that had been, apparently, put in a wrong box, then returned to sender instead of being put in the correct box when it was remailed by the other boxholder. There's no excuse for such carelessness (and callousness) about first class mail that can be vital—checks, family papers, etc.

Yours truly,

_____ _____.

_____, NEBR.,
March 3, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have just read your item in tonight's paper whereby you mention that the postal service stinks.

You are so right that I cannot help but congratulate you on your statement.

I have had about 35 years of work for the Postal Department, of which the last — years are as a city letter carrier.

To place it very mildly, I am continually embarrassed by having to give the poor service that I am required to give.

Sincerely,

_____ _____.

HYATTSVILLE, MD.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: I agree with you that something is amiss in the mail department and that the service "stinks."

During the 2 years I have lived at this address, I have acted more as a sorter of mail than a receiver of mail. This is a private residence, and mail for people living here 4 years ago, and 2 years ago, is left here two to three times a week. The mailman maintains that he is unconcerned with the name on the envelope and if it's this address the mail will be left here. Change of address forms were filed for both previous occupants, and yet it has fallen upon me to note this on their mail. Since I am about to move, this "service" leaves me terrified as to what will happen to my mail.

We also receive mail for other residents in our block, which I end up delivering.

Packages arrive looking as though they had come by way of a South Vietnamese battlefield.

Our next door neighbor has had similar experiences. In one case, a package deliveryman decided they had moved and returned packages to the sender; in another, important mail was delivered to a house with the same number blocks away. There was no similarity in the street names.

I wish you luck in your efforts, and hope that current deficiencies can be remedied before the Post Office joins the space age and starts sending our mail to Mars.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ——— ———.

———

CHICAGO, ILL.,
March 16, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE: I do hope you are successful in arousing the Congress to our dire need of improved postal service.

We mail all our radio tapes in steel containers like the enclosed, and this inside corrugated cartons, yet many of them are completely ruined in transit.

Please observe what force it would take to dent the enclosed container at its reinforced edge, yet this edge shows at least four such dents. And this is by no means an exception. With radio stations awaiting particular broadcasts for particular dates you can imagine how exasperating this is.

We trust your efforts to improve our service will prove most successful.

Very sincerely yours,

——— ———.

———

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: The enclosed clipping appeared in one of our papers a few days ago. How true it is that "Mail Service Stinks."

We write letters to Baltimore, our former hometown, every week. It is disgusting how long it takes for a letter to reach Baltimore, 3 days seems to be an average time for a first-class letter. Airmail does not accomplish a thing and it is just as well to save the few extra pennies.

It is difficult to say whether the delay is on this end or at the receiving end; it could be a combination of both.

Good luck in your having the matter of service investigated.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

———

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
March 8, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Representative From Nebraska,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have read your writeups headed "What's Happening to the Mail Service," and for a retired postal employee much of the criticisms of the present service is "damn disgusting."

First let me say the guidelines idea is more like slavery expectations. To be handed a tray of mail, and be told by a supervisor it had to be sorted in a specified time, is an imposition.

In my working days I have known what it was like to face a day's work before—an avalanche of work, but we were never told it had to be finished in a specified time. We had an incentive to go to it and do our best, and the next crew to take over from where we left off.

In my 36 years in the postal service I never worked under a slave-driving set of supervisors.

If it comes to the point where first class, now paying 116.9 percent of costs of handling, has got to be called upon to do the subsidizing of all deficits caused by changing methods of handling, it's about time the people as well as businesses, show their disgust. These above figures are shown on the sheet "Adjustment of revenue, operating reimbursements, and accrued costs—fiscal year 1962." If there's a later one, I'd appreciate one.

I could go on much more on this subject, but I don't think it necessary. I have written the Postmaster General several letters as to his transitions but in closing I want to say the most disgusting thing I have read of his ideas is snooping on the privacies of employees using restrooms.

I realize this has been a lengthy letter and I hope I haven't usurped too much of your valuable time reading it, but I would very much appreciate your reply to my comments.

Very respectfully,

——— ———.

Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement:

VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION

At the risk of being referred to as a "sinner in the congregation of the righteous," I feel impelled to express my position with reference to the President's recommendation on the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In his recent speech to the Nation on this subject, he said that he was sending up a law to the Congress and that there should be no delay in its immediate enactment. It is not the prerogative of the President to send up a law. He can only recommend legislation, and it is up to the Congress to enact the law.

The next day I was called by the press, asking if I would support the President's bill. At that time no bill had been introduced, and I replied that, until I examined the bill, I would take no position on it, but that if it contained certain provisions, I could not support it, and that I was not sure but that there was sufficient legislation on the books to obtain the goal which the President was seeking. In fact, under existing law, the Federal judge in Montgomery, Ala., issued an order which provided, among other things, that qualified applicants for registration who are not registered in July 1965, and have signed the priority sheet, and have presented themselves prior to July 1, will have their applications received and processed by the voters' referee already appointed by that court. The court also made it clear that any rejected Negro applicant "from this day forward" (Feb. 5, 1965) "may apply to this court for registration in accordance with the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 1971(3)" (Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960). The press in my district did not report my qualified statement, and thereafter I was forthwith taken to task by some prolific letterwriters.

Two days later, the President's bill was introduced in Congress. He had stated that his bill would be a "simple, uniform standard." It is not simple and it is not uniform. The fact is that, in its application, it is the most discriminatory piece of legislation that has ever been submitted to Congress. Under the formula, the State of Texas is exempt, as well as the State of California and the State of Florida. But the State of Alaska is included. I know of no registration problems in Alaska. The legislation applies to any State or political subdivision where less than half of the persons of voting age, residing therein, were registered on November 1, 1964, or if less than 50 percent of such persons voted on November 3, 1964. A political subdivision is not defined. It probably means a county, a city, a school district, a water district, an assessment district, and possibly even a precinct. But here is what can and will happen: A county that has 10,000 people of voting age is exempt if more than 50 percent of them are registered, or if more than 50 percent of them voted in the last Presidential election. That county could have 2,000 Negroes in it, not one of whom is registered or has voted, but because more than 50 percent of the population of voting age is registered and voted, the Negroes would have no rights under the proposed bill. Why this discrimination, advocated by the President?

The bill has ex post facto provisions which are definitely unconstitutional. The bill eliminates any test or device to determine qualifications for voting, but here again this only applies to about 15 percent of the States, leaving the rest of the States to set up such qualifications. If any State or political subdivision, covered by the bill, enacts any voter registration qualifications after the enactment of the law, it must forthwith file, in the Federal District Court of Washington, D.C., a petition for injunctive relief, and that court will decide the validity of these qualifications. Again, 85 percent of the States are exempt.

The fines and imprisonment provisions also only apply to 15 percent of the States.

If anyone in the covered States alleges within 24 hours after the closing of the polls that he was a listed voter under the act, that he was not permitted to vote, or that his vote was not counted, and the examiner is so convinced, the U.S. attorney may apply to the court for an order enjoining the certification of the results of the election, and no person shall be deemed elected where such injunction is issued until the matter is disposed of.

I predict that the Judiciary Committee will completely rewrite the President's recommendation before it is finally passed upon.

I am in full support of the proposition that all qualified citizens should be permitted to register and vote, and that there should be no discrimination in registration qualifications because of race, creed, color, or sex. I support the proposition that the right is reserved to the several States to determine the qualifications in accordance with the Constitution, and there is nothing in the Constitution that authorizes the Federal Government to determine these qualifications. I am supported in this by a Supreme Court decision as recent as 1959, which restated an earlier opinion, as follows: "No time need be spent on the question of the validity of the literacy test, considered alone, since, as we have seen its establishment was but the exercise by the State of a lawful power vested in it not subject to our supervision, and indeed, its validity is admitted." (*Lassiter* v. *Northampton County Board of Elections*, decided June 8, 1959, 360 U.S. 45) (*Guinn* v. *The United States*, 238 U.S. 347).

The 15th amendment is short and simple: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." The 15th amendment makes no mention of voter qualifications beyond excluding race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and does not confer upon the Fed-

eral Government any authority to legislate otherwise.

The 24th amendment which abolished the poll tax, abolished it only so far as voting for the President, Vice President, or their electors, and the Senator or Representatives in Congress. This gave the Federal Government no authority to eliminate the poll tax in any other State election, although many States have done so voluntarily. The pending bill attempts to do just that.

On this and other constitutional issues, I stand squarely with George Washington. These are his words on the subject: "If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurption; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed." (Washington's Farewell Address.)

President Johnson could have stated his objectives on television in 5 minutes, but he continued to meander over the whole pasture, from buttercup to buttercup, and spent 20 minutes rewriting the life of Lyndon Johnson to make it conform with his recent conversion. He was driven by emotion, fear, threat, and persuasion, to recommend this legislation. This is no atmosphere in which to legislate. The President intended to delay this recommendation until the end of the session, knowing that it would disrupt his friendly relationship with Congress. This was the last thing he wanted to do until after his Great Society legislation had cleared all the hurdles.

Weare, N.H., Protests VA Closings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the town of Weare in my district has protested officially the proposal to close or cut back the facilities of the Veterans' Administration in Manchester, N.H. I submit for the RECORD a copy of a resolution of protest adopted in town meeting and signed by the members of the board of selectmen. The resolution is further evidence of the concern of citizens across the country to this ill-considered, ill-advised decision on the part of the administration.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the administration in Washington has announced that it will soon close the Veterans' Administration hospital and the regional service office, both of which are located in Manchester; and

Whereas such a move will deal a serious blow to not only the war veterans in Weare but to those living in the southern part of our State; and

Whereas the reason given for the closing of these facilities is given as an economy move, to which we cannot subscribe in light of the fact that millions of dollars are being spent in various parts of the world to construct hospitals and other facilities for the benefit of those people in far-off lands: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the people of Weare in town meeting assembled this 9th day of March 1965, do hereby protest the closing of the Veterans' Administration facilities in Manchester and direct that copies of this resolution be transmitted to U.S. Senators NORRIS COTTON and THOMAS J. MCINTYRE and to Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND.

This resolution was accepted by the town at the annual town meeting Tuesday, March 9, 1965.

WALTER P. J. BRENNAN.
VERNON R. WOOD.
H. TALBOT PEARSON.

The Great Urban Tax Tangle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the increasing awareness in many parts of the country that the need to repair the administration of property taxes is urgent. Those of us associated with the great cities of this country have long been mindful of the close relationship between faulty property tax administration and the revenue plight of cities. We have been less aware of the relationship between faulty property tax administration and the less attractive physical appearance of parts of our cities. We have been even less aware that these problems are not limited to the larger cities, but are shared increasingly by local governments generally. I therefore read with great interest the informative article entitled "The Great Urban Tax Tangle," in the current issue of Fortune magazine. This account of the conclusions reached by a select group of tax and municipal experts at a conference sponsored by the Lincoln School of Public Finance in cooperation with the National League of Cities, the Urban Land Institute, ACTION, and Time, Inc., explains how property tax administration contributes to city slums and urban sprawl.

The article attracted my attention also because it endorses reform measures in property tax administration recommended by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in its recent two-volume report on "The Role of the States in Strengthening the Property Tax." My distinguished colleagues, Congresswoman DWYER, and Congressman FOUNTAIN, shared with me the honor of representing this House on that Commission when this report was developed during several Commission sessions.

Confident in the belief that the Members of this House would find it instructive, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the article entitled "The Great Urban Tax Tangle" appearing in Fortune for March 1965, in the RECORD following my remarks:

THE GREAT URBAN TAX TANGLE

(NOTE.—In view of the looming importance of local tax policy, Fortune presents below the substance of a roundtable discussion held last summer at Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif., and attended by many eminent tax and municipal experts. The conference was sponsored by the Lincoln School of Public Finance in cooperation with the National League of Cities, the Urban Land Institute, ACTION, and Time, Inc. Time's Pierrepont I. Prentice acted as rapporteur and moderator of proceedings. This is a condensation of the consensus report Prentice submitted to participants. A partial list of the participants appears at the conclusion of this article.)

While Federal tax policy has been recently subject to extensive debate, much less attention has been paid to the taxes that strike closer to home. Yet direct local government spending, including city, county, and school districts, has been going up much faster than Federal spending—from some $9 billion in 1946 to a level of more than $50 billion currently. If it continues to grow at anything like this rate, it will reach the $100 billion mark in the 1970's.

How all this new money is raised can have an enormous and decisive effect on how cities grow, how cities redevelop, where industry locates. It can also have a major influence on what it costs people to live in cities and whether our cities are livable. The bigger the local tax take, the greater the need for wise policies and wise methods of collecting those taxes. Mistakes that did not make much difference at the $9-billion level of 1946 much difference at the $9 billion level of 1946 future levels.

Almost all of us who participated in this round table would like to see local governments assume a bigger share of the responsibility for providing the standard of services their localities want, for we believe in keeping a maximum amount of decision making on spending close to the people who will have to pay. But the local governments cannot take on this bigger job unless and until they can find better ways to raise the revenues they will need. This raises such thorny questions as how much new money will have to be raised by property taxes, how property can be more justly assessed, and what the division of taxation should be between land and improvements.

None of us would dream of suggesting that local tax reform will cure all the ills of our cities. But most of us see a clear, close, and causal connection between what is wrong with our cities today and what is wrong with their tax systems. If slums are spreading in what should be fine closein residential areas, how largely is this because old housing is so lightly taxed (compared with good new buildings) that it is more profitable to let it sink into slums? If our cities are disintegrating around their perimeters instead of expanding in an orderly way, how much of this sprawl is because underused land on the outskirts is so lightly taxed that its owners feel no tax pressure to let it be put to better use when it is needed? If mass transportation is half empty and downtown is choked with parked private cars, to what extent is this due to the fact that our cities subsidize those who ride in cars by letting them park on the downtown streets for a small fraction of what it costs? Are we abetting sprawl by subsidizing horizontal transportation while taxing vertical transportation?

Most of us agree that the purpose and function of cities is to overcome the handicaps and inefficiencies of distance and make it easy and economical for people to live and work close together. In doing so they find that their opportunities are multiplied and they enjoy cultural and recreational facilities that would otherwise be impossible. In addition, cities achieve the vast economies of a central market where industry can find a wide choice of suppliers and trade can find millions of customers close at hand. All these advantages are frustrated when cities lose their compactness and when their traffic arteries are jammed.

All of us agree that much better metropolitan planning is needed, but most of us

think that planning can be pretty futile as long as our local tax system encourages land speculation and often makes it more profitable to misuse and underuse land than to improve it for its highest and best use. All of us agree that better zoning is needed, but zoning is only a negative power; it can prevent an unwanted land use but cannot assure a desired use; and today, alas, too much suburban zoning is snob motivated, speculation motivated, or tax motivated and does more harm than good. Too much suburban zoning seeks to block urban growth rather than to guide it; too much seeks to perpetuate a bucolic past; too much aims simply to keep lower-income families out and school costs down for the benefit of present property owners.

All of us recognize the urgent need for preserving plenty of open space in urban and metropolitan areas; but most of us think this urban open space should be open for everybody to use and enjoy. Very few of us think private owners and exclusive clubs should be given special tax consideration to let them hold large close-in areas off the market for their own exclusive enjoyment while waiting for the land price to multiply. Big estates, farms, and golf clubs belong out beyond the little plots where most people live, so they won't make so many families drive home past miles of "keep out" and "no trespassing" signs.

PROPERTY THE KEY

We do not oppose the local governments' efforts to get more money from income taxes, sales taxes, and grants-in-aid, but we do think most cities would be wise to play safe and figure that most of the added money they will need will have to come from the property tax, which now provides nearly 90 percent of all local tax revenues. All other local taxes provide only a little more than 10 percent, and even that would be much smaller were it not for a few very large cities whose level of spending is close to the limit of what property taxes can provide.

Most of us think some cities might wisely collect more revenue—in some cases a substantial revenue—from more adequate service charges for what are in effect publicly owned utilities: water supply, sewage disposal, garbage collection, parking space on and off the streets, etc. Most of us think more cities might be wise to use neighborhood assessments rather than citywide taxes to pay the first cost of parks, playgrounds, and other needed neighborhood facilities that will raise neighborhood property values. Many of us think more cities should be allowed to explore the local sales-tax potential to see how much added revenue it could safely produce. But when all these allowances have been made, it still looks as if local governments would have to rely on the property tax to meet an overwhelming part of their future needs.

So when we urge the need of local tax reform we mean mostly property-tax reform, and more specifically the taxation of real property, on which local government today enjoys an almost unchallenged monopoly. It is estimated that total tangible wealth of all kinds in the United States has a value of close to $2 trillion. The market value of real property (land and improvements) runs to about $1 trillion. This enormous potential base today yields taxes of some $17 billion, or about 1.7 percent. This yield surely seems low.

We do not recommend raising effective rates on real property as high as 3 percent, but we do think it is important to note that millions of Americans now live in urban communities that collect 3 percent or more and find it something they can live with—and 3 percent is still far below the admittedly ruinous 6.64 percent peak reached in Boston in 1959. So except for a few big cities, it is just plain nonsense to say that our local governments' right to collect real-property taxes gives them an inadequate tax base.

On the contrary, the potential base is enormous and is constantly growing, and even without reforms revenues will be going up. The property tax as it is now conceived and administered may indeed be a bad tax as its critics charge, fraught with bad economic consequences and crying for reform. It may be an unpopular tax and a tax that makes voters unhappily conscious of what local government costs. But it is not inadequate as a source and it is very far from exhausted.

THE CRAZY QUILT

The first step in reforming and improving property taxes involves more equitable assessment of underlying values. The assessment pattern today is a crazy quilt. Some property is so underassessed that it carries almost no share of the load. Other property is assessed and taxed 20 or even 40 times as heavily.

Assessments vary from place to place among the 4,142 municipalities, 2,575 townships, 6,004 school districts, and 5,411 special-tax districts included in 212 standard metropolitan areas. Assessments vary by age of property, with new improvements too often penalized by much higher percentage assessments than old buildings. They also vary with the competence, diligence, and motivation of the assessor, and often involve flagrant class favoritism. The 1962 census of governments showed vacant lots assessed an average of 20.5 percent of true value whereas the figure for nonfarm homes was 30.6 percent. Since then land prices have soared still higher, and today millions of acres needed for development are assessed at a small fraction of their asking price.

Local assessment inequalities are made worse by exemptions sponsored by the States. These include the limit of a few hundred dollars some States impose on assessment values of any land that is farmed (even when it may be held for development at many thousands of dollars per acre), and the homestead, veterans', and senior citizens' exemptions by which some State governments have sought to subsidize favored voters at the expense of local tax revenues. The limit on homestead exemptions is usually set at or below $5,000 of assessed value. But since assessments often run to only 25 percent of market value, this means that homes worth $20,000 may be completely tax exempt.

The importance of better assessments has been stressed by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which in one of its reports indicates that substantive changes in the property tax will be largely meaningless without improved administration. "Over the past 50 years notable advances have been made in * * * State and local fiscal administration, but in very many areas assessment administration has not kept pace with this progress * * * few officials feel under obligation to enforce the tax law as written. In some States, in fact, compliance by the assessors with the constitution and statutes would be a cause for general consternation. The average assessor makes himself a sort of one-man legislature. He—not the State constitution and the State legislature—defines local taxing and borrowing power and determines the value of a veterans' or homestead tax exemption by the level at which he decides to assess property. He is likely, also, to administer his own version of the personal property tax * * * Such practices breed disrespect for the tax law."

Since States make the laws that govern how local authorities can collect taxes, they must share the blame for most of what is wrong now with local taxation. Only the States can insist that all local tax districts should employ trained professional assessors; only the States can change the laws that make tax appeals so costly and often so futile; only the States can end the too common practice of making the cities pay for county services that the county performs only outside the limits of the great cities.

We urge that local governments should be given much wider control of their own taxing and borrowing powers than now prevails in most States. Most of us think all State limitations should be abolished, perhaps with the reservation that any increase in the local limits must first be approved by a local referendum; and quite a few of us think the bond market can be trusted to keep local governments from exceeding their safe borrowing limits.

NOT ONE TAX BUT TWO

The second step in improving local property taxes is to realize clearly the difference between taxing land and taxing buildings and other improvements on the land. By and large, heavy taxes on improvements are bound to discourage, delay, or even deter their realization; the bigger the improvement tax the smaller the owner's incentive to spend good money to improve his property instead of investing it somewhere else or putting it to some other use. Contrariwise, taxes on land (or, more correctly, site values or, perhaps still more correctly, location values) tend to encourage, speed, or sometimes even compel improvements. The bigger the land tax the bigger the pressure on landowners whose property is underused to do something to increase its earning power—or sell it to someone who will. (These divergent effects can be pretty decisive when an owner is making up his mind whether to sell his property today or hold out for a higher price, or whether to invest more money in improvements, let well enough alone, or demolish an existing improvement to save taxes.)

Almost all economists agree that the social and economic consequences of increased taxes on land are much better (or much less bad) than the social and economic consequences of increased taxes on improvements. But today the policy of almost every State forbids local governments to recognize the fact that the property tax is really two different taxes. On the contrary, the law requires them to tax and assess land and improvements alike. Perhaps more important, the practice almost everywhere is to assess improvements much more heavily than land, perhaps because many assessors seem to confuse the property tax with an income tax and hesitate to assess underused land at anything like its market value. The 1957 Census of Governments showed that, even before land prices started soaring, the assessments on homes were about a third heavier, in terms of true value, than those on vacant lots. Today the differential is even bigger.

We agree with the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, which found that "State and local governments have failed to make maximum use of the enormous potential inherent in the property tax for either the prevention or the cure of poor housing and other blight conditions. In fact, since the tax is based on the value of land and improvements, those who permit their property to deteriorate, reducing area property values, are rewarded with lower property taxes. Landlords who enhance the value of their property have their assessments raised."

We urge that the present discrimination in assessment practice, which tends to penalize improvements, should be stopped. Beyond that there is no clear-cut consensus among us on what further tax steps should be taken to correct what is now pretty obviously wrong. A few of us would favor a local capital-gains tax on land values alone to recapture some of the unearned increment that has made close-in land such a rich speculation; but others say a local capital-

gains tax on top of the Federal capital-gains tax would just make more landowners hold their land off the market even longer, while other landowners would just evade the tax by leasing their land instead of selling it. Some of us feel that taxing idle and underused land as if it were put to its most profitable use violates the principle of ability to pay; others reply that potential ability to pay is a better basis for taxation than what exists today. A few of us are afraid separate assessment of land would be too difficult; most of us think it would easier.

Some of us favor lightening the tax on improvements without increasing the tax on land. Others favor increasing the tax on land without changing the tax on improvements. Some of us favor penalty taxation on obsolete, dilapidated, or inadequate buildings occupying strategic land; others think the same purpose could be achieved more simply by taxing land at rates that would make its underuse unprofitable. Many of us favor the so-called Pittsburgh plan of taxing land at twice as high a rate as improvements. Quite a few of us would go all the way and shift the whole burden of local property taxation to the site value alone, as in the majority of communities in Australia and New Zealand, and a number of cities of South Africa.

But whatever our disagreement on how to correct today's practice of taxing improvements more heavily than land, we are almost unanimous in our agreement on the divergent impact of the two components of the property tax, and that this divergence must be taken into account in any sensible program of reform.

SOWING DISINCENTIVES

The effects of taxing improvements can be far reaching and are not just theoretical. A tax of only 1½ percent per year, for instance, may seem small but when it's projected over the 60-year life of a building it becomes a big item, and would be seen as such if it had to be paid in a lump sum. The results of having taxes go up the moment that improvements are made are all too visible today in the slow pace of replacement of millions of obsolete buildings that are still being used because it is not yet profitable to replace them. One big city, for example, found that one-fifth of all its housing violated its housing code. But the building department is helpless to close down these 40,000 units until enough good new units are constructed to give the tenants a better place to go. The proliferation of slums is to no little degree due to the fact that dilapidated and antiquated structures are assessed and taxed much less heavily than good new housing.

Ventures that promise a big profit yield will, of course, go ahead despite the present taxation system. But thousands of marginal ventures are held up. For example, on new shopping centers the taxes can run close to 40 percent of gross rents; on new office buildings close to 30 percent. The prospect of such a tax is bound to influence the investor's decision on what to build, how well to build, and whether to build at all.

Some highly pertinent research in this field has been done in Milwaukee by Prof. Mason Gaffney of the University of Wisconsin under the sponsorship of the Urban Land Institute. This research indicates how lightening taxes on improvements and shifting them to unimproved land values would change the profit arithmetic for new buildings in the central business district and the close-in blight ring. On many locations in Milwaukee tax reform would make 20-story office buildings profitable on prime sites where 12 stories is now the point of diminishing returns; it would make 6-story elevator apartments profitable in good locations where walkups now pay off best.

Professor Gaffney states: "Untaxing improvements would make a much higher intensity of use profitable in the heart of the central business district. * * * But we would not expect to get higher intensity of land use everywhere. On the contrary, the more intensive development and redevelopment of the central city area would drain the demand that is now proliferating the urban sprawl. This would deflate the speculative land prices that are driving homebuilders far out into the countryside to find land they can afford to build on. Concentrating high densities where high densities make economic and social sense should actually enable many families to enjoy low-density living much closer in to the city and so save the millions of hours wasted driving home past vacant or semivacant lots."

Professor Gaffney goes on to say: "More intense downtown land use could be further stimulated if more of the tax dollars that must now be spent keeping up with sprawl could be directed to the central business district to provide, for example, two-level sidewalks, escalator crossovers for pedestrians at busy intersections, quick and easy off-street parking, and other public improvements needed to make downtown more efficient and more attractive. * * * We also found that exempting buildings would not necessarily reduce the tax base, for the value of building exemptions would be capitalized into the value of the underlying land. Then increasing the tax rate on land could just bring the value of well-developed strategic land back to where it is now."

THE LAND-TAX EFFECT

It is essential to see that larger reliance on land taxes will have very different results from taxes on improvements and indeed from most other forms of taxation. Most taxes raise prices, which tends to discourage sales and so cuts production and eliminates jobs. But taxing the site value of land without taxing its improvements can't discourage production because, by definition, no production is involved. All the unimproved land in the world has been there since before time began and so supply is fixed. Almost by definition, the unimproved value of urban land derives, not from anything that past or present owners have done, but from what the community has built around it, and from an enormous investment of other people's tax dollars (often more than $10,000 a residential lot) to install the streets, schools, water supplies, sewer systems, police and fire protection, libraries, etc., without which the land would hardly be accessible or usable.

Few students now question the conclusion reached long ago by Turgot, Adam Smith, and most of the classical economists that taxes on unimproved land values cannot be passed on except in very special circumstances. Landowners cannot raise prices just because taxes go up. The value of land, after all, reflects the capitalized margin between the anticipated ground rent it can earn and the only cost that land as land has to carry—the land tax. The bigger the land tax the smaller this margin will be and hence the lower the price at which the land can be capitalized. The lower the land tax the easier it is for owners of underused land to hold it off the market to get a higher price. Outside Montreal, for instance, it was found that over 600,000 acres of land were being held for speculative purposes—eight times as much as the city's booming growth could absorb in a decade.

Inside our cities, as we have seen, it is the combination of low land taxes and the customary low assessment of decaying structures that helps make slums highly profitable real estate investments. It also thwarts current government plans for urban renewal. New York, for example, has had to pay between $400,000 and $600,000 an acre for slum clearance. At land prices like that only subsidized housing can provide low rents. In 1960 a special committee on tax policies in New York noted that even the $2 billion public-housing program had made no appreciable dent in the number of slum dwellings. Most of us agree with the committee's conclusion that "No amount of code enforcement, or tenement rehabilitation * * * will be able to keep pace with slum formation until and unless the profit is taken out of slums by taxation."

Meanwhile, in the suburbs, underused land is taxed lightly and prices have more than doubled. The National Association of Home Builders believes that the high price of land is one of the builder's most urgent problems; it threatens to price good new single-family homes out of the market. It is an important cause of premature subdivision as builders leapfrog far out into the countryside to find land on which they can afford to build—often on land that should be left open for years to come. Not all of us agree that the undertaxation of underused close-in land is the only cause of sprawl, but almost all of us recognize that heavy taxes on underused land could take most of the profit out of suburban land speculation and so bring millions of close-in acres onto the market at much lower prices.

While increasing the incidence of property taxation from improvements to land would bring important shifts in how land is held and used, it is not true that such reform would precipitate a general deflation in realty values. Some land prices would indeed go down, but others would go up. Specifically, higher taxes on land would make it less profitable to keep land off the market and this, in turn, would deflate those prices that are now inflated by speculation-created scarcity. But lower taxes on improvements would give owners an incentive to go to work. This in turn would tend to bid up the price of strategically located land, assuming, of course, that market demand is there. The biggest increase in land values would be in the central city. The decline would mostly be in the outlying areas.

The price shifts up and down might perhaps balance out with no change in total real estate values. Indeed, the total might increase insofar as reducing taxes on improvements led to more modernization of old buildings and more building of new ones. The point is that shifting the tax incidence would stimulate rather than stifle enterprise. The British economist, Colin Clark, has said: "Any good economist can demonstrate that the land tax is perhaps the only tax that doesn't discourage enterprise."

REDUCING CITY COSTS

It should be recognized that as we reduce the urban sprawl and put land to better use within cities we shall gain important side effects. Sprawl on the outskirts of our cities denies their basic purpose which, as noted, is to maximize the ease of business and social contacts. It also multiplies the cost of all those municipal services whose economy depends on density.

Consider, for example, water distribution. If demand for water doubles in a fixed area, all we need is to expand pipe diameters. But if demand doubles by the doubling of the service area, we must (a) double our pipe mileage; (b) increase the cross section of our old system at its base to transmit the extra load to the new extension; (c) increase pressure at the load center to maintain pressure at the fringes; and (d) increase the allowance for peaking.

Or consider the far more urgent problem of streets and highways, which now cost local taxpayers more than any other item except schools. The greater the sprawl the more miles of streets that are needed to get from A to B, and the more cars that will have to travel more miles along those streets. Fewer people can get to where they want to go on foot, and fewer people can get to and from where they want to be by mass transit. Sprawl does not take cars out of the traffic centers; on the contrary, it brings in more.

Sprawl is not a flight from traffic congestion but its principal cause. And in greater or less degree, today's tax-encouraged sprawl inflates every municipal cost, from sewage disposal to subsidized mass transit, from police and fire protection to education.

These costs are also inflated by the common practice of taxing city property for county services that stop outside the city line, a practice that should be stopped. Until recent steps were taken to correct the imbalance, Jefferson County, Ky., collected between 60 and 70 percent of its property taxes from Louisville, but spent more than 40 percent of its revenue for services it did not provide inside the city. As a result, the city was in effect paying a subsidy to its suburbs, and its tax rate was more than twice as high as the rate of nearly all other cities in the county. We urge the enactment of State legislation that would stop or at least discourage counties (or any other large tax district) from collecting taxes in any area to pay for services they do not offer equally throughout the area. Cities would not be the only beneficiaries of this legislation. It would also give some smaller tax relief to property owners in truly rural areas who may now be taxed to pay for the extension of certain urban services into the suburban fringe.

In addition, cities might greatly benefit by making direct charges for many municipal services. Just because a utility service like water supply, garbage collection, or sewage disposal is provided by the city instead of a private utility does not necessarily mean the service must be offered free or at a loss. Too few big cities seem to understand that they subsidize downtown traffic jams by charging much less than cost for downtown parking on and off the streets. It may or may not be good politics, but it is certainly crazy economics to let cars use metered parking space for 10 cents an hour (80 cents a working day, or some $200 a year) on land so valuable that stores just across the sidewalk pay from $1,000 to $10,000 a year rent for the same frontage.

If parking charges equaled parking-space costs, many fewer people would drive their cars to work downtown. Many more people would use mass transportation, and downtown would be a lot pleasanter place to shop. The number of cars entering Manhattan's midtown and downtown business districts on a typical day soared from 382,000 in 1948 to 590,000 in 1960, though the total number of people entering the area actually fell from 3,691,000 to 3,349,000. Most of the falloff involved shoppers who probably decided to stay clear of the worsening traffic congestion caused by those who drive to work.

SIMPLIFYING THE STRUCTURE

Obviously, there are many ways by which we can obtain better urban development and this report has touched only some of them. Central to the whole effort, however, is rethinking the subject of property taxation. Today many forms of personal property are taxed as well as realty. Many of these personal taxes have a very low yield and are little more than nuisances to the collector as well as to the taxpayer. There is a strong case, it seems to us, for dropping many of them. In addition to realty taxes (land and improvements), we shall probably continue to need personal-property taxes on producer durables (machinery and equipment). But consumer-property taxes should probably be limited to automobiles in order to help pay the multibillion cost of local streets paved for their use. Alternatively, it might be easier to drop the automobile tax and increase the State gasoline tax. In any case, the entire tax structure should be simplified.

In the process we should work to eliminate so-called tax shelters in the real estate field. Tax shelters flourish in typically small and artificially designed jurisdictions that have large taxable resources and minimum tax obligations. In New Jersey, for instance, which has some 567 jurisdictions, the taxload of some is 10 times higher than of others. Tax shelters of this kind contribute directly to the urban sprawl, giving industries an incentive to move into areas where they do not bear their fair share of municipal costs. The ideal solution to tax shelters is to abolish them. This can be done by insisting that all tax districts be made big enough to provide adequate service on the basis of adequate taxation without having islands of tax affluence and islands of tax poverty. An important start can be made by concentrating on the school tax, not only the biggest tax, but also the most variable. Most of us would favor putting the property tax for schools on a statewide or at least a countywide basis, with the State or county turning the tax take back on a per pupil basis to the local school districts. The latter would, of course, still be free to levy a supplementary school tax if the local voters wanted to pay for a higher local standard of education than the State-prescribed minimum.

THE VITAL 75 PERCENT

But the most urgent reform in the realty field, as already indicated, is to improve and change the principle of assessments. All property should be assessed at the same percentage of true value—a change one of our panelists says "would have earth-shaking consequences." Today many States in theory require 100 percent assessments on all property, but in practice the majority of assessments range from 5 to 45 percent. Most of us think the level should be as close to 100 percent as is practical. Selling prices, of course, tend to be erratic and to fluctuate in the short term. Allowing for error, assessments should probably average about 75 percent of value.

All assessors should be trained professionals appointed under the merit system instead of elected. One full-time professional assessor can do a better job than six amateurs working part time, and assessment districts too small to employ full-time assessors should get together. State equalization boards should be given bigger budgets and should be required to reveal the local assessment ratios on basic classes of property, including vacant lots, farms, single-family houses, apartments, and commercial and industrial properties. Full publicity should then be given to the equalization board's findings as well as to the actual assessment of each parcel. Such publicity would tend to make assessments self-policing, since each property owner would know how his assessment compared with assessments on similar property in his own and other neighborhoods. Chicago is giving a fine lead toward full publicity by advertising all its assessments in paid space over a period of time, and so is Los Angeles County. In some other communities local newspapers are meeting the publicity need by publishing assessments free as news, which indeed they are.

Finally, and extremely important, assessments should distinguish between the value placed on land and the value placed on buildings and improvements. Once again, most States have laws to this end but they are often honored in the breach. As a result, the assessed value of underlying land sometimes tends to vary with the improvements erected upon it. In New York adjoining lots today may vary enormously in assessed value. Most of us think it is nonsense to say that land and buildings cannot in fact be assessed separately. Some Australian States have been assessing land separately for 70 years with less complaint than is common in the United States. So has Denmark for almost as long.

THE JOB CAN BE DONE

Virtually all investors make separate appraisals of land and buildings before making mortgage commitments, and many States require banks and insurance companies to make these separate appraisals. All competent assessors know the standard methods for determining "the residual value" of land under a building, and presumably in many cases it would make just as much sense to set the land value first and assign the residual value, if any, to the building. Assessing land costs much less than assessing buildings because buildings have to be assessed one at a time, taking into consideration such diverse factors as age, obsolescence, maintenance, modernization, mechanization, etc. By contrast there is no need to place a separate value on each and every parcel of land. "Bench mark" parcels are currently studied carefully in many assessment offices. And intervening parcels can be valued by interpolation. These bench mark assessments could be greatly improved, and land assessments could be almost self-policing, for each landowner would know the assessments on nearby plots.

Thus, technically at least, it is feasible to improve our assessment system and to distinguish between the value of land and of improvements. How far the actual tax burden should be shifted toward land is, as already seen, a question on which experts differ. What is not open to question is that the incidence of property taxation, no less than its amount; is important in the development of our cities and outlying areas. And what is painfully true is that decisions made now will have larger and larger effects on the future. For, in one way or another, local communities will be raising more and more money, and, to repeat, mistakes that could be tolerated when local spending was at the $9-billion mark can be terribly burdensome now that it is heading for the $100-billion mark. Thus the case for reform of the local tax structure is every bit as pressing as and perhaps more pressing than the reform of the Federal tax structure. It is time that it got more attention from all citizens.

SOME OF THOSE PRESENT

Among the 70-odd participating specialists at the round table were Colin Clark, director, Institute for Research in Agricultural Economics, University of Oxford; L. L. Ecker-Racz, assistant director, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; Mason Gaffney, chairman, Economics Department, University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee; C. Lowell Harriss, professor of economics, Columbia University; Patrick Healy, executive director, National League of Cities; William F. Hellmuth Jr., dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Oberlin College; Orris C. Herfindahl, senior research associate, Resources for the Future, Inc.; James K. Hunter Jr., research director, Ohio Department of Taxation; James E. Lash, executive vice president, Action, Inc.; Harold F. McClelland, dean of faculty, Claremont Men's College; Herbert J. Miller, former executive director, Tax Foundation; Raymond Moley, a chief member of Roosevelt's brain trust; Ben Musa, president, Oregon Senate; Jerome Pickard, research director, Urban Land Institute; Chester B. Pond, director of research and statistics bureau, New York State Department of Taxation and Finance; Robert L. Purnell, chairman, Michigan State Tax Commission; Bonnie H. Riedel, former president, City Planning Commission, Los Angeles; Edward Staples, executive director, Missouri Public Expenditure Survey; G. Gordon Tegnell, research director, New York Chamber of Commerce; Mabel Walker, executive director, Tax Institute of America; William K. Wittausch, manager of housing research, Stanford Research Institute; and Archibald M. Woodruff Jr., provost, University of Hartford.

Address by Hon. Gerald R. Ford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, delivered an address on March 14, 1965, at the Michigan State University commencement exercises at East Lansing, Mich. The university proudly conferred upon the minority leader the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws.

We who served with Representative FORD are not surprised that he has been so honored. We know of his interest in and understanding of the serious national and international problems which our country must face; and we also know of his participation in the House in the formulation of legislation and debate concerning these problems.

Representative FORD is an able and effective Member of Congress for his own district and for our country. His exceptional qualities of integrity and character have given all of us inspiration and leadership; and I am happy to join with those in congratulating our minority leader on the honor which has been conferred upon him by Michigan State University.

Because I feel the minority leader's commencement address on the subject of freedom is an expression of vital significance to all of us, and because I believe his address should receive wider attention, under unanimous consent, I include Congressman FORD's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, MARCH 14, 1965

Today you cherish this point in time as you face wide horizons of opportunity. In reaching your present achievements, you have proved yourselves, have demonstrated qualities of imagination, eagerness to learn, willingness to sacrifice, and a readiness to accept new ideas with open minds.

This is neither a time to stumble, nor to falter, nor to fear in accepting the responsibilities of citizenship with the task of leading the way to strengthened moral, esthetic, cultural, and scientific values.

The challenges are many in this age of space and speed, changing events, and perplexing problems.

Recall that Emerson, the American philosopher, said "They conquer who believe they can." You, with your sharpened skills, will help conquer the massive problems of this century, and at the same time help your fellow men, whose lives must be balanced in an unbalanced world.

Progress depends upon men and women making and carrying out their plans, prepared to assume the risks and willing to accept the burden of responsibility.

In our earlier history, the challenge was that of opening the West to exploration, settlement and development.

Those strong-willed men and women drove their covered wagons through the wilderness into the setting sun with self-confidence and pride in achievement. Freedom to them was a great adventure, not something handed down from another generation.

The challenges of today are linked with new technology, the achievements of science, and the task of filling jobs demanding skills unheard of even a decade ago.

There are diseases to conquer, roads to build, land to till, social ills to cure, children to be taught, parts of great cities to rehabilitate, public money to invest and to spend wisely.

Seeking solutions with measured, calculated, intelligent, and technical steps, each person must have a choice without being crowded into the position of accepting one pattern, one way of life, if he has preferred alternatives. This in a word is—freedom.

Individual freedom of action and choice, within the framework of the law, was built into the Constitution by the Founding Fathers.

In the area of government, freedom must be maintained through a bipartisan effort which should receive widespread support from all Americans.

Two major goals must be achieved if the American democracy is to continue to exist and be strengthened throughout subsequent generations.

First, we must maintain a balance in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of Government as established by our Constitution.

The parallel task is to preserve the two-party system—the genius of our democracy. I ask, is it better than one or multiple party governments? Those one political party nations, behind the Iron Curtain, have no freedom and can't seem to catch up. Multiparty nations are mired in confusion and chaos.

Enlarging upon the first goal—that of keeping the three branches of Government in balance—I believe that if any one of them becomes too strong or too weak, the foundations of our Government will crack and our freedom will be threatened.

There are disturbing signs of slow erosion in the power of the legislative branch, a build-up of awesome strength in the executive arm, and a change from the intended direction in the Federal judiciary.

Congress, the legislative branch, has been criticized as being too slow to react in an age of speed. Critics have described the House and Senate as being too cumbersome, too old-fashioned.

Those critics perhaps are unaware that in Congress a system of checks and balances is provided by the Constitution.

When speed is essential, Congress has proved many times that it can react with dispatch to meet a crisis in war or in peacetime, in days of economic depression or in times of glowing prosperity.

It has been said that Congress frequently makes haste slowly. However, the act of deliberate slowness is a safeguard against racing to the brink of decision. It roadblocks a dangerous plunge. Congress should reach its major decisions only after adequate research, thought, and ample discussion.

When the balance of power in Congress is steeply tilted by an overwhelming majority in one political party, the system of checks and balances is endangered. This becomes even more serious when the executive branch is dominated by the same party.

Although the President is the Chief Executive and head of state for all of us, he does represent essentially the views of the people who voted for him. Members of Congress, those in the House of Representatives, are closer to the Nation's citizens because they are chosen by smaller segments of the Nation.

Members of the House are elected every 2 years, a fact which in itself places Representatives closer to the people. Every 2 years a Representative must go to his constituents for a mandate to continue in office. His record is placed on the line and he must be endorsed by a majority of voters in his district.

As in the Senate, the House is represented by nearly every major profession, national origin, and religion. Congress is a cross-section of the American people. This is your strength. It should not be lessened by an over-balance of power in the executive and judicial branches of Government.

The responsibilities of Congress are clearly defined in the Constitution, and include the making of all laws which are necessary and proper for carrying out the duties and powers of Government.

Under the Constitution, every statute requiring concurrence of Congress must be presented to the President. If the Chief Executive rejects a proposed act, he can be overruled by a two-third's majority vote of the Senate and the House.

It is quickly obvious that a crushing overbalance of political power in both Houses of Congress and in the executive branch weakens the safeguards of the Constitution.

Reflecting on the duties and obligations of the third branch of Government, it can be said that the Federal judiciary's function is to interpret the Constitution and the laws.

There is evidence that the judicial branch is arbitrarily elbowing its way to new positions of authority, disregarding the wise suggestions of judicial restraint made by the late Justice Frankfurter and others.

When the Supreme Court ordered States to reapportion on the one-man, one-vote concept, Justice Frankfurter in a dissenting opinion was critical of an assumption by the Court of "destructively novel judicial power."

"In this situation, as in others of like nature, appeal for relief does not belong here," Justice Frankfurter said. "Appeal must be made to an informed, civically militant electorate. In a democratic society like ours, relief must come through an aroused public conscience that sears the conscience of people's representatives."

Justice Frankfurter emphasized that the "Supreme Court's authority—possessed neither of the purse nor the sword—ultimately rests on sustained public confidence in its moral sanction."

I have stressed the need to preserve the two-party system as among the major areas of concern in maintaining our structure of government.

Without any indulgence in partisanship, I am sure we can agree that a strong two-party system is bedrock assurance that our Democracy will survive, prosper, grow, and help others in the world to accept their role in the society of free nations.

A crushing overbalance of strength in either party for too long a time makes a mockery of our traditions in government, weakens and softens the voice of the people, and places control in the hands of a comparatively small majority.

These, it seems to me, are currently the major goals to be sought in the area of government: a sensitive balance in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, and a strong two-party system.

What is your role in seeking these goals? Where do you start? What might be your guidelines for action?

First, you must have the mental and moral courage to become involved in the political world as voters, as taxpayers, as partisans, as candidates for office, as officeholders—yes, as patriots.

Those who sit on the sidelines, uttering harping criticism, fail to strengthen the foundations of our Nation.

By being a citizen-participant in our democracy and not a mere spectator, you develop a loyalty to your community, your city, your country, your State, and your Nation. This loyalty is basic to personal service and community improvement.

In becoming a part of what the late Justice Frankfurter described as an "informed,

civically militant electorate," you will discover the meaning of service and true citizenship.

Patriotism in action demands loyalty to a philosophy, to a set of ideas, to our Nation. It begins at home in your local environment.

Give purpose and direction to your role as a citizen by chosing a political party, after careful study of the philosophies of each. Perhaps you will switch your alliances. This is a choice under freedom. This, too, will require mental courage, which conquers fear and builds healthful, buoyant attitudes.

Good citizenship, it seems to me, is directly linked with the "aroused public conscience," which Justice Frankfurter said "sears the conscience of the people's representatives."

The question is how should an aroused public conscience manifest itself?

Is the rioting of college students protesting an alleged breach of freedom of speech a proper interpretation? Does a demonstration by more than 100 singing, chanting young men and women in the Department of Justice in Washington in behalf of Federal intervention in one of our States, constitute a meaningful representation of public conscience?

Would you say that the 700 persons picketing the White House with cries of "freedom now" or conducting a "sit-down" in the White House were examples of good citizenship in action?

Compare these examples with the actions of citizens in a community who band together to win an election, to raise money at the local level for a new high school, or with the coordinated civic effort to conduct an educational campaign on local issues dealing with more taxes for a better park and recreation area.

Certainly, police brutality anywhere is disgraceful, as is unbridled, uncontrolled, savage and senseless mob action, which scoffs at legitimate authority and the orderly processes.

The growth and prosperity, the state and strength of our Nation is the result of free citizens conducting their personal lives and careers within the constituted framework of authority, law, and order. This is not to say that changes in our laws or governmental practices is not necessary or essential.

For example, our present civil rights laws need strengthening to give statutory backing to the general provisions of the 15th amendment, which provides that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. This is the orderly process.

There is a fine line of distinction between an aroused public conscience and demonstrations of social revolution.

I seriously question the social merit of flamboyant, irresponsible mob action to focus attention on a public issue. We have procedures in our units of government, in the courts of the land, by which controversies can be settled with dignity and justice. This should be the path taken by an aroused citizenry in search of righting a wrong or in seeking a civic goal.

At the same time, public officials have the duty to see that laws are properly enforced. Those who are slow to act in fulfilling their obligations of their office, or who deliberately turn their faces from issues and controversies are indeed delinquents.

An informed voting public has the power of the ballot to replace those who fall in their duties, who fall short of their qualifications, who forsake the people for political gain. Appeals to the courts may be taken when that course of action appears necessary.

The rules of an orderly society may at times be subject to interpretation by government, by the courts, and by the people themselves, but only in a manner which insures due process of law.

Your guidelines as citizens include a great devotion to the moral and spiritual values, which are translated into nobility of character, social justice, national righteousness, and eventually, world peace.

Even the most modern of us know that we cannot build the foundation of our personal lives on the shuffling sands of chance. We need something of permanence and substance in finding direction in our lives.

A wealth of permanence and substance is found in being active, loyal citizens, dedicated to maintaining our democracy in the fraternity of free nations. No one ever made footprints on the sands of time by sitting down.

I have mentioned today several desirable qualities: imagination, eagerness to learn, willingness to sacrifice, readiness to accept new ideas with open minds, self-confidence, responsibility and finally, loyalty.

The blending of these qualities is the equation of the total ultimate in personal development needed in our Nation. It is to come mainly from the ranks of mature young men and women.

These are the qualities in man that mastered arts and sciences, created government and law, made cities of settlements founded in the wilderness, built skyscrapers on the sites of log cabins, invented covered wagons that gave way to railroads, automobiles and aircraft, made startling progress in several thousand directions leading us to the present.

Arnold Toynbee, scholar and historian, has said: "Our age will be well remembered, not for its horrifying crimes nor its astonishing inventions, but because it is the first generation since the dawn of history in which mankind dared to believe it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race."

You have the power of knowledge; you have proved a willingness to give more of yourselves than you receive in order to make this a better nation and a better world for others and yourselves.

The United States of America needs you. It needs your knowledge and your readiness to accept challenges as loyal citizens of a free society. It needs you as scholars, as knowledgeable persons with chosen careers.

There is no doubt that you will heed the challenging call. Your presence here today and the documents you receive for achievement in education are strong reflections of your desire to accept responsibilities in an exciting, turbulent, demanding, and changing world.

Congratulations. I salute you with faith and thanksgiving.

An Emergency Telephone Number Suggested for the Washington Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial by WMAL during the week of February 28, 1965, suggesting that the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. establish an emergency telephone number for the Washington metropolitan area. I believe this to be an excellent idea and I hope that the telephone company will act on this suggestion in the immediate future.

The article follows:

EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER

The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. should inaugurate a special emergency number for the metropolitan area. The number should be easy to dial—we suggest 505 because it looks like S O S, a familiar distress signal. It should not require a coin in a pay telephone.

Such a system is in use in England. When a person dials a three digit number, he is connected with an emergency operator and referred to police, fire, or ambulance service. In the District a caller could be connected with the Metropolitan Police Department. In Maryland or Virginia the caller could be connected with the local State police office.

The number of telephones on American streets has increased. So have street crimes. But a person in trouble may not have a coin handy in an emergency. A special number could help bring assistance quickly.

We believe the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. should develop a special emergency number for the metropolitan area.

Richard E. Byrd Memorial Boon to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, it is with much pride that I insert in the RECORD under unanimous consent a recent press release concerning a memorial to the late great American, Adm. Richard E. Byrd, a memorial that is today a center around which revolves an annual renewal of friendship between New Zealand and the United States.

This memorial overlooking Wellington, New Zealand, was the scene on March 14 of a service arranged by the National Council of Churches to commemorate the Antarctic Treaty and at which the theme of prayer was for world peace.

I commend this as a fitting and useful memorial to a distinguished Virginian who lived one of the most useful lives of our times. Admiral Byrd was a member of a prominent family, a family whose archives go well back into the early history of this Nation, and, as I am sure my colleagues know, was the brother of the outstanding and beloved senior Senator from Virginia, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD.

The press release follows:

THE RICHARD E. BYRD FELLOWSHIP

A unique ceremony takes place in the capital of New Zealand (Wellington) this Sunday (March 14) at the Richard E. Byrd Memorial high up on a hilltop overlooking the city and harbor.

This memorial was established by the Richard E. Byrd fellowship to honor the life and work of the late Admiral Byrd, and mark in tangible form the Antarctic Treaty.

The posthumous bust in bronze is set among stones brought up from Antarctica

and faces the direction of the South Pole. The concept behind the edifice is a space age cairn. It is intended to be a design that will never date and is symbolic of the forward looking approach of Byrd and the hope for the future that the Antarctic Treaty conveys. It is also the only physical recognition of the Antarctic Treaty that exists anywhere.

The late admiral called New Zealand his "second home" so the small plaque under his bust reads:

"Richard Evelyn Byrd, Rear Admiral, USN, born October 25, 1888, died March 11, 1957, ambassador of goodwill, friend of New Zealand."

One of the two larger plaques underneath carries the following:

"The greatest explorer of the air age. Richard Evelyn Byrd dedicated his life to peaceful progress for mankind. Outstanding in aviation and exploration; he was a scientist, a humanitarian, a champion of freedom and a great internationalist. His concepts of Antarctica as 'the great white continent of peace' are contained in the Antarctic Treaty.

May the spirit of the treaty endure and spread throughout the world."

The other large plaque sets out the main tenets of the Antarctic Treaty which was the first nuclear disarmament treaty ever signed and so is a special milestone along the road of history of the human race. The plaque reads:

"The Antarctic Treaty. Signed on December 1, 1959, by 12 nations, this was a milestone along the road to international cooperation. It provided for nonmilitarization, for the prevention of nuclear explosions and disposal of radioactive waste, for an international inspection system, for the pooling of scientific information. It demonstrated the subordination of national interests to the wider cause of science and increased understanding between nations."

This edifice was unveiled by the Right Honorable the Prime Minister, Keith J. Holyoake, as a national memorial and dedicated by the chairman of the National Council of Churches on March 11, 1962, in a colorful ceremony. Since then many leading Americans, including the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, former Under Secretary of State for the Far East, Roger Hilsman, Secretary of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges and Eddie Rickenbacker, famous aviator, have visited the memorial.

A service is held annually by the National Council of Churches. This year's guest speakers include the American Ambassador, His Excellency Herbert B. Powell, Sir Arthur Tyndall, Minister of Science Brian E. Talboys and other prominent citizens of the capital, including the chairman of the Richard E. Byrd Fellowship, Tracey M. Simpson Esq.

To encourage participation by American congregations the following cable has been sent to the president of the National Council of Churches of America by his counterpart in New Zealand:

"In this year of international cooperation I suggest fellow Christians in America join with the ceremony in Wellington commemorating the Antarctic Treaty, Sunday March 14, and pray for world peace." Signed Bishop John Holland, president, National Council of Churches, New Zealand.

This Wellington landmark, high on Mount Victoria, is thus a permanent acknowledgement of the bonds of friendship and spirit of cooperation between this country and America which have produced so many worthwhile efforts of joint endeavor between the two peoples.

Saturday Review: "Should Americans Travel?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I hope the trial balloon someone sent up several weeks ago on taxing Americans who travel abroad has been successfully deflated. This jingoistic approach to our balance-of-payments deficit, to my way of thinking, would be reprehensible even if it were practical.

An incisive critique of the travel tax suggestion appears in the March 13, 1965, issue of the Saturday Review. The magazine's editor, Norman Cousins, editorializes as follows:

It must seem strange to the world that the United States, which prides itself on having the highest prosperity and productivity on earth, should assert that it cannot afford to have its people travel to other countries or its businessmen put their money to work elsewhere.

I think the views expressed in the editorial merit the attention of Members of the House, and for that reason I include it in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

SHOULD AMERICANS TRAVEL?

The U.S. Government is worried about its dollars. More of them are leaving the country than are coming back. In an effort to stem the outflow, the Government is now trying to discourage Americans from traveling or investing abroad. The travel posters are coming down from the walls of our passport offices. Exemptions from taxes on foreign purchases are being cut by two-thirds.

It is difficult for us to get the news into focus. In fact, it makes us downright uncomfortable. Antitravel pronouncements are strange sounds in a nation that became great because its ideas were pointed outward and because it looked to human resources rather than to the accumulation of currency as the true source of its wealth. The dent in the national pocketbook from a dollar deficit will be inconsequential compared to the dent in the national traditions if the notion should prevail that it is not in the national interest to travel in other lands. Nothing is more in the national interest than to have a well-educated citizenry, knowledgeable about what is happening abroad and capable of participating in the making of great decisions concerning America's relationship to the rest of the world.

For decades, one of the major issues in American life had to do with the readiness of this country to define and carry out its responsibilities in the community of nations. Ever since Woodrow Wilson, the men in the White House have been seriously concerned about preparing the American people for major foreign policy decisions. Accordingly, Americans have been urged by their Government to take an active interest in world affairs. And foreign travel has been described as an important ingredient in the education of a 20th-century man. Now, however, confronted by fiscal problems, the Government has gone into reverse. Foreign travel and investment are to be shunned. But the basic outlook of the American people is not something to be turned off and on like a garden hose. If the ability and right to travel are among the highest attributes of a free society, then the principle is worth upholding even when economic expedients seem to suggest otherwise.

A great society becomes less great in direct proportion as it becomes less open. Far better to have an outflow of dollars abroad than a shrinkage of ideas at home. Moreover, it must seem strange to the world that the United States, which prides itself on having the highest prosperity and productivity on earth, should assert that it cannot afford to have its people travel to other countries or its businessmen put their money to work elsewhere.

What makes the entire matter most disturbing is that the Government has been taking advice from the wrong experts. It has been listening to economists when it should have been listening to historians. Throughout history, one of the signs of an affluent society has been the mobility of its citizens. For more than a decade after the Second World War, for example, the depressed English economy looked to visitors from more prosperous countries as an important source of revenue. But with the advent of recovery and prosperity, Englishmen again are roaming the world. Hence Britain no longer enjoys a surplus in travel exchange. The same is true of West Germany, Canada, and the United States. In short, an excess of travel spending over travel income is manifestation of prosperity and not a threat to it.

To be fair to the U.S. Government, it should be pointed out that officials have attempted to attract foreign visitors in large numbers. The increase was dramatic in itself, but it didn't offset the number of Americans who traveled abroad. The effort is going forward, of course, to encourage travel to the United States, but one wonders whether the impression of disorder and violence that outsiders have of the United States may not hinder that purpose. This country has given itself a black eye because of the epidemic of brutality and crime that has infected its cities and because of the upheaval caused by the delay in making the benefits and responsibilities of citizenship available to all its people. Beguiling travel posters are not enough, therefore, to give substance to the visit-America campaign. Far more productive would be an unremitting nationwide campaign against racial injustice and crime.

It is foolish to minimize the seriousness of a flight of capital. At the same time, it is pertinent to ask whether the elimination of obsolete or extravagant features of our military installations abroad might yield more dollar benefits than a reduction of travel. Many of these installations are of premissile vintage and are maintained more out of momentum and political pressure than stark military necessity. Some of them, indeed, have quite literally become luxurious country clubs, with superb golf courses and swimming pools. Not that there is anything wrong with recreation facilities for military personnel. What is wrong—and what accounts for a substantial drain of dollars abroad—is the maintenance of the kind of military establishment that has little relevance in an atomic missile age.

Still another question that has to be asked is whether the Government has taken fully into account the effects on the American economy if other countries should decide to retaliate. Already there have been threats of a costly cancellation of American aviation contracts by European airlines. One way or another, the United States has given a good example of how not to begin an International Cooperation Year.

No American need fear it is unpatriotic to see the world. The broader his outlook and interest, the better his qualifications to help build a great society.

Voice of Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, these are perilous days in our Nation. Hysteria is rampant. Many so-called Christian leaders are leaving their flocks and invading other regions of the country, not in an effort to preach and teach Christianity but in an effort to force upon local inhabitants the invader's political philosophy and to give to certain minorities special privileges and rights not accorded the majority of our people. This is no time for our leaders, for political expediency, to join in this mad invasion but rather we need calm, determined, impartial, and constitutional leadership so that all of our people are treated justly under law.

In line with this thought, there appeared in the Farmville Herald, on Tuesday, March 16, 1965, an outstanding editorial entitled "Voice of Reason." I wish every loyal American citizen could read this editorial written by an outstanding American, J. Barrye Wall, who loves his country and who is anxious to do everything in his power to see that constitutional government is maintained in America and that all of our people are treated fairly and justly with special favors to none.

The editorial is as follows:

VOICE OF REASON

Needed badly in this Nation is a voice of reason, to be heard far and wide. The voice should come from the White House, and it should be that of President Johnson, who is President to all of the people. It might be too much to ask of one who plays politics and thinks politics incessantly, but if it is delayed too long irresponsible and revolutionary movements in this Nation may get out of hand. If the President fails, then the Congress should take a hand.

Too much emphasis is being placed on the vocal minorities both in officialdom, and outside. Radical Congressmen make the headlines and the TV appearances, while several hundred other Congressmen, who realize the sad state of affairs get poor or no press coverage nationally. Public sentiment has been whipped to a frenzy by planned and poorly founded publicity. The President is not absolved in the use of such publicity for his own image, as he sees it.

For example, conditions are to be deplored in the State of Alabama, especially in Selma, which bears the brunt of a nationwide convergence of overzealous racial integrationists. No people should be placed in such a position in a free country. In addition to Rev. Martin Luther King, and his following of racial revolutionaries, there are hundreds of ministers of the Gospel concentrating their efforts on Alabama and leading revolutionaries against the people of that city and State. Men of the cloth responded to a call of the President issued through the Vice President to assist in the Alabama revolution. Unfortunately a minister was injured in a confrontation. Four citizens have been accused. He died. President Johnson sent his wife to his bedside in a Government plane, sent flowers of condolence to the widow. An admirable procedure in human relations, to be sure. The minister was not in the employ of the Federal Government, we don't presume, so under what precedent are these niceties done? Does the President show such courtesy to the widows of men who make the supreme sacrifice for their country in Vietnam?

This dramatization by the President's acts widens the growing breach between the Central Government and the States. Congress should take note and hasten to pass resolutions of condemnation of the acts of the executive and judicial branches which incite violations of the established rights of the general public in States and cities by the convergence of crusading do-gooders resulting in the disruption of normal relations and conduct of commerce.

It may be Alabama now, Mississippi preceded, but any State can experience the "invasion" of revolutionaries from hither and yon with practically no legal protection. So far as we know, no Congressman has raised a voice of reason. Congressmen, were elected by the people, and as such have the duty to protect the rights of the people. To fail will invite an uprising by the public, which must be avoided assiduously.

Confrontations like those in Mississippi and Alabama please no one but the Communists.

A voice of reason should be raised from high places in our Government without delay. Reason, not emotion must be reestablished to save this Government from more embarrassing incidents.

March 25, 1965—The 144th Anniversary of Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MARCH 25, 1965—THE 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

March 25, 1821 marks the first European echo of the American Revolution. On that date, 144 years ago, a band of dedicated freedom-loving Greek patriots raised a flag of liberty and swore that they would have freedom or die in the attempt. It was not the first time that the gallant remnants of the brave Greek nation had risen against foreign domination. For more than four centuries of alien domination, they had fought for liberty regularly, on an average every 11 years. Each of those attempts was drowned in blood and destruction.

But the 1821 rising was destined to succeed. Fighting against incredible odds, accepting stoically the price not only in blood but in property that the alien rulers exacted, the Greeks fought on amid their smouldering homes and burning orchards—for the trees, too, were destroyed to quench the spirit of liberty—and 8 long years later they won, as the Americans had won earlier, thus affirming for the first time in Europe the right of nations to rule themselves.

They found scant support from other European governments at first, those brave Greek fighters. The great capitals of Europe were more concerned with the balance of power and with supporting Turkey, whom they called then the sick man of Europe, rather than allowing the Greek subjects of the Turk to gain freedom.

But the justice of the Greek cause prevailed. The example of the American Revolution had sown seeds that had grown deep roots. Freedom lovers from other nations came to offer their lives in the cause of Greek liberty. Greeks are proud that Americans participated in that noble endeavor.

In 1821, when the Greeks rose against the Turkish Empire to throw off a yoke of nearly 450 years, to the average American Greece was either a remote country, somewhere in Europe, or an ancient civilization, famous for its books, and buildings. Soon, however, Greece became a real and immediate entity. The Greek struggle for freedom stirred the American press, aroused American orators and stimulated the neoclassic trends in American art, literature, and architecture. American opinion was unanimous: A people whose tradition was a source of inspiration to American democracy, a nation fighting for its liberty, should be free.

The first American to sponsor the cause of Greek liberty was Edward Everett, professor of Greek at Harvard University. A man of strong convictions, Everett was determined not only to make speeches for Greece, but to act. In the name of Greece he initiated a crusade against the reactionary and oppressive policy of the holy alliance in Europe.

His efforts for Greek independence were to bear fruit, and a year later popular feeling was officially reflected in President Monroe's annual message to Congress, which declared: "Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their (the Greeks') contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States."

The Greeks, on their side, looked upon the United States with hope and admiration. One of the first acts of the first Greek senate in May 1821, was the delivery of an address to the American people, beginning, "Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers: Having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode. Though separated from us by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us. Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue."

It was natural for the American institutions of higher learning to take the lead in aiding the Greek cause; there intellectual freedom was upheld as the cardinal aim in education, and youthful enthusiasm for justice and liberty ran high. From Harvard University came the signal for America's support of Greek freedom. It was given by Edward Everett 6 years before the outbreak of the Greek revolution, in his oration for the degree of master of arts in 1814, which he called the Restoration of Greece. It contained many prophetic notes. Judging by later reports, his listeners were carried away by the eloquence with which he pleaded for an independent Greece. After graduation from Harvard, Everett visited Hellas on the eve of its independence. He wrote an engaging account of his experiences in Greece during 1818 and 1819 which unfortunately has never been published.

It was Everett who guided Daniel Webster in his famous address on Greece, delivered before the American Congress.

Soon interest in Greece spread beyond Everett's campus at Harvard. Throughout the 1820's, students in American public schools, colleges, and universities were holding meetings, passing resolutions, and writing expressions of support for the Greek cause.

The youth of America at that time was keenly interested in the struggle for human freedom which it saw going on in Greece. Some young men volunteered in the Greek armed forces. Young George Jarvis, Jonathan Miller, and Samuel Gridley Howe distinguished themselves on the Greek battlefields. Their own American Revolution was only a few decades past; the interim years had seen the writing of the American Constitution and the careful construction of a Republic on the foundations of freedom. Theirs was not merely a passive interest in what was happening in Greece; they felt that their own ideals and lives were involved, and, over a hundred years ago, they felt America could not remain isolated.

Eventually, the heroic sacrifices of the Greeks could no longer be ignored. Public opinion in the civilized world was revolted by the brutal suffering of a small heroic nation that was obviously determined to die fighting rather than live in bondage and the great European powers swung their weight behind the Greeks who, at last, obtained for themselves the benefits of freedom, an idea that they gave to the world.

House Concurrent Resolution 17

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD, for the perusal of all Members of Congress, a copy of the house concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa. A copy of this resolution has been furnished the President, Governor Wallace and Sheriff James G. Clark, of Alabama, as well as the Iowa congressional delegation. I would call the attention of the full House to this document. It is a testimonial and heartfelt recognition by all Iowans of a great and just effort to secure for all Americans that most sacred privilege of freedom—the right to vote.

Moreover, the resolution is a protest by the people and State of Iowa against the cruel and violent denial of the right of petition by a group of Americans. No argument, however impassioned, can justify the callous disregard of the first amendment in the cruel suppression of a small group of American citizens to protest what is felt to be an injustice. This thwarting of an effort to bring forth grievance to governmental leaders cannot be condoned. It was denial of these very basic rights that flowered the American Revolution for independence.

Mr. Speaker, Iowa was a free territory before entering the Union. She was admitted a free State in 1846. Her motto has been "Our Liberties We Prize and Our Rights We Will Maintain." Mr. Speaker, that the State and people of Iowa wish to see the great blessing of liberty and human rights fall on all Americans is exceedingly well expressed in House Concurrent Resolution 17 of the general assembly. I commend it to the reading of all Members of the Congress, especially the truth of those words: "the loss of civil rights of any man of any race, color or creed diminishes and corrodes the freedom of all citizens of these United States."

The resolution follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17

Whereas citizens of the United States in peaceful assembly have been the victims of physical brutality, scourged with night sticks, tear gas, and whips, to enforce Governor Wallace's ban against a protest march from Selma to Montgomery, Ala.; and

Whereas at least 35 men and women suffering from the effects of this horrendous police brutality are now hospitalized; and

Whereas this march was organized to call the attention of the citizens of these United States to the denial of their rights to register to vote: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That we deem it necessary that this 61st general assembly support the President of these United States in using his rightful and just power to protect the right to peaceful assembly and demonstration; to curb the exercise of unlawful police power; to enjoin the Governor of Alabama to comply with the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964; to restore the rights of those Alabama citizens now denied these rights; to urge Alabama's Governor to use all due haste to conform to democratic principles inherent in the Constitution of the United States; to allow all citizens of Alabama to exercise their just and lawful franchise by due process of registration; to protect the rights, life, and property of those who are endangered while acting in a peaceful manner to enjoin the restoration of these rights; be it further

Resolved, That we recognize that the loss of civil rights of any man of any race, color, or creed diminishes and corrodes the freedom of all citizens of these United States; now therefore; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, to Governor Wallace and Sheriff James G. Clark, of Alabama, to Iowa Senators BOURKE HICKENLOOPER and JACK MILLER, and to Representatives SCHMIDHOUSER, CULVER, GROSS, BANDSTRA, SMITH, GREIGO, and HANSEN.

WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.
VINCENT B. STEFFEN,
Speaker of the House.

Congressman Colmer's Foresight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I should like to place in the RECORD a newspaper article from the Clarion-Ledger published at Jackson, Miss., on February 2, 1965, that brings clearly to our attention the astuteness and foresight of one of our colleagues whose dominant trait, I would say, is that of modesty.

The distinguished gentleman from Mississippi to whom I have reference, the Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER, it is now revealed, became convinced many years ago that the United States should use a firm policy toward Russia, a conviction that has been amply borne out by developments in more recent times. It is quite ironic, I think, that the revelation herein contained concerns a mysterious development involving the late Sir Winston Churchill.

Those of us who recall the fighting "Iron Curtain" speech made by Sir Winston at Fulton, Mo., in February 1946, often wondered why this address, one of the most important and outstanding of all those which originated with this great statesman, should have been delivered in a relatively small and obscure town in the Midwest rather than in Washington or at some other place recognized as a world center.

In an interview with Mary Ann Pardue of the editorial staff of the Clarion-Ledger, Congressman COLMER has given us the answer. He relates that, when he returned from an official visit overseas at the end of World War II, he recommended a get-tough policy with Russia, but the State Department turned him down, maintaining the time was not right. Subsequently, when they dined together in Florida, he found a receptive ear in Sir Winston, who responded by mentioning that he had a speech along that line that he would like to make before a joint session of the House and Senate. The State Department advised against his making it before Congress for fear it would anger the laborite government under Clement Atlee, who had succeeded Churchill.

I commend Congressman COLMER for making these facts public. I consider them an important contribution to the history that has taken place in the United States and elsewhere since World War II. The interview, as published, follows:

COLMER REPORTS CHURCHILL'S PROPOSED SPEECH VETOED

(By Mary Ann Pardue)

WASHINGTON, February 2, 1965.—The late Sir Winston Churchill's famous "Iron Curtain" speech delivered in Fulton, Mo., the year following the termination of World War II, was drafted for presentation before a joint session of Congress, the dean of the Mississippi congressional delegation revealed Saturday.

Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER said Churchill expressed a desire to address Congress when the two met in Miami, Fla., in February of 1946—a matter of days before Sir Winston spoke in Fulton on March 6 of that year.

SPEECH VETOED

In an exclusive interview, COLMER said Churchill's speech before Congress was vetoed by the State Department on the grounds that the famed World War II leader was then a private citizen and the department "didn't want to run the risk of offending the Attlee government." (Laborite Clement Attlee succeeded Churchill as Prime Minister in 1945.)

The Mississippian's meeting with Churchill came about as a result of COLMER's heading a special House committee on postwar economic policy and planning. In the late summer of 1945, COLMER and several other members of the committee made a trip abroad to confer with leaders of a number of the allied nations, primarily in the interest of promoting postwar trade.

In Moscow, they met with Premier Joseph Stalin, and in London they conferred with Attlee, whose labor government had just come into power. But they missed seeing Churchill, who, as COLMER expressed it, was

"on the Riviera recovering from his stunning defeat at the polls."

Back in this country, COLMER reported immediately on his committee's findings to President Truman, and recommended a get tough policy with Russia, emphasizing that "the only thing the Communists respect is firmness or force."

COLMER said Truman seemed to agree with this position, but sent him to the State Department where policymakers turned it down, saying the "timing was not right" for the administration to adopt a tough policy toward Russia.

"I think we were right," COLMER told his reporter. "I think subsequent events have proved it."

HEARTY RESPONSE

At any rate, he found a hearty response to his get tough theory when he met with Churchill. Since Sir Winston's views were important to the committee in formulating its report on the foreign situation, the State Department, which sponsored the committee's foreign tour, arranged for Chairman COLMER to interview Mr. Churchill when he visited the United States in the following February 1946. The distinguished Britisher not only granted the interview but invited the Mississippi legislator to dine with him at the Miami home of Colonel Clark, of the Canadian Army, where he was visiting. It turned out to be a very small and intimate party. The only other persons there were Mrs. Churchill, the Churchills' daughter, Sarah, Hore-Belisha, Secretary of War in Churchill's early World War II cabinet, Mrs. Hore-Belisha and the wife of an American general.

During the dinner, which lasted more than 2 hours, COLMER said he "emphasized my conviction about a firm policy in dealing with Russia, and the desirability of getting away from the policy of appeasement."

"I found that Mr. Churchill was very sympathetic toward these views," he added. "As a matter of fact, he said: 'Yes, Roosevelt and I appeased Stalin. We had to.'

"Then, in that typical Churchillian fashion, he kind of shook his finger at me and said: 'How did we know the atomic bomb was going to work? How did we know you wouldn't be called upon to expend the lives of another million of your splendid young men up the beachheads of the mainland of Japan?

" 'Yes we appeased him, but now, by God'—and he came down with his fist on the table—'the time for appeasement has ceased.' "

During the conversation, COLMER said he asked Churchill what assurances the United States and its other allies had that "once Russia obtains the secret of the atomic bomb, she won't pull a sneak Pearl Harbor attack on us?"

"The old warrior thought for a moment," COLMER recalled, and then replied:

" 'The only assurance we have is that they (the Soviets) don't have any assurance that if they drop the bombs on us tonight, we won't drop them in Russia in the morning.' "

COLMER said the inevitable cigars and brandy were passed around after dinner, and during the convivial interlude he complimented Churchill on his wartime speech before a joint session of the House and Senate, terming it a "delightful and inspiring message."

FACE BRIGHTENED

He said Churchill's face brightened up at reference to that congressional speech he made during a visit to the late President Roosevelt, and he told COLMER: "I've got another speech I'd like to make before Congress."

COLMER expressed confidence "it could be arranged," little suspecting that a roadblock on the proposal would be thrown up by the State Department.

After Mr. Churchill escorted Mr. COLMER to the door, his friend and host, Colonel Clark, accompanied the Mississippian to his car. Colonel Clark then said, "The old man was serious about that speech before the Congress. He really has a final message which he desires to deliver to the Congress and the American people." COLMER repeated that he felt it could be arranged; but he would have to clear it with the administration.

On his return to Washington, COLMER advised Speaker Rayburn of Mr. Churchill's desire. The Speaker in turn took the matter up with the President. Rayburn then advised COLMER that the State Department had vetoed the proposition.

COLMER's account of his hitherto unpublicized interview with Churchill will undoubtedly end the speculation that has persisted as to why one of Britian's greatest statesmen selected an obscure midwestern educational institution—Westminister College in Fulton—as the sounding board for one of the most important speeches of his long and distinguished career.

Certainly the content of that speech bears out the context of their dinner conversation, as related by the Mississippian.

Warning of the threat of Soviet Russia, which he said had drawn "an iron curtain" across central Europe, subjecting all the satellite nations behind that barrier to "a very high and increasing measure of control from Moscow," Churchill added:

"From what I have seen of our Russian friends and allies during the war, I am convinced that there is nothing they admire as much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than for military weakness. For that reason, the old doctrine of a balance of power is unsound."

Firearms Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the tragic assassination of President Kennedy has focused the attention of everyone on the ease with which firearms may be obtained in this country. They can be purchased by mail with no questions asked if one has the price.

As might have been expected, the reaction to the assassination has resulted in demands that something be done to bring tighter control over the sale of the weapons. Some of the proposals would practically bar the sale of guns to anyone and, on the other hand, some would not change the current law.

Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, has been a leading spokesman for those who would bring curbs to the sale, shipment and ownership of guns. I am certain that he realizes, however, that a balance must be struck between the regulation of the sale of guns and an individual's constitutional right to bear arms.

This point was very well made in an editorial in the Cape Cod Standard Times on March 17, 1965. I believe that my colleagues will be interested in the points that are made.

The editorial follows:

FIREARMS PROBLEM

In the aftermath of President Kennedy's assassination, there arose a wave of demand for more stringent regulation of the sale and possession of firearms.

Some of the proposals were illogical, while others made considerable sense. In the background, all the while, was the second amendment to the Constitution which guarantees the right of the people to keep and bear arms.

Currently before the U.S. Senate is a bill introduced by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, which would eliminate the importation of junk weapons, including such items as bazookas and flamethrowers, into this country.

In describing his bill, Senator DODD said, "I would like to make it perfectly clear that it is not my intention to impose an outright prohibition on the importation of all firearms, but rather to restrict the importation of those firearms which we have found to be sold mail-order and which end up in the hands of juvenile delinquents and adult criminals."

There appears to be a great deal of merit in sections of Senator DODD's bill and the proposed legislation should receive serious study. On the other side of the coin, there is a segment of opinion that holds that overly stringent regulations would serve only to make it difficult for the law-abiding citizen to own a firearm—for hunting on the Cape, for example—while the criminal, as always, would have a ready supply of firearms.

New York is a case in point. Its Sullivan Act makes it difficult for the average citizen to purchase a handgun, yet it seems to have provided little or no deterrent to the criminal element.

There is a general agreement that something should be done regarding mail-order sales of guns, since it is all too easy for juveniles or criminals to acquire weapons in this way. It also would seem wise to put an end to the sale to private citizens of such weapons as antitank guns, bazookas, flamethrowers and mortars.

It is to be hoped that Senator DODD's bill may be the beginning of legislation that will plug existing loopholes in our gun laws and at the same time maintain the law-abiding individual's constitutional right to bear and keep arms.

Institute on Advances in Biomedical Communication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during the many years that we have been vitally interested in the problems of medical research, we have become increasingly aware of the need for communicating the results of research to other researchers, to the clinician for practical application in the treatment of diseases, and to the lay public.

The problems of communication of research results are numerous and difficult. In fact, it is necessary to do research on the problems in the field of information handling or biomedical communication. Further, it is important that we generate interest in the prob-

lems of biomedical communication and that we support groups already working in the field.

I welcomed the opportunity to speak to such a group on Wednesday, March 10, 1965, as the luncheon speaker on a 4-day institute on advances in biomedical Communication, sponsored jointly by two of Washington's universities, the American University and the George Washington University. Interested groups within the universities who were operating this institute were the center for technology and administration of American University and the biological sciences communication project of the George Washington University. The theme of the institute was "The Diffusion of Information in the Biomedical Sciences." Under leave to extend my remarks I include the program, and the speech I made on this occasion:

INSTITUTE ON ADVANCES IN BIOMEDICAL COMMUNICATION PROGRAM

Theme: The diffusion of information in the biomedical sciences.

Director: Charles W. Shilling, M.D., director, biological sciences communication project, the George Washington University.

MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1965

Registration and coffee.

Opening of the institute.

Welcome by dean for sponsored research, the George Washington University; dean, School of Government and Public Administration, the American University; director of the institute, the George Washington University; director, Center for Technology and Administration, the American University.

Program orientation.

Introduction to the sessions.

Keynote session: Dr. Kenneth V. Thimann, president, the American Institute of Biological Sciences.

Luncheon speaker: Dr. Luther Terry, Surgeon General of the United States.

Session I

"Data Automation at the Veterans' Hospital," Dr. Larry Christianson, Director, Data Processing, Veterans' Administration.

"Computer-based Medical Information Systems—A Survey of Current Projects," Dr. Anne Summerfield, Systems Development Corp.

"The Automated Laboratory," Dr. George Williams, Laboratory of Clinical Pathology, National Institutes of Health.

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1965

Session II

"Information Obtained by Analysis of Serial Literature," Dr. Charles W. Shilling, director, biological sciences communication project, the George Washington University.

"Selective Translation and Wide Distribution," Dr. Raymund Zwemer, director, Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, translation project.

"The ILSE Program," Col. William McIntosh, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Luncheon speaker: "The Dolphin as a Communicator," Dr. John Lilly, Director, Communication Research Institute.

Session III

"Scientific Communication in MEIS," Capt. John DeCoursy, U.S. Navy, Military Entomology Information Service, Department of the Army.

"Diagnosis of Heart Diseases by Computer," Dr. Caesar Caceres, Chief, Instrumentation Field Station, Heart Disease Control Program, National Institutes of Health.

"Cross Discipline Communication Networks," Dr. Quentin Hartwig, Office of Technology Utilization, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"The Information Exchange—An Experiment in Communication," Dr. Errett C. Albritton, National Institutes of Health.

"Thesaurus Development in the Biomedical Sciences," Miss Winifred Sewell, National Library of Medicine.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1965

Session IV

"User Studies and Communication Needs," Dr .William S. Barker, head studies and support section, Office of Science Information Service, National Science Foundation.

"The Citation Index as a Communication Tool," Dr. I. H. Sher, Institute for Scientific Information.

"Scientific Information and the Abstract," Mrs. Phyllis Parkins, biological abstracts.

"A Review of Various Types of Indexes," Dr. Charles W. Shilling, director, biological sciences communication project, the George Washington University.

Luncheon speaker: Representative JOHN C. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

Session V

"Scientific Communication in NASA," Mr. Howard Alloway, Scientific and Technical Information Division, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"Scientific Communication in Science Information Exchange," Dr. Monroe Freeman, director, Science Information Exchange.

"Scientific Communication in the Atomic Energy Commission," Mr. John Sherrod, Chief, Information Services and Systems Branch, Atomic Energy Commission.

"Scientific Communication in the National Referral Center," Mr. Jack Stearns, National Referral Center.

"New System Concepts in Defense Scientific Communication," Mr. Gregory Abdian, Defense Documentation Center.

THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 1965

Session VI

"The Interdisciplinary Conference as a Means of Communication," Dr. Frank Fremont-Smith, New York Academy of Sciences.

"Career Dimensions of a Scientist-Administrator," Dr. James W. Colbert, National Institute for Allergies and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health.

"MIT Technical Information Project," Dr. M. M. Kessler, associate director of libraries, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Luncheon speaker: "The Search for Extraterrestrial Life," Dr. Orr Reynolds, Director, bioscience programs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Session VII

"The Role of the Crtical Review in the Communication Process," Dr. Walter Claus, Division of Biology and Medicine, Atomic Energy Commission.

"Self Adjusting System of Scientific Information Flow," Capt. John C. Busby, S.C., U.S. Navy.

"The Mediars Story," Mr. Scott Adams, deputy director, medical literature analysis and retrieval system, National Library of Medicine.

It is particularly interesting to note the large number of speakers drawn from Federal agencies. In fact, of the 30 different individuals speaking before the institute, there were 17 from various Federal agencies, including Dr. Luther Terry, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

There were 25 full-time attendants at the institute. Many of them were at administrative levels in Federal agencies. Others were from various parts of the country from libraries, research laboratories, and industrial concerns. However, all 25 shared a vital interest in the problems of biomedical communication.

Allen, Benjamin Perry II, Chief, Physical Science Technology, Bureau of Medicine, Food and Drug Administration, Crystal Plaza, Arlington, Va.

Berner, Clifford L., M.D., surgeon, director of research, Methodist Evangelical Hospital, 315 East Broadway, Louisville, Ky.

Erickson, Alan E., staff scientist and chairman, Library Committee, Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology, 222 Maple Avenue, Shrewsbury, Mass.

Fitspatrick, William H., assistant director, Science Information Exchange, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Forbes, Edward J., electronic engineer, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C.

Harley, A. J., Ph. D., senior scientific officer (assigned to mediars retrieval project), national Lending Library for Science and Technology, Boston Spa, Yorkshire, England.

Heenan, William F., information specialist, Battelle Memorial Institute, 505 King Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.

Hill, Yvonne, biological sciences communication project, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Huffer, Mary A., Acting Librarian, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Johnson, Eleanor, Bio-Medical Librarian, Bio-Medical Libraries, University of Chicago, 200 Culver Hall, Chicago, Ill.

Kelly, Ann S., Medical Records Adviser, National Center for Health Statistics, Department, Health, Education, and Welfare, North Building., Room 1743, Washington, D.C.

Kitzes, George, Biological Sciences Administrator, Chief, Physiology Division, Headquarters, Aeromedical Division, AFSC, U.S. Air Force, 6570 Aerospace Medical Research Laboratories, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Kubal, Gene Joyce, Chief, Maintenance Section, Division of Lending, National Agricultural Library, U.S. Department of Agriculture, South Building, Washington, D.C.

Mason, Clarence T., Director, The Carver Research Foundation, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala.

Mehring, Charles W., Administrative Officer, National Agricultural Library, 14th and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C.

Minckler, Tate M., Head, Tissue Pathology Unit, VRRB, National Cancer Institute, U.S. Public Health Service, Bethesda, Md.

Negus, Mildred E., Administrative Analyst, Government of District of Columbia, Department of Public Health, 300 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Nelson, George H., Biological Sciences Administrator, U.S. Army Biological Laboratories, Fort Detrick, Frederick, Md.

Palmer, Ralph L., IBM Fellow, IBM Co., 612 West 115th Street, New York, N.Y.

Pigeon, Robert F., Technical Information Officer, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C.

Sirkis, Joseph A., Rio-Engineer, Office Aviation Medicine, Federal Aviation Agency, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C.

Steinbeck, Herbert D., M.D., Adviser, Medical Information Systems, IBM, 2651 Strang Boulevard, Yorktown Heights, N.Y.

Thorner, Robert M., Chief, Research and Development Division of Chronic Diseases, U.S. Public Health Service, HEW Building, Fourth and Indiana Avenue SW., Washington, D.C.

Weichold, Kathryn E., Technical Information Specialist, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C.

Werner, David J., Graduate Assistant, The Technical Institute, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

"BIOMEDICAL COMMUNICATION: AN OUTSIDER'S VIEWS"—REMARKS OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOHN E. FOGARTY AT INSTITUTE OF ADVANCES IN BIOMEDICAL COMMUNICATION LUNCHEON, GOVERNOR'S HOUSE 8400 WISCONSIN AVENUE, BETHESDA, MD., MARCH 10, 1965

I am honored to be here today to join the discussions of this Institute on Advances in Biomedical Communications. As a member of Congress long interested in the health

needs of this country, I have been personally gratified in the past few years by the successes of our medical research programs, by the increased responsibility shown by Congress in protecting and advancing the health of this Nation, and by the priority being given to proposed legislation designed to bolster both this research and its application to the national health needs. An effective system of biomedical communications is an absolute "must" to the success of any such program, and I am particularly pleased to have this opportunity to examine some aspects of these matters with those who are experts in communication problems.

This Nation is justly proud of its medical research progress. The great epidemic diseases, which once swept over the country leaving behind broad wakes of pain and tragic loss of life, have been brought under control. In the past half century life expectancy has increased by more than 20 years, and, day by day, painstaking research is adding to the sum of our knowledge. These past achievements—and the hope that research holds for the future—make me greatly concerned about anything that threatens to limit further progress in improving the health of our people.

Now, the communications problem poses such a threat. Although this problem has been defined in terms of two major components—among scientists and between the scientists and the practitioners—it seems to me that any such distinction is essentially artificial. As an outsider—as a layman interested in health communications—I believe that all facets of scientific communications are intertwined and must be considered, each in the light of the other. And then I would like to throw out some questions for your consideration, somewhat as I have so often had the pleasure of doing while listening to expert testimony at the yearly Congressional appropriations hearings. I will be much interested in your reaction.

Both the researcher and physician are suffering from the fact that the massive growth of scientific knowledge has clogged our old channels of communication. Like many of our problems today, this one is of rather recent origin. No doubt all of you are familiar with a recent survey which, to me, summed up the problem neatly. It seems that in the 18th century there were only 10 journals to record the research results of the scientific world—and today there are 50,000. Further, it is estimated that by the year 2000 there will be almost 1 million journals in publication. In the 19th century, in order to make possible coverage of the 300 journals they had, abstract journals began to appear. Now there are 300 abstract journals—and journals which abstract abstracts are appearing.

Again—as with so many of today's problems—modern technology provides us with some new means to deal with our problems. After discussions between scientists, educators, physicians and communications people, modern information retrieval systems came into being but have hardly yet come into their own.

One such system, of course, is the medical literature analysis and retrieval system—medlars—which was established a couple of years ago by the National Library of Medicine right up on the Pike. This system, as you know, will permit hundreds of medical research articles to be indexed daily by language, date, title, and subject matter—then be retrieved by the computer in answering questions of individual research installations concerning new publications bearing on their immedate problems. The medlars also has the capacity to compile and print bibliographies of papers currently being published in numerous areas of specialization and research.

Unfortunately, the National Library of Medicine is the only library in the Nation with these capabilities. Therefore, these bibliographies can be provided only upon request to practicing physicians as well as to research scientists. The recent report of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke found the present state of most medical libraries in the United States is lamentable, largely because librarians have not received their due share of the greatly increased attention and funding for research. The Commission warned that unless something was done to improve our national medical library base, our increased growth in sicentific knowledge will become an exercise in futility.

Partly as a result of the recommendations of this Commission I have recently introduced a measuer into the House—identical with a measure introduced in the Senate by my esteemed colleague, Senator HILL—which, I believe, will do much to correct this deplorable situation.

This bill—if enacted—will provide Federal funds to assist in the construction and rehabilitation of medical library facilities, the training of medical librarians, the conduct of research and development in fields of medical library science, the expansion of basic library resources, the development of a national system of regional medical libraries. It will also provide for the support of nonprofit biomedical publication, and for the establishment of branches of the National Library of Medicine in various areas of the Nation.

If enacted, this measure will provide a vitally needed improvement in this Nation's library system. Biomedical research results will for the first time be adequately stored and indexed and an individual scientist in any part of the country will be able to obtain quickly and efficiently both a listing of new articles in his area of research and copies of papers he needs. Physicians, too, can, upon request, obtain comprehensive bibliographies concerning disease conditions they will have seen in their patients.

I am impressed by the magnitude of the job to be done, here, and I am as confident as any of you that much can be done with the electronic devices at our disposal. At the same time I must say that, to me, the retrieval of data is not the most difficult problem in communcations which we face today. There are other problems which seem to me even more basic, and each of them emerges from one primary consideration: the human element. I am convinced that while electronic devices are useful, it is men, working together, utilizing the best brains available, who are really the keys to an ultimate solution of the problem. I would like now to think out loud about some of the problems so dependent on the human element—and to get your reactions and suggestions as to what might be done.

Now I would not want to cast aspersions on the productive scientists of the Nation, but what can be done to assure that what you are retrieving is worth retrieving?

Almost as much has been heard about the publication explosion as about the population explosion. I am sure that this association was in the mind of an editorial writer on the New York Times recently when he suggested that more thought ought to be given to birth control techniques in the field of scientific publication. There is no doubt that the publish-or-perish syndrome causes the publication of papers which have little scientific merit and these papers help glut the retrieval mechanisms and are impossible to differentiate by purely mechanical methods. I have been assured by those competent to judge in various fields that papers have appeared which were rushed into print before the research results actually warranted distribution—and that this is continuing. It is likely to continue unless something is done about it. I know that editors of scientific journals are being urged to raise their standards for publication; I wonder if any members of this group are in a position to add their voices to such urging? I wonder, too, if this group has other practical suggestions to offer—you must have considered this problem—and I would be interested to hear what you think.

Directly related to the question of the quality of the scientific work is the question of whether the paper is well written. Again, I have heard it said that a high proportion of scientific papers are not well written, or not well enough written. If a scientific paper cannot be understood, it should not be published and might as well not be retrieved. What is anyone doing about this?

I know that the American Medical Association—in an unusually forward-looking effort—is doing something on its own about this problem. Two years ago the AMA—in cooperation with the School of Journalism at Northwestern University—began sponsoring a summer institute on medical writing for medical students and physicians. Through this institute (which will be offered again this summer) young scientists are trained to communicate more clearly and are given a greater understanding of the purpose of medical journalism and medical writing.

It is tragic but no doubt true that in the massive number of papers being published today many significant findings are lost because they are so badly presented that they are not properly understood. Why can we not have other and larger efforts to train scientists and physicians to be competent writers?

Yet well-written papers on high quality research—however well indexed and made available to other researchers—will not help the practicing physician who does not have the time to spend in the library. For him, the collection of data alone is not enough. To organize the enormous amount of data produced each year requires talented and scientifically trained medical writers. Such writers are today taking laboratory results—translating and summarizing—putting them in a form so that the practicing physician can read and understand. It is significant that almost without exception, this gap has been filled—not by scientists—but by people with little scientific background but expert at communicating facts and ideas. Thus, a whole new field of publications aimed at the physician has grown up in the last 15 years to help the busy family doctor keep abreast of the latest advances. I wonder if you think enough utilization is being made of this capability in communication? What more might be done?

Let me come back to the scientists in the laboratories of this country. At the heart of the matter is this question: How does the bench scientist find out what his colleagues are doing? I have heard it said that those who talk most about the communications "crisis" are the professional communicators, not the professional scientists. The argument runs that the men who are doing the most exciting work in any field know what their counterparts are doing, through personal correspondence with each other, through personal contacts at national and international meetings, long before any paper is published on the results of research in progress. In 1964 the Nobel Prize was awarded to two scientists working in the same research area although they were geographically half a world apart. It is a fair assumption that these two did not work in ignorance of each other's latest findings, nor did they wait for a new contribution to the literature to learn what the other had done. I am fairly certain, too, that the men who are today opening up the new genetics are well aware of what their colleagues are doing, whether they are in London, New York City,

Chicago, or at the National Institutes of Health here in Bethesda.

This leads me to one last question: Has any survey been made to determine how the laboratory scientist feels about the communications "crisis"? Have numerous surveys determined that these men who are working on the frontiers of the unknown think it is essential that they see every possible piece of relevant data, if they are to be successful? Do they fear that they are not now as aware of all the related work as they need to be? I don't know the answers to these questions, but there are probably answers—and good ones—that you can provide to me, in the course of this Institute.

During my 18 years of service on the House subcommittee which reviews Federal health expenditures I have exerted every effort to enhance this Nation's efforts in the medical research. I have heard some doubts raised concerning the long-range effect of the information retrieval effort. Surely any system of biomedical communication must evolve to advance research, not to stifle it. Perhaps I can illustrate this concern with an example once told to me by an able and well-known scientific administrator.

It seems that there were two laboratories, each headed by equally able scientists. In one laboratory the assistants—when they came up with an idea—were told to go to the library and thoroughly search the literature before beginning a project. In the other laboratory the assistants were instructed to plan their projects and proceed with research, allowing only minimal time for literature searching. The first laboratory, I am told, never duplicated any research, but it was the other laboratory that made outstanding research contributions.

To me, the moral of this story is that it may be just as well for a scientist not to know that what he is attempting has been attempted before and was found to be impossible—because he may attempt it and do the "impossible." I do not believe that first-rate scientists will ever be discouraged from this by whatever they may read—but others, who may have considerable potential for making discoveries, may be discouraged at a very critical point in their careers. I am concerned that this might happen, and I cannot help wondering if those of you here have given some thought to the possible eventual optimum size of all information retrieval operations? And have you considered possible inherent defects in the wide-ranging systems you are conceiving today for use tomorrow and the day after tomorrow?

I have spoken straightforwardly, here, this afternoon. The fact is that—on topics that directly concern the medical research progress of this Nation and the health of its people—I feel strongly. I believe that you will realize that I am a most friendly critic of your endeavors—I am asking for information to answer both your critics and to provide myself with a firmer basis upon which to stand when others raise these questions in my presence. I am seeking information. I can think of no better opportunity to get it than now. You are specialists in communications and its many aspects, and I am sure that you—for your part—will welcome this opportunity to educate me.

I want to thank you for sharing your platform with me today. And I want to assure you that I stand ready to do anything in my power to help assure that the recent great strides made in biomedical research will not be negated or even attenuated by faulty communications.

James Reeb: Eulogy for a Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Reverend James Reeb in Selma, Ala., has brought grief to all of us.

We can do nothing but admire his dedication to the cause of human rights, and mourn the necessity of his martyrdom.

Mr. Frank L. Bowron, a close friend of Mr. Reeb's from high school and a Casper, Wyo., attorney, gave one of the eulogies at a memorial service in his home city.

Mr. Bowron is a layman; he spoke with the sensitivity of a man deeply moved by the faith which proclaims that we are our brother's keeper.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD Frank Bowron's eulogy for the late James Reeb:

EULOGY TO REV. JAMES J. REEB, MARCH 14, 1965

(NOTE.—On March 14, 1965, Casper, Wyo., the hometown of Rev. James J. Reeb, held a memorial tribute to the minister who died at Selma, Ala. Three men who had graduated with Reverend Reeb in the Casper high school class of 1945 spoke. They were Casper's mayor, Patrick H. Meenan, Dr. Joseph Murphy, Casper physician, and Frank L. Bowron, Casper attorney. The following is Mr. Bowron's eulogy to his late friend:)

"Friday evening, after I had accepted Reverend Koopman's invitation to speak here today, I was in a restaurant having a cup of coffee when I heard a woman at the next table talking about the murder of Jim Reeb.

"Why did he go down there anyway," she said. "He had no business getting involved."

This, then, is the question I want to try to answer this afternoon * * * and at the same time attempt to tell you something about Jim Reeb.

Jim Reeb and I went through high school together, belonging to the same church and attended the same Sunday school class. He was a sensitive boy and intensely idealistic.

There was a war and he was not old enough to go * * * but he watched the fathers and mothers of his town endure the pain of losing sons * * * sons dying for the cause of freedom. And he learned that these parents * * * and these sons * * * if they were asked to repeat that sacrifice, would say: "Yes, I would do it again."

There was a teacher in high school * * * a dedicated woman of intelligence and vigor, who instilled in him a strong feeling for honesty and justice * * * and who by her dedication to teaching made an example of her very life of helping others. And if you asked her today: "Would you give these principles to Jim Reeb, if you had it to do over again?"

She would say: "Yes, I would do it again."

There was a minister in our church, who through those years, with infinite patience and dedication, encouraged Jim Reeb to choose the ministry as his career * * * and who by his own sacrifice and love, set before Jim an example of what such ministry can mean. And if we could ask that man today if he would do this again, * * * he would say: "Yes, I would do it again."

There was a succession of Sunday school teachers * * * all of them sincere Christian men and women, who taught Jim Reeb the message of love for his fellow men and love for God * * * and each of these, if you asked them today:

"If you had it to do over again, would you guide Jim Reeb by these teachings?"

Each would answer "Yes, I would do it again."

There are his parents, who taught him their own standards of honor and decency, love, and respect, * * * and who guided him by the same code by which they have lived. And if you asked them today if they would do that again, they would have to answer: "Yes, I would do it again."

And there is a wife, whose qualities of understanding and compassion, and whose courage matched his own, and who could say to him: "Do what you feel you must, * * * do what you know is right."

And no greater demonstration of their union could be found than when that wife was asked * * * during the vigil in Birmingham, whether Jim Reeb would go back to Selma if he had to do it over again * * * and she answered without pause or hesitation * * * for Jim: "Yes, I would do it again."

Jim Reeb was taught, right here in Casper, Wyo., that his going to Selma was the right thing * * * the decent thing * * * the Christian thing—to do. And it is because he accepted our teaching, and believed our truths and adopted our principles * * * it is because we helped shape his tragic destiny, that Casper, Wyo., must share this shame of Selma, Ala.

Our guilt was expressed by the woman in the restaurant when she said: "He had no business getting involved."

That woman spoke for millions of Americans whose creed has been: "I don't want to get involved * * * let them solve their own problems."

Today, most of these voices are silent * * * struck dumb by the human sacrifice of Jim Reeb on the altar of bigotry and hate.

But tomorrow, they will begin again:

"We don't have the problem here * * * I don't want to get involved." And soon, it will resolve itself again into that simple ageless answer that Cain gave the Lord: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

How appropriate to this moment is the answer of the Lord:

"What have you done? The voice of your brother's blood cries to me from the ground."

Today * * * all America is standing trial for the murder of James Reeb.

Today, by the murder of James Reeb, the mark of Cain is written across the face of the Nation.

If we fail Jim Reeb at this moment, we forfeit our highest aspirations to truth and honor and love.

If we fail Jim Reeb, we forsake all that is noble in our lives and we profane our hopes for our children.

If we fail Jim Reeb, may God have mercy on our souls.

Child Beating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the 88th Congress I introduced legisla-

tion to require the mandatory reporting to the police by doctors and others of child-abuse cases which come to their attention.

In the 89th Congress, I sponsored H.R. 3394, the District Commissioners' proposal, referred to in the following WMAL editorial which was broadcast during the week of March 7, 1965. I hope that we can enact this bill during the present session.

The article follows:

CHILD BEATING

Efforts to insure adequate protection against physical abuse to children in the District must continue until effective legislation is enacted. Meanwhile, District service organizations have developed new ways to help provide care for some of the children who are physically abused.

When a welfare worker finds a child that has been mistreated or grossly neglected, the child is removed from the home immediately. The child is referred to the Woman's Bureau of the Police Department. This affords temporary protection.

But there are other considerations. Doctors must have legal immunity when they file a report on a suspected child-abuse case. And not all battered children are from welfare or low-income families. These children must be protected as well.

The Commissioners prepared a bill to guard against physical abuse of children in the District. It's time Congress enacted an effective law.

Prayer of the Reverend Mr. Paul I. Nussle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Mr. Paul I. Nussle, Pastor of St. Ansgar's Lutheran Church of Salinas, Calif., was to have opened the meeting of the Senate today. Unforeseen circumstances prevented the Senate from hearing his prayer, which I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD for today:

Almighty God, Prince of Peace, who in our beloved Nation hast established the people to be ministers of Thy just ordinances: so turn our hearts and minds to Thee this day that we may be tools in the hands of your master craftsmanship.

As we bow our heads, we look down and see only miserable feet of clay which remind us we walk in these majestic halls but a few days. When we would move boldly with conviction, keep our feet from being mired in quicksands of prejudice. Lead us from the excuse of caution when we would drag our feet, and from the excuse of zeal when we would plunge foolishly without thought for Thy will. These feet of clay do walk in a discordant world, mould them to be instruments for bringing Thy Kingdom to men; and when these feet of clay are a hindrance to the accomplishment of Thy will, move our hearts that we might move ourselves out of the way so that Thy love will flow through this great Chamber to the cities and rural areas of our land.

In the words of the prayer of my church: give to all men the mind of Christ, and dispose our days in Thy peace, O God. Take from us all hatred and prejudices, and whatever may hinder unity of spirit and concord.

Hear us in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

—PAUL I. NUSSLE.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Supreme Court Salaries

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, a lively House debate was touched off last week on a bill to equalize the salaries of the Supreme Court Justices by raising them the $3,000 a year which was cut out of overall salary increases last year. In these times, the mere mention of the Supreme Court is enough to spark a controversy.

When Congress raised salaries last year, the Senate chopped $3,000 off the $7,500 raises each Justice was to receive. This year it was up to the House to restore the full raises for the Court.

However, Congressmen critical of the Court took advantage of the debate to level a barrage of comment before turning down the pay raise.

There is no doubt that the High Court's decisions may not always make everybody happy. But I feel that the Justices should not be penalized on something as petty as a pay raise for what some others feel have been its injustices. Representative EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, told the House:

> I did not know when the bill was to be brought up that we would have a sort of field day of criticism against our highest Court.

And a field day it was. My own feeling is that whether or not I agree or disagree with the Supreme Court, I will always fight to preserve its independence as an equal arm of the Government. The Court will always be with us, regardless of its decisions and their popularity and regardless of salaries.

It is a shame that the pay raise for which I voted was the victim of Congressional pique. I feel that this was a backhanded way to get back at the justices.

Speaking of civil rights and the Supreme Court brings me to a brief discussion of President Johnson's speech on voting rights. The President demonstrated in his speech that he can be an eloquent speaker, that he can truly lead the country along the path to equality for all—the path to the Great Society.

His moving speech was a fine example of how a politician with high ideas can carry them to the Congress and the country in a message that may stand in history with the others made by Presidents who met moments of courage.

I have always supported the constitutional right of every American to vote and shall continue to do so. It is unfortunate that the lawlessness of some of the extremists on both sides make it difficulty for all the people who believe in constitutional government to move ahead with a program to insure these rights.

You will recall that my bill for construction of a working model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin was referred to the Committee on Public Works for action. At the same time, I asked Chairman GEORGE FALLON, of Baltimore, for early hearings.

Last week Mr. FALLON sent me a very encouraging letter about this much-needed project for Maryland. Representative FALLON wrote:

> The investigation and study that you contemplate of the Chesapeake Bay Basin is of genuine interest to me, and you can be sure it is my hope to get quick action from the legislation.

Three notes about my staff:

Miss Gene Miller, who many of you have known for years, is now Mrs. Gene Hollis. She and Ed Hollis of the State Department of Chesapeake Bay Affairs tied the nuptial knot last week. Gene is serving me as executive secretary, as she did for my predecessor, Richard Lankford, of Annapolis. I wish Gene and Ed the best of luck.

My district representative, Silas Dennis, of Hyattsville, has resigned as chief of the Hyattsville Police Department. He started with me in January, taking leave from the department. He is now a permanent member of my staff.

Also, Carol Bodiford, of Suitland, has joined my staff as a secretary.

These staff members—as do all of them—stand ready and willing to serve you.

Legislation To Save Passenger Train Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. I rise in support for my bill, H.R. 6471, which I introduced last March 18, 1965, which would amend section 13(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the discontinuance or curtailment of passenger train operations or ferry services. I sincerely believe that the prompt enactment of this legislation is essential to save passenger train service in this Nation. Moreover, I am convinced that we simply must save railroad passenger services, and improve and expand them, unless our Nation is to have a completely congested highway system, and even dangerously overpacked airspace, only a decade or so hence.

The section of the Interstate Commerce Act which my bill would amend was enacted hastily in the closing days of the 2d session of the 85th Congress as part of the Transportation Act of 1958. This measure was regarded as emergency legislation intended to save the railroads from the alleged bankruptcy their spokesman had assured us was then facing the industry. Since that time, however, the railroads, instead of declining, have enjoyed some of the most profitable years in their history, but their higher profits, instead of bringing improved service to the general public as the Congress had the right to expect would be the case in exchange for the substantial aid it voted, have been accompanied with widespread service cutbacks and the discontinuance and downgrading of literally hundreds of passenger trains.

Section 13(a) under which the great decline in passenger train operations has taken place, has been characterized by one Federal court of appeals judge as a "strange, dismaying law—concerning which—one thing is certain; namely, that the public was ignored in—its—formulation." The first Federal court which considered this legislation not only found that it was a direct delegation to the railroad industry of authority to discontinue interstate passenger train services, but also that it was a clear invitation for such action.

The legislative history of section 13a, in my opinion, makes clear that Congress never intended by its action to enact legislation which would encourage the destruction of the passenger train. Rather, the whole purpose of the Transportation Act of 1958—which also contained many other provisions of great help to the railroad industry—was to do all that then seemed feasible to save, not destroy, railroad transportation in this country. Section 13a was enacted to provide a means of relief for those railroads which claimed that they had been unfairly treated by the denial of State railroad commissions of permission to abandon passenger services on which they allegedly were suffering heavy losses. The section was intended only to provide a means for the discontinuance of trains for which there was obviously no longer a need, and the record makes clear that Congress did not have in mind the abandonment of well-patronized and profitable trains like some of those which have been discontinued by the railroads under this provision.

Since the passage of this legislation, the railroads have discontinued literally hundreds of trains through the application of section 13a, whether justified or not. Experience has shown that the interests of the general public in passenger train services have not been adequately protected in these discontinuances.

Many have been abandoned without even the holding of a public hearing, and when such hearings have been held, the burden of proof that continuance of the train would not be an undue burden on interstate commerce has fallen upon the protesting public, which simply does not have access to the financial and other information needed to prepare an adequate case. Moreover, the present law is unfair in that it denies the public the right of appeal to the courts while at the same time granting this right to the railroads.

Section 13(a) is so loosely written that it actually permits the railroads, on their own initiative, to discontinue any passenger train, including those on which they are making a profit, by the mere posting of a notice. Unless the carrier files an application and unless the Interstate Commerce Commission intervenes, that train is automatically eliminated. The present law also places further unfair restrictions on the public and the ICC by requiring the Commission to render a final order in each case within 4 months of the original discontinuance date set by the railroads or else the operation of the interstate train or trains ceases automatically. This arbitrary and unreasonable time limitation deprives the public of adequate time to prepare its case and has required the Commission to shortcut its customary and well-established administrative procedures. Finally, even though the ICC may order a railroad to continue the operation of a train or trains for a period of 1 year, it completely lacks authority over the quality of the service provided during this period. The result is that railroads can, and have, deliberately cut back the service on such trains, through such actions as eliminating mail, dining cars, parlor and lounge cars and sleeping accommodations, so that customers are driven away and the railroads can show greater losses on the trains when they again announce their intent to abandon them a year later.

My bill, H.R. 6471, is intended to reverse this process and put the burden of proof upon the carrier's applicants where it belongs. Under this proposed legislation, carriers seeking to discontinue or change interstate passenger services would be required to apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission for authorization. The Commission would be required to hold public hearings and would be required to notify the Governors of the States at least 30 days in advance of such hearings. Before service could be discontinued or reduced, the Commission would be required to issue a certificate of findings that, first, public convenience and necessity require the change, in whole or in part, and that second, to continue the train or ferry operations without change would "constitute an unjust and undue burden upon the interstate operations" involved. The Commission also would be given authority to attach its own requirements as to the conditions, or terms, it finds needed for public convenience and necessity, including conditions for the protection of the interests of the employees adversely affected which are customarily imposed in other railroad abandonments. Provision also would be made for enjoining and punishing any railroad undertaking to make changes in service without compliance with the certification and hearing procedures.

Surely these amendments to section 13a are clearly in the public interest. They will put the burden of proof that passenger trains no longer are needed upon the carriers, where it properly belongs, but at the same time they will carry out the true intent of the Congress when it enacted section 13a by preserving a means whereby the carriers may circumvent grossly unfair decisions by the State commissions. The effect will be to give the Interstate Commerce Commission the power it now lacks but greatly needs to make certain that action to discontinue or change passenger train service is only taken in the public interest, and with the future and present needs of our Nation for such services clearly in mind.

Craven Shuttleworth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, countless people in Iowa and throughout the Nation felt a sense of deep sorrow and great personal loss with the recent death of one of our State's outstanding men, Craven Shuttleworth. He was a widely admired and respected citizen of Cedar Rapids for 40 years where his proud achievements earned for him an acknowledged position as leader both of the bar and of the community he served so well.

Craven Shuttleworth retained throughout his life that same spirit and dedication to excellence which characterized his play as one of the State University of Iowa's early all-American football players on one of his school's finest teams. At the same time he developed a gentle nature and devotion to the highest principles which endeared him to many friends and associates.

Craven Shuttleworth was long recognized throughout Iowa as a man of warmth, dignity, and unsurpassed loyalty. By the same token he shall long be remembered for using his many talents to contribute so richly to his university, his community, his profession, and most importantly to all those fortunate enough to know him and work with him. With his passing, each felt the profound loss of a great and true friend.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to enter into the RECORD a fitting editorial tribute paid Mr. Shuttleworth by the Cedar Rapids Gazette on March 11, 1965:

CRAVEN SHUTTLEWORTH

Even though he had been fighting health problems for many months, Craven Shuttleworth's quiet determination not to let them dampen his irrepressible spirit and kindly manner made his death a shock to his friends, of whom few men in this community had more.

He maintained his normal activities almost to the last under difficulties that would have discouraged most others. Throughout his life he lived by a philosophy—and a fine one—whether or not he expressed it to himself or anybody else in words. As a professional man and a responsible citizen he exemplified the clean, hard-hitting but considerate sportsmanship which typified his performance as an outstanding athlete in his undergraduate days at the University of Iowa. He was the kind of man you like to have, and are proud to have, on your side.

CCC Depresses Farmers Wheat Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, the Department of Agriculture announced that the Commodity Credit Corporation is suspending sales of its storage wheat for domestic unrestricted use for the time being. The reason given for this is that stocks now in producers hands or in commercial channels are sufficient to meet needs. I would say that they are probably the last people in the farm industry to realize this. For months I have urged the CCC to discontinue its practice of dumping products on the market at the ceiling price of 105 percent of the loan price. The effects of this practice can be readily shown in my own State of Minnesota where in 1964, while wheat production was down 2 percent, the total cash receipts, including Government payments, was down 18 percent from the 1963 figure.

At what level, then, Mr. Speaker, will the CCC resume its domestic sales? According to the March 19 announcement, the date of resumption would be "when and if it appears desirable to provide adequate supplies for market needs at reasonable and stable prices." The trouble is that the farmer will have no say in determining these "reasonable and stable prices."

Mr. Speaker, this point was very well made on the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association Daily Radio Roundup of March 22, 1965. I believe my colleagues would be interested in that report.

The report follows:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture announced last Friday that it has suspended the sale of storable wheat for domestic unrestricted use until further notice.

Apparently CCC will continue to sell wheat that is to be exported and, of course, will meet food-for-peace requirements under Public Law 480. It appears, too, that wheat in danger of going out of condition will be sold. But for the time being, CCC will not be competing with farmers and their cooperatives and others in the domestic market. The mills and other wheat processors will have to go out into the market to buy their wheat instead of relying on Government sales. Actually, domestic sales of Hard

Red Spring wheat were halted some time ago. Now other wheats have been taken off the counter.

According to the last report we've seen, the Commodity Credit Corporation on March 5 owned slightly more than 596 million bushels of wheat. That would be the Government-held reserve that it controls. Other wheat around the country is privately owned by farmers, millers, marketing organizations, and so forth. Government wheat from the 1960 and 1961 crops that has been resealed is being called, and elevators are getting loading orders.

When will Commodity Credit Corporation be back in the domestic market with its wheat? Perhaps not even CCC knows. According to its announcement, the door is wide open. Here, word for word, is what CCC said Friday: "Sales will be resumed when and if it appears desirable to provide adequate supplies for market needs and reasonable and stable prices."

That can mean most anything. Always in the past it has meant that the CCC ceiling price of 105 percent of loan value is clamped on when market prices begin to bump that ceiling. The ceiling price makes the market price.

What are "reasonable and stable" prices for wheat? Ask a farmer and you might find that a "reasonable and stable" price for wheat should be $2.50 a bushel, which is the parity price. And that farmer will be talking about the on-the-farm price—what he gets when he sells. Commodity Credit's 105 percent of loan ceiling, on the average, is $1.37 a bushel to the farmer. Is that a "reasonable and stable" price?

There's a big difference between $2.50 a bushel for wheat and $1.37. Perhaps the decision as to what price is "reasonable and stable" ought to be left to those who know the most about producing wheat, the farmers themselves. They are intimately acquainted with what it costs to run farms and pay taxes and buy supplies and repair machinery.

Largely as the result of strenuous efforts by GTA's M. W. Thatcher, there is a strong national effort to convince the Government that CCC's resale price ceiling ought to be raised. It should be considerably higher than 105 percent of loan. It should be at least 115 percent. It should be at least 115 percent when CCC reenters the domestic market with its wheat.

The agricultural community is waiting to see what the new farm bill will say about this resale price on grain.

A Bill To Permit the Transmission of Lottery Tickets in the U.S. Mails When Mailed in a State Where Lotteries Are Legal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to permit and allow the transmission in the U.S. mails of lottery tickets mailed in a State where lotteries are legal and proper.

My purpose in introducing this measure is to facilitate the distribution via of the mails of New Hampshire sweepstakes tickets. Obviously, these tickets are going through the mails because they are getting tremendous circulation. Last year, only 13 percent of the winners were New Hampshire residents. Clearly, the tickets just did not pick themselves up and fly all over the world.

As is frequently the case in connection with gambling, the Federal Government is doing no more than managing to make itself look hypocritically absurd. To the best of my knowledge, no one is getting in any trouble for the instances of ticket mailing I am sure have occurred, but why not make the law reflect commonsense? Not that most of our gambling laws do.

I urge the Congress to take this chance to remove restrictions against mailing of lottery tickets so long as the lottery ticket is mailed in a State where the conduct of such lotteries is legal.

VFW Supports President's Strong Action in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as Members of this House are aware, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is one of the most alert and active forces in our country in supporting policies affecting our Nation's fight for survival against worldwide Communist aggression.

An example of what the VFW has done for our country in this respect is the manner in which it sensed the importance of standing fast in South Vietnam. Long before South Vietnam became the critical battleground it now is, the VFW repeatedly warned against concessions in Laos.

With respect to the war in South Vietnam, the VFW has consistently supported a resolute and determined stand by the United States, and has performed a historic service to our Nation in helping rally national support for the strong position which President Johnson has taken against Communist aggressors from the north.

I invite the attention of Members of this House to a statement issued as a press release on March 17, 1965, by the national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. John A. Jenkins, of Birmingham, Ala., setting forth the VFW's full support of President Johnson's strong Vietnamese policy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is noteworthy that Commander Jenkins—who is a good friend of many in this House—points out that the VFW's position in this matter is based upon a resolution unanimously passed by the thousands of delegates to the VFW national convention in Cleveland, last August, and that this position was reiterated and reemphasized only 2 weeks ago by a resolution of the VFW National Security Committee, meeting in Washington in conjunction with the VFW Conference of National Officers and Department Commanders.

Commander Jenkins states very clearly why we must take strong action against communism in southeast Asia. In particular, I invite attention to the portion of Commander Jenkins' statement in which he explains why demands for negotiation under present circumstances really amount to a plea for surrender by the United States and, also, how these advocates of negotiation are undermining the efforts of our troops and our South Vietnamese allies in the bitter and deadly war now in progress in South Vietnam.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement by VFW Commander in Chief Jenkins:

VFW SUPPORTS PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S VIETNAM POLICY

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 17, 1965.—The national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. John A. Jenkins, Birmingham, Ala., today said that the VFW "fully supports President Johnson's strong actions against North Vietnam." Commander Jenkins said that the President's decision to strike at Communist aggressors from the north was in full accord with the longtime views of the VFW, which, at its 1964 convention in Cleveland, in August, unanimously adopted a resolution "calling for whatever action is necessary to win in South Vietnam."

The VFW commander said that the organization's National and State officials, and committee members, meeting in Washington last week enthusiastically endorsed the U.S. Government's decision to "deal with the Communist aggressors in the only language they understand—military power."

Continuing, Commander Jenkins said, "the VFW, consisting of 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans, fully understands that our Nation has no choice but to take a resolute stand against Communist aggression. The VFW reiterates its support of President Johnson's actions in Vietnam, and, at the same time, we deplore the calls of the faint-hearted for negotiation. As things now stand, all that is necessary to bring peace in South Vietnam is for the Communist aggressors to abide by their solemn agreements of 1954 and 1962."

Continuing, Commander Jenkins said: "The VFW is well aware that Peiping and Moscow are conducting a coldly calculated drive for all of southeast Asia. If we do not stand in Vietnam, we inevitably will have to make a stand under less favorable conditions somewhere else—and that means American fighting men will be losing their lives because we would have lost the advantage of our position in strategic South Vietnam.

"There is another thing," Commander Jenkins emphasized, "about negotiating and doing business with the Communist aggressors. It's this: We in this country may well realize that those who want to hoist the surrender flag through negotiations speak only for themselves, and a few others who share their timid attitude. Unfortunately, to the people of South Vietnam these calls for negotiation and withdrawal make it appear that there is widespread lack of support for our President in his fight against communism.

"Furthermore," Commander Jenkins said, "the VFW believes U.S. fighting men, who are now in a shooting war, should have the full backing of their country, and should not have to be subjected to the gunfire of the enemy and the sniping of critics in their own country."

Concluding, Commander Jenkins said: "The United States and the free world must face up to the fact that we are in a war in southeast Asia. The stakes are high and

involve not only the freedom of brave people in that area, but also the security of the United States itself. If we were to lose South Vietnam, we would inevitably be facing Communist aggression off the Pacific shores of the United States."

VA Versus Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed and shocked to read the contents of an editorial in the March 16 issue of the Washington Daily News. My shock and amazement stems from the fact that this editorial contains both factual errors and inaccurate inferences. The editorial, entitled, "VA Versus Politicians," follows:

VA VERSUS POLITICIANS

Suppose you were operating a business which cost you nearly $4 per day more for each customer than the national average. Or which had more than three times the annual upkeep cost of similar businesses. Or which was forced by circumstances to offer poor service.

Under such conditions, you hardly could be blamed if you decided to close your shop and move to a less costly, more convenient location. And the last thing you'd expect would be to find your decision a target of loud complaints by politicians.

Yet that is precisely the situation in which the Veterans' Administration finds itself as it seeks to close some of its hospitals and shift patients to newer and better ones. The very suggestion has brought howls of wrath from Members of Congress.

New York Senator Robert F. Kennedy, for instance, objects to the projected closing of the hospital at Sunmount, N.Y., in the Adirondack Mountains. He seems to think its closing would be an inconvenience to patients.

The fact is, as the VA has pointed out, that nearly half of Sunmount's patients come from more than 200 miles away. Recruiting of professional staff is difficult. Patients in need of highly skilled treatment must be transferred elsewhere. About the only people who stand to gain by Senator Kennedy's objection are the townspeople in Sunmount, who presumably are potential Kennedy voters.

Or take the VA hospital at Miles City, Mont., which has come under the protective wing of Democratic Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD. Because of its isolation and low patient load, the daily cost per patient at Miles City is $32.27 compared with a national average of $28.38. Staffers have had to be transferred from as far away as Minneapolis.

Another hospital the VA wants to close, at Brecksville, Ohio, has an annual upkeep cost three and a half times the national average and a cost per patient treated six times higher than average.

VA advisers concede that some of these hospitals are closer to the homes of some veterans than the new, modern medical centers which would replace them. But they ask: "When you need medical care, would you rather have quality or convenience?"

The answer is that veterans could get more of both if the politicians would only let them.

I would be the first to concede that the Veterans' Administration hospital at Sunmount, N.Y., should be closed if the facts relating to that splendid facility were as reported in the News editorial. Assuming that the Sunmount VA hospital is the hypothetical business referred to in the article, I am constrained to point out that the cost per day to operate the hospital at Sunmount, N.Y., is $29.01. The national average for similar Veterans' Administration hospitals is $29.43. Patients presently served by the Sunmount hospital will be forced to obtain their medical care and treatment in hospitals more than 150 miles away. Three hospitals have been designated to receive future patients who would have been formerly served at the Sunmount family. Two of these have a per diem cost in excess of the per diem cost at Sunmount. The average of the three is $30.64.

By any stretch of the imagination, could this be termed "less costly" to the Government or "more convenient" to the veteran population? The editorial erroneously cites as fact the allegation that "nearly half of Sunmount's patients come from more than 200 miles away. Recruiting of professional staff is difficult. Patients in need of highly skilled treatment must be transferred elsewhere." The fact is that more than 85 percent of the Sunmount admissions are from the 10-county area which the Veterans' Administration central office has designated as the Sunmount service area. None of these counties are 200 miles from Sunmount. During 1964, there were 1,304 new admissions to this hospital and only 71 of these were transferred from some other VA hospitals.

At the present time there is only one vacancy on the hospital staff, that of a psychiatrist. The hospital, however, has the services of four consultant psychiatrists. During the past 4 years, 20 applications for professional staff positions at Sunmount have been rejected because there was no vacancy on the staff.

Of the 1,304 admissions during 1964, only 47 were transferred to other hospitals, and 4 of these were for personal reasons. The remainder required cobalt therapy, open-heart surgery and similar unusual medical procedures which are not normally available in the average hospital.

Perhaps the Washington Daily News should look with its jaundiced eye at the other side of the ledger and question the propriety of abandoning this splendid multimillion-dollar plant which was completely renovated and modernized since 1952 at a cost of between $2½ and $3 million. Perhaps the News should take another look at the economy involved in the closing of a hospital which has been evaluated in the words of the chief engineer as follows:

The present condition of buildings, both structurally and in regard to overall condition, is considered to be equivalent to installations not over 15 years old.

Perhaps the Washington Daily News should examine the inconsistencies in the policy of the present administration which, on the one hand, creates a poverty stricken area by closing this VA hospital and depriving the community of 45 percent of its total income from wages, while, on the other hand, asks the Congress to provide relief for poverty stricken areas.

The News editorial asks: "When you need medical care, would you rather have quality or convenience?" I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the men who suffered or were wuonded on the farflung battlefields of the world protecting our national security deserve both quality and convenience with respect to medical care. If it takes "howls of wrath from Members of Congress" to get both quality and convenience of medical care, then I shall be howling the loudest.

A Rare Man of Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, Oscar Morris was a rare and vital kind of man, even in the field of journalism, which has given history more than its share of unusual men. Oscar was a writer and reporter who lived and breathed in the lines he put on paper. He was an able editor who knew his obligation to present both sides of an issue, but who defended his own views, popular or otherwise, with equal vigor. And, he cut the issues clean.

Oscar was a shirtsleeves newspaperman in the total sense of the term. He was at home and at his best with the men who covered city hall or the White House; with his companions black with newsprint or boys straining under a canvas bag of papers; with cameramen in the darkroom or with politicians in smoke-filled rooms.

Oscar Morris had an undenied compulsion to be where the news was, and for more than 27 years he followed the scent of developing news wherever it might lead him. At the same time, he was a deeply sensitive man, totally involved in the welfare of Salisbury, the Eastern Shore, Maryland, and his country. The hopes and disappointments, the plans and obstructions, the faith and even the fears of his neighbors, all these guided Oscar's pen and his heart.

I counted Oscar a friend. With him you always knew where you stood and it made you comfortable. With him one could feel a mind searching for facts, not just a personality searching for a place to hang his hat. Oscar sought the truth, and in his passing the truth has lost a friend.

Those of us in the public service have been stripped of wise counsel and a helping hand. The Daily Times, and indeed the times in which we live, have lost a rare and special kind of man.

Women's Advertising Club of St. Louis Contributes More Than $225,000 to Cancer Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, when I was invited to the annual gridiron dinner tonight of the Women's Advertising Club of St. Louis, I wrote that nothing would prevent my being there unless the House is working on legislation of such importance that I could not leave Washington. The bill before the House today, H.R. 2362, the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, is, of course, legislation of such great importance and significance, and so I have had to wire the president of the club, Mrs. June Darby Ellison, reluctantly advising that it will not be possible for me to be present. This is indeed a great disappointment to me, because the dinners are always delightful affairs, even if somewhat trying for public officials when the pointed shafts of wit strike close to our pretensions or vanity. I have always enjoyed these evenings and am sorry to miss the fun tonight.

But there is so much more than good humored song and commentary involved in a Women's Advertising Club of St. Louis gridiron dinner that I feel the work of this outstanding organization of career women would be of interest to my colleagues in the House, for it is directed at a field in which the Congress of the United States is also vitally concerned. I am referring to the effective support which the Women's Advertising Club of St. Louis has been giving since 1944 to cancer research.

ALMOST AS MUCH AS NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE SPENT IN ITS FIRST YEAR

According to a recent article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the club's contributions to this vital cause have approximated a quarter of a million dollars—money raised through the annual gridiron dinners, of which tonight's is the 31st.

Proceeds from the early shows went to a variety of causes: Blankets for Britain, ambulances for the Red Cross, training planes for the Civil Air Patrol, club canteen cars for the Salvation Army, and so forth. In 1944, when the club's president, Mrs. Erma Proetz, died of cancer, the club decided to devote the proceeds of its show to research on cancer. The money has been given to the Barnard Free Skin and Cancer Hospital, and to the medical schools of our two great universities, Washington University and St. Louis University.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is extremely significant that this one organization in St. Louis has raised almost as much money in the great cause of aiding suffering humanity through cancer research as the U.S. Government itself spent in the first year of operation of the National Cancer Institute. According to the information I obtained, the first appropriation for the National Cancer Institute in 1938 was $400,000.

WOMEN PLAY IMPORTANT ROLE IN ADVERTISING IN ST. LOUIS

St. Louis is proud of its advertising industry, which includes some of the outstanding advertising agencies in the Nation. As a woman, I am particularly proud of the caliber of professional ability demonstrated by women holding responsible positions of leadership in this industry in St. Louis, not only in advertising agencies but in corporations, banks, and other firms. The fact that they have devoted so much of their organizing and promotional ability to the cause of raising funds for cancer research—while providing the city with one of its outstanding dinners of the year—gives the Women's Advertising Club of St. Louis gridiron dinner a significance worth noting here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Therefore, under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit as part of my remarks, a news article by Peggy Johnson, entitled "The World Through Funny Glasses," in the Today's Women section of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for Tuesday, March 16, 1965, followed by a series of letters to President June Darby Ellison, Mrs. T. M. Sayman, and other officials of the club from institutions which have received grants from the club for cancer research.

Peggy Johnson's excellent article is as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 16, 1965]

THE WORLD THROUGH FUNNY GLASSES

(By Peggy Johnson)

Rehearsals for the Women's Advertising Club gridiron show are fast and furious this week. The elaborately costumed revue to be given at the Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel March 24 is a far cry from the first show 30 years ago. Then, uncostumed show members held up signs to set the scenes on a stage only 2 feet above the floor.

However, gridiron remains the same in spirit, Miss Beatrice Adams, its director said. She wrote the first script, acted in it and has had a hand in every subsequent show.

"Gridiron," she explained, "is for women who are up on what's going on in the world as they see it in newspapers, hear it on the radio or see it on television. Women don't come to see each other in last year's gowns, they come to laugh at themselves."

Gridiron researsals start early in January and are held 3 nights a week and all day Sundays.

"You get to know people and what they are really like," she said. "Being in the show teaches ingenuity and confidence, too. I remember one girl who never wanted a bigger part than the rear end of a horse. With her head covered she would come on stage and stomp her feet enthusiastically. On the night of the show the costume for the rear end of the horse mysteriously disappeared. She frantically grabbed a pair of men's long underwear and came stomping on stage. It brought down the house. After that, she graduated to starring roles.

"Another year, one of the girls became more and more nervous as the night of the show approached. She had only one line to say, but she felt she couldn't say it properly. So-o-o I just took the line out and gave her a lot of funny props. She got loads of laughs and applause. Later she confided in me that she had been going to a psychiatrist, and when the show was over, she didn't need him any more."

Early proceeds from the show went for such causes as blankets for Britain, ambulances for the Red Cross, training planes for the Civil Air Patrol and club canteen cars for the Salvation Army.

In 1944, when the late Mrs. Erma Proetz, the club's president, died of cancer, it was decided that the next 10 years' proceeds would be given to research on the disease. To date, more than $225,000 has been given to the Barnard Free Skin and Cancer Hospital, and the medical schools of both Washington and St. Louis universities.

At Barnard, the reserve fund from Gridiron, totaling $95,000, was put towards building an additional floor for research laboratories. At St. Louis University, $31,788 from the club is helping to establish a future institute of molecular virology. At Washington University's medical school, Gridiron provided a technician for a scientist engaged in promising research. Club funds helped pay also for reconstructing a laboratory for the study of normal and abnormal human development.

The St. Louis club has gained national recognition by its annual dinner and revue as successful fund-raising devices. Other clubs throughout the country have followed suit.

"Nevertheless," Miss Adams said, "in addition to raising money for worthy causes, the purpose of Gridiron is to show the audience the world and themselves through funny glasses."

REPORTS FROM ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

Next, Mr. Speaker, I submit letters from Father Paul C. Reinert, president of St. Louis University; Dr. G. O. Broun, Sr., dean of St. Louis University's School of Medicine; and Dr. Donald E. Flieder, director of the Department of Oral Pathology in the School of Dentistry and chairman of the university's cancer research committee, outlining the manner in which the Women's Advertising Club grants have been utilized in cancer research by St. Louis University:

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY,
January 7, 1965.

MRS. JUNE ELLISON,
President, Women's Advertising Club,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MRS. ELLISON: Funds awarded to St. Louis University by the Women's Advertising Club of St. Louis are administered by the cancer research institutional committee composed of 10 faculty members drawn from the Schools of Dentistry and Medicine, and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The committee is responsible to the President of St. Louis University through the vice president for academic affairs who is also the university research administrator.

The committee sponsors project-type grant awards, fellowships for both undergraduate and graduate students, and visiting lecturers who are authorities in the area of cancer research. A brief description and the amount and kind of support appears below. The sums cited are approximate but will not differ substantially from the figures that will be sent by the office of the controller in the official report to your organization.

1. Award to Dr. Dorothy Feir, Department of Biology: The award was for the sum of $2,400 to study the immunological responses of oncopeltus fasciatus. The awarded funds were to support the research expenditures for this project and a partial stipend to one graduate student working with Dr. Feir. Immunological considerations are of importance in cancer research since viruses are well known for the production of antibodies and viruses have been implicated recently in the genesis of cancer.

2. Award to Dr. Maurice Green, Department of Microbiology and Institute of Molecular Virology: The award was for the sum of $1,775 to study various components

of cells infected with a human virus that produces cancer in hamsters. This virus (which is derived from inflamed human tonsils) is the only known species that produces malignant lesions in animals. The virus does not produce known tumors in human beings. It is extremely important that this virus be examined in the light of a recently developed concept in cancer research circles that "all cancer is caused by viruses." The awarded funds were utilized to purchase a special attachment for use in the high-speed analytical centrifuge presently operated by the Department of Microbiology.

3. Award to Dr. Howard Yanof, Department of Physiology: This award in the amount of $690 sponsored two full-time summer fellowships working with Dr. Yanof on the measurement of blood flow by electronic equipment. Blood flow changes are known to occur around cancerous lesions; however, in the past such changes could not be measured without actually entering the vessels involved—a process whereby the intruding instruments themselves may induce blood flow changes. During the summer, Dr. Yanof and his fellowship students developed methods whereby blood flow may be measured electronically without actually entering the blood vessels, thereby reducing instrumental errors produced by entering vessels.

4. Award to Dr. Monroe Strickberger, Department of Biology: the award in the amount of $345 was to sponsor two lectureships in the field of genetics. Drs. Lewontin (University of Chicago) and Dr. Hirsch (University of Illinois) have been invited to give presentations before interested faculty members and graduate students. Genetic considerations are important in cancer research since it is known that many types of cancers tend to occur on a familial basis and this is particularly true for cancers of the gastrointestinal tract.

The committee has remaining funds of approximately $1,400 to disburse from the award made by the Women's Advertising Club last Spring.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Very sincerly yours,

PAUL C. REINERT, S.J.,
President.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
OFFICE OF THE DEAN,
St. Louis, Mo., January 30, 1964.

Mrs. T. M. SAYMAN,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MRS. SAYMAN: At this time, I wish to express my deep appreciation as Dean of St. Louis University School of Medicine for the generous support given to the St. Louis University Cancer Research Institutional Committee for investigations in the cancer field by the Women's Advertising Club.

Your generosity during the past year made it possible for support to be given to six cancer research projects being carried on by members of the faculty of St. Louis University. These projects include the study of the relationship of certain viruses to the production of tumors and the development of methods of differentiating those virus strains which possess the property of producing tumors as compared to those that do not have this ability.

Another project has to do with the development of methods of early diagnosis of cancer in the mouth cavity.

Another is concerned with tumors of the nervous system with certain studies of tissue metabolism and the effects of radiation, all of wihch are of value in the study of tumors.

Finally, it enabled certain members of our faculty to engage in activities and conferences having to do with the study of particles which contaminate the atmosphere and may contribute to the causation of cancer of the lung.

From all of this I think that you can see that your donation has been put to good use and has made a valuable contribution to our research program.

Again thanking you for this very important aid to St. Louis University, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

G. O. BROWN, Sr., M.D.,
St. Louis University Medical School.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY, DEPARTMENT OF ORAL PATHOLOGY,
St. Louis, Mo., January 5, 1965.

WOMEN'S ADVERTISING CLUB OF ST. LOUIS,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE WOMEN'S ADVERTISING CLUB OF ST. LOUIS: With the report of Father Reinert, I would like to include my personal note of gratitude for the support given over the years by the Women's Advertising Club of St. Louis. I have watched this program develop over a number of years since the time of the first award which was initiated by Miss Lea Allen. Over the years the Women's Advertising Club has contributed $31,788.16 to the cancer research program of St. Louis University.

During this period of time the cancer research committee has been gratified that some of the funds were used for projects performed by young women investigators. Also, the committee has a great interest in virus research and a substantial portion of the awarded funds has been for this purpose. We are also pleased that as a result of work supported by the Women's Advertising Club and other organizations that the university is now in the process of establishing an Institute of Molecular Virology. In addition, there have been several undergraduate medical students who have been supported by Women's Advertising Club funds and upon graduation from medical school decided to remain on a full-time basis in the area of cancer research.

This will be my last report to you since I have recently resigned as chairman of the Cancer Research Committee and I do want to take this opportunity to thank you again for your support over the years.

Very truly yours,

DONALD E. FLIEDER, D.D.S., M.S.,
Professor and Director, Department of Oral Pathology.

REPORT FROM BARNARD FREE SKIN AND CANCER HOSPITAL

The next letter, Mr. Speaker, is from Mr. George S. Hecker, president of the Barnard Free Skin & Cancer Hospital, on the $95,000 fund which has been accumulated in a reserve account known as the Women's Advertising Club Research Fund, as follows:

SHEPLEY, KROEGER, FISSE & SHEPLEY,
St. Louis, Mo., January 28, 1964.

Mrs. T. M. SAYMAN,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MRS. SAYMAN: The contributions of the Women's Advertising Club to the Barnard Free Skin & Cancer Hospital, derived from proceeds from its annual gridiron dinners, have been held by the hospital in a reserve account known as the Women's Advertising Club Research Fund, the annual income being accumulated and applied to principal. As of December 31, 1963, this fund totaled approximately $95,000.

After careful consideration, the hospital's board of directors has decided to construct an additional floor to the hospital for use as research laboratories, and has authorized the application of the Women's Advertising Club Research Fund toward the cost of these facilities. Facilities constructed with these funds will be identified as having been a gift of the Women's Advertising Club of the city of St. Louis.

The control, and possibly cure, of cancer will eventually come from research facilities. Without the generous contribution of the Women's Advertising Club, the construction of the proposed laboratory facilities would not have been possible.

We again wish to thank the Women's Advertising Club for its generosity. We commend you and your colleagues for your continued efforts for the cause of cancer research.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE S. HECKER,
President, Barnard Free Skin & Cancer Hospital.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE FINDS CONTRIBUTIONS INVALUABLE

The final letter in the series, Mr. Speaker, is from Dean Edward W. Dempsey of the School of Medicine of Washington University, reporting on how that institution has been using its cancer research gifts from the funds raised by the Women's Advertising Club of St. Louis:

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
OFFICE OF THE DEAN,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
St. Louis Mo., January 25, 1964.

Mrs. THOMAS SAYMAN,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MRS. SAYMAN: The funds which have been given by the Women's Advertising Club to Washington University School of Medicine have been allocated for cancer research. They have been used in a number of ways—at one time a much needed technician was provided for an investigator whose research had suddenly blossomed in an unexpected and gratifying direction. On another occasion, some of the expenses were paid for reconstructing a new laboratory devoted to the study of normal and abnormal human development. This laboratory, incidentally, displays a small bronze plaque commemorating the assistance given by the Women's Advertising Club.

At the present time there exists the sum of $15,714 in unallocated funds which the club has donated in the past. This includes the gift of $6,068.46 which was given last year at the gridiron dinner I have been treasuring this money in the expectation of changes we hope to make soon in the Wernse Cancer Research Laboratory. Dr. Valentina Suntzeff, who has worked in this laboratory for many years, is retiring and will be replaced by a younger and more active person. In recruiting this person and in refurbishing the necessary space, the funds given by the Women's Advertising Club will be invaluable.

I am glad of this opportunity to tell the club, through you, how useful and helpful their contributions have been. We are most grateful for your support, and can assure you that the money is spent carefully for a good cause.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. DEMPSEY, *Dean.*

Congress Must Act To Save States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD. I include the following editorial from the Peabody, Kans., Gazette-Herald which was written by Mr. William Krause, editor. I believe the trends in Government discussed by Mr. Krause and the congressional responsibility which he has emphasized relative to the Supreme Court decision on reapportionment are worthy of consideration by my distinguished colleagues in the Congress. The editorial follows:

CONGRESS MUST ACT TO SAVE STATES

With all its other problems concerning the future, the U.S. Congress has one responsibility this session which may well be the most important draped on its shoulders in half a century. That is, simply stated, to take whatever means it legally can to nullify the recent tragic Supreme Court decision on apportionment of State legislatures.

The arguments have all been stated before. The very wise tradition of one house elected on a basis of population, and one house on the basis of area as is the Federal Government, has worked exceptionally well, assuring that every segment is properly represented. The new law passed by the Court at the behest of big city political bosses will almost entirely disenfranchise rural areas of most States in the Union.

The vicious Supreme Court decision flies directly in the face of the U.S. Constitution and denies the people of the States the very basic right of selecting the method to elect their own legislatures.

But the problem goes even deeper. The United States has functioned through the years with a delicate balance between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government. Thirty years ago we saw attempts made by the executive branch to become dominant. It succeeded to some extent and the President has since been a much more powerful figure. Still, he is subject to the restraint of the Supreme Court in legal matters.

The Supreme Court, however, is subject to no restraint from anyone. There is no appeal from a Supreme Court decision—be it as tragic as the one on reapportionment. That is, there is no restraint except in the people themselves, and in this supercumbersome Government we have developed the people can only act through their elected representatives in Congress. Thus, the whole responsibility of saving the States from the absolute control of big-city political bosses—in many cases the seat of corruption in their State—lies in the U.S. Congress.

Remember, the decision was not demanded by the masses in the cities. Most city people are completely indifferent to it. Of those who do understand it, a majority probably understand the dangers in the Court's decision. The promoters and supporters of the poisonously soothing cry of one man, one vote" range from the usual misguided pseudointellectual to the very toughminded metropolitan opportunist.

Will Congress see and act on this great responsibility or will they fritter away yet another, and very vital, safeguard to the political freedom of a large minority of Americans?

Tobacco Acreage-Poundage Marketing Quotas

SPEECH

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5721) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price-support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity, first, to publicly thank my distinguished chairman for his graciousness in permitting me to appear here at this time and also my distinguished subcommittee chairman for his graciousness and fairness in holding one of the hearings in my area.

Mr. Chairman, as has been mentioned by my colleagues from Florida, at the proper time I shall offer an amendment. The purpose of this amendment is to delete from the bill the requirement that the proposed acreage-poundage program be put into effect for the 1965 crop.

Paragraph (b) of section 317 is the portion of the bill which directs the Secretary of Agriculture to institute this program this year. It begins on page 7 at line 9 and continues through line 6 on page 8.

This amendment strikes out this paragraph—that is, paragraph (b)—and there is no reference to 1965 elsewhere throughout the bill. The amendment also reletters subsequent paragraphs in section 317 and changes internal reference to these paragraphs which appear elsewhere in the bill.

The amendment makes no change whatever in the rules that fix quotas. It keeps the same years 1959–63 for determining averages so that no one could be hurt or helped by another year. The farmer who pours on the fertilizer this year cannot increase his quota and the farmer who has a crop failure cannot be hurt by this amendment.

Now let us see why this amendment is desirable.

It is simply a matter of being fair to a large number of growers in Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and perhaps other States.

If this bill should pass it would be like changing the rules in the middle of the game. The bill itself is of doubtful and debatable fairness all the way through, but certainly no fairminded person would agree that the laws which bind the competitors should be amended in the process of the competition itself.

The game is underway in Florida and Georgia. The whistle has blown. Even if it has not blown a little farther north the preparations have all been made and a last-minute rules change is still unfair when the growers have been officially notified by the umpires that the rules would be those in effect.

To understand what I am saying, let me remind those of you whose interest in tobacco is somewhat more objective and academic, that for many years we have had an acreage allotment system.

The allotments have been voted by the growers themselves in referendums on proposals submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture well in advance of the crop year to be affected.

The farmers have taken six acreage cuts in 11 years. Within the past 2 years two acreage cuts have been imposed—one a 10-percent cut, and another a 19.5-percent cut.

The last such cut of 19.5 percent was voted by the growers last December 15, approximately 2 weeks prior to the convening of the 89th Congress.

The cut was proposed and the referendum was called so that it would affect this very 1965 crop, and all of this was done in ample time for the farmer, the banker, the tenant, and everyone concerned and affected to make his plans and know what to expect from the Federal Government.

The farmer, of course, did not like the cut, but he dutifully and perhaps wisely, from the standpoint of his own long-range interests, voted it upon himself.

And now what has happened? Before our seats are warm certain interests begin talking about changing the whole system—the U.S. Government in a sense contracted with the farmer for 1965 but certain parties want the Government to break that contract and force another one down the unwilling throats of those who might choose to vote against it.

This proposed bill was not conceived overnight.

It is too intricate for that. No doubt the planning was going on in the Department at the very time the December referendum was being conducted—but whether I am correct in this surmise or not, many tobacco growers relied upon the laws of the United States, the rules of the Secretary of Agriculture, and the referendum.

He relied on them when he talked to his banker, he relied on them when he entered contracts with his landlord or tenant, as the case may be; he relied on them when he bought his supplies, prepared his land, transplanted his plants and fully committed himself to a certain size crop in the year A.D. 1965.

It may be that because of the later season the farmer in Virginia or North Carolina can withstand this change, but with varying degrees of hardship the grower to the south cannot. Equity does not take into consideration how many people are being denied equity. A matter is either fair to the minority as well as majority of the growers, or it is unfair, period.

Now, what is the harm that is done, and how is it too late for the farmer who sent me up here to represent him before fair-minded colleagues?

I mentioned a moment ago that the farmer took six acreage cuts.

But strangely enough, as has been pointed out, this bill gives him a 14-percent acreage increase before cutting his normal or average poundage that he will be permitted to sell.

I do not believe anyone is really trying to fool the farmers. The theory is that in giving him more acres but cutting his pounds he will be more selective in what he takes to market and this bill will help him to be more selective. The quality is expected to improve. But what about the competition in the quality market for the man for whom it is too late to increase his acreage? Tobacco farmers have a hard time staying alive. It is a borderline existence and many will be treated unfairly by being required to take an unfair rule change when it is too

late for him to compete fairly with those who are his competition.

If it was a case of cutting acreage all could cut, but my farmers cannot increase this year. If you must pass this law of doubtful fairness in many other respects, I call on you to give those who enter the race an even start by postponing it until 1966. That is all the amendment does.

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, for his statement and associate myself with his remarks and the remarks of my colleagues from the State of Florida.

The people in Georgia, and I represent the biggest Flue-cured tobacco growing district in Georgia, are opposed to this legislation. As my colleagues have pointed out, we are already planting tobacco. Our seedbeds have been prepared and plants are going into fields now. We have worked out our lease agreements. This legislation so far as our farmers are concerned is entirely untimely. So I join my colleagues first in opposition to this bill and next I join my colleagues in the effort to try to get this bill amended to extend the effective date of it to 1 year from now.

Letting the Bars Down on Foreign-Flag Competition With American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, a witness, Mr. Thomas Meyer, representing the International Seafarers' Union, stated that the administration had advised his union of their intention to seek an exemption under the coastwise shipping laws, so that foreign-flag vessels could compete with American-flag operations doing business with Hawaii and Alaska.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, as I stated to the witness, that this information was shocking, considering the fact that a number of American-flag shipping lines already serve these two States. For myself, and I am sure for many members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I serve notice now that if such an exemption is sought, I shall strongly oppose it.

After all, these American operations are not subsidized, and I have every reason to believe they are furnishing excellent service.

Official Maritime Administration figures show that our domestic fleet engaged in intercoastal and coastwise trade, had declined since 1939 until the end of 1961 from 805 to 363 vessels, of which 273 were in coastwise trade. Meanwhile, there have been constant attacks on the Jones Act, to water down the protection which the Congress, recognizing the essentiality of a domestic fleet, has incorporated into our shipping legislation.

As the Seafarers' International Union representative told our committee, the results of letting down the bars in favor of foreign-flag ships may well be catastrophic.

Mr. Speaker, when an American-flag ship is used to transport cargoes, all of the freight dollars are conserved to the benefit of the United States, whereas the opposite is true if other vessels are used. As a result, the American-flag steamship industry contributes almost $1 billion a year directly to our balance of payments. If there were no American-flag fleet, our balance-of-paymens deficit would be some $2 billion greater.

American Policy Toward South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 22, 1965, our very able colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative DONALD M. FRASER, delivered an impressive address on "American Policy Toward South Africa" before the National Conference on South African Crisis and American Action, at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C.

In my judgment, this address by a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee—who also serves as chairman of the Task Force on Foreign Policy of the Democratic Study Group—deserves the careful study of the Members of the Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It constitutes a compelling statement of the need for more vigorous action by the United States to bring about a change in the abhorrent apartheid policies of the Government of South Africa.

As a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations for 3 years, I am acutely aware of the importance of this problem. The image of our country throughout Africa, and our influence in that continent, would be greatly enhanced by the type of action Representative FRASER has proposed.

The following is the text of Mr. FRASER's address:

AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, no responsible citizen of this country can ignore what is happening in South Africa. Actions taken by the Government of South Africa challenge our conscience and call into question our leadership among Western nations. Every thoughtful person is on his own in attempting to plot our policies toward South Africa. For many of us, the simple fact of brutal racial discrimination which is the order of the day in South Africa should be enough to fix our policy. The denial of personal and political rights on the basis of the color of a man's skin is repugnant to our sense of decency. Any nation which as a matter of national policy sets apart people on the basis of race or creed and destroys their political and personal rights should be roundly condemned by every civilized nation.

This condemnation in words should be followed by action designed to make the disapproval effective within the limit of our capacity to do so. In a world in which men and women possess every hue and color of skin, it is unbelievable that such ugly discrimination can be left unchecked without reaping a grim harvest.

UNITED STATES CONDEMNS APARTHEID POLICY OF SOUTH AFRICA

The United States today does condemn the policies of apartheid in South Africa. The views expressed by the United States in the United Nations and in our bilateral relations with South Africa spring from a genuine feeling of dismay and moral indignation on the part of our Government. There is nothing hypocritical in our current policy.

But we need not establish hypocrisy before pressing on to the next question. Are we doing all that we can to change the policies of the South African Government?

The answer is that we are not.

It is true that we banned the sale of military equipment to South Africa in August of 1963 and that we joined in a U.N. resolution in December of that year calling upon all nations to cease the sale and shipment of equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition in South Africa. This measure has little effect upon South Africa.

In the meantime U.S. investments in South Africa have continued to grow. Moral condemnation alone seems to have had as little effect in South Africa as in the hard-core areas of racial discrimination in the southern part of the United Sttaes. It is entirely possible for the South African Government to conclude that U.S. denunciation of her apartheid policies is for the ears of others and that our real attitudes are reflected in our willingness to continue doing business as usual with her.

We need to adopt tougher policies toward South Africa. This is the conclusion which is shared by those Americans most knowledgeable about the realities of life in South Africa today.

Before we discuss what these policies should be, I want to answer several arguments offered by critics of a tougher policy.

SHOULD WE INTERFERE?

Some argue that we have no right to interfere in the affairs of another nation. If this principle has validity, it stems solely from expediency. It may be prudent at times to accept a policy of noninterference where an opposite policy would be, to coin a phrase, "counterproductive."

But the hard realities of the world today have left us with no choice. We are involved in the affairs of virtually every nation on earth, whether through our aid programs, our policy of containment, the activities of the USIA or even the CIA. We are not and cannot be an island unto ourselves.

The hollowness of the noninterference doctrine is illustrated by asking whether or not there is a man or woman today willing to sit idly by if the mass murder of Jews by the Nazis were to be reenacted. Of course, it is an entirely different question to ask, in what way a nation should interfere in the affairs of another nation.

SOUTH AFRICA IS AN ALLY

Next it is claimed that south Africa is pro-Western, anti-Communist and occupies a strategic location. The critics argue that our primary interest is survival in the deadly cold-war struggle and this is no time to jettison an ally such as South Africa. Moreover, we have space-tracking installations in South Africa important to our space ventures.

South Africa has been an ally of the West. We welcomed her contribution to the Korean war and her support of Western policies in joint defense and in the U.N. We do not seek to destroy these relationships.

We seek only to induce the Government of South Africa to abandon her policies of apartheid from which flow discrimination, segregation, and repression. Nevertheless a tougher policy toward South Africa may cause her to turn away from the West. We must, therefore, take a hard look at this possibility.

If we take the cold war as our frame of reference, the balance sheet on South Africa contains both liabilities and assets. Set against the strategic value she offers as an ally are the liabilities which flow from her policies. As Communist China seeks an increasing role in Africa, the racial policies of South Africa are tailor made for her benefit. Moreover, the longer that South Africa follows her current racial policies the more violent the inevitable explosion and the less likely that there will remain a country with Western orientation.

The strategic value offered by a friendly South Africa is real, but is of importance only under certain limited circumstances such as the closing of the Suez Canal. The ultimate resolution of the East-West struggle is unlikely to flow from any set of circumstances in which this strategic value of South Africa plays a significant role.

In a way, the cold war argument in favor of South Africa and the counter argument of Communist exploitation of South African policies deserve each other. That South Africa is a liability to the West does not serve to justify a tougher line on our part. Her policies are wrong, dead wrong. They are morally repulsive to civilized man. The Communists are exploiting this issue just as they exploit every issue which gives rise to grievances.

But our interest in changing her policies are not bottomed on Communist exploitation. They are bottomed on the fundamental moral issues involved. It is unthinkable that we should condone through inaction the policies of South Africa because of the cold war. Such inaction would represent a moral paralysis destructive of our capacity to lead in the years ahead.

REPRESSION NOT LIMITED TO SOUTH AFRICA

Finally it is argued that suppression of the rights of people is not confined to South Africa. Brutal repression marks the fate of many people all around the world. The Soviet suppression of the Hungarian revolt in the midfifties is a for instance.

We stood by wringing our hands and passing resolutions in the United Nations condemning the Soviet Union much as we have done toward the apartheid policies of South Africa. Why, it is asked, do we now single out South Africa for a tougher policy while millions of people are enslaved today under totalitarian rule around the globe.

Because we cannot cure all the evils of the world at once is no reason to refuse to act where we may have the capacity to act effectively.

Moreover, I believe that in general and within the limitations of the real world we are doing what we can to improve the political and economic status of people everywhere. It is a fundamental premise of American foreign policy that democratic societies pose the least threat to our security. We nudge along and encourage the development of such societies. True, we may not always go about it skillfully.

I am prepared, however, to defend this version of American policy at length and with tenacity. By and large we are forced to deal with nations as we find them—but always seeking to moderate their unfortunate policies and stimulating the evolution of more open societies. Thus, we encourage diversity within the Soviet bloc, and we look for ways through which their police states may be modified.

WHAT CAN WE DO FOR OPPRESSED PEOPLE ELSEWHERE?

Is there more we can do to restore freedom to oppressed peoples in these countries? The use of armed forces seems out of the question.

Would economic sanctions be effective? We have employed these against most bloc nations, and offer the inducement of lessened sanctions as bloc nations demonstrate independence of Soviet control. In both Vietnam and Cuba we are using even more drastic measures, albeit wih uncertain results.

Generally speaking the same philosophy has guided our dealings with totalitarian nations on the right, such as Spain, Portugal and some of the Latin American nations. We seek economic advancement for their people. We believe that over the long pull in every society forces exist which tend to expand political and personal freedom. Doubtless our priorities are affected by the cold war, but immediate survival has always demanded first attention.

In South Africa unusual circumstances prevail. A democratic society does exist in South Africa for Europeans. But the majority in that nation are wholly excluded from participation on the basis of their color. Once a society embarks on racial policies born of fear, the future looks hopeless as the inevitable tensions grow deeper, suspicion mounts and violence becomes more probable.

PEACEFUL CHANGE IN A DEMOCRACY REQUIRES PARTICIPATION

Our faith in a democratic society stems in part from its capacity to accommodate peaceful change. For this system to work, those whose interests require action on the part of their government must be able to exercise their political rights to get this action. In the United States it can be argued with some force that the existence of large numbers of Negro voters in the North played a decisive role in bringing about a positive, rather than a negative result as Negro citizens in the South finally took matters into their own hands and met violence in Birmingham.

Where will this ameliorating influence come from in a country which not only deprives its non-European citizens of any effective voice in government, but where the official, formal position of the government itself favors the complete denial of these rights? Without external pressure comparable to the pressure which the North brought upon the South in the United States, there is little hope in South Africa for the non-Europeans.

In short, our foreign policy recognizes that the forceful imposition of democratic concepts on other nations is extremely difficult, and we must rely a good deal on the gradual evolution of democratic ways as they emerge from experiences within each society, much as our heritage of democratic values developed on the British Isles painfully and over many centuries.

In South Africa the Europeans for the most part adhere to these democratic concepts for themselves, but they deny them completely to others on the basis of racial differences. Thus, there is little hope that with the passage of time the racial policies of that government will be corrected.

Every indication today bears out the impression of many observers that South Africa is headed for an increasing degree of police state repression toward the non-European majority. Unless this trend is reversed the world as well as South Africa will pay heavily.

NEW POLICIES TOWARD SOUTH AFRICA

What policies should we adopt toward South Africa beyond those we have today? I do not believe that we should break off diplomatic relations with South Africa nor does expulsion from the United Nations have much to offer. Some hope that increased contact and exchange of persons may bear fruit. I believe this course should be followed so long as South Africa is agreeable. Such policies, however, are unlikely to be enough.

RESTRICT INVESTMENT AND TRADE

I believe we must consider adopting unilaterally or in concert with other nations measures such as restraints on investment in South Africa, curtailment of trade and embargoes. It is my view that such measures should be gradually enlarged over a period of time until South Africa changes her racial policies.

I turn back for a moment to the critics.

Some will argue that such policies will not be effective because compliance by every nation with such restrictions and embargoes cannot be enforced. To illustrate this point they cite the heavy dependence of Great Britain upon trade with South Africa.

We won't know how effective a multilateral effort will be until we begin working out the details of such efforts. Willingness on the part of the United States to pursue such measures would represent an enormous step forward.

U.S. SHOULD ACT UNILATERALLY IF NECESSARY

But assume for a moment that we could not get the British to join us, or that even if they did there were still too many leaks. Should this deter us from acting? My answer is emphatically, no.

Our efforts to isolate Cuba were not conditioned upon worldwide compliance. We are equally free to bring pressure to bear on South Africa through various restraints initiated by the U.S. Government alone. It must be remembered that unlike Cuba, we are not seeking to destroy the Government of South Africa. We seek only to change her policies toward non-Europeans. We honestly and deeply believe this to be in her own interest.

But could even unilateral action by the United States bring about this result? Today the policy of apartheid appears to most South Africans to coincide with their economic interests. The substandard, discriminatory wages paid to non-Europeans represent a substantial economic benefit to the Europeans who gain the benefit of this labor at such low cost.

The history of discrimination, however, shows that when economic considerations clearly conflict with racial discrimination, racial discrimination begins to give way. This has been seen repeatedly in the United States.

Action by the United States to interrupt normal trade and commercial relations with South Africa would bring economic pressure on South Africa. An uneconomic consequence of their apartheid policy would be demonstrated. It will be even more persuasive, of course, as we succeed in winning broader support of these policies.

It is said that such action by the United States and other Western nations will only serve to harden the attitudes of the national party now in power as they exploit this unwarranted interference in their internal affairs from the outside world. No one can say with certainty what may follow from a substantial interruption of South Africa's commerce with other nations.

There are adequate reasons to believe that this pressure may provide the many Europeans in South Africa who today disagree with apartheid policy a more substantial basis on which to appeal for a change in that policy. Whatever happens, however, is surely to be less drastic than the final day of reckoning which will follow if no action is taken now. The longer South Africa travels down the road toward that final day of reckoning, the less chance that a society will emerge in which all can live together in peace.

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE, U.N. MAY ACT

It will not be long before the United States will have to make some hard choices about our policy toward South Africa. The International Court of Justice is likely to rule soon upon the question of whether or not South Africa has properly carried out her mandate over southwest Africa. Special committees of the United Nations have studied measures which may be taken against South Africa.

Action may come in the Security Council of the United Nations. Under section 5 of the U.N. Participation Act of 1945 the President may prohibit economic relations between the United States and any other country whenever the United States is called upon by the Council to give effect to its decision. To demonstrate our concern and our intentions, we should begin now to plan how best to effectuate the decision of the World Court if it should rule against South Africa, and how best to carry forward our determination that apartheid in South Africa must come to an end.

The actions which South Africa must take to end policies based upon racial discrimination, as Ambassador Stevenson has pointed out, must be worked out by responsible persons within South Africa.

WE MUST HELP SOUTH AFRICA MAKE RIGHT DECISIONS

We seek to create an environment in which the right decisions will be made.

We are a powerful nation. We want to employ that power for the advancement of mankind. The moral quality of our leadership is being sorely tested. Let us not falter. When the choices are difficult, we should follow that old and reliable maxim, "When in doubt, let us do what is right." Men everywhere will be grateful to us if we will do what is right.

Immigration and the Golden Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the history of immigration to America and the laws regulating immigration are of direct concern to all Americans in their desire to revise the immigration code in this session of Congress.

A very informative article by the Reverend Daniel Lyons, S.J., on this very subject appeared in the February 1965 issue of the Social Digest.

Therefore, with unanimous consent, I insert the following excerpts from this article into the Appendix of the RECORD:

IMMIGRATION AND THE GOLDEN DOOR

(By Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

More than 40 million persons have immigrated to the United States since 1820. Keeping the gates open was a deep-seated American tradition, part of the vision of democracy, expressed so well in 1886 on the base of the Statue of Liberty.

Birth in the United States confers citizenship on the children of alien parents, even if the parents themselves are ineligible for citizenship. The only qualification is that the person must be subject to U.S. jurisdiction.

In the 30 years prior to the Civil War (1830–60), 5 million immigrated to the United States. Many came from Britain, some came from Sweden and Norway; a few came from Italy. But the vast majority came from Ireland and Germany. The slums in which many of the Irish settled, plus their devotion to a church which most Americans viewed as "foreign and ruled by a foreign potentate," made many of the natives restless, and convinced them that the pot was boiling over, instead of melting. The German immigrants made matters worse. Puritan, Protestant America was keen on temperance, and took offense at the Germans' love of lager beer. The Germans felt their personal liberty was being threatened by this puritanical tradition. They raised tempers as well as eyebrows with their continental Sunday: plays, parades, picnics, dances, beer gardens, and gymnastics. There was plenty of native agitation against the Irish papists, and against the Dutchmen with their barbarous Sunday pleasures. Protestant clergymen added fuel to the flames.

CLOSING THE DOOR

In 1897, a 20-year struggle was begun to require a literacy test for immigrants. Any language would do, and there were generous exemptions, e.g., for those under 16. The legislation was vetoed by Presidents Cleveland, Taft, and Wilson, on the grounds that it merely tested the opportunities that had been extended or denied the immigrant in his native land, that it did not test his mental acumen or his moral worth. In 1917, under the strain of war, Congress mustered a two-thirds vote to override the Presidential veto. The literacy test was finally adopted.

In the minds of many, the oriental immigrant posed a problem as far back as the 1860's, when serious opposition arose to the Chinese on the Pacific coast. This was settled in 1880 by a treaty with China whereby it surrendered its most-favored-nation status and agreed to the exclusion of its nationals from the United States. Teachers, students, travelers, and merchants were excepted. The first Chinese exclusion act was passed in 1882. Problems arising from Japanese immigration to the west coast were more difficult to settle. Japan insisted on equal rights with other nations, while California clung to a disgraceful antioriental hysteria. This led to a deterioration in relations between the two countries culminating, 50 years later, in the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Almost all immigration ceased during the First World War, and this provided the occasion for a review of U.S. immigration policy. America was no longer the land of the raw frontier, and the industrial era was fraught with complications. Unions complained about the unlimited supply of cheap labor; champions of Nordic supremacy, like Lothrop Stoddard, warned America of the barbarian invasion, The war had accentuated nationalism to a remarkable degree. Even reasonable scholars agreed that America could no longer absorb a million immigrant a year. All this provided the atmosphere for the quota laws of the 1920's. The Asiatic Barred Zone, denying entry to all southeastern Asians, had already been passed during the war.

Theories and prejudices had set the stage: numerous sociologists and anthropologists of the early 20th century had maintained that mankind was divided into biologically distinct races, and that any intermixture was harmful. They held that America ought to aim at a population that was pure and Aryan. It was the same Nordic supremacy later peddled by an Austrian paperhanger.

RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

Before the close of the 19th century, clubs, vacation places, and even hotels began to close their doors to Jews. Many Americans were still sufficiently aware of their heritage of freedom to protest against this tendency, but all too many accepted the discrimination. Success by Jews was resented, and has been ever since. But the traditional enemy of fundamentalist America was the Catholic Church. Catholics and Jews were linked together, Jews were accused of dominating the Nation's economic life, while Catholics were accused of wanting to dominate the Nation's political and religious life. Catholics and Jews were charged with uniting in their opposition to the reading of the Bible in public schools. Many old guard Yankees were worried about the denationalizing forces at work in the country. The Romish church was charged with opposing the American ideals of free press and free speech, with opposing the public school system, and with trying to dominate politics. It was maintained that Catholicism threatened the Protestant belief in freedom of conscience, that Roman canon law conflicted with American law.

TURNING POINT

A complete turning point in American immigration policy began in 1921, with the passage of the Quota Act. Until then the laws had concentrated on higher standards of selection, but now a ceiling was put on the actual number of immigrants to be admitted in any 1 year. Under the 1921 act a maximum of 357,000 per annum could be admitted. The act of 1924 reduced this to 162,000. Several classes of aliens were exempt, e.g., those from the Western Hemisphere. The opposition to immigration was largely against the increasing numbers from southern and eastern Europe. The quotas were heavily weighted in favor of the countries of older immigration. The 1924 act also decreased that only members of the white and Negro races could be naturalized, and eligibility for citizenship was made a condition for admission as an immigrant.

The quota system satisfied all the accumulated demands of the restrictions. The national origins device set up a basis of selection that embodied the religious and racial heritage to the original settlers. It favored the "old" at the expense of the "new," the white Protestant Nordic against the rest of the world. Its discriminatory policies wrote the epitaph to the world's image of America as the land of opportunity. The tiny quotas set up for Asia were mostly for members of the white race who were born there.

Apart from sheer prejudice, there are always those who are governed by a pessimistic outlook. A Congressman stood on the floor of the House of Representatives to declare that, while a liberal immigration policy was satisfactory when the country was new and unsettled, the United States has now reached maturity, and was fully populated. He urged that further immigration be stopped. The year was 1797. In contrast, Dr. Louis Dublin, noted statistician and vice president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., points out that a young adult immigrant of 18 is worth at least $10,000 to the Nation, since that is what it costs to raise the average youth. He further testifies that the average net worth of such a person to the economy is between $30,000 and $80,000, depending on his potential power to earn.

IMMIGRATION CONTRIBUTION

Immigrants came to America when they were needed. There is nothing to indicate that they caused unemployment or lower living standards. During unrestricted immigration the volume rose during prosperity and dropped during depressions. The great depression of the 1930's came almost ten years after restrictive immigration began. The melting pot idea was a good one. The liberal philosophy of the 19th century held that freedom of migration was directly related to the doctrine of free trade. Men should be allowed to go where they were in greatest demand and of the greatest value. The contributions made by immigrants to the United States are undeniable and overwhelming. To take a fairly recent example, Albert Einstein, who was not good enough

for Nazi Germany because he was a Jew, emigrated to America and became the father of atomic energy and the atomic bomb.

Early in American history, such crafts as pottery and chinaware were introduced into Pennsylvania by German immigrants. The French set up the first munitions industry. The Swiss became the first watchmakers. Clothing was built up by the Germans and Austrians during the Civil War. Italians developed the domestic wine industry. Other immigrants from Europe developed bookbinding, printing, furniture making, mill and glasswork, and the art of making pianos. They also founded the chemical and drug industries, brewing, photography, and optometry. The work done by immigrants in medicine and biochemistry has been especially outstanding. The variety of cultural backgrounds in America played a priceless part in hastening her development. Immigration has had a profound effect in stimulating the American economy. There is every evidence that her quotas could be increased substantially today without prejudicing the economic interests of any group in the country.

The argument that immigrants take jobs away from natives overlooks the fact that immigrants, too, are consumers and consequently expand the market. William H. Beveridge refutes the popular conception that industry is like an iron sphere in which men struggle for room. Rather, it is elastic and capable of expansion. The struggling of those within is actually what makes it expand.

A BAD ACT

George Washington, in 1783, declared that "America is open to receive not only the opulent stranger but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions; whom we shall welcome to a participation of all our rights and privileges." When President Truman's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization wrote its report on the Immigration (McCarran-Walter) Act of 1952, it declared that the act was inconsistent with the principles of the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the institutions of government which have not only made America great, but are the hope of free peoples everywhere. The Commission pointed out that the national origins quota system is based on unsound theories long since proven invalid, on fallacies that are becoming more and more dangerous in a troubled world where national pride is strengthening.

The act of 1952 promotes Nordic supremacy. Laws which militate against other races, and even the southern and central Europeans of the white race, are a denial of what America professes to believe. They are detrimental to its foreign policy in a world where white people are a small minority, and it leaves America prey to damaging propaganda by those who would destroy the free world. The act enlarged on many existing discriminations, and inaugurated new inequities. It can only have been based on prejudices and deep-rooted fears.

The proud record of immigrants from Asia and southern Europe, both in peace and in war, should belie any fear of repealing the old established in a period of profound isolationism, policies which have been harmful in America and have created bitter enemies for her abroad.

INSTRUMENT OF DISCRIMINATION

The act ironically discriminates with great severity against those who have been convicted overseas of political offenses under the Communist system. It is also un-American to allow minor officials the unreviewable discretion to deny visas. The act's punishment against naturalized citizens makes them second class. The sweeping authority to banish them from the country is a cruel imitation of ancient Rome.

The President's Commission reported that the act injures people at home, causes much resentment abroad, and impairs America's position among the free nations, great and small, whose friendship and understanding are so badly needed in the struggle to keep the free world free. It appealed for a fresh look at the problem, with the hope for legislation based on humanitarian principles and consonant with America's obligations toward suffering mankind. The Commission recommends that the national origins quota system be abolished, and that visas be distributed without regard to race, color, creed, or origin. It recommends that the annual quota be increased from 154,000 to 280,000, based on one-sixth of 1 percent of the U.S. population. It recommends, lastly, that the maximum annual quota of visas be distributed on the basis of the following five catagories: The right of asylum, reunion of families, needs in the United States, special needs in the free world, general immigration.

President Johnson has stressed to members of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees that he wants the McCarran-Walter Act revised. Congressman CELLER, the chairman of the committee in the House, has introduced a bill to that effect, while Senator HART has introduced a similar bill in the Senate. The administration's proposed changes in U.S. immigration policy have already been endorsed by 75 Democratic and 6 Republican Congressmen.

Veterans' Administration Facilities in the State of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I addressed to Hon. William J. Driver, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, and his reply which relates to the facility at Dwight, Ill.:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM J. DRIVER,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DRIVER: I have received a number of letters and telegrams from individuals in my district and from various parts of the State of Illinois protesting against the proposed closing of the facility at Dwight, Ill.

These communications have to be answered and I would appreciate hearing from you as to the justification for such a step.

Yours very truly,

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR
OF VETARANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1965.

Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KLUCZYNSKI: This is in response to your recent letter concerning the closing of the Dwight Veterans' Administration facility and I want to thank you for your thoughtful inquiry which affords me this opportunity to clarify certain points.

Although you are quite properly concerned with this action as it relates to Illinois, it might give you a better insight into the reasoning behind the closing to examine the decision in the light of the history of the Veterans' Administration medical program since the end of World War II.

While the Veterans' Administration was fortunate in having a number of highly skilled and extraordinarily dedicated doctors, nurses, and other medical staff, the medical program in the period between World Wars I and II had not fully shared in the general progress of American medicine. Then, with the end of World War II, and the influx of huge numbers of veterans needing medical care, what might be termed a "medical revolution" occurred.

That revolution had one essential element—that medical decisions be made on medical grounds. With new professional direction and working closely with the Nation's medical schools, the VA hospital program moved forward vigorously to meet two concurrent challenges. The first and immediate challenge was to its ability to absorb the massive influx of returning veterans who needed and deserved nothing but the finest hospital care. All existing VA hospital space was used in this effort, and additional beds acquired from the Armed Forces or from others. The second phase, still going on, was to assure that our hospitals were the right kind, in the right place, and able to offer the fullest possible spectrum of modern medical care.

As part of this second phase, new facilities were built as rapidly as possible, and old ones closed. The decision to close hospitals was made for a number of cogent reasons, for many of the hospitals under VA control were already obsolete by World War II, and a considerable number of those taken over at the end of the war were uneconomical or in other ways unsuitable. For example, a number were originally constructed for other purposes. Some were old soldiers' homes; one was a girls' school; some were formerly hotels; and many were of ungainly cantonment type temporary or semipermanent construction.

These stopgap structures were closed continually throughout the years as new facilities were constructed, and since 1950 we have closed or transferred title to 19 hospitals.

Physical obsolescence is, of course, only one of the many factors considered in the always painful decision to terminate a hospital which, we recognize, is often a source of legitimate pride to the community in which it exists.

Other significant factors are the forward march of medical knowledge and the continued migration of the veteran population. For example, and to a large degree as a result of our own research, the number of hospitalized veterans suffering from tuberculosis declined from 17,000 in 1954 to 7,000 in 1964. As a result, we were able to reduce the number of tuberculosis hospitals from 21 in 1955 to but 4 today. Their closing illustrates the fact that progress in medicine, as in any field, requires the abandonment of antiquated instruments.

But the picture of the VA closing hospitals is only part, the negative part, of what we have been doing through the years. The positive part consists of a dynamic program of building new facilities where needed, and replacing and modernizing other hospitals. The program of building new and replacement hospitals is now proceeding at an annual rate of approximately $100 million.

There are many ways to measure the enhanced effectiveness of our medical program as a result of this revitalization. Perhaps the best—and most dramatic—is in the number of patients treated. With approximately the same number of beds as in 1960, our hospitals are now treating almost 750,000 sick and disabled veterans, over 100,000 more than in 1960.

Three facts are clear: First, decisions on medicine are best made on medical grounds; second, there is ample precedent for the

closing of marginal hospitals; and third, the Veterans' Administration is continually upgrading its facilities so that they serve more veterans more effectively.

Thus the closing of the Dwight hospital is a reflection of the fact that the Veterans' Administration cannot afford to maintain marginal units in a period of rising demand for its services, great changes in the focus of this demand, and increasing complication of the facilities needed to provide a full spectrum of care.

The continuing transfer of effort and resources by the Veterans' Administration into more effective facilities, far from conflicting with President Johnson's commitment to advance the health of the Nation is, I believe, completely consonant with it. For war, whether against foreign enemies, or the enemies of man's physical well-being, must be waged in the most effective manner, using only those tools that will best do the job.

Finally, and I think completely in line with your legitimate concern for the health of the community, veterans and nonveterans alike, it should be pointed out that the Veterans' Administration stands ready to assist in any effort to utilize this VA facility for health purposes or to meet other community needs, and that a number of former VA hospitals, such as those at Springfield, Mo.; Minot, N. Dak.; and Outwood, Ky., have been put to such constructive use by other Government or private nonprofit agencies.

One final word. The decision to transfer beds from the 11 marginal hospitals was taken only after the most detailed study during a period of many months; and the governing factor in this decision was the clear conclusion that the reorganization would increase the overall ability of our medical program to render better service to all veterans.

In view of your interest, I am also furnishing you with a copy of a statement Dr. Thomas H. Brem, professor of medicine at the University of Southern California School of Medicine, made to the chairmen of the several congressional committees. Dr. Brem is Chairman of a Special Medical Advisory Group, established by act of Congress to advise the Veterans' Administration relative to the care and treatment of disabled veterans.

Sincerely,

W. J. DRIVER, *Administrator.*

An 81-Year Career Comes to an End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 1965, my friend the Honorable Jacob Marks, a distinguished former municipal court judge and State senator from New York, died at his home in Manhattan. Judge Marks would have been 104 years old in June.

The story of Judge Marks' life is the history of this country for the past 100 years.

His life history should be noted by all those who refuse to liberalize our immigration laws.

We will never know how many, many like him have been lost to our country because of inhuman restrictions.

It is amazing to think that he remembered when Abraham Lincoln was shot and lived through that time almost 100 years later when John F. Kennedy also lost his life to an assassin's bullet.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article about Jacob Marks which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 21, 1965:

JACOB MARKS, AT WORK 81 YEARS

(By M. C. Blackman)

Jacob Marks, son of German-Polish immigrants to New York City, practiced law for 22 years. He served as a State senator for 2 years. He sat on the municipal court bench for 20 years. He handled courtwork as a referee for another 37 years.

Finally, well past the centenary of his birth, he reluctantly quit work. He had had almost 2 years of retirement when he died last night at his home at 585 West End Avenue, 3 months short of 104.

Mr. Marks followed his 81-year legal and public service career without a law degree or even attending a college. Thus, he cherished beyond its real distinction his appointment midway in his law career as a trustee of the public schools in the Yorkville district where he once lived.

The first century of his life also included attendance as a delegate from the Yorkville district to the New York State Constitutional Convention in 1894. When he died he was the sole surviving member of that convention.

His formal, daytime education ended when he was 13 and was graduated from grammar school No. 1 on Vandewater Street. He went to work as an errand boy at $2 a week, carrying parcels by day and attending night classes at the New York City evening high school.

That job didn't last long. It was not the less-than-princely salary that bothered him. He wanted to be a lawyer. So he went to work for a law firm on Pine Street as an office boy.

The salary there was only $2.50 a week, but he was allowed to study law in his spare time. He continued going to evening school on weeknights, and attended Cooper Union library class from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. on Saturdays.

His dream was realized on November 10, 1882, when he was 5 months past his 21st birthday. He was admitted to practice law by the general term of the Supreme Court of New York City (then the appellate branch of the court) after an examination by a board of examiners appointed by the court.

REFORMER

In 1904, he was elected to the senate, where he ignored orders from Tammany Hall and battled fiercely and sometimes successfully for various reforms. His independent zeal cost him his senatorial career; he was retired at the end of one term.

In 1907, he was elected from the Yorkville district as a justice of the municipal court for 10 years. In this phase of his career he was more successful, for in 1917 he was reelected for an additional 10 years.

When his 20 years were up, pursuant to an act of the court, he automatically became an official referee.

He still held the same position on June 24, 1961, when he went to Asbury Park, N.J., to celebrate his 100th birthday at a dinner party given by 40 relatives and friends.

Mr. Marks was then a sprightly man of 5 feet 5 inches, who weighed, according to his own description, 120 pounds full dressed.

A shy man, who neither sought nor wanted publicity, he nevertheless was asked the usual questions put to centenarians. He obliged by saying that he still took his one glass of beer before dinner every night, and further explained:

"Doctor's orders. Besides, I never cared for hard liquor."

BOTH JOHNSONS

He reminisced a little, too, having been born in the fourth month of President Lincoln's first term. He was old enough when Lincoln was shot to remember the commotion in his household.

"Come to think of it," he remarked, "I've lived through quite a few Presidents since then: Johnson after Lincoln, then Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Arthur when Garfield was shot, Cleveland, Harrison, Cleveland again, McKinley, Teddy Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, F.D.R., Truman, Eisenhower, and now Kennedy."

To this imposing list, before he died, he could have added another Johnson.

On his 100th anniversary, he riffled through the many birthday cards he had received and brought out his favorite. It was the picture of a rooster, and the caption said: "You've got a right to crow."

"You can say that again," the old jurist observed.

Surviving are three daughters, the Misses Josephine, Irene, and Dora Marks, who kept house for him in a seven-room apartment at the west end address. His wife, Henrietta, whom he married in 1884, died in 1925.

Japan Flaunts Salmon Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following excerpt from the Fishermen's News warns Pacific coast fishermen of the destruction of the U.S. red salmon due to Japan's high seas fishing operations.

As this article puts it, we must no longer ask, we must assert.

Here is the text of the warning which appeared over the signature of John Wedin, editor:

TO PACIFIC COAST FISHERMAN

The Bristol Ray red salmon which Japan is determined to take on the high seas late in May of this year is of tragic concern to every Pacific coast fisherman. It should be of concern of every thoughtful American.

Though the initial impact may sound the death knell only to those fisheries in Bristol Bay, the fact that Japan regards this high seas net catch as a rightful share is stern evidence of the dark future of the resource. Japan had no historic right to Bristol Bay salmon prior to World War II and it logically follows that her irrascible greed will insist that this thinking shall eventually apply to all races of North American salmon. Rest assured that when the Bristol Bay runs are decimated, she will look to the runs of the Fraser, Columbia, and Sacramento.

Bristol Bay is not the first to suffer. I. I. Lagunov, Soviet scientist, recently said, "At the present time we think it well known that the sharp reduction in runs of Pacific salmon, especially to spawning rivers of the Soviet far east is due primarily to the excess catch of salmon on the high seas by the Japanese fishermen."

And so the strong informal plea of a few weeks ago by the United States for Japan to restrict her catch of red salmon west of the provisional line has fallen on deaf ears. The Soviet catch has been harvested beyond its ability to sustain, and Japan is turning to our stocks for her needs.

America was on her knees to Japan last month in Tokyo. The unbecoming posture stems from a fear for survival of the once-great Bristol Bay runs. After three poor season, American fishermen must have a

good 1965 return. And why should she be forced to beg for her own fish from a nation whose fishery on our stocks began after the self-caused World War II?

This run is no longer virgin stock. Japan in an unprecedented flaunt of conservation, took nearly 2 million immature fish off Adak in August.

We must no longer ask, we must assert. No longer debate, but demand. Your dignity as a citizen, our dignity as a nation is at stake.

Need for Prompt Remedy

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the following commentary might properly be entitled "What's Wrong Here?" I do not believe there is a better way to make a case for an existing inequity than to present a specific situation. I therefore submit excerpts from a letter received from a young man in the armed services which I trust my colleagues in the House will read and give serious consideration:

I have been in the Army 19 months and was recently promoted from E-3 to E-4 and found that my wife's class Q allotment did not increase like that of a man who has only one dependent. The allotment for an E-3 and two dependents and less than 2 years' service is $123.10 and it remains the same for an E-4 with two dependents. The allotment for an E-3 with one dependent and less than 2 years' service is $95.20, but it moves up to $123.10 when a man is promoted to an E-4. This doesn't seem at all equitable.

For example, one of my buddies who has the same rating as I do and a wife and no children draws the same allotment. His wife is, of course, able to take employment, whereas we have a child, which naturally requires that my wife remain at home with the baby.

President Johnson recently concluded that families with an income of less than $3,000 annually are in the poverty class and should be given economic assistance through the Federal Government. Yet, strangely, a man in the service with two dependents receives $83.10 for living quarters and $123.10 per month allotment, which, with his basic pay, gives him an annual income of approximately $2,800. The serviceman with one dependent is naturally farther down on the poverty list by the same yardstick.

If I had not worked and saved my money before coming into the service, it would have been impossible for me to provide the basic necessities along with maintaining our life insurance, automobile insurance, and other miscellaneous obligations. When a man is required to give 2 years out of his life, it certainly doesn't seem right that he should be required to use funds for which he worked and saved during his civilian life for the right and privilege of serving his country. I pass these comments on to you, not alone because of my personal situation, but because there are many others like me with whom I have talked who have so expressed themselves.

I hope and trust that Congress will do something to rectify these inequities in the near future. It probably will not affect me since I am nearing the end of my term of service, but it seems to me that this should be corrected in the interest of the men who serve our country in the future.

It is my understanding that legislation is being offered by most of the members of the esteemed Committee on Armed Services to increase military pay and correct some of these inequities which prevail. This legislation should be a must in this session of Congress.

Hanoi's Role in the Vietnam War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by our distinguished columnist, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 26, 1965.

Mr. Drummond presents part of the proof of the role being played by the North Vietnamese Communist government in supplying the Vietcong with arms and leadership.

The article follows:

THE MASSIVE PROOF: UNITED STATES CAN NOW DOCUMENT HANOI'S ROLE IN VIET WAR

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The United States is ready to submit to the U.N. Security Council or any other proper body, massive and mounting proof that the war in South Vietnam is armed and directed from Hanoi.

The evidence is now fully prepared for use by the Government at the right moment.

It rests on captured arms, captured documents, Communist defectors, and interrogation of North Vietnamese prisoners of war.

It proves that the aggression against South Vietnam is inspired, commanded, controlled and supplied by the Communist regime in Hanoi.

This evidence shows a systematic violation of the frontiers which Hanoi agreed to respect in the Geneva agreements of 1954 and in the Laotian agreement of 1962.

This evidence makes North Vietnam the procuring force in the attempt to overthrow the Government of South Vietnam and, in the words of Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, "the mainspring of the whole Vietcong effort."

Here is a good cross-section of the information which documents the role Hanoi has played from the beginning:

Infiltration: From 1959 to 1964 Hanoi has sent 19,000 military personnel across the border to wage war against South Vietnam. This figure comes from cross-checked reports from prisoners, defectors, and secret documents. There is substantial information that 15,000 additional infiltrators entered South Vietnam during this period. In guerrilla warfare 20,000 guerrillas can be equal to a regular army of 200,000 to 300,000.

Vietcong leadership: Most officers, the key cadres, and the technicians for hard-core Vietcong units operating in South Vietnam are from North Vietnam.

Arms supplies: Large and increasing quantities of weapons are entering from outside. One captured Vietcong said that his entire company was recently supplied with modern Chinese weapons. A Vietcong arms cache contained recoilless rifles and ammunition, carbines, detonating fuses, 110 pounds of TNT, fuses for mortar shells, and other arms. Their identifiable sources were: North Vietnam, Red China, East Germany, and Hungary.

Another massive cache was seized last week. In it were 80 tons of armaments from Communist countries. Included in the capture were 1,000 Russian-made carbines, 900 Red Chinese rifles, several hundred Soviet submachineguns, antiaircraft guns, recoilless rifles, and grenades.

Supposedly the source of manufacture of these weapons is to be obliterated. Captured documents reveal instructions from Hanoi directing the infiltrators "to remove all markings" from their munitions. The infiltrators themselves start out from near Hanoi in North Vietnamese uniforms and change into South Vietnamese uniforms at the frontier.

The admission: Hanoi has officially declared that its "army is the instrument of the class struggle to liberate South Vietnam." It has said that "it is the brain and the factor that decides."

The thanks: The Vietcong have several times thanked Hanoi for its armed support.

No deviation: The Vietcong Communists have never once deviated from the Hanoi party line.

This is the evidence which caused the three-nation international control commission (India, Canada, with Communist Poland dissenting) to report that "beyond any reasonable doubt North Vietnam has sent arms and men into South Vietnam with the aim of overthrowing the legal government."

This is the evidence which has caused the United States to conclude that the Hanoi regime is in full strategic control of every action by the Vietcong and is providing the major share of its equipment and supplies.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1965, marks the 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. On that date in 1821 a band of Greek patriots began their struggle for freedom. This was the first echo in Europe of the American Revolution, and their efforts were inspired by the example of the revolution only a few years before which had brought about the existence of the "land of the free." The example of the American Revolution had sown seeds that had grown deep roots.

The Greeks looked upon the United States with hope and admiration. One of the first acts of the first Greek Senate in 1821 was an address to the American people:

Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers, having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode * * *. Though separated from us by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us * * *. Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue.

Freedom for the Greeks did not come easily or quickly. Finally, 8 long years later with the sympathy and support of the American people and ultimately that

of the entire civilized world, they won, as we had won earlier.

Mr. Speaker, Greeks are proud that Americans participated in that noble endeavor, and we too should be proud that we contributed to their inspiration as we join them in commemorating the 144th anniversary of their independence on March 25.

The Christian Science Monitor Gives an Example of the Area Redevelopment Administration's Success in Providing New Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor recently published a story describing the excellent work of the Area Redevelopment Administration in helping to provide jobs in a depressed mining area of West Virginia.

The establishment of the Ravens-Shinnston Corp. plant, as described by the Monitor article, is a model of how the Area Redevelopment program works at its best.

In this case, the people of the area, led by their elected officials, the State government, private industry, and the Area Redevelopment Administration joined together cooperatively to create new jobs in a new industry for West Virginians who would otherwise have had little hope of escaping the miseries of chronic unemployment:

ANOTHER SUCCESS STORY IN WEST VIRGINIA: ARA RETRAINING SALVAGES WORKERS

(By David K. Willis)

SHINNSTON, W. VA.—Pete Oliveto, cheerful in brown shirt and work trousers, pushed back his welder's mask and looked around at the men working on the factory floor. "Does a lot for the area, a plant like this," he said.

"Most of these men wouldn't have jobs otherwise. See him? Just out of school. What hope would he have had? There's no jobs here anywhere.

"Me, I was out of work for 8 months one time. Still got my unemployment card in my pocket. Show it to you if you like. I worked in the mines. Made more money there than here—but you'd work 1 day and never know about the next.

"Been here 2 years now. Spent last Christmas with my wife and kids. Second time in 15 years I remember doing that. Always away working or looking before."

This is a success story in the Federal Government's Area Redevelopment Administration (ARA). That is what the ARA is supposed to be doing: Giving men like Pete Oliveto a chance to earn a living.

In many other areas ARA has failed.

ARA was established in 1961 to spur job-creating businesses in depressed areas throughout the United States. Since that time it has given out $300 million in loans and grants for this purpose to communities and business firms.

The agency, which has about $82 million left in its lending account, is due to expire this June. President Johnson is asking that the program be extended.

DEFENSE WORK

Here, in a 400-foot-long factory 2 miles south of Shinnston on Route 19, sparks fly and hammers clang as the Ravens-Shinnston Corp. works two shifts a day.

The factory makes trailer tanks for long hauls. It makes 1½-ton ammunition carriers and 600-gallon storage tanks for the Army.

The plant superintendent, Hobart Cutright, says 32 men are working now. There will be 70 more by the end of the year. With three shifts, the total could eventually hit 250.

Standing with us, running his hand admiringly over a steel girder, was Shinnston's Mayor, George Rice. Mr. Rice has pushed the plant from the start.

"We saw the handwriting on the wall here a couple of years ago," he said matter-of-factly. "It's all mining here, but the mines are automated, and men have nothing to do.

"So we knew we had to do something. A group of us got together in town (Mr. Rice runs the local drugstore) and talked about getting some industry to come in."

COOPERATION SEEN

To qualify for an ARA low cost, long-term loan, the Shinnston Area Development Association held a meeting in the Moose clubhouse. It drew up a plan.

ARA sent down a team of inspectors, the State Industrial Development Authority approved, local townspeople dug deep into their pockets, and the project was launched in a blaze of energy.

The Ravens Corp. has long manufactured trailer tank bodies. It provided the technical experts. A big factor in getting ARA money—$424,000 in all—was a federally assisted retraining school already operating in Harrison County.

The 15,000 people in the greater Shinnston area put up $75,000. Ravens added $200,000.

"People were impatient," Mr. Rice said. "The plant took a year to build. There's a lot of redtape to go through. But we think ARA has done a fine job. We're very pleased.

A major delay came when local interests fought with Ravens to have a bigger voice on the board of the new company. The dispute now has been settled.

The plant has been helped immeasurably by two Defense Department contracts—one of $1.4 million for the ammunition carriers, the other for the 600-gallon tanks.

"Being a depressed area and having an ARA [loan] must have helped us get them," said Mr. Rice. "Anyway, we have them, and we're fulfilling them."

As he spoke Pentagon inspectors were making final checks on the first dark-green carrier at one end of the building.

"We estimate it costs $5,000 to train a single man—that's counting time lost on the job as he gets used to what he's doing," said Mr. Cutright. "But we're doing it, and the plant will go. No doubt about that."

Supreme Court Decree

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has no legal authority to reapportion the legislatures of the States of this Union. The Supreme Court decision of June 15, 1964, ordering reapportionment of State legislatures, particularly the State senates, is one of the most autocratic and dangerous decrees in all the history of the civilized world. This decision is reminiscent of the decrees handed down by Roman Emperors. I know of no decree in modern history wrought with more danger to freedom and self-government at the local level.

This order of the Supreme Court is a blow at the foundation stones of this Republic and our free enterprise system. This decision of the Supreme Court makes a mockery of the Constitution and is an insult to the Congress. If this decree of the Court is permitted to stand by the Congress, the Supreme Court can and will someday reapportion membership in the U.S. Senate. The Court can and will reapportion membership on boards of trustees, magistrates, and local officials throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am today joining my colleagues in introducing a bill which would nullify this unconstitutional and unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court. The bill I am introducing would return legislative power to the people, as intended by the Constitution. No legislative body in this country, whether it is the State legislature, city council, or the Congress itself, is free as long as this Damoclean sword of the Supreme Court is suspended over the legislative processes.

This bill would end the apportionment and reapportionment of State legislatures by the Supreme Court. It would keep the Supreme Court from reviewing reapportionment cases and would restrict the district courts from having the jurisdiction to entertain cases that would reapportion State legislatures.

The Supreme Court has usurped legislative powers. My people are fearful that we are drifting into a dictatorship by the Supreme Court. The Congress must act now to preserve the liberties of our people.

America's Vanishing Merchant Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, it was once said that illusion is the first of all pleasures. But when a popular belief threatens to strangle a vital arm of the Nation's defense and economic power, such self-deception can be fatal. There is a growing fear that America's once unchallenged maritime supremacy has become such a nationalistic mirage—a myth supported by indifference, deceptive statistics, and a naive misconception of the future role of oceangoing commercial carriers.

The United States, the largest trading Nation in the world, is today a sixth-rate maritime power—ranking behind Great Britain, Liberia, Norway, and the U.S.S.R. The fact is that Russia will soon have the world's largest merchant

marine—a 20-million-ton fleet by 1970, a 27-million-ton fleet 5 years later. By 1980, it has been estimated by our own Maritime Administrator the Soviet Union will be able to carry 93 percent of its commerce in Russian owned and operated vessels.

By comparison, with 90 percent of our world trade being moved by ship, and threatened as we are by a serious balance-of-payments problem, our deepsea fleet of scarcely 900 vessels over 1,000 tons is a smaller merchant fleet than we had in 1939.

It should be clear to even the most innocent and unsuspecting observer of the cold war that the Soviet Union has declared economic war on the West, with the United States the prime target. And, in the long run, this is a threat more patently dangerous to our National Security than a dozen Vietnam-like encounters. Such aggressive challenges, no matter how frustrating, expensive and serious, can be met and contained if we have the necessary economic might.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson suggested in his state of the Union message that the administration would tackle this alarming deterioration of the merchant fleet. He said he would recommend a "new policy for our merchant marine."

I submit that this problem is one that should have a very high priority, for it is a key element in many areas of great national concern—defense, world trade and the balance of payments, our ailing shipbuilding industry, foreign policy, national prestige, and public safety are among the more important.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention and careful consideration of my colleagues, the following editorial from the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., "Cargo Fleet Dwindles," which dramatically outlines the problems facing the merchant marine and calls on the Administration to work toward their solution:

CARGO FLEET DWINDLES

The United States continues to boast of its merchant marine, even as the latter sinks. Oversimplified, that is what worries Nicholas Johnson, maritime administrator of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

We are the world's largest trading nation, supplying 315 million tons of imports and exports each year, 99 percent of which go by ship.

Our foreign-trade liner fleet is composed of 315 subsidized and 100 unsubsidized ships. Unless we alter course to prevent it, these 100 vessels will disappear from our merchant marine, victims of old age, within 10 years.

To grant subsidies on these old ships would cost $50 million annually. To replace them would require an additional $600 million. Suppose we do not replace them?

In 1963, the total amount of Government sponsored cargo moving on American liners was 7,200,000 tons. Without the unsubsidized liners, all of this will have to go on the subsidized ships, and the percentage of purely commercial cargo on these latter vessels then will decline to, at most, 40 percent. What would be left of our purely commercial Merchant Marine?

The dry-bulk segment of our fleet (carriers of wheat, coal, iron ore, etc.) is even worse. We now carry approximately 5 percent of our total dry-bulk trade. In the next 20 years, the volume of these commodities will leap from 140 to 380 million tons. Meanwhile, our capacity to carry that trade will decline from today's small 7,800,000 tons to a puny 3,900,000 tons, about 1 percent of the total.

Our tramp fleet (operating without regular routes or ports) is composed of 130 vessels, only 7 built since 1945. Mr. Johnson says they are "inadequately maintained" and predicts that over the next 5 or 10 years, this fleet will be unable to meet Federal requirements or "will just break down forever."

There exists no program to replace it. To put 100 modern dry-bulk carriers under operating subsidy would cost $30 million annually at least; to build such ships in American yards would cost the Government a minimum of $400 million.

What all of this means is that our merchant fleet is growing smaller and more expensive as our needs for such a fleet increase. Our total merchant marine has dropped from 3,421 ships in 1949 to 2,529 today. Even after discounting the decrease resulting from sale or scrapping of war-built ships, our active commercial fleet has declined by 25 percent during this period. Excluding tankers, our domestic fleet, 192 dry cargo and passengers ships in 1949, has dwindled to 93 today.

Hundreds of additional ships are required to hold our own; expansion would require more than that. Part of the problem is ship construction; our shipyards, in which U.S. ships must be built by law, charge about 220 percent of foreign-ship prices, yet make relatively low profits. Shipbuilding does not lend itself to automation (750,000 man-hours may go into a ship) and in our 21 shipyards, operating at only 42-percent capacity, there is little incentive for extensive capital improvements that might reduce costs.

There must soon be an extensive review of ship replacement, Government fleet and/or shipyard subsidy, cargo-preference requirements (calling for use of U.S. ships for Federal cargoes), existing trade route restrictions, the build-American requirement, and our national security needs relating to this disappearing fleet.

We know from the experiences of World Wars I and II that a healthy merchant marine and a substantial shipbuilding capacity (we built 5,600 vessels during World War II at a cost of more than $15 billion) are essential to national well-being.

President Johnson, already sensitive to our vital railroad needs, ought next to turn the spotlight on our ailing merchant fleet.

Why Let Every Dick, Tom, and Harry in Our Country?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we will probably have immigration legislation before the Congress this session, it strikes me that Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones' article, which appeared in the California Redwood City Tribune on January 30, is worthy of our serious consideration.

Mr. Jones' article follows:

HITS IMMIGRATION PROPOSAL: WHY LET EVERY DICK, TOM, AND HARRY IN OUR COUNTRY?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

President Lyndon Johnson has called for a massive liberalization of our immigration laws and an end to the quota systems which have favored persons born in Western Europe over persons born elsewhere.

"The procedures we have followed," said the President, "imply that men and women from some countries are, just because of where they come from, more desirable citizens than others. Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition."

Now, at the risk of losing my Boy Scout merit badge for cosmic tolerance, I might suggest that if the majority of Americans had sprung, not from western Europe, but from central Africa or southern Asia, we would have a vastly different country. There are, in all parts of the world, fine human beings, but peoples differ widely in their social habits, their levels of ambition, their mechanical aptitudes, their moral traditions, and their capacities for maintaining stable, popular governments.

Why should the United States be the only advanced nation in the world to develop a guilt complex over selective immigration? Every other country that is attractive to immigrants selects baldly and without apology.

Trinidad is in the British Commonwealth. Yet under a new British law, immigration from Trinidad is closely restricted. But President Johnson's proposed bill would make Trinidad quota free.

The President has decried our present stringent quotas for Asiatic immigrants. Australia has no quota at all. It simply excludes anyone of non-European ancestry. And the Japanese Government discourages immigration from any country. A spokesman for the Japanese Embassy in Washington this month stated simply that the Japanese are of one race and proud of it.

Although any person may apply for immigration to Israel, that Government frankly seeks only an ingathering of the Jews. Last year a Jew who had become a Catholic was denied citizenship by an Israeli court.

Each year, for 175 years, the United States has received more immigrants than any other nation in the world.

President Johnson, in his immigration message, says that the current American immigration quota is 158,361 annually, and that there are already substantially more immigrants than the quota figures indicate. There are no quotas for Latin America, nor for spouses and children of American citizens. In addition, Congress keeps passing special bills to admit immigrants. According to the Population Reference Bureau the net immigration to the United States during the 10 years of the 1950's was 2.7 million.

President Johnson claims that his proposed bill would make it easier for people of special skills to come and help the American economy. Yet it would immediately double the quotas for such countries as Tanzania, Malawi, Yemen, and Nepal, in which persons with special skills needed in America might be hard to find.

Unlike the immigration restrictions of almost every advanced country, the President's bill would admit persons suffering from feeblemindedness, insanity, and psychopathic personality, if their families promised to take care of them. The requirement that immigrants would have to have the promise of a job would be taken out.

Now, if the President's bill were passed, who would come? You can get some indication by the current backlog of unsatisfied visa applications. In Greece there are 350 current applications for every place under the present annual quotas.

In India there are 150 such applications; in Israel, 150; in Portugal, 125; in Jamaica, 115, and in the United Arab Republic, 90. Is the President really going to try to satisfy these anxious-to-leave-home people in the interest of the success of our foreign policy?

Why haven't other advanced nations felt it in the interest of their own foreign policies to let down their immigration bars?

The plain fact is that nothing America could do without utterly destroying herself could measurably ease the population woes of a world in which 125,000 people are being added every day.

The plain fact is that as long as America remains prosperous, there will be cries of rage from people who would like to get in and can't. Even a well-heeled Korean coolie could live more comfortably on relief in a New York tenement.

And the plain fact is that America is not hurting for population or jobseekers. America now contains 193 million people. Our current birth rate is more than twice our death rate. By 1980, even without President Johnson's new, liberal immigration law, we will have 240 million people.

Every other nation in the world writes its immigration laws to suit itself. Every other nation in the world says, "It is our country, and so what?"

Well, it's our country, too, and when we start writing immigration laws to suit the hungry camel drivers of "Upper Malaria," old man history will bust his buttons laughing.

The Need for Public Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House an excellent address by my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, that was delivered before the 34th annual meeting of the National Housing Conference.

Mr. BLATNIK expressed eloquently the need for more and improved public facilities.

I am pleased to note that my constituency, the 39th District of New York, was well represented at the meeting. Representing Buffalo, N.Y., were Robert K. Sipprell, executive director of the Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority, and Mrs. Sipprell; Richard Lang Miller, executive director of the Greater Buffalo Development Foundation; and George F. Rand, Jr., vice president of the Marine Trust Co. of Western New York and Mrs. Rand.

Following are the remarks of Mr. BLATNIK:

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

The keynote of this administration was sounded by President Johnson in his state of the Union message when he said, "Our basic task is threefold: to keep our economy growing; to open for all Americans the opportunity that is now enjoyed by most Americans; and to improve the quality of life for all." These are the goals which your great oragnization has fought to achieve over the years. Those have been years of substantial progress and I am confident that the legislation which will be enacted by the 89th Congress will mark a major milestone in our unending efforts to build a better life for all of our citizens.

Those who hoped or feared that President Johnson's Great Society would be just an empty title have received their answer in a steady flow of Presidential messages and legislative recommendations sent to the Congress. While no one has yet discovered the secret of pleasing everyone, the administration's program as it is being unfolded in these messages shows a determination to accomplish as much as possible and a bold willingness to experiment in search of further answers.

I am particularly pleased with the President's emphasis on "quality of life." All too often we rate our national accomplishments just on the basis of quantity. Perhaps this is necessarily so because the economics which underlie our policies is not well equipped to measure quality. But I think the distinction is a very real one and one which should be made. I also believe that this emphasis has struck a responsive chord with the public and in the future our programs will be evaluated even more critically. This new dimension in our public policies has already been reflected in the staid pages of Fortune magazine. This month's issue carries an article entitled "The Half-Finished Society," which points out the disparity between our accomplishments in satisfying private consumption in contrast to public investment.

The article states, "Our immaculate homes are crowded with gleaming appliances and our refrigerators are piled high with convenience foods. But beyond our doorsteps lies a shamefully neglected social and physical environment."

This is strong language indeed and I think we can all agree that the author has taken a pardonable license with the facts—not all of our families enjoy gleaming new appliances on the one hand, and our towns and cities are increasingly successful in preserving and rebuilding attractive neighborhoods. Still there is much basic truth in the statement and it hits squarely at a problem which, in my opinion, calls for direct Federal assistance. In spite of the vigorous efforts of State and local governments, we have fallen far behind the need for public facilities. Everyone recognizes, at least in principle, that adequate water and sewer facilities, streets and sidewalks, public buildings, and so forth, are essential for sound community development. But too many people balk at the unpleasant burden of actually paying for them. In their minds they seem to divorce the benefits of public investment from the cost of paying for them and applaud the one and vote against the other. Admittedly taxes are still high, particularly at the local level. But we are paying a high and rising price for our neglect of public investment in terms of inadequate or antiquated or overcrowded facilities which carry their own cost, ranging from nuisances to outright threats to health and welfare.

This shortage of essential community facilities has a very direct bearing on our housing problems, not only by its effect on the public environment but by its effect on the volume and cost of housing production. The Housing Yearbook published by the National Housing Conference very perceptively includes up-to-date estimates of the minimum sales prices at which new homes are being offered in a number of cities. This gives an indication of how successfully private builders are serving families of modest income. I believe their new figures will be disquieting.

The Bureau of the Census has just released figures on sales prices of new homes and the median price in December was $20,600, a jump of $1,900 over the same month of the previous year. The Census Bureau release does not go into further detail but the economists at the National Association of Home Builders attribute this largely to the rapid rise in the price of land. And going one step further, this inflation of land value reflects largely the shortage of community facilities, particularly water and sewer lines, but including the whole range of necessary public investment that goes into a community. The shortage is not one of land itself but the fact that before land can be developed there must be a substantial investment in local public works. In most places builders say that they cannot build low-cost housing because they do not have the inexpensive land on which to put it. The administration's housing bill just submitted to the Congress includes some provisions which recognize this problem, such as the proposal for $100 million in grants next year for water and sewer facilities in growth areas. In my opinion, the basic solution to taking the inflation out of land values is a much higher level of Federal assistance for the whole range of essential facilities.

The fact is that the Federal Government has largely preempted the most fruitful source of revenue through the income tax. Moreover, this is a tax which yields an increase in the neighborhood of $5 billion a year without raising the rates as a result of normal economic growth. The overwhelming share of these taxes comes from our towns and citie and their needs should be given high prio.ity in the use of them. Local government is faced not only with limited sources of tax revenues but with rapidly growing responsibilities. In his testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, John Kenneth Galbraith stated, "The great economic anachronism of our time is that economic growth gives the Federal Government the revenues while, along with population increases, it gives the States and especially the cities the problems." Just as one example of what Professor Galbraith was speaking of is the fact that in the past 5 years school enrollment has jumped by 5 million. Other responsibilities of local government have also increased sharply reflecting not only population growth but the ever-rising standards demanded by our citizens.

We have already begun a piecemeal approach to this problem with Federal grants for selected purposes. I believe it is fair to state that all of these programs of grant assistance for local public works have been successful, efficient, and strongly supported by mayors, unions, and other liberal public interest groups. The water pollution control program has amply proven its value and will become ever more useful under pending legislation. Personally, I believe that both the overall dollar level of the program as well as the 30-percent grant ratio should be raised. But, in any event, we have made real progress since that day almost exactly 5 years ago when our efforts to improve and expand the program met with a Presidential veto which we could not override. Another program which made an important contribution toward overcoming the backlog of needed comunity facilities was the accelerated public works program. More than 7,000 projects around the country were aided with those grants. But the fact remains that we need not only larger Federal investment for this purpose but also a continuing program so that comunities can confidently plan their construction program in advance with assurance that a margin of Federal assistance will be available when they are prepared to get underway.

A program of substantial Federal grants for a wide range of community facilities is also important to another essential aspect of President Johnson's Great Society—the achievement of full employment and the maintenance of a high level of economic growth. Rapid economic improvement over the past 4 years has substantially reduced unemployment but there are still millions of men and women who canot find jobs or who can find only part-time work. While praising our achievements we must not lose sight of the bitter problems that confront these unemployed workers and their families. This is a waste which we canont tolerate either on humanitarian or economic grounds.

While we have sustained a remarkably long period of economic expansion extending to 4 years now, only a person with a very short memory can deceive himself that we have ruled out the possibility of recession. Much of our recent economic growth represents taking up the slack of the preceding years when the economy fluctuated between recessions and inadequate recoveries. Already many economists and business analysts are expressing concern over the trend of the economy later this year. In a growing nation it is not enough to maintain a level of production, even a high one. We must continue to expand to provide jobs for our growing labor force. This problem is compounded by the much-discussed postwar baby boom. Looking back 18 years we see a jump in the birth rate from 2.7 to 3.7 million. This means that over the next year or so the number of new jobseekers entering the labor force will increase sharply and be greater than we have experienced in decades.

President Johnson has cited unemployment of young, inexperienced workers as one of the greatest domestic problems facing us today. We cannot take it for granted that the economy will automatically produce the millions of jobs needed to provide for this influx of young workers and at the same time take care of those who will lose their present jobs through automation and shifts in demand and at the same time reduce unemployment to an acceptable minimum within a reasonable time.

The time to make our economic plans to assure that jobs will be available is now, and an important part of that planning should be a program to extend needed Federal assistance to overcome our multibillion dollar backlog of community facilities and meet the requirements for future growth. To accomplish this I have introduced a bill, H.R. 2170, which would authorize 50-percent grants for nearly the whole range of local public works in towns and cities of all sizes, with the further provision that in depressed areas these grants could go up to 75 percent. The bill would authorize a continuing program of $2 billion a year for these grants.

This bill would meet several pressing problems. It would make a meaningful increase in the volume of construction of needed community facilities thereby reducing the backlog which we must face up to sooner or later. It would help to make our cities better places in which to live and work. It would ease the financial crisis facing local government and help them to meet the whole range of their responsibilities. By opening up new land it would reduce the inflationary pressure on lot prices directly, reducing housing costs and making land available at costs consistent with lower priced housing. It would channel some of our tremendous national wealth to the neglected field of public investment and help redress the present imbalance between the private and public sectors. And finally, it will make an important and continuing contribution to sound and adequate growth of output, employment, and incomes.

This bill has already received the endorsement of the AFL–CIO and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association which has always played a leading role in community development. The need for Federal grants for this purpose is recognized by both of the mayors' organizations and has their support. And the principle of grants for community facilities has the support of the National Association of Home Builders who recognize the limitation on their markets imposed by the shortage of land ready for development and the present high level of land costs.

This bill is among my highest legislative priorities and I plan to hold hearings on it later this spring. I believe the need for such a program is urgent and I am hopeful that we will be able to enact it into law.

The Case for Extending the Prosecution of the Nazi Mass Murderers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware of the debate now going on in the West German Parliament over the extension of the statute of limitations on prosecution of Nazi war criminals. The latest reports seem to indicate that at least some extension will be enacted. In the following article of the New York Herald Tribune of February 25, 1965, the distinguished president of the American Jewish Committee, Morris B. Abram, outlines—in a memorandum which was given to the German Minister of Justice—how the German Government could extend the statute of limitations under German law to 1975. This memorandum presents a good solid case and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

The article follows:

JEWISH CASE FOR EXTENDING NAZI PROSECUTIONS

(NOTE.—West Germany's statute of limitations, as now interpreted, will make it impossible to start new prosecutions of Nazi war criminals after May 8. Last November, the West German Cabinet took the position that it would be legally impossible to extend the deadline. Reaction across the world stunned the West Germans. Last week, the West German Cabinet voted unanimously to support legislation to extend the deadline. The Bundestag is to debate such a measure on March 10. Morris B. Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee, met with the German Minister of Justice and gave him a memorandum on how he believes prosecutions can continue without doing violence to the law. This is his memorandum.)

I have had the benefit of reading a translation of your article on the subject in the official Bulletin of the Federal Press Service of January 8, 1965.

I respect your views: "We have regained freedom to live in accordance with law and order and we are no longer exposed to arbitrariness, including changing laws retroactively as the Nazi legislation liked to do."

As you, I believe deeply in the rule of law as the precondition of justice and civic peace. Therefore, I do not ask you to adopt special German legislation of an ex post facto nature to deal with the problem.

You yourself have seemed to recognize the widely accepted view that German Basic Law against ex post facto legislation, article 103, paragraph 2, applies only to substantive law.

You grant that some others feel that the statute of limitations is only a procedural rule and that an extension of its term would on that account not violate your article 103, paragraph 2, as ex post facto legislation. However, I am willing to accept your view that the statute of limitations contains both substantive and procedural elements and that an enlargement of the period would be constitutionally prohibited.

Finally, I have not overlooked, as you point out others have constantly, particularly those abroad, the fact that prosecutions in any case will after May 8, 1965, proceed in individual cases wherein some judicial action has been taken before that date.

On the other hand, I have noted with interest and concern your own recent statement in Tunis recognizing that a very small number may escape.

(Moreover, your further statement in Tunis that "it is in the spirit of a statute of limitations that some criminals escape justice" could cause considerable anxiety is misinterpreted.)

Again, despite the revulsion I share with the civilized world on the contemplation of Nazi crimes, I both respect and accept your adherence to the principle of the rule of law and I have predicated this memorandum on this premise.

You are prosecuting Nazi criminals under a German criminal law dating from 1871. Admittedly, this law covers these crimes, but these crimes are so gross as to extend far beyond the contemplation of the legislators of 1871.

Other states operating under a rule of law, such as France and Belgium, have recognized the inappropriateness of ordinary criminal statutes for Nazi crimes, and have treated them distinctly with different statutes of limitation.

Also, the Legal Committee of the Cousiative Assembly of the Council of Europe has recommended consideration of what basically has been the French and Belgian approach to this problem. Your nation is affiliated with the council and no doubt you are aware of the statement attributed to the chairman of the legal committee, Mr. Hermond Lanning of Denmark, on December 18, 1964:

"He specified that this recommendation was particularly aimed at the Bonn government but by politeness it would be aimed at all European governments."

It could be argued that the rule of law, developed by an international consensus, therefore not only permit but requires that Nazi crimes against humanity be treated other than as a simple domestic law violation. The view of the French National Assembly expressed on December 17, 1964 that applying the doctrine of the Nuremberg Tribunals, such crimes are not of an exclusively national character and therefore without a statute of limitations, is entitled to serious respect.

Certainly, if the Nazi "crimes against humanity" as defined by the United Nations resolution of February 13, 1946 and by the International Tribunal at Nuremberg, are so accepted as crimes under international law, they may be considered outside your 1871 code. Your constitution, article 25, appears to give ample support to the supremacy of such laws, providing that such take "precedence over the (domestic) laws and directly create rights and duties for the inhabitants of the federal territory."

From the above it would seem that prosecutions of Nazi crimes could proceed under law other than the Code of 1871, without the impediment of the statute of limitations provided in that code. Nothing exceptional would be required with respect to the 1871 code, merely a recognition that it is not the exclusive source for trial and punishment of Nazi crimes against humanity.

I somehow feel that the legislators in the relatively humane days of 1871 would not be surprised by such a determination.

But now I turn to a point which requires no speculation, no legal imagination or inventiveness, but only a rigorous and accurate application of the German Code of 1871.

If you should continue to hold the view that Nazi crimes against humanity must be prosecuted exclusively under the code of 1871, then I respectfully beseech you to reexamine the date you have chosen for the commencement of the 20-year period of the statute of limitations.

The 1871 Code directs that the time limitations runs from the day of the com-

mission of the deed, unless prosecution was impossible.

Admittedly, you have been commencing prosecution for several years of persons charged with Nazi crimes committed more than 20 years previously. Your basis for such actions is that until May 8, 1945, such prosecutions were impossible.

Thus you have extended the 20-year period of the statute by a discretionary determination of the date on which prosecution became possible.

You might within reason and on the basis of fact have chosen a variety of such dates, but May 8 (V–E Day), is not a defensible selection.

In short, you have recognized the principle that the statute did not commence running until the date prosecution became possible, but you have chosen the wrong date.

On V–E Day there was no German Government to enforce its 1871 Code. On V–E Day the German state had collapsed. It was weeks, and months, before the Allied powers were themselves able to restore a minimum of the ordinary processes of government beyond mere police power and sustenance rations.

To contend that any sovereignty and competence existed on V–E Day to ferret out all Nazi criminals is simply absurd. In point of fact, the Allies, preoccupied with the gathering of evidence for the prosecution of Goering et al. at Nuremberg, had great difficulty in the months that followed in obtaining the evidence in those limited cases.

Nor did the Allies ever pretend to do the complete task of bringing to justice all those Nazis whose acts were clearly subject to the 1871 code as well as other laws.

From my own limited experience on the staff of the International Military Tribunal, I know where attention was rightly focused and realize the limits of the resources of the occupying powers to bring all criminals to justice.

I recognize that up to now you have chosen to interpret the 1871 statute to mean that the 20-year period runs from the date any sovereignty, including the occupying powers, had the competence to prosecute. However, I submit that this is not the intention of the statute.

If you chose to employ a German domestic statute as the exclusive source of prosecution, consistency requires you read that statute as referring to the German Government's possibility of commencing prosecution. Surely in 1871 the German legislature did not have in mind the circumstance of prosecution of Germans by English, or Americans, and (1 year after the Franco-Prussian War) certainly not by the French. Thus the possibility of prosecution contemplated by the statute means possibility of prosecution by German authority.

On May 8, 1945, German authority did not exist. Nor did German authority and competence to commence prosecutions come into being for years.

There was no Ministry of Justice until 1949. There was no limited sovereignty until 1951. Not until that year did you have a Foreign Minister communicating with other powers in whose hands rested many records and witnesses necessary for prosecution. Final German sovereignty was not regained until the Bonn Conventions came into effect on May 5, 1955.

During this entire period, the records which a normal state accumulates and collates were understandably in a state of disarray. These records are the requisite of effective prosecutions. Even now many of these essential records are in the hands of other nations, a principal one of which (the U.S.S.R.) has been most uncooperative with your efforts to bring these criminals to justice.

It was not until 1958 that the Ministers of Justice of the various Laender agreed to create a central office for the coordination of information and investigation of Nazi crimes at Ludwigsburg. As late as December, 1964, it was announced that the Ludwigsburg staff would have to be increased to aid this work. Thus it is clear that until fairly recent times, prosecution has not been completely possible.

In this connection we must remember that the 1871 statute means not that prosecutions in general became possible, but that a prosecution of an individual is possible. I happen to believe that if this had been so in any particular case, you would have prosecuted. It follows, therefore, that the failure to prosecute a Nazi criminal means that due to the disorganization of the state for a long period it was impossible to have commenced such.

I therefore conclude that applying your own domestic law, the statute of limitations should run for 20 years from the date prosecution became in fact possible.

The facts which I have asserted here have been recognized by no less an authority than the German Ambassador to the United States. In "News From the German Embassy," volume IX, No. 1, dated January 5, 1965, Ambassador Heinrich Knappstein stated:

"As I know from my own activity in the denazification process, German courts during the early postwar years were not able—or only to a very limited degree—to try Nazi criminals, because the Allies reserved these cases almost entirely for themselves. Only with the establishment of the Federal Republic and the conclusion of the Bonn Conventions of 1954 was German judicature able to take on fully the prosecution of Nazi criminals. This was particularly difficult in the beginning as the most important documents were still in Allied hands, and because it was especially difficult, during those first turbulent years, to reach surviving witnesses who were essential for such trials."

In the same publication, volume VIII, No. 8, dated May 28, 1964, the Embassy published an interview with a "senior prosecuting attorney," stating the following:

"Question. How is it that the Auschwitz and similar legal proceedings were started so late?

"Answer. There are many reasons for this. It has only been since 1956 that the Federal Republic of Germany has enjoyed full sovereignty in this as well as other areas. Beyond this the Allies conducted the Nuremberg trials from 1945 to 1948, and in concluding them in 1948 did not call the attention of German judicial authorities to the documents that remained and that despite Allied efforts all perpetrators of crimes had not been brought to justice. The documents necessary to prosecute such criminal actions were scattered throughout the archives around the world. It took time to find out where they were and to get possession of these documents. There is a substantial body of documents in the East bloc states which remain inaccessible to us even today."

You have been candid enough to agree with me that some date after May 8, 1945, could reasonably be selected as a beginning point without violating your constitution or the rule of law as you see it. I very much hope you will now search for, select, adopt and announce a date consistent with the facts and fair to society, both German and international, which suffered so much from the Nazi horrors.

I believe the date 1955—the date when complete German sovereignty was regained—would be an appropriate date. This would extend prosecutions until 1975.

I recognize that your Ministry has been requested "to report to the Bundestag not later than March 1, 1965, whether in all pertinent murder cases investigations have been conducted and whether action has been taken to insure interruption of the statute of limitations."

I gathered from my conversations in Bonn that should your reply to the above question be in the negative, there would be a strong disposition in many German quarters, and perhaps in your government to extend by direct legislation the statute of limitations if (to use the words of the Bundestag resolution of December 9, 1964) "the criminal prosecution of such murders cannot be insured in any other way."

While many have argued that "ultimate justice" demands that such crimes should be punished even if special and exceptional domestic legislation is required, you have personally been understood to reject this view on the ground that the desired end does not justify such means.

However, may I submit, that the decision to ask for such legislation cannot, on your stated principles, rest on any estimate as to the number of criminals who will escape trial and justice if the time for prosecution expires on May 8, 1965. Therefore, I believe it is preferable not to wait until such a survey and estimate is made before announcing clearly and firmly that the time does not expire on May 8, 1965. An announcement to that effect predicated on the terms of the Code of 1871, with a realistic finding of the date on which prosecution became possible, would do justice to society and honor to the rule of law.

Attorney General Testifies on Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the statement by Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee on the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965, on Thursday, March 18, 1965.

The statement follows:

In our system of government, there is no right more central and no right more precious than the right to vote.

From our early history, the free and secret ballot has been the foundation of America. This Congress stands as imposing evidence of that truth. And, if we have needed reminding, Presidents in every generation have repeated that truth.

In a message to the 36th Congress, in 1860, President Buchanan observed that: "The ballot box is the surest arbiter of disputes among freemen."

In a message to the 51st Congress, in 1890, President Benjamin Harrison said: "If any intelligent and loyal company of American citizens were required to catalog the essential human conditions of national life, I do not doubt that with absolute unanimity they would begin with 'free and honest elections.' "

In a message to the 66th Congress, in 1919, President Wilson said: "The instrument of all reform in America is the ballot."

In a message to the 88th Congress, just 2 years ago, President Kennedy said: "The right to vote in a free American election is the most powerful and precious right in the world—and it must not be denied on the grounds of race or color. It is a potent key to achieving other rights of citizenship."

And yet, just 3 days ago, it remained necessary for President Johnson, in an eloquent message to this Congress, to say:

"Many of the issues of civil rights are complex and difficult. But about this there can be no argument. Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote. There is no reason which can excuse the denial of that right. There is no duty which weighs more heavily on us than the duty to insure that right."

The President called on the Congress and on the American people to meet that duty with the fullest power of heart, mind, and law. I appear before you today to support that commitment and to tell you in detail why this administration believes the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 to be sound, effective, and essential.

I. DENIALS OF THE PAST

The promise of a new life for Negro Americans was first expressed in the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution. The promise of freedom for the slaves was kept; the promises of equal protection and the right to vote without racial discrimination are yet, a century later, still empty.

Soon after the adoption of the Civil War amendments, Congress did indeed enact a number of implementing laws. Promptly after the ratification of the 15th amendment, the Enforcement Act of May 31, 1870, was passed, declaring the right of all citizens to vote without racial discrimination. Under the 1870 law, officials were required to give all citizens the same, equal opportunity to perform any act prerequisite to voting. Violation and interference were made criminal offenses.

In 1871, another law was passed to protect Negro voting rights. It made it a crime to prevent anyone from voting by threats or intimidation, and established a system of Federal supervisors of elections.

But these protections were neither adequately enforced, nor of long duration. Attempts to strengthen the legislation, occasioned by rising Negro disenfranchisement in the South, were unsuccessful. Congressional debates reflect the fear of disturbing the status quo of white supremacy. In 1894, most of the legislation dealing with the right to vote was repealed.

Meanwhile, some States had been busy enacting legislation to disenfranchise the Negro. They adopted a variety of devices, with no effort to disguise their real purpose—disenfranchisement of the Negro.

Whites unable to meet the new requirements were protected by the so-called "grandfather clause"—which could not possibly have applied to a Negro newly freed from slavery. The Supreme Court struck down the grandfather clause in 1915, but discrimination and disenfranchisement continued. The Negro's theoretical right to vote was successfully thwarted by intimidation and fear of reprisal. The white primary long served to disenfranchise Negroes, until declared unconstitutional in 1944. During this long period America almost forgot—and certainly ignored—its commitment to voting equality.

Beginning with President Truman's 1948 recommendation to Congress, based on the report of his Committee on Civil Rights, bills to protect the right to vote were introduced in successive Congresses.

Still, action did not come until the Civil Rights Act of 1957. That act authorizes the Attorney General to bring suits to correct discrimination in State and Federal elections, as well as intimidation of potential voters.

The Civil Rights Act of 1960 sought to make such lawsuits easier. It amended the 1957 act to permit the Attorney General to inspect registration records and to permit Negroes rejected by State registration officials to apply to a Federal court or a voting referee.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 sought to make voting rights suits faster. It amended the 1960 act to expedite cases, to facilitate proof of discrimination, and to require nondiscriminatory standards.

What has been the effect of these statutes? It is easy to measure. In Alabama, the number of Negroes registered to vote has increased by 5.2 percent between 1958 and 1964—to a total of 19.4 percent of those eligible. This compares with 69.2 percent of the eligible whites.

In Mississippi, the number of Negroes registered to vote has increased at an even slower rate. In 1954, about 4.4 percent of the eligible Negroes were registered; today, we estimate the figure at about 6.4 percent. Meanwhile, in areas for which we have statistics, the comparable figure for whites is that 80.5 percent of those eligible are registered.

And in Louisiana, Negro registration has not increased at all, or if at all, imperceptibly. In 1956, 31.7 percent of the eligible Negroes were registered. As of January 1, 1965, the figure was 31.8 percent. The white percentage, meanwhile, is 80.2 percent.

The lesson is plain. The three present statutes have had only minimal effect. They have been too slow.

Thus, we have come to Congress 3 times in the past 8 years to ask for legislation to fulfill the promise our country made in the 15th amendment 95 years ago, the promise of the ballot.

Three times since 1956, the Congress has responded. Three times, it has adopted the alternative of litigation, of seeking solutions in our judicial system. But three times since 1956, we have seen that alternative tarnished by evasion, obstruction, delay, and disrespect.

The alternative, in short, has already been tried and found wanting "The time of justice," the President said on Monday "has now come."

II. DENIALS OF THE PRESENT

The discouraging figures I have cited do not represent lack of will by any administration in administering the voting rights laws. These laws have been administered by four Attorneys General serving under three Presidents and representing both parties.

Nor do these figures represent any lack of energy, ability, or dedication by the lawyers of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. I believe I have never, whether in government, in private practice, or in the academic world, seen any attorneys work so hard, so well and, often, under such difficult circumstances.

What these Negro voting figures do represent is the inadequacy of the judicial process to deal effectively and expeditiously with a problem so deep seated and so complex.

My predecessors have, for a decade, given this committee example after example of how this registration process has been perverted to test not literacy, not ability, not understanding—but race. Like them, I could, today, give you numerous examples of such perversions.

I could cite numerous examples of the almost incredible amount of time our attorneys must devote to each of the 71 voting rights cases filed under the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964. It has become routine to spend as much a 6,000 man-hours alone only in analyzing the voting records in a single county—to say nothing of preparation for trial and the almost inevitable appeal.

I could cite numerous examples of how delay and evasion have made it necessary for us to gauge judicial relief not in terms of months, but in terms of years. For the fact is that those who are determined to resist are able—even after apparent defeat in the courts—to devise whole new methods of discrimination. And often that means beginning the whole weary process all over again.

In short, I could cite example after example, but let me, at random, pick just one: Selma, Ala.

III. THE RIGHT TO VOTE IN DALLAS COUNTY, ALA.

The story of Negro voting rights in Dallas County, Ala., of which Selma is the seat, could—until February 4—be told in three words: intimidation, discouragement, and delay.

There has been blatant discrimination against Negroes seeking to vote in Dallas County at least since 1952. How blatant is evident from simple statistics.

In 1961, Dallas County had a voting age population of 29,515, of whom, 14,400 were white persons and 15,115 were Negroes. The number of whites registered to vote totaled 9,195—64 percent of the voting age total. The number of Negroes totaled 156—1.03 percent of the total.

Between 1954 and 1961, the number of Negroes registered had mushroomed; exactly 18 were registered in those 7 years.

If effective and prompt remedies were necessary in any county, they were necessary in Dallas County. And as a result, the first voting case filed in the Kennedy-Johnson administration was brought against Dallas County on April 13, 1961.

The case finally came to trial 13 months later. In an additional six months came the district court decision. The court decided that prior registrars had, in fact, discriminated against Negro applicants. But, the court concluded, the current board of registrars was not then discriminating and, therefore, refused to issue an injunction against discrimination by the registrars. We appealed.

On September 30, 1963, 2½ years after the suit was originally filed, the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit reversed the district court and ordered it to enter an injunction against discrimination.

Nevertheless, the Department also had urged the court of appeals to direct the registrars to judge Negro applicants by the same standards that had been applied to white applicants during the long period of discrimination—until the effects of past discrimination had been dissipated. The court of appeals recognized that this type of relief might be needed in some cases, but did not order it in this case.

Our experience has shown that such relief is essential to any meaningful improvement in Negro voter registration in areas where there have been previous patterns of discrimination. Thus, after 2½ years, the first round of litigation against discrimination in Selma ended, substantially in failure.

Two months later, Department personnel inspected and photographed voter registration records at the Dallas County courthouse. These records showed that the registrars were engaged in obvious discrimination. With a topheavy majority of whites already registered, the registrars had raised standards for applicants of both races. The percentage of rejections for both white and Negro applicants for registration had more than doubled since the original trial in May 1962.

The impact, of course, was greatest on the Negroes, of whom hardly any were registered. Eighty-nine percent of the Negro applicants had been rejected between May 1962 and November 1963.

Of the 445 Negro applications rejected, 175 had been filed by Negroes with at least 12 years of education, including 21 with 16 years and 1 with a master's degree.

In addition to directly discriminatory practices, the registrars also were using one of their most effective indirect methods—delay.

For example, on 11 of the 14 registration days in October 1963, 60 or more persons waited in line to register, but the average number of persons allowed to fill out forms was 36. In previous years—when the applicants were predominantly white—up to 148 applications had been processed in a single day.

For Negroes to register in Dallas County was thus extremely difficult. In February 1964, it became virtually impossible. Then, all Alabama County Boards of Registrars, including the Dallas County Board in Selma, began using a new application form. This form included a complicated literacy and knowledge-of-government test.

Since registration is permanent in Alabama, the great majority of white voters in Selma and Dallas County, already registered under previous, easier standards, did not have to pass the test. But the great majority of voting-age Negroes, unregistered, now faced still another, still higher obstacle to voting.

Under the new test, the applicant had to demonstrate his ability to spell and understand by writing individual words from the dictation of the registrar. Applicants in Selma were required to spell such difficult and technical words as "emolument," "capitation," "impeachment," "apportionment," and "despotism." The Dallas County registrars also added a refinement not required by the terms of the State-prescribed form. Applicants were required to give a satisfactory interpretation of one of the excerpts of the Constitution printed on the form.

As the result, we decided to go back to court. In March 1964, we filed a motion in Federal court initiating a second full-scale law suit against discriminatory practices in the registration process in Dallas County.

It should be noted that in September 1964, pending trial of this second law suit, Alabama registrars, including those in Dallas County, began using a second, still more difficult test.

In October 1964, our reopened Dallas County case came on for trial. We proved that between May 1962, the date of the first trial, and August 1964, 795 Negroes had applied for registration but that only 93 were accepted. During the same period, 1,232 white persons applied for registration, of whom 945 were registered. Thus, less than 12 percent of the Negro applicants but more than 75 percent of the white applicants were accepted.

Finally, on February 4, 1965—nearly 4 years after we first brought suit—the district court entered its judgment. This time, the court substantially accepted our contentions and the relief requested by the Department was granted. Specifically, the court enjoined use of the complicated literacy and knowledge-of-government tests and entered orders designed to deal with the serious problem of delay.

Whether this most recent decree will be effective only time will tell. We hope and expect it will be. But the Negroes of Dallas County have good reason to be skeptical. After 4 years of litigation, only 383 Negroes are registered to vote in Dallas County today. The recent events in Selma are indeed demonstrations—demonstrations of the fact that, understandably, the Negroes of Dallas County are tired of waiting.

The story of Selma illustrates a good deal more than voting discrimination and litigating delay. It also illustrates another obstacle, sometimes more subtle, certainly more damaging. I am talking about fear.

The Department thus has filed four separate suits against intimidation of Negro registration applicants by Sheriff James Clark and other local officials.

The first of these filed alleged that the defendants had intimidated Negroes from attempting to register by physical violence, baseless arrests, and prosecutions of Negro registration workers.

We introduced proof that Sheriff Clark had deputies present at every civil rights mass meeting in Dallas County. They took notes and license tag numbers. They harassed, arrested, and assaulted young voter registration workers. The district court found, however, that the Government had "failed in its proof" and denied injunctive relief. This decision is presently pending on appeal.

We filed a second intimidation suit in November 1963. This suit alleged that the local grand jury sought to interfere with the operation of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice—and thus intimidated potential Negro voters who looked to the Department for assistance and action.

The Department of Justice introduced substantial proof in support of these allegations at the hearing, but the district court rejected this evidence and found that the grand jury had acted in good faith. This decision is also pending on appeal.

Our third Dallas County intimidation suit, also filed in November 1963, illustrates still a different level of harassment and fear. The defendants in this case, now awaiting trial, are the Dallas County Citizens' Council and its officers.

The suit alleges that they have adopted and sought to execute a program to frustrate court voting orders and to intimidate Negroes so they will not attend voter registration rallies.

We filed a startlingly overt example of this bigoted program together with our complaint. It was a full-page advertisement in the Selma Times-Journal on June 9, 1963, sponsored by the citizens' council. It was headed: "Ask Yourself This Important Question: What Have I Personally Done To Maintain Segregation?" And the text said, in part "Is it worth $4 to you to prevent sit-ins, mob marches, and wholesale Negro voter reigstration efforts in Selma?"

The fourth intimidation suit again was against Sheriff Clark and other local officials. It arose from events relating to voter registration and desegregation of places of public accommodation in Selma last summer. The case was tried before a three-judge district court in December 1964, and has not yet been decided.

At the trial, the Department introduced proof showing that the defendants had prosecuted, convicted, and punished Negroes discriminatorily and had issued and enforced injunctions preventing Negroes from organizing and discussing their grievances. Proof was also introduced to show that the defendants used unreasonable force against Negroes who exercised their rights and had failed to provide Negroes with ordinary police protection.

Let me be quick to point out that such intimidation is hardly limited to Dallas County; on this aspect as in others, Selma is merely a symbol. In Rankin County, Miss., three young Negro registration applicants were beaten in the registrar's office by the sheriff and his deputy. In our consequent suit, we were unable to secure relief even on appeal. The court ruled that the assault was not the result of bigotry, but of the deputy sheriff's vexation over crowded conditions in the registration office.

In Wilcox County, Ala., a Negro insurance agent became the first of his race to apply for registration in several years. Within weeks, 28 different landowners ordered him to stay off their property when he came to collect insurance premiums. To keep his job, the man had to accept a transfer and live away from his family, in a different county.

Again, we had to appeal. Today, 2 years later, the appeal is still pending.

There has been case after case of similar intimidation—beatings, arrests, lost jobs, lost credit, and other forms of pressure against Negroes who attempt to take the revolutionary step of registering to vote. And, despite our most vigorous efforts in the courts, there has been case after case of slow or ineffective relief.

We can draw only one conclusion from such instances. We can draw only one conclusion from the story of Selma. The 15th amendment expressly commanded that the right to vote should not be denied or abridged because of race. It was ratified 95 years ago. Yet, we are still forced to vindicate that right anew, in suit after suit, in county after county.

What is necessary—what is essential—is a new approach, an approach which goes beyond the tortuous, often ineffective pace of litigation. What is required is a systematic, automatic method to deal with discriminatory tests, with discriminatory testers, and with discriminatory threats.

The bill President Johnson has now sent to Congress, the bill about which he spoke so eloquently to you Monday, presents us with such a method. It would not only, like past statutes, demonstrate our good intentions. It would allows us to translate those intentions into ballots.

IV. THE PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

This bill applies to every kind of election, Federal, State, and local, including primaries. It is designed to deal with the two principal means of frustrating the 15th amendment: the use of onerous, vague, unfair tests and devices enacted for the purpose of disenfranchising Negroes, and the discriminatory administration of these and other kinds of registration requirements.

The bill accomplishes its objectives, first, by outlawing the use of these tests under certain circumstances, and second, by providing for registration by Federal officials where necessary to insure the fair administration of the registration system.

The tests and devices with which the bill deals include the usual literacy, understanding and interpretation tests that are easily susceptible to manipulation, as well as a variety of other repressive schemes. Experience demonstrates that the coincidence of such schemes and low electoral registration or participation is usually the result of racial discrimination in the administration of the election process. Hence, section 3(a) of the bill provides for a determination by the Attorney General whether any State, or a county separately considered, has on November 1, 1964, maintained a test or device as a qualification to vote.

In addition, the Director of the Census determines whether, in the States or counties where the Attorney General ascertains that tests or devices have been used, less than 50 percent of the residents of voting age were registered on November 1, 1964, or less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964.

The bill provides that whenever positive determinations have been made by the Attorney General and the Director of the Census as to a State, or separately as to any county not located in such a State, no person shall be denied the right to vote in any election in such jurisdiction because of his failure to comply with a test or device. I shall present at the end of my discussion of the bill the information we have as to the areas to be affected by these determinations.

The prohibition against tests may be ended in an affected area after it has been free of racial discrimination in the election process for 10 years, as found, upon its petition, by a three-judge court in the District of Columbia. This finding will also terminate the examiner procedure provided for in the bill.

However, the Court may not make such a finding as to any State or separate county for 10 years after the entry of a final judgment, whether entered before or after passage of the bill, determining that denials of the right to vote by reason of race or color

have occurred anywhere within such jurisdiction.

Because it is now beyond the question that recalcitrance and intransigence on the part of State and local officials can defeat the operation of most unequivocal civil rights legislation, the bill, in section 4, provides that the Attorney General may cause the appointment of examiners by the Civil Service Commission to carry out registration functions in any county where tests have been suspended by determinations of the Attorney General and the Director of the Census.

This result follows when the Attorney General certifies either that he has received meritorious complaints in writing from 20 or more residents of the county alleging denial of the right to vote by reason of race or color, or that, in his judgment, the appointment of registrars is necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment.

After the certification by the Attorney General, the Commission is required to appoint as many examiners as necessary to examine applicants in such county concerning their qualifications to vote. Any person found qualified to vote is to be placed on a list of eligible voters for transmittal to the appropriate local election officials.

Any person whose name appears on the list must be allowed to vote in any subsequent election until such officials are notified that he has been removed from the list as the result of a successful challenge, a failure to vote for 3 consecutive years, or some other legal ground for loss of eligibility to vote.

The bill provides a procedure for the challenge of persons listed by the examiners, including a hearing by an independent hearing officer and judicial review. A challenged person would be allowed to vote pending final action on the challenge.

The times, places, and procedures for application and listing, and for removal from the eligibility list, are to be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission, after consultation with the Attorney General, will instruct examiners as to the qualifications applicants must possess. The principal qualifications will be age, citizenship, and residence, and obviously will not include those suspended by the operation of section 3.

If the State imposes a poll tax as a qualification for voting, the Federal examiner is to accept payment and remit it to the appropriate State official. State requirements for payment of cumulative poll taxes for previous years would not be recognized.

Civil injunctive remedies and criminal penalties are specified for violation of various provisions of the bill. Among these provisions is one requiring that no person, whether a State official or otherwise, shall fail or refuse to permit a person whose name appears on the examiner's list to vote, or refuse to count his ballot, or intimidate, threaten, or coerce a person for voting or attempting to vote under the act.

An individual who violates this or other prohibitions of the bill may be fined up to $5,000 or imprisoned up to 5 years, or both.

It should be noted also that a person harmed by such acts of intimidation by State officials may also sue for damages under 42 U.S.C. 1983, a statute which was enacted in 1871. That statute provides for private civil suits against State officers who subject persons to the deprivations of any rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States. Private individuals who act in concert with State officers could also be sued for damages under that statute, *Baldwin* v. *Morgan*, 251 F. 2d 780 (C.A. 5, 1958).

The litigated cases amply demonstrate the inadequacies of present statutes prohibiting voter intimidation. Under present law, voter intimidation is only punishable as a misdemeanor, unless a conspiracy is involved. But perhaps the most serious inadequacy results from the practice of some district courts to require the Government to carry a very onerous burden of proof of "purpose." Since many types of intimidation, particularly economic intimidation, involve subtle forms of pressure, this treatment of the purpose requirement has rendered the statute largely ineffective.

In our view, section 7 of the bill, which prohibits intimidation of persons voting or attempting to vote under the bill represents a substantial improvement over 42 U.S.C. 1971(b). Violation of this section would be a felony and could result in the imposition of severe penalties which should prove a substantial deterrent to intimidation.

And under the language of section 7, no subjective "purpose" need be shown, in either civil or criminal proceedings, in order to prove intimidation under the proposed bill. Rather, defendants would be deemed to intend the natural consequences of their acts. This represents a deliberate and, in my judgment, constructive departure from the language and construction of 42 U.S.C. 1971(b).

The bill provides that a person on an eligibility list may allege to an examiner within 24 hours after closing of the polls in an election that he was not permitted to vote, or that his vote was not counted. The examiner, if he believes the allegation well founded, would notify the U.S. attorney, who may apply to the district court for an order enjoining certification of the results of the election.

The Court would be required to issue such an order pending a hearing. If it finds the charge to be true, the Court would provide for the casting or counting of ballots and require their inclusion in the total vote before any candidate may be deemed elected.

The examiner procedure would be terminated in any county whenever the Attorney General notifies the Civil Service Commission that all persons listed have been placed on the county's registration rolls and that there is no longer reasonable cause to believe that persons will be denied the right to vote in such county on account of race or color.

The bill also contains a provision dealing with the problem of attempts by States within its scope to change present voting qualifications. No State or county for which determinations have been made under section 3(a) will be able to enforce any law imposing qualifications or procedures for voting different from those in force on November 1, 1964, until it obtains a declaratory judgment in the District Court for the District of Columbia that such qualifications or procedures will not have the effect of denying or abridging rights guaranteed by the 15th amendment.

I turn now to the information we have regarding the impact of section 3(a). Tests and devices would—according to our best present information—be prohibited in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, and Alaska, 34 counties in North Carolina, and one county in Arizona. Elsewhere, the tests and devices would remain valid, and similarly, the registration system would remain exclusively in the control of State officials.

The premise of section 3(a), as I have said, is that the coincidence of low electoral participation and the use of tests and devices results from racial discrimination in the administration of the tests and devices. That this premise is generally valid is demonstrated by the fact that of the six States in which tests and devices would be banned statewide by section 3(a), voting discrimination has unquestionably been widespread in all but South Carolina and Virginia, and other forms of racial discrimination, suggestive of voting discrimination, are general in both of those States.

The latter suggestion applies as well to North Carolina, where 34 counties are reached by section 3(a) and where, indeed, in at least one instance a Federal court has acted to correct registration practices which impeded Negro registration.

In view of the premise for section 3(a), Congress may give sufficient territorial scope to the section to provide a workable and objective system for the enforcement of the 15th amendment where it is being violated. Those jurisdictions placed within its scope which have not engaged in such violations—the States and counties affected by the formula in which it may be doubted that racial discrimination has been practiced—need only demonstrate in court that they are guiltless in order to lift the ban of section 3(a) from their registration systems.

That is, section 3(a) in reality reaches on a long-term basis only those areas where racial discrimination in voting in fact exists.

V. THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE BILL

I have shown why this legislation is necessary and have explained how it would work. It remains to determine whether it is constitutional. The answer is clear: the proposal is constitutional.

Far from impinging on constitutional rights—in purpose and effect, it implements the explicit command of the 15th amendment that "the right * * * to vote shall not be denied or abridged * * * by any State on account of race [or] color." The means chosen to achieve that end are appropriate, indeed, necessary. Nothing more is required.

Let me pursue the matter a little. This is not a case where the Congress would be invoking some "inherent," but unexpressed, power. The Constitution itself expressly says, with respect to the 15th article of amendment: "The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation" (amendment 15, sec. 2).

Here, then, we draw on one of the powers expressly delegated by the people and by the States to the National Legislature. In this instance, it is the power to eradicate color discrimination affecting the right to vote. Accordingly, as Chief Justice Marshall said in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, 9 Wheat 1, 196, with respect to another express power—the power to regulate interstate commerce—"[t]his power, like all others vested in Congress, is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations, other than are prescribed in the Constitution."

That was the constitutional rule in 1824 when those words were first spoken by Chief Justice Marshall. It remains the constitutional rule today; those same words were repeated by Mr. Justice Clark for a unanimous Court just recently in sustaining the public accommodation provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. See *Atlanta Motel* v. *United States*, 379 U.S. 241, 255.

This is not a case where the subject matter was exclusively reserved to another branch of Government—to the executive or to the courts. The 15th amendment left no doubt about the propriety of legislative action. And, of course, both immediately after the passage of the 15th amendment, and more recently, the Congress has acted to implement the right. See the very comprehensive act of May 31, 1870, 16 Stat. 140, and the voting provisions of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964.

Some of the early laws were voided as too broad and others were later repealed. But the Supreme Court has never voided a statute limited to enforcement of the 15th amendment's prohibition against discrimination in voting. On the contrary, in the old cases of *United States* v. *Reese*, 92 U.S. 214, 218, and *James* v. *Bowman*, 190 U.S. 127, 138–139, the Supreme Court, while invalidating

certain stautory provisions, expressly pointed to the power of Congress to protect the right to:

"* * * exemption from discrimination in the exercise of the elective franchise on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. This, under the express provisions of the second section of the amendment, Congress may enforce by 'appropriate legislation.'"

And with respect to congressional elections, shortly after the adoption of the 15th amendment, the Court sustained a system of Federal supervisors for registration and voting not dissimilar to the system proposed here. See *Ex parte Siebold*, 100 U.S. 371; *United States* v. *Gale*, 109 U.S. 65. Constitutional assaults on the more recent legislation have been uniformly rejected. See *United States* v. *Raines*, 362 U.S. 17 (1957 act); *United States* v. *Thomas*, 362 U.S. 58 (same); *Hannah* v. *Larche*, 363 U.S. 420 (Civil Rights Commission rules under 1957 act); *Alabama* v. *United States*, 371 U.S. 37 (1960 act); *United States* v. *Mississippi*, No. 73, this term, decided March 8, 1965 (same); *Louisiana* v. *United States*, No. 67, this term, decided March 8, 1965 (same).

This legislation has only one aim—to effectuate at long last the promise of the 15th amendment—that there shall be no discrimination on account of race or color with respect to the right to vote. That is the only purpose of the proposed bill. It is, therefore, truly legislation "designed to enforce" the amendment within the meaning of section 2. To meet the test of constitutionality, it remains only to demonstrate that the means suggested are appropriate.

The relevant constitutional rule, again, was established once and for all by Chief Justice Marshall. Speaking for the Court in *McCullough* v. *Maryland*, 4 Wheat. 316, 421, he said:

"Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."

The same rule applies to the powers conferred by the amendments to the Constitution. In the case of *Ex parte Virginia*, 100 U.S. 339, 345–346, speaking of the 14th, 15th, and 16th amendments, the Court said:

"Whatever legislation is appropriate, that is, adapted to carry out the objects the amendments have in view, whatever tends to enforce submission to the prohibitions they contain, and to secure to all persons the enjoyment of perfect equality of civil rights and the equal protection of the laws against State denial or invasion, if not prohibited, is brought within the domain of congressional power."

See also, *Everard's Breweries* v. *Day*, 265 U.S. 545, 558–559, applying the same standard to the enforcement section of the prohibition (18th) amendment.

That is really the end of the matter. The means chosen are certainly not "prohibited" by the Constitution (as I shall show in a moment), and they are—as I have already outlined—"appropriate" and "plainly adapted" to the end of eliminating, in large part, racial discrimination in voting. It does not matter, constitutionally, that the same result might be achieved in some other way. That has been settled since the beginning and was expressly reaffirmed very recently in the cases upholding the Civil Rights Act of 1964. See *Atlanta Motel* v. *United States*, 379 U.S. 241, 261.

All workable legislation tends to set up categories—inevitably so. I have explained the premise for the classification made and, with some possible exceptions, as I have said, the facts support the hypothesis. But the exceptional case is provided for in section 3(c) of the bill which I have already discussed. Given a valid factual premise—as we have here—it is for Congress to set the boundaries. That is esentially a legislative function which the courts do not and cannot quibble about. Cf. *Boynton* v. *Virginia*, 364 U.S. 454; *Currin* v. *Wallace*, 306 U.S. 1; *United States* v. *Darby*, 312 U.S. 100, 121. See also, *Purity Extract Co.* v. *Lynch*, 226 U.S. 192.

The President submits the present proposal only because he deems it imperative to deal in this way with the invidious discrimination that persists despite determined efforts to eradicate the evil by other means. It is only after long experience with lesser means and a discouraging record of obstruction and delay that we resort to more far-reaching solutions.

The Constitution, however, does not even require this much forbearance. When there is clear legislative power to act, the remedy chosen need not be absolutely necessary; it is enough if it be "appropriate." And I am certain that you all recall that the Supreme Court—in sustaining the finding of the 88th Congress that racial discrimination by a local restaurant serving a substantial amount of out-of-State food adversely affects interstate commerce—made it clear that so long as there is a "rational basis" for the congressional finding, the finding itself need not be formally embodied in the statute. *Katzenbach* v. *McClung*, 379 U.S. 294, 303–305.

I turn now to the contention often heard that, whatever the power of Congress under the enforcement clause of the 15th amendment in other respects, it can never be used to infringe on the rights of the States to fix qualifications for voting, at least for non-Federal elections. The short answer to this argument was given most emphatically by the late Mr. Justice Frankfurter, speaking for the Court in *Gomillion* v. *Lightfoot*, 364 U.S. 339, 347, a 15th amendment case:

"When a State exercises power wholly within the domain of State interest, it is insulated from Federal judicial review. But such insulation is not carried over when State power is used as an instrument for circumventing a federally protected right."

The constitutional rule is clear: So long as State laws or practices erecting voting qualifications for non-Federal elections do not run afoul of the 14th or 15th amendments, they stand undisturbed. But when State power is abused—as it plainly is in the areas affected by the present bill—there is no magic in the words "voting qualification."

The "grandfather clauses" of Oklahoma and Maryland were, of course, voting qualifications. Yet they had to bow before the 15th amendment. *Guinn* v. *United States*, 238 U.S. 347; *Myers* v. *Anderson*, 238 U.S. 368. Nor are only the most obvious devices reached. As the Court said in *Lane* v. *Wilson*, 307 U.S. 268, 275: "The Amendment nullifies sophisticated as well as simple-minded modes of discrimination."

Nor do literacy tests and similar requirements enjoy special immunity. To be sure, in *Lassiter* v. *Northampton Election Board*, 360 U.S. 45, the Court found no fault with a literacy requirement, as such, but it added: "Of course a literacy test, fair on its face, may be employed to perpetuate that discrimination which the 15th amendment was designed to uproot." Id., at 53. See, also, *Gray* v. *Sanders*, 372 U.S. 368, 379.

Indeed, as the opinion in Lassiter noted, the Court had earlier affirmed a decision annulling Alabama's literacy test on the ground that it was "merely a device to make racial discrimination easy." 360 U.S. at 53. See *Davis* v. *Schnell*, 336 U.S. 933, affirming 81 F. Supp. 872. And, only the other day, the Supreme Court voided one of Louisiana's literacy tests. *Louisiana* v. *United States*, No. 67, this term, decided March 8, 1965. See, also, *United States* v. *Mississippi*, *supra*.

Thus, it is clear that the Constitution will not allow racially discriminatory voting practices to stand. But it is even clearer, as we have seen, that the Constitution invites Congress not merely to stand by and watch the courts invalidate State practices but to take a positive role by outlawing the use of any practices utilized to deny rights under the 15th amendment.

This bill accepts that invitation.

One may, I suppose, grant the constitutionality of the remedy proposed in this bill, but, nevertheless, oppose it on the ground that it places the ballot in the hands of the illiterate. On this theory, the remedy for existing discrimination would be to guarantee the fair administration of literacy tests rather than to abolish them. I suggest that this alternative is unrealistic.

In fact, the majority of the States—at least thirty—find it possible to conduct their elections without any literacy tests whatever. There is no evidence that the quality of government in these States falls below that of those States which impose—or purport to impose—such a requirement.

Whether there is really a valid basis for the use of literacy tests is, therefore, subject to legitimate question. But it is not for this reason that the proposed legislation seeks to abolish them in certain places.

Rather, we seek to abolish these tests because they have been used in those places as a device to discriminate against Negroes.

Highly literate Negroes have been refused the right to vote. Totally illiterate whites have been allowed to vote. In short, in these areas the literacy test is demonstrably unrelated to intellectual capability. It is directly related only to one factor: color.

It is not this bill—it is not the Federal Government—which undertakes to eliminate literacy as a requirement for voting in such States or counties. It is the States or counties themselves which have done so, and done so repeatedly, by registering illiterate or barely literate white persons.

The aim of this bill is, rather, to insure that the areas which have done so apply the same standard to all persons equally, to Negroes now just as to whites in the past.

It might be suggested that this kind of discrimination could be ended in a different way—by wiping the registration books clean and requiring all voters, white or Negro, to register anew under a uniformly applied literacy test.

For two reasons such an approach would not solve, but would compound our present problems.

To subject every citizen to a higher literacy standard would, inevitably, work unfairly against Negroes—Negroes who have for decades been systematically denied educational opportunity available to the white population.

Such an impact would produce a real constitutional irony—that years of violation of the 14th amendment right of equal protection through equal education would become the excuse for continuing violation of the 15th amendment right to vote.

The result would be something chillingly close to the mechanism once confidently described by the late Senator Theodore Bilbo of Mississippi:

"The poll tax won't keep 'em from voting. What keeps 'em from voting is section 244 of the constitution of 1890, that Senator George wrote. It says that a man to register must be able to read and explain the constitution when read to him. And then Senator George wrote a constitution that damn few white men and no niggers at all can explain." (See Collier's magazine, July 6, 1946; Hearings Before the Special Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946, p. 205.)

The second argument against such a reregistration "solution" is even more basic—and even more ironic. Even the fair administration of a new literacy test in the relevant areas would, inevitably, disenfranchise not only many Negroes, but also thousands of

illiterate whites who have voted throughout their adult lives.

Our concern today is to enlarge representative government. It is to solicit the consent of all the governed. It is to increase the number of citizens who can vote. What kind of consummate irony would it be for us to act on that concern—and in so doing to reduce the ballot, to diminish democracy?

It would not only be ironic; it would be intolerable.

VI. CONCLUSION

I have come before you to describe the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965, the need for this act, and some of the questions raised about it, and to do so in considerable detail. I will be happy to respond to your questions as fully as possible. I am prepared certainly, to remain here this morning, this afternoon, this evening, tomorrow, and every day that the commitee feels my presence would be helpful. This legislation must be enacted.

However detailed my presentation may be and however extensive your consideration may be, there remains, nevertheless, a single, uncomplicated, and underlying truth: This legislation is not only necessary, but it is necessary now.

Democracy delayed is democracy denied.

Civil Rights Versus Civic Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include a column written by Thomas A. Lane, which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer and other newspapers.

At a time when lawlessness and defiance of law and order has become something of a national pastime and when the leaders of such defiance of law and order are acclaimed as heroes by the President of the United States, it is refreshing to see a few writers with courage to state the facts as they are. I think Mr. Lane's analysis of the situation in Selma is an important contribution to pointing out what is really happening and I hope all my colleagues and the citizens of this Nation will read it carefully.

Mr. Lane's article follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS VERSUS CIVIC ORDER

(By Thomas A. Lane)

WASHINGTON.—The important issue in Selma was not civil rights, but civic order. The issue of voting rights was in the hands of a fairminded Federal judge who could be counted upon to require equitable administration of the registration law. The registrars of Dallas County were reported to be cooperating willingly with the court.

At this juncture, Dr. King announced that he would lead a march from Selma to Montgomery to petition Governor Wallace. Governor Wallace announced that he would not permit such a march because it would endanger the lives of the marchers and of motorists using the highway. When the marchers set out from Selma on March 7 in defiance of the Governor's warning, they were met by State troopers who commanded them to turn back and disperse. When the marchers refused to turn back, the State troopers used normal riot-control tactics to disperse them. In the melee which ensued, some marchers and some policemen were injured.

Some armchair editors have criticized the Wallace order. Yet, if one of our big highway trucks had plowed into and killed 50 of these marchers along the highway, these editors would have been the first to condemn Governor Wallace for permitting the march. Every citizen who has driven on our high-speed highways knows that they are designed only for motor traffic and that a string of marchers along both shoulders of the road would seriously increase the danger of accident. It was plain that Governor Wallace was doing his duty.

It is plain also that Dr. King knew Governor Wallace had to prevent the march. The march had no relevance to any reasonable right of petition nor of assembly. It could serve only to provoke a clash with the police, and that alone could be its purpose. But why would Dr. King seek to provoke such a clash?

There is persuasive evidence that Dr. King and the Federal Government are collaborating in creating a wave of public emotion which will enable the Democratic Congress to pass new civil rights legislation. In calmer moments, it would be difficult to enlarge the Federal powers before last year's voting rights legislation had been fairly tried. With the Selma stratagem, the people can be aroused to demand greater Federal intervention in local affairs.

It is noteworthy that Dr. King was absent from the first march when the planned violence was provoked but present for the second march when no further violence was needed. Dr. King testified in court that Administrator LeRoy Collins, of the Federal Community Relations Council, said it would be all right for him to lead the second march in defiance of the injunction of U.S. District Court Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr.

The President and the Attorney General have criticized the Alabama police who prevented the march but have not condemned the wanton defiance of public order which provoked the police action. The President has tolerated the invasion of the White House by defiant sit-in demonstrators, forbidding the White House Police to use necessary force to eject the trespassers. Attorney General Katzenbach, who so badly mishandled the riot situation in Oxford, Miss., will now prosecute the Alabama police for using unnecessary force. All this action is attuned to prospective legislation, not to the demands of justice.

Why did they pick on Alabama which was moving reasonably to comply with the new civil rights law? Mississippi had a lower percentage of registered Negro voters. But Mississippi did remain Democratic in the last election (except one Republican Congressman) while Alabama repudiated its Democratic leadership to elect five Republican Congressmen. Because the Alabama Democrats have alienated the present electorate, they can win in future elections only by creating a new electorate. This makes the situation in Alabama very urgent, politically.

The Republican Party, which bears a moral responsibility to oppose the cynical policy of the President, stands mute and uncomprehending.

Our leaders provoke militant defiance of local officials who bear the chief responsibility for preserving law and order in our society. These are the leaders who at other convenient times profess concern about our mounting crime wave.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, all lovers of freedom everywhere are in wholehearted sympathy with the unhappy Byelorussian people. These dauntless and daring souls regained their independence 47 years ago, but soon they were overwhelmed by the Red army of the Soviet and lost their freedom. The Government and the people of this country are painfully aware of the sad plight of the Byelorussian people since then. And it is sad to say that we have not been able to help them in any effective way, but it is heartening to see that the issue of Byelorussian freedom is kept alive through the efforts of Byelorussian-American Congress. I wish the congress success in all their worthy endeavors on the 47th anniversary celebration of Byelorussian Independence Day.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6815 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C* — 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*
Grider, George W., *Tenn*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Federal Republic of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Con. Res. 371. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 292. Resolution authorizing cards of identification for certain officers and employees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. Res. 293. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representative with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H. Res. 294. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Res. 295. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 296. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. Res. 297. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. Res. 298. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Res. 299. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the continuation of recent efforts on the part of the President to secure a universal condemnation of anti-Semitism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H. Res. 300. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study the operation of hospital facilities by the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Res. 301. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to transfer the responsibilities of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 302. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that oppression of minorities in Rumania through a systematic plan launched by the Communist regime in control of Rumania be condemned and the President of the United States is requested to take appropriate steps in our relations with the Rumanian Government as are likely to bring relief to the persecuted minorities in the controversial Transylvania region of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

144. By Mr. SENNER: Memorial of the Arizona State Senate to expand veterans' hospital facilities within Arizona; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

145. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting full appropriation support for the commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964; to the Committee on Appropriations.

146. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States supporting legislation to direct a survey to determine the feasibility of dredging a waterway between Tenakee Inlet and Port Frederick; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 6806. A bill for the relief of Wah Kin Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6807. A bill for the relief of Carmen Yaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 6808. A bill for the relief of Vibeke Langballe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6809. A bill for the relief of Miss Stella Klaridopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6810. A bill for the relief of Yi Joo Wang, Sue Juan Luan, Sue Shiang Luan, Regina Luan and Jean Luan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 6811. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of Clayton B. Hellner against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6812. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Badulato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6813. A bill for the relief of Antonio Lamberti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 6814. A bill for the relief of Antonio Salati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6815. A bill for the relief of Domenico Venditti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 6816. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Pastilha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 6817. A bill for the relief of Leo Temmer, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6818. A bill for the relief of Miss Patricia Peghini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 6819. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orhan Metin Ozmat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

142. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city council, Chicago, Ill., with reference to urging enactment of legislation for open registration and voting rights for all American citizens, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Appendix

Senator Dirksen Interviewed on the Art of Political Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the most delightful recent television interviews, and certainly one of the most informative ones, was conducted by Joseph F. McCaffrey with Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, as his guest. I have gone to considerable pains to get a transcript of the interview with our esteemed minority leader because I think the Senate should share in the wisdom which marks the comments of our colleague. The interview was first broadcast on WMAL-ABC TV, Washington, D.C., on February 7, 1965, on Mr. McCaffrey's program known as "Closeup."

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the interview be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOSEPH MCCAFFREY. Good evening, I'm Joseph McCaffrey. Welcome again to "Closeup, the Capitol." My guest this evening needs no introduction to anyone who has ever watched television, certainly no introduction at all to anyone who is interested in public affairs. This gentleman first came to Congress as a Member of the House in 1933 and served there until he retired voluntarily in January 1949. He was elected then to the Senate in 1950 and has served there ever since. I think if there was a Congressional Hall of Fame, and I really think there should be one, that this gentleman would be the first man who would be selected for it. Because he is, and I am sure that almost any other reporter who covers the Hill will agree, the complete Senator. He is the perfect Senator, if in the world of human beings there is such a thing as anyone who is perfect or anything that is perfect. And in just one moment I will yield the balance of the time on this program to the distinguished minority leader of the U.S. Senate, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. Senator DIRKSEN, in many ways it is a miracle that you were in the Senate, in that no one ever thought you would return to public life when you left the House. The verdict was that you were going to be blind. Will you tell us the fears and feelings that went through your mind at that time?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes, I remember the incident rather vividly. I had six or seven physicians including one here in Washington, a very noted physician who was an eye specialist who had been in the Wilmer Clinic at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore. I recall so well the day when he called in the morning and said there was a division of opinion as between him and others as to whether this retinitis condition was malignant or not, but they thought at least I ought to go to Johns Hopkins and think about having an enucleation—which is a nice fancy word for the removal of one of your eyes. I remember how Mrs. Dirksen and I wept when the news came. I very dutifully went to Baltimore that morning on the train. I remember telling the surgeon over there afterward, when I got there, that I had consulted with another doctor and came to the conclusion that I would not permit the removal of my eye. He said, "What doctor?" "Oh," I said, "A very great big doctor, He lives way upstairs." "Oh," he said, "You are one of those guys, are you?" I said, "Yes, I am. I am a rather rough, uncouth sort of a person, but I am one of those guys." He said, "All right, if that is the way you want it; I'm going to California tomorrow so make up your mind." I said, "I have made up my mind," and that was it. That is my good eye. The other one has some scar tissue on it but it does very well for peripheral vision. Incidentally I became an expert on eyes myself at that time but there is something that hits you, you can just envision a black world for a while.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Did you have any fear, any panic when they first talked to you about this?

Senator DIRKSEN. I would not call it panic but I was fully sensible of what confronted me and how serious this really was because just think of those limitations on what you can do and how long you have to be out of circulation before you can undertake to get anything done and learn an entirely new technique where you feel your way in the world.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Senator, those who observed you during your years from 1933 until 1949 in the House and who have observed you since your return here to the Senate say that you have changed a great deal, that you may have mellowed perhaps. How would you compare yourself in the Senate today with yourself when you were in the House? Do you see or think there is any difference in you as an individual as an operating Member of Congress?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, I think you will have to remember first of all, that I am somewhat older than I was in those days. I came here at age 36 or 37, full of energy and ready to just fairly push the dome off the Capitol, until older and well demeaned Members advised me that that dome has been there since they came and would be there when they were gone and would be there when I was gone. So perhaps it might be well to slow down a little. Then I think you learn certain things which somehow fill out your philosophy as a legislator and I pretty much agree with this kind of language—that this free government is like an old waterlogged scow, it doesn't move very fast, it doesn't move very far at one time, but it never sinks and maybe that is the reason we have a free government today. I was thinking how many free governments are just in too great a hurry that suddenly flop over and take on a dictatorial and despotic cast because they can't wait for normal forces to undertake the changes that are necessary in the constant climb of people to a better life.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Senator DIRKSEN, you have been criticized at times for not being consistent—that over the years, your position on various issues has changed.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well consistency is a hobgoblin of small minds—was it Emerson who said it?—a foolish consistency or an inconsistency and I have often thought the only people who do not change their minds are sleeping peacefully in some cemetery or they are in an institution—involuntarily there—and have lost the capacity to change their mind. So I hope that the time will never come when I can't adjust to new circumstances and new conditions because it is an accelerated world. How fast it moves—and I need only to get a touch of nostalgia and dip into my past; go way back to my boyhood days—to see the changes that have taken place to become thoroughly sensible of what has happened in this world.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. How would you sum up your philosophy of life, Senator?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, I want to be ready for change at all times. I think I subscribe fully to the definition of progress as the constant and intelligent and undramatic action of life on what is here. Perhaps I can best illustrate it by saying the atom has been here ever since this world was created but it has taken all these millions of years to break it down, to fracture it, to find it, to see what is inside of it, and to lay open this great force that has changed the whole destiny of the world and the destiny of mankind.

Mr. MCCAFFREY. Any Senator has a hectic pace in life and because Senator DIRKSEN is the Minority Leader in the U.S. Senate, his pace is even more hectic. It is nothing for him, for example, to have 150-200 people to come to se him in the course of a day and how does he get away from this? We have some pictures which I would like to show you at this time to illustrate how a Senator, in this case Senator DIRKSEN, relaxes. These are pictures—these are some of your flowers, Senator—and this is Mrs. Dirksen with you at your home in Leesburg and what do you grow down there? What crops do you grow?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, frankly, we grow a little bit of everything. Not only in the vegetable line but in the flower line as well. I do not want to be an expert. I do not want to be a professional. I never want to loose my amateur standing—

Mr. MCCAFFREY. As a gardener?

Senator DIRKSEN. As a gardener and so I go for these very simple things that give me a lot of joy whether you grow them singly or in great masses. People wonder some about my fidelity to the marigold. Well, take a marigold in great mass and it lasts right up to frost and are here all summer and fall. You can enjoy the mass color anywhere in the garden and it is a hardy flower. But I love petunias, I like to dabble a little in roses and on a small scale I do fairly well at it. I love zinnias because of their rich color. They just absorb all the color in the sun and what a gorgeous sight it is to see them in great mass colors all through the summer and it is another hardy flower, so hardy in fact that it has a way of resisting bugs. So does petunias. But that gives me a lot of fun and variety and then I garden a little in the vegetable field. Start early—that I learned as a boy—starting with radishes and lettuce and onions, the first to mature in early spring. And then you move on to carrots and turnips and to red beets and then, of course, you always have a stand of potatoes and a stand of tomatoes. I always have a little kale. There must be one

green vegetable with plenty of iron content.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Senator, in your youth you aspired to be an actor. In fact, you did write and sell and produce some plays——

Senator DIRKSEN. Very little but at least——

Mr. McCAFFREY. Well, you got paid for them and there are a lot of playwrights who have never been able to sell, you know. How related is politics to the theater, would you say?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, you have this common identity. To begin with, you deal with people. You are in front of people in political life even as you are on the stage and out of it there must develop a poise, a certain presence, a capacity for putting your thouhgts in words, in poignant expression, so that it is conveyed to people and persuades them and in that respect there is complete identity between the theater and I think, political life.

Mr. McCAFFREY. One of the main requirements, it seems to me, of a man in public life is that he had patience, that he be able to suffer fools gladly and that he take all the other little inconveniences which comes along and doesn't let these things get to him. Is this something that you have to be born with or can men in public life learn to adjust to all these things?

Senator DIRKSEN. They can learn but——

Mr. McCAFFREY. Some of them don't.

Senator DIRKSEN. No, the gift of patience, of course I think, is a highly desired attribute because you are dealing with people, they have fixations, they have convictions about any number of controversial matters. You have to hear them out. You have to be careful not to be too precipitous or capricious in pointing out what you think the weakness in the other fellows case may be, especially if he is on your side of the aisle politically speaking. So that requires, I think, gentle discussion and a very gentle oil can art as I call it, so that the bearings never get hot. You don't develop frictions that suddenly blow into pieces and if you can keep it on the quiet side and have every aspect of the matter explored without anybody becoming fractious at any time you're most likely to get results. What was it that Lincoln said—we shall sooner have the chicken by hatching the egg than by breaking it.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Is this the secret of your great ability to work compromises? Now there are many examples, in your case, of your ability to bring about a compromise, the most classic one and the one that will go on the history books certainly is the work you did on the civil rights bill last year in the Senate. Is this the secret of being able to get men to work together?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Restraining yourself first perhaps?

Senator DIRKSEN. If you have a common objective it is the starting point of course. There may be a dozen roads to get there. Some of them tortuous, some not satisfactory, some of them difficult, some of them over high ground—where lies the best road with the fewest barriers or obstacles in it? Well, it takes some doing, of course, to finally work around until you get into that road and that does require patience and you do have to hear the other fellow's case. He may not agree with you at all but, little by little, whatever difficulties are in the way begin to yield and before you know it you are at the end of the road and it looks as if it has been consummated by a rather satisfactory joining. And you say, all right, that's the route to get there, that's the route back, and that is the route up there again.

Mr. McCAFFREY. In your 30 years in Congress, you have served with hundreds of men and women. What do you think is the great hazard—now we are speaking as human beings—of public life? Do you think it is drinking or do you think it is the inability or refusal to grow as times go on or do you think it is a development toward cynicism that is apparent in some Members?

Senator DIRKSEN. First of all, there is a danger of getting into a political rut, so to speak, and life may go by you. That's very unfortunate indeed. That means, of course, that you will not adjust. What was it that Lincoln said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

Mr. McCAFFREY. If you come from Illinois you have to know Lincoln, don't you?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes; and then he added this one part. He said: "We must disenthrall ourselves and then we shall save our country." That is a great line and I think over and over a person in public life has to take inventory, to see where he is at the moment, to take a look back to see from whence you came and then see where the high road goes and then if your thinking is not attuned to it you disenthrall yourself. You take a new stance and a new look and if you are willing to look long enough and hard enough, I am rather confident that the right cast of mind and the right thoughts will come which are adequate to what lies ahead.

Mr. McCAFFREY. As a person and also in your many public statements you are always the optimist. Does your optimism ever falter in the face of all of the problems that face us today not only at home but also abroad?

Senator DIRKSEN. No, because even if there are frustrations and goodness knows every life is attended with some frustration certainly; there is still ample time and room and cause for optimism because there are so many good things and so many blessings that you can count in life that come. So I see no reason why one shouldn't look on the optimistic side. Besides how can you look on life constructively without being an optimist because it is the only aggressive, affirmative attitude of mind that will do you any good in coping with a problem there on the doorstep everyday.

Mr. McCAFFREY. You served under five Presidents, from F.D.R. through Johnson. Taking them one at a time, how would you appraise these men beginning with Franklin Delano Roosevelt. You were elected the same year he was first elected, 1932. You survived his big sweep of 1936 too.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, how should you appraise different personalities. Franklin Roosevelt and the mellifluous voice who had a way of charming people and did charm the country. There were so many things with which I disagreed in those days, many with which I agreed, many with which my constituents disagreed and then they used to scold me a good deal about it. But certainly a personality of a type all its own that is rather rare. Then followed by Truman, rather mundane, rather earthy who could chop off his words. I had a great regard for Truman. He could scold you in language that you could understand and at the same time he could pat you on the back. I recall when I went to say goodby to Truman after this eye malady struck me and I said I would wait in Washington until I went to say goodby. And I said, Mr. President, the custom is to pack your bags and get out of this town overnight but I would not do it. And he said to me at the White House, "Why did you quit? We need fellows like you around here." Well, when I got around to the Senate race, finally after friends importuned me, I remember Truman took me apart as nobody ever did as if he had never seen me in his life, yet he thought they needed me around here. When they observed his 80th birthday, I think, I was there and made a speech on the occasion and I joshed him a little about it and he laughed and he said, "Oh, DIRKSEN, life is like that." So he was a different type entirely but he had those who were devoted to him with a deep and affectionate devotion. And then of course, there came Dwight Eisenhower. As the whole world knows, I was for Bob Taft and I didn't know how President Eisenhower would think about me and particularly some of the remarks I made in the nominating speech in Chicago. You may remember that one line I said was that it wouldn't take a committee investigation to determine Bob Taft's politics. Maybe at the time I said it I wasn't fully conscious of the fact that it was quite a little dig but President Eisenhower and I became the firmest of friends and I carried the flag for him on issues and controversies.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Let you have that hot poker.

Senator DIRKSEN. I used to say that if nobody will pick up the hot poker I will pick it up. And then came the late John Kennedy. Of course, we had known each other for 10 or 12 years before he acceded to the Presidency. We knew each other in the House and we knew each other in the Senate. I had great affection for him and I think it was reciprocated. There was something genteel and gracious, there was a sublime grace about John Kennedy and it stuck to him all his days. And how often he called me to the White House to sit for perhaps an hour to talk about many things and say, "Where am I on this?" "Well, Mr. President, you're not." And then the question, how to get results? And of course, it is quite a compliment, I think, when the President who bears another party label from mine calls me to ask how he gets out of a difficulty and extricates himself from a real problem in the Senate. My duty as an American, of course, with an allegiance and fidelity to my country requires that I help him. I would be a poor citizen indeed if I didn't do the same for any President regardless of his politics where the country's interest is at stake. But he was truly a great character in my book. Now President Johnson and I sat across the aisle from each other——

Mr. McCAFFREY. The man you probably know the best.

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes, he as majority leader and I as minority leader. We used to make medicine, as I say, over in his office. Of course we had to make book and make schedule on what came up. The Senate is a two-way street, that is one thing we are always agreed on. A minority leader with some backing could just truss up the Senate any old time with a filibuster or anything else and stop it in its tracks and the majority leader could do likewise. And so we agreed that we had to work together because the overriding interest was the well-being and the welfare of the Republic, the United States of America. It was on that ground we used to battle it out and believe me we have had some hot and tempestuous times in his office and in mine but never at any time did either of us lose sight of the fact that the objective was the country and its people.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Let me ask you the final question, Senator DIRKSEN, and this is always an unfair question perhaps. But looking back over your life—and you said you do look back every once and a while—looking back over your life is there anything that you would undo that you did or is there anything that you didn't do that you would like to have done?

Senator DIRKSEN. Just one. That is when I voted for a bill while in the House of Representatives in the Truman administration to send miners and perhaps railroaders into the Army unless they quit striking and went back to work. That is the bill that Senator Taft stopped in its tracks in the Senate and as I look back I think if I could undo a vote that vote I would undo.

Mr. McCAFFREY. A pretty good record with only one regret out of what—maybe 3,000 votes or 5,000 votes that you've cast.

Senator DIRKSEN. It could be, but you see, there we were all caught up in a vortex of feeling that extended all through the country and people were getting pretty harsh about it and naturally that is reflected in the halls of Congress so perhaps they will stake me one vote that I regret. I do regert that one, of course.

Mr. McCAFFREY. I'll be back in 1 minute.

Senator DIRKSEN. I want to thank you very much for a delightful program.

Pickle Pickers for Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, Michigan pickle growers are still in a pickle. They still do not know if they are going to have any labor to harvest the crop. We have been told by the Department of Labor that there were plenty of domestic unemployed who were available, and that it was just a matter of the pickle farmers traveling around the country and finding help for next summer. Six grower associations have done this—traveling 62,000 miles, spending almost $60,000, and visiting 100 cities. As a result of their efforts, they expect to secure about 3,300 workers—and they need 20,000.

The Department of Labor apparently still feels that the situation is not critical, and that the farmers should make further efforts to recruit labor. The Department of Labor forgets, in my opinion, than planting decisions have to be made in 30 days, and that spring work is already here. I believe the pickle growers have made their effort to recruit labor, and that it is time for the Department of Labor to do one of two things:

Either promise to recruit sufficient domestic labor, or, if unable to do so, promise that members of the Department will pick the pickles, or allow Mexicans who want to return to work in our fields to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a serious problem. For every farm job, there is at least one city job involved—packing, selling, blowing glass, hauling. Unless the Secretary of Labor changes his mind, towns in my district will be dead this summer, and the farmers will try to plant some other crop—like potatoes, of which there already is an oversupply. This plan of the Department of Labor—this paper tiger—must be changed.

I include below figures supplied to me by the National Pickle Growers Association:

PROGRESS REPORT, DOMESTIC RECRUITMENT PROGRAM

State of Michigan

Summary information, 1964:	*Acres*
Planted acreage	24,600
Harvested acreage	22,800

State of Michigan—Continued

HARVEST WORKERS	*Acres*
Worker productivity:	*Acres*
0.87 bushels per hour (domestics)	7,200
1.2 bushels per hour (foreign)	12,800
Total	20,000

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

Estimates, 1965:

In order to provide a current report of progress made in securing harvest workers for the 1965 crop, the statistical service of NPGA, Inc., asked six grower associations for their experiences in the period ending March 15. The following information was secured (domestics only):

July 15, 1964: Total interviewed, 4,385; finished the season, 869.

March 15, 1965 (estimated): Total interviewed, 4,511.

July 15, 1965 outlook: Total interviewed, 11,000; finished the season, 3,300 estimated.

PROJECTION

Six grower associations represent 39.4 percent of 1964 harvested acreage. They estimate 3,300 domestics will finish the season picking pickles.

Using factor of 39.4 percent to determine effort of balance of growers' association, 8,376 domestics will be finishing the season in 1965 for 100 percent of group.

Total requirement for 1965 acreage, estimating 25 percent less acres will be harvested, and knowing that domestics are only 72 percent as productive, 20,000 domestics; deficit 11,624 domestics.

Summary of effort to Mar. 15 by 6 grower associations

Miles traveled in search of workers	62,000
Recruiters	28
Expenditures to date	$58,500
Cities visited	103

NOTE.—It is now estimated that harvested acreage of cucumbers for pickles in State of Michigan in 1965 will be reduced 25 percent and this reduction has already been figured into the above estimate of worker requirements because, it has been demonstrated that the productivity of a domestic worker is 72 percent of that of a Mexican national. Consequently, a larger supply of domestic workers is required to harvest the crop.

The above does not show that worker turnover during the season requires the replacement of 60 percent of domestics originally secured.

In addition to the 28 recruiters reported on the staff of the growers' associations, the staff of the State and Federal employment services have been working to secure domestic workers.

Public Welfare and Intergovernmental Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as a member of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations since its inception, I have been much concerned about Federal-State relations, and particularly with regard to Federal controls over the States which have accompanied Federal grant-in-aid programs.

An Advisory Commission report on the question of Federal controls associated with the administration of the public assistance programs has recently been issued and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The whole matter of public welfare and intergovernmental relations is one in which we are all concerned and Dr. James K. Pollock, professor of political science at the University of Michigan, has just put the matter in prospectus in a recent address which he delivered on March 2, 1965, before the Cleveland Welfare Federation. Dr. Pollock, it should be noted, was formerly Vice Chairman of the Advisory Commission.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Pollock's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC WELFARE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

As the country moves forward toward achieving the Great Society, wisdom and experience dictate that we should take soundings to find where we are. Since Government programs are not self-enacting, and since the governmental machine of 1965 is quite different from the one of 1935 or 1905, we had better understand the structure and mechanics of our vast Federal system, how it grinds out its work and how it serves the citizen.

The United States has been the great country of federalism. Our venerable Constitution would never have been made, let alone been successful, if it had not provided for a division of powers between the States and the Federal Government. But today we have reached a real crisis in the relationship between our numerous units of Government, and it is not yet clear whether they are successfully meeting the demands loaded upon them.

Unlike earlier times, when we had a much smaller and largely rural population, today we number 190 million people and nearly two-thirds of them reside in 212 metropolitan areas. During the decade 1950–60 these so-called metropolitan areas accounted for 84 percent of the increase in the Nation's population, while the population of the remainder of the country showed an increase of only 7 percent.

Furthermore, only about half of the inhabitants of metropolitan areas reside within the central cities of such areas, and the greatest growth has been in the fringe portion. It is estimated that within another two decades—by 1980—the United States will have a population of about 280 million people with approximately 190 million persons, or approximately three-fourths, residing in metropolitan areas.

However familiar we may be with these catastrophic figures, we must never underestimate their total impact nor reduce our efforts to meet the challenge which is presently before us. I should like you first, therefore, to ponder the immensity of our overall governmental problems.

I shall never forget the impression and the shock I had as a member of the first Hoover Commission in 1947, when I surveyed the total edifice of the Federal Government—not just in Washington and throughout the country, but over the world. Possessing inadequate powers of description, I could only feel the enormity of it all and try to keep some balance and perspective. I always got the feeling that our National Government was like a huge hippopotamus, wobbling around in an awkward fashion, quite uncontrolled—if not uncontrollable by human hands.

And yet that was nearly 20 years ago and today we have almost a half million more

Federal employees and nearly three and a half million more State and local employees.

Meanwhile, what has happened to the structure and functioning of government? Principally, all levels of government have come to operate in close proximity to one another through their numerous and varied agencies—Federal, State, county, and municipal, often supplemented by a host of special purpose bodies, all operating under an extremely complicated framework of laws and administrative regulations. Hence our greatest problems have become problems of intergovernmental relations. In a word, government today is performed by a very puzzling mixture of Federal, State, local and special units. Functions like public welfare are not neatly parceled out among the various levels of governmental units. All levels of government are involved together in almost every governmental activity.

The late Professor Grodzins, one of our most perceptive observers of the Federal system put it this way: "The American form of government is often, but erroneously, symbolized by a three-layer cake. A far more accurate image," he wrote "is the rainbow or marble cake, characterized by an inseparable mingling of different colored ingredients, the colors appearing in vertical and diagonal strands and unexpected whirls. As colors are mixed in the marble cake so functions are mixed in the American Federal system."

He then illustrated the point by referring to the health officer styled "sanitarian" of a rural county in a border State. This official he indicated embodies the whole idea of the marble cake of government.

"The sanitarian is appointed by the State under merit standards established by the Federal Government. His base salary comes jointly from State and Federal funds, the county provides him with an office and office amenities and pays a portion of his expenses, and the largest city in the county also contributes to his salary and office by virtue of his appointment as a city plumbing inspector. It is impossible from moment to moment to tell under which governmental hat the sanitarian operates. His work of inspecting the purity of food is carried out under Federal standards; but he is enforcing State laws when inspecting commodities that have not been in interstate commerce; and somewhat perversely he also acts under State authority when inspecting milk coming into the county from producing areas across the State border. He is a Federal officer when impounding impure drugs shipped from a neighboring State; a Federal-State officer when distributing typhoid immunization serum; a State officer when enforcing standards of industrial hygiene; a State-local officer when inspecting the city's water supply; and to complete the circle a local officer when insisting that the city butchers adopt more hygienic methods of handling their garbage. But he cannot and does not think of himself as acting in these separate capacities. All business in the county that concerns public health and sanitation he considers his business. Paid largely from Federal funds, he does not find it strange to attend meetings of the city council to give expert advice on matters ranging from rotten apples to rabies control. He is even deputized as a member of both the city and county police forces."

This may be an extreme case but it does, I think, accurately represent an important aspect of the whole range of governmental activities in the United States.

Nowhere are shared functions better illustrated than in the numerous Federal grant programs which are operating. In a recent Senate report, 115 programs or groups of closely related programs were identified. These authorizations apply to 8 of the 10 executive department and 11 independent agencies of the Federal Government. These Federal aids vary greatly in financial magnitude. The Federal aid highway program distributes more than $3 billion a year to States and their subdivisions. The public assistance program entails Federal assistance approaching $3 billion a year. In the new 1966 Federal budget $13.6 billion is scheduled for aid to State and local governments—almost triple the $3.8 billion in the 1956 budget. This accounts for 11 percent of total Federal cash payments as against 5 percent in 1956. To put it another way, of every dollar of total State-local general revenues, 14 cents come from Federal funds.

Simultaneouly total State payments to local governments jumped to $10,900 billion in 1962; $1,779 billion of this for public welfare, and $6,466 billion for education. This constitutes about 70 percent of local government expenditures for welfare and about 40 percent of their expenditures for education.

In the light of these figures it is not any longer realistic to think in terms of a tradition of separateness when we deal with the administration of any governmental function. Cooperation, carefully established interrelationships—not jurisdictional squabbles—must prevail if we are to have effective and efficient government.

Although the spotlight is on Federal aid, it must not be forgotten that the States are at the center of much of the planning and control of total governmental expenditures. They are responsible for the lesser units of local government; they are responsible for supporting or not supporting adequate public services; they condition to a considerable degree the success or failure of Federal programs. Our attention must therefore be directed to our State Governments.

While the Federal Government's share of the gross national product has remained rather steady at 16 percent, State expenditures have risen from 12 percent in 1958 to 14 percent of gross national product in 1962. They have had to take care of the population explosion and they have had the utmost difficulty in finding the necessary revenue. As has been indicated, the Federal Government helps considerably with grants-in-aid, loans and advances, shared revenues, and technical assistance. But no portion of Federal revenues is shared with the States without strings being attached.

The German system of dividing the income tax between the States and the Federal Government with a further division by the States with their local governments, must seem too simple and logical to our Federal bureaucrats, especially since there is only one tax collection for all three levels of government. Preisdent Johnson through his recent economic adviser, Prof. Walter Heller, hinted that some division of Federal revenue with the States might be one aspect of a revised federalism. But unfortunately the suggestion seems to have been knocked down.

Basically, however, the States must help themselves. As life magazine put it not long ago, "State government in this country is a mess." And as Thomas Jefferson observed, the only way in which the States can erect a barrier against the extension of national power within their proper sphere is "to strengthen the State governments, and this cannot be done by any change in the Federal Constitution * * * it must be done by the States themselves." He explained: "The only barrier in their power is a wise government. A weak one will lose ground in every contest." He could not, of course, envisage what our Supreme Court has done in the matter of apportionment.

Similarly, the Kestnbaum Commission observed: "If States do not give cities their rightful allocation of seats in the legislature the tendency will be toward direct Federal municipal dealings. These began in earnest in the early days of the depression. There is only one way to avoid this in the future. It is for the States to take an interest in urban problems, in metropolitan government, in city needs. If they do not do this, the cities will find a path to Washington as they did before and this time it may be permanent, with the ultimate result that there may be a new government arrangement that will break down the constitutional pattern which has worked so well up to now."

This was in 1955; now, 10 years later we not only see the Federal Government dealing directly with the big cities, but we have the proposal, renewed by President Johnson in his state of the Union message, for a new Federal executive Department of Housing and Urban Development to make sure that city problems are not neglected at the Federal level. Unfortunately, however, I scanned the President's message in vain to find any recognition of the indispensable role of the States in the successful operation of our Federal system. I don't believe he referred to the States or the Governors even once.

At the same time that we must vitalize and modernize our State governments, we must not think that everything can be run from Washington with direct pipelines to the cities. A number of our States in their administrative organizations and central leadership compare very favorably with the sprawling Federal Establishment; and poverty and air pollution and education are not going to be properly handled without the most effective State support and collaboration. We need strength not only at the center, but also at the periphery and all the way in between. This means better intergovernmental arrangements.

An optimistic note, I believe, is justified at this point. I therefore say that I think we have made progress in recent years in improving our intergovernmental relations—although we still have a long way to go. Since 1959 a notable step forward was the creation in Washington by act of Congress of an agency known as the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

This body of 26 members was set up to represent all the various levels of government in our Federal system and it consists of Governors, mayors, Cabinet members, Congressmen, State legislators, county supervisors, and three persons representing the public. Some 20 significant reports have already been published by the Commission containing a series of important recommendations dealing with most of the existing problems in the field. I commend these reports to your careful attention. Here at long last we have in our Federal system a Commission whose task it is to give continuing attention to the problems which our Federal system inevitably produces. Although implementation of the Commission's recommendations is slow business, because so many units are involved, nevertheless a large number of influential officials and citizens are carefully and sincerely at work trying to iron out the basic problems which make our Federal system sometimes creak and groan. A step in this direction is the important bill recently introduced by Senator MUSKIE referred to as the intergovernmental cooperation bill of 1965, S. 561.

Let me also give a few illustrations from two reports of the Commission; namely one entitled, "Statutory and Administration Controls Associated with Federal Grants for Public Assistance" and "Performance of Urban Functions Local and Areawide." As the first report indicates, we have had a cash outlay for assistance payments alone of some $54 billion in Federal, State, and local funds since the passage of the Social Security Act, and the report adds, "It is not strange that the public assistance programs have been subjected to critical scrutiny nor any wonder that from time to time intergovernmental relations have been strained."

After a critical review of the Federal grant-in-aid device as an important means for strengthening State and local government, the Commission rejects any proposition "that such grants be made a mere vehicle for fashioning greater concentration of administrative power in the Central Government" and it adds, "the Commission believes that Federal controls associated with the administration of grant programs should be kept to a minimum sufficient to assure a satisfactory performance consistent with the national purposes of the program, and to provide proper accountability for the expenditure of Federal funds." It adds finally "both the Federal statutory provisions and any implementing regulations governing a grant program should be developed with the desirability in mind of strengthening State and local government administration and should be carefully weighed against this objective before they are approved." The Commission also feels that State and local government should have "a significant voice in the development of Federal program provisions, especially when Federal requirements will affect their organizational and administrative structures."

With these ends in view, among other recommendations, the Commission proposed (1) that there be a judicial review of decisions by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; (2) that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be given increased discretion in regard to the operation of State plans; (3) that there should be a modification of the single State agency concept so that the States might be able to organize the structure of their executive branch in a matter more compatible with their own organization and administrative needs; and (4) that a permanent public assistance advisory council be established to advise the secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on proposed legislation, administrative regulations, and other related matters.

I commend these recommendations for your thoughtful consideration and I also suggest that as an organization you give more attention to these and other commission recommendations in this important field of intergovernmental relations. Your distinguished former mayor and now the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony Celebrezze, served on this commission with me and I am sure that he is sympathetic with the objective of ironing out difficulties between the States and the Federal Government and the cities as well.

Before concluding this discourse on intergovernmental relations I feel constrained to emphasize two additional points. First, the excessive number of units of government in the United States; and second, the need for State constitutional revision.

We cannot be reminded too often that as of 1962 we had 91,236 governmental units in the United States. Thirty-four thousand six hundred and seventy-eight of them, or nearly one-third of the total number were school districts; there were 56,507 local governments other than school districts of which 3,043 were counties, 17,997 were municipalities; 17,144 were township governments; and 18,323 special districts. Of the latter, Michigan has 3,817 and Ohio only 3,359.

When I was a delegate in our recent State constitutional convention I endeavored to eliminate townships from the constitution. I regret to tell you that I was only able to attract 41 votes out of 144. But I shall keep on trying.

So far as State constitutional revision is concerned, the Kestnbaum commission back in 1955 found "a very real and pressing need for the States to improve their constitutions." Having gone through the experience of our Michigan Constitutional Convention as a delegate, I can say that one cannot possibly realize how bad one's State constitution is until he submits it to the penetrating study of a State constitutional convention. It is never possible to do everything one would like to do, but to bring undoubted improvements to State constitutions is an urgent need.

As a final parenthetical remark I should like to quote to you section 5 of article III of our new Michigan constitution which I think is unique in this country and which I also believe to be something of a model for other States to follow in this field. It reads: "Subject to provisions of general law, this State or any political subdivision thereof, any governmental authority or any combination thereof may enter into agreements for the performance, financing, or execution of their respective functions, with any one or more of the other States, the United States, the Dominion of Canada, or any political subdivision thereof unless otherwise provided in this constitution. Any other provision of this constitution notwithstanding, an officer or employee of the State or of any such unit of government or subdivision or agency thereof may serve on or with any governmental body established for the purposes set forth in this section and shall not be required to relinquish his office or employment by reason of such service. The legislature may impose such restrictions, limitations, or conditions on such service as it may deem appropriate." I think you will recognize how this section encourages intergovernmental activity and removes the rigid limitations which are found in so many State constitutions against cooperative, shared activity particularly at the local level.

May I conclude these remarks by using the words of James Madison who said that the Federal system would be a success if we used reciprocal forbearance. If our various units of government could only use this reciprocal forbearance today, many of our problems would disappear. I might also add that if we did not place so much reliance upon government and placed a little more on the individual, that we would also be better off. In any case, the problems of the Great Society will go floundering unless we develop better teamwork between Federal, State, and local governments.

VFW Commander Jenkins Speaks Out Against Hospital Closings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. John A. Jenkins, of Birmingham, Ala., has played a leading role in protesting the announced plans for closing Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries and regional offices.

An able public speaker, a distinguished lawyer, and a highly informed spokesman on veterans matters, Commander Jenkins presents the case against the closings in a very effective manner.

On Sunday, January 7, 1965, Commander Jenkins carried the veterans case to the Nation. Appearing on the Mutual Broadcasting System program, "Reporters' Roundup," Commander Jenkins answered questions by a distinguished panel consisting of Mr. Ken French of the Mutual Broadcasting System, Mr. Clark Mollenhoff of Cowles Publications, and Mr. John Goldsmith of UPI.

In the course of this half hour program Commander Jenkins responded to the questions, explaining why the proposed closing of veterans facilities is uneconomical, unfair to veterans as a group, and is a breach of faith with those who have defended our country in its hour of need.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Mutual Broadcasting System is to be commended for its alertness to important issues and for its sense of public service, both of which were so well demonstrated in Mutual's decision to interview Veterans of Foreign Wars Commander Jenkins on "Reporters' Roundup." Because of the widespread interest in the proposal to close badly needed veterans facilities and because of what Commander Jenkins said, and how he said it, concerning the proposed closings, I include, under leave to extend my remarks, the text of the program, "Reporters' Roundup," on the Mutual Broadcasting System, January 7, 1965, featuring the appearance of Commander in Chief John A. Jenkins of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

REPORTERS' ROUNDUP—JANUARY 7, 1965

Mr. FRENCH. Reporters' Roundup—where bylines make headlines. This is Ken French, Mutual News. Reporters' Roundup comes to you tape recorded from the Mutual Studios in Washington, D.C. It is presented by the Mutual Broadcasting System as a part of a continuing effort to provide programs designed to keep you informed.

We have as guest the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, John A. Jenkins. The area of inquiry, obviously, is that phase of the President's program dealing with the closing of some veterans' facilities. Commander Jenkins has been an outspoken critic of some of the Presidential suggestions.

There have been efforts aimed at changing the mind and attitude of key Members of the Congress and the administration—some successful, some not. Certain Members of the Senate would not follow completely the lead of President Johnson. The President's VA topman, William J. Driver, who was confirmed during the past week, has not changed his thinking.

So with a qualified expert, VFW Commander John A. Jenkins, Reporters' Roundup will take a look at the problem and at methods of changing what some feel are mistakes.

To ask the questions, two outstanding Washington correspondence, Clark Mollenhoff, award-winning correspondent of Cowles Publications, and John Goldsmith, leading member of the UPI team of reporters. Mr. Mollenhoff will have the first question for Commander Jenkins:

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Commander Jenkins, it seems that your organization make some distinction between the policy on the closing of the VA hospitals and the elevating of Mr. Driver to the position of head of the VA. How do you draw that line?

Mr. JENKINS. We do, Mr. Mollenhoff. We say that the two are completely separate, and not connected things. We feel, first, that Mr. Driver as a career man is most knowledgeable and most qualified to be Administrator of the Department of Veterans Affairs. We feel that his name—nor would have the name of any person been submitted to the Senate for confirmation who had not agreed in advance to go along with these curtailment proposals. However, we do not attribute them to Mr. Driver and we feel that

he will make a very competent Administrator.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well now, who do you blame under these circumstances for this policy? Mr. Driver is the man who has been on the Hill doing the defending.

Mr. JENKINS. We blame two general categories. First, we blame the highest political power—or the seat of the highest political power—the White House, which has allowed to be nutured a certain philosophical concept to which we are very strongly opposed in that veterans are not entitled any preferential treatment from their country as a reward for their service to the country in time of war; and the second basis of blame is the Budget Bureau—that there is a very deliberate attempt, a very strong attempt at this time, to—for bookkeeping purposes—to balance the budget, or at an expected output of less than $100 billion.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well now, both of these entities that you suggest are responsible for this. The Budget Bureau, and the White House generally, are accountable to one Lyndon Johnson. Do you blame the President personally for this type of policy?

Mr. JENKINS. Not personally, no—but as a practical matter, his advisers and the highest echelons of his administration.

Mr. GOLDSMITH. Well, are you saying that this program of closing was instituted to bring the Federal budget down below the magic $100 billion level?

Mr. JENKINS. Partially. For the second reason we say that there is now, and there has been for many years, since the Economy Act of the 1930's, since the report of the Bradley Commission and the Hoover Commission, a philosophic concept that veterans' benefits as such are not in the best interests of the country. And we are opposed to that.

Mr. GOLDSMITH. Well, what is your feeling about the adequacy of VA hospital and domiciliary facilities across the country? Is there a good showing to be made that there is inadequate capacity now?

Mr. JENKINS. There certainly is. By the figures of the Veterans' Administration itself, it was projected that by 1980 they would need three times the bed facilities in VA hospitals which they now have. And I'll say this too—that the veteran population is growing older and the entire concept of medical treatment in our country is increasing by leaps and bounds. Hospitalization, medical benefits, medical attention are all increasing in every facet of our life, and I see no reason why this same is not true of the veteran population.

Mr. GOLDSMITH. Isn't it part of the VA argument that some of these facilities that are being closed are not properly located, properly positioned to take care of the load where the need is?

Mr. JENKINS. That's what they say. They support—and when I said "they" I mean the Veterans' Administration—support their projected curtailment by arguments which we believe to be fallacious and not to be the real reason. And they say that there are some lesser requirements, some diminishing requirements for hospital beds. Well, we say that's absolutely untrue. If that be true, there would be no need for additional hospitals, for instance, under the Hill-Burton Act.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well now, Commander Jenkins, if you want to be effective in this though, can you continue to tilt with windmills? Do you not have to have some adversary, some villian who is responsible for this dastardly thing that you are talking about here? Can you just fight generally and be effective?

Mr. JENKINS. We feel that that is the effective way to do it. We feel that personalities and attributing the evil motives to individuals as personalities would be harmful to our cause. We believe that, basically, we are right on two scores: First, the philosophical; second, on the budgetary attack.

Now I will say this, if I might. Insofar as the budgetary argument is concerned, we think that we can point out places where these curtailments proposed to save some $23.5 million annually, and we believe that we can point out places in the budget (or in a proposed budget) where this amount can be saved in better interests of the Nation as a whole than taking it out of the veterans.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, what about this domiciliary area? The Veterans' Administration appears to be in the position of saying that they are not really so sure there is much need for domiciliary care. How do you feel about this?

Mr. JENKINS. Well, I feel this: That first, their argument—their basic argument—on the domiciliary, as I understand it, is that the domiciliary should be operated only in connection and in conjunction with hospital facilities.

We say this: That the whole field of geriatrics and the treatment of the aging population—and the veteran population is aging—at some step of less sufficiency than hospitalization itself is not peculiar to the veterans population. It is a thing that is proposed, as we understand it, in other facets of the Great Society.

Mr. GOLDSMITH. Commander Jenkins, you say that you think there are other ways in which savings of equal or greater amount could be made. Give us some idea of how you would recommend such savings if you were in the Budget Bureau or in the White House in a position of responsibility.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, first I'd like to say—and we have some very definite recommendations—is that we're not opposed to foreign aid as such. And we don't want to put our organization in such a position. But we do believe that foreign aid should be limited to those people friendly to, and who believe in, the principles of government which our Nation believes in.

We point out, for instance, that there have been quite a number of grants to Indonesia. I don't know whether that's proposed to be continued or not. But we point out that we have been giving aid to Egypt and to Nasser; and we point out that we've been giving aid to Algeria under Ben Bella. And we feel that certainly the veterans of this Nation are entitled to consideration in preference to these gifts, regarding which a very cogent argument can be made that it's contrary to the best interests of our country.

Mr. GOLDSMITH. How about the programs that the President has lumped under the general heading "Great Society"? Many of these, I suppose, would help veterans, though not in their capacity as veterans. What's your organization's feeling about the "Great Society"?

Mr. JENKINS. Well, being against the Great Society is kind of like being in favor of sin. We don't know exactly what's contemplated and what's meant by the Great Society, yet. But we will say this: It was through the efforts and the sacrifices of the veterans of this Nation that this Nation now finds itself in the position to proceed with the Great Society. And we feel that we should not be the first casualties of such a society.

Mr. GOLDSMITH. Let me ask you this: Can you give us some idea of other areas in which the principle of veteran's preference has been ignored?

Mr. JENKINS. Well, as you may recall, there was a proposal in the Congress in connection with an Alaskan railroad this past session, that Civil Service preference to veterans be eliminated from that. We find that there is a constant and insidious, and sometimes very surprising, attack on veterans' benefits of all kinds and types.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well now, haven't you been able to at this stage, Commander, pin down who some of the people are who are responsible for this? I would think that your veterans organization would find that to be essential.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, Mr. Mollenhoff, I will say this: That we—all of these people are Americans, and our disagreements insofar as our concept of what's right and the morality of observance of the principle of loyalty on the part of our Government—we don't attribute evil motives to individuals as such. I just don't feel that it would be in the best interests of this struggle to name individuals.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, getting into this whole problem that you have—which is largely a political problem, isn't it? Do you agree with this?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, it is. Absolutely.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Let's get a political balance. Well now, you speak about foreign aid. There's a considerable lobby in favor of foreign aid—not only in favor of foreign aid, but in favor of foreign aid to Indonesia and to Egypt, the two that you mentioned.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Now to overcome this, aren't you going to have to get a little more sex appeal or a little more personality into this thing so that your point gets across more to the people?

Mr. JENKINS. Well, let me say this: From my travels over the country, I find that there's a growing disillusionment with the benefits that this country is getting out of some of the foreign aid. To be very charitable, we'll say "some" of the foreign aid. There's a growing feeling in the country that this has been administered and has been given in such a way—in ways that are not in the best interests of this country. And so we find there a built-in answer when they come back at us and say, "Well, these are economy measures, and you favor economy in Government—which we do—these are efficency measures, and you favor efficiency in Government—which we do." Our answer is that with these many millions going to Nasser and Ben Bella, we don't see why budget savings should be taken out of the hides of veterans.

Mr. GOLDSMITH. It sounds to me as if you're saying that there could be political repercussions against the administration if this program is allowed to continue. Is that right?

Mr. JENKINS. I think, nonestly, since this broke—and I've been in Nebraska and Delaware, the Dakotas, Pennsylvania—I have never seen our people so incensed and so stirred up about a matter affecting our veteran population. Governors, Members of Congress, members of the municipal governments, and State governments are stirred up about this particular proposal to curtail the facilities of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well now, are they stirred up about Mr. Driver, or President Johnson's administration? What are they mad at?

Mr. JENKINS. Well, I don't know that it's manifested itself in a sense of being mad. I don't think that really many of the people even know Mr. Driver, to be frank with you, and his name means nothing to them. And as far as the President, they are not mad with the President—certainly the election last fall and the results of it show that. But there's a great deal of disillusionment beginning with this thing called the Great Society, if this VA cut-back is a manifestation of the "Great Society."

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. You find this inconsistent with a great society and the expanded medical programs—is that the way you feel?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes. I find it most inconsistent with the expansion of social security, with the medical proposals which are being made, and with the other attributes which

are very nebulous as to what the Great Society consists of.

Mr. GOLDSMITH. Do you think that this opposition is being conveyed to Members of the Senate and the House, and are you helping convey it?

Mr. JENKINS. It is being conveyed, and we are helping to convey it and will continue to help convey it in every way that we can.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, who do you think are your most effective people up there in the Senate? For example, now—in helping you and stopping this type * * *.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, let's say this: That they are all great men, and of course we don't want to create grades of glory, so to speak—but we're very proud of Senator MANSFIELD, for instance, for the way he has come to the forefront in this struggle. And Senator PROUTY, who comes to mind right quickly, and there are numerous others in the House. And chairman TEAGUE, of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, has assured me that he will begin hearings on this matter by the middle of next month.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Now, ROBERT KENNEDY, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY was doing some work on this.

Mr. JENKINS. ROBERT KENNEDY did a magnificent job, and I was told Senator TED KENNEDY this morning, did a magnificent job in that question.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, do you think now—he was trying to make some points that the Veterans' Administration was relying upon what he considered to be insubstantial, nonsubstantial statistical information. Do you think he made this in a solid fashion?

Mr. JENKINS. I certainly do, and I think this—that the decision was made to close these facilities or curtail them, and then these facts of the Veterans' Administration, and arguments with these, were thought up after the decision.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, do you think that that's honest—for them to use that type of statistic to try to close veterans' hospitals?

Mr. JENKINS. I certainly do not. I think they should very frankly and openly give the real reasons, which we have previously referred to.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, if putting out these false statements is dishonest, as you indicate, then who is responsible for the dishonesty? Doesn't that get above and beyond just a matter of a little political fuss?

Mr. JENKINS. Well, actually who is responsible for the dishonesty, I don't know. But I will say this: That these people have to give some reason. And they cannot, or will not, give the true reasons—which are budgetary and the philosophical opposition to veterans' benefits.

Mr. FRENCH. Thank you, VFW Commander Jenkins.

The Future of the United States and What Its Citizens Can Do To Influence It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid speech delivered before the Halifax, Va., County Chamber of Commerce by Don L. Jordan, vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers, and chairman of the Board of the Johnson-Carper Furniture Co., of Roanoke, Va.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BEFORE HALIFAX COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

(By Don L. Jordan)

I want to talk to you for a short time tonight about the most important thing in the world to all of us right now—the future of our country—and what we as individuals can do to influence that future.

First of all, let me say that I am delighted that so many ladies are present. This concerns you as much as it does these men—possibly more so because of the enormous share of the American economy owned by women.

A so-called expert has estimated that women control between 75 and 90 percent of the wealth of this country. Some jokester has added that they go through their husbands' pants pockets at night, trying to get the other 10 percent.

We know that isn't so, of course, but even if it were, we would know that the money was in good and capable hands.

If we men were honest with you ladies we'd admit that without you there would be no homes—without you there would be fewer churches—and without you there wouldn't be any parent-teacher associations, either.

I know that it has been customary to say that women haven't cleaned up politics since they won the right to vote 45 years ago. Let me say right here that I think you have done more in those 45 years than we men have managed to do in the last 200.

Through your women's organizations and the women of the Democratic Party and the Republican party—I understand there are a few Republicans in these parts—you have done much to field better candidates; and, by electing them, you have helped obtain better government on all levels.

The year 1965 is highly significant to us Virginians. Just 3 weeks from today we will be observing the 100th anniversary of the surrender at Appomattox—less than 100 miles from where we are gathered tonight.

We shall remember lovingly those last ragged remnants of a once great army which Gen. Robert E. Lee led so gallantly in a glorious but hopeless struggle. But, at the same time, I am sure that all of us who are honest with ourselves will thank God that out of Appomattox there emerged a united and powerful nation with a mission in this world.

On June 15 at Jamestown, Virginians will join in spirit with their British cousins and freemen everywhere to celebrate the 750th anniversary of the Magna Carta. I hardly need remind you that from this immortal document emerged the factors and the guarantees which were to point the way to our own independence and to what we so proudly call the "American way of life."

The year 1965 is the 700th anniversary of the first British Parliament, the mother of all representative legislative bodies. It also is the 346th anniversary of the first free legislature in America—the House of Burgesses—which met at Jamestown in 1619. (Unfortunately, that was the same year that African slaves were introduced into the economy of the Virginia Colony and of the entire South—a terrible sin for which all Americans are continuing to pay unto this day.)

What was the spirit and the essence of the Magna Carta, of that first Parliament, of that first House of Burgesses which preceded the Declaration of Independence and our Federal Constitution?

Was it not the fact that all men, being created equal under the law and in the sight of God, have the "unalienable right," as Jefferson put it, to govern themselves under a system which they think best?

For 176 years the United States Constitution has been in effect. It still guarantees our rights and our liberties. But we would be blind, indeed, if we did not recognize that those rights and liberties are being infringed and are slipping away a little bit at a time through court decisions, Executive orders, and even through the ruling of bureaucrats.

The States created the Federal Union to do those things they could not do for themselves. Be it noted, however, that they reserved to themselves all powers which they did not give specifically to the Federal Government.

Today the 10th amendment is being nullified daily, and bit by bit all power is being concentrated in Washington. Within the past week we have seen and heard the proposal to remove control of registration and voting to the National Capital from the States where the Constitution put it.

If this trend is not halted, it should be obvious to us all that the States eventually will become no more than provinces of the Federal Government like those of France and other European nations.

It follows quite naturally that local government then will become only administrative in nature, with officials appointed and carrying out directives from higher up. In short, the processes of our representative republican form of government are being reversed at an alarming pace.

All right, then, who is to blame for this, and what can be done about it?

Let's look at the initial half of that question first.

Who is to blame?

Let us look no farther than this room for a beginning. You and I are to blame. Government is the people. If government isn't what we want, then we are guilty.

Do you want to hear something tragic? Among other things, Jefferson wrote in the declaration that King George III had sent to these shores "swarms" of officials "to harass our people and to eat out their substance."

Well, today employees of the Federal Government alone equal in number the entire population of the Thirteen Original Colonies in 1776.

In addition, we have all the State and local officials. It really is tragic. It's staggering and alarming.

Another great Virginian of that era of giants—James Madison—who was the chief designer of the Constitution—once wrote that without self-government this Republic would not survive.

This Nation has become great because of the spirit of initiative, of self-dependence, and of self-reliance of our forefathers. They believed that it is the duty of the people to support government and not that of government to support the people.

Somewhere along the line we have lost our perspective and our sense of values—the great American vision.

I seem to recall hearing not long ago the urgent advice: "Ask not what your country can do for you but ask rather what you can do for your country."

Those were brave and inspiring words, but they have been followed by the appropriation of more billions of dollars to do more things for more people.

The spending programs seem to be never-ending. Why? Because the people or the representatives the people elect are demanding them.

All this requires more and more taxes and—I shudder to say it—more national debt; more putting off the bill for future generations yet unborn to pay.

Most alarming of all, so far as we businessmen are concerned, is not just the multiplication of Federal Government regulation and the excessive taxation but Government competition with business.

Here's one to make you think: Federal assets in housing, community development,

commerce, transportation, and other normal activities of the private business domain now total $82 billion.

If you want to know what hurts the economy, look at this: The Defense Department stockpiled critical items until 40 percent now has been declared excess and earmarked for disposal. The Federal excess in tin alone is equal to two times the average national consumption of that metal in 1960–62.

Government continues to expand in the power business after getting its foot in the door under the guise of flood control and rural electrification. As late as 1930 only 6 percent of all power-generating capacity was Government-owned; in 1960 it was 23 percent and is still going up. I hardly need go into the loss of revenue because of tax-free cooperatives whose share has to be borne by legitimate business.

Only recently the U.S. Forest Service asked Congress for $1 million to produce seedlings for State tree-planting programs. Privately owned nurseries are fully capable of doing the job, doing it better and doing it cheaper.

There are a lot more examples I could cite if we had time.

The many harassments of business in the field of labor relations and even in the ordinary conduct of its daily affairs are so well known that I need not go into detail. All of you have almost daily experience with interference and dictation.

And now, what are businessmen doing to combat these trends, to assert their rights, to secure and influence proper government? To tell the truth: the answer is "not enough."

Unfortunately, business has been cast in the role of complainer. It fights back only after it is hit and often this is too late. Business needs to take the initiative—to foster positive legislation—to offer its ideas without being asked.

Because Federal taxation is heaviest and Federal regulation is the more onerous, we tend—quite mistakenly, I think—to concentrate the fire of our complaints on Washington.

This is important—yes—but the taxation and the regulation extends down to all levels—to State, city, county, town, and other subdivisions.

Let me make something clear: If there are in any part of this State or Nation poor quality Congressmen, legislators, city councilmen, county supervisors, or others in elective office, everybody is to blame; but businessmen are more at fault because they should be community leaders in every way, not just in their particular fields.

If corrupt, self-seeking politicians gain control of a government, businessmen are to blame for their apathy, their lethargy, and, yes, even their weakness in refusing to face facts.

Civic responsibility begins not at the top but at the bottom. He who votes only in presidential elections is a very poor citizen, indeed.

It is simply good business for businessmen to be interested in government at the grassroots. If we do not take the proper interest in local and State politics, it should be obvious that national politics and policies will never reflect a business viewpoint.

At the local level especially, businessmen not only have an obligation to get out and work for candidates and issues—but also they have a duty to seek out and to provide competent and able candidates. Money contributions are fine and so easy to make, but they don't replace work at the precinct level.

Let me ask you a soul-searching question: If candidates for public office do not come from the ranks of business and professions, where are they going to come from? You know the answer as well as I—from the ranks of the incompetents, the rabble-rousers, and the cultivators of minority gripes.

When that happens, as has been observed, we will have the sort of Government we deserve.

Businessmen have an obligation to themselves and to their communities to take an active interest in organizations which are seeking to wage their battles. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce—for one—is doing a magnificent job in conducting public affairs training schools throughout the country.

I hope you will pardon me if I cite a personal example: Many years ago I decided to help further the work of one association to which my company belongs—the National Association of Manufacturers. As my interest grew, so did my responsibilities.

Just recently they offered me the challenge of becoming national vice president and chairman of the public affairs advisory committee. This is going to take a great deal of time, but the stakes are high and the opportunity for service and accomplishment too strong to refuse. I am going to do the best that I can to help awaken the businessmen of America to their duty and privilege.

We must tell our story to the people. Assuredly we cannot sit back on our branches and howl for the status quo, while militant organizations and others more interested than we are, set out to shape the course of the country, the State, and our local communities.

Do some of you perhaps still think there is no need to get excited? No? Well, listen to this: Recently, the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce published in its magazine Action the results of a survey among high school and college juniors, taken by three great universities.

Here's what they found: 53 percent believed in Government ownership of banks, railroads, and steel companies; 62 percent said that the Government has the responsibility to provide jobs; 61 percent rejected the profit incentive as necessary to the survival of free enterprise; and 84 percent denied that patriotism is vital and plays an important part in our lives.

These figures are shocking. Somewhere, somebody is falling short of telling the true American story where it needs most to be told—to the rising generation. We businessmen must accept a very big share of the blame for that.

One of the toughest fights the cause of freedom has been confronted with is going to break into the open soon. This will come when President Johnson submits his promised proposal to amend section 14–B of the Taft-Hartley Act.

In blunt language, this means the killing of the right-to-work laws of Virginia and 18 other States. (There were 19 others, but labor unions already have forced repeal in one State this year.)

With the repeal of section 14–B will disappear the basic human right of every American to work where, when, and for whom he pleases without having to join an organization or to pay tribute to it.

Make no mistake about it—this is going to happen unless all of us face the issue squarely and accept our share of the responsibility to see that section 14–B of the Taft-Hartley Act is not repealed. Al of us should express our views on this critical question by communicating with our representatives in Congress.

And so, my plea to you tonight is to become genuinely interested in politics and government. The problem is not so much with those who are in politics as it is with the great number of us who are not.

The businessman who ceases to study his history, his economics, and his psychology along with his mathematics is living in the Dark Ages.

If government insists on being in business, then it is high time business got into government on all levels, starting at home—down at those grassroots.

"Public affairs" is a nice, respectable $5 word. I have a better word, a plain 5-cent word we can all understand: its politics.

Politics is a dirty word only because you and I choose to make it so. But remember this: government is only as good as the politics behind it.

Intelligent, good, sound government can exist only if businessmen and community leaders are willing to give it their thoughts, their talents, and their efforts.

In summary: government is what we choose to make it. The future of our communities, our State, and our Nation is up to us.

Will you join me in accepting that challenge?

Latin American Audit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Social Progress Trust Fund of the Inter-American Development Bank issued its fourth report. This report, which contains one of the most complete and accurate compilations of statistics on Latin American development, presents a balanced account of progress in the last year under the Alliance for Progress.

The report is optimistic, but it does not underestimate the extent of the challenge before us. Indeed, it highlights the significance of the fundamental social, political decisions that must be made if the statistics are to show substantial improvement.

The New York Times on Monday, March 22 discussed this report in a thoughtful editorial. This editorial points up the essential political nature of many of the problems that remain in Latin America and cautions against expectations of quick solution. I would like to call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LATIN AMERICAN AUDIT

The fourth annual report of the Social Progress Trust Fund, like its predecessors, is a gold mine of facts and figures on Latin America. Only the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA), an affiliate of the United Nations with headquarters in Santiago, Chile, provides any comparable amount of economic and social information.

Gold mines, of course, do not provide pure gold. The Inter-American Development Bank, which has administered the trust's funds of $525 million put up by the United States, has an understandable tendency to spotlight the good features and to minimize the bad. ECLA, incidentally, has the opposite tendency.

Both organizations present all the facts they can get. Latin statistics are often untrustworthy, but there is no doubt that 1964 was a favorable year. It was least favorable in most of the fields in which the trust fund works—land settlement and improved land use, housing for low-income groups, water supply and sanitation facilities and higher education. Only in the field of education was there significant progress. There were also important tax reforms and a general improvement in mobilizing internal resources.

Agrarian reform remains a basic weakness. The fund's report masks how little advance was made by stating that "at the end of 1964 limited progress had been made in rural institutional reform." It does add that "while

population is growing at an exceptionally high rate, agricultural production as a whole, and food production in particular, are increasing more slowly, if at all." Moreover, "most recent estimates indicate that in the current year agricultural production will decline from last year's level."

Translate these facts into social and political terms and the results are far from encouraging. Yet social reform is the ideological basis of the Alliance for Progress, and the hardest thing to get in Latin America—as Teodoro Moscoso, the first Coordinator of the Alliance, said recently at Mills College—are "the important and innumerable political decisions" required to make the Alliance a success.

The difficulties and weaknesses in the area are no reflection on the Social Progress Trust Fund, which is doing splendid work under the direction of the Inter-American Development Bank's president, Felipe Herrera, of Chile. It is nobody's fault that the process of development in economically backward countries is very long and very hard.

Foreign Trade: Exporter To Use Trade Zone in Three-Way Transactions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I submit, for printing in the RECORD, an article as an example of how some leading citizens of the State of Hawaii are meeting the economic needs of our country with respect to the balance-of-payments problem. I think this example should be brought to the attention of the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Hawaii Business and Industry, March, 1965]

FOREIGN TRADE: EXPORTER TO USE TRADE ZONE IN THREE-WAY TRANSACTIONS

(NOTE.—A new firm just organized to promote sales of secondhand heavy machinery in the Far East will try to reduce the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit by an ingenious barter.)

No sooner did Governor Burns last month announce the approval of a free trade zone for Honolulu than business firms began making plans how to put it to practical use. One of the first among these is Universal American Export Corp., a 6-month-old enterprise which intends to do some repackaging, labeling, and distribution of Far Eastern goods which it plans to export to the United States, Canada, and the Latin American countries.

According to Executive Vice President Harold E. Peacock, who has spent 3 of his 4 years in Hawaii doing the spadework for the formulation of Universal American Export Corp., and previous to that had 17 years of experience in military export business in Chicago, the firm will often take distribution rights of its Far Eastern clients' products in lieu of cash payment; in these cases it will use the trade zone to bring these products in and pack them under various labels, or do some light assembly and such. The finished goods will then leave for their destination wherever Universal American Export Corp. has managed to sell them.

USED FACTORY MACHINES

Universal American Export Corp.'s services to the Far East, for which it will be receiving such goods on occasion, consist mainly of exporting industrial heavy machinery to the commercially awakening oriental countries—primarily Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand. President of Universal American Export Corp. is State Senator Mitsuyuki Kido, and other officers of the firm include Vice President Howard K. Maesaka and Director Herbert Y. C. Choy.

The firm's philosophy is simple. In the United States, industrial production is fast reaching the stage of total commitment to advance automation—and this results in quick obsolescence of still perfectly operational equipment often only 5 or 10 years old. What to do with this heavy machinery is becoming something of a national headache, since obviously no U.S. producer can afford to employ older, less efficient models on the production line because competition would quickly overtake him.

According to Peacock, the same equipment, properly reconditioned and backed by a reputable firm's guarantee, is often the perfect answer to the prayers of industrialists of the less advanced countries where of course, it is far too early to think of the latest automation and data processing steps, and where for the next 15 or 20 years the machinery can perform much-needed service. Accordingly, the Universal American Export Corp. attempts to act as the mediator between the underindustrialized East and the many dealers in the United States who are overstocked with used heavy machinery rapidly losing value.

TEN FACTORIES FOR KOREA

The potential for such services seems unlimited—the consensus of all four of the firm's protagonists who together made an inspection trip to the Orient recently to see what the potential was. The results were beyond all expectations, says Peacock. Instead of returning merely with tentative commitments and market data they set out after, the quartet brought back satchelfuls of firm orders for equipping entire new factories, or completely refurbishing existing ones; a preliminary estimate of the value of the trip sets the figure at $8 million worth of reconditioned equipment.

Says Peacock: "We won't try to compete in the new machinery market, where the Japanese and the Europeans can always beat American prices—but in the secondhand field, the United States is not only practically the only large supplier, but it also has such a fast industrial pace that machinery is discarded when it has still plenty of useful life left in it." There is also the advantage of universal knowledge of American trade names, which are something of a status symbol in the underprivileged countries, and the reputation of American businessmen whose guarantee can be taken at face value.

The firm is handling an order for a complete shoe factory for South Korea, where they also asked for a cardboard box plant, a caustic soda plant, a furniture manufacturing factory, and six other plants making everything from plastics to terry cloth. Taiwan has ordered cement block and brick making machinery, and even in highly industrial Japan, the traveling group sold a polyethylene bag factory idea. In all the countries visited, the Universal American Export Corp. members appointed agents to handle additional business; one Tokyo firm thus selected estimated it could easily generate $10 million in annual business for Universal.

GOAL: 1,000 DEALERS

Following the trip to the future markets, the firm turned its attention to its suppliers, and a second mission was dispatched to the United States, there to sign up dealers who will be the source of the equipment. Universal's aim, according to Peacock, is to have at least 1,000 dealers organized to supply instantly the kind and quantity of reconditioned equipment required; by exacting a service fee from these suppliers, the firm has begun to take in the first money since its establishment last September, he adds.

Universal also intends to act as agents or brokers for the mainland dealer in facilitating the somewhat complex export proceedings, for instance by dealing with outlets already possesing export licenses and thus making it unnecessary for the small dealers to get one. Help will be also offered with bills of lading and other redtape, and with financing. The company's services will thus be of greatest value to the small and medium sized businessman who cannot afford to keep an oversea sales staff or appoint oversea agents in all these locations.

U.S. EASES FINANCING

The financial angle, actually, says Peacock, has been the stumbling block until quite recently, and the reason for the 3-year delay in getting the enterprise going. The United States has never been too export-minded—only something like 3 percent of the gross national product ever leaves the country, easily the lowest ratio among the world's industrial nations. The businessman's attitude is also apparent in the attitude of the public servant, who has never been too helpful in pushing exports, Peacock explains.

In the last few years, prodded especially by the alarming rate of gold outflow, various governmental branches finally began in earnest to help businesmen to set up export operations. Operations of outfits like the World Bank and the Export-Import Bank have been expanded; the Export-Import Bank now offers guarantees to the ordinary commercial bank of the buyer's credit, as long as the country dealt with is at least reasonably stable as to system of government and solvency. In this manner, it acts pretty much as the FHA does in respect to mortgage lenders. With this official encouragement, banks and other sources of financing at last became amenable to the idea of loans for export purposes.

TRADE ZONE HELPFUL

One trouble remained on the receiving end. Most of the Asiatic countries are poor in dollars, and their governments jealously guard their meager hoards against outflow. It is therefore extremely hard for the would-be buyer of U.S. equipment in one of these countries to supplicate his government for the release of dollar funds to finance his factory, unless it is one of overwhelming national importance.

At this juncture, the Hawaii trade zone came as a propitious answer. Now the Universal American Export Corp. can offer to take commodities in lieu of payment, bring them to the zone, and in turn sell them either in the United States or wherever dollars are plentiful. It will then act as agent twice, and earn a slightly higher commission, but in either case, it will also help to reverse the trend of capital outflow from the United States. And in Hawaii, the firm's activity in the trade zone is bound to create a few jobs at least in whatever preparation for the American market is necessary. The raw materials or products accepted as payment will be usually brought in as bulk shipment, and leave Hawaii packaged and labeled for their individual destinations.

Everyone at Universal American Export Corp. is highly optimistic about the growing Far Eastern market. On the customer end, the firm can offer 20-year payment terms, which are guaranteed up to 90 percent by the Export-Import Bank; on the dealer end, it can lure the mainland busi-

nessman with vistas of an unlimited, largely entirely unexplored and yet very eager market; and to wholesalers, it can paint the picture of inexpensive oriental products and raw materials coming in as barter which can be sold at a profit anywhere in the Western world. That first get-acquainted trip, says Peacock, has convinced the staff that enough business could be signed up right now to keep the firm hopping for 20 years.

The Strange New Language of a Magic Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, criticism, sometimes reaching the point of vilification, has been heaped on the Bureau of Reclamation as the result of its activities which have an effect on the landscape of this Nation. The criticism grows out of a conflict that is not new to this country, but has somehow been distorted to the point where the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation are regarded as the spoilers of our national heritage by a select group which has appointed itself the protector of our natural resources. This may come as a surprise to some of my colleagues who have always thought that the business of our public resources are handled through the proposals of the administration and the disposal by Congress.

A case in point is the creation of Lake Powell which is now backing up behind Glen Canyon Dam in Arizona. There are those who think that the loss of this red rock canyon is inexcusable and irreparable. One cannot deny that the opportunity to follow the original water highway through those magnificent canyons is gone, but that river has been replaced by a lake—the highway has been widened and fantastic new vistas have been opened up to the vast numbers of Americans who are using their leisure time to discover the great beauties of the West. Instead of destruction, there has been an exchange. We have given the Nation a recreational opportunity—yes, an esthetic opportunity that never would have been ours had not the construction of this key unit of the Upper Colorado River storage project brought about the exchange of a river for a lake.

For a description of what has happened in that magic land, I call your attention to the article written by Maxine Brown Phillips in Empire magazine section of the March 14, 1965 issue of the Denver Post.

The article follows:

THE STRANGE NEW LANGUAGE OF A MAGIC LAND

Probably you've never heard of Wahweap, or Entrada, or Nonnezosche, or Mah-Vah-Talk-Tump. But you will. You'll hear of them, and a great many others—musical Spanish names, stuttery Indian ones—which are entering the American vocabulary the same way Yosemite and Niagara and Bright Angel and Sequoia came into it.

The names are from a great scenic region newly opened for the enjoyment of the American people—the Glen Canyon national recreation area—and it is a whopper.

On January 21, 1963, a steel gate was closed at Glen Canyon Dam in north-central Arizona, and Lake Powell was born. The Colorado River began to back up into the system of canyons it had carved in ages past.

Eighteen months later, in August 1964, when the year's runoff was completed, the lake was 347 feet deep at the completed dam, and more than 160 miles long, reaching far up into Utah, past Hite, and into at least 90 tributary canyons and innumerable smaller streams and river valleys.

From the beginning, like the neighbors' kids waiting for you to get your new swimming pool filled, the tourists were waiting. By the end of the summer of 1963, more than 20,000 people—who came in 5,600 vehicles pulling 2,300 boats—had come to Lake Powell to swim, ski, boat, fish, camp or just look. In 1964 the lake was bigger, and so were the crowds.

They say it always helps to enjoy the country if you know the language, and the language of Lake Powell and the whole Glen Canyon region, like the land itself, is fresh and vivid and different.

Wahweap, for instance. You pronounce it "Wah-weep." It is a Paiute Indian word meaning, not, as might appear, a crying papoose, but "bitter waters." Wahweap is where you have to go now to put a boat, or a baited fishhook, or yourself, into the Arizona end of Lake Powell, or even to see more of it than the sullen, dark-blue section immediately back of the dam. The canyon in which the old river is now imprisoned makes a bend a short distance above the dam, and the rest of the lake is hidden away in the blue-shadowed, pastel-tinted pink-and-beige world of mesas, buttes, and plateaus.

Wahweap is the gateway to this world. It is a broad, basin-like stream mouth which opens into Glen Canyon 6 miles upstream from the dam. The bed of the stream furnished gravel, thousands of tons of it, for the dam. Now it is the site of all the major activities related to the lake, except for the production of power by the mighty turbines at the foot of the dam. "Juice and joy," someone is supposed to have answered when asked what the new dam was going to be good for. The joy begins at Wahweap.

EVERYTHING FOR THE BOATER

The National Park Service, which operates the recreational facilities, has its Glen Canyon headquarters here, and has built a handsome campground, with paved parking patios, flourishing trees and shrubs (watered by the new lake) and a huge picnic area complete even to louvered steel awnings for the tables.

The marine and sightseeing concession's headquarters are here as well. Since the lake has not yet reached its permanent minimum storage level, these facilities are temporary, but fully adequate. You can launch your own boat, moor it, buy all necessary supplies for it, or rent a boat, or take a boat trip lasting from 2 hours to 7 days with the pilots of Canyon Tours, Inc. Other concessionaires operate out of Hall's Crossing and Hite in Utah.

A marine service shop is in full operation at Wahweap, with all the gear and tackle an inland skipper will ever need, including a sun hat for his wife, and postcards to mail to the folks who had to stay home in Apple Grove.

Up the hill from the temporary arrangement are the beginnings of what will one day be one of the country's great marinas. On a big coral-colored dune there are curbs and paved streets and parking areas and thriving trees, a giant launching ramp 1,100 feet long and 200 feet wide, graded so you can put your cruiser into the water while staying dry yourself. The trees and the curbs and the paving are for a still unbuilt 320-room luxury motel, already named Wahweap Lodge, and its related services—an airstrip, restaurants, snack bars, and gas stations for cars and boats. Completion date for this development is estimated as sometime in 1970.

The Wahweap concession is headed by famous old riverman, Art Greene, who for years ran the white water, taking thousands of canyon lovers down the bruising but inspiring route pioneered by Maj. John Wesley Powell in 1869. Now he takes his ease as your host, and if you're lucky, his son-in-law, Earl Johnson, himself a master riverman, will be your personal pilot and guide on your tour of the shimmering blue lake that has swallowed the river.

Johnson, who loves the lake as if he had invented it himself, agrees that much beauty was lost with the inundation of Glen Canyon. But then he points to the myriad marvels of scenery now within reach of eye, foot, and camera, via the wide blue highway of impounded water.

"Before the water came up," he says, "there was simply no way into most of these places. A few crazy prospectors and some thirsty Indians have seen it. But the ordinary person couldn't get in, and if he did, he probably never lived to get out."

As you float past noble promontories, majestic amphitheaters, frowning escarpments, into shadowy narrow channels and vast, echoing caves, for mile after breathtaking mile, you can't get too excited about what lies drowned under the shimmering surface which is your avenue into a once lost wonderland. For one person who was privileged to see the secret beauties of the floor of Glen Canyon, thousands will share in the splendors of the new but ancient land Lake Powell has revealed.

So remember Wahweap. You'll go there, just as surely as you go to Yellowstone, the Grand Canyon or Rocky Mountain National Park.

SANDSTONE SCULPTURES ABOUND

What about Entrada? Entrada is the name of a sandstone you see cropping out all over the Four Corners country. It is remembered bitterly as the "Slickrock" by many an exhausted uranium hunter who has stood below the swelling, billowly contours of the Entrada cliffs and gazed in frustration past its unscalable slopes, to where another sandstone, Morrison by name, hung against the sky. For within the Morrison lay hidden the uranium ore. Perhaps this same prospector, his pick and Geiger counter put away in a basement closet, will float past the bosomy heights, and reflect that they're much prettier, now that he doesn't have to climb them.

Entrada sandstone forms the beautiful castle-like figures which dominate the scene at Wahweap, and may well make it known as the world's loveliest setting for a marina. It is only one of many kinds of sandstone you will get to know personally if you become a real Lake Powell buff—such as Navajo, and Wingate, and Kayenta, and Carmel, and Owl Rock. In spite of yourself you might get carried away, buy an armful of geology bulletins and rock books and become an amateur geologist, speaking wisely (and if a little inaccurately, who cares?) of geologic columns, middle and upper Jurassic periods, and crossbedded dune forms.

Then there are the names given to some of the more spectacular features in the region by sore-footed pioneers. Gunsight and Tower Buttes, the Hole-in-the-Rock, the Crossing of the Fathers. Not many people passed this way in the long centuries before the idea of a dam came to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. But some of those who did come left big tracks.

In 1776, a Spanish priest, Fray Sylvestre Velez de Escalante, with a party of Spanish soldiers, returning from an unsuccessful at-

tempt to link the Santa Fe missions with those in California, found a place to ford the river. Now the lake widens to a seascape of iridescent waves, many feet above where the good padre wrung the river water out of his robes. The party representing Imperial Spain does not seem so very far away when you reflect that the lake surface stands where the river ran some quarter of a billion years ago. And the Mormon pioneers, letting their 85 loaded wagons down a thousand feet through a narrow cleft in the canyon wall, the Hole-in-the-Rock, seem closer still.

There are some old familiar names of another sort, beloved of fishermen, which are part of the new playground's glossary—rainbow, kokane, largemouth bass, catfish. The fish are there, planted and native, by the thriving millions, the game and fish people report. And the sight of fishermen driving around the campground at dusk, trying to give away a panful or a basketful of fresh-caught finny beauties, confirms the report.

NATURE'S MIGHTIEST BRIDGE

There are the names of the 90 side canyons into which the new lake reaches its blue and sparkling arms. You will float in hushed silence through Cathedral and Driftwood and Dungeon Canyons, past towering, tilted walls which cut off all but a thin crescent of sky. You will buy more film than you can afford, use it all, and go back the next day, with still more film, and use all of that. On the map you will look at the thousands of inviting anchorages on the lake's nearly 1,800 miles of shoreline, and just hope you live long enough to visit them all—and the money holds out.

And what about Nonnezosche and Mah-Vah-Talk-Tump?

They are Indian names for the crown jewel in Lake Powell's glittering treasury, Rainbow Bridge. This greatest of all known natural arches lay sequestered in the remote wilds, unseen by all but those rugged and well-heeled enough to undertake either a 20-mile trip by muleback from the foot of Navajo Mountain, or a float trip down the river, and then a lengthy walk through the great canyons. Since the lovely wonder was found in 1909, more than 22,000 names, many of them repeats, have been inscribed in the autograph book kept at the bridge. Now, on a 1-day trip, you can ride in a handsome, cushioned excursion boat over 60 miles of the bluest, clearest water in the world, through scenes of arresting grandeur, walk a mile and seven-tenths through the sand, and see it yourself.

It will not seem strange at all that the great bridge has not one but four names. We have called it The Rainbow. The Navajos call it Nonnezosche. And the Paiutes have conferred upon it two fine tongue-twisters. Like many another man, the Paiute has both a mystical and a practical side. Having satisfied his sense of mysticism by calling it Barahoini, "The Rainbow," he related this incredible structure to something he could touch and understand. He calls it, and all bridges, natural and otherwise, Mah-Vah-Talk-Tump. It means "under the horse's belly."

FACTS FOR VISITORS

Distance from Denver

Approximately 70 miles, via Four Corners or Monument Valley routes, to Kayenta, Tuba City, and Page.

Accommodations

At Page, site of dam and 7 miles from Wahweap Marina and campground, all services—motels, stores, laundromats, churches, boat and trailer rentals, taxi. The Wahweap concessionaire, Canyon Tours, Inc., operates a modern motel, restaurant, and service station at the intersection of U.S. 89 and the Wahweap road.

Weather and roads

Recreation area open all year. Boating, lodging, meals available at all times. Roads always open. Main waterways of the lake expected to be open all winter for fishing and boating. At Wahweap, occasionally as low as zero in winter and as high as 106° in summer. All motel air conditioned.

Johnson Arts Bill Lacks Limits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star of March 18, published an article by James J. Kilpatrick—entitled "Johnson Arts Bill Lacks Limits." Mr. Kilpatrick, who I am proud to say is a personal friend of mine, is the able and distinguished editor of the Richmond News Leader, of Richmond, Va. This article raises some very pertinent points in connection with the pending legislation dealing with the arts and humanities. I feel certain that every Senator will benefit from reading the article; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON ARTS BILL LACKS LIMITS

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

NEW YORK.—Huntington Hartford's new Gallery of Modern Art towers over Central Park at Columbus Circle, a rose and white minaret in this Babylon on the Hudson, created by Edward Durell Stone in a burst of Byzantine vision. Your correspondent emerged from these rococo precincts one afternoon last week, bought a paper, and learned that Johnson had sent his own bill on the arts up to Congress. It is a bad bill in several different ways; and the impact of Hartford's charming gallery made it worse.

Let us not construe the Constitution. In any old fashioned view, the Congress has no more power to create a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities than it has power to make Harry Truman a duke, but in a day when the Supreme Court confuses desirability with constitutionality, anything goes. Let us object and except, and let the point go.

Simply from a standpoint of governmental administration, the President's bill is a monstrosity. He would create (1) a National Endowment for the Arts, (2) a National Endowment for the Humanities, and (3) a Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities, all of which would go into (4) a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. Meanwhile, the National Council on the Arts, which came into existence only last fall, would vanish into the maze, never to be heard from again.

These several agencies, under the President's bill, would be charged with disbursing new grants-in-aid "to groups or, in appropriate cases, to individuals engaged in or concerned with the creative and performing arts." The grants would finance group productions, or individual projects, in music, dance, drama, folk art, creative writing, architecture, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, industrial design, costume and fashion design, motion pictures, television, radio and tape and sound recordings. The companion provisions, dealing with the humanities, are equally encompassing.

The President's bill, sponsored by Messrs. PELL, JAVITS, and GRUENING in the Senate, and by Mr. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, in the House, is the fifth or sixth major proposal in this field to be put before the Congress this year. The Johnson version is better than the others in one respect only. It would authorize up to $5 million a year in Federal funds to be matched with equivalent private contributions.

In every other respect, Johnson's bill suffers by comparison. For example, an earlier bill by Senator GRUENING provides that a National Humanities Board must be made up with a "comprehensive representation of the views of scholars and teachers in the humanities and the arts." The Gruening bill also contains an explicit provision that such a board "shall not attempt, directly or indirectly, to direct, control, or otherwise influence the scholarship, teaching, research, or artistic endeavors which it supports." Neither of these provisions appears in the President's bill.

An earlier bill from Senator PELL also contains one or two clauses that are intended to provide some safeguards against a despotism of taste, by assuring a reasonable turnover in membership on the governing board. Johnson's version, by contrast, would create two cultural czars, one for the arts, the other for the humanities, and would give each of them power to disburse up to $15 million a year largely at his own discretion.

The new grants would be paid to recipients who met "such standards as may be approved" by the Government. The two chairmen would decide what artistic endeavors had "substantial artistic and cultural significance." In the end, they alone would conclude that a novel, or biography, or tone poem, or painting, or piece of sculpture had significant merit. They would choose the artists, writers, designers, and composers who would receive the Federal grants. This is regal tastemaking not seen since the days of Catherine the Great, and it would be conducted with public funds gathered through the compulsions of law.

Huntington Hartford's gallery has drawn contemptuous sniggers from the moment it was opened—and drawn heartfelt applause as well. Hartford's taste runs strongly to representational paintings and sculpture; he is like square, man. Most galleries, like the Guggenheim up the street, are from Far Gutsville, but the Hartford is close in. Its patron likes it that way. And it is his money.

That is the key point. So long as patronage of the arts is free and voluntary, Guggenheim and Hartford, and Wright and Stone, can compete fairly in the marketplace. You pays your money and you takes your choice. But once the really big money in the arts begins to come from the Federal Government, you still will pay your money, all right, but the dominant choice will be Big Daddy's.

We Can Win in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "We Can Win in Vietnam" appearing in the March issue of the VFW magazine. I found the article to be of exceptional and timely interest. It was written by John L. Smith, public relations director, VFW, and editor of the VFW magazine. Mr. Smith's article is

a report to the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on the war in Vietnam, written after the author returned from a recent tour of the country as a guest of the U.S. Department of Defense.

The article follows:

WE CAN WIN IN VIETNAM

(By John L. Smith, editor, VFW magazine)

(NOTE.—This article is a report to the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on the war in Vietnam, written after the author returned from a recent tour of the country as a guest of the U.S. Department of Defense.)

Pearl Harbor, the Battle of the Bulge, Anzio, Normandy Beach, all bring to mind moments of courage, suffering and death—occasions when the American determination to win overcame insurmountable odds to turn defeat into victory. These are memorable pages from our Nation's heroic past.

Today the American fighting man is carrying on in the same tradition. He is the same gallant fighting man. He suffers, he endures, he exhibits the same courage, the same determination. He is proud, he is confident. But today there is this difference—he is frustrated and he is disillusioned. These are the men who slosh through the rice paddies and try to survive in the jungles of South Vietnam.

To observe these men of courage firsthand is an opportunity that comes to few. It is thrilling and exhilarating. It is a never to be forgotten experience, for the American serviceman in Vietnam symbolizes all that is great in our Nation's past and is daily establishing new high standards that will forever live in the pages of American history.

But the shadow of tragedy is cast over South Vietnam. It is a shadow that tarnishes the bright image of those who are serving, suffering, and succumbing on the battlefield so that freedom might survive here at home. It is the shadow of apathy, the shadow of softness, the shadow of misunderstanding, the shadow of fear. These words are foreign to the man on the fighting front, but represent instead, the emotions of those at home.

It was frightening indeed to feel the strong grasp of a young Army captain who only hours before had been engulfed in the flame of war when he said, "Why don't you go back and tell the people in the United States that we can win this war. Why the hell don't you tell them about the battles we win. Why the hell don't you tell them to get off our backs."

Sad is the day when the American fighting man must tell his fellow citizens back home to get off his back. But that is not the feeling of just one man in Vietnam, it is a general feeling of the men living and fighting side by side with the South Vietnamese. Yes, these men resent the attitude on the homefront. They resent it when they read of the criticism back home. They resent our lack of "will to win." They resent the talk of "pull out" and they resent it when they read the results of an American poll that indicates 25 percent of the American people are not even aware that we are embroiled in a deadly conflict in Vietnam.

The struggle in Vietnam is a difficult one. It is difficult to fight and it is difficult for the American people to understand. In days gone by, however, the difficulty of any given situation was never considered. It was enough to know that the American fighting man was engaged in battle, for those at home to step to the front and lend full moral and physical support in a determined effort to win. Such is not the case today.

It is true that, according to the book, we are not at war. Americans in Vietnam today are serving in the role of adviser. The term adviser should not be taken lightly or scoffed at. This is in fact the role we play. All final decisions are those of the Vietnamese. But to serve as an adviser to an army at war, as the Vietnamese Army is, it is necessary to assume the same risks and exist under the same conditions as those doing battle.

This is a new breed of American fighting man in Vietnam. It is not enough for him to know the ways of war. He must also understand customs and traditions and be skilled in the ways of government. The American assignment in Vietnam is to help secure the country militarily and assist in the establishment of a workable government.

To the American outside of the confines of Saigon this means, in most cases, doing battle against the Vietcong Communists at the side of the Vietnamese soldiers. Once a given objective is gained, and this is usually a hamlet of 100 to 500 people, it becomes the objective of the American adviser to help in the establishment of a local government. Once a ruling body is established, a census is taken and schools and medical dispensaries are set up. An effort must then be made to train a defense force made up of men from the hamlet. It is hoped that this force will thereafter be able to defend the village and the Regular Vietnamese Army troops with their American advisers will be able to move on to a new challenge. This process is referred to as the pacification program. At best it is a long and arduous task, but there is hope that it can succeed.

An Army major, a veteran of World War II and Korea, perhaps put it best. "We must have the patience to win here in Vietnam or we will lose all that we gained in World War II. You must tell the American people that we need time. We know we can win if they will let us. Tell the people back home to realize if we pull out here we will just have to find a new place to stop and fight. This is more than a struggle for Vietnam. China is trying to drive freedom out of all of Asia. Sooner or later we are going to have to stop them. Later may be too late. If we fail the people here in Vietnam the chances are that no one else here in the Pacific would even look to the United States for assistance in the future."

The major's last remark was perhaps most significant. More and more there is the feeling both in and out of Saigon that the United States is tired of the whole thing and is getting ready to pull out. More and more there is talk of the paper tiger.

In the minds of the men on the fighting front such talk breeds contempt and defeat. A tough American sergeant put it this way, "Every time someone back home starts popping off about pulling out of Vietnam, chalk up another victory for the Vietcong."

Perhaps the sergeant was a bit harsh, but his sentiments do prevail in Vietnam. It is the general feeling that the home front dotes too much on the negative side of the struggle and spends too much time worrying about the power struggle in Saigon. Unquestionably, Washington must worry about the establishment of a second national government in Vietnam but in seeking this end it should not allow for a deterioration of the military situation.

Following the change in government the last week in January, a highly decorated Vietnamese officer had this to say when asked about how this would affect him personally and his unit, "Americans worry too much about government in Saigon. We are worried about killing Vietcong. When the Vietcong are all killed, then we will worry about good government in Saigon." Again, this is an oversimplification, but it is also a common attitude outside Saigon.

It is difficult without witnessing it first hand to understand the differences between Saigon and the rest of Vietnam. Saigon is a beautiful modern city of some 2 million population. Its people are obsessed with a new toy. That toy is freedom—a freedom to choose one's political leaders—a freedom that is only 10 years old. In American parlance, "everyone wants in the act." The politics embrace religion, customs and inexperience. It is doubtful that many of those in politics recognize the implications of the turmoil that has been created.

Outside of Saigon it is a different story. With the exception of a few smaller cities, the countryside is made up of primitive hamlets and villages and surrounding farmers. To them Saigon is another world. They have little or no understanding of the struggle they are involved in. They seek only to survive. If the Vietcong offer them protection, they will accept. If government forces offer them protection, they will accept. In the beginning, at least, they have no political allegiance. It is heartening however, to note that in areas that have been pacified, where schools and medical dispensaries have been established, the people show a genuine regard for the national government. This offers hope for the future.

The United States has already made a tremendous contribution to the future of South Vietnam in the way of life and toil and money. All of this will have been for naught if those at home do not rally round behind the men at the front with resolute determination to get the job done—a resolute determination to win.

The fact must be accepted that there is no easy way—no short cut to victory in South Vietnam. The way is long and tedious. It is filled with heartbreak and despair, but victory can be achieved with patience and perseverance.

To attain this victory it is time that the American people be given a clear cut picture of the situation as it now stands. The Government must establish a definitive policy and explain that policy to the people. The American public must be told in blunt terms that victory is our objective. Failure to establish this fact can only mean failure on the battlefield.

Every effort must be made not to escalate the war, but certain risks will have to be assumed if victory is the objective. The posture of battle must revert from defense to to offense. It is not more troops and more weapons that are needed in Vietnam, it is more determination on the part of the people and hence on the part of Government. Knowledge of the rightness of the cause must replace the fears of death and defeat. As a nation the United States has never hesitated to fight for what is right. Twenty-three thousand Americans on the fighting front are daily proving their determination. If they can endure the constant presence of death in that strange jungle fastness, surely we can develop the will to understand that they are fighting for us here on Main Street, U.S.A., and with the same courage and determination on the home front we can win.

"What the Bill of Rights Means to Me"—Three Prize-Winning Essays From Cheyenne, Wyo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, Cheyenne, Wyo.'s, Francis E. Warren Post No. 1881 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has conducted a contest among sixth-grade students on their understanding of "What the Bill of Rights Means to Me." The contest, conducted among students

in 44 classes of 21 Cheyenne, Wyo., schools, drew nearly 1,200 entries, from which a panel of judges selected 110 essays for the final competition. The winners in the final competition were Connie Gonzales, of Cole School—first place; Kenny Stewart, of Hobbs School—second place; and Susan Jasperson, of Lebhart School—third place.

Francis E. Warren Post Commander Lee Hines, of Cheyenne, informs me that the response to the project has been so encouraging that the post plans to make it a continuing annual program as a supplement to the VFW's "Voice of Democracy" project, which also is extremely popular in Wyoming.

Mr. President, I have read the three prize-winning essays on "What the Bill of Rights Means to Me," and I am very much impressed by them. It is heartening to me to know that these youngsters, who will be called upon to lead this Nation in the decades ahead, have such a fine working familiarity with the Bill of Rights and what the Bill of Rights means to the people of the United States. Despite the relative youthfulness of our Republic, the United States has the oldest unaltered form of constitutional government in the world. Only today's youth—tomorrow's leaders—can perpetuate this system.

I request, Mr. President, that the three award-winning essays on the Bill of Rights, to which I have alluded, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"WHAT THE BILL OF RIGHTS MEANS TO ME"—FIRST PLACE WINNER

(By Connie Gonzales, Cheyenne, Wyo.)

To me, the Bill of Rights is a means by which we can enjoy our birthright and our country. These were given to us by God, but the Bill of Rights was given to us by our forefathers.

The Bill of Rights is, to me, the rules by which our country is run. We don't have to worry that they are outdated. They are very modern, as our Government meets every year to be sure the laws are as good as they need to be to run our country.

If any changes have to be made in a certain law, they are made as soon as possible. These changes are called amendments. There are many amendments to our Constitution.

I feel, as a happy American, that I am blessed to have been born in a country where our laws are so fair and good. Of great importance to me is the right by which we have our own way to worship. Because, if we didn't have the Bill of Rights, we couldn't worship God in our own way.

Also, very important to me is the right of freedom granted to me. In my opinion this is the best country in the world. It is known as a free country because of our Bill of Rights. In other countries, a person's freedom can be taken from him. He might come home and find his parents and family gone. He would not know where they went. Dictatorships are run in this way. This could never happen in America.

Unless a man is a criminal, he has nothing to fear in our country. Even a criminal gets only what he deserves.

The Bill of Rights teaches us respect for the rights of others. All of this is what the Bill of Rights means to me.

"WHAT THE CONSTITUTION AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS MEANS TO ME"—SECOND PLACE WINNER

(By Kenny Stewart, Hobbs School, Cheyenne, Wyo.)

Often I wonder what America would have been like without our Constitution and Bill of Rights. In the time when America was just a colony of England one might be shot for saying something against the way the colony was governed. Now, with the Bill of Rights I am free to speak as I want. Every Sunday I go to the church of my choice to worship God. That is another advantage to the Bill of Rights. In some countries you are not allowed to worship God.

You can be anything you want to be in America. There are no caste societies here.

Often I think of what would have happened without men like George Washington, Patrick Henry, Abraham Lincoln, etc. America might have been worse than Russia. In the United States if you commit a crime you are not forced to give evidence against yourself in a trial by jury, and also if you commit a crime you are not taken and tortured as in the 1700's, a jury finds whether you are guilty and a judge decides how they are punished.

Now in America no one can be forced to leave his home. In the future I hope I can help enforce these laws so that America will be a better place in which to live. And so that people who live here can enjoy the freedoms that come with the country.

"WHAT THE BILL OF RIGHTS MEANS TO ME"—THIRD PLACE WINNER

(By Susan Jasperson, Lebhart School, Cheyenne, Wyo.)

When the Colonies of the United States turned against the King of England, a lot of the Colonies put lists of rights in their constitution. But when the Constitutional Convention met in 1787, the delegates took most of these rights for granted. Virginia and other States insisted that a bill of rights be made. Their demands were in the first 10 amendments, known as the Bill of Rights. The 10 amendments prove that our country has these rights.

1. People have the right to say and write what they want; the right to complain to the Government. Congress can't make laws saying what religion you have to belong to.

2. The people have a right to carry guns around so long as they have a license to do so.

3. In peacetime people can't be forced to have soldiers come in their home and live.

4. No person by law can come in and search someone's home without a piece of paper signed by a judge saying he has the right to do so.

5. No person can be put on trial unless the jury says he has enough evidence for a trial. No one can be tried twice for the same thing. No person can be forced in giving evidence against himself.

6. A person accused for something can't be put in jail while police find evidence.

7. In a lawsuit for more than $20, the person can demand a jury trial.

8. A person accused for something can get out of jail until his trial by lending some money with the court. This is called bail. No one can be tortured into telling something.

9. The framers who wrote the Bill of Rights didn't give us all the rights because if they had, the people wouldn't have any rights.

10. The rights that aren't given to the government are given to the people.

I wrote this essay on the Bill of Rights because everyone in this country should be glad we have this document saying what privileges we have.

Boulder, Colo.: 20th Century Shangri-La

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read in the March 29, 1965, issue of U.S. News & World Report that this fine magazine recognized Boulder, Colo., as being 1 of 13 most pleasant communities to live in. This magazine has performed a most valuable service for families who are looking for a highly-desirable place to settle. The problem of finding a pleasant and desirable place to find work and raise a family is a perplexing one to many Americans, especially in view of the rising tide of violence in big cities and the school problems and traffic congestion which are increasingly becoming headaches of metropolitan life.

This magazine went looking for communities where "the living is easy and the surroundings rewarding," where parking space is ample, where there is no commuter problem, and an almost negligible rate of crime.

I commend them on their choice of Boulder, Colo. The University of Colorado, one of our country's great universities which is located in Boulder, provides a highly stimulating cultural life for the residents of Boulder. In addition to the many opportunities to attend concerts, lectures by renowned scholars, and excellent dramatic presentations, there is ample opportunity for townspeople to participate in orchestras, musical comedy groups, dramatic clubs, and numerous organizations designed to cultivate a hobby or fulfill a suppressed desire. Boulder's World Affairs Conference brings together world-renowned scholars and statesmen for an unmatched week of lively colloquy on international affairs.

Boulder lies immediately at the foot of Colorado's Rocky Mountains. The scenic grandeur of the surrounding mountains attract many tourists, artists, and outdoorsmen each year. Within easy access lie a variety of mountains, lakes, and fishing streams. A considerable number of Boulder's residents are converted city dwellers who came originally to get away from it all and stayed when they found what they had always been looking for. From an economic standpoint, they couldn't have made a better choice, for new industry is moving in at an impressive rate. More and more companies are realizing that the ideal living conditions are one of the greatest assets they can have for making business flourish.

U.S. News & World Report made an excellent choice, and I recommend their article on Boulder for my colleagues' reading:

BOULDER, COLO.

Every weekend, winter and summer, a large part of the population of Boulder packs up and heads for the Rocky Mountains.

Some drive to nearby fishing and ski resorts, but many others hike, with packs on their backs, because the mountains start practically at the city limits.

Residents of this city of 50,000 say the weekly exodus tells two things about Boulder:

First, the city is filled with young people. The median age in Boulder is 24.

Second, the area is geared to the outdoors. A variety of mountains, lakes and fishing streams are all well within an hour's drive, and the climate is brisk and fairly dry all year long.

"I looked all over before setting up my business here after World War II," said Henry A. Bittner, president of a furniture-manufacturing firm.

"Boulder looked like a good place for growth potential, and it was certainly ideal from the standpoint of scenery, climate, and culture. I came here in 1949, and I couldn't be more delighted with my choice."

The brown, rugged peaks of the Rockies dominate the skyline of Boulder, itself a mile high. But it is the growing University of Colorado, with nearly 14,000 students, that dominates the city's life.

For one thing, the university is the city's No. 1 employer. Residents say, often regretfully, that every major decision in Boulder is taken with the university in mind.

Some new industries have moved in, occasionally over objections of citizens who feel Boulder is getting too big.

About 30 percent of the city's residents are college graduates.

"We have all sorts of things most cities of this size would never dream of," said a businessman enthusiastically. "Fifty restaurants, 2 museums, a summer theater, a writers' conference, concerts, 20 public parks, 2 hospitals and more than 20 public and parochial schools."

City officials think there is too much petty crime in Boulder. But there is hardly any juvenile delinquency, and major crime—one murder in about every 10 years—is hardly any problem at all.

Great Plains Wheat Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one of my constituents, Andrew Brakke, of Presho, S. Dak., serves as chairman of the board of Great Plains Wheat, Inc. In a speech in late February at Denver, Colo., Mr. Brakke outlined the objectives and accomplishments of Great Plains wheat. His talk outlines what the growers are doing to help themselves. Producers in 5 States make up the membership of the group. Because of the interest over such a wide area in the work of this organization I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brakke's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT PLAINS WHEAT ORGANIZATION

My remarks today are to be directed to the need for, composition of, reasons and objectives of, and the degree of accomplishments to date of our organization, Great Plains Wheat.

The title of my remarks, "The Great Plains Wheat Organization," is broad enough that I feel I can comment on my personal observations as a more recent member but still a spectator since its conception. Some of my remarks may be "old hat" to many if not most of you, but I think they are important enough to be mentioned again.

Great Plains Wheat exists today because wheat producers in the Great Plains States felt a responsibility to do something about their problem, (1) increasing wheat production, and (2) limited market opportunities. They realized the need and opportunities to expand and create markets with emphasis on export markets. Wheat commissions or equivalent organizations are now operating in five States, in the Great Plains area—North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and Colorado. These groups were authorized to form a regional organization, which led to the formation of Great Plains Wheat. I want to mention the tremendous asset and assistance Great Plains Wheat had from Mr. Clifford Hope, former Congressman and farmers' friend. He was known to many people as Mr. Wheat. I know Great Plains Wheat and many others will never forget him.

Great Plains Wheat is supported by about 300,000 wheat producers in the five States. Each State contributes financially to Great Plains Wheat on the basis of its average annual wheat production; likewise membership on the board of directors is in proportion to each State's contribution to the budget.

In addition, producer groups of Oklahoma, Montana, and Texas are associate or noncontributing members of the regional association. A similar organization was organized by producers in Oregon, Idaho, and Washington, known as Western Wheat Associates.

Great Plains Wheat is responsible for market development in Europe, Africa, Central and South America, and the Near East. It assists and cooperates with Western Wheat Associates in the Asian area.

At the present time, we are moving into new quarters for our Washington, D.C., office, and our central office is being relocated from Garden City, Kans., to Kansas City, Kans. Improved access and efficiency should result from this decision.

A new office was established in Caracas, Venezuela to service Central America and several countries on the northern fringe of South America. Other offices in Latin America are presently located in Lima, Peru; Bogotá, Columbia; and Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Europe and Africa are serviced from our Rotterdam office.

Our organization is producer organized, producer supported, producer managed, and producer controlled. I remember a few years ago a statement made by an important gentleman and officer in a tobacco commodity promotion program. He said, "What ever you do in your organization, keep control in the hands of your producers." But I believe this statement also places much responsibility on us. We must recognize the problems and be prepared to deal with them effectively. To deal with them, it takes organization and cooperation. We retain legal counsel and specialized assistance when necessary and desirable. We need to conduct ourselves and our organization in such a way that we instill confidence in other people. We have to do this. We do not buy or sell wheat ourselves. We encourage expanded markets by creating demands for our products abroad and help eliminate trade and shipping impediments at home, through the regular trade channels.

Great Plains Wheat is still a young group, hardly 6 years old, but ready for school, able and willing to learn because we recognize many if not most of the problems.

Our two biggest assets are dedicated people and a good cause.

In the last few years exports have risen remarkably from an export total in 1958–59 of 442 million bushels to about 860 million bushels in 1963–64. Exports face difficulty holding that figure in the present fiscal year because of numerous impediments, largely dock strikes, and at the same time tough competition from our competitors with good quality and sizable stocks, coupled with aggressive salesmanship.

The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (better known as Public Law 480) offers an opportunity for commodity groups to share in a cooperative effort to build dollar markets for U.S. farm products.

A portion of the foreign currency generated by Public Law 480 sales is appropriated by Congress for use in developing markets for U.S. agricultural products. Part of these funds are allocated to commodity groups through agreements with the USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service. Great Plains Wheat carries on foreign market development with the financial help of FAS funds.

Excellent examples where early assistance by U.S. aid programs have built firm support for increased cash markets for our wheat are in the countries of Japan and Italy.

Brazil could very easily offer large potential as a cash customer for U.S. wheat.

Through aid programs the United States has shared its food abundance with more than 100 countries since World War II and helped many countries recover from the effects of war. Our wheat surplus is turning into a negotiable product.

Our modern storage facilities, transportation system, capacity to produce a wide range of wheat qualities and types, all in adequate quantities, should be a natural advantage to the United States.

Among Great Plains Wheat continuing objectives, either on local, State, regional, national or international level area are:

To encourage development and production of wheats suited to consumer demands.

To continue improvements in grading and marketing system to maintain quality wheats moving in trade channels.

Seek fair and equitable freight rates for improving competitive position of U.S. wheat in world markets.

Furnish foreign markets quality information of U.S. wheat crops.

To cooperate with other segments of industry to insure the orderly movement of wheat into export marketing channels.

To continue surveillance on all marketing outlets for U.S. wheat and wheat products.

To assist and inform new users of wheat and wheat products.

To promote research in developing new food and industrial uses for wheat and wheat products.

To conduct a public relations and information program designed to inform the public on the role of wheat in the Nation's economy and seek approval and support these programs.

A committee with membership from each Great Plains State has been appointed to develop and coordinate trade expansion activities. An economic analyst, headquartered in Washington, D.C., has been assigned to work full time on a program developed by the Trade Expansion Committee and approved by the Board of Directors of Great Plains Wheat.

It is somewhat difficult to measure results and accomplishments of Great Plains Wheat in so much wheat exported or so much has been increased and utilized domestically because, as I mentioned before, we do not buy or sell wheat, but work with other groups in market promotion.

But there are some areas where we are reasonably sure we have definitely assisted in the increased use of wheat.

Japan is the No. 1 cash buyer of U.S. wheat. In 1963–64, the United States sold 75 million bushels of wheat to Japan, or double the previous year's total. This would not have been possible without wheat producers' efforts to secure reduced freight rates in the United States while conducting market promotion efforts in Japan itself.

Benefits are being realized from the improvement in grain standards which Great Plains Wheat spent much time and effort in helping attain. I feel this was an area where improvement was long overdue. Our grain standards were essentially the same as when they were put into use about 40 years ago, when exporting wheat was not carried on, much less even thought of. Our domestic millers buy largely on a baking test, but foreign buyers had only the old standards with which to gage quality. It is real doubtful that any other segment of industry is using 40-year-old sales policies and technique to attempt sale of their product in this competitive age.

In this area I feel we should be real firm and hold the line to allow time for improvements to be realized. I attended a meeting recently where Henning Vontillius, our marketing consultant in the Rotterdam office, made the comments that dock strikes are now hampering us, and we are running into heavy competition with Argentina's excellent wheat crop. Improved grain standards have improved our competitive position and exporters have without exception reported a marked improvement in quality of U.S. wheat exports.

Samples of our current crops are being distributed throughout Europe for evaluation and performance tests.

Shipments of Hard Red Spring Wheat are being assembled from Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota for the Japanese market. A Durum shipment is also expected for Japanese approval. In this area, cooperation of railroads will be necessary because present rates make it economically unfeasible.

Visiting trade teams present a continuing opportunity to promote U.S. wheat.

We are cooperating with education institutions both with manpower studies and research.

We are also working with educational groups and textbook publishers in providing photographs and written material for use in school systems in the Nation.

We are continuing training programs in foreign areas as needed.

The recent increase in subsidy to make our wheats more competitive was assisted by Great Plains Wheat.

This may give you some idea of the magnitude and complexity of our wheat situation. I realize this is by no means a complete report on Great Plains Wheat.

I believe Great Plains Wheat gives the wheat producer a definite opportunity to help himself in this dilemma we have allowed ourselves to slip into.

Had we had an organization such as Great Plains Wheat 10 years earlier, I am certain many of these problems would never have grown to such proportions or would be at least partially solved.

I believe the producer's biggest bargain today is his opportunity to support Great Plains Wheat and its market promotion, research, utilization, and information program.

If we fail now, a similar opportunity may never present itself, at least in our lifetime.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day.

The people of Byelorussia, often known as White Russians, are an ancient people whose history dates back much further than that of the Great Russians. They are one of the more numerous and ethnically distinct peoples in the Soviet sphere. Although racially related to the Russians and other Slavic peoples, they have always had a distinct national character of their own which has remained with them to this day.

Their historic homeland lies east of Poland and west of Moscow, with its center in the famous city of Minsk. Byelorussia became part of the Russian Empire early in the 16th century, and remained as such until the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 which destroyed the czarist empire. The Bylorussians were among the non-Russian national groups which asserted their freedom and proclaimed their national independence. On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian National Republic was established.

But, as happened in so many other cases, these long-subjugated people were not destined for freedom. Early in 1921, before they had a chance to enjoy the fruits of their victory, the Soviet Red Army overran their country and made it a part of the Soviet Union. In less than 3 years, independent Byelorussia vanished, and today it continues to live only in the minds and hearts of patriotic Byelorussians suffering under Soviet dictatorship.

Despite the heart-rending hardships endured by these people under one of the worst tyrannies known to man, the Byelorussians have not given up their hope for freedom. Let us continue our prayers that this day will not be far off so that these people may enjoy the blessings of freedom in their historic homeland.

Voting Rights Bill Constitutes a Revolution in American Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine article, by David Lawrence, entitled "Voting Rights Bill Constitutes a Revolution in American Law."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTING-RIGHTS BILL CONSTITUTES A REVOLUTION IN AMERICAN LAW

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The American people may discover someday that, if the voting-rights bill becomes law and is upheld by the courts, it can create a precedent for the most far-reaching changes which could affect not merely voting rights but the rights of citizens in almost every other field of law. For, indeed, the voting-rights bill constitutes a revolution in American law.

What it means can best be understood by applying the new formula to any other legislation. Thus, by using the schemes of the proposed voting legislation, Congress could suddenly decide that any State may be punished if it had had segregated schools going back for a period of 10 years.

States, moreover, which in the same period didn't have laws denying the right of a citizen to discriminate in the sale or rental of his property could for a considerable period of time be deprived of all rights to legislate anew on the subject of housing.

In short, all States which have had practices that now are disapproved could be put on probation for 10 years in the same way that several States would be placed under such a ban by the voting-rights legislation.

Careful examination of the proposed voting-rights bill shows that certain States are to be arbitrarily adjudged guilty of discrimination in the field of voting. Any of these States which cannot prove to the courts that there has been no discriminatory practice in registration of voting within its territory during the previous 10 years would not be able to enact through its legislature any new law on this subject and then enforce it without first going to a Federal court and getting permission to do so. This means that, no matter how just or fair the new State law happens to be, a Federal court may bar a State from enforcing the legislation just because someone in a local office, somewhere in the State, engaged during the 10 preceding years in discriminatory acts or practices.

Once a court judgment has been entered that such a State has discriminated in voting rights, this same State, for 10 years thereafter, has no redress in the courts on the matter of voting qualifications. For the proposed bill says flatly that no court can enter a declaratory judgment with respect to any State if there has been a judgment in a Federal court which determined that "denials or abridgement of the right to vote by reason of race or color have occurred anywhere in the territory" of the State during the preceding 10 years.

The new bill also declares that whenever a State or a political subdivision which, under its provisions, has been guilty of any discriminatory practices "shall enact any law or ordinance imposing qualifications or procedures for voting different than those in force and effect on November 1, 1964, such law or ordinance shall not be enforced unless and until it shall have been finally adjudicated by an action for declaratory judgment brought against the United States in the District Court for the District of Columbia that such qualifications or procedures will not have the effect of denying or abriding rights, guaranteed by the 15th amendment."

So, even when a State feels that it has by law removed discriminatory practices, it cannot put into effect any such law without going to a Federal court and getting permission to do so.

The new device means that Congress has taken unto itself the right to say that any law in the voting-rights field shall not be passed by certain States until the Federal courts have given their approval. If the same formula were generally applied, it would mean that many another statute of doubtful constitutionality—including the voting-rights bill proposed by the President—might well be suspended in its operation and enforcement until the district Federal court and finally the Supreme Court had passed upon its constitutionality or validity.

This is an unprecedented procedure. Hitherto, whenever a new law has been enacted, it has always been possible to question the validity of the law in the courts, but its enforcement has continued just the same until a court injunction is issued and upheld by the Supreme Court.

The proposed changes in America's lawmaking and law-enforcement process are of

vital importance to the Nation. It is beginning to be more and more of a puzzle why the majority of the Members of the Senate have announced—some of them even without thoroughly examining the bill—that they are going to sponsor and support it anyhow.

All this illustrates how easily constitutionalism can be brushed aside in an emotional era wherein street demonstrations and marches exert a controlling influence on Congress and bring about changes in the Constitution by a simple act of Congress without giving the people in the 50 States a voice in the amending process.

Byelorussian Independence: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the anniversary of Byelorussian independence. It is a day upon which we of the free world pay tribute to a people who for a few moments in a period of international upheaval had enjoyed the right of self-determination.

In commemorating Byelorussian independence, one calls to mind one of the greatest principles ever proclaimed by man, and that is, the principle of self-determination. It is this principle that provides the pulsebeat of democracy, for what it means in essence is that the peoples themselves have the sole right to determine their own national destiny.

Self-determination, as a principle of politics, had been a product of the age of enlightenment. It is a product of the thinking of those great philosophers of democracy such as John Locke who believed that man had a natural right to govern himself. Today it is easy for us to become indifferent to the genuine revolutionary character of this idea. For its time, this principle of natural rights was indeed revolutionary, for it had taken shape in a political climate when all men by and large believed that kings of nations governed by divine right, that is, that their power and authority were derived from God and thus all men were bound by the absolutist declarations of their government.

The notion of natural rights of man, however, preached a different doctrine. It held that all men had certain inalienable rights that derived from nature itself and among those rights was the right of self-government. In other words, the commonly held notion of power and authority of government from above was reversed, and these rights were now said to be deposited within the people who through the exercise of those rights created their own particular form of government.

Thomas Jefferson had, of course, applied this wonderful democratic principle to the American setting. And he fused this principle with the evolving concept of American nationalism which had taken the concrete form of our Declaration of Independence and eventually our Constitution. Thus in America, what had been a matter of theory had now become a practical political reality.

At the same time, however, another new principle that would determine man's destiny was also evolving, and that was the principle of nationalism. The Western world had witnessed the marriage of the principles of self-determination and nationalism in America. And as the 19th century moved on it was to see both principles govern the thought of all men who sought national independence.

Byelorussians were moved by both of these principles, but not until their opportunity had arisen during World War I were they able to apply them in their full meaning. Byelorussians, along with the other suppressed peoples of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires, had seen a new hope for their Nations as the power of the former oppressors had dissolved under the impact of war. Fired by a deeply engrained nationalism and inspired by the principle of self-determination, the leaders of Byleorussia declared their national independence and set into motion forces which they hoped would make their aspirations a concrete reality.

Self-determination remains the dream of men everywhere. Few people are more aware of this than the Byelorussians, or White Russians as they are also known to us. These people are united by cultural tradition, a common language, a history of struggle and most of all a common hope for freedom from foreign domination.

On March 25, 1918 Byelorussian people proclaimed its independence. On that date the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born, and it appeared that this new Nation would take its rightful place among the free Nations of the world.

Unfortunately, those hopes were never to become a reality; not because of any failure in their national resolve, but rather because of the awesome power of the newly emerging Communist Russia whose military forces had swept over the territories of the former Russian Empire, conquering them again, and eventually reasserting a new and more terrible form of tyranny.

On this day of national commemoration it is fitting, therefore, that we Americans pay tribute to the gallant Byelorussian peoples. It is also fitting that we take this occasion to reassert our own faith in the principles of democracy, for it is in those principles that we find the strength to sustain ourselves as a Nation in the trials of the present and future, and it as also in those principles that we find the greatest inspiration for all men who seek a better life.

The Liberal Spirit and the Liberal Task

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Dr. John Kenneth Galbraith Wednesday addressed the biennial convention of the National Farmers Union in Chicago with his usual brilliance, and his usual wit.

Although the address contained some advice to his listeners that may seem a little dangerous to those of us in the Senate—Dr. Galbraith told them to write us letters of noncongratulations, as well as congratulations—it merits being made available to all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBERAL SPIRIT AND THE LIBERAL TASK

(Address by John Kenneth Galbraith, professor of economics, Harvard University, and former Ambassador to India, before the annual meeting of the National Farmers Union, Chicago, Mar. 17, 1965)

President Patton, my friends, you are very good to have me here today. Indeed, I should be very grateful for your tolerance. Those who have done careful research into my personal history know that I was once employed by another farm organization. It is sometimes described as a rival organization. I was even its economist although I am not, I believe, now regarded as the principal source of its economic philosophy. However, that was all some time ago. My more serious crimes have been of later date. I have been living in recent years in that part of the country where, as John F. Kennedy once said, children must be taken in a bus to see a cow. I have even been an ambassador, an occupation not intimately identified with dirt farming. I am glad that in spite of these things you still want me as a friend.

The Farmers Union is a nonpartisan organization. It is also, by tradition and practice, a liberal organization. This afternoon I would like to reflect on some of the recent lessons of liberals—lessons I would hope we all might take to heart.

II

One of our lessons of modern times is that we can more easily win the battle against conservatism than the battle for liberalism. What has come to be called modern conservatism involves some rather serious built-in difficulties. It requires the man of means to explain the dangers of unearned income to the poor. And it forces the well and healthy to instruct the old and ill on the dangers of improved medical care. And men on fixed income must inform the farmer on the dangers of support prices. And we are asked to believe that the United Nations is a Communist trap and we had ought to head back to the caves.

This, and the rest, our voters do not buy. At election times, it is discovered that the instincts of people are generally sensible, liberal and humane. And so, in consequence, are our politicians. Elections are very good for political character. But once the elections are over we have a serious conservative slippage. The oracles warn those who are now safely in office that it is time for statesmanship and responsibility. These, of course, are the other terms for conservatism. Public appointments, it is agreed, should be reserved for men who would seem wholly reliable in New Rochelle. We don't mind liberals if we can be sure that they will be conservative just as soon as they are in office. And provided the Government is run by men who showed their reliability by going down the line for Thomas E. Dewey and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

That is why it is so much easier to defeat conservatism than to win for liberalism. It is a problem that afflicts us on both domestic and foreign policy. Today I want to say a word about both.

I have always been fascinated by the reaction of conservative statesmen to farm policy. We have a highly efficient agriculture. Even reactionaries sing your praises; you are the living proof of the vitality of the free enterprise system. One reason American agriculture is efficient is that rural America, at an early stage, recognized the importance of education. It invested heavily in human talent. It developed an excellent system of publicly supported higher education. Another reason is that, at an early stage, it saw the importance of public support to innovation. It made this a public industry. Yet another and, in my view, central reason for the efficiency of our agriculture is that 30 years ago we saw the importance of reducing the risk that is inherent in the free market. With support prices it became possible in agriculture, as it has always been possible in large-scale industry, to invest in expensive capital equipment without an excessive risk of loss. The massive mechanization of American agriculture was the result.

But none of this impresses the man of mature, conservative judgment. We must be careful not to spend more than we can afford on education. We must be very careful to avoid Federal control although the Federal Government has been investing heavily in our system of agricultural education for close to a century. We must avoid any activity that smacks of socialism although the land-grant colleges and experiment stations, from which most of our agricultural innovations has come, are not precisely monuments to private enterprise.

Most important we should get back to the market. Support prices are expensive and an interference with divine order. They should be reduced at once and abandoned as quickly as possible. The measure of a good politician is his willingness—at least between elections—to take bold stands on matters such as this.

Nor should anyone doubt the continuing influence of these attitudes. And not much is being done to counter them. A few weeks ago I heard Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, speak, with great effect, to a Boston audience on these matters. Orville Freeman has worked hard to win understanding in urban America. So has the Vice President and so have other liberal Senators and Congressmen from the Midwest. So, I might add, has Jim Patton. But these voices are few and, as of today, I would say that the dominant urban impression of the American farmer is that of a high-level grafter with a firm grasp on the public teat. This isn't especially good news but it is the truth.

III

To win better understanding of the farmer's needs—especially of the fact that almost all producers have now, in one way or another, won a considerable measure of security in their markets—is one of the important tasks of our time. There are no miracles by which this can be accomplished. Organization is one way; you should count it one of the major tasks of this body to put your case before the urban public and I would urge that you not be too easily satisfied by what they do. Another important step is to make sure that you have in Washington the kind of representative who makes up in quality, intelligence, and devotion to liberal principles what, increasingly, farm representatives will lack in numbers. The old, hay-burning orators from the farm belt have been gradually disappearing from the Congress and the last election carried off quite a few. But there are still some time-servers who think that the last authentic voice of agriculture was Arthur Capper and who believe they can win the confidence of urban voters by opposing all legislation important to city dwellers. You can't afford any of them any more. You should measure your men in Washington not by the way they persuade you of their devotion to agriculture but the way they persuade me, and my neighbors, of the need for a sound and effective farm program.

IV

There are two other tasks which should be on the agenda for the coming year. One concerns the problem of poverty and deprivation. The other concerns foreign policy. On both I would like to invite your support for a strong liberal policy both now as well as when the next election rolls around and everyone is a liberal once more.

We haven't been ignoring the problem of poverty in these past years; all compassionate people have recognized that, amidst a very high level of prosperity for most of our people, there were some—small farmers, slum dwellers, Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Spanish Americans, miners on the Appalachian Plateau, the aged, the ill, the American Indians—who were not participating. An unstated assumption of recent years has been that if the economic system could be made to work well enough—if it provided full employment, fair prices for the farmer and a satisfactory rate of economic growth—poverty would be remedied. No one would be poor.

An expanding economy is important. But it is not enough.

Economic growth only benefits those who are able to participate in the economic system. And participation in the modern economy is only possible if a person is prepared or qualified for it by health, race, age, and—given the demands of modern agriculture and modern industry—by education. If a person is excluded from industrial employment or from agriculture because of old age, bad health, a black skin, or an inadequate education he will remain poor no matter how rich everyone else becomes. This is our present situation. While most people are getting more affluent, the poor in the United States are still poor and they are decreasing in number only at a very gradual rate.

The remedy is to go to the root causes. The civil rights law was a major step. So is action to secure voting rights for Negroes. I a democracy most people get the services that they vote for themselves. A health system designed to meet the needs of the ill rather than the prejudices of the American Medical Association is also important. But most important of all is education. The discrimination which now runs against Negroes because of race is vastly reinforced by the discrimination which Negroes suffer because of lack of educational opportunity. This misfortune extends with almost equal severity to the uneducated whatever their race or color. And each year, as industrial and agricultural requirements become more exacting, the handicaps of the uneducated become more acute. Education—specifically directed at the people whose schooling has been or will be deficient—must be the spearhead of the attack on poverty.

President Johnson has put these matters firmly on the agenda. For this we must be solidly grateful. But I do not think it would hurt at all were liberal supporters of these measures to work for a little more money. Or even quite a bit more. I am unable to see why virtue is always assumed to be with the man who advocates a little less. Does it say anywhere in the Scriptures that St. Peter will only admit those politicians who can prove that they have cut some compassionate budget by at least 20 percent?

Now let me take leave of economic matters—though with one personal plea. Our goal in the United States is not the world's greatest wealth or the world's highest possible gross national product; our goal is the best possible life. Our goal is not to have the most goods. Our goal is the best civilization. That takes thought—and planning. I am willing, as an urban economist, to support farm programs; I would like to exact a promise in return that you do more to protect the countryside. On assumption that nothing is as important as a fast buck, we are allowing cities to spread over the countryside without thought or plan. We are using up our own space at an alarming rate. And we are desecrating what we do not use. We are turning our roadsides over to the billboards and the neon signs and the fried food stands. Instead of cornfields and trees we look out on a landscape of deserted automobiles, discarded beer bottles, and second hand Kleenex. These are not my pictures of rural America. Nor is it yours. But if that is how we treat our countryside more and more people are going to ask why we should bother to save it.

We must assert a far stronger control over our rural surroundings and our countrysides or we shall have none left worth preserving. This control is not the negation of liberty as some conservatives insist. It is the framework of liberty, as both liberals and conservatives will one day realize. We must now without hesitation, assert the importance of beauty and charm as against the claims of mere economic performance. In the past, we have often shied away from such issues. We have thought our hard masculine task was to expand production, eliminate unemployment, raise farm prices. These are important. But where we live is also important. We must start retrieving our highways and our countryside from the commerce, billboards and trash which is turning our country into one vast Coney Island. Beauty is both our greatest and most rapidly diminishing resource. It is something we must begin to cherish.

I plead now for more plain speaking by liberals on foreign policy.

This is important. All public servants are strongly influenced by the people from whom they hear. Liberals speak out on questions of domestic policy—agriculture, employment, minimum wages. They do not speak out on foreign policy. And they should and that applies to farmers too. A rapid calculation as to who will deal you the most bruising blow is the most primitive instinct of the public servant. It is the reaction of the sensible people that must always be on the minds of legislators and officials. A Secretary of State, like a Senator or school board member, must never be allowed to imagine that his principal hazard is from the communicants of the John Birch Society or even those who believed that the last word was written by John Foster Dulles. It is the liberal reaction that should worry him. Trust your instincts in foreign policy. And, in the future, when you encounter something you do not like, take time out to write a letter of noncongratulation. And bring the matter firmly to the attention of your Congressman and Senator.

For we need liberalism in our foreign policy just as we need it in our domestic policy and, in fact, the two are indistinguishable. Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy were great figures in the world. They brought prestige and power to the United States for one reason only: people knew they wanted the same things for the people of other lands, that they wanted for their own. They did not believe that liberalism stopped at the water's edge. It is as simple as that. And that is why they were mourned not only in the United States but throughout the world.

We do not imagine for a moment in Selma, Ala., the future belongs to the men with guns. (And I for one have a good deal of sympathy for President Johnson's evident preference for legal and civil procedures.) We do not suppose that the Negro demands for voting rights can be controlled by sheriffs, six-shooters and tear gas. And we also know the wise as well as the humane government is the one that puts itself solidly on the side of the people.

But in foreign policy, in the view of a surprisingly large number of people, a different set of principles are assumed to rule. Though we see the need of liberal policies in the United States, in foreign policy we think it wise to keep things in the hands of hardnosed men. There we can rely on guns and jet aircraft. There are those who talk of the need for the United States to be on the side of the people—to support their yearning for peace, literacy, economic improvement, freedom from oppression by dictators and war lords—are rather softheaded. They should confine their attention to Selma.

Again I do not think there is doubt as to where President Johnson stands. He is a Roosevelt man; Roosevelt, more than anyone else, saw the importance of a foreign policy that went beyond bad government and petty oppression to identify itself with the people. But we still have quite a few of the hardnosed professionals around who believe, despite all of the evidence, that where foreigners are concerned things can be settled with a gun. If demonstrations break out in Africa or Asia against the United States it is just those foreigners acting up again. Or they are being stirred up again by the Communists, as George Wallace likes us to believe that the Alabama Negroes are being led by the Reds. We are not at fault. We should remember that the Latin Americans even misbehaved in the presence of such a good and lovable man as Richard Nixon.

Most of the men who guide our foreign policy are sensible and liberal citizens. But it is a favored field for those who have a nostalgia for past error. And it is worse if liberals do not pay attention.

On matters of foreign policy, we have a long habit of acquiescence. We arouse ourselves about civil rights and national parks but, in foreign policy we readily tolerate concessions to men who should have gone out with John W. Bricker. This does not serve a President. He needs to hear just as eloquently from those who speak for a reason as he hears from the partisans of the "big stick" and those who would rather save 5 cents on foreign aid than $50 on the military budget.

Such are your beliefs and, over the years, you have had a reasonably good record in making them effective. Your friends stay in office; the political graveyard is full of men who wanted to turn back the clock—or just stop it for awhile. It takes time but, in the end, we win liberal programs here at home. The day is coming, I am sure, when we will do as well in the field of foreign policy. History is on our side.

L.B.J. Is Reassuring in Vietnam Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of all my colleagues to a very well written letter which appeared in the March 4, 1965, edition of the Jersey Journal. The letter in question was written by the Honorable Phelps Phelps, former U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic. Mr. Phelps has called attention to the way President Johnson has maintained a steady course during the Vietnamese crisis despite the advice which has been given him by those who favor a more aggressive role and those who wish us to withdraw from southeast Asia. Mr. Phelps, who I am proud to say is a resident of Jersey City, has called upon all Americans to support the President.

His letter follows:

[From the Jersey Journal, Mar. 4, 1965]

L.B.J. IS REASSURING IN VIETNAM CRISIS

DEAR EDITOR: In the face of mounting pressures and criticisms resulting from the crisis in Vietnam, President Johnson's calm and determined attitude is reassuring. He is besieged on one side by demands for a negotiated peace, and on the other for an escalation of the war, even at the risk of conflict with Red China.

He is accused on the one hand of doing nothing concrete to achieve complete victory, and on the other of doing too much by trying to help establish a stable government in Saigon.

He is charged with deliberately withholding the facts of the Vietnam crisis from the American people and even of trying to create a situation in which we would not be blamed for a nuclear attack on Communist China.

It should be remembered that the President is following a policy set forth in a congressional resolution: to oppose Communist aggression in Vietnam as well as other areas. With the scars of World War II still evident, he is trying to accomplish this without becoming involved in another international conflict. It should also be remembered that the task is being attempted against many imponderables, including the bizarre political situation in Saigon, and formidable military help being given to the Vietcong Reds by both Russia and Red China.

That the President has done so well under all these circumstances is one of the minor miracles. And any man who can perform miracles should expect our help and support, not our criticisms and complaints.

PHELPS PHELPS,
Former U.S. Ambassador to Dominican Republic.

Blight Along the Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, blight is no stranger to us. Urban blight, rural blight, highway blight, all exist in the midst of the beauty which characterizes our Nation.

Even in my own State of New Hampshire, which by any objective standard would have to be judged the most beautiful of all our States, I must admit that some scenery has been spoiled by the intrusion of abandoned automobiles.

The March 11, 1965, edition of the Concord Shoppers News, of Concord, N.H., contains an editorial on this subject in which the editor, in displaying some of the Yankee ingenuity which has made our corner of the Nation famous throughout the world, has come up with what might be the final solution to the problem of the abandoned auto.

While this particular solution might not be feasible, the editorial is to be commended for having called attention to what is properly a subject of serious concern. I feel that it deserves the wider readership which publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD brings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Part of the New Hampshire Scene," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PART OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE SCENE

Receding snow in the woodlands will soon reveal New Hampshire's scenic beauty—mountains viewed from between white birches, venerable spruces reaching into the heavens, and in the foreground the remains of junked automobiles.

The derelict cars are not a part of the picture we promote as "Photoscenic New Hampshire" but they are there for all to see nevertheless. Zoning, of course, has fenced off the drab sight in many towns and cities, but nevertheless the blight exists to such a degree that a trip around the countryside can lose its charm.

The junk dealers are not the sole offenders. You will often see a tarpaper shack flanked by one fairly nice automobile and perhaps three or four that have outlived their usefulness. The metal carcasses just sit there season after season, occupied only by small children at play or hens looking for a place to roost.

A new process has been invented to atomize used car hulks in short order, but it will be a long time coming to New Hampshire we can be sure. Meanwhile the discarded models are becoming more of a nuisance. In the cities, such cars are abandoned on the street or in parking lots. In this State, a lot of the outmoded automobiles are driven up a road to somebody's woodlot and pushed into the bushes.

If cars are to be abandoned, why not capitalize on the undertaking and make automobile graveyards more interesting? Say a property owner has a hill too small for a ski slope and swampy land at the bottom. Every Sunday afternoon he could stage a car junking spectacular, rolling automobiles over the cliff. Since George Washington's birthday was taken over by the new car dealers, the used care garages should have the right to claim the birthday of some notable too and parade a string of relics on that day to the jumpoff point.

We can see daredevil drivers ejecting at the last moment by means of a pulley-and-cable arrangement. We can even smell the hotdogs simmering at the concession stand. Everybody brings a camera and shoots terrific scences of cars in midair. The Governor gives a farewell pat to the fender of a preware cruiser. The marsh fills up, a layer of dirt is finally spread over the site, and all we need do it wait a few eons until metal is in short supply—and go in and dig it all out again.

Who knows—the nail file you left in your glove compartment may become an artifact.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed two water bills.

House worked on education assistance bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 5625–5729

Bills Introduced: 38 bills and 7 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1598–1635; S.J. Res. 66–67; S. Con. Res. 29–30; and S. Res. 91–93. **Pages 5638–5640**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 390, permitting volunteer fire companies to use second- and third-class bulk mailing at the rates established for nonprofit organizations (S. Rept. 129);

S. Res. 89, authorizing appointment of four Senators as a delegation to the next meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in Wellington, New Zealand (S. Rept. 130);

H. Con. Res. 7, to print additional copies of H. Doc. 103 of the 86th Congress relating to Code of Ethics (S. Rept. 131);

H. Con. Res. 83, to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas (S. Rept. 132);

H. Con. Res. 97, to print as a House document a pamphlet entitled "Our American Government—What Is It? How Does It Function?" (S. Rept. 133);

H. Con. Res. 125, to print as a House document the inaugural addresses from President Washington to President Johnson (S. Rept. 134);

H. Con. Res. 153, to print as a House document tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill (S. Rept. 135);

H. Con. Res. 165, authorizing the reprinting of H. Doc. 103 of the 88th Congress on "How Our Laws Are Made," with amendment (S. Rept. 136);

H. Con. Res. 167, to print additional copies of a study of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition for Federal projects (S. Rept. 137);

H. Con. Res. 338, to print as a House document the State Department's White Paper relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam (S. Rept. 138);

S. Con. Res. 27, to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments—Supplement, January 4, 1965" (S. Rept. 139);

S. 1462, authorizing contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, New Mexico, for payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands (S. Rept. 140); and

S. Res. 94, providing for payment of gratuity to survivor of deceased Senate employee. **Page 5637**

Bills Referred: Three House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. **Page 5625**

President's Message—Reorganization Plan No. 1 (Customs): Senate received message from President transmitting his Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 concerning Bureau of Customs of the Department of the Treasury, referred to Committee on Government Operations. **Pages 5666–5667**

Water Research: Senate passed, with committee amendment, S. 22, to promote a more adequate national program of water research. Motion to reconsider passage was tabled. **Pages 5680–5681**

Water Pollution Control: S. 560, proposed Federal Installations, Facilities, and Equipment Pollution Control Act, was passed with committee amendments, and with several Muskie technical corrective amendments. Motion to reconsider passage was tabled. **Pages 5681–5683**

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that Senate next week will consider S. 390, permitting volunteer fire companies to use second- and third-class mailing rates; numerous routine resolutions from the Committee on Rules and Administration; S. 1462, authorizing contract with Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, New Mexico, for payment of operation charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; S. 1000, permitting title transfer to movable property to agencies assuming maintenance responsibility for certain projects works; S. 254, authorizing construction and operation of Tualatin reclamation project, Oregon; and S. 1229, uniform policies with respect to recreation (if reported). **Page 5675**

Senate Schedule: By unanimous consent, it was ordered that during Senate adjournment until March

Appendix

Seriousness of Gold Situation Made Clear by Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a distinguished news columnist, Henry J. Taylor, has written a very interesting and alarming article on the gold problem now facing our Nation. The article was published in the March 12, 1965, issue of the Nashville Banner, and is entitled "Seriousness of Gold Situation Made Clear by Martin."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, Mar. 12, 1965]

SERIOUSNESS OF GOLD SITUATION MADE CLEAR BY MARTIN

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The eight saddest words in any language are: "I told you so" and "It is too late."

It has been many years since our country has heard such stark testimony as Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McC Martin's statement to a Senate subcommittee:

"The balance-of-payments problem is the most important and most serious of all of the problems President Johnson faces. We're in an emergency situation. Unless it is solved there is a very real danger that we could have a world depression."

While we help rescue the British pound, we rather smugly tell London mere palliatives aren't enough and the British money will not be safe until Britain takes the hard steps about her budget and costs that are prerequisites.

Oh, yes, we know—and say—what England must do. But we ourselves face up to practically nothing in our own dollar crisis and employ only easy, politically palatable measures.

The Federal budget has been balanced only six times in the 21 fiscal years since the war. And now our Government merely borrows more and more to pay for tax reductions.

The gold outflow first reached troublesome proportions in 1958 at $3.5 billion. Then 1959 was $3.7 billion and 1960 was $2.4 billion.

While running for election Mr. Kennedy said again and again, "I believe in a balanced budget," and in an October 1960 campaign speech he stated: "Our balance of payments will be strong and we can cease to worry about the outflow of gold."

The gold outflow in President Kennedy's first 2 years was $4.6 billion and he boosted the legal debt limit three times in his 34-month term.

The New Frontier inherited a Federal debt of $283 billion. By July 1964 it was $312.5 billion. And Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon officially estimates it will be $322.5 billion by July 1966.

This $39.5 billion increase, eroding the value and security of the dollar all the while, means the Kennedy-Johnson administration has run in the red at the rate of $6.6 billion a year.

By now the recovery point in our gold outflow has fallen so low that recovery is not certain. Thus, the time is late and the danger great, as Chairman MARTIN courageously stated.

When a nation's currency is threatened, the required steps are historic and famous throughout the world, and the financial world is watching, watching, watching to see if Washington applies these.

In terms of priorities, beyond balancing the budget, the first step is higher interest rates to attract world capital and stabilize the capital on hand. We forced this step on Britain as a condition for our aid, even though the Labor Government had campaigned against it. Yet in our dollar crisis the White House has actively intervened to keep our own rates down.

Foreign spending must be drastically cut. Yet our cash foreign aid exceeds last year's, and almost a million dependents of Government agencies and the military remain abroad—not only at the expense of the gold crisis but of the American taxpayers. The Defense Department ordered servicemen's dependents home a full 5 years ago. But one of President Kennedy's first official acts was to countermand the unpopular directive.

Oversea debts must be collected. Yet this column recently pointed out that France still owes us $6.3 billion and Britain $9.1 billion in World War I debts that remain due and unpaid to this very day.

Foreign assets must be marshaled. Yet, more than $2.8 billion (taxpayers money) in the form of foreign currencies—known as counterpart funds—are on tap abroad and largely neglected, as this column also detailed.

Chairman MARTIN warned that in this emergency situation nothing is too small to be ignored. Must he be forced one day to say, "I told you so" and "It is too late"?

The present paliatives are carrying us smack toward a devaluation of the dollar. And the world will continue to draw our gold and threaten the financial stability of the United States until Washington shows the courage to take each of the famous corrective steps required.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to commemorate the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian Independence, for in so doing we are remembering a brave and courageous people. The Byelorussians have displayed an inspiring commitment to the ideals of freedom and independence, goals which were realized in 1918. And even though their sovereignty as a nation was suppressed shortly thereafter, they have not yet relinquished this wonderful ideal.

The declaration of independence which the Byelorussians made in 1918 was to bring to fruition the long-cherished dream of freedom. Sadly, however, it was not to be that, "From now on the Byelorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power," as they so boldly stated in their assembly and fervently believed in their hearts. Within a year this nation was to be converted into a battleground, becoming a pawn in the maneuverings of enemies. Occupied first by the Red Army and then later by the Polish Army, Byelorussia was partitioned by these two powers in 1921, signalling the suppression once again of an independent republic and a national aspiration.

The rule of force, however, cannot obliterate the truth: That Byelorussia is a nation of culturally united people, speaking one language is a truth that cannot be denied. That the Byelorussians are an ethnically oriented people, working toward distinct goals is evident. That the Byelorussians wish to become a vital member of the international community is clear, though at present, even with U.N. membership, it is impossible for Byelorussia to raise her own, distinct voice.

It is with great admiration that we salute these people who yet hold to the ideal of national sovereignty and independence. We join with these long-suffering people as well as those Byelorussians who have become part of our American nation in the prayer that their aspirations shall be realized.

Resolution of Directors of Hawaii Edution Association in Support of Voting Rights for All Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the board of directors of the Hawaii Education Association, at a meeting held in Honolulu, Hawaii, on March 13, 1965.

I think that it is absolutely fitting that those who are dedicated to educating the youth of our State and our country go on record on such a crucial matter as this.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas many citizens, including some teachers in the State of Alabama, are even now being denied the right to vote; and

"Whereas teachers in Hawaii believe that those who are qualified to teach are also qualified to vote; and

"Whereas the National Education Association has called on its local and State affiliates to support their teachers whenever and wherever the right to vote of these teachers has been denied; and

"Whereas the National Education Association is working to eliminate barriers to voting privileges wherever they exist: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Hawaii Education Association support the National Education Association and all other organizations in their efforts to win voting rights for all citizens; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, U.S. Senators and Congressmen from the State of Hawaii, the Governor of the State of Hawaii, the Governor of the State of Alabama, the president of the National Education Association, the Alabama Education Association and the Alabama State Teachers Association."

Adopted unanimously, board of directors, Hawaii Education Association, March 13, 1965.

Independent Businessmen Favor Standing Committee Status for House Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming majority of the Nation's independent businessmen favor standing committee status for the House Small Business Committee, according to a poll by the National Federation of Independent Business on House Resolution 29, of which I am the author.

The results of the poll were reported to me in a letter from Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the federation. The text of his letter follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., March 16, 1965.

Re House Resolution 29.

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN GROSS: It gives me the greatest pleasure to advise you that in a current poll on your bill, House Resolution 29, which would provide standing committee status for the present House Small Business Committee, the result of the poll was 76 percent for your bill, 18 percent against, and 6 percent no vote.

Bear in mind this poll reached over 200,000 members of the federation, all individual members comprising exclusively independent business and professional men in the 50 States.

Your action in the present Congress in behalf of small business is a continuation of your action in behalf of small business in preceding Congresses, and you are to be complimented.

Bear in mind with the alarming reports reaching us of the increasing problems of small business the time has come now for the Congress to place the Small Business Committee on parity with other standing committees; that is, if there is to be any small business left in our overall economy.

In view of the importance of your action and the interest other Members of the House would have in your resolution I believe it would be important, as a matter of information, to insert this in the Appendix of the RECORD.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER, *Vice President.*

A Boost for Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the vital part played by our Nation's great newspapers in the struggle for equal rights for all Americans should be recognized. A remarkable educational process has been in operation on the editorial pages of thoughtful newspapers in all of the 50 States.

I am pleased to report that my hometown papers, the San Jose Mercury and the San Jose News, have regularly joined in this great ethical movement in editorial after editorial delineating the issues of the civil rights struggle and urging the Congress to provide the legislation appropriate to the enforcement of the 15th amendment.

The following is the editorial from the San Jose Mercury of March 20, 1965. I commend its forthright stand to the attention of my colleagues:

A BOOST FOR VOTE BILL

Gov. George C. Wallace and the Alabama Legislature, taken together, are a cogent argument for the Federal voting rights bill now pending in Congress.

Neither Wallace nor the legislators appear to have a very firm grasp of the provisions of the Constitution they are sworn to support and defend. Once the right of the ballot is assured all Alabamians—not just white Alabamians—it is highly possible Wallace and his ilk will shortly thereafter cease to hold public office.

It would be a mistake to underestimate the craftiness of the Alabama Governor, however. In seeking to evade his responsibility for protecting the participants in the forthcoming Selma-Montgomery march, Wallace hopes to force President Johnson to federalize the Alabama National Guard for that purpose.

In point of fact, the President may well have to do this, but it should not be overlooked that the Governor has equal authority to utilize these troops if civilian police agencies are unable to furnish sufficient protective manpower.

As to the Alabama Legislature, its members demonstrated their dedication to democratic principles by adopting, by acclamation, a resolution calling the Selma-Montgomery march "asinine" and urging Federal authorities to "persuade or otherwise encourage these marchers to cease and desist."

The Constitution, which guarantees Americans the right to assemble peacefully and petition their government for redress of grievances, is not to be taken literally in Alabama—according to the members of that State's legislature.

This is what the new Federal voting rights bill is all about. This is why Congress should enact it into law without delay. When all qualified citizens can vote, the lot of the demagogue will be considerably tougher.

Robert A. Taft: The Missing Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid editorial, by Vermont Royster, entitled, "The Missing Man," which appeared in today's Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 25, 1965]

THINKING THINGS OVER

(By Vermont Royster)

THE MISSING MAN

WASHINGTON.—In the spring of 1946 the Nation and this city were gripped in high emotion. A strike had stopped all the Nation's railroads together, paralysis was creeping over the economy and no end appeared in sight.

A joint session of Congress heard President Truman ask for authority to draft the striking railroad workers into the Army and force them to work. Within hours the House passed the measure without hearing or debate. The Senate too was ready to act instantly. And then one man—a lonely figure at that point—stood up and said, "Wait."

Not until today has a like emotion caught up this city. Stirred by the events in Alabama, President Johnson asked a joint session of Congress to promptly enact a new Federal voting law which, as he spoke, had not yet been drafted. From all appearances the Congress is now ready to move swiftly on the bill hastily drawn thereafter, once more laying aside all the normal habits of study and debate.

Only this spring there is no Robert Taft to rise and say, "Wait."

To a visitor this gives the Capital an eerie cast, almost like something out of Kafka. For many men are thinking one thing and saying something else.

Hardly anyone, let it be understood, objects to the moral principle laid down by President Johnson that it is wrong to deny any qualified voter his right to vote. Save perhaps such as Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, few quarrel with the view that wherever necessary the Federal Government can and ought to step in to protect that right. On that, the Congress overwhelmingly approves.

The doubts lie elsewhere, and there's not a newspaperman around who hasn't heard them expressed in private. They touch the sections of the proposed bill that would attempt to override by statute the constitutional right of States to establish voter qualifications so long as they apply equally to all, and at the sections that would apply dubious formulas for Federal intervention, sections frankly aimed as punitive measures at certain States.

If these doubts have so far been expressed only by a few southerners automati-

cally discounted on this issue—and certainly not by anyone with the loud, strong voice of a Senator Taft—it is because almost everyone hereabouts feels trapped by the high emotions of the moment.

Senator DIRKSEN, for example, booby-trapped himself. As Senate leader for the opposition party it would normally fall to him to see that the law proposed by the administration was carefully examined and fully debated before being brought to a vote. But Mr. DIRKSEN too got caught up in the emotions aroused in Alabama and the drama of the President's nighttime speech to Congress. He joined in the drafting of the bill.

Apparently he thought this an act of statesmanship, as well as a political act that would put the Republicans "on the right side" of the civil rights issue. But whatever was intended, the result was to involve the Republicans not only in the principle but in the details of the proposed legislation.

At that point the Republicans lost their natural leader, for Senator DIRKSEN could hardly participate in the writing of a bill and then stand up and ask sharp questions about it.

Thus deprived of leadership, it is perhaps not surprising that other Republicans have been hesitant. Those who have asked dutiful questions have aimed them mostly at technicalities, not at the heart of the unspoken doubts.

But the silence of the questioners cannot be attributed all to Senator DIRKSEN. In fact, his abdication of his normal role as opposition leader is in itself a reflection of the emotional tensions in Washington today.

The mood is such that no one wants to listen to rational questions. That mood was set the night President Johnson made his speech. The Congressmen assembled applauded not only the sentiments in that speech but his call to rush through a bill they had never seen. So for that matter, curiously enough, did the visiting Justices of the Supreme Court who will one day have to pass on the constitutionality of what is now proposed.

In this mood the Senate directed its Judiciary Committee to cut short its hearings and discussion and return the bill in no less than nine days. There were even Senators who objected to any committee hearings at all, preferring to enact the bill instantly.

Since then the pressures have mounted. The newspapers of the country, by and large, have taken the position that a Federal voting law is needed and therefore any voting law is all right, a point of view reflected in the letters arriving at Capitol Hill.

In Washington itself the leaders have driven relentlessly for speed, as if a hundred years must be rectified in a fortnight. The Democratic leader, Senator MANSFIELD, served blunt notice that if the bill wasn't law by April 15 Congress wouldn't be allowed an Easter recess. Senator DIRKSEN agreed, and called for Saturday sessions. Action, not reflection, is the order of the day.

In such a mood, who but a brave man could stand up and say, "Wait. Let me see what we are doing before we do it." Who but a brave man could ask now about constitutionality or propriety or the wisdom of the means to a wise end, knowing that to do so would tar him with the stigma of keeping company with an EASTLAND of Mississippi?

Of course that is what Robert Taft did, those many springs ago—stand up to an emotion-aroused Congress and ask that it think before acting. But then he was a man content to keep his self-respect and not measure it by applause.

These are different times, and somehow a visitor here finds that difference the most troubling thing of all.

Even the hastiest law may not do irreparable damage, and perhaps the good in the proopsed law will outweigh the unspoken doubts. What weighs heavier on the mind is that men in Congress should have doubts and fear to speak them.

Edward Keating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the people of Colorado and the people of this Nation lost a courageous and able leader. Edward Keating, a former Member of the House of Representatives who served with great distinction, was a man of purpose and vision whose efforts on behalf of the labor movement brought forth a series of accomplishments that will stand as a monument to his great generosity and spirit of justice. He possessed wisdom and insight which led to his understanding of the free enterprise system and the course it would take in history, and his was the sense of perspective which enabled him to recognize the role that labor would take in American enterprise.

Edward Keating was born in Kansas on July 9, 1875, the youngest of nine children of Stephen Keating, an Irish patriot who fought for Ireland's freedom and was forced to flee to America in 1848. His father died when Edward Keating was only 5 years old, so Mr. Keating knew early in his life what it means to work hard and to attempt to overcome poverty. But Mr. Keating grew up to be an inspired man. He transcended the hardships of his youth with a consuming desire to serve his family and his fellow man.

The energy which was to characterize his activities in the Congress and in the labor movement was immediately apparent at the outset of his career. He entered the newspaper business as a copyholder, but rose rapidly to become a reporter for the Rocky Mountain News. His career flourished as he accepted more and more responsibility, and in short succession he became city editor, managing editor, and finally became editor of the Rocky Mountain News, where he served from 1906 to 1911. He served as the president of the International League of Press Clubs during 1906 and 1907. Mr. Keating served as president of the Colorado State Board of Land Commissioners from 1911 to 1913.

In 1913, his service was rewarded by the people of Colorado with his election to the U.S. House of Representatives, where he remained for a period of 6 years. During that time, he was responsible for several notable pieces of legislation concerning the labor movement.

Soon after his retirement from the Congress, he became the editor of Labor, a dynamic paper that fought for the interest of the general public as well as for that of the American worker.

Edward Keating was a man of purpose whose life was notable by a series of considerable accomplishments. But probably the greatest monument to his achievements, and the one in which he would take most pride, is the great number of families that enjoy better homes, education, and medical care. His death is a great loss to the people of his State and his country, whom he served so nobly.

Fino Offers Bold Legislation for Federal Authority To Surmount the Rail Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to create a Federal Northeastern Transportation Authority to subsidize, rehabilitate, and restructure passenger transportation between lower Maine and northern Virginia—the jurisdictional area is delineated in detail below.

My bill sidesteps a number of the shortcomings of the legislation so far offered—unsuccessfully—to bring Federal aid to bear on the deteriorating rail situation. The bill calls for a wholly Federal authority to subsidize and regulate passenger transportation. The Authority proposed is not dependent on State financial support or political concurrence. The bill proposes wholly Federal financing of the passenger transportation deficit, in keeping with my concept of passenger transportation as an ultimately Federal responsibility. The bill provides for the structuring of the proposed Authority within the framework of an existing transportation program—the Mass Transportation Act of 1964. The bill would make available to the Northeast Transportation Authority $50 million of the money authorized to be appropriated annually for the mass transportation program.

The purposes of the Authority proposed under my bill would be severalfold. Initially, it would aim at the immediate rehabilitation of failing rail passenger services. This would be done by negotiating "cost plus" contracts with passenger carriers, whereby those carriers were given the difference between revenues of the required service and the cost of providing that service, plus a percentage of that cost as profit. Until the Authority should certify itself as ready to perform this task, the bill would empower the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Administration to make appropriate contracts with passenger carriers. A key objective of the proposed Authority would be the regularization of commuter rail service on a reliable contract basis.

The Authority would also, as proposed, seek to develop high-speed intramegalopolitan rail service, and would be authorized to use a share of moneys presently authorized to be used for demonstration projects by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

If constituted as set forth in the bill, the Authority would exercise rate and

route regulatory powers over megalopolitan air, rail, and bus passenger transportation as presently exercised by the ICC and CAB. These powers would be so exercised as to aim at the development of a more efficient and economical megalopolitan transportation structure. Wasteful competition would eventually be eliminated. Transportation resources would be rationalized: air, rail, and surface transit would be used for appropriate distances or districts. The regulatory powers of the proposed Authority would eventually—used in conjunction with cost plus passenger service contracts—be exercised so as to withdraw carriers from service obligations that could be better handled by another type of carrier.

The Authority would also be empowered, where necessary, to purchase or operate a carrier, although its power to take over properties without additional congressional consent would be limited to purchases of under $20 million. No passenger carrier could discontinue megalopolitan passenger service without the consent of the Authority.

The proposed Authority would have seven Commissioners appointed for 5-year terms, initially staggered. The salaries of Commissioners would be $21,000 per annum.

The proposed Authority would be financed by appropriation until such time as it might be granted the power to issue revenue bonds in connection with later undertaken specific operations or construction.

Since December, when I first began work on this bill, I have watched the railroads edge closer and closer to total abandonment of passenger service. These developments should not be a surprise. In the last quarter century, passenger service has shown a profit only during the war years. There is nothing new about the dilemma of the railroads, except the publicity that dilemma has received. Now we have come to the point where we must face up to the need—the immediate need—for large-scale Government aid.

Recently, the Regional Plan Association released comments of commuter railroad presidents the gist of which was that all the commuter lines serving the New York metropolitan area are willing to hand over their passenger operations to a responsible Government agency if Government subsidies are not forthcoming. These officials do, however, prefer the idea that the Government should contract for commuter service—or in essence, subsidize such service—in different areas rather than take over the railroads. I agree. I prefer the concept of "equalization payments" by which the Government pays for the difference between revenues and costs of providing what is, after all, a necessary public service, to the concept of Government owned and operated railroads. My bill aims at setting up a framework for Government financial aid—and not only to railroads, although they are our immediate concern, but to other carriers as well.

In my opinion, the political and financial responsibility for such financial aid and control must lie with the Federal Government. The simple reason is that the Federal Government has both the power and the money. The several States have little of either. They seem unable to agree on any plans that have any real teeth or treasury. Probably any State plans would involve largely Federal money in any event, so it is my feeling that the political body created to deal with the transportation problem in the Northeast ought to be a Federal agency. Ultimately, the financial and planning power of the Federal Government must be brought to bear—and there is no time like the present.

I am not proposing a nationwide agency. For the moment, I think we would do well to test a Federal transportation authority's ability to do the job in the area where the problem is most pressing—the northeastern urban "megalopolis." I do not think that these problems are the problems of metropolitan New York alone. I think that the problems of the urban coastal area are highly interrelated, and that controlled development of transportation in the Northeast should be on an integrated rather than scattered basis. It would not be fair to subsidize only the metropolitan New York transportation problem. The crisis presenting itself today is an opportunity and a challenge to regularize and modernize the entire northeastern transportation complex. A halfhearted, haphazard, and piecemeal attack on this problem will cost double tomorrow what it saves today.

I hope that progressive transportation thinking will not be shunted aside in the name of economy, because, as I said, such would only be false economy. I also hope that this proposal will not be branded as sectional, for while it is true that it is aimed at the transportation complex of just one area, it is also aimed to provide a trial run in Federal participation in passenger transportation. What can be learned in the Northeast can be applied to other areas as the economic patterns of those areas move, as they must, toward the socioeconomic complexity of the Northeast. Perhaps a Great Lakes Region Authority or a Southern Pacific Coastal Authority might follow a successful Northeastern Authority.

This is an innovative measure, but it is a considered one, hammered out as the sound points and shortcomings of other transportation proposals have exposed themselves. We live in an age of supercities and super problems. There is an ever-growing an necessary interrelation of politics and multidirectional growth planning. I urge the Congress to mold the future rather than be buffeted by it. This is a challenge to be grasped, not ignored.

Following is the megalopolitan jurisdiction:

THE MEGALOPOLITAN JURISDICTION

Maine: Counties of Cumberland and York.

New Hampshire: Counties of Hillsborough and Rockingham.

Massachusetts: All counties.

Rhode Island: All counties.

Connecticut: All counties.

New York: Counties of Suffolk, Nassau, Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York, Bronx, Westchester, Rockland, Putnam, Orange, Dutchess, Sullivan, Ulster, Greene, Columbia, Albany, Rensselaer, and Schenectady.

New Jersey: All counties.

Pennsylvania: Counties of Pike, Lackawanna, Luzerne, Monroe, Northampton, Lehigh, Berks, Schuykill, Lebanon, Dauphin, York, Lancaster, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, Bucks, and Philadelphia.

Maryland: All counties save Garrett and Alleghany.

Delaware: All counties.

District of Columbia.

Virginia: Counties of Arlington, Alexandria, Fairfax, Loudon, Prince William, and Fauguier.

David G. Osterer of Harrison, N.Y., Honored by Eloy Alfaro International Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. David G. Osterer of Harrison, N.Y., was honored recently by the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama as the recipient of its Grand Cross and Diploma. Mr. Osterer is one of Westchester's distinguished citizens and it is indeed fitting that he is the recipient of this important decoration. I am pleased to include in the RECORD the following editorial from the White Plains Reporter Dispatch:

AN HONOR FOR MR. OSTERER

Chances are that few in Westchester are familiar with the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama or that they even knew it existed until Thursday night when it honored David G. Osterer, of Harrison, with its grand cross and diploma.

But there are a great many people in Westchester who know and admire David Osterer and there are many more who are better off because he is the man he is.

The foundation, named after a former president of Panama, works toward improving the health of the peoples of the world and promoting the establishment of peace. It has numbered many renowned individuals among those chosen for its honor.

Its citation of Mr. Osterer read: "In recognition of his distinguished services to humanity, charity, ethical conduct in the business world, comparative religions, and in further recognition of his efforts toward the establishment of international peace."

Mr. Osterer is a man of deep religious conviction, close family ties, and wide charitable instincts.

Out of the regard for his own fine and healthy children and his conviction that man does not exist to serve himself alone, he came to accept the presidency of the United Cerebral Palsy Association of Westchester some years ago when it had fallen on bad times.

Badly disorganized, perhaps because it was caught up so in the emotional problems of the parents of the afflicted children who tried to keep it afloat, the association was given a firm hand and strong leadership, Mr. Osterer brought into it many distinguished and influential Westchester people and put their talents to work. The result has been an ever widening and increasingly beneficial

program for those stricken with cerebral palsy.

Mr. Osterer is an industrialist, and a successful businessman. The UCP is only one phase of the variety of activities which capture his energetic attention, but he is summed up to those who know him in the philosophy with which he approached the challenge of raising and disbursing funds for the UCP. "The public dollar is a public trust" is his slogan and he never let his colleagues forget it. His award is well deserved.

Iowa Newspapers Voice Support for Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, it is now obvious that the vast majority of Americans are solidly behind President Johnson's pledge to insure that all qualified citizens will be able to exercise their constitutional right to vote.

In my home State of Iowa, newspaper editorials have strongly supported the President's position and have pointed out the need for voting rights legislation.

I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members some excellent editorial comments from the March 17 issue of the Waterloo Daily Courier of Waterloo, Iowa; the March 17 issue of the Centerville Iowegian of Centerville, Iowa; and the March 18 issue of the Ottumwa Courier of Ottumwa, Iowa.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include these editorials:

[From the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier, Mar. 17, 1965]

IT'S TIME TO INTERVENE TO ENFORCE VOTE RIGHT

Any American citizen who can read and write English should be allowed to vote.

We heartily indorse President Johnson's proposal for a Federal law to establish the voting rights of Negroes wherever they are unfairly denied those rights.

Although the full details of the bill to be presented to Congress have not been announced as this is written, White House sources declare that it will not prohibit literacy tests. It will merely prohibit the use of literacy tests and other devices to discriminate against Negroes.

There is no constitutional problem. The 15th amendment clearly states: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Although this amendment became effective in 1870, it has not recently been implemented by direct Federal intervention. Recent civil rights bills have merely authorized court procedures and investigations. Now President Johnson proposes that some Federal official be allowed to take registrations and thus qualify citizens to vote.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act applied only to Federal elections. But it provided that in any court proceeding involving the fairness of a literacy test "there shall be a rebuttable presumption that any person who has not been adjudged an incompetent and who has completed the sixth grade" in an accredited school where classes are conducted in English "possesses sufficient literacy, comprehension and intelligence to vote in any Federal election."

That presumption is a fair method of establishing adequate literacy to vote. But it should be only a presumption which can be challenged by other evidence that, despite graduation from the sixth grade, the individual is still illiterate. Some schools pass students regardless of accomplishment merely to satisfy the letter rather than the spirit of compulsory school attendance laws.

Those who are not allowed to vote naturally must use other methods of attaining their just rights. Once the vote is attained, however, the individual has a moral obligation to refrain from demonstrations or other activity which deprive other citizens of their rights. As President Johnson declared: "The right of free speech does not carry with it the right to endanger the safety of others on a public highway."

And democracy does not consist only in guaranteeing to all citizens their fundamental rights. To succeed it must also enlist from all citizens a high degree of maturity and responsibility. The Negroes of the South will now have the opportunity to demonstrate the degree to which they possess those qualities. Some whites have not set a very good example.

[From the Centerville Iowegian, Mar. 17, 1965]

RIGHT TO VOTE

President Johnson has been joined by the Republicans and was presented a truly bipartisan civil rights voting bill to the Congress. Its intention—to guarantee the right to vote to every American regardless of the color of his skin.

There shouldn't be any argument about this bill. After all, it is written right into the Constitution of the United States that every American is entitled to vote. This bill is simply implementing a constitutional right.

Of course, a law, even a law giving the right of ballot, doesn't bring full equality to the Negro. Gaining that equality is still a long, tedius, and perhaps a painful road. There are other things to be resolved. Ignorance is one. Too many Negroes, and for that matter too many whites, are uneducated, are mired down hopelessly handicapped in a highly competitive society that places a premium on the intelligent, but finds little room for the blighted mind.

And if we can strike away ignorance, we will in due time strike away poverty.

But for the moment, one concrete thing we can do as a Nation is to extend the voting rights to the oppressed American Negro.

[From the Ottumwa (Iowa) Courier, Mar. 18, 1965]

THREE MEN AND A CAUSE

There are more difficult days ahead for the equality-denied Negro citizens of this country. There has been sickening brutality again, and there may be more.

Yet it seems to us that strides have been made in the past couple of weeks which will go far toward the total victory against second-class citizenship.

Three men became more involved, one enough to become a martyr. These three men have earned inclusion in the prayers of the people.

First is Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Back in 1955 King was a 27-year-old pastor of the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Ala. On December 1, that year, Rosa Parks, 43, was arrested for refusing to give up her seat in a bus to a white man. King and some 50 other Negro leaders met the following night and made a momentous decision: The Negro community of Montgomery should boycott the buses in mass protest. Out of that mushroomed all the Negro protests and demonstrations since. Dr. King has become leader and national hero of Negroes, always preaching nonviolence. Last year he received the Nobel Peace Prize. Last week he returned to Selma and put into motion the events which now promise so much.

The second person was a white Unitarian minister from Boston, the Reverend James Reeb. He was no threat to the South. He had no Communist inclination to wreck its economy, no racist ideas to despoil its people. He simply did what many others did. He went to Alabama to help Negroes register to vote. He happened along on a street where there was a hate-filled man with a club. James Reeb died of a crushed skull. Others have died in this cause. But this sacrifice was climatic. It foretold the move by the third key actor in this drama.

President Lyndon Johnson went before a joint session of Congress to speak. He did it at night when millions of his countrymen could listen. He delivered what might become his most effective, his greatest address. His underlying conviction came through in simple words. He used the title of the civil rights hymn, "We Shall Overcome." He left no doubt about his determination, and Congress left little doubt about its determination to follow.

Voting rights will not be granted hundreds of thousands of disfranchised Negro citizens until law grants them immediate registration on the basis of the simplest possible tests and in all elections. That cannot be done short of Federal registration. On this the President is now committed.

It has been an ugly chapter, and more ugly ones might follow. But thanks to these three men, a happy ending now is possible.

The 1967 Centennial of the Alaska Purchase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, next week will mark the 98th anniversary of the signing of the treaty that resulted in the greatest land acquisition by the United States since the purchase of Louisiana in 1803. This transaction, the Treaty of Cession, whose international significance was not fully recognized until the 20th century, provided for the purchase of Alaska from Russia.

The treaty was negotiated by William H. Seward, Secretary of State under President Andrew Johnson, and signed by him for the United States on March 30, 1867. Formal transfer of North America's greatest peninsula took place in Sitka, the site of Russia's North American headquarters, on October 18, 1867.

When the flag of the Russian-American Company was lowered on that day in early winter of 1867, and the American flag raised in its place, Russian dominion over a half million square miles in North America was ended. Russian-America became America.

The significance of the Alaska Purchase was recognized in the last Congress in its approval of an act to provide for recognition by the United States of the 1967 Alaska centennial celebration "not

only as an observance by the people of 49th State, but as an event of national significance."

Within the next days, Mr. Speaker, the Congress will receive a report from the Department of Commerce, carried out as directed by the 88th Congress. That report will include recommendations from the Commerce Department for Federal participation in the centennial event.

Planning in Alaska by the State, its communities, and its citizens for the 1967 observance is proceeding apace, and the observance in already taking substantial form. All of this is told concisely and completely in the annual report of the Alaska Centennial Commission, a unit of the State government.

In order that my colleagues may become more fully aware of the scope of planning in Alaska for the centennial event, and the progress that is being made, I offer here the first of a series, extracted from the Commission's annual report:

AN EVENT OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

"The Congress hereby recognizes the Alaska Centennial Celebration * * * not only as an observance by the people of the 49th State, but as an event of national significance." Public Law 88-610, approved September 24, 1964, by President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Design for the celebration of the centennial of the Alaska purchase in keeping with congressional recognition that it is an event of national significance is continuing as the year 1964 closes.

Toward achievement of its design, the Alaska Centennial Commission has organized its tasks under the headings of four specific objectives. These objectives—organizing special events for 1967, enhancing Alaska as a tourist destination, carrying out other programs of commemoration, and publicizing the centennial—are convenient headings for a review of progress and for glimpses of the shape of centennial year.

ORGANIZING SPECIAL EVENTS FOR 1967

Stage presentations

Preparation of a historical drama that will portray the highlights of Alaska's history—its native culture, discovery, colonization, exploration, transfer, and subsequent developments—is being planned by the Commission. Such a drama would tour the major communities of the State on a schedule arranged with local centennial committees, or would be presented by the local groups themselves. Presentation of the drama would, whenever possible, coincide with homecoming weeks as designated by the committees.

Historical dramatic or musical presentations also will be staged by communities, as in Kodiak, where Frank Brink's drama, "The Ram," will be performed; in Sitka, where the Alaska Day pageant will be presented; and in Haines-Port Chilkoot, where the "Dance of Alaska" will be presented. Staging of centennial year productions is being considered too, in Anchorage, Fairbanks, Cordova, and Homer, and is being explored by components of the Alaskan Command.

As the historical highlight of centennial year, Alaska Day in Sitka will be celebrated with fanfare and flourish even greater than is usually true. Guests from the United States and Soviet Governments will be invited, as will descendants of major figures from Alaska's history.

A cultural exchange group from the Soviet Union will be invited to visit communities of this once Russian possession. The proposal, which has been made to the U.S. State Department, will be subject to exchange agreements negotiated by the United States and Soviet Union in 1965.

Historical exhibit

Another kind of special attraction being considered for 1967 is a mobile historical exhibit that would tour the State, taking a small museum to Alaskans and their visitors who cannot travel to the State's major museums. Organization of traveling exhibits of Alaskan art and of the history of the Armed Forces in Alaska is also being encouraged.

Armed Forces, Coast Guard

Although detailed programs are not drawn, participation in centennial celebrations by vessels, aircraft, men, and bands of the Armed Forces and Coast Guard is planned.

Sports events

In the field of sports, a major event is scheduled for Fairbanks, and other events are being sought by several communities. In Fairbanks, the Global World Series, a double-elimination contest of international teams, will begin July 15, 1967.

Reenactments

Reenactment of historical events is being explored by the commission. One reenactment being seriously considered is the trek of gold seekers over the Chilkoot Trail. This would be a cooperative observance, of course, with British Columbia and the Yukon Territory—provinces of Canada joining in their national centennial of confederation.

Native culture

The original people of North America's greatest peninsula, Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts make up a substantial portion of the unique culture—in games, in art, in music—will be a prominent feature of centennial year.

Industry and labor

It is planned that industry and labor will be saluted during specific weeks during 1967. To mark their contributions to Alaska's development, important groups in the economy will be recognized by having weeks designated as Salute to the Timber Industry, Salute to the Oil Industry, Salute to Labor, Salute to the Fisheries, and others.

Historic dates

Events of importance in the history of Alaska, such as the discovery of Alaska, founding of the first permanent settlement, signing of the treaty, the transfer, discoveries of gold, meeting of the first legislature, opening of the Alaska Railroad and the Alaska Highway, and achievement of statehood, will be marked in commemorative ceremonies. Such ceremonies, staged on the anniversaries of events commemorated, will be jointly sponsored by local committees and the commission.

Dates of importance in communities will also be observed in ceremonies staged by centennial committees or by existing celebration groups.

In addition to special attractions being planned by the State and its towns and cities, special events marking the 50th anniversary of Mount McKinley National Park, the 50th anniversary of the University of Alaska, the 10th anniversary of Alaska Methodist University, and other anniversaries will be organized by commemorating groups.

Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, while the budget of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is regularly approved with an overwhelmingly vote despite annual attempts to undermine it, I feel that Members of Congress should on occasion throughout the year remind our citizenry of the vital importance of this committee. Because of the very nature of its activities, little national notice is focused upon it until its enemies begin their hatchet job when it comes time to authorize expenditures.

I congratulate dedicated members of the committee and of the staff for their patient, exhaustive, unswerving, and conscientious work in behalf of the national security. What they accomplish year after year on a relatively small budget reflects one of the best investments Congress has ever made.

It is gratifying to find in the Tribune-Democrat of Johnstown, Pa., of March 8 an editorial encomium of the committee and of Congress for authorizing the funds necessary to assure continuation of its activities. The firm patriotic endeavors of newspapers in smaller communities of our Nation offer readers an opportunity to understand the value of the work carried on by the Committee on Un-American Activities, and Congress in turn owes a vote of thanks to responsible editors for this service.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSE AGAIN BACKS SUBVERSION PROBE

In nearly every new Congress an attempt is made to eliminate the House Committee on Un-American Activities—so far without success. This year it was done by trying to recommit legislation authorizing $370,000 for the committee's expenditures. The recommittal motion was defeated 332 to 58, and the committee budget was approved by a vote of 359 to 29. That's about par for the course.

The argument is constantly made that in its 26 years of existence the House Committee on Un-American Activities has produced little legislation. That, presumably, is because the subversive activities the committee was created to investigate are to be found in many fields, and the ultimate legislation emerges from the committees assigned to deal with such things as education, defense, mails, labor, passports, and other subjects.

During its quarter of a century of inquiry, the House Un-American Activities Committee has prepared and published more than 500 separate volumes which, as Representative EDWIN E. WILLIS of Louisiana, present chairman of the committee, observed in House debate, constitute "one of the largest, most reliable, and most comprehensive reference series on communism available anywhere." These committee publications, said WILLIS, are used as texts in schools and colleges, as well as by Government security agencies and even foreign governments.

Representative GEORGE F. SENNER, JR., Arizona Democrat and a member of the committee, told the House that representatives of many executive agencies regularly visit the House Un-American Activities Committee to consult its files—agencies such as the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the State Department, the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and others.

If the House Un-American Activities Committee had done no more in its long life than expose the infiltration of government by Communists and fellow-travelers before, during, and after World War II, it would have justified all the money that has been spent

by the committee during its entire life. The *Alger Hiss* case is still remembered, but there were many more who were discovered by the committee in the 1940's and after. And its files are still the only central source of information about the subterranean activities of communism in the United States.

The Un-American Activities Committee has been the target throughout its history of denunciation from people ranging from outright Communists to "wooly headed" sentimentalists—and including some misguided "liberals" who regard its inquiry as a "witch hunt," forgetting that while there are no witches, there certainly are Communists. But it has always been supported by overwhelming majorities in the House, and the House vote last week shows that the support is not flagging.

A Man for All Seasons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the endless problems facing our President. The following editorial, which is an eloquent tribute to our Chief Executive, appeared in the March 22, 1965, edition of the Long Island Sunday Press, and I would like to call it to the attention of all Americans:

A MAN FOR ALL SEASONS

In a moment of calculated confession, the President of the United States last Monday night let the Nation in on a secret. He told us what kind of President he wants to be. Now that he has been more than 15 months on the job, we can ask what kind of President has he been—and what kind is he likely to become.

The first thing we have to do is throw away the labels—liberal, conservative, southerner, dispenser of corn. He's making his own category, and there is no single word that will pin down or sum up what he is all about. But at this early stage, it can be said that he has demonstrated the potential for greatness.

It is best that we be tentative with the adjective because all labels are misleading.

Greatness, unfortunately, is too often confused with perfection, and perfection is not for men, but gods. Greatness in men is not the result of accomplishing the ideal; in the American tradition, it is measured by how well a man approaches the possible.

President Kennedy articulated this philosophy eloquently. But Johnson is no political philosopher; he is a consumate politician acting out the stuff of the philosophy of the possible. His administration has been an exciting exercise in the uses of power in a democratic society.

He has been consistent without being rigid. He has a far-ranging, detailed program, but he is not a prisoner of doctrine. Beneath the high-sounding phrases of the speeches, beneath the talk of the great goals, there is the political realist who never confuses reaching for stars with touching them.

We can really believe him when he says, as he said Monday night, "I do not want to be the President who built empires, or sought grandeur or extended dominion. I want to be the President who educated young children to the wonders of their world. I want to be the President who helped to feed the hungry and to prepare them to be taxpayers instead of taxeaters. I want to be the President who helped the poor to find their own way and who protected the right of every citizen to vote in every election. I want to be the President who helped to end hatred among his fellow men, and who promoted love among the people of all races and all religions and all parties. I want to be the President who helped to end war among the brothers of this earth."

He invited Congress and the people of America to reach along with him for these stars. But he also intends to lead the way. Like the master builders of another age, he has drawn the blueprints for the cathedral all of us really want, that can be built only with the labor and love of all hands. Such a cathedral cannot be thrown up the way we make skyscrapers these days; it is a slow, perhaps never-ending process.

Yet from all sides, in all lands, we hear the raucous shouts of impatient idealists, revolutionists, radicals and reactionaries, each demanding his own idea of instant perfection through instant action. But in Panama, in Selma, in Vietnam, in almost every situation he has had to face, Lyndon Johnson has given the idealists a lesson in the uses of power, in its limitations and in its possibilities. He has a genius for knowing when to be patient and when to be impatient; when to be tough and when to be gentle; when to be corny and when to be direct. He has been, so far, a man for all seasons.

It bodes well for the hot summers and the cold winters that lie ahead.

F.D.R. 1934 Letter Advocated Preserving Wilcox Mansion—Buffalo Woman Has Note to Mead in Which President Supported Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the Ansley Wilcox house in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site. This is the place where Theodore Roosevelt was sworn in as President of the United States, and it is one of only four sites outside Washington, D.C., where the Presidential oath has been administered.

The preservation of the Ansley Wilcox house has wide support, and I was pleased to learn recently that in 1934 President Franklin D. Roosevelt expressed his interest in its preservation to Senator James M. Mead. Under unanimous consent, I include an article which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on March 2, 1965:

F.D.R. 1934 LETTER ADVOCATED PRESERVING WILCOX MANSION—BUFFALO WOMAN HAS NOTE TO MEAD IN WHICH PRESIDENT SUPPORTED SHRINE

As long ago as 1934, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and U.S. Senator James M. Mead, of Buffalo, were interested in preserving the Wilcox mansion as a historic shrine.

"These new attempts to save the mansion," said Mrs. William H. Grotz, of 83 Northrup Place, "interest me very much and I have a letter President Roosevelt wrote to Mr. Mead on the subject."

The letter, on White House stationery, is dated December 12, 1934. It says:

"DEAR JIM: I do not need to tell you that I have been greatly interested in learning from you that there is a possibility that the old Wilcox home with which I am personally familiar, may some day become a public memorial in memory of the taking of the oath of office by T.R. in 1901.

"Very sincerely yours,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

Mrs. Grotz, 78, said she is "a saver of things, particularly letters and autographs, and for the life of me I can't recall how I obtained this particular letter."

She plans to loan the letter to the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Committee, a group that is leading the current effort to turn the mansion on Delaware Avenue into a shrine.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian people, an anniversary sadly observed, for independence is a condition of the past for these unfortunate citizens of a proud country.

This tiny satellite country—a satellite in position, in government, but not in spirit, remains a constant reminder of the octopus arms of the communist doctrine.

Byelorussia knows the harsh, brutal stamping of armies over her soil.. Three and a half centuries of slavery are engraved on the pages of her history books, three and a half centuries of denial of human rights, dignity—oppression. Yet these bold people, never fearing suppressions, formed many governments to overthrow their foreign intruders.

We all remember the cruel annals written during the First World War. Byelorussia was not excluded. German armies captured part of the country and assumed military control. Russia controlled another segment. Finally, during World War I, the Byelorussian people proclaimed to the world that they were living and would continue to live. The Great National All Byelorussian Congress on December 5–17, 1917, decreed the state of order of Byelorussia and the rights and freedoms of its inhabitants and peoples.

On March 18, 1918, a constitutional decree established first the provisional form of the Byelorussian National Republic to create a completely independent statehood. By March 25, 1918, independence was reverentially proclaimed. The Government resulting from this proclamation expanded its activity in all fields of national life with the exception of the military—forbidden by the Germans. Important advances were made in the areas of education, culture, social protection. The Byelorussians tried to secure recognition from other states in order to open up diplomatic and consular offices in surrounding countries. The Republic was recognized de jure by Austria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland,

Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and the Ukraine.

The German troops withdrew in November of 1918 and immediately the Red army began to advance into Byelorussia. The Byelorussian forces were insufficient to offer sizable opposition. However, the Government continued its efforts to form armed Byelorussian forces to defend the independence but to no avail. Russian armies tramped through the country extinguishing the hope of the Byelorussian independence in their path.

The Polish-Bolshevik War ended with a treaty between the warring powers in Riga on March 18, 1921. Byelorussia, as a result was divided between Poland and Soviet Russia. Part of Byelorussia was given to Latvia and the other to the Russian Government. Eventually the Soviet Government was established after a war with the Byelorussians.

Today Byelorussia joins her neighbors in the suppressed struggle for national and individual freedoms—freedom of speech, of government. The candle of hope will burn through the rains of tyranny and the long expected dawn will eventually splash light on this unfortunate country.

The 47th Anniversary of Independence of Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, when the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918, their Democratic Republic was born.

This independence was achieved after many years of hope, struggle, and sacrifices. But victory and happiness turned to defeat and sorrow, for despite the courage and determination of the young Republic, Bolshevik forces soon overwhelmed it.

The Byelorussian-Soviet Socialist Republic was then created, but it does not represent the Byelorussian people—it is merely another Soviet satellite.

As we celebrate the 47th anniversary of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic's proclamation of independence, it is significant that the observance is made by not only Americans of Byelorussian descent and Byelorussian immigrants in the United States, but by the entire free world.

I know that some day, the independence and freedom the Byelorussian people lost 46 years ago, will be regained and preserved, for tyranny does not, and cannot endure.

It cannot endure, because it is conceived in evil, born in violence, and raised in despotism—and because it rules with force and injustice. It lacks popular support and therefore cannot endure.

But freedom, supplemented by strength and courage, can and does endure, because it is good and peaceful, governing with reason and justice. It enjoys broad popular appeal and does succeed.

That is why the Byelorussian people should not yield to despair. They should live with hope in their hearts, because some day they will be free again, for their courage and patriotism are strong and great.

Austin, Tex., Designated as One of the Pleasant Places To Live in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, we all take pride, and rightfully so, in our hometowns. Those of us in the Congress have labored, and still labor, to make our communities better places in which to live, and we know that this requires the combined efforts of many dedicated local officials and public-spirited citizens.

Austin, Tex., which I have the privilege to represent and to call my hometown, has for many years enjoyed an enviable reputation among Texans. As the State capital, it is the official residence of our distinguished Governor, John B. Connally; and many other present and former State officials. The University of Texas and other educational and research centers are located there, and thanks to the vision and effectiveness of its then Congressman, Lyndon B. Johnson, seven man-made lakes provide hydroelectric power, flood control, fishing, boating, water sports, and other recreational facilities.

Now what we Texans have known for a long time has been reported nationally by U.S. News & World Report. In its current issue, this highly regarded news magazine has designated Austin, Tex., as one of the pleasant places to live in the United States.

Today a group of appreciative citizens of Austin gathered at the municipal building to congratulate our city council, headed by the hard-working mayor, Lester Palmer, on their outstanding leadership. I was proud to join in this well-deserved tribute, and I am pleased now to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the article from U.S. News & World Report:

AUSTIN, TEX.

This capital of Texas and site of the University of Texas now has a population of 212,000. To visitors, however, it still seems like a small town.

Residents say this smalltown atmosphere is one of the reasons why they like it here.

There are no skyscrapers in Austin, no heavy industry, no unemployment worries, no big crime problem, no racial conflict, and no traffic congestion—except on weekends when there is a football game at the university. Austin is a clean city. The wide streets in the center of town are washed down every night after 10 o'clock.

Light, diversified industry complements the government-university economy on which the city depends mainly.

Many Austin residents have two homes, one in town and the other out on a lake.

There is a chain of seven lakes in and near the city, with 700 miles of shoreline.

In the next few years, Austin hopes to build up its tourist business.

President Johnson's LBJ Ranch is about 60 miles west of the city. Sightseers already have started to use Austin as a base for trips to the Johnson home and to the rugged hill country roundabout.

It Is Up to Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I was tremendously moved by the editorial entitled "It Is Up to Us," in the Fremont News Register of March 14, 1965.

As the struggle for equal human rights reaches its climax throughout our great country, and as we here in Congress prepare to fulfill our responsibilities by the passage of a memorable voting rights bill, I commend to my colleagues the text of this thought-provoking editorial:

IT IS UP TO US

The Reverend James Reeb, father of four children, and minister from Boston, has died as a result of a severe beating received from three unsympathetic white men in Selma, Ala., Tuesday.

He was but one of many who journeyed to the southern State to give support to the Negroes presently fighting to obtain equal voting rights in the United States. He is not alone in his cause, for there are millions of Americans today who hang their heads in shame for the deeds of a few of their brothers.

We must look at the facts surrounding his death, the death of others over the past months who have championed the cause of the Negro, and try to understand the causes for which they are fighting.

We fully understand the fact that for several hundred years, the colored person has been subjected to a second-rate citizenship in the South, or at least in parts of the South. We understand also that such a complete reorganization of the social standards for both white and colored is not easily accomplished in a short period of time.

But one particular point in the overall racial problem is not clear. Why is the Negro not allowed to vote in many places? Why are they stripped of a constitutional right in selecting their governmental representatives? In Dallas County, Ala., today there are undoubtedly many officials in office who would not be there tomorrow should the Negro be allowed to cast a vote today. Obviously, these people do not want equal voting privileges given to the Negroes.

This country was founded on the basis of equal representation in Government, with elected officials being put into office by a representative vote of their people.

It continues to operate that way, and in our great State of California today, we must carry out a reapportionment program or the Federal Government will step in and do it for us. Why? So the elected officials will truly represent the will of the State's people based on population density.

But what about the situation in the few Southern States who so tightly control the vote? Obviously by allowing all qualified Negroes to vote the picture would change considerably. Should not our Federal Government likewise step in and demand that action be taken immediately to remedy this shortcoming and violation of our Constitution as they are doing in California?

The crimes being committed against humanity in the bitter racial strife are monstrous and certainly a blot on the American way of life. We the people can see that these injustices are rectified.

Let us hope that the sufferings to date have not been in vain.

Terror on the Subways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following WCBS-TV editorial which was broadcast in New York City on March 19, 1965, and which graphically presents the problem of crime on the subways in New York:

At one time we might have titled tonight's editorial "Crime on the Subways." But that was before. Now our title is "Terror on the Subways." And unless something is done very soon, our title the next time might be "Panic on the Subways."

Terror and panic. These are strong words, perhaps a little sensational. But it's our conviction at channel 2 that terror and panic are the words to use, right now. If terror and panic are not afflicting subway riders at this moment, it won't be long before that happens. Unless, of course, something is done, something real, something big, something that will reassure the four and a half million people who ride the subways in this city every day.

The cause of the terror, of the approaching panic, is easily seen. Murder and mayhem. That's the cause. Major crimes on the subway last year rose 52 percent. I repeat, 52 percent. And this statistic contains the following events: 8 attempted rapes, 158 assaults, 257 robberies. In the years 1963 and 1964, eight people were murdered in the subways. And now there's been another. Another apparently senseless killing, without motive, the kind that could happen to anyone.

Small wonder then, that we speak of terror and panic.

With these statistics in mind, how would you feel walking underground into this deserted subway station? The Ind "A" train has just left. And you're there on the platform alone. If you're a woman, your fear would be even greater. And it wouldn't ease your mind to know that this is the Kingston-Throop station, which figured in the recent murder of Andrew Mormile, a 17-year-old high school student.

We can show you other stations, deserted, just as fearful.

The mayor, the transit authority, are talking about pilot programs in train to station communications, about platform to street alarm systems. Well, these are good ideas, of course, but really they are trifling answers to a critical problem. Something much more is needed than alarm systems. What is needed to reassure the public and to prevent crime is a policeman, the physical presence of the law, on every 1 of the 481 station platforms in the system, 24 hours a day.

In recommending this step, we are aware of the fact that it will be expensive. So we add this recommendation: If safety means an increase in the 15-cent fare, let's have it. It's a small price to pay for peace of mind and protection of life and limb. Terror and panic. It must be halted.

Legalized Gambling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in our near-perfect government of checks and balances, the high resolve of one branch sometimes leads it into an error of excess, but in due course a correction invariably is made. Yet it remains the obligation of all of us always to confront the possibility of a mistake whenever we see or sense it, and to prevent it from initially being made.

In the matter of taxation to meet the growing costs and mounting needs of public works, education, and social services, we are—somewhat like Government—each guided by a stabilizing conscience. And so, a problem becomes virtually nil when the presented choice is between a further burden upon the economy or a serious injury to the country's social fabric.

Among the responsible and thoughtful people of the congressional district of New York State whom I have the honor to represent, a dedication to American mores has led to apprehensions and fears concerning a measure which has just been introduced for consideration before the New York State Legislature.

The bill would permit creation of a legalized off-track betting system in the city of New York for the stated purpose of raising revenue to run the city and to eliminate bookmaking, the illegal gambling racket which fertilizes an octopus-like criminal empire infecting this country. Who could challenge the objectives? But who could accept the false thesis that by increasing neighborhood gambling we can reduce the number of rodents who feed upon it?

This cannot be a party matter. Governors, Senators, and other civic leaders alike in New York State have opposed legalized off-track wagering. The roster of opposition includes the honored New York names of Lehman, Dewey, Harriman, Rockefeller, KENNEDY and JAVITS. The threatened legalization of off-track betting is something on which we must see eye to eye as Americans. The discussion has lasted too long among government leaders and the public in New York City; and both the support and opposition to the proposal have been strong.

The proposed act, incorporating the device of a public referendum to decide upon a matter which should not pass beyond the critical purview of a legislative body, would remove responsibility far from the sociological expertise that it demands.

There exists nevertheless the imminent possibility of its passage.

What might appear on the surface to be an internal problem for the State of New York alone could, in truth, work far-reaching injury to our entire people. I come from the Syracuse area of upper New York State, removed by many miles from the city of New York and from the immediate impact of such legislation, but not by many miles from the ultimate influence of that great metropolis in action of this nature.

The more important problems which it would create, I am convinced, are of consequence even to those of you from other States and from areas where there is no horseracing and no wagering of note. The falling domino principle would surely apply to this bill endangering our Nation's social and economic fabric. No State, no community would be left unhurt by this act which would, by its passage, accord to one State the right to sound the sociological tune for the Union.

The right of a State to legislate moral matters is a historic one, and there is no disposition here to dwell upon that aspect. However, a State's assumption of a right to legalize procedures, such as I have outlined, of unquestionably negative value touches on the national interest and might properly deserve the attention of the Congress. Legalized off-track betting would promote poverty, encourage criminality and so prey upon the poorer classes as to set itself in direct conflict with the meaningful antipoverty program hopefully initiated by this Congress. It would additionally impose new problems on the law enforcement agencies of our country.

Abundant evidence establishes that such a measure would be the seed from which would grow a vast injury to our economic stability and to our American ethic. No single State should undertake, inadvertently or not, to generate forces which might do violence to our people's basic and historic decency.

In Great Britain, where illegal cash betting with bookmakers abounded, neighborhood off-track betting offices were legalized in 1961. Among the purposes of the betting and gaming bill, as then expressed by a wide range of public officials, were: To ease the burden on the police; to keep gambling within reasonable bounds; to equalize treatment for different social classes of the community—the upper-income bettors had access to credit bookmakers, the poorer did not—and to do something to restore some respect for the law. Now, with less than 5 years of experience, there is ample reason to conclude that these aims have hardly been realized. Instead, there have been an increase in gambling turnover of at least 400 percent, with the lowest income areas particularly affected; juvenile indoctrination into gambling as an acceptable form of entertainment; a great increase in the number of bettors and a coincidental rise in the volume of bad debts and the di-

vorce rate. Throughout Great Britain there are today more than 16,000 betting shops legalized with the owners paying taxes on the volume of wagering and taxes on income.

The accepted propriety of gambling—by implication on anything—has led to an extensive spread of gaming clubs where roulette, dice, one-armed bandits, cards, and other gambling opportunities are provided. We have of late seen advertisements in color in this country stating that Americans, are, of course, welcome to those clubs; and these are a reflection of how even a conservative society can alter one facet of its character, perhaps without conscious realization of the fact, over a short span of years.

There is pure horror in this situation. Its frightening aspects are skillfully described in a book only recently published, "Gambler's Money: The New Force in American Life," by Wallace Turner, Pulitzer Prize winning reporter on the New York Times. The author applies this description to one of our own garish cities:

This is the strangest city in America. It is also the origin of an infectious immorality that rides out of the desert on a golden flood of gambling wealth to spread its peculiar brand of ethics across the Nation.

Concerned for our social fabric, Mr. Turner concludes:

When gamblers are given a foothold in legality, they rapidly expand it into a permanent bridgehead from which they branch out in all directions. * * * At the very least, the gamblers must be contained. They must never be given the feeling that the general morality has been dragged down to their level. For if they do, they'll move a level lower and tug down on the rest of us from there.

It is argued now in New York that off-track betting will decrease bookmaking and ease the police burden, in addition to producing revenue variously estimated in a range from $10 million to $215 million for New York City. All of these contentions are patently unrealistic. Mr. Milton R. Wessel, an acknowledged expert on organized crime and law enforcement, who was chief Federal prosecutor of the 1959 Apalachin syndicate trial, ably covered aspects of the proposal in an article entitled, "Legalized Gambling—The Dreams and the Realities," published in the January 18, 1965, edition of the Nation magazine and reprinted in an excerpted version in the New York Herald Tribune of January 21, 1965.

Mr. Wessel states:

The New York State Commission of Investigation, in a sweeping series of raids during the fall of 1959, seized the actual account books of underworld gambling operations and so was able to pinpoint the sources of gambling cash. A resulting study showed the following: (1) baseball gambling represents 50 percent more money than horserace betting; (2) football betting is one-third larger than horseracing; (3) even basketball represents nearly as large a betting handle as do the horses. In addition, there is an enormous play on the numbers (policy) and a smaller, but substantial, play on boxing and hockey.

No bookie in the city of New York is going to close up shop just because legalized off-track betting (granting all the claims of its advocates) has deprived him of about one-seventh of his profits.

The fantasy becomes even more absurd when one examines in detail the proposals of the New York plan.

As if to confirm Mr. Wessel's conclusion—from actual statistics—lone in advance, the New York Times, of October 1, 1963, in an article by Charles Grutzner, exploring the effect of activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the local scene at that time, stated:

About the only thing that is not worrying the bookmakers is * * * State legislation to permit municipal horse parlors with legal off-track betting. The bookmakers believe that, instead of being put out of business by such competition, they would bet extra business.

The surviving bookmakers are not running too fast to pause for a horselaugh if you ask whether legalize off-track betting parlors operated by the city would put them out of business.

"If anything can help this sick business back into prosperity it would be a municipal horse room in every neighborhood," said one.

"In Britain off-track betting has quadrupled since they legalized bookmaking 2 years ago.

"Once betting on the races is made legal and respectable every other housewife will run to the nearest horse parlor to risk a couple of bucks. She'll soon find out that the illegal book will take her parlays, back-to-back bets and markers (play on credit) and carry her winnings to her. She won't have these privileges at a legal horse room. So, with a woman's experience in shopping, she'll take the bargain and never mind whether it's legal."

This bookmaker, whose views were shared by a majority of those interviewed, said legal horse parlors would become magnets for illegal bookmakers to operate in the vicinity.

The bigtime bookmakers—and there still are several—could not care less. Three-fourths of their business now is on sports games. And their big horseplayers are business executives or racketeers who want instant service by telephone. They envision no serious competition from a legal horse parlor where the bet must be made in person.

The real victim of legalized off-track betting would be the poorer classes. In effect, this was clearly indicated as an incidental result of a survey financed by Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., preparatory to its televising of a study in depth on off-track betting. The survery, dated November 1963, was undertaken by International Research Associates, Inc., and among its findings there were several which were particularly indicative: First, one out of four people who are currently not racetrack goers find the idea of a city-operated station appealing and think it would encourage them to bet.

Second. Puerto Rican men are significantly more likely than other New York men to say that they would use the city-operated off-track betting stations.

Third. Negro men are more likely than others to say they would bet almost daily; and

Fourth. Seventeen percent of New York's female population say that they will bet if the centers are provided by the city.

The implications are obvious for all to see. The technical problems involved, including a high cost of operation, appear to be matters significant only to the State of New York, which at present derives approximately $135 million directly from wagering at racetracks within the State. But surface appearances are rejected by responsible businessmen among my constituents who, more than depending upon a sense of foreboding, question the preachments and practices which an off-track betting law would set in motion.

Is it not devious for a Government to encourage widespread gambling, figuratively in every neighborhood, rather than to offer honorable solution of its fiscal problems by furthering a sense of civic responsibility? Is it not fiscally unsound to spend $1 in order to reap $2 in taxation when the present cost in New York State is one-fiftieth of that cost? Is it not unwise conditioning of a people to develop what has aptly been termed the "something-for-nothing syndrome"?

We live in an era of rapidly growing national economy, when the Nation is dedicating itself to an unlimited war on poverty and to the maintenance of its dignity and improvement of its image and its prestige. We must continue to strengthen all our safegards and to oppose all threats to those goals. It is with that awareness I seek to alert this Congress at this time.

Someday soon, perhaps sooner than we now realize, it may be necessary for this House of Representatives to demonstrate its serious concern.

Humanitarian Work of New Jersey Rotarians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the great humanitarian service being done by members of the Rotary Clubs in seven counties of New Jersey. The Rotary Club of Paterson, N.J., is very active in this great work.

These Rotary Clubs are soliciting medical and dental equipment as well as medical and dental textbooks to be sent to Rotary Clubs in India for distribution.

This material will ultimately be sent to an area which is principally rural in nature and contains approximately 130 million people. Although we have 1 physician for every 700 people in the United States, there is only 1 physician for every 5,000 people in this area in India.

The shortage of hospital beds in this area of India is even more shocking, and as a result disease and misery are rampant.

Dentists are practically nonexistent, there being only 1 for each 58,000 people, and the few dentists available there greatly need equipment.

I am proud that the Rotary Club of Paterson shows sufficient interest and concern to participate in this project, and I wish them success as well as the great satisfaction which comes from service.

Religious Bodies Unite for Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, today testimony on voting rights legislation was presented to the Committee on the Judiciary by Father John Cronin, assistant director of the Department of Social Action of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Seated with the distinguished clergyman at the witness table were the equally distinugished clergymen, Rabbi Richard Hersch, of the Synagogue Council of America; Dr. Robert W. Spike and Dr. J. Oscar Lee, executive director and associate executive director of the Commission on Religion and Race of the National Council of Churches. The denominations and organizations which endorsed the statement is so broad as to represent most of the religious groups and the overwhelming majority of Americans. The testimony represents the conscience of the Nation and I want to bring its text to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, today more than ever I am proud to be a religious man and associate myself with the views expressed in the statement which follows:

TESTIMONY ON VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION

(Presented to Committee on Judiciary, House of Representatives, by Commission on Religion and Race, National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, social action department, National Catholic Welfare Conference Social Action Commission, Synagogue Council of America, March 25, 1965)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Father John Cronin, assistant director of the Department of Social Action of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Accompanying me are Rabbi Richard Hirsch, of the Synagogue Council of America and Dr. Robert W. Spike and Dr. J. Oscar Lee, executive director and associate executive director of the Commission on Religion and Race of the National Council of Churches.

We come before you as spokesmen for the racial action and social action departments of the National Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the Synagogue Council of America.

Twenty months ago we, representatives of religious groups in the United States, came before Congress to petition with one voice for racial justice. At that time we asserted that, "The right to vote is a human right which is guaranteed by the basic law of the land. * * * Those human rights which men look to government to protect are called civil rights. The churches and the synagogues, indeed our free society as a whole, look to the State to incorporate these rights into its legal system and to insure their observance in practice."

We come before you today because the conscience of the Nation has again been stirred, in an unprecendented way, by the wanton denial of a basic American right—the right to vote. Men of good will everywhere have been shocked by the naked and cynical use of violence to deny that right. In the past months, hundreds of ministers, rabbis, priests, and nuns accompanied by thousands of lay people, have responded to the call of conscience by identifying themselves with those Americans who are deprived of their rights on the basis of race or color. By their presence, they have offered their spiritual support, prayers and pastoral care in many communities where men have endeavored unsuccessfully to register and to vote. We know by firsthand experience, that in many communities, men not only risk job and economic security, but life itself when the attempt is made by Negroes to register and to vote.

Now is the time to act. As religious bodies, we believe it imperative that the Congress respond to the moral indignation of the Nation by the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. This legislation will enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and will effectively supplement the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964.

We support the proposition that "No voting qualification or procedure shall be imposed or applied to deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race or color." Therefore, we urge that the formula prescribing the geographical areas to be covered, be broad enough to apply to all areas in which persons attempting to register and to vote experience difficulty because of race or color.

We believe that any provision that would unnecessarily delay and complicate the prompt registration of citizens is intolerable. Once the need for Federal examiners has been established, we wish to stress the necessity for making access to their services available immediately.

Congress should do everything in its power to prevent the frustration of the purpose of the bill through intimidation or economic coercion. Therefore, we urge that the penalties provided in section 7 be extended to cover every type of intimidation and coercion which are employed to deny persons the opportunity to register as well as to vote.

Another abridgement of human rights is the poll tax which historically has been and is now being applied to deprive persons of the right to vote because of race or color. We recommend strongly that the proposed legislation eliminate the poll tax as a prerequisite to registration or voting.

These observations flow from our concern to condemn clearly and unequivocally the injustice of voting discrimination and to call for a remedy that is both prompt and completely effective. They are a reaffirmation of position previously taken by our organizations.

On February 23, 1961, the general board of the National Council of Churches declared: "The denial of the right to vote contradicts the professed ideals and undermines the democratic heritage upon which this Nation was founded. It is a violation of justice that prevents the exercise of responsible citizenship which is necessary for the creation of the good society."

The Catholic Bishops of the United States on August 25, 1963, stated that, "No Catholic with a good Christian conscience can fail to recognize the rights of all citizens to vote."

The Synagogue Council of America has stated that, "The right to vote and participate in the affairs of government is necessary both to the establishment of the dignity of man and the strengthening of democratic life."

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is our task as religious leaders to help articulate the conscience of America. Good and dedicated men have died in recent months because they have sought to insure a right deeply rooted in our concept of human dignity and basic democracy. As religious men, they respected and honored the sacred dignity of every man. As loyal Americans, they strove to relive the spirit of Lexington and Concord, when the embattled colonists revolted from the mother country in order to insure the right of self-government.

The eyes of the entire world have been focused on recent events in our Nation. Men in every continent are waiting to see if, in fact, we will live up to the ideals we so freely profess. It is not too much to say that the honor of America lies in the hands of this Congress. We know that you will not fail this sacred trust.

APPENDIX

TESTIMONY TO JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, MARCH 25, 1965

The following denominations and religious organizations join in presenting this statement:

The Central Conference of American Rabbis.

The Rabbinical Assembly of America.

The Rabbinical Council of America.

The Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

The Union of Orthdox Jewish Congregations.

The United Synagogue of America.

The Unitarian Universalist Association.

The National Council of Catholic Men.

The National Council of Catholic Women.

The National Council of Catholic Youth.

The National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice.

National Catholic Social Action Conference.

National Federation of Catholic College Students.

Newman Club Federation.

The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church.

The Church of the Brethren.

The Episcopal Church, Department of Christian Social Relations.

The International Convention of Christian Churches, Coordinating Committee on Moral and Civil Rights.

Lutheran Church in America, Board of Social Ministries.

United Church of Christ.

United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 144th anniversary of the independence of Greece. In their homeland and in many nations which, like ourselves, have received immigrants from Greece, this 144th anniversary is being celebrated today. We are proud to honor this anniversary, for there are no more independent people or greater lovers of freedom than the people of Greece.

I think that we should take the time to reflect upon the courageous efforts of the Greek patriots who fought against overwhelming odds to gain their independence.

Although dominated for centuries by Ottoman rulers, the freedom-loving people of Greece never lost sight of the goal they have set for themselves and kept the hope that some day they might free themselves from oppression.

The first great step of the valiant fight for freedom by the Greek people from Ottoman rule was taken on March 25, 1821, when Bishop Germanos of Patras raised the flag of liberty of the Church of Aghia Laura. This revolutionary banner was blessed and the call to battle issued. Greeks by the thousands answered the call and the long campaign for independence began.

The Greek fighters were inspired by the successful revolution which occurred in America only a few years before and which brought about the existence of our great Nation. The example of the American Revolution had planted the seed of freedom which had taken deep root among the other freedom-loving nations of the world.

The efforts of those courageous Greeks impressed the freedom-loving people of the United States. The youth of America at that time was keenly interested in the struggle for human freedom which it saw going on in Greece. Some young men volunteered to serve in the Greek armed forces, with the realization that this cradle of Western civilization—the Greek nation—must not remain enslaved. Among those Americans who distinguished themselves in this battle for freedom were such well-known personages as Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, Capt. Jonathon Peckham Miller, Gen. George Jarvis, and a host of others.

This country took a firm stand in favor of the Greek patriots, and America's popular feeling was officially reflected in the 1822 message to Congress made by President James Monroe which set down the famous Monroe Doctrine. In promulgating this doctrine, he stated:

> A strong hope has been entertained, founded on the heroic struggle of the Greeks, that they would succeed in their contest and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth. It is believed that the whole civilized world takes a deep interest in their welfare * * * their cause and their name have protected them from dangers which might, ere this, have overwhelmed any other people * * * there is good cause to believe that their enemy has lost forever all domination of them; that Greece will become an independent nation. That she may obtain that rank is the object of our most ardent wishes.

The determination of the Greek people to be free and independent was not to be denied. With the aid of sympathetic volunteers from all over the world, the justice of the Greek cause prevailed and the yoke of Ottoman rule was shaken off and complete independence came to Greece in 1832.

America owes much to Greece, not only for her great contributions to culture and education, but also for the important role that the Greeks have played as a bulwark against communism and Communist aggression in the eastern Mediterranean, as a member of the NATO alliance. The Greek Government has granted the United States the use of its airfields and naval facilities and the Greek Army is supplied with modern arms and equipment under the NATO agreements. Thus, the role of the Greek nation in the free world is a vital and significant one.

Persons of Greek descent may well be proud of their cultural and political heritage with their contributions to government. The contributions of Greece to the cause of human liberty have been great and lasting.

Our commemorating of the Greek Independence Day serves as a reconfirmation of our devotion to democratic principles and of our faith that the idea which came into being a thousand years ago in Greece will surely win over the powers of darkness which threaten the world today.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district I have many good friends who are Americans of Greek extraction. Many of them are Greek immigrants who came to America because America loomed great in their minds as the promised land. They have grown with America and have become leaders in business, the professions, and in the civic and public life of our community. I join with them in honoring Greek Independence Day and assure them of continued support for their historic efforts to strengthen the structure of their social and economic life.

I feel sure that the coming years will enable the people of Greece to enjoy continued freedom and economic well-being, which they so richly deserve.

I salute the gallant Greek nation with these words, "Zito Hállas." Long live Greece.

Newspapers, 1965: When Preparation Meets Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today a recent talk by Mr. Otto A. Silha, vice president and business manager of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, before the Northwest Mechanical Conference, March 14, 1965.

I believe that this talk points out the vital role that newspapers play in the lives of all of us:

NEWSPAPERS, 1965: WHEN PREPARATION MEETS OPPORTUNITY

(Talk by Otto A. Silha, vice president and business manger, Minneapolis Star and Tribune; Northwest Mechanical Conference, Minneapolis, March 14, 1965)

First, let me say that I think the newspaper business is a stable growth industry, much like banks and insurance companies, and that the overall prospects ahead are bright indeed.

In a recent report of the U.S. Department of Labor, the printing and publishing industry is 1 of 14 growth industries identified for rising employment. As the volume of printed materials continues to rise, employment in the industry is expected to increase moderately but steadily.

Evidence of the growth of the daily newspaper business is overwhelming, if the record is simply examined:

First, today there are actually more newspapers published in the United States than at the end of World War II. In 1945 there were 1,749 dailies in the United States. Today there are 1,754.

2. Newsprint consumption in the United States in 1964 reached a new all-time high of 8,070,000 tons. Pounds of newsprint consumed per household have steadily increased from 265 tons in 1953 to 288 tons in 1964. A new analysis of newsprint trends in the United States prepared for ANPA by Dr. Jon G. Udell of the University of Wisconsin shows that newsprint consumption will grow by an estimated 3.1 percent in 1965 to a total consumption of 8,250,000 tons.

3. Newspaper employment has increased 30 percent since the end of World War II, climbing from 248,500 to 324,100, according to the U.S. Department of Labor.

4. Newspaper publishers for the past 5 years have spent more than $100 million each year for plant expansion and modernization. This rate of expenditure has been steady each year, indicating a consistent pattern of investment in new plants by newspaper publishers. This is a tangible demonstration of publishers' confidence in the future.

5. Newspaper circulation has climbed from 48,384,188 to 60,145,582 in 1964, an increase of 24.3 percent since 1945. Circulation per 1,000 population has stayed remarkably stable over many years: In 1940, 312 newspapers per 1,000; in 1963, 312 newspapers per 1,000. In other words circulation is keeping pace with increases in population.

6. Newspaper circulation and advertising sales have shown consistent increases since the end of World War II. The U.S. gross national product has increased about 5.9 percent per annum since 1947. But total newspaper sales have increased 6.69 percent per annum since 1947, from $2.1 to $5.8 billion in 1963. In total advertising, newspapers still lead all other media. Figures for 1964 show that total newspaper advertising went over the $4 billion mark.

But the most significant feature of 1964 advertising figures is the fact that national advertising, for the first time in about 10 years, scored a greater gain than total advertising expenditures for all media. To look at recent years, for example in 1962, there was a 4 percent gain for all media, newspapers gained 1.6 percent and national advertising in newspapers declined 2.6 percent. In 1963 all media gained 5.9 percent, newspapers gained 3.3 percent and national newspaper advertising declined 2.1 percent. But in 1964, very significantly, while overall advertising expenditures increased 6.7 percent, newspapers increased 7 percent—a greater gain than that of the average of all advertising media—and, most significantly, national newspaper advertising gained 7.6 percent over the previous year.

Mainly because of the buying of television time by advertisers, newspapers have had a whole decade of downward trend in the size of the national advertising pie going to newspapers. That downward trend has been halted and this is very good news.

I think one of the reasons for the relatively better showing by newspapers in 1964 is the growing realization on the time of advertising buyers that in television, which has been the booming medium of the last 10 years, approximately one-third of the total viewers in the United States are doing two-thirds of all the viewing. Recent research studies have validated this fact and you can imagine how important it is when advertisers recognize that their rating figures—their bible—are based upon an excess of viewing by the same people. I'm willing to venture a guess on a possible future research finding and that is that this one-third of the viewers who do

two-thirds of the viewing only do about one-sixth of the dollar spending in our country.

I am confident that further research work and further examination of the basic facts of life in the communications-advertising world today bodes well for newspapers.

Not so incidentally, we had unique and tangible evidence of new advertiser interest in newspapers a few weeks ago when two media vice presidents of Young & Rubicam flew out from New York to spend 2 days conducting an in-depth study of the Minneapolis Star and Minneapolis Tribune. They came at their own suggestion, not ours, and they worked 14-hour days to see everything they felt significant and to discuss details of newspaper operations. They attended a regular morning conference of the editorial department, a retail department staff meeting, a circulation sales meeting held in Moorhead; they went into our production departments in great detail.

All I can say, from hearing their own personal reactions, is that they flew back to New York greatly impressed with the vitality of a newspaper and with the complexity of its operations and with a feeling of a newspaper's concern for getting the job done in the best interests of the advertiser and the reader. There is no substitute for this kind of personal, on-the-scene observation of the inner workings of a newspaper organization and I hope other leading advertising men will emulate the initiative of Dick Anderson and Henry Sparks of Young & Rubicam. I am perfectly convinced that they are much better operators for the clients of Young & Rubicam in the purchase of all advertising, because of their greater knowledge of the intricacies, the judgment calls, and the plain hard work which go into producing a daily newspaper.

I have made at least indirect reference to competition. Looking at an analysis of "Competition in the Daily Newspaper Business" prepared for ANPA by Prof. Jesse Markham of Princeton University, we find this statement:

"One of the most important developments of the 20th century is the rapid growth and spectacular change of the information disseminating business.

"Only four decades ago the public was completely dependent upon the printed media for news * * * by 1950, 97 out of every 100 U.S. families had at least 1 radio receiving set. By 1960, 90 out of every 100 families had at least 1 television set."

In the face of that sort of rising competition, the kind of circulation gains that newspapers have posted is indeed remarkable and indicative. After all, what better proof is there of performance than the widespread public acceptance of the newspaper as measured by its circulation?

Now what makes newspapers better than the other news media? Or stated another way, what are the communication needs of society which other media are not as well equipped to meet?

I think that Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, answered these vital questions very well last October in an address at the 200th anniversary dinner of the Hartford Courant. I quote President Brewster:

"While the spoken word can travel faster, you can't take it home in your hand. You can't take it along easily in trains or planes; and it can't be picked up in a barbershop. It doesn't keep well for second thought, let alone reflection. Only the written word can be absorbed wholly at the convenience of the reader. The newspaper fits the reader's program, while the listener must fit the broadcaster's program."

President Brewster went on to state that the newspaper alone has a chance to absorb the reader, to create the mood with the power of the word. He called for live reporting and creative writing on newspapers to take advantage of their inherent opportunities.

He concluded by pointing to two other comparative advantages of the daily press. First he pointed to the power of disclosure, the patient digging beneath the surface to expose facts even if they disturb some of the "best people." Next, there is spokesmanship, he said.

"Newspapers are the only daily news medium substantially free of the restraints of dependence upon someone else's private or political power." Dr. Brewster pointed out that newspaper advertisers neither sponsor columnists nor are identified with editorials.

You know, someone has defined luck as what happens when preparation meets opportunity. I'm going to try to demonstrate for you tonight that newspapers have been working hard at the job of preparing for the future and that 1965 is a year when many opportunities are going to present themselves for newspapers to move ahead.

Let me first say a few words about the ANPA Research Institute. I have had the opportunity and privilege of being associated with this effort since 1958 and I have never been more sure than I am today that your industry's research program is on the right track.

Three years ago this spring the board of directors of the ANPA, in an effort to step up the intensity of our research activities, appointed a scientific advisory committee. Two members of that committee who are still serving all of us are Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, dean of the institute of technology at our own University of Minnesota, who serves as chairman, and Dr. John Pierce, executive director for research of Bell Telephone Laboratories, and not so incidentally, the principal scientist on the whole Telstar project.

After the untimely death of Trevor Gardner, the former Assistant Secretary of Air for Research and Development who deserves the everlasting credit of his country for his major role in producing the Atlas missile, the third member of the committee is now Dr. Carl Overhage of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, one of the world's leading authorities on information storage and retrieval.

These eminent scientists are serving all of us in the newspaper business, principally as a labor of love, because they think newspapers are important and because they feel that they may be useful in helping to keep us abreast of the technology of our times. I wish I had more time this evening to tell you about these men because each of them is most unusual, most perceptive, and most dedicated to improving the communication of ideas to mankind.

The ANPA Research Center at Easton, Pa., has a new research director, Donald Dissly, who was formerly research director at the Louisville Courier-Journal and Times. Mr. Dissly has been instrumental in redirecting our program at Easton toward a basic systems approach. His current major effort, paring a Di/An computer and an electron, may result in some of the most significant findings in graphic arts research history.

You are all familiar with the work of Bill Rinehart in the production department of the research institute and I need not elaborate on that tonight. But I do want you to know that your institute, under these two capable men—Don Dissly and Bill Rinehart—and with the overall administrative direction of Stanford Smith, seems to be on the right track toward the kind of definitive steps which will improve the quality of newspapers through the development of new processes or products, which will reduce the time between the news event and reader, and which will reduce production costs.

I don't mean to stand here tonight and tell you that there is nothing but a collection of rainbows and rosy clouds on the newspaper horizon. We do have some storm signals.

One of them is the labor situation among the New York City newspapers. There contracts expire on March 30, and once again, the representatives of unions and managements on the two sides of that negotiations table in New York seem headed on a collision course. You'll recall the last New York strike in the winter of 1962 which proved to be a disaster not only for New York newspapers and their employees, but for newspapers everywhere. Since the majority of major advertising decisions today are made in New York, it is axiomatic that those advertising decisionmakers we've talked about earlier are greatly influenced in their opinions of newspapers by what they experience in their close contacts with their own local newspaper institutions.

I think we can only hope here tonight that the New York negotiations are concluded without another strike.

One issue which has been overriding in the New York negotiations, and in many others, is that of automation. Unfortunately, automation has become a "scare" word in the newspaper business and in other industries and this has been needlessly so. Actually the effect of automation on employment in the United States has been wildly and irresponsibly exaggerated.

Four or five years ago social scientists and politicians were talking about automation and computers and cybernation reducing the working force by 20,000 to 30,000 jobs every week. The unemployment rate was going to hit 10 percent in 1965. As you know, total unemployment is actually down to less than 5 percent and latest reports from the Labor Department disclose that manufacturing employment has again increased for the third straight year.

These general statistics also apply basically to the newspaper business. Certain technological advances have occurred and obviously alert publishers are putting them into use in their newspaper plants, but these moves are just not being made with the labor-slashing impact which the ivory tower prophets of doom spoke of so glibly in the recent past. Some jobs are eliminated, productivity increases are being made, but attrition and retraining programs have more than cushioned the blow.

Recent newspaper and magazine articles have carried titles like "The Real News About Automation," "Automation is Not the Villain," and "Automation: A Job Creator, Not a Job Destroyer," and I hope that American labor leaders and leaders among the newspaper unions are reading them and thus will set aside once and for all the use of automation as a "fear" propaganda word.

I think I should mention one newspaper labor leader who has done this—Joe Bailey, Vice President of the International Typographical Union, in a recent article in the Typographical Journal, pointed out that the computer should not be regarded as a "Frankenstein monster" by newspaper unions.

In closing, I want to tell you about a luncheon which will be held next month in New York City. In my opinion it has tremendous importance for the newspaper business—your business—and for our understanding of it. Let me set the scene. The date is Wednesday, April 21, the place is the grand ballroom of the Waldorf Astoria Hotel where Presidents and Prime Ministers and Kings and other world leaders are often at the head table. At the climax of that luncheon next month a newspaper publisher will stand to receive the American Newspaper Publishers Association World Press Achievement Award. The spotlight will be on him. The Secretary General of the United Nations will have already expressed his thoughts regarding the function of the press in the world and now the spotlight is on one man—a newspaper publisher. He will not be an American. (American and Canadian newspapers are excluded in the competition.) His newspaper is a small one in our terms of reference—small in circula-

tion, small in advertising volume, small in number of employees. And this man will come from one of the developing nations of the world, not from a nation rich in natural and material resources like ours.

Why then, will this man stand in the spotlight on April 21, 1965? He will stand there because he and his newspaper will have demonstrated, in his land far away, that a newspaper can be one of the most important elements in developing a modern society in the world as we know it today. His newspaper will have won the ANPA World Press Achievement Award from among 36 newspapers that were entered in this competition from 24 different countries on 5 continents. This newspaper will have demonstrated clearly and understandably how it has played a major role in the political development, economic development, social and cultural development of a community and a nation. These are things which we take for granted here in our country, here in our business where you and I live.

I can tell you tonight that the man who will rise to receive the award and the applause in that Waldorf Astoria spotlight one noon next month is Cetin Remzi Yuregir, publisher of the Yeni Adana of Adana, Turkey. Adana is located 450 miles southeast of Istanbul on the Mediterranean coast.

The Yeni Adana, with circulation of just 5,000, is the largest newspaper in the 230,000-population city of Adana. Since the paper was founded in 1918 by a young schoolteacher, it has published continuously, except for one 17-day period in 1960 when it was closed down by the government then in power.

These have not been easy years for a newspaper in a developing nation. Its founder, Cetin's father, was sentenced to death by French occupation authorities and he fled to a small mountain village where he continued to publish in an old freight car on crude equipment. He sometimes used wrapping paper for newsprint and smuggled his newspapers into the occupied city of Adana. In its 47-year history this newspaper has seen economic and legal sanctions; it has changed from a partisan organ to an independent newspaper; it had its newsprint cut off, its publication suspended until a coup d'etat and a new government allowed it to resume publication.

You're probably wondering about the Yeni Adana's comparatively small ratio of circulation to population (5,000 to 230,000). The main reason is the low literacy rate in the area, estimated at 25 percent by specialists in Turkish affairs. The newspaper's impact on the community is widened, however, by oral reading in homes and coffee houses. As an example of its public service, Yeni Adana taught its readers the phonetic alphabet of Latin characters when Turkey converted from Arabic characters in 1928. Always this newspaper's editorials have boldly fought for reform and improvement.

And that's why you and I—each of us here in this room—should have great interest in the event which will take place next month at the Waldorf. I am confident that many Americans and many people all over the world will have a better understanding of newspapers and their primary role in everyday life as a result of the attention which this ANPA World Press Achievement Award will receive. Cetin Yuregir of the Yeni Adana, Adana, Turkey, will visit Washington, the White House, and he will tour several major cities of the United States before he returns to his native land to continue his deeply important job of producing a newspaper which is contributing mightly to development of a nation and a people.

And I am hopeful that many U.S. publishers will seize the opportunity afforded by the World Press Achievement Award and the story of Cetin Yuregir and his father's underground newspaper to reexamine their own newspaper's performance. Are we serving our public to the fullest as their reporters, their sentinels in the halls of government, the fourth estate? Are we doing our best? Are we as newspaper publishers living up to the trust placed upon us by our Founding Fathers in the inspired words of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights?

Yes, recognition of Cetin Yuregir can mean a great deal for newspapers and newspapermen and women.

I have spent some time on this preview tonight because it has such meaning for all of us. We take our newspapers, our jobs, our rights, and freedoms in publishing, for granted. I hope you will go back to your job as a newspaperman tomorrow morning with your head just a little bit higher. Yours is a proud calling. I hope each of you really believes something which I try to repeat whenever I have the opportunity, and that is that newspapers do make a big difference in people's lives every day.

America's Shortcomings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column written by my good friend Rabbi Harry Halpern, spiritual leader of the East Midwood Jewish Center in Brooklyn.

The column appeared in the East Midwood bulletin of March 12, 1965. In it Rabbi Halpern gives some of the reasons why we all should be proud to be Americans.

The article follows:

FROM WHERE I STAND

Who knows better the shortcomings and defects in the character of children than their own parents? We recognize their failings but we do not cease to love them. In an attempt to keep children from doing something of which we disapprove, parents sometimes say, "If you do this, I will not love you." This, of course, is sheer nonsense.

As an American I know all the criticisms which one can direct against our country. Race hatred, religious prejudice, political corruption, violent crime and economic strife, plus the accusation of imperialism from abroad—all of these mar the beautiful picture of a high-minded, benevolent democracy. But with all its shortcomings I still have reason to glory in the fact that I am an American.

I am proud to be an American because in spite of our differences with Soviet Russia, no mob has attacked the Russian Embassy, nor defaced its building. The police of Washington or of any city in our country which houses a consulate, are prepared to repel attacks upon the life and property of foreign legatees.

I am proud to be an American because we have never destroyed libraries of other nations, no matter how much we differed from them ideologically. Our respect for learning is more important to us than any political alinement.

I am proud to be an American because in spite of our strong position, militarily and economically, we have never told the leaders of any nation to "jump into the lake," (and we have no shortage of lakes).

I am proud to be an American because my country always honors its debts, although it may not always endorse the international actions which created the debt.

I am proud to be an American because this country has spent and is spending millions to alleviate want in underdeveloped lands, despite the fact that we are rewarded by gratuitous insults nad unfounded accusations against our integrity.

I am proud to be an American because, as I read of the suppression of free speech abroad, of the restrictions on the practice of religion, of the walls which are erected to keep people apart, I find that there is no other form of government for which I would like to trade my own.

My country has faults, it falls short of realizing its high ideals but despite the recognition of these things, I still find good reason to love America.

AFL–CIO Statement on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, at the recent meeting of the AFL–CIO Executive Council at Bal Harbour, Fla., on March 1, 1965, they issued a provocative statement on poverty which I feel should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the interest and information of my colleagues. The article follows:

STATEMENT ON POVERTY

(By the AFL–CIO Executive Council)

When President Johnson pledged an "unconditional war on poverty" a year ago, the AFL–CIO Executive Council pledged labor's unconditional support. We pointed out that "no nation in the history of the world has a greater capability of lifting all of its people above the level of want. The test we now face is our will to do it."

According to the poverty yardstick used by the President, about 35 million Americans are impoverished. Another count by the Social Security Administration indicates that 50 million of our fellow citizens of whom 22 million are children are in poverty or at its fringes. By any realistic standard, it can be said that from the fifth to a fourth of all Americans are still in want.

The persistence of poverty in the United States is the result of many complex causes and no single approach to the problem will provide the cure. Vitally important initial measures recently have been approved by the Congress, particularly with the passage of the Economic Opportunity and Civil Rights Acts. Other antipoverty proposals of President Johnson are now before the Congress. Still others—essential to success—must be adopted.

The diversity of needed measures, if the war against want is to be won, becomes apparent when the many causes of poverty are forthrightly recognized.

Studies reveal that over half of our neediest families are headed by a person who is a member of the labor force—employed or unemployed. In many cases he is jobless because of displacement due to automation, discrimination, lack of adequate skill or simply because work is not available. In many other cases, the family head is employed, but compelled to work only part time because of the lack of a full-time job.

However, the shocking fact is that in most cases, the heads of poor families who are in the labor force actually are employed at

full-time jobs. The Government's records show that approximately 25 percent of all impoverished families in America are headed by a person working full time, year round, for 50 or more weeks. These full-time working poor—with substandard wages and working conditions—represent the most shameful aspect of American poverty.

To effectively aid the more than half of our poor families headed by a person in the labor force, education and job training and the end of discrimination—vital as they are—will not be enough. For them and for the children of all poor families, the basic need is enough jobs, at decent wages, for all people who are willing and able to work.

Job-creating measures to end the persistently high rates of unemployment and underemployment must be vigorously pursued.

The answer for the 2 million families, headed by a regularly employed worker, who live in poverty is the minimum wage law improvements we seek—both the $2 minimum and increased coverage.

Nearly half of America's impoverished families are headed by persons who are not in the labor force at all. And their family incomes, from whatever source, are just too low to provide the bare necessities of life. They include families that have been broken by death, divorce, or desertion. They include the aged. And they include impoverished families with male heads of working age, who are disabled by illness or accident.

No war against want can succeed without adequate family income protection for those who cannot be self-supporting, even under conditions of full employment. It was precisely to meet the income-maintenance needs of these people—to keep them from impoverishment—that the concept of social security against the worst hazards of modern life was conceived. Unfortunately, expectations that our social insurance programs would adequately meet this need have not been realized.

Clearly, social security benefits for retirees, survivors, and the disabled—which are too low to provide the minimum necessities of life—must be increased. A hospital insurance program for the aged, under social security principles, must be adopted immediately. The benefit and coverage levels of all State social insurance and welfare programs must be brought up to date. Adequate Federal standards are needed to upgrade the unemployment insurance system and the archaic workmen's compensation laws of the States. Insurance for the families of breadwinners separated from payrolls by illness—now limited to four States and the railroads—must be improved and extended nationally.

What is more, as part of an all-out war against want, far more must be done to improve the housing and education of the poor, to refashion Federal farm programs so that the benefits are enjoyed by those most in need, and to reshape tax policies—Federal, State, and local—to reduce the burdens imposed now on those who are most impoverished. It is a sad irony that the Federal Government collects $100 million in income taxes and $200 million in excise taxes from the impoverished, while it engages in a war against poverty.

A hopeful aspect of the antipoverty effort, already adopted by the Congress, is the Economic Opportunity Act. With its concentration on education, job training, and counseling—and its emphasis on youth—this act is bringing leadership and resources to a task that is essential if an overall war against want is to be waged and won.

The AFL–CIO championed passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Now, we urge Congress to substantially expand the meager appropriation for this program.

We call on all affiliated organizations to become integral, active, and leading members of the antipoverty groups now being formed in hundreds of communities throughout the country. We urge all affiliated organizations to participate and give leadership in the development and operation of antipoverty projects.

These projects, under the Economic Opportunity Act, should provide the best possible assistance to the poor. It is also our view that on all work-related projects, the enrollees should receive no less than $1.25 an hour (the present Federal minimum wage) for each hour of work, that the work undertaken would not otherwise be done, and that no impairment of collective bargaining contracts or reduction of new hiring results.

Since its inception, the American labor movement has been striving to banish poverty from our midst—through trade union organization, effective collective bargaining, and legislative efforts. That is our historic objective.

We applaud the President for his leadership in the present national war against poverty. What is more, we are sure the President realizes that the Economic Opportunity Act—imaginative and vastly important though it is—cannot, by itself, wipe out poverty.

We are encouraged by the broad coalition of citizens from church, civic, and civil rights groups and representatives from labor, business, social welfare, and education, and others who have joined together in the formation of the citizens crusade against poverty.

The AFL–CIO pledges to continue to seek action on all of the many battlefronts on which an effective war against want must be waged. We urge the Congress and the American people to join us in this effort.

Gas (Nonlethal) in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, five of my colleagues in the House and I joined in a letter to the President of the United States protesting the use of nonlethal gas in Vietnam and asking for the immediate halt to this practice. We took this step because we believe that even the use of nonlethal gas is so abhorrent to the world that its use is contrary to United States policy in southeast Asia and will operate contrary to our best interests in that part of the world.

Yesterday, the New York Times and the Washington Post similarly called for an end to the use of gas in Vietnam pointing out that regardless of any military considerations the use of gas, even of a nonlethal variety, will bring the moral condemnation of nations all over the world.

James Reston also writing in the New York Times yesterday outlined similar considerations and expressed the view that we may have reversed a trend toward support for American policy in southeast Asia.

I make these editorials and Mr. Reston's article available to my colleagues by inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GAS (NONLETHAL) IN VIETNAM

The United States, in steady escalation of the Vietnamese conflict, is now revealed to have employed a nonlethal gas. It is possible to argue, as American military and civilian spokesmen do, that military objectives can be achieved with fewer casualties by using a gas that does not kill.

This argument overlooks one vital factor; and it displays, at the very least, a lack of imagination somewhere in the top echelons of the Armed Forces. People—ordinary people everywhere—have a strong psychological revulsion, if not horror, at the idea of any kind of poisonous gas, even a temporarily disabling type that only causes extreme discomfort including nausea and diarrhea when used against ordinarily healthy adults. But even this kind of gas can be fatal to the very young, the very old and those ill of heart and lung ailments.

In Vietnam, gas was supplied and sanctioned by white men against Asians. This is something that no Asian, Communist or not, will forget. No other country has employed such a weapon in recent warfare. If the United States believed that people everywhere would be logical and sensible and would understand that nonlethal gas constitutes really only another form of warfare and even a relatively humane one, someone has blundered grievously.

War, as Clausewitz said, "is only a part of political intercourse, therefore by no means an independent thing in itself." It is stupid to lay the United States open to a moral condemnation that is not confined to the Communist world.

The United States claims to be fighting in Vietnam for freedom, right, justice, and other moral principles, as well as against communism and for the security of the United States and the free world. By using a noxious gas—even of a nonlethal type—the Johnson administration is falling back toward the old axiom that all's fair in war. But this happens to be a war in which the moral stature of the United States is at least as vital as bullets, shells and bombs. Gas is a wretched means to achieve even the most valid ends.

BLACKENING OUR NAME

It is difficult to find out how much damage napalm and gas are doing the enemy but it is not hard to find out how much damage they are doing us. Our own Defense Establishment, every time it employs or permits the South Vietnamese to employ these weapons, is doing an injury to the good name of this country.

If these weapons were being employed with decisive effect, perhaps their use might be condoned as one of the necessities of a hard and brutal war, but in this situation there is not even the satisfaction of knowing that they produced impressive results. They have been employed just enough to bring down upon this country the rebuke of the civilized world. They have been utilized just enough to hold our country up to reproach. They have been resorted to just often enough to impose upon the U.S. Information Agency an impossible propaganda disadvantage.

The argument that the nontoxic gas is more merciful than antipersonnel weapons has some merit, but not much. The trouble is that although the gas may not be poison, the word is, and all the propaganda resources in the world cannot explain away its employment as an act of Christian charity and humanitarian mercy. The use of napalm against gun emplacements is debatable, but its employment against villages is indefensible and the difficulty of confining it to combat installations so great as to dictate that it be not used at all.

We hope that President Johnson will order the Defense Department to forgo the use of all gas and napalm in this war theater at once. The people of this country are pre-

pared for and equal to the hard measures that war dictates, when those measures are clearly inescapable and unavoidable in the prosecution of a military purpose. They will not be reconciled to the use of such weapons where alternate means of defense exist. If the war in South Vietnam can only be won by losing our good name, Americans who have patiently supported the struggle will waver in their purpose. Mr. President, let us stop all use of napalm and gas in South Vietnam at once.

WASHINGTON: JUST A LITTLE OLD "BENEVOLENT INCAPACITATOR"

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 23.—The Pentagon's main argument for using nauseous gas in Vietnam is that it is better in some cases to gas the Communists than to maim or kill them. The officers here even have a wonderful phrase to describe the new instruments of chemical warfare: "Benevolent incapacitators."

This, of course, was the defense for using poison gas in the First World War. It wasn't very "benevolent" and it often incapacitated a man for life, and it sent such a shudder through the world that even in so savage a conflict as the Second World War it wasn't used.

Secretary McNamara was careful to explain that he was not supplying "poison" gas to the South Vietnamese Army. He almost sounded as if he was doing the Communists a favor by treating them like rowdy race rioters in Rochester, but the thing is not quite as innocent as he made it sound.

WHAT NEXT?

The trouble with reverting to the use of any kind of gas in war is that it opens up so many other possibilities of chemical warfare. The use of gas on the battlefield has almost stopped in the last two generations, but the art of chemical warfare has not.

There is now a whole new arsenal of gases that not only nauseate, but stun and paralyze the enemy. The military correspondent of the Evening Star in Washington, Richard Fryklund, for example, recently reported on "the latest and best"—a gas called BZ by the U.S. Army.

He tells of recent tests of BZ at the Army's Chemical Warfare Proving Grounds at Dugway, Utah. Volunteer soldiers were submitted to the effects of BZ while they were executing simple battlefield operations.

"In one case," he reports, "a soldier on guard duty was gassed. He was approached by a strange soldier who said he did not know the password. The guard tried to remember what to do about it, couldn't, got tired of the whole problem and sat down and went to sleep."

Secretary McNamara emphasized that the only gas that was used in Vietnam was the same as the gas that can be purchased at a store. But the same argument made for nauseous gas could also be made for BZ or even for some of the paralyzing gases. After all, it is more "benevolent" to paralyze a man than to kill him with a machinegun.

Where do you draw the line on the McNamara argument? And even if you draw it at nauseous gas, how do you know what gas the enemy will use after you start this devilish business?

The national policy on the use of all chemical weapons has been that the United States would consider using them only if the enemy used them, but the Pentagon's reaction to the criticism of using nauseous gas was merely to express surprise that anybody would be disturbed.

Nobody concerned has even claimed that the use of the gas was effective. The military spokesman in Saigon said it proved of little value on the three occasions it was used. In two cases, according to United Press International in Saigon, it was discovered that no Reds were in the area. In a third, a few Communists may have been demoralized, but "there was a fair wind that day and the people were not very ill."

The main effect was merely to nauseate a lot of people all over the world with the thought that gas could be used merely on the authority of the South Vietnamese soldiers concerned.

One unfortunate aspect of the incident was that it occurred precisely at the moment when the United States was beginning to gain a little more understanding in the world for its policy in Vietnam.

Ever since the United States started bombing North Vietnam and dropping napalm fire bombs on Communist targets, there has been a considerable outcry for negotiations to end the war. President Johnson has insisted from the start, as he told 42 State Governors at the White House this week, that he would go anywhere at any time if he thought he could serve the cause of peace, but that there was simply no evidence that the Communists were interested in negotiating a settlement in Vietnam.

This view is now being confirmed by the principal foreign offices of the world. The British Foreign Secretary underscored the point at the White House today. He told the President that the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, had said in London a few days ago that it was useless to talk about negotiations.

REBUFFED ON TALKS

The French, who have been the principal agitators for a negotiated settlement, now concede that their explorations in Peiping and Hanoi have been rebuffed, and the Canadians report that their official on the International Control Commission in Vietnam was not even given the opportunity to discuss negotiations with the North Vietnamese Communists.

Accordingly, the propaganda was over, Vietnam was beginning to turn a little to the American side, when the gas incident was disclosed, incapacitating our own propagandists and not very benevolently either.

Conservation Retrenchment Would Endanger the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in this Nation's struggle from the depths of the great depression our Government entered a partnership with our farmers—a compact, if you please—to conserve and rehabilitate and rebuild America's greatest resource—the soil—which was washing, blowing, eroding, and wasting away because our farmers were too poor to forestall or to check this tragic loss to our Nation.

April 27, 1965, will mark the 30th anniversary of the enactment by the Congress of an historic piece of legislation, Public Law 46, which declared soil and water conservation to be a national policy and created the Soil Conservation Service to give leadership to such a program.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, this program has wrought miracles, to assure us today and the generations to come that the land will feed us and bless us, abundantly.

Our farmers embraced the conservation movement with amazing enthusiasm and eagerness. They have invested millions and billions of their own money, as their incomes would permit it, in works of soil and water improvement on their own farms. They have written for America a food insurance policy that will protect all Americans down through the years.

The money our Federal Government has expended on conservation, in cooperation with farmers, is the best investment this country has ever made.

In the light of all this, Mr. Speaker, it is a shocking development of our time that the administration now is proposing that the Government retreat, or withdraw, from its full participation and leadership in the conservation movement, and burden our farmers, who already are hard pressed, with larger costs for the protection of our most basic resources, a work which properly is the responsibility of all of us in towns and cities as well as upon our farms.

Mr. Speaker, I was a Member of the Congress, the 74th, which passed the historymaking Conservation Act, without a dissenting vote, 30 years ago.

The Soil Conservation Service began its work on a demonstration basis under the direction of that great North Carolina conservationist—the father of soil conservation in America—the late Hugh Bennett.

So favorably was this program received that by June 30, 1936, the Soil Conservation Service had in operation 147 demonstration projects, averaging 25,000 to 30,000 acres each, 48 soil conservation nurseries for the development and production of new plants, 23 research stations, and 454 Civilian Conservation Corps camps. About 50,000 farmers had applied conservation measures to about 5 million acres. Thousands more sought the opportunity to participate in the program.

Experience had shown that this work would be more successful if locally managed and locally controlled—if the people themselves formulated their own programs and carried them out with Federal technical and other assistance.

Out of this came the idea of the local soil conservation district—now generally known as soil and water conservation districts—organized by the local people under State laws. Out of this came the unique partnership, entirely new in our history, wherein the Soil Conservation Service, a Federal technical agency created by the Congress, offered its assistance through these local districts in compliance with local needs and wishes, in conformity with State law, and in cooperation with local and State agencies and organizations.

In February 1937 President Franklin D. Roosevelt submitted to the Governors of all States a proposed State enabling act authorizing the formation of soil conservation districts specifically for soil and water conservation. Legislatures of 22 States passed such laws that year.

The first soil conservation district in the world was chartered August 4, 1937.

I am proud to say it was in my home State—the Brown Creek Soil Conservation District in Anson County, N.C.

The Congress, beginning in 1937, fully endorsed the principles of this new movement by earmarking funds to provide the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service to the local people through soil conservation districts.

Since then the Congress has annually restated its views and its position on this great Federal-State-local cooperative undertaking by appropriating funds for this purpose on an expanding basis as the organization of districts swept across the country and the needs for technical and other assistance increased.

The Congress has strengthened this work also by creating new programs as needed. Notable among these are the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, aimed at corrective action in our long-neglected small upstream watersheds where more than half of our annual flood damage occurs and most of our water problems originate. Another is the Great Plains conservation program, first of its kind tailored to a great region of this land—a region having problems peculiar to its climatic and soil conditions—problems that can be solved only by a long-term approach.

Another is resource conservation and development projects, a new pilot program in 10 representative areas where an intensive effort will be made to accelerate the development of natural resources as the base for raising the economic level of the people, both rural and urban.

These and other advances in our national soil and water conservation program have stemmed from the experiences of people working together in soil conservation districts.

And, as the program has grown, it has come to be more meaningful to the people of the towns and cities as well as to the owners and operators of our vast farm and ranch lands. Urban people have always had a stake in this program, and they have supported it for 3 decades, but today they are participating in it more fully and deriving more direct benefits than in the early days of the program. The small watershed program is a good example of equal town-country cooperation and equal direct benefits. So too, is the growing trend toward income-producing recreation activities on private lands, and recreation projects growing up around watershed project reservoirs that are creating a substantial source of income in hundreds of American communities.

Mr. Speaker, our national soil and water conservation program has come a long way in these 30 years. Today nearly 3,000 local soil and water conservation districts cover more than 1.7 billion acres of land. These districts have nearly 2 million cooperators operating 648 million acres of land. They have applied 40 million acres of contour farming, nearly 20 million acres of stripcropping, 1.2 million miles of terracing. They have planted 11.3 million acres of trees and have built 1.3 million ponds.

Out of the total of 569 watershed projects approved for Federal assistance, nearly 400 had entered the construction stage in fiscal year 1964. Soil surveys have been made on 822 million acres. More than 16,000 Great Plains landowners and operators were drought-proofing 33.8 million acres of land under the Great Plains conservation program. Those are just a sampling of accomplishments.

These are accomplishments for all the people, for our land and water resource is the base of our economy, the foundation of our American way of life.

Despite these advances, we who have followed this program closely for the past three decades, know that soil erosion is still the dominant conservation problem on the non-Federal rural land of this country. Two-thirds of our land still needs conservation treatment of some kind. Conservation problems are inadequately treated on 62 percent of the cropland, 73 percent of non-Federal pasture and range, and 55 percent of non-Federal forest and woodland.

Mr. Speaker, I have recounted this brief history of the development of our national soil and water conservation program and some of its accomplishments because I am sorely troubled by the administration proposal for retrenchment in the Government's participation in the conservation movement.

I refer to the proposal in the President's budget message to reduce the item for technical assistance in the Soil Conservation Service appropriation by $20 million, and to establish a public revolving fund into which recipients of services would be required to pay 50 percent of the cost of such assistance. I am told this proposal originated in the Office of Budget Director Kermit Gordon, whose views on agriculture I have discussed previously in the House.

Mr. Speaker, adoption of this proposal would deliver a crippling blow to conservation in this country. It would do the program great harm. It could destroy it.

This proposal came like a bolt out of the blue. No study was made of its possible impact. No one familiar with the inner workings of this great program was consulted.

If any were, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture was not one of them. On examination, one must conclude that this proposal originated with a Budget Bureau official who did not have the background to think it through. And perhaps it was put into motion by people who should know better but are willing to cripple existing essential programs in order to provide more money for new Government ventures such as the Appalachia program.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone would set out to create poverty in this Nation, I know of no surer way to do it, in the long run, than to stifle or discourage the conservation of our basic and vital resources.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, is it possible that the Director of the Budget and those high in the administration who follow his leadership are totally unaware of the histories of fallen civilizations down through the ages? Those civilizations withered and vanished when the rich soil that sustained and nourished them was eroded, wasted, and washed into the seas. I appeal to the Budget Director and to his followers to familiarize themselves with this doom that has befallen nations and peoples in centuries past.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have worked closely with the conservation program for many years believe the immediate effect of the Budget Bureau proposal would be to reduce the establishment of soil and water conservation work by 50 percent.

It would have the further effect, once the Federal Government abandons its traditional position in this cooperative undertaking, of decreasing State and local government contributions, thus further crippling the program.

I am told that the $20 million reduction in funds for technical application assistance would reduce farm ponds by 30,000, terraces by 2,700 miles, earth moving of all types by 350 million cubic yards.

It would reduce sales to soil conservation district cooperators and contractors serving them of concrete by 200,000 cubic yards, concrete pipe by 6,670,000 feet, corrugated metal by 1,635,000 feet, steel pipe by 870,000 feet, asbestos-cement pipe by 1,300,000 feet, aluminum pipe by 5,370,000 feet, water pipe by 3,130,000 feet, tile by 75 million feet.

It would reduce contracting for water conservation and control conservation practices by $160 million. It would eliminate an estimated net profit of $14 million, thus forcing many small contractors into bankruptcy. It would eliminate 15,000 equipment operating and servicing jobs paying an average of $3,500 annually, a total of $52,500,000. It would cut the purchase of heavy equipment by contractors by 700 to 1,200 units—also light equipment purchases—totaling $20 to $30 million per year.

It would reduce by about 50 percent or 5 million acres the land seeded annually to grass, legumes, and grass-legume mixtures. This would cut sales of grass and legume seed by 60 million pounds annually, and cut sales of fertilizers for establishing grass and legume stands by 1 million tons annually.

The proposed cut would reduce by about 50 percent or 250,000 acres the land annually planted or seeded to trees and leave State and local agencies and private nurseries with a surplus of 250 million seedlings.

Mr. Speaker, the impact, as I have shown, would spread far beyond the landowners whom we would deprive of the conservation technical services they have been receiving. It would wreak havoc among various business segments of our society. The relatively small amounts the Federal Government puts into conservation are returned manifold to the public in the form of increased earnings and profits, and to the Federal Treasury in the form of greatly increased income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal of the administration that the Government retreat from its participation and leadership in the conservation movement is not in the national interest. It is dangerous to this Nation. It has stirred a clamor throughout the country of such

proportions as to convince any reasonable man that the people insist that our basic and most precious resources be preserved, and that our Government shall measure up to its responsibility and shall not shirk, or languish or flag in these undertakings that insure the future of this Nation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I here urge the administration to disavow any interest in any proposition that will cripple or destroy the conservation movement.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body may with full confidence assure their constituents that if this matter is pressed it will go down to resounding defeat in the Congress, and that the Congress will reaffirm the stand it took 30 years ago—that conservation is a national policy and the Federal Government has a responsibility of participation and leadership in protecting and building our vital and basic national resources.

Congressman Monagan's Brilliant Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very brilliant book review recently appearing in the New York Times written by our very able, outstanding, distinguished, and beloved friend, the esteemed gentleman from Connecticut, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN.

This article reviewed the recent books, "Home Place" by the distinguished journalist, William S. White, and "House Out of Order" by our very able and distinguished colleague, the Honorable RICHARD BOLLING, both books dealing in various ways with the House and the Congress, its rules and procedures, some current criticisms and proposed reforms.

I think that Congressman MONAGAN has put both these books in proper perspective and his commentary will be a very valuable, lasting contribution to the subjects and questions discussed.

I take pleasure in congratulating and highly commending my valued, esteemed, and dear friend, Congressman MONAGAN, on his fine, superbly written book review. Truly, it was a gem of clarity, wisdom, and commonsense.

The book review follows:

A MEMBER TAKES THE FLOOR

(By JOHN S. MONAGAN)

The open season on Congress continues. Nearly every week sees the publication of a new book viewing clinically and usually unfavorably the Members of our National Legislature and the congressional institution itself. Senators like JOE CLARK of Pennsylvania, give their view halloo and join the hunt. The alumni magazine of the former Congregational Indian School in New Hampshire, which I had the honor to attend, recently juxtaposed, with what I hope was unconscious humor, pictures of the school's nine better-than-average congressional alumni with an article entitled "Can Congress Survive?" by a Ph. D. faculty member. Even Pageant magazine turned an inquiring eye on Capitol Hill last November and sandwiched its notorious "rating" of congressional Members between articles on "Kissing After Marriage" and ads explaining how to remove hemorrhoids.

Two books on the House of Representatives now arrive to join the swelling tide on this fascinating subject. In spite of their rather arch titles, "Home Place," and "House Out of Order" are stimulating and knowledgeable and, therefore, welcome. However one may view their conclusions, they have the authority and genuineness that are lacking in too many legislative studies and can come only from prolonged exposure to Representatives and representative assemblies.

From the point of view of experience it would be difficult to find people more competent to dissect the House than William S. White, columnist, congressional correspondent, and idolator of the Senate; and RICHARD BOLLING, nine-term Congressman from the Fifth District of Missouri. At the same time, one would be hard put to discover a greater divergence of opinion than that reached by these pundits as a result of their dissection. White's view is generally friendly and constitutes a spirited defense of the status quo. BOLLING's is critical to the point of being waspish.

Chafing at the restraints imposed by the seniority system and committee review, BOLLING would reform the House by making the party caucus the supreme arbiter of policy and the ultimate source of committee nominations. Under this dispensation, the majority would be the strong right arm of the White House. WHITE, however, finds the seniority system inevitable but improvable and justifies the present procedure as necessary to constitute a vital legislative winnowing process and a means whereby this House of Congress performs its function as a coordinate branch of our Government rather than as a servile agent of the Executive.

Bandying epithets such as "legislative barons," "oligarchs" and "mandarins," BOLLING takes out after the House committee chairmen, labeling them "perverse" and "elderly" and charging them with frustrating the popular will as expressed in Executive proposals. His particular targets are the Rules Committee, which he calls an "abbatoir for liberal legislation," and its astute chairman, Judge HOWARD W. SMITH, whom he terms the director of the "conservative fugue."

WHITE, on the other hand, points out the role of the House in making "climatic decisions" in our national affairs, explains the necessity of committee work in an institution of 435 Members and singles our chairmen like WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, of Ways and Means; EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, of Judiciary; and GEORGE MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, of Appropriations, as men who are little known nationally, but who have done more than many well-publicized Senators to shape the financial, social, and defense policies of our Nation.

Recognizing the limitations of the seniority system, WHITE maintains convincingly that there is no viable alternative. While granting the recent obstructionism of the Rules Committee, he argues with force that it would have to be invented if it did not exist and that it can be bypassed whenever a determined majority so decides.

Viewed in proper perspective, BOLLING's strictures seem less tenable and WHITE's measured support more reasonable when one actually identifies committee chairmen such as the men named above along with MILLER, Democrat, of California, of Science and Astronautics, MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, of Foreign Affairs, PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, of Banking and Currency, and HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, of Commerce. Some of these men admittedly are no longer young, but they are clearly not opposed to progressive legislation. One may question too whether a House which in the last Congress produced a civil rights bill, a tax cut, legislation fostering vocational education and industrial retraining, financing for the wheat sale to Eastern European countries, a pay increase to Government employees, the antipoverty program, and increased social security benefits can legitimately be described as a "shambles" and in "wretched conditions" as charged by BOLLING.

All will agree that House procedures are far from perfect, and BOLLING provides valuable suggestions for upgrading in this area and in the fields of conflict of interest, length of congressional terms, control of campaign costs, selection of committee staffs, and improvement of committee hearings. Incidentally, as a progress note it should be pointed out that the House itself this year adopted a 21-day rule for discharging bills from Rules and also empowered the Speaker to route conference reports past Rules and directly to the House. However, when one compares our House with other assemblies in the world—the raffish and regimented House of Commons, the cowed Chambre des Deputés, and particularly the captive bodies behind the Iron Curtain—one can take pride in our achievement and status.

While discursive and unven in style, "House Out of Order" provides an excellent analysis of congressional press relations, candid and sometimes irreverent portraits of House leaders, an interesting category of congressional types, detailed and revelatory if somewhat self-congratulatory, sidelights on the passage through the House of the Landrum-Griffin and civil rights bills and a serious booboo in characterizing "Southie Is My Home Town," the alma mater of South Boston, as a "ribald" song. BOLLING's main proposal would split the Democratic Party or revive the Republican-Conservative-Democratic coalition.

"Home Place" is tight, well-organized and magnificently written. House members will take issue with White, however, on his undue reverence for the Senate and his criticism of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The unending monologs in the other body, the lack of germaneness and the action by the two major Senate rules of "unanimous consent or nervous prostration" are not admired by the orderly House. In his criticism of the committee, White seems unaware of recent subcommittee work and solid legislative achievement in a time of increased isolationism.

For the ultimate description of the House, White's words are appropriate. It is, he says, "a microcosm of the people of the United States themselves"—with all their virtues and all their faults.

Legislative Resolution 30

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Nebraska has recorded its opposition to the proposals of the Bureau of the Budget calling for the reduction in funds for the agriculture conservation program and the establishment of the proposed revolving fund for the Soil Conservation Service. I call to

the attention of my colleagues Legislative Resolution 30 as passed by the Legislature of Nebraska 75th session on the 19th of March 1965:

"LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 30

"Whereas land and water are the basic physical assets of the State of Nebraska and their maximum conservation and development are essential to the continued economic development of this State; and

"Whereas soil and water conservation is basic to the development to the soil and water resources of Nebraska; and

"Whereas soil and water conservation programs have been accepted by the citizens of the United States of America as a logical, legitimate, and necessary responsibility of Government; and

"Whereas 30 years ago the Federal Government initiated this program in cooperation with local and State governments; and

"Whereas the local and State governments of Nebraska in response to the needs of the people of the State and in cooperation and participation with the Federal Government have accelerated financial assistance in resource conservation; and

"Whereas over two-thirds of the farmers and ranchers in Nebraska are now actively involved in applying a complete conservation program to their land; and

"Whereas local people are now contributing a major share of the cost of these programs; and

"Whereas the Bureau of the Budget in their 1966 fiscal year budget recommendation is now recommending that a $100 million cut in funds for the agriculture conservation program and the establishment of a revolving fund whereby cooperators of soil and water conservation districts will be required to pay for the technical services for laying out conservation practices by the Soil Conservation Service personnel: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the State Legislature of Nebraska hereby record its complete opposition to the proposals of the Bureau of the Budget calling for the reduction in funds for the agriculture conservation program and the establishment of the proposed revolving fund for the Soil Conservation Service; and be it, therefore, further

"*Resolved*, That now is not the proper time to consider such cuts by the Congress of the United States of America but that the U.S. Congress be encouraged to continue to provide adequate funds in line with the needs of these important programs; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee; Congressman GEORGE M. MAHON, chairman, House Appropriations Committee; Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture; Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN, chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture; U.S. Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, U.S. Senator CARL T. CURTIS; Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM; Congressman DAVID MARTIN; and Congressman CLAIR CALLAN; and Kermit Gordon, Director, Bureau of the Budget; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the senior Member, Senator CURTIS, be requested to set up a conference between the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture and the Nebraska congressional delegation; and, to report back as soon as practical the results of such conference.

"PHILIP C. SORENSEN,
"President of the Legislature."

I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 30, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 75th regular session on the 19th day of March 1965.

HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

Air Force Association Supports Military Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is generally known by now that the great majority of the members of the House Armed Services Committee have introduced bills identical to the one sponsored by our chairman, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, providing for a military pay increase.

I believe this indicates the strong desire of the committee to have legislation enacted to correct the inequity of pay scales now existing between the military and their civilian counterparts.

In connection with this legislation, the Air Force Association, in a recent news release, underlined its firm support of the military pay bill. In view of the excellent support the Air Force Association has given to the men in the armed services throughout its history, this action deserves appropriate recognition.

I am therefore pleased to include in the RECORD the text of the news release issued by the Air Force Association:

The Air Force Association has voiced its strong endorsement of the military pay bill introduced in Congress by Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services.

"The bill prepared by Congressman RIVERS incorporates the main objectives in military pay reform which AFA has championed for many years," said AFA's President Jess Larson.

"Specifically, its enactment will eliminate the disparity in pay of enlisted men and officers in their first 2 years of service, which has been allowed to widen ever since the Military Pay Act of 1952.

"It will bring all military pay more closely in line with increases granted to Federal civil service employees since 1952.

"Most important, it will reaffirm to the serviceman and his family that the Congress and the American people, while they cannot compensate him for the hardships and dangers he faces in their behalf, want to help him maintain a standard of living for his family comparable to that of his civilian counterparts."

The bill introduced by Mr. RIVERS calls for an average pay increase of 10.7 percent in basic pay for all members of the Armed Forces. Increases for enlisted men in their first 2 years of service would range from 13 to 33 percent, and for officers about 20 percent. For those with more than 2 years' service enlisted men would get an average raise of 11 percent, officers slightly over 6 percent. Total annual cost of the legislation would be about a billion dollars.

Mr. Larson expressed AFA's appreciation to the "overwhelming majority of the membership of the House Armed Services Committee who are cosponsoring this legislation with Congressman RIVERS," which, he said, "promises early and favorable action on the floor of the House."

He said AFA will be pleased to testify on the bill before the House committee as soon as the association's military councils and executive committee have had an opportunity to prepare detailed recommendations.

A President's Finest Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's speech on voting rights before the joint session of Congress has been recognized throughout the Nation as an historic speech.

His words were the strongest and most forthright in favor of the voting rights of Negroes that any American President has ever spoken.

The Minneapolis Spokesman, an outstanding Minneapolis paper, included an editorial in its March 18 edition written by its editor and publisher, Cecil E. Newman. Mr. Newman's fine editorial is indicative of the positive reaction which the President's speech inspired, and it deserves the attention of all the Members of the House.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the text of the Minneapolis Spokesman's editorial:

A PRESIDENT'S FINEST HOUR

Monday night the President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson, of Texas, made perhaps the greatest speech a chief executive of this great Nation ever made, on the unresolved right of the Negro to full voting rights in this country—rights which are guaranteed by the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

No other President speaking to Congress and the American people has ever before so honestly, unequivocally, and courageously laid the issue so squarely and fully on the line—for all to see and heed.

Pulling no punches Mr. Johnson placed the violation of the rights of the Negro to the ballot, the accepted practice in a number of States, right out where the whole world could see it. And in doing so he arrayed himself and the power of his office definitely on the side of the Negroes' who have been denied the right to vote by intimidation, murder, beatings, economic reprisals and trick tests set up and designed by State legislatures and vote registrars for the sole purpose of keeping the Negro disfranchised.

There was no compromise in the southern accent and voice of a southern born President who, although admittedly proud of the region of his birth, recognizing its strengths and weaknesses, was prepared to disregard all except the rights which he said all Americans must enjoy equally, if this Nation was to live up to its great promise and national law.

In President Johnson's message there was not a word of comfort to the Wallaces, the EASTLANDS, the ERVINS, the ELLENDERS, the STENNISES, the SMATHERS of his own party or the STROM THURMONDS of the Republican Party. Most of this crowd sat on its collective hands as other Members of the Congress, the judiciary, the Cabinet and the

gallery arose spontaneously to its feet to applaud when President Johnson praised the Negro for his struggle to get the United States in line with the aims and promises of its Constitution.

In commenting on the long struggle for human rights in this Nation he told the people of the Nation that "The real hero of this struggle is the American Negro." As true as this statement is, no President before Johnson had ever so frankly and forcibly reminded the country of the Negro's magnificent courage under extreme adversity, and those auditors who were touched by the magnificent truth, and courage of his statement could not help but stand and applaud.

We doubt that in the years ahead Lyndon Baines Johnson will ever have a finer hour than he had Monday night. His "we shall overcome," was also a tribute to those brave Negroes and whites who have led and marched in behalf of freedom and justice, now. He accepted the genuine applause with a sober dignity that reminded one of the long hard road still ahead.

We felt rather proud of being an American Monday night despite our obvious continued concern against the injustice which is practiced against our Negro people, as President Johnson pointed out in all 50 of our States. Our pride was based on what we believe is the ability of this Nation and its people when the chips are down to make a final determination based on truth and justice. This has happened all through the history of this Nation and the time has come for it to happen in the instance of the American Negro—for no force as President Johnson said, "can keep back the tide of freedom and justice."

He asked the Congress to pass as soon as possible a voting rights bill which would insure the right to vote of every American citizen who can write his name, in all elections, local, State, and National. If such legislation is passed, and it must be enacted, the final barriers to full citizenship will have been pushed aside to allow every qualified American man and woman of voting age to participate in the selection of public officials. This will greatly affect the peace, harmony, and unity of the country which has long been divided by the denial of constitutional rights to part of the country's citizenry.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to President Johnson and the aroused public opinion which convinced him that he had to take a strong position and promised him the support which made his Monday night speech such a great document of true statesmanship.—CECIL NEWMAN.

Jimmy McHugh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I insert therein the wonderful song, "Massachusetts," recently composed by one of America's greatest, popular, musical geniuses, Jimmy McHugh, with the lyrics written by the gifted Dorothy Wayne.

Jimmy McHugh is one of the Nation's greatest popular composers, a member of the ASCAP board of directors, and one of the most magnetic, dynamic personalities in the music business, greatly admired, beloved and appreciated in show business and wherever he is known.

He has had a remarkable career. Born in Boston, July 10, 1894, of musical parentage, he has truly risen to the topmost rank of his great profession. Under unanimous consent I include, as part of my remarks, a comprehensive biographical sketch which has been furnished me by his and my dear friend, Jimmy Rule, of ASCAP. It shows in a very graphic way the wide sweep and tremendous versatility of Jimmy McHugh in writing so many outstanding songs that will go down in American history as significant of our times and so appealing to our people that they have taken on the character of standard compositions and are played over and over again by popular demand for public entertainment throughout the Nation and the world.

Jimmy McHugh and his family have always been very highly respected in his home city of Boston, and his brother, Larry, now associated with him in his large, varied enterprises, served in the Massachusetts State Legislature for 16 years and is a distinguished member of the bar.

My fervent wish is that Jimmy McHugh will continue writing great songs because his type of music is the kind of music that the American people want. We of Massachusetts are very proud of this illustrious native son. He brings great luster to our great Commonwealth and its historic capital city of Boston.

The biographical sketch follows:

JIMMY MCHUGH

McHugh, Jimmy, composer; born, Boston, Mass., July 10, 1894. ASCAP 1922. Of musical parentage, early musical education with mother. Education: St. John's Preparatory School, Boston. While office boy with managing director of Boston Opera House, acted as accompanist for rehearsals. Declined scholarship in New England Conservatory of Music to pursue musical career in Boston and New York. Was partner Mills Music Publishing firm from 1921–30. Early song hits: "Hinky Dinky Parlez Vous," "My Dream of the Big Parade," "My Kid," "Lonesomest Girl in Town."

For 9 successive years wrote Cotton Club shows in Harlem where he introduced Dorothy Fields as lyric writer and such greats as Duke Ellington in 1927. Wrote Lew Leslie's "Blackbirds of 1928" with songs: "I Can't Give You Anything but Love Baby," "I Must Have That Man," "Digga, Digga, Doo," "Doin' the New Low-Down." Wrote last Midnight Ziegfeld Roof Show; then International Revue in 1930 with songs: "On the Sunny Side of the Street," "Exactly Like You," "International Rhythm," "Hello Daddy." Show songs: "Let's Sit and Talk About You," "Futuristic Rhythm," "In a Great Big Way."

"Vanderbilt Revue," 1931 songs including: "Blue Again," "Button Up Your Heart."

"Rhapsody in Black," song, "Harlem Bolero." "Singing the Blues," songs: "Singin' the Blues," "It's the Darndest Thing." "Clowns in Clover," songs: "Don't Blame Me," "Clowns in Clover."

For Radio City Music Hall opening wrote songs: "Hey, Young Fella," "With a Feather in Your Cap," "Happy Times."

"Palais Royale Revue," songs, "Thank you for a Lovely Evening," "I Love Gardenias." "Riveria" (summer show), song, "Lost in a Fog." "Shoot the Works," song, "How's Your Uncle?" "The Streets of Paris," songs, "South American Way," "Rendezvous Time in Paris." "Keep Off the Grass," songs, "A Latin Tune, a Manhattan Moon and You," "Clear Out of This World," "On the Old Park Bench." "As the Girls Go," 1948, songs "I Got Lucky in the Rain," "You Say the Nicest Things, Baby," "As the Girls Go." "Strip for Action," 1956, songs, "Too Young To Go Steady," "Lose Me as There Were No Tomorrow."

Honored by Harvard University and Georgetown University. Also doctor of oratory and doctor of music. Wrote both seventh and eigth war bond songs; produced 1945 war bond aquacade for seventh war loan drive at Beverly Hills Hotel, raising $28 million in one night—largest amount in one evening in United States. Awarded Presidential Certificate of Merit for meritorious conduct in aid of the war effort by former President Harry Truman. Past president, Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce—still member of board of directors; member board of directors of Beverly Hills YMCA Youth Center; Opera Guild of Southern California; Beverly Hills Philharmonic Association; life member, Amateur Athletic Union of America; awarded Man of the Year Beverly Hills in 1955.

Founder and president of the Jimmy McHugh Polio Foundation, and Jimmy McHugh Charities, Inc. who have donated 35 respirators to the hospitals in and around Los Angeles for polio patients.

Wrote for motion pictures since 1930, song hits include: "I'm Shooting High," "Lovely Lady," "There's Something in the Air," "Where Are You?" "Let's Sing Again," "I Love to Whistle," "My Own," "You're a Sweetheart," "Dinner at Eight," "My Dancing Lady," "I'm in the Mood for Love," "I Feel a Song Comin' On," "Thank You for a Lovely Evening," "Lost in a Fog," "Cuban Love Song," "Tramps at Sea," "With All My Heart," "Comin' in on a Wing and a Prayer," "Go Home and Tell Your Mother," "The Music Stopped," "A Lovely Way to Spend an Evening," "I Couldn't Sleep a Wink Last Night," "Say It (Over and Over Again)," "A Touch of Texas," "Serenade to a Wealthy Widow," "I Can't Believe That You're in Love With Me," "Murder, He Says," "Let's Get Lost," "Lovely to Look At," "Dig You Later (Hubba, Hubba, Hubba)," "When My Sugar Walks Down the Street," "I'ts a Most Unusual Day," "You'll Know," "How Blue the Night," "I Walked in With My Eyes Wide Open," "Life Can Be Beautiful," "I Miss That Feeling." "The First Lady Waltz," written in honor of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and presented to her on her 34th birthday, is cited in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 6, 1963.

Home: Beverly Hills, Calif. Address: care of ASCAP.

The words of his impressive song, "Massachusetts," follow:

Massachusetts, Massachusetts,
Born of the First Thirteen,
Where elm trees rise 'neath Cape Cod skies,
And the Pilgrims found their dream.

Massachusetts, Massachusetts,
Born of a spirit free,
Where hand in hand they made their stand,
For peace under liberty.

Massachusetts, Massachusetts,
Will always lead the way,
From Bunker Hill and Lexington,
To the glory of J.F.K.

Massachusetts, Massachusetts,
Born of a nation's cry,
Where brave hearts lie,
Massachusetts, born never to die, born never to die.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1965, marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussian independence. The German occupation of western Byelorussia during the First World War had provided an opportunity for the leaders of Byelorussia to express their love of freedom and their longings for independence. Although the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty between the Central Powers and Soviet Russia on March 3, 1918, ignored these aspirations for liberty, on March 25, 1918, the valiant national council proclaimed Byelorussia an independent republic.

The Byelorussian state had little chance to survive despite the bravery of its people. With the defeat of Germany, the Soviet Government repudiated the Brest treaties. Occupying all lands evacuated by the Germans, the Soviet proclaimed a Byelorussian S.S.R. on January 1, 1919. In the peace treaty between Poland and the Soviets in March 1921, Byelorussia was partitioned between its two large neighbors. The Second World War, however, ended with almost all of Byelorussia within the Soviet border.

Today the Soviets make some pretense of permitting a special status for the Byelorussian S.S.R. It is a signatory of the United Nations Charter and signed the partial test ban treaty in Moscow. We know, however, that the Byelorussian people have been completely subjugated to the Soviet Communists and are among the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain, without basic political rights, without fundamental freedoms, and without the opportunity for self-determination.

We in the United States have a living link with the people of Byelorussia in thousands of Americans of Byelorussian ancestry and Byelorussian immigrants who have helped to build our country. As the leaders of the free world, we have a special responsibility to sustain the love of freedom among all people. As free men we must sympathize with all those behind the Iron Curtain who are denied the priceless rights of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion.

Because of our devotion to freedom, it is fitting that we pause a moment in our daily work and join with Byelorussians throughout the free world and our countrymen of Byelorussian descent in celebrating this anniversary of the proclamation of an independent Byelorussian republic. We reaffirm that the maintenance and strengthening of freedom around the globe is the main tenet of American foreign policy, and that we have faith that freedom will ultimately win in the never-ending struggle against tyranny. We take this occasion to assure the Byelorussian people that they have not been forgotten by the free world. We understand their plight, and sympathize with the hope for freedom that they must keep hidden from Communist sight. It is our wish that the day will come when all men may live in a world of peace and plenty and, above all, of freedom.

Berkeley High School of California Salutes Wausau High School of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, last year when Wausau High School of Wisconsin received the 23d Annual Bellamy Award, Phil Omi of Berkeley High School in California extended that school's greetings and best wishes.

I am enclosing a copy of Mr. Omi's remarks on behalf of the students of Berkeley High, which received the Bellamy Award in 1959, for our colleagues' information and interest.

The remarks follow:

PHIL OMI, BERKELEY HIGH SCHOOL, BERKELEY, CALIF.

On October 12, 1959, Berkeley High School, adjacent to the renowned University of California campus, was the proud recipient of the Bellamy Award. Although Berkeley High is now in a secondary role, it is just as proud today, as it congratulates Wausau High School for great achievements, as it was in 1959.

Berkeley High School is proud of its traditions, achievements, and reputation. From a meager beginning in 1880 with 7 pupils, it has grown to over 3,200. In 1884, Berkeley became the first accredited high school in the State of California.

Being the only public high school in Berkeley, my school represents a cross section of the community both socially and economically. Thus it becames a meeting place for the intermingling of varying ideas and cultures of many races. Varied conditions warrant particular attention. For this reason, a true democratic spirit is reasonably feasible at Berkeley. Courses in Russian, semantics, and oriental history are offered for those who seek a new experience or a special challenge.

We at Berkeley High find ourselves united throughout our daily school lives. One method for developing unity is our widely known daily newspaper, the Jacket, which features an open-forum column where all can express their views on any matter. An extensive educational program, after school activities, and excellent athletic teams bind us together in our role as students enjoying a wholesome high school education.

One highlight of this past semester has been the emergence of school government in the community spotlight. With the city split with the issues of our time, our school's student governing body, the board of control, has taken it upon itself to voice a stand on the issues. Also, we have gotten the board of education to pass a bill, making it possible to hear controversial speakers on campus. This enables all to follow a basic democratic precept—to view the issues from all sides.

We at Berkeley High School extend our hands in friendship from across the miles and welcome Wausau High School and Wisconsin into the Bellamy Award family.

Gas in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, we recently learned from newspaper reports that chemical warfare is being used in Vietnam. This is the first time the United States has been involved in the top combat use of gas since World War I. Editorials in yesterday's New York Times and Washington Post and James Reston's column in the New York Times reflect the reaction of many Americans to this revelation. I urge my colleagues to read the following:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 24, 1965]

GAS (NONLETHAL) IN VIETNAM

The United States, in steady escalation of the Vietnamese conflict, is now revealed to have employed a nonlethal gas. It is possible to argue, as American military and civilian spokesmen do, that military objectives can be achieved with fewer casualties by using a gas that does not kill.

This argument overlooks one vital factor; and it displays, at the very least, a lack of imagination somewhere in the top echelons of the Armed Forces. People—ordinary people everywhere—have a strong psychological revulsion, if not horror, at the idea of any kind of poisonous gas, even a temporarily disabling type that only causes extreme discomfort including nausea and diarrhea when used against ordinarily healthy adults. But even this kind of gas can be fatal to the very young, the very old, and those ill of heart and lung ailments.

In Vietnam, gas was supplied and sanctioned by white men against Asians. This is something that no Asian, Communist or not will forget. No other country has employed such a weapon in recent warfare. If the United States believed that people everywhere would be logical and sensible and would understand that nonlethal gas constitutes really only another form of warfare and even a relatively humane one, someone has blundered grievously.

"War," as Clausewitz said, "is only a part of political intercourse, therefore by no means an independent thing in itself." It is stupid to lay the United States open to a moral condemnation that is not confined to the Communist world.

The United States claims to be fighting in Vietnam for freedom, right, justice, and other moral principles, as well as against communism and for the security of the United States and the free world. By using a noxious gas—even of a nonlethal type—the Johnson administration is falling back toward the old axiom that all's fair in war. But this happens to be a war in which the moral stature of the United States is at least as vital as bullets, shells, and bombs. Gas is a wretched means to achieve even the most valid ends.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 24, 1965]

BLACKENING OUR NAME

It is difficult to find out how much damage napalm and gas are doing the enemy but it is not hard to find out how much damage they are doing us. Our own Defense Establishment, every time it employs or permits the South Vietnamese to employ these weapons, is doing an injury to the good name of this country.

If these weapons were being employed with decisive effect, perhaps their use might be condoned as one of the necessities of a hard and brutal war, but in this situation there is not even the satisfaction of knowing that they produced impressive results. They have been employed just enough to bring down upon this country the rebuke of the civilized world. They have been utilized just enough to hold our country up to reproach. They have been resorted to just often enough to impose upon the U.S. Information Agency an impossible propaganda disadvantage.

The argument that the nontoxic gas is more merciful than antipersonnel weapons has some merit, but not much. The trouble is that although the gas may not be poison, the word is, and all the propaganda resources in the world cannot explain away its employment as an act of Christian charity and humanitarian mercy. The use of napalm against gun emplacements is debatable, but its employment against villages is indefensible and the difficulty of confining it to combat installations so great as to dictate that it be not used at all.

We hope that President Johnson will order the Defense Department to forego the use of all gas and napalm in this war theater at once. The people of this country are prepared for and equal to the hard measures that war dictates, when those measures are clearly inescapable and unavoidable in the prosecution of a military purpose. They will not be reconciled to the use of such weapons where alternate means of defense exist. If the war in South Vietnam can only be won by losing our good name, Americans who have patiently supported the struggle will waver in their purpose. Mr. President, let us stop all use of napalm and gas in South Vietnam at once.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 24, 1965]

WASHINGTON: JUST A LITTLE OLD "BENEVOLENT INCAPACITATOR"

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The Pentagon's main argument for using nauseous gas in Vietnam is that it is better in some cases to gas the Communists than to maim or kill them. The officers here even have a wonderful phrase to describe the new instruments of chemical warfare: "benevolent incapacitators."

This, of course, was the defense for using poison gas in the First World War. It wasn't very benevolent and it often incapacitated a man for life, and it sent such a shudder through the world that even in so savage a conflict as the Second World War it wasn't used.

Secretary McNamara was careful to explain that he was not supplying "poison" gas to the South Vietnamese Army. He almost sounded as if he was doing the Communists a favor by treating them like rowdy race rioters in Rochester, but the thing is not quite as innocent as he made it sound.

WHAT NEXT?

The trouble with reverting to the use of any kind of gas in war is that it opens up so many other possibilities of chemical warfare. The use of gas on the battlefield has almost stopped in the last two generations, but the art of chemical warfare has not.

There is now a whole new arsenal of gases that not only nauseate, but stun and paralyze the enemy. The military correspondent of the Evening Star in Washington, Richard Fryklund, for example, recently reported on "the latest and best"—a gas called BZ by the U.S. Army.

He tells of recent tests of BZ at the Army's Chemical Warfare Proving Grounds at Dugway, Utah. Volunteer soldiers were submitted to the effects of BZ while they were executing simple battlefield operations.

"In one case," he reports, "a soldier on guard duty was gassed. He was approached by a strange soldier who said he did not know the password. The guard tried to remember what to do about it, couldn't, got tired of the whole problem and sat down and went to sleep."

Secretary McNamara emphasized that the only gas that was used in Vietnam was the same as the gas that can be purchased at a store. But the same argument made for nauseous gas could also be made for BZ or even for some of the paralyzing gases. After all, it is more benevolent to paralyze a man than to kill him with a machinegun.

Where do you draw the line on the McNamara argument? And even if you draw it at nauseous gas, how do you know what gas the enemy will use after you start this devilish business?

The national policy on the use of all chemical weapons has been that the United States would consider using them only if the enemy used them, but the Pentagon's reaction to the criticism of using nauseous gas was merely to express surprise that anybody would be disturbed.

Nobody concerned has even claimed that the use of the gas was effective. The military spokesman in Saigon said it proved of little value on the three occasions it was used. In two cases, according to United Press International in Saigon, it was discovered that no Reds were in the area. In a third, a few Communists may have been "demoralized" but "there was a fair wind that day and the people were not very ill."

The main effect was merely to nauseate a lot of people all over the world with the thought that gas could be used merely on the authority of the South Vietnamese soldiers concerned.

One unfortunate aspect of the incident was that it occurred precisely at the moment when the United States was beginning to gain a little more understanding in the world for its policy in Vietnam.

Ever since the United States started bombing North Vietnam and dropping napalm fire bombs on Communists targets, there has been a considerable outcry for negotiations to end the war. President Johnson has insisted from the start, as he told 42 State Governors at the White House this week, that he would go anywhere at any time if he thought he could serve the cause of peace, but that there was simply no evidence that the Communists were interested in negotiating a settlement in Vietnam.

This view is now being confirmed by the principal foreign offices of the world. The British Foreign Secretary underscored the point at the White House today. He told the President that the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, had said in London a few days ago that it was useless to talk about negotiations.

REBUFFED ON TALKS

The French, who have been the principal agitators for a negotiated settlement, now concede that their explorations in Peiping and Hanoi have been rebuffed, and the Canadians report that their official on the International Control Commission in Vietnam was not even given the opportunity to discuss negotiations with the North Vietnamese Communists.

Accordingly, the propaganda over Vietnam was beginning to turn a little to the American side, when the gas incident was disclosed, incapitating our own propagandists, and not very benevolently either.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the First World War many submerged and almost lost nationality groups regained their freedom and attained sovereign and independent status. That was one of the most welcome results of a terrible and most destructive war. Subject nationalities of once powerful but now crumbling empires threw off the yoke of their oppressors and proclaimed their freedom. The Byelorussian people, who had been held down under the Russian czars for centuries, proclaimed their national independence on March 25, 47 years ago.

The people of Byelorussia had their own sovereign, independent state before the rise of the Russian Empire. Then, centuries ago, they were overwhelmed by the Russians, lost their independence and suffered under the czarist autocracy of Russia. During the long period under the czars, they carefully guarded their national traditions and their heritage, never abandoning hope for a chance to regain their national freedom. They therefore seized upon the welcome opportunity provided by the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia, and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918. They established their own democratic form of government in their historic capital city, Minsk; and in the short time allotted to them, they began to rebuild their war-torn country. Unfortunately, however, the Byelorussians were not to enjoy their richly deserved reward for long. In December of that same year the Russian Bolsheviks expanded the area under their control. The Red Army overran Byelorussia, which was annexed by the Soviet Union, with some 10 million Byelorussians as helpless victims.

Since then Byelorussians have been living under the oppressive yoke of their detested Communist overlords. Their lives are rigidly regimented and their labor is ruthlessly exploited. Their movements and behavior are closely watched by the ubiquitous state police, and they are forced to work for the Moscow-controlled Communist state. Their tyrannical bosses are trying to extinguish all ethnic and national sentiments among them, including all hope of freedom for Byelorussia.

Fortunately, even under these almost unbearable conditions, the liberty-loving Byelorussians still cling to their ideals of freedom and independence. In view of their steadfast dedication to these noble ideals, I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that they will have their reward in freedom. On this 47th anniversary of their independence I wish the Byelorussian people fortitude and forbearance in their struggle against totalitarian tyranny.

Jewish Life in East Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 28, 1965, concerning the almost nonexistent Jewish community in Communist East Germany:

JEWISH LIFE TODAY IN EAST GERMANY: A SINGLE RABBI FOR NINE SYNAGOGUES

(By Martin G. Berck, of the Herald Tribune staff)

There are 1,500 avowed Jews who live in Communist East Germany. Most are elderly persons who receive pensions that enable them to live rather comfortably. As victims of the Nazis, they get a degree of preferential treatment from the state. They worship in nine synagogues maintained by the state, with services conducted by laymen, a few part-time cantors, and a single rabbi remaining in the country.

Those who want it can get kosher meat from a slaughter house in East Berlin. Matzoh for the Passover season is available from Hungary. Prayer shawls are imported from West Germany and Israel. Kosher wine, sweet or dry, comes from Bulgaria.

The East German Jewish community maintains two old-age homes, with state funds. It publishes its own religious and other printed material, including a Hebrew calendar and a newspaper that appears four times a year. As the eastern remnant of a prewar German Jewish population of 600,000, it sees to the upkeep of 125 cemeteries, many centuries old, scattered throughout the country.

An account of this dwindling branch of Jewry emerged last week in an interview with Helmut Aris, a resident of Dresden, and a member of East Germany's Communist Party, who serves as president of the Union of Jewish Congregations in East Germany.

Mr. Aris and two Protestant clergymen—Dr. Moritz Mitzenheim, Evangelical Bishop of Thuringia, and Dr. Gerhardt Bassarik, director of the Evangelical Academy in East Berlin—formed an unusual delegation to the Pacem in Terris convocation of scholars and statesmen convened here by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

TWENTY YEARS

Here for a 5-day stay, they said they believed themselves to be the first East Germans in 20 years to have attended an international conference of this kind in the United States, which, of course, has no diplomatic relations with East Germany. A State Department spokesman in Washington said that other groups, mostly of clergymen, athletes or journalists, have visited here from East Germany from time to time, but not, so far as he could remember, for a political conference. East Germans must first obtain a temporary travel document from the Allied Travel Office in West Berlin before applying for a U.S. visa.

Mr. Aris is a 57-year-old administrator of a scientific institute connected with the chemical industry in Dresden. Like many of his fellow Jews, he spent most of the war as a slave laborer. He escaped and went into hiding at the time of the destruction of Dresden by Allied bombs shortly before the war's end. Mr. Aris has a son who is director of an electromotor factory and a daughter who heads the costume department of a state-owned theater.

There are perhaps 30 Jews under the age of 20 in all of East Germany. According to Mr. Aris, the community sees to it that those of school age receive instruction twice a month in Jewish religious and cultural matters. In the last 2 years, there have been two religious Jewish weddings in East Berlin. Ritual circumcisions—there was one recently—are performed by a Jewish physician in East Berlin. Two bar mitzvahs—the ceremonial admission of 13-year-old Jewish males into the adult congregation—will be celebrated in Dresden in the coming months.

ROTATING RABBI

For such important occasions, the rabbi, who is Dr. Martin Riesenburger, travels to wherever his services are needed. Otherwise, the rabbi, who is a civil servant, visits the congregations on a rotating basis. There is one synagogue in East Berlin, where about 750 Jews live. There are two places of Jewish worship in Leipzig, and others in Dresden, Erfurt, Karl Marx Stadt, Schwerin, Magdeburg and Halle.

The one in Dresden shares a cantor with one in Leipzig and uses the chapel of a cemetery. For some services there is a choir composed of young Protestant theologians.

As with other denominations in East Germany, statistics on Jews are based only on persons who are registered on community lists. The Jewish community takes no account of persons of Jewish ancestry who are not registered.

According to Mr. Aris, many of the children of mixed marriages choose to remain Jewish and participate in what he described as a "very lively cultural and religious life." Besides religious services, there are concerts held in the synagogues.

Is there pride in Israel?

"But of course," Mr. Aris replied. He went on:

"The Jews of East Germany are proud of the accomplishments of those Jews who are in activities that once were closed to Jews, activities that Jews in the German Democratic Republic could carry on if there were enough of them, such as agriculture."

NO POLITICS

Mr. Aris put questions of domestic and international politics off limits on the ground that he is not a political man. These included questions concerning the antipathy of the Communist bloc nations to Zionism and to Israel, and the subject of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

Is a religious commitment consistent with a Communist society's view of a "socialist" man?

Yes, said Mr. Aris. "Judaism has always been with progress, and has not been bound by dogma—Judaism has always been socially oriented."

He cited Old Testament laws for freeing slaves every 7th or Sabbatical year, and for redistributing land every 50th year, the Jubilee.

"There need not be any contradiction between socialist belief and the carrying out of Jewish principles and belief," said Mr. Aris. "Even though the reconciling of religious faith and dialectical materialism might present some problems, it need not be approached in philosophical terms, but in terms of everyday living."

Everyday living for Jewish pensioners means getting along on around 650 East marks a month, a sum equivalent to about $160 at the official rate but with far greater buying power than it might indicate. A couple living on two pensions could manage comfortably, Mr. Aris said. As officially recognized victims of the Nazis, their pensions are higher by around 200 marks than other East Germans, and they are permitted to retire at an earlier age. For men, it is 60; for women 55.

NO AGRICULTURE

Those who are pensioners were described by Mr. Aris as being distributed "normally" through the worker and professional classes, and in the small private sector of the economy. Only in agriculture are Jews not represented a phenomenon that makes them envious of the farmers in Israel.

Contacts with Israel are limited to exchanging greetings on the Jewish New Year. There are more active contacts maintained with Jews in the Communist bloc countries, presumably through their central Jewish councils, but not with Russia, where there are no such organizations.

Mr. Aris seemed anxious to convey a picture of Jewish life in positive terms: East Germany is a place sincerely trying to make amends for the past, a place where Jews live in dignity, equality and freedom. As for whether there are grounds for optimism among Jews interested in the survival of their community, Mr. Aris had this to say:

"Jewish existence always required optimism. The ups and downs of Jewish history have shown that the ones with natural optimism survive."

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, every year the 25th of March provides us with an opportunity to pay our respects to the intellectual achievements of the Greek people, as well as their steadfast and wholehearted commitment to democracy, and defense of the best of Western ideals.

In fact, today represents the 144th anniversary of the independence of the modern state of Greece. Yet I am sure we are all aware that it is impossible to even talk about Western civilization without mentioning the contributions which the Greeks throughout history have made. Indeed, it is in the ancient city-state of Athens that the idea of democracy was first discussed and applied. The great minds of antiquity—Socrates, Plato, Aristotle—debated and analyzed the myriads of possible political systems, and many of their insights remain valid to the present day. At the same time, others were founding or shaping the outlines of a great number of the arts and sciences with which we are all familiar: poetry, drama, painting, sculpture, and architecture; geometry, trigonometry, zoology, botany, physics, and mathematics. Our world today would be a far more primitive place had not these and other Greeks first begun to explore and explain their surroundings in meaningful human terms.

Lest it be thought that their successors on that rocky peninsula achieved nothing, we need only recall the culture and glory of the Byzantine Empire, as well as the achievements of Nikos Kazantzakis, George Seferis, Elia Kazan, Dmitri Mitropoulos and many others in our own time.

The determination of the Greeks to fight for their heritage and their ideals

has been demonstrated time and again, from the battle of Thermopylae, to the battle of Missolonghi, to the battle of Athens during the Second World War. We are, therefore, privileged and honored to acknowledge our debts to Greece, and our friendship and sympathy for the Greek people. I take this opportunity to add my own best wishes to those of others on this anniversary, and express the conviction that the glory of Greece and the closeness of our relations with that country will forever remain.

Mr. Speaker, Greek achievements and accomplishments are known to me because I have many Greek constituents. I have the greatest admiration and respect for those whose ancestral bond is to Greece. Their contributions—religious, civic, athletic, social, political, cultural, economic—have considerably enriched my home community of Rochester, N.Y., and earned the Greeks the lasting friendship of their fellow citizens.

So, on this occasion while my thoughts are meant for all Greeks, they are prompted particularly by my appreciation and affection for those I have the honor to represent in Congress.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Tshombe's Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that you cannot keep a good man down. And that adage is certainly coming true in the case of Premier Moise Tshombe of the Congo.

Two years ago, it was even the custom in our State Department to underestimate his abilities; rundown his accomplishments and to attempt to paint him as some sort of a tool of Western imperialism.

He was reviled by the Reds, and still is. He was fought by the petty politicians and would-be dictators who preached their own doctrine of race and religious hatred.

But he has survived, stronger and more respected than ever, offering a voice of hope in a continent torn by hatred and violence. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of March 22, 1965, entitled "Tshombe's Strength."

As the editorial states, it is, indeed about time and I hope that the administration and the State Department will take note:

TSHOMBE'S STRENGTH

Premier Moise Tshombe of the Congo has grown significantly stronger in recent days. His trip to Nairobi, Kenya, to take part in the meeting of the Organization of African Unity, has begun to pay dividends. He has made an excellent impression, and understandably so, on many OAU leaders who have reviled him in the past as a sort of lackey in the service of Western "imperialism."

This crude and dishonest caricature of the man has been drawn, of course, by Communist propagandists—especially the Chinese—aided and abetted by such people as Nasser's and Ben Bella's Arab smear artists in Cairo and Algiers. It is a caricature that has muddled a lot of soft-headed people in the West, and it has persuaded some of the Congo's neighbors to support the so-called rebels against Tshombe and his legitimate government in Léopoldville.

These rebels—who have been playing the Communist game, wittingly or unwittingly—are guilty of having committed unspeakable atrocities against whites and blacks alike. But now, as a result of Tshombe's conversations in Nairobi, the Congo's neighbors are taking a new look at the situation. The Sudan, for example, has indicated that it will no longer lend itself to the shipment of Algerian, Egyptian, and Communist arms to the Red-led anti-Tshombe forces. And Uganda has said much the same thing.

Similar declarations may be expected from other members of the OAU, including President Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya. The true nature of the Congolese rebellion is becoming clear to such leaders, and they don't like what they see. So Mr. Tshombe is slowly but surely gathering support where it counts. It's about time.

Lead, Zinc, and Copper Disposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am desirous of expressing my warm appreciation to all those who were so helpful and considerate to me and our committee in facilitating the favorable consideration by the House on Tuesday, March 23, under unanimous consent of the bill, H.R. 1496, as amended by the Senate. This measure authorizes the disposal, without regard to the 6 months waiting period, of lead, zinc, and copper from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

As the House understands, this bill provides for the disposal of certain urgently needed strategic materials, principally lead, zinc, and copper that are urgently needed by industry to alleviate current shortages which are causing part-time operation and unemployment in certain industries, and are now threatening to cause even greater unemployment and more serious conditions in these industries.

I want to commend the subcommittee for its prompt, expeditious consideration in reporting the lead and zinc bills when they were before us. It was our expectation and intention to proceed promptly with consideration of several bills for disposal of copper that were pending in the House, but which lacked needed reports from the Federal agencies concerned.

However, when the lead and zinc bills were sent to the other body, certain amendments were added to the zinc bill providing for copper disposal. We should have much preferred to conduct our own hearings on copper in the House, but under the circumstances, since this measure and the lead bill were incorporated into the zinc bill, we did not feel it would be desirable to duplicate the Senate hearings. It was the decision of the House Armed Services Committee to expedite action on these disposals by accepting the Senate amendments, even though we felt that it would have been better to proceed with hearings on each individual disposal request, and in accordance with our practice, receive adequate evidence concerning the subject matter of pending copper bills, thus giving those who introduced measures on this subject full opportunity to be heard and have their witnesses heard and thus enable our committee to make its own record in our own committee hearings.

However, I feel that we have discharged our duty to the House and to all those concerned in accepting the Senate amendments in this particular instance, even though we do not want it to be understood or construed that this established a precedent that would be followed in the future.

We have made every possible effort to safeguard the national interest in these disposals and to prevent the disruption of markets and price variations to the extent that can be done by legislation, and we have taken great pains to assure there will be orderly, fair, equitable disposal procedures and that our committee will be in a position to followup these matters to make sure that the intent of this legislation is being followed in every feasible, practicable manner.

In all these disposals, it is our expectation that the Government will make a profit from the sales taking place as a result of the action of the Congress on this bill.

There are so many people who are serving and assisting our committee in these matters that it would not be possible to enumerate all of them here. I do want to express my warm, personal appreciation to my very distinguished chairman, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, who contributed so invaluably to the results achieved, to the officials of the Government, particularly the General Services Administration, the Office of Emergency Planning and those from industry who gave us the benefit of their views and their valued cooperation.

I am also especially thankful to several distinguished friends and colleagues of the committee and the House who introduced bills for the disposal of copper and who so graciously withdrew their request for House committee hearings in order to expedite final action. Some of these colleagues are: the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE], the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN], both members of the Armed Services Committee, and our esteemed colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, [Mr. ST GERMAIN], the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON], and my valued colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

I think that the example set by all these and other distinguished gentlemen in the House on Tuesday in expediting this bill is one of the finest instances of wholehearted cooperation I have seen during my service here, and I hope the passage of the bill will be helpful in alleviating the shortages of these valuable metals and improve the sorry plight of several industries faced with operational and unemployment problems as a result of present conditions affecting the availability of these materials.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 47th anniversary of the Byelorussian declaration of independence. On that day in 1918, the hopes and aspirations of nearly six-score years were realized. A once-proud people joyfully welcomed the opportunity to demonstrate to the world that the long czarist oppression had not dulled their zeal for self-government. We are all sadly aware that the republic was short-lived; but, to my mind, there is a particular poignancy surrounding the Soviet takeover. For many among us do not comprehend the depth of the anguish which this unwarranted act created among Byelorussians, both in the homeland and around the world. The reason for this is that a great number of individuals, in the United States and Western Europe, assume this people to be a group native to Russia. On the contrary, Byelorussia is a separate entity, with its own language, culture, and customs. It is for these very reasons, coupled with the memory of past independence, that the people of this nation never capitulated in the face of czarist rule and oppression. They remembered a period, several centuries before, when their nation had flourished, and had made significant contributions to the progress of Western man. These sentiments gave rise to several courageous revolts, each of which was crushed by the forces of Imperial Russia. The Byelorussian people displayed the same independent courage under the Communist yoke, and in the famous Slutsk uprising of 1920, heroically battled against impossible odds, in the full knowledge that if unsuccessful they would experience even greater cruelty and reprisals. The Red army wiped out the resistance, fierce vengeance was taken, and a foglike silence enveloped the country.

Let no one be deluded by the absence of physical revolt since 1920. History shows that the Byelorussian people have not given up. Quite the contrary, the flame is very much alive. Having been subjugated for all but 3 of the last 170 years, they have developed a singular capacity for passive resistance, and it is this quality which sustains them now, and in which the Kremlin can find no solace or comfort. By one means or another greater measures of freedom will come.

National Writers Question President's Voting Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks I would like to include three articles by nationally known and respected newspaper columnists who raise some serious questions about the President's voting rights bill.

Mr. Speaker, before this Congress is stampeded into ill-advised action which may mean the destruction of some of our most precious rights as a free people, I suggest we study some of these statements.

The articles which follow include a column by Richard Wilson from the Washington Evening Star of March 24, a column by David Lawrence from the same edition of the Star, and a column by John Chamberlain in the Washington Post of this morning, March 25:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 24, 1965]

QUESTION LINGERS ON VOTING BILL

(By Richard Wilson)

The question that the advocates of the new voting rights bill have as yet failed to answer adequately is this: Why should literacy tests as a qualification for voting be perfectly all right in 45 of the 50 States but invalid in the other 5?

If a voter in Alabama who cannot read or write is qualified to vote in a Federal or any other election why should not an illiterate New Yorker have the same right? The right to vote certainly has no connection with the number of people who vote, and it is manifestly unjust to bar an illiterate from voting in a State where less than 50 percent of the qualified voters cast their ballots, but to permit him to vote in a State where more than 50 percent of the voters go to the polls.

This, nevertheless, would be the effect in 606 counties in 10 States of the passage of the voter rights bill sent to Congress by President Johnson.

The only justification offered for this anomaly is that it is the only way to force election officials in those 10 States to register Negroes to vote. Otherwise, they will enforce prohibitive regulations that prevent Negroes from voting, but not enforce the same regulations on whites who could not meet the qualifications.

This is another example of the devious legislative tactics in the Johnson administration to achieve results by legal circumlocution. Another outstanding example is the aid to education bill that attempts to get around the church-state issue.

From the President's recent statements it can be concluded that what he really desires is the removal of virtually all restrictions on voting for persons 18 years old, and over, if they are sane, and in spite of the fact that the Supreme Court would have to reverse itself in finding that the imposition of reasonable qualifications is valid.

It must be admitted that literacy tests as a qualification for voting are honored in the breach in the North. Thirty States have no such requirements. States that do have literacy requirements often do not enforce them, or the enforcement is so cursory as to be meaningless.

New York requires proof of an eighth-grade education or demonstration of the ability to read as a requirement for voters. This excludes a great many people, including recently arrived Puerto Ricans, from voting and is being challenged in the courts. Previous Federal legislation proposals would have required a sixth-grade education as proof of literacy.

Residency requirements are universal. In short, people are not born in this country with an inherent right to vote at any time or any place. This is a right for which they must qualify by tests that vary from State to State, and which was affirmed by a 1959 Supreme Court decision. The layman would think that the Constitution is quite clear on this point in its 1st article and in the 17th amendment, to say nothing of the 1959 decision of the Supreme Court.

Furthermore, the Johnson voting rights bill recognizes this principle by providing that a voter shall be stricken from the rolls if he fails to vote at least once in 3 consecutive years. Thus the Federal law would impose restrictions Congress regards as reasonable while outlawing other restrictions imposed by the States.

Why is not the issue confronted squarely? Why is Congress not asked to abolish literacy requirements in all States altogether?

The answer to that is clear. It is because literacy requirements have validity both in reason and in law. It makes sense that a voter should have at least an elementary ability to read and write the language of the country in which he resides. It makes sense that States should have the power to set reasonable minimum standards for voters, and the proposed law recognizes that by itself setting some standards. It hardly needs to be argued, also, that a Federal law should apply equally to the citizens of all States.

The strange, awkward, and unequal nature of this new legislation shows how wrong it is to try to legislate on such complicated matters in an atmosphere of violence-provoking public demonstrations.

The Johnson administration was rushed into the presentation of a law that has so many obvious flaws that it can immediately be challenged in the courts. Elaborate and tricky formulas provide no answer for a more basic question: Why in a nation with compulsory, universal public education are so many people, Negro and white, illiterate? And why should there be a premium on illiteracy in some States and not in others?

[From the Washington (D.C) Evening Star, Mar. 24, 1965]

FORCED VOTING MAY BE ON THE WAY

(By David Lawrence)

Forced voting may be on its way for the individual citizen in the United States. Thus far the coercion would apply only to certain persons in particular States. But this is a form of discrimination which has been included in the pending voting rights measure.

Just why President Johnson has approved of the idea of punishing certain citizens because they do not vote at least once in 3 years is a mystery. There are lots of persons who become ill or suddenly find they have to be away from home on election day or cannot get an absentee ballot in time. No explanation has been advanced as to just why such individuals are to be penalized if they fail to vote.

The voting rights bill, which is supposed to be passed by Congress soon, would penalize newly listed voters rather than those

already registered, since it would apply only to those voters whose names have been put on the list of eligibles by Federal examiners or registrars. The proposed statute actually says that a citizen may lose his right to vote and that his or her name can be removed from the list of eligibles by a Federal examiner if the latter determines that the individual has not voted "at least once during 3 consecutive years" while listed as eligible.

Compulsory voting is enforced in some countries, but it applies to all citizens. As far as is known, every country with such a system penalizes everyone and not just selected citizens.

Oddly enough, with all the talk about antidiscrimination and giving every citizen an opportunity to vote, nothing has been done by the administration to prevent corruption at the polls, either in the casting or the counting of the ballots in all Federal, State, and local elections. Yet the Federal Government now is assuming the right to control the voting process in all elections throughout the country. The only reference in the bill to improper counting pertains to those States that, under the rules to be laid down, will have been adjudged to have discriminated in the past. The law would not apply to dishonesty in other States. The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial, said the other day:

"Alabama and the other States of the deep South are not the only places where citizens are deprived of their right to vote and to have their votes counted honestly. At every election in Chicago thousands of Negroes and other citizens are intimidated and bribed by Democratic precinct captains. Illiterate voters and voters who swear they are illiterate are followed into the polling booths and the voting machines are pulled for them.

"Another method of controlling votes is particularly effective among voters who are receiving public welfare payments or living in public housing. They are visited in their homes, asked to sign ballot applications, and then told they need not appear at the polls. Their votes are cast for them early on the morning of election day.

"All these practices are just as illegal and immoral as the various devices to keep Negroes from voting in Alabama; yet we have heard of no move by the leader of the Great Society party to assure honest elections in Chicago."

Undoubtedly there will be amendments proposed to protect the voters, but it is difficult to see how these will apply to all 50 States, since the legislation is particularly framed to deal only with certain States where there has been discrimination in the past by reason of race or color. Timothy P. Sheehan, chairman of the Cook County Republican Central Committee in Chicago, has sent to all Republican members of the Illinois delegation in Congress a telegram that reads in part:

"Stiff penalties should be written into the new law so that the voter can properly exercise his free will and judgment without fear or intimidation, as well as stern penalties for failure of election officials to count and tally the votes properly in order to prevent the many abuses which take place in Chicago and other major cities."

Charges have been made that the 1960 Presidential election might have resulted in a victory for the Nixon-Lodge ticket, rather than for Messrs Kennedy and Johnson, if the votes had been properly counted in certain States, including Illinois—particularly in Chicago and Cook County.

The Chicago Tribune also says: "The recent report by the Eagle Eye Organization on the election last November 3 is a shocking catalog of the ways the Democratic organization systematically steals thousands of votes."

But it so happens that the new civil rights bill is concerned with punishing only the South, allegedly for discrimination in the past. No effort is being made to apply all the restrictions with respect to voting rights to the other States of the Union, where, statistically speaking, there has been no discrimination because more than 50 percent of the persons of voting age were registered or cast their ballots in November 1964.

The new legislation, if passed in its present form, will turn out to be a highly discriminatory measure, though ostensibly designed to cure discrimination in the registering of voters.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 25, 1965]

YOUR VOTE: CAN UNITED STATES SET STATE STANDARD?

(By John Chamberlain)

The State motto of Alabama is "Andemus jura nostra defendere," which is translated as "We dare defend our rights." It is a noble motto, and possibly Gov. George C. Wallace thinks he is living up to it in his various pronouncements. But under any republican form of government (and Alabama is supposed to have such a government) the rights of a State are inseparable from the rights of the citizens of that State, and these rights must be defended with impartiality. They belong to Negroes and whites alike. Thus there can be no legitimate complaints if, under the 15th amendment, Congress should finally enact a law that might result in sending Federal registrars—and even Federal troops—into communities that have failed to give prospective Negro voters a fair shake.

The law, however, should be limited to sending in registrars to provide even-handed justice in enforcing any given State's own election standards. The Federal Government has no right to substitute standards of its own. For the U.S. Constitution guarantees to the States the right to set their own voting qualifications, whether of age of literacy, provided the qualifications do not discriminate against anybody on a basis of race, creed, color, or previous condition of servitude.

As things now stand, the Johnson administration would in effect abolish the literacy test in any State in which 50 percent of the eligible voters are either not registered or have failed to vote in the last election.

As is intended, this would strike at places like Selma, Ala., where there have been instances of arbitrary and unfair applications of the literacy qualification.

But it would also strike at South Carolina, where violations of the law respecting registration of literate Negro voters have been conspicuous by their rarity. The South Carolina law stipulates that a person must be able to read a section of the Constitution or, as an alternative, possess $300 worth of property as registered on the tax books.

There have been no outstanding complaints that South Carolina communities have been applying the law in a discriminatory way. Yet, since fewer than 50 percent of the people over 21 years of age voted in the last election in South Carolina, Washington would be justified under the proposed legislation in sending Federal registrars to oversee voting throughout the State. And the Federal agents would be empowered to suspend South Carolina's literacy requirements in favor of a purely nominal test that would not meet the State's own unexceptionable standards.

What impresses honest and decent southerners about all this is that it actually denies equal protection of the law under the pretense of providing this protection. It penalizes the just along with the unjust. The big trouble in South Carolina, for example, is that voters are lethargic. But lethargy is neither a State nor a Federal offense.

The proposed voting registration law would also discriminate unfairly between the good Southern States and a Northern State such as New York, which has its own literacy test.

In New York a voter has either to show that he can read or write English or present evidence of an eighth-grade education. This effectively disqualifies Puerto Ricans who are literate only in Spanish.

No doubt the purposes of the New York law are good: propositions are presented in the polling booth in the English language, and citizens who can't read these propositions can hardly vote intelligently on them. Yet, since more than 50 percent of New Yorkers go to the polls, the State would be allowed to continue its literacy test whereas South Carolina, for instance, would not. How this can be justified under the U.S. Constitution, which says the privileges and immunities of the citizens shall be equal, is a mystery.

So let's have a Federal law that will guarantee fair enforcement of local election laws without telling States what their own standards shall be. It is a rule of good legislation that it should not throw out the baby along with the dirty bath water.

A Fourth Subsidy for Cotton?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, to those of us already deeply distressed over the cotton subsidy structure, the prospects of still another layer is chilling. The New York Times of March 17, which usually is not overly critical of administration programs, had a sharp and pointed summary of the cotton program.

The article follows:

A FOURTH SUBSIDY FOR COTTON?

When it comes to subsidies, cotton takes the cake. The American taxpayer is now doling out about $800 million a year in three different subsidies on cotton.

Last year the Government began making payments to domestic mills to offset the subsidy paid to cotton exporters which, in turn, came about because high-price supports for growers priced American cotton out of world markets.

Now still another group wants relief. Independent cotton finishers, who say they are being discriminated against by the payments made to big, integrated textile companies, are clamoring for a fourth subsidy of their own.

Their demand is understandable. They reason that with so much being paid out, enlarging the cake a little more will not matter. The indepdents have no illusions about solving the problem. They know that despite subsidies, synthetic fibers are still increasing in importance and imports of textiles from abroad continue to grow. They merely feel cheated.

Their plea should not be heeded; but it should make clear to taxpayers, who have had to pay the bill for cotton's insatiable appetite, the utter absurdity of the present program. There is sure to be someone who will suggest giving a fifth subsidy to consumers; but the only real way to end the soaring costs of cotton goods is to get rid of the whole bundle of cotton subsidies—each and every one of them.

A Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution of March 21, 1965, signed by a convention of Americans of Byelorussian Descent held in the Hotel Biltmore in New York City on the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Byelorrussian Democratic Republic:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CONVENTION OF AMERICANS OF BYELORUSSIAN DESCENT, HELD ON MARCH 21, 1965, AT THE HOTEL BILTMORE IN NEW YORK CITY FOR THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

The Byelorussians of the free world have been closely following the events in the country of their origin. By virtue of their unflagging efforts to keep in touch with their former compatriots, there emerges a picture of Byelorussians oppressed by communism but forever trying to improve their present status and to change their future for the better. Undoubtedly, they have succeeded in pushing back the darkness somewhat. Nonetheless, their aspirations to a Byelorussian statehood have so far been blocked by the incubus of a foreign ideology, placed on their country by violence.

The idea of democratic freedom and independence, which the Byelorussians have consecrated with lives, is indestructible among them. This idea was given impetus by the anti-Russian uprising in 1863; it was developed and enriched by a host of writers of the National Rebirth Movement, and in the years of the Byelorussian National Revolution of 1917 to 1918 it reached fruition. The convention believes that national independence for Byelorussia will be realized, for the independence movement constitutes an organic part of the historical process in this century.

Democratic sovereignty, the theme of this period, was expressed by the Byelorussians through their national leader, the Poet Janka Kupala (1882–1942), who wrote: "Each people should be its own master."

Sooner or later, the Byelorussian nation shall become its own master. This is its most sacred dream and yearning. The achievement of this goal is in the interest not only of Byelorussia but of the whole community of nations.

In the world of today, cowering from the specter of nuclear war, international understanding is more urgently needed than ever. The existence of the United Nations underlines this need.

Coexistence and cooperation among nations, however, will rest upon firm foundations only when each nation will speak for itself; when neighboring states or nationalities will not usurp another nation's name and economic resources, as in the case of Byelorussia, whose name is being used by Russia in its international manifestations and blackmailing.

The endeavors of Byelorussians to have the right to speak for themselves and to be their own masters constitute the essence of recent developments in Byelorussia. They become especially obvious among the younger generation of the Byelorussian intelligentsia: among writers, artists, teachers, and students. Through their voices and creative talents, the Byelorussian people are striving to rehabilitate their past, of which it was totally deprived during the years of Stalinist terror, and to promote a maximum of political and economic freedom. Taken all together, these aspirations form the core of the idea of independence and democracy as it was promulgated in the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

We, the participants of this convention for the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian independence: Therefore solemnly

Resolve, In the all-out, further struggle for free Byelorussia, to spotlight the cultural, economic and political achievements of the Byelorussian people; to unmask before the world the political, economic, and moral enslavement of Byelorussia by Soviet-Russian imperialism.

May the torch of the Byelorussian democratic republic of March 1918 never go out.

Long live the free democratic Byelorussia.

New York March 21, 1965.

For the Convention:

STANISLAU STANKEVITCH,
Ph. D., National President of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.

ULADZIMIER NABAGIEZ,
M.D., President of the New York Branch of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.

SIARHIEF HUTYRCHYK,
President of the New Jersey Branch of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.

"Why Didn't Someone Tell Me How Big It Had Grown?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the attached letter which I have received from Mr. Robert D. Burns, of 14 Liberty Street, in Petaluma, Calif., telling me the tale of his "dependent relative" has "touched me," as I believe it will all the rest of the Nation's taxpayers.

It puts me in mind of the old story of an African native who took a baby python into his hut to eat up the rats and mice that infested it. It thrived on its diet of rodents and it grew and grew and grew. However, when it had doubled in size, rats and mice were not enough and it ate up the native's chickens. Later and larger, it ate up his goats. Finally, the native realized that his once little pet was sizing him up. He turned to flee—but, too late. His last words as he disappeared inside the snake were, "Why didn't someone tell me how big it had grown?"

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring this letter to the attention of my colleagues, and I am taking the liberty of quoting it below:

PETALUMA, CALIF., *March 16, 1965.*

Hon. DON CLAUSEN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I hate to tell you my troubles, but I have tried everything else I know. I feel that only you can help me.

I have a dependent relative staying with me who has very little fiscal responsibility. He is very good natured and means well, but he keeps buying presents for my wife and me, and our two children. He charges these presents to my account. When he sees something that he thinks we need he buys it for us.

Many of these things are not needed by us and in very few cases are they exactly what we would have bought if we had bought these things ourselves. Because he doesn't work for a living, money doesn't mean too much to him and he tends to buy the first thing he sees and doesn't shop around like I would do if I were purchasing items. He is also quite generous to the poor and needy, but often gives to those he doesn't know are just feeding him a soft line.

I just received a bill for his last spending spree and it gives me a sick, hopeless feeling. I keep thinking how much better off I would be if I could just spend that money for the things I want and could give to the people and charities I think are needy.

He won't listen to me, but he will listen to you because he respects you. Please use your influence to cut the spending habits of my Uncle Sam.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. BURNS.

Medicare Bill Is Expensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the great pressure brought on individual members of the House Ways and Means Committee to produce a medicare bill without extensive hearings and complete scrutiny.

There are many grave doubts by men with foresight over the long-term costs of the proposed medicare bill.

The Chicago Sun-Times editorial on the subject, Monday, March 22, directs specific attention to the future costs of this legislation:

MEDICARE BILL IS EXPENSIVE

The administration's bill to provide medical care for the aged is now being readied for presentation by the House Ways and Means Committee. It promises to be more expensive than anticipated.

The new medicare bill could more than double the social security taxes of many employers and employees.

The social security tax increases specified in the administration's medicare bill would come in two forms, in an increase in the tax rate and an increase in the tax base on which the tax rate is computed. The increases would be staggered in seven steps over the next 21 years. After the final increase an employee earning $6,600 a year, and his employer, would each pay a social security tax of $369.90.

In 1965 the same employee and employer will each pay a social security tax of $174.

The administration's medicare bill is a pig in a poke, as we have noted on this page in the past. The benefits offered are limited. It is almost certain that there will be strong pressure brought to bear to increase those benefits once the bill is passed. The proposed increases in the social security tax base and tax rate needed to finance the bill, as proposed, would not take care of any increases in benefits. More money would have to be found. The most likely way of raising that extra money would doubtless be even more increases in social security taxes.

Alternative bills have been offered the committee. One is sponsored by the American Medical Association, called the eldercare bill.

The AMA bill proposes that the Government make full coverage health insurance available from private health insurance companies to those over 65 on the basis of need. The Government would pay all or part of the premiums with local authorities setting the level at which Federal assistance in meeting premium costs would be granted.

The AMA estimates its program would cost $1.5 billion annually.

The cost of the administration's medicare bill has not been accurately set. Reliable estimators set the figure from $1.5 billion to $6 billion annually.

The House should carefully consider all the alternative bills offered to the administration's medicare bill.

There is no necessity to rush legislation through that might fall short of the needs it is supposed to remedy and be expensive as well.

City Beautification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, one of the great challenges of our time, in my opinion, is insuring that our great cities not only are functional, but also are esthetically pleasing.

An excellent article on this subject recently was written by my good friend, Mr. Robert D. Sipprell, executive director of the Buffalo, N.Y., Municipal Housing Authority. The article, which I am calling to my colleagues' attention, was published by the Buffalo Evening News:

LET'S RENEW BUFFALO'S HERITAGE

(By Robert D. Sipprell)

It was gratifying to see in the News the rather full coverage given to the text of Edmund Bacon's recent presentation at the festival of arts feature in Albright-Knox Art Gallery.

I have known Ed and respected his leadership in the planning field for many years. His emphasis on beautifying the city and forming an image to work toward seems simple enough, but is important food for thought of which every citizen can partake.

In developing his theme, Mr. Bacon used some significant and key phrases: "The city is really the people's art; * * * focal centers of neighborhood indentification and pride; * * * traveling about the city should be an esthetical experience; * * * blending of the old with the new."

A useful human being must have a purpose, self-respect, and a sense of belonging or identification. The same applies to a city if it is to be a really living thing.

These are elements of an image. But there are two images to be dealt with—the one you see in the mirror and the one you present to others. There is a mutual relationship and both must be satisfying.

Buffalo has a great heritage, both culturally and physically. The image it has of itself and the image presented to others desperately needs to be brought into focus.

We have as substantial a claim to recognition as any city in the country. But like a rare piece of glass, a graceful antique, or an old master's canvas, we sometimes fail to recognize its worth. We need an art appreciation and cultural reawakening.

Buffalo has been the benefactor of some of the great names in architecture and planning and such heritage should be preserved and built upon.

Take, for example, the works of Frank Lloyd Wright. The finest examples of his residential designs from the early 1900 period rest in Buffalo and are perhaps the only products of this particular period of his influence that have remained continuously in private residence use.

A near duplicate in Chicago of one such Buffalo residence is currently the object of a historic preservation for which a fund of more than a quarter million dollars has been developed under direction of Chicago Planning Comissioner Ira Bach.

Buffalo's cultural edifice, such as Albright-Knox Gallery, the Historic Building, Science Museum and Kleinhans Music Hall are second to none.

Perhaps least known by the average citizen is that the famous planner and lanscape architect, Frederick Law Olmstead, laid his hand upon this city before the turn of the century. It was his vision that was to some degree responsible for our famous parkways framed in cathedral-like arches of stately elm trees. From Symphony Circle to Humboldt Park and the Science Museum, we have a cultural arch built into our city plan that could be the envy of any city in America or central Europe.

The intersecting circles in the parkway system were meant to be "focal points" for a subtle change in direction and to anticipate a new vista (Mr. Bacon's esthetie experience) at the next turn. Yet they lack accent and have lost some of the original artistic and design value.

But the basic cultural arch is still there and the whole of our city plan can be related to it like a coathanger on which clings the whole garment keeping it from getting out of shape.

Renewal for cultural values is equally important with downtown business district or waterfront. Outdoor sculpture, better landscape design and introduction of more fountains would return our "cultural arch" to its rightful function. Water has been used as an element of design since ancient times and a city on the lakes should make more use of this, its most native material.

Cultural facilities and artistic accents have the distinction of belonging to everyone and can have a personal as well as a total identification. This is in the path of developing neighborhood focus and creating an image.

As Ed Bacon said, "The really great expression of art in the present day is going to be fulfilled when the experience of circulating about the city is a continuous flow of harmony and beauty."

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 47th anniversary of the signing of the Byelorussian Declaration of Independence.

It is altogether appropriate that we in America should join with all freemen in commemorating this date, for the Byelorussian people are no longer free to determine their own course in world history.

Their territory has been seized by the Soviet government and the people subjugated in a police state. Yet, there is strong evidence to indicate that the people have not been incorporated into the Communist view of total domination over the minds of men.

The Byelorussians retain their spirit of independence and their love of freedom.

In this citadel of freedom, the Congress of the United States, we are pleased to acknowledge the Byelorussian Declaration of Independence as a further bulwark against the tyranny of political and personal oppression.

March 25, 1918, was a historic date in Byelorussian history and in world history. The expression of liberty and human dignity written into the Declaration have lasted throughout the succeeding 47 years.

The Soviets may rule the land, but as long as there are those who remember this great Declaration of Independence, no Soviet regime will conquer the free hearts of Byelorussia.

Vice President Hubert Humphrey Addresses the Robert H. Goddard Memorial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our Vice President, as all of us know, serves as Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council and on the occasion of the Robert H. Goddard Memorial Dinner last Saturday evening advised those in attendance exactly what kind of Chairman he proposed to be.

His appearance at Cape Kennedy this last Tuesday on the occasion of our successful Gemini shot was a great boost to the morale of those engaged in the program.

Under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the Vice President's remarks at the Goddard Memorial Dinner:

SPEECH BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, ROBERT H. GODDARD MEMORIAL DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 19, 1965

As many of you know, just as soon as I became Vice President, my space problems started. First, there was my home. People said it was too small. But I refused to move.

Then there was my office. My former Senate colleagues, sentimental to the end, decided that my office as Vice President was too large. That time I moved—one of the rare occasions in American history when anyone expanded into smaller quarters.

Honestly, getting the Gemini into orbit is nothing compared to getting a Vice President settled down.

The President said, "HUBERT, you better forget about office space, and start worrying about outer space."

Many of you apparently have wondered precisely what kind of Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council I will be.

That, at least, is the word I get along a nonelectronic grapevine.

Of course, there could be no more appropriate place than at this dinner honoring Robert Goddard, the father of our space program, for a new NASC Chairman to present his views.

We are all greatly in Dr. Goddard's debt. The way of space is the way of the pioneer—it is the way of the builder. And Robert Goddard was a pioneer and a builder—a true visionary.

Robert Goddard said, "Every vision is a joke until the first man accomplishes it." Well, we have seen some of the results of Robert Goddard's vision, and it is no longer a joke, but a magnificant reality.

Each of you has a longstanding, deep interest in this reality—in our national aeronautics and space programs.

President Lyndon Johnson, both as Senator and as Vice President, provided strong, persistent, and visionary leadership and support. He will continue to do so.

And I intend to continue, as best I can, that Lyndon Johnson tradition. That is the kind of chairman I hope to be.

I am an advocate of a dynamic space program—a program which will suceed in reaching the goals we have set—and one which will set new goals—one that can see beyond the moon and into fields where we can only speculate about the knowledge awaiting us.

And I can promise you this will not be an advocacy simply of formal duty and responsibility. What I have learned of our space and aeronautics programs has made me an enthusiastic advocate.

It has also made me an eager student. I don't expect to become an "instant expert," but I do intend to learn by study and asking many questions.

I want to know if we are going to reach the goals set for this program by President Johnson and by our late President John Kennedy. Or has there been slippage? If there has been, why did it happen?

Is there unnecessary duplication of space efforts? Or, is there inadequate teamwork and faulty interfacing of information between agencies and between government and industry?

If we aren't doing what we should, I shall want to know why not. If the fault lies with an apathetic people forgetting the value of our space efforts. I will carry the message of the program to them.

If the fault rests with the Congress cutting back for cutting alone, I hope to be able to help there.

And if it appears that in government or in industry, there is weak administration, casual technology, sloppy or wasteful work, then together, all of us must act.

This is the kind of role I have tried to play during the 16 years I spent in the Senate working for good education—for better health and welfare programs—for urgently needed civil rights legislation. It is my role today as we work for the Great Society.

Let me assure you that the Great Society envisioned by President Lyndon Johnson is not one limited to the fight against poverty, ignorance, disease, and intolerance. The Great Society requires, in addition, an urgent quest for excellence, for intellectual attainment, for crossing new frontiers in science and technology.

Let me emphasize that an adequately funded, well-directed space program is an integral part of our Nation's commitment to its future, to its greatness.

As one who has been an advocate of domestic programs which do cost money and which are not yet finished—who knows that much remains to be done and knows how expensive it will be—I have been asked how strongly I support the space program which, according to some, will take billions of dollars away from other useful programs during the next decade.

This strong and prosperous economy permits us to do many things and to do them well. We can put a man on the moon at the same time as we help to put a man on his feet. We conquer outer space even as we conquer poverty.

I do not consider our domestic needs to be competitive with our space needs—any more than I consider them to be competitive with our national defense requirements. We can afford to do what is needed in space, in general welfare, and for our national defense.

Are we spending too much on space—and not enough on problems associated with our own planet? Both, it should be obvious, are bound together.

It is not a question of space or social welfare.

It is not the moon or medicare.

It is not Apollo or education.

It isn't Pegasus or poverty programs.

It isn't launch pads or highways.

We can and must do all these things. Our rich and dynamic Nation—growing richer every day—can afford all of these things. Our space dollars need not—and will not—deprive, starve or decimate any other useful programs.

One reason why I do support our space efforts strongly has to do with what might be called its social and economic spin-off. Let's just look at one domestic program—education.

The spin-off from the space program in education has been tremendous.

Since its beginnings in 1958, the space program has served as a spring tonic to the American education system. It has done this from the grade school through the post-graduate university.

It has challenged—and it will challenge increasingly—our finest and most creative minds to the solution of new, vital, and complex tasks.

The exploration of space represents the "frontier of our times" which either this country or another will explore.

Aside from the physical frontier of space, it also represents a frontier of technology and knowledge—an unending quest for new materials, improved techniques, more skilled scientists and engineers, better technicians and managers. Possibly the one most precious resource in this conquest is that of highly trained and dedicated people which it has attracted and developed.

And, our American schools have risen to the space challenge. In the grade schools and high schools, science courses have been modernized and new ones added. New textbooks have been written. Science teachers have been attending refresher courses to keep pace with rapid scientific advances.

The most gifted of our students are encouraged to expand their talents by means of scholarships and other assistance. Through the National Defense Education Act, which was passed in 1958, after Sputnik I, over 50,000 gifted science students have benefited from loans and fellowships.

NASA supports universities throughout the country in training space-oriented scientists and engineers; in building laboratories; in conducting space-aeronautics research.

Currently, almost 2,000 Ph. D.'s are in NASA-supported training at 131 colleges and universities. Soon these programs will exist in 142 institutions and cover every 1 of our 50 States. And consider the diffusion of knowledge resulting from such a program.

We are training advanced scholars in such diverse fields as astronomy, physics, metallurgy, and chemistry—to name just a few.

If the space program had no other side effect beyond what it has done for education in the United States, it would be worth it. But, obviously, education is not the only field where benefits can be measured.

Resources devoted to space progress create more resources for many, many other purposes. In medical research, in the biological sciences, in our earth sciences as well as in the life sciences, our space program has brought vast gain to our Nation and our people. It will continue to do so.

And our space programs have already demonstrated their usefulness in direct, practical, and peaceful ways. President Johnson reminded me recently of a speech he made about 2 years ago, indicating that the Weather Bureau predicts the following savings based on accurate weather prediction just 5 days in advance.

We will save $2½ billion a year in agriculture, $45 million in the lumber industry, $100 million in surface transportation; $75 million in retail marketing; and $3 billion in water resources management.

As the result of the competence of our weather satellites, we are already providing the nations of the world timely warnings on a global basis.

Certainly, too, we have much to gain from the accomplishments in communications.

Here again our system of private capital and Government-sponsored research has helped to tie the world community closer together through communications satellites.

And our space program has provided great stimulation to our economic and technological growth. After all, every dime of our space money is spent right here on earth. So far, there are no subcontractors on the moon.

The space program has meant profits, jobs, economic growth. In the last 6 months of 1964, the Department of Defense alone spent over $5 billion on missile and space systems and aircraft. DOD spent in contract awards for experimental, developmental, test and research work in missile space work almost $3 billion.

The space program has meant jobs too. As you know, there have been 300,000 men and women employed on the Apollo program alone.

It has infused our economy with new life. It has founded new research. It is has developed hardware and constructed laboratories and other useful facilities.

And I want to underscore an undeniable fact of this infusion—the teamwork between our privately financed and privately run companies on the one hand and the Federal Government on the other is one of the major sources of strength of the whole national space program. In fact, it is basic to the strength of this great country.

By the year 2000 this country will be even greater—quantitatively as well as qualitatively. Our population will have doubled. I checked with the Census Bureau yesterday and they tell me there will be 361,947,000 people then—90 percent in cities, 40 percent along our seaboards.

And to meet the needs of that population, our country cannot stand still. Our economy—a continued and strengthened partnership economy—must not stand still. And if the economy must grow rapidly, our technology cannot pause or stop. We are still a developing Nation—our future is unlimited.

But, even if we could not tonight point to a single immediate dollar return from the space program, we must continue—for that is man's history, as well as our destiny.

The pace of scientific discovery has increased. Only 39 years ago this month, knowledge and intelligence conspired within an American pioneer named Robert Goddard and we had a liquid fuel rocket.

Suddenly, in these few short years, a man now moves at speeds 3,000 times faster than his own legs can carry him. And in Col. John Glenn who is here with us tonight, we have a man who has already done this.

Thus we have seen in our own lifetime the world move from horsepower in its literal sense to men thrust into orbit about the earth. Who wishes to stop there? Not America. Not its people or its President. Not any man or woman in this room.

As Chairman of the Space Council, I do not intend to oversee the slowing down of our pace. I do not intend to witness the diminishing of our efforts.

If we were the only nation engaged in a space program, it would still be in our best self-interest to increase our efforts.

But, of course, we are not the only nation exploring outer space. This week's news from the Soviet Union should emphasize what we have already known well. The Soviets are investing great energy, vast resources, and know-how with great success in their space program.

Our military security rests on the same advanced research and technology as the space program. If we ever face a major confrontation with our enemies—whoever they may be—it will be in terms of Winston Churchill's "wizard war."

If we are not strong in "wizard warfare," we are doomed.

Our national security alone would suggest reason enough for us to strive for absolute leadership in space exploration.

Wherever we stand, we cannot stand still.

Each time we pause, we have had a shock from the Soviet efforts in space—from sputnik in 1958 to the man in a spacesuit yesterday.

We can and do salute the Russian achievements. We can and do admire Russian science and technology. We can and do hope for totally peaceful uses of outer space. We can and do demonstrate our eagerness to cooperate with everyone in this quest.

But, we would be foolish if we did not understand the military implications of Soviet space science, as well as our own.

Each Russian shock has produced action here. But a mature nation should not need shock treatment. We are a peaceful nation; we are a peace-loving people; but we would ignore the real interests of the free world if we diminished our military efforts in space.

That is why, even today, four great companies in the United States are competing in the design for a manned orbiting laboratory.

And even as we explore every responsible avenue for peacemaking and peacekeeping, we must insure that our military space program receives its full measure of support.

Well, in the time I have been talking to you, John Glenn went a third of the way around the globe. I don't intend to keep you for a full orbit.

I simply want you all to know that I am determined to work hard on this space program—for its intrinsic value as an intellectual search, for its domestic value as an economic goad for growth, as a pervasive stimulus for excellence, and, finally, for its importance to our military strength and the survival of free society.

Two years ago in a speech, I said, "This is a wonderful time in which to live. It challenges the best in us.

"It calls for doing the impossible—performing miracles. Mediocrity must give way to excellence; timidity to daring, fear to courage.

"We dream of sending a man to the moon in this decade. We know that dream will be fulfilled only with sacrifice, a commitment, a plan and a program."

I am delighted to have made my "maiden voyage" into outer space speeches among those of you who have indicated by your actions, your willingness to do the impossible—your commitment to excellence, daring, courage—to a plan and a program which will make America a great society in a great, and explored, universe.

Disabled Veterans and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include herein a press synopsis of a speech I recently delivered before the Disabled American Veterans at Southbridge, Mass., in my district, with reference to the closing of the Rutland, Mass., VA Hospital and the most deplorable events at Selma, Ala.:

DISABLED VETERANS AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Before the Disabled American Veterans at Southbridge Sunday, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN made a dual attack on the proposed closing by the Veterans' Administration of the Rutland VA Hospital and what he termed the "hideous brutality and savage mistreatment of Negroes and whites at Selma, Ala."

"In the name of our immortal veterans, Rutland VA Hospital must be kept open," said PHILBIN, "and in the name of everything that is sacred in this country, the inequities of Selma must be speedily redressed, voting rights assured to all, and civil rights in every respect be safeguarded and enforced.

"There is no way that anyone could possibly justify the closing of the Rutland VA Hospital. It is necessary, yes imperative, to provide proper hospitalization and care for the veterans of central Massachusetts, indeed our entire area.

"To transfer these veterans to other hospitals miles away from their homes, or even to other inadequate institutions near their homes is a shabby and completely unsatisfactory way to care for the needs of sick and disabled veterans.

"I have personally appealed to President Johnson in strongest terms not to permit VA to destroy, alter, or reduce the fine service Rutland Hospital is rendering.

"This is a time for this great organization and all veterans groups, and all relatives and friends of the veteran, 87 million strong, to demand their rights from the Federal Government.

"The abandonment of Rutland Hospital might save some relatively paltry sum for the Government, though this is very doubtful and has not been shown by the figures, but such action would visit our veterans and their dear ones with pain, anglish, and inconvenience that no economy measure could ever justify.

"I have been much encouraged by my talk with the President, and my colleagues in the Congress, but the struggle to keep Rutland Hospital open will be long and difficult, and we must continue our united front with all possible vigor and intensity, until we have achieved our goal of proper, comprehensive, modern medical care and treatment for our veterans."

Touching on the situation at Selma, PHILBIN said:

"The events at Selma are nauseating and sickening to all Americans, especially to veterans who fought to have the liberties and civil rights of everyone in this great, democratic Nation.

"We want no police state tactics here. We want no storm troopers, no Russians cossacks beating helpless people, white or black, whatever their color because they dare to stand up for voting rights, or other civil rights that are and must continue to be the birthright of every American.

"There can be no compromise on this issue. Congress has provided the law, and will continue to supplement it in every way necessary. But it is up to the executive department and the enforcement officials of this great Government to enforce the law, to protect the people in their right to assemble, to speak, to protect, and to vote, and to be treated as equals under the law.

"If these precious things cannot be secured in America to all people, then we shall be untrue to our own heritage of freedom, and we will become the laughingstock of the world.

"There can be no delay, equivocation or compromise. I hope and pray this issue can be settled promptly and effectively in an orderly way under the law without further bloodshed and trouble. At all costs it must be settled if it takes the armed strength of this Government to do the job. American freedom and justice must be guaranteed to all."

Pacific Northwest Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the awful impact of the December–January floods in the Pacific Northwest is difficult to comprehend. The damage to roads, bridges, buildings, and other works of man has been very costly and has caused great suffering and inconvenience. However, these can and will be replaced within a few months or years. This is not possible in the case of damage to productive soil resources. Mr. Donald Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, is quoted in the accompanying article as stating that it will take "at least 1,000 years" to restore topsoil to its previous productivity.

With permission I include the article by Joe Bianco, agricultural editor of the Oregonian:

(By Joe Bianco)

PENDLETON.—East of here in the snow zone where the Blue Mountains and the Wallowas snuggle closely, an unusually heavy pack is giving everyone the shivers.

A spell of warm weather, accompanied by rains, could melt tons of snow, causing another disastrous flood.

"There's a high snow pack on Catherine Creek. It is quite saturated and high in moisture," declared Ted Sidor, extension agent in Union County. "Very little came off in the last floods. I feel we're sitting on a powder keg."

The problem is compounded by another heavy pack on the Grand Ronde River. These waterways empty into the highly productive Grand Ronde Valley where more than 110,000 acres were under water during December and January. Some 4,000 acres are still in flood condition.

DAMAGE TALLIED

Agricultural damage in Union County to livestock, wheatlands and other crops, as a result of the two major floods, was $7 million.

In the Umatilla Valley, one of the high producing wheat areas of the State, a similar danger exists, according to Gerald Brog, Umatilla County extension agent. He said the snowpack on the Blue Mountains' western slopes contain enough water to create another serious flood condition.

Reconstruction work of channels and dikes has progressed in the Umatilla and Grand Ronde basins, but not to a point where floodwaters can be controlled.

Throughout this agricultural land the damage caused by the great floods is still very evident. Many of the meadowlands in the flood zone are under heavy silt. Gravel and other debris litter fields. Gulleys lace the rolling wheatland. Some have been filled. But there are still miles of miniature gorges which pose a hazard to field equipment. In some fields in Umatilla County, particularly near the small community of Reith, the swirling floodwaters of the Umatilla River created large craters * * * some measuring 30 feet across and 30 feet deep.

One of the greatest losses in this wheat country has been the top soil. In Umatilla

County which, suffered $6.9 million damage, the soil loss was estimated at $4.2 million, according to Vic Johnson, extension agent. Ralph McEwen, administrator of Oregon Wheat Commission, said the steeper the slope the more severe the erosion. He said millions of tons of valuable topsoil was lost in the flood. He dramatized the loss in this manner:

"An inch of dirt on 1 acre weighs about 160 tons. A 200-acre field is estimated to have lost 32,000 tons of its best crop-producing soil. It would take 6,500 truckloads of dirt to replace what was washed out of this field in 24 hours.

"Good stands of wheat are being torn out because we can't get equipment on the fields," he said. The wheat ranchers will have to reseed in many areas. There will be the additional expense of recultivation and fertilization, according to McEwen.

On some of the smaller acreages the cost of restoration is prohibitive.

SILT DEPOSITED

An example is the small holdings of Albert Miller, 84, who farms about 20 acres of barley near Reith along the Umatilla River. Miller, who rents the bottom land, has been farming since 1942. The floodwaters deposited several feet of silt. To remove it with hired men and machines would cost $37.50 an hour.

"I can't afford it. And I don't plan to do anything about * * * just let it sit there," said Miller.

Miller's attitude earlier was shared by others. It was felt a new pattern of farming would develop, meaning a gradual departure from wheat to other agricultural crops.

Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service, during an interview in Portland, February 9, 1965, declared there would be changes in the farming pattern as a result of the flood.

He said Government surveys of the flood damage showed the injury to farmland was of major magnitude. Williams declared the soil lost in the floodwaters cannot be restored in this lifetime, and added, it will take at least 1,000 years to replace it with the same degree of productivity.

CUT PREDICTED

"This will mean the gradual reduction of the production base for wheat, beans, and other crops which flourish in this region," said Williams.

"I think it will mark more strongly than ever before the movement of steeper slopes into grass production and livestock as opposed to cultivation of wheat, beans, and similar crops," he said. However, on the flatter lands the farming of the cultivated crops will continue, he maintained.

A different version of the future was advanced by Gene M. Lear, associate director of the Oregon State University Cooperative Extension Service.

Said Lear:

"I expect to see more flood control dams, more diking, and more pressure on agencies responsible for such programs. I would expect there will be more attention to this because farmers in the lowlands are concerned over the fact of what appears to be control of floodwaters by high river dams."

What this means is that the channel capacities are not sufficient to feed out water which was held back by dams during height of the flood.

Another Ohio State University agricultural spokesman, Marion D. Thomas, agricultural economist, feels the flood damage will not, in his opinion, cause anyone to shift from wheat production. He added that the experience of the flood will serve as an impetus to step-up conservation practices.

The same view was shared by James Hill, manager of Pendleton Grain Growers. Hill said the flood will change the pattern of farming "a little bit." There will be added emphasis on soil erosion practices, he said.

Hill also viewed the disaster from the economic standpoint. He said it had created some increased volume of business but it was "hardship business." In the long run, he maintained, it will become negative business because it comes from farmers whose profits are small.

"The flood hit us when production was off 20 percent and prices were down 15 percent," he said. "This could mean 2 consecutive years with depressed conditions. The farmer's income has been decreasing steadily from the high point in the early 1950's. While the cost of living is rising and the prices paid by farmers also increasing our net income is dropping at a faster rate."

"As for the outlook * * * well, let's wait and see what happens at the spring runoff," said Hill.

The Conscience of the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Loyola University in Chicago has one of the finest, most progressive and up-to-date schools of social work in the Nation today. During the current academic year, this school is celebrating its 50th anniversary of service to the profession and the community.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a report recently published by the university on the work of the school. In these times of renewed interest in our social and domestic problems within the United States, it is gratifying to know that the Nation is endowed with dedicated, highly qualified individuals who have devoted many years of their lives to helping others at a neighborhood, community, and city level.

Mr. Speaker, the report follows:

THE CONSCIENCE OF THE COMMUNITY—A TRIBUTE TO 50 YEARS OF SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

MATERIAL, EMOTIONAL, AND SPIRITUAL POVERTY ARE THE CONCERN OF SOCIAL WORKERS

Man by any measure is a most complex creature. Reflect upon the vast accomplishments of man: his powerful use of reason, intellect and will to fashion the great and classical ideas of philosophy, poetry, theology, economics, political theory, and law: his powers for exploration and adventure to win vital victories over nature's mighty forces: his probing, inquiring ability to invent the wheel, paper, printing, the internal combustion engine, the airplane and more recently to harness nuclear energy.

Unfortunately the same society whose technology is capable of orbiting the heavens in a man-controlled spacecraft can turn its back on the dirt-poor belts of America: Appalachia, the sun-baked slums of the American Indian, and the tenements of the Nation's big cities.

Yet out of this Nation's concern for advancement there has also arisen a concern for compassion. There are people who are willing to remember and serve the neglected in our society.

These are the social workers. Numbering 20,000 professionals, they are concerned with the millions of Americans who are afflicted by severe material, emotional and spiritual poverty.

The social work professionals assist society's outcasts, the unemployed, the sick, the aged, the mentally ill, and the minority groups. Social workers very often serve in a sociolegal situation such as the termination of parental rights in the case of neglected or dependent children, or the placement of children for adoption. The accused prisoner who must forfeit his right to freedom because of insufficient funds to make a bond, finds social workers pleading his cause too.

Thus, the social worker is the conscience of his community. For he examines the causes and consequences of social decay and by virtue of his professional training, assists persons not ready to cope with their own problems.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK—FIFTY YEARS OF SERVICE

At Chicago's Loyola University there has been a steady realization of the need to educate trained social workers. Under the dynamic leadership of the Reverend Frederic Siedenburg, the school of social work was launched in 1914. At the time it was the first Catholic school of social work in America. The courage and dedication of this dynamic Jesuit provided the impetus for a school which has educated thousands of men and women for professional service in social welfare.

The Loyola School of Social Work has had a significant impact upon its community and the profession. The school has trained more than one-third of the professional social workers serving in the Chicago area's private and public agencies.

As a tribute to the service and activities of the school of social work on the occasion of its golden anniversary, this Loyola report, explores in word and picture, some of the ideas and attitudes of the school and its graduates.

SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION DEMANDS IDEALISM AND REALISM

The two men who direct the educational program of the school of social work are its dean, Matthew H. Schoenbaum, who is widely respected for his volunteer posts with numerous civic and Government agencies, and the Reverend Felix P. Biestek, S.J., director of fieldwork, who has earned an international reputation as a social work educator.

Dean Schoenbaum describes Loyola's philosophy of social work education as one which "constantly presents the students with the fact that there does exist a kinship between man, his neighbors, and God."

According to Father Biestek, the casework method, which is the approach to teaching which Loyola's School of Social Work advocates, demands that in the person-to-person relationships with a client, "the professional must be a firm-footed realist and a clear-eyed idealist."

"There are 65 accredited graduate schools of social work in the United States and Canada," Dean Schoenbaum says, "Virtually all of them maintain a good ratio of faculty to students which results in a tutorial method of teaching. This is the fact at Loyola also where a faculty of teachers and fieldwork supervisors number 25 and the students number 186.

"During a 2-year curriculum, the students receive a truly professional education for active social work with classroom lectures devoted to principles and skills and fieldwork practice in many public and private agencies where these skills are practiced under faculty supervision.

"In addition to the synchronization of class theory and practical application in fieldwork, the school develops in the students a spirit of scientific inquiry through a selected program of research."

Dean Schoenbaum has held his post of leadership in the school of social work since 1947; however, his career in the field spans 30 years. He has served with the Board of Education in the District of Columbia and the Corrective and Protective Services unit of the District of Columbia's Department of Public Welfare.

The dean is also a member of the advisory committee on social services to the Chief Justice of the municipal court of Chicago and a number of other posts where his background and training as an attorney are of value.

"It is highly important that the social worker be sensitive to the law, its power and many implications," Dean Schoenbaum asserts, "for the social worker's role with his clients is a very special one, and quite frequently constitutes an awesome responsibility.

"Think of the burden placed upon a professional social worker when he must stand before a judge in a court of law and calmly recommend the continuation or termination of parental rights for a delinquent or dependent child. Or think of the long-range implications of a social worker's recommendation to a court to place a child for adoption with a specific family," he asks.

These are the varied responsibilities which professional social workers today must face in addition to their traditional roles of assisting many persons secure material help.

"During the fieldwork period of social work education, there are many other services which the students learn to offer," says Father Biestek.

"They learn how to counsel widows with young families on methods of receiving public financial assistance. They learn to assist the destitute aged persons who need long-term nursing care, and they are taught how to assist the handicapped not only with the very important family and financial problems, but also with the sensitive emotional adjustments necessary to make by one who has lost his eyesight, speech, or a limb," he adds.

Father Biestek has distinguished himself as a writer in the field of social work education. Among his several books is "The Casework Relationship," which since its publication in 1957 has been translated into five languages. Another important contribution of Father Biestek's was his chairmanship for 4 years of the accreditation commission of the Council on Social Work Education.

"The thrust of Loyola University's School of Social Work is to assist in the development of social consciousness and a social conscience; to orient the candidates for the master's degree to the role of their profession in the democratic society in which it operates, and to provide them with a philosophy of life which will always recognize the dignity of the human being," explains Father Biestek.

MSGR. RAYMOND GALLAGHER: SPOKESMAN FOR A MORE RESPONSIBLE ATTITUDE TOWARD POVERTY

The Federal Government will soon be allocating funds to alleviate poverty in America. For many years, however, there have been significant contributions made in this area by a number of private voluntary agencies. One of the largest of these private groups is Catholic charities, whose agencies are active in 137 Catholic dioceses in the United States.

According to Msgr. Raymond Gallagher, a 1948 graduate of Loyola's School of Social Work, who is secretary of the 375 member agency National Conference of Catholic Charities, in Washington, D.C., both private and public agencies must cooperate to eliminate the hard core of poverty which exists in the United States today.

"In other nations," he explains, "poverty can usually be traced to national catastrophies such as war, pestilence or enforced movements of people. But in America second and third generations of hard core poverty exist. It is unfortunate that we idealize the strong and don't give any recognition to the disabilities of many who cannot compete in the race for material success," he comments.

Monsignor Gallagher has given thoughtful consideration to industry's responsibility for social welfare and urges retention and retraining of the employees whose functions have become obsolete through automation.

"Thus there would be an elimination of the idea that government is a good provider, and a return to a much more personalized and dignified relationship between employee and employer."

DORA SOMERVILLE: AIDS IN REHABILITATION OF YOUNG OFFENDERS

Some offenders against society are not so fortunate as to have the opportunity for rehabilitation without imprisonment. Because of the seriousness of the crimes with which they are charged, auto theft, rape, burglary, etc., their menace to the community is very real, and they must be confined.

For Dora Somerville, one of five commissioners on the Illinois Youth Commission, these young people are a great challenge to social work. "Our task," she explains, "is to move them from a pattern of delinquency to one of responsibility."

Miss Somerville, a 1947 graduate of Loyola's School of Social Work, has a great opportunity to aid many young offenders. Each year the commission helps rehabilitate nearly 4,000 youths. As a commissioner, Miss Somerville hears their cases at the Illinois training schools (St. Charles for Boys, Geneva for Girls) and at the industrial State training school for boys, Sheridan, and the reception and diagnostic center for boys in Joliet.

Miss Somerville has had an opportunity to serve in the correctional field in a number of capacities. Prior to her present appointment she was director of the social service department of the municipal court's psychiatric institute and earlier was program coordinator at the Illinois State Training School for Girls in Geneva.

"No one offense causes delinquency," she believes. "It results from a combination of many things—family disorganization, frustration, a child left too early on his own, and powerfully destructive community forces."

To counteract these influences, Miss Somerville, as a youth commissioner for the State of Illinois, tries to help the delinquent develop three inner sources: hope, a desire to prepare for the future, and persistence.

"Social workers can be one of the greatest influences in an urban community," she says, "for their work is direct; it affects the poor and underprivileged. But social reform must also be their concern for the future, with emphasis on such vital areas as poverty, unemployment, education, and civil rights."

RAYMOND P. GANEY: STABILIZER FOR A COMMUNITY

In sharp relief to the poor who must turn to the public agencies for assistance and guidance are the many middle class clients of the adult and child guidance center of St. Francis Hospital, in the quiet tree-filled suburb of Evanston, Ill., just north of Chicago.

"It is a great error to feel that social work services are needed only by poor people," says Raymond P. Ganey, chief psychiatric social worker for the large private hospital's center. The hospital serves an area of more than 200,000 people.

"Human emotions, must be kept in balance. When the perspective is lost and the emotions become unglued, when fear, anger, insecurity, and tensions mount, many a stable person drops threateningly toward mental illness."

At this crucial stage, the psychiatric social worker, in collaboration with the psychiatrist and psychologist, explores the troubled emotions and works toward sound diagnosis and reasonable goals.

Raymond Ganey is typical of many psychiatric social workers now found in increasing numbers in private hospitals, institutions, and welfare agencies.

Ganey has had fine preparation for his work. He was assistant director of the social service department of the psychiatric institute of Chicago's municipal court, and while a student in Loyola's School of Social Work, he interned at the Institute of Juvenile Research specializing in child guidance work.

Last year, he estimates, the adult and child guidance center treated over 400 cases requiring almost 4,000 direct patient contacts. Many of those who come to the center do so at the suggestion of their own physician, their school, or the hospital's busy outpatient or emergency departments.

"The psychiatric social worker is concerned with the stabilization of the entire family. We're not just concerned with a child's problems. We see his parents and when adults seek help for themselves their children often profit from the relief of family stress," he says.

"Every social level has its own social pressures. Slums and suburbs alike are subject to the pressures which cause stress in family life. As social workers, we must learn to listen to their problems and remember that feelings are facts, but facts are not necessarily feelings," Ganey concludes.

FRANK CIZON: RESEARCH SHAPES THE FUTURE OF SOCIAL WORK PROFESSION

To Dr. Frank Cizon, one of the major functions of the social worker is to act as the social conscience of the community.

"Many people who are comfortable in life are unaware of the pressing problems of the poor," Dr. Cizon points out.

"The social worker is in a position to pinpoint areas of community need which must be met by community effort. He can do this by making community leaders aware of the needs which he sees every day in his work."

Dr. Cizon underscores this idea in his own work as director of research for the school of social work. The research projects which he directs probe many festering social sores in Chicago neighborhods, and point out to the social agencies on the front line how they solve the social problems with which they are involved.

"The expansion of social work practice demands a constant reevaluation of the success or failure of what the social worker accomplished. By providing our students with an idea of research methods, we help prepare them to evaluate their own actions and the services they provide once they enter the field," Dr. Cizon asserts.

To give students this knowledge of research tools, Dr. Cizon each year directs the second-year class in a special research project.

In recent years they have studied attitudes toward delinquency in a typical Chicago community (Garfield Park), sought attitudes toward retirement and old age from 302 recipients of old-age-assistance and studied 290 families on ADC to determine their special needs.

This year, under Dr. Cizon's direction, 34 students interviewed 236 people in housing projects, tenements, middle class homes, and luxurious lakefront high-rise apartments. Their object was to gain knowledge of the attitudes and behavior of social classes in Chicago's near north, Lincoln Park, and Gold Coast areas.

"We were looking to uncover the influence social class and community membership had on opinions, attitudes, and behavior," Dr. Cizon says. "We searched for opinions on community awareness, urban renewal, educational and family interests, self-concepts and mobility aspirations," he said.

Dr. Cizon's research found that the real poor—the unemployed, the sporadically em-

ployed, or the unskilled—were not interested in aspirations or betterment. They sought security. "This attitude must be understood in neighborhood planning such as urban renewal. Programs for rebuilding neighborhoods must salvage the spirits of the residents for urban renewal must rebuild people as well as buildings," Dr. Cizon asserted.

Rebuilding people is also the prime concern of another project on which Dr. Cizon is working with members of Loyola's Psychology Department. This project, now underway at the Cook County jail, aims at developing a standard for the classification of inmates confined for petty offenses, based of their need for rehabilitation. The study is financed by an $85,000 grant from the State of Illinois and will extend into 1965.

The goal of the project is to develop a series of tests which can be quickly administered to newly arrived prisoners and which will aid jail officials in determining their proper classification.

"Punishment is not enough for the petty offenders who are returned to society in a short time. They are usually in custody because of conditions other than their offenses. Many have no skills and can't get jobs.

"Anything that can be done to make them function more effectively in the community will be a social service. It will be a financial saving to the community, too, because, given proper training, many of these offenders will not return to jail.

"The social worker," Dr. Cizon says "actually promotes community stability. He becomes, in a sense, the hand of community responsibility. In this way, everyone in the community benefits from his services, not just those he helps directly."

BERNADETTE MICHIE: A FAMILY ORIENTED CASEWORKER

A devoted, secure family is not only a joy to its members, but a strong factor in the stabilization of society and a strong nation.

What happens when marital conflict rips the family apart? When husband and wife stop being partners and become opponents, family life is gravely threatened and eventually the community is dulled by the discord.

The only solution for many sick marriages rests with a social worker skilled in the methods of marital counseling. Such a specialist is Bernadette Michie, director of casework services for the Catholic Family Consultation Service, an agency of the Chicago Archdiocese.

Miss Michie, who has an average of 70 cases requiring marital counseling in her department each month, believes the chief responsibility of the social worker dealing with marital problems is to protect and enhance family life.

To achieve this, the social worker helps lay bare the cause of the trouble and then assists the partners in understanding and overcoming their problems.

"The two basic causes for marital trouble," Miss Michie points out, "are a breakdown in communications and emotional immaturity." A problem, such as unemployment, might precipitate a crisis but the actual reason for the difficulty will be that the couple have long ago ceased to communicate with one another.

"We are family oriented in our approach," she explains, "we don't just take into account the people with whom we work, for conflict also disturbs the children."

Miss Michie, who has headed the family consultation service for the past 3 years, has discovered no clear-cut formula for marital happiness. But she is much more definite about the causes of marital unhappiness.

"We social workers are finding that many marital problems stem from emotional immaturity. A mature individual can handle such things as freer suburban living or the temptations of easy credit, but the emotionally immature cannot."

MARGARET QUANE: POTENTIAL DROPOUTS ARE HER CONCERN

The Nation's job market is flooded with unqualified persons seeking positions for which they will never qualify. One serious cause of this situation is the school dropout. When a child drops out of school too soon, often it is not because he cannot compete intellectually, but rather because social or emotional problems have robbed him of his ability to compete.

If such problems go unrecognized, he may miss forever his priceless opportunity for education.

Margaret Quane, supervisor of social work in the Evanston public schools and a school social worker since 1948, summarized her role this way:

"The school social worker steps in whenever a teenager needs help because of his behavior or attitude in the classroom or the community. When a student is in trouble outside the school, the social worker can often help him avoid a criminal conviction which would remove him permanently from society.

"The school social worker explores every facet of the student's life including his situation at home, his school relationships, and his personal life.

"Our whole concern is to prevent delinquency. Our task is to learn of potential dropouts, and extend the teacher's services into the home," she says.

STEPHEN GREEN: THE PROFESSIONAL CAN NEVER CEASE TO LEARN

Learning is a lifelong process. Today's educated man cannot end his college career and begin a profession as if the two were separate entities. Continuing education is essential for continuing success.

Stephen Green, director of training and personnel for the Cook County Department of Public Aid, not only believes this to be true, he has shaped his training program around the theory.

Mr. Green, a professional social worker and a teacher, entered the field in 1934 when he took a summer job in public aid before returning to his duties as a history teacher for the Chicago Public Schools. This temporary job has lasted 30 years and in that time Mr. Green has worked continually to upgrade social work by stressing education and inservice training.

At Cook County Public Aid, an agency with 4,000 employees, Mr. Green pursues two main objectives in his training program. He is first concerned with raising the level of training for the total field, and secondly, with pioneering in new methods of training.

Although there are only 20,000 professional social workers in the United States today, there are places for an estimated 550,000 social workers. Mr. Green's work helps close this gap.

"In 1957," he explains, "as divisional director of Illinois Public Aid, I started the idea of sending outstanding employees back to school to obtain a master's degree in social work.

"Now," he continues, "with the Social Security Act amendments, States are required to establish training programs, so the idea has spread throughout the country."

To date 85 employees have so far earned master's degrees under this plan.

"Through each of our many programs," Mr. Green points out, "we encourage our employees to continue training and learning. After all, we are responsible not only to our agency, but to the total field of social work."

BETTY V. BOYLE: FIELDWORK FULFILLS A PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATION

Social work education blends classroom instruction with fieldwork experience. This training experience is provided by 25 community agencies which cooperate with Loyola by permitting a unit of students to work in each agency a certain number of days a week under close supervision.

One of these cooperating agencies is the Mid-America chapter of the American National Red Cross, where three Loyola students are currently training.

Miss Betty Boyle, a Loyola social work graduate and director of Red Cross Service to Military Families where Loyola students spend 2 days each week, is proud to point out that Red Cross has assisted the training of student units from Loyola and the University of Chicago for over 30 years.

"Students are a blood transfusion to an agency," Miss Boyle says. "They force you to be current. You can't teach social work practice of 10 years ago to students. They already know the latest trends in the field from their classroom work."

In service to military families, where a staff of over 50 caseworkers handle problems relating to servicemen and their families, students gain experience in family oriented casework. They handle cases selected by the agency's student supervisor, Mrs. Arloa Worthington, to give them a clear idea of the helping process. Student cases relate to many family stresses such as marital discord, medical planning, emotional problems, illegitimacy.

The reward an agency receives for making its facilities available to students from a graduate school of social work is the satisfaction of assisting the development of the profession. If you really believe in a profession, Miss Boyle feels, you have an obligation to promote it. In addition, she believes, Red Cross and other agencies which help train Loyola students, are also contributing to the community by assisting Loyola in developing professional social workers.

"A professional social worker," she explains, "requires a minimum of supervision, brings an understanding of human behavior to his work and can quickly diagnose a problem and determine which cases may be successfully treated and which are impossible.

"It costs the community less," Miss Boyle says; "to have a professional social worker taking care of community problems. The more we can do to increase their number, the better it will be for community well-being."

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

No era in the history of man has been without its social problems. But in this day of automated industry and vast metropolitan complexes, the weight of social problems has become almost oppressive. Providentially, however, we are gradually learning to cope with these problems that cause mankind so much pain and frustration.

Many private and public agencies are deeply involved in the betterment of social conditions throughout the Nation. For a half century, Loyola University has participated in this vitally important work through the preparation of social workers among whom, as the pages of this Loyola report indicate, are men and women of the highest dedication, devotion and professional competence.

JAMES F. MAGUIRE, S.J.,
President, Loyola University.

Junkyard Preventive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Beaumont Journal, a fine newspaper in

my district, had an article in its February 3, 1965, edition regarding a suggested proposal made by Eliot Janeway, a New York economist and columnist, to free the U.S. industry from the burden of accumulated obsolete machinery by means of exporting depreciated capital equipment. As mentioned in the article, this might well fit into President Johnson's plan to keep the Nation's highways beautiful.

I believe this article will be of interest to all Americans.

JUNKYARD PREVENTIVE

A New York economist and columnist has advanced a proposal that appears to fit the future pattern of President Johnson's broad plan to remove the ugliness along the Nation's highways and replace it with beauty.

The suggestion, by Eliot Janeway in Ward's Quarterly, a new magazine aimed primarily at management interests, is that the United States send some of its used machinery and motor vehicles to underdeveloped countries as part of our foreign aid program.

It makes sense.

Exporting depreciated capital equipment is one way to free U.S. industry from the burden of accumulated obsolescence. It would supplement the flow of cash foreign aid with depreciated equipment, and, as Janeway points out, it would accelerate the outflow of U.S. cars and trucks and thus strengthen the national boom at one of its strongest points—the automotive industry.

Obviously such exports would reduce the number of cars and trucks turned out to graze, so to speak, in junkyards throughout the country. Once these unsightly heaps were removed, as the President proposes they should be, the exportation of old motor vehicles would help prevent new accumulations.

Underdeveloped countries would benefit from such a program, for the simple reason that they would receive more of the things they need. U.S. industry, given tax write-offs for participating in the program, would have that much more money to pump into production and expansion, and thus boost the national economy.

The 144th Anniversary, Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, March 25 is not only Greece's national holiday, but it is the date on which the seeds sown by the Founding Fathers of the American Republic bloomed on another continent for the first time.

On March 25, 1821, an overwhelmingly outnumbered, valiant band of Greeks rose against their foreign ruler, as they had done every generation for four centuries, only to be beaten down every time in waves of terror that spared neither humans, nor animals, nor even trees—this ruler had systematically destroyed the forests and orchards of Greece.

But the justice of the Greek cause prevailed because the rising of March 25, 1821, was designed to succeed, perhaps because the new American Nation had established that all nations have the right to live in freedom. The American Nation supported the Greek fighters for freedom and thus the Greeks, who first established freedom as the one true basis of government, became independent once more.

Mr. Speaker, in the 144 years since, Greece has been a faithful and gallant ally of America. In the First World War, the Second World War, the fight against Stalinist domination of Europe, and the Korean war. In the fight against Communist terror the American Government helped the Greeks materially, and they won, beating back an invasion launched by international Communists, and set an example that we would like to see emulated in Vietnam and elsewhere, the Greeks won because their people could be trusted to fight, gun in hand, for freedom, as they had always done—most notably in the glorious struggle which began on March 25, 1821.

Navy League President Promotes Military Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, more than 30 members of the House Armed Services Committee have introduced legislation which would provide for a pay increase for our military men, which is vitally needed, following the lead of Chairman L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina. I am a strong supporter of this legislation, and I have also introduced a bill, H.R. 1526, which would require an annual report to Congress comparing the salary rates of the uniformed services and those of private industry, to bring our military pay rates in line with civilian salaries.

I am pleased to bring this legislation to the attention of the House of Representatives, and will also like to commend to the Members the following article from the March 18, 1965, Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., reporting on the very articulate and forceful views of Rear Adm. Robert H. Barnum, of New York, president of the Navy League of the United States:

PAY HIKE FOR MILITARY HELD VITAL TO CURB LOSS OF KEY PERSONNEL

(By Mike Deehan, Times-Union staff writer)

Military pay is so low the services cannot hold on to the men they train, the president of the Navy League of the United States declared here last night.

Rear Adm. Robert H. Barnum, of New York, addressing the league's Jacksonville Council in the Officers Club at Jacksonville Naval Air Station, also said the loss of trained men costs the American taxpayer additional money to train replacements necessary to operate this Nation's defenses.

"It seems tragic that the American serviceman is deemed good enough to serve his country all over the world * * * and is deemed good enough to defend his country—indeed the free world—and to lose his life, but is not deemed good enough by civilian leadership for him to be paid even as much as a 40-hour-per-week civil service employee, grade for grade," Admiral Barnum said.

He added that no industry or major business corporation could survive with an employee "quit rate" similar to that of the Armed Forces. He said the Navy loses 20 to 25 percent of its enlisted personnel each year.

"We lose within 5 years 10,000 of the 13,000 officers commissioned each year. After 8 years, only 7 percent of the officers remain in the service. The rest simply cannot afford to stay and serve their country," he said.

Barnum, a Reserve officer, is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and now is an executive with United States Steel Corp. in New York. Currently completing his second year as president of the league, he is making a nationwide effort to get the salaries and living standards of military officers and enlisted men raised to a standard comparable with their civilian counterparts.

"A number of military service chiefs have made a continued appeal for adequate pay and allowances. The reply from the civilian side of the Pentagon merely indicates, 'It's not needed,'" he said.

"What can the man in uniform do? He quits the services and America loses in the fantastic costs of the turnover of our trained, competent, service people—technicians, pilots, navigators, electronic experts, and others—at the very time there is a 25-percent increased demand for qualified technicians in all critical branches."

Barnum said that without a draft law, the number entering the enlisted ranks of all services—perhaps excepting the Marine Corps—would drop to near zero.

"Many American servicemen (and their families) exist on subpoverty income levels by definition of the very Government they serve.

"Moonlighting is a necessity for the people in almost every military area of the country."

He said the Air Force has found it has 5,047 personnel on public relief and 55,000 more eligible for benefits.

"The Navy League must exercise the finest kind of leadership possible to obtain for the Armed Forces the recognition they desperately need," the admiral said.

"As we do this let us also realize that, first, we are doing a constructive service for Americans of all walks of life (taxpayers) in the reduction of over $3 billion lost each year because of the loss of trained service people, and, second, we would have a far better, far more capable military team if we paid them sufficiently to encourage the most competent to remain in the services for their careers and as Americans first class," he concluded.

Iowa City, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, my hometown Iowa City, Iowa, has been selected by the U.S. News & World Report news magazine in the March 29 issue as one of the "Pleasant Places To Live in United States." The U.S. News survey team selected 14 places in the United States where living is easy and the surroundings rewarding. The survey searched for communities where life is serene and satisfactory, with advan-

tages that troubled big cities do not have. Iowa City was selected as one of the smaller cities where life is still held to be good.

I am very proud of my hometown, Mr. Speaker. Iowa City is rapidly becoming the cultural center of the Midwest and now it is chosen as one of the pleasant places to live by a magazine of nationwide repute. I am proud to represent this city and its people in Congress. I know it as a pleasant place to live, but to allow my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the opportunity of learning of this fine place, I ask unanimous consent to include the U.S. News & World Report statements in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

IOWA CITY, IOWA

Talking about life in Iowa City, Lane Davis, professor of political science at the University of Iowa, said this:

"A big city, at best, can be an exciting, high-voltage place, but an impersonal place as well. A small town is very personal, and frequently very dull.

"A university town like this is a happy medium. You don't get killed when you walk down the street here, and you are seldom bored."

This is indeed a university town. Included among the 45,000 residents are 14,000 college students and 6,000 people who work for the university.

Iowa City benefits not only from the presence of the university, but also from a steady growth in business and light industry. It gives the impression of being prosperous, lively, clean, and safe.

Occasionally, students have held civil rights demonstrations in Iowa City. Few Negro families live here, however, and a civic booster said: "Actually, we don't know what racial problems are."

Procter & Gamble built a plant here in 1956. Robert Marsden, the manager, explained why:

When the company decided on new facilities to serve its western markets, Mr. Marsden said, cities and towns in several States were examined.

After the field was narrowed to a small group of college towns, Iowa City was chosen because it was a good location for shipping, offered a plentiful supply of high-quality labor, and was an attractive place for employees to live.

In Mr. Davis' opinion, a sensible way to judge a place is the time it takes to reach other places of interest.

"You can cover a lot of ground in 1 hour from Iowa City," he said. "You can find good restaurants, for example. In 5 hours you can drive to Chicago.

"It's easy to go shopping downtown in Iowa City. The stores don't offer a wide choice, but you know the people in them.

"Then there are all the other things associated with the university. There is 10 times more cultural activity here than anybody can take in. And the people who make this go on live here."

Why Didn't They Stay Home?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, many people have commented upon the motives of those who have demonstrated in Selma, Ala. Many have called the demonstrators Communist inspired. Others describe them as misguided do-gooders.

Last week, on the editorial page of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Tribune, there appeared a strong, clear answer to these critics, an answer which not only supports those demonstrators who protest against injustice, but point out the reasons why all morally decent Americans must take a position during these times.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert this fine editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHY DIDN'T THEY STAY HOME?

"Why didn't those ministers stay home? They had no call to go down to Selma * * * they have plenty of problems to tend right here at home."

That was one comment we heard—more than once—this week on the influx of clergy from all parts of the country to that small Alabama city so many of us had never heard of before.

We also heard this:

"That idea of marching to Montgomery was just plain ridiculous. How can decent people honestly believe cluttering up our roadways or any of these other protest actions are going to do any good * * * if you ask me, they're all Commie inspired * * * that's what."

And this:

"When I saw those TV newsreels of those frightened, weeping people being chased by that posse * * * well, it was the first time I'd cried * * * really ached with sorrow and shame * * * since a year ago November."

Comment No. 1 leads us to wonder—just how do we define "home" when it comes to marching out to do battle against forces threatening its walls?

Do we limit "home" to our house and yard, perhaps; or to our city, our county, our State, our country?

Do we protest at indignities and injustices heaped only on members of our immediate family? On those down the block? Where do we draw the line? Or do we just keep mum, as so many did in the Germany of the 1930's and 1940's did—and, at last, heard that dreaded pounding on their own door.

As for comment No. 2, on protests, we're intrigued as to how that Bethesdan explains our confrontation at the bridge at Concord to his children—or the Boston Tea Party.

As one columnist put it this week: "I just can't believe that it's necessary to have a brigade of Communists around to let somebody in on the fact that he can't register to vote * * * or that his head has just been split open * * * or his church burned."

Certainly demonstrations aren't pleasant affairs, either for the participants or those about them. They must indeed delight the Communists who love to see this type of dissension in the free world although they take a very dim view indeed of any such goings on in their own. And, heaven knows, some of those unbathed, long-haired, unkempt-looking individuals trying to crash the White House or the Department of Justice aren't our cup of tea and are abusing the privilege of free assembly and protest.

But, abuses aside, these demonstrations seem to have been one of the few paths open to a large group inching their way on the road to full citizenship. And it does look as though Congress—and courts—haven't felt any particular urge to spring into action on their behalf.

As for comment No. 3, many felt this way. And many must agree that those four Bethesda clergymen going to Selma were brave men indeed * * * men of the caliber of like Senator DAN BREWSTER, who risked friendships and career to run against George Wallace last spring, and men who surely hold the philosophy expressed by President Kennedy in his "Profiles of Courage"—"A man does what he must * * * in spite of personal consequences, in spite of obstacles, dangers and pressures * * * and that is the basis of all human morality."

These are men, too, who express concern over the many groups in this land of ours—far right and far left—who are taking words like "American" and "liberty" and "Christian" and "Constitution" to recruit the nonthinking to their peculiar causes and to prove that they and they alone are true patriots.

We certainly can issue no blanket condemnation for the people of Alabama, as some feel impelled to do.

We love the South. And we firmly believe that every hamlet—every city—in this country of ours, be it South, North, East, West—has its small share of residents who'd like nothing better than to get on a horse and swing a chain at somebody. (We must admit, however, that most of their fellow citizens hesitate to put them in any position of authority.)

For every chain swinger in this country, there are thousands of good men. Perhaps the moral indignation voiced across this land at the Selma brutality, will give the more timid of these the necessary impetus to speak out.

It isn't always easy to do. But neither is it easy to face armed troops at a bridge—be it Concord—or a span over the Alabama River.

For those Americans wanting that simple answer we mentioned earlier, we will suggest two:

Allowing all American citizens to vote, as suggested by President Lyndon Johnson in his magnificant address to the Congress Monday night.

And bearing well in mind that "the real tragedy of evil comes when good men do nothing."

Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on March 8 and March 15 the town of Concord, Mass., held its annual town meeting.

The town meeting of this historic community in Massachusetts adopted unanimously a resolution expressing its concern for the rights and liberties of all Americans.

As the inheritors of the proud tradition of 1775, the people of Concord sounded a new call for the achievement in practice of our democratic principles. I would like to include this fine resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks:

Resolved, That we, the citizens of Concord, Mass., in town meeting assembled, express our deepest concern over the violation in the State of Alabama of the fundamental personal rights and liberties given to every American by the Constitution of the United States.

Since 1775, when, at the bridge in Concord, men first fought and died for the cause of human freedom in our country, we have made progress toward realizing this ideal for all of our citizens. We are also well aware that much more needs to be done in all the States of the Union.

That nearly two centuries later, American citizens must suffer and die in seeking these constitutional rights and liberties seems to us a retreat from principles so dearly bought by so many. Let therefore all of us resolve to increase our efforts to the end that the rights and liberties guaranteed by our Constitution will be enjoyed by all; further

Resolved, That the selectmen of Concord be and hereby are authorized to send copies of the foregoing resolution to such public authorities in this State and elsewhere as they may deem advisable.

CORNELIA LAWRENCE,
Town Clerk.

Lions International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the story of Lions International starts in 1917, when its founder, Melvin Jones, of Chicago, counseled that "no club shall hold out as one of its objectives the financial gain of its membership." American businessmen working through the Lions, have put new meaning into an idea as old as civilization itself—man's duty to his fellow man.

Every Lion thinks first of his own country and rightfully so, but he does not blind himself to the good in people of other nations. If he did, he could not long remain a Lion.

Lions are men who desire to develop friendships among the peoples of many lands; men who are interested in good will and good fellowship, instead of distrust, fear, and hate. We cannot forget the Lions International youth exchange program. This program is based on student vacation exchanges financed by local clubs and provides visiting foreign students with a true picture of American family and social life. Seldom has a program received so much commendation in the early stages of its existence. It is an experiment in international living and is splendidly successful.

As the largest service club organization in the world, the Lions organization has achieved an outstanding record in its assistance to the sightless and in the area of the prevention of blindness. Lions has been a member agency of CARE since 1957. In each community where the purple and gold banner of Lionism is displayed, an untold number of humanitarian services are rendered.

As a member of the Downtown Miami Lions Club, I am proud to direct your attention to what we call the "objects of the association," which are in brief:

First. To create and foster a spirit of "generous consideration" among the peoples of the world through a study of the problems of international relationships.

Second. To promote the theory and practice of the principles of good government and good citizenship.

Third. To take an active interest in the civic, social, and moral welfare of the community.

Fourth. To unite the members in the bonds of friendship, good fellowship, and mutual understanding.

Fifth. To provide a forum for the full and free discussion of all matters of public interest—partisan politics and sectarian religion alone excepted.

Sixth. To encourage efficiency and promote high ethical standards in business and professions; provided that no club shall hold out as one of its objects financial benefits to its members.

A few years ago a simple, meaningful, two-word motto was chosen by the Lions. These two words are "We Serve." It is the belief of Lions International that it can work under that simple, sincere motto, knowing that out of the sum total of its efforts, will come better days for all mankind.

As part of its effort to promote good government and good citizenship Lions place major attention on and take positive action for developing those programs intended to emphasize, encourage, and foster the American way of life.

As an example of this kind of action, a fellow Lion, Brig. Hubert W. Holmes, chairman of the citizenship and patriotism committee of district 35A, Florida Lions, brought to my attention the following resolution adopted by District 35A Lions International:

Whereas it is the responsibility of every Lion, both individually, and in concert with all other Lions assembled in meetings of their respective Lions clubs, to live up to the "Lions International Club Activities Code of Citizenship and Patriotism"; and

Whereas in our opinion there now exists a continuing threat to our "American Way of Life" from extremists of both the right and the left; a possible weakening of our recognition of our duties to our country; a lessening of the patriotic urge to unselfishly serve our country in the preservation of our hard-won freedoms; and the immediate and continuing direct and insidious attacks of Communistic ideology on traditions, ideals, religious freedoms, as well as our political and economic rights as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore,

We, the board of directors of the Hialeah Industrial Lions Club, in meeting assembled this 25th day of July 1963, on behalf of ourselves and the membership of this club do hereby, by this resolution, adopt a program the purposes and objectives being as noted herein; and

Therefore, it is further recommended and requested that all Lions, Lions clubs, and Lion districts in the State of Florida, and Florida Lions while assembled in the next Florida Lions State Convention do favorably consider the adoption of this active program of American citizenship and patriotism and at the same time adopt this resolution as an expression of their own beliefs: Now, therefore, be it further

Resolved, That we pledge ourselves individually and collectively to take vigorous and positive action by encouraging, participating, and helping to develop educational programs designed to emphasize the American way of life to include our traditions, ideals, religious freedoms, as well as our political and economic rights as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; and to insure that our children, and the public are informed of the nature of the international Communist conspiracy to conquer the world.

MORTON BERNSTEIN,
President.
WILLIAM J. RAMSAY,
Secretary.
S. G. OSBORNE, IPP,
Chairman, Citizenship and Patriotism Committee.

Attest:

JOHN F. HATTAN,
Cabinet Secretary-Treasurer.

Not Right Place To Cut Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLLAND REDLIN
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial expressing the concern many of us feel about proposed changes in technical assistance financing in the soil conservation program appeared in the March 1965, edition of the North Dakota Rural Electric magazine. Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NOT RIGHT PLACE TO CUT BUDGET

The North Dakota Association of Soil Conservation Districts has gone on record as strongly opposing a recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget calling for a $20 million cut in the 1966 appropriations for SCS technical assistance to landowners and operators in local soil conservation districts.

The association's resolution has the unanimous backing of the 70 soil conservation districts in the State as well as the North Dakota congressional delegation in Washington and most State leaders. At this time, one North Dakota farm organization has voiced support to defeat the budget cut and others are expected to take similar action soon.

The proposal would mean a decrease of approximately 20 percent below the level this year.

In addition, it would require landowners and operators in soil conservation districts to pay approximately 50 percent of the cost of Federal technical assistance they now get in planning and field work to develop soil and water conservation practices on the farmer's land.

What would this mean?

Frank Schaan, Balta, president of the State association, said: "District supervisors contacted throughout the State estimate that if the Budget Bureau's proposal is enacted into law, there would be a drop of about 50 percent in the number of soil and water conservation practices carried out."

This is because local soil conservation districts would be unable to bear 50 percent of the cost of the technical assistance out of their own budgets and "it's doubtful" if farmers would be willing to pay for this assistance. "Instead, they just wouldn't initiate conservation practices such as planting trees, building dams, irrigation and watersheds."

The ultimate result would also affect to a degree the local economy. It's estimated, for instance, that about 50 technicians would be out of work and perhaps forced to leave the State for other employment.

The Budget Bureau proposes legislation to establish a revolving fund as a means of

handling cash payments to the Federal Government as partial payment for SCS assistance. Should such a fund be established and money collected from farmers and soil conservation districts, it is expected the Budget Bureau would ask SCS to turn back an equivalent amount of its appropriation to the Treasury.

This proposal, presumably directed toward releasing Federal funds for new Federal programs, was apparently predicated on the erroneous assumption that the chief purpose and effect of the conservation program is to increase production. And, since American farmers now can produce more of some products than we consume, the soil conservation effort can be safely reduced.

Here in North Dakota we know that this isn't true. We remember too well the dust storms of the past, and the dried-up waterholes. We're thankful for the tremendous job soil districts have done in the past to help eliminate the wastes of erosion. We know much more remains to be done and unanimously conclude that the program should not be thwarted.

What can you do?

Why not write your Congressmen? Ask them to lead the fight. We know they will without being told, but your letters will mean valuable ammunition from the grassroots when they appear before hearings and when discussing the proposal with colleagues.

Pollution of Lake Erie and the Niagara River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, 1965, at a meeting of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N.Y., a resolution was adopted in support of a public hearing in Buffalo by the United States-Canadian International Joint Commission concerning the pollution of Lake Erie and the Niagara River.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the resolution which follows:

Whereas Stanley P. Spisiak, chairman of the Water Resources Committee of the State conservation council after appearing before a congressional committee on pollution has called for an international public hearing in the city of Buffalo on Lake Erie and Niagara River water pollution; and

Whereas Mr. Spisiak requested action by the United States-Canadian International Joint Commission "to analyze and survey the international waters along the Niagara frontier and to hold a public hearing preferably in Buffalo in the near future to gather current information pertaining to the pollution of these waters"; and

Whereas each year the incidences of water pollution along the Niagara frontier becomes more and more acute causing more and more bathing beaches to be closing on the American side of the waters; and

Whereas there is a great need for the enactment of more stringent Federal laws preventing and controlling water pollution along the Niagara frontier: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this common council express an intent to support Mr. SPISIAK and join with him in requesting that a public hearing be held here in Buffalo by the United States-Canadian International Joint Commission concerning water pollution; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson, the United States-Canadian International Joint Committee, Senators ROBERT F. KENNEDY and JACOB K. JAVITS and Congressmen THADDEUS J. DULSKI, RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, HENRY P. SMITH, III, CHARLES GOODELL and BARBER B. CONABLE, Jr.

DELMAR L. MITCHELL,
Chairman.

Sioux City, Iowa: A Beacon of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY L. GREIGG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, speaking as a former mayor of the city of Sioux City, Iowa, I am particularly proud of that community's outstanding record in its program for international visitors. Mr. Elmer Swenson of Sioux City, serves as chairman of the Mayor's Committee for International Visitors and has been instrumental in the development of a strong and vibrant program. Largely because of the untiring efforts of Mr. Swenson and the other members of the committee in building a successful program, Sioux City is one of six communities in the entire Nation included in "A Beacon of Hope"—the first annual report to the Congress by the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. I believe my colleagues will be interested in the following statement from that Commission:

The U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, a group of persons outside Government appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate in accordance with certain provisions of the Fulbright-Hays Act, is undertaking a most interesting study of one aspect of this Government's international educational and cultural relations program. I heard about this on Wednesday of last week when the Chairman of this Commission, Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., president of the University of Connecticut, was the keynote speaker at the conference of the National Council for Community Services to International Visitors here in Washington. Dr. Babbidge, said, in part, to an audience of several hundred persons from all over the United States who serve foreign visitors:

"As you probably know, the first publication and the first annual report to the Congress of the Advisory Commission was a booklet entitled "A Beacon of Hope." It rapidly became evident to the members of the Commission during the gathering of the material on which this book was based that the Government's international educational exchange programs, and indeed the whole idea of international exchange, had widespread support from all branches of the citizenry. Many of you, you will remember, answered letters from the then Chairman of the Commission, John W, Gardner, giving your views as to the importance of the program, how it could be imprved, and so on.

"In fact, the Commission was so impressed with this widespread volunteer effort that it is now, as many of you know, in process of preparing, or more accurately gathering, information to prepare a special report to the Congress which we are sure will show that this support is not only widespread but that it goes deep. Proof of the depth of this support lies, of course, in the endless and countless hours of time and effort which all of you or perhaps I should say, all of us, put into this program with no compensation other than the joy which comes from civic duties well done, responsibilities fulfilled and the personal pride and satisfaction of knowing that one's efforts have not gone unnoticed.

"In order to prepare this report and make your efforts known, we are sending a writer to six communities scattered about the United States. He will be taking a look at how the programs for foreign visitors and students operate in these cities, how volunteers are recruited, how they are trained, what they do, the number of visitors they handle per year and so on. We have chosen two cities on the east coast, Philadelphia and Atlanta; two in the Middle West, Sioux City and Dallas; and two on the west coast, San Francisco and Corvallis, Oreg. We know from experience that each of these cities has a somewhat different arrangement for handling foreign visitors and, indeed, as I mentioned elsewhere this evening, this variety of organization and method of providing programs for foreign visitors is characteristic of the pluralism of American society. We know also you have a magnificent story to tell and we wish to do it well for you."

I am particularly pleased that Sioux City, Iowa, was one of the communities selected by the Department of State to have its volunteer efforts in this program explained. Sioux City, as you may know, has a Mayor's Committee for International Visitors. I take considerable pride in having been instrumental in starting it at the time I was mayor there. Sioux City is one of several communities in the United States in which the municipal government gives recognition to the importance of foreign visitors in a rather distinct way.

I have no doubt that when the Advisory Commission issues its special report to the Congress and later to the general public on the vast volunteer effort that goes into these programs as an indication of the tremendous widespread support that they engender all over this great country, all of you will find it most interesting and worthwhile reading.

The 144th Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 25, marked the 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. It was on this day in 1821 that the people of Greece began their struggle to throw off the yoke of Ottoman rule. It was a struggle that was to end successfully 6 years later, bringing to a close centuries of domination.

We celebrate other national independence days of great importance, but this day has a special significance. For it is the ancient Greeks who have bequeathed to us the philosophy and principles that have formed the cornerstone of our representative Government. In classical times Greece was one of the citadels of

Western civilization. It was the Greeks who created the model state, and their achievements are the legacy of modern civilization.

There has long been a bond between the Greeks and Americans. When Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the flag of freedom over the monastery of Aghia Lavra, President Monroe and Daniel Webster, as well as other American statesmen, were quick to declare they were in full sympathy with the intention of the Greek people to win freedom and self-determination.

Since winning their independence, the Greeks have had their ups and downs. But through it all they have remained firm in their dedication to freedom, democracy, and the dignity of man.

Greece had the misfortune to be overrun by the Nazis in World War II. No sooner had the Nazis been defeated than the Greeks were beset by Communist guerrilla forces.

With a hand from the United States under the Truman Doctrine, the Greek Government was able to subdue the Communist insurgents and maintain its hard-won independence.

Today modern Greece stands as a bulwark of democracy. It probably holds the distinction of having fought communism longer than any other member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. And the Greeks are one of our staunchest allies in the defense of freedom.

We can never fully repay our debt to the Greek people for their defense of freedom and their development of democratic institutions. But we can take time out on this occasion to salute the million and a half Americans of Greek origin as we join hands with our allies across the Atlantic in celebrating Greek Independence Day.

Rescue of Lt. James Cullen From the Sea of Tonkin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago newspapers all over the country featured the dramatic rescue of Lt. James Cullen of Winchester, Mass., from the Gulf of Tonkin. The full story of Lieutenant Cullen's experience and his remarkable courage has now been made available and I would like to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Lieutenant Cullen was positioning his F-100 for a strafing-bombing run on the naval base installation Quangkhe on the east coast of North Vietnam. As he approached from the northeast to make a run from the west to east, toward the sea. He received a radio call that reported that two small ships up the river from the naval base were really throwing up a barrage of antiaircraft fire. The two ships were lined up bow to stern. Realizing their threat to the bombers that would follow, Lieutenant Cullen elected to make his run on them. As he flew inland he was engulfed in flak bursts, coming from the ships. Then he turned his aircraft left to run from west to east down the river. At about 5,000 feet of range he started firing his 20-millimeter cannon, to keep the Vietminhs' heads down on the ships.

As the rounds began to hit around the first ship, Lieutenant Cullen's aircraft took a hit right in the cockpit with shrapnel wounding him in the arm. Deciding to proceed with the run despite the damage and the wound, he continued firing as he closed on the ships. As the first ship disappeared under his aircraft's nose, he started dropping his bombs. The aircraft skimmed over the first and second ships at about 100 feet. The aft guns of the second ship were throwing up a wall of flak. Cullen's aircraft was critically damaged as the flak staggered his aircraft. Turning slightly and looking back he could see the hits on the two ships. The guns appeared to be silenced.

As he looked forward he saw another F-100 being tracked by tracers from a gunboat. Disregarding the critical damage already received he pointed his aircraft at the gunboat and started firing.

Suddenly Cullen's F-100 nosed down toward the boat and the fire lights illuminated. The flight controls would not respond. He continued firing and hits appeared dispersed on the boat. The boat's guns were silenced. Selecting the emergency hydraulic system and pulling back on the stick with both hands his aircraft bottomed out just above the waves.

It went into an uncontrolled right climbing turn over the naval base. The firelights had burned through and went out. He was streaming about 150 feet of flame starting from aft of the canopy.

Trying left rudder, he was able to reverse the turn to head out to sea. He stayed in the torching aircraft determined to get clear of the naval base and the boats clustered around the mouth of the river. He finally ejected just prior to impact. As he descended in his parachute he could hear the anticraft guns firing and the explosions on the nearby shore. Landing in the water a short distance from the Vietminh boats, he watched the closest boats turn toward him as he activated his rescue beacon. Then above he saw the F-100 fighters had started a tight circle above him. The boats stopped and he could see the flashes of guns from one of the boats. Suddenly two of the fighters turned in on the boats and drove them away with their guns. He climbed into his raft. The scene was spectacular. Explosions bellowed out as the bombs were falling on the naval base complex. The noise was overpowering and the only counterfiring came from small boats offshore. The destruction at Quangkhe appeared complete indicating a terrific pounding for the Vietmin. Columns of smoke and secondary explosions marked the shore. After what seemed like a long wait in the Gulf of Tonkin, off North Vietnam, a rescue seaplane—U.S. Airforce—arrived with more fighters and released the F-100's that had covered the downed pilot for 35 minutes. The rescue plane made a sea landing guarded by the Navy fighters and pulled Cullen into the plane. Five minutes later the aircraft was airborne and headed back to DaNang Airbase.

Prosecution of Persons Charged With World War II Crimes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a concurrent resolution of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of New York, memorializing the Secretary of State to request the Government of West Germany to enact legislation extending the statute of limitations pertaining to the prosecution of persons charged with World War II crimes:

SENATE RESOLUTION 107

Whereas the statutes of the Government of West Germany provide for a limitation of time in which to bring charges against those persons accused of war crimes committed during World War II; and

Whereas the term of the statute of limitations so enacted provides that such persons must be brought to account for these crimes within 20 years; and

Whereas the term of 20 years expires during this year of 1965; and

Whereas many of those charged with the greatest of these war crimes have not as yet been brought to justice; and

Whereas if the statute of limitations is not extended, those persons who have not appeared in answer to these charges will, if not brought before the appropriate tribunal within the 20-year period so provided, be then immune from prosecution; and

Whereas it is common knowledge that many of the most infamous of those persons held accountable for these crimes and atrocities are still at large or not accounted for; and

Whereas it would be outrageous to permit those accused of such villainous crimes to go unpunished: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Secretary of State of the United States of America be, and he hereby is respectfully memorialized to request the Government of West Germany on behalf of the Government of the United States of America to enact appropriate legislation extending the statute of limitations pertaining to persons charged with World War II crimes for an additional 20 years, making said statute of limitations to be 40 years in all; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to do everything possible to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

JOHN T. MCKENNAN,
Clerk.

GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,
Secretary.

Results of Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, recently I completed another poll of public opinion in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania. This district lies to the north and east of the city of Pittsburgh wholly within Allegheny County. Its total population is 409,291, of whom 109,923 are registered Democrats and 108,092 are registered Republicans.

The 18th District of Pennsylvania features a great many industrial areas along the Ohio and Allegheny Rivers and has many strictly residential areas. It has a little farming in the sections

farthest removed from the city and quite a little coal mining.

Most ethnic groups of any sizable importance are found in the district, with a higher than normal number of Germans and Italians.

An equal number of questionnaires were sent to Republicans and Democrats. No way of determining how many of each party responded was utilized. Only signed replies were counted. The percentage tabulations follow:

TABULATED RESULTS FOR POLL CONDUCTED JANUARY 1965

1. All things considered, would you rate President Johnson's performance in office as (a) good, (b) fair, (c) bad? (a) 32 percent; (b) 55 percent; (c) 13 percent.

2. Do you believe that America's prestige in the world has improved in the last 4 years? Yes, 17 percent; no, 83 percent.

3. Should we (a) make greater efforts to win the war in South Vietnam, or (b) seek a truce and get out? (a) 56 percent; (b) 44 percent.

4. Do you have confidence that the U.S. dollar will for the predictable future remain one of the soundest currencies in the world? Yes, 68 percent; no, 32 percent.

5. Would you favor keeping the U.S. military out of Africa, except under United Nations auspices? Yes, 89 percent; no, 11 percent.

6. Would you vote to cut our Federal excise taxes at this time by approximately $2 billion? Yes, 56 percent; no, 44 percent.

7. Do you think the national minimum wage should be (a) kept at $1.25 per hour, or (b) raised to $1.50, or (c) be raised to $1.75? (a) 57 percent, (b) 32 percent; (c) 11 percent.

8. Should we abolish race and nationality in determining eligibility for immigration to the United States? Yes, 43 percent; no, 57 percent.

9. Do you believe that the administration's antipoverty program will substantially reduce poverty in the United States? Yes, 20 percent; no, 80 percent.

10. Do you favor President Johnson's proposal to advance $1 billion for public schools in poverty impacted areas? Yes, 66 percent; no, 34 percent.

11. Do you support Defense Secretary McNamara's plans to abolish the military reserves and reassign some of their units into the National Guard? Yes, 74 percent; no, 26 percent.

12. Would you favor the gradual elimination of our farm price-support program? Yes, 88 percent; no, 12 percent.

13. In considering medicare for the aged, would you prefer (a) it be financed out of general tax funds, (b) it be financed by increasing social security taxes, or (c) that no new program be adopted? (a) 31 percent; (b) 25 percent; (c) 44 percent.

14. Do you believe that it is good for the country that the Democrats have a 2 to 1 majority in the House and Senate? Yes, 15 percent; no, 85 percent.

Communications, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, during the last 6 months of 1964, a dramatic exhibit entitled "Communications, U.S.A." was seen by hundreds of thousands of people in the Soviet Union.

This was the sixth in a series of exhibits to be held in the Soviet Union since the signing of the 1959 cultural exchange agreement with that country.

This exhibit was prepared by the U.S. Information Agency in cooperation with the Bell System and some 30 other private American businesses.

I believe that the membership of the House will be interested in a brief article from the February issue of the Southern Bell Telephone News, describing "Communications, U.S.A.," its itinerary and the enthusiastic reception it received from the Soviet people. I will, therefore, insert the article in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Bell System and other private American firms whose cooperation and generosity have made this and other projects of this type possible. This is an excellent example of fruitful cooperation between private industry and Government—the type of cooperation which helps to make the American way of life, our point of view, and our national objectives, more understandable to the people of foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, there are myriad ways in which private American initiative and enterprise contribute to the attainment abroad of these important objectives. There are thousands of individuals and groups in the United States who sponsor, finance or operate, various projects abroad. The range of these undertakings is considerable. They include building and staffing of schools, operating of hospitals and health centers, promoting various self-help projects, distributing relief, sponsoring of exchanges and many, many other activities which—either directly or indirectly—convey the meaning of our free society, and project the image of America throughout the world.

For the past 2 years, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been studying this vast private American effort overseas—its scope, its direction and impact, and its relationship to our Nation's foreign policy goals.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I have been vitally interested in this project. I am pleased to report that the subcommittee findings are expected to be published in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, the article which I mentioned earlier follows:

COMMUNICATIONS EXHIBIT IN RUSSIA: JA! AMERICAN TELEPHONES!

"Come and show us more of your achievements and sell us the telephone apparatus." "Come and see us more often and acquaint us with your life." "This is wonderful. There should be more such links with the U.S.S.R. We wish you well."

These comments were only a fraction of the favorable reactions to "Communications, U.S.A.," a U.S. Information Agency exhibit that attracted hundreds of thousands of people in the Soviet Union. In its first showing—July 24 to August 26—the people of Leningrad lined up for nearly a mile to get in. On September 28, "Communications, U.S.A." made its debut in Kiev and produced a similar turnout during its 4-week stand. The final stop was in Moscow, from December 3 to January 7.

BELL SYSTEM PEOPLE ON STAFF

The exhibit, spreading over 15,000 square feet and displaying everything from public telephone booths to a laser demonstration, was put together with the assistance of the Bell System and 30 other private businesses. Five Bell System operating company people helped staff "Communications, U.S.A." There were two exhibit guides, who could speak, read, and write Russian—Stefania Wasuta, a business office supervisor with the New England Co., and Lawrence R. Maxwell, a supervising service foreman in the plant department of Mountain States. The three other telephone people rotated as technical directors in the three cities. J. B. Siedlarz, Jr., general engineering manager, eastern area, Bell of Pennsylvania, served in Leningrad; Charles Morgan, Jr., general plant extension and costs engineer with Southern Bell, worked the Kiev showing; and John L. Segall, general marketing engineer in the marketing department, New York, Co., served in Moscow.

Since Russia has less than 3 telephones per 100 people as compared to 44 per 100 people in the United States, the Russians were delighted to see the variety of telephone instruments. Reported Larry Maxwell: "The best description of their reaction * * * is to say that Santa Claus has come to town. They are tickled to death to hold the phones, turn the dials, punch the keys. They ask if they can call the United States from our phones in the exhibit."

GUIDES QUESTIONED

The crowds questioned the guides on technicalities, since electronic specialists, technicians and student groups attended the showings as well as the general public.

Some questions were politically provocative, but most inquiries were asked in friendly curiosity. Many people ask about life in America: How much do you make a month? How much does a new car cost? Do you have all the produce you need in the stores?

"Communications, U.S.A." was the sixth in a series of exhibitions to be held in the Soviet Union since the Cultural Exchange Agreement was signed in 1959. Said a USIA official: "It is the cooperation between private industry and government which made the presentation so dramatic in the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that such cultural and informational exchanges will do much to make the American point of view more understandable to Soviet citizens."

Alaska: Looking Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the anniversary of the earthquake of the greatest magnitude ever to occur in North America, the earthquake which struck Alaska at 5:36 p.m. on March 27, 1964. This sudden convulsion of the earth's crust brought death to 113 Alaskans and resulted in property damage of almost a third of a billion dollars.

The tragic and destructive earthquake will be marked tomorrow in Alaska in memorial services for those who died, and in observances looking toward the future.

That Alaska's future is bright can be credited not only to the Alaskans' love of the land and their determination to rebuild it, but also to prompt and effective action by agencies of the Federal Government, and to generous assistance made available by the Congress of the United States. For all Alaskans, let me say, we are very grateful. "Alaska has bounced back," writes Ward T. Sims of the Associated Press in an article in the Anchorage Daily Times on March 20. In order that others may know how Alaskans view their future, I introduce here Mr. Sims' article, "Alaskans Look for Greatest Year":

ALASKANS LOOK FOR GREATEST YEAR

(By Ward T. Sims)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Alaskans are a tough breed. A year ago the great earthquake killed 113 people and wiped out the life's work of many others. Those who were left turned to with a will and today new homes, new businesses, new life show what can be done with work and courage.)

"The cards were dealt last March 27. Some of our people have left, but those of us with our roots here want to see the game played out."

The game holds slim promise, insofar as can be seen now, for John T. Kelsey, of Valdez, who speaks so resolutely although his property losses were among the highest suffered by any individual in the catastrophic earthquake of last March 27.

But here in Alaska's largest city the scars are largely healed.

"A few months ago we were on our knees," said Manager Don Dickey, of the Alaska State Chamber of Commerce. "But now we look for 1965 to be Alaska's greatest year so far."

On that Good Friday of 1964, the earth of south-central Alaska trembled as it had never trembled before in the recorded history of North America.

In Anchorage and Kodiak and Valdez and Cordova and Seward the land writhed; fissures opened and snapped shut; huge trees were whipped in two; buildings and bridges crashed and streets cracked and sank.

In the wake of the convulsions came the agony of Valdez, of Seward, of Kodiak, and of such little known places as Chenega, Kaguyak, Kalsin Bay.

Monstrous sea waves generated by the earthquake clawed at those six communities and others, not only in Alaska but far south along the shore of the Pacific.

Valdez counted 31 dead, Seward 11, Kodiak 5, Chenega 23, Kaguyak 3, Kalsin Bay 6, from the seismic waves.

Th total loss in Alaska was surprisingly light; 113 deaths were attributed directly to the disaster. Public and private real property damage exceeded $311 million.

Despite the tragedy, Alaska has bounced back.

In Anchorage, where nine died in the quake, building permits last year totaled more than $25 million, up $8 million from the boom year of 1963.

"The determination of the people to rebuild and go ahead has been the most important factor," said Anchorage Mayor Elmer Rasmuson.

The 1964 salmon pack was some 3.7 million cases, a record for the past 15 years. King crab production reached a new high of 85 million pounds, up from 78 million pounds in 1963.

The outlook for tourism, the State's most important industry next to fisheries, was bleak indeed immediately after the Good Friday disaster.

By summer's end, however, the tourist industry had made strong recovery and the outlook for 1965 is very bright.

Reconstruction of facilities destroyed last March 27, and construction unrelated to the disaster, have given the State's economy a tremendous shot in the arm. Oil exploration is expected to pick up considerably.

Visible scars of the disaster are still upon the land. The scars of the people are less apparent. At Valdez, Kelsey and his brother, Robert, saw a lifetime of labor, a family business, wiped from the earth in a few moments.

They operated the Valdez Dock Co., a pier and warehouse complex capable of handling three freighters at one time. The quake shattered the dock and warehouses. Landslides and sea waves erased all traces of the facility, along with a major portion of the Valdez business district.

Tests have shown that the entire townsite is completely unstable and the entire city is to be moved to a new site 4 miles away.

"I don't know whether we will still be in the dock business, after the city moves," Kelsey said, "but I have no intention of picking up and leaving Valdez."

The determination to stay, to rebuild, is a theme one hears frequently. It is a theme even of those who suffered staggering personal losses.

One is Joyce Wyatt, a striking blonde who is now studying anthropology and archeology at Orange Coast College at Costa Mesa, Calif. Joyce, now 25, and her husband, Donald, were camped on a knoll overlooking the Gulf of Alaska near Kaguyak, on Kodiak Island, the evening of last March 27. Wyatt was doing geology work.

"I was cooking dinner in the tent, and my husband was down below, on the lowlands, on the beach, trying to find some fresh water sources," she recalls.

"Suddenly, everything began shaking violently. My first thought was that a volcano had erupted. I ran out to the edge of the cliff, where I hung onto an antenna mast. I can remember screaming for my husband."

His body was found 4 days later. Yet today Joyce says: "I'm going back to Alaska, to prove that I can take it, to prove that it can't beat me down."

In a cluttered, garishly painted quonset hut at Kodiak, Carl Rodli runs a makeshift replacement for his marine supply store swept away, along with a major portion of downtown Kodiak. At 37, Rodli, a native of Newport, Oreg., plans to stick it out in Kodiak. Why?

"After everything was said and done, we ended up with a net worth of about a minus $45,000, but I have faith in this area. I'm confident I can pay what I owe and, still come out okay over the long pull."

In Anchorage, Virgil Knight, a tall, straight-shouldered man who works for the Federal Aviation Agency, moves with a limp. He is reluctant to speak of his experiences on that day a year ago, but is eager to talk of events since.

"The earthquake brought out a lot in people they didn't know they had. The thing that is important, now, is the way the community has regained its vigor."

Knight lived in the Turnagain residential area of Anchorage, where 77 homes slid over a bluff into the muddy waters of Turnagain Arm.

In a few moments on March 27, 1964, Knight lost his wife, his right leg, his home, and 35 years' possessions. He and his wife were crushed when they were caught in a closing fissure. Leora Knight never regained consciousness. Virgil Knight was hospitalized for 10 weeks.

"He bucked up very fast," comments a colleague about Virgil Knight. "He's quite a guy."

In the shiny newness of St. James The Fisherman Episcopal Church in Kodiak, the congregation gazes each Sunday on the cross that never fell, the cross Louis Horn hung above the altar 16 minutes before disaster struck.

The Reverend Donald Bullock remembers asking Horn if the eyebolts he was using to hang the cross were large enough.

"Even in an earthquake, Father," Horn laughed. Moments later, his words were tested and found true.

The tall dark man most residents of Kodiak know simply as "Legs" is in another calling.

Henry Legrue, a former Navy cook, operated the Beachcombers, a nightclub outside of Kodiak, on Potato Patch Lake. He was in his home next door when the earthquake hit.

"It was rough, but there wasn't any damage at the house or at the club. Then I noticed the water in the bay was acting kind of funny and my first thought was, 'tidal wave.'

Seismic waves crashing ashore wiped out Legs' home and business. Not a trace of either was left.

The next day, Legs and his wife, Eta, were pressed into service to cook for the homeless and rescue workers.

When the emergency eased, an offhand remark about riverboats got Legs headed into business again. With the aid of a Small Business Administration loan, Legs bought the 250-foot cruise ship *Canadian Prince* and had it towed from Vancouver to Kodiak.

Near the site of the old Beachcombers Legs opened a cocktail lounge aboard the landbound vessel on December 29, with $14 in the bank and $2 in his pockets.

"Before I could take in a dime," Legs recalls, "a friend borrowed the $2 and the cash register broke."

Now Legs has a 75-seat dining room in the *Prince* and plans to convert 54 staterooms for hotel use.

An employe of an Anchorage photo lab, Mrs. Blanche Clark, had just picked up some film at the J. C. Penney store and was waiting for the traffic light to change on Fifth Avenue when the earthquake started.

"A huge slab from the front of the Penney building fell to the sidewalk on edge and then fell outward broadside on the car, but the car frame prevented it from crushing me."

Mrs. Clark doesn't remember how long she was trapped. After the slab was lifted and she was cut from the remains of the car, doctors found she had a broken neck, broken right arm, cracked ribs and a punctured lung. Mrs. Clark now is back on the job.

Sig Digree, a craggy-faced newspaperman, and his wife, Betha, operated the weekly Kodiak Mirror. They had set July 1, 1964, as the target date for selling the Mirror and retiring to a home on Oregon's beautiful Rogue River, at Shady Cove.

The seismic sea waves washed away the Kodiak Mirror. Last Christmas week the floods which ravaged California, Oregon, and Washington destroyed their new home on the Rogue.

"We still have the Mirror, and we will rebuild," Digree said. "I guess you just don't get Alaska out of your system overnight.

"I might as well admit it, Betha and I have been a little stunned with the turn of events in 1964. We couldn't do much about it—nature was in the driver's seat both times."

Miami Beach: 50 Years of Sunshine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today, Friday, March 26, 1965, marks the 50th

anniversary of the incorporation of the city of Miami Beach. In recognition of this event, the city's celebration will reach a climax this Saturday with a gala parade featuring State, local, and civic organizations.

During this half century, Miami Beach has become the convention and "fun-shine" capital of the Nation with over 2 million convention delegates and tourists visiting and enjoying the "Playground of the World" last year. The motto of this year's celebration perhaps best describes what this 50 years has been like, "Miami Beach—50 Years of Sunshine."

The city was incorporated on March 26, 1915, by 31 of the 33 registered voters living in the area and became a city on May 25, 1917, when the Governor signed its charter. Today, those 33 voters have grown to 38,023—out of a total population of 65,000—making it the third most populous city in Dade County and the eighth most populous in the State of Florida.

As it celebrates this 50th anniversary, the citizens and officials of Miami Beach can take pride in the city's growth and development. It has become much more than a playground as Mr. Haines Colbert has pointed out in a column which appeared in the Miami Herald on March 23, 1965. "Miami Beach is where you are and what you are doing. It is everything that the press agents and comedians say and more."

Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Colbert best describes just what Miami Beach means and what it has meant to its residents, visitors, and vacationers:

BEACH IS ALL THEY SAY IT IS—UP: ONLY DIRECTION IT KNOWS

(By Haines Colbert)

The television camera pans down a row of towering hotels, picks up a glimpse of surf and lingers over a palm tree silhouetted against the moon.

A watcher in Terre Haute doesn't need to be told that's Miami Beach.

Inside one of the hotels, a $10,000-a-week entertainer looks over his audience and tells what he sees—a carpet of mink sprinkled with diamonds and the blackened faces of people who pay $50 a day for a room and spend the day lying in the sun beside a swimming pool which no one uses.

Everyone roars because that's Miami Beach.

A few blocks away, a millionaire entertains in his home. Someone mentions the hotels, and the hostess says she hasn't been in that area for years—too noisy, too ornate, too crowded, too everything.

But she lives at Miami Beach.

Other residents and visitors haven't been to hotel row, either, but not because they object to it. They're older people with limited incomes, and they dance or play cards or chess in public parks.

The entertainment is free, and they are enjoying Miami Beach.

An old man, bearded and wearing a yamulka, bargains for cabbage and a half-pound of meat which his wife will cook on a hotplate in their hotel room. There's no glamor where they live, at the south end of the beach, but the weather is better than in the Bronx.

Miami Beach is where you are and what you are doing. It is everything that the press agents and comedians say and more—wild and sedate, sumptuous and drab, overdressed and tasteful.

And it is the only community of its size and prominence in which some of the founders still are around to tell what happened.

In 50 years, Miami Beach has grown from a town with 33 registered voters—there was no exact population count—to a city of 65,000 which is visited by some 2 million tourists and convention delegates every year.

But population figures don't really tell the story. Five years after the town was founded, the census of 1920 showed a population of only 644, and growth has been slow in recent years because of lack of space. The beach pretty well fills its 7 square miles.

The value of property is a better indication. In 1920, the assessed valuation of real estate was $224,000. The same area and what has been built on it was assessed last year at $584,001,750 by the city and at $796,362,700 by Dade County.

The first permanent structure at Miami Beach was a two-story home built in 1886 by Charles H. Lum on what now is the site of the Tides Hotel at 1220 Ocean Drive.

At last count, the beach had 368 hotels with 30,500 rooms; 2,900 apartment buildings containing 30,000 units; 7,000 residences and hundreds of other structures—office buildings, stores, churches, and public places.

This was within the city limits, running from the tip of the island at Government Cut to the boundary with Surfside between 87th and 88th Streets.

Beach residents have just about stopped complaining over the free use of the name of their city for everything on the oceanfront up to Broward County.

Lum, the first home builder, and his father, Charles, were indirectly responsible for the development of an even greater territory. They and their friends, Elnathan T. Field and Ezra Osborn, at one time owned the shore from Government Cut to Jupiter—a stretch of more than 65 miles.

The Lums landed from a schooner in 1870 saw what seemed to them to be a good place to raise coconuts, and went back to their home in Red Bank, N.J. They interested Field and Osborn.

Rats ate most of the coconuts planted by the four, and Field went back to New Jersey for advice and money. He returned with John S. Collins, a well-known horticulturist, who offered both technical help and $5,000.

Field and Osborn eventually sold their land to Collins, and the Lums sold theirs in 1912 to the brothers J. N. and J. E. Lummus of Bronson in Levy County. J. N. Lummus, in his book, "The Miracle of Miami Beach," said he and his brother paid the Lums $80,000 for 500 acres.

But Collins, who started a wooden bridge across the bay where the Venetian causeway is located now, and the Lummuses ran out of money.

They were rescued by Carl G. Fisher. Fisher and his partner, James A. Allison, were natives of Indiana and had made a fortune by buying the patent for a carbide automobile headlight, developing it and selling out to Union Carbide.

Fisher stopped off at what was to become Miami Beach and took a piece of the action. He lent $50,000 to Collins and $150,000 to the Lummus brothers, in each case taking a large share of land as a bonus for making the loan.

The Fisher money made Miami Beach. Fisher's chief lieutenant, C. W. (Pete) Chase, who lives at 1900 Meridian Avenue, estimates that his boss spent more than $50 million on the development of the property—$6 million out of his pocket before he sold the first lot and the remainder out of income.

Thirty-one of the thirty-three voters living at the beach incorporated it as a town March 26, 1915, and J. N. Lummus was elected mayor. The town became a city with the signing of its charter by the Governor May 25, 1917.

World War I was slowing down tourism and speculative buying, however, and the Lummus brothers moved out in 1918. Their property was bought by N. B. T. Roney, of Camden, N.J., a financier who built the first stores on Collins Avenue.

Fisher put up the first big hotel, the Flamingo, in 1920, and Roney built the Roney Plaza in 1925. The Flamingo was demolished to make way for an apartment house after World War II, leaving the Roney Plaza as the oldest of the large hotels still standing.

The beach was promoted flamboyantly during Fisher's lifetime, but he seemed to have in mind a community modeled after Palm Beach—a resort for rich men.

Fisher built six polo fields in all, and brought the best players in the world to compete on them.

Mansions costing up to half a million dollars were built on the oceanfront by such men as Harvey S. Firestone, president and founder of Firestone Rubber Co.; Albert Lasker, advertising agency tycoon; John D. Hertz, of the rental car and taxi companies; and the movie makers, Albert Warner, of Warner Bros., and Nicholas Schenck, of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

The best thing that happened to Miami Beach was the appointment in September 1925 of Claude A. Renshaw as city manager. Renshaw, an engineer and the former mayor of Roundup, Mont., served the beach until his retirement in March 1958 and was credited with giving the city a financial stability which it never has lost.

Miami Beach was one of the few Florida cities to come out of the depression with good credit. As a result, it was able to put in more and better public works than other cities.

Private builders went on a spree after World War II. For a few years, Miami Beach was putting up more new hotels than the combined total of the rest of the world.

The comedians joked then about the man who must be going downhill financially because he was in last year's hotel.

That also was the time of the S and G Syndicate and wide open gambling, when you could walk for blocks on Collins Avenue without ever being out of earshot of the race results coming from hotel loudspeakers. Waiters picked up the bets at poolside.

The collapse of the S and G under pressure from Chicago gangsters who wanted in and the Kefauver committee ended that phase.

Many Beach residents said the city couldn't exist without gambling. Hotels had taken the place of the Firestone and other mansions, and there weren't enough wealthy tourists to keep all of them going.

But the character of the Beach changed again.

It switched from being a winter resort, largely closed down in the summer, to a year-round operation. That was accomplished partly by inducing tourists to come at cut rates in the summer, partly with airline package tours and partly going after conventions.

Three hundred conventions brought close to 500,000 delegates to the beach last year.

The beach auditorium, with seats for 3,534, was too small for the conventions when it was completed in August 1950, at a cost of $2 million. An 18,000-seat convention hall costing $4.5 million was opened next door in October 1958.

Television began to help out when the coaxial cable between Jacksonville and Miami was completed in the spring of 1952. Network shows were staged at the beach periodically after that, and the community was so grateful when Arthur Godfrey began regular telecasts there that it named a street for him.

Jackie Gleason, although he's missed out on the street naming so far, is the beach's new hero.

It can't all be due to television, but the beach is booming. At 50, it's the liveliest ex-coconut farm on earth.

This is a great day in the history of Florida. Everyone who has had a part in the progress of Miami Beach, from its earliest founders, whose foresight and wisdom carried them through the most trying times, to the present day city fathers, has reason to be proud today.

I know that my colleagues here in the Congress join me in wishing happy birthday to the city of Miami Beach, Fla., the sparkling jewel of the Atlantic seaboard.

In the Future: A Country Run by Court Decree?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, my friend Forrest Allen, one of the Cleveland Plain Dealer's outstanding newsmen and columnists, is a man who weighs his words carefully. Recently he considered the growing concern many feel about the courts' encroachment on functions properly reserved to the legislative branches of all levels of government, and I commend his remarks to my colleagues for its thoughtful approach to this problem:

If the present trend continues, it will not be too many years before this country will be run by court decrees instead of by laws adopted through democratic processes. The latest local attempt to bypass the legislative process involves the reorganization of Ohio's judicial system.

A Cleveland law firm has asked a Federal court for an order to set aside the State's court system and establish a new one by decree. Basis of the plea for Federal intervention is that plaintiffs are being denied due process guarantees in the U.S. Constitution.

Such denial, it is contended, arises from the long delay between filing of a lawsuit and bringing it to trial.

There couldn't be a worse approach to the problems of judicial reform in Ohio. There is scarcely a lawyer or a judge in this State who would deny that the administration of justice in our metropolitan centers has become a monumental headache.

But saying that much is only the first sentence of the story.

Side by side with this awareness of the problem is a growing determination on the part of the bar, the judges, and a good many lay persons that something must be done about it.

There is some possibility that the present legislature may take some first steps, however remote that possibility may seem at the moment. Despite the lack of progress in the past, it seems to me there is substantial hope for improvement in the near future.

The case for reform—which must come from legislative enactments and changes in the State constitution approved by the voters—is being piled up almost daily.

The Ohio Legislative Service Commission has just published a staff research report on "Problems of Judicial Administration." It is a tremendously important handbook for anyone who seriously seeks court reforms in Ohio.

Efforts toward effecting modernization are being supported in varying degrees by the Ohio State Bar Association, a leader in this drive, the Ohio Judicial Conference and many judges and lawyers as individuals.

This is not just a matter of waving a wand. It is not just a matter of law. It involves politics of many varieties, self-interests and even selfish interests that are deeply entrenched, and professional stubbornness of a high degree.

Advocates of reform have not yet been able to bring a concentration of strength at the right time and the right place. But they are coming closer all the time.

To try to resolve this massive resistance to change by a court decree from some Federal judge is like trying to repair a watch with a monkey wrench.

A Responsible Republican Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, this morning James Reston, of the New York Times, devoted his column to the praise of Republican legislative efforts in the 89th Congress.

He points out that against overwhelming odds, the Republican Party here in Congress has contributed constructively and creatively to domestic legislative programs, such as civil rights, and to our foreign policy.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Reston's column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks:

WASHINGTON: A RESPONSIBLE REPUBLICAN OPPOSITION

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 25.—The Republicans in Congress are proving to be a constructive opposition. They are working against overwhelming odds—32 to 68 in the Senate, 140 to 294 in the House—but they have maintained a sense of purpose and even a sense of humor.

This is not an easy exercise. When a party has been overwhelmed at the polls, as the Republicans were in 1932 and again in 1964, the task of reconstruction seems almost hopeless. Its leaders are scattered, its numbers reduced in the Congress, its power undermined in the States, its organization disrupted, and its party workers demoralized.

Yet the Republicans, though they have been out of power for 24 of the last 32 years, are not acting like a bitter or obstructionist minority. They are supporting President Johnson's foreign and domestic programs when they think he is right and trying to put forward constructive alternatives when they think he's wrong.

THE VOTING RECORD

The voting-rights bill is a dramatic illustration of the point. The Republican leader in the Senate, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRSEN, not only worked with Attorney General Katzenbach in drafting the bill, but is now helping guide it through the Judiciary Committee against the opposition of the Southern Democrats.

The Republican leader in the House, GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan, along with Representative JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, Representative WILIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, and other Republicans, are leading a campaign to strengthen the voting-rights bill and extend its provisions to many thousands of deprived Negroes not covered by the administration's proposals.

There is no evidence that the Republican Party stands to gain, at least in the short run, by a vast increase in Negro voting. On the contrary, all indications are that the new Negro voters will side overwhelmingly with the Democratic Party, and could even help win back for the Democrats in the 1968 presidential election the Southern States won by the Republicans last year.

Yet the Republican leaders in this Congress are quite consciously trying to remove the charge leveled against the party in the Goldwater campaign—that it sought to win by appealing to the anti-Negro elements in both the North and the South.

THE VIETNAM RECORD

The controversy over policy in Vietnam also illustrates the constructive attitude of the Republicans in Congress. The Democrats are highly vulnerable to political attack for their record in that peninsula. They underestimated the power of the North Vietnamese, and helped destroy what little political unity existed under the Diem regime in South Vietnam.

It is not quite fair to say, as the Democrats constantly do, that they are merely carrying on in that country the policy started by the Republicans under President Eisenhower. They have changed the whole character of the war in the last 3 years, yet the Republicans have supported the President more consistently than some of the leaders of his own party.

Seldom in the history of the Nation have the Executive and the Congress managed to find a working arrangement in which the President had adequate power and the legislature had adequate control, and this is certainly not the case now.

The administration has the votes and the political skill to work its will on the home front—even on such controversial issues as voting rights, Federal aid to private school education, medical care for the aged, public housing, and aid to the Nation's most impoverished areas.

In the foreign field, the President's will is almost supreme. In Vietnam, for example, he is free to do almost anything he wishes—either to extend the bombing beyond the 19th parallel into the region of Hanoi and Haiphong, or to call for a truce and negotiate a settlement.

THE PRESIDENT'S RESTRAINT

Nevertheless, in both the domestic and foreign fields, the President has not used this extraordinary power without respect for the Republican opposition. He has consulted with them constantly before settling on his budget or announcing his domestic legislative program.

He has used his appointive power fairly by bringing Republicans into key positions and avoiding a partisan or ideological Cabinet. In fact, he has relied on Senator DIRKSEN almost as if the Illinois Senator were the majority leader.

Thus, unlike the early days of the New Deal, when Franklin Roosevelt drove the Congress rather than winning its confidence, Johnson has been as restrained in the use of his vast power as the Republicans have been generous in the exercise of their limited power.

This has been easier, however, for the President than for the Republicans. They might easily have drifted into bitterness and irresponsibility after November, and this they have not done.

Statement of the Honorable George V. Hansen of Idaho Before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and to include extraneous material, I include in the RECORD one paragraph of a statement made to the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments by Mr. William Brown, research director for the Delaware State Chamber of Commerce.

The paragraph is:

We believe the people of every State should have the right to fashion a State legislative system which best meets the needs of that particular State, as long as they adhere to a republican form of government, to their own State constitution and laws, and the applicable provisions of the Federal Constitution.

I also include statements I made before the same committee.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important matters to come before the Congress in many years. Because of this, and because of the fact that the House Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled similar hearings for the near future, I believe the statements will be of interest to my colleagues.

My statements follow:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE V. HANSEN, SECOND DISTRICT IDAHO, BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, MARCH 4, 1965

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is a privilege and an honor to appear before you today and make this statement on a matter I believe to be one of the most important to come before the Congress in many years.

On September 13 of this year it will have been 177 years since the Continental Congress passed a resolution putting into effect the Constitution of the United States. It has been ratified by the 11th State—New York—less than 2 months previously.

Less than a year ago, and nearly 176 years following its adoption, the Supreme Court of the United States struck a severe blow at the very roots of this Constitution. Until that time—last June—I doubt that anyone in the United States with any knowledge of our Government and our history would even have considered it a possibility that the Supreme Court would presume to take upon itself the authority to inform the sovereign States of the Union that it didn't like the way their legislatures were structured—and that they must reapportion according to the Court's dictates.

The determination handed down last June by the Supreme Court was by no means unanimous. Justice Potter Stewart, in a bitter dissenting opinion, said the decision "finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our Federal Union."

Justice Stewart also said:

"What the Court has done is to convey a particular political philosophy into a constitutional rule, binding upon each of the 50 States * * * without regard and without respect for the many individualized and differentiated characteristics of each State * * * stemming from distinct history, distinct geography, distinct distribution of population, and distinct political heritage."

Mr. Chairman, the fact that Justice Stewart's views are shared by many is attested to by our presence here today.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution of the United States by its very nature is a document of carefully limited Federal powers with all other authority residing in the States. Probably the most remarkable feature of this instrument was the provision for a legislative body divided into two branches, one branch based on geographic representation, and the other on population. This, in my opinion, is perhaps the greatest contribution to political science made by the United States and is just one of the many delicate checks and balances provided for in the Constitution. Through it a majority cannot run roughshod over the rights of the minority, nor can a minority for long willfully obstruct the majority. It assures that careful deliberation will be given to all matters brought before the Congress. True—it perhaps, sometimes, slows down the legislative process. But it also prevents us from "acting in haste and repenting in leisure."

Most of the 50 States have legislative organizations similar to the Federal body; that is, one house based on population and the other on geography or other factors. And it is this system of government at which the Supreme Court decisions strike.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of great significance. Our State governments are not based on the Federal system—it is the other way around. Our Federal system is based on the systems of the States which founded our National Government.

None of the Thirteen Original States apportioned both houses of their legislatures solely on the basis of population. In the upper house, or senate, Delaware and New Jersey had equal representation for each county, regardless of population. Georgia, Massachusetts, New York, and Rhode Island had equal representation based on geographic units other than counties. Maryland, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia based representation on geographic units with minor modification based on population. The upper House of Connecticut was based on population, but with major limitations to achieve geographic diffusion, and it was the same in New Hampshire, but with minor limitations. Only the upper House of North Carolina was based solely on population—and the North Carolina lower House was also based on population, but with major limitations, as in the case of the upper House of Connecticut, to achieve geographic diffusion.

So—the so-called Federal concept was not new. It had existed in the founding States. And, Mr. Chairman, without the adoption of this system, it is extremely doubtful that the Constitution would ever have been ratified. The smaller States, fearful of the power that would be exercised by the larger States should representation in both Houses of the Congress be based solely on population, were unwilling to support a strong national government. But with the "great compromise"—the apportionment of one House on population and with equal representation in the other—the fears of the small States were allayed and our Federal Constitution came into being.

Most of the States subsequently joining the Union adopted the bicameral system, and it has worked well. It has afforded the minority in the States the same protection it has afforded the minority in the Federal Government and, at the same time, has prevented the minority from long obstructing the will of the majority. It has led to a deliberative legislative process.

It is essential, Mr. Chairman, that the majority be protected from the minority by having one house of a bicameral State legislature apportioned on a basis of population. It is equally essential that the minority be protected from the majority by having the other house based on factors other than just population.

This is the system we have today, and it is a proven system. However, it is now under attack and unless the Congress acts—and acts soon—it will be destroyed. I uphold the right of the Court to correct inequities within the system. I would deny the Court the right to change the system.

A troublesome question arises in my mind, Mr. Chairman: With our Federal system based on th checks and balances of the founding States—if those checks and balances are abolishd by judicial fiat, how long will it then be before that same Court applies that same one-man, one-vote principle and decrees that both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate must be apportioned solely on the basis of population?

In the matter of the reapportionment of State legislatures Justice John M. Harlan said:

"Judicial entry into this realm is profoundly ill advised and constitutionally impermissible."

We must correct the Court's mistake, Mr. Chairman, and we must see to it that the Court is alerted to the fact that the great majority of the people of the United States will not tolerate, now or in the future, the Court's "entry into realms * * * constitutionally impermissable."

I support, without reservation, a constitutional amendment which would state that both houses of a bicameral State legislature need not be apportioned solely on the basis of population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to state my views to you today on this matter.

ADDITION TO THE STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE V. HANSEN, SECOND DISTRICT IDAHO, BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to present this supplementary statement to further clarify my position on reapportionment.

I believe it is important to emphasize that in advocating a constitutional amendment to allow one house of a bicameral State legislature to be apportioned on a basis other than population, we are asking for nothing new. This is possibly the most tried and proven piece of legislation ever considered for adoption. We, the proponents of this amendment, can comfortably point out that the system we desire to perpetuate has been by far the most successful of the legislative combinations used among the several States. This, in fact, was the very system used in one form or another by each State represented at the Constitutional Convention and was the pattern adopted in arriving at the "great compromise" of the U.S. Constitution.

Many points are raised questioning what would happen under the proposed amendment. The best and most irrefutable answer is to ask what has happened in the course of our history since the Constitution was put into operation on September 13, 1788, and prior to the recent catastrophic Supreme Court decision.

May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that our Constitution provides for a Federal Republic, not a democracy; and article IV, section 4, guarantees each State a republican form of government. May I add that pure democracy has been described many times as

the worst possible form of government. Under pure democracy, the minority—or a minority—has no rights. It is completely at the mercy of the mob rule of the majority. And it is toward pure democracy that the one-person, one-vote concept leads us.

The point is raised that one house of a bicameral State legislature, controlled by minority representation, can block the will of a majority of all of the people of the State. But this overlooks the fact that the States, as well as the United States, have an executive branch, the chief of whom—the Governor—is elected on the basis of one person one vote. Thus, with the executive branch and one house of a legislature controlled by the majority, it is hard to see how the other house of this legislature could long thwart the will of the majority. Rather, it merely serves as a curb on the unbridled exercise of power by the majority.

If I may be permitted to do so, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer briefly to one or two questions that have been posed.

First, it has been asked whether a person who is deprived of the right to vote because his grandfather had not voted in a particular State should have recourse to the courts. Certainly he should. Such legislation, if enacted by any State, I believe would clearly be in violation of the equal protection and privileges and immunities clauses of the 14th amendment. I do not believe any court in this land—State or Federal—would uphold such a law.

Also, I do not believe an issue such as a granfather clause, or an issue such as a person being deprived of the right to vote because he does or does not own property, is relevant to the subject being considered. We are not discussing individual voting rights, but rather the question of the value of a person's vote—whether or not it should be of equal weight in determining the membership of both houses of a bicameral State legislature.

We believe this decision should rest with the people of each State, and not with the Federal courts.

Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, we are not attempting to create a new governmental process—we are merely defending a system that has existed for nearly 177 years and one that has been by far the most predominant form of government used by the States of this great Nation. True, there have been some inequities, and those that have not been corrected should be. But let us not throw out the baby with the wash water—let us not destroy the system just because some correctible inequities may exist.

Nearly every question that could be asked concerned with the effect of the proposed amendment has the unique potential of being answered by conditions of actual experience—an advantage seldom enjoyed by any such piece of major legislation. I hereby reaffirm my support of a constitutional amendment allowing one house of a bicameral State legislature to be apportioned on a basis other than population.

The 144th Anniversary of Greek Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, civilization owes much to ancient Greece, but it owes a great debt to modern Greece, also. Greece of old gave us heroes and sages on whom to pattern a way of life at the same time that it nourished a spirit of freedom that not even centuries of oppression could extinguish.

The hopes that inspire freedom-loving men everywhere burned on through Roman, Byzantium, and Ottoman Empire occupations, burned bright enough to light a war of liberation that lasted almost a decade.

The war of independence that brave Greeks launched on March 25, 1821, a date which today all free men celebrate, unfortunately had to be rewon many times.

But none of the enemies of freedom finally prevailed, and it is a glory to all of us that the flood that was post-World War II communism broke, finally, on the stone wall that was Greece.

Mr. Speaker, the people who are free, and the people who one day will be free, together owe and will owe a great debt to the people who cradled our Western civilization.

Mail-Order Gunrunners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 7, 1965. It refers to the subject matter of three bills which I introduced yesterday: H.R. 6745, which would require the registration of pistols in the District of Columbia; H.R. 6782, which would increase taxes on those dealing in weapons of destruction; and H.R. 6783, which would prohibit the sale of firearms in interstate commerce to individuals.

The editorial follows:

MAIL-ORDER GUNRUNNERS

The case for tightening controls over interstate commerce in firearms was well established during the last session of Congress, yet nothing happened and the various bills before the House and the Senate were allowed to wither in committee. As the memory of the murder of President Kennedy with an imported, mail-order rifle recedes into the background, the difficulty in overcoming committee paralysis and the gun lobby in Washington becomes no easier, and it is not unlikely that Senator DODD's new efforts in the current session again will be obstructed.

But there are dangers for the obstructionists, as there are for the general public which favors the proposed legislation. Those who profess to speak for the 35 million gun owners in the country are doing them a poor service by refusing to draw a clear line between those who have a legitimate right to arms, as guaranteed by the Constitution, and those who do not.

The case against further legislation is based on the contention that it would infringe the second amendment's "right of the people to keep and bear arms"; that it would permit the Federal Government to encroach on the law enforcement prerogatives of the States, and that, as Senator MAGNUSON, of the Commerce Committee argued, it would not provide effective arms control.

Yet Senator DODD's bill would do little more than plug the loopholes in and carry out the intent of Federal laws which have been on the books since 1934 and 1938. It would make it more difficult for criminals and juvenile delinquents to get around these statutes by mail-order shipments. Testimony that 25 percent of mail-order guns, estimated at 1 million in 1963, went to purchasers with criminal records speaks loudly in favor of the proposed bill.

Rather than hamper, it would help the States in dealing with firearms which have been escaping their control. Its proponents do not claim it will wipe out crime, but at least it represents a serious effort to deal with a serious problem in a relatively moderate manner. Continued obstruction could well produce a public outburst, in event of another crime of national and international proportions, for much more drastic legislation.

L.B.J. Struck the Right Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks by Bob Considine about President Johnson's address to the joint session on the voting rights bill.

Mr. Considine's column appeared in the New York Journal-American of March 18, 1965, and follows:

L.B.J. STRUCK THE RIGHT NOTE

(By Bob Considine)

Have you ever heard a President make a more emphatic speech to the Congress than L.B.J.'s declaration of interdependence? Listening to him made one wonder how many of his predecessors would have come on and on with such uncompromising come-all-ye.

"It's not just Negroes really, it's all of us who must overcome the crippling legacy of bigotry and injustice * * * and we shall overcome," he called out to the Chamber and to the world. He had neither secrets or holds to bar, nor bush to beat around.

It never occurred to him, he said after a nostalgic dip into his days as a poor teacher of poorer Mexican American children, that one day he would stand where he now stood and hold the power he holds.

"But now that I have this chance, I'll let you in on a secret," he went on, his soft southern voice taking on the steely ring of the deputy sheriff laying down the law. "I mean to use it."

It rang out like a shot.

Hard to picture President Kennedy saying it, at least that way. J.F.K.'s speech on the occasion of presenting a new and clearer voting bill to the Congress would have packed more poetic language and thus blunted some of the urgency. President Eisenhower would have said it in a message delivered to the clerk, after perhaps an announcement at a news conference.

President Truman would have sounded angry, saying the same words L.B.J. drawled, and this would have created pockets of sullen misgivings here and there in the Chamber. President Roosevelt would have sounded as if he were lecturing, something in the manner of a Groton don. President Hoover would have considered it better handled by a commission, perhaps. President Coolidge would have been asleep by that time of night.

Local, State Governments Must Be Strengthened or Washington Will Take Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Rochester Post-Bulletin on March 17, 1965, and which was written by Mr. Albert Marshall. Mr. Marshall is a well-known and distinguished veteran newspaperman whose byline appears regularly in many Minnesota newspapers. In this article, I feel that Mr. Marshall shows more than his usual insight into one of our most serious problems; that is, the breakdown of our traditional system of checks and balances within our system of government: I feel that the article, which I now submit, is self-explanatory:

LOCAL, STATE GOVERNMENTS MUST BE STRENGTHENED OR WASHINGTON WILL TAKE OVER

(By Albert Marshall)

ST. PAUL.—The State capital is a busy place these days. Once again the legislature is hard at work at its endless task of creating new laws and revising old regulations to meet ever changing conditions affecting the life and economy of our citizens.

One cannot help but wonder as one sees these hard-working representatives of the people examining, discussing, and debating important issues, what their deliberations will include in another 30 years. For under the pressure of mighty forces the status of the State as a cornerstone of local autonomy is being challenged.

One force that threatens the supremacy of the State over local affairs has developed with the changing pattern of daily life. Back in 1930, a bit less than half of Minnesota's population lived in urban centers (places of 2,500 or more). Today, the urban population of the State represents close to two-thirds of the whole.

Between 1930 and 1960, population of the cities increased by 865,000 people, while the nonurban (farm and country dwellers) declined in number by 15,000.

And the legislature, preponderantly representative of rural Minnesota and oriented to its needs, has by this shift in population become burdened with an increasing list of urban problems involving such diverse matters as crowded schools and the complexities of a fast-growing Twin City metropolitan district. These problems have become more acute with each passing month.

Not so long ago, the legislature was disposed to let the cities "stew in their own juice"—reflecting the feeling of its rural majority that urban matters were not essentially a State responsibility. More recently legislators have come to realize that inasmuch as most Minnesotans now live in cities, their situations are a major concern of the whole State.

MORE AND MORE FEDERAL

This realization may have come too late, however. For city officials, caught in the maelstrom of forces beyond their power to manage or finance, have increasingly turned to a more receptive arbitrator of their destinies—the Federal Government.

This is quite natural as the cities have always had more effective representation in Congress. And Congressmen have been kept acutely aware of city problems by their constituents.

This natural inclination to seek help from Washington has also played into the hands of those politicians who believe in a strong centralized Federal Government as the vital force in our national political system. President Johnson is an adherent of this philosophy as are two of his closest advisers, both Minnesotans, Vice President HUMPHREY and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

Another advocate of this philosophy, LeRoy Collins, former Governor of Florida, has said that "it is not the evolution of our society that has made the exercise of Federal power necessary, but the lack of will and the limited abilities of the States. State failures and national concern about them have invited and encouraged the Federal Government to step in."

Freeman decries as a myth the possibility that functions of Government can be divided between Federal and State Governments. He has declared that Washington should assume a far larger participation in affairs hereto considered the province of States and their subdivisions—because of the "serious drawback to State and local action (posed by) lack of financial resources."

Minnesota's former Governor confidently asserts that the "Federal Government will continue—and should continue—to have a growing role in the affairs of our communities."

President Johnson now asks Congress to establish a department in his administration that will deal directly with urban affairs. If such a Cabinet post is created it is inevitable that the Federal Government will make the ground rules to control the actions of local officials—a function formerly performed by the States.

Those who believe that you can't have a responsive citizenry duly concerned with public affairs unless individuals are given the opportunity of taking a significant part in the democratic processes at the local level are apprehensive of a trend that would delegate policymaking decisions to Congress and to Federal administrators.

NEW BID FOR MORE POWER

Have Congressmen and Senators sufficient time to ride herd on all the many problems of a local character when they are already overburdened with questions of interstate nature and those which concern America's defenses and relations with other nations?

HUBERT HUMPHREY has testified to their present predicament. While still a Member of the U.S. Senate, describing his hectic life as a national legislator, he stated, "I receive over a thousand letters every day in the week. I have hundreds of visitors, I receive not less than 70 long-distance calls every day of my life."

The Vice President maintained that most men in Congress were under similar pressures. Said he, "If I work less than 14 hours a day, I feel that I have denied both my work and my official duty. It is utterly impossible to work less if you want to be effective in Congress."

It is quite evident that Congressmen are humanly incapable of taking on a new burden of activity—as would be the case if they were impelled to take an active part in directing affairs formerly undertaken by State officials and those elected to perform county, municipal, and school board duties.

What would be bound to happen? Obviously Congress would have to delegate authority to administrative officials. That is not a pleasant thought in the minds of those who remember how redtape and bureaucratic procedures have often baffled the electorate.

Many Americans emphatically disagree with Secretary Freeman when he disputes the idea that "local government is more democratic and thus functions administered by governmental units close to the people are administered best."

It would seem that an issue of major importance to all Minnesotans is involved in the Federal Government's latest bid for power. The correct answer to effective progress on the local front surely lies in another direction—one of beefing up State and local governments so that they can perform the more onerous tasks confronting our cities.

Missouri Barges, Dams Ready for Record Thaw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following article from Business Week, March 13, 1965, which indicates the prospects of an increased water crop on the Missouri River which will be greatly beneficial to navigation and power interests and which represents a very great step forward in the complete utilization of the main stem reservoirs on the Missouri River. These were authorized in the comprehensive plan approved by the Committee on Public Works and authorized by the Congress in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944. The construction of these reservoirs, such as Garrison, Oahe, Fort Randall, Big Bend, and Gavins Point, now just about completed, has represented one of the great engineering projects in this country. In order that the reservoirs may be fully utilized they must be filled to their conservation capacity and because of the millions of acre-feet of storage it takes many years for this goal to be reached. It is with great pleasure that I report to the House that predicted flows for this spring are anticipated to be of the general magnitude of the 1952 floods.

The floods on the main stream, of course, will all be controlled this year, and the water needed for conservation storage for navigation and the development of hydroelectric power will amount in 1 year to what might otherwise take a number of years of average flow. This brings closer the time when the conservation storage will be filled to its optimum capacity, and the maximum utilization of these reservoirs will become a reality.

The article follows:

MISSOURI BARGES, DAMS READY FOR RECORD THAW

(NOTE.—Snowpack on heights is at levels that brought disastrous floods in 1952, but new dam system has never yet been filled; so both barge and hydropower men are happy.)

When the snows melted in the spring of 1952, more than 30-million acre-feet of water swept down into the Missouri River's upper basin and destroyed some $180 million worth of property—the worst flood disaster in the region's history.

This winter, snow surveyors along the flanks of the Continental Divide and on the

Dakota plains took a look at a February snowpack of similar proportions—and became nearly ecstatic. If precipitation follows suit through April, they say happily, this spring's runoff might equal 1952's.

The difference this time is that everyone will be ready for it. Following the 1952 disaster, the Corps of Engineers in 1954 completed six dams northward from Yankton, S. Dak., to trap the big spring thaws and to build up reserves for hydropower plants in the upper basin and for barge movements in the lower basin and the Mississippi.

WAITING

But for 11 years things have been so dry and the dam system has held so much less water than it was planned to contain that power production has been working at a poor level of efficiency.

Hydropower interests made plans to build supplemental steam generating plants. Downriver, barges have had to be loaded less and less—sometimes only to 22 percent of capacity—as river levels dropped. This in turn has forced rates higher, affecting bulk shippers and manufacturers all over the Midwest (Business Week, Jan. 23, 1965, p. 132). Navigation and power interests have fought increasingly for what water there was.

Except for 1962, when the year's yield was 30-million acre-feet, or 25 percent above normal, water yield since the dams were finished has averaged 79 percent of normal. In 1961, the yield was only 11-million acre-feet. The reservoirs, meantime, use 20-million acre-feet a year to turn the generators, keep the boats afloat, and make up evaporation losses.

RECORD PACKS

This year the engineers expect reservoirs to top out at 57 million acre-feet. The optimism over this spring's "harvest" is based on last month's snow measurements; these showed accumulations 57 percent above normal in the mountains—where February usually has only 65 percent as much snowfall as April.

Sixteen of eighteen stations reported a record pack for February, while snowfall at Canyon Station in Yellowstone Park exceeded the previous high set in April of the flood year 1952. On the plains, where the thaw will begin this month, accumulation is less spectacular but still substantial.

LONG-RANGE NEEDS

Engineers and business interests agree that though impressive, this year's big drip will not solve the region's long-term problems. The reservoirs—at Gavins Point, Fort Randall, Oahe, Garrison, and Fort Peck—will need at least another harvest such as this year's promises to be before water storage will reach the proper levels.

The runoff, however, will alleviate somewhat the rivalry between power and navigation concerns. Power companies may now be able to delay building their steam generating plants for a couple of years. Barge men are hopeful they may soon have a longer navigation season. Says Capt. A. C. Ingersoll, Jr., president of Federal Barge Lines; "This will bring closer the day of long-range water resource management."

HAZARDS, TOO

On the Lower Missouri and the Mississippi effects are already apparent—not all of them good. Unexpectedly warm weather last week broke the ice cover, causing some damage south of Omaha. At St. Louis, river gages registered a 10-foot rise in 3 days. Though there is little danger of flooding, the faster currents slow up northbound tows and increase operating costs. Also, if the water gets much higher, locks may have to close, and this will stop river traffic north of St. Louis.

Indictment by Numbers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a very thoughtful editorial from the Tampa Tribune in Florida on the subject of the President's voting rights bill which indicates further the very substantial shortcomings of this proposal and evidences the fact that it is essential that the bill be substantially improved if the right to vote is to be protected against discriminatory practices while at the same time preserving the constitutional rights of the States to fix reasonable standards for registration.

Certainly leaving out 30 of the 50 States and applying unreasonable penalties to those areas included that have not in fact discriminated is hardly the way to accomplish this objective.

The editorial follows:

INDICTMENT BY NUMBERS

"Experience has clearly shown that the existing process of law cannot overcome systematic and ingenious discrimination. No law we now have on the books can insure the right to vote when local officials are determined to deny it."

Thus spoke President Johnson in urging a joint session of Congress to enact a law giving Federal officials power to take over voter registration in districts where Negroes allegedly are discriminated against.

Every fair-minded southerner will agree with the President that a denial of voting rights to any person, because of race, is a moral and legal wrong which cannot be tolerated.

But we must disagree with Mr. Johnson's contention that presen laws are not sufficient to end this discrimination.

We cite two pieces of evidence—one fresh from the news wires, one from recent files.

In Mobile yesterday, Federal Judge Daniel H. Thomas ordered the registrars of rural Perry County (county seat: Marion) to cease using the State literacy test and to provide enough personnel to process at least 100 voter applications a day. If the registrars have not processed all pending applications by July 1, the judge said, he would direct a Federal referee (already appointed) to take over the job.

This command is so specific in terms and time that we fail to see how the Perry County registrars can avoid compliance.

And we refer once more to the case of Macon County (Tuskegee). Until 1961 Negroes in this county, despite the fact that they constituted three-fourths of the population, had been effectively deprived of voting rights. On one pretext or another professors at famed Tuskegee Institute were disqualified, while white field hands were registered.

But today there are 3,300 Negroes on the voting rolls, as compared with 2,900 whites. They got there through Federal court proceedings which put an end to the former discriminatory practices. The Civil Rights Act of 1960 was the sweet chariot which carried the Negro to victory in this fight for justice; and it was strengthened by the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

When a Federal judge has power to suspend literacy tests used unfairly against the Negro, to order an end of dilatory tactics by registrars and, if necessary, to install an agent of the court to sign up voters, what further law is needed?

The Johnson bill has not yet been laid before Congress. But as outlined by official sources, its approach is disturbing.

It would, so we are told, automatically empower the Federal Government to supersede county and State registration procedures if less than 50 percent of eligible citizens were registered or less than 50 percent of eligibles voted in the presidential election last November.

This mathematical index of discrimination is both illogical and unfair.

Some southern counties in which there is no two-party contest for State and county offices habitually cast a light vote in general elections; some have a lower-than-normal registration because poll tax payments still are required for State elections; some with large Negro populations have a short vote because many Negroes, though not barred from voting, are simply not interested.

One of the States in the minus-50 category is Virginia. But if there is any discrimination in voting practices in Virginia, we've never heard of it. Another is Alaska. But Senator GRUENING explained that bad weather cut the voter turnout last November. The effect of such a classification is to make a State or county prove its innocence—a complete reversal of American principle.

The only justification for Federal intervention in registration procedures is when there is clear evidence of discrimination. This evidence can readily be obtained and offered to Federal court by Justice Department agents.

President Johnson made an eloquent appeal to the national conscience in the matter of Negro rights. But law must be constructed on the rock of reason, rather than the shifting sands of emotion. Congress has the duty to see that no legislation designed to protect the Negro's rights commits a wrong against others.

Let This Be a Lesson to Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the more practical observations that nations as well as individuals can make is to learn from the accomplishments or failures of others.

This point is especially well expressed in an editorial which appeared in the Palos Regional, March 13, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

LET THIS BE A LESSON TO US

For some time, stories have been coming out of Russia telling of drastic, if severely limited, changes in economic policy. The gist of them is that the Soviets have been testing such once-despised capitalist principles as the profit motive in order to stimulate production and indifferent administrators.

Now, it seems, another lengthy step is being taken. It has been announced that by the end of 1965 a third of Russia's consumer-

goods factories will also be operating on a capitalist principle. They will produce only what retailers can sell.

This certainly won't strike Americans as remarkable. That's exactly the way things are done in this country under our system of free, competitive mass production, and distribution. But in Russia, just the opposite policy has been followed. Factories have ben told by the planners what to make and in what quantity. As a result, stores are stocked with inferior, over-priced, unwanted goods. And consumers have been vigorously complaining.

So Russia, even if slowly, is moving toward a supply-demand consumer economy, complete with a certain amount of profit motive. One may be sure that this is being done out of reluctant necessity—it must be something of a humiliation to the Soviet hierarchy to imitate capitalism to any degree, and Karl Marx, very likely, is revolving in his grave. At any rate, there is a lesson in this for us. Our production-distribution system, working all the way from the sources of raw materials to our splendid retail stores, does more good for more people than any other system man has been able to think up.

The District of Columbia Crime Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following two editorials broadcast recently by station WWDC here in Washington.

Both of these editorials concern H.R. 5688, the so-called omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia. The station's comments will be of interest to all of our colleagues.

The editorials follow:

THE RIGHT TO FEEL SECURE

(NOTE.—Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC President Ben Strouse began before the vote by the House of Representatives on March 22, 1965. We welcome comments).

For several weeks, WWDC editorials have been discussing "The Right To Feel Secure." This station is concerned because Washington residents do not feel secure, either on the streets or in their homes. We say those who ignore this condition or who make excuses for it are deluding themselves.

But we also say that those who reach for quick and easy answers to crime problems in Washington are deluding themselves. We think it's a pity the majority of the House District Committee is so infected.

Once again the committee majority has urged on the House its all-purpose crime measure, H.R. 5688. It is like nothing so much as the man who threw out the baby in order to get rid of the bath water. In one mighty whack this bill would overturn the Supreme Court's Mallory decision, rewrite the complex law on insanity and crime, restore arrests for investigation to fashion, greatly increase the penalties for certain crimes, and redraft the law on indecent and obsecene literature and materials. Any one of these subjects would be complex enough to baffle most Congressmen if presented in separate bills. To expect 435 House Members to comprehend and swallow such a gumbo in a single afternoon is utterly fantastic.

The House ought to tell its District Committee to withdraw H.R. 5688 and start over.

THE RIGHT TO FEEL SECURE

(NOTE.—Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC President Ben Strouse began after the vote by the House of Representatives on March 22, 1965. We welcome comments.)

Once again the House of Representatives—blindly following the lead of its misguided and overzealous District Committee—has rammed through the so-called omnibus crime bill. This is the same free-wheeling, repressive, unpalatable cure-all for Washington crime that sailed through the House in the 88th Congress. Parts of this bill have been vetoed by the White House in earlier years for the simple reason they were clearly unconstitutional. And the Senate has demonstrated in the past that it will never accept parts of this bill which read "as if the Constitution of the United States has been suspended in its Capital City."

Yet here was a majority of the House, closing its eyes to these realities, going down the line for H.R. 5688. What a way to run a railroad.

The residents of Washington—for a variety of complex reasons—no longer enjoy the right to feel secure on the streets or in their homes. The action of the House in rushing to passage the omnibus crime bill restores no security to these citizens. Rather, it denies them the sober, carefully considered revision that is required of our crime control process to make it an efficient, effective system.

The only consolation is that soon a Presidential commission will undertake the job which the majority on the House District Committee seems unable or unwilling to tackle.

Another Hoosier First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following editorial from the Shelbyville, Ind., News, March 24, 1965, for the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ANOTHER HOOSIER FIRST

It was especially nice yesterday to be a Hoosier as our own Virgil I. "Gus" Grissom of Mitchell played the No. 1 role in the brillantly successful three-orbit journey around the earth of Gemini-3, America's first two-man space craft.

There also is good reason to believe that Gemini-3 is the first truly maneuverable space craft, having been directed by Grissom to change its orbital path in flight.

And Grissom was the first man to make two flights into space, being a veteran of a Mercury suborbital flight nearly 4 years ago. We are sure to hear more of both him and his copilot in yesterday's flight, John W. Young, as the Gemini and even more daring space ventures unfold in the future.

From lift-off to final safe recovery of these two men, the prayers and cheers of millions of Americans and of other millions of well-wishers around the globe, were with them. And in the "front row" of the praying and cheering section were Hoosiers in every single section of the State. For all of us Indianans, the entire venture was a multifaceted Hoosier first. That's how we feel about our own.

Praises Nomination of Henry Fowler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's disclosure that he will nominate Mr. Henry H. Fowler to be the Secretary of the Treasury was a pleasant and welcome announcement to me.

Mr. Fowler is an able and dedicated public servant, who has given much of his time to his country at great personal sacrifice. His professional services are in constant demand at all times, and his decision to accept a call to duty from his President is indicative of his love for his country and his fellow man. All of us should be most grateful for his decision to serve in this most important position.

I commend to my colleagues an editorial from the Alexandria, Va., Gazette of Wednesday, March 24, 1965. The editorial follows:

AN ALEXANDRIAN HONORED

A singular distinction has been accorded Virginia and, more particularly Alexandria, in the designation by President Johnson of Henry H. Fowler to be the Secretary of the Treasury, the second highest Cabinet post. He is outranked only by the Secretary of State in the order of precedence among the President's top advisers. It is an appointment well deserved and one for which Mr. Fowler is especially qualified by experience and by temperament.

Only one Virginian has preceded Mr. Fowler in this important post. Carter Glass of Lynchburg, who led the fight for banking reforms that culminated in the establishment of the Federal Reserve Board, and who served the Commonwealth with great honor in the U.S. Senate for many years thereafter, was the Secretary of the Treasury in the closing days of the administration of Woodrow Wilson. Both Senator Glass and Henry Fowler were Virginia born and bred. Both devoted their lives to public service. Both were faced in their careers with great change in the processes of Government and, more particularly in its fiscal affairs.

The problems of the days of Carter Glass concerned themselves with the domestic banking structure and a variety of paper bank currencies. The reforms instituted were bitterly fought by the banking community and others. But in the end they were welcomed. As time passed, Senator Glass became regarded as a great conservative and fought many of the fiscal and monetary policies of the New Deal.

Henry Fowler comes to office at a time which has its problems of a far different nature than those that confronted Carter Glass. The dollar is the foundation stone of world currencies. It is as good as gold, a particularly embarrassing fact as attested by the unfavorable balance of payments, one of Mr. Fowler's major problems. He is regarded as a progressive in economic matters at a time when new remedies are called for by new developments. He has had a long record of Government service, dating back to 1934, when he joined the then new Tennessee Valley Authority as counsel. His last prior public service was as Under Secretary of the Treasury and his outstanding feat was the advocacy and ultimate approval of the 1964 income tax reduction.

Alexandrians know Mr. Fowler best as an outstanding political figure, a churchman

and a banker. We can rest assured that, as a man and as a public servant, he will carry the responsibilities of his new post well.

Economic Life of Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, history has demonstrated that economic depression among America's farm families has far-reaching effects on the economic life of the Nation. The damage is severe enough when limited to farmers themselves, but it does not stop there. It extends to the main streets, then to the trade centers, and eventually to the manufacturing and industrial areas of the Nation.

The following letter from the Oregon Wheat Growers League indicates that the danger signals are flying. I urge my colleagues to give the problem of low farm income the attention it deserves to prevent a slowdown or reversal of our rising gross national product:

OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE,
March 22, 1965.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: We again wish to call your attention to the fact that the farm cost-price squeeze is continuing to be more and more apparent. A minor depression has already arrived in the rural areas. Business on main street, in the towns which are primarily dependent on agricultural prosperity, has fallen off appreciably. Farmer financial reserves have been used up during the last decade to a point where a problem, which for a number of years did not seem too serious, has now become alarmingly evident very rapidly.

This is affecting the availability of short term credit from lending institutions all throughout the crop producing areas. We think you realize the importance, in modern wheat farming where there is so much out-of-pocket expense involved, of a good line of credit. The loss of confidence by local banks and other lending bodies in the ability of established farm customers to repay, is a red light that points to real trouble ahead. Our banking people are greatly concerned, our growers are even more concerned when they know what this means as a deterrent to operating efficiency.

We submit that, unless farm income is improved, this present credit situation will tighten and will add to an already serious situation. We cannot help but recall the old and often used statement that national depressions are farm led and farm fed. They often occur when prosperity seems to be at a peak. Minor rural recessions, we think are the danger signal and that we must all attempt to avert what seems so certain to be in the future.

The domestic marketplace is the logical place to help regain the balance of income that wheat farmers must have in order to remain solvent. Full parity for wheat used domestically for food will be of material assistance in regaining this balance.

We feel certain that you will give serious consideration to active support of legislation which encompasses this requirement.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. WELBES,
Executive Vice President.

The Incredible Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the Chief Executive has proposed, and the committees of the Congress are now considering, a so-called civil rights voting bill. It is one of the most vicious, liberty-destroying, unconstitutional measures that has been proposed to the Congress since the adoption of our Constitution.

The Congress is being asked to enact a law that would clearly violate the Constitution. It would strike down State provisions that, since time immemorial, have been held proper and constitutional by the Supreme Court of our land. Yet, we saw this same Court, with one exception, leading the applause when the Chief Executive was making his address to the Congress. These same judicial officers will be the final arbiters on the constitutionality of whatever is enacted by the Congress.

A scheme has been set up which, if adopted, will convict the States which have been selected by the administration to be taken over by the Attorney General, who will be set up as a czar over the electoral franchise. He is given unlimited power and authority over certain Southern States, simply because less than 50 percent of the adult residents failed to particpiate in the national election of 1964. Many citizens did not participate because they felt they had no choice. Yet, this bill, as in Communist Russia, would require adults to participate in elections—whether they desired to do so or not.

The legislation, if enacted, will virtually wipe out State lines in the South, complete the centralization process, and demolish the constitutional guarantees which have meant so much to our people in the past.

We are told that the Soviets have a record of 99.9 voting percentage for candidates without opposition. This perhaps is the goal of those who sponsor this legislation—elections, full participation, and no opposition. A complete takeover such as we saw in Germany in the 1930's is possible under this bill. At that time, many good people in Germany did not realize what was happening. The same could be true today.

This bill has been drawn up under a stress of hysteria and has been literally promoted through street demonstrations. When the Founding Fathers established our system of government, they set up a democratic process of government under which deliberative action was made paramount. Some other nations of the world have long lamented the fact that their governments are periodically overturned because of revolutionary elements parading and demonstrating in the streets. Yet, we now appear to be heading in the same direction.

The Attorney General in his appearance before the Judiciary Committee of the House in explaining the bill admitted that there had been no discrimination in registering people to vote in Virginia. The Civil Rights Commission has exonerated Virginia and readily admitted in its report that Virginia had not discriminated in registering people because of race, color, or creed. Yet, this bill convicts Virginia; puts the stamp of the criminal upon her; when all concerned readily admit there has been no discrimination so far as registration is concerned. This shows the viciousness of the bill. This shows the scheme behind its enactment and the diabolic effort to take over the electorate of our State regardless of the fact that there has been no discrimination. Yet, we stand convicted because of the criteria set up in the bill to convict an entire State, all of its officials and leaders, without a hearing, and when it is admitted by all that they are not guilty.

It will be a sad day for America when our elected officials establish a pattern of willingness to change our form of government at the behest of minority pressure groups who are willing to go to any lengths to impose their will.

I include with my remarks a splendid editorial entitled "The Incredible Bill," which appeared in the Wednesday, March 24, edition of the Richmond News Leader. The editor of this newspaper, Mr. James J. Kilpatrick, has long warned of the direction toward which we are heading. This editorial cogently points out the fallacies of the criteria set up in this bill and I commend this to the reading of the Members of the House.

THE INCREDIBLE BILL

Most of today's editorial page is given over to publication of the text of Mr. Johnson's proposed "Voting Rights Act of 1965." We urge readers of every political persuasion, liberals and conservatives alike, to take the time to read this bill and to reflect upon its provisions.

In earlier comment, we have touched upon what seems to us the most serious fault in the bill, that it undertakes to fix "qualifications for voting" through the process of Federal law. The power to fix qualifications for voting is a power clearly reserved to the States, subject only to the requirement that qualifications be enforced without discrimination among voters. In our own view, it is simply beyond the powers of the Congress, under the 15th amendment or any other provision of the Constitution, to fix general "qualifications for voting" not related to State discrimination by reason of race or color.

Let us move on today to what might be called the "trigger provisions" of the bill. It will be seen that the act would apply, under section 3, only to States that maintained on November 1, 1964, some "test or device" as a qualification for voting. But the law would not apply to all such States. It would apply only to those States, employing a test or device, in which less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age were registered on November 1, 1964, or in which less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of 1964.

In Virginia, a prospective voter is required to register in his own handwriting. Under the bill, this would be a "test or device." Last November, only 41 percent of the Commonwealth's voting-age population voted in the presidential election. Alabama saw 36 percent of its adults voting. Alaska 48.7, Georgia, 43.2, Louisiana 47.3, Mississippi 32.9, and South Carolina 38.0. Though less than half the adults of Arkansas and Texas voted in November, the two States reportedly em-

ploy no "test or device" as the phrase is defined in the bill.

Note the discriminatory effect of the arbitrary cutoff point of 50 percent. South Carolina would be affected, but neighboring North Carolina—where 51.8 percent voted—would be exempt. Alabama and Mississippi would be subject to all the punitive provisions of the bill, but adjacent Tennessee—where 51.1 percent voted—would be exempt. New York has a literacy test far more rigorous than Virginia's, but 63.2 percent of the adults voted in New York, so New York would be exempt.

Let us move on to another provision. Note section 5(d), at the foot of the second column of the text. This has to do with persons, both white and Negro, who may have been registered by the "examiners" or registrars to be appointed under the law. The names of such persons "shall be removed" from the list if they fail to vote "at least once during 3 consecutive years." Any other registrant, under normal State procedures, may vote or fail to vote as he pleases; but those persons registered by the Federal agents would be placed under a special compulsion.

Many other provisions might be singled out for discussion. Under the Constitution, the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction "in all cases in which a State shall be party," but that provision is simply ignored in section 3(c) of the bill. Under the most ancient provisions of our Government, the States have had power to pass laws defining the qualifications of franchise, and a presumption of constitutionality has attached to such laws. But under section 8 of this bill, these ancient provisions would be repudiated. No affected State could change its own voting laws without first begging the approval of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Until Virginia were ruled exempt, the city of Richmond could not even provide by ordinance for additional precinct polling places.

These are some of the features of the President's incredible bill. Pushed along on winds of strong emotion, the bill reportedly commands the support of 80 Members of the Senate. We cannot believe that 80 Members of the Senate have studied the measure thoughtfully or have pondered the mischief it would do to the federal system of government this Republic has known so long. Whatever the sins of Alabama and Mississippi and Louisiana may have been, two wrongs cannot make a right; they cannot make even a civil right. And discrimination is not to be cured by a punitive statute that singles out a few States and leaves the rest alone.

Unsung: Forgotten Life of Usefulness Recalled by Rosenbloom Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, last week one of West Virginia's most able former Members of the House of Representatives passed away. He was the Honorable Benjamin L. Rosenbloom, of Wheeling, W. Va., who served with distinction in the 67th and 68th Congresses from 1921 to 1925. On Wednesday, I called the attention of the House to his passing.

Today, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to Mr. Rosenbloom from one of the State's most distinguished editors, Thomas O'B. Flynn, editor of the Wheeling Intelligencer, Wheeling, W. Va.:

UNSUNG: FORGOTTEN LIFE OF USEFULNESS RECALLED BY ROSENBLOOM DEATH

Trailblazers do not always reap the rewards of their feats, either in material gain or public recognition. Too often the real pioneer is forgotten in the rush of lesser men who come along to cash in on his vision.

The late Benjamin L. Rosenbloom, who died in the Cleveland Clinic on Monday, belonged to this company. In some respects Ben Rosenbloom was a man who lived before his time. A lifelong opponent of prohibition, his was for years a voice in the wilderness in both the Senate of West Virginia and the Congress of the United States. But he lived to see his State and his Nation reject the policy after his contribution to the movement had been largely forgotten. He was a pioneer in the feeble early agitation to rid the Nation's streams of pollution at a time when this was regarded as a fanciful vision. He plead the cause of depletion taxation when such advocacy was considered the spouting of a political crackpot. He was in the front battlelines of other unpopular causes which later were embraced.

Senator Rosenbloom had other distinctions. He had the proud record of never having missed a rollcall in either the Senate of West Virginia or the National House of Representatives, and he possessed always the courage of his convictions. Although a Republican from early manhood he deserted his party when he believed the Democratic Party under Mr. Roosevelt to represent better what he regarded as the liberal viewpoint, but lost his enthusiasm when the New Deal, Fair Deal, and their successors strayed from what he believed to be the moorings of sound American doctrine.

Eighty-five years of age when he died, Mr. Rosenbloom had lived in retirement and virtual obscurity for some years, his public service and vision remembered only by the fading few of his own generation. But the work he did, the inspiration he provided, the impetus he gave to numerous enlightened movements will live on.

Our Big Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the Lincoln Star of March 22, 1965, which states succinctly and honestly the dilemma in which Nebraska and the other farming areas of this country face. I believe that wider understanding of our situation would be gained if more people could read this statement and I therefore include it in the RECORD for that purpose.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, Mar. 22, 1965]

OUR BIG PROBLEM

Pondering certain areas of the latest Federal census, especially those pertaining to income, is enough to make a Nebraska loyalist cry out in his sleep.

We take an eastern Nebraska county, not far from our own Lancaster County. It is a county with a local reputation of being wealth. It is basically agricultural, progressive in its methods and ranks well for its yields of corn and wheat. If anyone referred to the county as being underprivileged and only a couple of steps above Appalachia he would have a fight on his hands. Nebraskans are a proud people.

But facts are facts. In that particular county the average median income is around $3,500 a year. Approximately a third of the people have an income of less than that. Only about 4.5 percent of the county's people enjoy an income of $10,000 or more per year. That includes the people of inherited wealth who get their income from checks in the mail rather than through earnings. The great preponderance of the population of the county are dependent upon agriculture for their livelihood. There is not much industry in the area. But if there were it would not help agriculture. It would only help those employed in the industry or in related services.

Moreover, approximately 80 percent of Nebraska's annual income derives from agriculture. Further, the figures of this particular county compare closely with those of all other rural Nebraska counties.

The problem in Nebraska is not shiftless, ignorant people, nor backwardness in farm technology. Nor is it the infertility of the soil or inadequate rainfall. It is not something for which further agricultural research will find a specific remedy. The problem is that Nebraska is an extractive State, allowing its products to be priced into the market at less than subsistence figures while paying national prices for the finished products needed.

This is the problem in a nutshell and it is the No. 1 problem of this and every agricultural State. It is a relationship that must be stopped and reversed for it is growing worse rather than better.

Change of Government in Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I believe it is important that I keep the membership of the House informed of Governmental changes taking place in the area under our committee's jurisdiction. Therefore, for the information of the House, I wish to make some brief remarks about the recent changes in the Government of Rumania.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gheorghiu-Dej, the first party Secretary and President of the Council of State of Rumania passed away last week.

On March 22, at a Politburo meeting of the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers Party, Mr. Nicolae Ceausescu, was elected First Party Secretary and Mr. Chivu Stoica was nominated as the President of the Council of State. His nomination was recently confirmed by the Council's National Assembly. Mr. Gheorghe Maurer continues as Premier—President of the Council of Ministers—and Vice President of the Council of State.

Brief biographies of the three gentlemen I have just mentioned follow:

BIOGRAPHY OF NICOLAE CEAUSESCU (CHOW-SES-COO)

Born January 26, 1918, in Scornicesti, a village in southern Rumania. He joined the

Union of Communist Youth in 1933 and has since been active in Communist affairs. He became a member of the Rumanian Communist Party in 1936 at the age of 18 and was jailed for illegal political activity in 1940 and not released until the coup against the Iron Guard Dictatorship in August 1944. After the coup, his release, and after Rumania joined the allies he was Secretary of the Central Committee of the Union of Communist Youth, and in 1945 became Secretary of the Bucharest City Communist Party organization. In October 1945 he was elected to the Central Committee of the Rumanian Communist Party and when the Communist and Social Democratic Parties merged in February 1948, in the Central Committee of the new party he was an alternate member. He became Secretary General in the Ministry of Agriculture in April 1946, and was concerned with the nationalization of large land holdings. He became Assistant Minister in March 1949 dealing among other things with the establishment of agricultural collectives. In March 1950 he became Assistant Minister of the Armed Forces and was given the rank of Major General. In May 1953 he was made a full member of the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers Party. On April 1954 he resumed his ministerial post to become a member of the Secreariat of the Centrail Committee as a candidate member of the Politburo. In December 1955 he became a full member; in June '60 he became one of the secretaries of the Politburo and then yesterday he was named First Secretary.

BIOGRAPHY OF CHIVU STOICA (STOY-KA), NEW PRESIDENT OF COUNCIL OF STATE OF THE RUMANIAN PEOPLES REPUBLIC

Born August 8, 1908, in a village near Ploestei. Became a railroad apprentice at age 12, and later became a steelworker in Bucharest. Joined the Union of Communist Youth in 1929 and the Rumanian Communist Party in 1930. His association with the former President Gheorghiu-Dej dates from 1932 and he was imprisoned with him for many years until the coup against the "Iron Guard" dictatorship in August 1944. Thereafter he specialized in trade union activities for the Communist Party and in January 1945 became vice president of the Rumanian General Conference of Labor. In October 1945 he was elected member of the Politburo of the Rumanian Communist Party and when the Communist and Social Democratic Parties merged in February 1948, he was downgraded to alternate member of the Central Committee, but in 1953 again became a full member. In January 1946 he was general manager of the Rumanian Railway Administration. In April 1948, Minister of Industry. In November 1949, Minister of Metallurgical and Chemical Industries, and in March 1950 became Vice Premier. He became Premier in 1954 and his major activity was coordination of the various industrial ministeries. He then resigned subsequently when Ion Maurer became Premier in 1956. In March of 1961 he became one of the secretaries of the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers Party and yesterday was elected president of the Council of State.

BIOGRAPHY OF ION GHEORGHE MAURER

Born September 1902 in Bucharest. He is the only one of the top leadership that was not also a proletarian, a worker. He had legal training as a youth. He came into prominence as a lawyer seeking to defend Communists in trials before the war, in 1927. Subsequently he became a member of the party. He was not imprisoned during the war, and apparently was instrumental in securing the release of Dej and other top Communists from prison at the time of the coup in August 1944. He started out in Government as the Secretary General (something like our Assistant Secretary) of the Ministry of Communications and Public Works. He then became Under Secretary in the Ministry of Communications in 1946. In 1948 he became Assistant Minister of Industry. He was one of the Rumanian delegates in 1946 to the Paris Peace Conference that drafted the Treaty of Peace with Rumania. In 1948, he was purged at the instance of Anna Pauker, and when she was deposed in 1952 he started back on the road to prominence. He was made alternate member of the Party Central Committee in 1955, and was appointed Ministry of Foreign Affairs in July 1957. He was president of the Presidium of the Grand National Assembly in January 1958. He then was the equivalent of Prime Minister (head of government). He became a full member of the Party Central Committee in June 1958 and a member of the Politburo in 1960. In March 1961 he became Chairman of the Council of Ministers and was a Vice President of the Council of State at the same time. Since June 1960 he has been a member of the Politburo.

Colleges Can't Complain About Pros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Joe Foss, Commissioner of the American Football League, former Governor of my State of South Dakota, and a world-renowed hero of World War II, has again evidenced that he can make quick, logical decisions and then stick by them.

Recently there has been much discussion of so-called early signings of collegiate football players by the professional leagues. Foss has agreed to sit down and work out an equitable solution for both the colleges and the professional sports people.

To those who know collegiate and professional sports best—the sportswriters—it comes as somewhat of a surprise that some college coaches and some athletic associations should be so vocal about this alleged abuse. The truth of the matter is that many sportswriters feel that the colleges skirts are not clean in all respects and until they help clean up their own houses they should not be pointing fingers at the professional leagues.

Following is an article written by Pat Harmon of the Cincinnati Post under date of January 5, 1965, which touches on this point very well:

I see the University of Georgia has just learned that its all-America tackle from Pennsylvania, Jim Wilson, played a college season after signing a pro contract.

And four players for the University of Oklahoma were ruled out of the Gator Bowl last Saturday, because they had joined up with the pros.

The colleges are screaming "unfair" at the pros, but I don't think they have a complaint. The boys are just doing what the good old universities taught them.

I don't think Georgia recruited Jim Wilson for his fine mind. I doubt that Oklahoma sought out and signed, on paper, a star like Jim Grisham so that he could inspire study groups. Now Grisham has signed another paper, and Oklahoma ought to be proud. Oklahoma taught Grisham to play football so well, his future employers couldn't wait.

Wilson and Grisham, like the others, were taught to play football. They are getting promoted to jobs that pay more money for doing the same thing.

Some of the athletes may have read where one of the bowls was paying $300,000 to the competing teams. This is comparable to a full house at one of the Cleveland Browns' pro shows, and I don't blame some of the boys for wanting a bigger dividend.

It's still a practice at some schools to give the head coach and his assistants a bonus for working a bowl game. The players are supposed to be satisfied with the fun.

The bowl games are going to grow. There will be more of them. I see where a Dallas source says the city netted an extra $1.5 million in retail business last week. All because Nebraska and Arkansas came in to play a bowl game. The people in Dallas aren't going to let that game die. They might make it bigger.

The colleges themselves don't make a clear line between their business and the pros. At the Gator Bowl, two pro coaches, Sid Gillman of San Diego and Al Davis of Oakland, were shown on TV with their tables right on the sideline. Seven players from Florida State rushed over to the tables and signed, while the cameras were on them. I think that was all right. I think it would have been all right if they'd signed before the game, too.

If an athlete goes to school principally to play football, I see nothing wrong with it. And if he wants to sign pro, I say let him. Let him play in the bowl games, too.

If an engineering student makes a commitment with General Electric before he graduates, no one suggests he should be tossed out of school. When I was in school, I knew some girls who had been sent to a coeducational college because their parents thought it was the best place to find the right kind of a husband. No one screamed when the girls got married and didn't finish school.

It should be the same with football. Instead of complaining about the pros who signed their kids, early or late, the colleges ought to say, "Great! We made him what he is."

The colleges are applying a double standard, but I happen to think Jim Wilson and Jim Grisham are just as good as the other football players.

Cradle to the Grave and Too Much Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the local press continues to render a real service, and not alone on local matters. In fact, often on issues of national concern the local or grassroots press speaks from experience and insight and thus with an authority our national leaders and legislators do not have.

An editorial in the March 11 issue of the New Holstein, Wis., Reporter, entitled "Cradle to the Grave and Too Much Government," is a case in point, and I place it in the RECORD with the hope that Members of both bodies of the Congress will read it.

CRADLE TO THE GRAVE AND TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT

This week we received in the mail a mat 5 columns wide by 12 inches deep, which is evidently one of the first salvos in the war on poverty, which we were asked to run free of charge for the Government.

So did 12,000 other editors throughout the country. One paper we have seen ran the mat, big as it is. A few other editors ran the copy as a part of their personal columns. But not Bud Tischler. Rather, he went on to say:

"The mat has a big heading: 'Be Somebody,' and then tells about the opportunities for young people 16 to 21 years of age, out of school, who can't find jobs and can't serve in the Armed Forces, in joining the Job Corps.

"In the Job Corps, the youth are told, they will associate with other young people their age, eat good food, learn a trade. Best of all, they get $50 a month while learning.

"Now this is a wonderful opportunity. The U.S. Government is spending millions of dollars on the program. The newspapers were asked to contribute, with this first advertisement, about $600,000 worth of space and the Government spent maybe $20,000 on the mat, mailing, etc.

"Why do we question it?"

Most weekly plants would gladly take youths 16 to 21 years of age and teach them a trade if they can get by with paying them $50 a month plus board and room. In fact years ago our printing plant and others like it throughout the country did just that. And this same thing happened in virtually every trade.

But now we can no longer do that. We must pay minimum wages, including time and one-half for overtime.

Youths, who do not have financial resources, can no longer go out on their own and learn a trade because no employer can hire them except at great financial loss to the company while the youths are learning. They must go, instead, to a trade school, and if they don't have money for tuition they can't go there.

We don't know what procedure the Government plans to follow with its Job Corps. Perhaps they will subsidize some of the schools to teach trades. That will mean more millions.

If we really want to war on poverty, we can do it by allowing business to have the same privileges the Government is taking in this instance. If an inshop apprentice training program were allowed at reasonable salary rates, a lot of youths today walking the streets could be gainfully learning a trade. And they'd do it at no expense to the taxpayer.

However such a program is too simple. There are no bureaucrats mixed up in it.

Perhaps the President will want to ask Mr. Meany and Mr. Reuther and Mr. Carey and the other fatcats of the AFL–CIO command post if he may have a special dispensation to do something sensible like this for our country and the young people who are caught in a bind?

Byelorussian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Byelorussia. I am pleased to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute on this occasion to the brave Byelorussians whose short period of freedom was cut short by the Bolshevik forces of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government which now rules the Byelorussian people certainly does not represent their wishes or hopes, but merely serves as an instrument of oppression. Thus, the Byelorussian people suffer in the same manner as the other captive peoples of communism under a cruel dictatorship.

May I take this opportunity to commend the many Americans of Byelorussian origin who continue to strive for the eventual restoration of freedom for their homeland.

This anniversary serves as a reminder that the spirit of freedom continues to burn in the hearts of the Byelorussian people behind the Iron Curtain and that the desire for independence and self-government continues to be the greatest weakness of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, may I again emphasize to the Members of the House the importance of establishing a special House Committee on Captive Nations in order to call to the attention of the world the cruel oppression under which the Byelorussian and other captive nations of communism suffer.

Since I, myself, am descended from immigrants who came to the United States from Poland, I have maintained a special interest in the peoples of areas adjacent to the land of my forebears. The heroic people of Byelorussia have been extremely effective in maintaining their spirit and determination in the face of Communist oppression. We must not permit their spirit and determination to be in vain.

Immaculate Heart of Mary Missionary Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, approximately 2 years ago, the Missionhurst priests, whose national headquarters is located in Arlington, Va., inaugurated a "Pyramids for Christ" campaign in an effort to build a permanent home for the Seminarians of the Immaculate Heart of Mary Missionary Society here in Washington, D.C.

Just before Christmas last year, this campaign resulted in the dedication of such a home, and I believe all who read this RECORD may be interested in the following account of the seminary and the remarks of the Father Provincial at its dedication:

THE SEMINARIANS OF THE IMMACULATE HEART OF MARY MISSIONARY SOCIETY

From the spring of 1955 until December of 1964 the Seminarians of the Immaculate Heart of Mary Missionary Society moved five times before taking up residence in their new and modern functional seminary at Eighth and Lawrence Streets NE. in the vicinity of Catholic University. The seminarians moved into their new home 2 days before Christmas 1964. Most are from the United States, although one comes from Japan and one from Hong Kong.

The meandering of the seminarians in and around the Catholic University campus the past 10 years is small compared to the missionary labors of the society which makes up 5 percent of all Catholic missionaries and which celebrated its 100th anniversary in 1962.

This first American seminary of the society which has its headquarters in Belgium was dedicated Sunday, March 7, at 3 p.m. by the Most Reverend William J. McDonald, auxiliary bishop of Washington and rector of the Catholic University of America. Open house at the seminary was from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m.

The rector of the seminary is the Reverend John P. Schotte, CICM. He is assisted by Father Paul G. Wynants, CICM, who is spiritual director to the 21 graduate students and seminarians. The graduate group includes priests who are studying philosophy, religious education, sociology, and history. Two priests and a brother are theology students and four brothers are studying philosophy.

The attractive seminary was blessed by Bishop McDonald in ancient ceremonies which will include blessing the outside cornerstone, the 6 individual chapels, the lovely chapel which seats 75 people and the building itself which includes 26 double rooms for students workshops, cafeteria, recreation room, library, and conference rooms. The lower level of the four-story building even has a fully equipped barber's room, for the priests must learn to cut hair as well as to handle basic sanitation and medical skills, use tools for the building of schools, chapels, and residences in faraway places and minister to other needs of primitive or emerging peoples.

Two rooms at the entrance to the building are decorated with artwork from China, Haiti, and other major fields of the IHM band. The long main hall leading to the chapel features a striking series of paintings by Father Nico Vandenhoudt, CICM, which illustrate the Apostles Creed. Other furnishings throughout the seminary come from countries in South and Central America, the Congo, and the Far East where the IHM missionaries toil for Christ.

The chapel has an electronic Allen organ, lovely facet glass windows and stalls for the students in a semicircle around the altar where mass is offered facing the congregation. A unique lighting effect makes it possible to frame the altar in a halo of light while a skylight during the day and a grilled light panel after dark immediately above the altar focuses attention upon the eucharistic banquet table.

The attractive stations in hammered bronze came from the art studio of John Ausloos, sculptor and goldsmith in Louvain (Belgium); the glass windows are the work of the Nobis Studios in Youngstown, Ohio. The wood statutes of St. Joseph the Worker, the Immaculate Heart of Mary, the Sacred Heart and the central wooden crucifix are the work of Italian craftsman in the mountains of Bolzano (Italy).

From the street, the six-color facet glass window depicts Mary Immaculate with a missioner at her feet. From the second floor corridor the kneeling figures are framed in light, forming a separate scene for students. Similarly, the Blessed Lady fills the corridor window on the third floor. The two-story window catches the morning sun and the day's reflected light. It is lighted up at night for all to see, casting a brilliant but peaceful light on passers by.

The seminary project began more than 2 years ago when a group of laymen joined the

Missionhurst priests at their American headquarters on 25th Street off North Glebe Road in Arlington, Va. They launched a "Pyramids for Christ" campaign, building one contributor onto another to raise a roof over the heads of these young American missionaries.

The Most Reverend Theophile Verbist who founded the society in Scheut, Belgium, a suburb of Brussels, in 1862 had as his goal the creation of what he called a "specialized battalion," warriors for Christ, who would go into the mission fields and reap the harvest of souls with their own hearts, hands, and their very lives if necessary.

The American provincial of the society, the Very Reverend Alphonse Rigouts, CICM, who spoke during the ceremonies and particularly thanked the volunteers who have helped raise the money and who have made contributions and pledges. One handsome memorial plaque with some 500 names of contributors inscribed on individual plates decorates the main lobby near the entrance. Another, with similar plates of some 300 who made specific pledges and contributions for the chapel, is displayed near the chapel entrance.

Speaking at the fund raising kickoff at Missionhurst more than 2 years ago, one of the lay promoters said: "The good fathers of Missionhurst need ammunition for their battalions in the field. They need provisions for their shock troops on God's battlelines from Formosa to Indonesia and from Singapore to Haiti and Guatemala. We have been called upon to wage a unique war, a war in which we feel no bodily pain, receive no mortal wounds, bleed no crimson blood, or walk any tortured mile. By taking pen in hand and heroically pledging ourselves to financial sacrifice for God and the missions tonight, we can raise up another barracks for young American volunteers for tomorrow's specialized battalions. We can feed, clothe, train, and teach them with one stroke of the pen. There is an appointed time. The time is now."

Many who helped the society in its initial drive have moved away, others have died, but their work goes on as the labors of the Missionhurst priests and the charity of their American friends places another jewel in the crown that is the circle of seminaries making up the religious communities clustered around the glorius Shrine of the Immaculate Conception and the Catholic University of America.

As Bishop McDonald intoned the solemn words of consecration, "Our help is in the name of the Lord," this latest jewel of the church militant in academic setting took on the added grace of the Holy Spirit to prepare candidates for the "specialized battalions" of the venerable Theophile Verbist for the century ahead.

For the seminarians, their appointed time has come.

REMARKS OF VERY REV. ALPHONSE RIGOUTS, CICM AMERICAN PROVINCIAL AT DEDICATION OF SEMINARY

This is a great day for us and we are happy that you have come up in such great numbers to rejoice with us. A hearty welcome to all of you. We even have a representation from a faraway place, from Indonesia: two confreres, who happen to pass through here on their way back to their mission. One of them is H.E. Archbishop Schneiders of Makassar.

We are also honored to have with us H. E. Baron Louis Scheyven, Ambassador of Belgium, in Washington, who has been closely associated with our society for many years. While a diplomat in China, he knew our missionaries very well and had many occasions to help them. His own cousin was a member of our Society and worked and died as a missionary in the Congo.

After residing for nearly 10 years in temporary, make-shift seminaries, which often were not conducive to regular seminary life and studies, and which were quite crowded, our seminarians are now in a real, permanent building, and it's a good one, quite adequate to their needs. Our seminarians are the first beneficiaries of this tremendous improvement. They feel the difference.

The missions will also profit from this building. We are fortunate to have it ready, just when our vocation program in this country got well off the ground. Our 1,400 priests and brothers in the missions are rejoicing with us today and they are looking forward to the reinforcements which they hope to receive regularly from here. Not only do they appreciate the increase in numbers with the arrival of young American missionaries, but the work and methods of the veterans in the field will also be enriched by the addition and the injection of the generosity of the American heart and of the efficiency and practicality of the American mind.

Our predominant feeling today is one of gratitude, which dispels all the construction headaches we have had. We are grateful that God has blessed us abundantly giving us the means to put up this building and the seminarians to fill it.

We are grateful to you, good people of this area, and to the thousands of people all over the country, who have helped us financially and have made the erection of this building possible. Without being obligated to us, you have made financial sacrifices over and above the financial support which you owe and which you give weekly to your own parishes to the schools which your children attend. Your only motivation has been your charity and your awareness of the need existing in one of the causes dearest to the heart of God: the foreign missions.

Our thanks to our promotion, to Father Paul and Father Albert, and to their dedicated lay helpers, who have sacrified time and effort in the fundraising campaign. Our thanks to our confreres here in the States, who have done what they could to solicit donations for this building in their own locality and among their friends.

Without the help of all you good people, this building would not have been possible. Being a mission congregation, which constantly has to pour money into the missions for the daily support of 1,400 missionaries, whose weekly collections average only a couple of dollars, we have no capital to fall back on for construction even of most necessary buildings such as this seminary.

We can justly be proud of this building. I am the first one to admit that this is not the most beautiful and the most expensive seminary that exists or that could be built. We had severe budget problems necessitating the elimination of anything that might be luxurious or superfluous. You won't find any wall-to-wall carpeting. I am sorry that we cannot give you a ride to the top floor in an elevator. We had to deal with strict zoning limitations, resulting in a very compact building. We have used every square foot available and permissible.

It would not have been justifiable to put up a luxurious building, since we were using money given by others, many of humble condition, perhaps at the cost of great personal sacrifice. We could not have curtailed our confreres in the missions by cutting down the regular support which they have been receiving through Missionhurst.

It would not have been wise to train our seminarians in luxurious surroundings, on wall-to-wall carpeting, when next, upon their arrival in the missions, they may have to walk on a roughly finished cement floor and take a shower standing under an old oil drum filled with river water.

But whatever the limitations of this building may be, it is a functional one and a beautiful one. We have reason to congratulate the architects and the contractors. I appreciate greatly the understanding of our budget problems and of our philosophy on the part of the architects, John M. Walton & Associates, in particular Mr. Ernest Rauth, the project architect. We got our money's worth.

We would have liked to show you on this day a completely finished building. We ask your indulgence. Setting the dedication for this date was a miscalculation on my part. Somehow this construction has known numerous delays not entirely due to the weather. This construction has caused more than the usual amount of headaches for architects and contractors.

If here or there you find that a wall panel is missing; if you find that there is too much of a slip between the stairs and the wall; if you find no name on the front entrance; if you can walk through a library stackroom without bookstacks, rest assured, it was not planned this way, and I am confident that someday somehow everything will be completed. Anyway, we are glad that we are in, and the building is quite livable as it is, as you will notice.

Bishop McDonald will soon proceed with the blessing of the cornerstone and of the building. We will ask God to give us many more recruits for the missions. We will ask Him that those who will be trained here may become persevering and zealous workers in His vineyard.

We are grateful to Bishop McDonald for having taken time off for this ceremony on this day, the feast day of St. Thomas, filled with academic sessions at the university. In the person of Bishop McDonald, we also want to thank Catholic University for educating most of our seminarians. If some of you should wonder why we located in this place, so near to the railroad tracks, with commercial buildings across the street, it's because we want to be near Catholic University, so that our seminarians and priests-graduate students can walk over for classes at Catholic University.

A word of thanks to those who have contributed time and effort to embellish this ceremony and the reception, in particular the faithful Missionhurst Mission Guild.

Oops, There Goes Pakistan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie, Ind., Star:

OOPS, THERE GOES PAKISTAN

The U.S. policy of pumping millions of dollar aid to so-called neutral nations has failed so miserably that it's even becoming apparent to the liberals who have long advocated such assistance programs.

For years the conservative elements in the nation have been critical of our sending hundreds of millions of dollars to, for example, Indonesia. But our Government, under Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and now Johnson, continued to shell out the funds to President Achmed Sukarno. Now Sukarno is completely in the Red China camp and $900 million of American taxpayers' money is down the drain.

Now we have new evidence of the ineffectiveness of our aid-to-neutrals policy, as if any further proof of it were needed. Aid to neutrals cannot only fail to keep them neutral, but can convert friends into

neutrals. As witness to this grim fact, we present Pakistan.

Under President Mohammed Ayub Khan, Pakistan was one of our strongest supporters in the cold war. He took Pakistan into the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), an association of nations formed in 1954 to aid member countries in event of external military attack. SEATO is directed against any Red aggression that might develop. Ayub Khan also brought Pakistan into North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a pact aimed at the threat of Communist territorial aggression in Europe. He also signed bilateral mutual defense as well as trade, friendship, and cooperation agreements with the United States. Pakistan appeared to be the core of anti-Communist defense in its part of the world. Our military planes used Pakistan bases. We poured in military aid to the extent of $4 billion.

During that same period the United States was giving massive aid to India, in exchange for which we received neutralism. We also received considerable lecturing from the late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, who petulantly scolded us for our materialism and other alleged offenses against good form. Nehru's intellectual scorn for materialism never became so marked that he turned down any of our aid, needless to relate.

In any event our continued aid to India, with which Pakistan has a number of unsolved problems, has alienated Pakistan. Ayub Khan this month received a hero's welcome in Peiping. Agreements on trade, cultural activities, air travel, etc., have brought Pakistan and Red China closer together. What has happened is that Ayub Khan figured that if India can make hay playing a neutralist role, why not Pakistan? Frankly, we can hardly blame him. If you can benefit as much by taking neither side in a dangerous contest it isn't human nature to take sides. Our foreign policy, which doesn't distinguish friends from neutrals, or even from enemies, has had its inevitable result. A friendly nation is turning neutralist.

Perhaps it's time for the State Department to have one of its periodic agonizing reappraisals of foreign policy. We ought to examine the practical merits, as well as the morality, of a policy which allows massive aid to nations that express no choice between countries ruled by free men and those ruled by gangsters. Perhaps any nation that can't make up its mind between these two sides doesn't deserve another dime of the American taxpayers' hard-earned dough.

The Precious Rights at Stake in Ignoring the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Congress is being asked to help destroy a precious system of government which has given greater opportunity and a better way of life to more people than any other system ever devised by man. Under pressure of demonstrations, threats of mob violence and in submission to the demands of the agitators of lawlessness, the President is asking for a voting rights bill which surely will destroy this Republic as it has functioned for more than 180 years. When so much is at stake, should we not take time for at least reasonable debate of the voting rights bill and decide upon it in an atmosphere of cool calm rather than in the heat of the national hysteria of the moment?

As a part of these remarks I would like to call your attention to the following column by James J. Kilpatrick which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 25, 1965.

VOTING BILL PILES WRONG ON WRONG

With so many interesting and pleasant things to write about—spring, Julie Andrews, Whitey Ford's arm—it is a pity, truly it is, to have to beg once again for a calm and thoughtful look at President Johnson's Voting Rights Act of 1965. Yet this is a bad bill—bad in ways that need to be understood if something precious is to be preserved—and the lighter topics can wait, if Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., can't.

This precious something is a system of government obedient to a written constitution. If the Congress sacrifices this high principle to the pressures of a turbulent hour, the Congress may succeed in redressing some palpable wrongs, but a fearful price will be paid in the loss of ancient values.

Under our federal system, the power to fix qualifications for voting clearly is lodged with the States. Article VIII, section 2, of the Constitution spells it out:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." In the whole of the Constitution, no more explicit provision can be found.

Time after time, the Supreme Court itself has emphasized this reservation of power to the States. Just 6 years ago this spring, in the Lassiter case from North Carolina, the High Court expressly reaffirmed an unbroken series of opinions to this effect:

"The States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the rights of suffrage may be exercised, absent, of course, the discrimination which the Constitution condemns. * * * The right of suffrage is subject to the imposition of State standards which are not discriminatory. * * * We do not suggest that any standards which a State desires to adopt may be required of voters. But there is wide scope for exercise of its jurisdiction. Residence requirements, age, previous criminal record, are obvious examples indicating factors which a State may take into consideration in determining the qualifications of voters. * * *"

In the particular context of Johnson's bill we should note carefully what this unanimous Court went on to say. "The ability to read and write likewise has the relation to standards designed to promote intelligent use of the ballot. Literacy and illiteracy are neutral on race, creed, color, and sex, as reports around the world show. * * * In our society, where newspapers, periodicals, books, and other printed matter canvass and debate campaign issues, a State might conclude that only those who are literate should exercise the franchise."

In the final paragraph of this 1959 opinion, the Supreme Court condemned those trumped-up "literacy tests" that have been employed in some cases as "a device to make racial discrimination easy." But no such charge could be fairly brought against North Carolina's requirement that a prospective voter "be able to read and write any section of the constitution of North Carolina in the English language."

"That seems to us," said the Court, "to be one fair way of determining whether a person is literate, not a calculated scheme to lay a trap for the citizen."

This whole body of long-established law would be violated by the President's bill. This is a bill to establish, by Federal law, new "qualifications for voting" in certain States. The system contemplated under this bill would not be limited to registering those Negroes who might have been denied the franchise by reason of their race. The provisions would apply to "any person." Neither would the bill apply to Federal elections only; it would apply, on its own terms, to "any Federal, State, or local election." Section 3(A) of the bill spells this out. In the half a dozen affected States, "No person shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his failure to comply with any test or device." In section 3(B), "test or device" is defined to mean any requirement that a prospective voter "(1) demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, (2) demonstrate any educational achievement or his knowledge of any particular subject, (3) possess good moral character."

In brief, the bill undertakes to prohibit in these States the imposition of those very qualifications, when used without discrimination, that the Supreme Court repeatedly has approved.

It is said that no fewer than 80 Senators, including some good and able men, are ready to howl their approval of this destructive scheme. To say that "Alabama has brought this on herself" is both wrong and irrelevant. This bill is the work of Johnson and the Congress. On them lies the burden of piling wrong upon wrong. And they do it, incredibly, in the name of "rights."

Lebanon Editor Appraises Vietnam Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, William A. Smith, managing editor of the Granite State Free Press in Lebanon, N.H., recently wrote an editorial appraising the position of the United States with respect to the situation in Vietnam. It is a thoughtful and perceptive commentary by a distinguished editor of New Hampshire and I offer it for the RECORD for the consideration of Members:

THE ART OF THE POSSIBLE

Someone has described politics as "the art of the possible." In an imperfect world we must face the fact that there is a difference between what one wants to do and what, under factual circumstances, one can do. In the Vietnam crisis it is evident that the United States faces discouraging alternatives. We can withdraw like a "rubber tiger," or we can keep on like a "rubber tiger" unless we risk an allout war.

We cannot claim that the Government of South Vietnam is asking for our help. All the present evidence, words, and actions by the Vietnamese people suggest the opposite is true. The terrain favors the guerrilla tactics of the Vietcong, and we have been unable to protect ourselves or the people of South Vietnam. Our purely retaliatory moves, such as bombings of North Vietnam, carry other labels by most of the world, and especially by the Communist world. We have had only token help, financially and otherwise, from the rest of the free world.

Perhaps our leaders should make a further study of "The Art of the Possible." We have

been told what President Johnson wants to do—to negotiate from a position of strength—but we have not been told what can be done.

There are two questions that continue to puzzle us. First, why can't we turn this problem over to the United Nations, not that such action would solve the problem in Vietnam, but it would take us off the hook.

A second question is, Why do we assume that the Vietcong, or Red China, or Russia is capable of ruling all of Asia? Certainly the Western Powers have demonstrated that they cannot control even a small part. Who thinks that even the Red Chinese can control the vast area of Asia without a common language, without modern communications, without modern roads, and without the education needed for intelligent self-government? It is true that ruthless central government could liquidate millions of any opposition, but there will always be many millions left in a country that places small value on the life of an individual. Russia is already realizing the difficulties of uniting its satellites into any semblance of unity. Sometimes we think that the Red Chinese would have plenty of problems if they were handed the entire mess on a silver platter.

Greek Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on this historic occasion, it is highly appropriate that we should pay fitting tribute of congratulation, gratitude, and admiration to the Greek Nation and the infinitely great Greek people both at home and abroad.

Little we say could adequately express the feelings of affection and pride we have for our Greek-American friends and neighbors for their tremendous contributions of superb citizenship, marvelous achievements for our free way of life and the warmth of their friendship and the depth and inspiration of their patriotism. Surely, in these great respects, no other people in this or any other country could possibly excel them.

And there is another thought which inevitably prompts our wonder, pride, esteem, and appreciation in unlimited and glowing terms today, and that is the glory of the Greek heritage and the great debt which we share in common with all other civilized nations for the truly indescribable benefits and blessings conferred by that epochal heritage upon all mankind.

Hellenism is more than a nationality, more than a racial entity, more than a passing phase of contemporary life. It is a great, ancient, deeply entrenched, world culture infusing virtually every type of civilization in the world, an influence for good and beauty and the "golden mean" that touches profoundly into many ways of life, particularly those like our own that are animated primarily by full recognition of the worth and dignity of individual man and rest upon the freedom and moral authenticity of the individual human being.

The cult of the beautiful, the supremacy of moral and familial values, the dialog of personal liberty and the exaltation of the human spirit which the ancient Greeks brought forth and gave to the world form, in truth, the very basis of our philosophy and practice of ordered free government and the modes and customs of our everyday life.

I could go on and on to recite the wonders of Greek law and culture, Greek art, literature, Greek sculpture, philosophy, science, mathematics, democracy and general culture and the immortal contributions of the Greeks to us and to world civilization.

But I could talk for many hours and days and never fully encompass the wide range, deep impact and most significant effects of Greek contributions to this great country of ours and to many other great countries, not only in this generation, but throughout the long channels of history.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the Greeks of antiquity and of the present-day world. I am proud and grateful for what they have done for mankind, for America, for all our people, and for our Nation.

And I am proud of their warm, inspiring friendship and personal loyalty which means so much to me. How fortunate we are to have them as great, constructive forces in our America.

And how fortunate the world is to have such a great people, wedded to all the finest principles of freedom, democracy and justice which their ancestors did so much to fashion and promulgate to the world, as neighbors, as friends and as steadfast fellow workers in the protection and enrichment of that freedom.

How fortunate we all are that the glorious Greeks are with us. May they long endure to shed their light and their warmth on struggling humanity and honor and sustain us with their devoted friendship.

Greek Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1821, Greek patriots raised the flag of liberty and swore to win freedom or die in the attempt. On this anniversary occasion it is becoming that we here in the Congress of the United States should review and give expression to our great and everlasting debt to ancient and to modern Greece and the people of Hellenic blood. After our own Revolution the Greeks were the first nation of Europe to throw off an alien yoke and fight for national freedom. While our own freedom may have been a source of inspiration to the Greeks, we, in turn, derived from Greek history much guidance.

Alexander Hamilton, while agreeing that a federal government should be an association of independent communities, argued for a strong central government. He said:

> Theory is in this case fully confirmed by experience. The amphictyonic council had, it would seem, ample powers for general purposes. It had in particular, the power of fining and using force against delinquent members. What was the consequence? Their decrees were mere signals of war. The Phocian war is a striking example of it. Philip, at length, taking advantage of their disunion and insinuating himself into their councils, made himself master of their fortunes.

Madison, also a student of the history of Greece, warned that no foreign power should ever be permitted to deal with separate states. He pointed out that the Kings of Persia and Philip of Macedon through intrigues with the amphictyonic confederates, destroyed their league.

Madison's Journal, and other notes and journals of the Constitution, are filled with references to the experiences of the Greek cities and lessons derived from their mistakes which were applied by Madison and Hamilton to our own situation and to our profit.

Not only is Greek history interwoven with our Constitution, both through philosophy and warning against errors, Greek philosophy is discernible in our political science. In his Politics Aristotle uses the term "politics" meaning "citizens."

The early Athenian Government gave people freedom of thought, speech and action. Its laws were designed to benefit all citizens. Their early experiment with democracy came nearer to providing justice for all citizens than any form devised before or since that time.

In the field of science, Hippocrates is known as the "father of medicine." His code of medical ethics is expressed in the pledge:

> With purity and holiness, I will pass my life and practice my art. Into whatever houses I enter, I will go there for the benefit of the sick and will abstain from every injurious act and corruption. Whatever in my professional practice—or even, not in connection with it—I see or hear in the lives of men which ought not to be spoken of abroad, I will not divulge. While I keep this oath unviolated, may it be granted me to enjoy life and the practice of the art, always respected among men, but should I break or violate the oath, may the reverse be my lot.

This oath is still subscribed to by those who practice medicine. It is not surprising that medicine made great strides under the leadership of Hippocrates. He recognized the value of keeping and studying case records.

One of the most noted of Greek scientists was Aristotle, who wrote on such subjects as physics and biology. He explained the use of the lever a hundred years before Archimedes was born.

Two Greek scientists, Leucippus and Democritus, advanced the atomic theory.

John Stuart Mill wrote:

> The Greeks are the most remarkable people who have yet existed * * *. They were the beginners of everything, Christianity excepted, of which the modern world makes its boast * * *. They were the first people who had a historical literature; as perfect of its kind * * * as their oratory, their sculpture, and their architecture. They were the founders of mathematics, of physics, of

the inductive study of politics, of the philosophy of human nature and life. In each they make the indispensable first steps, which are the foundation of all the rest.

Publishers' Newspaper Decries Unfair Reporting on Selma Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Publishers' Auxiliary, the newspaperman's newspaper in the March 27 edition. No comment on my part is necessary.

IN DEFENSE OF SELMA—AS A CITY OF OPPORTUNITY

The angels have not smiled, nor even looked with pleasant neutrality, upon Selma, Ala., the past few weeks. Nor has the Nation's press.

In what may be an unprecedented sea of self-righteous indignation, a number of the country's larger dailies—a few small papers as well—as have let traditional journalism mandates drown in a flood of merciless scorn and calumny directed upon a small American city that might better have been used as a station of progress and charity than as an image of brutality and inhumanity.

Editorialists and columnists have examined with microscopic care the soul of the city as if it were apart from all that has been experienced and reported in the past. Editorial cartoonists, particularly, have practiced an alarming lack of restraint—at times taste—in picturing residents of this small town as monsters possessed with rodent souls, a mass of renegade apostates from American and Christian concepts. Yet sentiment and viewpoint, in the case of Selma, seems to have been even stronger ingredients of page 1 than of the spaces commonly allotted to expressing editorial opinion.

It might be noted that the great figures of our fourth estate have not been those who fought just for the rights of a free press, or self-freedom, but for freedom and justice and fair treatment for all. This mandate must apply equally for all people and their places—Saigon, Syracuse, or Selma.

It is regrettable, and sad as well, that in this great news story so little of greatness has emerged in journalistic coverage. That so little of really good, clear, objective reporting has been seen. The journalist may still remember with some pride some of the great journalism that was datelined Little Rock and Birmingham and Rochester. There is an almost alarming sameness in the stories emanating from this new Alabama battleground of rights, a formulated format from which adjectives and verbs march forth like rows of dominos from the printed page.

Selma seems to have offered newsmen opportunity for some really great, human-interest reporting. An opportunity to show the town of Selma as it is, not unlike many other American towns in all sections, a base for the display of human frailties and courageousness. It is not to our credit that in all the crescendo of words and news pictures, the harp has not been tuned to the more positive and constructive.

At least, a small part of the time.—W.A.D.

The Dislocation of the Patent Office, a Disservice to the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the attention of all my House and Senate colleagues, the article below, prepared by Mr. Stan Stanton, a resident of my congressional district, who shares my acute concern over the proposed move of the U.S. Patent Office from the Washington metropolitan area:

THE DISLOCATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE, A DISSERVICE TO THE NATION

From time immemorial the U.S. Patent Office has been situated in Washington, D.C.; "so long that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary."

By an act of April 10, 1790, Congress vested authority to grant letters patent jointly in the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the Attorney General, subject to approval by the President of the United States. Provision was made that such letters patent should be recorded in the Office of the Secretary of State.

By act of February 1, 1793, the connection of the Secretary of War with patent affairs ceased, and the jurisdiction in patent matters was brought closely under the Secretary of State.

An act of July 4, 1836, established and attached the Patent Office to the Department of State. From 1840 to 1932 the Patent Office enjoyed the occupancy of its own fine building, especially designed and specially constructed to contain its entire operation—a happy situation spanning nearly a century.

The act organizing the Department of Interior, dated March 3, 1849, transferred the administration of the Patent Office from the Department of State to the Department of Interior.

Then in 1925, by Executive order of March 3, President Calvin Cooledge transferred the Patent Office from the Department of Interior to the Department of Commerce—lock, stock, and barrel, by the stroke of a pen.

The U.S. Patent Office administers the American patent system. Our Nation's science, technology, and the useful arts are in its domain. Here the largest collections of applied technical information are lodged. These collections or man's advance knowledge represent a priceless asset in respect to our Nation's industrial economy, and a boon to the whole wide world.

Every average workday the Patent Office receives an amount of 350 applications for new patents. This rate amounts to about 86,000 patent applications a year. Figures tend to reveal that there has been an increase of more than 10,000 applications over the past 10 years. It is estimated that it takes an average of 3½ years to process a patent application from the filing date to the day of issue.

At the present time, October 1964, there is a backlog of more than 200,000 applications. The processing of these applications is being done in cramped quarters more resembling niches and nooks than offices of patent examiners. Here is the bare minimum of a desk and chair, and the examiner has little or any room for patent files, reference matter, and the other necessary material. The professional examiner is in a very unhappy situation indeed.

An excerpt from a lecture delivered in Dallas, Tex., March 21, 1963, addressed to the Southwestern Legal Foundation reveals a common scene:

"The solicitor goes to Washington to interview an examiner on an important case, and after explaining the position to the examiner, is told 'Well, you file an amendment, and I will consider it.' Or, in some instances, 'Why interview this case now? You're not under a final.' This examiner's neighbor in the next cubicle, on being interviewed on another case, says, and so forth."

The point of the excerpt is not the interview, but the fact the solicitor and the examiner had the interview in a cubicle.

An examiner is worthy of a room, an anteroom for the visitor to sit in while awaiting the interview, and a file and storage room for reference material and such. More office space is sorely needed.

It is said that the professional patent examiner, today, is a very important link in the dynamic and vast complex of applying today's new knowledge and techniques to our industrial system. The professional examiner—believe it or not—is a very, very important person indeed.

This very important person who performs an excellent examining job while cramped in a cubicle must be provided with decent accommodations and working facilities in order that he may continue to be efficient and effective in carrying out the Patent Office programs for insuring timely processing of patent applications. The astronomical figure of more than 200,000 patent applications in the backlog must be greatly reduced.

Here is a suggestion—a plan—if you will, for the procurement of the sorely needed and necessary space; this plan will allow for a healthy growth of the Patent Office from this year to the year 2010: permit the Patent Office to occupy the entire Department of Commerce Building, and add four more floors to the building.

As has been truly stated, the Patent Office ranks second to none with any other office or agency of the Government in its importance to the technological development and industrial advancement of our Nation. If this is true (and it is), then, the proposition, as advanced, should be given every consideration. It is believed that the Secretary of Commerce, and the entire Department of Commerce complex—excluding the Patent Office—should be housed in an adequate building complex of its very own. The Secretary is deserving of better quarters than he now occupies.

Permitting the Patent Office to remain in the present Department of Commerce Building, and allowing it to expand therein, while adding four floors for future growth (the addition to be in keeping and architecturally conforming to the building's present design), the plan would allow for the healthy growth of the Patent Office from the year 1965 to the year 2010 and beyond.

The occupation of the entire Department of Commerce Building by the Patent Office, with the superstructure added, appears to be the most frugal way of providing a decent home for the Patent Office operations. The taxpayers of the Nation would bless the administrative frugality inherent in the proposed plan.

Frugality considered as basic, here are a number of strong and valid reasons why the Patent Office should not be dislocated:

1. Some 2,400 individuals comprising the Patent Office personnel are established in their homes, or reside near the present situation.

2. The $22 million annual Patent Office payroll is now, and has long been, in the economic lifestream of the District of Columbia.

3. From time immemorial, Washington, D.C.—the Capital of the United States of America—has been the address of a large number of Patent Office practitioners. While the Patent Office has been an American institution for more than 125 years, two local patent law firms, Mason, Fenwick & Lawrence, and Watson, Cole, Grindle & Watson, have been in continuous practice close to the physical plant for more than 100 years.

4. A heavy concentration of patent experts have long been located in Washington, D.C. The District of Columbia has been their business address. Some 630 patent lawyers are listed locally. The reason for their address here is that in most patent and trademark matters time is of the essence as legal rights pertinent thereto are governed by statutes. To obtain all the information necessary to prepare for obtaining and protecting such rights of patent and trademark clients would place a great burden on the legal profession if the present facilities were dislocated.

5. The present close proximity of the Patent Office to the Library of Congress, and the numerous local libraries, both public and private, containing priceless reposits of scientific and technological knowledge, allows for easy availability of deposited knowledge to the professional patent examiner, the patent practitioner, the scientist, and the inventor.

6. The Copyright Office—a sister agency born out of the same constitutional provision that gave birth to the Patent Office—is situated nearby. The Washington-located law firms, and the attorneys who represent their clients before the tribunals of the Patent Office, also represent clients before the Copyright Office; and also make use of the records and files of the Copyright Office.

7. The Patent Office presently is situated near the Court of Customs and Patents Appeals (CCPA). Patent Office decisions, by law, must be reviewed in the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

8. Patent Office practice needs easy access to the nearby Treasury Department, and its Customs Office, for posting of infringing trademarks and the matters pertinent thereto.

9. Presently, the Patent Office is near the district court. The Patent Office practitioner also needs easy access to the district court for appeal in patent and trademark cases.

10. Dynamic Patent Office practice is often involved in the rules and regulations promulgated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) concerning the legality of certain beverage and food labels. The location of HEW is close to the Patent Office.

11. Active Patent Office practice is often occupied with the problems involving the correct labeling of herbicides, pesticides, insecticides, and other toxicants requiring scrutiny and ruling by the office administering the pure food and drug laws. The Patent Office is presently near this important agency of the Federal Government.

12. At his Washington, D.C., address the Patent Office practitioner is not too far from the embassies and legations where he often must go for the interpretation, translation, authentication and legalization of certain legal instruments.

13. The present Patent Office is near the State Department for easy access for the legalization of certain papers and documents, and for the impression of the great seal of the United States, when needed.

14. The practitioner now finds the Patent Office easily accessible from nearby airports, railroad station, and bus terminals.

15. An abundance of fine hotels, motels, and restaurants abound near the Patent Office's present location.

16. The present location of the Patent Office, and the offices of the local Patent Office practitioners, are circled by established banks providing every kind of banking facility.

17. The Patent Office's present continuing training program for its personnel contemplates the use of classes provided in the universities, colleges, and secondary schools near the present situs.

18. The Patent Office, now, is close to the Government Printing Office (GPO). The nearness happily expedites the editing and publication of the "OG," the Official Gazette.

19. Presently the Patent Office is being served by a large and well-established postal system; its incoming and outgoing mail adds up into astronomical figures.

20. The Patent Office is now near the Federal Trade Commission, a related regulatory body to whose offices and tribunals the active Patent Office practitioner must have easy access.

21. The active Patent Office practitioner also has frequent intercourse with the nearby Bureau of Internal Revenue in matters concerning alcoholic products and tobacco products and the proper labeling thereof.

22. In matters relating to patent practice, the Patent Office practitioner, at times, has dealings with the nearby Department of Justice.

23. About matters pertinent to plant patents, examiners of the Patent Office, and the Patent Office practitioner, consult easily with the experts in the nearby Department of Agriculture.

24. The present Patent Office is situated near adequate, established housing and apartment facilities.

25. The present Patent Office is encircled with a diversity of recreational facilities.

26. The present Patent Office is close to established bookstores, and a multitude of shops that cater to the fulfilling of every conceivable kind of need.

27. Most of the Patent Office practitioners, as lawyers, are members of their respective State bars, and also are members of the bar of the District of Columbia. The Maryland and Virginia bar requirements differ from the requirements of the Washington, D.C., bar. In either the State of Maryland or the Commonwealth of Virginia one must have an established office to legally practice law in those jurisdictions. Dislocating the Patent Office from Washington would necessitate changing the present laws.

28. Cases presently taken on appeal to the district court, located in the District of Columbia, would, if the Patent Office were dislocated, necessarily be heard in the District Court of Maryland or the District Court of Virginia. Any dislocation of the Patent Office would necessitate a change in the judiciary setup.

29. The countries of the world look to Washington, D.C., as being the official address of any important Government office. The Patent Office, it has been said, is a very important office.

30. The publication of the U.S. Patent Quarterly is efficiently published and distributed from its close proximity to the Patent Office.

31. There is daily an influx of out-of-town attorneys into the District of Columbia for an omnibus of reasons: to make contact with the local associate; to argue their cases before the local courts and tribunals; to make searches; to use the library facilities; etc.

32. An adequate electric power and light system now services the present Patent Office; a dislocated Patent Office would be poorly serviced in this respect.

33. An adequate supply of pure drinking water is presently available to the present situs of the Patent Office.

34. Established hospitals and clinics, with all of the most modern equipment, abound in the local area.

35. A superabundance of the medical profession, serving in all of the practices and specialties, is available in the local area.

It appears abundantly clear that the Patent Office should remain in Washington, D.C. It ought to be allowed to grow and expand in its present location. The entire Department of Commerce Building should be turned over to the Patent Office. The dislocation of this very important office would be a major catastrophe and a great disservice to the American taxpayer.

Commissioner Reilly Discusses the Antitrust Aspects of Reciprocity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, last month Commissioner John R. Reilly of the Federal Trade Commission delivered an excellent address before the Joint Winter Conference of the Salesmen's Association of the Chemical Industry and Chemical Buyers Group of the National Association of Purchasing Agents.

His address, entitled "Antitrust Aspects of Reciprocity" offers a great deal of insight into the threat which reciprocity poses to the operation of our free enterprise system and the difficulties encountered by the Government in its efforts to combat this evil.

So that my colleagues may have the benefit of Commissioner Reilly's thinking and experience in this important area, I place the text of his speech below:

ANTITRUST ASPECTS OF RECIPROCITY

(Remarks of John R. Reilly before Joint Winter Conference, Salesmen's Association of the Chemical Industry and Chemical Buyers' Group, NAPA, New York City, Feb. 18, 1965)

As one charged with the duty of assisting in the regulation of business, one is never quite sure of the reception awaiting him at a gathering of the regulated, and I find it reassuring that I am invariably cordially received. It always gives me reason to hope that if I conduct myself with the proper degree of prudence, I'll make it back to Washington intact.

I think that among the regulatory agencies the lot of the Federal Trade Commissioner is somewhat more difficult than most since he has every reason to believe that he and his organization are universally unloved, and the likelihood is very great that he is right. Most of the regulatory agencies confer benefits as part of their functions, that is, they award routes, channels, rates, etc., and this permits them to at least on occasion play the agreeable role of the benefactor. The FTC, on the other hand, in the opinion of many, is nothing but bad news, one of its principal functions being to issue cease and desist orders, the popularity of which is minimal. But, as I say, I am very glad to be here and I am grateful for the opportunity of addressing you.

I should explain at the outset that my remarks here reflect solely my own opinion and should in no way be taken as a pronouncement of Commission policy.

Also, none of my remarks will have any application to any case presently before the Commission or currently contemplated. Nor

should anything I say be taken as a prior commitment to assume a given position in any future fact situation with which I may be confronted.

Now, the reason I say this is because it is apparently currently fashionable for enterprising lawyers to exploit remarks made by Commissioners in their public speeches in a procedural gambit to establish prejudice and thus lay the groundwork for disqualification. This practice, which I find very distressing, is hardly calculated to create a favorable climate for any meaningful government-business dialog. It tends to have a muzzling effect whereby the government official cannot utter a simple declaratory sentence without garnishing his remarks with so many conditions, qualifications, and reservations that it's a minor miracle if he is at all intelligible.

So, while I have convictions which I will freely express, I intimate nothing as to how they will or should be applied to a given set of facts which I may in the future be called upon to adjudicate.

And now if you will permit me one final preliminary observation, I should explain that while I propose to speak on reciprocity, I am aware that this group includes both purchasers and sellers and while my remarks may seem to be cast in a form directed to sellers they really should be considered as applicable to a corporate practice in which the purchasing department as well as sales has a stake.

In the process of preparing my remarks I have read enough on this subject to realize that it's not entirely strange to you. Apparently groups in the chemical industry have been addressed on more than one occasion on the subject of reciprocity, and surveys appear to indicate that your industry has not been backward in employing it. In fact, I have a disturbing feeling that I may be addressing some of reciprocity's foremost practitioners, who possibly know more about it than I do. However, let me have a go at it, even though I may be expressing, at least in this gathering, a minority view. However, I am sure that some of those among you who are concerned with purchasing are less than enthusiastic about reciprocity. So perhaps I am not entirely alone.

There is no question reciprocity is widely practiced, with hundreds of firms integrating to so-called trade relations function into their corporate structure as a permanent fixture. I've seen estimates that as many as 500 corporations use trade relations on a systematic basis; that it might be involved in 20 percent of total sales and that a preponderance of firms in the chemical industry are dedicated to the practice in greater or less degree.

A lot of rather facile justifications are offered in defense of reciprocity. They range from unabashed opportunism, for example, "If he wants our business, he'd better give us some of his," to something approaching a moral obligation or a latter-day application of the Golden Rule, for example, "One naturally favors one's friends," or "Decency demands that we buy from him because he buys from us."

On the other hand, there are some in industry as well as in Government who look upon reciprocity as a practice of questionable ethics, more in the nature of payola or bribery than a straightforward business practice.

I think the best way to proceed is to briefly examine the cases in which reciprocity has figured and then try to extract from them what it is about reciprocity that causes the law to look askance and then perhaps to draw some conclusions as to why it looks askance.

Reciprocity is nothing if not versatile. It has the capacity to bring about a violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act outlawing unfair methods of competition, section 7 of the Clayton Act directed against anticompetitive mergers, the monopoly and restraint of trade provisions of the Sherman Act, and, I think, most significantly it is a practice analogous to tie-in selling proscribed by section 3 of the Clayton Act and held to be one of the practices "* * * which because of their pernicious effect on competition and lack of any redeeming virtue are conclusively presumed to be unreasonable and therefore illegal * * *."[1] Of course, for technical reasons reciprocity does not violate section 3 as such and I would hesitate to take the position at this juncture that the practice is per se illegal.

Back in the 1930's the Federal Trade Commission issued cease and desist orders in three cases in which it found reciprocity to be an unfair method of competition. Two of the cases involved the volume of freight used by large meatpackers. They used this leverage to induct railroads to purchase equipment from firms owned in part by employees of the meatpacker who had control of traffic.[2] The third case arose out of the practice of a large California foodpacker using its freight volume and purchasing power to induce steamship companies and suppliers to use a San Francisco Bay marine terminal in which the foodpacker held a substantial interest.[3]

The most recent Commission case involving reciprocity is of course that involving Consolidated Foods Corp. now before the Supreme Court after a decision adverse to the Commission in the court of appeals.[4] In that case the Commission attacked the acquisition, by a food wholesaler and retailer, of a producer of spices on the principal ground that the acquiring firm, the food wholesaler, could foreclose competitors of the acquired firm, the spice producer, by insisting that its suppliers use the acquired firm's products to the exclusion of competitors. In this case reciprocity was incidental to a section 7 merger case and supplied, in the opinion of the Commisison, the anticompetitive effect necessary for striking down the merger.

In other cases brought by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, reciprocity has been charged in a restrait of trade or monopoly context, sometimes in conjunction with a merger case, sometimes alone.

In the Ingersoll-Rand case the court held that Ingersoll-Rand, by virtue of its proposed acquisition of manufacturers of coal mining equipment, would be in a position to use its steel purchases to force steel companies to buy their coal needs from coal producers using the equipment of the firms Ingersoll-Rand sought to acquire.[5]

In a recent case brought by the Antitrust Division, it was alleged that General Motors' position as the nation's largest shipper of freight gave it the power to monopolize the market for railroad locomotives by compelling railroads to buy their locomotives in return for their being permitted to carry General Motors' tonnage. The Justice Department brought both civil and criminal actions in this case and the criminal indictment has been dismissed for lack of evidence. The civil action is still pending.[6]

In another still pending case the Antitrust Division has alleged that General Dynamics used its considerable purchasing power to compel suppliers to purchase their industrial gas needs from General Dynamic's subsidiary, Liquid Carbonic.[7]

I mention these cases not so much to indicate the diversity of statutes upon which reciprocity has an impact but to show the increasing preoccupation of the enforcement agencies with the question of reciprocal dealing, and while the question of mergers and acquisitions figures prominently, directly or indirectly, in most of the cases, I feel it would be unwise to conclude that it is only in a merger context that the agencies will question reciprocity. The three FTC cases arose out of formal or informal corporate relationships between two firms, nevertheless, those relationships were not of the essence of the violation. They merely provided the framework within which the reciprocal dealing occurred and reciprocity was held to be bad not because of a "merger" or "acquisition" but because it was anticompetitive in its own right.

We know then that in certain circumstances reciprocity will be held to be illegal, and I think perhaps the most fruitful thing we can do is to consider what makes it illegal or in what circumstances it is or may become illegal.

A study of the cases and some of the legal writings on the subject strongly suggests, as I have noted earlier, that reciprocity probably is not illegal in itself but becomes illegal only if it possesses certain characteristics or produces certain results. I don't mean by this that there are necessarily benign types of reciprocity but only that some types are at least minimally objectionable from a legal or economic point of view and thus might escape legal sanction.

The essential effect of reciprocity which raises the hackles of the law is the substitution of an extraneous consideration for what should be the controlling criteria in the purchase and sale transaction. Our competitive system rests on the fundamental premise that men left free to do so, will purchase their needs on the basis of price, quality, and service and that the competitive struggle to excel in the furnishing of these three, results in a healthy competitive economy and, hopefully, in a workable and fruitful society.

Reciprocity ignores price, quality, and service and substitutes something in the nature of a bribe or a threat. Either way the object of the proposition is induced through fear of loss or hope of gain to forego the exercise of his independent business judgment in purchasing his needs. Thus, at the outset the principal underpinning of the competitive structure is subverted. To say that one practicing reciprocity takes these things into consideration, that is, considers price, quality, and service, and thereafter practices reciprocity is to beg the question. If these three considerations control his decision, he is not practicing reciprocity. If they don't control his decision, he is. In choosing between two potential suppliers equal in price, quality, and service, to favor one's customers is not reciprocity, it is commonsense and certainly has more to recommend it than flipping a coin. Reciprocity by definition is the selection of suppliers on the basis of their purchases from you.

Of course, the elimination of price, quality, and service is not a violation of the law. This is a free society and I may purchase my needs on whatever basis I wish, however frivolous, including the way my supplier parts his hair or eats his soup. If, however, what I do amounts to forcing anyone to buy my products or foreclosing others from selling theirs, I stand in imminent danger of legal sanction.

Thus, reciprocity can be bad both for what it is—coercive—or from the standpoint of what it does—foreclose competition. The two may be, and frequently are, found in combination, but they can exist apart from one another and might still make reciprocity illegal.

The first of these characteristics, coercion, is illustrated by the three FTC cases I have cited, since those cases involved what amounted to the crudest kind of arm twisting, and I think it can be said that they stand for the proposition that it is basically an unfair method of competition to impede free selection by coercion.

I think we would have no problem agreeing upon the general proposition that coercion has no place among competitors in a free economy and that certain kinds of foreclosure of competition can be equally destructive of a healthy economy. The difficulty would arise however in agreeing upon what constitutes coercion or what constitutes

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

the sort of competitive foreclosure which the law should recognize as bad.

I can conceive of four degrees of emphasis in sales situations where the sales pitch is accompanied in the mind of the seller who has reciprocity in his heart by a conviction that his purchases from the prospective buyer should influence the buyer's decision to buy from him. The first and most elemental is the arm twisting approach which I have just described. The second is a sort of hardheaded reciprocal back scratching agreement along the lines of "You buy from me and I'll buy from you." The third can be described as the hat in hand "Won't you buy my violets" approach. And the fourth consists of purchasing from a prospective customer in the fond but unspoken hope that he will become more than prospective.

I think this last can be eliminated out of hand because obviously the time-honored human practice of "buttering up" is not coercion, nor does it produce the adverse effect of foreclosing competition.

Conversely, the first type, that is, the arm twisting, is without doubt coercion and illegal and if anyone present thinks it is not, I'd be happy to have him leave his name and address as I think we ought to become better acquainted. I should note of course that the naked threat must be a credible one. I doubt anyone would consider it a violation of law for a small firm to threaten an extremely large one since the threat is obviously not credible and is therefore unlikely to produce any result.

It is the other two situations which, to my way of thinking, pose a problem in determining whether they involve reciprocity and whether it is illegal. The first of the two, the mutual back scratching suggests an absence of coercion. On the contrary, it is an agreement freely entered into between the two parties dealing at arm's length with one another. If this is the case, there is in fact no element of coercion and the practice passes the test from that standpoint. It's not completely off the hook, however. It remains to be determined whether the effect is so adverse that the law will recognize the agreement as bad and strike it down. The practical effect of the agreement is of course to remove the two parties from the marketplace to the detriment of competition and it might well be found that the arrangement is therefore unjustified as being unreasonable. If, for example, the purchases of either are so great as to make an appreciable adverse impact upon competition, the agreement could very well be held an illegal form of reciprocity. Reasonableness might turn on the size of the firms, for example, because two small firms might be able to enter such an agreement; it does not follow that two giants could. In the latter situation the size of the firms and the concomitant impact upon competition may make the arrangement unreasonable. The law always looks askance at anything that removes a competitor from the marketplace or removes a substantial portion of the relevant market from the operation of free competition, and to countenance such an arrangement it must be shown that there is a countervailing reasonableness which obviates or outweighs the adverse competitive effect.

The one remaining of the four situations I described, the "Won't you buy from me" approach, where the seller does not explicitly threaten or cajole but rather politely points out that since he buys from the supplier it would be awfully nice if the supplier would buy from him. The very approach of the seller in this case strongly suggests he is not in a good bargaining position either on the basis of size of purchasing power and the likelihood is that there is neither coercion nor competitive effect even assuming the supplier goes along with the request. Even here however the law would take a good hard look. It stands to reason that although the words are bashful and self-effacing the firm uttering them might not be. A billion dollar corporation making such a "request" does it with considerable coercive effect and the inference would be very strong that the coercion was intended, particularly if the object of the plea is a small firm whose survival might depend upon its sales to the large customer.

Thus, power and size are immensely important considerations both in examining for coercion and for competitive effect. As to the latter, their application is obvious because power and size would be direct factors in economic impact. In the case of coercion, power and size are necessary to establish the credibility of the threat. Indeed, power and size are probably the single most important consideration in the question of reciprocity. Immense buying power may not be used as the Supreme Court said "* * * to stifle competition by denying competitors less favorably situated access to the market."[8]

Entirely apart from strict legal considerations, reciprocity, just from the economic standpoint or from the standpoint of prudent business practice, is open to criticism on many counts. It deranges the economic system, reduces efficiency and is essentially uneconomic. It could, if widely practiced, discourage entry into a market, increase concentration, and place an undue emphasis on size and diversification. As a systematic corporate habit, it would be difficult to kick. It could have a narcotic effect on sales effort and invite retaliation. It can result in payment of high prices and the acceptance of inferior quality. If practiced widely through the economy, the sales function would have about as much get-up-and-go as a minuet.

Considering it has so little to recommend it, it's surprising that reciprocity has gained such currency and, indeed, has apparently become an appendage pretty firmly attached to some corporate structures. Nevertheless, it is not something that can be practiced without hazard. I cannot imagine any circumstances under which the law would look upon it benevolently although in some instances it might gain a grudging toleration.

I think the sum of all this is that reciprocity is not a good idea from the legal or economic standpoint and leaves much to be desired as a long-range business practice.

---

[1] *Northern Pacific Railroad Company* v. *U.S.*, 356 U.S. 1, 5.

[2] *Waugh Equipment Company, et al.*, 15 F.T.C. 232; *Mechanical Mfg. Co., et al.*, 16 F.T.C. 67.

[3] *California Packing Corp., et al.*, 25 F.T.C. 379.

[4] *F.T.C.* v. *Consolidated Foods Corporation*, 329 F. 2d 623.

[5] *U.S.* v. *Ingersoll-Rand Co.*, 320 F. 2d 509.

[6] *U.S.* v. *General Motors Corp.*, 63 Civ. 80, N.D., Ill., January 14, 1963.

[7] *U.S.* v. *General Dynamics Corp.*, 62 Civ. 3686, S.D., N.Y., Nov. 8, 1962.

[8] *U.S.* v. *Griffith, et al.*, 334 U.S. 100, 108.

National Conference To Combat Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this week a National Conference To Combat Obscenity was held in the Nation's Capital.

The Honorable O. K. Armstrong, former Congressman from Missouri, and chairman of the Citizens Council for Decency of Springfield, Mo., presided as chairman of the conference.

Among the outstanding speakers, who discussed this problem, were Senator JACK MILLER of Iowa and Congressman JOHN DOWDY of Texas.

The conference adopted a resolution which I believe will help focus public attention on a real problem facing society and our Nation:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE TO COMBAT OBSCENITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 22-23, 1965

WE RESOLVE

We of this Conference To Combat Obscenity highly resolve to continue our efforts, as citizens and members of the organizations we represent, to halt the tide of obscenity and indecency in publications and entertainment in our Nation, in order to protect our children and youth from the clear and present danger of immorality and delinquency, which inevitably result from pornography, and to overcome this tragic sickness in society, which, unless healed, will quickly lead to the moral and physical decay of our Nation.

TO ALL OFFICIALS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

We are alarmed to find that Washington, D.C., appears to be the smut-capital of the Nation, in that there are numerous newsstands and retail outlets that display and sell the most obscene and indecent magazines and paperback books produced in America today. We are shocked at the flood of nudity, illicit love, homosexuality, lesbianism, and all other types of sexual perversion on open display. We reflect that our Nation's Capital is visited by many thousands of children and youth every season of the year, and that many of these, as well as those residing here, are exposed to the vicious, filthy literature on many of Washington's newsstands. We call upon the President and Members of Congress to investigate these conditions and apply appropriate remedies.

TO THE PRESIDENT

We respectfully suggest to the President that the forces of amorality in this country are so intrenched and so well organized that a sweeping investigation by the FBI might be in order.

We are reminded that the President of the United States has the great and honored responsibility to nominate, for life tenure, the Justices of the Supreme Court and other Federal courts. We respectfully request that in the filling of any vacancies in the future, and particularly in the Supreme Court, the President select jurists well known and respected by their fellow citizens as being favorable to upholding the standards of decency that have guarded and protected the public from the beginning of our Nation, and which standards are based upon the concept of the sacredness of every human being in the sight of God, and in the sanctity of marriage and the home.

NEWSSTAND PROPRIETORS AND SELLERS

We urge citizens in every community of our Nation to appeal to newsstand proprietors and sellers of publications to refuse to accept from their publishers or wholesalers, and to refuse to handle, display or sell, such magazines, books, and other materials that appeal to prurient interest, glorify illicit sex, debase womanhood, and present obscenity in an attractive manner, and in such ways as to corrupt children and youth. We remind the distributors and sellers of publications that they have an obligation and duty to the communities which they serve to maintain and elevate the moral standards of the community.

ENTERTAINMENT

We call upon all producers and exhibitors of all forms of public entertainment to rec-

ognize their responsibility not to present that which violates the laws against obscenity, or offends the standards of decency established for the protection of the public.

With respect to the motion picture industry, we call upon its executives, officials, and all others to reestablish the production code, adopted in 1930 and revised in 1956. We urge the Motion Picture Association to withhold its seal of approval from any film that violates the production code and the standards of decency in our communities, and demand that such films be eliminated in the future.

We remind producers of television programs that children and youth comprise their greatest audiences, and that decent families will not tolerate the further drift toward obscenity in plots, situations, and dialogs, in TV entertainment.

LEGISLATION

We call upon citizens of our Nation, and especially molders of public opinion, to support legislation that will strengthen the laws of municipalities, States, and the Nation, against obscenity; and to enlist other concerned citizens in the crusade to outlaw the peddling of smut and filth in all their forms, particularly to the Nation's youth.

We endorse the proposal to establish, either by action of Congress or by Presidential appointment, a commission to study pornographic materials of all kinds and to recommend to all agencies of the Government courses of action to combat this national evil.

We urge that citizens make organized protests to proper authorities because of the display and sale of materials objectionable for children and youth on property owned or controlled by governmental agencies.

THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

We commend the members of the Supreme Court who announced the majority opinion in the Roth-Alberts case, in 1957, which established a working principle for ridding our communities of obscenity.

We deplore several recent decisions of the Supreme Court, which have overruled the decisions of many State courts in obscenity cases, this in effect making the highest court in the land a board of censors as to what constitutes obscenity, a responsibility which, as Chief Justice Earl Warren has declared, should be left to juries in lower courts. We deplore the fact that such decisions have significantly encouraged the traffic in obscenity.

INTERFAITH SEMINARS

We urge that responsible religious leaders in each city or community promptly hold interfaith seminars, to examine the effects of the new amorality among youth, resulting from pornography, and how to grapple with the problem.

LAW-ENFORCEMENT EDUCATION

We urge Mr. J. Edgar Hoover to use the facilities of the FBI to set up a training program for law-enforcement officers of States, counties, and cities, in uniform procedures to be followed in obscenity cases.

FUTURE ACTION

We recommend for the consideration of all church groups of all faiths, and all civic organizations interested in public morality, the formulation of a plan whereby a more united voice can be heard by all publishing and entertainment media; that the plan include the establishment of permanent groups, particularly in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles areas, to cooperate with law-enforcement officials to combat obscenity, and to cooperate with producers of films for moving pictures and TV programs to see that films are not made and shown that violate the production code.

We ask that a copy of these resolutions be carried to the President, personally, at his convenience by members of this conference, and that copies be sent to each Member of Congress.

OUR APPRECIATION

We express our appreciation to Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, for his arranging for our meeting in the Senate Office Building for our night session, and express our condolences to him on the passing of his mother, which prevented his being present. We express our appreciation to Senator JACK MILLER of Iowa and to Congressman JOHN DOWDY, of Texas, for explaining pending legislation in the Congress as pertains to obscenity and leading the most helpful discussion at the meeting.

O. K. ARMSTRONG,
Conference Chairman.
REV. MORTON A. HILL,
Resolutions Chairman.

Agriculture Hall of Fame Rises From Dormant Stage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER L. MIZE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the March 1965, issue of the Kansas Electric Farmer:

AGRICULTURE HALL OF FAME RISES FROM DORMANT STAGE

On May 11, the first building of the 10 building complex of the agricultural hall of fame will be dedicated. The hall of fame, located near Bonner Springs, will give recognition and tribute to agriculture's part in America's greatness. For the farmers of America this will be a major achievement. For the people of Kansas it will be a distinct honor.

The hall of fame, which many persons thought was a thing of the past, has been in a dormant stage for the past 2 years. During that time, a complete reorganization of the hall of fame administration took place. Details were closely scrutinized, the architectural design was redesigned and additional planning was completed * * * the result being that an improved hall of fame is rapidly moving ahead.

Kansas has the opportunity to plan an important role in the development of this national living monument which will serve to raise the prestige and stature of farming. Kansans are fortunate that our State was chosen for the site which, when developed, will be a tourist attraction ranking in greatness with the Truman Library of Independence, Mo., the University of Kansas at Lawrence, Kansas State University at Manhattan, and the Eisenhower Museum at Abilene. For the first time in the history of agriculture, farming will be recognized as a profession. The modern-day story of agriculture and its tribute to the American farmer will be a strong public relations tool to improve the image of the farmer.

Drives are presently underway for Kansas to raise an additional $250,000. When a drive for funds was first organized in 1960, Kansas was assigned a goal of $1 million. The Kansas goal was cut nearly in half ($456,000) during the past reorganization of the executive board of the Hall of Fame. Wilbur Levering, State chairman for the hall of fame, said that slightly more than $206,000 has been raised in Kansas.

"Kansas has been greatly honored by being chosen as the site of the hall of fame," said Levering. "Because of this, it should be the first State to reach its quota." Levering further pointed out that this is a one-time-only drive * * * it will not be repeated.

It is hoped that Kansas will meet her quota by May 1 so that a presentation may be made at the dedication of first hall on May 11. If the quota is met, it will finance the construction of one building. A plaque will be erected acknowledging this accomplishment.

The first building, first hall, is now in use for administrative and display purposes. Included in the first hall is a large exhibit hall—bigger than a college basketball court—available for key displays. It also has a large meeting room. The building is constructed on a 257-acre tract of land owned by the hall of fame. An adjoining 350 acres purchased by Wyandotte County and 70 acres purchased by the State will be developed as park areas.

Some of the features included in the overall project are a hall of States, auditorium and conference rooms, outdoor amphitheater, agricultural museum and historical library.

The hall of fame will be essentially a living memorial and a year-round showplace for agriculture and related industry. It will give a preview of tomorrow, recognition of today and acknowledgment of yesterday.

East Chicago, Ind., City Council Resolution on 14(b)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is now crystallizing its opposition against the low wage mislabeled "right to work" laws now in force in a number of States throughout the Union. Indiana and several other States have repealed this low-wage statute during their legislative sessions this year.

This Congress could greatly aid the buying power of the Nation and help maintain prosperity and employment by repealing section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act which helps promote mills, factories, and runaway industry into low-wage areas.

Lack of public buying power brought on the depression in the early thirties and I hope history does not repeat itself. Millions working at low wages in the mislabeled right-to-work States cannot purchase autos and other products made by workers in fair-wage States.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks the following Resolution 138 enacted by the East Chicago, Ind., City Council. This resolution advocates the repeal of section 14(b) and also the termination of right-to-work laws in various States throughout the Nation:

RESOLUTION 138, EAST CHICAGO, IND., CITY COUNCIL

(Resolution memorializing the city of East Chicago to enact legislation to restore full freedom of collective bargaining as uniform national labor policy and practice throughout the United States, by repealing existing sanctions of State right-to-work laws contained in section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and by other appropriate action)

Whereas section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting

and Disclosure Act of 1959 sanction the enactment of State right-to-work laws prohibiting the negotiation of agreements between unions and employers assuring union security during the term of such agreement; and

Whereas by constitutional provision or statute 19 States have such right-to-work laws in effect, and by counties and other local bodies have adopted and put such laws into effect; and

Whereas such laws are contrary to and in derogation of provisions of Federal law contained in sections 8(a), (3) and 8(f) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, which in the absence of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, permit under specified conditions the negotiation of agreements between unions and employers assuring union security during the term of such agreements; and

Whereas State right-to-work laws undermine union organization and interfere with full freedom of collective bargaining between unions and employers; tend to depress wages and working conditions and to promote strikers and instability and antagonism in labor-management relations; and unfairly compel unions to represent and bargain for workers who are unwilling to bear the cost and responsibility of participation in union organization and collective bargaining; and

Whereas State right-to-work laws are unfair and antilabor in their effects and are designed to weaken and harass labor unions in their organization efforts and in representing workers in bargaining with their employers; and

Whreas labor unions are generally rendered less effective in promoting the welfare of wage earners, and wages and working conditions are generally lower in States having right-to-work laws than in States where such laws do not exist; and

Whereas successful implementation of the national labor policy in support of union organization and collective bargaining is not possible unless unions and union security are accepted by management as desirable forms of industrial dealings: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the City Council of East Chicago, Ind., urgently requests that the Congress of the United States enact such legislation as may be necessary and appropriate to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, which sanction State right-to-work laws, and to restore full freedom of collective bargaining as uniform national labor policy and practice throughout the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the city clerk of the city of East Chicago, Ind., to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing their State in the Congress of the United States.

JOHN F. CONROY,
Presiding Officer.

Attest:

JAMES F. GINTHER,
City Clerk.

Why Not Socialism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Randolph Marshall Pitts, an outstanding young high school student in Arlington, Va., made a prize-winning speech earlier this month before a Virginia State convention of the Teenage Young Republicans.

I believe that Randy's subject, as well as his unusual presentation, deserves the attention of all who read this RECORD. I am pleased to insert his speech in full:

WHY NOT SOCIALISM?

(An address by Randolph Marshall Pitts, before the Young Republican Federation of Virginia 1965 convention, Richmond, Va., March 2, 1965)

Socialism is a worldwide movement. A century ago, its supporters could be counted in the hundreds—today they number close to a billion.

These are dedicated people. The gospel they preach is to them nothing less than a regeneration of society. They believe that the world is ripe for change—and they mean to change it.

We are gathered here today to voice our opposition to the Socialist movement. How can we—the few—have the moral right to oppose so many? I will show you that we not only can—we must. Finally, I will suggest to you how.

First, it will be necessary to strip away a facade of myths which shield socialism from the light of truth. What, indeed, is socialism? A complete answer would be too lengthy for this convention. Accordingly, I will limit my comments to a few important fundamentals.

Socialism is defined by its advocates as a movement which aims at the ownership by society of the principal means of production and distribution—with their management by government for the prevention of exploitation, and for the benefit of the people as a whole.

Socialism and communism are alike in spite of liberalist hogwash to the contrary. The father of them both is Karl Marx. Socialism is but the first stage in society's enslavement—communism is a further development, or higher stage of socialism.

The distinction between the two stages is made clear by the following:

Under socialism, from each according to his ability—to each according to his deeds.

Under communism, from each according to his ability—to each according to his needs.

How simple these words—yet how foreboding their meaning. I will return to them later.

Early in the 19th century, there were numerous men in England and in France who reacted strongly to the harsh environment generated by the industrial revolution. These became known as the Utopian Socialists, and they made penetrating criticisms of the capitalist system. While they were groping for a new gospel to preach, two men were born who were to leave a more lasting imprint upon society as a whole.

Their names were Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

Like the Utopians, Marks and Engels were Socialists. They, too, wanted, in their own way, to improve society.

But there the resemblance ended. The socialism of the utopians was based on humanitarianism. The socialism of Marx and Engels sought to establish two classes of humans—the bourgeois and the proletariat—which would be pitted one against the other in a struggle to the death. Marx preached that socialism must "transform" society. Rather than transform, he really meant destroy. Listen to his disciple, Lenin, who said, "The essence of revolution is not that a new class shall govern by means of the old machinery, but that it shall smash up this machinery and govern by means of a new machine."

History assures you that Mr. Lenin practiced what he preached. So do most other Socialists.

And so, I believe that it is now just and right to label socialism a conspiracy. It plans to conquer us—and has told us so in many languages and in many forums repeatedly. I wonder sometimes why we do not seem to listen.

What else is socialism—as defined and practiced in Marxism? It may surprise some that Marxism is more than a system of social and economic doctrines. It is also, in the wide sense of the word, a philosophy. Even more surprising, one original concern of the cult was with the nature of matter. Lenin wrote that matter is "the objective reality which is copied, photographed, and reflected by our sensations, while existing independently of them"—and he considered that this was also the view of Marx and Engels.

Well, what is so revolutionary about that statement? Matter exists, and we perceive it by our senses. Hardly earthshaking.

But we should beware; these are Socialist words. Here is another example of a simple, insignificant statement—of no consequence—unworthy of attention. But it is a Socialist statement, and like so many others, it is a microscopic seed from which a vast and venomous foliage grows.

To illustrate this point, let's listen to Engels as he argues that there are only two main philosophies—idealism and materialism. According to the idealists, he says, mind in some form or another is the primary being from which everything else is sprung; while according to the materialists—the disciples of socialism—matter is the primary being from which mind has taken its origin.

From this, a number of closely related topics emerge in the Marxist-Leninist mumbo-jumbo:

"Man's perception is reliable, and reveals an independently existing material world accurately.

"Nature stands in no need of a Creator, but is itself the creator of men and minds.

"We can improve our knowledge of nature by employing the methods of the natural sciences, but the methods of speculative philosophy can lead to no useful knowledge."

I hope that "tilt" signs went up all over this hall at those last statements. Something new called "Nature" has been set up in socialism as a basis for everything. It is a visible, feelable entity which encompasses all. It can be weighed and measured and chemically analyzed. A mathematician can write its formulas—a physicist its laws. Nature is an orderly thing, predictable, steerable, and uniformly exact.

Please note that nature creates men's minds in the Socialist dogma. It follows then that formulas can be written for minds—and physical laws established for their modes of operation. By stirring in or leeching out an ingredient here and there, we can create a new detergent—or a new mind.

So now, man and his mind can be represented by an equation such as $ax^2 - bx + c = 0$. This is very precise and scientific—why don't we go one logical step further? Modern computers gobble up formulas such as that and solve millions of them per second. Let's stuff man into a computer along with all the rest of socialism's "Nature". Then we will ask the machine to describe the universe. What is its shape and size? Of what does—or should it consist? How should it be populated? What should the people do? What should they think?

Absurd? By no means. I have just described to you the avowed goal of socialism. If you don't believe this to be so, you had better find out soon—before it is too late—if it is not already so.

Read the works of Marxist maniacs and you will discover that dialectical materialism leads to Marxist naturalism leads to scientific empiricism leads to historical materialism leads to Marxist morality leads to central planning—and thence into the guts of a computer.

In this neat, scientific, orderly concept of society, what happened to the human spirit? What happened to God?

The answer to both of these is found in the Socialist version of the state. The state will program the computer and spew out the instructions for all men's needs. Remember, I mentioned that communism promises to each according to his needs. Who determines those needs? The state. How does the state determine needs? By central planning. What is the most efficient planning tool? A computer.

With nanosecond speed the computer will turn out programs for nails and rockets and toothpaste and cereal—all of the material needs of mankind. And what is even more attractive in upper utopia—since matter creates mind—the computer will turn out ideas. There will be programs for creativity, for ambition, for pride, for joy and fear and love—and, of course, for hate.

Is this what you want? No? Then the time to do something about it is now—right now.

I promised to suggest what we should do. I will outline this quickly.

We must be the first—not the last—to discover and deal with society's imperfections. Socialists point an accusing finger at the poverty, crime, slums, and social inequities we have allowed to fester in our midst. They have an answer—you have just heard me describe it. If we are to escape being inundated by the Socialist wave, we must take positive action. We must analyze the causes of our social blemishes. We must think of democratic—or rather republican means to prevent their reoccurrences and, of course, to correct them as they are. We must put democracy to work with greater energy and a higher productiveness than the Socialists can ever hope to offer.

In summary, I do not want to live in a materialist socialism. I want my mind and body—and my soul to be free. To achieve this, I plead with you, let's put democracy to work.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

House passed elementary and secondary education assistance bill.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held Monday, March 29, at noon.

President's Message—Economic Development: On Thursday, March 25, Senate received President's message recommending a program of area and regional economic development, focused upon the needs of distressed areas—referred to Committee on Banking and Currency.

Pages 5762–5765

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—LABOR-HEW

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on fiscal 1966 budget estimates for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, with testimony in behalf of funds for their respective agencies from the following witnesses: William E. Simkin, Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service; Howard W. Habermeyer, Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board; Frank W. McCulloch, Chairman, and Arnold Ordman, General Counsel, both of the National Labor Relations Board; Howard G. Gamser, National Mediation Board; Gen. Wade H. Haislip, Governor, U.S. Soldiers' Home; and Keith Fry, who read the statement of Carl J. Johnson, Executive Director, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

Hearings continue on Thursday, April 1, on proposed funds for the Department of Labor.

D.C. MATTERS

Committee on the District of Columbia: Subcommittee on the Judiciary held hearings on the following bills:

S. 1319, authorizing the D.C. courts to release selected offenders from prison at specified times to engage in gainful employment, with testimony from Irving Bryan, Assistant Corporation Counsel, who was accompanied by Donald Clemmer, Department of Corrections, both of the D.C. government; and Howard C. Anderson, Bar Association of the D.C.;

S. 1321, authorizing bond requirements in connection with attachment before judgment to be fixed at twice the amount of property attached rather than twice the amount of the claim, with testimony from Larry Margolis, Assistant Corporation Counsel, D.C.; Michael Schuchat, Bar Association of the D.C.; and Howard C. Anderson;

S. 1317, authorizing D.C. Commissioners to prescribe penalties for handling and collection of dishonored checks and money orders, with testimony from Irving Bryan, who was accompanied by John W. West, Treasury Division, D.C.; and

H.R. 66, authorizing the D.C. Board of Parole to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to expiration of his maximum term, with testimony from Irving Bryan, who was accompanied by Hugh F. Rivers, D.C. Board of Parole.

TRAFFIC SAFETY

Committee on Government Operations: Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization continued its hearings on the role of the Federal Government in traffic safety, having as its witnesses John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce; Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, Department of Commerce; and Stephen N. Shulman, representing the Department of Defense.

On Thursday, March 25, on page D227 the DAILY DIGEST stated that NASA Administrator James E. Webb had testified in connection with this matter; actually, testimony was received instead from Charles A. Webb, Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission.

TUALATIN RECLAMATION PROJECT, AND WATER PROJECTS RECREATION

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported with amendment S. 254, authorizing construction of the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon.

Committee also considered, but took no final action on, S. 1229, proposed Water Projects Recreation Act, and will resume its consideration on Tuesday, March 30.

Appendix

Export Expansion Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Senate Commerce Committee on March 17, 1965:

EXPORT EXPANSION ACT OF 1965

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity to be here this morning. I thought that I might start as a witness in this proceeding by generally outlining the problem as we see it. I will leave the specifics mentioned by the chairman to the industry witnesses who will follow me. These industry witnesses can develop much of the detailed information sought by the committee.

I would like to emphasize first that we are trying to bring about a condition in the world that will allow our private industries to compete on an equal basis with other nations for business opportunities.

We have had a change in the complexion of world affairs in the last 10 years. As we are all aware, our task immediately after World War II was to help rebuild the shattered, war-torn nations of Europe and Asia. These nations were industrialized countries with long histories of commercial enterprise. We conceived it to be our duty to help them back on their feet, to get their economies operating again to the point where they no longer needed our aid. That job is done. The industrialized, commercial nations are humming. We did our job so well that those very nations now are competing with us to capture the commercial markets in the remaining portions of the earth.

So we are shifting course—turning a corner—to a new concept of world trade and foreign relations. Basically, we are looking to the newly emerging nations for new markets, for new customers for our wares.

Many of the new emerging nations are now approaching the point that, with a little financial help, they could become very good customers indeed. We have to understand this new concept—we have to analyze the situation to determine where our best opportunities lie. We have to go after the business. That means giving our salesmen both the understanding and tools to work with.

It is clear that one of the biggest problems is in the field of finance. These young nations want to buy. We want to sell. But they are not rich. In some cases they may not look like good credit risks at this moment. An underdeveloped but emerging nation is in the position of needing heavy capital goods, but does not have the money to buy directly from U.S. manufacturers. I'm talking about a country, for example, that wants jet aircraft, heavy farm equipment, and other types of industrial machinery, buses, trucks, and so on.

So what happens? Unable to buy from U.S. firms, the struggling young country looks for easy credit terms on which it can finance the machinery of progress and the tools of modernization. The young country has no choice. Even though it might prefer to deal with U.S. firms because the products are of superior quality, delivery schedules are better, and other ancillary services are topnotch, the impecunious nation is forced to go where it can make any kind of deal at all.

In our own economy, many groups of people could not buy the products they want if they could not get good credit for installment purchases.

That is one of the key purposes of title II of this bill, the Export Expansion Act of 1965. Under title II, our Government could provide a mutually satisfactory meeting ground for our sellers and other nations' buyers. The Export-Import Bank of Washington could provide this meeting ground. This bill would make it possible for the Eximbank to follow through on making financing of the type I have been discussing a reality.

Let me offer a simple example, Mr. Chairman. Take company X, which manufacturers an item we will call a widget. Let us say that the widget costs $1 million. It is in prime demand in an up-and-coming nation. But that country, like the young couple, has no money, only a good future.

We talk about credit. The nation is interested. Company X wants to sell. But the company does not feel it is in a position to assume the economic and political risks involved with selling a relatively expensive item to customers in this new nation. The American company does not know the country well. The company looks to our Government for advice and assistance.

The type of governmental assistance we think that can be applied, and would be developed from this measure, is a broadening of the role of the Export-Import Bank. The Bank could move to guarantee a much broader kind of lending by private banking institutions which service our export trade.

It is a very simple concept, but a very important one. Company X sells its widget on much the same basis that it does to a customer in the United States. The Eximbank guarantees the financing, with the backing of the Government. The wheels of commerce roll.

The key portion of this bill is the part that in some measure changes the concept of financing by Eximbank that helps make our manufacturers fully competitive with other industrial exporting nations of the world.

I trust that during the course of these hearings you will hear a number of specific examples of what is being faced by our people as they attempt to sell abroad. I'm sure that a number of exact sets of figures will be offered to you by other witnesses. I will give you one good example of the need for this legislation.

It is estimated, for example, in the aerospace industry alone there is a potential market for $2 billion worth of sales in countries that presently cannot purchase our products because they are inadequately financed.

When you begin to examine this in terms of the jobs that are produced in the United States, you begin to see the significance of selling abroad.

A second item is in terms of our balance of payments. Improving our sales abroad offers the only long-term solution to the vital balance-of-payments problem our Nation faces right today.

We can make short-term, stop-gap gestures at shifting the balance back in our favor. But over the long pull, the only thing that will produce credits for us with foreign nations is to trade with them. In this way, the money they owe us for the products they buy here tips the scales in our favor. We must have a favorable balance in order for us to meet our present commitments abroad.

At present we are exporting more than we import. But we do not export enough to also cover our military operations and assistance commitments in other nations. We must increase our foreign trade. Our national interest demands it.

I would like to make one more general point. In title I of this bill we are attempting to set up ancillary machinery to help carry out the principles set down in title II. In other words, our Government must help get enough trained people out into the markets of the world to do an effective job of promoting our trade with the other nations.

There are about 135 centers around the globe, either capital cities, or having a population in excess of 1 million people. In only 93 of these do we have any commercial attache at all. Anything we do in the other centers is largely hit and miss.

We can very successfully aid our private businessmen in developing the markets of the world, if we exhibit the will to do so. The mechanisms for achieving that end are clearly spelled out in title I of the act.

Gentlemen, this is what we hope to accomplish through the bills Senator MAGNUSON and I have introduced. I would like to emphasize again that we, as a nation, must help these younger nations to finance their purchases with our own U.S. companies. If we don't we will fail in the competition for world trade.

If we fail in the competition for world trade, we will not only injure ourselves in the political and diplomatic relationships that we have with these countries, but we will also see our economy falter. We need that share of world trade that we aren't getting now to maintain our trade momentum. It will provide us with the percentage which is necessary to keep us moving.

The difference beween the business that we lose without the credit mechanisms in this bill and the trade we enjoy if this concept is adopted spells for many industries the difference between profit and loss, prosperity and depression.

The prospering of a business means jobs, this means development of our country, and finally, it means the kind of friendly, peaceful relations with the emerging nations of the world we want and need.

Gentlemen, in my opinion this is a key way to produce world peace. We help develop friendly allies rather than hostile enemies. We do it not by merely handing them money—but by trading with them, respecting their ability to do business and grow. Through this act we say to them: "We give you a hand now to get you over the rough spots. The day will come when you don't need our credit guarantees. When that day comes, Godspeed, and we will be pleased to continue doing business with you on any other mutually advantageous basis."

I appreciate having had the opportunity to appear before your committee to testify on this most important matter. I would also be most happy to answer any questions that the committee might have.

Iowa's Elderly Like Their State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the highly reputable Wallaces Farmer poll recently published the results of a survey which had been taken in Iowa on the question, "Where do our senior citizens plan to go when they retire?" The overwhelming majority of Iowa citizens expressed a strong desire to remain in their home State and close to their family and friends. I feel that we in Congress should be aware of the wishes of our senior citizens as we study legislation pertaining to their retirement and commend the results of this poll to my colleagues.

FARM FOLKS' VIEWS ON RETIREMENT

Do you plan to retire from active farming at age 65? And when you do retire, where do you want to live?

The Wallaces Farmer poll has been asking Iowa farm people these questions. On the first "Do you plan to retire at age 65?" they answered as follows:

[In percent]

	Men	Women	Total
Undecided	62	56	59
Yes	20	20	20
No	18	24	21

Younger men, with retirement a long way off, were more inclined to say yes than older ones. Men 65 and over, who were right up against the problem, voted only 57 percent yes and 43 percent no.

Women weren't as much interested. A woman in Wright County said, "I don't think a woman ever retires. She still has to cook and clean and has the washing to do."

The poll also asked, "When you retire, where do you want to live?" This question was also asked in 1955. See how men and women scored in different years.

[In percent]

Men:	1955	1964
On the farm	48	58
In small town	42	40
In larger city	10	2

There was a higher percentage of owner operators in 1964 than in 1955, probably 62 percent in 1955 against 69 percent in 1964. Only an owner has a choice here. A tenant has to move on retirement.

Social security also made a difference in the comparisons with 1955. Apparently more elderly farmers are now field renting their land, holding on to the farm buildings, raising a garden and a few head of stock. With social security added, they can work out a fair income.

For older men and women, the choice was overwhelmingly to stay on the farm if they could. Men of 65 and over voted 86 percent for retirement on the farm. Women were 93 percent in favor.

Some older folks said that while they wanted to live in Iowa, they hoped to go to a warmer climate for part of the winter.

An older farmer in Ringgold County said, "We'll probably retire here in Iowa, but it depends on where the kids are by then."

A farmer in Sac County spoke for many: "I'll always stay in Iowa. It's a wonderful place. People leave looking for better places, but you notice how many come back to Iowa after a couple of years."

The poll also asked, "When you retire, in what part of the country would you like to live most of the year?"

	Percent
Iowa	84
Some other Corn Belt State	2
California	2
Arizona or New Mexico	4
Florida	2
Other	6

Iowa came out ahead in a big way, with older people giving it the biggest vote. Over 95 percent of men 65 and over voted to stay in Iowa. Maybe one reason is that older folks sometimes just hate to move.

California seems to have lost some of its attraction for retired Iowa farmers and Arizona and New Mexico are gaining.

Government Patent Infringements—Erosion of American Patent Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to do something about the infringement and the erosion of the American patent rights by foreign concerns.

This bill will at least put the Congress of the United States on record concerning the purchase by the Government of the United States of products from foreign countries where there is an infringement of our Government patent rights. The least that the Government of the United States can do to protect its own interests is to stop encouraging foreign producers from infringing on American patent rights by purchasing their products.

In support of the bill which I have introduced, I wish to point out the reasons for my doing so.

(1) FEDERAL AGENCIES BEGIN PURCHASES OF INFRINGING DRUG PRODUCTS

For many years, purchasing agencies of the Federal Government bought patented drug products only from the owners of the pertinent U.S. patents or their licensees. It was not until December 1959, that the Military Medical Supply Agency, a branch of the Department of Defense, departed from this policy by buying unlicensed tetracycline, a broad-spectrum antibotic effective against a wide range of infectious diseases, from an Italian source. Since that time, other Federal purchasing agencies, principally those associated with the Department of Defense, have purchased several drug products covered by U.S. patents, from unlicensed foreign sources, principally Italian, for use in the United States in direct and deliberate violation of U.S. patents.

In purchasing unlicensed drugs from foreign sources for use in the United States, the Federal Government has not limited itself to situations where the patent has been involved in litigation or where the patented product has been involved in Federal antitrust litigation. Suggestions to the contrary are untrue. Mere involvement in litigation of a patent or a patented product would, in any event, provide a poor rationale for deliberately violating patents.

The validity of several of the patents covering drug products purchased from unlicensed foreign sources by the Federal Government has never been contested, and several patented drug products so purchased have never been involved in Federal antitrust litigation.

The Federal Government's purchases of unlicensed Italian drug products have been facilitated by the fact that Italy provides no patent protection for either drug products or processes. It is the only major country in the free world which does not provide such patent protection.

(2) LEGAL LOOPHOLE CITED IN JUSTIFICATION

Certain purchasing agencies of the Federal Government have found a loophole in Federal law that they say permits them to violate U.S. patents. The pertinent statute provides that whenever an invention covered by a U.S. patent is used or manufactured by or for the United States, without license of the owner thereof or lawful right to use or manufacture the same, the patent owner's remedy shall be by action against the United States in the Court of Claims. (28 U.S.C. 1498.)

It will be noted that in this situation the patent owner does not have his primary patent right to put a stop to the Federal Government's violation of his patent rights. The patent owner cannot obtain an injunction from the court, even at the end of successful litigation. It is unfortunate that the patent holder is limited in all cases to the recovery of damages—court action is expensive, compensation is long delayed, and adequate recovery is unlikely since the extent of the damage suffered may be very difficult to establish.

It is unjust that the Federal Government should have what amounts to a preferred position with respect to its own violation of patents issued by it. The legislative history of 28 U.S.C. 1498, shows that it was contemplated that the statute as amended in 1918 was intended to insure the Federal Government's having clear access to inventions during wartime emergency situations. However, no such limitation is expressed in the statute and this has offered a temptation to purchasing agencies of the Federal Government to violate U.S. patents even in the absence of an emergency situation.

Purchases of patented products by the Federal Government from unlicensed sources have by no means been limited to drug products, but have extended to the products of many other industries as well. The net result has been a serious erosion of the rights of U.S. patent owners.

(3) NO LOOPHOLE FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The erosion of American patent rights in connection with Federal purchases now threatens to extend to local governments as well. While this erosion depends upon a loophole in the law where Federal purchases are concerned, there is no such loophole whatsoever for local

governments which attempt a similar action. We know of no statute which would permit infringements of U.S. patents by local governments and no statute preventing patent owners from obtaining court orders to stop further violation of their patent rights by local governments, as well as obtaining damages for patent infringement.

(4) ATTEMPTED JUSTIFICATION FOR GOVERNMENT PATENT VIOLATIONS

An attempt has been made to justify the violation of U.S. drug patents by Government agencies on the ground that the prices quoted by suppliers of unlicensed foreign-made drugs are lower than those quoted by American patent owners and their licensees.

Of course, patent-infringing, Italian-made tetracycline can be sold at lower prices. The reasons why this is so are clear and simple. Unfortunately, they are also inconsistent with the demands of the American system: the Italian producers of tetracycline pay wages that are one-fourth of the rates prevailing in the United States; they have had to bear no research costs for the development of tetracycline or other new drugs; they have incurred no costs in developing the market for tetracycline in this country; they pay no Federal, State, or local taxes. In brief, they are exploiting a readymade situation.

In this connection, it is important to note that the prices quoted by Pfizer to Federal and local government agencies on tetracycline are less than 50 percent of the prices quoted when the product was introduced. Similarly, Pfizer's prices to the trade generally have declined by 43 percent. Even with such substantial price reductions, Pfizer's prices for tetracycline products are not as low as those for products produced from patent-infringing Italian-made tetracycline.

(5) UNLICENSED FOREIGN-MADE DRUG PURCHASES ARE "PENNY WISE AND POUND FOOLISH"

The attempted justification for infringing Government purchases on the ground that the prices quoted by suppliers of unlicensed foreign-made drugs are lower ignores both the short-range and long-range adverse consequences of these purchases to the American economy and can well be characterized as "pennywise and pound foolish."

Such purchases of unlicensed Italian-made drugs can cause loss of jobs by American workers; encourage additional dumping of Italian-made products in the United States at prices lower than those charged in the regular Italian market; discourage American drug research; hurt the unfavorable American balance of international payments; and reduce tax revenues for Federal, State, and municipal governments. Each of these adverse consequences will now be briefly discussed.

(A) LOSS OF JOBS BY AMERICAN LABOR

Purchases of unlicensed foreign-made drugs by Federal and local government agencies cannot help but adversely affect American workers. The reduction in sales volume represented by these purchases and the further patent violations they encourage have already resulted in the loss of jobs by American workers, and this job loss can be expected to increase. To this must be added the so-called economic multiplier effect—the further jobs these wage earners would have created for other workers by spending their wages.

General production costs in Italy are lower than those in the United States. It should be recalled, for example, that there is a very substantial difference between wage rates in this country and in Italy—that wages in Italy are approximately one-fourth of those paid in the United States. Thus, the effect of extensive purchasing of Italian-made drugs for use in the United States is to displace highly paid American workers with low paid Italian workers.

(B) DUMPING OF ITALIAN-MADE PRODUCTS ENCOURAGED

The term "dumping" applies to the practice of making sales for export to another country at lower prices than those charged for the same product in the home market. Dumping is a form of price discrimination and unfair competition generally condemned in international trade in the free world.

Prices on tetracycline products to large government hospitals in Italy are over twice the prices offered to the U.S. Government for unlicensed foreign-made tetracycline. Having no stake in the U.S. market and having spent nothing to develop this market, Italian suppliers have no hesitancy in selling tetracycline for the U.S. market at dumping prices.

(C) AMERICAN DRUG RESEARCH DISCOURAGED

The American prescription drug industry is characterized by unusually high research expenditures. From the time a promising compound is first spotted in a research laboratory until the time it may finally be marketed, several years of work are likely to be involved. The cost of research and development of a single new drug has been estimated to average $6 million by Dr. Austin Smith, president of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, in testimony before the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations on April 8, 1964.

Money is, of course, spent on promising new drugs which are ultimately discarded and never reach the market for one reason or another. For the drug industry as a whole, the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association has said that the odds are more than 6,000 to 1 that a newly discovered drug will never reach the market. In spite of these odds, the American drug industry has nevertheless gained over 340 new drugs from 1941 through 1962, and these drugs have saved millions of lives.

Comparisons of deaths from several diseases between the year 1935, when the United States had a population of 127 million persons, and 1962, when there were 187 million persons, are significant. In 1935, 70,000 people in the United States died of tuberculosis; in 1962, fewer than 10,000. More than 100,000 Americans died of pneumonia and influenza in 1935; in 1962, about 61,000. Syphilis took the lives of almost 20,000 in 1935; in 1962, fewer than 3,000. More than 4 million Americans living today would be dead if the 1937 death rate had continued.

The American system is strengthened by its patent structure, provided for by the U.S. Constitution to advance science by protecting inventors. More drugs have been discovered in the United States under the protection of a strong patent system than in any other country. Italy, with no product or process patent protection in the drug field, has produced no important drug discoveries.

Expensive as it is, drug research is no dispensable luxury. It is the very lifeblood of an industry devoted to saving lives and promoting health. Further vital discoveries undoubtedly will be made as intensive industrial medical research continues. To diminish the sources of funds for its support would be a distinct disservice to humanity.

(D) AMERICAN BALANCE OF PAYMENTS ADVERSELY AFFECTED

While this country's overall balance-of-payments situation has reportedly been somewhat alleviated, this remains a serious problem which deservedly continues to receive intense attention in Washington. The purchase of foreign-made drugs and other products and their importation to the United States for use in violation of U.S. patents should be more carefully scrutinized for their direct and adverse impact upon our unfavorable international balance-of-payments situation.

(E) AMERICAN TAX REVENUES REDUCED

What the overall loss to Federal, State, and local governments is as a result of the Federal Government's practice of purchasing foreign-made drugs and other products from unlicensed sources for use here in violation of U.S. patents cannot be precisely estimated; nor can the extent of loss, should the practice become more widespread, be accurately predicted. It is clear, however, that the loss in taxes has been substantial and that if this practice continues and spreads to local governments, such losses will increase.

Purchases by Federal, State, and local governments of products made in the United States put money to work within this country and produce tax revenues for Federal, State, and local governments. When products made abroad are purchased from a foreign company, no such tax revenue is generated.

Over the past decade, Pfizer has paid more than 112 millions of dollars in Federal income taxes, as well as additional millions of dollars for State and local taxes. Other American drug companies have paid comparable amounts in Federal, State, and local taxes. Pursuit of a policy which would diminish these tax revenues would be indeed shortsighted.

(6) DISCOVERY AND LICENSING OF TETRACYLINE

The discovery and development of tetracycline, one of the drugs now being purchased by the Federal Government from unlicensed Italian sources, is a typical example of the "risks and rewards" of pharmaceutical industry research.

It originally stemmed from an attempt by Pfizer scientists to determine the

chemical structure of the then existing broad spectrum antibiotics, oxytetracycline and chlortetracycline.

For over 2 years, a team of seven Pfizer chemists—joined by Dr. Robert B. Woodward of Harvard University, codiscoverer in 1944 of the synthesis of quinine, and in 1951 of one of the major steps in the total synthesis of cortisone—worked to determine the structures of these two compounds. This long and expensive research work ultimately led to the discovery of tetracycline by one of the Pfizer chemists and the filing of a patent application on tetracycline in the U.S. Patent Office.

Following two Patent Office interference proceedings, the basic pioneer patent on tetracycline was issued to Pfizer. Pfizer has granted licenses on tetracycline to four companies: American Cyanamid Co., Lederle Laboratories; Bristol Laboratories, Inc.; Olin Mathieson Chemical Co., Squibb; and the Upjohn Co.

It is a violation of this tetracycline patent for anyone to make, use, or sell tetracycline in the United States without a license, and a subsequent reseller or user of unlicensed tetracycline also violates this patent.

(7) LITIGATION INVOLVING TETRACYCLINE

In 1958, the Federal Trade Commission issued a complaint against Pfizer and its licensees, containing antitrust charges, principally relating to tetracycline. After extensive hearings covering more than 11,000 pages of testimony and 8,000 pages of documents, the hearing examiner, a member of the Federal Trade Commission staff, cleared Pfizer and its licensees of all the charges and ordered that the complaint be dismissed. He held that the discovery of tetracycline was patentable; that false or misleading information was not submitted to the Patent Office; that Pfizer's tetracycline patent is valid; that the licenses issued by Pfizer under this patent are valid; and that there was no agreement or conspiracy to fix prices and no attempt to monopolize.

This decision was appealed by the Commission attorneys to the full Federal Trade Commission, which in August 1963 reversed the hearing examiner in part. The Commission did not pass upon the validity of Pfizer's tetracycline patent, but it did, among other things, order Pfizer to grant additional royalty-bearing licenses under its patent to domestic applicants. Pfizer has appealed this order to the Federal Court of Appeals, strongly contesting any requirement that Pfizer grant additional licenses, and has not granted any additional licenses. The order will never become effective unless it is affirmed by the Federal courts.

Pfizer's tetracycline patent was not held invalid by the Federal Trade Commission. Indeed, the validity of this patent is not an issue in any litigation between Pfizer and the Federal Government.

Pfizer has instituted suit for infringement of its tetracycline patent against all companies preparing tetracycline dosage forms in the United States from unlicensed Italian-made bulk tetracycline. The order of the Federal Trade Commission, which is now being appealed to the Federal court, does not affect Pfizer's right to continue to enforce its tetracycline patent against infringers.

In August 1961, an antitrust suit was filed by the Federal Government against Pfizer and others in the Federal Court for the Southern District of New York, charging that the defendants had conspired to restrain trade, monopolize antibiotic production and sales, and fix prices. These charges were similar to those asserted in the Federal Trade Commission antibiotics litigation and contained nothing new. It should be emphasized that the filing of this suit was merely a presentation of charges, not the decision of a court. We have denied the charges, we are vigorously contesting them, and we are confident of ultimate vindication.

(8) THEFT OF TETRACYCLINE CULTURES AND PROCESS INFORMATION

In January 1964, a decision was made in a civil suit in the New York State Supreme Court instituted by the American Cyanamid Co., a Pfizer licensee, involving the theft from that company by one or more of its ex-employees, of cultures and process information pertaining to three broad spectrum antibiotics—tetracycline, chloretetracycline, and demethylchlortetracycline. The court found that several Italian companies had received delivery of confidential tetracycline process information and had also received delivery of tetracycline cultures stolen from American Cyanamid Co.

It is a matter of public record that several individuals are under Federal indictment in New York for transporting to Italy stolen tetracycline cultures and for conspiracy, three of whom have pleaded guilty. While those in this country who were involved in this violation of law can be punished, many of the Italian companies which received delivery of the confidential tetracycline process information and stolen cultures are producing and marketing tetracycline. Tetracycline produced by these companies is continuing to find its way into the American market through firms which prepare tetracycline dosage forms here from bulk material supplied by such companies.

(9) IMPORTANT ISSUE AT STAKE

There is an important issue at stake in the matter of governmental purchases of foreign-made drugs for use here in violation of U.S. patents. The laws of the United States have provided a strong patent system for the precise purpose of encouraging long and expensive research work of the very type which led to the discovery of tetracycline. We cannot stand aside while erosion occurs to patent rights which help to provide the funds necessary for the continuance of important medical research, the kind of research that has made the United States the world leader in the discovery and development of lifesaving products.

The issue here goes far beyond Pfizer's patent rights on tetracycline. If local governments and others are allowed to violate drug patents with impunity, they will be encouraged to violate any and all patents. This may well have the effect of discouraging research in many other industries, as well as in the pharmaceutical industry.

Finally, we can emphatically state that if we are to continue to spend millions of dollars a year on drug research; if we are to pay American wage scales; if we are to maintain a sales and marketing organization to promote the fruits of Pfizer research in keen competition with others in our industry in a free enterprise system; if we are to pay significant sums by way of Federal, State, and local taxes—if we are to do all of these things, and at the end of the year's activity turn over a little better than 4 cents to our shareholders for every dollar of sales, we will never be in a position to compete with antibiotic pirates who contribute nothing to the development of a drug and find their haven in a country that does not give any recognition to drug patents, who pay wages and offer working conditions which are substandard in comparison to those in this country, and finally, who contribute nothing in the way of taxes to support our democratic institutions.

Tax Relief Proposal for Low-Income Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, a tax reduction to a bare minimum to individuals with low incomes as a substitute for Federal doles and subsidies is what would be accomplished by legislation introduced in the House of Representatives by me today.

My bill would reduce the income tax to $5 for those citizens classed in the poverty status to eliminate the need for handouts from the Federal Government.

This bill, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to income tax on individuals, including married persons filing joint returns, heads of households and single persons, is a technically drawn bill to halt the tendency of Government to tax those low-income groups, while keeping them in the subsidy and welfare class.

In drafting the legislation, the poverty class definition adopted by the administration which includes those persons making $3,000 or less annually was used.

In taxing the person making $3,000 or less annually, the Federal Government is going to the source of a man's livelihood, and returning to him a dole or subsidy putting him squarely under the thumb of the "Great White Father."

Rather than pay his rent or give him a welfare check, why not eliminate his income tax? My bill would accomplish this and also keep the principle of having every American wage earner pay at least a minimum tax under the $5 feature of this legislation.

The legislation would not cost the Federal Government a great deal of money, but would be offset by a decrease in welfare doles. There were 10,500,000 taxpayers in the poverty category who paid only $1.6 billion in taxes in 1962, about 3.6 percent of the total individual income tax collected for the year.

This bill could take the place of a major new spending program, for example, the Appalachian bill or the proposed new housing program, and make the individual less dependent on a paternal Federal Government and more dependent on himself.

Outgoing Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, in his final public speech last Friday urged a further tax reduction for the Nation's low-income families, adding support to this legislation.

I am hopeful that the bill will have early early hearings and departmental reports, because it is vitally needed.

A Reasonable Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. CALLAWAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to appear before the House Committee on the Judiciary today. In my testimony I urged a reasonable approach which would assure voting rights to all qualified citizens throughout the country and which would not single out some States for special treatment. The formal testimony is as follows:

A REASONABLE APPROACH

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I thank you for the opportunity to appear here today.

I am here, gentlemen, because I consider the bill before this committee, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, a bill of utmost importance to all Americans. Proof of its importance is the interest that this subject has generated throughout the country. Like all Americans, I wholeheartedly agree with the aims and objectives of this bill as stated in section 2, that "no voting qualifications or procedure shall be imposed or applied to deny the right to vote on account of race or color."

The right to vote is already a basic American right guaranteed to all qualified citizens by our Constitution and our laws. To deny this right to a single person because of race is unthinkable.

In looking at the complaints before the courts, I believe that the problem is less one of adequate laws, than one of expeditious enforcement of the laws that we have. In some cases deliberate roadblocks have been placed to thwart or at least delay justice. This is wrong; we cannot condone it; I do not condone it. We have a duty to correct it. But in correcting what is clearly wrong, let us not create further wrongs. Let us attack the problem, let us analyze each complaint, let us examine what went wrong and then enact corrective legislation.

I am here to wholeheartedly support any reasonable legislation that attacks the real problem of voting rights—legislation that eliminates delays in procedure, to assure every qualified citizen the right to vote regardless of race or color.

But I cannot support H.R. 6400 as it stands. I cannot support this bill because, though I agree with its stated end, I do not agree with its means. For in pursuing its proper goal of assuring voting right, H.R. 6400 would establish a dangerous precedent, and would be discriminatory in application.

I base my first objection that it would establish a dangerous precedent, on section 4(a) of the bill—that section pertaining to the appointment of Federal examiners or registrars. Under this section the Attorney General would have the power to authorize the appointment of Federal registrars for national, State, and even local elections; not only upon the complaint of 20 residents, but in addition he could do so without any complaints, when "in his judgment the appointment of examiners is otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment."

Let us consider this subsection for a moment. The Attorney General is here given what appears to be total discretion and power. With no rules set forth to guide his judgment, he, alone, at his own whim, can impose Federal registration control at any time, and the people have no recourse. His decision shall be final. His power is absolute, and it has been said that absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Therefore, before this extreme step it taken, let us consider the nature of this office of Attorney General. We do not have to look far to see during 11 of the last 15 years, the Attorney General has been a key campaign figure for the successful presidential candidate.

The Attorney General from 1949 to 1952 was J. Howard McGrath, chairman of the Democratic National Committee during the 1948 campaign. In 1953, the appointment went to Herbert Brownell, a former Republican National Committee chairman and one of the top directors of three Republican presidential campaigns. And Attorney General Robert Kennedy was the successful manager of his brother's presidential campaign. These men had the highest responsibility of getting out the vote for their party. Clearly then, the Attorney General can be a man whose mind is not entirely free of partisan politics.

Keeping in mind the unlimited authority given to him in section 4(a) of this bill, it is not impossible that some day, some politically minded attorney general—Republican or Democrat—could decide to use this power for political gain.

Let us suppose "that in his judgment the appointment of examiners is necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment" in an area that he knows to be sympathetic to his party. Could he then appoint the county campaign chairman as chief registrar with strong precinct bosses as his deputies, and send them into that area to register voters door to door? The answer is "Yes," he could, because there are no specifications for methods of registering, and there are no tests or rules involved in the selection of examiners.

If you are now thinking that my suppositions are far-fetched, let me ask you to indulge me one more time by extending your imagination even a little farther. Consider with me the possibility that this bill, once the precedent is established, is only a first step. Could it then lead beyond Federal control of registration to complete Federal control of polling officials and polling places? Of course it could, and in taking that chance, this Nation of freemen could conceivably lose the very basis of its freedom.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct your attention to that portion of H.R. 6400 which I consider to contain the greatest injustice, section 3(a). This section would single out selected States for punitive treatment.

Section 3(a) of the bill divides this Nation into two groups of States. Group 1 consists of States which "the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device as a qualification for voting and with respect to which the Director of the Census determines that less than 50 per centum of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964." Group 2 consists of all other States.

Under this bill the second group of States may require a voter to read or write. The first group may not. The second group may require a voter to have a sixth grade education or its equivalent. The first group may not. Group 2 may require a voter to have good moral character. Group 1 may not. This bill would result in dividing our Nation into two different kinds of States, some with more rights than others.

I do not speak at this time on the question of the merits of literacy tests or the tests of moral character, but only on the question as to whether it is right to have different sets of rules for different States.

Obviously, there is no constitutional or moral basis for giving certain States more rights than others. The only claim of constitutionality lies in the contention that the formula in H.R. 6400 is a reasonable way of separating the States that are discriminating because of race in violation of the 15th amendment, from those that are not. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a valid contention.

The formula separates States where the 1964 presidential vote was more than 50 percent of the persons of voting age from those States where the vote was less than 50 percent. The assumption is that a low percentage of voters must be due to the discrimination that is prohibited under the 15th amendment.

But is this assumption true in fact? Or are there other factors—perhaps even more important factors—contributing to the low voter turnout in the Southern States. I say that there are.

The report of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting in November 1963 discussed psychological and legal causes of a low voter turnout. Particularly significant to me is a parapgraph on page 1 of the summary of this report as follows: "The Commission strongly believes that effective two-party competition in all areas of the Nation will build and maintain interest in public affairs and lead to greater voter participation."

In 1949, a Texas scholar, Dr. V. O. Key, former head of the political science departments of Johns Hopkins, Yale, and Harvard, noted that "the low level of participation in southern voting can by no means be attributed entirely to Negro disfranchisement. Nonvoting by Negroes does not alone produce the low turnout percentages; in most States in the South the rate of participation by whites falls far below the rates of the total voting population in two-party States."

Mr. Chairman, here we have the key. Look at the seven States singled out by the Attorney General as the only complete States affected by the formula—Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, and Alaska. Of these States six are Southern States with a low voter turnout due primarily to the one-party system. The seventh, Alaska, has a low turnout apparently because of the problems of cold weather and isolation of voters. We may not like the one-party system of the South or the cold of Alaska, but these reasons for low voter turnout have nothing to do with the 15th amendment or racial discrimination.

It is a well-known fact that Democratic primary victories in the South have been tantamount to election and that in most

instances Democratic primaries far outdraw the general elections that follow. For example, in the last Governor's race in my own State of Georgia, the Democratic primary drew 852,000 voters while the general election for that office drew only 312,000.

Similar figures for presidential elections are of course not available, since they are not preceded by popular primaries. But there is ample evidence to show that a two-party system, with its consequence of many contested elections on the same ballot, brings out a much larger presidential vote.

Let me quote again from the President's Commission on Registration and Voting: "When an election is expected to be close, the strong partisan is even more inclined to vote."

I ask you, gentlemen, how many elections are expected to be close in a State where 90 percent of all candidates run unopposed? The report goes on: "A great ally in the long-range fight against apathy is politics itself—the two-party system. Effective two-party competition prompts political involvement, spurs interest in politics and campaigns, and strengthens a person's feeling that his vote counts. We believe that two-party competition is essential to build and maintain interest in public affairs, and consequently leads to greater voter participation."

The President's own Commission obviously felt this point to be tremendously important—yet, it was apparently overlooked by the framers of H.R. 6400.

Competition is the basis of active politics. It is a truism to say that with more contested elections—more people vote. But in the Southern States affected by this bill, there were few contested elections. In my own State of Georgia, at the time of the November 1964 presidential election and on the same ballot with the presidential electors, 4 of 10 congressional seats were uncontested; 32 of 54 State senate seats were uncontested; 191 of 205 State house seats were uncontested, and 34 of 35 candidates for solicitor general were uncontested.

There were uncontested State elections for 37 superior court judges, 2 public service commissioners, 3 supreme court justices, and 2 appellate justices. Thus you see in Georgia that in our congressional, general assembly and statewide races 305 out of 348 State elections were uncontested.

Also on the ballots of the various counties were a total of more than 1,000 local officials such as county commissioners, city commissioners, mayors, clerks, ordinaries, and justices of the peace. While no figures are available to me at this time on the number of contested local races, I would estimate that there were no more than 25 of the more than 1,000 local elections.

It doesn't take a strong imagination to see how many more voters would have presented themselves to the polls in November 1964 if each of these thousands of posts were contested.

Let me return for a moment to the report of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting participation. Their study found that "it is no coincidence that the growth of the Republican Party in the South has impelled many more voters of both parties toward the polls."

This is true, but our Republican Party in Georgia is still weak. It is still struggling, but the progress of this struggling party has been remarkable.

In the 1960 presidential elections, there were only four congressional Republican candidates and very few local Republican candidates. The total vote in Georgia in this election was 728,759. In 1964 with the increase in the number of contests, both in congressional races and in local races, the total presidential vote rose to 1,139,352. An increase of 56 percent. My own district increased its congressional vote turnout by 43 percent over 1960 when given a good two-party fight in which to vote. By 1968, with the growth of the Republican Party in Georgia, I have no doubt that the figure will rise above 50 percent of those of voting age. But of course, under this bill which is based only upon the November 1964 election, Georgia would still be singled out as a State not having the right to determine its own voter qualification.

Let me point out one other fallacy in relating voting percentages to racial discrimination. The fallacy is that figures on voting age population do not actually reflect the number of persons who might be reasonably expected to vote. These figures include transients, noncitizens, military personnel, and others who would not normally vote in the areas where they are recorded. Now this may not make a significant difference in some areas, but in my district, the third congressional district of Georgia—the home of Fort Benning and Warner Robins Air Force Base—it makes a great deal of difference.

Let me cite the example of Chattahoochee County. In Chattahoochee County, only 4.4 percent of those of voting age voted in the 1964 presidential election. Surely, if the percentage of those voting is a valid criteria for racial discrimination, this county must be the most discriminatory county in the Nation.

But is this the case? There have been no complaints of racial discrimination in Chattahoochee County. What then is the situation? It is simply this: The military base of Fort Benning covers approximately three-fourths of the county. Included, therefore, in the voting-age population of Chattahoochee County are thousands of troops and students at the infantry school who do not vote there. So this county, which voted 86 percent of its registered voters in the 1964 election is credited with voting only 4.4 percent of those of voting age. The problem is compounded by the fact that even in so obvious a case of injustice, there can be no appeal from the census statistics. This is one more example of why I say that H.R. 6400 is based on an unsound, unfair formula.

Mr. Chairman, let me reiterate my position.

1. The right of an American citizen to vote is basic and must not be abridged because of race or color.

2. The present problem is not one of inadequate laws, but rather one of enforcement of the laws that we have. The problem is particularly one of delay in proceedings.

3. Any voting rights legislation should be aimed at speeding up proceedings and guaranteeing registration of all qualified voters throughout the country.

4. The granting of uncontrolled authority to the Attorney General and Federal registrars sets a dangerous precedent.

5. The fact that a State voted less than 50 percent of those eligible in the 1964 election is more likely to be caused by a one-party system rather than by discrimination under the 15th amendment.

Gentlemen, my closing plea is this: Do not attempt to end voting discrimination among the races by setting up deliberate discrimination among the States. Do not report favorably a bill that picks out one section of the country and treats it differently from all others. Remember, as the President said, that those affected by this bill still have to live and work together. Therefore, give us a bill that all responsible elements—North and South, Democrat and Republican, white and Negro—can support. By doing this you will see all States and all races united and working together to forever end voting discrimination wherever it is found.

Migrant Workers: A Learnable Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James J. Kilpatrick which appeared in a Miami newspaper of recent date:

MIGRANT WORKERS: A LEARNABLE LESSON—IF WE CAN GET BUREAUCRATS INTO ORANGE GROVES

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

In California, in Florida, and in a dozen other States, that employ migrant labor to harvest crops, a classic lesson is taking shape in the science of government and how it goes away.

This is textbook stuff; it teaches not one lesson, but a dozen—lessons in statecraft, in economics, in human nature. But the first lesson to be gained from this experience is that fact and theory are not necessarily close together. Sometimes fact and theory aren't even on speaking terms.

By way of background, it will be recalled that the so-called "Bracero law," which was Public Law 78 of the 82d Congress, was permitted to expire on December 31. Under this law, thousands of migrant laborers from Mexico and elsewhere were permitted to come to the United States on temporary permits as farm laborers. In some cases, especially in the beginning of the program, some of them almost surely were exploited. They were poorly housed and poorly paid. Conditions greatly improved, however, and the program was going well—so well that organized labor began to raise an effective cry that these aliens were taking jobs that American citizens should have.

Under these pressures, Public Law 78 was terminated. The admission of migrant farmworkers then reverted to the basic immigration statute, Public Law 414 of the 82d Congress. One of the provisions of this law is that before any migrants may be admitted, the Secretary of Labor must certify that qualified American workers are not available for the jobs. In the view of Secretary Wirtz, there are plenty of qualified American workers available—3 or 4 million of them, depending on who's counting the unemployed—and Mr. Wirtz is proving very stubborn about certifying migrants for admission this season.

In testimony before the Senate Agricultural Committee, Mr. Wirtz made a plausible case. He was backed by a number of union spokesmen whose arguments seemed equally tenable. After all, on paper it looks so reasonable: here are, say, 3,000 jobs picking fruit or cutting cane; and here are 3,000 men out of work. All that is required is to get the jobs and the men together; and if the rate of pay is not high enough, then raise the rate of pay to a point where the jobs become attractive.

Pretty theory; hard facts. Since the 1st of January, Mr. Wirtz, the employment service, and of course the growers themselves, have been recruiting American laborers at a desperate pace. Under the rules, the employer must put up money for bus transportation, tools, and equipment, and agree to pay minimum hourly wages of $1.15 to $1.40. This wage scale is from 20 to 55 cents higher than the 1964 scale.

The growers do not object strongly to this scale for efficient workers, who earn much

more on piecework anyway, but they object furiously to paying these rates to inexperienced drifters.

Sad to say, the growers have had mostly drifters to deal with. Of 74 unemployed men recruited for 1 date-picking assignment in California's Coachella Valley, only 4 were still on the job a month later. Of 97 men recruited for another assignment on January 1, only 11 were still there on February 15. Florida's Senator HOLLAND has cited the story of 1 cane grower in the glades who managed, after hard exertion and substantial expense, to round up 74 men to cut his crop. Forty-one of them took one look at the matted can and refused even to go into the fields; two others cut themselves with machetes; after 5 days, only four were still willing to work; then they quit, too.

No one denies that the labor is hard. It is stoop work, hoe work, ladder work. But it is work that Mexicans, Bahamians, Jamaicans, Japanese, and Filipinos are accustomed to; the money they earned was vital to them. By and large, unemployed American men are not accustomed to this labor; the thought of climbing a 45-foot ladder to pick dates gives them the willies; and they are shunning the jobs.

Meanwhile, other lessons emerge. A number of growers, especially of tomatoes and truck crops, have hesitated to plant this season, not knowing whether they will have labor to harvest. Bank loans tend to tighten up. Plants that process fruits and vegetables face a growing uncertainty that in turn affects their payrolls. And the loss amounts. "I have lost 500 to 800 boxes of oranges, at $2.35 per box," reported a Mrs. Collins in Lakeland, Fla., "because I could not get labor to harvest them. They fell to the ground and rotted." Mrs. Collins is a small grower. A typical large grower, the W. H. Clark Fruit Co., in Jacksonville, has abandoned 30,000 boxes of tangerines that have now "deteriorated beyond value."

The moral in all this is that social and economic problems cannot be solved overnight by political decree. If our Federal masters would learn this in the orange groves, they might usefully apply the lesson in other fields, too.

Davenport's Bendix Employees Contribute to Space Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the recent two-man Gemini space flight so successfully accomplished by our astronauts Grissom and Young was the culmination of the combined efforts of many of our country's finest manufacturers. I am justly proud of the Pioneer Central Division of Bendix Aviation in Davenport, Iowa, for its contribution to the instrumentation of the Gemini vehicle. The dedicated workers of Davenport's Bendix plant are a credit to our society. To allow my colleagues the opportunity to know more of this fine group of workers and their contribution, with unanimous permission I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Rock Island Argus of March 19, 1965.

ASTRONAUTS WILL DEPEND ON PIONEER CENTRAL INSTRUMENTS

DAVENPORT.—In their Gemini-Titan II space flight scheduled for Tuesday Astronauts Gus Grissom and John Young will depend on instruments developed by Davenport's Pioneer Central Division of the Bendix Corp.

According to George A. Lewthwaite, general manager of Pioneer Central, Grissom and Young will introduce a new era in spaceflight technology.

In the case of the Gemini, the pilot will have an essential part in the launch, orbital fight, and reentry. The rocket is not designed as was the Mercury, which was automatic in these respects.

Lewthwaite, said Bendix technicians in cooperation with the McDonnell Crew Station integration group, which has responsibility of representing the astronauts' viewpoint on all design decisions, gave this element emphasis.

Accurate semiautomatic equipment will be aboard, but as a complement for an intelligent and well trained astronaut. The Mercury capsule was controlled from earth.

Lewthwaite said Pioneer Central worked closely with McDonnell to provide flight instrumentation to meet the prime objective of simplicity, reliability and effectiveness in equipment design.

He explained that Pioneer Central has provided the longitudinal accelerometer which is one of several conditions considered in establishing the abort condition. Located directly under the abort signal light, it is the prime instrument during launch.

OTHER INSTRUMENTS

Lewthwaite said Grissom will depend on the accurate and reliable performance of other Bendix-supplied instruments, the altimeter, which performs the prime function during reentry, a rate of descent indicator and the emergency drogue switch.

Young will have the same instruments available to him so that either astronaut can perform essential flight functions.

Another phase of Pioneer Central participation is its supply of the optical liquid level sensor.

The sensor, according to Bendix officials, is used to measure the exotic rocket fuels of hydrazine and unsymmetrical dimethyl hydrazine as well as the fuel oxidizer, nitrogen tetroxide.

It is pointed out that there will be 22 sensors aboard the Titan II.

Technicians say specifications for the Titan II sensor required a completely new configuration designed to withstand severe vibration and shock and resist chemical erosion. A special light-emitting diode in the sensor is necessary to withstand these high vibration levels.

The Martin Co., Baltimore, has the overall program responsibility of the Titan II launch vehicle.

Why Bail Out the Communists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars are alert to the dangers of the Communist threat. Their director of national security and foreign affairs, Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, wrote for the March issue of the VFW magazine this persuasive discussion of the dangers which lie ahead if the United States embarks on the course of expanded trade with the Communists.

The article follows:

NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps (retired) director, national security and foreign affairs)

The growing rush of Western governments and commercial interests to do business with the Reds points to an alarming conclusion: Russia's soft talk is paying off—for the Kremlin.

Ever since the Communists came to power they have been plagued by economic problems. The reason for their difficulties is basic. Communism has flouted every moral and economic law. All is subordinated to the supreme Red goal of world domination. And that means, of course, the destruction of the United States and freedom everywhere.

How, then, have the Red rulers been able to keep the Communist system going, even making spectacular gains in weapons development and production? Because all else was sacrificed to achieving power for aggression against the United States and our free world friends.

Example: To build the industrial base for heavy armament production, the Kremlin deliberately shortchanged Russian agricultural requirements. The result was the agricultural mess with its repeated crises in Communist food production.

Thus, there has been a massive failure of the Communist system. It's what the free world had been saying and hoping would happen. Such a food failure could force the Kremlin to change tactics, to put its emphasis on bread instead of bombs. And the whole world would benefit.

But what did happen? The United States bailed the Kremlin out of its mess with our subsidized wheat. Of course, we did get paid. But, here's the key point: It was the product of our system, based on freedom and dignity of the individual, which the Kremlin is determined to destroy, that kept communism from paying the full penalty for its moral and economic sins.

The VFW was strongly opposed to the wheat deal. Events have continued to demonstrate the wisdom of our stand.

The wheat deal also did something else. It affirmed what the Communists had long suspected: that the free world would provide what communism needs. In recent months the Kremlin has expanded its shopping list and activities. From the free world it's getting even chemical plants.

This rush to make a profit out of trade with communism is pleasing to the Kremlin but it can't come as a real surprise. After all, it's just what Lenin said would happen. He told his followers not to be overly worried if they made economic mistakes: the capitalist countries would, in their desire for profit, make up communism's shortcomings and in so doing hasten their destruction.

Little wonder then that Communist rulers are moving so swiftly and deliberately in creating the technological and industrial base for advanced weapons for both nuclear and conventional warfare. The Kremlin bosses are certain that the free world—for a profit—will provide what communism needs.

For the free world profit seekers it will be, according to the Red plan, cash on the barrelhead today and heads on the chopping block tomorrow.

It's a strange twist: that the free world, condemned to destruction by the Reds refuses to let communism fail.

Mayor Puksta of Claremont Evokes Spiritual Heritage in Bicentennial Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last fall, when Congress was not in session, the city of Claremont, N.H., celebrated its bicentennnial. On that occasion, my good friend Mayor Charles P. Puksta issued a proclamation and message, both of which, in moving terms, evoke the sense of spiritual heritage that is woven through the fabric of our national life. At the bottom of all things, it is our spiritual foundations which have given life and meaning to America, a truth that often seems to be forgotten in this day of materialistic pursuits. It behooves every American and, in particular, those of us with responsibilities in the Government, not to forget. Mayor Puksta's words thus are timely and valuable. I am proud to call them to attention of the House as a sign that the people of my great State still honor this heritage even as they advance into the age of space.

The proclamation and message follow:

A PROCLAMATION CONCERNING THE CLAREMONT BICENTENNIAL

Whereas the founding of Claremont occurred on October 26, 1764; and

Whereas the founding settlers underwent extensive personal hardships and risk of life and fortunes in courageously battling the natural elements, and dangers of the wilderness, and hostile enemies to nurture the existence and the growth of the settlement of Claremont; and

Whereas residents of Claremont, through the years to the present time, have distinguished themselves before the peoples of this Nation and of the world in such vocations as engineering, agriculture, manufacturing, government, theatrics, medicine, religion, military service, and education, and in so doing have brought credit and honor to themselves and to our community; and

Whereas sons and daughters of Claremont have converted their visions into reality and, for us, have molded a heritage conceived through the continuous melding of their wisdom, their fortitude, their resourcefulness, their labors, their resolutions, and their faith; and

Whereas it is befitting that we should meditate on the sacrifices and hardships endured by our forefathers in protecting and passing to our generation the personal freedoms, the material benefits, the cultures, and the spiritual blessings we now enjoy, and, furthermore, that we should resolve to protect and to enhance these inheritances in passing them to the next generations: Now, therefore

I, Charles P. Puksta, mayor of the city of Claremont, N.H., do hereby proclaim the days of October 24, 25, and 26, 1964, as Claremont bicentennial days and call upon all citizens, industries, clergy, mercantile establishments, and public officials to arrange and participate in programs commemoratory of this occasion as may be appropriate.

CHARLES P. PUKSTA,
Mayor.

CLAREMONT BICENTENNIAL MESSAGE

(By Mayor Charles P. Puksta)

There is much to be learned from history. Many students of history are struck by the similarity they find between peoples and their environments in different periods of history.

I am sure many of you availed yourselves of the opportunity this bicentennial has provided to read the early history of the founding of Claremont. Much of that history has impressed me. One of the greater impressions was the degree in which religion formed the basis of the community life for our founding settlers and the role religion had in the development and growth of the Claremont community. The two were entwined so close that years and years passed before the records of the township were separated from the records of the church.

Our present city hall was developed in stages from the structure of a church. This development is displayed in a series of early photographs now on exhibit in a special bicentennial presentation in the council chamber in city hall.

As religion molded the lives of our founding settlers, so it must be the basis of our lives today. From their faith they drew the strength to hew our community out of a new world into which they had entered equipped only with a few bare material essentials and a clear intellect. With these they labored to adapt and apply the resources nature had provided in a virgin wilderness to fulfill their needs. Their inventiveness was born of their intellect. They used their intellect to provide for their physical preservation; to provide for their protection, for this was part of their preservation; and to govern their relations with one another for this, too, was part of their preservation.

Indeed, to them, morality, born of their church, was not a garment, like a party dress, to be adorned for personal appearance but, rather, a reality to be lived.

Our founders traveled for days and months to go from their Old World to their New World. Today we are on the verge of launching from our Old World into distant new worlds in the universe separated from our Old World also by days and by months. The similarity between the time of our founders and our time today is there to contemplate; only the environment is changed. The personal needs are still the same; namely, to provide; to preserve; to protect. The equipment required is also the same; a faith in God, a few material essentials, and a clear intellect.

This is a time of remembrance; this is also a time of resolution. Let us today resolve to follow the time-proven example of our founders and face the challenges of our day as they faced the challenges of their New World.

This is also a joyous occasion. So let us take one more lesson from the past. As our founders worshipped hard and worked hard, they also played hard. So, in this observance, let us be reverent, let us be dedicated, and let us be joyous.

Philadelphia Naval Shipyard Wins President's Citation for Cost Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues will recall past reports that the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard would be closed. Fortunately those of us who had been fighting long and hard to keep the shipyard open were able to prove conclusively to Secretary McNamara that it should remain open because of its excellent record of efficiency in the Nation's service.

I call the attention of my colleagues today to the outstanding record of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard employees in cutting costs—a record so fine that the yard has now been awarded a Presidential citation for its support of DOD cost reduction programs. The Philadelphia Naval Shipyard saved $27 million during fiscal year 1964, more than four times the amount assigned by the Bureau of Ships.

Mr. Speaker, employees of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard are entitled to a hearty vote of thanks for their important contribution not only to the Nation's defense but also to its economic well-being. I am inserting a clipping from the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard Beacon which tells of the recent much-deserved honor accorded to the Philadelphia yard.

Secretary McNamara's decision late last fall not to shut down the Philadelphia shipyard came as an unexpected but welcome surprise and appeared to bring with it an assurance that the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, for the first time in several years, is not in danger of abandonment in the immediate future.

With increasing frequency during the last 4 years the Defense Department has been reported ready to close the Philadelphia yard.

In the past 2 years Pennsylvania Congressmen waged a continual battle in Washington to save the yard but many were not optimistic about Philadelphia's chances to escape McNamara's list of 95 dying defense installations.

The Navy's shipyard complex is over 160 years old and reached its present level of 11 yards during World War II when public and private shipbuilding and ship repair facilities were greatly expanded.

The end of World War II brought a contraction in shipbuilding activity. Many private shipyards closed. The Defense Department reports that the Navy's 11 yards were only being utilized at 63 percent of capacity last June.

During World War II, employment in the Navy yards reached 353,000. Now it is about 85,000, with some 7,100 employed at Philadelphia.

McNamara in 1963 appointed a blue-ribbon Defense Department Shipyards Policy Board to determine the extent of excess shipyard capacity and recommend which naval shipyards should be closed. Reports circulated repeatedly indicating McNamara would close Philadelphia.

Shipyard employees and Philadelphia area Congressmen agreed that the shipyard had an excellent record and felt it could be saved if a clear presentation of the facts could be made to the Defense Department.

Assistance was obtained from the Pennsylvania Congressional Steering Committee, a bipartisan group of five

Pennsylvania Congressmen appointed by Governor Scranton to assist the State's interests in Washington.

In addition, James E. Van Zandt, special representative of Governor Scranton, Congressman JAMES A. BYRNE, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and I, as Pennsylvania members of the House Armed Services Committee, worked with the steering committee in numerous presentations to Defense Department officials in behalf of the shipyard.

Efforts of the group were aimed both at informing the responsible officials of the many factors in Philadelphia's favor, and attempting to obtain additional assignment work to the Philadelphia shipyard to prevent further employee layoffs.

Arguments in behalf of the yard were based on the simple fact that the Philadelphia shipyard has about the best record of performance and efficiency of any of the 11 naval shipyards.

The Defense Department special study completed last fall indicates that our arguments in Philadelphia's behalf were well founded.

The high-level study panel sought to close two yards on the east coast. It considered the yards at Philadelphia, Boston, Brooklyn, and Portsmouth, N.H.

The study group found that "Philadelphia stands out as the single best shipyard to retain under all factors evaluated, while Portsmouth and New York rate lowest as the shipyards warranting retention."

Next to Philadelphia, Boston was found the most desirable to retain because of its proximity to north Atlantic sailing routes and because its closing would produce the smallest cost savings.

The Defense Department study gave no indication of further shipyard closings in the foreseeable future. Needs were projected through 1972.

The fact that Philadelphia's retention was found even more desirable than that of another yard still left open was seen as an implied assurance that the immediate threat of closings has at long last been removed.

A number of Congressmen and I for long have sought to have the Navy provide the Philadelphia shipyard with the capability to overhaul nuclear submarines since this appears an important Navy function in the future which would help assure higher employment levels.

Although our efforts until last fall have not seemed to meet with success, the possibility of obtaining this additional responsibility at Philadelphia now seems greater.

The study group determined the Navy strategic need for three east coast shipyards capable of nuclear submarine overhaul. The yards at Portsmouth, Norfolk, and Charleston now have this capability but Portsmouth will be closed.

Philadelphia was the only east coast yard found by the study group in a position to readily acquire this nuclear capability with minor charges.

The article follows:

YARD WINS PRESIDENTIAL CITATION FOR COST REDUCTION

Philadelphia Naval Shipyard has won a Presidential Citation for its outstanding support of the Department of Defense cost reduction program.

The award was presented to the Shipyard Commander on March 10 by Rear Adm. W. F. Petrovic, Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Field Activities, at a management luncheon last week.

The shipyard was cited for its reported savings of $27 million during fiscal year 1964, an amount 400 percent above the goal assigned by the Bureau of Ships and without parallel in any other activity under Bureau of Ships management.

The citation reads:

"In special recognition of an outstanding contribution to greater economy and improvement in Government operations during the 10th anniversary year of the Federal incentive awards program." It is signed by the President.

Under the cost reduction program, savings had to be capable of documentation and measurement in terms of quantity, unit price and dollar value, and verifiable by audit.

Objectives of the program were: buying only what is needed, buying at the lowest sound price, and reducing operating costs.

To help achieve these objectives, a cost reduction organization was formed in September 1963 in the shipyard, headed by the comptroller, Capt. H. C. Milliren, as coordinator, assisted by J. J. Cona of the Internal Review Division. A representative of every department helped to coordinate the cost efforts within departments.

Extremists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, immediately after the President, in an unusual night appearance before a joint session of the Congress on March 15, requested the Congress to pass without delay his so-called voting rights bill, I made a brief statement. In that statement I pointed out not only the unconstitutionality of the proposal but its punitive provisions against certain States of the Union. I emphasized, among other things, that New York State, requiring certain educational qualifications, was exempt while several Southern States, among them my own Mississippi, would be punished by having its election machinery taken over by the Federal Government.

My brief statement was:

COLMER RAPS PRESIDENT'S VOTING RIGHTS BILL

It is difficult to comprehend how any student of the American Constitution and devotee of American institutions could endorse the so-called voting rights bill today submitted to the Congress by the White House. Obviously it was hastily conceived in an atmosphere of hysteria produced by a series of demonstrations, many of which were undoubtedly unlawful. Nothing as drastic, short of the occupation of the Southland by Federal troops at the conclusion of the unfortunate fratricidal War Between the States, has ever been proposed by a President of the United States.

The proposed bill is aimed at a particular section of the country and is, therefore, class and geographical legislation.

It proposes among other things that different criteria be set up for qualifications for voting in the different States of the Union. For instance, there are some 20-odd States whose election laws provide for certain educational qualifications. Among these are New York as well as several Southern States.

If this proposed bill is enacted into law a citizen of New York would be required to take a literacy test while a citizen of one of the affected States, at which the bill is aimed, would only have to show that he was a resident of the State, was of legal age and had not been convicted of a felony. To understand that the bill is unquestionably unconstitutional one need only to read article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States which provides, "The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." This provision was also carried forward in the election of U.S. Senators.

Moreover, this bill provides for the first time for Federal control of State primaries in all Federal and local State elections.

Of course, the proposal for Federal registrars is a flagrant, punitive and highly provocative assault upon the constitutional rights of the citizens of the States to conduct their own elections.

We have indeed arrived at a sad state of affairs when the Congress is requested to pass such far reaching and unconstitutional legislation. But possibly even more tragic is the fact that the so-called liberal complexion of the present Congress is such that this repugnant proposal, like all others that the President requests, will pass.

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—AN IMMORAL LAW

Being a Congressman from Mississippi, the current whipping boy, along with Alabama, of the false liberals I recognized that I would be suspected of bias.

However, on March 22 the Wall Street Journal, certainly no extremist or suspect of regional views, carried a most scathing attack upon the President's voting rights proposal under the title "Review and Outlook—An Immoral Law."

The editorial is as follows:

When President Johnson last Monday asked Congress for a new law to safeguard the voting rights of Negro citizens he rested his case on the Constitution and on a basic principle of morality.

What he has now proposed that the Congress do is enact a law which would violate that Constitution he asks us not to flout and, more, which is itself immoral.

If you think not so, consider:

The administration bill offers a formula—a complicated one, which we will come to in a moment—to prohibit certain States from using any test of a citizen's ability to read and write our language as a qualification for voting.

The argument for doing this is the 15th amendment to the Constitution, which provides, clearly enough, that neither the Federal Government nor any State shall deprive a citizen of his vote "on account of" his race or color.

But the proposed bill does not stop with providing means against the violation of the 15th amendment. It does not aim at insuring that any such State literacy test shall be fairly drawn and impartially administered so that it may not be used as an excuse to deprive anyone of his vote "on account of" his race.

The effect—and indeed the purpose—would be to abolish such tests entirely in the affected States. And that flies squarely in the face of this self-same Constitution which the President professes to uphold.

The very first article of that Constitution authorizes the individual States to decide the qualifications of voters in both Federal and State elections, subject only to the proviso that whoever is deemed qualified to vote

for "the most numerous branch of the State legislature" is automatically qualified to vote in Federal elections.

Making this a State function was no casual decision. It was reaffirmed in identical language in the 17th amendment—adopted, incidentally, more than 40 years after the 15th amendment, which provided that all such qualifications should be impartially applied among all citizens.

This principle in the Constitution has been repeatedly upheld and affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, not merely in dusty antiquity but as recently as 1959 by judges presently sitting upon that bench.

Now we are well aware that there are a good many people, and perhaps the President is included, who oppose any literacy requirement. They say that a man's illiteracy is irrelevant to the question of having his judgment counted in public affairs. No man can quarrel with the right of such people to argue their case and, if persuasive, to alter the Constitution so as to prohibit them.

But the requirement that voters be able to read and write is by no means restricted to those Southern States now the object of this special legislation. Many others—including New York State—require that qualification, as the Constitution entitles them to do.

If it is immoral, as the President says, to deprive a qualified citizen of his right to vote "under color of a literacy test," is it moral to violate one part of the Constitution under the color of upholding another which is in no wise in conflict?

Nor does the question end there, for what this bill proposes to do is to set up a double standard. Some States would be permitted to keep their literacy requirement. Others would not.

The formula prescribed is that of a ratio between the number of persons of voting age within a State and the number of voters in an election. If 50 percent or more of the voting age inhabitants do vote, then the State is absolved. The Federal authorities will keep out, and the State may set its own qualifications for voters, including literacy tests. Otherwise, no.

The formula has been carefully devised so that in practice it is expected to apply only to six States, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia. In these States the Federal authorities would not only have the right to supervise voter registration but to abolish the voter qualifications they don't like.

A few moments reflection on this formula will suggest such weird paradoxes, and the possibility of such strange discriminations, as to stagger the mind.

A minor one is that a strict application of a formula would probably make it applicable to Alaska. However, a way has been devised to exempt it, which as much as anything suggests that the intent is not to write a general rule of law but to subject certain States to special laws.

Not so minor, but certainly weird, is the provision that a person once registered as a voter by the Federal authorities will be stricken from the list if he fails to vote "at least once during 3 consecutive years while listed." In short, you have to vote or you can't.

Of more consequence is the fact that if we have this law a citizen, white or Negro, can be entitled to a vote in Alabama no matter how illiterate he is, or for that matter even if he is a moron. But if the same citizen, white or Negro, lives in New York State he will not be entitled to vote.

This would create a truly ingenious paradox. The illiterate citizen, Negro or otherwise, would find himself with more "rights" in Alabama and her five outcast sister States than in the great State of New York. More, the educational level of the voting citizens of Alabama, the low level of which is part of the general complaint against it by civil rights leaders, would be further reduced. And this by Federal sanction.

Unfortunately, the irony is not funny. Beneath the paradox lies a serious question. Is it moral that our national laws should apply one rule to one State and another to another, requiring that the people of one State abolish qualifications for voters while the people of another State may uphold their standards?

It makes no difference whether 99 percent of his neighbors vote or whether only 20 percent do. It makes no difference whether he has voted in the last three elections, or in none at all before he presents himself at the polls. His right is to vote or not vote as he pleases.

That is the whole of the moral issue. And the whole duty of Government, insofar as it touches this matter, is to see that all equally can exercise this right.

The constitutional duty of the Federal Government is to see that this right is not abridged—anywhere, populous States or sparse States, Northern States or Southern States, where many go to the polls or where few take the trouble to. The means of assuring this—everywhere—is what any Federal voting law ought to do, and all it ought to do.

To play with complicated formulas, to measure justice by percentages, and to aim punitive laws at some States, not only violates both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution but buries the real moral question in sophistry.

Nor is that the end of the consequences of that weird formula. Recall that it permits the Federal Government to put all this machinery in motion, the takeover of the whole voting procedure by Federal authorities, only when the voting percentage of a State falls below 50 percent of the voting age population. If there was ever a device open to what President Johnson calls manipulation, this is it.

So long as a State contrives that one-half of its adults vote, it is free of the formula. This will not be overlooked by ingenious men who can contrive many things when justice is measured by percentages.

And this brings us to what we think is the fundamental immorality of this proposed law, unintended though it may be by those who drew it.

Any citizen, white or Negro, has the right to be treated by the law like all other citizens. If he has to meet qualifications to vote—age or any other—they must be only the qualifications asked of all. If he qualifies like any other he has the right to vote, and to deny him that right is to deny him what is inalienably his.

Following this on March 29 another highly respected publication, the U.S. News & World Report, in an editorial by its editor, David Lawrence, under the title "Bowing to the New Extremists," made even another strong assault upon the proposal.

Mr. Lawrence's editorial is as follows:

BOWING TO THE NEW EXTREMISTS

(By David Lawrence)

The Government of the United States appears to have bowed to a new set of extremists.

The President, in an emotional address to a joint session of both Houses of Congress, described in general terms an unprecedented piece of legislation on voting rights and demanded that it be promptly passed. The text of the bill, however, wasn't even made public until later in the week. Members of the Supreme Court, attired in their judicial robes, sat in the front row in the House Chamber during the proceedings and joined in the applause for the President's speech.

The sweeping proposals which the President virtually ordered Congress to pass were pressured by street demonstrations, violent and nonviolent, sit-ins and lie-ins in many parts of the country and even inside the White House, as well as the Capitol, and other Federal buildings. All this was designed to stampede the Chief Executive and Congress to brush aside the Constitution and to accept the extremist doctrine that "the end justifies the means." The tactics of the demonstrators triumphed.

The Constitution explicitly gives to each State the power to determine the qualifications of voters in national, State, and local elections. The Constitution also declares that the right of citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of race or color.

The new proposal arbitrarily singles out those States in the Union which, on November 1, 1964, happened to have registered less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age residing in the State or in any political subdivision, or in which less than 50 percent of such residents voted in the presidential election last November.

This is a statistical yardstick which would automatically adjudge as guilty of discrimination a State which had used any literacy test if in such a State less than half of the population of voting age had been registered to vote or if "any person acting under color of law" had in the previous 10 years engaged in any act denying the right to vote because of race or color.

An appeal to a three-judge court—only in Washington—would be allowed. Instead of the usual presumption of innocence for a defendant, the bill would establish a presumption of guilt for the suspected State or county. The governmental body not only would have to prove that it was not guilty of an act of discrimination on a specific date but also of any other such act on any other date in the preceding 10 years.

The bill, moreover, would strike down in those States any "test or device" that may have been used in past years, even though State laws may have sought to establish whether or not an applicant had the ability to read and write, or may have prescribed some other standard test of literacy such as the Supreme Court of the United States itself upheld as recently as 1959.

To select certain States or areas and apply one kind of law to them while permitting other States and subdivisions to be immune from such interference is a conspicuous violation of the Constitution.

The whole controversy has revealed a disregard of basic constitutionalism. It is motivated by the reasoning of those who have argued that two wrongs make a right. It grows out of the rationalization, which so many people are making today, that, because injustices have been committed and discrimination has once been practiced on a wide scale in certain areas of the country, it is permissible now to diminish the rights of the States themselves.

Have we come to the point where the Congress of the United States may decide on whether a State will be permitted to remain in the Union? Have we reached a position where the national legislative body will do again what it did 100 years ago after the War Between the States had ended? The same State legislatures which had ratified the 13th amendment, abolishing slavery, were suddenly declared illegal by Congress when they rejected the 14th amendment. New legislatures were ordered to assemble and in some instances Federal troops were sent into the legislative chambers to compel "ratification" of the 14th and later the 15th amendment.

This was what happened in the Reconstruction period in American history. Are we to go through another such tragic era because of the submissiveness of both a Congress and a President to the dictates of pres-

sure groups whose emotional demonstrations cause friction and disorder?

It is a sad story. Organized incitement to violence has swept many areas of the country. To yield to such demonstrations is to weaken the whole fabric of democracy and to encourage mobocracy.

It is a time for the processes of reason to supersede the hysteria of impassioned groups of citizens. For, granting that they have been unjustly treated, are there no ways to accomplish effective reforms except by violent demonstrations and a distortion of the basic provisions of the Constitution? Or must we continue to bow to the new extremists?

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge my colleagues in both the House and the Senate not to permit themselves to be stampeded in this emotional and hysterical atmosphere into enacting this unwise, punitive, and unconstitutional legislation. I make this appeal not as a Mississippian, not as a southerner, but as an American who respects and has repeatedly taken the oath in this House to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Texas Is Big in Fashion Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post yesterday, March 28, there appeared an article concerning the garment industry in Dallas. I feel that this article is of such importance that it should be brought to the attention of the Members.

While the writer only mentioned several of the plants located there, I wish to point out to the membership that there are many similar plants for the visitor to Dallas to see.

The article follows:

TEXAS IS BIG IN FASHION MARKET TOO

(By Ruth Wagner)

DALLAS, TEX.—The story of fashion in Texas is the boom story of the whole Southwest.

Fashion showings held here last week feature everything from budget priced playclothes to costumes retailing for several hundred dollars and beaded evening gowns tagged as high as $1,000. But only a few years ago, Dallas was known as the capital of housedress manufacture.

Today, the cheap cotton housedress is unknown. In its place, Dallas ships out by the thousand, shifts, shirtdresses and sheaths, all designer-styled or at least copied from recognized designers. At the moment, activity is high in dark-toned "transition" cottons, destined to be seen not in the kitchen but on city streets.

The hub of all the activity is the Apparel Mart, a huge building the size of two city blocks and constructed in the approved contemporary southwestern style of architecture. It was opened only last October.

The entrance lobby, wide as a city street, is paved with marble and leads past a brooding trio of dark modern statues and a bank of escalators to an enclosed central courtyard that extends upward the full four stories of the building.

This court, surrounded by curved walls covered in lumpy white accoustical plaster is filled with fountains, tropical plants, and piped-in music.

Overlooking it on each of the four floors are balconies with conversation groupings of low leather-covered chairs.

Away from the central courtyard on two sides extend corridors lined with shiny showrooms, in which are displayed not only the wares of the Dallas apparel manufacturers, but those of many California and New York houses as well, plus those of many fabric manufacturers.

Each showroom is decorated in a different style (colonial, Victorian, Danish modern, Hong Kong wicker, etc.) and contains chummy little arrangements of chairs and tables where coffee can be served and buyers can write orders.

Everything is geared to hospitality, charm, and a leisurely pace. And it is this atmosphere which has brought 75,000 department store buyers from the Southwest, Midwest, and South during the past year. Why should they travel to New York City, fight their way between Seventh Avenue's pushcarts and wait for elevators to ascend to crowded showrooms in grimy skyscrapers when they can be welcomed to Dallas with open arms?

Many former Seventh Avenue denizens have also immigrated to Dallas.

"This is the life for me," confided one elderly veteran of many years on the Avenue. After 15 years here, he has slowed down, improved his health, and gotten richer. "The pace is even slower than in California, but who needs to hurry that much? We produce plenty."

A crew-cut sales manager in his midtwenties remembers New York without regret. "I made 80 bucks a week and spent $1.50 a day to gulp a tuna fish sandwich and a cup of coffee," he said. "Here I can eat lunch almost all week for $1.50."

He also has an apartment in one of the many new high-rise towers that dot the landscape, and has discovered a friendly supply of pretty girls, who aren't all trying to outdo each other in the career race.

There is a huge labor market here, and the manufacturers have banded together to set up a school to train workers, both white and Negro, in the use of the single-needle machine, the most vital tool in clothing manufacture.

One of the oldest firms is Nardis of Dallas, which makes smart sportswear here and also has a subsidiary in Hong Kong for beaded and embroidered creations.

Another is Lorch, whose young vice president, Lorch Folz, looks like a college boy but acts like an energetic executive.

Others are Mike Benet Formals, makers of gowns for many a high school prom; Bogart Sportswear, run by a new Texan who was a European refugee; Miller-Randazzo, whose principals recently came from New York; Tribute, specializing in half sizes; Clifton Wilhite, famous for evening wear, and Charles Dickey, a couture-type house with considerable style.

The market also includes makers of children's clothes, uniforms, hats, and lingerie.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussians are one of the little known Slavic peoples whose homeland in the northwest of Russia and east of Poland has been part of the Russian Empire for centuries. These sturdy and stouthearted people, never numerous or strong enough to cope with their more powerful foes, the Russians in the east and the Poles in the west, had been overwhelmed by the Russians. For centuries they endured all sorts of hardships under the czarist regime, and when that regime was no more, they then saw their chance to attain their national goal early in 1918.

On March 25 of that year Byelorussian leaders proclaimed Byelorussia's independence of Russia and established the Byelorussian Republic. They formed their own democratic government, began rebuilding their war-torn country and were doing their utmost to rebuild the shattered fabric of their social, economic, and political life. At the outset they were faced with the numerous insurmountable difficulties, and the defenses of the country were in a sad state, wholly inadequate to protect it against its powerful foes. It became an easy prey for the Red army of Communist Russia late in 1918, and thus the Byelorussian people enjoyed their freedom for only a very brief period before they were robbed of it.

But the idea of freedom has nver deserted the Byelorussian people, and they still cling to it in the firm hope that some day they will attain it in their historic homeland. Nearly half a century of Soviet domination has not caused despair among the Byelorussians; they still feel that since theirs is a righteous and sacred cause, it will in the end win out against Communist totalitarianism. On the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian independence let us all hope and pray that their just cause will prevail against the forces of Communist oppression.

Halstead Industries, of Wynne, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Arkansas are justly proud of their efforts to bring industry to the State and to provide increasing numbers of job opportunities.

The city of Wynne, Ark., located in Cross County, has been a farming center and continues to serve growers of cotton, rice, and soybeans with livestock growing in importance. But, in addition, the local citizens, through their industrial development program, have attracted to their community plants and processing companies. One of these is the Halstead Metal Products, Inc., of Zelienople, Pa.

On March 25 this article appeared in many of the newspapers of the South, and I believe that it will be of general interest to the Members as an illustration of the growing industrialization of Arkansas:

HALSTEAD INDUSTRIES OF WYNNE, ARK.

WYNNE, ARK.—Just before dawn one morning early this week, the largest single load of copper tubing ever shipped left a mill at

Wynne headed for a refrigeration equipment plant 150 miles away at Grenada, Miss. The size and type of this load and its potential economic impact on these small communities made it unusual in several respects.

Produced at the Halstead Metal Products plant of Halstead Industries at Wynne, the shipment consisted of 202,000 pounds of copper tubing carried in a special arrangement of high side gondolas. Each piece of tubing was 1⅝ inches in diameter and about 130 feet long.

No conventional railroad car or truck could accommodate such straight lengths. So Halstead, working with the Missouri Pacific Railroad and the Illinois Central, used two 65-foot gondola cars end to end, dropped the ends of the cars where they coupled, and unitized them so that the result was one car capable of handling a 130-foot-long straight tube.

This week's shipment was the third use of this unusual double gondola in the last 6 weeks. In that time, about 500,000 pounds of the long length copper tubes have been shipped from Halstead at Wynne to a customer plant at Grenada for further processing and assembly into components for refrigeration systems.

Because of handling and transport equipment limitations, copper tubing is normally cut and shipped in either 20-foot straight lengths or coiled. Availability of these 130-foot straight lengths is designed to cut tubing costs, and minimize and simplify further processing and handling of the tubing by the customer.

Each 130-foot length weighs about 231 pounds. Thus the largest shipment of 202,000 pounds amounted to over 21 miles of copper tubing. At the plant in Grenada, this tubing is further drawn to a diameter of three-eighths inch, resulting in the equivalent of over 447 miles of tubing.

These shipments have another unique aspect in that they represent the first significant processing by private industry of refined copper recently released from the Federal Government's stockpiles.

About 2 million pounds of this stockpile were sold to Halstead specifically for processing at Wynne. As a result, this small southwest community is a major beneficiary of the program that began last December when the General Services Administration announced the sale to industry of 20,000 tons of refined copper to help alleviate the raw material shortages the industry faces.

The efforts of several prominent Congressmen helped to target some of this copper to Wynne, to directly solve a community problem there. A town of 6,000 about 45 miles west of Memphis, Wynne is typical of many farm communities that have started industrial development programs to create jobs for the oversupply of labor caused by farm mechanization.

Halstead Industries was attracted to Wynne by this labor supply and started construction on the 150,000-square-foot tube mill here 2 years ago. The firm's headquarters and main plant are at Zelienople, Pa., 30 miles north of Pittsburgh.

In 1963 copper producers were able to assure the company that raw materials would be available as required. But the drying up of this country's available raw copper supply changed that. About 60 people are now employed at the $3.5 million plant at Wynne. Expansion plans and the continued availability of copper could put as many as 500 to 600 to work at the mill.

Up through December, Halstead was trucking about 300,000 to 500,000 pounds of copper ingots to the Arkansas tube mill per month. But this was not sufficient to effectively put the tooling to work. The firm estimates that about 10 million pounds per month would keep the plant operating near its present capacity.

In seeking relief for the plant and the area's plight, Halstead Metal Products applied to the Defense Material Division of the GSA for priority in the purchase of copper to be released.

Representative E. C. GATHINGS, Democrat, First District of Arkansas, was a major supporter of these efforts. He indicated that the low operating level at Wynne had been costing the company and the Government about $70,000 per month in fixed overhead costs because of the lack of raw material. Failure to secure this copper, he added, might necessitate mothballing the plant.

Coupled with major efforts by Arkansas Senators FULBRIGHT and MCCLELLAN, and Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, who helped to secure an additional 500,000 pounds for processing at the Zelienople plant, a measure of temporary economic relief has been provided to the Wynne, Ark., area.

Britain's Unhappy Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the March 2, 1965, issue of the Chicago Tribune:

BRITAIN'S UNHAPPY DOCTORS

Britain's national health service faces the threatened resignation of its 23,000 family doctors and many of its 10,000 dentists. They have grown increasingly unhappy over the low rate of pay the Government gives them, the large amount of trivial or unnecessary work they are called upon to perform, and the lack of time and incentive to improve their own skill.

These complaints are reflected also in the large number of British doctors who migrate every year and the alarmingly inadequate number of young Englishmen who decide to go into the field of medicine.

What is happening in Britain demonstrates the danger of assuming that government medical insurance is something that can simply be grafted onto existing social security programs. It takes only two to make old-age or unemployment insurance work: the government and the applicant for assistance. The applicant either qualifies or he doesn't. If he does, he gets his money and the program has fulfilled its purpose.

No program for medical care could survive if it depended only on regulations and money. It can't survive without the willing support and cooperation of the doctors. If the doctors are unhappy with a program, it may struggle along for a time as Britain's is doing, and the average patient may find it satisfactory. But sooner or later it will have to be adjusted to appeal to the doctors or it will inevitably collapse.

In spite of Britain's troubles, our own administration is pushing doggedly ahead with a medical program apparently designed primarily to please the planners themselves. It will be disappointing to a great many of the people who are counting on it to help them, and it is actively opposed by most doctors. The American Medical Association has proposed an alternative plan which it calls eldercare.

Nevertheless administration leaders are so sure that their bill will pass that they haven't even deigned to tell us what is wrong with the doctors' plan, if indeed they have any intelligent criticism of it. This is no way to win the support of the people whose support is so important to the success of any medical program, even one as limited in scope as Mr. Johnson's. Does the administration really believe that doctors are expendable and can be replaced with civil service clerks in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare?

State Corporation Commission of Kansas Adopts Resolution Calling for Repeal of Excise Tax on Communications Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, because it is my contention that one of the wartime excise taxes which should be repealed is the tax on telephone service and other vital communications services, I have introduced legislation for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of this 10-percent tax.

I am pleased, therefore, to receive a resolution from the State Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas memorializing the Congress to repeal this same tax.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I respectfully urge my colleagues to study this resolution and to give attention to the cogent reasons set forth in the language of the resolution as to why the tax should be repealed.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION BEFORE THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

Whereas users of telephone communication services have been and are now subjected to a Federal excise tax; and

Whereas said tax was adopted during World War II to discourage the use of the telephone communications system for purposes unrelated to the successful prosecution of war, and to raise revenue therefor; and

Whereas the manifest intention of Congress was to adopt said tax as a wartime expedient for limited purposes and for a limited life; and

Whereas the war and emergency conditions which made necessary the imposition of said tax have long since ended; and

Whereas in the absence of those vital adjustments which war makes necessary, said tax is unjust and discriminatory in that telephone communication is a necessity and is the only such necessity used by the public in the prosecution of its daily personal and business affairs subjected to such a tax; and

Whereas this commission, having due regard for its statutory duty and moral obligation to insure to the public of this State adequate and efficient telephone communications service at the lowest possible cost, is of the firm conviction that said tax is inimical to the public interest and the functions of this commission: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to repeal said tax on communications services; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized by forwarding copies of this resolution to the Kansas congressional delegation, to the Ways and Means

Committee of the House of Representatives, and to the Senate Finance Committee, and that copies hereof be sent to the Federal Communications Commission, the several State regulatory commissions, to the secretary of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners and to the telephone companies operating in the State of Kansas.

By the commission it is so ordered.

RAYMOND B. HARVEY,
Secretary.

The Closing of Veterans Facilities and Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, for more than a month now, hearings have been underway before the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives concerning the Executive order closing certain veterans facilities and hospitals.

As Congressman at Large for the State of Ohio, I am sorry to note that the regional office of the Veterans' Administration is contemplated to be closed. This closing, in my humble judgment, will have a serious and disabling effect upon the service rendered to veterans in my State and, further, this order closes what is known as the Broadview Heights Hospital at Broadview Heights, Ohio. I certainly feel that there is no justification for this closing and that it is being proposed notwithstanding the staggering waiting list of veterans who seek medical treatment in VA facilities.

I attach, Mr. Speaker, the statement I made March 26, 1965, before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on this subject.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. SWEENEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, CONGRESSMAN AT LARGE, FOR THE STATE OF OHIO BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. Chairman and members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to your committee for the opportunity being afforded me here today of appearing before you in connection with the decision of the Veterans' Administration to close the veterans hospital at Broadview Heights, Ohio.

As Congressman at Large for the State of Ohio, I am particularly concerned about this decision as it affects veterans in my State and I wish to direct my remarks specifically to the decision to close the Broadview Heights Hospital.

In my State, as in the Nation, this decision has precipitated much attention and discussion and there has been great speculation with respect to the impact this closing would have on the broad medical program of the Veterans' Administration insofar as Ohio was concerned. I strongly submit that the program to close veterans facilities that has been initiated is but an economy measure, ordered in the name of economy by the agency head in response to the direction of the Bureau of the Budget.

Upon receipt of the Administrator's public relations release with regard to the VA program in Ohio, I was moved to support the Administrator's decision to close this particular facility, as the release suggested that this facility was in fact surplus and that it would be economically unwise to continue its operation.

With all respect to the agency and its personnel, the original propaganda release was excellent, but most incomplete. While the propagandist for the agency made pious claim that this decision was being made to effect a better public understanding of the VA program and what the agency is doing throughout its system, it very clearly and most intentionally masked over the fact that existing Veterans' Administration facilities in the State of Ohio were not doing the job for the veterans of northeastern Ohio, and the additional fact that there is a backlog and waiting list in excess of 500 veterans waiting for hospital beds in veterans facilities in my State.

In the light of such propaganda, is it any wonder that the distinguished Senator from Montana, the majority leader of the other body, reacts violently to this agency decision.

I, too, feel compelled to reverse my original feeling of support and oppose this closing as I was originally advised that, of the 92 some-odd veterans being treated at the facility that was being considered for closing, 18 of this number would be transferred to the Brecksville Neuropsychiatric Hospital and the balance would be transferred to nearby veterans facilities.

This was most reassuring, as on this basis a great case could be made in support of the Administrator's decision. However, since the receipt of that memoranda, I have had an opportunity to read the transcript of Dr. Joseph H. McNinch, Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, when he appeared before this committee on February 23, and again on February 25. In that testimony, Dr. McNinch advised the committee that on occasions there are as high as 240 eligible veterans waiting on lists for beds at the Neuropsychiatric Hosital at Brecksville—which has a capacity of 994 beds.

Dr. McNinch again testified that there were over 308 eligible veterans as of December 1, 1964, awaiting admittance to the Cleveland Veterans Hospital, which has a bed capacity of 800. I cannot, in good conscience, support a decision to close a Veterans' Administration hospital in a district of some 477 beds, and to reassign 92 patients presently in that hospital, when there is a waiting list of some 500 plus veterans seeking medical treatment.

It is incomprehensible that the Veterans' Administration would suggest that the veterans of northern Ohio be directed for treatment all over the United States, encountering traveling expenses and in an ailing condition, before they could receive care, while we have a veterans hospital at our door. This decision would result in veterans of northeastern Ohio being sent to Butler, Pa.; Coatesville, Pa.; Dearborn, Mich.; and Downell, Ill., to receive the treatment that the Government has guaranteed them. I believe that Dr. McNinch's testimony before this committee not only confirms that it would be unwise to close this particular hospital, but that it would be inconsistent with good medical judgment.

I sincerely believe that the Veterans' Administration ought to turn this facility into a nursing care, domiciliary institution. This would free beds in both the Cleveland and the Brecksville hospitals and would permit veterans whose conditions are somewhat static to be transferred nearby to this new domiciliary-type institution.

I do not support the plan that the Veterans' Administration ought to be patronizing outside nursing homes in northeastern Ohio, when they can retain a facility of their own for this use which would be ideal by way of location and service.

I believe that a survey should be undertaken to determine whether or not Ohio veterans who are undergoing care in other places would prefer to come back to Broadview Heights, Ohio, for treatment and to be closer to their homes and their loved ones.

The ill-advised decision to close this hospital has caused a mad scramble in Ohio by State, county, local, and private authorities, all of whom are interested in taking over this splendid facility. Each interest that is petitioning for this hospital has a very meritorious plan in mind for its use. Without gettting into the respective merits of each proposal, I am prone to point out that the veterans who have fought in the defense of this land in all its wars have an absolute priority of entitlement on this institution.

This hospital is located in one of the most expanding areas of the Nation. The growth potential of this area is immense. The need for greater veterans' facilities can be clearly foreseen.

My conscience does not permit me to overlook those veterans who are suffering and—yes—dying on waiting lists and who are being overlooked by this decision to close this hospital.

This is the 100th anniversary of the second inauguration of President Lincoln, and I believe that the Administrator of the Office of Veterans Affairs would do well to address himself to the closing paragraph of President Lincoln's remarks on that occasion, to the effect:

"Let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle."

I quite understand the effort being advanced here in Washington to economize. I quite understand the President's budgetary position, and I sympathize with his efforts and the efforts of the VA Administrator to hold down the cost of Federal expenditures; but, I respectfully suggest to this administration that there must certainly be some other area of Federal spending that can be trimmed without taking it out of the veterans' budget.

This Nation has a moral commitment on this subject which must be fulfilled without equivocation. In short, I do not join in the Administrator's conclusion that the VA is affording fair medical service to the Ohio veterans by this proposal.

Thank you very much.

Stewart Philosophic on Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. J. George Stewart, was the subject of a feature article in the February 27 issue of the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal.

In view of some of the unfair criticisms that have been leveled at him I feel it is only just that he receive due recognition in an objective article:

STEWART PHILOSOPHIC ON CRITICS

(By Tom Greer)

J. George Stewart might be called a stormy petrel in the rough seas of Washington's power politics.

As Capitol Architect—the post he has held since 1954—Stewart has incurred the opposition of some of the Nation's most powerful

lawmakers and opinion molders. So far, he has weathered the storms, rolled with the waves and come bobbing up, undaunted by heavy assaults aimed at his professional abilities.

He was appointed to the lifetime, $15,000-a-year post by President Dwight D. Eisenhower upon the retirement of David Lynn, who was Capitol Architect for many years. According to press reports of August 1954, Stewart was recommended for the job by Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Williams said recently he did not recommend Stewart, and the Capitol Architect agreed that Williams did not. According to Stewart, he was recommended to Eisenhower by Republican leaders of both the House and the Senate.

Such notables as Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and Donald Cantry, senior editor of the Architectural Forum, have been loud and vehement in denouncing Stewart's architectural talents and capabilities. This opposition apparently has not bothered Stewart in the slightest.

"When you have about 500 bosses, you can't expect to please them all," is his philosophical reply to questions about his reaction to criticism. "I don't do anything I'm not told to do," he said.

Born in Wilmington in 1890, Steward finished grade and high school here and attended the University of Delaware, 1907–10. He played football at Wilmington High School for 4 years and at the university for 3. He never lost his love of athletics and from 1931–34 served as a member of the Delaware Athletic Commission.

Stewart left the university in his junior year to enter the contracting firm, Stewart & Donahue, Inc., which his father helped found. Nearly 50 years later, in 1958, the University of Delaware conferred upon Stewart a B.S. degree in engineering.

Stewart & Donahue, of which he later became president, was at one time called the largest contracting company south of Philadelphia. Much stone and brick work, including bridges, roads, houses, and landscape features on farms, estates, and public lands in the Wilmington area was designed and supervised by the company.

Stewart was elected Delaware's U.S. Representative in 1934. During his single term in Congress, he served as a member of the House Committees on Rivers and Harbors and on Indian Affairs.

He lost in a try for reelection in 1936, a Democratic landslide year. "I voted for the Social Security Act," Stewart said of his defeat, "and I think that may have had something to do with my failure to win reelection."

He returned to Wilmington and resumed work with Stewart & Donahue until 1942, when the company was dissolved and its equipment sold. Stewart then joined Hercules Powder Co., for which he did technical fieldwork in construction and engineering and the application of naval stores.

In January 1944, he moved to Florida, where he studied for and qualified as a real estate broker, took out a license and engaged in that business for about 2 years. During that same period he also worked as an engineering and real estate consultant.

Stewart next returned to Washington in 1947 when he was named a member of the staff of the Senate District of Columbia Committee by the late Senator C. Douglass Buck, chairman.

He stayed with the committee until 1951 when the post was abolished.

He was named director of the Republican National Committee's speaker's bureau in 1953 and became Architect of the Capitol the following year. Meanwhile, he had served as an engineering consultant to the Justice Department and the Corps of Engineers.

Among the so-called monuments to Stewart are new Senate and House Office Buildings, the newly completed controversial Rayburn Building and improvements to the east front of the Capitol. His recent projects included overseeing the installation of improved lighting and air conditioning and refurbishing in the Library of Congress, and modernization of the Capitol Power Plant.

These accomplishments have not come about without sharp criticism and frequent opposition from some leading figures on Capitol Hill.

Senator DOUGLAS has called Stewart "the most expensive, most wasteful, most incompetent architect whom we could possibly engage." DOUGLAS roundly criticized Stewart for allowing a third House Office Building to be built without connecting doors between the offices of Representatives and the space occupied by their staffs.

Senator PROXMIRE has opposed Stewart's retaining the office of Architect of the Capitol.

The magazine, Architectural Forum, has raked Stewart over the coals for presuming to "own" the Capitol.

But the former Representative from Delaware has, so far, come through these engagements with his job still intact. Once the Senate shouted down by voice vote an effort to withhold the budget for the Architect of the Capitol—typical of the support Stewart has managed to mount whenever his post has been threatened.

An article in the January 1965 Reader's Digest, "Colossal New Palace on Capitol Hill," by James E. Roper, criticized the new Rayburn Building severely, calling it a "monstrosity" and purporting to point out shortcomings in its design and alleged exorbitant costs of its construction.

Shortly after publication of the magazine, Stewart issued a 12-page answer to the charges.

Stewart is the eighth man to hold the post of Architect of the Capitol. He likes to say that he is the second Delawarean to occupy the position since the office was established in 1793. He cites William Thornton—who won the competition for the design of the Capitol in 1792 and supervised its construction from 1794–1802—as the other Capitol Architect from Delaware. The basis for Stewart's contention is that Thornton, who was born in the Virgin Islands, became a U.S. citizen in Delaware in 1788.

Stewart spends much of his time in Washington but maintains a voting residence in Hollywood, Fla.

He says he has no immediate plans to retire but guesses he will "wear out someday" and have to quit. Meanwhile, he enjoys fishing in Florida about once a year and an occasional game of golf at the Wilmington Country Club, of which he is a member. He also belongs to the Wilmington Club.

Stewart comes to Wilmington frequently to see his daughter, Mrs. Irene Whisenant, and his three grandchildren. He also has a son, Frank, at Dewey Beach, whom he visits.

AFBF Board Calls for Action on Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, acting under instructions from the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the president of the agricultural organization, Mr. Charles B. Shuman, recently wrote a letter to President Lyndon B. Johnson concerning the policies of the U.S. Department of Labor that are causing farm labor shortages and eventual loss of fruit and vegetable crops throughout the Nation.

While I have not always concurred in the views of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in this instance I find their statements excellently put and deserving of the most careful attention by the President, his Secretary of Labor, and the Congress.

Unless action is not taken to get the Department of Labor off its collision course toward costly shortages of food for the American consumer, our growers face great economic losses, and our citizens will experience difficulties in purchasing fruits and vegetables at reasonable prices.

Mr. Shuman's letter was carried in the March 22 issue of the AFBF official newsletter.

The newsletter follows:

SHUMAN WRITES TO L.B.J.—AFBF BOARD CALLS FOR ACTION ON FARM LABOR

The American Farm Bureau Federation's board of directors has directed AFBF officers to seek Presidential action as part of a continuing effort to provide an adequate supplemental farm labor force. The board of directors, meeting in Chicago this month, said labor shortages exist or are imminent in nearly every section of the country.

Following the board meeting, AFBF President Charles B. Shuman sent the following letter to President Lyndon B. Johnson:

"At a recent meeting of the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the board—reflecting the growing concern of our members relative to the farm labor situation—took action to recommend modification of present national policy relating to farm labor employment.

"The current and prospective shortage of farmworkers stems, of course, from national policy relating to the number of foreign farmworkers admitted to the United States for temporary employment in agriculture, and the requirements which must be met by farmers who wish to be eligible to employ such workers.

"Experience with the administration of such policies so far this year provides factual data that warrant their reexamination.

"Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz quite properly has established the principle that no foreign farmworkers shall be admitted so long as unemployed domestic workers willing and qualified to accept such employment are available.

"With this basic concept we have no quarrel. We must, however, express our conviction that the administration of this concept involves two major errors, which, if not modified, will have undesirable consequences not only for farmers but for agricultural processors, related service and marketing concerns, including many workers employed in processing and service industries, and ultimately consumers.

"First, the assumption that there are substantial numbers of unemployed persons who are willing, qualified, and available for seasonal farmwork is erroneous.

"According to the monthly labor force reports of the Department of Labor, approximately 2.8 million of the 3.8 million unemployed workers have been unemployed for less than 14 weeks. This unemployment is basically frictional unemployment. These

workers are temporarily unemployed. In the vast majority of such instances it would be foolish and shortsighted for the worker to leave home to accept seasonal temporary employment in agriculture. To do so would be to seriously reduce his opportunity to obtain more permanent employment in line with his skills and experience.

"This leaves less than 1 million workers who have been unemployed for 14 weeks or more. At any particular time, most of these million unemployed are unavailable for employment in agriculture for any one of or a combination of the following reasons:

"1. Many of these unemployed persons are currently unemployed working wives, whose husbands are employed. (The unemployment rate for women over 20 years of age is 33 percent more than that for men.) Obviously these unemployed women should not be expected to leave home to accept temporary farm jobs.

"2. Many of the unemployed are located at long distances from the area of employment. An unemployed factory worker in Chicago or New York is hardly a potential farmworker in Florida or California.

"3. Many of the unemployed are physically handicapped or otherwise not qualified for farm employment. Many are elderly or feeble. Farmwork is commonly hard and monotonous work.

"4. Many of the unemployed are voluntarily so, or in no particular need to accept employment not to their liking; perhaps the recipients of unemployment benefits.

"We believe it follows that at any particular time or place there is a very limited number of unemployed persons who are actually available, willing, and qualified for farmwork, and who live within a reasonable distance of the area in which such work must be done.

"We think this has been clearly demonstrated by the massive Department of Labor recruitment programs in California and Florida during January and February. These programs have not resulted in a substantial increase in the number of domestic farmworkers.

"We submit that it is inequitable to compel farmers to spend large amounts of money in vain efforts to recruit workers from the ranks of the unemployed or to provide transportation for substantial distances to workers who do not stay on the job.

"We submit that under these circumstances it is unreasonable to hold adamantly to the policy that no foreign farmworkers shall be admitted in 1965.

"Second, the assumption that hourly earnings guarantees should be imposed on a piece rate wage system is inequitable and unreasonable.

"The widely used farm piece rate wage system provides individual incentive and is preferred by both employer and employee.

"It is one thing to require farmers to establish piece rates which will permit a worker of average capability who works with reasonable diligence to earn specified amounts.

"It is something entirely different to require farmers to guarantee that each worker be paid specified amounts per hour regardless of the amount produced.

"Because farm labor employment by a particular farmer may vary from zero to many workers in a few days' time, and because most farm labor employment is for a harvest period of a few weeks, or at most a few months—farmers have historically, and of necessity, employed on a piece rate basis virtually anyone who is available at harvest time—the ambitious and the shiftless, the capable and the incapable, the able bodied and the handicapped.

"A guarantee of hourly earnings cannot be imposed on this system without disruptive and inequitable consequences. The less productive are rewarded for their nonproductivity. In the short run farmers' costs are exorbitant. In the long run no benefit will result to the less productive worker, because in the long run farmers cannot afford to hire them. By such action we effectively deny employment to those persons most needing employment.

"We submit that experience in the early months of this year already provides evidence that a guarantee of hourly earnings added to a piece rate wage system is unreasonable and unworkable.

"We submit that if farmers pay piece rates that result in acceptable earnings by average workers this is all that can reasonably be required, and that the criteria should be modified accordingly.

"The consequences of present policy are far more adverse than has been yet recognized.

"It appears to us that included among such consequences are the following:

"1. The expansion of fruit and vegetable production in Mexico and in the Caribbean area is well documented in the January hearings on this issue by the Senate Agriculture Committee. This shifting of production from the United States to other nations has been stimulated by wage differentials between such areas and the United States, and by critical labor shortages. It will be further stimulated as the wage-cost differential is widened. The more farm wage costs are pushed up in the United States the more an expansion of competitive production in such other areas can be anticipated. Some of this development is by U.S. farmers, processors, and capital.

"2. Farmers in the United States will curtail their plantings of high-labor-requirement crops in 1965 unless some assurance is forthcoming concerning the labor outlook. In many cases it is reported that banks are unwilling to finance production of such crops in the light of the current farm labor situation.

"3. Employment in agriculturally related industries will be reduced as a result of the above developments. Once an expansion of an industry occurs in another country, it is not likely that the lost employment can be regained.

"4. U.S. exports of processed fruits and vegetables will be reduced; U.S. imports of fresh and processed fruits and vegetables will be increased; both changes adversely affect the balance-of-payments situation.

"5. Crop losses will be sustained. Already, the Florida Citrus Mutual has reported a loss in unharvested, overripe, and spoiled fruit of from $4 to $6 million, all directly attributable to insufficient pickers. We do not believe it is possible to administer the present policy without causing additional losses.

"6. Some farmers, and particularly small farmers, will be forced out of the production of crops with high labor requirements. The inevitable response to a tight farm labor situation is a crash mechanization program; although to be sure this cannot be done overnight. Small farmers do not have the volume of production over which to spread economically the heavy costs of a crash program of mechanization.

"7. An increase in prices to consumers and a reduction in quality of fresh and processed food products that require large amounts of hand labor.

"It would be impractical to make quantitative estimates of the significance of each of these factors. But we do not see how it is possible to avoid the conclusion that each of the consequences listed will flow inevitably in some degree from present national policy.

"Your consideration of the need to modify existing policy in light of the above is respectfully requested."

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the distinguished Chargé d'Affaires of Lithuania, Mr. Joseph Kajeckas, honored my home city of Waterbury by attending ceremonies there on February 21, 1965, commemorating the 47th anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuania's Independence. The speech of Mr. Kajeckas eloquently sets forth the noble Lithuanian history and brings forcefully before us the tragic plight of Lithuania today. In addition he makes a firm affirmation of faith that this great historic nation will one day be free and independent. This speech is worthy of wide circulation and I am happy to append it to my remarks:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

(NOTE.—The following are translated excerpts from an address delivered by Joseph Kajeckai, Charge d'Affaires of Lithuania, at a commemoration of the 47th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence, in Waterbury, Conn., on February 21, 1965.)

I am especially happy to be with you, the Lithuanian Americans of Waterbury, as you commemorate the 47th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. You are a brilliant example of the motto of your State of Connecticut: "Qui transtulit sustinet," which refers to a person who has been transplanted and has still sustained his original heritage. And the Lithuanians of Waterbury have indeed enriched their adopted State and country by preserving and bringing to a new growth the heritage of their homeland, Lithuania.

Thus, the Connecticut State motto points with pride to the continuity of human dignity and the free institutions which result from it. This is, indeed, the basis too of Lithuania as a nation, and it is therefore natural that an old tradition of freedom should flower in a new land of opportunity.

Let us, on this anniversary of Lithuania as a free and independent modern state, briefly review the salient features of her history. Although we meet to commemorate the emergence of Lithuania as a member of the family of free nations in the 20th century, we are really marking a country's rebirth. For Lithuania is historically one of the oldest and most continuously established nations in Europe.

The Lithuanian language, for example, is one of the very oldest Indo-European languages that originated several thousand years before the birth of Christ; it is so ancient that Immanuel Kant once said, "The Lithuanian tongue possesses the key which opens the enigma not only of philology but of history." The first historical mention of the Lithuanians occurs in the writings of Tacitus in the second century A.D. The Lithuanian people, who had always lived in a number of principalities by the shores of the Baltic Sea, were finally united into a modern state by King Mindaugas more than 700 years ago. Later, in the process of stemming the Teutonic Knights' "drive to the sea" and the west for several centuries, the Lithuanian territory was extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea, and bordered on Muscovy.

Later on, however, when the expanding czarist empire brought Lithuania under its domination, the Lithuanian people revolted five times against the Russian czars, in 1794, 1812, 1831, 1863, and 1904–05. After 120 years of such czarist domination, it was as World War I drew to a close that the Lithuanian people finally had a chance to regain their independence and freedom.

For decades on end, Lithuanian patriots both in and out of Lithuania had rallied their people to the cause of a new and independent life for their homeland. When President Woodrow Wilson emphasized the principle of self-determination of nations, the Lithuanians realized that they could, in the aftermath of the war, clearly hope to gain the support of the West for their just aspirations to national freedom and independence. A meeting of the Lithuanian Taryba or Council in Vilnius in September 1917, prepared the groundwork by determining that Lithuania must become an independent state "organized on democratic principles"; at the same time, that Council noted in a resolution that "the interests of Lithuania gravitate much more to the west than toward the east or south."

In other words, the Lithuanian representatives who prepared the way for the declaration of independence realized and emphasized that the historic destiny of Lithuania was bound up with the West; this had been true when Lithuania first embraced the Christianity of the West, during the Middle Ages, and was emphasized anew when Lithuania protected the West against the Teutonic Knights at Tannenberg in 1410. Furthermore, the 120 years of czarist oppression, from 1795 on, had only strengthened the Lithuanian resolve to depend on the Western conception of democracy. This alinement with the West was alluded to in the declaration we commemorate today, the declaration of independence of February 16, 1918. It was this declaration also that convoked a Constituent Assembly of democratically elected delegates from all parts of Lithuania. This assembly ratified the provisions of the declaration and established the conduct of relations with other States.

The reason why I stress these details of the events of 1917 and 1918 is to make it perfectly clear, first, that the declaration of independence of 1918 led not to the creation of a new State, but to the modern rebirth of one of the very oldest States in all of Europe. Second, that rebirth was one whereby Lithuania again demonstrated that her interests lay in the West, both culturally and politically.

In the face of these facts, how absurd it is for the Soviets to claim, as they repeatedly have, that Lithuania "ethnically" belongs in the Soviet Union. And yet this absurdity has been mouthed by the Soviet leaders as an explanation of why the Lithuanian people supposedly chose to join the U.S.S.R. in 1940. Actally, what happened was that the Soviets first took over the country by armed force, and then rigged an election in which there was only one slate of candidates—the Communist slate: The results of this election were announced, moreover, by a wire service in London 24 hours before the polls had closed.

The Soviet takeover of Lithuania in June 1940 began, however, with armed aggression. This kind of Soviet tactic was not too surprising, because right after Lithuania declared her independence in 1918, the Soviets waged a campaign to prevent the establishment of an independent front. Soviet troops had invaded Lithuanian soil, but were finally repulsed at the end of 1919 by a brave and determined Lithuanian volunteer army. In 1940, however, the odds were so unequal as to make all-out military resistance by Lithuania impossible; but after Lithuania had been occupied by the Soviets, there were a number of uprisings in Lithuania led by partisan fighters in the Lithuanian underground, and these continued for about 10 years.

When the Soviet Union occupied Lithuania in 1940, its act of aggression was in direct repudiation of a long series of bilateral and multilateral international agreements. Probably no small nation had ever been protected by as many solemn international agreements as was Lithuania, and the other Baltic States; but every single one of these agreements was broken by the Soviet Union. The political excuses, the mock elections, the colonialism of "liberation"—all these facets of Soviet tactics are familiar to everyone now. The murder, the genocide, the deportations, the Russification—these are all common knowledge. Even the most naive have become convinced, if not by what happened in the Baltic States or in Budapest, then by Die Mauer—the Berlin wall.

The whole world knows about Russian treachery now, and the Baltic States have long served as a paradigm of how untrustworthy Soviet pledges and promises are. The Kremlin's attempts to cover up for overtly aggressive acts and large-scale murder are about as farcical as the reeling succession of Soviet leaders. Hardly had Stalin been removed from a stately tomb than his remover was removed. And so it will be with their uneasy successors; those who trample on individual liberty in the name of totalitarian dogma must be prepared to be themselves trampled as individuals. "Sic semper tyrannis."

But just as the Soviets are champions of treachery and deceit, so the United States has been a champion of resistance to communism and its methods. The Lithuanian people are thus most grateful to the Government and people of the United States for their consistent refusal to recognize the Soviet aggression in Lithuania and the other Baltic States, and for their continued support of the just aspirations of Lithuania to regain freedom and independence. It is my pleasure to read to you today a letter I received from the Acting Secretary of State in honor of our commemoration:

"DEAR MR. CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES: On the occasion of the 47th anniversary of Lithuania's National Day I am pleased to express to you the sincere good wishes of the Government and people of the United States.

"Nearly 25 years have elapsed since the sovereign Lithuanian nation lost its national independence in the wake of the illegal annexation by the Soviet Union. But the indomitable spirit of the Lithuanian people and their yearning to live in freedom and independence have not been dimmed throughout these years.

"In recognition of the right of a free people to national self-determination, the U.S. Government has firmly and consistently stood by its declared policy of nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. The United States thereby not only accords recognition to the Lithuanian people's devotion to the cause of freedom and national independence, but expresses its confidence that this cause will ultimately prevail.

"Sincerely yours,

"GEORGE W. BALL,
"Acting Secretary."

Lithuanians everywhere are very grateful for this most recent expression of U.S. policy. As for friendship, the examples are all around us. It is with particular pleasure that I cite the longtime friendship and support for the Lithuanian people of your Congressman, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN (who is also a former mayor of your city) and Senator THOMAS J. DODD. They have a keen knowledge of Communist tactics and an ardent sympathy for the Lithuanian cause; together with Senator RIBICOFF and Governor Dempsey, they have represented moral values in Government, and in championing the Lithuanian cause they have championed freedom throughout the world. To them, your mayor, the Honorable Joseph McNellis, and many other legislators and governmental executives throughout this country, the Lithuanian people are warmly grateful.

As long as people who thirst for freedom have such friends, there is every reason to have faith that the day inevitably will dawn when the Lithuanian nation will again be free and independent. In the meantime, we must work together to hasten that day, and we must work vigorously. Anyone who feels that the cause of freedom will take care of itself will not sleep well for very long.

Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, tragic events of recent days have emphasized how far our Nation must travel before brotherhood becomes something more than an ideal.

As we grapple with the means for achieving social justice, I believe it is wise that we keep in mind the ideals we are striving for.

It is for this reason that I bring to the attention of my colleagues a brief poem that was composed by one of my constituents and was published in the Buffalo Evening News. The author of the poem is Mr. Joseph Manch, who is superintendent of public schools in Buffalo.

The poem follows:

WHO IS MY BROTHER?

Who is my brother?
He is the man who holds my hand
In earnest of his faith in me
When I am in travail,
Who smiles and owns awareness
Of our common bond as members
Of one shrinking, little world.

Who is my brother?
He is the man who stands apart,
Remote and distant, silent and cold
Not feeling he is part of me
Or I a part of him.

Who is my brother?
He is the man whom I have never seen,
Who lives in climate
Foreign to my sight and touch and tongue,
Whose creed and color are not mine,
Whose customs mirror what he feels and knows
From where he views the world,
Whose birth was just as great a miracle as mine,
Whose right to live and love and dream
Has equal stature under God with mine.

Who is my brother?
He is the man who finds no comfort
In his present circumstance,
Whom fortune has not favored
In his prospects or his needs,
Who sees no hope nor promise
In tomorrow or another scene,
Who finds no quick escape
From loneliness and black despair.

Who is my brother?
He is the man who struggles
To be fully free,
Who seeks his own identity,
Who reaches out to be himself
In every word and thought and act,
Who gives to every other man his due,
However strange his visage and his view.

Who is my brother?
He is the man who finds life good,
Who knows great joy
In man's response to faith and truth,
Who recognizes beauty in the meanest place
And seeks to share what he himself enjoys.

Who is my brother?
My brother is every man.

Aid to Education: A Mandate From the People

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to lend my support to the Elementary and Secondary School Education Act of 1965. With our expanding and growing economy, we must continue to improve the education of the American people. We must build more classrooms, improve the quality of teaching, and equalize educational opportunities for every American child.

The youth of our country is our most important national resource. As a nation we have a vital interest in their education. For this reason I fully support the goal which the Education Act seeks to attain—that of bringing better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most and to provide incentives for everyone who wants to learn.

I oppose across-the-board aid to private schools on constitutional grounds. I do favor categorical aids which in my opinion would not be unconstitutional. This bill does not violate the principle of separation of church and state. America has accepted her role as the defender of human liberty and democracy. Now we must realize the fullest educational potential of all American children—the underprivileged as well as the affluent—to strengthen our position as the defender of liberty and democracy.

Among the many telegrams and letters which I received urging my support of the education bill were the following telegrams from educational organizations and schools:

We urge full support of President Johnson's education bill. Urge opposition to any amendments and urge you to vote against recommittal.

WILLIAM RYNACK,
President Metropolitan Association of Higher Education of the National Education Association, Time and Life Building, New York City.

The city teachers association of New York urges you to vote in favor of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (H.R. 2362) in its present form.

We implore you to vote against any efforts to amend or recommit (H.R. 2362).

HARRY VANHOUTEN,
Executive Director City Teachers Association of New York, Time Life Building, New oYrk City.

Please be advised that the Executive Council of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO voted in February to support President Johnson's elementary and secondary school program. In support of this position, our union is now conducting a nationwide referendum.

CHARLES COGEN,
President American Federation of Teachers.

We appreciate the courtesy shown to our representatives by you and your office last week. We are happy that House Education and Labor Committee approved H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. We urge your full support to H.R. 2362 as approved by the committee. This is a good education bill and should be passed by the House now.

CLAYTON E. ROSE,
New York State Teachers Association.

As chairman of the Hewlett Woodmere Teachers Association I urge that you oppose all amendments to H.R. 2362 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Vote against any motion to recommit. Vote for and please urge your colleagues to vote for the final passage of this long overdue bill.

Yours respectfully,

JOEL RINDLER,
Hewlett High School, Hewlett, N.Y.

That you oppose all amendments to H.R. 2362 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Vote against any motion to recommit. Vote for and please urge your colleagues to vote for the final passage of this long overdue bill.

Yours respectfully,

NICHOLAS A. GIROLAMO,
Chairman, Federal Legislative Committee, South Nassau Zone Teachers Association, Forest Lake School, Wantagh, N.Y.

As chairman of the Valley Stream North High School Faculty Association, I urge that you oppose all amendments to H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; vote against any motion to recommit; vote for, and please urge your colleagues to vote for the final passage of this long overdue bill.

Yours respectfully,

ALPHONSE P. MAYERNIK.
Valley Stream North High School.

The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America has gone on record in favor of President Johnson's bill providing for Federal aid in education opportunity for America's underprivileged children, regardless of whether they attend public or religion-sponsored schools.

MOSES I. FEUERSTEIN,
National President, The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

Entire Orthodox Jewish community deeply opposed to any amendments to education aid bill especially judicial review amendment which would torpedo every possibility of bills hoped for enactment. Strongly urge you to vote against judicial review and other crippling amendments for which you will earn our deep gratitude.

RABBI MORRIS SHERER,
Agudath Israel of America.

Hatch Act Liberalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, a new publication, the Federal Times, contains an editorial in the March 10 edition about liberalization of the Pernicious Political Activities Act, otherwise known as the Hatch Act. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 4959, to strike out the restrictive passages of the act and allow Government employees to play active political roles.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would not open a floodgate of political activity by Government employees. It would be a sense of Congress measure under which the Civil Service Commission and other Federal agencies could relax restrictions.

More civic and political leaders are realizing every day that certain restrictive provisions of the Hatch Act are keeping Government employees in a sort of iron maiden in which they are penalized if they move in any direction.

The increasing number of nonpartisan political groups can be directly attributed to the Hatch Act. This is causing a situation in the Washington area which is almost unique in the United States. We in Congress and the man in the White House exemplify the highest traditions of partisan politics. Yet, not 5 miles away in the Washington suburbs, we are being surrounded by political jurisdictions replete with nonpartisan political parties composed mostly of Government employees which have been "hatched" from the two-party system. I submit that this ridiculous situation must be changed.

With this in mind, I offer the following editorial from the Federal Times:

RESTRICTION OR PROTECTION?

Several proposals have been made to amend or repeal the Hatch Act. This is the 1939 law which bans partisan political activity or campaign participation by Government workers.

One proposal would ease the restrictions, thus permitting employees to engage in political activity within limits set by their agencies. The other would eliminate all restrictions.

Any plan which expands the freedom of action for individuals is welcome. However, Government employees need to realize that complete freedom has its price.

The Post Office currently has a mailbag full of trouble as it investigates charges of political pressure during fund solicitations in the recent campaign.

The complaints are based on charges that postal regional offices designated one man to receive campaign contributions. The money reportedly was collected from postmasters and mail carriers. Funds raised were then said to have been channeled to political candidates.

This is the second investigation of a Hatch violation during the last election. The first case dealt with sale of $100 tickets to the Democratic gala by officials in the Rural Electrification Administration. Investigation

on this has been completed but no findings have been announced.

It is easy to conjure up the problems that could arise if all restrictions on political activity of Government employees were removed.

A request for a political contribution would be difficult to refuse—if the request came from the boss. A flood of propaganda leaflets could pile up on desks. Briefing sessions could turn into political rallies as partisan presentations colored the reporting of facts.

Whether the problems envisioned ever would develop is an academic question. The point to be made is this: If the Hatch Act is to be modified, then guidelines must be clearly established to insure that the new freedom granted will not destroy the protection provided under the old rules.

Joseph McCaffrey Commentary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, murder is an appalling act no matter where it occurs, on Route 80 in Alabama or on the streets of Pittsburgh, my own city. One is sometimes tempted to believe that it is a less shocking act today for many people than it was only a decade ago. But are we really so hardened to violence?

Joseph McCaffrey spoke about this last Friday evening in a very perceptive WMAL-TV broadcast. I think his words should be carefully read and pondered by all Americans.

JOSEPH MCCAFFREY COMMENTARY, WMAL-TV, MARCH 26, 1965

We have learned nothing since the murder on November 22, 1963.

It is almost as if we have adopted violence as a way of life here in the United States.

It may be that our population of almost 200 million people has precluded us from abiding by that old philosophy of "live and let live" * * * we can't seem to adjust to living in close proximity with our neighbors.

That is, if our neighbor is not an exact copy of ourselves.

The recent violent deaths in Alabama indicate that we want those copies to think as we do, too. It is not enough that they be of our own color—they must also have our prejudices and our hatreds.

Peace on earth to men of good will.

But men of good will seem to be harder to find these days. It may be that television contributes to this blood thirst we are now witnessing.

If the Old West was as it is portrayed on television, today the West would have undertakers as the wealthiest men, and the States of the West would be populated with gun-toting idiots.

But the Old West wasn't like that. The winners were the men who could think and did think—the gun slingers were on the periphery.

Yet today we dignify them, via television, as the men who won the West. If the West had depended on them for its development, it would be as barren today as the moon.

Our heritage from the Old West was the cooperation of neighbor with neighbor, with help in return for help, and with a respect for the other man and his beliefs.

For these things violence can never be a substitute.

The Two Faces of the Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Arthur Krock which appeared in the Sunday, March 28, 1965, edition of the New York Times:

IN THE NATION: THE TWO FACES OF THE OPPOSITION

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the leader of the Senate minority, defined the clasic role of the political opposition as an obligation to support the party in power when it is right and oppose it when wrong. A corollary of the formula is that the opposition should always seek first by thorough inspection to eliminate what it considers wrong in an otherwise constructive piece of legislation.

But DIRKSEN's immediate method of asserting the opposition's role toward the President's voting rights bill gives scant service to the corollary. And this has pointed up the dilemma in which the small Republican minority in Congress finds itself painfully involved.

The dilemma is: should their leaders join the responsible majority party in drafting legislation, especially measures whose objective has been a traditional Republican policy? Or should minority leaders await the final formulation by the majority before deciding what their party position is to be on the details of the draft? DIRKSEN, as leader of the Senate Republicans, grasped the first horn of this dilemma. The House minority leaders grasped the second.

OPPOSITION PARTICIPATION

DIRKSEN volunteered for the job of coauthor of the President's voting rights bill, an offer which the administration was very pleased to accept. In so doing he assumed Republican coresponsibility with the President and with MIKE MANSFIELD, the Senate majority leader, for the bill as a whole.

Representative GERALD FORD, of Michigan, the House minority leaders, backed by such prominent Members of his rank and file as Representatives JOHN LINDSAY, of New York City, reserved the opposition function of trying to amend the text where his group might find this essential to the constitutional and practical attainment of the objective. The difference between these concepts of the required role of a constructive opposition is fundamental where a matter of domestic policy is concerned.

REPUBLICAN CORESPONSIBILITY

When congressional action proposed by the party in power involves war, or the presence of an emergency that could lead to war, the classic role of the opposition is to participate actively with the majority at all stages. The failure of Presidents F. D. Roosevelt and Truman to make a partner of the Republican minority in such situations evoked the famous complaint of Harold E. Stassen: "They come to us for counsel," he said, "not at the takeoffs but after the crash landings." And seldom if ever has a titular minority leader committed his party, as DIRKSEN did, to the extent inherent in his status, to full partnership with the responsible majority in the drafting of major domestic legislation.

His reasons were substantial. But the price of minority leadership as DIRKSEN is exercising it is preclusion of the flexibility required by the opposition—in this instance to broaden the scope of the administration measure and at the same time mesh its machinery more smoothly into the Constitution. By already retreating from support of one major provision of the President's bill that has the effect of flagrant discrimination among the States, DIRKSEN has tacitly acknowledged the value of a far more thorough inspection than he gave the text before he stamped it with the label of the official Senate Republican leadership. The major amendment he now will support is directed at an enforcement formula by which elections in four States—Arkansas, Florida, Tennessee, and Texas—where the statistics of Negro voting denote discrimination are made immune from Federal supervision by reason of the fact that they impose no literacy test, though their voting percentages in November 1964, were below the 50 percent requirement of the bill for this immunity.

FORD'S STAND VALIDATED

It was on the sound presumption that revolutionary, legally controversial legislation drawn in such haste would develop fudamental flaws that Representative FORD, the House minority leader, declined the invitation from DIRKSEN and the Democratic leadership to introduce (and thereby sponsor) the administration text. He wanted to preserve flexibility to the House Republicans, and the time to make a sound evaluation of how and in what respects, this flexibility should be used to improve the legislation, from the minority standpoint. FORD finds sufficient evidence of the soundness of his position in DIRKSEN's rapid persuasion that the bill needs clarifying language to assure it will not protect, in four or more States, the discriminatory practices against Negro voting that it is precisely designed to forbid.

Such are the two concepts of Republican opposition. And thus far, with the President's measure in the committee hearings stage, and under heavy political pressure for rapid translation to a similar truncated examination by the whole congressional body, FORD's theory of the role and responsibility of an opposition has justified itself better than DIRKSEN's. Furthermore, he is initiating changes on which his party can lay claim to having made improvements in a text from which its Senate leader originally precluded himself by coauthorship.

Economic Assistance to Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been very much disturbed and uneasy over the situation in Vietnam, and about the possible escalation of the conflict in southeast Asia—both frightening threats to our goal of a peaceful world.

I was therefore tremendously encouraged and impressed by President Johnson's recent proposals for economic assistance to that region when peace has been restored; and I am hopeful that from this positive approach we may be able to effect a prompt and responsible solution to the problems which now face us in that area.

In addition, I was certainly heartened by the endorsement by the New York Times of such proposals, in its editorials of March 27 and March 28.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am taking the liberty of inserting these two editorials, which speak for themselves.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 27, 1965]

A VITAL STEP TOWARD PEACE

President Johnson has taken a major step forward by offering to help in wider and bolder programs of regional economic development in southeast Asia once peace is restored. In effect, he has begun to open the long-awaited diplomatic track with which some of his advisers had hoped the bombing of North Vietnam would be accompanied.

The President's statement, vague and guarded as it is, begins the vital process of defining the kind of settlement the United States is prepared to accept in Vietnam. Much more definition will be needed, along with concrete proposals for bringing about the honorable negotiation the President has just evoked as an objective. For each passing day makes it clearer that military measures alone will neither defeat the Communist guerrillas nor attract their political masters to the conference table.

The regional approach is essential. A settlement within the confines of Vietnam itself will be difficult to achieve. If compromises are to be found, they will be found only over a wider region that covers the four successor states of Indochina and, perhaps, much of southeast Asia.

A regional development plan that would enable southeast Asia to produce a huge rice surplus for North Vietnam and mainland China—both critically short of food—could not fail to play a positive part in peace discussions. The Communist effort to seize the rice-surplus areas of southeast Asia by war would appear less attractive once it became clear that vastly larger supplies could be obtained through peace.

Such a prospect exists in the United Nations plan for an international Mekong River development that would outshadow the Tennessee Valley Authority in size and scope. The urgent common interest that Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam have developed in this project has taken precedence over their ancient national rivalries.

Presumably this is the kind of project President Johnson has in mind. It can help lead the way not only to a settlement in Vietnam but to a stable peace in Asia. It is the route the United States failed to take in 1953 and 1954 when fighting was ended in Korea and Indochina.

From 1953 to 1964, the United States has plowed almost $15 billion into military aid and defense support in the Far East, but less than $1 billion into development loans and technical assistance. The armistice with Communist China and North Vietnam did not bring peace, in part because both sides were less interested in organizing cooperation than in pursuing the cold war. The opportunity that was missed a decade ago may be recovered again if the United States pushes forward now with imaginative proposals for Asian development which, at the same time, may help bring about the peace negotiations that will make development possible.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 28, 1965]

SOMETHING MORE THAN BOMBS

The limited American air war against North Vietnam is now entering its eighth week. It is not too soon to ask what it has accomplished—and why it has not accomplished more.

The aim of the continuing air offensive, accompanied by threats of further escalation, was to persuade the North Vietnamese Communists to halt their armed infiltration into South Vietnam. When it was undertaken, one of President Johnson's highest advisers predicted privately that the Communists' will to fight would be weakened in 2 months. So far, there is no indication that he was right; on the contrary, there clearly has been a stiffening of Communist positions, as Secretary Rusk has admitted.

The Soviet Union has announced that arms aid is on its way to North Vietnam. More important, a direct Soviet-American confrontation in southeast Asia through the use of Soviet volunteeers in North Vietnam has been publicly threatened by the top Soviet leader, Communist Party First Secretary Brezhnev.

The Vietnamese and Chinese Communists have stiffened their positions even more. Hanoi, which a few weeks ago privately indicated agreement to French and United Nations proposals of negotiations—while refusing a cease-fire—now rejects such proposals. Backed by Moscow, the North Vietnamese insist that there can be no talks while American bombing continues. Peiping has taken the most extreme position of all. It insists there can be no negotiations before the complete, unconditional withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. The Vietcong, which shows some signs of independence from Hanoi, has enthusiastically adopted the Peiping line.

Meanwhile, the American bombing—not to mention use of nonlethal gas—has significantly alienated world opinion. Concern about the danger of a major war is widespread. Equally important, there is profound puzzlement about Washington's objectives and tactics.

The trouble is that President Johnson, a master of domestic politics, had until last week seemed to forget that war is politics too, even if pursued by other means. He launched a military offensive, but neglected his diplomatic offensive.

Now the President has promised American aid for wider and bolder programs of regional economic development benefiting all of southeast Asia, including North Vietnam. Despite its vague terms, this promise indicates that Washington is beginning to face up to the need to offer its opponents in southeast Asia a diplomatic, political and economic exit from the military cul-de-sac in which we as well as they are now entrapped.

Persuasive peace proposals can be a political weapon not only toward world opinion, at a time when Americans are bombing Asians, but in presenting moderate Communists with an alternative they can support within the Communist camp. That camp is divided, not only along national lines but within each national capital. And nowhere are the divisions more critical than in Hanoi.

Neither the Vietcong nor the Chinese Communists can be swayed by the bombing of North Vietnam, which causes them no direct pain. They are pressing to intensify the war. The Vietcong, particularly, has made major military gains in recent months and sees every successive Saigon coup as another nail in the coffin of its enemies. It will not be easy for Hanoi, in these circumstances, to shift course and seek a negotiated settlement, even with Soviet backing.

Military pressure alone—which implies a demand for unconditional surrender—is unlikely to swing the balance in the Hanoi leadership toward a negotiated settlement. Positive American proposals, which suggest a way out and a viable future for North Vietnam, are the essential complement.

President Johnson's statement last week could be the precursor of proposals offering Hanoi, once peace is restored, access to the rice of South Vietnam, trade with the West, an end of the embargo and diplomatic boycott that Washington and Saigon have imposed since 1954, and entry to international development assistance. Area development schemes covering the entire Mekong Valley could be pushed. These, linked with concrete proposals for negotiations and firm offers of a phased American withdrawal from South Vietnam in accordance with the Geneva agreements, could not fail to influence events.

An immediate Communist response might not be forthcoming. But the words would be heard both within the Communist regimes and outside. World opinion would be rallied. That support will be needed, especially if the war in Vietnam is about to enter a new and more virulent phase.

The 1967 Centennial of the Alaska Purchase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I hereby offer for the attention of my colleagues and others the second part of "An Event of National Significance," as depicted in the 1964 Annual Report of the Alaska Centennial Commission. I refer to the projected observances in Alaska in 1967 celebrating the 100th anniversary of Alaska's existence under the American flag.

The Commission is made up of 16 prominent Alaskans. They are Vernon Forbes, its chairman from Fairbanks; Mrs. Alice Harrigan, its vice chairman from Sitka; Claire O. Banks of Anchorage; William R. Cashen, of College; Jack Farnsworth, of Soldotna; Bill Feero, of Skagway; Mrs. Genevieve Harmon, of Juneau; Jack R. Peck, of Anchorage; Donald E. Perkins of Nome; Robert Powell, of Anchorage; Mrs. Doris Volzke of Ketchikan; Arthur F. Waldron, of Anchorage; Edward M. Wolden, of Anchorage; Frank P. Young of Fairbanks; George Sharrock, of Anchorage; and and Mrs. Helen Irick, of Kodiak. Staff for the Commission consists of an executive director, Herb Adams, and a secretary, Mrs. Beverly Swanson.

This part concerns projects and programs of the Alaska Centennial Commission that aim at enhancing Alaska as a tourist destination, and with the task of carrying out other programs of commemoration:

AN EVENT OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE—PART 2

ENHANCING ALASKA AS A TOURIST DESTINATION

In its planning for 1967, the Alaska Centennial Commission is seeking not only to stage events that will attract attention and audiences in 1967, but also is seeking to enhance Alaska as a tourist destination in that year and years hence.

PERMANENT PROJECTS

Toward this objective, permanent centennial projects are being adopted by local centennial committees across the State. To quality for 25-cent-per-capita grants, which were approved by the 1964 legislature, such projects must meet a community need, be commemorative of the centennial year, and have a reasonable prospect of completion by 1967. Such grants also must be matched by the local committee.

At the centennial exhibition site in Fairbanks a 40-acre exhibition of Alaska and Alaskan history is planned by 67 North, the

Fairbanks Centennial Committee. In part aided by centennial per capita grants, the exhibition will also be financed by city and private contributions. Among other attractions planned are the Riverboat Nenana, a building housing Huerlin paintings, and an Indian village.

In Anchorage, permanent centennial projects being planned are three geodesic-domed buildings and a monument to William Henry Seward. Projects being explored by groups other than the committee itself are an Alaskan animal zoo and a sports arena.

In Sitka, an authentic Russian tearoom is being established near the Ferry Terminal by the Sitka Centennial Committee. Reconstruction of a native fish camp of the 19th century is also planned.

Illustrations of other permanent centennial projects are restoration of two gold-rush buildings by the Skagway Centennial Committee, reconstruction of Fort Kenay by the Kenai Centennial Committee, construction of museums by the Homer Centennial Committee and by the Wrangell Centennial Committee, and establishment of an aquarium and forest products display by the Petersburg Centennial Committee.

Permanent centennial projects being explored include the construction of a replica of an early log church by the Gastineau Channel Centennial Committee, establishment of a salmonboat tourist attraction by the Ketchikan Centennial Committee, establishment of a library by the Metlakatla Centennial Committee, construction of an auditorium by the Sitka Centennial Committee, preservation of an aboriginal site by the Soldotna Centennial Committee, creation of a memorial to Vitus Bering and his voyage of discovery by the Cordova Centennial Committee, and purchase of museum cases for the library by the Kotzebue Centennial Committee.

In addition to adopting permanent projects for themselves, local committees and the State Commission are encouraging similar action by other organizations. An illustration is the Sitka Historical Society's fundraising effort, endorsed by the Sitka Centennial Committee, to preserve the Russian mission, a registered national historic landmark. On the State level, the commission is inviting State societies and associations to give thought to projects they will sponsor as contributions to the centennial year.

HISTORIC SITES

Another important means of enhancing Alaska as a tourist destination is through erection of historical markers and placement of historical plaques. More than 30 highway markers are now in place, and this program of the department of highways is continuing. Fifty bronze plaques to identify sites and buildings important in the history of Alaska have been purchased and will be mounted on buildings such as the Elk's hall in Juneau (where the first elected legislature met) and at sites such as Kasilof (where the Russian colony of St. George was established). Sites and buildings important in the histories of communities will be marked by local centennial committees.

Interpretive markers are slated for erection in 1965 at Old Sitka and Castle Hill, both State-owned historic sites. Funding for physical improvements at the flag-raising site of Castle Hill is being sought by the commission.

At the same time the commission is proceeding to identify sites for marking, it is carrying out an inventory of sites now marked. With this information, two publications—a guide to historic sites in Alaska and a history map—will be issued in advance of 1967. Based upon these, history-land trails, growing in importance as tourist attractions, will be organized.

CIVIC IMPROVEMENT

Another means of enhancing Alaska as a tourist destination is the planned paint-up, clean-up campaign that will be conducted across the State. Sponsorship of the project is being proposed to a number of statewide organizations.

LOCAL HISTORY

Local histories are being compiled by several centennial committees and they are being assisted by the commission. In some cases, this basic information will be utilized for a local history-guide or map; in others it will be published as a community history.

Labor and business groups and associations of all kinds are being urged to mark centennial year by producing their histories. Being compiled by the Alaska Council of Churches to mark the centennial is a history of religious groups in Alaska.

SCHOOLS, CHURCHES

Schools are expected to participate by presenting Alaska, past and present, through assemblies and special programs. Together with churches, schools may participate in the organization of symposia for reflection upon culture and civilization in Alaska.

CARRYING OUT OTHER PROGRAMS OF COMMEMORATION

During 1967, pioneers—the builders of Alaska—will be honored in ceremonies. And, organizations are being urged to pay especial recognition to their members who have played significant roles in the public life of the State.

PUBLICATIONS

A series of monographs dealing with selected aspects of Alaska's history and people is being planned in conjunction with the University of Alaska. Aimed at making good accounts of important developments widely available, all titles in the series would be in similar format.

Issuance of publications by others is being encouraged by the Commission. Tentatively slated for publication by 1967 are: "Alaska History" and "Alaska Aboriginal Culture" (National Park Service), and "Geographic Dictionary of Alaska" (U.S. Board on Geographic Names).

A new biography of Seward (Oxford University Press), a new history of Russian-America (Viking), the story of the Alaska-based Russian attempt to gain Hawaii (University of California), and an account of 19th century American exploration of Alaska (Yale)—all scheduled for publication in advance of the centennial year, will call attention to the approach of the centennial.

MEDALS, STAMPS

The centennial of the purchase will be commemorated by bronze and silver medals bearing the centennial emblem on one side and, on the reverse, a profile of the man whose vision resulted in the purchase, William H. Seward. The medals will be sold by local centennial committees with all profits going toward their projects.

A commemorative postage stamp will also be issued. The U.S. Post Office Department is being urged to designate Sitka as the place for first-day issue.

Visitors to Alaska in 1967 will receive certificates noting the centennial, and they will be able to purchase privately produced souvenirs of much variety.

Progressive Growers' Association Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Growers' Association in my congressional district has just completed a survey of its membership of 700 farmers. This survey shows that a drastic curtailment of planted acreage in tomatoes, strawberries, miscellaneous vegetables, brussels sprouts, cucumbers, and beans will result if supplemental foreign labor is not available for California farmers. Obviously, this will create extreme hardship for the employees in canneries and other allied industries, many of whom are Mexican-Americans. It is ironic that certain propaganda groups are fighting the realism that crops simply will not be planted without supplemental labor and in so doing are hurting the minority groups they profess to be helping.

Below is a table showing the planting intentions of 700 farmers with or without supplemental foreign labor:

Crops	Acreage	1965 crop survey	
		With supplemental foreign labor	Without supplemental foreign labor
		Percent	*Percent*
Tomato	3,579	94.8	33.3
Strawberry	234¼	66.2	25.7
Miscellaneous vegetables	674½	102.4	51.7
Brussel sprouts	1,218	99.7	35.3
Cucumbers	157	67.5	19.1
Beans	65	69.2	----------
Total, all crops	5,928¼	94.5	34.7

It should be pointed out that though the survey indicates that one-third the usual tomato acreage, 3,579, will be planted for a total of approximately 1,200 acres that these plants are predicated in 98 percent of the cases upon the possibility of harvesting by machine. Thus, jobs for human beings will be sacrificed in favor of the inferior quality which will result from machine picking. This, too, will have an adverse effect upon Mexican-Americans and other domestic workers.

The 47th Anniversary of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, the courageous people of the formerly independent Byelorussian Democratic Republic marked the 47th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence. In the United States, a convention of Americans of Byelorussian descent was held on March 21, 1965, to commemorate this date. Although their former compatriots remain under the iron rule of Communist Russia, there is no doubt that the citizens of present-day Byelorussia joined silently, but forcefully, in this observance.

For the flame of freedom burns deep within the Byelorussian people. The successful effort at independence in 1918 was the culmination of many attempts

to secure for themselves a national identity over the years. But self-determination is a word that is not in the Communist lexicon, and this independence was shortlived. Despite this fact, the traditions, customs, and spirit of a Byelorussian nation continues on. The importance of this national group, and its ability to identify as a national group, is underscored by the fact that their Communist masters feel the need for a separate "puppet" state within the borders of the Soviet Union.

By marking the anniversary of the independence movement of these brave people, we expose the fiction of this puppet regime and encourage the legitimate aspirations of Byelorussians everywhere for self-determination in their homeland. Those of us who have the benefits of freedom can do no less than this.

Residual Oil Quotas Should Go

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1965, I addressed the House concerning the continuing problems imposed on New England by unfair residual oil quotas, see page 4613 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 10, 1965. As I pointed out, these quotas are extremely unfair to New England and indeed the entire eastern seaboard. Hopefully, they will soon be abolished by this administration which is doing so much for the coal mining regions of this country and the oil producing regions of this country, and so little for the consumer and so little for New England. It is encouraging to me that the message is getting through to the people in my district.

William Rotch, the editor and publisher of the Milford Cabinet, recently wrote a perceptive editorial on the subject. The Littleton Courier, whose editor Jack Colby has frequently spoken out against the injustices of the residual oil quota, has also commented perceptively on the subject.

Because even now the decision by this administration on residual oil quotas is pending, I insert these editorials in the RECORD in hopes that their message will be read by those charged with this important decision.

[From the Milford Cabinet & Wilton Journal, Mar. 25, 1965]

WHY GET EXCITED ABOUT RESIDUAL OIL?

Chances are that most people in New Hampshire have never seen any residual oil and would not recognize it if they did. Yet, in Washington their Congressman is urging the administration to lift quotas on the amount of residual oil that can be imported and charging that New England industries are bleeding to death in order to subsidize the coal interests of the Appalachian States.

The residual oil story would appear to shed some light on how politics can replace the laws of supply and demand, of how world trade can affect New Hampshire, and why it makes sense to have JIM CLEVELAND stand up in Congress and make speeches calling for fewer restrictions on imported fuels. What is it all about?

The Cleveland version of the story is explained in the adjoining column. But a few days before we read his remarks we were chatting with an engineer for one of the big New York power companies. We asked him to explain in simple language the problem of residual oil and why we should get excited about it. This explanation may be oversimplified, but for what it is worth we pass it along.

In the United States petroleum is refined in huge technically sophisticated plants that break down the crude oil into a variety of products. In some countries, Venezuela for one, the refining process is not carried so far, and after the gasoline is extracted what remains is a heavy black substance known as residual oil and valuable principally as an industrial fuel. Most residual oil comes from these foreign refineries and the amount that can be imported into the United States is limited by quota.

"My company's plants are equipped to burn either residual oil or coal," our engineer friend explained. "The oil is much cheaper and we would prefer it, but we cannot get enough. The Government quotas bear no relation to our needs, or to the increasing demands for electricity.

"The result is," he went on, "that we burn more and more coal. This is nice for the coal companies, and perhaps it helps Appalachia, but never forget that the cost is passed right along to the consumer, and if the coal interests are being helped it is only at the expense of the people who use our electricity."

This explanation ties in with what JIM CLEVELAND has been saying in Washington. By limiting imports of residual oil the administration forces New England industries to use a more expensive fuel. Chances are the consumer never knows what is hitting him; he just knows that prices keep going up.

So we elect a Congressman to go down to Washington where we hope someone listens when he declares that New England is willing to pay its full share of the costs for the national welfare, but it deeply resents the constant and silent tribute it has to pay to the special interests of the coal-producing States.

[From the Littleton (N.H.) Courier, Mar. 18, 1965]

TRIBUTE TO SPECIAL INTERESTS

"We in New England are more than ready as we have always been, to pay our share of costs for the national welfare, but we deeply resent and deplore this silent exaction of tribute to special interests."

Making this statement on the floor of the House in Washington recently was Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND, and reference was being made to restrictions of residual oil coming into New England. These controls on a fuel so basic to our economy "are slowly bleeding us" for the benefit of coal-producing areas, Congerssman CLEVELAND charged.

The coal industry today is vigorous and healthy, with even brighter prospects ahead, and the residual oil quotas could be discarded completely without affecting the coal areas. Yet it is these areas, representing powerful economic and political blocs, that are responsible for the continued maintenance of the quotas that place a heavy financial burden on the consumer of fuel in New England—with no relation to the economic problem of our coal-producing areas.

"These same coal-producing areas have won a huge Federal subsidy in the form of the Appalachian bill," Congressman CLEVELAND pointed out. "Let me say that we in New England are most sympathetic with the economic problems of Appalachia. We, too, are part of the Appalachian chain and we know what it is like to lose whole industries on which the economic life of our communities depends. We are fighting back and making a good fight. We do not ask the rest of the country for special favors. But we do ask for terms of fair competition.

"While our taxes will be taken to help finance this tremendous Appalachian program for 11 States, we are also paying additional tribute to the coal States in the form of high fuel costs, unnecessarily imposed through the discriminatory residual oil quota system.

"New Englanders are being asked to support the Appalachia program, yet at the same time we are being forced to endure hardship through the fuel policy imposed largely by the power of the Appalachian coal States."

As the Congressman points out, it is high time that controls on a fuel so basic to the New England economy be removed once and for all. There is no room for discrimination of this or any other kind.

Gas Warfare: A Switch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the current furore over gas warfare has a curious sidelight which could encourage distrust of official statements. This concerns the manner and timing of "revelations" that gas was used 2 years ago against villages in Yemen.

My special interest in this matter stems from the fact that first accounts of the Yemen incident came as a news scoop by a husband-wife foreign correspondent team, my friends Tom and Harle Dammann of San Diego, Calif.

That scoop, for which Mr. and Mrs. Dammann were nominated for a Pulitzer award, is referred to in the following editorial carried Thursday, March 25, in Chicago's American:

GAS WARFARE: A SWITCH

The worldwide reaction to the use of riot-control gases against Communist forces in Vietnam has up to now followed a highly predictable pattern. The United States is being bitterly denounced for allowing the use of gas in warfare—any gas, even the nonpoisonous types used against rioters in many countries—and the Communists are wringing all the propaganda value out of it they can, which is plenty.

A remarkable twist has been given the situation, however, by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—perhaps by accident, perhaps not. It indicates that Washington may have outsmarted itself, not for the first time, and is now taking the heat that should have been directed against President Nasser of the United Arab Republic.

Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, senior Republican on the committee, late last week said he'd concluded that the United Arabic Republic had been using gas warfare against villages in royalist-held territory of Yemen. This was not exactly news in itself. In June 1963, Chicago's American carried detailed reports from Saudi Arabia on the gas warfare charges made by the Imam Mohammed el-Badr, deposed King of Yemen. The stories were filed by our Middle East correspondents, Tom and Harle Dammann, who had checked them out with representatives of the International Red Cross and American and British military observers.

According to eyewitness reports passed along to the Dammanns, bombs that had fallen near the Imam's headquarters in Yemen had killed some victims and caused hemorrhaging or severe blistering in others. There were charges, unsubstantiated, that "radioactive weapons" had been used. The Red Cross was asked to investigate, and for a time Saudi Arabia planned to bring up the charges in the United Nations.

Subsequently, though, the story dropped out of the news. The official bodies concerned joined in damping it down, even though the reports of gas warfare never were disproved and seemed to have been confirmed all down the line.

Evidence is that the hush-up was the result of pressure from Washington. Whether it came from the White House, the State Department, or the Pentagon is not clear, but it appears that publicity for the poison-gas charges would have conflicted with the Kennedy administration's then-current policy of backing Nasser. It might, moreover, have endangered disarmament talks then going on with the Soviet Union, since there were hints that the gas bombs had been supplied by West Germany.

HICKENLOOPER's statement, coming so conveniently before the announcement that gas had been used in Vietnam, may indicate that the wraps are coming off, and we'll now hear a lot more about the Yemeni charges.

That, of course, would help direct world censure against Egypt and away from us. This kind of maneuvering may be "smart," but it's also repellent. The whole story indicates managed news is still current policy in Washington—that public opinion is still regarded as something to be turned on and off at will and directed where the government wants it. That belief needs to be fought, now and always.

Department of Agriculture's Opposition to Cargo Preference Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of the Cargo Preference Act, better known as the 50/50 Act, I was very much interested in an article in this morning's Baltimore Sun.

The purpose of the above-mentioned act is to assure that 50 percent of the shipments made under the AID program are shipped in U.S.-flag vessels when they are available. Several of the Goverment agencies do everything they can to avoid this law but the Department of Agriculture has been the greatest offender. This is borne out in the article which follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE CALLED HOSTILE TO U.S. FLEET

NEW YORK, March 28.—The Department of Agriculture was charged today with displaying "overt hostility" toward the American-flag merchant marine.

The denunciation, directed primarily against Charles S. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture, came from the Seafarers International Union.

Signed by Paul Hall, president of the SIU, the letter charged that the Department of Agriculture has consistently been hostile to the merchant marine "and that, while expending billions of dollars annually to support a small segment of our farm population, has never missed an opportunity to wail loudly about the high cost of using American ships."

COPIES SENT OUT

The original letter was sent to Murphy. Copies were sent to all members of the Maritime Advisory Committee, which was created by Executive order of President Johnson last June to consider the problems of the American maritime industry.

Hall represents the SIU on that Committee.

Copies of the letter were also sent to the chairmen of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, House Banking and Currency Committee, House Agriculture Committee, Senate Commerce Committee, and House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Hall's letter strongly criticized Murphy's recent testimony before the International Finance Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

MURPHY IS QUOTED

On March 16, Hall said, Murphy told the subcommittee members, in essence, that the use of American-flag merchant ships is detrimental to the export of U.S. farm products to Russia and other Communist countries.

Murphy has also been severely criticized by the American Maritime Association and the American Tramp Shipowners Association.

The two associations have assailed him for saying that America has lost wheat sales to Russia because of the Cargo Preference Act. The legislation assures that part of any U.S.-financed agricultural product sales be shipped by American vessels.

The letter sent by Hall noted that the amount spent by the Agriculture Department for farm subsidies is 12 times the amount spent for all programs of assistance to the merchant fleet, and that 3 subsidies paid on cotton alone cost American taxpayers $800 million a year.

This figure is 10 times the annual cost of the entire cargo preference program, it added.

INTENTION CALLED CLEAR

"We have been told by representatives of the Department," Hall added," "that Agriculture has no wish to thwart the clearly expressed intention of Congress that this Nation shall have a strong merchant marine.

"Yet we are continuously being confronted with new evidence of Agriculture's antipathy toward the merchant marine. Certainly your attempt, before the International Finance Subcommittee, to again downgrade and devaluate the role of our merchant marine, in our Nation's commerce, is a striking case in point."

The SIU president also noted that his union had detailed a series of specific charges against the Agriculture Department in a 40,000-word presentation to the Maritime Advisory Committee November 16. In the presentation, the union had called for the replacement of the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman.

"Although 4 months have elapsed," Hall continued, "Agriculture has not seen fit to respond to this document, but instead has continued to pursue the same policies which gave rise to the charges therein."

A Responsible Republican Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remaks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Friday, March 26, 1965, edition of the New York Times:

WASHINGTON: A RESPONSIBLE REPUBLICAN OPPOSITION

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 25.—The Republicans in Congress are proving to be a constructive opposition. They are working against overwhelming odds—32 to 68 in the Senate, 140 to 294 in the House—but they have maintained a sense of purpose and even a sense of humor.

This is not an easy exercise. When a party has been overwhelmed at the polls, as the Republicans were in 1932 and again in 1964, the task of reconstruction seems almost hopeless. Its leaders are scattered, its numbers reduced in the Congress, its power undermined in the States, its organization disrupted and its party workers demoralized.

Yet the Republican, though they have been out of power for 24 of the last 32 years, are not acting like a bitter or obstructionist minority. They are supporting President Johnson's foreign and domestic programs when they think he is right and trying to put forward constructive alternatives when they think he's wrong.

THE VOTING RECORD

The voting rights bill is a dramatic illustration of the point. The Republican leader in the Senate, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, not only worked with Attorney General Katzenbach in drafting the bill, but is now helping guide it through the Judiciary Committee against the opposition of the southern Democrats.

The Republican leader in the House, GERALD R. FORD of Michigan, along with Representative JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, and other Republicans, are leading a campaign to strengthen the voting rights bill and extend its provisions to many thousands of deprived Negroes not covered by the administration's proposals.

There is no evidence that the Republican Party stands to gain, at least in the short run, by a vast increase in Negro voting. On the contrary, all indications are that the new Negro voters will side overwhelmingly with the Democratic Party, and could even help win back for the Democrats in the 1968 presdential election the Southern States won by the Republican last year.

Yet the Republican leaders in this Congress are quite consciously trying to remove the charge leveled against the party in the Goldwater campaign—that it sought to win by appealing to the anti-Negro elements in both the North and the South.

THE VIETNAM RECORD

The controversy over policy in Vietnam also illustrates the constructive attitude of the Republicans in Congress. The Democrats are highly vulnerable to political attack for their record in that peninsula. They underestimated the power of the North Vietnamese, and helped destroy what little political unity existed under the Diem regime in South Vietnam.

It is quite fair to say, as the Democrats constantly do, that they are merely carrying on in that country the policy started by the Republicans under President Eisenhower. They have changed the whole character of the war in the last 3 years, yet the Republicans have supported the President more consistently than some of the leaders of his own party.

Seldom in the history of the Nation have the Executive and the Congress managed to find a working arrangement in which the President had adequate power and the legislature had adequate control, and this is certainly not the case now.

The administration has the votes and the political skill to work its will on the home front—even on such controversial issues as

voting rights, Federal aid to private school education, medical care for the aged, public housing, and aid to the Nation's most impoverished areas.

In the foreign field, the President's will is almost supreme. In Vietnam, for example, he is free to do almost anything he wishes—either to extend the bombing beyond the 19th parallel into the region of Hanoi and Haiphong, or to call for a truce and negotiate a settlement.

THE PRESIDENT'S RESTRAINT

Nevertheless, in both the domestic and foreign fields, the President has not used this extraordinary power without respect for the Republican opposition. He has consulted with them constantly before settling on his budget or announcing his domestic legislative program.

He has used his appointive power fairly by bringing Republicans into key positions and avoiding a partisan or ideological Cabinet. In fact, he has relied on Senator DIRKSEN almost as if the Illinois Senator were the majority leader.

Thus, unlike the early days of the New Deal, when Franklin Roosevelt drove the Congress rather than winning its confidence, Johnson has been as restrained in the use of his vast power as the Republicans have been generous in the exercise of their limited power.

This has been easier, however, for the President, than for the Republicans. They might easily have drifted into bitterness and irresponsibility after November, and this they have not done.

Freedom Foundation Cites Wausau High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, Wausau Senior High School in my district was singularly honored last year in its selection to receive the 23d annual National Bellamy Award. In the March 12, 1965, issue of the Skyrocket, the school newspaper, it is noted that the Bellamy Award program which was presented at Wausau Senior High last October 9, has merited a citation by the National and School Awards Jury of the Freedom Foundation. The jury considered the program "an outstanding accomplishment in helping to achieve a better understanding of the American way of life."

The program was selected to receive the George Washington Honor Medal Award for the 1964 Patriotic program.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Wausau Senior High School for the honor it has brought to its community and its State and for the example it has set for high schools throughout the country. I also congratulate the National Bellamy Awards program for its citation and ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the Skyrocket entitled "Freedoms Foundation Cites Wausau's Bellamy Program," be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The article referred to follows:

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION CITES WAUSAU'S BELLAMY PROGRAM

The Bellamy Award program presented in the senior high auditorium October 9 has recently merited a citation by the National and School Awards Jury of the Freedoms Foundation. The program, termed by the jury "an outstanding accomplishment in helping to achieve a better understanding of the American way of life," was selected to receive the George Washington Honor Medal Award for the 1964 patriotic program.

The award program has been nominated for Freedoms Foundation honors several times since 1957, with the nominations being presented by various interested individuals. From time to time Bellamy Award schools have received awards for editorials in their school papers, or for the Bellamy issues of their papers, but this is the first time that the Bellamy program itself has been so honored.

Nomination for Freedoms Foundation Award requires presentation by the nominee of material to substantiate the nomination. Miss Judith Yarbrough, national student chairman of the Bellamy Award and a student at Old Dominion College, assembled the materials representing last year's Bellamy program.

The presentation to the committee consisted of a large scrapbook, divided into sections following the credo of the Freedoms Foundation. One section of the credo, "Right to free speech and press," illustrated the coverage of the Wausau program from announcement of the school's participation, a year and a half earlier, to the actual participation. News stories and pictures from the Skyrocket, and the Record-Herald, were arranged in chronological order, unfolding the story of the winning of the award, development of plans for the award festivities, and the actual Award Week activities. The section's climax was the Employers' Mutuals story advertisement which appeared nationally and internationally in leading magazines.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today, 10 million Byelorussians are not allowed to celebrate their national holiday. But Americans remember and praise the brief spark of freedom which excited these people 47 years ago; for it is a symbol of the liberty sought by all men.

Throughout its long history, the Byelorussian nation has suffered and resisted domination. In 1965, however, it is subjected to the cruelest of all imperialisms: communism. In the name of that sterile and hyprocritical ideology, Byelorussians have been forced to give up their national aspirations, speak a foreign tongue, and adopt a new religion.

In 1918, with the fall of the autocratic czarist regime, Byelorussian leaders proclaimed the independence of their nation. For 3 brief years they were to experience liberty. Then, in 1921, the Red army attacked and occupied this newly born state. Ravished to fit Soviet designs for world domination, the Byelorussian National Republic has been forced to lose its strong cultural, political, and economic ties with the West. Even during the darkest hours of this brave nation, however, the Soviets were unable to stifle the true spirit and pride of a noble people. Standing firm against Soviet domination, the great Byelorussian poets added their voices against the alien yoke which had descended upon them. Yanko Kupala sounded the lament for all Byelorussians with these touching words:

My fatherland—it is the whole world,
I have torn myself away from my native soil.
Yet still I am not free from it—in sleep
I dream of Byelorussia.

VA View on Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, my district of San Diego, Calif., suffered the largest of first-round defense installation cutbacks under this administration. I can therefore understand, perhaps better than most, the feelings of numerous colleagues whose home communities seem likely to lose a veterans hospital.

At the same time, I think our new Veterans' Administrator, W. J. Driver, makes an eloquent case in defending his agency's recent economy order. I ascertained Mr. Driver's views after inquiring whether or not the shutdown of some existing hospitals might have any effect on the scheduled construction of hospitals such as the 1,040-bed edifice authorized in San Diego.

I have obtained Mr. Driver's approval to make public his response, by letter dated March 9, 1965:

MARCH 9, 1965.

Hon. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VAN DEERLIN: I appreciate your thoughtful inquiry concerning the plans of the Veterans' Administration for the new San Diego Veterans' Administration hospital, particularly since I feel that all who share your concern that we continue to maintain a healthy, vigorous, and effective program of veterans medicine should know the philosophy behind the hospital construction program currently being undertaken by the Veterans' Administration.

The essence of this philosophy can be simply stated: just as a recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court indicated that representation in State legislatures should be based not on trees or acres, but on people, the deployment of the medical resources of the Veterans' Administration should be based on its ability to aid the maximum number of sick and disabled veterans with the maximum effectiveness, and not on any extraneous considerations.

The medical program of the Veterans' Administration looms large in America's total medical effort. For example, it employs approximately 4 percent of the Nation's physicians; and 15,000 of the Nation's nurses. The Veterans' Administration is the Nation's largest single employer of a number of medically oriented or medically allied professions, including clinical and counseling psychologists, dietitians, medical and psychiatric social workers, physical therapists, and occupational therapists. It contains almost 8 percent of the Nation's hospital beds. And, it has actually spent since 1950 the sum of $1,040 million on hospital construction or renovation, and is presently engaged in an additional $645 million worth of hospital construction.

Medical facilities and personnel are, of course, in critically short supply nationally. Therefore, any organization such as the Veterans' Administration that controls a significant proportion of such facilities and personnel bears the heavy responsibility, in fact the moral duty, of employing them to their maximum potential. Certainly, beds cannot be permitted to lie comparatively fallow in some areas, while others, such as the States of Florida, California, and Arizona, suffer as a result of an inordinate shortage of VA hospital beds.

I believe this preamble points to the obvious reply to your letter: that the decision to close hospitals in other parts of the country will have absolutely no adverse effect on new hospitals planned for California, and this most definitely includes construction at the San Diego and Los Angeles hospitals, which will go forward at optimum speed. In fact, since the VA operates within a ceiling of 125,000 beds, the closing of marginal hospitals in other parts of the country will simply permit us to transfer capacity to areas such as California which have insufficient beds.

Finally, I hope that you will feel free at any time to inquire about the progress of the San Diego hospital or on other matters affecting your constituents.

Sincerely,

W. J. DRIVER,
Administrator.

Judge Oscar F. Mason, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Judge Oscar F. Mason, Jr., of Gastonia, N.C., was honored with the designation Piedmont Personality of the Week by the Gastonia Gazette in its edition of Sunday, March 28, 1965. This is a splendid recognition of one of my closest friends and one of North Carolina's leading jurists.

Judge Mason has rendered great service to his community in many ways. His work for many years as judge of the municipal court of Gastonia has reflected great credit upon him and his city. As a resident of Gastonia I take particular pride in his record of service.

I extend my warm congratulations to Judge Mason as the Piedmont Personality of the Week and under unanimous consent, I include the newspaper article from the Gastonia Gazette in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE GASTONIA GAZETTE PRESENTS ITS PIEDMONT PERSONALITY OF THE WEEK—OSCAR MASON JUDGES WITH FAIRNESS

(NOTE.—Judge Oscar Mason: 6 days a week he sits behind the polished bench while the endless procession of law violators come into his court for trial. It isn't pleasant work because court cases aren't generally nice. But Judge Oscar Mason, Jr., hears and rules with the best tools at his disposal. Attorneys who know him best regard Judge Mason as a jurist who metes out sentences in firm fairness. The judge is in the news daily—court matters must be processed daily. While there is no outstanding accomplishment attached to him recently, his day-in and day-out service to Gastonia as he sits in judgment on persons from all walks of life merits some attention. Judge Mason has served his city and State well. Recognizing him as a man who believes in people, the Gazette salutes Judge Oscar Mason, Jr., as Piedmont personality of the week.)

A man who serves the city of growing beauty 7 days a week, and whose contribution can't be measured in dollars and cents, sits on the bench of Gastonia Municipal Court.

He is Judge Oscar Mason, Jr., who has served the city almost continuously since 1937, either as solicitor or judge.

It was in 1925 hat he established his law practice here, just a year after receiving his law degree from the University of North Carolina in 1924. Before entering Carolina, he had graduated from Lenor Rhyne College at Hickory.

His father had been a member of the North Carolina House of Representatives and an attorney. Young Mason wanted to follow in his father's footsteps.

He not only became a lawyer but, like his father, served in the house of representatives. He spent one term in Raleigh, 1927–28.

Attorneys and other civic-minded leaders of Gastonia say the one qualification a man must have to serve as judge of municipal court is humility.

They say he must know and like people because one wrong conviction can damage a person for life.

It's an awesome responsibility.

One of the problems that often comes up involves decent young men who have been led astray but find that a court conviction can very well keep them out of the Armed Forces.

Circumstances often figure in such cases. Often times, a serious judgment may blacklist the offender for life.

A lesser judgment may teach a good lesson and at the same time leave a defendant's record clean, making him a useful member of society and not a burden on the State.

In many cases, a youngster's future may be charted in Judge Mason's court. Justice may be rendered in many ways and not always in convictions.

Judge Mason is a man known to have a unique sense of perspective in dealing with the wayward.

Mason has stood in the shoes of the attorneys who come before him to represent their clients.

Aside from his job as judge, Mason also practices law but cannot deal in criminal cases. He and his brother, George, also an attorney, are legal advisers for many large firms and corporations.

Thus, his is a split situation. On one hand, he is a judge. Yet, he is an attorney but practices no criminal law. "The two just don't mix." The conflicts are too great.

He feels it is a wise law that prevents judges from representing people in criminal cases.

But this doesn't keep him from handling civil cases. When not on his bench in municipal court, he often may be found in civil court presenting a client's case before another judge.

In this instance, he is on the other side of the fence, so to speak.

It's always hard to send a person to prison. Mason's philosophy is that prison is akin to death in that a man's freedom has been taken away.

But, there are times when prison is a person's own safeguard.

Take a case that came up about a year ago. Mason remembers it well.

A man was charged with public drunkenness, a minor offense. He was a chronic violator, though, giving the judge wider jurisdiction in sentencing.

He could have put the defendant in jail.

Or, he could have turned him loose with a small fine.

The man, when he appeared before Judge Mason, was obviously in bad physical condition. He was sick. "I felt that I might be sending him to his death if I sent him to prison," recalled the judge.

So, he did what he though was best. He set the man free. It was a sure bet, almost, that the drunk would be back in court within a matter of days.

But he wasn't. A few days later he was killed in an automobile wreck.

Fate has taken a hand.

"As I review this in my mind, I always wonder if sending that man to jail would have saved his life," comments Mason.

Either way, though, he could have died.

The best opinion of a judge comes from those who deal most with him—attorneys. And, among Gastonia's corps of attorneys, the feeling is prevelant that Mason is a fair judge.

An overly harsh judge often gets the reputation of a "hanging judge."

Mason is known for rendering justice to all, regardless.

It's mandatory to take a motorist's drivers license if he's convicted of driving drunk.

Mason is responsible for this. While a Member of the House, he introduced the bill. This law has been credited with saving many lives down through the years.

It leaves the judge no choice. Until Mason's bill was passed, the discretion was in the hands of the judge whether or not to suspend a drunk driver's license. Even then, the maximum suspension was for only 6 months.

Oddly enough, Judge Mason recalls that he conceived the idea of mandatory license revocation while bird hunting. "I was with some other hunters. We came upon a wreck and found an injured man. The wreck had been caused by a drunken driver."

It was then that the thought ran through Mason's mind that something ought to be done to take the intoxicated driver off the highway.

Mason is a friendly fellow. He always has a big "hello," for those he meets on the street or in the supermarket.

But, municipal court is his domain and there he is boss. The lawyers know this and respect Mason for it. Defendants, too, soon grasp the court's dignity and authority.

All will tell you, however, that Mason is just.

He has been known to "take court downstairs" and into the parking lots to give hearings to those unable to walk up the stairs to the second-floor courtroom.

"Three strikes and you are out," is a familiar baseball phrase.

It is also heard around municipal court. The reason is that a first offender for public drunkenness, unless there are circumstances, draws only a fine.

It's the same for the second offense but the third time "and you're out." This simply means that a man gets two changes. On the third, if he's convicted, he goes to jail for 60 to 90 days, usually serving time for the first two convictions.

Once out of jail, he gets the same change—three convictions before he's back in jail.

One Sunday morning, a man stopped Judge Mason at the rear of city hall. The man had been before Mason literally hundreds of times. Fact was, he had just returned home from the Dallas prison camp.

The man was upset about having lost a pocketknife. He had lost it, he said, between the time officers arrested him and the judge sentenced him.

The man "told the judge off" and went his way.

A day or so later, he was back in Mason's court. Mason could have thrown the book at him. But, he didn't.

Said an observer who was familiar with the situation, "If that man had talked to me the way he did Oscar Mason, I'd have put him under the jail."

Mason is not a vindictive man, though. In each case, he puts himself in the place of a 12-man jury. He asks himself, "Would a jury convict this man?"

If the answer is "No," he usually renders a not guilty verdict, and vice versa.

The defendant, then, is given the benefit of the doubt.

"You can't please everyone," Judge Mason has said often "but I try to run a fair court."

There are many who will back him up.

The Education Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer some thoughts on certain sections of H.R. 2362, the bill to provide Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. I agree, Mr. Chairman, that financial assistance to local schools is needed in some sections of our country. But I fail completely to understand how anyone can consider the formula for apportionment of Federal funds under title I to be an equitable method of judging local need. Although we are told in the bill itself that the main purpose of the grants to school districts is to help areas with "concentrations of children from low-income families," I was utterly amazed to learn that the 10 wealthiest counties in the Nation—with an aggregate of 32,000 families having poverty-level income—will receive almost $9 million in Federal grants. At the same time, the 10 poorest counties, also with 32,000 poverty-level families, will receive only $4.5 million, or just half as much as the wealthiest counties.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we delete the aid proposed under this bill to those school districts having a family median income in excess of $4,000 per year. Those wealthier districts can well afford to take care of the less fortunate in their own districts. In most cases, those school systems are best which govern themselves and support themselves at the local level. We should not attempt to solve the financial problems of our Nation's schools without first recognizing that the sole sources of Federal money are the private citizen and the free enterprise corporation. Every time the Federal Government takes a dollar from these sources, claiming to return it to them in various benefits, a portion of that dollar stays right here in Washington. Moreover, under this bill, apparently some of this money goes not to the areas which really need it, but to areas like Westchester County, N.Y., which will receive nearly $2.2 million under title I alone. Counties in other parts of the Nation with the same number of poverty-stricken families will receive only about one-third the amount of Westchester County, the sixth wealthiest county in the United States.

Further, I should like to point out that this proposal will cost the people of my State more than twice the amount that the State will receive in grants. The people of California can spend their money more efficiently than that. I cannot help but feel, Mr. Speaker, that passage of this bill, as presently written, will signal the development of another bureaucratic slush fund—poorly administered and poorly apportioned as to its funding. That is the basic reason for my belief that this bill must be sent back to committee for further study and redrafting.

I also feel that we are nationalizing education to an extent previously unheard of. Under the provisions of this bill, the Commissioner of Education becomes a virtual czar, with powers almost unlimited. Under title III, for example, the Commissioner is authorized to establish model schools at the local level—upon terms and conditions to be specified by him. Although the proposals for the schools originate at the local level, the State governments only make recommendations to the Commissioner, who will approve only those proposals which meet whatever criteria he may establish. This is the beginning of highly centralized control over the Nation's education—centralized to the point where all power may soon reside in one man, probably in a new cabinet position.

Mr. Chairman, we need to improve our education system, and to some degree improvements can be achieved through the use of Federal assistance. But let us not assume that Uncle Sam can do it all. Every dollar of aid offered by the Federal Government brings with it a sacrifice of some measure of local control. Proponents of this legislation have spoken loudly and at great length about their belief that no controls are imposed under the terms of this bill. But they are wrong, because the Commissioner of Education sets the basic criteria for every plan to be used in the States, and money is forthcoming only if the State meets the criteria of the Commissioner. That is control of an inherently dangerous kind.

If the Federal Government wanted only to be of assistance to communities around the Nation, it would be both helpful and logical simply to pass tax resources directly back to the localities needing assistance. But this bill involves much more than monetary support. I urgently suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we talk about an enlightened approach to assistance to education: such as tax relief at the Federal level to those who pay school taxes at the local level; such as Federal grants only to areas which demonstrate a true need for such assistance; such as giving adequate recognition to the basic responsibilities of the States and local districts in the matter of education.

Mr. Chairman, I urge recommittal to allow for a basic reconsideration of the many inequities brought to light in the course of debate on this legislation.

And, finally, it is now obvious that discussion will be cut off before the bill can be fully debated. The 10 minutes which have been permitted for discussion on each section of this important bill are hardly adequate in view of the vast importance of the legislation and the fact that four or five amendments have been offered for many of the sections. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that majority rule in a democratic society was ever intended to include the stifling of legitimate debate. Since we in the minority cannot even present our views, much less have them submitted to a fair hearing, I am beginning to see at firsthand the grave dangers attached to one-party rule. This bill involves commitment which will run continuously and will no doubt cost the taxpayer as much as $5 billion per year in 5 or 10 years. Certainly we cannot afford to limit this debate arbitrarily in light of the long-range effects on our Nation, our schoolchildren, and our local governments.

Providing for Consideration of H.R. 2362, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 2362 which is the climax of a 20-year struggle for Federal aid to our hard pressed State and local boards of education. I say climax because—make no mistake about it—this bill is going to pass for the simple reason that the people of this Nation want it to pass.

Our educational needs are national in scope and this bill proposes to raise educational levels nationally. We have heard all the old shibboleths about local control being threatened by this measure. This simply is not true.

Even under the old Articles of Confederation, Federal aid to the States was enacted. The Land Ordinance of 1785 provided that a section in each township should be set aside for public education. And there have been many, many other acts where the Federal Government assisted the States without threatening local control. The Morrill Act of 1862, the Smith-Hughes Act, the two great GI bills passed after World War II and during the Korean conflict, the National Defense Education Act and the measure to provide aid to so-called federally impacted area, a bill which always causes so many opponents of bills such as H.R. 2362 to do semantic flip-flops as they become ensnared in their own rhetoric, and many other acts which have put the

Federal Government into the business of educating Americans without once threatening local control.

I know from the many letters and telegrams that I have received from educators and concerned citizens of the 14th District of New Jersey that the good people of the district which I have the honor to represent, want this bill to pass.

Title I of this bill provides assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families by providing funds to give some kind of educational chance to the 5 million children in this rich and abundant Nation, whose families are existing—you really cannot say living—on an annual income of $2,000 a year or less, and children living in families having incomes of over $2,000 under the programs of aid to families with dependent children.

My State is a wealthy one, one of the wealthiest in the United States, which is not unlike those in other parts of this Nation. This is the great paradox of America, stark poverty in the midst of great abundance. This bill will give all of the children in New Jersey a chance to rise through their own efforts aided by the greatest contribution of the United States to the world, the concept that education is for all.

Under title I, New Jersey would receive $20,196,092 of the estimated $1,060,082,000 which would be dispersed among the States.

Hudson County where 6,936 children come from homes with a family income of less than $2,000 will receive $1,969,824. The effect of this in my own county will be to provide a great educational stimulus which otherwise could not be accomplished without severe damage to the financial structure of the county and without placing an increased burden on the property owners of Hudson County, who are already making heroic sacrifices to educate our children.

I cannot, of course, speak for every school system in America, but I do know that in Hudson County this money will be used wisely by our capable school administrators and I think that it will go far toward breaking the poverty cycle among the disadvantaged who live in my part of the State of New Jersey.

It is a source of great satisfaction to me that this title concedes that children in nonpublic schools who are educationally disadvantaged are also worthy of attention from the Federal Government. Under title I, the local educational agency can make provision for children in nonpublic schools in terms of providing special educational services.

Similarly, under title II, textbooks, library resources, and other such educational material may be made available to children in nonpublic schools on a loan basis, without, in any way, threatening the barrier between church and state.

Under title II of the State of New Jersey will receive $3,223,812 of the approximately $100 million which will be distributed for library resources, textbooks and instructional materials.

Under title III for supplemental educational centers and services grants will be made from State allocations by the Commissioner of Education to local public educational agencies for the purpose of financing supplemental educational services and centers. It is expected under this title that the local public educational authorities will be able to set up programs which will be of benefit to all children whether in public or private schools, without aiding any religious group.

Of the $100 million to be disbursed under this title, New Jersey's share would amount to $3,150,198 of the estimated distribution of $100 million.

Title IV of the bill would amend the Cooperative Research Act of 1954—Public Law 83-531—to provide a broader base for the support of research and development programs so that our educational programs can continue to keep abreast of the times. In this way, great improvements in methodology could be achieved while at the same time, ways could be discovered to achieve desired educational ends with a minimum amount of expenditure.

Title V of H.R. 2362 would authorize the appropriation of $25 million to the States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. The Commissioner of Education will grant each State board of education the sum of $100,000 which amounts to about 85 percent of the $25 million and the remainder will be apportioned among the States on the basis of the number of public schoolchildren in the State. New Jersey's share will amount to $576,593.

Never have the Members of this Congress been given a better opportunity to advance the cause of American education by a single stroke. By the passage of this bill we can further expand the splendid American dream that any American boy or girl will be given a real opportunity to achieve commensurate with his or her aptitude or ability. This measure, in a practical way, allows us to use the broad Federal tax base to wage war on ignorance and poverty in the United States. I know that this Congress will be equal to the challenge. I urge every Member of this House, Mr. Speaker, to become a part of the greatest single legislative achievement in the field of education that has ever been enacted in this House, by voting in favor of H.R. 2362.

Are We Our Brother's Keeper?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there has just come to my attention a remarkably fine article on the philosophy of international development programs, written by the distinguished author and economist, Barbara Ward—Lady Jackson—in the February 8, 1965, issue of Christianity and Crisis: A Christian Journal of Opinion.

Barbara Ward's article makes abundantly clear why the developed countries of the West should assist the less developed of the world. To Barbara Ward the purpose of aid is not at all to "win friends and influence people" or to earn gratitude, but rather to redress a dangerous imbalance that exists in a world where the gap between the rich nations and the poor nations is still growing. Being a deeply committed Christian, she also sees the process as an expression of the brotherhood of man, reminding the reader of President Kennedy's statement in his inaugural that—

> To those peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right.

Barbara Ward draws a striking analogy between the arguments raised against the international developmental programs of today and the typical arguments raised in the 19th century against self-help programs for the poor within a nation.

Barbara Ward is an outstanding interpreter of international affairs. For many years an editor of the Economist, she has also written a number of books on international economics, including "Faith and Freedom" and "The Rich Nations and the Poor Nations." Her recent article in Christianity and Crisis is adapted from her chapter in "Christianity Amid Rising Men and Nations," published on March 26 by Associated Press.

Barbara Ward's outstanding article, entitled "Are We Our Brother's Keeper?" and subtitled "Nothing Is Scarce but Imagination and Will," is set forth below, and I commend it to my colleagues and to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ARE WE OUR BROTHER'S KEEPER?

(By Barbara Ward)

I would like to pick out for consideration two of the consequences of our total involvement in scientific and technological change and try to ask whether there are any particular Christian insights or energies that may help us to deal with this revolution. It may well be that energy is the more important. Many problems are, after all, accessible to human reason. What Christianity has brought is not so much the answers as the energy to see that the answers are applied. It has been an extraordinary source of dynamic power and dynamic change.

Men of other cultures and other faiths—and men of no faith—will often support the same solutions, because they can be grounded in the normal human wisdom and reason of men as rational beings. But between acceptance and action can fall the shadow—the shadow of inertia and habit and self-love. How do we preserve the energies needed to maintain the momentum of a dynamic society?

It is perhaps the first responsibility of Christian faith to provide the goad. As Christ said, if salt loses its savor, it is fit only to be thrown into the privy. Christian purpose and dedication are as vital as the proposing of Christian, and therefore humane, solutions.

What are some of the vast changes that challenge our reason and our energy today? I propose to discuss two—the fact of unity and the fact of abundance. These facets of our scientific and technological revolution have extraordinary implications for policy today. The reality of unity hardly needs stressing. You cannot get away from the fact that in a universe in which you can fly

supersonically and arrive before you set out, no land is very far from any other. Nor are human beings, when instant communication of words and images—as by Telstar—can take place all round the planet. And we simply have no conception yet of what these new forms of total communication will do to human consciouness.

ABUNDANCE IN A UNIFIED WORLD ECONOMY

Another facet of unity is worth examining at greater length, because it is not quite so obvious. One of the consequences of the industrialism and technological change of the last 100 years has been to create a unified world economy. The industrial powers around the North Atlantic—rich white nations—are so far the only nations to make the full breakthrough to the modern affluent economy, though Japan is close behind, and Russia is coming up.

This group of nations has created a world economy in which the impact of the chocolate milkshake drinkers of Manhattan on the cocoa farmers of Ghana is pretty complete. This inner industrial core of wealthy nations has gone out to look for its raw materials, to bring them back to be fed into the industrial structure of the Atlantic, and in return has sent back manufactures—largely consumer goods—to satisfy demand in local markets. This movement has made up a sort of systole and diastole of an economy that moves as one all around the world, sometimes shakily, sometimes poorly, but undoubtedly as a single world system.

Now this world economy suffers from a very considerable degree of imbalance—another factor of which we are insufficiently aware. The Bible, of course, reminds us that "to him who hath shall be given," and nowhere is this more true than in the uncontrolled, unregulated market economy. The circulation of trade between the wealthy, developed, industrialized Atlantic nations and the great penumbra of developing states—in Asia, Africa, and Latin America—tends to serve the interests of the rich nations and to discriminate against the poor.

Our realization of this fact is relatively new. Every single Western tariff is so arranged that it discourages the growth of manufacturing and processing in underdeveloped countries. The rule is zero tariffs or low tariffs on raw materials; higher tariffs on semimanufactured goods; full tariffs on manufactures, and then if some of these poor little manufactures manage to creep in, on goes a quota to make absolutely certain that they are kept out.

Again in the field of raw materials, prices tend to instability. Over the last 10 years, for instance, in Latin America the entire import of private investment and of public capital has been offset by the fall in primary prices. Actually, there has been a negative outflow of funds. In primary prices in general, there was a 30-percent movement in terms of trade against the poor countries between 1951 and 1961.

These are just a few examples of the way in which the world economy has an unconscious bias against the developing world—and this in a genuinely unified economy with interdependent functions and with a decision-making process that, though it is usually carried on in the main cities of the Western World, can vitally affect economic trends everywhere else.

In short, there is interdependence in the world market, even if it is no more than the interdependence of a brute economic kind that occurs when nations impinge upon each other in pursuit of their own interests. There is, therefore, an a priori case for asking whether some higher form of interdependence, one with some smell of humanity about it, may not be in order.

In technology, in communication, in transportation, in the world market, unity is a fact. How much more our unity is underlined by the possibility of annihilation. Once a neighbor can lob a bomb over your back fence, he is a neighbor whether you like it or not. This is the position of our world. We have, all of us, the possibility of seeing the annihilation of the entire human species.

These, then, are the inescapable unities that now underlie the community of mankind. The concept of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God has, of course, been a part of Christian belief since its origin. We inherited the faith from the Jewish belief in a single God of the universe and from the universal reason beloved of the Greeks. But the concept of a single humanity could not be realized until our own time, because the means of communication were largely lacking. The most significant change of our time is that the physical unity is now a fact.

But the economic, military and technological energies have advanced far beyond our humane, constitutional and political energies. We have a community, then, that is real in its risks and not yet real in its obligations. This is a wholly new situation. We may have dreamed about unity and talked about brotherhood. Now suddenly we are confronted with their physical preconditions—and very disconcerting we find it. We Christians are apparently no more alive to the fact of brotherhood, no more conscious of the common humanity of this entire terrestrial family, than those who have never heard of Christ.

ENFRANCHISING THE WORLD CONSUMER

The second consequence of our scientific revolution is, perhaps, even more astonishing. This is the liberation of physical resources. Until the day before yesterday, the amount that could be done for your neighbor, whatever his misery, was severely limited because, broadly speaking, the limits were always fixed by the size of the harvest. There was just so much food to go around. If the pressure of population went beyond that point, then people starved. This limiting factor upon the concept of charity was, if you like, very like the limiting factors on the concept of brotherhood. You might accept in theory the brotherhood of man and your duty to your neighbor. In physical fact it was difficult to realize the one or practice the other.

Now, in the last few decades, the old implacable limitations have been raised. The facts are so startling that we are only just beginning to grasp their scope. At the core of it all stands, naturally, the American farmer. Every time he cuts down his acreage, he puts on more fertilizer and produces twice as much on half the land. This in turn comes up against the technologically unimprovable Western stomach, which refuses to increase its capacity. The result is the piling up of surpluses. The wheat surplus is the most notorious, but there are others.

The European farmer is closing the gap, and tropical farmers may not be far behind. Imagine being flooded with bananas. I have visited West African research stations where they cheerfully say that they can get a 1,500-percent increase in cocoa output by very simple changes in cultivation and fertilizer. Yet there is already a year's carryover of cocoa on the world market.

The surpluses first appeared on our farms. But the problem will spread to industry. We do not yet know what next vast increases in productivity the computer revolution may bring us. The possibility here of unlimited energy would be the most startling and vital increase in resources we could conceive of.

What do we do about all this potential increase? Oversupply in a market system does not resolve itself. Our Western market system has vital characteristics of flexibility and diversity, of productivity, of attention to detail, of the search for profit as a discipline, and as the means of making a genuine margin for reinvestment. But the market system has had from the beginning—as Marx, incidentally, foresaw—the problem of keeping demand in step with supply. Marx saw that the West's so-called Christian society was based upon the exploitation of man by man. He predicted that the poor would grow poorer, that the system would break down under the weight of what will be called excessive production, but will in reality be underconsumption.

Do not let us underestimate Marx. He was the first political economist to see that the coming of the industrial revolution, based on the accumulation of the capital applied to technology, would redically remake the face of the earth. He also saw, with outrage, the first stages of primitive accumulation in Britain, carried on in large measure at the expense of the poor. His mistake was to feel that nothing could be done about it.

Fortunately, the constitutional traditions of European society opened up the vote and the possibility of political action to the workers. They were no longer helpless pawns. At the same time, Christian conscience simply said that even if this degree of exploitation was, as some maintained, essential to the economic system, it would have to stop.

These two forces—Christian conscience and liberal constiutionalism—operating in our Western society little by little raised up the mass of the working people. They could organize trade unions and form political lobbies. Their own pressure was added to the conscience of the rich. They secured better wages and a larger share of effective demand. And distributive justice in the shape of progressive taxation added to their opportunities. The hopeless proletarian of the 1860's became bit by bit the fine, upstanding consumer of today. The Marxian prophecy—that demand would never rise to meet the new vast sources of supply—was defeated within domestic society.

But when we turn to our present problems of supply, to the new vast outpouring of wealth and surpluses, we have to see that in our world economy we have not yet acted in any comparable way to build up demand. The enfranchisement of the mass consumer is still a great unfinished business in the world at large. There the Marxist prophecy has reappeared. The poor nations grow poorer, while the rich grow wealthier still. The analogy is quite relevant. The conditions of trade I have described discriminate against primary producers. They cannot earn enough from the work they do for us, in producing primary products, to develop their own capital and technological apparatus.

I think the analogy can be pressed further. One reason that the masses procured a better share of the products of their work was that their own powers of association and self-defense were acceptable to the constitutional tradition of the Western world. Today do we not see something comparable in the emerging part played by the developing world within the United Nations? We talk about "power blocs" and mutter about irresponsible Afro-Asians in our worried way. But may we not be seeing something comparable to the earlier creation of useful, necessary, countervailing power within our domestic Western society?

Indeed, may not the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development at Geneva, where trade is being discussed from the point of view of the developing nations, be a very salutary reminder that two-thirds of the human race do not fully profit by the economic system under which they live, that they are beginning to notice this and to concert together the policies they need to reverse the disadvantage? This I regard as entirely healthy for the world economy. It is a trend the rich nations should welcome, encourage and, above all, actively follow up.

The second great factor was the better organization of the internal market. This I

have already mentioned, but I would like to add one of the key figures in the revolution—Henry Ford. He realized that if you paid a worker $5 a day, he might actually buy the car he was producing. If, in the developing world, we can contrive means by which the developing nations can, in the world exchange of goods, earn a better return, they in turn will provide more effective demand for the goods the West can produce.

If the Henry Ford analogy can be somewhat expanded, you can say that if we in the West make efforts to put a floor under raw material prices and, through various measures of countervailing finance organized through the International Monetary Fund, put more consuming power at the poor nations' disposal, we shall have given them wider access to the world market—rather as Henry Ford expanded domestic demand, once he had seen that his workers were also his customers.

"COALS IN THE BATH"

The third aspect of the analogy concerns transfers of wealth from rich to poor. It was a combination of constitutional tradition and Christian conscience that compelled statesmen to accept the fact that there is a mutual obligation between rich and poor and that progressive taxation is a justifiable and useful way of seeing that some of the surplus of the rich is spent upon increasing the opportunities of the poor.

I stress this word "opportunities." The transfer was not a dole. It was not a handout. The transfer went into education, into trade schools; it went into hospitals and better housing. It went into the improvement of factories and cities, in which, although heaven knows they were not perfect, people could work and live with some self-respect. These new opportunities led to the emergence of a skilled working class and to a ladder of mobility and social opportunity. It was, in short, a creative transfer of wealth, and it began to change the exploitative jungle into some semblance of a humane order.

Again, if this analogy is correct, it provides the rationale for foreign aid. Let us for the moment accept the yardstick of 1 percent of national income—in fact, only France is achieving it at this time. If this transfer of wealth is devoted to the creation of opportunity, to the building up of skills, to educational programs, to the transformation of agriculture through extension services, to the beginnings of local processing and manufacturing—into all the creative possibilities of an expanding economy—then it is possible that it will repeat in our international society the civilizing and humane advance that followed from the adoption of income tax within our domestic economy.

Sometimes, I confess, when I hear people talking about economic assistance and the developing world, I am struck more and more forcibly by the resemblance between the two periods. It appears to be one of the unattractive features of the rich that they seem unable not to despise the poor. Think of the things that were said about the proletarians of the 19th century—proletarians because they were always producing children. Every time you gave them a wage increase—so went the argument—they would have 10 more children, so it was no use. How much this resembles what one hears now about the developing societies of Asia and Latin America—useless to give them economic assistance, because their birth rate is such that they cannot make use of it. Or take the other great classic Victorian cliche—the coals in the bath. No good doing anything for the poor; give them a bath tub and they put the coals in it.

This is too terribly like the talk you hear now: Do not give tractors to Africa, because they will take them duck shooting. The old complaints reappear: feckless, idle, irresponsible people; if you pay them more, they work less. There is hardly a criticism made now about developing societies that was not used in the 19th century against the poor. And part of the reason is this bias, this inability of those who are already rich, competent, skilled, intelligent, not to feel in some way that all this is due to their own superior efforts and that, therefore, others have failed in the human scale.

Domestic experience shows that if society gives them the opportunity, the education, and the background to develop all their inherent skills, from being miserable proletarians they quietly turn into fine, upstanding consumers. I would like to bet that 100 years from now people will look back on this period and say: "What ridiculous things they used to say about the developing nations," just as we look back now and say: "Heavens, the things they used to say about the migrants."

It is particularly important, I believe, for a self-proclaimed Christian society to consider this possibility. It has been thoroughly warned by its founder that myopia comes all too often with great wealth. We should be aware of the amounts of complacent and comfortable myopia now surrounding the whole discussion of economic assistance, a myopia remarkably like the early discussions of the "good poor" and the "undeserving poor" in Victorian England.

AN INESCAPABLE OBLIGATION

Let me sum up. If we accept a regular transfer of wealth—say, of 1 percent of national income, devoted to building up opportunities and skills in the developing lands; if we organize the gains from international trade more equitably; if we encourage developing lands to act together in defense of their interests—then I believe we have a good chance of repeating in the world economy the creative transformations we have seen inside our domestic society. We would see at the world level the building up of a mass market in which the exchange of goods would serve both parties, in which the ability to take a creative part in the whole cycle of consumption and production would lead to the possibility of self-help, the ability to save locally—the ability, in short, to build up that apparatus of modern technology without which nations remain poor, whatever their resources.

A world that is one in physical, but not in moral, fact; a world that combines unheard-of abundance with deepening poverty—this is the world that confronts the Christian conscience today and lays all Christians under an inescapable obligation to act.

But how? The short-range answer is, of course, to turn the abundance into a working tool for the attack on misery and ignorance and urban blight, and to build up a worldwide order with some of the essential underpinnings of solidarity and justice. But the long-range answer, of detailed work and sustained dedication, has many obstacles to overcome. The first is perhaps to persuade our wealty societies to accept the fact of affluence.

Take America, for instance. Some of your leading businessmen and retired statesmen and elderly Senators all too often argue that you are heading for bankruptcy. This is a very odd assumption. To give you one or two examples: The figure today for the savings of the American people has reached $1,000 billion—a trillion. This does not sound much like bankruptcy to me. Take another factor, the celebrated drain on gold. A large part of the drain in the last 3 years has not followed from foreign aid or even military expenditure. It has followed the determination of American businessmen to invest overseas. Excellent—and what happens as a result? A very large flow of resources will return in due season to the United States. How can a country with something like $60 to $70 billion worth of investment overseas talk of bankruptcy?

It is essential for the citizen to get some sense of the abundance that is available. Resources are physical resources, brought together by human intelligence and transformed into utility by machines and human skills. These are the realities underlying the dollars and cents. Owing to the fabulous productivity of modern technology, resources—except in the shortest run—can, in a country as wealthy as America, pretty well be expanded to meet any desirable end. The crucial point is, as we have said, to keep demand expanding. As U Thant once said: "It is no longer resources that limit imagination; it is imagination that limits resources."

Our current economy underlines these facts. The combination of intelligence, capital and technology now at work in the Western world makes it possible for the nations to spend $80 billion a year on arms and still have the national income go up by 3 to 4 percent a year. In 1963–64, the United States added about $30 billion to its national income. If it devoted 1 percent of national income to aid and 2 percent to the domestic war on poverty, there would still be some $15 billion for extra consumption at home. Resources will remain abundant. Materials are backed by the immense powers of substitution in the chemical industry. Water will flow from desalinization. Existing energy leads on to atomic energy, to solar energy, to energy from the tides. Labor abounds due to a rising birth rate and the job-reducing tendencies of automation. No, nothing is scarce except imagination.

We have no right, under these conditions, to talk of bankruptcy. We have no right to disguise to ourselves the fact that we are enormously rich. I believe that much of this talk is an evasion of responsibility, and subconsciously is meant to be exactly that. So let there be no doubt about it. It is not our resources that are lacking; it is our will to use them, our wisdom to use them, our ability, if you like, to rise to the limitless possibilities that science and technology have placed in our hands.

Is not this the prime challenge to the Christian conscience? Resources exist on one side, need on the other; can there be any challenge more direct than this? After all, if you go back to the Gospel, the most specific promise of salvation ever pronounced is for those who feed the hungry; the only specific damnation is for those who do not. I always find the words extremely disconcerting, although I find many Christians can read them without turning a hair.

Today when we confront the naked and homeless, the hungry and the sick, all the old alibis are gone—all the old limitations have vanished. We confront a stark moral issue. The resources to act are available; the need for action is obvious. What shall we do?

Honored for Solar Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, while the United States probes outer space and attempts to learn the secrets of the sun and the stars, Mr. Harry E. Thomason, a patent attorney for the U.S. Army Materiel Command here, has harnessed the sun's rays and put them to work heating and cooling his house at 7354

Walker Mill Road in District Heights, Md.

Mr. Thomason recently was awarded $100 by the Army Materiel Command for his solar heat collector invention which he developed on his own time and separate from official duties. He voluntarily gave the U.S. Government free license to use this and several other of his inventions in solar heating and cooling.

Mr. Thomason's work in solar energy has been widely recognized. He and the solar houses he has built in suburban Maryland have been the subjects of articles in national magazines and in scientific journals.

The award he received is an honor justly accorded this attorney-scientist.

Christian Education—America's Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington, the Honorable JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, honored my congressional District on March 20, 1965, by appearing at Gardner-Webb College at a convocation held throughout an entire weekend. Mrs. HANSEN was one of several outstanding Americans appearing at the several functions sponsored by Gardner-Webb College at Boiling Springs, N.C. Others participating were Gov. Dan K. Moore of North Carolina; Mr. D. W. Brosnan, president of the Southern Railway System; and Dr. T. W. Wilson who substituted for Dr. Billy Graham due to illness of Dr. Graham.

The address of Mrs. HANSEN was one of the outstanding features of the entire weekend of activities and meant much to the people who were privileged to hear her presentation. The appreciation of the faculty, students, and suporters of Gardner-Webb College was evident to all present.

I take this opportunity to express again my appreciation to Mrs. HANSEN and insert her address as a part of the Appendix today:

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION—AMERICA'S SECURITY

(By JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, Member of Congress, at convocation ceremonies, Gardner-Webb College, Mar. 20, 1965)

INTRODUCTION

Mr. WHITENER, Mr. Chairman, President Poston, reverend clergy, distinguished alumni, and faculty of Gardner-Webb College, and friends of the college, thank you very much, Mr. WHITENER, for your cordial and gracious introduction. May I say in response to you that the House of Representatives of the United States has no more distinguished Member than yourself. It has been a great pleasure to serve with Congressman WHITENER, and I shall never forget the remark of another colleague of ours who, when I first came to Congress, said to me, "BASIL WHITENER is one of our finest and ablest Members and reflects much credit upon his State and this House." This has been exemplified many times.

It is also a genuine pleasure to return this morning to North Carolina. I had never been in your State until 2 years ago when Congressman WHITENER persuaded me, very easily, to speak at your great university at Chapel Hill for the status of women's conference held by your federation of business and professional women's clubs.

Immediately I fell in love with your State; with its beauty, people, and hospitality.

My own district has many North Carolinians. One of North Carolina's ablest Congressmen, ROY TAYLOR, was born in my district, and when I entered the legislature many years ago, our very distinguished and probably the finest highway director we have ever known was Lacey Murrow, formerly from North Carolina.

The chairman of my very first campaign committee for the legislature was born and raised in North Carolina and is the descendant of soldiers who fought here during the Revolutionary War.

I am deeply honored that you have asked me to participate in your convocation today—to be present during the award of honors earned for achievement of service and to share in the reaffirmation of our college's goals.

Probably at no time in the history of the world has there been such a need for total education or as much demand. On every campus in America there are discussions about tomorrow's educational future.

You are particularly fortunate here to live in a smaller collegiate world than many do, for on campuses such as yours, there is time to thoughtfully and prayerfully appraise the future—to measure the steps necessary for you to take in advancing the American struggle against the tyranny of ignorance, and finally, to provide that spiritual strentgh for life which you have so well experienced as "Christian education—the extra dimension."

I would never have been in politics at all if it had not been for my desire years ago to support and assist education in my own State. It is an old story, but as the depression drew to its close, our schools were almost bankrupt. I felt that I, who had had the privilege of a good education at my own State university, owed some portion of my life to service so that others too might share in a better preparation for living.

It was my great fortune and privilege as a Member of our Legislature, to serve for 22 years as a member of the Education Committee of our House of Representatives and spend 8 of those years as chairman of the committee.

I note in our audience today—many women, distinguished alumnae of your college, friends of your college; women whom, I am sure are serving in every known capacity as outstanding members of school boards, PTA's, community school council groups.

It gives one a warm feeling of pride in the achievement and accomplishments of these women and all of us must be deeply grateful for the thought, time, and, energy that they give to community service. I am glad that it is part of your college goal.

Your theme "The Decade of Advance To Assure the Extra Dimension—Christian Education," seems to me a particularly fitting topic on this lenten morning in our restless, tumultuous, rebellious spring of 1965 and it is also particularly appropriate that you have set aside this weekend on your campus to plan and pray.

The story of your college is a distillate of the romance belonging to all educational growth and progress. It is a reflection of self-sacrifice and struggle and the deep concern manifested by your people long ago for America's future. That you began here, determined to expand the horizons of the mind, was a deed as valiant as any done by those who have carried our flag into battle.

I was fascinated by the book, "Lengthened Shadows," which President Poston so kindly forwarded me. On its pages is not only your story, but that of education. It brought back to me the early struggle in my own State to establish our academic institutions. I could see on these pages, almost as if they were alive, the figures, minds, and souls of those young men and women who, not too many years ago, came to your early institution with their precious $76.05 as payment for 9 months attendance here. Those boys and girls kindled their own wood fires and one can almost see them at their desks as winter dusks fell—reading, writing, thinking, dreaming.

I salute their parents who must have gone without many luxuries to spend even that $76, for money was not plentiful in that era. It took courage and faith in what Christian education would mean in the years to come for parents to put aside, bit by bit, money to invest in education.

I am reminded of one of our own institutions of learning in a neighboring State, founded by a woman who crossed the plains in the forties, whose tuition fees were a variety of commodities—sacks of potatoes, firewood, eggs, chickens, fish, venison. Like your own college, that institution still stands as a symbol of service.

In accepting an invitation to speak anywhere one does it very humbly, always asking, "What may I say that will have meaning, not only for the hour of the speech, but what may be left behind for later thought?" This was true when President Poston asked me here. I tried to assess today's problems and the challenges of this tumultuous world about us.

Finally the last question I asked myself was, "What is the deep meaning of this March morning in this year 1965?

"What challenges does it bring?

"What part of the answer will education here at Gardner-Webb make?"

Unfortunately I could not shut myself away in an ivory tower of silent contemplation and withdrawal from this world to formulate my thoughts.

Congressmen have no such hidden place other than their own hearts and minds. Our offices are filled day and night with problems affecting not only the destiny of our immediate districts, but with those of the entire Nation and the world around us.

Old boundaries of time and space are gone. We are inextricably, whether we like it or not, woven into the fabric worn by all mankind. We are part and parcel of a great and stirring world.

For more than 6 weeks I have sat on a Subcommittee of Appropriations in the House of Representatives working on a multiplicity of human affairs. These vary over a wide range of apparently unrelated subjects—the quality and quantity of educational training necessary to grant fulfillment for the Indian youth of our own continent; schools in far-off Samoa where they are utilizing the first complete TV classrooms in the world; schools and teachers for the mandated trust territories at the fringe of the Pacific; erosion control; recreation for the people of your State and mine; forest development from Louisiana to Michigan—Maine to Oregon. Gigantic research programs were presented for our review.

Indeed you may be interested to know that 13 percent of the Department of Interior's budget is research.

One small example—upon the development of a saline water program may rest the future of wide areas of this Nation and the welfare of many people.

A complete understanding of the relationships of pesticides to people has barely begun.

We had to ask ourselves many times to evaluate the answers which will be formulated in research.

How may future exploration of the world's surface guide us to the better placement of buildings in faroff Alaska so that another earthquake will not be disastrous?

What are the answers to proposed Indian Tribe termination?

What economic programs based on natural resource development will improve our national economy?

How can we preserve for the never-ceasing stream of people along the highways of our Nation the forests and wild rivers?

Have we an answer to the acres of junked cars I saw lying in a far-off spot on the upper Missouri River in Montana?

I am sure America can be no less ingenious about the disposition of its rubble, the preservation of our beauty than we have been in finding the composition of the moon's surface.

Congress is also constantly involved with each full national day. Rising tides of passion and demands for solutions wash and roll against us.

I want you all to know this, your Congress debates each issue with good conscience and with care remembering you, the individual, your dignity, hopes and aspirations, your freedoms. It remembers too that deep in the heart of every person is the ever-searching and demanding call for peace on earth; yet at the same time preserving our national integrity.

Congress, too, remembers the final total—our Nation's dignity and the Nation's responsibility of living within its constitutional structure of democracy.

I have told many people in my own district through the years of my public service to remember one thing always—this is a government of the people. You are inescapably part of this Nation.

Government is not a giant monster in some remote place—it is you. The sum total of the American mark upon history, time, and civilization will be the total of our collective aspirations and accomplishments.

This is a restless era we share. You know as I, that morning after morning our newspapers are filled with such stories as:

"Across the Nation crimes of violence rose 9 percent for murder, 18 percent in aggravated assault, 19 percent in rape, 12 percent in robbery."

"The situation in Vietnam grows more serious."

"Congestion increases on highways and streets."

"School dropouts face job scarcity."

"Berkeley students revolt."

These are not gentle headlines and I know that you, even as I, often feel a sense of frustration, anger, resentment, and weariness.

You ask, as I, what has happened? What has gone wrong in our affluent, once comfortable, secure society—a society which probably has the highest standard of living ever known in the world?

Are we at once both rich and poor?

And there is the question which you and I are deeply concerned with at this convocation.

Where are we going?

Will the march of national progress like an invading army trample our souls into the dust?

This is a time also for perspective, for a glance behind those headlines.

In 1789, the year in which North Carolina ratified the U.S. Constitution, the population of the United States was 3,791,342.

I cannot pass the ratification of our Constitution without saluting the patriots of North Carolina who before affixing their signatures to that great instrument of government, demanded inclusion of our Bill of Rights. Forever this Nation will owe a debt of gratitude to North Carolina.

In 1800 there were 5,308,487 people in 16 States, many of them wilderness.

In 1900 there were 76,212,000 people in 45 States.

In 1965 there are 50 States with 193,145,000 people.

Perhaps very few women in this room realize that until the year 1837 no woman was admitted to a coeducational institution. Today out of a total of 4,987,867 students working toward college degrees 1,936,106 are women.

Very simply, our Nation has suddenly grown beyond its wildest dreams and it has grown before we have had a chance to solve all of the problems caused by that growth. We face terrific economic changes and at the same time the basic problem of food, clothing, and shelter for our millions and understanding of their dilemmas.

We are a nation searching daily for its own soul—as we have searched before in other times and other places through the centuries.

We do have the courage, faith, and perseverance to weather the gales of frustration, insecurity, the tides of anger and injustice, the sharp knife of fear, and to find eternal peace.

At Plymouth Rock, Concord, Lexington, Kings Mountain, The Marne, and Iwo Jima, in a thousand despairing moments we transformed discouragement into splendor and dedicated that splendor to the American principles of justice and right.

In the years that are now gone, in thousands of cabins from coast to coast nights were filled with arrows, fires, threats of death.

Thirteen struggling tiny colonies sat down to defy their king, to declare the tenets of the people's belief in the rights of man with the Declaration of Independence.

We have lived with strife and evil and have overcome it.

It will happen again.

However, in this year of 1965 we, knowing of the keen necessity for education, can ill-afford not to set forth our problems, and proceed to solve them with the full processes of democracy in accomplishment of our goals.

We are a nation well aware of our natural resources and deeply devoted to their best possible use.

Our most precious resource, however, is our young people, many of whom will, within the next decade, begin to assume their responsibilities for the management of America.

No sensible person today can fail to realize that since we have come to live within the ugly shadow of the atom, we must recognize more than ever before in the world's history the fundamental importance of education to our development and to the welfare and security of you and me as well as every other human being on the face of this earth.

Total education is the life blood of democracy, and democracy is the life blood of the free world. The United States, in a brief 170 odd years, has risen, as I pointed out a moment ago, from a colonial revolutionary movement to a position of world power and prominence.

Unless we use that power wisely and well, we shall fail not only ourselves and the vision of our forefathers, but also the hopes and aspirations of countless other people.

It is equally axiomatic that every person in our society should be developed to the fullest extent of his or her potential, for the individual, the Nation, and the world are all beneficiaries of such a program.

Our beloved late President Kennedy wisely said in a message to Congress:

"Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hopes for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself in an era such as this all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity."

It is usually easy to build a case for the intellectual elite. No one will deny an education to a great scientist, or a great mathematician. I would like to reverse the question and ask—are we as willing to thoughtfully train those who will not plan flights to the moon but whose most deadly capacity can be his unintelligent vote at the ballot box.

I have always been interested in our gifted children and in programs for these children, but I would like to suggest that the neglect of any of our children is at our peril.

You would not, I am sure, vaccinate only one child in a community for smallpox.

The inquiring mind of genius can only function to its fullest potential in a solid, educated society which values it, and it cannot flourish on the quicksand of illiterate surroundings of unhappily, misfitted people, angry at their impotence and waiting only for a moment to strike at rewards that belong to the gifted and energetic.

This, I think is becoming of increasing concern to thoughtful people, and it may now be the proper time to ask ourselves this morning a basic question—why do we educate?

1. For citizenship, which involves not only an awareness and appreciation of all facets in our society, but also of concomitant responsibilities. Man living in the shadow of his own doom, must make answer. It is imperative, in the exercise of his rights and performance of his duties, that every individual act on the basis of well-informed judgments rather than prejudice and ignorance.

2. We educate for parenthood, so that the lasting benefits of education—moral and spiritual as well as intellectual—may be passed on and become part of our national fabric.

3. We educate to develop a society which prizes decency and integrity, the dignity of the individual, and which works to further man's contribution to understanding and solving the problems of the world in which he lives.

There may have been a time when these goals could have been accomplished with little formal education. That is not now true. You recognized it at Gardner-Webb years ago.

We live in a complex society in which technology is highly developed.

Our population is increasingly urban, extremely mobile, and the pace of life generally much swifter than that of our fathers and mothers.

The more complicated the practical business of living becomes, the darker the headlines, the more necessary our educational programs and educational consciences at all levels.

There is no longer a large market for young, uneducated labor. Out automated society requires increasingly well-trained workers. Statistics show that while unskilled factory production workers have been unable to find jobs, the U.S. Employment Service at the same time has been unable to fill thousands of specialized positions, ranging from chemists and physicists to toolmakers and other technicians.

As automation becomes the rule rather than the exception, positions involving little more than manual labor will decrease even further.

Unless students are early inculcated with a desire for this necessary education and an awareness of its value, they will not pursue it, and here lies part of the reason for some of today's turbulence.

I wonder if many of us realize that 3 out of every 10 children entering the nineth grade fail to finish high school. Elementary school is their total educational experience.

Yet at that elementary level, our classrooms are overcrowded, teaching is all to often incompetent, and facilities are inadequate.

Many classrooms are so packed that children can only attend half a day—700,000 of them in the United States.

Apart from the basic educational lack in this situation to the child, it has two grim-

mer results for society: the encouragement of juvenile delinquency, particularly when both the child's parents work a full day, and it gives less education at the lower levels at the precise time when more is needed if we are to produce citizent adapted to our complex society.

It is not only in our elementary fields that a lack exists. Universities are jammed. This exploding growth of many of our great institutions is possibly causing much oftoday's student restlessness. These was a time when all colleges assumed that each enrollee was an individual and that faculty members lived within the realm of the collegiate experience to assist young people in preparing their way into adulthood.

My on State university has 26,000 students. There is now little opportunity for individual discussions.

This experience is repeated on a hundred campuses.

Be grateful that yours still offers the opportunity for human communion.

At the same time our universities mushroom, we see another startling situation. No one knows its full precise cause, but there is a determined search for the answers. However, we do know that it is small comfort to a nation which has achieved jet airliners, cake mixes and the secrets of outer space to find it necessary to increase numbers of institutions for mental illness.

Once we were a nation moving onward—looking ever forward at the frontiers of unconquered land beyond the high mountains, across wide western rivers.

We have now reached the outer fringes of that land—possessed, settled and developed it.

Today we face the problem of living peacefully upon it.

For this we have the energy and talent and with the assistance of colleges such as yours we shall understand and solve:

The problems of our cities.

Provide for the betterment of living within them.

Root crime and crime's causes from its dark caves.

Obliterate ignorance.

Reaffirm our faith in God and diligently continue the eternal search for peace on earth, good will to men.

We shall rewrite the ugly headlines and tell instead the story of a nation devoted to its responsibilities, a nation thoughtfully determined to find the best and finest answers to its problems and challenges.

We shall, like all those others who have gone before, through our prayers and with God's help, call upon our Nation to reclaim all her beauty, her glory, and acknowledge through our loving service, our joyous hope for life eternal.

What Happens to Displacees?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the problem of people displaced by urban renewal projects has often given rise to charges that they are only transferred to another slum area. Federal Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver has effectively refuted these charges in a recent announcement. I include it and a Washington Evening Star editorial of March 24, as part of my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 24, 1965]

WHAT HAPPENS TO DISPLACEES?

Urban renewal critics like to argue that the program does little if any good for the low- or moderate-income families displaced from slum area. And they contend, by implication at least, that vast numbers of these unfortunate people merely are reshuffled from one slum area to another.

It is certainly true that few of these families actually wind up in private housing within the rebuilt renewal projects. But one of the primary reasons they do not is that the high costs of new housing are beyond their reach. With a few rare exceptions, the various governmental schemes to reduce these costs have not been successful. That is why the President, in his housing message this year, proposed an entirely new approach through rental subsidies. The idea has merit.

As a special survey by the Census Bureau in 132 cities around the country has just shown, however, the relocation of displacees within new project areas is not the only way to improve their lot. In all, the Bureau recently interviewed some 2,300 families who were displaced during a 3-month period last summer. It found that only 6 percent now live in "substandard" dwellings. The majority, as might be expected, are paying somewhat higher rent. But most are getting more for their money than before. The survay showed a slight increase in homeownership. Only about 13 percent of the displacees were relocated in public housing. While 90 percent received counseling, financial, or some other form of aid from renewal agencies, some 70 percent of the total number actually found new housing accommodations on their own. As a general rule, those who took advantage of renewal-agency assistance fared better.

Robert C. Weaver, the Federal housing Administrator, says these findings "refute frequent charges of widespread failure by urban renewal to meet its rehousing obligations."

This is not to say, of course, that the critics will be silenced. For there is surely room, as Mr. Weaver concedes, for a great deal of improvement, both in relocation procedures and in the availability of decent housing at prices moderate-income families can afford. What the Census Bureau study does suggest, however, is that the changes of failure in relocation have been grossly exaggerated—and often deliberately so.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY NEWS RELEASE

Ninety-four percent of the people displaced by urban renewal operations, still residing in the same locality and for whom there are known addresses, are currently moving into standard dwelling units.

They are, as anticipated, paying more rent on the average and a slightly larger share of their income for their housing than before.

These two key facts are revealed by a special survey made by the U.S. Bureau of the Census for the Housing and Home Finance Agency to determine what has actually happened to people displaced from urban renewal sites.

"This survey, carried out by the Census Bureau with thoroughness and dispatch, should remove much of the guesswork and uninformed speculation from the question of urban renewal relocation," Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver said.

"The findings show that as a result of improvements instituted in relocation procedures in the past few years, a much better job in rehousing displaced families is being done than in the past—a better job than many expected.

"The findings also refute frequent charges of widespread failure by urban renewal to meet its rehousing obligations for those it displaces. While still not perfect, the rehousing record of urban renewal overall has now reached a high level of proficiency.

"The facts from the survey, however, further confirm the serious shortage in our cities of good housing within the means of those of low and moderate income, and the difficulties of social and economic adjustment that confront many displaced families.

"The Congress recognized these problems in part in the 1964 Housing Act when it approved supplemental aid to lower income displaced people for a temporary period. The President's 1965 housing and urban program goes much farther. It centers strongly on a major increase in the total supply of good housing for those of more limited means, and for more concerted use of resources in the social and economic reestablishment of those at or near the poverty level."

The census survey data were obtained directly from displaced families through a check of their status several months after they had moved. It covered dwelling units where displaced families had moved from projects in 132 cities throughout the country where relocation was actively underway during June, July, and August of 1964. Interviews were conducted at 2,300 dwelling units by census enumerators from Thanksgiving 1964, to early January 1965, reaching all relocated households in the sample of the Census Bureau for whom current addresses were obtainable. Interviews could not be obtained with another 542 families displaced from projects in the cities surveyed for these reasons: 138 had left the area; 278 could not be located, and 126 were unavailable or refused to be interviewed.

The survey was ordered, Mr. Weaver said, for four reasons:

"1. We wanted an independent check of our regular system of relocation reports, which rely heavily on data from local public agencies, and sample inspections by regional office staffs.

"2. We needed to know whether our efforts in the past 4 years to make the relocation process more humane and effective were bearing fruit. The survey indicates they are paying off.

"3. Because of repeated attacks and criticisms charging widespread failure in urban renewal to assure adequate rehousing of those it displaces, we wanted an outside, objective survey of the facts, which the census has now given us.

"4. We wanted data on additional aspects of relocation not covered in our regular reporting system, to know more about the problems these families face in adjusting to a new urban environment."

Findings of the survey disclosed the following facts:

Ninety-four percent of those interviewed were living in standard dwellings, with all modern sanitary facilities after relocation. Six percent had moved to substandard units.

Median gross rents for the displacees were higher after they moved rising to $74 a month compared to $66 before. The median proportion of income spent for rent increased from 25 to 28 percent.

The data also show that the 30 percent of the households who availed themselves of local public agency help in relocating fared better in avoiding rent increases than those who relocated themselves. For those aided by the local agency, the percentage of whites paying less than $50 a month for rent after relocation increased from 17 to 39 percent, and for nonwhites from 26 to 39 percent. For those who found quarters on their own, the below $50 rent group declined from 14 to 7 percent for whites and from 23 to 24 percent for nonwhites after relocation. This, in part, reflects the fact that 90 percent of placements in public housing were made through local public agency channels.

A majority of those relocated found the conveniences of their new location about the same or better than their old one. However, others were adversely affected by the change. The data show:

That 50 percent reported their journey time to work about the same from the new location; for 37 percent it was greater, and for 13 percent it was much less.

That 43 percent found the convenience of neighborhood shopping about the same; 23 percent much more convenient, and 34 percent much less convenient.

That 53 percent found that public transportation was about the same; 18 percent found it much more satisfactory, and 29 percent found it less satisfactory.

That 34 percent found their place of worship about the same distance; 21 percent found that it was closer, and 45 percent found it farther away.

Nearly 90 percent of the relocated families received counseling, financial or other assistance from the local public agency. Seventy percent of all families surveyed found their own housing accommodations. For white families this proportion was 80 percent; for nonwhite families it was 60 percent.

Nonwhite families constituted a little more than half of the 2,300 families surveyed. They also had somewhat less success in finding standard housing. Whereas 97 percent of white families moved to standard housing, the percentage for nonwhites was 91 percent. For the 60 percent of nonwhites who found their own housing accommodations, the percentage of those obtaining standard housing dropped to 89 percent.

The survey data also disclosed the basic economic problems faced by displaced families.

Forty percent of all families reported incomes of less than $3,000 a year, and nearly 80 percent of less than $6,000. The incomes of half of the nonwhite families, however, were below the $3,000 level compared to only one-fourth of the white families.

About 13 percent of the families—nearly 300—were rehoused in public housing, three-fourths of these being nonwhites.

Two-thirds of the displaced households consisted of three or more, persons, and one-third of five or more persons.

Fifty-nine percent of the households had lived at their previous address 5 years or more and over 80 percent for more than 1 year.

Two-thirds had been renters in their previous residences, and one-third owners. Following relocation the percentages of homeowners rose slightly to 37 percent.

Results of the survey will be used by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent, the Urban Renewal Administration, to extend the progress being made in finding good housing for displaced families and to develop additional measures to assist in the human adjustments of these families in new locations and reduce the impact of higher rents on limited incomes. The findings will also be provided to local public agencies, community officials, and others to develop more effective means of assisting displaced families and meeting their problems of social and financial adjustment to achieve better living standards.

Closing of Veterans Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by William R. Clay, president of the Maryland State Council of Veterans Democratic Clubs, and a copy of the resolution adopted by both houses of the Maryland General Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur with these resolutions and also express my dismay at these proposed closings:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM R. CLAY, PRESIDENT OF THE MARYLAND STATE COUNCIL OF VETERANS DEMOCRATIC CLUBS IN THANKING THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND

I wish to thank the Maryland House of Delegates in passing House Resolution 67 and the Senate of Maryland in passing Senate Resolution 43 regarding the proposed closing of certain Veterans' Administration facilities. In closing Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries homes the Veterans' Administration would substantially decrease its abilities to render service to the American veteran and their survivors.

The Veterans' Administration closing of installations is completely inconsistant with the platform of the National Democratic Party, both on a State and on a National level.

I call upon our national Democratic administration to reconsider the closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals and I strongly doubt that the Democratic Party on both State and National level will allow the closing of any Veterans' Administration installation and I call for a total mobilization of the efforts and resources of the Maryland State Council of Democratic Veterans Clubs to prevent this proposal from becoming a reality.

WILLIAM R. CLAY.

SENATE RESOLUTION 43

Senate resolution expressing the concern of the senate of Maryland at the proposed closing of certain Veterans' Administration facilities

Whereas the Senate of Maryland is informed that the Veterans' Administration has decided and determined to close 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliary homes, and 16 regional offices in the United States; and

Whereas such decision appears in direct conflict with the announced aims of the national administration to improve the lot of its needy citizens; and

Whereas the decision of the Veterans' Administration also substantially impairs its ability to render service to veterans, their widows, children, and other survivors; and

Whereas the announced closings are purportedly for the purpose of producing fiscal savings, but would be accomplished at the expense of and great sacrifice and hardship to our veterans; and

Whereas Veterans' Administration regional offices, hospitals, and domiciliaries serve either the service-connected persons or those who are in deep financial need, many of whom are on small Government pensions and otherwise in desperate circumstances; and

Whereas the plight of the domiciliary member is particularly pathetic in that a typical such member is 68 years old, is disabled principally by heart disease, has no family and an income of only $66 a month from a Veterans' Administration pension; and

Whereas the action of the Veterans' Administration seems poor recompense for our veterans, victims of our wars, great and small, and for those who depend upon them; and

Whereas a grateful Nation should bestow upon its needy veterans all of the gratitude which its resources permit, so that those who have risked their lives in its defense may live out their failing years in some degree of security and freedom from want and hardship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Maryland, That the senate wishes to register herein its dismay and urgent concern at the contemplated closing of these facilities and institutions and to urge that the Veterans' Administration and the national administration reconsider its decision so to do; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; William J. Driver, Veterans Administrator, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Senators DANIEL B. BREWSTER, JOSEPH D. TYDINGS; Members of the Maryland congressional delegation as follows: ROGERS C. B. MORTON, CLARENCE LONG, EDWARD GARMATZ, GEORGE FALLON, HERVEY MACHEN, CHARLES MATHIAS, JR., SAMUEL FRIEDEL, and CARLTON R. SICKLES; Senator William L. Hodges, honorary State president, Maryland State Council of Democratic Veterans Clubs; and Hon. William R. Clay, Court House, Upper Marlboro, Md., State president of said council.

The New Proposal for Health Insurance for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues before Congress is medical care for our senior citizens.

After thorough consideration the House Ways and Means Committee has reported H.R. 6675, a bill introduced by Chairman WILBUR MILLS, providing in place of the original medicare bill a combination of three proposals: First, an expanded Kerr-Mills program for hospital and medical assistance to the indigent aged and for other public assistance; second, an insurance program for hospital care for senior citizens as in the former King-Anderson bill; and third, a voluntary plan to cover the cost of physicians fees and drug costs along the line of the eldercare plan.

Also this legislation includes a 7-percent (minimum $4) across-the-board increase in old-age survivors and disability insurance.

The cost of this new legislation for 1967 for its first full year of operation would be $5 billion from general revenue, $500 million from premiums collected for the voluntary health care plan and the remainder from increased payroll taxes.

These latter taxes would be raised by a change in the taxable annual earnings from the present $4,800 to $5,600 January 1, 1966 and to $6,600, January 1, 1971, and also a rate increase.

The voluntary doctors' fee insurance would be financed by persons over 65 paying monthly premiums of $3 each deducted from their monthly retirement benefits. The Federal Government would match this $3 premium out of general revenue.

Private insurance carriers would carry out, under contract, the administrative functions of this part of the bill.

The expansion of Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the indigent aged would require participation of States in the program—and requires these States to

provide an income test to determine eligibility, but not with rigid income standards to adversely affected persons with large medical bills.

Members of the Ways and Means Committee say this new bill is fiscally on a sound basis in that it would not endanger the existing social security system as it was said the original medicare plan would have done.

Certainly the legislation remains controversial in that it is a combination of eldercare, medicare, and Kerr-Mills. When it is considered by the House, there will be no changes or amendments, so House Members must take it or leave it as it came out of committee. Republicans may have one opportunity, if they desire, to offer an alternate plan.

Already, the AMA has expressed opposition, but I can find few colleagues who do not feel the bill's good outweighs its less desirable features and therefore who do not plan to vote for it. They say and I agree there is a need for a program, although, of course, this proposal does not completely satisfy everyone.

Meanwhile, however, there is little doubt but that this bill will pass with a large majority and in due course be signed by the President into law because he has praised the bill.

Finally, I might add that in my opinion this legislation has much more to recommend it than the original medicare plan over which there was so much disagreement.

Dr. Frederick A. Cook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, this June 10 will mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of a great American explorer, scientist, author, and physician, Dr. Frederick Albert Cook. Dr. Cook will be recalled by many as a central figure in one of the most unfortunate controversies on the American scene, which was the famous dispute that waxed hot more than half a century ago as to who was the first man at the geographical North Pole.

Dr. Cook was written off by many would-be authorities at that time, but history has a way of grinding well the fine sands of truth and fact, divorcing them from emotional arguments and the contemporary pressures of established groups. I find it significant, Mr. Speaker, that over the years more and more acknowledged polar historians, geographers and explorers have come to accept the original findings of Dr. Cook.

It is not my intention to revive this controversy, Mr. Speaker, but only to join the reputable historical groups which are joining together in this centennial year of Dr. Cook's birth to celebrate the occasion, and to renew their requests for an objective appraisal of the accomplishments of this exceptional American pioneer of the Poles—both North and South.

In June the Dr. Frederick A. Cook Society, composed of a distinguished group of Arctic explorers, geographers, oceanographers, historians and interested citizens, will join with the Sullivan County Historical Society and the officials of the town of Delaware to mark the centennial of Dr. Cook's birth.

Dr. Cook was born in the hamlet of Callicoon in Delaware township, Sullivan County, N.Y., on June 10, 1865, the son of a German immigrant doctor who served in the Civil War. He spent much of his life in Erie County, N.Y., and he is buried in Buffalo's Forest Lawn Cemetery.

Among the authorities who have recently called for a re-examination of Dr. Cook's accomplishments is a former Cheektowaga, N.Y., teacher and traveler, John Euller. Mr. Euller, who has written extensively on Polar matters, including several books, was a member of the observation team in the 1964 "Operation Deep Freeze" in the Antarctic. He is a graduate of McGill University's department of geographic studies and is a Fellow of the American Geographical Society.

Mr. Speaker, in the December 1964 issue of Arctic, the Journal of the Arctic Institute of North America, Mr. Euller had a commentary on Dr. Cook. It is significant that this scientific publication has accorded space to recall the accomplishments of this great explorer.

Following is Mr. Euller's article:

THE CENTENARY OF THE BIRTH OF FREDERICK A. COOK

(By John Euller)

The year 1965 will mark the passing of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Frederick A. Cook—physician, traveler, writer, and polar explorer. Cook is doubtlessly best remembered for claiming to be the first man to reach the North Pole. It is equally well remembered that the claim was quickly challenged by Robert E. Peary—naval officer, civil engineer, and also polar explorer. Peary asserted that he and not Cook had been the first to reach the Pole, and furthermore he held Cook's prior claim to be false.

Both men had strong personal motives, and the result was a bitter controversy. Each man's story had its weaknesses, but a majority of the press backed Peary. In a relentless campaign Cook was disputed, ridiculed, and in the end largely—although not unanimously—discredited.

Claim and counter-claim were made in 1909. By 1920, the year Peary died, the storm had subsided. By 1940, the year Cook died, it was all but forgotten, although the original question of who had been first at the Pole was never really resolved. Meanwhile a sizable literature has developed and continues to grow, new facts have come to light, and Cook's cause continues to find support among a small number of skeptics who seek a true verdict in place of what some feel was a decision forced by newspaper propaganda.

Dr. Cook's 100th anniversary is a fitting occasion for a review of the evidence and a restatement of the case. The recognition of Cook's personal achievement is at stake, but a larger issue is to determine—if possible—history as it really was and not as some might wish it to have been. The essential requirement—indeed, the only requirement, if justice is to be done—is to restrict the discussion to the pertinent facts and their logical interpretation. Hearsay, pseudo-scientific testimonials, and evidence not directly related to the case should be rejected, although these three categories account for many hundreds of thousands of words in the published literature. From this stringently defined base at least seven arguments emerge that support the view that it was not only possible but very probable that in April 1908 Cook was the first man to reach the North Pole.

1. Feasibility of method: As Peary, Cook adopted Eskimo methods of travel; if they differed in any way, Cook's technique was superior. He used lighter sledges, a smaller party, and lived in part off the land. He was 43 years old, in excellent physical condition, and experienced in polar travel and living. Thus endowed, the journey to the Pole was for him perfectly feasible.

2. Proven ability: Cook's base was at Annoatok in Greenland. From here he traveled to Cape Stallworthy at the northern tip of Axel Heiberg Island, and from this point he started his journey across the polar ice. He planned to return by roughly the same route, but he was carried off course by drifting ice. He returned to land much farther south than he expected and the consequent delay forced him to spend the winter at Cape Hardy on Devon Island. The following spring he sledged back to Annoatok and thence south to Upernavik where he met a Danish ship. The total distance travelled was approximately 2,680 nautical miles. The part of the journey between Annoatok and Cape Stallworthy and the return from the first landfall in the Sverdrup Islands to Upernavik amounts to some 1,640 miles. That Cook made this part of the total journey and that he therefore had the necessary ability for sustained, long-distance artcic travel has never been doubted. It was thus well within his ability to travel the additional 1,040 miles from Cape Stallworthy to the Pole and return.

3. Original descriptions: At the time of Cook's journey no one had ever before seen the region that lies close to the North Pole. When Cook returned he described what he had seen: no land, a continuation of the polar ice pack, essentially a frozen ocean but in a state of continuous motion and upheaval. This was not profound, but it was original, and all subsequent accounts, including Peary's, agree with Cook's original descriptions.

4. Unknown westerly drift: When returning south from the Pole heavy overcast forced Cook to navigate by dead reckoning. He laid his course to take into account what he thought to be a slight eastward drift of the ice. It was not then known that in the region where Cook traveled, the ice drifts toward the west. Cook was thus carried 100 miles west of his expected landfall, and the consequent delay, already mentioned, forced him to winter at Cape Hardy. Cook could not have invented or anticipated this drift; the error caused by it lends great credibility to his account of the journey. Furthermore, the amount of the offset suggests that he began his return journey at a point north of the Queen Elizabeth Islands.

5. Ice islands: In 88° North Cook saw an unusual ice feature: a flat-topped mass of ice, higher and therefore thicker than ordinary sea ice, and with an upper surface marked by undulations or waves. What Cook had discovered was an ice island, one of the tabular masses of ice that are now known to have their origin in the ice shelves that rim parts of the northern coast of Ellesmere Island. The ice islands are known to drift in the area of the Arctic Ocean between Alaska and the North Pole in a slow clockwise motion, moving southward along the west side of the Queen Elizabeth Islands. The discovery was incidental to Cook's main purpose and was forgotten until 40 years later when the ice islands were rediscovered during an aerial reconnaissance, but again

we have something Cook could not have invented and his account gains credibility from it.

6. Bradley Land: When marching across the ice Cook saw in 85° North what he thought to be land, far distant and to the west. He named it Bradley Land in honor of his benefactor. Curiously, 2 years before Peary had made a similar discovery, roughly 150 miles to the south. Neither man could possibly strengthen his claim to the Pole by falsely reporting the discovery of land; yet neither Bradley Land nor Peary's Crocker Land was ever seen again. Were both men liars? A more plausible explanation is that both had sighted an ice island, possibly the same one, but higher and more massive than Cook's first discovery. The 150-mile distance between the two sightings does not contradict the observed drift of present-day ice islands. Ironically the two rivals corroborate each other.

7. A consistent narrative. Cook's published account of his journey to the pole has never been seriously refuted on the basis of internal evidence. This in itself is not remarkable, since he was its sole author and had ample time to prepare it. But in the 50 years that have passed since it was written, the external evidence cited above has come to light. Cook could not have invented his accurate descriptions of the north polar region, of ice islands, or contrived to have himself set off course by an undiscovered drift. This becomes an argument in itself. How were all these circumstances incorporated into his account? It is the final and perhaps strongest argument for its authenticity.

To summarize the main points: a feasible method of travel, a proven ability to make extended arctic journeys, the first correct descriptions of the area around the North Pole, discovery of a westerly drift of the ice northwest of the Canadian Arctic Archipelago, discovery and accurate description of ice islands, corroboration by Peary in the matter of Bradley and Crocker Lands, and a logical narrative consistent with external ex post facto evidence.

Has the case been proved? The answer is still "No." The exploits of Cook and Peary were long, lone journeys over moving ice; no monuments could be erected, no competent witness accompanied either man. Neither man's claim is subject to positive proof—and never will be. Each man's claim must rest on his word and on the logical consistency of his story supported by whatever external evidence can be adduced. The case for Cook is strong and should be reviewed by fair-minded men.

At Dr. Cook's 100th anniversary it is perhaps late to seek a restoration of his claim—but it is not too late. The editor of his last book said this about the explorer: "His tragedy paralleled that of Columbus. He was rejected, despised * * * and neglected. Columbus turned to divine support; Dr. Cook relied on the innate sense of justice in men."

Mexican Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in 1963, after much careful consideration and discussion, the Congress enacted legislation which called a halt to the importation of Mexican farm labor as of December 31, 1964.

Since that time, there has been a concerted effort on the part of the growers to reinstate this program, despite the fact that there is more than sufficient labor available in this country to do the necessary cultivating and harvesting of farm crops.

With so many of our own domestic farmworkers unemployed, it would most certainly be morally wrong to revive the bracero program, and I agree wholeheartedly with the editorial which appeared in the New York Times of March 27, and which once again voices the opposition of that paper to any reopening of our borders to the influx of Mexican workers, to the detriment of our own domestic laborers and their families, who are available and willing to do the work.

I attach the editorial, herewith, and call it to the attention of my colleagues.

SQUEEZE ON THE MIGRANTS

After years of successful sabotage by the corporate farm lobby, Congress finally was able to slam the door last December 31, on the legal importation of hundreds of thousands of low-wage Mexican laborers to harvest American crops. Now California growers are engaged in a callous, rearguard action to reopen the migration floodgates and thus to condemn American farmworkers to continued exploitation.

Every device short of outright refusal to accept domestic farmworkers has been used to discredit the Labor Department's recruitment efforts. The growers' aim is to prove that crops will rot if Secretary Wirtz does not authorize the emergency admission of large number of braceros from Mexico. State officials already have thrown their support behind the farmworkers in the Salinas area, and pressure for a wholesale breakthrough is mounting in the rest of California.

Thus far Mr. Wirtz has stood fast—as he should. He is making a personal inspection of the obstacles to getting enough workers in California. Already he has discovered that one answer is the survival of abysmal living conditions in some migrant labor camps. He said the filth at one camp near Salinas made him ashamed that anything so bad existed in America.

In line with his duty under the general immigration law, Mr. Wirtz has held hearings and established $1.40 an hour as the prevailing rate California growers must offer domestic laborers before he will certify any shortage requiring the importation of foreign help. This wage standard is scheduled to become effective April 1, and certainly no need for braceros should be assumed until it has had a comprehensive test. And, if this wage proves insufficiently attractive, there is no reason why the law of supply and demand in the labor field should not bring a higher one.

Once growers are compelled to recognize the necessity for paying a living wage, America's highly profitable corporate farms will cease to be "sweatshops in the sun" and no shadow of excuse will exist for the mass import of cheap foreign labor.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

A Piece of the Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced H.R. 5918, which is identical to a bill I introduced during the 88th Congress. This proposal would make it unlawful for an employer to require blanket patent assignments from prospective employees where this assignment is a condition of employment.

There is a great need for clarifying legislation to determine the rights of the employed inventor in the United States. All of the recent discussions concerning patent rights in connection with Government research and development contracts fail to touch meaningfully on the rewards due the individual inventor.

Under unanimous consent I include at this point in the RECORD an article pointing out the various aspects of the situation that exists in this regard. It was written by Mr. Albert S. Davis, Jr., and appeared in the December 1963 issue of International Science and Technology.

A PIECE OF THE ACTION

(By Albert S. Davis, Jr.)

If management is going to pay out substantial money every year for suggestions about saving paper clips and economizing on carbon paper, it seems illogical to the point of idiocy not to specially recognize the patentable invention and the man or men who made it.

Logical or illogical, there is increasing argument these days that corporate inventors should receive some share of the added profits or savings that come from their patentable inventions. On March 18, 1963, Congressman GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., of California introduced H.R. 4932, a bill which proposed to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 by stating, very simply:

"It shall be unlawful for an employer to require as a condition of employment that any prospective employee of his or any of his employees agree to assign any patent or patentable invention to the employer or to maintain or enforce any agreement with any of his employees to assign any patent or patentable invention to the employer where such agreement was a condition of employment." This bill was routinely referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and has received no action.

Soon after the bill was introduced, a university foundation specializing in matters of intellectual property announced further progress in its continuing investigation of the employee-employer patent payment relationship; another university planned a seminar on the subject. A U.S. Senate subcommittee distributed a detailed study of such practices in Europe. Management magazines printed analyses of corporate practices in the United States. A correspondent to this magazine suggested that a falling curve of invention and patent fecundity was due to the automatic and uncompensated takeover by corporations of inventions made by their employees.

Then, in mid-October of this year, the Kennedy administration issued a lengthy policy statement concerning patent rights on U.S. Government-supported research, but wound it up by splitting hairs in saying that there was no single answer to the question of rights. Simultaneously, the Department of Commerce asked the National Inventors Council for advice about questions of patent ownership and specific steps the Federal Government might take in promoting inventions and their application.

Not all of this smoke is due to a particular fire at this particular time. Nevertheless, there is more restlessness now about corporate patent payments than there has been in many years.

One reason is that, whether fringe benefits to an employee come freely from an employer seeking to hold migratory scientific and technical workers or are negotiated in collective bargaining agreements, the various forms which benefits can take have been rather well explored. With rare exceptions, patent payments offer enticing new ground for examination of fringe rewards.

By various indexes the amount of invention does seem to be waning. If it really is, it may be an easy argument to say that a man possessing latent inventive ability, even if he is hired to exercise it, can be induced to use it more fully if we pay him specially for succeeding in doing so.

Over and above the arguments as to whether a promise to share the added savings or profits with the inventor will produce more inventions, and whether such a system could be administered, is the fact that many corporate managers feel a bit uneasy about not paying the inventor a share. Most of us have been raised in the Judaeo-Christian moral tradition, and we keep saying to ourselves "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out thy grain."

When the Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Foundation questioned a carefully selected sample of productive corporate-employed inventors in 1962 to learn wehther they could be stimulated to produce more inventions, by far the largest proportion of those replying said that they could, and that cash payments, bonuses, and royalties on a percentage basis were the way to do it. A favorable creative environment, selection of one's own projects, professional recognition, and better education on patents ranked far below monetary stimulus.

Benjamin F. Miessner, a self-styled lone-wolf inventor who has earned a million and a half dollars in royalties and patent sales on his inventions, put the case very succinctly in American Engineer:

"That I many times out-produced corporate inventors was due to one overpowering reason. Like the independent inventors of other days, I could keep at least some of the fruits of my creations * * * I could see a pot of gold and much more important other rewards at the end of my rainbow."

Mr. Miessner probably overstates the case of nonassignment by regularly employed inventors in the early days of our industrialization. The cost of modern production with its complex organization, is at least as significant in the change which has come about in the corporate patent environment. Nevertheless there is justice and logic in his argument.

PRIDE AND PROFIT

Corporate inventors are human. Any one of them who has achieved a major scientific success which has been patented and developed on a significantly profitable basis has pride in what he did for his employer. Yet his own advancement does not always keep pace with his company's, and it never compares with the diamond-studded evaluation which is put upon his creation by the company's advertising and public relations material.

When the inventor audits his own personal books, he finds a $1,500 raise, an extra week of vacation, perhaps his name on the door, and two more scientific meetings per year. And at this point he looks at the profit and loss statement and reflects, wistfully or irascibly, that he would like to have what is referred to in Las Vegas as "a piece of the action." This conclusion may not be entirely logical, but it is entirely human.

The principal corporate answer to this desire to cut in on the game is that the inventor is hired and paid to invent—not to do routine technical work. If it were not for the fact that his particular time and talent applied to the solution of a problem and held some promise of success, he would not have been employed to begin with.

"But," says the research worker, "if I get a piece of the action, I think I can do even better. Soundly patentable invention is extremely demanding. Why not give me that extra bit of inducement? If I succeed, your corporate rewards will be so high that you will never miss paying me a modest share of them."

Factually, it cannot be proven either way; we really need figures with a high correlation factor, not formal argument or testimonials.

As yet those figures, if they can be educed, are not available. While a number of the economically significant European countries (as well as many of those within the Russian economic and political orbit) have provided in one way or another for a corporate inventor's sharing in the profits or savings from the exploitation of his patents, the statutes are by no means identical.

SUBSIDIZING SERENDIPITY

Frequently a distinction is drawn in both law and corporate practice between the inventor who is hired to do research (or whose invention falls within the expected scope of his activities) and the one whose invention is a byproduct. In the latter case, the researcher takes title to his invention; a hired inventor is usually specially compensated, though not always. The foreword by U.S. Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN to Dr. Fredrik Neumeyer's exhaustive study of this subject for the McClellan (previously the O'Mahoney) Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights is significant as to what might emerge from such a critical examination of the facts:

"The ultimate question to which Dr. Neumeyer's study leads is this: Should steps be taken to restore the patent system, in at least some measure, to its traditional role of rewarding the inventor, in order the better to carry out the constitutional objective of 'promoting the progress of science and useful arts?' * * * Most of the industrial countries of the world that have taken a fresh look at this issue in recent years have enacted legis-

lation designed to assure those inventor-employees, who are not expressly employed to do research and make inventions, a share in the rewards flowing from the inventions they make, instead of leaving the allocation of such rights to private contracts as we do in the United States."

At first blush, figures on the total number of patent applications filed per capita, when correlated with those countries which require special compensation for corporate inventors, seem to support the argument that payment breeds inventiveness. Switzerland, Germany, Sweden, Austria, and Denmark all have some such provision, and all of these countries are more inventively productive per capita than is the United States.

Such statistics, though, are subject to any number of explanations, ranging from differences in patent application procedure and validity of patents in the acid test of infringement litigation to definition of who is a patent applicant. The fact that Liechtenstein has led all countries in patent application productivity over a period of 10 years, indicates how misleading such figures may be.

In any event, United States employers do not appear to have been persuaded that granting a share of the profits to employee inventors will increase invention enough that they should do so. Ten years ago the National Industrial Conference Board surveyed 48 typical companies. Twenty-two of these paid extra compensation for employee inventions, ranging from a nominal $1 upward. Three of these (all aircraft companies) paid a sliding-scale share, another paid a flat percentage. The same survey was made in 1963, and the results this year indicate a tendency to pay higher fixed amounts, but there is no move towards percentile awards.

This is not to say that employers do not make flat-sum awards, and substantial ones. Westinghouse Electric Corp. announced this year that Belvin B. Ellis, one of its senior power transformer engineers, had for the second time been awarded $5,000 for a transformer core design. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.'s suggestion plan can lead to an award of as much as $10,000.

Such plans, of course, are used by a tremendous number of companies. Often, however, research and development oriented personnel are barred (as at Goodyear) from the award system. The patent possibilities of suggestion plan innovations are, at most, only one factor in evaluating either the eligibility of a given suggestion, or the amount which should be awarded.

A USEFUL MONOPOLY

Reflecting on what is supposed to be the unique nature, the scientific and economic contribution, of patentable invention, there is no obvious reason (except the always-stated "We hired him to do it") for the widespread adoption of suggestion plans and the skimpy existence of patent recognition.

Ignoring that reason, is there something special about the patentable idea? Does it have greater inherent value than trademarked or copyrighted material, than know-how or other private inventions, or than sound technological or business practices which cannot be and are not exclusively enjoyed? Should the patentable idea lead to a significantly higher special award for it?

One answer is that its inherent characteristic of useful monopoly distinguishes it from other types of innovations.

How long will the possibility of corporate patent awards based on a share of profits stutter along? There are three areas of pressure which will probably play the largest part in its potentially wide acceptance.

The first, of course, is gradual agreement with the proposition that such an incentive system will make invention-oriented personnel more productive. As yet, no study seems to support this argument clearly and unmistakably.

Such a proposition, to succeed, must overcome a myriad of other arguments. There is always the basic one that the inventor is hired to invent. Professional management will contend that a profit-sharing system is unduly favorable to the named inventor, that it ignores the contributions made by every other segment of a corporate enterprise to the success of any new product or process venture, and is exceedingly difficult to operate.

The research director, having recruited across the year's graduating classes, promoted to research assignments a dozen men whose postgraduate courses have been paid for by the company, and having stolen three top steroid chemists from a competitor, may understandably feel that these men are hired to be inventive—not to do routine benchwork. This conclusion is reinforced when he looks over several million dollars' worth of laboratory and specialized research apparatus and reflects on the fact that only 1 in 10, or 15, or a hundred of his men's patentable inventions will really pay off and that the others have to be carried as deadweight. His opposite numbers in corporate planning, production, marketing, sales, and finance also tell him in firm, round tones that their efforts have contributed at least as much as the inventor's.

PICKETING PATENTEES

The second area of pressure will be from legislation. However, the legislative approach (essentially that of Senator McClellan's subcommittee) has been to wait until the proof was in, and that proof may be long in coming. Even more unlikely is an across-the-board collective-bargaining approach (which is presumably what Congressman Brown's bill would lead to). If there is a legislative requirement, it will be produced by judgment that special compensation to the corporate inventor is justified by basic equity concepts, and in the hope that such action will lead to a fresh spurt of invention and innovation.

There will be pressure from a third area: inventors, organized and unorganized. Writing as a guest editorialist in Rubber World, Ephraim K. Cohen, director of the Council of Engineers and Scientists Organization—West (CESO-W) complained of hearings held by Senator Long on legislation to specify who holds title to patentable inventions made in the course of Government-sponsored R. & D. contracts: "* * * although elaborate testimony was given by Government and industry, no Miessner, nor any inventor, was heard. In most countries of Western Europe, and even in Japan, the situation is different. There the law has long recognized that when the employee-inventor looks for a job he can easily be forced to sign an unfair assignment contract. To provide equity, laws were passed which gave special rights of compensation to inventors in spite of any contracts they may have signed. * * * The employed inventor himself has the responsibility of telling the nation the truth."

THE ORGANIZED INVENTOR

But, while individual inventors may supply the emotional and logical background for such action, the organized persuasion toward it would have to come from a large number of inventors adversely affected by current patent practices. While that presupposes heavy union involvement in such a move, it does not appear to be in sight, as yet.

Nevertheless Oscar Jager, director of publications and public relations of the industrial union department of the AFL-CIO, put organized labor clearly on record for the future in April of 1962:

"Like salaries, patents are a matter for collective bargaining where unions are concerned. But unlike salaries, patents affect only a relatively few employees. They are, in other words, hardly a striking issue. Progress will be slow even when a more militant union spirit exists. I must leave for our engineering unions the job of defining a policy on patent rights for these employees. But in the American system, it is generally accepted that he who does the work or thinks through the idea should get the major share, or, at least, a fair share, of the benefits. I know that it doesn't necessarily work out that way, but I expect that this will be the general aim of our unions. Some day, perhaps, we shall have enough engineers organized so that we can exert real pressure in the area of patents."

The alleged practical difficulties of invention incentives are manifold. An obvious one is that, if ony one inventor is named as the patentee, compartmentalization and jealousy can become a serious obstacle to the free association of talented individuals which is so vital to successful creation of new products and processes. It has happened under such conditions that laboratory doors have shut, conversation at lunch and scientific meetings have been exceedingly guarded, and cooperative contribution discouraged.

Any invention is the product of combined efforts, some lying far in the past, by the time it succeeds. Many of the contributors are not named on the patent because they are not technically inventors.

The commercial development of an invention, including its patenting, requires at least as much effort of a very high order as did the making of the invention. Or at least that is usually the case, and we are told so almost invariably. If an employer grants special recognition to the inventor, directly geared to the profitability of the exploitation of his invention, the other contributors to its commercial success—the team members who are not inventors, the patent counsel, the production men and marketers—get to wondering whether they, too, should not erect lightning rods and see whether they can be struck by the golden bolt.

In the Western European system this problem is met largely by granting special compensation to research workers only under unusual circumstances, and by measuring that compensation against other company contributions—which does not necessarily settle the emotional involvement of the other contributors. In Sweden, when the inventor's primary task is research or inventive activity or when he solves a problem as part of his course of employment and under specified orders from his superior, he is specially compensated only if the value of the patent title acquired by his employer exceeds reasonable compensation by his normal wages and other benefits.

In fixing compensation in Germany, the governing rules involves the value of the invention (its economic usefulness), the percentage which the inventor has contributed to the total value of the invention, and a complex algebraic computation of the compensation. While this approach is somewhat formal, it demonstrates (with parallel action in other countries) that, between the extremes of arbitration and formulas, a solution is possible.

The most obvious answer, though, is one already in use in the United States—the fact that major suggestion systems can and do cope with the problem daily.

There are alternatives to direct financial recognition of patentable inventive effort, whether lumpsum or percentile, and a number of companies are using them. The most favored is the direct management approach: patents, used or not, are like any other significant contribution made by a research worker. As such, they will be recognized by advancement up the ladder of employment, by salary, fringe benefits, and by positions of prestige. A significant number of the companies surveyed by the National Industrial Conference Board and Dr. Rossman replied that they did this; it is almost axiomatic that most corporations do so, knowingly or not.

Emotionally, this may not always be enough; the inventor still keeps looking at

the magnitude of his particular success. Indeed, if his brainchild does not succeed, he is apt to assert that the fault lies in mismanagement by others, rather than its own defects.

Patented inventions also fail commercially because they were made at the wrong time, because they encounter unsurmountable competition from similar inventions, and because they are 10 or 20 percent short of the workability which the market demands.

Personally they may fail as well: In the hierarchy of all but the largest of modern corporations, the bigger plums are management ones, and all too often the promotion of a highly skilled inventor to tasks of research management effectively sterilizes his usefulness for scientific and technological creation.

A thorny problem, the solution of which is as yet only vaguely indicated—and an integral part of the patent brouhaha.

How Are We Doing?—Not at All Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mr. Bill Purcell who is a contributor to the South Coast News of Laguna Beach, Calif. It is a most timely warning.

HOW ARE WE DOING?—NOT AT ALL WELL

(By Bill Purcell)

It seems to me that our country needs a bath. With good strong soap.

I've been around for quite a while and I cannot remember when the United States of America was in a worse internal mess than it is today.

The great depression was grim, God knows. But the roots of that evil were economic.

Now we have anarchy, violence, bitter hatred, bloodshed, contempt for law and order, and moral decay. Murder is up 9 percent. Rape is up 19 percent.

Less than 18 hours after President Johnson made his impassioned plea to the Nation for decency and common sense, the clubs were swinging again in Alabama.

The last few weeks our TV and newsreel cameras handed our enemies a ready-made program of visual evidence that must be making the boys in the Kremlin and Peiping rub their pudgy hands in glee.

All they have to do is splice together a 30-minute filming of the shameful American scene, title it "We Told You So," and show it around the world.

Think what such a news film would show!

The unbelievable spectacle of a young punk parading the campus of the University of California with a filthy word lettered on a sign.

U.S. citizens being clubbed and gassed for trying to exercise their constitution rights.

The funeral of a slain man of the cloth struck down because he championed the rights of his fellow men.

Police with dogs patrolling the subways of Philadelphia ("The City of Brotherly Love") because the lives of subway riders are not safe from creeps with knives.

Sit-ins inside the White House. Demonstrators prostrate in the streets a stone's throw from the White House.

What is the answer? Who knows.

But when crime, including narcotics addiction, in America is growing faster than the population;

When toughs can beat up public school teachers;

When gangsters can muscle into American banking;

When pornography is peddled in the name of art and dirty books make the bestseller lists;

When our children are on the mailing lists of these peddlers of filth;

When the streets of our cities are not safe for our citizens to walk in—and women organize (as they are doing in Minneapolis) to protect themselves from thugs;

When officers of the law are defied, attacked and spat upon—

Then we had better get ourselves straightened out. And quick.

The Great Society? In my opinion, we are not ready for it.

What we need—it seems to me—is first of all a sane society.

Washington Post Can't Go Along With All Radical Ideas of Martin Luther King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post has been one of the leading advocates of Martin Luther King. The newspaper has found glory in his call for defiance of law and order in the South and they have applauded his right to break laws which he determines "are unjust." But even the Washington Post finds that its idol is reckless and irresponsible in his radicalism.

The following editorial from this morning's Washington Post points out how wrong King's proposal for a boycott of Alabama. I agree with the Post editorial. I only wish the editors were as concerned about the other lawless acts advocated by King and practiced by his followers.

The editorial follows:

BOYCOTT ALABAMA

In waging a peaceful campaign to secure civil rights for Negroes in the Southern States, the Rev. Martin Luther King has touched the conscience of the world. He is one of the few leaders in history, following the supreme example of Ghandi, who have conducted a struggle against social injustice without ever departing from the highest standards of ethical conduct. But even while remaining within the strict confines of the code of nonviolence, Dr. King can make mistakes. Consider his call for an economic boycott of the State of Alabama.

Brushing aside for the moment questions of principle, would an economic boycott of the State of Alabama help Negroes to secure equal rights? It is doubtful.

Suppose that a significant number of business and trade union leaders agreed with Dr. King and ceased handling the products of Alabama's industries. An effective boycott would have to affect not only the products shipped from Alabama, but also the raw and intermediate products that are sent in. It would require not only a ban on steel shipments from Birmingham, but cutting off of the supplies of iron ore and other imported materials. The boycott, if it were extended to cover all products might well result in more economic disruption outside Alabama than in the State itself.

And to the extent that the impact of the boycott fell upon Alabama proper, both Negroes and whites, racists and moderates would be punished in a wholly indiscriminate fashion.

An important matter of principle is also involved. Those responsible for killing Jimmy Lee Jackson, the Reverend James Reeb, and Viola Liuzzo would like nothing better than to maintain Alabama as a closed society, a mean racist enclave within a country which is at last beginning to erase the injustices of the past two centuries. Removing Federal deposits from the banks of Alabama and boycotting her industries will only strengthen the hand of the Ku Klux Klan and silence those moderates who are revolted by racist acts of violence.

A broad spectrum of public opinion, one which embraces a majority of the Congress and the White House, supports Dr. King and the specific blows which he has aimed against social injustice. But it is not likely to countenance an economic boycott which would punish the innocent along with the guilty and push Alabama farther away from the mainstream of American life.

Public Opinion Poll: First Congressional District of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have sent out a questionnaire covering major national issues to the people of the First Congressional District of Arkansas. I find that these observations, views, and opinions are most beneficial to me, even though the responsibility of favoring or opposing legislative proposals belongs to me.

Especially is it gratifying to use this system of poll taking because I am the beneficiary of obtaining the participant's views expressed in the form of comments written upon the ballot or on the back of it. Many times a question-by-question analysis was written, which offers a clear insight into the thinking of the person I am privileged to serve.

The tabulation of the latest poll has been completed and I am pleased to share with other Members the information contained in it. The response to the poll was highly gratifying as 19.5 percent of those who received ballots participated as compared with 16 percent in 1964 and 17 percent in 1963. This poll reflects an excellent cross section of opinion in the 10-county eastern Arkansas district. Farmers, bankers, wage earners, housewives, and people in all walks of life favored me with their replies to these questions. Arkansas newspapers printed copies of the questionnaires, which were clipped out by many people and mailed to me. Area radio stations publicized the questions and cooperated in the effort. The interest in their Government and the problems that face the Nation has resulted in a definitive and significant expression of opinion.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the results of the poll, as follows:

	In percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
1. Changing our immigration laws by the elimination of the national origins quota system and providing entrance for persons with needed talents and skills?	39	46	15
2. A Federal law that would call for the registration of firearms?	46	48	6
3(a) Medical care for the eligible citizens over 65 to be financed by social security taxes?	18	76	6
(b) Such hospitalization for the elderly if the money to pay for it were deposited into a separate and distinct fund?	47	41	12
4. Federal aid for:			
(a) Public school construction?	45	49	6
(b) Public school teachers' salaries?	31	62	7
(c) Private or ecclesiastical (church) schools if based solely upon individual needs?	19	74	7
5. Continuation of the so-called right to work laws?	80	12	8
6. Increasing the Federal minimum wage rates to $1.25 per hour and time and ½ for a workweek of over 40 hours?	32	59	9
7. Strengthening the laws to prevent crippling strikes such as the recent walkout by members of the Longshoremen's Union?	89	7	4
8. The Appalachia area aid program?	22	58	20
9. Government aid in the building of mass transportation facilities to relieve highway congestion in urban areas?	41	46	13
10. Generally the President's overall plan known as the Great Society?	19	66	15
11. The manner in which President Lyndon B. Johnson is handling the Vietnam conflict?	31	49	20

Puzzles in the Vote Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, there is no denying that the right to vote must be assured to all American citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed. Voting discrimination in the United States can no longer be tolerated. However, as the following significant editorial of the Chicago Daily News points out, the Congress must approach the problem of eliminating discrimination with great care to avoid the possibility that new discriminations will replace the old.

I commend this editorial to the readers of the RECORD:

PUZZLES IN THE VOTE LAW

Congress is getting down to work on a voting-rights bill in such a mood that quick passage is all but certain. It is right that a bill should pass; the discrimination against the Negro at the polling place in certain sections of the country is intolerable.

But while it is easy to sort out the basic rights and wrongs on this issue and come down on the side of a strong law, the details as to what it should contain do not sort so easily. Take the question of literacy tests as a prime example.

In the administration proposal, a literacy test becomes one of two basic guides in establishing discrimination. The other is a turnout of less than 50 percent of the voting-age population in the 1964 presidential election.

Using these guides, the proposed law could invoke the Federal power to register Negroes in States where discrimination by literacy test is the worst—Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia. But some strange ironies would ensue.

Alaska, which has no discrimination problem, would nevertheless be affected. Large areas of Arkansas, Texas, Tennessee, and Kentucky—and smaller areas in other States where the voting turnout falls below 50 percent—would be exempt because these States have no literacy tests. In the affected States, the literacy tests would be nullified, but in others literacy tests would remain unaffected.

In practice, this could mean that an uneducated Negro registered in Alabama under Federal law would lose his right to vote if he moved to New York, since New York has a literacy test. Yet no one is accusing New York of discriminating against the Negro where voting rights are concerned.

Both in the wording of the law and in its application, great care is obviously required to avoid new discriminations in knocking down the old ones. There are also questions of constitutionality in legislation that affects States unequally.

Illinois would be untouched by the proposed law, since it falls outside the scope of either of the two guides. Voting is well above the 50-percent mark, and Illinois has no literacy test.

The attention drawn to such tests by the proposed Federal law might, indeed, cause this State to reexamine its voter registration requirements. An illiterate in Illinois may sign his registration card with an "X" and request help when he goes to the polls. He may also ask for help if he is barely able to sign his name properly.

In practice, this provision leads to much more help in the voting booth than can be explained on any rational basis. The question arises whether vote frauds under the guise of liberal voter registration are not as much an abuse of the democratic process as the fraudulent barriers to voting erected in the South.

In either case, the aim is the same—to control the outcome of balloting, which can be meaningful only when it represents the free will of the people.

Equal Rights for Men and Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my resolution to amend the Constitution to provide specifically for equal rights for men and women.

My reason for introducing this resolution is simple. I feel that equality should not be a question of sex, and that women should enjoy the economic and occupational rights of their male counterparts.

I urge the Congress to take this opportunity to make women's equality a matter of law.

The Delaware Expressway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 29, 1965, entitled "The Solution: Underground":

THE SOLUTION: UNDERGROUND

Highway designers seem to dwell in a mysterious world all their own.

The obvious, the logical, and the best way to run the Delaware Expressway through the heart of historic old Philadelphia is to tunnel it underground. This has been apparent for some time. But the highway engineers who produced a monstrous design—which would desecrate the Independence Hall and Penn's Landing area with a 12-lane superhighway, elevated more than 20 feet in the air, topped with fences and overhead lights and signs—hate to admit there is anything distasteful about their plan.

Well, Philadelphia isn't going to stand for it.

Pennsylvania Highways Secretary Harral, belatedly and reluctantly, has agreed to authorize another study of the highway design if a request is made formally and through proper channels. He will get the request, all right, but it is hard to understand why the secretary stands stubbornly on ceremony at this late date. Both U.S. Senators from Pennsylvania, the mayor of Philadelphia, and this city's delegation of U.S. Representatives—among many others—already are on record against the "Chinese Wall" design for the highway.

It is absurd to say the highway cannot be put underground. In New York, Baltimore, and other cities motor traffic is tunneled not only underground but under water. If the additional cost is not prohibitive elsewhere, why should it be in Philadelphia?

Hundreds of millions of dollars already have been spent, or are tentatively committed, in public and private undertakings to beautify and revitalize the area around the birthplace of American independence. It is essential that the new highway be compatible.

To contend that redesigning the highway will delay its construction is an exceedingly hollow argument. It was more than 3

months ago, on December 21, that the Inquirer—in an editorial entitled "Put It Underground"—detailed many reasons why the original highway design ought to be changed. All through the winter there has been a storm of protest against the "Chinese Wall" proposal.

Where the blame for delay belongs is clear enough: on the highway engineers who designed this monstrosity and on their superiors who have tried to defend it.

The 1967 Centennial of the Alaska Purchase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I hereby offer for the information of my colleagues and others the concluding part of "An Event of National Significance," as depicted in the 1964 annual report of the Alaska Centennial Commission. I refer to the 100th anniversary of the Treaty of Cession whereby the United States concluded terms for the purchase of Alaska from Russia.

Although planing for the centennial event in 1967 is encouraged and coordinated by the Alaska Centenial Commission, much of the preparation is carried out by 22 centennial committes organized in the communnities of Alaska. The committee names and their chairmen are as follows: Alaska Railbelt, Mary Carey; Anchorage, John Urban; Copper Center, Howard Kibble; Cordova, Pete Loveseth; Fairbanks, Curtis E. Boone; Gastineau, William Biggs; Haines-Port Chilkoot, Carl Heinmiller; Homer, Mrs. Dixie Judd; Kenai, Mrs. Allen L. Petersen; Ketchikan, Gordon Zerbetz; Kodiak, Pete Deveau; Kotzebue, Mrs. Ray Heinrichs; Metlakatla, Arnold Booth; Ninilchik, Waldo Bishop; Petersburg, Carroll Clausen; Seward, Larry Urbach; Sitka, George Beacom; Skagway, Carl Mulvihill; Soldotna, Lottie Edelman; Valdez, D. F. "Woody" Huls; Wrangell, Sharon Traylor; and Yakutat, Harry Bremner.

This part of the Alaska Centennial Commission's report tells of present planning for publicizing the centennial event and of anticipated Federal participation:

AN EVENT OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE—PART 3

PUBLICIZING AND PROMOTING THE CENTENNIAL

Centennial Press

Chief among present means of publicizing the centennial is the publication of the monthly Centennial Press, carrying news of centennial planning and extracts from works of Alaska's history. Mailed to those engaged or interested in centennial planning, it goes to about 1,200 persons. Newspapers and radio and television stations, which occasionally use selections from it, also receive news releases periodically from the commission.

Displays

Displays of historic photographs and notices of the approaching centennial are also used. Such displays are now at the New York World's Fair and in State ferry terminals. They will soon be aboard the ferries and in the major air terminals of the State.

During early 1965, signs urging travelers to return to 1967 will be erected at points of departure.

Displays will be mounted, in advance of 1967, at the Andrew Johnson historic site in Tennessee. It is hoped that arrangements can also be made for a special display at Fort Ross in California.

Slide show

Important in stimulating interest in Alaskan history, and thereby stimulating interest in the centennial, is presentation of the first segment of an Alaskan history slide show, this portion covering the period 1724–99. Entitled "Discovery, Exploration, and Colonization," it is being shown, accompanied by a taped narration, by local centennial committees and by the commission to organizations of all kinds. Work is proceeding on subsequent historical periods.

Photographs of old engravings and maps utilized in the slide shows are also employed in displays and will be used later for a picture album of Alaska history.

Historic map

Historic maps of Alaska are being issued in facsimile to promote interest in Alaska's past. A copy of the map (1731) carried by Bering on his voyage of discovery and of a map (1758) drawn 17 years after the discovery have been reproduced and sold across Alaska, the United States, and Canada. Profits from the sale of the maps go to local centennial committees, with initial costs of the reproduction returned to the State treasury. Free copies of the maps are distributed to Alaska's schools, museums, and libraries.

Emblem use

Wide use of the centennial emblem and motto is being urged on salmon labels, stationery, matchbook covers, telephone books, postal cancellation dies, and in advertising of Alaskan firms. Four-color stickers are being furnished to local committees for resale.

License plates

Centennial license plates are being produced for use on vehicles beginning in 1966. These plates will carry an attractive totemic design, the dates 1867–1967, and the centennial motto, "North to the Future."

Conventions, conferences

Alaska is being suggested as a site for conventions and conferences during 1967. Among other groups invited are the Soviet-American Conference, the National Conference of Mayors, and a subgroup of the United Nations. An Alaskan vacation as a contest prize is being explored.

Invitations to former Alaskans will be sent during 1966, inviting them to return to Alaska during the centennial year. These invitations will originate in centennial committees, with local homecoming weeks being suggested as a time for visits.

Other

In addition to publicity that is being generated by reconstruction and preservation efforts in Alaska now, and publicity that will be generated by events of the centennial year, other projects such as a gift of a totem pole to the Russian people, press luncheons in the lower 48, and television presentations are contemplated as promotional programs.

FEDERAL PARTICIPATION

Under legislation enacted by the 88th Congress, and signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson, the centennial celebration is declared to be an event of national significance. A study is now being prepared by the U.S. Department of Commerce that will recommend the extent and manner of Federal participation. Proposals for specific forms of participation will be made by the Alaska Centennial Commission.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

While the commission has sought to narrow the focus of its centennial planning by describing tasks in terms of several objectives, it has also sought to widen the vision of what centennial year can be by suggesting that 1967 be seen as a target date to get everything done that can be done. Such a view of the centennial year, it has been observed, would give rise to creative ideas, give impetus to action, and give added zest to life in Alaska as progress is made toward that goal.

The Future of the Chesapeake Bay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, much is being said these days, and hopefully much is going to be done in the cause of conservation of our natural resources, defense against air and water pollution, and developing our Nation's scenic beauty. This all-out effort is not based on the altruistic dreams of utopian planners, but goes to the very roots of our economic and environmental prosperity.

In this light, I have recently called attention to the increasing dangers facing one of America's finest assets, the Chesapeake Bay, dangers ironically brought about by an ever-advancing civilization. In this light I have introduced appropriate legislation, H.R. 5495, which would authorize the Secretary of the Army "to conduct a complete study of the Chesapeake Bay Basin including the tributaries and to construct, operate and maintain in the State of Maryland a hydraulic model with an associated technical center."

Since the introduction of this bill, I have been in contact with virtually all of the State and local agencies interested in the economic and conservation aspects of the bay, and their response has been extremely heartening. Civic and industrial leaders are outspoken in their support of this measure, and, perhaps most important, the influential press corps from the several States and localities surrounding the Chesapeake Bay have joined in the appeal to save this vital waterway which is virtually a Mediterranean of America.

On March 26, one of the leading newspapers of the mid-Atlantic seaboard, the Wilmington Evening Journal, had this to say, "There can be no doubt that the time is already very late in the Chesapeake for any assurance of its future as a magnificent American asset." I believe these words and the accompanying editorial put the issue of the future of the Chesapeake Bay in its proper perspective.

HOW ABOUT A MODEL CHESAPEAKE?

U.S. Representative ROGERS C. B. MORTON represents the nine counties of the Eastern Shore of Maryland. How is it that this Republican, product of Kentucky, managed to win reelection last fall over a popular Democratic candidate despite the Democratic landslide?

(This is as good a spot as any to mention that Mr. MORTON of Talbot County, Md., is a brother of U.S. Senator THURSTON B. MORTON, former GOP national chairman.)

How did he win reelection? That's for Eastern Shoremen to say. But our theory is simply that he did it by demonstrating he thinks there is no place under the sun half as wonderful as the Chesapeake with its rivers and shores. For instance here is how he regards the bay:

"The Chesapeake is one of our Nation's greatest natural resources. It is a throbbing artery of national and international commerce * * *. It is a God-given estuary of unsurpassed beauty. * * * It provides man with a rare, and tragically dimishing, opportunity to commune with nature.

"It serves as a winter habitat for the migratory waterfowl of the eastern flyway. Its waters are a world renowned fishery for oysters, crabs, clams, shad, and other fin fish unchallenged in quality and variety."

But Mr. MORTON sees the Chesapeake Bay and its shores in peril.

He worries about the 10 million cubic yards of silt to be dumped somewhere as spoil from dredging the ship channel from the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal to Baltimore. What will that do to oyster beds and fish-spawning beds?

And how about the vast quantities of wastes that pollute the bay every day? How can the fast erosion of shorelines be halted? How can new commerce and industry be attracted to the region—and the great new recreation and tourist industry be further encouraged?

One tool he sees as of great potential value is the subject of a bill he has introduced in Congress. It calls for a "hydraulic model" of the whole bay and its tributaries. On the order of the U.S. Corps of Engineers big model of the Mississippi River—long used in research into flood control and the like—this Chesapeake model would, Mr. MORTON feels, be of great aid to canal engineers, wildlife experts, and others.

He sees it as a scale model covering 12 acres showing "in detail the bay, its major tributaries and land features; it will duplicate the tides, currents, and freshwater streams." The price? $2.5 million. "Based on experience with other such models," he says, "this one will result in savings far beyond the cost of the project."

There can be no doubt that the time is already very late in the Chesapeake for any assurance of its future as a magnificient American asset. We see no reason to doubt the usefulness of the Eastern Shore Congressman's proposal. Even so it would be just one tool in an effort to preserve the natural wonder that is Chesapeake Bay.

Emotion and Politics Should Not Be Sole Vote Bill Guides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD one of the best editorials I have had the privilege of reading, regarding the proposed voting rights measure now pending in the Congress.

The editorial was written by one of the Nation's outstanding editorial writers, Mr. Guy L. Smith, editor of the Knoxville Journal, Knoxville, Tenn. The editorial appeared in the Monday, March 29, issue.

Mr. Smith's penetrating analysis of the bill should be read by every Member of the House. I commend it to you for a guideline to follow in solving this great problem.

EMOTION AND POLITICS SHOULD NOT BE SOLE VOTE BILL GUIDES

There is widespread conviction in Washington that the President's new voting rights bill, submitted to Congress last week in draft form from the office of the U.S. Attorney General, Nicholas Katzenbach, will wheel through both Houses by substantial majorities and with little actual consideration by those who comprise them as to just what the bill is about.

This unthinking haste on the part of our national legislators was certainly not what the Knoxville Journal had in mind when it commented favorably upon the objectives of the President's speech to a joint session of Congress on March 15, and urged that the job of giving the Negro his voting rights be gotten along with to cure an injustice which has existed for a century.

At the time the President made his address we, and many others who have sympathized with the Negro's plight, had no notion that Congress was ready to abdicate its responsibility as a deliberative body and to adopt a piece of legislation forthwith, regardless of either its constitutionality or its discriminatory character, so far as its impact upon all States was concerned. We had no idea that what the President planned was the introduction of a formula for compulsory voting which is certainly nowhere mentioned in the Constitution and is repugnant to our whole concept of a free ballot. We did not foresee that the President and the leadership of both parties in both Houses of Congress would conspire to enact a bill no less vicious in its discriminatory provisions than are those in the voting laws of the six or more States toward which the legislation is directed.

ONLY TWO INGREDIENTS

What thoughtful people throughout the country will feel is that the President's bill is to be considered by Congress—indeed, was considered by those who authored it—solely on grounds of emotion and political expediency and with the purpose of gaining its adoption by Congress on the basis of these two ingredients alone.

It is too bad that this is the situation, because it rules out the kind of consideration which deserves to be given to any law which affects the basic right—for which we have contended for the Negro as well as the white—of every citizen of this country.

It is a matter for sorrow, too, that the Republican leadership in both Houses was apparently committed in advance to any kind of bill which the President saw fit to submit. Thus there exists no organized opposition in either House to sections of the bill now in committee that do violence to the constitutional concept of government traditional in this Republic.

It is a matter for sorrow that the President chooses to do anything other than what could be done without violence to the Constitution and without discrimination against any States in the Union. Discrimination in voting practices against the citizens of one State deserves the identical Federal reprisal that is contemplated in this bill against only a few. How can the President and Congress in good conscience strike down the voting laws and practices in half a dozen States, while leaving untouched 13 others?

ONE OF TWO COURSES

Here, in a State which has never had any requirements for voter eligibility on the books except legal residence, we repeat that it is the obligation of Congress to take one of two courses, either of which in our conviction would do no violence to the Constitution or discriminate against any State:

1. Strike down eligibility requirements in all States, opening them up to Federal registrars wherever discrimination on account of race, creed, or color can be shown, or

2. Enact the President's bill to include a mild form of eligibility requirement for all States which could then be policed by Federal "examiners," as described in the bill, wherever discrimination was shown.

Either course followed would contemplate removal of the 50 percent voting requirement which is clearly unconstitutional—only in Russia and other Communist countries are citizens required to vote.

Section 3(a) of the Johnson bill reads as follows:

"No person shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his failure to comply with any test or device, in any State or in any political subdivision of State which (1) the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device as a qualification for voting, and with respect to which (2) the Director of the Census determines that less than 50 per centum of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964."

SLY REQUIREMENT

Injection of this sly requirement that 50 percent of the citizens of voting age in any State must have been registered and must have voted was clearly a plan to outlaw voter discrimination in half a dozen States, while in no way interfering with voter eligibility tests which are on the books in 13 States in addition to those which are the special targets of this legislation. It seems to us that it is beyond rational debate that a citizen of this State, for example, who votes with no eligibility requirement other than residence, should be able to move into any other State in the Union and vote on the same basis, if the Federal Government is to assume jurisdiction on the question of eligibility.

The trouble is that many Members of Congress are apparently ready to act in the role of politicians rather than in one of statesmen. They are thinking of what will get them votes in next year's elections, rather than what is fair to and constitutional for all voters of all races in all States.

A Look at the Republican Party in the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, our distinguished minority leader and my close friend, Mr. GERALD FORD of Michigan, was the guest speaker before the National Press Club of Washington, D.C. This was an outstanding and well-articulated statement concerning the shortcomings of the present administration and the efforts of the House of Republicans to discharge their responsibilities as an effective minority party.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] before the Press Club in the Appendix:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, REPUBLICAN, OF MICHIGAN, BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Let's take a look at the Republican Party in the House of Representatives. It's true that the new House Republican leadership hasn't won any spectacular legislative successes. This has been appropriately noted by some. But we never campaigned on a platform that—by some strange sleight of hand or magic potion—we could double our numbers and slice the opposition in half before November 1966.

As you well know, the numbers on each side of the aisle in the House have remained the same since November 3—140 Republicans to 294 Democrats. The odds are rough. But, to coin a phrase—with a little different twist—we shall overcome.

You in your profession and those of us in my profession face the same powerhouse—but in a different way.

The White House and all its troops try to spoon-feed you—and they try to clobber us. The President has virtually unlimited resources for working his will—a veritable army of experts, authorities, researchers, propagandists, and the like.

He is also king pin of the branch of Government that employs 2½ million civilians and controls the destiny of 2,600,000 military personnel. These two groups have a payroll cost totaling $28 billion—and together they will spend over 127 billion tax dollars in fiscal 1966.

This awesome power and the vast apparatus, if used improperly, could mean the withering away and eventually the death of the two-party system.

There is nothing constitutionally ordained about running our Government through two great political parties.

But almost from the start our Nation made such a choice. It was a wise decision. We avoided the chaos of a multiparty government. We avoided the loss of freedom of the single party system. And we built into government an additional set of checks and balances.

Not only does a strong second party provide the electorate with legislative alternatives but also with a remarkably high level of honesty and frankness.

Our American news media have a noble tradition in demanding the facts, bursting the bubble of propaganda, unstuffing the shirt, and exposing the corrupt. You of the news media can perform your job better if the relative strengths of our two parties are more nearly in balance and not so far out of kilter.

When both the executive and legislative branches are dominated by the same political party, the Committees on Government Operations of the House and Senate, which have broad investigating authority, should be under the control of the minority party. It smacks of legalized collusion when we find the suspect and the district attorney are blood relatives. To make our Federal Government function better, to help you get the facts, Republicans in Congress believe this new idea would be a step in the right direction.

Here would be a genuine vehicle to assure that the voice of the minority would be heard, that the majority would be constantly on notice that its actions or inactions were subject to effective and critical review. Here would be an assurance the public through your help would know that any coverup or wrongdoing would be improbable if not impossible.

It is safe to speculate that with such a setup there would be more public confidence that the real Bobby Baker story had been told.

The Democrats certainly have us overwhelmed numerically in Congress. We could say, "What's the use?" That's no answer for the American people, for you or for ourselves. Fortunately there is a constructive ferment right now in the Republican Party.

We have already made some reorganization of our internal machinery. The research and planning committee is working at long-range policy. We are creating special task forces on major substantive issues in such rapid succession that one observer said we were setting up "an antipoverty program for Republican intellectuals."

JOHN RHODES, with a beefed-up staff, is policy committee chairman, and this reorganized group will deal with current, day-to-day legislative problems.

On the basis of simple mathematics, the administration can pass about everything it wants to in this Congress, particularly if it twists a few arms as it did in the Nasser victory on an appropriation bill a few weeks ago. Nevertheless we will win on some issues in this Congress. More importantly, Republicans will build a record for a substantially stronger representation after November 8, 1966.

The Republican strategy in the House will be diversified. We'll be grateful for any Democratic support, North or South. To compete with the administration, we will offer:

1. Opposition to administration's aims and methods when we think both are wrong, but never obstructionism just for its own sake.

2. Constructive alternatives to administration schemes when we feel they are tackling the right problems at home or abroad, in the wrong way.

House Republicans have already recommended responsible proposals this year in medicare, education, housing, and Appalachia.

3. Workable programs, developed through our task forces, to meet the many problems the administration is ignoring or neglecting. We refuse to concede that Democrats have a monopoly on ideas for the solution of domestic or foreign difficulties.

4. Wholehearted support for the President when we think he is right. Vietnam policy in the last few weeks is the prime example. More and more Republicans have stanchly backed the President while more and more Democrats have changed their tune to favor immediate negotiation and tail-between-our-legs withdrawal.

On the domestic scene we recall that the Congress has enacted three laws on civil rights since 1957. Progress has been made in the South because there is a growing public conscience and sense of justice.

Yet even in 1964 far too many eligible Negroes of voting age were not registered to vote in 11 Southern States. For some part of the 2,800,000 who are unregistered, the franchise is unattainable regardless of their qualifications. In some islands of resistance, the 15th amendment to the Constitution is still being flouted.

The Republican leadership insists this violation of constitutional rights must end prior to the 1966 election.

The achievement of this goal requires a new and strong Federal voting rights law. This legislation should:

1. Effectively and speedily end the unconstitutional denial of the right to vote everywhere in the United States.

2. Terminate unreasonable standards for registration and voting without interfering with the reasonable requirements established by the States.

3. Terminate any discriminatory application of requirements for registration and voting.

4. Should not penalize areas which are not guilty of discrimination.

The voting rights bill which the administration has submitted to the Congress falls short of meeting these standards.

This bill appears to affect only the 18, possibly 20, States which have some kind of literacy test as a qualification for voting. It does not apply to four southern States in which are found 25 percent of the unregistered Negroes of the South—Arkansas, Florida, Tennessee, and Texas. It does not apply to Smith County, Tex., with low voter turnout among a population of 27 percent Negro. On the other hand, it does apply to Aroostook County, Maine, where only 1 percent of the population is nonwhite.

This bill ignores those discriminatory practices used in the States that do not employ literacy and similar tests.

In the literacy-test States it largely ignores discrimination that touches less than 50 percent of the population.

This bill introduces a strange kind of geographical discrimination. It nullifies the literacy test in Martin County, N.C., where 49.9 percent of the voting-age population went to the polls in 1964, but it leaves the literacy test in full effect in Guilford County, N.C., which registered a turnout of 52.5 percent of its voting-age population.

This bill leaves untouched too much discrimination in too many places. If it is passed as drafted, the Congress will find itself struggling with yet another voting rights bill in 1966 or 1967.

The administration's bill will not accomplish all that must be done. Under the leadership of Congressman WILLIAM MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, I believe there will be a Republican voting rights bill in the House of Representatives that will be more comprehensive in its application. The Republican members of the House Judiciary Committee, the members of the House Republican task force on the right to vote and others have been at work on such a bill for several weeks. They are considering, among other proposals, those made by Republican Members of the Congress before the President presented his bill. This more effective proposal will be ready for consideration by the House Committee on the Judiciary.

This overall blueprint for Republican legislative action is based on what we conceive to be our duty to the 43 percent of the American electorate who put us in office, and to the people as a whole who face ever-increasing Federal domination and erosion of their liberties unless an articulate opposition functions effectively.

It is based on the hard truth that the Republic Party to win in 1966 must earn and regain the respect of many millions of voters—and it cannot do this by sitting on the sidelines and waiting for an international or domestic catastrophe to produce a call for a change of leadership.

It is based also on a profound conviction that something more than talk of unity and consensus is demanded by the challenges of our times.

We subscribe to the observation of Senator Robert A. Taft in 1951, endorsed by John F. Kennedy in 1960, that if you permit appeals to unity to bring an end to criticism, we endanger not only the constitutional liberties of our country, but even its future existence.

We raise the question of whether it is enough in these days of danger and turmoil for our President to continue to act as a consensus politician instead of a statesman who leads.

Waiting for a consensus can and often does mean ignoring little problems until they become big ones.

It can and does mean inaction until the riots start—whether in Saigon or in Selma.

As recently as January, the President was referring with satisfaction—according to some well-known columnists—to our policy in South Vietnam as one of creative inaction.

To me, this is a fantastic concept—better described, perhaps, as "dynamic paralysis."

Yet this attitude was reflected in the state of the Union message, which suggested that the international scene was so improved that we could all but forget it in favor of domestic affairs.

The disarray of NATO is all but ignored by the administration. Nasser and Sukarno thumb their noses with seeming impunity.

And the disruptive voices in the Democratic Party not only undercut the President in his conduct of foreign affairs at a time of national crisis; they also raise the very grave danger of a Communist miscalculation as to our intentions in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

We believe in keeping the ball on the enemy's goalline—not backpedaling to our 20-yard line before starting the next play.

The President can always count on Republican support when his foreign policy is firm and decisive on the side of freedom and in the national interest.

But if ever there was a time for broad-guaged revival of genuine bipartisanship in foreign policy in the spirit of the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, that time is now.

Senator Vandenberg, who was my fellow townsman, was largely responsible for my getting into politics.

He arrived at a thoughtful concept of the Nation's best interests in foreign policy matters which served the American people magnificently well—and it is a concept which I would be honored to help to expand beyond current policy in South Vietnam.

But foreign policy bipartisanship in the Vandenberg pattern means genuine consultation across party lines in determining policy—not just using the Republicans for afterthought window dressing.

It does not mean merely a summons to the White House in a moment of crisis, and then calling in the photographers and announcing Republican endorsement of an administration policy already determined.

Nor does it mean foreclosure of Republican criticism of foreign policy when we are convinced the administration is wrong.

Some of our problems, particularly a lack of unity, have been created by Republicans. On behalf of America's future, I suggest that the present political imbalance—however self-inflicted—is not a good thing.

Under our system no party can be doctrinaire, sectarian, narrow in its appeal or misrepresented to have such an image, however, unfair the charge might be—and still attract the majority of the electorate.

The high ground of moderation with unselfish unity is not only common horsesense for a political party—it is also representative of the people and in keeping with the underlying genius of the American political system.

The day-to-day rebuilding of Republican policy and the party must begin in the Congress—and because all the House must face the voters next year, the heaviest burden of the task must be carried in the House.

We aim to correct that imbalance—to reestablish two-party government. Far from lamenting our fate, House Republicans are wide open to fresh ideas and confident that new approaches, full participation, and renewed dedication can earn new friends for the Republican Party and made an important contribution to the future of America.

Military Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, in this time of national prosperity as we attempt to launch a Great Society unparalleled in the history of man, one segment of our society continues in economic bondage.

I speak, of course, of our uniformed military personnel whose economic plight is reaching proportions of a national disgrace.

Earlier this month I introduced a bill—H.R. 6553—which would increase pay for men entering military service and those with less than 2 years of service. This is a small step in the right direction.

But on the broader scale of general military pay, I have received a letter from a constituent of mine who is now on Active Army duty in a foreign country. This letter from Army Capt. Richard P. Yates of Ripon, Wis., speaks for itself as the most eloquent testimonial for the need of action by Congress that has come to my attention.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this letter to the attention of my colleagues and under unanimous consent, include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HEADQUARTERS, BERLIN BRIGADE,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER,
SUBSISTENCE BRANCH,
APO, New York, March 22, 1965.

Subject: Military pay increase.

Hon. JOHN A. RACE,
Representative from the State of Wisconsin,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This letter is a request for your support of a substantial military pay increase.

Two recent clippings from the Stars and Stripes newspaper of March 5, 1965, are quoted for your information.

One is the caption below a picture of a pretty blond, and reads as follows: "Ex-bunny at Work—Mary Ellen Terziu, a former Playboy Club bunny girl, has gone to work as a $7,200 typist for the House Education and Labor Committee, headed by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York."

The other is under the headline "Military Losing Trained Officers, Men at Serious Pace." I will quote the first two paragraphs for you:

"Despite two military pay raises in as many years, the armed services are losing trained officers and enlisted men at a serious pace.

"An Associated Press survey shows that the services regard still inadequate pay, poor housing, prolonged separation from families, and eroded fringe benefits as major factors."

From here, the article written by Fred S. Hoffman and carried over the AP wire, gave detailed figures on losses by service and grade.

Let's analyze this situation to see what it offers. First, let us assume that Miss Terziu works 5½ days per week at 8 hours per day, does not draw overtime pay for hours worked over 40, and has 2 weeks' vacation with pay per year. Her hourly pay, as a typist, comes to $3.27 per hour.

A captain with between 4 and 6 years of Government services, who is to be available 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, who has been unable, due to circumstances of his job, to take more than half of his vacation time, earns $1.42 per hour computed at his basic pay rate, or $1.98 per hour if all pay and allowances are considered.

While Miss Terziu, who is a handy example, is called upon to be basically familiar with forms, letters, typing procedures, and other routine operations, let us compare the necessary scope of knowledge for a typical Army captain.

Since letters on this subject cannot avoid being subjective to a degree, I offer myself as a typical officer—not with an exceptional form of duty—but rather with a routine but necessary type of assignment and an average background of service.

After joining the Army in June 1959 with a commission (RA) in Quartermaster and detail in Armor, my experience has included:

Command of a mechanized flamethrower platoon—involving knowledge of tank gunnery for both normal and special weapons, armor and infantry tactics, tracked and wheeled vehicle maintenance, communication procedures, maintenance and equipment, desert survival, first aid, as well as the care and preservation of minds, morale, and body of some 20 other human beings, who were not mine only to train, but after duty as well.

Executive officer of an installation headquarters company: 350 persons to supervise, educate, train, discipline, counsel, and lead. A unit messhall and supply room to supervise, including the inspection to be sure the U.S. Government is getting maximum use of its dollar.

Quartermaster inspector: Technical inspector of all Q.M. equipment on a post, ranging from petroleum storage tanks to scarves, to be sure all is maintained properly, repaired when economically necessary to protect the Government interest.

Storage officer for class II, III, and IV products—used knowledge of the characteristics of all items of quartermaster responsibility other than food, to insure maximum utilization, proper storage, preventative as well as curative maintenance and proper stockage levels to provide for emergency operations. Included working knowledge of a great variety of petroleum products.

Class I officer—Am supervising a $4,200,000 annual business in both perishable and nonperishable foodstuffs—to insure their proper storage, issue and consumption both in troop messes and in a commissary store which is essential in an oversea theater. Am supervising a bakery. Have and need a working knowledge, developed on the job, of a foreign language in both technical and conversational fields to properly work with local citizens at the place of duty. Must know the characteristics of a great variety of foods and be able to properly gage the life of items to insure fullest possible use. Must plan for the requisition of food items, and properly compute to avoid excess yet avoid running out when shipments fail to arrive.

Some 6½ months have been spent as a student at Army schools, not including the time which was spent by the Army instructing me as an ROTC cadet.

Further, like most commissioned officers, I am a college graduate, and many officers have post graduate degrees.

All these add up to a great variety of subjects to be known, a great amount of money spent in training as well as much responsibility handled by one typical Army captain. It is not felt necessary to discuss the extremely high mental, moral and physical standards imposed upon the commissioned officer today.

Yet, a typist is paid a salary which is between 2 and 2½ times the captain's pay. She no doubt has a certainty of where she will be living and working for more than 3 years at a time at best. She may choose to get married and can be sure of living with her husband without a knowledge of long separation frequently forced upon her by her job.

The unpleasant sides of the military have been accepted by the career soldier and officer with the belief that the Government will live up to its promises. The danger and sadness have been felt to be part of the job, and reasonable exchange for an income which offers an opportunity to properly provide for a family. We do not yet have that type of income.

By the constant shaving of the benefits to the serviceman, such as the discussed cut-

ting of commissary privileges, losses to the Government of trained personnel increase. By the failure of pay to meet the standards needed to provide for a family in the manner which the soldier's counterpart in experience, age, and education can do, trained men leave the service for the good of their families. By the constant promise of future benefits at cost of present discomfort, and then the possibility of reduction of future benefits, it is no wonder that the soldier has no faith in his Government to support him in his time of need. The President has stated his desire that the military become first-class citizens, yet a college graduate with nearly 6 years of experience earns less than half the salary of a typist.

A pay raise, not only in basic pay, but in quarters and subsistence allowances, is essential to keep trained, capable individuals in the service. Retention of trained people is clearly a desirable and money-saving proposition.

To not give a raise could cause far more expense to the Government due to constant replacement of trained personnel than the cost of a good pay increase.

As an Army officer and citizen of Ripon, Wis., I urgently request your support for an increase in military pay.

RICHARD P. YATES,
Captain, QMC,
Chief, Subsistence Branch.

World's Image

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the public image on which the United States spends millions of dollars annually is suffering from malnutrition as a result of the actions in Selma, Ala. The shock of brutality in Alabama has vibrated to all parts of the world. The nonwhite populations in foreign countries are listening and viewing these events with consternation. The police assaults on the marchers in Selma must make foreigners wonder if democracy practices what it preaches.

The primary reason why we must attack the problems of discrimination is rooted in our basic commitments as a nation and people. Discrimination due to race, color, and religion should be eliminated not to make others think better of us but because it is incompatible with the principles to which our democratic society is dedicated.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and in my travels abroad, I have been asked by foreign correspondents in African nations why a democratic country like the United States portrays a global image that the white race is superior or entitled to special privileges because of race. The Soviets and particularly the Red Chinese are using the Selma incidents to propagandize the nonwhite nations that the color of people is the determining factor for classifying citizenship in Alabama. Pictures showing scenes of brutality in Selma are being distributed in Asia by the Red Chinese.

The United States is widely regarded as the home of democracy and the leader of the struggle for freedom, for human rights, and for human dignity. We are expected to be the model and no higher compliment could be paid to us. So our failure to live up to our proclaimed ideals are noted and magnified and distorted.

Racial discrimination and its exploitation by the Communists have injured our international position. The reason we have not suffered greater damage is that we have made progress in removing discriminatory laws and practices and have advanced to full equality. We must regain our lost image by demonstrating to the world that our Nation will not tolerate racial and social injustices among its citizens.

Who Speaks for the Church?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in the March 28 issue of the Washington Star there appears an article by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, entitled "Who Speaks for the Church?" It is an excellent article. It deserves to be read by every clergyman in the Nation, as well as by laymen. Dr. Harris wonders aloud how so many of our clergymen can ignore or "sweep under the rug" the Communist threat, while concentrating their efforts on other causes, however well meaning they may be. He notes that:

Among those who are asuming national and world leadership among the churches, it must be admitted that so far as communism is concerned, there is, to use a Scriptural phrase, "a silence that could be heard in heaven."

The article follows:

WHO SPEAKS FOR THE CHURCH?
(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

A fear-haunted question is raised in a recent letter from a highly intelligent life-long friend, prominent in the affairs of a great Eastern city. He poses an agonizing query growing out of the disruption and dislocation in the contemporary yeasty humanity. He asks, "Into what kind of a world are our grandchildren headed?" An influential Communist, who is a Judas to his U.S. citizenship, answered in the dedication of a book he wrote some years ago—"To my great-grandson, J.W.K., who will live in a Communist United States." That would mean that he would live under a coercive government where the vote is not denied to just a tiny minority but in a system in which no one is allowed to vote except where the ballot is stamped by a dictator.

Concerning the right to vote in our land, this is a time of seething emotion bordering on hysteria. In some demonstrations dunce caps and martyr halos are strangely mixed.

In such a time it needs to be said, especially to the churchmen who are so aroused, that in facing squarely domestic adjustments to meet the tests of true government by the people, the unpardonable sin is for Americans out of zeal to redress any national flaws, to allow themselves, unknowingly, to be used by a sinister world conspiracy against human dignity. This blasphemous system is engaged in a lying world campaign to utterly distort the true image of this Nation of our pride and prayer. The hate America propaganda, whose poison is being blown around the planet, is born of communism's fear complex that the United States, with its material and moral might, is the one and only power that can thunder to this scourge of fetters—"You shall not pass." Never in history has there been such a colossal campaign to peddle lies about any country. Lenin's directions are now in full operation that any distortion or prevarication is permissible if it advances the cause he fathered.

For instance, one of the charges being made about "imperialistic America" is that the one-tenth of its population belonging to the Negro race, the descendants of slaves snatched from the savage tribes of Africa, are here treated with contempt, denied all opportunities for advancement, and in spite of the Emancipation Proclamation held in virtual subjection. American Negroes thousands of miles from home, members of Joey Adams entertainment group touring the world, nailed down that lie at a public question and answer period in a foreign country. They were being taunted by communistic stooges about the place of their race in America. One of the quartet indignantly answered for them all. Glaring at the questioners he said: "Listen, Pals, outside of heaven there is only one place I want to be and that's the United States. Sure, we got problems, but we've got laws, and we've got courts, and we've got millions of Americans of all races and creeds and all colors, who are willing to lay down their lives to make possible the freedom of a man called Abraham Lincoln. We've got it made in our country!" This black man was exposing the fiction of the communistic line.

Let no one in America, now deeply concerned about voting rights for some groups belonging to one-tenth of our population, be so naive as to be oblivious to the ugly fact that the communistic conspiracy which is out to deny the sacred right of the vote for everybody, is using the present agitation in America to advance their own evil cause. There is more back of that statement that can be put in this article.

The question we are raising here, with no condemnation for religious leaders who are marching today in a cause that grips their conscience, is: Have these same leaders any vivid realization of what is in store for all Americans if the world objectives of that blasphemous, godless system, are attained? And, make no mistake about it, it is so far on its way as to blanch our faces with fear. But with this menace hanging like a Damascus sword over the fragile thread of our liberties, are these same religious leaders so vociferous now as they deal with growing pains of a democracy, equally vocal as they face the most dastardly system the ages have known? It is a tragic fact that the answer to that question must be "No." Among those who are assuming national and world leadership among the churches, it must be admitted that so far as communism is concerned, there is, to use a scriptural phrase, "A silence that could be heard in heaven."

One of these leaders has said, "Let us quit moralizing about communism and to communism." His word for that conspiracy, and that of many of his colleagues, is accommodation, coexistence, cooperation. We are speaking now of Protestant leadership. Thank God the Roman Catholics are arrayed against religion's most malignant foe. Would to God that in every church in America the perils of this godless force were being poured into the minds of the young—and, of the older. Would that every church, as its bounden duty, would have its entire mem-

bership familiar with every chapter of J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters of Deceit." There could be no more effective antidote to the tragically mistaken attitude of some church leaders as they encourage the coming generation to stroke the ferocious leopard (which has not changed its spots) and to murmur, "pretty pussy."

It is high time for religious people of every name or sign to raise the question in this time of dire crisis, "Who speaks for the church?"

The Buddhists' Role in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, over 2 years ago I warned that some of the Buddhists were being used by the Communists in their efforts to subvert the nations of southeast Asia.

As you recall, Mr. Speaker, Buddhist demonstrations against the government of the late President Diem for alleged religious persecution played a big part in the crisis in that country.

As I feared and as I predicted, these activities have not ceased after the tragic murder of President Diem. Buddhist-led and inspired demonstrations against the successive governments in Vietnam have aggravated the political situation in that country and have hampered the government's efforts directed against Communist Vietcong subversion and guerrilla warfare.

Just the other day, my attention was called to an article relating to this subject which appeared in the March 13, 1965, issue of the Hong Kong Tiger Standard. I am inserting that article in the RECORD at this point, and I wish to commend it to the attention of the Members of the House.

BUDDHIST CHIEFS BACK VIETCONG

MOSCOW.—A Communist correspondent reported in the newspaper Pravda today that South Vietnamese Buddhist leaders are on the Communist side.

Wilfred Burchett, Australian-born freelance newsman wrote that South Vietnam's Buddhists from the highest to the lowest ranks "understand that American intervention is the only cause of a continuation of the war."

"Their movement has taken on a decisively anti-American coloring and cooperation between the Buddhists and the (Communist) National Liberation Front is being carried on at all levels.

"Two respected Buddhist leaders are members of the Central Committee of the National Liberation Front," Burchett wrote.

The Moscow-based newsman made the statement in the concluding article in a series of reports he made on a recent visit with rebel Vietcong forces in South Vietnam.

Meanwhile, the Buddhist Institute of Saigon (Vien Hoa Dao) today issued a communique officially confirming that the "movement for the safeguard of peace and the happiness of the people" sponsored by Senior Monk Thich Quang Lien had no link with the institute.

The communique said the movement stemmed from Thich Quang Lien's personal initiative and that the institute now regarded the matter as "settled."

The communique was signed by Senior Monk Thich Nhat Thien, chief of the institute's press service, after a meeting of institute leaders. The communique actually confirmed statements made earlier this week by institute director, Thich Tam Chau, who is the second highest ranking bonze in the Buddhist hierarchy.

The communique also charged that Thich Quang Lien had failed to honor a promise he had made to dissociate himself from the movement.

Meanwhile, Thich Quang Lien told the press he had no intention of resigning from his post as president of the movement.

Thich Quang Lien added: "Our movement is actively continuing to establish contacts with various political and religious organizations in order to achieve as rapidly as possible the aim laid down by the movement—the return of peace in Vietnam."

The "Association of Unified Buddhism for Vietnam" today announced that its scheduled annual general assembly would open next Sunday, and not tomorrow as initially planned.

The meeting, to be held in Saigon's central pagoda, was expected to last 2 or 3 days and review Buddhist developments for the past year as well as to fix a "program of action" for the current year.

Informed sources said it was probable the association would use the occasion to examine Vietnam's present situation and define its attitude toward the major problems facing the country.

The meeting will be presided over by superior bonze, Thich Tinh Khiet, supreme leader of the Unified Buddhists of Vietnam.—AP and AFP.

Constitutional Convention May Become Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, when the President delivered his message on voting rights to a joint session of Congress one of the things that shocked millions of television viewers was the spectacle of robed Justices of the Supreme Court sitting on the front row enthusiastically applauding the more controversial details of his proposals.

Some of these Justices appropriately refrained from doing so but the sight of the Chief Justice and a few others clapping mightily was the equivalent of watching the referee and other officials joining the cheering section of one partisan crowd immediately prior to making "impartial" decisions on the football field.

Mr. Speaker, this is shocking, but we have become enured to these tragic travesties in recent years and there lies the awful rub.

My friend Lee Kelly, editor of the Thomasville, Ga., Times-Enterprise, discussed the Court and its decisions in a recent column of that fine newspaper. I commend this to my colleagues and all others who might want to read an intelligent discussion of this trend and the necessity for a constitutional amendment because of one recent decision:

[From the Thomasville (Ga.) Times-Enterprise, Mar. 27, 1965]

OBSERVATIONS: CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION MAY BECOME REALITY

(By Lee E. Kelly)

There is a growing conviction among many people in various parts of the Nation, that something must be done to stem the powers now being exercised by the U.S. Supreme Court, which has seemed at times to be more concerned with interpreting laws in line with what the jurists would like to see rather than what Congress intended the law to be.

Outstanding among these laws, was that dealing with civil rights, in which matters of sociology seemed to have more bearing on their decision than the provisions of the Constitution.

Another major item in a long string of decisions, was that dealing with reapportionment of the membership of the general assemblies of some of the States, Georgia among them. It also had to do with reapportionment of the membership of the House of Representatives of the United States.

The decisions in a number of cases seem to run counter to accepted interpretations of the Constitution, particularly as they relate to the right of the people of a State to determine the manner and method for electing their representatives in the lawmaking bodies of their State.

There has been talk at times of strong action by Congress to reassert its lawmaking prerogatives which at times appear to have been usurped by the High Court. Failing to have action by that body there has been talk of having a Constitutional Convention, the purpose being to write an amendment to the Constitution outlawing the Supreme Court decision requiring houses of State legislatures to be reapportioned by population.

So far, 21 States have petitioned Congress to this end, and only 13 more are needed to effectuate the desired action. The 34 States would mean that desired two-thirds of States approved the proposal for a Constitutional Convention, and their action could cause Congress to go along with it.

The petition procedure never before has been employed in our country, and it is pointed out, it may not be exercised in this case, if Congress should go along with a Congress-approved amendment, to accomplish the desired end rather than take a chance of having the matter settled in a Constitutional Convention.

From past history, however, it is foreseeable that without the threat of a successful petition, the Congress would not take any affirmative action to set aside the High Court decision.

The fact that one of the two legislative bodies in seven States other than those that have petitioned Congress, have taken petition measures, reflects the determination of the states to bring the matter to a head. They appear to have both the power and the determination to do it. They are under pressure from the people in their own States, who want the present era of confusion and disorder arising from reapportioning decisions to be ended.

The Supreme Court apparently intends to eventually nullify the Constitution through substitution of its own decrees as the law of the land. The effect of such continued procedures is obvious and in the end we could have an era of rule by men rather than by law, yet the High Court is sworn to uphold the law.

The original concept of a well-balanced republican form of government was that we should have a lawmaking body to pass laws, a supreme court to rule upon their constitutionality in line with the words of the Constitution, and an executive department to administer the laws. Now the Court and the executive department have about canceled out the need of the Congress, by substitution of their own rules and views.

Unique School Heading Off Dropouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, knowing of the interest of Members of the House in the school dropout problem, I would call to their attention the very successful program initiated in the city of Akron to combat this matter.

Aware of my great interest in the field of education and my sincere belief that only through education can opportunity be open to all, Akron secondary school's supervisor Ronald Switzer approached me with what I considered a most practical solution to this most vexing subject.

I would have my colleagues of the House note that this meeting took place some 3 years before Mr. Shriver came to us with his most complex and unintelligible plan. I would like to call Mr. Shriver's attention to Akron's successful operation called the Leggett Work-Study School.

I would emphasize that this is a most practical approach to the dropout problem. In effect they have adopted my phrase "one must learn to earn well."

I have found that Akron educators, administrators, and teachers alike, are dedicated to the principle of absolute equality of educational opportunity.

The team who inaugurated and are bringing the program into reality are Akron school superintendent, Martin Essex, Akron secondary school supervisor, Ronald Switzer; Leggett school principal, Donald Krenrick; and program work coordinator, Frank Buhas. I wish to commend these fine school executives as well as others who have participated with them in this most outstanding work.

I also wish to congratulate those students who have taken part in these activities. A higher standard of living for our citizens is in the offing. I would that everyone might share in the prosperous life. This, they can only accomplish if they secure good training in their early life.

The Akron Beacon Journal of March 23 carried a very fine story about the Leggett Work Study School. It was written by the most able Tony May. Mr. May has written many fine stories about the educational field. Under unanimous consent I include this story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

UNIQUE SCHOOL HEADING OFF DROPOUTS

(By Tony May)

Fragile—handle with care.

This is an invisible label stamped on the future of 100 boys from every part of Akron who are participating in a unique educational experiment, the Leggett Work-Study School.

"It's a matter of timing," explained Akron secondary schools supervisor, Ronald Switzer. "These boys were chosen for this experiment because they are potential dropouts.

"At this crucial age of 16 and 17, we've saved a few—lost a few. But who can really tell how many of them would have dropped out had it not been for the program" he said.

Successes outnumber failures 9 to 1, Switzer said. Of 130 students who enrolled during 1964, only 30 left the school and all but 8 of these returned to regular high school. About 90 of the 100 now enrolled are doing well, he said.

The 3-year experiment has just passed the halfway point, and Leggett Principal Donald Krenrick and the program's work coordinator, Frank Buhas, presented a progress report to the advisory board Monday.

In the program—"a pilot study to prepare youth for employability"—the goal is to give each youth as much academic knowledge as possible while allowing him to work part-time for motivation.

Flexibility is the key to the academic program. It's arranged not to interfere with the boys' employment. Many leave the classroom for work at 11:30 each morning.

Most are employed either in area restaurants or as custodial help in the schools.

"Generally, we're finding we've underrated the boys on the level of classwork they can and will do," Krenrick reported.

He cited the school's science program, originally intended as "home mechanics" but now upgraded to include astronomy and biology.

Reading, too, has improved through the use of unorthodox teaching methods: "We're using a strip-film reader normally used in speed-reading classes."

Arithmetic's story problems (the six apples, four oranges type) have new meaning for these boys, Krenrick added.

The youths are writing their own problems now—using weights, measures, and operations they encounter in their afternoon jobs.

"If a boy works at Sanginiti's Restaurant, the arithmetic problem begins, 'Mr. Sanginiti told me to * * *,'" the principal explained. These student-prepared problems then are used in tests.

"Now we're embarking on a new teaching unit based on budgeting. The boys recently added up how much they've earned and now they're wondering where it went.

"They're going to find out," Krenrick said.

Buhas' job is to help the boys find part-time work.

"I try to steer them toward jobs they like. Otherwise, they'll be unhappy and end up missing work and getting fired."

Akron Schools Superintendent Martin Essex explained: "We want to make a more responsive, accepted youngster. We hope to make each one a responsible member of society."

He noted that without the work-study experience, some of the boys might have dropped out of school—jobless and unemployable in the future.

After 2 years in the program, these youths can either return to the regular high school to seek a diploma or get a full-time job using his part-time work as experience.

"If we aren't 100 percent successful remember these are the 'bad risks' we have chosen. The good risks don't need the help," Essex added.

Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was honored to appear before the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, which is now conducting the hearings on the voting rights proposed legislation and to have inserted my remarks at the Wednesday, March 24, evening session. I do not want to seem vain, but by putting my own testimony into the RECORD I wanted the Members of the Congress and the people of the country to know how I stand on this issue because it is of paramount importance to myself as well as the whole country. We are facing today the greatest experiment in democracy in the history of the world.

The remarks follow:

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

(Statement of the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER, Representative of Florida, before the House Judiciary Committee, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman)

The CHAIRMAN. Representative PEPPER, of Florida, our distinguished Member from the great State in the South. We are very glad to have you here, Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee. I appreciate the privilege of appearing before this committee upon this momentous issue. Like most of you here on this committee, I am not a stranger to this struggle to try to remove bars and barriers from the fair exercise of the voting privilege for the people of the country.

I think it was in the late 1930's I introduced the first bill to outlaw the poll tax in Federal elections on the theory that it was at the present time as a requirement that the proposed voter pay a sum of money, a condition and not a qualification.

I introduced a similar bill later on in the 1940's, after President Truman recommended his civil rights proposal and I believe we got it out of the Judiciary Committee of which Senator Norris was the chairman twice, but it died as a victim of the well-known filibuster in the Senate.

I have also had bitter experience ever since I entered public life in being politically victimized for trying to stand up for what was decent for the Negro citizens of our country.

I remember in the Florida House of Representatives in 1929 a member who had moved to Florida from Georgia introduced a bill to condemn Mrs. Hoover, President Hoover then being President, for including in an invitation to a White House tea the wife of the Negro Congressman from Chicago, Ill., Mr. DePriest, and I was bitterly attacked for that vote. I was one of the 13 in the house who voted against that resolution, and as I said, I was severely attacked for it when I ran for reelection to the House and then again when I ran for the Senate for the first time in 1934.

I recall one occasion I was in California speaking for the Democratic ticket and I made a talk one afternoon in a Negro Baptist Church—that happens to be my faith—something that I had often done in both Alabama and Florida.

Pictures were taken as I was walking down the aisles and speaking in the pulpit and walking out of the church. About 2 weeks after that, I found that a very violent anti-Roosevelt publisher in the State published 200,000 copies of a paper and disseminated it all over the State with my picture in that Negro church.

Somehow these critics excluded the Lord from that Negro pulpit. In every election in which I have been engaged since I ran for the House of Representatives in the Florida Legislature in 1929, I have had to face the so-called race issue as many of you have, in trying to stand up for what I thought was good and right for America as well as for the people, particularly of the South.

The CHAIRMAN. That only proves what Andrew Jackson once said, "One man with courage is oftentimes a majority."

Mr. PEPPER. You are very kind, Mr. Chairman.

So I, like so many of our citizens in America, view this as a historic bill and this as a momentous occasion in which we are all privileged to have a part.

When Thomas Jefferson wrote the words in the Declaration of Independence that all men were created equal by God, he was well aware, of course, that there were many Negro slaves in the United States. I have always summized that he did not intend to be describing the condition of his country, but was laying down the ideal for the new Nation that was coming to birth.

Nearly a hundred years elapsed before the bonds of physical slavery were stricken from the Negroes of many parts of the country. Up until that time, Negroes were bred and worked and sold like cattle. Finally, the bonds were broken in a terrible struggle.

Incidentally, if I may say so, I was not only born in Alabama myself but I am proud to be the grandson of two Confederate soldiers, one of whom was captured at Vicksburg by a general named Grant who seemed to have acquired considerable fame thereafter.

So I come of a heritage that stretches back beyond the Revolutionary War without an ancestor born or living outside the South. I mean I come of a Southern family. I am not a newcomer to the South. I think I have roots deep enough to be able to speak as a Southerner and I am proud to speak as a Southerner in support of this bill.

Mr. DONOHUE. But you graduated from Harvard.

Mr. PEPPER. Pardon.

Mr. DONOHUE. But you graduated from Harvard.

Mr. PEPPER. I think that made me a better southerner, I learned a little more. I notice that we southerners who came out of the South and went to better schools did better thereafter. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts for having that great institution in his State. This is why I want to see the South offer the very best educational opportunities to all of its boys and girls.

Mr. Chairman, in the early days of this country a white man had to be what we would almost call a millionaire today in some States to be eligible for the office of Governor, and, of course, the poll tax prevailed up for a little while ago and still prevails in some of the States in respect to State voting.

Women did not have the right to vote until 1920, a long time after Thomas Jefferson wrote those stirring ideas of equality into the Declaration of Independence.

During the years after the Civil War, the War Between the States, if they want to call it that, the Congress did make commendable efforts toward trying to implement the 15th amendment.

The courts, not as understanding or as sympathetic as they have been in late years, basically struck down those amendments and political compromise or something else led the Congress to the repeal of many of the acts that were designed by Congress to implement the provisions of the 15th amendment.

However, as I said on the floor the other day, I thank God for the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the last decade or two.

The Federal courts under the admonition and direction of the U.S. Supreme Court, have whittled away one and another of the impediments which have barred so many people from the exercise of all or many of their civil rights, not only the voting right.

The CHAIRMAN. I heard that speech of yours and it was admirable.

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I was certainly very much inspired by yours; you touched me off to want to say something and I just wanted to try to speak in the same spirit in which you spoke so movingly.

In late years, the Congress has made further efforts to progress this cause. In 1957—and great credit goes to our eminent and distinguished President for the leadership of that fight—and again in 1960 he played a large part; and finally last year, we passed the Civil Rights Act which contained a weakened, if not an emasculated provision relative to the enforcement of voting rights for Negroes, particularly.

There have always been these ingenious devices which have been contrived by clever and capable hands; as soon as the courts would strike down one they would come up with another and if necessary, the Governor would call a special session of the legislature to put some more on the statute books. That meant more long and tedious litigation, because if you are going to have any trial at all and any judicial hearing at all, you have to conform to the basic requirements of due process, an opportunity to be heard and so on.

So there have always been these various obstructions that have been put in the path of the efforts we have designed. Thus, while some progress is detectable, not a great deal has been made and surely not enough has been accomplished.

Then in late weeks, the Nation has been shocked and shamed at what has happened in my native State of Alabama. I cannot in good conscience other than condemn it in the most severe sentiments that I am able to express, nor can I refrain from saying that I think a part of it was calculated and politically conceived by a Governor who thought to fasten his political power upon a State by the attitude and the position that he took. That is just my opinion, others have a right to theirs.

Anyway, we have seen the spectacle of people being denied the right effectively to register. We had two of our distinguished colleagues before the Rules Committee who came up in behalf of a resolution that there be a committee of the Congress to investigate what had happened in Selma, Ala. I asked one of our distinguished colleagues how many days of the week the registration offices remained open and he said, "Two." Well, I said, "How many do they register a day?" Well, he said they have got up to 70. Well, twice 70 is 140, and I said, "How many would you say there are in the county who are eligible?" I understood him to say some 16,000.

Well, it is not very difficult to make a quick calculation as to how long it would take that many people or even a few of that number, thousands of people, to register at that rate.

So the whole registration machinery was designed apparently to limit the number of people who could register.

The facts speak for themselves as to the number of people who have voted, and therefore the implication is deducible that they were prevented from voting by either the denial of the right of registration or intimidation against their exercising the right to vote.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are the greatest experiment in democracy in the history of the world. I realize how many of my fellow Alabamians and many southerners feel about changing a pattern to which they are accustomed, but we are living in an age when our democracy is on trial before the world and people are questioning the integrity of our democracy, whether we mean what we say when we tell them that we want to help them to have a democracy, a democratic form of government.

Here with spectacles such as we had in Birmingham—and I only mention them now (it has not been so long since there were other States that exhibited a shameful practice before the country and before the world now quieted to a large or total degree); but the spectacle of dogs being set upon human beings who did nothing more than walk peacefully down the street; or denying men and women the right to walk two abreast along a four-lane highway without telling them, "You will have to walk on the side of the road if you walk or we are going to go along to see that you don't obstruct traffic"; giving them 2 minutes to disperse and then on the expiration of 1 minute charging them with horses, beating them over the heads with bludgeons, trampling women and children in the name of the law and by the authority of the highest law officer of the State, the chief magistrate of the State, and then brutalizing those people with tear gas as they did—for what?

They dared to try to get out of what some white men call "their place." Some of them say, "A Negro is all right if he will stay in his place." They presume how to describe him and to determine his place.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it just happens that the Constitution of the United States fixes the place of all of us in America and God fixes the place of all men white or Negro, or those of any color, born or naturalized in the United States, are citizens of America under one flag, dying if need be, for one cause, supposedly protected by one Constitution, dedicated to the principles of our democracy, all brethren under the fatherhood of God.

So the time has come at long last when we have got to come to grips with this problem, painful in some respects as it is to those who are immediately affected. There are some white citizens who say "yes, you have an ignorant Negro majority you are going to put me under in my country."

Well, how did those Negroes come to be ignorant? To a large degree because the white man did not provide the schools and the opportunity for them to get an education. Indeed, there have been those who did not want the Negro to get an education for he would want more money as compensation for his labor; he would want more rights; he would be more impatient of restraint or restriction.

When I was in the Senate and before I lived in one of our noble and beautiful places in Florida, Tallahassee, our State capital. To show you how sentiment of our people in the South is changing (and many of you know that Tallahassee is a fine, old southern town and the southern ways are still their way of life)—let me give an example. Three or four years ago they had a terrible controversy in Tallahassee over whether Negroes could ride other than in the back end of a city bus.

One day a Negro woman went in and there was not a vacant place and she sat down in the middle of the bus. The busdriver told her to get back to the rear and she refused to do it and he had her arrested. The Negroes boycotted the busline and it nearly went broke; and there were a lot of demonstrations and acts of violence. The city was in turmoil for a long time over whether or not Negroes who paid the same fare that anybody else paid could ride in any part of the bus where there was a vacant seat.

Fortunately, that matter was settled and now when you go to Tallahassee anybody rides anywhere in the bus that he can find a seat and if he can't, he stands anywhere he wants to stand. That is illustrative of what is going on in the South.

I am proud of the way the South has accepted the civil rights law. I voted for it and I am proud that eight of us who voted for it lived in the South, and one of them is the distinguished gentleman on this committee, Mr. BROOKS; four from Texas and two from Tennessee and our distinguished colleague, Mr. WELTNER, from Atlanta. I am proud to say that every single one of us was reelected.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we will have much trouble getting your vote to send a strong bill from the Rules Committee to the House.

Mr. PEPPER. I think I am going to look very sympathetically upon this legislation and I think that every man should conscien-

tiously follow his conscience and his good judgment and both are going to be on the side of the support of this bill as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Chairman, you have done a great service to your country in presenting this bill. I won't go into the details of the bill. It has been carefully prepared. There are points that probably will be raised and will be clarified in the course of the debate in your able explanation of the bill which I am sure you will give.

We are bent upon great business and I want to congratulate this fine committee for what it has done to produce this splendid bill.

I am privileged and proud to be here to assure you of my support for it in every way that I can help.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for his splendid remarks which I share with him wholeheartedly. It is my privilege to have developed a very keen and friendly relation with him since he returned to the Congress.

Thank you very much. I share with you in all your views.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank you very much. I appreciate those kind words from my able and good friend from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brooks?

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his kind remarks. My great-grandfather also fought on the Southern side on both sides of my family. They survived that and I survived the 1964 bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure our able friend from Texas will survive all the tests of the long future. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other questions?

Mr. CORMAN. No questions. Mr. Conyers. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lindsay?

Mr. LINDSAY. Our colleague, Congressman PEPPER, has handled himself extremely well, made a very good statement. It does appear a Harvard education has not hurt you at all.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank my distinguished friend from New York.

The Untold Part of the Selma Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been fed millions of words in the newspapers and over the radio and TV depicting the good people of Alabama as monsters, as degenerates, as every vile thing that could be named. At the same time the Martin Luther King demonstrators have been pictured as sweet, loving, dedicated martyrs to a noble cause.

There were many in the demonstrations who were motivated by good intentions, but there were others whose actions have filled the people who witnessed the march with disgust. These incidents have not been reported by the press and for good reason, they would disgust all good people everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should tear away the curtain which has been so carefully placed around Martin Luther King and his followers. Let us find out what kind of people are being called "saintly" and who we are being told we must allow to continue their demonstrations at whatever cost to our national morality or freedoms.

The following article from the Sunday, March 28, edition of the Birmingham News speaks for itself. Is it any wonder in such an atmosphere that there was bloodshed?

The Birmingham News article follows:

LOVEMAKING IN OPEN DEFINITELY OCCURRED IN SELMA PRAYER VIGIL

Alabama has been rife with rumors of widespread immorality among civil rights demonstrators during and before the march on the State capitol at Montgomery.

Charges have included illicit relations in the streets of Selma and at the march campsites; urinating in the streets of Montgomery; as many as 40 attacks by Negroes on a white female demonstrator, resulting in her death; and a general immoral climate in the civil rights movement.

Some of the rumors proved completely without basis, including the death of the woman marcher.

Others have been proven true according to reliable sources and eyewitness accounts. These are the charges of illicit relationships among couples in the streets at Selma and urinating by demonstrators outside the capitol in Montgomery.

As for the immoral acts in Selma, city Public Safety Director Wilson Baker told the Birmingham News upon questioning, "There very definitely was some of it." Baker said it occurred during a so-called all-night prayer vigil on Wednesday, March 10.

An Associated Press writer, Kelso Sturgeon of Atlanta, was also at the scene that night and he told the News there was "no doubt about it."

Sturgeon said, "I saw at least three couples involved in intercourse. There was considerable hanky-panky."

Baker said it "was very definitely open in kissing and loving and drinking."

The charge that similar activity took place at the various campsites during the march to Montgomery could not be substantiated.

The tents were segregated, the men in one and the women in another. Troops formed a semicircle around the campsite and marshals on the march staff patroled the area during the night.

On the all-night vigil in Selma, newsmen, including two reporters for the News, witnessed demonstrators as they urinated in the middle of Montgomery's Dexter Avenue less than 50 yards from the capitol steps.

The demonstration had begun early in the day, but by nightfall had dwindled to about 200, largely members of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, led by SNCC's James Foreman.

As the demonstrators departed, Montgomery police tightened their ring around those left and would not let any back in.

A ring of people—men and women, Negro and white—stood and locked arms while others in the group of demonstrators urinated.

One Negro boy was hustled off to jail by police on a charge of indecent exposure.

A reporter for the News also said there was evidence of petting and lovemaking between white and Negro demonstrators.

Some ministers were present and witnessed it, he said.

Hundreds of ministers from over the nation participated in the civil rights movement. There were also nuns and church laymen. College students also joined the ranks of the demonstrators. There was a large number of beatniks.

The All-Purpose Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News has presented a thoughtful and telling analysis of the medical care plan approved by the Committee on Ways and Means, with particular emphasis on the cost to employees and their employers and the impact on the freedom of the individual to handle his own arrangements with his own money. These are vital factors which concern every working man and woman in the United States. There is no denying that effective means must be found to provide medical care for those in need but I doubt very much that the average American taxpayer would tolerate the use of his tax money to provide medical care for those financially able to pay their own medical bills.

Alternative programs have been proposed which, in my opinion, are preferable and would adequately meet the need. It is regrettable that the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means has felt it necessary to institute a program which, as the following editorial points out, is just another step toward total Government management of individual income:

THE ALL-PURPOSE CURE

The camel is such an ugly beast (so the saying goes) that it looks as if it had been put together by a committee. The comment is apt in considering the medicare bill that emerged from the House Ways and Means Committee. The ungainly product of the committee process is full of humps and has doubtful workability.

The committee took the administration's proposal for compulsory health insurance for the elderly under social security, and grafted on a voluntary insurance program to cover medical and surgical fees. Then it tied the deal to a general increase in social security benefits and a hefty boost in taxes.

All of the objectionable features of the original medicare proposal are retained. The voluntary insurance program, which was offered as a sensible alternative, becomes frosting for the cake, to be paid for out of increased benefits. And the projected cost soars from the original estimate of $2 billion in the first year to something close to $6 billion.

The need for some measure to ease the financial burden of medical care for the elderly is undeniable. But the House committee's attempt to find something for everyone all at once, and hang the expense, raises the question of whether the committee doesn't need a doctor more than the people it is trying to help.

Predictions that medicare would become a nose in the tent (there's that camel again) are more than borne out by the committee's action favoring the bill on a party line vote, 17 to 8. If it can double in size in the first step toward passage, who can say how large the program will become in a few years' time? Or how quickly it will spread to other age groups and interfere with doctor-patient relationships, just as the American Medical Association has been warning?

Consider what will happen to social security taxes if this bill passes. Both the tax

rate and the level of income to which it applies will go up. Now 3.625 percent on $4,800 of annual pay ($174 per year), the tax would rise steadily to 5.6 percent on $6,600 a year, or $343.20 in 1987. These are the amounts deducted from wages and salaries; employers put up equal amounts. This means that even if no further increases are made (a doubtful assumption) $686.40 a year will be paid for nearly every employee into social security alone, before any provision at all is made for Federal income taxes, excise taxes, sales taxes, property taxes, and all the other visible and invisible taxes that bite into the paycheck.

With compulsory health insurance, we take another step along the road toward total Government management of individual income. Less and less is left to the individual to spend as he pleases or save toward the "rainy day" or retirement.

According to the Tax Foundation, the total taxes collected by all levels of Government averaged out to $2,600 per family in 1964, up from $2,493 in 1963. And the trend is steadily upward. A cut in Federal income tax is offset by the increases in social security, State and local taxes. Local government in Illinois, for example, increased in cost by 105 percent from 1954 to 1964.

The need for some form of medicare would be greatly reduced if individuals were left free to make their own arrangements with their own money. But the Government way is to take the savings in advance and tell the individual, "Relax, we'll take care of you."

It will, too. It already does, by taking massive bites out of the paycheck and doling the money back in dribbles, in its own good time and subject to its own conditions.

Whether its medicare or some other program sold on the theory that "it's good for you," the result is the same—a steady erosion of individual initiative and choice.

The Road to Freedom in East-Central Europe

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL J. KREBS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum from the 11th session of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, Document No. 393, dated March 24, 1965:

THE ROAD TO FREEDOM IN EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

I

The prevalent view in the West is that the situation in Europe has undergone a significant change for the better during the last 2 years. Fully absorbed by the rift with Red China, by difficulties with its Eastern European satellites and by domestic problems, the Soviet Union is supposed to have dropped any expansionist aim in Europe. Preoccupation with the war in Vietnam and economic prosperity, as well as an over-optimistic assessment of developments in east-central Europe, further feed the impression that Western Europe is not only secure but can look forward patiently to the gradual recession of Soviet influence.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations cannot share this optimistic evaluation of recent events in Europe. In the view of the assembly, one can at best speak of a change of Soviet tactics in Europe. The policy of intimidation, as symbolized by the Berlin ultimatum (1958–62), foundered on the shores of Cuba. The emphasis is now on political penetration through the old device of popular fronts. The new, nationalist and moderate, image some of the Western European Communist Parties are striving to project is likely to serve this purpose regardless whether or not it was a genuine emancipation from a rigid, Moscow-set course of policy. But this new emphasis on political penetration in no way excludes the danger of a return to the policy of intimidation. The possibility, indeed, that Moscow may revert sooner or later to the attempt of gaining ground by pressures, backed up by conventional military power, cannot be discarded. In this context, the practical deterrent influence the nations of Eastern Europe represent, to the extent they endanger Soviet lines of communication, constitutes a factor of Western European security which cannot and should not be neglected.

There can be no doubt that the Communist world is beset with troubles. The deepening Moscow-Peiping rift, the instability inherent in the collective-type of leadership the Soviet Union has had since the ouster of Khrushchev, the structural crisis of Communist agriculture, the more and more obvious inadequacy of rigid economic planning—are undeniably hampering Soviet expansionism.

But these developments should not obscure the fact that Communist aims have not changed; that Soviet military power remains deployed in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and the Baltic States, that is, in the heart of Europe; that the apparently increased autonomy of the Communist Parties in Western Europe enhances their effectiveness; that the new projection of the satellites as genuinely independent removes an important obstacle to Communist advances through political penetration and internal subversion; that the widely heralded changes in Eastern Europe have not altered the nature of the Communist regimes or their basic, if less evident, dependence on Moscow; that these changes are designed to make the Communist system work and thus render it domestically more acceptable and internationally more respectable.

If one is mindful of the divergencies which have developed recently within the Western Alliance and of the slackening of the sense of danger in Europe under the impact of a rather optomistic view of the crisis the Communist world is undergoing, one can only conclude that difficulties are present on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Opportunities to gain ground, therefore, appear to be open to both the free and the Communist side.

It is the considered view of ACEN that if the free nations hold their ground in the next few years and continue to demonstrate their determination to help the peoples in east-central Europe to recover full freedom and independence, while refraining from actions apt to lend prestige or to help the Communist regimes to solve their serious economic problems, necessity will compel these regimes to adopt more rational ways involving greater freedom of action for economically essential segments of the population, such as the technological and managerial elite and the peasants. Concessions induced by pressure and necessity might unleash an irreversible process of disintegration of the totalitarian pattern. The very nature of the Soviet regime, with its built-in crises of succession and civil war potential, might provide the opportunity for such a process culminating in acts of self-deliverance.

II

To further the process of national and human emancipation in Eastern Europe, it is essential to distinguish carefully between the peoples of east-central Europe, the potential allies of the West, and the Communist rulers who keep them in bondage.

It is imperative to avert any kind of actions apt to be construed as acceptance of the finality of the political status quo in Eastern Europe.

It is most useful to indicate by appropriate diplomatic actions awareness that uniting Europe in its natural borders and making it politically, militarily and economically self-reliant is, in the long run, the only sound and dependable foundation for peace and security in the key area of Europe.

It is necessary to show awareness of the fact that in spite of the differences from one Eastern European country to another, their situation is fundamentally the same. Their relationship to the Soviet Union cannot be defined in terms of an alliance or a mutual security arrangement. The Soviet Government guarantees, indeed, the Communist regimes against their internal enemies rather than national territory against external aggression. The certainty of Soviet intervention acts as a deterrent upon the ruled and an assurance to the rulers. In such conditions the attitude of the majority toward the regimes remains one of mute hostility. This hostility and the pressures it causes, chiefly in the form of noncooperation and other types of passive resistance, is a proven source of positive changes, particularly when it goes hand in hand with steady pressures from without. It creates, moreover, for the Soviet Union a risk factor, which has played in the past and, given the growing nuclear stalemate, may again play in the future an important deterrent role to Soviet aggressiveness.

One can hardly stress enough that the diminution of unnecessary terror in east-central Europe, on the pattern adopted in the Soviet Union, does not mean a basic change in the Communist system. The dictatorial rule by a single party, a minority group, supported by policy and military forces, remains the essential feature of the Communist regimes. The freedoms of speech, press, assembly and association are still denied in east-central Europe. There is no multiparty system, in spite of the nominal existence, in some countries, of sham peasant or democratic parties which have adopted the platform of the Communist Party and have acknowledged its "leading role." The "elections" are still held with single governmental lists. There are no opposition candidates. This one-party system is basically the same in the nine captive countries, in spite of some differences in the degree of police control and of the operation of the economic system. Guarantees against arbitrary arrest and detention and the rule of law are still conspicuous by their absence. Religion and churches continue to be persecuted.

In all the East European countries the peasants constitute the majority of the population. But, with the single exception of Poland, they have been deprived of their freedom and their land by collectivization, which was enforced in most of the area during the last decade, after the death of Stalin. Consequently, the peasants are deeply hostile to the dictatorship of the Communist minority.

III

For all these reasons it is incumbent upon the Assembly of Captive European Nations to stress that, both in the short- and long-term perspective, the Western Powers have a vital stake in the friendship of the peoples of Eastern Europe and a clear interest in fostering among them the belief that there is for them reasonable hope of deliverance.

In this conviction, the Assembly appeals to the governments and peoples of the free world, and particularly to the U.S. Government:

1. To reaffirm at every appropriate occasion the validity of the wartime and postwar legal comitments and pledges with respect to

Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania and to ask compliance therewith;

2. To call before the United Nations and in negotiations with the Soviet Union for an all-European settlement based on the right of self-determination and to seek the withdrawal of Soviet troops from east-central Europe, the restoration of political and human rights and free elections under international supervision;

3. To demand a United Nations inquiry of the state of human rights and fundamental freedoms in east-central Europe, including an investigation of conditions in prisons and forced-labor camps;

4. To exact—as proposed by the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO in its statement of March 1, 1965—in return for whatever credits or other economic advantages the free nations may deem expedient to grant, commensurate concessions in the form of: (a) effective and self-enforcing measures to assure the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms to the peoples of east-central Europe; (b) changes in the economic policies of the Communist regimes designed to foster social welfare and do away with the present, politically motivated but economically deficient course of policy, both in agriculture and industry; and (c) hard and fast commitments to put an end to Soviet economic exploitation by means of discriminatory prices in the foreign trade between the Soviet Union and the individual east-central European countries and thus make certain that Western credits will not indirectly subsidize the economy of the Soviet Union.

Uncle Sam Is the Goat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article entitled "Uncle Sam Is the Goat" by Henry J. Taylor, which appeared in the Tulsa World on February 6, 1965:

UNCLE SAM IS THE GOAT

(By Henry J. Taylor)

IT'S A DREAM WORLD

President Charles de Gaulle can draw gold and threaten our dollar because, on balance, we owe France more than France owes us.

What nonsense. Totally false. France is in hock to us for everything but Napoleon's cocked hat and the family silver. Until a more outrageous situation comes along this one will do.

We're to blame, nevertheless. The Internal Revenue Service slaps you in jail if you fail to pay your debt to our Government. But if you're a foreigner, oo-la-la, forget it.

This is the root of the trouble. The United States has always been a gleeful giver abroad but a very stupid collector.

Generation after generation of European government money men seem to put our debt collectors under an anesthetic. A few whiffs, a few banquets under crystal chandeliers, some parez-vous about zis or zat, and the next thing you know our little lambs—wafted into some strange kind of inferiority complex—are dumping foreign nations' taxpayers' responsibility smack in the lap of the American people.

In this native yen to buy international good will we lose the respect of the Europeans as well as our money.

The price? It is colossal. Yet you never hear about it from Washington.

I have verified all figures in this article with the New York Federal Reserve Bank, and nothing here refers to America's $113 billion foreign aid—all free. I refer only to truly due obligations incurred by nations mostly now rich and loaded with gold.

France, for example, typifies just one of 20 countries owing us World War I debts which remain due and unpaid to this very day. The aggregate among the 20 exceeds $20 billion. But who would know it?

The French sum is $6.3 billion. It was many times higher than this but, guess what, France negotiated it down. Then in 1931 France said she couldn't pay that year's installment. Washington declared a 1-year moratorium.

Well, that was the end of that. Paris simply refused to resume payments. Our taxpayers have made up the difference. The French Government no longer even carries these billions on official statements covering France's external debt.

In addition, while De Gaulle draws gold, France has outstanding three loans arising from World War II. These total a tidy $592 million. The repayment rate? A mere $21.5 million last year, $22 million due this year, and $22.6 in 1966, etc., on the first of these of which $409 million is owed.

Moreover, France also owes us $170 million still unpaid since 1945 on an Export-Import Bank loan, prepayments on which make the next installment not due until 1967.

Yet, sunk under this mountain of debt, De Gaulle is nevertheless free to take a $150 million bite out of our dwindling gold reserve in a single recent day.

In similar fashion Britain still owes us $9.1 billion in World War I debts that remain due and unpaid. Oh, no, France has no monopoly on the anesthesia.

Germany owes us nothing, which is what she gets for attacking the world and losing the war. She now holds more dollars in her reserve than any country in the world. But Germany—like France, Italy, Spain, Holland, and most European countries—feels uneasy about her dollar balances and has steadily increased her gold holdings relative to dollars.

European enthusiasm for President Johnson's proposal to free about $55 billion of the gold required to back our dollar is mighty, mighty understandable. It means the debtor nations, who now somehow call themselves creditors, can continue to get a piece of the U.S. pile.

If Mr. Johnson were so zealous in insisting on Europeans paying their debts as he is on changing the law to free our gold we would not have to ship a single ounce on balance and, in truth, the gold outflow could be reversed overnight..

Isn't there anything—anything, anything—that can bring our officials out from under the ether? When, oh, when, will the American interest really be put forward in Washington?

Segregation, Subsidies, and Megalopolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great interest a publication issued by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, located in Santa Barbara, Calif.

The contents are as provocative as the title, "Segregation, Subsidies, and Megalopolis."

Written by Bernard Weissbourd, president of Metropolitan Structures, Inc., which specializes in the construction of apartments, hotels, and offices in eastern and midwestern cities, the text also appeared in the December 19, 1964, issue of Saturday Review under the title, "Are Cities Obsolete?"

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Weissbourd's comments to my colleagues concerned with problems of urbanism. Indeed, with the President pinpointing the needs and challenge of urban America, I think "Segregation, Subsidies, and Megalopolis" is most timely, and I include it herewith:

SEGREGATION, SUBSIDIES, AND MEGALOPOLIS

(By Bernard Weissbourd)

From 55 to 60 million more people will be living in metropolitan areas in 1980 than were living there in 1960. How will we manage? Already our cities are decaying faster than they can be rebuilt. Parking is a universal problem. The tax base of the city is eroding as industry moves to the suburbs. A significant part of the white population is also moving to the suburbs, while the cores of our cities are filling with Negroes as the migration from the South steadily rises. The cost to the cities of trying to adjust the migrants to a new kind of existence imposes additional burdens upon the city's tax base.

Taxes are also rising in the suburbs to pay for the high cost of municipal services spread out over areas of low population density. Open space is being consumed at a terrifying rate, so that suburbs once in open country are now surrounded. Traveltime to the city has multiplied as the expressways get clogged during rush hours.

Some experts do not find these problems of city decay and suburban sprawl unduly alarming. They maintain that the continuing dispersal that present trends indicate for the future is inevitable, and not necessarily undesirable. I believe the opposite.

Suburban sprawl and urban decay have not come about solely because people have made a free choice in a free enterprise market. That choice has been influenced by Federal housing subsidies, which, purporting to be neutral, have in fact subsidized low-density middle-income living in the suburbs and have thereby financed the flight of white population from the city. Another factor affecting this dispersal has been our segregation practices within the city.

The lack of public discussion about the influence of housing segregation and Federal housing subsidies upon urban growth patterns has been a barrier to understanding the problems of the city and suburbs and has created a feeling of hopelessness about the future of America's cities. It is my purpose here to show that it is possible to deal constructively with the problems of the metropolitan region if these important factors are not ignored.

THE LOW-DENSITY URBAN REGION

Compared to the time span of Western civilization the modern urban complex, sometimes called megalopolis, is a new, young phenomenon. Some people are confident that a new technology of communication and transportation will solve many of the most intractable problems of the metropolitan region and that, in time, the region of the future will emerge.[1] "The spatial patterns of

Footnotes at end of speech.

American settlements," it is now believed, will "be considerably more dispersed, varied, and space consuming than they ever were in the past." [2] One author envisions "continuous low-density urban belts stretching from Maine to Virginia, from Toronto and Pittsburgh to Milwaukee, and from Amsterdam to Frankfort and Mannheim. However, there seems to be no reason why, properly organized and interlaced with greenbelts, freeways, natural reservations and sites of historic interest, and accented vertically by occasional high-rise elements, these low-density urban regions of tomorrow should not be more livable and effective in satisfying the totality of human values than the transitional urban forms of today." [3]

Acceptance of low-density regional development as the pattern for the future is encouraged by the lack of genuine popular support for a massive attack on the problems of the city and the region. To most suburban residents their experience "seems not one of personal retrogression but of continuous improvement. By moving out of the slag heaps of the worked-out city they have improved their surroundings sufficient for a generation." [4]

While no businessman whose offices must be located in the central business district, and no dweller in the city slums, can accept the decline of the city with equanimity, it is quite likely that if we do nothing to alter present trends the low-density urban region will be the pattern of the future. The New York metropolitan region, for example, has grown outward along major transportation arteries. The axis of growth extended 5 miles in 1900, 25 miles in 1960, and may become 50 miles by 1985. Under existing zoning patterns of low-density development twice the amount of land will be developed in the next 25 years as in the entire history of the New York region.[5] A similar pattern emerges for every metropolitan region in the United States as a projected 45 to 50 million more people are added to suburbia by 1980.

Acceptance of low-density regional growth also implies a curtailment of mass transportation, for mass transportation works well only in highly concentrated areas where trip origins and destinations are clustered and not where they are widely dispersed. Conversely, the automobile, which functions so efficiently for decentralized traffic, becomes highly inefficient under conditions of intense demand. Suburban sprawl will thus bring about a further decline in mass transportation, as increasing reliance on the automobile brings more congestion to the central districts.

THE DECLINE OF THE CITY

Each new expressway not only undercuts the market for mass transportation but accelerates the movement of industry away from the central cities. The truck and the car have given the manufacturer new opportunities to select sites in outlying areas. The movement of industry from central city locations to outlying suburban locations has created a new phenomenon—out-commuting. "The movement each morning of people from homes in the center portions of the urban areas to jobs on the periphery is growing fast. The spectacle of groups of blue-collar workers traveling outward by car pool against the flow of incoming traffic is now a common sight on the roads of many large cities. In fact the spotty and fragmentary information on this phenomenon suggests that it may be one of the fastest growing streams of traffic among the complex currents of our urban areas." [6]

Nor have the results of the Federal programs for slum clearance, urban renewal, and public housing so far given any reason to expect that the trend toward city decline and low-density regional settlement will be reversed. Slums in the cities are growing faster than we can clear them. Even in New York City, which has had the largest slum clearance and rebuilding program of any city in the United States, the rate of deterioration of housing units has been as great as the rate at which new housing has been constructed. We should not expect urban renewal to work so long as there is no place for persons evacuated from the slums to live. People displaced by urban renewal and by the new expressways have created new slums.

The new luxury apartment buildings constructed since the end of World War II have not prevented the exodus of middle-income white families to the suburbs. It was thought that upper income families would move into these expensive apartments and people in the next income level would move into the apartments thus vacated. Instead, the vacated apartments were converted for occupancy by lower income people. Middle-income families who could not afford private schools for their children moved to the suburbs, leaving behind in the cities people without children, upper income families, and low-income families who had no choice. The problem was compounded by the impact of segregation practices. Apartment buildings vacated by those who moved into new luxury accommodations were converted into slums overnight. The "trickle-down" approach failed as the trickle became a torrent.

Moreover, no one is satisfied with public housing. By rejecting all those whose incomes exceeded the prescribed limits public housing has developed a concentration of those members of society who are not able to support themselves. Coupled with the fact that most cities have followed a deliberate program of segregation in public housing, the result has been to create in many places an environment lacking in all of the positive attributes of urban life. The second generation of many public housing occupants is now coming to maturity and it is already clear that many of them will never become viable members of society.

Urban renewal programs aimed at aiding the central business district show greater promise of long-range success, probably because there is considerable strength in the central business district to begin with. New office buildings in the central areas of each of the metropolitan regions demonstrate that financial and commercial institutions, public utilities, newspapers and magazines, and government, together with the lawyers, accountants, stockbrokers, and others involved in serving these institutions, require a centralized location.[7] Most cities in the United States have only one business district. The fact that Los Angeles now has several scattered clusters of office buildings, does not indicate a decentralization of office activities. The diffusion may make doing business in Los Angeles a little more difficult than in Chicago or Baltimore, for example, but the clusters of office buildings in the California city are still reasonably close together in relation to the region as a whole. It is certainly not possible for the office activities of Manhattan Island to be spread out over suburbia. Even most of the retail stores in the central business districts, which declined for a while because of the competition of suburban shopping centers, have begun to revive.

Thus, although a sizable number of people and industries has moved out of the central city, there has been far less movement of office activities to outlying areas than some reports would lead us to believe.

THE EXPLODING POPULATION

The movement of white population to suburban areas and the concentration of Negro population in the central city will be intensified during the next 15 years if present trends continue.

In 1960 about 63 percent of the total population of the United States or about 112 million persons lived in what are known statistically as standard metropolitan areas." [8] Between 1970 and 1980 as much as 73 percent of the total population will reside within the urban complex. If the postwar birth rate continues, the total population will have increased between 1950 and 1980 from 150 to 260 million, an increase of 110 million people in 30 years (a single human generation).[9] More than two-thirds of these 110 million people will have settled in megalopolis, if events do not alter present trends.

Population projections beyond the year 2000 begin to reach astronomical numbers. It is not necessary, however, to look that far ahead. The children are already born who will be forming households in 1980, only 16 years from now. It is becoming clear that the new dwellings, transportation, offices, and factories that these people will require will either contribute further to city decay and suburban sprawl or provide the opportunity for creating a new regional environment.

Since the end of World War II the Negro population has been increasing even faster than the white population. Philip Hauser points out that the decline of the nonwhite death rate together with the increase in their birth rate has resulted in a rate of growth for nonwhites 60 percent higher than for whites.[10] This great national rise is dwarfed by an even more explosive increase of nonwhites in metropolitan areas.[11] By 1990 about 2,500,000 Negroes are expected to be living in the Chicago metropolitan area, about 1,500,00 more than in 1960. "At that time there would still be a slight majority of whites in the city of Chicago and one-fourth of the entire consolidated area population would be nonwhite." [12] These projections assume accelerated suburbanization of nonwhites in the future. However, "if the exact trends of the 1950 to 1960 decade were to be extrapolated into the future they would show a majority of nonwhites in the city of Chicago by 1975 and a substantially higher proportion of nonwhites for the total consolidated areas." [13]

The migration to the cities of rural Negroes and southern whites and Puerto Ricans has already imposed heavy tax burdens on the city. In 1959, for example, New York City spent $50 million for remedial programs for its Puerto Rican newcomers, more than it spent on all its parks, libraries, zoos, and museums in that year.[14] In its 1959–60 budget New York City assigned 23 percent to public hospitalization, health, and welfare and 20 percent to education.[15] The great growth rate of the Negro population in New York, through continued migration as well as natural increase during the next 15 years, will tend to increase even further the city's costs for welfare, health, and education.

The picture that emerges from these forecasts is far from salutary. Low-density regional settlements in which industry and the white population spread out over the countryside without adequate mass transportation contrasts with the concentrated Negro occupancy of the center city, whose tax base has diminished by the flight of industry and whose expenses have increased for the care of its immigrants. Moreover, a growing number of the center-city population will be commuting to jobs in the suburbs while many of the suburban whites will continue to travel to jobs in a still strong central business district.

The waste of human resources and money in this increased commuting, the inability of the automobile and the expressways to handle the traffic, the changing character of the city largely occupied by a financial and business community and a segregated Negro population, the financing of public services for a migrant population in the face of disappearing industry and lost taxes, the interdependence of the financial and commercial life of the suburbs and the city—these are

Footnotes at end of speech.

all reasons for not allowing present trends to continue.

But are there alternatives? As we have noted, there are many who doubt whether the trends are reversible. I believe the pattern can be changed, but first it is necessary to say something about the Federal housing subsidies, because they are both one of the causes of suburban growth and one of the possible tools for creating a different picture for the future.

THE INFLUENCE OF FEDERAL SUBSIDIES

It is important to understand that dispersal of the urban population in the United States has not come about solely as a result of a free and open market. Government inducements to buy in the suburbs have been substantial and have brought about a remarkable increase in homeownership since the war. In 1957, of the total mortgage debt of $107 billion, on one- to four-family nonfarm homes, $47,200 million were FHA-insured or VA-guaranteed.[16] Of the balance, so-called conventional loans, a substantial portion was held by savings and loan associations.[17] The funds involved in the Federal encouragement of homeownership is thus enormous compared to the amounts involved for rental housing in the city. Inducements for homeownership, of course, have been of little or no value to the city, since land has not been available in most of America's major cities for single-family homes.

The success of the Federal housing program in suburbia results from the availability of mortgage funds that have not had to measure up to the usual free-market considerations of risk and competitive yield of other investments. Guarantees and insurance by the United States provide money for suburban homeownership at interest rates lower than the market over longer periods of time.

A subsidy is also involved in the activities of Federal and State savings and loan associations. Because law restricts the investments of these associations largely to home mortgages,[18] the flow of capital has been directed artificially to suburbia, and money has been made available for houses at rates lower than those which would have been available if the homeowner had had to compete for the funds with other sources of investment of comparable risk. To the extent that desposits in savings and loan associations are insured by the Federal Government under the Federal Home Loan Bank System, capital is attracted that must be invested in home mortgages. The Federal insurance, then, constitutes an indirect subsidy.[19]

Another heavily subsidized Federal housing program—public housing—has also contributed to the condition of our cities. Public housing has been the prisoner of its opponents, who have largely determined its character. Locating public housing projects in the inner city has contributed to keeping lower income people in the city and has strengthened the patterns of segregation, except in a few cases where careful planning has been able to achieve successfully integrated projects.[20] One arm of the Federal housing program has financed housing for middle-income families in the suburbs. The question may well be asked: Why should not the opposite program have been adopted?

Other Federal subsidies have also had their influence. The disproportionate amount of the Federal budget allotted to agriculture[21] has helped bring about the mechanization of the farm and speeded up the migration of both Negro and white farm labor to the city. Similarly, the Federal defense highway program has represented an enormous subsidy to the automobile at the expense of mass transportation. Whether these subsidies have been beneficial or detrimental is not pertinent here; what they indicate is that the condition of our metropolitan regions is not the result of natural forces alone. The Federal Government has played a major role in contributing to the shape and character of urban America.

The goals of the Federal housing program originated in the New Deal attempt to house the one-third of the Nation that was ill-housed. Attention was focused on homeownership for the middle class and public-housing for the needy. The impact of these programs on the physical and economic aspects of the city and region was not considered. Moreover, the acute housing shortage of the post-World War II period obscured the need for a national long-term housing program. In more recent years social goals have been subordinated to the desire to stimulate the construction industry in order to minimize unemployment. It is impossible to predict what the shape and character of city and region might have been if the United States had had a national long-range program designed to provide housing for middle-income workers in the city and sites for industry and lower income industrial workers in outlying areas. Surely, if the country had decided in 1948 that it wanted to subsidize higher density apartment development in the suburbs rather than lower density homeownership, and mass transportation rather than expressways, it is unlikely that all of the forecasts would point to suburban sprawl as the pattern of the future.

Catherine Bauer, in noting "the general past trend, however imperfectly realized, toward everyone in his place, in a standardized one-class, one-age-group, and one-color district, devoted wholly to residence," has pointed out that "this was not, however, the result of any conscious overall plan or public decision to encourage maximum social segregation. It came about more or less by accident, as a side result of forces and policies employed for quite different and often distinctly progressive or idealistic ends, and because we were reluctant to assume any conscious collective responsibility whatsoever for the social pattern. What we failed to recognize was that the powerful tools employed for civic development and home production also predetermine social structure to such an extent that there is little room left for free personal choice of flexible adjustment. The big social decisions are all made in advance, inherent in the planning and building process. And if these decisions are not made responsibly and democratically, then they are made irresponsibly by the accidents of technology, the myths of property interest, or the blindness and prejudice of a reactionary minority." [22]

TOWARD RENEWAL AND NEW DEVELOPMENT

To avoid the implications of present trends America will have to assume some responsibility for its overall social patterns and use of the powerful tools employed for civic development and home production to reshape the areas of free personal choice.

The forces at work in the city and region are cumulative. They all move together toward making the city a more desirable or less desirable place to live. The Federal subsidies that have encouraged highway construction instead of mass commuter transportation and thus drawn industry out of the city have reduced the city's tax base. A lower tax base means less money for education and for the adjustment of rural migrants to urban life. Poor schools and changing neighborhoods encourage middle-class white families to move to the suburbs. Higher welfare costs increase the tax rate and thus encourage industry to relocate in outlying areas. All of these factors are interrelated. If they can be altered, it might be possible to reverse the cycle of urban decay and deterioration and move the forces of the marketplace toward renewal and reconstruction.

A total program is needed that recognizes the interdependence of city and suburbs. The creation of new communities on the outskirts of suburbia is a necessary element in the restoration of the inner city. The vitality of the city is, in turn, important for all of the inhabitants of the region. A total program must be able to differentiate between which of the forces must be shaped by government action in a private enterprise system and which may not.

We cannot, for example, prevent those industries which do not require a central location from moving to less expensive land in outlying areas. However, through a regional open-space plan, we can limit the areas in which these industries may choose to locate. We cannot prevent middle-class white families from leaving the cities because their children are not being educated in accordance with middle-class standards. But we can induce middle-class families to live within the city if we can create areas large enough to establish a genuine community with good schools. We can find the land for these communities by clearing industrial as well as residential slum property, provided that we undertake to relieve the city of part of its tax burden or change the methods by which it collects taxes.

New towns are already being created in areas beyond suburbia to accommodate an exploding population, but these new towns may become exclusive suburbs, which in time will be engulfed by suburban sprawl.

I am suggesting a different kind of new town program. We should attempt to create new towns pursuant to regional open space and transportation plans. These towns will also accommodate industrial workers and industries displaced by an intensified residential and industrial slum clearance program in the core areas of our major cities. At the same time, on the land within the cities made available by slum clearance, new communities can be established for middle-income families.

This program would make both the central city and the new towns more heterogeneous in social composition, reduce travel distances to work and thus diminish the transportation problem, and, finally, bring suburban sprawl under control by regional planning of open spaces and mass transportation.

SEGREGATION

Present segregation practices are a serious obstacle to this kind of program; at the same time they provide an additional reason why a program designed to create heterogeneous communities both within the city and beyond the suburbs has become imperative If there were no racial problem in the United States, we might have begun long ago to shape our policies toward moving industry and industrial workers to outlying locations and restoring the city to city workers.

Not only is the Negro population of our cities increasing in numbers but housing for Negroes is becoming increasingly segregated. The question of segregation is always present when the character and location of public housing and urban renewal projects are being determined. An unwillingness to face up to it has paralyzed city planning. It is necessary to deal with the question not only for the sake of civil rights for Negroes but in order to free city planning from some unspoken assumptions that underlie almost everything that happens about housing in our cities.

Juvenile delinquency and adult crime, school dropouts and unemployment, the spread of slums and the cost of welfare, are all related to segregation in the cores of our cities. The social and economic costs of these problem areas both to the Negro and to the community as a whole are enormous.

Some sociologists compare the urbanization of the migrant Negro from the rural

Footnotes at end of speech.

South to the Americanization of the earlier waves of immigrants from Europe.[33] It is true that each new immigrant group settled at the centers of our cities, often in slums, becoming part of the labor pool. Each worked its way up toward social and economic success despite the discrimination practiced by older and more established members of the community. It is true that the same cycle is also going on in the Negro community. But the process is slow, the numbers involved are large, and the rising discontent of the Negro people will not permit patterns of segregation to continue without increasingly severe upheaval.

Migrants from the rural South, whether they are Negro or white, come from a culture very different from that of urban America. The problems of educating their children so that they will be equipped to work in the modern world of science and automation are enormously compounded by cultural segregation. And because the ghetto has become so large, the problem has changed in character. Some of the students in Chicago high schools located in the midst of Negro neighborhoods have never been downtown. Some have never seen a suburb. Their contact with the urban culture of the metropolis is limited to school and to television. Their culture is that of the rural Negro living in the city, a culture that cannot interact with the urban culture unless the two can come in contact. Under these circumstances education for Negro children is of primary importance. Yet the segregated school pattern will be very difficult to change wherever there is a substantial segregated Negro population within the boundaries of the city.[34] In Chicago, just as one example, more than 50 percent of the children in the public grade schools are nonwhite.

The Negro ghettos will not dissolve of themselves. The middle-class Negro family has had great difficulty in finding suitable housing outside of the segregated lower income neighborhoods; only very recently has housing for these and higher income Negroes begun to open up. A policy of nondiscrimination in rentals or sales can help, but the ghettos are still so large that only a major plan to induce a substantial part of the Negro working population to live in outlying new towns can bring about a more uniform and just distribution of these people among the population as a whole.

We should not underestimate the difficulties of creating interracial communities. Experience shows, however, that it is possible to create interracial housing in stable communities where the housing is sufficiently subsidized. New York's State-subsidized housing program has produced a number of interracial projects. Prairie Shores in Chicago, a successfully integrated housing project, demonstrates that racial antagonism recedes if the accommodations are a bargain. It is easier to establish integrated housing in new developments than in areas that are already either all white or all Negroe, but it is not necessary for every neighborhood in a new town to be interracial. If there is no policy of segregation, neighborhoods can develop by choice, as has happened in ethnic communities created by second-generation European immigrants.

The existence of heterogeneous communities in outlying areas will make it more possible for the Negro to relate to the urban culture. Schools in a smaller community, for example, can be so located that even if there are neighborhoods within the community that are predominantly white or predominantly Negro all of the children can attend the same schools. So many industrial workers are Negro that any program for creating outlying new towns for industry and industrial workers must aim for heterogeneity. As for the cities, where Negroes are already established, a program to bring back middle-income white families must encompass the creation of interracial middle-income neighborhoods. If America is not prepared to accept interracial communities, there is little hope of arresting the decline of the city.

THE VALUE OF CITY LAND

There has been a tendency to assume that the flight to the suburbs means that people prefer a suburban home to a city home. But the ability to make a choice has not been possible since the 1920's when most of the land within the borders of every American city was built upon; the choice ever since has been between apartment living in the city and a house in the suburbs.

Land values are perhaps the best measure of what people prefer. The fact that residential land values in the city are everywhere substantially higher than in the suburbs shows how desirable central location is to most people. The amount of new construction of high-rise apartment buildings in the city indicates that some people with means are willing to pay more for apartments built at higher cost on more expensive land in the city than for houses built at lower cost on less expensive land in outlying areas, even if their choice means sending their children to private schools. Moreover, the current boom in suburban garden apartment developments suggests that when close-in suburban land for homes is scarce many people choose close-in suburban apartments rather than outlying homesites despite the subsidies available for the latter.

Central location still retains great economic value, and this is the best evidence that the city can be restored. Land value, in the end, is the measure of economic potential. Favorable economic forces do exist in the city, and therefor the restoration of middle-income communities in the city becomes a possibility. The task of restoring the city also becomes easier because large areas of relatively inexpensive industrial land are available in virtually every American city.[35] Most of these areas are centrally located, having been the sites of the early industries around which the city clustered. They are now often used for very low economic purposes such as coal and lumber storage and no longer functional railroad yards. Many of the buildings in these industrial slums are dilapidated; some are abandoned. Several equare miles of this type of land exist in Chicago along the south branch of the Chicago River and in the railroad yards south of the Loop. In Baltimore, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad owns more than 150 acres of such land south of the Camden Station within a stone's throw of downtown. If new outlying communities are created, thereby increasing the total housing supply for people now living in city slums, the values of both residential and industrial slum property will decline and thus reduce the cost of acquiring this ill-used land for urban renewal.

FEDERAL SUBSIDIES REDIRECTED

Only a slight extension of the tools already in hand is needed to foster the development of middle-income communities within the city and of new towns on the outskirts of suburbia. The Housing Community Development Act of 1964 (which was not enacted into law) proposed for the first time that the Federal Housing Administration insure mortgages for the purchase of land leading to the development of new communities. The administration thus proposed to finance new town developments, although the result may well have been that under such a program the new towns would have become exclusive suburbs like many new towns now being built with private financing.

Assume, however, that FHA and VA financing were abandoned except in urban renewal areas in the city and in new town developments. In addition, assume that a regional open space and transportation plan were required before this financing is made available. Assume, further, that the regulations governing savings and loan associations were amended to allow them to allocate a substantial portion of their funds to financing mortgages for multiple dwellings, and to limit financing of either homes or multiple dwellings to established suburban areas, to the cities, or to new towns, in regions where an open space and transportation plan exists. Moreover, suppose that the VA and FHA regulations prohibiting discrimination because of race were also applied to savings and loan associations. Suppose, in addition, that the FHA programs for middle-income housing (sec. 221d3) were made available in the new towns, so that the goal of an economically heterogeneous community would be vigorously pursued. Suppose, finally, that each new town were required to provide some minimum of public housing and housing for the elderly in order to be eligible for Federal financing.

These Federal tools, almost all of them readily adaptable, would be powerful inducements for the creation of heterogeneous new towns in which individuals and industry displaced from the city, together with some of the 80 million new people to be housed between now and 1980, could be accommodated. Moreover, Federal incentives could be geared to the creation of new towns of higher density so that effective mass transportation between them and the center city could be developed.

Assume that the Federal urban renewal programs for clearing residential slums and renewing central business districts were extended to permit the clearance of industrial slums. And assume that the Federal Government were prepared to finance the construction of industrial facilities in new town industrial parks. Can there be any doubt that such a program would have enormous impact in hastening the creation of new town developments and in clearing land within the city for the construction of middle-income communities?

The large subsidies involved in public housing might also be used to encourage these developments. From the beginning public housing in the United States has always been intimately associated with welfare, but more than 30 years have now passed without any examination of this underlying premise. The question today might well be: Why should public housing subsidies be associated with welfare of all?

The defects of the public housing program result largely from the segregation practices of most cities and from the income limitations on the occupants. The results in most large cities has been to concentrate the low-income Negroes in these central city projects. As soon as a family exceeds the income limits, it is evicted. But if the income is still inadequate for a middle-class dwelling, the family often has to move into a slum dwelling. As long as our cities are not free from slums, the question may properly be asked whether the slums should be occupied by employed lower-income families or by people on public welfare.

This is not the place for a full exposition of the problems associated with public housing. The questions are raised, however, to show that if we were to make welfare payments for rent to persons needing shelter, and use the public housing program to build housing for industrial workers in new town developments, the resulting housing would be more in keeping with the needs of the city and the region.

Footnotes at end of speech.

LONDON'S NEW TOWNS

An approach similar to the one proposed here has been undertaken in England. The enormous urban population growth that is new occurring in the United States was anticipated in England some 30 years ago. London was the capital of an empire and its population crossed the million mark about 1800. The trend to the suburbs was already well underway in the 1920's; in the two decades before World War II the smaller ring around London gained 1,700,000 residents and the regional ring gained 5,900,000, while the county of London lost population.[26]

London's answer was the creation of new towns. They were built beyond the greenbelt that had been established outside the suburban ring. Occupants of the East End and industry resettled there. The program has been the subject of controversy, but it is now generally conceded that, on the whole, it has been successful; current criticism centers about errors in planning, lack of culture in the new towns, and other faults not directly pertinent here.[27] Although conditions in the United States are very different from those in England, and London's program cannot be imitated here, the establishment of new towns to accommodate economic expansion, population growth, and what the English call overspill from the areas being cleared inside the city is a sound idea.

REGIONAL PLANNING

It should be clear by now that I am proposing regional planning only in a most restricted sense. It is not necessary for public agencies to provide comprehensive master plans for each region, leaving no room for diversity created by private choices. Some planning, however, is necessary, particularly by the agencies responsible for water, sewer, and transportation because they must be able to project the future needs for public services of an ever-expanding population. In many places these agencies plan independently of each other, and the Federal agencies that subsidize housing do no planning at all. What each region now needs is a plan covering all of the agencies already involved in the expenditure of public funds, which states where and when the public will spend its money for water systems, sanitary and storm sewers, highways and rapid mass transportation, and in what areas subsidies will be available for housing. Regional growth can thus be controlled, with private enterprise left to develop variety within the overall framework of the plan.

The agencies that decide on the location of public buildings, such as Federal office buildings and State college campuses, should also be involved in this planning, because where these buildings are placed greatly influences the direction of regional growth. The General Services Administration of the Federal Government, for example, has been seeking a site for a new U.S. Patent Office, to be built on the outskirts of Baltimore. The Urban Renewal Administration, on the other hand, has spent a great deal of Federal money in renewing the central business district of Baltimore. It apparently had not occurred to anyone that building the Patent Office in downtown Baltimore might substantially help the downtown renewal process and that land might be available there. Fortunately, the situation may yet be rectified since the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad has offered a free site for the Patent Office on the undeveloped industrial land that it owns within a stone's throw of downtown Baltimore and of the commuter station between Baltimore and Washington. The location would have many advantages both for the Patent Office and for Baltimore's renewal process.

REAL ESTATE TAXES

An essential part of this program is the clearance of industrial slums at the cores of most of America's cities. One of the major obstacles to this has been the reluctance of cities to lose industry for fear of further jeopardizing their real estate tax base. But industry is moving to the suburbs anyway, and the real estate tax structure of the city will have to be revised in any event. Real estate taxes in most places have already reached the limits of economic feasibility, representing 18 to 25 percent of the gross rentals of residential properties. Assessments against property are still the major means by which cities collect taxes, and they have fallen behind in their share of the total tax dollar. In 1932 all cities collected $2,600 million in taxes, all States collected $2,300 million, and the Federal Government collected only $2 billion by 1959; the cities had become poor relatives and collected only $11 billion compared to $20 billion by the States and $73 billion by the Federal Government.[28]

A case can be made that the wealth produced by the cities has been drained out by Federal taxes and redistributed first to agriculture, second to suburbia, and third to the cities. At the same time the welfare costs of the cities have increased their tax rates, so that what the Federal Government has contributed in the form of urban renewal has been taken away by the costs of municipal services. The cities must revise the methods by which they raise revenues, and a greater share of the cost of health, welfare, and education must be allocated to the Federal Government. The migration to the cities of rural Negroes, southern whites, and Puerto Ricans is a national problem; the Federal Government should bear the tax burdens this has created.

Before State as well as Federal power becomes available to solve the problems of real estate tax revision and regional planning, the now rural-dominated State legislatures must develop greater sympathy than they have exhibited for the problems of the city and region. The recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court on reapportionment give some hope that city and suburb may soon have more influence upon State legislatures in their dealings with urban problems.

CONCLUSION

Obviously, each city or each region has unique problems that require more specific solutions than a generalized paper like this can provide. Nevertheless, these proposals are not offered just as a panacea. We should bring suburban sprawl under control so that we can get better transportation, water and sewer control, and more open space, but a regional plan will not necessarily produce a beautiful region. There is still much to learn about new town development, about the creation of communities in which the citizens can govern themselves and in which life is pleasant and interesting. Similarly, the restoration of middle-income families to the city does not automatically solve the financial problems of the city, nor will troubles in race relations disappear even if all communities are racially heterogeneous. We should not try to control too much. At best, we can give direction to economic and social forces already at work and seek to provide better communities in which people can create a variety of environments appropriate to their way of life.

It is possible to shape the character of our urban environment. The population explosion provides the opportunity and existing Federal subsidies provide a means. If we deal realistically with segregation and with the sources of city revenues, we can create a more livable community. Public thinking and discussion can clarify what we value about urban life. If we know what kind of urban environment we want, the power and the tools to create it are at our disposal.

---

[1] Webber, "Order in Diversity: Community Without Propinquity," in Cities and Space, the Future Use of Urban Land, 1963, 43.

[2] Id., 23.

[3] Tunnard and Pushkarev, "Man-Made America: Chaos or Control," 1963, 443.

[4] Vernon, "The Myth and Reality of Our Urban Problems," 1961, 30–31.

[5] Tankel, "Importance of Open Space in the Urban Patterns," in Cities and Space, the Future Use of Urban Land, 1963, 53.

[6] Vernon, "The Myth and Reality of Our Urban Problems," 1961, 6.

[7] Id., 42. Also see Edwards, "Central Business Districts," 4 Journal of Housing, 186.

[8] Hauser, "Population Perspectives," 1960, 72.

[9] Id., 35.

[10] Id., 58.

[11] Id., 59.

[12] Bogue and Dandekar, "Population Trends and Prospects for the Chicago-Northeastern Indiana Consolidated Metropolitan Area: 1960–1990," 1952, 28.

[13] Id., 28.

[14] Higby, "The Squeeze," 1960, 38.

[15] Id., 42.

[16] Haar, "Federal Credit and Private Housing," 1960, 132. Mr. Haar deliberately excluded the role of the savings and loan associations from an otherwise excellent book.

[17] Id., 138.

[18] U.S.C.A., sec. 1464(c). See also ch. 32 Ill. Rev. Stat. 791.

[19] The special tax treatment under the Internal Revenue Code for State and Federal savings and loan associations also requires that a certain portion of their funds be invested in "residential real property containing four or fewer family units." 1954 Internal Revenue Code, subtitle F, ch. 79, sec. 7701(a) 19. See also, Internal Revenue Code, subtitle A, ch. 1H, pt. II, secs. 591–593.

[20] Mayer and Stein, "Public Housing as Community," Architectural Record, April 1964, 169.

[21] Statement by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., is particularly pertinent. 11 Journal of Housing, 609.

[22] Bauer, "Social Questions in Housing and Community Planning," 7 Journal of Social Issues, 21–23. Cf. Miss Bauer's "The Form and Structure of the Future Urban Complex," in Cities and Space, the Future Use of Urban Land, 1963, 73.

[23] Handlin, "The Newcomers," 1959. Cf. Silberman, "Crises in Black and White," 1954, 36–58.

[24] See Hauser, in Chicago Perspective, June 1964, 36.

[25] Vernon, "The Myth and Reality of Our Urban Problems, 1961, 45–46.

[26] Foley, "Controlling London's Growth," 1964, 9–10.

[27] Madge, "The New Towns Program in Britain," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, vol. XXVIII, No. 4, Nov. 1962, 208.

[28] Higby, "The Squeeze," 1960, 31.

New Deal in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, last week the Congress finally lived up to its constitutional commitment and passed legislation dealing with the apportionment of congressional districts. In my view, such legislation had been a long time in coming.

It is unfortunate that congressional redistricting has been many times a political football. It is my hope that this legislation will keep "gerrymandering" to a minimum. The American people

deserve an honest and fair deal in the makeup of their congressional districts. I agree with a recent editorial that appeared in the Cape Cod Standard Times that the fight for equal representation is underway.

The inequities that now exist must be corrected—the editorial which follows points up the need:

NEW DEAL IN CONGRESS

The fight to give equal representation to voters, regardless of where they live, is getting somewhere. The House of Representatives, by a voice vote, has passed a bill requiring all congressional districts to be as compact as possible, with no district varying more than 15 percent above or below average population for a district. The Senate, since it is not directly concerned, is expected to let the House handle its own affairs.

This new regulation is vitally needed. Many examples show why. Consider this: One Ohio district has more than 800,000 inhabitants, while another has only a little more than 200,000. South Dakota has only two districts, but one has twice the population of the other. The list could be prolonged.

Such inequalities are sometimes due to partisan gerrymandering, sometimes to a desire to give the country districts as many Congressmen and the cities as few Congressmen as possible. Either reason is lamentable. The House should be applauded for its vote to introduce justice in apportionment.

Judaism Assailed in Soviet Article

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I read in Monday's New York Times yet another distressing article bearing upon the continuing trend of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

In Minsk, capital of the puppet Republic of Byelorussia in the U.S.S.R., an article appeared in a local newspaper crudely attacking Judaism and Jewish institutions.

Throughout these many months, I have been looking for positive indication that the Soviet authorities may be inclined to reverse their ominous discrimination. Yet hardly a week passes when we do not hear of renewed offensive undertakings.

Under unanimous consent I included the New York Times article, written by Mr. Irving Spiegel, in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDAISM ASSAILED IN SOVIET ARTICLE; U.S. JEWISH GROUPS SCORE HYSTERICAL ANTI-SEMITISM

(By Irving Spiegel)

A coordinating body of 24 national Jewish groups charged yesterday that an article in a prominent Soviet newspaper reviles Judaism as an enemy of the Soviet people.

Label A. Katz, chairman of the steering committee of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, the coordinating body, said in a statement that the article appeared in the February 2 issue of Zviaza, a newspaper of Minsk, capital of the Byelorussian Republic.

The 1,350-word article as translated by Mr. Katz' group from the Byelorussian, charges Judaism with being "the enemy of human culture * * * the hotbed of a code of morality hostile to the Soviet Union." The author is listed as Ju Muraviev, a senior lecturer at the V. I. Lenin Byelorussian State University.

Titled the "Shadow of the Synagogue * * * for the Verdict of Reason," the article says in part:

"The shadow of the synagogue: It has shrunk and moved back, but it still crosses our path. It is reminder of the evil, heavy darkness that blinded thousands and thousands of people, poisoned their souls and stuned their bright aspirations. In our day, the servitors of the synagogue strive to prove that Judaism is not an accumulation of harmful prejudices, but a 'form of culture'; not dead superstition, but 'living words'."

The article declares that "efforts to disguise the true face of Judaism are doomed to failure."

"Like all other religions," it goes on, "Judaism is the enemy of human culture, is in contradiction to science, and is the hotbed of a code of morality hostile to us."

Mr. Katz described the article as "hysterical anti-Semitism" and said "its abusive character is obviously intended to promote a policy of suppression of Soviet Jewish life by intimidating the Jews of Minsk."

Minsk's population of 500,000 includes 30,000 to 40,000 Jews. There are about 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Katz said the tone of the article was similar to that of other anti-Jewish material published in the Soviet Union "and bearing Soviet imprimatur."

The article, Mr. Katz said, "conjures up crude and medieval distortions of Jewish ritual and practices and condemns Judaism as not only an outmoded religion but one that defends what is dead and rotten."

The article also scores the United States as the "center of contemporary Judaism" and adds that American Jewish groups are headed by "such leaders of big business as Guggenheim and Morgenthau, Harriman and Rockefeller."

The 24 Jewish organizations that assailed the article include the American Jewish Congress, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the Jewish Labor Committee and the National Council of Jewish Women.

People-to-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most exciting adventures in international understanding and economic development is the linking of cities and towns here in the United States with communities elsewhere throughout the world.

Just last week the historic town of Concord, Mass., invited the historic town of Rionegro in the province of Antioquia in Colombia to join in a direct action program. Rionegro was the site of an historic constitutional convention in 1886 and is as proud of its patriotic heritage as is Concord of the North Bridge and the Minuteman statue.

The selection of Rionegro is particularly appropriate in this case because Massachusetts and the Department of Antioquia have formed a mutual arrangement under the Partners of the Alliance program under the Alliance for Progress.

When the Massachusetts team which visited Antioquia reached the town of Rionegro they were received warmly and I am sure that this is only one sign that a very fruitful partnership between the two communities will be developed.

The Lowell, Mass., Sun published an enthusiastic editorial about the prospects for this town-to-town arrangement and I make this example available to the House by including the editorial in the RECORD:

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE

Concord this week became the first community in Middlesex County to take direct action under the people-to-people program of the Federal Government. The town's action in inviting a community in Colombia, South America, is join in a sister-town relationship is to be commended.

The Government's Alliance for Progress program with South American nations is starting to bear fruit in some places. The stability of civilian government under republican forms in many South American countries has been a long-sought condition. With the creation of new industries, coupled with better means of transportation and communication between key cities within those nations, and better education for the masses of people who live virtually isolated from the rest of the world, some measure of stability is beginning to appear.

The major problem faced by some of the more progressive Latin American nations, such as Colombia, is inflation. There is nothing which can bring a nation to a standstill, or a government to its knees, faster than devaluation of its currency. Things which Americans today take so much for granted, such as home loans, or financing to buy domestic or business equipment, are virtually unknown in South America where the value of such commodities fluctuates violently with latent depreciation of monetary value.

An exchange, such as that proposed in this week's Concord invitation to Rionegro, can lead to a better mutual understanding of the best both peoples have to offer each other—culturally, politically, educationally, historically, and in many other ways.

The program is not earth shaking. It will commence modestly. First there will be an exchange of letters between schoolchildren and then community leaders. This will produce an exchange of ideas. Eventually, it is hoped, there will also be exchange visits between leaders and groups of the two communities.

Rionegro is similar to Concord in many respects. Populations are about similar. Both are located near major cities. Both are rich in their respective nations' histories. Rionegro was the site of Colombia's constitutional convention after independence was gained from Spain in 1820. Concord was the scene of the first battle of the American Revolution and of meetings of the Provincial Congress before the Revolution.

Rionegro is in the State of Antioquia, with which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has established similar relations under the Alliance for Progress.

This is a small step but in the right direction toward achieving better understanding between the world's people.

No Economy in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared recently in the Troy Record newspaper and which was written by Mr. Dwight Marvin.

Mr. Marvin is a distinguished veteran newspaperman who was considered the growing concern many feel about Federal spending as the country moves forward toward achieving the Great Society. His article, entitled "No Economy in Washington," is a good example of his ability to see what is happening in Washington today and why some of the Great Society programs should be carefully weighed by Congress before appropriating more billions of dollars to do more things for more people.

I am pleased to call Mr. Marvin's article to the attention of my colleagues.

A THOUGHT FOR TODAY: NO ECONOMY IN WASHINGTON

(By Dwight Marvin)

Let us be fair to both sides. Great Society talk is great talk. It entertains everybody—and it convinces a few, chiefly those who see the surface instead of digging down to foundations.

Great Society, with all the miraculous cures of social and physical defects, is a tremendous political agency. It can elect men and keep them in office.

But sooner or later the trouble begins. Everything that is worth having in this life must be paid for. There has not been a word, not even a whisper, from the White House or the current political leadership about costs. You cannot pay out multibillions to make everybody happy without meeting the bills. The only alternative is borrowing; and this merely postpones the payments. Eventually the borrower has to discharge his debts; and in the meantime he must pay the interest.

Now of course pictures of a beautiful world where everybody is happy and has four meals a day, two cars, and money in the bank are popular; and they mean votes. Indeed, that is their background objective. All people who know anything about politics realize that. But they are dangerous pictures unless they are accompanied by a plan to pay for them.

Have we such plans? No; we have not. We have the customary assurances that it can all be done by small tax increases which nobody will really feel. Which of course is as near the truth as any well-fashioned lie. We can have medicare, or get it started for instance, by social security increases. But medicare will bring inevitable added plans for pardise for the old. And the tax burden rises toward the socialistic scheme of taking all money beyond the price of food, clothes, and shelter and spending it on the voting groups who can get it.

Of course it is tough to hold back anything we want. It is tough for children to be sent to bed early when they don't want to go. But if they are to be healthy—something they cannot understand—they must sleep. It isn't pleasant to measure spendings with a clear study of the way they are to be paid for. An honest way, if possible; because politicians rarely figure accurately. They want legislation, so they over estimate and under estimate at will. The only way that is honest is to balance each item of Great Society accurately against costs and means of raising the money. This isn't being done at all.

Water Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, in the face of greatly increased demands for pure water in the future, we also face the fact that our total supply of available water is strictly limited by nature except for negligible amounts which can be obtained from desalinization of sea water.

The average annual precipitation in the United States is about 30 inches which amounts to about 4,300 billion gallons a day. But not all of this water is available for our use. The total streamflow from surface runoff and ground water amounts to about 8.5 inches per year which is about 1,200 billion gallons a day. It is this amount which is available for our use.

One of the problems here is that not all of this water is where the people are. Because the fact that our available supply of water is not evenly distributed with the population we face the problems of reusing water several times in large population centers.

This means that we must concentrate our efforts on reducing the water which is allowed to flow down our streams during periods of heavy rainfall. By building reservoirs, both large and small, it is possible to eliminate the possibility that rainfall will go down our streams in such volume that it cannot be used.

But the building of reservoirs is far from the only measure which will insure that streamflows are even the year around. The farmer, by proper conservation practices, can help in this struggle to eliminate huge streamflows during rains and small or no streamflows when there is no rain. By farming in such a way that millions of tiny reservoirs are formed by his tilling, the farmer contributes to the maximum utilization of our available supply of water. The water held in these millions of tiny reservoirs is delayed on its trip downstream insuring that it can be used by cities and towns along the stream instead of rushing in an unusable torrent immediately after it falls.

I will discuss later the steps that have been and must be taken in the future to insure that we make the best possible use of our water supply.

Realty's Brainchild: Condominiums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the important real estate industry has given us fresh evidence of its progressiveness and ingenuity through the development of condominiums.

Condominiums are a new concept of cooperative apartments in which purchasers of units become titleholders of their own apartments. The city of Baltimore will soon have the first of such multiple-occupancy buildings which will be built in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. It will be known as Strathmore Tower and will shortly be erected on the corner of Park Heights and Strathmore Avenues. Plans for this new structure call for 60 custom-designed apartment homes ranging in price from $20,000 to $50,000. I am happy to join the realtors of Baltimore in their best wishes for the success of this new project.

Inasmuch as condominiums are not well known, I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to an excellent article in the January–February 1965 issue of the Journal of American Insurance, which explains this new dimension of apartment ownership excellently. It is as follows:

REALTY'S BRAINCHILD: CON'DO-MIN'I-UMS

Real Estate News these days heralds the "new" condominium concept, a plan allowing purchasers to buy and take title to their own units in multiple occupancy buildings. Condominiums, now allowed by law in 42 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, are being built as apartment buildings, attached townhouses, retirement colonies, combination business and residential quarters, offices, and even motels.

Promoters tout such properties as new, and point up their novelty by using diacritical marks in advertising to teach potential customers how to pronounce the Roman word: con'do-min'i-um. Yet condominiums were known almost 4,000 years ago in ancient Babylon, where at least one houseowner sold the first floor while retaining ownership of the second floor. In a papyrus deed dated 434 B.C. there is a description of an apartment unit with instructions on rights of conveyance and title insurance arrangements. Roman rules of law were upset when condominium owners went to court to fix their rights and obligations.

Today's surge of interest in condominiums began only a few years ago when the concept was imported from Europe and Puerto Rico by enterprising real estate dealers. Real estate men and builders recognized that multiple dwelling units now constitute more than one-third of housing being built in the United States. The percentage is even higher in central cities. To meet the demand of a growing population for inexpensive housing for low- and middle-income families, condominiums were offered as a means of combining the benefits of homeownership with the convenience of apartment living. Instant acceptance of the concept is proved by the experience of Illinois, which witnessed the building of $50 million in condominium projects within 10 months of the adoption of legislation approving the projects.

Popularity of the condominium concept among city dwellers is not difficult to understand. Such units require considerably lower cash outlays than cooperative apartment buildings because each purchaser makes his own mortgage without acquiring an interest in a co-operative corporation. A typical condominium garden apartment might cost $15,900 with a $3,200 downpayment. Monthly outlays of about $100 cover principal, interest, taxes, insurance on common areas and maintenance charges of $10 per month. Importantly, the buyer is not liable for the default of any other unit owners, and if he decides to sell the others have the right of first refusal before the unit is offered on the open market. Each unit gets its own tax statement as well as individual bills for utilities, including heat, hot water and air conditioning.

Property and liability insurance, a basic requirement for all properties, is provided through unique arrangements conceived by underwriters. Common areas, operated by owners' associations, may be insured under special multiperil policies against both property damage and liability hazards. Risks of individual units may be covered by multiperil homeowners policies or by separate fire, liability and burglary forms. Rents insurance, protection against situations in which an owner moves out without paying his proportionate share of expenses, may also be provided by the SMP form.

"But condominiums," says one veteran mutual underwriter, "pose knotty problems involving amounts of insurance applicable to each unit. It may ultimately be necessary to draft a new form so building corporations and unit owners may be covered under a single policy." Underwriters also are wary of loss adjustment problems posed, for example, by fires that destroy parts of units and common areas or by injuries that may occur between commonly held and individually owned areas.

Yet problems posed by this "new" 4,000-year-old housing concept are no greater challenge than many others for which mutual property-liability insurance has devised protective coverages.

Noah Mason, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in mourning the death of our most distinguished former member, Noah Mason, of Illinois. Those of us who were privileged to serve with him recognized him as an extremely dedicated legislator who, throughout his entire service, fought to maintain the integrity and independence of the legislative branch of government.

Noah Mason was especially recognized in Illinois as a dedicated public servant whose long career enhanced the effectiveness and dignity of the Congress.

Noah Mason was a man of strong conservative political principles. He was also known to us as a wonderful human being with a wholesome sense of humor and with genuine interest in the welfare of his fellow man. He was an extremely valuable member of the Ways and Means Committee and a rock of Gibraltar in support of sound principles in the legislative area covered by his committee.

Mrs. Derwinski joins me in expressing our sympathy to Mrs. Mason and the family. We miss Noah since he retired less than 3 years ago and will always remember him as a true friend, understanding colleague, and, above all, dedicated American.

Theory Versus Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the issues in the controversy over the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling are well pointed up in an editorial which appeared March 25 in the Wall Street Journal.

Here is the text:

THEORY VERSUS REALITY

A Senate subcommittee recently started hearings on the proposed constitutional amendment to modify the Supreme Court's reapportionment order, and its seems the flow of nonsense has dried up from one side of the argument while rushing unabated from the other.

When the Court first issued its order, there was a rash of proposals directed more at the Court itself than any constitutional problem. These have not reappeared, and Senator BAYH, the subcommittee chairman, vowed that his hearings would not become a "springboard for vilification of the Supreme Court of the United States."

The amendment's proponents are now sticking closely to the question of whether a State should be allowed to apportion one house of its legislature on a nonpopulation basis if voters approve the districting by referendum. As further evidence of moderation, some of the proponents are advocating a requirement of referendum reapproval every 10 years. This would keep a State from getting stuck with an apportionment after a majority has ceased to favor it, a possibility some consider the last real argument against giving States the option the amendment provides.

The amendment's opponents, though, have continued to fog the issue. Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley, for instance, complained that "all the proposed amendments seek to evade the judgment of the Court"—as if the power of Congress and the States to change the Constitution is somehow subordinate to the Court's power to interpret it.

The biggest bit of fogging, though, is precisely in the phrase "one man, one vote." Contrary to its backers' claims, the Court ruling does not decree that every man's vote be represented equally. It simply says that legislative districts will be substantially equal in population. This has no effect on the most overwhelming single fact of apportionment—that a man who favors the losing nominee finds his vote represented not at all.

This is no picayune objection. Consider the situation where a single big city, dominated by a taut political machine, contains a bit over half the State's population. An unmodified equal-district apportionment will turn control of the State over to the machine boss, even if this prospect frightens a majority of the State's citizens comprising nearly everyone outside the city and a minority within it. For the sake of majority rule in some abstract theory, the system will have trampled majority rule in reality.

A hypothetical possibility? Perhaps, but its specifics are not far from the political facts of life in, say, Mayor Daley's Illinois. The possibility is real enough, we think, to constitute a powerful argument for giving the States a modicum of discretion in apportionment.

Address by Sargent Shriver at the University of Notre Dame, February 18, 1965, on Receiving 12th Annual Patriotism Award of the Notre Dame Senior Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to an eloquent address delivered by R. Sargent Shriver at the University of Notre Dame on February 18.

The occasion was the presentation of the 12th Annual Patriotism Award of the Notre Dame senior class to Mr. Shriver. The class explained that they had chosen Mr. Shriver for the award as a tribute to his faithful and effective leadership in the real revolution of the 20th century.

In his speech Mr. Shriver pointed out that young Americans serving in the Peace Corps and the War on Poverty programs were exhibiting the finest qualities of true patriotism and warned his listeners that "to be lukewarm in this time of national crisis really is treason."

I know that many of my colleagues will find this speech of great interest and I, therefore, insert its text at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SARGENT SHRIVER AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, SOUTH BEND, IND., FEBRUARY 18, 1965

Four years ago this month, 15 to 20 persons were working—night and day—in Washington's Mayflower Hotel trying to establish the Peace Corps. Your president, Father Hesburgh, participated in some of the discussions: so did dozens of other educators, businessmen, labor leaders, churchmen, etc.

But outside the hotel, the overwhelming majority of "experts" on foreign affairs were laughing at the idea of a Peace Corps. They and most adult Americans were scoffing not only at the idea, they were openly skeptical, even disdainful of the capacity of young Americans to live and work abroad—"Kids can't succeed in jobs overseas," they said, "Even mature men and women and trained diplomats have failed in this kind of work."

Today we know they were all wrong. The doubters, the skeptics, the cynics, the faint-hearted, yes, the "experts" were wrong.

But their attitude dramatizes our greatest national problem now: We are our own worst enemies. We sell ourselves short. We lack confidence in our capacity to find new ways to solve problems. That's why we're all busy justifying the way we do things now. We seek security within our own group—within the country club set, or within our business group, or professional group—or as members of the "giant middle class."

In 1932, a great American told this country: "The only thing we have to fear is fear

itself." Today, I tell you: "The only thing we have to fear is ourselves."

I mean that. I know we are fighting a war—two wars—one against poverty—the other, worldwide, against communism. Still, the real enemy is within. The real enemy is ourselves—the myths we indulge in, the distances we create between ourselves and our fellow man—and our own lack of faith.

Last summer, I read an article called "Keeping the Poor in Their Place." The author, Walinsky has this to say: "In the present-day America, the middle class is defined, largely, by the fact that the poor exist. If the present poor should become middle class, no meaning would remain to that phrase—"middle class." And, he argued we still have poverty in this country, because:—The middle class majority does not want to improve significantly the lot of the poor—the middle class actively desires to keep the poor where they are." That is an awesome statement—frightening and challenging. But is he right? Do we middle class Americans need to look down on the poor in order to feel superior ourselves? If the fellow next door has a hi-fi, do we have to have a stereo—and he he has a stereo with two speakers do we have to have one with four speakers and a special set of earphones? Do we have to prove that we count by playing the game of "One Upmanship?"

Maybe that's the explanation of some of the crime and violence in our country. Maybe when an 89-year-old woman gets mugged by some teenager, that's his way of saying: "Look at me, I'm important. I can harm you. I can upset your middle class attitude and values."

I have heard it said—time and again—about Negroes—"Why do they buy those great big flashy cars—why do they buy a big Cadillac? With the same money, they could fix up their homes and give their kids some books." But who are we to criticize them—when we use money in the same way? When we try to prove how great we are by outdoing the fellow next door—or the fellow down the street—or the poor.

MEANING OF "AMERICAN"

The true patriot—knows that to be an American is more than being in the middle class. You can be middle class, and French. You can be middle class, and German. You can be middle class and Russian. Was Patrick Henry middle class? Was Thomas Jefferson middle class when he wrote: "We can not expect to be translated from despotism to liberty, in a featherbed." Jefferson also said: "What country before ever existed a century and a half without a rebellion?—"The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time, with the blood of patriots and tyrants. That is its natural manure." Are those good middle class statements? And here at Notre Dame you must have heard that the Catholic Church—that christianity—grows and prospers—even requires "The blood of martyrs."

In the Peace Corps we have found a new way of saying "I am an American." Last year, a former Ambassador from Bolivia visited our Peace Corps office. He told me—"Mr. Shriver, I am one of those who predicted the Peace Corps would fail. But you have succeeded in my country far beyond my wildest imaginings. The reason your volunteers have reached my people is simple—they came to learn. For the first time we were confronted with 'Gringos' who wanted to learn from us. They wanted to learn our history, our culture, our language, our way of doing things. And in teaching them, we grew, quite unconsciously, softly, quietly, psychologically, ready to accept instruction from them."

That's one way Peace Corps volunteers, say: "I am an American." In effect, they say: "Maybe our way isn't best. We're here to help you, not to make you do things the way we want you to." Maybe that's a new form of patriotism—not exclusively love of one's country—of the hills, valleys, cities and farms of one's own land—but love of humanity.

Tom Carter, a Peace Corps volunteer who served in Chimbote, Peru wrote:

"Our school has no roof. It would be a $10 project and about 1 day's labor for two or three Peace Corps men to build that roof. Yet, we don't do it. If we gave my school a roof it would always be that, a gift, the 'Gringos' roof. When it needed fixing, no one could fix it. If it takes me a year to talk my neighbors into putting on that roof, it will be worth it. Because then it will be their roof, on their school. It would be a small start, but in the right direction. Maybe then we would take on a little harder project, and step by step build up a powerful organization interested in progress and strong enough to do something about it. It has to be an organization that does not need me, otherwise it would collapse when I leave."

Tom Carter's way is a new way of being an American. Tom Carter is big enough to accept the pace and the values of others. Maybe true Americanism, true patriotism is being big enough to admit that we don't know everything, that we can make mistakes, and that we can learn from others. That's where we began, after all, in 1787: This country got started—our Constitution got written—because there were 55 men who gathered in Philadelphia who were big enough to admit that things were bad. The convention was originally called merely to draft some amendments to the Articles of Confederation. But the true patriots—men like James Madison, of Virginia and James Wilson, of Pennsylvania—they knew the Articles of Confederation had to be scrapped—and they had the courage to say so.

FACING OUR PROBLEMS

These men looked around them and said: Our country is in bad shape. We've got problems, and we'd better do something about them.

Back then—it was toll roads and tariffs and barriers to trade. Now, it is toll roads and barriers to opportunity—to education, to jobs. But the solution—the basic solution is the same.

We have to be big enough to take stock—to admit our failures:

The failure of our school system to prevent dropouts;

The failure of public housing projects to solve the human problems of the poor;

The failure of urban renewal to eradicate slums;

The failure of an expanding economy to provide jobs for youth and growing numbers of hard core unemployed;

The failure of our welfare programs, to break the cycle of poverty which goes on from generation to generation; and

The failure of all our social programs, taken toegther to stem the rising tide of delinquency, crime, poverty, and alienation.

Yesterday, President Johnson said to the Congress in his poverty message:

"From the very beginning, this country, the idea of America itself, was the promise that all would have an equal chance to share in the fruits of our society.

"As long as children are untrained, men without work, and families shut in gateless poverty, that promise is unkept."

In Detroit, in Chicago, in New Haven—in every city and every State, patriots are rising to their feet and saying:

Let's face our problems. Let's eliminate the tariff barriers and toll roads to opportunity. The old Articles of Confederation are no good. In 1787 the word was "Union"—today, the word "Coordination" is more fashionable. But the problems are the same—our schools, our hospitals, our family counseling services, our mental health clinics, our legal service agencies—all of these are as separate, as divided, as the 13 colonies were. To get from one to the other is as difficult for the poor, as it was back in 1787, to go from colony to colony. We need now, in each community—a more perfect union—a union which will work—which will keep the promise—"To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The ability to admit failure—to face up to it—that is the first mark of the patriot.

The second mark of the patriot is the ability to learn from others—to admit that we don't know everything—that others can teach us something. That's what we done have in the Peace Corps. And that's what we're doing in the poverty program. We're learning from the poor. We're listening to them.

LISTENING TO THE POOR

Listen to these words from Mrs. Janice Bradshaw from Pueblo, Colo.—a woman who never finished grammar school. She said:

"Poverty is a personal thing.

"Poverty is taking your children to the hospital and spending the whole day waiting there with no one even taking your name—and then coming back the next day, and the next day, until they finally get around to you.

"Poverty is having a landlady who is a public health nurse—who turns off the heat when she leaves for work in the morning and turns it back on at 6 when she returns. It's being helpless to do anything about that because by the time the officials get around to looking into it, she has turned the heat back on for that day—and then it will be off the next.

"Poverty is having the welfare investigators break in at 4 o'clock in the morning and cut off your welfare without an explanation—and then when you go down and ask, they tell you it is because they found a pair of men's house slippers in the attic, where your brother left them when he visited last Christmas.

"Poverty is having a child with glaucoma and watching that eye condition grow worse every day while the welfare officials send you to the private agencies and the private agencies send you back to the welfare and when you ask the welfare officials to refer you to this special hospital, they say they can't—and then when you say it is prejudice because you are a Negro, they deny it flatly—and they shout at you, 'Name one white child who we have referred there'—and when you name 25, they sit down—and they shut up—and they finally refer you, but it is too late then because your child is permanently lost 80 percent of his vision—and you are told that if only they had caught it a month earlier, when you first made inquiry about that film over his eyes, they could have preserved most of his vision."

That's the voice of the poor. And being an American is learning to listen.

The "experts": Also told us that poverty-stricken youngsters didn't want to work, because if they did, there were plenty of jobs and no one ever applied for these jobs. And they told us that city kids would never volunteer to go to a Job Corps center out in the woods away from the bright lights.

JOB CORPS CENTERS

Well, during the first 50 days of Job Corps, 188,000 young men and women have volunteered. They write us on postcards, on letters, on torn pieces of paper. They write to "Job Core" and "Job Choire" and "Job Chore"—but they all say—We want to go to work. We want a new chance to learn.

And I remember what one of the first 30 boys said when he walked into the Job Corps center in Catoctin, Md. He said he thought it would be a camp with barbed wire around it—like the concentration camps he had seen on television. And when he was asked why did he come if he thought that's what it would be like, he said, "This is my

last chance to do something good."—And he was only 17.

The "experts" told us that white boys from the rural South would not mix with Negroes from the slums of northern cities. They predicted race riots in the Job Corps centers. But already for more than a month such boys—Negro and white from Kentucky and Georgia and Virginia—have been studying together, eating together, and sharing sleeping quarters—with Negro boys from the slums of Baltimore and Philadelphia—without a single incident.

We still have a lot to learn—even from teenage boys with a third grade reading level, and police record. Are you prepared to learn from them—to find out what is wrong with our schools, our employment service, our welfare agencies? If you are, then you will have found a new way to say: "I am an American." And you will have given a new meaning to patriotism—because the third mark of the patriot—the true patriot is that he is willing to make a commitment. He isn't afraid to make the plunge. He doesn't have to play it safe by staying in his own small social group.

Right now, there are a lot of people who call themselves patriots, true Americans. But really—they're afraid to get their hands dirty with poverty at home—and they're also afraid to go abroad—to Africa or Asia where people have a different color, speak a different language, eat different food.

The other week, I got a letter about helping the poor. The writer said: "I feel we should go ahead and send them money."

Do you know what those words "send them" really mean? They mean that the poor are somewhere far away—and that our contact with them should be confined to the U.S. mails.

HUMAN INVOLVEMENT

Such people want to help the poor—but not have any human contact with them. We do the same thing overseas.

Back in 1961 President—then Vice President—Johnson was visiting Africa for the independence ceremonies in Senegal. He rode through the streets of Senegal with our Ambassador. Typically, President Johnson reached out of the official car to shake hands with the Africans. But when he did, our Ambassador grabbed his arm back. He offered—he almost insisted—that Johnson put on gloves—so that our President's hands, his flesh would not be contaminated by touching the flesh of the Africans. President Johnson rejected the gloves—and it may not surprise you, that that gentleman is no longer Ambassador to Senegal.

The true patriot isn't afraid to shake hands—and he doesn't have to wear gloves either. You can't fool the poor. You can't fool other nations. If you trust them, if you are willing to make the plunge, to commit yourselves, then you will know what it means to be an American.

It means that in that other America—the America of the poor, you will be welcome with an outstretched hand and a level gaze. It will mean that when you are thanked, you will not be secretly despised. It means that you will be trusted—because you have been willing to trust them.

That is what a patriot is. That's what an American is.

As Andrew Jackson said, "I would to God we had less professions and more acts of real patriotism."

We need patriots like that—I said it at the start of this speech—and I'll say it again. We need patriots like that because, right now, our biggest enemy is ourselves—our sense of smugness, our superiority. And right now, the biggest struggle we face is a struggle with the false patriots—the ones who say "I am an American" by looking down their nose at the poor, by looking down their nose at other countries and other people, by seeking security within their own little groups.

Fortunately, that kind of false patriotism, that kind of phony Americanism is under attack. On one flank are those 188,000 kids who have applied for the Job Corps. They weren't afraid to take the gamble. On the other flank are the thousands flocking into the Peace Corps, into the domestic Peace Corps, called VISTA, into the Papal volunteers, into dozens of private volunteer programs in their local communities. Last week, the American Bar Association passed unanimously a resolution calling for the legal profession to enlist in the war against poverty. And each day brings more into the ranks.

We are seeing now beginnings of a giant pincer movement—those two flanks gradually closing in to crush and eradicate the enemy that lurks within—the enemy which is ourselves.

A NEW PATRIOTISM

Will you join the ranks of those true patriots? It won't be just fun and games. This new patriotism is a patriotism defined by service, tried by rejection and hardship, tempered by disillusionment and frustration.

But will you take that first step? Or will you hang back? How many of you in the security of your parents' homes; in the assured prestige that comes with education; in the respectability that comes from graduate work. How many of you will retreat from that commitment? How many of you will join Peace Corps, or VISTA, or Papal volunteers? How many of you will help 4- and 5-year-olds through Project Headstart—or give poor teenagers their first break by working in Job Corps centers?

And how many of you will blow neither hot nor cold—but lukewarm? That is your choice—between an Americanism based on false feelings of superiority, and snobishness—and deep down, on hidden fear. Or an Americanism based on commitment—humility—and eagerness to learn.

Before you seal off your heart—before you take the easy way to success, to security, to superiority here at home—recall to mind the words of St. John in the Apocalypse where he quotes our Lord as saying:

"I know of Thy doings and find they are neither cold nor hot. I would Thou were one or the other. Being what Thou are, lukewarm, neither cold nor hot, Thou wilt make me vomit you out of my mouth."

I'm sure you men of Notre Dame are not lukewarm. Notre Dame, with its great endowment of priests and scholars, and that new library, stands for much more. And your fathers and mothers—and the saints—have struggled for more than sons who are lukewarm, tepid. For to be lukewarm in this time of crisis—to abstain, to play it safe—is worse than to err. It is to join the enemy. It is treason.

The Art of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us should applaud President Johnson's direct and strong policy in Vietnam.

Joseph Alsop in the following column from the New York Herald Tribune of March 5, 1965, relates this policy to the maxims of the ancient Chinese Sun Tzu.

The article follows:

MATTER OF FACT: "THE ART OF WAR"

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The two stern new attacks on North Vietnamese targets have many meanings. Most obviously, they mean that President Johnson has decided not to imitate:

"The good old Duke of York!
He had ten thousand men;
He marched them up the hill,
And marched them down again."

The logic of his own prior actions; the President's courage and his admirable distaste for defeat; above all, his sane but properly proud conception of the American role at this juncture in history—these are the factors, beyond doubt, which have compelled the biggest and most painful decision that Lyndon B. Johnson has taken since he assumed his heavy burden.

The bombing of Xombang and Quangkhe leaves no further room for the suspicion, or, in some quarters, the hope, that President Johnson is secretly ready to subside by degrees into surrender, which in some quarters is fashionably described as negotiation. But if he has set his face against surrender what sort of policy does his big decision then in fact imply?

Perhaps the best clue is to be found in a quotation from Sun Tzu's "Art of War," which is currently being passed by mouth in this ingrowing city. Sun Tzu, who probably lived about 4 centuries before Our Lord, was the Chinese Clausewitz. Or perhaps that is unfair; for this man of ancient China, whose date and personal history are matters of dispute, was both more profound and vastly more succinct than the famous German military theorist.

If Sun Tzu is being quoted hereabouts at this juncture, moreover, there are good precedents for this. The writings of Mao Tse-tung and the North Vietnamese military commander, Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, reveal that these two brilliant enemy leaders have given more time to studying Sun Tzu than to almost any other authority.

Apparently Sun Tzu's maxims have been given currency because Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara has been reading the lucid and scholarly translation by Col. Samuel B. Griffith of the U.S. Marines. At any rate, the tag from Sun Tzu that is currently being quoted is:

"The supreme art of war is to subdue the enemy without fighting."

Three more of Sun Tzu's maxims are perhaps relevant as well. They are as follows:

"The art of employing troops is that when the enemy occupies high ground, do not confront him; with his back resting on hills, do not oppose him."

And: "He who intimidates his neighbors does so by inflicting injury upon them."

And: "To a surrounded enemy you must leave a way of escape."

In other words, President Johnson and his advisers are working, by the cut-and-try methods the President prefers, to find ways of "inflicting injury" on the North Vietnamese to an extent which will persuade them to cease and desist from their aggression against their neighbors.

Following the rule about the hills and the high ground, the President is using the kind of American power to which North Vietnam is most vulnerable and in which North Vietnam is most deficient. The aim, of course, is not really to "subdue the enemy without fighting"—which is impossible. The aim is to avert a catastrophic American defeat and to give the South Vietnamese freedom to choose their own future, with as little fighting as possible.

And precisely here is where the fourth Sun Tzu maxim above quoted is exceedingly important to bear in mind. For the careful dosing and timing of the President's re-

prisals against North Vietnam make it clear that he wishes to leave the other side the widest possible "way of escape."

Negotiation is indeed the aim, but by no means the kind of negotiation now being urged by the sort of people, and, in some cases, by the very same people, who swore to us that Fidel Castro was merely a disinterested patriot and that Mao Tse-tung was just a high-minded agrarian reformer. The "way of escape" for the North Vietnamese is simply to leave their neighbors alone, after which any other difference can be negotiated with extreme ease.

In any warlike situation, one must also remember Sir Robert Walpole's dour remark about the war with Spain: "They ring the bells now; later on, they will be wringing their hands." But there are times when the risks of surrender are even uglier than the risks of bold action. The President, in his formidable way, has seen that clearly.

Furor Over Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today, I joined with five of my colleagues in writing to the President to urge the halt of the use of nonlethal gas in Vietnam.

Our argument was based primarily on political considerations—we have paid too high a price throughout the world for the use of chemical agents which, although nonlethal, arouse the concern and disapproval of peoples all over the world.

On Saturday, March 27, the Lowell, Mass., Sun in a thoughtful, balanced editorial made a similar point in noting the tremendous danger of escalation raised by our supplying of the gas to the South Vietnamese troops.

I would like to call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues by including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FUROR OVER GAS

Reports that the United States has supplied some tear and nausea gas to South Vietnam for use in the guerrilla war there have touched off an emotional reaction at home and abroad that is quite unfair and wholly out of proportion. Ironically, some of the criticism here at home has come from politicians who have urged a stronger effort in fighting the Communists in Vietnam.

Abroad, the reaction has been blown all out of proportion to what has actually occurred. The truth is that the United States is not conducting gas warfare in Vietnam. The South Vietnamese have used the gas only three times—and it was not very effective at that. Most likely it will be used only rarely in the future, if at all.

To be sure, the word "gas," when associated with the word "war," brings forth ugly connotations. But if critics were to be realistic, they would condemn not the use of this nonlethal gas, but the employment of napalm and white phosphorus bombs. Certainly, if a Vietcong village is to be overcome, it is more humane to use tear gas than to set fire to the whole village, killing everyone.

The real problem with the tear and nausea gases in Vietnam is not that they are more inhumane than other tools of modern warfare, but that along with the napalm and white phosphorus bombs, they seriously increase the risk of escalating the whole conflict even more than it has been.

Moreover, since introduction of gases in South Vietnam, even the nonlethal variety, was bound to ignite a political storm, we wonder why the President was not consulted in advance. This type of decision should not be left to field commanders.

We don't want to see the Vietnam struggle escalated any more than is necessary to induce the North Vietnamese to negotiate. On these grounds, we are wary about the use of napalm and white phosphorus, and about the apparent free rein given to field commanders in the use of other weapons and tactics.

Also, since the United States is undeniably responsible for the recent significant escalation of the war, including its extension to North Vietnamese and Laotian territory, we hope that the diplomatic preparations for space are simultaneously being laid by our Government. We have received few clues that they are, but we trust that our moves up to now have necessarily been in the area of secret feelers.

If not, we are headed along a one-way street toward total war with China.

The Arab Diversion Project: Menace to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I learned today of an extremely informative article apearing in the Washington News, written by Mr. Earl Richert, which describes the warlike diversion plans now being implemented by certain Arab States.

If this program is successfully effectuated, it will be a direct threat to the existence of Israel as a viable and stable Nation.

There is no purpose served by this diversion design except an outright affront to Israel. And it is this senseless, unjustified policy which is undermining not only the peace of the Middle East, but the world as well.

Under unanimous consent, I include this newspaper report in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

DIVERSION PROJECT COULD TOUCH OFF ARAB-ISRAEL WAR

(By Earl Richert)

OLD JERUSALEM, JORDAN, March 30.—The fabled Jordan River gushed by a few feet away—at about the speed and width of a good-sized mountain trout stream in the United States.

"Look at the bank," said the Arab guide bitterly, "and see where the water should be," pointing to a level much higher up.

We were viewing the lower Jordan at the spot a few miles east of Jerusalem where John the Baptist baptized Jesus, and only a short distance from where the river ends its journey by flowing into the Dead Sea.

Truly the Jordan wasn't much of a river at this point, not nearly what one could logically expect at a time of year when a river should be flowing near full, if ever.

It is the Arab contention that already the lower Jordan is showing the effects of the Israelis' tapping Lake Tiberias (the Sea of Galilee) to irrigate the Negev Desert in southern Israel.

The Jordan River forms north of Lake Tiberias. Its headwaters are small rivers forming in Lebanon and Syria. It flows into Lake Tiberias and then out of it to the Dead Sea. (Much of the river forms the border between Israel and the Arab States of Syria and Jordan.

PUMPING

The Israelis began pumping the Lake Tiberias water for the huge Negev irrigation project last summer and the Arabs have been plotting revenge.

The argument between the Arab States and Israel over use of the Lake Tiberias and Jordan waters is of world importance because it could well bring war—and involve both the United States and Russia.

The Arab retaliation plan, approved by two summit conferences of the Arab States, is to divert the headwaters of the Jordan in Lebanon and Syria and to build a big dam on the Yarmuk River in the kingdom of Jordan which flows into the lower Jordan River.

The diversion projects in Lebanon and Syria would be particularly damaging because they would keep much-needed fresh water from entering highly saline Lake Tiberias.

WAR?

The Israel Government has said that, since water is the lifeblood of its country, it will not stand for the diversion.

Will the Arabs go ahead with their diversion plans in face of the war threat from Israel?

Some U.S. experts in the area doubt it, saying the Arab countries never will stick together long enough to complete such costly and complicated projects as are contemplated.

And two of the Arab countries most involved, prosperous Lebanon and United States-aided Jordan, are known to be anything but enthusiastic.

But dominant thinking is that the projects will proceed—that the Arab countries have gone so far now with their agreements and plans that any backout by such countries as Lebanon and Jordan would bring a quick toppling of their governments by Arab nationalists.

Certainly Arab leaders say they will go ahead.

'We're dealing with Arab waters in Arab lands. There is not the slightest possibility of a backdown," said one top Arab leader.

SYRIA ACTS

Lebanon and Jordan can drag their feet and proceed slowly but Syria is showing it is red hot for action by starting to build a showy access road for a diversion canal within sight of the Israel border.

And already, according to the Syrian Government, Israel guns have killed one tractor driver and wounded two laborers on the access road project.

The oil-rich Arab countries of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait have pledged to put up most of the money for the diversion projects, an estimated $38 million.

A unified Arab command under an Egyptian general has been formed to lead the Arab armies in case war with Israel comes.

Strangely enough the diversion projects would not give the Arab countries much more water than they would have received under a plan evolved by the late Eric Johnston, a special U.S. emissary in 1953–55. They rejected that plan but the Israelis accepted.

The Arab designs plainly are more psychological and political than economic. It's their scheme for revenge for the many humiliating defeats they have suffered from

the Israelis and they can do their foe considerable damage by keeping fresh water out of Lake Tiberias.

They swear they are going ahead. And, if they do, it seems certain that the Israelis will act, possibly by bombing the Arab pumps and canals. Thus the situation is explosive.

"A Report of Programs and Progress" by the Legislative Council for Photogrammetry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House passed the Interior Department's appropriation for fiscal year 1966. Included in the appropriation were funds for continuing the new mapping capacity of the U.S. Geological Survey.

While I am aware of the need and importance for good topographical maps of our country, which this agency provides, I am also aware of the recently published report by the Legislative Council for Photogrammetry entitled "A Report of Programs and Progress."

The purpose of the pamphlet is to describe the Federal competition which the private photogrammetric profession feels it faces from Federal mapping agencies and proposes recommendations for relieving this situation and creating savings for the taxpayer.

Because I know other Members of the House, like myself, are supporters of greater economy in Government, I feel that excerpts from this report would be of interest to them:

FOREWORD

Webster defines photogrammetry as the art or science of surveying or mapping with the aid of photographs. This technique is used in most major mapping programs of today by private industry and its counterparts in the Federal Government.

The economic system of the United States is based on private enterprise regulated where necessary to prevent monopoly and to provide for freedom of competition.

This report has been prepared in an attempt to highlight the philosophy of the private photogrammetrists and their national organization. Our activities are directed toward finding solutions to the inequitable Federal competition existing between Federal mapping agencies and the mapping profession. It is designed to bring to the general public, the executive branch of the Federal Government, and Members of Congress a greater awareness of the seriousness of the Federal competition faced by our profession.

The genius of the private enterprise system is that it generates initiative, ingenuity, inventiveness, and unparalleled productivity. Obviously, with the normal rigidities that are part of Government, the same forces that produce excellent results in private industry cannot develop to the same degree in Government.

William S. Bergman, executive director, defines the council's position with respect to the responsibilities of both Government and business:

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Providing accurate and adequate small-scale maps for general public use is logically the province of the Federal Government. It is recognized that the economic growth of the Nation and of the world is dependent to a large extent upon how much we know about the physiographic features of the land and resources available for exploitation and the ready accessibility of this information. In today's world, maps are the basis for comparisons, planning, and decisions necessary to designing procedures that take advantage of all natural conditions.

In the early years of photogrammetry only Federal agencies could afford the full utilization of photogrammetric equipment developed and pioneered by private operators in this budding profession. Initially, the Government's attitude toward photogrammetry was paternalistic, but as mapping needs increased it has become increasingly possessive. It recently became abundantly clear to us that for photogrammetry to expand and progress as a private enterprise, a reversal of this trend, long and difficult though it may be, must be facilitated.

Growing public awareness of maps has created new demands for map detail, for standardization of presentation and for various formats. We must expect that the Federal Government will and should inevitably continue to increase its role in providing good maps to the public. However, we are not in agreement with the philosophy that the Federal agencies have adopted toward participation of established, well-qualified private firms in the accomplishment of the mapping programs.

A large percentage of the Federal funds appropriated are spent each year to purchase capital equipment and plant facilities and to enlarge the already vast in-house capabilities of Government bureaus. With the new facilities, additional Federal employees are needed. The result is, almost without exception, duplication of facilities already available in private firms and personnel in excess of the number needed in private firms for comparable work.

The lack of recognition by these various Government agencies of the professional standards maintained by the industry has resulted in Federal agencies with photogrammetric capabilities actually selling their services to other Federal agencies and eliminating any possibility of the work going to private enterprise. Yet these very agencies have shown manifest unwillingness to set contracting standards with which all photogrammetric work could be negotiated.

The presence of these factors within the Government has given rise to an aggressive sales program by the agencies to solicit new business programs for their bureaus. These programs often bear little or no relation to the mission of the agency. We find representatives of the Federal agencies in liaison or coordinator positions throughout the country, working with local authorities to develop cooperative programs wherein contracts or agreements are entered into which provide that the services of the bureau or agency will be used. These same services are available from private firms and, in many cases, from private firms in the same community.

The cost of providing these services to an agency's customer is rarely determined on a realistic basis prior to the agency's entry into the project. In contrast, private companies must make firm proposals on their services, figuring in all costs. Once a proposal has been accepted and a price fixed, the private firm must meet all the terms of its contract within the fixed price agreed upon.

We take the viewpoint that whenever Federal services are provided, the costs should be viewed in dollars of tax money. True costs can be determined only when actual overhead costs, including such items as vacations, sick leave, building rentals, heat, electricity, air conditioning, supervision, research and planning staffs, travel, management training programs, etc., are added to direct job costs.

Current investigations and computations of known Federal costs lead us to believe it is possible to prove conclusively that Federal costs for accomplishing mapping of any kind are substantially higher than private industry. Despite the excessively equipped plants and abundance of personnel available on a permanent basis to Government bureaus, our industry can produce to the same quality standards and meet production schedules more easily.

Various bills pending before Congress are examples of the concrete steps that must be taken to put an end to the kind of Government competition which threatens demise to our profession mostly comprised of small businesses—all taxpayers. Still more concrete steps are needed.

We desire to see legislation presented and enacted into law which will conserve Federal funds granted to States, municipalities, and counties, as well as other organizations, which are to be spent for mapping, resources inventories, planning, and general development. The provision should be made that private enterprise must be used in preference to Federal agencies or federally supported organizations, offering substantially the same services or products.

Photogrammetric firms are not asking for handouts or concessions. They want a business climate in which by the grace of their ingenuity, enterprise, and hard work, they can be free to practice their profession which is so essential to the Nation's progress.

In the United States, under our free-enterprise system, the burden of proof regarding the economic soundness of private enterprise versus the Government should be assumed by the Government, not private enterprise. By stipulating use of private enterprise on federally funded assistance programs, the healthy atmosphere of competition between rival companies would be continued—clearly demonstrating why our industry is confident that we can perform any task as well, if not better, with less cost to the people of the United States.

In the Council's recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS

Private mapping firms should be free to offer the business community and the agencies of the Federal Government, a healthy, competitive market as members of our free enterprise society. Mapping in the perimeters of research and development are all, of course, areas of responsibility of the mapping agencies, and it is the function of the Government to supply adequate mapping services. But these same agencies should be directed to utilize to the maximum extent the capabilities of qualified photogrammetric firms.

The Federal mapping agencies themselves should be required to utilize fully the services of private photogrammetric firms in every instance where the best interests of all the taxpayers may be served, taking cognizance of the hidden costs of agency mapping services.

Congressional committees with responsibilities concerning the budgeting of funds and drafting legislation should be presented with all the facts. It is the hope and the aim of this council that these committees will endeavor to explore and then reassess this full problem.

Legislation should be presented and enacted into law which would conserve Federal funds granted to States, municipalities, and counties for mapping services by providing that private services be employed when possible in preference to Federal or State agencies in carrying out federally financed mapping programs. This would provide the pri-

vate operator a competitive opportunity, yet it would not deny the rights of the Federal agency nor the need of the public. It would also remove the incentive which the States now have to acquire photogrammetric facilities with Federal funds.

It is not the intent of private photogrammetric firms to replace the activities of the Federal mapping agencies. Rather, we seek a partnership with the Government, utilizing the best features of both. Control, administration, and coordination to be performed by the Government; and production of mapping in already established areas by private industry.

The Legislative Council for Photogrammetry submits that the burden of proof regarding the economic soundness of private enterprise versus the Government should be reaffirmed by the Government in its deeds as well as in its words.

Necessary Steps To Be Taken for Successful Bargaining in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is a detailed and comprehensive study covering the marketing of agricultural products. Information and data included in this study is based on U.S. Department of Agriculture statistics and reports, studies and information gathered from colleges and universities, information compiled by an NFO Research Committee and on an analysis prepared by this committee. The NFO Research Committee was made up of NFO leaders with varied backgrounds and experiences, including men with degrees from some of the Nation's leading colleges and universities.

FARM PROBLEM GETTING WORSE

It has become quite aparent in the last 12 years that general economic conditions in agriculture are worsening.

The Nation's economy has made tremendous growth in the last 20 years. The national gross product has made spectacular gains almost without interruption. Agricultural producers are the only major segment of the economy that have not shared in this continually increasing prosperity of the Nation.

Every farmer, through his own personal experience, is familiar with the fact that the price of the products he has to sell has been steadily decreasing with the exception of an occasional upturn, while the prices of the products he has to buy in order to continue farming in a modern agriculture have been continually rising. This condition cannot continue to exist without serious repercussions for all farmers.

The percentage of parity received by farmers is at the lowest level since 1939. If farmers lived in an industrial area they would be considered in the poverty class if they did not receive $3,000 per year moneyed income, or in other words, spendable income. By these standards, 47.1 percent of all the farmers are in the poverty class. The following table points at the percentage of farm families in major agricultural States that were in the poverty class in 1963—this means families with below $3,000 moneyed income:

	Percent
Colorado	34.4
Illinois	38.9
Iowa	44.8
Indiana	34.1
Kansas	40.1
Kentucky	58.5
Minnesota	48.5
Missouri	53.7
Nebraska	46.1
North Dakota	43.1
Ohio	35.3
Oklahoma	45.1
Michigan	31.5
Pennsylvania	32.6
Tennessee (1.2 percent are colored farmers	62.0
South Dakota	52.5
Wisconsin	38.4
Wyoming	30.6

National average: 47.1 percent of all the farmers in the poverty class. Forty-six percent of all families in rural America are in the poverty class, this includes the farmers and all small towns of 5,000 and under.

Comparison of per capita farm income with nonfarm income

Per capita nonfarm income	$2,181
Per capita farm income from farming	903
Off farm income	473
Total farm income from both sources	1,376

The $903 per capita farm income from farming is only 41.4 percent of the $2,181 per capita nonfarm income.

Source: Economic Research of the USDA.

The above documented figures should make any farmer who feels he is a good businessman, stop and think. These conditions did not just happen. There had to be a reason or reasons.

How did these conditions come about? Certainly not because farmers do not produce a needed product. Food and fiber produced on the farms of America are the most essential commodities in the Nation. On the producing end, the agricultural industry is the most efficient industry in America. This means something must be wrong in the pricing of agricultural products.

The agricultural industry has changed from the horse and buggy days of 25 to 30 years ago to the modern automated industry it is today. But while this has happened the farm producers have done practically nothing about changing their marketing structure. Other segments of the economy have not only automated, they have also organized.

The industrial segment of the economy puts a price tag on its products. Labor bargains for fair wages. But the farmers go to the marketplace as individuals and ask the buyer, "What will you give me?"

As the economy becomes better and better organized, the groups that have organized get in a stronger and stronger position and the groups that have not organized get in a weaker and weaker position. The farmers have remained in the position of the unorganized.

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS WILL DWINDLE

Many proposals have been advanced in the past to meet the problems of agriculture. These proposals can really be considered in five categories: Government programs, use of cooperatives, increasing efficiency, reducing the number of farmers, and depending on the law of supply and demand.

The depression of the early thirties brought about a general realization that low prices had been a part of the beginning of the depression. Government farm programs were then initiated and farmers turned to these programs to meet their critical problems. At the same time, labor stepped up its organizational efforts and soon started bargaining successfully. Industrial corporations got larger and stronger and soon were successful in establishing profitable price levels for their commodities before the commodities were even manufactured. While the other segments of the economy started trying to meet as many of their problems as they could through their own efforts, farmers started relying almost entirely on Government farm programs.

This worked rather successfully until the early 1950's. Then the Government programs came under attack both from within and from outside of agriculture. The political power of farmers started diminishing as prices went down and more and more farmers were forced to leave the farm. It was probably a foregone conclusion that as farmers turned to more modern equipment, fewer farmers would be needed—but lower prices accelerated the movement of farmers from the farms.

Today, only a skeleton remains of Government programs. They are in disrepute because of two basic reasons—constant and, many times, unfair attacks, and governmental costs which, in most cases, are given unfair publicity. Farmers cannot expect the Government to meet all their problems for them. This is not the function of the Government. Farmers, themselves, must first do all they can to meet their own problems. It is then the responsibility of the Government to assist the farmers in meeting any problems they have been unable to meet themselves. This, the Government has done for all other segments of the economy. The Government gave farmers the tools they need to meet many of their problems when the Capper-Volstead Act was passed in 1922. But farmers have never used their legal rights to any great degree.

Farmers can expect Government farm programs to continue to dwindle away in the near future. This fact is pointed out by reliable and informed publications such as the Kiplinger Letter. Behind-the-scene observers also know this to be a fact. But despite this fact, farmers should support any legislative proposals or administrative policies that will assist farm income because all studies made by leading universities point out that there would be a drastic drop in farm prices without Government programs. But in the meantime, farmers should do everything possible to meet their own problems, because the politi-

cal strength of farmers has reached an alltime low and they will soon be largely on their own. A congressional district is not considered a farm district unless 20 percent or more of the voters are farmers. By this standard, there were 251 farm districts 40 years ago; 165 farm districts 10 years ago; and today, an alltime low has been reached with only 53 congressional farm districts.

COOPERATIVES MUST INCREASE

Farmers produce 100 percent of the food produced in America and their real economic power lies in this production. This economic power is worthless unless farmers use it together.

There are basically two kinds of cooperatives. There is the service cooperative and the marketing cooperative. The chief function of the service cooperative has been largely one of keeping prices in line on the products farmers have to buy. This is a worthwhile service but not one that can accomplish much more than it already has, and certainly it can do very little more about closing the income gap for farmers.

The marketing cooperative will vary somewhat by the commodity it represents. Marketing cooperatives have been formed more in the milk industry than in any other part of the agricultural industry. They were originally set up for several purposes, but mainly to develop an additional outlet for the sale of milk. And, of course, some were set up with the hope of bargaining for a fair price. These cooperatives have, however, developed largely into sales groups with practically no bargaining power, and since there are so many of them, they have become competitive with each other—thus dividing farmers' bargaining power. The milk cooperatives remain as a sales outlet for farmers but they have not changed their structure to meet very many pricing problems for farmers. This is proved by the prices dairy farmers receive for their products. No one should ever indicate, however, that the milk cooperatives do not perform important services in handling milk production, because they do. The time and efforts farmers have put into their cooperatives have not all been wasted. The experience farmers have gained can be very useful and the services the cooperatives perform must be used to a great extent.

Today, we do have several grain cooperatives, but they, too, have become largely competitive with each other; thus dividing farmers' bargaining power. Still, they do perform some necessary services.

Cooperatives in the livestock field have generally been small. Some packing plants have been started but with very little success.

In summing up, cooperatives do perform many necessary services, but their individual structures make it impossible for them to effectively compete with organized, volume buyers. No one can argue against the theory of cooperatives but their fixed structures and lack of volume keep them from meeting modern day agricultural pricing problems.

FARM EFFICIENCY MUST INCREASE

Farmers are applying new and more efficient methods to their operations and this they should. They must continually be on the alert for new and better, more efficient methods of production. The research done in various institutions and farm suppliers has added to the efficiency of the agricultural industry. To make the best use of new methods, it ofttimes becomes necessary to enlarge the farm operation. This is considered by many to be the solution to the farm problem.

Efficiency alone, however, will not give the farmers equal status with the rest of the economy, unless they also have a favorable margin of profit. Efficiency is necessary and it is an integral part of a successful agriculture picture—but alone, it has not brought a profit level to agriculture enjoyed by the other major business segments in our Nation's prosperous economy. Efficiency can be successful only to a point. For example—if a product is bringing a given price which is below the cost of production plus a reasonable profit, greater efficiency can help; but, after efficiency has been improved to the maximum and still a cost of production plus a reasonable profit price is not received, then something must be done about increasing the price of the product. Agriculture has already proven it is the most efficient industry in America. Still profit returns for the agricultural industry are far below the profit returns of other, less efficient industries.

A solution for the farm problem has been offered in the form of bigger and fewer farms. The object being, to raise the per capita income of farmers by having fewer farmers divide the net income of agriculture. The success of this approach, however, depends upon the disappearance from the scene of large numbers of farmers in order to insure the survival of the remainder.

This approach is based on the assumption that the profit level in agriculture will get so low that smaller farmers cannot live on their profit and will be forced to leave the farm. The fallacy in this reasoning is that a high percentage of the farmers already have outside income. Their farm income is secondary or, in plain words a sideline.

NO CHANGE FOR OUTSIDE INCOME

The larger the farm operation gets, the less chance a farmer has of subsidizing his income without side work, because if he leaves his operation under the management of hired labor, he will soon be broke. His operation requires his management. When there is no profit left in his operation because of lower and lower prices and he starts losing money, the bigger the farm the more he loses and the quicker he is out of business. His neighbor, who has stayed a smaller operator subsidizing his farming operation with outside income, will be farming long after the bigger operator is broke. Any business, in order to remain sound financially, must sell its products for a profit. A good businessman will not stay with a business that does not return a profit on the investment, comparable to that of other businesses.

The law of supply and demand is advanced as a solution to farm problems. There was a time in agriculture back when buyers and sellers had almost equal strength, that supply and demand could determine a fair price for farmers, but by its very nature, this is no longer true. For the available supply and available demand to determine a fair and equitable price, no producer can be large enough to significantly affect the total supply and no one firm or source of demand can be large enough to affect the total demand for any given commodity. Of course, we still have this situation on the supply side, but no longer do we have it on the demand side.

EXAMPLE

Largest farmers: First, 5,000 acres—more or less; second, 50,000 cattle; third, and so forth, only fraction of percent of total supply.

Largest processors: First, handle 18 percent of total production; second, handle 12 percent of total production; third, and so forth.

The two are not similar. Must be for supply and demand to determine a fair price.

GOVERNMENT WILL PUSH SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST

Some say what agriculture needs is a free market; letting supply and demand correct any and all problems. This really means survival of the fittest. The theory behind this is when there is an oversupply the price will go down until it becomes unprofitable to produce the given commodity, and then production will be decreased and the price will come back to a fair level. The business segments of the economy threw the complete use of this theory out the window a long time ago. They manufacture, maybe, a 60-day supply ahead but this supply is kept in inventory either at the manufacturer level or retailer level, and, a fair price level is maintained. In other words, this means that the business interests control the supply and create the demand by letting on to the market only that amount of their production for which they can get their price. This gives business interests stability.

If agriculture is to operate with stability it must follow the same practice. Supply and demand, of course, must be a factor but not a sole price determining one. If agriculture is to use the theory of supply and demand to its advantage then a surplus disposal system must be set up to take care of any surplus that exists or develops. This would be using supply and demand factors to the advantage of the agricultural industry.

The present marketing system has kept the consumer supplied with food after the farmers have produced it. In the early history of our Nation, the buyer and seller met and bartered. Then as the population increased and the country grew in size, the producers had to start delivering to centralized points. The buyers came to these points. Buyers increased in numbers and competition grew. The prices paid to agricultural producers generally lagged behind the prices paid to the rest of the economy,

but still followed general prosperity to a great degree driving prosperous periods.

The present marketing system was developed largely for, and in many cases by, the buyers. Times and economic factors have changed, but the marketing system has not. New forces have appeared. The present marketing system is really only a distribution system. The services rendered are inefficient and costly to the producer.

CHAINSTORES RULE THE ROOST

Today, the chainstores rule the roost. They tell the processors the price they are paying. This means that when a farmer delivers his products, the price he is going to be paid has already been determined, and the buyers only reflect in their bids the price the chainstore is going to pay. This means the present marketing system does practically nothing about price. The producer has wasted his money when there are more delivery points than the farmers really need or any charges are paid for anything other than handling. The farmers, therefore, are the victims of many living off them by charging for services which are only a waste of time, money, and effort. The present marketing system only serves to allow the buyer to pit one farmer against another individual farmer. Small outlets are pitted against each other and the larger volume markets pit one area against another area.

The present marketing system is a buyers' market, with the buyers naming the price to be paid as the farmer delivers his products and says, "What will you give me?" Under the present marketing system, instead of marketing his product the farmer takes his product to the marketplace and pays the penalty.

The only answer to present-day agricultural problems must be a modern marketing system that will bring equity of income to agricultural producers and meet the marketing problems of the agricultural industry.

MARKETING SYSTEM IS THE KEY TO SUCCESS

Let us study the basic requirements for a successful modern-day marketing system. This system must make it possible for producers to establish bargaining power equal to or greater than the strength of the buyers. Until this is done the producers will continue to take the prices offered by the buyer. The producers must get in the position and be ready and willing to cut off their available supply to the buyers in order to back up farmers' bargaining power.

Bargaining between two strong economic forces is a battle between two giants. In a battle of this nature, you can expect strong disagreements to arise and these disagreements will not always be settled without a struggle. The producers cannot make their bargaining power felt and will always be forced to yield, unless they can and do cut off the available supply to the processor. This means the producers must be willing to keep their products on the farm until buyers are willing to bargain in good faith. This fact has been substantiated by some university studies on farmers' bargaining power. For example, the pamphlet from Purdue University, "Group Bargaining Power for Farmers," had this to say:

> In order to secure beneficial results at the bargaining table, the group must have some degree of power with which it can force concessions from the opposing side in order to secure a favorable solution to the negotiation.

Buyers are strong and well organized. Some of the larger processors in each commodity have plants or facilities in all major agricultural producing areas. This means producers must have one centralized bargaining organization which bargains industrywide, or the buyers cannot be dealt with successfully. Any division of bargaining power only lets the buyers pit group against group. It is also necessary for one centralized bargaining organization to cover all major commodities. Otherwise, any gains made will soon be lost, because farmers will shift to producing the commodities for which the gains were made. However, if gains are made on all major commodities and these are gains kept in relative balance, then there will be no added incentive for producers to shift from producing one commodity to another commodity.

FARMERS MUST ORGANIZE TO SURVIVE

In order for producers to achieve the desired success in the bargaining field, they must first have an organization. The following statement taken from Special Report No. 10, entitled "Agricultural Bargaining Power: Some Factors To Consider," published by the University of Minnesota, points out this fact:

> Apparently if farmers are to achieve greater bargaining power it must come about through group action, since the individual farmer has little or no bargaining power.

Bargaining cannot be carried out successful unless the organization that represents the producers, has the proper structure. The organization must have stability of membership. This can be accomplished only through the use of membership agreements which are binding on both the organization and the producer. This membership agreement should cover the rights and obligations of the producer as a member, as well as the responsibility of the organization. There must be enough teeth in the membership agreement to make it possible for the organization to be able to make and carry out marketing obligations for its members. The membership agreement should clearly define the bargaining procedures so the rights of the members will always be protected. A program to take care of excess production must be authorized under the membership agreement. This is necessary because farmers must not only be concerned about getting fair prices for their products, they must also be willing and ready to meet all the marketing problems of the agricultural industry in order to be successful.

A careful balance of control must be maintained in the organization because an organization such as this would be very powerful. All major decisions on marketing conditions and prices bargained for should always be made by the members—not by one individual or a board of directors, and these decisions should require a high percentage approval of the members affected.

There must be enough centralized control in the organization to build effective bargaining power industrywide, with the ability to combat organized and well financed opposition. Democracy must always be maintained within the organization so it will always work for the benefit of farmers.

The organization must be adequately financed. In the initial phases, dues will be necessary, but after the organization is in full operation there should be a percentage checkoff on all sales made in benefit of the members. This is the only fair way to finance the organization because this way, each member will pay his proportionate share based on benefits received.

ORGANIZE OR PERISH

The organization should have one goal and one purpose—meeting the farmers' marketing problems. If the organization is in business, then there is a conflict of interest. The leaders are likely to be more interested in making a profit on the business than in getting fair prices for farmers. This has caused the downfall of past efforts.

The organization must operate in such a manner that there will be close cooperation and understanding between the members and the leaders. The goals, objectives, and methods should be clearly understood by both so there will be the least possible wasted effort. A clear understanding of these points will also make it more difficult for organized opposition to divide the efforts of the organization.

Contracts with processors must be secured if prices are to be stabilized and marketing problems met. Contracts protect gains made and assure continuity of programs. A contract is necessary because this is the only method that can be used to spell out the obligations of both the processors and the bargaining organization.

EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS TO HANDLE EXCESS PRODUCTION MUST BE DEVELOPED

There must be an efficient system for supplying the processor and, in turn, the consumer needs.

The organization must be a dependable source of supply for the processors. This is the reason the membership agreement must have enough teeth so when contracts are signed with processors, the products will be delivered.

A continued educational program should be carried on to keep the consumers informed about the farmers' problems and to keep the farmers informed of the desires and needs of the consumers.

Price incentives should be paid for quality production. The producer who produces a quality product, should be paid accordingly.

The organization should be fair and always ready to listen to the problems of the processors and others. However, its prime responsibility is to meet the needs of its members and this should never be forgotten.

Success of the organization will largely depend upon the cooperation and support of its members and the members must continually keep increasing the strength of their organization through the signing of new members.

This concludes the part of the study relating to the economic conditions of agriculture, the past proposed solutions, the advantages and disadvantages of the present marketing system, and the basic requirements of a successful modern day marketing system. We have sincerely tried to be unbiased in this frank analysis of what has been happening in agriculture as far as marketing is concerned. The points that we have made on the weaknesses of past efforts were not intended to be derogatory in nature. They were intended to be constructive in nature, so pitfalls of the past can now be avoided. It is our belief that the experiences of the past can be used to meet the challenge that American agriculture faces today. It seems to us that thinking farmers will agree with the basic requirements outlined for a successful modern day marketing system. We must forget the animosities of the past and build together, as producers, for the future.

NFO PROGRAM MEETS FARMERS' NEED

The structure of the NFO collective bargaining program meets all the basic requirements necessary to put a successful modern day marketing system into operation.

The NFO collective bargaining program was developed by farmers and offers all farmers the only opportunity they ever had to solve their pricing and marketing problems in a businesslike manner that will bring stability to their industry. There is a great deal of misunderstanding about the NFO collective bargaining program and the methods the NFO is using in its efforts to secure fair and stable prices for the American farmers. We want to take time to generally discuss the structure of the NFO, the progress it has made, the purpose and use of holding actions, the signing of contracts with processors and the job yet to be done.

The most misunderstood part of the NFO program is the purpose and use of holding actions. Therefore, we will have a thorough discussion on holding actions and on the organization's stand and policy concerning violence. The biggest unanswered question in the minds of many farmers concerning the NFO program is what will be done with surpluses when NFO is successful. Very few nonmembers realize that the NFO has a detailed plan that will prevent surpluses from developing in several commodities and has a structure ready to put into operation that will take care of any surpluses that may exist or develop in the other commodities. All of these points will be thoroughly discussed and a clear explanation will be given.

NFO—FOR FARMERS BY FARMERS

The NFO is made up entirely of farmers and run by farmers. Only producers of farm commodities can be members of the NFO. This means the NFO is truly a farm organization. The bylaws of the organization prohibit it from going into business. Therefore, it is a service organization. It has only one service to offer farmers and that is the opportunity for farmers to join together to meet the one problem that has never before been met for farmers; a way in which they can start pricing their products at the marketplace using the same principles and methods that everyone else in the economy uses to price their products or services.

Farmers do not have a choice. They are either going to price their products together and meet the marketing problems of their industry, or they are going to continue to go to the marketplace and say, "What will you give me?" and let the buyers determine the prices that are going to be paid.

If farmers choose to sit back and do nothing about their marketing problems, then they can expect to reecive lower and lower prices for their products. No one else will solve their problms for them. There may be an occasional upturn in price, but it will be short lived, and the next drop in prices will reach even lower levels. This has been the general price pattern for the last 12 years. Every farmer who has been farming since 1952 knows this to be true.

On the other hand, farmers do have the opportunity to meet their pricing problems through the NFO. NFO members and leaders honestly believe that almost every farmer who will take time to study the NFO collective bargaining program with an open mind, will join and will be an active members because he will realize he has nothing to lose and everything to gain.

The NFO has always stressed that the first and always the most important step farmers must carry out in order to price their products at the marketplace is to organize. Nothing can be substituted for strength at the bargaining table. Many farmers have been fearful of the NFO membership agreement. It is hard to understand why this has happened, because the membership agreement is written in plain, everyday language and is easy to understand. It very clearly points out the obligations of both the NFO and the member. The membership agreement must be used to unite farmers' bargaining strength under the NFO collective bargaining program and give stability to the organization.

The best way to get a clear picture of the meaning of the membership agreement is to pick out the most important points and study them. They are as follows:

When a farmer joins the NFO, he authorizes the NFO to be his bargaining agent for all the commodities marketed from his farm with the exception of those already covered by marketing contracts.

FARMERS MUST BE FREE TO MARKET

He is free to market as he chooses until such time as a contract is consummated with a processor, and the only way a contract can be consummated with a processor is by a two-thirds vote of approval by members attending a meeting for which they have been given a 10-day written notice sent by first-class mail, giving the date, time, place, and purpose of the meeting. This is the greatest protection a member could have because two-thirds of the members will never vote to bind themselves to market under the NFO until they know the terms of the contract with a processor including price, delivery points, and all the marketing requirements expected of them.

The membership agreement is a legal and binding document. The member signs the membership agreement for a period of 3 years and agrees to pay $25 per year for dues and fees. If, during this period of time, a contract is consummated with a processor and a member sells under this contract, then 1 percent of his gross sales will replace his membership dues and fees. This will be the cheapest marketing cost a farmer has ever paid and he will be getting a fair price for his products. The NFO is not saying "Pay 1 percent and we will get you a price." It is saying "We will get you a fair price and then you will have to pay 1 percent to keep the program operating in the future."

A member may terminate his membership in the NFO at the end of his 3-year period. In order to do so, he must give written notice of his desire to do so not more than 20 days nor less than 10 days prior to his expiration date. If no notice is given, then his membership will automatically be renewed for another 3-year period. This is the same type of termination clause that is carried in many marketing arrangements.

No contract or agreement can be effective unless it contains a penalty clause. Therefore, the membership agreement specifies that when a contract has been consummated with a processor covering a member's commodity and the member sells his commodity to a processor other than the one specified by the contract, the member shall be assessed 10 percent of the gross sale of the commodity for liquidated damages. This clause was put in the membership agreement largely to give assurance to processors that they will receive the supply they have contracted for when their contracts with the NFO are in effect. It is not expected that the penalty clause will ever have to be used against NFO members because, certainly, they will never give their two-thirds vote approval to put contracts with processors into effect until they know they are going to receive many advantages. Therefore, they should have no desire to market elsewhere.

Provisions are contained in the membership agreement for a surplus disposal program that can meet the problems of any surpluses that may exist or develop.

NFO BARGAINING ESSENTIAL

The other provisions of the membership agreement clearly establish the obligation of the NFO in bargaining—how it is to be done while keeping all the major pricing and marketing decisions in the hands of the members. The responsibilities of both the NFO and the member are clearly defined. The farmer joining the NFO does not sign a membership agreement that can be easily changed, because no changes can be made with-

out the two-thirds vote approval method by the members, as has been outlined for ratification of contracts with processors. Certainly, the NFO membership agreement is democracy at its best. It makes it possible for NFO members to keep control of the organization and still bring their production together in an effective manner for the purpose of bargaining. The most any member could lose would be $25 a year because he is completely protected through the two-thirds vote approval requirement. Twenty-five dollars a year is a small investment, indeed, to protect the large investment a farmer has in his business. A farmer joining the NFO has nothing to lose and everything to gain.

A member is bound to the organization by the membership agreement. The bylaws in the NFO cover the administrative end of the NFO. The rights and obligations of the members are spelled out in the membership agreement and cannot be changed through the bylaws. The only mention of the bylaws in the membership agreement has to do with the processing of complaints and payment of dues and fees. The bylaws of the organization set a system of checks and counterchecks to keep proper administrative balance in the organization.

The officers are responsible for picking the best qualified personnel they can find to carry out the functions of the organization. It is their obligation to see that the efforts are coordinated and that the organization keeps moving forward as fast as possible toward complete victory which is so vital to the future of agriculture. They must keep informed and carefully analyze every situation so mistakes and pitfalls can be avoided. It is their duty to keep the membership informed, as much as possible, on the activities and progress of the organization. They must give the best advice they can to the members on steps to be taken and strategy to be used in bargaining. Cooperation between members and officers at all levels of the organization is of vital importance to the success of the NFO.

A farmer should not join the NFO with the same attitude that he has had many times when he joined other organizations. In other organizations, perhaps he just joined and paid his dues to have somebody else do something for him. NFO cannot be successful that way. Every NFO member should look upon the NFO as the only tool he has to meet the most pressing problem he has in his business—taking unfair prices for his products.

POWER LIES IN NUMBERS

This means members must work to get new members. This is what will bring success. Members should attend their county meetings and accept responsibility. When they are called upon to do a specific job, they should do it to the best of their ability. The NFO is only as strong as the members make it. Members must realize that in an economic battle like the NFO is waging, gains are not given away freely or easily—they must be earned. We will not win every time something is tried, but we must profit by every mistake and take advantage of every opportunity. A quitter never wins and a winner never quits, so the philosophy of all NFO members must be "We will not quit until complete victory is secured."

The next part of the NFO collective bargaining program to consider is the four basic steps that must be taken in order for farmers to price their products at the marketplace.

First. Organizing is the key to success. This is always the most important thing to do. When a farmer joins the NFO he adds his production to the strength already built. Production is what really counts at the bargaining table.

Second. A sufficient amount of the total production of any given commodity must be brought together so buyers cannot fulfill their needs from other sources.

Third. Farmers must make their bargaining power felt, and the only really effective way to do this is through the use of a holding action.

Fourth. The ultimate goal must be contracts signed and activated with processors, which will mean fair prices for farmers and make it possible for them to set up a structure whereby they can put a successful modern day marketing system into operation that will meet the marketing problems of the agricultural industry and take care of any surpluses that exist or develop.

The necessity of organizing speaks for itself. Certainly, any thinking farmer knows he cannot do anything by himself. A large number of marketing groups or marketing agencies only divide the bargaining power of farmers. Even two groups would do that. Processors must have agricultural production to stay in business. Their processing plants are only worth junk price unless they have agricultural production to process. Therefore, all farmers have to do is to bring enough of the total production together for the purpose of bargaining together and selling together, and they can price their products together.

The size of processors varies greatly, but in each commodity there are always a few, very large processors. These processors have plants or facilities in many areas. Therefore, in order to have the maximum effect on these processors, your organization must cover all the productive agricultural areas.

PROBLEMS MANY—POWERS OBSTACLES

One marketing practice not generally known is that processors and handlers in all commodities assist each other when any of them are short of supply. Two methods are used to do this.

First. Some of the production to be delivered is directed to a processor who is short of supply. In meat, this may be done from buying stations or from a plant's supply. In milk, this is done with one plant buying from another plant. In grain, it is done from elevator to elevator and by interception of grain in transit.

Second. Direct sales made from one processor or handler to another.

These facts prove first, the necessity of affecting the total supply and second, the necessity of bargaining industrywide in order to really have an effect on the processors.

Every farmer in the United States could belong to one organization but if that organization did not make it possible for the farmers to make their bargaining power felt, then the buyers would still name the price and instead of that organization being a bargaining group, it would only be another marketing agency. The real test of an organization is whether it goes to the buyers and asks them what they will give or whether a price tag is put on the products. If any group or organization uses the first approach, then that is a group or organization that is doing collective begging not collective bargaining.

FARMERS MUST SAY I WANT SO MUCH

The NFO is proud to be in the latter group: Everyone else in the economy except agriculture puts a price tag on their products or services. Farmers, too, must put a price tag on their products. If the processors will not pay the fair price the farmers have determined they must have in order to sell their production, then if an organization is really a bargaining group it must make its members' bargaining power felt. The only really effective way to make farmers' bargaining power felt is to use a holding action. This is the same principle that everyone else in the economy uses today—except the farmers. Industry puts their price tag on the products they manufacture and you either pay their price or you do without the product. That, in reality, is a holding action and it takes place every day. Labor strikes when they can not get a fair wage.

The purpose of a holding action is to temporarily reduce the available supply so processors cannot fulfill their needs from other sources and must sign contracts that will make it possible for farmers to price their products at the marketplace and set up a marketing structure that will take care of any surpluses that exist or develop. Those who oppose the NFO efforts, of course, try to convince farmers they should not hold. One of the points they talk about is tonnage buildup during a holding action. Let us look at some interesting figures on this matter.

RESULTS OF WITHHOLDING

Amount of tonnage gained in a 30-day holding action if 100 percent of cattle and calves were held off the market: Average number of cattle marketed per day, 365 days per year in the United States, in 1963, 74,608; 74,608 head of cattle gaining 2.5 pounds per day would gain in 1 day, 186,520 pounds; 74,608 head of cattle gaining 2.5 pounds for 30 days would gain 5,595,600 pounds; 74,608 head of cattle gaining 2.5 pounds for 29 days would gain 5,409,080 pounds; 74,608 head of cattle gaining 2.5 pounds for 28 days would gain 5,222,560 pounds; and so on: All cattle held off the market are not gaining for a full 30-day period. One day's kill will only be gaining extra weight for 1 day. Total amount of live weight gained in a 30-day holding action if all cattle and calves were held, 86,723,301 pounds. Total amount of live weight marketed per day on the average during

a normal period of marketing on a 365-day average, 76,413,700 pounds.

The total amount of extra tonnage gained in a 30-day holding action if all cattle and calves were held off the market and would make a daily gain of 2.5 pounds each, just a little more than 1 day's kill would be built up. On the total year's supply, this would be an increase in tonnage of less than one-third of 1 percent. The total tonnage build of pork if 100 percent of the pork was held off the market in a 30-day holding action, would be less than 1 percent increase on the total year's supply.

The average weight cattle slaughtered in 1962, was 1,005 pounds. This was 12 pounds lighter than in 1961, and 19 pounds lighter than in 1963. NFO had a holding action in 1962, proving that the processors were forced to slaughter lighter weight cattle during the holding action to get their supply, thereby bringing the yearly average weight down. The average dressed weight in 1962 was 574 pounds per carcass. Ten pounds lighter than in 1961 and 16 pounds lighter than in 1963. The yearly average price paid for cattle in 1962 was $22.95 per hundred compared to $21.41 in 1961 and $21.10 in 1963. The high for the year in 1962 was in the month of September when the market reached $24. This was the month NFO had the holding action. The high for the year 1961 was January when it reached $22.49, and the high in 1963 was also in the month of January for a price of $23.11 which was still showing the effects of the holding action, because in February it dropped to $21.73 and in March to $20.75.

Let us say that in a 30-day holding action we were holding 50 percent of the normal supply off the market. This means that 37,304 head would be going to market every day on the average. Let us say that the last 15 days of the holding action the processors were forced to get half of this 50 percent supply in a weight bracket of 70 pounds. This would cut the tonnage being processed by 90,648,720 pounds which means that in a holding action you cut the total tonnage, not add to it.

REASON MUST PREVAIL

The above figures need to be understood by farmers because it does take at least 2 weeks to really get into the core of a meat holding action. The reason for this is that the buyers always have some captive cattle they can get their hands on and there are marketing interests that can influence and/or force the sale of a certain number of cattle, hogs, and sheep. There is other organized opposition that can influence some farmers to ship their livestock. All of this livestock will be sold anyway, so the quicker it goes to market the better off the NFO is in a holding action because then the production that has not been sold is in stronger hands. Those who are opposing the NFO effort with the supply they control or are able to influence, must continually keep trying to convince more and more farmers to sell if they are to break the holding action. The only way they can do this is by making them think that the holding action is having no effect and that it is useless to hold.

Farmers should always remember that in a holding action, there is no middle ground. They are either going to support the buyers and marketing interests, or they are going to join the NFO and support the effort. If they sell, they are supporting the very people who have helped keep farm prices down.

A short holding action can accomplish very little, if anything. At the best, it can only be of a little nuisance variety. It takes several days before a holding action can really affect the buyers because of their captive sources of supply.

If you will notice, the opposition always attacks holding actions. They never mention any other part of the NFO program. The reason for this is that they know they must convince farmers a holding action will not work, because they realize that if farmers keep their production on the farm in sufficient quantities, the battle is over and the NFO has won. Afterall, what else is there to eat besides food? The processors must have agricultural production for their plants. If they cannot get enough production from other sources and NFO is the only source they can get it from, then they will be forced to sign contracts with the NFO for the production they must have. And these contracts will return farmers fair prices and make it possible for them to meet their marketing problems.

Demonstrations are often held in a holding action. Many are started by individuals. There are a few points to remember about demonstrations. First, they must always be peaceful. Demonstrations are important, but must be used for two purposes—first, to show the strength of the organization; and, second, to prove to the buyers that farmers are united and have organized to sell together and that they are going to price their products at the marketplace.

A holding action is a voluntary action. All the NFO does is advise its members to hold for the prices they have determined they must have. NFO members are asked to contact nonmembers for the purpose of explaining the NFO collective bargaining program and asking nonmembers to join the NFO and support the efforts.

This economic battle will never be won on the highways of the Nation or on someone else's business property. It must be won through reasoning and persuasion in the barnyard. Anytime the production leaves the farm, it is too late as far as that production is concerned.

NFO DOES NOT ADVOCATE VIOLENCE

The NFO policy concerning violence is very clear and emphatic. The NFO does not advocate or condone violence. In a holding action, you have a situation where opponents of NFO will do everything possible to blacken the name of the organization. There are many times when an inflamatory situation develops because a farmer has decided to hold and has promised his neighbor that he will hold, and then he lets a buyer or a market representative convince him that he should sell and he sells. The one that really causes trouble like this to develop is the buyer or the market representative who convinced the farmer to sell, but, of course, he has already headed back to town or perhaps he just called the farmer from a telephone many miles away. These situations call for cool heads and good reasoning.

Many times false promises are made or false information is given to get the farmer to sell. When this is done, it is very obvious that the buyer or market representative is only trying to keep farmers at his mercy so he can continue to make his profits off of the farmers or keep collecting his commissions. It is time farmers wake up. Just where have these buyers and market representatives been and what have they been doing while farmers' prices have continued to go down? Have they not been making their profits and collecting their regular commissions? Farmers had better realize that their only real friends are other farmers with the same problems and that it is time they supported each other. Farmers must start running their own business instead of letting someone else run it for them.

As the NFO has continued to make great progress, it has become obvious to the processors, even the largest, that the NFO is representing many times the volume of production that any other source of supply represents. This turns their attention to the NFO. They are also realizing more and more, that unless they get in on the ground floor their competitors can get a source of supply they can never get.

SOME SUCCESS NOTED

Because of these reasons, the NFO has been successful in setting up some marketing arrangements with some of the Nation's largest meat processors. These marketing arrnagements are of great importance to the NFO, to the processors, and to the farmers in general. As far as the NFO is concerned, they are important because:

First. It is recognition by the processors.

Second. This is setting up the initial phase of the NFO structure for a successful, modern-day marketing system which will go into operation when the master contracts are activated.

Third. It gives the NFO an opportunity to prove that it can do what it says it can do. This means getting a flow of livestock to the participating processors in an orderly manner and in the quantity they need.

Fourth. It starts members actively cooperating in marketing and gains experience in the marketing field for the NFO.

Fifth. It helps build NFO's bargaining power and puts pressure on nonparticipating processors. If a nonparticipating processor has been getting a high percentage of his supply in one area and much of that supply starts going to a participating processor, then the nonparticipating processor must go farther to get his supply. As his procurement costs rise, he will soon see the advantages of becoming a participating processor.

In the meantime, the job of the NFO is to get more and more nonmembers to join the NFO so we have enough production to fill the processors' needs, as more

and more of them look to the NFO for their supply. This is a race of time for the NFO. We are getting close to setting off a chain reaction where processors will be changing their procurement methods if NFO members really cooperate in marketing together because we now have enough of the total production signed to do this. The race of time means we must sign every nonmember we can now, so we can keep ahead of this chain reaction. This can only be done if NFO leaders and members keep working and signing new members.

These marketing arrangements are of great importance to processors because: First. Today we have a very inefficient marketing system. Many times, processors get their supply a long ways away from their plants. They do this because of past business practices. This costs the farmers because, in the end, it is taken off of the general price level. Under the NFO marketing arrangements, the supply will come from close by into the plants. This will cut transportation costs, cut down on bruises, and reduce procurement costs.

Second. This will develop into a dependable and even flow source of supply.

OTHERS NOW DETERMINE PRICES FOR FARMERS

Today, farmers are paying many marketing costs that do not help them at all pricewise. Livestock prices, today, are almost entirely determined by the chain stores. They let the prices be known, in many instances 2 to 4 days ahead of purchases. Therefore, the price the farmers receive for their products only reflects the price the chain stores are paying, which is usually a rather uniform price. The processors receive information each day on the general price being paid for fresh meat cuts. They get this information by teletype and it is put out by the packers' organization. This is called the yellow sheet. Let us use an example—suppose $30 a hundred is being paid for a given carcass. This is a price based on a central point. The buyers then figure the transportation difference and their prices are established. Any costs paid by farmers other than absolute necessary handling costs are wasted. Marketing arrangements will save market costs. There, of course, will be specified delivery points. Existing facilities will be used when possible, but the number of facilities used will be greatly reduced from the present number used today.

On cattle, the NFO members will usually be able to sell on a grade and yield basis, if they desire. Present marketing interests have fought this. However, when farmers can be certain an accurate grade and yield is being given them, they will benefit by selling on this basis. Here is why: A buyer must buy under what an animal will grade out much of the time, because he will soon lose his job if he buys very much livestock that does not dress out. Packers keep a record on each lot purchased. The NFO has made arrangements at several plants where a member can see his own cattle on the hook. This can make the member a little additional money. Farmers, in general, are already benefiting from marketing arrangements in some areas without realizing it. As the marketing arrangements start working, existing groups start cutting marketing charges and raise prices. Watch for this and let people know why it is happening. Do not sell marketing arrangements on the basis of getting a price advantage because it is not legal for buyers to pay a price advantage. Savings in marketing costs can, however, result in a better price for members at times. Present marketing groups will fight hard and raise prices abnormally in trying to break the NFO effort. Do not let this confuse you. Marketing arrangements must never be considered our goal. They must be used to pave the way for contracts that will get fair prices for farmers, and they are very important for this purpose.

NFO is working along the same line in grain. Plans are underway to move some dairy products under more favorable conditions. All these efforts are making other groups more active. Cooperatives which, in the past, have fought each other, have now merged. The more pressure NFO builds, the faster we will have complete victory.

WE MUST BUILD TO SUCCEED

All efforts take the full cooperation of members. They must realize that they will make a little sometimes and then, they may lose a little. But, we must always keep our ultimate goal in sight. All of the steps NFO is taking are necessary to lead to our ultimate goal—contracts with processors that make it possible for farmers to price their products and set up a marketing structure that meets the problems of the agricultural industry, including taking care of any surpluses that exist or develop.

Contracts with processors is the only way to maintain the gains made. A master contract is necessary because bargaining must be done industrywide. One processor can no more pay a fair price for agricultural products than one farmer can establish bargaining power for agriculture by himself. Farmers must establish enough bargaining power to be the controlling factor in the industry and on all major commodities. This also means that minor commodities can either help lead the battle or follow the major commodities.

The NFO has already signed many processors of dairy, grain, and meat to master contracts. These contracts stipulate the price based on quality products, that NFO members have decided they must have; incentives to be used where possible to reduce the supply; take seasonal variations in cost of production into consideration; meet processors' supply needs; have a services-rendered clause making it possible for NFO members to receive an advantage over nonmembers because of services rendered, and sets up a surplus disposal fund and a promotional fund.

MASTER CONTRACTS ESSENTIAL

In order for NFO members to start pricing their products under the master contracts, enough processors must have signed the contract to have reached the 60-percent activation figure of NFO members must be in a position to market 60 percent of the designated production, which means that enough of the industry and producers have been signed up to be the controlling factor in the market. With processors signing master contracts with the NFO, it means that NFO is well into the last phase of its collective-bargaining program. All it takes to activate the contracts is for enough more farmers to join the NFO and add their production to the present strength already built by NFO members, and the economic battle for farmers has been won. The only thing holding up final success is farmers, themselves, because the NFO collective-bargaining program is sound and the NFO is well on the way to complete victory. Complete victory is assured because of the strength of the NFO. How soon this comes about depends on the efforts NFO members exert and on farmers themselves.

When farmers price their products at fair levels they must also meet the marketing problems of their industry in order to maintain their gains. All major commodities must be brought up in relative balance. This is a vital part of the NFO collective-bargaining program. If this is not done, just as soon as victory is won in one commodity many of the farmers producing other commodities would start producing that commodity, and the gains made would soon be destroyed. However, if all commodities are brought up in relative balance, then there is no more incentive to shift production of one commodity to another commodity than there is today. Therefore, the production of the entire agricultural plant must increase before any increased surplus production problem will develop. This could not come about overnight, and besides the population is rapidly increasing.

NFO HAS SURPLUS SOLUTION

Very few people, except NFO members, realize that the NFO collective-bargaining program covers the taking care of any surplus that may exist or develop. Let us look at the basic principles of the NFO program that covers any surplus production. First, in the past, the problems on surplus production have usually developed before anything was done about the surplus. The problem is much easier taken care of before it develops. The NFO cannot set quotas on individual producers—only the Government can legally do this. So then, how will NFO do it? Production can be in balance with consumption: First, before it is produced; second, after production has started; or third, after it is completed. In order for NFO to use step 1, it will take a vast educational program and great producer support. The reduction of production on livestock, after it is started, can be accomplished through contracts with processors using incentives to sell hogs, cattle, and sheep at lighter weights. Example: Butcher hogs are normally marketed at a 230-pound average. Before tonnage got too heavy the spread between lighter and heavy weight hogs could be increased until it became unprofitable to sell at heavier weights. Incentives could be used to get bred beef heifers sold which would break the cattle cycle. Incentives could be paid on choice veal dairy heifer calves to reduce future milk production. These would not be expensive programs when done industrywide.

On grain, a 12-month supply becomes available for market in a 30- to 60-day period of time at harvest time. This means the grain must be stored and storage charges must be added to the price. Any production left over at the end of each year must be disposed of because the building up of supply with storage costs rising would wreck the entire effort. The problem of one commodity cannot be considered just a problem of that commodity because if this is done, it will soon affect other commodities. A surplus disposal fund will be set up when contracts are activated. The 2 percent to go into this surplus disposal fund will be more than taken care of as far as net to the NFO member is concerned from money received from the processors for services rendered. This will be largely derived from savings over the present marketing system and from improvements in procurement for processors, as well as many other improvements for processors. A large portion of the surplus disposal fund will be used to buy burdensome supplies from normal market channels. Poorer quality products will be bought in order to cheapen the total cost. This would be comparable to the inventory always kept by industry. The products bought could be sold back into market channels as needed. Other methods of disposal could be diverting the products bought to worthwhile welfare work—a humanitarian service by agriculture. These products could also be used for the development of new foreign markets overseas by reducing prices. This cannot be done under present methods of marketing. Remember, when discussing agricultural surpluses, there has seldom been more than a 2- or 3-percent surplus produced in any given year.

MILK PROBLEM CAN BE SOLVED

In milk bargaining, it must always be remembered that approximately 50 percent of the milk production goes into bottled milk and 50 percent is manufactured. A fairly high percentage of the milk bottled is sold by producers under marketing agreements. These cannot be disturbed while in effect. This means we must organize all producers we can who are selling milk going for manufacturing purposes and sign all manufacturing plants possible. We must also sign all other milk producers to the NFO membership agreement; thus bringing their production, other than milk, under the NFO. As these producers see NFO working, they will, undoubtedly, urge their existing groups to form legal structures to sell together and this will, in the end, bring about the setting up of a legal structure with the NFO that will unite farmers bargaining power. This will mean using existing groups, experience and facilities to assist all commodities in meeting the needs of agriculture. These steps are to be taken when master contracts are activated. If additional problems arise concerning surpluses the NFO has the structure through which those problems can be met. The NFO is setting up a vast oversea sales network. Contacts have already been set up in 52 foreign countries.

NFO GROWTH PHENOMENAL

The NFO's growth has far surpassed any previous efforts in agriculture. This has come about because thinking farmers know the NFO's collective-bargaining program is sound. The bargaining of NFO is many times greater than that which previously has been achieved in agriculture. This is the reason NFO is making great strides in bargaining with processors. Processors will learn that the NFO collective-bargaining program will also solve many of their problems and establish stability in the entire industry.

The challenge to agriculture is clear. Are farmers ready to stop their punishment at the marketplace or do they want more? They can stop it. The NFO collective-bargaining program is the answer. The formula is simple:

First. Organize into the NFO for the purpose of bargaining together, selling together, and pricing agriculture production together.

Second. Use holding actions when necessary to get sufficient contracts signed by processors.

The challenge to NFO is to give leadership to farmers to finish up the job. No one else can or will do it. Other feeble efforts will be made as NFO gets closer to its goal but NFO has the only program that can do the entire job. The strength of the NFO is now so great that a continuous battle will be waged until complete victory is achieved. This means holding actions will come at frequent intervals with periods in between being used to set up marketing arrangements and to carry on negotiations with processors.

The most important job at hand as always is to organize. This means every NFO member working to sign up nonmembers. Production brought together under the NFO membership agreement is what it takes to win. The NFO is calling on all nonmembers to join the NFO now so we can all start pricing our products at the marketplace like business men and women.

Urban Renewal Causes Bulldozer Shudders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 14, 1965.

It demonstrates one of the pitfalls encountered in the administration of an urban renewal program in New York City.

The article follows:

WHERE THE WORDS "URBAN RENEWAL" CAUSE BULLDOZER SHUDDERS

(By James Lynn)

On the western edge of Harlem, literally in the shadow of Morningside Heights these winter afternoons, is a four-block patch of land that has been officially designated as something called a neighborhood conservation district.

When the city created the Morningside neighborhood conservation program, less than 4 years ago, the idea was to upgrade the buildings in the district, which range from big, labyrinthine apartments on Morningside Avenue to brownstone rooming houses on the side streets from 120th to 123d.

Like most schemes to make people comply with the letter of the law, the Morningside program has been something less than a complete success. But it has been a good deal more than a failure, and now the people who live in the conservation district and have tried to make the program work are afraid that all their efforts may have been wasted.

A proposal is before the Morningside Renewal Council that would swallow up the conservation district in an urban renewal area under the Morningside general neighborhood renewal plan. Rightly or wrongly, many of the tenants and landlords on those 4 blocks are convinced that urban renewal means bulldozing their buildings.

They will get a chance to voice their fears at a renewal council meeting Thursday night, but the council will almost certainly vote to put the district under urban renewal. Its steering committee has already voted twice to do so.

A PHYSICAL SEPARATION

The renewal council takes in dozens of organizations, including most of the big institutions on Morningside Heights: Columbia University and its satellites, Union Theological Seminary, St. Luke's Hospital, Riverside Church, and so on. The conservation district is separated from these institutions, geographically and otherwise, by the crags of Morningside Park.

The institutions generally favor urban renewal below the park, but most of them voted at the last renewal council meeting to have the steering committee reconsider its first decision. The committee held a special meeting, invited the people in the district to state their views—and voted again for urban renewal.

The Reverend Dr. Eugene Callender, of the Presbyterian Church of the Master, spoke in favor of renewal at that special meeting, although he will vote against it Thursday night because his own congregation is opposed. Dr. Callender argues that the city's conservation program in the district is scheduled to end in June anyway.

But Patrick White, an accountant who lives with his family in one of the big apartment buildings on Morningside Avenue, says the city's conservation director in the district, J. Lloyd Grant, has not ruled out the possibility that somebody from the city can stay on part time to help hold the community's gains against building blight and landlords' indifference.

"The citizens of the area have awakened themselves to the point where they care what goes on in the area," Mr. White told the renewal council last month. And a tour of some of the building in the district confirms that the citizens do care.

The people who own those brownstone roominghouses and live in them themselves often have "two or three mortgages sitting on their heads now," according to Garland Lamb, who owns property in the district with his wife, LaCretia, but does not live there.

PLUMBING PROBLEMS

The burden of ownership is further weighted, Mr. Lamb went on, by the new city sanitary code, which requires a bathroom on every floor of a roominghouse, even if two floors of it are occupied by the owner and his family. Mrs. Ada Jackson, who paid off

her mortgage only a year or so ago, was given a crushing estimate of $7,300 for plumbing work to make her brownstone comply with the new law.

And what worries people like Mrs. Consuelo Pickering about urban renewal is the likelihood that roominghouses in the area may be banned even if the buildings are not torn down. Mrs. Pickering stood in one of the large, clean rooms she rents for $12 a week and complained in a voice touched with a Virgin Islands accent:

"I cannot take the chance of turning this house into units. In the first place, you have to put the tenants out. And after that, it's a vacancy all the time."

The city's housing and redevelopment board says there is no blanket prohibition on roominghouses in urban renewal areas, any more than there is any certainty that the existing buildings would be razed to make way for high-rise apartments.

SOMEONE WHO CARES

But the emphasis in urban renewal projects unquestionably is on creation of individual apartments for each family unit. The question is whether the people who move out of Mrs. Pickering's $12 a week rooms can afford to move into self-contained apartments that rent for twice as much, or even more.

Not all the landlords in the district are like Mrs. Pickering, who has been renting rooms since 1943 and still has to work in a doctor's office downtown to help make ends meet. Some of the absentee landlords, in particular, have needed a good deal of prodding to make their buildings conform to the various codes of the buildings, health, fire, and sanitation departments.

But the plumbers are working now even in some of the bad buildings, and for every foot-dragging landlord there is another like Mrs. Marie Gillem, who was taking good care of her brownstone before the city ever thought of neighborhood conservation.

"I believe if you're going to live in a place you should fix it for your life," Mrs. Gillem says. "These houses was well built, because when I remodeled"—she bought the house in 1949—"they broke their saws on the wood."

And there are still others like Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Whiteman, who have only one tenant in their 15-foot-wide brownstone, but keep three floors for themselves because the three children they brought up there—scattered now to New Jersey and Virginia—like to come back to the home place with their own children.

Backers of renewal point out that the conservation district might actually fare better under Federal funds, which are now available for city code enforcement, than it would if city conservation is phased out this summer. But the very words "urban renewal" sound too much like "Negro removal" to some ears, and the neighborhood is worried that population pressure from predominantly white Morningside Heights will push Negroes farther toward the ghetto of central Harlem.

The suspicions are not lulled by stories like Mrs. Charlotte Pointer's. Mrs. Pointer has lived on Morningside Avenue for about 20 years, although she did have to move 5 years ago to make room for Public School 180 at West 120th Street.

ONE OF THE WORST

Mrs. Pointer lives only three blocks north of that school, and right across the street from Public School 125 at West 123d Street. But her children and her grandchildren have had to go north of 125th Street to school—"through one of the worst areas of the city," she says—because Public School 180 is zoned for Morningside Heights children.

In the same building with Mrs. Pointer lives Mrs. Ivy Hazzard, who came to New York from Jamaica 47 years ago and moved into her present six-room apartment in 1941. She works as a beautician and pays $95 and change in rent every month, about $30 less than Mr. White pays for an identical layout on another floor.

"I would like to stay," Mrs. Hazzard says, and she is not convinced she would be able to stay under urban renewal. Conservation was a good thing, she says, because "it pushed the hand of the landlords, and if it cleaned out one apartment it was good for all the apartments."

No matter what Mrs. Hazzard and the other tenants think, though, Morningside Heights has a majority on the renewal council. As Mrs. Hazzard puts it, "It seems the people that don't live in the area have the most say."

The Present Situation of the Hungarian Minority in Transylvania

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague from New York [Mr. HALPERN] in deploring the mistreatment of the Hungarians living in Communist Rumania.

The 1,700,000 Hungarians in that country constitute the largest ethnic minority in Eastern Europe. Their cultural institutions are threatened with destruction by the Communist regime, largely because of the Hungarian Revolution in 1956.

The uprising in Budapest established the Hungarians, both in Hungary and in Rumania, as the enemies of the Communist state. Demonstrations of sympathy with the freedom fighters were conducted in Rumania while the fighting was in progress. Hungarian students marched in Cluj, Medias, Timisoara, and Tirgu Mures. The demonstrations frightened the Communists. It appeared for a time that the revolution might spread into Rumania itself.

As a result, those who took part in the demonstrations were savagely repressed. Russian troops throttled the nationalistic outbreak in Rumania, and thousands of Hungarians were arrested—many of them were later executed. The Rumanians inflicted such severe controls over the previously autonomous Hungarian group that Russian troops left the country 2 years after the revolt.

The Rumanian Government has continued its efforts to fragment and assimilate the Hungarian minority. One of the most far reaching measures has been the consolidation of Rumanian and Hungarian schools. Also, Rumanian has been designated the official language. Moreover, the state cultural agreement between the Communist governments of Rumania and Hungary has in effect ended any meaningful connection between Rumanian Hungarians and their motherland. Among other provisions of the agreement is a prohibition against the publication of any book concerning Transylvania, which is where most of the Hungarians live, without approval of the Rumanian censors.

It is no easy matter for an Hungarian living in Rumania to visit Hungary. It is not unusual for a Hungarian to wait 6 months to a year for permission to visit the motherland. Conversely, Hungarians who visit Rumania are strictly limited to certain areas.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no visible improvement in the situation since I last discussed the subject in July.

I believe the United States should oppose mistreatment of minorities where ever it occurs. I think we should lend our power and prestige to the struggle against the overt discrimination being practiced in Rumania. It should be remembered that the Hungarian and Rumanian people have many interests in common, one of them being the ambition to rid themselves of Communist domination.

At a time when Rumania seems to be seeking closer ties, both economically and politically, with the United States, I think this country should make clear its belief in the fundamental principal of equality for all races and creeds. In Rumania, specifically, I think we should be concerned with the Hungarian minority's right to conduct its own schools, use its own language and, in general, to maintain its historic institutions in a free and peaceful manner.

Paul Tsongas' Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important things that a returning Peace Corps volunteer can do for his country is to share his experiences with his friends and family in his own home community.

Paul Tsongas of Lowell, Mass., spent 2 years in Ethiopia and is now bringing that land and its problems alive for his friends in Massachusetts.

A recent column in the Lowell, Mass., Sun describes one of Paul's sessions with slides and discussion. It is a graphic account of international understanding in action and I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PAUL TSONGAS' MISSION

(By Pertinax)

LOWELL.—Paul Tsongas pointed to the picture of the little black girl squinting in the sun, her back bent under a burden of wood. "There she is," he said, "8 years old, carrying wood. She will carry wood all her life." There was that in his voice—a warmth, a hurt, a caringness—that made one understand why the Peace Corps have been able to build small oases of love and hope in the spreading desert of hate-America.

They have built more tangible things than that, too. In Paul's case, in Ethiopia, his group built a school dormitory and a library for the 1,700 students who came from a 350-mile radius to study in Wolisso—and now he is taking time from his studies at Yale Law School to give illustrated lectures, hoping to raise money to stock the library. But "lecture" is too cold a word for the informal way

Paul operates. The slides are shown, and each picture prompts a little story, or evokes a mood. Paul's delivery is studded with dry, rueful wit, making him most informative in a painless and amusing way.

Excess of any sort makes Paul wince (nothing makes him wince more than the "ostentatiousness" of the American Embassy in Ethiopia's capital, Addis Ababa, which leaves him almost speechless) and he's going to wince now because we're noting that we heard (not from him) he was so successful as the first American they'd seen in Wolisso that, henceforth, all Americans were "Tsongases" to them. He entered the country, he admits with disarming candour, "Scared. We were all scared I guess. It was much worse than we'd expected." But when it came time to leave Ethiopia he would have, if he could have, brought back chunks of it with him. Mostly people.

Ethiopia was vast, mysterious, terribly alien. Its tone seemed to be set by the bridge with three graceful arches, but it was over nothing, began and ended in nothingness. In this lush, fertile land, the people were like people anywhere, except that they seemed to be adrift in a century far removed from the 20th. The slides gave flashes of life in Walisso: Primitive housing, dressing—the stateliness of a white-clad funeral procession: "They don't mourn long here. Death is commonplace," * * * the silent child, "He followed me everywhere, never speaking. I wanted to bring him home with me," * * * a scowling fellow, "He studied in Kansas and was discriminated against. He hates America," * * * the sporting life, "We weren't too successful with our sports program. Things happened, like the time a snake coiled on the pitcher's mound and, in killing it, the baseball bat was broken"; pictures of nervous scenery, ranging from the spectacular to the insipid; and politicians, "This was the mayor. He never helped very much, but hindered when he could. But he was always on hand for speeches"; a group of grinning teens: "They were crazy about Tony Bennett's 'Rose Rose I Love You.' I got to hate that record."

The dedication ceremonies for the new dormitories were the high spot of Paul's stay, the straight, brick-walled lines and neat terraces, a bit of today in surroundings of day before yesterday. And Emperor Haile Salassie was coming too, for his first visit there in 20 years: "We'd all met him when we first arrived, and we were supposed to say a few interesting words to him. I couldn't think of a thing then, so I just shook his hand. Now I was to meet him again. I was so excited I put up the flag upside down. That way, it meant Ethiopia was in a state of war. Good thing someone noticed the mistake. I had my little speech ready in English, but the Emperor asked me to give it in Anharic. I think I must have done a poor job from the pained expression on some faces. Later, the Emperor asked me what State I came from. When I told him he said, 'Oh, the state of Kennedy.' He said he was very fond of the President. I know his death shocked them all deeply there."

After graduation from Dartmouth in 1962, Paul, son of Mr. and Mrs. Efthemios Tsongas of Fairfield Street, spent 2 months in Peace Corps study in Georgetown. He was in Ethiopia for 2 years. After his LL.B., he hopes to get his master's in African affairs, and this summer will teach at UCLA for the Peace Corps. He wants to go back to Ethiopia, for despite the light touch in his lecturing, his involvement has turned into commitment. "They're extremely sensitive there and proud. This money I'm collecting for the library now—it has to be given them in a way that won't make them think it's charity. Where they will accept a friend, they resent a Santa Claus." He is eager to go back, to feel again the sense of "being of some use * * * doing something worthwhile."

Among the most interested in Paul's audience at the Transfiguration Church in the GOYA-sponsored program were Mrs. John Goodwill of Chelmsford, whose son, Peter, is a Peace Corps teacher in Adi Quala, Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Mr. and Mrs. John Rogers Flather, whose son, Newell, served with the Corps in Ghana while another son, John, Jr., is with the Peace Corps in North Borneo.

Organized Mobocracy Well Trained To Produce Martyrs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson, Miss., Clarion-Ledger, of March 21, 1965:

ORGANIZED MOBOCRACY WELL TRAINED TO PRODUCE MARTYRS

Techniques of action by mobsters thronging the streets today are a matter of well-drilled, organized discipline.

It used to be that an army was a group of men gathered together and organized for the purpose of carrying out a specific purpose outlined by its leaders.

A mob was a disorganized group of individuals acting on separate but concurrent, emotional motivation.

Today, these things are different as has been demonstrated in streets of Southern cities during the past several years, but most vividly enacted in Alabama within the past weeks.

Now these mobs are trained, schooled, and purposeful, specially trained and practiced in the technology of directing mob action on unwilling opposition to gain their own ends.

John W. Campbell, has done an intriguing editorial on "The Mobsters," in a recent issue of Analog, a science fact-science fiction publication, pointing out that the first fundamental of mobster technique is to establish that the mob action is a peaceful demonstration.

This is to promote the idea that the nonuse of clubs, swords, or guns or other lethal devices by the mobsters constitutes peaceful action, yet neglects to acknowledge that the smothering of someone with a pillow is just as murderous as beating his brains out. It's just less noisy, since you can't hear the victim screaming, yet he winds up just as dead.

The professional mobster operates on two levels, Campbell points out. The first is on the propaganda level, establishing that his is a moral cause, a popular, democratic movement. Then there must be acceptance that the modern, nonviolence doctrine, forbids punishing criminals, which, instills the guilt or shame complex in those attempting to restrain the mobster lawbreakers.

To the mobsters, it is essential that defenders and law enforcement officers be forced to use their weapons since the mobsters must have martyrs, people bleeding, injured, and even dead.

Shame or guilt are emotions played to the extreme by mobsters. This is one of the main reasons for using young women, children, and clergymen in the front ranks of the peaceful demonstration. If they are injured or even killed in riotous outbreaks, the mobsters have gained an almost insurmountable propaganda advantage.

The mobsters work overtime shrieking abuse in the use of weapons of mob dispersal such as fire hoses, cattle prods, electric batons, and even dogs.

The mobster editorial lists a number of mob-control techniques which might be used in discouraging demonstrations without the use of the more common weapons, but does not suggest just how to handle Federal court orders overwhelmingly favorable to the mobs.

Summing up, Campbell points out that when reading the news reports, remember this:

"The Nazis, Communists, and others who have worked out the techniques of mob action over the years were ruthless, cold-blooded, highly pragmatic men of brilliant intellect. They worked out precise blueprints of how to achieve, with an unarmed mob, things that an army could not do. It's done by specific use of specific techniques of psychology and sociology. And it's done for the same purpose that an army marches; to force the opposition to surrender to the will of the mobsters."

It works, too. They'd been hailing Hitler as unarmed mobs for some time before the weakening resistance of the Germans made it time for the Nazis to start arming themselves. By that time, of course, their opposition had surrendered; the armed Nazis were intended to force the less amenable French and Polish to surrender.

Worked just fine, didn't it?

Who needs guns to conquer a country? All you need is the blueprint for mob action, unarmed citizens, and a population that doesn't realize they are being smothered into surrender. You don't hear the shrieks of the guy being smothered under a pillow.

Facts Not Whitewash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the editorial which is made a part of this insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Washington Post has made the excellent suggestion that Senator JOHN WILLIAMS of Delaware, should have headed the committee which allegedly investigated Bobby Baker and his pals.

It is too bad the Post did not come to this editorial conclusion many months ago when it became completely obvious that the majority members of the committee were interested in covering up this sordid mess, not exposing it.

There is plenty of evidence in connection with these scandals that has never been properly explored. Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware, at the head of a committee seeking the truth, could provide a great public service.

Now that it has made an excellent editorial start let us hope the Washington Post will continue to pound on its Democrat friends in Congress to install Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware, at the head of a real factfinding committee which would provide the public with the truth, no matter who may be involved.

The editorial follows:

PARTISAN INVESTIGATION?

Minority Leader GERALD FORD's bid for Republican control over the two chief investi-

gating committees of Congress has a superficial appeal. It is extremely difficult for any administration to investigate itself. When Congress and the executive branch are controlled by the same party, an investigation is more likely to be a cover-up than a rigorous factfinding operation, as the Bobby Baker inquiry demonstrated. But this does not mean that every investigation of a governmental agency should automatically be turned over to the opposition.

The unfortunate fact is that minority investigators are no less inclined to play politics than the majority. If investigation of a Democratic administration became the special prerogative of the Republicans, abuse of the power could be taken for granted. And use of the investigative power to aid a partisan assault is no less reprehensible than use of that power in a cover-up operation. The trouble with Mr. FORD's suggestion is that he assumes the investigative function is a partisan one, and it should operate as far as possible above party.

The famous Teapot Dome investigation exposing corruption in a Republican administration took place during another Republican administration with a Republican—Owen J. Roberts—as counsel, although Senator Thomas J. Walsh, a Democrat, was the most active congressional participant. Similarly the excellent work of exposing governmental inefficiency during World War II was accomplished by a bipartisan committee under Senator Harry Truman, a Democrat looking into the weaknesses of a Democratic administration. These inquiries courageously brought forth the facts without regard to partisanship.

The Senate would have been well advised to turn the Bobby Baker investigation over to a bipartisan group headed by Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware, not because he is a Republican but because of his reputation as a factfinder and the work he had already done on that case. The emphasis ought to be upon factfinding ability, knowledge of and interest in the field rather than partisan leanings. In taking investigations out of the hands of the whitewashers, it would not be sound policy to turn them over to a different set of partisans with a different ax to grind.

Danger in the Potomac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, what appeared to be an obituary was printed in the March 29 edition of the Washington Evening Star. It concerned the death of Lake Erie, the victim of manmade pollution. It saddens me to read that a lake of such size is dying from pollution because we have a river, the Potomac, which may be another victim of pollution and man's waste.

The Star story by Orr Kelly refers to attempts to revive Lake Erie before rigor mortis sets in. But Mr. Kelly cautions that if these efforts fail, "there is reason to doubt that the President can fully realize his goal of making the Potomac a model of conservation for the Nation."

These are striking words and even the hint that the Potomac may die right before our very eyes points out the tragedy of inaction, indifference, and apathy. We all know what the problem is, although we may not know the most effective way of solving it. But time is slipping through our fingers as fast as pollution is pouring into our rivers and lakes.

We must give President Johnson and Secretary Udall full support in the campaign to rid the Potomac and other waterways of pollution. I believe that we must get something done now regardless of what it costs.

This generation cannot rape the future and existence of the next generations because of inaction in our time. The death of Lake Erie may well be the bell tolling for all our water.

I hope that the appropriate committees in the Congress will take due notice of the Evening Star article which was written so well by Mr. Kelly. I therefore present it here for my colleagues to peruse:

U.S. EXPERTS NOW SEE HOPE OF SAVING DYING LAKE ERIE

(By Orr Kelly, Star staff writer)

Water experts are hoping to pull off a major scientific and engineering miracle—bringing a dying lake back to life.

If they succeed, it would be an achievement comparable to putting a man on the moon. The cost, they hope, will be somewhat less than the moon program.

The object of their hopes is Lake Erie, where the natural process of aging has been vastly speeded up by pollution streaming in from the cities and industries around its shores.

When Public Health Service water pollution control experts went to work on Lake Erie 2 years ago, almost all the scientists told them a lake can't be brought back to life—and they tended to agree.

REASON TO HOPE

"When we started, we really had no reason to believe we could reverse the dying process," said James Coulter, Assistant Chief of the technical services branch of the water control agency.

"But I think now that there's reason to hope we may come up with a program for the lake within a year."

When he was asked if anyone disagreed with his hopes for the lake, he thought for a few moments and then admitted he couldn't think of anyone outside the agency who agreed. "It's fair to say that we stand pretty much alone," he said. "We're going to have to prove our case."

But if they can prove their case, it may mean new life not only for Lake Erie but also for other lakes and even such bodies of water as the Potomac River estuary, which stretches from Washington to the Chespeake Bay and is in many ways like a large lake.

PRESIDENT'S GOAL

If they fail, there is reason to doubt that the President can fully realize his goal of making the Potomac a model of conservation for the Nation, a river where it will be not only safe but pleasant to swim, fish, water ski, and sail.

To understand what the water experts are up against, it is necessary to know something about Lake Erie's problems and how it got that way.

Every major river flowing into the lake is grossly polluted, according to C. W. Northington, director of the Pollution Control Agency's Lake Erie Field Station. The bacteria count in the Cuyahoga River, which flows through Akron and Cleveland, has been measured at a rate four times the level that would be expected in a stream of raw sewage.

Last summer, scientists went out on the lake and measured the amount of oxygen in the water at the bottom of the large central basin. They found virtually no oxygen in an area covering about half the basin, an area of 2,600 square miles.

Any fish that blunder into this vast biological desert are quickly smothered.

NO SIMPLE ANSWER

To the layman, the obvious answer is to cut off the pollutants that flow into the river in enormous amounts from municipal sewage plants, industries and farmlands.

But this would no dothing to control the huge amounts of materials that are carried in by wind and rain or are deposited by birds and animals—materials that fertilize the lake and hurry it along in its process of dying.

And a program to clean up the manmade pollution would not solve the problem caused by the millions of pounds of nutrients already in the lake.

Algae, the green scum that covers parts of the Potomac, feeds on these nutrients—primarily nitrogen and phosphorous. The tiny living organism draw oxygen from the air and the water and suck in energy from the sun. When they are near the surface, they put oxygen back into the lake, in some cases so much that it chokes the fish. But as they drift toward the bottom, they draw oxygen from the lake, creating the huge dead sea at the bottom of the lake's central basin.

A NATURAL PROCESS

When they die, they decay and further fertilize the lake so that the next crop of algae is more luxurious—and more of a nuisance—than the one before.

This is a natural process that goes on over long periods of time in all lakes. It normally takes place slowly—in geologic time. But in Lake Erie, which has been fertilized by vast amounts of pollutants, it is taking place so rapidly that changes in the lake can be measured from year to year.

Scientists suspect that a very similar process is taking place in the Potomac just below Washington. At an office in Annapolis, they are now trying to put together a "mathematical model" of the Potomac estuary. They hope soon to be able to ask questions of a computer and get back answers that will help them find ways to clean up the river.

This week, scientists from the Water Pollution Control Agency will begin to tell the people who live around Lake Erie how to solve their problems.

The first step would be to provide every city around the lake with the most efficient possible waste treatment plant. Even then, Coulter said, it may be necessary to pipe the almost pure water from these plants somewhere outside the Lake Erie basin.

Tied in with this would be a program to separate the storm and sanitary sewers in the cities around the lake so that storm waters don't overflow, carrying raw sewage into the lake.

COST IN MILLIONS

No one really knows how much this would cost but, Coulter said, it is not unreasonable to think in terms of many millions of dollars. The cost of separating the storm and sanitary sewers in just one city, Cleveland, has been estimated between $470 million and $700 million.

The bad news that the water experts are now beginning to break to the people of the Lake Erie area is that, if they do all of this, the result will not be to clean up the lake. If they are lucky, it will simply keep the lake from getting much worse.

Lake Erie will still be a dying lake, but it will die more slowly.

But Coulter and Leon W. Weinberger, chief of the water agency's basic and applied sciences branch, are hopeful that they can go beyond this and begin to bring the lake back to life.

TWO VILLAINS

To do this, they will have to find ways to remove whatever it is that causes the algae to grow, suck the oxygen out of the lake and kill the fish. The two villains, they think, are nitrogen and phosphorus. But there is so much nitrogen that removing it is a hopeless task. So they are now trying to find some practical way to get the phosphorus out of the lake.

One way would be to flush out the lake by bringing vast amounts of water from somewhere else—but this might only move the pollution problem from Lake Erie on down to Lake Ontario.

Intriguing possibilities, Coulter said, would be to harvest the unusable "scrap" fish that now inhabit the lake and scoop the blooming algae off the lake and hauling it off to be buried somewhere else.

An idea of how much it would cost to "sweep" the 10,000-square-mile lake can be gained from the fact that it has been estimated that it would cost $100,000 a year just to remove the floating debris from the few square miles of the Potomac River in the Washington area.

The 4-Month Eyesore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with redtape. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 17, 1965, which contains a classic example of the redtape syndrome:

CAR ABANDONED IN OCTOBER FINALLY HAULED AWAY

(By Tim Hutchens, of the Herald Tribune staff)

After the better part of the winter, discontented residents on 50th Street in Woodside, Queens, bade farewell yesterday to a beige and green sedan that had arrived in the neighborhood last October.

In November, leaves stopped swirling around it. Later, snow fell and plows pushed the snow around it.

Late yesterday afternoon, hours after the Herald Tribune began making inquiries about the vehicle, a police car and then a tow truck arrived and removed it from its location near 31st Avenue where it had stayed for almost 4 months.

Snow fell and then plows pushed the snow around the car.

From time to time, a policeman happened along and placed a summons on the car's windshield.

The car's owner, however, had not returned to collect them.

As a matter of fact, despite continued citizen complaints, he has not attended to his car since the last week in October when he abandoned it. The car—its windows shattered, its tires punctured—was still there yesterday.

A housewife on the block became curious about it and, in late October, called the police in the 114th precinct.

She was told, she said, that the car would be checked out.

Several weeks later, during the Christmas season, several tickets appeared on the windshield but later were blown down the street.

She called the police again and was told that the car was the problem of the Sanitation Department.

She called the Sanitation Department's office in Queens but was told that the car was a police matter.

"I went back and forth, back and forth," she said, trying to recall how often she called either the Police or the Sanitation Department people.

Yesterday, a police sergeant at the precinct gave his department's official thinking on such matters:

If a car has a license plate and is left in one spot on a public street for more than 24 hours, the police consider it their problem and notify the registered owner to move his vehicle within 3 days.

If the car has no license plate, it is considered abandoned and is a Sanitation Department problem.

The car in question bears the 1964 New York license 7752QB—indicating that the owner is probably from Queens.

"I don't know why it would take this long to move the car," the sergeant commented. He said he would investigate.

No matter whose problem it is, the car represents a violation of the city code, but neighbors saved their best legal arguments until February 1.

Any car on a public street after that date, by law, needed the 1965 registration sticker on the license plate.

No sticker came, as expected, but along came another officer, a "big husky one," a resident on the street recalled, and deftly slapped another ticket on the windshield.

"What's the idea of more tickets?" the woman who first called the police, recalled asking.

"All we can do, ma'm," she remembered his answering, "is put-on tickets."

Meanwhile, grammar school students to and from P.S. 151 down the block at 50th Street and 31st Avenue might cut themselves on the car's broken and cracked windowpanes, she fears.

What's more, neither she nor her neighbors, who live in two-story townhouses, believe that the car blends in well with their street scene.

"What's the next step?" she asked in response to the Herald Tribune's New York in Crisis series.

A man who came to her door early this month, perhaps, had a part albeit drawn-out solution.

He asked if she thought it would matter if he removed the car's right front fender. She said it didn't seem like a very good idea. The police, she said, might one day get around to claiming it.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Italian-American War Veterans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce into the RECORD some recent remarks by Mr. John F. Nave, past national commander of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States. As supreme conference marshal for that organization's recent convocation in the Capital, Mr. Nave speaks for many of the fine American citizens of Italian extraction who have served in the Armed Forces of this country.

Attached are Mr. Nave's remarks:

THIRD WASHINGTON CONFERENCE MARCH 12–14, 1965, ITALIAN-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Past National Commander John F. Nave, of Syracuse, N.Y., supreme conference marshal)

The Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, made up wholly and without exception of honorably discharged American war veterans and nonprofit and nonpolitical in scope, was originally founded and incorporated in the State of Connecticut in 1932.

Since that time other States have incorporated the group as follows: New York (1933), New Jersey (1936), California (1939), Pennsylvania (1940), Ohio (1943), Rhode Island (1950), and Florida in 1955.

However, since its birth and inception in the State of Connecticut, it has held only three Washington conferences. The first was held in 1950, headquartered in Hotel Washington; the second in 1963, at the Congressional Hotel; and the present third one in 1965 in the Hotel DuPont Plaza.

The main purpose of these conferences is to evaluate both realistically and practically the objectives and purposes of the organization not only in the academic but also pragmatic light. Hence, meetings of a national character are held in Washington, and leading American figures in the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government are counseled and asked to address the group.

For example, such legislative leaders as Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Representatives SAMUEL STRATTON, of New York, PHILIP PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, CARLETON KING, of New York, FRANK ANNUNZIO, of Illinois, ALEXANDER PIRNIE, of New York, PETER RODINO, of New Jersey, and others have attended the conference.

Such men as Veterans Administrator William Driver, Chairman, U.S. Foreign Claims Commissioner, Dr. Edward D. Re, and others have addressed the conference.

There was a separation of 18 years between birth of organization and first Washington conference, 13 years between first and second Washington conference, and only 2 years between second and third one.

The reason is statistically very clear:

We were recognized by name under only 14 different State laws in 3 different States at the time of our first conference in 1950.

We were recognized by name under only 82 different State laws in 6 different States at the time of our second conference in 1963.

We were recognized by name under only 93 different State laws in 6 different States at the time of our current third conference in 1965.

In addition, we are now recognized by administrative action under many Federal laws, such as those administered by the Internal Revenue Service, Department of Defense, U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, U.S. Patent Office (Trademark Registration), Library of Congress (Copyright Registration), U.S. Civil Service Commission—all having been gotten since 1960, save for one gotten in 1947 (IRS tax exempt status).

In short, we have made dynamic and unprecedented legislative and administrative gains since 1958. Whereas we ended the 1958 fiscal year with being recognized under 35 different State laws, by the end of the 1964 fiscal year this total jumped to 93, a meteoric rise of almost 170 percent in a very short span of 6 years. We unofficially believe that no other national organization of veterans equaled this record.

Add to this fact that the Italian American War Veterans of the United States was recognized under only 1 Federal law by administrative action before 1958, and in total 11 since then, one can surmise why these conferences were called at lesser intervals of time.

One of the biggest purposes and goals of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States is to obtain a congressional charter. After a lapse of nearly 14 years, in 1964 and again in 1965 bills have been introduced in the Congress for purposes of incorporating the organization by act of Congress.

Many fellow Americans fail to understand the importance of groups like the Italian American War Veterans of the United States. To be sure, the group is composed 100 percent of loyal and honorable discharged American war veterans. However, their purpose is to achieve and try to do those things other fellow American veterans groups cannot do, or do as well.

Our world is getting smaller. It is important we take on more of an international rather than national flavor. Our group is not hyphenated, but one with more of an international outlook. It is not looking backward, but rather forward. Unfortunately, this is grossly misunderstood.

President Kennedy in his inaugural address stated not all generations of Americans were called upon to defend freedom, only a chosen few. By the same token not all members of our organization have been given the same opportunity, except for war service. However, in 1948, when the critical elections were taking place in Italy, and whether Italy remained free as a democracy or went communistic, the issue in the United States was serious. If Italy remained free, the United States retained an ally. If Italy went communistic, the United States would, of necessity, have wound up paying billions of dollars more for armaments to stop the communistic scourge.

In 1948 the Italian American War Veterans of the United States with other groups through letter writing campaigns, packages, etc. helped to preserve democracy in Italy and retain an ally of the United States—at a tremendous savings in U.S. budgetary costs. In peace and war it is extremely important to have organizations in the United States who can bridge understandings between nations of the world.

The Congress is slowly removing its blind spots in realizing the importance of congressionally chartering veterans' organizations such as the Catholic War Veterans and Jewish War Veterans. In 1964 for the first time in American history the U.S. Senate passed congressional charter bills for these groups.

The Third Washington Conference of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States points out very strongly to the Congress that there are no Communist governments in Catholic countries save Cuba and Poland (Catholic war veterans), no communism in Israel (Jewish war veterans), no communistic government in Italy (Italian American War Veterans of the United States), no communistic government in France (Franco-American war veterans), no communistic government in England (several British American war veterans groups), no communistic government in Greece (Greek-American war veterans), no communistic government in Ireland (Irish American war veterans); yet, there is a cesspool of communistic activities in South and Central America (there is no Latin American war veterans), and also a cesspool of communistic activities in southeast Asia (there is no Asiatic American war veterans).

Is this pure coincidence? We think not. The families and members of these internationalized (not hyphenated) American war veterans organizations are constantly bridging the gap of understanding in the small but personalized way, in bringing forth the true meaning of America to the land of their ancestors.

Unfortunately, through the melting pot and otherwise, these internationalized types of American war veterans are slowly eroding away. Like the buffalo of the Old West, extinction appears in the future. Will the Congress wake up and suddenly reverse itself by giving these loyal American groups the right and protection of a congressional charter? They deserve it.

We believe in the past the Congress has been blinded by so-called big veterans organizations that make it appear they have a monopoly on patriotism. However, the smaller internationalized type of American war veterans organization (often dubbed by the bigger ones as hyphenated—which is a grossly unjustified terminology that misleads other fellow Americans as to their true value and worth) is just as patriotic and American, if not more so.

The State Legislatures of Massachusetts (1962), Rhode Island (1963), New Jersey (1963), Pennsylvania (1963), and New York (1964) have all adopted resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to grant the Italian American War Veterans of the United States a congressional charter and/or national recognition. It is quite apparent that the State legislatures see the great merit in promoting the existence and progress of internationalized type of American war veterans organizations in the

United States. It is to be hoped that the Congress does not waste too much time in coming to the same conclusions.

The Third Washington Conference of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States was held on March 12, 13, and 14, 1965. We sincerely hope that history will record them as constructive and ushering in a period of new understanding toward internationalized types of American war veterans groups. Also, that such groups as the Italian American War Veterans of the United States are not hyphenated, or split, but rather 100-percent American without any reservations whatsoever. And that they have and will continue to make great contributions for America in time of peace and war.

Subsidized Cargo Lines Assert Tramp Ships Deserve Aid, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the eminent marine writer of the New York Times, Mr. Edward A. Morrow, described an interesting proposal by the successful element of our American merchant marine to assist their not so successful counterparts; namely, to aid the tramp ships which participate in our commerce.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his article:

SUBSIDIZED CARGO LINES ASSERT TRAMP SHIPS DESERVE AID, TOO

(By Edward A. Morrow)

The most successful segment of the American merchant marine offered a solution yesterday for the problems of the industry's least successful segment.

The subsidized operators of general cargo ships, who receive approximately $200 million in Government assistance annually, outlined a program for redeveloping tramp or bulk shipping operations, which now receive nothing in direct subsidies.

The Committee of American Steamship Lines, which represents 14 of the Nation's 15 subsidized operators, estimated the program would cost the Government $1.3 billion over a 25-year period. But they emphasized that they did not want any outlay by the Government to cut into their own subsidies.

In a 28-page report the committee declared that the "decision whether or not to extend direct Government aid on a long-term basis for the creation and maintenance of a modern, bulk-cargo fleet should be decided promptly by Government." The report acknowledged "it is not a simple decision."

The report noted that the Nation's bulk trade, consisting primarily of petroleum and ore imports, had increased 140 million tons over the last 13 years. Although the cargoes represent only 20 percent on a value basis, they constitute 85 percent of the Nation's foreign-trade tonnage. U.S.-flag ships carry less than 5 percent of this tonnage.

The committee estimated that a 100-ship program for 25 years would cost some $850 million in operating subsidies. Operating subsidies are granted chiefly to put a U.S. shipowner's labor costs on a par with those of foreign competitors.

The construction subsidy costs were put at $213 million for 30 vessels averaging 55,000 deadweight tons and $252 million for 70 other ships averaging 25,000 deadweight tons.

THE 1936 ACT APPLIES

Construction subsidies are designed to enable a shipowner to buy a ship constructed in the United States for the price at which he could purchase it in a foreign shipyard.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 limits operating subsidy to common-carrier liners by requiring operation on regular routes. This means there is no Government aid for the bulk-cargo fleet, the study pointed out.

"A long-range contractual commitment of aid to a bulk fleet based on operating and vessel price parity will involve yearly appropriations for shipyard and operating subsidy estimated to cost about $52 million per year for a 100-ship, 25-year program," the report said.

"If any new policy is contemplated for subsidizing a U.S.-flag bulk-cargo fleet, the Government should assure itself, before undertaking this extension of the subsidy-support program, that manning of both subsidized liner fleet and the new bulk fleet will be at levels appropriate for modern, mechanized vessels," the report added.

Any "arbitrary or experimental reductions" in the current subsidies for the 300-odd general-cargo ships would be "unwise," the report asserted.

Any significant change in this phase of the maritime-aid program "could seriously jeopardize the continued strength of this one viable segment of our merchant marine and result both in a cessation of new construction and a flight of capital from the industry."

The committee cited several arguments for the bulk fleet. It said such a fleet would make a substantial contribution to the balance of payments; would maintain an active pool of trained U.S. seamen, and would reduce the dependence of the Nation on foreign fleets to meet its growing import needs.

Public Opinion Poll—15th Congressional District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the results of my request for the opinions of residents of the 15th Congressional District of Illinois on some of the problems facing our Nation. I was gratified by the tremendous response to my poll—with a total of 18,745 completed questionnaires returned to me and tabulated as of March 26.

The results of the poll are as follows:

Results of Representative CHARLOTTE T. REID'S *public opinion poll*

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you feel that fiscal responsibility demands that the Federal Government must operate within a balanced budget?	89.7	9.0	1.3
2. Because of deficit financing, the temporary national debt limit has been increased by $31,000,000,000 in the last 4 years. Do you favor the administration's request for a further increase in the national debt limit beyond the present $324,000,000,000?	7.8	90.3	1.9
3. President Johnson is asking Congress to approve a greatly expanded program of Federal aid to education at all levels—preschool to graduate—increasing the fiscal year 1966 education budget to a total of $8,600,000,000, with $1,500,000,000 of this in completely new programs.			
(a) Do you favor this greatly expanded Federal aid to education program?	36.9	58.9	4.2
(b) Do you favor aid to students in both private and parochial schools?	26.2	69.1	4.7
4. Do you favor the administration's compulsory plan to provide limited hospital and nursing home care for people over 65, regardless of need, to be financed through new payroll taxes on present employees and employers covered by social security?	12.1	85.7	2.2
5. Do you favor a constitutional amendment which would allow prayer and Bible reading on a voluntary basis in our public schools, thereby rescinding recent Supreme Court decisions?	82.4	15.6	2.0
6. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to return to each individual State its right to apportion 1 house of its bicameral legislature on factors other than population if its citizens so desire?	75.2	17.3	7.5
7. Sec. 14B of the Taft-Hartley Act permits the individual States to pass "right to work" laws if they so desire. Do you favor repeal of sec. 14B, thereby making it illegal for a State to pass a "right to work" law?	20.6	71.7	7.7
8. Do you favor the administration's proposal to revise the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act to abolish the national origin quota system, to establish a general quota pool not based on country of origin, and to increase the total number of immigrants coming to the United States?	16.5	77.4	6.0
9. Do you favor an agricultural program which would provide a gradual reduction in the level of price supports and production controls?	80.4	14.1	5.5
10. Do you favor—			
(a) U.S. aid to Communist-bloc nations?	6.1	80.3	13.6
(b) Expanded trade with Communist-bloc nations?	23.7	70.5	5.8

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1966

SPEECH

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6767) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I take this time especially to commend the appropriating committee on expenditures for the fine work which has been done in this particular department by this particular subcommittee. I should like to mention each member individually, because this is a committee which works very closely with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

It has been a pleasure to see a new chairman of a subcommittee of any kind take the floor and have at his fingertips the factual knowledge Chairman DENTON has had this afternoon in presenting his legislation and in answering questions. He has done an admirable job. He has taken over, of course, from a great American, a great builder of the American land and for the American people, whom we honor every time he gets to the floor and every time we see him in action, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman KIRWAN. It can truly be said that Congressman "MIKE" KIRWAN is a friend of people.

It is rather interesting to note that the next two Members on the majority side are former members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the authorizing committee for most of the expenditures handled by this subcommittee. I refer to the gentlewoman from Washington [MRS. HANSEN] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH]. We hated to see them leave our committee. They are doing an admirable piece of work on their new committee.

Over on the other side, it rather does my heart good to hear people stand up and talk about the Indians, and to have Dr. REIFEL, the Member from South Dakota, a member of the Indian race, stand up with all the knowledge that he has at his disposal and be able to give us the picture as he, a member of that race, understands it, in the bringing out of a bill which is apparently satisfactory to him. He honors all citizens of our country regardless of race, by the use of his talents.

The new Member from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] has taken over on the subcommittee and is learning his position well.

I would be remiss if I did not call attention to the fine services which Mr. Wilhelm has provided in years past as staff member. Now his duties are being taken over by Mr. Evans, who is doing fine work.

I should especially like to commend the committee for bringing so many factual matters into its report. It is an interesting report. It is a report from which many of us can gather facts that will be very useful to us as we go about our everyday work.

I also wish to express my sincere appreciation that the committee has seen fit to follow through with the legislative history of the land and water conservation fund bill as it was written here on the floor of this body. Federal funds in this program were to be used on a 50–50 matching as such funds are to be contributed to the States. The action of this committee keeps that policy intact—50 percent matching and not 40 percent as proposed by the executive department is to be the criteria.

Many of the people representing the States in their support of the land and water conservation fund bill did so with this understanding. I am glad that the committee has seen fit to go contrary to the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in this respect.

Also, I think it is well once again to call to the attention of the members of the committee and of the House generally the fine relationship that the authorizing committee has with the Committee on Appropriations in this legislative situation. Relative to the appropriation for the Office of Saline Water, this committee recognized the fact that what the executive department recommended—and for that matter what even the Bureau of the Budget recommended—was practically all of the money that had been authorized for the saline water program and yet the authorization for the saline water program does not end until the end of fiscal 1967. Keeping that in mind and wishing to have the work of the Office of Saline Water carried on in an orderly and efficient manner, the committee saw fit to divide the appropriations between fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967. This to me is keeping faith not only with the authorizing committee but also keeping faith with Congress. If this program is to be increased and extended, it is up to this body to do it and not for the executive or administrative department of the Government to defeat our purposes by spending the money before the matter of added and additional has been thoroughly studied and the necessity for the increases in authorization have been proved.

All in all may I say thank you to this fine subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for a job well done.

A World They Never Made—Luckily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, last week the Washington Star carried a timely article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones regarding the waste of energy and intellect that characterizes a small but vocal element of America's college-age youth. Unfortunately, Mr. Jones' observations are true.

He vividly points out the lack of responsibility of the aimless student protest groups and beatniks and their warped outlook on life in our country and excessive criticisms of our national policies. He succinctly drives home the point that today's young people should utilize their talents more productively thereby earning the privileges of freedom and justifying their parents' labors and sacrifices which made it possible.

I believe every Member of Congress will suscribe to Mr. Jones' sentiments. Under unanimous consent I place "A World They Never Made—Luckily" in the Appendix of the RECORD.

A WORLD THEY NEVER MADE—LUCKILY

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

I have been visiting a couple of our great northern universities and in one of them I spent half an hour sitting around the kookie corner looking at and listening to the beats and the zens.

The kookie corner usually occupies part of the large basement snack bars in the student union buildings where coffee is cheap and talk is priceless. For laboratory examples of sophomoric sophistry and contrived eccentricity you can't beat it.

It is a place where aversion to soap has somehow been confused with profundity. Here is where the beards gather, and the girls in blue jeans and boots carry guitars. Sheep dog hairdos and Neanderthal haircuts are a dime a gross. But saddest of all is the uniform—the uniform of the slob.

The kookie corner abounds with talk—high flown, furious, cynical, or bitter. No one has much experience, and not many are really very good students, but cork-weight ideas feathered by polysyllabic words are batted back and forth like badminton birds, and everyone imagines he is enunciating great truths.

At the round table next to me I tuned in on a Niagara of conversation between one musk ox, two male airedales, two nanny goats, and a chittering chimpanzee about the evils of American militarists and our "imperialist posture" in Vietnam. They were sympathizing with themselves over the possibility of being caught inside a fireball, and a proposed protest march was under discussion.

The musk ox laughed bitterly and shook his shaggy head.

"It's a world I never made," he said.

Now, there, of course, was truth.

For all the frightening implications of a technology that can now destroy continents (which the musk ox and his friends had nothing to do with) there are several other things they had nothing to do with, either.

One was the building of the great university, the product of millions of man-hours behind the plow, in the snow-drifted lumber camps, in the foundries and offices. It was built because citizens, most of whom had never seen the inside of a college classroom, were prepared to contribute an enormous value of cheese, wheat, automobiles, and pulp, which they might otherwise have put in their own pockets, to the higher education of their children, including the musk ox.

There have been other dividends from the world he never made. One is life. If persons now long dead had not dissected plague victims, experimented with dangerous pox postules, and permitted themselves to be bitten by anopheles mosquitoes, three of the six places at that roundtable would be vacant.

The musk ox and his friends may plan a protest march in safety because men long forgotten chose to die at barricades. The

fact that the denial of this right in far-off Selma, Ala., gains the top headlines indicate the measure of the victory. The musk ox may go to the university library and read books sneering at representative democracy and advocating the dictatorship of the proletariat because men risked death for freedom of speech in the world he never made.

Ah, yes. The musk ox is against militarism and war. On this campus the week after the military ball there is the antimilitary ball. The beats and the members of ad hoc committees for this and that are out in force.

When I was in college I was sure that wars were made by shadowy merchants of death, promoting their huge munitions industries from castles in Switzerland. Weapons made wars. Disarmament, even if only we disarmed, was the answer.

So, I laughed at my friend, Andy, who was in ROTC, wasting his time in the afternoons parading around with that ridiculous Springfield on his shoulder.

When the roof fell in at Pearl Harbor, Andy and a thin khaki line were over on Bataan. Andy never got back. But he bought a little time while the rest of us could build some ships, go through crash training, and get over to restore the situation.

"World I never made." There is euphoria in self-pity, comfort in blaming the older generation, smugness in unbarbered rebellion that is not much else.

I wonder what the sons and daughters of the musk ox, the airedales, the nanny goats, and the chimp will say about the world their parents made.

The Ansley Wilcox Mansion, National Historic Site

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of legislation to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the Ansley Wilcox Mansion in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site, I am most pleased with the tremendous response we have had in favor of its preservation. Local citizens have offered and given their services to keep this property in repair until such time as action can be taken to make it a national shrine.

Many groups and organizations have gone on record in support of this proposal. Most recently, the Erie County American Legion in Buffalo, N.Y., unanimously adopted a resolution which I include at this point in the RECORD, under unanimous consent:

Whereas Theodore Roosevelt, 23d President of these United States, took the oath of office in the year 1901 in the famous Ansley Wilcox Mansion on Delaware Avenue, in the city of Buffalo, N.Y.; and

Whereas various organizations and prominent citizens have to date thwarted efforts to demolish this historical building, and

Whereas we, as community spirited Legionnaires, firmly believe the Ansley Wilcox Mansion should be preserved as a memorial to President Theodore Roosevelt: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Erie County American Legion, regularly convened this 25th day of March 1965, go on record as urging Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall to preserve this mansion, and hereby urge all citizens of Buffalo and surrounding areas to join with the American Legion in exerting all efforts to preserve the rich heritage of the Wilcox Mansion; and be it further

Resolved, That all Legionnaires and Legionnaires' friends be urged to write to Secretary Udall requesting the use of every force at his command to bring the preservation of the Ansley Wilcox Mansion to a successful conclusion.

MICHAEL J. KOGUTEK,
Erie County Commander.

Who Speaks for the Church?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in this day of national stress it is fitting that one of the great leaders of national religious life has spoken out regarding the part that the church takes in events. It is my hope that we might give full attention to the following article by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, as it appeared in the Washington Star, March 28, 1965:

WHO SPEAKS FOR THE CHURCH?

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

A fear-haunted question is raised in a recent letter from a highly intelligent life long friend, prominent in the affairs of a great eastern city. He poses an agonizing query growing out of the disruption and dislocation in contemporary yeasty humanity. He asks, "Into what kind of a world are our grandchildren headed?" An influential Communist, who is Judas to his U.S. citizenship, answered in the dedication of a book he wrote some years ago—"To my great-grandson, J.W.K., who will live in a Communist United States." That would mean that he would live under a coercive government where the vote is not denied to just a tiny minority but in a system in which no one is allowed to vote except where the ballot is stamped by a dictator.

Concerning the right to vote in our land, this is a time of seething emotion bordering on hysteria. In some demonstrations dunce caps and martyr halos are strangely mixed.

In such a time it needs to be said, especially to the churchmen who are so aroused, that in facing squarely domestic adjustments to meet the tests of true government by the people, the unpardonable sin is for Americans out of zeal to redress any national flaws, to allow themselves, unknowingly, to be used by a sinister world conspiracy against human dignity. This blasphemous system is engaged in a lying world campaign to utterly distort the true image of this Nation of our pride and prayer. The hate America propaganda, whose poison is being blown around the planet, is born of communism's fear complex that the United States, with its material and moral might, is the one and only power that can thunder to this scourge of fetters—you shall not pass. Never in history has there been such a colossal campaign to peddle lies about any country. Lenin's directions are now in full operation that any distortion or prevarication is permissible if it advances the cause he fathered.

For instance, one of the charge being made about imperialistic America is that the one-tenth of its population belonging to the Negro race, the descendants of slaves snatched from the savage tribes of Africa, are here treated with contempt, denied all opportunities for advancement, and in spite of the Emancipation Proclamation held in virtual subjection. American Negroes thousands of miles from home, members of Joey Adams entertainment group touring the world, nailed down that lie at a public question and answer period in a foreign country. They were being taunted by Communistic stooges about the place of their race in America. One of the quartet indignantly answered for them all. Glaring at the questioners he said, "Listen, pals, outside of heaven there is only one place I want to be and that's the United States. Sure, we got problems, but we've got laws, and we've got courts, and we've got millions of Americans of all races and creeds and all colors, who are willing to lay down their lives to make possible the freedom of a man called Abraham Lincoln. We've got it made in our country." This black man was exposing the fiction of the communistic line.

Let no one in America, now deeply concerned about voting rights for some groups belonging to one-tenth of our population, be so naive as to be obvious to the ugly fact that the communistic conspiracy which is out to deny the sacred right of the vote for everybody, is using the present agitation in America to advance their own evil cause. There is more back of that statement than can be put in this article.

The question we are raising here with no condemnation for religious leaders who are marching today in a cause that grips their conscience, is: Have these same leaders any vivid realization of what is in store for all Americans if the world objectives of that blasphemous, godless system, are attained? And, make no mistake about it, it is so far on its way as to blanch our faces with fear. But with this menace hanging like a Damascus sword over the fragile thread of our liberties, are these same religious leaders so vociferous now as they deal with growing pains of a democracy, equally vocal as they face the most dastardly system the ages have known? It is a tragic fact that the answer to that question must be "No." Among those who are assuming national and world leadership among the churches, it must be admitted that so far as communism is concerned, there is, to use a scriptural phrase, "A silence that could be heard in heaven."

One of these leaders has said, "Let us quit moralizing about communism and to communism." His word for that conspiracy, and that of many of his colleagues, is accommodation, coexistence, cooperation. We are speaking now of Protestant leadership. Thank God the Roman Catholics are arrayed against religions most malignant foe. Would to God that in every church in America the perils of this godless force were being poured into the minds of the young—and, of the older. Would that every church, as its bounden duty, would have its entire membership familiar with every chapter of J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters of Deceit." There could be no more effective antidote to the tragically mistaken attitude of some church leaders as they encourage the coming generation to stroke the ferocious leopard (which has not changed its spots) and to murmur, "pretty pussy."

It is high time for religious people of every name or sign to raise the question in this time of dire crisis, "Who speaks for the church?"

Rivers and Harbors Congress Lists Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of serving as chairman of the Recreation and Wildlife Committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Last summer this committee met at the Rivers and Harbors Congress' 51st annual meeting here in Washington, and discussed a number of vital issues and made worthwhile recommendations on the use, conservation, and control of America's vast water resources.

The committee, presided over by Mr. George S. Smith, mayor of Easton, Pa., adopted resolutions on several topics, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers policy on recreational aspects of reservoir projects and the Tocks Island recreational project.

I think this committee's views should be of interest to a number of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I include the complete text of the Recreation and Wildlife Committee report in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RECREATION AND WILDLIFE AT THE 51ST NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

The Committee on Recreation and Wildlife of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress convened at the 51st annual convention in Washington, in the Virginia Room of the Mayflower Hotel, at 10 a.m., June 3, 1964.

The meeting was conducted by Dr. George S. Smith, mayor of the city of Easton, Pa., a delegate of the State of Pennsylvania, who acted as temporary chairman in the absence of Representative ED EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma. The secretary was L. E. Eisenhauer of Van Wert, Ohio, a member of the Ohio delegation. Rollcall was taken and the following members of the committee were present: Robert H. Anderson, Ohio; Frank W. Dressler, Pennsylvania; Ney C. Landrum, Florida; Randolph Hodges, Florida; Richard B. Hellstrom, Florida; Andrew Wyosky, Ohio; Valein A. Giselair, Louisiana; J. C. Timman, Louisiana; Carroll Swearingen, Texas; Donald A. Young, Maine; William E. Miller, Jr., Pennsylvania; Clayton M. Hoff, Delaware; Vernon Deal, North Carolina; Howard B. Boswell, Texas; C. R. Gutermuth, Washington, D.C.; Hays Arnold, Georgia; K. K. Kennedy, Florida; Joseph R. Snyder, Missouri; Wilmer McCutcheon, Florida; William J. Sheehan, Ohio; R. L. McKinney, Jr., Texas; Marshall N. Dana, Oregon.

There were no committee reports.

There was no old business.

Unfinished business: Mr. Frank Dressler, Executive Director of the Water Resources Association of the Delaware River Basin presented a statement of the water resources association calling for the support and establishment of national recreation areas as integral parts of selected reservoir projects. The following resolution was adopted by the Recreation and Wildlife Committee:

"It is resolved by the Committee on Recreation and Wildlife that the President of the United States be requested to require the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to: (1) Apply the criteria contained in the Recreation Advisory Council's Policy Circular No. 1 to each reservoir project it has under study to determine if a national recreation area should be developed as an integral part of any or all of these projects; (2) report the results of these tests to the Recreation Advisory Council; and (3) to support the creation of those reservoir-centered national recreation areas that the Corps of Engineers determines meets all of or the major criteria in Policy Circular No. 1."

The committee unanimously adopted this resolution.

An amendment was proposed by Randolph Hodges, Tallahassee, Fla., and seconded by K. K. Kennedy, Ocala, Fla., that the following addition to the previous resolution include, "flood control projects in addition to reservoir projects." This amendment was unanimously approved.

A resolution was introduced supporting the proposed Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1964 (H.R. 3846) which reads as follows:

"Whereas the outdoor recreation needs of the American people are expected to triple within the next 35 years; and

"Whereas the public demand for water-related recreation activities is growing even faster than the demand for outdoor recreation generally; and

"Whereas the proposed Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1964 (H.R. 3846) would authorize an orderly, fiscally responsible and timely program for helping to finance an expanded local, State, and National effort to provide adequate outdoor recreation opportunities for the American people: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Recreation and Wildlife, 51st Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress does hereby endorse the principles of H.R. 3846 and urges its prompt enactment by the Congress of the United States."

The resolution was proposed by C. R. Gutermuth and seconded by Andrew Wyosky. The resolution was unanimously adopted.

A resolution was introduced regarding the wilderness bill currently before the Congress of the United States and seconded by Robert H. Anderson, of Cleveland, Ohio. The resolution is as follows:

"The Committee on Recreation and Wildlife endorses in principle the recommendation to maintain the areas that have been designated as wilderness, as provided in H.R. 930."

This resolution was unanimously adopted.

A resolution regarding Tocks Island recreation project was introduced by Clayton M. Hoff, of Delaware and seconded by C. R. Gutermuth of Washington, D.C.

"It is hereby resolved by the Committee on Recreation and Wildlife of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress that the proposal for recreation projects in the Tocks Island area having met all the requirements as set down by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, to wit, having a spacious area, located and designed to achieve a high recreation carrying capacity within the region of service, to assure interstate patronage, although nonurban in character strategically located within easy driving distance, having recreation as the dominant or primary resource management purpose, and being established in an area where other Federal and non-Federal programs will not fulfill the high priority recreation needs in the foreseeable future."

The establishment of the Tocks Island recreation area is fully endorsed and carried unanimously.

The following committees were appointed for the year, 1964–65 with instructions to report on pertinent subjects at the next annualy meeting of the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Parks and Recreation Areas Committee (land use): Clayton M. Hoff, chairman; William J. Sheehan, Andrew Wyosky, Frank W. Dressler.

Recreational Activities Committee (including boating): L. E. Eisenhauer, chairman; Ney C. Landrum, Robert H. Anderson, C. R. Gutermuth.

Wildlife Committee (terrestrial and aviary): Donald A. Young, K. K. Kennedy, Andrew Wyosky, C. R. Gutermuth, chairman.

Wildlife, fish, and other aquatic life: Randolph Hodges, chairman; Hays Arnold, Harold G. Wilm, C. R. Gutermuth, Mr. Strickland.

These men were named as the nuclei of committee. Each chairman was authorized to name sufficient members from the Recreation and Wildlife Committee to serve on the subcommittee so as to total nine members.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Statement on Unemployment Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement by the AFL–CIO Executive Council on Unemployment Insurance at Bal Harbour, Fla. on February 23, 1965:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., FEBRUARY 23, 1965

The AFL–CIO welcomes the expressed concerned of the President over the condition of the unemployment insurance system. We look forward to his more extended message on this subject, and we urge early action by the Congress.

The shortcomings of the jobless pay program have distressed unemployed workers for many years. Right now with 4.8 million unemployed, only 2 million of these—considerably less than half—are drawing benefits.

We have shown again and again the deficiencies in coverage, in eligibility requirements, in the amounts and duration of benefits. These limitatons add up to a most serous indictment of the effectiveness of the program. Of every five wage or salary dollars lost as a result of unemployment, only one is recovered by the jobless benefits system.

The following changes are necessary to modernize the program. They can be put into effect without changing the basic Federal-State structure of our system:

First, coverage should be extended to include all establishments without regard to the number of employees, employees in nonprofit institutions, farmworkers, and all others who can be given protection consistent with good administration. Workers who are employed for short successive periods in different States should be allowed to accumulate their work experience both for determining their eligibility as well as for calculating their benefit amount. Great Lakes seamen should receive equal treatment with other covered workers.

Second, States should be required to provide jobless workers with weekly benefits of at least half their weekly wage loss, and for at least 26 weeks if they cannot find employment in that time. The maximum weekly amount should be appropriately adjusted to the economy of each State by set-

ting the benefit ceiling at no less than two-thirds of the average wage level within its own borders. No State should be permitted to establish unreasonable definitions of who is entitled to benefits. Reducing out-of-State benefits should be prohibited, and individuals who are taking approved training should not be disqualified. All of these changes can be accomplished most easily within the present Federal-State structure by withholding the State offset (or reduction) in the unemployment insurance tax where these minimum requirements are not met.

Third, there should be a Federal program of benefits for the long-term unemployed whose jobs have disappeared because of automation or other changes in employment patterns or who are caught in a recession job shortage and have used up all their benefit rights under the State programs. They should then be entitled to Federal extended benefits for up to 6 months more if they need that much time to complete their adjustment and obtain employment.

Lastly, the financing of the system should be strengthened by substantially increasing the taxable wage base, by providing equalization grants to States with abnormally high benefit costs, by requiring solvency standards for reserve funds, and by allowing States to adjust tax rates without resort to experience rating.

Action is 20 years overdue. During all the years since the end of World War II, as we have sought to make the necessary basic reforms in unemployment compensation, we have been told in recession periods that it could not be done then because of the tax burden that would fall on industry. In good times we were told it was not necessary. It has been the old story of repairing the leaky roof. And now, as the clouds of unemployment are breaking just a little we hear the familiar voices saying there is no need for action.

The time to make changes in our unemployment insurance system is now.

Women Fly Supersonic Airliners at FAA Center for Safer Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, members of the Manpower Subcommittee are always interested in examples of effective use of Federal employees. Mr. Joe Young, the able columnist for the Washington Evening Star in a recent issue of that paper has painted in dramatic words one such story.

Due to the uniqueness and highly effective manner in which the Federal Aviation Agency is using part-time employees at its research facility in Atlantic City, I am inserting in the RECORD Mr. Young's story of Sunday, March 28, which I believe will be of interest to all Members.

The story follows:

THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT: WOMEN FLY SUPERSONIC AIRLINERS AT FAA CENTER FOR SAFER AVIATION

(By Joseph Young)

ATLANTIC CITY.—Mrs. Anna Kertz, an attractive housewife, is piloting a supersonic transport plane at 2,000 miles an hour, which minutes ago left New York's Kennedy Airport and in little more than an hour will land in Los Angeles.

What's this? you say. Supersonic transport planes are still on the drawing board and are years away from being built.

That's right. But at the Federal Aviation Agency's National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center here, a battery of housewives and grandmothers are flying planes of the future as well as present planes in existing air traffic conditions and those that will develop in the years ahead.

It's all simulated flying, of course, but done on such a realistic basis, complete with regular FAA controllers, radar screens, etc., that an observer has a difficult time separating reality from make-believe.

STUDY 1970-75 SITUATION

It's all part of FAA's program to make commercial aviation more safe for the flying public as well as safer for the public on the ground. A considerable number of fatalities have occurred on the ground when military planes have crashed into homes and public buildings.

With the continued expansion of commerical aviation as well an increasing number of privately flown and military planes (the FAA has jurisdiction over these aircraft also), the FAA has to make plans constantly for handling the increased air traffic, both in the air and on takeoffs and landings. Therefore, it must project into the future 5 and 10 years and more. It can't wait until the last minute before dealing with the complex traffic control situations.

To use real planes in experimenting with air traffic control on takeoff and landings, as well as pattern control in the air, would result in carnage and incredible waste in human life and money.

Therefore, FAA has set up a simulated pilot center here, manned by housewives, who are under civil service and in grades 2 and 3, jobs that normally pay $3,600 to $5,200 a year. Except that these women, some of them grandmothers, don't work on a full-time basis. They may work a week or two and then be grounded for a week or so while new commercial airline flight patterns are mapped for them.

MANY NEVER IN AIR

Most of them have never flown commercially and some have never been in a plane—a real one that is.

Most of those who have flown have been up but once and in an FAA training plane just to get the feel of flying.

But that doesn't prevent them from being good "pilots" as far as FAA purposes are concerned. A 2- or 3-month training course prepares them for their duties.

They sit before their console control boards with a plan of the flight before them. With headphones on, they listen to instructions from regular FAA controllers in adjoining rooms.

The ladies use regular controls to take off, navigate the plane during the flight, adjust to various altitudes, observe holding patterns, and finally land amidst complicated traffic conditions.

Although they never leave the large pilot control room during their working hours, their flights take them all over the United States and throughout the world where we have commercial interests. They like their jobs. They find their duties extremely interesting and not in the least monotonous.

Without leaving the simulated pilot control room, they may spend the next week simulating flights in and out of Dulles and National Airports in the Washington area. They "fly" under air traffic conditions which the FAA estimates will prevail in the Washington area—commercial, military, and private—in 1968 or 1970.

ALL DATA RECORDED

All of their experiences, including takeoffs and landings and flying patterns while in the air, are recorded by high-powered data processing machines, and the information is analyzed by FAA controllers and technicians. The controllers also watch every move of the lady "pilots" on their radar screens.

The day we were there, we watched Mrs. Barbara McDuffie, a housewife with two small children, piloting an Ozark Airlines turboprop transport from Denver to Kansas City. Mrs. McDuffie was due to land at the new Mid-Continent Airport in Kansas City, which will be used in addition to the city's present airport. Also figuring in the situation was the increased military air traffic developing at nearby Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base.

With considerable help from FAA controllers and her own radar equipment, Mrs. McDuffie made a perfect approach and landing without the least bit of trouble.

Meanwhile, a few rows down, Mrs. Kertz was winging her supersonic transport over Kansas City by now, and—such is the speed of supersonic travel—she already was making preparations for the landing approach at Los Angeles.

Incidentally, Mrs. Kertz has never even flown on a jet plane—as a passenger or otherwise—but she is at home in her supersonic cockpit.

"It's great fun," she said. "I can hardly wait to ride in a real supersonic plane."

MANY SAFETY ACTIVITIES

The 1,800 employees at NACEF are engaged in many other activities making it safer for all of us to fly. Tests and experiments and simulated conditions on crashes, to develop the best in safety equipment; acceleration and deceleration of specially constructed steel sled models to determine safe takeoff and landing speeds; constant tests of aircraft under various conditions to determine capability and safety standards—these are all part of the NACEF's everyday activities. FAA test pilots assist in these projects.

NACEF manager William F. Harrison says of his employees:

"You must remember that these 1,800 employees, who represent skills, crafts, and professions of every conceivable nature, are all civil servants. It makes me proud of the Government civil service system."

The Hammond Pictorial History of the American Negro

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL J. KREBS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, at this time of moral crisis in our Nation's history, as dramatized by the unhappy events in Selma, Ala., I should like to call attention to the thoughtful comments of that distinguished Negro historian, Dr. Charles H. Wesley, of Central State College at Wilberforce, Ohio, in his foreward to the forthcoming "Pictorial History of the American Negro" being published by C. S. Hammond & Co. of Maplewood, N.J.

FOREWORD

(By Charles H. Wesley [1])

Pictures of the American Nation of peoples would be composed of various minority groups, each of whom has been contributing through the years to the development of

[1] President of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, Washington, D.C.

American life and history. Many races, cultures, and peoples have found their homes in this, the land of the free, and an American picture should include all of them. It is well known that lines have been drawn and that there have been omission and separation of peoples on the basis of religions, language, race, and color. These peoples have come from England, Ireland, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and all Europe, parts of Asia, and the islands, but it must be remembered, also, that millions came from Africa. This land in history has had civilizations, cultures, and governments in ancient and medieval periods, prior to the rise of the devastating slave trade, which were just as valuable and as glorious to history as those in Europe prior to the rise of its national states. From the 16th century through to the middle of the 19th century, within the law and outside of the law, the descendants of Africa were brought involuntarily, as others had come voluntarily and involuntarily, to the Western World. We are a nation of immigrants, or the descendants of immigrants, none of whom has a priority in history's esteem.

The Negro population has grown through the years until it now constitutes the largest minority group of the American population, and next to the Indian population, is the oldest of America's minority groups. Negroes arrived in the area of the United States nearly a century prior to the founding of the first English colony, having come with Spanish explorers, but not as slaves, and having been participants in a settlement in Virginia in 1528. It is important that this length of continuing residence be known since there has been some tendency to regard the Negro as one of the out-groups in America, who should return to his native land, rather than as American, and accordingly can be omitted from word and pictorial presentations of America.

This group of Americans, as have other groups, has made significant contributions to American life and culture. These contributions have been made by individuals and they have been made by the group, despite disadvantages, discriminations and separations from the mainstream of American life. The account of these contributions should be better known to all Americans in the interest of the improvement of human relations. In this respect, there is no such thing as "Negro history," or "Jewish history," "Irish history" or other histories, as separate entities or detached contributions to American history. The only reason why there is such a history is the neglect, omission and distortion of contributions which have been made by these special groups. Too often historians have presented in textbooks the story of one group, and for them have told this story well; but they have neglected to present the story concerning other groups of people. The result has been that it has required many years and special endeavors to call to the attention of the textbook writers, the historians, the social scientists and the people who read, who look, and who think, that peoples of different colors and cultures have also contributed to American history. For these reasons, the Hammond Pictorial History of the American Negro has significance and definite meaning for all Americans.

This picture history * * * carries the observer through the American colonial period, the institution of slavery, the irrepressible conflict, the effects of Jim Crow, the migrations to the North and to cities, the changes in the Negro status, the decisions of the courts, the marches to freedom and the Negro today. Pictures from many sources are presented in this unusual presentation with brief descriptive and dramatic wording.

In this connection, Samuel Taylor Coleridge in his "A Day-Dream" writes "My eyes make pictures when they are shut." Pictures in eyes that are shut have been made of the Negro in history, and have been supported and developed by lack of information and personal contacts. In fact, in order that people may understand people, information is not enough. There must be learning experiences, eyes must be opened to see pictures rather than permit the eyes to be closed and maintain the same false and incorrect pictures which have been learned from an earlier generation, parents at home, uninterested and biased teachers at school, and from people in the streets. The home, the school and the neighborhood are the places where boys and girls are first "carefully taught" the ideas, the concepts, the pictures and the word pictures which are fundamental in their adult lives for the characterizations of darker Americans. The images which they receive are often maintained throughout their years.

Moreover if a Negro youth is unable to identify himself with those who are seen in pictures of American life because their very appearance seems to denote for them a superiority, he can so readily assume his own inferiority. This reaction is described by Booker T. Washington as a youth in his "The Story of the Negro," as he described a picture in his first geography used in the elementary grades. The book had on one page a picture of George Washington and beside him was a picture of a naked African with a ring in his nose and a dagger in his hand. This type of presentation has created bad reactions from white and black youth, the former through assumptions of superiority and the latter of inferiority.

It is the challenging task of publications, teachers, schools and community agencies to remove and reconstruct the basic false concept, to give new experiences and impressions in the interest of good human relations, and to substitute new pictures and truthful images, so that the stereotypes of difference and inferiority can be removed. Even if youth should have in earlier years the implanting of correct ideas, memory can be very short, the impressions of the environment are deepened vigorously and imagination of them can be much longer. The images oftentimes outlast the words even when allied with fact. And yet, the once learned fact can be erased by a fertile imagination stimulated by separations, innuendoes and disparagement, but the picture can remain. Words may fade, but pictures fade less often and they can continue to exist in the subconscious self. Making history graphic through pictures is a most important step in the current educational program.

This is basic in the quest for background by Negro youths and adults in the United States. Unfortunately, there is a self-image of depreciation created by the Negro people of themselves. It is not a consciously adopted image created by them. There are facts which they face in their environment that create and reenforce the image. There can be a change in this self-picture when the facts and the inspiration for the future can be directed for definite purposes. When they see themselves as inferiors and are conditioned as intellectually and culturally incompetent, and there are no evidences in books and classrooms to oppose, delimit or explain this conclusion, there is frustration, defeatism, and reaction against others.

Negroes have undertaken to do something about this. They have organized the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, and have been publishing studies, textbooks, and individual pictures of prominent Negroes which have been placed on the walls of schools, colleges, universities, and institutions, so that more correct views can be secured of these aspects of Negro life and history. The strength of the forces seeking to keep the Negro in his place, and to have him as a despised person, had been so great that it is necessary to have all avenues of education used in order to bring to the masses of Americans new and truer views concerning Negro-Americans. In such situations, pictures have value, and particularly pictures which show that the participants are, after all, human beings, Americans at work and at play, striving for advanced status as citizens, searching for the ways of freedom known to other Americans, learning activities valuable to the community when they are accepted or have the opportunity.

Such pictures * * * are not primarily for entertainment, and they should be connected with the appropriate discussion in words which should also lead to additional reading. There is need in Negro history for historical books, documents, and primary sources on solid historical foundations. There is need for interpretation, brilliant narration, and sound teaching of the facts of unknown Negro history. There is also a definite need of pictures, portraitures, and pictorial presentations for the study of Negro history and minor scenes, some with completeness and others with less completeness. The picture can become the gateway to a larger learning.

There are scenes herewith in the history of the current freedom movement, which can lead to the development of understanding and esteem for its leadership, its demonstrations by youth from the schools, colleges and universities and the sacrifices in money and themselves by dedicated men and women, white and black. There are scenes of misguided white Americans clad in robes and hoods who rudely and violently block the free pathways of American democracy, revealing their crude efforts to keep the Negro in his place. Scenes appear of Negro groups who, because they have freed themselves from fear itself, march nonviolently along the road to freedom, refusing as Americans to be ignored, neglected, or denied. Such pictures, even when eyes are shut, will not leave undisturbed the onlooker and the reader.

The ultimate test of the value of these pictures can be found in the changed attitude which disregards color and ethnic divisions and uses it as an integral aspect of the total American scene. When eyes that have been shut have made incorrect pictures, they should be opened to the realities of these pictures which are descriptive of the Negro-American's history, and they may lead toward the truth, and finally to changes in attitude and in behavior. Through these channels, some southerners and some northerners may then free their minds and eyes of the stereotypes which have violated the truth for so long a period as well as the American dream itself. Seeing truly and really they may reject the slanted newspaper interpretations, and discard the inherited local caricature and burlesque of the American with the darker skin.

Just as the maps, charts, and graphics of the C. S. Hammond Co. have given Americans world understanding of international problems, scenes, and peoples, it is more than probable that the wider distribution of these pictures of our national scenes will have similar effects within the Nation. Since the dramatics of the Negro revolution have been treated and editorialized in varying ways by writers and observers, and by the many representatives of the press of the Nation, it is in this context that this presentation of pictures has definite values.

Why the Italian American War Veterans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce into the RECORD

some recent remarks by Mr. Joseph Bosco, a resident of Everett, Mass., and a longtime friend and constituent of mine. Mr. Bosco is National Commander of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, and, as such, represents many of the fine American citizens of Italian extraction who have served in the Armed Forces of this country.

The remarks follow:

WHY THE ITALIAN AMERICAN WAR VETERANS?

(By National Commander Joseph Bosco)

The question is often asked, "Why the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.?" That question is posed in the light that there are other major veterans organizations to which we can belong.

We can answer in part that most of us do belong to one or more of the other veterans organizations. But, we might further reply, however, by asking similar questions in retort. For example:

"Why the Veterans of Foreign Wars?" an organization recognized by Congress in 1932; or

"Why the American Veterans?" (commonly known as the Amvets), a group that came to life by congressional approval in 1947; or

"Why the World War I Veterans?" a group that gained recognition by the national government in more recent years; namely, 1958; or

By similar reasoning, "Why any of the other members of the veterans group?"

At this point it is important to note that each of the mentioned veterans group, and others, was formed many years after the American Legion first took root in September of 1919.

Therefore, if we are to reason the question logically, the answer must of necessity be an illogical one. The answer could be and possibly should be, that no other veteran entity should have a right to existence, because the American Legion had preceded all others.

At this stage of our reasoning someone might anticipate with the exclamation, "True, but the others of the veterans group do not set up a nationality barrier as a condition to membership." And that seems to be the stereotyped answer by those who seek an easy escape from reality.

But, let us see whether that observation is justified, and whether it is radically different in substance? If we read the purposes of each of the major veterans group, and the others too, we find that basically, the objectives are similar and in many respects identical. Yes, truly overlapping. Those objectives fall in three general categories, namely:

1. To uphold and preserve the Constitution of the United States and our American way of life.

2. To protect the veterans interests.

3. to extend the arm of care to the widows and orphans of deceased veterans.

Fundamentally, then, each is founded on the same overall scope.

However, let us probe a bit further. Let us bring to light the obvious. It is conspicuously apparent that there are variations in the membership requirements of each group. By way of illustration:

a. We observe that the Veterans of Foreign Wars limits its membership entirely to campaign medal service veterans (which, of course implies oversea service.)

b. The Disabled American Veterans limits its membership to disabled veterans and to other restricted requirements.

c. We are aware that the Am-Vets embraces only veterans of World War II and Korea.

d. And, at the other extreme, we see that World War I veterans opens its doors only to servicemen of World War I.

Consequently, if we exclude the American Legion which supposedly permits membership to all veterans, whether they be disabled or nondisabled, or whether they served overseas or in the continental United States, it becomes obvious that each has its own membership limitations. And, if we stretch the point further we might likewise note that even the American Legion has some limitations when it bars from membership the Spanish-American War Veterans.

Foremost then and the one thing in common among the various groups is that each represents only a certain segment of the veteran population.

Now, if we seek out the definition of the word "segment" we find it defined as a "part" of entire thing, and, of course the "part" of anything is only a minor portion. So that, if we spotlight the word "minor" we observe that it is the adjective for the noun "minority."

In essence then "minority" is the key word and the basis of membership in each of these other veterans' groups.

But, let's be more explicit. And, again using the major organizations as illustrations, if we belabor the point we see that:

1. The Veterans of Foreign Wars caters to the minority group that served overseas;

2. The Disabled American Veterans includes within its fold the minority group of disabled veterans and other limited requisites;

3. World War I veterans embraces the minority group of servicemen of World War I;

4. The Amvets includes only the minority group that served in World War II and Korea.

Are not then each of these groups segregating and being selective concerning membership?

This brings us to the big imponderable question. Why did each of these minority groups form its own organization when each could have joined the American Legion, which gives such wide latitude to membership? While this answer will not be found expressly stated in any paper, document or constitution, it can be assumed without doubt that each was formed to safeguard the immediate rights and interests of that special group.

It can be presumed that each group feared that its particular type of veteran might be discriminated against. If not intentionally, at least by oversight. And, for that reason, each group sprang to life. Each set itself up as the watchdog against any possible disregard of its own identifiable veteran. Each was set up to be on the alert against encroachments of its own special rights.

So, in final analysis, we cannot escape what is apparent. The truth of the matter is that each veteran organization is an assemblage of minority groups organized according to its restricted membership requirements and primarily for its particular purposes. Each is first concerned with the things close at home. That is, the needs of its immediate membership, and then generally for all veterans. Fortunately, however, none of these groups has monopolized things to its sole interests and all veterans have benefited as a result.

By the same reasoning then, the answer to the big question becomes clear and unequivocal as to "Why the Italian American War Veterans of the United States?"

We are an organized minority of veterans in existence by virtue of the same rights as any other group and for the same patriotic reasons, and rightfully so. It is our contribution to a general cause.

Let us take heed. That organized minorities are the spark of life in American society, for the improvement of human relations. Organized minorities are the checks and balances of our very structure of government. Organized minorities are the barrier to a malicious majority which might otherwise take over lock, stock, and barrel. Organized minorities are the sounding board that keeps people on the alert. Organized minorities are the vanguard against despotism and all the other isms. Organized minorities are the preventive cure against abuse of power. And, above, all, let us never forget that it was an organized minority that uprooted colonialism on this continent, and founded the United States of America.

We, therefore, the Italian American War Veterans represent well over two and one-half million veterans of Italian parentage who have served our country honorably in time of war. Thousands of whom have left their limbs and their lives on foreign soil to preserve the ideology, that all men are created equal.

Yes, we are an organized minority tied by bonds of service. Organized not for the sole purpose of gaining special privileges, but organized to see that the rights of all veterans, and for that matter of all men be safeguarded against arbitrary power. And, finally to see that there is an equal administration of our just laws regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

That is why the Italian American War Veterans exist.

Merchant Fleet Down 11 Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article from the New York Times which is another indicator of the falling prestige of our American merchant fleet. With the total commerce of American increasing and expanding daily, it is a dark page in American history that shows the ever-decreasing statistics of our once dominant American merchant marine.

The article follows:

MERCHANT FLEET DOWN 11 VESSELS—LOSS EQUALS THAT OF 1963, ANNUAL REPORT SHOWS

The American Merchant Marine Institute's annual status report, describing the Nation's privately owned fleet, illustrates the continuing decline of the American merchant marine.

The statistical report, published yesterday, showed that privately owned ocean-going ships of 1,000 gross tons or more decreased by 11 vessels, reporting a similar loss in 1963. The report was prepared by Chester J. Szychlinski, the institute research director.

As of January 1, the fleet consisted of 963 ships aggregating 10.2 million tons gross and 14.7 millions deadweight. It was composed of 31 combination cargo-passenger ships of 442,000 gross tons and 272,000 deadweight tons, 643 freighters of 7.6 million tons deadweight and 289 tankers aggregating 6.7 million tons deadweight.

DEADWEIGHT INCREASE

Gross tonnage measures the cubic contents of a vessel expressed in units of 100 cubic feet. Deadweight tonnage measures a vessel's lifting capacity, or the number of tons of 2,240 pounds that a vessel will lift when loaded to her marks.

While the number of vessels was lower at the end of 1964 the total deadweight of the fleet increased some 150,000 tons as a result of the delivery of ships larger than those

that were scrapped or sold to foreign buyers during the year.

The report noted that the trend in the number of ships has been downward since the postward peak of 1,262 in 1951, with the exception of 1962 when there was a slight gain over the previous year. Since 1951 the privately owned fleet has declined by 365 vessels, or 25 percent.

This decline, the report noted, took place while the Nation's waterborne trade rose from 193 million tons to over 307 million tons, or 59 percent, from 1951 through 1962. Total world seaborne trade, by comparison, rose from 640 million to 1,230 million tons, or 92 percent.

Making comparisons with the merchant fleets of the world, the institute report pointed out that over the 13-year period the world fleet increased 46 percent in number. While the world fleet deadweight capacity increased 111 percent the American fleet's decreased 4.2 percent.

Looking back to 1939, the report noted that the American fleet represented 10.8 percent of the world fleet in number and 14.5 percent in deadweight. It now represents 5.4 percent in number and 7.3 percent in deadweight.

The composition of the fleet made the picture "even more dismal," the report said. The average fleet age was over 17 years, showing further deterioration since the start of 1964.

Obsolescence is still a major problem, with 73 percent of the fleet consisting of ships 18 years of age or older. Less than 17 percent of the ships were built in the last 10 years.

Walla Walla, Wash., To Honor Naval Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, this coming May 15 the citizens of Walla Walla, Wash., will dedicate a public park to the memory of one of the outstanding Naval heroes of World War II, Capt. Albert Harold Rooks.

I bring this event to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress because many Members of Congress may well recall the extraordinary heroism and courage displayed by Captain Rooks while commanding the cruiser U.S.S. *Houston* during World War II. Facing overwhelming odds Captain Rooks gave his life to the cause of liberty when he was killed by enemy fire as he directed the *Houston's* final fight. Prior to that time, in a series of engagements between February 4 and 27, 1942, Captain Rooks displayed extraordinary heroism, outstanding courage, gallantry in action and distinguished service as commanding officer of the *Houston* while in action against superior Japanese enemy aerial and surface forces. He was posthumously awarded our Nation's highest recognition, the Congressional Medal of Honor. I would like to read the accompanying citation:

For extraordinary heroism, outstanding courage, gallantry in action, and distinguished service in the line of his profession, as commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Houston* during the period February 4 to 27, 1942, while in action with superior Japanese enemy aerial and surface forces. While proceeding to attack an enemy amphibious expedition, as a unit in a mixed force, *Houston* was heavily attacked by bombers; after evading four attacks, she was heavily hit in a fifth attack, lost 60 killed and had 1 turret wholly disabled. Captain Rooks made his ship again seaworthy and sailed within 3 days to escort an important reinforcing convoy from Darwin to Koepang, Timor, Netherlands East Indies. While so engaged, another powerful air attack developed which by *Houston*'s marked efficiency was fought off without much damage to the convoy. The commanding general of all forces in the area thereupon canceled the movement and Captain Rooks escorted the convoy back to Darwin. Later, while in a considerable American-British-Dutch force engaged with an overwhelming force of Japanese surface ships, *Houston* with H.M.S. *Exeter* carried the brunt of the battle, and her fire alone heavily damaged one and possibly two heavy cruisers. Although heavily damaged in the actions, Captain Rooks succeeded in disengaging his ship when the flag officer commanding broke off the action and got her safely away from the vicinity, whereas one-half of the cruisers were lost.

I am proud to state, Mr. Speaker, that Capt. Albert Harold Rooks was born in Whitman County of my congressional district, educated at Walla Walla High School and graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1914.

Dedication of the park by Walla Walla citizens to the memory of Captain Rooks is a fitting memorial. It should help remind all of us of not only the heroism of Captain Rooks, but the sacrifice of the thousands of other Americans who fought and died in the cause of liberty.

Fukumoto Brothers Display Great Public Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on March 9 of this year I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin on February 10. That article, Mr. Speaker, described one of the sources of the strength and vitality of our great State of Hawaii—the willingness of its citizens to assist one another in times of chaos and disaster.

One of the unsung heroes which upheld this great tradition during the recent floods at Keapuka was Delivery Service, Inc., owned and operated by these brothers, Richard, Rikino, and Harold Fukumoto. With no thought of the economic loss which they would sustain, the Fukumoto brothers volunteered their trucks, drivers, and helpers to transport the water-damaged appliances between Keapuka and the service shops. Indeed, this was no small effort and expense on their part. I take pride in being personally acquainted with the Fukumoto brothers and pleasure in commending them for their action.

An American Success Story in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, we have long prided ourselves over the proven fact that in this great country of ours the paths which lead to personal success are many and varied. While they very seldom are smooth, straight, or short, these paths are open to all Americans, regardless of race, color, creed or sex. Only last week we reaffirmed our belief in this our way of life by approving legislation to provide the children from impoverished homes the vehicle by means of which they too might achieve success.

It is with a sense of pride and extreme pleasure that I call to the attention of the Congress an American success story in Hawaii. It is about a woman in Hawaii who is the mother of five children, the oldest of whom is in college and the youngest of whom is only 6 years of age. She started to work in her teens as a maid. By virtue of long years of hard work, careful saving, prudent investment, and, yes, study at night schools, she has achieved such a notable measure of success that her story was told in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin & Advertiser of Sunday, March 21, 1965. She is Mrs. Mildred Kida, wife of Theodore Kida, both of whom are close friends of mine.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert this great story in the RECORD as another item of proof that one can still realize one's dream of success in our American way of life:

"HOE HANA" TO HIGH FINANCE

(By Mary Cooke)

"You have the initiative, you work hard, and you have ability. You should work for yourself, not work for people."

Mildred Kida remembers her last employer, a kamaaina businessman, telling her this after she had worked several years as maid and housekeeper for the family.

"What have you done with the money you earned?" he continued.

"I put it all in the bank," she answered. "Ten thousand dollars."

When she left her maid's job, this was the working capital with which she started a Manoa boardinghouse, her first business enterprise, in 1950. Twelve years later she sold it and bought another house in which she established the Punahou Rest Home, Honolulu's first home for elderly Japanese women.

This summer, she and her husband, Theodore, will open the new three-quarter-million-dollar Kida Nursing Home, first nursing home project approved by the Federal Housing Administration in Hawaii, now nearing completion at 2900 Pali Highway.

DECLARATION FOR INDEPENDENCE

Mildred, who started to work for people when she was 13 years old, says, "I always wanted to be independent."

Her declaration for independence was an echo of her father's ambition, now achieved after he spent more than 30 years at hard work in sugar and pineapple fields on Maui. There, in the 1930's, Mildred said she and her mother and sister also labored in the canefields as "hoe hana" women.

At the age of 10, she had her first brush with an independent business venture when

her father, Chukichi Nakama, left the canefields, leased 20 acres and started to raise pineapples on a contract basis.

She spent the summer working in the pine fields until sundown every day. At night, by the light of a kerosene lantern, her father did his figuring on an abacus and Mildred, eldest of eight children, helped him keep books.

"I was familiar with handling the money when it came in," she said.

THE HARD YEARS

That was during the depression years when you could buy bread for 5 cents a loaf, cotton cloth was 15 cents a yard and palaka shirts sold for 50 cents apiece. The Nakamas lived in a house without electricity, washed clothes by hitting them with a stick on a board and ironed with a charcoal iron. They made their own charcoal from kiawe branches. They also burned guava and kiawe wood to heat the Japanese bath Nakama built for his family.

"We ate mostly bananas, tomatoes, papayas, tofu, miso soup and noodles, noodles, noodles. We hardly knew what taxes were, we paid so little," said Mildred.

A WILL AND A WAY

When the market dwindled, Mildred's father lost his pineapple contract and she remembers the day some men came to repossess the truck he had used in his work.

To feed the family, he turned to raising pigs and produce. Mrs. Nakama started a tofu factory in Puunene and drove a horse and buggy around central Maui to make deliveries to her customers. To get food for their pigs, Mildred walked from house to house collecting swill in two kerosene tins suspended from a log pole over her shoulders. To feed her mother's horse, she and her brothers and sisters went around the countryside collecting bagfuls of kiawe beans.

"My father used to tell us that the best gift God can give is the ability to work," said Mildred. "He told us, too, 'If you cannot save money when you're young, you'll be poor for the rest of your life.' "

FIFTY YEARS TO SUCCESS

Besides serving as Mildred's earliest inspiration, those years of frugal living, tenacity, ingenuity, and enterprise have paid off for the plucky old couple.

She said her father, the son of a rice farmer in Okinawa, finished his schooling there and came to Lahaina in 1906 because he could earn more in Hawaii than in his homeland. She said her mother arrived from Okinawa as a picture bride in 1920.

"My parents had the potential to work for themselves. They always wanted to. It took them 50 years to reach success."

Today, Mildred says her parents own land at Waiawa on which they have seven houses rented to tenants. The successful watercress farm across the road was developed by Nakama and his wife on land they leased when they moved here from Maui in 1939. Now they are 70 and 76 years old and, although retired, Nakama still wields his sickle to help harvest the cress, and daily lends his still-deft hands to tying up the bundles of fresh wet greens with narrow strips of banana fiber, ready to go to market.

WORK, AN HONORABLE ESTATE

The ever-present theme of Mildred Kida's story, from childhood on, is "work, an honorable estate" in her book.

Through her high school student years on Maui she was a part-time maid and got her room and board with the families she worked for. When her family moved to Waiawa on Oahu, she got a full-time maid's job in Honolulu which she kept after she married Theodore Kida.

She worked for their room and board and a salary of $200 a month while her husband was going to electrical appliance school and earning $90 a month. They continued living at her employers' home until after their first baby was born.

"For 5 years my only asset was a sewing machine," she said. "I don't believe in buying things when you don't have your own home yet.

FROM MAID TO PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Not only does she believe in work and thrift, but she never missed an opportunity to learn on the job. When she worked in private homes on Maui she learned family and party cooking. Later, she made $30 a day catering wartime parties on Oahu.

In her full-time maid's job, she tried her hand at household budgeting and marketing, became expert at it, and finally was given the responsibility of managing her employers' housekeeping expenses.

Thus, when the opportunity came to launch a boardinghouse and go into business for herself, she had confidence in her ability to run it.

Mildred limited her boarders to 23 University of Hawaii men students. "Girls make too many phone calls and iron too much," she said.

Working from 6 a.m. to 11 p.m. every day, Mildred shopped for, cooked, and served two meals a day to her boarders, cleaned all the house except the students' rooms, and did all the housework and laundry for her growing family.

Ten years and four babies later, she had paid off a $27,000 mortgage on the boarding house.

A NEW BUSINESS

While her days were so filled with serving the needs of the young and the very young, an 87-year-old man applied for lodging in the boarding house. There were no vacant rooms, so Mildred and Theodore had him come to their home in Manoa where he got not only room and board, but Mildred also took care of him.

He was the first aged person she had ever had under her care, and from this experience she learned about the needs of old people. It was from her association with this elderly boarder that the idea for her next investment, a rest home for the aged, originated.

Forthwith, the boarding house was sold, another house bought, and Mildred hired nurses for the 'round-the-clock shifts at her Punahou Rest Home. She herself kept the jobs of cooking and cleaning.

PREPARATION FOR THE BIG STEP

Theodore, meanwhile, had worked for 16 years as an appliance mechanic. With the success of his wife's two business enterprises, the idea of the new Kida Nursing Home began to take shape, and last year he left his job to study for his new position of administrator of the now abuilding home.

At Kaimuki High School and the University of Hawaii he took bookkeeping, accounting, and business administration. He also researched existing nursing homes and made a study of the California Nursing Association presentation of nursing home facilities.

Mildred, too, found time to study. She took Kaimuki High School night courses in business and attended art and interior decorating classes. As a result, she has had a hand in choosing the interior color schemes for the new building.

But her biggest job there will be as head of the kitchen and housekeeping departments. She and her husband have hired a nursing director for the 74-bed operation, and they will have 36 other employees covering 24-hour shifts.

THE CONSERVATIVE WAY

Despite her stepped-up schedule as a businesswoman, Mildred still does her washing and cooking and cleaning at home.

"I think we should try to be conservative even when we can afford more," she said. "When the children were young I gave them a schedule to live by so I could get my work done. Now they help by cleaning their own rooms, taking care of the yard, doing some meal preparation, and dishwashing."

Their oldest son is studying business administration on the mainland. Alan, 13, is a student at Stevenson Intermediate School and Randall, 10, Marjorie, 8, and Diane, 6, all go to Manoa school.

"I'm really enjoying my life today because I can spend more time with the children," she said.

"I took Randy to all the political headquarters during the campaign last fall, he's interested in politics, and the children are learning hula and ballet and Okinawan dancing. Alan goes to bodybuilding class and he does such neat work in his hobby of model building."

Leaving the boys' room which was lively with political posters and shelves filled with models, she showed us the rest of their attractive home in upper Manoa Valley.

"I really love our family life," said this happy and successful woman. "I don't enjoy social life too much unless it's a business meeting, too.

"I think," she philosophized, "that maybe people aren't accomplishing as much as they can today because of too much social life."

Keeping Coins in Circulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the vexing problems facing the United States today is the shortage of coins.

An excellent editorial in the New Brunswick Daily Home News contains some practical and sensible suggestions for "Keeping Coins in Circulation."

If these suggestions are adopted, the coin shortage will be at least alleviated and possibly will be eliminated.

The editorial follows:

KEEPING COINS IN CIRCULATION

The Government's long-expected announcement that it will cease using silver in its coinage and change to a cupro-nickel coinage next year will be along soon.

Many nations use cupro-nickel coins and they have proved entirely satisfactory. They are attractive and durable. They work in vending machines. And copper and nickel are relatively abundant while silver is becoming scarcer and scarcer.

As plans are made for the new coinage, Congress and the Treasury Department must make sure that they do not commit the errors of the past which have so aggravated the coin shortage for a year.

In order to keep speculation in and hoarding of the new coins at the lowest possible level, the new coins should bear no date and should be adopted as a semipermanent standard design, say for a 20-year period.

There is no logical reason for dating coins today. Our postage stamps are not required to bear dates. Neither does our currency bear a date of manufacture, but only dates of authorization.

Another sensible way of keeping hoarding and speculation at a minimum is to omit the mint mark from the new coins. The use of a special mark for mints other than Philadelphia results in an additional variety for collectors and speculators and hoarders to acquire. If all coins of each denomination are identical, hoarding can be cut in half.

Another, and more drastic means of preventing hoarding, is to require the Federal Reserve banks to mix newly minted coins with circulated coins before distributing them to member banks. This makes quantities of new coins more difficult to acquire, and scratch marks from the mixing make the coins less desirable numismatically. In Britain during World War II, the minters intentionally discolored new coins to keep them in circulation rather than in hoards and collections.

The coming radical change in U.S. coinage will create massive problems, and every possible precaution should be taken to put the new coins into circulation and keep them there.

Judges: Remedy for Unfitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in the March 26 issue of Time magazine there is a very fine article paying tribute to an outstanding man, Judge Phil Sheridan Gibson.

The National Commission on Food Marketing, of which I am a member, is fortunate to have this outstanding jurist as our chairman.

Under unanimous consent I include this article concerning a part of his distinguished background in the RECORD at this point:

JUDGES: REMEDY FOR UNFITNESS

Illness, or age, or simple inertia may leave him unqualified for his job, but the judge who deals daily with the lives, liberty, and property of people forced to come before him may have been appointed for life. If so, he can be fired only for gross misconduct. If he has been elected, it usually takes some sort of major scandal to unseat him. Is there no other way by which the honest but unfit judge can be removed from the bench when necessary?

The Federal judiciary has no answer short of impeachment—a tactic successfully used only four times since 1789. Yet senile, lifetime judges have plagued even the Supreme Court. In the 1920's the failing Justice Joseph McKenna once wrote an opinion stating the exact opposite of what all nine Justices, including himself, had voted to say. As for State courts, there have been many efforts to let bar groups monitor unfit judges and recommend removal. But what lawyer wants to bring charges against the very judge who may hear his next case?

QUIET PERSUASION

Now California is trying a widely admired device that may solve the problem. The idea began taking shape in the early 1950's when a murder trial was interrupted for 4 days because the judge vanished on an alcoholic binge. Indignantly, California's now retired Chief Justice Phil S. Gibson, spurred a barbench study that turned up a surprising number of shocking statistics. Of five judges in one county, four had been absent for as long as a year because of ill health. Despite mounting case loads, other judges thought nothing of taking 3-month vacations and playing golf during court hours. Others needed psychiatric care; many were just plain aged.

Chief Justice Gibson pressed for a State constitutional amendment that would give the California Supreme Court full power to remove unfit judges at every level, including its own. The State legislature and California voters overwhelmingly approved such an amendment in 1960. The bench-dominated body that has been set up to do the high court's investigating work is a nine-member Commission on Judicial Qualifications—five judges, two lawyers, and two laymen. The commission operates out of San Francisco under executive secretary Jack E. Frankel, an able, tactful lawyer of 40.

Gripes about judges may come to Frankel from any private citizen, though meaningful complaints generally come from other judges, lawyers, and grand juries. To safeguard the traditional independence of the judiciary, Frankel focuses only on alleged disability and misconduct—for example, senility, public alcoholism, or persistent discourtesy. The commission has the power to subpena medical records, order medical examinations. Once the commission is convinced that a complaint has merit, Secretary Frankel simply sends the judge a registered letter outlining the charges and adds a polite request: "Please comment."

QUIET RESIGNATION

Some judges immediately blast back that personal enemies are out to persecute them. But most recognize that resignation is preferable to the alternative: a commission hearing and public review by the State supreme court. So far, the commission has received 344 formal complaints, found 118 worth investigating, and produced 26 actual resignations. All of the departed judges quit with no publicity whatever. Only one judge under investigation (for berating prosecutors) has ever availed himself of Supreme Court review. He won his case and stayed on the bench.

California is also fostering judicial fitness by new benefits that encourage judges to retire at 70. If he quits after 20 years on the job, a California judge goes on receiving 75 percent of his pay for life. If he fails to retire at 70, the pension drops to 50 percent. In 1959 California had about 80 judges aged 70 or over. Now it has only six.

So successful is California's system that similar legislation is pending in Colorado, Florida, Kansas, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Texas. The American Bar Association is pondering endorsement of the idea that California-style discipline should extend to Federal courts as well. Congress might very well balk and there might be constitutional problems,[1] but aid in the maintenance of U.S. judicial fitness deserves serious consideration.

[1] Such as the fact that article 3 says flatly that Federal judges "shall hold their offices during good behavior."

Judicial Review of Dismissal or Suspension of Classified Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to give persons in the classified civil service a right to a hearing before removal and suspension and a right to judicial review of dismissal or suspension in the Federal judicial district where they were employed.

Under this bill, a dismissed or suspended employee may have judicial review of his dismissal or suspension in the judicial district where he was employed. Under present law, employees must come to Washington, and this expense deprives many of their day in court.

My bill would humanize this presently unjust and unfair law.

This remedial legislation should receive the more serious and favorable consideration of the Congress.

The 144th Anniversary of Greek Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, one of our stanchest and most steadfast allies, in the struggle against godless communism, has been Greece. The Greeks were among the first to feel the heavy hand of Communist terrorism and banditry. By extending a helping hand in 1947, we were able to help Greece overcome her Communist insurgent problem, and go on to again become a viable nation and later a valued member of the NATO alliance. In so doing we partially repaid the debt we all owe to our heritage of Greek civilization and democracy. It is therefore fitting that on the occasion of her 144th anniversary, we again remember our debt to this valiant little Mediterranean nation. It is with these thoughts in mind that I wish to insert in the RECORD this statement by the Royal Greek Embassy:

THE 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY, MARCH 25, 1965

March 25, 1821, marks the first European echo of the American Revolution. On that date, 144 years ago, a band of dedicated freedom loving Greek patriots raised a flag of liberty and swore that they would have freedom or die in the attempt. It was not the first time that the gallant remnants of the brave Greek nation had risen against foreign domination. For more than four centuries of alien domination, they had fought for liberty regularly, on an average every 11 years. Each of those attempts was drowned in blood and destruction.

But the 1821 rising was destined to succeed. Fighting against incredible odds, accepting stoically the price not only in blood but in property that the alien rulers exacted, the Greeks fought on amid their smouldering homes and burning orchards—for the trees too were destroyed to quench the spirit of liberty—and 8 long years later they won, as the Americans had won earlier, thus affirming for the first time in Europe the right of nations to rule themselves.

They found scant support from other European governments at first, those brave Greek fighters. The great capitals of Europe were more concerned with the balance of power with supporting Turkey, whom they called then the sick man of Europe, rather than allowing the Greek subjects of the Turk to gain freedom.

But the justice of the Greek cause prevailed. The example of the American revolution had sown seeds that had grown deep roots. Freedom lovers from other nations came to offer their lives in the cause of Greek liberty. Greeks are proud that Americans participated in that noble endeavor.

In 1821, when the Greeks rose against the Turkish Empire to throw off a yoke of nearly 450 years, to the average American, Greece was either a remote country, somewhere in Europe, or an ancient civilization, famous for its books and buildings. Soon, however, Greece became a real and immediate entity. The Greek struggle for freedom stirred the American press, aroused American orators and stimulated the neoclassic trends in American art, literature and architecture. American opinion was unanimous: a people whose tradition was a source of inspiration to American democracy, a nation fighting for its liberty, should be free.

The first American to sponsor the cause of Greek liberty was Edward Everett, professor of Greek at Harvard University. A man of strong convictions, Everett was determined not only to make speeches for Greece, but to act. In the name of Greece he initiated a crusade against the reactionary and oppressive policy of the Holy Alliance in Europe.

His efforts for Greek independence were to bear fruit, and a year later popular feeling was officially reflected in President Monroe's annual message to Congress, which declared: "Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring, and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their [the Greeks'] contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States."

The Greeks, on their side, looked upon the United States with hope and admiration. One of the first acts of the first Greek Senate in May 1821, was the delivery of an address to the American people, beginning, "Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers: Having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode * * *. Though separated from us by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us * * *. Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue."

It was natural for the American institutions of higher learning to take the lead in aiding the Greek cause; there intellectual freedom was upheld as the cardinal aim in education, and youthful enthusiasm for justice and liberty ran high. From Harvard University came the signal for America's support of Greek freedom. It was given by Edward Everett 6 years before the outbreak of the Greek revolution, in his oration for the degree of master of arts in 1814, which he called "The Restoration of Greece." It contained many prophetic notes. Judging by later reports, his listeners were carried away by the eloquence with which he pleaded for an independent Greece. After graduation from Harvard, Everett visited Hellas on the eve of its independence. He wrote an engaging account of his experiences in Greece during 1818 and 1819 which unfortunately has never been published.

It was Everett who guided Daniel Webster in his famous address on Greece, delivered before the American Congress.

Soon interest in Greece spread beyond Everett's campus at Harvard. Throughout the 1820's, students in American public schools, colleges, and universities were holding meetings, passing resolutions and writing expressions of support for the Greek cause.

The youth of America at that time was keenly interested in the struggle for human freedom which it saw going on in Greece. Some young men volunteered in the Greek armed forces. Young George Jarvis, Jonathan Miller and Samuel Gridley Howe distinguished themselves on the Greek battlefields. Their own American revolution was only a few decades past; the interim years had seen the writing of the American constitution and the careful construction of a republic on the foundations of freedom. Theirs was not merely a passive interest in what was happening in Greece; they felt that their own ideals and lives were involved, and, over 100 years ago, they felt America could not remain isolated.

Eventually, the heroic sacrifices of the Greeks could no longer be ignored. Public opinion in the civilized world was revolted by the brutal suffering of a small heroic nation that was obviously determined to die fighting rather than live in bondage and the great European powers swung their weight behind the Greeks who, at last, obtained for themselves the benefits of freedom, an idea that they gave to the world.

Schools Should Match Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Denver Post under date of March 11, 1965, urging the adoption of a minimum wage by the Denver School Board. The editorial is as follows:

SCHOOLS SHOULD MATCH MINIMUM WAGE

Nearly a month ago, the Denver school administration applied for $106,724 in Federal funds to carry on a special antipoverty project among school youth under the Neighborhood Youth Corps program.

The plan was to provide jobs for 325 young people 16 years and older from families in the poverty classification. They would do maintenance work in school buildings and on school grounds and help out in school libraries and lunchrooms.

Superintendent Oberholtzer and his staff deserve credit and praise for planning and initiating this project. It is one of several efforts they have undertaken to support the national war against poverty and help the victims of poverty in the Denver schools.

Unfortunately, however, the school administration has been reluctant to accept the minimum wage standards required by the Federal Government as a condition for granting the Neighborhood Youth Corps funds.

The school administration considers it would be improper to pay the Youth Corps students the Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour, when about 752 student and adult employees of the schools are now being paid less than that amount for the same kind of work.

And the administration is reluctant to spend an extra $85,000 to $90,000 to bring the present employees up to the Federal minimum. We believe that, irrespective of the youth corps project, the extra money ought to be spent and wages in the Denver schools ought to be raised at least to the Federal minimum.

About 280 of the present school employees are adult women who work in the lunchrooms and are not much below the minimum wage now. About 472 of the employees are student sweepers who start at 95 cents an hour and are paid considerably less than the rates prevailing in the Denver area.

Most of the caddy boys who carry out groceries at the major chainstores now receive $1.25 an hour under union contract, and all will receive at least $1.25 by July 7 of this year. Some will receive $1.32.

The union minimum for part-time sweepers in the Denver area is $1.75 an hour; and the Denver career service minimum, which is based on the rate prevailing among private employers, is $1.45 for the same type of work.

It is true that the State minimum wage for women and minors in some occupations is 80 cents an hour. But that rate was set in 1958 and the State industrial commission is now in the process of revising it. Since 1958, average hourly earnings in manufacturing have increased by more than 40 percent.

In this affluent society in this period of high living costs, employers who pay less than the Federal minimum, whether they be public or private, may actually be contributing to the problem of poverty instead of helping to alleviate it.

The schools ought not to be in that position. They ought not to be using young people as cheap labor to perform tasks that draw a much higher compensation when they are performed by adults. And they ought not to be paying adult women less than the Federal minimum, even though there is no legal requirement to do so.

Many of the student sweepers use their income to help support families who are suffering from poverty. At $1.25 an hour for a few hours work a day, they would hardly be in a position to support them with too much munificence.

Finally, the Denver schools ought not to be arguing to the Federal Government that Denver is a low-wage community, so impoverished that it cannot afford to meet the Federal standards.

This is not Appalachia and it ought not to behave like a depressed area.

Alaska: Adventureland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, Alaska expects to be host to more visitors during 1965 than ever before. With five vessels now operating along Alaska's marine highways, restoration of quake damaged highways completed, the number of tourist accommodations much increased, and Alaska's wide fame as an adventureland becoming even wider, it is no surprise.

For those of my colleagues who plan to visit Alaska in 1965 I have available in my office, Alaska: Adventureland, the 15th annual progress edition of the Fairbanks-News Miner. Thanks to its fine edtiorial staff, printshop crew, and equipment, the Fairbanks-News Miner has produced a superb introduction to Alaska, adventureland. Assurance of Alaska's hospitality and ample scope of visitor accommodations is contained on its editorial page, as follows:

ALASKA: ADVENTURELAND

This year's Alaska progress edition affords prospective visitors a preview of what they may see and do in the 49th State in 1965.

After cataloging attractions from Glacier Bay to Alyeska, from Mount McKinley to Barrow, from Valdez to Kodiak, the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner staffers and contributors who worked on this edition came to the conclusion that activities and facilities for tourists this year are more numerous and widespread than before the great Alaska earthquake of March a year ago.

As Gov. William A. Egan declares in a special report appearing in "Alaska Rebuilds" (sec. A of this edition), Alaska has rebounded, the earthquake slowed us down only temporarily, and "it now appears that 1965 will be a record year for travel to Alaska."

The south-central area, where earthquake, flood, and fire struck on Good Friday last year, has now rebuilt to the point where more events and accommodations are offered than before. The new State ferry *Tustumena* now serves Kodiak, Seward, Seldovia, Homer, and Anchorage, while the Chilkat ferry connects scenic Cordova with Valdez, the "Little Switzerland" of Alaska.

With the marine highway system extended and highways restored and improved, Alaskans themselves will be surprised to inventory the travel opportunities available via the Alaska highway and ferry system and daily flights to the far north.

Despite the shattering blow of March 27, 1964, the young economy of Alaska is proving its vitality. The many families who will be heading north to see our unique attractions can travel with the happy thought that they are helping to keep our Nation's gold system stable.

In a front page editorial published before the entry of the 49th State into the Union the Washington (D.C.) Daily News referred to Alaska as "an awakening giant."

In this year 1965, the validity of this description is becoming more apparent.

Alaska now welcomes families in all the smaller States to head north and take a good look at our land of adventure. Some may decide to return and make Alaska their permanent home. We are sure that those who do will find a gracious and friendly reception in our land of opportunity and challenge.

General de Gaulle: Unfriendly Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a report by the editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers which I believe reflects the thinking of many of us regarding the recent actions and statements of our supposed friend and ally, General de Gaulle of France.

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., reviewing General de Gaulle's decision to send aid to North Vietnam and other measures, comments, "With a friend like 'Hard Time Charlie,' who needs enemies?"

It is Mr. Hearst's suggestion that we Americans exercise our displeasure and disapproval of these actions by refraining from visiting France this year. In this suggestion he agrees with Senator FULBRIGHT, who recently proposed the same thing, but he perhaps wisely refrains from the tantalizing description of sin and shame attributed to that country in the Senator's remarks. It is not the lust and wantonness of Paris that should motivate us, if indeed the French capital has such captivating qualities, but rather the actions of the French Government so deliberately taken to frustrate and harm the strength and policies of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I insert at this point in the Appendix the report of Mr. Hearst appearing in the Hearst newspapers of March 21, 1965:

GENERAL DE GAULLE, "UNFRIENDLY ALLY"

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, the Hearst newspapers)

You have probably heard the rather oft quoted remark attributed to Marshal Villars, a French general, to his sovereign, Louis XIV, as he left Paris for one of their 18th century wars. It goes like this: "Protect me please, sire, from my friends back here; I can take care of my enemies myself."

This quotation crops up in my mind every time I read the latest nasty crack or act of today's No. 1 French general, Charles de Gaulle. With a friend like "Hard Time Charlie," who needs enemies?

Up to our neck in the jungles of Vietnam—where we need no help from any of our allies but certainly have the right to expect that they do not help our Communist foes—all we've been getting from the President of France is a pain in that same neck.

Up to now it had been mostly heckling, but last week he started directly aiding our foes.

It isn't as though our task in that corner of the world were unclear; we have spelled it out for anybody to read. Even Charlie with his head way up there in the clouds must understand.

It is the task—sometimes appearing to be thankless—of protecting free nations from aggressions of the Communist war machine. The Vietcong guerrillas who are invading free South Vietnam. Behind them is surely Red China.

Until recently we have confined our aid for South Vietnam to that unhappy nation's own bloody soil. This has never been called a war, and for a long time the American forces in South Vietnam were, in theory at least, on a supply and training mission.

Now we have been using the "persuasion" of air strikes to destroy limited military targets in the Communist homeland of North Vietnam—the idea being to deal increasing punishment until the Reds call off their invaders.

De Gaulle can't possibly misunderstand what we are doing. Nor can he still believe that we are going to accept his oft-repeated line that we cannot keep the free nation of South Vietnam free from Communist domination.

To agree to fresh economic aid and more generous credit terms to North Vietnam, as the French Government did this week, thus becomes a calculated injury to the United States and the cause of freedom for which American soldiers have been dying.

It would be fitting to call it the last straw except that we have learned that there is always another straw, and another—calculated to give the United States a really hard time in world affairs—from "hard-time Charlie."

He is surely one of the alltime worst friends an ally ever had.

To me, there's no reason to sit still and take De Gaulle's unfriendly arrogance with a Gallic shrug, as if to say, "Ah, well, that's Charlie for you."

It has long been clear that diplomatic representations mean nothing to him. The latest evidence was the editorial silence in the Paris press on the speech last Tuesday by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball.

Mr. Ball's words were about as tough as diplomacy can get. They expressed the growing irritation within our administration—and that, of course, includes the annoyance of President Johnson—with the open opposition of De Gaulle to American policies in Vietnam.

It is one thing for a nation to express its doubts of another nation's policy by taking a disinterested attitude and saying in effect, "We'll sit this one out." It's quite another thing for the head of a nation not only to deride the policy of another nation and declare it futile, but to try to convince other countries joined in an alliance of freedom of his point of view, as De Gaulle has been doing.

Naturally, Nguyen Tu, an industrial expert of the North Vietnam regime, is overjoyed with De Gaulle's credit trade extension. It will mean that much more money to support the Vietcong guerrillas in South Vietnam. However you look at it, De Gaulle is contributing to Communist strength.

Sukarno of Indonesia also is contributing to Communist strength by seizing properties of the free world. The difference is one of method.

All this helps explain the irritation in the administration and the words of Mr. Ball, who said, "When national positions are vigorously promoted without regard to their effect on the responsible common efforts of other states, free world interests may well be injured."

Now, if France were truly a democratic nation, with true freedom of press, such a speech by so important an official of the United States would provoke immediate editorial reaction.

There was none.

The only conclusion to be drawn from this is that the French press is under control of the Government, which indicates that De Gaulle is more of a dictator than he would like to concede.

The fact that De Gaulle scorns diplomatic protests need not end the matter.

There is another way in which the American people can express displeasure, and that is by not spending their money in France.

A couple of weeks ago I urged this suggestion in commenting on a speech by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Arkansas Democrat and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. The Senator exhorted Americans to shun "the artistic pocket picking of Paris at least for a year or so," as an expression of the "enlightened self-interest of our people" so as to help halt the drain of gold dollars from the United States. The De Gaulle regime (and, of course, other countries, too) is busy turning dollars into gold reserve.

In view of the latest examples of De Gaulle's unfriendliness, there is all the more reason today to recommend that you omit France from your travel itineraries.

This is not written with any animosity toward the French people, or with any lack of appreciation of the historical grandeurs or scenic beauties their country offers the traveler. Nor does it mark on my part an endorsement of what has been called the new isolationism. In other words, the suggestion not to spend American money in France is not an ideological position but rather a practical way of expressing disapproval of the diversionary, anti-American policies of President de Gaulle.

Of course, one big way to help redress the balance of payments in our favor (which has been tilting against us for quite some time) would be for Americans to first get acquainted with the historical grandeur and incomparable scenic attractions of our own country. Additionally these sights—historic and scenic—produce a sense of reverence, and wonder, and thankfulness just to be an American. It always does in me anyway. It is also true that firsthand knowledge of our country makes us all better representatives abroad.

But, if travel across the Atlantic is your bent, there are many countries with pleasures and interests equal to those of France: England, Ireland, Scotland, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal. All have places the equal of

France's in historical interest and some excelling in scenic magnificence.

Skip France this year and let the general feel it where it hurts, in the pants pocket.

Housing Problems in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks I have been placing in the RECORD a series of articles on "New York City in Crisis," which have been appearing in the New York Herald Tribune. The following article cites a specific example of what often happens when the citizen complains. It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 17, 1965:

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE $1 MILLION HOUSING REPAIR FUND?

(By Tim Hutchens)

A new telephone listing for city residents to call with housing complaints is raising the question of what happened to the $1 million appropriated last month for the solution of emergency problems.

On January 31, Council President Paul R. Screvane disclosed that the city had placed $1 million in a revolving fund to finance emergency repairs on slum buildings. Mr. Screvane is chairman of the city's antipoverty operations board.

On Monday, Mayor Wagner designated Worth 4-3000 as the official number of a communications center where unhappy tenants could complain to city agencies.

In its first 24 hours of operation, the center referred 1,537 calls to eight city agencies.

Were chunks of the $1 million being used to help answer the complaint?

The question was put to Mr. Screvane's office at noon, transferred to the mayor's office, then to the office of Milton Mollen, the mayor's housing chief, and finally to the housing and redevelopment board.

Despite assurances from the last two offices that information about the $1 million was forthcoming yesterday afternoon, none was made available by the time municipal offices closed at 5 p.m.

Others have also been curious about the special appropriation.

Ted Velez, executive director of the East Harlem Tenant's Council, said his organization reported to the mayor 2 weeks ago that 79 buildings in its area could use the emergency funds.

"But to date," he said, "we haven't received a word regarding an appointment with him."

The approval of the funds came with a ruling by the board of health that certain housing conditions dangerous to life and health—such as lack of water or electricity—enables the city to make repairs in private buildings and then bill the landlords.

Most of the tenants calling the new emergency housing number are complaining about a lack of heat.

Of the 1,537 calls received between 9 a.m. Monday and yesterday morning, 626 were referred to the department of buildings and 851 to the department of health. Other calls went to such agencies as the city housing authority, the city rent and rehabilitation administration and the police department.

At the health department, Lester J. Rosner, the agency's administrative assistant commissioner, said the center was funneling "basically the same kind of information."

He pointed out, though, that a complaining tenant no longer has to call several city agencies before reaching one that offers him some satisfaction.

At the department of buildings, Julius W. Schneider, the agency's assistant director of operations, said that he does not expect that the average time of 3 weeks to investigate a complaint will shrink much.

Of the reports already received, he said, "we haven't had a chance to analyze them."

And on the fourth floor of her apartment at 313 West 117th Street, Mrs. Clarence Baker, who registered a chronic complaint to the center 8 minutes after it opened Monday, said yesterday that her heat continues to drop each afternoon toward the temperature outdoors.

Her lack of steam was first reported in the "City in Crisis" series 2 weeks ago.

The new communications center, designed to expedite complaints to city agencies, is now located in, temporarily, a downtown civil defense facility.

Present plans call for a permanent, $10,000 center at 280 Broadway with a full-time staff of 20 persons—more as needed—and a payroll of $175,000 per year.

The Other Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Progress Bulletin of Pomona, Calif., in a very timely editorial entitled "The Other Cost," recently commented on the growing size of Federal grant-in-aid programs.

The Progress Bulletin declared:

The cost of grants-in-aid, in terms of dollars, is enormous. The other cost, which must be measured in the subjugation of local government which is far more responsible to the needs, wants and problems of its regions, is greater still.

In my view, this is a very accurate and appropriate assessment.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

THE OTHER COST

It has been said that Federal grant-in-aid programs have grown to the point where they are unmanageable. Whether or not this extremity has been reached, they are ascending to stupefying dimensions.

In 1966, the proposed Federal budget indicates, they will reach the record figure of $13.6 billion—$2.2 billion more than for 1965 and $3.3 billion above the 1964 appropriations. Practically all of the increase is in the area of welfare and education, including such programs as economic opportunity; educational assistance; manpower development and training; health and research; and housing and community development.

The question here is not whether any or all of such programs are good or bad, necessary or unnecessary. It is whether they are a proper function of the Central Government. And, further, it is a question of whether the rights, obligations and responsibilities of State and local government—to say nothing of those of individual citizens and families—are to be totally submerged by Federal bureaucracies which control the purse strings and lay down the rules.

The cost of grants-in-aid, in terms of dollars, is enormous. The other cost, which must be measured in the subjugation of local government which is far more responsible to the needs, wants and problems of its regions, is greater still.

GOP Plight Seen as a Historic Challenge and Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, several metropolitan newspapers last Sunday carried an extremely piercing and analytical story on the Republican Party by former GOP chairman, the Honorable Leonard Hall.

A former colleague in the House, an able lawyer, and a politician with an outstanding record of success, Len Hall is probably the best qualified Republican in our Nation to objectively examine our Party. My personal relationships with Len Hall go back over a decade, and I am pleased to recommend his article to members of both national parties as a further illustration of his political acumen.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun Times, Mar. 28, 1965]

GOP PLIGHT SEEN AS A HISTORIC CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY

(By Leonard Hall)

No question about it. After more than three decades of decline at the ballot box, the Republican Party is in bad shape. While the situation is discouraging to some, I see the party's plight as an historic challenge and opportunity.

Since its debut with Abraham Lincoln, the Republican Party has provided many of America's greatest leaders. During a great part of the last century it gave our country its best, most substantially progressive government.

What, then, has happened to cause a majority of voters to favor the opposition? And what should be done about it?

Essentially, the answers can be found in an analysis of dramatic Republican victories last November, despite the nationwide Democratic tide. In Massachusetts, the home of the Cabots and the Lodges, John Volpe, the son of Italian immigrants, was elected Governor, and Ed Brooke, a descendant of Negro slaves, was overwhelmingly reelected attorney general. In California, GEORGE MURPHY, an Irish-American Roman Catholic, overcame seemingly impossible odds to be elected Senator. In Hawaii HIRAM FONG, a descendant of contract laborers brought from China, won reelection to the Senate by a huge majority while Democrats were sweeping virtually all other offices in his State.

The lesson of the Volpe-Brooke-Murphy-Fong triumphs is that it is not enough for the Republican Party to run first-rate candidates, men who are dedicated to basic Republican principles. The men I named certainly filled that bill and are superb public officials. But they also represent a cross section of America as it is today.

Unfortunately, there are far too few Volpes and Brookes and Murphys and Fongs in the Republican ranks and our party gives the appearance of being an organization of white Anglo-Saxon Protestants.

We have permitted our party to become too exclusive. We have been trying to elect national candidates with the descendants of the people who came over on the Mayflower, and that boat just wasn't big enough.

America is a nation of racial, religious, and ethnic minorities. Overall, even the white Anglo-Saxon Protestants are a minority. To serve adequately and to succeed in elections, the Republican Party has got to reflect America.

I admit, regretfully, that when you attend any meeting of Republicans on the national scale the faces you see and the names you hear are rarely Negro, Italian-American, Polish-American, Irish-American, or Jewish, or any of the other groups that combine to make up our country.

We are excluding from our party the Americans we now need most. We may not like to talk about it, but every election proves that each of these minority groups votes often as a bloc. And every year, these minority groups are voting more and more for the Democratic Party. Why? Because the Republican Party has lost touch with these Americans, and consequently we have lost their support.

Look at what happened in 1960 and 1964: In both of those presidential elections the Republicans lost 75 percent of the Roman Catholic vote. We lost 80 percent of the Jewish vote and we lost from 75 to 96 percent of the Negro vote. These figures are crucial to the future of the Republican Party. I do not believe that any political party could win national elections with these important minority groups permanently arrayed against it.

DEMOCRATS HAVE 2-TO-1 EDGE

In 1964, only 25 percent of American voters—one in four—regarded themselves as Republicans. The Democrats had 53 percent of the voters—a 2-to-1 lead over us, and a clear majority of the country.

We must not underestimate the meaning of those figures. If our party is to win a national election in 1968 or 1972, we have to do the impossible—hold onto all the Republican votes, win the independents, and win a large number of Democrats, too.

Our party did not always face such odds. For almost 75 years the Republicans dominated American politics.

The disaster that started the decline of Republican popularity was, as everyone knows, something that was beyond the control of any party, any President, or any government—the great depression—and what the Democrats did to place the blame for that depression on the Republican Party changed the course of American political history. Distinctive minority groups, most of whom lived in the big cities and were hit hardest by the depression, deserted their Republican traditions for Democratic jobs. On top of that, Franklin D. Roosevelt, a master of party politics, stamped the "big business" label on all Republicans.

However, we cannot blame the Democrats entirely for our situation. Frankly, I believe that we brought a great part, if not most, of it on ourselves. The "big business" label stuck because we did attract big business—and not enough other people. In particular, we did not attract the minority groups that were outside our party but were becoming an increasingly powerful factor in politics.

It is true that when we start a national political campaign we will form a Jewish committee and an Italian-American committee and a Polish-American committee and so on. Then, when we get into office, what do we do?

A comparison of the Cabinets under Dwight D. Eisenhower with those under John F. Kennedy and President Johnson will show what I mean. When I went to Washington as Republican national chairman in 1953 I found that President Eisenhower had told all Cabinet officers that they could bring in their own men as deputies, staff assistants, and advisers. When I looked over the list of appointments I discovered that a great percentage of the jobs had gone to Michigan and New York. Why? Well, first, that's where big business is. And second, the Cabinet, while long in brains, was somewhat short on politics. As a result, the Eisenhower administration turned out, in the eyes of the public, to be almost exclusively Anglo-Saxon and Protestant, even though Mr. Eisenhower himself remained the idol of all elements in the country.

Then we come to the Kennedy-Johnson era and what do we see there? We see a Goldberg. We see a Ribicoff. We then see a Celebrezze; we see a Gronouski. And now we see Connor. And remember, in politics it's often what you look like, as much as if not more than what you really do, that brings you support.

The Democrats recognize that America is made up of minorities and see that they are represented at the highest level of government. In the Republican Party, the minorities are not so recognized.

The other day I attended a meeting of Republican congressional leaders and others who want to help in the Republican congressional campaign of 1966. Someone said, "What's wrong with us?"

"Look around the table," I said.

Here we were, a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant group. There was not a Jewish man there. There was not a Polish-American. There was not an Italian-American. There was not a Negro. The person next to me said, "Len, I think there's one Catholic."

CHANGE IN IMAGE, ATTITUDE NEEDED

Until we change our image and our attitude, we cannot and we will not win national elections. Barry Goldwater's loss in 1964 was worse than it should have been, but Goldwater never had a chance. With what was arrayed against our party in 1964, no Republican candidate could have won.

Now that Lyndon Johnson is in the White House for a full term of his own, our Republican situation is critical. President Johnson knows more about the workings of politics and government than any President in memory. He realizes that his hopes for the Democratic Party to stay in power rest on the big cities, which is where most of the minorities are. Because Mr. Johnson is an extraordinarily able politician, the need for a change in Republican attitude is all the more imperative.

What should Republicans do now? There is no one simple answer, no quick and easy remedy. But we must begin by building a broader base for this party. We must get away from the idea that this is an exclusive club. I do not mean that we should pander to the minority groups, as some liberal Democrats do.

It's our job to show members of minority groups that our policies will preserve their heritage and provide them true opportunity.

We need their participation in developing such policies and keeping them attuned to the times. Their participation in developing Republican policy is the best way of demonstrating our concern for the true and lasting interests of all Americans.

We should make it clear that every American is entitled to an equal place in Republican politics, Republican government and the Republican Party. More than that, we must actively enlist into the Republican Party all Americans—Negro, Italian-American, Irish-American, the Polish-American, Catholic and Jew.

We must sign more of them up as volunteers in the precinct, give them places on our party tickets, invite their views, and above all, appoint them to responsible, decision-making positions at our national conferences and conventions. We must show them that the Republican Party is not a private club, but that it represents the whole country and is concerned with all of America's problems and opportunities.

GOP CAN'T IGNORE THE NEGRO

Some Republicans contend that the Democrats have the Negro vote sewed up and there is nothing we can do about it. They are wrong.

We cannot write off any group of Americans. In the first place, as a matter of principle, the Negro's vote should not be taken for granted by any party. The Republican Party should offer to the Negro voter, as it does to all American citizens, the freedom of political choice.

In the second place, as a matter of politics, the Republican Party cannot ignore any minority group—certainly not the Negroes, who make up a sizable proportion of the voting population and are concentrated in the big cities, where the Republican Party is weakest.

If we hope to regain our political strength, we must get down to the practical politics of winning support among big city minorities. To carry New York State, the Republicans must make an impact on the Jewish, Puerto Rican, and Negro voter in New York City. If we do not show strength with those minorities, we don't carry New York. Similar political situations exist with Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, Chicago and Illinois, Detroit and Michigan, Cleveland and Ohio.

Unless we can make great political gains among minority groups, we will continue to lose the big cities by tremendous votes. Big losses in the big cities cost us the big States. It is impossible—realistically, if not mathematically—for the Republicans to win a national election without four of the eight biggest States.

REPUBLICANS CAN WIN MINORITIES

Can the Republican Party win support among the minority groups? The answer is yes. We have done it, and we are doing it. Not long ago I went to a reception in New York for Gov. George Romney. A Negro guest came up to say hello to me. He said, "Mr. Hall, I just wanted to tell you that I'm a New Yorker now; but I'm here tonight because I was one of the Negro leaders in Michigan for George Romney." It is of passing interest to note that in the last election in Michigan Romney got 20 percent of the Negro vote, whereas Goldwater got 2 or 3 percent.

Romney, William W. Scranton, John Volpe and Nelson A. Rockefeller have broadened the Republican Party in their States to include not only the Negroes but all minority Americans. These Republicans are successful as candidates and as Governors, in part, because they have made the minorities part of the Republican family. We have got to establish this same principle at the highest national level of the party. Specifically, I would like to see a broad cross-section of Americans at meetings of the Republican National Committee and the new Republican Coordinating Council.

While we are learning to attract minority groups, we must also learn to show more tolerance for political differences between Republicans. There are differences of opinion in this country, and there will always be differences within parties. I am opposed to those fellows who say you should have a conservative party and a liberal party. It is unrealistic to think you can have that clear a political division in 50 States. What one State regards as a vital liberal issue is meaningless in another. I have long been convinced that our country is healthier with conservatives and liberals in both major parties.

DISSENT IS A NATURAL TRADITION

My belief is that we should not try to paper over our differences or pretend they don't exist. Dissent is one of democracy's greatest traditions, and we should make an asset of it—as the Democrats have done. I will go further and say that we should establish some kind of a forum, preferably in Washington, where we can display the full range of political thought in our party and the great diversity of political talent we have. We should bring to his forum all the Volpes and Brookes, the Smileys, the Romneys, the Rockefellers and the Scrantons, the Hatfields and the Evanses, the Percys and the Bob Tafts—all the established party figures from around the country and the younger leaders who are coming up. I disagree with those who feel they have to be afraid of anybody who is moving into the national picture. My feeling is that the more we can see Republicans move, the better off we are.

In advocating such a forum I do not intend to diminish the public role of our congressional leaders such as Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois and Representative GERALD FORD, of Michigan. They have vital responsibilities in Congress and they should continue to speak out. But so should members of the national committee and the new Republican Co-ordinating Council. So should moderate Republicans and conservative Republicans. So should the Republican Governors.

It may be heresy for me to say this because I spent 14 years as a Congressman on Capitol Hill, but I feel that it is a healthy development that the Republican Governors are getting together and pressing for a more positive and progressive Republican program. With their help, we can create a better record that will bring new members and a new spirit to the Republican Party.

MUST ABANDON NEGATIVE VIEW

We have got to get out of our negative, foot-in-the-cement posture. A political party out of power as long as we have been automatically becomes classed as negative. I want to make it plain that I think the Republican Party, when it is in power, brings the best government to the country. But you can't govern unless you get elected. We give the country better government; but, and it hurts to admit it, the Democrats are better practical politicians.

This must change. Ours is a great party, with a long and honorable record of service. But there is no built-in guarantee for continuous terms of Democrats in the White House. Certainly we will always be a minority party if great groups of Americans feel they are not wanted in the Republican Party family. If the Republican Party is to live and prosper, it must again become what it was created to be—the party for all Americans.

End of Cheap Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to include another editorial from the New York Times, from this morning's edition, once again in opposition to the importation of foreign labor, a program which nas tended to continue the depression of our own domestic migrant labor.

The editorial speaks for itself, and I insert it herewith:

END OF CHEAP FARM LABOR

Secretary of Labor Wirtz sharply reflected the expressed intention of Congress when he told importunate corporate farmers that they could never again expect Government authorization for the mass import of cutrate foreign labor to harvest American crops.

No crops will spoil if the growers finally face up to the need for a substantial increase in the wages that have for so many years made migratory farm laborers the country's most exploited workers. Their average earnings have never come to much more than $1,000 a year—a third of the level President Johnson has taken as the dividing line between poverty and decency.

Even a doubling of farm wages should mean little in costs to consumers. A recent survey by the Labor Department found that the field labor cost for picking oranges was 1 to 2 cents a dozen, as against a retail price of 50 to 72 cents at big-city markets. For lettuce the picking cost was a little over 1 cent a head, the retail sales price 23 cents. The farm laborer can move far up the economic ladder without any profound impact on the pocketbook of this best fed of nations.

Abolish National Origins Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to have included in the RECORD the resolution unanimously adopted by the 1,500 members and delegates to the 81st annual meeting of United Hias Service, held in New York City, on March 14, 1965, urging the enactment of the administration immigration bill which would abolish the national origins quota system. United Hias Service is a worldwide Jewish migration agency, well known for its many years of outstanding work and humanitarian aid to immigrants.

The resolution follows:

IMMIGRATION LAW REFORM

(A resolution unanimously adopted at the 81st annual meeting of United Hias Service, Hotel Roosevelt, New York, March 14, 1965)

Whereas for many years, members of United Hias Service have been urging revision of the basic U.S. immigration and nationality law, so that our quota allocation system would reflect American democratic concepts concerning the dignity and worth of the individual; and

Whereas specific proposals for the abolition of the national origin quota system were made by President Lyndon B. Johnson and by his predecessors, Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower and Truman; and

Whereas these recommendations have been adopted and sponsored by many Senators and Representatives of the Congress of the United States, by the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, by leading labor organizations and by all the major Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and nonsectarian agencies interested in immigration reform; and

Whereas the need for these reforms has been for these reforms has been voluminously established by testimony and actual experience gathered over the years; and

Whereas such changes in the quota allocations system, in addition to removing injustices, will be of practical help to many thousands of our coreligionists who are waiting in various countries to join their relatives in the United States; and

Whereas these recommendations have been in corporated in S. 500 before the Senate and H.R. 2580 before the House of Representatives: Now, therefore,

We urge upon the membership of United Hias Service that representations be made to their Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States that these pending bills on changes in the quota allocation system be enacted and that they take such further appropriate action which would be consistent with our national interest and would infuse our immigration and nationality laws with the cherished humanitarian and democratic principles of our Nation, and set an example of leadership in the free world.

Auto Buying Headaches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by John Osborne which appeared in the March 27, 1965, edition of the New Republic magazine and which is one of the best arguments for simplifying sales contracts.

Despite the tongue-in-cheek criticism of the truth-in-lending bill the article points up the need for this legislation.

I am a sponsor of this bill in the 89th Congress. It is H.R. 111 and is currently pending before the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

The article follows:

AUTO BUYING HEADACHES: A LESSON IN THE HIGH COST OF BORROWING

(By John Osborne)

The General Motors Acceptance Corp. and I have recently completed an interesting and, to me, instructive venture in cooperation. We have cooperated in the purchase of a Chevrolet and in my education. I now know enough about the loan business, automobile division, to perceive the trouble with truth-in-lending bills of the kind sponsored by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois. The trouble with them is that it is impossible to comprehend, much less to convey, the truth about this sort of lending. This, in effect, is what spokesmen for the loan industry have said in thousands upon thousands of words at congressional hearings, and they are quite right.

Although I did not realize it at the time, my conversion to the industry view began on October 23, 1962, when I casually inspected and signed the GMAC conditional sales contract presented to me by a Chevrolet salesman in Washington. It seemed to set forth in clear and simple terms a good deal of the truth in lending that Senator DOUGLAS was demanding. There were items marked "principal balance" ($2,470.71), which I took to be the amount of the loan; "Finance charge" ($407.13), which I read to mean "interest"; and time price balance" ($2,877.84), obviously the total that I would be paying to GMAC in the next 3 years. A single, perfectly understandable sentence disposed of "terms of payment" ("the time balance is payable * * * in 36 installments of $79.94 each, commencing December 7, 1962, and on

the same day of each succeeding month thereafter."). Neither the word "interest" nor any reference to a rate of interest appeared in the contract, but I did not balk at the omission. There before my eyes was the figure labeled "Finance charge," so much more forthright than a percentage. Any fool, I told myself, could determine the rate of interest by dividing the amount of the finance charge by the principal balance.

The start of my active education, or awakening, may be dated 17 monthly payments later, in April of 1964, when my wife and I decided to apply $800 in a lump sum to the car debt. I marked a check for this amount "to principal, account 68,053," sent along a separate check for the regular payment falling due at around that time, and asked in an accompanying note whether and how the remaining payments and the total of interest would be affected. I assumed that in reducing the principal we had saved a fair sum in interest, and I looked forward to being told how much it was.

On May 13, 2 weeks after the money and the inquiry had been mailed, a GMAC envelope arrived. Warmed by what I took to be a moderately prompt reply, I opened it and read the following: "As a matter of good business procedure it is our practice, from time to time, to verify the unpaid balances on our customers' accounts. Will you please, therefore, fill in the information called for below and return." The information called for below consisted of "unpaid balance," "date and amount of last remittance," and a signature. Reflecting that GMAC wanted to know what I wanted to know, I set this form letter aside and awaited some individual word. After another fortnight had passed without any, I fired off a rather curt request for a reply. After a week or so of continuing corporate silence, I appealed to the salesman who had sold us the car, recalling that he had then appeared to be chummy with GMAC. He made it evident that he considered my inquiry and impatience exceedingly odd. But he did intercede and I soon received a telephone call from a lady at GMAC. It developed that she had signed the form letter. She first rebuked me in a nice way for having failed to answer it, pointing out that a prepaid and addressed envelope had been provided. She then informed me that GMAC considered my $800 to be the equivalent of 10 monthly payments, with a trifle over. She said that I might defer further payments until the 10 months had expired, or—with a distinct edge in her voice—I might continue to pay at the previous pace until the balance of the contracted total was paid off. Then, and in that event, she said, GMAC would rebate any excess that might be due me. All of this was stated so briskly, and with so clear an implication that I was being childish, that I accepted it without demur and was glad to hang up the telephone.

Thereafter I made some payments on the prescribed dates, let others pass, and on January 7, 1965, paid in a second lump sum the balance due on the contract (I actually overpaid by $54, which GMAC refunded at its leisure). In a note with the final check I called attention to the fact that the debt, including the total of interest which would have accrued over the full 36 months of the contract, had now been repaid 10 months ahead of the ordained time.

SIMPLE ARITHMETIC

As I was trained to expect by then, a hiatus followed. In the 4 weeks and 5 days which elapsed without a response, I did a lot of figuring and thinking. All of it proved to be fallacious, but it was educational. Since GMAC had divided the sum of the "principal balance" and the "finance charge" by 36, and so arrived at my monthly payment of $79.94, I assumed that by dividing each of the same amounts by 36 I could determine the portions of the monthly payments which had applied to interest ($11.31) and to principal ($68.63). It therefore seemed reasonable to anticipate a rebate of 10 times $11.31, or $113.10, in interest that would have been paid over the final 10 months of the contract period. While I was at it, I divided the amount of the finance charge by the amount of the principal balance and came up with 16.88 percent. If this was the rate of interest over the 36 months, the annual rate appeared to be one-third of it, or a little over 5.6 percent. Fair enough—and there was that $113.10 coming back to me any day now.

But I fell to fretting: was it fair? What about the $800 paid "to principal" last April? Could it be that in treating it as 10 monthly payments, GMAC had absorbed $113.10 (the amount of the anticipated rebate, by coincidence) as interest and reduced by that amount the sum which I had explicitly paid against the principal? Could it be, also that since then I had been paying interest not only on the $800 but on the $1,165.71 which supposedly had been repaid against the principal over the previous 17 months (at $68.63 per month)? If GMAC had knocked $113.10 off my $800 and credited $686.90 of it to principal, it seemed to me that I should then have owed something like $618 of the initial "principal balance." At 5.6 percent a year, the interest on that amount for the 10 months covered by my $800 would come to about $28.85. For the 8 months between the $800 payment and the final payment, it would be a little less. But, counting monthly payments in the interval, I had paid $148.04 in what I regarded as interest, plus the $113.10 which I confidently expected to recover in the awaited rebate. Drunk on this arithmetic, I prepared to be injured if GMAC rebated less than $230.

On February 12, 1965, along with a clear title to the Chevrolet and a cheery card certifying that I had established a satisfactory credit rating with GMAC, the rebate check arrived. It was for $29.60. Being pretty well conditioned by this time, I was more puzzled than outraged. After a pause for inward pacification, I wrote a letter of inquiry to GMAC, setting forth my simple arithmetic and asking a few simple questions. I was aware by then that GMAC's practices were common, no doubt with some variations, to the automobile finance business generally and, more broadly, to other fields of credit; and I said as much in the letter. My main questions were: why the difference between the rebate I had expected, at a minimum, and the one I had received? how did GMAC calculate the finance charge and the total debt? and, was it impossible for a debtor to reduce the finance charge with a lump payment in midcontract unless the entire loan was paid off ahead of the contracted date. I also asked whether GMAC had treated my $800 as I had been led to believe and, if so, by what authority.

With what I now recognize as dazzling speed, GMAC answered the inquiry precisely 2 weeks after it was mailed from my office in Washington to its office in Washington. The answer was in the form of a telephone call from a Mr. R. K. Thomas, who identified himself as an assistant manager of GMAC's Washington office. He could not have been nicer, more informative, and more baffling. As will appear, he was a touch baffled himself.

First, he apologized: GMAC had rebated $55.87 less than it should have. GMAC had mechanized its accounting processes and in handling my $800 "the machines got a little bit involved." In short, the $800 had been treated as 10 monthly payments, as the GMAC lady had said it would be, and GMAC had gone back and recalculated it as the lump payment it was only after my questions were received. When I asked Mr. Thomas whether the routine handling of the payment meant that a portion of it had been credited to interest, rather than to principal as I had directed, we got down to tacks and to the essence of my education.

"We do not use that word 'interest'," Mr. Thomas said. "We stay away from it." The laws governing interest rates do not necessarily apply to charges called by other names, he said, so GMAC and other finance companies avoid "that word." Also, the tendency of customers such as myself to think in terms of "interest" and "principal" distorts the picture. Once the total debt has been calculated by adding the "finance charge" to the "principal balance," the distinction vanishes. There remains a single sum—the "time price balance," the actual debt—to be considered. But, I said, there must be a basis for calculating the finance charge. Mr. Thomas acknowledged that a percentage is used for the purpose. My figure of 5.6 percent per year was pretty close; in my particular contract, it was 5.5 percent, with a yearly fraction added to cover insurance. After the original calculation is made, however, percentages disappear from GMAC thinking and, when possible, from any discussion such as we are having.

Here Mr. Thomas threw in the information that GMAC's dealers, rather than the finance companies, set the rate (he went so far as to use the term) charged to car buyers. The rate may be bargained up or down; it may be higher or lower than the 5.5 percent applied to my loan. And this variation is what often enables dealers to undercut each other. How much higher could it go? Well," said Mr. Thomas, obviously a bit on edge, I'll answer that this way. If a dealer offered us a contract figured at 10 percent, we would not buy that contract."

And a good thing, too, as I discovered later: District of Columbia law restricts the nominal rate on new car loans, which we were discussing, to 8 percent. For used cars it can rise legally to 16 percent in the District and to 15 percent in neighboring Maryland. In 33 other States the new car maximum varies from 7 to 12 percent. True rates of the kind which Senator DOUGLAS wants disclosed, and which are not necessarily true, would figure out to something less than twice these nominal rates. In my case, for instance, an actuary might say that I would have paid 10.2 percent instead of 5.5 percent over the whole life of the contract.

THE RULE OF 78

About the rebate: was I to understand that $29.60 would have been the correct amount if I had kept to the contract schedule and paid off the balance when I did, with no intervening lump payment? Without saying in so many words that this was correct, Mr. Thomas with many other words left me to believe that it was. He said that in dividing the finance charge by 36, and imagining that I had thus arrived at the monthly sum credited to it (not to interest, he again reminded me), I had made a common error. By the time I paid off my contract, he continued, most of the finance charge—or rather, that part of the total debt which had started out as the finance charge—had long since been collected. "We use what we call 'the rule of 78'," Mr. Thomas said, as if this closed the subject. Sensing that my education was about to reach its peak, I asked him to explain the rule of 78. He tried.

You add the digits from one through 12. This gives you 78. And there, by a magic universally respected in the finance business and sanctified by the laws of some States, you have (in the words of a Better Business Bureau pamphlet) "the total number of installment units outstanding month to month in a 12-month contract." The rule derived from this propositon can be applied to any loan contract calling for a fixed number of monthly payments. With a 36-month contract, adding the digits from 1 through 36 produces 666. You figure that in the 1st month of such a contract the loan earns

-0⁸⁄₆₆₆ths of the previously incorporated finance charge; in the 2d month, 3⁵⁄₆₆₆ths, and so down to the 36th month when 1⁄₆₆₆th is still to be earned. The rebate due upon prepayment at any point is the proportion, figured in 666ths, that has yet to be marked off the original charge. If I grasped the nature and effect of this procedure, Mr. Thomas indicated, I would understand that in the 26th month of my contract very little of what in the long ago had been the finance charge remained to be either paid or rebated. "We have had customers," he said with an indulgent chuckle, "who paid up 2 or 3 months before the last payment was due and thought they had quite a rebate coming."

I had to accept Mr. Thomas' view, and the evidence supporting it, that this arithmetical spookery provided the most equable method yet devised for collecting what I innocently thought of as interest on such loans. Far from paying interest on money that GMAC had previously recovered, I realized now that I had been paying the interest much faster than I had been repaying the principal and, had I but known it, doing myself out of an incentive to retire the loan before the last payment was due. Still and all, I failed to discern a rational connection between the rule of 78 and the way in which the finance charge had been calculated and buried in the total debt. Mr. Thomas, who had swung a strong bat for his side up to that point, seemed to weaken when I said as much. "It's just an expression we use in the finance business," he said. "I don't know why."

But he recovered with what he patently thought to be a smasher. "We don't have to pay any rebates," he said. "We do it as a matter of policy." Ever so gently, he reminded me of that terse, understandable sentence in the contract which begins, "The time price balance is payable * * * in 36 installments." Mr. Thomas did not have to finish the lesson. When I plagued GMAC with lump payments and settlements ahead of time, I was violating the contract I had signed. It was good of GMAC, mighty good of it, to take my money out of order. He spelled out another factor. In the District of Columbia and many States, no laws require rebates upon prepayment. One exception is Maryland, where lenders are required to say in their contracts that they will rebate upon prepayment. If, but only if, a customer asks for the information, GMAC will now tell him how much rebate is due upon prepayment in any given month, less a prepayment charge for settling up within the first 12 months of the contract.

This led us to my final question: Was it really impossible to reduce the finance charge with a lump payment in midcontract, unless the entire loan was repaid at the time? After observing once more that at such a point there would be no such thing as a separate finance charge to be reduced, Mr. Thomas said, in effect, and rather wanly, that it was impossible, with one qualification. If I had specifically demanded that the old contract be terminated and a new one drawn up when I paid the $800, we could have done that.

Would they have done it? Mr. Thomas said after a pause, "We would have done it." He also said that the lady with whom I dealt earlier should have told me this. But the bone of it was: it was up to me, not GMAC, to see that full advantage was taken.

In a subsequent conversation, Mr. Thomas said that GMAC's procedures call for lump payments to be taken into account in figuring rebates, whether or not the customer has the wit to demand it. But he said he could not guarantee that this would be done. Human errors would creep in, he explained. With all respect to Mr. Thomas, I reflected that up to this moment the error in my case had been blamed on the machines.

Truth in lending? I am for it. And for somebody telling me what it is.

The Answer to Terror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the tragic and shameful bombing of our Embassy in Saigon, we could, if we so desired, easily fight fire with fire, and launch an overwhelming military offensive against Hanoi in retaliation. This would of course only serve to extend and escalate the war, and would result in addtional horror and bloodshed for all concerned.

The New York Times this morning carried an editorial, entitled "The Answer to Terror," which makes a timely and sensible recommendation that, instead of continuing our efforts to solve the problems in Vietnam by means of military might, we give serious consideration to the planning of a sincere peace offensive.

I earnestly believe that the editorial deserves our immediate attention, and I insert it, herewith, for the benefit of my colleagues, and urge their careful reading of the same:

THE ANSWER TO TERROR

The sense of doom that seems to lie over the Vietnamese conflict was given a horrible symbol in the terrorist attack on the American Embassy in Saigon.

The war escalates, and it can do nothing but escalate since both sides continue on courses that must crash because they are opposing, adamant, and dependent on force. The fact that some form of escalation from the Communist side was just as predictable as the previous U.S. escalation is no comfort for yesterday's savage act of terrorism in Saigon and no reason to condone such a ruthless atrocity.

The temptation to strike back—and much harder—is clear, though in his temperate statement yesterday, President Johnson seems to be resisting it. The conflict has been moving, not like a vicious circle, but like a vicious ascending spiral ever since the reprisal policy began after the Vietcong attack on Pleiku last month. That policy has thus far failed of its purpose of forcing Hanoi to call off its campaign of subversion and aggression in South Vietnam.

The previous U.S. policy, tried for 4 years, of creating a stable, viable, independent South Vietnam had also failed. The subsequent extension of the war to North Vietnam was a tacit admission of the failure. There is no adequate reason to hope that a further escalation can succeed in anything but more death and destruction, and the grave danger of bringing in the Russians and/or Chinese, and also bringing them together.

The problem that Vietnam represents is not going to be solved by military means. The solution lies in the political, economic, and social fields. But the situation has now deteriorated to such a degree that the only instrument Washington has and uses is military force. There was a time, and not very long ago, when negotiation was a promising possibility. In present circumstances it seems that neither China nor Russia nor North Vietnam is interested. Yet, sooner or later, negotiation will again be feasible if the ground is prepared with some other seed than bombs, and it should be prepared now.

The United States has the power to repay the Saigon atrocity with force a hundred or a thousand times over. This requires no thought, no skill, no diplomacy, no understanding—just power. It would not bring about Hanoi's unconditional surrender. A serious peace offensive might bring the desired results. Its preparation is urgent and essential and should take precedence over the planning, now evidently underway, for extension of the war.

Seasonal Use of Foreign Workers in Fruits, Vegetables, and Other High Labor Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a telegram was sent to Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, on March 30 by a large number of Members of the House of Representatives. The full text of the wire and list of Members sending it follows:

MARCH 30, 1965.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
The Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.:

Members of Congress interested in agriculture are shocked by your reported attitude that seasonal use of foreign workers in fruits, vegetables, and other high labor crops is unnecessary and will not be approved. Planting time is here and thousands of acres will not be planted because there is no assurance of labor to tend and harvest crops. This is particularly harsh on small farmers who cannot carry out on their own extensive, expensive, and repeated recruitment campaigns to try to obtain domestic workers. Perhaps consumers will be able to afford the increase in prices which will inevitably result from your reported attitude but packinghouse and cannery workers, truckers, and producers cannot afford the loss of their jobs and their income. The clear intent of Congress in permitting the Mexican labor law to lapse was that existing provisions of the immigration law should be used to meet seasonal labor shortages. This is clear from committee reports and from debate in the House and Senate. American farmers will gladly use American workers if your Department can provide them and give assurance that they will stay on the job. But until you can provide such workers and such assurance your clear duty is to permit the entry of foreign workers where they are needed.

HAROLD D. COOLEY, North Carolina; GRAHAM PURCELL, Texas; WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia; E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas; RALPH J. SCOTT, North Carolina; THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi; JOHN L. MCMILLAN, South Carolina; D. R. MATTHEWS, Florida; JAMES A. HALEY, Florida; A. S. HERLONG, Jr., Florida; TOM MURRAY, Tennessee; WILLIAM M. TUCK, Virginia; ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida; CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California; CHARLES S. GUBSER, California; JOHN F. BALDWIN, Jr., California; J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, California; JAMES B. UTT, California; BURT L. TALCOTT, California; GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, California; DON H. CLAUSEN, California; EDWARD J. GURNEY, Florida.

Lake Erie Dying?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, one of my deep concerns is the serious pollution problem in Lake Erie, and I am working for strong legislation to help combat water pollution throughout the Nation.

An excellent article on the magnitude of the problem in Lake Erie—and the odds we face in controlling and abating pollution in that body of water—appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 29, 1965.

I would like to call the article to the attention of my colleagues:

U.S. EXPERTS NOW SEE HOPE OF SAVING DYING LAKE ERIE

(By Orr Kelly)

Water experts are hoping to pull off a major scientific and engineering miracle—bringing a dying lake back to life.

If they succeed, it would be an achievement comparable to putting a man on the moon. The cost, they hope, will be somewhat less than the moon program.

The object of their hopes is Lake Erie, where the natural process of aging has been vastly speeded up by pollution streaming in from the cities and industries around its shores.

When Public Health Service water pollution control experts went to work on Lake Erie 2 years ago, almost all the scientists told them a lake can't be brought back to life—and they tended to agree.

REASON TO HOPE

"When we started, we really had no reason to believe we could reverse the dying process," said James Coulter, Assistant Chief of the Technical Services Branch of the Water Control Agency.

"But I think now that there's reason to hope we may come up with a program for the lake within a year."

When he was asked if anyone disagreed with his hopes for the lake, he thought for a few moments and then admitted he couldn't think of anyone outside the agency who agreed.

"It's fair to say that we stand pretty much alone," he said. "We're going to have to prove our case."

But if they can prove their case, it may mean new life not only for Lake Erie but also for other lakes and even such bodies of water as the Potomac River estuary, which stretches from Washington to the Chesapeake Bay and is in many ways like a large lake.

PRESIDENT'S GOAL

If they fail, there is reason to doubt that the President can fully realize his goal of making the Potomac a model of conservation for the Nation, a river where it will be not only safe but pleasant to swim, fish, water ski and sail.

To understand what the water experts are up against, it is necessary to know something about Lake Erie's problems and how it got that way.

Every major river flowing into the lake is grossly polluted, according to C. W. Northington, Director of the Pollution Control Agency's Lake Erie Field Station. The bacteria count in the Cuyahoga River, which flows through Akron and Cleveland, has been measured at a rate 4 times the level that would be expected in a stream of raw sewage.

Last summer, scientists went out on the lake and measured the amount of oxygen in the water at the bottom of the large central basin. They found virtually no oxygen in an area covering about half the basin, an area of 2,600 square miles.

Any fish that blunder into this vast biological desert are quickly smothered.

NO SIMPLE ANSWER

To the layman, the obvious answer is to cut off the pollutants that flow into the river in enormous amounts from municipal sewage plants, industries, and farmlands.

But this would do nothing to control the huge amounts of materials that are carried in by wind and rain or are deposited by birds and animals—materials that fertilize the lake and hurry it along in its process of dying.

And a program to clean up the manmade pollution would not solve the problem caused by the millions of pounds of nutrients already in the lake.

Algae, the green scum that covers parts of the Potomac, feeds on these nutrients—primarily nitrogen and phosphorus. The tiny living organism draw oxygen from the air and the water and suck in energy from the sun. When they are near the surface, they put oxygen back into the lake, in some cases so much that it chokes the fish. But as they drift toward the bottom, they draw oxygen from the lake, creating the huge dead sea at the bottom of the lake's central basin.

A NATURAL PROCESS

When they die, they decay and further fertilize the lake so that the next crop of algae is more luxurious—and more of a nuisance—than the one before.

This is a natural process that goes on over long periods of time in all lakes. It normally takes place slowly—in geologic time. But in Lake Erie, which has been fertilized by vast amounts of pollutants, it is taking place so rapidly that changes in the lake can be measured from year to year.

Scientists suspect that a very similar process is taking place in the Potomac just below Washington. At an office in Annapolis, they are now trying to put together a "mathematical model" of the Potomac estuary. They hope soon to be able to ask questions of a computer and get back answers that will help them find ways to clean up the river.

This week, scientists from the Water Pollution Control Agency will begin to tell the people who live around Lake Erie how to solve their problems.

The first step would be to provide every city around the lake with the most efficient possible waste treatment plant. Even then, Coulter said, it may be necessary to pipe the almost pure water from these plants somewhere outside the Lake Erie basin.

Tied in with this would be a program to separate the storm and sanitary sewers in the cities around the lake so that storm waters don't overflow, carrying raw sewage into the lake.

COST IN MILLIONS

No one really knows how much this would cost, but Coulter said it is not unreasonable to think in terms of many millions of dollars. The cost of separating the storm and sanitary sewers in just one city, Cleveland, has been estimated between $470 million and $700 million.

The bad news that the water experts are now beginning to break to the people of the Lake Erie area is that, if they do all of this, the result will not be to clean up the lake. If they are lucky, it will simply keep the lake from getting much worse.

Lake Erie will still be a dying lake, but it will die more slowly.

But Coulter and Leon W. Weinberger, chief of the water agency's basic and applied sciences branch, are hopeful that they can go beyond this and begin to bring the lake back to life.

TWO VILLAINS

To do this, they will have to find ways to remove whatever it is that causes the algae to grow, suck the oxygen out of the lake and kill the fish. The two villains, they think, are nitrogen and phosphorous. But there is so much nitrogen that removing it is a hopeless task. So they are now trying to find some practical way to get the phosphorous out the lake.

One way would be to flush out the lake by bringing vast amounts of water from somewhere else—but this might only move the pollution problem from Lake Erie down to Lake Ontario.

Intriguing possibilities, Coulter said, would be to harvest the unusable "scrap" fish that now inhabit the lake and scoop the blooming algae off the lake and hauling it off to be buried somewhere else.

An idea of how much it would cost to "sweep" the 10,000-square-mile lake can be gained from the fact that it has been estimated that it would cost $100,000 a year just to remove the floating debris from the few square miles of the Potomac River in the Washington area.

VFW Supports Armed Services Committee Military Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as Members of this House are well aware, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is an organization that believes in a strong national defense, and does something about it. The VFW has long recognized, as have many Members of this House, that the most important single part of our Armed Forces is the personnel—the fine officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

The VFW, consisting of 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans, knows how important it is that we continue to have dedicated, loyal, and skilled fighting men.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed noteworthy that the VFW has come out squarely and clearly in support of a major pay increase for the armed services. In so doing, the VFW was not the least bit vague about what it believed should be done. This great organization of oversea combat veterans has formally announced its support of the pay raise bill which I and 33 other members of the committee have introduced.

The National Security Committee of the VFW, meeting in conjunction with the VFW Conference of National Officers and Department Commanders, March 6–9, unanimously adopted a resolution expressing support of a major military pay raise such as is provided for by the committee proposal, and the committee further recommended that the national commander in chief, Mr. John A. Jenkins, Birmingham, Ala., publicly set forth the organization's position in this matter.

Commander Jenkins, who is well known to this House, approved the ac-

tion of the national security committee, and issued a powerful public statement telling why the VFW supports a substantial and immediate pay raise for our fighting men. This is, Mr. Speaker, another example of the alert and constructive manner in which the VFW works for the interest of our servicemen, active and retired, and their dependents.

Because of the importance of the VFW's action, I include, under leave to extend my remarks, the text of the resolution passed by the VFW National Security Committee supporting the committee military pay raise bill, and the statement of VFW Commander in Chief John A. Jenkins.

Because of the importance of the position the VFW is taking in this matter, I recommend these two documents to the attention of Members of this House:

THE VFW URGES IMMEDIATE MILITARY PAY RAISE

Mr. John A. Jenkins, Birmingham, Ala., national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, today called for "a big and immediate pay raise."

Commander Jenkins said the VFW was encouraged by the recent action of Chairman L. MENDEL RIVERS of the House Armed Services Committee, who last week introduced a bill for a major across-the-board military pay raise. "The VFW," Commander Jenkins said, "fully supports a pay raise such as that introduced by Chairman RIVERS." Continuing, the VFW commander said, "Chairman RIVERS, by starting the ball rolling for a military pay raise, is doing something that is required from the standpoint of justice for our military personnel, and also from the standpoint of our national security."

Commander Jenkins, who has visited U.S. military installations in the United States and overseas, said, "We are calling on our men in uniform for sacrifices in terms of separation from their families, long hours of duty, and greater dangers, such as South Vietnam.

"At this time it is, indeed, a sad situation that when our fighting forces are the only thing that is standing between us and disaster today, the Government continues to take such a niggardly attitude with respect to fair pay for the military."

"The VFW," Commander Jenkins said, "consisting of 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans, understands the problems of the fighting men and will continue to work for a fair pay scale for those in uniform. Any fair pay scale must be a big increase over the present pay rates."

Commander Jenkins emphasized that the VFW's support for a military pay raise is based on a unanimously adopted resolution of the 1954 VFW national convention, and a similar resolution by the VFW's national security committee at its meeting in Washington, March 6–9, 1965.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING PAY RAISE FOR THE ARMED SERVICES

Whereas the Government has permitted military pay to drop far below industrial and Government civil service pay scales; and

Whereas such discrimination against those in our armed services is adversely affecting enlistment and retention of the kind of fighting men our Nation needs to survive; and

Whereas the interest of fair play and justice to our servicemen, as well as the requirements of our national security require a major pay increase for officer and enlisted personnel; and

Whereas the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee has introduced legislation which would go far toward establishing adequate pay rates for the military: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Security Committee recommends that the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, express appreciation to the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS for his leadership in defending the interests of our fighting men; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Security Committee recommends to the commander in chief that the VFW actively continue to support an immediate pay raise such as would be established by Chairman RIVER's proposal; and be it further

Resolved, That such pay raise for the military should be retroactive to the effective date of the last pay raise for civil service employees of the U.S. Government.

American Legion of Richmond County Interfaith Breakfast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 28, 1965, I had the pleasure of participating in the Interfaith Breakfast of the American Legion of Richmond County. Rabbi Murray Kohn of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun gave the principal address and under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his address:

BROTHERHOOD OR SMOTHERHOOD, 1965

Congressman MURPHY, Borough President Maniscalco, Assemblyman Russo, Councilman Connors, and friends, once again I have the distinct pleasure to participate in the annual Interfaith Breakfast and share with you a few thoughts of how to secure the spirit of good will throughout the year.

We live presently in an era which nothing is any more surprising. Very little is left to the imagination. Man has embarked upon an actual attempt to bridge planets, to explore the physical possibilities already in a reaching stage, to control mortal afflictions of the body which claim millions annually. Where as in the past we spoke of years, then months, then weeks, then days to conquer distance we speak already in terms of hours, minutes, and seconds.

Indeed, we are perhaps very fortunate to witness, behold, and experience these tremendous changes. I personally believe that we ought deemphasize our misgivings about the future developments and emphasize the wonderful possibilities awaiting us in the forseeable decades. How much easier it will be to live, how longer will it be possible to live, and how much more men will be enabled to share in the inherent gifts of God's created universe.

Yet with all these possibilities and advantages man must turn to another aspect of his life. To paraphrase the prophet Zechariah: Not only by the might of nature nor through the visible physical power can God be known nor man progress—but the time-enduring strength of humanity lies in the spiritual position man has attained.

In the past, the human society was theocentered—(God oriented). Today our society is being homo-centered (man oriented). Man's egocentricity eclipses God; it drives a dike between man and man and thus resulting in the gentlemanly separation between man and God.

We somehow placed God in His majestic abode while slamming the portals of our privacy in His face.

We have been keeping God out of our lives, inviting Him only on occasion when it's absolutely necessary. We offer lipservice, rather than heart service—words instead of deeds.

We often invoke the Fatherhood of God, but honestly, does God need our approval for that? Without our OK He still is Our Father. But due to man's moral freedom the choice has been left with man to effectuate the brotherhood of man.

And look what has transpired. We have a long way to reach the day when all men will see each other as sharing a common destiny and a common ancestry and a universal faith in one God.

Someone once said:

"The aim of man is to be the temple of God." It is our task to purify ourselves and cleanse our hearts and minds from the prejudices which were created on sheer lack of knowledge and understanding. There is no such thing in the eyes of God as race, color of skin or a religion that holds the monopoly of the main path to God.

All men are the children of God and every prayer, wherever it is offered and by whomever it is uttered, is acceptable by God as long as it is sincere, honest, and with love for God and man.

A gentleman once received the sad news of his only son's untimely death. His first words were: "My son I have lost, but not my heir, humanity is my heir."

In other words, we can formulate the following observation:

Man is being told that the ways to God are many but the road to mankind's common destiny is only one, that of: Brotherhood, understanding, and tolerance.

We in this great country of ours are presently on the road to achieve a society of the "Sumum Bonum" the greatest good for the greatest number. Let us not fall victims of complacency and think that civil rights, religious prejudices will solve themselves. Not at all. It depends on our will, on our own decision, on our own resoluteness to proclaim an end to attitudes which were easy to conceive but a menace to deliver. Not necessarily that always our fathers were right. We have inherited from them many good things. We are also the heirs of attitudes which unless discarded we shall remain in the talking stages but never emerge as a generation which wrote its own chapter of progress into the annals of human history.

Let us not abuse the intelligence and abilities God gave us by seeking refuge in abject ideas. Let us unite in an effort to promote the universal ideals of the kingship of God and the kinship of all mankind. Let our prayers become actual deeds and not empty phrases, and our belief in brotherhood as the only means of securing a brighter future. If ecumenism is to have any meaning we must endeavor to assure a spiritual renaissance which will find a rightful place for every man and his ideals.

Let's make our dreams a beautiful reality rather than reality a far cry from our dreams. It's a question between "brotherhood or smotherhood"—I hope we shall all make the right choice through actual deeds of which the future generation will be proud of us. Thank you.

We Butter Communists' Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

include an editorial which appeared in the Centre Island News of March 24, 1965. The situation outlined in this editorial is obviously one which needs correction.

I commend the paper for bringing it to the attention of its readers, and I should like to also bring it to the attention of the Members of Congress.

The editorial is as follows:

WE BUTTER COMMUNISTS' BREAD

Many Americans do not eat as much butter as they would like to eat because it costs a little more. But how do you like the idea of paying taxes to provide butter for Communist East Germany? Does that make your margarine taste better?

Last August, the Commerce Department issued an export license to allow the shipment to the East German Reds—the ones who have the Berlin wall—of American butter valued at $860,000.

American exporters plan to sell 2,204,600 pounds of butter at a price of 39.009 cents a pound.

The reason American exporters can get butter to sell at that price is that you, as a taxpayer, pay a subsidy of 24.5 cents a pound.

If you multiply 24.5 cents per pound by the 2,204,600 pounds of American butter being sold to the Communists in East Germany, you will find that the cost to American taxpayers is $540,127.

Can't you think of something better to do with half a million of your dollars than to subsidize butter for Communists?

The Silver and Coinage Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, during this session of Congress there has been some discussion on the floor about silver with reference to coinage, and there will be more.

Secretary of the Treasury Dillon told a House Appropriations Subcommittee at recent hearings that a variety of coinage proposals are being studied in view of the silver shortage, and the Treasury may make recommendations to the Congress on the subject in April.

Several bills, mostly identical, have been introduced by our western colleagues calling for a cut in the silver content of our silver coins. It is said that the real purpose of these bills is to permit a rise in the market price above the present $1.29 level, and to keep the Treasury as a potential buyer in the market.

I am greatly concerned about the situation for two reasons: First, the existing coin shortage which affects everyone, and, second, the effect of an additional price rise on the users of silver, as well as the dealers and consumers of silver in my district.

There is not enough silver to continue its use in coins in any amount, however small. The bills which have been introduced call for a 30-percent silver content in new coins. The only way even this amount can be continued in coins is to call in outstanding coins containing 90-percent silver, melt them down and issue the cheap coins. Will the collectors, hoarders and speculators give up coins when the silver content is worth three times the face value as would be the case if these bills are passed?

The simple solution might well be to issue new coins made without silver which can be used alongside our present coins. This was done by Great Britain 20 years ago when they ran short of silver. The public can then do as it pleases with our present silver coins in circulation.

The market price for silver must not be permitted to rise above the $1.29 level. This price represents a 42-percent rise in the last 3 years, and was forced up to this level as a result of Government purchases in order to help the miners. It should now be used to stabilize the market as called for in the enactment of silver legislation in 1963.

I am particularly interested in sterling silverware which is manufactured in my district. During the past 15 years, the price of silver has doubled while the unit sales have been cut in half, with resultant unemployment. Higher prices will price this commodity out of the market which is, indeed, the case with sterling silver holloware now. The ability to purchase such items is now confined to a limited few.

I feel the proper amount of concern for the silver miners whose situation was clearly set forth by a sponsor of one of the silver bills in an address to the Colorado Mining Association on February 6, 1965, when he said:

To briefly summarize, I would say that no matter what happens with regard to silver-coinage legislation, miners are going to enjoy unprecedented prosperity.

I wish I could say the same for those who use silver.

At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD an article written by Laurence D. Collins, headlined "Silver Coin Question: Old Problem Renewed," which appeared in the Boston Globe on February 28, 1965. This article, I believe, is pertinent, timely, and supports my conclusions. It reads as follows:

SILVER COIN QUESTION: OLD PROBLEM RENEWED

(By Laurence D. Collins)

In 1896 William Jennings Bryan thundered his famous challenge to the enemies of unlimited coinage of silver: "You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns. You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

For his oratory Bryan won the first of three Presidential nominations, and mining interests of the West won a champion.

Today mineowners still have a cause, but their only champion is the American Mining Congress, and its oratory is considerably less eloquent than Bryan's.

What is their cause?

The coinage of silver again. Only today they're not fighting for unlimited coinage of silver. They'll settle for the Treasury leaving any amount of silver in coins.

But the Treasury has its problems. It just doesn't have enough silver to go on minting coins with the prevailing silver content. Half-dollars, quarters, and dimes are 90 percent silver. Too much, the Treasury says.

They're not the only ones either. The Silver Users Association, representing the silver users in industry and the arts, claims silver coinage only serves to subsidize the mineowners by creating an unnecessarily large demand for the limited amount of silver available. Industry and the arts consumed 123 million ounces of silver in 1964, and their need for the metal continues to increase.

Supply and demand. There's the rub.

In 1964 total free world production of silver amounted to 215 million ounces. The U.S. Treasury alone used 203 million ounces of silver for coinage. In order to do this the Treasury was forced to take a sizable bite out of its silver stocks. But how long can it do this?

Because of new coin production and redemption of silver certificates by the public, U.S. silver reserves dropped by about 23 percent in 1964. That amounts to 364,500,000 ounces.

The chronic coin shortage is, of course, a key factor in the current silver crisis. Coin-hoarding, once considered a mark of thrift, is now an object of the Treasury's wrath.

Is hoarding really that big a problem? Apparently. Take the Kennedy half dollar. During 1964, 201 million were minted. They contained 36 percent of the silver used by the Treasury that year.

Have you received one in change yet? A great many Americans haven't, because too many of those who have are keeping them. Kennedy half dollars were not meant to be commemorative coins. They were meant to circulate. They don't.

Almost everyone concerned, even the mine owners, agrees that the silver content of U.S. coinage must be reduced. But it is up to the Treasury to make the difficult decision of just how big any cut will be. And then it has to convince Congress.

The Treasury plans to announce its decision in April. It had originally planned to reveal it this month but was forced to postpone the announcement because of incomplete studies.

Why should it be such a problem? Why doesn't the Treasury just cut the silver content of coins 40 or 50 percent and just let it go at that?

It's those coinhoarders again. And worse still, the out-and-out speculators.

The going price for silver today is $1.29 a troy ounce. But this price does not reflect the reality of supply and demand in the silver market. The Treasury has artificially imposed that price merely by making silver available from its own stocks and pegging it at $1.29 an ounce.

Why $1.29? A silver dollar contains 0.77 troy ounces of silver. Anyone wanting to cash in a $1 silver certificate for a dollar's worth receives a cartwheel, 0.77 ounces. At that exchange rate a full ounce figures out to $1.29.

Now if the Treasury simply cut silver content from the present 90 percent to, say, 50 percent, it would still be faced with a declining silver reserve, albeit a slower decline. As the Treasury's supply of silver dropped and demand steadily increased, the $1.29 price tag would soon be meaningless.

Enter the speculator. In anticipation of higher prices for silver, hoarding of our present coinage with its 90-percent silver content would be inevitable. Dwindling silver stocks, renewed shortage of coins. This is where we came in.

Shortly after World War II Britain was faced with a similar silver shortage. It simply stopped minting coins with silver. The U.S. Treasury is considering this solution, too. But, of course, the mineowners are violently opposed.

Another group especially concerned is the vending machine industry. If silver is removed from coinage, millions of vending machines will have to be refitted with new slug rejectors. The industry claims this would cost up to $115 million.

Reduce silver content or drop it completely, the Treasury can expect a barrage of criticism in either case. No wonder it postponed the decision.

Meanwhile, the American Mining Congress has come up with one profoundly simple reason for retaining silver in U.S. coinage: "The United States always had silver in its coinage * * *"

That's a steep drop from William Jennings Bryan.

Subway Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following two articles from the New York Herald Tribune of March 28, 1965.

The first concerns what New York City is not doing about crime on the subways and the second concerns what Philadelphia has done about the same problem.

The articles follow:

SUBWAY CRIME: NEW YORK JUST TALKS ABOUT IT

(By M. C. Blackman)

At the beginning of this eventful century, when a group of practical visionaries broke ground in front of city hall for the city's first subway line, Russell Sage gazed into a very cloudy crystal ball and prophesied:

"New York people will never go into a hole in the ground to ride * * * Preposterous."

A prediction that might have been made with more accuracy was that New Yorkers, emerging from their holes in the ground, would have one thing in common: complaints. For well over half a century these complaints have been, more often than not, standard, unvarying, ineffectual, and about less than life and death matters.

But recently the complaints have taken a graver turn, and the transit authority, the police department, and other public officials are listening and beginning to act.

In 1940, when the city acquired the privately owned IRT and BMT and added them to its own IND, the whole subway network was hailed by transportation experts as "the world's longest, fastest, and safest urban rapid transit system."

The riders, moved by emotions ranging from annoyance to outraged indignation verging on hysteria, griped for decades about such things as inhuman crowding, noise, dirt, poor ventilation, unexplained delays and other things, all adding up to one main effect—discomfort. They suffered most during the morning and evening rush hours.

In recent years, however, a new emotion has crept increasingly into the picture. It is fear. And the cause is crime in the subways. The hour about which they complain are different, too.

The frightening hours may be divided loosely into two riding periods: the pleasure hours, between the evening rush and midnight or a little later, when most New Yorkers depend upon the subway trains to take them to the theater, to meetings, to dates, to visit with friends; and the desolate hours, between midnight and dawn, when some 115,000 nightworkers and late revelers ride the subways. It is then that most stations are deserted except for evildoers lurking in passageways, on stairways, and at the far reaches of platforms; and trains are thinly occupied.

There is no doubt about it; New Yorkers are afraid in those periods to use their "longest, fastest, and safest urban rapid transit system."

AWARENESS

The semiautonomous transit authority has issued some statistics, which are undramatic at best and confusing at worst. Last week, it said the total number of crimes increased 22 percent in the last 6 years, and the number of felonies 102 percent.

What is the significance of this in light of the statistics tossed out last Wednesday by Transit Authority Commissioner Daniel T. Scannell in a press conference? He said that only 1 percent of the crimes committed in the city occurred on the subways. One percent. On top of that, Mayor Wagner says New York ranks 16th in crime rate among major American cities.

Subway riders' emotions apparently are not swayed by statistics. Their fear and anger reached an emotional peak on March 12 when 17-year-old Andrew Mormile was viciously stabbed to death on a Manhattan-bound IND "A" train in Brooklyn by one of two swaggering young thugs who had already annoyed and molested many other passengers on the eight-car train.

The terrible part was that the victim was so young, so innocent, so inoffensive. It was only 11:30 at night (during the pleasure hours), and young Mormile was returning from a Friday night date. He was minding his own business. He was even dozing in his seat when he was rudely jostled awake by the swaggering pair, who demanded either cigarettes or money (police are not sure which). When he protested, he was wantonly killed.

If it could happen to him, the subway public reasoned, it could happen to any law-abiding, unprovocative passenger.

In connection with the Mormile case, the transit authority offered another statistic intended to be reassuring: It was the first subway homicide this year, while in the same period 89 others occurred elsewhere in the city.

SUGGESTIONS

Never let it be said that New Yorkers complain without offering suggestions about how to cure the cause of their complaints. Everybody from the mayor down to the lowliest rider, it appears, has suggested methods for combatting crime in the subways.

One of the mayor's suggestions—that policemen and firemen wear their uniforms on the subway trains to and from work as a deterrent—was put into effect for a while. Then the policemen and firemen began talking about portal-to-portal pay. It also developed that since police and firemen's shifts begin a 4 p.m., midnight and 8 a.m., the only effective one for uniform wearing was the midnight. It also was ascertained that the average length of time spent on a train by policemen and firemen going to and from work was only 20 minutes. The idea was dropped.

Last Sunday, District Attorney Frank D. O'Connor, of Queens, went on a television program for half an hour and announced that he had suggested to the transit authority a seven-point program to combat crime in the subways. This is not to impute publicity seeking to Mr. O'Connor as a sole motive, but he did get attention.

And what about the suggestions? The Queens district attorney is considered an able prosecutor and has been mentioned for higher office, but he is not an expert on police or transit problems. His seven suggestions reached the transit authority and came to the attention of a junior executive whose duty it is to study and appraise all such proposals before passing them on to the manager of the system and perhaps to the transit authority commissioners.

He said that all of his suggestions, like most that are received, fell into three general classifications: (1) old or repetitious; (2) impractical or impossible; (3) already in effect.

Dozens of volunteers besides Mr. O'Connor have urged shorter and more frequent trains than the four- to eight-car ones now operated with 20-minute headways in the early morning hours. It is not logistically feasible to run shorter than four-car trains, according to Leonard Ingalls, transit authority public relations director, because of the use of interdependent married couple units of two cars and the fact that the third rail would not function with less than two of these units. Besides, the length of the train is determined not by the average use on a run but by the maximum load expected on a trip, which may be 20-odd miles from the Bronx to the outer reaches of Brooklyn.

One suggestion indicated strongly that Mr. O'Connor is not a subway rider. It was to saturate attack-prone stations such as the tri-level station at 74th Street and Roosevelt Avenue in Queens with round the clock uniformed and plainclothes policemen.

It happens that this station is one of the busiest, day and night, in Queens, being the terminal for several bus lines and a point of transfer between IND, IRT, and (during parts of the day) BMT trains. It also, according to the transit authority, has the lowest crime rates of any station in Queens.

Another suggestion, showing that Mr. O'Connor is unfamiliar with subway operations, was to have the local police precinct number at the cashier's eye level "so he doesn't have to go through central headquarters."

In case of train or platform trouble, the change booth attendant doesn't call the nearest city police precinct (which may be a mile or more away); he calls the transit police, because it is their job and because they can get there quicker. If the trouble is serious, as in the Mormile murder, they call city police.

It does no good to urge passengers in the early morning hours to stand where the cashier can see them, as Mr. O'Connor suggested. It does no good to urge subway riders to do anything; officials have been telling them for 60 years not to crowd into center cars and stand up when they could find seats at each end of the train. They still do it.

The Transit Authority is trying to do something about the two suggestions most frequently received: installation of two-way radio communication from train crews and personnel on the platforms to headquarters, and increasing the size of the transit police.

PILOT PROJECT

More than 50 percent of the equipment needed for a pilot two-way radio project has been installed on 300 cars that will be used on the Lexington Avenue line between Bowling Green and 125th Street. But the test will not be ready to start until July 1. If it proves successful after an indefinite experimental period, the project will be extended to the entire subway system at a cost of more than $4 million. In the same field, closed circuit television cameras on platforms have been proposed by several amateurs.

As for increasing the transit police force, as suggested by Mr. O'Connor and hundreds of others, that has run into a division of opinion among Transit Authority members along political lines. The force has been increased 22 percent in 6 years, and last Wednesday the Transit Authority's Republican member, John J. Gilhooley, announced that he had asked Mayor Wagner to increase the Transit Authority police force by 782 to 2,000, enough to provide a patrolman for each train at night. He met instant opposition from the Democratic Mr. Scannell, who said he spoke also for the missing chairman, Joseph E. O'Grady. The cost would be $8 million a year, paid by the city.

Chairman O'Grady later issued a statement concurring with Commissioner Scan-

nell's position, and also confirming the 1 percent crime figure.

The greatest headache confronting TA and city police in combating subway crime is the oft-noted attitude of witnesses in refusing to cooperate. There were 10 riders who looked on while young Mormile was being killed. Police were frustrated to the point of despair by the fact that all 10 fled without waiting to give descriptions of the assailants or to volunteer to testify against them.

Without their help, city police rounded up two suspects, teenage Negroes, charged one with homicide and held the other as a material witness.

A television network devoted half an hour last Tuesday to a discussion by psychologists and sociologists on why New Yorkers act that way. They spoke profoundly of fear of reprisal, apathy, a breakdown of social democracy and other overt or hidden motives, but Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy summed it up much more simply. He said New Yorkers simply have an aversion to "getting involved" in anything that does not threaten them personally.

When a New Yorker does go to the aid of a stranger, out of a latent sense of civic duty, or does help capture a lawbreaker, his action rates headlines as a rarity, and not the psychologists, the sociologists or the police commissioner seem to explain satisfactorily why this should be.

IN PHILADELPHIA—A VERY LOUD BARK

PHILADELPHIA.—All's quiet in Philadelphia's subways, thanks to vicious police dogs, specially trained German shepherds on the alert with the uniformed policemen who accompany them. They are patrolling this city's 3 miles of underground concourse, riding 28 miles of track in subway cars, or roaming the various stations.

Their role is to prevent gang wars, to scare off thieves, to rout vandals, and to prevent rapes and other crimes. It was an attack on a 15-year-old Almonesson, N.J., girl by a mob of 17 to 20 hoodlums—while six men stood by and refused to help the girl—that brought the dogs into the subways.

The March 6 assault on the girl aroused public indignation so great that Mayor James H. J. Tate called in his police commissioner, Howard P. Leary, and they instituted several changes in police procedure.

Lt. Joseph F. Larkin, 53, a 23-year police force veteran of some of the toughest beats in the city, was assigned 12 dogs and more than 120 extra men.

He was given orders to keep crime out of the city's three subways, out of the central city concourses. He was promised four more dogs next week and many more just as soon as the animals and their police handlers can complete the 3 mnoths' training it takes.

The canine patrol, which got underway March 10, stopped a potential riot in the Broad Street subway. It broke up a hassle involving 75 youths at the Market Street elevator. It routed a holdup suspect in the city's Locust Street subway.

It scared away much more crime. The dogs work daily from noon until 7 the next morning, the peak hours of crime. With each dog there is a policeman.

"There's been a terrific change since we brought in those dogs," Lieutenant Larkin said. "They are doing plenty of good. We have had no rapes, no cashier robberies, no other serious incidents, not even teenage subway vandalism since the K-9 corps went to work.

"Sure, we still find drunks in the subways, and vagrants. But the sex maniacs, the homosexuals have left their haunts. Like so many others, they are afraid of the dogs."

All the German shepherds are from 90 to 100 pounds. They are on leash and trained to attack only on their handler's orders. They are expert at sniffing out persons hiding in the dark recesses of the subway stations.

Lieutenant Larkin said the public seems much more secure with the dogs than they did before. "Women especially," he said, "show their pleasure. They talk to the handler, even pet the dogs, for the animals—although vicious on command—are gentle under their discipline."

"With good reason," said Lieutenant Larkin. "A gang of kids might jump an armed policeman but they'll refuse to bait a cop with 100 pounds of raging dynamite ready to jump at them."

A Terrible War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the brutal bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, which has further complicated the difficult task of determining U.S. policy in Vietnam, the Washington Post this morning shed some useful editorial light on the perspective within which we should view our national dilemma.

Most of us, Mr. Speaker, are very much aware of the inadequacy of the information we have on which to form our judgments of U.S. policy, so we can appreciate the wisdom of the Post's suggestion that to denounce existing policy without being prepared to offer a better alternative is more mischievous than constructive.

I include the Post editorial under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 31, 1965]

A TERRIBLE WAR

The shocking terrorist attack on the U.S. Embassy in Saigon was hardly needed to demonstrate what a brutal and barbaric struggle is taking place in South Vietnam. That was already well known. Still, we need to note that this barbarous attack upon unarmed men and women, children, civilian employees and bystanders, American and South Vietnamese alike, was made by forces that have been protesting the methods of the South Vietnam troops in battlefield situations.

What is going on in South Vietnam is a war in which every living person is a combatant, in which no man, woman or child has any sanctuary, in which there can be no peace for anyone. It is not surprising that this sort of war can be waged most effectively by those who acknowledge no rules or restraints.

The Government of the United States, as it is frequently advised by many of its own people and by its friends abroad, is in a very disagreeable and difficult situation. Agreement does not extend very far beyond this self-evident conclusion. We know we are in a very difficult predicament. We know how we got there. The numerous advisers who pour their counsel on the Government are not so prolific with suggestions as to how we can alter our situation without incurring risks and inviting dangers as bad or worse.

The Government is advised that it should negotiate—but all the powers with whom it might negotiate have let it be known that they are unwilling to negotiate until the United States withdraws and leaves the country to the victors. The appeals for negotiation need to be addressed first to Hanoi, to Peiping and to the Vietcong. There can be negotiation, no doubt, when they wish to negotiate but it is difficult to see how anything can be done as long as the departure of the forces of the United States is made a precondition to settlement.

The United States also is reproached for its failure to delineate its policy to South Vietnam. The reproach might be more aptly stated as a reproach for a policy that is disliked. That policy is to live up to our commitment to the South Vietnamese people, whom we have pledged to support as long as they wish to struggle for their independence and freedom. Those who dislike this policy, and the acknowledged distress and discomfort in which it has involved us, owe the Government, in all candor, an explanation of the alternative policy which they would pursue so that its discomforts may be examined. It is mischievous to simply denounce the situation at which we have arrived, the predicament that we are in and the policy to which we are committed without offering any specific alternative proposals. The essence of policy decision is in having a choice between available courses of action. Let the terms of the alternatives be made known. If there is a better course that this country can pursue with honor surely those in authority would be glad to learn of it.

It ought to be emphasized, however, that there are no time machines available. The events of the past 10 years cannot be extinguished. The future begins tomorrow and not yesterday or on some yesterday 10 years ago on which we might have elected to stay out of South Vietnam. The critics of the policy of the United States can be most helpful by suggesting what ought to be done next instead of proposing what should have been done last year or 10 years ago.

In spite of the accelerating violence of the battle, the primary and legitimate interests of the major powers involved actually do permit a great deal of maneuver. Surely those interests, sooner or later, will assert themselves. The United States, on its part, wishes only a free and independent South Vietnam. North Vietnam, in the end, surely would have its essential purposes served best by a friendly, viable and productive neighbor from which the United States and all other foreign troops had departed. These are not irreconcilable purposes and after more or less destruction of life and property no doubt they will be put upon the negotiating table. It is too bad it could not be sooner rather than later.

Hon. Noah Mason

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, our late distinguished colleague, Noah Mason, and I took our oaths of office as Members of the House of Representatives for the first time on the same day. Thereafter he and I served together on the same committee for 10 years, until that committee on claims was absorbed by the great Committee on the Judiciary under the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act. I was fortunate later to renew my association with him when

I was elected to the Committee on Ways and Means. I think, therefore, Mr. Speaker that I served intimately with him over a longer period of time than most, if not all, of the Members of the House of Representatives.

I came to know him well and to respect him deeply. He brought to the committee meetings, and, of course, to this Chamber, a keen and perceptive mind which was a tremendous asset when explaining his strong convictions. While we seldom agreed politically, in the words of our great Speaker of the House of Representatives, he was never disagreeable. And I believe that he felt that I reciprocated in kind. This was typical of the relationship that Noah Mason had with most Members of this House.

This Nation will always require legislators with the stature of Noah Mason regardless of party affiliation. The courage of one's convictions is essential to proper exposition of the legislative problems that face any great nation. Everyone knew exactly where he stood on everything and everyone knew exactly how he voted on difficulties issues because he never shirked his obligation to record his convictions. I shall, Mr. Speaker, miss him a great deal as will the Members who value these fine attributes of character in their colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I extend to his family my deep symathy.

Hon. Noah Mason

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to receive word of the passing from this life of one of our most beloved former colleagues, the Honorable Noah Mason.

I was privileged to serve with Noah Mason in the House for 24 years, and more particularly, it was my rare privilege to work with him perhaps as closely as any Member because of the respective positions which we held on the Committee on Ways and Means as chairman and ranking member for a period of several years.

Mr. Mason was one of the most beloved individuals who ever sat in the House of Representatives. His Welsh humor, his disarming candor, his unquestioned integrity, his high personal standards, his Rock of Gioraltar character were qualities well known and appreciated by all of us. We regretted his decision at the end of the 87th Congress to retire from the House because we realized how his presence in the Committee on Ways and Means and on the floor of the House would be missed from day to day. We did have the privilege of seeing him from time to time and, on rare occasions, he did come back to the Committee on Ways and Means and visit with all of us in committee. We are all saddened by his death because men of his stature and men of his stamp are few and far between. With the greatest of sincerity, I can say that when I received this sad word, in my mind's eye I began to review the significant contributions which this great man made to his State and his Nation and to the work of this body over the many years of his service here. They are far too numerous to relate on this occasion but I can assure you they were many in quantity and significant in quality. My deepest sympathies go to his wife, children, and other loved ones.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the committee for the splendid job it has done in preparing and reporting to the House this historymaking bill.

It is clear that precedents are being swept aside today, and that the Federal Government is entering an area in a very substantial way insofar as monetary assistance and support are concerned that has heretofore been believed to be principally one for the legitimate function of the several States and local subdivisions of government.

But the desperate conditions in many States and communities make the assistance provided by this bill more or less mandatory upon those interested in strengthening our national school system, broadening the educational opportunities of all our youth and perpetuating the vigor and well being of our American society.

The needs of modern day education are so great and so demanding, so crucial if you will, that truly they can only be met in their entirety on a national basis by the Federal Government by the support and assistance of local and State agencies and functions by the National Government. Wisely and soundly administered as provided by the bill, this aid should not and will not impair basic control of education at local and State levels.

It has been demonstrated in very many ways throughout the Nation that the States and local governments and the subdivisions thereof are no longer able adequately to provide the financial aid imperatively needed to adequately sustain elementary and secondary education throughout the Nation.

I will not allude at length to the problems of illiteracy and subnormality and the plight of the disadvantaged child, and the grave problems of so many communities that are not able to cope with the ordinary problems of providing a good, sound education for their children, let alone the many extremely challenging problems presented by special groups of children for whom special techniques and opportunities must be provided.

It is unquestionable, to my mind, that the time has arrived, indeed it has passed, when we must come to grips in a practical sense with the essential problem of strengthening our entire educational system, not only in physical terms such as plant and buildings, but in enlisting the best available specialized personnel and modern techniques and the maximum utilization of modern, instructional technology.

In this regard I have always been very much impressed with the sage observations of my friend, the late, very distinguished and esteemed Senator Robert Taft, who declared in substance that while "education is primarily a State function, in the field of education as in the fields of health, relief, and medical care the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States."

In these few words, Senator Taft, with his discerning mind and acknowledged genius in statecraft, well summarized for us of this generation in short concise terms the scope of the obligation of the Federal Government in basic fields that relate to the education of children and adults and the general well-being and vigor of all our citizens.

It should be noted that these remarks were made more than 10 years ago, and they not only pointed very significantly to areas of compelling need, but outlined and in a sense prophesied in effect, the direction in which this great Nation should and must move, if we are to discharge our full obligation to the people and the children of America. In fact, these words are at once a gleaming blueprint as well as a concise program for political and social action in basic areas in which we are commendably and urgently advancing at this very hour. These noble words are worthy of a great statesman; they are the promise of our future fulfillment.

While the pending measure provides substantial funds for general and special educational purposes, it is not what might be called a broad bill in the sense that it covers the entire field. It is in fact a rather circumscribed bill, since it is designed "to bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most."

Admittedly, it is difficult to arrive at a proper, workable formula that will equitably distribute funds throughout a country as large as ours, but on the whole the Committee has managed to tackle and perform this job in a very creditable manner, and I believe it is practical and can be effectively executed.

I do not propose to argue the case that various conditions of poverty trace back and are directly attributable to lack of educational opportunities, because I believe in my mind and heart that fact is

self-evident—well substantiated in our contemporary national life.

To be sure, there are those unfortunates among us so constituted that they cannot pursue any education very far, and they are, and in justice and compassion must be, the natural objects of our concern, and must be provided for in some way outside the orbit of a general, education bill.

It is those who are possessed of the talents and the ability, if not always the zeal, necessary to absorb an education, that we seek to deal with in this forward-moving bill.

It is those, who through no fault of their own are born into environments of abject poverty, where they and their families are living below normal subsistence levels, those who well may be the potential leaders and workers of tomorrow, the ones upon whom America must depend, if we are to go forward as a great world power and a great Nation committed to a strong, free, productive, and adequate economic system that will provide prosperity and opportunity and high standards for all those willing to seize them in this Nation of free choice where initiative, work, and opportunity combine to make for individual fulfillment and national strength.

I feel very strongly about this question, because I think that we could do no greater disservice to our country than to continue conditions within its boundaries that deny to some children, not fortunate to be born into self-sustaining families, the chances that every American child, every child living among us, should have to secure a decent education, and to develop his or her potential for his own benefit and for that of his family and the country. Such an opportunity is a condition precedent to the full, proper development of our great potential. It is the promise of this Nation come to reality, the real hope for the future of freedom and democracy.

America cannot go forward part educated and part uneducated; some of our children afforded the right to adequate educational training and self-development, and others denied these essential privileges of free government in the space age.

I do not believe that democracy, as we know it and want it in this country, can flourish in these advanced, critical days without a well-informed citizenry, and with entire masses of our people and our children spread out in chronic pockets of need and distress across the country uneducated, untrained, unaware of the true significance of what is taking place about us, unequipped for the tasks and duties of citizenship, poorly schooled for leadership, consigned to lives of disadvantage, poverty, handicap, and frustration, wasting their natural talents and aspirations in the welter of confusion, uncertainty, and want which surround most of those who never have real chance to learn, or really know or understand what is going on around them. Such conditions are a sorry image for our Nation in the world—a traversy up on our glorious past and future destiny.

Where there is economic deprivation, there will be ignorance. There will be fear. There will be diseases. There will be crime. There will be juvenile delinquency and school dropouts. There will be antisocial conditions militating against the welfare of the state and American institutions. There will be bitter resentment and stark frustration taking refuge in radical panaceas and subversion. There will be gravest danger to the continuity and survival of this great, free Government.

I appreciate that the Committee could have selected different formulas for distributing the aid provided in this bill. But, in the main, I think that the one selected will enable us to make a good start and if it does not function as we now believe, we can in turn change it. On the whole, I think the formula is fair and workable and hope it will be effective.

The formula is relatively simple and determines grants to local, public school districts on the basis of one-half the average expenditure per pupil in the State times the number of children aged 5 to 17 years coming from families with annual incomes of less than $2,000 and the number of children aged 5 to 17 years from families receiving aid to dependent children with incomes of $2,000 or more per year.

The data to carry out this formula are readily available and the grants should reach those communities that need them most, we hope, without redtape or delay.

In the process, we can be assured that Federal funds provided will be directed to those localities where the problems exist and are concentrated.

The funds will be transmitted to each State educational agency. In turn, that agency will transmit authorization to each local public education agency operating a State approved program.

Under the bill, the State agency determines whether the programs and projects submitted by local school districts are designed to further the purposes Congress has in mind. In addition, the State agencies will adopt such fiscal control and Federal accounting procedures necessary to assure proper disbursement of the Federal funds paid to the State. It would also initiate procedures to assure that the payments to school districts will be used for the programs and projects which have been approved by the State agency.

We have had assurances that Federal funds made available to the States will be used so as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of State, local, and private school funds that would otherwise be made available for these purposes, and that such Federal funds will in no case supplant local, State, and private school funds.

Under these provisions, States must set forth appropriate fiscal controls and fund accounting procedures and provide for making such reports as the Commissioner may reasonably require. It would seem, therefore, that insofar as the Congress can accomplish this end, rules of accountability, economy, and efficiency will be insisted upon, so that no Federal funds are improperly or wastefully used or diverted to uses not permitted by the act.

I hope that the regulations written incident to the act will encourage and insist upon economical management of all programs utilizing funds provided by this bill.

The shocking rise in State and local educational costs has occasioned great concern in many local communities where each year sees larger shares of total municipal budgets being spent for education. In many instances, tax rates in these communities have bounded to truly intolerable levels, and are threatening the economic soundness and general well-being of many communities. To be sure, this bill should and will help.

At the same time, it should be made clear that Federal moneys made available by the bill are not to be wasted, not to be frittered away with lavish, overexpensive, extravagant programs far beyond the needs and the capacity of the local communities involved.

The problems of meeting our educational needs in providing proper physical accommodations, qualified teachers, and the wide variety of special programs required by modern-day education are difficult enough without complicating them by unsound projects at the local level, obviously extravagant and beyond the means and the needs of the communities, and the Congress must make every effort to make sure that in this regard Federal funds shall not be available for uneconomical, poorly conceived, poorly administered educational programs.

The bill is designed to help the individual pupil and the funds made available are to the individual pupil and not to public schools or private schools as such unless they can meet the criteria spelled out by the bill.

Provision is made for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional material on the basis of children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools in each State.

The appropriation by State authority is in line with American traditions and past practices.

Effective limitations have been placed on the distribution of the funds to make sure that the benefits are to be available to the children and the teachers, and not to institutions, and that public authority shall retain title to materials furnished on a loan basis.

Supplemental educational centers and services are provided by the bill, and as I mentioned previously, initiative and responsibility for the operation of school programs rests with State and local authority.

Cooperative research is encouraged and financed. National educational laboratories are provided. Grants to strengthen State departments of education are afforded, and, across the board, the bill strengthens education systems in many effective ways that are necessary today, if we are to meet the educational needs of the American children and the American people.

I feel that those who oppose the bill or want some change in the formulas have presented their views extremely well, and I am sure conscientiously, but frankly I am unable to accept either their premise that there is no present need of this bill, or their obvious efforts to portray the bill as an effort to build up in

this country a conforming, educational bureaucracy that would destroy the initiative as well as the independence of the several States and dissipate the differences between them by law. The contrary is true since the bill is implemented by State and local agencies.

I can understand the reasoning of those who fear Federal dictatorship over education because to this I am strongly opposed, but I have the strong feeling that it is based upon fears and doubts concerning our local and State governments and our National Government that are not justified. We must and will safeguard our cherished, historic State and local self-government.

There is no reason to believe, for example, in my opinion, that the Federal Government intends to take over the job of education in this country to the exclusion of States and local units any more than there is reason to believe that the States and local communities would stand by and let Federal bureaucrats do it.

There are many and increasing areas in which the Federal Government is participating in the affairs of States, communities, and individuals, and this tendency has been stepped up in recent years. But if this trend is confined to promoting and strengthening the efficiency and effectiveness of the States and local units and providing necessary assistance under proper safeguards to protect constitutional rights, there should be no reason to fear it will result in the destruction of State and local governments, in fact it should strengthen them and the Nation as well.

I believe that in this day and age when we are growing so fast and are living in a world of such fabulous invention and scientific miracles when knowledge is mounting, and where speed is so often of the essence and where lack of funds can be paralyzing and devastating to modern progress, it is entirely defensible that we should distribute some of the huge revenue of the Federal Government, derived from the people, to lighten the burdens of some subdivisions of government where the people reside, where their needs are, and where many urgent requirements exist, to help them with their governmental problems and particularly the financial problems arising from them. Our Government through our agricultural programs, has long done this with good effect for animals. It is time we did it for people.

I think it is unrealistic to think that some of these problems like education, health, general welfare, can be met without putting the taxing power of the Federal Government behind their solutions, in some discoverable, effective, reasonable degree.

Personally, I should like to see this done in such ways that would make it abundantly clear that the Federal Government does not intend and will not intervene in the administration of State government and will not take over the conduct or affairs of government at State and local levels—will not become a great, dictatorial force of centralized government stemming from Washington bearing down on the States and obliterating the rights of local communities, making a centralized police state out of this free Nation and its independent States.

In a word, we have a practical problem here. The State and local communities can no longer properly do the job of education. In fact, in some respects some of them have never done the job well.

In these days, if this essential job is not done in time, not only the communities, but State and Federal Government will suffer dire consequences. Every man, woman, and child in this country will be in danger, the Federal Government itself will be in danger of being overrun by the masses of untutored, untrained, uneducated people reproducing themselves at a terrific rate and weighting down our entire structure, familial, political, social, economic, and governmental, and in time turning this country into a virtual Tower of Babel dominated by the unenlightened, the unfit, and perhaps the twisted and distorted of mind and ideas, into a radical, totalitarian state. That is a prospect to which we cannot and must not turn the deaf ear of complacency.

Be that as it may, I think this bill is a worthy one. Its objectives are high-minded and lofty. It seeks to fulfill a great national need. If it is well and wisely administered it will fulfill that need well and thus greatly contribute to the banishment of poverty, ignorance, bigotry, and substandard conditions, which, if continued long enough at present and constantly increasing rates, would soon weaken the very pillars of this great Government.

Some have doubts that even now we can do this job. They think the problems of untutored human proliferation and population explosion have gone beyond us, and it is too late. I reject this view. I think we are late in tackling the problem, but if we show the will, determination, and skill, and the willingness to make bold, new steps forward, we can do the job and we can save America for ourselves, our posterity, and for the world, and for the greater glory of man joined in brotherhood under the fatherhood of the Divine Master.

I do hope that in the administration of the bill the basic truths I have outlined above will not be overlooked and that the Federal agencies concerned will keep this bill in proper perspective, not as an instrument for federalizing State and local governments, but as an effective weapon to use in the war against poverty, ignorance, disease, and the disgraceful lowliness degrading the standards of this country and endangering the survival of this free Government.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

J
11
.R
v.111
appt
apr 1-30

Appendix

American Hospital Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a reporter of great ability, keen insight, and outstanding objectivity is Michael J. O'Neill, the Washington bureau chief of the Medical World News. Mr. O'Neill has recently paid tribute to the director of the Washington office of the American Hospital Association, Kenneth Williamson, whom Congress knows as a most effective spokesman for hospitals. Those of us in the health field have a high regard for Ken Williamson and his dedicated services; and I am very pleased to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the article entitled "Capital Rounds," which was published in the March 26, 1965, issue of Medical World News.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL ROUNDS

(By Michael J. O'Neill)

Kenneth Williamson, the American Hospital Association's man in Washington, is a quiet operator. He shuns the spotlight as vigorously as a politician seeks it. But he knows the Government and Congress like the back of his own hand. And he gets results.

It is no accident that the House Ways and Means Committee's new medicare bill is just about what the doctor ordered—as far as the American Hospital Association is concerned. Williamson and his staff have been working behind the scenes for nearly a decade to bring this about.

They have kept in constant and cooperative touch with key figures in the Government, such as medicare's chief architect, Wilbur J. Cohen. They have worked closely and well with such congressional leaders as Ways and Means Committee Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas. And they have even maintained friendly contacts with the AFL-CIO's top spokesman on social security affairs, Nelson H. Cruikshank.

Even more important, however, is that Williamson long ago recognized that powerful political and social forces were propelling the Federal Government more and more deeply into the health field. And he decided that these forces could not be rolled back, or even simply dammed up. The most the American Hospital Association could hope to do, he felt, was to influence the trend enough to promote a good working relationship between the Government and the hospitals, and thus avoid a permanent estrangement.

Williamson knows the hospital field inside and out. As an experienced hospital administrator, he helped start Blue Cross in southern California, helped fight a compulsory health bill as head of the California Hospital Association, and later served as executive director of the Association of Western Hospitals. He joined the American Hospital Association as assistant director during World War II and sparked the development of many of its important programs.

CONSERVATISM NO BAR TO REALISM

After a brief tour of duty as executive vice president with the Health Information Foundation, Williamson returned to the American Hospital Association as an associate director in 1953 and took over its increasingly important Washington operations. He is a conservative and just as opposed to Government medicine as most doctors. But he is also a hard-boiled political realist who feels that it is better to work with rather than against the political and social tides.

"The primary requirement is to meet the needs of the public," he says. "There are certain things which the voluntary field can do by itself. But where we see that the needs cannot be met this way, we should take the initiative to bring in the Government in a supporting role. If you just sit on your haunches and oppose the Government at every turn, you run the very great risk of ending up forcing the Government to go further than it wants to or needs to."

Williamson disagrees with his American Medical Association colleagues who argue that medicare and similar Federal health programs are driving the country straight down the road to socialized medicine. "One of the main reasons that socialized medicine has developed in Britain and some other countries," he says, "is that the health groups failed to act voluntarily to bring the Government in to help meet the public's needs. As a result, a system they don't like was forced on them. We are on quite a different course here in the United States. We are moving toward a partnership with the Government in the health field. And this is a good thing."

THE AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION GIVES COMPLETE COOPERATION

In addition, Williamson argued for cooperating fully with every Government agency, congressional committee, Senator, or Congressman working on aged-care legislation. Whether a proposal was good, bad, or indifferent, the American Hospital Association cheerfully supplied technical data, cost estimates, special analyses, and anything else that was requested.

Williamson encouraged the Social Security Administration to make on-the-spot studies of hospitals, and talked the hospitals into cooperating fully. The American Hospital Association called in special teams of experts, arranged meetings, and sponsored studies to help the drafters of legislation solve special problems.

As a result, Cohen, MILLS, and other key officials gradually concluded that they could depend on the hospitals to cooperate in the development of an effective medicare bill. They were receptive to the American Hospital Association's suggestions—even to the idea that it would be good to have Blue Cross serve as an intermediary between the hospitals and the Government.

On this point, Williamson and his staff kept insisting that Blue Cross could do a better administrative job than the Government, charge less, provide better controls over hospital standards and utilization, develop a more effective information program for the aged, and smooth relations between the the hospitals and the Social Security Administration. And a provision to let hospitals pick their own administrative agency—which will almost certainly be Blue Cross—finally found its way into the medicare bill.

Williamson and his team also played a role in getting the bill's drafters to provide full reimbursement for hospital costs, to permit the Joint Commission on Accreditation to police standards, and to require a hospital affiliation for long-term facilities.

All in all, the many medicare provisions favoring hospitals are the product of years of behind-the-scenes effort and skillful legislative strategy. And much of the credit for this belongs to the American Hospital Association's quiet man in Washington.

Jewish Federation-Council of Los Angeles Honors Congressman Jim Corman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1965, the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles presented its coveted Hollzer Award to Congressman JAMES C. CORMAN. The award was in recognition of JIM CORMAN's outstanding service in fostering good will and understanding among religious and racial groups in the Los Angeles area.

The award was presented by Mr. Walter S. Hilborn, dean of the Jewish community of Los Angeles. Mr. Hilborn is a member of the board of directors of the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles and a vice chairman of its community relations committee.

I know that my colleagues of both parties would like to join in this salute to JIM CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD both Mr. Hilborn's introductory remarks and the acceptance speech of our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. CORMAN]:

PRESENTATION OF AWARD BY MR. WALTER S. HILBORN

Throughout the years we have worked diligently to strengthen civil rights guaranteed to all persons by the Constitution and to preserve the basic separation of church and state. Each year at our annual meeting we adopt resolutions which evidence our dedication to these ideals. Thus, we were vitally concerned with the ultimate enactment of the civil rights bill by the Congress last year.

Congressman JAMES CORMAN, our honoree, was a decisive factor in each field. His important role in the enactment of the civil

rights bill was described by John Averill in the Los Angeles Times in the following eulogistic language:

"As one of the junior members of the House Judiciary Committee he demonstrated such immediate talent in piercing to the heart of complex legal questions and shattering arguments by the opposition, that he wound up as the leading utility man for the Northern Democratic forces, backing the bill." Aveill quoted a southerner: "If we could have Corman on our side, we might have come out of this in better shape."

For his leadership in this historic fight we are deeply indebted to Congressman CORMAN. We are equally grateful to him for his fight against the Becker amendment, which—if it had passed—would have brought religion into our public schools. In this fight he showed himself to be a man of principle and of courage. His position on that issue almost cost him his seat in Congress, for his opponent and right wing radical extremists used this during the last campaign to smear and defeat him. Fortunately, they failed at it.

His battles fought were our battles. All we can do is honor him by presenting to him the highest and most coveted award of the organized Jewish community, named after our first president, the late Judge Harry Hollzer. The award, which bears his likeness, has the following inscription:

"TO CONGRESSMAN JAMES CORMAN

"For outstanding service in fostering good will and understanding among religious and racial groups in the Los Angeles area.

"Presented by the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles at its annual meeting, January 31, 1965. "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together."

Congressman CORMAN, it is a distinct honor and privilege to present this award to you in behalf of the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles. May this occasion always be one of the durable satisfactions of your life.

ACCEPTANCE OF AWARD BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES CORMAN

You all must know how truly honored and delighted I am to receive the Hollzer Memorial Award. This occasion reminds us of the impact for good that one man's life can have on the lives of so many. The 66 years that Harry Hollzer was on this earth and, more specifically, the 13 years he devoted to unifying the Jewish community of Los Angeles, have given to our city an organization with purpose, with direction, and with strength, an organization which has eased the burden of countless citizens and has enriched the total community.

The most debilitating question in this large, complex, and imperfect world of ours is always "But what can I—only one—do about it?" When we are tempted to answer that question with "Nothing," we would be well advised to review the life of a single man, Judge Harry Hollzer.

To share with you this observance of 500 combined years of service is a stellar occasion. That is a lot of years—more years than all the committee chairmen, put together, have served in the Congress. That 500 years of service has changed the lives of thousands of citizens of Los Angeles. It has given orphaned children homes and families. It has helped combat racial bigotry and anti-Semitism. It has made loans available to students and businessmen. Truly, it has reached almost every segment of community life.

The fact has not escaped my attention that last year you honored a prominent politician, the year before a famous Methodist lawyer. I cannot claim to be in their class, but at least I am in the category of both. You have generously mentioned two efforts in which it was my good fortune to be involved during the last Congress: Passage of the Civil Rights Act and defeat of the Becker amendment. It was a satisfying year for me, and a successful one for all who have some understanding of, and respect for, the constitutional rights of individual Americans.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

In dealing with the Becker amendment, our greatest adversary was a broadcast misunderstanding of what religious freedom in America is all about. It is my observation that most people respect the right to religious freedom of each American. Though theologically we may suspect that all our Friday or Sunday morning seatmates are headed for Hell in a breadbasket, we're willing to go along with the system which gives them that choice. Yet, many have lost sight of the proper relationship between the church and the state. If we are to retain that freedom of choice, we must keep our religious activities above and beyond the control of Government. The Becker proposal, advocated as a step toward bringing God into our public life, would, in truth, have brought Government regulation into our individual religious convictions and practices.

This controversy is rooted in a nationalism that has more and more become defied. Patriotism for one's country is a laudable trait. But nationalism raised to the level of religious fervor is disastrous. History is replete with the tyrant's use of religious nationalism.

We have won the battle with Becker, thanks to the vigorous efforts of every major religious denomination in this country. His cause is pretty well laid to rest. But this was the battle, not the war. The ill-conceived union of the cross and the flag, as epitomized by Gerald L. K. Smith, is a trusted tool of the rightwing. We are far from delivered from that scourge.

CIVIL RIGHTS

A much more constructive endeavor of the 88th Congress was the passage of the Civil Rights Act. This legislation was a reflection of a new high in our national standards of morality. We abolished the legality of racial discrimination in important segments of American society. To all Americans, we said that race, color, or religion would no longer be used to deny equality at the ballot box, in the marketplace, or in the enjoyment of public facilities. The act was the accomplishment of two great Presidents and two great political parties each making substantial and constructive contributions. John F. Kennedy was the principal architect of the bill. Lyndon B. Johnson made it his first objective when history thrust the Presidency upon him. Congressmen CELLER and McCULLOCH in the House, and the then Senator HUMPHREY and Senator KUCHEL in the Senate, led a successful legislative battle which was beyond the most optimistic hopes of those of us who support strong civil rights legislation.

I think we would not do proper honor to the memory of Harry Hollzer if we took this occasion to congratulate ourselves for a job well done in the field of human relations and, more specifically, race relations. At best, we may say that we have a job well begun. We must recognize that the Negro would have considerably less than equality, and the Nation considerably less than harmony, if we must resort to legislative statute and court decree at every point in our interracial relations. We shall not have attained our ultimate goal until that day when a legislative committee could find no witnesses interested in civil rights legislation, and that day when a judge would be shocked that a citizen would have to come to his court to obtain equality with his fellow citizen of another color.

MORALITY AND THE LAW

Frequently, during the course of our hearings on the Civil Rights Act we were urged to do nothing because you cannot legislate morality. We rejected this premise, not because it was untrue, but because it was irrelevant. Just as all laws do, the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibits certain kinds of conduct. It doesn't establish morality in the hearts of men.

This is the promising and exciting challenge which lies ahead for each of us and for our Nation. If one wonders how far we have to go, I would remind you that just last November an overwhelming majority of Californians decided that although we are delighted to have Negroes play baseball at Dodger Stadium, we don't want them playing on our neighborhood sandlots. But 20 short years ago we wouldn't even let them play in Dodger Stadium. Let's hope it doesn't take us 20 years to realize what we are doing to ourselves by the decision we made last November. We need to think a little less about how lucky Willie Mays is that he is allowed to play baseball and a little more about how fortunate we are to live in a day when we can watch him. I'd like to say, parenthetically, that this analogy would be a little more accurate, and our chances for winning the 1965 World Series would be a little better, if Willie Mays played more often in Dodger Stadium and less at Candlestick Park.

PROGRESS IN HUMAN RELATIONS

The discouraging part of our progress in race relations is that, although no one wants to go back from whence we came, few seem to want to go on from where we are. I suggest to you that in this endeavor each of us has a tremendous opportunity to prove the validity of racial equality by living it daily. For most of us it is going to involve change. From time to time it will be awkward and, from time to time, we may have to be unpleasant to those who resist change. But the objective is well worth the effort. If we can relieve our society of the artificial barriers which lock some people out and other people in, if we can remove fear and suspicion from our own hearts, then our few brief years on this planet will certainly have been worth while to us, to our neighbors, and to our Nation.

Proposed Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a number of people have called to my attention an excerpt from Babson's Reports, dated March 22, 1965, and entitled "Southern Transition." These comments from Babson's Reports are concerned with the President's proposed voting rights legislation. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN TRANSITION

Southern businessmen—particularly those in communities or regions having majority Negro population—are weighing the implications of passage of the proposed voting rights bill.

If the measure should be passed in the essential form proposed by the President, it would, for practical purposes, do away with all but the simplest of voter qualification tests for local as well as national elections.

There's no doubt that political control of countless southern towns, cities, even coun-

ties, will be in the hands of Negro citizens within a short space of time.

In most cases, local Negroes do not have the education, training, or ability to handle governmental responsibility.

A further problem is the fact that the Negroes in countless communities constitute the have-not group, and it is feared the local taxes may be raised drastically by the new governments in an effort to correct this imbalance hurriedly by much enlarged welfare programs and other redistributive devices.

This could lead to the abandonment of some property and the closing or relocation of local businesses.

It appears quite likely that a large number of "ghost towns" may thus be created, requiring a substantial Federal assistance.

Because of the deep feelings developed during the recent crises, it cannot be expected that the passage of a law will correct all that is wrong, or protect the affected areas from new—and sometimes graver—problems of transition.

Astronauts Get a Wet Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Gay Talese has accurately captured the spirit of the welcome given our astronauts, Virgil I. Grissom and John W. Young, in New York City on Monday. This New York Times reporter clearly describes the enthusiasm and support of the New York public and, I believe, the Nation, of our space program, as personified by our heroic astronauts. Particular note should be taken of the words spoken by our Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY for this tumultuous welcome in New York City. Surely this represents the ground swell of American opinion to continue our exploration and development of space:

ASTRONAUTS GET A WET WELCOME—BUT CHILLY RAIN HERE FAILS TO DAMPEN THE JOY OVER GRISSOM AND YOUNG

(By Gay Talese)

New Yorkers littered the sky yesterday with tons of swirling tickertape, confetti, and old newspaper headlines—and at the bottom of it all, moving slowly up lower Broadway, surrounded by marching bands, were two quiet Americans: Virgil I. Grissom and John W. Young.

It was no day for a parade. It rained hard and the wind was raw. And yet at noon several thousand people waited along Broadway to cheer the astronauts who last week rocketed into space—and yesterday rode past at 7 miles an hour in a Lincoln convertible.

Sitting between them, poised and gregarious—so different from the astronauts—was Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who had flown to New York an hour before. At La Guardia Airport, he greeted the spacemen, their families and dignitaries.

"The people of the United States," he said, "are proud of the achievements of these two young men and I am sure that New York, rain or no rain, will give them a welcome the likes of which they have never had."

Then the motorcade, consisting of 25 autos and 40 police motorcycles, formed and the ride began from LaGuardia to the starting point of the parade—Bowling Green Park in downtown Manhattan.

This is New York's oldest park. In 1776 there was a riotous scene there with patriots knocking off the British crowns that capped the park's fence. But at 12:05 p.m. yesterday, as the parade began to move, the fence and the park's trees were streaming with ticker tape tossed from a dozen skyscrapers by hundreds of people who did not mind getting their heads wet in the driving rain.

OVER 5,000 POUNDS OF PAPER

Most of the tape and wastepaper, 5,000 pounds of it, was provided by the city's department of public events; but it was so windy at noon that paper was blown from one window to another, from one skyscraper to another.

Marge Scheyder, a receptionist standing at a 13th-floor window of the Irving Trust Co.'s offices, had only to stretch a hand to catch flying ticker tape and throw it down at the astronauts below.

Five minutes after the parade began, Major Grissom, Lieutenant Commander Young, and Vice President HUMPHREY were entangled in tape and speckled with confetti, and the windshield wipers of their car swabbed furiously in an effort to prevent the soggy paper from blocking the view.

Ahead on Broadway the space heroes could see flags waving on both sides of the street, cameras flashing in their faces, people waving from roofs and those in the street yelling, "Good work, Gus. Attaboy, John."

As they continued to roll uptown toward city hall the astronauts discovered part of the international world that is New York. They moved past the offices of Lufthansa, then Sardi's Pizza, then Berlitz; then the Bank of Montreal, the Bank of Tokyo, the French American Banking Corp., the Marine Midland Trust Co., the Bank of North America.

Then they passed McCoy's Irish Bar—and a drinker stood on a stool and yelled out the door, "Good boy, Gus." A woman in the Parklane Hosiery Shop, inspecting seamless micromesh stockings, walked out into the rain and stood on her toes and tried to see.

But she could not see a thing; most people could not. The police ringed the motorcade so tightly that, to most sidewalk witnesses yesterday, the parade was merely the noise of motorcycles, the flash of cameras, the long strands of ticker tape that tangled even with the tower of Trinity Church and cut across the nose of the courtyard statue of John Wattes—last royal recorder of New York (died 1836).

Commander Young's middle name is Watts, but he is no relation of the royal recorder. When the motorcade finally got to city hall, Mayor Wagner took the commander to a painting of New York State's 15th Governor, John Young (1847–1949). No relation, the astronaut said.

After Mayor Wagner introduced the spacemen to dignitaries in city hall, they all assembled on the portico steps. The bands continued to play, rain falling into the brass instruments, everybody drenched, and that is why the speeches were so short.

The commissioner of public events, Richard C. Patterson, introduced everybody to the crowd and then Mayor Wagner presented the two astronauts, as well as to Dr. Robert C. Seamans, with the city's highest award—to Gold Medal of Honor.

Dr. Seamans, who is Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, said: "I think I can speak in behalf of the entire space program when I extend a vote of thanks for the opportunity you have given us to explore space."

THE SPACEMEN JUST SMILE

The astronauts, who generally abhor public speaking and even shy away from interviews, said nothing. They merely smiled, as did their families seated nearby. Then Vice President HUMPHREY, hatless as he was in the parade, told the gathering:

"America salutes not only the astronauts, not only the scientists, and not only their families, but the thousands and thousands of people engaged in the space program who made this Gemini flight possible."

After the city hall program was over, at 12:50 p.m., the motorcade moved to the United Nations.

There the Secretary General, U Thant, presented medals and two autograph sets of United Nations stamps to the astronauts. Then it was a private lunch at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel and more speeches, more praise, more applause.

That is the way it continued even as the space heroes and their party made plans to see the Broadway musical, "Hello, Dolly."

Major Grissom was put in a spot he likes to avoid—speaking to the public. Smiling, he told the Waldorf-Astoria gathering: "We were overwhelmed by New York—as all small-town boys should be."

Then Commander Young, still damp, said, "I haven't seen so much water since we got out of the Atlantic."

Today the astronauts are scheduled, after a brief stop in Newark, to appear in Chicago—for another parade and more receptions and speeches.

A World They Never Made—Luckily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, with his usual wit and preception, Columnist-Publisher Jenkin Lloyd Jones has zeroed in on the beatnik and Zen Buddhist set which flutters around the campuses of many of our great northern universities. In a column entitled "A World They Never Made—Luckily," Mr. Jones notes:

There is euphoria in self-pity, comfort in blaming the older generation, smugness in unbarbered rebellion that is not much else.

Mr. Jones spent a few hours in the "kookie corner" of one of our northern universities—"a place where aversion to soap has somehow been confused with profundity," and he was not at all impressed with what he saw.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that his column from the March 27 Washington Star on the kooks and their corner be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WORLD THEY NEVER MADE—LUCKILY

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

I have been visiting a couple of our great northern universities and in one of them I spent half an hour sitting around the kookie corner looking at and listening to the beats and the Zens.

The kookie corner usually occupies part of the large basement snack bars in the student union buildings where coffee is cheap and talk is priceless. For laboratory examples of sophomoric sophistry and contrived eccentricity you can't beat it.

It is a place where aversion to soap has somehow been confused with profundity. Here is where the beards gather, and the girls in blue jeans and boots carry guitars. Sheep dog hair-dos and Neanderthal hair-

cuts are a dime a gross. But saddest of all is the uniform—the uniform of the slob.

The kookie corner abounds with talk—high flown, furious, cynical or bitter. No one has much experience, and not many are really very good students, but cork-weight ideas feathered by polysyllabic words are batted back and forth like badminton birds, and everyone imagines he is enunciating great truths.

At the round table next to me I tuned in on a Niagara of conversation between one musk ox, two male airedales, two nanny goats and a chittering chimpanzee about the evils of American militarists and our "imperialist posture" in Vietnam. They were sympathizing with themselves over the possibility of being caught inside a fireball, and a proposed protest march was under discussion.

The musk ox laughed bitterly and shook his shaggy head.

"It's a world I never made," he said.

Now, there, of course, was truth.

For all the frightening implications of a technology that can now destroy continents (which the musk ox and his friends had nothing to do with) there are several other things they had nothing to do with, either.

One was the building of the great university, the product of millions of man-hours behind the plow, in the snow-drifted lumber camps, in the foundries and offices. It was built because citizens, most of whom had never seen the inside of a college classroom, were prepared to contribute an enormous value of cheese, wheat, automobiles, and pulp, which they might otherwise have put in their own pockets, to the higher education of their children, including the musk ox.

There have been other dividends from the world he never made. One is life. If persons now long dead had not dissected plague victims, experimented with dangerous pox pustules and permitted themselves to be bitten by anopheles mosquitoes, three of the six places at that roundtable would be vacant.

The musk ox and his friends may plan a protest march in safety because men long forgotten chose to die at barricades. The fact that the denial of this right in faroff Selma, Ala., gains the top headlines indicates the measures of the victory. The musk ox may go to the university library and read books sneering at representative democracy and advocating the dictatorship of the proletariat because men risked death for freedom of speech in the world he never made.

Ah, yes. The musk ox is against militarism and war. On this campus the week after the military ball there is the antimilitary ball. The beats and the members of ad hoc committees for this and that are out in force.

When I was in college I was sure that wars were made by shadowy "merchants of death," promoting their huge munitions industries from castles in Switzerland. Weapons made wars. Disarmament, even if only we disarmed, was the answer.

So I laughed at my friend, Andy, who was in ROTC, wasting his time in the afternoons parading around with that ridiculous Springfield on his shoulder.

When the roof fell in at Pearl Harbor Andy and a thin khaki line were over on Bataan. Andy never got back. But he bought a little time while the rest of us could build some ships, go through crash training, and get over to restore the situation.

"World I never made." There is euphoria in self-pity, comfort in blaming the older generation, smugness in unbarbered rebellion that is not much else.

I wonder what the sons and daughters of the musk ox, the airedales, the nanny goats and the chimp will say about the world their parents made.

Another Tragedy in Alabama—But Who Is To Blame?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Southwest Virginia Enterprise, Wytheville, Va., of March 30, 1965:

The cowardly murder of a Michigan housewife, mother of five children is another horrible tragedy—the aftermath of Martin Luther King's big production of a nonsensical propaganda show. We again point out the idea—the march and everything connected with it was absurd. It positively accomplished nothing except widening the gap between two races, and paint a distorted and prejudiced picture of Alabama and the South. Also it is now recognized as we emphasized prior to the march of eccentrics, that the entire plan would have flopped if the TV, radio, wire services, magazine reporters and photographers had not made the inexcusable mistake of labeling it as news—taking priority over every happening or event anywhere on the globe.

The Enterprise fully recognizes the various reasons that can be advanced as to why a mother with five children shouldn't be far away from home, and taking chances that scarcely any woman would take in being a chauffeur for the Selma-to-Montgomery marchers.

But the fact remains that low minded criminals fired upon her car as she drove along the dark highway and those so involved are madmen. The cowardly act is regretted by the citizens of Alabama, by Governor Wallace, and southerners' regrets are even deeper than that of the majority of the people of the remainder of the Nation.

The distraught and highly nervous husband the day after the killing acted naturally in placing the blame on Governor Wallace. But any half-way fair-minded person will readily realize that Mr. Luizzio is in gross error, as is anyone anywhere who attempts to place the blame or condemn the Alabama chief executive. The same idea prevailed when the Rev. James Reeb died from injuries received while engaged in civil rights demonstrating in Selma. This is the proof of what takes place when hysteria is created. A pent-up-electrically-charged emotional situation has created a national disgrace.

Who is really to blame for the deaths in Alabama? Governor Wallace refused to allow the march. When he realized the President and Justice Department were going to assure the march in disobedience and against highway safety laws and State laws, Wallace wisely requested that the Federal Government assume the responsibility for the safety of the demonstrators. How correct he was, for think how much louder would have been the hue and cry if only State police and State troopers had been on duty. Yet Mr. Johnson's wrath was very evident at being asked to accept the responsibility for the march he approved.

It is our contention the responsibility for the death of Mrs. Luizzio and likewise Reverend Reeb rests upon the shoulders of the leaders and planners of the march of infamy. Dr. Martin Luther King would not have been stopped in his determination and obsession to grab the headlines and see the irrational plan was carried out. President Johnson and the Justice Department cannot escape from sharing the responsibility. In our firm belief the National Council of Churches leaders stand today in the dazzling spotlight of opinion of all unbiased people as also being among those responsible for the tragedies. Remember the National Council of Churches made a nationwide appeal for outsiders to go to Alabama and march. A march that was against a Federal order. Standing in the brilliant sunlight of the midday sun are this group who played the big role in a highly exaggerated drama. We do not see how it is possible within the realm of commonsense application not to place responsibility where it belongs. This newspaper does not point the finger at the group with prejudice or an intolerant attitude. It is simply the heart rendering and breaking results of what we have for months and months predicted would take place when breaking laws at the State or local level are upheld by a few powerful officers in a powerful centralized government. Also when a man like Dr. Martin Luther King gains power, and has strong financial support the harvest is bound to be bitter fruit.

We have to this day never found out where the civil right fanatics—the ministers, the students, the paid agitators were a few months ago. Surely the incidents have not been forgotten, although they didn't near approach receiving the news coverage of the Alabama march.

We are talking about the riots and violence that were stirred up by a lawless Negro element in Harlem, Rochester, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Paterson, Elizabeth City, Boston and Cambridge, Mass., resulting in wholly unprovoked loss of lives and the destruction of millions of dollars of property? And we don't believe President Johnson made two or three nationally televised talks, and every daily newspaper used streamer headlines to play up his statements. Is suffering, the destruction of property, the loss of life—if it occurs north of the Mason-Dixon line and involves race insignificant? Why any more so than in the South? We still seek the truthful answer to the question.

The Enterprise has been deeply concerned over the warped, twisted and misleading picture one sees from the slanting of the news. The Dothan (Ala.) Eagle in an editorial—news story last week gives some first-hand information that should shock every reader * * * we hope somehow the true facts will penetrate into the shells of the politicians and the entire citizenry. The need for truths, not propaganda, was never as great as it is in the racial issues, and the political-motivated civil rights acts.

The Dothan, Ala., newspaper reports as follows:

"We have seen a letter written from on the spot by a State trooper, a true Christian sickened by the things and the people he has seen and heard at close range in the recent days he has been on duty in Selma. The letter was to his family because 'I wanted to tell you myself these things so you will not be misinformed by anyone or anything.' A couple of paragraphs are revealing:

" 'It's mostly just a gathering of rebellious Negro trash, homosexuals, beatniks, thieves, dope peddlers, addicts, and paid professional agitators,' said on paragraph. 'This is the bunch of people that L.B.J. is trying so hard to please. Mother, with the leadership this Nation has now I can't see how in the world this country can continue to exist as a free, God-fearing people.'

" 'Regardless of one's feelings about integration, voting rights, mixed marirages, whether for or against,' said another paragraph, 'this way is not the way to change it. I have seen Negro men and white women, white men and Negro women loving each other, holding each other, hands all over each other, right here in the middle of the streets in Selma, Ala. Bearded beatniks, filthy, dirty

young white girls dressed like men, so-called preachers in overalls and some priests in their suit with the collar turned backward, all are here, living, eating, sleeping with these Negroes, cursing Alabama and us. * * * People who live here are fed up to the point of desperation. This is what has migrated into the State of Alabama, with the protection and blessings of President Johnson, the Justice Department, and Supreme Court.'

"One of the most nauseating trappings about the stage—managed travail of Selma is the part—even leadership—taken by the invading clergy. At the urging of the National Council of Churches, ministers, preachers, priests, rabbis and self-ordained have swarmed to the center of agitation. Using a holier-than-thou attitude they have sought to cloak an evil outrage with the respectability of religion.

"The damage they have done thereby to the religious fabric of this Nation is beyond calculation."

The Dothan editor had used as caption for the editorial "The Devil Smiles." We would say that he is laughing loud and long by now.

Dr. Joseph Melnick, of Baylor University Medical School, Receives Modern Medicine Award for 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the modern war on disease, which is fought daily in research laboratories and clinics around the world, is most usually waged by men who remain anonymous to the outside world, filled with populations which owe their very existence to the dedicated work these men perform.

One such man is Dr. Joseph L. Melnick, chairman of the Department of Virology and Epidemiology of Baylor University Medical Center, in Houston. He has devoted his life to detecting and studying viruses, and has made significant contributions to the development of the polio vaccine.

Recently, Modern Medicine chose Dr. Melnick as one of its 1965 recipients of the magazine's Award for Distinguished Achievement. Nominations for these awards come from deans of medical schools, leaders of medical organizations, and members of the Modern Medicine editorial board.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, which was published in the January 1965, issue of Modern Medicine, on pages 96–98, naming the various achievements of Dr. Melnick, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JOSEPH L. MELNICK, PH. D., CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF VIROLOGY AND EPIDEMIOLOGY, BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, HOUSTON

When Dr. Joseph L. Melnick, began studying viruses, the important ones could be counted on the fingers of two hands. "And those that we could work with in the laboratory we could count on one hand," he comments. Most of his career has been devoted to viruses, which had just been shown to be made of nucleoproteins when he received his Ph. D. from Yale in 1939. In 1941 he was awarded one of the first fellowships from the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and embarked on the work that helped propare the way for development of the polio vaccines.

Always a superb technician, Dr. Melnick fathered many techniques for studying viruses, including a method for detecting polio virus that was 100 times more sensitive than previous methods. One of his first published works on polio, with Drs. James Trask and John Paul, dealt with detection of polio virus in flies. Whether flies give the virus back to people never has been definitely settled, but the researchers did prove that flies could contaminate food with the virus. Dr. Melnick and his early coworkers, Drs. Robert Ward and Dorothy Horstmann, found that a person may remain a carrier of the virus for 7 or 8 weeks. They also determined that monkeys infected with polio virus can support growth of the virus in tissues outside the central nervous system. This finding was one of the first steps toward a polio vaccine.

Between 1949 and 1954, Dr. Melnick, then associate professor of microbiology at Yale, and his associates made a discovery that "set off an explosion in the field of virology." They found that polio virus was not in a class by itself but actually belonged to a much larger group of viruses with similar properties, now known as enteroviruses. Because of this work Dr. Melnick was selected in 1955 to head the National Foundation Committee on Enteroviruses, which included John Enders, Albert Sabin, Gilbert Dalldorf, William Hammon, and Jerome Syverton. These outstanding virologists carried out a series of collaborative studies and fostered the ready exchange of information between laboratories that led to much of the present understanding of the new human viruses and to methods for studying them. Dr. Melnick headed a similar committee for the National Institutes of Health from 1960 to 1963, and he now heads a new NIH committee on the picornaviruses.

Dr. Melnick left the professorship of epidemiology at Yale in 1957 to head the virus laboratories of the Division of Biologics Standards at NIH. A year later he was asked to set up a department of virology at Baylor University College of Medicine in Houston, "the first virology department in any medical school in the entire country," he recalls. He maintained close contact with NIH, however, serving on the committee that helped set standards for live polio vaccine on the training grant committee for infectious diseases, on the board for viruses and cancer, and on the human cancer virus task force.

In 1960 Mr. Melnick and Craig Wallis found a means to stabilize live polio vaccine so that it could be kept for weeks without refrigeration. They discovered, while studying factors that influence growth of viruses, that magnesium chloride stabilized oral polio vaccine, so that it maintained its potency for long periods without having to be kept at freezing temperatures.

In 1949 Dr. Melnick and his colleagues obtained the first human virus in crystalline form, the human wart virus. He has since recognized that this is one of a family of tumor viruses, which he has named the papova virus group. Eleven years later his attention was turned inadvertently to the association of viruses and cancer when the SV–40 virus, a papova virus of monkeys that causes tumors in animals, was found in polio vaccines. Dr. Melnick and his colleagues have found that when SV–40 produces tumors, the virus disappears but the tumor cells contain a new intranuclear antigen. Recently they, together with scientists at NIH discovered that adenoviruses can be hybridized with SV–40 and that human cells infected with such hybridized adenovirus develop the SV–40 tumor antigen.

Durand Doctor Home After African Duty on SS "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Eau Claire, Wis., Leader about a Durand, Wis., doctor, points out the success of Project Hope's philosophy of bringing proper medical facilities to developing nations for training purposes.

Under Project Hope, the world's first peacetime hospital ship—the SS *Hope*—sails to countries all over the world. On board is a modern American hospital. Taken aboard are doctors and nurses from the visited countries.

Instead of trying to reform outdated medical practices in the clinics and hospitals where the practices are being performed, Hope puts the medical personnel of these nations on board the SS *Hope* and has them work under ideal conditions.

The success of this theory is shown in the Leader article. As Dr. Joseph P. Stringer explains, midwives in Guinea, Africa, delivered babies in places riddled with cobwebs, birds, and rats. But after a few weeks aboard the *Hope* these midwives adopted modern sanitary practices.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Leader article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AFRICAN DUTY ON SS "HOPE" OVER: DURAND DOCTOR HOME

DURAND.—Durand Dr. Joseph P. Springer has resumed his practice here after a 2-month interlude in Guinea, West Africa aboard the SS *Hope*.

As one of a team of 30 physicians and surgeons from Maine to California he had undertaken a stint with a people-to-people project launched in 1958. President Dwight Eisenhower asked a Washington, D.C., heart specialist to lead a project aimed at providing health opportunity for people everywhere.

Since that time aboard a 15,000-ton reconverted hospital ship which saw service in World War II and Korea, medical men have helped bring friendship, mercy, new therapies, medical texts, and equipment to Indonesia, Vietnam, Peru, Ecuador, and Guinea.

When the current tour is completed in Guinea the ship will be returned to the States for a badly needed overhaul—and continued service in the cause of humanity if enough supporters can be found to keep it going.

Dr. Springer flew in December from wintry, rural Wisconsin into summery, densely populated Africa aboard the gleaming white hospital ship.

He dusted off his college French, learning that language was a barrier at first in diagnosing cases, sometimes with the help of two or three interpreters to describe a patient's history and symptoms. Peace Corpsmen helped with some French would oblige by coming off the street to assist in untangling particularly difficult dialects.

His first patient was an expectant mother whose pregnancy had gone wrong and who had only one-eighth of her normal blood supply when he examined her, two grams of hemoglobin in a blood test which normally provides 15. Transferred from a hospital to the ship she received badly needed transfu-

sions and corrective surgery which led to her recovery.

His last was a lad of four with a hereditary blood defect, sycle cell anemia, which left him with a dangerously low blood count. Corrective treatment is available and was being given when Dr. Springer left for home.

Children fight an uphill battle for survival with only about one of four infants surviving beyond age 4. Malaria is the biggest killer. In between he helped Guinean Dr. Camara Komnos and Duila Ibrahima, a majeur, as they ministered to patients with elephantiasis, yaws, leprosy, and intestinal parasites all common to tropical regions. A majeur holds no medical degree but cares for many patients with routine ailments in a nation with a severe shortage of doctors.

Dr. Komnos, schooled in Dakar, is one of a handful of Guinean doctors attempting to care for the needs of two to three million persons. As an educated man the doctor has also been pressed into government service in the newly emerged nation which incensed General De Gaulle of France by accepting complete independence rather than to go along with his proposal to join a French commonwealth of nations to achieve independence gradually.

In a period in which the United States offered little aid, apparently out of a wish not to pique the French leader even more, Guinea looked elsewhere for help and found it in the Kremlin.

Russia built a hospital in the capital, Conakry, which was one of two in which Dr. Springer and his African partners carried on.

The Russian aid extended to supplying around 30 doctors under contract and technicians to assist in the Guinea medical program which provides state medical care.

Aboard ship the Guineans assisted Dr. Springer in surgery. On land, he was the doctor's assistant at the operating table.

A preliminary coolness to U.S. citizens when the SS *Hope* first arrived is yielding to fellowship in attacking the ever-present medical problems, Dr. Springer said.

He helped antidiphtheria and tetanus inoculation clinics in which children requested to bare their arms cheerfully stripped off every stitch and rarely squealed or yelled at the touch of the needle.

He followed in the footsteps of another general practitioner who had made the acquaintance of a group of midwives in training on shore in the hope they might come to accept the necessity for cleaning the cobwebs, excluding the birds and chasing the rats from the rooms where Guinea mothers give birth to their children.

Nobody marked on a calendar the day the trainees in midwifery began visiting the SS *Hope* to watch the maternity practices there.

But Dr. Springer's eyes sparkle a bit when he notes that since those visits to the ship the midwives are beginning to apply elementary practices of cleanliness they had known about for a long time but had probably never observed in practice before.

Now he's home with a few bright and deftly drawn water colors, some masks to hang on the wall, a deeper understanding of the vast complexity of U.S. commitments in Africa, and a new appreciation for the patience of many Africans.

What will he remember a decade from now when he thinks of Guinea?

He answers quickly, firmly, and without hesitation: "The people. I found them to be cooperative in every way, friendly, basically human, decent people.

He probably won't forget either, the night he boarded a dugout canoe with some native oarsmen and a Polish doctor holding the spotlight while he hunted crocodiles in the river near Conakry. But that's another story.

Pornography—Resolutions of Conference To Combat Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this week a group of highly intelligent and dedicated persons from all parts of the United States, representing many civic and religious groups, met in Washington to discuss means of fighting the traffic in obscene publications and other materials.

At the end of a 2-day conference, during which many speakers outlined both the scope of the fight and some of the means used to halt the flow of pornographic materials, a set of resolutions was adopted.

I ask permission to have these resolutions reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I wish to call special attention to two resolutions which I feel have an interest for Members of Congress.

The first is the resolution asking that something be done to clean up the newsstands in our Nation's Capital, where smut is made available in great quantities. The resolution points out that Washington is the capital of the world, that millions of people visit here every year, and that with such lewd displays we give a poor image of our country and, especially, of our seat of Government.

The second resolution which should concern Members of Congress. Proposes the appointment of a commission to study the means of combating the traffic in obscene and pornographic materials and alerting the public to the attendant dangers of such traffic. I was especially interested in this resolution, since I have pending in this session a bill—identical to a bill which was passed twice by the Senate—which would set up such a commission. The bill is S. 309. I believe that the enactment of this proposed legislation would do much to carry out the recommendations of the Conference To Combat Obscenity.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE TO COMBAT OBSCENITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 22–23, 1965

We resolve,

We of this Conference To Combat Obscenity highly resolve to continue our efforts, as citizens and members of the organizations we represent, to halt the tide of obscenity and indecency in publications and entertainment in our Nation, in order to protect our children and youth from the clear and present danger of immorality and delinquency, which inevitably result from pornography, and to overcome this tragic sickness in society, which, unless healed, will quickly lead to the moral and physical decay of our Nation.

TO ALL OFFICIALS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

We are alarmed to find that Washington, D.C., appears to be the smut capital of the Nation, in that there are numerous newsstands and retail outlets that display and sell the most obscene and indecent magazines and paperback books produced in America today. We are shocked at the flood of nudity, illicit love, homosexuality, lesbianism, and al other types of sexual perversion on open display. We reflect that our Nation's Capital is visited by many thousands of children and youths every season of the year, and that many of these, as well as those residing here, are exposed to the vicious, filthy literature on many of Washington's newsstands. We call upon the President and Members of Congress to investigate these conditions and apply appropriate remedies.

TO THE PRESIDENT

We respectfully suggest to the President that the forces of amorality in this country are so entrenched and so well organized that a sweeping investigation by the FBI might be in order.

We are reminded that the President of the United States has the great and honored responsibility to nominate, for life tenure, the Justices of the Supreme Court and other Federal courts. We respectfully request that in the filling of any vacancies in the future, and particularly in the Supreme Court, the President select jurists well known and respected by their fellow citizens as being favorable to upholding the standards of decency that have guarded and protected the public from the beginning of our Nation, and which standards are based upon the concept of the sacredness of every human being in the sight of God, and in the sanctity of marriage and the home.

NEWS STAND PROPRIETORS AND SELLERS

We urge citizens in every community of our Nation to appeal to newsstand proprietors and sellers of publications to refuse to accept from their publishers or wholesalers, and to refuse to handle, display or sell, such magazines, books, and other materials that appeal to prurient interest, glorify illicit sex, debase womanhood, and present obscenity in an attractive manner, and in such ways as to corrupt children and youth. We remind the distributors and sellers of publications that they have an obligation and duty to the communities which they serve to maintain and elevate the moral standards of the community.

ENTERTAINMENT

We call upon all producers and exhibitors of all forms of public entertainment to recognize their responsibility not to present that which violates the laws against obscenity, or offends the standards of decency established for the protection of the public.

With respect to the motion picture industry, we call upon its executives, officials, and all others to reestablish the Production Code, adopted in 1930 and revised in 1956. We urge the Motion Picture Association to withhold its seal of approval from any film that violates the Production Code and the standards of decency in our communities, and demand that such films be eliminated in the future.

We remind producers of television programs that children and youth comprise their greatest audiences, and that decent families will not tolerate the further drift toward obscenity in plots, situations, and dialogs, in TV entertainment.

LEGISLATION

We call upon citizens of our Nation, and especially molders of public opinion, to support legislation that will strengthen the laws of municipalities, States, and the Nation, against obscenity; and to enlist other concerned citizens in the crusade to outlaw the peddling of smut and filth in all their forms, particularly to the nation's youth.

We endorse the proposal to establish, either by action of Congress or by Presidential ap-

pointment, a commission to study pornographic materials of all kinds and to recommend to all agencies of the government courses of action to combat this national evil.

We urge that citizens make organized protests to proper authorities because of the display and sale of material objectionable for children and youth on property owned or controlled by governmental agencies.

THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

We commend the members of the Supreme Court who announced the majority opinion in the Roth-Alberts case in 1957, which established a working principle for ridding our communities of obscenity.

We deplore several recent decisions of the Supreme Court, which have overruled the decisions of many state courts in obscenity cases, this in effect making the highest court in the land a board of censors as to what constitutes obscenity, a responsibility which, as Chief Justice Earl Warren has declared, should be left to juries in lower courts. We deplore the fact that such decisions have significantly encouraged the traffic in obscenity.

INTERFAITH SEMINARS

We urge that responsible religious leaders in each city or community promptly hold interfaith seminars, to examine the effects of the new amorality among youth, resulting from pornography, and how to grapple with the problem.

LAW-ENFORCEMENT EDUCATION

We urge Mr. J. Edgar Hoover to use the facilities of the FBI to set up a training program for law-enforcement officers of States, counties, and cities, in uniform procedures to be followed in obscenity cases.

FUTURE ACTION

We recommend for the consideration of all church groups of all faiths, and all civic organizations interested in public morality, the formulation of a plan whereby a more united voice can be heard by all publishing and entertainment media; that the plan include the establishment of permament groups, particularly in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles areas, to cooperate with law enforcement officials to combat obscenity, and to cooperate with producers of films for moving pictures and TV programs to see that films are not made and shown that violate the production code.

We ask that a copy of these resolutions be carried to the President, personally, at his convenience by members of this conference, and that copies be sent to each Member of Congress.

Goals of Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleagues will share my interest in the excellent statement prepared earlier this year for the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by Prof. Varden Fuller, of Berkeley and the University of California.

Dr. Fuller, who is a distinguished professor of agricultural economics, has raised some very important questions regarding commodity markets, land values, and farm policy, and I commend his discussion to our colleagues for their attention:

GOALS OF FARM POLICY: A COMMENT ON COMPARABLE RETURNS TO FARM LABOR AND INVESTMENT AS A GOAL OF PRICE AND INCOME POLICY[1]

(By Varden Fuller[2])

We are now approaching a half century of numerous proposals and of many actions relating to the role of Government in the economics of agriculture; yet the ultimate goals of policy have remained persistently obscure and elusive. In the 1920's the slogan underlying legislative proposals was "Equality for Agriculture," reflecting the idea that tariffs protected industry but not agriculture and thereby caused unfairness as between the prices received by farmers and prices they paid for production and consumption goods.[3]

In the 1930's the focus shifted to "price parity." This concept was adopted by Congress in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and has been the foundation of price support programs throughout the following years.

Notwithstanding that price parity, as a concept of an equality goal and as a statistical measure of comparative disadvantage, has endured and has served as a foundation of price support programs, there have been many responsible expressions of doubt that price interventions are a satisfactory way to approach legitimate income goals. Congress reflected this concern in 1936 and again in 1938 by providing authorities for basing farm programs on "income parity." However, to make income parity the direct objective of the individual commodity price programs has never proved to be administratively practical.

Following the abandonment of the inspecific idea of "equality for agriculture," the recognition of the insufficiency of price parity, and the intractability of income parity to serve as effective bases for the achievement of ultimate policy goals, the center of attention in the search for a proper goal of public policy appears now to be coming into focus on another comparative income concept. This goal is stated in the 1964 report of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, "Farm Policy in the Years Ahead" (p. 10), as follows:

"A level of farm income enabling efficient producers to earn returns on their labor and investment comparable with returns realized on similar resources outside of agriculture."

This, also, I suggest is an intractable and elusive goal. To begin with, there is the need to define "efficient producers"—what are the criteria to be applied: To the farmer as a manager? To the farm as an enterprise? To the area of production in which the farm is located? Defining and measuring "comparable returns" is also a job for which there are no objective criteria. Yet, if such a goal is to have precision, determinations must be made. But unfortunately, in the lack of criteria founded on reason and justice, arbitrary rules must be promulgated, thereby further compounding the regulatory abrasions already so notoriously associated with the administration of allotments and production controls.

There is, however, a still more serious question—of which the Commission's report takes notice but fails to give sufficient analysis. The Commission's report notes: "Computing returns on investment in land presents a difficulty, for in the long run land values themselves are considerably affected by the level of farm income. Thus in computing the comparable return for agriculture, land values might be fixed as of a recent date" (p. 10).

It is logically correct that the major influence on farmland values should be the level of income produced. The fact of the matter is, however, that since 1950 farmland values have risen sharply and continuously even though there has been no rise in farm income. Net farm income per acre has varied up and down in the postwar years but in 1963 was still at the same level as in 1950. In contrast, farm real estate values climbed year after year until by 1963 they had doubled over 1950. Further detail's are shown in table 1:

TABLE 1.—*Value of farm real estate and annual net income per acre,[1] United States (48 States), 1950–63*

	Per acre		Indexes (1950=100)	
	Value	Income [1]	Value	Income
1950	$65	$13.38	100	100
1951	75	15.54	115	116
1952	82	14.74	126	110
1953	83	12.81	128	96
1954	82	12.28	126	92
1955	85	11.50	131	86
1956	90	11.52	138	86
1957	97	11.71	149	88
1958	103	13.51	158	101
1959	111	11.57	171	86
1960	116	12.25	178	92
1961	118	13.05	182	98
1962	124	13.60	191	102
1963	130	13.37	200	100

[1] Based upon all land in farms. "The measure of net farm income used was total net income of farm operators, plus interest paid on farm real estate debt, and net rents paid to nonfarm landlords."

Source of value and income data: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Given the income picture and the "cost-price squeeze" in agriculture, farm real estate values should logically have not risen in the years 1950–63. Farm real estate in ratio to income was not significantly undervalued in 1950. During the 1940's the average ratio of land values to annual farm income was 4.5. Net farm income per acre (all land in farms) averaged approximately $13 for the years 1942–49 as against $12.90 for 1950–63. In the latter 1940's the ratio of land value to annual farm income rose to a ratio of approximately five. Had this ratio been maintained, the national average value per acre of farm real estate in 1963 would have been $65 instead of the inflationary level it had attained of $130 per acre.

This inflationary spiral has occurred in all regions, but in different degrees. It has been far less severe in the Appalachian, Lake States, and Northeast regions. It has been the sharpest and most accelerated in the Pacific, Southeast, Mountain, and Southern Plains regions.

There are several important policy questions that are inherent in this inflationary manifestation. One of these, which relates directly to the immediate question, is whether society at large should assume an obligation to secure for farmers a comparable return on inflated land values, and if so whether this is not an elusive goal, incapable of attainment, since the policy goal and the inflationary spiral would apparently be reciprocally self-accelerating. The Agricultural Advisory Commission was apparently uneasy on this point for it noted that "in computing 'comparable returns' for agriculture, land values might be fixed as of a recent date" (p. 10).

These issues of policy suggest the need to examine the influences that have brought on the inflation, and what its impacts have been upon the earnings of other productive services, especially farm labor.

No one has offered a conclusive explanation of the spiral in land values. The American Farm Bureau Federation has suggested that "a need for additional land to increase farm size is one reason. Others include: "A hedge against inflation, expectation of further increases in values, and a hope that the farm income situation will improve." (AFBF Official Newsletter, Nov. 9, 1964, p. 179.)

There is the well-known propensity to capitalize income benefits that are realized

Footnotes at end of speech.

from Government price support programs. This shows up in the prices and rents of land having allotment rights as against the lower values of equally productive land which has no allotment right. Such capitalizations reduce the earnings of labor but they would not necessarily provoke an inflation of land values disproportionate to the income currently being realized. An inflationary trend of the order now being observed must be based upon anticipations that are not directly related to current income—that income will rise in the future, that the inflation will continue indefinitely, or that future benefits will be realized in some other form. Officials of the Farm Credit Administration believe that anticipated benefits of farm enlargement leads farmers to pay inflated prices. Deputy Director Bushnell has stated:

"The answer lies in the fact that the majority of farmers are not buying full-sized farms. They are buying land to add to existing holdings—in an effort to utilize their machinery and have a more economic, efficient operating unit. Having purchased their base units when farm prices weren't so inflated, they figure they can 'average out' their investment and still get a fair return on the enlarged units. So, farmers are forced to pay a higher premium each year for tracts they must add to their operating unit to stay competitive in a fast-changing industry. * * * The young man who wishes to buy on today's market by making a small downpayment, much as his city cousin does in purchasing a home, is out of luck.

"Even if he finds a lender who will finance him on that basis, the odds on his being able to carry his debt from farm earnings are stacked against him." (Farm Credit Administration advance release, Sept. 25, 1963.)

The desire to obtain additional land for purposes of farm enlargement is a major source of activity in farm real estate transfers. However, it cannot be identified as the sole influence in the inflationary spiral because farms are being bought by nonfarmers as well as farmers with the intent of their being operated as whole units.

Whatever the combination of influences, this inflationary momentum is unquestionably a major contributor to the cost-price squeeze in agriculture. Governor Tootell of the Farm Credit Administration, has commented:

"The land banks have a difficult problem of lending the farm family enough to be of service without contributing unduly to further land market inflation. * * * In many areas of the country farmland prices have advanced to where the rate of return on the price asked for most farms is less than the average farm mortgage interest rate. This is true even if only hired labor rates are allowed the owner-operator in figuring net returns. If a reasonable managerial wage also were included as a cost the rate of return on the land would be even less. Compounding the problem is the further fact that advancing land prices have brought higher real estate taxes for most farmers. * * * This is one of the main crosscurrents within agriculture that is complicating the efforts of lenders, such as the land banks, to adjust their lending programs to meet the needs of a rapidly changing agriculture. * * * Credit will supply an increasing proportion of capital needs because internal generation of capital (from farm earnings) is too low on most farms to meet existing needs. * * * As the current custodians of a farmer-owned credit system, we have more than a moral obligation to meet the legitimate credit needs of our farmer-members. After all, adequate but sound credit is necessary to keep control of farming in the hands of farm families." (Farm Credit Administration advance release, Nov. 24, 1964.)

MAGNITUDES OF INCOME OBLIGATION IMPLIED BY A POLICY GOAL OF "COMPARABLE RETURNS"

How far below "comparable returns" is the present level of farm income? How much additional burden is imposed if the policy is to obtain returns on investment which embraces land inflation? What is the impact of land inflation upon the residual earnings of labor? The writer has made some calculations relating to these questions.

In table 2 (cols. 1 and 2) are found the magnitudes which result from one method of imputing earnings to land at current (inflated) land values and also to nonland production investment. In both instances the earning rate applied is the average interest rate on outstanding farm mortgage debt. Earnings imputed to labor (col. 3) are based upon the estimated man-hours of labor (self-employed and hired) for all farmwork valued at the national average hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing. These interest rates and wages are approximations of what might be defined as "comparable returns." As thus imputed, the total of comparable returns to labor and investment are found in column 4. Comparing these magnitudes with realized agricultural income, as indicated in column 5 of table 2, indicates the gap between the goal (as thus defined) and present reality. Percentagewise, recently realized agricultural income is running between one-half and two-thirds of the level necessary for the achievement of comparable returns. If an earning for management were imputed the gap would be wider.

TABLE 2.—*Imputed earnings at "comparable returns" to investment and labor in agriculture, United States (48 States), 1950–62*

[Dollars in millions]

Year	Earnings at "Comparable returns"				Realized agricultural income [4]	Ratio: realized to "comparable returns" (percent)
	Real estate [1]	Non land capital [2]	Labor [3]	Total		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1950	$3,251	$1,328	$21,797	$26,376	$18,175	69
1955	4,614	1,528	23,823	29,965	15,965	53
1956	4,838	1,504	23,455	29,797	15,905	53
1957	5,190	1,551	22,671	29,412	16,081	55
1958	5,565	1,718	22,256	29,539	18,131	61
1959	6,095	2,004	22,559	30,658	15,922	52
1960	6,496	1,940	22,205	30,641	16,613	54
1961	6,700	1,938	21,977	30,615	17,623	58
1962	7,147	2,028	21,713	30,888	17,976	58

[1] Computed by taking interest on current total farm real estate values at rates for all lenders on farm mortgage debt outstanding. (See table 5 for details.)
[2] Computed as above for aggregate values of production assets, including machinery and equipment, and inventories of livestock and feed.
[3] Man-hours of labor (self-employed and hired) estimated to be required for all farmwork valued at the average hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing. (See table 5 for details.)
[4] Operators' net income plus interest paid on farm mortgage debt, rent paid to nonfarm landlords, and wages paid to hired farm labor.

Source: Basic date from U.S. Department of Agriculture.

It is to be observed that imputed earnings to nonland capital and labor remained relatively constant through the years 1950–62. For nonland capital this is true because total farm investment other than in land has not risen markedly, widespread impressions to the contrary notwithstanding. For labor, the relative constancy in imputed earnings is because the rise in "comparable return" (i.e., manufacturing) wage has been approximately offset by declining man-hours of farm labor required. (See table 5.)

Table 3 carries out two adjustments of imputed earnings. For farmland the imputed interest earning on investment is based upon a series of value magnitudes that reflect what total farmland values would have been if no post-1950 inflation in land values had occurred. This is done by holding land values in the same ratio to income as prevailed for 1949–51. For labor, imputed earnings are at 85 percent of the manufacturing wage, which reflects roughly the difference in purchasing power of income in rural as against metropolitan areas. The effect of these two adjustments is greatly to reduce the total imputed income representing "comparable returns." As may be seen in column 5 of table 3, the gap between imputed and realized income on this adjusted basis narrows to the range of one-third to one-fourth.

TABLE 3.—*Adjusted imputed earnings at "comparable returns" to investment and labor in agriculture, United States (48 States), 1950–62*

[Dollars in millions]

Year	Earnings at adjusted "comparable returns"				Ratio: Realized [4] to "comparable returns" (percent)
	Real estate [1]	Nonland capital [2]	Labor [3]	Total	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1950	$3,487	$1,328	$18,528	$23,343	78
1955	3,109	1,528	20,249	24,886	64
1956	3,095	1,504	19,936	24,535	65
1957	3,125	1,551	19,270	23,946	67
1958	3,657	1,718	18,918	24,293	75
1959	3,176	2,004	19,175	24,355	65
1960	3,416	1,940	18,874	24,230	69
1961	3,729	1,938	18,681	24,348	72
1962	3,899	2,028	18,456	24,383	74

[1] Same computation as table 2 except that farm real estate value is held at the ratio to income that prevailed in the 3-year period 1949–51.
[2] Same as in table 2.
[3] Imputed earnings to labor are at 85 percent of the manufacturing wage rate.
[4] Same realized income data as in table 2 were used to compute the ratio.

LAND INFLATION VERSUS LABOR DEFLATION

In logical economic reasoning, the returns to farmland are supposed to be a residual—the remainder of income after labor (self-employed and hired) has been compensated at the levels of income that workers and farmers could have earned in other occupations and after the going rate of return has been earned on nonland investment. But the behavior of farmers, for whatever complex of motivations, appears to invert this relationship: they appear to be quite willing to buy land and to enter into mortgage obligations therefor, at prices so high in relation to realized income that only a depressed residual is left to compensate self-employed and hired labor.

Table 4 carries out an imputation which treats labor income as a residual. It compares labor income results when land is valued at current (inflated) levels as against the income results when land values are held at the 1949–51 ratio to farm income. Comparing the results in column 2 with those in column 4 indicates the substantial impact of land inflation upon labor earnings. In effect, the benefit of labor saving technological advances in recent years has been fully absorbed into land values. If land inflation had not occurred, the total dollar residual for labor would have been substantially constant through 1950–62; consequently, as man-hours of labor declined (see table 5) the earnings per hour would have significantly increased. In 1962, the inflated value demands of land were in effect costing some 36 cents per hour of labor earning.

TABLE 4.—*Residual earnings to labor with income imputed to investment under current land values and under stabilized land values, United States (48 States), 1950–62*

Year	Under current (inflated) land values [1]		Under stabilized land values [2]	
	Total (1)	Earning per hour (2)	Total (3)	Earning per hour (4)
	Millions		*Millions*	
1950	$13,596	$0.90	$13,360	$0.88
1955	9,823	.77	11,328	.88
1956	9,563	.80	11,306	.94
1957	9,340	.84	11,405	1.03
1958	10,848	1.03	12,756	1.21
1959	7,823	.76	10,742	1.04
1960	8,177	.83	11,257	1.15
1961	8,985	.95	11,956	1.26
1962	8,801	.97	12,049	1.33

[1] Total realized agricultural income (as defined in table 2) less interest imputation on total investment with land values at current levels.

[2] Same as above except that the real estate component is held at the ratio to income that prevailed in 1949–51, and hence avoids the effect of the inflationary spiral in land values.

TABLE 5.—*Appendix of data and sources*

Year	Farm mortgage interest rates [1] (percent)	Hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing [2] (dollars)	Estimated man-hours of labor used [3] (million hours)
1950	4.5	1.44	15,137
1955	4.7	1.86	12,808
1956	4.7	1.95	12,028
1957	4.7	2.05	11,059
1958	4.8	2.11	10,548
1959	4.9	2.19	10,301
1960	5.0	2.26	9,825
1961	5.1	2.32	9,473
1962	5.2	2.39	9,085

[1] Average for all lenders on loans outstanding; compiled by U.S. Department of Agriculture. (See Agricultural Statistics, 1963 and 1958.)

[2] Compiled by U.S. Department of Labor. (See Manpower Report of the President, 1964, p. 229.)

[3] Includes self-employed and hired labor used on crops, livestock, and farm maintenance. (Compiled by U.S. Department of Agriculture. See Agricultural Statistics, 1963, p. 493.)

It is often said that American agriculture is becoming evermore capital intensive—that the investment per worker is rising sharply. The unfortunate fact, however, is that most of the apparent capital intensity is really only inflation intensity. This writer interprets the facts analyzed above, together with the comments made by the administrators of farm credit to imply that the financial structure of agriculture is moving into a dubious situation.

The writer further states his belief that Government price support policies have been a major contributor to farmland inflation. With prices assured (at least on the supported commodities), farmers have anticipated income benefits that actually have not materialized. Moreover, and of no less importance, bankers and other mortgage lenders have derived a sense of security from the existence of price support programs, and possibly also from an expectation that levels of support will continue to be increased to cover rising costs. Consequently, they have made loans that otherwise would not have been made.[4] This augmentation of the supply of mortgage credit has in turn reinforced the demand for land and thereby been an influence to inflation.

The inflationary spiral in farm real estate has in effect miscarried what is broadly assumed to be the purpose of the price support programs because their effects have been realized in higher land values rather than in better returns on labor. At the present stage of affairs, price or income programs designed to give effect to a policy goal of comparable returns to labor and investment are not likely to overcome this miscarriage; rather, they apparently would add further to fueling the fires of inflation.

A further comment on the hypothesis of Deputy Director Bushnell (as contained in the quotation on p. 5) should be made. There is no doubt of the vigorous demand for land by farmers for the purpose of enlarging their units. And it is generally accepted that farm enlargement is necessary to efficiency, therefore meritorious. But it should not be accepted that land value inflation is an inevitable side effect, especially if the prospect is that the financial structure of agriculture may thereby be made more unsound. Rather than to be concerned with how Government might guarantee returns on land purchases which take place at unwarranted prices, an alternative concern of Government could quite properly center on how to avoid the inflationary side effects.

If there is warrant for a role of Government activity in commodity markets, the warrant should be no less for a Government role in real estate markets. Legislators may wish to consider the possibilities for such a role. In any event, legislators should be aware that price support programs which are supposedly designed to improve the welfare of those who work in agriculture are succeeding mainly in contributing a major influence toward provoking or at least encouraging economic anarchy in farm real estate markets.

[1] Prepared for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, January 1965.

[2] Professor of agricultural economics, University of California, Berkeley.

[3] In the words of Peek and Johnson: "World price fixes domestic price of every crop of which we export a surplus. Industrial tariffs can and do protect prices of articles for which the crop is exchanged. The fair exchange value of the crop is thus reduced in proportion to the protection afforded industry. The protective principle is operated for the benefit of industry to the detriment of agriculture which can no longer afford to bear the burden." George N. Peek and Hugh S. Johnson, "Equality for Agriculture," 2d ed., 1922, p. 3.

[4] "Farm borrowing has been increasing at a substantially more rapid rate than capital requirements in the industry since 1950." (Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, Monthly Review, September–October 1964, p. 7.)

Proposed Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., which is ably edited by Dean B. Livingston, has published in the March 25, 1965, issue an editorial which points up the concern of many people in the South that the President is giving more evidence that he is trying to put the people of the South through another era of Reconstruction. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Like Reconstruction Days," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIKE RECONSTRUCTION DAYS

The situation in Alabama seems to be retrogressing to a feeling similar to those experienced by both Negroes and whites during Reconstruction days. Then, the exultant Negroes, spurred on by the carpetbaggers from the North, assumed unto themselves a blatant, braggadocio attitude.

The Negroes in Alabama, led on and supported by the hundreds of Negro and white supporters who flocked down from the North, are cocky and arrogant, according to news reports. The Reverend Ralph D. Abernathy, chief aid to the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, was quoted by the New York Times as saying:

"When we get to Montgomery, we are going up to Governor Wallace's door and say, 'George, it's all over now. We've got the ballot.'"

And the similarity of the situation increases with federalized National Guardsmen and regular Army troops and military policemen aiding and abetting in the ridiculous march from Selma to Montgomery, just as Federal troops protected the Negroes and carpetbaggers who took over the State capitol in Columbia after the War Between the States.

The situation will continue as long as President Johnson and his administration continue to support the Negroes in nonviolent actions that can only end in violence. Instead of urging Martin Luther King and his followers to obey the law and resort to the courts, the President is backing King and cohorts in flaunting the laws of the State of Alabama and is using Federal forces to do so.

While deploring the world reaction to events in Alabama, the President is at the same time pouring more and more fuel on the propaganda blaze that emanates from Alabama through the publicity-seeking actions of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Congress for Racial Equality, and other racial organizations.

It may be that Martin Luther King has laid a trap for President Johnson. If so, L.B.J. has fallen into it—and not for the good of the United States.

Ballot Box, Not Boycott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, moderation and reasonable order must replace violence and emotion in the struggle for civil rights of all Americans.

The Chicago Sun-Times has been a strong advocate of effective civil rights legislation and its proper implementation. It, therefore, speaks in a honest and practical sense on this subject.

On Tuesday, March 30, the Chicago Sun-Times printed an editorial discussing the threatened boycott of Alabama. I believe this editorial to be an extremely logical and a sound discussion of the situation:

BALLOT BOX, NOT BOYCOTT

Riding on the momentum that has built up in the events of recent weeks, Alabama civil rights leaders now plan to bring pressure on the State legislature to impeach Governor Wallace and try to stage a national economic boycott of Alabama products.

The Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., proposed that civil rights groups bring economic pressure on the State until authorities allow at least 50 percent of qualified Negroes to vote and until Governor Wallace announces he and others are prepared to halt the "reign of terror" in Alabama.

There comes a time in any battle when a wise leader pauses to survey and consolidate his gains, before plunging ahead to new territory. He is not moved by anger at the enemy's atrocities to excesses of his own that might weaken his own cause.

We believe Dr. King is at that point now. His call for a national boycott of Alabama appears to overlook the tremendous changes that already have been wrought and are underway. A boycott would be a complicated matter. It would require stopping shipments of steel, textiles, and agricultural products. It would be an act in restraint of trade and interstate commerce.

The Alabama of Governor Wallace is outside of the union spiritually but it would be a formidable task to cut it off from the other 49 States commercially. There are many decent Alabamanians in the capital who are working for Dr. King's goals. Their work would be hampered by an attempt at economic boycott.

It is a weapon the use of which certainly at this time would be premature; it could do the civil rights movement more harm than good. The best weapons against the racists of the South are law and public sentiment.

The Nation's sympathy and indignation have been aroused by the struggle of Negroes in Selma, Ala., to be recognized as citizens and voters. Stubborn resistance to their attempts to register to vote has been compounded by violence and murder. Congress as a consequence is working on a measure that would put Federal registrars in places where local officials refused Negroes the right to vote, a measure that would have been considered impossible to pass a year ago but which now may win even the support of some southerners. Vice President HUMPHREY says the bill may be passed by May 1.

Governor Wallace's conduct has been shameful. It is in keeping with his flying the Confederate flag over his capitol but not the flag of the United States. It would be salutary if he could be impeached, the objective voiced by Rev. James Bevel, one of Dr. King's spokesmen. We hope it is true as Bevel said, that Alabama citizens, Negro and white, are fed up with Wallace.

But impeachment proceedings in the Alabama Legislature should not be forced by a boycott or threat of boycott, as Bevel suggests. Such force has no place in democratic procedures. There is a difference between boycotting a busline or a merchant and trying to stop intersate commerce. The best way to get rid of Wallace and his ilk is through the process that put him in office: through the vote.

That is why, if civil rights workers in Alabama put first things first, they will concentrate on getting the right to vote made universal. Not every section of Alabama is as benighted as Selma and Dallas County. In the capital, Montgomery, the voices of moderation already have been raised and many achievements in racial harmony are being made.

Committees composed of Negro and white citizens have been working together and have made civil rights progress in many areas including schools, restaurants, and hotels. In 4 years the number of registered Negro voters has doubled in Montgomery County; 40 percent of eligible Negroes are now registered.

In his story in this paper Sunday, Hoke Norris noted the professionalism and effort to cooperate shown by the Montgomery police toward marchers and the press. One Negro policeman has been hired, so far, a real breakthrough for the old South. There were no incidents or brutality in Montgomery during the march last week.

This is the sort of effort that must come, at the local level, if the racists of the South are to be conquered. Eventually those who have seen the light in Montgomery must prevail over the man who sits in the capitol in Montgomery. We believe this must come about by the ballot box rather than by boycott.

A Tribute to Oscar C. Dancy, Mr. County Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at the age of 85, Oscar C. Dancy, of Cameron County, Tex., is the oldest county judge in our Nation, and in his many years on the bench, he has been an exemplary public servant. Pursuing his profession with devotion, dedication, and dignity, Judge Dancy is well known for his abilities and his well-respected accomplishments.

In the March 1965 issue of Texas Parade, on pages 14–16, there was published an article which describes Judge Dancy's many admirable qualities. I request unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. COUNTY JUDGE

(By Jack Galloway)

A Washington reporter once referred to him in a report of a committee hearing as "the country judge from Texas." His constituents dubbed him "Oscar, C. for Concrete" through his dedication to build long-lasting, concrete highways. He has been called "political patriarch," "a living legend," and a host of epithets ranging from "benevolent dictator" to "father protector," depending upon how the caller stood on the particular issue at hand. His craggy countenance and dogged perseverance are known and respected in official offices throughout the State of Texas and in the Nation's Capital. At 85 years of age, Oscar C. Dancy, of Brownsville, Tex., is the oldest county judge in the United States, with the longest tenure of office—42 years as county judge of Cameron County, and known throughout the country as "Mr. County Judge."

Oscar Dancy once called on President Truman at the White House simply because, as Dancy put it, "I wanted to meet the only county judge who had spent more money than I had." Truman had spent some $20 million in bond money as county judge of Jackson County, Mo.; Dancy, at that time, had spent a scant $10 million.

But the indefatigable Oscar Dancy is working on a public project to equal that amount in one combined bite at Federal and county purse strings: A massive $10 million drainage proposal to reclaim the rich but now salt-threatened delta land of the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas.

He seems always to be stumping for one big issue or another, from highway paving proposals in the 1920's to flood control in the 1960's. He pushed for a water treaty with Mexico in the 1940's, and, most recently, lobbied effectively for the establishment of a National Seashore Area on Texas' long, coast-hugging Padre Island.

Oscar Dancy's vote-getting invincibility is a political fact of life in south Texas. He was defeated only once at the polls, in 1932. Dancy recalls with a chuckle, "I think they blamed me, along with Hoover, for the depression." A stanch Democrat and all politics, his sweetest and strongest victory came in 1962, when he defeated his first Republican opponent by a majority of more than 2 to 1.

The staggering prospect that faces any political opponent of Oscar C. Dancy is that nothing can be pinned on him, except his age. His 42-year record as county judge is marked by nothing but scrupulous honesty. Dancy is so unacquisitive that he does not even know how much salary he makes (it's $10,356 a year), and he refuses to accept $3,000 of it. Two separate acts of the Texas Legislature allocated annual salaries of $1,500 to county judges for establishment of juvenile courts; one act providing for counties bordering on Mexico, and a second for gulf coast counties.

Qualifying on both counts, Dancy says he does not believe that the legislature intended him to have "that extra money," so he sets the entire amount aside in a special fund, for accomplishing what he considers good for the county. The fund pays for lobbying trips to Washington and Austin, and for his favorite persuasive tactic of talky breakfasts and dinners; but he will not tap his "special fund" for campaigning.

A voracious reader and voluminous letter-writer, Oscar Dancy has acquired a special passion for education, admonishing all parents, as judge of probate and child adoption courts, to make sure their children receive at least a high school education—something that Dancy himself did not achieve. Somewhat wistfully the judge admits, "I had little better than a common school education, but we had McGuffy's Reader and the Blue Book Speller, and anyone who had those can't be classified as illiterate."

Dancy is a native of North Carolina. After serving a law office apprenticeship he was granted a law degree with only 4 months' study at a small Tennessee college. He was drafted as mayor of North Wilksbow, N.C. "I told them that I was going to raise taxes, and I did," resigning in 1909 to come to Texas. Dancy had planned to go into real

estate promotion, but changed his mind and passed Texas' first bar exam.

Judge Dancy now has a burning interest in Latin America, and he has taken three trips by plane and bus into Central America in the last 3 years, " * * * because I wanted to see communism firsthand. It's a wonder," Dancy says, "that the whole country down there isn't run over with them." He was especially distressed by a military takeover in Honduras in October of 1963, shortly after he had visited that Central American Republic. Dancy had been impressed with the country's progress. With a deep sigh he remarked, "It's a tragedy; they were doing so well."

Dancy himself is still doing well, and from the present outlook, he will continue to do so for a long time.

Asked whether he will seek reelection when his present 4-year term expires, Judge Dancy replied, "I'll cross that bridge on my 87th birthday: December 22, 1966."

"If I had to make the decision now," he added with a wink, "I'd join the Peace Corps. I would get $75 a month plus expenses, and I'd save some money."

Older Americans Act of 1965

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3708) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, the increasing number of elderly people in our communities reflects a profound change in the composition of our population. In 1900, life expectancy at birth was 49 years; today, it averages over 70 years.

But, as President John F. Kennedy said:

> It is not enough for this great Nation to have added new years to life—our objective must be to add new life to those years.

In establishing an administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this bill recognizes the need for a high-level agency that will command the respect and pay full attention to the needs of our elderly, so that the social and economic problems of nearly 20 million aged citizens can receive the attention they deserve.

For many years, the office handling aging affairs has moved from one HEW department to another—with wasteful results. It will also be more efficient and less expensive to have two or three fewer levels of bureaucracy through which to pursue the useful aims of this program.

Among these aims are an adequate income; the best possible physical and mental health; suitable housing; full restorative services, opportunity for employment without age discrimination, retirement in health, honor, and dignity; pursuit of meaningful activity; efficient community services when needed, immediate benefit from proven research knowledge; the free exercise of individual initiative.

It would seriously handicap these programs to seek to operate them from a base subsumed under the Welfare Administration which is where current aging affairs are located. Old people dread being on welfare. They do not want to be led or served by the Welfare Administration—Federal, State or local—unless, as a last resort they have to go on old-age assistance.

The number of our citizens over 65 continues to increase at the rate of nearly 1 million a year. In the first half of the 20th century there were 3 million over 65, representing 4 percent of the population; today, the nearly 20 million represent 10 percent of the population; in 15 years, 1 in every 4 citizens will be 65 or over.

The provisions of H.R. 3708 will permit this House to take proper steps to meet the challenge of the future. This bill gives the problems of our older Americans a high priority within the Federal Government. It will enable us as a nation to build a better standard of life for our aged as well as enable them to achieve a useful and more meaningful role in a society which owes them much and can still learn much from them.

"Way Seen Easier for Dictatorship"—Article by David Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished news columnist and editor of U.S. News & World Reports, David Lawrence, has pointed out, in a recent news article, how easy it is now for the U.S. Government to be turned into a dictatorship. The article is entitled "Way Seen Easier for Dictatorship," and it was published in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star on March 25, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article, which should be of concern to every Member of this Congress, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAY SEEN EASIER FOR DICTATORSHIP

(By David Lawrence)

Will the U.S. Constitution—now being arbitrarily transformed by Congress and the Supreme Court without regard to the customary amending process—be utilized someday by a future President to build a dictatorship within a centralized government in Washington?

All the provisions of the Constitution could be subordinated and rendered obsolete by a series of statutes passed by a majority of both Houses of Congress and signed by the President. Only three provisions of the Constitution, for instance, really need to be invoked allegedly to justify an assumption of power by the Federal Government which could diminish, if not altogether wipe out, virtually all the rights of the States. The three devices that are to a large extent in use already are as follows:

1. The phrase "to regulate commerce among the several States," as written in the Constitution, has been used by Congress to pass legislation controlling the business and economic affairs of the Nation, irrespective of State lines, as well as the social life of the people. This power is not only being asserted in housing, in education, and in employment practices, but is being enforced through the granting or withholding of Federal funds to particular localities.

2. The phrase "equal protection of the law" in the 14th amendment to the Constitution, already has been cited as authority for intervening in any State where a local statute happens to be disliked by any pressure group that, through demonstrations or threats of violence, is able to gain the support of a majority in Congress.

3. The 15th amendment to the Constitution, which declares that the right of citizens to vote "shall not be denied or abridged" by any State "on account of race or color," now is being construed as giving to Congress the power to control the whole election process by passing a few laws. This could mean the removal of all qualifications for voting except those that happen to suit the party in power.

These epochal changes are being put into effect in certain respects already, in disregard of the amending process prescribed in the Constitution. But the argument made is that the methods are in keeping with "the spirit of the times" and that "the end justifies the means" because the objective is a worthy one.

The present Supreme Court, composed of a majority with no previous judicial experience, has in recent years been approving this process of changing the Constitution. The big question is, When will public opinion insist on the use of the method prescribed in the Constitution itself for amending that document?

After the downfall of Hitler, this correspondent happened to be talking with a prominent professor of a German university who had lived in Germany throughout the whole period of the dictatorship. When asked why he and his fellow citizens allowed Hitler to come into office and extend his power by opportunistic interpretation of the constitution, the professor replied:

"We were indifferent, and didn't sense what was coming. We were too much concerned with our own affairs. We in the educational world were preoccupied with our own pursuits. We took it for granted that everything being done was for a worthy objective. We didn't realize what we were getting into until it was too late."

Today it would be relatively easy for an autocracy to emerge in the United States. The power of the Chief Executive permits him at his discretion to allocate large sums of the taxpayers' money to States that are cooperative and to refuse those sums to States that do not go along with the will of the Chief Executive.

Members of Congress are submissive because their own elections are controlled by pressure groups whose power is bound to be increased as all voting restrictions are about to be removed. President Johnson already has suggested that anybody over 18 years of age should be permitted to vote, irrespective of whether he or she can read and write.

Never in American history has so much power been concentrated in the Federal

Government, which is nowadays virtually directed by the one man who occupies the highest office in the land. He can insure his own reelection by bestowing favors on the political bosses of the large cities, especially now that electoral votes of most States can be controlled by a few persons with powerful organizations behind them. This has been made easier by the decisions of the Supreme Court compelling a reapportionment of the States, so that power will be lodged hereafter in the big cities and their bosses. It takes only a few such cities to control a majority of the electoral votes of the country.

Conference to Combat Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I and the distinguished members of the House Postal Operations Subcommittee have worked for over 2 years developing legislation that will protect the public from receiving obscene mail. Our subcommittee has reported a bill (H.R. 980) which I sponsored and which I consider one of the most effective pieces of legislation in this area in modern times.

During the development of this legislation one fact has stood out over all others—the American people are deeply alarmed over the traffic in smut and cesspool publications. This was evidenced again recently at the Washington, D.C., Conference To Combat Obscenity. Some 300 citizens representing every walk of life attended the conference and adopted the following resolutions. I commend these to the attention of every Member of the Congress:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE TO COMBAT OBSCENITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 22–23, 1965

We resolve: We of this Conference To Combat Obscenity highly resolve to continue our efforts, as citizens and members of the organizations we represent, to halt the tide of obscenity and indecency in publications and entertainment in our Nation, in order to protect our children and youth from the clear and present danger of immorality and delinquency, which inevitably result from pornography, and to overcome this tragic sickness in society, which, unless healed, will quickly lead to the moral and physical decay of our Nation.

TO ALL OFFICIALS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

We are alarmed to find that Washington, D.C., appears to be the smut capital of the Nation, in that there are numerous newsstands and retail outlets that display and sell the most obscene and indecent magazines and paperback books produced in America today. We are shocked at the flood of nudity, illicit love, homosexuality, lesbianism, and all other types of sexual perversion on open display. We reflect that our Nation's Capital is visited by many thousands of children and youths every season of the year, and that many of these, as well as those residing here, are exposed to the vicious, filthy literature on many of Washington's newsstands. We call upon the President and Members of Congress to investigate these conditions and apply appropriate remedies.

TO THE PRESIDENT

We respectfully suggest to the President that the forces of amorality in this country are so entrenched and so well organized that a sweeping investigation by the FBI might be in order.

We are reminded that the President of the United States has the great and honored responsibility to nominate, for life tenure, the Justices of the Supreme Court and other Federal courts. We respectfully request that in the filling of any vacancies in the future, and particularly in the Supreme Court, the President select jurists well known and respected by their fellow citizens as being favorable to upholding the standards of decency that have guarded and protected the public from the beginning of our Nation, and which standards are based upon the concept of the sacredness of every human being in the sight of God, and in the sanctity of marriage and the home.

NEWSSTAND PROPRIETORS AND SELLERS

We urge citizens in every community of our Nation to appeal to newsstand proprietors and sellers of publications to refuse to accept from their publishers or wholesalers, and to refuse to handle, display or sell, such magazines, books, and other materials that appeal to prurient interest, glorify illicit sex, debase womanhood, and present obscenity in an attractive manner, and in such ways as to corrupt children and youth. We remind the distributors and sellers of publications that they have an obligation and duty to the communities which they serve to maintain and elevate the moral standards of the community.

ENTERTAINMENT

We call upon all producers and exhibitors of all forms of public entertainment to recognize their responsibility not to present that which violates the laws against obscenity, or offends the standards of decency established for the protection of the public.

With respect to the motion picture industry, we call upon its executives, officials, and all others to reestablish the production code, adopted in 1930 and revised in 1956. We urge the Motion Picture Association to withhold its seal of approval from any film that violates the production code and the standards of decency in our communities, and demand that such films be eliminated in the future.

We remind producers of television programs that children and youth comprise their greatest audiences, and that decent families will not tolerate the further drift toward obscenity in plots, situations, and dialogs, in TV entertainment.

LEGISLATION

We call upon citizens of our Nation, and especially molders of public opinion, to support legislation that will strengthen the laws of municipalities, States, and the Nation, against obscenity; and to enlist other concerned citizens in the crusade to outlaw the peddling of smut and filth in all their forms, particularly to the Nation's youth.

We endorse the proposal to establish, either by action of Congress or by Presidential appointment, a commission to study pornographic materials of all kinds and to recommend to all agencies of the Government courses of action to combat this national evil.

We urge that citizens make organized protests to proper authorities because of the display and sale of materials objectionable for children and youth on property owned or controlled by governmental agencies.

THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

We commend the members of the Supreme Court, who announced the majority opinion in the Roth-Alberts case in 1957, which established a working principle for ridding our communities of obscenity.

We deplore several recent decisions of the Supreme Court, which have overruled the decisions of many State courts in obscenity cases, this in effect making the highest court in the land a board of censors as to what constitutes obscenity, a responsibility which, as Chief Justice Earl Warren has declared, should be left to juries in lower courts. We deplore the fact that such decisions have significantly encouraged the traffic in obscenity.

INTERFAITH SEMINARS

We urge that responsible religious leaders in each city or community promptly hold interfaith seminars, to examine the effects of the new amorality among youth, resulting from pornography, and how to grapple with the problem.

LAW ENFORCEMENT EDUCATION

We urge Mr. J. Edgar Hoover to use the facilities of the FBI to set up a training program for law enforcement officers of States, counties, and cities, in uniform procedures to be followed in obscenity cases.

FUTURE ACTION

We recommend for the consideration of all church groups of all faiths, and all civic organizations interested in public morality, the formulation of a plan whereby a more united voice can be heard by all publishing and entertainment media; that the plan include the establishment of permanent groups, particularly in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles areas, to cooperate with law enforcement officials to combat obscenity, and to cooperate with producers of films for moving pictures and TV programs to see that films are not made and shown that violate the production code.

We ask that a copy of these resolutions be carried to the President, personally, at his convenience by members of this Conference, and that copies be sent to each Member of Congress.

Rev. Morton A. Hill, S.J., (Chairman, Resolutions and Action Committee), Secretary, Operation Yorkville, New York, N.Y.; Dr. O. K. Armstrong, (Chairman of the Conference), Chairman, Citizens Council for Decency, Springfield, Mo.; Arthur W. H. Magnusson, Essex County Sheriff's Office, Courthouse, N.J.; Mrs. Van Newkirk, Operation Moral Upgrade, Los Angeles, Calif.; Edward Rekruciak, National Vice Chairman, CDL, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Charles Conn., Representative of Church of God, Cleveland, Tenn.; and Raymond Gauer, Chairman, Los Angeles County Commission Against Indecent Literature, Los Angeles, Calif., Resolutions and Action Committee.

"Selma Situation Oversimplified"—"Voting Bill Piles Wrong on Wrong"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed with two recent articles by the distinguished editor of the Richmond News-Leader, by James Jackson Kilpatrick. One article was published in the State, of Columbia, S.C., on March 18, 1965, and was entitled "Some Conflicts Pit Right Against Right—Selma Situation Oversimplified." The other article was published in the

Washington Evening Star of March 25, 1965, and is entitled "Voting Bill 'Piles Wrong on Wrong'."

I ask unanimous consent that both of these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., Mar. 18, 1965]

SOME CONFLICTS PIT RIGHT AGAINST RIGHT—SELMA SITUATION OVERSIMPLIFIED

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Some years ago, Richmond Lattimore summed up in a trenchant line the difference between melodrama and great tragedy; the one pits right against wrong, he said; the other pits right against right.

In an emotional hour, it is all too easy to treat the news from Alabama as bloody melodrama, in which the Negroes are completely in the right and the whites completely in the wrong, Dr. King the handsome hero and George Wallace the surly villain.

Such a simplistic view has been accepted from Toronto to Berkeley. From one end of the country to the other, newspapers, preachers, students, and politicians are booing and hissing. It is a visceral response, and for some of the elements of this story—especially the brutal clubbing of the Boston minister—this furious reaction doubtless is justified in terms of elementary right and wrong.

Yet a quiet suggestion may be in order that the news from Selma transcends the melodrama of a violent week or month; it contains elements of great tragedy, too. It needs to be said—and perhaps it needs especially to be said at a moment when the rafters are ringing and the floor is shaking and the crowd is going wild—that this conflict also pits right against right; and we ought not to be responding with clenched fists and hoarse cries, but with reason and compassion and a deeply troubled heart.

Of course the Negroes have rights on their side. In the immediate context, those Negroes who live in Lowndes County, and are qualified by age and residence, most certainly have a right to vote. The demonstrators and marchers, resident and nonresident, have rights of free speech and peaceable assembly. They have a right not to be bullied or beaten. These rights are solid, massive, unarguable; and at whatever cost in Federal intervention, by troops or otherwise, these rights will have to be made secure.

Yet, still in the immediate context, there are conflicting rights that merit consideration too, and these have been obscured. The sincerity of this whole affair, viewed as an effort to register Lowndes County Negroes, stands gravely in doubt.

In January, when it was possible for Negroes to come and register, as ordinary citizens following ordinary procedures, they did not come.

Then, on signal, they came in unmanageable droves—hundreds at a time, to create conditions of deliberately contrived disorder. The prospective registrants included children, nonresidents, out-of-State sympathizers. At one point, the Negro leadership asked for a number system, by which each applicant would be given a number as if he were waiting for service at a bakery; but when this system was agreed to, the Negro leadership repudiated it out of hand.

The right of free speech, as the Supreme Court many times has made clear, is not an absolute right. Neither is the right of assembly. When circumstances suggest that "free speech" carries a clear and present danger of provoking riot or panic, public interest overrides a personal right. It is irrelevant, in this regard, that white southerners ought not to be provoked into violence by the taunts of Negro leaders. It is a fact that men may be inflamed, as it is a fact that wood burns; one cannot, in the name of free speech, cry "fire" in a crowded theater.

As an abstract proposition, to pursue the immediate context, any man has a right to walk from Selma to Montgomery. But this is not a right that can be multiplied by a thousand straggling marchers, by night and day, effectively usurping the use of a public highway and denying its safe and peaceful use to others.

Finally, to make one more immediate point, law-abiding men have a right to expect that the orders of a Federal district court will be obeyed, and that no man may arrogantly put himself above them. Procedures exist, as recalcitrant Southern Governors have learned, by which such orders may be promptly appealed and set aside. But Dr. King "can't wait." Where in the name of ordered liberty does he find a right to put himself above the law?

It is not the immediate context that matters. This is a tragedy of generations, or of eons, and not of turbulent hours. The rights of the Negro people (not merely their legal rights, but their rights as human beings) cry out for vindication; and God knows the white South carries a terrible burden of guilt for its sins. Yet today's white southerner also has rights both legal and human—rights to public order, to legal process, to domestic tranquility; and he has certain elementary rights of political self-preservation that he cannot be blamed for invoking against the obliteration of property values he largely has created.

These are terribly hard times for the Negro, but they are harder than they need to be. Last week's uproar registered no voters, proved nothing, gained no lasting peace; the various "marches" served only to put new pressure on the Congress for the enactment of more laws of doubtful wisdom. In this effort, Dr. King understandably feels that all the rights are on his side; but there are those of us, fully supporting his people's right to vote, who say: not all the rights; not all of them.

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 25, 1965]

VOTING BILL "PILES WRONG ON WRONG"

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

With so many interesting and pleasant things to write about—spring, Julie Andrews, Whitey Ford's arm—it is a pity, truly it is, to have to beg once again for a calm and thoughtful look at President Johnson's "Voting Rights Act of 1965." Yet this is a bad bill—bad in ways that need to be understood if something precious is to be preserved—and the lighter topics can wait, if Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., can't.

This precious something is a system of government obedient to a written Constitution. If the Congress sacrifices this high principle to the pressures of a turbulent hour, the Congress may succeed in redressing some palpable wrongs, but a fearful price will be paid in the loss of ancient values.

Under our Federal system, the power to fix qualifications for voting clearly is lodged with the States. Article VIII, section 2, of the Constitution, spells it out:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each States shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." In the whole of the Constitution, no more explicit provision can be found.

Time after time, the Supreme Court itself has emphasized this reservation of power to the States. Just 6 years ago this spring, in the Lassiter case from North Carolina, the High Court expressly reaffirmed an unbroken series of opinions to this effect.

"The States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the rights of suffrage may be exercised, absent, of course, the discrimination which the Constitution condemns. * * * The right of suffrage is subject to the imposition of State standards which are not discriminatory. * * * We do not suggest that any standards which a State desires to adopt may be required of voters. But there is wide scope of exercise of its jurisdiction. Residence requirements, age, previous criminal record, are obvious examples indicating factors which a State may take into consideration in determining the qualifications of voters. * * *"

In the particular context of Johnson's bill, we should note carefully what this unanimous Court went on to say. "The ability to read and write likewise has the relation to standards designed to promote intelligent use of the ballot. Literacy and illiteracy are neutral on race, creed, color, and sex, as reports around the world show. * * * In our society, where newspapers, periodicals, books, and other printed matter canvass and debate campaign issues, a State might conclude that only those who are literate should exercise the franchise."

In the final paragraph of this 1959 opinion, the Supreme Court condemned those trumped-up literacy tests that have been employed in some cases as a device to make racial discrimination easy. But no such charge could be fairly brought against North Carolina's requirement that a prospective voter "be able to read and write any section of the Constitution of North Carolina in the English language."

"That seems to us," said the Court, "to be one fair way of determining whether a person is literate, not a calculated scheme to lay a trap for the citizen."

This whole body of long-established law would be violated by the President's bill. This is a bill to establish, by Federal law, new qualifications for voting in certain States. The system contemplated under this bill would not be limited to registering those Negroes who might have been denied the franchise by reason of their race. The provisions would apply to any person. Neither would the bill apply to Federal elections only; it would apply, on its own terms, to "any Federal, State, or local election." Section 3(A) of the bill spells this out. In the half a dozen affected States, "No person shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his failure to comply with any test or device." In section 3(B), "test or device" is defined to mean any requirement that a prospective voter "(1) demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, (2) demonstrate any educational achievement or his knoweldge of any particular subject, (3) possess good moral character."

In brief, the bill undertakes to prohibit in these States the imposition of those very qualifications, when used without discrimination, that the Supreme Court repeatedly has approved.

It is said that no fewer than 80 Senators, including some good and able men, are ready to howl their approval of this destructive scheme. To say that "Alabama has brought this on herself" is both wrong and irrelevant. This bill is the work of Johnson and the Congress. On them lies the burden of piling wrong upon wrong. And they do it, incredibly, in the name of "rights."

The Best Education Is Where You Find It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the April issue of the Atlantic carries an

article in a section called "Our Best High Schools" dealing with the high school in Green River, Wyo.

Green River is a city with a population of approximately 5,000 and its high school has achieved a national reputation for its teaching in science. The reasons for this proficiency are very clearly explained in the article by John V. Bernard, the superintendent of schools at Green River since 1948, and a recipient of a doctorate in education from the University of Wyoming at Laramie, Wyo.

I commend this article to my colleagues and am pleased to call it to their attention and to the attention of all in America who are interested in unusual accomplishments of educational institutions.

The article follows:

OUR BEST HIGH SCHOOLS—SCIENCE IN THE SMALL SCHOOL; GREEN RIVER, WYO.

(By John V. Bernard)

The most improbable place one might expect to find an outstanding high school would be in the Green River area of Wyoming—a relatively isolated, sparsely populated country, 180 miles from Salt Lake City, the nearest metropolitan area, and a region more noted for the abundance of rainbow trout, antelope, deer, and elk than for people. Here a high school exists which has been rated as one of the top 10 in the Nation in the teaching of physics. It has consistently won superior ratings in science and industrial arts fairs, in National Forensic League performances, in music festivals and art exhibits, and in athletic events.

What has produced this fine high school? Nearly a decade ago, the school administration decided that special emphasis should be given to the teaching of science and mathematics in order to meet the rapidly increasing demands of modern technology in a nuclear and space-conscious world. Science classes soon took on a new importance and dimension. The science club was revitalized. To spend time outside school working on new, challenging science projects became the accepted practice for students. In January 1958 a Green River High School student fired a rocket to such heights (approximately 4,000 feet) that he received nationwide publicity. Students vied with each other in making plants and rats radioactive. The Southwest Wyoming District Science Fair was organized, and later it become an annual event, with Green River High School the host school and one of its science teachers the permanent director.

In April 1960 a student project, the Downfall of Parity, took first prize at the Wyoming State Science Fair and was a finalist at the National Science Fair in Indianapolis. An outstanding entry in the Colorado-Wyoming Bi-State Science Fair at Boulder in April 1962 was a project on nuclear magnetic resonance—the work of a Green River freshman. In 1963 two Green River entries, aerodynamic design of road vehicles and a study of matrix algebra, won in State competition and were exhibited at the bistate fair at Boulder.

The population of the school district is approximately 5,000, and its great distance from other centers of population creates a high community interest in local enterprises, especially the school and its activities. This healthy interest is dramatically shown by the fact that the voters have never defeated a school bond issue, the most recent having been passed by a vote of about 5 to 1.

High community interest and spirit are responsible for the excellent caliber of school board trustees. Being a member of the school board in Green River is looked upon as a great honor and a serious responsibility, and competition for school board posts is often very keen. The axiom that good schools are synonymous with good school board members is reflected in the progressive school policies of Green River.

Although Wyoming is primarily an agrarian State, this district is to a great extent industrial. It is an important division point of the Union Pacific Railroad, and now is recognized as the largest trona mining area in the world. Development of these trona mines and refineries has occurred within the last 15 years. Three chemical mine-refinery complexes are now in operation. An effective public relations program aimed at local industries and their employees has resulted in energetic support for the school program.

The chemical plants actively encourage young people to study science. A scholarship is awarded each year to the outstanding senior at Green River High School by one of the trona companies. These companies furnish judges for the Southwest District Science Fair, and together with several business people and business houses, give generously to help finance an excellent science fair in the local area. Their personnel are made available as judges at fairs or as lecturers at the high school. The companies donate their time freely in showing the students their processes and new developments. By witnessing production and talking with scientists in action, students can obtain valuable basic data. Thus, a fertile climate for scientific interest is established through the help of practical scientists in industry.

Conventional techniques are still used in teaching all phases of science at Green River, where a strong emphasis of fundamental concepts has always been stressed. Every attempt is made to avoid prosaic patterns, principally by involving the students in purposeful experimentation and by challenging them with advanced work to the limit of their ability.

In the fall of 1962, the National Association of Biology Teachers selected as the outstanding biology teacher of Wyoming a teacher from this high school. This teacher has written a manual entitled "Laboratory Guide to Experimental Rat Surgery."

To make biology an exciting subject, an atypical approach is used. In the initial course, required of all students, instead of emphasis on a great mass of detail and theory, the accent is placed on guided elementary experimentation to provide the student with a basic understanding of living processes. Student projects have ranged from training a rat to walk on a tightwire, to inducing beriberi in rats through strict dietary control, and to rat surgery. Typical of the experiments is one in which sophomore students successfully removed the pancreas from a pregnant rat. Until the birth of the baby rats, the mother failed to show any signs of diabetes, but shortly afterward, diabetes became apparent, demonstrating that even in the embryonic stage, the supply of insulin from the young rats was sufficient to maintain good health in the mother. In addition to the usual biological apparatus, the students have had a miniature zoo, consisting of an alligator, monkeys, snakes, rats, aquariums, and desert terrariums to entice their interest.

Since last September, the biology department at Green River High School has been taking part, along with 70 other high schools in the Nation, in an experimental program developed by the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study Group, Educational Committee of the American Institute of Biological Sciences, supported by the National Science Foundation. The courses differ from traditional courses in that they place greater emphasis on molecular and cellular biology; they stress investigation and principles—the universal rather than the applied aspects of biology. The teacher does not supply the student with the answers. He discovers them for himself through thought-provoking questions.

When a vice president of a major corporation indicates that more than 40 percent of the products it now sells were not even in existence 10 years ago, it is apparent that 4 years of high school is too short a time to acquire the basic knowledge needed in the world today. This fact has been recognized, and a continuous curriculum study committee made up of teachers from grades 1 through 12 has been established. The programs in science, math, English, music, and other subjects are a continuation and development of courses presented in the elementary and junior high schools.

The elementary teachers have found that the new math has helped prepare children for higher math, since it uses techniques and terminology that do not have to be unlearned but rather are carried on to the higher grade levels. The basic skills are stressed thoroughly as in the past, since they are an essential part of any math program.

As curriculum changes have been made from year to year, the faculty has carried on a program of parent orientation, making for the ready acceptance of changes. For example, night classes were organized in the new math to keep parents abreast of the program and to eliminate the always present resistance to change.

The program of accelerated modern math is continued in the junior high (seventh and eighth grades). Algebra I, usually given in the ninth grade, is offered to eighth-grade students who show exceptional aptitude in math. Selection is based on the students' grades and teacher recommendations, as well as a prognostic examination, the Iowa Aptitude Test, given at the end of the seventh grade. The student who takes algebra in the eighth grade has the opportunity to complete 5 years of high school mathematics before graduation.

In the science field, as in mathematics, there exist both horizontal and vertical correlation of subject matter and techniques. The elementary school science program is aimed at the understanding and interpretation of the world and an appreciation of the total environment. Students are introduced to the scientific method and to the steps in problem solving. At this age more than at any other, the wonder, excitement, and thrill a younngster has from a discovery of his own, and the values he attaches to his findings, leave lasting impressions and awaken desires to probe further into the ever-advancing perimeters of science. In their zest for knowledge, the youngsters have absorbed so much that their parents, many of whom are college graduates, are amazed. Things are now included in the elementary science program which were not in their course of study until high school.

The same philosophy is the basis of the junior high science program, which stresses the stimulation of as many sensory receptors as possible. Taste, for example, was used in a chemistry experiment that surprised some pupils. Applying the elementary knowledge of mixing hydrochloric acid and sodium hydroxide until neutral, pupils produced common table salt. At this age they were skeptical of the result until they tasted the final product. On making salt the students became aware of the presence of atoms, molecular weights, and elementary chemical equations.

Chemistry is the senior high school is based on imaginative thinking about the question of the how and why of facts. The course is presented as a historical compilation of facts and events rather than as a known and inflexible body of knowledge. It was planned to incorporate some of the best points of the Chemical Education Materials Study (CHEM), a group appointed by the American Chemical Society, and the Chemical Bond Approach (CBA), a small group of

chemists financed by the National Science Foundation, but to keep the course within the capabilities of the high school student. In the laboratory, students are given fewer instructions in more advanced experiments, and in some cases, none. One of the students is currently trying to extract alkaloids from sagebrush (abundant in the area); another is trying to determine the effects of various factors on the rate of crystal growth. The better students are encouraged to do research on their own in projects which coincide with their own interests.

The most up-to-date presentation of physics, the Physical Science Study Committee physics course, is used in the high school. The text is Physics, written by the committe, which is financed by the National Science, Sloan, and Ford Foundations. Students soon realize that physics is not static but continually evolves from basic research and inquiries. These concepts are developed by thorough exploration in the laboratory and analysis of the text. For example, the development of a model is used to explain the behavior of light. From this laboratory experiments and study of the text, the student first assumes that light is similar to particles. Information is then presented in a series of experiments which show that the particle model is not satisfactory in every respect, and that a wave model can better explain most of the phenomena associated with light. This type of physics study simultaneously heightens a student's interest in higher mathematics because it demonstrates that physics is the application of mathematics to matter in action.

The Green River High School Science Club is affiliated with State and National organizations and has a branch organization within itself, the Junior Engineering Technical Society. Currently utilizing methods learned in the physics courses, the club is building a gas laser. The laser is perhaps one of the most important inventions of recent years and is certainly one of the most active areas of scientific research. The students' working model has been financed by the science club.

The annual science fair has continued to create an ever higher degree of interest, and has had to move from the school gymnasium to a larger exhibit hall. Projects can be in any field of science, engineering, or mathematics and can be the work of either a single individual or a group; however, only exhibits submitted by individuals are eligible for scholarship awards. The University of Wyoming has been very cooperative in such ways as supplying information and furnishing judges for the science fairs.

In addition to equipping students for everyday living, the mathematics curriculum of the high school strives to prepare the potential scientist for college work. Recognition of new subject matter, such as logic, probability and statistics, topology, and modern abstract algebra, has created new needs in math curriculum. The recommendations of the School Mathematics Study Group, an NEA affiliate, and the Commission on Mathematics, appointed by the College Entrance Examination Board, have been followed in planning this course of study.

It must not be construed from what has been said that an inordinate emphasis has been placed on the science program to the detriment of the rest of the curriculum. This facet of the curriculum has been stressed, since it reflects the public interest in science during the past few years. The rest of the program is considered to be equally important. A similar balance of training in the fundamentals teamed with allied activities has produced much that is worth while.

In the field of English and speech, Green River High School was given the National Forensic League award for outstanding work in 1958—one of the smallest schools in the United States to receive it. The speech program has ranged from the solid core of debate to the production of such plays as "The Robe," "Bye-Bye Birdie," and "Finian's Rainbow." The latter two combined the resources of both the English and music departments.

Students at Green River High School have excelled in other activities. Since 1958, the high school annual has been rated first in its class in 5 out of 7 years, and one year, best in the State in all classes. Directly correlated with social studies, English, and speech was the innovation of an annual student-legislature assembly, in which students from the entire southwest area of Wyoming participate. The school was one of two in the State which was asked to participate in Project Talent, a test sponsored by the U.S. Commission on Education to explore the utilization of human talents.

The industrial arts program is geared to the demands of local industry and to the needs of the students not planning to attend college. As an example of the interest in this field, the department originated the State Industrial Arts Fair, another annual event, now held at various schools throughout the State. In the 1964 model-car competition sponsored by the Fisher Body Craftsman's Guild, one student designed and built a model of such excellence that he won the senior division first-place award for the State of Wyoming.

Green River recognizes that the classroom teacher is the keystone in the educational organization. The selection of outstanding teachers is a continuing and intensive procedure. Salary scales, physical plant, supplies, and climate are some of the factors that attract teachers to a community, but Green River believes that the reputation established by a school is equally important in getting good teachers. The high regard in which the school is held throughout the State and among student teachers and university placement centers has been of tremendous assistance in the job of recruiting. Prospective teachers are aware of the educational climate. In commenting on why he chose Green River, a teacher new to the system said that he had heard of the rapport between administrators and teachers and of the board-minded community not fearful of intellectual freedom.

Green River has a strong nucleus of capable teachers who have remained in the system. It is also part of the procurement policy to secure young, dynamic teachers who are working on their higher degrees, even though they will stay with us only a few years. While we have them, the students reap the benefit of their most energetic and productive years. This combination of old and new has avoided the development of a parochialism in ideas and methods.

The administration must assume the responsibility to see that good teachers are stimulated so they continue to be good teachers. The closeness of personal contact between administrators and teachers facilitates the recognition of each teacher as an individual and underscores the importance of his day-to-day work. It promotes the development of pride in being part of a good school. For teachers to do their best work, they must have good classroom equipment. In addition, the administration of the salary scale is tempered by an awareness that quality teaching cannot be measured solely by the amount of training and years of experience.

In essence, what has been achieved here is the outgrowth of an educational philosophy developed by the citizens and school personnel. Even though children are taught in groups, learning is an individual process. With the ever-increasing acceleration in learning, it still must be crystal clear that children are not small adults; they have a psychology of their own. Enthusiasm for knowledge and learning must be transferred from teacher to student, who in turn develops his interest through work and with effort. A hundred years ago, Horace Mann said, "A teacher who is attempting to teach without inspiring the pupil with a desire to learn is hammering on cold iron." This is still true. A teacher must also have freedom from harassment and freedom to teach differently.

It is our belief that education in a democracy gives everyone the equal right to become unequal as rapidly as his natural ability and determination will allow. Within the framework of excellent teaching and administrative guidance, the students at Green River are consciously provided the means to develop in this manner.

Proposed Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of Senators a very impressive editorial from the March 25, 1965, issue of the Savannah Evening Press, of Savanna, Ga. The editorial is entitled "Shifting Minds and Promises Kept." I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Savannah Evening Press, Mar. 25, 1965]

SHIFTING MINDS AND PROMISES KEPT

When he spoke to the Congress and the Nation on March 15, President Johnson said of his voting rights legislation: "While I have proposed to you other measures to serve the strengthening of our free society and the happiness of our free people, I regard action on the measures proposed in this message to be first in priority. * * *"

Since that time the legislative wheels on Capitol Hill have emitted the definite sounds of gears being meshed together against their natural motion. Arm twisting is definitely the order of the day, so much so that the Members of Congress have been told by the leadership that they will get no recess for Easter unless the voting rights bill clears the decks.

This type of attitude flies into the face of the best tradition of the Congress, particularly the Senate which is regarded as the slow, deliberative body. Additionally, no worthwhile legislation has ever materialized as the result of the ramrod process.

This is not the first time that a proposal for Federal election registrars has found its way to the floor of Congress. In 1891, the House passed a bill offered by Representative Henry Cabot Lodge, the Massachusetts Republican, which called for the appointment of Federal officials of both parties on election boards in any congressional district upon the petition of 500 voters.

The Senate debated the bill for 46 days, at the end of which the majority attempted to put through a cloture resolution requiring only a majority vote. Four days of continuous session without adjournment followed but it failed to break the filibuster. The proposal of a force bill was then abandoned, never to be taken up again in the Senate.

The ironies of politics are indeed strange. Two years later when he was a Member of the Senate, Lodge made historic use of the filibuster himself. Thus, we see that shifting minds in politics are not unusual, although the issues at times make it difficult to square one's conscience.

President Johnson is getting praise from some civil rights organizations for his proposal of Federal intervention within the States to assure voting rights for Negroes.

Yet it is not so long ago that Mr. Johnson had a totally different view of the propriety and constitutionality of any attempt by the Federal Government to intrude in State and local elections and to take from the States their rights under the Constitution to qualify voters.

On May 22, 1948, in Austin, Tex., Johnson said: "This civil rights program, about which you have heard so much, is a farce and a sham—an effort to set up a police state in the guise of liberty. I am opposed to that program. I fought it in Congress. It is the province of the State to run its own elections."

We are told that consistency is the bane of small minds. A man who was a 100 percent segregationist up to 1957, and 66 percent segregationist between 1957 and 1960, as judged by his rollcall votes in the Senate, has accomplished a complete somersault. As one Washington news report put it during last year's presidential campaign, "Johnson saw his presidential chances in 1964 severely limited by his southern identification." So he sloughed off that old skin for a new image.

But there is more involved than just the changed image of the man who currently occupies the White House.

We hold to the belief that numerous sections of the Johnson proposed legislation are clearly unconstitutional and that the Congress would do well to think long and hard about enacting such a measure.

Let us assume, however, for the purposes of discussion that the provisions are constitutional. This concession and enactment of legislation will not mean that peace and tranquility will prevail in the Nation—from a racial viewpoint.

James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, has already served notice in Washington—at judiciary square—that quick passage of the President's voter registration bill will not end civil rights demonstrations. "To relax pressure now would be to relax progress," his audience was told.

Herbert Woods, Washington director of CORE, spelled out seven immediate demands upon the Federal Government:

"That the Federal Bureau of Investigation stop taking notes and start arresting people; the FBI enforce present civil rights laws; that brutality, intimidation and murder in connection with civil rights demonstrations be made a Federal offense; that the FBI investigate on a day-to-day basis instead of only when sensational events happen; that Congress pass quick voter legislation; that Congresmen be unseated where large percentages of voter discrimination occurs; and that new elections be held within 9 months after discriminated voters have been registered."

The threat made by Farmer is no idle one; we need only recall events in various parts of the Nation prior to the election last year.

There were lots of loud pronouncements that passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 would bring an end to the various racial demonstrations. Events certainly proved the predictions wrong; but not the promises of some civil rights organizations.

It is an open secret that leaders of these organizations agreed to a truce during the critical period of the presidential campaign so as not to embarass their candidate, the man from Texas. Had the demonstrations been waged with preconvention fury, a larger segment of the public presumably would have voted for Barry Goldwater and these groups feared the Arizona senator.

The passage of time has proven this point: when the civil rights leaders promise to demonstrate, that they will.

With the vow already in the record, it brings us to this question: Why the rush to pass the voter registration bill? It apparently will solve nothing and deter not one single demonstration.

If President Johnson has any sincere wish in his dreams of a Great Society, he had best put on his thinking cap and devise some method of bringing these demonstrations to a grinding, screeching halt. Lacking this action, there soon will be no society left to be great or otherwise.

The leaders of some of the so-called civil rights groups have openly declared war on all the legal concepts of this Nation and the several States. It cannot continue and especially with the open or implied sanction of the Nation's Chief Executive.

The President must recognize the nature of his enemy for what and who he is. Tomorrow may be too late.

Al Yemen—Cold War Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the March 22 issue of Washington Report carries a very interesting article written by DeWitt Copp, managing editor, which I recommend to the Members of Congress. The text of the article follows:

AL YEMEN—COLD WAR CROSSROADS

Al Yemen means "the right hand" in Arabic. The country of Yemen takes its name from its location in respect to the Holy City of Mecca, and not from its geographic position. If it did, it might be called the Heel of the Arabian Peninsula. It is a heel washed by the Red Sea along 250 miles of coastline, extending from the strategic strait of Bab el-Mandeb, Saudi Arabia's southwestern tip.

With a population of something less than 5 million living within an area of 75,000 square miles, this tiny land of antiquity has been, since September 1962, the scene of conflict. It is a conflict which presently involves over 50,000 Egyptian troops committed to outright aggression through the political ambitions of President Gamal Abdel Nasser. But underlying this fact, there runs a line of direction from Moscow to Cairo which antedates the attack on Yemen and which reveals an overall plan of action more subtle and devious than is generally known.

SOVIETS AID YEMEN

At the time of the Suez crisis in October 1956, Yemen's monarch, Imam Ahmed, armed with Soviet weapons, began sporadic warfare along his country's ill-defined southern border against the forces of the British protectorate of Aden.

The British resisted, however, and by March 1957, had temporarily put an end to the Imam's plan. The British then reported to the United Nations that Yemen had gotten her arms from Nasser and the Soviet bloc.

By August 1957, Imam Ahmed was ready to try again. He had received six shiploads of arms from the Soviets, including T-34 tanks. The British responded in kind and once more put an end to his efforts. But Soviet technical and military aid continued to flow in.

In early 1958, while Nasser and Ahmed were dickering over the jointly formed United Arab States, Yemen's Crown Prince Saif al-Islam al-Badr was making a grand tour of the Communist countries. He returned home with trade agreements from 10 of the same, including Red China.

By the middle of that year, Soviet technicians were at work at Yemen's major Red Sea port of Hodeida with plans first to transform it into a modern base and then to staff it with their own people.

In 1961 Ahmed withdrew from Nasser's union, totally disenchanted with Egypt's leader. A year later, in September, he died and was succeeded by his well-traveled son, Mohammed al-Badr. Al-Badr's rule lasted exactly 1 week. At dawn, on September 26, 1962, his newly appointed chief of staff, Col. Abdullah al-Salal, supported by pro-Nasser elements in the army utilizing Russion-built tanks and weapons, attacked the royal palace at San'a and the walls came tumbling down. The wily al-Badr, however, had escaped into the mountains. Upon seizing power, al-Salal declared himself Prime Minister, and it took just 4 days for the Soviets to grant official recognition.

AL-BADR BEATS NASSER

On October 7, 1962, came the first report of al-Badr's escape. Nasser announced that his 3,000 troops already in Yemen, would finish the job al-Salal had bungled. Shortly thereafter, as world attention became riveted on the Cuban missile crisis, al-Badr counterattacked and full-scale war developed. Nasser rushed in Soviet guns, tanks, jets, and 20,000 of his men. The King's barefoot fighters, Zaidi Moslems, of the fiercely faithful Shi'a sect, drove back and demoralized Nasser's elite warriors. With supplies from Saudi Arabia and Jordan, al-Badr's guerrillas actually began to move forward.

In December 1962 the U.S. Government agreed to recognize al-Salal's rule on the promise that Nasser would withdraw his troops. Instead of living up to his end of the bargain, Nasser reinforced his troops and, through the winter months and into the early spring, the fighting continued.

Following a factfinding mission by U.N. Under Secretary Ralph Bunch, U.S. diplomat Ellsworth Bunker came up with a plan to bring peace to Yemen. Under it, Nasser again agreed to withdraw his forces if Saudi Arabia promised to halt its aid to the Royalists. To make sure the promise was kept, U.N. observers would patrol a strip 12 miles wide along Yemen's border with Saudi Arabia. Once again Nasser was taken at his word, the worth of which he proved by replacing the troops he withdrew from Yemen with fresh ones.

RENEW FIGHTING IN YEMEN

In May 1963, al-Badr announced the Egyptians had not lived up to their pledge and began a new offensive. The fighting became heavy and sustained. Its echoes began to reverberate through the United Nations, and the Security Council finally got down to a serious discussion of the situation. On June 11, 1963, it passed a resolution 10 to 0, with the Soviets abstaining, to send a 200-man observation team to Yemen for 2 months on condition the cost would be paid by Saudi Arabia and Nasser's United Arab Republic. The team was to have three purposes: (1) To supervise the withdrawal of 28,000 Egyptian troops; (2) to end Saudi Arabian aid; (3) to demilitarize the already mentioned strip along the Yemeni-Saudi border.

Heading the truce team was Sweden's Maj. Gen. Carl (Bull) von Horn. A veteran of the Gaza strip and the Congo, he had gone to Yemen in April and had predicted the war

could go for 10 years. Not so his commander in chief, U Thant, who saw the finish "within 2 to 4 months." Between July and the end of October 1963, the U.N. team generally accomplished two-thirds of its assigned mission. However, the most important condition for success, the removal of Egyptian troops, it was unable to bring about.

General von Horn quit in disgust (reportedly over a lack of equipment and supplies) and by October 30, U Thant's earlier optimism was gone as he announced the observation team was to be withdrawn. The reason he gave was Saudi Arabia's refusal to pay any more of her share of the cost. He admitted she had lived up to her part of the bargain and the Egyptians had not. At the last moment, the Saudi Arabians agreed to continue to help finance the U.N. observation team.

ARABS HOLD CONFERENCE

In the latter part of January 1964, Nasser held a summit conference of Arab leaders. Thirteen nations were represented. When the meeting concluded, it was announced that progress on the Yemen issue had been made, but hardly a week had passed when, on February 4, Saudi Arabia announced it had not come to any agreement and had not even met with any of the Yemen Republic's leaders.

And there the matter stood for some months—President al-Salal in his shaky capital at Sana, his determined opponent, Mohammed al-Badr, tenaciously perched in the mountains and, back at the pyramids, Nasser, trying to figure a way out of a very expensive mess which by that time had cost him over $150 million in hard cash and a lot of Soviet-furnished military equipment, not to mention thousands of his troops killed and wounded. As for the United Nations, its mission remained in Yemen until September 1964, observing.

In October 1964, a second all-Arab summit meeting took place in Cairo and in November it was announced a "cease fire" had been arranged with a proposed all-Yemeni conference to take place in December. This meeting failed to materialize.

On March 7, 1965, an Associated Press report from Yemen told of Egyptian forces launching an assault in northern Yemen. The attack appeared to be the opening of a spring offensive.

Nasser's original miscalculation in believing he could make an easy conquest of Yemen has cost him mightily, and his prestige is on the block. But the Soviet investment in Yemen is so considerable and of such long standing that it will not be lightly forfeited. While the fighting has been raging in the mountains, the Soviets have completed work on the Port of Hodeida. This port, which Soviet technicians now operate, will accommodate Soviet trawlers whose real purpose is well known.

Just north of San'a, an 11,500-foot airstrip has also been completed under Soviet supervision. It is the longest airstrip in the entire Middle East, and a glance at the map will show its geographic-military importance with regard to the Mediterranean, Africa, and points east. While the Soviets have concentrated on shipping and aircraft facilities, their Chinese comrades have built a modern highway to connect Hodeida and San'a. In fact, investigation shows that for nearly a decade Yemen has been a point of intense Communist interest and activity for reasons that have nothing to do with bettering the social and economic welfare of the Yemeni. Al-Badr, like his father before him, wooed the Communists and then was betrayed by them because they put their rubles on Nasser. This is a reality he has learned the hard way.

Nasser has been able to finance his venture in Yemen partially because he has received approximately a billion dollars in various forms of U.S. foreign aid since 1953. The hot sands of Middle Eastern politics are shifting and the United States must decide if it is to influence these shifts or simply be a spectator in the high-priced seats. A positive change could be started with the reevaluation by the Congress and Administration of foreign aid for Nasser's Egypt.

Discriminatory Features of Proposed Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the National Observer of March 29, 1965, includes an editorial which warns against the discriminatory features contained in the President's proposed voting rights legislation. The editorial is entitled "A Punitive Bill." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PUNITIVE BILL

Emotions—even in a highly educated, 20th century, automated democracy—can run so high that men fear to speak their minds.

So it has been for almost a month, as the voting rights heat has built ever higher. Most of those voices who assert that men should be denied a vote because of the color of their skins were stilled long ago. The only question for most citizens has been how to bring about Negro suffrage in those places where it is denied.

But so high has the heat been built, so pell-mell the push to accommodate the marching thousands, that sensible questions are being overlooked. This is so even in the Congress, that body created to deliberate over the drafting of the laws, to deliberate so that correcting one injustice does not sow others in its place.

The voting bill now before Congress is plainly punitive legislation. If that is the intent of the Congress and the Nation, even under emotional duress, so be it. But let there be no mistake that this is what it is.

It is directed against six States: Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia. The record of these States on Negro voting is bad indeed, viewed over the past 100 years. But Georgia, Virginia, and South Carolina have been moving to liberalize, slow though the movement may sometimes be. And in each of the six States there are citizens who do not oppress, citizens who in scores of quiet ways work to keep southern society together as a segment of American society—including increasing the Negro vote. That aside, what is the intent—to get the Negro his vote or to punish for the sins of the past?

It is understandable that there should be a desire to punish, particularly among Negroes, particularly among the more emotional, both Negro and white. But what of the bulk of the population—is that its intent? Does it know what this voting bill provides?

For one thing, in effect it provides these six States can have no literacy qualifications for voting, whereas the other States can if they so wish.

And there is no doubt that this is aimed specifically at these six States; a complicated formula has been devised to make it so. If 50 percent or more inhabitants of voting age in a State have been voting, Federal authorities will stay out.

The voter himself is put under strictures, apparently to force him to vote. For if a person once registered to vote in these States fails to vote "at least once during 3 consecutive years while listed," he is stricken from the register. This may be the politician's dream, but it is hardly in the mainstream of the Nation's democratic history.

One essential reason the Nation is in an uproar—a belated uproar—over voting rights is that what can be denied a Negro in South Carolina can perhaps be denied a Swede in Minnesota or a Jew in Kansas or an Anglo-Saxon in New York. Thus the drive to equalize the vote, everywhere.

But if six Southern States can be made to conform to unusual voting standards, why not Minnesota and Kansas and New York? And why, some sad day, limit this punitive conformity to mere matters of the vote?

Hon. Bradford Morse Speaks on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at a memorial meeting on Boston Common for the Reverend James Reeb, of Boston, who was so cruelly slain in Selma, Ala., the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE, summed up in two short phrases the very heart of the civil rights struggle today.

In commenting on the need for Federal legislation and pledging his support for a bill that will guarantee, once and for all, that basic right of citizenship—the right to vote, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman MORSE, said:

> So long as there are second-class citizens, there can be no first-class citizenship.

This conviction that all Americans are involved in the current struggle for voting rights is also reflected in the Congressman's declaration that "those who march in Selma march for us." It seemed to me that these two phrases reflect the fundamental understanding that this is a truly national issue. Until it is resolved in favor of equality, our country will be infected with hatred and bigotry.

The brief remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman MORSE, spoke volumes about the century-old battle for equality.

His statement rang true for the thousands of people massed on Boston Common that Sunday and I wanted my colleagues to have the benefit of his thoughts by inserting this reference to the Congressman's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Propaganda Fiasco of the Year?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the following editorials from the Chicago Daily News and Look magazine, respectively, remind us again that the Communists are ever alert to use any incident to discredit the United States. We have had sufficient evidence in the past of the effectiveness with which the Communists will use propaganda, and it is difficult to understand why we continue to give them openings to discredit us. The responsibility for our recent ineptness in connection with the use of nonlethal gas in South Vietnam rests squarely with the administration. Regrettably, it will take many years to erase the memories of this serious propaganda defeat.

The editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Daily News]

PROPAGANDA FIASCO OF THE YEAR?

The U.S. Information Agency is said to be so concerned over the destructive psychological impact of disclosures of employment of even a mild kind of gas warfare in Vietnam that it is demanding such tactics be halted at once.

That would be the crowning irony of a story replete with irony. For the fact remains that the United States, in its bumbling, bighearted way, was only trying to take a little of the savagery out of the savage business of war. It was trying to substitute such things as tear gas for bullets and bombs where possible, especially where civilians might be intermingled with enemy soldiers. The difference between this and the bombing of Hiroshima is manifestly the difference between day and night.

And yet this relatively kindly enterprise was undertaken with such fantastic ineptness that Communists could plausibly cry "gas warfare!" and "chemical warfare!" and "the same old American butchery."

The fact of the employment of the disabling gases was allowed to burst upon the world so suddenly that the Communist accusations preceded any U.S. explanations. And the explanations, when they came, sounded embarrassed and defensive.

There is no indication, indeed, that the agency whose assigned job is to understand and predict the impact of policy decisions upon people's minds—the USIA—was ever consulted in the matter. Moreover, it must be inferred from official statements that the field commanders had been delegated the right to employ the disabling gases whenever they saw fit. And that is to suggest that the people in charge in Washington had not the slightest idea of the volatility of the idea of gas warfare when unaccompanied by careful definition and explanation.

The affair may well go into the books as the propaganda fiasco of the year. We hope there will be none such in the future.

[From Look magazine]

GAS: NOBODY'S MISTAKE BUT L.B.J.'S

Nonlethal gas may indeed be as humane as the Pentagon claims, but its use in Vietnam was a political blunder. Even more so was the surreptitious way in which its use was introduced. Had a calm announcement of our readiness to use "riot control agents" in certain situations been made beforehand, the bad propaganda effect could have been minimized. Instead Secretaries Rusk and McNamara had to weigh in late with a defense of the decision which sounded like a post hoc rationalization.

Certainly these gases themselves are not especially horrifying. Tear-inducing and nauseating chemical agents have been employed to break up riots in the United States and elsewhere. Their use in battle, however, recalls their antecedents, World War I's phosgene and mustard gases, giving them a symbolic importance out of proportion to their comparatively innocuous character. Military men may call this reaction irrational. Nevertheless, logic is unlikely to alter public objection to the use of gas.

The decision for Vietnam appears to have been reached without adequate consideration. The White House disclaims Presidential responsibility; Press Secretary Reedy says it is "not the sort of thing" that comes up for high level approval.

As Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, the President is of course responsible for any act undertaken by the military. Moreover, whether or not the actual decision was his, it should have been. The United States has an uphill task winning international approval for our defense of Vietnam. Such understanding as we have gained ought not be dissipated to such small purpose, especially without plenty of serious thought on the part of our President about the political consequences.

Is the President Moving Too Slowly for ADA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the country will probably learn next week whether the President is moving along with a tempo fast enough to suit the designs of Americans for Democratic Action. The occasion will be the annual convention of that organization which has no small amount of influence in shaping the policies of this administration.

Columnist Lyle C. Wilson has written an article entitled "ADA Readies a Shock," which contains some food for thought. It follows:

ADA READIES A SHOCK

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

Big business and industrial supporters of the Johnson-Humphre administration are due for a shock next week when they learn what L.B.J.'s leftwing sponsors are planning for the Great Society.

Americans for Democratic Action meets here next week in annual convention. ADA comprises the administration leftwing, a powerful ally on whom L.B.J. placed most of his blue chips last August when he tagged HUBERT H. HUMPHREY to run for Vice President. H.H.H. was a founding father of ADA. Mr. Johnson's final choice was between Mr. HUMPHREY and Senator EUGENE L. MCCARTHY, also of Minnesota, another ADA star. Mr. Johnson's presidential campaign of necessity was to appease ADA. He remains stuck with that necessity.

ADA is neither Communist nor classically Socialist. Welfarism under a wholly centralized national government is ADA's political religion. This is a high-cost, cradle-to-grave Federal welfarism with ever-increasing centralization of power, planning, and control in Washington and, more specifically, in the Office of the Presidency. Socialism and this centralized ADA welfarism are not identical but they could live together.

ADA's enormous influence in Government comes of its triumphant infiltration of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. ADA also helps to make law in the judiciary and to make policy in the Congress. But the executive department is ADA's special field. ADA entered the Kennedy and Johnson administrations as water enters a sponge.

There is right now in ADA publications, however, a note of disenchantment with President Johnson. ADA seems to feel that Mr. Johnson talks big about a Great Society but is dangerously committed to economy in Government, perhaps, even, to a balanced budget at some future time. Although Mr. Johnson has accomplished not much in the area of Government economy, it has been enough to alarm ADA spenders. That is because ADA's patent medicine for all social ills consist of Federal money, much of it borrowed.

ADA looks hopefully to a Government spending budget of $150 billion in 1969. That is the year in which ADA expects Mr. Humphrey to succeed Mr. Johnson as President. This hope is based on an implied commitment from L.B.J. to put his No. 2 man in the White House when he is through with the place.

That is what ADA has been shooting for—an ADA President. Who needs Congress if he has the White House and $150 billion annually to spend? ADA regards the current Johnson spending rate of near $100 billion a year as a "chintzy" program which will not do what ADA wants done.

For example, ADA wants to spend $40 billion in 10 years on education. Edward D. Hollander, chairman of ADA's executive committee, has set 1967 as a deadline for full employment and 1970 for abolishing poverty. ADA believes in thinking big.

ADA pressure undoubtedly will tend to move Mr. Johnson further and faster on the path to centralized welfarism, a goal which appears to be wholly compatible with the administration's programs as outlined so far.

Honor Roll of the Gemini Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in any great American undertaking such as the Gemini manned space flight program, certain key leaders' names become household words and gain the admiration and respect of the American people. Names such as Chris Kraft, Chuck Mathews, Bill Schneider, Deke Slayton, General Davis, General Funk, and Mr. McDonnell are such leaders. Their names are known to all America as leaders in our Gemini program which has started our great new series of manned space flights as a forerunner to the Apollo program. Behind these leaders and the astronauts are the true heroes of the Gemini program. Their work represents days, months, and years of sacrifice and dedication to assure the success and safety of our astronauts in this effort. For the benefit of all people it is my privilege to list an honor roll of key personnel participating in the Gemini program. They represent personnel of NASA, industry, and of the military establishments, who have worked so successfully together to fulfill our national space program objectives:

Name	Organization	Area
R. McFarland	Martin Co.	Airframe/Structures.
T. Shiokari	Aerospace Corp.	Do.
J. MacDonald	Martin Co.	Vehicle propulsion.
R. G. Olander	Aerospace Corp.	Do.
L. D. Wilson	Aerojet	Engine.
G. M. Forslund	Aerospace Corp.	Do.
J. Llewelyn	Martin Co.	Flight controls.
E. Mitchell	do	Hydraulics.
L. Jackson	do	Flight termination.
R. E. Ringe	Aerospace Corp.	Do.
J. Folberth	Martin Co.	Electrical system.
R. C. Weaver	do	Malfunction detection system.
H. S. Siesel	Aerospace Corp.	Do.
J. Atkinson	Martin Co.	Instrumentation.
R. H. Dickinson	General Electric Co.	Ground guidance.
H. Nonken	Burroughs Corp.	Ground guidance computer system.
C. W. Pittman	Aerospace Corp.	Guidance equations.
A. Chambers	do	Do.
L. Bush	do	Performance status.
J. W. McCurry	do	GLV development status.
B. A. Hohmann	do	Design certification, GLV.
Col. R. C. Dineen	U.S. Air Force	Do.
KEY PERSONNEL, GEMINI PROGRAM OFFICE		
Eldon Hall	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Systems engineering.
D. Cain	do	Reliability and quality.
L. Day	do	Test.
J. Edwards	do	Mission operations.
J. P. Field	do	Program control.
D. R. Collins	do	Design criteria, environment and mission sequence.
W. J. Blatz	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
W. F. Hoyler	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Spacecraft structure.
W. B. Engelbart	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
R. L. Frost	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Environmental control system.
H. Imster	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
R. R. Carley	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Guidance and control system.
L. M. Warren	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
H. J. Overal	do	Propulsion and retrorocket system.
N. R. Schulze	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Do.
C. M. Jackson	do	Communications system for Spacecraft 3.
R. E. Perkins	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
J. W. Good	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Instrumentation system.
L. R. Blanke	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
P. S. Miglicco	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Electrical system for Spacecraft 3.
G. J. Weber	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
K. F. Hecht	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Landing and escape system.
S. H. Simpkinson	do	Pyrotechnics.
KEY PERSONNEL, GEMINI PROGRAM OFFICE—continued		
F. J. Smith	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Pyrotechnics.
R. M. Machell	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Crew station.
A. J. Wiegand	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
J. V. Correals	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Gemini pressure suit and GFAE.
L. T. MacMillan	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Spacecraft production test summary.
W. H. Douglas	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Reliability estimates for crew safety and mission success.
D. A. Defreece	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
Walter F. Burke	do	Gemini spacecraft design certification.
Charles W. Mathews	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Do.
Howard W. Tindall	do	Mission planning.
Carl R. Huss	do	Do.
Vearl N. Huff	do	Trajectory design.
Louis D. Allen	do	Flight crew equipment.
Warren J. North	do	Do.
James W. Bilodeau	do	Do.
James J. Donnegan	do	Computer support.
R. D. McCafferty	do	Mission simulator.
Hal Parker	do	Do.
Jeremy B. Jones	do	Flight plan integration.
K. M. Nagler	Department of Commerce	Weather forecasting.
Lt. Col. John G. Albert.	U.S. Air Force	Launch director.
Charles Ciccherti	Martin Co.	Chief launch vehicle test conductor.
Frank X. Carey	do	Launch vehicle test conductor.
G. Merritt Preston	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Spacecraft test.
George F. Page	do	Spacecraft test conductor.
John D. Hodge	do	Flight control.
Eugene F. Kranz	do	Do.
Clifford E. Charlesworth.	do	Flight dynamics.
Charley B. Parker	do	Do.
Arnold D. Aldrich	do	Guidance and navigation.
Charles A. Berry, M.D.	do	Medical monitor.
Capt. Robert B. Sheridan.	U.S. Air Force	Chief network controller.
Maj. L. Gordon Cooper.	do	Cape capsule communicator.
Robert F. Thompson	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Recovery support.
Col. J. E. Warren	U.S. Air Force	DOD support.
Donald E. Stullken	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Recovery support.
Rear Adm. D. W. Sarver.	U.S. Navy	Recovery.
Rear Adm. D. M. White.	do	Do.
John C. Stonesifer	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Carrier recovery team.
Col. T. P. Tatum	U.S. Air Force	Air rescue.
Capt. J. W. Guidry	U.S. Navy	Recovery control.

Oregon Sees Need for Educational Income Tax Credits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the ever-increasing need for tax credit relief in order to offset educational expenses which hobble the average wage earner is rising at an alarming rate. Potential college students are being denied an opportunity to further their academic pursuits because of the taxload on the average American. Taking income tax money, deducting bureaucratic overhead costs, and passing money on does not offer sufficient help to higher education. Some sort of tax credit should be given in this field.

My State of Oregon, Mr. Speaker, is wealthy in educational opportunity as compared with the great majority of her sister States. However, many cannot take advantage of these opportunities under existing tax structure. An editorial in the McMinnville, Oreg., News Register on March 24, 1965, is particularly well worded in the presentation of the problem. My good friend, Philip N. Bladine, News Register editor and publisher, should be congratulated for his editorial stand, which I would like to share with Members of the House:

SCHOLARSHIP AID NEEDED

Magnitude both of the existing resources and urgent need in Oregon's scholarship program for college and university students was shown in a recent plea for aid by officials of the Oregon State Scholarship Commission.

David D. Johnson, executive secretary of the commission, reported that on March 1—the deadline date for high school students to apply for scholarships awarded by the commission to private and State system schools in Oregon—in excess of 5,000 applications had been received.

Only a quarter of these students, who need an all-important helping hand in obtaining higher education, can be helped from resources now available. Johnson said funds available to the commission from private and public sources both for scholarships and work-study programs will allow grants for only 1,200 of those 5,000 applicants.

The commission director said, "The large majority of youngsters who apply for scholarship aid are not looking for a handout but just cannot undertake full financing of their educational costs, which now are some $1,650 a year at State schools, more at private institutions."

He went on to emphasize, "If those who are contemplating establishment of scholarships and work-study programs could only see some of these many applications and realize the capabilities and determination of these young people, they would realize the tremendous importance of doing all in their power to see that this precious human resource is not let go to waste."

Average scholarship awarded by the commission, which receives and screens nearly all applications by students both from Oregon and other States for assistance in Oregon schools, is $250. Often this helping hand is the difference between high school graduates obtaining a college education or not. Officials of the commission are urging that business, industry, civic and social groups act promptly if they are considering contributions to the scholarship program, either in private schools or in the State system.

Many scholarships would not be needed if legislation contemplated in the Congress should come into effect offering income tax credit for educational expense of family members. Many families with children who now need help to meet the cost of college could meet these costs within the family income if they had some offsetting tax credit. Certainly this seems far more effective an approach than to regularly increase Federal

expense and taxes to collect money in Washington which then can be returned in Federal aid to education.

Greatest benefit of such an approach would be to keep Uncle Sam's fingers out of local educational processes where they are now dipping with greater and greater frequency.

Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege today of presenting to the House Judiciary Committee my testimony regarding a responsible approach to the complex and important matter of voting rights legislation. I asked first that we view recent events with reason and with full posession of significant facts. Second, I urged an unemotional and thorough consideration of the legislative proposal presented to us by the President. And third, I suggested that we proceed in a responsible manner to deal effectively with unequal application of any State's voting qualifications while acting in accord with the Constitution to provide that each State retain its rightful power to establish its own voter qualifications. Following is the testimony I presented:

A RESPONSIBLE APPROACH

(By Congressman JACK EDWARDS of Alabama)

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee for this opportunity to present my views with regard to H.R. 6400 and the general subject of voting rights legislation.

As we all know, the subject has been one of real concern to the Congress for several years, and justly so, since it involved one of the most fundamental concepts of our democratic system of government.

The 15th amendment to the Constitution guarantees to every American citizen the right to cast a ballot. This right is basic to representative government. I believe in this right of every qualified citizen to register and also to cast a vote on election day. Anything less than a full and equal opportunity to vote by all qualified citizens presents our country with a problem which must be corrected.

And I want to make it very clear, Mr. Chairman, that I join with other citizens from all parts of the country in regretting the violence which has broken out in recent weeks over this issue. It has been a tragic series of events, not only for Alabama, not only for the South, but for the United States. I know that we all concur in the need to bring an end to violence, and to bring men of good faith together in the interests of advancing harmony and progress.

We, in Alabama, also regret that the issue has been presented to the Nation in a vastly oversimplified manner based on incomplete information. We would ask that events in Alabama be judged on the basis of demonstrated facts, and according to the same standards used to judge events elsewhere. With this kind of approach, concerned persons everywhere will reach conclusions reflecting a realistic combination of understanding and indignation.

For example, if law-enforcement officers in Washington, D.C., or Rochester, N.Y., find it necessary to forcefully eject demonstrators from public buildings and streets in the interests of community order, then perhaps it is conceivable that law-enforcement officers in Southern States can act in similar ways to maintain law and order in their own communities without bringing down the wrath of the Nation. Alabama citizens are also concerned with order in their communities. And these are sentiments which I believe we hold in common with other respectable people throughout the Nation.

All of us will agree that the key to the American right of peaceful demonstration and protest is responsibility. Reasonable men assume that a demonstration by individuals acting responsibly is to be honored. But how easy it is to lose sight of the distinction between responsibility and irresponsibility when we are far from the scene. And how quickly the distinction becames clear when one's own freedom to move through a hallway or along Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington is affected.

And, if I may add, gentlemen, how easy it is for citizens around the country to divert their attention from unsavory social and economic and political conditions in their own cities and towns in order to join in what has evidently become the popular activity of pointing an indignant finger at an easy target.

Without question, many of the individuals engaging in demonstrations in Alabama have been motivated by a sincere desire to see voting rights extended to all citizens. Unfortunately, others have sought to becloud the facts so as to exploit the good intentions of many other Americans for their own purposes, to encourage the setting of a double standard of values, and to arouse emotion both in Alabama and elsewhere.

What are some of the facts which have been effectively submerged?

1. On February 4, 1965, in Mobile, Federal District Judge Daniel H. Thomas issued an order, acting under the civil rights laws of 1960 and 1964, requiring the board of registrars in Dallas County, Ala., where Selma is located, to receive and register all persons who submitted applications.

Further, he ordered that if the requested registrations could not be completed by July 1965, the Federal voting referee would receive and process applications.

I want to submit, Mr. Chairman, that the officials of Dallas County, though not pleased with the order, were going about the business of complying with it. Further, they were taking pains to let the country know of the actions they were taking and planned to take. But this real evidence of progress toward expansion of voting rights made no difference to the professional demonstrators. The agitation work was begun, and senseless violence erupted, even though the avowed goal of the demonstrators had already been achieved through the courts.

2. In Alabama, we do not have the oversimplified voting participation pattern that some would have the Nation believe. We have approximately 115,000 Negroes registered to vote in the State, more than 20 percent of the vote cast in the 1960 presidential election.

In other words, today's objective in Alabama is not a complete reversal of direction. Rather, we have made some good beginnings, and we have been moving ahead. The intrusion of demonstrations, carrying with them the heated emotions of both extremes, has served not to aid progress in Alabama, but to retard it.

3. Just 5 years ago, on March 18, 1960, there was a proposal made in the U.S. Senate to enact legislation establishing Federal voting registrars to serve as enrollment officers in cases where voting registration discrimination existed against a particular race or class. That proposal, offered as an amendment by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, was weaker than H.R. 6400 in that the machinery for Federal voting registration would be set in motion by the complaints of 50 persons instead of only 20 as in the current proposal.

The amendment was defeated on a vote of 53 to 24 when Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and the then Senator Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, opposed it, along with others who raised constitutional questions. Among those voting against it were Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and the present majority leader of the other body, Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana.

Surely the reasons which these distinguished gentlemen had for opposing a system of Federal registrars in 1960 cannot have changed so drastically that now in 1965 the same gentlemen and others will allow themselves to be swept along in the tide of emotional popular feeling created in part by demonstrators for a goal which has already been reached.

In 1960, the Congress acted in this matter as a coequal branch of Government, as it should. It felt itself capable of giving thoughtful consideration and intelligent evaluation to a serious legislative proposal.

In 1965, are we in the Congress to enthusiastically abrogate our responsibility as a coequal branch of Government? Are we prepared to cast away our legitimate function as an effectively independent national legislature as the result of widespread emotional turbulence? Have we relegated ourselves to the status of a rubberstamp?

Or do we feel that we are a responsible body capable of evaluating conditions and facts, and then taking deliberative action to provide sound legislation with a view to orderly progress? We are a coequal branch of Government made up of elected representatives of the people and charged with the lawmaking function. Perhaps the real question today is whether we understand that function and are willing to exhibit courage to fulfill it, or whether we have failed our responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, in order to fulfill our constitutional responsibility as the National Legislature, we should consider very carefully the bill that the President has recommended to us despite his urging that we enact it against an early deadline and with no compromise.

The bill would, in general, eliminate literacy tests in any State or country where less than 50 percent of those of voting age were registered or voting in the presidential election of 1964.

Let us consider for a moment the question of literacy tests. The Supreme Court has on several occasions defended the right of States to establish literacy tests as a voter qualification. As recently as 1959, in the Lassiter case from North Carolina, the Court said:

"The ability to read and write likewise has some relation to standards designed to promote intelligent use of the ballot. Literacy and illiteracy are neutral on race, creed, color, and sex, as reports around the world show."

The Attorney General has indicated that the President's proposal would not flatly abolish literacy tests. But it certainly would outlaw them for a period of 10 years in the few States and counties affected by the bill. We should consider whether or not the country is prepared to set aside constitutional provisions for a temporary period of whatever duration.

Literacy tests themselves are not evidence of discrimination. The application of them can be. And so corrective legislation should not be aimed at literacy tests unless we are ready to prohibit them everywhere in the country, and unless we disregard constitutional principles.

With regard to other deficiencies of the bill, the Honorable HOWARD H. CALLAWAY, of Georgia, presented testimony to this committee on March 29. I want to associate my-

self with his remarks. Mr. CALLAWAY ably demonstrated the problem which is presented in attempting to segregate States where the 1964 presidential vote or registration was more than 50 percent of the persons of voting age from those States where the vote or registration was less than 50 percent.

He pointed out the factors other than discrimination which may lead to a low voting percentage in a general election or to a low registration. He demonstrated that in States with a history of political domination by one party, the vote may be greater in primary elections than in general elections, or the registration may be low because of the lack of contested elections. And he showed that substantial numbers of persons of voting age may not register to vote for reasons having nothing to do with discrimination: transients, noncitizens, military personnel, or persons who simply want nothing to do with voting for personal reasons.

And he brought out the vast opportunity this bill would provide for a politically oriented Attorney General to apply provisions of the bill for partisan political gain.

The bill gives the Attorney General power to appoint Federal examiners simply on the basis of "his own judgment." And it prescribes no tests or rules for selection of the examiners and specifies no methods of operation. It gives the examiner power to register voters as he sees fit.

There is nothing in the bill to prevent an Attorney General from appointing a county political party chairman as voting registrar with power to register or refuse to register voters as he wishes. This would be an extraordinary authority.

How can we justify the feeling that punitive Federal action must be taken against States which record a voting registration or participation of less than 50 percent while we pay no heed to places where the percentage might be 51 or 60 percent. Surely in the light of cool analysis some months in the future this arbitrary proposal will appear to be artificial and contrived to many who may not see it now. How soon would the Congress again be called on to enact new voting legislation all over again?

And if this kind of action can be taken against a few selected States, then it appears that some other punitive action can be taken against some other group of States for some other apparently worthy objective. But we should consider that a central government with this kind of authority can proceed another time with less regard to the real or suggested merits of the objective, and with less regard to an informed popular will.

This is how the national Socialist movement of the Germany of the 1930's was brought to prominence: greater government authority on a wave of emotional fever followed by the loss of individual political expression. The stage preceding acquisition of absolute power by Adolf Hitler was the period during which the national legislature allowed itself to be intimidated by executive authority into putting its stamp of approval on measures eliminating the potence of representative government. Today's popular demand for centralization of power is tomorrow's dictatorship.

If we now are to approve voting rights legislation we should do so in the light of cool analysis and reason, not on the basis of emotion. We should not put the Federal Government in the position of dictating a State's voting laws on the basis of arbitrary percentages in an arbitrarily selected election.

What we should do is retain State authority to determine its voter qualifications in accord with the Constitution, but assure that each State's qualifications are applied without discrimination to all individuals regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin.

I wonder if many Members of Congress today do not fear within themselves that many persons feel so strongly in favor of a voting rights law that just any voting rights law will do without regard to its real merits. I have the distinct impression that it takes courage today in a Northern State to publicly declare oneself in favor of taking a close look at the President's bill or to suggest that there may be improvements that can be made. In that connection, I want to make note here of some of the comments we have seen recently in nationally respected newspapers.

1. Arthur Krock, in the New York Times, March 16, 1965:

"The administration's bill * * * would reverse precedents deeply embedded in the constitutional and political history of the United States. And care must be taken lest the backswing prove too wide for the conscience of the Supreme Court and the obligation of Members of Congress to the people of the several States."

2. Arthur Krock, in the New York Times, March 22, 1965:

"The more time that is allowed to point out the flagrant Constitutional and procedural flaws in the draft submitted by the administration, the more plainly these flaws will be exposed."

3. Richard Wilson, in the Washington Evening Star, March 24, 1965:

"The question that the advocates of the [President's] new voting rights bill have us yet failed to answer adequately is this: Why should literacy tests as a qualification for voting be perfectly all right in 45 of the 50 States, but invalid in the other 5? This is another example of the devious legislative tactics in the Johnson administration to achieve results by legal circumlocution. Literacy requirements have validity both in reason and in law. It makes sense that a voter should have at least an elementary ability to read and write the language of the country in which he resides. It hardly needs to be argued, also, that a Federal law should apply equally to the citizens of all States. The strange, awkward and unequal nature of this new legislation shows how wrong it is to try to legislate on such complicated matters in an atmosphere of violence-provoking public demonstrations. The Johnson administration was rushed into the presentation of a law that has so many obvious flaws that it can immediately be challenged in the courts."

4. John Chamberlain, in the Washington Post, March 25, 1965:

"The law should be limited to sending in registrars to provide even-handed justice in enforcing any given State's own election standards. The Federal Government has no right to substitute standards of its own. What impresses honest and decent southerners about all this is that it [the President's proposal] actually denies equal protection of the law under the pretense of providing this protection. It penalizes the just along with the unjust. So let's have a Federal law that will guarantee fair enforcement of local election laws without telling States what their own standards shall be."

5. James Kilpatrick, in the Washington Evening Star, March 25, 1965:

"This is a bad bill, bad in ways that need to be understood if something precious is to be preserved. This precious something is a system of government obedient to a written Constitution. If the Congress sacrifices this high principle to the pressures of a turbulent hour, the Congress may succeed in redressing some palpable wrongs, but a fearful price will be paid in the loss of ancient values. The bill undertakes to prohibit in these States the imposition of those very qualifications, when used without discrimination, that the Supreme Court repeatedly has approved."

6. David Lawrence, in the Washington Evening Star, March 25, 1965:

"The 15th amendment to the Constitution * * * now is being construed as giving to Congress the power to control the whole election process by passing a few laws. This could mean the removal of all qualifications for voting except those that happen to suit the party in power. Never in American history has so much power been concentrated in the Federal Government which is now virtually directed by the one man who occupies the highest office in the land."

Finally, Mr. Vermont Royster, in the Wall Street Journal for March 25, 1965, writes of the mood in Congress for hasty action on the bill—a mood set by ultimatums for this committee to complete its work by a certain date.

He writes:

"In such a mood, who but a brave man could stand up and say, 'Wait. Let us see what we are doing before we do it.' Who but a brave man could ask now about Constitutionality or propriety or the wisdom of the means to a wise end. What weighs heavily on the mind is that men in Congress should have doubts and fear to speak them."

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, Congress has the choice today of acting in a responsible fashion, or allowing itself to be propelled into an irresponsible act. I join with many others in hoping that our choice will be the former. Thank you, again, for permitting me to present my views.

The Week That Was

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William J. Coughlin has woven together several significant events in space in his editorial of March 29 in Missiles and Rockets magazine. Mr. Coughlin recounts the magnificent achievement of our manned Gemini flight and the achievements of Ranger IX providing additional pictures of the Moon as well as the success of *Voskhod II*. Against this background he evaluates the skills developed in our space effort against their background of application in solving problems here on Earth, particularly those pressing problems faced today by the Department of Defense. He accurately notes that the practical precision of our space program is helping us to solve problems of immediate concern to our national defense.

THE WEEK THAT WAS

(By William J. Coughlin)

CAPE KENNEDY.—As this is written, Astronauts Gus Grissom and John Young are in orbit, the cheers of Moscow crowds still are ringing in the ears of Cosmonauts Pavel Belyayev and Aleksei Leonov, Ranger IX has concluded a successful midcourse maneuver en route to the Moon, and Mariner IV is racing Zond II toward Mars.

One might say without much fear of contradiction that the space race is warming up.

Although still some distance behind the Russians, the United States, after a faultless Titan II liftoff, definitely is back in the race. There was more than the usual tension at the cape as the countdown proceeded for GT-3. In addition to the strain associated with any manned flight was the realization that after long months of drought, the

United States was opening a new period of manned space operations.

There was a great deal riding on the performance of GT-3.

The Russians already had scored a neat bit of oneupmanship with the 17-orbit, 26-hour flight of *Voskhod II*, during which Leonov stepped out into space. It was a performance still more than a year away on the U.S. schedule. Furthermore, it raised the significant question of whether it might be a step toward assembly in orbit—an indicator of the direction the Soviet lunar program might be going. If so, the Soviets may have decided to make their lunar effort with their present booster—thereby bypassing an expensive development program for a new launch vehicle.

All of this increased the tension at the cape over the start of the manned Gemini-Titan series. A string of windy, cloudy days, which threatened to delay the launch, did nothing to ease things.

Tuesday, however, dawned clear, warm, and calm in Florida, even as the Russian cosmonauts were receiving their acclaim in the Soviet capital.

T-135: Start stage 1 oxidizer surge chamber adjustment. Verify all airborne hatches and doors are secure.

As Gemini control droned through a list of what the two astronauts had for breakfast, downrange weather reports indicated fair weather in the landing areas. The communications network was in a go condition around the world.

T-120: Start first guidance command test in conjunction with three-axis reference system (TARS) programer test. Verify guidance command test complete.

From California, Jet Propulsion Laboratory relayed details of the progress of the Ranger midcourse maneuver then underway. Astronauts Grissom and Young concluded their short bus ride to complex 19 for their longer ride in *Molly Brown*. Complex 19, a significant one in the Titan program. It was from this pad that Titan I made its first successful 5,000-mile flight. Now its successor was making its debut as a manned booster.

T-60: Start white room evacuation. Start TARS drift test.

The biomedical team was standing by at the forward medical center. While the astronauts were running through preflight checks in their spacecraft, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY was visiting the control center.

T-35: Start lowering erector. Start range telemetry readout.

Indication of an oxidizer leak in stage 1 of the booster was checked out during a hold. Meanwhile, down came the erector. The count was resumed. Helicopters took their positions over the abort recovery area.

T-5: Start range telemetry recorders. Arm stage 1 destruct arm switch and range safety switch to internal.

All eyes, all cameras now on the missile.

T-1: Stage 1 flame bucket water pressure check. Verify flight control programed sequence test is complete.

Liftoff.

Titan II pushed its Gemini payload into orbit in a flawless launch.

Why have we gone into such detail on the by-now-familiar routine of a manned launch at the Cape? Because there is a very definite connection between the perfection with which this complex task was carried out and the theme of this special issue. It is precisely these skills which the Department of Defense is seeking to put to work on the problems of limited warfare. Though the space race continues, so do the problems of Vietnam. If one can hit an orbit in space with such precision, there must be an answer to the problem of hitting a tank just across a ravine.

There must be command and control techniques of value to armies in the field. There must be advanced materials available to deep-submergence vehicles. There must be sensors capable of detecting enemy troops hidden from aircraft by foliage. There must be electronic gear capable of order-of-magnitude improvements in submarine detection.

It is these problems which this issue seeks to spell out—and it is this industry from which DOD seeks the answers. There remains much to be done here on earth as we reach for the stars—even in such a notable week as this.

Independence of Senegal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, April 4, 1965, marks the fifth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Senegal. On this memorable occasion, we wish to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Leopold Sedar Senghor, President of the Republic of Senegal; and to His Excellency Ousmane Soce Diop, the Senegalese Ambassador to the United States.

This occasion provides us with the opportunity to commemorate the independence of one of the most stable and progressive states of the African Continent.

As early as the 17th century, at the behest of one of the most famous and talented of French politicians, Cardinal Richelieu, France established its first African settlements in what has become known as Senegal. It was here that the first real town, named after the French monarch, Louis XIV, was built—Fort St. Louis, which still stands. As the headquarters of the Government General of French West Africa until 1902, it became and has remained a thriving port for the produce and commerce of the Senegal River hinterland. Further south, however, another city was established. Built on a small islet called Goree, once used as a major base for the slave trade, and then moved to the mainland for the purpose of expansion, this little hamlet grew in size to become one of the most magnificent cities in all of Africa today, Dakar. It occupies very nearly the most westerly point in Africa with one of the best natural harbors on the continent. Its position astride the main trade routes between Europe, America, and Africa has made it the major port in west Africa as well as its most important air terminal.

The economy of Senegal is based upon agriculture, and primarily upon peanuts as a cash crop. The sandy soils in which the peanut thrives were first put to use by the French, who introduced it early in the 19th century. Fully aware of the problems associated with a single-crop economy, the Senegalese have undertaken and encouraged the development of other industries. Many plants are engaged in processing and distributing locally produced raw materials from textiles to sugar.

After an extended study of the economy of the country, the Senageles Government propounded a 4-year development plan, under the terms of which other sectors would be promoted and expanded. This included the phosphate industry, the fishing and fish-canning industries, and the diversification of the textile industry. In addition, new ones would be established: a fertilizer and chemical industry, a petroleum refinery, as well as smaller factories in rural areas in order that the population movement to the larger cities will be reduced.

This plan is an indication of the rational and farsighted means by which Senegal is going about solving its economic problems. Rather than resorting to unattainable projects in order to fill the mind, the government of Leopold Sedar Senghor has conscientiously outlined programs which will, when effected, provide tangible and meaningful results for the portions of the population which most need such assistance.

Under the leadership of their poet and scholar President, the Senegalese provide us with the hope that an African society will be able to peacefully synthesize the best elements of African and European cultures, and become a model for other African states in the future.

A New Kind of Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, last year frequent appeals were made to the President and the State Department to bring pressure upon Russian authorities and assert the distress of all America at the suppression and oppression of the million Russian Jews.

A recent editorial in the New York Herald Tribune hits the nail on the head:

A NEW KIND OF MURDER

Persistent official Soviet anti-Semitism continues to be documented by testimony before the United Nations Human Rights Commission, meeting in Geneva. As Justice Haim Cohen, of Israel's Supreme Court, pointed out, Soviet officials have oppressed the 1 million Jewish believers in the Soviet Union even more than they have oppressed other religious communities.

The Russian Orthodox Church and the Baptists have been permitted to retain a church, monastery, or convent for every 2,000 believers under the restrictive Soviet regulation of all religions. But there are only 90 synagogues left in the entire Soviet Union, Justice Cohen reported—only 1 for every 15,000 believers. Furthermore, unlike other faiths, the Russian Jews are not allowed to organize on a nationwide basis or remain in contact with synagogues outside the country.

These are charges the U.S.S.R. can hardly shrug off as the acts of irresponsible people or as mere misunderstandings. They go far beyond the bureaucratic harassment of matzoh bakeries and snafus in the distribution of books in Yiddish. Only an actively pursued anti-Jewish national policy emanating from the Kremlin could be responsible. Nazism popularized the word "genocide." Will communism be the cause for creation of a new word to describe the murder of a religion?

Law To Prevent Strife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House of Representatives a bill that I regard as an effective instrument with which to put an end to the racial troubles now shaking the entire Nation. This bill is identical to the one I introduced in 1963. Had it been reported out of committee and acted upon by the Congress, we would have been spared much of the strife which has ensued. Also, several lives would have been saved.

The proposed legislation would bar any person, irrespective of his race, creed, or color, from crossing a State line for the purpose of demonstrating in violation of law or otherwise fomenting lawlessness or inciting to riot.

The country vitally needs this legislation and the public generally approves it. I hope that my bill may be favorably considered in the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member and to which committee I am sure it will be referred.

Although the President of the United States and his Attorney General may now be concerned over the current outbursts of law defiance and disorder in many places throughout the North and South, it seems to me that they display a strange blindness as to the essential causes of these riots and acts of law violation.

When I consider the disgraceful concerted defiance of law which has occurred in communities such as Danville, Va., which is in my own congressional district, and the disgraceful conduct of these invaders and agitators in Alabama and other places, it is perfectly obvious that the participants are responding to incitation from outsiders. These people have no interest in the welfare of the States they invade. Their main purpose is to foment strife and discord and to create a cleavage between the races. As most everyone should know by now, many of these agitators are believed to be Communists. Even the theme song they chant, "We Shall Overcome," was written by a person alleged to be a Communist. In this motley crew are such characters as Peter Seeger, Carl Braden, and Frank Wilkinson, who are incendiaries of the worst order and whose records are well known in the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, as well as in the courts of the country.

For various motives, these persons and organizations from afar have been stirring up the people to fever pitch and are working incalculable mischief. This situation is being reenacted in many places. In virtually every case the disobedience to law has been shown to have been methodically inculcated into what were ordinarily peaceful and peace-loving people. If we are to avoid a major tragedy on a national scale, these uprisings and organized floutings of law must stop.

The way to stop them is to prohibit outsiders from invading States where they have no business except to stir up disorder, or from conspiring to do so.

The law I have in mind would have equal application to everyone. It would apply to the Ku Klux Klan and any kindred organizations; it would apply to the NAACP, or to CORE and SNCC, as well as to the Communist Party. In short, it would apply to all persons who travel in interstate commerce for this sinister purpose. My bill is clearly within the purview and intent of the Constitution, and is something that is needed for the protection of the great bulk of our population, the law-abiding public that bears the responsibility of our industry, our government, and our religion.

There is nothing strange or novel about my bill when viewed against the background of existing law. Since 1910, when Congress adopted the Mann Act—18 U.S.C. 2421—this legislative body has enacted a substantial number of criminal laws to free interstate commerce of corruptive influence and to aid the States in law enforcement.

The Mann Act was aimed at the suppression of the white slave traffic. It prohibited the transportation of female persons across State lines for immoral purposes. Later, in 1919, Congress made it a Federal offense to transport stolen automobiles in interstate commerce—18 U.S.C. 2312—and this was later expanded to cover other kinds of stolen goods—18 U.S.C. 2314.

In 1934, Congress enacted the Fugitive Felon Act, prohibiting interstate travel to avoid prosecution for crime, and this enactment was expanded in 1960 and 1961—18 U.S.C. 1073, 1074. Clearly, if it is sensible to penalize interstate flight to avoid prosecution, it makes even better sense to prohibit interstate travel which is undertaken with the intent of violating the law. Such an enactment has the effect of deterring wrongdoing at its very inception.

Congress has seen the wisdom of this approach. In 1961 it enacted a law prohibiting travel in interstate commerce with the intent to carry on, or commit, any crime of violence to further any of a number of specified activities—18 U.S.C. 1952.

My bill merely carries this approach to its logical conclusion by penalizing travel across State lines with the intent to riot or violate State law.

The legislation I propose would have prevented some of the riots and community outbursts which have bothered the Nation at times for generations. Even the famous Hatfield-McCoy feud of the last century, with all its sadness and family suffering, might never have happened if such a law had been in existence.

Without exception, I feel that States are capable and desirous of enforcing the law on a local basis. This can be accomplished if they are protected from the vicious outside influence which snub our laws and ignore our community mores, resulting in the chaos prevalent among us today.

It is a sad day in America if our local and State officials are deprived of exercising their police power. This power historically rests with the localities and with the States.

I would beg the Department of Justice and others to keep their agents at home and leave the enforcement of law to local officials and not send these agents into the States and localities unless requested so to do by the governor or legislature of the State involved. Unfortunately, some of these agents appear to advise and consort with the lawbreakers and impede the local police in suppressing public mischief.

I believe the law I propose is one that the right-thinking people of this Nation deserve. It will protect the sound, taxpaying, law-abiding element from the lawlessness and threat of riot and violence brought in by outside agitators.

The language of my bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Congress finds that the recent and increasing practice of certain persons and organizations, with diverse ulterior motives, to enter States, Territories, Commonwealths, or possessions of the United States, of which they are not residents, for the purpose of fomenting disobedience to their laws has led and leads to violent disorders gravely disrupting the peace and threatening the welfare of the entire Nation.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this Act to promote the general welfare and assure peace and order by prohibiting in interstate commerce, or from conspiring to do so, where the purpose of such travel is to incite to riot or to engage in the violation of any law.

SEC. 2. (a) Title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after Chapter 53 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 54—INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, TRAVEL IN FOR UNLAWFUL PURPOSES

"Whoever moves or travels in interstate commerce with the intent (1) to incite to riot or to commit any act or engage in any conduct which would tend to incite to riot, or (2) to violate any law of any State, Territory, Commonwealth, or possession of the United States shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) If two or more persons conspire to violate subsection (a) of this section and one or more such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be punished as provided in said subsection (a).

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed in anywise to limit the exercise of jurisdiction by any such State, Territory, Commonwealth, or possession over any crime or offense committed therein or cognizable under the laws thereof."

Good Judgment, Constitution Used by Wallace in Crisis Over March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial written by David Lawrence. I wish every American could read this excellent article:

GOOD JUDGMENT, CONSTITUTION USED BY WALLACE IN CRISIS OVER MARCH

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—For the first time since Federal troops were mobilized in connection with racial disorders—in Arkansas in 1957, in Mississippi in 1962, and in Alabama in 1963—the President of the United States has acted in full conformity with the Constitution. For in the present instance the Governor of a State has made a formal request for the help of Federal forces—something which was absent on all previous occasions.

CLEAR

The Constitution is explicit on the point. It says that Federal troops are to be supplied as protection "against domestic violence" only when the Governor or the legislature of a State requests military force. Oddly enough Governor Wallace of Alabama in May 1963 specifically called this to the attention of the White House and later sought a ruling from the Supreme Court of the United States pointing out that neither he nor the legislature had made any request for the use of Federal troops to deal with the racial disturbances or to carry out school-desegregation orders in his State. The reply made at the time was that the troops were merely mobilized as a precautionary warning. Since the troops were not actually called to the scene of the potential trouble, the Supreme Court refused to rule on the question of constitutionality.

Most Americans are unfamiliar with the fact that in 1957—and in 1962 and in 1963 and today—the Chief Executive has been forbidden by law to use Federal troops even to enforce a Federal court order. For Congress in August of 1957, by unanimous vote, repealed the statute which had authorized a President to use Federal troops "in the execution of judicial process." Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON of Virginia, in a speech to the Senate on October 14, 1957, pointed out that this had previously been "the only express authorization" in law for the use of Federal troops in carrying out a court order. He declared that, when the law was repealed, anyone who wilfully used troops for such a purpose was subject under another statute to a jail sentence as well as a fine.

The erroneous belief that Federal troops can legally be used to enforce a court order has long prevailed, but the President of the United States is obligated to utilize only Federal marshals to "execute the judicial process." U.S. marshals can arrest anyone interfering with the carrying out of a court order. If arrests are resisted, and "domestic violence" results, even if a State is then unwilling or unable to give immediate protection to the marshals, it is nevertheless deemed necessary that reliance on the processes of the court be continued—namely, contempt proceedings and jail sentences.

Under the Constitution, the Federal Government can send whatever military forces may be needed into any of the States to "protect each of them against invasion." Whenever there is "domestic violence," the Constitution authorizes the President also to provide protection—which could include the calling out of the State militia or use of Federal forces—but this applies only "on application of the legislature, or the Executive when the legislature cannot be convened."

Governor Wallace last week wisely transferred to the Federal Government responsibility for maintenance of public order in Alabama in the present circumstances. He was acting in accordance with the Federal Constitution in doing so. President Johnson plainly didn't like the transfer and showed his irritation over it at his Saturday press conference. But the fact is that the Alabama Governor was taking a course which he believed would avert a possible loss of life or injury to citizens.

For as long as the Alabama authorities were using their own police, the chances of incitement to violence and of disorder that could get out of hand were greater than would be the case with Federal forces in charge. While the Alabama Governor spoke of monetary considerations as having motivated his request and that of the State's legislature, it is obvious that Alabama did not want to undertake either the responsibility or the expense of protecting thousands of marchers over a 50-mile stretch of highway when there was actually an "invasion" by thousands of citizens from other States who were bent upon showing their scorn for the people and the authority of the State of Alabama.

Past experience has shown that there were possibilities of serious disurbances arising out of the march from Selma to Montgomery. However much the Governor of Alabama or the President of the United States may dislike the fact that troops have had to be mobilized, it was the only solution in the circumstances.

For what the Nation is dealing with today is the problem of "domestic violence" incited by street demonstrations and "marches" which are described by their supporters as "nonviolent" and "peaceable" but which, in the face of the bitterness of feeling now existing not only in the South but in other parts of the country, have already resulted in death and serious injury to innocent persons.

Reverend Turesdell Alleges That His Reasons for Leaving the Alabama Freedom March Were Misrepresented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, in a speech before the House of Representatives last Tuesday, March 30, 1965, Mr. DICKINSON, of Alabama, stated that the Reverend Norman C. Turesdell, of Dubuque, Iowa, left the Alabama freedom march in disgust with the immoral conduct of the marchers. The Reverend Dr. Turesdell has informed me that this was definitely not the case, and I have asked him to prepare a statement for the RECORD in order to clarify this matter. His statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REV. NORMAN C. TURESDELL, OF THE WARTBERG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, AT DUBUQUE

Congressman DICKINSON, in his speech on the floor of the House, Tuesday, March 30, stated that I, Norman C. Turesdell, left the Alabama freedom march in disgust at the alleged immorality among the marchers. This is a blatant lie. I saw no evidence of this alleged immorality in my participation in Selma and Montgomery. I left Alabama to return to my studies at Wartberg Theological Seminary. I was not disillusioned, but inspired by the freedom marchers' responsible Christian conduct as they demonstrated for human rights.

The Proposed Voting Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in Monday's Wall Street Journal, March 22, 1965, which has been printed elsewhere in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, unjustly criticizes the administration's proposed voting law. I have written the Journal commenting on the editorial.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1965.

EDITOR,
Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial of March 22, labeling the administration's voting rights bill "an immoral law," seems to me to indicate a lack of understanding about the facts surrounding literacy tests and the proposed law.

The editorial apparently assumes that the literacy test has been applied fairly to white voters in the areas under question and unfairly only against Negroes. Thus, all we would need to do is eliminate the unfair requirements applied to Negroes. However, the Attorney General testified before the House Judiciary Committee that highly literate Negroes have been refused the right to vote by use of literacy tests, while totally illiterate whites have been allowed to vote.

Thus, in a very real sense, this bill would require the same standard for both Negro and white in the affected States; i.e., no literacy test. This seems reasonable since poorly qualified whites have been voting for years in State and Federal elections, and the States have raised no objections. To now insist on a "fairly administered test" contradicts their own practice over the years. It is true that many States have literacy tests. The number is 18, including my State of Connecticut as well as New York. It is also true that 32 States, almost twice the number, seem to function satisfactorily without such tests.

The editorial suggests that the law would abolish literacy tests in the affected States. It would not do so. First, no literacy test would be suspended unless (1) the Attorney General certifies that it is being used to deny the right to vote because of race, and (2) voter registration on November 1, 1964, or voting in the 1964 presidential election was below 50 percent. Following this determination, literacy tests would be suspended during registration by examiners. After 10 years free from racial discrimination, the suspension could be terminated upon petition to a Federal court in Washington, D.C.

The editorial also suggests that use of a concept of 50 percent of the voting-age population opens the whole matter to manipulation. This assumes that the 50-percent figure will be used for future elections. It will not. It will be used only in connection with registrations as of November 1, 1964, or voting in the presidential election. It will be rather difficult, even for ingenious men, to manipulate those figures.

One other factor apparently ignored is the voting rights sections of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964. These laws permit the Government to bring suit in cases of discrimination no matter what the percentage of the vote or registration. No State or locality is free to deny the Negro the right to vote.

It is suggested that these States are being penalized unfairly, and some charge that this is ex post facto legislation. If this legislation does penalize the affected States, the penalty is not for violating a 1965 law in 1964, but for violating the law of the land for 95 years; ever since the ratification of the 15th amendment to the Constitution in 1870.

Sincerely,

DONALD J. IRWIN.

Leonard Horn Named Colorado State University Stockman of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I call to the attention of the House that one of my friends and constituents, Leonard Horn, of Wolcott, Colo., who has spent his entire life as a rancher in his home area, was honored by Colorado State University on February 23, 1965, during its Livestock Days, as the Colorado State University Livestock Man of the Year.

The annual award is made by the university to a stockman who has obtained National or State recognition through his ability as a leader, his capacity as a stockman, and his service to his community and State. I know from personal observation that Mr. Horn is worthy of the honor that has been bestowed upon him. In his ranching operations, Mr. Horn has emphasized range improvements and cooperated with others.

Leonard Horn has served on many local, State, and National groups concerned with ranching and the use of public lands. It is fitting that he receive the recognition that has been given to him and we shall always be reminded of the example that he set by the portrait of Leonard Horn which will be hung in the Animal Science Building of the Colorado State University campus at Fort Collins.

I offer to Leonard and his wife, Dorothy, who has worked so closely with him, my congratulations on this outstanding recognition of their efforts.

Under permission previously granted, I include with my remarks the text of a release detailing Leonard Horn's ability and accomplishment that led to his designation:

HORN NAMED STOCKMAN OF THE YEAR

Leonard Horn, Wolcott, Colo., cattle and horse producer, has been named Colorado State University's Stockman of 1965.

Horn has pioneered range improvement projects throughout Colorado which have won him national recognition. He serves on three national committees concerned with land use.

Horn was selected for the Colorado State University honor by a committee representing various phases of the State's agricultural industry. He was cited for a long list of contributions to the livestock industry and agriculture at the local, State, and National levels.

The Eagle Valley rancher was honored during the awards banquet held at Colorado State University, February 23. The banquet, was attended by livestock producers and agricultural leaders, held during Colorado State University's annual Livestock Days program.

Horn has spent his entire lifetime ranching in the Eagle and Colorado River Valleys in the central Colorado Rockies. He and his wife, Dorothy, operate the V Eleven Ranches, which consist of 2,000 acres of deeded land plus grazing permits on Bureau of Land Management and National Forest Service lands.

They run about 500 producing cows and yearlings plus 200 extra yearling cattle to be put on summer pasture, and breed and train quarter horses. He has served on the Colorado Agriculture Commission for the past 9 years.

His capabilities in range management have won him a number of leadership positions at the State and National level. In April of last year he was named by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman to the Secretary's Special Committee on the Mutliple Use of National Forests.

In addition, Horn has served the past 8 years on the National Advisory Board Council of the Bureau of Land Management. He also heads the public lands committee for the American National Cattlemen's Association.

At the State level, Horn is a member of the State advisory board to the BLM, serving as vice chairman for the past 4 years, is cochairman of the Public Lands Committee of the Colorado Association of Soil Conservation Districts, and heads the Range Improvement Committee of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association.

As chairman of the CCA committee, he has actively participated in production of a range improvement educational film in cooperation with the National Forest Service and Colorado State University. The film depicts several range improvement projects, showing the increase in forage production for both cattle and wildlife.

Horn is a nationally recognized judge for American Quarter Horse Association approved shows. He has judged many Colorado shows, the Wyoming State Fair, and at numerous other events in neighboring States.

A native of McCoy, Colo., he is the son of the late Arthur L. Horn, a pioneer rancher in Colorado, and Lulu Horn, who now resides in Glenwood Springs. Young Horn received his elementary and high school education in McCoy.

With money earned from a trapline, Horn began in the cattle business while in grade school, developing a small herd of cattle. In his late 20's he was put in charge of his father's cattle operations, continuing until the herd was dispersed after his father's death in 1934.

In 1931, Horn homesteaded 640 acres adjacent to his father's ranch. This was used as a cow camp in connection with his father's cattle operations. He used the homestead as his headquarters until 1938 when he purchased his present ranch just west of Wolcott.

During the years he has added other pieces of land and ranch property to make up the V Eleven Ranches. Applying his range improvement program he has doubled his per-acre hay production and increased productivity of some land by 400 percent. These gains were accomplished with new irrigation systems, new grass and legume varieties, fertilization and other practices recommended by Colorado State University, the Soil Conservation Service and others.

Horn also has improved the public lands he uses. In a cooperative BLM range rehabilitation program, he developed 25 stock water ponds, cleared sagebrush and reseeded 300 acres, and improved 900 acres of juniper type rangeland.

On national forest lands, he has cooperated in a range demonstration improvement program, developed stock water facilities, erected fencing for rotation grazing and conducted range improvement programs.

Cattle from the V Eleven Ranches regularly top the market at Denver, reflecting the high quality and reputation of the present beef herd. Quarter horses from the ranch have consistently won shows and performance contests throughout the West.

Horn is a past member of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association Board of Control, the Rocky Mountain Quarter Horse Association, Western Slope Quarter Horse Association, American Quarter Horse Association, National Cutting Horse Association, and the American Society of Range Management.

He has been a member of the district advisory board for the BLM for 10 years and served as chairman for the past 2 years. He is past president of both the Eagle County Cattlemen's Association and the Eagle Valley Roping Club.

Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Jo Ann Hardee, one of the brightest and most able of Detroit reporters, has recently written a series of five articles on the poverty program. The first of these most informative articles, which was published in the Detroit News, follows:

WAR ON POVERTY: IS IT BOON TO POOR—OR ILLUSION?

(By Jo Ann Hardee)

WASHINGTON, March 13.—Is the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 the first shot in a war on poverty?

Or is it a cruel illusion that promises hope to the poor but benefits only politicians?

President Johnson called it "the first time in all history that a great nation is able to make and is willing to make a commitment to eradicate poverty among its people."

Administration officials have repeatedly stated that poverty can be virtually eliminated in 10 years.

Critics have called the act, with its $727 million appropriation, "a rehash of New Deal programs that couldn't get through Congress on their own merits" and "a potential political boondoggle."

What is the Economic Opportunity Act?

First, it is not yet a war on poverty. Six months old, it is largely in a reconnaissance stage.

MODEST SUM

Officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) admit that they are still learning the extent of the problem and still experimenting with means of meeting it.

They candidly agree that the $727 million budgeted through July 1 is a very modest sum in relation to the $40 billion spent by the Federal Government alone on antipoverty programs such as unemployment compensation job retraining, vocational education, and welfare.

They also agree that few of the estimated 34 million Americans classified as "poor" will be touched by the OEO effort this year.

For example, the Job Corps enrollment goal is 40,000 by July 1. But an optimistic goal for that date is to have 77 Job Corps conservation camps open with maximum capacity of 7,700 youths.

If the full Job Corps total were reached, together with the 150,000 goal of enrollment in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, that will still mean nearly 800,000 unemployed, out-of-school youths will not be touched by these programs during this fiscal year.

"Our greatest problem," said one OEO official, "is that people may expect too much, too soon."

But he denied that the flood of publicity about the war on poverty coming from the White House and the OEO might lead the public to such expectations.

Edgar May, Deputy Director of the VISTA program, the so-called Domestic Peace Corps, put it this way:

"Asking us how soon we will wipe out poverty is like asking President Roosevelt, on the day of Pearl Harbor, how soon we would win the war."

Senator PHILIP A. HART, Michigan Democrat, added:

"When the enemy is powerful, it's small wonder there is confusion when the attack begins."

But President Johnson, in an effort to speed the war on poverty, already has asked a doubling of the original budget request, pared by Congress, to $1.8 million in the next fiscal year.

Second, the antipoverty effort is not a new dole.

It will not immediately increase the income of those now classified as poor. The Council of Economic Advisers said last year it would cost $11 billion annually in direct grants to raise income for every American family above $3,000 and for every individual above $1,500.

LEAVE ROOTS UNTOUCHED

The report, foundation of the Economic Opportunity Act, concludes:

"But this 'solution' would leave untouched most of the roots of poverty.

"It will be far better, even if more difficult, to equip and to permit the poor of the Nation to produce and to earn the additional $11 billion and more."

This is the premise of the OEO, which has as its goal remedying lacks in health and education, especially among the young, that prevent them from being fully productive.

Critics claim that this goal could have been better served by expansion of vocational education or the manpower development and training program.

SENT BILL BACK

It should be noted, however, that many Republican legislators who advocate these alternatives voted to send the Vocational Education Act of 1963 back to committee.

It is true that the bulk of OEO's program is familiar:

The Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps are similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps and National Youth Administration programs of depression days. Bills to establish them died in 1963, before becoming part of the antipoverty package.

Urban skills centers were part of the 1963 vocational education bill, but were never funded.

Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) is a new name for the National Service Corps which was bottled up in committee before it was added to the Economic Opportunity Act.

Community action programs were evolved from the problem-ridden Juvenile Delinquency Control Act of 1962 and the privately financed Ford Foundation projects, both of which created coordinated services from existing social agencies.

ADMISSION OF FAILURE

But OEO officials say the vital element in the act is the mobilization of all methods of combating poverty, rather than a program-by-program, piecemeal approach.

They also state that the current antipoverty effort is a frank admission that the ordinary means to economic advancement have failed one-fifth of the Nation.

As one report states:

"The poverty that persists appears to be of a kind that is immune to the influence of general economic growth and to that of welfare programs designed specifically to relieve want and destitution."

RESHAPING IS GOAL

No one in the OEO believes that $727 million, or even $1.8 billion, can do, by itself, what hundreds of billions in expenditures have failed to do over the years.

The goal of the act is to use Federal seed money to reshape existing agencies and programs.

It was designed to provide communities with 90 percent Federal funds for 2 years, then reduce Federal aid to 50 percent, hopefully encouraging the reduction of programs that did not actually meet the needs of the poor.

But President Johnson has already asked Congress to extend the period of 90 percent Federal aid for 10 additional months, to June 30, 1967.

SOME LACK RESOURCES

"If we do not do this," he said, "many communities, especially those in rural or isolated areas and which lack the resources to get underway quickly, will be unable to qualify before the cutoff date."

Critics have called the program an intrusion of Federal Government upon localities, the introduction of a new Federal bureaucracy.

But some advocates of the Opportunity Act say one of its chief weaknesses is its reliance upon local initiative which has already failed to meet the problem.

Critics also say there is potential for misuse of funds and politically motivated programs designed more to gain votes than to provide true economic advancement.

OEO officials are painfully aware of this potential.

OTHER WATCHDOGS

They are now developing auditing systems to insure proper expenditures.

And there are other watchdogs.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has its own task force studying poverty. The House Republican conference has established a committee, headed by New Jersey Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, who introduced his own antipoverty bill last year.

This committee will not only watchdog the antipoverty program but will attempt to prepare its own economic opportunity package, affecting the middle class as well as the poor.

In addition, the House Education and Labor Committee has set aside $50,000 for a watchdog operation.

SHRIVER ANSWERS CRITICS

Finally, the antipoverty effort has been called a gigantic public relations campaign. Critics have stated that it is designed less for direct assistance to the poor than to arouse the public to the need for action.

OEO Director Sargent Shriver flatly denies this:

"Our real purpose is a total recommitment of resources. Perhaps some of the traditional agencies resent this and perhaps some of them haven't moved as rapidly as they should.

"But our purpose is not public relations, it is a shakeup of the entire system of services that have served the poor."

HERE TO BREAK CYCLE

Another poverty official said:

"We are not here to make the poor more comfortable. We are here to break the cycle that produces poverty out of poverty.

"To do this, we must change traditional piecemeal approaches and gain a coordinated program, especially for the young. We must find the poor who have not been reached by traditional agencies and we must follow up to see that those who have escaped poverty do not slip back.

"Really, the title of the act is more accurate than the term 'war on poverty.' What we aim to provide is, precisely, economic opportunity."

Older Americans Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3708) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging."

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 3708, introduced by the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative JOHN FOGARTY, is one of the most all-inclusive and satisfactory pieces of proposed legislation in the field of aging to come before this House.

I rise to support H.R. 3708 because I believe this proposed legislation takes a major step in moving the sometimes ponderous bureaucracy of the Federal Government toward efficient management and practical programs in the field of aging affairs.

There are plenty of things about the attitude of all elements of our communities toward the elderly which cannot be legislated. Their place and participation in society, for example, and their health and dignity.

But isolation and misery can be prevented or reduced. We can provide the opportunity and means for proper food, clothing and housing, for productive employment or voluntary service, for insuring that society can catch up with science.

All levels of government have the responsibility—in cooperation with private organizations and individuals—to act vigorously to improve the lot of our aged.

This bill encompasses many programs to pursue these goals, but most significantly it starts out with investing the entire program with proper dignity by setting up a special Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This will be of enormous help to the Secretary of the Department, it will add great prestige to concept of serious programs of benefit to our older people. Our urbanized and industrialized way of life has often removed useful and satisfying roles which the elderly played in the smalltown family life of an earlier American era.

But we must see to it that the skills and talents of our older people are not discarded. The bill H.R. 3708 will help older Americans toward a more meaningful life.

New Phase in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, for the past several days, the New York Times has had some excellent lead editorials on the developments in Vietnam.

I agree with the views set forth by the Times, and under leave from this House I have been taking the liberty of inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Today's editorial once against points out that retaliatory bombings and escalation of the war will certainly not bring about unconditional surrender on the part of North Vietnam; nor can it guarantee that overtures will be made for negotiation, unless this great country of ours will lead the way in proposing peaceful solutions rather than utilizing its force and might to enlarge military operations.

I am including that editorial in these remarks, and hope that each and every Member of this House will read the article seriously and objectively:

NEW PHASE IN VIETNAM

The American predicament in Vietnam now is one for which the French have a word. It it "engrenage," which roughly translated means getting caught in a massive set of moving gears.

The limited air war against North Vietnam having thus far failed to persuade Hanoi to halt its aggression—as the attack on the American Embassy in Saigon confirms—President Johnson reportedly now faces a proposal to increase the pressure. And Ambassador Taylor evidently has returned from Saigon to help him decide how much to step up the raids.

The attacks theoretically can be escalated in various ways. They can be heightened in frequency or in intensity. They can be broadened in target choice, adding economic installations to the military ones struck so far. And they can be stepped up in geographical sensitivity, in proximity to North Vietnam's control center and capital, Hanoi.

To escalate the attacks in frequency or intensity or in choice of targets offers little, especially if they continue to be limited largely to the southern third of North Vietnam. Between the 17th and 19th parallels, there simply are not enough targets.

That was one reason it was suggested to the President last year that the operation begin with small scale, semiclandestine attacks, as in Laos. That way it was thought there would be enough targets for a year and yet Moscow would not be put on the spot and Hanoi would not lose face in gradually making quiet peace overtures.

But the publicly announced mass raids decided on in February seem not only to have forced Soviet arms shipments and a stiffening of position in Hanoi, but to have assured that the target list would be exhausted in 2 or 3 months. That eventually is now on the horizon, although efforts are being made to postpone the inevitable by reducing the size of the attacks.

The fact is that escalation by going north of the 19th parallel is the only practicable way to increase the pressure. The first question that must be decided here is whether it is feasible to prevent installation of a Soviet air defense system of surface-to-air missiles and jets if, as reported, this equipment is on its way. The recent attacks on the radar links in North Vietnam's air warning and ground control system suggest that this may be the American intention. It could lead to a direct confrontation with Russia.

Attacks on military and industrial installations in the Hanoi-Haiphong area, moreover, would risk conflict with China—not only in the air but on the ground, which would mean another Korea. Even so doughty a government as the military regime in Thailand, which now is virtually a cobelligerent alongside the United States, has warned that the Red River valley region surrounding Hanoi and Haiphong is the beginning of the high sensitive Chinese periphery.

Even if these dangers do not eventuate, the number of significant military and industrial targets north of the 19th parallel is not extensive. North Vietnam is a primitive agricultural country with only about 150,000 industrial workers and miners in its 17 million population. The North Vietnamese Communists undoubtedly would not enjoy losing the few dozen small factories they have built or restored over the past decade. But they simply do not have much to lose.

It seems clear bombing will not bring about Hanoi's unconditional surrender. It may not even produce a negotiation, unless the United States makes persuasive peace proposals that both rally world opinion and offer Hanoi a more attractive route to viability than reunification of Vietnam by force.

In Defense of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Legion sponsors the American Legion national high school oratorical contest. The Legion's oratorical competition, developed primarily to instill a keener knowledge and appreciation of the Constitution of the United States on the part of high school students, has been approved since 1943 by the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

The contestant that we of the Sixth District of Georgia are proudest of is John B. Mostiler, the son of Mr. and Mrs. John L. Mostiler, of Griffin, Ga. Johnny, a senior at Griffin High School, has as his speech coach Miss Julia Elliott of the Griffin High faculty.

Johnny has hurdled the first levels on the long climb to the grand prize awarded to the winner of the national contest. He began by winning the local oratorical contest sponsored by the Griffin American Legion, Post 15, then went on to win the Sixth District contest, the area contest and the State contest at Athens, Ga.

On March 29, 1965, he competed with State champions from Florida, Alabama, and South Carolina, and was selected as the regional winner. Johnny will go to the area semifinals in Houston, Tex., April 5, to compete against other regional champions. If his luck, and his voice, hold out, he will then continue to Portland, Oreg., for the final competition for the grand prize.

In his speech, entitled "In Defense of the Constitution," Johnny challenges the American people "to give our Constitution a fair trial, let's judge it now in the light of its criticisms." "If we pause and look at our Constitution constructively rather than critically," as Johnny does in his speech, we too may come to the same conclusions as he does: The Constitution is the blueprint of our Federal Government. "We must now assure the world that we shall maintain it. It shall be sustained."

It is with pleasure that I include in the RECORD Johnny Mostiler's winning speech:

IN DEFENSE OF THE CONSTITUTION

("There never was an assembly of men, charged with a great and obvious trust who were more pure in their motives, or more exclusively and anxiously devoted to the object committed to them than were the members of the Federal Convention of 1787."—James Madison.)

What was the "great and obvious trust" of which Mr. Madison was speaking?—Molding 13 unorganized States into 1 strong indivisible Nation. From May until September these men met, facing questions of representation, aristocratic rule versus rule of the people, and a strong central government versus a weak one. The debates were long and tedious, for each man knew that he was not only deciding the type of government under which he preferred to live, but he was also deciding the fate of a nation. The debates ended and the Constitution of the United States of America was drafted. The Founding Fathers were proud of their work. George Washington referred to the Constitution as, "That precious depository of American happiness." Thomas Jefferson called it, "The ark of our safety." Thus our Constitution has stood—barrier against tyranny, temple of liberty, and cornerstone of our American way of life.

Recently, our barrier has been bombed, our temple violated, our cornerstone chipped. Our Constitution has been barraged by disparaging and vilifying remarks. Cries of "Our Constitution is obsolete. Let's revise it"—"No, let's rewrite it" have been heard throughout our Nation. As a thinking people, we find ourselves facing this question—"Is our Constitution obsolete? Should it be scrapped and a new one written?"—A searching question, isn't it? And one which we must answer. Therefore, in order to give our Constitution a fair trial, let's judge it now in the light of its criticisms.

First, there is the charge that the Constitution is too narrow in scope—that it is too inflexible to allow the Government the carte blanche power it needs to rule effectively. In answering this question let us first decide whether or not we want our Federal Government to have carte blanche power. Hitler had it, Napoleon had it, Mussolini had it and the Russian Communists have it—Do we want our Government to have it? This was the very thing our Found-

ing Fathers guarded against. Have our ideals so radically changed? As for its inflexibility, President Woodrow Wilson had this to say. "It vests executive power in a single chief magistrate, for whose election and inauguration it makes carefully definite provision, and whose privileges and prerogatives it defines with succinct clarity; it grants specifically enumerated powers of legislation to a representative Congress, outlining the organization of the two Houses of that body * * * ; and it establishes a Supreme Court with ample authority * * *. Here the Constitution's work of organization ends, and the fact that it attempts nothing more is its chief strength. For it to go beyond the elementary provisions would be to lose elasticity and adaptability." An intensive study of the Constitution will bear out President Wilson's statement. The Founding Fathers definitely outlined the role of the Government in the federal system. By not going into detail, and saying exactly which laws the Federal Government could or could not pass, they allowed for changing political situations. Article I, section 8, clause 18 was inserted to add flexibility. It allows the Government "To make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers [those expressly delegated to it]." Granting the President extensive powers during wartime is another way the Founding Fathers prepared for changing conditions. Is the Constitution too narrow in scope? Judge for yourself.

Another criticism has been leveled at the amending process. It is too slow and cumbersome, some say. Are we to understand that it is too cumbersome to allow the people to decide yes or no on major changes in the federal system? Abraham Lincoln called democracy "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Thomas Jefferson said that ours is a system of government in which "the supreme power is lodged in the people." Are the people to be left out? Has our Government grown so large as to have no room for the individual and his opinion? The prohibition amendment may have been a mistake, but it was the mistake of the people and not Congress. The wheels of democracy grind slowly, but thoroughly. "We the people of the United States of America" are sacred words. Let's not violate them by changing a necessary implement of individual freedom.

The Supreme Court has also come under fire. Why should we allow nine men supreme authority in constitutional interpretation? Why shouldn't we? A constitutional interpreter is as necessary to our longevity as a free nation as a referee is necessary to the orderly continuation of an athletic event. Someone must interpret the rules, why not delegate that responsibility to a body free of political pressure? The very fact that politicians are dedicated to the principles of certain political parties is the chief stumbling block to allowing them the power of constitutional interpretation. The conflicting opinions presented by politicians would lead to chaos in our Government. This is what our enemies are waiting for and therefore, the very thing which must not happen. We must, at all costs, keep politics out of constitutional interpretation.

The Bill of Rights has been attacked. One of the amendments under criticism is the fifth amendment, which states that a person may not be made to testify against himself. Since this is a stumbling block in the prosecution of Communists in our Nation, many have called for its repeal. The 1st and 14th amendments have come under similar criticism.

Is this just? Our forefathers established a government of principle, not expediency. When we convert to a government of expediency, we will have lost the very essence of democracy. Our Government will become tyrannical. Principles never change. They have been written indelibly in the hearts of men by the blood which has so freely flowed in their defense. Principle is the factor which has made our Nation great, and since the Bill of Rights is a statement of principle, it should remain unaltered to insure our greatness.

If we pause and look at our Constitution constructively rather than critically, we will be like the man from one of Stephen Vincent Benet's poems who said:

"I guess I haven't thought about it much.
I been too busy. Way I figure it
It's this way * * *
There's a buried thing in all of us,
Deeper than all the noise of the parade
Out of the flesh, out of the minds and hearts
Of thousands upon thousands of common men,
Cranks, martyrs, starry-eyed enthusiasts,
Slow spoken neighbors, hard to push around,
And men with a cold passion for mere justice.
We made this thing, this dream.
This Land unsatisfied by little ways,
Open to every man who brought good will.
We made it and we make it and it's ours.
We shall maintain it. It shall be sustained."

Benjamin Franklin sounded the challenge when he said, "Gentlemen, we have given you a federal government, if you can keep it." Mr. Franklin was speaking of the blueprint of our Federal Government, our Constitution. We must now assure the world that, "We shall maintain it. It shall be sustained."

Catholic Paper Calls for Return to Reason in Alabama Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, although their voices are few, there are those in the country who sense the danger of the mass hysteria which has been generated against Alabama. I am proud of those newspaper writers and editors who have the courage to issue a word of caution in accepting as a new messiah, the self-styled savior of the Negroes in America. There are those who dare to say that Martin Luther King may be a rabble rouser. There are those who ask for a return to the American virtue of fairplay and in fair reporting of the news and who are against the biased and one-sided reporting that has been such a marked part of the Alabama demonstrations.

In this connection I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and to the clergy who rushed so eagerly to Alabama, the following editorial from the Wanderer, national Catholic weekly, published at Madelia, Minn.:

KING "HOLLERING FIRE"

The civil rights leaders are now standing on the theater, as the President put it, "hollering fire." With the battle for voting rights apparently won, they press on, exposing themselves to danger, needlessly upsetting law and order in southern communities and contributing, some think, to such tragedies as the ugly racial incidents at Collinwood High School in Cleveland.

The point having been made, and dramatically, and with national sympathy at its highest peak on the subject of civil rights, there is the feeling here that Martin Luther King, a Nobel winner, should begin to act more the statesman than the leader of a mob.

Instead we hear from all points there is going to be more. An Episcopalian priest comes to St. Paul to predict a blood-soaked summer in the South. A prominent Negro author lectures in Minneapolis along the same line. King promises more demonstrations in other Southern States.

While this goes on, there has been the near riot in Cleveland, where the Negro does have the vote, and in Detroit a Negro minister found it necessary to try to end Negro picketing of a small grocery store whose owner, a white, gunned down a Negro thug who was attempting a robbery.

King now will march on Montgomery, a court order in hand. His ends have been served repeatedly by other favorable decisions, and now the Congress is turning to help serve another. But it is King's feeling that a higher moral law gives him the right to disobey court orders he does not approve, and possibly there is some other high moral law at work that compels him to continue demonstrations that are no longer so heroic as they are dangerous and disruptive.

We wonder, though, if he is leading, or if the competition among Negro civil rights leaders is not in fact pushing him into extreme positions containing seeds of revolutionary peril. The enactment of a new Civil Rights Act, for example, is likely to come as an anticlimax.

The philosophy is afoot that some swift change makes all change inevitable and swift. With one example of victory—already practically won—the forces he and the others are leading may find any delay on any other troublesome problems frustrating and impossible to accept. Many responsible Negroes, for example, contend that any official restraint upon a Negro is discriminatory and constitutes brutality. Many are getting the idea that every flaw of society can be solved if enough prone or upright bodies block the public thoroughfares.

But it is time there was understanding that this can't be a Government ruled by ultimatum. This would not be a democracy much longer if the President were to respond to every demand for Federal troops whenever there is trouble. Yet, we have men of the cloth, the moral leaders of the Nation, handing down ultimatums, ordering the President to produce the troops. This freedom the Negroes say they want would be a peculiar sort of freedom indeed if it were achieved on these revolutionary terms.

Worse yet, there is good reason to fear that the continued examples of demonstrations by civil rights advocates and the predictable responses by southern redneck sheriffs are going to have an influence in the northern Negro slums that will make last summer's rioting in Harlem and Philadelphia seem as safe and harmless as a dance about the maypole. Some of the lesser leaders, in fact, directly encourage such looting and brutally, either for its shock effects on the villainous "Whitey" or because of the cynical determination to lead and thereby exploit. There is no reason to believe that this last is limited to the low level of leadership.

But the main danger to these whipped-up frenzies lies in their promise, to the emotions, of the nonattainable. No law or pronouncement, no ultimatums, no broken bodies are going to make the poor suddenly prosper, teach the illiterate to read or make

astute political scientists of sharecroppers or slum dwellers. Nor will any law make palaces, with running water and maid service, out of rundown shacks or rat-infested apartments. Laws don't make the ignorant wise, the shiftless ambitious, nor do they force any human to like any other human.

There is a long, hard haul ahead for the Negro. It is time for his leadership to stop leaping up and down in the limelight for attention and buckle down to the much more difficult job ahead.

Military Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a statement by Mr. Robert A. Means, the national secretary of the Fleet Reserve Association is the most succinct and comprehensive statement of why we need a substantial military pay increase that I have seen thus far.

I believe every Member of Congress who is interested in seeing to it that our military personnel are treated as first-class citizens should read Mr. Means' statement. I, therefore, commend it to the attention of the entire membership:

ENLISTED GROUP ENDORSES REPRESENTATIVE RIVERS' MILITARY PAY BILL

(By Mr. Robert A. Means)

Mr. Robert A. Means, national secretary of the Fleet Reserve Association, stated today, "The Secretary of Defense's reported action of the past 3 weeks to subvert the military pay proposal of Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS is a heinous effort to relegate career military personnel to a future of poverty and second-class citizenship."

Mr. Means' statement came after the Fleet Reserve Association, an organization composed of more than 61,000 active duty and career enlisted men of the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps, learned of the Secretary of Defense's reported tactics in his offensive to kill the military pay raise proposal. The proposed pay bill, H.R. 5725, was introduced on March 3 by Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. The committee, comprised of 25 Democrats and 12 Republicans, feels so strongly in favor of the measure that 33 Members joined Mr. RIVERS by introducing identical companion bills.

Mr. McNamara opposes the measure which will give an average 10.7-percent raise to all active duty personnel. As a member of the President's current Federal Pay Panel he has recommended a 3-percent across-the-board pay raise for servicemen.

The Secretary of Defense is using every means at his disposal to wage an all-out war to defeat Mr. RIVERS' bill. To accomplish this he is doing the following: (1) stressing the fact that the military has received two pay raises in the past 2 years; (2) controlling all news emanating from the Pentagon on this subject; (3) monitoring the testimony of Defense Department witnesses appearing before congressional committees; (4) downgrading and refuting comprehensive studies of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps which positively prove the deleterious manpower problems of the services and the crying need for a substantial military pay raise; (5) discouraging and discrediting congressional support of the Rivers pay bill, and (6) he has selected personnel to serve on yet, another Department of Defense pay study to delay action on the Rivers bill.

The above action is shocking in the light of his recent testimony before the House Armed Services Committee during his defense posture report for 1966. At that time, he said:

"We cannot compensate the man in uniform for the unique hazards of the military profession but we can and should see to it that he at least shares with the civilian population the rising American standard of living."

The following chart, taken from the House Armed Services Committee's study, graphically shows how the American serviceman has fared in salary increases in comparison with his civilian counterpart since 1952:

Military pay increases have not kept pace with those of other groups, 1952–64

	Percent
Military officers enlisted over 2 years' service	36.6
Civil service	46.3
Production worker (manufacturing) [1]	52.7
Professional and technical workers [2]	56.2
Clerical and kindred workers [2]	62.1
Army-Air Force wage board	66.7
Motor-truck drivers [1]	70.4

[1] 1952–63, actual; 1964, estimated.
[2] 1952–62, actual; 1963–64, estimated.

The Secretary of Defense is deprecating the total cost of the Rivers pay measure which is slight by more than $1 billion. Let's break this total figure down and see how much of a monthly increase it will be in the pockets of the enlisted man:

Grade and rating		Percent increase	Actual dollars
E-9	Master chief petty officer	10.4	$54
E-8	Senior chief petty officer	8.8	38
E-7	Chief petty officer	15.3	58
E-6	Petty officer, 1st class	12.4	41
E-5	Petty officer, 2d class	12.4	33
E-4	Petty officer, 3d class	8.8	18
E-3	Seaman	18.7	19
E-2	Seaman apprentice	13.7	12
E-1	Seaman recruit (over 4 months' service)	13.0	11
E-1	Seaman recruit (less than 4 months' service)	13.0	10

Mr. McNamara in extolling the two pay raises of the past 2 years knowingly fails to state that the findings of his 1963 military pay study showed that military pay lagged 26 percent behind comparable civilian pay and that the pay increases of 1963 and 1964 fall far short of overtaking that 26-percent disparity.

He also fails to tell the American public that on the heels of the 1963 pay raise he changed the eligibility requirements for foreign duty and proficiency pay nullifying the effect of the raise for scores of thousands of military personnel.

The Secretary of Defense stresses the importance of the "fringe benefits" enjoyed by servicemen. The "value" of these benefits are mushroomed out of proportion. The truth of the matter is that while fringe benefits in civilian industry are growing at a rapid rate, the military's fringe benefits are declining year by year. In 1959 the military's fringe benefit cost was 28.68 percent of the military payroll costs while the civilian fringe benefit cost was only 24.9 percent of the civilian payroll costs. In 1964 the military fringe benefit cost dropped to 27.9 percent of the military payroll costs and civilian fringe benefit costs rose to 28.8 percent of the civilian payroll costs.

A recent Air Force study of its 719,000 personnel reveals: (1) 5,000 Air Force personnel have received relief benefits; (2) 55,000 more are technically eligible but are too proud to accept them; (3) 169,000 personnel receive basic pay below the Government poverty standards; (4) 148,000 personnel "moonlight" (work in civilian jobs in their offduty hours) to supplement their military pay; and (5) 180,000 wives of Air Force personnel work to help support the family. These shocking facts are not unique to the Air Force, the other services share these statistics proportionately.

Moonlighting among military personnel is causing growing concern among our military leaders. The Secretary of Defense explains the problem away by saying that the serviceman moonlights to provide luxuries and frills for himself and his family. A Defense Department study of the practice states that one major cause of moonlighting is the luxurious desire of military personnel to provide higher education for their children.

When the plans for the administration's Job Corps were announced it was learned that the underprivileged young boys participating in this program would receive up to $105 a month. In comparison, a seaman with 2 years of service in the Navy receives only $99 per month. The Department of Defense endeavored to refute this comparison but it boils down to the fact both boys receive room and board, medical care, etc., and yet the boy serving in the Armed Forces of his country receives $6 a month less in wages.

What does this proposed military pay raise mean to the American taxpayer? The House Armed Services analysis of their pay proposal states:

"As consequence of the failure of military pay to keep pace with increases provided other workers in the economy the military departments have experienced a serious inability to attract and retain high quality personnel. This problem reflects itself in constantly recurring training cost expenditures by the departments and a loss, in some instances, in actual operational readiness."

These constant recurring training costs are being borne by the American taxpayer. For example, the total cost of the training an enlisted radar electronic specialist is $23,000. The Navy's overall reenlistment rate has dropped from 25.3 percent in 1962 to 20.3 percent for the first 6 months of fiscal year 1965. This means that 79.7 percent of naval personnel, trained at great expense, leaves the Navy at the end of their obligated service. They are replaced by untrained recruits who in turn receive the costly training. This expensive and wasteful cycle is repeated year after year. Would it not be wiser to invest a portion of the recurrent training cost in adequate military pay and help to solve the services' biggest problem—the retention of personnel?

What is President Johnson's position on this issue? During the recent presidential campaign, on August 21, he addressed a joint session of the National War College and Industrial College of the Armed Forces at Washington, D.C. He told his audience, "I very much want our uniformed citizens to be first-class citizens in every respect. I want their wives and children to know only first-class lives."

At that time he pledged "at the earliest possible moment," to take "whatever steps both human equity and national defense may require to enhance the standing and morale of those who defend us."

Now, 7 months after that address, the President's silence condones the Secretary of Defense's action to negate his pledges of last August.

The need for a substantial military pay raise requires no more study. The Department of Defense conducted a thorough study of military compensation late last summer. It was completed in October 1964 and still lies on the desk of the Secretary of Defense awaiting release. Congressman RIVERS' mili-

tary pay proposals appears to be based on the findings of such a study.

The Fleet Reserve Association does not contend that passage of Mr. RIVERS' bill will cure all the ills of the services' personnel retention problem. But it will surely be, in the words of a high-ranking naval officer, "a step in the right direction."

Mr. Means finished his statement by saying, "The Rivers military pay proposal is a fair and equitable measure to aid in raising the serviceman to an acceptable, comparative standard of living in relation to his civilian counterpart. The Fleet Reserve Association is squarely behind it and urges the American public to support it by writing their representatives in the U.S. Congress demanding their support."

The Fleet Reserve Association was formally chartered in 1924 and gains its name from the Fleet Reserve components of the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps which allows personnel to transfer to an inactive status, subject to 24-hour recall, upon completion of 20 years of active service.

During the past 41 years the Fleet Reserve Association has represented the enlisted man in military legislative matters on Capitol Hill and interceded in his behalf with the Defense Establishment and other Government agencies. Through its watchful and temperate approach the rights of the enlisted man have increased and the association has become the voice of the enlisted man.

For further information contact Robert W. Nolan, editor, Naval Affairs.

Allis-Chalmers: Company on the Comeback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., one of the Nation's oldest and largest corporations, was the subject of an article which appeared in the March 15, 1965, issue of Forbes magazine.

The article described in some detail the gains which this firm made in 1964, after a previous period of decline. It focused on the work of Mr. Robert Stevenson, president of Allis-Chalmers, in lifting the company's earnings by 88 percent last year.

The dramatic comeback of Allis-Chalmers is of great significance to the people of my congressional district, where the company's headquarters and many of its facilities are located.

As the Forbes article points out, Mr. Stevenson concentrated his efforts at improving the firm's present plants rather than scrapping them to build new ones in areas where wages are lower.

That decision by Mr. Stevenson vitally affected the people of Milwaukee County, and indeed, of Wisconsin. It is, therefore, exceedingly gratifying to us to watch the financial upturn which Allis-Chalmers is experiencing.

In order to acquaint my colleagues with some facts on this important American corporation and its hard-working president, I am inserting the Forbes article at this point in the RECORD:

NOT YET PROVEN

(Bob Stevenson, of Allis-Chalmers, knows that yesterday's goat can be tomorrow's hero. But after lifting earnings 88 percent last year, he isn't in either role yet.)

Allis-Chalmers racked up some of the best gains in U.S. industry last year. Sales of $629 million set a new record, 16 percent over 1963's $543.9 million and even breaking the 1956 alltime high of $547.4 million. Earnings of $1.37 per share rose 88 percent over 1963's dismal 73 cents, though they were still far below the old $2.42 to $3.60 range of the midfifties.

CRITIC'S CHOICE

For Chairman Robert S. Stevenson, the gains brought a smile to a face that has known all too many lines of worry. Under Stevenson, this great Milwaukee company had lost much of its old earning power. Unable to increase its market share against General Electric and Westinghouse, A-C had to get out of steam turbine generators in 1962, take a $40 million writeoff. Over a period of years, Stevenson was forced to slash the dividend from $2 to 50 cents.

In desperation, Stevenson assumed the role of corporate critic. When his newest plant also proved to be his most inefficient, he closed it, and embarked on a thorough plant modernization program at others. Aided by outside consultants, he tackled the job of reshaping Allis-Chalmers' old-fashioned organizational structure. He changed 9 product-oriented divisions into 10 operating divisions aimed at specific markets.

Despite last year's spectacular gains, Stevenson readily admits he deserves no medals yet. He judges his company by return on equity; and while its return of 4.2 percent last year was double that of 1963, it was still wretched compared with the 10-percent-plus average of U.S. industry in general. Stevenson's only claim is that the direction is right: "We're taking a lot of routes toward a better result," says he.

SOURCE OF HELP

Much of the improvement at A-C last year came from added volume, but some did come from the extensive changes Stevenson has made at the 118-year-old company. "The organizational structure is completed and should last for many years," he said. "You could see the results in certain selling divisions over and above the effects of the boom. Before, to sell a system we had to put a task force together and put it under an independent manager.

"Now each division can borrow what it needs from other divisions and run the show. It has really helped."

As usual, A-C's three tractor divisions—farm equipment, engine and materials handling, and construction machinery, which yield some 60 percent of sales—set new highs. "In total, the tractor group will set another record in 1965," predicted Stevenson. And what about A-C's lag in profitability behind the leader in each of these fields—Deere in farm equipment, Caterpillar in construction, Clark in materials handling? "I'd say the gap could be closed some," he answered.

Stevenson also had good news about two other groups, industrial equipment and utilities, which in 1963 accounted for about 40 percent of sales and a lot of red ink. "It was a sick business and it's not sick any more," said he. "Some of our improvement did come from the electric utility side."

Last year A-C also made some hidden gains. Export sales broke all records to reach $72.3 million, up 7 percent over 1963. The company also ended last year with a backlog of $261.5 million, the largest in its history.

FURTHER PROGRESS

Stevenson also has grounds to hope the improvement in profitability will continue. The production rearrangement he began over a year ago in his massive West Allis works, which makes heavy electrical equipment, won't be finished until the end of the current quarter. The Norwood, Ohio, plant, which makes pumps, motors, and generators, won't be in shape until the year's end, and the Pittsburgh plant, which produces distribution transformers, not until some time next year. "We didn't get too much advantage from plant reorganization last year," said Stevenson. "It doesn't constitute a miracle. We're still going to have to go through a shakedown period. If it's any good at all, the benefits will increase gradually as time goes by."

In fact, many at Allis-Chalmers feel that the proof of the pudding will come in 1965 and 1966. Then the results of all this plant rearrangement will show whether Stevenson should have spent his money as he did on his old plants or scrap them to build new ones in low-wage areas. Only then will Stevenson finally qualify for the gold medal or the donkey's tail. But Allis-Chalmers' longtime stockholders are already beginning to feel a bit better about the direction of things.

Horton Questions American Aid to Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., has put in my hands the text of a letter its respected membership recently sent to Secretary of State Rusk.

The letter touches on an issue of grave concern to millions of other Americans; namely, whether it is in the best interests of the United States and the preservation of world peace for our Government to provide assistance to the United Arab Republic.

For the many reasons I have cited previously in remarks made from the House, I do not believe American aid should continue to Nasser. So strong is this belief that I joined a majority of my colleagues in the House earlier this year in voting to restrict the sale of surplus agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic.

The sad fate of that restrictive amendment is known to all of us. It was stricken by the Senate and a subsequent attempt to replace it here in the House failed, even though I again voted for it.

Threafter, I introduced H.R. 4781 which calls for the end of all aid to Nasser.

Mr. Speaker, in support of my bill, I take pleasure in sharing the contents of the letter which the Society for the Prevention of World War III addressed to Secretary Rusk.

I might add that the type of information this letter seeks can be compared to that which I feel would be made available to our colleagues if the House were to adopt House Resolution 266. This resolution, which I sponsored recently, would amend the rules of the House to permit the Secretary of State to appear before us and respond to inquiries involving matters under the jurisdiction of

his Department and about which Members of Congress should be informed in greater detail.

The letter follows:

OPEN LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE, THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK

SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 15, 1965.

DEAR SECRETARY RUSK: It was most depressing and indeed alarming to read press reports that unnamed U.S. officials insist that American aid to Egypt must go on despite recent Egyptian provocations (Washington Post, Jan. 6, 1965). It is only natural that Americans should express outrage over the continuation of multimillion-dollar subsidies to a regime which only recently insulted our people and contemptuously lampooned the Statue of Liberty—the symbol of freedom everywhere.

However, of even more fundamental concern to security-minded Americans are the persistent efforts on the part of some State Department officials to conceal the anti-U.S. policies pursued by President Nasser, aiming at the destruction of America's position in key areas of Africa and the Middle East. Our taxpayers have been asked to support the Nasser government to the tune of approximately $1 billion on the specious grounds which the above-mentioned unnamed U.S. officials reiterate in defense of aid to Nasser. These officials allege that aid to Egypt bolsters U.S. influence over that regime; that such aid has moderated Nasser's aggressive proclivities; that such aid keeps the situation in the Middle East quiet and that it has blocked Soviet penetration in the Middle East.

If U.S. aid has allegedly accomplished all or some of these admittedly worthwhile goals, certainly the American people are entitled to a concrete accounting of these achievements. In previous correspondence with the State Department, the society, too, has been assured that aid to the Nasser government is accomplishing these objectives. For instance, 2 years ago, the State Department assured us that within 1 month Nasser would withdraw from Yemen.

Mr. Secretary, we must frankly state that there has been no response to our challenge precisely because there is no significant evidence. On the contrary, all of the available information shows that U.S. aid has been largely instrumental in strengthening Nasser's capabilities to do us harm and to further exacerbate tensions in the Middle East and Africa as well as to further cement his ties with Moscow.

Nasser's dedicated hostility toward the United States and his collaboration with the Soviet Union are two sides of the same coin. On September 20, 1962, radio Cairo announced to the people that the Egyptians "wish to be allies with the Soviet Union" in their "battle of life and death against Western imperialism * * * particularly American imperialism." These policies and sentiments have not changed one iota. Thus, in his notorious Port Said address of December 23, 1964, Nasser vilified our country as the "imperialist aggressor" and in gutter language told Americans "to go to hell" with their aid. It is no coincidence that Soviet expansion in the Middle East accelerated subsequent to Nasser's seizure of power. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to state, as the facts will bear out that Soviet inroads in this key area of the world were largely facilitated by the Nasser regime.

On November 30, 1964, President Nasser's rubberstamped National Assembly endorsed a resolution "denouncing the abominable crime committed by American and Belgian imperialism in the Congo and calling upon the United Arab Republic to provide sufficient aid to the Congo. * * *" One of Cairo's leading newspapers, Al-Ahram, helped to whip up this hate-inciting propaganda under a blazing headline "Aggression Against the Congo and the Responsibility of the European and American Peoples" (Nov. 29, 1964).

These attacks against the United States are not merely propaganda exercises, as some U.S. officials would have us believe. They are part of a coordinated drive to undermine our position and prestige in key areas of the world. Thus, the Nasser government has been among the chief instigators in inciting Africans against the United States; egging on Panamanians to riot against our country at the Canal Zone; and fomenting anti-U.S. actions in Libya. In the Middle East, the agents of the Nasser regime are constantly at work striving to undermine the independence of neighboring states while her 40,000 troops in Yemen are a pistol aimed at the vital oil interests of the United States and our Western allies.

It has been reported that State Department officials have stated that during 1964 many evidences of moderation have appeared in Egyptian policies. If this would be true, why is it that the United States is still in conflict with Egypt in such a great number of countries: in Aden, Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen? Is it not a fact that in every one of these countries Nasser seeks to remove one of our bases or to undermine the position of one of our allies, or to hamper our communications, or to reduce or limit our influence? We hope it is not the fact of Nasser's intent to compensate us for the destruction of the American library (of course, with our taxpayers' money) which constitutes Nasser's alleged moderation. This reminds us of what Senator PAUL DOUGLAS said recently: "Arabs exert a great fascination on two types of people: British maiden ladies and members of our State Department."

The so-called Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Conference is another vehicle for Nasser's anti-U.S. activities. This organization, largely staffed by Egyptians with headquarters in Cairo, is forever fomenting attacks against our country among the newly created States of Africa and Asia. When President Nasser in his Port Said speech defiantly declared, "Our policy is clear and we say it openly. We say that we sent arms to the Congolese people and we shall keep on sending arms to the Congo," he revealed the true nature of his regime which is not only a threat to peace and security but a dagger poised at the very vital interests of our country.

Can it be said that those U.S. officials who defend aid to Egypt and carefully skirt over the fundamental question of the nature of the Nasser regime, are meeting their responsibilities in terms of protecting the national interests of our country? All of the significant evidence in word as well as deed, shows that the Nasser government is by its very nature anti-American and anti-Western. The good works attributed to United States aid to Egypt indicate, in our opinion, that the American people are being kept in the dark and misinformed concerning the real character of the Nasser government. It is this lack of candor and clarity which dismays the society.

According to the recent vote in Congress, the President is empowered to continue aid to Egypt if he finds it in the national interest. This raises, among others, the following questions:

1. Is Nasser's pressure on Libya to liquidate American bases there in our national interest?

2. Is Nasser's providing the Congolese rebels with weapons in our national interest?

3. Is the war waged by 40,000 Egyptian troops in Yemen in our national interest?

4. Is Nasser's anti-Western propaganda in the Aden zone in our national interest?

5. Is Nasser's interfering with our relationship with Ethiopia, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, and elsewhere in our national interest?

6. Is Nasser's undermining of our prestige in the various African countries in our national interest?

7. Is Egypt's sending an ambassador to Communist North Vietnam in our national interest?

8. Is the continuous anti-American propaganda in the Government-controlled Egyptian press (such as the cartoon showing Uncle Sam putting a dagger in the back of an Egyptian) in our national interest?

9. Is it reasonable to expect that certain neutral and nonalined nations would make a proper choice between Soviet imperialism and the United States if we continue to pay tribute to the Soviet Union's chief satellite in Africa?

These are crucial questions which the State Department will have to answer without prejudice and without wishful thinking in advising the President if further aid to an archenemy is desirable. We fully agree with a Cairo dispatch on this subject which recently appeared in the New York Times:

"It [further aid] will help free money that President Nasser can spend on arms shipments to the Congo, to Cyprus, Algeria, or South Arabia to oppose the United States and its allies."

The lessons of history show that appeasing regimes of the Nasser type only whets the appetite of its rulers and increases their potential for doing harm. This was precisely why appeasing Hitler boomeranged against those who thought that they could accommodate the aggressive and lawless character of the Nazi government. The American people have always been prepared to support aid programs which would further the national interests, but they will not support assistance to regimes which thrive on anti-Americanism and spread their hatred among other peoples.

The society believes that the moment has now come when our Government must take full inventory of those who are our genuine friends and those who turn our generosity and good will into poisoned arrows aimed at peace and security. For years, the society has stressed that all foreign aid programs should be governed by the principle that "recipient governments must demonstrate responsibility and reciprocate our friendship and good will." By this test, regimes ruled by such dictators as Presidents Nasser or Sukarno are automatically disqualified. We believe that, if the U.S. Government acts with decisiveness on the basis of this principle, it would break once and for all the vicious circle of blackmail and bribe which has so vitiated the worthwhile goals of U.S. foreign aid.

It is our considered judgment that the American people are fed up with the soothing syrup administered by some U.S. officials concerning the Nasser government. Their disillusionment is reflected in the growing resentment in Congress where their representatives are rightly challenging those who persistently apologize for the Nasser government's defamatory and hostile activities against the United States. If the U.S. foreign aid program with its many positive features is to continue to receive the support of the people, there must be a total elimination of those programs which lend aid and comfort to our enemies.

Respectfully submitted.

ALBERT SIMARD,
Secretary.

ISIDORE LIPSCHUTZ,
Treasurer.

Grain Terminal Association Supports Small Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Grain Terminal Association roundup for March 26, contains some shocking figures of just how many farmers each section of the country would lose if administration officials wanting to reduce farm population by 2½ million have their way. The roundup indicates, for example, that our Midwest States would lose 65 percent of present farmers. Those who look favorably at this administration solution to the farm problem would profit from the Grain Terminal Association's farsighted analysis, and I wish to insert it in the RECORD for their benefit:

GTA SUPPORTS SMALL FARMERS

Some of the Nation's foremost citizens are serious when they talk about getting rid of 2½ million of this country's 3½ million farmers.

But as one Member of Congress asked his colleagues, "Would the American public then be at the mercy of a few giant producers who would control the supply and prices of food?"

A national magazine took up that question and answered it this way: "If farmers in the past decade had been able to keep their prices rising at the same rate as the prices of other wholesale commodities, housewives now would have to spend an additional $4 billion a year for food. That would be $4 billion that now is going for cars and clothes and homes and furnishings and appliances."

As you remember, it was Budget Director Kermit Gordon who stirred up a big storm with his talk about eliminating 2½ million farmers. That brought thousands of letters to Washington from farmers and other rural people. Many of them were from businessmen who told Washington that grocery stores, clothing stores, furniture stores, auto agencies, and other businesses would be wiped out by the thousands. The small towns would wither.

A rural banker wrote that "every time we lose 10 or 12 farmers, we lose the people who would spend the money to sustain one average-sized business—a matter of roughly $100,000."

Just what would it mean if 2½ million more farmers were forced off the land? The Southern States would be hardest hit. They would lose more than 1 million small farmers, 79 percent of those now farming in those States. The Midwest States would lose 65 percent of present farmers, about 860,000 small producers. The Northeast States would lose 2 out of 3 farmers, about 150,000 total. The Western States would lose 210,000 farmers, or 66 percent of those they now have. It is estimated that many ranchers with as much as 2,000 to 3,000 acres would be eliminated in the West.

Of course, the land would still be there. It would just be divided up among the 1 to 1½ million remaining farms. These would all be big farms. The land might be farmed harder than ever. The big operators would, it is believed, skip right over the small towns to buy their supplies at wholesale in the larger distribution centers. They would be in a position to organize and name the price when buying or selling.

But among the million remaining farmers some would not be as big as others. And soon it would be their turn to be pushed out.

This is what GTA's M. W. Thatcher meant when he said: "Farming is going to continue. The question is, Will it be carried on by the farm families of this country, the economic and social base of our democracy, or is it going to be done by big plantation owners, barons of the soil, feudalistic overlords, who will not be concerned about the towns and villages and the people?"

Voice of Reason From Montgomery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include an editorial from the March 30 issue of the Montgomery Advertiser. The editorial points out the double standard of reporting the news from Alabama and certain northern cities:

TIME AND TIDE WILL RUN THROUGH THIS DAY

Many are the Alabamians today who are oppressed by embittered despair that the world has come to think of them as a strain of barbarians.

He is profoundly convinced that a double standard of judgment exists in Alabama.

He recoils from the horror of a Michigan woman being slaughtered on a highway. But he is at a loss to know why that slaughter is viewed as a special category of offense against the Creator; why her murder offends the national sense more than the murder of a prominent Memphis matron in an alley or the piecemeal murder of Kitty Genovese on the streets of New York as a dozen people watched.

He is bewildered that when a Negro educator from Washington is assassinated on a Georgia highway neither Governor Sanders nor Ralph McGill is blamed. When the same thing happens in Alabama, our Governor is indicted for murder.

He has noted in the Bible that it is in order to contrast the mote and the beam; he has read "judge not lest ye be judged." He has read God's word on the Pharisees. So an Alabamian is bewildered when he is chided for pointing out that a New York nightstick is a club in Alabama.

The answer to the contradictions is not soothing. But the reality has to be faced.

In the first place, there has been a lot wrong with the South. And, alas, it is viewed in the context of the Civil War. The prewar commercial conflicts between the industrial North and the agricultural South were savage and irrepressible. The conflict amplified the differences in the two regions and the Negro slave was the South's emblematic "peculiar institution."

The Great War was fought; slavery was not the exclusive cause by any means, but that became the national illusion and continues to be outside of the history books. It seemed that the slaves were manumitted by Union deliverers over the dead bodies of Confederate oppressors.

A southerner murdered Lincoln. Booth was mentally incompetent, but the murderer was treated as a southern enterprise. In turn, the South was subjected to Reconstruction.

The mass of the Negroes were in the South and a frank system of apartness, sanctioned by the U.S. Supreme Court, developed. Southern politicians exploited the race issue, precisely as northern politicians are doing so today. This cements the deliverer versus oppressor concept.

The South had such misfortunates as Heflin, Blease, Watson, Bilbo. There followed international events such as the Scottsboro trials. All of this, taken with the past, perpetuated the association of Negro repression with the South, like sand with ocean waves. The national sense is that southern violence is entwined with the second stage emancipation of a race.

That is why the murder of a Michigan matron on U.S. 80 is placed in a more heinous category than that of a Memphis matron in an alley or Kitty Genovese on the streets of New York.

This double standard is irrational, but we in Alabama simply have to face the reality of its existence and cut our cloth to that pattern. That does not mean meek, dispirited acquiescence in the fanatical indictments of ourselves by lustful politicians. Nor need we abandon the defensive lash found in the parable of the mote and the beam: "We may say that this was God given and bring it to bear with skill."

Our troubles are many and will plague us for a long time. Restraint, a realistic regard for the aspirations of others and reliance upon the law will lighten the burden.

And in the current despair of the pillory, we may take heart from confident conviction that this State and all its people have a bright destiny. The resources of this State and the momentum of their development are great. We are afflicted at present, but these afflictions are not on the scale that can hold back the dawn.

Change and adjustment have occurred and there will be more. Expansion of our educational system and industrial development will lead irresistibly to higher levels for all. It is easier to bear the orgiastic slanders of our State if we remind ourselves of the larger fact of our certain destiny as a great one among the States of the Union.

Farm Labor Camp Filth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the significant findings of the factfinding trip to California this last week by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz was the frequent incidence of filthy, unsanitary, and disgraceful farm labor conditions.

Dick Meister, writing in the San Francisco Chronicle, on Tuesday of this week, points out that the Secretary's findings have been confirmed by the growers own representative, the Council of California Growers.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about American workers being unable or unwilling to do "stoop labor," but I suggest that this article points out some of the real problems. I urge that it be read by all who are really concerned with attracting and holding an adequate and stable supply of farmworkers:

FARM GROUP BITTER ABOUT CAMP FILTH

(By Dick Meister)

The Council of California Growers in a blistering attack on some of the people it represents, expressed outrage yesterday at the "filthy, disgraceful" farm labor conditions found by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz. "Responsible California agriculture has been clobbered by the black sheep," declared the council, chief spokesman for the State's growers. It cited "the operators of filthy, disgraceful farm labor camps" and "growers who incredibly enough did not have toilet facilities in their fields." Concern over a lack of field toilets also was raised at a meeting of the State board of public health here yesterday. Dr. Herbert A. Lints, a Berkeley physician, warned that "this is a public health hazard that could spread diseases—typhoid for one." Dr. Lints urged the State health board to require all growers to provide such toilets. Dr. Malcomb Merrill, State health director, told him he would report to the board's next meeting on whether it had such power.

Disgust expressed by Wirtz for over some conditions he saw on his tour of California farm areas last week "was no exaggeration" said the council which had observers accompanying the Secretary. If Wirtz agrees to growers' requests for imported Mexican labor, the council added, it will be because he "understands the problems faced by responsible growers."

But it will not be because "all the things he saw served to convince him that all California growers are really doing everything they can to fully utilize and maintain a qualified domestic labor force.

"The overall impression gained by the Secretary and the public was not good." The council called this "tragic," commenting that a great many agricultural interests "worked their hearts out to bring together with Mr. Wirtz and his party the people and the facts which could accurately and honestly enable him to better understand the many ramifications of our growing crisis." How much of Wirtz' "overall impression" will affect his decision on imported labor, the council added, "can only be guessed at." The council blamed the bad conditions primarily on labor contractors and camp operators, but it said growers have "the ultimate responsibility and we can't pass the buck." Growers, the council warned, "are going to continue to get clobbered unless we do something about it. And fast.

"Growers must play the game fair and square. This means providing the type of decent facilities and conditions that will help attract and hold domestic workers.

"If these things are done and still a legitimate shortage exists then the case will have been honestly and fairly proven."

Growers, the council urged, must clean up their worker housing or see that housing provided workers by others is cleaned up.

"The same applies to those of us who live in areas where our local housing authorities operate facilities right out of the 'Grapes of Wrath' era" it added. Most growers, the council said, know the need "to see that decent conditions are maintained both in the camps and in the fields, but obviously some don't and it's up to us collectively and individually to see that the type of things that do exist that are wrong are made right."

The council, a frequent critic of Wirtz in the past, called his California visit a "20-hour-a-day tour by a man who appeared genuinely interested in getting all of the facts he could."

The Herd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, we are still confronted with the so-called voting rights bill which is now pending in the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate. It is apparent to impartial minds that the legislation is intended to subjugate people in certain sections and to federalize elections therein wiping out State sovereignty as well as obliterating State lines in those particular areas with no thought of protecting the rights to register and or vote in the Nation as a whole. The architect desires forced elections, full participation and no opposition. This has been the strength of the Communists even though they are in the minority in the countries they rule. They have taken over the election machinery, created a police state and browbeat and ruled with an iron hand.

This bill, if enacted, would be a long step in that direction for America in the sections of the country that the bill covers. I have a feeling that people all over the Nation are beginning to realize what a boobytrap this proposed legislation is, the dangers inherent in it and some at least are speaking out against the rank discrimination proposed in this legislation. It is the most vicious, punitive, insidious, iniquitous measure that has been proposed to the Congress. It is liberty destroying as well as unconstitutional. The formula set out in the bill is simply a scheme to have Federal officials take over the electoral franchise in certain States. There is so much evil in this bill that many of us hope that if enough of the people in America can be given the facts that there will be a great resentment against those who are trying to stifle the States and localities into not having free and untrammeled elections.

Recently there appeared in the Lynchburg News an editorial entitled "The Herd." This editorial points out cogently the hysteria surrounding the introduction of this bill and the evils of goose-stepping to the demands of minority pressure groups. I wish every Member of this House would read carefully and ponder the merits of the editorial which is as follows:

THE HERD

The Congress of the United States is supposed to be a deliberative body. In the past, its greatest strength has rested in its rules which protest the rights of minorities and prevent the Congress from taking precipitant action in times of crisis.

Watching the eagerness with which the Congress applauded the pious platitudes and cliches of Lyndon Johnson that "black Monday" night, we wonder. We had the impression that it was as eager to rubberstamp the President's voting bill before even hearing the details of it, as the German Bundestag was to do the bidding of Adolph Hitler 30 years ago.

Has the time come in this country when it is possible for Communist-inspired professional agitators and anarchists to create such a domestic crisis that the representatives of the people will jump to do their bidding?

What is possible for the present crop of agitators to accomplish in the name of "civil rights," is possible also for other agitators to do in the name of other causes. It would be possible for unionists to create such a crisis through strikes, demonstrations, and violence, that the Federal Government would be asked to take over the Nation's transportation system, its steel mills, its automotive plants, or what have you. And it would be possible for agitators on college campuses, with the help of the Federal courts, to so paralyze college operations that Federal laws would be demanded to insure that the institutions could function normally. Where there is Federal law, of course, there is Federal control.

No matter what any Member of the Congress says, or what Lyndon Johnson says, or any professional agitator says, there is no need for a new voting law. All that is needed is to enforce the laws alerady on the books, as the courts are now doing. But that is the hard way. The President is seeking a more insidious way—that of strengthening Federal power by means of a new law which circumvents the courts and gives the executive branch of the Central Government authority to control all elections. It is much easier to govern when one has absolute power than it is when one must share power with other branches of Government, and, in this country, with the States and the people.

We doubt that there is 1 percent of qualified voters who are being denied the right to vote—and none in Virginia. But the Congress is eager to give the President the power to interfere with elections of all the people, in all of the States.

The old Nazi and Communist trick of creating crises and anarchy in order to get special considerations is working well. It is working, because the Congress has shown repeatedly that it can be stampeded. In short, it has shown the characteristics of the bovine species of animal which is most easily driven—cattle.

Farming Without the Mexican Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial appeared in the March 22 Minneapolis Tribune. It reminds us that a period of adjustment, perhaps several years, will be required to make the transition from the bracero system to a system of domestic farmworkers receiving fair wages under decent working conditions and living conditions.

Along with a number of my colleagues here in Congress, I met with Secretary Wirtz to urge him not to be stampeded into turning back to the old bracero

system. I am certain that Congress does not intend to renew Public Law 78.

The Minneapolis Tribune editorial follows:

FARMING WITHOUT THE MEXICAN IMPORTS

Braceros, long an integral part of farming in States near the Mexican border, are missing this year, and growers who long have predicted that they couldn't get along without the imported field workers are worried.

The theory of ending Public Law 78, which governed the entry of Mexican farm labor, was that the additional jobs (more than 60,000 in California last year) should be made available to Americans in need of work. The growers have maintained that domestic workers would not do the stoop labor.

This year the new system is getting its first test and the results are less than satisfactory. The California State Employment Service has successfully recruited domestic farmworkers, but only about one in three has stayed with the work.

Growers say they don't dare put a big investment into such fragile crops as tomatoes if they have no assurance that crews will be available to harvest the crops. Secretary Wirtz has been asked to use the loophole in the new law permitting importation of workers for jobs not filled by domestic labor.

But a few months are not an adequate test of an employment plan legislated with sound reasoning behind it. Available American workers, many of them inexperienced in farming, will have to get used to the jobs, and some will have to be trained for farm machinery. Wages in some areas will rise, and inevitably consumer prices on the food raised will be affected.

It may take several years to adjust to the new system, but the goals of more jobs for Americans and better income and working conditions for whoever does the fieldwork are worth a real effort during the transition period.

Employee Newspaper Gives Some Food for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, how refreshing it is to hear, in these days of confusion and wild demonstrations in the name of liberty, a clear, calm voice reminding us of some forgotten truths. Such a voice comes to us in an editorial from the Wingfoot Clan, employee newspaper published at the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. plant in my hometown of Gadsden, Ala.

The editorial follows:

LIBERTY

"Liberty, too, must be limited in order to be possessed."—Burke.

Sometimes, in this present age, when we are confronted with the tensions and confusions of life, we tend to become anxious and bewildered. The world seems wobbly on its axis and the picture of events seems out of focus.

One word which seems to occupy the minds of many of our people is liberty. It's a good word but what does it mean? Liberty for what?

We have the right to own property but do we have the liberty to trespass on the property of others?

We have the liberty to drive an automobile but does that liberty give us the right to disobey traffic laws?

We have the right to park our automobile but are we at liberty to park it beside a water plug or block a driveway?

We have the right to walk on a sidewalk but do we have the liberty to force another into the street?

We have the right to enjoy the beautiful scenery of our country but are we at liberty to discard bottles, cans, wrappers, and papers on our highways and in our parks?

We have the right to build a house on our property but are we at liberty to disregard the pertinent zoning and planning laws?

We have the right to freedom of opportunity but does that give us the liberty to demand rather than merit?

As Burke pointed out, the very word liberty implies that there must be certain restraints imposed, in order that liberty might exist for all.

The right to use our fists stops where the other fellow's nose begins.

Liberty, under the law, implies that there must be a respect for law in order that the liberty of all might be preserved.

The liberty to have a job certainly implies that the individual must have certain qualifications commensurate with the skills required on the job. To disregard the qualifications would infringe on the rights of those who are qualified for the job.

We are a nation governed by laws and not by men. No man is a law unto himself because such a condition would endanger the liberties of others.

Liberty is precious but unlimited liberty for any person, group, or organization would deprive others of their liberties. Unbridled liberty is chaos and confusion and detrimental to the common good.

To possess liberty ourselves we must recognize the limitations of our liberty and the liberty of others.

Toynbee, the eminent historian, pointed out that two of the final steps leading to loss of liberty are apathy and dependency.

A "don't care" attitude and a dependency on governmental or other agencies for "cradle to grave" security can lead us to the same doom that overtook 19 great civilizations of the past.

No Surpluses in the Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of American agriculture is that of distribution. We all know that the world scarcely has a surplus of food products and that the real problem is making it possible for us to get our food to those who need it. A recent editorial in the Lincoln Sunday Journal and Star of March 21, 1965, points this out so simply and forcefully that it deserves wider circulation and I include it in the RECORD for that purpose:

NO SURPLUSES IN THE FUTURE?

Gunnar Myrdal, famed Sweedish economist, told members of the National Farmers Union in Chicago last week that the farm surplus problem, which has plagued the United States, will come to an end in the near future.

He said the time was fast approaching when this Nation must shift gears and produce all the food its advanced agricultural technology permits. Otherwise, he said, the burgeoning populations of underdeveloped countries will face starvation of hundreds of millions of people.

The Swedish economist undoubtedly knows whereof he speaks. He is on his way home after completing studies of the food problem in south Asia. The task should not be that of the United States alone and Myrdal purposes the help of other developed nations.

This would indicate that the world must do more than increase production. It must learn cooperation in marketing, sharing of responsibilities, and how to live in peace.

Present U.S. surpluses could be absorbed in a hungry world if they could be distributed and if the nations of the world would lay down their weapons and concentrate on economic development.

If one reads Myrdal correctly, he is saying the future alternative to feeding the world may make it unacceptable. He says repercussions from starving millions could be expected and could include political totalitarianism ushered in by violence.

The American farmer, now the problem child, could very well be the first line of defense.

The farmer's dilemma is a strange one. He is the envy of the Communist world which cannot or has not learned his secret. Yet in the United States, because he is so efficient, the Government can't decide what to do with him or for him or to him.

When the statesmen of the world can do their job as well as the American farmers, there will indeed be a better world.

Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, dismissal yesterday of the NAACP suit that sought to decrease congressional representation of certain States because of voted discrimination, points up sharply, I think, the need for a statute enforcing section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

One week ago today I urged the House Judiciary Committee to make my bill, H.R. 6029, a part of the voting rights bill of 1965. I said then and I continue to believe that passage of H.R. 6400, the administration's bill, has the highest priority. I think my proposal can be made a part of it without jeopardizing its chances for prompt enactment.

The people of American want the Congress to do everything that is constitutionally possible to insure the right to vote and not merely a portion of that which is constitutionally possible.

The problem, in the words of President Johnson, is "the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy." It is the "destiny of democracy" because the right to cast a meaningful vote is the essential right which distinguishes a democracy from other forms of government. It is the "dignity of man" because any democracy which denies to one man an equal opportunity to vote with other men denies his essential human dignity.

I include as part of my remarks a news story about the dismissal of the NAACP

suit from this morning's New York Times:

NEGRO VOTER SUIT BARRED BY COURT—SOUGHT TO CUT HOUSE SEATS OF STATE CURBING FRANCHISE

WASHINGTON, March 30.—The U.S. district court here dismissed today a suit to compel a reduction in house of representatives seats of States that deny Negroes the vote.

The suit was filed by the NAACP legal defense and educational fund, which asked the court to order the Commerce Department and its Census Bureau to collect in the 1970 census the statistics needed to carry out section 2 of the 14th amendment.

That says that States shall have their house delegations reduced by the same proportion that those to whom they deny the right to vote bear to the voting-age populations of those States.

Dismissing the suit, Judge William B. Jones ruled that neither of the two groups represented by the fund had standing to sue.

One group, composed of 15 registered voters from States that do not deny Negroes the right to vote, contended that failure to enforce section 2 diluted their right to vote by giving seats in the House to States not entitled to them.

Judge Jones said their interest in the matter was "remote and speculative and shared by millions of others."

"They are not personally aggrieved or affected in a legal sense by defendants' [the Government agencies'] refusal to take future action in connection with the 1970 census."

The second group, composed of 10 persons from Southern States who contended they had been denied the right to vote, asserted that carrying out section 2 would deter this denial.

SEES NO REMEDY

Judge Jones said that even if he granted the order they sought and a reapportionment gave existing House seats to other States, that "would not vindicate their right to vote."

"They would find themselves in the same position that they are in at this time," he said.

He called the possibility that enforcement of section 2 would end the denial of their right to vote "remote and speculative."

Judge Jones also found that the census law did not authorize Federal officials to get the statistics and make the computation necessary to carry out section 2. Congress would not give them this authority in 1929 and has not since changed its mind, he said.

Jack Greenberg, director-counsel of the fund, said in a statement issued in New York that the fund intended to appeal.

"When we filed the case, we knew it would be a long, hard struggle," he said. "Section 2 of the 14th amendment is quite clear in its intention, but unfortunately has never been enforced.

"Events in Selma [Alabama] underscore the gross injustice of permitting States to bar Negroes from polls on one hand while counting them on the other for purposes of inflating the size of their congressional delegations."

In an affidavit filed with the court, Abram J. Jaffe, director of the manpower and population program of Columbia University's Bureau of Applied Social Research, described a system for distinguishing those who did not register because of apathy from those who were prevented from doing so.

He calculated that if section 2 were enforced Texas would lose six House seats, Virginia four, Alabama three, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina two each, and Florida, Louisiana, and Oklahoma one each.

Program of Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to set forth the legislative program of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State.

This program was adopted at a meeting held at the Hotel Piccadilly, 227 West 45th Street, New York, N.Y., at an executive meeting on Saturday afternoon, January 9, 1965, with Harold R. Moskovit, State president of the Affiliated Young Democrats, presiding:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF NEW YORK

The Affiliated Young Democrats of New York at their statewide legislative committee meeting held yesterday noon at the Hotel Piccadilly, 227 West 45th Street, New York City, endorsed the following legislative program for 1965, which will be introduced in the State legislature by their 19 members in the State senate, of which the chairman is Senator Samuel L. Greenberg, of Brooklyn, and their 41 members in the assembly, of which the chairman is Assemblywoman Aileen B. Ryan, of the Bronx:

"Raise drinking age to 21 years; primary election for all State officers; adopt new code of New York City Air Pollution Control Board for Cleaner Air; more housing; abolition of capital punishment; permanent personal registration be made statewide, with two changes: (1) must vote at two consecutive national elections, (2) do not have to reregister if move in same county; vote at 18 years, stop turnstile justice by recodifying the statutes as it relates to juveniles, with the unison of Federal and State laws; more vocational camps, rehabilitation, and training centers; favor 2 voting days for national elections, first Monday and Tuesday in November; more State aid to education; extend ban on racial discriminations in housing and protection against slum landlords; create more judges; legalized off-track betting by referendum; raise minimum wage to $1.50 an hour; mandatory free tuition at all State and city universities and all community colleges; outlaw boxing; permanent spring primary election day in June; stronger code of ethics; presidential preference primaries; legislature to at last ratify the 15th amendment; preserve our great natural resources; program to discourage dropouts in schools; State aid to public museums, create statewide recreation department; bonus for Korean veterans; increase teachers' salaries; more and better aid to the aged and mentally ill; favor 3-day weekend plan to celebrate all holidays, except religious holidays, on Monday; help migrant workers; stronger law against dope peddlers; and finally, we strongly urge, again, that a printed record of all the proceedings verbatim of the 1965 State legislature be published, and made available to the public."

Richard H. Wels, chairman of the State legislative committee of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York, presided at this important meeting.

Computers, Nonvoters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that the furor of the 1964 election has subsided the issues and results are political history. A look at some of the questions which remain to be settled is in order. One of the questions is the impact of earlier television-radio projections on Midwestern and Western States at a time when their polls were still open for ballot.

The Chicago Heights Star, a community newspaper with an interesting and astute viewpoint on politics discusses this question thoroughly in an editorial of March 21, which I place in the RECORD at this point:

COMPUTERS, NONVOTERS

On more than one occasion this newspaper has expressed concern over projecting national election results before all voters have gone to the polls. How many west coast people, we have wondered, fail to vote because computers have indicated that their votes won't make a difference anyway?

In light of this, it is interesting to read of a speech made by Pierre Salinger, former White House press secretary, before the Women's National Press Club in Washington. Mr. Salinger made an unsuccessful bid for the U.S. Senate last November, entering the race in California for the seat he held by appointment.

He told the press women that, on the basis of a recent poll, more than 350,000 Californians did not vote. Television-radio projections at 4:30 p.m., Pacific time, indicated that President Johnson had already won the big prize. The fact that thousands of residents of the State saw no good reason to ballot on the Senate post and various other offices and propositions is a sad story in itself.

The fact nevertheless is, however, that discouraging presidential voting alone can be a sticky business.

Nobody will argue that the outcome of the 1964 race was materially affected by forecasts of the results, for the margin was far too decisive. But the impact on a relatively close contest might spell the difference between victory and defeat for a candidate, and there is the additional chance that the projection itself might be grossly inaccurate, by virtue of an error at best or a bit of mischief at worst. As recently as 1960, the computers were pouring forth fantastically misleading prognostications in Illinois, chiefly because the source of the sample returns was not taken into consideration.

Even after all polls are closed, meanwhile, projections of the outcome have their drawbacks. Poll watchers for the apparently defeated faction can be expected to lose interest, whereas workers on the winning bandwagon will want to achieve the best possible precinct records as they look toward the division of spoils.

But the thing Mr. Salinger had in mind primarily was the number of persons apparently not voting at all because of time zone differentials apprising them of the probable results in advance. He has a right to be personally concerned, since the stay-

at-homes might have changed the results of other contests, including his own.

We are not sure that Mr. Salinger and this newspaper remain on the same wavelength, though, when it comes to solving the problem. He urged that polls in national elections close at the same instant, from Maine to Hawaii. His plan would embody 24-hour voting, with a common closing time.

Not among those endorsing a marathon voting period, we suspect, are persons who tallied results of Illinois' gruesome at-large House of Representatives election. Nor are we sure that a protracted balloting session would not open the way to "repeater" voting and other frauds.

It would seem that the most sensible solution is to put a lid on the national results until all polls are closed, or to revise election hours just enough to synchronize closing hours without disenfranchising anyone.

I believe we in Congress should give serious thought to this problem.

Boycott Is Un-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, along with all the other illegal and unlawful acts, demonstrations, defiance of court orders which he engineered, Martin Luther King now demands that the State of Alabama be crippled by an economic boycott.

Don't buy anything produced in Alabama—

King cries.

Wreck their industries, throw their people out of work, create more poverty and it's too bad if the Negroes suffer, but it just has to be.

This is the callous, inhumane, un-American attitude of this so-called leader of the civil rights movement. Mr. Speaker, Martin Luther King is not interested in voting rights for the Negroes of Alabama; he is not interested in helping the Negroes of Alabama gain equal economic opportunity; he is not concerned with helping them to build a better life. He is interested only in the power he gains by using the Negroes of Alabama to his own selfish ends. If this is not his purpose, why would he demand a program that can only hurt most the very people about whom he expresses such concern?

The tragedy of this hour is that there are those who encourage and support the immoral and illegal acts of Martin Luther King. I refer to an article in this morning's edition of the Washington Post which states:

The Childs Securities Corp., a firm that underswrites municipal bonds, said today that it plans to do no business with Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed and shocked that a reputable business firm would be so unethical and so lacking in American principles as to participate in such an action. The support of an economic boycott against a whole State and its people is a well-organized Communist technique which has been used to topple every government which the Communists have taken over.

I would hope that the executive vice president of this company, a Donald E. Barnes, would reconsider his ill-advised letter to the Governor of Alabama, threatening to boycott our State on the demand of an agitator who has set himself above the law and above the traditions of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud those writers and public officials as well as officials of private business who have condemned Martin Luther King's un-American tactic of calling for a boycott of Alabama. It will be my purpose to spread upon the RECORD, so that Members of Congress and the American people may see, the names of those companies who aline themselves with those who are doing all possible to destroy America; those who are ready and eager to wreck private companies and local communities and the States of the Union; ready and eager to deprive thousands of American citizens of all races, colors, and creeds, of the means of making a livelihood.

So that I will not be accused of quoting out of context, I include as a part of these remarks the entire news story from the Washington Post of April 1, 1965, dealing with the Childs Securities Corp.:

WILL BOYCOTT ALABAMA, SECURITIES FIRM SAYS

NEW YORK, March 31.—The Childs Securities Corp., a firm that underwrites municipal bonds, said today that it plans to do no business with Alabama.

Executive Vice President Donald E. Barnes, in a letter to Alabama Governor, George C. Wallace, said the firm would refrain from purchases and sales of all securities issued by the State, its cities, school districts, or other political subdivisions.

Barnes' letter said the firm acted because of "credit considerations, arising from the failure of the Wallace administration to protect the citizens of Alabama in their exercise of constitutional rights."

"The prospects for business and industrial growth in the State have thus been placed in doubt," it said.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this education bill raises several important philosophic considerations which I would like to discuss. One of these is Federal aid to education, another is States rights and States responsibilities, and the equation for measuring the worth of this bill.

There is no doubt that the closer Government can be to the people, the more control the local citizen can maintain, the safer is our republican form of government. We are a federation of States, and yet the great experiment of loose States and absolute local control failed in the Articles of Confederation. This form of government was so weak that our forefathers reformed our system into our present structure, to give greater strength to the Federal Government. This was in recognition that certain responsibilities are beyond the scope and management of State government. In between these two extremes rest a gray area, that becomes the subject matter of constant controversy. We fought a Civil War over such a major controversy, and there it was decided by force of arms and much spilled blood that in the area of government preempted by Federal law the Federal Government predominates.

The principle of States rights has never been surrendered in the hearts and minds of the people of the United States, and I myself in many aspects favor the acceptance of local responsibility and control, not as a sentimental heritage from my forebearers, but as a result of fear of complete control by an impersonal, far-removed power that may not understand the needs and particular problems of the people of my State. Our culture and laws are devised to fit our own situation, and we ourselves can best understand and solve these unusual problems.

So by broad principle, I believe that States on their individual problems can best solve these themselves and should accept these responsibilities.

This is the ideal, but this cannot in reality be the final answer, for in reality there are many pressing problems on which the States have not and probably cannot adequately accept their responsibilities. It is in this area that alternatives become elusive.

This is where our avulsion to Federal aid to education collides with the need to educate. What are our fears? That through Federal aid to education a centralized government will control the minds of the young, and by so doing any future despot could then subvert our country and establish a dictatorship.

In comparing the principle of States rights to the need of educating our young for our national security and well-being the element of danger lies in the control of the curriculum. If Federal Government cannot or does not control the subject matter and accent, these young minds would not be molded to the thinking of the centralized agency.

So I believe the battleground is not whether or not the Federal Government should assist States in their educational needs, but rather whether or not the aid proposed would carry with it controls on the curriculums itself. We have long had Federal aid to education, such as the GI bill which educated so many of our citizens after World War II, who otherwise would not have had such educational opportunities. No one would deny the value of this program.

I believe the greater numbers of Americans today believe that it is proper for the United States to assist the in-

dividual States in the expenses of education; provided this help is given in such a way as to not infringe on the rights of the States to control their own educational policies.

I apply this test to the House elementary and secondary education bill, and I believe the bill insures that the controls of education will remain with State and local school agencies.

Section 604 of the bill is entitled "Federal Control of Education Prohibited." I would like to read this section to you:

> Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by an educational institution or school system.

If this bill is passed by the Senate, money would be allotted to the State and the State would, in turn, distribute this money to the local school districts. Your local school districts that run the schools have no direct contact with the U.S. Government.

This education bill does not carry with it any control on the curriculums. In the church-state battle, the original bill carries with it direct grants to parochial schools, which offended many on the church-state principle. In the committee, this bill was so modified to remove those direct grants. I consulted with religious leaders in my district who opposed these original direct grants to parochial schools, and they were unanimous in stating that almost all objections had been satisfied, and indicated that they could not conscientiously oppose passage in its amended form, especially in view of the good of the bill.

Generally, it is best that States legislate their own affairs and care for their own problems. It has become apparent, however, that the costs of educational facilities are increasing to such a point that many States cannot fully provide the necessary facilities. The question then is whether our children and Nation should be made to suffer as a result of this failure to provide educational opportunities.

Our country today faces a growing need for educational facilities. Today, one-fourth of all Americans are in our Nation's classrooms. Attendance in elementary and secondary schools will increase by 4 million in the next 5 years; 400,000 new classrooms will be needed to meet this growth. And already one-half of our Nation's existing classrooms are more than 30 years old.

Today one student out of three now in the fifth grade will drop out before finishing high school, if the present rate is allowed to continue.

If we want to cut down the number of our citizens on public welfare, the best way is education of the present generation of young people. Lack of education and poverty often go hand in hand. Unemployment of young people with an eighth-grade education is four times the national average. It does not seem reasonable to spend $2,500 a year for a family on relief and only $450 a year per child in our public schools. But these are the facts. These growing needs must be met.

The 16th District of Texas will receive over $2.7 million to help defray the rising costs of education for children of families earning less than $2,000 a year. The school districts will receive needed textbooks and library materials selected by themselves, and the present program of help to local school districts impacted with the children of Federal personnel will be continued for 2 years. This is so important to our communities having a large military population.

Educating our children to the best of their abilities is important not only to our children themselves, but vital to keeping our State and local governments effective and our Nation safe from tyranny. A local community cannot be prosperous and attract new industries with many people unskilled to do the work of the community. A State cannot be effective unless its citizens are educated enough to recognize the needs of the State and meet the responsibilities of citizenship. For our national security we must have brainpower behind our armed might. We must compete and surpass the Communists in the technology race. The more educated a people become, the more it resists Communist tyranny. We cannot hide the fact that today the United States and the entire free world is in a race of minds and technology against the major Communist countries. In an actual sense it is a matter of survival of our system.

We are the oldest constitutional government in the world, but we can no longer dream along in a world of yesteryear, safe and secure in academic arguments.

Our country shall remain strong only as long as the weakest link is made strong enough to cope with the threats and aggressions of our enemies. Armament is not the entire answer to security. Sparta of Greece found this out in ancient times. Our strength as always lies in the utilization of our free spirit, in inventiveness, in the exercise of our minds, to the benefit of us all. Our hope for the future lies in the development of the minds of our young people through education, not only in how many missiles or troops we can send abroad. Latent genius and talent may lie anywhere, in the most crowded city, in the most humble surrounding on the Rio Grande. Young minds are like cotton crops or oilfields. They grow valuable and useful only as you cultivate them and attend to them.

So applying the necessary safeguards to insure local controls of education; considering the advantages to our security with a strong educational system; weighing the great need of our children of poorer families and needs of our less populated areas of the 16th District, and the fact that at least 18 out of 19 counties of our district would qualify for this assistance, I support the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The "Neighbors Abroad" Program in Palo Alto, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Palo Alto, Calif., in my congressional district, are actively engaged in a program of international cooperation and understanding which is worthy of note and comment. Palo Alto, as we all know, is the home of one of our Nation's greatest centers of learning—Stanford University. This distinguished community has historically taken an active interest and role in international relations because of its association with the university which attracts scholars and visitors from throughout the world and which has sent its faculty, students, and graduates to every country.

With this background and rich tradition, the people of Palo Alto have undertaken a new program to help achieve better relations and understanding with their neighbors abroad. They have embarked upon a town affiliation program, which while still in its early stages, is already most successful. I wish to comment briefly upon some of the more significant accomplishments of this program in the hope that by so doing we may encourage more American communities to initiate affiliations with their counterparts in other countries.

Six years ago, in the spring of 1959, Palo Alto's civic leaders began to explore the possibility of establishing a sister city relationship with a foreign city. In the beginning, contacts were made with the American Municipal Association and the U.S. Information Agency in order to obtain advice and guidance regarding the town affiliation program. Several unsuccessful attempts were made to seek out a sister city, and it was not until July 10, 1962, that, quite unexpectedly, the Palo Alto City Council received a letter from Attorney Miguel V. Roca, the mayor of Palo, on the island of Leyte in the Philippine Republic, which contained the heartwarming invitation "to make our two cities twins." On July 23, the Palo Alto City Council voted unanimously to enter into a town affiliation with Palo, and Mayor David B. Haight called a meeting of citizen leaders to develop further plans.

Thirty-five persons, representing 19 Palo Alto organizations, responded to the mayor's call, and during the next 3 months devoted their time, their talents and their energy to planning and organizing an effective program. Representatives of this group visited other communities which had already established sister city affiliations; they discussed their plans with interested individuals and organizations; they began to study about Palo, its people, customs and institutions; they visited the Philippine consulate in San Francisco.

On October 7, 1962, the Municipal Council of the City of Palo unanimously adopted a resolution confirming the affiliation. Shortly thereafter the late General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur, in a letter expressing his pleasure in learning of the affiliation, extolled the bravery of the Palo citizenry in resisting and fighting against the enemy, and stated that "the people of Palo are, indeed, worthy of this honor."

On January 18, 1963, those who had been working to implement the affiliation program selected a name by which it might be symbolized. The name selected was "Neighbors Abroad," and it has proven to be an appropriate appellation for a distinguished and dynamic group of citizens working together to achieve friendship and amity between people.

Since formalization of the town affiliation program. Neighbors Abroad and its counterpart in Palo, the Giants Club—glory is achieved nobly through sacrifice—have accomplished much. While the two cities are separated by nearly 7,000 miles, they and their people are linked by the sister city movement, one facet of the people-to-people program endorsed by the Government of the United States.

A brief recapitulation of some of the accomplishments of the Palo and Palo Alto program may indicate the scope and beauty of the effort. It is obvious, of course, that many of the benefits of such an affiliation are subtle and intangible, but as such, they are perhaps the most meaningful.

An early accomplishment was the purchase and delivery of various pieces of sports equipment for the children of Palo. The funds for this gift were collected by junior high school children in Palo Alto who sponsored a "Philippine fiesta" at their school and by a local sports group, the Palo Club. The sports equipment was delivered personally to the people of Palo by Navy commander, Robert Bergner, a resident of Palo Alto.

One of the greatest health problems facing the citizens of Palo is the prevalence of parasitic diseases which cause great suffering, decrease average life expectancy to 42 years, and affect even those not afflicted because of their adverse effect on agricultural productivity. Schistosomiasis, or snail fever, is endemic to the Palo area. About 80 percent of the children over 10 years of age have this crippling disease. It was learned that the lack of shoes or other footwear was a contributing factor to the high incidence of the disabling, often fatal disease, and also to the prevalence of hookworm.

Palo Alto's most dramatic venture in cooperating in the fight against the parasitic disease, and one which highlights Palo Alto's desire to involve large numbers of the local community in the sister city program was the collection and shipment or more than 4 tons of shoes for the young people of Palo. These shoes were distributed in Palo by trained personnel who instructed the recipients in the prophylactic properties of the shoes—in many cases, the first to be worn by the children. Through the generosity and cooperation of Mayor Villegas, of Manila, also a participant in the sister city program, the shoes were freed from customs on the docks in Manila.

Neighbors Abroad has encouraged Palo Altans to visit Palo, and several have already done so. Three residents of Palo have visited Palo Alto and have met with the sister city committee. Continued efforts are being made to promote reciprocal visits, but the great geographic distance between the communities is a definite deterrent.

Many other commendable accomplishments have already been realized. A detailed listing is, however, impossible here, but it should be pointed out that the people of the two towns have developed and strengthened a great and lasting bond between themselves. The citizens, and particularly the students, are exchanging letters; Palo Altans assisted in the establishment of the first library for Palo; Palo Alto has participated annually in the Palo fiesta, and purchased the perpetual crown for the queen; direct communication between community leaders has been achieved through the amateur radio network; each city has given and each has received. The relationship between the two is excellent and mutually rewarding.

During the planning stages of Palo Alto's sister city program, it had seemed highly probable that a city in the Western Hemisphere would be the most logical affiliate for the community. Indeed, in the fall of 1961, the Palo Alto City Council had developed a series of criteria and characteristics for their sister city. Ideally, she was to be in Latin America—to compare with Palo Alto's Spanish and Mexican background and traditions. Preferably, she was to be a university city—again like Palo Alto—and should be relatively comparable in population.

A city which met all of these qualifications was Oaxaca, Mexico. The U.S. Department of State assisted in the preliminary explorations. Neighbors Abroad and the Palo Alto City Council sustained interest in developing an affiliation with Oaxaca, and such was accomplished during the early part of 1964. Relations between Oaxaca, and Palo Alto have proceeded rapidly and excellently. Only 2,000 miles separate the two communities, thus facilitating personal visits. Many Palo Alto residents have already visited the unique city of Oaxaca, rich in culture and tradition.

In May 1964, Oaxaca's distinguished young major, Dr. Horacio Tenorio Sandoval, and his charming and beautiful wife visited Palo Alto to participate in the community's colorful May Festival. Dr. Tenorio served as cogrand marshal of the festival. Later that same month, Palo Alto's major, Dean R. Cresap, city council member, Mrs. Frances Dias, and city manager, Jerome Keithley, visited Oaxaca.

This was only the beginning of what is already an outstanding sister city affiliation. Last December, for example, 10 young people from Oaxaca arrive to spend 1 month in Palo Alto's homes and schools. The competition to host the children was great, but 10 Palo Alto families are now richer for this unique experience.

Neighbors Abroad is now developing final plans to send Palo Alto youngsters to Oaxaca this coming summer. Again, the competition for this unique aspect of the sister city program was intense and generated even greater interest in Neighbors Abroad and the people-to-people program. The 10 high school students have now been selected and are now preparing for their trip to Oaxaca where they will live with individual Mexican families, attend public school and serve as able ambassadors of Neighbors Abroad and their country, thus completing a two-way exchange—the first of an annual program.

The people of Palo Alto, and particularly those who have worked to create and support the sister city program, are to be complimented for their outstanding work in promoting improved understanding and more cordial relations between the people of the world.

Second District of Illinois Participates in Historic March in Alabama

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor and experienced the pride of mentioning on several occasions the participation in freedom's fight in Alabama of the good men and women of the Second Congressional District of Illinois.

I have mentioned the experience of Ralph Fertig, one of the pioneers from our district who some 2 years or so ago, was thrown into a jail in Alabama and frightfully beaten by his jailers, all in the cause of freedom.

It has been my privilege to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the graphic and moving narrative of her experience in Selma by Emily Taft Douglas, wife of the great senior Senator from Illinois and resident of, and voter in, the Second Congressional District. Dr. Walter Johnson has furnished me with the names of distinguished American historians recruited by him for the finishing lap of the historic march, all of which I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent graciously granted to me, I am now including in my remarks the complete text of the article in the April 1, 1965, issue of the Hyde Park Herald, by the Honorable Leon M. Despres, alderman of the fifth ward in the city of Chicago. At a future date I hope to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete list of persons from the Second District who participated in the march in Alabama, a list which is now being prepared by Mrs. Walter Johnson and Alderman Despres.

Alderman Despres' article in the Hyde Park Herald follows:

OBSERVATIONS FROM THE CONFEDERACY

(By Leon M. Despres, fifth ward alderman)

Taking part in last Thursday's voting rights demonstration in Montgomery, Ala., was one of the great experiences of a lifetime. For all who went, it was an opportunity to participate in a historic event and give encouragement to actions which will immensely improve the entire United States. Our community has a vital, direct stake in the success of the Alabama vote drive.

Our planeload of 92, sponsored by Alderman Chew, arrived at Montgomery at 11:30 Thursday morning. The keynote for the day was struck immediately at the airport under an official city sign which read: "Welcome to Montgomery."

The Reverend Aron Gilmartin, a Unitarian pastor from California, addressed us and said: "As soon as the afternoon program is concluded, you are asked to proceed immediately to the area where the special buses will pick you up for the airport. It is absolutely essential that all demonstrators leave Montgomery immediately after the program, because we expect the troopers and the National Guard to be withdrawn this evening."

The remarks from Mr. Gilmartin showed at once how different this demonstration was from the 1963 march on Washington. The march on Washington was a dramatic, national, social, and religious affirmation of equality in the midst of hospitable national shrines in the Capital of our Nation.

The march on Montgomery was a tense drive for equality at an unhospitable shrine in the capital of the Confederacy.

The bus took us quickly on U.S. 80 to the campsite at the edge of the city, and we were able to join the end of the column of marchers a short distance away. The 4-mile march itself was sensational. The first part lay in an all-Negro section of Montgomery, and the second part in an all-white section and the central business district.

During the first part, crowds lined the streets, waved at us, spoke to us, smiled, wept, nodded, and expressed encouragement and exultation. They made a wonderful show of southern hospitality. One example that stands out was a man at one corner, all smiles, who graciously held out cold, opened bottles of Pepsi-Cola for thirsty marchers. Apparently he had been doing this during the entire 2½ hours of the march. People heard the loudspeakers' appeals to join the march and fell in. A few people were reserved, but not many.

The invisible line which divides Negro housing from white housing, as it does in Chicago, came next. There we saw a segregated white firehouse just like most fire houses in Chicago. There we saw stony-faced, silent white people crowding the porches as we marched by. I saw only one porch return our waves. Our lines fell silent too. The joy of the earlier part of the march transformed into quite different feelings. Earlier, when we passed a segregated Negro school, the pupils couldn't stop smiling and waving, no matter how often we photographed them. Later, students at the windows of a segregated private white school couldn't stop looking stern, and turned their backs when we photographed them.

More hostile people lined the streets in the business section. Their passions led them to line the streets even though Governor Wallace had asked all white people to stay away. Here we met the jeers which reporters have written about. Here the parade marshals began to look anxious, asked us to close ranks, urged us not to talk to the crowd, told us not to step out of line for photographs, and kept perfect order. The watchers' hostility had to be seen and heard to be believed. Southern hospitality stopped when the inhabitants changed color.

The military protection was overwhelming. Naturally there were soldiers along the line of march, but you could see how impressive the protection was when you looked a block away and saw that there were sentries at all streets, reserve companies of foot and motorized equipment, and soldiers on roof tops. In all directions, you saw soldiers with communications equipment held to their ears for continuous attention. There were FBI men in the unmistakable Brooks Bros. suits, and probably a great many other Federal representatives sprinkled throughout the crowd.

At the capitol, the area of the demonstration was clearly marked out by sawhorses, and we were the prisoners of our protectors, with ample latitude for the demonstration but no right to move outside the area. Stretched across the capitol steps, two rows of uniformed Alabama State officers barred our way. Behind them on the steps and at the windows of the capitol, white Alabama State personnel watched the demonstration with concern.

On top of the capitol flew the flag of Alabama, and under it, the flag of the Confederacy. There was no flag of the United States.

Everywhere among the demonstrators were priests, ministers, rabbis, and nuns. Their very number was awe-inspiring. Even they, perhaps especially they, were unwelcome to white Alabamians. At the airport, a young white man with a baby in his arms looked up at some priests and asked: "Are you Catholic fathers?" "Yes," answered one. "I am Catholic, too," said the young man, "and now that you have been here, I hope you will stay home. We don't need you here." That was all. However, other Alabamians need them desperately; and perhaps the young white man does too.

The program itself was deeply moving, especially Dr. King's talk. I felt that he summarized the situation well when he said: "Segregation is on its deathbed in Alabama, and the only question is how costly Governor Wallace and the segregationists are going to make the funeral."

I talked with as many Negro Alabamians as I could. I found them tremendously encouraged, courageous, and proud over what is taking place. Last Thursday, however, it was not possible for me to find white Alabamians to talk with.

I wish that every fifth ward resident could have been in Montgomery last Thursday.

One eight-year-old white boy I read about expressed the sentiments held by our community. When his father asked him if he understood what the President was talking about on TV, he said he thought the President meant, "the colored people should be free."

The march to Montgomery helped hasten that day of freedom. I think Alabama will never again be quite the same. I hope that soon, over the dome of that State capitol of Montgomery, where Jefferson Davis changed flags in 1861, there will once again fly not the Confederate flag of racial supremacy but the American flag of freedom and equality.

Mr. Speaker, here is a partial list of the men and women who marched in Montgomery with Alderman Despres and his daughter Linda:

Charles Henderson, 1451 East 55th Street.

Mrs. Elizabeth Elwin and her daughters, Susan and Katherine Elwin, Bernadette Vial, Victoria Pyle, 5603 South Dorchester.

Norman Adamson, 7004 South Merrill.

Henry Seele, 5459 South Blackstone Avenue.

Dr. Ruth Lerner, 1525 East 53d Street.

Mrs. Helen Ketterer, 5481 Ridgewood Court.

Dr. William Shoemaker and his son Robert, 4908 South Kimbark Avenue.

Mrs. Deborah Meier, 1343 East 50th Street.

Janet Linford, 5435 South Kenwood Avenue.

Dr. Edgar H. S. Chandler, 1366 East 58th Street.

Mr. Devereaux L. Bowley, Jr., 5558 South Kimbark Avenue.

Mrs. Betty Nance, 5122 South Woodlawn Avenue.

Mr. Elliott Knauer, 4919 South Dorchester Avenue.

Curtis Hayes, 6011 South Woodlawn Avenue.

Rev. Earl Neil, 6451 South Woodlawn Avenue.

Rev. Bellarmine Wilson, 6426 South Dante.

Prof. Jacob W. Getzels, 5704 South Dorchester Avenue.

Fabian Necheles.

Mr. and Mrs. Peter Bright and two children, 1336 Hyde Park Boulevard.

Eugene and Jeanette Dibble, 1227 East Madison Park.

Mr. John C. Godbie, 5432 South Woodlawn Avenue.

Dr. Quentin Young, 1512 East 55th Street.

Fredericka McDew, 1170 East 54th Street.

Sherwin Kaplan, 1601 East 55th Street.

Manpower Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4257) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. BELL. Madam Chairman, as one of those who supported the Manpower Development and Retraining Act from the very beginning, I wish to say that I support this bill now and the improvements contained herein as they relate to that program.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C* — 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Getty., Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*
Grider, George W., *Tenn*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

Hebrew Academy of Washington Celebrates 21st Anniversary—Leon Cherner Honored—Israel Ambassador Harman Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, education must prepare our youth for a rapidly changing, complex, and diverse society. Institutions of learning must respect the individual in order to encourage the development of humane and enlightened men and women, and must effect the character and quality of living. To do this, education must itself represent excellence in all its teachings.

Last night the excellence that can be reached by educational institutions was indeed evident as the Hebrew Academy of Washington celebrated its 21st anniversary at the Shoreham Hotel. In celebrating its year of maturity, the Hebrew Academy honored Leon Cherner, a citizen appreciated locally, and nationally and internationally, for his leadership in community affairs and his religious and charitable participation.

Approximately 900 were in attendance at the dinner meeting which opened with an invocation by Rabbi Nathan Abramowitz of the Tifereth Israel Congregation. Jerry Wolman served as chairman of this year's testimonial. The well-known owner of the Philadelphia professional football team, and prominent builder, characterized Mr. Cherner "as a founder and devoted member of the Academy's society of patrons. His outstanding generosity and liberal support" are worthy of emulation. Participants in the program included Norman C. Kal, toastmaster; Randy Howard Cherner; and Dr. Solomon N. Skaist, principal of the Hebrew Academy, who gave the benediction.

In extending greetings Charles R. Beacham, vice president of the Ford Motor Company, spoke of the coming-of-age of the Academy and expressed tribute to Leon Cherner, "a good friend who is an outstanding citizen of his community, and a highly respected representative of the automobile industry."

Beacham went on to say:

I have known Mr. Leon Cherner for many years, and worked closely with him, and it is not at all surprising to me that he should be your guest of honor tonight.

Some men give a great deal of themselves to their chosen business or profession, and are very successful; but find they have little time or energy left over for service to their community.

Other public-spirited individuals give generously of their time and energy for many worthy causes—for awhile, that is, until their business begins to suffer for want of attention.

But now and then comes along one of those truly gifted individuals who demonstrates that it is possible—if one has the courage, the understanding, the desire and the enterprise—to do all things well.

Leon Cherner is such a man. He long has been a pace setter in the automobile business, and the honor you are paying him here tonight is ample testimony of the position he has earned as a respected member and benefactor of his community.

Louis C. Grossberg, chairman of the Society of Patrons, addressed the gathering and told of the progress of the school and the honors achieved by the students of the Hebrew Academy. He gave a warm and heartfelt tribute to the honoree, Leon Cherner.

The presentation of a coveted award to Mr. Cherner was made by the Honorable Avraham Harman, Ambassador of Israel. Excerpts of his eloquent remarks will follow later.

Responding to the presentation, the recipient replied:

"I would be less than honest if I didn't admit it's nice hearing good things about myself. (Now maybe my wife, my sisters, and my partner Henry Gertler, will appreciate what a bargain they have in me.)"

Mr. President, it was my privilege, as a friend of Leon Cherner, Norman C. Kal and others who were participants and who are constructive citizens, to be present on this significant occasion. I am a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Education and it is officially gratifying to join those citizens who help to strengthen the many forceful facets of our educational system.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the remarks of Louis C. Grossberg and Ambassador Avraham Harman and the response by Leon Cherner at the 21st anniversary banquet of the Hebrew Academy of Washington, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE MESSAGE OF LOUIS C. GROSSBERG, CHAIRMAN, SOCIETY OF PATRONS

Joseph Andelman, the president of the academy, who is prevented for reasons beyond his control from being here tonight, asked me to bring greetings to you, ladies and gentlemen.

Let's look at the record. In 1943 a handful of dedicated men—mostly rabbis, founded the academy with an enrollment of 17 children. They had no money, no building, no general acceptance, very little prospects for the future. They did have, what Jews throughout the generations have always had—an abiding faith that "Got vet farsorgen" translated "The Lord will provide."

Our enrollment today consists on einhoro of over 450 boys and girls. They come from every background of religious life—orthodox, conservative, and reform. The faculty, in all departments of the school, are most highly qualified and dedicated educators. In the California achievement tests our children have scored grades which place them 2 years ahead of normal. Our graduates are achieving highest honors throughout this country's leading high schools and colleges. This, because of the excellent primary education they receive at the academy's secular studies. The Hebrew department provides our youngsters with the kind of basic knowledge of Hebrew which will stand them in good stead if they wish to pursue their studies further, or, in any event, gives them an insight into the rich and glorious heritage which is their birthright.

We now have a magnificent school building which every Washington Jew can—and does—point to, with pride. Many of our sincere, fine Jewish friends in days gone by, unaware of the great good their children could derive from attendance at the academy, refused to send their children there. Today all this has changed. We have youngsters whose parents are in the professions, in business, in the diplomatic corps—in fact one of our last year's graduates is the daughter of Ambassador and Mrs. Avraham Harman who are with us tonight.

In 1943 the academy had no money. We still need money. However, we do have ways and means now of getting the funds we need. We get it from tuition, the telefund campaign, the society of patrons each member of which contributes $550. or more annually to our scholarship fund: the Foundation for the Hebrew Academy of Washington, Inc., this annual donor dinner, and, last, but not least, from the activities of the ladies of the academy auxiliary. It is thus apparent that the Hebrew Academy is a flourishing institution.

On the occasion of celebrating the 21st annual dinner of the Hebrew Academy at which you, Leon Cherner are the honoree, I have the unusual distinction of wearing 3 hats and I am quite happy to tip each one of them to you, Leon.

I am chairman of the Society of Patrons of the Hebrew Academy. I tip this hat to you, Leon for the enthusiastic help you have given us since the society was formed some 7 years ago. Not only as a charter member of the society of patrons but in many other ways, notably through your help in the telefund campaign, has your ardent support been felt.

Leon, I tip my hat to you for the dedication you have displayed in our efforts toward implemeting the Israel bond program. As chairman of Fiduciary Investments you have been instrumental, in your quiet, efficient way—in inducing many of our local banks and trust funds adminstrators to purchase bonds in considerable amounts. You, personally Leon, each year buy Israel bonds in large amounts and handsomely contribute to the United Jewish Appeal.

As president of the Jewish Community Council I have the honor and pleasure to commend you Leon for all the wonderful things you have done for many of the 130 affiliated organizations that comprise the membership of the council. Be it the home for the aged, the Jewish Community Center, your synagogue, which I personally know owes to you and your family a good deal

for its very existence; to the B'nai B'rith or any worthwhile cause here or elsewhere, Jewish or non-Jewish which needs a helping hand, they find in you a ready and gracious response.

There are many meanings to many words; there is a meaning to the word, "truth"—there is a meaning to the word "charity"—there is a meaning to the word "selflessness"—there is a meaning to the word "devotion." The best of these meanings come to the fore when we, who know you mention the name Leon Cherner. The standards you set for your community responsibilities are high indeed. Yet you never shirked any of them, in fact, you surpassed them.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE AVRAHAM HARMAN, AMBASSADOR OF ISRAEL TO THE UNITED STATES

There are three reasons why I am very grateful for your invitation to be present here when you are celebrating the 21st anniversary of the Hebrew Academy of Washington and are paying such richly deserved tribute to Leon Cherner.

The first is that my three children have had the benefit of attending the Hebrew Academy and the Midrasha which is connected with it. The academy is a fine school, well administered, and with an outstanding group of teachers. I would like to express my appreciation to the academy for having given my children a deep understanding of their Jewish roots, excellent facilities for their general education, and an understanding and appreciation of American life and civilization which I hope will remain with them throughout their lives.

The second reason is that I have the honor to represent here in Washington a country in which the Hebrew civilization came into existence, and where in our day it has been revived. Just a short time ago we received a further understanding of the depth of this ancient root and of its persistence. A group of our archeologists from the Hebrew University have just completed their season of digging at the Fortress of Massada, overlooking the southern end of the Dead Sea, where our ancestors made their last stand against the Roman conqueror over 1900 years ago. The men of the Hebrew University found 17 fragments of scrolls that have been buried in those ancient days, and they could read them with as much fluency as they read their morning newspapers published in Tel Aviv.

I believe that this is an example of the durability and supremacy of the free human spirit enshrined in our faith and civilization which have overcome all the pressure and tyranny and which persist to this day.

I believe, too, that the Hebrew academy itself is a great example of the superiority of the free spirit over tyranny. Your institution was founded in 1943 when it seemed that nazism, which had proclaimed an all-out war against Judea, was set to win. But here you are, 21 years later, proudly celebrating the steady progress and growth of a school dedicated to teaching eternal truth. The tyrant of 21 years ago is gone. We can look forward in the hope that that will be the destiny of all tyranny.

My third reason for being here is that since my arrival in Washington I have had the pleasure of knowing your guest of honor. Our paths have crossed in many places. I have the pleasure of worshipping in the same synagogue and know how greatly he has helped his Congregation Tiferet Israel to consolidate and expand its many spiritual and educational services to its growing membership. I am very grateful indeed, to him for his oustanding leadership in the economic progress and development of my country through Israel bonds. He has interested many people in this effort in which he himself has participated in such an outstanding way. I know that he has played a similar role in all public causes in Washington, and in the Jewish community of this city.

His concern and dedication to the Hebrew academy is just one example of this. He is indeed, a symbol of the men that we speak about in synagogue in our prayers every Sabbath, and on whom we call down divine blessings, "those who concern themselves with the affairs of the community in good faith." It is a great pleasure to be given the opportunity of coming here tonight to convey to him on your behalf a plaque honoring him on this occasion.

EXCERPTS FROM RESPONSE BY LEON CHERNER, THE HONOREE

I stand here as a representative of all of you; you who really deserve the recognition—you who provide the support for this 21st annual banquet of the Hebrew Academy—you, without who, there wouldn't be any good causes.

Some people say I'm a good salesman. It's true that my life is people—that I love people, but I think you must be good salesmen, too. Let's say we're sold on each other—and sold on the importance of the work we do together.

How can I thank you all? Even if I had the words, they would be poor compared to the thanks you all deserve.

As a symbol of our business, I thank John Connors, Charles Beacham, and the others from the Ford Motor Co. who have given their weekend to be with us. As a symbol of our community, I thank our many associates from the banking world who are paying us interest tonight.

And, as your symbol, I personally thank each of you for making me your guest of honor. I am grateful to you all for the previous memory you have given me. God bless you all.

Fair Employment for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, this last week I had expected to address the closing session of a very interesting Industrial Relations Institute at the Alameda Naval Air Station, which adjoins my congressional district in California.

Unfortunately, our consideration of the education bill precluded my attendance, but the address was made in my absence by my sister, Mrs. Charlotte Danforth.

My remarks were directed at the critical problem of providing and promoting fair and equal consideration in employment, a consideration which is all-too-frequently denied today. I believe that our colleagues and all who are concerned with this important question may find these remarks of interest.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JEFFERY COHELAN, BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS INSTITUTE, ALAMEDA NAVAL AIR STATION, MARCH 27, 1965

I would like to speak to you today not strictly about the problems of industrial relations or personal management, for this has been your program for almost a week. Rather, I would like to talk about a related but much broader problem with which we all need to be concerned—the problem of more effectively utilizing our human resources; of seeing to it that every American is allowed to work to the fullest of his abilities.

In Selma, Ala., and in the Congress of the United States, a vigorous movement is underway to insure that Negroes and all other minority group members are no longer denied the right to vote in any election; that they are no longer prevented from fully exercising this fundamental right which is so clearly guaranteed by our Constitution.

But guaranteeing the right to vote—a right which has been most frequently and flagrantly abused in the South—is only one important step that must be taken. We must also move, and move forcefully, to insure fair and equal consideration in employment—whether it be government or private—and this is not only a southern problem, it is a national problem.

When we talk of the free enterprise system, we think in terms of a free market in which goods, talent, and ideas move freely without artificial restrictions.

This system has served us well and during the last 5 years, with the help of new depreciation schedules and a significant tax cut, we have achieved a record of prosperity unparalleled in our history. Yet this system has shown some serious imperfections which contradict its goals and have caused this Nation to fall short of its potential.

We know, for example, that we enjoy a standard of living unmatched anywhere in the world. But we also know that 35 million Americans fall below the line of poverty with family incomes of less than $3,000 a year.

We know that the American factory worker earns more than $100 a week. But we also know that millions of Americans are growing up in families where the father, if there is one at all, has never been able to work, or who has worked at common labor all his life because he has never had the chance to do anything else.

We know that our colleges are graduating more students than ever before. But we also know that each year more than 100,000 young people with leadership potential do not go on because they lack the economic means.

We know that nearly 1 million teenagers are looking for work, and when the additional ingredient of skin color is added, the figure becomes a national disgrace.

Last year fully 23 percent of all nonwhite teenage boys and 31 percent of all nonwhite teenage girls were unemployed and seeking work.

In the adult labor force, the unemployment rate for nonwhites was twice as great as for whites, and the preparation of persons regularly on part time because of the inability to find full-time work was five times as high.

The great tragedy of these shameful inconsistencies and inequities is that they are caused largely by artificial barriers—by inadequate education, by a cycle of poverty which viciously perpetuates itself, by poor health, and most important, by discrimination based on race, religion, and national heritage.

The loss that has resulted from this discrimination in employment has not only been deep in human suffering, it has been deep in lost potential as well. As a matter of fact, the Department of Commerce calculated recently that in failing to utilize Negroes and other minority group members at their present levels of training and education, the Nation was wasting a substantial portion of their productivity and contribution to the national ecenomy. The loss figure set for 1963 was a staggering $11.1 billion.

The report also stated that if Negroes and other nonwhites were permitted to achieve the same educational levels as their white neighbors, and if discrimination did not hamper their full participation in the econ-

omy, that the gross national product in 1964 could have been expanded by nearly $22 billion.

And let us not think that this underemployment and unemployment—this waste of human resources and potential—will be relieved by sheer economic expansion alone.

Last year our economy grew by $38 billion. But in his Economic Report to Congress in January of this year, President Johnson pointed out that another similar gain would do little more than enable us to hold our own.

These huge losses because of what might be called economic obtuseness or social blindness are not unique to history. For hundreds of years, the economic and social systems of countries have been hampered by class distinctions. At one time, unless you were born into the aristocracy, you had little hope of attaining a position of authority or responsibility. Yet this form of foolish snobbery and wastefulness passed and today the sons and grandsons of farmers, laborers, and poor immigrants are the managers of great enterprises.

Hopefully, we are at long last beginning a period that will see the just end to discrimination based on the irrelevancy of race.

We have the moral impetus, spurred on by the fight to secure full voting rights.

We have the economic motivation made clear in lost purchasing power and human potential.

We have the executive mandate, which all of you are familiar with, banning discrimination in Federal employment and by those doing business with the Federal Government.

And we have the congressional commands of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 making unlawful discrimination based on race, or religion, or national origin by any employer, by any union, or by any employment agency.

All this is essential, but more still is required.

This country's great productive capability is based essentially on four factors: on capital investment, intelligent management, the advanced state of our technology, and the skills of our labor force.

These factors must work together, they must grow almost abreast, but the contribution of the labor force has been lagging through insufficient preparation and use of our manpower. There has been a steady shift toward demand for higher skill levels, but our educational and training systems and our social customs have not provided them.

And it is significant to note, I think, that while every estimate of future manpower needs indicates that professional and technical jobs requiring high degrees of education and skills are increasing most rapidly, that nearly two-thirds of all nonwhites are working in unskilled jobs. It is really any wonder then that our newspaper want ads are filled with thousands of open jobs while our unemployment remains consistently around 5 percent? And that is 5 percent of a labor force that has grown by 4¾ million jobs in the last 4 years.

There is no possible way that discrimination can be fully ended or the efficient matching of workers and job opportunities completely accomplished by the Federal Government alone.

We can follow the kind of fiscal and monetary policies that will help sustain growth, and we have done this through the tax cut, the revised depreciation schedules, and our protection of the dollar's stability .

We can develop programs aimed at freeing business and government from the social customs that have restricted the choice of workers, and we have done this through the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Executive orders on employment, and the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

We can make Federal resources available to help upgrade the labor force and we have done so through the Manpower Development and Training Act, the poverty program, and the Vocational Education Act.

All this and more we can begin, develop, and make available. But in a free nation such as ours, these efforts will all be for naught unless the programs are seized upon and used by the people.

In the long run it will be the leaders of our communiites, it will be you who are participating in this institute and who are leaders in your own fields, who will create the climate, who will make the decisions, and who will take the steps necessary to rid our land of the dread disease of discrimination and move our country forward to fulfill its rich potential.

But let me offer a few suggestions, which hopefully may encourage and stimulate further discussion, for the responsibility mut be taken and the problem must be met. The future of our free and democratic society demands it.

First, we can work in the business community to expand and further programs of equal opportunity in hiring and retention; to encourage them in the areas where they already exist and to develop them where they do not. Here in the bay area, leadership has been taken by some companies, and good records have been established by others, but certainly much more can be done.

Second, we can make an all-out effort, in government as well as in business, to let every manager, every foreman, every personnel man, and every worker know that we mean business when we say that skin color, and national origin, and religion are not to be part of our selection and our promotion system.

Third, we can be sure that we live up to the intent as well as the letter of Executive Orders No. 10925 and No. 11114 which ban discrimination because of race, creed, color or national origin in employment by the Federal Government, by those who do business with the Government, and on all federally assisted contract work. Let us be sure that our own actions and our own attitudes are as highly motivated as the law.

Fourth, we can give consideration to compensatory efforts and compensatory opportunities. Equality in hiring should mean that every worker is considered on an equal basis, but such often cannot be the case today. For many, many years some Americans, and the Negro in particular, have been systematically denied and deprived the conditions—the education, the training, and the experience—that would make this equality possible.

Is it not equally possible then that we could compensate in some fair manner for these past denials; that extra consideration could be given in placement, in on-the-job training, and in other areas, without infringing on the equally legitimate rights of other workers? Proper application may not be easy but certainly the problem warrants our efforts.

Fifth, and finally, we can let everyone around us know—relatives, friends, employees, and associates—that by denying equal opportunities to our fellow citizens because of the color of their skin, or the country of their birth, of the place where they may worship, that we make hypocrisy of our democracy. We not only betray ourselves, but we compromise our history and we weaken our resolve before the world.

We Americans of this decade are offered a rare opportunity. For a hundred years and more, the promise of our law has been equality but our precepts have not been equaled by our deeds.

Now, however, we can make the dreams and the promises a reality. We can wipe out the last roadblocks to full equality in voting and we can break down the last stubborn barriers to full participation in employment.

The task is already begun. With your help, and your neighbors, and your neighbors' neighbors, we can succeed and America can truly be the land of the free.

Senator Magnuson, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, all of us here in the Senate are familiar with the traits of the chairman of the Commerce Committee which make him one of the most respected, effective, and best liked legislators on Capitol Hill. However, the world outside is not blessed with the opportunity to be closely associated with this affable gentleman. An excellent article, published in the April 2 issue of the Wall Street Journal, points up many of the qualities of Chairman MAGNUSON which endear him to his colleagues. In order that other people can better understand this gentleman from Washington, I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE "MAGGIE"—IN A CASUAL WAY, WASHINGTON'S MAGNUSON GETS MUCH DONE

(By Dan Cordtz)

WASHINGTON.—If a Senate poll were taken to pick that clubby group's half dozen most popular, most influential, and most anonymous Members, chances are that on all three lists would appear one name:

"MAGGIE."

That's the way it would be put down on most ballots, too. For to his affectionate colleagues, the full name of WARREN G. MAGNUSON is somehow too stiff to go with his casual, unbuttoned informality. Even after 20 years as Democratic Senator from the State of Washington, he exudes an air of good fellowship that prompts total strangers to call him by his nickname.

Presiding over a public hearing in the bluff, rambling fashion, chewing a big cigar and with his dark-rimmed spectacles slipping down his ruddy nose, he can appear a faintly comic figure. Grammatical slips, mispronunciations, and malapropisms are not unknown to him, and he persistently confuses such terms as "balance of trade" and "balance of payments."

If this manner occasionally traps an outsider into taking Senator MAGNUSON for less than he is, it doesn't deceive his peers. His name may mean little to the public outside his home State, but within the club it carries unmistakable weight. The point is being proved once more in the case of the proposed law to require health warnings on cigarette packages. The introduction of a Magnuson bill was the signal for 2 weeks of full-dress hearings which wind up today. If he cares to declare himself, the Senator from Washington will undoubtedly have a great deal to say about whether the final law applies to cigarette advertising as well as package labels.

Senator MAGNUSON's official credentials alone guarantee attention to his views. He is chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, whose legislative jurisdiction affects an estimated 90 percent

of the Nation's industry and commerce; he is chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which holds the purse strings of most Federal regulatory agencies; and he is chairman of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee, which doles out contributions to colleagues at election time.

Senator MAGNUSON also enjoys the special status that goes with long service (he ranks eighth in seniority), a place on the Democratic policy committee and membership in the Senate's shadowy inner circle. He is one of the few active remnants of the fading "establishment" which helped Lyndon B. Johnson run the Senate for nearly 8 years. The President and Senator MAGNUSON, in fact, share a close personal friendship that goes back almost to the day in 1937 when both were sworn into the House of Representatives.

PRESIDENT WAS BEST MAN

"We came here together, went to war together, and came back together," the Senator declares proudly. He modestly omits the fact that the President served as best man last year when Senator MAGNUSON married Mrs. Jermaine Peralta, a Seattle widow.

More important than official rank and highly placed friends, though, is the all but universal fondness felt for Senator MAGNUSON by men of the most diverse political persuasion. Conservative Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat of Arizona, who has spent 38 years in the Chamber, labels him "a Senator's Senator." (One popular definition: "A man who, if he can't help you win, helps you look good losing.") Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, declares, "MAGGIE doesn't have an enemy on either side of the aisle." Adds liberal Democrat PHIL HART, of Michigan: "He is just one of the really nice guys in this place."

A psychiatrist might contend the 60-year-old Senator's desire for friendship reflects a childhood insecurity. Orphaned at the age of 3 weeks, he was adopted by a Swedish family in Minnesota. But at the age of 17, he worked his way west—riding freight trains and doing farm labor—until he reached Seattle. Seven years later, he had worked his way through the University of Washington and its law school and in 1933 won his first election, to the State legislature. Since then he has been in 23 more and won them all, although he received the scare of his life in 1962 when an unknown minister came within 45,000 votes of turning him out of his Senate seat.

Like many of those in the Senate, Senator MAGNUSON seems to find most of his pleasure in the company of his fellow club members. He plays poker with a congressional group almost every Thursday night, attends football and baseball games with Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia. A good companion, he is fond of telling funny stories about his fellow Scandinavians. Before his marriage, he was one of the capital's gayer bachelors; now he spends most evenings reading and works at painting on the weekends. He is an unabashed sentimentalist, a quality that endears him to his frequently thickskinned Senate mates.

But popularity on Capitol Hill is more than a matter of being a pleasant, amusing "nice guy." To get along, goes the proverb, go along. And Senator MAGNUSON tries hard to help his colleagues wherever possible. Some outside critics suggest he is a bit too accommodating and even something of a "wheeler-dealer." But the most sternly moralistic among his fellow Senators deny there is anything sinister about his horse-trading.

"MAGGIE" wouldn't compromise with principle," one realistic Senate veterans says, "but he's not one of those fellows who looks for a moral issue in every little political proposal. He's not dogmatic or doctrinaire. He can give a little on most things. Some of these birds around here see everything in such categorical terms, they never have any room to maneuver."

Placing Senator MAGNUSON within the ideological spectrum is not easy. Both the Americans for Constitutional Action and the Americans for Democratic Action rate him, on his voting record, as a solid liberal. He wears that badge proudly, but adds that he is a conservative in fiscal matters. "I helped cut $6 billion off the Federal budget in the last 10 years," he declares. Some of his friends describe him as an instinctive conservative whose natural bent is tempered by political realism and a soft heart.

Even when he is sheepherding an administration proposal or one of his own through his committee, moreover, Senator MAGNUSON is always seeking the sort of consensus so dear to his friend in the White House. And if he finds it impossible to get, he's quite content to let the matter rest until a better day. "We seldom pass a bill in the Commerce Committee that isn't pretty well agreed on," he remarks.

NO ARM TWISTER

Nor is such agreement the grudging result of any arm twisting on his part. The chairman of a Senate committee enjoys broad power, and more than one has been known to use it tyranically at times. But not the senior Senator from Washington. His permissiveness makes the public hearings of the Commerce Committee the most relaxed in town. It encourages many members to indulge their penchant for comedy, and occasionally reduces the time schedule to a shamble. Once the doors are closed on executive sessions, committee members say, their chairman is brisker, but never domineering.

So adroitly has Senator MAGNUSON steered clear of controversy that he has really only been embroiled in a couple of bitter, knockdown battles. One was the dispute over construction of a multipurpose dam in Idaho's Hells Canyon in 1956 and the other was the 1959 wrangle over Senate confirmation of Adm. Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce (Senator MAGNUSON suffered one of his infrequent defeats when the big dam was rejected in favor of two low-level dams, but he was on the winning side as Admiral Strauss was retired to private life).

When he is forced into the line of fire, Senator MAGNUSON usually emerges magically unscathed. He pushed the public accommodations section of the civil rights bill and the communications satellite bill through his committee without alienating either the southerners violently opposed to the first or the liberals adamantly against the second. Second-ranking committee Democrat JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, on the other hand, was raked from both sides and lost the election for assistant majority leader partly as a result.

But his fellow Senators don't just like Senator MAGNUSON; they trust him. "Everybody knows MAGGIE's not out to do anybody in," explains a colleague of years' standing. "He has no further political ambitions, so he's not trying to take anything away from somebody else. All he wants is to be liked." This attitude, plus his acceptability to L.B.J. and the Senate's elders, was responsible for Senator MAGNUSON's selection (over then Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY) as head of the Senatorial Campaign Committee.

As they trust his good faith, moreover, Senator MAGNUSON's colleagues also trust his instincts and judgment. "I doubt," asserts a strong liberal, that MAGGIE ever read the civil rights bill clear through. He doesn't have a mind that focuses on detail and niceties. But he came down hard on the right side." And if he is no deep thinker, he is also far from ill informed where his own legislative specialties are concerned.

RELIANCE ON STAFFS

He relies heavily on personal and committee staffs whose abilities are acknowledged by Democratic and Republican Members alike. (So many persons work for Senator MAGNUSON directly or indirectly that one long corridor of the Senate Office Building is known as "MAGGIE's alley.") And unlike many in Congress, he does not spread himself thin. He specializes in his committee's concerns, with particular interest in fisheries, merchant marine, and the like which mean bread and butter to his home State.

It's a rare Senator, therefore, who can bring himself to turn Senator MAGNUSON down when he entreats support. "He'll go to a fellow like JOHN STENNIS, for example, and tell him how desperately the Pacific fishing industry needs help," says an admiring associate. "STENNIS won't give a damn one way or another, but MAGGIE will be so earnest and so determined that he'll figure if MAGGIE feels that strongly about it he he must be right. Anyway, the demand is never outrageous and it never involves taking something away from somebody else. If MAGGIE usually gets what he wants, it's because he usually wants what he can get."

Nonetheless, his modest goals have resulted in such legislative plums as a $10 million Federal grant for the 1962 Seattle World's Fair; a chain of dams along the Columbia and Snake Rivers; and an amendment to the food-for-peace program adding fish to the surplus foods which can be sold to foreign countries under special, easy terms. (The only fish currently in surplus in the United States just happens to be pink salmon, most of which is caught and canned in the Pacific Northwest.) And Washington, 23d State in population, collects one of every six Federal public works dollars.

Many of his contributions, his admirers say, go unnoticed because Senator MAGNUSON avoids attracting attention. In fact, his manner of operating may have been best described by President Kennedy when he spoke at a 1961 dinner honoring Senator MAGNUSON's 25th anniversary in Congress.

"Most Members of the Senate," President Kennedy said, "have developed the art of speaking with precision and clarity and force. The secret of Senator MAGNUSON's meteoric career has been the reverse. He may make clear speeches to you on great public occasions, but in Washington he speaks in the Senate so quietly that few can hear him. He looks down at his desk—he comes into the Senate late in the afternoon—he is very hesitant about interrupting other Members of the Senate—when he rises to speak, most Members of the Senate have left—he sends his messages up to the Senate and everyone says, 'What is it,' and Senator MAGNUSON says, 'It's nothing important.' And Grand Coulee Dam is built."

What Are We Doing to Our Youth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, what are we doing to the youth of America when top Government officials, leading editorial writers, and clergymen support agitators who advocate defying the law and encourage violence to obtain objects?

A casual reading of any newspaper in any big city in America gives you the an-

swer. Crime rates in all our big cities are skyrocketing. Murder by teenagers, violence by minority groups is becoming commonplace.

What other result can we expect from the weak, from depraved minds when they are told day after day that they have been abused and injured and have the right to take any means for redress?

Mr. Speaker, America will be destroyed if we continue to tell our young people and all the minority groups that the way to adjust grievances is not through the courts, not through legislation, but by demonstrations and violence in the streets and by ruining economically those with whom you do not agree.

The shocking story in yesterday's newspapers about a young girl in New York City who fatally stabbed one youth and critically injured at least two others, should give us pause for thought. I include the news story as carried in the Washington Star for April 4:

NEGRO GIRL 15, CHARGED IN WHITE BOY'S SLAYING

NEW YORK—A husky Negro girl, 15, was accused yesterday of the switch-blade knife killing of a white youth and the critical wounding of two other persons in arguments on a sidewalk and a subway train.

The girl, Susan Doctor, was charged with homicide and was held without bail pending a criminal court hearing.

Police described her as weighing 165 pounds and looking older than her age. She wore a black leather jacket and black slacks.

They said she killed Javier Neives, 16, and wounded his pal, Wilson Lopez, 16, also white, because she objected to their attitude as she, her mother, and friends passed them on a sidewalk.

Only about 15 minutes later, police said, she stabbed and wounded Rodney Jackson, 46, a Negro, on the train, because she took offense at his manner when he asked directions.

THREE OTHER GIRLS CHARGED

In an unrelated subway incident, police accused three Negro girls of beating and kicking an unidentified white woman and booked them as juvenile offenders. The police said the girls shouted at the woman: "We are Negroes and proud of it."

In the stabbing case, police gave this account:

The 15-year-old girl, with her mother and a group of friends, left a party in East Harlem and headed for a subway station to return home to Brooklyn.

Nieves and Lopez, standing near the station, mimicked the way the mother talked.

While others in the group walked on, the girl remained behind, argued with the youths, then whipped out a knife with a 5-inch blade and stabbed both in the chest.

TWENTY-FIVE SEE STABBING

Then she caught up with the group and boarded the train.

Jackson, a passenger on the train, asked the girl's mother for directions.

The girl got into an argument with him and began stabbing him as the train pulled into the 96th Street station while 25 other passengers looked on in horror.

William La Tour, 22, of Staten Island, an off-duty housing authority policeman who was standing on the station platform, ran into the car and disarmed her.

"I saw this girl with her arm up stabbing this man who was sitting down," he said. "I got into the car as the door opened and grabbed, trying to get the knife away from her.

"She was about to attack me when I identified myself (as a policeman) and had my shield in my hand. She quieted down."

RAN THROUGH TRAIN

The police said the three girls in the other incident were among five Negro teenage couples who ran through a Queens-bound subway train shortly after midnight, shouting obscenities.

The police said the white woman did not answer their statement about being proud of being Negroes, or other remarks, and that they began assaulting her.

Patrolman Joseph Schaefer, off duty and in civilian clothes, said he saw the attack.

"I jumped up" he said, "and started to grab the girls * * * five of the Negro boys crowded around me as I moved in. But two sailors and a busdriver—also Negro—came to my aid."

Canal Facts, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am glad that the Army Engineers have seen fit to extend until July 3 the deadline for comments and criticisms on their feasibility report which recommends construction of the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, more appropriately known as the billion-dollar ditch. An editorial in the March 31 issue of the Pittsburgh Press explains why additional time is needed to review and analyze the Engineers' report. I ask unanimous consent that this interesting editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANAL FACTS, PLEASE

Opponents of the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal have discovered serious weaknesses in the feasibility report of the Army Engineers, who have recommended construction of the costly project. There are so many weaknesses, in fact, that the Board of Engineers should feel obligated to extend the April 3 deadline for protests.

The Upper Ohio Valley Association, which has been trying to analyze the Engineers' massive report issued March 1, has demanded complete copies of a survey conducted by Arthur D. Little & Co. This study purportedly measures the canal's probable economic impact on the region and Nation.

According to the upper Ohio group, the Engineers report that no additional data is available. Until all details of the Little report are revealed, however, the public will not be abel to judge adequately, the feasibility of the "billion dollar ditch," which is regarded by many as an enormous waste of public funds.

Opponents of the canal contend that paragraph 8, appendix IX, of the feasibility report "indicates that Arthur D. Little & Co. 'may have concluded that on certain assumptions' the canal would not produce sufficient benefits to warrant construction."

Since the taxpayers are being asked to shell out $1,128 million (with annual charges of $55,800,000) for this project, they certainly deserve to know all the pertinent facts. If there are no details to hide in the Little report, the Army Engineers should have no objection to releasing all information relating to the survey.

This factor alone is reason enough to extend the 1-month period alloted for filing protests. But the Upper Ohio Valley Association also has pointed out many other defects in the Engineers' report which require explanation.

The association contends that the $1,128 million estimated cost of the canal is at least 25 percent low. It also charges that the Engineers report fails to specify the full width of the project, underestimates the cost of farm homes to be condemned, omits a number of bridges needed, fails to include any provision for rail access to the harbor, underestimates excavation costs, and neglects to account for anticipated price increases during construction of the proposed canal.

If the Board of Engineers wishes to be fair to the taxpayers, it will approve extension of the protest deadline until all these points can be clarified. In view of the enormous cost of this project, the board cannot, in good conscience, ignore these serious objections.

The Selma-Montgomery March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following two items, one an editorial which appeared in the Elba Clipper, Elba, Ala., and the other a news story. Slowly but surely the truth about the Selma-Montgomery march is coming out.

The articles follow:

THE ELBA CLIPPER

(By Lucile K. Woodham McRae)

Alabama has had a profusion of rumors of an awful lot of immorality among civil rights demonstrators prior to and during the Selma-Montgomery march last week. A two-column bordered article in Sunday's Birmingham News entitled "Lovemaking in open definitely occurred in Selma prayer vigil," gave some of the details of those awful days. Many people had known about the lovemaking and wondered why it was that newspaper and television reporters, on the scene by the hundreds, were not taking pictures and reporting these awful immoral actions when they were making such a to-do about the march. An editorial in the Dothan Eagle on March 19, was the first report I saw in any of the Alabama newspapers and then Sunday the Birmingham News gave a detailed account of what happened in Selma. The same thing has happened at other places.

Quoting from the Birmingham News article: "Charges have included illicit relations in the streets of Selma and at the march campsites; urinating in the streets of Montgomery; as many as 40 attacks by Negroes on a white female demonstrator, and a general immoral climate in the civil rights movement." Some of the rumors proved without basis, stated the News, others have been proved true according to reliable sources and eyewitness accounts. An Associated Press writer told the News, "I saw couples involved in intercourse. There was considerable other hanky-panky." Selma Public Safety Director

Wilson Baker told the Birmingham News there definitely was immorality among civil rights demonstrators and "was very definitely open in kissing and loving and drinking."

Newsmen, including two reporters for the News, witnessed demonstrators as they urinated in the middle of Montgomery's Dexter Avenue less than 50 yards from the capitol steps. A ring of people, men and women, Negro and white, stood locked arms while others in the group of demonstrators urinated and one Negro boy was hustled off to jail by police on a charge of indecent exposure.

It has been reported by an Associated Press writer, and also by a reporter of the Birmingham News, there was evidence of petting and lovemaking between white and Negro demonstrators. Some so-called ministers were present and witnessed it, the reporters said.

It has been learned that hundreds of pictures were taken of activities in Selma, en route to Montgomery, and in Montgomery. It has also been reported that a daily newspaper has had the privilege of using such pictures and refused to do so. Why? Are they also endorsing such actions It is common knowledge and a proven fact that drunkenness and sex orgies did mark the civil rights march. It is being reported that this kind of characters were recruited and paid by the day to be involved in sex with opposite members of either race. Instead of this free love being condoned it was encouraged. As reported by Congressman BILL DICKINSON, who also has the proof, "Free love among this group is not only condoned; it is encouraged. It is a fact and their way of life. Only by the ultimate sex act with one of another color can they demonstrate they have no prejudice." It's reported that there were many, not just a few instances of sexual intercourse in public between Negro and white. Negro and white freedom marchers invaded a Negro church in Montgomery and engaged in an all-night session of debauchery within the church itself and the leadership of the church had to get help to have these freedom marchers put out of their church. Yet not one word of such action was reported by the daily Montgomery newspapers. Why? Were their reporters failing to be on the job or was the control of those newspapers denying the readers this information. It is understandable why the many pictures taken of the sex activities were not printed but why did those newspapers fail to report what was going on during the demonstrations? Did they call themselves protecting Alabama from further bad publicity? Alabama folk were not those who were participating in such actions except those falling under the influence of outsiders who came to Alabama for that particular reason.

There were many Alabama Negroes participating in the civil rights demonstrations who were shocked at what happened. And many Selma Negroes are not happy that they can't trade at Selma stores where prices are good. But the Martin Luther King gang are watching them and not allowing them to trade freely where they can get the best price. Yet Martin Luther King claims to be against discrimination, and he claims to be a minister of the Gospel.

Reported in the Dothan Eagle was a letter by a State trooper, sickened by the things and the people he had seen and heard at close range in the days he was on duty in Selma, who said "It's mostly just a gathering of trash, homosexuals, beatniks, thieves, dope peddlers, addicts, and paid professional agitators. This is the bunch of people that L.B.J. is trying so hard to please." He continued with "Regardless of one's feelings about integration, voting rights, mixed marriages, whether for or against, this is not the way to change it. I have seen Negro men and white women; white men and Negro women loving each other, holding each other, hands all over each other, right here in the middle of the streets in Selma, Ala. Bearded beatniks, filthy, dirty young white girls dressed like men, so-called preachers in overalls, and some priests in their suits with the collar turned backwards, all are here, living, eating, sleeping with these Negroes, cursing Alabama and us * * *. People who live here are fed up to the point of desperation. This is what has migrated into the State of Alabama, with the protection and blessings of President Johnson, the Justice Department, and the Supreme Court."

Martin Luther King is like most politicians. Most politicians will run for office until the people get tired of their sweet talk and vote them out of office. Martin Luther King has received support in his voter registration demonstrations. But apparently he is real foolish and can't resist his attempt to be a dictator of the United States. It could be he has now made that fatal move when he will find himself without the necessary support. His true color of hate is beginning to show.

Even Lyndon B. Johnson may not be able to continue to support him in his last proposal to boycott Alabama, though the President has been a tool in the hands of King all this time. For that reason there is no telling what Lyndon B. Johnson may do if Martin Luther King puts the pressure on him. That effective pressure is similar to being blackmailed. Could there be a reason for the President having to lend an ear to Martin Luther King?

NEWSMEN SAW MISCONDUCT AT SELMA

(By Al Kuettner)

MONTGOMERY.—Did Martin Luther King's organization recruit civil rights mercenaries for the Selma-to-Montgomery march with offers of up to $14 a day, plus food and sex?

A substantial segment of our society believes the answer is "yes." A U.S. Congressman has made the charge in bare knuckle words on the floor of the House.

King admits there were some unfortunate incidents during last week's march but he and his organization deny categorically that wholesale sexual promiscuity took place, as charged.

Let us take up finances first.

Virtually all of the up to 30,000 persons who eventually participated in the march to Montgomery were volunteers, drawn to the scene by sympathies, racial ties, or politics.

Scores of interviews with marchers from all over the Nation produced almost uniform petition when it came to money. They said they were financed by students back on the campus, by their churches, or their organizations.

A number brought gifts of food, clothing, and money and shared these with the local movement.

Andrew Young, King's first assistant, acknowledged that about 25 full-time staff members of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference were on the paid administrative staff of the march.

Young said the marchers were provided with food, sleeping bags and, in a small number of cases, shoes. The food was either bought by the organization or donated.

The stories of sexual depravity on this campaign have been widespread.

A woman in Atlanta, went to her beauty shop the other day and her hairdresser remarked: "By the way, have you heard that—"

The story she told as fact originated in Selma, Ala., more than 200 miles to the west, only a few days earlier. It was an unfounded rumor, checked out by responsible newsmen and discarded, that a white woman had died after a weekend orgy involving many Negroes.

The most often repeated stories relate in details that are growing wilder by the day how wicked sex parties took place beneath the tents each night of the march.

An evaluation of how serious this became depends on your definition of an orgy. There were some individual acts of misconduct observed by newsmen who camped with the marchers and who were on the lookout for unusual activity.

What went on prior to March 21 when the trek to Montgomery began is another matter. To be fair to the hundreds who came to Alabama for the march itself, the two periods need to be separated.

Before the march was organized, there was a virtually unsupervised time in Selma when hundreds were roaming from church to church and into nearby apartments they shared with Negro tenants. There was a 4-day-and-night period when demonstrators—white and Negro—were packed beneath blankets, bedrolls, and plastic tents in a street confrontation with police.

This is the period out of which most of the sex charges have blossomed. Reporters on the street saw a considerable amount of socializing between male and female youths, white and Negro, that went beyond friendship on behalf of civil rights. After the first time and after some warnings from Negro clergymen, most of the courting appeared to stop.

Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the executive branch is of the opinion that the U.S. Government should take no action specifically to condemn the virulent attack being waged against persons of the Jewish faith in the Soviet Union. I disagree emphatically with this belief that if the United States just ignores these violations of human rights, they will, somehow, fade away.

The State Department has even opposed the Ribicoff resolution, of which I am a cosponsor, which would condemn Soviet anti-Semitism.

I am pleased to report that the senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania rejects this "head in the sand" approach to human rights and religious freedom, and has adopted a resolution condemning anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution, which urges action on the part of the President and the State Department, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

"The general assembly of the Commonwealth protests the wrongs and sufferings imposed by the Soviet Union upon its Jewry. Its enmity of religion is a matter of historical record and its discrimination against synagogues and Jewish worshippers is well known. Jewish congregations there are forbidden to organize a central body or contact Jewish groups outside Russia. Yiddish language institutions and other Yiddish cultural institutions have not been restored since their destruction by Stalin.

"Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states: 'Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.'

"A public protest against Soviet anti-Semitism is scheduled to be held Sunday, March 28, 1965, at 3 p.m. at Independence Square in Philadelphia. In protesting against the ill treatment of Soviet Jewry the general assembly should encourage participation in the rally by citizens of all religions in our Commonwealth as part of its effort to call the attention of the world to the plight of our brothers: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That people of all religions in this Commonwealth be encouraged to attend and participate in the public rally to protest Soviet anti-Semitism to be held in Philadelphia at Independence Square at 3 p.m., Sunday, March 28, 1965; and be it further.

"*Resolved*, That the Department of State be hereby respectfully memorialized to request of the Soviet Union that it grant to its Jewish citizens the right to freedom of worship; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States restate the position of the United States in opposition to these acts of discrimination against Jewish citizens and that he instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to make known the sentiments expressed in this resolution in every possible manner; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate of the Commonwealth, to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Member of Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the legislatures of the States in the United States, the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and the Soviet Ambassador to the United States."

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of senate resolution, serial no. 45, introduced by Senators Benjamin R. Donolow, Charles R. Weiner, William J. Lane, Thomas P. McCreesh, John H. Devlin, Thomas J. Kalman, Louis C. Johanson, and Martin Silvert, and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 15th day of March 1965.

MARK GRUELL, JR.,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

Another Depression?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Indiana and other States are making outstanding progress on either repealing the so-called phony labeled right-to-work legislation or defeating legislation that calls for its enactment in various States.

Since section 14b of the Taft-Hartley law has divided our Nation so that about one-fourth of our States now operating under it are paying substandard wages to factory workers and other employees.

During the last 12 years, thousands of industries have relocated or moved to these low-wage areas. Millions working in these industries have been completely taken out of the purchasing market for automobiles, refrigerators, and hundreds of other products manufactured, which are priced to meet the economic needs of our workers in "living wage areas." If this condition continues, buying power will be curtailed as in the 1920's and another depression will scourge the economy and employment in our Nation:

CITY OF GARY,
Gary, Ind., March 29, 1965.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Following the directive of the Gary Common Council, enclosed herein is Resolution 952 (a resolution of the city of Gary urging Congress to enact legislation to restore full freedom of collective bargaining as uniform national labor policy and practice throughout the United States, by repealing existing sanctions of State right-to-work laws contained in section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and by other appropriate action, adopted by the Gary Common Council on the 16th day of March 1965.

Your truly,

BETTY MALINKA,
Clerk, City of Gary.
IRENE KOTAKES,
Chief Deputy, Civil Division.

RESOLUTION 952

Resolution of the city of Gary urging Congress to enact legislation to restore full freedom of collective bargaining as uniform national labor policy and practice throughout the United States, by repealing existing sanctions of State "right-to-work" laws contained in section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and by other appropriate action

Whereas section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 sanction the enactment of State "right-to-work" laws prohibiting the negotiation of agreements between unions and employers assuring union security during the term of such agreement; and

Whereas by constitutional provision or statute 19 States have such right-to-work laws in effect, and by ordinance or other enactment numerous municipalities, counties, and other local bodies have adopted and put such laws into effect; and

Whereas such laws are contrary to and in derogation of provisions of Federal law contained in sections 8(a), (3) and 8(f) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, which in the absence of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, permit under specified conditions the negotiation of agreements between unions and employers assuring union security during the term of such agreements; and

Whereas State right-to-work laws undermine union organization and interfere with full freedom of collective bargaining between unions and employers; tend to depress wages and working conditions and to promote strikes and instability and antagonism in labor-management relations; and unfairly compel unions to represent and bargain for workers who are unwilling to bear the cost and responsibility of participation in union organization and collective bargaining; and

Whereas State right-to-work laws are unfair and antilabor in their effects and are designed to weaken and harass labor unions in their organization efforts and in representing workers in bargaining with their employers; and

Whereas labor unions are generally rendered less effective in promoting the welfare of wage earners, and wages and working conditions are generally lower in States having right-to-work laws than in States where such laws exist; and

Whereas successful implementation of the national labor policy in support of union organization and collective bargaining is not possible unless unions and union security are accepted by management as desirable forms of industrial dealings: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Gary, Ind., urgently requests that the Congress of the United States enact such legislation as may be necessary and appropriate to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, which sanction State right-to-work laws, and to restore full freedom of collective bargaining as uniform national labor policy and practice throughout the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the clerk of the city of Gary to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing their State in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the common council this 16th day of March 1965.

LOUIS G. KARRAS,
Presiding Officer.

Attest:

BETTY MALINKA, *City Clerk.*

Presented by me to the mayor for his approval and signature this 19th day of March 1965.

BETTY MALINKA,
City Clerk.

Approved and signed by me this 19th day of March 1965.

A. MARTIN KATZ,
Mayor, City of Gary, Ind.

The Education Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a comment, by the Richmond News Leader of March 31, 1965, on the pending education bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEMPORARY OR OTHERWISE

As the education bill highballed through the House last week, Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York, paused to remark on some curious diction in the text. One clause of the bill offers to supply modern educational equipment and specially qualified personnel on a temporary or other basis to public or other nonprofit schools. Logic suggests that the other basis could be permanent.

Similarly, the only other kind of nonprofit school besides a public school is a private one.

Another part of the bill offers Federal money to publish curriculum materials and texts "developed at curriculum research centers and elsewhere." The curriculum research centers are provided for in the bill, but "elsewhere" means texts developed anywhere under the sun. And yet another clause providing free school equipment says "The term 'equipment' includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment, and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them." Those necessary enclosures or structures thrown in so casually at the tail end sound very much like whole new school buildings and plants, housing whole new schools, paid for 100 percent by the Federal Government.

And of course, that's exactly what they are. When the Senate approves the measure ("if" seems out of the question), a Federal school system will have been erected behind a screen of doubletalk, with the curriculum, texts, administrators, and teachers selected, developed, and supplied by the Federal Government—without Federal control, of course. The $1.06 billion authorized, naturally, is just the starter.

The ballyhoo behind the legislation says it will bring children in underprivileged areas up to the educational standards of the Nation. But of the six titles, only the first sets up criteria based on poverty; the other five allow the Commissioner of Education to dispense money as he pleases. A close study gives some indication of the empire herein established:

Title I: The poverty formula, tied to present expenditures per pupil, results in the largest grants going to 10 of the wealthiest counties in the country. However, grants must be "consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish," and the Commissioner can hold up funds until the local people knuckle under.

Title II: The Commissioner makes gifts of library books and equipment to local agencies on whatever "equitable" terms he chooses. He deals directly with the local school boards or institutions, bypassing State departments of education.

Title III: The Commissioner sets up so-called supplemental educational centers, with the Federal Government paying all costs for "establishment, maintenance, and operation of programs, including acquisition of necessary equipment." Local officials (not the State) must ask for these centers, but their plans must meet the Commissioner's arbitrary criteria. Within the language of the law, these "centers" can be complete model school systems, from elementary through high school. The State's function is limited to offering "recommendations."

Title IV: The Commissioner makes grants to colleges and universities for research, surveys, and demonstrations. The present U.S. Commissioner says, "Our goal is a national network of federally supported but State- and university-operated research centers."

Title V: Having emasculated the State education departments, the Commissioner now proceeds to "strengthen" them. The bill provides direct grants to compliant States for educational planning, curriculum research, publication of texts, and the training of administrators. To complete the hideous marriage, the Commissioner is given authority to lend U.S. personnel to the States and to bring State personnel into the U.S. Office, for 2-year periods.

Seldom has a law been proposed in such a flurry of deceit. It is only in the last title, title VI, that the definitions are given which hint that "equipment" includes whole school systems, with the necessary plans, teachers, and texts supplied by the Federal Government. But it is also title VI that seals the law with the mark of duplicity. In title VI, we are assured that, after the Federal Commissioner of Education has set the criteria, planned the educational approach and goals, approved the texts, and rewarded compliant State departments of education, he won't control education. "Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system." If a wee bit of control does seep in, no doubt it will be no more than temporary or otherwise.

Residual Oil: April Fool Joke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Last Friday I issued a press release on the residual oil problem, and I am happy to note that on Saturday the Secretary of the Interior agreed with me. We both feel that there is no national security basis for this program.

The Secretary has referred the question to the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning to make "a searching new study." I hope this does not result in the interment of the question in this quiet burial ground.

The matter has been studied to death. We need no new studies. We request a prompt finding by the Director that there is at this time no national security basis for the controls.

Then, I trust the President will have the courage to issue a proclamation bringing this injustice to an end.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., ISSUED ON FRIDAY, APRIL 2, 1965

New England is once again to be victimized by the imposition of quotas for residual oil imports.

We had hoped and expected that we had convinced the Secretary of the Interior that his controls were on a very shaky legal foundation, there being no national security basis for his program.

We had thought that he was aware of the harm being done to New England, already suffering acutely from economic benefits given to other sections of the country to its disadvantage.

We had believed that his April 1 pronouncement would be: "No more controls for New England."

Imagine our consternation when we are told on March 31 that everything would be all right for New England, only to find out on April 1 that some last minute influence caused the Secretary to do a complete about-face. What happened? If there was no national security reason to impose controls on us on March 31, what intervened to create a national security basis for this hardship on April 1?

At his press conference on March 31, the Secretary of the Interior said: "We had contemplated what would have amounted to an open end program in Florida and the five New England States, with a continuation of the existing program in the other east coast States. This represented my best judgment as a solution."

But this was not the April 1 decision of the Secretary. His best judgment was not allowed to prevail. Who intervened? Whose judgment is being substituted for that of the Federal official duly charged with this great responsibility by the laws of the land? Who played this April Fool's joke on New England?

The Secretary says that he does not have the power, "acting alone, to make a decision" on the national security question. Why not? The President of the United States delegated to him all the vast powers of the Presidency in respect to oil matters. What more powers does the Secretary need?

Who says that New England must continue to suffer this burden, when the Secretary of the Interior has concluded publicly that in his best judgment these unfair controls are not needed?

The Secretary admits honestly that consumers are paying a penalty of about $40 million a year as the result of this program, and a large percentage of that penalty is inflicted upon New England.

The Secretary admits honestly that he doesn't like and cannot justify the present plan, and he begs for an "alternative, workable plan." There isn't any such plan.

The only alternative to the present outrage is no controls. The alternative is for the Federal Government to admit the truth; there is no national security reason to justify this program. Once that admission is made, this jerry-rigged scheme to sabotage New England can be ended, and free enterprise can begin to make sense out of this expensive boondoggle promoted and maintained by the Department of the Interior.

Chemical and Biological Weapons May Be a Greater Threat to Our National Survival Than the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said lately about the use of chemical and biological warfare in our conflict in southeast Asia. So that it will be readily available to every Member of Congress, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this afternoon a synopsis on this subject written by the Honorable Charles J. Conrad, of California.

Mr. Conrad, in addition to being a 10-term veteran of the California State Legislature, is a widely recognized expert in the field of chemical and biological warfare. I feel that his remarks on this subject are well worth studying:

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS MAY BE A GREATER THREAT TO OUR NATIONAL SURVIVAL THAN THE ATOMIC BOMB

1. The Communists could obtain their objectives more readily.

Even assuming the Communists believe they could win a nuclear war, they would inherit a nation in ruin and deaths running into millions. On the other hand, if they temporarily immobilize our population and defenses by use of chemical and biological weapons, they could seize a civilization complete with slave labor.

2. It is possible to build, undetected, a striking capability of chemical and biological agents.

Unlike nuclear weapons, which require an enormous industrial capacity capable of detection, chemical and biological agents can

be produced in factories disguised as breweries, fertilizer plants, etc.

3. Even under total disarmament the Communists could wage a chemical or biological war.

All other weapons require military hardware, i.e., warplanes, submarines, guided missiles, etc., to deliver them upon an enemy target. On the other hand, it would be possible for the Soviet Union to offer a complete disarmament with inspection, then at a later date, utilize fishing vessels, commercial aircraft or saboteurs to attack us with chemical or biological agents.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS OFFER GREAT POSSIBILITIES TO THE FREE WORLD FOR EFFECTIVELY AND HUMANELY STOPPING COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

1. All other weapons from the spear to the atomic bomb can cause death.

By contrast there are chemical and biological agents that do not kill but merely cause temporary incapacitation.

2. In guerilla warfare it is difficult to differentiate between friend and foe.

Any bombing of an area such as Vietnam will cause casualties among friendly civilians. The use of incapacitators will enable us to segregate Vietcong infiltrators from government supporters.

3. Bombing supply trails is difficult and would have to be continually repeated.

On the other hand, it would be possible to seal off the trails used to bring arms and supplies to the Vietcong by drenching the area with persistent chemicals; i.e., chemicals whose effect will remain for a period of time.

4. All other weapons can destroy a civilization.

The use of incapacitating agents, however, leaves the industrial and agricultural capacity of the area untouched. This relieves the United States of the necessity to support the population after the end of hostilities.

5. In the event of all-out war, chemical and biological agents can destroy the Communists' food supply.

This is Red China's greatest fear and one reason for the continued propaganda against chemical and biological warfare. Red China could survive a nuclear attack better than the destruction of her rice and wheat crop. In print this may sound inhumane, but the United States has surplus food and considerable experience in feeding populations. If forced to resort to such methods, we could relieve the suffering of the civilian population more quickly and easily than would be the case following an attack by conventional high explosives or nuclear weapons.

WHY THE SECRECY REGARDING CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS?

1. It is a holdover from ancient superstitions which associated such weapons with the devil and black magic.

2. It was part of the Allied propaganda following World War I. The victors were unwilling to outlaw submarines, aircraft, etc., but felt they could safely denounce "poison gas" because, at that time, Germany had the most advanced chemical industry.

3. The decision in World War II (which may have cost American lives) that we would use chemical weapons only in retaliation.

4. Continuous propaganda from the Soviet Union and Red China which is often repeated by certain groups here in the United States. Obviously, our enemies wish to prevent the use of these weapons while at the same time they prepare to use chemical and biological agents against us when the time is ripe.

WE SHOULD REMEMBER THE DECISION TO USE THE ATOMIC BOMB

Recent disclosures indicate one of the reasons for the decision to drop the A-bomb on Hiroshima was the knowledge that sooner or later the Soviet Union would be able to develop such a weapon. Had we not been the first to use atomic warfare, the Communists might rule the world today. For we would not have developed the bomb and during a later crisis (the Berlin airlift or the Cuban missiles) we would have faced a Soviet Union armed with nuclear weapons while we were defenseless.

If we continue our present policy, this can happen with chemical or biological weapons.

IF WE BEGIN UTILIZING CHEMICAL OR BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS, WON'T THAT LEAD TO THEIR USE BY THE COMMUNISTS?

The Communists will use such weapons anytime they believe they can get away with it. The quicker we start using the humane type of chemical agent in areas such as Vietnam, the quicker the public, press, and government leaders will become aware of the capabilities of such weapons, as was the case with the atomic bomb. The people of the United States then will understand the necessity for building up our chemical and biological arsenal as well as developing a defense against an attack by such weapons.

DON'T WE HAVE A TREATY AGAINST THE USE OF CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE?

No. The U.S. Senate wisely refused to ratify the Geneva Convention outlawing such weapons for two reasons, which are as valid today as they were 40 years ago.

1. The statement by General Fries "An outlaw nation would always use this weapon against us if it felt it could gain victory by so doing."

2. The history of World War I showed the chemical weapon to be relatively efficient and relatively humane.

In World War I, 24 million pounds of mustard gas caused 400,000 casualties; that is, one casualty for every 60 pounds of mustard, 8 times as effective as high explosives. But death occurred in only 2 percent of the chemical casualties and only 7 percent were so severely injured that they had to be discharged from the service. With high explosives, death occurred in 26 percent of the casualties and this does not take into consideration men who lost legs, arms, were blinded, etc.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE NOT EVEN BEING TOLD WHAT WE ARE ACTUALLY DOING

1. A new chemical to replace tear gas in control of mobs has already been adopted by the U.S. Army.

This agent is known as CS. It has been used successfully in many parts of the world and here in the United States was used by the Maryland National Guard to put down the riot in Cambridge last May. Despite this fact, the press and public have been kept in almost complete ignorance and CS has not been utilized on other occasions where its use could have saved lives and property.

2. The so-called defoliation project in Vietnam has been hamstrung through political interference.

The public was subjected to enormous amounts of propaganda against this project not only from the Communists but from various groups here in the United States. The truth is the defoliation project was reasonably successful and could be much more so if the military were allowed a free hand in the choice of chemicals and when and where to use them.

THE PUBLIC IS OFTEN SUBJECT TO SCARE STORIES

While U.S. officials regard honest discussion of chemical and biological warfare "rather delicate," fantastic yarns make headlines several times a year.

A prime example was the report of an anti-espionage expert in the West German Embassy in Moscow being drenched with mustard gas in a monastary. The U.S. medical official mentioned in the story is not known and no Soviet agent would think of using mustard because of its strong odor and comparatively slow action.

Reports from Cuba have been equally inaccurate. Yet the same news media that reports such fantasies do not supply the public with factual reporting of the threat and possibilities of chemical and biological warfare.

EVERY DAY'S DELAY INCREASES THE DANGER

It takes time, money, manpower, and especially public awareness to put our chemical and biological capabilities on a par with our nuclear forces. In addition, every day's delay sees American lives lost in places such as Vietnam, lives that might be saved through the use of chemical agents.

WHAT MUST BE DONE?

1. Our elected officials must familiarize themselves with the subject.

2. They then must have the courage to help end the ignorance and superstition that surrounds these weapons and tell the public, within the limits of national security, of the dangers and opportunities existing in these weapons.

3. We should announce to the world through the United Nations that chemical and biological agents cannot be controlled through treaties or inspections; that they pose both a threat to the free world; and an opportunity to halt mob violence and stop Communist aggression in the most humane manner; that the United States has no treaty prohibiting the use of such weapons and that we feel free to do so whenever our national security or the interest of the free world indicates that such weapons should be utilized.

4. The press, radio, and television should give widest possible coverage to the actions mentioned above. In particular, opportunity should be extended to the military and responsible Government officials to answer the propaganda that would most certainly reach record heights if the above suggestions were put into effect.

The Congressional Secretaries Club Observes Its 30th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago a small group of congressional staff members got together and formed an organization that has rendered and continues to render invaluable service to our offices. I refer to the Congressional Secretaries Club.

Formed to work toward the solution of problems common to all congressional offices, to promote greater cooperation between our offices and Government agencies involving the perplexities of our constituents, and to further the general welfare of congressional staff members, as well as provide a program of enlightenment, special activities, and sports, the club has reached a new landmark.

On its 30th anniversary the club membership reached an all-time high of 2,802 members, in addition to Members of Congress who are honorary members.

Last Saturday night the club held its anniversary banquet at the Hotel Shoreham and honored the President of the United States, who began his Washington career as a congressional secretary,

making him the recipient of the annual "Man of the Year" award. The placque was accepted for the President by a member of his staff. The Secretary of the Year award, made annually by the newspaper Roll Call, went to Clary Cochowski, secretary to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI]. Miss Virginia Butler, of the Ways and Means Committee staff, club vice president, was banquet chairman. A special anniversary award was given to Sidney Yudain, Roll Call editor and publisher, for his contribution to and support of the club during the past decade.

Hyde Murray, a member of the professional staff of the House Committee on Agriculture, and president of the club, made a challenging speech, outlining club accomplishments as well as pointing the members to greater goals in the future.

Mr. Murray's anniversary address follows:

REMARKS OF HYDE MURRAY, PRESIDENT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL SECRETARIES CLUB

Distinguished guests, officers, directors, and members of the Congressional Secretaries Club, we're going to try to make the length of all speeches tonight conform with the rules of the House, not the Senate.

I cannot pass up this chance, though—it comes only once every 30 years—to talk to you a little bit about what the Congressional Secretaries Club means—what it's all about, and where it's going.

For 30 years the growth of this organization has paralleled the public life of our Man of the Year and the events of three of the most turbulent and rapidly changing decades of man's existence on this earth.

In 1935, some 30 years ago, there was a great depression in our country. Lyndon Johnson was attending Georgetown Law School and working as a congressional secretary then.

In 1940 war clouds were forming over America and the world after 8 years of far-reaching domestic change had been wrought by the New Deal. Congressman Lyndon Johnson played an important part in those changes as a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Texas.

By 1945 World War II was over, and the atomic era was at hand. Lt. Comdr. Lyndon Johnson had served his Nation in the Armed Forces and was once again a Member of the House, taking his part in America's task of rebuilding the world, while avoiding a nuclear grave.

During the next 5 years the threat of world communism became a menace to freemen everywhere. In 1950, a new crisis broke out in the Republic of Korea. Lyndon Johnson by this time was a U.S. Senator, and again he participated in deliberations and decisions that wrote history.

In 1955, President Eisenhower looked down Pennsylvania Avenue at a Congress dominated by a political party now his own. The world and the Nation wondered if a deadlock in democracy would occure; but the majority leader of the Senate, Lyndon Johnson, and the late and kindly gentleman who served so long as Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, put their country first.

By 1960 a new dimension had been added: the space age was upon us: sputniks, orbits, capsules, astronauts, all became used, if not new, words in our vocabularies. Lyndon Johnson again played an important role in that effort, and in 1960 he was elected as the Vice President of the United States.

Tonight, some 30 years after the founding of the Congressional Secretaries Club, he is the single most powerful man in the world. But is that why we honor him tonight? I think not.

Rather, I think we honor him simply because he is a local boy who made good, a graduate of the congressional school of hard knocks. Yes, his biography may list Texas as his home, but I suspect his heart belongs to the Hill.

And that, I suspect, describes every one of you here tonight. Whether your hometown is Waterloo, Westchester, or Walla Walla, something has happened to you in Washington.

The challenges, the opportunities for service, the excitement, the prestige, and the camaraderie of the busiest place in the world have got you—like our man of the year—hooked, but good, more than enough to compensate for the hazards, the disappointments, the cynicism, the frustrations, the fatigue, and the heartbreak that also lurk here.

Through the years the Congressional Secretaries Club has been an important vehicle for providing the camaraderie that puts politics on a personal level. If you haven't made friends with a member of the opposite party or a member of your own party since you've been in the club, you just haven't been a member very long.

GOALS OF THE ORGANIZATION

As you know, the Congressional Secretaries Club through the years has pursued three main goals: First, to make your office function better; second, to provide for your general welfare; and third, to provide you with a good social and recreational program.

I think you'll agree that this club has, through the years, done an outstanding job of meeting these goals. But the future demands even more.

Thirty years ago there were 127 million Americans. Today there are 192 million. Thirty years from now there will be at least 322 million. World population is exploding, and our tomorrows promise us many opportunities and many problems.

As the largest and oldest employee organization on Capitol Hill, the Congressional Secretaries Club has an obligation to share in these challenges.

Now don't get me wrong—we aren't going to carry the world around on our shoulders (that's what we have our man of the year for). We should definitely continue to have parties, sports, trips, recreational activities, and so on—but we should, I think, continue our efforts to develop and grow as an effective and constructive staff institution.

How, you may ask, can the Congressional Secretaries Club, whose membership is made up of just about every shade of political opinion on display, undertake such a project?

Here's how:

ASSISTS NEEDY CHILDREN

First, we should be concerned about the Capitol Hill community and what kind of place it is. For reasons too obvious to enumerate, we should be concerned about what kind of citizens today's Capitol Hill's children will become tomorrow. Only a few of you live here, but all of us work here. There are boys and girls right here on Capitol Hill who don't have decent shoes, who don't own warm coats, and who receive very little personal concern from anyone. The club has and is conducting its annual clothing drive for this purpose. Last year some 51 high school girls in this area stayed in school wearing clothes that you ladies donated.

This week the board voted to adopt Catharine Watkins School just 12 blocks from the Capitol, so tonight you're the godmothers and godfathers of 1,150 kids here on Capitol Hill. We hope to raise enough money to see that every child in Watkins School has decent shoes and clothing this year. I know these kids can count on you.

UPGRADING STAFF COMPETENCE

Secondly, in the years ahead the club must also do more to upgrade the general professional competence of the congressional staff structure. More people mean more constituents, and more constituents mean more problems, and more problems mean more letters, and more letters mean you'll have to answer them better and quicker than you do now. The growing complexity of legislation also demands greater technical skill and educational requirements of the congressional staff.

I'm talking about you, because you're going to have to do a better job if the Congress is to perform its constitutional role.

Wasn't Thomas Jefferson right—and I'm one of those who believes he was a pretty solid citizen—when he said: "If men were angels, no government would be needed; and if all men in government were angels, the separation of the power of government would likewise be unnecessary"?

Congress, as an equal partner in the Federal trinity, simply must have the best possible internal support.

Yes, partisanship has its place, but I don't care whether we're in the mainstream or a part of the consensus—Republicans or Democrats, liberals or conservatives, moderate liberals or moderate conservatives, or whatever else—our first duty is to our country, and we should all become as good at the particular skills we employ as we can.

If you don't think this is important, just look at page 47 of your program. Based on the historical fact recorded therein, the chances are that 26 of you will become Members of the House of Representatives, 4 of you will become U.S. Senators, and 1 of you—maybe one of you—sitting out there tonight will someday hold the office that our 1965 Man of the Year now holds.

Yes, my friends, the community and the Congress are important to the Congressional Secretaries Club, but so in the years ahead will be the world.

The beginning of an international parliamentary secretaries group has already been started by your board. Our meeting with the staff members of the Japanese Diet last year was the first step. More work will be done this year, and perhaps some day it will be expanded into a forum for the exchange of ideas and communication between the parliamentary staff structures of all those nations which lodge the trust and hope of their people in representative government.

This 30th anniversary salute, I fear, has violated the 5-minute rule, and I hope you will forgive me for talking too long. I hope, though, sincerely that as this wonderful organization goes forward, you will think about what a Congressional Secretaries Club president will be saying about you at the 60th anniversary banquet some 30 years from now.

Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that Utah has now become one of the 46 States whose laws make possible the community sponsorship of federally assisted urban renewal projects. This fact results from the recent action taken by the Utah Legislature and concurred in by Utah's new and energetic Governor, Calvin L. Rampton. Prior to that, Utah was one of only five States in the Union having no enabling legislation to allow local participation in this program. I am proud to have been able to do my part to promote urban renewal legislation.

Let me point out some of the program's meritorious features. It can result in the elimination or arresting of municipal blight; it can rebuild rundown areas and develop new uses for them. Urban renewal can help reduce expenditures in police, fire, welfare, and other relatively fixed municipal costs. It can draw new investment into the community for the construction of housing and business and industrial buildings. It can create new jobs. The partnership which it creates between local government, private enterprise, and the Federal Government accomplishes many otherwise impossible things.

The Federal contribution to the cost of the program is an important consideration: it makes possible loans and grants for carrying out many of its features. Special FHA financial aids and public housing assistance help to provide low-rent or moderate-rent housing for families displaced by urban renewal. Relocation grants are made to reimburse displaced families and businesses for their moving expenses and for direct losses of property. Urban renewal, then, is designed to help compensate local citizens, businesses, and communities for out-of-pocket losses incurred when renewal programs are introduced. More important, however, the program is designed to stimulate local communities to initiate needed projects. It is a program to help people help themselves.

In his recent message to Congress on cities, President Johnson stated:

> Our cities are making a valiant effort to combat the mounting dangers to the good life. Between 1954 and 1963 per capita municipal tax revenues increased by 43 percent, and local government indebtedness increased by 119 percent. City officials with inadequate resources, limited authority, too few trained people, and often with too little public support, have, in many cases, waged a heroic battle to improve the life of the people they serve. But we must do far more as a nation if we are to deal effectively with one of the most critical problems of the United States.

In my opinion, the federally assisted urban renewal program seems to be one answer to the problems of our cities. I have supported this program; I plan to continue to do so.

I feel this way even though most of the cities in my State are small; and only one city in Utah has over 100,000 in population. However, the urban renewal program can be helpful to smaller cities. As a matter of fact, nationwide, more than 70 percent of all the cities in the program are under 50,000 in size. Also, Congress has made special provision for these smaller cities by fixing the Federal share of the costs to communities under 50,000 population at 75 percent, instead of the 66⅔ percent allowable to the larger cities.

There is still widespread misunderstanding about urban renewal, however. I recently received a publication that helps to clear up some of its misconceptions. It is the annual report issue of Business Review, published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. The Review carried a most interesting and enlightening article entitled "The Toil and Turmoil of Urban Renewal." Because I think this article makes significant reading for all American communities, I would like to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE TOIL AND TURMOIL OF URBAN RENEWAL

(In ancient days, said China's Lao-tze in the sixth century B.C., men lived in peaceful rural simplicity. Then men attained knowledge, wrote books, complicated life with inventions, and moved from the fields into cities. Hence all the misery of men.)

Like the elephant which six blind men of Indostan went to "see," urban renewal casts many different images. One person sees it as metropolitan rejuvenation to make cities more livable. Another is impressed by its displacement of people. Still others are struck by its slow progress, its diverse objectives, its high cost. Differences of opinion are inevitable in an undertaking with the dimensions and complexities of urban renewal.

A city is a mass of humanity cooped up in a mass of masonry. The city is where the tumult is—a clatter and a chatter of multitudes on the sidewalks, a screech of rubber on asphalt, the shriek of a fire engine, the rumble of a subway, a Fourth of July parade, a 5-o'clock stampede to the suburbs, a shooting in a side-street saloon, and the honking of impatient motorists. The city is also where one goes to enjoy Van Cliburn at the piano, Ormandy on the podium, Fonteyn in the ballet, or Willie Mays in center field. In addition to the performing arts a city offers a cultural smorgasbord of art galleries, libraries, museums, and a variety of educational, scientific, and philosophic organizations affording fruitful opportunities to enrich hours of leisure.

For millions of citizens, the city is home in the fullest sense of the term—a place to live, to work, to play, to go to school. Many city dwellers are transfers from farms or villages; more and more, however, are city born and city bred. They love the city where there is always something going on; they loathe the countryside, dull and dead. Nocturnal orchestration of crickets and peepers would annoy urban sleepers, but not motor trucks thundering through the streets.

Urbanization is a product of our business civilization, our commercial and industrial economy. Seventy percent of the country's population occupy 1 percent of the land area. The heaviest concentration is in 219 metropolitan areas, each of which has as its nucleus a city of 50,000 population or more.

Urban concentration has its disadvantages but it also has its vexations. Familiar to everyone are: the traffic congestion in city center brought on by the widespread preference for personalized transportation, the shortage of downtown parking space, the decline of mass transit, the smog, the strain on water supply, the pollution of streams and the expense of sewage disposal, the exodus of urban population into ticky-tacky towns, the influx of minority groups and their socioeconomic segregation in residential ghettos, the detrioration of certain commercial, industrial, and residential areas of the city, the decay of downtown business districts, shrinkage of the tax base, skimpage of municipal services, unwillingness of suburbs to merge with the city—in short, metropolitan muddles, 219 of them.

HOW URBAN RENEWAL GOT STARTED

Urban renewal had its legal origin in the enactment of State enabling laws, some of which date back to 1944. Almost every city has its areas of rundown residential properties that have degenerated into unsightly and unsanitary shanty towns unfit for human habitation. Once a neighborhood reaches that stage of degeneration and decay, the contagion may spread further. Blight often begets more blight, and private enterprise may be powerless to rebuild.

Obstacles to restoration by private enterprise are basically twofold. First is the difficulty of assembling the parcels of multiple ownership into a sufficiently large tract to justify a restoration project. Almost always such plans are thwarted by a "holdout" or two. A second obstacle is the discouragingly high cost. Efforts to assemble land for a renewal project are likely to touch off speculative inflation of land values; and old buildings, howsoever dilapidated, have some value which becomes a significant item in the cost of new construction.

Remedies for these two basic obstacles to private restoration of slums were sought, therefore, in State enabling legislation and the Federal Housing Act of 1949 under which a community acquires and assembles properties in slums, using the power of eminent domain where necessary. Local and Federal Governments pay the net cost of renewal, which is the difference between the cost of acquiring and clearing slum properties and the income received when the land is sold or leased for public or private redevelopment. The so-called writedown is not intended to be a subsidy to the private redeveloper, who must pay a fair value for the cleared land, but is a cost of slum clearance. In some States such as Pennsylvania, there is a modest contribution to the net cost of renewal.

Subsequent amendments to the act raised the sights and broadened the horizon. In addition to slum clearance, provision was made for conservation and rehabilitation of areas that do not require demolition. Furthermore, provision was made for assistance to hospitals and urban colleges and universities to achieve needed expansion and to cope with blight encroaching on their doorsteps. Above all was the realization of the need for Federal aid to revitalize the economic base and taxable resources of cities. Slums are not confined to residential areas of cities. There are also commercial, industrial, educational, and recreational slums. Thus the concept of slum clearance was broadened to make Federal aid available to cities in need of comprehensive urban renewal.

HOW URBAN RENEWAL WORKS

Urban renewal works best when there is competent leadership at the local level, and the wider the degree of local participation the greater the success. The Federal role is largely one of financial and technical assistance.

To qualify for Federal aid, a locality must establish a so-called workable program for community improvement. Such a program must have the following basic elements:

1. Codes and ordinances establishing adequate building standards of health and safety.
2. Detailed neighborhood analysis to identify the nature and extent of the area in need of restoration.
3. Formulation of a comprehensive plan for the community's future development.
4. Administrative organization with authority and responsibility for coordinating and carrying out a community program.
5. Evidence of adequate financial resources to support the local share of an urban renewal program.
6. Provision of housing to meet the needs of families displaced by the renewal project.
7. Assurance that the entire community is fully informed and is given an opportunity to participate in the development and execution of the program.

Depending upon State-enabling statutes, the local public agency may be a department of the city government or a special agency appointed by the mayor with, or, as in Philadelphia, without the approval of city council. After the local public agency's plans are completed and approved by the Urban Renewal Administration, Federal assistance is made available in a loan and grant contract in

which the local agency bears one-third of the net project cost and the Urban Renewal Administration, two-thirds. For cities of 50,000 population or less, the cost sharing is one-fourth local and three-fourths Federal. Larger cities may also qualify for three-fourths Federal matching funds if they absorb certain planning costs.

The Housing Act of 1961 permits the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) to join in a program of mortgage insurance and purchase to make more moderate rentals possible. Long-term loans below market interest rates can be made to nonprofit organizations and cooperatives, limited dividend corporations, and certain public agencies to build housing for people of moderate incomes. To facilitate the most reasonable rents or carrying charges, FHA waives its usual one-half of 1 percent insurance premiums and insures loans for as long as 40 years.

Actual operations usually begin with acquisition of properties. In most instances, titles to the parcels are obtained by negotiation with the owners, and court condemnation proceedings are used only as a last resort. In all cases, local agencies are expected to assist displaced people and businesses to find suitable relocations. The relocation, of course, is seldom satisfactory in all respects to the family or business relocated.

Removal of structures and clearing the land is generally done under contract with a private contractor who, in some instances, may lay out the streets and other improvements. Meanwhile the city installs the necessary public facilities. When the land is ready for development it is publicly advertised and new construction takes place in accordance with the established plan.

WHERE URBAN RENEWAL WORKS

The Federal urban renewal program is nationwide. An indication of its scope is the growing number of communities participating. From 31 communities with renewal projects at the end of the Urban Renewal Administration's first fiscal year in 1950, the number has grown to 743 as of 1964 at mid-year. The 743 localities participating are distributed among 42 of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Moreover, five of the eight States without localities participating in urban renewal have enabling legislation, as shown in the map.

Pennsylvania, with renewal projects in 85 localities, and New York in 66, are in the forefront of urban renewal. Other States with relatively large numbers of communities engaged in renewal are New Jersey, Michigan, Georgia, and California. In some communities the need for renewal may arise from the nature of its industries; in others it may be overcrowding or obsolescence and overage of private and public facilities.

Urban renewal is taking place not only in most parts of the country but also in all kinds of communities. Large cities were among the first to take advantage of Federal assistance to replace their blight-stricken residential and industrial areas with modernized construction. Subsequently, communities of medium and small size followed, as shown in the chart. By 1964, over half of the localities participating in urban renewal were in communities of less than 25,000 population. Of course, well over half of the country's communities under 25,000 population are still untouched by urban renewal, though many of them have blighted areas.

HOW URBAN RENEWAL HAS GROWN

Over 1,300 urban renewal projects had been started as of mid-1963.

In 1958, for the first time, the number of projects under sledge hammer and trowel exceeded those in the paperwork and blueprint stage. Now project completions are mounting. By the end of fiscal 1963, over 100 projects had been completed, and numerous others were nearing that stage.

With many renewal projects in many communities still in various stages of advancement, it is difficult to comprehend the overall accomplishments of the urban renewal program, but it may be helpful to cite some benchmarks of progress. Through June 1963, most of the congressional authorization of $4 billion for urban renewal grants had been utilized, almost 30,00 acres of land had been slated for acquisition and redevelopment, approximately 129,000 structures had been demolished, and 157,000 families had been relocated from blighted areas undergoing renovation. Of the families relocated, 46 percent, according to reports of participating agencies, went into standard private rental housing, about 21 percent into standard sales housing, and about 25 percent into public housing. The remainder—approximately 8 percent—relocated themselves into quarters that did not conform with minimum standards of safety and sanitation. The latter did not avail themselves of the relocation services offered by the local agencies established for that purpose.

Substantial progress has also been made in the expanding conservation program focusing on rehabilitation of urban properties capable of restoration without demolition. Most cities have some forlorn-looking properties, unhinged, unpointed, unpainted, and covered with the silt of time. Such buildings, too desolate for habitation but too good for condemnation, can be prime material for urban renewal's salvage program. Over 45,000 structures and 107,000 dwelling units have been selected for restoration and by June 1963, work had been completed on more than 17,000 structures, including more than 25,000 dwellings.

URBAN RENEWAL'S SIDEWALK SUPERINTENDENTS

Urban renewal has recently encountered a spate of criticism from sidewalk superintendents—professional and amateur. Urban renewal is criticized for its architecture, its overemphasis upon bricks and mortar, its failure to eliminate slums, its bulldozer tactics and displacement of people, its snail-paced progress and alleged lack of clearly defined objectives.

It is asserted that urban renewal legislation is ill conceived, that the central administration is too paper bound, that local agencies formulate their petitions to Washington more in terms of money than ideas, that city planners are "blue sky," that slum dwellers get pushed around, and that blight grows faster than its eradication. The severest critics maintain that urban renewal is a failure and should close shop.

Probably the most serious of these indictments is the removal of people and businesses preparatory to slum clearance by exercise of the power of eminent domain. Though upheld by the courts, the process is criticized as an arbitrary infringement upon the rights of the dispossessed families. In answer to the charge, the Urban Renewal Administration points out that as a prerequisite for Federal assistance a local agency must provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for dispossessed families, and provision is made for followup of all those required to move. Of families being moved currently in Philadelphia, for example, 96 percent are successfully relocated to safe and sanitary housing. Some inevitably relocate without seeking assistance of the relocation office. A prominent builder operating in a number of urban areas points out that virtually the only direction that slum evacuees can move is up.

Slum clearance is the most vulnerable spot of urban renewal and there is where the sharpest shafts are hurled. The reason for the disappointing progress in slum clearance is the inability of the private housing industry to build houses that low-income families can afford. The Housing Act offers financial aid in making up part of the difference between the cost and reuse value of sites, commonly called the land writedown. But the value of land is only a small fraction of the monthly rent or purchase price. Newly built housing, therefore, is seldom within the means of the lowest income groups.

Some progress toward a solution of this basic difficulty has been made under the Mitchell-Lama program in New York City. The essence of that program is a 50-year municipal loan up to 90 percent of development costs at low rate of interest plus a 50-percent tax abatement for a fixed number of years. Under such a plan it is possible to replace slums with satisfactory housing for low-income families.

An entirely different program inaugurated by the Ford Foundation concentrates on renewal of urban people—the families who live in the "gray areas" of cities. Grants have been made to 41 slum schools as focal points for projects designed to improve the educational and employment opportunities of disadvantaged groups. The underlying basis of the experiment is the conviction that social planning must accompany physical planning.

The problems of substandard housing, health, and sanitation, school dropouts, unemployment and crime are all so closely related to each other and of such tremendous magnitude that now, for the first time, a Federal antipoverty program has been devised to deal with them in a comprehensive manner.

URBAN RENEWAL'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Urban renewal has instilled new life in American cities from coast to coast. In the heart of Boston, which was as bad as if not worse off than Philadelphia, a multimillion-dollar Government center of Federal, State, and private office buildings is replacing a 60-acre slumdom.

An insurance building resembling a tall boat in drydock is the eyecatcher of Hartford's Constitution Plaza built on reclaimed land alongside the Connecticut River.

One of the most amazing transformations is Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle—a family of sleek skyscrapers occupying what formerly looked like the junkyard of a steel mill at the source of the Ohio River.

Cleveland's Erieview Plaza Building is the showpiece of a quarter-billion-dollar renewal complex capitalizing on the city's vast lakescape.

In like manner, St. Louis is making the best of its Mississippi River waterfront formerly dominated by weatherbeaten warehouses. A 630-foot Gateway Arch, symbolic of westward expansion also symbolizes the city's urban modernization.

San Francisco's Golden Gateway apartment-townhouse project and the half-billion-dollar Century City in Los Angeles are among the outstanding renewal developments on the west coast.

In all of these cities as well as in Baltimore, Norfolk, Nashville, Minneapolis, and many others the stamp of urban renewal is the vastly improved appearance of their downtown business districts. Gone are the solid rows of ancient buildings with dirty faces. The new center-city look sports more open space, more glass, more class.

One of the best ways to strengthen the economic base of a city is to spruce it up with modern architecture, utilizing new building materials and new ideas as reflected in the handiwork of numerous urban renewal re-creations. This stimulates new private investment, attracts new industries, keeps some of the older ones that are flirting with the idea of moving elsewhere. An old-line Philadelphia firm of considerable size and prestige that had been "looking around" joined the renaissance with a magnificent structure of its own. Urban renewal has far-reaching generative effects.

In reply to a critic bemoaning urban renewal's burden on the city treasury, William Rafsky, a leader in the Philadelphia program, points out that "civic improvement programs have resulted in an increase in assessments, reversing a trend of declining real estate values" and that "they have made possible civic services with no recent tax increase."

Urban renewal adds immeasurably to the amenities of urban living in such developments as Lincoln Center, the Golden Triangle, and the Golden Gate. With the continuing concentration of population in metropolitan areas there is a growing need for more cultural facilities. Moreover, the variety and quality of such facilities play an important role in attracting industries with large complements of scientific and research personnel.

In former generations, cities took great pride in citing their rates of population growth from one census enumeration to another. They seemed to be oblivious to the accumulation of problems generated by the very process of growth until conditions became intolerably acute. Some of the worst aspects of urban living are now being remedied with federally aided renewal efforts planned and executed by local agencies. Much of the criticism of urban renewal is based upon mistakes made in the early years of the program, and urban renewal frequently gets blamed for things outside its jurisdiction—such as property condemnation for construction of highways and other improvements. This is not to say that urban renewal has achieved perfection, but the program is making a commendable contribution toward better urban living. "In our urban areas," said President Johnson, "the central problem today is to protect and restore man's satisfaction in belonging to a community where he can find security and significance."

The Tobacco Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, several years ago, when the successful operation of the tobacco program was questioned, I gave a talk describing the operation of the program, why it is needed, and the distinctions which not only require but also make workable a separate farm program for tobacco. While I said at that time that "increasing yields per acre may make production adjustment through acreage control more difficult as new varieties and cultural methods are adopted," that is not my chief reason for recalling the speech. I do think many parts of that review remain pertinent, and because it may be of interest at this time I ask unanimous consent that my remarks of August 30, 1957, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TOBACCO PROGRAM: WHY IT IS NEEDED—HOW IT IS WORKING

(By Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky)

The welfare of my State, which is an agricultural State, rests very largely on the productivity and economic well-being of her farmers. Most of these farmers raise tobacco—for Kentucky is one of the great tobacco States, and supplies high quality burley, as well as Dark-Fired and Dark Air-cured tobaccos, to the entire world. The price of tobacco is a matter of vital concern to some 200,000 rural Kentucky families, because it directly affects their income, their standard of living, and their future opportunities.

That price is determined, not alone by the well-established demand for quality cigarette tobaccos, but also by the effective operation of the production control, or marketing quota, program for tobacco—through which growers cooperate with their Department of Agriculture to maintain a balanced supply in line with that demand. The necessity of keeping supply and demand in balance, in order to avoid ruinous price fluctuations, is generally recognized—as is the function of Government in providing for farmers the legislative and administrative means to do this job.

In maintaining stable supplies through production control—when this course is chosen by two-thirds of the farmers—our tobacco program also appropriately provides for price supports in order to safeguard individual farmers against unnecessary loss. This is not a subsidy. I want to make that clear from the outset. It is not a special benefit or a giveaway. Price support is simply a tool—in the case of tobacco, it is a loan which is repaid—in our production-control kit. In this tobacco production-adjustment program, price support does two things: First, it makes possible the adjustments in the total supply, which are achieved over several crop years, by stabilizing prices during the period in which these adjustments are being made. Second, it extends equal price protection to all farmers contributing to the production-control effort.

While the tobacco price-support and production-control program is in several respects similar to our programs for the other basic commodities, it is in many respects unique—in its design, operation, and results. And although the tobacco program has been an outstanding success among all our farm programs, I believe it is neither well understood nor as widely appreciated, at least in areas of the United States which do not produce tobacco, as it deserves to be.

For example, it has been said on the floor of the Senate that under this program the growing of tobacco is subsidized by the Government, and by taxpayers. A number of people may be under that mistaken impression, for I have also seen it expressed in newspapers and magazines. On the other hand, I understand that officials of the Department of Agriculture have sometimes been criticized because their other price-support or production-control efforts are not as successful as the tobacco program. That may not be entirely fair either, because each commodity is different and has its own special problems; what works for one may not work at all for another. Even in the Department of Agriculture, however, the merits of the tobacco program occasionally seem to be overlooked, or may not always be fully appreciated.

I hope we can bring about a better understanding of this program, and obtain for it the broader appreciation it deserves—not only among tobaccomen, but among all who are interested in farm problems, programs, and policies. I hope that I can contribute something to that understanding by describing today some of the basic reasons why a separate and distinct program is required for tobacco, and by showing how our present program makes good use of those characteristics which set tobacco apart in a class by itself.

Although I will discuss the program in the light of the most recent proposal to eliminate fixed 90-percent support for tobacco, the facts I expect to point out may apply with equal force to questions which may arise in the future, as they have in the past.

DISCRETIONARY PRICE SUPPORT HAS BEEN PROPOSED FOR TOBACCO

The Secretary of Agriculture recently recommended to the Congress a new approach to the farm problem. He said that production control is impractical, and that present laws governing acreage allotments and price supports are obsolete. He asked for major changes in the different price-support programs for the six basic farm commodities—corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice.

These programs, of course, play a central role in our efforts to protect, stabilize, and increase farm income so that farmers may share more fully in, and contribute more effectively to, the general prosperity and economic welfare of our country. They deal, however, with a wide variety of complex problems, many of which have proved difficult to solve, and which, therefore, are the subject of continuing attention and effort by the Congress, the executive branch, and by those most concerned—the farmers themselves.

After appearing before both the Senate and the House Committees on Agriculture, Secretary Benson laid his specific legislative recommendation on this subject before the chairman of the House committee on May 28. I am expressing my views at this time on this matter, as it affects tobacco growers, because I am convinced that that proposal would, if adopted, seriously threaten or destroy our tobacco program.

The official departmental proposal is primarily a request for much greater, and discretionary, flexibility—from 0 to 90 percent, or as a second choice from 60 to 90 percent of parity—in the price-support levels of the basic crops already under flexible support formulas. Now, I have the highest respect for the Secretary of Agriculture, and for his integrity in seeking overall solutions which will be fair and helpful to farmers, and which will benefit the country as a whole. I realize that he is faced with serious problems of continuing surplus production in some of the commodities for which strict production controls may not be desirable or practical—a responsibility which Congress, and agriculture itself, shares.

Included also in the Department's request, however, was tobacco—which has a distinct program of its own, for reasons I believe I can show are sound, and which is not a flexible support crop. As far as tobacco farmers are concerned, the idea of abandoning 90 percent support is a drastic proposal which is not justified by today's needs or by the record of performance made by that program.

I see no reason to compound our farm problems by opening the door to controversy over abandoning a program which has proved workable, effective, popular, economical, and fair to all segments of the industry and to the Nation as a whole.

TOBACCO PROGRAM—AND TOBACCO ITSELF—IS IN A CLASS BY ITSELF

In supporting this view, I will not take time to review the history and development of the tobacco program, although that history is most enlightening and offers us many lessons which we can study with profit today. It is enough to say that our present program rests squarely on that long history—which goes back 50 years to the days of the night riders in Kentucky, and over 300 years to the first crop control measures in the New World, taken at a time when severe depression in the tobacco areas already walked hand in hand with overproduction. (In 1639 the Province of Virginia enacted a tobacco production adjustment law.)

The tobacco program is distinctive not only in its historical origins, which proved in violence the need for production and mar-

keting controls long before such measures were adopted generally. It is also distinctive in the justifiable confidence which growers have placed in their program, and in the diligence they have exercised to keep that program sound. It is distinctive today as the one program with fixed supports, at 90 percent of parity, and established by law, and which, through effective production controls has made that support level work—to the advantage of growers, the Federal Government, and the taxpayer.

This is not to imply that tobacco has won a favored position to which it is not fully entitled, or at the expense of other commodities. That is not true. On the contrary, while billions have been spent in honest efforts to solve the problems of other commodities, and those of a lagging farm economy in general, the tobacco farmer has held the line and stuck to his program of balancing supply with demand.

Neither is it to imply that this program is necessary suited to other commodities. They have their own characteristics and particular problems. The only question involved here is whether or not a large group of over three-quarters of a million farmers, working together, is entitled to the help and assistance of their Government in carrying out and administering the program of their choice so long as they keep that program on a reasonably sound and equitable basis. My answer to this question is that their performance in good faith entitles tobacco growers to the continuation of their present program.

We have this distinct tobacco program today simply because the production, marketing and consumption of tobacco itself is in many ways unique. It therefore requires a different price support and production control program.

I would like to discuss now those characteristics which make tobacco different—which both require a separate program for it, and make that program workable. This fact has received too little attention: that the unique nature of tobacco not only creates special problems, but has also given us the solution to those problems. This coin has two sides. When we turn over the challenge we find opportunity—an opportunity which tobacco growers seized years ago, and which must not arbitrarily be taken from them.

I. PRODUCTION DIFFERENCES

First, as to its production, tobacco is a high-labor crop. It requires some 410 man-hours of labor to raise an acre of burley. That compares to approximately 81 man-hours for an acre of cotton, 11 man-hours for corn, and 4 for wheat—where, of course, a man may produce on 100 times as many acres.

Most of these long hours of labor represent hard, backbreaking toil. It takes a full year to produce an acre of burley tobacco. In fact, because seedbeds are often burned, steamed or chemically treated in the fall, before the crop is sold, the tobacco farmer's year may be 13 months long.

The seedbed is ordinarily sown in January or February. The young plants are carefully nurtured under canvas, and are transplanted when the ground warms up and the weather is right. In the summer months, the tobacco is cultivated a number of times, wormed by hand or sprayed, topped, suckered, and perhaps primed. Then it is cut, hung in the barn, cured, stripped, sorted into grades and tied in hands—and finally sold just in time to prepare the seedbed for the next crop. Each of these operations, and the many others involved, are done by hand. Each requires careful management and attention. Successful tobacco culture is an acquired art—as well as a skill based on years of experience.

At every step of the way, the tobacco grower is beset by disease, pests, and capricious weather. Having finally learned to control to some extent the additional vagaries of his markets, the tobacco farmer feels that a reasonably stable price structure is indispensable to his efforts, and is his just due.

In terms of his special need for effective price supports, this high-labor requirement means that when the four or five baskets of burley produced on an acre of our tobacco land are set out for sale on the warehouse floor, a year of the farmer's toil, hope and fears is sold at auction. Typically, tobacco is this farmer's major cash crop—his primary source of income. Our growers must depend, then, to an unusual degree on their price-support program.

This mutual dependence of growers on their program has, however, served to encourage and develop that spirit of cooperation and sense of responsibility which contribute so much to the success of the tobacco program. In the practical operation of that program, tobaccogrowers, and representatives of the trade as well, join together to resolve their problems in a way that is fair to all, and that is in the best interests of their industry and its individual members.

Second, tobacco production is not mechanized. For example, no machine has been developed to harvest the delicate tobacco leaves—which are as perishable as green garden vegetables until they are cured.

Because tobacco culture is unsuited to mechanization, and production has not been mechanized, we know that the second acre of tobacco costs the farmer as much to raise as the first. For many crops, it may be true that production per farmworker has doubled in the last 15 years—thus creating a "new dimension in farm policy" in these areas. Contrary to the general trend, however, and because of increased quality requirements, raising an acre of tobacco requires more labor today than it did 15 years ago. (Table I.)

The belief that the "technological revolution" in agriculture as a whole makes possible, through increased mechanization, sufficiently lower costs on added units of production to more than offset the lower average price received does not apply in the case of tobacco. Nearly every grower would like to increase his tobacco acreage, of course—but not when he knows that the price he receives would drop, while his hours of labor and cost per unit of production would remain about the same.

This basic difference in production methods, which sets tobacco apart from the trend in much of agriculture, does, however, simplify the issue as to what is a proper level of price support for this crop. There is little question about the level of prices required to assure tobacco farmers a fair return for their labor. Tobacco farmers, large and small, are generally agreed that 90 percent of parity provides them a decent minimum wage floor (although less than hourly rates for common labor), and that a lower price would not be accompanied by a compensating increase in sales and decrease in labor requirements.

Third, tobacco is an intensive crop. For this reason, it is well suited to our small family farms, in hilly country, and on soils where other crops may not do so well, as well as on superlative soil such as we have in the Kentucky bluegrass.

The average size burley allotment in my State last year was 1.37 acres. However, that acre and a third produced over a ton of high-quality cigarette tobacco—worth $1,400 to the Kentucky farmer who sold it on last December's market. That typical Kentucky patch of tobacco, in fact, produced burley for 2 million cigarettes, or 10,000 cartons.

Only 2 percent of all burley allotments are larger than 5 acres; 90 percent are smaller than 2 acres; and one-fourth are half an acre or less (table II).

Because high value of production is associated with these small plots, however, and because our present program works, hundreds of thousands of modest family-type farms are able to depend on their tobacco allotment as a major source of income. For example, 300,939 farmers have burley allotments this year, of which 146,611 are in Kentucky. Including Dark-fired and Dark Air-cured as well as burley, there are 174,579 tobacco allotments in Kentucky.

The continued progress and growth of Kentucky agriculture rests, then, to a large degree, on our tobacco price support program. Most of the rural families in my State live on small farms, and have few alternative sources of income. These farms, cultivated intensively rather than extensively, do not have the broad fields of level, tillable acreage suited to large-scale crop production with heavy equipment and self-propelled machinery. Tobacco is and must be their main cash crop. In fact, at least 3 out of 4 farms in my State raise tobacco, and some 200,000 rural Kentucky families depend on tobacco for a substantial or major portion of their income.

These are the men who know tobacco best—and who produce the world's finest tobacco. I do not believe they will agree that it is worth less than parity, or that their years of experience and months of toil should be sold cheaper.

In terms of workable production controls, however, this intensive land use means that tobacco can well afford the strict measurement and compliance checking we now have, the cost of which is less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the crops' value. Small allotments having a high dollar value of production make accurate measurement practical and economical. So again we find reasons in the nature of tobacco culture itself which justify a distinctive production control and price support program.

Fourth, tobacco is a highly specialized regional crop. Burley and Flue-cured tobacco—the major cigarette types—accounted for 90 percent of last year's billion-dollar tobacco crop. Kentucky produced two-thirds (66.2 percent) of the burley, North Carolina two-thirds (67.6 percent) of the Flue-cured tobacco.

In my own State, tobacco is a quarter-billion-dollar crop, and produces 43 percent of Kentucky's cash income from farm products sold. In the great Bright leaf State of North Carolina, over half the farm income comes from tobacco. Nine States raise most of our tobacco, and within those States there are highly concentrated areas specializing in the various qualities of tobacco, of which there are 26 distinct domestic types and 1,466 grades (table III.)

This concentration is a natural historical consequence of tobacco's peculiar dependence on soils and climate. Identical seed planted in adjoining counties may produce two different types of tobacco. Each year's weather may turn out a markedly different tobacco crop in the same area. Under identical weather conditions, variations in soil from farm to neighbor's farm result in noticeably different qualities. Moreover, each stalk of burley tobacco produces several grades from tips (until recently worth least) to trash (customarily worth much more)—and I have not mentioned differences resulting from cultural and curing practices.

This complex array of qualities, which depends on such a variety of closely related factors, is highly important to our tobacco trade and to our modern tobacco industry. It marks a difference in product which makes clear, I believe, tobacco's need for a special program of its own. It is local specializatrum of products—from heavy, smoke "black" tobaccos to the mild, bright, golden leaf.

This local specialization, moreover, contributes greatly to the effectiveness of our tobacco program. Perhaps in no other crop would rigid allotments based on historical production be more justifiable, nor could historical production patterns be continued more equitably.

I do not say that our tobacco program allows complete freedom of enterprise, but the equity of historically based production patterns is well established and widely accepted. Tobacco producers do feel that this program, in which they join together in a cooperative effort to comply with the law of supply and demand, provides them essential freedom in the marketplace to sell their product for what it is worth.

II. MARKETING DIFFERENCES

Marketing differences which require a separate and distinct price-support and production control program for tobacco, and which also make the present program workable, are perhaps even more significant than the production differences.

My fifth point, therefore, is that all our farmers' tobacco is channeled exclusively through central markets. None is kept on farms. Each selling season farmers must take the entire crop of cigarette tobacco to the auction warehouses—scene of the familiar "tobacco chant."

Our system of cooperative marketings for tobacco was developed after years of trial and error and travail. It works well. It seeks to provide uniform sales conditions, to insure that buyers are available for all the tobacco offered, and that farmers are protected from sharp seasonal fluctuations in price through the option which each may exercise of selling at the price bid or else having his baskets of tobacco delivered to the "pool" under the price-support program.

This auction warehouse system, operating in conjunction with the pools, is the central mechanism around which our successful tobacco program is organized. It offers distinct advantages in the price support operations of that program. For example, it makes possible a definite floor, not only for the tobacco crop as a whole, but for each farmer's individual lots of tobacco.

Under this plan, it has not been necessary for the Government to purchase large surpluses, as with some other crops. The plan is also fair to the farmer, in that he is the direct beneficiary of the price-support effort—receiving immediately 90 percent of parity in cash, and a dividend on any amount over that for which the tobacco is later sold. This whole operation is so sensible, in fact, that it is handled without loss by the farmers' marketing cooperatives under contract with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Our central marketing system also makes practical and workable the realistic production controls required for no-loss operation of 90-percent supports, because it permits accurate identification of the source of all tobacco sold. In addition, it makes conveniently available the data for accurate market reports on the amounts and prices of the various graders sold.

The sixth difference which sets tobacco apart, and requires a separate program for it, is the limited field of buyers for this crop. As I pointed out when I sponsored the amendment first establishing in law 90 percent of parity as a separate provision for tobacco, the major buyers competing for the tobacco offered by three-quarters of a million farmers can be counted on the fingers of both hands. Six companies produce 99 percent of the cigarettes, and three of these account for 73 percent (table IV).

This is a situation unique in agricultural marketing as far as I know. Usually less than half a dozen major buyers are represented on any auction floor. These buyers can scarcely fail to be familiar with each other's needs and practices. A farmer who trucked his crop of tobacco 50 miles to the warehouse was at the mercy of buyers before the protection offered by this fixed support floor was inaugurated.

I consider my speech on this subject, made in the Senate on June 17, 1948, still to be a correct statement. That was during the debate on the long-range agricultural program, which required a change from fixed 90-percent supports to flexible supports down to 60 percent of parity on all basic commodities, including tobacco. At that time the Senate adopted my amendment preserving 90-percent support for tobacco, it was written into the law, and this separate provision for tobacco has been retained through every change made in our farm programs since that time. I quote from that speech:

"It is my contention, and one which I believe is supported by the facts, that the unusual conditions under which tobacco is produced and marketed, when coupled with the usually limited field of buyers, operate to give a dominant bargaining position to the buyers and to deprive the producer of tobacco of a free market, in the sense that a market is enjoyed by the producers of other agricultural commodities. In this limited market, the buyer pays a price which is not necessarily or always related to the law of supply and demand, but is fixed by the maximum amount the buyers must pay to get the tobacco, which in reality is the support price. For this reason the support price should remain fixed at 90 percent of parity."

As I pointed out 9 years ago, and I quote: "The tobacco farmer must take his crop to the place where the representative of the great tobacco manufacturers will come to buy his crop. Unless the representatives are there, the tobacco farmer cannot sell his tobacco. The farmer who has spent a year in backbreaking toil to produce a crop of tobacco, which is his cash crop and his principal source of income, knows that he must sell his tobacco to one of the few buyers, or else lose his years' labor. Can it be doubted that the buyers know that the farmer must sell or lose the work of a year?"

At that time, I offered the opinion, "which is one shared by my constituents, who know every phase of tobacco growing, buying, and selling, that the Federal Government offers through its parity and support-price program the only substantial assurance the tobacco growers have that they will receive a reasonable price for their product."

A seventh distinction, which operates to make our tobacco loan program among the most effective of farm price-support efforts, relates to the excellent storage qualities of tobacco. Cured tobacco, redried and compressed into 1,000-pound hogsheads, is virtually nonperishable, thus reducing the risk of holding loan stocks several years for improved markets. In fact, tobacco increases in value as it is aged. This enhanced value in itself often covers storage and interest charges on loan stocks held for up to 2 to 4 years.

Without a fixed level of support, on the other hand, this very storability would operate to the farmers' disadvantage—as it did for the hundred years when 1 year of good prices was followed by 2 or 3 years of starvation prices. In the absence of a strong support program, tobacco farmers are placed in double jeopardy; first, from lower prices caused by a year of unexpected abundance, and second, from reduced production or lower prices in later years as these hogsheads are moved from storage into trade. Producers of perishable crops, at least, are exposed to economic loss only once, and need make but a single adjustment.

It may be argued that flexible supports are desirable for semiperishable commodities, where old stocks must be moved or spoil, or where adjustments must reflect current consumption at all times. But, in tobacco, the very possibility of lowering supports could tend to depress prices. Progressively lowered support prices would, of course, soon destroy the tobacco program, and would result in huge losses in the process.

III. CONSUMPTION DIFFERENCES

An eighth and very important consideration is that there are no alternative uses for our tobacco. Most farm products have a number of uses, and can compete in a wide variety of markets at different price levels; many in fact must take into account these changing relationships. Again it may be argued in the case of some other crops that flexible supports will enable these commodities to seek out alternative uses and markets, or will encourage industrial utilization of farm products. Tobacco has no such opportunity.

This lack of alternative uses for tobacco clearly shows the need for controlling production and supplies in line with the demand for cigarette tobaccos. Burley and Flue-cured growers know that they are completely dependent on this single-use market, that at best they can profitably sell only as much tobacco as we smoke.

On the other hand, the limited use for tobacco provides a much clearer picture of the demand-supply situation than most commodities enjoy. The question of how much tobacco is needed is argued within relatively close limits, and is understood by farmers. They can then support, and do support, a program which meets these realities, and which gives each of them a fair share of the market at a fair price. So once more a special problem in tobacco contributes to the practical workability of our present program.

My ninth point concerns the relatively inelastic consumer demand for tobacco. Agricultural economists have shown, and it is historically true, that the price farmers receive for their leaf bears little or no relation to that consumer demand. The supply of tobacco, of course, almost wholly determines prices farmers receive, and realistic recognition of this fact has led growers to acceptance of progressively more effective production controls.

Burley consumption, in turn, may depend on a number of factors, but the price paid to the farmer is not a major one—because his percentage of the retail sales price is so small. These two facts taken together—that consumer demand plays a minor role in determining the farmer's price, and that his price scarcely affects consumption of tobacco—make an effective, stable price-support program essential if tobacco growers are to share equitably in the fruit of their labor. In addition, they remove from economic controversy the desirability of 90-percent support for this commodity.

I would like to point out here why the price farmers get for their tobacco has little or no effect on domestic sales of cigarettes. In a pound of manufactured tobacco, worth $3.45 at retail last year, Federal and State excise taxes account for $1.37, or 40 percent; manufacturing and distribution margins are $1.53 or 44 percent, and the farmers' end is 55 cents or 16 percent. For the tobacco in a 25-cent pack of cigarettes, the farmer receives about 3½ cents. Therefore, a 10-percent drop in farmers' prices would save only 3 mills on the cost of a pack of cigarettes.

I believe American consumers are willing and able to pay the farmer this very reasonable price for his tobacco. I might add that whereas farmers generally receive 40 percent of the consumer dollar—and we are concerned about such a low share—tobacco farmers receive less than half that.

As I understand the reasoning behind the Secretary's present proposals for all the basic crops, a lower support price is supposed to stimulate increased consumption and sales so that the price drop will be offset, or more than offset, by an increase in farmers' sales,

and therefore an increase in their gross income or net income. This may be true in the case of other farm commodities, and I know that in manufacturing, for example, the greatly increased sales volume which may result from small reductions in price has played a very important part in our economic development.

However, because the consumer demand for tobacco is relatively inelastic in the first place, and because prices paid farmers are scarcely reflected in the retail price of cigarettes in the second place, I do not believe that the Secretary's argument would apply in the case of tobacco.

It is true that "production times price equals income," but the experience of tobacco growers is that small increases in production can cause sharp decreases in price, and in their income—and that prices continue to fall far faster than any increase in poundage sold can possibly make up.

IV. HOW THE TOBACCO PROGRAM HAS WORKED FOR THE GOVERNMENT

A 10th difference is that, alone among our different price-support operations for nonperishable commodities, the tobacco program does not result in burdensome Government-owned stocks. As a matter of fact, the Commodity Credit Corporation does not now own a pound of tobacco—and has not had a pound of cigarette tobacco in its inventory since World War II, when it help supply our Allies. CCC neither has to buy tobacco in the open market, nor under purchase agreements—nor has it been necessary for CCC to take title to any loan tobacco in recent years. In other words, tobacco is not subsidized. The tobacco price support program has, in fact, made several million dollars in interest profits on CCC loans.

This remarkable record must be credited to the farmers who have made the sacrifices necessary to keep their part of the bargain in this program. The Government can do no less than to keep its part of the bargain and maintain 90 percent support prices so long as growers continue to demonstrate their willingness to keep this program sound.

The distinctive machinery for this efficient and economical program is to be found in the operations and responsibilities of the tobacco pools, or grower cooperatives, which undertake to sell loan stocks of tobacco at a profit to the farmer over the 90-percent rate, and which over the long run have succeeded in doing so. These pools may not be wholly perfect, but they are a very important part of a system which has dealt with difficult problems with outstanding success. Several of them predate our Government programs by a number of years, and their experience and influence are generally recognized.

Our tobacco loan program actually operates just as the name implies it should. It is expected that the tobacco held as the security for those loans will be advantageously merchandised at private sale, and that the money advanced will then be repaid to the Government in full. It has worked this way with conspicuous success. In the 11 years since the war, for example, CCC has loaned $1½ billion to the tobacco pools to cover the amounts advanced to farmers. Nearly a billion dollars of that has been repaid by these pools, with interest, and the remainder is secured by current stocks of tobacco. I submit that this is an outstanding record for any Government loan program particularly on a farm commodity. (Table V.)

I will not take time to mention here a number of less striking differences in the operation of our tobacco program and the legislation which governs it, except to say that tobacco farmers, their leaders and their representatives in Congress, have generally resisted a number of special or fringe benefits enjoyed by other commodities. They have done so for the sole reason that they did not want in any way to jeopardize their right and claim to fixed 90-percent supports.

A final difference between tobacco and other farm commodities is that it is the only one on which excise taxes are imposed.

While the operation of our price support program for tobacco has not cost the Government anything, tobacco has brought immense revenues to local, State, and Federal Governments. This fact alone merits the continuation of a tobacco program which insures stable prices and balance supplies.

Each year Federal and State excise tax receipts from tobacco far exceed farmers' cash receipts for tobacco, as the chart from the cover of the March Tobacco Situation shows. The Federal excise tax on tobacco returned $1,639 million to the Government last year. States received $513 million from their own excise taxes. Municipalities benefited by substantial sums. In addition, import duties on tobacco amounted to $19 million last year. While not levied with a view toward aiding farmers, these considerations ought to at least obtain for tobacco farmers a sympathetic attitude toward their problems and needs.

These annual receipts of over $2 billion in Federal and State revenues from the growers' efforts are about double the return to the growers themselves. That relationship is well illustrated by the blue stamp of a rather glum DeWitt Clinton which seals every pack of cigarettes. The stamp is worth 8 cents to Uncle Sam. The grower gets 3½ cents for the tobacco within.

This high-revenue-producing capacity and special contribution sets tobacco apart, in a separate class by itself. As my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Florida, stated on this floor 2 years ago: "It is a highly important matter to the Federal Government, therefore, that tobacco growers shall prosper, and that there shall be a sustained abundant level of tobacco production as free as possible from either overproduction or underproduction."

It may be pertinent to point out here that the Federal tax alone produced by tobacco since 1932 ($25 billion) would pay twice over for the entire cost to the United States of the farm price-support and farm-income stabilization programs, broadly interpreted, for all commodities, basic and nonbasic, in the last 25 years. This includes CCC nonrecourse loan, purchase, and payment programs; the National Wool Act; the International Wheat Agreement; donations of commodities to other nations; Public Law 480 sales for foreign currencies; school lunch and other welfare distribution; the Sugar Act; Federal crop insurance; acreage allotment payments under the ACP program from 1937 to 1944; parity payments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; and the programs under the triple A of 1933.

V. HOW THE TOBACCO PROGRAM HAS WORKED FOR TAXPAYERS

In commenting for a moment on how the present tobacco program has worked for taxpayers and consumers, I would like to refer to the figures accompanying the Secretary's well-known letter of May 2 to Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. It was the substance of this letter which Secretary Benson shortly thereafter embodied in his legislative proposals for tobacco as well as the other basic crops, and which he sent to the House Committee on Agriculture on May 28.

These figures indicate that in the last 25 years, through June 30, 1956, the "net realized cost of programs primarily for the stabilization of farm prices and farm income" was $11.8 billion. Tobacco's share of that amount was $105.3 million, according to the table on page 7—or less than 1 percent of the total, charged to the Nation's fourth largest field crop produced by 11 percent of her farms. It is a modest figure when compared to the others on that page, and in saying this I do not imply that the other commodities and other farmers do not fully deserve the help we have tried to give them.

I would like to point out, moreover, that the great bulk of this money was spent for soil conserving activities in the 1930's. Only the figure "3" to the right of the decimal in this $105.3 million amount reflects CCC losses on tobacco price-support operations. That was the cumulative figure, over all the years of the tobacco programs, through June 1956. Since that time the loss has been reduced as of May 31 of this year to only $10,924—or eliminated for all practical purposes. Furthermore, interest income on CCC loans is not shown in this table—possibly because tobacco is the only commodity which produces an interest profit. Since 1948 and before, therefore, the entire tobacco price-support program has operated without loss—winning for it an especially unique place in our farm price support operations.

I believe this analysis shows how well the tobacco program has served taxpayers as well as farmers, and will continue to serve them in the future. All our people, in cities and towns as well as on farms, may well consider it the most successful of all our farm programs—in their own and their neighbor's interest.

One other point in the Department's May 2 statement calls for comment. That is, that "about two-thirds of all producers are at the minimum (allotment for burley) and thus sealed off from any visible relationship between the level of their price support and the size of their allotment." That is not true. As I have shown, in table II, only one-fourth of the burley allotments are at the minimum of five-tenths of 1 acre or under.

Finally, I would like to review what our tobacco program has meant to farmers.

VI. HOW THE TOBACCO PROGRAM HAS WORKED FOR FARMERS

Perhaps the most eloquent testimony on what farmers think of their tobacco program is found in the referendum votes. In the elections held since 1948, burley and Fluecured growers have consistently cast ballots approving marketing quotas by between 95 and 98 percent. Their interest in these elections is real, because the tobacco program is vital to their welfare.

In April 1955, for example, 74 percent of the eligible burley voters came out to vote. That was the year our growers were faced with the hard decision to cut their allotments by 25 percent, reduce minimum allotments from seven-tenths to five-tenths acre, increase the penalty on excess or "red card" tobacco from 50 to 75 percent, and close the door to establishing allotment history by growing penalty tobacco. The vote was in favor of the program—by 96 percent. That is quite a plurality and quite a turnout at the polls for any election. In all the history of our farm programs, I can think of no more dramatic demonstration than this of the willingness of a group of farmers to make the sacrifices which are sometimes necessary to keep their program sound.

A brief glance at the dollar-and-cent figures on farm prices and income over the years will show what this program has meant to tobacco farmers in pocketbook terms. At the turn of the century Kentucky farmers could sell their tobacco for only 4 cents a pound. Farmers were desperate—literally up in arms—but began then to organize for the long search for a solution to their problems. In 1910–14, a stable period for agriculture generally, burley was worth 9 cents, and the crop brought farmers barely $20 million.

Conditions had not improved a great deal by 1930–34, when representatives of growers began working with the Department of Agriculture on what was to evolve into our present tobacco program. Fifteen years later, 1945–49, burley prices were 3½ times higher—

and the crop was worth six times as much to farmers—a quarter of a billion dollars instead of $40 million. Even in terms of "real" dollars, burley prices had nearly doubled, and larger but controlled crops tripled farmers' purchasing power from their burley.

These gains have been maintained and improved under peacetime operation of our postwar program. Last year the burley crop sold for the highest prices on record—averaging 63.5 cents a pound for a crop which returned $322 million to farmers.

Farmers are selling their 1957 Flue-cured crops in the Carolinas today, and marketing has been finished in the Georgia-Florida belt. This crop, too, is bringing record prices—a dramatic change from the situation last year when Flue-cured supplies threatened to get out of hand, and which must be credited to a realistic cut in allotments, prompt measures to eliminate less desirable varieties, and participation in the soil bank. Burley growers, who cure their crop more slowly by natural air drying and market it later in the year, are looking forward to another favorable selling season on their 1957 crop, now being housed in their tobacco barns.

I think this record of increased crop values and better tobacco prices clearly shows what our tobacco program, using the tools of 90 percent support and production control to match, has meant, and can continue to mean, to farmers (table VI).

CONCLUSION

I do not say tobacco farmers have no problems today. We do have some problems in tobacco—as in all other phases of agriculture with which I am familiar. We need to maintain and increase our export sales—which account for 6 percent of the burley market and a larger portion of the market for other tobaccos. Increasing yields per acre may make production adjustment through acreage control more difficult as new varieties and cultural methods are adopted. The shift to filter cigarettes is changing consumption patterns, and new manufacturing methods are beginning to be used.

But these are all problems which can be handled, and should be handled, within the framework of our present program—using the successful techniques already developed where these are applicable, and taking full advantage of the hard lessons of the past. In the past we have been able to meet problems at least as serious as these—within this framework. There is no need now to tear down the house built so painstakingly over many years.

I do not say that the tobacco program is perfect. Minor modifications in it have been made from time to time—without disturbing the foundation of 90 percent support on which it is erected—and may need to be made in the future. I do not say that it operates without a certain pulling and hauling at times. This is inevitable where a variety of interests are involved, and wherever earnest efforts are made to realistically limit production so that farmers may obtain fair prices without sibsidies. My colleagues and my friends know that I have helped work out these problems on many occasions.

I do say that tobacco farmers have learned how to work with and through the elemental forces of supply and demand, instead of being crushed by these forces. They have shown that by controlling production to match the demand they can achieve stabilized prices at an acceptable level without Government subsidy. They have made 90 percent-of-parity supports work—without loss to either growers or taxpayers.

In view of the latest proposal to Congress to abondon 90-percent support for tobacco, it seemed to me appropriate and timely to lay the facts in this matter before the Senate. It may well be that the Department of Agriculture, in drawing up a general, or blanket recommendation for all the basic commodities, simply failed to take into account the special nature and particular needs of tobacco—or the specific advantages offered by the present tobacco program. If that is the case, as I believe it to be, I trust the Department will not press its recommendation as applied to tobacco. In any event, I have no fear that the Congress would adopt such a proposal—which would threaten the livelihood of three-quarters of a million farm families.

I oppose lowering supports for tobacco. I am confident that my colleagues from the tobacco States take the same position, and will join me in opposing any move to destroy the present tobacco program. Furthermore, I believe it is plain to anyone who understands the problem that our tobacco program needs to be continued.

My purpose here today was to analyze this problem, to set out the basic reasons which require a distinct and separate price support and production control program for tobacco, and to show how the unique character of tobacco production, marketing, and consumption also contributes to making our present program effective and workable. It seemed to me worthwhile to enumerate those characteristics which make tobacco different, and the consequences which must follow from them, and I hope this appraisal will prove helpful.

Thanks to the joint efforts over many years of a great many conscientious and devoted people, and to the active cooperation of tobacco farmers everywhere, the tobacco program has been conspicuously successful. I believe it is a basically sound, helpful and essential part of our total farm program today. I believe it can continue to serve faithfully and well the Burley growers of my State, the rural economy of the South, and hence the general welfare of our country—and do so without placing an undue burden on the Federal Government or the taxpayer.

In closing, I feel I can do no better than to quote the President's agricultural message to the Congress of January 11, 1954. President Eisenhower said at that time that "each farm crop has its own problems, and these problems require specific treatment." And in regard to tobacco, the President stated: "Tobacco farmers have demonstrated their ability to hold production in line with demand at the supported price without loss to the Government. The relatively small acreage of tobacco and the limited areas to which it is adopted have made production control easier than for other crops. The level of support to cooperators is 90 percent of the parity price in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect. It is recommended that the tobacco program be continued in its present form."

I believe those conclusions are still valid, and that that recommendation is as sound today as it was 3½ years ago.

TABLE I.—*Labor used in production of field crops*

	1940-44 (hours)	1955 (hours)	Percentage more (+) or less (−)
Tobacco:			
Man-hours per acre	436	494	13
Man-hours per 100 pounds	42	34	19
Cotton:			
Man-hours per acre	99	81	18
Man-hours per bale	182	93	49
Wheat:			
Man-hours per acre	7.4	4.3	42
Man-hours per 100 bushels	43	22	49
Corn:			
Man-hours per acre	25.6	11.4	55
Man-hours per 100 bushels	80	28	65

Source: Agricultural Research Service, USDA, June 1957.

TABLE II.—*1957 burley tobacco allotments—Distribution by size; cumulative percentages*

	Kentucky	United States
0.3 acre and under ... percent	9.3	12.8
0.5 acre and under ... do	19.6	26.8
0.7 acre and under ... do	49.6	63.6
1 acre and under ... do	60.7	73.6
2 acres and under ... do	82.6	90.0
5 acres and under ... do	96.7	98.2
Average allotment ... acres	1.37	1.03

Source: Tobacco Division CSS, USDA, April 1957.

TABLE III.—*Farmers' cash receipts from tobacco—Latest 5-year average; percentage of total for 9 leading States; percentage tobacco contributes to State's cash receipts from sales of farm products*

	Tobacco receipts (million)	Percentage of United States	Percentage of all farm products sold
North Carolina	$491	42.8	52.7
Kentucky	230	20.1	42.4
South Carolina	92	8.0	26.1
Virginia	83	7.2	18.0
Tennessee	73	6.4	15.4
Georgia	66	5.8	10.3
Connecticut	23	2.0	13.4
Maryland	19	1.7	7.6
Florida	22	1.9	3.8
Other tobacco States	48	4.1	1.2
United States	1,147	100.0	3.7

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA, June 1957.

TABLE IV.—*Cigarette output by companies, 1956*

	Billions of cigarettes	Percent of total
American Tobacco	128.9	30.1
R. J. Reynolds	113.5	26.5
Liggett & Myers	68.4	16.0
Brown & Williamson	50.0	11.7
Philip Morris	39.7	9.3
P. Lorillard	22.8	5.3
All others	5.1	1.1
Estimated output	428.4	100.0

Source: Harry M. Wooten report, Printers' Ink, Dec. 28, 1956.

TABLE V.—*CCC postwar commodity loans—Net cash outlay to farmers under price support program fiscal years 1947 through 1957*

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	Percentage repaid to date	Purchases
All commodities	$19,718.1	$6,065.8	30.8	$6,179.3
Wheat	5,940.4	1,387.8	23.4	442.4
Cotton	5,410.3	1,802.3	33.3	67.7
Corn	3,644.5	653.1	17.9	534.1
Tobacco	1,526.9	945.3	61.9	1.6

Source: Commodity Credit Corporation, USDA.

TABLE VI.—*Burley tobacco prices and crop values, U.S. season average price and value of production, 5-year averages from 1910*

	Price per pound (cents)		Crop value (millions)	
	Actual	Purchasing power	Actual	Purchasing power
1910–14	9.7	24.4	$20.2	$60.5
1915–19	23.5	38.1	65.7	113.4
1920–24	20.4	31.7	55.7	85.8
1925–29	21.9	33.9	57.8	89.4
1930–34	12.8	25.9	41.5	83.4
1935–39	22.2	44.3	67.0	133.3
1940–44	35.4	56.7	148.3	232.4
1945–49	43.8	47.9	247.3	271.5
1950–54	50.6	45.7	303.4	273.2
1955	58.6	52.3	275.2	245.7
1966	63.5	55.7	321.8	282.3

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA, June 1967. Cols. 3 and 5 adjusted to "real" prices and values by using 1947–49 index of prices paid by farmers for commodities, services, interest, taxes, and wage rates equals 100.

Exclusiveness Hurting GOP, Volpe Asserts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful calls to the 13th Annual Republican Women's Conference this year came from Gov. John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts.

Governor Volpe made the vital point that a political party must be inclusive, not exclusive. And he noted that this formula has brought results in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. As a member of three minority groups, the Governor said, he has seen from his own experience the value of appealing to all people.

I think that the Governor's remarks deserve the attention of all thinking Republicans and under unanimous consent I insert the April 4 Washington Post account of his talk in the RECORD:

EXCLUSIVENESS HURTING GOP, VOLPE ASSERTS

(By Kay Roberts)

Gov. John A. Volpe of Massachusetts gave his party, the Republican Party, and his audience, Republican women, a good scolding yesterday for "deadly exclusiveness," and said, in essence, that it is time to shape some things up.

Speaking before the final brunch of the 13th Annual Republican Women's Conference, Volpe charged the GOP with deserting the minority groups that originally made up the party: "farmers, Negroes, Americans of all ethnic groups—French, Poles, Italians, and so forth."

"We sought and took their votes, but we gave them very little recognition," he said. "The Republican Party became the exclusive party—exclusive at the top. We excluded instead of included the minority groups who were in fact the very life blood of our party."

FOR SOMETHING

Himself the son of Italian immigrants and a onetime card-carrying member of the plasterers union, Volpe said that the Republicans must concentrate on bringing ethnic groups and labor back into the party.

They must be shown, he said, "that we care for them and for their problems—that we, the Republican Party today, are for something rather than against everything—that we are for education, for mental health, for highways, for industry, for jobs, for people in all walks of life."

And he added, "first of all we must show that our party is not living in the 19th century and trying to face 20th century problems."

DISUNITY OFFSET

He said that President Johnson carried Massachusetts by 1,236,000 votes last November but that he [Volpe], his running mate and the Republican candidate for attorney general, Edward W. Brooke, a Negro, won by several thousand on the State level.

Disunity of the Republican Party at the national level, he said, was offset at the State level by hard work coupled with a ticket that "was not wrapped up in an exclusive Anglo-Saxon Protestant package."

Volpe described other 1964 races that put Republican representatives of minority groups into office. These he said disrupted the deadly exclusiveness of the Republican Party.

The Late Emmet J. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1965, the American maritime industry lost one of its greatest men in the passing of my longtime friend, Emmet J. McCormack, cofounder of Moore-McCormack Lines. I should like to call to the attention of the House what his associates at Moore-McCormack Lines had to say about him in their 1964 annual report:

The death on February 24, 1965, of Emmet J. McCormack, cofounder, former chairman of the board and director of Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., marked the end of a lifetime in shipping.

Mr. McCormack was born in Brooklyn, N.Y., in 1880 of Irish immigrant parents. His boyhood days were spent in the area presently occupied by the company's piers at the foot of 23d Street. After leaving school at the early age of 14, he found gainful employment in various enterprises. He shipped out for a while as a seaman, later retiring to become a deckhand on a towboat. This latter job provided the means for this 25-year-old natural-born salesman to organize his own coal bunkering operation, the Commercial Coal Co. Later he acquired a part interest in a 150-ton salvage boat, which was the beginning of an eventful life in shipping. At the age of 31 he was head of the company that started the Richmond-Brooklyn ferry service.

In 1913, Emmet J. McCormack joined forces with Albert V. Moore and formed the Moore & McCormack Co., Inc., later to become Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc. The blend of their talents, knowledge and experience, coupled with a faith in the future, contributed immeasurably to the success of the company.

Mr. McCormack was cited by King Gustaf VI, of Sweden, with the Royal Order of Vasa, and also was honored by the Government of Brazil which awarded him the Order of the Southern Cross. In addition, he was named honorary mayor of St. Louis, and an honorary citizen of the State of Maryland. He was a former deputy commissioner of the city of New York.

During World War I, Mr. McCormack served as an Overseas Adviser on Transportation to the Chairman of the U.S. Shipping Board, the Navy, and the War Department. He was instrumental in organizing the United States Lines prior to its being acquired by private interests.

He was associated with the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, a director of the New York Dock Co., a member of the American Bureau of Shipping, a member of the Naval Architects and Marine Engineers. He was ex officio chairman of the American Steamship Owners Association, now known as the American Merchant Marine Institute.

In addition to his maritime interests, Mr. McCormack organized the Kingsboro National Bank and was chairman of the board until its merger with the Colonial Trust Co. which is now part of the Meadow Brook National Bank. He was active also in the Democratic Party and served as a delegate to several national conventions.

To those of us who were not fortunate enough to know Mr. McCormack in the days of the *Barnstable*, the *Montara* and the *Saga*, one had only to see the friendly greetings extended to him from all hands on his way to and from his table at India House or the Whitehall Club to understand what his unfailing optimism and warm Irish wit meant to the company in those early days. As one of our directors recently put it "Mac has nothing but friends." As we confront the myriad problems facing the domestic shipping industry, we shall sorely miss his wise counsel.

Goodby to Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a big city newspaper editor can be more provincial than a barefoot country boy when he writes about something he does not understand. An editorial in the Sunday Star of April 4, 1965, entitled "Goodby to Braceros" demonstrates this. A short editorial can include so many inconsistent and misleading statements that it is impossible to answer.

A very few of the misleading statements are mentioned in the following letter which I wrote to the editor of the Evening Star.

This is a most serious and difficult problem that cannot be twitted and passed over with a flippant "goodby."

I ask Congress and the Secretary why Public Law 414 is available to hotel operators, but not to farmers? Unemployed are more willing to learn the service trades than "stoop" labor.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1965.

Mr. NEWBOLD NOYES,
Editor, the Evening Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NOYES: Your editorial "Goodby to Braceros" displays a provincial ignorance of vegetable agriculture and an utter disdain for the real problem of the migrant family.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with testimony that termination of the temporary Public Law 78 was not intended as a termination of the permanent Public Law 414. Growers are not asking Secretary Wirtz to enforce Public Law 78; they, and numerous workers in industries allied with or dependent upon agriculture, are urging the Secretary to legally utilize Public Law 414 to prevent wholesale crop spoilage and unemployment of local domestic workers. You must try to understand the difference.

The problem is appreciated by everyone who lives and works in a vegetable producing area—and not understood by eastern big city dwellers who have never been on a farm and have no idea how artichokes or asparagus grow.

Like you, our Department of Labor is not oriented to the farms or agriculture. City-dwellers enjoy the "chow lines" and banquets, but ignore or neglect the problems of planting, cultivation, harvesting, processing, and distribution of vegetables.

If you had to live only a week with a nomadic farm family (especially observing the sensations and feelings of the innocent children), you might know somewhat of the cruelties you want to perpetuate with the "migrant system." Next to communism and war, the migrant life is the cruelest existence to which we can subject children—truly un-American. The braceros did not "roam"; only the American domestic workers roam. This is a pathetic tragedy which should be discouraged—not encouraged.

For your information and consideration, unskilled farm workers earn more than they can earn at any other job anywhere. Is not the farmer just as entitled to competent, reliable labor as the manufacturer? Should the farmer alone be required to accept the rejects and unemployables from other industries?

Is the California farmer the one to carry the burden of solving the social and environmental problems of Harlem and the big city slums, the economic and planning problems of the West Virginia and Kentucky coal fields, and the educational and social problems of the South?

Admittedly, farm wages, working and living conditions should be improved; but it should also be remembered that the men living in California "farm labor camps" enjoy a better, cleaner bed; more ample and nutritious food; and better washing and laundry facilities than they have at home.

Automation and mechanization of agriculture is speeding ahead—eliminating first the jobs of those who need them most—the low-skilled, local domestic worker.

In yor noble humanitarian mission against the farmer why do you ignore the principal "mass exception to the law"—the wholesale importation of foreign workers to Washington, D.C., for work in restaurants and hotels? Is none of the 4 million unemployed Americans able to do this work? Why do you not advocate that Secretary Wirtz deny Public Law 414 to the hotels? Should not the big city hotel and restaurant operators be required to hire those drawing unemployment checks here in Washington every week—before importing foreign workers? Should not the wages of the hotel worker be increased to entice the unemployed in the Washington, Baltimore, and New York areas to come to work? Why such a different attitude toward farmers than hotel operators? Because the hotels are here and the farms are faraway in California?

Sincerely,

BURT L. TALCOTT,
U. S. Congressman.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

SPEECH
OF
HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 26, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, this is a crucial time for education in the United States. Some people may ask, why, in view of the economic progress we have been making and our predominant position of world leadership, it is necessary for the Federal Government to now begin to provide substantial aid to our Nation's elementary and secondary schools?

Our schools need Federal aid today because they are continually being asked to do more than was required of them in the past. Our schools are being asked today, not just to provide a basic education for all children, but to provide an education which will equip youngsters for a successful college career or to provide an education which will equip other youngsters for a highly competitive, skilled labor market.

Our schools need Federal aid today because we have reached the point in national maturity where we can no longer be satisfied with a goal of education for all, but we must strive for the goal of quality education for all.

Our schools need Federal aid today because in the decades to come the investment we make will determine whether we continue to be the most prosperous nation in the world, and the leader of the free world's democracies.

Historically, this country has realized that to have a strong, flourishing democracy there must be a strong, well-educated citizenry to support it. As far back as 1787, when the Continental Congress declared in the Northwest Ordinance that "Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged" the Federal Government has realized its responsibility toward supporting our educational system.

The Federal Government contributed to the educational resources of this Nation by establishing the land-grant college system when it saw that State and local governments could not provide the higher education desperately needed by the youngsters of our growing and spreading Nation. In 1917 there was a growing need for vocational education to train and equip our youngsters with job skills, a need which could not be filled by State and local governments alone, thus the Federal Government responded with the vocational educational acts. When our troops returned from Europe and Asia after World War II, no State or local government could fill their thirst and need for education, so the Federal Government once again stepped forward, this time with the GI bills. And again, when it was a need for training youngsters in the engineering and scientific and technical fields, a need that could not be filled in any other way, the Congress passed the National Defense Education Act to fill this gap.

The role of the Federal Government in giving aid to education has been an accepted and honored part of our history for almost 175 years, accepted because each program was enacted to meet definite needs only when other remedies were inadequate, honored because each program has been administered without evidence of Federal restrictions on academic freedom.

H.R. 2632 shall take its place in history as another instance where the Federal Government has seen the need to join with the State and local governments in proving adequate education for our citizens.

H.R. 2632 will be accepted by the American people because this program will be enacted to meet definite need where other remedies are inadequate. H.R. 2632 will be an honorable part of our history because it will be administered without evidence of Federal restrictions on academic freedom.

To properly carry out their primary responsibility for public schools, the State and local governments must have the utilization of the greater financial means which the Federal Government can provide through the various titles of this bill.

Title I of the bill provides approximately $1.06 billion for aid to school districts where at least 3 percent of the elementary and secondary school youngsters come from families with annual incomes of $2,000 or less. Approximately 5 million of our 48 million schoolchildren come from such families, families whose income prevents them from supporting the decent schools their children desperately need in order to break out of the grasp of poverty. Title I is designed to support and encourage the establishment and expansion of special programs, including the construction of minimum school facilities where needed, to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children of low-income families. These programs will be conducted, where needed, under a shared time arrangement so that no child who needs these services are denied them.

Title II of the bill provides $10 million to States for the purchase of books for elementary and high school libraries, and to purchase textbooks for children in public and private nonprofit schools. This title in the bill recognizes that every child must have access to the basic materials of instruction, if he is to receive a decent education.

Title III of the bill proposes a 5-year program to establish supplementary educational centers and services which would provide educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools. During 1966, $100 million would be distributed among the States for these programs which will enrich the educational diet of our children.

In title IV, there is authorized the training of research personnel and improved dissemination of information derived from educational research and development. This would give more assistance to the research facilities which are directed toward improving the quality of our schools.

Finally, title V of the bill authorizes grants for the strengthening of State departments of education. The $25 million provided in this title would stimulate State departments of education to continue their leadership role in the development of quality education for all American children.

The enactment of H.R. 2632 will mean a brighter future for our schools, for millions of our youngsters, and inevitably, for our country.

Air Flight Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with H.R. 2175, which would prohibit the coin-operated sale of air flight insurance, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article appearing in the March 21, 1965, issue of the New York Times entitled "Flight Insurance Fought by Pilots" and a subhead "Union Says Airport Vending Encourages Sabotage."

The article follows:

FLIGHT INSURANCE FOUGHT BY PILOTS—UNION SAYS AIRPORT VENDING ENCOURAGES SABOTAGE

WASHINGTON, March 20.—The Nation's airline pilots have opened an all-out campaign to ban the sale of flight insurance at airports.

The drive, a major project of the Air Line Pilots Association, is based on the pilots' belief that easy-to-buy trip insurance is too much of a temptation for sick minds.

The pilots' union asserts that insurance has been a possible or definite factor in at least five fatal crashes attributed to sabotage. And, it says, the insurance involved in most of the cases was airport vended.

The association has injected its considerable influence into one of the most bitter of aviation controversies. The union has no support from the Federal Aviation Agency and thus far only scattered backing in Congress.

The heat of the controversy can be best judged by a recent lawsuit, filed by the son of a man killed in a recent sabotage case. He sued the three insurance companies who sold the saboteur $105,000 in airport policies, accusing them of negligence in not screening the killer when he bought the insurance.

EXPERT WAS CONSULTED

The FAA last July asked an insurance expert to determine the relationship of flight insurance to sabotage cases and to recommend whether airport sales should be banned. The expert was Clarence Pell, Jr., who heads the aviation division of a large insurance firm.

His verdict: Neither limiting nor eliminating flight insurance would solve the sabotage problem.

The association challenged Mr. Pell's finding as somewhat suspect. It questioned the wisdom of having an insurance executive judge the merits of a question that would wipe out a lucrative business. The union says that flight insurance sales total $40 million annually. Some insurance officials say the actual figure is under $20 million.

While the pilots' group was naturally suspicious of Mr. Pell's objectivity, he was not alone in his findings. In 1963, a Government-Industry Committee on Airline Sabotage reached the same conclusion.

Here are the arguments and counterarguments on the issue:

For insurance: Why penalize the public by removing an inexpensive form of protection for families and loved ones? Sabotage is a terrible but admittedly rare crime.

Against insurance: Passengers can get protection elsewhere, through long-range travel or regular life insurance. For that matter, the families of those killed in air crashes aren't exactly being left destitute, even without flight insurance. The handmaiden of every air tragedy is an avalanche of lawsuits. One major accident involved damage claims of $77 million. Only about 20 percent of the passengers buy airport insurance.

For: Not all travelers can afford to buy large long-range policies or large amounts of regular life insurance.

Against: Why single out air travelers as having an apparently exclusive need for protection? At least 80,000 Americans die every year in automobile accidents, falls, drownings, fire, and other mishaps compared to the 200 who died in airline crashes last year. Air transportation can no longer be considered in the "special risk" category. Insurance companies admit this. They sell regular life insurance to pilots and stewardesses for the same rate paid by those who don't fly for a living.

For: There is no evidence to show that elimination of airport insurance would solve the sabotage problem. Motives other than insurance frequently are involved.

Against: Nobody says the elimination would end sabotage. But it would minimize the chances by removing the temptation for an easy payoff.

For: The record shows that not a single saboteur has ever collected from an insurance policy. This knowledge is the best deterrent against the crime.

Against: The fact that nobody has ever collected in the past is not likely to keep some deranged person from trying it anyway, nor has it prevented the most recent sabotage-for-insurance cases. Because an aircraft bombing usually involves total destruction, the saboteur believes he has at least some chance of getting away with his deed. Few laymen are aware of the clues that a bombing leaves behind. Sabotage is by no means a perfect crime, but there is considerable evidence that saboteurs regard it as such.

For: Anyone insane enough to commit mass murder isn't going to be deterred because he can't buy insurance at an airport. He would buy insurance elsewhere.

Against: Regular insurance involves some screening, by no means perfect, but at least more thorough than sales through an impersonal vending machine or by a girl at an airport counter. The availability of airport insurance probably tips the scales toward murder in a saboteur's mind.

Comdr. John M. Donlon, U.S. Navy, of Amsterdam, N.Y., an Outstanding Example of a Successful Naval Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of real pride to me that a native of my congressional district and a resident of my home city of Amsterdam, N.Y., has recently been honored on two separate occasions by the U.S. Navy of which he is an outstanding officer and a model of the kind of success that can come to a top career officer in this outstanding field.

The officer in question is Comdr. John M. Donlon, U.S. Navy, commanding officer of the nuclear-powered submarine U.S.S. *Shark*—SSN 591.

Commander Donlon has been honored by the Navy in two ways. First, he and his ship were awarded the 1964 Marjorie Sterrett Battleship Fund Award for battle efficiency and excellence. In addition, Commander Donlon also was himself awarded the Legion of Merit, one of the Navy's top decorations, for outstanding service as commanding officer of this great submarine.

Mr. Speaker, I have a particular pleasure in bringing to the attention of my colleagues here in the House the exploits of Commander Donlon, because he was first appointed to the Naval Academy by my distinguished predecessor from the original 32d District of New York, the Honorable Bernard W. "Pat" Kearney, who will be remembered by many Members as having been for many years an outstanding and distinguished Member of this House, and one whom I am proud to call my friend.

I know all of us in Amsterdam share "Pat" Kearney's pride in the achievements of this young man whose excellence Congressman Kearney recognized so clearly so many years ago when he appointed him to the Naval Academy. In fact Commander Donlon's achievements bring not only cerdit to himself and his family, but they also testify to the diligence with which former Congressman Kearney discharged his duties as a Member of this body in nominating young men to our service academies.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help adding one further observation, and that is that the submarine *Shark*, which Commander Donlon commands, is a sister ship of U.S.S. *Tinosa*—SSN 606, for which my wife was the original sponsor in Portsmouth, N.H., more than 3 years ago.

As a Member of this House and also a member of the Naval Reserve, I salute Commander Donlon, the officers and men of the U.S.S. *Shark*, Commander Donlon's family and friends in Amsterdam, and Gen. Pat Kearney, who appointed him to Annapolis.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two articles from the Amsterdam Evening Recorder, which describe these achievements in greater detail:

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) Evening Recorder, Oct. 20, 1964]

COMMANDER DONLON'S SUB WINS STERRETT AWARD

A submarine, commanded by an Amsterdamian, has been named winner of the 1964 Marjorie Sterrett battleship fund award. The nuclear-powered U.S.S. *Shark* (SSN591) under Cmdr. John M. Donlon, was selected by the Navy as first in battle efficiency competition during the year, and announcement was made by Adm. David L. McDonald, chief of naval operations, in a letter received last week:

"DEAR CAPTAIN DONLON: Congratulations to you, your officers and men on the occasion of the award of the Marjorie Sterrett battleship fund prize to the U.S.S. *Shark*.

"The history of the Marjorie Sterrett battleship fund is a manifestation of the faith that the American people have in our country and in our way of life, and of the trust placed in the Navy to safeguard these ideals. "The achievement of the U.S.S. *Shark* in winning this honor during the battle efficiency competition conducted by Commander Submarine Force Atlantic Fleet during fiscal year 1964 reflects the high standards of performance and leadership on the part of all hands during your tenure. This attainment by your command is an outstanding example of readiness.

"Well done."

STARTED IN 1916

In addition to the ward, enlisted men on the *Shark* will benefit from a cash prize of $638 for the ship's recreation fund. The Sterrett award dates from 1916 when the fund was started by the Tribune Association (now the New York Herald-Tribune) after receiving a dime from Majorie Sterrett, 13-year-old Brooklyn girl who had been reading about preparedness and who wanted to help build a battleship.

Various types of warships have been honored by the Navy which this year selected submarine competition, and the *Shark* was given No. 1 rating among the 90 submarines of the Atlantic Fleet. The Pacific Fleet award among 55 subs went to the U.S.S. *Scamp*, sister ship of the *Shark* and commanded by Cmdr. A. J. M. Atkins, classmate of Commander Donlon at Annapolis, 1949.

The Amsterdamian was given command of the *Shark* 1 year ago after transfer from the *Tinosa*, latest nuclear sub commissioned last week at Portsmouth, N.H. Sponsor of the *Tinosa*, launched 2 years ago, was Mrs. Samuel S. Stratton who witnessed Saturday's ceremonies at Portsmouth.

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) Evening Recorder, December, 1964]

CMDR. JOHN DONLON GETS LEGION OF MERIT MEDAL

An Amsterdam naval officer, Cmdr. John M. Donlon, U.S. Navy, has been presented with the Legion of Merit, the Nation's fifth highest award, for "exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service during a period of 1964."

Presentation was made last week by Rear Adm. Elliott Loughlin, commander of Submarine Flotilla 6 at the Charleston, S.C., naval base. The citation states:

"The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Legion of Merit to Comdr. John M. Donlon for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service during a period of 1964 as commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Shark* (SSN-591).

"Planning for and successfully executing a complex, difficult and important independent submarine operation, Commander Donlon, through his sound judgment, leadership and professional skill, was instrumental in achieving results of great value to the Government of the United States.

"His diligent and meticulous preparation, and his careful analysis and documentation of information were highly important contributions to the success achieved. His inspiring performance to duty was in keeping with the highest traditions of the U.S. Naval Service," according to the citation given by Paul H. Nitze, Secretary of the Navy, for the President.

Since the operation of the submarine *Shark* is classified, the Navy Department release offered no further information concerning the Legion of Merit award.

The crew of the *Shark* was recognized in October when the sub was honored with the Marjorie Sterrett Award as "first in battle efficiency" among 90 submarines of the Atlantic Fleet.

The Amsterdamian, son of Newspaperman Hugh P. Donlon and member of the Annapolis class of 1949, took over as commander of the sub in November of 1963. He and his family are currently residing at 1401 Pooshee Drive, Charleston, S.C.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is anyone in Congress or in my home State of Florida, who is more enthusiastic about education on all levels, or who believes more strongly than I, that more money needs to be spent on education, not only for classrooms, but for instructional materials and teachers' salaries.

I believe strongly, too, that our educational system is the real strength of our Nation. I always will support sound measures that improve education.

For example, I would gladly support a bill which earmarked a portion of our Federal tax moneys to be turned back to the States, earmarked solely for use in our State educational system, and which would leave control in State hands. Such a proposition would preserve the integrity of our State and local educational systems, which is a great overriding issue in this whole matter.

But after studying this bill and studying the report by Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's Committee on Education and Labor, I am convinced that this is not a sound piece of legislation.

There are many reasons why this bill is unsound. The biggest danger is that for the first time in the history of the Republic, the Federal Government is entering the field of general aid to education at the elementary and secondary level, signaling a dramatic shift of power from the local level to Washington.

This bold injection of the Federal Government into this field is camouflaged by proponents who argue the main purpose for the bill is that the Federal Government should and will help, in this legislation, poor school districts and underprivileged children.

As a matter of fact, however, this argument does not hold up on close examination of the bill. Instead, the most money will be funneled into the richest school districts in America and the least into the poorest.

Under this formula, the 10 richest counties, with approximately 32,000 children from poor homes, will receive $9 million.

The 10 poorest counties, with the same number of children from poor homes, will receive just half that amount, about $4.5 million. Nothing could be more unsound than this.

Here is another example of this inequality. Texas, Maine, and Florida have approximately equal per capita income per person and per family. Under the bill, Texas receives twice as much per school age child as Maine does, and half again as much as Florida does. This is certainly unfair.

Further, the bill ignores State distribution of school moneys, and under the present formula is another example of the inequality for distribution.

My 11th Congressional District of Florida is a case in point. Under title I of this bill, where the bulk of the money, over $1 billion, is to be spent, the 11th District, with desperate classroom shortage, thousands of students in double session, with more than twice the number of pupils than the 9th District, and raising 38.9 percent of its school money from local taxes, gets only $1,824,958.

The Ninth District, in turn, has no classroom shortage, raises only 19.6 percent of its school money from local taxes, but gets $2,009,840, or $200,000 more than we do under the bill.

As a matter of fact, taxes collected from my district by the State actually are funneled into the ninth district, as well as others, under the minimum foundation plan.

Yet, under this bill, we get a far less proportionate share of Federal money than this other district, although we not only deserve but actually need a greater proportional share. My district's tax money will be used in part to subsidize this other district and make a further imbalance.

There are more reasons why this bill is unsound.

There is the business of helping private schools which is to be done under this bill. I certainly do not think the Federal Government has any business using public Federal tax money to support private schools.

This provision tries to avoid the church-state issue by not giving money directly to private schools, but by making public facilities available to private school students. Thus, the church-state issue is carefully skirted, but for the first time this bill will put the Federal Government into this field, using public tax money.

Answers to questions dealing with whether or not pupils will be transported from private to public schools or whether the public school teacher will conduct

classes in private schools were completely contradictory and were left unsettled.

Title II of the bill provides $100 million for both public and private school textbooks and library materials. The U.S. Commissioner of Education is given the power to set standards for texts and textbooks, the most dangerous thing I can imagine, what goes into a textbook, what kind of a textbook we are going to use in our schools. And yet, under this bill the Commissioner will make far-reaching decisions in this matter.

Under title III, the Commissioner will get $100 million to establish model schools at the local level, possibly the first step toward a complete takeover of our school system by the Federal Government. The Commissioner has authority to establish Federal-local schools without the approval of the State education agency. In other words, in this instance, the Federal Government will be fully in the local school business.

Title IV provides another $100 million for Federal education centers, permitting the Commissioner to further buttress his own Federal school power under title III. This new power provides more muscle to the Federal Government to get further in the education field.

In summary, I would go back to the main argument for this bill, that it is designed to aid economically deprived or neglected schoolchildren.

But a thorough analysis proves otherwise. Title I of the bill will distribute over $1 billion of the $1.3 billion total to 90 percent of the school districts in the country, without regard to actual need.

Under the remaining titles, distribution is not tailored to need, either; in fact, there is not even an attempt here to utilize the banner of poverty, although administration backers claim the bill is geared to the economically deprived child.

The textbooks and instructional materials under title II, for example, are not limited to needy children or poor schools, but are admittedly provided as part of a general program.

The Federal-local schools in title III are not limited to deprived children, or problem students, but specify "persons of varying talents and needs," in other words, everyone, again stretching the education dollar to the breaking point.

We see here, then, for the first time, the Federal Government moving swiftly and surely into the field of general aid to elementary and secondary schools, casting the die for Federal control and doing away with the policy of local and State support and control of our public schools, a policy substantially followed for nearly 200 years in our Republic.

Various Republican proposals offering alternative solutions have placed principal emphasis on local control. This would be achieved through granting tax credits to the extent of local school taxes up to $100.

In addition, authorization would be given for a Federal income tax credit for individuals who assume the cost of tuition and other expenses of a college education.

Further demonstrating Republican concern for underprivileged children, Republicans have proposed to include a federally supported program for youngsters from 3 to 7 years of age, together with a $300 million grant to the States for this purpose.

Many educators believe and the hearings adduced testimony that training in the preschool years is the most important period in the lives of underprivileged children.

However, these and other constructive proposals were rejected outright as the huge administration majority has voted time and again to cut off debate.

The Democratic leadership in the House has made a travesty out of the legislative process in the consideration of this bill.

I think Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, always a strong supporter of education and a member of the Education and Labor Committee, has summed up the problem well in the following remarks she made about this muzzling:

> Mr. Chairman, I have been a Democrat all of my life, and one reason I have been proud to be a Democrat is because we have believed in protecting the rights of the minority. I have never interpreted the Democratic platform or the statements we have made that this applies only to ethnic groups; that we are only interested in protecting the rights of Negroes or any other minority. There was a man long ago who said, "I may disagree with what you say, but I will defend to death your right to say it."
>
> Today it seems to me we have in the House a determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement.
>
> A statement was made a moment ago by one of my colleagues, with whom I have been on the same side in many legislative battles. He said that all the members of the committee on this side agree that there is no possibility of a church-state issue. As a Democratic I do not understand why we, as the majority party, are afraid to have this discussed. I wish that for once we could have a Supreme Court decision on whether such aid is constitutional or is not.

Mrs. GREEN's plea today to open debate was a brave attempt to buck the administration as was her effort yesterday to improve the distribution system which is so unsound.

Now I have always been enthusiastic about supporting our education system. And if States cannot raise enough local tax dollars, then I would favor giving them back tax dollars earmarked for education, from the income tax. But let us leave the control of education in local hands. Why is it necessary to surrender to the Federal bureaucrats?

I have seen nothing that convinces me that a few Federal administrators in Washington, highly insulated in their bureaucratic offices from the many varied problems of local school systems, are better prepared to solve school matters than local authorities.

In fact, I am convinced that they will not solve them nearly as well as local officials.

Education we are all for. But, let us reach good education through sound measures, not through poor legislation, as is this bill.

Conservation Fate Could Prove Costly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune, published in Salt Lake City, Utah, dated March 28, 1965.

The editorial deals with an acute problem which the Congress will be forced to face in the near future—the problem of the continued success of the technical services program of the Soil Conservation Service.

I have previously pointed out, Mr. Speaker—and it has been pointed out by many of my colleagues—that the proposal to reduce by $20 million the funds available to the SCS for these services is a false economy. The program is a proven one. Since its inception it has benefitted not only the farmer, but every segment of our economy.

The editorial is an excellent one. I urge all of my colleagues to read it and take to heart the message it contains.

The editorial follows:

CONSERVATION FATE COULD PROVE COSTLY

Congress should carefully scrutinize the Budget Bureau's recommended reduction of $20 million in the appropriation for the U.S. Soil Conservation Service for the next fiscal year.

The proposed trim is linked with a plan to charge farmers and ranchers cooperating in soil conservation districts up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance received in soil and water rehabilitation programs. Payments would be credited to a special revolving fund to finance future technical aid for landowners and operators.

On the face of it, charging for a service seems reasonable, even though the plan departs abruptly from the policy of the Soil Conservation Service for the last 30 years. Recreation users of public lands are being charged for the privilege beginning this year. Legislation is proposed for user charges for inspection of poultry, grading of wheat and other crops, certain border inspections of private vessels and aircraft and to create a revolving fund for the Rural Electrification Administration. Such charges presumably are to be gaged somewhat on ability to pay. Many low-income farm families could not afford the added expense.

HITS LEAST ABLE TO PAY

The suggested cutback in the conservation program is reported to be part of a plan to pare older Government programs to offset expenses incident to President Johnson's Great Society plan, mainly in health and education.

Before taking action, Congress should endeavor to determine whether the damage done to the productivity and stability of the soil would be offset by the new, touted programs. The "war on poverty" envisions rural family loans, 30-year loans to cooperative associations and some retraining. We seriously doubt that the loss of about one-third of the present SCS technical staff available to farmers and ranchers in building soil and water resources, would be compensated for in the newer proposals.

Landowners and tenant farmers affected by the economy move in many cases would be

the least able to pay for the services, and a number are least convinced of the need for long-term conservation practices. Most affluent farmers have already improved their land under the SCS program. Those expected to pay for a service heretofore free would include marginal operators and newcomers to the land with little or no undersanding of the necessity of nature in balance. An indirect result of the proposed change in policy would be a drop in State and conservation district support.

SOIL EROSION NATIONAL PROBLEM

Accelerated soil erosion and its effects remain among the most crucial problems bearing directly upon the total economic strength of the country. Soil erosion remains serious on more than 700 million acres of privately owned rural lands in the United States, and the equivalent of 500,000 acres is lost each year as a result of erosion and other forms of land damage.

Erosion increases flood damage, chokes streams and lakes with sediment, damages fisheries, and reduces the ability of the land to meet the demands of expanding world populations.

Studies show that the Soil Conservation Service was already operating on an "economy" budget. In Utah, for example, where the number of farmers cooperating in 43 soil conservation districts totals about 12,500, the number of SCS technicians available has been gradually falling off because of budget deficiencies. Last year the Soil Conservation Service was able to handle only 7 of 10 requests received for technical assistance. Even so, the agency helped achieve some remarkable improvements on land treated.

It is difficult, often inconsistent, to argue against a proposed economy. But this plan entails diverting funds from a proved, beneficial long-term program to untried experiments in the Great Society. And it could create more poverty of natural resources and beauty as well as farm production and income.

Outstanding Entertainer of 1964—Vikki Carr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, Miss Vikki Carr, one of the finest young vocalists of our time, was honored recently by the Mexican-American Community of Los Angeles represented by the East Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the Council of Mexican-American Affairs, the American GI Forum, the East Central Area Welfare Planning Council, and the Mexican American Political Association.

That these five major civic organizations were unanimous in their tribute to Miss Carr is indicative of the high esteem in which the Mexican-American community holds this outstanding songstress.

Mr. Speaker, having been extended the courtesy of making the official award presentation to Miss Carr, I did so flanked by the presidents of the sponsoring organizations and Miss Carr's parents.

I congratulated these leading Mexican-American organizations, individually and collectively, for having selected Miss Vicenta Florencia de Casillas Cardona, better known as Vikki Carr, as "Outstanding Entertainer of 1964."

I also commended them for their effort in highlighting Mexican-Americans, such as Miss Carr, for their achievements in all fields of endeavor in the form of an award to be given jointly by these prominent organizations on an annual basis.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the printed program announcing this reception and award presentation ceremony honoring Miss Vikki Carr, Los Angeles' own "Outstanding Entertainer of 1964."

In addition, I would like to include an excellent Los Angeles Times article on Miss Carr's Los Angeles singing debut in the Cocoanut Grove of the Ambassador Hotel.

These two items provide a brief summary of Miss Carr's rising musical career, and will help convey some idea of the deep pride the entire Los Angeles community takes in her successful debut.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity of joining with Miss Carr's family and friends in extending to this most talented artist and lovely young lady my very best wishes for her future success and happiness.

VICKY CARR—OUTSTANDING ENTERTAINER-1964

"I Have Dreamed Golden Dreams"—Poor Butterfly.

The year 1964 was a year of progress for a multitude of presons in a wide variety of fields. In the case of Miss Vikki Carr, 1964 was a year when the entertainment industry and the general public alike proclaimed her as an outstanding talent. As in the case of most dedicated artists, success was no accident to Vikki Carr. It was the fruit of 7 years of hard work and much preparation.

A great deal of credit must be given to Miss Carr's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Carlos Cardona of Rosemead, Calif., whose encouragement and advice helped smooth out the problems which inevitably mark the path to success.

The East Los Angles Junior Chamber of Commerce, in cooperation with the Council of Mexican-American affairs, American GI Forum, the Mexican-American Political Association and the East Central Area Welfare Planning Council, takes great pride in honoring Vikki Carr as the "Outstanding Entertainer-1964."

Her efforts to help her community by raising funds for scholarships, and her pride in her Mexican-American hertitage, have not gone unnoticed by persons both in and out of the community.

Congratulations are in order for Vicenta Florencia de Casillas Cardona—Vickki Carr.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Mar. 6, 1965]

SUCCESSFUL DEBUT: VIKKI CARR TRIUMPHS AT GROVE

(By John L. Scott)

Florencia Visenta de Casillas Martinez Cardona, who chose the professional and easier to remember name of Vikki Carr, made her major Los Angeles debut Thursday night at the Cocoanut Grove before an enthusiastic, capacity audience.

Among celebrities applauding Miss Carr's vocal efforts were Bill Dana, Lloyd Bridges, Inger Stevens, Carolyn Jones, Jim Nabors, Annette Funicello, Steve Forrest, Robert Lansing, Peter Brown, Harry Guardino, George Jessel, and various others.

Eighteen months ago Vikki Carr was a comparative unknown, singing more or less for her supper in a small night spot now extinct. Today she's a Liberty recording star, has appeared on TV in Las Vegas and Australia, and is considering at least two offers for Broadway musical shows.

LOCAL GIRL

But her Grove appearance has proved her greatest thrill, she said after the performance Thursday. The girl from San Gabriel (Rosemead High School) told her cheering audience: "I've come home."

Few local products have won such a reception in their own community, but Miss Carr wears her plaudits gratefully and graciously.

The songstress of Mexican extraction, and in her early twenties, produces the big sound when she sings. She reminds one of a hoydenish Judy Garland—a little girl with a large voice that can tax a nightclub's sound system.

VARIETY OF SONGS

She also achieves in certain tunes that plaintive note so necessary for good balance in a program.

Miss Carr reveals that so important natural flair for songmaking, which, with careful nurturing, should take her far.

Her program at the Grove practically ran the gamut of the nightclub song catalog, ranging from "Bye-Bye Black Bird" to a novelty caled 'Supercalifragilistic Expialidocius." Honoring her proud parents, who were in the audience Thursday, she included a Mexican number, "Cuando Caliente El Sol," and bowed off with a thank you piece to a standing ovation.

The songstress was introduced by Carolyn Jones and held modest court at an after-show champagne reception.

Miss Carr enjoyed the efficient backing of Freddy Martin's orchestra conducted by Andy Thomas. Martin and his band played a stirring "Holiday in Mexico" overture to open the show.

Manpower Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4257) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, we Republicans recognize unemployment as both a personal and a national tragedy. It is a personal tragedy for the jobless individual and his family. It is a national tragedy because of the loss of productivity and revenue and the waste of our greatest national resource, the skills of our people.

A few years ago the Republican policy committee sponsored a searching study, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] into the causes of unemployment in this country and the possible remedies. I served as chairman of one of the subcommittees for that study.

We learned that one out of every five unskilled workers was without a job, that the unemployment rate among untrained persons was three times higher than among the trained. We learned, at

the same time, that jobs were going begging for lack of qualified applicants. To a great extent, therefore, the unemployment problem did not result from the inability of our economy to create jobs, but because of our failure to train people to fill them.

Our Republican study group in 1961 endorsed the need for such legislation as the Manpower Development and Training Act, which was passed the following year. My colleagues will recall that on the House floor we substituted for the bill reported by the Committee on Education and Labor a bill embracing the Republican study group's recommendation and largely written by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The role of the opposition party in our form of government is an important one. It has been correctly said that we should support the administration when it is right, criticize it when it is wrong, and be ready to offer constructive alternatives to bills we agree with in principle but disagree with in detail.

The constructive alternative offered by Republicans in 1962 resulted in the successful manpower development and training program. The bill before us would strengthen and extend this program and, therefore, has my wholehearted support.

Sister Mary Jeanine Gave Witness to Her Faith at Selma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration for the many clergymen and members of religious orders who participated in the demonstrations for human freedom in Selma, Ala. As events have tragically shown, it took an act of courage to be part of this demand for justice for all Americans. By their presence, the ministers, priests, rabbis, and nuns gave witness to their love for their fellow men and to their belief in the brotherhood of the sons of God.

I am proud that among those who took part in the demonstrations in Selma was Sister Mary Jeanine, a native of my home city of Milwaukee and chairman of the Department of Sociology at Cardinal Stritch College.

Frank A Aukofer, of the Milwaukee Journal, wrote a sensitive and vivid story of Sister Jeanine's day in the front line of civil rights demonstrators.

That story follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Mar. 16, 1965]

CITY NUN KEYSTONE IN SELMA LINE

(By Frank A. Aukofer)

SELMA, ALA.—A frail looking Milwaukee nun was the keystone of "the Selma line" here all day Monday. With the bright Alabama sunshine slowly burning her face, Sister Mary Jeanine, 47, chairman of the sociology department at Cardinal Stritch College stood facing police in the same spot all day without anything to eat and only a small cup of water to drink. She did not have the water until after 3 p.m.

Temperatures were in the mid-70's in the afternoon. Not a cloud marked the sky and there was no shade.

LINE OF HUMANITY

The "Selma line" was how demonstrators here referred to the line of humanity that confronted police and sheriff's deputies from Wednesday night until the march on the Dallas County courthouse Monday.

Sister Jeanine is the former Bernice Gruesser, daughter of John A. Gruesser, now of St. Petersburg, Fla. She is a Milwaukee native and a 1934 graduate of St. Mary's Academy in Milwaukee.

Sister Jeanine's civil rights day started with a march shortly after 9 a.m. She was in the eighth row.

When the sheriff's posse stopped the marchers, the line spread wider and Sister Jeanine moved up to the second row. She stood there until about 10:30 a.m., when clergymen were asked to fall back to consider their next move.

However, a line of demonstrators was left facing the police and sheriff's posse.

STANDS IN THE MIDDLE

Up front, in the middle, stood Sister Jeanine. "We can't leave the young people here alone," she said.

The Franciscan nun was wearing a black wool sweater and a rain cape over her habit, and black rubber boots.

The cape went about noon.

Msgr. Franklyn Kennedy, editorial manager of the Catholic Herald-Citizen in Milwaukee, took the cape from her. But the boots and sweater remained.

She sang. She clapped. She prayed with the other demonstrators.

And all the while her face burned.

It did not go unnoticed. Around 1:30 p.m., a television technician stepped out of a crowd of newsmen and walked up to the nun.

He handed her a small tube of first aid cream and said "Compliments of CBS, Sister."

Because she was in the front row, Sister Jeanine became part of the reception line which shook hands with the day's distinguished visitors, Representatives EDWARD BOLAND, Democrat, of Massachusetts and SILVIO CONTE, Republican of Massachusetts and William Evans, administrative assistant to Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat of Massachusetts.

Another nun, Sister Rose Maureen, a freckle-faced ("I'm a Kelly") Maryknoll nun from San Francisco, spent the afternoon at Sister Jeanine's side.

SANDWICHES GIVEN OUT

About 2:30 p.m., civil rights workers passed out peanut butter sandwiches. Sister Jeanine passed them along to those around her, including two Negro girls, 10 and 11, from Selma. The nun's hands had been resting on the girls' shoulders for an hour.

Sister Jeanine did not take any sandwich because, she said, there were others in the line who had not had anything to eat all day.

When aids of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., started organizing the courthouse march, late in the afternoon, Sister Jeanine was placed at the head of the group of marchers formed from those who had been standing at the barrier. On each side of her was a Unitarian minister. They had been with her most of the afternoon.

Sister Jeanine and her two Unitarian escorts wound up in the 39th rank as they were assimilated into the main line of march.

About half way on the six block march to the courthouse, Sister Jeanine started to limp—sore feet.

"How do you feel now?" asked Rabbi Allan Levine, 32, of Rochester, N.Y., who was in the rank behind her.

"I feel just wonderful," she said.

After the service for Rev. James J. Reeb, at the courthouse, Sister Jeanine stood on the sidewalk in the path of the lead marchers. It paid off.

"I got to shake hands with Martin Luther King," she said excitedly.

PROTESTERS LINK ARMS

For the return march, she linked arms with Father Francis Doyle, of St. Louis, Mo., executive secretary of Joseph Cardinal Ritter's human rights council there, and Otis Flournoy, a Negro field staff member of the National Methodist Student Movement.

About 7:30 p.m., on her way back to Good Samaritan Hospital for supper and a night's sleep, Sister Jeanine paused in front of Brown's Chapel Church to put her arm around a Negro girl.

"Well," said the nun, "it was a great day."

"Sho 'nuff," the girl replied.

A Record of Great Accomplishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, the San Francisco Bay area paid long overdue tribute to a World War II hero and a courageous spokesman for veterans' causes. The public honor extended to Frank Curley was sponsored by the San Francisco County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

This ceremony on March 8, 1965, also paid special recognition to the American Gold Star Mothers.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD information contained in the program which gives Frank Curley's record of accomplishment, salutes the American Gold Star Mothers and lists those who paid a personal tribute:

A RECORD OF GREAT ACCOMLISPHMENT

Frank enlisted in the Armed Forces April 6, 1917, the very day this Nation took up arms in defense of its principles. He was only 17½ years old then, and was overseas several months later. Subsequently, while he, himself, was a patient in a service hospital, he went out of his way to help the more severely disabled servicemen around him.

Personally modest, Frank has no concern for himself. On the other hand when he is pursuing a claim for a disabled veteran or his dependents, he has no equal. He is the expert in such matters. He is a fighter for veterans, their dependents, for good government and other things that are right. And a winner. The record books are overflowing with the difficult cases he shepherded to successful conclusions—even where others before him had failed.

In 1945 Frank authored a workable on-the-job training program cooperated with labor and industry to iron out any differences for the protection of the disabled veteran trainee. Finally after months of meetings with labor and industry the training program was acceptable to the Division of Apprenticeship Standards of the California Department of Industrial Relations. Then Frank introduced it to the Veterans' Administration

which was accepted as a workable program, thus returning thousands of World War II disabised veterans to dignity, employability, and as taxpaying citizens.

Frank spearheaded drives for many recreational and rehabilitation facilities, established first San Francisco Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, fought a long uphill battle for the erection of the Wheel Chair Haven at Kezar Stadium just to mention a few.

An expert on affairs of veterans and legislation, Frank never does anything casually. He thinks things through, applies his analytical legally trained mined, resolves the difficult.

Frank Curley enjoys support of members from all veteran organizations, labor and industry, because of his complete dedication to the principle of putting the interest of veterans, their dependents and his Nation above private or personal consideration.

MELVIN SOSNICK COMPANY SALUTE TO AMERICAN GOLD STAR MOTHERS

We feel how weak and fruitless must be any word of ours which would attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But we cannot refrain from tendering you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the people they died to save. We pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

Those sentences reach the heart of the matter. The essence of a nation embattled in the simple trust that death is easier to face if the flag is still flying when we fall, and bereavement partakes less of outright tragedy in the knowledge that those who died saw the flag aloft in their last moments.

We are debtors both to you and to your departed sons. We have gained immeasurably from the payment in blood and tears that you and they have jointly made. It is our comfort to know that you, who share the loss, have remained among us to share the gain.

The knowledge of the fact also sustained your sons, we are sure.

MELVIN SOSNICK,
Chairman of the Board.

A personal tribute extended to Frank Curley and American Gold Star Mothers.

President Lyndon B. and Lady Bird Johnson; Hon. John F. Shelley, mayor, San Francisco, Calif.; Hon. William J. Driver, Administrator, Veterans' Administration; Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER, Congressman, 8th District, California; Hon. "J" Eugene McAteer, senator, 14th California District; Hon. Peter Tamaras, supervisor, San Francisco; Maj. Gen. Roy Lassetter, Jr., U.S. Army; Rear Adm. Harold J. Cokley, Marine Corps, U.S. Navy; Charles L. Gould, captain, USNR, Publisher San Francisco Examiner & News Call Bulletin; Allen Martin, VFW Department Commander, California; Claire, Dianne, and Gary Caulfield; Marjorie Hoe, president, 8th district American Legion auxiliary; Marvin Sosnick, president, Melvin Sosnick Co.

Hon. Noah Mason

SPEECH
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the recent death of our former colleague, the Honorable Noah Mason, of Illinois. It was my privilege to serve with him for many years. He was a tower of strength, a dedicated American who fought for those principles which he considered good for the country. He was a disciple of good government. This Nation is better off because he served here.

Mr. Mason was a friend. He was humble, modest, and affable. Universally respected, Noah had a way of commanding the good will and understanding of his contemporaries. Since his decision to retire he has been missed. The Nation sorely needs more men of his caliber, who are willing to stand up and be counted on the side of right and honor.

To his surviving widow and children I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention today to the efforts of private business in this country toward providing a proper kind of encouragement and assistance for the quality education we all want for America's young people.

Too often we hear the statement that local government and private sources are not capable of providing for our educational needs. Too often, in our eagerness to improve educational standards, we tend to overlook what progress is being made by non-Government sources, and too quickly come to believe that the Federal Government must step in as the only source of competence.

It has recently come to my attention that the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. of St. Paul, Minn., has announced its second $1.5 million grant to assist in the training of future teachers. This unique plan involves the distribution of individual grants of $2,000 in teaching tools and reference materials to each of the approximately 700 accredited teacher training colleges in the United States.

Mr. R. H. Herzog, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. vice president, in announcing the program, said that the assistance grant program will enable teacher's colleges to expose future teachers to modern teaching techniques that will help them cover more material more effectively in the classroom.

The 1965 grant matches a similar program in 1963 that awarded $1.5 million in equipment to 500 public, private, and parochial schools across the country.

"The first AGE program clearly demonstrated the interest of teachers in improving their methods of presentation," Herzog said. "More than 1 out of every 10 eligible schools in the United States submitted proposals," he said.

Each $2,000 grant will consist of a complete teacher training unit in visual classroom communications. Included will be a unit of instruction in the use of visual aids, reference books, sets of transparency originals of illustrative material in 70 different subjects, transparency making equipment, and classroom and portable overhead projectors and supplies.

The new Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. grant will be made available to any college offering accredited teacher training courses leading to certification and graduating more than 12 students a year. Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. said it will use Circular 719, "Earned Degrees Conferred 1961–62," published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as the source for eligibility and only schools listed therein will be awarded grants upon application. The circular is the most recent report issued by the Government.

Any such college will receive the $2,000 grant simply by applying before May 31, 1965. Distribution of the awards will be made at that time.

I can most heartily agree with Mr. Herzog's feeling that private industry has a responsibility to support our education system. This grant program is a prime example of industry meeting that responsibility. Mr. Herzog also said:

By improving our education system at its roots—where teachers themselves are trained—we would hope to ultimately help improve the students. Thus, all American free enterprise profits from these same people, who though their education and motivation will move our great corporate enterprises forward in the future. We must recognize our stake in education.

The knowledge explosion is one of the salient characteristics of our age.

With more and more knowledge available, it becomes imperative for the teacher not only to cover an abundance of material but that she cover it interestingly and effectively. She must make learning important to her students and must motivate them to continue to learn so that they will make a meaningful contribution to our national life rather than become a drain upon it.

Today's complex society puts a great premium on brainpower. The challenge of today's and tomorrow's teachers is greater than at any time during the Nation's history. It is generally recognized that the country's growth and prosperity—indeed its very survival—is largely dependent upon the ability of our schools to turn out thinkers, doers, innovators, and leaders.

We hope that our new program will encourage our teachers in that essential mission.

Immorality and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an address by Hon. Sprulile Braden, dean of American ambassadors. I rec-

ommend its reading and careful study, as it is a subject of great importance:

IMMORTALITY AND COMMUNISM

(By Hon. Spruille Braden)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, from the depth of feeling with which I say we thank you, I trust everyone here will sense how grateful Mrs. Braden and I are for the hospitality of the Americanism Educational League, and for the special award given me yesterday by its trustees. Also, I am indebted to the Knightly Order of St. Brigette for the presentation to me of its Grand Cross.

Thus to be honored and to find ourselves in this distinguished company ordinarily would suffice to make us optimists, seeing the bright side as opposed to pessimists looking for gloom. (Parenthetically, I reject the definition of an optimist as one who doesn't care what happens so long as it doesn't happen to him—and a pessimist as one who lived all of his life alongside an optimist.) Instead of pretending that all events are ordered for good in the best of all worlds, I prefer to be a realist, a bit cynical perchance, and even an extremist, who believes in Thomas Jefferson's dictum made in 1791: "We prefer war in all cases to tribute under any form and to any people whatever." In short, I am not a romanticist who believes that good always automatically conquers evil any more than I believe that evil, because of its dirty and foul blows, has an invincible edge. If we will protect ourselves in the clinches and slug it out with the Devil, we can win.

Speaking of the Devil, an old Spanish aphorism is pertinent: "The Devil knows more by reason of his age than because he is a demon." While the passing years have not given me, I hope, any Satanic tendencies, I have acquired quite an experience in fighting a variety of demons. Among them have been a motley crew of shady characters, Latin American dictators, and Communists. Also, as chairman of the New York City Anticrime Committee, crooks in general along with some elite gangsters striving for anonimity. But, even these latter, when they are so careless as to wind up behind bars are socially very choosy—quite high hat; in prison they look down on the Communists, who may be their fellow tenants, as below the salt and a despicable lot with whom they will have no truck.

It has been said that at first we are kids and then we kid ourselves. Well, at least on two things I do not kid myself:

1. For many years I have declared that the gravest issue facing humanity is not nuclear warfare and all the horrible death-dealing weapons science has produced; the insidious dangers of inflation; budgetary and balance-of-payments deficits; the undermining of the private enterprise system; nor even the gradual erosion of our freedoms. Nor is it aggression and the threats thereof; or socialism which inevitably leads to some form of totalitarianism, usually communism in our day. No. The major threat to mankind is the breakdown in morality everywhere, including government, where morality, like memory, seems to fade with the passage of time. I further hold that the worst of all immoralities is communism.

2. I have reiterated time and again that while I hoped to live out my life in relative tranquillity, due to the twin evils of immorality and communism, I was sorry for my children and much sorrier for my grandchildren. Now, these malevolent forces have expanded and spread so rapidly that I no longer am sure that my declining years will be unperturbed and peaceful.

It is rash for a layman to dive into the subject of morals, which even in ecclesiastical hands can be very dreary. Also, morals vary widely according to time and place. A multiplicity of wives is highly respectable in some parts but not in others—at least not legally. As the Duchess said to Alice: "Tut, tut, child, everything's got a moral, if you can only find it."

I shall not now try to find and comment on generally accepted morals or flagrant immoralities. Most of us know what are good morals even if we don't always practice them assiduously. Instead, I shall point to a few random governmental actions and influence which are viewed widely with little or no criticism, but which I believe to be measurably immoral because they harm the whole community, individually and collectively.

1. Every responsible citizen is for the maximum possible equality of opportunity. But, to equate freedom and equality recently has become a popular pastime, especially by a galaxy of demagogs. This never can be done and to attempt to do so is silly, because given full equality, men stagnate, whereas given liberty they soon become unequal, energetic and progressive; incentives take hold; hard work replaces featherbedding; sciences, technology and the arts advance; income becomes proportionate to production, and honesty is self-imposed until it becomes almost automatic as one sure-fire essential for success. All of which make for the spiritual and material well-being of the public under the capitalist system.

2. Government is immoral when by excessive and discriminatory taxes and spending coupled with an autocratic and large bureaucracy, it claims to create "economic growth." Actually, it does no such thing, but on the contrary, robs Peter to pay Paul, hampers or destroys free, private, competitive enterprise which gives men the opportunity to develop their individual potentialities. Under a paternalistic and centralized government, men in all walks of life and of every calling increasingly seek aid or subsidies from the bureaucratic power; the inappropriate and indelicate, or even outright corruption seep in at all levels of society; pride of craftsmanship degenerates; people want something for nothing and "Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death" is reduced to a simple "gimme."

I do not consider it ethical for any government—such as we have experienced in the United States of America over the last three decades—to resort to the wornout and discredited ideas of a welfare state; i.e., in a word socialism, which the famous ex-socialist, Max Eastman, characterized as the "flop of the century."

3. Washington should not cover its confusion, lack of knowledge and blunders by employing thousands of public relations experts and spending hundreds of millions of dollars each year to write and feed self-serving stories, or enervating myths to the public, whose complacency in the face of serious problems too often flows from this type sedation known as managed news. This is a prime example of kidding ourselves.

4. Even our language under this process is distorted. "A curbstone guess" is dignified as "a calculated risk." "Human rights" are described as being far superior to and in conflict with "property rights," when in fact without "property rights" there can be no other "rights," human or otherwise. Only freemen, and never slaves, have "property rights."

5. Our farmers are called independent although the Federal Government tells them what and how much to produce, in what fields to plant, and determines their income. If they disobey they are fined and even sent to jail. In the end, when people are thus told when to sow and when to reap, they will lack for bread.

6. "Free workers," with governmental sanctions and legislative support, are compelled to join a union and pay dues. I question the ethics of this system. True, a union officer misappropriating funds may be brought to trial. But is it an any less henous immorality for labor leaders to use both the power of their unions and the dues for their own aggrandizement and to back politicians and policies to which, as individuals, the workers are indifferent or even opposed?

The few transgressions committed or licensed by the Government itself, which I have listed, at first glance may appear relatively insignificant; but they alarm me because not only do they harm the community and therefore are immoral, but still worse they: (a) typify the usages which have destroyed nation after nation through all history; (b) are precisely what the Communists try to inveigle us into doing because if we comply they hope to take over; and (c) weaken the United States of America domestically and thereby expose the country to conquest, at least by alien ideas and eventually militarily from abroad.

The Hammurabi code promulgated earlier than 2,000 B.C. by imposing controls over wages, prices, production, consumption and all the rest of the economy, wrecked Babylonia. Governmental extravagance and a bloated bureaucracy killed individual initiative and led to the fall of ancient Greece. A planned economy of state maintenance for the slothful and excessive taxation brought the collapse of the later Roman Empire and regression of a civilized society into the Dark Ages. The welfare state of the Incas became so delibitated as to become easy prey for Pizarro and his Conquistadores. In its turn, the great Spanish Empire broken when the throne so regimented every activity that no one could earn a living except by being a public employee, a priest, or a sailor. So Portugal, in its day, the richest empire in the Western World, disintegrated. For the same reasons the British Empire is now dissolving before our eyes. God forbid that the United States of America follow any further down these disastrous trails than it already has.

The details of recorded history may be full of falsehoods, just as romance is of truths. But it's broad movements over long periods of time prove that only nations committed to the principles of individual initiative and ownership of property have risen above penury, produced science, art and literature and promoted the general welfare. Moreover, no major civilization ever perished primarily because it was murdered by an external enemy. In each case, the victim first was weakened by its own internal measures; in effect, it really committed suicide.

We must heed these cruel lessons of the past lest we be condemned to live them again.

Amidst all of the confusions and surprises of the modern world, a bangup blunder may work out well—but only very rarely and by accident—after all there was the flier, "One-Way Corrigan"—who took off for California but landed in Europe. However, some of my less than favorite orators in the U.N. seem to feel that by following the absurd, better results will ensue than from logic. For instance, they denounce the United States of America and Belgium for humanely rescuing hundreds if not thousands of black and white hostages from the Congo, in the face of an official report to the U.N. that "Witnesses attended scenes in which victims were dismembered, disembowelled, and the heart later used for a ritual food."

Thus do Moscow, Peiping, Belgrade, and other Communist capitals make common cause with savages and cannibals.

As Talleyrand said of the trial of the Duke of Enghein: "This is not merely a crime. It is much worse; it is an imbecility."

Those words about size up the Communist conspiracy. It is not merely a gross immorality and a crime, but an imbecility. Communism while pretending to march toward progress actually is a reversion to a primitive system of tribal life and the morals of the ant heap. Never in the many times it has been tried through all history has it

benefited either its subjects or humanity. Basically, it is stupid in its impracticability and evil in ideology, performance, and effect.

Its system of government and way of life have been one long record of blunders, depravity and atrocities. Under this obscene conspiracy, there have been committed every known crime; broken promises and treaties, lies heaped on lies, thefts and tortures and individual and mass murders.

Yet in our epoch, because of mankind's ignorance, apathy and unwillingness to think, communism has grown in less than 50 years to its present size, huge power and vast wealth.

By their iniquitous but shrewd intrigues, the Communists have contributed measureably to the civilized nations weakening themselves. They have subverted the United States of America and other countries into adopting many of the socialistic regulations, regimentations and laws which have been corroding our fundamental freedoms.

Aiding this huge conspiracy have been countless innocent although well-intentioned sentimentalists or idealists. Stalin baptized these groups as "useful idiots." Even the Chairman of the Policy Planning Staff in the State Department has advocated in writing what Senator J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland, called an amazing plea for the destruction of our national sovereignty and our existence as a nation.

Starting from practically zero in 1917, the Communists have come to control about one-third of the earth's surface. Since 1946 they have been taking over and enslaving peoples at the rate of 7,000 per hour—mind you per hour—not per day or week. This paradox, that an absurd and cruel failure opposed to all logic should spread to the degree it has, justifies, I believe, my contention that communism is the worst of all immoralities.

An essential ingredient of the Communist conspiracy at all times has been to humiliate and weaken the United States of America, causing it to lose the respect of the world and to suffer ridicule as a rather cowardly "paper tiger." Beyond the many serious incidents such as in Korea where somewhere between 5,000 and 6,000 of our boys taken prisoners were brutally murdered, there have been the Berlin Wall, Vietnam, and Cuba. Moreover, the Commies, like the bongo drummers, keep up an incessant rat-a-tat-tat of both minor and major annoyances and worse, to embarrass our Government.

It has become an international sport—almost a monthly occurrence for mobs inspired by the local governments to storm and virtually wreck our Embassies and other establishments abroad. The Kremlin a few months ago set up a so-called solidarity fund with $100 million to finance student agitations, riots, and insurrections throughout the Americas. To these ends, Castro's Cuba is serving as an educational center and sort of clearinghouse. Eight thousand students from all over this hemisphere already have been trained in these subversion schools. While serving as Ambassador in Argentina, then under the police state dictatorship of Peron, I told a true story of an Ambassador who appealed to the Foreign Minister for protection of his Embassy building. When the latter offered to send more police, the Ambassador begged: "Don't send more police, but fewer students." Perhaps the antics of a very small number of students in Berkeley last month may be relevant.

A favorite Communist trick is to kidnap U.S. citizens, including our military. Our "no win" policies have prevented effective protests being made in these cases by Washington. The State Department has jettisoned an 1860 ruling of the Supreme Court that "the great object and duty of government is * * * the protection of the lives, liberty, and property of the people * * * whether abroad or at home * * * and any government failing in the object of the performance of the duty is not worth preserving."

My personal experience has taught me that the sole thing Communists respect is effective strength greater than their own. Accordingly, Moscow knows that for its conquest of the world, the United States of America first must be encircled and defeated, preferably from within. The Communists prefer to resort to armed conflict only as an extreme measure, when and if they are convinced they can win an easy victory. But the encirclement of the United States of America is taking place exactly as per Lenin's specifications. Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Asia, and Africa either have fallen, or are in danger of doing so. But the gravest threat to the security of our country lies in the Communist infiltration, espionage and insurrection throughout the Western Hemisphere and particularly in Cuba.

For a time the U.S. public was wrought up at the thought of a Communist bastion on that island, only 90 miles off our shores. Latterly, however, due either to the indifference of our leaders or their unwillingness to face and give the public the facts, this Cuban menace, despite the Bay of Pigs and the October 22, 1962, missile confrontation, has been lost in the shuffle of world events and pushed off the front pages, radio, and TV by Vietnam, the Congo, and other faraway trouble spots.

I am compelled to say the meanest thing that can be said, "I told you so," because several times in respect to the growth of communism throughout Latin America I have issued the strongest warnings, only to have them ignored. In 1945 I told about Peron along with his anti-U.S. attitude, as he collaborated with the Communists. In 1952 I spoke out against the Guatemalan Communist regime of Arbenz and the Marxist one in Bolivia. Finally, nearly a year and a half before Fidel Castro came down from the hills on January 1, 1959, to take over in Cuba, I warned that our then policies would lead to chaos and communism on that island. I alerted the State Department 6 months before the tragic Bay of Pigs defeat that, as then planned, it would fail. Far in advance of the October 22, 1962, confrontation, I declared publicly that there were missiles on the island of Cuba.

Frankly, I am tired of being a Cassandra and only recite these facts because I am convinced that my sources of information are just as accurate now as they were before. I am convinced there still are many missiles, at least of short and intermediate range, hidden on the island of Cuba and that there are submarine bases or pens, including those in underground caves opening on the surrounding waters.

King Phillip of Spain said: "He who controls Cuba controls the Americas." President Jefferson expressed the same thought, as did our own famous strategist, Admiral Mahan, when he declared the Carribean was vital for the defense of the United States of America.

Therefore, I make so bold as to say that unless the Communists are driven out of Cuba, that island, under Moscow and Peiping direction, more than any other part of the world, will continue to be a cancer eating out the very innards of the Western Hemisphere. The Cubans cannot save themselves; they cannot go up against machineguns, tanks, and gas unarmed. Hence, I maintain that the only way to drive the Communists (including Russian, Chinese, and African troops) out is by an invasion by patriotic Cubans, supported by other Latin American contingents, but with the main effort and responsibility falling on the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marines.

If we will take this positive action it will show that we mean business and so restore to us the respect of other nations and help galvanize freemen everywhere into action to regain their liberty. The encouragement thus given to our allies in southeast Asia and Africa might even bring victory and independence to them. Many neutralist nations well might throw out their Kremlin bosses and flock to our side because a brave and successful action in Cuba would convince them that ours was the winning side.

Never before has the United States of America feared to fight for justice and freedom. Never have we paid tribute as in the case of the Cuban prisoners taken at the Bay of Pigs; nor ransom to bail out of our citizens and soldiers from Communist prison camps. If the United States of America is to survive it is high time to stop being timid and once again to hold cowardice to be utterly immoral.

Ladies and gentlemen, in many ways I have drawn a gloomy and pessimistic picture. Yet, in the words of the South Pacific song, I remain a "cockeyed optimist," provided the United States of America returns to and stands firmly on certain unchanging principles, which for years past I have enunciated; i.e., whenever I could get anybody to listen to me.

I have maintained that foreign policy necessarily may change according to circumstances, times, and place, but that there are certain immutable principles which always must outweigh policy. These principles are:

1. Respect is the sine qua non of all foreign relations. Irrespective of every other consideration and under all conditions, the United States of America must demand and get respect. To do so we must first have self-respect and exact from our own and other governments respect for their obligations and the sanctity of agreements.

2. The sole reason for being of the State Department and Foreign Service is to protect and advance the legitimate interests of the United States of America. If ever they should become illegitimate, then they are unworthy of this great Nation and should not be supported.

3. Every policy and action must be moral. Leaving ethics to one side, only in this way will we win and hold the confidence and respect from other countries which are so essential for a solid and enduring amity between peoples.

4. While never attempting to impose our way of life or form of Government, our ideas or even our moral standards, on others, we should ourselves stand unswervingly for and practice the system of republican constitutional, representative government laid down for us by the Founding Fathers in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

We can adhere to these principles and help save our civilization by following the precepts set forth by George Washington in his Farewell Address, the finest statement ever made on both domestic and foreign policy. If with moral fiber we will dedicate ourselves to doing these things then, with God's help, the United States of America will defeat communism along with many other immoral forces. We will preserve our freedoms and insure peace for our children and grandchildren in, if not the best of all worlds, at least in a much better one than the present.

Liberia in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, 1965, the Wilkes-Barre Rotary Club had as its speaker His Excellency, the

Ambassador of Liberia, the Honorable S. Edward Peal.

I was most happy to make the arrangements for Ambassador Peal's appearance in my hometown on that date and it is especially gratifying to me to learn from the club's president, Attorney Joseph Tomascik, that the Ambassador's address was an exceptionally fine one and was very well received by all the members of the club and guests present on that occasion.

In fact, President Tomascik thought so well of the Ambassador's speech that he forwarded a copy of it and requested that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

After reading it, I certainly agree that it should receive wider circulation and it should be of particular interest to those students and others whose attention has been turned in recent years to the new and emerging nations of Africa and their problems and programs of economic, social, and political developments.

As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to include the excellent address of Ambassador Peal.

Address follows:

LIBERIA IN PERSPECTIVE

(By Ambassador of Liberia, S. Edward Peal)

Among the many pleasant surprises which an ambassador on assuming his duties in your Nation's Capital soon discovers is the multiplicity of opportunities available to him to travel around the country to address audiences. In a manner this eagerness on the part of the American people to hear the story of other peoples and in doing so to obtain an understanding of all sides of a question is deeply rooted in the American tradition of free speech. It is an attitude which amply conforms to one of the primary purposes of an ambassador's mission—to get to know as much as possible about the host country and its citizens, as he endeavors at the same time to explain the policies of his Government and the traditions of his own land and people.

This healthy curiosity which happily characterizes the American public deserves therefore instant and grateful recognition from me.

But in a special sense this should be welcome to African Ambassadors. What little is known of our continent was told until recently by foreigners, usually of another race, for motives which have not always been either honorable or wholesome.

No other continent has suffered so much from stories told with such flippancy as to make it clear that mockery was their only purpose. No other people have had to carry such a crushing weight of distortions and untruths—so that at times in their agony they have been tempted to cry out "To the torch" with every word written in the past about Africa. Thus any African must react with unusual appreciation not only to the fact that Americans want to hear about his continent but more especially that they should prefer to have that story told by Africans themselves.

At the risk of appearing immodest, I venture to claim this afternoon that no African is better qualified to begin to tell that story than a Liberian whose roots while reaching deep into American history are also firmly planted in Africa and who draws inspiration and sustenance from all things African—pure, proud and groping.

That is why I am grateful for the invitation extended me through Congressman FLOOD to address you today. Indeed I am glad to be among you, to share in your fellowship and the reaffirmation of the Rotary faith and ideal which have caused your organization to be held in high esteem around the world and have won the admiration of all progressive people.

May I also say that the joy I derive from my presence here today springs partly from the knowledge that from the sons and daughters of this great State came much of the energy which has made America a landmark of human progress in our world. By words and deeds you have nurtured the cause of freedom, equality and justice for all men. And Liberia, since she shares your ideals, will ever cherish the bonds which link her to the United States.

But there are also practical reasons for the pleasure any Liberian experiences in visiting the State of Pennsylvania. Bethlehem Steel, one of the great industrial corporations of this Nation, by helping to develop the iron ore resources of Liberia, is making a substantial contribution to our economic progress. As more and more of that ore pours into the blast furnaces in this State, it is but natural that more and more Liberians will follow with interest its destination and thereby come to know a little more of life in Pennsylvania.

So let me now give you a brief description of my country, and tell you something of its history and the motivation of our people.

Liberia can be found between 4½° and 8½° north of the Equator.

This is a land located well within the tropical belt with such typical features as shallow lagoons, white sand beaches and mangrove-covered marshlands. It rises gently from the shoreline to a vast undulating plateau, 2,000 feet above sea level. It is laced by many large rivers, threading through savannahs and heavy evergreen forests. This forest is known to contain 235 different species of marketable timber.

There are two seasons—the dry and the rainy—and an average temperature of about 80° F. The rainfall varies between 200 inches along the coast to about 66 inches in the interior, with a very high degree of humidity.

Liberia has an area of 43,000 square miles and a population of less than 2 million, broken down according to some ethnologists into 28 main tribes speaking some 20 different dialects. English, however, is the official language.

The founding of Liberia goes back into the history of slavery in the United States.

It is not necessary for me to discuss some of the lively arguments which centered around this tragedy in human relations.

Here was a people living in what was said to be a society where "all men are born free" finding it necessary to leave that society in search of freedom. Many in this audience are well aware of some of the burning issues raised during those times which led to a bloody civil war, some of the aftermaths of which, have lingered on much longer than Christian charity will tolerate.

Though the founding of Liberia was one of the solutions experimented with, it must be said with great emphasis that she never found herself outside the many manifestations of the ugliness of slavery until nearly half way through the 20th century. Out of every tragedy something good may be salvaged. It was the mighty political upheavals and great wars that ushered in an increased sense of international morality which made possible Liberia's acceptance by the world community and enabled her to broaden the scope of her striving for progress beyond the narrow limits of mere survival. The supreme test during those long dark years was to exist fully realizing that she must remain as a constant symbol of faith and hope to all black people.

The uniqueness of that struggle and survival will never lose its thrilling meaning in the annals of human endeavor. Poverty and its handmaiden deprivation were a long nightmare but the challenge had to be met. Thus, when the President of Guinea, Sekou Toure, in rallying his people for freedom, said, "We prefer poverty in liberty to riches in slavery," he was echoing a familiar sentiment because long ago his Liberian brothers had shown the way.

What other satisfaction could we Liberians want for having kept the faith than this defiant demonstration of the aspirations of all Africans.

That was the background against which Liberia was founded in 1822 by "88 free men and women of color" under the auspices of the American Colonization Society.

Among the moving spirits of this society were such distinguished Americans as Bushrod Washington, a cousin of your first President, George Washington, Francis Scott Key, author of "The Star-Spangled Banner," Robert Findley and Elijah Caldwell.

Administratively, Liberia is divided into nine counties and three territories with a system of government based mainly on American institutions.

An important development on the world scene today is the determination of peoples heretofore denied equality and justice to assert their rights and make their full contribution to progress. Such assertions are heard wherever denials in any form are practiced. And so it ought to be.

But let me say what a consolation it is if where such struggles are taking place there can be found men sharing ideals in which we believe. For so long as this pertains, we can have less fear of the outcome.

Thus, if some of the social and economic changes in this mighty country can command a consensus among the vast majority of Americans it is because they continue to operate within the broad spectrum of American traditions, sustained by ideals in which the overwhelming majority of the leadership in such struggles have never lost faith.

Changes of a vast nature are taking place in Africa. It is good to know that many of those involved in these changes have an economic, political, and social orientation along American principles.

This has been Liberia's role in an Africa coming into the fullness of freedom and building for a future. Drawing upon an experience profoundly influenced by long association with America and buttressed by institutions whose strength has been fed by ideals shared with America, Liberia wished to make a constructive contribution to an Africa grappling with the problems of economic and social development.

What are some of the preoccupations of Africa today?

First and foremost is the complete commitment to the eradication of every form of injustice from the continent. Speaking with one voice, we say that denial of human rights is indefensible and that any form of colonialism in Africa is intolerable to the independent States in Africa.

Let me therefore remind you of Liberia's initiative at the United Nations in focusing world attention on apartheid in South Africa and on Portuguese colonialism.

No other recognition for this record is needed than to say that Liberia was proposed by all the African States for election to the Security Council and was thus the first to represent Africa on that Council south of the Sahara.

Similarly, if the case on South-West Africa is fast reaching the stage of determination at the International Court of Justice at The Hague, where it is hoped justice will be given to the people of this African nation, it is because of Liberia's leadership in pressing the contentious proceedings, acclaimed and supported by the other African States, against South Africa.

Another preoccupation of Africa is unity. No doubt you have read of the many efforts

to achieve this objective. In this respect no African leader has striven harder and longer than President Tubman of Liberia. Soon after Africa began to win freedom and sovereignty President Tubman issued a call to all African leaders, promulgating certain basic principles for the achievement of unity and cooperation. In many ways differing from the catch-all phrases and glib political slogans these principles came to represent in the hard light of reality and experience the course which prudence and wisdom confirmed.

Beginning from the premise that success is more quickly achieved in those areas where agreement is easier to come by and the immediate needs are greatest, Liberia has never tired of impressing her sister States in Africa with the best methods for working out relations among them. Its reward was achieved at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in 1963 when the Charter for the Organization of African Unity was adopted, embodying the principles which had first been put forward by Liberia in an Extraordinary Gazette in 1959, then again at the Saniquelle summit conference later in July of that year between Ghana, Guinea, and Liberia and, a third time at the first Conference of Independent African States at Monrovia in 1961.

Let me say here that it has ben a strange phenomenon that our friends in this country should have been slow in appreciating President Tubman's contribution in this critical area of African progress, although the record has been so impressive. Fortunately, the reaction among African leaders has not been so reserved.

Shortly after these momentous developments in 1959, here is what the magazine Africa Report in its August 1959 issue had to say in assessing President Tubman's role and the part played by Liberia:

"Member States of the African bloc rallied behind Algerian nationalists this month in a special 5-day meeting at Monrovia, Liberia.

"The officially sponsored Monrovia conference was the latest in a series of history-making political and diplomatic meetings held by Africans on African soil, all designed broadly to foster African unity."

Tracing some of the steps along the path of unity, this reporter concluded:

"This month, with nine national flags flying over the Monrovia capital alongside the banner of the rebel Algerian government, Tubman's poised entry into the pan-African scene was complete."

That is why throughout Africa today, President Tubman is so widely acclaimed, a typical example being these words of welcome addressed to him by the President of Gabon when he visited that State:

"We are proud to welcome you as head of a country whose democratic institutions and steps toward economic and social progress constitute an example for us and for many others."

Nor should it be forgotten that the African Development Bank with headquarters at Abijan, the Ivory Coast, of which all African independent States are members, was first conceived in Monrovia and vigorously promoted into reality by Liberia.

Or consider his posture on the issue of war and peace. He was one of the first to call on world leaders to commit themselves as a matter of principle to a no-war pledge.

Also, fast gaining acceptance are Liberia's recommendations regarding the settlement of boundary disputes and mediation and conciliation among states.

What objective person would not stand in admiration at such a broad and constructive approach to crucial world and African problems?

But these contributions would have been unlikely had not the policies and commitments of Liberia as a Nation been guided by the best traditions of a free society.

So let me ask you to dismiss at once the myths you have read about Liberia. To understand Liberia and appreciate her value, as with most situations, she must be placed in the correct perspective in the struggle of man, the black man, for freedom, human dignity, and equality. These myths I should mention were part and parcel of that struggle and those times. Let Liberia be judged only by her record.

In economic and social development Liberia is emphasizing the free initiative of man, and no Liberian has done more in bringing that into full realization than President Tubman. On assuming office in 1944, he enunciated the open-door policy whereby foreign capital and skill would be invited to help develop the natural resources of the country. The response has been good especially among business people in this country. Let them continue to look to Liberia as a fruitful field for their investment. It has been profitable for them and us and we intend to keep it that way.

Where a few years ago, there were some doubts about the viability of the country, a modern society is now making an historic impact. Rubber, once the main export of the country, has yielded first place to iron ore, which is said to have the richest ferrous content to be found anywhere in the world.

Our economy is being diversified and our people now look to the future with increased confidence.

Let me turn to the words of President Senghor of Senegal for a present-day description of Liberia, given in the preface of a recent book by Lawrence Marinelli, entitled "The New Liberia," and published by Praeger. I commend this well-written study to those of you who may wish to know more about my country. Senghor said:

"To appraise President Tubman's grand design we must recall what Liberia was when he was first inaugurated in January 1944. * * * The situation of Liberia was that of a particularly underdeveloped African country. It had not been colonized by a great power, but by philanthropic endeavors with more good will than technical or financial means. The moral devastations that came with the breakup of traditional societies were the most terrible * * * but there is happily a positive aspect: the economic infrastructure, industrial cultures, schools, hospitals, and, above all, the modern spirit. * * * From these positive assets Liberia had scarcely benefited before 1949 * * * after all what could several thousand impoverished Americo-Liberians do? Very little—unless there appeared among them a great politician with a grand design offering them reasons for living, and, above all, for action, William Tubman was going to revolutionize Liberia and give it not only a modern ideal but modern means to achieve it.

"The most positive result of these activities is—I have witnessed it myself—there are no longer Americo-Liberians or natives. There is a Liberian nation to which all its citizens are proud to belong.

"William Tubman * * * open door is not the transposition pure and simple of liberal capitalism. * * * The development of reresources on a cooperative basis presupposes concerted and flexible planning. * * * Today one can measure the positive results of this policy of economic expansion.

"Thus do we view William Tubman. Leader of his people, founder of the Liberian nation and creator of its modern economy he has done more alone than all his predecessors did together. We do not smile at Liberia the way we did before 1944. Today Tubman is among the African heads of state who are most listened to, most respected."

I hope these words of a world-known African statesman, poet, and writer, will help to lay to rest for all times the myths about Liberia.

Finally, let me say how much Liberia takes pride in her friendship and cooperation with the United States. But like most things if friendship is to remain fruitful and mutually beneficial, one must never become too complacent about it. A friendship that is allowed to turn stale is soon lost; a friendship that fails to find new sources of pleasure and enrichment will not last. There are so many things in so many areas in which Liberians and Americans can cooperate effectively to strengthen their democracies and make our world happy for all peoples. There is a rotary club in Monrovia. How splendid it will be if you will begin as of now to search out with that club some of the avenues along which our two peoples can explore the possibilities of making our friendship more responsive to the needs and aspirations which we share.

Ambassador Stevenson To Receive Eleanor Roosevelt Political and Public Service Memorial Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, Adlai E. Stevenson, our distinguished Ambassador to the United States, has been selected to receive the Eleanor Roosevelt Political and Public Service Memorial Award for 1965. The Ambassador has received many well-deserved honors during his years of outstanding public service. This particular honor, though, carries with it a special significance. It is given annually in memory of Eleanor Roosevelt to that person who best exemplifies her spirit.

The Eleanor Roosevelt Political and Public Service Memorial Award was conceived by a group of her friends as a fitting and lasting memorial shortly after her death in 1962. They formed an independent award committee consisting of the following distinguished citizens: John J. B. Shea, Francis W. H. Adams, Richard A. Brown, Eugene Callender, Stephen R. Currier, Irving M. Engel, Arnold L. Fein, Abraham Feinberg, Thomas K. Finletter, Eleanor Clark French, Lloyd K. Garrison, Mrs. Louis A. Gimbel, Jr., Milton A. Gordon, Mrs. Dorothy Hirshon, Thomas R. Jones, Mrs. Robert Kintner, Arthur B. Krim, Orin Lehman, Mrs. Dorothy Norman, Frederick W. Richmond, Curtis Roosevelt, WILLIAM F. RYAN, Dore Schary, JAMES H. SCHEUER, Henry D. Sedgwick, R. Peter Straus, Telford Taylor, Robert Wechsler. In 1963, the award committee made its first presentation to Lloyd K. Garrison, and in 1964 selected Anna Rosenberg Hoffman as the award recipient.

This year, the award committee unanimously chose Adlai Stevenson to receive the Eleanor Roosevelt Political and Public Service Memorial Award. The following essay, written by Dore Schary, beautifully expresses the intent of the committee in choosing an annual recipient for this unique award.

MRS. R.: POLITICIAN

All of us who loved Eleanor Roosevelt have spoken and written at length about her devotion to causes of good and welfare. Her labors on behalf of the conquering of diseases; her fight for better educational opportunity; her steadfastness in the field of civil liberties; her intolerance toward inadequate housing; bigotry; industrial discrimination and her allegiance to the humanities are documented for all to see.

Too little is said of her tough capabilities as a politician. In this area she was always surprising the opposition who were constantly misinterpreting her massive benevolence as a sign of political naivete or ignorance.

Her performance as a delegate to the United Nations and her contribution to the bill of human rights proved her competence in international politics. Her willingness to defy the less astute members of her own party is on the record. She has opposed private interests or Presidents if need be, if principle was being sacrificed for expediency.

She was unremitting in pursing principle, and in world affairs or national problems or State and city politics, she was willing to pick up the lance and give battle. There are a number of unhorsed opponents who bear witness to her skill and tenacity as a combatant in the political tournaments.

Eleanor Roosevelt's favority political theme was the responsibility of each citizen to participate in the affairs of his government at local, State, and National levels. It was her contention that our elected officials reflected the interest and devotion of the electorate; that, in effect, we got what we deserved or earned.

It is a credo that all members of every reform movement should repeat each day as a remainder of their basic obligation.

There was with the sweet smile and the soft voice of Mrs. Roosevelt an iron will and steely convictions that not only benefited the Democratic Party but could remain a shining inheritance to all of us who occasionally forget that principle must be pursued without considering the consequence.

The hand-illuminated parchment plaque being presented to Ambassador Stevenson contains the last photograph taken of Mrs. Roosevelt in her lifetime and reads:

Adlai E. Stevenson, whose devotion to and efforts for the cause of good government splendidly reflect those ideals and principles which dominated the mind and heart of Eleanor Roosevelt.

The award will be presented to the Ambassador at a dinner on April 12 at the Hotel Pierre in New York, sponsored by the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, the citywide reform Democratic movement, Mrs. Roosevelt's major political interest in the last years of her life.

Voting Rights Act of 1965 Is Bad Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, eligible Americans should have the right to vote, but it should not be done at the expense of tearing down the structure of State government. There are three provisions of the Constitution that affect the matter of voting. The first is article I, section 2, which reads as follows:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States * * * and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

The next one is amendment 15, which has this to say:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Subsequently amendment 17 was placed in the Constitution which has to do with the direct election of Senators and says this:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

The two constitutional provisions, one of which was amendment 17, which came after the adoption of amendment 15, lodged the authority in the States to set qualifications with respect to voting. Hysteria, propaganda, and hasty appeals for action do not change the effectiveness of the State authority with respect to voting unless the qualifications set out by the State would discriminate against segments of the population or are themselves unreasonable. Then such State provisions would be subject to being reviewed as to their constitutionality.

I cannot agree with the doctrine enunciated by President Lyndon B. Johnson in his recent message to a joint session of Congress which was based on amendment 15, and this alone.

The Congress is working under a high top priority rating on what is known as the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The bill brings under Federal jurisdiction for the first time State and county elections. As it is worded, it applies to six States which are: Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia. These States are covered because less than 50 percent of their people who are 21 years of age or over cast a vote in 1964, which was set up as a guideline in the legislation. The effect of the bill would be to deny those six States the right to invoke literacy tests such as knowledge, intelligence, education, or morality on any of the citizens of such States who may wish to vote. The result of directing legislation at six States and six States only is quite unusual and highly discriminatory in that a person can vote in those States even though he cannot read and write, whereas in New York State and many others in the Nation, he will be deprived of the right of franchise.

It is reasonable and most desirable that a voting citizen should have at least a little bit of sense and a person who has not been convicted of a felony. There are two main considerations when you speak of providing rights of all of our citizens to vote. They should be given the right to vote, yes, under reasonable standards, but such a system should adhere to the law of the land—the Constitution of the United States.

This bill which is now being studied in both Houses of Congress would lodge discretionary power in the U.S. Attorney General to step in and by the use of his appointment of voter registrars deprive the local citizens of the right to qualify voters within those six States. There can be little doubt that such authority in the Attorney General to supervise the registration of voting in this manner is not only irregular but runs counter to the expressed provisions of the Constitution which gives the States the full and complete authority to set reasonable voter qualifications.

This bill will be approved by a fairly good majority in both the House and the Senate it appears without doubt. When this happens it would ride herd over the privileges that States have always enjoyed in this country. That is bad—very bad legislation.

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the Nation's greatest industry. It is the most important industry to the well-being of our people. The President sent to the Congress today proposals for legislation of great significance and meaning to our farm people and to the Nation. I have introduced this legislation as H.R. 7097 and, because of the broad interest, I am placing in the RECORD a statement I made to the press on this bill.

The statement follows:

THE FARM BILL

I have today introduced the administration's omnibus farm bill, and our Committee on Agriculture will consider the proposed legislation carefully, thoroughly, and expeditiously.

The administration is to be commended for the great amount of work it has done in an effort to develop policies and to improve programs with the overall objective of stabilizing farm income, revitalizing rural America, assuring abundant food and fiber for consumers, and bolstering the national economy.

However, I am certain the legislation contains many controversial provisions, and I regret that the administration is so late in presenting its farm recommendations to the Congress.

Moreover, I had hoped that the administration would by this time have submitted recommendations concerning cotton and the problems which will face our textile industry if the one-price cotton program is not continued. I have been assured that we will receive recommendations from the administration at an early date.

Our committee will do everything in its power to make up the lost time, to compose all differences, improve and refine the legislation wherever possible, and to bring about

the enactment of a bill that will be fair to our farmers and to all Americans.

The President through this new farm bill proposes, among other program changes, to place greater reliance on the market price for wheat and rice. For years, the American farmer as a result of his greater efficiency has not received a fair price for his products. Prices farmers receive are substantially below such farm prices 15 years ago.

Actually, a very good case can be made on the proposition that farmers now are subsidizing the consumers of the Nation by billions of dollars a year, because their income from their investment, management, and labor is much smaller and therefore they must accept lower standards of living than their customers who are engaged in the undertakings of other segments of the economy.

The bill submitted by the President attempts to deal with this inequity. As I understand it, by getting more of the farmers' income from the marketplaces rather than from subsidy at taxpayers' expense, as proposed in the new legislation, a slight increase in the price of bread will mean only $1.60 per person a year, and in the case of rice, only 30 cents per person per year.

Surely, this is a small price to pay a healthy and prosperous agriculture.

I personally am determined to improve farm income, and to protect our family system of agriculture.

We shall have the Secretary of Agriculture before our committee tomorrow to discuss the details of the legislation, and then the various divisions of the bill—such as wheat, feed grains, rice and wool—will be referred to subcommittees for separate hearings.

I am not certain at this time whether we shall take an omnibus bill to the House for action, or present separate bills as we make our determinations on the best policies and programs for the various commodities.

Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second of a series of articles on the poverty program written by Jo Ann Hardee, of the Detroit News:

NEW "POVERTY" DEFINITION WILL TIE IT TO LIVING COST

(By Jo Ann Hardee)

WASHINGTON, March 15.—A new definition of "poverty" will be announced by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) within 2 months.

It will be more precise than that developed by the Council of Economic Advisers, which set the poverty level at $3,000 for a family and $1,500 for an individual.

It is expected to raise the poverty line for nonfarm families to $3,120 and lower it to $1,850 for farm families.

WEIGH COST FACTORS

Instead of a flat-income figure, the new definition will be based generally upon cost of living, taking into consideration regional location, urban versus rural life, farm versus nonfarm life, age, and educational level.

As a measure of cost of living, the OEO is using the Social Security Administration low-income budget for a four-person family. This allows 70 cents per person for daily food and $1.40 per person for all other expenses, including housing, clothing, school expenses, medical costs and transportation. This index requires $3,120 yearly income.

But the OEO recognizes that the adequacy of such and income is related to costs of living in a particular locality.

SEEK BASIC STANDARD

Its figures show that a farm family which grows its own food could achieve the same standard of living on $1,850 a year, while some city dwellers would require more than $3,120 for the same standard.

"What we are developing is a minimum living standard," said Leon Gilgoff, Deputy Director of the OEO's Department of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

"If we meet this basic level we can move on. The program is certainly not designed to stop at an arbitrary income level of $3,120. Only the coldest hearted person would say that 70 cents per person for daily food is an adequate living."

The new definition is expected to answer critics who quarreled with the $3,000 to $1,500 evaluation of poverty.

* * * * *

Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, noted that more than 1 million members of the Armed Forces had less than a $3,000 annual income, including living allowances. They also said that retired persons on social security would be barred from that program if they earned more than $3,000.

Critics also said the definition did not take into account noncash income such as farm products.

Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Traverse City, Mich., Republican, said an older couple with 6,000 shares of International Business Machines stock would have a cash income of $3,000 annually, but their stock would be worth $300,000.

"Naturally, it would be ridiculous to include or exclude someone from an antipoverty program on an arbitrary income basis alone," Gilgoff said. "That's why we have placed emphasis upon community action programs.

"INDEX BY AREAS

"At the community level, persons are being screened on the basis of their need. They certainly shouldn't be excluded from the program if they make $3,121, are unemployed, poorly educated, and have six children.

"But we are trying to develop more accurate guidelines for screening," he added. "Eventually we hope to develop a poverty index for individual communities similar to the unemployment index now in use."

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, an opponent of the antipoverty bill, is developing its own definition of poverty through a special task force of 100 business leaders.

It has urged a market-basket approach, using cost of living as the guide to poverty. Its definition, expected in April, is to be based essentially upon the same criteria as the OEO's.

BREAKING IT DOWN

Gilgoff's inventory of poverty is a complex breakdown of the 34 million persons designated as poor by the Council of Economic Advisers.

Those figures showed that 78 percent of the poor were white; heads of 60 percent of all poor families have only grade school educations, one-third of the poor families were headed by a person over 65.

Gilgoff's poverty inventory is designed to show a precise profile of poverty.

When completed it should reveal how many persons in a given geographical region are at the poverty level; their ages, sex, color, educational level, housing quality, health and whether they live in cities, rural areas or on farms.

This can be contrasted with the comparable standards of living of similar persons in the same geographical area.

HOPE FOR BATTLE PLAN

OEO analysts believe the new definition will not only answer criticisms that the previous flat-income level was too vague, but will pinpoint the methods needed to combat poverty.

"We realize that the definition of poverty used to develop the economic opportunity act was vague and transitory," Gilgoff said. "It was, however, wise as a jumpoff point for immediate action.

"We realize also that our programs were not developed on the basis of the effectiveness of one approach as opposed to another. They were built on the demonstrated need of 34 million people.

"With a breakdown of the poverty category into types of needs, we can evaluate the cost of a specific program in relation to its effectiveness."

HOW TO BREAK CYCLE?

OEO officials are primarily concerned with "breaking the cycle of poverty," Gilgoff said. They wish to move people out of poverty and keep them from slipping back into a poverty status.

The breakdown will give OEO officials a better idea of where to put its limited resources in order to do the best job. They recognize that $727 million is a very small sum in relation to the $40 billion now being spent by the Federal Government alone in antipoverty programs such as welfare.

As an example, Gilgoff's new poverty definition will show how many children under 15 live in poverty-ridden families. OEO analysts frankly admit that the best opportunity for breaking the poverty cycle rests with the young.

* * * * *

The breakdown also is expected to "give us a guide to the kind of person that works out best in an antipoverty effort," Gilgoff said.

EXCEPTIONS TO RULE

"There may be some classifications for whom the only answer is a transfer payment of increased social security. The elderly, as an example, have little opportunity to reenter the job market. Although we reject the transfer payment as a solution to poverty, the elderly are an example of the case in which it may be the only reasonable answer.

"Another case might be that of a mother, now on Aid to Dependent Children, who perhaps should have the option of working or staying home with young children."

In his planning and evaluation, Gilgoff is using the systems analysis methods of the Department of Defense where he was formerly employed.

"When we have a complete poverty inventory and as we gain fiscal and economic maturity, we can judge the cost of a specific program against its effectiveness," he said.

"If it doesn't work, we should be and intend to be, the first to reject it."

How We Reject Christ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous material, I submit the following editorial from the Deseret News, published in Salt Lake City, Utah, and dated March 13, 1965.

The editorial points up the way in which we are drifting away from the laws of God; how this drift is even being encouraged by some members of the clergy; how this drift is being condoned and encouraged by universities and bar associations; how this drift is carrying us, day by day, farther and farther away from the moral precepts of our fathers; how this drift is losing for us the moral base on which our great Nation was founded and grew.

It is a thoughtful and thought-provoking editorial, Mr. Speaker. I believe it should be read by all who are concerned as to where we, as a nation, are going.

The editorial follows:

HOW WE REJECT CHRIST

There are various ways of rejecting Christ. We need not be atheists or pagans to turn our backs upon Him. We can even profess to know Him, and still deny Him by our works, as Paul has said.

America claims to be a Christian nation. We say "In God We Trust" on our coins, and sing about it in our national anthem, and yet we take many steps which oppose the very things we profess.

Preachers who appear to advocate Christianity teach doctrines which are directly contrary to the sacred precepts given us by the Saviour. Politicians pass laws which defy divine principles.

In New York, one of our greatest States, we now have a movement in the legislature to pattern after Illinois, another of our greatest States, in liberalizing morality laws.

The bar association there is asking the legislature to rule that "adultery shall no longer be a crime; homosexuality shall no longer be illegal; the age of consent shall be reduced to the tender age of 16 for any persons wishing to enter prostitution.

A minister in Baltimore told college students that sex is fun—relax and enjoy it. Fornication, he said, is not a sin, so stop feeling guilty about your sex activities.

England is entering the same road. A high official there favored the same kind of free love—advocating it publicly. Students at one of the best colleges in Britain may now keep girls overnight in their dormitories if they pay the school a fine of 3 pounds sterling.

When God says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," what preacher can set the law aside and say this sin is "fun" and people should relax and enjoy it? When great states wish to legalize filth and say there is no sin in it, do they not reject the being who issued divine injunctions against it?

Christ denounced fornication. Can a "man of the cloth" remove the divine restriction? Are men beginning to consider themselves greater than God?

A recent religious publication bearing an official imprimatur, would make us think so as it says on another subject:

"Every day the priest obeys that command (meaning the celebration of the eucharist). He stands before the altar and cries out to God to come down from Heaven and take up his residence under the appearance of bread and wine. God obeys. The priest may be weak, or sick, or ignorant, or even evil. It makes no difference. When he gives command, Almighty God obeys. What an extraordinary power this is. No king, no dictator, no president ever possessed anything like it."

A Gallup poll in England, taken about Christmas time, showed that 65 percent of the people no longer regard Christmas with any religious significance.

Sunday in most countries, and certainly in the United States of America, is now a holiday for the vast majority. It too has lost its religious significance for most people. Some churches actually teach that if you attend a religious service on Sunday, the rest of the day may be given over to sports or frolic of your own choosing.

America is the land "choice above all other lands," but its divine protection rests upon the worship of Christ who is the God of the land.

Are signs such as those mentioned above significant?

Does the trend they portray have any bearing on our national security in these times of great world unrest?

To what extent may we hope to enjoy the blessings of Heaven if we reject the God of this land? What proportion of the population must join in the rejection before this Nation as a whole is considered recreant toward God?

Anciently Abraham bargained with the Lord for the preservation of a city. The Almighty was willing to spare it for a faithful few—if they could be found.

Can Latter-day Saints and other sincere Christians become a leaven in the lump to preserve America while the majority of its population seems to turn its back upon the Savior?

What better patriotic duty can they perform than to walk righteously before their God?

Backtracking on Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, all of New England was shocked last week by Secretary of the Interior Udall's abrupt about-face on the question of import controls on residual oil.

After assuring New England Representatives that a decision would be made to eliminate the quota on residual oil for New England, the Secretary's decision was reversed and he permitted only a slight increase in the current quota.

Since the Secretary himself has admitted that the national security interest in continuing the quotas is not a significant factor, it is difficult for us to escape the conclusion that our region is the victim of rank discrimination.

On Friday, April 2, the Boston Herald in a fine editorial asks "What is the justification for this extra fuel tax on New England?" It is a good question and one which deserves a good answer.

The editorial follows:

BACKTRAINING ON OIL

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has put himself in a completely untenable position by his latest action on residual oil import quotas.

Three weeks ago he told Senators testifying at Interior Department hearings: "The President has given me full and sole and complete authority to make this decision (on continuing or ending oil quotas) * * *. I'm going to make it on my own."

This week, after first deciding to exempt New England and Florida from all controls, he reversed himself under pressure from White House and Justice Department lawyers and announced simply that quotas for the east coast would be increased by 75,000 barrels a day.

The lawyers argued that, because the quotas were established for national security purposes, it would not be legally "viable" to treat some areas differently from others. But counsel for the New England Council had filed a brief showing that there was no legal barrier to such an arrangement. And Mr. Udall, until the last moment, had accepted this view.

Raising the quotas does not, of course, meet New England's problem.

This region is a heavy user of residual oil, consuming upward of 70 million barrels a year. And most oil users, such as our electric utilities, are not in a position to switch to other fuels. For New England, as Senator MUSKIE has said, it is not a question of residual or coal, but rather residual or disaster. The new import quotas barely make up for the decline in domestic production.

The squeeze comes on price. The quota system inevitably forces residual prices upward. The cost of residual oil is now higher in the United States, an energy rich country, than in many energy poor countries. Secretary Udall himself estimates that the quota system is costing U.S. consumers $40 million a year. And a substantial part of that bill is paid in New England.

And what is the justification for this extra fuel tax on New England? Ostensibly it is national security—protecting domestic oil and coal producers. But Secretary Udall, who is supposed to have the last word on the matter, says dropping the quotas in our case would not hurt the national security.

It is hard to avoid the conclusion, therefore, that this region is being victimized by selfish oil and coal interests who are bringing pressure on the Interior Secretary through the White House.

We hope that the strong protests made by the New England congressional delegation and other regional spokesmen will serve to counteract these pressures and bring about a settlement of the quota question on its merits. The whole quota system should be scrapped. At very least it should be scrapped in New England and Florida, where there is no significant competition between imported residual oil and domestic fuels.

Secretary Udall was right the first time. He should have stuck by his guns.

Don't Drown the Grand Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will be asked, in due course, to judge whether dams should be built on the Lower Colorado River, which would create a reservoir in the Grand Canyon National Park. This is such a frontal attack upon one of our Nation's most splendid and revered natural wonders that any projects which would lessen its majesty must certainly be reviewed with the greatest of care.

From my preliminary study, I am somewhat astounded to learn that these proposed dams would not actually add to the total volume of water for the area. In fact, the evaporation from the dams themselves would indicate a net loss of water. Perhaps in this great day of specialization there is a logical explanation for such proposals, but I have always thought that reclamation projects should have as their objective the reclaiming of

land or water. The proposals to build dams on the Lower Colorado do neither.

From my knowledge as of this moment, I view with alarm any project that would have such an adverse effect upon one of the jewels of this world which we are privileged to have within our country.

As part of my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Press, which I believe expresses the views of a vast majority of our people:

DON'T DROWN THE GRAND CANYON

Congress should look long and hard at a California-Arizona proposal to spend $750 million to build dams above and below the Grand Canyon.

The lower dam would flood the canyon's inner gorge for 13 miles into the national park. It would spoil one of America's great scenic wonders. It would set a precedent for invasion of Glacier, Yosemite, Grand Tetons, Yellowstone, Big Bend, and other national parks on which Federal Engineers want to build dams.

There are other reasons for resisting this scheme:

The two dams would waste millions of gallons of water through evaporation in the hot, dry climate and through seepage in the porous canyon walls; water that could be used if permitted to flow naturally to Hoover Dam.

Though this is called a reclamation project, it would not reclaim a foot of land. The dams would be used only to produce expensive power, raising the cost of electricity in the Southwest. Coal-fueled steamplants—and the Mountain States are loaded with coal—could produce much cheaper power.

There is not now enough water in the Colorado River, which carved the Grand Canyon, to fill the reservoirs behind Glen Canyon Dam, at the Arizona-Utah border, and Hoover Dam, downstream at the Arizona-Nevada border.

The dams would make even saltier the salty, silt-laden water now delivered in the river to Mexico, by treaty. We have acknowledged our obligation to deliver usable water to our neighbor.

One beneficiary would be the Reclamation Bureau, which is pushing this lush new project to maintain its organization.

None of this makes economic sense. And it is a crime against nature. Congress should dismiss this proposal and go to work on more constructive ideas to bring water to the Southwest.

How Do We Justify School Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Wasau Record-Herald in my congressional district which appeared on Tuesday, March 30, 1965, raises certain questions about equalizing educational opportunities across the Nation. Using a concrete example of the kind of tax break some States, like Lousiana, give to their industries, the Record-Herald makes the very sensible point:

If we can justify equalizing educational opportunities across the Nation it must be on the basis of whether the local tax base can or cannot bear the burden of adequate school tax—not whether it will or not.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, the editorial, entitled "How Do We Justify School Aid?" follows:

HOW DO WE JUSTIFY SCHOOL AID?

How can we justify Federal aid to education? In our mind, it can only be justified as a method of equalizing educational opportunity—and even then it is only justified if the variation in school funds is substantial. As we have pointed out many times in the past, it is most difficult for men sitting at desks in Washington, D.C., to be completely fair in determining need around this big country.

Thus, it was not too surprising when someone analyzed the administration school aid bill and found that 10 of the wealthiest counties in the Nation, with only 2 to 4 percent of their children in the so-called poverty category, would receive $8.9 million in 1966, while 10 poor counties, with 35 to 54 percent of their children in the poverty class, would receive about half of that—$4.5 million. As Congressman LAIRD pointed out, Wisconsin's Forest County will get far less than a Maryland county where family incomes average around $10,000.

The Southern States would put in the least amounts per capita and receive the greatest amounts per capita in return. Is this right? Is it true that the Southern States cannot bear their own education burden?

Take a look at an advertisement by the State of Louisiana Department of Commerce and Industry in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report. Under the heading "Long-Range Tax Protection," here is what the ad says:

"Louisiana grants 10-year exemption from property taxes on plants and equipment of new and expanding manufacturers. Now, under a 1964 act, these properties cannot be assessed—after the 10-year-exemption period—higher than the ratio that all property assessments in the area bear to actual value."

Take a $6 million new plant built in Wausau. If it went on the tax rolls at two-thirds of that, or $4 million, it would pay property taxes of $160,000 per year, more than half of which would be devoted to the cost of education. Over a 10-year period, such a plant would pay $800,000 in taxes for schools in Wausau; in Louisiana it would pay absolutely nothing—for schools or for anything else!

So what happens when Federal aid to educations is passed? The Louisiana plant again will get favored treatment, since far more Federal aid will go to Louisiana per pupil than to Wisconsin.

If we can justify equalizing educational opportunities across the Nation it must be on the basis of whether the local tax base can or cannot bear the burden of adequate school tax—not whether it will or will not!

Wisconsin citizens would be wise to protect their own interests by writing their representatives in Congress. Our education costs— already high— are going much higher because we are going to help schools in Louisiana and other such States which will not help themselves if Federal aid to education is passed.

No Biz Like Poverty Biz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a dispatch from the New York battlefront gives a glimpse of how goes the war on poverty. As chronicled in the New York Daily News:

POVERTY—IT'S WONDERFUL

President Johnson's war on poverty, New York branch has finally got itself into high, or high-cost gear. Mayor Wagner is requesting another $10,300,000 in Federal taxpayers' money. First, though, some spoilsports are expected to demand an investigation of Harlem's controversial haryou-act program. This costly spectacular has long been the subject of equally spectular rumors of financial hanky-panky. Its books may have to be audited before our mayor is allowed to hand it another $1.5 million.

Then there's the fascinating case of Mrs. Mary Conway Kohler, a lady lawyer who, it turns out, is getting $500 per week as a poverty "consultant," whatever that is.

Queried about her new job, the lady says sweetly it's none of anyone's business. No biz like poverty biz.

A Terrible War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the real tragedy of the terrible war being waged in Vietnam is that the most commonly advanced alternatives lead only into blind alleys: to wider war or the surrender of independence. Neither it seems to me are acceptable; neither are consistent with mankinds goals of peace and freedom.

If we were to withdraw abruptly today, as some so vigorously advocate, South Vietnam would fall to a Communist attack which has increasingly been waged and directed from the north—from North Vietnam and Communist China itself. The independence which we have pledged to help a new nation maintain—the independence which is inherent in our own tradition—would be lost.

But the loss of South Vietnam to Communist pressures would do more than destroy independence in that country alone.

It would clearly menace neighboring Thailand and Cambodia. It would bring increased pressure on already beleagured Malaysia. It would open a side door into India. It would threaten the Philippines and even Australia. It would make impossible any alternatives for Indonesia. It would, in brief, imperil independence and freedom in all of southeast Asia.

But the other alternative certainly offers no better choice. If the war continues to escalate; if the United States continues to lead through its strength, which is in the sea and in the air, then the North Vietnamese, and the Communist Chinese, and even the Russians, can respond through their strength which is terror and massive attacks by land.

The bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon is an example. The employment of thousands and hundreds of thousands

of Communist and American troops is another. And the devastation of millions through nuclear war, from which there would be no real victor, is an ever present possibility.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind that the only reasonable, sane and productive course of action is negotiation. But let us be sure of our grounds. Let us be sure that we have something to negotiate. And let us recall that the history of the world is replete with examples of disaster when negotiations were conducted from weakness. For weakness breeds contempt and the Communists have made clear their contempt for weakness.

Negotiations like the tango, furthermore, take two, and to date the Communists have indicated no desire and no willingness to remove the barriers—the aggression, the subversion and the terror—to meaningful discussions.

If the Communists can be persuaded to leave their neighbors alone, then peace is possible in South Vietnam and all of southeast Asia. For as the Washington Post stated on March 31:

> The United States, on its part, wishes only a free and independent South Vietnam and North Vietnam, in the end, surely would have its essential purposes served best by a friendly, viable and productive neighbor from which the United States and all other foreign troops had departed.

The attainment of peace and independence, which are our abiding goals, has not and never will be easy. It requires patients, perserverance and persistence. But it is possible if we, in the words of John Kennedy, never negotiate out of fear, but never fear to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, I call our colleagues' attention to the thoughtful article in the Washington Post of March 31, which I have already referred to briefly, and urge that it be read by all who are concerned with this most critical of problems:

A TERRIBLE WAR

The shocking terrorist attack on the U.S. Embassy in Saigon was hardly needed to demonstrate what a brutal and barbaric struggle is taking place in South Vietnam. That was already well known. Still, we need to note that this barbarous attack upon unarmed men and women, children, civilian employees and bystanders, American and South Vietnamese alike, was made by forces that have been protesting the methods of the South Vietnam troops in battlefield situations.

What is going on in South Vietnam is a war in which every living person is a combatant, in which no man, woman or child has any sanctuary, in which there can be no peace for anyone. It is not surprising that this sort of war can be waged most effectively by those who acknowledge no rules or restraints.

The Government of the United States, as it is frequently advised by many of its own people and by its friends abroad, is in a very disagreeable and difficult situation. Agreement does not extend very far beyond this self-evident conclusion. We know we are in a very difficult predicament. We know how we got there. The numerous advisers who pour their counsel on the Government are not so prolific with suggestions as to how we can alter our situation without incurring risks and inviting dangers as bad or worse.

The Government is advised that it should negotiate—but all the powers with whom it might negotiate have let it be known that they are unwilling to negotiate until the United States withdraws and leaves the country to the victors. The appeals for negotiation need to be addressed first to Hanoi, to Peiping, and to the Vietcong. There can be negotiation, no doubt, when they wish to negotiate but it is difficult to see how anything can be done as long as the departure of the forces of the United States is made a precondition to settlement.

The United States also is reproached for its failure to delineate its policy to South Vietnam. The reproach might be more aptly stated as a reproach for a policy that is disliked. That policy is to live up to our commitment to the South Vietnamese people, whom we have pledged to support as long as they wish to struggle for their independence and freedom. Those who dislike this policy, and the acknowledged distress and discomfort in which it has involved us, owe the Government, in all candor, an explanation of the alternative policy which they would pursue so that its discomforts may be examined. It is mischievous to simply denounce the situation at which we have arrived, the predicament that we are in and the policy to which we are committed without offering any specific alternative proposals. The essence of policy decision is in having a choice between available courses of action. Let the terms of the alternatives be made known. If there is a better course that this country can pursue with honor surely those in authority would be glad to learn of it.

It ought to be emphasized however that there are no time machines available. The events of the past 10 years cannot be extinguished. The future begins tomorrow and not yesterday or on some yesterday 10 years ago on which we might have elected to stay out of South Vietnam. The critics of the policy of the United States can be most helpful by suggesting what ought to be done next instead of proposing what should have been last year or 10 years ago.

In spite of the accelerating violence of the battle, the primary and legitimate interests of the major powers involved actually do permit a great deal of maneuver. Surely those interests, sooner or later, will assert themselves. The United States, on its part, wishes only a free and independent South Vietnam. North Vietnam, in the end, surely would have its essential purposes served best by a friendly, viable, and productive neighbor after the United States and all other foreign troops had departed. These are not irreconcilable purposes and after more or less destruction of life and property no doubt they will be put upon the negotiating table. It is too bad it could not be sooner rather than later.

U.S. Employees Face Exile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, here is more evidence of a shocking destruction of integrity in Government.

These are some of the basic facts in the shocking effort to engage in economic retaliation against those men who have been willing to agree to testify on behalf of Chief Security Evaluator Otto F. Otepka:

First. There were disagreements on security standards in the State Department, and Otto Otepka and some of his aids believed that security standards were being relaxed to the point that it was harmful to national interest. Otepka testified on the laxity.

Second. Conflicts developed as between the testimony of Otepka and some of his superiors, and he was told of the testimony of superiors who contradicted him.

Third. Faced with this challenge to his integrity, Otepka produced documents from his files to prove that he was telling the truth and that his superiors were lying about the handling of a security matter. Production of these documents, for a committee of Congress is being used as grounds for trying to fire him.

Fourth. Otepka's superiors put a wiretap on his telephone and made some recordings. John F. Reilly and Elmer D. Hill took part in this, and they informed David Belisle they were going to do it. Later they told Belisle what they had done.

Fifth. Reilly, Hill, and Belisle were called before a Senate subcommittee and denied they had taken part in any wiretap of Otepka or had any knowledge of any listening device on Otepka's telephone. This was untruthful testimony under oath on a material matter before a properly authorized subcommittee of Congress. This was perjury, according to Senator DODD.

Sixth. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee obtained evidence that proved conclusively that there were wiretaps on Otepka's telephone and that Reilly, Hill, and Belisle knew of it.

Seventh. Then Reilly and Belisle admit they knew of the wire tap, but contend that there were no recordings made and that they believed it was an ineffective wiretap with only static.

Eighth. Later, Hill admitted that he made the wiretaps, with Reilly present, and that about a dozen recordings were made. He said that Belisle was engaged with conversations with him and with Reilly prior to the wiretaps and after the wiretaps.

Ninth. Reilly and Hill were permitted to resign without derogatory comment. Belisle has been permitted to remain on the State Department payroll. Since then, Reilly has been hired by the FCC where it is reported that the personnel record from State had no derogatory comment on Mr. Reilly.

This is an incredible story if one stops there, but it is shocking when one looks at what has followed:

First. The State Department continues to press charges to try to fire Otepka—charges that were filed by Reilly, the perjurer, the giver of untruthful testimony, the falsifier.

Second. In March 1964, six of Otepka's associates were transferred out of the security division into the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs for work on what was supposed to be a super secret project. At the time, these men contended it was a disciplinary move to get them out of security because they had continued to support Otepka and had agreed to give testimony on his behalf.

Third. A year later, despite William J. Crockett's assurance that the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs job was a bona fide job, two of these men—John R. Nor-

pel, Jr., and Howard Shea—are being transferred out of the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs. This important super secret project turns out to be not so important as Crockett said it was a year ago, and precisely what Norpel and Shea and others contended it was.

Fourth. Now Norpel is being transferred to El Paso, which he regards as a demotion and an "economic retaliation" against him by superiors who resent his support of Otepka. He is being transferred to a job that I am informed was slated to be abolished only a few months ago. Mr. Norpel is wary about accepting this job, transferring to El Paso where he may be left high and dry by abolition of the job.

Fifth. Shea is being transferred to Denver, in another move that appears to retaliation.

Sixth. Norpel and Shea resisted the efforts to transfer them out of the Washington area to a job that represents a demation, and which also represents a possible threat to their civil service rights. As of last Friday, these men had their State Department salaries cut off and were placed in a category of absent without leave. The State Department hierarchy is going to force them to take the demotion and to take jobs that could be abolished.

This is a most shocking set of circumstances. It is something the Congress should go into immediately, and call all of the witnesses to determine all of the facts and all of the reasoning behind the State Department actions.

This appears to be a brutal effort to coerce civil service employees who have had the courage to stand by Otepka despite the efforts of the State Department to oust this career security evaluator. Norpel was an FBI agent for 10 years with an excellent record prior to his transfer to the State Department security division in 1961. Since then he has worked on some important security cases with Otepka that revealed some major weaknesses in security operations. Apparently his only crime is that he sticks with Otepka and will tell the truth when it embarrasses his superiors. It appears that Shea falls in the same category, with an excellent record until he decided that he would tell the truth and back Otepka.

If this action against Norpel, Shea, and others is allowed to stand, then there is no civil service protection for honest career employees. We might well ask what this Government is coming to if the perjurers and liars are protected and coddled, and the men who tell the truth to Congress are harassed and hounded by bureaucratic superiors.

Mr. Speaker, the following article in the April 4, 1965, issue of the Des Moines, Iowa, Register provides further information on the unbelievable effort that is being made to crucify and exile courageous employees of the Federal Government:

CUT OFF PAY OF TWO OTEPKA FRIENDS

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The State Department has cut off the salaries of two security officers who supported chief security evaluator Otto F. Otepka and opposed what they call "disciplinary transfers" out of the Washington area.

John R. Norpel, 39-year-old former FBI agent, said Saturday that the State Department is engaging in "economic retaliation" because of his efforts to fight a transfer that can "destroy" his civil service job rights.

NEW POSTS

Norpel and Howard Shea, also a security officer who agreed to testify for Otepka, were notified in February that they were being assigned to posts in El Paso, Tex., and Denver, Colo.

Both filed objections on grounds that the new jobs represented demotions, and also because it appeared that the new posts might be discontinued at any time.

Neither Norpel or Shea has been able to obtain any more than curt replies from the State Department personnel office or from William J. Crockett, the Deputy Under-Secretary of State who is in charge of administration. Crockett has been a key figure in efforts to oust Otepka.

Otepka gave testimony before a Senate committee that was critical of his superiors, then produced three documents to prove he had told the truth and his superiors had not on a security matter.

Norpel and Shea wanted specific assurance that the new jobs would not be abolished within a few months after they took the job. They also wanted to know why they were being removed from positions in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, to which they were assigned only a year ago with assurances that this assignment required their expertise as investigators and security evaluators.

SIX-WEEK EFFORT

For 6 weeks, they have tried unsuccessfully to obtain written explanations of the reasons for the transfers, which were to be effective April 1. Instead of explanation, they have received notes indicating they have received all the information they will receive, and that the transfer decisions would not be changed.

Norpel wrote to Secretary of State Dean Rusk last week to appeal to him to examine the transfer decisions, but no reply had been received from Rusk when Norpel and Shea were informed they have been cut from the State Department payroll and must not visit the offices they occupied in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs.

The notice, from G. Marvin Gentile, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, stated that Norpel and Shea are to be considered absent without leave from their Government jobs until they report to the posts in El Paso and Denver.

Norpel, who has a GS-13 civil service rating, received a salary of $13,750 a year. Shea, with a GS-12 rating, received a salary of $13,000 a year.

The letter of explanation from Crockett to Norpel stated that the assignment was made because of "the critical need for trained investigators in our field offices at this time."

"GOOD OF SERVICE

"Your previous background as an investigator, and your present availability for reassignment has led to my decision that your reassignment to El Paso is for the good of the service."

Crockett stated that the position to which Norpel is being assigned "is a bona fide one."

Norpel in his correspondence has pointed out that only a year ago Crockett shifted him and five other men who supported Otepka from the security division, and at that time assured them that it was because of the great need for their services in a special secret project in the Bureau of Inter-American affairs.

Norpel said Saturday that the assignment to the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs was "a farce," and that it appears that the assignment to El Paso is "merely to get me out of the way."

There have been assurances that Norpel will be permitted to return to Washington to testify on behalf of Otepka when his ouster hearing comes up in May. However, the transfer of Norpel and Shea would remove them from daily contact with Otepka.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

When he transferred to the State Department security division in 1961, Norpel started working on a special project that involved restudy of a number of security cases of some high-level State Department career officers.

The work of Otepka, Norpel and others on these special projects resulted in spotlighting laxity in the security procedures at the State Department followed by the highly critical investigation of State by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Guns Do Not Commit Crimes

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the second amendment to the Constitution states in part, "the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed." In view of this I would seriously question the constitutionality of proposed legislation calling for registration and taxation of firearms. This sort of action would only harass the legitimate gun owner, and would not correct the critical crime problem existing in the United States today.

Guns do not commit crimes, Mr. Speaker; people carrying guns commit crimes. Instead of badgering the hunter, the gun collector, and other legitimate gun buffs, I believe a far better approach to the problem is the one proposed by Congressman CASEY, of Texas.

The gentleman from Texas has introduced a bill, H.R. 5462, which provides for a mandatory Federal sentence of 25 years for anyone guilty of using or carrying, during the commission of a robbery, assault, murder, rape, burglary, or kidnaping, any firearm which has been transported across a State line.

Many feel that punishment for armed crime should rest with the State in which the crime was committed. However, some courts do not adequately come to grips with the problem by the leniency shown to the criminal in all too many cases. Thus, a mandatory Federal sentence would be an active deterrent to any criminally inclined person since he would know that, should he be caught using or carrying firearms during the commission of a crime, a 25-year sentence would be the minimum that he would receive.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is precedent for this Federal action in the existing mandatory Federal sentences for trafficking in narcotics.

Registration of firearms would affect only decent, law-abiding citizens, and would not even inconvenience criminals. After all, who would expect anyone to register a weapon with which he in-

tended to commit a crime—particularly in view of the fact that any weapon being used by a hardened criminal was probably stolen in the first place?

Mr. Speaker, something must be done to curb our rapidly increasing crime rate; but legislation more oppressive to the decent citizen than to the criminal is not the way to achieve it.

South County Farmers Present Plan To Alleviate Labor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a series of articles is appearing in the Gilroy Evening Dispatch of Gilroy, Calif., written by Carmen F. Filice, concerning the effort of southern Santa Clara County farmers to improve working conditions in order to attract domestic migratory workers as a placement for braceros. Mr. Filice is an accomplished, longtime writer for the Gilroy Dispatch. In this series of articles, Mr. Filice's excellent literary style is enhanced by his intimate knowledge of the subject which can only come from a lifetime of close association with it.

The first article which appeared in the Gilroy Dispatch for March 30 is submitted herewith. I commend it to those who have only heard the side of the farm labor story which paints the farmer in a bad light.

Let us hope that the Federal Government now fulfills its promise and cooperates with the South County Association of Family Farmers and the Progressive Growers Association.

The article follows:

SOUTH COUNTY FARMERS PRESENT PLAN TO ALLEVIATE LABOR SHORTAGE

(By Carmen F. Filice)

(The following is the first in a series of articles describing the ambitious and revolutionary Camp for Migrant Farm Labor Families as proposed by a committee composed of members of the Progressive Growers Association and the South County Association of Family Farmers in accordance with the suggestions and counseling of various public officials and interested private citizens.

(If the attempt accomplishes nothing else—which would be deplorable because it opens a new avenue toward solving the controversial and critical farm labor problem—it has brought together to a common meeting table farmers and professional educators, laymen and religious, county, State, and Federal officials, all striving toward a common end.

(Bringing the proposed project to this point of development represents a milestone in the field of human relations.)

Embattled farmers of south Santa Clara County, facing a critical shortage with the loss of vital bracero labor, have thrown the ball back to the Federal Government in a now-it's-your-move action in an effort to ease the tightening farm labor squeeze.

A committee representing two grower groups, the South County Association of Family Farmers, and the Progressive Growers Association, headed by Mike Mayekawa, chairman, and Earl A. Garrettson, secretary, has formulated a detailed, rather complex, and definitely revolutionary plan for a migratory family farm labor housing facility of 100 units.

Constructing the migratory labor camp largely depends upon Federal Government financial support to the tune of 90 percent of the $309,000 projected cost; the sponsoring group, through one of a variety of means, would provide the other 10 percent.

The plan emphasizes the needs of the family, providing in addition to adequate shelter, sanitation, health, and educational benefits over the 5-month period the camp would be in use extending from June 1 to October 31.

Goal of the project would be the housing of 100 migrant families providing a labor pool of up to 250 workers. Priority would be given to families with the most adult workers wherever possible, according to the policy outlined in the request for Government financial assistance submited to the Office of Economic Opportunity of Santa Clara County, which is headed by Arthur Potts.

The project, which will be presented to the full memberships of the grower groups involved in the near future, after a few final details have been worked out, is actually the result of (quoting directly from the official request):

"Many hours of meetings and conferences between the executive committee of the farmers association, the secretary-manager of the Progressive Growers Association, the California State Division of Housing, the South County supervisor (Sig Sanchez, who has followed the progress of the project step by step), Santa Clara County Health Department and (officials) of the Gilroy public school system."

One of the primary sculptors of the program, and the person who fashioned the official request for Office of Economic Opportunity assistance was Father John T. Dwyer, pastor of St. Mary's Catholic Church. The complicated task Father Dwyer accomplished can readily be appreciated as the migrant camp program is reviewed in this newspaper in subsequent issues.

The overall program, however, committee members are quick to point out, is a composite of opinions and suggestions made by many interested individuals, officials, and groups. No one faction or segment, religious affiliation or business organization dominated any of the proceedings, they state.

Basic aim of the camp facility originally was simply to provide housing for an augmenting labor pool. Obviously, even if the optimistic maximum of 250 workers were achieved it would be a mere drop in the bucket compared to the overall South County needs at peak harvest season. But the camp would be a start and might well initiate a trend.

However, a coined word soon made itself felt in the deliberations—"upgrading." It soon became apparent that the farmer representatives, officials, and interested consultants were going to shoot for something in the way of a summer housing facility which was to be much more than the minimum required by Federal regulations.

The Federal Government, committee members point out, requires only that tents erected over board flooring, a community cooking area and rather rudimentary sanitary accommodations be provided for a family crip. This was not sufficient for the South County pioneer project, it was decided, although the cost would be doubled and then tripled as planning neared completion.

Again quoting two sections from the official request to the Office of Economic Opportunity, it can be readily seen what the prevailing opinion was throughout the planning deliberations:

"A genuine, sincere effort has been made on all sides to upgrade [capital letters are used in the official copy] those who use the camp. Quarters had to be provided which gave some privacy * * * easy supervision and maintenance * * * that were of a kind in which families would be able to take some pride."

The second quote: "In order to upgrade the residents during their stay at the camp, a complete program was worked out with the Santa Clara County Health Department."

Perhaps the best indication of the high degree of interest of all involved in this pioneer project was the attendance of the professional educators invited to the conference table. Gilroy superintendent of schools, Edmond Bullard, his assistant, Edmund Richard, and every principal of all the schools in the city system were on hand. The educators were present in unanimous force.

Along educational lines, upgrading included offering 2 months of schooling to migrant camp youngsters aged 7 through 11. They would be transported daily during July and August to a regularly conducted school program in the local public school system.

Bullard requested that he be notified by April 15 if the program was to go into effect.

Another outstanding educational upgrading innovation is that children entering first grade, kindergarten age, and perhaps younger would be enrolled in a language enrichment summer school program. This phase would be designed to acquaint with English children who come from predominantly Spanish-speaking families.

This program would be under the sponsorship of the Interfaith Migrant Committee, a nonprofit incorporated group which worked in this field last year.

Children 12 years of age and over would be permitted to work in the fields with their parents. Those below schooling ages would be cared for during the day in a day care center in the multipurpose building.

Part of the multipurpose building—another upgrading innovation—would be devoted to a medical clinic which, it is hoped, would be staffed on a full-time basis by county medical personnel, including a physician, nurse, and clerk.

It is doubtful if any other summer migrant camp has ever gone to such great pains to provide for the health and education of its occupants as has the south county pilot project. To the knowledge of the committee members, no other camp in existence or contemplated offers extensive services of this type.

And at a cost of $1 per day per family which includes service charge for the housing unit and all utilities.

Subsequent Gilroy Evening Dispatch articles will deal with the physical plant of the migrant family labor camp—how it is constructed, its supervision and administration, and the pressing need for facilities of this nature.

It is to be remembered that as in all first-time projects there is much groping in the dark. Some of the questions that have arisen have never before been encountered and therefore the answers have not been readily available.

Needless to say, all connected with framing the program feel that if it receives Federal approval and is subsequently put into operation, it will be a boon to the south county as an expanding source of farm labor.

And will be a firm blow at the "poverty pocket" stigma applied to this area of late. Who ever heard of an economically depressed area where the temporary summer workers had modern up-to-date housing, built-in babysitting, and medical services available within a few steps?

Debauchery in Selma-Montgomery March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, eyewitness accounts continue to come in attesting to the debauchery and immorality which was a part of the Selma-to-Montgomery march. The incidents which were so much a part of the march have disgraced the entire country and put a label of shame upon those who would tolerate indecencies for whatever reason.

I hope the clergymen who were present and clergymen throughout America will rise up to condemn the activities which took place and the kind of people who were responsible for the activities as well as those who excuse them.

The following news story from the Huntsville News, Huntsville, Ala., tells the story of the march as seen by one of the State troopers who was there:

TROOPER TELLS OF MARCHERS' DEBAUCHERY

(By Hollice Smith)

State Trooper Capt. Lionel Freeman, who returned here this week after being in Selma and Montgomery for 3 weeks, said he saw "a little bit of everything" while assigned there.

Activity carried on at night was "something scandalous," stated Captain Freeman, head of the Huntsville district of State troopers.

Sex acts between Negroes and whites occurred on the ground in Selma every night for about two and a half weeks prior to the march to Montgomery, the veteran State trooper said.

Captain Freeman said he witnessed some of this activity and heard numerous reports from news reporters and photographers.

Some of the reporters from northern papers were among the observers. "We asked them if they wrote about the immoral activities that went on. Some said they did, but that it was cut out before it got in their papers."

While assigned to keep the Negroes in a certain area in Selma with the "Berlin rope," Captain Freeman said he witnessed one sexual relationship where a priest stopped a couple and made them "come up to the front line by the rope." The couple had been about 30 rows behind the rope.

Asked if it seemed to bother the priest, Captain Freeman said "not too much."

The trooper said he could not do anything about the act because he, as well as other officrs, were there only to retain and keep the demonstrators from going up town.

He described a majority of the white persons participating in the marches as filthy, dirty, and beatniks.

The marchers "purposely mixed," the trooper related. "They absolutely tried to get us to harm them. One tried to get officers to knock the devil out of him by saying he was going to sleep with a white woman that night" and by making other similar statements.

The marchers knew the troopers and other officers were there to restrain them from running wild, Captain Freeman explained, and many of them seemed to take advantage of that. They didn't seem to try to hide their immoral activities, he added.

About 2 hours before the Reverend James Reeb of Boston was beaten, Captain Freeman said he and a large group of other persons saw two white men dressed as priests walk across U.S. Highway 80, each holding hands with two Negro girls—about 14 to 16 years of age. This sort of stuff may have triggered the beatings, the officer said.

He continued that he did not think half of those dressed as priests were actually priests. Captain Freeman reported that 34 persons dressed as priests went upon a sidewalk in front of the capitol building steps in Montgomery about 10 o'clock one night and said they wanted to pray. They were retained on the sidewalk—and kept off the capitol steps. They stayed until about 3 a.m. "Some of them used some of the most vile language I have ever heard," the trooper captain stated. "If they were priests, they need to go back to schools."

Some of the white beatniks in the group told officers they were being paid $10 a day, being fed three meals a day, and allowed to sleep with a female companion.

Captain Freeman said, "Some of our investigators knew some of the marchers to be card-carrying Communists."

He was in Montgomery when Mrs. Liuzzo, of Detroit, was killed about 20 miles west of the capital while shuttling marchers from Montgomery to Selma.

There were 35 troopers from the Huntsville district assigned to the Montgomery and Selma area. Twelve of that number were from Madison County. Only Cpl. C. H. Lowery and Trooper H. P. Sexton were left to carry on duties of troopers in Madison County.

"Dear Uncle Sam"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. SCOTT

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD two letters, one addressed to me and another to "Uncle Sam," by one of my young constituents, concerning the tragic death of her brother, Owen Lawson, in the service of our country in South Vietnam. The closing sentence of her letter to "Uncle Sam," I have found, expresses the feelings of a substantial number of my constituents:

WOODSDALE, N.C., *March 31, 1965.*

Hon. RALPH J. SCOTT,

Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My family wishes to thank you for your kind expression of sympathy occasioned by the loss of our son and brother in Vietnam.

Please accept the enclosure which expresses just how I feel about the crisis in Vietnam and our loss.

Yours truly,

VICKIE LAWSON.

AN OPEN LETTER TO UNCLE SAM

WOODSDALE, N.C., *March, 1965.*

DEAR UNCLE SAM: I am 14 years old and in my second year in high school. Today, I returned to school after attending the funeral of my brother on yesterday. I am not able to concentrate on my lesson because my heart is so heavy with grief. Only 4 years ago he was at the same place preparing for his future. He had achieved his goal of becoming an aircraft mechanic, but he only had a chance to enjoy it for a short length of time.

He was killed on February 10, in a hotel blast at Qui Nhon, South Vietnam, as a result of a sneak attack by the Communist forces. Uncle Sam, I cannot tell you how sad this incident has made my family and me even though he did die a hero's death. As time passes we know that God will lighten our hearts, but if this situation is allowed to go on at the pace it is going now, there will be many more families throughout the United States whose hearts will be heavy, because they have lost a son or a brother in Vietnam. Uncle Sam, is it worth the price that these young boys are paying? How many more young men will be cut short of their goals because of Vietnam? How many more young ladies like my sister-in-law will be made widows in their late teens and early twenties by this war? How many children will not remember or know their fathers because they have been taken away from them by this war?

How many more families will receive the dreaded telegram that we received? It was even worse for us because we had seen the debris of the hotel in the news even before we were notified and every time there was a knock at the door, we hated to open it because we thought it was a message from you that he was among the casualties at Qui Nhon. Finally, we did receive the unwanted message.

Uncle Sam, I'm very young, and I don't understand all the diplomatic treaties that control our relations with other countries. But what I would like to know is what happened on that fatal day, February 10, when the hotel was bombed? How did the Vietcong get past the guards and the protective fence to plant this bomb? Was it a lack of troops or were we depending on the South Vietnamese to stand guard for us?

Although I am young, I believe my country can prevent the spread of communism in South Vietnam in a much better way than it is doing. As I see it now, five or six young men are sent over in the disguise of "advisers," killed and replaced by five or six more only to be killed. Uncle Sam, I have read in the paper and seen in the news where Russia is sending ground-to-air missiles to North Vietnam. I believe that the United States is the strongest Nation in the world military-wise, and that it can protect its interest in South Vietnam in the same way that the Russians are now doing.

Uncle Sam, if we are going to remain in South Vietnam, please send enough troops and equipment over there so that we can fight on the level with the Communists.

When the first issue of our paper came out, my heart swelled with pride when I read the alumni news, "Former Student Assigned Vietnam Duty." This headline had referred to Owen, my 21-year-old brother. Imagine my feeling as we are editing this issue's alumni news, "Former Student Killed in Vietnam Duty." Just a few short days between the issues.

I should like to close, Uncle Sam, by saying, please fight like the Nation we are, if we must fight, or bring our loved ones home.

A grief-stricken young girl.

VICKIE LAWSON.

House Un-American Activities Committee and the Klan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Un-American Activities Committee's announced intention to investigate the Ku Klux Klan has raised many ques-

tions as to whether this committee is the proper one to carry on such an investigation. On March 31, the New York Post published an editorial concerning this proposed investigation which I urge all my colleagues to read and consider.

The editorial follows:

HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE AND THE KLAN

The decision of the House Un-American Activities Committee to launch a "searching investigation" of the activities of the Ku Klux Klan warrants no capricious cheers.

The House Un-American Activities Committee has traditionally been unable to distinguish between opinion and act, between unorthodox ideas and incitements to terror and violence. It has operated on the crude theory that radical ideas and protests were a product of an international Communist conspiracy. Its files and inquiries have, in fact, been used to bolster the wild KKK contention that the civil rights movement is a Communist plot.

That the committee now turns its attention to the KKK is hardly reassuring.

Dangerous as Klan violence is, detestable as are its doctrines, any moves to combat the organization must accord fullest protection of due process to Klan witnesses and scrupulously refrain from infringing upon the rights of free speech and association.

The House Un-American Activities Committee, as the record has shown, is incapable of conducting such an inquiry.

Legislation is needed to combat Klan-inspired violence. But it is essental to distinguish between stamping out KKK terrorism and outlawing the Klan.

Any effort to do the latter will inevitably revive the problems encountered in enforcing the Smith Act, where it has proven virtually impossible to root out a political organization without infringing upon the individual rights guaranteed by the Constitution. There is the additional practical problem: the Klan can circumvent efforts to outlaw it by simply setting up business under a new name at a new address, or enlisting under the banner of the Birch Society.

The target is not private prejudice but overt, systematic terror—the murders, whippings, vandalism and harassments to which civil rights workers, supporters and sympathizers have been rejected.

There is everything to be said for the administration plan to increase the penalties and broaden the scope of the 1870 statute. This prohibite efforts to violate the civil rights of any person. Putting new and sharper teeth into this statute is a meaningful proposal which should be urgently considered by a congressional committee.

But the House Un-American Activities Committee is not the group to undertake this serious business. There are far more responsible congressional bodies to which the mission can be entrusted.

Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in our fair State of Hawaii people of different races take pride in the fact that they have proven that racial prejudices can be overcome. Whenever intolerance rears its ugly head anywhere the people of Hawaii rise to protest. So it was that the Maui Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution denouncing the violent action taken by governmental authorities against the civil rights marchers in Selma, Ala.

The resolution follows:

Whereas civil rights demonstrators in Selma, Ala., who have been trying to organize an orderly and peaceful march from Selma to Montgomery for the purpose of obtaining voting rights have been harassed, intimidated, coerced, brutally beaten, and even shot at by Alabama police officers; and

Whereas the rest of the people of the United States, and people throughout the world, have been appalled by the vicious and cruel conduct of the government authorities in Alabama in their treatment of the civil rights demonstrators; and

Whereas said civil rights demonstrators are only asking that they be given the same right to vote as other free Americans; and

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson has requested Congress for the swift passage of new voting rights legislation to assure Negroes and other minority the right to vote: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Maui, That it does hereby go on record denouncing the violence used by Alabama governmental authorities against the civil rights demonstrators; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of Hawaii's congressional delegation be urged to vote for the swift passage of new voting rights legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to Senator HIRAM L. FONG, Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE, Representative SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, and Representative PATSY T. MINK, Washington, D.C.

South Africa: A Bright Spot on a Dark Continent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 5 of this year, South African Ambassador, H. L. T. Taswell, addressed the Commonwealth Club of California in San Francisco on the subject "South Africa: A Bright Spot on a Dark Continent."

I am sure all of the Members of the House and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be particularly interested in the comments which Ambassador Taswell made:

SOUTH AFRICA: A BRIGHT SPOT ON A DARK CONTINENT

During the last few months, the American flag has been torn to pieces and defiled in certain countries in Africa and Asia. There have been violent demonstrations against American embassies, and abuse has been hurled at the American Government.

I am sure you will have noted that none of these violent anti-American demonstrations have taken place in my country, the Republic of South Africa. We in South Africa remain friendly and well disposed toward the United States of America, and anxious to strengthen the natural bonds of friendship we have with you.

Many of those who have been hurling abuse at America are the very ones who have been so rigorously maligning and criticizing us in recent years.

DEVELOPMENTS IN AFRICAN COUNTRIES CAUSE CONCERN

I have entitled my talk today, "South Africa: A Bright Spot on a Dark Continent."

Let us take a look at some of the things which have been happening in certain other parts of Africa during the past year or two.

In many newly independent African states, the Story has been one of the establishment of one-party dictatorships, of the suppression of justice and freedom of the press, of falling standards of living, health, and education, of collapsing economies.

In one country, the white non-Arab population has dwindled since independence from 1.2 million to 100,000 as a result of shocking and ruthless discrimination.

Not so long ago, a small African island state received its independence in what was termed a classical handover of authority. Only a matter of days later, its government was deposed by armed revolution which resulted in the slaughter of hundreds of Arabs and Asians. A Communist regime took over. A satellite tracking station operated by the United States was forced to close down.

In three independent African countries there were mutinies in the armies. Unable to cope with the situation themselves, their African governments had to invite white troops to come in to restore order.

Serious border clashes took place between several African countries, resulting in many people being killed or wounded.

Tribal warfare in a central African country resulted in the slaughter of an estimated 8,000 men, women, and children.

The recent barbarous atrocities committed by rebel forces in the Congo have made the civilized world shudder with horror. Thousands of people were shot or savagely beaten to death. They included many whose only crime was that they could read and write, and accordingly fell into a class termed the intelligentsia, which the rebels wished to exterminate. The loss of life in the Congo revolt is put at 40,000.

REACTION TO AMERICAN-BELGIAN RESCUE OPERATION

You will, I am sure, recall the details of the humanitarian operation undertaken in November 1964, to rescue the American and other white hostages who were held and threatened with death by the rebels.

America and Belgium were roundly condemned for the operation by Communist sources, and particularly by the Red Chinese.

But isn't it most significant that so many African states took a line that so closely followed the Communist one?

For several years we in South Africa have been warning against Communist penetration and subversion in Africa. Our warnings have fallen on ears not so deaf as unwilling to hear.

Every month now brings fresh evidence that we have been right.

In the last 5 years there has been a most marked expansion of Communist influence in Africa. Russia is now represented in about 21 African States, European Communist countries in about the same number. Red China is represented in about 16. Roughly one-third of Peiping's total diplomatic missions abroad are in Africa. Communist China is extending its influence with financial aid, with arms, guerrilla training, and direct subversion. Chinese policy is based on color. It is antiwhite.

In recent years we have been accused of being out of step with developments on the rest of the continent. But let me ask this question. With development in so many parts of Africa taking the turn they have, who would want to be in step with them?

We are not prepared to adapt conditions in our country to suit the whims and fancies of hostile politicians in African countries who cannot bring about stability in their own lands.

We in South Africa do, however, have great sympathy for the African peoples and understand their ambitions. We are ready and willing to cooperate and develop sound and friendly relations with all responsible African countries which feel the same way toward us.

INTERNAL RACIAL POLICY

Let me turn now for a few minutes to our internal racial policy.

When looking at our racial picture in South Africa, do not try to equate it with the position in the United States. Our country is made up of a number of national groups, still preserving their own customs and traditions, talking their own languages. Our problem is more of a multinational one.

When the first white people settled in South Africa over 300 years ago, the country was virtually unoccupied. At about the same time that the whites moved northward into the interior, black people—or Bantu, or Africans—were moving southward from central Africa. The two groups met for the first time in the vicinity of the Fish River in about 1779.

About the turn of the last century, roughly half of an area, extending southward from the Limpopo River and constituting British South Africa, was occupied by whites, and half by blacks.

What has happened since? Three areas within this general sphere were set aside by the British Government as areas within which the interests of certain black national groups, or nations, were paramount. They today constitute the Protectorates of Bechuanaland, Swaziland, and Basutoland.

In 1910, the remaining territory in this general sphere became the Union of South Africa. In 1913, those areas within the Union in which the interests of the various black peoples were paramount, were set aside for them by the Union Government. They have consistently been preserved ever since as the homelands of the various black national groups or nations.

So the position remains that that part of the whole sphere which was occupied by black national groups at the turn of the century, is still occupied by them today.

Apart from the white and the black people who originally settled in South Africa, we have two other main groups. One is the colored community, comprising people of Malay descent and others of mixed blood. They live principally in the cape. The other group is our Indian community, centered principally in Natal.

What is our basic policy?

We believe that there should be no domination of any one race by another. To achieve this, our policy is aimed at the creation of separate states for the national groups which originally settled in South Africa, and the development of the greatest possible degree of governmental separation for the groups which have grown up in our midst.

In this way, each group can have a future of its own, in this way, the various groups can live on an equal footing. In this way, we can form a consultative body in which the leaders of all races can meet on a basis of equality to consider matters of common interest and ways of removing friction. In this way, we can create a multinational commonwealth or common market, with political independence and economic interdependence.

POSITIVE PROGRESS

Positive progress has been made in this direction. The Transkei, centuries old home of the Xhosa people, already has its own all-Bantu African Legislative Assembly. It is composed partly of traditional leaders, partly of members elected on a one-man one-vote basis by all Xhosa citizens. In area, the Transkei is about the same size as the Netherlands or Switzerland, but larger than Belgium, Israel, or the Protectorates of Basutoland or Swaziland.

Executive power is vested in an all-Bantu African Cabinet, consisting of a Chief Minister and five other Ministers.

The Transkei serves as a model, toward which the other Bantu national groups are progressing, in keeping with their own traditions.

The South African cape colored people have a national council, currently consisting of appointed and elected members. The basis of the council is to be expanded and its powers increased.

For the Indian population group, a national Indian council has been formed.

With all these bodies, the Government of the Republic maintains the closest contact.

Race relations are improving, harmony is increasing in South Africa. Internally, our country is one of the most peaceful in the world.

SOUTH AFRICA HAS HIGHEST STANDARDS

Nowhere in the other independent countries of Africa do people, regardless of their race or color, have as high a general standard of living, education, or health as they do in South Africa. What is more, the gap is widening; we are racing ahead of the rest of independent Africa.

There are already over 2,000 Bantu African university graduates. In 16 years, South Africa produced more Bantu African graduates at local universities than 9 African States, with a combined population of 70 million, have succeeded in doing during the past 50 years. Three Bantu university colleges in our country are now swelling the number of our university graduates.

Already there are 29,500 Bantu African teachers. Each year an additional 2,000 graduate from 47 teachers training colleges.

There are Bantu African doctors, lawyers, professors, nurses, etc. Over 12,000 Bantu Africans own their own businesses. One of the largest gasoline service stations in the Republic is owned by a Bantu African. Some businessmen bank as much as $2,800 a day. Three are reputed to be millionaires. The purchasing power of Bantu Africans today is roughly $1.4 billion per year. A solid middle class is developing.

A similar story of success may be told in connection with the colored and Indian communities.

Striking proof of how favorable conditions are in South Africa is given by the fact that thousands of Africans are constantly streaming illegally across our borders in order to seek the superior benefits which South Africa can offer. Over 1 million foreign Africans are in our country—that is 10 percent of the Bantu population.

A further indication of South Africa's advance is that, with only 6 percent of Africa's population, we generate 20 percent of the continent's total geographic income.

Our country produces six times as much steel as the rest of the continent combined twice as much electricity, and four times as much coal. Our railways carry as much freight as the rest of the continent combined. We have almost as many telephones, cars, buses, tractors, trucks, as the rest of Africa. The nonwhite people in South Africa, incidentally, own more motor cars per capita than do the citizens of the Soviet Union. We take nearly 18 percent of the continent's total imports, and supply about 20 percent of its exports.

Our economy is booming, we are marching vigorously ahead on a path of dynamic progress.

SOUTH AFRICA—WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO THE UNITED STATES

What does South Africa mean to our friends in the United States?

The United States is encountering a serious balance-of-payments problem. This is imposing a severe strain on the dollar and on American gold stocks.

Instead of drawing money away from the United States, South Africa is actually contributing to the strength of the dollar and helping the United States in its balance-of-payments problem.

It is doing this, first, by importing far more from the United States than it sells to the United States. Our imports from you in 1964 reached a record figure, estimated at $385 million. Considerably more than you imported from us.

Incidentally, about 33 percent of all U.S. imports to the African Continent go to South Africa.

We are aiding your balance-of-payments position in a further way, for South Africa is a lucrative field for American investment. Your investments in our country, which have been built up over a period of many years, now total about $450 million. On these investments, your annual dividends, interest, and transferred profits give you a return of 13 percent. When you include your reinvested profits, your total return is 17 percent.

Is there any country in the world where you get a better return?

American firms investing in South Africa include many of the largest and most highly respected firms in American business and financial circles. They invest, not because they like us or dislike us. They invest on sound business principles.

Some of your industrialists are increasing their investments in our country—not with dollars, but by raising funds out of investment capital generated in South Africa.

Total American and foreign investment in our country is equal to that in the rest of the continent of Africa put together.

South Africa has never asked for, nor received, foreign aid. Your proposed expenditure on foreign aid in Africa this year is about $145 million. Not one penny of this finds its way into my country. We do not increase your balance-of-payments problem, we lighten it by standing on our own feet.

We are one of the very few countries in the world which have paid all their war debts.

My country is the world's largest producer of gold. Our annual production has reached the record figure of 29.1 million fine ounces, valued at just over $1 billion. This gold flows into the free world. It enables Western countries to bolster their currencies, it contributes to stability, and promotes international trade.

One final point: I mentioned earlier that an American satellite tracking station was forced to close down in an African country now cooperating with Red China. In South Africa, an American satellite tracking station and an American missile tracking station are doing valuable work for you with the fullest cooperation and help of the South African Government.

In the First World War and in the Second World War, men of our armed forces stood shoulder to shoulder with men of the American Armed Forces. Since then, South Africa has again on two occasions responded to the call and come to the assistance of the United States and the free world—once was during the Berlin airlift, the other was in the Korean war.

In many other parts of independent Africa, chaos is gaining ground and a power vacuum is forming. In South Africa, there is prosperity, stability, and hope for all peoples of all races. What is more, South Africa stands as a guardian of the strategic tip of southern Africa.

The Pattern of Coming Events in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a radio address by Dr. W. S. McBirnie, speaking over Voice of America radio on April 2, 1965. Dr. McBirnie has just returned from southeast Asia, and his address is most timely and should be given great consideration by the administration in determining the policy that America should follow in the very near future:

THE PATTERN OF COMING EVENTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Based upon an extensive series of interviews in southeast Asia, in March 1965)

It is rather a sobering experience to know that something of great consequence is going to happen, and to know that your own country's Government does not know it.

The odds are all against the likelihood of a private citizen, however careful a student of foreign affairs, pitting his interpretation of coming events successfully against the opinion of the most powerful government on earth, with all of its superb intelligence sources upon which to draw. And to do so might seem presumptuous, or preposterous, to say the least.

Yet that is the position in which this program finds itself. I know, or to be more restrained, I believe I know the pattern of future events in South Vietnam. Evidently the Government does not know. A conference of historic proportions is underway, right now, in Washington. Ambassador Taylor is there for reports, recommendations, and consultations. You, the listeners, may judge for yourselves, or wait for history to prove the accuracy of our analyses and predictions—but this is what this program believes is now to come.

As James Reston writes:

"The immediate question is clear enough. The President's decision to bomb North Vietnam has not achieved its objective. It has not persuaded the Communists to stop their infiltration and military subversion in South Vietnam.

"It has committed the prestige and power of the United States in a war against the North Vietamese Communists, without success, and the question now is whether to increase the military pressure or withdraw.

* * * * *

"The British explored the prospect of a Vietnamese settlement with the Soviet foreign minister, Andrei A. Gromyko, in London, but he brushed them off. The Johnson administration has made many more private inquiries about a negotiated settlement than it cares for political reasons to admit, but these have been rebuffed.

"President Johnson has been in touch with Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, of Canada, who has a representative on the International Control Commission in Vietnam, on the prospect of useful negotiations, but Pearson has had to report to the President that the North Vietnamese are not interested, at least for the present.

"Even the French, who have been leading the campaign for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, concede privately they received no encouragement either in the North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi nor in the Communist Chinese capital of Peiping.

"The issue, therefore, it not whether President Johnson is ready for negotiations. The North Vietnamese Communists have been rejecting a negotiated settlement for months.

"The issue before the President and his associates, including General Taylor, is therefore, much more complicated than the national argument about negotiations would make it seem. In fact, the North Vietnamese insist on seeing the struggle in southeast Asia not as a local war, but as a test of the cold war all over the world." (Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Apr. 1, 1965.)

Look carefully at the chain of events:

1. The Vietcong had driven us to the wall, because we were fighting on their terms—not ours. They were expecting a negotiated settlement as a result of their growing victories in their "native" jungle warfare, fought as it was on their own ground.

2. The President made the right decision, temporarily, to shift the technique of fighting the war on our terms; not theirs,—to turn our big weapons on the Vietcong war-related targets in North Vietnam. The Reds did not expect this, and it threw their hopes and plans for negotiation on terms favorable to them back several months. The United States, in effect, had been willing, even anxious, to come to the bargaining table, but armed with much more strength than the Vietcong expected.

3. At this point the United States has made a strategic error—too obviously our intention and goal was negotiation, not victory. But there is really nothing to negotiate; not now, at any rate. For the Reds won't negotiate at present on terms unfavorable to them, since we cannot accept less than their retreat. They therefore will not relax their program of terrorism in South Vietnam, nor will they (presently) negotiate, for this would cause them to lose face in the eyes of the world Communist movement.

4. The Reds were all set to announce a big victory on March 10, at the Afro-Asian Conference in Algiers, but our attack on North Vietnam upset their timing. So they quietly canceled the Afro-Asian Conference, postponing it until June 19, when it is rescheduled. This means that they expect to have a new plan in operation by that time. What plan? This is what I believe that I know, and that the U.S. Government, I fear, does not.

5. The Red Chinese must find a way to get us to the negotiation table when their strength again becomes relatively greater than ours. They never negotiate to make concessions, as we almost always do. This simple principle has not yet penetrated widely into liberal Washington thought, because Socialist liberals are evidently unable to face communism realistically and comprehend its nature and methods. For example: Communism never negotiates differences. It always seeks victory in negotiations, either in part or in whole. This is unvarying Communist procedure. So now they are unwilling to really negotiate on South Vietnam because the increased U.S. strength there gives them no advantage, and they must always find an advantage before they will enter into serious negotiations on any issue, particularly one so important as this.

6. The plan is to wheel large land armies from China into position, to threaten to flood South Vietnam with waves of soldiers, inundating the South Vietnamese and Americans by sheer numbers. But to make this threat viable they must also demonstrate atomic capability, and have maintained a propaganda campaign in the press expressing their professed willingness, at whatever cost to themselves, to bomb South Vietnam with atomic bombs, as well as to invade in great ground army strength. Then the Reds are counting on the unwillingness of the United States to fight an atomic war, and also knowing the public outcry in the United States over annihilation of all Americans in South Vietnam, they will then have their bargaining cards.

7. Therefore we must expect an atomic development, testing of bombs, the announcement of a surprising stockpile of ready bombs, and the means of delivering them, all, I would think, before June 19, 1965, though the date again may be postponed if the Reds feel it necessary.

8. So the Reds are preparing to shake the world by a two-faceted thrust, and then, confronting us with this thrust, they are counting on world pressure, and public opinion expressed in this country, to get us ready to negotiate from a position of relative weakness.

Of course we are not really weak, just unable to bring ourselves to risk the death of all our troops in Vietnam, and to engage China in an atomic war. Leftwing opinion molders are now softening up public sentiment in this country, hence the ads in newspapers emanating from leftist groups' appeals for peace by abandonment of South Vietnam.

9. It will be Russia that will, at the moment of highest tension in the approaching United States-Red Chinese confrontation, step in, offering to negotiate. Red China does not really want war, but they are determined to drive us out of southeast Asia by this threat. Furthemore, they wish trade concessions for all Communist lands, since all are in economic and agricultural trouble. It is, therefore, to get America out of South Vietnam, and to open the West for trade with Red China, that the Russians and the Red Chinese have plotted together the coming confrontation.

As mediator, Russia knows she will get, in return, much in trade concessions for Red China, and in gratitude for bringing about a peaceful settlement, she will be granted the relaxation of our trade barriers with the Soviet Union herself.

So now you know what we believe is in the wind. Many things can upset this whole scheme of the Communists, but I believe this is the way their immediate Communist planning is headed. And so I look for: (1) the massive threat of war; (2) the mediation of Russia, followed by the conference table; (3) the resulting sizable trade concessions for both Red China and Russia; (4) a seat at the United Nations for China—which means the end of free China, since it will involve diplomatic recognition by the United States; (5) then, a great going out of the tide of war threat, a period of false security based upon the illusion of peace; (6) and what will this have cost the Soviet Union and China? Just some planning, some propaganda words against each other, to make us believe they are enemies and that Russia is inclined toward friendliness with us as a result of their phony split, all of which is a preposterous bluff.

That is all it will have cost the Red bloc, and they will receive everything they want from us and will be in a much stronger economic position to continue the war of subversion and revolution around the world. And most deplorable is the fact that we seemingly do not realize we are being drawn into this Red trap. We are very likely to end up paying for the strengthening of our enemies and underwriting the advancement of communism from its Russian and Chinese bases.

A Woman Legislator's View on Consumer Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Washington, CATHERINE MAY, recently delivered a notable address to the 38th annual convention of the Soap & Detergent Association. The speech, entitled "A Woman Legislator's View on Consumer Protection," is a forthright expression by an eminently forthright person and contains all of the elements that make the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] an effective and articulate legislator—humor, candid analysis, and good, commonsense.

I commend the address by the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], delivered on January 28, 1965, to the attention of all my colleagues and under unanimous consent include it in the RECORD at this point.

The speech referred to follows:

A WOMAN LEGISLATOR'S VIEW ON CONSUMER PROTECTION

(By Hon. CATHERINE MAY)

I have been asked to speak to you today as a congressional housewife on the subject of the consumer versus Congress. I do so in the full realization that the main problem on your mind today concerning the American housewife is how in the dickens to keep her from wondering where the suds went. But that's your problem and Madison Avenue's.

I feel I have a few problems of my own in speaking to this group today. I have come here with a mild suspicion that you good people may have asked me to speak in the belief that my views on public affairs correspond in some degree with your own. My speech will concern itself with a theme that I have been reiterating over and over this past year before groups similar to your own and I suspect some of you in the audience have already suffered through one or two versions of it. In any case, I am assuming that most of you have divined my political and economic orientation from those speeches of the past year.

But I must remind you that, since I last spoke in your interest area, a rather violent political upheaval has shaken our country from coast to coast. As a result of that political upheaval I stand before you today as a member of the "Whooping Crane Society," i.e., a survivor Republican. And, as such, I feel compelled to admit honestly that there are growing indications that the Republican Party may not be as dominant today in the Nation's affairs as it was in the heyday of Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

This last year we made a major blunder. We transgressed a political axiom: Never ask a question in public unless you know in advance what the answer will be.

We Republicans asked our countrymen, "Why not victory?"

The answer came roaring back, "You're short 16 million votes, that's why not victory."

Maybe we should have stood in bed.

So, let there be no mistake about it—I stand before you today minus a union card in the Great Society. In addition, I humbly confess I may never qualify for membership because I am having so much difficulty understanding some of the messages that are being sent up to us on Capitol Hill by major spokesmen for the Great Society. As I am sure you know, they are telling us that America is a paradise lost, to be federally regained. Within the context of one public statement we are told that American people are poverty ridden, ignorant, pressed into slums, our water poisoned, our air polluted, our food contaminated, and our cosmetics defiled. But, at the same time, thank goodness, in only 4 enlightened years we have become the richest, strongest, best educated, and healthiest people in all the world. Obviously, this means we must embark upon a realistic and businesslike program—in short, frugally extravagant and cautiously bold—for only through liberal conservatism can we ever achieve chronic deficits that are fiscally sound.

In addition to being very busy trying to understand the "blueprint for the grand design," I have, since the calamitous day of November 3, also been much involved with the "sage of good fellowship" that has been going on in the Republican Party as we immediately began, in traditional Republican style, to close our ranks and build party unity. You know, those fellows who say the Republican Party is dead and gone just haven't been reading the newspapers. We Republicans haven't had such fun since the cadets at The Citadel, in Charleston, lofted the first shells into Fort Sumter 103 years ago.

The sport we have been having among ourselves makes the uncertain probings of Secretary McNamara in Vietnam look like a friendly, dynastic game of touch football.

Never before has so small a party so greatly bled.

Clearly we Republicans are vital and strong—so much so, to paraphrase Thomas Jefferson, we are drenching the tree of liberty with the blood of our own patriots.

Considering all this, if I seem a bit edgy on your platform today, put yourself in my position: A fellow Republican might be in the hall.

And now, quickly before you think I am trying to make a partisan speech here today, I am going to bring in mention of the Democrats. Maybe we Republicans do have a little family spat now and then. Maybe we do dote on party slack fill and on fractional political weight. But, really, this is as nothing as compared to our political competitors who wear the brand L.B.J. The Democratic Party is having great troubles with truth in packaging. And, furthermore, the Democrats are detecting a little fraticide in their own party. With Lyndon to the right of them, HUBERT to the left of them, into the valley of 68 will charge BOBBY and TEDDY.

As I said when I began my remarks, a significant political upheaval has occurred since I began stressing the theme and philosophy that I have been asked to repeat here today. I feel, therefore, that in order to preclude any possibility of misunderstanding, I owe it to you to make this very clear:

If you think I shall go on resisting Federal intrusion into areas constitutionally and traditionally reserved to the States, the communities and individual citizens; if you have asked me here on the supposition that I shall continue to oppose Federal harassment of private enterprise; if you count me among those pledged to fight the cult of consumeritis and politics in the pantry—and determined also to defend the intelligence of American housewives and uphold their freedom of choice; if you expect me, in these remarks today, to decry paternalistic government and the baleful doctrine of bureaucratic infallibility—then, my friends, I must in all candor tell you this: Relax, your expectations, will be relaxed.

And, in this context I will now make some comments as a Member of Congress concerning the shape of things in your industry's areas of immediate concern.

To begin with (though, admittedly, my congressional crystal ball is often clouded) I think you are home free on water pollution. Though, naturally, Congress will want representatives of your industry to retestify on the progress you have made.

This victory you have fashioned yourselves, by your own aggressive and foresighted effort, through the creation of the new biodegradable detergents. I warmly congratulate you of the soap and detergent industry on this achievement valuable to our Nation and important to yourselves. The best way anyone has ever devised to forfend Federal intervention is to remove the excuse by forehanded action.

And, this brings me to the heart of my speech (no pun intended). Or, rather, the speech I have been giving so often about the virulent outbreak of consumeritis in Congress over the past few years. To recap I shall quote myself in placing before you some of the viewpoints I have been stressing.

I have been saying that I am opposed to further extension of Federal regulation into the marketplace. I have been expressing my alarm that since coming to Congress I have noted that the voices of the self-appointed champions of the consumer have become evermore vocal and militant in their demands for investigations and hearings and new Government authority to set up rules and regulations in the field of the free market. These apostles of regimentation of the marketplace have been out in full cry for 3 years. In spite of the overwhelmingly ample Government safeguards that already exist certain people in Government, aided by specially set up organizations, keep insisting that Mrs. American housewife and her consumer husband are wandering, baffled, uncomprehending, and empty headed through dangerous clip joints, i.e., better known as supermarkets, being constantly robbed by Simon Legree, the storekeeper. Bills have been introduced in Congress that cannot help but imply that manufacturers of food and fiber products are taking every possible advantage of the consumer through deception in sizes and weights of packages and with misleading label information printed on them. Another Government agency, charged with consumer protection, has been urging housewives, through many means of communications plus public meetings, to submit their complaints to the Government concerning things that displease them at the buying counter.

A National Commission on Food Marketing was created in the last Congress. I am a member of this Commission. I am proud to have been appointed to it. But, I have not been proud of some of the irresponsible statements that have been made concerning its purposes. This Commission is barely beginning its study in the very important field of learning more about how our modern marketing system works to get food from farm to table. Yet, these statements imply that conclusions have already been reached and these conclusions, of course, assume that there will be a scandalous exposé of dishonest practices by the manufacturers and the middleman. This Commission could provide our country with one of the most important and helpful studies ever made by a congressional commission. But, only if it is allowed to work in an atmosphere of openminded and honest inquiry without prejudgment.

This type of governmental and political activity, over such a long period, has resulted in creating many misleading impressions and it is no wonder that a lot of good people are being fooled into joining the hue and cry for legislative action in Congress. Because of my concern, about a year ago, I set myself the task of trying to do what I could to balance propaganda with perspec-

tive. To try and get through to the American public, particularly women, with the warning that they should always take a good look at what the government may be doing to them while it says it is doing something for them.

I have been using the famous truth-in-packaging bill as introduced in the Senate last year as one example. This bill, as you know, would give the Federal Government the right to dictate weights and other standards for product containers. Here is a bill that has been recommended by the President's Consumer Advisory Council and one which is being supported by the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mrs. Esther Peterson, in her position as Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs. And, don't ever mistake it, at first glance it has tremendous appeal for any American shopper. Why shouldn't a woman be entitled to adequate information printed on the label which would help her decide on one can of beans over another can of beans, or one package of detergent over another package of detergent? She should have good labeling but I just happen to think that the company that produces that product should provide the labeling information for his package, and I also think that the American housewife is entitled to something more flexible and something more informative than a Federal yardstick used in Washington, D.C. Just as I think that the product manufacturer should have the flexibility to package his own product in the way that will make it most competitive in the market place when Mrs. Housewife comes in to select. Of course, this gives him the freedom to mislead his prospective customer if he wishes to do so. But, heaven help him if he does. To quote myself again:

All the Government officials and all the government laws in the world are as nothing compared to the impact Mrs. America has on Mr. Manufacturer and on Mr. Storekeeper when she makes up her mind to buy one brand over another. And when she makes that decision, no power on earth can save the businessman or the producer of the product who made the mistake of displeasing her. She has done and is doing a wonderful job in needling, inspiring and in regulating American business enterprise.

And, to reward her, I want to protect her. Not with more government regulations and laws—I want to protect her freedom of choice."

Now I know that you in this group today are on my side in this battle. The big question is how are we doing as we face the 89th Congress in the year 1965? It ain't good.

Our legislative difficulty is not concerned with the truth or the cogency of our shared views. Frankly, I think the American people, once they had the facts, would be with us in overwhelming majority. But, we are hampered by the disproportionate publicity of the opposing views (and, if I weren't trying to be a diplomatic lady, I would say at this point—where were some of you guys these last 3 years?") combined with the disproportionate political division in Congress. In both Houses of Congress every Republican is now flanked by two Democrats. Each one of the 20 House committees and nearly all Senate committees are 2-to-1 Democrat. Add this to these facts: The Democratic platform promised enactment of the packaging and labeling bill—last year the President demanded its enactment—labor has made this item a legislative "must"—four Members of the House have already reintroduced last year's Senate bill—and the report from the Senate side is that this year Senator HART will try to have his bill sent to the Senate Commerce Committee where it is presumed that it has a greater chance for favorable action.

It would seem indeed that the consumeritis virus has a very fertile congressional field in which to work these days.

So, where do we go from here? Well, I would like to end this message today by sharing a few thoughts on this and with your permission, offer some advice.

First, I repeat that the best defense against Federal skullduggery is for you yourselves to clean up any known trouble areas which can be seized upon to justify the use of the Federal shillelagh.

Deceit of any kind in the marketplace, even in isolated instances, is indefensible. I know you have patiently stated time and time again that you feel exactly the same way. I know we are agreed also that marketplace chicanery is not the rule but the exception. But where you can—wherever you can—if you of industry will yourselves root out these problems, correct them and prevent their recurrence, you will have done the best possible thing to keep your enterprises free of public criticism and restraint.

Second, you cannot imagine how disheartening and confusing it is to your friends in public life when industry, with its cherished anarchy, comes to us with a label of conflicting voices. Believe me, labor unions march up Capitol Hill lockstep and in unbreachable phalanx on every issue of real importance. As one who in private life has known the problems of business firsthand, I understand how difficult it is to achieve harmony on any issue that cuts across the great complex of individual companies—but again, where and when you can, you should strive for unity on the overriding issues. For only then can your views become clearly comprehended by people in Government; only then can your combined power and influence be brought fully to bear; only then can you develop an effective counterpoise to the relentless forward march of the disciplined collectivistic forces arrayed against you.

As for specific legislation—such as the Hart bill—I have never seen a legislative fight lost until the vote has been counted. In other words, if you will move tirelessly and vigorously and in concert with industries allied with you on this issue, you have no reason to be defeatist about it. Here, I must, of course, enter this reservation: all bets are off if the President, who is virtually enthroned politically, moves this legislation front and center. He has, with this Congress, a whim of steel.

Third, you of industry should unify your position on this legislation to the maximum possible degree and then advance that position in the proper places with all the persistence and energy you can command.

Fourth, you should move in many media, and continuously, to bring the pitfalls of this legislation home to the American people and thereby counteract the claims of its proponents.

Finally, I very earnestly repeat this suggestion: Do your best—your very, very best—all of the time, to pinpoint the areas that invite criticism, and then move with the kind of boldness and decisiveness you have so commendably demonstrated in the pollution area to purge yourselves of error.

It would overtax your patience if I attempted now to cover the many other areas that give you concern—antitrust probabilities for example, and taxation, restrains on advertising, and enlarged regulatory powers for such agencies as the FTC and FDA.

But all of it can be lumped into this one generalization: In Congress, due to the 1964 election, all systems are "go." Restraint in the National Government at this point is the restraint the President is disposed to exercise. Our system of checks and balances has become a blank check with an unlimited balance. That part of business leadership which in the last campaign helped to saddle America with unbridled executive power might well burn a few candles before the altar of making L.B.J. stand for "let's be judicious." I wish them luck.

And, my friends, for all of you I wish much more than luck. I wish you continuing prosperity in an environment of freedom kept hospitable to vigorous and healthy competition. Those of us in public life who have pledged ourselves to the preservation of a system of free enterprise will, I assure you, stand firm in the frontline of the battle to save our system. May it be your disposition, now and in the future to do no less. May S O S become your battle cry as well as our own.

Now I must ask you, please, to excuse me. I just glimpsed a Republican. If I don't stop right now, he may get away.

Thank you for your courteous attention.

U.S. Language School Readies Servicemen for Oversea Posts—Monterey Center Gives Short Vietnamese Course; Student Tries Albanian on "Dentist"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, our most important and everlasting military victories will be won with "words" more than guns. Today we send troops abroad inferiorly "armed" if they cannot communicate with our allies and enemies. To speak another language is to be "twice armed."

No school anywhere teaches oral communication better than the Army Language School.

A recent article by Glynn Mapes, of the Wall Street Journal, tells some of the story of the Defense Language Institute, Monterey branch. All Members should know this extraordinary school well.

U.S. LANGUAGE SCHOOL READIES SERVICEMEN FOR OVERSEA POSTS—MONTEREY CENTER GIVES SHORT VIETNAMESE COURSE; STUDENT TRIES ALBANIAN ON "DENTIST"

(By Glynn Mapes)

MONTEREY, CALIF.—Seated in a dental chair, a U.S. Army private hesitantly asks: "A eshto e nevojshme te m'a hiqni dhembin?" That's Albanian for "Must you pull my tooth?"

Back comes the answer in Albanian: "Me duket se po," which means, in plain English: "I'm afraid so."

Fortunately, the soldier's toothache is no more real than his dentist, a Navy seaman equipped with a pair of dental pliers. This visit to the dentist is just a training exercise at the Defense Language Institute (DLI) school here, where the soldier, the sailor, and thousands of other American servicemen are being taught languages they will use on oversea assignments.

The make-believe dentist's office is part of Realia City, several buildings at the DLI school with rooms fixed up to resemble banks, shops and restaurants. While an instructor stands by watchfully, students act out various roles in these settings, ad libbing in the foreign tongue they are studying. "In this way we allow the students to actually apply their language skills in realistic surroundings," says Yukata Munakata, a member of the faculty.

THIRTY-THREE LANGUAGES

The Realia City exercises are designed to supplement classroom instruction at the

steadily expanding Monterey school. Founded in 1941 to teach Japanese to Army intelligence agents, the school now offers instruction in 33 languages and dialects spoken by more than 75 percent of the world's population. This year its 500 civilian teachers will train about 3,700 servicemen, up from 2,400 in 1960.

The DLI, which is run by the Army for all the services, is headquartered at Anacostia, District of Columbia. A branch there trains about 200 students a year and several thousand other students are farmed out on a contract basis to Syracuse, Yale, and Indiana Universities and to commercial language schools. But DLI's biggest single facility is at Monterey.

The number of servicemen studying a particular language at Monterey tends to reflect U.S. involvements overseas, so now the school is getting a good many students assigned to learn Vietnamese. About 1,000 servicemen will get training in Vietnamese this year, five times more than the number 5 years ago.

To handle this heavier load, school officials have set up a 12-week subfluency course aimed at building a primarily military vocabulary in the southern, or Saigon, dialect. This condensed program glosses over the Hanoi dialect of the north and the nuances of Vietnamese culture which are normally covered in the standard year-long course.

STRATEGIC SWAHILI

There's also a considerable buildup in the number of students studying Swahili, a common tongue for nearly 40 million East Africans. "Swahili is not just another peculiar, exotic tongue," says Milan G. P. de Lany, chairman of the Swahili department. "It's now among the top 10 languages of the world in strategic importance." Most graduates of the Swahili course are assigned to U.S. embassies and consulates in East Africa where they work with their African counterparts, or serve as interpreters.

In its classrooms, DLI gives precedence to speaking and understanding a language rather than to reading and writing skills. "Whether he likes it or not, a student must first memorize phrases and learn the sounds of the language," says Shigeya Kihara, director of DLI's research and development program.

From the first day of class students are encouraged to speak the new language constantly; as their vocabulary grows, they encounter written forms. The time lag between speaking and writing might run a few weeks for Spanish or French but stretches to several months for some Oriental languages whose calligraphy—the writing of the thousands of symbols—is an art in itself.

No one who hasn't finished high school can get into a DLI course and nearly 85 percent of the students have been to college. There are no draftees at DLI; most students selected to attend have volunteered for a type of duty which requires foreign language ability.

Enlisted graduates often wind up with one of the Defense Department's intelligence organizations. There, many of them translate foreign military documents.

Some officer graduates go on to universities to study the political and social climate of the country whose language they've learned. Then they are assigned to that country as "foreign area specialists." But most officer graduates are sent immediately to one of the nearly 50 countries where U.S. Armed Forces are stationed for service as attachés or as staff members of military advisory groups.

Instructors say that some of DLI's poorest students have turned into outstanding graduates. "In these few cases," says research director Kihara, "we must wait until the men put their training to work in the field before we can see the proof of our teaching methods."

He cites Maj. Joseph Hennigan who was assigned to the Korean Armistice Commission after completing a DLI course in Korean last year. "He was an extremely poor student here, but now he speaks Korean like crazy and rebutts the North Koreans in their own language," Mr. Kihara says proudly.

As the Monterey student body grows, DLI has been having trouble finding enough qualified instructors. Both the Vietnamese and Swahili department now are seriously undermanned. The institute hopes to solve this problem by an intensified recruitment drive among the large foreign student population in the United States.

Once hired, a new instructor is required, as part of his training, to study a language that is as foreign to him as the language he teaches will be to his students. With future Russian teachers studying Burmese and Turkish recruits taking Serbo-Croatian, school officials believe all concerned will get a student's eye view of linguistics.

Use of Gas in Combat Remains Clouded Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Washington Post published an article by Howard Margolis which represents, in my judgment, one of the most thoughtful analyses of the implications of the use of gas by United States or South Vietnamese forces that I have seen.

It appears from Mr. Margolis' researches that there is conflict within the administration as to the possible effect of our use of even nonlethal gas. As he points out an argument can be made that "any use of gas in combat necessarily involves a serious risk of escalation."

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

USE OF GAS IN COMBAT REMAINS CLOUDED ISSUE

(By Howard Margolis)

U.S. endorsement of the use of riot-control gases in Vietnam is being interpreted by many subordinate military and civilian officials as a step toward the general approval of the use of nonlethal gas warfare.

Whether this was the intent of recent statements by the President and the Secretaries of State and Defense is not clear.

Their statements were much more narrowly worded, stressing that only commercially available riot-control gases were used, and then primarily in situations where appropriate to save civilian lives, not for general combat.

From what was said, officials opposed to promotion of nonlethal gas see the administration as backing away from a position it had stumbled into.

But officials favoring the promotion of the gases appear to view these same statements as a diplomatic retreat in the face of the sharp public reaction around the world, but nevertheless a step toward the adoption of a progas position.

The central issue is the risk that promotion of the use of nonlethal gas might break down inhibitions against general gas warfare.

No one could be found in the administration who seems to favor the use of lethal gas. Equally, almost no one seems opposed to bringing down political inhibitions against the use of nonlethal gases, provided there could be assurance that there would be no escalation to poison gas.

What the opponents of such a policy question is how a reliable line is to be enforced against the use of poison gas once the general idea of gas warfare has been accepted.

Those favoring the use of the gases see them as a substitute for bullets and bombs and napalm and hence a step toward more humane means of warfare.

Those opposed doubt that use of such gases would, on net, make warfare much more humane. More important, they fear it would have the contrary effect by eroding inhibitions on the use of poison gases, which are a singularly undiscriminating and cheap means for mass slaughter.

None of the officials interviewed who were knowledgeable about the subject appeared to believe that the lines presently laid down by the administration were very likely to hold.

Several of those favoring the use of gas stated that the real line lay between gases that are known to be nonlethal and experimental gases about which there is still doubt. In their view, nominally nonlethal secret gases are not yet classed with "riot control agents" simply because there is not yet sufficient proof they are nonlethal.

In this view, the line delineated by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara between civilian and military gases seemed at best unenforcible and at worst meaningless.

According to a military riot-control manual, for example, the vomiting gas included by Rusk and McNamara in the tear gas family will make its victims violently sick, with a splitting headache, for periods of up to 24 hours.

So it can readily be argued that secret military gases that merely put people to sleep for 24 hours are more humane than vomiting gas, and that the real distinction is that there is not yet adequate evidence that all those put to sleep will wake up.

To officials favoring the use of gas, the essential problem is to overcome irrational public distaste for the idea of gas warfare by educating the public to understand that the gases that would be used, unlike those of World War I, would not kill or impose permanent injury.

A general who was interviewed stated that he believed there was no chance at all that use of nonlethal gas would lead to the use of lethal gas.

A higher ranking civilian official was less emphatic. But he felt there was no question but that a clear line could be drawn today between permissible and nonpermissible gases—nonlethal and lethal—and that if, in the future, this line were blurred it would be possible to go back to the no-gas position.

Officials opposed to the encouragement of gas doubted that any such line could confidently be expected to hold.

The problem, in this view, is the pressure that would exist on combatants to use the strongest gases they thought they could get away with, as the Vietnamese chose to use vomiting gas rather than ordinary tear gas. The pressure would presumably be much stronger when both sides are using gas. Thus, an argument can be made that any use of gas in combat necessarily involves a serious risk of escalation first to gases that occasionally cause lasting injury, or occasional death to victims exposed to unusually heavy concentrations, and then to outright killing gases.

Although the likelihood of such escalation cannot be determined, opponents of a progas policy judge the risks sufficiently severe to outweigh any realistic military or humane advantage of promoting the use of gas.

Appendix

Legislators' Policy Statement on Traffic Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Western Interstate Committee on Highway Policy Problems of the Council of State Governments, located at 211 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif., I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Legislators' Policy Statement on Highway Traffic Safety."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATORS' POLICY STATEMENT ON TRAFFIC SAFETY

A CALL FOR LEGISLATIVE LEADERSHIP

Traffic accidents are relentlessly killing and maiming more and more of our citizens, day in and day out. The economic costs of these mishaps are staggering.

In spite of this situation, we seem to show no great alarm and have generally failed to take strong countermeasures. Perhaps we have become immunized against the "little" tragedies on our highways by the greater horrors of past wars and by the major catastrophes of earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, and similar disasters which result in large-scale destruction of life and property. Conceivably, we may have even become hardened by the frightening possibilities of the nuclear age.

The irony in this thinking is that while highway fatalities and injuries do not have the dramatic impact of the all-at-once tragic disaster, in cumulative results we have killed and hurt more people in traffic than in all our wars, hurricanes, floods and earthquakes and similar calamities since this country first was founded.

I refuse to believe that the American public has become callous to the tragedies that occur on our highways every day.

This senseless waste of our resources must be stopped—and it can be by forthright legislative leadership.

The Western Interstate Committee on Highway Policy Problems has taken steps to exercise such leadership through this policy statement, developed by the subcommittee on traffic safety. Approved at the committee's annual meeting November 18, 1964, at Cheyenne, Wyo., this document outlines four basic policies for legislative action.

These policies are, in fact, a challenge to every legislator which the citizens of his State expect him to meet. Their adoption and support will set the stage for significant advances in the traffic safety efforts of all the Western States.

Senator BEN ARNOLD, of Arizona,
Chairman, Western Interstate,
Committee on Highway Policy Problems.

FOREWORD

The growing problems manifest in the traffic accident records of the Western States, and projections of future highway use, raise new challenges to legislative leadership. New courses must be charted and greater application of proven methods must be supported if the rising tide of death and injury on our highways is to be turned back.

This document recommends four basic legislative policies which are designed to meet this challenge. It strongly urges every legislature of the western region to:

1. Adopt a broad statement of legislative intent concerning those functions of government relating to motor vehicle ownership and operation.

2. Sponsor motor vehicle law studies to insure that the best legal tools are available to administrative and enforcement officials.

3. Plan now for meeting urgent immediate needs and the expanding needs of the future.

4. Support needed research in the motor vehicle field and encourage adoption of valid research findings.

Highway accidents have increased sharply in every State and community. Current accident prevention measures, obviously, are failing to keep pace with the growing problem.

This should be a matter of grave concern to every State legislature here in the West, and throughout the Nation, for as policymakers, legislators have primary responsibility to establish, give direction to, and support effective traffic safety programs.

Nationally, new highs have been reached in each of the last 3 years (1962–64) in traffic fatalities and injuries, and in economic costs. The annual death rate (deaths per 100 million vehicle miles) also has climbed during this period and represents the first upward change since 1955. Traffic accident statistics for the Western States are part of this grim picture.

These facts all point to an inescapable conclusion: Traffic accidents and costs will accelerate even more rapidly unless aggressive action, spearheaded by legislative leadership, is taken immediately. Long-range forecasts predict that by 1975 this Nation will have 31 million more licensed drivers, 34 million more motor vehicles, and will travel 450 billion more vehicle miles. Economic losses resulting from traffic accidents are expected to increase by $2.7 billion. (Present figures: 93.7 million drivers, 82.6 million vehicles, 798 billion vehicle miles, $7.7 billion in accident costs.)

While all branches of Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—share the responsibility for protecting the public from bodily harm and economic loss in using the roads and streets, the greatest burden falls upon the legislature. This is because law is the foundation of all official programs and lawmaking is the exclusive responsibility of the legislature. This is a prerogative that cannot be delegated.

Through legislative directives and appropriate fiscal policies, the lawmaking body creates the climate and provides the blueprint for the State's accident prevention programs. The officials can carry out their responsibilities only within that framework. The public, on its part, will be responsive to the demands placed upon it only to the extent it understands and is sympathetic to the laws that apply. Thus, the operation of the highway transportation system—its safe and efficient use—depends largely upon the legislative mandate.

LEGISLATOR'S POLICY STATEMENT

In approving and implementing the following four basic policies, the legislatures of the Western States will lay a solid foundation for more effective and productive traffic safety programs in each State and throughout the region.

1. Statement of legislative intent needed

Adopt a statement of legislative intent declaring in broad terms the purpose of those functions, normally included in motor vehicle codes, which govern the ownership and use of motor vehicles.

Such a statement would recognize the huge public investment in our highway transportation system and would provide general guidelines for officials with specific responsibilities under the law to insure its safe and efficient operation in the public interest.

It would also set forth for the information of the judiciary, without limiting in any sense the power of judicial review, the broad framework within which the specific law is expected to be administered and enforced. It is intended that this declaration of legislative purpose would be incorporated in the body of the law and not be subject to deletion by the revisor of statutes.

In substance, the statement would recognize that these functions perform a vital public service in safeguarding and facilitating the use of the roads and streets; that in performing such services, the officials are expected to adopt reasonable policies, rules, and regulations, based on recognized standards and consistent with the need for insuring safe and efficient highway use.

It would state that officials responsible for interrelated functions will cooperate with each other, engage in research and planning activities as may be necessary to keep pace with new developments and growing needs, and where appropriate, cooperate with local officials, and officials of other States and the Federal Government; and, finally, that it is the intent of the leigslature to equip each function with the necessary authority and budget to maintain an adequate level of performance in all functions, consistent with the expanding needs of highway transportation. (See text of "Suggested statement.")

2. Sponsor traffic law study

(a) Sponsor a comparison of the State motor vehicle and traffic laws with the nationally recognized Uniform Vehicle Code.

(b) Take such action as may be appropriate to bring about greater uniformity with the provisions of the code, and thereby with the laws of other States.

(c) Insure that study findings are kept up to date as changes are made in the State law or in the Uniform Vehicle Code, in order to maintain a current inventory.

(d) Enact legislation providing for a model traffic ordinance for cities and authorize its adoption by reference.

To be currently adequate, in the sense of providing the needed degree of service and safety to the public, the law must be responsive to changing requirements resulting from the greater number of vehicles and drivers using the highways, technological advances and improved concepts of traffic control. The need for a high level of uniformity among the Western States in area of common concern long has been obvious and has become even more evident with increasing volumes of interstate travel.

Present motor vehicle laws cover a wide range of subject matter. Keeping abreast of the best existing law in all its complex aspects is difficult, if not impossible, without a current, running inventory in comparison with the provisions of the Uniform Vehicle Code, which is the nationally recommended guide for motor vehicle legislation. The studies should be kept current to reflect changes made in the law from time to time and in the uniform standards, to provide an up-to-date, reliable guide for the information of the legislature.

The lack of uniformity in traffic regulations among cities, both within the same State and nationally, also constitutes a major problem to the traveling public.

The recommended model traffic ordinance for cities is consistent with the provisions of the Uniform Vehicle Code relating to municipal traffic control.

States with laws that conform closely to code provisions affecting municipalities facilitate the adoption of the model traffic ordinance by their constitutent cities. In States where this is not the case, the model can be adjusted to meet constitutional and statutory restrictions.

In either case, however, the adoption of uniform traffic ordinances by all municipalities within a single State would be advanced materially by legislative enactment of a suitable traffic ordinance, based on the recommended model, together with authority which would enable cities to adopt it by reference. Authority to adopt the ordinance by reference would reduce substantially publication costs which often times are burdensome to many local jurisdictions.

3. *Plan now for meeting present and future traffic needs*

Sponsor and support a comprehensive study of all State functions governing the ownership and use of motor vehicles to the end that sound plans and programs are developed to meet present and growing future needs of each function.

It is necessary to the current and future effectiveness of the traffic safety activities of each of our States, and regionally, that legislative action be on a planned basis, guided by full and complete knowledge of all the facts which apply. It means, logically, that legislators, in addition to lawmaking, should accept responsibility for leadership in assessing the impact of these activities on people, and in determining what must be done to bring about desired improvements, now and in the forseeable future, to keep pace with the ever-increasing demands of highway transportation growth.

Such determination can come about only through factual study of present and anticipated future highway safety problems with which the State must deal, and through the administrative functions of Government assigned to cope with these problems.

Under legislative auspices and leadership, and with the cooperation and assistance of State officials and representative private and public groups with a stake in highway transportation, problems and needs can be studied factually, and realistic plans can be developed to meet current and future traffic demands. This joint approach, which brings together in a common effort the legislative and executive branches of Government, working in cooperation with informed professional and citizen leaders, provides a sound organizational structure for the conduct of an effective program.

Our Western Interstate Committee on Highway Policy Problems, by resolution, advocated such a factual study approach in this area of concern at its meeting in Seattle in 1958.

This committee reaffirms the resolution of 1958, and again urges that its recommendations be put into effect.[1]

4. *Support research*

(a) Support and encourage research in the motor vehicle field by providing funds, if needed, by pooling funds with other States, or by using funds available to the States from the Federal Government or from private sources.

(b) Consider the need for a continuing appraisal and inventory of research conducted in each State, as well as regionally.

(c) Foster use of research findings in carrying out future planning and programing.

The need for research and practical application of its findings has been recognized for many years as vital to sound highway development. In addition to substantial sums spent on planning in the highway field over the years, considerable sums have been used for research in guiding construction and improvement programs.

This is in sharp contrast to the relatively small amount of funds devoted annually to research on subjects related to the regulation and control of motor vehicle use, and to the safety of the motoring public. Much more money and far more effort must be directed to research in those areas.

There are many problems relating to highway use which cannot be solved because of the lack of adequate definitive knowledge. Pertinent facts in these troublesome areas must be developed through research in some depth. Only then can answers be found to vexing questions plaguing legislatures and administrative departments in the States.

The need for such research transcends State lines and is common to every State. Some of the needed research can be accomplished by the individual States, and certainly efforts should be made toward that end. However, no one State can be expected to accomplish all that is needed, and, further, individual action can result in duplication if proper means of coordinating those efforts are not exercised. It seems logical that steps should be taken for States to pool their funds for research on common problems, with other States or with the Federal Government, in a coordinated program.

A number of States have established research facilities in their governmental structure and are financing and conducting many worthwhile special studies and research projects on their own initiative. A number of research centers and technical institutes in universities and colleges are workng in cooperation with State governments on many projects. In addition to State funds, the assistance of grants from Federal Government agencies or private organizations is being used to carry out research projects.

Our colleges and universities should be encouraged to bring their full resources to bear on this problem. Further, we should support such research efforts by our own motor vehicle agencies on an individual, joint, or regional basis, as may be most feasible.

SUGGESTED STATEMENT OF LEGISLATIVE INTENT

The legislature recognizes that the development of a modern and integrated highway system which is so essential to safe and efficient highway transportation represents a large investment of public funds.

To insure maximum public benefits from such investment, authority has been vested in appropriate agencies of Government for the establishment, construction, maintenance and operation of needed road facilities, within the limits of funds made available.

Additionally, the legislature recognizes that other functions of government, hereinafter established to govern the ownership and use of motor vehicles, also are supported by public funds and render important public services which contribute to the safe and efficient use of roads and streets.

These responsibilities of State government include such functions as vehicle registration and titling, driver licensing, safety responsibility, police traffic supervision, accident investigation and reporting and use of accident records, traffic operations, and similar functions conducted under motor vehicle laws and affecting motor vehicles and their use.

In fulfilling these responsibilities, it is expected that the officials will adopt such reasonable policies, procedures, rules, and regulations as may be necessary, within the authority granted by law, and in so doing shall make appropriate use of recommended standards developed by recognized official groups to insure a desirable level of uniformity throughout the State and with other States. Such uniformity is especially important in the use and application of uniform signs, signals, and markings.

It is expected, further, that the officials will cooperate with each other where such cooperation is essential, and not otherwise prescribed by law. Moreover, there is also need for more effective coordination of activities among all branches and levels of government in carrying out their respective traffic safety responsibilities, including the Governor's office, the State legislature and city councils, and administrative, enforcement, and judicial officials of the State and its political subdivisions. In all matters of mutual concern, and where appropriate, cooperation also is encouraged among State officias, officials of other States, and the Federal Government, and other responsible groups, both public and private.

Highway transportation is a dynamic force in our society and is influenced by new developments and changing public needs. To keep abreast of foreseeable adjustments, it is expected that the officials will engage in such research and planning as may be necessary and as may be provided for hereinafter. Such efforts should be conducted in cooperation with all interested public and private groups, and directed toward the development of realistic traffic accident prevention programs to guide legislative decision and enlist public support in meeting immediate and potential needs.

In keeping with the policies herein enunciated, it is the intent of the legislature to equip each function with the necessary authority to maintain an adequate level of performance in all functions concerned with the ownership and use of motor vehicles, as they are hereinafter established, consistent with the expanding needs of highway trans-

[1] Copies of the resolution and information about States which have undertaken or completed such studies may be secured from the Council of State Governments, Western Office, 211 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94108.

portation, in order to protect the public safety, promote the general welfare, and advance the economy of the State.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC SAFETY OF THE WESTERN INTERSTATE COMMITTEE ON HIGHWAY POLICY PROBLEMS

Senator A. Woody Hewett, chairman, Colorado.
Representative Magnus Aasheim, Montana.
Senator Ben Arnold, Arizona.
Senator Lee Backstrand, California. (Deceased.)
Assemblyman James C. Bailey, Nevada.
Representative W. J. Beierlein, Washington.
Senator Ray O. Burge, Idaho.
Representative Raymond W. Davenport, Jr., New Mexico.
Senator Robert Elfstrom, Oregon.
Senator Robert M. Holcomb, New Mexico.
Representative Norman E. Howard, Oregon.
Representative Elmer C. Huntley, Washington.
Senator Gordon McGowan, Montana.
Senator Andrew McMaster, Wyoming.
Senator Gordon E. Melody, New Mexico.
Senator Warren L. Monroe, Nevada.
Representative Ward Myers, Wyoming.
Representative Norman W. Ohlson, Colorado.
Representative Max D. Rogers, Idaho.
Speaker Charles Welch, Jr., Utah.

GUIDES AVAILABLE

As an aid to legislative judgment and decision a number of guides and standards have been developed by professional and technical groups in the highway transportation and traffic safety fields. They include:

"Action Program for Highway Safety of the President's Committee for Traffic Safety" which includes recommendations on all activities of State and local officials responsible for safe and efficient use of the highways.

"Uniform Vehicle Code and the Model Traffic Ordinance" developed by the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances as guides to States and municipalities, in the field of motor vehicle and traffic legislation.

"Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices," prepared by a joint committee of National, State, and local officials and other authorities, to provide engineering standards for uniform signs, signals, and markings.

Interstate compacts, developed on driver licensing and vehicle safety equipment by the Council of State Governments to encourage greater uniformity among the States in these matters.

Annual inventory of traffic safety activities of the National Safety Council, which measures the performances of States and cities.

Driver education achievement program, conducted by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety.

National motor vehicle traffic experience

Category	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	Percent change, 1963–60 [1]
Deaths	38,137	38,091	40,804	43,600	[2] 47,500	+14
10 months	31,134	30,788	33,372	35,380	39,250	+26
Injuries	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,500,000	1,600,000	[2] 1,700,000	+14
10 months	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,150,000	1,250,000	1,400,000	+27
Property damage accidents	9,500,000	9,500,000	10,000,000	10,500,000	[2] 12,500,000	+11
Economic loss (in billions)	$6.5	$6.9	$7.3	$7.7	[2] $8.2	+18
10 months (in billions)	$5.3	$5.5	$6.0	$6.4	$7.1	+34
Types of accidents, deaths:						
Pedestrian	7,850	7,650	7,900	8,200		+4
Collisions between motor vehicles	14,800	14,700	16,400	17,600		+19
Noncollision	11,900	12,200	12,900	13,900		+17
Collision with railroad trains	1,368	1,267	1,245	1,340		−2
Collision with bicycles	460	490	500	570		+24
Collision with fixed objects	1,700	1,700	1,750	1,900		+12
Other collisions	85	85	90	90		+6
Number of or increases in—						
Motor vehicles (millions)	74.5	76.4	79.7	83.5	[2] 87.0	+12
Drivers (millions)	87.4	88.9	92.0	93.7	[2] 96.0	+7
Mileage (billions)	718.8	737.5	767.8	800.0	[2] 838.0	+11
10 months	598.8	613.1	639.0	664.8	699.0	+17
Mileage death rate	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.5	[2] 5.7	+4
10 months	5.2	5.0	5.2	5.3	5.6	+8
Population death rate	21.2	20.8	22.0	23.1	[2] 25.0	+9
10 months	21.4	20.6	22.2	22.9	25.3	+18

[1] For figures for 10 months the percent change is for 1964–60.
[2] Estimated January 1965.

Source: Data reported to National Safety Council, December 1964.

How Handicapped Are Overcoming Barriers to Employment in My Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of a theme entitled "How Handicapped Are Overcoming Barriers to Employment in My Community," by Miss Anita Kenison of Iola, Kans.

Miss Kenison, a 17-year-old senior at the Iola High School, is the 1965 winner in the Governor's committee on employment of the physically handicapped "ability counts" writing contest. Her theme is a cheerful and appreciative commentary on individual victories over physical handicaps by people in her community and a tribute to the handicapped worker throughout the Nation who with courage and perseverance fulfills a contributing role in our society in the face of personal misfortune.

The essay follows:

HOW HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY

Handicapped heroes of the past and present are familiar to many: Demosthenes, a stuttering, stammering boy who developed into a golden-tongued orator; Beethoven, who composed treasures in music while totally deaf; Franklin D. Roosevelt, the nationally loved President who was stricken with infantile paralysis; and Helen Keller, blind and deaf since a child, who is undauntedly proving today that barriers to the handicapped person can be overcome.

The small community in which I live takes pride in its handicapped overcomers. The minister of a local church is a kind, understanding man who enjoys the pleasant days of the year when he can stroll to his church office, his white cane tapping the sidewalk ahead of his feet. A cheerful widow lives in a small brown house on Sycamore Street. Though confined to her bed, she is busy creating crossword puzzles for a major newspaper and visiting with her friends. Retiring after successfully serving my community, the head librarian has read the lips of children and adults for 31 years. Her tireless efforts have won our library national recognition as one of the outstanding midwestern libraries. The list continues telling of a magazine agent whose legs are stiffened with arthritis, an accountant whose curved spine does not limit his accuracy, a foreman at the cement company, a farmer, a fieldman at the milk company, a teacher, a taxicab driver, and many other respected citizens who, while unknown to many in the world, have displayed courage and determination in the fight against barriers to employment.

Though the impaired worker's road to success has been blocked in my community as well as in others across the Nation, the 81,000 handicapped workers who were rehabilitated into employment in 1960 are living testimonies of the fact that the barriers are being overcome.

One of the employed handicapped people, a jeweler in our town, has surmounted many obstacles. Growing up on a ranch in western Kansas, he lived a normal childhood until polio struck. It paralyzed him from the waist down, leaving him with useless legs and confining him to a daybed and the part of the house in which he could maneuver a cumbersome wheelchair. During the endless hours he lay in bed, he decided to build a life of his own. He wanted to be fully independent.

Many barriers suddenly confronted him. How would he be able to get a job? He was not able to climb stairs or curbs, he had no skill or profession, and he might not be accepted in a community. Determined to achieve his goal, he invented a unique cart with which he could scale and descend curbs by himself. Instead of needing two people to help him down a flight of stairs, now, with the aid of the cart, he needed only one. Faced with the problem of transportation, he bought a car for which he invented a handbrake and hand accelerator. With his cart, he could get into the driver's seat, pulling the cart in after him. He had overcome the architectural barriers.

Taking advantage of specialized training, he graduated at the top of his class for certified stainless steel workers and also became skilled in the jewelry profession. After being successfully employed in several jobs, he bought his own jewelry store in our town where he now has a prosperous business, a loving family, and the respect of the community.

Among the various barriers he has overcome, his biggest fight was with his own morale. "It was hard for me to go down the street on my cart," he said. "I have to remember humans are curious creatures. When they stare at me, they are not ridiculing me."

Many other handicapped people in my community and across the Nation have also come a long way. Faced with the task of finding a way to climb stairs, open and close doors, and maneuver in a place of business, they have usually discovered, with the aid of their

own creative ideas, new devices, or medical improvements, a way to surmount the difficulties. By developing their abilities in specialized training and rehabilitation programs, they have been able to obtain employment in jobs which they can do as well, or better, than anyone else. Conquering their wavering morale, they have been accepted in their communities. The handicapped workers of my town who have met and conquered these obstacles have gone on to live happy and successful lives which have aided my community in its desire for betterment. Handicapped workers, in my community, as well as in others, are overcoming barriers to employment.

March 19 Designated as "Aviation Day" by Seattle Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, March 19 was designated "Aviation Day" by the Seattle Chamber of Commerce. It is appropriate that an organization concerned with the promotion of commerce should salute aviation since commerce and aviation have gone hand in hand from the very beginning. Seattle and the State of Washington can testify to this partnership because the financial benefits that flow from aviation have done a great deal to form a solid economic base in the Pacific Northwest.

The Seattle-Tacoma Airport is the area's hub for air commerce and here the economic benefits can be easily seen. There are 12,000 men and women directly and indirectly involved in supporting the airborne traffic generated by the airport. Adding their dependents, it means that some 31,000 King County residents—men, women, and their children—are dependent on the operations at the airport for their livelihood.

Air transportation means aircraft and Washington has always been a leader in the manufacture of commercial and military planes. The Boeing Co. is the No. 1 supplier of jet airliners; almost 80 percent of all of the jets operated by the U.S. airlines were made by Boeing. Last year was one of the busiest ever for Boeing; they sold more than 1 billion dollars' worth of jet aircraft to airlines in this country and abroad. This, too, adds to the total value of aviation to the area, creating new jobs and spreading the payroll dollars of the Boeing family to thousands of retail outlets throughout the State.

As chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, I am deeply interested in the development of aviation and I know that this interest is shared by all of my colleagues, especially the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, the able chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee.

The rapid growth of aviation has had a significant impact not only on the development of the Pacific Northwest, but on the development of all other areas of the United States and the committee has long been conscious of the economic value of our air transportation network.

A day does not go by that one airline, or another, does not announce an order for new jet aircraft. All told, the airlines have on order some 300 new jets, and I know that there will be more orders placed this year and in following years.

Along with the new flight equipment, the airlines are investing in new reservations equipment, improved airport services, and other systems that will benefit both the passenger and the shipper. The airlines are putting more than $100 million into all-weather landing systems and this will greatly improve the reliability of operations in bad weather.

These are all wise investments for the airlines and it will enable them to maintain their leadership in world aviation. Fortunately, the airlines have now turned the corner and their earnings are going to make possible better and more reliable service to the public. We are glad to see this happen.

The improved financial picture is a good sign and one that will encourage the airlines to go full speed ahead with their improvement program. The benefits of a financially sound air transportation system are many and varied, and it is to be hoped that the airlines will have more years like 1964 so that they will be able to continue their investment in improving the national network of air transportation. It is one of the best investments I know.

A description of what the airlines are doing to build a new airline system was spelled out in an Aviation Day talk given to the Seattle Chamber of Commerce. It was given by Jack M. Slichter, vice president for traffic, of the Air Transport Association of America. I ask unanimous consent that the highlights of his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts of remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR TRANSPORTATION MOVING INTO HIGHER GEAR

(By Jack M. Slichter)

Seattle is the cradle of commercial aviation. It is an articulate proponent of our present system of scheduled air service, a leading supplier of airline aircraft and has an immense stake in the future of the airline industry.

You all have an unparalleled role in the past, present, and future of the airline industry, and it's nowhere more exemplified than in some current figures concerning the Boeing Co., which last year became the first manufacturer in history to sell in 1 year more than $1 billion worth of commercial airliners and spare parts to the U.S. scheduled airlines and their foreign-flag counterparts.

Transportation is but one facet of the many-sided nature of the airlines. To say that it is the main purpose of the airlines' existence is to neglect a vital contribution to your economy.

Today, every third person in Seattle owes his livelihood to the aircraft, airlines, and associated industries.

The impact of the airline industry in Seattle can be measured in very definitive terms. There are 6,000 men and women who work directly for the airlines, the port of Seattle, the Federal Government agencies, commercial establishments at the airport, and other direct airline oriented industries. Their combined yearly paycheck exceeds $40 million. Airlines based at the airport disbursed about $45 million for the purchase of services and supplies in the Seattle area. Of this sum, $26 million was paid directly in wages and salaries to their Seattle area operational and sales personnel.

Yearly, the commercial air carriers purchase about 60 million gallons of aviation gasoline and kerosene, and about 380,000 gallons of aviation oils. The value of just this one airline purchase amounts to over $17 million annually.

Sales, which the Seattle area industrial and commercial enterprises realize because of the scheduled airfreight services, are in excess of $12 million, and because of the constant availability of fast and efficient air service, your products are selling in markets throughout the world that a few short years ago would have been impossible to reach. Your salmon is on display in Belgian stores, your chickens and oysters are daily flown to domestic and international marketplaces. More often than not, these Seattle products are on the shelves and counters in less than 24 hours after they are picked up from the processing plants.

Besides the direct economic activity generated by the airlines, there is also a secondary value attached to the service they bring to King County. It is also estimated that about 550,000 airborne visitors spend more than $30 million in the Seattle area for downtown accommodations, food, amusements, and shopping. This injection of $30 million in the local economy creates as many as 3,000 more jobs per year.

The airline industry presently operates a fleet of some 450 pure jet aircraft. Of these, 357—79 percent of the entire jet fleet—were Boeing 707's, 720's, and 727's. During 1964 the airlines took delivery of 125 new pure jet aircraft and presently have on order about 280 jets. Thus, in just a little more than 1 year, the airlines have added, and are committed to add, just about as many jets as were acquired during the first 5 years of the civil jet age.

Today, some 60 U.S. cities, or every city with a population of over 350,000, receive jet service. It is the airlines' intention, when the new jet aircraft are operative in the system, to bring jet service to as many or more cities, and the local service carriers will be the ones to bring the benefits of the jet age to the many intermediate American cities which have only seen a jet passing overhead on its way to a metropolitan airport.

The price tag on this investment for better service is more than one and a half billion dollars, which is one of the heaviest single rounds of equipment orders undertaken by the airlines. As a new investment, consider that of the total $5 billion in flight property now owned by the airlines, one-half was acquired in the last 5 years.

Looking beyond into the next decade, of course, there is the supersonic transport, a project which has already captured the interest of your aviation industries, and will see Seattle as a key hub in the supersonic transport development program. The airlines are interested in this aircraft because it promises greater speeds and speed of transport has always been the No. 1 passenger demand. The supersonic transports will not be inexpensive. Our best estimates are that they will cost some $30 million each. And this is just the beginning. To buy the supersonic transports and put them into service will cost the airlines billions of dollars, both in direct capital investment and in training crews, operational personnel, and ground handlers. While the Government may well advance much of the initial cost, present

plans call for repayment of the Government advance out of supersonic transport earnings.

There has been a great deal of publicity about the airlines' current prosperity. The airlines are indeed in a period of reasonable earnings and it is about time. Just mentioning dollar figures is not an objective measurement of the airlines' economic situation. It does not really make a great deal of difference whether or not the airlines last year made a net profit of $150 or $200 million. What's important is to put airlines' earnings into proper perspective and it is right here where we run into our first roadblock.

We feel that the domestic trunk airlines' rate of return in 1964 will reach 10 percent. It is a marked improvement in earnings, but I feel that it is more important to consider that in the first 6 years of the jet age, and this includes 1964, the domestic trunk airlines had an average rate of return of only 4.9 percent.

After years of disappointing results, topped by a loss of $35 million in 1961, the scheduled airline industry has regained some of its lost ground, largely as a result of gains in traffic, and a very heavy emphasis on cost control and effectiveness.

Our Government regulatory agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, has recognized the need for the airlines to overcome the financial inertia that has plagued them for these many years and has said that the industry must have adequate earnings "for an extended period of time."

Much can flow from the airlines' changing of gears: more jobs, certainly, and more benefits to the economy of a Seattle, and Seattles throughout the country. But more than that, when national prestige has never before been so important, it is critical that we reassert our longstanding leadership in aviation. We cannot afford to let that leadership go by default just because the true value of aviation has not been realized.

Seattle has long recognized the value of aviation. That is one good reason why your city has long been a leading community of the United States, and of the world. I know that this leadership will continue.

Editorial Supporting Congressman Harley O. Staggers' Proposal To Increase Federal Income Tax Exemption from $600 to $1,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to share with the Members of the House the 6 p.m. editorial given by Mr. Joseph McCaffrey on WMAL–TV "News 7" on March 30, 1965, in which he endorses the proposal by the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, our distinguished dean of the West Virginia congressional delegation in the House of Representatives, to raise the Federal income tax personal exemption from $600 to $1,000 per year.

The gentleman from West Virginia, Congressman STAGGERS, has labored diligently to achieve this objective for the past 15 years, and it is my hope that the editorial which I cite will be of some small help to the gentleman from West Virginia, Congressman STAGGERS, in obtaining favorable action in the House of Representatives on this matter of importance to every American family.

The Great Society is moving to help those who have nothing, and every administration has done something to help those who have a great deal, but it is about time that somebody tried to help those who are trying to help themselves but haven't gotten very far.

Even the well-to-do Douglas Dillon, the retiring Secretary of the Treasury, recognized this last week when he said that there should be a tax reduction for the low-income families. In his last formal speech as Treasury Secretary, Dillon said that the low-income families have not been given adequate tax relief.

Congressman HARLEY O. STAGGERS heard the retiring Secretary loud and clear. STAGGERS, a West Virginia Democrat, said this is what I have been talking about, and he asked for some support for a bill he has offered in almost every Congress for the last 15 years.

Raise the personal exemption from $600 to $1,000, STAGGERS believes, and you have helped the small-income earner better than any other way. Not only that but it is the quickest way to bring about relief.

Other Members of Congress have long plumped for a boost in the personal exemption and now that there is a recognition of the problem of the low-income family building up, perhaps Congressman STAGGERS and the others who support a boost in the exemption will get help in the House and Senate.

Tribute to Col. Glenn Balch, Author

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, those of us who have the privilege of living in our great West all have a secret fear that the magnificient traditions of the frontier lands that challenged American dreams and ambitions, may someday be buried and lost under the steamroller of modernization.

But these fears are laid to rest so long as men like Col. Glenn Balch take pen in hand to capture forever in graphic words the wild splendor and beauty of the great West.

This month, Glenn Balch will see the publication of his 28th book in a series that has captured the imagination of young Americans for more than two decades. Another of his books is being made into a great film. A brief account of this outstanding American author and Idaho resident appears in the Salt Lake City Tribune of March 9, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL A BIG MONTH FOR IDAHO AUTHOR

(By Carl E. Hayden)

BOISE.—April will be a special month in the horse-dog-boy life of Glenn Balch, Idaho's literary Gary Cooper.

For a motion picture based on his book, "Indian Paint," will be released, and his 28th book, "Western Horseback Riding," will be distributed.

BORN IN TEXAS

Mr. Balch, who has the physical appearance of the late actor, began writing novels (his latest is one of his few factuals) about boys, dogs, and horses in 1937.

Mr. Balch was born in Texas, and this might have had something to do with his selection of Houston Avenue in Boise as the site for his home.

Except for one violent interlude—World War II—his production has been fairly steady.

In the war, Glenn served in the 10th Combat Camera Unit in the China-Burma-India theater. He concluded his military career as a lieutenant colonel and commander of his unit.

Mr. Balch, who was a forest ranger and a roaming newspaper reporter before going under contract to the Thomas Y. Crowell Publishing Co. with his book, "Riders of the Rio Grande," holds medallions presented him by Freedoms Foundation for "outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life," and by Boys Clubs of America for "Lost Horse."

While studying under novelist Oliver La Farge at Columbia University, Glenn met his wife-to-be, Elise Kendall, a Floridian.

"TIGER" TO START

"Tiger Roan," the story of a wild horse that became a rodeo outlaw, firmly placed the Boisean as a keen man with a pen.

Two volumes later the military notified Glenn it had a uniform that was just right for him. That was the end of his pennings—and the beginning of his shutterings—for 4 years.

Back in Idaho, Mr. Balch studied the mustangs roaming Twin Buttes Mesa in Owyhee County and wrote "Wild Horse," "Christmas Horse," "Lost Horse," and "Winter Horse."

Mr. Balch's books have been republished in England, and have been translated into Swedish, German, Norwegian, Spanish and Dutch.

The 175th Anniversary of the Granting of the First U.S. Patent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, this year is the 175th anniversary of the granting of the first U.S. patent.

George Washington granted that first patent to Samuel Hopkins, of Philadelphia, on July 31, 1790, for a new way of making potash and pearlash.

Since that time the American patent system has protected millions of inventions, and been an important factor in the progress of American science and industry.

In commemoration of this anniversary, a full-page ad recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal, sponsored by N. W. Ayer & Son. It explains the advantage of our patent system and cites good reasons why we must retain this system.

Mr. Speaker, the text of this important statement on patents follows:

"ON THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST U.S. PATENT, THE UNITED STATES

"To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

"Whereas Samuel Hopkins of the city of Philadelphia and State of Pennsylvania hath discovered an Improvement, not known or used before, such Discovery, in the making of Potash and Pearlash by a new Apparatus and Process; that is to say, in the making of Pearlash 1st by burning the raw ashes in a Furnace, 2d by dissolving and boiling them when so burnt in Water, 3rd by drawing off and settling the the Sey, and 4th, by boiling the Sey into Salts which then are the true Pearlash; and also in the making of Potash by fluxing the Pearlash so made as aforesaid; which Operation of burning the raw Ashes in a Furnace; preparatory to their Dissolution and boiling in Water, is new, leaves little Residuum; and produces a much greater Quantity of Salt: These are therefore in pursuance of the Act, entitled "An Act to promote the Progress of useful Arts," to grant to the said Samuel Hopkins, his Heirs, Administrators and Assigns, for the Term of fourteen Years, the sole and exclusive Right and Liberty of using, and vending to others the said Discovery, of burning the raw Ashes previous to their being dissolved, and boiled in Water, according to the true Intent and Meaning, of the Act aforesaid. In Testimony whereof I have caused these Letters to be made patent, and the Seal of the United States to be hereunto affixed. Given under my Hand at the City of New York this thirty first Day of July in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred & Ninety.

"G. WASHINGTON."

This is a document you've probably never seen.

It has had millions of descendants and they have done a great deal for your income, health and enjoyment of life.

This is the first U.S. patent, issued on July 31, 1790.

A man named Samuel Hopkins got the first patent, on a new way to make potash and pearlash. George Washington signed the patent, indicating a matter of some importance to the whole country.

And so it was, and still is.

THE IDEA BEHIND IT ALL

The founders of our country wanted, as they said, "to promote the progress of science and useful arts."

They realized, however, that few people are going to invest time, labor and their savings in working out new inventions if others—without the need of recovering this investment—can simply copy new things after they have proven their success. Under that rule, there would be very few real advances and the public would be the loser.

So the Founding Fathers wrote into the Constitution a provision for a patent law, one of the earliest for any nation. This law was enacted on April 10, 1790.

The cotton gin, the reaper, the telephone, the automobile, electric light and power, electrical appliances, the tractor, the airplane, the radio and TV, the safety razor, new metals, glass ceramics, petroleum products, chemicals, and computers got their start through the encouragement of the inventive spirit. These and thousands of other innovations have made America the top industrial power in the world.

There is something more of tremendous importance.

BETTER HEALTH, BETTER FOODS

Countless lives have been saved and the cost of illness reduced through new medicines developed by the pharmaceutical and drug industries in cooperation with doctors, scientists, government, hospitals, and universities. New nutritional values have been added to foods and new varieties of food products introduced through the research and inventions of the food and dairy industries.

Progress in many fields continues to be advanced by the patent system and the way it works with fairness to all.

In return for the inventor's right to exclude others from making, using, or selling his invention for a specified period of time, the details of each patent are made public. For a nominal fee anyone can get a copy of the drawings and specifications, study them, and try to make an improvement on what has been learned. Competition thereby is fostered and our technology expanded.

Over the past century we have served many businesses that have started with nothing but an idea.

They have grown to be big businesses because they have had, and continue to have, management with the brains, steadfast purpose, and vitality to take an idea and put it to work.

These are among the businesses that are now providing ever-improving products for millions of people and jobs and wages for millions of workers.

Beyond this they are supplying a substantial part of the taxes that support cities, States, Government, and defense; billions of dollars a year.

Where once there was only an idea there are now countless plants and services across the land and new things with each rising of the sun.

THE EVERLASTING QUEST

Vital to all progress are the encouragement of adventuring minds and the hope of rewards for risk and performance. It is this hope that provides the incentive for investors to put their savings into new ventures and the expansion of those already established.

The everlasting quest of business is to make great dreams come true.

Pacific Fisheries Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, expansion of Russian and Japanese fisheries is the subject of the leading editorial in the Sunday, February 28, issue of the Seattle Times.

"Pacific Fisheries Competition" is the title of this outstanding editorial, which points out that this country has been quick to act in behalf of its interests in Africa and southeast Asia, and then asks:

Why there is not a greater sense of urgency regarding an international problem as close to home as the North Pacific fisheries?

The editorial, which I shall shortly ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, also notes that Red China in the not-distant future may join other Asian nations depleting the resources of the Northeastern Pacific.

The Seattle Times editorial reflects the growing concern of our Pacific States over the increasing menace of foreign encroachment in waters adjacent to the United States, a concern which also exists in other coastal areas of our Nation.

This concern is justified by facts of the growing strength of Communist fishing fleets, and by reports in Soviet Russia's controlled press and official publications.

In January of this year, the Fisheries Research Institute of the College of Fisheries, University of Washington, Seattle, published one of its periodic series of translations from Soviet newspapers and periodicals.

I shall quote only a few brief excerpts from this extensive 67-page single-spaced report, but these will give an indication of the Soviet buildup:

Vodnii Transport, December 15, 1964: "In a speech before the Supreme Soviet, the Minister of Fisheries, A. Ishkov, said that the 1964 catch will exceed 5 million metric tons as compared to 1.8 million in 1950. In the same time period, the number of fishing vessels has doubled, and the horsepower of the fishing fleet has increased 400 percent. More than 82 percent of the 1964 catch was taken on the high seas. The target catch for 1965 is 5.6 million tons of fish and other sea products."

Vodnii Transport, September 17, 1964: "Radio facsimile apparatus has been installed in a number of trawlers fishing in the North Pacific. The vessels are able to receive timely weather data from weather centers in Khabarovsk, Tokyo, Pearl Harbor, San Francisco, and Kodiak Island. Such weather forecasts provide a safeguard on long passages and during cargo operations at sea."

Vodnii Transport, June 30, 1964: "After a 3-month trip, the trawler *Bikin* has returned to its home port, with a catch of 3,200 tons of fish from the gulf of Alaska."

Rybnoe Khozyaistov, August 1964: "Commercial fishing for shrimp has begun in the Pacific Ocean. Two vessels are now in the Bering Sea near the Pribilof Islands that were specially constructed for shrimp operations."

Vodnii Transport, September 17, 1964: "The first Soviet tuna mothership, the *Leninskii Luch*, has arrived in Vladivostok from Japan. She was constructed at the Hitati shipyards. The 5,000-ton vessel carries six catcher motorboats and is equipped to receive and process 1,200 tons of tuna."

Mr. President, competition for the protein-rich fisheries resources of the oceans of the world will continue to grow. As it grows the United States, as the Seattle Times editorial states, has been steadily falling behind. As the editorial further indicates fisheries will be one of the great international growth industries of the immediate future, and it asks:

But will Uncle Sam share in that growth?

The answer to that question must be affirmative. The Congress should and must take such legislative steps as may be appropriate to assure that the answer is affirmative.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, titled "Pacific Fisheries Competition," appearing in the Sunday, February 28 issue of the Seattle Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACIFIC FISHERIES COMPETITION

This month New Zealand joined the list of nations that have expanded their jurisdiction over fisheries from 3 to 12 miles offshore—a move of small international consequence, by a small nation, but illustrative of the way in which some countries act decisively to protect their home-spawned fisheries resources from wide-ranging foreign fleets.

New Zealand fishermen had become alarmed at the presence of Japanese fishermen on their coasts. The New Zealand Government promptly acted.

Our own Government has been far less decisive in its response to a far greater expansion of foreign fishing off Alaska.

With the approach of a new fishing season, the problems raised by the expansion of Russian and Japanese fishing in the northeastern Pacific are more acute than ever.

Nor is it likely that Russia and Japan alone will supply all the foreign competition for North American fishermen in harvesting fish on this side of the Pacific.

Writing in the February issue of the Fishmen's News, Dayton Lee Alversen, base director of exploratory and gear research for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in Seattle, makes this thought-provoking observation:

"Do not be overly surprised if someday a mother ship and catcher vessels sail out of Shanghai through the Sea of Japan and set a course for the North Pacific area * * * Japan is constructing fishing vessels for Red China. Where these are to be deployed is anybody's guess."

Alversen might have added that Red China already outranks the United States as a fisheries power—as do Peru, Japan, and the Soviet Union.

The sorry fact is that since the Second World War this country has been steadily falling behind in fisheries competition with countries that heavily subsidize and protect their fishermen in somewhat the manner that Uncle Sam does many of his farmers.

The protein needs of a steadily expanding world population provide assurance that fisheries will be one of the great international growth industries of the immediate future. But will Uncle Sam share in that growth? Alversen says:

"If we are to improve or even maintain our competitive position in harvesting living resources from the sea, it will be necessary to modernize our fishing methods, vessels, and tactics."

This country has been quick to act in behalf of its own interests in such remote areas as southeast Asia and Africa.

With spring in the air and a new fishing season about to begin, it is pertinent to ask, surely, why there is not a greater sense of urgency regarding an international problem as close to home as the North Pacific fisheries.

Maybe there will be a greater showing of concern when Red China joins other Asian nations in depleting the resources of the northeastern Pacific.

Address of Edwin M. Hood

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in mid-February, Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America discussed the uncertain state of our maritime position in the world. His speech was delivered to the Propeller Club of Portland, Oreg., whose members are capable, leading personalities in port and allied activities in Oregon. The speech of Mr. Hood is informative and his views are worth the closest consideration.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the address in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A FORMIDABLE MARITIME CHALLENGE

(Speech by Edwin M. Hood, president, Shipbuilders Council of America, before the Propeller Club, Port of Portland, Portland, Oreg., Feb. 13, 1965)

As a major power, the United States is geographically isolated from much of the world. The oceans virtually surround us. It has been said that in time of emergency 95 percent of all materials would have to be moved by sea. The importance of seapower should thus be self-evident.

Without a strong Navy, supported by a complementary strong merchant marine, under its own control in such time of emergency, the United States could well be fenced off from its allies and oversea bases. With the tremendous buildup of naval and merchant strength presently taking place elsewhere in the world, particularly in Russia, the case for an effective U.S. merchant marine—at defensible costs—on the grounds of national and international security alone is overwhelming.

With others, we of the private shipyard industry have long believed that the maritime needs of our country must be considered, evaluated and fulfilled within the framework of total seapower requirements. In that sense, seapower is recognized as including merchant ships as well as naval vessels, shipyard capacity, trade and commerce, and the ability to use geography and the oceans to advance national objectives.

To us, all of these separate parts must be coordinated to enhance our national interests, and it is for this purpose that we have continued to recommend the establishment of a Presidential Advisory Commission on Seapower Superiority. The Maritime Advisory Committee, worthy though its purposes may be, is directed to only a single facet of our present seapower dilemma.

Here is what I mean by a sea-power dilemma.

The Soviet Union is moving rapidly to control the oceans and trade routes of the world. As a naval power, she is already second only to the United States. As a maritime power, experts predict she will surpass the United States in less than 2 years. Because of her enormous fleet expansion program, the Soviet Union will soon be able to manipulate ocean freight rates at will, and through a superiority in terms of numbers of ships in-being and mobility, she will be well on the road to economic domination of the world, and the weight of numbers will soon begin to tell.

As of November 1, 1964, 673 merchant vessels of various sizes and types—mostly dry cargo ships and tankers—totaling 6,450,000 pennyweight were on order or under construction for the Soviet Union. With her own shipyards fully utilized, this tremendous building program is being accomplished by awards of sizable contracts to shipyards in East Germany, England, Finland, Holland, Hungary, Japan, Norway, Poland, Sweden, and Yugoslavia.

As of December 1, 1964, there were 40 commercial vessels, totaling about 615,000 pennyweight, on order or under construction in the United States. These involved 3 tankers, 34 cargo vessels, and 3 ferryboats. In other words, the Russians are building 16 times as many merchant ships as we are. In terms of tonnage, they are outbuilding us by a ration of better than 10 to 1. And, I might add, the Soviet Union is committing large domestic resources and a substantial portion of its foreign exchange to enlarging its merchant fleet.

While the Communists are building a new and modern seapower potential, almost half of our naval fleet is composed of 20 vessels 20 years of ago and older. In less than 2 years, more than two-thirds of our Navy fleet will be over age. About 90 percent of all U.S.-flag dry cargo ships and 55 percent of our U.S.-flag tankers are 20 years of age or older. Our fleet of dry cargo ships engaged in domestic trades is virtually extinct. The average age of the ships in our Great Lakes fleet is 47 years. Our private shipyards are more than 50 percent idle. And, U.S.-flag shipping is carrying only 5 percent of our export and important commercial cargoes.

This comparative inventory of seapower resources presents at once a threat and a challenge.

Two months ago, the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. David L. McDonald, defined seapower as including both merchant and naval vessels plus "the mix of military, technological, and industrial capabilities related to the sea which crosscuts and intersects almost every aspect of our society." He said "the sciences of the sea may be on the threshold of an era of enormous expansion" and called for "a renaissance of American maritime capability."

We wholeheartedly agree that a maritime renaissance must be approached with the objective of obtaining a dollar's value for every dollar spent. This objective, however, should be accomplished on the basis of not how much or how cheap, but how good. From what I have already outlined, it should be clear that the quality of our total seapower effort leaves much to be desired.

But, when we talk about cost, to what do we really refer? Surely not only the financial statements showing the dollar value of assistance given by the Government.

Nothing creates such a wide diversity of employment, in such a variety of other industries and geographic locations as does the construction a ship. Furthermore, maritime activities represent a joint venture undertaken by Government and industry, for the public good, and much is returned to the taxpayer and the public treasury in the form of employment, tax revenues, trade, balance of international payments, and national security.

Not too many years ago, in 1957, the then Maritime Administrator demonstrated with actual experience statistics reflecting governmental expenditures on the one hand, and with generated tax revenues and other offsets on the other hand, that U.S. maritime activities, from 1936 through 1957, had cost the American taxpayers not one red cent. No doubt the same case could be made today.

A regiment of economists and accountants, however, could not unravel and estimate the true financial cost, or take into proper account the multitude of indirect advantages to a nation building and operating its own merchant marine. The question, then, to be decided at this point and time in history would appropriately seem to be "what is the present and possible future cost to this Nation of not having an adequate shipbuilding and shipping capability?" We of the private shipyard industry suggest that this cost may well be beyond all comprehension.

Admiral McDonald also said in his speech before the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers in New York on November 13, 1964, that "each generation of Americans takes a perverse delight in scuttling the merchant marine."

Even at this moment, there are those in Washington and elsewhere who are valiantly trying to promote the notion that all or part of the ships for the U.S. merchant marine should be constructed in foreign shipyards rather than in U.S. shipyards. The ultimate consequences of any such idea seem to have escaped them. Their proposed actions, if put into motion, could lead to the complete destruction of the U.S. private shipyard industry and ultimately to the complete demise of U.S.-flag shipping. The destiny of

our cherished way of life could well be at stake.

It should be almost axiomatic that under existing world tensions, and with the rapid technological progress taking place on so many different fronts, the United States cannot afford to become dependent, even slightly on other nations to provide modern ships for our merchant marine. Obviously, any "build abroad" or "buy abroad" alternative for our shipbuilding and shipping requirements would only aggravate the present situtaion, lead to further deterioration in the Nation's maritime posture, and severely weaken our seapower capability.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt began his 1938 message to the Congress on the U.S. merchant marine with this statement: "I present to the Congress the question whether or not the United States should have an adequate merchant marine. To me there are three reasons for answering this question in the affirmative. In substance, they were national security, national economy, and national prestige. Last week, a quarter of a century later, President Johnson, in his state of the Union address, indicated that he would soon send to the Congress a new policy for our merchant marine. As he approaches this formidable task, we hope he will present these three affirmative reasons as to why the United States should have an adequate shipyard industry:

1. The Secretary of Defense has said that from a purely military standpoint, a shipbuilding capability in this country is essential. If a shipbuilding capability is essential, it follows that the capability to repair and overhaul ships is equally essential.

2. Shipyard activities generate jobs, equipment sales, and production of material in every State of the Union.

3. If shipbuilding work is purchased abroad, these jobs and their consequent economic effects disappear—U.S. Treasury receipts decline accordingly and the balance of international payments is adversely affected.

The Chief of Naval Operations put it more concisely on November 13 last when he said:

"We all know that the more ships we have constructed for us in other lands and the more foreign bottoms we use to transport our exports and imports, the less need we have for shipyards in our own country. This, of course, means slow but certain death of those precious skills and know-how so essential to any seapower industry. This we cannot afford. We must become vitally—let me repeat, vitally—concerned with preserving and maintaining our repository of trained manpower resources found in our shipyard facilities.

"The reasons are fairly obvious. From this bank of sea technology will come the hundreds of specialized ship types we need to hold our status in the world. And if this talent bank be sufficient, we can, in the future, prevent the mad scramble of World Wars I and II to get our seapower cabin in order."

Even more concisely, the General Court of Massachusetts in 1641 proclaimed that the building of ships was "of great importance for the common good." But, the building of ships in the context of modern days, still "of great importance for the common good," is a vital taproot of vast national strength.

The question of size of the merchant fleet, the degree of reasonable control of the seas, and the degree of control over our own trade and commerce, together with the effective competitive use of merchant shipping to offset our adversaries, are proper matters for high national strategy determinations. The use of the merchant fleet as an economic weapon, just as the Soviet Union is now doing, should be given to priority consideration by the best authorities of the United States on a coordinated basis. No country in history has ever held a leading position without at the same time holding a reasonably dominant position on the seas. The relationship between seapower, shipping, and shipyards is equally historic. The sum of commercial ship operations—use and deployment—plus shipyard capacity and efficient use, then, must be contained proportionately in the total concept of seapower.

Accordingly, we urge that a program for maritime renaissance be carried to the highest levels of Government and to the citizenry. To this end, we again urge the appointment of a Presidential Advisory Commission on Seapower Superiority, composed of knowledgeable persons from both public and private life, for the purpose of recommending requisite steps to insure that the United States will long maintain supremacy on the high seas. Only on a top-level, coordinated basis can this basic challenge be faced effectively, realistically, and reasonably. We fervently hope that this concept will be included in the emerging design for the Great Society.

Democrats Introduce 100-Year Water Plan Study—Statement by Hon. Charles Moon, Member, House of Representatives, State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by the Honorable Charles Moon, a representative of the 39th District of the State of Washington House of Representatives. This statement contains relative and pertinent information which probably could be well considered by other States of the Union in the very important matter of water resources.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATS INTRODUCE 100-YEAR WATER PLAN STUDY

(By Hon. Charles Moon)

Because of increased interest in a Federal level to examine the possibilities of diverting excess waters from the Pacific Northwest to the Pacific Southwest, it is vitally necessary that the State of Washington embark immediately upon a complete and comprehensive study of the magnitude and distribution of our water resources, uses of this resource, and projections of future supplies and uses for the next 100 years in the State of Washington.

At the present time there are five water plans proposing to make use of our State waters to help States in the Southwest United States. Determination to divert Washington State water is, in the final analysis, a decision which will be made in the U.S. Congress. However, without factual long-range study plans and information, we in Washington State are helpless to tell Congress whether or not we have or do not have a surplus of water for our long-range needs.

We and the Democratic leadership of both the house and the senate are right now drafting a bill, to be introduced tomorrow, which will, when passed provide the necessary facilities and appropriations to get such a study underway immediately.

Purpose of this study will be to identify and project for the next century, Washington's water requirements for all beneficial uses which will include irrigation, mining, manufacturing, domestic municipal, power development, industrial, recreation, and wildlife and fish uses.

The purposes of the information developed in the study are: For the determination of whether or not Washington State does or does not have water which is surplus to its future and long-range needs.

To determine any benefits or detriments to the State of Washington which can and will result from future proposals to divert our water to the States in the Southwest.

To provide sufficient information to enable Washington State to develop means of meeting long-range water requirements for all the beneficial uses for the entire State.

To make this study it will be necessary that the responsible agency cooperate with all affected State agencies, local governments, Federal agencies, and other entities concerned.

It is envisioned that the agency which is made responsible for this study will enter into contracts with the State department of agriculture for studies relative to long-range irrigation needs; the department of natural resources and others to deal with water needs for their purposes. The State pollution control commission would be called in for water quality requirements necessary in our total resource picture for the next 100 years; fishermen's and sportsmen's and recreation groups would assist in recreation and fishing information details, and our State colleges and universities would be called upon to lend their talents and research capacities to making this a factual, comprehensive study.

In a letter recently received from our senior Senator, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, he urged that this legislature immediately consider, in the light of the necessities on the Federal level, commencing with the collection of this necessary information. He further stated that the entire Washington State congressional delegation is interested in this proposal and the reaction of this legislature to this matter.

We sponsors, both senators and representatives, feel that we cannot wait any longer to commence this study. Our neighboring State of Oregon has paved the way—recently appropriating more than $300,000 for the start of their study. It is our feeling that we in Washington should do as much, or more. We would envision that the agency made responsible for this study would utilize an outline and format similar to that developed by Oregon, adapted to our own unique resource needs, in the implementation of this program.

An appropriation and study of this kind is not setting a precedent in Washington State government. The department of commerce and economic development is at the present time embarked on such a program dealing with the economic future of our State. Their progress has been notable and the study which we propose, dealing with water resources, will be a valuable supplement to their work.

The legislation which will create this study plan does not require any broad and sweeping changes of existing State government structure. It is not necessary that additional boards or commission be established, or nebulous and undefined powers be given any agency.

Our bill, as it will be introduced, will simply call for the immediate implementation of this long-range study along the lines already described. It would clear the way for the State department of conservation to concentrate its energies on our water resources, on the studies, inventories, and management practices necessary to insure the orderly and

rapid development of needed resource information.

This legislation would transfer the departments of mines and geology which are now in the department of conservation, to the department of natural resources. It would transfer the soils and water conservation committee to the department of agriculture, and would change the name of the department of conservation to the department of water resource conservation. It would outline the objectives of the study and direct that department to conduct the study, and would call for sufficient funds for them to do the job.

The idea of this study is neither new nor original for this session. A number of resolutions have been drafted which would make such a study possible, but have not been introduced, but nowhere has a proposal come before the legislature which is as sweeping in scope and benefits for the State of Washington.

Other legislation introduced this session would have created a board and department of water resources but it was cumbersome, complicated, and nonspecific to the needs of the State. As stated, this need not involve nebulous, nondirected boards, and commissions, or vast sweeping departmental changes. Done in this straightforward fashion there is no reason why both parties cannot join with us and immediately get to work on a century of progressive planning for Washington State.

First Lady of Home News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons the Home News, of New Brunswick, N.J., is one of New Jersey's great daily newspapers is the fine caliber of its officers and employees.

Recently the Home News published an editorial entitled "First Lady of Home News."

It is with deep pride, pleasure, and honor that I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD this editorial, because Miss Melicent E. Perkins represents the high degrees of competence, character, and dedication that have contributed to the success, progress, and greatness of the Home News.

The editorial follows:

FIRST LADY OF HOME NEWS

Today is a day unique in the history of the Home News.

Today Miss Melicent E. Perkins begins her 66th year of association with this newspaper.

It was on March 26th, 1900, that Miss Perkins accepted the position of stenographer for the late William B. Boyd, father of Hugh N. Boyd, who is now publisher. She rose steadily up the ladder holding successively higher positions, becoming secretary of the Home News Publishing Co. in 1923 and later becoming secretary-treasurer, a position she holds today. She is also a director of the company.

Hundreds of reporters and printers have come and gone during Miss Perkins' association with our newspaper. Hundreds of millions of copies of the Home News have been printed and read. And with simple majesty Miss Perkins has been a part of all this. She has over the years helped four publishers make difficult decisions. She has been a warm friend and wise counselor to hosts of us, present and former members of the Home News family.

Miss Perkins' handclasp is firm, her laugh hearty, her sense of humor strong, her participation in the management of our newspaper active, inspiring, and effective. She's at her desk every day, and on payday her signature is on the checks.

Newspaper people are often slow to praise their own, but we are proud and honored to be able today to salute Miss Melicent Perkins, a fine friend, First Lady of the Home News.

Are the Civil Rights Demonstrations Leading to Totalitarianism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, because so many Americans are moved to compassion when it is believed any people suffer injustice, many of our citizens are being misled in the current demonstrations of Martin Luther King. Hailed as nonviolent and strictly for the purpose of securing voting rights for Negroes, the true character of the riots is becoming clearer each day. There is a strong odor of totalitarianism connected with the demands of Martin Luther King. If he has his way, not only the South, but all America will be his victims as we lose our system of Government under a dictatorship made possible by the revolutionary tactics now encouraged and condoned.

A warning of what lies ahead is contained in a column by William S. White which appeared in newspapers this past week.

Mr. White's article follows:

IN WASHINGTON

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—An odor of totalitarianism is rising from the supposedly nonviolent leadership in the Negro civil rights movement of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

Just as it seemed that the men of reason and restraint, in North and South, were at last to be able to raise their heads in this tragic business, Dr. King's call for an economic boycott of the entire State of Alabama has shocked the sensible North, repelled and sickened the moderate South, and maddened and rearmed those irreconcilable southerners who resist all concessions to the Negro.

It is an act hardly less damaging to the cause of true civil rights than the acts, on the other far end of the stick, of such men as Gov. George Wallace, of Alabama, and former Gov. Ross Barnett, of Mississippi.

For what Dr. King proposes is tactically indefensible and morally intolerable. It is nothing less than the application of the principle of total warfare—against the just as well as the unjust, against Alabama Negro as well as Alabama white. A man who appeals so often to the higher moral law now urges what is in principle the economic bombing of defenseless cities.

Its timing is, moreover, provocative and mischiefmaking beyond ready belief. For Dr. King summons up the forces of unreason and the technique of the general strike at the very moment when the entire Johnson administration and a great majority of Congress are engaged upon a historic program to secure Negro voting rights. And it is this man, this holder of the Nobel Prize for Peace, who has so long been presented as the chief voice of responsibility and reason within the Negro movement.

If his demands were not already being met as fast as elementary orderliness and a decent regard for the minimum rights of dissenters in a free society could possibly meet them, his position might to some extent be understandable, even though wrong. In all existing circumstances, his attitude surely cannot be adopted even by advanced civil rights advocates unless they believe that a single, unelected person, granting him the highest motives, is entitled to pronounce a judgment of economic strangulation upon a part of the Union.

Those who sit comfortably and righteously in the North and tirelessly condemn not merely the entire South, but also every man who attempts to raise the smallest word in its defense, will reject all this, as they always do. But what they are doing and what Dr. King is now doing, for the first time in his case, so far as this columnist has seen, endangers the very goals toward which they give such endless lip service. For there is in this, as in every poignant controversy, a human limit of tolerance. Let it be transgressed long enough and harshly enough and irremediable chaos is the only result.

It is not pleasant to be in the middle of such an issue. For such a man becomes the chosen villain on the same day of both sets of extremists, and has no friends any more. When the mail comes each morning, it is like being hit in the face by twin sacks of wet sewage. At one and the same hour a man is a southern Tory Bourbon and a hireling of Yankee carpetbaggers. This is perhaps a too personal way of saying that most Americans are not even remotely aware of the depth of bitterness being fomented in this Nation by the George Wallaces—and also, let northern people recognize, by the Martin Luther Kings.

All the same, the middle way is the only way if justice and national union and national order are to be preserved; for justice never lies with men of passion and violent tongue.

That part of the South which will not submit to fair play for the Negro is demonstrably being forced to its knees by lawful process. Is it not now time, in all conscience, for an end to, or at least a suspension of, the long pilorying of one tortured region of this country? Is it not now time to put a period to marches and demonstrations, and now to end an outright effort to destroy the economy of a whole State, at least until Congress has had a chance to work its will?

A Government Lottery as a Revenue-Raising Device

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution to establish a select committee of the House of Representatives to study the advisability of using a Government lottery as a revenue-raising device.

I urge the Congress to establish this committee to investigate the lottery.

Surely, the obvious trend toward the lottery device in this country indicates that the national lottery idea is at least worth investigation.

For my part, I am fully convinced that investigation of the lottery mechanism will indisputably prove its merit. I urge the Congress not to shrink from social and financial reality.

First International Hangar Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, during March 19–21 in my congressional district in Arizona, we established a first of which Arizonans and the Nation may be proud. Various aviation groups, the Tucson Airport Authority, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Director General of Civil Aeronautics of Mexico cooperated to hold the First International Hangar Session. This project is significant not only because it is the first of its kind on an international basis, but because it should bear fruitful results in terms of our relationships with our Latin American friends.

Mr. Najeeb E. Halaby, Administrator of the FAA and Senor Ramon Perez Morquecho, Director General of Civil Aeronautics in Mexico, met with 500 pilots and representatives of general aviation from Southwestern States and Mexico.

Administrator Halaby inaugurated these fly-in-type hangar sessions soon after taking office. The Tucson meeting provided unprecedented opportunities for those citizens active in aviation in Mexico and the United States to meet face to face with local, State, and Federal public servants charged with the responsibility of regulating aviation. The session was an example of genuine government-to-people and people-to-goverment democracy.

I commend Mr. Halaby and Senor Morquecho for their initiative in making the meeting a success.

Those who attended the fly-in were provided answers to their questions and the reasons and the philosophy of the actions taken by each Government on both routine and controversial matters.

Senor Morquecho paid tribute to the Federal Aviation Agency and Mr. Halaby for contributions toward the advancement of aviation, including establishment of well-equipped airports throughout the United States and development of a common system of air traffic control and navigation aids for both civil and military aircraft. He cited the exemplary safety record of aviation in the face of an ever-increasing load of activity.

Mr. Halaby said in part:

We chose this city as the site of the First International Hangar Session because we believe its symbolizes to a great extent the spirit of friendship and understanding between nations and between people which we are trying to further here today.

We are grateful to the Tucson Airport Authority also for sponsoring us here today. We have found these hangar fly-in sessions to be extremely effective as a two-way communication vehicle between the Federal Aviation Agency and the public it serves. I might add that I personally have learned a great deal through these give-and-take sessions.

All of our previous sessions, however, have been aimed exclusively, or at least primarily, at U.S. pilots. This is our first venture in the international area.

I trust it is not the last, for I believe meetings such as this can help cement the historic ties of friendship and good will which bind the United States and Latin America.

We are honored to have with us today my counterpart in the Government of Mexico, Senor Ramon Perez Morquecho. His presence here and mine emphasize the importance which both of our Governments place on informal meetings of this kind.

This First International Hangar Session served to resolve many local problems. In addition, it established a rapport between two major Government officials that will serve both countries well.

All of us benefit from better relations and an improved understanding of the problems of our Mexican neighbors. International air travel offers citizens of both countries a way to exchange ideas, learn each other's customs, and broaden understanding.

I congratulate the Tucson Airport Authority and its manager, Mr. Charles H. Broman, and Mr. James Vercellino, director of the Arizona Department of Aeronautics, and all of the Government and industry officials responsible for sponsoring this unique meeting.

Water Pollution Along the Niagara Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution relative to the prevention and control of water pollution along the Niagara frontier, which was adopted by the Erie County Board of Supervisors, Buffalo, N.Y., on March 13, 1965:

STATE OF NEW YORK, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY, CLERK'S OFFICE,

Buffalo, N.Y., April 1, 1965.

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify, that at a session of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, held in the county hall, in the city of Buffalo, on the 30th day of March 1965, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

"Whereas, Stanley P. Spisiak, chairman of the water resources committee of the State conservation council after appearing before a congressional Committee on Pollution, has called for an international investigation public hearing in the city of Buffalo on Lake Erie and Niagara River water pollution. Mr. Spisiak requested action by the United States-Canadian International Joint Commission 'to analyze and survey the international waters along the Niagara frontier and to hold a public hearing preferably in Buffalo in the near future to gather current information pertaining to the pollution of these waters'; and

"Whereas each year the incidences of water pollution along the Niagara frontier becomes more and more acute causing more and more bathing beaches to be closing on the American side of the waters; and

"Whereas there is a great need for the enactment of more stringent Federal laws preventing and controlling water pollution along the Niagara frontier: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this board of supervisors express and intent to support Mr. Spisiak and join with him in requesting that a public hearing be held here in Buffalo by the United States-Canadian International Joint Commission concerning water pollution."

Attest:

WALTER A. HOLZ,
Deputy Clerk.

The Memphis Commercial Appeal on Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal:

A NATIONAL CRIME

The ballyhooed Selma-to-Montgomery march had been completed without trouble. The Alabama Governor was commending his State for its restraint under heavy pressure from the outsiders. Suspense had faded from the story and the Nation was willing to take the spyglass off of Alabama. Just a few days before, a reporter named Jimmy Breslin had written in the New York Herald Tribune of how New York should be worrying about its own race and crime problems instead of sending pilgrims to Selma.

There things stood. A bit of daylight was showing.

And then a murder and a return to the headlines of the despised name of the Ku Klux Klan.

Not that the slaying of a Detroit woman who had come to Alabama is worse than the brutal subway killing of a New York white youth by Negroes a few days earlier. No excuses can be found, though. Murder is foul and uncivilized whether on a New York subway train or on a desolate stretch of highway in Lowndes County, Ala. And with the attention of the Nation—indeed, of the world—riveted on Alabama at this time, it was an utterly stupid deed.

Admittedly there are low forms of human life, and this was the act of one of the lowest orders.

It will be said that the good people of Alabama deplore such primitive violence. True. Good New Yorkers abhor the city jungle with its disregard for human life.

There are good people and bad. Environment, physical and mental, can lead to the demented hatred that causes murder.

But America, a land that regards itself as blessed with freedom, cannot rest content when city streets or lonely roads are unsafe.

This is not the day of the highwayman or the cutthroat.

Someone has to answer for the slaying of Mrs. Viola Gregg Liuzzo, shot as she drove the highway between Selma and Montgomery. Arrests have been made, and the import of the crime was so great that the President of the United States announced their apprehension. The suspects are identified as Ku Klux Klansmen.

Unfortunately, the murder is a national incident and it serves little purpose to try to place it in the perspective of crime that occurs from day to day in many places.

This, in a sense, is a threat to national security. It widens the gulf in racial understanding. It hardens the attitudes of distant peoples to the South. But most of all, it drives the spike of insecurity into the heart of any American who drives from State to State. For who can feel secure when he is deeply aware that his out-of-State license plates may invite violence—perhaps death?

Leased Cars for Mailmen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the intelligent analysis of the editor of the Washington Evening Journal. I hope that every Member of the House of Representatives will give this fine editorial careful consideration:

LEASED CARS FOR MAILMEN?

The Post Office Department is genuinely interested in ways to cut down the high expense of transporting the mails. Recently a bulletin to postmasters announced a breakthrough in machinery to read addresses and ZIP code numbers and sort certain types of mail automatically. When and if such a system goes into operation we'll be happy to put a ZIP code number on every letter we write.

Another recent suggestion for cutting mail distribution costs had to do with the cars driven by rural mail carriers. At present, the carrier furnishes his own car and is reimbursed 12 cents a mile for route mileage. The suggestion was that the Department discontinue this practice and, instead, lease cars from large companies which (reportedly) would furnish them at a lower cost per mile.

Frankly, we're suspicious of this suggestion. In the first place, either the leasing contract with the Post Office Department would be profitable, or it wouldn't. If it is profitable we see endless possibilities of graft, favoritism, kickbacks, and payoffs in the awarding of the leases. To think any such system of leases could be kept free of politics is naive.

Further, we suspect that any such leasing system would require the creating of a new postal bureau to oversee and police the system. The presumably lower price per mile would soon be swallowed up in overhead.

(We suspect, also, that the company which had made money leasing cars to businessmen and salesmen at 8 to 10 cents per mile would find leasing cars for service on rural routes a considerably different kettle of fish. It's one thing to drive a hundred miles nonstop on paved highways, and quite another to drive a hundred miles on rural roads, stopping at every mail box.)

Finally, we think the rural mail carriers would have a legitimate beef about such a system. These men are rugged individualists. If you don't think they're rugged, try doing their work. And if you don't think they're individualists, just look at the variety of vehicles they choose for their daily chore. The make and model that suits one carrier isn't likely to suit another. And that's as it should be.

Nobody takes better care of a car, or gets more miles out of it economically, than the car's owner who is paying his own car expenses. Regimentation in such fields is not likely to cut costs but to raise them in the long run.

Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office Appropriation Bill, 1966

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7060) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, when this legislation was in committee the request of the Post Office Department for additional permanent employees was reduced from 20,520 to 6,625. While I realize the committee has provided for temporary employees which they feel are sufficient in number to maintain current services, the failure of the committee to provide for the necessary permanent employees will be a distinct disservice to our many areas of rapid economic expansion.

The Department's original request was the minimum request and was kept at that minimum figure in order to help with the President's economy in Government program. That 20,000 figure was the minimum figure necessary to maintain the current efficiency of the Post Office Department. If the Department were to eliminate all of the overtime now necessary, it would take twice the request they made in order to maintain adequate service to its 45 million family and 4.1 million business patrons.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite familiar with the problems that the Department faces in areas of rapid economic expansion. In my own district we have had 36 new post offices constructed in the last 11 years. Some of these have been in communities which as short a time ago as 1957 did not even exist. These post offices are making use of the latest equipment and systems for processing the mail but they also need employees.

If the Post Office Department is going to continue to meet the needs of areas of rapid economic expansion, they must have the manpower to do so. The committee action cripples the request for that manpower and the Department has attempted to be reasonable in their request.

Several of the communities in my district are so understaffed that substitute carriers and clerks have been working as much as 60 hours per week. On top of this the regular employees have been working overtime as well. The normal morning deliveries are arriving at residential homes as late as 5 p.m., and the continued growth in my area will mean added problems to the post offices in meeting the demands for adequate service.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem that if the fine record of our Post Office Department has made in the past is to be continued, additional permanent postal employees will be needed.

The Need To Improve Working Conditions for Farm Laborers

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, any reasonable and literate person ought to be able at this late date to read the congressional handwriting on the wall. The 88th Congress, in its wisdom, decided that time had run out on the "temporary" bracero program, and that it should expire at the end of 1964. The President, in his wisdom, signed into law that decision and thereby obligated himself and his administration to carry it out. The 89th Congress, in its wisdom, is not going to buckle under the pressures that have been generated to revive the discredited bracero program. The President is not going to buckle under those pressures, and the Secretary of Labor is not going to buckle under those pressures.

The bracero program is as dead as the dodo bird. It is time for the leadership in the farm industry to stop looking for cheap, captive sources of labor. It is time for the leadership in the farm industry to exert itself in a positive and constructive and progressive manner in order to help solve the farm labor problem. It is time to look forward to the day when the farmworker can share in the fruits of his labors. Today, for the sweat off his brow that he leaves in the rich and abundant fields and orchards which he harvests he receives for his part a pittance, a pat on the back, and a passport to nowhere. Justice, decency, and humanity demand that progress not pass him over for yet another generation.

Farmworkers under State and Federal labor laws are relegated to a second-class citizenship. Millions of Americans are protected by minimum wage, maximum hours, and child-labor laws. Millions of Americans are protected by workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation. Millions of Americans are assured decent housing for their families, good schools for their children, health and medical facilities. Not so the farmworker.

Historically, labor laws were designed to regulate and set a floor under the

working conditions of employees in industry and trade. At first these laws were limited to specific types or places of employment or to certain industries. Some of these laws have been extended to cover employment generally, but usually agricultural employment is expressly excluded. Even where no specific exclusion exists and the laws could cover farmworkers, they often are not applied.

For example, in only eight States and Puerto Rico are there laws or regulations which specifically regulate farm labor contractors and crew leaders. Only a few States, California, Colorado, Connecticut, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, have laws setting safety standards for vehicles used in the transportation of farmworkers, and for the operation of such vehicles. Farm labor camps are regulated as to housing, location, and construction of the camp in 30 States. But in 20 States there is no such regulation. And even in the States where there are laws on this subject, the standards are very limited in most.

Only 11 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia provide a minimum age for employment of children on farms. This age is 14 in Connecticut, Alaska, Hawaii, Missouri, Texas, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. In four States the minimum age is 12. In one State, Utah, the minimum age is 10. Compulsory school attendance requires children to attend school, usually to age 16, in most States. But in many States the laws permit children under 16 or even under 14 to be excused from school in order to work on farms.

In only four States and Puerto Rico do workmen's compensation laws cover all farm employment. Only 17 States have any specific coverage for farmworkers at all. Only Hawaii and Puerto Rico provide any minimum wage coverage for all farmworkers. Hawaii requires a minimum of $1.25 an hour. Six States have wage payment laws and wage collections laws for farmworkers. Only Hawaii and Puerto Rico specifically cover farmworkers in their unemployment insurance laws. In one State, California, farmworkers are covered by a temporary disability law.

Federal laws supplement these deficiencies somewhat. The 88th Congress enacted more laws for the protection of farmworkers than perhaps any other Congress. The Economic Opportunity Act contains provisions for the assistance of migrant farmworkers and for low-income rural families. The Housing Act of 1964 provides for grants to States or its political subdivisions, or private nonprofit organizations, to assist in providing housing and related facilities for domestic farm labor.

Have these laws been utilized for the benefit for farmworkers? What are we doing now to implement them and to pass additional legislation in the area of minimum wages and workmen's compensation? There are the fruitful areas of work and inquiry where the time and energy of the people and the Congress could be well spent.

The farmworker is the forgotten man in the industrial revolution that has benefited almost every other class of worker. Part of the evil inherent in the bracero program was that it served to keep the farm industry in a constant state of depression, as far as the workers were concerned. Braceros were a cheap source and a captive source of labor. They stifled competition and formed a crutch on which farmers and growers became accustomed to lean. That crutch is gone. It is now time for the farmer and the grower to walk without it, to seek his labor needs in the competitive market, and to give decent wages and working conditions to their employees.

This afternoon, in the Washington Daily News, John Herling ably reviews some recent events in the struggle to upgrade conditions in the farm industry. With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD this incisive and enlightening column by John Herling:

W.W.W.'s CRUSADE

(By John Herling)

Perhaps it is inaccurate to describe the efforts of Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz in the farm labor sector as a crusade. He himself would prefer to say that he sticks to his responsibility under the law and that he is doing only what Congress plainly intended him to do and what President Johnson would want him to do.

Maybe so. But in the administration of any law or policy, the character of the administrator—made up of gutpower plus brainpan—is often decisive, whether his regulatory function is direct or indirect.

Secretary Wirtz, accompanied by Labor Under Secretary John F. Henning, spent an intensive 4 days last week in California on the problems connected with the use of braceros—imported Mexican workers—in American agriculture. While California occupies the central place in the farm labor arch, more than 20 other States also have habituated their farm economies, to a considerable extent, to the use of imported workers from Mexico and the British West Indies.

But as of December 31, 1964, the law which permitted the importation of Mexican workers—Public Law 78—expired. To the shock of many of their employers—the growers—Mr. Wirtz had made it clear that he was not going to shut his eyes to the intent of Congress and permit the growers to keep on bringing in low-paid Mexican workers.

While field trips by Government officials are often a dime a dozen, there was a special quality about this one: Mr. Wirtz flew into the eye of the hurricane—the high-pressure center of the growers' indignant demand for cheap imported labor. His trip appears to have accomplished two things: One, the growers came to know Mr. Wirtz, and while they huffed and puffed, they did not succeed in blowing his house in. And second, within the space of 1 week the growers who were red-eyed ripe for conflict have now apparently come around to the point where, in effect, they adopt the attitude of Isaiah and L.B.J. and say, "Let us reason together."

In short, their attitude has changed because the Labor Secretary made it clear that when he said that Public Law 414 (the existing immigration law) was not going to be used as a subterfuge to do by other means what had been outlawed as of December 31, 1964, he meant it positively.

Boiled down, here is the way Secretary Wirtz finds the situation: "Much clearer now than it was at the start of this trip is that here is a basic, profound movement ahead as far as the agricultural economy of this State and some of the social implications of that change are concerned. The discussion a year ago—even 2 or 3 months ago—was in terms of superficial aspects of this situation. There was the suggestion that U.S. workers won't do stoop labor, and there were other catch phrases of one kind or another that were bandied around. What is now clear as you travel the State, talk to the growers and to the workers and to their representatives, to people of very strong conscience who are leaders in the attempt to meet this problem, to clergymen, to public officials, there is a much more basic development taking place.

"Three aspects of this development stand out: First and fundamental is the fact that Congress, by terminating Public Law 78, changed a situation in which there had previously been a fully assured, guaranteed labor supply for California agriculture. That no longer will be the case. The second change involves the fact that this previously guaranteed and assured labor supply had been provided under terms which included no competitive or bargaining power as between the employer and employees. Employment was solely on terms and conditions which could be dictated, subject only to the application of laws by the employers. From here on there will be a competitive factor in the labor situation which there has not been before. The third element, hardly appreciated or recognized in the public discussion of this matter, is that Public Law 78 had the effect of putting at least a fifth of California agriculture on the basis of its being performed by single individuals, men who lived apart from their families, and who came here alone as individuals, from Mexico.

"In the future, if the families move with the men who do California's agriculture work, there will be problems of schools, housing, churches, and of facilities of one kind or another to be met. With all of these factors taken into account, the changeover will be fundamental."

Overtime in the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to true economies, but oppose vigorously false economies. I do not fuss with the Appropriations Committee for curtailing unnecessary expenditures or for insisting on maximum economies. However, I do not subscribe to the theory that the Appropriations Committee is infallible in their judgment.

The Post Office Department requested sufficient funds for the Bureau of Operations to eliminate some 15,000 man-years of excess overtime. They proposed to accomplish this by the appointment of regular employees. This approach is nothing less than good management and would produce eventual economies.

Mr. Speaker, experience has proven that it is not efficient to employ excessive temporary employees or to work regular employees excessive overtime. In the first instance, it is a costly process training temporary employees and certainly because their employment is temporary they leave the post office for employment elsewhere whenever they can find permanent jobs. This vicious and costly cycle continues on and on.

In the second instance, it has long been known that employees performing hours of overtime are not as productive as during their regular hours of employment. Cost-conscious and progressive private firms found this to be true, and as a result have taken proper steps to eliminate excessive overtime in their plants. Certainly if this is true in the cases of companies operating for a profit, it is equally true in the case of the Government.

I regret that the Appropriations Committee did not provide sufficient funds to enable the Bureau of Operations in the Post Office Department to convert their temporary employees to a permanent basis.

The report states:

Additional funds will allow about 1,300 positions to be used as an experimental program to reduce the excess overtime work by postal employees.

It is my contention that the time for experimentation has long since passed. The work exists—it is being done—either by temporary employees or by the use of excess overtime. Neither course is proper.

The solution is to provide sufficient funds so that regular clerks and carriers can be employed to do the work of the Post Office Department.

Dereliction in Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has been asked time and again to accept without change several legislative proposals from the executive branch of Government with the admonition that we in the Congress should not change a comma, or remove a period. The steady cry from the minority side is that "the heavy hand of the executive branch is extracting its pound of flesh." In these legislative proposals, it is demanded that each be passed without amendment. The gentlelady from Oregon, Representative EDITH GREEN, has now made this cry bipartisan.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to have supported the motion of the lady from Oregon with respect to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Her amendment meant great benefits to my State of West Virginia and I am truly sorry that I was the only member of my delegation to support her. Under unanimous consent I include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, "Dereliction in Debate," which forthrightly brings bipartisanship to the complaint that "legislation should not be debated or amended, but should be passed as is," in order that my colleagues may see the same:

DERELICTION IN DEBATE

It's tempting merely to chuckle about partisan politics when Republicans complain, as one of them did the other day, that "the Great Society has turned into the great steamroller." But when a northern liberal Democrat supports the substance of that complaint, perhaps it's time to listen.

To wit, Representative EDITH GREEN's searing commentary on both the administration's primary education bill and the tactics used to speed House approval of that measure. The lady from Oregon noted that while her fellow Democrats brag of guarding minority rights, their benevolence evidently doesn't extend to congressional minorities which question official infallibility. She observed, "It seems to me we have in the House a determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement."

The debate did seem curiously restricted for a proposal with such far-reaching implications. Also, the bill is such a Rube Goldberg contraption that, as Mrs. GREEN said, more debate was needed simply "to let the House know what is actually in the bill." The measure is so confusing that at one point even its sponsors couldn't agree on what its language allowed. Still, its backers seemed intent on passing it without change, and treated most amendments peremptorily, without record votes and often without discussion.

Such arrogance might be understandable if the amendments were merely political or trifling. Instead, many of them dealt conscientiously with the bill's fundamentals, such as the fact that while its ostensible purpose is helping the disadvantaged, its systems of allocating Federal funds heavily favors already wealthy States.

The majority even brushed aside bipartisan attempts to facilitate judicial tests of the bill's constitutionality. The proposal intentionally walks close to the constitutional line on church-state questions, and Federal courts often evade jurisdiction on this issue by finding that no one is directly enough affected to bring suit. One proposed amendment might have helped simply by encouraging judicial review; another definitely specified who would be eligible to start constitutional tests.

Since the bill fosters a multiplicity of approaches to aiding children in church schools, it has endless opportunity for chaos unless the constitutional questions are resolved quickly. Not surprisingly, the judicial review provision was backed by the National School Board Association, which represent boards covering 95 percent of the Nation's pupils. The House majority chose to avoid the whole constitutional issue.

Simply by closing its ears to serious questions, the Democratic majority achieved the victory of having its measure passed practically untouched. This bit of vanity means, among other things, that some disadvantaged children will get shortchanged, and the Nation's school boards will have to struggle with the tough questions the House was afraid to face. As with so many past Federal programs, the price for dereliction in congressional debate will be paid by those the program purports to help.

Washington Star Editorial Raises Objections to Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, lest it is believed that only southerners are objecting to the unfair, discriminatory and highly dangerous voting bill sponsored by the President, I call your attention to the editorial, "Voting Discrimination," which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, April 4, 1965.

The editorial follows:

VOTING DISCRIMINATION

Our basic objections to the administration's voting rights bill have already been stated. We think there is need for a reasonable literacy test, provided there is no discrimination in its application to would-be voters. The administration's bill, in one aspect, outlaws any and all literacy tests, and is designed to permit total illiterates to vote. The educational voting level is low enough now without enacting a Federal law to push it down even farther.

The second important aspect of this bill imposes its harsh and punitive provisions on any State which has a literacy test, and in which fewer than 50 percent of the residents over 21 are registered or actually voted in the 1964 election.

This bill contains other provisions which are reminiscent of the Reconstruction era following the Civil War. But the two which we have mentioned, taken together, offend one's sense of fairness. If enacted, in its present form, this bill would result in a legislative discrimination as bad or worse than the evil the bill is supposed to remedy.

Let's take the case of Virginia, which is brought under this bill because it requires a literacy test and, though more than 50 percent of its eligibles are registered, fewer than 50 percent voted in 1964.

What is Virginia's literacy test? As spelled out by Senator HARRY BYRD in his recent statement, any person desiring to register must be able, without assistance, to give in writing the following information: His name. The date and place of his birth. His current residence. His occupation. And, if he has voted before, the county and precinct in which he voted. That is all.

Is this a test which opens the door to such obviously discriminatory requirements as being able to interpret to the satisfaction of some ignorant registrar sections of a State constitution? Is it a test which asks too much of a person who wants to vote on the important and complicated issues which face us today? We do not think so. Furthermore, the administration concedes that this is not an unreasonable literacy test, and that there is no evidence that it has been used in Virginia to discriminate against Negroes.

If this is so, why does the bill link a reasonable and nondiscriminatory literacy test to an arbitrary formula with respect to voting or registration percentages?

One explanation is that the statistics on registration are unreliable. But this is said to be true in West Virginia, which is not affected by the bill because it has no literacy test. What nonsense.

In addition to Virginia, the States covered by the bill are Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Alaska. We are puzzled by the inclusion of Alaska, in which Negroes certainly are not discriminated against. There are few if any there. As to the others, we haven't enough information to pass judgment.

But it is our firm belief that this is a discriminatory bill. If its purpose is to protect Negro voting rights, it discriminates in favor of New York, which requires a rather strict literacy test but which has met the voting percentage standards. It also discriminates in the case of Texas, which did not meet the percentage-of-voting standard in 1964, but which does require a literacy test, although it is verbal in character and is called by some other name.

There have been reports that the administration's bill will be changed or modified in some unrevealed aspects. We hope this is true. We also hope that the bill, if modified,

will be made applicable to Virginia (in which we have a special interest) on the basis of facts rather than fiction. And certainly not on the basis of some arbitrary formula dreamed up by someone who hasn't the faintest idea what the facts are. Or, if he knows, doesn't care.

Revision of Copyright Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, introduced a bill which provides for a general revision of the copyright law. I introduced an identical bill, H.R. 5680, as a cosponsor of this legislation. This bill contains the first sweeping reform of our copyright laws since 1909.

The bill, which was prepared at the instigation and with the aid of the U.S. Copyright Office, would establish a single national system of statutory protection for all works, published and unpublished, including those of authors, composers, artists, book publishers, industrial designers, universities, and even widows of writers. The measure is now pending before the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, Copyrights, and Revision of Laws, of which I am a member.

Recently, the Washington Post published an informative article on the subject, entitled "Some Wrongs Need Righting in the Copyright Law." It was written by Jack C. Landau and appeared in the issue of March 28, 1965. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert this article into the RECORD:

SOME WRONGS NEED RIGHTING IN THE COPYRIGHT LAW—BILL BEFORE CONGRESS WOULD STRENGTHEN OUTDATED RULES

(By Jack C. Landau, Washington Post staff writer)

A decade ago, the U.S. Copyright Office decided that major revisions were needed in our antiquated 1909 copyright law.

The primary objective was to aline the United States with European countries by giving our writers and composers more protection against piracy of their works.

It was hoped that this increased protection would result in higher royalties which, in turn, would stimulate production of artistic and scientific writings.

A coordinate goal was to resolve the tangle of legal problems that have arisen from advancements in communication media, most of which were either in their infancy or undreamed of in 1909. These include motion pictures, phonograph records, radio, commercial and educational television, photographic duplicating, and tape recordings.

Almost everyone was in favor of revisions. But, as the Register of Copyrights, Abraham Kaminstein, soon found out everyone also had a philosophical and financial ax to grind.

At the heart of the copyright problem is the traditional American division over the place of the artist and scientist in our society.

There is the theory that the artist or writer has a strong proprietary interest in the work he creates and should be able to control its use and charge for it as he would for any other piece of property.

But there is also the tradition that, in the best educational interests of the Nation, scientific, literary, and musical material should be cheap and easily available to schools, universities, and libraries.

The general rule in copyright is that there can be no reproduction of a copyrighted work without the permission of the author, or whoever bought the work, and the payment of royalties; not a sentence from a poem; not a verse from song; not a chart from a high school chemistry book.

Many exceptions to this rule have developed. Most of them favor schools, newspapers, and libraries under judicial interpretation that a line from a T. S. Eliot poem, for example, is "fair use"; or that, by statutory exemption, a school production of songs from "My Fair Lady" is "not for profit."

Copyright coverage has expanded over the years, again through judicial interpretation, from books and music to include ballets, uniquely designed clothing, the graphic arts, sculpture, and interpretations of noncopyrighted works such as Beethoven's Fifth Symphony.

The group favoring tighter laws includes writers, backed by book publishers, and composers, backed by music publishers. They are generally opposed by the giant educational establishment, librarians, historians, and newspapers.

Although the Copyright Office started discussions about law revisions with various groups more than 10 years ago, the draft bill was not presented to Congress until last July. The bill was not passed, so Kaminstein revised it slightly. The second proposal was introduced last month.

The new bill would revolutionize the theory of copyright enforcement. Under the present law, a copyright lasts for 28 years with a right to renew for 28 years and a right to sell the entire 56-year term. Any unexpired term goes into the owner's estate. And a writer, for example, may lose his copyright by distributing a book without the familiar copyright designation or some other copyright notation, in a prominent place.

Under the new bill, the term is the life of the author plus 50 years. The author can sign away his rights for only the first 35 years and the unexpired 50-year rights would go directly to his widow and children, so they would not be subject to his debts—a provision similar to many life insurance policy provisions. He would not lose his copyright by publishing a book without imprinting the copyright notation.

In addition, the present dual system of copyright enforcement is swept away in favor of one uniform system, all under the statute. At present, authors can sue under the copyright law or under the rather amorphous theory that a pirating author is engaging in "unfair competition" with a legitimate author.

Authors would be given additional protection under the controversial manufacturing clause. At present, only 1,500 copies of a book written by an American but published abroad may be imported into this country. This limitation is supported by the powerful printers' unions, which fear the cheaper publishing costs in Europe and Asia.

The new bill would raise this limit to 3,500 copies. But, more importantly, if the limit was broken, the author would not lose his copyright as he does under the present law.

The biggest financial boon in the bill would go to composers and music publishers, especially in the popular music field.

Under the present law, music may be recorded on regular or LP records with a royalty payment of 2 cents per record sold. The payments are made by the record manufacturer to the copyright owner. Jukebox operators pay no royalties under a special exemption.

Under the new bill, record companies would pay 3 cents per record or 1 cent per minute on an LP. Jukebox operators would be required to pay royalties.

The most complex problems involve the use of copyrighted textbooks, dramas, musicals, and periodicals in schools and on educational TV.

The educational system has retained its right to make fair use of copyrighted works, but the new law does little to explain fair use or not for profit.

Is it fair use to make copies of 1 chart, 10 charts or 40 charts from a chemistry textbook that may have cost the publisher $10,000 to develop? To make 10 sets of 3 pages of laboratory experiments? To photocopy a 10-page section on hydrogen?

Is it not for profit when a university charges 20,000 students $1 apiece to hear Peter, Paul, and Mary perform copyrighted hit songs—if the money goes to the university library fund? Is it not for profit when a high school group sings Oklahoma songs to finance a trip to New York or to buy new uniforms for the football team?

Educational TV receives rather novel treatment in the proposed bill. It would permit an open circuit educational TV station, such as Washington channel 26, to broadcast a reading of a chapter from the late Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring" without paying royalties if the broadcast was during school hours for children's science studies—even if thousands of housewives also tuned in. This was done by a Boston radio station.

This provision for education could be expected to cause controversy when educational TV goes into the adult education field in night broadcasts.

When the first proposed bill was introduced last July, it had a provision to permit the Government to copyright its publications if an agency head thought a copyright would be in the public interest.

This would have reversed the present law.

Federal agencies supported the proposed provision, believing that many valuable Government reports never reach universities because the Government Printing Office does not have commercially oriented distribution facilities or a budget which permits expensive printing. The book publishers, they said, would invest money in printing and distribution, but only if they could be assured of protection against pirating by obtaining an assignment of a Government copyright.

However, newspapers, schools, historians, and other scholars argued successfully that an assigned Government copyright would make it difficult to quote Government reports because time and money would have to be spent to trace down successive copyright owners. This, they argued, would dampen enthusiasm for research and would counter the American tradition that Government studies belong to the public to use free.

The provision was taken out of the latest proposed bill but the Warren Report is an example of how private publishers can attempt to copyright Government publications. The report, of course, was not and could not be copyrighted.

Various publishers added prefaces, forewords, indexes, appendixes, maps, charts, and photos and copyrighted their versions of the report as an entity.

The proposed bill is before Congress and probably will undergo changes. No one knows whether it will emerge "not with a bang but a whimper." (A line from the Hollow Men, by T. S. Eliot, copyright 1925, 1930, and 1958 by Thomas Stearns Eliot; copyright 1934, 1936, and 1963 by Harcourt, Brace & Co. from T. S. Eliot, Collected Poems, 1909 to 1962: reproduced here without permission.

A Disabling Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the House very shortly will be receiving legislation from my Committee on the Judiciary with respect to a proposed amendment to the Constitution providing for succession to the Presidency and particularly dealing with the question of presidential disability. I personally consider this proposed constitutional amendment one of the real important challenges of this 89th Congress. I question the advisability of placing in the Constitution the proposed language because of its rigidity.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Wall Street Journal had a very exciting editorial which thoroughly sets forth the concern I have with respect to the proposed constitutional amendment. Under unanimous consent I place it in my remarks so that my colleagues who may not have had the opportunity to read it may have the benefit of the questions raised therein:

A DISABLING AMENDMENT

Since these columns have long urged some repair of the procedures for dealing with the succession to the Presidency, and particularly those dealing with the question of presidential disability, we wish we could commend the Bayh amendment to the Constitution which proposes to repair them.

Yet the more we reflect upon the objections raised by Senator DIRKSEN, the more we are persuaded that he is right. To adopt the Bayh amendment as it is now written, it seems to us, could be a serious mistake.

Like Senator DIRKSEN, we aren't objecting primarily to the substantive provisions of the proposed amendment, although there are some sections that strike us as dubious. What seems truly unwise is to freeze into the Constitution the details of procedure, making them difficult to alter under any circumstances, impossible to change in an emergency.

Take a look at the long and detailed Bayh amendment in an adjacent column. The first three sections are properly matters for constitutional consideration. The first and third simply restate the present law, providing for the Vice President to take over on the death or resignation of the President, and for the Vice President to act for the President whenever the President states that he is unable to perform his functions.

The second section provides that when the office of Vice President is vacant, for whatever cause, the President may nominate and both houses of Congress may confirm a new Vice President. Admittedly, the merits of this are debatable, but on the whole it strikes us as a sensible provision. In any event it is properly a constitutional question.

The fourth and fifth sections are something else. Here we find detailed procedures on how to decide when a President is unable to carry on. To put the onus of such a decision on the Vice President and the Cabinet, all of whom will have personal interests in the result, strikes us as of dubious wisdom. This question aside, however, it seems to us foolish—and possibly dangerous—to write such procedures into the Constitution where they may be altered only by a favorable vote of the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

It is not at all difficult to imagine an instance where these officers would be unable to agree, and where then Congress would be powerless to act. Conversely they could combine to oust a President, and Congress would be equally powerless to stay their action.

The provisions for restoring power to a temporarily disabled President are even worse. Here the amendment allows a 7-day hiatus in which the Vice President and the Cabinet may object, 7 days in which the Government might be paralyzed in a moment of great crisis.

And all this dangerous language is totally unnecessary. Article II of the original Constitution, while silent upon how the question of disability should be decided, quite plainly says "Congress may by law provide" for the case of "inability of both the President and Vice President." What can be done by legislation requires no constitutional amendment.

Nor should the one means be substituted for the other. The purpose of a constitution is to lay down principles and provide for the structure of government; in this, as the writers of the original document knew, a certain rigidity can be wise. The fundamentals of government ought not to be too readily changeable.

But a constitution cannot anticipate all the details of all the questions of the future. That is why those original draftsmen so often, and so wisely, included that phrase, "Congress may by law provide" for carrying out in an ever-changing life the details of government.

So it seems to us, as it does to Senator DIRKSEN, that we would be ill-advised to forget that distinction. To create a new office, a sort of substitute Vice President, will require a constitutional amendment. It might be useful also to reaffirm in this fashion the authority of Congress to make provision from time to time on the question of disability, so that there will be no question of the authority of the man called upon to perform the duties of the President.

But if we imagine that men can today foresee every possible eventuality and meet every possible contingency, the country may well regret it some 7 days in a distant May.

An Exception for the Kennedy Film?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the USIA film, "John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," is the subject of special legislation this session which would allow its showing to the American people. The following editorial from the March 30 Minneapolis Tribune dispassionately outlines the principal objection to this proposal:

AN EXCEPTION FOR THE KENNEDY FILM?

It may be a lost cause, given the Democrats' overwhelming majority in Congress. But until the die is irretrievably cast, reasonable voices should continue to question the special legislation proposed to allow the showing of a U.S. propaganda film in this country.

The film, "John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," was made for foreign showing by the U.S. Information Agency. It is a highly emotional, extremely effective propaganda film.

The word "propaganda" needs to be stressed, because that sums up the purpose for which the film was made, and the role it plays. It is not a cool, objective, "warts and all" history of the late President.

Perhaps it will be argued that since John F. Kennedy is no longer personally a political power in the national arena, the film's propagandistic nature can be ignored. (Party partisans of, or opponents of, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY might have unspoken thoughts on this score.)

But those who object to the special legislation are not concerned about the Kennedy legend itself; they are uneasy about providing still another precedent for the domestic use of government-sponsored propaganda films. An earlier exception was made to allow the domestic showing of a film recording Mrs. Kennedy's Asian journey.

The basic legislation which limited USIA's propaganda work to the foreign field was wise; the unease many feel at setting precedents for similar Government activities at home should not be shrugged aside.

The Kennedy film is a good film; it is not unique or earthshaking. There is no overwhelming reason why it has to be shown here.

The Governors Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, "The Governors Speak," which appeared in the Indianapolis News of March 26, 1965, points to evidence of discontent which is felt in many quarters with the Great Society's programs. This editorial is well worth reading and well worth remembering, no matter on which side of the aisle the reader may sit.

The editorial follows:

THE GOVERNORS SPEAK

Evidence that all is not well within the ranks of the Great Society emerged from recent executive committee meetings of the Governors' conference held in Las Vegas, Nev.

By a margin of almost 2 to 1, the Nation's Governors today are Democrats, a statistic often cited as proof of increasing liberalism and an asserted groundswell of popular opinion toward welfarism and assorted Federal panaceas.

It appears, however, that the Governors themselves do not agree. In fact, they passed a resolution at their recent gathering condemning the growth of the Federal bureaucracy, and focusing particular fire on that alleged godsend from Washington, Federal aid.

The Governors pointed out that "the Federal share of total taxes collected equals 70 percent," that States and localities are pressed for revenues, and that the Great Society proposes to increase both the Federal take and the strain on local governments. The resolution states:

"The latest Federal budget lists approximately 85 local grants-in-aid activities and as a consequence these programs are beginning to exceed the level of manageability.

"The dollar value of grants-in-aid programs has increased from $3.1 billion a decade ago to approximately $10.6 billion this year, and

the continued growth of such programs makes State and local governments even more dependent upon the Federal Government.

"Such programs often force the States to send tax moneys excessively to certain areas in order to match the allocation of Federal funds."

To avoid this cycle of increasing Federal power and decreasing State vitality the Governors urge a program of tax credits, releasing revenue to the States outright without Federal interference with their use. The resolution notes politely that this step is urged by "certain economic advisers of the present administration." It might also have noted that it is the approach recommended last fall by Barry Goldwater, for which he was roundly condemned by liberal politicians and publicists.

Whoever recommends it, the idea is a good one, since it would simultaneously impose a check on Federal expansion, restore vigor to the States, and halt the advance of bureaucratic controls. Unfortunately, it is just that set of reasons which makes many planners in Washington opposed to this and all other "tax-credit" ideas. Although these spokesmen talk a great deal about "aid," their real concern is to establish Federal control, and they are hostile to any program which does not include that feature.

The alleged demands of the States for Federal assistance are often cited as reasons for Federal grant-in-aid programs. The Governors' resolution makes it clear the States do not like such programs, and do not like the dependence on Washington resulting from them. As with American farmers, discussed on this page recently, the asserted "demand" for Federal services is a fiction created by the bureaucrats themselves, to advance their program of increasing expenditure and intervention.

The Science of Oceanography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the important new science of oceanography is coming more and more into its own each year. In the Congress, our colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman BOB WILSON, is one of the most knowledgeable in this field. On March 10, he gave a very penetrating and thoughtful speech outlining the opportunities ahead in oceanography. He knows what is being done in this field by our Government and he has some highly constructive suggestions on how to improve what we are doing and to streamline the way we do it. He has introduced legislation which would carry out his ideas. I would like to include his recent remarks at this time:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BOB WILSON, REPUBLICAN, OF CALIFORNIA, MEMBER, HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, TO AIAA/USN MARINE SYSTEMS AND ASW CONFERENCE, MARCH 10, 1965

Ladies and gentlemen, needless to say, I'd rather be there enjoying San Diego's climate than here in Washington today. Being an enthusiastic chamber of commerce member I will bet 100 to 1 with the meteorologists present that the weather is better there than here.

Then, too, I would have thoroughly enjoyed welcoming each one of you personally to our dynamic growing area which has become a magnet for so many oceanographic and related scientific endeavors. It is fitting that many of you are identified with space activities, since San Diego, which developed the original Atlas booster and Mercury vehicles, has been vitally concerned with developments in outer space. And we likewise share a mutual interest in oceanography. The pioneering role of Scripps Institute of Oceanography and the expanded activities of the Naval Electronics Laboratory and other Federal agencies here become our credentials in this field. We accept with you the challenge of exploring and harnessing the power and benefits of the ocean and the unexplored lands beneath it.

It is fitting that many of the experts in the field of outer space are now turning their eyes from the distant stars to the oceans lapping at their feet. The unexplored depths of the sea have become known as inner space and to my notion that is a fitting name if for no other reason than it can help to explain the parallel problems that pertain to both areas.

In less than 10 years, man's experience has progressed in outer space from a simple grapefruit-sized satellite to actual manned space travel plus television surface contact with the Moon and the imminent closeup views of Mars.

There can be no question that progress in space has stemmed primarily from a concentration of interest by the Federal Government, which replaced a proliferation of interest both governmental and private. For my part I believe the vast potential of inner space holds so much more promise and potential than a trip to the stars that I am impatient to eliminate governmental diffusion. It is time to coordinate and channel the resources of the Federal Government into a program that will turn the plans and dreams of many of you into realities.

There is no question in my mind that the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under the Eisenhower administration—October 1, 1958—is the benchmark from which progress in outer space will always be measured. I believe it is time for the formation of a similar agency concentrating in the area of inner space.

I have introduced legislation again this year, similar to my original bill of last year, which calls for the formation of a National Oceanographic Agency. Under the peculiar techniques of nomenclature this would be known as NOA, an illiteration no self-respecting seadog could object to. NOA is needed if we are to realize the dramatic potential of oceanography.

As did its sister agency, NASA, the new NOA would absorb related functions from many different agencies of the Federal Government and give them a definition of purpose and concentration of programs that would produce far more progress for every dollar invested.

As a politician, let me give you some of the political reasons why oceanography has lagged on the national scene. Most departments and agencies of Government today look to Capitol Hill for specific sponsorship of their roles and missions. Committees of Congress are given the responsibility of overseeing the activities of these departments and agencies. For example, the Defense Department looks to the Armed Services Committee for guidance and legislative championing. The Commerce Department must gain the approval and, in fact, the support of the Commerce Committees. In most cases, the committee members become expert in these specific areas of interest and in doing so become champions of that particular cause.

Yet, poor little oceanography with its program parceled out among 22 different bureaus, including 9 departments or agencies, is truly an orphan with little chance to grow to meaningful maturity. Space exploration would have suffered the same fate had not it been for the formation of NASA, plus a new committee in Congress with primary jurisdiction over NASA's activities. With a champion on the Hill, you can be sure the cause of oceanography would advance more quickly, with more meaningful results.

Now I recognize that opposition to such a concept is politically inevitable. In the first place, many of the oceanographic activities in various bureaus, agencies, and departments have their own advocates within such units and resistance to change out of fear of the unknown is inevitable and even understandable.

NASA faced the same problem during its days of incubation. The military departments, for example, loudly protested the loss of some of their more exciting projects to a new nonmilitary agency. Other boards and committees threw roadblocks in the way but reason finally prevailed and NASA became a reality with attendant results.

We can expect and, in fact, are already experiencing doubts and verbal roadblocks to the formation of NOA. Yet, I submit that those who fear the unknown prospect of giving up oceanographic activities and prerogatives within a given agency are being provincial in their outlook. Such fears are for the most part unfounded. There is no intention to remove from the Navy Department, for example, those oceanographic activities that directly relate to military needs. There is no doubt in my mind that on the contrary the Navy will find that a combined agency will accomplish more in her behalf in military developments than she could, going it alone. Many programs that are integral within existing agencies would not be carved out of that agency, at least in most instances. For example, Navy, Air Force, and even Army still continue space research, although at a reduced level, despite NASA's prime role in this area.

Unfortunately, one of the major roadblocks to the adoption of a new agency is the matter of committee jurisdiction. The committees in Congress would likely be hesitant to approve by themselves the diminution of their authority in the field of oceanography. Frankly, I expect the creation of this new Agency to be bogged down in a legislative morass unless a clear-cut directive from the White House gives the proposal the solid footing it needs.

As a matter of fact, I am convinced that action in the field of oceanography leading to the formation of a new agency hinges to a great extent on Presidential sponsorship. The new Agency would be a creature of the executive branch of the Government, therefore, the Chief Executive must be the enthusiastic sponsor of a deparmental reorganization plan involving oceanography. This does not mean the creation of a new Cabinet post, but it does mean a reshuffling of overlapping authority in this vital field if we are to have the necessary progress.

It is incredible to me that such an agency has not been in effect for years. There can be no question that the potential benefit to mankind far exceeds the probable benefit from space exploration. This is not to downgrade the exploration of outer space. I enthusiastically support research projects in this area, but the benefit to mankind in terms of material wealth harvested from the sea and the ocean floor makes Federal participation on a grand scale in this area a sound business proposition.

Perhaps this sounds like strange philosophy from a member of a political party that advocates less Federal action in most fields of human endeavor and more reliance on State and local governments. There is nothing incongruous about my position on this. In fact, it jibes very well with the

classic interpretation of constitutional rights.

Clearly, the seas around our borders are a Federal possession, a Federal responsibility, and a Federal opportunity. Even the most conservative constitutionalists can fully support an all-out federally sponsored oceanographic program. This is not to say, of course, that industry or States or communities should not be encouraged to make their contribution to progress also. It is a big ocean and Uncle Sam should be the first to say "Come on in, the water's fine."

Federal participation in oceanography is heightened by the implications of modern military science. Control of the seas has always been a classic goal of the leading nations of the world. Up to recent times, this has meant control of the sealanes for surface ocean traffic.

All of us know now that the new dimension of depth has compounded the military problem and made so-called control of the sea ever so much more difficult Competition among nations in this area has, frankly, been the greatest prod that oceanography has had in its lifetime. Much of the remarkable progress made in recent years must be laid directly at the door of the Navy and to a lesser degree the other military departments. Expenditures for deep submergence research, sonar, and ocean floor mapping have had a distinct military significance. The Honorable Robert W. Morse, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, announced to Congress yesterday that the Navy's oceanographic program has increased 9 percent in the past year, and a request for $129 million is included in the new Navy budget for 1966.

This is a healthy sum of money. Why, then, my interest in making a nonmilitary agency the chief advocate of an oceanographic program. For one reason, the orphan, oceanography has grown out of his adolescence and is ready for long pants. The military must, of course, continue to have a dominant role and interest in oceanography just as it has in space activities. We must not, however, fence off the oceans to give them the status of a battlefield for this would deny to our people the maximum beneficial use of this enormous asset.

Right now I give full credit to the Department of Defense for its recognition of the need for coordination in this field. The Inter-Agency Oceanographic Committee, originated under the experienced and capable hands of Dr. Wakelin, and sparkplugged by Comdr. Bob Abel, has achieved remarkable results in tying together a lot of loose ends and eliminating at least some duplication of effort in this field. I must give credit to Adm. Denys Knoll, Chief Oceanographer of the Navy, and his predecessor Adm. Ed Stephan, who despite their military leanings and the mission of their office, have had the good sense to recognize and foster nonmilitary potentials as they developed under their military programs.

Industry is awakening to the profit potential of oceanography and this is one of the healthiest and most encouraging signs of real maturity. When science, through its laboratory experiments and computations, develops processes and products that have a profit potential, all mankind becomes the beneficiary in one degree or another. I recognize that the interest of many defense industries is excited and spurred on by the prospect of additional Federal funds, but I am not critical of the interest. As a member of the Armed Services Committee of Congress I have seen many military-developed sinews of war become the muscles of commerce. Who can forget that the 707 or DC-8, that brought many of you to San Diego would still be in the dreams or on the drawing board of engineers and scientists had it not been for military necessity. Who can doubt that the military oceanographic programs of today will lead to a better life for future generations?

Getting back to the problems of arousing effective political interest and action in oceanography, I would like to point out to you that great interest has been shown in recent years by Members of Congress. In the 88th Congress, which concluded last December, over 50 bills were introduced to benefit the oceanographic program. Admittedly, most of them died aborning, but the fact that so many were introduced is a sign that progress is being made. If you will pardon an alliteration: With so many "political eggs" being spawned, at least a few are bound to make it back to the open sea. The efforts of Senator MAGNUSON and my colleagues, Congressmen HERBERT BONNER, of North Carolina, and ALTON LENNON, of North Carolina, HASTINGS KEITH of Massachusetts, TOM PELLY, of Washington, and especially GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, and WILLIAM MAILLIARD, of California, deserve your enthusastic appreciation and support.

If you will allow me now to move from the political into the educational arena, I would like to make an obvious point regarding the importance of increased educational activity in this field.

It is amazing how few universities offer programs leading to degrees in ocean sciences or ocean engineering. I venture to say more courses in restaurant management or stage designing are offered to our young people. There can be no doubt that more textbooks have been printed on finger painting than oceanography. This is hard to comprehend, because no field could offer young people the exciting prospects of exploration, danger, sportsmanship, recreation, and remuneration as does oceanography.

James Webb, the Administrator of NASA, has taken a bold step in advocating grants of $25 million for predoctoral training in space research. Over 185 universities are working on NASA-sponsored research projects. An estimated 3,000 graduate students will be engaged in research and advanced training in space sciences this year. What a contrast with our own field of interest.

You and I have reason to be concerned about the unrealized potential of oceanography and the importance of a concentration of effort in this field if we are to make significant progress.

In conclusion, let me tell you today that I am optimistic for increased Federal recognition of your problem and a vastly expanded Federal interest and acceptance of responsibility. I would be less than human if I did not tell you that I am envious of your prospects for the future in this exciting and rewarding endeavor. Were it not for the 2-year contract which I recently received from the electorate, I might be tempted to join you. In lieu of this, I assure you of my continuing interest and emphatic support of your chosen profession.

Who knows, if my contract is not renewed, I may be knocking at your door for a job on the ocean bottom.

Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to note that the City Council of Indianapolis, Ind., has seen fit to endorse the proposals by President Lyndon Johnson aimed at guaranteeing to all citizens their constitutional right to vote. Accordingly, I place in the RECORD at this point the text of a resolution passed unanimously by the council on March 15, 1965. Signed copies, bearing the official seal of the city of Indianapolis, have been sent to President Johnson, Senator VANCE HARTKE, Senator BIRCH BAYH, and myself.

The resolution follows:

"RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the citizens of the city of Indianapolis that Negro American citizens, in striving to gain their rights to register and vote, in the city of Selma, Ala., have been denied the right to peaceably aassemble to petition their government for redress of grievances, and their right to register and vote, and that violence has erupted in their attempts to further said rights; and

"Whereas President Lyndon Baines Johnson has indicated to the citizens of the United States his firm resolve for Federal action to guarantee the right of Negroes or of any other citizens, who seek to redress their grievances, to peaceably assemble, and the further guarantee of all citizens' rights to register and vote in the election of public officials, and said President Lyndon B. Johnson has indicated that legislation will be proposed to Congress to guarantee said rights, promptly and effectively: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, Ind.*, That the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, on behalf of the citizens of this city, does hereby support the proposals of President Johnson for prompt and effective Federal action to safeguard the lives of all persons who seek to register and vote, and to guarantee to these persons their right to register and vote, and that the common council instruct the city clerk of the city of Indianapolis to forward a copy of this resolution to President Lyndon B. Johnson, Senator R. VANCE HARTKE, Senator BIRCH BAYH, and Congressman ANDREW JACOBS, JR."

Adopted by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis this 15th day of March 1965.

Joseph C. Wallace, President; Max E. Brydenthal, Rev. James Cummings, Albert O. Deluse, Harold J. Egenes, Thomas C. Hasbrook, Rufus C. Kuykendall, R. Thomas McGill, Daniel P. Moriarty, Members.

Attest:

ANGELINE ALLSTATT,
City Clerk.

M. MAY SEAY,
Deputy City Clerk.

And the mayor of the city of Indianapolis, Ind., joins with the common council in the above and foregoing special resolution.

JOHN J. BARTON,
Mayor.

Textiles and Two-Price Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from my hometown newspaper, the Index-Journal on April 2 is excellent and timely in every respect. This splendid editorial points out the need to eliminate forever two-price

cotton. I commend this editorial to the attention of every Member of the Congress and to the people of the country:

TEXTILES AND TWO-PRICE COTTON

Much textile history—past and future—is contained in this simple statement by William E. Reid at the recent meeting of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute:

"We have one-price cotton, and it must be retained."

He had reference to the Agricultural Act of 1964, whose intent is that "upland cotton produced in the United States shall be made available for domestic use at a price which is not in excess of the price at which such cotton is made available for export."

With these words the two-price cotton system was ended, at least until July 31, 1966. They represent victory in a great struggle going back a decade or more and reaching into the highest levels of government, Now, as Mr. Reid said, the industry seeks to retain the one-price system in some form that will allow American textile plants to buy American cotton at no more than the rest of the world must pay for it.

The complicated situation goes back to the price support programs begun in the great depression of the 1930's. It began restricting the textile industry with congressional legislation in 1939 forbidding American mills from purchasing foreign cotton except in minute quantities.

It became acute in 1956 when an export subsidy was provided to keep artificially-supported American cotton from losing its world market. This subsidy represented the difference between the American support price and the world market price. It varied some, but was set at 8½ cents a pound in 1961 and remained at that level until last year.

It was this subsidy which created what became known as the two-price system, one price for the world market and another price 8½ cents a pound higher for American mills. This means that an American textile manufacturer had to pay $42.50 more for a 500-pound bale of American cotton than his foreign competitor had to pay.

Since raw cotton accounts for better than half the cost of producing a yard of typical cotton cloth, the effect of this is obvious.

The two-price system came at a particularly bad time for the American textile industry. Modern textile plants had been built by the U.S. Government following World War II to replace those destroyed by our Armed Forces during the war in such countries as Japan and Germany. These new plants poured a great flood of textiles into the world market as the pent-up need created by the war was becoming an oversupply. Add to this the much cheaper labor available to those countries, and the situation became critical for the American industry.

It would take a book—and a big one at that—to recount the paths the American textile industry followed seeking relief. Some success was won in voluntary quota agreements with such countries as Japan, but as one country's imports leveled off those from another area such as Hong Kong started up.

The chief concern was over the two-price cotton system, however. There were four possible remedies:

1. Eliminate the price-support program.
2. Eliminate the export subsidy.
3. Place an offsetting fee to equal the 8½ cents a pound of the export subsidy on the cotton content of textile goods imported into this country.
4. Provide an equalization fee on cotton used by the American manufacturer, enabling him to purchase American cotton at what, in effect, would be the world price.

Method one and two would have meant immediate ruin to the approximately 600,000 small and often marginal farmers among the 800,000 American cotton producers. Nobody thought Congress would do either, and no serious effort was made to have this done.

A tremendous effort, lasting for years, was made to get an import fee on the cotton content of imported textile goods.

The Tariff Commission has the authority to effect this if, under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Secretary of Agriculture presents evidence in support of his findings that cotton textile imports are having an adverse effect on Government cotton programs. It should be noted that the findings must be that the Government cotton program is adversely affected, not that the textile industry is being crippled.

The Secretaries of Agriculture under Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy made such reports of findings, but in both instances the Tariff Commission denied the request.

All administrative paths thus being closed, there was but one approach left—to seek congressional approval for an equalization payment to offset the export fee. The American textile industry has historically opposed such legislation, and it sought it then only as a last recourse to eliminate the intolerable two-price system as fundamental to the cold realities of the current situation.

President Kennedy, calling textile problems "serious and deeprooted," sought administrative relief. That failing, he sought legislation, commenting, "The inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry, for which a solution must be found in the near future." Johnson continued that support.

Luther Hodges, then Secretary of Commerce and a former textile executive, said "Our Government is actually destroying a basic industry essential to our economy and national defense."

Mountainous accumulations of statistics support this position.

Hearings were begun in 1962 on a one-price cotton bill, and it was passed April 8, 1964. It provides certificates for cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation equal to the amount of the export subsidy. The certificates can be issued anywhere along the line of handling, except to the producer, for cotton used in this country.

The law runs until July 31, 1966. New legislation will be necessary if it it so be continued, but the form it will take has not yet become clear. There is some support for a direct payment to the producer, which would eliminate subsequent subsidies and payments.

The textile industry has resented, and rightly so, the implication that it is being paid a subsidy when it buys American cotton at the same price it is sold to foreign competitors. The two-price cotton system was not of its making, but grew out of the cotton price-support program, which grew into the prohibition of purchases of foreign-grown cotton, which grew into the export subsidy.

It wants neither to be favored nor discriminated against.

The long period of uncertainty between the proposal of legislation and its enactment was a trying one for the industry, since no provision was made for an equalization fee on cotton held in the form of manufactured goods. There could be another such period if legislation to continue the one-price system, in whatever form it takes, is delayed too long.

Voting Law Could Create Problems in Apache County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, anyone who does not believe that the Johnson administration's proposed voting rights legislation poses serious corrolary problems should read the following article from the Phoenix, Ariz., Gazette of April 1, 1965.

The article follows:

VOTING LAW COULD CREATE PROBLEMS IN APACHE COUNTY

Imagine—

A government wherein officials who set rates and levy taxes are themselves exempt from taxation.

Those who have power to establish laws and regulations are immune to the laws.

A near-totalitarian government in some foreign lands? Actually, under certain conditions, it could be Apache County, Ariz., if the Voting Rights Act of 1965 becomes a law and if its provisions are applied to Apache County.

U.S. Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach has said the law will apply to Apache County because: (1) Arizona has a "test or device" as a prerequisite for voting; and (2) less than 50 percent of persons of voting age residing in the county were registered on November 1, 1964.

Apache County has an estimated population of 36,000 and about 25,000 are Indians; with the Navajo and Apache reservations and the Apache National Forest comprising almost 75 percent of the total area of the county. Therein lies the cause for concern among some Apache County residents.

County Attorney Richard Greer explained:

If all Indians of voting age were registered, regardless of whether they could read or write, and if these Indians voted in a bloc, the Indians could outvote others in the county about 2½ to 1.

Supervisor districts are located in such a manner that the Indians could elect two of three supervisors, and thus control the board. This majority could set the tax rate at any figure desired, with the knowledge that the Indians live on Federal reservations and therefore pay no State, county, school or city taxes. The tax, set by the Indian majority, would then apply only to non-Indians.

The Indians could elect a Navajo sheriff, for example, who wouldn't have jurisdiction over a single Navajo; they could elect a Navajo lawyer as county attorney, and he would have no criminal jurisdiction over the Navajos.

Greer calls this "representation without taxation." He added:

"By voting in a bloc, the Indians could control Apache County. They could set a tax rate so high as to ruin businessmen and ranchers, discourage business expansion and actually drive population away from the county."

A State official agreed with Greer, and he told the Gazette:

"This actually could kill Apache County."

Greer continued:

"Let's consider what might happen if Federal registrars come in and register Indians left and right without too close a check on even basic requirements.

"First, if there is an obvious case of vote fraud on the reservation, say someone voted twice, I couldn't prosecute the offender. The State of Arizona and its courts have no criminal jurisdiction on the reservation.

"Second, how could residence requirements ever be checked? Even many of the Navajos in the four-corners area don't know whether they live in Arizona, Utah, or New Mexico. And we couldn't go on the reservation to check without permission of tribal leaders.

"The laws must be changed to apply the same measure of laws for Indians as for non-Indians.

"I know of no one here who is opposed to the registration of Indians, or to Indians voting, but the Indians should be qualified under State law just like the residents of any other county."

It is estimated there are about 18,000 residents of voting age in Apache County, about 13,000 Indians and 5,000 non-Indians. The 1964 registration was 4,697 and it is estimated that 1,800 of this total were Indians. The 1964 presidential vote was 2,042 for Johnson and 1,849 for Goldwater.

Chief problem in registration has been the vast distances between villages on the sprawling Navajo Reservation, which takes up almost all the area north of U.S. 66 in Apache County. In places, Navajos would have to travel 80 to 129 miles in order to register.

Mrs. Virgie Heap, county recorder, has said she has not sent more deputy registrars to the reservation because of the conflict between State and Federal laws. She actually would have no authority over registrars on the reservation, but would be responsible for their actions, it was noted.

Under provisions of the Voting Rights Act, the Federal Government could send Federal registrars into Apache County to register voters. The State's literacy test could not be applied, under this Federal law, and there would be no requirement other than age and residence for registration.

A Difference in Emphasis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, John A. Penello, regional director of the National Labor Relations Board in Baltimore, recently rendered a decision which graphically illustrates the use and abuse of propaganda with racial overtones in a dispute between an employer and a union attempting to organize his employees.

Mr. Penello's decision overriding the objections of the employer was rendered on September 9, 1964, and the union was certified as the employees' representative by the National Labor Relations Board on January 8, 1965.

The following article on the matter appeared in the Washington Afro-American on February 16, 1965, and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

FROM THE WORKBENCH

(By Clarence Mitchell)

APPLAUSE FOR MR. PENELLO

A recent decision of the National Labor Relations Board in the laundry industry presents an interesting treatment of what happens in a labor dispute when civil rights questions arise.

Usually, civil rights problems arise because employers try to prevent their employees from joining a union by saying that this will lead to social equality. One of the earliest examples was a case in which circulars were distributed saying, "If you want a n - - - r for a boss, vote for the CIO and get him."

Another famous example was the picture of President James B. Carey, of the IUE–CIO, dancing with a beautiful lady. The lady was an African and the dancing occurred at an international affair in Europe. This picture was given front-page publicity in Mississippi for the purpose of killing an organizing drive that was in progress at the time.

USE OF DOG PHOTO PROTESTED

The laundry case involves use of racial matters by employees and their supporters. The employer charged that the union seeking to organize the workers used signs showing dogs with bared fangs, placards showing police brutality, and a fire hydrant and hose beside a fat, bald man with a club and money bag couldn't stop us and neither can hoses stop us, and neither can the boss.

The employer charged that this was a deliberate and sustained effort to exacerbate and inflame racial emotions, "thereby preventing the attainment of the high election standards which the [National Labor Relations] Board has for so long demanded."

The opinion of John A. Penello, regional director of the NLRB, was the basis for the National Board's decision. Mr. Penello's opinion contained these comments:

"There is a vital difference between the basic themes of these two campaigns. In each, the idea that unions support racial integration and equality was hammered home, yet the purpose of such emphasis was different.

"LITERATURE DESIGNED TO INFLAME

"The campaign literature distributed by the employer * * * was designed solely to inflame racial hatred and to engender a conflict between colored and white workers in a southern plant.

"The employer attempted to take advantage of the latent prejudices of his white workers by equating unionism with integrated working conditions, knowing that such conditions would be distasteful to the white workers.

"A picture of a white union leader dancing with a colored woman implied that unionism would bring in its wake social and physical race mixing."

Speaking of the laundry case, Mr. Penello pointed out that the basic theme of the literature was that colored persons had banded together to overcome their de facto inferiority in American society. The action was described as:

"Unionism, according to the theme of the campaign, is another method of concerted action which colored persons may use to better their lot in society. Thus, a distinction must be drawn between racial propaganda designed to inflame racial hatred and set the tone of a union campaign as a battle of one race against another and racial propaganda designed to encourage racial pride and concerted action."

CONSCIENCE HAS BEEN STIRRED

This case shows how deeply the national conscience has been stirred by efforts to promote civil rights. The entire opinion written by Mr. Penello shows a grasp of the subtle differences between using racial themes to promote discord and using illustrations of how other oppressed people freed themselves for the purpose of instilling courage and determination among those seeking better conditions for themselves and their fellows.

A few years ago it is entirely possible that this case would have been decided against the employees. The person making the decision would have been unable to see where there was any difference between an employer showing an interracial couple dancing and a labor union showing dogs attacking civil rights workers.

Mr. Penello is to be congratulated for his decision, but the advocates of civil rights must remember that even now there are not very many government officials like him. It may well be that more person-to-person talks will make it possible to reduce the number of themes used on signs.

It is also important to continue to stress the fact that the civil rights struggle is interracial. No one could suggest that a sign showing colored and white pickets being carried off to jail together in Mississippi was designed to inflame race hate.

How the Handicapped Are Overcoming Barriers to Employment in My Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, a young constituent of mine, Miss Marybeth Meffert, a senior at Boise High School, will be in Washington the latter part of this month to attend the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Miss Meffert won this trip to Washington by taking first place in the Idaho 1965 Ability Counts Contest with her essay with the above caption.

We, in Idaho, are very proud of Marybeth and her achievement. We are also proud of the other young people who competed for the award she has won. There can be, unfortunately, just one State winner in Idaho in this contest; but the real winners are those about whom these young people wrote—the handicapped. Through Marybeth's and other essays on this topic, a wider understanding is gained about the handicapped and the very real contribution they can, and do, make to our society.

It is with great anticipation that I am looking forward to meeting Marybeth when she arrives in Washington.

Her prize-winning essay follows:

HOW THE HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY

(By Marybeth Meffert, Boise High School)

Not many years ago, the handicapped were seldom seen working competitively with the able bodied. They were isolated, kept away from social contacts, and rejected by society. Employers did not know how to measure the potentials of a handicapped person, and unfortunately they often drew their own conclusions, based on ignorance and prejudice—negative ones.

The handicapped themselves deserve all the laurels for breaking through the barrier of misconceptions and the biased opinions of the ignorant. It was not easy. It took the courage and determination of individuals who refused to give up; who said, "I will," when society said, "You can't." Often through sheer will power alone, severely disabled persons proved to society that they could take their place in the community as valuable and self-reliant citizens.

Any handicapped person should be able to be employed if he is given the necessary training and proper job placement. Proper job placement is especially important when considered from the viewpoint that anyone, even an able-bodied person, is handicapped if he is placed in a job situation for which he is not equipped. A disabled person should not be considered handicapped in respect to his job if he is capable of doing the work.

Here in Idaho, Live, Inc., has placed approximately 40 handicapped persons per year on the competitive labor market since 1949. Given the chance that time, training, and proper job placement afforded, these individuals have proved themselves to be competent and resourceful.

This year, 13 blind students are attending Idaho colleges. Their textbooks are records with the labels printed in braille. These young people have amazed their fellow students and the members of the faculty with their self-sufficiency. They have also earned the admiration of their school, their community, and their State. They are young men and women who, in spite of their handicap, are learning to take their place in the world of tomorrow.

Handicapped persons are at more of a disadvantage in States such as Idaho than in areas where there is a great deal of manufacturing. Being made up mostly of rural communities, Idaho has little industry, which has often proved to be a source of employment for the handicapped. In communities such as ours an imaginative approach must often be used to find work for a disabled person.

But there are jobs, and for each of these jobs there is a handicapped person who can successfully fill the position. A blind, partially deaf man skillfully handweaves rugs, though his eyes will never see their beauty. A woman who cannot stand because of an orthopedic hip ailment sits, and her fingers fashion lovely wind chimes. A man in a wheelchair sits in the courthouse, administering driver's license tests. A rodeo rider proves to be tough competition in the calf-roping event, despite his two artificial legs. It was not easy for these people, nor is it easy for the other handicapped like them who are striving for independence though they are disabled. These individuals are living testimonies to the fact that handicapped people can lead useful, productive lives.

Once employers would not hire the disabled because it disturbed them to have a handicapped person around. Handicapped individuals who have proved their capabilities deserve the credit for changing employers' opinions. Now the nearly unanimous viewpoint of employers is: "I do not object to hiring the handicapped if they can do the work."

Employers who give the handicapped a chance to prove themselves are seldom sorry. Statistics show that the handicapped make the most reliable employees, having less absenteeism than others.[1]

Because of the fine examples set by handicapped workers, the barrier of employer prejudice is quickly melting away. In this way disabled persons are helping society to overcome its handicap—crippling prejudice and blinding misconceptions.

Yet there is more to be done. Here in Idaho there is a waiting list of handicapped people who need jobs. There are inadequate funds to meet the needs of the State in giving these people the training they need and seeing that they obtain suitable jobs. Progress has been made, but it is not enough. Obstacles have crumbled and fallen away, but there loom more barriers ahead that are yet to be overcome. Judging by the past record of the handicapped in my community, I feel sure they will remain dauntless and undefeated no matter how formidable those barriers may be.

[1] Wishik, Samuel M., M.D., "How To Help Your Handicapped Child," Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 219, p. 23.

Fourteen Lost in Transit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, contrary to reports of Washington, D.C., newspapers, California growers have been and are making extraordinary efforts to recruit farm labor—from all over the country.

They recruit and advertise in almost every State within the continental limits. Every State employment agency has been requested to refer any available worker to California. The Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and others have been trying desperately to recruit and force all governmental agencies to recruit to prove their theory "that those big city people, unemployed from factories and processing plants, and drawing regular generous unemployment compensation, will move to California to work on farms for 3 or 4 months each year during harvest seasons."

The following is an accurate account of a recent recruiting effort. The account is from the Salinas Californian newspaper, March 31, 1965. The results of this extraordinary recruitment effort are typical.

By this time, most of these recruits have probably quit the farmwork and are competing for jobs against local domestic restaurant workers and common laborers:

[From the Salinas (Calif.) Californian, Mar. 31, 1965]

FOURTEEN LOST IN TRANSIT: MIDWEST FARM RECRUITS ON JOB

Seventy-four out of 118 field workers recruited by Growers Farm Labor Association of Salinas east of the Mississippi River last week are on the job in the valley's fields today.

The men were recruited in the St. Louis, Springfield, and Joplin areas of Missouri and around Kansas City, Kans. All were unemployed when recruited. Most said that they were, or had been, farmworkers.

When the three buses bringing the men West arrived in Salinas over the weekend, 104 men were aboard. Fourteen had been lost in transit. What happened to the 30 who apparently didn't go to work after arriving in town is anyone's guess.

The new farmworkers, in groups ranging in size from 5 to 15, are currently employed by California Coastal Farms, Jack T. Baillie Co., Salinas Marketing Cooperative, Bruce Church, Inc., Harden Farms, and Merrill Farms. Most of them are thinning lettuce. Some are harvesting asparagus and cauliflower or transplanting celery. They are residing in labor camps in the Salinas and Gonzales areas.

Cost of transporting the men to Salinas and feeding them en route, according to the association, was $52.60 each. The men are expected to pay back their fares in weekly installments.

Interstate recruitment is one of the criteria set forth by the Labor Department that growers must meet in order to remain eligible for the use of foreign supplemental farmworkers under Public Law 414.

Another criterion is the payment of a minimum wage of $1.40 per hour effective April 1.

Local growers have not yet officially announced whether they'll start paying $1.40 Thursday. And Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, who toured the valley last week, hasn't announced what disposition he has decided to make of the local request for 5,100 foreign supplemental workers through April 30.

One major lettuce grower-shipper, Bud Antle, Inc., recently announced that it is going to use an all-domestic work force and not push for workers under Public Law 414.

Jack Bias, executive vice president of the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association and E. J. Raffetto, president of the California-Arizona Farm Labor Association, are reportedly conferring with Labor Department officials in Washington, D.C., today about the minimum wage requirement. Bias last week asked Wirtz to delay imposition of the $1.40 minimum wage.

Racing to the Moon: If We Do Not Win, Things May Be Rough for Us Here on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of our outstanding success with the Ranger and Gemini programs in NASA, it is important to note with sober outlook the importance of our space program to our national security. Mr. Roscoe Drummond has aptly described the seriousness of our space effort in his Washington Post article of March 28, 1965. The essential points which Mr. Drummond makes, bear reiteration to the American public for our race to the moon is certainly not a scientific stunt but a serious step-by-step program to establish and maintain our country's preeminence and security in this new environment:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 28, 1965]

RACING TO THE MOON: IF WE DON'T WIN, THINGS MAY BE ROUGH FOR US HERE ON EARTH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The race to the moon continues and, whether we relish it or not, the United States is in it to the end.

The outcome is not in sight, but Gemini's magnificent, two-astronaut performance, plus Ranger's precise lunar photography, show that after our tardy start we are on the way.

We are still behind the Russians, for a bad reason; we failed to grasp the worldwide psychological impact of outer space exploration.

We did not even grasp it in 1957 when the great Soviet first, Sputnik I, went into orbit. We failed to realize that at stake was the reputation of American science, the genius of American industry and the capac-

ity of our free institutions to seize and respond to the challenge.

Instead, too many in high places poohpoohed it. One of the most influential officials remarked while millions of people listened to Sputnik's signals: "How ridiculous. Nothing more than tossing a basketball into the air."

Not that nothing was being done, but for the most part it was business as usual, science as usual; nothing urgent, nothing galvanic—and the Soviets raced on. We did not get really moving until 1961 when Congress made a lunar landing in this decade a national objective.

We are catching up. We may be nearer to even in the race than we think. Our timetable is public. Theirs is secret—though we know a good deal about it.

Our handicap has been the tardy development of powerful rockets. Twice as much rocket thrust lifted Voshkod as put Gemini into space. It will be 1967 before the mighty 1.6-million-pound thrust of Saturn will be ready to put the three-man Apollo into orbit.

But the maneuverability of Gemini III was a first. It had abilities its Soviet equivalent didn't. It changed its altitude—the shape and direction of its orbit; essential to achieving a rendezvous in space.

Naturally we want to win the race to the moon. But that is not the end in itself. The essential thing is to achieve preeminence for the United States in the mastery of outer space.

It was preeminence on the seas which gave Britain its ascendancy for a hundred years. It was Allied preeminence in the air which guaranteed victory in World War II.

If we concede preeminence to the Russians on the way to other planets, we will be conceding it to them on this planet.

If we do, our problem will be survival under the worst of all conditions because mastery of outer space is an essential condition to preserving freedom on earth.

Our goal is not to deny the highways of outer space to any other nation. It is to make sure that no nation can deny those highways to us.

Internal Revenue Service Should Request Authority To Waive Interest on Underwithholding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Internal Revenue Service Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen is to be congratulated for the statement promising sympathetic considerationl for those taxpayers suffering hardship in paying balances of 1964 income taxes because of underwithholding last year. The announcement would seem to concur with the concept of H.R. 4659, which I introduced in February to permit taxpayers owing balances because of underwithholding to spread payments over the coming 12 months without penalty.

Mr. Cohen cannot waive interest on unpaid balances, inasmuch as Congress alone has authority in this matter. I believe, however, that a request from Mr. Cohen would stimulate the Ways and Means Committee and both Houses to enact the necessary legislation before the April 15 deadline, and I am hoping that he will choose to make a request of this nature without delay.

My view is that the Federal Government was needlessly lax in failing to give proper notice that payroll deductions might not cover total tax bills as a consequence of the change in tax rates during the 1964 calendar year. Since introducing H.R. 4659 I have been informed by a number of employees right here on Capitol Hill that they were shocked in making up their tax returns to learn that deductions had fallen far short and that they are now faced with an indebtedness of serious proportions. If our own congressional staff members were ignorant of what was taking place, how in the world should we expect people back in our home districts to be aware of the situation?

I have seen a number of advertisements by banking and lending institutions offering to make money available—at regular interest rates—for taxpayers who need to catch up on their IRS bills before April 15. While it may be gratifying to stockholders of these business houses to experience increased activity in the loan departments, there is no justifiable reason why the Federal Government should allow its own negligence to create a minor boom of this kind.

Until Mr. Cohen made is announcement, there was a very serious question in regard to those who are not in position to negotiate bank loans. His lenience has apparently solved that problem, yet there still remains the matter of whether it is in propriety for the Federal Government to charge interest on the befuddled taxpayer who through no fault of his own will be in arrears with IRS beginning April 15. Mr. Cohen's approach would seem to answer in the negative. I hope that he will support this inclination with a request for a waiver of interest, and I trust that Congress will act with all haste to preclude the inequity that is at present in making.

Retirement of Maj. Gen. James L. Snyder

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1965, Maj. Gen. James L. Snyder, the commanding general of Brooke Army Medical Center, retired from the U.S. Army after more than 32 years of service. At a retirement ceremony culminating his brilliant career, General Snyder was honored as more than 2,000 troops from units of the medical center and Fort Sam Houston passed in review.

Born at Medora, N. Dak., General Snyder was graduated from high school at Ashton, Idaho. He attended the University of Washington and received his B.S. and M.S. degrees from the University of Washington. He received his medical degree at the George Washington University School of Medicine in Washington, D.C., in 1933, and entered the Army upon completion of his internship a year later.

While previously stationed at the Army Medical Service School, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., where most Army Medical Service personnel train at some time in their careers, General Snyder served as training officer, school secretary, director of the department of tactics, techniques, and logistics, and assistant commandant. He assumed the position of commandant of the Army Medical Service School on October 1, 1959, and in December of 1961 General Snyder became the commanding general of Brooke Army Medical Center.

One of the Army Medical Service's foremost authorities in field medicine and training, General Snyder, while commanding the medical center, directed a vast and complex program which covers nearly every phase of medical education, training, patient care, and research.

General Snyder started the first Army Medical Service officer candidate school in July 1941, and subsequently assisted in the rapid expansion of schools of the technical services and the officer candidate school system of the Army service forces in 1942.

While serving with the 1st U.S. Army in England preparing for the invasion of Europe, he set up demonstrations to prove the value of his theories on the simultaneous discharge of troops and the loading of casualties into landing vessels. He landed on D-day with the 1st Army and supervised the establishment of medical units and the evacuation of the wounded through the bitter fighting of France, Belgium, and Germany.

General Snyder has taken part in special studies of problems encountered by the Army Medical Service in both arctic and tropical regions. While in Europe from 1956 to 1959, he formulated the first area medical service concept which has proven to be so effective for the U.S. Army. He has been a leading proponent of preparedness for medical care in a disaster. This includes not only disaster training within the medical service, but he has also emphasized the urgent need for this type of training in medical schools through the medical education for national defense program and through his cooperation with local civil defense organizations.

Among his many decorations for valor and distinguished service are the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal and the Croix de Guerre from France.

During his outstanding career, General Snyder has compiled a record of many achievements in the field of Army medicine and practice, for which we of this Nation are deeply grateful. General Snyder's retirement is the Army's loss, but I am proud to say that it is San Antonio's gain as General and Mrs. Snyder will continue to reside there.

Education and Labor Committee Should Review the Election Machinery of Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I stated publicly that I felt that Education and Labor Committee should review the election machinery of labor unions. I did this in light of the recent revelations by the U.S. Department of Labor of election result manipulations. These final results showed that Mr. Paul Jennings had defeated James B. Carey for the post of president of the International Union of Electrical Workers. This was a complete reversal of the result announced by the trustees of that union. Mr. Carey has just sent me a copy of his resignation, for which I ask permission to include in this statement.

Despite Mr. Carey's resignation, I still am of the belief that the Education and Labor Committee should review the election machinery of all labor unions.

The copy of the resignation follows:

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT JAMES B. CAREY OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL, RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS AFL–CIO, APRIL 6, 1965

I have devoted my whole life to organizing and advancing the welfare of the workers of the electrical manufacturing industry. For 32 years I have given them the full measure of my energies, my skills and my devotion. Over these three decades the economic security, the dignity and the happiness of the men and women of our industry has transcended all else in importance. It is a matter of deep satisfaction that during these 32 years their economic, social and political progress has transformed the industry and the lives of the workers whose toil has turned its wheels and built its prosperity.

Circumstances of history made it necessary for us to organize the electrical industry not once but twice, and also to provide the leadership that routed for once and for all Communist influence in all mass production industries. I had the incomparable privilege of being part of that organizing leadership and the leadership that insured the future of democratic unionism in the United States.

In these campaigns and achievements I was profoundly fortunate in having as my associates many of the truly outstanding men and women of the modern American labor movement, people of heroic dedication and selflessness. My associations and friendships with these leaders of democratic unionism vastly enriched my life and work as I hope I may have contributed in some degree to them and to their labors in trade unionism.

What I have given to the industrial union movement has been amply repaid in the deep satisfaction I have found in the opportunity for service to trade unionism and the men and women of our industry.

For the past 15 years I have been honored with the presidency of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers AFL–CIO, a labor organization that we created literally out of nothingness and built into the greatest union of electrical manufacturing workers in the world. This has been an achievement that can never be minimized or sullied, and I shall always derive the deepest satisfaction from the role I was privileged to play in founding and leading the IUE.

A point has now come in the affairs of our union, however, that requires the establishment of a new unity and a new internal solidarity to insure the IUE's continued progress. We have witnesses with sorrow the growth of internal dissention and disagreement that threaten the IUE's future. At all costs the International Union's splendid promise must not be jeopardized.

The IUE as an instrument of service for the welfare and happiness of hundreds of thousands of men and women in our industry must not be injured or diminished.

I have often declared to our international executive board and to other bodies of the IUE that I would not hold any office which I did not hold by the clear-cut will of the men and women I serve.

Because of this and because of the interim report on the IUE's presidential referendum released yesterday by the U.S. Department of Labor I have come to the painful conclusion that I can best serve our beloved union's future, its unity, and solidarity, and its capacity for advancing the interests of all electrical workers by resigning from my position as president of the IUE. The interests of the International Union and its future are far greater than any individual or group of individuals.

I was completely surprised by the results of the recount, which I had no reason to expect.

The interim report states that the investigation is not complete and that it will be continued. Numerous questions have not been answered or resolved. In view of this I believe I would be fully justified in remaining in office and await a final resolution of these questions. However, I believe that I can best serve the unity, future growth, and effectiveness of the international union by offering my resignation to a meeting of the international executive board which will convene here tomorrow.

I will want, of course, always to be of service to the men and women of our industry and to the democratic labor movement which has been and which will continue to be so encompassing a part of my life.

My most fervent hope is that the executive board will provide the far-seeing leadership that will insure the IUE's continuing independence, autonomy, integrity, and internal democracy. My heart and my soul will be constantly with these leaders and members of the IUE as they move unitedly into the future, always working for the men and women of our industry and always looking forward.

Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join my colleagues in the introduction of a voting rights bill that, if enacted, will reflect sound progress, based upon uniform principles of law, in an area of paramount importance.

As I sat in this Chamber and listened to our President speak on this subject just a few weeks ago, I sensed that the Chief Executive was echoing the sentiments previously expressed by so many of us who had already registered strong support for legislative action to insure that the basic rights guaranteed the citizens of this Nation by our Constitution were not denied. When we passed the Civil Rights Act during the last session of Congress, we were hopeful that we had devised an effective means to combat the discrimination problem. But, as subsequent events have proved, that measure was not enough; something more is needed.

Following the President's recent address to the joint session of the Congress, a reporter stopped me in the corridor to inquire as to my reaction to the message. My immediate response was that "I hope Congress will be prompt and decisive in its action." Further, I said that I would be awaiting the administration's proposed legislation, hoping that it would effectively deal with the problem which now had reached a crisis stage.

The administration's bill was filed and I, along with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, was disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those individuals who say we must clear up this Southern problem. I believe that we must take action to eliminate the American problem of voting discrimination wherever it is practiced. Yes, it is a national problem and the action Congress takes should apply throughout the 50 States.

The administration's bill was drafted during a period of great tension and presented to the Congress at a time when emotions were high. At first glance, a number of people hailed the measure. I was not in that group. I applauded its stated objectives, but not its suggested methods. I could see that the proposal was deficient in several respects.

Since that time, we, on the minority side, have been working strenuously to develop a plan to correct the deficiencies in the administration's bill. What has emerged is being labeled as a constructive Republican alternative, but let me strongly emphasize that I am not seeking to affix a party label to the measure that is finally enacted into law. We are after headway, not headlines.

At this point, I would like to cite a few specifics from the bill which I have introduced.

A Federal examiner is appointed by the Civil Service Commission when the Attorney General receives 25 or more complaints from residents of a county alleging denial of the right to vote on account of race or color. The examiner immediately determines whether these persons are qualified to vote. Challenges by the State may be made to a Federal hearing officer, appointed by the Civil Service Commission, within 10 days, and the hearing officer must render his decision 7 days thereafter.

Determination by the hearing officer that 25 or more persons are denied suffrage because of race or color establishes a pattern or practice of discrimination. Immediately thereafter, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint such additional Federal examiners and hearing officers as necessary to register all other persons within the country who may be subject to discrimination.

The bill provides for an appeal of the hearing officer's decision to the local Federal Court of Appeals if made within 15

days. All persons found qualified to vote by the examiners shall be entitled to vote. Those who are challenged shall vote provisionally until the appeal is decided by the hearing officer and the court. Provisional voting will encourage a prompt determination of the appeal. The administration's bill provides exactly the same appeal procedure, except that there is no authority for provisional voting.

The bill provides that examiners shall disregard literacy test requirements for persons who possess a sixth grade education. But, Federal examiners under this bill will apply to all other persons a State's literacy test, provided it is fair and nondiscriminatory. The administration's bill requires the complete elimination of literacy tests in a few States or their subdivisions, caught in its net, no matter how reasonable the tests or how fairly applied. At the same time, the administration's bill permits other States to enact literacy tests in the future.

The bill deals with the problem of physical and economic coercion and intimidation. It permits registrants in a county in which a pattern of discrimination has been established to bypass local registrars, if they have reason to believe that they will be subjected to coercion and intimidation. In addition, our bill provides for civil and criminal penalties against those officials who engage in such coercion and intimidation. The administration's bill contains similar provisions except that the Attorney General must take affirmative action to waive the requirement that a person first appear before a local registrar.

The bill does not overturn constitutional principles by requiring States to establish their innocence. The administration's bill does do this by presuming a State or a political subdivision, covered by the bill, guilty of discrimination until it receives from a Federal court in the District of Columbia a declaratory judgment that it has not violated the 15th amendment in even one instance in the past 10 years.

The bill does not invalidate laws or ordinances of State and local governments in contravention of established constitutional principles. The administration's bill would require States and their political subdivisions, covered by the bill, to come to a Federal court for validation of their future laws and ordinances relating to voting requirements. Such is required by the administration's bill even though the laws and ordinances of the State or local community have never been found to be discriminatory.

In summary, I believe that the bill faces up squarely to the problem and offers a sensible approach to a prompt solution.

Resolution on Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in line with the discussion we held here in this House earlier this afternoon, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the 18th Annual Americans for Democratic Action Convention on April 4.

It points up quite vividly the plight of our domestic farmwokers, particularly those engaged in migratory labor, and certainly strengthens our arguments against the restoration of the Mexican farm labor importation program, which the Congress terminated as of December 31, 1964.

The resolution is a follows:

RESOLUTION ON FARM LABOR

The Nation's 1.5 million farmworkers are the most poverty stricken, the most exploited and the most depressed work groups in the United States. They earn an average of less than $1,000 a year. They are employed for an average of only 140 days in the entire year. And they are specifically exempted from virtually all of the social legislation which has long protected most other Americans, including the Fair Labor Standards Act, unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation, and the National Labor Relations Act.

In addition, farmworkers are the only American work group which has been forced to compete with foreign workers for jobs in this country. Until this year, several hundred thousand docile and semicaptive laborers were imported annually mainly from Mexico and the British West Indies for temporary work in the United States on corporate farms. The importation of this cheap labor force naturally depressed the wages and limited the job opportunities of competing American farmworkers. It was a major reason for their abysmal poverty.

After a long and bitter fight, liberal organizations, including ADA, church groups, labor unions, and civic organizations succeeded in getting Congress to end the foreign farm labor importation programs. The programs officially terminated on December 31, 1964.

Unreconciled to its loss of a virtually unlimited reservoir of cheap labor, agri-business has launched a massive lobbying and publicity campaign to restore the importation programs. The growers and their allies charge that American workers "are not available," that they are "too lazy to work" and that they will not "perform stoop labor," such as picking oranges. These great proponents of free enterprise demand that the Federal Government "assure" them a sufficient labor force. At the same time, they denounce the "Government interference in business" posed by the adverse effect regulations which seek to protect U.S. workers.

The growers and their allies are currently villifying the Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, for his refusal to violate the intent of Congress. The Secretary has courageously withstood the tremendous pressure campaign. He has demonstrated that U.S. farmworkers are available and can be recruited for work in agriculture if sufficient wages and 20th century working conditions are provided.

ADA commends the Secretary highly for his courageous stand. We continue to oppose any foreign farm labor importation whatsoever. We regard the importations as nothing less than a means of undercutting the meager wages and working conditions of the poorest of America's poor.

In addition, we believe the exemption of farmworkers from this Nation's social legislation is an injustice which should be quickly remedied. These workers were left on the outside during the enactment of the New Deal legislation only because the then-powerful farm bloc had to be placated. No economic or other justification existed then or today for the exemption of men, women, and children who need the protection of this legislation the most.

ADA therefore strongly urges:

(1) Full coverage of farmworkers under the minimum wage, maximum hours, and child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

(2) Full protection of the farmworkers' right to organize into unions through coverage under the National Labor Relations Act.

(3) Full coverage of farmworkers under the unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation laws.

(4) Increased coverage for farmworkers under the Social Security Act.

ADA also believes that the misery to which farmworkers have so long been subjected because of their being singled out for exemption from legal protection and for exploitation has resulted in problems which require special solutions. We therefore urge that special efforts be made—and if necessary, additional legislation be enacted—to meet the education, health, housing, and other welfare problems of agricultural laborers, particularly the migrant workers. Also, we strongly urge that Congress enact legislation which will provide a permanent recruitment program to bring farmworkers to areas of labor need at the time of need. This program must include necessary safeguards for farmworkers, especially concerning wages and working conditions.

The deprivation of America's farmworkers is so huge that it poses one of the largest single challenges to the Great Society. What this Nation does to erase the harvest of shame among agricultural laborers will be one of the most important tests of the seriousness and the effectiveness of its war against poverty.

House Un-American Activities Committee Should Investigate the Ku Klux Klan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think that our colleagues and other readers of the RECORD may be interested in a WTOP radio and television editorial presented late last week.

While I do not endorse this statement in its entirety, it is a good exposition of a reasonable viewpoint and does raise questions which I believe are of concern to many Members of this House:

[This editorial was broadcast on March 31 and April 1, 1965, over WTOP radio and television]

WTOP EDITORIAL

There are those who want a congressional agency other than the House Un-American Activities Committee to conduct the inquiry into the Ku Klux Klan. And it is true that Un-American Activities' investigations of the past were too often marred by sensationalism to give that particular group an impressive reputation.

Nevertheless, the committee has an undoubted claim on the subject of Klan activities. Because that is so, the HUAC has to be given a chance to prove what it can do in the present circumstances. And we, for one, are willing to see the committee given that chance.

Already, however, plans for the investigation are raising some difficult problems. According to Chairman EDWIN WILLIS, the com-

mittee's scrutiny will involve not only the Klan but such other organizations as the Black Muslims, the Minutemen, and the American Nazi Party.

We recall that when Congressman WELTNER, of Georgia, first proposed a probe of the Klan early in February, he was careful to say that the congressional interest should be in overt activities, not what some organization may represent in the way of ideas or ideology. What a man thinks—individually or collectively—in his own business. It is only when he begins to act on the basis of his beliefs that Congress has a legitimate interest.

So in the probe of the Ku Klux Klan, the Un-American Activities Committee must restrict itself to what the organization does, not what it stands for. The same holds true for all other groups which may be included in the investigative effort. The question here is not how repulsive some points of view may be. It is the need, as Congressman WELTNER emphasized, to make a distinction between thought and deed—which, in the case of the committee, is a very delicate but very necessary process.

This was a WTOP editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

Remarks by the Honorable Richard L. Roudebush, U.S. House of Representatives, Sixth Indiana District, Before the Indiana Council of Teachers of English, Saturday, April 3, 1965, at Marian College, Indianapolis, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, my very able colleague from Indiana, Congressman RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, has led a long and active fight for the past 4 years in effort to obtain a commemorative postage stamp for the late Ernie Pyle, famed Hoosier war correspondent during World War II.

Congressman ROUDEBUSH has won wide backing and support for his campaign in behalf of an Ernie Pyle stamp.

This applause for Congressman ROUDEBUSH's efforts comes from a wide spectrum of American life, including millions of World War II veterans who recall Ernie's fine reporting.

Congressman ROUDEBUSH was recently invited by the Indiana Council of Teachers of English to present an address on the life and works of Ernie Pyle, a native of the congressional district which Congressman ROUDEBUSH represents in the 89th Congress.

His remarks concerning this great Hoosier are worthy of the attention of this entire body, and I include them in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SIXTH INDIANA DISTRICT, BEFORE THE INDIANA COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH, SATURDAY, APRIL 3, 1965, AT MARIAN COLLEGE, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

It is a genuine pleasure to be here today.

And, I wish to thank your president, Dr. James Mason, for his kind invitation to speak before the spring meeting of the Indiana Council of Teachers of English.

It was requested that I direct my remarks today to the life and work of Ernie Pyle, the famed Hoosier war correspondent who was killed during the closing days of World War II.

For nearly 4 years now, we have been seeking approval by the Post Office Department for the issuance of an Ernie Pyle commemorative stamp.

Ideally, the stamp should have been issued this month to coincide with the 20th anniversary of Ernie's tragic death on the tiny Pacific atoll of Ie Shima, located west of Okinawa.

In our campaign to obtain a commemorative stamp in honor of Ernie Pyle, we have contacted literally hundreds of civic groups, veterans organizations, and other interested persons throughout the Nation.

The support we have received has been encouraging.

More than 100 Members of Congress l ave written letters lending their support.

We have also gained the support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars which endorsed the stamp by formal resolution during their national convention last year in Cleveland.

Support from the journalistic field has also been most gratifying.

United Features Syndicate endorsed the stamp proposal with this comment: "During World War II it was our privilege to syndicate Ernie's column which was read religiously by families and friends of our fighting men in Europe and the Pacific. His ability to offer them a soldier's insight into the war, and the warmth with which he wrote of the ordinary foot soldier, endeared him to the Nation. Ernie was a journalist in the very best tradition, setting a high standard that reporters strive to emulate today."

The Wyoming Press Association, the Georgia Press Association—representing 225 newspapers—the Kansas Press Association, the New York Press Association, and the Maryland-Delaware press associations have all supported our efforts.

Mention should also be made of support from the American Council on Education for Journalism, the Pacific Stars and Stripes, the New York associated dailies, and Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Our campaign has also been endorsed by perhaps the most exclusive club in the United States—the Medal of Honor Society.

Chartered by Congress in 1958, the Medal of Honor Society limits its membership to persons who have received this Nation's highest military award—the Congressional Medal of Honor.

In a letter to Postmaster Grounouski, the society declared, "Ernie Pyle not only distinguished himself by writing brilliantly about the brave and noble deeds of our fighting forces overseas but added new stature to his profession by combining his unique and warm personal talents with responsible and objective reporting. In this manner his work contributed immeasurably to the morale of our troops as well as the men and women on the homefront."

In addition, we have introduced legislation (H.R. 1723) which provides for the issuance of a commemorative Ernie Pyle stamp.

As of today, the Post Office Stamp Advisory Committee, has not acted favorably on this 4-year effort in support of an Ernie Pyle stamp.

They are scheduled to meet two more times this year, and I have been told that the Ernie Pyle stamp could be on either agenda.

Thus far, I have been most restrained in my criticism of the delay in acceptance of this stamp, which incidentally, would be the first time a working newspaperman has been so honored.

I must admit, however, that I have not been exactly elated with the many times that Ernie Pyle has been overlooked.

Last winter it was discouraging, to say the least, when the Post Office Department announced it was honoring an Italian poet born 700 years ago, and a foreign political document signed 750 years ago.

And, I'm sure you have all seen the different birds and animals that adorn some of our new commemorative stamps.

I am an admirer of wildfowl, but I do believe a valid case has been made for the issuance of an Ernie Pyle commemorative stamp.

Like millions of Americans who went overseas in World War II, my interest in Ernie Pyle stems back to that period.

The life and work of this newspaperman had an enormous impact on millions of Americans.

No other journalist ever evoked such mass affection as was accorded him during his tenure as a national figure.

There was, of course, a reason for this.

He bridged a gap in the knowledge of the Great War and of the men who were waging it—a gap which was not appreciated until his reporting began to span it.

Many other war journalists were as enterprising, as brave, as impeccably accurate in their war dispatches as Ernie Pyle.

No other correspondents, however, told the story of the soldier with such insight and such moving sympathy.

And his personality so permeated his column, as it had done in peacetime with a smaller audience, that readers came to think of him not as a stranger, but as their friend—their friend Ernie.

As a GI, in Africa and Italy, I knew Ernie Pyle by reputation as a friend and a true chronicler of the war.

As a Member of Congress, for the Sixth Indiana District, I now represent the area where Ernie was born and raised in western Indiana.

Many of his friends and relatives still reside there, and these folks have been most helpful in our campaign to obtain a commemorative stamp.

Petitions requesting the Post Office Department issue a commemorative stamp, have been circulated in the small town of Dana, Ind., where Ernie was born on August 3, 1900.

"I wasn't born in a log cabin," he wrote in one of his columns, "but I did start driving a team in the fields when I was 9 years old, if that helps any."

Ernie's boyhood was not unlike that of thousands of Indiana farm boys, except that he was an only child and was left to himself a good deal.

There was no plumbing in the home where Ernie Pyle spent his boyhood. There was a backhouse, and Ernie took his baths in a washtub near the woodstove in the kitchen.

When Ernie was a child the lack of such things was not considered a deprivation by respectable Indiana farmers.

Ernie was educated at Indiana University where he majored in journalism.

He never graduated. After attending for 3½ years, he left in his senior year after his girl friend decided in favor of another man.

He was an excellent student at Indiana, became editor of the Daily Student and worked on the yearbook.

After leaving school, his first job was as a reporter on the La Porte Herald.

This was just a brief steppingstone for newspaper jobs in Washington, D.C., and New York.

While working on the Washington Daily News he met Geraldine Siebolds, of Minnesota, a Government worker in Washington, and they were married in 1926.

Fed up temporarily with the newspaper business, he drew out his savings and bought a model T roadster.

Ernie and his wife took a long trip, driving leisurely around the United States.

It was on this trip that he originated his "traveling" column.

From 1935, until the war broke out, Ernie and his wife traveled around the country, writing stories on every conceivable subject, and winning quite a reading public.

Ernie once estimated that they stayed in more than 800 hotels, crossed the Continent exactly 24 times, flew in 66 different airplanes, rode on 29 different boats, walked 200 miles, gone through 5 sets of tires, and put out about $2,500 in tips.

His war reporting carried the same kind of homey and simple quality that made his travel column so popular.

Whether writing about a terrifying air raid in London, the Normandy invasion, or a group of soldiers talking about home, Ernie captured the image of the situation that gave his millions of readers back home in the United States a true picture of the war.

His reports earned him a Pulitzer Prize in 1943.

His two books, "Here Is Your War," published in 1943, and "Brave Men," in 1944, were both best sellers, and earned a fortune.

Admired by the public, GI's and officers alike, Ernie left the European theater before V-E Day to cover the war in the Pacific.

President Roosevelt had been dead only 5 days when Ernie went ashore on the tiny Pacific atoll of Ie Shima, on April 17, 1945.

Five miles square, the tiny island was, nevertheless, the scene of one of the bitterest engagements in the Pacific.

Three Japanese airstrips were at stake, and the 77th Infantry Division's officials history of the battle records that not one Japanese soldier surrendered and did not stop killing until killed.

On April 18, Ernie rode toward the front line with a jeepload of troops looking for a new location for a command post.

A machinegunner opened fire from about one-third of a mile away, and Ernie was struck in the temple. He died instantly.

He was buried on the island, and the body was later transferred to Hawaii where it remains today, at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Punchbowl Crater.

The entire Nation was saddened by the news of Ernie's death, and he received many posthumous honors.

It has been 20 years this month since his death, and he is still remembered by the men who fought in World War II, and millions of Americans who followed the war through his columns.

Today, as you may know, the journalism building at Indiana University is named in honor of Ernie Pyle.

I think it would be a fitting tribute to this great Hoosier to be honored by the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp, and I pledge to continue my efforts to do so.

Thank you for inviting me and God bless you.

Poor "Junior"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask to insert in today's RECORD an editorial by Al McIntosh, editor of the Rock County Star-Herald, Luverne, Minn. As usual, Al provides us with a telling analysis of one of the major problems of our times, the decline in personal responsibility and integrity.

The editorial follows:

POOR "JUNIOR"—HE THOUGHT EVERYBODY WAS ON THE "MAKE"

One day when "Junior" was 14 he noticed his father grinning all over when he came from the office.

"Got pinched for speeding but Jake down at city hall got the ticket fixed for me," he said.

When "Junior" was 15 he was with his mother in the family car when she backed into a tree. The damage would easily exceed $100.

"We'll say that somebody rammed into it when we were parked downtown," she said, "then we'll collect insurance for it because that's what insurance companies are for."

When "Junior" was 16 he listened to grandfather reminisce about the "good old days of rationing" when he made $100,000 blackmarketing cars.

That same night "Uncle John" was bragging that on a good share of his business he sent no bills and took no checks. Just cash. "Why be a sucker and let those punks in Washington get it all?" he asked.

When "Junior" was 17 he listened one night to his lawyer uncle bragging about how cute he'd been in getting his client off scot free in a court case.

"It took a little high-class arm twisting on one of the witnesses," he bragged, "and by the time he got to court we had it made."

"Even if you know they're guilty you never want to plead 'em guilty because you can't make any money that way," said the uncle.

When "Junior" was 18 his family pulled every possible string to get him a paying scholarship at a coveted Ive League eastern school. They even lied about the family income to make it seem that "Junior" needed financial aid.

He didn't make the grade there but by a stroke of luck he wangled an appointment to a service academy.

"Junior" was having it a bit tough scholastically. An upperclassman sold him the answers to the calculus examination.

"Junior" was caught and expelled.

On his return home his mother went into paroxysms of hysterical weeping over the disgrace.

"How could you have done this to us?" she sobbed.

"This isn't the way we raised you."

Doctor of Humane Letters to Hon. John T. Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure last Saturday to accompany the Honorable John T. Connor, the Secretary of Commerce, to the campus of my alma mater, Ohio Northern University at Ada, Ohio, where he received the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters.

The Secretary's address at the Founder's Day Convocation was an excellent statement of the problems that confront us, and I include it with my remarks as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE JOHN T. CONNOR

I am most happy to speak here at Ohio Northern at the kind invitation of President McIntosh and my good friend Dean Robert Fischelis, of your College of Pharmacy.

I have known Dean Fischelis through my own past connections with the pharmaceutical industry—connections which I have severed as a businessman but retained as a consumer. The headaches you get in government are no milder than those you get in business.

In a sense, although I am out of the drug industry, I'm still very much concerned with the health of the American people. Now it is their economic health that concerns me most urgently, rather than their physical well-being. But the two are closely related. A healthy economy requires a healthy work force, and good health is necessary for us to enjoy fully the fruits of our country's unprecedented prosperity.

So, as Secretary of Commerce, no less than as the former president of a leading pharmaceutical firm, I am interested in what is necessary to keep Americans healthy physically and economically. This is a big problem with many facets. And it is a problem that challenges each of you and this institution on the 94th anniversary of its founding.

I have mentioned the pharmaceutical industry because it is a link we share through your fine School of Pharmacy, but also because what Dean Fischelis and his faculty are doing here this weekend is symbolic of the challenge we face—whether we are in education or business or government or one of the professions.

I helped create the problem he and the Nation's pharmacists are facing. My former company spent—and is still spending—about $30 million a year to discover and develop new drugs. Other companies spend similar large sums to help create the biochemical armaments of the war on disease.

Together they have helped make American medicine the finest in the world—not only by providing the medical profession with more effective drugs, but by putting those drugs and the knowledge of their use into the hands of the physician and into the corner drugstore.

You can see the problem this rapid change creates for the pharmacist who has been out of school—even for a few years. Most of the drugs doctors are prescribing today were not on the market a decade ago. And most of the prescriptions the pharmacist will fill 5 or 10 years from now could not be written today. The drugs haven't been discovered yet.

And this is a problem that is appearing throughout our society.

There is an explosion of knowledge going on all around us. It's coming out of industrial laboratories and out of the laboratories of our colleges and universities.

And it's not merely an explosion of scientific knowledge—in the usual sense. It's much more than a rapid expansion of our understanding of the physical and biological aspects of our life. It involves the social and cultural areas as well.

The sociologist, the political scientist, the psychologist who left school a few years ago can't afford to be ignorant of what the computer, for example, is doing to his field of knowledge—any more than can the physicist or chemist. The same thing is true of the economist and the business manager.

And it's not just the computer hardware or any other advance in equipment that is responsible for the change. There are new ideas emerging in every field that are potentially revolutionary in themselves.

Our experts in the Department of Commerce, for example, are working to develop the idea of the noted Harvard University economist, Prof. Vassily Leontief, into an important tool of business and government policymaking. Computers are involved, but the important thing is the concept. And the result—called the "input-output"

tables—is deceptively simple. It boils down to a set of tables that show in quantitative terms the complex interrelationships in our national economy. It shows how much business is generated in each segment of the economy by an additional dollar's worth of output anywhere in the economic structure.

Right now we don't know just what impact the development of these input-output tables will have. But you can be reasonably sure that the next generation of economists and businessmen and government officials won't be able to do its job adequately if it doesn't understand the use of this and similar economic tools.

Keeping abreast of one's field today is truly a lifetime job. Those of you who are students here have really only begun your education. You may never come back to Ohio Northern for a special course or seminar. But increasingly more and more college graduates will find it necessary to return to the campus—for postgraduate programs. Like the seminar on contemporary pharmacy being held here this weekend, these programs will be designed to bring you up to date and to broaden and deepen your understanding of the changing environment in which you work.

Businessmen are finding it necessary to strengthen their academic groundings in management techniques. They also are finding that periodic sessions on college and university campuses are very valuable means of broadening their understanding of the social and political changes that vitally affect their business operations.

So I think it is particularly symbolic that a seminar on contemporary pharmacy should be part of this annual founder's day observance. The best way you can honor the past of this great institution is to look to its future. And this is what you are doing.

Ohio Northern was born of Henry Solomon Lehr's desire to raise the level of competence of the poorly trained public school teachers in his region. He was trying to close the gap between what had been adequate—or at least tolerable—and what would be required of teachers in a burgeoning American economy. He dealt with the realities of the present—recognizing both the shortcomings of the past and the opportunities unfolding before our country and our people.

I think we must do the same.

President Johnson has summoned the American people to the task of building a Great Society. He has enormous faith in the idealism of our people and in their ability to respond to great challenges. But there is nothing "pollyannish" about his thinking. He recognizes that Government cannot hand out a Great Society to an apathetic people. He realizes that we must do this job together over whatever period of time it may take, and that most of the work must be done through private initiative rather than through Government action.

I personally think this calls for a new alliance of the campus and the company—of the academic and business worlds—in a sustained effort to cope with the problems and exploit the opportunities before us. I think such an alliance is especially needed in the field of education, manpower development, and employment opportunities.

I say "field" rather than "fields" because these are all aspects of a single challenge. You can look at it from different viewpoints. You can talk about the need to develop our manpower resources to meet the demands of an increasingly sophisticated economy. You can talk about the right of the individual to a job and an opportunity to earn his own livelihood. You can talk about his obligation to develop marketable skills, or about the obligation of government, business, and the schools to give him an opportunity to develop his productive—and human—potential.

But these are all part of the same ball of string. And you know the answer to the question: Where do you start to unravel a ball of string? You start anywhere.

The same thing is true of this problem of education, human development, and economic growth. You start where you are—whether you are in business, in a classroom, or in a position of public or community influence.

As a businessman and now as head of a Government agency charged with promoting economic development, I have been very much concerned with this problem of matching our manpower supply to the changing demands of an increasingly technical and rapidly changing economy.

The shifts on both sides are dramatic—on both sides of this supply and demand relationship. Not only is there continuing change in the kinds of jobs required, there is a big change occurring—as a result of the postwar baby boom—in the labor force available for these jobs.

The most dramatic change in job opportunities, of course, has been the decline in farmworkers—from 37.5 percent of all American workers in 1900 to only 5 percent in 1964.

The proportion of factory blue-collar workers, however, has risen only slightly. But there have been substantial changes within this group. The demand for unskilled workers has dropped sharply from 12.5 percent to 5 percent. The demand for skilled workers has risen from 10.5 to 14 percent, and the demand for semiskilled workers even more—from 12.8 to 20 percent of all workers.

The big growth has been in white-collar workers—from less than one in five workers in 1900 to nearly half the work force in 1964. The demand for professional, technical, and similar workers has nearly tripled. The demand for managers and officials has risen 50 percent. And the percentage in clerical and kindred jobs has increased fivefold since the turn of the century.

Today it is virtualy impossible to get a job in a factory without a high school diploma, and it is even more difficult to get an office job without this minimum educational qualification. At a higher level, there is a great unsatisfied demand for top quality, highly educated people in virtually every field. In the Commerce Department, we are particularly concerned with the lack of advanced-degree people capable of doing engineering research and development—people who can bridge the gap between the basic scientific discovery and the production line.

On the other side of the picture, the labor force is growing faster than in the previous postwar period, and the composition of the labor force is shifting toward youth and inexperience.

Because of the baby boom after World War II, we had half a million more young people entering the labor force last year than the annual average of the previous 5 years. Between 1957 and 1962, the total labor force grew at an average rate of less than 800,000 a year. From 1962 to 1964, it grew by 1.2 million a year. And for the rest of this decade, the growth is expected to be about 1.5 million a year. This means we must create some 9 million new jobs—1.5 million a year—just to take care of the growth in the labor force through 1970.

And that doesn't include doing anything about the 4 million currently unemployed, or about the additional workers that would move into the active labor force if the prospect of finding jobs improved significantly.

Another major change in the labor force is the above-average growth in nonwhite—mainly Negro—participation. Although nonwhites make up only slightly more than one-tenth of the current labor force, they will account for roughly one-fifth of the growth in the labor force during the remainder of the decade.

This constitutes a major challenge for both education and business. These young Negro men and women must be equipped in our schools and colleges to fill the higher skilled jobs that will be opening during the rest of the 1960's and beyond. But they must know that the jobs—which formerly were closed to them—will be there and will be open to them when they are prepared to take them. This will require a close cooperation of business and our institutions of higher learning to identify and meet the special educational needs of these young people—including the urgent need to strengthen their motivation to obtain higher education.

Today the unemployment rate among Negroes in the labor force is about 10 percent—double the rate for the population as a whole. For teenagers it is triple the general rate, and for Negro teenagers, I understand, it runs on the order of 25 percent.

I am concerned about the manpower development problem from the business point of view. But, as a businessman, nothing gave me greater satisfaction than the knowledge that I was helping to create jobs for my fellow citizens.

I think most businessmen feel this way. And I think businessmen are ready to accept the challenge to work intimately with the educational institutions and governmental bodies in their areas to help create job opportunities for every pair of willing hands.

In providing an adequate education for every American, there is a role for each of us to play. There is a local community responsibility. The State has a major responsibility. Our churches and our private educational institutions have a big opportunity. And the Federal Government has an important supplemental role to play.

I think the President's education program deserves full business support. I am not worried about Federal aid supplanting local support or local control in education. The job we face in education is so big that we need all the help we can get. And, if education is among the most important business of our society—and I think it is—we need not be afraid of the American people losing interest in it at the local and community level.

At the same time, I think business has a special obligation to support institutions such as this. Variety in educational opportunity is an important support and safeguard of a democratic society. But it must also be quality education. And business corporations, as well as individual businessmen, who have the means, should make support of private colleges and universities one of their continuing obligations.

President Johnson pointed out recently that this is the richest and most powerful country that ever existed, and that the might of past empires was little compared with ours.

"But," he said, "I do not want to be the President who built empires, or sought grandeur, or extended dominion. I want to be the President who educated young people to the wonders of their world—the President who fed the hungry—and helped the poor to find their own way—and enriched the simple, daily lives of every family. And I want to be the President who helped to end hatred among his fellow men, and war among the brothers of this earth."

I think this is what we all want. I think we want to be part of the generation that helped make these things possible for all our fellow men, and for all the world.

The campus and the corporation represent two of our most important means of furthering this ambition for America and mankind. I think they must work together in mutual support and with common purpose to achieve our goals. I am confident that they can work together for the benefit of an enlightened and capable people in a free and prosperous society.

Thank you.

Blowin' in the Wind: A Progress Report on Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the House to a noteworthy public service by RKO General Broadcasting. RKO, which has its headquarters in my district, has produced an exceptional radio program on brotherhood and civil rights called "Blowin' in the Wind: A Progress Report on Brotherhood." The program describes the course of brotherhood in this country through music, historical references and the words of our Presidents.

RKO, which is a national group of 7 radio and 5 television stations, has made this program available, without cost, to more than 2,000 stations in this country. It was carried by nine stations in the South.

The program originally was produced for Brotherhood Week in February. At that time it was broadcast by the seven RKO stations. In addition to supplying the program to American stations, RKO also sponsored a worldwide distribution through—to name just a few of the outlets—Radio Free Europe, the Voice of America, the British Broadcasting Corporation, and the Armed Forces Radio Network.

The program was largely the work of Martin Weldon, director of public affairs for RKO, who wrote and produced the show. Weldon has received a letter of commendation from Eric F. Goldman, special consultant to the President, for his "vigorous and skillful work in behalf of American ideals."

Also involved with the production of the program were RKO President Hathaway Watson, Executive Vice President Sam S. Slate, and Jerome Bess and Folksinger Oscar Brand, who narrated the program.

Under unanimous consent, I submit an abstract of the program script for inclusion in the RECORD:

BLOWIN' IN THE WIND: A PROGRESS REPORT ON BROTHERHOOD

(Special 45-minute radio program for Brotherhood Week, February 21–28)

Mr. OSCAR BRAND. On January 20, 1965, the 36th President of the United States took the oath of office. He spoke about 1,500 words. These were 36 of them.

Tape excerpt from Johnson's inaugural address: "Justice requires us to remember when any citizen denies his fellow, saying 'His color is not mine,' or 'His beliefs are strange and different'—in that moment he betrays America, though his forebears created this Nation."

Mr. BRAND. This is Oscar Brand. This program is called "Blowin' in the Wind: A Progress Report on Brotherhood."

RKO General Broadcasting produces this program for its seven radio stations in honor of Brotherhood Week, the week of February 21, as set aside by the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

We do this in the hope that someday every week will be Brotherhood Week, and every day, not officially set aside by anyone or any organization, but in our hearts.

The program is essentially musical, the fourth in our series, "Musical Americana," music tracing a chapter of the American story.

And we call the program "Blowin' in the Wind: A Progress Report on Brotherhood" because we seem to have made some progress—slow and painful, to be sure—but progress just the same. While the song "Blowin' in the Wind" says that the answer to the question "How long must we wait for full brotherhood" is blowin' in the wind—and the winds of the future are always unpredictable.

Up with instrumental, "Blowin' in the Wind," segue to vocal "Blowin' in the Wind," sung by the Johnny Mann Singers:

"The answer, my friend, is blowin' in the wind,
The answer is blowin' in the wind."

Mr. BRAND. It's a thick, tight circle—poverty, envy, hate, resentment, guilt—and no place in the circle for brotherhood to break in.

Yes, it can make a man especially bitter if he loses his job, or can't get one, because of certain things which have nothing to do with his abilities, because of factors beyond his control, like the color of his skin, or his race, or his religion, or where he comes from. There was a time when the people who came here from Ireland ran up against this.

Quite a few years later, there was one man of Irish descent who not only applied for a job, but got it. And this is what he said, to the whole world, the day he started work, which was January 20, 1961.

Voice of John F. Kennedy, from inauguration speech: "My fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man."

Mr. BRAND. But brotherhood seemed far away—as faint and sad as a lost dream of love—when John F. Kennedy was shot down, for many of us the most sorrowful experience of our lives. Was it hate that pulled the trigger? Was it a mind diseased by frustration? We may never know. But strangely, in the national feeling of revulsion, the influence of hate groups diminished. Hope could stir again.

The house we live in. This house called the United States is just that. A collection of sovereign States, each of which gave up a good slice of its sovereignty to the Federal Union. And it wasn't a simple matter—getting the States together.

Recording of "We Shall Overcome," sung by Joan Baez:

"We shall overcome, we shall overcome,
We shall overcome someday.
Oh, oh, deep in my heart I do believe
That we shall overcome someday.

"We'll walk hand in hand, we'll walk hand in hand,
We'll walk hand in hand someday.
Oh, oh, deep in my heart I do believe
That we shall overcome someday.

"We are not afraid, we are not afraid,
We are not afraid today.
Oh, oh, deep in my heart I do believe
That we shall overcome someday.

"We shall overcome, we shall overcome,
We shall overcome someday.
Oh, oh, deep in my heart I do believe
That we shall overcome someday."

Mr. BRAND. Many of those who sing this song—hands clasped and swaying—must recall that a President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, once looked forward to a world for them—and for everyone else—founded on four freedoms.

Voice of Roosevelt enunciating the four freedoms: "The first is freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear anywhere in the world."

Mr. BRAND. Of course, if we had all that, we'd have full brotherhood now. But things take time. It seems to be taking especially long to achieve freedom from want everywhere in the world. And when times are hard for a man, it's difficult for him to feel brotherly toward anyone, including himself.

Ira Hayes was an Indian—how better to begin this story? An Indian, a Marine, a war hero, a legend. But even a war hero and a legend can be a casualty—in the struggle that never ends.

Who knows why men act unbrotherly toward one another? Maybe it's because we all come into this world naked and alone, and that's a pretty unimportant way to feel, and later on, when we get the chance, it makes us feel a lot more important to be able to put someone else down just on the color of his skin or where he comes from.

The histories call it the New World the settlers came to from Europe—but it was really the same old world of suspicion and fear, as each new group of arrivals tried to find a place, as some of those who had arrived before them resisted. One by one, year by year, the ones who had arrived first felt threatened by the new ones coming in and tried to keep what they had. Using all the methods of resistance: denial of jobs, knives, guns, all the way down to ridiculing different religions and strange accents.

There were so many accents: Spanish, French, English, Dutch, Swedish, German, Scottish, Irish, Polish, Greek, Czech, Rumanian, Russian, Italian, Chinese, Japanese, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban—and while the procession of new arrivals continued, there were always the Negroes—refused even the status and opportunities of new settlers because they were not free. Many say they are still not free. This is their anthem, their prayer—not a battle cry, a prayer, that the doors be opened.

In the early days there was rivalry and bitter distrust among them.

The pendulum swings, back and forth. Racial ridicule, political revenge, and social snobbery have never really been very funny to the victim. Sometimes these differences have been used by voteseeking politicians. One such period in our history saw the American farmers united against the rest of America. But the pendulum does swing—and sometimes forward. In our own time, a Broadway musical comedy recognized a crucial, and a hopeful, fact: we are not born with hate in our hearts, children grow up to hate only if grownups teach them to.

Also in the time many of us remember personally, a man named Hitler taught his people to hate, taught them so well that they helped him put to death millions of Jews, Poles, Russians, Englishmen—even Germans. But Hitler never reckoned that the rest of the free world—stung by the need to defend itself, furious at his threat to all its principles—would bury its differences, and fight together and work together. Indians and Frenchmen, Negroes and whites, Englishmen, Greeks, Canadians and Australians, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. Few of them said they were fighting for brotherhood, but most of them knew or felt, that unless they won the battle, all would be lost—freedom of religion, any chance for brotherhood, life itself.

Perhaps the most ironic thing about the war was the fact that one of the major architects of the victory was himself of German descent, a man named Eisenhower. He later became President, and at one time

he said—he might have been looking backward at Germany, or he might have been looking forward for America, or he might have been doing both—at one time he said:

Voice of Dwight D. Eisenhower: "A people that values its privileges above its principles soon loses both."

Mr. BRAND. All our Presidents remind us from time to time about our principles, because they all see this as part of their job. Our job—our first job—is to listen. It's possible that we don't listen well anymore, because so many of the words sound the same, and we take so many things for granted. Maybe our big need is to start listening again, because the words have always been there, in our songs, in our Constitution, in our Bible, in the words of our Presidents. Inauguration Day—January 20, 1949. The words of Harry S. Truman.

Voice of Harry S. Truman: "We believe that all men have a right to equal justice under law and equal opportunity to share in the common good. We believe that all men have a right to freedom of thought and expression. We believe that all men are created equal because they are created in the image of God."

Mr. BRAND. Where do we stand now? Back where we started? I don't think so. I think we're ahead. There are signs and portents. There are signs and portents that more of us are becoming less insecure, less greedy, less ignorant, less fearful, less ready to hate, less guiltridden. Signs and portents. A civil rights law. An antipoverty program. A dream of a Great Society. A United Nations. A week devoted to thinking about brotherhood, which could any one of these days break out into a habit. Signs and portents—but nobody really knows which way the wind will blow, how really close we're getting to brotherhood. Nobody really knows. Except possibly you.

Report on March to Montgomery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following editorial from the Greensboro Watchman, published at Greensboro, Ala. It deals with the march from Selma to Montgomery:

THE YEAR 1965 AND THE CAMP MEETINGS OF THE 1820'S: A PARALLEL IN FRENZY

We are surprised that some of our learned church historians have not drawn the parallel between the civil rights demonstrations of the 1960's in Alabama and the camp meetings, or bush-arbor meetings, of the 1820's in the Appalachian and nearby regions.

Both have religious overtones; indeed, they have been held ostensibly for religious purposes—but that does not hide their deeper and less palatable meaning. In the camp meeting days, the frontier people gathered for hundreds of miles around, coming in buggies, in wagons, on horseback, and afoot, for gatherings that often lasted as long as 2 weeks. There was endless open-air preaching, and some of the assaults on the devil were violent and earth shaking. The listeners often became frenzied—shouting and screaming, mumbling in unknown tongues and even lapsing into unconsciousness. Others became so violent that they stripped the very bark from saplings. Alcohol always lurked in the background, and then there was the usual sexual orgy—with a crop of new babies, not always wanted, arriving 9 months later to populate the frontier. Some of these frontier leaders were great preachers, who fed those who were religiously hungry. Others were mere frauds, flexing their vocal chords against the Devil, and at the same time seeing to it that the Devil had his own way. Those congregated at the camp meetings were starved for companionship, for social contact, and for sex.

The civil rights demonstrations, in which the northern preachers have tried to seize control from the emotional Negroes, resembles the old-fashioned camp meeting more than the sponsors would like to admit. The preachers show the same zeal as those of the camp meeting days—some of their preachings genuine and authentic, but far more for the mere purpose of arousing the passions. There has been lusty singing and marching and shouting, and lurking in the shadows, there again has been the strong stimulus of alcohol, making some of the more timid mighty brave and daring. And there has been the usual outburst of sex, with Negro preachers and white blonde girls bedding down for the night under the same blanket, and vice versa, until things got so bad that, in the final days, there was segregation after all. The women were kept in separate tents from the men on the road to Montgomery.

Alabama, of course, is the Devil of the 1960's—and these crusaders have obviously made some headway against him. But they haven't conquered nor, in fact, do we believe they want to conquer. They want to keep something to shout about, to sing about, to march about, to lie about. These poor creatures want to keep something which offers them adventure; which brings something different into their starving urban lives; which gives them an excuse to vent their passions, and to let off their steam precisely as the camp meeting gave those others a century and a quarter ago. We speak our own sentiments alone, and not those of the average Alabama observer, when we say that we actually feel sorry for them; they are so utterly hopeless; their lives have so little meaning that we pity them.

The Lake Erie Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial published on April 1, 1965, the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express made an eloquent appeal for strong action to halt and abate pollution in Lake Erie.

Pollution of this lake is a very serious problem that has far-reaching implications. I would like to bring the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

ENDING LAKES POLLUTION VITAL TASK

What are the prospects for the Great Lakes, accustomed to be described as the world's largest and most valuable source of fresh water? Bad, according to Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio, unless something drastic is done to conquer the rising tide of pollution.

Senator YOUNG quoted expert predictions that Lake Erie and perhaps the other Great Lakes would be "dead within a decade or two" from pollution. Into Lake Erie alone, the Senator said, each day 3 million tons of debris and filth are dumped, making it probably the largest body of seriously contaminated fresh water in the world. And what is happening in Lake Erie, he told the Senate, is typical of what is happening in the other Great Lakes where cities bordering them and their tributaries discharge sewage into the water. The lakes, he warned, are rapidly becoming one continuous cesspool.

It is an extremely ugly picture and in all likelihood it will get worse before anything can be done to make it better. However, this is reason to welcome a word of optimism from James B. Coulter, Chief of Water Projects of the Public Health Service Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control. His opinion is that pollution can be controlled, that Lake Erie could be restored to health in 10 years. He said the project would require the cooperation of Federal, State, and local governments.

And it's no insignificant project, either. It would include these steps: Cleaning up the tributaries which carry sewage and industrial wastes into lake waters, maintaining water quality at present levels by reducing the amount of nitrogen and phosphorus entering the water, stepping up sewage treatment up to one-half above present costs, dredging the bottom sediment and harvesting crops of algae and aquatic growths.

Coulter said the salvage of Lake Erie "depends on what people want and how much they are willing to pay for it." In this situation there isn't much choice. It's a cinch things can't be allowed to go on as they are. We can't afford to let such a vital national asset as the Great Lakes go down the drain. We can't afford not to take the steps necessary to restore them and maintain them as they ought to be. We think the imperative nature of the task is gaining impressive recognition. The cost will be heavy, but it is unthinkable that the money will not be forthcoming and put to effective and beneficial work.

The Proposed World Trade Center for Lower Manhattan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the current proposal for the building of a world trade center in lower Manhattan in New York City has many disadvantages which have been overlooked or ignored.

Some of the objections are contained in the following editorial which was broadcast by WCBS in New York on November 24–25, 1964, and which I commend to the attention of our colleagues:

WCBS CRITICAL OF WORLD TRADE CENTER PROPOSED FOR LOWER MANHATTAN

The Port of New York Authority's proposal to condemn 13 square blocks of lower Manhattan for a world trade center demands critical reappraisal.

The tendency has been to swallow whole the catalogue of benefits the metropolitan area could expect to derive from the scheme. But not much publicity has been given the other side of the story. In our judgment, the disadvantages are considerable. They outweigh positive aspects, and should be examined with candor.

The trade center scheme rests on the assumption that the port's economic health depends on efficiency, and efficiency depends on how physically close to one another you can bring firms and agencies engaged in world trade. Yet the port authority consistently glosses over evidence that, first of all, export-import activity is already highly centralized below wall street: secondly, trade center space has been set aside for government agencies having nothing to do with international commerce: and thirdly, bulldozing a few hundred small retail stores now on the site would contribute little to a meaningful concept of economic health.

Further misgivings arise when you consider the tax picture as it affects New York City. The port authority enjoys tax exempt status. On the proposed trade center, however, it has agreed to pay the city three or four million dollars voluntarily—in lieu of taxes. But this is small potatoes compared with the tax yield the city could expect were private interests, not a public agency, to construct the $350 million project. Striking 13 blocks of real estate permanently from city tax rolls hardly qualifies, in our opinion, as enlightened municipal self-interest.

For the Wagner administration to sacrifice jobs, businesses and future tax revenue to the trade center plan would run counter to accepted practices of good government. The trade center's so-called public purpose is open to serious question. Nothing would better indicate the city's willingness to act in the public's true interest than bold opposition to the trade center plan in its current form, and on the site now proposed for it.

We Must Not Destroy the McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a concerted effort is being made to destroy the McCarran-Walter Act as it relates to admission of immigrants, and make admissible hundreds of thousands of additional immigrants each year. I am convinced this would be contrary to the public interest. The Secretary of State has admitted that we already have one of the most generous immigration policies in the world, though he favors a few changes.

This effort to destroy our quota system and open the floodgates for new categories of admissions should be defeated. I expressed my views on this subject in testimony given to the House Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the distinguished member from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is chairman. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that statement:

STATEMENT OF O. C. FISHER BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION, HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I desire to record my opposition to H.R. 2580. This measure would destroy our time-tested traditional national origins system of admitting immigrants from European countries. It would transfer from the Congress to the Executive the responsibility of determining how many immigrants would be admitted each year. It would give to a politically appointed commission power to decide who would be admitted and from what country they would come. This would create a bonanza for immigration lawyers and influence peddlers, and would not be in the public interest.

Unfortunately, the real purposes of this proposal are obscured in political motivations, emotionalism, claims of racial discrimination, alleged foreign policy embarrassments, and a contention that we are desperately in need of the skills of those who would be admitted under the new policy that is proposed.

Now, what are the real purposes of this bill? One man described it as a numbers game, and I think that is a fairly accurate description. The real purpose is to increase the number of people who can be admitted to this country each year. We might as well be frank about it.

The alleged discriminaion is, of course, ridiculous. Since admissions from various European countries is now based upon the ratio of people from those nations who were here in 1920, it would be just as sensible to contend that the Italians, the Russians, the French, or others discriminated against this country because more of them did not choose to emigrate here prior to 1920. In other words, discrimination has no place in this discussion.

Likewise, the claim that the State Department runs into embarrassing situations because all nations are not treated alike, is, in my judgment, flimsy and very farfetched. Other nations, in their wisdom, impose certain restrictions on admission of immigrants, and so do we. That is their business, and we have our business to look after.

The same is true of trade policies. Some of our people did not like the Common Market when it was announced some years ago. Diplomats representing the member nations that comprised the Common Market could have reported to their respective governments that they were embarrassed by claims of discrimination from some of their foreign counterparts. But who would contend that those countries were for that reason under any obligation to rescind their trade restrictions which were imposed to serve their own self-interest?

The matter of immigration policy, as with trade policy, is purely a domestic issue, and has always been treated as such by all countries.

It could, of course, be contended that we discriminate against the English, the French, the Italians, and all quota countries because we admit people from the Western Hemisphere without any quota restrictions at all. In a manner of speaking, that is true. But that is a part of our policy, the making of which comes under the head of our own business. The fact, for example, that we admit an Argentinean without regard to any quota does not mean that we consider that South American as a better person than an Englishman who can be admitted only under a strict quota.

I mention this to illustrate how ridiculous is the discrimination contention. It simply has no place in this discussion.

The real question to be resolved is: Do we need more immigrants? We now admit about 300,000 a year. Frankly, I think that is too many, under present conditions. We already have 196 million people in this country. The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that at the present rate of growth we will have 372 million by the turn of the century. By the year 2000 it is estimated world population will approximate 6 billion, and that at the present growth rate it will pass 25 billion by 2070.

It is imperative that we consider our normal population growth, and the population explosion around the world, in the fashioning of immigration policies for the admission of more people to this country.

Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to question the good faith of those who insist this legislation is needed in order to be able to admit more skilled people. Again, I am convinced that is an excuse, not a reason. I simply do not believe very many people are sincerely concerned about supplying more trained and skilled people for our labor market. I have not heard that appeal coming from prospective employers. On the contrary, it comes from the politicians and organized selfish-interest pressure groups as an excuse to justify their desire to have our restrictions broken down so more people can be admitted. Besides, our present law contains the same preferential treatment for skilled people as is proposed in H.R. 2580. Yet I understand that only 2,500 immigrants were admitted because of special skills last year.

NEW IMMIGRANTS SWELL RELIEF ROLLS

Another reason we do not need to increase the number of immigrants is because of the burden they become to so many localities in terms of unemployment, housing, education, crime, subversive activities, and assimilation problems in some instances.

It must be assumed that most of our new immigrants are good people and deserving. But despite the screening, the records are replete with instances of bad characters who, though relatively few in number, manage to get in despite all precautions.

We are told there are 35 million in this country who are poverty-stricken or are in that general category. We have scores of welfare programs, local, State, and Federal, the costs of which have increased astronomically in recent years. Yet, sponsors of this legislation want to admit more, a good many of whom would undoubtedly be added to relief rolls or would otherwise become burdensome. In other words, we have our hands full trying to handle our own problems with our 5 million unemployed and others who are in need of retraining, rehabilitation, and other types of help.

Now, what will the proposed increase amount to? Sponsors estimate it will be about 60,000 a year, bringing the total to about 360,000. If that is true, then why not put an overall ceiling of 360,000 on the total number who can be admitted in any one year, and write it into the law? I daresay sponsors would not stand for that.

The fact is that the increase will probably be substantially more than that if the bill is passed. There is simply no way of estimating the number of refugees, Asiatics, Africans, and others who would be admissible under the terms of H.R. 2580, because there is no way of determining in advance how many of the eligibles will choose to seek admission and how many of the applications will be granted. Estimates of the total increase run as high as 1 million a year. Perhaps that figure is a bit extravagant, but I will not be surprised if more than a half million come in each year under the Celler bill, if enacted.

In addition, we must assume that pressures for increases in the nonquota category will occur in the years ahead. Rate of population growth in Latin America is the highest in the world, and there is much poverty. It is estimated that the already overpopulated area of Latin America will double during the next 20 years. So we must brace ourselves for stepped-up pressures to admit more of those people.

The big increase under the Celler proposal would come primarily from Africa, Asia, and some from southern Europe.

Mr. Chairman, the far-reaching effect of this legislation is simply too important to be decided, or even influenced, on the basis of politics or emotionalism. We are playing for

keeps. Once this bill is enacted, the die is cast.

We already have a good immigration law. It has stood the test of time. The McCarran-Walter Act, which reenacted the provisions now under attack, was passed over a Presidential veto on June 26, 1952, by a vote of 278 to 112 in the House and 57 to 26 in the Senate. I am convinced the vast majority of Americans want it retained. I recently submitted a questionnaire to every voter in my district, and included the immigration issue. The responses, which have been tabulated, revealed that 78 percent of my constituents are opposed to the proposed changes. There is a lot more grassroot opposition to this bill than the sponsors realize.

Mr. Chairman, in considering this legislation let us think in terms of what is best for America and its future. Are we to become the dumping ground for the surplus populations of other countries?

Above everything, let us keep control of immigration in the Congress where it belongs. Someone wisely suggested that it would be better to have a mathematician select who comes here, under a formula, than to have a politician do it, without any formula at all. With that I agree.

I respectfully urge the committee to reject this bill.

Safeguards Against the Delinquency of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an inspirational and eloquent address by the beloved 91-year-old President David O. McKay of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints at the opening of the church's 135th annual conference in Salt Lake City, Utah, last Sunday morning.

President McKay has developed those recognized safeguards necessary to combat the delinquency of youth—the home, the church, the school, and the moral atmosphere of the leaders of the Nation, town, and community. He has shown the necessary environment to which every child is entitled and pointed out many of the areas where the adults of this Nation are failing in their responsibilities.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, this significant spiritual sermon deserves the thoughtful consideration of every parent, every churchman, every educator, and every public official in our Nation. This can only serve to emphasize earlier concern voiced in these matters by the President of the United States in his message on crime.

President McKay's address follows:

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST THE DELINQUENCY OF YOUTH

(Address delivered by President David O. McKay at the 135th annual conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, held in the Salt Lake Tabernacle, Sunday, Apr. 4, 1965)

My brethren and sisters, and friends of the television and radio audience, as I approach this solemn duty, I sense fully the need of your united support, and particularly the sustaining and guiding influence of the spirit of the Lord.

"I charge thee", wrote Paul to Timothy, "before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ * * * teach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering" (II Timothy 4: 1–2).

In the same letter he prophetically declared "that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, * * * lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God: Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof" (II Timothy 3: 1–2, 4–5).

It is in the spirit of Paul's charge and prophecy that I approach the subject of safeguards against delinquency of youth. In naming these safeguards, I have nothing new to offer. You have heard them mentioned frequently, but I think, as with the gospel principles, it is fitting that we be active in season and out of season, that we reprove, rebuke, exhort, admonish, with all long-suffering as we contemplate the rising crime wave, and bring home to each of use, if possible, the realization that greater diligence is needed.

Few will question the fact that we are living in perilous times; that many people have lost their moorings and are being "tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive" (Ephesians 4: 14).

Among the glaring evils of our day are two which seem to be most detrimental, and which must be curbed if we would preserve true Christian ideals. These are: First, an increasing tendency to dishonor the marriage vow; and, second, the mounting juvenile delinquency. Careful research would undoubtedly disclose a close relationship between these two unwholesome social conditions.

As evidence of the first, we need only to glance at the number of divorces in the country at large. Recent statistics disclose that one out of every four marriages are separated by the ever-grinding divorce mill.

But it is the ever-increasing crime wave that I desire to call attention to this morning. Children are being corrupted by it; youth are caught in its whirlpool, and are being contaminated overwhelmingly by it.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who is probably our Nation's leading authority on crime, made the following alarming report at a dinner held in his honor in Chicago, Ill., on November 24, 1964:

"To every man and every nation there comes a time when decisions must be made about grave problems. Further delay in seeking solutions can bring disaster. That time has come for the United States.

"The moment has arrived when we must face realistically the startling fact that since 1958 crime in this country has increased five times faster than our population growth. Serious crimes—murder, forcible rape, robbery, burglary, aggravated assault, automobile theft—have mounted steadily since the end of World War II. In 1951, these crimes for the first time topped the 1 million mark, and more than 2.25 million serious crimes were reported during 1963.

"Even more ominous is the fact that this terrifying spiral in crime has come about through a growing wave of youthful criminality across the Nation. Last year for the 15th consecutive year, crimes involving our young people increased over the previous year. For all serious crimes committed in the United States in 1963, youthful offenders were responsible for 72 percent of the total arrests for these crimes. The cost of our crime has now reached the staggering sum of $27 billion a year.

"What a grim and unhappy commentary on the moral climate of this great Nation. The moral strength of our Nation has decreased alarmingly. We must return to the teachings of God if we are to cure this sickness. These shocking statistics, together with the public's apparent indifference to them, are indicative of the false morality we are tolerating today. It is a false code which is based on the worship of things of man's own creation. It is as imperfect and feeble as man himself. However, captivating to the senses, this type of moral climate cannot give the support nor the strength which is so vital to our national survival. This breakdown in our moral standards can only render us impotent as a people and as a nation."

In calling attention to these conditions, I would not have you think that our young people generally do not merit our confidence. It is the few, not the many, of whom we now speak.

When, a few years ago, a little 4-year-old lad wandered into the Badlands of North Dakota, the whole countryside was aroused and organized for the rescue. They gave no thought, however, to the hundreds of 4-year-olds who were safe in their mothers' keeping. A train wreck or an airplane disaster shocks us to attention, awakens sympathy and a demand for more safeguards, while to the hundreds of trains and airplanes carrying millions to safety, we give scarcely a passing thought.

So while we solicitously call attention to the tragedies in the stream of human life, let us not be unmindful of the much greater group who move steadily and successfully along, avoiding the sandbars and rapids of sinful indulgence and spiritual decay, whose noble lives confirm and increase confidence in the growing generation. As we seek the lost sheep, let us be appreciative of the "ninety and nine" that are safe in the fold.

But no matter how firm our confidence is in the majority of the young, we must not close our eyes to the fact that the number of delinquents and youthful criminals is ominously increasing. In the interest of the moral atmosphere of our communities, the welfare of the State, the perpetuity of our democratic form of Government, we must search for the causes of this upswing in crime, and, if possible, remove them and apply the proper remedies.

One important cause of the increase in child delinquency is a let down in home ideals. A growing desire for economic independence, or a too eager willingness to improve financial circumstances, has influenced too many of our mothers to neglect the greatest of all responsibilities—the rearing of a family. Director Hoover makes the definite statement that "In the background of these youth offenders lies the story of shocking neglect. Boys and girls are being deprived of the care and guidance necessary to the proper foundation of their characters. Their lawlessness had its roots in every instance in broken homes where mothers and fathers, because of their neglect, misunderstanding, or irresponsibility had failed in their primary obligations. More often than not, God was unknown, or, more important, was unwelcome in their homes.

"On the other hand, in nearly every instance the youthful offender would have been a strong, upright citizen had he been given a chance. If his pent-up energies and desires had been directed along wholesome channels; if his problems—the problems that made him a problem child—had been solved by patient and attentive parents, he would have proved to be an influence for good in his community."

You may think me extreme, but I am going to say that a married woman who refuses to assume the responsibilities of motherhood, or who, having children, neglects them for pleasure or social prestige, is recreant to the highest calling and privilege of womankind. The father, who because of business or political or social responsibilities, fails to share with his wife the responsibilities of rearing

his sons and daughters, is untrue to his marital obligations, is a negative element in what might and should be a joyous home atmosphere, and is a possible contrbutor to discord and delinquency.

There are three fundamental things to which every child is entitled: (1) a respected name, (2) a sense of security, (3) opportunities for development.

The family gives to the child his name and standing in the community. A child wants his family to be as good as those of his friends. He wants to be able to point with pride to his father, and to feel an inspiration always as he thinks of his mother. It it a mother's duty so to live that her children will associate with her everything that is beautiful, sweet, and pure. In the words of former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover: "After we have determined every scientific fact, after we have erected every public safeguard, after we have constructed every edifice for education or training or hospitalization or play, yet all these things are but a tithe of the physical, moral, and spiritual gifts which motherhood gives and home confers. None of these things carry that affection, that devotion of soul, which is the great endowment from mothers."

And the father should so live that the child, emulating his example, will be a good citizen, and, in the church, a true Latter-day Saint.

A child has a right to feel that in his home he has a place of refuge, a place of protection from the dangers and evils of the outside world. Family unity and integrity are necessary to supply this need.

The home is the best place in the world to teach the highest ideal in the social and political life of man; namely, perfect liberty of action so long as you do not trespass upon the rights and privileges of another.

The great need of the American home today is more religion. Parents should make it obvious both by their actions and their conversation that they are seriously interested in the fruits of true religion. Example of parents should emphasize the need of honesty in our dealings with our family, our neighbors, and all with whom we come in contact; of kindness to our employees, of fair play to our employers, or good measure to our customers.

The Lord places the responsibility directly where it belongs, wherein He says that it is the duty of parents to teach their children the principles of the Gospel and to walk uprightly before the Lord, and if they do not so teach, the sin be upon the heads of the parents.

Next to the home as a safeguard to delinquency, the church should be a dominant force. The other day I was pleased to note a recent Gallup poll published in a late edition of the New York Herald Tribune, which revealed that in 1964 at least 45 percent of the entire adult population of the Nation attended church in one typical week, and that although the percentage dropped 4 points since the peak year of 1958, it is still so high that it completely eclipses the 5 percent and 7 percent in some of the other leading countries. It is interesting that although men are reputedly not very religious, 40 percent of the entire male adult population of the United States attends church each Sunday. Forty-nine percent of the women attend regularly. This means that 49,500,000 adult men and women attend church services in the United States. But what of the other 55 percent of men and women who do not attend church, and what of the children who come from the homes of these men and women? Their indifference toward church should tend only to spur us to more earnest and diligent activity.

Where there is an indifference toward Christian churches, we shall have to place next to the home, not the church, but the public school as the most influential factor in lessening delinquency.

I believe with all my heart that the most paramount objective of the public school system from kindergarten to the university should be character building and the evolving of true, loyal citizens of the Republic. The teaching of the three "R's," of the arts and sciences, even the delving into research work, should be but a means to the development of true manhood and noble womanhood.

True education is awakening a love for truth, a just sense of duty, opening the eyes of the soul to the great purpose and end of life. It is not teaching the individual to love the good for personal sake; it is to teach him to love the good for the sake of the good itself; to be virtuous in action because he is so in heart; to love and serve God supremely, not from fear, but from delight in His perfect character.

Upon the teacher rests much of the responsibility of lifting society to this high level. Ralph Waldo Emerson, reputedly the wisest American, said, "Character is higher than intellect. A great soul will be fit to live as well as to think."

Another safeguard against delinquency of youth is the moral atmosphere of the leaders of the Nation, town, and community. This is determined by the ideals and actions of adults, and particularly of civic officers and those who are entrusted to enforce the law.

If we are sincere in our desire to reduce the delinquency among youth, let us look to ourselves as members of the community and as leaders and officials in civic circles. A Nation that has conquered great material difficulties, and harnessed the physical powers, must have some more effective means of combatting the cynicism of its youth—the cynicism born of widely flaunted dishonesty of those in high places, insincerity of leadership, and gaudy pageantry of crime.

Yes, we are living in perilous times, but let us hope that they may be to the present generation as the fiery furnace that consumes the dross but purifies the gold.

A clean man is a national asset. A pure woman is the incarnation of true national glory. A citizen who loves justice and hates evil is better than a battleship. The strength of any community consists of and exists in the men who are pure, clean, upright, and straightforward, ready for the right and sensitive to every approach of evil. Let such ideals be the standard of citizenship.

Let us here and now express gratitude for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, with its priesthood quorums and auxiliary organizations especially organized to combat the evils of crime and juvenile delinquency. It was established by divine revelation of God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ. Its glorious mission is to proclaim the birth of the restored gospel, to uplift society that people may mingle more amicably one with another; to create in our communities a wholesome environment in which our children may find strength to resist temptation, and encouragement to strive for cultural and spiritual attainment; to make ineffective the influence of designing men who would make profit out of their fellows, who are fallen so low as to be slaves to their appetites and passions—and who would fill their purses through the weaknesses of addicts of gambling, drunkenness, and nicotine. The gospel is a rational philosophy that teaches men how to attain happiness in this life, and exaltation in the life to come.

God help us to discharge our responsibilities to our youth by making an environment in home, in school, in church, and in our communities that will be uplifting, wholesome, faith inspiring, I pray in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

Foreign Aid at the Grassroots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. Orrin Shipe, managing director of CUNA International, Inc., testified last month before the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House.

The Humphrey amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 made it the policy of the U.S. Government to use cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan associations to implement the self-help objectives of our economic assistance programs.

While revolts, palace intrigue, and civil unrest in the developing nations have made the headlines, CUNA has been quietly working at the grassroots level to improve the lot of the people in these countries. As Mr. Shipe states, over 800 credit unions have been chartered in Latin America and 600 more are awaiting their charter. The young credit unions have established a solid record of fiscal stability and reform. The results have been encouraging enough to warrant expansion of CUNA's efforts to Africa, Asia, and the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of and appendix to Mr. Shipe's testimony for the CUNA International, Inc., so that the Members of the House may better understand this important link in the chain of reform binding the people of the United States to the aspirations of the peoples of the world:

STATEMENT OF J. ORRIN SHIPE, MANAGING DIRECTOR, CUNA INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FORMERLY CREDIT UNION NATIONAL ASSOCIATION), TO COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, less than a year ago I reported to you that technicians directed by CUNA International, Inc. (formerly Credit Union National Association), under a contract with the Agency for International Development had organized 600 credit unions in Latin America.

Today, I am happy to report that this number is now 800, with 600 more awaiting chartering authority. There are now about 420,000 credit union members in Latin America. Most of these members earn no more than $100 per year, and most have never saved before.

Savings of these members have now reached $16.5 million. Loans outstanding are now $22 million. Since 1962, Latin American credit unions have loaned $45 million. All these figures represent phenomenal growth.

But it is not by statistics alone that the success of the CUNA-AID program should be judged. We are finding that credit unions expand their members' horizons. Credit unions serve as training centers in the process of government; they afford members their first experience in democracy. The members readily accept the cardinal rule of credit unions: one member, one vote.

Probably most important from our point of view, and from the standpoint of U.S. foreign policy, the credit union has turned out to be an important vehicle to provide the

Latin American poor with a new self-reliance, a new self-respect, a new initiative.

A fine example is the community credit union in Iquitos, Peru. Iquitos is an isolated town in the jungle not far from the headwaters of the Amazon River. Organized in the poorest section of Iquitos, the credit union now is the largest in Peru. It has more than 3,500 members who have saved about $1 million. In Peru, this is a remarkable achievement. But most significantly, the credit union has proven to be a springboard for community action programs. It is now financing a low-cost housing project for its members.

All over Latin America, credit unions are leading people to appreciate their own power. Once a successful credit union gets underway, it serves as the foundation for other developmental projects. The members move forward with confidence, bolstered by their success with the credit union.

This improvement in motivation does not come about automatically. Our technicians have operated educational programs for 4,000 Latin Americans in over 120 seminars.

I should like to point out that CUNA has contracted both with AID and with the Peace Corps. There is a particularly strong development program underway in Eucador under Peace Corps auspices. In addition, CUNA itself has for some years undertaken development work on its own before the involvement of the U.S. Government. This involvement has simply accelerated our expansion activities.

In order to supply the committee with more detailed information, I am filing an appendix to this statement. The appendix contains information on all our programs: CUNA-AID, CUNA-Peace Corps, and CUNA alone.

You will note that our activities are not limited to Latin America. Our work in Africa is just beginning. We have made a good start in Korea. Plans are being formulated for programs in India and Pakistan. We are committed to moving ahead.

APPENDIX TO STATEMENT OF J. ORRIN SHIPE

The Humphrey amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 made it the policy of the U.S. Government to use cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan associations to help implement the self-help objectives of our foreign aid program. Their use, it was felt, would add a new people-to-people dimension to U.S. Government efforts to assist developing countries.

To implement this new program, the International Cooperative Development Service was set up in the Office of Material Resources in AID/Washington, and authorized to enter into a series of global openend contracts with U.S. cooperative organizations qualified to help establish cooperatives abroad. To date seven contracts are in force, one with the Credit Union National Association (CUNA), of Madison, Wis., and six other national cooperative organizations.

CREDIT UNIONS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

A credit union is a cooperative association organized to promote thrift among its members and to accumulate a fund from these savings to make needed loans to members for useful purposes at reasonable interest rates.

It also has been described as a uniting of the efforts and knowledge of a group of people who have a common bond and share a common need for accumulating savings, providing a source of credit and developing or fostering among themselves cooperative action. Credit unions are a means by which people get together and work together toward the solution of one of the chief problems affecting developing communities, the satisfaction of basic human needs through self-help.

In uniting efforts toward the solution of their problems through credit unions, each individual in the group participates in the activity which causes the group to improve or develop.

A credit union can be started in any group: people working for the same employer; people who live in the small community; people who are members of the same church, labor union, or fraternal order. Membership is open to everyone in the group. Basically, every credit union is a group of friends and acquaintances who want to help each other. The only purpose of a credit union is service—not charity or profit.

CREDIT UNIONS—A MEANS OF SAVINGS

Communities in Latin America are assuming responsibility for the management of local affairs. They have to manage their limited capital assets to increase production and to develop and improve their standard of living and way of life.

The pattern of development in Latin American and other less-developed countries has had the effect of providing the larger share of proceeds from industry or agriculture, whether in profits or emoluments to the main towns. The remaining proceeds have been spread among the indigenous population at a low per capita income rate. Millions of people are continually in servitude during most of their lives and in many cases pay interest several times the amount of the principal. Reputable organizations providing natives with credit for personal or productive use are practically nonexistent; in most instances, they are limited to the usurer.

The internal mobilization of capital has to be accomplished first by using these small sums on a broad base, and the best, indeed, the only way in which this is economically feasible is through a credit union, where the self-help aspect eliminates the administrative cost of the operation.

Credit unions throughout the world have always maintained truly self-help programs. This feature of credit union development is most important, especially in developing countries where people in these countries often look outside of themselves and their communities for the solution of their problems:

Even in the cooperative movement itself at times due to a lack of this self-help feature, development has taken place without this effective financial contribution or active participation in management from the people within the local community.

CREDIT UNIONS—BASIC FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Credit unions are set up and operated for and by groups of interested people who have some established interests with each other or some existing common bond. They are legally chartered by government, and are usually supervised by the chartering agency, but are otherwise fully owned and controlled by their members under the one-member one-vote process. Day-to-day operations are carried on by a board of directors, and a credit and supervisory committee operating under delegated authority from members and according to accepted bylaws and operating policies.

Credit unions offer numerous benefits and services to members varying from group to group. Basic standard benefits include:

1. Encouraging, motivating, and providing a ready facility to help members practice thrift by systematically saving—even very small amounts of their incomes.

2. Providing low-cost loans.

3. Providing finance and budget counseling.

4. Planning expenditures, keeping out of heavy debt involvement to high-rate lenders.

5. Frequently providing services such as insurance coverages for loans and insurance to match member savings, and insurance protection against losses which may arise in its financial operations.

6. Education of members and training of officers in finance management through the democratic process.

The key to credit union success with low-income people is perhaps the feeling of group solidarity growing out of group action, and the confidence developing in these finance institutions that are member owned and controlled. Credit unions exist—to some degree—in some 75 countries of the world and are increasing steadily.

CUNA INTERNATIONAL, INC.

CUNA was organized in 1934 as an association of credit unions in the United States. In 1940, Canada was admitted and in 1946 membership was expanded to include credit unions in the Western Hemisphere. Since 1957, all credit unions through the free world are eligible for the services which CUNA International provides.

CUNA International, the credit unions' own international confederation, serves and coordinates this worldwide program. AID is using credit union technicians provided by CUNA to help implement the Humphrey amendment in its cooperative development programs; and helping credit union people extend this worldwide thrift service to the people of developing countries to which CUNA is fully committed.

CUNA's specific goals are to promote the organization of new credit unions; perfect credit union laws in the States, provinces, and countries in which credit unions operate; improve methods and techniques of credit union operations, and coordinate and direct the efforts of all credit unions in their drive to give the people throughout the world an opportunity to economic, social and educational advancement through self-help.

CUNA, through its World Extension Department, has been engaged for more than a decade in channeling assistance for the development of credit unions in many developing countries. This assistance by the people in credit unions did not begin with the creation of the World Extension Department of CUNA in 1954. It was the outgrowth of a desire to insure that assistance as was customarily given by credit union members to less developed countries for this purpose be better deployed and also extended. Prior to this time, many United States and Canadian provincial leagues had been assisting credit union development in the Caribbean and in South America.

Within the limits of its resources, CUNA has tried to answer the great number of requests for assistance it is receiving at its Madison headquarters. It is with such assistance to local leaders by guidance and training that a sound and stable credit union development is taking place in the Caribbean Islands of Jamaica, Trinidad, the West Indies, and the Netherlands Antilles; in the Latin American countries of Mexico, Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia Peru, Panama, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and in the Pacific in the Fiji Islands, Samoa and Korea; and in Tanzania, Kenya, Ghana, and Nigeria in Africa.

In 1961, following on the Humphrey amendment, the Alliance for Progress decided to include assistance to the South American countries participating in the program for the development of credit unions, cooperatives, and savings and loan associations. Following this, a contract was signed with the Credit Union National Association to develop credit unions.

Under the leadership of CUNA technicians, credit unions have increased in Latin America from 432 in September 1962, to over 1,200 by December 1964, with over 600 additional groups awaiting charters; members increased from 124,000 to 420,000; savings of members from $4.2 million to $16.5 million, and loans

outstanding to members from $4 million to $18 million. Loans are made for some 25 different purposes covering personal or consumer loans, farm production loans, self-help housing loans, and loans to start small business enterprises.

Growth approximated or exceeded 100 percent in each of these 2 years. Considering that most members earn $100 per annum or less, this overall growth is phenomenal. The new program is saving low income credit union members of Latin America an estimated $3 million or more annually by way of interest charges, and is raising $40 or more in new capital for each $1 of technical assistance cost. In addition, it is establishing a new and completely self-sustaining and self-perpetuating program for the low income people of Latin America.

Some of the reasons for credit union success are:

1. It is a simple type cooperative.
2. It deals with only one commodity—money.
3. It creates no new problems; it is set up only to solve problems already existent.
4. It is less vulnerable to competition because it is self-contained and operates in the closed circuit of its own members.
5. Other enterprises need capital with which to start operations, but the credit union, in the process of developing capital, is carrying on one of the two main functions of the society—savings.
6. The credit union can be scaled down to meet the needs of the lowliest people, as well as meet the needs of the most demanding, and it can be brought within the grasp of all people.

The extent of this unsatisfied need among less developed peoples of the world has been clearly shown by the part that CUNA, with its limited resources, has played in the launching of credit unions in some 70 countries and territories as shown hereunder:

United States	22,000
Canada	4,700
Africa:	
Basutoland	3
Ethiopia	3
Ghana	20
Kenya	3
Malawi	2
Mauritius	1
Nigeria Republic	19
Sierre Leone	4
Southern Rhodesia	2
Tanzania	40
Uganda	8
Zambia	2
Asia:	
Hong Kong	3
Korea	71
Pakistan	13
Thailand	75
Vietnam	20
Latin America:	
British Honduras	44
Costa Rica	34
El Salvador	46
Guatemala	8
Honduras	37
Mexico	535
Nicaragua	1
Panama	42
Argentina	3
Bolivia	73
Brazil	80
British Guiana	17
Chile	112
Colombia	211
Ecuador	104
Paraguay	2
Peru	396
Surinam	15
Uruguay	3
Venezuela	75
Australasia:	
Capital Territory	5
New Guinea-Papua-Solomon	14
New South Wales	186
Queensland	14
South Australia	4
Tasmania	9
Victoria	86
Western Australia	7
Caribbean islands:	
Anguilla	2
Antigua	7
Barbados	17
Cayman Islands	1
Dominica	20
Dominican Republic	28
Grenada	16
Haiti	29
Jamaica	127
Montserrat	6
Netherland Antilles	56
St. Kitts	4
St. Lucia	5
St. Vincent	8
Trinidad-Tobago	133
Pacific islands:	
Fiji	284
New Zealand	8
Philippines	671
Tonga	1
Western Samoa	20

The assets of these credit unions amount to approximately:

[In thousands]

U.S. territories and possessions	$9,100,000
Canada	2,150,000
Africa	875
Asia	10,000
Australasia	19,000
Caribbean islands	9,500
Pacific islands	4,800
Latin America	16,500

The strength of the credit union movement is not its monetary assets, important as they are. Its greatest value is its contribution to the growth and development of its members, its practical demonstration of democracy at work, its development of leaders from among its membership, its demonstration of private enterprise as a means for attaining social, economic, and political freedom.

CUNA has played a dynamic role in these developments.

Cooperation between AID and CUNA has resulted in the extension and acceleration of credit unions in the developing countries Since the first agreement in 1962—the agreement to develop credit union systems in Latin America—AID has broadened the scope of the partnership—in January 1963—to include all other regional areas.

As I mentioned in my covering statement to this appendix, the development work carried on by CUNA International takes three forms: The CUNA-AID program, the CUNA-Peace Corps program, and the work of CUNA alone. The figures in the tables above give a good indication of the progress of each of these programs.

For example, the CUNA-AID contracts have been limited up to now to work in a dozen countries of Latin America: Venezuela, Brazil, Peru, Colombia, Bolivia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, Panama, Nicaragua, and El Salvador. Additional credit union programs can be started in a country under the CUNA-AID program on the basis of a task order worked out by the local AID mission.

Feasibility surveys have been mounted in Ethiopia, Sudan, Nigeria, Tunisia, and Sierra Leone. The average cost per country of a credit union organizing program is $50,000. On the basis of present performance, each technical assistance dollar expended in Latin America has generated over $40 in new capital through credit union savings.

Activities with the Peace Corps have been confined to Ecuador, where an intensive organizing program has gotten underway.

The remaining credit union development listed in the above tables is due to the CUNA world extension program operating alone and independent of any government support.

Strong areas of credit union development outside of Latin America include Australia, Jamaica, Netherlands Antilles, Trinidad-Tobago, Fiji, and the Philippines. We are proud of the support of credit union leagues in the United States and Canada which has made this development possible. Out of this development have come many heartening examples of what credit unions are accomplishing.

A peasant woman in Arequipa, Peru, near the Chilean border, exercised her credit union membership rights by borrowing the equivalent of $22—not a significant sum—but nevertheless, an amount of money sufficient to enable her to buy three used beds for her nine children, the first time any member of the family had slept off the ground.

In Peru, the poor people in the isolated jungle town of Iquitos, not far from the headwaters of the Amazon River, have shown how a credit union can influence an entire community's growth. Organized in the poorest section of the town, the credit union is now the largest in Peru. It has more than 3,500 members, deposits approximate $1 million, and has started financing low-cost housing projects among its members.

From September 1962, to December 1964, savings held by Latin American credit unions have increased at a phenomenal rate: from $4.2 to $16.5 million, in excess of a threefold increase.

There are other examples of opportunities opened by credit unions: a loan permitting a young lawyer to pay for his license to practice; a newly licensed dentist to buy his equipment; a mechanic to open his own tire recapping shop.

Credit unions also expand people's knowledge. They act as training centers, teaching people with limited training a basic understanding of the truth about their country's development, and having them participate in this development in a democratic manner. For the first time, in most cases, they practice the basic principles of democracy.

Credit unions are also bringing people and their communities out of isolation. Through uniting their savings into significant sums, they are being brought into the mainstream of their country's economic life, and are becoming an integral part of their country's development.

This remarkable progress is directly attributable to the education and training programs, programs designed not only to instill technical competence, but also to develop local leadership.

CUNA has provided this type of training to more than 4,000 volunteers in over 120 seminars throughout Latin America.

Among local communities, it is in the awakening of the recognition of this need, capacity, and ability to help themselves that the credit union has made its best contribution to development. Only those who have seen the self-reliance, self-respect, and initiative which a credit union engenders can fully appreciate the extent to which this is true. Credit unions, simple as they may seem, have tapped the greatest national resources of many countries through their success in bringing about this awareness by their self-help cooperative program. Where

this recognition is awakened, there will be a great willingness to participate fully and freely in development ventures. Without this recognition, all other efforts are likely to fail in the long run.

Polish American Newspaperman John Switalski Recalls Turkish Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an article by Mr. John Switalski which appeared in the Polish American, March 30, was reproduced in the Hairenik Weekly, a journal of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation of North America, Thursday, April 1.

In view of its tremendous historic importance, the nationwide observance of the sufferings of the Armenian people 50 years ago is most noteworthy, and numerous publications are reviewing this great tragedy of the Armenian people.

The article is of special interest since in a very timely fashion it places the anniversary of the Turkish genocide against the Armenians in a very broad perspective.

With leave granted I place the article in the RECORD at this point:

POLISH AMERICAN NEWSPAPERMAN JOHN SWITALSKI RECALLS TURKISH ATROCITIES

(By John Switalski)

We are nearing the 50th anniversary of the first monstrous act of genocide in the 20th century. In April of 1915 the rulers of Turkey saw fit to wipe out the Armenian nation, the oppressed ancient inhabitants of Asia Minor and the Caucasus. One-half of the Armenian people were savagely massacred or driven to starvation and death in the Syrian Desert. The remainder had to abandon ancestral homes and flee into exile.

The Turkish atrocities excited indignation throughout the Allied countries during World War I and, after the defeat of the Central Powers, an attempt was made to restore an independent Armenia. The Armenians who returned to their Caucasian heartland, however, had to resume fighting both the Turks and the Russian Bolsheviks. President Woodrow Wilson asked Congress to establish an American mandate in Armenia to help the gallant nation maintain its existence. Isolationist-minded Congressmen succeeded in frustrating Wilson's intentions.

So Armenia once more was partitioned between Turkey and Russia. The Bolsheviks, of course, set up an "Armenian Soviet Republic," Red heads of which immediately began a new massacre of the Armenian national patriots who had fought for their country's freedom.

So tyrannous was the Communist rule of Armenia that the people rose in 1921 and drove out their oppressors. This was the first time any nation ever overthrew a Communist regime without outside help. A few months later, however, the Russian Red Army restored rule to the Armenian Communist Quislings.

Two years later this oldest Christian nation got its Yalta: the Lausanne Treaty. The Allies made a feeble attempt to bargain for an independent Armenia but when the Turkish representative threatened to walk out the Armenian case was shelved.

The Allies' betrayal of Armenia to a defeated power was bad enough, but the failure to punish Ottoman Turkey for the genocide was not only reprehensible but nurtured the terrible genocide of World War II. Hitler was to say, "The world forgot about the Armenians," and then proceeded to liquidate 6 million—mostly Polish—civilians.

(Ironically, it was a pre-Hitlerian German court that acquitted Soghomon Tehlirian, the Armenian hero who assassinated in Berlin Talaat Pasha, the Turkish interior minister who directed the Armenian massacres in 1915.)

Today the struggle for an Armenian identity continues in Soviet-occupied Caucasus, where another very ancient nation, Georgia, attempted an uprising in 1956. It is hard to understand why the U.S. Government does not remind the world of these captive nations each time the Kremlin denounces the United States for trying to keep southeast Asian countries free.

Besides the semicolonial satellites (Poland, Hungary, etc.) imperialist Russia maintains outright colonies in both of these countries, White Ruthenia (Byelorussia), Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. And that's not all. In central Asia the vast country of Turkestan remains partitioned between Soviet Russia and Red China while new African states are born almost weekly.

The Poles, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Slovaks, and Armenians all have cousins in the United States to remind the West of their enslavement. But the Kazakhs, Kirgiz, Uzbek, Tadjik, and Uighur peoples of Turkistan have no spokesmen in the West. Not even their Moslem coreligionists the leaders of the Arab States, have the traditional Islamic courage to lift their voices in the United Nations on behalf of their enslaved brethren. Not even at a time when they are giving arms and propaganda support to the non-Moslem, Communist-led Congolese terrorists. They are closer to Hitler and Stalin in ideology and character than to Feisal, Jinnah, and Hatta. Hence there are no spontaneous Arab demonstrations to protest Sukarno's imprisonment of Hatta.

For geopolitical reasons, Russia's rule over central Asia is less oppressive than is Red China's (compare Austria's rule in Galicia with Russian and Prussian of the Poles). Therefore, Communist China's effort to deprive the Kazakh, Kirgiz, and Uighur peoples of their language and culture has caused tens of thousands of these Tartar peoples to flee into the Soviet Union from Sinkiang (Chinese-held eastern Turkistan). But the Russians also have forced the Kazakh, Kirgiz, Tadjik, and Uzbek Soviet republics to substitute the Cyrillic alphabet for the Arabic formerly used. Russification continues.

The Tibetans, too, lack blood relatives in the West to write to Congressmen reminding them of Red China's imperialism. Few Tibetan exiles have reached the West and while India has granted asylum to their leader, the Dalai Lama, he is not permitted to make any pleas for the freedom of his unhappy country. How Gandhi must turn in his grave.

What an eloquent speech U.S. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson could make were he to remind the U.N. of Russo-Chinese Communist colonialism in central Asia.

District of Columbia Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, prevention of crime is everyone's business. This is so in the District of Columbia just as it is in New York.

In connection with this I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial broadcast during the week of March 21, 1965, by WMAL here in Washington:

DISTRICT CRIME

The failure of some District residents to give full support to the Metropolitan Police Department has helped increase the city's crime rate. Others remain indifferent to the crime problem. Almost no one wants to get involved by volunteering as a witness or notifying police of a crime.

Two recent cases point up the problem. In both cases policemen needed help in making arrests and asked bystanders to call the precinct for reinforcements. In both cases the people refused. In one case onlookers laughed at the officers who were struggling with the suspect. In the other incident bystanders kicked and jeered the arresting officer.

Unless there is a change in attitude, the city's crime rate will continue to spiral upward. Crime prevention is everyone's business. The President's Commission on Crime can help direct efforts to reduce crime, but it will need the full cooperation of every citizen.

Mexican Tomato Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I draw the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to the following article by the Council of California Growers, which appeared in their March 22, 1965, issue of Insight:

LOS ANGELES.—Approximately 80 percent of the fresh tomatoes handled in the Los Angeles fruit and vegetable wholesale markets in January were grown in Mexico. In the San Francisco-Oakland markets Mexican tomatoes represented roughly 30 percent of the total.

This is a 30-percent increase over the same month 5 years ago in the Los Angeles markets and helps explain the sharp decrease in the acreage of winter tomatoes grown in the Coachella and Imperial Valleys, says the Council of California Growers.

"California growers of fresh tomatoes and other winter vegetables are finding it increasingly difficult to compete against Mexican growers with lower labor and tax costs," it was pointed out by O. W. Fillerup, executive vice president of the council.

"In Mexico," said Fillerup, "the average farmworker receives the equivalent of about $1.56 per day. In California, the Mexican bracero earned an average of about $1.39 per hour on piece rates during 1963.

"During the current controversy over the farm labor shortage, agriculture's critics continue to say that the problem can be solved simply by increasing wages. California growers, already paying the highest wages in the United States, did increase their pay scales since the end of the bracero program, but still they haven't been able to attract enough domestic workers to fill the bracero gap in such crops as citrus.

"The big question is: How much more can California growers increase wages without pricing themselves out of the markets?

"Mexico and other States of the United States with lower labor costs have the potential to supply our domestic markets if California growers are forced out of competition. Mexico, for example, has doubled her irrigated acreage in the past 12 years, from 6 million to 12 million acres, most on the west coast within easy access to our markets."

The council obtained its figures on Mexican products sold in the Los Angeles and San Francisco-Oakland markets from the Agricultural Marketing Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In the Nation: The GOP Substitute Voting Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Arthur Krock which appeared in the April 6, 1965, edition of the New York Times.

THE GOP SUBSTITUTE VOTING BILL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON.—The substitute for the Katzenbach-Dirksen voting rights bill that was offered to Congress today by the House Republican leadership vitally serves the public interest in a number of ways.

It is a great improvement over the measure which President Johnson urged Congress to rush through virtually intact. For example, it is national in scope instead of discriminatory among areas where, by the administration's own formula for determining that Negro voting rights have been denied, this denial is a fixed practice. The improvement is accomplished by placing the burden of proof of nondiscrimination on a county-by-county instead of a State-by-State basis.

PROVISIONS OUTLINED

The House Republican bill preserves the common right of all States, granted by article I of the Constitution to require literacy tests if these are administered without violation of the 15th amendment's ban on racial discrimination. But these tests would not be required of applicants with at least a sixth-grade education, whereas the Katzenbach-Dirksen bill would open the ballot to many illiterates by abolishing all literacy tests in some, but not all, of the States which fall within its presumption that, since less than 50 percent of Negro voting eligibles voted in the presidential election of 1964, there exists a fixed pattern of racial discrimination.

AVENUES OF APPEAL

The proposed substitute also opens more direct channels of appeal, to the judicial and executive branches of the Federal Government, for qualified Negro voters with complaints of racial discrimination. And by rejecting the arbitrary formula of the Dirksen-Katzenbach measure that is based on a State's voting statistics of November 1964, but applicable only to certain of the States reached by the formula, the House Republican bill would not penalize communities innocent of fixed discrimination with those guilty of it.

The substitute will not satisfy those who hold that the 15th amendment cannot constitutionally limit the grant of article I to the States to prescribe voting qualifications, if these do not violate the ban of the amendment on their use for racially discriminatory purposes. In this opinion, only by another constitutional amendment can Congress be empowered to require a State—New York, for illustration—to accept a sixth- instead of an eighth-grade certificate as a qualification for voting. But these objectors have no visible prospect of inducing the congressional leaders of either major party, or a congressional majority, to legislate their view of the limitation of the 15th amendment on article I. And few, if any, lawyers or political observers believe it would stand a chance of affirmation by the current Supreme Court.

BILL'S CONSTITUTIONALITY

In point is a remark attributed to a highly placed Government lawyer by a visiting member of the profession, in response to the question whether the official was confident the administration bill is constitutional: "I'd rather you asked me if I am confident the Supreme Court will so declare it."

This confidence conceivably might have been justified, even if the test before the Supreme Court had been of the original Katzenbach-Dirksen text. But meanwhile the authors have modified provisions which could have strained the constitutional concepts of justices most inclined to resolve doubts of legality in legislation whose purpose they ardently approve. These modifications, however, left untouched inequitable and hamhanded provisions which (except for New York's requirement of literacy in English), are the target of the House Republican substitute.

Some of these defects are accidental in measures such as the Katzenbach-Dirksen bill, drafted under the pressure of partisan and personal competition for popular credit as well as the pressure generated by the President's demand for quick action. But the textual consequences in this instance demonstrate once again the services to the public interest of time for analysis of drastic programs by a congressional minority which fulfills the function of a constructive opposition.

A PUBLIC SERVICE

By assuming the role of coauthor of the President's bill, and supporting Mr. Johnson's foreshortened timetable, Senate Minority Leader DIRKSEN abdicated these important public services to the House Republican leadership. It has now performed them.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Tribute to Dr. Raymond L. Smith, President, Michigan Technological University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND F. CLEVENGER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 9, 1965, I shall have the opportunity to join with other Michigan citizens to pay tribute to Dr. Raymond L. Smith, president of Michigan Technological University, at Houghton, Mich., in the Upper Peninsula.

Those of us who will be present for Dr. Smith's inauguration as the seventh president of Michigan Tech, are well aware of the contributions he has made to education in general, to Michigan Technological University, and to the State of Michigan as a dedicated educator. In connection with his inauguration, I take this opportunity to place in the RECORD Dr. Smith's biography which has appeared in Michigan publications:

BIOGRAPHY OF DR. RAYMOND L. SMITH

In the spring of 1939 a skinny kid from the Maine backwoods stepped off the boat at Seward, Alaska. He had just turned 22 years of age and his only possessions were $50 in cash, a few clothes and a few tools. He had come to seek his fortune.

The youth's plans at that point were a bit nebulous, but the one thing he had not considered was enrolling in a university. On January 1 he became the president of one.

Last week Dr. Raymond L. Smith sat in his office and pondered his recent appointment as the eighth chief executive of Michigan Technological University. The road to this post is studded with enough quirks of fate and ironies to make it almost too incredible for even the standard Horatio Alger story.

That road started many years ago back in Vanceboro, Maine, where Dr. Smith was born. Despite some economic hard times he recalls a relatively happy childhood doing all the things any kid would do that was raised in the woods.

The new president's first jobs were in the lumber camps of the area, and by the time he was 18 he was a veteran of several big river drives from the logging camps to the mills. During the early depression years he worked in restaurants and picked up other odd jobs.

"We spent a lot of time riding the rods and in open boxcars," Dr. Smith says. "We'd hear about a job somewhere and hop the next freight to get there." His steadiest work during the 1930's was from 1935 to 1938 when he served as a psychiatric aid at the Institute of Living, then called the Hartford Retreat, a mental institution in Hartford, Conn.

A few years earlier the young Smith had obtained a private pilot's license, and by 1938 he and some friends had saved enough money to purchase an old Great Lakes biplane. While the dickering was going on, another friend approached him with glowing tales about the land of opportunity in Alaska.

The day the airplane deal was closed, Dr. Smith backed out of it and withdrew his share of the money. That same day the airplane crashed on its first flight by its new owners, and the next day Smith left for Alaska.

First he went to Seattle, and spent his last money for some tools and steerage ticket to Seward.

"Imagine our disappointment," Dr. Smith recalls, "when we eventually made our way to Fairbanks, and instead of finding work, we found breadlines.

"At that time," he says, "the Alaska Steamship Lines provided the only transportation to and from Alaska. We were warned if you ended up on relief, you would be shipped out of Alaska and never sold another ticket to return, and we didn't want that."

Then somebody tipped them there was a little college outside of town a few miles—the University of Alaska—and they might find odd jobs there. The first person they ran into on the campus was a shabbily dressed man in overalls, who tried to interest the two boys in enrolling in college.

"He said maybe if we'd go see the president, or somebody with authority, we might get a job, and going to school wouldn't cost much," Dr. Smith explains, but we had no intention of going to college.

Then the man, whom they thought was the janitor, told them he had a rundown cabin in the nearby woods, and they would be welcome to stay there if they wanted to fix it up. They agreed immediately, and spent the remainder of the summer renovating the cabin and laying in a supply of firewood.

"Later we went to see the college president," Dr. Smith said, "and, believe it or not, it turned out to be the man in the overalls—Dr. Charles E. Bunnell, the first president of the University of Alaska. He was a great man, and probably had more influence on my later life than any other person."

Dr. Bunnell not only gave the boys part-time jobs, but talked them into enrolling in college as well.

Dr. Smith earned his degree in mining engineering with an option in metallurgy in 1943. As a member of the Enlisted Reserve Corps he was soon called to active duty in the Army. Because of his metallurgical option he was sent to Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Md., for basic training and cadre school, and he became an instructor in instrument repair.

It was during his Army service that the then Corporal Smith met Beatrice Bennett, of Hartford. After 6 months they were married. "We named our first son Bennett (but they call him "Biff" so I wouldn't forget Bea's maiden name."

After the war he returned to Alaska to teach at the University of Alaska for 3 years.

In 1949 the Smiths went to the University of Pennsylvania where he was a research associate and did graduate work. He obtained his M.S. degree in metallurgical engineering there in 1951 and his Ph. D. degree in the same field in 1953.

After earning his doctoral degree, Dr. Smith joined the research branch of the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, which has one of the largest nonprofit research laboratories in the Nation. He began as a senior research metallurgist and by 1958 had been made technical director of the laboratories.

This latter position entailed not only the technical direction of the laboratories proper, but helping to maintain financial support from government and industry and supervising a large staff of varied scientists, engineers, and technicians.

In 1959 he joined the Michigan Tech faculty as professor and head of the department of metallurgical engineering, and a year later took on the additional duties as coordinator of research.

He has served on most of the major faculty and administrative committees of the university and most recently has been an active member of the long-range planning committee. A program formulated by this committee was formally adopted by the board of control last October.

The program, designed to accommodate a 9,000 enrollment by 1975, has two principal objectives: improve the university as a center of engineering and science and meeting the growing demand for college education of all kinds.

Included in the program are plans to expand all areas of the university's operation, particularly graduate enrollment, research and service through the division of continuing education, establishing a liberal arts degree program on the Houghton campus in 1965 and establishing 4-year degree programs on the Sault Ste. Marie campus in 1965.

Under Dr. Smith's direction, Tech's Department of Metallurgical Engineering has become one of the largest and most respected in the Nation. It has also become the most active academic department on the campus in research, obtaining governmental and industrial research contracts totaling about half a million dollars during the past 5 years.

For several years Dr. Smith has been engaged in research involving ultra-high-purity iron, and has produced through a tedious laboratory process some of the purest iron in the world.

Dr. Smith holds membership in many professional societies and has held numerous key offices on a national level in such organizations as the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical, and Petroleum Engineers (AIME).

Dr. Smith celebrated his 48th birthday last January 25, but both his actions and appearance belie his age. His hair is becoming increasingly touched with gray, but his 5-foot, 10-inch frame is draped with a compact 155 pounds—scarcely 10 pounds more than he weighed when he stepped off the boat in Alaska that day so long ago.

He is an avid outdoorsman, an accomplished trick water skier and likes both participant and spectator sports, particularly ice hockey. His favorite activities are hunting and fishing and he likes to ski and golf when time permits, but he has a particular fondness for the water.

For the past 4 years the Smiths and their two sons, Biff, a 17-year-old high school senior, and Martin, a 6-year-old first-grader, have lived in a comfortable lakeside house on Chassell Bay, about 10 miles south of the Tech campus.

The new university president, called "Ray" by most of his friends and Tech colleagues, is a personable easygoing type. He can be roused to anger on occasion, but his ire subsides quickly, and he is not the type to be

vindictive or hold a grudge. By regularly taking home sheaves of paper he crowds several days work into any 24-hour period, and has been known to work aboard one of his light boats in search of reprieve from the jangling telephone.

The papers, technical journals, and other paraphernalia that litter the desks and tables in his office look like they've been left there by a howling nor'easter. Usually, however, he can locate at a moment's notice whatever memo or scrap of paper that is needed to answer the particular question about the particular project he is concentrating on at the moment.

Reaction on the Tech campus to his appointment has been almost 100 percent favorable despite the ever-present difficulty of trying to please all of the people all of the time. As one campus wag summed it up, "there will probably be one or two people on the faculty who aren't happy with the board of control's decision, and if they are against it, is only shows what a good decision it was."

Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the historic Appalachian regional development bill, which I cosponsored, is now law. This act will not in itself eliminate poverty in the Appalachian region, but it will provide opportunities for countless impoverished human beings to help themselves to a better life.

One of the best expositions of the need for this legislation, and the accomplishments that can be expected now that it is law, was published in the March issue of the National Limestone Institute's publication, Limestone. I ask unanimous consent that this informative article, by Edmund W. Woodbury, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPALACHIA 1965–71

(By Edmund W. Woodbury, former legislative assistant to Congressman PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois; Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire, and currently assistant to the president of NLI)

Does passage of the Appalachia bill herald a broad new policy of the Federal Government?

Passage by Congress of the $1,092,400,000 Appalachian regional development bill seems likely to herald a broad new policy of the Federal Government of attempting to attack regional economic and social problems on a vast scale with a wide range of programs coordinated under one planning authority. Key feature of the legislation is an accelerated 5-year roadbuilding program totaling $840 million in Federal funds for 2,350 miles of development highways and 1,000 miles of local access roads. The remaining $252.4 million will support a series of measures designed to combat the geographical causes of poverty in the Appalachian Mountain region of our country. Federal aid would be given for reclamation of public lands destroyed by strip mining, stepped-up vocational education, construction and temporary maintenance of health facilities, research on water resource control and development, construction of sewage treatment plants, loans for timber development organizations, and increased availability of funds for State and community participation in Federal grant-in-aid programs. In addition there would be long-term contracts for up to 10 years, with landowners and operators, for soil stabilization, erosion and sediment control, reclamation through land-use changes and other conservation measures to develop soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and recreation resources.

Serving only as a planning, research, and coordinating function in the execution of the program, the Appalachian Regional Commission will be made up of a Federal member appointed by the President and the Governor and his representative from each of the 11 States included by the act. The Federal member would serve as cochairman with another cochairman elected by the State representatives.

The multiprogram campaign against economic causes of poverty in Appalachia will be expensive. Total Federal contributions up to July 1, 1971, when the program is scheduled to terminate will amount to an estimated $2 billion. Lesser State shares of the cost of the Appalachian regional development program will swell the total cost to a figure over $3 billion—for direct aid to 360 counties in the Appalachian area. The July 1971 cutoff date indicates, however, that the program will not be a continuing or recurring expense item in the Federal budget but should end on or near a certain date with no further additional costs to taxpayers all across the country.

NOTABLE LEGISLATION

Never before has the Federal Government pumped so much funds into highway construction of direct benefit to only one area. The available share of Federal aid to State contributions for primary and secondary road building is the highest ever granted. A perhaps revealing sign for the course and extent of future Federal participation in highway programs. Road building and improvement in the Appalachian area is scheduled for a multifold increase.

Unlike present highway planning and construction, roads will not be built according to needs determined by existing or projected traffic counts but the needs for encouraging and creating traffic in areas where there is now little or no travel. These new highways are intended to open up areas to commerce. The new highways planned for are, therefore, called development highways and when completed would be added to the States' primary systems.

At the very time the Appalachia bill was enacted into law, other areas of the country were seriously being considered for aid from similar legislation. There is strong interest in Congress to establish regional development plans for the northern Great Lakes area of norther Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota; the Ozark region of southern Missouri, southern Illinois, Arkansas, eastern Texas, and eastern Oklahoma; and northern New England including Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. Other regions are also beginning to take a new look at their problems and possible solutions. The administration through its Budget Bureau has already stated that it "intends to propose very shortly, as part of the extension and improvement of the area redevelopment program, measures to encourage and assist regional planning for redevelopment of distressed areas."

Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, has already introduced S. 812 which would authorize the President to create other regional commissions to set up plans for different sections of the country. Senators Moss, of Utah, and MONTOYA, of New Mexico, have introduced S. 1033 which would set up a regional planning commission for Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado. S. 662, introduced by Senators MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, METCALF, of Montana, BURDICK, of North Dakota, and MCGEE, of Wyoming, would create a regional commission for North and South Dakota and portions of the States of Montana and Wyoming lying east of the Rockies. Similar legislation has been introduced in the House. Another area often also mentioned for a regional planning commission is the Deep South.

WHAT IS APPALACHIA?

Appalachia has been formally defined by Congress as a 360-county mountainous area in the 11 States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Virginia, Ohio, Tennessee, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama. If approved by the Appalachian Regional Development Commission and the Governor of New York, an additional group of southern counties in the State of New York may be added.

The area of 15.3 million persons to be covered under the act stretches from Pennsylvania in the northeast to Georgia and Alabama in the southwest. Statistics show that this mountainous 11-State region in the eastern United States has not only failed to share in the economic growth experienced by other sections of the country over the past 20 years but has actually declined in wealth in its critical industries.

APPALACHIA'S PROBLEMS

Appalachia, blessed with natural beauty and abundant rainfall while being largely isolated from population centers of the country, has been a victim of the sharp decline of her two major industries: coal mining and agriculture. On many a face in Appalachia can be seen the miserable despair of hopeless poverty.

Appalachia produces about two-thirds of our Nation's bituminous and all of its anthracite coal, but in the years between 1951 and 1961 production of coal in the area fell 32 percent and because of the automation of coal mines, employment of miners dropped 66 percent. At one time in the State of West Virginia 115,000 miners were employed; today there are about 35,000. Moreover, years of strip mining have laid barren to erosion thousands of acres of Appalachian land and polluted by acids an estimated 4,000 miles of rivers and streams. Over 2 million inhabitants have left the area in the last decade.

What farms that do remain in the area are usually small, hilly, and increasingly unsuited for competing in modern, mechanized agriculture. But these farms are still suited for limited grazing if proper steps are taken to build up the soil depleted by years of neglect. Covering three-fifths of Appalachia, timber is an abundant resource that has been poorly managed, but cut under proper procedures, could be a profitable crop. An estimated 70 percent of this timber is possessed by persons owning 50 acres or less.

Due to its mountains Appalachia suffers from poor communications and inadequate transportation facilities that have deterred the entry of other industries into the area to create economic development to take the place of coal and agriculture. Many areas are not conveniently interconnected by highways. Usually built many years ago, what roads that do exist are frequently torturous and even unsafe to travel because of inadequate width, steep grades, sharp curves, and the deterioration caused by age and neglect. Because of the northeast to southwest direction of the Appalachian Mountains, and the general absence of passes, the region has always posed a barrier to east-west and north-south travel. Much of the area has therefore remained outside the mainstreams of communication, and has consequently

been bypassed in economic growth and development. The construction of an adequate highway system for the area is therefore a necessity.

Lack of economic development has created an unfavorable tax base which hinders self-improvement and the opportunity to break the vicious circle of poverty and decay—despite heartening State and local efforts. The area has had significant but limited success in pulling itself up by its bootstraps.

But the potential of the Appalachian area is great. Besides rich mineral and timber resources, the area has great scenic beauty which would attract many more visitors from other parts of the country if roads were better in quality, more convenient, and easier to drive.

BROAD EFFECTS OF THE LEGISLATION

The likely effect of enactment of the Applachia bill will be to stimulate the economy of the whole Appalachian region. Retail sales and construction will be boosted. There should be economic development, a decrease in unemployment, and greater tax revenues. Sales of gasoline, autos, and tractors should rise. There is a strong chance that there will be a rebirth of the hardwood lumber industry and higher farm production, chiefly in livestock. New industries should be attracted to the area, and there will be a higher rate of population growth—creating more consumer demand and spending. Expanded research work will be done at colleges and universities in the area which will beneficially encourage more and better faculty members. Education in general will improve, and the rate of school dropouts—unusually high in Appalachia—will be reduced. There should likewise be a decrease in the exodus of younger people leaving the area. Health problems—particularly malnutrition—will diminish.

But the principal but hard to measure effect of the legislation will be to make Appalachia a somewhat happier place in which to live. Personal hope may be given to the younger generation of Appalachians who choose not to move on to other areas of the country but to remain in the land where they were born.

CONTENT OF THE LEGISLATION ROADBUILDING

Roadbuilding is the recipient of the greatest share of funds to be spent under the $1,092,400,000 Appalachian program. Over a 5-year period $840 million will be spent by the Federal Government for the construction and improvement of 2,350 miles of development highways and 1,000 miles of local access roads in addition to the existing Federal highway expenditures for the area. The total projected State share of the costs of highway and road construction over the 5-year program is estimated to be $360 million for a combined State-Federal expenditure of $1.2 billion. As pointed out earlier, the Appalachian program will terminate in 1971 and if past highway programs are indicative, perhaps additional Federal funds will be required to complete the highway undertaking. The average yearly Federal contributions will be $168 million although most of the funds will actually be spent during the later years of the program.

The Federal share of the costs would range from 50 to 70 percent, depending upon the decision of the Secretary of Commerce based on the recommendations of the Appalachian Regional Commission. The potential Federal share would therefore be susbtantially higher than the present 50-percent assistance given to ABC highways but lower than the 90-percent aid under the interstate program. It is certain that almost all the new highway work will qualify for the 70-percent rate. Local access roads would be authorized for specific residential, recreational, educational, or industrial purposes.

Costs of highway construction in Appalachia will be high. Two-lane highway construction east-west through mountains of West Virginia and Kentucky is estimated to cost $1 million per mile while highway costs through flat terrain will range roughly between $300,000 and $500,000 per mile. The average cost of local access roads is estimated to be $50,000 per mile although in South Carolina and Alabama, the estimated cost dips to $24,000 per mile. Costs will be roughly divided $790 million for the 2,350 miles of development highways and $50 million for the local access roads.

After first consulting with the local State highway departmnets, the Appalachian Regional Commission will make recommendations on the general routing and location of the highways and local access roads and on their construction priority to the Secretary of Commerce who will then either approve or modify these plans. Each new development highway will be added to the Federal aid primary system and continued maintenance will be required of the States involved. Local access roads will not join any Federal aid system.

Language in the bill specifies that States may give "special preference" to the use in road construction of mineral resources native to the Applalachian region. This would include limestone. The Secretary of Commerce can require that coal derivatives be used in highway construction to the maximum extent possible up to 10 percent of the road work authorized.

LAND CONSERVATION

Land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control for Appalachia will receive $17 million over a 2-year period. Individuals or groups of individuals will be paid up to 80 percent of the cost of conservation practices which will improve and develop their soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and recreation resources. Eligibility for such assistance would be limited to 50 acres. In carrying out this phase of the legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture will use the services of the ASCS committeemen, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Soil Conservation Service.

This section of the legislation was significantly changed from the original version of the bill introduced in the last Congress. The original bill would have granted farmowners $17 million solely for pasture improvement on 25, as opposed to 50, acres of their land. The possible Federal share of the grants was also 80 percent. This section was killed in the Senate, and this year it was redrawn to cover broadly all land conservation practices and was not limited only to pasture improvement. Despite attempts by some legislators to knock out even this broadened land improvement feature, the section was kept in the bill. The number of acres eligible for rehabilitation and improvement per landowner or farmer, as pointed out, is 50 rather than last year's 25 acres. For each of the 2 years of authorization, $8.5 million will be spent. By 1971 an estimated 3.3 million acres could be improved.

The effect of this new section on the use of limestone compared to the original pasture improvement version is to diminish the potential expenditures for aglime. Nevertheless, within the Appalachian States participating in the land and soil improvement program, an increased market for aglime is created because of its high utility in reclaiming and improving the often depleted soil common to Appalachia.

EVALUATION OF THE LEGISLATION

The Appalachian regional development bill has not been uncontroversial. Criticism has been directed at its large cost, its socialized medicine, its concept of what constitutes poverty, and its preferential special benefits for only one section of the country to the "discrimination" of other areas in need. The idea of having an Appalachian Regional Commission has been sharply attacked as the "first of a series of such regional octopuses which, if not stopped, will extend their tentacles into every part of the Nation to thwart freedom of State and local action and to make it subservient to the wishes of the Federal Government."

Some members on the House and Senate Public Works Committee flatly opposed the bill when it was considered last year. In the Appalachian area, however, the concept of regional devlopment received wide bipartisan support.

This year some minority members on the House Public Works Committee introduced their own measure. Instead of merely being directed at Appalachia, it would attack poverty areas all across the country.

While it differed in details, scope, and administration from the majority bill, the significant point was that even those formerly opposed to the Appalachia bill now admitted that some Federal action was needed to combat regional poverty. In other words—lmpressively showing an awareness and concern of social and economic crisis and despair, both parties now firmly recognize the need of regional Federal aid to areas that are depressed beyond the point that it is reasonable to assume that State and local efforts will be successful in overcoming a depressed area's economic crisis and despair.

However, the minority bill, by omitting a regional planning commission of any sort to coordinate regional development programs to alleviate poverty, evidenced a potential weakness (for programs other than the highway construction). It could seriously suffer from a lack of coordination and integration of programs for developmental highways, vocational education, health facilities, timber development organizations, mining area restoration, water resource surveys, and sewage treatment works. Ironically, it is almost certain that the program would have been not only more costly—not necessarily a flaw, but more importantly, it would probably have been inefficient.

This criticism does not mean that the majority bill was perfect. The boundaries of Appalachia as established in the bill were in some instances rather dubiously drawn. While it is unquestionably important to have the whole Appalachian area interconnected by development highways, it appears implausible that 76 counties out of 360 in Appalachia that are not even eligible at the present time for Area Redevelopment Administration and Accelerated Public Works funds should be included in features of the legislation other than highway construction—such as the specially beefed-up Federal grant-in-aid programs. In South Carolina, for instance, all six included counties cannot show sufficient economic need to qualify for even ARA assistance; only one qualifies for APW aid. And South Carolina like Alabama has so far requested none of the highway funds (excepting local access roads).

But considering its flaws, the value of the approved Appalachia bill can be summed up as both a social and economic shot-in-the-arm. There is no question that Americans owe compassion to their fellow Americans, and that although perhaps some unfortunate persons are poor through their own laziness and indifference, many, many more are poor through circumstances that they cannot themselves control. It is to the poor, beaten down by circumstance and geography, that the Appalachia bill addresses itself to, and remarkably well. It effectively complements other Federal and State antipoverty programs.

The original Appalachia report drafted in 1963–64 (by a Commission established by President Kennedy at the urging of Appalachian State Governors) indicated not only a keen awareness and investigation of the problems and needs of Appalachia, but moreover, was creditably marked by an absence of sentimental, vague thinking. Progress of the report into bill form and hearings from

July 1964 to February 1965 clearly showed a tempering of an idea by give and take from both supporters and critics into a realistic, fair, and promising final piece of legislation.

It is noteworthy that Republican Governor William Scranton of Pennsylvania made some of the most effective suggestions that were later incorporated into the law as finally written—namely, reclamation of lands destroyed by strip mining, control of underground mine fires, and the elimination of the Appalachian Development Corporation, a public-private hybrid that, as originally proposed, had grave possibilities of turning into a wheeling-dealing financial nightmare.

In plain dollars and cents the bill makes sense. Over a 10-year period substantial savings can possibly be made in the $5 billion of Federal relief money that Appalachia would normally have consumed without passage of the bill since the number of persons receiving relief in Appalachia is proportionately 45 percent above the rest of the Nation. If Appalachia were on an economic level comparable to the rest of the United States, an estimated $5.2 billion more would be earned in the area thus making a substantial addition to the U.S. gross national product.

CHARACTER OF PROGRESS IMPORTANT

In seeking to measure poverty, the figure of a minimum income of $3,000 per family is often considered as a dividing point between poverty and well-being. This figure, as the Appalachian study report too briefly notes, is unrealistic because when a family's living expenses, nonmonetary income, and property are taken into account, the $3,000 statistic is often either too low or too high. Consequently, the Appalachian Regional Commission must not become obsessed with the objective of attaining the $3,000 income level for Appalachia, but rather, the objective of helping to make Appalachia a worthwhile and decent place to live and work in.

Poverty in Appalachia will not be eliminated by the legislation just passed. In fact, it is highly doubtful that Government can ever by itself eliminate poverty. Opportunity is provided, however, for human beings to step out of poverty, and it is only this simple but profound opportunity that most impoverished citizens in Appalachia seek.

The initial success of the revolutionary Appalachian regional development bill will depend, first, on adequate planning and wise supervision and, second, on the establishment of priorities for concentration of efforts. First attention should be given to sections within Appalachia in greatest need.

Hopefully, the Appalachian development will be an orderly development. Sensible development of tourism, for example, should be made without the more objectionable forms of commercialism. An acute need must be met for more Federal, State, and local parks, historic areas, recreational areas, and scenic parkways.

Desirably, local officials and citizens will enthusiastically put their shoulders to the wheel to clean up their towns and to encourage strong community action for good. Many opportunities for service will exist for responsible voluntary organizations and local enterprises.

And, great effort must be made to insure that the natural beauty and charm of the area be preserved if it is to remain attractive for both local citizens and millions of new visitors.

The progress of Appalachia will be watched with great interest by the American public.

Letter to the President of the United States From the President of the United Mine Workers of America Protesting the Latest Increase in Residual Oil Importation Authorized by the Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia, which is the Nation's second largest coal-producing congressional district, I am deeply concerned over the proposed increase of 75,000 barrels of imported foreign residual fuel oil per day. It is my understanding that this proposed increase will eliminate by direct competition a potential market of 6,700,000 tons of coal presently produced.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cite the following letter addressed to the President of the United States by Mr. W. A. "Tony" Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America, in which he very clearly outlines the seriousness of this additional unfair competition from a growing flood of residual fuel oil imports. I thoroughly and completely agree with the position so explicitly presented by Mr. Boyle.

The letter follows:

APRIL 2, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The United Mine Workers of America deplores the increase in residual oil import quotas for the quota year 1965–66. The administration has dealt a cruel blow to the hopes of the people of Appalachia for a better life. The proposed increase of 75,000 barrels of residual oil per day further undermines the economic health of the coal industry, an industry which is absolutely essential for Appalachian rehabitation.

We have on many occasions called attention to the connection between coal jobs and Appalachian prosperity. We have also pointed to the disastrous impact upon coal jobs brought about by excessive and unwarranted residual oil imports.

You must know, Mr. President, that the continued importation of residual fuel oil threatens the elimination of a coal payroll in Appalachia in excess of $1 billion. It further strikes hard at the jobs of several hundred thousand persons and at the sustenance which goes to the people who depend upon such jobs.

You have evinced an interest in the problems of the Appalachian region. That is why it is totally incomprehensible to us that the level of oil imports has been allowed to increase to a staggering 755,000 barrels per day for the coming quota year.

A proposal has been made by various components of the coal complex to expand job opportunities in Appalachia, if a reasonable quota level on residual oil imports were established. This proposal did not look for a complete abolition of residual oil imports. It did request, and we believe justly so, that an equitable plan be worked out on residual imports for an extended period of time, so that the coal industry could plan ahead.

If this proposal had been adopted, if you had removed the ever-present threat of residual fuel oil which hangs over the head of the coal industry, a tremendous investment would have been made by the coal complex in Appalachia. The net result of this investment would have been more jobs for coal miners in Appalachia, more income for the region, a strong and more competitive coal industry, as well as a definite added value to the national welfare. Instead, your administration has embarked on the opposite course. We are shocked that this decision has been reached. We are fearful of the ultimate consequences of the present course of action. We cannot see any real hope for the Appalachian coal industry so long as it must face unfair competition from a growing flood of residual fuel oil.

Therefore, we request that you reaffirm the necessity for a continuation of residual oil import controls. Further, it is our hope that these controls will be strengthened and made meaningful in terms of the protection of American jobs and the income of American citizens.

We understand that a request has been made for a personal conference with you on this matter. We hope that this can be arranged soon, so that we may plan our future course with confidence that we will have the support and protection of your administration as we face the challenges of the future.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. BOYLE.

Hoover Attacks Critics of Crime Rise Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as a continuing testimonial of my respect for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its distinguished Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an article published recently in the Washington Evening Star. This article, written by Miriam Ottenberg, a staff writer for the Star, eloquently describes Mr. Hoover's FBI methods in reporting crime statistics. It is difficult to comprehend the motivation of those who would bend crime reporting to suit supposed sociological purposes, instead of pursuing what should be the universal goal of all good citizens, the detection and elimination of crime and its causes. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOVER ATTACKS CRITICS OF CRIME RISE FIGURES

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Attacks by some newspapers and sociologists on the FBI's crime statistics were condemned by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover last night as a deliberate attempt to minimize the Nation's crime problem.

He spoke out after various sociologists and criminlogists were quoted as saying things aren't as bad as they look—or wouldn't be if the FBI changed its methods of compiling crime figures.

One socioloigst admitted to a reporter why critics are suddenly challenging the FBI's long-accepted crime figures.

For the past decade, he explained, an increasing number of offenders have been put on probation or sent to psychiatric clinics rather than to jail or released early on parole. And the FBI's index of serious crime has risen 58 percent since 1958. The rate of crime repeaters has also climbed.

Fearing that some people may make a connection between more crime and more experimental methods of dealing with criminals, these sociologists have solved the problem by attacking the crime statistics.

The sociologists are also embarrassed because the latest FBI crime figures clearly demonstrate that poverty and deprivation are no longer the sole answer for crime.

Crime, according to these figures, is on the rise in the suburbs and the known perpetrators are juveniles from middle-class homes. All this time, the sociologists have insisted that the way to get rid of crime is to clear out the slums.

Without going into why some people are trying to play a numbers game with crime figures, Hoover declared: "There is a deliberate attempt in some circles to minimize our national crime problem."

"In doing this, some well-known valid factors are used which help to explain the increasing volume of crime, along with much inaccurate and unreliable conjecture and opinion," he continued.

"The high volume of crime nationally is a fact which cannot be rationalized away."

Actually, FBI statisticians analyzing the latest crime figures find that your chances of becoming the victim of a serious crime are increasing six times faster than the population is growing.

Unless something is done to reverse the trend, FBI crime reporting experts agree, the Nation faces another 78 percent increase in serious crime over the next decade.

Against the background of a Presidential request to Congress for assistance to local law enforcement agencies in curbing spiraling crime rates, the theorists, still maintain their arguments against the FBI's crime figures.

They argue, for instance, that babies and old people shouldn't be counted in figuring crime rates since they don't commit crimes.

Actually, the crime rate doesn't measure the number of criminals but the number of victims. Babies are as likely to become murder victims as their elder sisters and older people are frequent targets for purse snatchers and yoke robbers.

Some sociologists have been quoted as saying that the FBI should alter its crime statistics somehow to take into consideration the disproportionate increase in the 15- to 24-age group, the "war babies" now responsible for 70 percent of the serious crime.

An FBI spokesman said that the FBI for many years has been acutely aware of this age group. Arrests of these young people has been increasing almost twice as fast as their population growth.

The main reason why the FBI estimates a 78-percent crime increase over the next decade is due to an expected population rise of 10 million in the crime-prone 15- to 24-age group.

The FBI experts, however, reject the theory that just because there are more young people there automatically is more crime. Theoretically, they argue, crime should be going down as educational opportunities and living standards go up.

VENEREAL RATE JUMPS

The FBI's youth crime figures are paralleled by HEW figures showing that in the past decade, the syphilis rate in the 15-to-19 age group has doubled and the illegitimacy rate for girls under 20 has increased by 47 percent.

FBI experts consider this symptomatic of family instability and breakdown, like its own youth crime figures.

Across the Nation, in the suburbs as well as in the cities, more and more juveniles under 18 are becoming involved in serious crime.

In the past decade, arrests of persons under 18 for nontraffic offenses has increased by 123 percent, almost triple the population increase in the 10 to 17 age group.

The suburbs are being hit even harder than the city folk by the juvenile marauders. Suburban communities report a higher proportion of juvenile arrests for such crimes as burglary, larceny, and auto theft than the cities do.

In the big cities, 48 percent of those arrested for serious crime are under 18, compared with 51 percent in suburbia. A preliminary survey has indicated that only a small percentage of these juveniles are going from the center of town out to the suburbs to do their stealing. Most of these young thieves actually live in the suburbs.

Nowhere is juvenile crime more prominent and the efforts to minimize it more insistent than in auto theft. Some sociologists argue that if most auto theft were written off as "joy riding," the published rate of serious crime would go down. The FBI calls that "defining away crime."

JOYRIDE AUTO THEFTS

The Internatiohal Association of Chiefs of Police Advisory Committee to the FBI on crime reporting has rejected on three occasions various proposals to eliminate "joyride" auto theft.

FBI statisticians agree for these reasons: A nationwide survey showed that in the vast majority of auto thefts, the police don't know the reason for the theft when they finally recover the car. Furthermore, a car is often a man's most valuable asset. Its loss, even temporarily, is serious and frequently, when the car is located, there are signs of deliberate damage.

FBI and police also point out that most serious crimes are accomplished in stolen cars. They don't regard a high-speed chase after an armed robbery as any childish prank.

"It is incongruous to argue that our young people should have a license to borrow a citizen's automobile with its average value of $1,018, increasing the cost of police services, causing insurance rates to jump, and frequently resulting in serious injury," an FBI official said, "Too often, and we've got the cases to prove it, the so-called joy ride is the beginning of a career of crime."

Amateur statisticians have argued there are more car thefts because of more cars. Not true, says the FBI. During the past decade, auto thefts increased by 92 percent, while auto registrations increased by 42 percent.

The other method of defining away crime proposed by some sociologists is to raise the larceny minimum from $50 to $100 or more on the theory that the cost of living has gone up.

The FBI takes the position that whether the thief steals a $10 camera or a $300 one from your car, the criminal act is the same. Also the value of the property stolen is relative to the victim's circumstances. To a newsboy, the loss of his bicycle hurts as much as the loss of a diamond pendant to a wealthy woman.

FBI experts also point out that statistically the crime rate won't be affected if the cutoff figure goes to $100. All forms of larceny are going up. Since 1958, larcenies without regard to value and larcenies over $50 showed the same 47 percent increase.

A final claim that the FBI's crime figures are distorted comes from those who say police reporting of crime has improved, so more crimes are reported. The FBI says that's nonsense, since the improved reporting of 1 police department or even 10 of them could hardly affect nationwide trends.

The fact is, says the FBI, that the number of offenses reported doesn't even cover all the serious crimes that actually occur. Out of fear, shame, embarrassment, or a reluctance to get involved, some people don't ever tell police that they have been victimized.

So crime is still being underreported, not overreported.

U.S. crime trends, 1958–64

	Percent
Property crime, up	62
Crime index, up	56
Violent crime, up	40
Population, up	10

These trends, based on FBI figures, show how crime has outstripped population since 1958. That year was chosen because thereafter FBI reports dropped statutory rape, larcenies under $50 and manslaughter from the crime index. The index now includes murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny over $50 and auto theft.

Who Points a Finger?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. CALLAWAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent and heated controversy over the events taking place in Alabama, I call to the attention of my colleagues the question posed by the following editorial from the Columbus, Ga., Enquirer:

WHO POINTS A FINGER?

What's needed by the vociferous supporters of tolerance and brotherhood in this country is a little more tolerance and brotherhood of their own.

Prejudice seeps from their angry and vengeful slanders on Alabama.

Do they call for love and understanding to solve the problems which they view? No, they call for troops and boycotts. They cry for the Government to close down bases that provide money and jobs for white and Negroes alike. They call for efforts to crush Alabama's economy even further into the ground so that the wicked white southerners will be given their just deserts.

Mark well how these defenders of Negro rights preach their cause. Their manner bears a striking resemblance to the Negro's worst oppressors.

Those who were justly aroused by the trooper attack on Negro marchers Sunday leave the gnawing impression that they would relish the sight of U.S. troops giving the same treatment to a white segregationist mob.

Yet, is not violence all of the same cloth? Can any of us—white or Negro, southerner or northerner—point a pious finger at in-

tolerance and violence, and say, "mend your ways, and follow my example."

What example do the visiting ministers in Selma wish for the 95 percent of Selma's honest and good people to follow? New York's example? Philadelphia's? Chicago's?

How long would a band of crusading segregationists be safe on the sidewalks of Harlem? What kind of welcome would meet a marching band of Alabama citizens who were intent on marching through Harlem and into Brooklyn, and maybe on to the New York City Hall to protest the firing of School Superintendent Gross?

Malcolm X was present in Selma a few weeks ago and emerged unscathed to keep his appointment with death in a Harlem revival hall. Shall we condemn all of Harlem's residents because he was gunned down there? We should not, any more than we should blame all Alabamians for the attack on Reverend Reeb.

Tolerance and understanding are two-way virtues, and there is not enough present on either side of the tense racial question.

The troubles of other sections are no excuse for Alabama's—or the South's—difficulties in racial relations. But they do seem to provide an honest basis for arguing that emissaries from Selma might well return with the visiting ministers to their own communities and do a little praying over their problems.

Supporters of last year's civil rights bill argued that its passage would take the race issue out of the streets and put it in the courts. We were dubious, and noted the example of States such as New York and Illinois which have stringent civil rights laws and still have demonstrations and protests.

But we hoped that the supporters were right and that the bill's provisions would allow a more peaceful approach to civil rights problems.

Unfortunately, that has not been the case, and the fuse is hotter today than ever.

As we have stated numerous times, the Negro deserves the same right to register and vote as a white man does. That is beyound debate. But there are legal remedies upon legal remedies available if the Negro meets unreasonable resistance.

These legal remedies may be slow but they are the price of maintaining an orderly society, which is the only kind worth having.

The ministers in Selma should speak a knd word for Governor Wallace. And they should advise in favor of lawful recourses.

That would be the real test of their tolerance and brotherhood.

A Resolution To Declare Election Day a National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced a resolution to declare election day a national holiday.

In my opinion, there is no reason why election day should not be a national holiday. Even when the election being held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November is a State or municipal election, the day itself is still a day of democratic decisionmaking characterizing the American way.

I believe that this 1 day a year when the American public makes its great political decisions ought to be a legal holiday. I urge the Congress to make it such.

Danville, Va., Commemoration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the city of Danville, Va., in my congressional district, began a commemoration of the stirring scenes which took place there a century ago when the community became the last seat of the Confederate Government.

The program began with a reenactment of the arrival in the city of President Jefferson Davis and his Cabinet. Later, before a large crowd assembled in front of the Danville Public Library, Dr. James I. Robertson, Jr., a native of Danville, prominent historian and at present executive director of the U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission, delivered an address in which he gave an impressive review of the part played in the war by Danville, with special emphasis on the closing scenes.

Because of the important history thus brought to the forefront, covering the point in our history when the great war that forged us into a powerful Nation was drawing to a close, I should like to insert this address in the RECORD so that it can be widely read. I am sure the information it provides will be especially valuable to schoolchildren, as well as to people of all ages who care to look back into our past.

The address follows:

One hundred years ago today was a Monday, and it was hot and chaotic in Danville. The once-quiet little city on the banks of the Dan was in the throes of military activity such as it had never known before. Squads of gray-clad soldiers marched through the dusty streets; occasionally a troop of cavalry clattered past; on those avenues not already jammed with wagons, ambulances, and accumulated equipment, sweating horses strained to pull cannon and caissons up to commanding heights.

Across the river soldiers and townspeople worked side by side constructing a network of trenches to guard the northern approaches to Danville. A half-mile west of the city, where a wagon-rut trail branched off from the Salibury Road and snaked its way toward Yanceyville, trees had been felled and deep earthworks dug to accommodate a battery of artillery. Mount Vernon Methodist Church and Memorial Hospital now mark the spot where a brigade of shipless sailors, under daredevil Adm. Raphael Semmes, manned cannon that pointed silently toward the river.

A few hundred yards east of this strategic intersection, ragged Confederate soldiers guarded the home and distinguished guests of Major and Mrs. William T. Sutherlin. But at the same time these southern troops cast apprehensive glances northward at the bluffs across Dan River. A mighty Union Army was moving toward Danville from somewhere in that direction.

The serenity so long a characteristic of Danville had suddenly given way to confusion as soldiers and civilians alike were caught in a frenzied whirlpool of self-preservation. The small town that had heretofore thrived on semi-isolation abruptly found itself mushroomed into the capital of an embryonic nation.

For the past 4 years, and in spite of its relative remoteness, Danville had felt the convulsions of Civil War. Many of its sons had fought—and no small number had died—in the 18th and 57th Virginia Infantry Regiments and in Harry Wooding's Danville Battery of Artillery. Early in the war the city had become one of the major Confederate supply depots; but warehouses bulging with military material were of little relief to townspeople who suffered from a lack of food and medicines. In 1862 the first of several military hospitals was established in the city. Soldiers North and South who survived the archaic medical practices of that day never forgot the kindnesses of such volunteer nurses as Annie Eliza Johns and the town's Episcopal rector, the Reverend George W. Dame.

Danville had had welcomed guests earlier in the war. The secessionist Governor of Virginia, John Letcher, paid a visit to the city in January 1864, and was given as royal a banquet as scanty foodstuffs would permit. A month earlier Gen. John Hunt Morgan, the famed Kentucky cavalry leader, stopped briefly in Danville with his family—and sadly extended his stay in order to bury his infant son in Grove Street Cemetery.

The city also had unwelcomed guests. In the autumn of 1864 Confederate officials in Richmond had ordered six tobacco warehouses converted into prisons for captured Federal soldiers; and for the past 9 months townspeople had seen more than 5,000 of the enemy packed into filthy compounds where one Confederate official termed the conditions "truly horrible." Indeed they were. By April 1865, more than 1,300 prisoners had died of starvation, exposure, and disease—and lay buried south of town in a country cemetery chosen more from necessity than from preference.

The fullest impact of war, however, was yet to come. Danville's week of destiny actually began late Sunday afternoon, April 2, 1865, when the clicking telegraph key of the Richmond & Danville Railroad announced the somber news that the Confederate government was abandoning Richmond and entraining that night for Danville. This news caught Danville's citizens totally by surprise, but they recovered quickly and began making hasty preparations to receive a host of visiting dignitaries. The first of many trains from Richmond rolled into Danville in midmorning on Monday, April 3. Throughout that day, wrote Trainmaster J. H. Averell, "other trains soon followed. There were women and children in boxcars, many without baggage, few with anything to eat. It was a sad scene, but the doors of Danville houses were wide open, and an old Virginia welcome met the refugees, and they were soon housed as comfortably as possible."

A large delegation of city fathers met the first train, for on board was the leading southerner of that day: Jefferson Davis, president of the Confederate States of America. Those Danvillians who beheld Davis for the first time were shocked at his appearance, for the cares of war were etched deep in his countenance. He was then 56, tall, slim, and hollow-cheeked. His hair and beard were snow-white; he was now blind in one eye. His favorite son had died of scarlet fever 2 years before, and his wife was even then fleeing southward for safety. Small wonder that Davis' shoulders sagged noticeably from the heavy load he bore. He was ill and weary; yet nothing had dimmed his hopes and dreams for southern independence.

So fervently did Davis still espouse the Confederate cause that Danvillians marveled openly at his energy during those 8 days he was in the city.

Davis accepted the invitation to be a house guest at the country home of Major Sutherlin. But he was there only to sleep, eat and rest. When not in the temporary government offices on Wilson Street, he was superintending improvements on Danville's fortifications, formulating a grand design for the union at Danville of the armies of Lee and Joseph E. Johnston, attending to a mass of correspondence, meeting with a variety of officials, and exuding a confidence shared by few of his colleagues.

Major Sutherlin recalled: "During the period that he spent at my house, he never at any time within my hearing expressed any concern for himself, but his whole heart and soul seemed to be absorbed in his feeling for the people of the South. I believe he would have cheerfully laid down his life if it would have saved them from defeat."

In an effort to bolster morale, Davis on Tuesday, May 4, issued a proclamation to the South—but one which only the people of Danville ever saw. His plea for renewed strength in the war reassured some, but engendered little hope among the mass of people. Nevertheless, Danvillians extended every courtsey to the aging statesman. Scores beat a path to the Sutherlin home in order to pay their respects; dinner invitations were countless; and on those few occasions when Davis broke away from governmental work to take a relaxing ride in Major Sutherlin's carriage, he was greeted all along the way by cheers of affection. In later years Davis would write: "Nothing could have exceeded the kindness and hospitality of the patriotic citizens (of Danville). They cordially gave us an 'Old Virginia welcome' and with one heart contributed in every practicable manner to cheer and aid us in the work in which we were engaged."

And then, on Monday morning, April 10—after days of uncertainty and apprehension, came news of catastrophe: Lee's army had stopped retreating at a hamlet called Appomattox; Virginia was lost.

That night Davis packed his few personal belongings and prepared to leave the city. In a letter to Danville Mayor J. M. Walker, Davis thanked him for many favors and added: "The shadows of misfortune which were on us when I came have become darker, and I trust you will accord me now, as then, your good wishes and confidence in the zeal and singleness of heart with which I have sought to discharge the high trust which the people of the Confederate States conferred upon me."

Near 9:30 that night guards around the Sutherlin home snapped to attention as out of the door, with heavy steps, came their President. The Sutherlins accompanied him to the front gate, where a cavalry escort waited behind the carriage. The tall, sad man with an aristocratic air bowed to Mrs. Sutherlin, shook her husband's hand, and spoke words of thanks in an unmistakable Mississippi accent. He mounted the carriage and nodded to the driver. The procession started downhill into the city. The carriage's chief passenger, limp from fatigue and sorrow, bounced conspicuously as wheels struck rocks and pits.

Even as the party made its way down Jefferson Street (the city's western limits), plainly audible was the sound of shouting, gunfire, and breaking glass as mobs indiscriminately looted the city's shops. Halfway down the street the horses began to prance nervously; the stench of disease and death emanating from the Army hospital at Jefferson and Wilson Streets was almost unbearable. The procession moved rapidly past the grim brick building and turned into Wilson Street. There, government workers, methodically burning records in the front yard of the Benedict home, paused in their labors to gaze silently at the man in the open carriage.

Soon the party passed a tobacco warehouse in which lay part of the living debris of some 700 Federal soldiers still confined in the prisons. Most of these men were prostrate from starvation and illness. Again the cavalrymen escorting the President had difficulty in restraining horses who sensed the presence of death.

On reaching the Piedmont Railroad depot near the river, the party encountered a new obstacle: a mob of frightened people who shouted, shoved, and fought to get aboard an already overloaded train awaiting its main passenger. It was obvious that Lee's surrender and the probability of Federal troops being in the city shortly had given rise to uncontrollable panic.

Only after several anxious moments was the man with snowy beard and hair able to get from his carriage onto the steps of the last of 12 railroad cars. The moment he entered the coach, soldiers mounted the car platforms and used bayonets to hold back the frenzied mob. Suddenly, with a belch of steam and smoke, the train started southward. The cars disappeared slowly around a bend, but not before the engine's shrill whistle echoed through the valley of the Dan and announced in woeful tones that Jefferson Davis and the Confederacy he represented were journeying into history.

In the panic and disorder that followed Davis' departure, it was not to be wondered, wrote one eyewitness, that the whole social structure of the town was thrown into a state of almost helpless disorganization. Unreasoning terror and dismay had taken full possession of the community, and discipline had given place to utter and aimless confusion. Recognized authority there was none, and all attempts at preserving any semblance of methodical government were disregarded.

For 16 days Danville was the victim of lawlessness. Anarchy ran rampart until, on April 27, 1865, the lead elements of the veteran VI Corps of the Federal Army of the Potomac marched up Main Street. Eight thousand Union troops placed a noose of military occupation around the city. Martial law would prevail for the next 8 weeks—but that is another story with which we will concern ourselves at another time.

Utilizing the historical perspective of 100 years, several conclusions might be made of Danville's participation in the Civil War. The city was never the scene of a big battle, and its contributions to the Confederate cause were no more or less than the sacrifices of other sections of the South. The affairs that transpired here during the 8 days that Danville was the last capital of the Confederacy did not—as they could not—alter appreciably either the length or eventual outcome of that war. But to Virginians in general, and Danvillians in particular, this city's role in that tragic holocaust of a century ago should have deep significance.

Here the futility of the southern cause was painfully demonstrated.

Here manifestations of southern deficience and northern determination merged into a pool of American heritage that has remained our most prize possession.

For the loved ones of those men in gray who died in the defense of southside Virginia—as well as for the loved ones of those men in blue who perished in the prisons and hospitals of this city. Danville holds a magnitude of grief, an import of sorrow, that transcends the 6,221 engagements of that Civil War. Heartache is not measured by the size of the heartbreaker. For countless mothers, wives, and sweethearts, Danville was the shattering end of the Civil War, the site of the crashing down of the curtain over their hopes and anxieties. Here—for both those who gave and those who grieved therefrom—Danville became as solemn and as eternal as Chancellorsville and Gettysburg.

That is why we remember Danville in the 1860's; that is why its hills are hallowed; that is why the flowing waters of the Dan are symbolic of a nation's tears.

Many centuries ago, an eastern potentate ordered his soldiers to search every corner of the kingdom and to find him the three wisest men in existence. When at last the three most learned sages stood before the King, he told them: "I must be the wisest ruler of all. Therefore, I command you to draw up for me one statement, one sentence, that will apply to all of life and all of the universe."

The three wise men spent weeks in deep meditation. Finally, they presented to the King one statement that seemed irrefutable. That statement was: "And this, too, shall pass away."

On the surface, this motto might appear to apply to everything known to man. But it is not so. It fails to have applicability to certain intangibles that outlive the ages—the intangibles of man's legacies from the past, his never-ending quest for freedom, his inherent struggle for liberty. Such ideals cannot pass away, for they are the basic emotions placed in each of us by our Creator. So long as we continue to believe that we are truly made in the image of God, freedom and liberty are everlasting.

These were the same ideals for which northerners and southerners struggled near here a century ago. The heart-rending events at Danville, and even the awesome Civil War of which they were a part, were but passing moments in the ever-moving stream of history. Weighed against all the events of humanity stretching over thousands of years, those 4 years and that one war might seem relatively insignificant. So might they be save for the motivations behind them.

The northerner in blue and the southerner in gray who suffered and died in Danville were fighting for American ideals as each envisioned them. One was seeking a revision of an old independence; the other hoped to obtain a new independence. Yet both were in essence struggling for freedom, liberty, love of country, and the desire to make tomorrow a little better for the children than today was for the parents. Both were fighting, and both were willing to die, for what each considered the betterment of himself and his neighbor.

It was inevitable that one would triumph and the other would fail. But from the heroism of the victor and the valor of the vanquished was fused a new nation that grew, prospered, and remains today the sole hope of the world.

Therefore, we Americans of North and South can take increased devotion from the sacrifices of a century ago at Danville: for from small seeds of human tragedy planted here ultimately blossomed the stately forest of national unity. The hatreds of yesteryear that exploded and ran part of their jagged course on the hills overlooking the Dan eventually matured into the brotherhood that has safely carried our Nation through four subsequent wars. Since 1865, the common patriotism exhibited by northerner and southerner alike has been inexorable testimony that the wounds of the Civil War were not too deep for healing, that our Nation and the ideals which it exemplifies, live in burning majesty.

The Civil War was the accelerator, not the deterrent, of that transformation.

The universal turmoils of today are such that evangelical Americans cry out: "Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet; lest we forget." But with a prideful cognizance of our heritage, and with renewed confidence in the future, we can surely refute the three wise men of old. We can point with reassurance to modern America—to the devotion that

has made it, to the determination that sustains it—and we can, as we must, proclaim to the overcast skies: "No. By the grace of God, this too shall not pass away."

Pocono Record, Stroudsburg, Pa., Fully Supports Tocks Island National Recreation Area on the Delaware River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege during this session of the 89th Congress to join my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], in the introduction of legislation which would authorize the creation of a national recreation area on the Delaware River near Stroudsburg, Pa.

Known as Tocks Island National Recreation Area, the proposed 46,000-acre site would be located on both the Pennsylvania and New Jersey sides of the Delaware and would be centered around the great, new 37-mile-long lake which would be created by Tocks Island Dam. The dam was authorized by the Congress in 1962 and planning is already well underway on it.

Hearings have been conducted on the recreation area, both during the 88th Congress and, last month, in this Congress by the gentlemen of the Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I know that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] joins me in an expression of deep gratitude to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the highly regarded chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS, for the painstakingly fair manner in which hearings have been conducted. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], of course, is the ranking minority member of the committee, and his skillful leadership in pressing for action on TINRA is evident.

This past week, the Pocono Record, one of the leading newspapers in my congressional district, ran an editorial endorsing Tocks Island National Recreation Area. Aside from the fact that the editorial, itself, is superbly written and well reasoned, the comment is notable in that it represents a strong reaffirmation of this newspaper's long standing belief in the need for such a recreation area.

The Pocono Record has been directly concerned with the Delaware River Basin and its needs for the past 20 years. Mr. Horace G. Heller, the Record's general manager and a personal friend of my revered predecessor, Representative Francis E. Walter, has been among the leaders in Pennsylvania in the fight to preserve our great natural resources and increase our State's economic growth.

I am pleased to call the attention of this body to the editorial statement in support of Tocks Island National Recreation Area which appeared in the Tuesday, March 30, edition of the Pocono Record.

The text follows:

RECORD BACKS TOCKS

The Pocono Record stands unequivocally behind the creation of the Tocks Island Dam and the Tocks Island National Recreation Area.

And for the most good for the most people, it favors control of the recreation area by the National Park Service.

Feasibility reports, starting 30 years ago with Incodel (Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin), have shown that the dam is needed.

The cramped, teeming millions of megalopolis show that the recreation area is needed.

While there are several major benefits to be derived from the dam and recreation area, there are also a host of relatively minor benefits.

The two most important uses of the dam will be for a huge source of drinkable water for many miles surrounding the dam, and for flood control.

The cities of New York and Philadelphia, and the communities between these cities and the dam, have an ever-increasing thirst and need for water. We have the same thirst and will share in this water conservation basin.

The Delaware River Basin Commission has started wheels in motion which will result in interstate cooperation for distribution of the water on an equitable basis.

Monroe County residents need not be reminded of the effects of floods—Tocks Island Dam and its smaller satellite dams will help to prevent a repetition of August 18, 1955.

Of course, the major use of the 46,000 acres to be set aside around the lake will be recreation.

An anticipated 7 million people per year will use the area for camping, sports, and vacations. Probably most of these are people who haven't the time or the finances to wander to the great parks of the West.

Those who have the resources to head west will probably do so anyway. But what about the millions upon millions who also need a respite from the choking swelter of the city?

Other benefits from the dam, as shown by feasibility reports, include salinity control in the Delaware River below Trenton. By maintaining a constant level of water in the Delaware during most seasons of the year, salt water can be kept back from this fresh water port.

Pollution control is also important. A constant level dispels the danger of low water brackishness—with concurrent fish loss and stagnant water.

Hydroelectric power is an important byproduct of the dam. New sources of power must be sought and utilized where possible with the rapidly increasing needs of the adjacent areas.

Two results of the creation of the recreation area will be the preservation of the Upper Delaware River Basin for public use and natural beauty, and an economic boost for an area included in Appalachia.

The arguments against the dam and TINRA pale—not into insignificance, but into questions for the people and their legislators to work out while creating this remarkable project.

These questions include adequate planning and zoning at the smallest and largest governmental level; interim tax payments by either the State or Federal Government to taxing bodies which will lose land to TINRA; adequate compact wording to insure enough water for future growth in this area.

Also, the best possible relocation programs for persons living within the boundaries of TINRA, and allowances so that the Tocks Island regional advisory council has true advisory powers to governmental agencies dealing with the area.

Keeping these questions in mind, the Pocono Record steps squarely behind the program.

A Federal System of Education?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I had the good fortunate to read a splendid article which was written by Mr. Clinton H. Pearson of Nashville, Tenn., which appeared in the April issue of the New Age magazine, a publication of the Scottish Rite Freemasons. This organization has an outstanding record of support for our country's public school system. In his statement, Mr. Pearson warns of the many dangers of transferring a community's educational responsibility to the Federal Government.

These remarks are of timely interest since the Federal aid to education bill is still before the Congress for consideration. I commend Mr. Pearson's message to the attention of my colleagues and under unanimous consent I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A FEDERAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION?

(By Clinton H. Pearson, Jr.)

The population of the United States is rapidly expanding. There is an interest in the education of the young and the enlightenment of all the people. This education responsibility is that of the public schools, our primary source of education and development. This gives rise to a question of the quality of our present system and its related schools. A simple solution to some education problems is consolidation. However, this involves the transferring of a locality's fundamental responsibility to a centralized authority. In essence this change involves the submission of a locality's basic power to a centralized control. Because of this primary element, a Federal system would be invading and taking away the people's power. On account of this resulting factor, a Federal system should "not" be developed in the United States.

A Federal system of education would involve and control "curriculum, instruction, supervision, and support." In substance the youths' minds would be subject to a directly controlled influence either through the teachers and instruction or indirectly through the outside direction of subjects and methods of instruction to be utilized. A Federal system through its control over individuals would therefore control the Nation's stature.

The greatness of a nation may be manifested in many ways—its purposes, its courage, its moral responsibility, its cultural and scientific eminence, the tenor of its daily life. But ultimately the source of its greatness is in the individuals who constitute the living substance of the nation.

This governmental control has another aspect which must be considered. A Federal system of education would be a step toward a socialistic form of government.

Our free, democratic way of life is in direct contrast with the government control of a slavelike communistic state. The institution of a Federal system of education would be a reversal from our arduously acquired ideals of freedom to the stern, tyrannical experiences of the past.

A Federal system of education would require governmental control of the previously mentioned factors of curriculum, instruction, supervision, and support. However, one main fallacy of the suggested arrangement is the lack of any check by the people. They would have no jurisdiction of the curriculum, the methods of instruction, the efficiency of supervision, or the necessary amount of support.

The vast amount of material for the construction of a curriculum and subsequent information would require orientation and production. This data would ultimately be: A curriculum fashioned to promote the goals of the State passed to the schools from the hands of political authority. However, a free concept would place curriculum under a control of free people [where] the subject matter is a response to the force of public opinion.

In close relation with the curriculum is the instructional process. The manner and methods of presentation would have a definite affect upon the way in which a subject is perceived and learned. A Federal system would result in a continuous educational program for instructors in learning the controlled, planned methods for teaching the conformed subject matter. There would be no academic freedom and the end result would be regimentation of the whole population.

One apparent and very probable issue to occur in this vast system of supervision is political influence. Governmental control will result in political influences and presures. The ideal of a political immunity could not exist in either administrative or teaching positions. The development of bureaucracy would result in the rise of incompetence and inefficiency.

The greatest concern of the present population is the support section of this system. The salaries of both teaching and supervisory personnel with the variation of expenses should be determined primarily by the cost of living for a specific locality. Taking this fact into consideration, setting a proper standard for the support of a vast Federal organization becomes an impossible task. The expense of a Federal system will result in an increase in the now excessive burden of taxation. No economy will or can result from the adoption of a Federal system of education.

The United States is a world symbol of the free, independent ideal. Concerning their past efforts and freedoms acquired through them, Americans "may point with pride to those that are now their heritage, lifting high their heads among the world's peoples, as their country unfurls high its flag among nations." If America wishes to retain this freedom, the facts reinforce the belief that a federal system should "not" be developed in the United States.

Uninsured District Motorists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which was broadcast during the week of March 28, 1965, by WMAL here in Washington.

My bill, H.R. 634, would provide protection against the thousands of uninsured motorists in the District of Columbia. I am also the sponsor of the administration's home rule bill, H.R. 4644. If Washington had home rule the Congress would not have to be bothered with the kind of legislation called for in this editorial.

The editorial follows:

UNINSURED DISTRICT MOTORISTS

District residents suffer unnecessary financial losses every day the city goes without adequate uninsured motorist protection. There are more than 265,000 cars registered in the District. More than 35,000 of these are uninsured and represent a hazard to every citizen. The Commissioners must direct local efforts to have Congress correct this situation.

Last year a measure drafted by the Commissioners died when Congress adjourned. A new measure to establish an unsatisfied judgment fund to pay for damages caused by uninsured District motorists has been sent to Congress. But merely sending a bill to Congress is not enough. The Commissioners and citizens' groups must exert pressure for enactment. After all these years, the District deserves adequate protection against irresponsible uninsured motorists.

Small Bank and Small Town in Wisconsin Show How in Cooperation With the Small Business Administration They Have Created 4 Industries Employing 400 People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, each day I have received half dozen letters from people in small towns asking why the Government does not establish some business in their town to create jobs. If the Federal Government were to build a plant in every small town in our Nation, we would go into bankruptcy overnight.

The people and the banks of the small towns must do the job themselves and the sooner the people of our small towns awaken to this fact, the better it is going to be for their communities.

The job of obtaining industries and creating jobs can be done if the people in the little towns will cooperate and if the banks in their little towns will cooperate and enlist the services of the Small Business Administration.

My good friend Walter Jensen, president of the First Bank of Grantsburg, of Grantsburg, Wis., has furnished me with a résumé of what they have done in their town. There is no reason under the sun why every town in our Nation cannot do the same thing if they just have the will to do it, and if they are determined that their community will not die. I doubt whether there is anyplace in America where a small-town bank has done so much for the attracting of industry as has this little bank in northwestern Wisconsin.

I am putting the accomplishments of this little town and this little bank in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all Americans to see what can be done if there is the will to do it among the people in a community.

Grantsburg is a village of 900 people in Burnett County. The Congress of the United States salutes Grantsburg, Burnett County; Walter Jensen, the First Bank of Grantsburg, and the Small Business Administration for a job well done and an inspiration to the people of our great Nation.

We have analyzed the results of financing industrial development in our area the past 9 years and we thought some facts and figures may be of interest to other small banks, our congressmen, State officials and other engaged in trying to build industry for their community.

We find that most industries need long-term financing for the purchase of machinery, land, and buildings and they also need a considerable amount of short-term credit on a seasonal basis for the production of goods and the carrying of inventory. We are happy to state that excellent help and advice along with a participation in industrial loans has been furnished us by the Small Business Administration. We are also glad that we have had much help from our correspondent banks in furnishing overline financing of inventory and accounts receivable. In all instances our bank has participated in both the long-term financing as well as the short-term financing. We would like to give some facts and figures on three companies all of whom have been assisted by SBA and by correspondent bank financing.

Company No. 1: This company needed long-term financing for the purchase of additional production machinery and vehicles to increase production and to cut the cost of production. The company secured an SBA-bank loan the early part of 1956 for $30,000 and such loan was increased to $70,000 in the early part of 1959 at which time the original loan had been paid down to $15,767 so the total investment by the SBA and bank in long-term finances amounted to $84,232. In the early part of 1956 the company had 32 men working, with gross income that year of $260,545 and a total payroll of $86,974. The following year after additional machinery and equipment was added, sales jumped to $406,798, employment increased to 40 men and a payroll of $95,251. During 1964, this same company had a gross volume of business of $1,209,705 with a total payroll of $349,000 and during the period of 1956 through 1964 the company paid State and Federal income taxes of $176,886. At the present time, the company has 111 employees with a payroll of over $370,000. The bank-SBA long-term loan has now been paid in full.

Company No. 2: This company obtained a bank-SBA long-term loan of $40,000 in the early part of 1957 which was later increased to $60,000 in 1960 and again increased to $95,000 in 1962. Actual total loans after deducting pay-

ments during the period amounted to $130,342. In early 1957, the company employed 28 persons and had gross income of $241,811 with a payroll of $81,189. The company has shown a growth each year since 1957 and in 1964 it had gross sales of $757,000 with a payroll of $269,000 and a total of 86 employees. During the period from 1957 through 1964, the company paid Federal and State income taxes of $74,678.

Company No. 3: In the latter part of 1958 this company was in dire need of additional machinery, equipment, and working capital. A bank-SBA long-term loan was completed for $160,000 and in 1962 such loan was increased to $200,000 and in 1963 an additional loan of $35,000 was granted for the purpose of adding to their plant building and modernizing their heating plant. After deducting interim payments on the real estate-chattel mortgage loan granted by the bank and SBA, total loans to this company is $344,591. In 1959 the company had gross sales of $611,109 with a total payroll of $285,304. At that time they employed 98 people. The company has showed continuous growth and has now more than doubled the sales since 1959. In 1964 total sales were in excess of $1,300,000 and at the present time production is on an annual basis of $1,750,000. Total payroll in 1964 was $663,000 and the company employed 160 people. Since the first SBA loan was made the company has paid Federal and State income taxes of $126,000.

Summarizing the results of three loans made in cooperation with the Small Business Administration and with help on short-term financing by our correspondent banks, the results would be as follows: Total employment increase from 158 to 357 persons, gross payroll has jumped from $453,367 to $1,281,518, gross sales has increased from $1,113,000 to $3,367,000. During the period covered above, the three companies received bank-SBA long-term loans of $559,165 and during the same period have paid Federal and State income taxes of $377,600.

The above figures do not tell the whole story. The 357 employees also pay income tax to the State and Federal Governments and they create buying power which is beneficial to small town businessmen and to the bank. In the above analysis we have not taken into consideration fringe benefits paid to employees by these companies.

Company No. 4: Figures and facts relating to this company are not included in the above figures. We just completed a new $76,500 bank—ARA-SBA participation loan for the purpose of purchasing the plant occupied by the company and for constructing additional manufacturing spaces. Also included are funds for the purchase of modern machinery to step up production. In this case the bank has handled all the financing for the company for the carrying of seasonal variations in inventory and now they are set up with long-term financing on buildings and machinery and the bank will continue to finance seasonal inventory loans. The company started with 5 employees and will now employ 40 to 50 people.

In all fairness to these industries, we must give them credit for sound management and for creating wealth locally that is beneficial to local governments as well as the tens of thousands of dollars such industries spend each year for other machinery, equipment, and supplies which also creates employment and profits to others.

With a continued downtrend in farm income and with the prospects of fewer and fewer farms it is highly desirable that we continue to promote industry in our small towns if our towns are to grow and prosper and if our banks are to continue to grow and prosper. Our deposits have increased from $5 million in 1956 to $10 million as of December 31, 1964. We feel this could not have been possible without the growth of these industries and these industries would not have grown and prospered without financial assistance from the Small Business Administration, our correspondent banks, and our bank.

From the above information it would appear that industrial development is simple. It is not my intention to convey or suggest that building industry in a small town or anywhere else, for that matter, is easy. First of all, we need someone with an idea, then we need men who are trained and have the ability to operate and manage an industry. Also we need men who are willing to furnish risk capital ahead of the bank and SBA.

There is a lot of untapped human resources in every community and men who are willing to risk funds if they are given some cooperation and encouragement.

At this time I want to give high praise to the Small Business Administration for the wonderful job that they have done in this community. Besides paying the SBA loans back with interest, in a matter of 5 years these industries will pay in Federal taxes more than the amount of the loans that they have received from the Small Business Administration. In other words, the Small Business Administration is making taxpayers out of Americans instead of taxeaters.

I hope that these examples furnished by this small town of Grantsburg, Wis., will be an inspiration to the thousands of other small towns in America as to what can be done.

Real Progress That Will Mean Real Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. MACKAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, Atlanta is a city that has been plugging and struggling and making progress for a long time, and the reason that it has its fine name today is its hard-working people. I want to include here just a brief article from a newspaper that publishes in my district—it will give my colleagues a glimpse of one of our Atlantans at work. Mr. Hubert F. Lee, editor and founder of the Dixie Business, is the author. For years, he and his newspaper have talked and written about and urged progress on our people—and this, to my mind, is one of the things that really counts. Mr. Lee wrote the article I am including here in May of 1922—that is how long he has been working for a better Atlanta. In the more than 40 years since Mr. Lee's article, Georgia has developed a fine system of parks, and Stone Mountain, in our Fourth District, has been developed into a busy, enchanting place to see.

The article follows:

REAL PROGRESS THAT WILL MEAN REAL PROSPERITY

(By Hubert F. Lee)

Progress and prosperity is the predominant thought of the entire citizenship of Atlanta now, and will continue to be during the merrymaking of next week. Atlanta has ever been constantly on the alert for anything that will further the cause of a greater and bigger city and State. Looming in the distance are prospects of continuing for Atlanta and the entire Southland not simply a week, but forever, this progress and prosperity idea.

That movement well on foot is to seek the creation of a national park out of our vast stretches of wooded mountain land in north Georgia. Looking to this end a party of government dignitaries will leave Atlanta Monday to thoroughly explore the potential national recreational grounds.

Out of having a national park located so near, millions of dollars will stream into the coffers of Atlantans. A supervacation place will be convenient at minimum cost. Interest in culture and extensive travel will be fostered and the Empire State of the South will be the twinkling star sought by all traveling Americans.

Let's stand ready to throw our concerted efforts behind this worthy project. Stone Mountain is a mere pebble, compared with its immensity.

The Tax Status of Professional Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, I introduced a proposal, H.R. 4969, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to clarify the tax status of professional associations and corporations formed under the laws of the several States.

At this point in my remarks, I include the copy of Resolution 1 passed by the Minnesota State Legislature supporting the enactment of the proposal contained in my bill, H.R. 4969. The text of the resolution is as follows:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ADOPT S. 177, H.R. 697, OR H.R. 4969

"Whereas self-employed individuals have for more than 20 years been discriminated against under Federal tax law because they could not adopt retirement plans covering themselves unless they incorporated or formed associations taxable as corporations; and

"Whereas the Internal Revenue Service in November 1960 issued the so-called Kintner regulations which laid down guidelines to be used in determining whether or not groups of self-employed individuals would be eligible to be taxed as corporations; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Minnesota in reliance on the guidelines contained in the Kintner regulations and in order to remove the discrimination against professional persons under Federal tax law, passed in 1961 a Professional Corporation Act relating to physicians and in 1963 a Professional Corporation Act relating to attorneys; and

"Whereas the Internal Revenue Service on February 3, 1965, issued amendments to the Kintner regulations which would deny to physicians and attorneys organized under one or the other of the Minnesota Professional Corporation Acts and acts of other States similar thereto the right to be taxed as a corporation under Federal tax law and thus nullify the action of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; and

"Whereas there has been introduced into the 89th Congress, S. 177, H.R. 697, and H.R. 4969, which would amend the definition of corporation in the Internal Revenue Code to make clear that professional corporations are included therein and would as a result require the Internal Revenue Service to recognize corporations formed under either of the Minnesota Professional Corporation Acts and acts of other States similar thereto as corporations for the purpose of the Internal Revenue Code: Be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the Congress of United States be urged to enact S. 177, H.R. 697, or H.R. 4969; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Minnesota send copies of this resolution to Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, to Senators MCCARTHY and MONDALE, and to all Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Minnesota.

"A. M. KEITH,
"President of the Senate.

"L. J. DUXBERRY, Jr.,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

Passed the senate this 11th day of March in the year of our Lord 1965.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary to the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives this 30th day of March in the year of our Lord 1965.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Approved April 1, 1965.

KARL F. ROLVAAG,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Filed April 1, 1965.

JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
Secretary of the State of Minnesota.

Why Not March for White Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy when a human life is wiped out by violence anywhere in our Nation.

The city of Detroit has been in the news recently because two of its citizens were victims of violence, Mrs. Viola Liuzzo on an Alabama highway and Michael Railsback in a Detroit park. There was a national outcry over the first murder, relative silence over the second. Earlier, during the height of the Selma crisis, nine white high school students were stabbed by Negroes after a basketball game.

Some people are troubled by what they regard as a double standard of morality arising from the special attention being given to injustice in the South. Others realize the difference, but raise the point out of mischief.

In any event, I believe the matter should be clarified and put in perspective. Penetrating editorials in the Michigan Catholic, April 1 issue, and the Detroit Free Press of April 2, address themselves to the moral question.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the editorials follow:

[From the Michigan Catholic, Apr. 1, 1965]

WHY NOT MARCH FOR WHITE RIGHTS?

"Nine White Students Stabbed by Negro Youths." It was a grabby headline and it was featured recently in our Detroit papers. The regrettable incident occurred, as most everyone remembers, after a high school tournament basketball game.

By unfortunate coincidence, it happened at just about the same time as the historic march on Montgomery, Ala., was being organized. And it led to some pretty scorching questions.

"How come," some Detroiters wondered, "everybody wants to march for Negro rights and no one is protesting this heinous attack on white boys?"

There was, perhaps, some sincerity in the question but those who asked it, if they were not tongue-in-cheek bigots, had missed the whole point of the drive for racial equality.

There are uncounted events so saturated with evil that no comment is expected. All over our Nation, every day, there are murders, beatings, assaults, thefts, and generally a myriad violation of God's law. Is it necessary to pick each one up by the ears and condemn it?

Well then, why the special attention to injustice in the South?

Precisely because the evil here is wielded by the power structure of a State. And that's a lot of power.

As citizens we have the right to assemble peacefully and protest. But when citizens do this and are met by all the massive power of a State in brutal retaliation, where can they turn? Who can you call when a policeman hits you?

They can call on the only civil power superior to a State, the Federal Government. But Federal power wisely does not want to get any more involved in States' affairs than it already is. Prudence makes us label the button that summons Federal aid, "panic."

But what if the situation is really panic? How do we let Federal "big brother" know the button was pushed?

We go south, young man, not foolishly to break any law, but to assemble, petition, and march. We give our voice to silent mouths, our hearts to crushed spirits. We do this, that is, if we've got the courage to face a white wall of hate that can and does kill.

Why we do not publicly protest the violence of the North? At the risk of multiplying marches, we could. But here criminals are realistically sought, frequently found, and often punished.

In the land of southern hospitality, one crime that apparently is a virtue is the extermination of rebellious Negroes and white outsiders.

Where is even an indictment for all the recent civil rights murders of the South? Even in the totally repulsive slaughter of Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, Federal agents were the first to capture and book four suspects. At this writing the State of Alabama is still dragging its heels.

Down South they're not just whistlin' "Dixie" anymore. It's a new song and dance. The tune is, "Leave Us Alone" and the dance is a time step—plenty of time. Everybody's doing it from Gov. George Wallace to Archbishop Thomas J. Toolen of Mobile-Birmingham.

It is, of course, no surprise that Wallace, the secular power structure and many ordinary white citizens of the South are committed to this thesis. What is disappointing is Archbishop Toolen's attitude.

It causes no little source of personal agony to disagree with a man who has given some 50 years of his life to the priesthood and whose dignity is marked by his apostolic succession.

It is easy to sympathize with the task of guiding a diocese like his, beset as it is with racial, conversional, and financial problems.

It is apparent, too, that the archbishop has deep and sincere involvement in the racial conflicts of his land. His offer of Catholic property for the last stage of the Montgomery march is evidence of that. And there are many more proofs.

But he is singing the song of the south. His refrain refers to these crusaders who are eager beavers and who are trying to divide the people.

Those injustices that need correcting, concludes Archbishop Toolen, "will be corrected in time." Here's the flat note. The time is now.

It has been said that no army is as powerful as an idea whose time has come. Beyond that power, the Christian conscience is awake now to racial injustice and prejudice. There is no turning back or, as Dr. Martin Luther King puts it, "We will not be turned around."

If this racial revolution will continue in a nonviolent movement of Christian love, then the Christian community must not only participate, but lead. We realize the near promise of martyrdom such a commitment would demand of Catholic leaders everywhere and especially in the south. But come it must.

The opportunity for neopagans to recognize us once again by our love for one another is indigenous to this movement. If we let it pass us by we should never again dare to claim we are followers of the crusading Christ.

W. X. K.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Apr. 2, 1965]

WHY MIKE IS A VICTIM, MRS. LIUZZO A MARTYR

Detroit—like every other northern city—is being criticized in the South today for hypocrisy and a double standard of public morality.

Southerners, and many northerners who agree in part with them, cite the murder of young Michael Railsback Tuesday night in a Detroit park.

Why, they ask, should Mrs. Viola Liuzzo be a martyr and not Mike? Why should the leaders of civil rights movements attend her funeral, and not Mike's?

The physical comparisons are close. Both were murdered in cold blood. Mrs. Liuzzo was taking part in a civil rights demonstration; Mike was exercising his civil right to walk in safety in a public place.

Mrs. Liuzzo was shot by white men who violently opposed the changing pattern of race relations in Alabama. Mike, white, was killed by a Negro.

Certainly some comparison is valid. Both were murdered, and murder must be fought with all the forces available. But there the comparison ends.

Mrs. Liuzzo was taking part actively in securing voting rights for Alabama Negroes.

Mike's role was passive. She was killed as a result of race hatred. He was killed, apparently, for the $9 in his wallet.

The fact that race was an issue in Mrs. Liuzzo's death was central. In Mike's death, it seems to have been incidental.

But the fact remains that our crime rate is higher than the reported southern crime rate. We have a job to do here, as well as seeing that a job needs doing in Alabama.

Both Mike and Mrs. Liuzzo were victims of ignorance in one form or another. Both were killed by people who had no regard for human life, or for the rights of others. Detroit must fight the battle here just as hard as it must be fought elsewhere.

The difference is that Detroit is fighting. Detroiters are working and studying to come up with answers, trying to wipe out the ignorance and poverty which breed most crimes. Alabama can hardly say the same.

And this is why Mrs. Liuzzo will be recorded as a martyr, and Michael Railsback as a victim. The force of society was on Mike's side. The community at large, the government, the police force were outraged at his death.

Mrs. Liuzzo, on the other hand, was killed in a society in which government has acquiesced in violence. The community of Alabama citizens might have been sickened, as James Kilpatrick said on this page yesterday, but public officials from George Wallace to Sheriff Jim Clark helped create the atmosphere in which such things are allowed to happen.

The blame for Mike's death belongs to the person who killed him. The blame for Mrs. Liuzzo's death belongs in part, at least, to the southern leaders who have either failed to lead or have led down a dark and bloody path.

Address by Hon. James K. Carr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by a great public official, Hon. James K. Carr, the former Under Secretary of the Interior. The Federal Government's loss was the distinct gain of the city and county of San Francisco where he has become general manager of public utilities and, I am sure, contributing to the successful administration of our former colleague, Hon. John F. Shelley, the mayor of San Francisco.

The address follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE REMARKS OF JAMES KENNEDY CARR BEFORE THE HIBERNIAN LUNCHEON CLUB OF SAN MATEO COUNTY, ST. PATRICK'S DAY, MARCH 17, 1965

This is the first time, as one proud to have four Irish grandparents, I have succumbed to the seductiveness of an invitation to speak on St. Patrick's Day. My action could mean that I am either courageous or utterly lacking in judgment, for in this assembly of Irish ancestry, doubtless there are tenors who can sing better than any selected soloist, and there are orators whose melodious voices are shackled in silence while a lesser man speaks. Perhaps the situation is akin to the fact that the only way to have a truly successful St. Patrick's Day parade is to have everyone march abreast.

Although there are " * * * greetings flung in Irish, and the flood of Celtic banter, and the hectic flush of racial pride upon St. Patrick's Day" some may consider it strange indeed that this annual unmatched enthusiasm and joy on March 17 is in celebration of a day that a man died. And equally thought provoking is the fact that the man died 15 centuries ago.

We celebrate not because the world was rid of that 76-year-old man on March 17, in the year 461; rather, we observe this day because in kindly Gaul, far from his beloved Armagh he received his eternal gift. That day the spirit of Patricius, the "Apostle of the Irish," the "Man of Providence," went forth to heaven to reflect God's glory forever.

We rejoice because this righteous man ignited a spiritual force that saved Europe for Christianity, a force that continues to reverebrate around the world.

We commemorate March 17 because from the flame St. Patrick lighted came an understanding of the dignity of man and from it the founding of this country of free men.

We celebrate because after tear-stained centuries of battles for freedom a modern developing Ireland is emerging economically and bringing the fruits of democracy to a people that never abandoned hope from centuries of seemingly hopeless oppression.

It is to this Emerald Isle and its harvest of hope that I should like to direct my emphasis today. This better life for the Irish people now and in the future is a just reward for a nation's devotion to St. Patrick.

Most of you are familiar with the life of St. Patrick. Imperfect and ignorant as he accounted himself, he became the fitting instrument of a divine design.

He was born in Britain. At 15 or 16 he became a captive of pagan Irish warriors, destined to herd swine on the hills of Slemish. Then his flight, his preparation, self-conquest, and his return in episcopal dignity to bring Christ's teachings to the land and the people that he loved. With the blessing of the High-King of Tara he went forth to overcome the Druids; to build churches and monasteries, heal the sick, cure the deaf and the blind until in Saul, although he longed for Armagh, victim of illness and pain, attended by St. Tassach, in mid-Lent, "he sent forth his spirit to Heaven." Then for 12 days the eminent men of Ireland stood watch with hymns and psalms and canticles through the dispute for his mortal remains, until his secret burial—probably in Downpatrick.

After the barbaric hordes laid waste a Europe that was the boast of Rome—decaying within and failing on the fringes—there were the followers of St. Patrick who were the core for the enlightenment and religious revival of the continent. Like a spring tide the monastic period swept over Europe. From Christianity and its respect for the dignity of man came the Bill of Rights and these beloved United States of America. It was the indomitable, perservering, St. Patrick that paved the way. And for 15 centuries the indomitable, persevering, humor-loving Irish have carried his influence to all the corners of the world.

The day before he died, President Kennedy eluded to this unconquerable spirit at San Antonio. He said:

"Frank O'Connor, the Irish writer, tells us in one of his books how, as a boy, he and his friends would make their way across the countryside, and when they came to an orchard wall that seemed to high and too doubtful to try and too difficult to permit their voyage to continue, they took off their hats and tossed them over the wall—and then they had no choice but to follow them."

And President Kennedy at Ireland's great Shannon Airport in June 1963, summed up what so many of us feel when he bid the Irish people farewell, a farewell that was forever. He said:

"So Ireland is a very special place. It has fulfilled in the past a very special role. It is in a very real sense the mother of a great many people, a great many millions of people, and in a sense a great many nations. And what gives me the greatest satisfaction and pride, being of Irish descent, is the realization that even today this very small island still sends thousands, literally thousands, of its sons and daughters to the ends of the globe to carry on an historic task which Ireland assumed 1400 or 1500 years ago."

On that same trip, at Cork, the President did not forget the Irish sense of humor.

He introduced Monsignor O'Mahoney, who came from Cork, as "the pastor of a poor, humble flock in Palm Beach, Fla."

On the same occasion after introducing Dave Powers, Larry OBrien and Congressman BOLAND, he said:

"I don't want to give you the impression that every member of this administration in Washington is Irish—it just seems that way."

It was my priviledge to be in Ireland for a few days about 3 months after President Kennedy's visit. The bond between the people of Ireland and the people of the United States was never stronger.

About a year before that it was my real pleasure to be the first of my family in 110 years to return to the boyhood home of my grandfather, Francis Carr, at Killybegs in County Donegal. I marveled how those people, planting and reaping by hand eked out a living on the rocky land of northwest Ireland. The fishing docks probably hadn't changed much since my grandfather left them for America. It was a great thrill to peruse the parish records at St. Mary's Rectory and find there his signature on two entries as a witness for baptisms.

But near Killybegs the Donegal woolen industry thrives. A short distance beyond the skilled artisans continue to produce the world-renowned hand painted Belleek china at the little village of the same name where the waters of Lough Erne start their cascade through the hydroelectric plants at Ballyshannon.

As one returns to Dublin through Sligo and Carrick-on-Shannon, the friendly people and beautiful countryside are reminders that industrial expansion at the cost of losing open space and green fields, polluting water, and polluting air, may not really represent progress considering the history of Ireland.

My red-haired maternal grandfather, Michael Patrick Kennedy, a native of Tipperary, must have felt somewhat the same when he left San Francisco in 1884. He moved to the more peaceful East Bay hills to operate a dairy on land near what is now Cedar and Arch Streets in Berkeley. Later he operated a larger dairy at College Avenue and Webster.

As a measure of how some people cherish the traditions of Ireland I recall the comment of a friend, Marcus McInerney of Limerick, as we stopped to permit a funeral procession to pass across the bridge at the River Shannon. The casket was enclosed in glass on a wagon, with the top-hatted driver high on the seat steering four handsome black horses. The dark-suited mourners walked behind on their way to the church. Marcus said, "I want to go the old way—not in one of these modern hearses." I couldn't help but think how sometimes in our frenetic modern world we are too busy to take time to reverently bury the dead—even to attend the funeral of a close friend.

During those trips in 1962 and 1963 I saw a new Ireland is emerging under the leadership of Prime Minister Sean Lemass and President Eamon de Valera.

Incidentally, last spring, a few months before I moved to San Francisco, I attended a luncheon for President de Valera at the State Department dining room. When we met I told him I had a special fondness for Ireland because my four grandparents

were Irish. He laughed and with reference to his Spanish name remarked: "That's better than I can claim."

Under the leadership of De Valera and Lemass Ireland for the first time in history is experiencing an economic boom. The decline in population which has continued for more than a century has been arrested and reversed.

No more is there an exodus to American shores in hope and agony which prompted James Joyce to describe the Atlantic as a bitter bowl of tears. The Ireland of the mists and the bogs is gone forever. The shamrock is the symbol of one of the more highly efficient jet airlines in the world, Irish International Airlines.

Young men such as Brian Lenihan of the Justice Department and Brendan O'Kelly of the Irish Sea Fisheries Board represent a new generation full of confidence with a will to succeed and set a new pace of economic progress.

Typical of their work is the promotion of a study on ways to improve the commercial fisheries of Ireland. It was my pleasure to work with them on the proposal which resulted in an agreement on October 15, 1963, between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Lemass. The report was the first cooperative report on the subject between the two governments and private industry. The first report on the study in July 1964 is the beginning of an effort to change the Irish fishing industry from a dawn-to-dark operation near shore to a high-quality fishing industry serving both foreign and domestic markets. It is another part of the economic program that will bring new wealth to Ireland.

The Irish Government's 5-year program for economic expansion beginning in 1959 was aimed at a modest increase of 2 percent annual growth in gross national product. In 4 years the annual increase was 4½ percent or 18 percent for the period through 1962. In a new enthusiastic program the Irish Government is aiming at a 50-percent increase in income between 1960 and 1970.

As one Irish representative said:

"If the Irish can be a success abroad there is no reason why they cannot be equally successful at home, given the appropriate opportunity."

Speaking of success—perhaps we can learn some lessons from the Irish of today.

In Ireland a free, cultural, law-abiding democratic society is financing publicly owned development projects from their own thrift. Ireland is not depending upon foreign aid funds from America. Her people are among the better fed and better housed peoples in the world. Ireland has a plentiful labor force, less crime, fewer juvenile problems and a better educated citizenry than many so-called, highly developed countries of the world. It is no wonder that U.S. firms are eyeing investment possibilities in Ireland.

I am sure a majority of this audience will agree that Ireland is an extraordinary country and the Irish and their descendants are extraordinary people.

George Bernard Shaw is reported to have said as an Irishman:

"Other people see things and say, 'Why?' * * * But I dream things that never were and I say, 'Why not?' "

And, to conclude, on this occasion in honor of St. Patrick, in honor of the Irish and all they represent, I cannot summarize it any better than President Kennedy did speaking before the Irish Parliament when he said with reference to Shaw's remark:

"It is that quality of the Irish, the remarkable combination of hope, confidence, and imagination that is needed more than ever today. The problems of the world cannot possibly be solved by skeptics or cynics whose horizons are limited by the obvious realities. We need men who can dream of things that never were, and ask why not."

Iowa Newspaper Points Out Effective Method of Fighting the Ku Klux Klan and Other Forms of Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, the Ku Klux Klan has been the center of a good deal of publicity in recent weeks. President Johnson has attacked it. The House Un-American Activities Committee has voted to investigate it. And there are proposals to pass new legislation to control it.

I have grave reservations as to the effectiveness of either investigating the Klan or legislating against it.

However, I think we should all remember that, in disposing of organizations such as the Klan, the Communist Party, or the Black Muslims, there is no real substitute for an informed and enlightened intellect among citizens on the local level. If these extremist groups are not sustained at the grassroots, they will wither and die.

In this connection, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members an excellent and appropriate editorial from the March 30, 1965, issue of the Centerville Iowegian of Centerville, Iowa.

As the editorial points out, the Ku Klux Klan has not always been confined to the South. During the 1920's the Klan had some influence in Iowa. But it has long since left that State. The reason, as the Iowegian editorial points out, is that it was not tolerated by the local citizenry.

The history of the Ku Klux Klan in Appanoose County, on the southern border of Iowa, is a lesson for the whole country. Once local citizens realize how divisive extremists groups can be in their community, examine their consciences and then stand up against them, the Ku Klux Klan and all other forms of extremism will disappear politically from America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the Iowegian editorial:

DISCREDITED KLANS

The Ku Klux Klan came in for some scorching criticism on the part of President Johnson last week. Four men identified with that unsavory organization were arrested and charged with the murder of a Detroit mother who was participating in the civil rights voting march on Montgomery, Ala.

The Ku Klux Klan has no place in American life. It operates under hooded secrecy and its method is to strike terror into the hearts of its adversaries. It has a reputation of resorting to brute force. Beating and clubbing are too frequently its allies. It is an organization that has no place in America.

Back in the 1920's the Ku Klux Klan gained some short-lived favor in Appanoose County. In those days members portrayed themselves as pure American, making it seem almost patriotic to be a part of their movement.

Fortunately, many people in the community vigorously resisted the spread of the Klan idea. The Klan had extreme prejudice against certain racial groups and religions, and upon close study its cause was un-American rather than American. It tried to dominate by bluster and threat rather than persuasion and example.

Some of our most responsible citizens in Centerville fought the Klan movement even though they were threatened. Businessmen who refused to join the Klan were told they would be driven out of business. It was a movement to forget in local history, because it was anything but a proud movement.

In the end the Klan movement came to its rightful end in Appanoose County. It was recognized for its true weaknesses. Shortly after mid-1920 the leaders of the local movement moved on, and the healing process started. For a generation it was almost a taboo subject since time had to be allowed for wounds to heal.

The South should do the same as we did 40 years ago. It should reject and discredit what is in reality an un-American organization that has no role or place in America.

Voting Rights Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I know of no man in either body for whom I have more respect, both professionally and from a standpoint of personal probity, than the venerable senior Senator from Virginia, HARRY FLOOD BYRD. It behooves all of us in both Houses to hearken when he speaks; to consider at length his position on any item of legislation. He speaks with a wisdom that comes only from long years of unselfish dedication to the cause of responsible Federal Government.

His statement of April 2 on the so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965 is required reading, in my opinion, before any Member of the Congress casts his or her vote on this proposal. There are Members who have not had an opportunity, I am sure, to read all of his statement and, with unanimous consent, I insert it at this point in the RECORD.

I urge every Member to read each sentence. Take this issue of the RECORD home with you, if necessary, and study Senator BYRD's remarks. We are given, in this statement, every reason any man needs to defeat this proposal, now, before it is too late; before, in future years, we have to undo the mischievousness this bill will create if it is hastily and unwisely enacted.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S SO-CALLED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

To the People of Virginia:

This is a statement about the administration's so-called "Voting Rights Act of 1965." I am making it as a Member of the U.S. Senate representing Virginia under oath to uphold the Federal Constitution.

I am intensely aware of the democratic liberties to be achieved through our form of government, and to be guarded by it.

I am also dedicated to preservation of the principles and requirements of our State-local-Federal system and the checks and balances necessary to protect it.

The Federal Government of this country has worked itself into fiscal, monetary and military difficulties which are exceedingly serious.

Now the Federal administration is allowing itself to be influenced beyond reason by the emotion of domestic hysteria; and by its own actions it is inflaming so-called civil rights issues.

The so-called voting rights bill now before Congress is an act of the present administration. It admittedly was drafted by the Federal Attorney General.

It is a vicious bill. It clearly bears the unreasonable stamp of hysteria. Even Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, the New York chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has called it "harsh."

The administration has pushed its consideration ahead of everything else. Committee hearings have been arbitrarily limited. Efforts to amend it are discouraged.

There is a terrific administration pressure to pass the bill before Easter. But this statement is not made with such intemperate haste. Instead, it is made with all deliberate speed.

I have analyzed all provisions of the bill. They are iniquitous in effect and contemptible in design. The administration has been advised of the odium in which I hold its proposal.

I have also studied the Federal Attorney General's testimony. He admits drafting the bill. Neither the bill nor the testimony is worthy of men entrusted with high office in the National Government of this country.

The proposal is made in the name of voting justice. It would be less hypocritical and more accurate to describe it as Federal law designed for vindictive use against six States selected in advance.

It is a proposal grossly to offend Virginia; and not only this. It is subversive of the Constitution of the United States and the whole system under which we are governed.

The Attorney General has documented his own cynicism. He has proclaimed his impatience with judicial process, and his lack of faith in it.

I quote directly from the prepared testimony of the Federal Attorney General before the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 23, 1965. He said:

"The judicial process, upon which all existing remedies depend, is institutionally inadequate to deal with practices so deeply rooted in the social and political structure."

I never expected to hear a responsible member of the legal profession or an Attorney General of the United States take such an attitude or make such a public statement about the judicial process.

Based on this rejection of government by law and not men, this Federal Attorney General seeks in a voting rights bill to arrogate judicial power to himself in areas of his own choosing.

A written Constitution protects us from despotic rule. For this protection against oppressive government we rely on the checks and balances of division of power and separation of powers.

The power of government is divided between State and Federal Government. And in both State and Federal Government, legislative, judicial, and executive powers are separated.

The Federal Attorney General, speaking for the administration, is demanding that the legislative branch of the Federal Government empower him—a political appointee in the executive branch—to preempt the judicial branch in areas he has chosen to punish.

That is not all. He is demanding power by Federal legislation to usurp the constitutional power of States he has already chosen to be his victims.

There is more. He is demanding this power under general Federal law which by his own design is limited to enforcement in only a handfull of States.

He decries racial discrimination in voting practices, but he deliberately wrote this bill to exempt all voting discrimination in a four-fifth majority of the 50 States from its application.

The Federal Attorney General tortures legal reasoning in the scheme he contrived to include and exclude States from the vengeful clutches of his bill.

The States he wants to incriminate are caught by his own dictates combined with a devious statistical formula. Under terms of the bill—

The Federal Attorney General—by asserting that the voting requirements in a target area are racially discriminatory—may indict a whole State or any subdivision as violating the Constitution of the United States and Federal law; and

If 50 percent of the voting age people in the area were not registered to vote on November 1, 1964, or if 50 percent did not choose to vote in the 1964 presidential election, the State or locality—with never a day in court—is automatically guilty of the Federal Attorney General's indictment.

When a State or locality is convicted by this kangaroo procedure, the Federal Attorney General orders invasion of the State or subdivision by an unspecified number of Federal registrars.

Occupation of the State or subdivision by the Federal registrars will continue for an unspecified and indefinite period of time.

The purpose of the Federal registrars is to impose and enforce the will of the Federal Attorney General with respect to voting laws, ordinances, and practices in the State or locality.

The practices, operations, and locations, etc., of the Federal registrars are limited only by the whim of the Federal Attorney General, but they will include registration of persons to vote when they claim they have been disqualified under State or local requirements. And the Federal registrars will collect annual poll taxes in States where they are imposed.

(And the Federal Attorney General says he will extend his authority to all elections—Federal and State, general and primary, and local and district, including those for bond issues and the like.)

The State or locality has no rights to any sort of judicial appeal until it is actually incriminated by the Federal Attorney General's drumhead court. Then it may enter an appeal from the position of a culprit already convicted and sentenced.

The appeal in that position cannot be to test the validity of the Federal Attorney General's action. It is in the nature of an appeal for a pardon which is necessary before the State or locality can be released from the clutches of the Federal Attorney General and his Federal registrars.

But like the State or locality, the pardon appeal is virtually prejudged by the terms of the bill.

The appeal can be made only in a remote specially selected three-judge Federal court in Washington, D.C. (The Federal Attorney General says this is desirable for uniformity of decision.)

The State or locality is convicted by the Federal Attorney General of racial discrimination in voting practices, but much more than this is involved in getting a pardon from the Federal Attorney General's special court at the doorstep of the Federal Justice Department in Washington, which is headed by the Federal Attorney General.

This court is allowed to grant a pardon to a State or locality only when it is able to prove to the court's satisfaction that for 10 past years—

Not only the State or locality, but also everybody in it, "acting under color" of its laws or ordinances, has been totally innocent.

Not only of racial discrimination in voting practices, but also totally innocent of all discrimination suggestive of voting discrimination.

(The Federal Attorney General says complying with the "equal but separate education" doctrine of the Federal Supreme Court which stood as the law of the land for a half-century would be an example of a practice suggestive of voting discrimination.)

Until a State or locality convicted by the Federal Attorney General is given such a pardon, under such conditions, by such a court, it is not allowed to enforce any change in any of its election laws or ordinances without permission from a district Federal court in Washington.

The extremes to which the administration and its Attorney General have gone to exempt the majority of States and convict a minority are beyond the realm of reason.

They demonstrate the bias and prejudice under which the bill was conceived and with which it will be enforced. The bill itself is literally based on discrimination as between States.

There is nothing in the Virginia constitution or statutes which can be honestly interpreted as discriminatory with respect to voting rights or registration.

I doubt that the Federal Attorney General can find a State where it is simpler or easier for anyone to register than it is in Virginia, or where election practices are cleaner.

If in truth, or consequence, there is any evidence of discriminatory voting practice or procedure in Virginia I am unaware of it.

If there is any evidence of racial discrimination in the registration laws or voting practices in Virginia, the Federal Attorney General has not given it the usual Federal fanfare.

Even the Federal Civil Rights Commission—with all of its bias and prejudice and snooping—has found that—

In Virginia there appears to be no racial discrimination with respect to voter registration and that Negroes "appear to encounter no significant racially motivated impediments in voting."

Despite all the activity of his own agents combined with that of the Civil Rights Commission agents, the Federal Attorney General says there is no widespread voting discrimination in Virginia.

But the Federal Attorney General persists in misrepresenting Virginia as a State with discriminatory registration laws or engaging in discriminatory voting practices.

He admits that this bill which he has drafted for the administration is fixed so that he can incriminate Virginia.

He admits also that he has designed this administration bill so that he can exempt Texas from its application.

In advance he has said that he will incriminate Virginia and exempt Texas.

He says Virginia is caught in his numbers game because 41 percent (not 50 percent) of its voting-age people voted in the presidential election of November 1964.

But he says Texas, where 44 percent (not 50 percent) of its voting-age people voted in the presidential election of November 1964, is not to be subjected to the application of his numbers racket.

When the Federal Attorney General was asked why Texas was to be exempt, he said:

"Texas is out for the reason that it does not have a literacy test. The literacy tests are the devices that have been primarily used in order to prevent Negroes from registering."

For those who may be misled by the Federal Attorney General into believing that Virginia has a literacy test, I shall compare

the so-called voting tests and other requirements for voting in Virginia and Texas.

Both States voted less than 50 percent in the presidential election of November 1964.

Both States have a relatively high percentage of nonwhite population.

Both States in November 1964 required the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite for voting in all but Federal elections.

The voting lists for the 1964 presidential election in Texas were composed of the names of persons certified by the poll tax collectors as having either paid their $1.75 poll tax, or as having formally applied for and received a certificate of exemption from payment for voting in the Federal election.

Like Texas, Virginia voters were exempt from payment of their $1.50 poll tax as a requirement for voting in the 1964 Federal election. The voting lists in Virginia were composed of the names of persons who had been registered under the Virginia voting registration laws.

In Texas, the so-called test is applied to prospective voters by the tax collector when they undertake to pay their poll tax; or when they formally apply for a certificate of exemption.

In Virginia the prospective voter is billed for his poll tax along with other taxes. He is asked simple questions of identification when he registers to vote at the office of a registrar.

In Texas the prospective voter must be able to understand the questions asked by the tax collector, and give the answers. In certain cases a husband can apply in behalf of his wife, and a wife can apply in behalf of her husband.

In Texas, article 5.14 of the election code requires the following questions to be answered:

Name?
Age?
Sex?
Race? (This is presumed to have been outlawed by a recent Federal court decision).
Occupation?
Length of residence in the State of Texas?
U.S. citizenship?
Native-born or naturalized citizen?
State or county of birth?
Length of residence in county.
Texas post office address (if residence is in an incorporated city or town give the ward, street, and number of residence in lieu of post office address, and length of residence in such city or town)?
Political party affiliation?

In Virginia, title 24, section 68, of the code requires the following questions to be answered in writing by the person registering, without assistance:

Name?
Age?
Date and place of birth?
Residence?
Occupation?
Have you ever voted before?
State, county and precinct where you last voted?

(Members of armed services are required to give their service, serial number and discharge date where pertinent.)

(Naturalized citizens are required to give date, court and State where they received their naturalization papers, along with their petition and certificate numbers.)

All persons registering are required to sign the following oath:

"I ——— do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I am entitled to register under the constitution and laws of this State, and that I am not disqualified from exercising the right of suffrage by the constitution of Virginia."

But the Federal Attorney General, while admitting that both States are ensnared in his voting numbers trap, reveals that he has written this bill for the administration so that—

He can exempt Texas by simply asserting that Texas has no literacy test. But he can incriminate Virginia by inferring that Virginia has some kind of a voting test that will not get his approval.

The fact is that in State and local elections on questions of bond issues, debt, and other matters of public finance, Texas voters must own taxable property.

There is no such requirement in Virginia.

For State and local elections Texas requires payment of poll taxes for 1 year; Virginia requires their payment for 3 years, but the 3-year requirement does not apply to new voters coming of age or moving into the State.

What does the Federal Attorney General do about poll taxes? He exempts Texas from application of his bill. But his bill provides that his Federal registrars sent to poll tax States will collect the taxes for 1 year—as in Texas—from persons they qualify to vote.

Beyond this, he has testified that neither he nor his Federal registrars will "recognize" the 3-year poll tax requirement—as in Virginia.

But while the Federal Attorney General refuses to recognize the requirement to pay poll taxes for 3 years as a requirement to vote, he provides in his bill that he and his Federal registrars can disenfranchise persons they have qualified to vote contrary to State laws if they do not vote "at least once during 3 consecutive years while listed."

The people of Virginia, and the Nation, are justified in the condemnation of legislation such as the Federal administration and its Attorney General propose in the so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965.

They would pin a rose on Texas, but incriminate Virginia.

And when they incriminate Virginia, they deny it the judicial process accorded a murdered.

They would convict Virginia of voting discrimination, but deny it a pardon until it has proved its innocence of something else for 10 years.

They admit there is already ample law under which allegations of discrimination can be tested in the judicial process, but they want this special law to bypass judicial process for the punishment of the States of their choice.

For purposes of this law, the Federal administration and its Attorney General condone an eighth-grade education voting test in New York, but they want the power to qualify a moron to vote in Alabama.

They decry discrimination devices, but they have proposed a law which in itself is a discrimination device.

The Federal Attorney General has no patience with the judicial process for the victims of this bill. He wants the power to deal with them himself.

The Federal administration and its Attorney General propose to incriminate certain States by means of dictator-type decree and a statistical formula.

They demand for themselves the right, under certain conditions which they name, to disenfranchise people they themselves qualified to vote.

The Federal administration and its Attorney General propose by a single Federal statute to take away the constitutional rights of States and substitute Federal Executive decree.

If this can be done for this administration, for the purposes of this bill, to punish the States it has chosen, it can be done at other times for other purposes to destroy the constitutional rights of others, the Constitution not withstanding.

It is significant that this bill would extend Federal control over all elections—Federal, State, local, and party primaries.

Federal agents are not to confine their control only to elections for political office. They extend it to State and local elections with respect to public finance—bond issues, credit, expenditures, etc.

Simply by changing the statisical formula the Federal administration and its Attorney General can be empowered to extend their control over any and all States they wish to give this treatment.

What would remain of our form and system of government if all elections in all States and localities were controlled by the Central Government.

Only last month 99.9 percent of the people in Moscow voted in an election of candidates who had no opposition. And when Mr. Khrushchev voted, he was not required even to produce identification.

Negotiate What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the demands for negotiations in Vietnam have increased in tempo and volume. Several nations have urged this course, as well.

Yet the United States remains reluctant to negotiate and not without reason. This is discussed with good logic in the following editorial from the Indianapolis Times of April 3, 1965:

NEGOTIATE WHAT?

Seventeen nations have signed a petition urging "negotiations, as soon as possible," to end the fighting in Vietnam.

The purpose of the negotiations, according to the petitioners, would be to find a political solution to the war "in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of the Vietnamese people and the spirit of the Geneva agreements on Vietnam."

The main legitimate aspiration of the people of South Vietnam is to be let alone, to get the Communist Vietcong from North Vietnam off their backs, so they may stabilize their government and go about developing their country—free of strife, for a change.

The spirit of the Geneva agreements was that South Vietnam would be a free country. What had been French Indochina was carved up, creating the states of North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam. The United States and South Vietnam did not sign, because there were too many concessions to the Communists—but Red China, the Soviet Union and North Vietnam, among others, did sign.

The violator of that agreement is Communist North Vietnam, encouraged at the least, by Red China and the Soviet Union.

In this light, what is there to negotiate?

The freedom of the people of South Vietnam?

This would repudiate the Geneva accord and every sense of moral decency.

That leaves only one other possible issue for negotiation—the complete withdrawal of all Vietcong guerrillas, infiltrators, killers, propagandists and bomb-throwers. With an adequate guarantee against their return.

North Vietnam does not offer this. Red China resists it.

The 17 small nations—none with a direct stake in the Vietnam war—submitted their petition to Secretary of State Rusk who properly received it "with great interest." They also sent it to Russia, Red China and North Vietnam, the only governments in a position to provide the only answer—by pulling the Vietcong out of South Vietnam.

This requires no negotiation—simply a decision to keep the promises they made in the Geneva agreement.

A Black and White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George R. Davis, minister, National City Christian Church, read a paper on Sunday, March 14, 1965, not as a part of the sermon, but as a statement before over 1,200 persons.

In the emotional atmosphere, sometimes bordering on hysteria as it relates to civil rights matters, all of us would do well to study the very thought-provoking and moving words of this respected clergyman. Dr. Davis' statement follows:

A BLACK AND WHITE PAPER

A call went out on Friday and again on Saturday from certain religious, civic, and civil rights leaders that the services of the churches in Washington, D.C., and everywhere across the Nation be used on March 14 to express militant demands for increased civil rights pressures, and that the services also be used as memorials to an outstanding minister who died at the hands of violent men this past week, in Alabama.

What I am about to do will meet those requests only in part, and I will meet the requests in a way which goes beyond the expectation and intention of those who quite rightly asked that the events of tragedy during recent days and weeks not be ignored by the churches. Because I will be expressing views at some points I have not heard expressed by the clergy this past week, in addition to making clear, very clear, some convictions I have against social injustices, and in addition to using portions of our services as brief memorials and for special prayers. I am sure I will not please all who hear me, perhaps will please no one at all. And yet I cannot remain silent. Across the years of my ministry, as I look back now, there were times when I remained silent, when I should have spoken, and times I spoke when I should have remained silent. Today I am confident, I must not remain silent. Only time will reveal the wisdom of my decision. Silence could leave the impression I am totally in sympathy with all that has recently taken place in Washington, and across the Nation, thus using my silence to let people draw their own conclusions about my feelings, without becoming involved personally in the crisis. On the other hand my silence could be taken as a complete lack of feeling, or concern, an unawareness of tragedy.

Let nothing I say later on in this paper, be taken as an effort to tone down the brutal facts of the assault upon innocent people engaged in Alabama or anywhere else in peaceful demonstrations, or to tone down the sickening happenings in Selma, Ala., last Sunday. Surely all of us, at least any of us who dare to wear the name Christian must be disturbed to the center of our being as we think about the senseless killing of the minister, as we think about his family, and of the many killings of human beings, Negro and white, in the South, yes, but also in the North. Later in brief moments of silence we shall remember these dead. And if there are those who would like to contribute to the memorial funds which have been established for the Reverend James Reeb family, and who wish to send those gifts through this church, that will be done. And such gifts would be fitting, even if they were not needed by the family, and I do not know of their needs, but they would be fitting nevertheless as symbols of concern. All of the above I wanted to say before I speak the one special word which has not been spoken by the "responsible clergy," this past week, or recently. At least I have not heard it, nor read it, from the clergy. Perhaps it has been spoken, but not reported by the press. This would not be surprising. The "responsible press, and radio, and television" seem to be willing at times to report only one view. I know this from having seen the word I speak, twisted, lifted out of context. So before I speak that word, which has not been spoken by the clergy, or the pickets, or the marchers, or the civil rights leaders, or at least I have not heard it spoken, I wanted to say the above.

And before I speak that word, I wish also to say the following: Can there be any among us, who wear the name Christian who do not feel shame for the long injustices practiced toward our fellow Americans, in the denial of voting privileges, the shameful patterns of segregation in most of the ways we have conducted our society? And let us now forget for a moment the so-called secular parts of our society, trains and buses, theaters, housing, jobs, schools, where men and women, youth, boys and girls, just because of the color of their skin, have been robbed of their dignity, their decency, their human rights, their American rights. Let us forget for a moment the pointing of the finger of scorn at the South. The North is guilty too. And this has been almost forgotten, if not totally forgotten, in the impressions left. The North is guilty too, perhaps even more so, with a kind of self-righteousness, a thin veneer of pretense. But let us forget all of the above for a moment, and think just about the churches across America, where we have allowed to be practiced what some have rightly called the most segregated hour of the week, the hour of morning worship on Sundays, in American churches. Let us pause to think just about the churches, forgetting, I say, for the moment, what we call the secular society. Let us think just of the churches, for the moment, where not considering the matter of church membership at all, men and women have not been made welcome even to enter, because of the color of their skin. [And I will not pose with self-righteousness myself, even though I have received into the membership of National City Christian Church all people who came forward, Negroes as well as whites, and during my ministry the church has been integrated. Indeed we have members from many national backgrounds, and of several races.]

Now that I have said all of the above I wish to say the one word, composed of many words, I have not heard spoken by the clergy. And it should be spoken. This is the word. I reject the mood which has been increasingly growing in this Nation, that is the movement of the solution of our problems to the streets. I reject the spectacle of laughing off, or condoning, or considering unimportant, or accepting as the normal pattern, by giving encouragement to such action, teenagers, children, and adults sprawled over the halls of the Justice Department, and the White House, especially the White House. I reject the spectacle of people throwing their bodies in front of vehicles, locking arms across busy streets and highways, marching in places and in numbers, inconsistent with a sense of real responsibility, all in the name of peaceful demonstrations. It is not the right to peaceful demonstrations, marches, picketing, against which I lift up my word. Free men have these and other rights. It is the encouragement of the mood as the way by which ends are to be gained, and the mood has been growing and encouraged, about which I speak my word. I take issue with clergymen who this past week laid down ultimatums to the President of the United States, ultimatums to be met "or else." I take issue with clergymen who this past week said there "are times to ignore law and order" to gain desirable ends. I take issue with clergymen who with surprising arrogance this past week left the impression God speaks to them alone, and may not be speaking to sincere men who sit in the desperately dangerous seats of our national authority and leadership, and who accused their fellow-clergymen of being snowed by the President, after they returned from talking with the President and were impressed with his sincerity and intentions. I reject men who said this past week, "If some are killed in Alabama, the blood will be on the hands of the President of the United States," who said, "The President should lead the march on Selma," who inferred "The spirit of Christ has left the churches in the South, all of the white churches, and gone elsewhere." There are those who will say, "But all of this was in the past, spoken under pressure, let us forget all of this." But these remarks were made by responsible men in times of great emergency, and gave encouragement to irresponsibility on the part of youth, and others. I insist therefore the word of caution and moderation I am speaking is not out of place, or irrelevant to the situation. I reject the arrogance which presumed to suggest that the President of the United States needed to be reminded by men who hardly knew him, of his responsibility, when he had shown such concern in so many ways for the welfare of all of our citizens, from the moment he assumed the Presidency under such tragic circumstances, and who with others of many groups and both parties has been leading this Nation along to higher and higher goals toward making the rights of all secure. Indeed our present President must be given major credit for last year's strong civil rights law. I have been profoundly grateful this past week, there has been a man in the White House, trained, mature, disciplined, who would not be pushed into hurried action (that is action based on momentary judgments), or "blackjacked" into a course of action by any pressure groups, and yet a man who made it very clear at his conference with the press yesterday, where he stands.

He does not need my defense, perhaps might even consider certain parts of this paper mentioning him to be presumptuous. Be that as it may. Well he might insist on his right and obligation to conduct that high office in such a manner (in his way), as one thinks of his long and faithful service at every level of our national life, as one thinks of his stability evidenced hour after hour since that black November day in 1963, and as one thinks of the overwhelming "yes" this Nation said to him in November 1964. Of course, what the President said on Saturday (March 13) concerning human rights, civil rights, citizen rights, he has said so many times before. And only those who had paid no heed or who were wrapped up in their own egotisms could have failed to hear and understand him. This Nation did not deserve last week to be made a spectacle before the world by having our national leadership lifted up to ridicule and their motives carelessly questioned. I truly believe the South was moving forward, in many areas, that many people of good will were beginning to break through the walls of resistance. And I also know, and so do you, or you should know, that long before last week our Government was preparing new legislation to strengthen, to put teeth into vot-

ing rights, and other rights. [And it is in a sense tragic now to leave the impression before the world that the recent pressures brought all of this about, and that it would not have been brought about otherwise. In other words that we as a nation are taking at last to the streets, as the real means to gain the goals. Our Attorney General on the "Today" show, during the week of March 15, himself declared, in answer to questions, that the legislation was on its way, had been on its way for months. Last week did not enhance our position, our image, in many ways, including our display before our marching, picketing, neighbors all around the world, that we too are finally dedicated to this way of the streets as the way. And the impression also has been left around the world, and this was the purpose of some irresponsible people in their stepped up activity, that our leaders were not prepared to take action, except when compelled to do so, by high pressures, or when blackjacked into doing so, or when given ultimatums. It is this sort of movement in our Nation toward a policy, a frame of mind, about which I speak my word. One thing may be said about us as a nation, we did "come through it," as we will come through much else, on the long, long road we have to travel in the worldwide revolution now upon us. I lift only a word against the drift to demonstrations and ultimatums as the way to which we must be finally committed.]

As one who supports the National Council of Churches, and will continue to do so, my whole ministry has been and will continue to be dedicated to the ecumenical movement, the "ecumenical church," I reserve however the right to declare, I think the most recent calls for militant action were ill times and did not serve well the interests of Nation or church. I reserve the right to declare that not only the violent and evil men who killed James Reeb are guilty, but also some who stand in self-righteous innocence, who were a part of the aggravation, when ill-timed, must also share the guilt. Perhaps all of us are guilty in one way or another. I am willing to accept my part of the guilt. [I wish now to reject the wild accusations some have made against the Councils of Churches, local, national, worldwide, as being in the grasp of leaders who cannot be trusted, and that the churches should turn away from the councils. The work, ministry, and record of the councils, and of the leaders, have been too vital, too outstanding, to listen to such voices. But one may still reserve the right to honest opinion concerning specific actions and pronouncements. And one may still object to irresponsible statements, such as some made in Washington, and elsewhere, recently, and to which I have previously referred, and to ultimatums laid down even by "men of God."] I reserve the right in the present dialog to take issue with an irresponsible public official, let us say a segregationist Governor, or a bishop who indulges in an irresponsible statement or ultimatum, though his basic purpose is sound.

[Often men fail their opportunities. I said in August, 1963, in a sermon, "Our Way of Life Is Threatened," "Unless States and cities, and persons, move more rapidly to bring justice to our social order, to deal with the problems of discrimination, Federal power will be used. It is always second best to take from communities and States, the power of law enforcement, but the continued denial of human rights to minorities, will offer no other course than Federal intervention." Governor Wallace and the State authorities of Alabama had the opportunity, the week of March 15, to retain to the State such rights related to guaranteeing peaceful assembly and marches. Not doing so, the President had no other choice than the one taken. But I also insist the civil rights leaders, in the light of the President's strong and eloquent address to the Congress, Monday, March 15, and in the light of other factors moving in the direction of real achievements, had a supreme and glorious opportunity to call off, at least for the time being, all marches, demonstrations, picketing, to give the Nation a time of ease, and calm. But because so many are committed to this way, the way of the streets, and no doubt for other reasons, the golden opportunity was passed by.

When the Federal Court through Judge Johnson spoke concerning marches and demonstrations, and in particular the march from Selma to Montgomery, law and order were upheld, and with guarantees from police power of the Federal Government. But I think we should also be reminded that before the judge issued his decision, there were "responsible men," even some clergy, who had already declared how they would act, whatever the decision of the court. It is all of this about which I lift up my word. In how many cities, and States, could we at one and the same time provide protection such as given for the Selma-Montgomery march? Back of that question is my real concern, the drift toward a way, a way men have used, and rightly so, at times, and in places, but always while they were still committed to some other way as the beter answer.] [We speak of the August 1963 march on Washington, as a peaceful march. It was indeed, and as I look back upon it now, though I spoke against it at the time, I would agree it may have contributed to the forward progress of civil rights. But let us take a second look. (1) That march had all of the power of military personnel in the military district of Washington, D.C., guaranteed to stand ready for any emergency. (2) That march had all of the police force of Washington, D.C., and hundreds from New York City in preparation. (3) That march had the urgent request of authorities of the District to all people to stay off the streets, unless they were in the march. In some ways for a day or more in Washington we lived in a police state to guarantee peace. Many stores did not open, and those open had little business. Before the march started, looking down the streets, one had the impression of a "ghost town." (4) That march had the guidance of many responsible leaders to control the "hot heads." In fact two clergy refused to go on the platform at the great mass meeting to give prayers, until one of the radical leaders "toned down" the written remarks he was to deliver. Twice they insisted that he tone them down, before the very moving, and religious program began, as reported by press, radio, and television. Even of that vast march it may now be sincerely asked, "Is this way, into the streets, and which is becoming increasingly the mood of our time, the way we wish to encourage?" The word I speak is merely to raise this question now, and I think it is a relevant question.]

[I think it should be pointed out that not only the Washington march, and the Selma-Montgomery march had to have a vast cover of police protection, and it had to be either State or Federal, but that any march of such size could not be held anywhere in the Nation without some such assurances. And the risks will be increasingly great. We have heard it declared that passage of the voting rights bill will not stop the demonstrations, indeed will increase them, perhaps their size as well as their tempo. And this we must count on no doubt. The voting rights bill should pass and as hurriedly as possible, within proper limits for intelligent debate, and perhaps allowing for minor and needed changes. And much, much else must be done. I only lift my word concerning the movement of the time toward the streets. There are those who tell me such a caution is irrelevant to the times, and is not in the "mainstream". There are those who will try to relate my caution to reaction. There was a time in the sad and tragic days of the McCarthy hearings when men and women were held up to ridicule as fellow travelers, "pinkos," Communists, because they dared to speak against right wing extremists, and because they would not go off the deep end with the McCarthy school of thought and behavior. Is it possible today, when a man dares to speak a word of caution about "the streets" that he will be accused of being against social justice? I am now on the defensive no doubt, but I will allow my pulpit utterances and my practical record in the ministry, in the ecumenical, interracial, and interfaith areas, long before I came to Washington, as well as since I came to Washington, to speak for themselves. And I will allow time to speak down the years.]

I urge my country and our people to reject the mood of our time, and to move away from complete surrender to a philosophy of seeking our answers in the streets, in gangs, in marches, in untamed crowds, in threats, in ultimatums. It is not only in civil rights we must confront this, it is everywhere. Do we wish to be rid of a chancellor of a great university, we march, we picket, we shout. Do some wish to subscribe to Castro's tune, in defiance of law, we ignore the Nation's request, violate her best interests, and humanity's best interests, and take to the streets. And if we watch carefully the faces and action of the participants, they are not all saints. To some all of this is a big joke, we do it for kicks, and there are also the beatniks out for the lark, and there are the extremists of all varieties.

And of course there are the earnest and genuine folk, and the saints. If I say or write anything which would suggest lack of respect for men like Ralph Bunche, many of my fellow clergy, and many faithful people, this is not my intent or spirit. But I do feel compelled to lift my word at the point where I have lifted it, and now. To open one's mouth today is to be misunderstood, misquoted, quoted out of context, and sometimes to be relegated to the company of people whose ideas you do not follow at all, but who will take advantage of a word of caution as being agreement with injustice, and the deep sickness of our time. But the word I have spoken I have not heard elsewhere. I doubt very much if in such a revolutionary time my little word will be heard, let alone followed, but I had to speak my word. Free men have the right to petition, to peacefully picket, to demonstrate, to march. There are deep, long injustices, to be removed, and they will be removed, as history shows, by peaceful means or by violence. It could have been hoped we were really ready for law and order, for an increasing turning to the courts, to the ways of mature men, and especially when we are trying to lead a strife torn world, and many new nations to the ways of law and order, to the way of world courts. And this is especially so, when this Nation has done so much, and made so much progress, and really did not finally deserve to be presented before the world in such a sad light. It is true indeed free men have the right to a great deal. They also have the right and obligation to be responsible. [In the present dialogue I offer my views sincerely, but not dogmatically in the sense that I reject the right of other men to question my views. I do insist the word I have spoken needs to be spoken, and I insist on the right of good conscience to speak it. And I hope I do so in good will and Christian charity.] [When men look back upon this time, and were to ask me, "Where were you?" I will have to answer, "I did not march." But I like to believe I have for a good many years been deeply involved, with some results, in my own way. And only God, not I, nor they could be the judge of that.]

GEORGE DAVIS.

Liberals Push Red Line for Peace in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert the following article from the Indianapolis Star of April 4, 1965:

LIBERALS PUSH RED LINE FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

(By Michael Padev)

WASHINGTON.—Liberals, Socialists and other supporters of what is known as the left are often offended when they are accused of being soft on communism.

They point out that they are, in fact, more effective in their opposition to communism precisely because their liberal policies of social reform deprive the Communists of the most popular points in their program. The argument is that when the voters discover that not only Communists are for the poor or for social justice, they won't join the Communists but will, instead, support the liberals, the democratic Socialists and the other leftwingers. Only the left can fight communism effectively, these liberals argue, because only the left can present to the people popular and appealing political programs.

I have never been impressed by these liberal arguments for the simple reason that I don't accept the notion that Communist political programs are popular. The Communists have never come to power by way of the ballot box anywhere on earth. Communist political programs have never had popular appeal except with a minority of voters. The Communists themselves admit that. For this reason Communists reject the idea of democratic government and of free democratic elections. Those liberals who believe that you can fight the Communist danger effectively by a program of social reform haven't studied communism seriously in either theory or practice.

FOREIGN POLICY STAND TAKEN

It is in the international field, however, that liberals fail most of the time to see the true nature of the Communist danger. That's why liberal foreign policy programs can seldom combat international communism in any serious way. More often than not liberal positions on foreign policy problems actually help the Communists.

I used to think that the liberals did this out of sheer ignorance combined with political stupidity. But lately I have been asking myself, What is it that the liberals really want, say in Vietnam?

And I have come to the reluctant conclusion that in Vietnam most liberals want the same things which the Communists want. This does not mean that the liberals should be considered Communists or pro-Communist. But it does mean that, on the Vietnam issue, the Communists and some of the liberals find themselves on the same side of the political barricade.

Liberals, for example, or at least most of them, want the U.S. air strikes over Communist targets in North Vietnam stopped immediately. So do the Communists. Most liberals advocate a phased American withdrawal from South Vietnam. So do the Communists. Most liberals want some form of neutralization of South Vietnam. So do the Communists.

CRY OF COLONIALISM RAISED

Most liberals are horrified to see the United States expand its political influence and military power in southeast Asia. So are the Communists. Most liberals argue that the Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam are not agents of the Communist regime of North Vietnam but are local patriots and revolutionaries who want to free their country from "colonialism." This, of course, is exactly what the Communists are saying.

Perhaps the most revealing document on liberal thinking on Vietnam was published the other day in an editorial in that New York daily newspaper which rightly claims to be the official organ of the liberal establishment in the United States. The editorial favors an American-sponsored "regional development plan" in South Vietnam to supply the necessary food for the hungry Communist states of North Vietnam and Red China. The editorial said "the Communist effort to seize the rice surplus areas of southeast Asia by war would appear less attractive once it became clear that vastly larger supplies could be obtained through peace."

I submit that such a solution of the Vietnam crisis would be welcomed by the Communists. Nothing suits better the Communist purpose than to obtain, in Winston Churchill's words, "the fruits of war without war."

Senior Citizens' Health Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call to the attention of the membership my views on medicare as outlined in my monthly report to the residents of my congressional district last month.

SENIOR CITIZENS' HEALTH PROGRAMS

(From Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, 20th District of Pennsylvania)

At long last it appears that Congress—both the House and the Senate—will act favorably on legislation to provide adequate hospitalization, nursing home care, home nursing care and diagnostic services for our elder citizens, 65 and over, the program will come under the Social Security Act, as I have long advocated.

President Johnson sent the following message to a recent luncheon meeting held in Washington and sponsored by the Senior Citizens Golden Ring Council of New York. In substance, he said:

"The crusade for health care is on the verge of victory.

"The long debate is drawing to a close. There is going to be a program of health insurance for older people in this country. And the basis of that program is going to be our great social security system.

"For far too long older Americans have had to cope as best they could with the steeply rising costs of hospital care and other health services that you need.

"You have been patient in your actions, progressive in your thinking. Now your patience is to be rewarded by action."

Congressman MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee—attended that luncheon, and told the guests the health care package would include the following:

1. A basic social insurance program of hospital care, based on the King-Anderson bill.

2. An increase in social security cash benefits.

3. An optional supplementary program covering many health expenses—not included in the basic hospital insurance program—to be partially financed from Federal funds.

4. Improvements in the existing Kerr-Mills Act (medical assistance for the aged)—to include provisions for medical care to needy children, as well as the needy elderly who cannot qualify under the social security program.

The bill—including the four programs—was reported out by the Ways and Means Committee on March 23. It is now in the Rules Committee awaiting a rule under which it will be considered by the House. (The Rules Committee determines whether a bill comes out under a closed rule—meaning no amendments can be offered from the floor—or an open rule—meaning that amendments can be offered by the Members for consideration.)

One thing is certain—however—the bill will reach the floor of the House for a vote. Early this session, Members of the House passed a resolution reinstating the 21-day rule—which authorizes the Speaker of the House to call up for House action any bill approved by a legislative committee that has not been cleared for House consideration by the Rules Committee within 21 days. In other words, the Rules Committee received the legislation on March 24, and if it takes no action, Speaker MCCORMACK can have the measure placed before the House for consideration after April 14. Therefore, we will soon have the opportunity to vote for the legislation.

In 1956, when I ran for Congress in a special election, I campaigned on a platform stating my support of the Forand bill to provide hospitalization, medical care and drug costs for persons receiving social security and railroad retirement benefits. After my election, I introduced the Forand bill and became a cosponsor (84th Cong.).

I have reintroduced that bill each Congress—up to the present—(89th Cong.). This session I cosponsored the King-Anderson bill (H.R. 1813). The administration backed the King-Anderson program, and while it did not provide broad coverage, I have stated I would vote for it if a better program was not obtainable. However, I felt the provisions of the Forand-Holland bill were preferable. In an effort to appease the American Medical Association, the administration deleted the portion of the old Forand-Holland measure "to provide coverage of medical and drug costs" and kept the hospitalization and nursing care coverage.

The AMA was not to be appeased, however, and it opposed even the limited version. That organization, over the years, has prevented the legislation from coming before Congress.

The AMA first opposed, then endorsed—and finally supported—the Kerr-Mills Act (medical assistance for the aged). This is a welfare program under which all persons 65 and over, who are on relief, can receive needed medical and hospital care, plus dental and eye care, diagnostic services, home nursing services and drugs with all costs paid by the State and Federal Governments. Under that program persons, 65 and over, who are receiving Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits are entitled to hospitalization and nursing home care only, provided the pensioner can prove that he and/or his children cannot afford to pay for such care. * * * His income is below a certain

amount * * * and * * * he has no private life insurance or property over a specified amount. (Each State is different.)

Pennsylvania citizens—65 and over who are on relief or pensions—do not receive any benefits under the Kerr-Mills Act which they did not already have under the State welfare program. The only help the act gives our State is to reduce the cost to the State, as the Federal Government now pays half the costs. Several other States with welfare programs similar to ours—New York, Michigan, New Jersey, etc.—also participate in the Kerr-Mills program, since it authorizes the Federal Government to share in the State's cost. Many States, however, do not wish to pay their share of the cost—so they do not participate in the program; consequently, their elder citizens (with or without pensions) receive no health care.

In the November 1964 election, the people of America elected a President and Vice President, as well as Congressmen and Senators, who campaigned on platforms including adequate health care for our senior citizens. There was little doubt that the limited program—under the King-Anderson bill—would be enacted into law.

However, the American Medical Association—in a hysterical, last-ditch stand—came up with a fancy-named program, eldercare, and it claims to cover everything at no cost to any individual (just the State and Federal Governments * * * who are really you and me), but in the fine print—you find out that maybe you will have to pay something after all.

Supposedly, the main concern of the AMA is the lack of health insurance coverage for doctors' fees and medicines, yet, this coverage was provided by the Forand-Holland bill, and the AMA claimed it would result in socialized medicine. Now, it laments for the poor pensioners because inadequate care is not offered under the original King-Anderson bill. But under the King-Anderson bill, as amended by the committee, this is not true.

The amended King-Anderson bill has a provision of considerable interest to our pensioners not included in the other bills. It grants a 7-percent increase to the 20 million social security beneficiaries (about $1.3 billion a year).

Another section of the amended bill increases the Federal share of public assistance programs in the various States, helping old-age assistance recipients, blind pension recipients, and persons receiving assistance because of disability (other than social security disability). Needy children—on relief—will also be included.

Federal funds to the States will be increased under this section—for programs conducted in behalf of the aged in mental and tuberculosis institutions.

Following is a résumé of the major medical care proposals. You may judge for yourself, the true facts.

Résumé

Provisions	King-Anderson bill (medicare)	Herlong-Curtis bill (eldercare)	Byrnes bill (GOP)
Who is eligible?	All persons 65 years of age and over	All persons 65 years of age and over	All persons 65 and over.
Benefits	60 days inpatient hospital care; patient to pay cost for 1 day (approximately $40). 60 days in nursing home if posthospital care required and patient is transferred from a hospital. 240 health care visits at home. Outpatient hospital diagnostic services; patient to pay ½ amount required under inpatient service (approximately $20) for each 30-day period of diagnostic service furnished. Optional voluntary insurance to cover doctors' fees, surgical fees, and medicines, $3 per month by pensioner and $3 per month by Federal Government.[1]	Would depend upon type of contract that State would make with private insurance companies. Would hope to have all medical and hospital costs covered.	Would pay first $1,000 (except for $50) and 80 percent of remaining costs of hospital and 80 percent of medical costs.
Who would administer the program?	Social security system	States, either through the department of welfare or the department of health.	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Treasury Department of Federal Government.
How program would be financed?	Increase in social security taxes; not over 50 cents per week, $26 annually, and general revenue taxes for those not covered by social security or railroad retirement (persons on relief).	Federal Government and State government would participate, and in many cases the pensioner would have to pay part or all of the premium, other than Government share, if personal income so merits. (States will decide maximum income allowed to permit pensioner full benefits, free of personal cost, like Kerr-Mills.)	Graduated premium contribution by pensioner based on income, by State and Federal contribution.
Estimated maximum yearly cost to individual.	$26 while working	Would depend upon State plan	$114 after age 65.
Total cost of program (estimated).	$2,000,000,000 (without optional insurance)	$2,100,000,000	$3,400,000,000.

[1] Private insurance companies, that pool resources to provide, on a nonprofit basis, approved low-cost health insurance to the elderly for health costs not covered under social security plan; the Federal Government will exempt them from antitrust laws.

Eldercare: Let's look at it—calmly.

This is a medical insurance program for all persons 65 and older—and would be voluntary on the part of the States and individuals—(meaning the State legislatures would have to vote to take part in the plan before it would be available to its citizens—same as the Kerr-Mills program). Benefits would differ with the various States (according to private insurance policies contracted by the States) * * * and financed by "matching funds" with the Federal Government paying up to 84 percent to States to help pay costs of private insurance coverage.

Now—here is an interesting item, little publicized or discussed, the legislation provides that "recipients would pay all, part or none of the premium costs, depending on their income and the State plan. * * *

"Participants would certify their income to the State agency administering the program. Persons paying the full premium would have the benefit of an income tax deduction for payments, as well as statewide bargaining for * * * health insurance" (Congressional Quarterly, Mar. 5, 1965). States could administer the program through their department of health or department of welfare (as Kerr-Mills), and private insurance companies—such as Blue Cross and Blue Shield—could also help administer it through contract with the State.

The cost would depend on, if and how, the States used the plan. It has been estimated, however, that $2.1 billion of State and Federal funds would be required.

There is little doubt the American Medical Association is spending millions of dollars on spot announcements on 792 radio stations, the ABC television network and 166 independent channels, on page-size ads in the three national newspapers chains, small weekly publications, and in the 14 million pamphlets and circulars distributed in doctors' offices throughout the Nation.

Yet the sponsor of the AMA's eldercare bill, Congressman A. S. HERLONG, rebuked the association last week, as reported by the New York Herald Tribune:

"'These advertisements,' Representative HERLONG said, 'stated or implied that if and when H.R. 3727 (the eldercare bill) passed, these comprehensive hospital, medical, and drug benefits would automatically follow.' This is 'not accurate,' he said, 'because such benefits would flow only if a State chose to participate in eldercare.'

"'I knew what was in the (eldercare) bill before I sponsored it,' Representative HERLONG said. 'I was strongly for it' because the States would determine a patient's eligibility and the extent of benefits he would receive. 'I am still for that principle and I don't think you have to make any exaggerated claims for it.'"

PERTINENT FACTS

1. Our population now has more than 18 million persons—65 and over.

2. Four out of five have a chronic ailment.

3. After age 65—over 90 percent are hospitalized at least once, 66 percent are hospitalized two or more times.

4. Persons over 65 usually stay in hospital twice as long (15 days) as younger persons.

5. One-half of aged couples—where one is hospitalized sometime during the year—have total medical bills over $800 in 1 year.

6. Fifty-four percent of aged have no hospitalization insurance and many have inadequate coverage. Two-thirds of aged—with incomes less than $2,000—have no hospital insurance.

On the basis of the information furnished, I feel certain you will approve my vote in support of the administration's King-Anderson program.

Rugged Individualist Writes to His Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement entitled "The Rugged Individual," which unfortunately describes the attitude of too many

of our fellow citizens who want to have their cake and eat it too:

THE RUGGED INDIVIDUAL

A young man lived with his parents in a public housing development. He attended public school, rode the free school bus, participated in the "free lunch" program, played in the State parks, swam in the city pool. He entered the Army and, upon discharge, kept his national life insurance. He then enrolled in the State university, working part time in the State capitol to supplement his GI check.

Upon graduation, he married a public health nurse, and bought a farm with an FHA loan. He then obtained a Small Business Administration loan to go into business. A baby was born in the county hospital. He bought a ranch with the aid of another GI loan and obtained "emergency feed" from the Government.

Later, he put part of his land into the soil bank. His parents live comfortably on the ranch with their social security and old-age assistance checks. REA lines supplied electricity. The Department of Agriculture helped clear the land. The county agent showed him how to terrace it. Then the Government paid part of the costs of a pond and stocked it with fish. He was guaranteed a sale for his farm products by a Federal agency and was also paid for not growing the crops.

Books from the public library were delivered to his door. He banked money which a Government agency insured.

Then one day he wrote his Congressman:

"I wish to protest excessive Government spending and high taxes. I believe in rugged individualism. I am opposed to all socialistic trends and I demand a return to the principles of our Constitution."

A Bad Voting Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the highly respected Cleveland, Ohio, Press. It is an excellent editorial and should have the attention of the Members:

A BAD VOTING BILL

The sole purpose of enacting new voting rights legislation is to end voting discrimination, once and for all, wherever it exists.

This is a purpose to which the American people should have dedicated themselves 100 years ago, but did not. It is a purpose which now must be fulfilled by a firm, clear, and unimpeachable act of Congress.

The proposal now under consideration would not achieve its noble purpose.

It would end discrimination in certain States and localities while permitting it to continue in others.

It would substitute a statistical formula for the constitutional guarantee of due process in courts of law.

It would abolish literacy tests and other voter qualification requirements in some sections of the country but leave them standing elsewhere.

It would allow an illiterate white man to vote in Alabama, but let New York State deny the ballot to an intelligent Negro who could not prove he had the equivalent of an eighth grade education.

It would make the U.S. Attorney General, through his agents, sole arbiter over voting practices in the Deep South but permit local authorities to retain control in Northern States.

It is bad legislation.

What should a Federal voting rights law do?

First of all, it should make clear that the privilege of the ballot box may not be denied to anyone, anywhere, for reasons of racial, religious, or any other type of prejudice.

Second, it should set up effective legal machinery for making sure that registration and election laws are administered as fairly as is humanly possible.

It should apply with evenhanded justice in every locality—South Side Chicago, the delta counties of Arkansas, Texas as well as Alabama and Mississippi. It should admit the truth—that discrimination has no home locality.

Such a law could be written, and in far simpler terms than the administration's cumbersome document.

When Martyrdom Becomes Bigotry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I would like for the Members of the Congress to have the opportunity to read the very fine editorial from the Tallahassee Democrat, of Tallahassee, Fla., of March 29, 1965.

Condemning entire States and regions for the actions of a few is bigotry. This is a nation of laws, and the day that we abandon this concept, our Nation will be at an end. We may not agree with the law, but we have to obey the law. It is past time that many of the problems of mass demonstrations we have been confronted with in recent times were moved off of the streets and into the courts, where they rightfully belong.

The editorial follows:

WHEN MARTYRDOM BECOMES BIGOTRY

Martin Luther King is on firm philosophical ground when he says any man is free to violate a law or official order which his own conscience tells him is immoral or unjust—if he is fully willing to bear the punishment for violation.

The willingness to bear the punishment is the essence of freedom. It is in the classic pattern of martyrdom. We have too many who demand the academic freedom of Socrates without being willing to drink his poison, who insist on emulating Joan of Arc without risking her immolation at the burning stake. On this point, the Negro leader rates hero stature.

Where King goes wrong, though, is in presuming to define "the conscience of America" and the moral law of mankind according to his own beliefs, as he did yesterday on a national television program when he attempted to justify his violation of a Federal court order at Selma.

Then, on that false premise of any mortal's right to dictate matters of conscience, he proceeded to pass judgment on the whole State of Alabama because of the derelictions of some officials and the vicious criminal acts of a few individuals. He called on the whole Nation to boycott and penalize all the residents and nonresident interests of the State of Alabama until they are willing to conform to the conscience of King and his minority group.

This becomes assignment of guilt by association, punishment of the community for sins of the few as surely as was the destruction of Lidice by vengeant Nazis.

It is the difference between leadership through personal conviction, and tyrannical dictation of conscience.

It passes beyond the boundary of freedom to the risk of martydom, in the field of bigotry which so many of King's followers see only in the activities of those who oppose him.

Carrying freedom that far can bring only strife between contending consciences; then anarchy, or the tyranny which inevitably arises to keep order until men can restore their freedom to live by rational laws of their own making. This process could result in several generations ahead of us hardly ever hearing the term "civil rights" from the past, or for their future.

A Tribute to Mr. Richard Klinck, 1965 Teacher of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, at the White House today, President Johnson paid further tribute to the field of education by presenting the 1965 National Teacher of the Year Award to Mr. Richard E. Klinck, a sixth-grade teacher of Wheat Ridge, Colo.

This award, "in recognition of outstanding achievement as a teacher," is sponsored annually by Look magazine in cooperation with the council of chief State school officers. The purpose of the national awards program is to encourage all teachers to aspire to greatness in their chosen profession and to interest more young people in pursuing teaching careers.

I am very proud of Mr. Klinck's citation, since he is both a very close friend and a constituent. I feel very fortunate that he taught my daughter in the sixth grade at Reed Street Elementary School in Wheat Ridge.

My family and I can personally attest that Mr. Klinck maintains the highest standards of excellence in the teaching profession.

The April 20 issue of Look carries an article on the national teacher of the year and on the four other teachers named to the honor roll. In the Look article, Mr. Klinck outlines some of the principles he follows in his teaching. I would like to include some of these notable statements in the RECORD:

I am trying to help develop thoughtful citizens, people who will know what to do with their responsibilities, so I try constantly to relate what we do in class to the world around us.

In Look, Mr. Klinck also reveals the reasons for his love for the sixth grade, which he has continued to teach rather

than move into the other grade levels or administrative positions—

You have children you can begin to talk to in an adult manner, yet they are still young enough to accept discipline; it is the age of intellectual transition—just at the borderline of independent thinking. As far as possible, I want to master the sixth-grade psyche.

In March of 1965, Richard Klinck wrote an article for the Colorado School News which is an exposition of his educational philosophy, and which I feel expresses the high standards we hope our educational system will emulate. I heartily recommend this article for the reading of my colleagues, their constituents, and all people interested in educational excellence.

The article follows:

[From the Colorado School News, March 1965]

I AM A TEACHER

(By Richard E. Klinck, Colorado teacher of the year for 1965)

I am a teacher.

I do not believe anyone has ever had a more proud statement to make. I do not whisper it, or say it offhandedly, for I am proud, glad to have been somehow chosen for what is certainly one of the greatest opportunities in all of human endeavor. I say it sincerely, for everyone to hear. I believe it fully. I am proud to be a teacher.

As a teacher I have a classroom—a miniature world—where every day a group of students comes. Some come willingly, openly curious, and anxious to know and to learn. Others come for comformity, by necessity, with a certain reluctance to learn and a deep unawareness of the magic of knowledge that is all around them. They come from a variety of homes, from a variety of pasts, to the present. And I for awhile am their future. They have come together and they are my class and I am a teacher—their teacher.

I am no mere gatherer of information that I shall use to make mimeograph minds—each exactly like the others. To be but this is not to be a teacher. Instead, I shall teach the thrill of absorbing knowledge, the need of possessing knowledge, the pleasure and satisfaction in the attainment of knowledge. When each day is done I will have passed a few pages along in each of the texts, in each of the subjects, but if I have done that, and no more, I have failed. My day—and, more especially, theirs—was worthless. But in that day—each minute of each hour—I will have taught how to think, how to study, how to select fact from fiction, how to form opinion, how to laugh at one's self, how to select and create a code of conduct, how to observe and collect and record ideas. Every minute—every hour—with no time wasted, for we have so much to learn.

And the learning comes in sitting quietly and dreaming for a moment or two; in listening to a fellow classmate and evaluating what he did or what he had to say; in joining in laughter when something is funny; in listening for the sounds that make up our world; in looking to the mountains and to the sky and wondering, always wondering; and in a multitude of other things—but never wasting a moment on the crude and the vulgar and the worthless.

It is a big order, being a teacher. I can never escape it. Every moment of my waking hours is a part of being a teacher. The way out does not exist, nor should it. There is no 8-hour day in my profession. For my attitudes, my ideals, my activities all seem to gravitate around the fact that I am a teacher. I become—or try to become—what I challenge others to become—aware of their world, awake to its romance and adventure and weaknesses. And so I am always alert to an idea I can use in class; a bit of knowledge that may apply here or there to prove a point or cause one of my students to better see; an observation that is illuminating to me and may be so to those I teach; a situation that needs improvement; an opportunity to learn myself. So I am a teacher all of the time. I reach out to every chance to learn and to teach, finding the chances are always all around me.

I teach how to think, more than what to think. But by thought, deed, and example I teach the what to think as vividly as I can. Therefore, I must be constantly self-critical or I cannot teach. I must attempt to be constantly humble and unassuming as I try to find the path to what must be the proper thought, the proper deed, the proper example.

I speak knowing some of my words will never be heard, while others will take root and flourish. It does not bother me that all I say is not heard—only that the wrong part will not be heard. I do not know which words will make the point, turn on the mind, cross the bridge to a student's learning—and so I must choose every action and every word and every deed properly.

Not that I do. I often fail. So I must constantly look at myself and criticize what I find there—finding it insufficient and in need of improvement. I will find myself never to be the teacher I would like to be. When I have become that, I shall have begun to fail. I am no better than my students—simply more experienced. I am prone to mistake and apt to make error, and I must always be human.

Yes, they will forget the fact that I teach—much of it—but it makes no difference if I have taught them to use the minds God has given to them. Then I have been successful. And because I am teaching the mind I have an opportunity that cannot be surpassed. I possess the opportunity to help my America by stressing the ideals and bases that have made this country what it is and what we wish it to remain. But I must beware of teaching such beliefs blindly. I must not imitate or merely reflect the beliefs of others. I must draw conclusions, constantly search for answers, and share these to help each of my students arrive at a set of well-defined and well-established ideals.

As a teacher, every day gives me the opportunity of teaching the importance of being one's self—of being an individual; of teaching the necessity of having goals, a good enough that is good enough; of setting standards for one's self and constantly raising those standards so that they remain just out of reach. Every day gives me the opportunity to teach in terms of concepts, with facts fastened to them in meaningful ways—not merely the accumulation of facts alone. I must teach conceptual thinking so that when the facts have been forgotten a basic understanding persists. Then I have taught and the student has learned. Then—and only then—I have been successful.

Every day gives me the opportunity of teaching the love of learning—the desire to absorb and go ahead for the sheer pleasure of gaining in wisdom and self-esteem. I must help each of my boys and girls—no matter what his esoteric IQ—to have pride in himself, to be able to admire and like himself. I shall teach daily the pleasure of working hard.

I shall know a curious blend of emotions day by day: despair and elation, frustration and contentment, impatience and realization, sadness and happiness, fulfillment and defeat. I will know the soaring spirit that comes from hearing of one of my students who went on to be honored and acclaimed and I will take a bit of the credit for having caused him to succeed. And I will know sorrow when I hear of a youngster of mine who has failed and acted against our society—and I will take a bit of the blame for not having helped him to avoid that deed, that defeat.

The sorrow and frustration, the despair and impatience and defeat will linger only for awhile. They will drive me on and make me desire another tomorrow so I may make amends and try again and do better this time—and perhaps succeed. From time to time will come elation and contentment, fulfillment and happiness, which will be most remembered and most cherished and make going on possible and desirable.

I see the future in my classroom and I have the power to make that future brighter and richer in mind and in heart. I am something special. I am something beside which I can stand proud.

I am a teacher.

South Africa: A Bright Spot on a Dark Continent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of South Africa has consistently proven itself to be one of our staunchest friends.

South Africa has never asked for nor received foreign aid.

South Africa is the most politically stable government on the continent.

South Africa is economically stable.

South Africa's imports from the United States are a great deal larger than its exports to the United States, thus contributing immensely to our balance-of-payments problem.

In an address to the Commonwealth Club of California at San Francisco, Calif., on March 5, 1965, the South African Ambassador to the United States, H. L. T. Taswell, presented interesting facts about his great country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Taswell's remarks on that occasion:

SOUTH AFRICA—A BRIGHT SPOT ON A DARK CONTINENT

During the last few months, the American flag has been torn to pieces and defiled in certain countries in Africa and Asia. There have been violent demonstrations against American Embassies and abuse has been hurled at the American Government.

I am sure you will have noted that none of these violent anti-American demonstrations have taken place in my country, the Republic of South Africa. We in South Africa remain friendly and well disposed toward the United States of America, and anxious to strengthen the natural bonds of friendship we have with you.

Many of those who have been hurling abuse at America are the very ones who have been so rigorously maligning and criticizing us in recent years.

DEVELOPMENTS IN AFRICAN COUNTRIES CAUSE CONCERN

I have entitled my talk today, "South Africa—A Bright Spot on a Dark Continent."

Let us take a look at some of the things which have been happening in certain other parts of Africa during the past year or two.

In many newly independent African states, the story has been one of the establishment of one-party dictatorships, of the suppression of justice and freedom of the press, of falling standards of living, health and education, of collapsing economies.

In one country, the white non-Arab population has dwindled since independence from 1.2 million to 100,000 as a result of shocking and ruthless discrimination.

Not so long ago, a small African island state received its independence in what was termed a classical handover of authority. Only a matter of days later, its government was deposed by armed revolution which resulted in the slaughter of hundreds of Arabs and Asians. A Communist regime took over. A satellite tracking station operated by the United States was forced to close down.

In three independent African countries there were mutinies in the armies. Unable to cope with the situation themselves, their African governments had to invite white troops to come in to restore order.

Serious border clashes took place between several African countries, resulting in many people being killed or wounded.

Tribal warfare in a central African country resulted in the slaughter of an estimated 8,000 men, women, and children.

The recent barbarous atrocities committed by rebel forces in the Congo have made the civilized world shudder with horror. Thousands of people were shot or savagely beaten to death. They included many whose only crime was that they could read and write, and accordingly fell into a class termed the intelligentsia, which the rebels wished to exterminate. The loss of life in the Congo revolt is put at 40,000.

REACTION TO AMERICAN-BELGIAN RESCUE OPERATION

You will, I am sure, recall the details of the humanitarian operation undertaken in November 1964 to rescue the American and other white hostages who were held and threatened with death by the rebels.

America and Belgium were roundly condemned for the operation by Communist sources, and particularly by the Red Chinese.

But isn't it most significant that so many African states took a line that so closely followed the Communist one?

For several years we in South Africa have been warning against Communist penetration and subversion in Africa. Our warnings have fallen on ears not so deaf as unwilling to hear.

Every month now brings fresh evidence that we have been right.

In the last 5 years there has been a most marked expansion of Communist influence in Africa. Russia is now represented in about 21 African states, European Communist countries in about the same number. Red China is represented in about 16. Roughly one-third of Peiping's total diplomatic missions abroad are in Africa. Communist China is extending its influence with financial aid, with arms, guerrilla training and direct subversion. Chinese policy is based on color. It is antiwhite.

In recent years we have been accused of being out of step with developments on the rest of the continent. But let me ask this question. With developments in so many parts of Africa taking the turn they have, who would want to be in step with them?

We are not prepared to adapt conditions in our country to suit the whims and fancies of hostile politicians in African countries who cannot bring about stability in their own lands.

We in South Africa do, however, have great sympathy for the African peoples and understand their ambitions. We are ready and willing to cooperate and develop sound and friendly relations with all responsible African countries which feel the same way toward us.

INTERNAL RACIAL POLICY

Let me turn now for a few minutes to our internal racial policy.

When looking at our racial picture in South Africa, do not try to equate it with the position in the United States. Our country is made up of a number of national groups, still preserving their own customs and traditions, talking their own languages. Our problem is more of a multinational one.

When the first white people settled in South Africa over 300 years ago, the country was virtually unoccupied. At about the same time that the whites moved northward into the interior black people—or Bantu, or Africans—were moving southward from central Africa. The two groups met for the first time in the vicinity of the Fish River in about 1779.

About the turn of the last century, roughly half of an area, extending southward from the Limpopo River and constituting British South Africa, was occupied by whites, and half by blacks.

What has happened since? Three areas within this general sphere were set aside by the British Government as areas within which the interests of certain black national groups, or nations, were paramount. They today constitute the Protectorates of Bechuanaland, Swaziland, and Basutoland.

In 1910, the remaining territory in this general sphere became the Union of South Africa. In 1913, those areas within the union in which the interests of the various black peoples were paramount, were set aside for them by the union Government. They have consistently been preserved ever since as the homelands of the various black national groups or nations.

So the position remains that that part of the whole sphere which was occupied by black national groups at the turn of the century, is still occupied by them today.

Apart from the white and the black people who originally settled in South Africa, we have two other main groups. One is the colored community, comprising people of Malay descent and others of mixed blood. They live principally in the cape. The other group is our Indian community, centered principally in Natal.

What is our basic policy?

We believe that there should be no domination of any one race by another. To achieve this, our policy is aimed at the creation of separate states for the national groups which originally settled in South Africa, and the development of the greatest possible degree of governmental separation for the groups which have grown up in our midst.

In this way, each group can have a future of its own, in this way, the various groups can live on an equal footing. In this way, we can form a consultative body in which the leaders of all races can meet on a basis of equality to consider matters of common interest and ways of removing friction. In this way, we can create a multinational commonwealth or common market, with political independence and economic interdependence.

POSITIVE PROGRESS

Positive progress has been made in this direction. The Transkei, centures-old home of the Xhosa people, already has its own all-Bantu African Legislative Assembly. It is composed partly of traditional leaders, partly of members elected on a one-man, one-vote basis by all Xhosa citizens. In area, the Transkei is about the same size as the Netherlands or Switzerland, but larger than Belgium, Israel, or the Protectorates of Basutoland or Swaziland.

Executive power is vested in an all-Bantu African Cabinet, consisting of a Chief Minister and five other Ministers.

The Transkei serves as a model, toward which the other Bantu national groups are progressing, in keeping with their own traditions.

The South African cape colored people, have a national council, currently consisting of appointed and elected members. The basis of the council is to be expanded and its powers increased.

For the Indian population group, a National Indian Council has been formed.

With all these bodies, the government of the Republic maintains the closest contact.

Race relations are improving, harmony is increasing in South Africa. Internally, our country is one of the most peaceful in the world.

SOUTH AFRICA HAS HIGHEST STANDARDS

Nowhere in the other independent countries of Africa do people, regardless of their race or color, have as high a general standard of living, education, or health as they do in South Africa. What is more, the gap is widening, we are racing ahead of the rest of independent Africa.

There are already over 2,000 Bantu African university graduates. In 16 years, South Africa produced more Bantu African graduates at local universities than nine African states, with a combined population of 70 million, have succeeded in doing during the past 50 years. Three Bantu university colleges in our country are now swelling the number of our university graduates.

Already there are 29,500 Bantu African teachers. Each year an additional 2,000 graduate from 47 teachers training colleges.

There are Bantu African doctors, lawyers, professors, nurses, etc. Over 12,000 Bantu Africans own their own businesses. One of the largest gasoline service stations in the Republic is owned by a Bantu African. Some businessmen bank as much as $2,800 a day. Three are reputed to be millionaires. The purchasing power of Bantu Africans today is roughly $1.4 billion per year. A solid middle class is developing.

A similar story of success may be told in connection with the colored and Indian communities.

Striking proof of how favorable conditions are in South Africa is given by the fact that thousands of Africans are constantly streaming illegally across our borders in order to seek the superior benefits which South Africa can offer. Over 1 million foreign Africans are in our country—that is 10 percent of the Bantu population.

A further indication of South Africa's advance is that, with only 6 percent of Africa's population, we generate 20 percent of the continent's total geographic income.

Our country produces six times as much steel as the rest of the continent combined, twice as much electricity, and four times as much coal. Our railways carry as much freight as the rest of the continent combined. We have almost as many telephones, cars, buses, tractors, trucks, as the rest of Africa. The nonwhite people in South Africa, incidentally, own more motor cars per capita than do the citizens of the Soviet Union. We take nearly 18 percent of the continent's total imports, and supply about 20 percent of its exports.

Our economy is booming, we are marching vigorously ahead on a path of dynamic progress.

SOUTH AFRICA—WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO THE UNITED STATES?

What does South Africa mean to our friends in the United States?

The United States is encountering a serious balance-of-payments problem. This is imposing a severe strain on the dollar and on American gold stocks.

Instead of drawing money away from the United States, South Africa is actually contributing to the strength of the dollar and helping the United States in its balance-of-payments problem.

It is doing this, firstly, by importing far more from the United States than it sells to the United States. Our imports from you in 1964 reached a record figure, estimated

at $385 million. Considerably more than you imported from us.

Incidentally, about 33 percent of all U.S. exports to the African continent go to South Africa.

We are aiding your balance-of-payments position in a further way, for South Africa is a lucrative field for American investment. Your investments in our country, which have been built up over a period of many years, now total about $450 million. On these investments, your annual dividends, interest and transferred profits give you a return of 13 percent. When you include your reinvested profits, your total return is 17 percent.

Is there any country in the world where you get a better return?

American firms investing in South Africa include many of the largest and most highly respected firms in American business and financial circles. They invest, not because they like us or dislike us. They invest on sound business principles.

Some of your industrialists are increasing their investments in our country—not with dollars, but by raising funds out of investment capital generated in South Africa.

Total American and foreign investment in our country is equal to that in the rest of the continent of Africa put together.

South Africa has never asked for, nor received, foreign aid. Your proposed expenditure on foreign aid in Africa this year is about $145 million. Not one penny of this finds its way into my country. We do not increase your balance-of-payments problem, we lighten it by standing on our own feet.

We are one of the very few countries in the world which have paid all their war debts.

My country is the world's largest producer of gold. Our annual production has reached the record figure of 29.1 million fine ounces, valued at just over $1 billion. This gold flows into the free world. It enables Western countries to bolster their currencies, it contributes to stability, and promotes international trade.

One final point—I mentioned earlier that an American satellite tracking station was forced to close down in an African country now cooperating with Red China. In South Africa, an American satellite tracking station and an American missile tracking station are doing valuable work for you with the fullest cooperation and help of the South African Government.

In the First World War and in the Second World War, men of our armed forces stood shoulder to shoulder with men of the American Armed Forces. Since then, South Africa has again on two occasions responded to the call and come to the assistance of the United States and the free world—once was during the Berlin airlift, the other was in the Korean war.

In many other parts of independent Africa, chaos is gaining ground and a power vacuum is forming. In South Africa, there is prosperity, stability, and hope for all peoples of all races. What is more, South Africa stands as a guardian of the strategic tip of southern Africa.

Congressman Zablocki Discusses General de Gaulle's European Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a statement broadcast yesterday over station WAUK in Milwaukee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, gave a thoughtful and informative appraisal of General de Gaulle's policies toward Germany and Eastern Europe.

Congressman ZABLOCKI's talk also includes a concise description of the European policy proposed for the United States by Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, director of Columbia University's Research Institute on Communist Affairs.

I believe that Representative ZABLOCKI's remarks will be of wide interest in the House:

DE GAULLE, FRANCE, AND THE WESTERN ALLIANCE

(Broadcast by Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, on WAUK's "Report from Washington," April 4, 1965)

One of the most significant trends of the early 1960's has been the growing breach between France and the United States—two traditional allies. Today, I would like to explore briefly some of the causes, effects, and implications of this growing foreign policy problem.

France today is led by one of the great men of its history—President Charles de Gaulle. He is a strong leader who has brought France into the ranks of the world's prosperous nations, while liquidating its colonial empire.

For many years this otherwise brilliant man has had an unreasonable prejudice against those he terms "Anglo-Saxons," that is, the British and the Americans.

Part of this attitude may result from still-smoldering resentment at his treatment by Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt during World War II. Those two leaders often acted in ways that enraged De Gaulle.

There is more to the rift in the Western Alliance, however, than De Gaulle's personal pique. He views France as a great nation with a glorious past and an even more promising future.

He believes that France can best work out its destiny as the leader of a Europe which is free of the influence of England and the United States.

The Europe which De Gaulle envisions goes far beyond the six nations of the Common Market—France, West Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg.

His vision encompasses also Eastern Europe and at least that part of the Soviet Union west of the Ural Mountains in west-central Asia. To this end France has been developing friendships with East European states, including Poland.

Through this policy he hopes to help Germany to achieve reunification within a European framework.

Although France and Germany have been age-old enemies, De Gaulle has attempted to bind the two nations closely together. He apparently believes that a reuinted Germany, led by France and dependent upon France for nuclear protection, would no longer be a threat to Europe, but rather the opportunity for Europe to emerge as a third great power.

At the same time, De Gaulle opposes any organized unity in Europe. He seeks to keep ties between Western European nations loose in order to allow the eventual admission of the eastern bloc countries into his federated states of Europe.

To achieve both the reunification of Germany and free intercourse with Eastern Europe, De Gaulle knows he must have the agreement of the Soviet Union.

For that reason he has made efforts to enlist the Soviet Union as a collaborator. The Russians, eager to exploit any trend which weaken NATO, the Western Alliance and the position of the United States in Europe, have been receptive to these moves.

France and Russia appear to be alining their policies on the future of Germany.

Both want to exclude the United States and Great Britain from discussions on German unity, the frontiers of the German state and the level of armaments which it will be allowed to maintain.

They want to substitute as negotiators the neighbors of East and West Germany—including Poland and Czechoslovakia.

The United States, of course, vigorously opposes such a move. It is still the American presence in Europe which is the principal deterrent to a Soviet attack on Berlin and Germany. Our nuclear-armed planes and missiles still form a protective umbrella over all Europe—including France.

The present German Government—and the opposition German Socialist Party—recognize the necessity for continued American influence in European affairs. Germany, therefore, has not been enthusiastic about De Gaulle's so-called grand design for Europe.

While the United States has opposed initiatives by President de Gaulle, our own policies in Europe largely have been frustrated—often largely because of the hostility of the French leader to any concepts that originate in Washington.

President Kennedy's European policy largely was centered around the concept of encouraging increased economic and political unity among the states of Europe, including Great Britain. This integrated Europe would then deal closely with the United States in a political and economic alliance.

This strategy, for all its merits, was wrecked by De Gaulle's refusal to allow Great Britain to join the European Common Market.

Also thwarted have been U.S. efforts to fortify NATO by creating a nuclear-armed fleet of ships to operate in European waters with crews of mixed nationalities. Once again, France refused to cooperate. Our other European allies—with the exception of Germany—also were generally reluctant and so the plan has been shelved.

That is the situation today. We are attempting to stop initiatives by France, and France is attempting to short circuit our policies in Europe. The result has been virtual stalemate and the deterioration of the Western Alliance.

Many feel that there is a great danger that America may cease to be relevant or important to the future of Europe, and that Europe itself may become increasingly dominated by narrow nationalisms.

Among them is Dr. Zbigniew Brzenzinski, the noted Polish-American expert on communism. Dr. Brzezinski, who is director of Columbia University's Research Institute on Communist Affairs, recently testified before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee of which I am chairman, during hearings on the Sino-Soviet split.

In his testimony, Dr. Brzezinski presented a program for American initiatives in Europe which he proposed as a Johnson plan.

Although I do not agree entirely with all aspects of this proposal, I think it deserves careful study at the highest levels of policy-making in our Government. Dr. Brzezinski believes that American policy in Europe should have five main objectives:

First, to convince the East Europeans—particularly the Poles and the Czechs—that East Germany limits their freedom without enhancing their security. This would require greater contacts with Eastern Europe by the United States while isolating East Germany.

Second, to promote Polish-German reconciliation. This would require an American declaration that the present Oder-Neisse frontier would be formally and finally recognized at the very moment that Germany is reunified.

Third, Dr. Brzezinski proposes that U.S. policy should aim to minimize Russian fear

of Germany by encouraging West Germany to assure the Russians that under no circumstances will it develop a nuclear capability.

Fourth, it should relate the expansion of trade with Eastern Europe to more extensive cultural and social contacts with the people of that area. In this way, Dr. Brzezinski believes, the position of the Communist governments can be undercut.

Fifth, he believes that the United States should promote multilateral ties with West Europe and in East Europe. As Soviet control wanes and Eastern European nationalism reasserts itself, it should be the goal of American policy to promote political and economic integration—both in East and West Europe.

To achieve these goals, Dr. Brzezinski proposes a general all-European economic development plan which would cut across present East-West partitions, in which the United States would take the initiative and participate.

The Columbia University professor believes that by seizing the initiative for reuniting Europe, the United States would thwart the ambitions of President de Gaulle and reestablish our influence on the Continent.

This is one proposed solution to the present impasse in Europe—caused largely by President de Gaulle. Undoubtedly there are other approaches. The President and the State Department presently are giving the situation careful study.

I am confident that their policy decisions will be aimed at retaining for the United States its historic role in fostering a new Europe from the ashes of nations ruined by World War II.

The Voting Rights Bill Is Constitutional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, Mr. Ralph McGill. It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 4, 1965:

Surveys of opinion from some of the Nation's best-known lawyers and professors of law heavily support the belief that the proposed voter legislation now before the Congress is constitutional. Some southern political figures are contending it is not. Most of these are doing so merely to keep potential opposition off balance and to silence segregationist extremists.

There is no argument that many of the Southern States have been abridging the rights of voters because of race for 85 years and more. Until recently, these restrictions were statewide in a few States with some small relaxation in cities. In others, denial was confined to the more rural counties. In some States abridgments continue to the present in the more rural counties.

Southern tests vary widely. All must be measured against the 15th amendment which states:

"The rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Opponents argue that article I, sections 2 and 4, of the Constitution makes unconstitutional the legislation now before the Congress. These sections give the State legislatures the right to set qualifications for candidates and to establish "the times, places, and manner of holding elections." (Even the laymen will hardly insist this wording permits the practice of establishing voter qualifications that abridge the rights of the voter.)

The 15th amendment is quite clear. The congressional approach is merely a means of enforcing the main article of amendment 15 by the "appropriate legislation" specified in the concluding sentence of the amendment. The manner of holding elections is not in any way touched by the pending legislation.

Decision by Southern States to disfranchise the Negro directly and the poor white indirectly came with a rush after the Tilden-Hayes election in 1876. (Mississippi, to be sure, had made earlier beginnings.) The Hayes forces made a deal for southern support to assure Hayes' election. The price was an end to reconstruction and a removal of troops. The 14th and 15th amendments quietly and conveniently were forgotten. In 1895 the "separate but equal" court decision, brought in a case of rail travel, quickly was applied to all aspects of life.

Since that period of the previous century most southerners have grown up without questioning that the discriminations and disfranchisement were legal and proper and were the undoubted, settled "way of life."

Southern "tests" vary according to State history, the presence of large cities—or lack of them—the amount of industrialization, population percentages, and so on.

In Alabama, for example, a new State bill was introduced this year by State Senator Hawkins, of Gadsden. "We know," he said, in putting his bill before the legislature, "that voting registration has been very restrictive in Alabama. It has been designed to keep people from voting."

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Bluefield, W. Va., Selected as All America City—Community Projects Result From Civic Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the city of Bluefield, W. Va., has been honored with a merited citation as an All America City. The community has under planning and construction projects totaling more than $20 million.

The citizens of this progressive Mercer County city are "licking their problems instead of their wounds." The resourcefulness and cooperation of the men and women of the area are helping themselves through local contributory funds and the aid of moneys of government invested in building a better Bluefield.

Recently I addressed the annual dinner meeting of the Junior Chamber of Commerce. I sensed then, as on previous visits there, that youthful initiative was being directed by young businessmen in coordination with experienced industry leadership. And this remarkable record of effort has been recognized on a national level.

Mr. President, in today's Charleston, W. Va., Gazette a news article provides the essential facts in announcing the award. I ask unanimous consent that this informative story be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLUEFIELD WINS HONOR AS ALL AMERICA CITY

BLUEFIELD.—Community projects that involved thousands of persons and cost more than $20 million resulted Wednesday in Bluefield's selection as an All America City.

The programs have been underway almost 5 years. During that period, unemployment has declined from 20.6 to 8.1 percent and bank deposits have risen from $49.6 million to $68.6 million.

The National Municipal League and Look magazine, cosponsors of the All America City Award, said citizens of Bluefield "were honored for pressing toward their own solution to the economic sag in depressed Appalachia."

The announcement touched lightly on racial relations which have caused demonstrations in the Mercer County city. "The last traces of discrimination in town began to fade when the board of trustees of the YMCA-YWCA voted unanimously to desegregate the new $750,000 building," the announcement said.

Earlier, the Tazewell-Mercer County Council on Human Relations said that race relations in Bluefield are so poor as to make an All-America Award inappropriate.

But on the standard of a city's helping itself, there was no argument on Bluefield's qualification.

Among other accomplishments of the city and its 19,000 residents are:

Development of Skyland, Inc., a tourist and recreation area atop East River Mountain, at a cost that will eventually reach $2.5 million.

Formation of Bluefield Development Corp. with a capital of $750,000. The corporation was primarily responsible for obtaining a textile plant for the city that employs 240 workers and is valued in excess of $1 million.

Implementation of a fundraising drive for Bluefield State College that raised $500,000.

Passage of bond issues that enabled the city to accomplish $10,514,000 worth of improvements, including urban renewal, expansion of a city park, a public housing program, and construction of an armory and county health center.

Fred Langenheim, manager of the Bluefield Chamber of Commerce, estimated that in addition there have been about $7 million in industrial and business developments during the period.

"While we are delighted with the recognition given our community," Langenheim said, "we realize that we are at the beginning of programs that will be going on for a long time. Being named an All America City doesn't mean our problems are solved."

Langenheim said it would be a mistake to assume that the chamber or any other single institution or individual was responsible for Bluefield's success.

"This accomplishment was the result of a strong city manager form of government, excellent support from the news media and was directed by a group of courageous, energetic and enthusiastic citizens."

Langenheim said City Manager Randolph Whittle, Mayor Henry F. Warden, and Al Modena, Melvin Grubb, Robert Connor, and Edward Steele, members of the chamber's municipal affairs committee, warranted special praise.

Langenheim said that if duplications of persons who worked on more than one project were not counted, more than 12,000 men and women had been directly involved.

In addition to Bluefield, All America City Awards were made to Hopkinsville, Ky., Winston Salem, N.C., Columbia, S.C., Niles, Ill., South Portland, Maine, White Bear Lake, Minn., Keene, N.H., Hazleton, Pa., Fort Worth, Tex., and Green Bay, Wis.

Winning cities were picked from a field of nearly 100 by a jury which included Dr. George H. Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, and chairman of the council of the National Municipal League.

In addition to Dr. Gallup, selectors were William E. Dauer, president of the American Chambers of Commerce Executives; Miss Lois V. Edinger, president of the National Education Association; Mrs. Dorothy W. Ford, president of the Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; and George W. Jones, secretary of the San Francisco Labor Council, AFL–CIO.

Others: Mark Matthews, former president of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Willard V. Merrihue, chairman of Effective Citizens Organization; Vernon C. Myers, publisher of Look; Mrs. Robert H. Rawson, assistant to the president, Greater Cleveland Foundation; Allen H. Seed, Jr., vice president, Keep America Beautiful; Mrs. Robert S. Stuart, president of the League of Women Voters of the United States, and Dr. Donald H. Webster, director of the bureau of governmental research and services, University of Washington.

Baltimore's Most Exclusive Key Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sunday Sun recently brought to light the secret of the success of the district office operation of my very able colleague CARLTON R. SICKLES, Maryland's Representative at Large.

I think all of us would be interested in knowing how to keep a busy, active district office in operation 5 days a week with an exclusively volunteer staff, so I commend the following article which appeared in the Sunday magazine of the Baltimore Sun, March 7, 1965, to the attention of our colleagues:

BALTIMORE'S MOST EXCLUSIVE KEY CLUB

(NOTE.—It's the "Sickles Score." Its 20 women members staff the Congressman's office in Baltimore—free.)

(By Cherrill Anson)

The most exclusive key club in town is the Baltimore office of Representative at Large CARLTON R. SICKLES.

The keys belong to the "Sickles Score," a group of 20 attractive women who have made the Maryland Democratic Congressman the envy of Washington's Capitol Hill by running his office cheerfully, efficiently, and without pay.

"Their work is excellent," he says happily, "and their esprit de corps is tremendous."

They are also the reason that an office can be run without as much as a budget allocation for paper cups. (Score members buy them out of their own pockets.)

Although as the State's only Congressman at Large SICKLES has a constituency of 3,200,000, he receives no more for office expenses than any other Member of the House with more than 500,000 constituents.

Last spring the 43-year-old former attorney from Prince Georges County actually considered closing the Baltimore office so that funds could be diverted to hire additional help for his beleaguered Washington staff.

But Mrs. Robert Smelkinson, a longtime friend who became a $2,800-a-year Baltimore field representative for the Congressman in May, was opposed to having a dark office.

She conceived the idea of a volunteer office staff and called on a friend, Mrs. Eugene Schreiber, to act as volunteer coordinator and shaper of the project.

Together the two recruited the Score, most of whom are suburban housewives and

mothers in their early thirties. Twice a month each fastens a tiny gold Sickles pin to her collar, travels to St. Paul and Fayette Streets, and unlocks room 717 of the Calvert Building with a key attached to a Sickles key chain.

The efforts of Score keep the office, where the Congressman works at least one day a week, open Monday through Friday from 10:30 a.m., to 3:30 p.m., or later. Some members even take work home.

Alice Schreiber, a tall, ebullient girl with Carol Channing eyes, three children, and experience as a Federal economist, had never managed an office before. But she didn't see why it should differ much from running a home. Both, she reasoned, would alternate between crash programs and periods of routine operation.

You know, most of the time you may be able to run a house with the help of one person. But you may need three for a big dinner party, without being in a position to keep three on full time.

In the office the problem is solved by having a second group of 50 volunteers called corps whose womanpower can be called on for such special projects as the sending out last year of 500 enlarged texts of the Kennedy inaugural address, with accompanying letters.

Some of the corps are unable to leave their homes regularly, but others are on the waiting list for the smaller group. Score members relinquish their duties unwillingly; Mrs. David Yumkas, who was in the original group when the project started late in August 1964, has since moved to Richmond but commutes to Baltimore twice a month rather than be dropped.

Such enthusiasm delights the Congressman and mystifies his colleagues on the Hill, where observers say they know of no identical congressional office setup.

Although most were politically unresponsive to begin with, all the Score members have become fervently interested in government. They sponsor a series of monthly bipartisan political seminars on important issues, visit Washington and Annapolis, and attend local political functions which they never would have attended before.

"Working closely with a legislator is what does it," one of the 20 explains.

"It has made us aware of the fascination of politics and government. I feel personally related to the Federal Government now. Before I started working here I thought, 'It is so big—what can one person do?' But I realize now that the answer is 'A lot.'"

"Congressman SICKLES's expression of his sense of our importance and his warmth and rapport sustain this operation," another adds.

The continuity and heart of the operation lie in three boxes of folders on the radiator (marked "nontypist," "medium typist," "top typist"), and a 28-page office manual, and a clearly labeled cabinet of supplies brought in from Washington.

The volunteers, who rate their own typing ability, take work from the appropriate box, where it has been left by the volunteers of the previous day. So that skills will be husbanded, top typists concentrate on letters, medium typists on envelopes and file cards, an nontypists on the drafting of letters and the clipping of newspapers and periodicals.

The manual compiled by Mrs. Schreiber makes the office virtually self-explanatory. It not only suggests graceful exits for sticky situations (when the constituent on the other end of the line demands to know the SICKLES stand on Vietnam or the price of steel, the volunteer can turn to the telephone section and be counseled to "sweetly but firmly * * * refrain from giving the congressman's views. Ask the caller to write to the Washington office"), but also spells out office procedure in detail.

Since most of the volunteers were originally not only politically unknowing but also secretarially green, there were some early S O S's. One came from a girl who could not open the file drawer. (She was advised to push the button in with her thumb.)

But the Score members learned fast and quickly began to turn out an impressive volume of work. From the papers which are clipped each day, lists are compiled of constituents who are to be congratulated on marriages, births, 25th or 50th wedding anniversaries, awards, or honors. Each gets a letter from the Congressman. New parents also get a copy of the Government booklet on infant care, while brides are sent 10 useful pamphlets.

Letters (the grand total is 100 or more a week) also go out to Peace Corps appointees and to persons who have been granted rural route postal service because of the Congressman's efforts in their behalf. After SICKLES invited the farmers in his constituency to request Department of Agriculture publications, the Baltimore office sent out 5,000 bulletins. They also prepared the dossiers on 130 applicants for appointment to the service academies.

In addition, the Score handles invitations from organizations which want the Congressman to speak or appear; processes requests for copies of bills passed by or before the House; keeps the mailing list for the monthly newsletter up to date; prepares weekly summaries which brief SICKLES on news of the city and State and on what civic and political leaders in the area are doing and saying; and deals with a steady stream of constituents who walk in or telephone to ask for the Congressman's help.

The volunteers find that many who come in seeking Federal benefits (for which they are often not eligible), essentially need, and might have their lives changed by, a more immediate kind of help—food, eyeglasses, medicine, legal advice. Out of this realization has evolved the special project of compiling a directory of private, city, State, and Federal aid sources.

"We have no limit on our activities," a Score member says. "The Congressman lets us use any idea which has value."

"Incidentally," another chimes in, "we have a ball."

The Score members are: Mrs. Bernard Aiken, Mrs. Arnold Fleischmann, Mrs. Joseph Francus, Mrs. Leonard Freedman, Mrs. Bertram Goldstein, Mrs. William Goodman, Mrs. Alfred L. Hurwitz, Mrs. Mitchell Katz, Mrs. Michael Kitt, Mrs. Joseph LaVan, Mrs. Eugene Lewis, Mrs. Harold Peremel, Mrs. Allan Resnick, Mrs. Larry Rosenthal, Mrs. Sheldon Roth, Mrs. William Ross, Mrs. Sherald Seidman, Mrs. Joseph Sills, Mrs. Allan Thomas, Mrs. Charles Yumkas, Mrs. David Yumkas, who commutes from Richmond, actually makes the group number 21.

The lively group attended inaugural festivities in the Mayflower Hotel after they and their husbands had been transported to Washington by a chartered bus. On the side of it they fastened a large sign: "SICKLES for something in 1966."

One of only 12 Congressmen-at-large in the House of Representatives, SICKLES has frequently been mentioned in connection with the 1966 Maryland gubernatorial race. He has held the congressional seat since 1962, when it was created as a temporary solution to the reapportionment hassle.

Several Baltimore civic groups which would love to have the same kind of enthusiastic support have contacted Score members to get the secret of the groups' success. "And, of course, we're glad to tell them anything we can," Mrs. Schreiber says. "But their real problem is that they don't have Congressman SICKLES."

A svelte blond Score member raised her head from her work long enough to agree. "He," she proclaimed, "is a doll."

Opposition to Railroad Subsidies—Letters from George M. Campbell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, recently an eastern railroad, in order to continue its commuter service, has sought Federal financial assistance, rather than place its own house in order and increase fares to a cost-covering basis.

George M. Campbell, of Cleveland, Ohio, has written letters to me and to Under Secretary Clarence D. Martin, Jr., of the Department of Commerce, condemning further subsidization of this line or of railroads in general.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Campbell's letters be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
March 18, 1965.

Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Senator from Ohio,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Attached is a copy of my letter of today's date to Under Secretary of Commerce Clarence D. Martin. As a regular rider on the "Shaker Rapid" I expect to pay whatever fare is necessary to enable that operation to be self-supporting, and I would not expect the taxpayers of Larchmont, N.Y., or Greenwich, Conn., to be any more willing to subsidize the commuting cost of Shaker Heights residents than I am to subsidize them. * * *

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. CAMPBELL.

MARCH 18, 1965.

Hon. CLARENCE D. MARTIN, Jr.,
Under Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: I have read with interest and considerable displeasure the attempts of several Senators to have the people of the United States "bail out" the long mismanaged New Haven Railroad so that the commuters from Westchester and Fairfield Counties can continue to receive transportation to and from work at below cost.

I see no reason why I or other taxpayers not using the New Haven's facilities should subsidize, even in part, the traveling expenses of basically well-paid individuals so that they can enjoy the pleasures of suburban living. I suggest, instead, that the price of commutation tickets be brought in line with actual costs and that those who use the railroad pay their own way in full. I doubt very much if any of those commuters would be interested in helping to subsidize either the private commuting service which I use to get to my office or my business, which also provides a service to others.

I believe you advised the Senate Commerce Committee of the administration's opposition to this form of subsidy. I appreciate you taking this action and hope you will continue opposing the proposals of those Senators who appear to be more interested in giving financial help to their individual

affluent constituents than in making the the best use of either all taxpayers' money or the Federal Government's credit.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. CAMPBELL.

View of Left Out of Focus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, when one political columnist quotes another political columnist, it is generally on a pretty serious matter. In her column which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on March 20, 1965, Alice Widener quotes William S. White to point to a new, ugly intellectual objectivity which accepts, without question and without even identification, the well-known Communist infiltration and influence in leftwing organizations.

The column speaks for itself. Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

VIEW OF LEFT OUT OF FOCUS

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK.—Decent Americans should join with columnist William S. White in recognizing and deploring what he describes as the ugly new intellectual objectivity in our Nation. This alleged objectivity, he says, accepts as student leaders those rabble rousers, radicals, and anarchists at university campuses and other places who substitute howling license of speech for genuine freedom of speech.

In some quarters, Mr. White points out, there is far more sympathy for these extremist student demonstrators than for other boys of the same age risking their lives in Vietnam in a fight for real freedom against Red tyranny.

On March 15, the very same day that White's column appeared in New York, the New York Times carried a front page article entitled "The Student Left: Spurring Reform" by Fred Powledge. In my opinion, this article is characteristic of the ugly new "objectivity," for it presents an out-of-focus picture of what he describes as the leftist "new activist intelligentsia" rising on college campuses.

Part of the Powledge article reports in 16 paragraphs of 130 lines on the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America. A single paragraph states, "Last October, J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, wrote that the DuBois Clubs had been spawned by the Communist Party, U.S.A. and that the club's ideology was one of 'discord, hate, and violence.' "

The foregoing sentence in the Times is immediately followed by the "objective" subhead "Hoover Viewed As Threat" and the paragraph, "Many members reply that Mr. Hoover is part of the reactionary force that the DuBois group believes is the greatest threat to American society."

Thus Times writer Fred Powledge equates "objectively" the highly informed, expert statement of a superior, distinguished public official such as J. Edgar Hoover with the subversive slander of him and the FBI by a Communist youth group.

There follows in the Times article seven paragraphs about Miss Bettina Aptheker, a DuBois Club member at the University of California at Berkeley who calls herself a "Marxist Socialist." Miss Aptheker is quoted as saying that the "sort of society" she believes should exist has "almost been achieved" in the Soviet Union. Fred Powledge identifies her as "the daughter of Herbert Aptheker, a writer on Negro history and director of the Institute for Marxist Studies here (New York City)."

Now it is true that Herbert Aptheker is a writer and director of the institute mentioned. But Mr. Powledge did not inform his readers that Herbert Aptheker appearing on behalf of indicted Communists, testified in Federal court in 1949 and again in 1954 that he had been a member of the Communist Party since 1939. Moreover, the House Committee on Un-American Activities reports that Aptheker was officially listed by the CPUSA in 1961 as a member at large of its national committee.

Columnist White writes that it isn't popular to say Communists are exploiting extremists of right and left in our country, inside and outside the civil rights situation. "No, it is not popular to say this," says Mr. White, "it is only true."

Wisely, he points out that this truth should not serve neofascists or any other extremist group as an excuse for brutality or violence, or as an excuse to deny to Negroes their absolute right to vote in all elections.

In addition, Communist exploitation of freedom of speech and assembly should not serve as an excuse for description of the "Filthy Speech Movement" at the University of California as merely the puerile current expression of student revolt—as did the New York Times in an editorial of March 15.

I agree with William S. White that our rich Nation is becoming poor in old and once-irreplaceable values. These are all the values, middle class morality values, which the Communists seek to destroy. Decent Americans should band together and put a stop to it.

Lincoln as a Surveyor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "A Lincoln Survey Boomeranged," written by Sidney M. Harris, and published in the February issue of the American Surveyor and Photogrammetrist, published in Washington, D.C., for land surveyors and mappers throughout the free world. This article gives some little-known facts about the period in Lincoln's life in which he served as a land surveyor and points out in an interesting manner some of his activities in this field. It also reveals that even in failure, Abraham Lincoln was undaunted and continued to pursue his goals and to build the friendships that later were to stand him in such good stead.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LINCOLN SURVEY BOOMERANGED

(By Sidney M. Harris)

Abraham Lincoln was a natural born "surveyor," but not a surveyor of land; that came later—the hard way. He was a surveyor of mankind, and this distinguishing quality of character paid him well in friends, which meant more to him than possessions.

In his youth, Lincoln's great desire for knowledge made him appear lazy to his hard-working, unlearned neighbors. He could often be found "lounging around" with a book or paper. If he had work to do, he did it well, but steady work was not easily found in that day by a person who was unestablished and unsettled, and he did not marry until he was 33.

He was somewhat of a drifter, but he had chosen the New Salem area as his home and always returned there after making a flatboat trip to New Orleans, or fighting in the Black Hawk War as captain of the Illinois Militia.

Lincoln had many jobs of short duration, and wherever he worked he made friends. In 1833, at the age of 24, he was made postmaster at New Salem, Ill., by President Andrew Jackson, a Democrat, although Lincoln was a Whig, later Republican. Author Carl Sandburg said in his writings that, "No Democrat wanted the job."

Abe was more learned than most ordinary men in the area with a similarly low income. He was glad to get the job—not so much for the salary (which he surely needed) but for an opportunity to read the papers that passed through the office.

Reading and discussing local and national current events delighted Abe. The newspapers were his main source of information. His salary as postmaster, which was based on the revenue that passed through his office, amounted to $6 or $8 per month. The infrequent arrival of the mail, and the small amount of it left Abe with plenty of time to read and to engage in other activities.

At that time, the Illinois country with its fertile prairies was a sought-after home for many migrants from the East. Business was so good in Sangamon County that County Surveyor John Calhoun was compelled to find an assistant. He had heard of Abe Lincoln's aptitudes and trustworthy qualities.

Calhoun, a Jackson Democrat, sent word for Lincoln to come to his office. He explained his need for someone who could help him with the surveying work, and asked Abe if he thought he could do it. Abe, always ready to accept a challenge, thought he could.

Abe agreed to take the job, providing he could speak as he pleased and not be tied up politically; Calhoun agreed to let Abe run his own private affairs. Abe believed his job as postmaster would not interfere with his job as surveyor—if he ever became a surveyor. He had never done any surveying, and knew he would need to study a great deal to gain a working knowledge and skill that could turn out creditable work for the county.

Mentor Graham, a schoolmaster, was sought by Abe to help him conquer "The Theory and Practice of Surveying," by Robert Gibson, published in 1814. They studied until the late hours of the night, and sometimes Lincoln worked alone until daylight. It was a tedious and exacting study that included decimal fractions, logarithms, trigonometry, the use of mathematical instruments, changing the scale of maps, operating the circumferentor (now the transit), the art of leveling, and mastering the methods of the times for measuring areas.

Abe pursued his studies so thoroughly that his friends feared for his health, but in 6 weeks time he had mastered the book and surveying instruments. Calhoun assigned him work in the north end of Sangamon County as a deputy surveyor. Abe took his assignment seriously, as he did any job he contracted to do. His first recorded report as deputy surveyor was submitted January 14, 1834. Other records reveal his work was accurate, although he used a grapevine for his surveyor's chain until he could afford to buy the proper instruments.

Lincoln also delivered mail, which he carried in his hat for the people he might meet in the area in which he was working. As much as he liked being a postmaster, and "moonlighting" as a surveyor, he had failed to conquer poverty. The chain of adversities that had pursued him through life continued. Debts from a prior adventure in the grocery business, which failed, were a source of embarrassment to him.

A man who had one of Lincoln's outstanding notes brought suit against him when he could not meet the demand for payment. The court ordered Abe's possessions sold to satisfy the debt. As it happened, his only possessions of value were his horse and his surveying instruments which he needed in his business.

James Short, a Sand Ridge farmer, heard about the sale by the court, and was present at the auction. Short bought the horse and surveying instruments for $125 and gave them back to Abe.

Lincoln's salary as a surveyor was $3 per day, when he worked, and $2.50 for making a plat and report. His earnings as surveyor and postmaster left him little or nothing to apply to his $1,100 debt incurred as a result of his failure as a merchant. But the two positions made him many friends and brought him a certain amount of distinction which proved beneficial in later ventures.

Lincoln pursed his work as surveyor with much diligence, laying out roads, township lines, and town lots. He surveyed a 10-acre plot of land on the Sangamon River northward from New Salem. Soon settlers were flocking into the area and building homes. The spot became known as Petersburg. Lincoln laid out one street in the village crooked because if he had made it straight the home of Jemima Elmore would have been in the street.

As Petersburg became recognized as a better location for a growing community many people from New Salem relocated in Petersburg. As Petersburg grew, New Salem diminished. In a short time there were so few families, and so little business left in New Salem that the Post Office Department, in 1837, considered it unwise to continue the post office. As a result, Lincoln lost his job of postmaster.

Lincoln's inability to keep a steady job was not due to his lack of integrity, skill, or industry. It was, perhaps, his temperament and the times that wrought so many changes in his career. But he applied himself wisely and diligently and each job he lost catapulted him onward into something better. He became a lawyer, a legislator, a Congressman, and 24 years after surveying himself out of the position as postmaster he became President of the United States.

An Unwelcome Spring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Southern Star, Ozark, Ala., on April 1, 1965:

AN UNWELCOME SPRING

An easing of racial tensions in Alabama is the hope of all citizens who have a sincere interest in the welfare of this State. However, this is not likely to come about soon, as Martin Luther King runs amuck and unchecked, calling for an economic boycott, and attempting to bring about anarchy in Alabama.

Judgment has been passed on Alabama without a fair trial. We have been found guilty in the eyes of the Nation of every vile, slanderous insult that King can concoct. Certainly not guilty in the eyes of many, but in the kangaroo court presided over by the molders of public opinion—the national news media—Alabama has been made out to be in the same class with the Nazi butchers of the Hitler regime. This is a malicious lie which demands retracting. However, we have little recourse with most of the powers that be, from the President of the United States on down, holding the deck stacked against us.

When we read the analogies of Nazi Germany and Alabama it makes the blood boil. If anything we see the analogy the other way around. Watching King spouting his diatribe, and listening to his followers shout slogans in return to a prompter, we have a feeling that many Germans must have had in the 1930's when they saw Hitler rising to power, and were virtually powerless to do anything about it.

We do not think that this country is headed for a dictatorship immediately, but there exists so little hope for State and local government to exercise any authority over areas previously reserved for them, it makes one wonder in fear.

The question that keeps wanting for an answer is—will there be a leveling of tensions? Will the Nation wake up in time to see the true color of the movement fed by Martin Luther King?

The only hope for a sane solution to racial strife is compromise between responsible leaders of both races, both in Alabama, and on the national level, as this is a national revolution in the truest sense.

Compromise is difficult to visualize now, becuase all we can hear is the strained voices of extremists on both sides. The ravings of King and his followers make any sensible solution to the problem extremely difficult. They want everything now, their way, with no compromise.

On the other hand we have the element in Alabama, just as other States have them, who think the solution to the problem lies in the gun, and the club. This is the way to lasting disaster. Those who killed the Detroit housewife, the minister in Selma, and Negro youth in Marion, are just as much an enemy of Alabama as Martin Luther King is, perhaps more so.

These killings cannot be justified by any standard. The reasoning that Mrs. Liuzzo should have been at home with her family is sound. But on the other hand, she should be free to travel the highways of Alabama without fear of harm, just as we should be free to ride through sections of Chicago or Harlem without fear or threat of harm. But unfortunately this is not the case, there are sections of this country where the life of an Alabama citizen would be in grave danger, just as Mrs. Liuzzo found her rendezvous with danger and death on a lonely rural Alabama highway. This is the shame of this Nation.

We have lived for generations in peace and harmony with the Negro in Alabama, and can continue to do so—if the powers that be will let the State attempt to work its own problems out free of outside interference. This is wishing a lot, as there is no indication the State will be free to do anything on its own any more.

Negroes have been wronged in Alabama in many areas, in many ways. Responsible, sensible citizens acknowledge this. Most are willing to let bygones be bygones, and accept change, and work for the betterment of both races with the least possible conflict. But again, how can this be done when agitators are calling for the impeachment of Governor Wallace in one breath, and an economic boycott of the State in the next.

If King and his leaders were sincerely interested in the welfare of the Negro in Alabama they would call off the dogs, and give the leaders of this State a chance to show definite plans of making certain changes which would improve the status of the Negro. But we don't believe they are sincere in their beliefs. They are not really interested in Alabama's welfare. They are interested in its destruction along with other areas which still believe in a form of government free of socialism, pinko-Communist tinges and all that goes with the Great Society.

We acknowledge many of our faults in Alabama, and believe the people of this State are willing and able to work for a better day, correcting injustice where it exists, and continuing a way of life that is based on respect for local government, and respect for the principles of Christianity.

The people of Alabama as a whole are a churchgoing, God-fearing people. Their souls must be greatly disturbed at the spectacle they have recently witnessed. A spectacle that condoned practically every form of debauchery along the route of march from Selma to Montgomery that is imaginable. Yet this spectacle was endorsed, supported, and sanctioned, lock, stock, and barrel by the President of the United States, and it moved with the Reverend Martin Luther King at its head, professing to be a minister of the Gospel, and having at his back scores of northern clergymen.

King told an audience in San Francisco, and broadcast it over the national airwaves, that evil is deep rooted in Alabama. What, pray tell does he think was deep rooted among his imported followers and marchers? We call it evil in the rawest form. But obviously President Johnson, and the majority of those living King's lie, look on it as a Sunday school picnic.

We are far from being prudish about many things, but lately we have been firmly convinced that moral decay has its roots in Washington, D.C., and is bursting into full bloom this spring.

"A Choice for Americans"—Address by Senator Thurmond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, earlier this year, my home State of South Dakota was privileged to have as one of its visitors our distinguished colleague, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

He was the guest speaker at the annual meeting of the chamber of commerce in Aberdeen, and delivered a most forceful and thoughtful address on the problems of our times and the prospects that lie ahead for the type of free society that has been ours for nearly two centuries.

Mr. President, the fact that his speech is, indeed, a vital one is demonstrated by the fact that the publication, "Vital Speeches of the Day," printed Senator THURMOND's address in its February 15, 1965, edition.

I request permission that this important address be made a part of the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHOICE FOR AMERICANS—THE CHALLENGE IS YOURS

(By STROM THURMOND, U.S. Senator from South Carolina, delivered before the Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce, Aberdeen, S. Dak., Jan. 9, 1965)

This gathering tonight is so pleasant and congenial that it would be appropriate on my part to fit my remarks to the occasion, and if I could not add to the good spirits, to at least refrain from saying anything that would be other than palliative, avoiding at all costs anything that is not palatable.

Yet the recent past and the apparent future course of our Nation is such that I cannot but speak to you in a serious vein of matters which to me are most discomforting.

It is possible that what I have to say would not be acceptable for even a less congenial occasion. In the book "Cold Friday," published posthumously last year, Whittaker Chambers made this observation: "The West is swayed by a profound will to die. * * * Actually, and with the profoundest vindictiveness of unhealth, it does not wish to be defended; it deeply resents anyone who would defend it and will seek to destroy him. * * * Because it cannot be defended without facing the truth about itself. Nor can anyone truly defend it without, ultimately, speaking the truth about it. That it cannot stand and so, first of all, it must long to destroy those who would save it."

Only time will tell whether Chambers' conclusion is accurate, but I feel certain that the events of the years since he recorded this observation would not have shaken his belief. It may well be that our society will not now face the truth, nor permit the truth about itself to be presented. Yet Chambers also admitted, in his words, that "truth has become the one consuming need, since nothing else has real worth." With this I am in wholehearted agreement, and to the best of my ability, I want to discuss with you the truth about where we as a nation and a society are now and where we appear to be going.

The fruits of a futile U.S. foreign policy pursued since World War II have ripened. U.S. interests are suffering at new lows everywhere.

In Vietnam, our Nation is involved in an undeclared war with the forces of communism. While we maintain the guise of mere training and assistance of the military forces of South Vietnam, we are actually engaging the enemy directly in combat, and American casualties are mounting steadily and at an increasing rate. We are not winning this war; indeed, we have not yet resolved that winning the war is our first and prime objective in the area. Despite the vague official assurances being given, the war in South Vietnam is going so badly that our policymakers are now worrying not about saving southeast Asia, but about saving face. After Gen. Maxwell Taylor, on his recent visit to the United States, reported to the President on the situation in Vietnam, the New York Times quoted Secretary of Defense McNamara saying to the President as the newsmen entered for the conference: "It would be impossible for Max to talk to these people without leaving the impression the situation is going to hell."

Certainly the fate of southeast Asia, all the way to the coast of Australia, and probably the fate of all of Asia, hangs on the outcome of the war in Vietnam. As pointed out recently by Columnist Joe Alsop, a loss or withdrawal by the United States from Vietnam will mean moving the boundary of freedom back to the beaches of Waikiki.

In Western Europe, the NATO alliance has fallen into a shambles. What was conceived and organized as a "mutual defense pact" has become a "mutual fencing pact," each with swords drawn and attempting to carve up the other, diplomatically, of course. Our Government has expressed its lack of confidence in the competence of our NATO partners to share in the control of nuclear weapons, and Western European nations have not concealed their lack of confidence in U.S. willingness to defend Europe with nuclear weapons as the agreement provides. Another new discordant element has been added to the relations, as Germany now fears that the United States will depart from our historical position on reunification of Germany in direct negotiations with the Soviets.

In Africa, the situation is chaotic. All the blame cannot be laid on the Communists. The United States, as a reaction to Communist anticolonialism propaganda, has for years followed a policy of "independence now," pressuring our allies such as France, Britain, Portugal, and Belgium to grant independence to their colonies when there was inadequate preparation for self-government, and the total lack of stability essential to, an independent government's operation. In the Congo, for instance, we were prime movers and financiers in bringing the relatively stable Katanga province under the completely unstable central Congolese Government. We supported the expulsion of Mr. Tshombe. Recently, in desperation, we supported the return of Tshombe to head the Central Congolese Government. We transported Belgium paratroopers into the Congo in an attempt to rescue white people from the Communist-supported rebels. Again, we were forced to desist by a well-operated propaganda campaign. Nasser of Egypt and Ben Bella of Algeria, as well as the Soviets and Red China, are supporting the Communist rebels with both men and arms, although both Egypt and Algeria have been the recipients of generous U.S. assistance.

In Latin America, Communist subversion, terror, and influence continue to flourish from Cuba, where communism is now an entrenched bastion. Our Government has chosen the alternative of constructing a canal as a means of circumventing the recurring crises in Panama, but that is likely to end up a blind alley. The economic feasibility of a new canal depends on the use of nuclear energy for its construction, and that route is now barred by the Treaty of Moscow, entered into in 1963.

Even in less turbulent areas, U.S. interests are suffering. Pakistan, formerly one of our staunchest allies, has been disillusioned by U.S. shipment of arms to India, while the United States refuses to consider the possibility that India may commit aggression against Pakistan as it did a short time ago against Goa—this time using American arms. Greece, where the cold war first turned hot, has now at United States urging signed a 12-point treaty with Communist Bulgaria; and Turkey, our staunch ally and an enemy of communism, has with U.S. approval, signed a trade pact with the Soviet Union.

Our policy of accommodation toward the Soviets has not caused the intended mellowing. True, at the moment, their words are milder; but this has occurred frequently in the past when the Soviets needed a surface hiatus in the cold war. Their propaganda and actions tell the true story. Their propaganda on the Congo situation is as untruthful and vicious as any ever disseminated. The Soviet leaders have thrown down the gauntlet in southeast Asia, warning the United States that any retaliation against North Vietnam or Red China by the United States would bring the Soviet Union to the assistance of their Communist allies. Meanwhile, the Soviets, far from abandoning the alternative of nuclear arms as a means of conquest—as was concluded by our Government at the time of the test ban treaty—are straining mightily at a program of weapons research and development for qualitative breakthroughs, particularly in the areas of ICBMs to carry monster bombs and antiballistic missile defenses. They are also using this breathing period for a massive program of submarine production, both nuclear and conventional.

Despite the obvious failure of our policies of accommodation, our Government has prescribed more of the same in bigger doses. The latest aspect of this policy is trade with the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc satellites. The Soviets make no pretense about their intentions. Their first priority in the current period is to build their materiel base by obtaining from the West those products, materials, and processes which will fulfill the needs that their government-managed, forced-labor, "planned" economy can never meet. Despite the fact that the Soviets have proved themselves a hopeless credit risk and invariably untrustworthy, our Government seems intent on once again bailing them out of their economic crisis. Not only will trade with the Soviets strengthen an avowed and unswerving enemy, but it was be at a net economic loss to the United States.

The United Nations, rather than becoming an instrument for solution of world problems, has virtually become a part of the problem rather than a part of the solution. The United States, after some very strong words, backed down on its threat to have a showdown with the Soviet Union on its failure to pay assessments for U.N. peacekeeping operations for which the U.N. Charter prescribes a nation shall lose its vote in the General Assembly. The financial crisis of the U.N. continues. Meanwhile, Indonesia has announced its withdrawal from the U.N., and logically we can expect other "neutralist" and not so "neutralist" nations to follow suit when they have a real or imagined pique at some action or inaction of the U.N.

Our country has placed great emphasis on attempting to create a favorable image of the United States around the world—probably, far more emphasis than was due. Yet the U.S. image across the world is at an all-time low. Our embassies are being stoned and stormed, our diplomats attacked, and our property burned.

Of far more significance is our international monetary position. In the last decade, our short-term liabilities to foreigners, which are callable in gold, have increased from $13.6 billion to $26 billion. In the same period, our gold stocks have diminshed from $21.8 billion to $15.6 billion. We have been assured that no one has any basis to doubt the value of our dollar. Basis or no basis, we had better hope that none of our foreign creditors have their doubts raised to the point they start demanding gold; for at that point we will face an impossible dilemma. Nor is the situation improving. Our balance-of-payments deficit continues at about $3 billion per year.

Nor is our national defense posture reassuring. Despite the huge sums appropriated for defense, there has been a minimum of progress on qualitative advances in strategic weaponry. Although the scientific and technological revolution continues, there is a marked complacency about new concepts in strategic weaponry which causes to be ignored the inevitable toll of deterioration and obsolescence. The philosophy of arms control and disarmament wields persuasive influence on the research, development, test, and production decisions in the Department of Defense. Criticisms of false economies are parried with aversions to the mythological reductions by the Soviets in their defense spending. It is impossible, of course, to determine how much resources are being devoted by the Soviets to armaments. It can-

not be measured in terms of monetary values, whether the funds come from their formal defense budget or are diverted from elsewhere. This is because the materials consumed by defense and civilian industry are not priced uniformly on an economic basis, such as cost, but rather is variably priced according to the priority of the use as established by the Soviet Government. Thus the price of steel, for instance, may be fixed for military uses at one-half the price that it is fixed for uses in consumer production.

Although we now have a clear superiority in strategic nuclear strength, the prospect for the period after 1967 is fraught with vulnerabilities. The Soviets may well draw abreast, and perhaps even surpass the United States, particularly if we go through with our announced intention of trading with them.

Our situation domestically is no less serious.

Fiscally, we are continuing down the primrose path. The formal national debt has now increased to $318.9 billion, requiring annual interest payments in excess of $11 billion. Three times during the last completed fiscal year it was necessary for Congress to increase the statutory debt limit. Last year's deficit was a resounding $8.26 billion. The total informal national debt including accrued liabilities now exceeds $1¼ trillion. This is by no means the whole picture. The total formal governmental debt in the United States has now reached $434 billion, and private debt has reached the awesome proportions of $826 billion, bringing the total of formal public and private indebtedness to $1¼ trillion. These figures tell more than a story of money. For instance, they reflect the expanded (and consequent) influence of Government. As an example, the first U.S. President, back in 1789, reported 350 civilians on the U.S. Government payrolls—1 for every 11,225 citizens. By the end of the next 100 years (1889), there was 1 Government worker for every 400 workers; 35 years later (1924), the ratio was 1 for 215. Today there is 1 U.S. employee for every 76 Americans. The gross national product of the United States has increased about 33 times since 1900, while the labor force increased 1½ times. During the same period, however, Federal Government expenditures increased by 234 times.

From this starting point, the prospects for the coming session of Congress should be considered. Another substantial tax cut is proposed. The appropriations for the poverty program are requested to be doubled. A new program for Federal aid to education, beginning at preschool level and going through graduate studies in college, at a beginning cost of $1.5 billion is demanded. In the medical field, it is proposed to go beyond research and establish regional diagnostic centers and community treatment centers. The task force which recommended this program estimated its cost at $7 billion. Separate antipoverty programs for regional application are proposed. Among the almost innumerable other demands are highway landscaping programs, new programs for controlling air and water pollution, urban park and street landscaping programs, additional conservation programs, and even a "wild rivers" bill.

Of even greater import than the fiscal aspects of these proposals are the political consequences. Each such intrusion of Government into the affairs of individuals, however beneficial to the individual from a materialistic standpoint, places more power over the individual's life and conduct in the Central Government.

Already our political and social structures have undergone drastic changes from the individual-based system envisioned by the Constitution. The Supreme Court has, of course, been the primary instrument in these drastic departures from the Constitution. One good example is the intrusion by the Federal judiciary into the political question of State legislative apportionment. The power of decision on the structure of State governments has been taken from the people and usurped by the Court in these decisions. Another major change has come through the cases on prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. The Court has declared unconstitutional a practice that had become traditional through years of unchallenged usage.

There are other areas equally significant, although less publicized, in which the Court has accomplished radical changes in traditional and constitutional concepts. For instance, the Court recently handed down a decision in a labor-management relations case. The issue in the case revolved around whether a company could discontinue one phase of operations and subcontract for it without negotiating first with the union. The Court held that the matter was negotiable, and that the company could not make what some have long called a management decision without agreement of the union. Interestingly, the Court also implied that the Government had a legitimate voice in the scope of activity of a given private enterprise, and in the nature of the investment.

Other changes are quietly in process. There is a strong movement underway to convert the Federal Bureau of Investigation into a national police force, a change which the present Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, has in the past successfully prevented.

Crime is at an alltime high, particularly crimes of violence and crimes against property. The threat of violence and disorder hangs ominously over many of our communities.

Corruption and misfeasance in high places draws little public clamor, even when exposed in all its ugliness. You are familiar, for example, with the many ramifications of the Bobby Baker affair.

This, in brief, is the state of our Nation as we begin a new year.

I am reminded that the studies of R. G. LeTourneau show that the average age of the world's great governments has been 200 years, and that the general steps through which they progressed and regressed were: from bondage to spiritual faith; from spiritual faith to great courage; from great courage to liberty; from liberty to abundance; from abundance to complacency; from complacency to apathy; from apathy to dependency; and from dependency back again to bondage.

In this connection, the five basic reasons given by Gibbon in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" for the death of that great civilization are also worthy of note. As Gibbon listed them, the reasons were: "(1) the undermining of the dignity and sanctity of the home—the basis of all human society; (2) higher and higher taxes to fund the spending of public money for free bread and circuses for the people; (3) the mad craze for pleasure; (4) the building of great armaments for the defeat of an external enemy when the real enemy was within—the decay of individual morality and responsibility; and (5) the decay of religion, faith fading into mere form, losing touch with life and its power to guide the people."

I leave it to your individual judgment whether and where our Nation falls into the ladder of life of the average great government, and whether there is a parallel between the reasons isolated by Gibbon as responsible for the decline and fall of the Roman Empire and the state of our own society.

It is my fear that the forces of atheistic materialism are not conveniently confined within the Communist bloc or even excluded beyond our shores. What other reason than the dedication to atheistic materialism here in our own society can account for failure to even attempt to inspire the nations of the world with the spiritual values of liberty and free enterprise instead of our accepted traditional policy of attempting to light a guiding beacon powered by inert materialism? Do we fear to offer the world more than greater material abundance because in so doing we might have to admit to ourselves that the foundation of our own society has been shifted from spiritual values to materialistic clay? Do we refrain from pointing out to the peoples of the world the fallacies and tragic results of atheistic materialism underlying Socialist philosophy because we fear too much of the criticism might be applicable to our own society?

It has been well said that the greatness or weakness of any society depends, in the final analysis, on the outlook and attitude of the individuals which comprise it. It follows that the course and destiny of a society depend on the individual.

This is particularly true in the United States today. No longer is there a strong and balanced two-party system in the Congress to moderate the excesses of a political majority. If there is to be a moderation of our course, much less a return to original values envisioned by the Constitution, the direction must, at least for the next 2 years, come from the people themselves. Under existing circumstances, this will require something little less than a miraculous change in the sense of responsibility and capacity for effective expression previously evidenced by the individuals which comprise our society.

In the final analysis, it is not only the fate of our society which is at stake, but a final judgment on each of our personal lives. In considering this judgment, it is not amiss that we consider the judgment of the church in Laodicea, which was in these words from the Book of Revelation: "I know thy works; thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth. Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked."

Can we, or will we, escape the same judgment?

The guidelines for those of us who choose to avoid such a judgment are clear, but demanding.

We must choose to fight for a recognition of the supremacy of God in national and individual affairs, for without Divine guidance we can accomplish nothing.

We must choose to fight for a return to the Constitution, for it is the best political charter yet devised by which men can govern themselves.

We must choose to fight for freedom, for without it our existence is meaningless.

We must choose to fight for honesty and integrity, in private and in public life, for without them our society is doomed to degradation.

We must choose to fight for law and order, for in the absence of law and order, society is reduced to mob rule.

We must choose to fight to keep the Nation strong economically through support of free enterprise, for without responsible stewardship of our resources, we forfeit our stability.

We must choose to fight to keep the United States strong militarily, for without superior military power we cannot maintain both freedom and peace; but in so doing, we must keep ever in mind that within ourselves are potentially our most dangerous enemies—spiritual poverty, preoccupation with materialism, complacency, and apathy.

It is a formidable task; I challenge you to its undertaking.

Results of Fifth Annual Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to announce the results of the fifth annual congressional questionnaire in Michigan's Eighth District. I am indeed most grateful for the tremendous response—over 14,000 questionnaires have been received. As tabulation was started several days ago, the results are based on the returns of 11,465.

I am inserting a news release on the results which follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 7, 1965.—In record numbers, Michigan's Eighth District voters called for less Federal taxes in Congressman JIM HARVEY's fifth annual questionnaire. Obviously delighted with the number of returns, Congressman HARVEY said that 11,465 returns were tabulated, far and away the greatest response ever. "It was necessary," he said, "to turn over the returns on hand last week so that the results would not be unduly delayed. Returns still are coming in and I would estimate that we have received over 13,000."

Congressman HARVEY added, "As I have done each year, I intend to have the results published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and sent along to the President. The questionnaire has many values but none as important, I believe, than to encourage citizen interest in our Government."

With only two exceptions—one on the question of increasing trade with Communist countries of Europe and the other on balancing the budget except in periods of recession or national emergency—the voting was relatively close. On the Communist trade issue, voters turned down any expansion by 70.3 percent to 22.7 percent, and decisively supported a balance budget by 92.1 percent to only 4.2 percent.

Among the closest votes on an issue which remains of paramount importance, present United States policy of military and economic support in South Vietnam, some 51.1 percent supported the Nation's current course, while 36.9 percent objected. Many of those not voting on this question, 12 percent, added such notes as "What policy?" or "I don't have all the facts to answer this."

The closest vote of all dealt with increasing social security benefits and liberalizing existing earning limitations, accompanied by appropriate increases in social security taxes. This was just slightly favored, 51 percent to 43.8 percent. Without question, the need to raise taxes to support the increase deterred acceptance of this proposal. Without the overwhelming support of those voters who indicated they were retired, it never would have carried. The retirees supported the question, 73.6 percent to 18.8 percent.

Congressman HARVEY was particularly interested in the results on the elimination of the Federal excise taxes on automobiles and another question concerning the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population. Eighth district voters strongly supported Congressman HARVEY who has introduced legislation on both of these matters.

Voters carried the elimination of the excise taxes on automobiles by a margin of 61.5 percent to 32.5 percent, and were even stronger for the right of States to handle apportionment of their legislatures more freely by a vote of 66.6 percent to 24 percent. On the question of repealing section 14–2 of the Taft-Hartley Act, nullifying State right-to-work laws, only 24.9 percent favored it, while 60.2 percent were opposed. It was interesting to observe that even hourly employees failed to favor such action, turning it down 46 percent to 41.3 percent.

Altering immigration laws to base admission on skills rather than country of birth gained good backing, 62.1 percent to 29.3 percent.

Voters also approved Federal funds for public school construction and teachers' salaries by a 53.3 percent to 37.4 percent margin. Though it was fairly close, textbooks, special teachers, and library aid for private and parochial schools were turned down, 54.4 percent to 33.8 percent.

A new Federal medicare program for elderly citizens, by the social security approach, was firmly rejected, 62.2 percent to 21.8 percent. A health program for the elderly to be financed from the Government's general funds, together with an average of $6 monthly premium to be paid by participants, carried by a rather slim margin, 47.2 percent to 35.7 percent.

Here are the results of the questionnaire:

	Percent—		
	Yes	No	Undecided
Do you favor—			
1. A new Federal medicare program for our elderly citizens:			
(a) To be financed by increased social security taxes on employers and employees?	21.8	62.2	16.0
(b) To be financed from the Government's general funds, together with an average $6 monthly premium to be paid by participants?	47.2	35.7	17.1
2. Elimination of Federal excise taxes on automobiles?	61.5	32.5	6.0
3. Increasing trade with Communist countries of Europe?	22.7	70.3	7.0
4. Repeal of sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, nullifying State right-to-work laws?	24.9	60.2	14.9
5. Balancing the budget, except in periods of economic recession or national emergency?	92.1	4.2	3.7
6. Altering immigration laws to base admission on skills rather than country of birth?	62.1	29.3	8.6
7. An additional $1.2 billion in aid to education for—			
(a) Public school construction and teachers' salaries?	53.3	37.4	9.3
(b) Textbooks, special teachers, and library aid for private and parochial schools?	33.8	54.4	11.8
8. Present U.S. policy of military and economic support in South Vietnam?	51.1	36.9	12.0
9. Legislation increasing social security benefits and liberalizing existing earning limitations, accompanied by appropriate increases in social security taxes?	51.0	43.8	5.2
10. Guaranteeing the right of any State to apportion 1 house of its legislature on factors other than population?	66.6	24.0	9.4

Save Cumberland Falls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled, "Save Cumberland Falls" which appeared in the April 2, 1965, issue of the Gleaner-Journal of Henderson, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

SAVE CUMBERLAND FALLS

The Cumberland Falls Preservation Association has been reactivated to continue to fight the proposal of the U.S. Corps of Engineers that hydroelectric dam be erected near the beautiful Cumberland Falls in a State park.

The association is made up of eastern Kentucky residents, but there is no reason why this organization should not be statewide, for the objective of the group is of interest to all Kentuckians.

Such a dam certainly would affect the flow of water over the falls, which would be a mile downstream from the proposed dam location.

Cumberland Falls is one of the works of nature that has attracted thousands to the State park, not only from other parts of Kentucky, but from other States.

Since the park has been established, constant improvement has been made to provide room for more tourists who want to see one of the State's most beautiful attractions. Now facilities for camping have been added to the comfortable lodge and its cabins, and hundreds visit the park daily during the summer season.

The dam proposal is being studied now by the State department of State parks, recommendations will be turned over to Gov. Edward Breathitt.

It would appear that acceptance of such a proposal would be contrary to the goal of the parks department, which has spent much money and effort in building one of the finest State park systems in the Nation.

The deterioration of one of the finest attractions Kentucky has to offer tourists certainly would appear contrary to the goal of the State.

Father Lemieux Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a few minutes today to pay tribute to a very close friend of mine in Seattle, the Very Reverend Albert A. Lemieux, S.J., a man who is greatly admired and highly respected by all who know him.

Since 1948, Father Lemieux has been president of Seattle University, and the list of his achievements there is a long and brilliant one. Under his dedicated

and untiring leadership, the university has flourished to an extent that in itself stands as a silent tribute to his love of humanity and devotion to duty.

Father Lemieux retires today from the position to which he has been so faithful, and if, as he hands over the reins of administration to another, he looks back with pride at his contribution to the cause of good citizenship, he will find his feeling shared by all of us who have followed his activities through the years.

We have seen that his service has not been limited to the students who have drawn upon his magnificent store of education and experience, but has been equally generous in response to calls for participation in civic affairs, charitable endeavors, guidance programs, and so forth. In fact, I do not think I am wrong in saying that his beneficial influence has been felt in every aspect of community life. His years in Seattle have been years of concern for the welfare of every citizen.

The outstanding ability of Father Lemieux has not been without formal recognition, for he has received awards and honors from several civic and educational groups. In 1952, he received an honorary doctor of laws degree from Portland University, Portland, Oreg.; 1956 brought him a Seattle First Citizen Award from the Seattle Real Estate Board, and in 1958, he was given a distinguished service award by the Seattle University Alumni Association. In 1959, the Seattle Chapter of B'nai B'rith honored him with its man of the year award, and in 1962, Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.—where Father Lemieux had spent time as a student and instructor before coming to Seattle—presented him with an honorary doctor of laws degree.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I take this means of congratulating Father Lemieux for having expanded to such an extent the work begun by the two members of the Society of Jesus who came to Seattle in 1891 to establish a church and school. These two priests, the Reverend Adrian Sweere, S.J., and the Reverend Victor Garrand, S.J., in erecting these first buildings, imbedded deeply in our soil the roots of the splendid institution that is Seattle University today. The university's growth has been assisted by a great many excellent faculty members and generous benefactors since that time, who will always be remembered with love and gratitude, but I am sure that no single one of these has done more than has Father Lemieux to earn a place of honor in the hearts of all of us. I feel I can speak for all citizens of Seattle in expressing thanks for a job well done, as well as extending to this distinguished educator our best wishes for the future.

An editorial in a recent issue of the Seattle Times adds emphasis to all I have just said, and I should like to quote the editor's words at this point:

> Under the 17-year leadership of the Very Reverend A. A. Lemieux, Seattle University grew from a little two-block college to become the largest private university in the State. The university is now an asset of inclaculable worth to the community and the Northwest.
>
> This week Father Lemieux departs the office in which he has so ably served. His last special project here has been raising funds for a $2.5 million library which will become the academic center for the campus of 4,000 students.
>
> Friends of Seattle University have thought, from the very beginning of the fundraising project, that the library should be considered a monument to Father Lemieux's leadership.
>
> This feeling was made official Thursday evening at a farewell, appreciation banquet, when it was announced that the magnificent new addition to the campus will be named Lemieux Library.
>
> Indeed, a fitting tribute.

The 1964 Stokes Award—Miss Juanita Greene, of the Miami Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on April 9 in Miami, Fla., the Thomas L. Stokes award for the best daily newspaper writing on resource issues in 1964 was presented to Miss Juanita Greene, a staff writer of the Miami Herald.

This coveted award for distinguished journalistic endeavor was given to Miss Greene for her "penetrating series of articles on public utility rates and rate-making procedures in Miami and in Florida." The judges said Miss Greene's work "reflected deep digging into the records of the utilities and the regulatory agencies, and translation of the complex material into articles easy for the public to understand—all in the finest Tom Stokes tradition."

I want to express my own congratulations to Miss Greene for her tremendous accomplishment. I have read her work in the Miami Herald and the Stokes award committee does honor to itself and to the memory of the late, great Tom Stokes, the syndicated columnist for whom the award is named, by honoring Miss Greene for her notable series.

Miss Greene searched tax and earnings reports, questioned members of the Florida Public Utilities Commission and officers of the utilities, and talked to experts who had prepared a $12,000 survey of utility rates for the city of Miami. She reported both sides of the issue in simple language.

She commented at the end of her series:

> I am convinced now that the public can be effectively informed because the situation is not as complicated as the utilities and their attorneys would like their customers to believe.

I also wish to congratulate the Miami Herald for its great public service in encouraging Miss Greene to pursue her assignment and for courageously publishing her articles.

The Miami Herald found Miss Greene's digging so fruitful that it had this to report to its readers in an editorial entitled "Who Protects the Public?"

There is obviously nothing public about the Public Utilities Commission in Florida—

The Herald declared:

> It is clear that the railroad and the utility companies can do as they please because the State agency has fallen down on the job. At best, it is incompetence. At worse, it demands an immediate investigation by the Governor's office.

The Herald editorial continued:

> Whether the people of Florida deserve a reduction in the electric and phone bills is a question that will have to be decided by the courts. We certainly cannot look to the Utilities Commission for the answer.
>
> But one thing is clear immediately. The people of Florida are indebted to the Miami commission for that $12,000 survey. It has uncovered a real mess in Tallahassee.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that Miss Greene's series has helped bring about hearings on electric and telephone rates in Florida. I expect that Florida's utility consumers will benefit as a direct result. But I find it supremely ironic that this documentation of the shortcomings of utility regulation in my State does not deter the Florida Public Utilities Commission from urging that existing Federal regulation of electric sales be weakened.

S. 218 which is urged in the name of "States rights" would mean the end of responsible regulation of electric utility systems in the United States. It would substantially wreck the regulatory system created by the Congress in 1935.

This proposed legislation seeks to deprive the Federal Power Commission of its authority to regulate interstate wholesale electric sales. But if this power were taken from the FPC, the Florida Public Utilities Commission would not be able to fill the void in my State. The Florida commission has no jurisdiction over wholesale electric rates.

Mr. Speaker the Nation's electric consumers deserve better treatment than enactment of S. 218, or its counterpart, H.R. 5955.

The recent national power survey estimated that modern technology and cooperation in the electric power industry can result in savings to consumers of $11 billion a year by 1980. The key to realizing savings of this magnitude is more and more interstate movement of electric power, as more and more power systems pool their operations and join their systems with regional and national transmission lines to take maximum advantage of time, load, and seasonal diversities.

But at the same time that more power than ever is moving in interstate commerce, there are those who seek to destroy the one source of protection which consumers have—the Federal Power Commission.

I hope the progressive leaders in all segments of the electric power industry will stand up and oppose this attempt to turn back the clock to pre-1935 days, when there was virtually no Federal regulation of the power industry and when the State commissions which did exist were powerless to regulate operations beyond their respective State borders.

Healthy, fair, effective utility regulation can work. The FPC has been proving that since 1961.

I urge those forces which are now trying to destroy the FPC's ability to regu-

late to go back and reread their history. The Federal Trade Commission investigation of utilities in the late 1920's and early 1930's stands as a clear and present warning. The abuses unearthed in that investigation resulted in enactment of the Public Utility Holding Company Act and the Federal Power Act, in 1935.

To repeal substantial portions of those acts, as S. 218 or H.R. 5955 would do, would be to invite disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous agreement to insert in the RECORD at this point several of the articles which won for Miss Greene the 1964 Stokes Award.

The articles follow:

[From the Miami Herald, Nov. 15, 1964]

REGULATION BY EAR?—STATE WITHOUT RATE BASE FOR TWO KEY UTILITIES

(By Juanita Greene)

The State's rate fixing agency has nothing in its records to refute or support claims of an outside expert that Florida's two biggest utilities are overcharging customers.

The near empty files of the Florida Public Utilities Commission offered little last week except the suspicion that it is regulating the utilities by ear. Or at best, by scratch pad.

No current rate base could be found for either Florida Power & Light Co. or Southern Bell Telephone Co. Not even reasonably current. And the rate base is the key to utility regulation, because it shows how much money the utility has invested in its plant.

Without it, the PUC can't say whether the utilities are making more, less or as much as they are allowed.

The last rate base for Florida Power & Light Co. was worked out in 1960. The last for Southern Bell was in 1952.

Investigating to the last detail all the things that go into a rate base is a time-consuming job. And even its critics acknowledge that the PUC is overworked and understaffed.

But a rate base is not necessarily a complicated thing.

Even its definition, as found in Florida law, is simple:

Into the rate base should go "the money honestly and prudently invested in such property used and useful in serving the public, less accrued depreciation."

The gold-plated controversy stirred up by the city of Miami and utilities expert Arnold Hirsh revolves around a few simple points.

The problem is not so much understanding these figures, but getting them.

Try, for example, to find out on what basis the PUC ordered FPL to make its last and much-publicized rate reduction—the $10 million cutback last spring.

There are no work sheets in the files in Tallahassee to support it—no "underlying data."

"I'm sure there must have been a rate base worked up of some kind, but where it is, if it still exists, I don't know," said F. H. Romig, director of the PUC's finance department.

WHERE'S SCRATCH PAPER?

Romig, in Tallahassee, told Herald Capital Bureau Chief Robert Sherrill: "The whole thing may have been done on scratch paper until we finalize it. (It hasn't been finalized.) Maybe the scratch paper is around."

Romig then offered another clue. Working with him on the case was J. D. McClellan, an assistant.

"Maybe," said Romig, "he has it in his head."

McClellan was reached in Miami, where he is going through the books of a gas company.

He reported that his head contained no recent FPL rate base. None, he said, was worked out last spring during the negotiations.

All the PUC did, said McClellan, was take the company's 1963 annual report and divide what it earned into what it had invested.

That is similar to what Hirsch did in his independent study, using figures on file with the Federal Power Commission in Washington.

But the PUC's calculations are nowhere in the record.

So there are no PUC figures to compare with those arrived at by Hirsch.

The Washington, D.C., consultant disturbed the historic tranquillity on the utility regulation front last month with a report that both FPL and Southern Bell are being allowed to make far too much money.

In the past 5 years, he claims, they overcharged their customers more than $225 million.

Hirsch made his computations not only on book figures picked out of Federal Power Commission files in Washington (which are more complete than PUC files), but also on various adjustments he considered necessary. So the totals on his overcharges vary, depending on the adjustments made.

He called the $225 million figure conservative. Proportionately, it would be split by about $133 million for FPL and $92 million for Southern Bell.

FPL, Hirsch said, should be made to cut back another $29 to $33 million this year.

Southern Bell, he said, is making $25 million a year too much just on its operations inside the State—not counting the long-distance business that goes outside.

Impressed with the big figures, and Hirsch's experience and ability, Miami is pressing for some answers. It has put the burden not on FPL and Southern Bell, but the PUC, the only agency in Florida that can regulate them.

In preliminary remarks to what may develop into a long and hard-fought battle, the PUC called the Hirsch report "fantastic" and Southern Bell said it was "absurd." FPL, studying the report, has said nothing yet.

But Miami is sticking with Hirsch. It put his report in the hands of its legal department and has demanded an answer from the PUC in 30 days.

UTILITY BILLS? STATE FILES NO HELP

The city figures $225 million is too big a wad to be brushed aside with adjectives.

The "excess" profit would put a lot of the overhead wires in both systems underground.

It could build a superhighway of more than 200 miles, or a giant medical complex, or enable the State to forego its sales tax for more than a year.

Hirsch's principal complaint is that FPL and Southern Bell are padding their rates with expenses that don't belong there.

Though there are no official files to go on, it can be presumed that a comparison of Hirsch's figures and PUC figures would show:

That the PUC allows utilities to put more in their rate base than Hirsch does. And the bigger the rate base, the more income allowed.

That the PUC allows the utilities to deduct from their net operating income many items that Hirsch would include. The companies are allowed to make only a certain percentage of net operating income before, in theory at least, they are ordered to cut rates. So utilities try to divert as much as possible from "net operating income."

When the PUC last worked up a rate base for FPL, it took the period for the 12 months ending September 30, 1960, and arrived at a rate base of $471,994,000.

Hirsch took the year ending December 31, 1960, and figured it at $451,300,824. That's about $20 million less than the PUC allowed.

The PUC put net operating income at $35,900,000. Hirsch insured it at about a million more than that.

The PUC concluded that FPL was making too much money and ordered a reduction of gross revenues by $6,250,000. But Hirsch claims the company's excess was more than $20 million.

The PUC first worked up a rate base on FPL in 1957, 6 years after the State legislature took electric utility regulation away from the municipalities and put it in the hands of a State agency. After the first rate base came the first rate cut of $4,725,000. There was no public hearing and FPL didn't fight the order.

Two years later the PUC ordered a second, smaller reduction—$2,864,000. Then in April 1960, it cut another $200,000 by restricting excess capacity charges.

Then, also in 1960, the PUC and the public got curious about FPL's income when the power company came up with a loose half million dollars as retroactive payment for a new Metro franchise tax.

By July of that year the PUC staff was convinced the power company was making too much money. It was December before a reduction—of $6,250,000—was ordered. Like all reductions, it was to take effect on future, not past bills.

Seldom is a rate cut made retroactive, requiring refunds to overcharged customers. The PUC and most regulatory bodies operate on the "water over the dam" theory.

Hence the longer a reduction order is delayed, the more excess profits the utility is allowed to keep.

The 1960 order was preceded by a hearing, which was recessed after FPL officials suggested the two staffs get together and work out a compromise. Agreement was reached before the hearing reconvened.

The PUC study that led to the $10 million reduction last spring was prompted by the new Federal income tax law, which gave a break to all utilities and set off reduction orders all over the Nation. The FPL order was announced in April, at the time PUC Chairman Ed Mason was running for election.

When the PUC was handed the job of regulating fast growing utilities in a fast growing State, it had little to allow it to keep pace. For years it subsisted on stingy budgets appropriated by legislatures not unfriendly with the utilities. It got more money last time, but has a lot of catching up to do.

At the beginning, Romig recalls, there was only one man in the finance office.

Until 1956, there was no such thing as a field staff.

"About the only time we got to look at a company's books," said Romig, "was in a rate case."

In 1957 Romig went to the legislature and got money for a field staff of two, to ride herd on 200 utilities. In 1959 he got two more. Now there are 10. Three cover the Miami area, checking on more than 70 utilities.

The PUC staff is able to spend an average of 2 weeks of every quarter in FPL's office, checking over what FPL hires more than a hundred persons to compile. Much of the company's work is done on computers. When the PUC men go in to check this work, they have to employ the same techniques that would have been employed 50 years ago.

Public apathy also works as another handicap to the PUC, claims Lewis Petteway, its veteran general counsel, now also executive director.

In 1961 the PUC held a public hearing in Jacksonville on some significant changes in Southern Bell's rate structure. It was widely publicized in advance, though it was not to be a full scale hearing on all rate aspects and no rate base was worked up.

Hardly anybody showed up and the protests that were made were on minor points.

By contrast, in 1952 when a full scale rate hearing was held in Miami, the community raised about $100,000 and brought in outside experts. The hearing lasted for days, pro-

duced a pile of testimony that when stacked, stood three feet higher than Petteway.

That was the last time Southern Bell was called on the carpet and extensively challenged. Since then the rates have been adjusted up and down, but usually by informal negotiation.

Petteway stresses an important point in utility operation:

"The consumer pays for everything."

He also points out that it is the utilities that are regulated that get the regulatory laws passed.

Last spring Petteway complained in an interview:

"We don't get much help from the public. There are no organized consumer groups, and local government seldom lends us assistance."

Later the city of Miami appropriated $12,000 for the Hirsch report. It asked Metro and the 26 other Dade municipalities to participate but got no response. Miami, too, learned a lesson about apathy.

[From the Miami Herald, Nov. 25, 1964]

BIG JOB, NOT ENOUGH TOOLS: AN INDIFFERENT PUBLIC PICKS ITS THREE UTILITY GUARDIANS

(By Juanita Greene)

The decisions of three men affect the utility bills paid by millions of consumers. Curiously, they are not well known to the public which elects them. Their role is explained in this last article of a series on the utilities controversy.

Playing the role of public watchdog over Florida's private utilities today are three elected officials.

They are supposed to throw their weight into the democratic system of checks and balances.

Their decisions also have a definite bearing on bill balances and the checks that ratepayers mail monthly to electric, telephone, and some gas companies.

Despite their tremendous responsibilities, these three officials are little known to the general public, which elects them to office with yawning indifference.

On the Florida Public Utilities Commission is 77-year-old Jerry Carter, a wisecracking politician of the old school; 46-year-old Billy Mayo of Tallahassee, member of an old and politically entrenched Florida family; and 47-year-old Edwin Lee Mason from Miami, who rose rapidly after starting out as a peace justice in the once politically powerful Allapattah area.

With a stingy budget and an overworked staff, the PUC administers laws lobbied through the legislature by the utilities themselves.

Until recently, Florida spent more money on the livestock board's screwworm eradication program than it did on utility regulation.

Today the budget is up to a little over a million dollars a year, and it includes salaries for 144 persons, including the three commissioners who recently got raises from $12,500 to $14,000 a year.

Over the years, when few except the private utilities were paying much attention to the PUC, it developed a philosophy which the commissioners still expound today.

It deemphasizes the role of the ratepayer and underlines the importance of allowing the utilities plenty of financial flexibility so they can borrow money at good rates to continue rapid expansion.

When Mason was running his easy race for reelection last spring he declared the commission's task was that of fully protecting the public from excessive charges, yet assuring a healthy climate that will attract investors.

Lewis Petteway, the commission's veteran general counsel who now also serves as executive director, declared in a recent speech before an investors' group:

He called this a "huge irreparable loss to the ratepayer."

"We are convinced that nitpicking regulation can never make a worthwhile contribution to the economic growth and development of our State. On the contrary, we recognize that regulation must merit the respect and confidence of the sophisticated investors."

He said the attitude of a ratemaking body should be one of healthy cooperation rather than one of strained aloofness.

PUC: WATCHDOG IS ELECTED BY A YAWNING ELECTORATE

There are times, however, that the Commission does exhibit strained aloofness. It did so recently in an order rejecting a petition of a local attorney for a full-scale public hearing on what he termed were excessive rates charged by Florida Power & Light Co.

Said the PUC, in part, in its order of September 22:

"General rate investigations of large utilities are time consuming and tremendously expensive for all parties concerned. Ultimately, of course, such expense must be borne by the ratepayer."

Then it commented that some people are always dissatisfied with rates, regardless of the level, and ask for costly investigations.

It added:

"Even if it were feasible from a practical viewpoint, it would be economically unsound for a regulatory agency in the Nation's fastest growing State to permit and encourage continuous rate investigations."

History bears out this philosophy. Seldom in recent history has the PUC involved itself in a full-scale rate investigation of a big utility, and even less seldom has it taken its fight to court. Reductions usually are ordered after compromise conferences where the attitude of general cooperation prevails, and the utilities are seldom dissatisfied to the point of suing.

Despite its September decision, the PUC now plans a full scale hearing on FPL and Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co. rates in January.

Both hearings were prompted by a report made for the city of Miami by an outside rate expert who claims the State's two largest utilities are overcharging their customers. Miami sent the report, by Arnold Hirsch, to the PUC and asked for a reply.

The city, like all others in Florida, lost its right to regulate private power companies in 1951, when the legislature passed a bill giving the sole authority to the PUC. The bill had the acknowledged support of FPL and other utilities. Six years later the PUC called its first major hearing on FPL and ordered a reduction.

In his report, Hirsch charged that FPL and Southern Bell overcharged their customers by more than $225 million over the past 5 years.

To prevent this in the future, he suggested that the Governor be empowered to appoint a citizens board of review each year to look over the general rate situation in the State.

It would have the authority to examine all records of the PUC and the utilities it regulates, including their Federal income tax returns.

Other suggestions have been advanced from other sources for improving the effectiveness of the PUC. The PUC itself claims with more money to hire a bigger and better staff it could do a better job. This need was partly met by increased appropriations by the last legislature.

Petteway believes more public interest in and support of the PUC would be as effective as anything else.

Some of the most effective regulatory bodies work with a staff that is not under the direct control of the elected or appointed heads. This is the case with Metro's Water and Sewer Board. The staff is on the regular county payroll and does not take orders from the board, so its recommendations can be made more independently.

In discussing utility regulation and rate hearings, Petteway makes a point that he fears the public often overlooks. The cost of both the legal defense and prosecution is paid by the ratepayer.

The utility passes on the cost in its rates. The PUC lawyers and staff are paid for with State funds.

The utility lawyers are not only high priced, but frequently well known. Former Gov. LeRoy Collins, Petteway pointed out, once got $20,000 for handling a Southern Bell rate case while he was working as a private attorney. And Gov. Farris Bryant, he said, represented a gas company while in private practice.

Many members of the legislature also have private utilities among their private clients.

Drawing on his long experience in the business of public rate regulations, Petteway makes two other important points:

"It is the utilities that are regulated that get the regulatory laws passed."

And, "In the end, the ratepayer pays for everything, because all a utility's expenses are passed on to him."

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 13, 1964]

UTILITIES' TAX SAVINGS MAY BRING RATE CUTS

(By Juanita Greene)

(The Federal Government is enabling, Florida's private utilities to save a lot of money this year, and even more next year. In this report, Herald Staff Writer Juanita Greene shows how it could affect the ratepayer. The report is one of a series on the State's utility picture.)

Thousands of Florida's electric, gas, and phone customers can look forward to the New Year with some hope for lower utility bills.

The savings, if they materialize, will be compliments of Uncle Sam, partly or entirely.

For among those benefiting from last year's cut in Federal income taxes are all the State's privately owned utilities. They're saving millions. And they're due for another tax reduction next year.

The cut raises two significant questions.

Will Florida's Public Utilities Commission order all, or even some, of the companies to pass along the savings to their customers?

If a cut is ordered, will it be retroactive to cover all the extra revenue realized this year?

The first decision is up to the PUC. The second may be up to both the PUC and the courts.

The utilities started benefiting from the tax break last January 1. That is when the first Federal cut, from 52 to 50 percent of corporate income, went into effect.

Ten months later the utilities commission ordered each of the 75 companies it regulates to put the savings in a special account and await further instructions. Though it ordered the money set aside, the commission did not promise it would order it passed along to the consumer in the form of a rate cut. But it said it might.

Even if it does, however, there is some question whether the accumulated savings, piled up since last January, will ever reach the pocketbook of the ratepayer.

THEY'LL FIGHT ANY REBATES

The utilities are expected to fight a retroactive rebate. They will claim that any order for rate cuts can apply only to future, not past, earnings. Their main argument will be the well recognized "water over the dam" theory of utility regulation. It holds, and so have the courts, that reductions go into effect only after official hearings and the issuance of an official order.

Had the PUC ordered rate reductions in January or shortly thereafter, there would be less doubt that the savings would be passed along to the consumer. But, except in the case of Florida Power & Light Co., it made no official pronouncement until Novemberber 12. And that was not an order to cut rates.

Asked about the legality of a future rate cut order which would take in savings accumulated since January 1, or even to November 12, Lewis Petteway, general counsel for the PUC, replied:

"I'm afraid you are just going to have to speculate about that one.

"I am reasonably sure," he added, "that the utilities will think it can't be done."

The utilities will benefit from another income tax reduction to take effect January 1, 1965, when the tax goes down from 50 to 48 percent.

The fact that the utilities got a tax break this year and will get another next year was part, but not all, of the reason an outside consultant hired by the city of Miami is claiming that FPL and Southern Bell Telephone Co. are collecting excessive revenue from ratepayers.

Arnold Hirsch, Washington, D.C., said in his report that FPL should have been made to reduce its rates by at least $39 million this year and another million next year. Southern Bell, he said, should have cut $24 million this year on intrastate rates and another million next year.

REPORT CITES OTHER FAULTS

He said the companies were making excessive profit not only because of the income tax reduction but also because depreciation was excessive, the rate base too broad, and the allowable return too high. In addition, he claimed Southern Bell's capital structure was too unbalanced and too much of its profit was being siphoned off by American Telephone and Telegraph Co., its parent company, and Western Electric, its chief supplier.

Hirsch took note of the fact the PUC got FPL to agree to cut its rates by $10 million last May, but he said that was not enough. This year FPL will still make $29 million too much, he said.

The PUC also took note of the $10-million reduction when it called for public hearings, prompted by the Hirsch report, to be held in Miami early next year. Those on Southern Bell will be January 18 and March 29 and on FPL January 28 and April 12.

"A small part of the current year's reduction," reported the PUC on the FPL rate cut, "was due to the reduction in the Federal income tax rate on corporations, granted by the Congress, effective retroactive to January 1, 1964. No consideration was given in the $10 million reduction to the further decrease in the income tax rate for the year 1965, it being the purpose of the commission to take another look at the earnings of this utility in 1965, in light of the further reduction in the tax rate."

Of the $10 million cutback in revenue, only about a million and a half was attributable to the income tax break, FPL officials have reported.

PUC STUDIED FOR MONTHS

Apparently stung by the Hirsch report, which the city of Miami filed with the PUC in November with a request for "affirmative action," the PUC declared in an order for next year's rate hearings:

"The commission has been constantly involved since early March of this year in a series of investigations involving the earnings of all major utilities under its jurisdiction for the purpose of determining whether any rate reductions were in order for the various utilities involved."

It reported that Petteway had, on March 11, "announced in the city of Miami that the commission had even then begun an investigation" of the major utilities earnings.

This March 11 statement by Petteway, however, was no broadscale, general announcement. Petteway had come to Miami to address the Traffic Club on another matter and did not mention the tax cut or its effect on rates in his speech.

While he ate lunch a Herald reporter, asked him about the utilities' tax break, which by that time had already resulted in rate cut orders by some commissions in other States.

Petteway's remarks to the reporter were informal and off the cuff. He said the PUC had called for financial statements from regulated utilities to determine if rate cuts are in order. To date, except in the case of FPL, no determination has been made.

EXCESS GAINS IN MILLIONS

Hirsch figures that on the basis of the company's own books, with none of the adjustments re recommended, FPL will make an excess of $18,100,000 this year above the liberal 6.98-percent return on investment allowed by the PUC. Some, but not all, of this excess is due to the tax cut. Next year, he said, the excess, based on company records, will be $20,600,000 if no cut is ordered.

On the same basis he figures that Southern Bell made an excess of $9,950,000 over its allowable 6.6-percent return on intrastate investment this year. With a further tax break due next year, the excess will go up to $11,600,000 if no cut is ordered.

These figures do not take into account the other changes recommended by Hirsch, but only the surplus resulting from present procedures and the tax break.

In one of its orders the Commission reported that the hearing called on Southern Bell was the result of investigations in which "the Commission has been constantly involved since early March."

The purpose of the hearing, it said, will be that of "reviewing its earnings and rate structure, and making whatever adjustments, if any, may be appropriate and in the public interest."

Yet neither the Southern Bell nor the FPL hearings will be on orders of the PUC to show cause why its rates should not be reduced. Such an order would have put the burden of proof on the utilities. The orders, instead, put this burden on the city of Miami and Hirsch. They state that the Hirsch report, filed with the commission by the city, "constitutes a very serious indictment" and add that Miami has an "obligation" to support it.

SESSIONS SET "TO HEAR ALL"

FPL and Southern Bell have not been ordered to do anything in connection with the coming hearings. The PUC orders state the hearings were called "for the purpose of hearing all interested parties who desire an opportunity to testify" in order that "the commission may be fully advised," and "make whatever rate adjustment, if any, may be appropriate and in the public interest."

FPL and Southern Bell, declared the orders, "should be given an opportunity publicly to justify rates, charges and earnings."

The opportunities to be heard at the hearings were also extended to include the public—and the PUC itself."

It wants to bring "to the public's attention its various ratemaking policies and philosophies so that the public may know how its interest is protected."

Miami City Attorney John Barrett said several weeks ago that the city of Miami would bring Hirsch to testify at the hearings.

Other PUC-regulated utilities benefiting from the income tax are gas companies that supply customers through underground systems. That includes all natural gas and some manufactured gas companies. One of the largest and fastest growing—City Gas—still is operating in Dade and several other counties on temporary rates set by the PUC without public hearing.

Society, the Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the House to an original prize-winning speech written by Miss Regina Bailey, a student at the University of Wisconsin Kenosha Center. Miss Bailey recently received a first-prize award for this presentation at the 17th annual intercenter forencis tournament. I am convinced that you will find this as informative as I did.

The speech follows:

SOCIETY, THE JUDGE

(By Regina Bailey)

What a wonderful country we live in. How great to belong to a free, rich nation. Just look at all we have. Our modern skyscrapers are among the greatest manmade structures in the world. Our dams hold back mighty rivers. We have conquered our sky and are reaching forward to begin a conquest of the universe.

And man, what have we done for man? Why that's easy. Educational institutions are booming throughout the Nation. Research is developing at a pace more rapid than ever. New methods of teaching are continually being brought to light.

But is man really being taken care of in our modern society? I mean the inner man. What has society done to aid man in his search for truth and self? Well, it is this society which often leaves man wandering aimlessly in spirit, that claims the right to judge a man's actions, though often these actions are the result of the temperament and trends of this very society. Let's take a look at what's happening to our people today.

A young high school girl got a hold of a quart of whisky. Because of a fight with her boyfriend she drank the entire contents during noon hour. That afternoon the girl was rushed to the hospital from school where she'd collapsed. She narrowly escaped death.

More often this carelessness with potential dangers is showing up. On February 10 our city's newspaper reported the following: "Sunday, five juvenile boys, 14- and 15-year old's, were brought to police headquarters several of them completely intoxicated as the result of drinking stolen liquor." The question that comes to my mind is where were their parents and their training? Especially when it happens over and over again.

It isn't only the younger generation which is losing its balance in life. In New York, one of the top violin makers shot his wife in front of their 12-year-old daughter. They had had an argument over visitation rights concerning their child. They'd had their marriage annulled.

About the same time two men were arguing as to whether or not the dog of the first would bite the second. The argument became violent and one man was shot in the chest. Is this the reaction we must come to expect?

A politician in our town had a lovely wife and children. But the world began to overpower him. He had moody spells, and began to drink heavily. He lost interest in family responsibilities. Finally he killed himself. Others, some famous like Marilyn Monroe, have also found the world just too much to take.

The saddest documentary of our times is the unreasoned killing. A boy, who stabbed

a girl he knew because he'd had the urge to do it. Another boy, denied use of the car, took a shotgun, killed his parents and sister, then turned himself in to the police.

These horrible cases, children killing, suicide among young adults all help us see the deadly diseases which are afflicting our society. I believe that in some way, most of these tie in with the loss of, or indifference toward a deep religion and faith. Let us see in one case what this loss of religion helped to bring about.

In the February Reader's Digest, in an article entitled "If They Had Only Waited," a mother tells her story. The story in which she is preparing the wedding of her 18-year-old son, class valedictorian, to his already pregnant girl. She says, "Long ago I had given up attending church, assuming that Paul could learn the difference between right and wrong at home, could select his own religion when he was older. Naturally, he soon abandoned Sunday school. But what spiritual inspiration had I given him as a substitute for church?"

Paul did just as his mother wished, but he chose the religion of self indulgence. His mother was very good about giving him the marks of success in our society, a jalopy of his own, and a nice, good-looking girl. What she failed to give him, as she herself admits is the strong spiritual background necessary to cope with our modern world.

Then we have Paul's religion of self indulgence. This shows lack of concern and disregard for others. This concern is a very essential part of almost every religion. Could we say that his girl, Nancy benefited from his selfishness? Did the parents of these two children deserve the slap in the face they received? Paul and Nancy in their selfishness succeeded only in bringing heartbreak to two families.

It's strange, isn't it, the way society is willing to compromise its morals, and people are ever ready to rationalize a judgment so they can do it their way. People no longer think much of the already pregnant bride. What of the girl who follows the same course yet is unable to get married? Society seems to soothe its conscience be scorning this girl and the child she may bear.

What I want is a religious person. No, not the individual who goes to church as though he were a machine. Rather a person who thinks of success or failure in terms of good and bad, not in terms of riches; a person who realizes an act is wrong even though it may be something he wants. A person who is concerned about others.

This individual would also get the bonus of improved mental health. Here again society tends to look down on and judge harshly the mentally ill. And again it may be in part society's attitude toward religion which helps bring about the commonness of mental illness.

On Sunday, February 21, This Week section of the Milwaukee Journal was devoted entirely to mental health. On the very first page was an article entitled "Faith as Medicine." It stated, "A strong and determined faith creates mental and emotional security and helps allay anxieties within the family as well as those strains and pressures outside it." Maybe the loss of faith has a greater effect than just the protection of moral standards. Maybe society should not smile quite so condescendingly at the believer.

Maybe the man who sought suicide as the answer to his problem could have used the strength and consolation of faith to help him when the world became too trying. Maybe the children and adults who drink and use dope wouldn't need their world of fantasy. I believe that part of the reason a strong faith helps us so much in our daily lives, is that it helps us keep our view of the world from becoming too distorted. It keeps in our mind a purpose for doing what is right, and an aid to accomplishing it.

We have called society a judge, and that she is. Throughout our lives she observes, either approving or disapproving. But I claim that society is an irresponsible judge. The people of our society often condemn individuals for situations and incidents made possible by values which society as a whole accepts.

It is you and I who form the backbone of society. If we refuse to compromise our morals, and refuse to stand by as our fellow man approaches defeat. Only then will others follow. Only then can we look upon the whole of the people of our country the Great Society, and say the words of praise, "You are just in your judgment."

The So-Called Voting Rights Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which recently appeared in the Southwest Virginia Enterprise, a newspaper published in the city of Wytheville, Va. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and particularly to all at the executive level of the Federal Government who assisted in drafting and recommended passage of the so-called voter rights bill.

The editorial follows:

THE SO-CALLED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Only a mighty tidal wave of public protest, rolling from all sections of the country can prevent the passage of what in our opinion is the most vindictive law ever presented to a Congress of the United States. The radical, mentally disturbed, hatred-filled brain of Thaddeus Stevens who strutted in Congress during the Reconstruction era years never devised a plan or a punitive law more un-American in content, and unconstitutional in aim than the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (H.R. 6400-S. 1564), the President's law. It is a law that could well dismember the United States even while we fight our deadliest enemy on the other side of the world.

Never have we had a greater concern or deeper worry for the future of this Nation as a democracy than at this hour. We are not thinking in terms of any political party, be it Democrat or Republican, for some leaders in Congress of both parties stand today by virtue of their own statements and actions as sponsors and supporters of the bill. The venerable and highly respected HARRY F. BYRD (30 years of service in the Senate) called it a "vicious bill. It clearly bears the unreasonable stamp of hysteria * * * the provisions are iniquitious in effect and contemptible in design * * * the extremes to which the administration and its Attorney General have gone to exempt the majority of States and convict a minority are beyond the realm of reason * * * they demonstrate the bias and the prejudice under which the bill was conceived and with which it will be enforced * * * Neither the bill nor the testimony is worthy of men entrusted with high office in the national Government of our country." With these and many, many more, truthful and factual statements, the Virginia Statesman that has steadfastly pursued and advocated the precepts of Patrick Henry, Jefferson, Wilson and others has done so in pointing out that he issued the statement "as a member of the U.S. Senate, representing Virginia to uphold the Federal Constitution."

It has been our belief that all Senators—all Members of the House—the President, are pledged and have taken an oath, with hand placed on the Holy Bible to uphold the Constitution of the United States. If we are correct, then how can any official stand before the people of the Nation, and the entire world crying out his determination to uphold the Constitution, as he swings his right hand, while the left hand remains like it was tied to his body. In other words, to enforce that part of the Constitution that appears to be politically expedient, but stomp, cover over, bury, forget that portion which assures States rights and protection for all Americans—yes, even the minorities? Is not this what has been taking place? Has any other person, aside from Dr. Martin Luther King, who is welcomed to the White House with open arms had the intestinal fortitude to tell the Nation that he will break a law when he considers it unjust? Dare Governor Barnett, of Mississippi or Governor Wallace, of Alabama, make such a statement? Mr. Barnett is supposedly still being pursued by the Justice Department boys for disobeying a court order. Dr. King did likewise but it was not even criticized to our knowledge by one single member of the Justice Department.

The brazen attitude of Attorney General Katzenbach is really startling. Senator BYRD points out that the head of the Justice Department "has documented his own cynicism. He has proclaimed his impatience with judicial process and his lack of faith in it." Labeled by Columnist Ross Valentine as King Katzenbach's Konspiracy, the Attorney General admits he wrote the bill, that Virginia and five other States of the South and Alaska will be incriminated, but that Texas will (Johnson's home State) be exempt.

Never in our lifetime, and from whatever knowledge we have gained of the history of the United States, have we read or heard of as much unadulterated hypocrisy contained in one bill. Here in the limelight of the people of all 50 States, and viewed from afar (often with misunderstanding, thanks to the slanted reporting) by millions are the high-ranking leaders of this great Nation, pictured with tears (but they are crocodile tears) running down their cheeks at the injustices of voting, while they sit in their swivel chairs and luxury-filled offices and actually have the gall to say the bill is to eliminate discrimination. It requires no knowledge of law; it requires no college graduate, or even a high school graduate, for an average child in the upper grades of the Wytheville elementary school, who has read and has been given some directed study of the Constitution, to recognize it as despotic discrimination.

Outwardly today as in the many years past, Washington, when viewed by the eye for outward appearances is beautiful, inspiring, colorful, the Capital of the present greatest Nation in the known world. But look closely, and one does not have to wait long to smell the stench that comes from the smoke screen that rises from the centralization of power for every State and individual. It is nauseating, and we cannot possibly visualize or attempt to peer into the future, for we are today at the forks of the road. The so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965 has led the United States to that destination. Its passage can very easily place all Americans on the road that has only one ending—dictatorship, a police state.

The proposed bill drawn up by a man who in our book is saturated with prejudice and biased views has challenged an ex post facto law. It is forbidden by article I of the Constitution—that proposes to make a crime of

yesterday's violations (for 10 years back) of voting registration practices that are to be outlawed. And its provisions to deprive a few States of the South (a punishment obvious to all) of the power to establish a literacy test for all voters irrespective of race or color is in further violation of the Constitution. There is something dreadfully wrong as we stated in a previous paragraph, when one shouts about enforcing the Constitution, and 5 minutes later endorses and asks for passage at once of a law that is as filled with holes of an unconstitutional nature as a sifter.

The idea of depriving, and mind you, the South only (and only six States) of any voter qualification other than age and residence is a death sentence, but the punishment is meted out in stages. The torture chamber of medieval England would be a good comparison. While we do not agree or endorse all that Liberty Lobby says, we are in complete agreement with the description of that periodical below as the death is carried out in stages:

"First, the rise of a new class of Southern State politician—a breed of demagogs—coming into political power on a wave of pie-in-the-sky promises of free State money for everyone.

"Next, the futile attempts to carry out those promises by taxing the farms, business, and industry of the South at ever-increasing rates, even while failing to satisfy the demands of the poor for more * * * and more and more and more.

"Then the flight of business and industry from the unbearable demands of the welfare state, and the tragic streams of white refugees—following their jobs to the North and West.

"Finally, the necessary establishment of the all-black States as Federal reservations, populated only by Government bureaucrats and their Negro dependents, but—unlike their counterparts on the Indian reservations—represented in Washington by a powerful voting bloc of nearly 40 Congressmen and 8 Senators."

Unless every thoughtful American who dreads the dismemberment of his country as much as Abraham Lincoln did will write not only his Congressman and both Senators, but every Congressman of his State, and as many Senators as feasible, they are unlikely to be able to withstand the pressure for passage. The distinguished Senators BYRD and ROBERTSON deserve special praise, as does BILL TUCK.

And if this bill passes, it will be a greater victory for the Communists (whether or not they have had anything to do with it) than our defeat in Korea.

Upbeat Thinking by GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from Freedom in Education, entitled "Upbeat Thinking by GOP," referring to the Republican alternate education proposal:

UPBEAT THINKING BY GOP

The Republican education aid bill may very well prove, in the long view of history, to be of greater significance than the Johnson education program.

For the Democratic proposal labors under the author's own genius for compromise. Herbert Bayard Swope once put it this way: "I cannot give you a formula for success, but I can give you a formula for failure—which is: Try to please everybody." Which might suggest that the Johnson bill, though apparently assured of passage, may contain the seeds of its own future difficulties.

The Republicans have come up with an aid bill that neatly sidesteps the church-state controversy and provides complete equality of treatment for every taxpayer and schoolchild. The GOP in Congress is surely to be commended for performing with ability the classic role of the minority. The concept of grants of up to $200 to parents of schoolchildren, tied in with a college tax-credit proposal, as advocated by the Republicans, is certainly bold and imaginative; it is worthy of a more serious response from the Democratic opposition than being labeled as mere warmed over Goldwaterism. Indeed, it resembles more closely the classic junior GI bill of rights in calling for direct grants to parents, and its college tax-credit features are modeled directly on Democratic Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF's bill which came within two votes of passage in 1964.

If it is conceded that the chief drawback of the GOP proposal is that it does not guarantee assistance to education (the aid being in the form of cash and credits to individuals), a correction can be found in the original GI bill itself, which the Republican spokesman referred to when introducing their proposal. Grants under the GI bill did indeed go to the individual, as with the Republican bill, but they were negotiable only for education expenses at an accredited school.

It may well be that the GOP proposal could cause both parties to pause from the argument long enough to review the issue in the light of the GI bill. Surely the Democratic leadership should stop long enough to consider how much could be gained if they would disengage themselves from the clutches of Madam Compromise and try aiding the individual. How much indeed would be gained if future aid programs of both parties were designed to meet the needs of the ultimate object of our concern in education: the student.

In any event it must be acknowledged that the Republican proposal has advanced the day when America can put aside the discussion of the religious faiths of her children and concern herself with the educational needs of these children, not their creeds. CEF applauds this advance and wishes it well.

A Teenager's Thoughts on Negotiations Over Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the President's speech last night at Johns Hopkins University in which he reversed his prior position of negotiation only from strength and committed us to another Korean truce talk marathon, I submit to my colleagues what one American teenager is thinking:

HUNTINGTON, N.Y.,
April 7, 1965.

Representative GROVER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read in the New York Times that mail is mostly in favor of negotiations on Vietnam. I am opposed to it. Whenever we negotiate with the Communists we bargain and compromise our rights, not theirs. These negotiations would be no different.

I am in support of any measures needed to win the war in Asia. We cannot keep allowing communism to grow and still expect to have a free world. People who say we have no business in Vietnam (Is WAYNE MORSE serious or does he just like to debate?) are wrong. Even if we weren't concerned about the independence of Vietnam (I say independence because we refuse to guarantee a free government) it is a vital link in the geographical containment of communism. We must protect our form of government using whatever means are necessary. In international affairs the end justifies the means, to a reasonable degree. My only question is why weren't effective tactics used months ago? All Americans must remember that if the North Vietnamese and Red China wanted peace, all they would have to do is stop their aggression and subversion. It seems some people want the United States to be a real big brother, never hurting or striking back, never getting angry, never going on the offensive itself. We are at war in Asia, yet our governmental policy is to achieve stalemate. Why not attempt to beat North Vietnam? If we are sucessful, then it is free. If we are half successful, we have a compromise (with the south free). Now, if we are only half successful, we have lost.

I do not want war. I would be crazy if I did, for I am still in high school and will probably have to go into the service within the next decade. But we must protect ourselves and our beliefs.

Sincerely,

BOB DIETZ.

Farmer and the Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, entitled "Farmer and the Market" from the April 7 issue of the Washington Daily News:

FARMER AND THE MARKET

One of the featured points in the argument the Johnson administration has offered for the catchall farm bill just sent to Congress is that it would save the Treasury an estimated $200 million. And still increase income to farmers.

A taxpayer saving of $200 million in less Federal subsidy to farmers and an additional $100 million assigned to raising crop prices would both come from hiking the prices of what the consumer buys.

It adds up to this: In exchange for the iffy prospect that as a taxpayer he may be stuck for less to prop up farm prices, the consumer would pay more for the food he buys—another penny a loaf for bread, for instance.

By stretching hard, we can dimly see a possible virtue in this. It could be interpreted as the first feeble step toward restoring the marketplace, instead of the Government, as the controlling factor in farm prices. This is, or ought to be, the ultimate purpose of any farm program.

But his bill, if anything, tightens Federal controls over farming—at least in feed grains, rice, wheat, wool, and land use. (The cotton scheme will come later.)

Agriculture Secretary Freeman says the farmer ought to look more to the market for

his income than to the Government. But how can he do this when the Government goes as far as it does in telling him how much he can plant, outbidding the market for his products, and otherwise entrapping him in redtape?

In sum, the new bill is mostly a rehash of the type of farm legislation which has been in effect the last 30 years. The result of that legislation is an enormous Government hoard of farm products, a drop in farm exports, a decline in farm income and higher prices for consumers. Not to mention a huge cost to the taxpayers.

President Johnson is said to be planning a blue-ribbon commission to review the whole monstrous farm program. We need another Government commission like a cotton farmer needs another boll weevil. But if this is a sign that the administration at last recognizes that somehow the Government has got to get at least most of the way out of the farm business, it may be a hopeful sign.

So far, progress to that end has been nil.

A Man Named William and "The Good Old Days"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Erich Klossner, of Pullman, Wash., recently made an excellent speech at the annual speech contest of the toastmasters. His speech is entitled "A Man Named William and 'The Good Old Days' " and I was so impressed with his articulate and well-expressed remarks that I wanted my colleagues to have an opportunity to read Mr. Klossner's speech. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include the speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

A MAN NAMED WILLIAM AND "THE GOOD OLD DAYS"

(By Erich Klossner)

Mr. Chairman, fellow toastmasters, and guests; at a time when the world seems to be preoccupied by so many cross-purposes of mankind, let us reflect a little while on what a man named William so often referred to as "The good old days." Some of you may recognize in William a likeness to some individual you have known. Who William was is not important. But what William was, and the things he stood for, could be of interest.

William was a member of a past Midwest generation, who, if asked to make an icebreaker speech in toastmasters, would decline on the grounds that he had had no education. As the oldest in a family of 10 children he soon became aware of the meaning of responsibility, which allowed him only one 3-month period of formal classroom education. But in the practical school of hard knocks he absorbed the impact of clearing 160 acres of scrub oak, hickory, and maple, not with power machinery, but by hand with ax and saw; with pick and shovel. Too many times he saw this land he had cleared, washed over by the adjacent river before the crops of wheat and corn could be harvested. So, after 40 years of such hand-to-mouth existence, having learned the carpentry trade through intermittent periods of apprenticeship, it was quite by chance that he became interested in a brochure featuring the advantages of a small northwest town of 1,100 inhabitants, which was bound to grow because a State agricultural college had been established there just 12 years before. It looked like a real opportunity for a carpenter.

So, at the age of 41, with his life savings of $250 in his pocket, and a family of six for whom to establish a future, William headed westward to this promised land. Today there are scores of buildings still sturdy and habitable because of his skill with the tools of his trade. Sixty years ago, when an exceptional construction plan called for a circular stairway, the contractor consulted the college manual arts department for a procedural technique on how to lay out a circular stairway. The head of the department advised him to turn his problem over to William—he was the logical choice for such an assignment. In later years one of William's most treasured possessions was a textbook on manual arts, published by this same head of the manual arts department. It was inscribed: "To William, a master of his craft."

This was the uneducated man who would be amused by such later-day slogans as: "A chicken in every pot"; "the New Deal"; "the Fair Deal"; "the New Frontier"; the "Great Society." Because he was uneducated he could not follow the logic of killing off little pigs and plowing under growing crops as a means toward better times. Because he was uneducated he felt that Government tampering with the currency and devaluing the dollar was just another way of adding water to the soup. Because he was uneducated he frowned on the practice of cash price supports and subsidies for idle lands. As an uneducated individual he never shared the advantages of a minimum wage law, sick leave with pay, unemployment compensation, nor old-age public assistance programs. In his uneducated way he argued that wealth and prosperity could not be legislated, but had to be achieved through the mechanics of productive enterprise, motivated by the individual's faith in his own potential.

Thus in his later years, because of the bureaucratic takeover of much that was once the individual's responsibility, he often pondered "the good old days." The good old days when it was deemed safer to hide a few savings dollars in a baking powder can stashed away in the rear of the kitchen cupboard, rather than trust it to a bank whose deposits were uninsured. The good old days when summer dust on the highways and winter mud on Main Street was ankle deep. The good old days when the fire department consisted of one hose cart, drawn by whatever dray outfit was first on the scene, perhaps in time to wet down the smoldering ashes. The good old days when the leg-weary farmer followed behind a team of horses pulling a single-blade plow; when it required a harvest crew of 32 hands to accomplish what 3 men and a combine can do today. The good old days when scarlet fever, diphtheria, typhoid and consumption cut the span of life expectancy to 20 years less than it is today. The good old days of which the contemporary Joaquin Miller wrote: "Oh, these battles, they last so long, from babyhood to the grave."

But for William they would always be the good old days because he was on his own. Every barrier of economic frustration provided a challenge and incentive to the end of his 95 years. By the time of his final exit he long had known the lateness of the hour; the shadows falling from the cross of age, on narrowing trails that vex and circumvent. Now we enshrine him and "the good old days" in memory, like a flower, its blooming done—reverently preserved between the gently folded pages of sacrifice, diligent application and honest intent. The good old days? Did they ever exist? Of course that answer must depend upon your viewpoint. But a man named William—he did exist; he was a reality; he was my dad.

A Newspaper Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Copley newspapers have rendered distinguished service from Illinois to California. Many of us in Washington are familiar with their work through the articles by Herbert Klein, editor of the San Diego News. The St. Louis Globe Democrat, December 26–27, 1964, printed a book review by Louis La Cross, editor emeritus of the Globe Democrat, reviewing the personal history of the newspaper Copleys, entitled "The Thin Gold Watch."

Mr. La Cross, who is a distinguished St. Louis editor, made comments which are of interest and which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues:

THE COPLEYS—ILLINOIS TO CALIFORNIA: A NEWSPAPER SUCCESS STORY—"THE THIN GOLD WATCH," A PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE NEWSPAPER COPLEYS

(By Walter S. J. Swanson (Macmillan) reviewed by Louis La Cross)

This story of the Copleys and the Copley chain has its roots in Illinois, but the Copleys really struck it rich in the newspaper business in California and the chain now has been extended to Hawaii.

The founder, Col. Ira Clifton Copley, bought his first newspaper in Aurora, Ill., in 1905 and before his death in 1947 had acquired 24, though when he turned over the command to his adopted son, Jim, in the symbolic, thin gold watch ceremony, the total had been reduced to 14. Jim remains the head man with papers in Illinois at Springfield, Elgin, Aurora and Joliet; in California at San Diego and other cities.

Ira Copley's family was in the utility business and this is where he got his start. The parents moved from New York to Aurora to establish a gas-light company. Ira, who was born in 1864, went to Yale. He returned from school to find his family in dire circumstances due to competition from the development of electricity. The Yale-educated son had to earn a living by turning to manual labor including ditch digging, until the family's gas firm made a comeback. Ira's career became many sided: soldier, utility magnate, newspaper owner and politician. Politics really got him into the newspaper business—he bought the Aurora paper to bolster his political career. It did—he served 12 years in Congress.

A member of the Illinois National Guard, the "colonel" title was acquired during his service in the Spanish American war.

The thin gold watch tradition was established when the citizens of Elgin, where Copley had a paper, decided to give him a testimonial dinner and to present an Elgin gold watch with I. C. Copley enscribed across the front. The citizens' thoughtfulness did not extend to remembering to pay for the gift. So Copley footed the bill and the watch became his most highly regarded possession, which he passed on to his adopted son, Jim, as the symbol of management.

The selection of Jim to direct the newspapers caused another adopted son, Bill (from different parentage) long a resident of Paris, to file suit for an accounting of the $26,000,000 estate. A court order settled the claim and Jim was assured full command.

The story includes wealthy publishers who crossed the Copley path in California: E. W.

Scripps, William Randolph Hearst, F. W. Kellogg and John D. Spreckels, Scripps and Spreckels both once lived in San Diego and had papers there. They were purchased by Colonel Copley. The Copley Press now has a newspaper monopoly in San Diego, sixteenth largest city in the Nation, with a metropolitan area of more than 1,000,000 population.

While the colonel was a Republican congressman, he classified his newspapers as politically independent.

The endurance of the Copley chain may be regarded as the realization of the colonel's dream of a father and son successful association. The author of this book is a Copley editorial executive.

Scare Talk Hits at Coal's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial, entitled "Scare Talk Hits At Coal's Future," which appeared in the April 3, 1965 issue of the Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

SCARE TALK HITS AT COAL'S FUTURE

As if coal didn't have enough problems—competing with Government-subsidized nuclear energy, a flood of cheap residual oil from Latin America and its fair competition from oil and gas—a Purdue University professor of nuclear engineering is sounding a doom warning in a bid for a stepup in atomic-energy developments.

Dr. Lew Kowarski says that the United States will have used up its entire reserves of coal, gas and oil by the year 2020—a comparatively short 55 years from now.

Dr. Kowarski, a visiting Frenchman, says our civilization is doomed—or at least faces a definite end "of industrial civilization if no replacement is found." What Dr. Kowarski is pushing for is rapid establishment of atomic breeder reactors which would literally make possible the burning of rocks, whereby the U.S. soil would yield enough energy to last for millions of years.

Nobody ever got anything for nothing—not really—so we have to offer some unscientific skepticism about the whole business. The truth is that these breeder reactors are terribly costly to build. A pilot model of one is currently being built near Fayetteville, Ark., in an international cooperation of Government and business.

Such facilities would eventually produce energy at a cheaper cost than today's conventional fuels, but at a comparatively huge initial cost.

Granted that our fossil fuels—coal, gas, and oil—will some day be depleted, we still deplore scare talk like that of Dr. Kowarski. We have good reasons, we think, to doubt his 2020 projection. New reserves of fossil fuels are being discovered—and more efficient methods of extracting them from the earth are being developed—at a more rapid rate than they are being used, unless our information is false.

The day will come—though not in the lifetimes of more than a fraction of today's population—when nuclear energy, solar energy and perhaps something even better will furnish our chief fuel and power supplies.

Scare talk now shouldn't be needed. And haste in pouring vast sums of public moneys into competition with industries that furnish a livelihood for hundreds of thousands of people is just not wise or even proper.

Fighting Crime With Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, perhaps some of my colleagues missed the following article which appeared in the April 2, 1965, Washington Daily News and I would like to bring it to their attention at this time. It requires the thoughtful consideration of each of us.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 2, 1965]

FIGHTING CRIME WITH STATISTICS

(By Richard Starnes)

In the plaintive lingua franca with which organs of doctrinaire liberalism communicate, the signal has been passed that the way to cope with the Nation's crime problem is to question its existence.

A rash of stories has appeared in New York, Washington, and elsewhere containing the same wistful theme: What appears to be a grave increase in crime is nothing more than statistical legerdemain authored by that sly old sleight-of-hand artist who runs the FBI.

It is not stated quite that baldly, to be sure, but that is the line anyway, and we are certain to hear a great deal more of it. J. Edgar Hoover has always been fair game to the handwringers, and the new there-ain't-anybody-here-but-us-chickens approach to the Nation's crime problem is part and parcel of this old hostility.

But an important new element has been added. Gradual awareness had developed that there is one crime statistic that transcends all the others. This is simply the sad, monumentally discouraging fact that nearly 8 out of 10 serious crimes that take place in the United States are committed by repeaters—by parolees, unregenerate beneficiaries of wrist-slap sentences, scornful backsliders whom penologists call by the unpronounceable term "recidivists."

This shocking, and generally ignored, statistic means a number of things, all of them profoundly distasteful to the sort of mind that coined that classic bit of sentimental rubbish about there being no such thing as a bad boy. If 80 percent of serious crime is committed by old lags who repeatedly have been thru the revolving-door courts, jails, and parole boards, it is clear evidence that there is serious failure in our system of dealing with criminals after their arrest.

What is wrong—and what the people who are zeroing-in on the FBI's statistical picture of crime dare not admit—is that the philosophy of probation, parole, indeterminate sentence, and unduly light terms for serious offenses is a proven failure. It is not important whether the criminal is categorized as sick or wicked, but it is important if he is turned loose when the odds are 4 to 1 he'll quickly revert to type and prey on me and mine.

J. Edgar has done a thing rare in the annals of Government. He has run a powerful national investigative agency without permitting it to become an instrument for the oppression of the people. But even this is not enough for the ordained liberal messiahs; he has earned their enmity by his patient campaign to bring sanity into the treatment of criminals. With a characteristically oblique approach they now seek to palliate the Nation's failure to deal realistically with crime by attacking—not crime or criminal—but the FBI's statistical picture of same.

The same species of nonthink has taken place in the United Kingdom, which has also been plagued by an epidemic increase in crime. Again in England the statistics were blamed, and there they have succeeded in wiping out one large category of crime with the stroke of a pen. Auto theft, it was ruled, would no longer be classified as theft until the car has been missing for 28 days. That sharply reduced the statistical incidence of auto theft, to be sure, but it did nothing to reduce the disgraceful frequency with which Great Britain's criminals pinch other chap's motors.

A Great and Historic Landmark

SPEECH

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, we in this Congress are leaving more than footprints on the sands of time. We are passing legislation which raises great new standards whose effect will be felt for generation after generation yet unborn.

As a former teacher, I feel very deeply about the need for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. When this bill is signed by the President, it will constitute a great and historic landmark. Men and women with vision, imagination and determination in and out of the Congress have fought unceasingly for this legislation. As a result, we are now on the threshold of a new era in education.

HELP FOR STUDENTS IN NEED

Mr. Speaker, when I first had the good fortune to come to this great Congress, it appeared to me that the over-riding priority in this Nation should be legislation of this nature. Before voting for tanks, planes, and guns, and before voting funds for the space program, I felt it was necessary to place first things first and bolster our education system. That is why, on several occasions, I voted against huge defense and space appropriations because I felt that education aid was the first priority and the very basis for a strong defense and space program. When the House passed the aid to education bill in 1960, and the clerk called my name in the rollcall, I was tempted to shout "Hallelujah," instead of "Aye." Although the bill passed in 1960, it did not successfully negotiate all the legislative shoals. Like many education bills since, it failed. There followed several years of fruitless controversy over the church-state issue and other sources of deadlock. But we have now overcome these obstacles.

There are about 105,000 children from low-income families in West Virginia who will benefit from this legislation

under title I, which provides $15.7 million for the State of West Virginia. I am pleased that local school administrators will decide the projects for which these title I funds will be made available.

BOOKS AND LIBRARY MATERIALS

Some $900,000 will be provided to West Virginia schools for books and library materials. In the last school year, the average schoolchild in West Virginia shared in only about $2.19 worth of school library resources. The West Virginia school libraries contained an average of only eight books per pupil. Title II will furnish means for more closely approximating the standard figures of $4 to $6 annual per pupil library expenditures, and the 10-volume-per-pupil library content recommended by the American Library Association.

SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL CENTERS

The remaining titles of the bill allocate funds for establishing supplemental educational centers and services in areas where educational opportunities in the regular schools are limited; for broadening current and establishing new programs of educational research and implementing the findings of such programs; and for the improvement of State education departments throughout the Nation. The results to be expected from these measures are meritorious in themselves, and they will also influence the accomplishment of the purpose of title I: the provision of high quality education in low-income areas.

ALLOCATION FORMULA

During our debate on this bill, attention was called to the disparity among States in the amounts of money the schools in the various States would receive, especially under title I. Such disparities are bound to exist under a formula which takes under consideration the varying population figures of the States, and more so if the amount of money per pupil spent by a State is added as a factor in the allocation formula. This, of course, was the case in the formula of H.R. 2362.

Under the formula, the amount of the grant to each State is determined by multiplying the number of school-age children from families with annual income of less than $2,000—including children from families whose income is more than $2,000 only because they receive aid to families with dependent children relief—by one-half the average per pupil school expenditure within that State. Since some States have many eligible children and some only a few, and since there is a wide range among the States in the average per pupil expenditure, disparities are the result.

A look at the nature of these disparities should prove useful.

The grants to New York under this bill will equal about 4 percent of that State's total educational outlay before this measure. For West Virginia, the figure would amount to 12.2 percent. So while New York may receive a larger total of money than West Virginia, it is equally clear that the grant to West Virginia represents a larger proportionate addition to the funds to be expended in education than does the grant to New York.

AN EDUCATOR COMMENTS

Dr. Grant Venn, Wood County superintendent of schools, recently wrote me:

The children of this country simply cannot be educated based on the present tax system which makes local funds so scarce for this purpose, even though the local and State efforts have far exceeded local moneys in this area. This bill literally provides general education aid to each school district based on the number of low-income children in the schools. To me, this seems to be as good a criterion for judging where the money should go as any I know. However, I would be the first to recognize that it is not the only one, but it does seem to me that it would then leave within the hands of the local board of education the decision as to how this money should be spent in most cases.

OUR GREATEST RESOURCE

The young people of West Virginia are the greatest resource we possess—greater even than our coal, our rivers, or the natural God-given beauties of our mountains and our valleys—and we must invest to give our young people the very best in education. In 1965, the West Virginia State Legislature enacted a far-reaching program for the improvement of education. In his inspiring inaugural address on January 18, 1965—delivered in the snow, just as another great inaugural address was delivered in the snow by President John F. Kennedy 4 years ago—Gov. Hulett Smith pledged for West Virginia an administration of excellence. He added:

First, I am determined that excellence in education will be our No. 1 goal. A great educational system is a prerequisite to a great state.

We must continue to press forward to improve our school system in West Virginia and Nation. I salute the teachers and school administrators in West Virginia who are working diligently toward that end, and pledge my personal efforts to help every step along the way.

Railroad Retirement Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to provide benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 for children of deceased railroad employees who are over the age of 18 and below the age af 22 and are attending an educational institution as full-time students.

I strongly urge the Congress to make it possible for children of deceased railroad workers to go on to college by providing these benefits. It may well be that these benefits can make the difference between a family's being able to afford or not being able to afford to send a child to college. This being the case, I do not think that the Congress can, in keeping with its commitment to higher education, ignore this chance to rectify an obvious shortcoming of the Railroad Retirement Act.

It is certainly no innovation for us to acknowledge that dependency can, in case of students, legitimately extend well beyond age 18. The Internal Revenue Service, for example, acknowledges that for tax purpose, a student can be a dependent well beyond the age of 18.

I commend this bill as a much needed humanization of the Railroad Retirement Act.

Putting Congress to the Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the real process of study analysis and decision-making, which I think is the role of Congress, is being sorely tested these days. A number of thoughtful editorials appearing in very diverse publications which point out the fact that in view of the very far reaching and important legislation which Congress is acting on, some of the procedures involved are open to question.

Walter H. Annenberg, the independent and outspoken editor and publisher of the Philadelphia Inquirer, has rather bluntly discussed this matter in an editorial which appeared on April 6, 1965. I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues and the editorial follows:

PUTTING CONGRESS TO THE TEST

These are days of crucial decisions in Congress. Rarely in history have so many bills of critical importance, with so great potential impact upon such large numbers of people, converged upon Capitol Hill and advanced simultaneously to the threshold of incisive action.

The House of Representatives is to begin debate Wednesday on a bill to provide medical care for millions of aged Americans of our time and for generations to come—an issue that has aroused heated controversy for years.

On the same day, the Senate is to take up an aid-to-education bill, already passed by the House, which would set new precedents on several counts—in channeling Federal funds into public schools at the elementary and secondary levels, in providing funds for library books and other services for nonpublic schools, and in linking education aid to the war on poverty with a formula for disbursement of funds that has stirred much argument over its effectiveness.

Before the week is ended a voting rights bill is due on the House floor, a measure that has generated not only enormous emotion but substantial disagreement over constitutional issues.

President Johnson's farm message, submitted Monday, calls upon Congress to grapple in depth with some of the most complex and frustrating economic problems of the mid-20th century. His proposals will get close scrutiny amid growing demand from the farmers themselves for policy changes.

In the wings of the House and Senate Chambers are other pieces of legislation that would have profound and far-reaching effect on American life—including public housing and urban development, recreation, and conservation, to mention only a few.

It seems to us that the real test of Congress in this landmark session is not so much the quantity of legislation passed but the quality of it. In the key issues—health care, school aid, and voting rights, for example—enactment of bills of some kind is almost a certainty. Will they be the best bills obtainable? That is the question.

A school aid formula supposedly geared to the fight on poverty—but which would make New York, Texas, and California the principal beneficiaries—is open to improvement. The same is true of a health care plan that uses one set of rules and procedures to pay hospital bills and an entirely different set for doctor bills.

Statesmanship and proficiency in writing laws above the level of mediocrity—these are the needs of Congress now.

The Independent Inventor's Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing effort to bring to the attention of the Congress the often unheard plight of the independent inventor, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD a speech by Mr. A. J. Hayes, international president of the International Association of Machinists, at a symposium today celebrating the 175th anniversary of the U.S. patent system.

Mr. Hayes' remarks were as follows:

REMARKS BY A. J. HAYES, INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS, AT SYMPOSIUM CELEBRATING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. PATENT SYSTEM, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 8, 1965

I am most appreciative of this opportunity to join this distinguished company for the purpose of commemorating and saluting the 175th anniversary of the founding of the patent system of the United States.

Specifically, I have been asked to discuss and present the views of organized labor with respect to the policies that govern our patent system. Therefore, let me forewarn you that I feel that this time will be best spent if I use it to call attention to certain policies and practices which, in the view of the labor movement need correction—rather than to elaborate upon those aspects of our patent system upon which there is universal agreement.

Lest there by any misunderstanding, I assure you that though I may appear critical of certain patent policies and practices, I have the highest regard for the dedicated corps of public servants who strive—though short-handed and overworked—to keep up with the flood of patent applications that flow into Washington on a constant and never-ending stream.

I want to say, also, that in the opinion of organized labor, our patent system has served our Nation well. So well, in fact, that I doubt if we could find another Federal program more wirely accepted and approved by the average man on the street than our patent system.

We are not only a practical people—a nation of menders, fixers, tinkerers and troubleshooters, but we are also—as Gunnar Myrdal concluded in his epic study entitled "An American Dilemma"—a highly idealistic people.

And one of our most cherished ideals—an ideal that is dear to the heart of every American—is that of the lone inventor, working night after night in his workshop—seeking the better mousetrap that will bring the world beating a path to his door.

That is the dream—the dream of the little man who makes good—who converts a bare idea into a working model of fame and fortune. To paraphrase Sir Walter Scott's famous lines—Breathes there a man with soul so dead who hasn't at some time had an idea and said, "I think I'll try to get a patent on that."

I have no statistics to back me up, but on the basis of my knowledge and experience with those who work at the machinists' trade, I wouldn't be surprised if a very high proportion of the more than 3 million patents issued since 1790 have gone to machinists. Having worked as a machinist—both as an apprentice and a journeyman—I can tell you that the average machinist has a lazy streak—in that if a job needs to be done, he'll figure out a way for a machine to do it.

Accordingly, one of the many tasks we find ourselves performing—at our machinists' headquarters, is answering letters from the membership that usually start out, "Dear sir and brother—can you tell me how to go about getting a patent?"

Well, of course, we are always glad to give our members advice and counsel even though we know that in this case their chances of breaking their heart are much better than their chances of breaking into the market with a product—no matter how patentable.

For the fact is that despite isolated success stories, the legend of the lonely inventor, sweating away in his workshop—is more fiction than fact.

Like so many other things in modern America, invention has become big business. Seventy percent of all patents today are issued to corporations. About 75 percent of all research and development is financed by Federal funds—and 60 percent of these funds go to no more than 10 giant concerns.

As a result of the institutionalization of invention, even the concepts and terms by which we describe the processes of technological pioneering have changed. The rugged, individualistic inventor has been largely replaced by a team engaged in a group process known as research and development—or, in the shorthand of modern speech—simply R. & D.

Since most research and development is done on public tax dollars—under Federal contracts—and since most of the corporations that perform this research are entitled to keep the patents that result, we also have the strange situation in which the public pays twice for the same product. This is one of the major areas of dispute and disagreement in our present patent system. One of the chief critics—Senator LONG—of Louisiana has pointed out that it is a system which accentuates and encourages monopoly. And, as a professor of law, commenting on the giveaway of patents developed at public expense, stated before a Senate Small Business Committee hearing recently, "Never has so much money been spent by Government with so little regard for the economic and social consequences."

Of course, no one knows how many millions of dollars have been generously channeled to corporations because of this opportunity to combine public subsidies with private profits. But this is not the only way in which many corporations receive what in my view are undue or unjustified rewards under the present patent system.

These are the corporations that receive millions of dollars from patents that are based on the inventions of their employees. In nearly every corporation, workers must sign a preemployment patent agreement assigning to the employer all rights in any invention which might prove patentable during the tenure of his employment.

Of course there are justifications by which corporate managers rationalize their expropriation of employee inventions. Management claims that not only do they pay the researcher for his time, intelligence, and skill, but also furnish the costly facilities and materials which make invention possible in a technology as sophisticated as ours. In saying this, they are, of course, saying that equipment and facilities are more important in the process of invention than human skill, intelligence, and inspiration. And we, of course, do not agree.

Moreover, the purpose of our patent system as stated in article I, section 8 of the Constitution is "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors, the exclusive right to their respective writings and inventions."

And corporations do not invent. People invent. Some authorities, much closer to this field than I, point out that corporate expropriation of employee patents is not only inequitable but contravenes the constitutional purpose in that it actually discourages rather than promotes the progress of science and the useful arts.

They point out that when an employee realizes that his inventions automatically become the property of the company, he not only loses his incentive to invent, but is even sometimes tempted to suppress an invention which might be of great public benefit.

There are even those who say that this accounts for the fact that our annual rate of patent issuance has remained relatively static at around 65,000 a year—despite astronomically increased expenditures for research and development as well as tremendous increases in technically qualified personnel.

Though, in the United States, management has been able to enforce its claim to the right to receive the full benefit of employee patents, some other countries have enacted laws which limit this right by specifically protecting the employee's interest in his invention. For example, in West Germany, under the so-called law on workpeoples inventions, an employer can claim the right to use an employee's invention, but he must make a reasonable payment to the worker in addition to his normal wages.

The amount of this payment depends on the economic value of the invention, the position of the employee, and the contribution which the company itself has made to the development of the invention.

A few American companies have made a start in this direction by establishing—sometimes in negotiations with the union, but more often unilaterally—plans by which employees are granted a certain scale of monetary rewards for patents that the company uses.

Congressman GEORGE BROWN, of California, is trying to establish such a legislative protection for employee inventions in the United States through H.R. 5918 which he has introduced in this session of Congress. This bill, if enacted, would prohibit preemployment agreements which require employees to waive their rights to inventions.

Another area which affects the rights of individual inventors involves the cost of obtaining a patent. We, in the labor movement, believe that the fees charged and the procedures followed should be as few and simple as possible. It is my understanding that even the simplest and most straightforward patent will cost anywhere from $200 to $500 to obtain.

Perhaps this isn't considered a significant amount in some circles, but to the average worker—who makes between $2 and $3 an hour—$200 or $500 represents a lot of saving and a lot of sacrifice. To effectuate the true purposes of our patent system, I think we must keep filing fees as low and procedures as simple as possible. The Federal Govern-

ment is not adverse to subsidizing all kinds of activities that are considered to be socially desirable.

Therefore, in the interest of encouraging the progress of science and the useful arts I think we must resist those who now wish to raise patient filing fees even further beyond the reach of a goodly proportion of the American people.

Finally, I believe that a consideration of our patent system would be incomplete without some note of the impact of technology progress upon people.

Through changes in technology—changes that are coming with increasing rapidity today—we are drastically altering the traditional relationships between men and their jobs, between work and income, and between labor and leisure.

For example, to a larger extent than is generally realized the processes of production are being dehumanized by the technology of automation. Not only have millions of men and women been replaced—or threatened with replacement—by the so-called little black box but a large portion of those that remain are losing all sense of accomplishment because the jobs they do are so narrow, so repetitive, and so remote from the final result.

Human beings are simply being overwhelmed by technology—technology so far-reaching and so fast-spreading that the minds and emotions of men are unable to adjust.

Though we cannot stop—nor do we wish to stop—the flood of American technological inventiveness—I suggest that the patent we need most right now is one on a method to restore human satisfaction and fulfillment to the workplace.

Well, I could philosophize at some length on the human implications of technological change, but in the interests of time, let me summarize my remarks as a whole by saying that though we all agree that our patent system is worthy of the general public approval which it receives, it could—and should—be strengthened by:

First, putting into the public domain all patents developed at public expense;

Second, enlarging the rights of inventors in relation to their employers; and

Third, by keeping the system of patent issuance within the reach of as many people as possible by making it as inexpensive and simple as possible.

The Army That Never Kills Marks Its 100th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled, "The Army That Never Kills Marks Its 100th Birthday," which appeared in the April 4, 1965, issue of the Messenger and Inquirer, of Owensboro, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

THE ARMY THAT NEVER KILLS MARKS ITS 100TH BIRTHDAY

If any institution is respected and respectable today the world over it is the Salvation Army. Yet its founding 100 years ago scandalized and shocked Victorian England.

The hypocritical, tea-sipping society, where even piano legs were referred to as "limbs," was scandalized that anyone should dare to point to the vice and crime and degradation that festered behind its facade of polite gentility.

It was shocked that anyone could consider thieves and drunkards and beggars as victims of circumstance and not willful sinners, and actually go among them and attempt to elevate their lives and their aspirations.

The "anyone" was William Booth, a dedicated young minister working with the impoverished masses of London's slums. He soon learned that nothing could be accomplished by preaching to people with empty stomachs. No one could be led to God, he found, if he were rejected by society.

As a result, he set up soup kitchens, provided shelter for homeless men and, later, rescue homes for "fallen women." His object was not handouts but the physical and moral means to enable these people to achieve self-respect and independence.

The Salvation Army was born. The year was 1865.

Booth was an advanced social thinker who attacked all the injustices of the political and economic system of his day. He advocated a program of reform that included rehabilitation homes for alcoholics, nursery care for children of working mothers, schools for poor children, low-income housing, probation for first offenders, and a missing persons bureau.

He even went so far as to assert that the Government owed every man the food necessary to keep him alive while he searched for work.

Inevitably, Booth was considered a dangerous radical. Early Salvationists were scorned by the "better" classes, even attacked by mobs and sent to jail.

Today, in its centennial year, 1 million Salvation Army workers operate in 71 geographic areas and 147 languages. The army's hospitals, nurseries, camps, settlements, community centers, casework, counseling, disaster aid and much more continue into a second century the great work begun by Gen. William Booth.

Silver Platter to the Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert the following article from the Indianapolis Star of April 4, 1965:

SILVER PLATTER TO THE REDS

Under Secretary of State George Ball's recent remarks about economic and military "interdependence" signaled a new gush of hope from the one-worlders.

It's the same old story. The idea is that we disarm and hope the Russians and the Red Chinese will be good little fellows and disarm, too. We would turn over our constitutional rights to a world supergovernment run by officials who know little about the United States and American life, and care less. We would also share our food and consumer products with other nations. Gunnar Mydral, the Swedish Socialist, appearing recently on the platform with Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, suggested that the United States, under an internationalized program arranged by the United Nations, feed the world.

The one-world nonsense has been kicking around for a long time. Now its principal ingredients and chief gimmick is U.S. disarmament. Bring home and dismantle the B-58's with their nuclear weapons that are flying on alert 24 hours a day. Abandon nuclear research. Get rid of the mighty missiles that put the muscle in U.S. talks with Communist powers—the missiles the Reds know are there, which put the temper in their tone and make them listen.

Would the Reds then quit sending missiles and military advisers to Cuba, infiltrating Latin America and Africa, subverting and invading southeastern Asia? Would Mao-Tse-tung quit beating his war drums and fabricating nuclear weapons? Would his goons quit worming their way into American left-wing union and student movements, deluging the "emerging nations" and their own people with hate propaganda, getting ready for World War III?

The one-worlders apparently think they would. We don't.

The Communists would go right on being Communists, using the weapons of subversion and infiltration which they employ with such skill and success. They would commandeer the supergovernment and its "international peace force" and we would, to be sure, have one world—a Red world.

Iowa Arms & Ammunition Plant To Build Shillelagh Missile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives, the fine contribution that the residents of the First Congressional District of Iowa are making to our defense efforts. The Iowa Arms & Ammunition Plant at Burlington, Iowa, is participating in production of Shillelagh guided missile systems. The highly skilled and dedicated workers in the Burlington, Iowa, Arms & Ammunition Plant justly deserve the recognition and appreciation of all Americans for their highly important role in helping to defend our Nation.

I include for the RECORD a recent news story which appeared in the April 5 edition of the Burlington Hawkeye newspaper which describes this contribution by the workers at the Iowa Arms & Ammunition Plant:

IOWA ARMS & AMMUNITION PLANT TO BUILD SHILLELAGH MISSILE

A $200,000 modification project is scheduled to start at the Iowa Arms & Ammunition Plant about May 1, paving the way for Mason & Hanger-Silas Mason Co. participation in production of Shillelagh guided missile systems. Actual production should be underway by the end of the year, it was reported over the weekend by the Eye, Iowa Arms & Ammunition Plant newspaper.

The Shillelagh is a highly accurate guided missile designed to provide troops with close support against stationary or moving targets. Field tests have proved it equally effective against tanks, opposing troops and field fortifications.

Designed for use with Sheridan lightweight armored reconnaissance vehicle, the Shillelagh can also be fired from a helicopter.

The work here will be carried on by the company under subcontract with the Aeronautics Division of the Philco Corp., prime contractor to the U.S. Army Missile Command for production of the Shillelagh system.

ASSEMBLY AT IOWA ARMS & AMMUNITION PLANT

Final assembly of the weapon will be accomplished here. Aeronautic's Lawndale, Calif., facility will manufacture components and produce certain nonexplosive subassemblies.

Sherman Smith & Associates of Burlington has been selected by the Corps of Engineers as architect-engineers on the Line IV-B modification project. Contractors to perform the modification work will be selected and announced later.

Negotiations to bring the Shillelagh contract here began more than a year ago. While the first production schedule will be small, company officials hope that followup work will lead to sizable production activity.

According to the Army Times, the Shillelagh will give troops a weapon that achieves a number of firsts. The Times said:

"Capabe of firing a missile or a conventional round through the same tube, the Shillelagh will use combustible conventional ammunition, in which the entire casing is consumed. The Shillelagh conventional round, a 152-milimeter shell, will be multipurpose with the same round effective against personnel, field fortification and armor."

ARMORED VEHICLE

Development of the Shillelagh system has paralleled development of the General Sheridan armored vehicle.

"It is planned that the General Sheridan, with the Shillelagh as its main armament, will be used as a reconnaissance vehicle for armor and infantry elements, as well as an antitank weapons carrier for airborne and combined arms operations," the Army newspaper said.

Weighing only 16 tons, the Sheridan was made possible through Army development of specially treated aluminum armor. The result is an armored vehicle small enough for airborne operations.

Accuracy of the Shillelagh was demonstrated last fall during test firing operations at the White Sands, N. Mex., Missile Range. Working with missiles that had just undergone 4 months of rugged environment testing, soldiers from Fort Knox, Ky., fired the weapon accurately against both stationary and moving targets. The soldiers had no previous experience firing the missiles.

The Author—Mark Van Doren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, seldom has a nation produced such a gifted individual as the United States has in the person of Mark Van Doren, a resident of Cornwall, Conn., which I represent.

Mr. William Claire, former assistant to Congressman ST. ONGE, has written a biographical article on the life and works of Mr. Doren and I now ask permission that this article, "The Author—Mark Van Doren" which appeared in "The Booklover's Answer," be inserted in the RECORD.

THE AUTHOR—MARK VAN DOREN

(By William F. Claire)

In his celebrated autobiography, Mark Van Doren has said that his birthplace (Hope, Ill., June 13, 1894) would be "hard to find on any atlas, though it still exists as Faith and Charity, its sister villages named a century ago, do not."

The son of a rugged country doctor, he moved at the age of 6 to Urbana, where he attended the University of Illinois and began a writing career that has spanned a half-century of excellence in poetry, fiction, and criticism.

At the university, he studied under Stuart Sherman and wrote the first of his many books, a critical study of Thoreau. Commenting some 46 years later on a reissue of the book, Stanley Edgar Hyman called it a brilliant, even staggering, accomplishment by a student.

He served in the Army during World War I and later joined his brother Carl Van Doren on the Columbia University faculty. His Ph. D. study of John Dryden became his second book and one of the first to appear under the imprint of Alfred Harcourt, Donald Brace and Will D. Howe.

While his earliest published poem had been accepted by H. L. Mencken for the smart set during his college days, it was not until 1924 that his first volume, "Spring Thunder," was printed. T. S. Eliot, whose review in England of the Dryden book had much to do with establishing its permanent fame, also wrote favorably of the new poetry.

From 1924–28, he set a productive pace that has been unmatched by any other major writer. He brought out two new volumes of verse, wrote a critical study of Edwin Arlington Robinson, served as literary editor of the Nation, collaborated with Carl on a study of British and American literature, compiled his famous "Anthology of World Poetry" and continued teaching at Columbia. During this period he and his wife, the former Dorothy Graffe, also produced two children.

An epic poem, "Jonathan Gentry," came out in 1931, and after a winter spent on his Cornwall, Conn., farm, he wrote another narrative poem, "A Winter Diary." In this 1935 book, he also included 33 sonnets, which Allen Tate in a recent review said amounted to the "finest work in its genre of this century." This book, still another collection and a series of new poems entitled "America's Mythology" were undoubtedly strong factors in his Pulitzer Prize Award for collected poems (1939).

Important critical works were also written during the thirties, the most prominent of which was "Shakespeare." Writing in 1942, however, in a preface to his "Private Reader," he announced his farewell to formal criticism by stating that he "no longer felt at home, even—or especially—in its finest rooms." The publication of the "Happy Critic" recently indicates that his announcement was somewhat premature. The demand for his comments on literature continues and while his approach is appreciative rather than critical in the academic sense, the essays are masterpieces of penetration and insight. Writers examined include Hardy, Herrick, Mann, Cervantes, and Whitman among others.

A legendary teacher at Columbia for 39 years, Van Doren retired in 1959. He has served since as Bolyston professor of rhetoric at Harvard sharing that chair during an academic year with Robert Lowell. He is the present chancellor of the American Academy of Arts and Letters.

At Columbia he taught such diverse people as Lionel Trilling, Allen Ginsburg, Thomas Merton (perhaps the best description of Van Doren the teacher can be found in Merton's spiritual autobiography, "The Seven Story Mountain"), Clifton Fadiman, John Berryman and the recent Pulitzer Prize winning poet, Louis Simpson.

The late James Thurber has described his impact when he said, "Mark Van Doren is so many men that I have to open my front door and my windows when he visits me in order to let all of him in."

Needless to say, Van Doren's accomplishments stagger the imagination. To his poetry and criticism can be added three novels, innumerable short stories, a play ("The Last Days of Lincoln," widely read but as yet unproduced by a major company) and books such as Liberal Education, Invitation to Learning (after the CBS radio show), children's books, mystery stories and a series of illuminating introductions ranging from the Limited Editions club volumes to recent paperbacks.

Each generation seems to discover Van Doren in its own special way. While it is impossible to estimate the number of readers he has had during his career, his influence has been considerable. Not surprisingly, the autobiography represents the best view of Van Doren's total commitment to life and literature.

Matters have been somewhat complicated (if, as many people assume, a writer has to be placed) by the fact that Van Doren has never joined a particular school of poetry. Like Conrad Aiken, he has assidiously avoided the limelight, although it has often been thrust upon him. Critics have compared him to Frost, Hardy, and Robinson but most have been in agreement that he has forged a body of poetry unique in this century.

In recent years, Van Doren has been collecting his work in a series of books, and his next is expected to contain all of the longer poems he wishes to preserve. At the same time, he continues to write new material that demonstrates his absolute mastery of form and ever-increasing awareness of the mystery and beauty of the world.

His is the sure touch of genius. It may be an eon or two before we produce another inspired writer in this country with quite the same grasp of life in all of its particular and universal aspects. Meanwhile, he gives us some hint of the music he hears in "Undersong," a majestic poem he wrote recently which begins:

"In wonderment I walk to music pouring
Out of so dark a source it makes no sound"—

And ends, after more than 80 remarkable lines—

"Evenly, unevenly as rhymes
Rival the pure chimes
Of never ending truth that for so long
Has sung to such as me this undersong."

Through Difficulty to the Stars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we have in our day and time no lack of consideration and comment addressed to the imaginative appeal of the new space age. The age of exploration and intrusion into the mysteries of the outer space of the universe and the inner space of the oceans. One aspect of this new era and a practical realization of the great promise and challenge it presents is the accommodation of the human physiology to the conditions of the new and often hostile characteristics of space environment.

In an articulate and imaginative presentation, our colleague from Texas,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ, treats this theme. His forum was a most appropriate one, Brooks Air Force Base in his native State. Not only is Brooks one of the outstanding bases for the training of aerospace pilots and technicians, it also has the first and most complete medical facility dealing with aerospace medicine. I commend to the House the reading of the remarks of Mr. GONZALEZ which are incorporated herein below:

PER ASPERA AD ASTRA

(Address of Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ at Brooks Air Force Base, Apr. 2, 1965)

I cannot conceive of a more appropriate theme for a dining in at Brooks than this one—through difficulty to the stars—which is similar to the motto of the Royal Air Force.

It was here that John Kennedy, on the eve of his death, his untimely voyage to the great beyond—said:

"And in the new frontiers of outer space, while headlines may be made by others in other places, history is being made every day by the men and women of the Aerospace Medical Center, without whom there could be no history."

Mankind has always been held in a state of fascination by mysteries, and men have ever tried to understand and conquer those things which have been beyond their comprehension. It has been this persistent curiosity that has brought us to our present state of scientific knowledge and technical understanding. Yet the deepest mysteries remain unsolved, and you are engaged in probing some of these secrets, to help solve the dark secrets of universe itself.

Men are drawn to the shores of oceans because they cannot understand or comprehend the awesome powers and strange beauty of what Queen Isabella of Spain called the ocean sea, that fearsome water that covers most of our earth. We have learned to sail on the surface of the sea and even to dive and cruise in the borderlands of its depths, but man has yet to discover how to survive in the greatest depths of the sea, and so its deepest mysteries remain undiscovered, its awesome powers a secret yet to be opened to the mind of man. Just as men have stood on lonely beaches and pondered the awesome powers of the sea, so they have stood transfixed, gazing at the depth and mystery of the heavens, always wondering what secrets the stars held and whether there were other worlds like or own in that infinite distance of the universe.

If the secrets of the sea remain unknown, it is because men have yet to learn how to survive in the vast depths of the hostile ocean. And if the mysteries of the universe are still unknown to our inquiring minds, it is because we cannot live yet in the void of space. Only if man can live in space can he conquer it, and he can survive in space only through the efforts of men like you. If one day we do journey to the moon and beyond, and if one day the darkness of space is understood by men, it will be in no small part due to your diligence, your persistence, your energy, and your unflagging curiosity.

And what of man and the moon, what of man and the stars?

No one can truly say when a man first gazed at the stars, or what he thought because this surely happened long before history was recorded.

Ancient men worshipped the stars as gods. Thousands of years ago men believed that the stars held the keys to man's fate, that the stars could be read as signs to say whether a man would have a good or bad day, or whether his life would be happy or marred with misfortune. Astrology was popular with the Egyptians and with the Romans, and it is still a favorite practice of people all over the world. Even today, you can read your fortune in the newspapers, your fate foretold by readers of the stars. We all know that the position of the stars and the conjunctions of the planets have nothing to do with our fate and fortune, but men do not understand the stars yet, and so their mystery lends itself to the foretelling of time, through that most ancient of arts, astrology.

The Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Indians of Central America all observed the stars. They were able to see that the heavens moved in an orderly fashion, were able to construct calendars based on the movements of the universe itself. Their observations were by no means crude, for who today can match the Aztec calendar for accuracy, though the Aztecs left no key to their language, though they themselves disappeared as a civilization.

Even more astounding to us in the 20th century than the accuracy of the Azetc astronomers, is that of the men who built the circle of stones in England, at Stonehenge, perhaps as an observatory, perhaps as a temple, but perhaps as a giant calculator by which the eclipses of the sun and moon and the phases of the sun could be accurately forecast.

No one truly knows the mystery of Stonehenge today, though generations of scientists have speculated on its purposes.

But by far the most interesting theory about Stonehenge is that it was in fact an enormous calculator, a computer by which men could gage the actions of the heavens and foretell with great accuracy the phenomena of eclipses of the sun and moon.

No one can ever know absolutely why Stonehenge was built, nor what it was used for. But if the theory that Stonehenge was a calculator is true—and it is hard to disprove it—then that huge and mute circle of stones on England's lonely moor stands as a monument to the power of the stars over man's imagination, as a monument to skill and daring and curiosity.

The intensity of the power that the search for knowledge of the stars and the determination of conquest of space holds over men's minds can be attested to by the manned space flights. Every time a man is launched into space, millions of people gather quietly before their television sets, watching the great rockets thrusting men into that ultimate ocean, infinite space itself. And though we cannot see the space capsules as they cruise on the edge of space, we follow their progress through illuminated maps and count the seconds from the mission clocks, always praying that that lonely man or men will return safely from his brief dive into that vast void.

And so today, perhaps more than ever in the history of man, we have our eyes on the heavens, determined to solve the deepest mysteries of the infinite universe. And if those mysteries are solved it will be because men could go into space and live long enough to learn the secrets that are locked in that void. In the final analysis, the success or failure of manned space flight depends on people like you, because on your shoulders is the burden of devising systems that will permit men to live in space, that most hostile of all environments. The conquest of the vastness of space depends heavily on life support systems, and when that conquest is done, you will be able to take just pride in a near-impossible task well done.

II

Sometimes we seem obsessed in this country by the drive for space, and indeed the quest for knowledge is as pervasive as anything else in our lives.

There are a few central facts governing our lives, and one of these is the explosion of knowledge in this century.

In this century knowledge has advanced so far and so quickly that few men can conceive of it or grasp it. Sir Francis Bacon, the great Elizabethan scholar and philosopher, once set out to learn all he could of the world's fund of knowledge. No man today however brilliant, would dare attempt to learn everything about a single discipline, let alone all of them!

One of the aspects of the advance of knowledge is the age-old question of whether man is master over his creations, or whether he himself will be mastered by the products of his own genius. If this Pandora's box question was important a hundred or a thousand years ago, it is of supreme importance today, when our very survival depends on it. These momentous questions remain unresolved today—perhaps we may never solve them—but it seems to me that we must.

Will the atom—whose secrets were unlocked to form the deadliest of all engines of destruction almost exactly twenty years ago—become our servant or our master; will it be a great, inexaustible genie, or will it destroy us all?

What will outer space be, when we have conquered it? Will it be a battleground or will it offer a peaceful area of exploration or even commerce? Will the life support systems we are building be used to insure man's survival in space or only insure the ability to use space to destroy life here on earth?

I do not propose to answer these questions here tonight, for no man could. What I am saying is that if our knowledge is greater, then so is our responsibility; and if our power is greater, so also is the burden on us to use that power responsibly.

As a politician I cannot avoid these issues. As scientists, neither can you. For a scientist does not work in a vacuum. His work is related to the world outside his laboratory; his experiments have an impact far beyond the confines of his test tube.

Like the chain reaction under the stadium at the University of Chicago, the discoveries of science can pose grave new problems for the world outside. But while the scientist holds some responsibility to direct the uses of his discoveries, he is not and cannot be alone in this responsibility; he and his fellow man must bear the burden together.

I believe that the scientific community has done admirably well in helping direct the new-found powers and knowledge of our time, and this is an achievement of which we can all be proud. I, for one, am grateful for the leadership of the scientific community.

But why should a scientist help direct the uses of knowledge and power? I have said that it is because he does not work in a vacuum; and his work affects the community at large. No man could give a better reason for a scientist to take up his social responsibilities than did John Donne, who wrote his immortal essays in the early 1600's. In his devotions, Donne said that "No man is an island, entire of itself." And, "Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind." If Donne was involved in mankind, so are we today, for we literally hold the fate of all mankind in our hands. And if anyone is unconvinced of his responsibilities to mankind, let him remember Donne's words: "But I do nothing upon myself, and yet I am mine own executioner." If we fail to take up our responsibilities, if we do nothing, we may very well be acting as our own executioners.

But we have not failed, thus far. We have dealt with the great problems caused by our scientific advances, and if we have not yet solved all our problems, we have at least not taken the easy way out by refusing to think about them at all.

Thus it is that we have determined not to use space as a mere area in which to race, but have instead taken the more difficult road of a systematic, carefully planned and deliberate exploration of space. But lest any man be tempted to forget our determination to remain a free and powerful nation, we are also exploring the possible military applications of space technology. So in space, as with the atom before, we are hoping for the best by making peaceful use of our power and knowledge, and at the same time preparing for the worst by keeping our military technology strong.

As scientists, you are meeting your responsibilities to mankind by helping to meet our dual goals in space—peace, but with a strong guard up.

III

As a politician, I deal with every aspect of public policy; I decide on and cast votes dealing in issues great and small, and deal with every condition found in a city and county of 700,000 people.

I am constantly made aware that most people are not really very concerned with affairs outside of their immediate concern. That is, even though there are a great many people who are concerned about—say civil rights in Mississippi and poverty in West Virginia, most of us are not concerned at all, beyond reading the headlines and perhaps developing an opinion, one way or another.

I wonder whether we can afford this attitude of noninvolvement. As scientists and as politicians—can we limit ourselves to our test tubes and offices? I think not.

It was here in San Antonio that a great example was set * * * men dedicated to the discipline of scientific inquiry and truth met * * * several Russian scientists joined * * * no fear or reprisal * * * no taint, etc. Perhaps only in this environment may we find mankind's salvation.

I think that we must be involved in society and in the world around us. If we are not really involved, if we stand aside, we are abandoning the field to others, risking that nothing at all be done to correct blight and injustice, and risking that what is done is wrong. These are risks that, as citizens in a free society, we cannot afford to take. A free society is a thing of great passions—that is the difference between a free country and an enclosed one. For in a totalitarian country you will find indifference—noninvolvement—a dependence on decisions rendered from above. A totalitarian society is a dispassionate one, if you will; it is cold and indifferent.

Aristotle wrote that, by definition "Man is a political animal." We are indeed political animals. In our politics there are great passions, because great passions are the stuff of which freedom is made. That is why, I believe, we cannot afford to be aloof, uninvolved, and dispassionate; we cannot afford to let others suffer or be subjected to degradation and injustice. James Baldwin wrote in a fine essay not long ago that "whoever debases others is debasing himself." And this is true. We can neither afford to debase others nor stand aside while others are being debased. The essence of our free society is involvement, concern, participation. No man, no matter what his calling, can afford to abandon the political field to others. As a freeman, he is obliged to make his own decisions and to play his own role, not leave it to others.

I think that we would prefer to have a neater society. Freedom and democracy are not really very neat. Decisions are hard to arrive at in a free country, and there is always dissent. It is noisy and sometimes it is confusing; but it is good. A free, healthy society is a noisy thing, not a neat one. It has no quick and easy solution to anything, it is stubborn, hard to manage, raucous, passionate—but it is a healthy and invigorating thing. As scientists, as military men, as citizens—we are obligated to keep it that way. So our responsibility to society extends beyond the laboratory. You must help direct the uses made of your discoveries, to help insure that the knowledge is our servant rather than our master. But beyond even this awesome duty, you and I must be involved in all of the concern of our society and in all of the problems of our fellow men, because that is our responsibility as freemen in a free society.

Our challenges are great, for we live in a time of great discovery. If our problems in this world are great, so are our opportunities.

I am optimistic about our future, precisely because we do have great responsibilities, great challenges and great opportunities.

In our age, we can, by the proper use of our knowledge and power make all men free. And we will.

Per ardua ad astra.

Crime and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the increase in crime in our Nation is a problem of great concern to us all. Perhaps in desperation, many proposed solutions to this problem have involved the limitation or suspension of the constitutional rights of arrested persons.

Two articles which have come to my attention recently suggest that more policemen and more police activity offer a better solution than the infringement of constitutional liberties.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the texts of a March 27 editorial in the Minneapolis Star, and an article from the March issue of Civil Liberties:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Mar. 27, 1965]

MORE POLICE PATROLS PAY OFF

Minneapolis' decline in major crimes for the first 2 months of 1965 is good news for the city and a credit to its police department.

Along with a 9.1-percent decrease from January and February of 1964, Police Chief Cal Hawkinson says the number of cases solved was up 3.3 percent from last year. That, at least, is what the statistics show, even though they ignore such pertinent factors as the weather and economic and age trends in a city's population.

If the statistics have some validity, however, so also does Hawkinson's observation that the greatest crime drop came in areas where police patrolling has been increased. He suggests that the addition of four squad cars and eight sergeants is paying off in a safer city.

But the police chief also warns that a 2-month improvement is hardly sufficient to conclude that the local crime splurge has been reversed. The fact that the Minneapolis crime rate increased 136 percent in 10 years, although the city's population showed a slight decline, stacks the odds against that hope.

Yet, at a time when many police and legal experts are grasping every chance to blame the Nation's crime increase on judicial demands that basic rights of suspects be respected, it is worth while to note that Minneapolis has recorded at least a temporary statistical cutback in crime. It is a healthy bit of evidence that increased police activity—and not criticism of the courts—is one step in the right direction.

THE SUPREME COURT AND POLICE AUTHORITY

(By Nanette Dembitz, general counsel, New York Civil Liberties Union)

(NOTE.—Critics of the Supreme Court in Congress, in the legal profession, and in the press were joined recently by Lewis F. Powell, Jr., head of the American Bar Association. He charged that some of its decisions have "swung too far in affording rights which are abused and misused by criminals." "The Criminal Gets the Breaks" was the succinct title of a recent New York Times magazine article on the same theme. The Supreme Court's critics are especially bitter about its decision that a defendant's confession, made while he is held in the police station, cannot be used to convict him. The Whitmore case in New York has recently headlined this issue. George Whitmore had confessed, while in the custody of the police, to the notorious murder of Janice Wylie and Emily Hoffert; his conviction seemed certain until the District Attorney discovered that the confession was false—the result of police dictation. This analysis of the issue by Nanette Dembitz, general counsel to the ACLU's New York affiliate for the past 10 years, is part of a discussion of the Supreme Court's decisions on criminal procedure. A graduate of Columbia Law School where she was an editor of the Law Review, Miss Dembitz was formerly an attorney in the Department of Justice and now practices law in New York City. The Supreme Court's decisions on police station confessions have had their main impact in Washington, D.C., where the courts enforce Federal rather than State law.)

Under Federal law, like the law of most States, a policeman may arrest an individual on the basis of probable cause to believe he has committed a crime. Then, after booking him at the police station, the policeman must proceed with the accused to a judge or a judicial commissioner for his arraignment—for a determination, made with greater objectivity than the arresting officer's, as to whether there is indeed probable cause to hold him. The policeman "must with reasonable promptness show legal cause for detaining arrested persons," as the U.S. Supreme Court said in the McNabb case.

The pivotal requirement throughout criminal procedure of probable cause strikes a compromise between liberty and security. Something more than mere suspicion is required but something far less than certainty. Thus, there was probable cause for the recent arrest in New York City of a person with the same build, race, and clothing as a reported robber but who in fact had no connection with him—a complete, but reasonable, case of mistaken identity.

POLICE STATION DETENTION

Prompt arraignment of the accused before a judicial officer is primarily necessary to prevent, as the Supreme Court says, an "intensive interrogation, easily gliding into the evils of 'the third degree'" in the police station. Critics of Supreme Court decisions assert that they are of course opposed to the third degree; but they ignore the problem the Court must face—how to prevent it. Generally speaking, there is no witness to the third degree except the victim and several policemen. Without some extraordinary circumstance supporting the victim's testimony against the policemen, who corroborate each other's version, a lawyer knows a claim of police brutality in the station house is hopeless.

The effective means to limit the third degree is to prevent lengthy police station de-

tention. Prompt arraignment as the Supreme Court said, "checks resort to those reprehensible practices known as the 'third degree' which * * * still find their way into use. It aims to avoid all the evil implications of secret interrogation of persons accused of crime."

Even apart from brutality, the accused held in a back room of a police station necessarily feels himself a helpless victim of overwhelming force. He knows there is no time limit on his detention and that his contract with the outside world is at the mercy of his interrogators.

In one of the cases frequently criticized because the conviction was reversed, though no brutality was established, the accused was held upstairs in a police station for 26 hours. Do we want the accused, whether innocent or guilty, subject to this procedure for obtaining evidence? The statement "You are under arrest" should, we believe, signal the commencement of an orderly procedure, not a dread use of overwhelming authority against a helpless victim. The policeman is an administrator, not a secret inquisitor.

Interrogation of the accused can of course continue after his arraignment before a judge. The difference is not only that the judge has then informed him of the charge against him, and of his legal rights—including the right to obtain an attorney—but more important, the accused is lodged in a jail whose institutional arrangements preclude incommunicado detention and secret interrogation.

PROMPT ARRAIGNMENT AND OTHER RIGHTS

Prompt arraignment, as part of the structure of orderly criminal procedure, buttresses other important rights. A frequent purpose of police-station interrogation is to try to find probable cause for holding a person when he has been arrested on mere suspicion and hunch. If the police must obey the command of prompt arraignment, they will also have to obey the command to arrest only on probable cause.

Another basic of our criminal procedure is the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination, of which the judge informs the accused at his arraignment. The privilege is worthless if the accused believes, before the judge informs him otherwise, that he must reply to police-station interrogation. Surely the privilege should not be available at the will of the police or reserved for knowledgeable criminals who are expert enough to assert it before their arraignment.

The only method the Supreme Court has for enforcing the prompt arraignment rule is to reverse convictions when the accused confessed during his unlawful detention in the police station. When the police illegally hold a man but fail to obtain evidence of guilt, they release him. Thus virtually the only cases to come before the Supreme Court on appeal—and the only apportunity it has to consider and condemn illegal police station detention—are those in which the police succeed in finding evidence of guilt.

When the Court reverses a conviction because the confession was obtained during an illegal detention, it removes the police's incentive to disobey the prompt arraignment rule. The Court in effect pressures the police to obey the rule in dealing with all of us—to the benefit of the dignity and security of everyone arrested.

USEFULNESS OF POLICE STATION DETENTION IN CRIME DETECTION

What about the critics who say that admissions secured by police station detention are necessary to prosecute crime? A partial answer is that this interrogation would tend to be least successful when the need for proof would be greatest: against an experienced and practiced criminal. Further, though in a few glaring cases crucial evidence may consist of police station admissions, the available statistical data indicates that prolonged station house interrogation is of insubstantial value overall in obtaining convictions.

In Washington, D.C., for a number of years there was an established procedure of "arrests for investigation," which served largely the same purpose as police-station interrogation after arrest for a crime. Making a careful survey of the practice for 1960 and 1961, a committeee appointed by the District of Columbia Commissioners reported that in approximately 17 out of each 18 cases of arrests for investigation, the prisoners were eventually released. Thus, despite the fact that the police could hold these suspects indefinitely, and even though over half of those ultimately released were in fact held more than 4 hours, proportionately few convictions resulted from this unrestricted police station interrogation.

In candor, however, it must be recognized that the prohibition on police-station interrogation—like other protections of the individual—will preclude proof of guilt in some cases. Whether one accepts or rails at a degree of sacrifice in crime-detection depends in part on one's sense—for on this there can be no controlled experiment—of how rapidly and pervasively police control would spread if the Supreme Court let down its guard. I take it that police practices, like many social institutions, are mobile and develop and progress unless restrained or pushed back.

But the final answer to whether one applauds the Supreme Court depends on a personal emotional quotient. Part of my thanks to the Court is for a sense of security. I can feel that if I, whether guilty or innocent, were to be subjected to police authority, it would be a limited authority, and I would still be functioning within a prescribed order of rights and duties.

Key to Sane Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the April 4, 1965, Cleveland, Ohio, Plain Dealer. It is from a very highly respected newspaper and worthy of our attention.

The editorial follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Apr. 4, 1965]

KEY TO SANE VOTING RIGHTS

As the House Judiciary Subcommittee prepares for the second stage of its work on the voting-rights bill, it becomes more and more obvious that the legislation as drawn by the administration is not wholly acceptable to either side of the controversy, nor to many constitutional authorities.

As presently drafted, the measure covers States or subdivisions having literacy tests and less than 50-percent voting participation.

Civil rights groups are protesting the limitations and indications are that, in this area, the legislation will be broadened.

Constitutional authorities are basing objection to the bill on grounds that it violates article I, section 2 of the Constitution, which provides that "electors (voters) in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Invoking of the Federal registration apparatus in the bill would annul all State voting qualifications except those pertaining to age, length of residence, conviction of a felony and mental incompetence.

The administration holds that the 15th amendment supersedes article I. The amendment provides that the "right of citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Ohio has no literacy test. Ohio's revised code, section 3503.01, requires a registration applicant to be 21; to be eligible to vote he must have been a State resident for at least one year. Further requirements are that he must have resided in a particular county for 40 days and in a particular voting precinct for 40 days to be eligible to vote in those county and municipal elections.

State literacy tests loom as the key factor in preparing the legislation for floor action.

There should be no objection to such a test that is reasonable in the knowledge required, that is nondiscriminatory and is uniformly applied. The major protest by rights groups has been that the tests were too complicated and were directed at keeping the franchise from Negroes.

Congress should also take the greatest care that legislation drafted to protect the rights of a minority does not intrude on the rights of a whole community.

A strong Federal law is needed to end the tragic problem of Negro voter discrimination but it should be directed to the discriminatory application of unreasonable literacy tests, to registrant intimidation and limitation on availability of the registration process. It is pertinent that the validity of many literacy tests has already been upheld by the Supreme Court.

Forecast for Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared on the front page of Barron's, national business and financial weekly, on April 5. I believe it is an excellent analysis of the coinage and silver situation, and I commend it to my colleagues.

CROSS OF SILVER: NO NATION CAN LIVE OFF ITS CAPITAL FOREVER

While invariably rewarding, luncheon meetings of the New York Society of Security Analysts, like the menus, tend to be cut-and-dried. Last week, however, the society was treated to a discourse which, compared to the customary corporate fare, struck this member as a triumph of clarity and style. On the unlikely subject of "Coinage and Silver," Simon D. Strauss, vice president of the American Smelting & Refining Co., had some fascinating things to say. Alone among the great powers, Mr. Strauss observed, the United States has inherited a coinage that has survived unchanged since 1792. "In that year, when Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, asked Congress to authorize the minting of coins containing 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper, he hit upon a composition that has met all the tests of a satisfactory coinage. Silver coins

are attractive, durable, hard to counterfeit, and meet the psychological need of the public for a coin of real value that carries the ring of authenticity." To those who, despite the gleaming record, would abandon silver coins, the speaker addressed a thoughtful warning: "The lesson of history is that when currency of intrinsic value disappears completely from the monetary system, in due course the currency of that nation loses substantially all its value. This was true as far back as the ancient Greek city-states and the Roman Empire; it was true of Germany, Japan, and Italy as recently as World War II."

Those who refuse to learn from history, as the saying goes, are doomed to repeat it. Far from resting peacefully buried among the myths and shibboleths of the past, silver coinage today has become a critical issue of monetary policy. Congress lately has held extensive hearings at which producers, consumers and disinterested sources have testified at length. The U.S. Treasury, which has perhaps the greatest single stake in finding a solution, has been busy analyzing various points of view for months. Its recommendations, originally scheduled for February, are due to appear any day.

In the heated clash of interests which is likely to ensue, cool appraisal will be hard to come by. Hence now is a better time than most to press the search, through a wasteland of claim and counterclaim for the mother lode of truth. To begin with, the record reflects scant credit on the Treasury, which repeatedly failed either to recognize the gravity of the silver crisis or to take effective measures to relieve it. In belated alarm, officials in and out of the Department reportedly are weighing such coercive proposals as banning the export of the precious metal or the hoarding of coins. Silver always has been a durable commodity. Today it promises to become a premanent symbol of mismanaged money.

In the United States, as we have observed before, mismanagement of silver is a tradition which dates back at least to the heyday of William Jennings Bryan. Under former Secretary C. Douglas Dillon, however, the classic confusion was vastly compounded. During his first year in office, the Treasury persisted in selling the precious metal at 91 cents an ounce, thereby lavishing a $20 million windfall on speculators and running down the Nation's store of "free" silver. Subsequently, Mr. Dillon presided over a run on silver dollars (which his Department encouraged by providing buyers with bags full of cartwheels) and the subsequent ignominy of doling out packets of silver dust. Until the Feds cracked down, department stores and supermarket chains, in an effort to overcome the shortage of change, began "minting" wooden nickels. One way or another, during his tenure, Treasury holdings of silver plunged from nearly 2 billion ounces to 1.4 billion and, at the current rate of attrition, suffice for only a few more years. Hence the pressing need for altering the coinage.

The hard choices confronting Mr. Dillon's successor reflect a basic shift in the silver market. Overpriced by Government fiat for generations, and hence in excess supply, the precious metal at long last has come into its own. Silver, of course, yields only to gold in malleability and ductility; it also boasts the highest electrical and thermal conductivity, and the brightest color of any metal. As one admirer has said, "Its noble appearance and the ease with which it can be worked are responsible for its age-old use as tableware, jewelry, and in the decorative arts." Since World War II, moreover, industry has found it increasingly valuable in photographic film, surgical and dental equipment, storage batteries, and missiles. Even prior to the outbreak of hoarding, finally, the rise of silver in coinage, sparked by the proliferation of vending machines, was growing apace. A half decade ago, global demand outstripped current supply by nearly 70 million ounces; last year the shortfall soared to over 350 million.

So huge a deficit might have defied the best efforts of the first and greatest Secretary of the Treasury. The recent incumbent never had a chance. Mr. Dillon failed to grasp either the true dimensions of the silver scarcity or its implications for the coinage. Hence, from start to finish he pursued a policy of too little and too late. After belatedly halting the silver bargain sale, the Treasury let nearly 2 years elapse, until the price had climbed perilously close to $1.29 an ounce (the point at which holders would be tempted to redeem silver certificates), before pressing Congress for new legislation. The lawmakers responded by slashing the last link between paper money and the metal, a move which, by the Secretary's optimistic reckoning, would free silver enough to last for 15 years. Like other official forecasts, however, this one swiftly went awry. Spurred by the disappearance of silver dollars, the hoarding of newly minted Kennedy halves, and a mounting shortage of quarters and dimes, the drain on U.S. stocks accelerated. Last summer the Department cut its earlier estimate in half; now, with time growing uncomfortably short, it seeks to make the best of Douglas Dillon's sorry legacy.

While there is no easy way out, certain avenues look more promising than others. Some officials propose that the Treasury declare illegal both the export of silver and the melting down of coins. Repugnant in principle and unenforcible in practice, such bans merely would succeed in turning otherwise law-abiding citizens into hoarders and smugglers. By the same token, abandoning silver coinage, a suggestion pushed by users' groups, would be a shocking break with nearly two centuries of tradition and a fresh blow to shaky foreign confidence in U.S. ability to manage its finances. What the Treasury should do, we submit, is acknowledge the rising price of silver and, like any prudent consumer, seek to stretch the available supply. Thereby it would fall in line with other countries, notably Italy and France, which today mint acceptable coins with roughy one-third the U.S. silver content. It also would ease the transition to the higher values which the metal, sooner or later, seems likely to command.

Such a policy, to be sure, hazards running afoul of Gresham's law, which stipulates that bad coin drives out good. The risk is real. However, as Simon Strauss pointed out last week, "if the public is told that the new coins will contain no silver at all, hoarding will occur on an even larger scale. * * * We fear that some difficult days do lie ahead regardless of what the decision is." Even the richest country in the world, we conclude, cannot live off capital forever.

A War on Public Apathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, on the President's crime message.

The article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 10, 1965, and follows:

JOHNSON'S CRIME MESSAGE—A WAR ON PUBLIC APATHY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson's message on the said state of law enforcement and law observance has many purposes, but its most important is this:

To create a massive, nationwide, public anticrime wave.

The President's appeal is that, while it is necessary to strengthen the means of enforcement, it is crucial to strengthen the will for law observance.

This is why Mr. Johnson put it as his foremost goal to "arrest and reverse the trend toward lawlessness."

This is why he put the role of the individual citizen as the first ingredient of progress.

"The starting point," he said, "is the individual citizen * * * the people will get observance of law and enforcement of the law if they want it, insist on it, and participate in it."

Obviously, the President seeks better law enforcement at every level of government. But those who are familiar with his thinking know that, above all, he hopes to generate an anticrime crusade by civic groups—chambers of commerce, Rotary, PTA, League of Women Voters, NAACP—in every community of the country.

The objective is individual awareness, individual alertness, and individual participation in a voluntary commitment to do something about it.

The rising rate of crime in the United States is ominous and dismaying. It is getting worse, not better.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation reports that more than 2¼ million serious crimes occurred last year, a 10-percent increase over the previous year.

The increase was 3 percent gerater in suburban areas than in the more heavily populated areas.

Crimes committed by juveniles are rising more rapidly than crimes committed by adults. More than 40 percent of all arrests for serious crimes involve people under 18.

The one statistic which sums it all up was used by President Johnson: Since 1940 the crime rate in the United States has doubled; it has increased five times as fast as the population increase since 1958.

The President does not overlook the need to attack the problem at its roots by combatting poverty and improving education, health, housing and recreation. But he rightly warns that "crime will not wait while we attempt to pull it up by its roots."

The president of the American Bar Association, Lewis F. Powell, Jr., of Richmond, Va., has been making the same point.

"We can't await the milleninium when crime will wither away because its underlying causes are removed," he said recently. "We must act now to protect decent citizens from criminal molestation of their persons and property."

To fail to do so is to invite a breakdown of the first duty of government.

The way crime has been increasing year after year suggests that we are much nearer to such a breakdown than many realize.

It is to avert such a calamity that President Johnson is seeking to strengthen the social instinct for law observance.

Public apathy and public unwillingness to become involved—these are actual deterrents to law enforcedent.

The President is acting to reverse this apathetic tide of public opinion and create in its place a kind of public anticrime wave which will nourish law observance and aid law enforcement.

What the President is asking is that every citizen, every civic leader, every civic group aid in making law observance the most compelling instinct of the Nation.

Remarks by Eugene P. Foley, Administrator of Small Business Administration, at Luncheon Sponsored by Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board, in Jackson, Miss., March 30, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the people in Mississippi were privileged to welcome Mr. Eugene P. Foley, Administrator of Small Business Administration last week. He spent several days in our State explaining the functions and scope of his agency.

It is heartening to know that Mr. Foley is familiar with our economy and its needs. As an able Administrator, he pledged cooperation in his agency's role of supplementing the economic progress we are making is Mississippi.

The people of Mississippi were delighted over his visit and we hope to have him with us again soon.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the speech Mr. Foley made in Jackson on March 30. It follows:

REMARKS BY EUGENE P. FOLEY, ADMINISTRATOR OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, JACKSON, MISS., MARCH 30, 1965

Time marches on in Washington and Mississippi.

As Shakespeare put it:

"All the world's a stage
And all the men and women merely players,
They have their exits and their entrances."

Here in Mississippi I believe the curtain is going up on a new era of progress. I do not mean to belittle progress made in the past. Progress begets progress. Progress builds progress. The broader the economic base becomes the greater the economic interaction, the greater the spinoff into new areas.

The Gemini project, for example, was executed with the assistance of a Mississippi firm. Its role was relatively small—but it points to the potential of the future, the potential for research and development in your economic development.

The giant Saturn rocket which will propel explorers to the moon is being tested at the 13,000-acre missile testing center in Hancock County in the southern part of the State. And not to far from it is a large $125 million (Standard) oil refinery recently added to Mississippi's rapidly growing economy.

You know the pattern of progress. You are seeing it unfold. You are in the heart of the world of tomorrow, the southern "space crescent," and the significance of this to the future of your economy is tremendous. You have a foothold in the multimillion dollar space program.

You know that since 1960 there has been an investment of $366 million in new industries and that these industries created more than 34,000 jobs.

And you know that expansion of existing industry has created another 15,000 jobs.

You know that last year Mississippi added 65 industries while 55 others expanded, providing more than 8,600 new jobs and representing a capital investment of $72 million.

You know that the 1964 legislature at Governor Johnson's request strengthened the economic development program and provided for concentrated, organized research and development to pay the way for what the Governor described as opportunities for the people of Mississippi.

Your Governor is showing the way.

Your Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board, your Mississippi Economic Council, your local chambers of commerce, the Mississippi Manufacturers Association, the Mississippi Bar Association, and many other groups are giving the Governor their enthusiastic and sustained support.

I am standing before you today to say simply that if you want our help we stand ready to help. We will dovetail our programs to your needs.

We are already helping to some extent—but we can do more and we will do more.

Our regular loan program for small businessmen resulted in 619 loans to Mississippi businesses during the past 4 years. They totaled more than $28 million. We were able to help 2,627 Mississippi firms obtain a share of the Government procurement totaling about $62 million.

But there is one of our programs that has not been utilized in Mississippi—perhaps because you have such an effective economic development program of your own.

I refer to our 502 program—our community development plan.

This is a program, as its name indicates, that is designed to develop the economies of individual communities. It is a community program, community planned, community initiated, community executed. We simply provide a loan if the proposal is sound.

It's not a handout.

It's not a something for nothing program.

It's a business proposition. It is a partnership of your community and your Government for the general economic improvement of your community and your State.

Under this program SBA puts up $8 for every $2 put up by a local community development corporation.

The development corporation makes specific proposals and SBA acts on each proposal. The maximum for each specific proposal is $350,000. This can be repaid over a 25-year period. The standard interest rate is 5½ percent. In areas of substantial unemployment this drops to 4 percent.

I am not offering this program as a substitute for your fine State economic development program. I am offering it as a supplemental program to be utilized along with your State program as a booster.

I understand that certain of your industrial bonds are issued against the full faith and credit of a municipality. It may well be that to avoid a heavy governmental indebtedness which would inhibit necessary public projects you will want to consider our community development program. It does not involve any pledge against the full faith and credit of a local government.

I understand also that your industrial development program does not finance commercial properties like shopping centers, and business buildings, transportation facilities like truck terminals, community facilities like hospitals and nursing homes, recreational facilities, and tourist development.

This can be done under our community development program. It offers a broader scope of development, an opportunity for a diversified economy in each community.

It includes the cost of land, of buildings, and of equipment.

It has a great flexibility. I want to emphasize that we do not lay down rigid architectural guidelines. We do not require conformance to any set pattern of development.

We adapt our programs to the needs of communities and regions.

We want communities to capitalize on their diversity, their unique features, their flair for the unusual because in this flexibility and diversity lies much of the strength and resilience of small business.

Our emphasis is on community action. President Johnson's basic policy is that communities provide the leadership for programs affecting their area and that the Federal Government, when necessary, will provide advice and resources.

Communities in 46 States have used our 502 program to broaden and deepen their economies. SBA has made 551 loans under this program totaling $81 million. A total of 28,600 jobs were created. The total value of projects involved was more than $110 million.

Other Southern States are using it to a greater or lesser degree. North Carolina, as a matter of fact, has used it more than any other State.

Lincoln County, N.C., provides an outstanding example. Business and civic leaders and Government officials have joined forces there to form a community development company program that has brought loans totaling $1.5 million to provide jobs for about 500 persons. These loans went to finance new textile plants, a shopping center, and a funeral home.

In Portsmouth, Va., a 1-man barbecue operation was expanded into a 32-man operation with an annual payroll of $200,000. The business now grosses $1.5 million a year. The expansion came with a $153,000 local development company loan.

In Chicago, Ill., there is a unique development. A group of 400 persons have joined in a development corporation to build a small business arts and craft center in an urban renewal area. The clearance project had wiped out the shops of that type clustered in the area. The unique small business center now being built will revitalize this distinctive feature of that community.

We have been working with the group and expect a loan application at the proper time.

The purpose of the Small Business Administration is to strengthen the national economy by helping to build a stronger small business sector. And this community development program is one of our major instruments for getting the job done, for discharging our responsibility to the small business community.

It has two important roles, just as your own economic development and "balancing industry with agriculture" programs have. The first is to help to modernize and expand and diversify existing business and industry; the second is to bring in new industry.

With it you can build motels and hotels and restaurants.

You can build manufacturing plants and buildings to house small business.

You can build transportation terminals and tourist attractions and processing plants.

You can build blast furnaces and steelworks and rolling mills.

You can build plants designed for research and development and tie your fortunes to the stars of the space age.

You can build rest homes and convalescent homes.

You can build warehouses.

You can build meatpacking plants and feed processing facilities.

You can finance lumberyards and firms to sell farm machinery and equipment.

You can finance electrical repair shops and production of aircraft parts.

You can build drugstores and grocery stores, doctors' and dentists' offices, hardware stores and meat markets.

You can build sports and recreation camps and bowling alleys and tourist resorts.

You can build parking facilities.

You can mill wet corn, make creamery butter and process sausage.

You can build facilities for new and used car dealers.

You can build vocational schools, beauty shops and flower shops, even airports and fields.

This gives you an idea of the flexibility and the versatility of this program.

I am not saying that this is your sole salvation in the area of economic development. One of our national political figures had a line to read in a speech which said in effect that a certain program was not a panacea for all problems. He read the line this way: "Now I want you to know that I am not saying that this is a pancreas for all your problems."

And I am not telling you this program is a panacea for all your problems.

I am saying simply that I think it can be of significant value in your economic development program because of the depth and diversity it will give your own programs.

We also have our regular loan program with loans for the smallest to the largest small businessman. We have our procurement assistance program to help small business get its share of Government contracts. We have our management assistance program and our small-business investment company program to assist in management training and in creation of equity capital.

We are also participating in the war on poverty and, under the Economic Opportunity Act, we are working with a number of Mississippi communities that have indicated an interest in helping to build stronger small-business sectors in deprived areas where jobs and opportunities are most desperately needed.

We are working, for example, at Corinth which has a community action program and intensified vocational training already underway.

We are hopeful that a small business development center will be set up here in Jackson as headquarters for this type of loan and management assistance program here.

The liberalized loans under this economic opportunity program range up to $25,000 and extend for terms of up to 15 years.

A community must have a small-business development center before being eligible for this program because it must be a broad-based effort. It requires the support of business and labor and government and universities.

At this center applicants for assistance are interviewed and their business problems analyzed. Those that make sound proposals are referred to the SBA office. If a loan is made the center follows through with guidance and counseling.

We have a national program called Score—the Service Corps of Retired Executives—which we have meshed with this program in some areas. Retired businessmen who have volunteered their services counsel and advise small businessmen with problems. More than 800 of these volunteers are at work on problem cases and individuals granted poverty loans.

The first poverty loan went to a fruitcake bakery in St. Charles, La., to increase its output and to add praline production and pecan sales to its activities. This enterprise began as an effort by a consumers cooperative with a membership of 800 rural families.

These loans to deprived areas not only build opportunities and create jobs. They have a healthy effect in other dimensions. They build community leadership and a sense of civic responsibility. Businessmen want a community that is healthy in all dimensions. Their interests and the best interests of the community are one and the same. And so they work for their community. They work to improve it and create a better environment.

And so the effect of poverty loans is sociological as well as economic. We are, as I said, working with a number of Mississippi communities on the application of this program in their areas. We feel that this program, coupled with community development, can add a new dimension to your great record of progress.

This is a way to give the free enterprise system an opportunity to create opportunities and expand the economy in a free, competitive market.

These programs provide keys to opportunities for thousands of Americans.

They give them their opportunity to achieve fulfillment in our democratic society through our economic system—not through handouts.

These loans fill a gap in private financing in areas that commercial institutions are reluctant to enter. We prefer that private financing make these loans and we even provide guarantees up to 90 percent to banks that will make them. It is only as a last resort that SBA steps in with a direct loan.

And so we feel that with our programs we are helping in some small way to build a better America of tomorrow.

We believe that we can be of assistance to you in building the Mississippi of tomorrow.

You are laying a firm foundation for growth.

You are expanding your economic development effort.

You are intensifying business and industrial research.

You are seeking out new industry—and you are searching for new world markets to channel trade out through your three ocean ports.

You are looking ahead into the unique opportunities offered by space exploration.

You are looking forward.

And when you look ahead you move ahead.

We at SBA are ready to work with you in any way that will help you.

A golden era of economic development is within your capability and capacity.

We wish you the very best in your efforts to reach this new dimension of progress.

Thank you.

Resolution by State of Hawaii Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the people of our fair State of Hawaii have deemed it a great honor to have this august body take time to commemorate the anniversary of Hawaiian statehood, as it did on March 18, last.

As an expression of appreciation the Hawaii State Legislature, in the name of the people of the 50th State, adopted a concurrent resolution thanking the Congress for remembering Hawaii statehood day.

Under unanimous consent I include the resolution in the RECORD:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION BY HAWAII LEGISLATURE

Whereas the Congress of the United States on March 18, 1965, generously gave of its invaluable time to commemorate the sixth anniversary of Hawaii's admission to the Union; and

Whereas Congressman CARL ALBERT led the tribute to Hawaii and magnanimously announced that the United States is a better place by virtue of Hawaii's admission to the Union; and

Whereas Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN, extraordinary leader of the battle for the passage of the Hawaii statehood bill, truly praised the Congressmen of Hawaii, SPARK M. MATSUNAGA and PATSY T. MINK; and

Whereas Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK was bestowed the signal honor of presiding as acting Speaker on this memorable occasion; and

Whereas Congressman SPARK M. MATSUNAGA eloquently declared that the Hawaii Statehood Act was "the greatest civil rights legislation of the 1950's": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1965, the senate concurring, that it does hereby extend its heartfelt thanks to the Congress of the United States for commemorating the sixth anniversary of Hawaii's admission to the Union; and be it further

Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN, Congressman CARL ALBERT, Congressman SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, and Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK.

An Appeal to Our Elected Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today I had a personal visit from Professor Bowers, of Bradley University, representing a number of professors at Bradley who conceived a statement of their views with respect to the situation in South Vietnam. I think it would be fair to point out that this statement was completed before the professors had any knowledge of the President's speech on this subject last night. Nevertheless, while I certainly do not agree or subscribe to the views expressed by these professors, but feel that they have the right to be heard and I am therefore at their request asking unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

AN APPEAL TO OUR ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES

We, the undersigned, members of the Bradley University faculty feel that the American policy of escalating the war in Vietnam, since February 7, 1965, is fraught with enormous dangers for the future of mankind.

A major war in Asia will not contribute to the solution of the cold war conflicts and problems between the Communist bloc and the Western Powers. With approximately one-third of the human race now living under Communist control, we cannot, we dare not, undertake to shoot them all off the planet. The problem is one of finding some way of living on the same planet with the Communist bloc, as we have begun to do with the Russians after some 40 years of effort. We believe the problem is not primarily a military one. After more than 10 years of military efforts in Vietnam it seems clear to us that a military solution has failed. Our bombing of military installations has not brought the Vietcong to reduce their activities in the south, nor has it brought Hanoi closer to negotiating a settlement. Rather, escalation of the war encourages greater unity and determination within the Communist camp. It has encouraged the

pro-China faction in Hanoi, and discredited the group in Moscow interested in peaceable coexistence and reducing tensions.

We urge our Government to take immediate steps to negotiate a cease-fire and to work for a political settlement in Vietnam before all of Asia is inflamed in a massive war.

We urge our Government to support the Mekong River valley project or the economic aid program for North and South Vietnam, which was recently suggested by President Johnson. We believe realistic bargaining can better proceed upon the basis of a constructive program, rather than from the multiplication of atrocities on both sides. In the nuclear age military victory is a concept use of bigger and bigger weapons leading toward the ultimate use of nuclear bombs a step toward the suicide of all mankind.

H. W. Bach (political science), James C. Ballowe (English), Steven Blume (English), William L. Bowers (history), Lester H. Brune (history), Margaret L. Carter (English), Edgar L. Chapman (English), Joy Dedman (English), Romeo Garrett (sociology), Arlen J. Hansen (English), John H. Harvey (foreign languages), Ernest Ising (physics), Myrtle Kent (English), B. P. Lathi (engineering), Brendan Liddell (philosophy), Robin Linstromberg (economics), James Morrison (sociology), Richard Oehling (history), Carleton Smith (sociology), Reed Smith (political science), Philip Weinberg (engineering).

A Forgotten Texas Hero: Col. Leonard Williams, 1800–1856

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George W. Winningham, of Mexia, Tex., has written an article concerning Col. Leonard Williams, in which he outlines the great contribution Colonel Williams made to the State of Texas during the period of its revolution and while it was a Republic. Colonel Williams is buried in Hill County near Mount Calm, Tex., and has relatives residing in that county. The article by Mr. Winningham follows:

A FORGOTTEN HERO—COL. LEONARD WILLIAMS, 1800–1856

(By George W. Winningham)

Historian Ray Walter has said that Col. Leonard Williams is a forgotten pioneer Texas hero. Texas historians have neglected to give the prominent place to him which his services during our Texas revolution, Republic of Texas, and the early years of statehood merited. His grave was neglected 102 years before a marker was erected in 1958. He is buried in the Pitts Cemetery 2 miles inside Limestone County, south of the Hill County town of Mount Calm.

From 1819 or 1820 when the Williams brothers, Leonard and William, appeared in Texas, in the Nacogdoches area, with their half-breed Cherokee wives, Leonard was prominently identified with the ebb and flow of the political events which resulted in Texas independence and annexation to the United States by treaty.

Soon after their arrival in Spanish Texas, the Williams brothers were captured by Comanche Indians and were held in captivity for 2 years. They were forced to do slave labor for the Comanches. They were frequently beaten by the squaws. In spite of long hours of grueling labor and cruel beatings at the hands of the squaws, Leonard mastered the Comanche dialect and talked their way to freedom. The 2 years in captivity was a sort of schooling which prepared the colonel for the role he was to play in the history of Texas under the leadership of Sam Houston.

After his return from captivity in 1822, Colonel Williams engaged in trading with Indian tribes, but history loses sight of him until 1835. He fought with Ben Milam at Bexar when General Cos, General Santa Anna's brother-in-law, was forced to surrender. In this battle, Williams lost an eye from gunshot wound.

Beyond a doubt his most important service to Texas was rendered during the Texas revolution. The Cherokees under Chief Bowls were restless and to counteract influence of Mexican agents, Sam Houston sent Colonel Williams as his agent to form a peace treaty with Chief Bowls and his restless Cherokee warriors. His Cherokee wife gave him a standing with the Indians as a blood brother and he was successful in preventing the Cherokees from entering the war on the side of the Mexicans or staging independent Indian raids on white settlements. By keeping the Cherokees peaceful, he contributed much to the success of the Texas revolution. It would have been impossible for Houston to have fought an Indian war and with the poor equipment and poorly trained army to have won a victory over Santa Anna.

The colonel could speak seven or eight Indian dialects and this enabled him, as Houston's Indian commissioner, to make a number of peace treaties with various Indian tribes. It is said the Indians never broke a treaty they made with Williams. Knowing their language and their wild ways, they opened their villages to him far and near on trading expeditions and missions of mercy to ransom white captives. He was on a trading expedition when he saw and tried to ransom Cynthia Ann Parker. There is no record of the number of white captives he ransomed from Indian captivity, but the number is impressive. His most important ransom case was the two children who were captured inside the city limits of Austin, Tex. He and an Indian companion remained on the trail of the Comanche raiding party 2 years before they located the children, ransomed and returned them to their relatives.

The colonel was loyal to his Indian friends. On one occasion he rode a long distance to apprehend and hang several white outlaws who had been robbing and murdering a friendly tribe of Indians.

In 1842, Houston appointed four commissioners, Colonel Williams among the number, to deal or "treat" with Indians on the frontier. The colonel played an important role in the council at Tehuacana Creek when a peace treaty was signed with a number of Indian tribes which ended a war against the whites and again Robertson County and adjacent area was opened to settlement.

The colonel was Indian agent at Torrey's Trading Post below Waco when Texas was annexed to the United States by treaty. He turned the agency over to Federal authorities.

The colonel finally retired to the land set aside for his services to Texas, and resided on it near the present town of Mount Calm until his death in 1856. He died of an old scalp wound inflicted by an Indian warrior. He is buried in Pitts Cemetery in Limestone County about 2 miles from Mount Calm where a number of his relatives still live.

The many heroic deeds of this man in the interest of Texas will never be known. His deeds were considered by Sam Houston as well worth preserving as a part of our history. When Williams was on his deathbed, Sam Houston sent two men to his home near Mount Calm to write the history of his life, but the colonel was too ill to be of any help. His life is glorified with service to Texas but most of the history of his life died with him. Suffice it to say that he performed heroic services for Texas which placed him in a class with his friends Sam Houston, Ben Milam, and other great heroes of Texas. The difference lies in the fact that history was not as kind in preserving his deeds of valor as it has been in preserving the deeds of other great Texans. He is one of the forgotten heroes of Texas history.

The New Spirit of Social Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great developments of our times is the new spirit of social action centered in our religious institutions. Exemplifying this spirit were three sermons delivered this past weekend in Washington, as reported in the Washington Post of April 5, 1965.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 5, 1965]

CALLING RIGHTS DRIVE "RED" SEEN AS TRICK

The Reverend James P. Archibald said yesterday that charges of Communist control over the civil rights movement represent "an old trick of those who have opposed social change."

In a sermon at St. Paul Methodist Church in Chevy Chase, Mr. Archibald said the leaders of the civil rights drive are persons of "high principles and sound moral integrity.

"Whenever there is an attempt to break a social pattern, there are beatnik groups and offcolor societies that move in to join the festivities," he said. "But let's not be deceived * * * this is an old trick * * * of putting a bad but familiar label on your opponent."

CUTS IN WELFARE CRITICIZED

The Reverend David G. Colwell of First Congregational United Church of Christ said yesterday that holding down the costs of welfare and retraining programs here "is not good economics, and is surely not good Christian service."

Mr. Colwell criticized "certain Members of the Senate" for not providing aid to dependent children of unemployed parents in the District although all 50 States receive this Federal aid.

"The result is that an unemployed father is faced with a cruel dilemma," Mr. Colwell said in his church newsletter. "Either he permits his children to go hungry * * * or he must leave home."

INDIAN THEOLOGIAN CALLS FOR UNITY

An Indian theologian sounded a call for Christian unity yesterday in a guest sermon at the Falls Church Episcopal Church.

The Reverend Isaiah Jesudason, 1 of 13 ecumenical fellows from around the world visiting this area as guests of the Council of Churches of Greater Washington, said there is now the "promise of a Christian faith which will be truly universal."

Mr. Jesudason, a member of the interdenominational church of South India and lecturerer at a Kerala seminary, said Christians of all races and cultures must join together in seeking world peace.

The Development of Our Nation's Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, when Congress is in session, one of the most difficult tasks of a Member of Congress is keeping abreast of fast-moving events in and around Capitol Hill. Fortunately, to assist us we have available a number of worthwhile sources of information on matters involving Congress.

One of the most valuable and unique, in that it is the only news program devoted exclusively to congressional matters, is Joseph McCaffrey's report on "Today in Congress," broadcast at 6:50 p.m., Monday through Friday, over radio station WMAL here in Washington.

I always find Mr. McCaffrey's reports interesting and informative. Last week, there were several messages included in this program which I feel are of unusual and widespread interest and, therefore, worthy of the attention of all my colleagues. I am well aware that Mr. McCaffrey's program is "must" listening for Members of Congress. However, for those who may not have heard the messages broadcast last week which I refer to above, I place them in the RECORD at this point:

TODAY IN CONGRESS

(Broadcast on Mar. 29, 1965, WMAL radio, Washington, D.C.)

The people of America are restless. Past failures cry out for corrective solutions. As a nation, halting and isolated steps have been taken to develop our water resources. Only recently have the people in the Washington area become aware of the need to develop all of the water resources of the Potomac River Basin. River bank beautification, flood control in the upper river, navigation in the lower river, small boat harbors for recreation, improvements in river water quality to permit swimming and fishing are only some of the public benefits to be derived from a fully developed and improved Potomac River.

The Congressmen and Senators from the Potomac River area are anxious to improve their river. They realize that other rivers throughout the Nation also need to be improved. That is why they join with other Congressmen and Senators in support of the Corps of Army Engineers and the Department of Interior to build engineeringly sound and economically justified water resource projects throughout the Nation. Such a project is the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal—a project destined to be one of the great interconnecting waterways hauling 81 million tons of traffic annually.

TODAY IN CONGRESS

(Broadcast on Mar. 30, 1965, WMAL radio, Washington, D.C.)

In the time period since World War II America appears to have been more concerned with the welfare of the world than with its own welfare. We have been quick to help improve the economy of other nations but slow to solve our own domestic problems.

The current Congress is aware of the need to increase the number of jobs available in our Nation to provide employment for a population increasing by 8,000 people each day. A bill to improve the depressed economy of Appalachia has been passed. Bills to train our disadvantaged youth and thus to provide them with a salable skill have been passed. The Congress has done a great deal to improve the human factor in our economy but it must also be aware of the need to improve the physical resources of the Nation. One such need is to interconnect the Ohio and Mississippi River navigation system with the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway navigation system. Such an interconnection will benefit both systems and spread the benefits of low-cost water transportation throughout the Nation. By reducing the cost of transportation, jobs for the people are increased in number because 20 percent of the sale price of any product you buy is made up of transportation charges. Reduce these charges and more products can be sold and more people can be employed.

TODAY IN CONGRESS

(Broadcast on Mar. 31, 1965, WMAL radio, Washington, D.C.)

Half the fun of a vacation lies in the planning. Most people in the Washington area think in terms of salt water vacations. However, the State of Ohio—lying 6 hours by car to the west of Washington—is planning a vast improvement in its vacation facilities. Ohio is setting aside $60 million in State funds for use in developing camping sites, cabins, boat ramps, swimming areas, restoring historical sites so important in the development of the great western reserve territory, improving access to fishing streams, hatching fish and putting them in Ohio waters to improve fishing, buying land, and stocking it with game for public hunting and doing all things necessary to make visitors welcome to "the wonderful world of Ohio."

The Congress is also being asked to help Ohio become a more attractive vacation area for all of the people of the Nation to enjoy. A navigable waterway will be built between Lake Erie and the Ohio River. When it is completed families with boats can spend their vacations on waterway trips traveling anywhere on the Great Lakes—Saint Lawrence Seaway and on the Ohio-Mississippi River waterway systems. Our fresh water inland waterway systems will be interconnected for all to use and enjoy. When the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal is built the Nation will have more than 28,000 miles of interconnected waterways. It is a low-cost transportation system bring pleasure to the people and economic strength to the Nation.

National Farmers Union President James G. Patton Urges Creation of an American Ombudsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have proposed the establishment of an administrative counsel of the Congress, modeled after the Scandinavian ombudsman. This American ombudsman would help Congressmen help their constituents in the constituents' problems with the Federal bureaucracy, without interfering with traditional congressional-constituent relationships.

I am pleased that James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, has endorsed this proposal and urged the establishment of an American ombudsman in a recent article.

The article follows:

WE NEED AN AMERICAN OMBUDSMAN?

(By James G. Patton)

Some people—and I'm one—think we now have so many kinds of public officials, that we need at least one more.

We need someone to watch the watchers for us.

Governments seem increasingly unwilling to trust the common folk who support them, as they become increasingly more complex.

Reporters are now being discouraged in Vietnam, insofar as those in charge can accomplish it. The military always try to treat a war as their own private affair. But the same tendency is, regrettably, spreading through civilian government also.

Years ago the U.S. Supreme Court decreed division of offshore oil and other minerals as between the seaboard States and the Federal Government; that is, the rest of us.

Then the whole subject became thickly veiled in bureaucratic secrecy, and we do not yet even know whether that division has been accomplished, though billions of dollars of public money ride on the results.

This sort of thing is increasing both in our vast Federal bureaucracy and in our States, some of which are as complex as are many sovereign nations.

Further, bureaucrats seem depending more and more on the mindless machinations of computers—Government by cybernetics—which ought never to rule over human beings.

And, public officials seem increasingly reluctant to be bothered by or on behalf of the people to whom they are legally responsible.

The Swedes, whose Government and economy furnish the world, in many respects, a model of efficiency and peace, sensed this a long time ago. So they created a public office specifically to deal with it, that of ombudsman, which roughly means "watcher."

His office gets all complaints about governmental acts, and questions about public matters generally. If he doesn't know the answer or how to remedy the complaint, the law empowers him to find out, and to take action or to recommend it.

Representative HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, truly says that the great dilemma of democratic government is how to give officials enough power to run things "and at the same time protect civil liberties by giving citizens a practical means of correcting administrative errors and abuses."

He adds: "If there are no avenues for correcting maladministration, programs * * * such as social security, public housing, and veterans benefits, are full of possibilities for individual injustice."

Representative REUSS notes that our 535 Members of Congress act as unofficial ombudsmen. But this job plagues them so that they have too little time to think or to act about the great tasks of legislation and the great problems of administration. In some offices, nine-tenths of staff time and effort is taken up with the job of ombudsman alone.

He also notes that Congress long ago provided an Office of Legislative Counsel to help Members draft laws, and a reference office to help them with research.

Now, he says, Congress needs an Office of Legislative Counsel—of an ombudsman—to which questions and complaints would automatically flow, when they concern the vast and murky workings of administrative offices.

The Swedish office was created away back in 1809. Finland, Denmark, New Zealand, and Norway followed suit, and other nations are considering it.

Everyone who has ever been frustrated by a personal problem complicated by bureaucratic government, will be interested.

But perhaps we need an ombudsman to watch legislative bodies, too. What might such a peoples' lobbyist tell us about some bills regularly introduced and passed in our Congress, and our 50 State legislatures?

National Museum Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation to enlarge the present activities of the Smithsonian Institution in national and international research, training, and publication in the museum field. The bill is known as the National Museum Act of 1965.

The recent growth in the number of museums, their collections, and activities, has far outstripped the ability of the museum profession to provide trained personnel for the study, planning, coordination, and staffing of the Nation's museums. The achievements of a few outstanding museums in investigating new techniques for display, cataloging, and conservation, new relationships between historic, scientific, and artistic objects, and new concepts of communication, reveal how much remains to be done to make effective the universal opportunities for education and cultural progress which these institutions could offer to the public.

The primary responsibility for the support of the individual museum should remain with the community which it serves. However, needs for a national and international program of cooperative research and training to assist museums large and small to make their maximum contribution require national recognition and leadership.

Much is already being done. The U.S. Office of Education has taken a constructive interest in the educational activities of museums, particularly with regard to the functions of the museum as a support facility for university and public school education. The National Science Foundation is considering the role of museums in furthering scientific research and raising the level of public scientific awareness. The Department of State has made a number of leader grants to foreign museum professionals to stimulate the international exchange of ideas and experience in the museum field. The Smithsonian Institution, in one of its primary roles as the National Museum, has long recognized its responsibilities to the national museum profession. It has recently undertaken to introduce a limited number of museology interns in its museums and has engaged in a joint program with the American Association of Museums in the complementary areas of museum training, education, publications, and a continuing survey of museum problems and resources.

It is proposed that the present activities of the Smithsonian Institution in museum research, training, and technology be recognized and strengthened by the passage of a National Museum Act which would establish within the National Museum a coordinated program of national and international research, training, and publication in the museum field. The program would be supervised by the Director of the National Museum under the direction of the Board of Regents and Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the time is long past to insure the voting rights of all Americans, no matter what their race, color, or religion. President Johnson should have the full support of this House for his plea that there be no delay, no hesitation, no compromise with our purpose on this issue. I am proud to say that the Young Men's Christian Association of Pittsburgh has recently adopted a statement of support for the President's stand. That statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF PITTSBURGH, MARCH 18, 1965

The Young Men's Christian Association of Pittsburgh has as one of its stated purposes the following:

"To unite persons in a worldwide fellowship by a common loyalty to Jesus Christ for the purpose of developing Christian personality and building a Christian society."

Having this objective, we are concerned with events and conditions both in our local community and elsewhere which tend to divide instead of unite, and which tend to tear down instead of build up a Christian society. So we are deeply concerned with the events in Alabama in recent days, where strife and bloodshed have marked the struggle of the Negro for equal rights under law.

We share the anguish of the various elements in conflict in Alabama in this struggle, realizing that equality has not yet been achieved in our own State, and that we ourselves are not blameless. But we must record our sympathy with all those who by nonviolent means are seeking the right to vote, and our condemnation of the excessive use of force to quell demonstrations to aid in this endeavor.

We commend the President of the United States for his statement to the Congress of March 15, 1965, in connection with this crisis in our national life, and we pledge continuing endeavor to achieve equality for all persons regardless of race as an essential ingredient in our association's purpose as above stated.

Voting Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent editorial from the April 4, 1965, Washington Sunday Star. I commend it to the membership.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Apr. 4, 1965]

VOTING DISCRIMINATION

Our basic objections to the administration's voting rights bill have already been stated. We think there is need for a reasonable literacy test, provided there is no discrimination in its application to would-be voters. The administration's bill, in one aspect, outlaws any and all literacy tests, and is designed to permit total illiterates to vote. The educational voting level is low enough now without enacting a Federal law to push it down even further.

The second important aspect of this bill imposes its harsh and punitive provisions on any State which has a literacy test, and in which fewer than 50 percent of the residents over 21 are registered or actually voted in the 1964 election.

This bill contains other provisions which are reminiscent of the reconstruction era following the Civil War. But the two which we have mentioned, taken together, offend one's sense of fairness. If enacted, in its present form, this bill would result in a legislative discrimination as bad or worse than the evil the bill is supposed to remedy.

Let's take the case of Virginia, which is brought under this bill because it requires a literacy test and, though more than 50 percent of its eligibles are registered, fewer than 50 percent voted in 1964.

What is Virginia's literacy test? As spelled out by Senator HARRY BYRD in his recent statement, any person desiring to register must be able, without assistance, to give in writing the following information: His name. The date and place of his birth. His current residence. His occupation. And, if he has voted before, the county and precinct in which he voted. That is all.

Is this a test which opens the door to such obviously discriminatory requirements as being able to interpret to the satisfaction of some ignorant registrar sections of a State constitution? Is it a test which asks too much of a person who wants to vote on the important and complicated issues which face us today? We do not think so. Furthermore, the administration concedes that this is not an unreasonable literacy test, and that there is no evidence that it has been used in Virginia to discriminate against Negroes.

If this is so, why does the bill link a reasonable and nondiscriminatory literacy test to an arbitrary formula with respect to voting or registration percentages?

One explanation is that the statistics on registration are unreliable. But this is said to be true in West Virginia, which is not affected by the bill because it has no literacy test. What nonsense.

In addition to Virginia, the States covered by the bill are Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Alaska. We are puzzled by the inclusion of Alaska, in which Negroes certainly are not discriminated against. There are few if any there. As to the others,

we haven't enough information to pass judgment.

But it is our firm belief that this is a discriminatory bill. If its purpose is to protect Negro voting rights, it discriminates in favor of New York, which requires a rather strict literacy test but which has met the voting percentage standards. It also discriminates in the case of Texas, which did not meet the percentage-of-voting standard in 1964, but which does require a literacy test, although it is verbal in character and is called by some other name.

There have been reports that the administration's bill will be changed or modified in some unrevealed aspects. We hope this is true. We also hope that the bill, if modified, will be made applicable to Virginia (in which we have a special interest) on the basis of facts rather than fiction. And certainly not on the basis of some arbitrary formula dreamed up by someone who hasn't the faintest idea what the facts are. Or, if he knows, doesn't care.

The Urban Population of the United States Cannot Expect To Have a Great Society Borne on the Bowed Backs of American Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has this week received the administration's Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. As we begin our study of this vital legislation, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a fine editorial analysis of the farm situation which was published in the Washington Post earlier this week.

In addition to its well-reasoned approach, I feel this editorial is of particular significance because it reflects the views of a large metropolitan newspaper which has for many years ably presented the problems of urban areas to its readers. An equally important service has now been performed in educating its urban readers to the problems facing rural America and in effectively emphasizing the overwhelming interdependency of these two segments of our society.

As Americans we have not only an indirect but a direct stake in the entire social and economic condition of our Nation. The truth is that there can be no lasting prosperity in the city without prosperity on the farm. We must therefore seek a broader realization that a sound and successful farm program serves not merely the interest of region or group, but the national interest.

In this spirit I wish to enter into the RECORD at this point the following editorial appearing in the Washington Post on April 7, 1965:

JOHNSON ON AGRICULTURE

The President's letter to Congress on farm legislation admirably states the objectives of national agricultural policy and appropriately acknowledges the obligation of the American people to pay the costs of producing their food.

No one can quarrel with the President's statement of purposes when he puts our goal at an abundance of food and fiber at stable prices, a workable balance between supply and demand at lower costs to Government, an opportunity for the efficient farmer to earn parity of income from farming operations, equal opportunity for rural people and effective use of farm resources abroad.

The city folk of the Nation needed to be reminded that they are spending a smaller part of the family income than ever before for a better diet than they ever have had before. And they needed to be told that farmers are getting 5 percent less for their products than they got 15 years ago and that many of them are earning less than the statutory minimum wage. The urban population of the United States cannot expect to have a Great Society borne on the bowed backs of American farmers. The predicament of agriculture is a reproach to a nation in which every other economic group is enjoying the greatest prosperity in history.

The changes in the farm program set forth in the President's letter are very complicated and difficult to analyze. In principle, there is a great deal to be said for the idea of deriving a larger percentage of the farmers' income from the marketplace and a smaller percentage of it from Government payments. There was a time when the two-price system involved, with its discrepancy in the domestic and export price levels, would have been objected to as an export subsidy. But there has been so much interference with the natural world price levels of farm exports already that the situation is not profoundly altered by the resort to the certificate plan proposed.

The wheat plan vests the Secretary of Agriculture with great discretion in the allocation of certificates among growers. The distribution on the basis of the respective shares of producers in the wheat market was not ideal but it limited the Government to some standard. Distribution on the basis of what is fair and equitable leaves almost unlimited discretion to the Secretary in fixing the shares of the individual farmer. No doubt it is desirable to have some standard other than that heretofore provided, but the new proposals involve a very sweeping delegation of authority.

The President's proposals make plain the enormous and complicated problems of dealing with agricultural surpluses. Difficult and complicated as they are, it is certain that they are not anywhere near as difficult as the problem of agricultural deficits. President Johnson's suggestions of this week make much more hopeful reading than the recommendations which Premier Brezhnev made last week for solving the agricultural shortages in the Soviet Union.

New York Journal-American's Subway Protection Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the New York American, one of the outstanding evening newspapers in the United States, has been in the forefront of the effort to curb the horrendous crime running rampant through the New York City subway system.

The Journal American has suggested a program for action which would be aimed at providing safety for the millions of New York subway riders. This program includes the use of highly trained and skilled police dogs in the subway system as a major deterrent to the armed thug, the rapist, the mugger, and the young tough.

Our experience here in Washington and particularly on the Hill with these marvelous police dogs is evidence of the high regard in which they are held in many areas of the country.

Urban areas of Philadelphia as well have had great success in the use of these police dogs.

One of the highlights in the recent Police Show in Madison Square Garden was the effectiveness with which these dogs can be trained to attack criminals and thugs and subdue them at the command of the master.

The Journal-American is to be praised for its leadership in this field. Not only has it reported the news of crime and its devastating aftermath, but it has led the campaign to do something about this crime. With these dogs in our parks and subways New York will not be permitted to become "6 o'clock town" with people afraid to venture out at night.

Disfigured African Boy Finds Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, although Project Hope primarily is interested in educating doctors and nurses of developing nations in modern medical techniques, Hope, in the process, performs miraculous surgeries and treatments.

One such example is described in a recent article in the Miami, Fla., Herald. The news story tells the tale of a young Guinean whose face was maimed and distorted to such an extent that he could not close his eyes.

Mr. Speaker, following plastic surgery aboard the white hospital ship SS *Hope*, the African youth—Mommadu Dialo—was able to shut his eyes. The scars removed in the operation removed his ugliness and permitted him to live a normal life.

Through Hope's teaching-training program Guinean doctors obtain the skill to perform similar operations and treatments. Thus, Hope helps others help themselves.

The entire story is told in the following Miami Herald article:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Feb. 18, 1965]

DISFIGURED AFRICAN BOY FINDS HOPE

(By Jean Wardlow)

Every day for 2 months the African boy came and waited.

He sat quietly on the U.S. medical mercy ship *Hope*, there in Conakry, Guinea.

His head was covered with a towel. He'd let no one see his face—a face full of scars

and ugliness; eyes that had never closed in 20 years because of disfiguration.

For 2 months Mommadu Dialo came and sat * * * and waited for the plastic surgeon—a Miamian—he was told would be there soon.

It had happened a long time ago—when he was 3 days old.

The night breeze which waved tall grasses of his village was cool. The lumbering and dancer-footed animals with high, curling horns already had sought their shelters. Only a hyena's cry protested the darkness.

The fire of the village burned bright.

Soon Mommadu's cry would join the hyena's. His mother would drop him into the fire. By the time they got him out, Mommadu's face was twisted wreckage.

Mommadu was never a part of his people after that. He was something apart—ugly, laughable, pitiful. It depended upon who looked at him.

That's why Mommadu waited every day for 2 months for Dr. Thomas Baker, who recently completed his fourth volunteer stint with the SS *Hope*, a floating hospital which brings not only medical help, but trains local doctors, nurses, and technicians in countries that need them.

"Mommadu's was the most dramatic case I've ever seen on these trips," Dr. Baker said. "The before and after pictures are amazing. But not only his appearance changed. It made a difference in his whole personality."

Skin grafts gave Mommadu eyelids. Further surgery changed the ugliness. He had been blind in one eye and Mommadu is due for a cornea transplant soon.

But it was only one case of the many hundreds which come aboard the *Hope* every week, the doctor said.

The ship, a former Navy vessel, is staffed by volunteer doctors and nurses. The doctors even pay their own transportation to and from the *Hope* for short stints.

Its financed by contributions to the People-to-People Health Foundation and industry's donations of drugs and equipment, and has been winning friends for America by treating the world's sick.

The *Hope* ("health opportunity for people everywhere") goes only to countries it's invited (60 are awaiting it) and has treated for 10-month stints since 1960 in Indonesia and South Vietnam; Peru; Ecuador, and, now, in Africa.

Dr. Baker, who lives at 5200 SW. 59th Avenue, and his associate, Dr. Howard Gordon, whose home is at 4408 Toledo, have split volunteer shifts of 6 weeks each to serve aboard the ship.

Two days after Dr. Baker returned home, Dr. Gordon was on his way. Their enthusiam for the project has spilled over to other associates in the Florida and Dade County Medical associations who also have volunteered for the *Hope*, and to local clubs and organizations where they give slide- and movies-assisted talks on the hospital ship.

A local south Florida Hope Committee, which will help raise funds and needed articles for the ship in this area—similar to those in other cities—is being formed. Mrs. Gordon is temporary chairman.

There are less than 100 doctors in the entire country of Guinea, with less than 4 million people, Dr. Baker said. There is only one dentist and no obstetricians. Babies are delivered by midwives "who have a high social standing in the community," he said.

There are two hospitals, one of them built by the Russians 5 years ago. The other was built by the French.

"It's a country just achieving independence," Dr. Baker said, "and they're afraid of everybody. The Russians, the Red Chinese and the Americans are all vying politically, economically and medically to influence this potentially wealthy country.

"When we first went in, doors were closed everywhere. This is gradually thawing. Now the people are accepting us. They know what we're trying to do.

"And the Reds are beginning to see—and be afraid of—how much the people think of what we're doing," he added.

Peace Corps members acted as translators for the many dialects and several languages used in the country, Dr. Baker said. And the *Hope's* medical staff took two things for granted: malaria, "everyone has had it" and superstition.

"You accept both facts and went on with your work," the doctor said.

"All the women wear strings tied about their waists, some knotted, some with beads. They believe they must wear these for fertility.

"And witch doctors still practice."

"We had no trouble with them," Dr. Baker said. "They sent us their tough cases."

Costs of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to call the House's attention to a fine letter from a constituent, Mrs. Robert C. Hunt, of Chattanooga, Tenn., who explains the sacrifices which she and her husband make to give their children the advantages of an advanced education. Mrs. Hunt cities the pressing need among low- and middle-income families for tax relief in order to meet their obligations to their children. In view of the fact that productive individuals such as the Hunts pay taxes to support educational opportunities for all children, I believe they should receive every possible encouragement to also seek greater opportunity for their own.

There is a need for positive action by Congress in the field of assistance to individuals seeking higher education. In the near future, I shall introduce legislation to provide realistic tax credits for those parents incurring the expense of sending sons and daughters through college.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mrs. Robert Hunt's letter of March 16, 1965, addressed to Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Stanley S. Surrey, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN, TENN.,
March 16, 1965.

Assistant Secretary STANLEY S. SURREY,
U.S. Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the Chattanooga, Tenn., Times, on Monday, March 8, you are quoted as saying "that proposals to grant tax credits for college tuition payments would give benefits to those who have no real need for help." They go on further to say that you are "the ranking Government expert on taxes and his statements often reflect the pattern of administrative thinking in that field."

I would like to know just how many children you have and if you have had the burden of sending them to college as well as keeping the rest of the family going and paying the taxes we have to pay. It is possible that there might be a few who would receive benefit "that have no real need for it," but from my information, even that is not likely, for the wealthy set up trust funds for their children to offset this. It is a very wise thing for them to do and it is too bad the rest of us are unable to do it. There is by far and away many, many others of us, we middle-class group, who want to send our children to college and will work our heads off to that end, rather than to have to borrow money to do it or beg from the Government.

Yes, I know there are many scholarships offered but those are for only those young people with exceptionally high grades. We happen to have three children who have normal intelligence, have to work very hard for their grades and would not qualify for a scholarship. My husband is an outstanding attorney in Chattanooga but does have great integrity and will not overcharge any of his clients. So—when the time came for our oldest child to go to college, I went to work in order to supplement the income to make it possible. Then, 2 years later, our second child was in college. I think you can figure out what a terrific strain that would be on any middle-income family. This same one is now at Wheaton College working toward a masters in Christian education—she worked for a while in order to supplement and had to pay nearly $250 income tax out of the little amount she made. We now have a third coming along whom we very much want to send to college. What is the answer do you think? Should we all look to the Federal Government to decide who should go and to send our children to the college they deem to be the right one?

Wouldn't it be better for the many families in our category to get some relief on income tax for doing the job ourselves? Once we educate our children are they not in a position to make more income and in turn pay more income tax to the Government? Is the Federal Government trying to take every bit of initiative away from the people? I wonder. How could granting tax credits to those who would rather do it themselves "actually slow up progress in education" as you say? It would give families a chance to send their children to college without Government assistance and a drain on the Treasury.

I hope this does not sound bitter. But I am writing in disgust for after sending two to college and one to go, my husband and I have not been able to put away or save anything toward our old age, which we should have been able to do. Oh, yes. We have social security, but when that time comes we will then be in the President's own terms the "Poverty group" and in the meantime paying taxes to send other children to college when we received no relief on sending our own. Is that fair form to you, sir?

I would like very much to hear from you in answer to this.

Sincerely,

MRS. ROBERT C. HUNT.

The President Opens the Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting herewith the lead editorial in the New York Times for today, April 8, on the President's address last evening at Johns Hopkins University.

I was tremendously heartened by the President's proposal to bring about "unconditional discussions" on the Vietnam situation, and I am hopeful that from this serious peace offensive, we may soon reach our goal of world peace.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, April 8, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT OPENS THE DOOR

President Johnson last night projected an American policy on Vietnam in which the country can take pride. He indicated that the United States now may begin to apply as much determination and ingenuity to seeking peace as it has to waging war. He has wisely broken his long silence on American purposes. And, much as this newspaper and many Members of Congress have urged, he has restored the olive branch that balances the arrows in the eagle's claws.

The President's proposal to seek a Vietnam settlement through "unconditional discussions" with "the governments" concerned opens the door to peace explorations in a wide variety of forums with Hanoi, Moscow, even Peiping, although not with the Vietcong directly. He has broken new ground as well, in explicitly offering to North Vietnam American aided regional development, food-for-peace programs and—implying the possibility of increased recognition—"peaceful association with others."

In urging Secretary General Thant to initiate a plan immediately for increased development in southeast Asia to aid in the establishment of peace rather than merely to follow its restoration, he has given wings to long-pending, imaginative proposals by men such as Ambassador Chester Bowles and Canada's Prime Minister Lester Pearson.

The size of the proposed American contribution—$1 billion is half the estimated cost of the initial five-dam program of Mekong Valley development—is less important than the willingness to participate for the first time in a jointly financed aid program with the Soviet Union.

The President's speech has, in short, at last begun the essential process of changing the context of a problem that, as usually stated, appears insoluble. In proposing a South Vietnam tied to no alliance and containing no foreign military base, the President has accepted the concept of ultimate American military withdrawal and of an independent South Vietnam that would be neutral and yet free to seek outside assistance if threatened.

Most important, the President's speech nowhere repeats Secretary Rusk's vague and wornout homily about negotiations being inconceivable until the Communists "leave their neighbors alone." It recognizes that negotiations are not only conceivable but necessary if that desirable purpose is ever to be achieved.

President Johnson has now provided a bold answer to the appeal made to him last week by the chiefs of 17 nonalined states and earlier by many of our allies. It would be too optimistic to expect a favorable reply from the Communist countries, at least at first. But they are provided with plenty of food for thought.

Neither they nor anyone else can dispute the fact that a serious peace offer has been made. It is now clearly up to them to make a reasonable response.

The Federal Student Loan Program Is a Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most brilliant successes of our Federal Government in the field of education has been the student loan program.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article describing that success which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 21, 1965:

STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM A SUCCESS

(By Terry Ferrer)

Six years ago, the Federal Government stepped into a new field of educational support: loans to college students.

The beginnings were modest in February of 1959. Some $6 million was sliced up among 1,227 colleges to make some 7,000 loans available. Each college had to put up $1 for every $9 it received from Washington. Each student could borrow up to $1,000 a year, with a loan ceiling of $5,000, and was expected to begin repayment 1 year after graduation, when a 3-percent interest rate begins, and to end repayment after 10 years.

At the time, skeptics declared that the program, part of the National Defense Education Act, simply wouldn't work. "There wasn't enough money," they said. "Since the colleges had to administer and collect the loans, they would be running all over the country for years, trying, at prohibitive cost, to find delinquent loanholders," they said. "Students wouldn't borrow," they said, "because families didn't borrow for higher education. And if they did, they wouldn't pay their debts."

Like most prophets of doom, the skeptics were partly right and partly wrong. More money was forthcoming from Congress. In fact, as the U.S. Office of Education testimony before the House and Senate Education Subcommittees has shown in the last 2 weeks, the $6 million has now ballooned into $443 million, loaned over the 6 years to 640,000 borrowers at 1,618 colleges.

Obviously, the students did borrow, in unprecedented numbers and amounts. In fact, the National Defense Education Act student loan program virtually changed the American family's thinking on borrowing for higher education and convinced both students and their parents that buying college on time payments was as logical as installment buying of a television set or a car.

By way of contrast, 10 years ago, only 83,000 students borrowed the total of a mere $13.5 million from their colleges. This academic year alone, the Federal Government is giving $145 million to colleges for student loans.

Have the students been repaying their debts? Yes and no. Peter P. Muirhead, Associate Commissioner for Higher Education in the Office of Education, said last week that $2.8 million has come in in "accelerated payments"—meaning that some students had paid their debts sooner than they needed to.

But more than offsetting this bonanza is $3 million past due. However, Mr. Muirhead said in a telephone interview, "of this $3 million, almost $2 million is overdue by only one payment. Some $1.1 million is overdue by two or more payments. Remember that a bank does not write off a bad debt until after six payments are missed."

Asked to compare the college delinquent payment rate with the 1.9 percent general public rate currently cited by the American Banking Association, Mr. Muirhead said: "There are about 275,000 borrowers now in collection status. About 8,000 are overdue by 1 payment. This gives us a rate of almost 3 percent."

But, Mr. Muirhead continued, of deep concern to the colleges involved is the cost of administering and collecting the Federal loans—as the skeptics predicted. According to a survey of 395 representative colleges in the loan program, Mr. Muirhead said, the average cost of processing and collecting a typical loan of $2,000 borrowed over 4 years is $135.42 per student. The study, conducted by the National Association of College and University Business Officers, estimated the total administrative costs to the colleges in the current fiscal year at between $5.6 and $6.6 million, a sizable sum.

Nearly 90 percent of the institutions surveyed felt that they should be reimbursed by the Government for this expense, in whole or in part.

Mr. Muirhead said that both the House and Senate education subcommittees are considering such reimbursement, perhaps on a matching basis. Further, he said, there is a possibility that the Government can help with payments which have been deferred because the borrowers were either in the armed services or the Peace Corps or they had gone on to graduate school. Such deferments totaled $3.7 million in the year ending last October.

Also under consideration, Mr. Muirhead said, are requiring the student to have a cosigner (not now necessary), cutting down the 10-year repayment period, requiring a minimum yearly repayment, and encouraging voluntary collection agencies set up by the colleges themselves. Mrs. EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, chairman of the House subcommittee, feels that a possible answer is to have a Federal agency collect the loans after the colleges make them.

But Mr. Muirhead indicated that the Office of Education is considering "systematic application" of the voluntary cooperative programs, whereby associations of colleges and universities use a commercial bank or create a nonprofit agency to make collections. The commercial-bank approach is now being used by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest and the Associated Colleges of Illinois, both served by the American National Bank and Trust Co.

The 24 colleges of the State University of New York have a cooperative service center for collections, and the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York is considering such a program. State colleges in Connecticut and Maryland are using the joint approach, and it is under consideration in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, North Carolina, and Ohio.

The voluntary approach seems preferable to collection by a Federal agency. But some tightening of repayment by the Federal Government and aid to the colleges for administrative costs do seem desirable.

Nevertheless, the Federal student-loan program has more than justified its original concept as a way of helping needy students through college. The need to strengthen and refine the program's operation should not detract from its overall resounding success.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses cleared tobacco bill for President.

Senate worked on school aid bill.

House passed medicare bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 7231–7262, 7341

Bills Introduced: Nine bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1744–1752; S.J. Res. 69; and S. Con. Res. 32. **Pages 7237–7238, 7341**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 339, providing for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, Nebr., with amendments (S. Rept. 150);

S. 1570, to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education (S. Rept. 151);

S. 702, providing for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quinaielt Indians (S. Rept. 152);

S. 795, to permit assessing of Indian trusts and restricted lands within the Lummi Indian diking project, Washington, through a draining and diking district (S. Rept. 153);

S. 1135, to extend to June 1, 1967, the period during which the President may transmit reorganization plans to Congress, with amendments (S. Rept. 154); and

Report of Committee on Labor and Public Welfare entitled "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States," together with individual views (S. Rept. 155). **Pages 7237, 7341**

Tobacco: Senate adopted conference report on H.R. 5721, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco. **Pages 7288–7289**

Authority To Meet: Special Committee on Aging and the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency were authorized to meet on Friday, April 9, while Senate is in session. **Page 7341**

School Aid: Senate worked on H.R. 2362, to strengthen and improve the quality of the Nation's elementary and secondary school facilities, rejecting the following amendments:

By 39 yeas to 49 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Dominick amendment providing that applications for grants under title III (supplementary educational centers and services) must have been approved by the State educational agency concerned; by 38 yeas to 56 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Prouty amendment providing a substitute formula for fund apportionment ratio under title III of the bill; by 32 yeas to 59 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Pearson amendment to provide for more gradual reduction of payments in impacted areas as a result of termination of certain activities of the Defense Department; and by 38 yeas to 53 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Dominick amendment to title II (financial assistance to local school agencies for education of children of low-income families), to provide a substitute for the aid-giving formula in the bill by adding funds based on the States "effort index" reflecting the amount spent by each State in relation to its ability to pay.

Pending at adjournment was Ervin amendment to require Commissioner of Education to give 30 days' notice in Federal Register of any proposed payment under this bill and to permit individual taxpayer suits to challlenge constitutionality of such payment. The yeas and nays were ordered on this amendment and by unanimous consent it was agreed that on Friday, April 9, after Senate convenes at 10 a.m. further debate on the Ervin amendment shall be limited to 10 minutes, equally divided. **Pages 7262–7277, 7280–7341**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. **Pages 7277, 7287, 7291, 7305**

Quorum Call: One quorum call was taken today. **Page 7287**

Program for Friday: Senate met at 10 a.m. and recessed at 9:15 p.m. until 10 a.m. Friday, April 9, when after 10 minutes' further debate it will vote by yeas and nays on the pending Ervin amendment, to be followed by further consideration of the bill. S. 1564, voting rights bill, will be reported by Committee on the Judiciary. **Page 7341**

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—SUPPLEMENTAL

Committee on Appropriations: Committee continued its hearings on H.R. 7091, second supplemental appro-

Appendix

South Dakota Teacher's One-Room School Described in Time Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9, 1965

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the April 9, 1965, issue of Time magazine includes an article describing the activities of Mrs. Alice Lundberg and her students at Unityville, S. Dak.

All across South Dakota, dedicated teachers have performed a great public service in ministering to the needs of small communities in rural areas. That story is told in part in the article published in Time magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SURVIVAL OF THE ONE-ROOM

In historical parks across the United States, tiny museum-piece schoolhouses, with belfry, potbellied stove, and initial-scarred benches, set city-bred youngsters to speculating about how cute the one-teacher, one-room school must have been. Yet for a surprising number of children, this kind of school is neither quaint nor historical: they attend one daily. Despite the big trend toward consolidation, some 10,000 one-room schools still function in rural America.

The number has been dropping steadily: from 196,037, or 70 percent of public grade schools, in 1918, to 13,330, about 20 percent, in 1960. To survive, a one-room school has to be firmly rooted in its isolated location far from population centers and in the fierce pride of rural residents who want their own school and fear the corrupting influence—and higher taxes—of the town school districts. The one-room school is most numerous in such Midwest States as Nebraska, Wisconsin, and the Dakotas, most hardy in the mountain regions of Montana, Colorado, and Nevada.

ROOF WATER

In Unityville, S. Dak., a 12-family hamlet 42 miles northwest of Sioux Falls, Mrs. Alice Lundberg, 36, drives her white 1959 Mercury 8 miles from her farmhouse each morning to reach the white wooden schoolhouse by 7:45 a.m. Alone in the 28- by 25-foot classroom, she spends 80 minutes plotting the day's 36 separate topics for her 17 pupils, who come from 7 nearby farm families. She teaches them on six grade levels, from first to eighth (she has no sixth and seventh graders). The 68-year-old school is surrounded by corn and barley fields; 48 silos filled with Government-owned surplus corn loom nearby.

The school has no running water, which explains 1 of the 10 commandments hung on the wall: "Stop and think before you drink." (Another one says: "Choose a date who would make a good mate.") Children drink from a canister containing rainwater drained off the schoolhouse roof. Prominent on a bookshelf near the door is a roll of toilet tissue, from which the children unself-consciously tear off a length as they leave for one of the two privies out back under a couple of evergreens.

At the 9:05 bell, the patient, methodical Mrs. Lundberg plunges into her multiple chores. For 15 minutes she flashes reading cards to her three first-graders, has them read a story, "George and the Cherry Tree." Some of the others stray from their individual assignments to follow the story. Next comes a second-grade language class for Keith Myren, 8, and Becky Koepsell, 7, interrupted by questions from the still reading first-graders. Then second-graders read aloud, while Mrs. Lundberg checks desk to desk on the work of others. An 8-minute science lesson for the fourth and fifth grades centers on such questions as, "Why is water often muddy?" Mrs. Lundberg deftly fields second-grade arithmetic questions while teaching eighth-grade biology, stops to help a boy identify a picture in his reading book. If a pupil cannot get her attention, he amiably asks an older pupil, who is happy to help.

So it goes throughout Mrs. Lundberg's day. The children remain cooperative and orderly, observing the rule that no more than two can leave their desks at once. Mrs. Lundberg, who has taught for 16 years in one-room schools, has altered her methods little during that time, and doubts the value of such trends as new math and language techniques. "We prefer the traditional methods," she says. "The only technique is good planning."

A PICKLED BAT

Elsewhere one-room teachers, more open to new methods, take advantage of their unique situation to create a modern ideal: the ungraded school. In a 5-year-old, electrically heated brick school amid the rolling hills of Acton, Mont., 20 miles from Billings, Mrs. Lorna McKenney, 40, lets her nine pupils ignore grade lines, develop at any pace they can. Lugene Ivie, in her second year, reads so fast she stumbles over the words. Based on State tests, six of the pupils rate above the national averages in reading, language and arithmetic.

When a child surpasses in arithmetic, his name goes on the blackboard in colored chalk. One day last week, five names were on the board and, explained Mrs. McKenney, "Connie's name should also be in color, but yellow is the only color left and she detests yellow." The school's prized science exhibit is a pickled bat; its biologically educational mascot is a live monkey.

Mrs. McKenney insists that her school compares favorably with most city schools. "We have a full day of teaching here. No breaks for announcements. No running in the halls. No stopping in the middle of a sentence when the bill rings. These kids here aren't underprivileged."

RATHER SORRY PLACES

Yet one-room schools are dying for sound and substantial reasons. Mrs. Lundberg may preserve good three-R education, and Mrs. McKenney may prove that a one-room school can adopt new trends. But the bulk of such schools, says Robert Isenberg of the NEA's rural education department, "tend to be rather sorry, ill-equipped place." Buildings are as much as 100 years old. Most of the teachers have had less than 4 years of college training.

The handicaps of having to teach all grades at once are ultimately insuperable, and the children often go into high schools unable to compete with pupils from bigger grade schools. Isenberg estimates that by 1970 there will be fewer than 5,000 one-room schools. The buildings will be torn down, sold as American Legion posts, or kept as reminders of the institution that first made possible the American ideal of universal education.

One Thousand Attend Community Protest Against Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, I had the privilege of participating in a rally of over 1,000 persons from Port Chester, Rye, Harrison, and Greenwich at Congregation Kneses Tifereth on King Street in Port Chester to protest Soviet persecution of Jews, the closing of synagogues, schools, cemeteries, and the outlawing of Hebrew.

Mr. Speaker, it was a moving and solemn occasion, reflecting citizen concern and conscience. I hope the voices raised there and throughout the United States and the free world will be heard in Moscow.

It is my hope also, Mr. Speaker, that a sense of the Congress resolution condemning Soviet persecution will soon be passed and that its passage will have effect "to permit the free exercise of religion in the U.S.S.R. and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders."

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from the Port Chester Daily Item following my remarks:

DEFEND OUR BROTHERS—1,000 ATTEND COMMUNITY PROTEST AGAINST SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

(By David Ellingson)

Resolutions against the Soviet oppression of Jews will be introduced in Albany and Washington today.

A sense of Congress resolution will be introduced by Congressman OGDEN REID, Republican, of New York, while a joint resolution protesting Soviet oppression of Jews will be presented today in the State senate and assembly by Senator Max Berking, Democrat, of Rye, and Assemblyman Anthony Gioffre, Republican, of Port Chester. The resolution will urge President Johnson and the Congress to take action against such Soviet action as the closing of Jewish synagogues, schools and cemeteries in the U.S.S.R.

The 3 legislators announced their intention yesterday afternoon before over 1,000

persons from Port Chester, Rye, Harrison, and Greenwich who gathered at Congregation Kneses Tifereth Israel on King Street in Port Chester to protest Soviet anti-Semitism.

Congressman REID told the audience that religious persecution of Jews in the U.S.S.R. is a shocking violation of the United Nations Charter.

Today he will introduce a concurrent sense of Congress resolution in the House of Representatives, calling for the Soviet Government to "permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders."

The Congressman hoped that protests voiced at the synagogue yesterday will be heard around the world, particularly in Moscow. He urged that the United Nations Commission on Human Rights be allowed to enter the Soviet Union to investigate allegations of religious intolerance and persecution.

A telegram from Congressman RICHARD L. OTTINGER was read to the group. He has introduced a resolution in Congress condemning the U.S.S.R. for persecuting Jews.

Meetings similar to that held in Port Chester yesterday will be sponsored by various Jewish organizations throughout the United States within the next several weeks, according to Ernest Adler, program chairman for the KTI assembly.

Guest speaker Rabbi Herschel Schacter, spiritual leader of the Moshou Jewish Center in the Bronx, received a standing ovation when he pressed the interfaith assembly to seek measures which would allow the faith of our fathers to remain the faith of our children in a world everywhere at peace.

He proposed that petitions against Jewish oppression in the Soviet Union be circulated everywhere in an area communities and through the Nation. "This must not be shelved aside as just another issue in the cold war," he declared.

Americans, the rabbi said, should avail themselves of their opportunity to pass such petitions in a free country.

Rabbi Schacter has traveled and observed conditions behind the Iron Curtain. He stated that matzo has become the symbol around which Soviet Jews are gathering; it represents "a nonsensical resistance" against religion on the part of the Government. (Matzo bakeries are among Jewish institutions which the Government has closed.)

Yesterday's rally was not called to protest the politics and philosophy of the Russian Government, the rabbi observed, but "earnestly and sincerely to give voice to our deep chagrin over the fact that over 3 million Jewish people are being deprived of elementary, basic freedom."

The KTI rabbi, Joseph Speiser, presented a message to the assembly before other speakers were introduced. Citing scripture, he noted that the cry to be raised at the meeting was "Open up unto us the gates of righteousness, and if you cannot, then let my people go."

The 2-hour gathering was followed by a parade from the synagogue to Lyons Park on Putnam Avenue, where Port Chester Mayor John L. Messina read a proclamation setting aside this week in the village for protests against Soviet anti-Semitism.

The line of marchers stretched in large bunches for three blocks. Children leading the parade carried signs reading "Down with Russian Hitlers," "Let our people live with freedom," and "Equal rights for Jews in Russia."

Before he read his proclamation, the mayor recalled witnessing Nazi anti-Semitism during World War II in Germany. "Words can't express what we saw 20 years ago," he said, "but words today might prevent a recurrence."

Other religious, political and civic leaders had addressed the assembly while it met at the synagogue:

The Reverend Wesley D. Osborne, minister of Summerfield Methodist Church in Port Chester, and president of the Port Chester Ministers' Association, took his text from a teabag which carried the slogan "Conscience gets a lot of credit for cold feet."

He urged that groups seek rights which were granted by God before constitutions were ever drawn. "I must never again be a victim of cold feet," he said, "nor must you. It is a matter of humanity."

The Reverend Peter Rinaldi, pastor of Corpus Christi Church in Port Chester: "We must stand united in defense of our most sacred principles and of our brothers."

The Reverend William V. Guy, minister of the Bethesda Baptist Church in Port Chester: "Men of good will must not remain silent in the face of injustice."

The Reverend George W. Swope, minister of North Baptist Church in Port Chester: "We ought to search our own hearts and souls here in Port Chester" to determine if discrimination exists among groups in the village. All faiths have discriminated against others at times; "there are no black sheep or white sheep."

M. Paul Redd, president of the Rye-Port Chester chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People: "One of the best things in the world to tell Soviet Russia is that the United States has cleaned up its own backyard." He called for solutions to discrimination against Negroes in this country.

Capt. Charles A. West of the Salvation Army: "We must carry each others' burdens." He wished for a "vaccine to stamp out the evils we find in our world today."

Anthony Posillipo, supervisor of the town of Rye: "This large turnout is no surprise to those who know this community. You can count on the prayers and all-out support of the citizens of our community."

Rabbi Moses J. Sharagowitz of KTI and Rabbi Aaron Singer of the Harrison Jewish Community Center offered the invocation. The benediction was presented by Rabbi Moses Davidowitz of Temple Sholom in Greenwich.

Voting Rights and Selma, Ala.—Resolutions From Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9, 1965

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, one of the most direct and democratic expressions of government in this country is the traditional New England town meeting, which many Massachusetts communities have retained to this day. Within the past few weeks, town meetings in Concord, Natick, and Sudbury, Mass., have adopted resolutions expressing their deep concern over recent occurrences in Alabama and over the denial of voting rights to certain of our citizens.

Copies of these resolutions have been forwarded to me; and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with similar resolutions adopted by the city councils of Brockton and Cambridge, urging prompt enactment of legislation guaranteeing the right to vote for all citizens.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL TOWN MEETING MARCH 8 AND 15, 1965

Vote unanimously: That the citizens of the town of Concord adopt the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we, the citizens of Concord, Mass., in town meeting assembled, express our deepest concern over the violation in the State of Alabama of the fundamental personal rights and liberties given to every American by the Constitution of the United States.

"Since 1775, when, at the Bridge in Concord, men first fought and died for the cause of human freedom in our country, we have made progress toward realizing this ideal for all of our citizens. We are also well aware that much more needs to be done in all the States of the Union.

"That nearly two centuries later, American citizens must suffer and die in seeking these constitutional rights and liberties seems to us a retreat from principles so dearly bought by so many. Let therefore all of us resolve to increase our efforts to the end that the rights and liberties guaranteed by our Constitution will be enjoyed by all. Further

Resolved, That the Selectmen of Concord be and hereby are authorized to send copies of the foregoing Resolution to such public authorities in this State and elsewhere as they may deem advisable."

CORNELIA LAWRENCE,
Town Clerk.

RESOLUTION BY TOWN MEETING MEMBERS OF NATICK, MASS.

Resolved, That the town meeting members of Natick, Mass., here assembled in their 1965 annual meeting, hereby instruct the moderator to convey the following sentiments to President Lyndon B. Johnson:

"We deplore the apparent brutality recently shown by Alabama State police and other law enforcement officers to our fellow Americans in Selma, Ala. As we meet here tonight under one of the oldest forms of representative government in America it seems only proper that the precious right to vote no longer be denied to any law-abiding citizen for any reason, quasi-legal or otherwise. I am sure you will agree with us that the time has come when we must stop merely talking brotherhood and see that some action is taken to really guarantee that every American is truly accorded those equal rights we hear so much about."

Unanimously adopted upon motion duly made and seconded at the opening session of the 1965 annual town meeting, Tuesday, March 9, 1965.

FRANCIS G. MCGEE,
Town Moderator.

RESOLUTION BY CITIZENS OF SUDBURY, MASS.

Be it resolved, That we, the citizens of Sudbury, Mass., in town meeting assembled, register our feelings of outrage concerning the brutality of those in Selma, Ala., who have deprived American citizens of their constitutional and human rights.

We, too, feel the pain which the Reverend Mr. Reeb felt when he was viciously struck down. We feel that if our society is to exist another 189 years, indeed, if it is to survive, it will do so only if we support the concepts of freedom, of human dignity, of equality, of justice, and of brotherhood which our ancestors nourished into reality on these very grounds.

We, therefore, urge those in authority to use their voices and their good offices as we are attempting to use ours, to speak out—to speak out unequivocally in support of the

demands of American citizens in Selma, Ala., for the free exercise of their constitutional and human rights; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution and a record of the vote of the town meeting thereon shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, and Representative HAROLD D. DONOHUE, immediately.

Unanimously voted at the annual town meeting of Sudbury, Mass., March 4, 1965.

LAWRENCE B. TIGHE,
Town Clerk.

CITY OF BROCKTON IN CITY COUNCIL,
MARCH 22, 1965

Whereas the 15th amendment to the Constitution guarantees to all citizens the right to vote; and

Whereas the National Congress has before it proposed legislation to implement the purpose of the 15th amendment to the Constitution; and

Whereas President Johnson has asked for speedy enactment of legislation and has further asked that Americans throughout the United States support the meaningful purpose of such legislation: It is hereby

Resolved, That the Brockton City Council commend the action of President Johnson to further enhance the guarantee of this right to vote for all citizens; and the Brockton City Council asks its representatives to the National Congress that deliberate speed should be given to the enactment of this legislation and that copies of this resolve be sent to Senators SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY and to Congressman BURKE.

Adopted.

MELVIN B. CLIFFORD,
Clerk.

Approved.

ALVIN JACK SIMS,
Mayor.

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE IN CITY COUNCIL,
MARCH 15, 1965

Whereas the recent events in Selma, Ala. have focused national as well as international attention on the plight of the American Negro in that godless city; and

Whereas the right to vote has long been recognized as one of the most sacred rights as well as an obligation on the part of every citizen throughout the entire country; and

Whereas certain insecure elements of the white community are making inhuman and unbelievably vicious attempts to preclude the Negro citizens of Alabama from exercising their voting rights; and

Whereas every citizen throughout the entire country must bear a portion of the guilt that necessarily results from the shame of Alabama; and

Whereas our Government can determine it to be feasible to send our troops to Vietnam to protect the people there fighting for their basic liberties: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Cambridge City Council go on record as being bitterly opposed to the events presently taking place in the State of Alabama as well as similar events in any other part of the country relating to the voting rights of the American Negro citizen and urging President Lyndon B. Johnson to immediately take the necessary corrective action indicated in those States as well as Alabama; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the members of our congressional delegations, to the Governor of the State of Alabama, and to the widow of the Reverend James J. Reeb who died in the fight to allow all men, regardless of race, creed, or color to be able to exercise their right to vote as provided by the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That his honor the mayor, Edward A. Crane, appoint a committee of the entire city council to draw up suitable resolutions on the death of this brave American, deploring the brutal murder of the Reverend James J. Reeb who made the supreme sacrifice so that all Americans might receive the rights to which they are entitled by the Constitution.

THOMAS M. MCNAMARA,
City Clerk.

American Versus Oversea Tourism: Idaho's Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, because of the great concern expressed recently over the outflow of dollars from this Nation that our tourists are spending abroad, I believe it is timely to point out that all 50 States, individually and in close harmony, can solve this problem. They simply need only stress to our adventurous citizens to "See America First."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask all my colleagues to visit Idaho—either this summer to view its scenic beauty and to fish, in the fall for fine hunting or in the winter to enjoy the world's finest winter playground.

With due respect to the variety of tourist attractions the other 49 States offer, I wish to point out a few little-known but important features of my State.

Idaho, with vast forest and mountain areas, abounds with wildlife. The 10-year average of deer bagged is 66,000. Nearly 25,000 sage hens are taken each year by hunters from Idaho and by visitors. About 15,000 elk are taken annually by hunters and the State has the second largest elk herd in the world. There are special hunts for moose and a season for taking black bear. Limited hunts are held for mountain goats and bighorn sheep. Native and blue grouse abound in the forests of this 53-million-acre State and in a recent year 138,000 were bagged.

Idaho has 2,000 lakes and 35,000 miles of streams which yield more than 11 million trout and 4 million spinyrayed fish each year. Fish include rainbow, brook, brown, golden, mackinaw, and Dolly Varden trout; and chinook, sockeye, and kokanee salmon. Migratory salmon and steelhead runs are on the increase in the larger streams and rivers.

L-shaped Idaho covers 83,557 square miles and includes elevations varying from more than 12,655 feet to 710 feet. This geographic phenomena is an unequaled attraction for the student and lover of nature. Of Idaho's total area more than two-thirds is in Federal ownership. Much of this land is so rugged and primitive that man has not yet found means or stamina to explore it.

In a recent year, recreation vied with timber as the State's second most important industry, contributing about $150 million to the State's economy. More than 4 million out-of-State visitors vacation in Idaho. They were accommodated by Idaho's 15 national forests in the summer and 250,000 returned in the winter to ski and toboggan.

Briefly, this is what the tourist can find in Idaho, and I am sure that my colleagues are as deeply moved by the splendor and recreational opportunities of their own States.

It is logical, therefore, that if the citizens and leaders of every State in the Union would intensify a campaign to "See America First," our money would stay at home and the American tourist would more fully share in the heritage of our great land.

The Author—Mark Van Doren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, seldom has a nation produced such a gifted individual as the United States has in the person of Mark Van Doren, a resident of Cornwall, Conn., which I represent.

Mr. William Claire, former assistant to Congressman CONTE, has written a biographical article on the life and works of Mr. Doren and I now ask permission that this article, "The Author—Mark Van Doren" which appeared in "The Booklover's Answer," be inserted in the RECORD.

THE AUTHOR—MARK VAN DOREN

(By William F. Claire)

In his celebrated autobiography, Mark Van Doren has said that his birthplace (Hope, Ill., June 13, 1894) would be "hard to find on any atlas, though it still exists as Faith and Charity, its sister villages named a century ago, do not."

The son of a rugged country doctor, he moved at the age of 6 to Urbana, where he attended the University of Illinois and began a writing career that has spanned a half-century of excellence in poetry, fiction, and criticism.

At the university, he studied under Stuart Sherman and wrote the first of his many books, a critical study of Thoreau. Commenting some 46 years later on a reissue of the book, Stanley Edgar Hyman called it a brilliant, even staggering, accomplishment by a student.

He served in the Army during World War I and later joined his brother Carl Van Doren on the Columbia University faculty. His Ph. D. study of John Dryden became his second book and one of the first to appear under the imprint of Alfred Harcourt, Donald Brace and Will D. Howe.

While his earliest published poem had been accepted by H. L. Mencken for the smart set during his college days, it was not until 1924 that his first volume, "Spring Thunder," was printed. T. S. Eliot, whose review in England of the Dryden book had much to do with establishing its permanent fame, also wrote favorably of the new poetry.

From 1924–28, he set a productive pace that has been unmatched by any other major

writer. He brought out two new volumes of verse, wrote a critical study of Edwin Arlington Robinson, served as literary editor of the Nation, collaborated with Carl on a study of British and American literature, compiled his famous "Anthology of World Poetry" and continued teaching at Columbia. During this period he and his wife, the former Dorothy Graffe, also produced two children.

An epic poem, "Jonathan Gentry," came out in 1931, and after a winter spent on his Cornwall, Conn., farm, he wrote another narrative poem, "A Winter Diary." In this 1935 book, he also included 33 sonnets, which Allen Tate in a recent review said amounted to the "finest work in its genre of this century." This book, still another collection and a series of new poems entitled "America's Mythology" were undoubtedly strong factors in his Pulitzer Prize Award for collected poems (1939).

Important critical works were also written during the thirties, the most prominent of which was "Shakespeare." Writing in 1942, however, in a preface to his "Private Reader," he announced his farewell to formal criticism by stating that he "no longer felt at home, even—or especially—in its finest rooms." The publication of the "Happy Critic" recently indicates that his announcement was somewhat premature. The demand for his comments on literature continues and while his approach is appreciative rather than critical in the academic sense, the essays are masterpieces of penetration and insight. Writers examined include Hardy, Herrick, Mann, Cervantes, and Whitman among others.

A legendary teacher at Columbia for 39 years, Van Doren retired in 1959. He has served since as Bolyston professor of rhetoric at Harvard sharing that chair during an academic year with Robert Lowell. He is the present chancellor of the American Academy of Arts and Letters.

At Columbia he taught such diverse people as Lionel Trilling, Allen Ginsburg, Thomas Merton (perhaps the best description of Van Doren the teacher can be found in Merton's spiritual autobiography, "The Seven Story Mountain"), Clifton Fadiman, John Berryman and the recent Pulitzer Prize winning poet, Louis Simpson.

The late James Thurber has described his impact when he said, "Mark Van Doren is so many men that I have to open my front door and my windows when he visits me in order to let all of him in."

Needless to say, Van Doren's accomplishments stagger the imagination. To his poetry and criticism can be added three novels, innumerable short stories, a play ("The Last Days of Lincoln," widely read but as yet unproduced by a major company) and books such as Liberal Education, Invitation to Learning (after the CBS radio show), children's books, mystery stories and a series of illuminating introductions ranging from the Limited Editions club volumes to recent paperbacks.

Each generation seems to discover Van Doren in its own special way. While it is impossible to estimate the number of readers he has had during his career, his influence has been considerable. Not surprisingly, the autobiography represents the best view of Van Doren's total commitment to life and literature.

Matters have been somewhat complicated (if, as many people assume, a writer has to be placed) by the fact that Van Doren has never joined a particular school of poetry. Like Conrad Aiken, he has assidiously avoided the limelight, although it has often been thrust upon him. Critics have compared him to Frost, Hardy, and Robinson but most have been in agreement that he has forged a body of poetry unique in this century.

In recent years, Van Doren has been collecting his work in a series of books, and his next is expected to contain all of the longer poems he wishes to preserve. At the same time, he continues to write new material that demonstrates his absolute mastery of form and ever-increasing awareness of the mystery and beauty of the world.

His is the sure touch of genius. It may be an eon or two before we produce another inspired writer in this country with quite the same grasp of life in all of its particular and universal aspects. Meanwhile, he gives us some hint of the music he hears in "Undersong," a majestic poem he wrote recently which begins:

"In wonderment I walk to music pouring
Out of so dark a source it makes no sound"—

And ends, after more than 80 remarkable lines—

"Evenly, unevenly as rhymes
Rival the pure chimes
Of never ending truth that for so long
Has sung to such as me this undersong."

The Rescue at Rowland Cave, at Mountain View, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9, 1965

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, this week we have read of the heroic rescue of four men from Rowland Cave, at Mountain View, Ark. These men had been trapped for 2 days by rising water that flooded almost 400 feet of the cave entrance.

The rescue was directed by William Karras, of Arlington, Va., who flew to the scene with four young men who made up the National Capital Grotto Rescue Squad.

They were accompanied by three Navy divers. One of these Navy divers, Chief Petty Officer Lyle E. Thomas, died from a heart seizure just after the last man had been brought out safely.

Also aiding these two teams, that were flown by the U.S. Air Force to Arkansas, were the Hondo rescue team, of Missouri, comprised of Conway Christensen, Chuck Rominger, and Jim Sparks; and two gulf coast divers from Morgan City, La.—Jim Springer and Tom Kleles.

My particular interest in this event centers around a young man from New Hampshire, Fred A. "Mickey" Forbes, Jr., of Wilton, N.H. This young man is a member of the grotto rescue squad, and is an Eagle Scout from troop 10, in Wilton. He developed his love for the outdoors and for adventure in the Granite State. He is the son of a member of my staff, Fred A. Forbes, Sr., my press secretary.

The fact that these young men—ages 16 to 18—devote their time to training for the strenuous sport of spelunking and rescue work, is commendable. These rescue teams are on 24-hour call, and of course, never receive much notice in these emergencies. This particular rescue started at 2 a.m., from Andrews Air Force Base, and was a continuous operation by these young men—who went without sleep for better than 48 hours.

My congratulations go to Mr. Karras, who trains and directs these youngsters, and who was participating in his third cave rescue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article describing this operation, from the Washington Evening Star of April 6, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 6, 1965]

NAVY DIVER DIES AFTER AIDING IN RESCUE OF FOUR MEN IN CAVE

A veteran Navy diver assigned in Washington collapsed and died yesterday just after he had helped rescue four men from a flooded cave in Arkansas.

The victim was master diver, Lyle E. Thomas, 39 who lived at 6292 Marlboro Road, District Heights, Md. He was an instructor at the Navy's Deep Sea Diving School at the Washington Navy Yard.

Three divers from the school and a five-man team from the National Capital Grotto Rescue Squad here were flown early yesterday to Jacksonville Air Force Base at Little Rock, Ark., and then taken to Rowland Cave in nearby Mountain View.

In a 2-hour rescue operation, the divers guided the four trapped men—all Arkansas residents—through more than 200 feet of water that had risen to the roof of the bowl-shaped cavern and had trapped them for more than 24 hours in an elevated chamber.

COLLAPSES MINUTE LATER

According to William Karras, 39, of Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va., leader of the citizen diving crew, Thomas collapsed in the mouth of the cave only a minute after the rescue operation was completed about 4:50 p.m.

"He just pitched over and didn't get up," Karras said this morning.

Karras and his crew returned home about 3 a.m. today. The Navy divers remained at Jacksonville Naval Air Station, Tenn., pending an autopsy on Thomas today.

Karras said he tried mouth-to-mouth resuscitation on Thomas, then started 2 hours of heart massage, but was unable to revive the Navy man.

AUTOPSY PENDING

Pending the results of the autopsy, Stone County, Ark., Coroner Dr. T. J. Burton attributed Thomas' death to a heart attack.

In Washington, a spokesman at the diving school said Thomas had no history of a heart disease or weakness. If he had had, he would not have been permitted to dive, the spokesman said.

In addition to Thomas, the Navy sent Lt. Albert P. Festag, of Woodbridge, Va., and GM1c. Thomas A. Jenkins of 2227 Gaylord Street, Suitland, Md., to take part in the rescue.

With Karras in the citizen crew were John Thybony, 18, and his brother, Scott, 16, of 625 Woodland Circle, Falls Church, both students at J. E. B. Stuart High School; Michael Forbes, 17, of Bethesda and Henry Hoover, 19, of Cheverly, Md.

Karras said he was called by telephone Sunday evening by Arkansas police who had contacted a member of the National Speleogical Society, to which the cave explorers belong.

Karras in turn called the diving school, which supplied its three divers.

The eight rescue workers flew from Andrews Air Force Base about 1 a.m., yesterday and went immediately to the cave, a tourist attraction in the Ozark foothills.

The four they rescued are Hugh Shell, 40, of Batesville, Ark., and three college students—Hogan Bledsoe, 20, of Lake Village,

Ark.; Steve Wilson, 20, of Batesville, and Mike Hill, 19, of Batesville. Bledsoe and Wilson are students at Arkansas Tech and Hill is a student at Arkansas College.

A Call To Hate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the executive secretary of the Associated Baptist Conventions of Idaho and Utah recently wrote about "a growing sickness in our culture." He had been listening to a well-known "radio preacher" inveigh against the American and Southern Baptist Conventions for trying to maintain communication with Baptists from Russia; and he said:

Since that time, I have heard other voices, voices sometimes cloaked in tones of piety, righteous indignation, freedom, or patriotism, but close beneath the surface is this call to hate, to fear that which is different from ourselves, whether it be the color of skin, difference of religion, political differences, or a differing culture or philosophy of life.

The executive secretary is Robert J. Smith, of Twin Falls; and he went on to say that the divisive voices of extremists are sowing suspicion, fear, and distrust in the minds of our people. He concluded that the time has come to "test the voices that fill the air, to unsnarl the mazes of words and half truths."

This is wise counsel, Mr. President; and I think it entirely appropriate that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "A Call To Hate?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Idaho-Utah Baptist Messenger, September 1964]

A CALL TO HATE?

(By Robert J. Smith)

Early this summer while driving across Idaho I heard the program of a well-known radio preacher. Nearly the entire time of this high-priced national broadcast was given to condemning and berating the American and Southern Baptist Conventions for allowing some Russian Baptist pastors to appear on the platforms of their national convention meetings. Why this should be so surprising I don't know. The strongest evangelical work being done in Russia today is being done by Baptists. As this man spoke, I was suddenly overwhelmed with the feeling, this man is asking me to hate these people. Because they are of a different culture, a different background, brought up under a political system with which we cannot agree, they are suspect, and even though they name the name of Christ as Savior, we are not to listen to them or to have fellowship with them. To do so is to make us suspect, and to banish us also from the select company of God's elect. If they had only come with a message of condemnation and hate of their own nation, if they had spoken against communism with the fervor and zeal of a patriotic American citizen, they might have been received. They might also have forever shut the door on any kind of evangelical witness among their own people. Is it so hard to understand why they would speak with restraint? Paul could speak glowingly of the saints in the very household of Caesar, as pagan a court as ever existed, but when we speak of the saints in the household of communism we are to show our Christian spirit by a response of rejection and hate.

This is only a minor illustration of a growing sickness in our culture. Since that time I have heard other voices, voices sometimes cloaked in tones of piety, righteous indignation, freedom, or patriotism, but close beneath the surface is this call to hate, to fear that which is different from ourselves whether it be the color of skin, difference of religion, political differences, or a differing culture or philosophy of life. The right to differ has been basic to our freedom, but not to hate, to ostracize, to twist and pervert the truth in order to throttle and shut out the voices of others. James, in his epistle says, "We use the tongue to bless our Father, God, and we use the same tongue to curse our fellowmen, the same mouth—surely, my brothers, this is the sort of thing that never ought to happen. Have you every known a spring to give sweet and bitter water simultaneously? Have you ever seen a fig tree with a crop of olives, or seen figs growing on a vine? It is just as impossible for a spring to give fresh and salt water at the same time." How much hate, fear, division, mistrust can be promoted under the cloak of the Gospel of Jesus Christ?

These divisive voices have done irreparable harm to the cause of Christ. Because suspicion, fear, and distrust are sown in the minds of our people, the result is withdrawn and fragmented stewardship. Those who suffer are the dedicated missionaries who have given the best of their lives to promote the cause of Christ. The work in our own States—work among our youth, our camping programs, our church extension efforts, aid to needy churches, all of this is throttled and slowed down. This is not the Spirit of Christ, it is the spirit of hate and division. Our convention has withstood vicious and unfair attacks without retaliation or recrimination. Herein lies strength not weakness. I believe the time has come, however, to test the voices that fill the air, to unsnarl the maze of words and half truths, to give our attention to those who have proven through their ministry they are ministers of the love of God in Christ. James closes the third chapter, "And the wise are peacemakers who go on quietly sowing for a harvest of righteousness—in other people and in themselves."

What Freedom in America Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following essays which won prizes in the Boyertown American Legion Essay Contest, "What Freedom in America Means to Me," by Charles Lessig, a 12th-grader at Boyertown area high school and "Terribly Proud," by Janet Adams, an 8th grader at the Boyertown area junior high school.

The essays follow:

WHAT FREEDOM IN AMERICA MEANS TO ME

(By Charles Lessig)

Freedom is my being able to write this essay and not having to fear that someone will condemn me for what I say here. My idea of freedom may be different from other peoples; it may be the same. This is not important. What is important is that they are my ideas. They come from a mind that does not have to fear to think what it wants to. They come from a person who does not have to fear to say what he thinks. Freedom of the individual to express his thoughts and abilities is the living heart of our country.

Rivers are in many ways similar to the freedoms of Americans. They travel their normal courses and give life to the creatures in them. If the water in the river becomes less, the creatures living in it can no longer live a normal life. Many will die. If there is an overabundance of water, there may be a flood and much destruction may result.

Similarly we, as Americans, depend upon our freedoms for living. If too many of our freedoms are taken away, we can't survive. Given too much freedom we may end up only destroying ourselves and others around us.

To check the flooding of a river we build dams. To check our freedoms we establish laws and governments. But, just as a dam does not make a river flow, neither do our laws nor governments make us live. We are free to do what we want. We may abuse our freedoms. Dams are not foolproof and neither are laws. But the American who chooses to abuse his freedoms cannot call himself a truly free American.

What are some of my freedoms?

Living in a country where I know I am master of my life is freedom. I may choose to better or to destroy my life. I may endeavor to succeed in any occupation. No one will make me succeed or fail. It is up to me.

Freedom is knowing that my rights will be protected. I must feel certain that no one is going to deny me what I am rightly entitled to. We cannot call ourselves completely free until we know that every American is able to enjoy equal freedom. Discrimination against just one person in my country detracts from my freedom because by being in my country that person is a part of me.

Freedom is having my own parents teach me what they think is right and to put certain restrictions on me. Freedom is knowing that my posterity will enjoy the freedoms that my country has offered me and my forefathers. Freedom is looking at the stars, or the ocean, or a tree, and feeling happy.

Freedom is helping other people. Freedom is being able to laugh or cry when I want to. Freedom is worshiping God in peace. Freedom is feeling secure. Freedom is playing a ball game.

Freedom is calling this country my country.

TERRIBLY PROUD

(By Janet Adams)

The freedom which I enjoy as an American citizen means very much to me. I don't believe there is another nation in the world I could love so well. A sharp pain shoots through my heart when I realize that not all are as safe and happy as I am with a land so free and rich.

I am terribly proud of my country; it's something I can call my own. No one can deny me the right to say: "I am an American."

The liberty I love means a chance to be what I want to be; the goal I choose can become reality. There is a great satisfaction in growing up and knowing that this Government I will someday support is on

my side. Someday I will mean something; be treated as somebody.

I can choose the education I want and—with adequate funds—develop my character into something worthwhile.

I want so much to learn, to answer the many questions in my mind, and I find the solutions are just waiting to be discovered.

One of the most important elements of our independence is truth. Being lied to, and having the truth leak out later to trusting ears, hurts. This is one reason why "we the people" of America can be glad. We know the truth and can trust.

My freedom in America also means the chance to be a Christian. I can believe in God and my Savior. No one can take either away from me—nor would they. I firmly believe that America is on God's side.

My freedom means that when I am older, with ideas of my own, I will not have to inhibit my deepest feelings and criticisms. I can find an equal ear in my fellow freemen. Because of great men like Thomas Jefferson and George Washington, I hold the privilege of speaking and writing at will.

Yet, I am protected from fools who would use every trick in the book toward slandering others because the very wise forefathers of America also provided a system in which they sought to insure domestic tranquillity.

Another freedom I will someday enjoy is the right to elect leaders of my country. Someday, on my shoulders will be placed this great honor. I must learn now to use this indulgence wisely, so my children and grandchildren will someday enjoy the liberty that is mine.

I believe that my freedom is the result of a strong, just government and in order to protect these liberties we must always maintain loyalty, knowledge, truth, trust, and a keen sense of right and wrong.

With these essential qualities planted firmly in our souls, I believe that our Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" shall protect the great freedom of Americans now and yet to come—forever and ever.

Republican Position on Voting Rights—Address by Thomas H. Brigham, Alabama Republican State Chairman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9, 1965

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Mr. Thomas H. Brigham, who is the chairman of the Republican Party in the State of Alabama, in connection with the position that the Republican Party takes in the State on the matter of voting rights.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS BY THOMAS H. BRIGHAM, REPUBLICAN STATE CHAIRMAN, DELIVERED TO THE REPUBLICAN COUNTY ORGANIZATION OF WINSTON COUNTY, ALA.

Mr. Chairman, fellow Republicans, and guests, as you know, this is the first occasion that I have had the opportunity to speak in your county, and it is a distinct privilege for me to address you tonight. It is indeed a privilege because Winston County has been the bastion of Republican strength in Alabama over the years—and during the darker years, you have been a symbol to me and to other Republican leaders that there was hope—hope that we could make Alabama the two-party State she deserves to be.

That hope was fortunately transformed into a reality at the Federal level last year, when we elected five outstanding men to the U.S. Congress, including your own JIM MARTIN.

Now we must address ourselves to another difficult, but realistic task—the challenging task of creating two-party competitive government from the statehouse to the county level.

It is certainly our obligation—and, yes, perhaps it has become our destiny to lead Alabama out of the wilderness of confusion and away from the disruptive forces that plague our State today.

It is a monumental task but we must and we will offer superior candidates at the State and local levels who will be able to articulate the basic conservative Republican principles that this country was founded on, and that we believe are still sound and practical principles today.

And, in accomplishing our goals, we as a party must address ourselves to many important issues. One such current issue requires our comment now and concerns the so-called basis for the disruptive activities in Alabama the past few weeks and apparently in the weeks or even months to come.

I would like to read a position paper which has been developed over the past several months by the leadership of the Alabama Republican Party:

"Several important questions are now being directed toward the Alabama Republican State committee. These questions demand a public stand by our party, to define our present position and to establish our posture as we work toward the campaigns of 1966. Our position must be clear to our present office holders, the candidates we intend to recruit, our party members, workers and supporters.

"These questions and our proposed replies are as follows:

"Question. What is the position of Republicans in Alabama regarding equal voting rights; and, what do we propose in order to implement the Negro's right to vote?

"Answer. We believe all qualified Americans should register to vote and should exercise that privilege after registration. We are concerned for the rights of all Americans. We would point out that while great issue is made for Negro registration, there is little concern for whites and other minorities to exercise the right and duty to vote. The shameful record of white voters remains at less than half of those eligible to register, and a great number (35 percent of those registered do not bother to vote. With such apathetic participation in the election processes, we can ill afford to limit our attention to special groups.

"We do not concede that implementation of constitutional rights requires manipulation of the law, to give special favor or consideration to different groups and minorities. We do not believe that constitutional rights can be guaranteed by ignoring the Constitution. We believe that special consideration to any group of citizens clearly violates the intent of the Constitution and simply reverses alleged discrimination. We believe uniform application of the law is mandatory, if we are to avoid chaos and if our Republic is to be maintained.

"The 15th and 19th amendments are specific in the power of the Congress in protecting the right to vote and we find no provision for negating the role of the States in setting voter qualification requirements, so long as the law is applied uniformly within the State.

"We recognize the fact that our Constitution is being subjected to very liberal interpretation and it is the responsibility of the individual States to take steps to avoid further intervention by the courts and by the Congress.

"We feel that failure of Alabama Democrats to make this same recognition of fact has brought us to our present plight, and in fact, has accelerated the drive for Federal control over the States.

"We wish to emphasize that we in no degree support the minimal voter standards established by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We believe that ever-increasing complexities of Government and the attendant issues demand that an informed electorate be maintained if we are to survive as a nation. This requires some qualifications other than age, or even simple literacy. While we do not hold with oppressive requirements, neither do we hold with no requirements. If simple literacy is to be the sole requisite one might ask why not reduce the age requirement to 13 years and allow the sixth-grade children to vote.

"We therefore think it necessary for our State legislature to consider legislation which will relieve the pressure for Federal control over our election processes insofar as is possible. We recommend uniform State election laws, with qualification examinations tailored in such a way as to test general aptitude and comprehension in lieu of of specific skills or achievements. Grading of these exams by electronic data processing or other mechanical devices would eliminate the human element and the probability of charges of discrimination against individual registrars.

"We believe such tests would withstand Federal challenge, maintain local and State control, and result in a competent electorate.

"We do this in recognition that the serious competent voter is disenfranchised when public responsibility is made a mockery by eliminating reasonable requirements for voter qualification.

"Question. Will the Alabama Republican Party assist Negroes to vote?

"Answer. As previously stated, we are concerned for the right of all qualified Americans to vote. Our party is established along lines of political philosophy and principle, and not along racial lines. We do assist all Republicans to register to whatever extent our resources permit. We are a political party, and are in existence to elect competent public officials who will administer our local, State, and Federal Government. According to the conservative and constitutional principles we espouse due to practical political demands, we therefore work with those voters who generally agree with these principles.

"We generally devote less time to areas where we might produce little favorable results or even adverse reaction. We have found that few Negroes support our philosophy of opposition to the welfare state or our positive programs for self-reliance—free enterprise—and local self-government.

"We believe if we are to remain a responsible party, we must pursue our concept of the proper role of the Federal Government, without regard to racial consideration. We charge that the Democrat Party has deliberately divided itself along racial lines in order to serve expedient ends, without regard to the principles incumbent upon a responsible political organization.

"Question. What does the future hold for the Republican Party in Alabama? Will we support the Republican National Committee, or will we become a mutation of a national party, such as the Alabama Democratic Party? Republican, or Alabama Republicans—which is it to be?

"Answer. We are the Republican Party of Alabama, not 'Alabama Republicans. We intend, and assure that this stand will continue.

"We understand that the very nature of the conservative American is that he must be an individual, not a conformist. We do not all agree on any occasion in Alabama, we do not expect to agree with all Republicans elsewhere. We occasionally believe the majority opinion of Republicans in Congress to be in error, but, we consistently believe that of Democrats to be in error on many important issues.

"We believe that the concept of government as intended by our forebears can be best administered by the Republican Party majority. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD supports this belief. The Alabama delegation to the 1964 Republican convention voted in support of the party platform that will stand until it is altered or amended.

"Some acts in Congress by individual Republicans, or even occasionally by a majority of Republicans, do not alter the official party stand on the issues. Those few Congressmen and Senators who do not support the party platform, will have to face their constituents in the next election. This is the Republican way. We have not degenerated to arm-twisting, intimidation, bribery and pork barrel to force our elected officials to blindly support the party line. We repeat, the plight of our country, and of our southland is the result of ruthless blundering by ambitious, power-hungry Democrats. We find few faults in the overall record of the Republican Party as a whole. Most that we find can be rectified by a strong conservative Republican force from the South—and this is our intent.

"SUMMARY

"Question. What is our position regarding equal voting rights; and, what do we propose to do in order to implement the Negro's right to vote?

"Answer. (1) We believe all qualified Americans should register to vote and should exercise that privilege after registration.

"(2) We believe the Constitution leaves voter qualification to the States as long as the law is applied uniformly within the State.

"(3) We propose uniform and reasonable voter and election laws for Alabama drawn so as to avoid charges of discrimination, and the threat of Federal referees and registrars.

"Question. Will we assist Negroes to register?

"Answer. Only a prejudiced organization would deliberately give special attention to Negroes or any other racial minority. We are a political organization soliciting our support from all who generally believe in the Republican concepts of proper government. We attempt to assist all Republicans to register.

"Question. Will we continue to support the National GOP?

"Answer. (1) We are part and parcel of the National Republican Party. We disagree sometime with other Republicans, but our disagreement with Democrats is both basic and constant. It is the role of the South, our role, to improve and project the long standing conservative record of the GOP.

"(2) We support our 1964 GOP platform which is our guideline until amended."

Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add the name of the Manchester Neighborhood Council in my home city of Pittsburgh to the list of organizations in my congressional district which are in strong support, as I am, of the President's call for voting rights legislation.

A resolution adopted by the council recently follows:

RESOLUTION ON VOTING RIGHTS BY MANCHESTER NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Whereas we as a society and individuals aspire to create wider participation in basic and inalienable rights; and

Whereas it is the intent of the Bill of Rights that there be universal suffrage; and

Whereas legislation has been passed including the 1964 Civil Rights Act to implement the intention of the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas Negro Americans in Selma, Ala., and other places still encounter difficulties in registering to vote;

We support President Johnson and call on the Congress to develop and pass new legislation that is aimed at meeting the practical problems that are still being encountered by Negro Americans who desire to become full first-class citizens by participation in the electoral process.

Social Security Inequities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, we have today passed H.R. 6675, the Social Security Amendments Act of 1965, and in so doing have accomplished much that is good. There are of course, portions of this bill with which I still strongly disagree, but, as we know only too well, under the rule under which this bill has been considered we have been forced to take "the bitter with the sweet."

I have previously introduced a bill (H.R. 6153) which would raise the income limitation for individuals receiving social security benefits, without penalty, from $1,200 to $2,400. The bill we passed today has taken a step in the right direction by expanding the "band" of $1 reduction in benefits for $2 in earnings, from $1,200 to $1,700, to $1,200 to $2,400; but I do not believe we have gone far enough.

In this vein, then, I commend to our colleagues an article by Mr. Gerald Burke, of Binghamton, N.Y., which appeared in the February 1965 issue of the Feed Bag:

BURKE ON BUSINESS: SOCIAL SECURITY INEQUITIES

A little over a quarter of a century ago, many Americans were up in arms over a radical change in their way of life. Payroll deductions for social security began in 1937 despite considerable opposition. Today, social security is accepted. Most Americans will agree it has filled a great need. People had to be educated to the aims of social security, they needed assistance, and most of all, understanding, especially when applying for the benefits provided by law.

But as with all laws, the people responsible for administration are limited by the laws they must administer. This is unfortunate in many respects. A great deal of unjust criticism has been leveled against the Social Security Administration. We forget too readily that Congress creates the laws that govern this great Nation.

The social security law should be overhauled in several important areas to keep pace with the progress we have made during the last quarter century. Social security is basically an old-age, survivors, and disability insurance plan. During working years, employees, their employers, and self-employed people pay social security taxes. The law originally was designed to take care of the participants when their earnings stopped. The purpose was to replace part of the earnings the family lost because of retirement, death, or disability.

LONGER LIFESPAN

Medical science has made it possible for man to live longer. These extra years now are possible through wonder drugs, new techniques learned through research, and tremendous expenditures by private enterprise in a never-ending search to provide us with the very best we've grown accustomed to expect. This is democracy in action and we wouldn't have it any other way, but there is a price tag on every step of progress made by mankind. Why lengthen man's life if we cannot make these extra years meaningful?

Here is the conflict. Our present social security laws have not provided adequately for today's living. Contributions to social security are compulsory but the beneficiaries are selected carefully. A large segment of our economy is discriminated against.

Why should we ask everyone to pay predetermined rates for benefits and then make it difficult, if not impossible, for a large majority to ever get more than a token return on their investment?

INCOME LIMITATIONS

Originally, a person getting social security benefits was penalized if he earned more than $1,200 per year from personal services. This penalty was abolished when he became 72 years of age. Then he could earn all he was able to and still collect full benefits. How did one manage in the meantime? Living costs had increased and medical bills were heavier. Why penalize him for working, when he was able to, in order to earn the additional money he needed to meet increased expenses?

Our lawmakers recognized how unfair this situation had become. In 1959, the law was changed. They ruled that no matter how much you earned in a year, you could get monthly benefit payments for any month in which you neither earned wages of more than $100 nor rendered substantial service in self-employment. This offered an opportunity to many people who felt they were entitled to benefits. Additional changes along these lines were made in 1961 and as late as May 1963.

CIRCUMVENTING LAW

Almost everyone wants everything he is entitled to get. We find many perfectly honest people sitting down and figuring every angle to earn as much as they can without losing a benefit check.

People resort to every subterfuge they can think of to arrange their affairs so they can claim maximum benefits. The man on salary tries to make a deal with his employer to get him to give him two, three, or four big checks for work he may do during the year; both conspire to make it appear the services are rendered during a short period of time. Morally, they both feel they are doing no wrong. Of course, their acts are illegal.

The self-employed man is told he does not lose his benefit checks for the months he does not perform substantial service, so he plans to take an extended vacation and arrange a work schedule so his earnings are concentrated in the shortest period of time. He, too, wants to enjoy maximum benefits.

We should not lose sight of the fact that income from interest, dividends, rental property, and capital gains does not hinder a person from drawing social security benefits. The more of this income a man has, the less his need for social security. Nevertheless, if he contributes, he is entitled to benefits. Both the employee and the self-employed man know earnings are subject to review, and they may have to return benefit checks illegally earned. The stakes are high, so many are willing to take the chance. The law is not realistic or democratic. It is morally wrong to encourage a person to degrade himself by conspiring to cheat or to refrain from honest labor in order to collect benefits he has paid for over the years.

CHANGES NEEDED

Why should this be necessary? We spend millions of dollars every year to raise the standards of living in other countries, thereby increasing purchasing power to insure prosperity. Then we turn right around and penalize our own people for attempting to make the most of their God-given abilities. It doesn't make sense. If our people earned more and had social security, too, they could spend more as well. Instead of writing off thousands upon thousands of taxpayers who receive social security benefits plus the little extra they are allowed to earn, we could turn many of these people into taxpayers with dignity, pride, and independence. America has grown because of the faith we've had in the future. Should we destroy this faith in the minds of our senior citizens?

Many of our senior citizens find it difficult to get by on social security alone and even more difficult to work out a plan to supplement their income without endangering the benefits they are entitled to without working.

TALENT IS LOST

Some of our best brains are "going to seed" because they refuse to be a part of this deception in trying to beat an impractical law. Many brilliant men start deteriorating when they reach retirement age because they have lost incentive.

A man between the ages of 62 and 65 is not old. He may feel old if he feels useless, but if he has a purpose in life he has many fruitful years ahead. Some of the most creative work has been produced by men over 62.

Why should Uncle Sam say to these people, "You'll have to cut down on your compensation or do some clever conniving; otherwise, you'll lose some of your benefit checks"?

Or, "Lay off until you are 72. Then you may earn all you can and be perfectly honest about it because you get full benefits regardless of your income?"

Which is more important—to determine man's potential on earth or get man to the moon?

Why not create a commission to conserve the greatest of our natural resources, the preservation of rugged individualism?

Many a man at present retirement age has some good contacts and actually is needed on the job. He may give these up to qualify for benefits and find out at 72 that he has drifted too far away to be of any real value. Then he really feels lost. How much time can you lose from your job or business without feeling you've lost contact? Why waste this precious time?

The good Lord does not set an age for death. Why should we by law set an age for enforced retirement by penalizing those who have much to contribute to our society? Wherever there has been a genuine need, we Americans have filled it. There is a genuine need now to make the most of man's maturity.

Increase in Domestic Farmworkers

SPEECH

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in further response to the request for information made by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], I would like to provide additional data regarding the greencard workers in agriculture.

First, and this I believe is a very basic point, the green-card worker is now and always has been, for the purposes of employment statistics, counted as a domestic worker. Once a work record is established, he is entitled to unemployment compensation or whatever other benefits his type of work provides workers who are American citizens. As a result, the green-card worker is not counted separately and is considered available domestic labor.

Since July 1, 1963, every Mexican applying for a permanent visa to work in the United States has been required to prove that he has a bona fide job offer. The Department of Labor, through its affiliated State employment security agencies, must then check to insure that a labor shortage actually exists in that job classification and that the employment of this worker will not adversely effect U.S. workers similarly employed. On the basis of its findings, the Labor Department may either approve or disapprove admission.

As I reported earlier, between July 1, 1964, and March 24, 1963, there were only 387 Mexicans approved for agriculture work. This compared with 2,099 during the previous fiscal year.

The following chart shows the type of requests and the number approved from July 1, 1963, through March 24 of this year:

Type of request	July 1, 1963, to June 30, 1964	July 1, 1964, to Mar. 24, 1965
Total requests	17,461	20,373
Total approved	4,174	2,832
Nonagriculture requests	8,232	12,430
Nonagriculture approved	2,075	2,447
Agriculture requests	9,229	7,942
Agriculture approvals	2,099	387

Of the 2,099 agriculture approvals in fiscal year 1964, 1,738 were approved in the Dallas, Tex., office. Similarly, from July 1, 1964 to March 24, 1965, 328 of the 387 were approved in the Dallas office.

Furthermore, I have been advised by the U.S. Immigration Service, that the number of green-card workers commuting to the United States on a daily basis to work in agriculture is "negligible."

Mr. Speaker, when we consider the fact that the number of American workers employed in agriculture has increased by more than 23,000 over the figure of a year ago, and when we relate this figure to the very small number of green-card approvals during the last year, it is hard to escape the conclusion that Americans are willing to do farm labor and that more are doing it than ever before.

Fighting the Forces That Threaten Rural America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have expressed on several occasions on this floor my concern about the economic forces that threaten rural America. Our farmers and our rural communities are facing problems that can well devastate our farms in our smaller communities. I would like to commend to you and my colleagues a speech given by Harold Bertsch, Administrator, Farmers Home Administration, at a meeting of the USDA Club of Greater Kansas on March 17, 1965, in Kansas City, Mo., on the problems threatening rural America. I would especially like to point out solutions advanced for combatting these problems.

The speech follows:

FIGHTING THE FORCES THAT THREATEN RURAL AMERICA

(By Howard Bertsch)

There are more voices being raised today, about the problems facing the farmer, the rural community, and the rural poor than we have heard for many, many years.

This is good. This is very good.

I had the feeling about 5 years ago that a great blanket had been drawn over rural America and that all of its troubles were to be hidden by a perpetual winter snow. No spring would ever come again to reveal the ugliness, and the promise.

All this has changed.

I am impressed by the quantity and the quality of the words I am reading, and hearing, about rural problems.

I intend today to repeat these words.

They state the case well. They come from many sources.

First, what is it they say about the family farm?

Let me begin by reading you a few paragraphs written by a Wisconsin farm wife this past January in a Catholic magazine and made a part of the RECORD by Congressman CALLAN, of Nebraska:

"Within a radius of 2 to 3 miles of the family farmland, we can count eight deserted farmsteads. This is sad and a little frightening. Analyzed, it means that about a fourth of the rural people in our neighborhood have left the land. Multiply this by thousands of similar sections of the country and you have a very disheartening result indeed. These people have been forced to sell their land, or perhaps, have left it idle because they are weary of trying to continue the uphill climb toward a fair and just reward for their labors. The saddest part of the dilemma is that 9 out of 10 persons, thus inhibited, do not want to leave their homes and their land which may have been in their family for generations."

This is an emotional statement. Written by a person who cares very much and is not afraid to let her feelings show.

Senator LONG of Missouri recently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from a farm woman in Missouri who was more restrained in her language, but equally effective in presenting the farmer's plight. I think the two statements go well together.

"DEAR SENATOR LONG: (The farm wife begins.) There has been published recently in our county a summary of farm records from a group of farmers who live in Audrain County.

"This summary shows up very vividly what a number of people know is happening and has been happening to the farmer's economic condition.

"The average farm and family earnings was $6,147. This figure includes $478 for the value of home-produced food. The average capital managed on these farms was $161,000. * * * The most simple arithmetic would show us that this capital would have produced a greater return just invested in Government bonds. * * * In every operation whose records were analyzed there was a negative return for labor. * * * We realize the stock and trite answer that supply and demand is the answer. We are aware of the very firm opinion that the law of supply and demand has not worked and will not work for agriculture unless its academic meaning is reversed—that is, the farmer supply his product and demand a price. If he doesn't lose his self-respect first, he just might do this."

Even this farm woman begins to get emotional toward the end of her letter. Who wouldn't when they know that they, year after year, literally give their labor away.

Now let me quote from a different source, from a recent statement by Congressman HAROLD COOLEY who for many years has been chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives.

Congressman COOLEY, irked by statements that indicated that a million farmers were all the farmers needed, had this to say:

"If a million farmers can produce food for all of us—why not a half million, a quarter of a million, a hundred thousand?

"Then, where will these few thousand large individual or cooperate operated farms get their supplies? From the local machinery dealers? The feed dealers? The seed dealer? Not on your life. You would see direct buying from wholesaler and manufacturer that would leave little room for the local farm supply dealer and little need for the other local retailer who would be depending on a dwindling hinterland.

"You would create poverty in rural America faster than you could lick it—even with the best intentions. It has been suggested that food production might eventually be concentrated in a few strong hands—which by that time might be able to exert sufficient control to manage their production as auto builders manage theirs. And this would avoid surpluses and then get the Government out of agriculture. But would this be a happy solution?

"Would the American public then be at the mercy of a few giant producers who would control their very sustenance? Or would the American people take it upon themselves to regulate food production publicly as they regulate any other public utility controlling the Nation's lifeline? Both of these have been suggested as serious possibilities. Am I overdramatizing? I do not believe so. We have already gone a long way down a road marked by abandoned farms and dying towns. And this is no time to run out on agriculture."

This is a rather dramatic statement, too, considering the fact that the chairman is usually rather restrained in his remarks.

Let me add one sentence from a Farmers Union publication that, in a way, sums it all up:

"There were 6.8 million farms 30 years ago. There are half that number today."

Now, as part and parcel of the current debate over what is happening to the American farm, there is a never-ending "numbers" game being played. Everyone recognizes that the number of farms had dropped down to 3.5 million by 1960. Too many people are spending their time trying to rationalize some ideal number of farmers. These people like to work out neat tables showing how incomes are divided among the 3.5 million. To this they add tables showing which income levels are producing most of the food.

The tables look neat. The conclusions drawn seem obvious.

But I say we must resist the pleasure that comes from playing the "numbers" game.

Behind those numbers are people. And you cannot fit people into the unreal world of statistics.

You just cannot do it.

The only reason we try to do it is that we have more figures on our agricultural economy than on any other section of our economy, and more people, with more time, to spend their efforts in arranging and rearranging those figures.

I say, forget figures.

Instead let us set ourselves a simple goal: To help as many people as we can to find in rural America a place in which to live and work and enjoy life.

We have support in this position.

President Johnson has said time and again that he did not intend to stand by and see the family farm plowed under.

And in his recent farm message he talked of helping all farmers, not just the favored few.

The President said our programs should:

"Provide efficient family farmers an opportunity to earn parity of income;

"Assist those small farmers who have little chance to enlarge their operations but whose age, physical handicap, or lack of education, prevent their shifting to other employment; and

"Assist those farm families who seek to enlarge their productive resources in order to obtain a decent living and have the opportunity and the capacity to do so."

It seems to me a careful reading of the President's message indicates he is not overly concerned with numbers.

In the Farmers Home Administration we are doing what we can with all the talent we possess to serve the full range of family farmers. There is no lower limit. If a man applies for our help and we can help him, we do so.

We do not ask him if he bears a magical number.

Now about the rural community. There is almost as much being said today about rural communities as about family farms.

There are those who say that the small rural community is a thing of the past. That a community has to be a certain size to survive.

Here too we refuse to play the "numbers" game.

The Farmers Home Administration is currently engaged in several methods of strengthening rural communities.

We are advancing funds for rural water systems. This phase of our endeavors gained its strength in Kansas and has recently demonstrated its appeal in Missouri.

We are advancing funds for the improvement of rural housing including special projects for senior citizens. Here too the Kansas City area is setting the pace with an outstanding example of a rural senior citizen housing project in nearby Oak Grove, Mo.

We are helping rural communities build recreation areas.

In all these endeavors we do not ask a rural community if it is on some magic numbers list. We ask only if it can repay our loan.

We have support for this approval in high quarters, too.

The President has said that he would not stand idly by and watch rural communities wither away.

And in his farm message he called for the economic development of smaller and medium-sized communities to insure a healthy economic base for rural America.

There has been an equal, if not greater amount of talk and discussion lately about the rural poor.

This is really encouraging. For even more than the family farmers, and the small rural communities, the rural poor were swept under the table during the blank, unseeing years of the fifties.

One of the best statements about poverty has been, not a new statement, but the recent frequent repetition of Mrs. Roosevelt's words:

"Only in the 20th century, perhaps, has anyone asked why people are poor. * * * Only today has it become a matter for everyman's conscience. And now—for poverty is like a giant infection which contaminates everything—we know that unless we can eradicate it by the use of all of our new scientific and economic materials, it can in time destroy us."

President Johnson's position in his war on poverty is well known. In his farm message he dwelt at length on the extent of rural poverty. There is no mistaking his meaning when he says "we can wage an unconditional war on poverty and win it."

In the Farmers Home Administration we find that this is one area where no one is playing the "numbers" game. For sure there are still those who wonder just how much can be accomplished. But no one is arguing that what this country needs is blank thousand poverty stricken families, no more, no less.

The number here is zero.

We take a great deal of satisfaction in knowing that within 2 months' time we have helped some 2,000 low-income rural families get a few of the resources they need for better living. We are making this the major phase of our endeavors.

I must confess that I, for one, am stimulated by the vast amount of discussion and debate that is taking place.

And by the clear green light we have received to drive ahead as hard as we can drive to strengthen the family farm, rebuild the rural community, and wipe poverty from the face of the land.

This is a great time and a great period in which to be a part of USDA.

We are coming alive again. We have a purpose. We have a mission.

We are involved with families, with people first, and with inanimate objects, second.

If we will but bring the resources to the people, they will solve their problems.

Let us get about the task that lies before us.

Medicare-Social Security: A Historic Milestone

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve

the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, today is a historic occasion for the people of Los Angeles, the State of California, and, indeed, in the life of our Nation.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the leadership, as well as the individual Members of the House, on both sides of this debate, on the statesmanlike manner in which we have considered and now overwhelmingly approved, on a nearly 3-to-1 vote of 313 to 115, the landmark Medicare and Social Security Amendments of 1965.

As one of the bill's original sponsors, I am proud to have offered my full support and to have played some part in the passage of this progressive and forward-looking legislation.

The measure not only contains the most comprehensive medicare health insurance plan for America's senior citizens ever adopted by either House of Congress, but it also includes the largest increase in social security benefits approved since the program was started 30 years ago.

We owe a special debt of gratitude to both President Lyndon Johnson and former President John Kennedy for the outstanding national leadership they demonstrated in the long struggle to bring this urgent matter before the people of the country and before their elected representatives here in the Nation's Capital.

The historic action we have taken today is of particular benefit to California's 1½ million elderly citizens, as well as the 17 million other Americans over the age of 65, for it will enable them to prepay in their earlier, more productive working years, most of their own hospital and related health expenses during retirement.

In addition, the bill provides an optional supplementary health insurance plan available at minimum cost to all persons over 65 and designed to cover their major medical and doctor bills.

Finally, the measure includes a long-overdue 7-percent across-the-board cost-of-living increase in social security benefits for some 20 million Americans—a real help to them by raising the minimum level of their basic economic protection.

These three key provisions of the Medicare and Social Security Amendments of 1965, plus several other substantial improvements in current federally assisted health programs, make this bill the most significant piece of health and social welfare legislation in American history.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been convinced that the elderly are not asking for charity.

But they do want and deserve, and I believe this measure will help give them, a system offering an opportunity to plan for the future—to permit them to live their remaining years in earned dignity, secure in the knowledge that they have provided adequately for their own needs during retirement years.

Because of the tremendous importance of this legislation to every citizen, I will insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD information outlining its provisions.

The first statement, entitled "A Brief Overall Summary," is a short description of the bill, and the other article, entitled "A Summary Analysis of Major Provisions," contains a more detailed explanation of the Medicare and Social Security Amendments of 1965.

The statement and article follow:

BRIEF OVERALL SUMMARY

The bill establishes two coordinated health insurance programs for persons 65 or over under the Social Security Act: (1) a "basic" plan providing protection against the costs of hospital and related care, financed through a separate payroll tax and trust fund; and (2) a voluntary "supplementary" plan covering payments for physicians' and other medical and health services financed through small monthly premiums by individual participants matched equally by a Federal Government general revenue contribution.

Undergirding the two new insurance programs would be a greatly expanded medical care program for the needy and the medically needy. This program would combine all the vendor medical provisions for the aged, blind, disabled, and families with dependent children now in five titles of the Social Security Act under a uniform program and matching formula in a single new title. The Federal matching share for cash payments for these needy persons would also be increased; services for maternal and child health, crippled children, and the mentally retarded would be expanded; a 5-year program of "special project grants" to provide comprehensive health care and services for needy children of school age, or preschool, would be authorized; and present limitations on Federal participation in public assistance to aged individuals in tuberculosis or mental disease hospitals would be removed under certain conditions.

With respect to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system the bill would increase benefits by 7 percent across the board with a $4 minimum increase for a worker, cover certain currently uncovered occupations and wages (doctors, and income from tips), continue benefits to age 22 for certain children in school, provide social security tax exemption of self-employment income of certain religious groups opposed to insurance, provide actuarially reduced benefits for widows at age 60, and pay benefits, on a transitional basis, to certain persons currently 72 or over now ineligible; liberalize the definition for disability insurance benefits, increase the amount an individual is permitted to earn without suffering full deductions from benefits, revise the tax schedule, and increase the earnings counted for benefit and tax purposes so as to fully finance the changes made, and make certain changes in allocations to the old-age and survivors insurance and disability insurance trust funds.

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF MAJOR PROVISIONS—H.R. 6675—MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965 (HOUSE VERSION, APRIL 1965)

This analysis of the medicare and social security amendments of 1965 (H.R. 6675), as acted on by the House is in the three tables—(1) a description of the basic hospitalization program; (2) a description of the optional supplementary medical program; and (3) a description of amendments to the Social Security Act, the Kerr-Mills law, and other miscellaneous provisions.

TABLE 1—BASIC HOSPITALIZATION PROGRAM (UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM)

Eligibility: All persons aged 65 years or over who are now, or will in the future, be entitled to monthly social security or railroad retirement benefits (except Federal employees who retired after 1959).

All persons aged 65 years or over, or who will reach age 65 before 1968, who are not eligible for monthly social security or railroad retirement benefits. This part of the program to be paid for from general revenues of the Federal Government, not paid for out of social security trust funds.

Effective date: July 1, 1966, except for services in extended care facilities, which will be effective January 1, 1967.

Enrollment: No enrollment necessary. Coverage is automatic to those eligible.

Cost to the individual: Benefits extended to eligible persons without cost as a matter of right; no "needs test" required.

Benefits:

1. Inpatient hospital charges for up to 60 days of hospitalization in each spell of illness, subject to a $40 deductible amount.

2. Twenty days of nursing home care in each spell of illness, after transfer from hospital; 2 additional days of nursing home care (if needed) can be added for each day that the patient's hospital stay was less than 60 days, to a maximum total of 100 days.

3. Outpatient hospital diagnostic services, subject to a $20 deductible amount for such services furnished by the same hospital during a 20-day period.

4. Posthospital home health services for up to 100 visits after discharge from hospital or nursing home (when patient is under care of physician).

Financing: Through the social security system—payroll taxes from employee, employer, and by self-employed persons. Taxes paid into separate hospital insurance trust fund to assure that actuarial soundness of trust funds and the entire social security system is safeguarded. Tax rates for employee (matched by employer) will be: 1966, 0.35 percent; 1967–72, 0.50 percent; 1973–75, 0.55 percent; 1976–79, 0.60 percent; 1980–86, 0.70 percent; 1987 on, 0.80 percent.

These amounts would be automatically deducted from payroll check (as at present) on first $5,600 earnings a year during 1966–70 period. Thereafter, they would be based on first $6,600 of annual earnings. Program will cost each employee, employer only 38 cents a week, rising to about 54 cents a week for each during 1967–72 period.

TABLE 2—OPTIONAL SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL PROGRAM (UNDER PRIVATE INSURANCE CARRIERS)

Eligibility: All persons age 65 or over, on an optional, voluntary basis, regardless of whether or not they are eligible for social security, railroad retirement, or other benefits.

Effective date: July 1, 1966.

Enrollment: Enrollment for persons age 65 years or over before January 1, 1966, will begin 2 months after enactment of bill and continue to March 31, 1966. Regular enrolling periods thereafter.

Cost to the individual: If person chooses to participate in this program, it will cost him $3 per month. Amount would be automatically deducted from monthly benefit check of those persons receiving social security or railroad retirement benefits. Others would pay their contribution into special trust fund directly.

Benefits: In addition to the benefits listed in table 1, those choosing to participate in the supplementary medical program would be entitled to:

1. Physicians' and surgical services furnished in a hospital, clinic, office, or in the home.

2. Hospital care for 60 days in a spell of illness in a mental hospital (180-day lifetime maximum).

3. Home health services (without regard to hospitalization) for up to 100 visits during each calendar year.

4. Additional medical and health services, provided in or out of a medical institution, including diagnostic X-ray and laboratory tests, electrocardiograms, basal metabolism readings, and other diagnostic tests; X-ray,

radium, and radioactive isotype therapy; ambulance services (under limited conditions); surgical dressings, splints, casts, iron lungs, oxygen tents, artificial limbs, eyes, etc.

Benefits under this program are subject to an annual deductible amount of $50. Then the program will pay 80 percent of the patient's bills (above the $50 deductible).

Financing: Persons participating in this program will pay $3 a month ($36 a year).—An additional $3 per person per month will be paid into fund by Federal Government out of general revenues.

TABLE 3—OTHER PROVISIONS

Social security benefits: Increases by 7 percent (with a minimum increase of $4 a month) all old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits. Increases would be retroactive to January 1, 1965. Now minimum benefit raised from $40 to $44 a month. Will benefit an estimate 20 million persons.

Child's insurance benefits: A child's insurance benefits would continue to be paid until the person reaches age 22 (instead of age 18) if child is attending accredited school or college as a full-time student after he reaches age 18. Will be effective as of January 1, 1965, and benefit estimated 295,000 young people.

Optional benefits for widows at age 60: Widows may have option of receiving social security benefits at age 60, with actuarial reduction of benefits they would otherwise receive at age 62. Effective for second month after enactment of bill, benefiting estimated 185,000 widows.

Disability insurance amendments: Liberalizes eligibility requirements and waiting period for persons covered by disability insurance provisions of Social Security Act. Will benefit estimated 155,000 disabled workers.

Benefits to persons at age 72 or over: Liberalizes eligibility requirements by providing a basic benefit of $35 a month at age 72 or over to certain persons with a minimum of three quarters of coverage under the Social Security Act, acquired at any time since the beginning of the program in 1937. Will benefit an estimated 355,000 persons.

Retirement test: Liberalizes the social security earned income limitation. Beginning in the 1966 tax year, a person receiving benefits will be able to earn $1,200 a year without having his benefits reduced; earnings between $1,200 and $2,400 a year would be subject to a $1 reduction in benefits for each $2 of earnings up to $2,400; a $1 reduction in benefits for each $1 of earnings above $2,400 would take place. Existing law limits this provision to $1,700 instead of $2,400.

Miscellaneous amendments: Other amendments to the Social Security Act authorize benefits to certain divorced women, coverage of self-employed physicians and interns, amendments affecting annual gross earnings of farmers, coverage of cash tips received by an employee after 1965, and an exemption from social security taxes of self-employed persons of the Amish and other religious sects.

Improvement of Kerr-Mills program: Extends the provisions of expanded State medical assistance programs not only to the indigent aged, but also to needy persons who are part of the dependent children, blind, and permanently and totally disabled programs. Establishes a single and separate medical care program to replace the differing provisions for the needy in other parts of the Social Security Act. Provides a level of redical services States must offer to receive Federal payments. Requires States to provide a flexible income test for eligibility.

Other provisions

Public assistance amendments: Increases the Federal share of payments under all State public assistance programs, effective January 1, 1966. Contains other amendments providing Federal incentive to States to benefit aged persons in tubercular and mental institutions.

Child health program amendments: Increases Federal authorization for maternal and child health services and for crippled children services. Authorizes grants to higher education institutions to train professional personnel for health and related care of crippled children, particularly mentally retarded children with multiple handicaps. Authorizes a new 5-year program of special project grants to provide health care and services for children from needy areas. Authorizes grants to help States, to implement mental retardation plans.

Financing improved social security benefits: Improvements in the regular social security program and increased benefits provided in the bill would be financed through a revised payroll tax schedule. Taxes on employees, employers, and self-employed persons are paid into social security trust fund as in the past 30 years. Rates of tax are designed to guarantee the actuarial soundness of the social security system.

The revised tax schedule and the rates under existing law are:

[In percent]

Years	Employee and employer tax rate (each)		Self-employed tax rate	
	Existing law	Proposed in bill	Existing law	Proposed in bill
1965	3.625	3.625	5.4	5.4
1966–67	4.125	4.0	6.2	6.0
1968	4.625	4.0	6.9	6.0
1969–72	4.625	4.4	6.9	6.6
1973 on	4.625	4.8	6.9	7.0

As in the past, these amounts would be automatically deducted from payroll check. Tax would be paid on first $5,600 (instead of present $4,800) during the 1966–70 period. Thereafter, they would be paid on first $6,600 of annual earnings.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C* — 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*
Grider, George W., *Tenn*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. *Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

A Thoughtful Gift to Marquette University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent donation of $2,250,000 to Marquette University of Milwaukee by Mr. C. Frederic Wehr, retired chairman of the Wehr Steel Co.

This gift, the largest in the history of the university and, indeed, of the city of Milwaukee, will make possible the construction of a new chemistry building on the campus.

Another part of the money will be used to endow distinguished professorships in chemistry and physics and the remainder will be used to create a science endowment fund.

This gift has sparked a renewed effort in our community to provide the contributions—both by industry and individual donors—needed to complete Marquette's current $15 million fund drive. The funds are greatly needed to maintain the university's role as an important educational center in the Midwest.

Through his gift, Mr. Wehr has assisted not only Marquette, but also the people of Milwaukee and Wisconsin who will benefit from the enhanced science programs which the funds will make possible.

In order to acquaint my colleagues further with this outstanding example of civic-minded giving, I am inserting at this point an article from the Milwaukee Journal of February 11, and an editorial which the same paper ran on the following day:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Feb. 11, 1965]

MU GETS $2,250,000 FROM STEEL EXECUTIVE—BIGGEST GIFT IN HISTORY OF JESUIT SCHOOL; UNIVERSITY WILL USE DONATIONS BY WEHR FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF SCIENCE CENTER

Marquette University has been given $2,250,000, the largest gift in the school's 84-year history, to be applied to establishment of a science center.

The donor is C. Frederic (Todd) Wehr, retired chairman of the Wehr Steel Co., of Milwaukee, who now lives in Libertyville, Ill.

The gift was announced Thursday after the 75-year-old industrialist and Father William F. Kelley, president of the Jesuit university, signed three sets of documents transferring the funds in ceremonies at the university.

The chancellor of the university, signed the agreement along with Wehr and Father Kelley.

The gift will be divided into three parts.

One, of $500,000, will go toward a new chemistry building which will bear Wehr's name. It is to be erected within 3 years on a plot east of the new life sciences building, 530 North 15th Street.

Another part, $750,000, will be used to endow a distinguished professorship in chemistry and one in physics.

The remaining million dollars will establish the Wehr Science Center endowment, to be used as a special board of trustees sees fit.

Marquette has agreed to provide at least 4 million from its own resources for the new chemistry building and a companion structure for physics.

Those two buildings, with the existing life sciences building, will constitute the Wehr Science Center, named for Henry and Barbara Wehr, the donor's parents, who died in 1924 and 1926, respectively.

The new chemistry building will include a reception room built as a memorial to the parents of the donor.

Wehr's gift raised the total pledged in the greater Marquette fund drive to $9,578,721, the university said. In all, 3,936 donors have contributed or pledged.

Father Kelley said the Wehrs had made large gifts to the university in the past, principally for medical education.

Wehr said that he had been talking with university officials about the grant for roughly 2 years.

WEHR SPEAKS QUIETLY

The signing itself was a matter of fact procedure. When Wehr spoke at all, he spoke quietly. He penned his signature as emotionlessly as though he were signing a luncheon check.

He stands more than 6 feet tall. Except for a diamond ring on his left hand, he was conservatively garbed. His suit, which included a vest, was oxford gray. His shirt and tie were blue.

He arrived at the university in a white, chauffeur-driven Cadillac.

The life sciences building, completed in 1962, will be named for the Wehrs in recognition of their aid.

START BUILDING IN SPRING

Plans for the new chemistry building are virtually complete. Construction is to begin this spring. The site is in the Marquette urban renewal area approved January 26 by the common council.

The physics building is to be completed in 5 years.

Marquette University agreed to seek outstanding scholars for the professorships within 18 months.

It also agreed that after major projects of the science center were completed it would "use its best efforts to establish and endow other professorships * * * to promote the growth of science education and research in the allied fields of mathematics, biochemistry, biomedical engineering, and computer technology; to obtain funds to provide science scholarships for superior students and to erect such additional facilities as may be required."

The agreement said that Marquette would now be able to "proceed promptly to integrate the proposed center with the MU urban renewal area, promptly apply for matching funds for research from the Federal Government and for other assistance, and provide laboratories and equipment which will improve the opportunities for professors to acquire assistance from various national philanthropic sources."

WEHR MAKES STATEMENT

After the papers were signed, Wehr said: "I have given a great deal of thought to this thing over the years.

"My father came here in 1856. The family always has been proud of Marquette, has always looked up to Marquette.

"I thought that with Marquette we could keep our name in the State of Wisconsin for many, many years to come."

Wehr is himself a graduate of Cornell University in Ithaca, N.Y. He attended West Division High School.

Marquette's current fund drive goal it $15 million. It plans to seek another $15 million between 1966 and 1971. In the present campaign the school has been given 21 gifts of $100,000 or more.

MRS. CRAMER GAVE $929,470

Its largest previous individual gift was the estate of Mrs. William E. Cramer, widow of the editor of the Evening Wisconsin, a Milwaukee daily newspaper which has passed out of existence. She died in 1922, leaving a will which, when settled in 1934, provided $929,470 for the medical school.

The present medical school building is named for her.

The Ford Foundation granted Marquette $1,180,000 in 1956 and another $1,796,000 in 1957.

The Wehr family included four sons and three daughters, of whom the only survivor is Todd.

The others were Henry, Edward R., William, Mrs. Louise Falk, Mrs. August Grau, and Miss Louise Wehr.

The steel company was founded in 1910 by their father. It is a large electrical steel casting firm.

PRESIDENT UNTIL 1958

Wehr was president until 1958, when the steel firm acquired the Dings Magnetic Separator Co. At that time he became board chairman and Robert L. Manegold became president.

Wehr moved to Libertyville in 1963 and sold his interest in the company in 1964. Now known as the Wehr Corp., it has plants in Verona (Dane County) and Chicago as well as in Milwaukee.

There was no connection between the announcement and another fact mentioned at the university. Thursday was Father Kelley's 51st birthday.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Feb. 12, 1965]

THOUGHTFUL GIFT

The $2,250,000 gift to Marquette University from C. Frederic Wehr, retired steel company executive, is not only handsomely generous but also constitutes thoughtful giving.

Only part is earmarked for a specific "brick and mortar" project—the $500,000 that will go toward a new chemistry building. Marquette will also use other funds for this structure and a physics building which, with the existing life sciences building, will make up the Wehr Science Center.

Another $750,000 will endow distinguished professorships in chemistry and physics, and the remaining $1 million will set up an endowment to be used as a special board of trustees sees fit. The arrangement thus permits flexibility and assures a core of talent around which a strong scientific faculty may be molded.

The gift, which is the largest in Marquette's history, may serve a further purpose. It may inspire other donors to provide the gifts, large and small, that Marquette needs to meet its current $15 million fund drive.

Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. Opens Microfilm Systems Laboratory for Government and Industry in Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the programing of information storage and retrieval systems for Government and industry has become an increasingly significant function of the microfilm industry in light of the growing demand for methods of streamlining recordkeeping and related activities in our automated and computerized business society.

To accommodate this need, the 3M Co.—Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing—recently opened a microfilm systems development laboratory in Washington. I attended the news conference held in connection with the opening, at which Internal Revenue Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen explained the new nationwide microfilm system recently set up to place the massive legal records of the Service on a uniform basis

Mr. Cohen described the reports and information retrieval activity—RIRA—a magnetic tape-computer-based system that utilizes microfilm and high-speed microfilm reader-printers.

The system is being used by the Revenue Service to streamline legal information services needed to assure fair and consistent interpretation of the law for the Nation's taxpayers.

The RIRA program analyzes legal data collected from 32 field offices and national office divisions in Washington and disseminates the data on rolls of microfilm stored in cartridges to information centers.

The focal point of the system is the Counsel Legal Information Center—CLIC—where the film can be viewed and printed automatically. There are four of these centers in Washington, and one each in New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Chicago, Atlanta, Dallas, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.

The objective of the new system, Mr. Cohen explained, is to solve three major information problems: caseload coordination, legal research, and compilation of legal statistics. He said:

Before we began using our microfilm system, coordinating pending cases among field offices and between the litigation and technical functions of the chief counsel's office was one of our most acute legal management problems.

That office handles more than 28,000 tax matters, annually, in addition to working on long-range tax legislation and regulation programs. This work is handled by some 650 attorneys assigned to 32 field offices and the office in Washington.

Mr. Cohen said:

Decentralization, volume of work, and the complexities of Federal tax laws make it difficult for the chief counsel to maintain consistency. Before the retrieval system was established, it was possible for two or more attorneys working on similar cases to come to different conclusions and be quite unaware of it."

Gathering legal statistics is essential, but time-consuming by the time statistical reports are compiled manually, they are in danger of being out of date.

Microfilm was advantageous, but microfilm geared to professional people had to be found. It was essential that the attorney could disregard the mechanical aspects and treat the machine as he would a lawbook.

With the system adopted by IRS, the attorney simply checks the index, requests the microfilm cartridge containing the information he wants, and places it in the reader-printer. By pressing a button he gets a print of the document appearing on the screen in 5 seconds.

The benefit to the taxpayer is obvious. He now has even greater assurance of fair and consistent interpretation of tax laws, Mr. Cohen said.

The "Filmac 400" reader-printer used in the IRS system is the newest of the Minneapolis Mining & Manufacturing Co.'s line of microfilm equipment in MicroForum. This new system development laboratory includes cameras, microfilm duplicating equipment, data processing machines, a printer employing a unique "dry silver" paper process, as well as a complete line of reader-printers.

To make certain that every recordkeeping method can be analyzed and a tailormade microfilm systems can be devised to accommodate any requirement, MicroForum includes equipment of other manufacturers as well as Minneapolis Mining & Manufacturing Co., D. W. McArthur, vice president of Minneapolis Mining & Manufacturing Co. Microfilm Products Division, said.

Mr. McArthur represented the company at the opening of MicroForum. Both are from the St. Paul, Minn., headquarters of Minneapolis Mining & Manufacturing Co.

The first MicroForum was opened in St. Paul. In less than 3 years, Mr. McArthur said, some 600 persons representing 200 commercial organizations and government agencies used that facility. Nearly every Government department and agency in Washington uses microfilm in one or more areas, he added.

With this proven interest, we saw a need for a systems development laboratory closer to Federal Government and major eastern users of microfilm. These people, we felt, needed a convenient laboratory where they could probe and prove microfilm systems compatible with their individual needs.

New and experimental capabilities designed to satisfy these needs may well be shown here in months and years to come.

To bring all this into perspective, I point out that there are evolutionary parts to many of these systems. For example, although the system in use in the IRS offices is the most modern available today, it can be expected to undergo improvement and change. Then, because of this evolutionary nature of information management systems, a problem-solving approach to systems development must have both short- and long-range goals. This is necessary because what you do today must be compatible with what you would like to do tomorrow.

Among those invited to attend the opening were members of the tax-writing House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees, ranking members of the Senate and House Space Committees, members of the Minnesota congressional delegation, and officials of the Commerce, Treasury, Agriculture, and Post Office Departments and Veterans' Administration.

John Mill, Jr., is in charge of the Washington MicroForum.

The opening ceremony also featured a presentation to the National Press Club of microfilmed pictorial history of the club's World War II "canteen" for servicemen.

The photographs preserved for NPC records include the memorable pitcture of former President Harry S. Truman accompanying actress Lauren Bacall "on" the piano, another of Mr. Truman playing a duet with "violinist" Jack Benny, several mementos of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's visits to the canteen and action shots of many of the headliners who entertained there.

William M. Blair of the New York Times, president of the NPC, accepted the microfilmed album presented by Minneapolis Mining & Manufacturing Co. MicroForum.

Farm Labor Management Committee of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of the 1964 annual report of the Farm Labor Management Committee of Michigan. This is a voluntary association of fruit and vegetable growers in my State, who several years ago began to recognize the economic and social problems connected with a migrant farm labor supply, and set about to improve the situation.

By their own initiative, they have taken the lead in charting a new course in the solution of problems attending our migrant agricultural workers. They have not waited for some government program. On the contrary, they are making great strides in meeting their problems locally. Better migrant housing, better working conditions, improved human relations between migrants and the communities in which they work, have already resulted from the efforts of this organization.

Growers have developed farm labor management classes which are largely and regularly atttended. An overflow attendance turned out at a workshop on

the subject held on the campus of Michigan State University. Programs involving improved training, supervision, communication, and understanding give promise of improved productivity and reward for workers, growers, and consumers. These growers are demonstrating excellent results and the merit of voluntary group effort.

Present chairman of the committee is Mr. Harry H. Nye, of St. Joseph, Mich., a successful fruit grower in southwestern Michigan who was most instrumental in the organization of the committee, a strong proponent of the philosophy that local problems should be locally met. W. L. Mainland, of Milford, Mich., is vice chairman, and Catherine Daly, of Benton Harbor, is secretary. The organization has a migrant housing committee chaired by Lloyd Fox, of Shelby, Mich.; a committee on human relations under the chairmanship of another of my valued constituents, Oscar J. Dowd, of Paw Paw, Mich.; and in Information Committee headed by Rudolph Reinbold, of Saginaw, Mich.

Activity on the part of growers who are dependent upon migrant labor to meet their problems in the traditional voluntary way should be encouraged and applauded, Mr. Speaker. I am proud to call the attention of the House to the success of the Farm Labor Management Committee of Michigan.

The Case for the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial from the Progressive Farmer. It presents the case for the South in the present attempts by power-hungry agitators to discredit a whole section of America.

The editorial follows:

CASE FOR MISSISSIPPI, ALABAMA, AND THE SOUTH

Mississippi, Alabama, and other States of the Deep South have been reviled for more than a century by holier-than-thou fanatics. In the civil rights troubles of recent years, this "Hate the South" campaign has reached a crescendo, with the area represented as a lawless land where hate and fear stalk hand in hand. Everywhere he looks—be it in the press, on television, in books, in movies—the white southerner sees himself libeled, lied about, and dragged through the mud of vindictive misrepresentation.

Ever since we have had a nation, the North and East have been infested with a surplus of self-righteous folks with a Messiah complex. They say: "Look at me. See how pure I am. Why can't you be like me?" Forthwith, they set out to save the world—in fact, to remake it in their own image. But many people don't like the image—and refuse to be recast by it.

This is the crime of the people of Mississippi—and Alabama—and the South. They don't want to be recast in someone else's image. They don't regard themselves as any better or any worse than people in other parts of the Nation.

There is much in the South that needs to be changed. We have all the unlovely traits of people everywhere. But the good people of the South—a section chockful of fine folks of kindness and good will—despise lawlessness and murder. Yet they have never been able to understand why a murder in Mississippi is any more heinous than one in New York's Harlem or Chicago's south side. Murder for any reason is a despicable crime. And is an Alabama murder inspired by racial conflict any more damnable than murder resulting from a labor dispute in Pennsylvania? Every good person is against murder, no matter why and where it happens.

Moreover, when southern people hear their States condemned as a lawless land, they wonder where their critics are getting their crime statistics. Of crime, for example, Mississippi has less than its share, ranking lowest among the States. In spite of lurid stories to the contrary, the vast majority of people—white and colored—are living together in all our Southern States in peace and good will.

Much publicity has been given to the Oberlin contingent that has come south to rebuild a burned church. But how many know of the Mississippi Committee of Concern, a local group, whose sole purpose is to rebuild burned or damaged churches? And how many know that this group is rebuilding 20 or more burned Negro churches?

Of course, we must face plain facts. Not even its most sympathetic friends can condone the restriction of voter registration in any State on a basis of the voter's color. The right to vote is a free man's most precious possession. And while we recognize the problem facing white citizens where they are outnumbered 2 or 3 to 1, there is no alternative to giving the vote to all who can qualify.

There is no excuse for the mass violation of laws by civil righters. Often, southern officials play into their hands by not letting them demonstrate. We say: Let them demonstrate so long as they are law abiding. Throw them in jail if they get rowdy, obstruct traffic, or otherwise break the law. Many times when given permission to parade, they decide not to. For 9 out of 10 of their leaders are more interested in publicity than in establishing the right to vote.

Those who seek to gain their ends by any means, no matter how destructive or vicious, are nothing new in history. But it does seem to us we have those today who, to gain their ends, would throw overboard all the principles that have made us the strongest and most envied nation in the world. America must choose between law and order and responsible democracy or mobocracy and anarchy. Either we make that choice or no citizenry—East, North, West, or South, will tomorrow be safe.

Public Library Progress in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is now more library conscious than at any time in the history of the Republic. Greater progress has been made in the development of libraries throughout the Nation in the past decade than in any period of the movement's history. The Federal Government in cooperation with the States has made millions of dollars available for this purpose.

But, Mr. Speaker, in no State of the Union has this movement been more substantial than in my native State of Mississippi. While this has been a cooperative effort on the part of the citizens of Mississippi, I am sure that all would agree that this would have not been possible had it not been for the unselfish and dedicated efforts of one person, the director of the Mississippi Library Commission, Mrs. Lura Gibbons Currier. I have never known a more dedicated public servant than Mrs. Currier. Surely future generations as well as the present one will be immeasurably indebted to her for her dedicated and tireless effort in the expansion and development of Mississippi's libraries.

However, her efforts in behalf of her life's work have not been confined to Mississippi. She is recognized all over the Nation as an outstanding leader in this worthwhile movement; and is in great demand throughout the Nation as a public speaker in this work.

A former resident of my hometown of Pascagoula, she was instrumental in the planning and establishment there of one of the most modern public libraries in the country. All Mississippi, as well as people throughout the Nation, are deeply indebted to this friend of the library.

The Mississippi Library News in a recent and factual and illustrated booklet contains a well deserved and appropriate editorial captioned "An Important Milestone." The editorial follows:

AN IMPORTANT MILESTONE

February 1 marked an important milestone at the Mississippi Library Commission. On that date 10 years ago Lura Gibbons Currier became the 39-year-old agency's fourth executive director. If we measure progress by the distance from the starting point, great strides have been made in library development in Mississippi in these 10 years. If we measure progress by the distance from the goal, Lura would be the first to say "We have just begun." The broad accomplishments of this decade are too numerous to detail here.

We wish only to speak of the one who has been the motivating power behind these accomplishments.

Lura works hard at her job of improving and developing libraries in Mississippi. Her schedule is a round-the-clock one, week in and week out. Only an extraordinary person could stand up to it. But even so no one State could possibly contain her great energies and unusual talents. Her contribution to librarianship has been spread over the entire United States in a variety of forms. Legislatively on a number of occasions she worked long hours with the ALA Washington office. She merits a significant portion of the credit for the successful passage of the Library Services Act of 1956 and its renewal in 1961. Published articles in library literature (many less than requested) attest to her prolific mind and unusual style of writing. Lura is the only person we know who can make exciting reading out of a routine and otherwise dull report. More than a score of out-of-State offices put aside everything when a "Currier communication" arrives. And often we are surprised to see in print comments from one of her letters.

And finally her wise counsel and professional knowledge have been generously given as she answered calls (again more than she ever accepted) from many States and from

her own for speeches (and you've missed a treat if you have not heard one of her speeches with intriguing titles), workshops, and consultant services. The time consumed in these services did not take the place of but was in addition to her regular duties in the State.

So, Lura, on this 10th anniversary the editor of MLN and the editorial staff salute you. You have given style and status to the library profession. May the first 10 years prove to be the hardest (though we seriously doubt it) even though we are certain the next 10 will be the fullest.

Drifting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, among the many newsworthy items that appear in the Chicago Tribune is one which I believe serves a most worthwhile purpose—that of giving an opportunity for the youth in the Chicago area to find expression in the printed word. One of the recent articles which the Voice of Youth printed was written by a young constituent, Peter Baugher, 17, who is on the honor roll and in top level courses at New Trier Township High School in Winnetka, Ill. Mr. Baugher presents a thoughtful and clear-sighted view of the weakness in our foreign policy where communism is concerned, and I commend his article to the readers of the RECORD:

DRIFTING

(By Peter Baugher, New Trier Township, junior)

We consider a Boy Scout who hikes in unfamiliar woods without a compass foolish. We would condemn as incompetent any sea captain who left port without knowing his destination. These statements we accept as obvious. Yet our commonsense seems to desert many of us when we discuss American foreign policy.

For many years now the United States has been drifting from crisis to crisis, considering each one individually with little apparent realization of the need to define our stand in the overall struggle between communism and democracy. President Johnson has told us that the United States will stand firmly behind any freedom-loving nation. Yet that generalization is neither sufficient to satisfy our allies of our steadfastness, nor to convince the Communists of our determined opposition.

The reluctance of our officials to declare their policy, results from the quixotic hope that the nature of communism will change, and that we all will live happily together. We need only refer to speeches of Communist leaders to observe the fallacy of this argument. Whether through warfare, subversion, or sanctimonious pleas for coexistence, the Communist purpose has never faltered from a desire to control the world. We can recognize the threat by refusing to negotiate over Vietnam until the last invading Vietcong guerrilla is expelled. Those who advocate neutralization are blind to the failures of this course in Laos. Those who argue for immediate settlement, at any cost, lobby for defeat—not victory.

Astounded at the audacity of such a proposal, our leaders tell us these problems are too complicated to be understood by private citizens who have not had the benefit of hearing the scholarly analysis of McGeorge Bundy or Walt Rostow. Recognizing and determining to fight communism at all levels is too simple to solve these difficult dilemmas. We must realize, however, that it is our policy of drifting which makes our oversea decisions so complicated. We have contradicted ourselves so many times that we must now assess which course of action will break the fewest of our promises.

Further, we should understand that regardless of any involved policy considerations, the basic choice is a simple one between continued weakness, and a determined counterattack on communism.

Wilbur Mills and Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, there were, of course, many comments by various columnists, broadcasters, and TV newscasters on the day H.R. 6675 passed the House of Representatives. I think one of the best of these newscasts was the TV news show by Joe McCaffrey at 11 p.m., Thursday, April 8, in which he described the part that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, our distinguished colleague from Arkansas, WILBUR MILLS, played in the passage of this momentous legislation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including this newscast in the Appendix to the RECORD at this point:

WILBUR MILLS AND MEDICARE

(By Joe McCaffrey, TV News show)

WILBUR MILLS comes from a town called Kensett, Ark.

WILBUR MILLS comes a long, long way from that town.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is now, for praise or blame, the father of the medical care for the aged program.

Over the years, organized oldsters have pointed the finger at MILLS and blamed him for not bringing the medicare bill out of his Ways and Means Committee.

When the time was right, MILLS not only brought out the medicare bill, he brought out a deluxe, chrome model, which far exceeded the hopes of even the most rabid medicare supporter.

No one forced Chairman MILLS to act. He moved once he had made his determination and then he moved in his own way.

When he brought that bill to the floor he was, as he always is, a model parliamentarian.

For one thing, he knew the bill, section by section, paragraph by paragraph, sentence by sentence, word by word. No chairman knows his legislation as well as the man from Arkansas.

But what most impresses those in the gallery and, for that matter, those on the floor is the courtesy, the patience, and the thoughtfulness of the gentleman from Arkansas as he makes a presentation. He will yield for any question, he will carefully explain and, the committee members say, he is like that in the committee.

He never gets ruffled, he never is discourteous, he is never impatient. Yet he never seeks headlines, he never takes bows.

To know and watch WILBUR MILLS in action is to appreciate Congress at its best.

Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News has published a series of articles on the poverty program written by Jo Ann Hardee. The third of this series of articles follows:

MILLION YOUTHS MIRRORED IN FIRST JOB CORPS RECRUITS—PART 3

(Third of a series)

(By Jo Ann Hardee)

THURMONT, MD., March 16.—These are the first recruits in the war on poverty, 85 young men wearing the green uniform emblem of the Job Corps, a ladder with an arrow pointing upward.

Their stories are very like those of an estimated 1 million out-of-school unemployed youths, aged 16 to 21, throughout the Nation.

A boy from south Jersey looks 10 years old, is actually 16 and a dropout from the ninth grade.

A husky 17-year-old from Connecticut dropped out of school in the seventh grade, finished the eighth in night school.

NEED A TRADE

"I'd hoped for something like this," he said. "I need to learn a trade. I thought it would be better outside (of school). I didn't like school much. But I guess I've learned. You don't go anyplace without a trade."

An 18-year-old from West Virginia who worked in the coal mines after he left school in the sixth grade wants to learn to operate a bulldozer.

They come from 14 States—some with the thin, pinched faces of Appalachia, some with the bravado of the big city gang. All with no diploma and no job.

The Job Corps, illustrated by this first camp, and its urban brother, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, are key features of the antipoverty drive.

THE MOST CRITICIZED

They are also its most criticized facet.

Nearly half of the $727 million appropriation for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was set aside for youth programs. These are:

The Job Corps: Residential centers for unemployed youths, 16 to 21. Projected enrollment by July 1 is 40,000 with 100,000 more to be enrolled by July 1966.

To date, 77 conservation centers in 40 States have been announced. These have a capacity of 100 youths each who will engage in conservation work while gaining basic literacy and job training.

THREE WOMEN'S CENTERS

In addition, there are 6 urban job skills centers, each with a capacity of 1,250 to 2,600 youths and 3 women's centers for 250 to 325 women each.

Enrollment is for a maximum of 2 years, with the average stay projected at 6 months.

Corpsmen will be paid a "terminal allowance" of $50 for each month of service. Of this, $25 may be allotted to a dependent and the Federal Government will match such

allotments with an equal amount. The trainee will receive $30 a month allowance room, board, clothing, and medical care.

Neighborhood Youth Corps: Designed for 150,000 young persons who stay in their communities. Its aim is to return an out of school youth to school and keep others from poverty families in school.

BASIC TRAINING

Such young persons receive $1.25 an hour for service in government or nonprofit agencies. In the out-of-school program, they are to gain basic literacy and job training.

Work study: Gives employment to 100,000 low-income college students and is administered through the colleges.

Chief criticism of the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps is that they will not produce employable youths.

Senator JOHN G. TOWER, Texas Republican, who was a key opponent of the bill said today:

"The Job Corps makes no pretense of skills training. Instead it offers improved physical health, increased weight, cheerfulness, self-confidence and a feeling of security.

"The underlying purpose of the program is claimed to be the improvement of the employment prospects of our youth. Supplying them with suntans and an appreciation for outdoor living clearly won't help them find jobs.

He is seconded by Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, Wisconsin Republican, who is chairman of the House Republican Conference.

"In Wisconsin, we've had State conservation camps for 4 years.

CALLS IT GIMMICK

"It's a fine program for young boys. But nobody kids anybody that it's an antipoverty program. These boys aren't helped, they're helping us with our conservation efforts.

"If the poverty program wants to do the proper job, it should utilize and expand existing vocational education facilities," he added. "But the Job Corps camp in one Wisconsin county is 85 miles away from the nearest vocational school.

"I wouldn't say the program is a hoax, but it's an attractive gimmick."

Director of the Job Corps, Dr. Otis A. Singletary, former chancellor of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, disputes this view:

"In the rural centers, we can't do as precise a job of vocational training as the urban centers," he said today.

"We offer basic education to young men who aren't ready for vocational training that requires basic education, job habits, and a certain degree of physical health.

GOAL TO MOVE FAST

"Our goal is to move the youths as rapidly as possible from the rural centers into the urban ones for skills training."

He noted that some urban centers are being jointly operated by universities and large industrial firms such as the Job Corps center at Camp Kilmer, N.J., operated by Federal Electric Corp. and Rutgers University, or the center at Astoria, Oreg., operated by the University of Oregon and Philco Corp.

"It is this cooperation between educational institutions and industry that will offer a new approach to job skills training," he said.

RAPPED BY REPRESENTATIVE FORD

A similar criticism is made of the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

House Minority Leader GERALD FORD, Michigan Republican, said the Neighborhood Youth Corps is a potential "new WPA."

"If this program develops into a means of getting Federal funds to perform menial city jobs, it is not worth the investment.

"The need is for on-the-job training that will produce employable persons. But it could develop into an unfortunate boondoggle."

Other critics have suggested that the Neighborhood Youth Corps is "make work" and complain that young people will not learn saleable jobs skills in "meaningless busywork activities."

Small Business Urges Continued Independence of SBA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a letter has been received by me from the National Federation of Independent Business commenting on my press release of March 19 concerning the independence of the Small Business Administration. This letter by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of that organization, endorses the view expressed in my press release.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Burger and the press release be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., March 19, 1965.

Re Small Business Administration.

Hon. JOE EVINS,
Chairman, House Small Business Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVINS: You are to be complimented on your release of March 19, "EVINS Backs Independence of SBA" in the expressed views as outlined in your release, in which we concur 100 percent.

The proposed action of merging SBA in the Department of Commerce comes to the writer with no surprise as it will be found from the first instance our action, beginning in 1953, in our testimony before the Small Business Committees and the Banking and Currency Committees we continually and repeatedly recommended that SBA be made an independent agency, and more important, that the overall policy of SBA be placed exclusively in the hands of the Administrator, subject to review by the Congress.

You are privileged to insert this letter in the RECORD, and we are also directing a letter to the President of the United States on this.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

EVINS BACKS INDEPENDENCE OF SBA

Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, said today he is "opposed to any change affecting the independence of the Small Business Administration, the one Federal agency that represents the interests of the Nation's 4.6 million small businessmen."

EVINS said he was making his position clear because of "rumors and reports that plans are underway in some quarters to terminate SBA's status as an independent agency and make it, in effect, a subdivision of the Commerce Department."

The latest report, EVINS said, was in the March 15, 1965, edition of the Washington Post in the column on internal Federal matters written by Jerry Kluttz. "Mr. Kluttz has a reputation for accuracy," said EVINS, "and I believe that his report is based on knowledge he has gained from qualified sources."

EVINS said in a statement:

"To place the department that champions the interests of small business under the Commerce Department is illogical and retrogressive. It is illogical because the Department of Commerce has responsibilities now that require its full attention. It is retrogressive because prior to 1953 a bureau dealing with small business matters on a limited basis was in the Department of Commerce.

"After much debate and lengthy hearings, Congress concluded that small business had to have a one-stop agency where it could take its problems and get an answer without having to go to a half dozen different agencies. This necessity is even more pressing now than in 1953.

"With small business subjected to greater stress from the technological revolution, from the pressures of competition from giant competitors, and from a dozen other facets of change that challenge its very survival, this is no time to downgrade small business programs and lose them in one of the Federal Government's largest departments.

"Small business is important to our economy. It provides the livelihood for about 60 percent of our population and supports about 40 percent of our labor force.

"It accounts for 80 percent of dollar volume in construction and more than 70 percent in retail, in wholesale, and in services—and for more than 30 percent of value added in manufacturing.

"Its role in the economy must be stimulated and strengthened. That is the purpose of SBA and that must continue to be the overriding purpose of the Nation's small business assistance programs."

A Tribute to the House Democratic Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting remarks made by Joseph McCaffrey, a distinguished news commentator, on March 29, 1965, on his daily program carried on Channel 7, ABC television, Washington, D.C.:

COMMENT OF JOSEPH MCCAFFREY

There is nothing Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK likes better than a cigar and a big margin on a rollcall vote.

Overlooked in all the Presidential sleight of hand last week over the passage of the aid to education bill in the House of Representatives was the work of the team of MCCORMACK, ALBERT, and BOGGS.

That's the Democratic leadership team in the House of Representatives: CARL ALBERT, the majority leader, and HALE BOGGS, the party whip. Although credit goes to the President for getting his education bill through the House, the work at the voting level was still done by the men who know the House the best: MCCORMACK, ALBERT, and BOGGS.

Gone are the stories which we used during the weeks after the election about the Democrats having so many Members in the House they would never be able to hold the party together. Those Democrats, we said, will break up, no one will be able to hold them together on the key votes.

Remember, we said, what Sam Rayburn used to say about it being better to have a slim margin than a big one?

But even when the Democrats lost a respected voice on the Education Committee, as Mrs. EDITH GREEN lead the fight against the administration formula for funds to educate poor children, the leadership in the House was able to hold.

There are some close ones yet to come in the House, but on the record to date the team of MCCORMACK, ALBERT and BOGGS should win most of them.

A tribute, perhaps, to three men who know the playing field, the opposing players, and their own men better than any three men who have worked together in those jobs in years.

Education Bill—More Homework

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a recent Christian Science Monitor editorial, which follows, expresses the concern felt by many citizens about the haste with which bills are being approved by the Congress and, specifically, about certain aspects of the elementary and secondary school aid bill:

EDUCATION BILL—MORE HOMEWORK

President Johnson is keeping up a relentless pressure to get his aid to education bill adopted quickly and without further amendments. He wants the House version accepted by the Senate without change. The Senate Education Subcommittee granted the President his wishes by rejecting all amendments in 3 days of consideration.

Some are still hopeful of getting an amendment giving the poorer States a larger proportion of the aid. Others would like to see amendments to clarify the church-state questions involved.

In the House, for example, Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, one of the stanchest and most knowledgeable supporters of Federal education legislation, declared herself "in the unfortunate position * * * of being one of the dissenters," troubled by the religious school aid issue. The implications of this bill for the future of the public school in America are tremendous.

Republicans in the House wanted to know whether public school teachers would be allowed to teach in parochial schools. Answers were not clear cut. It would appear, however, that local school officials could permit public school teachers to extend educational services and arrangements such as shared-time classes and educational television programs, to parochial school students in parochial school buildings.

Because there is considerable doubt among some constitutional law experts as to the constitutionality of the bill, some, including Representative GREEN, favor an amendment to provide for judicial review. They contend that otherwise there is a good possibility courts would hold that neither individual taxpayers nor institutions have legal standing to sue.

We question whether it is in the ultimate interest of the United States for an administration to put so much pressure on Congress to push through so many important measures with such undue haste. Our concern is due to our belief that the education bill, as well as other vital administration proposals such as the voting rights bill and the presidential succession bill, can and ought to be amended to provide much needed safeguards.

We would like to see congressional resistance to executive pressures sufficient to improve these measures.

Miss Ann Tarleton Wins Louisiana State Competition in Oratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, just recently, during the month of March, a young lady from my congressional district, Miss Ann Tarleton, a senior student at the St. Charles Academy in Lake Charles, La., won first place in Statewide competition in the field of oratory at the Louisiana Junior Classical League Latin Club Convention. I feel this accomplishment is worthy of note inasmuch as it is significant to see our youth of today developing to the extent that some can reach such heights both in thinking, and in the ability to voice, and put these thoughts across to others.

This is by no means the first competition in which this particular young lady has been engaged, and in which she has won honors. She has won trips to various parts of our Nation as a result of her interest and aptitude in Future Homemakers and Farmers of America. As an indication of her versatility, she has won many blue ribbons in sheep competition which she raises herself on what she has named "the world's smallest sheep ranch"—her own backyard in the city.

Miss Tarleton's accomplishments and success in all her endeavors reflects credit not only upon herself and family, but upon her instructors and school where she has become inspired and trained.

I commend to the attention of this body the very short theme upon which Ann Tarleton won her most recent honor in oratory. The text of her address follows:

LOUISIANA JUNIOR CLASSICAL CONVENTION SPEECH

(By Miss Ann Tarleton, St. Charles Academy, Lake Charles, La.)

Twilight zone—that undefined moment which precedes total darkness—now encompasses the 20th century. Twilight is considered the forerunner of peace and contentment, yet this twilight which encompasses the 20th century is the foreshadowing of another darkness—the darkness acquired through man's deceit and mistrust. As partners in propaganda, mistrust and deceit have woven a web of darkness which threatens the soul of civilization, a threat which is the essence of the ills of the world.

The problem today is not unique. The threat of deceit haunted man when Cain killed Abel. The threat of mistrust haunts man in the cold war. And together mistrust and deceit will continue to haunt man unless something is done.

This ghostly picture is readily exemplified in foreign affairs, our own Government actions, and social pressures. Perhaps the country which best depicts the picture of deceit in foreign affairs is Russia. Since 1945, Russia has broken 50 of her 52 major agreements. Naturally, this causes men and nations in all parts of the world to feel the shadow of disbelief.

When Cuba was granted her independence, the United States promised to protect her citizens. Yet, because of a masterful campaign of deceit, the Cubans not only mistrust the United States, but their own leaders.

This atmosphere of mistrust has settled in our own country. Many American citizens are outspoken in their lack of confidence of our national leaders. This prompts misunderstanding.

When our Government resorts to arms to oppose Communist aggression, it is called a war monger. Yet, if it attempts to negotiate foreign entanglements, it is tagged "appeaser." Our citizens are confused by this growing lack of confidence, mistrust, and misunderstanding among nations.

This reveals the problem in its true nature—insincerity of society. For example—if a person saves his earnings, his friends call him a miser. If he spends his money, he is called a spendthrift. If he goes to church regularly, his associates call him a hypocrite. But if he misses church, he is called a heathen.

This attitude continues to grow, and unless the nations of the world find a solution, the future may well become an era of discontent. This growing menace to our future security and progress can be surmounted—by individual process. Our challenge today is to enkindle in man truth, understanding, and sincerity.

Perhaps Stephen Vincent Benét meant to insure the peace of twilight when he wrote: "Our earth is but a small star in the great universe. Yet of it we make, if we choose, a planet unvexed by war, untroubled by hunger or fear, undivided by senseless distinctions of race, color, or theory. Grant us the courage and foreseeing to begin this task today, that our children and our children's children may be proud of the name of man."

Colgate-Palmolive Co. Shows High Level of Ethical Conduct

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a recent news story from New York City points to a high standard of ethics and fair competitive practices in America's business community.

I refer to the action taken by one of the largest companies in the Nation, the Colgate-Palmolive Co., in refusing a so-called bargain offer to purchase highly valued trade secrets of a competitor, Procter & Gamble. In view of the amount of adverse publicity so often unfairly directed at the U.S. business community, I believe the story of the Colgate-Palmolive Co.'s exemplary action should be duly noted.

The story is this, in brief: Colgate-Palmolive and Procter & Gamble are companies engaged in one of the most keenly competitive areas of the American consumer merchandise market. Obviously, an extensive amount of research, planning and creative thought goes into the shaping of marketing strategy and tactics by each of these companies. Equally clear is the fact that in such a highly competitive market area a great deal of time and thought is given to considering what the opposition is planning.

With this as background, consider the monetary value it would be to one of these companies to obtain its competitor's detailed budget for sale and distribution of one of its leading consumer products. According to an assistant U.S. district attorney, Procter & Gamble placed the value to a competitor of inside knowledge of such a budget at no less than $1 million.

The Colgate-Palmolive Co. was offered such inside information, in the form of a detailed 188-page marketing and advertising plan devised by Procter & Gamble. Colgate-Palmolive, immediately upon receiving this offer, reported the incident to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for that agency's action. Last week the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York, Mr. Joseph P. Hoey, commended the Colgate-Palmolive Co. for its conduct in promptly alerting authorities to this illicit offer. A former employee of Procter & Gamble has been arrested and charged with industrial espionage in the matter.

Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of a congressional district in which the Colgate-Palmolive Co. has a major plant, I of course am greatly interested in any news story which reflects well on one of my constituents. But of even greater importance, the action taken by Colgate-Palmolive officials reflects well on our entire American business community—and at a time when the free enterprise system is under attack from foreign enemies and domestic, homegrown critics.

As I have said, too often do gaudy, misleading headlines lead the public to believe that the ethics and sense of competitive fairplay of our Nation's business community is at an alltime low. We hear baseless charges of a so-called profit-first philosophy allegedly held by executives of today's large corporate enterprises. By such charges, the enemies and critics of American business hope to undermine public confidence, not only in this country but abroad as well, in the social efficacy of the free enterprise system.

For this reason, at this time the story of one large U.S. company's exemplary demonstration of the highest of ethical business standards, even in the most aggressively competitive areas of the free enterprise market, deserves notice and consideration.

I join U.S. Attorney Hoey in commending the Colgate-Palmolive Co. for its action in this case. And I earnestly hope that the real significance of this incident is brought home to all those who, without facts to support their charges, have unfairly and unjustly projected a false picture of American business ethics and standards in recent years.

H.R. 2362 Should Be Promptly Approved in the National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly hope and trust that the Senate will promptly and overwhelmingly approve this afternoon, H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, that this House resoundingly adopted just a week ago.

It is practically the unanimous judgment of most educational and legislative authorities that this measure is the best practical compromise that could be reasonably devloped to meet and dissolve the conscientious objections of the various groups who sincerely desire to effect the fundamental objectives of this measure.

In substance this bill will provide: First, a 3-year $1.06 billion program of Federal grants to States for allocation to school districts with large numbers of low-income families; the uses of the funds to be decided by local school districts, subject to State and Federal approval; second, a 5-year program of grants for the purchase of books and library materials; third, a 5-year program for the establishment of supplementary education centers and services; fourth, 5-year programs to improve educational research and to strengthen State departments of education; and fifth, a 2-year extension of school aid to districts impacted by the presence of Federal installations.

Let us all be reminded of the fact that $1 billion of the expenditures proposed in this bill will be directed at raising educational quality for deprived children and these funds will be distributed into and throughout more than 90 percent of the Nation's school districts.

The 2-year extension of assistance to impacted areas, although in my opinion it should be extended for at least 5 years for proper school planning purposes, is at least an acceptable adjustment and is imperatively needed in a great many school districts.

Let us also remind ourselves that no Federal money may, by this bill, be provided directly to nonpublic schools and that the bill specifies that none of its provisions authorizes any Federal control over school curriculums, instruction, and administration of personnel, or the selection of teaching materials. The bill also states that nothing in it "shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment for religious worship or instruction."

Mr. Speaker, for some 20 years this country and this legislature has been trying to reasonably solve the problem of providing this type of Federal aid to our elementary and secondary education groups. Very likely the bill that we passed here a few days ago and is now being debated in the Senate constitutes the last, best chance to provide it. Let the Congress, finally, stop talking about the education of children who yearly grow older and beyond legislative assistance while we quarrel and quibble and delay. Let us exert this last effort to revitalize these particular segments of our national school system.

This bill represents merely a 1-year authorization and, if need be, it can be wholesomely amended after a year's experience. The passage of this educational bill will be, in truth, an experiment and not an irrevocable act. I urge the Senate to follow the patriotic example of this House and give it a try before this day is over.

King's Boycott Immoral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the demand of Martin Luther King for a boycott of Alabama is awakening Americans to the immorality of this agitator. Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following column written by James J. Kilpatrick which appeared in a number of newspapers across the country:

A CONSERVATIVE VIEW: KING MAKES A TACTICAL ERROR

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, being still mortal and not yet divine, remains subject to the same rules of fate that act upon other men; and one of these rules is never to push your luck too far.

Dr. King blundered Sunday evening in his call for a boycott on Alabama. At a moment when he had everything going for him—when a combination of superb strategy and tragic circumstance had won the country and shamed his antagonists—he overstepped himself. He may never know how much this act of arrogance will cost him among those decent elements of the South's power structure on whom so much of his cause depends.

Consider the course of events in recent weeks. Until Dr. King and his associates moved on Alabama, the name of Selma was almost unknown. Not one man in 10,000 could have located Lowndes County. Highway 80 to Montgomery was a meaningless line on the map. The issue of voting rights was barely simmering on congressional stoves. The conscience of the white South was troubled, but not troubled deeply.

Over a period of 9 weeks, Dr. King singlehandedly changed all that. He elevated Selma to a household word, roused the Nation to the denial of the franchise in Alabama, and raised Highway 80 to the prominence of the early Christians' Road to Rome. He prompted Lyndon Johnson into sponsorship of the most drastic voting rights bill since 1870, and he galvanized the Congress into pledges of immediate action.

Then came the murder of Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, and the drama to its shocking climax. There should be no mistaking the reaction of the white South to this vicious and cowardly crime. Decent southerners from the Potomac to the Mississippi were left sick—almost physically sick—by the wretched event. A moment of catharsis was at hand. In shame,

sorrow, and revulsion, an agonized South might well have yielded significant gains to the Negroes' cause.

Out of the jaws of this victory, in the old phrase, Dr. King on Sunday evening snatched defeat. His call for a punitive boycott of Alabama will undo the most important part of his achievement, for the latent forces of decency in the South, ready to concede much rightness in the Negroes' demands, will react to the boycott with hot resentment. There can be no armistice now.

If I am not mistaken, the overplayed hand will cost Dr. King some measure of respect elsewhere in the country, too. He is in the position of a man whose case at bottom rests on one appeal: Be fair. But here he says to the country: Be unfair.

He was urging the South to do right because it is right; now his case loses its moral urgency. Do right, he says, or it will cost you money. The effect is to hang a price tag on justice, to confuse the granting of rights with the selling of steel.

Dr. King no longer is engaged in searing the South's conscience; he is out to hit the South's pocketbook. Along with prejudice, he would eliminate bank deposits. He is a curious exercise in morality.

The sweeping and unselective boycott demanded by Dr. King would hit the just and the unjust alike. If the maneuver succeeds to any appreciable degree, Alabama's economy surely will suffer, and in the nature of things, Dr. King's own people will suffer along with it.

In truth, they will suffer most of all, for the Negroes' future in the South depends heavily upon employment opportunities and improved education. A prolonged boycott, sustained through the cooperation of organized labor, could have a catastrophic effect upon programs of the greatest importance to the ultimate solution of all these problems.

The most regrettable effect of Dr. King's new strategy will be to alienate the good will of many white southerners who were moving in his direction.

The rest of the country may not fully understand the remarkable change in attitude that has been developing in the South. From Virginia to Louisiana, fresh currents of thought and reflection have been stirring. Old barriers have been falling in windrows. Many whites and many Negroes were quietly exploring areas of understanding never before explored. But if there is to be a boycott, everyone must be flung centrifugally back to the edges once more.

We have moved in a twinkling from what is right to what is expensive; we have gone from love to money, and a South that was ready to be persuaded by the one appeal will only be antagonized by the other.

A Bombshell in Rio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently at one of the White House briefings, I asked the question as to why there seems to be a news blackout on Cuba, both from the State Department and the White House, and was assured that communism had lost its adherence in Central and South America and was no longer an important factor, and that Cuba was in a mess both socially and economically.

I felt at the time that this casual dismissal of Cuba as a communistic problem did not have in fact the background assurance which the State Department seems to offer as an excuse for this apparent news blackout.

Now comes the news that Saturday $300,000 in large bills was captured from Communist Italian leaders who were transporting the money on behalf of Russia, to be used in Brazil to further Communist parades, sit-ins, and all types of Communistic propaganda projects.

In this morning's Washington Post, an article by Messrs. Rowland Evans and Robert Novak again brings to the front the Communist proposals from South America wherein the United States will be asked to leave the Organization of American States as well as the Inter-American Development Bank, to be replaced by Fidel Castro.

It seems to me that the Communist activities within 90 miles of our shore should receive far more attention than is apparently the case, and also I feel the public should be informed by the State Department or by the administration of what is going on, rather than having to get the information entirely from the newspapers.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1965]

INSIDE REPORT—A BOMBSHELL IN RIO

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

A cabal of South American governments is secretly fusing a political bomb to toss in Uncle Sam's lap at the pan-American conference in Rio de Janeiro next month.

The bomb: A proposal now in the draft stage, by adventurous young nationalists of Chile's new Christian Democratic government. If presented in its present form, the Chilean proposal could turn the Rio meeting—and the whole inter-American system—upside down.

The plan would junk both the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Inter-American Development Bank and replace them with all-Latin organizations excluding the United States. Moreover, while Uncle Sam would be asked out, Fidel Castro would be asked in. Thus would the United States be isolated from Latin America.

This is precisely the goal of the Communists. But what is being readied for Rio is not a Communist invention, but the product of emotional nationalism (spliced with generous portions of anti-Yankee sentiment) now running rampant through South America. This is the most troubling Latin development since Castro's attempts to export revolution came a cropper and is potentially more dangerous.

The prophet of this movement is an Argentine economist and international bureaucrat named Raul Prebisch. As head of the United Nations Economic Commission on Latin America (ECLA), Prebisch devised a doctrine that shows the developed half of the world (led by the United States) dominating and victimizing the undeveloped half (including Latin America). This is accomplished, according to Prebisch, by paying the underdeveloped half far less for its raw materials than they are really worth.

The appeal of this doctrine to the Latin American mentality was immense. Here was a way to shift blame for the region's stunted growth from the Latin's own political and economic inefficiency to the Colossus of the North. The Prebisch cult has disciples in governments all over Latin America—Argentina, Uruguay, Peru, even the primarily pro-U.S. Government of Brazil.

But nowhere is the Prebisch sway stronger than among Chile's high-flying Christian Democrats. ECLA's headquarters are located in Santiago. Chile's President Eduardo Frei has asked Prebisch and three other international bureaucrats to study the prospects of further economic integration in Latin America.

One prominent Chilean Christian Democrat put it to us this way in Santiago last December: "Here in Chile we are all sons of Prebisch."

From this flows the four remarkable proposals contained in the secret Chilean draft proposal.

One of these—calling for the United States to give Latin American commodities special trade preferences just as European nations help their excolonies in Africa—is quite sensible. It has long been quietly pushed by Thomas Mann, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. The three other points, however, go off the deep end, as follows:

1. Establishment of a new Latin American organization, which would in effect supplant the OAS. Far from including the United States, this new organization would bargain against the United States.

2. Conversion of the Inter-American Development Bank into a bank to encourage Latin American integration. The United States would have no say in the management of this bank, though, quite naturally, it would be financed mainly by Uncle Sam.

3. A cordial invitation to Castro to join these new organizations now that the United States has been excluded.

Unbelievable? Consider a recent interview in a Santiago newspaper of Gabriel Valdes, the Chilean Foreign Minister.

Attacking U.S. control over its own aid money and the economic isolation of Castro's Cuba, Valdes says: "The United States grants either more or less assistance or loans to those countries it likes or which it considers more democratic. This discrimination cannot continue."

Further, Valdes calls for "permanent assistance, not voluntary or with a fixed deadline," from Washington in return for continued political alliance.

With hardboiled Tom Mann in charge of economic policy, Washington is not about to knuckle under to this thinly disguised blackmail. But if the Chilean blueprint for dividing the United States from its Latin neighbors actually is unveiled in Rio next month, the detonation will be music to Communist ears everywhere.

President's Speech on Vietnam Restates Firm U.S. Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reprint in the Appendix of the RECORD a perceptive analysis by Washington correspondent William S. White of President Johnson's recent speech on our country's Asian policy.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 9, 1965]

VIETNAM SPEECH: POLICY AS FIRM AS EVER

(By William S. White)

President Johnson's so-called "new" policy for dealing with Communist aggression in South Vietnam is not new in fact nor does it in the smallest way soften his real position.

To the contrary, he feels—and objective reading of what he said at the John Hopkins University supports him in this—that its meaning is simply firmly to establish the two bedrock necessities for remaining in Vietnam until aggression has been brought to a halt by self-enforcing peace arrangements that will not and cannot be later cast aside by the Communists as other agreements have been.

The vital words here are "self-enforcing." The President will never go along with some spurious deal resting only on Communist promises to quit attacking South Vietnam. For his own part, in short, he considers himself more deeply committed than ever before to bringing those attacks to an end. If others think he is less committed, as some seemingly do, the answer is simple: Surely, he ought to be the best witness of the intentions of Lyndon B. Johnson.

The first of the twin bedrock necessities to staying in Vietnam is a continuing American military action, which will be carried just as far as the Communists force it to be carried. The President is astonished, as to this point, that so much of the interpretation of his Johns Hopkins speech has so stressed his promise in some circumstances of American economic aid to Vietnam and southeast Asia generally and so kissed off these other passages:

"We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement * * * peace demands an independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others—free from outside interferences—tied to no alliance—a military base for no other country." How do you get any more committed than this?

This continued American military action is not merely to help protect South Vietnam. It is vital to prevent what has always been the nightmare of American policymakers, the nightmare of a total collapse in South Vietnam's morale and government which might make impossible further effective American assistance of any kind.

The second bedrock necessity is to placate, so far as may be rationally possible, the endless fretful complaint from Allied governments and some sections of responsible opinion at home that the United States is offering no "constructive" alternatives to continued war.

It is here that Mr. Johnson's suggestion for a cooperative economic development of southeast Asia takes its place. Once the nations directly involved begin this development in good faith, he is prepared to ask Congress to authorize a billion-dollar American "investment"—not, by the way, a mere American gift—in such an enterprise. Here, again, the President is both disappointed and surprised at some Republican criticism of this as an effort to "buy peace."

In the first place, we are already spending far more than a billion a year in South Vietnam alone, putting military and economic expenditures together. In the second place, what he is speaking of as a possibility for southeast Asia generally is already taking place in South Vietnam. In the third place, the principles of such a program were in fact recommended to President Kennedy by Mr. Johnson as Vice President as early as 1961. He sees it as about what we have done widely long since in Latin America to prevent chaos and Communist encroachment.

In the fourth place, this problematical and future American carrot, though sincerely held out if the Communists will make it possible to hold it out usefully, weighs far less than the here-and-now American stick that accompanies it. No country being attacked has in all history been given a more profound and more powerful military American guarantee than the guarantee the President has now given to South Vietnam.

Major Theatrical Production Will Have Memphis Premiere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, some persons think that we are having a cultural explosion in this country.

While that point is highly debatable, I think we can all agree that the interest in the arts is on the increase. An interest by leaders of governments at all levels and financial support from foundations and other philanthropists have certainly contributed to enlivening the lively arts. Just last week President Johnson administered the oath of office to members of the National Council on the Arts. This new group will do much to encourage the creative activity and interests of our people.

The growth of repertory theaters such as Memphis' Front Street Theatre has been spotlighted by Time magazine and other national publications. No longer must we in the hinterlands depend on New York as the sole dispenser of entertainment and enlightenment from the legitimate stage.

In fact, next month the American and English-language premiere of Ugo Betti's "Troubled Waters" will be presented at Memphis State University. My city takes an especial pride in this because following its Memphis performance, the professional company will move to New York with the late Italian dramatist's modern tragedy.

Edwin Howard, amusements editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, reported this forthcoming event in a recent edition of his column, The Front Row. His article follows:

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar, Apr. 7, 1965]

THE FRONT ROW—MEMPHIS GETS BETTI PLAY BEFORE NEW YORK CITY

(By Edwin Howard)

Memphis' emergence as a hub of theatrical activity takes another spurt forward today with the announcement of the American and English language premiere at Memphis State University May 13 to 15 of Ugo Betti's "Troubled Waters." The professional production will then move to New York for what it s hoped will be an extended run.

The late Italian dramatist's modern tragedy will not only be performed, but produced, in Memphis. Following the Memphis premiere, the company will move to the Gramercy Arts Theater off Broadway in New York. Previews in New York will begin about May 20, followed a week later by the official opening.

This major theatrical event for Memphis was announced jointly today by Dr. Harry Ausprich, chairman of the MSU speech and drama department, and Eric Salmon, guest professor of drama for the spring semester.

Salmon's own company, Theater Outlook, is now casting and will produce the Betti drama on the MSU campus. Theater majors will be permitted to watch rehearsals and will participate in weekly seminars on the production. A company of eight actors will arrive on the campus about April 15 to begin rehearsals. Salmon will direct and design the production. Also on the campus during the production period will be a lighting designer from New York and one of the translators of the play, Gino Rizzo. "Troubled Waters" will shortly be published in a new collection of Betti's plays translated by Rizzo and William Meriwether.

RENEWED INTEREST IN BETTI

Betti, who died in 1953, is the most important Italian dramatist since Pirandello and one of the major figures in the modern theater. He has been relatively neglected in the United States until recently. Last year his "Corruption in the Palace of Justice" was produced off-Broadway. "The Queen and the Rebels," his best known play in this country, was revived off-Broadway this year. Salmon's production of "Troubled Waters" will reach New York late next month, and in September Claude Rains is to appear in a Broadway production of "The Burnt Flower Bed."

Salmon considers "Troubled Waters" one of Betti's most important plays. "It is," he says, "another in the fascinating series of attempts by 20th century dramatiste, from O'Neill to Camus and Pirandello to Miller, to write a modern tragedy of major proportions."

The English actor-director's first appearance on the Memphis theatrical scene was made last spring when he lectured on Britain's so-called "angry young men." When MSU initiated a guest professorship in drama, Salmon was the first person Dr. Ausprich thought of. Salmon has been on the campus 2 months now, teaching classes in advanced acting and directing, and himself directing the forthcoming MSU-community production of "The Winter's Tale," to be presented April 27–May 1 by the Memphis Shakespeare Festival, Inc.

AT $25 A TICKET FOR OPENING NIGHT

I asked Salmon how he was going to teach and direct two plays at the same time. He said, "It is going to be rough, actually. But the frame of 'Winter's Tale' is there. The hard, imaginative work is finished, but there is, of course, a lot of polishing yet to be done and the two productions will overlap about 10 days.

"I propose to handle that by gritting my teeth."

The first of the three Memphis performances of "Troubled Waters" will be a gala premiere for special patrons of the production. Tickets will be $25 each and will include an after-theater supper. The other two performances will be open to the public at $2.50 each.

After production costs are paid, proceeds will go to MSU to help underwrite the special chair in drama. Salmon has already agreed to return next spring and Dr. Ausprich said it is hoped he may be resident professor of drama all next year.

THE 750 JONESBOROANS APPLAUD FRONT STREET'S "FANTASTICKS"

Memphis' growth as a theatrical center got another boost Monday night when Front Street Theater's touring unit presented "The Fantasticks" to an enthusiastic crowd of 750 at Arkansas State College in Jonesboro.

The audience was made up of about half students and half townspeople and "they really flipped," according to one observer. Director George Touliatos said that, as after

last week's performance in Clarksdale, Miss., the company was asked to come back some time in the future.

"The Fantasticks" played to about 1,150 people in its two road-show engagements. The Lions Club in Clarksdale broke even and Arkansas State made about $1,000. Front Street charged a flat fee to cover costs for both performances, leaving profits, if any, to local sponsors.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, it is always educational to read the observations of a man who is probably the keenest political observer of our time. I refer to James A. Farley, former Democratic National Committee chairman and U.S. Postmaster General, now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. His remarks about the changing world in politics are worthwhile reading. So that all Americans may have the benefit of his views, I request that his comments be included in the RECORD.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Mar. 15, 1965]

PERSONAL REPORT: WASHINGTON

(By Robert E. Baskin)

The Nation's Capital, of course, is famed for its large number of resident political experts, who can prophesy, project, and interpret just about anything that happens or is about to happen on the political fronts.

But if one wants to get a quick, 1-hour lesson in politics and the meaning and background of public affairs, there is no better place to go than suite 1800 at 515 Madison Avenue in the heart of Manhattan.

The man you meet there is 76 years old, but he stands tall and straight, his mind is as sharp as it was 30 years ago when he masterminded great campaigns, and his attitude is one of great vigor, tremendous enthusiasm, and unflagging curiosity.

He is James Aloysius Farley, who for half a century has been one of the great figures in Democratic politics, the man who engineered Franklin D. Roosevelt's 1932 and 1936 campaigns, who forecast uncannily the outcome of the latter (F.D.R. winning all but Maine and Vermont) and who early last year predicted President Johnson would win a landslide victory.

Today the former Postmaster General and Democratic National Committee chairman is board chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. He is a busy man.

But he has not relinquished any of his interests in politics and can talk charmingly and succinctly on intricate political matters, such as the present confusing situation between the forces of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY and New York Mayor Robert Wagner in New York State.

Farley keeps his ears open. His advice on political matters is sought by many persons. It is no secret in Washington that Mr. Johnson has maintained close contact with him, and there are few occasions when Farley can not come up with a forthright piece of advice. Almost invariably he is heeded.

Although he eventually fell out with Franklin Roosevelt, he's never been an outsider in Democratic Party circles that really count. His acute political sense has been and still is one that cannot be ignored.

It is interesting to observe that Farley does not live in the past, and he firmly believes the political world of today.

"The new breed of politician," he wrote recently, "is far superior to its predecessors." The reason is patently simple.

"The country has improved immeasurably, has become far more complex and hence requires far more able men to run it."

In the modern world, Farley continued, "the old-fashioned ward leaders who relied on the May-waltz, the clambake, and the Thanksgiving turkey are as quaintly moribund as the old harness shop.

"The modern district leader has to have the answers on new school financing, public health policies, and proposed zoning changes."

The expanding news media have also made American citizens better informed, Farley says, and this tends to liberate them from "the outmoded bosses of our political past."

In his office, which is cluttered with memorabilia of his political years, Farley enjoys talking with visitors and makes it a point to answer his phone whenever it rings.

"It's simpler than having a secretary running in to tell me somebody is on the phone," he said recently.

Despite his high standing with the party's wise men, New York Democratic leaders passed him over for the senatorial nomination in 1958 and for Governor in 1962 and in both cases the lesser known nominees were defeated. Farley's conservative views may have been the reason for being passed over by the liberally oriented New York party.

Farley is blunt about some long revered political practices. In a law day speech at the University of Georgia last spring he had this to say about logrolling:

"I have rolled many a log, secure in the knowledge if someone didn't roll the logs there wouldn't be any lumber even to build a stadium for these grandstand quarterbacks. I count it as a vital part of government that a Senator from Arizona, for example, is likely to look with favor upon a new lighthouse in Maine, provided the Senator from Maine views with sympathy an irrigation project in Arizona."

Investiture of Anthony J. Paterno as Knight Commander of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the House Resolution 99 passed by the 74th General Assembly of Illinois and introduced by State Representatives Euzzino, DiPrima, Romano, Merlo, Pusateri, Ropa, and Zagone. On Saturday evening, April 10, over 2,000 Chicagoans attended a banquet in honor of Mr. Anthony J. Paterno on the occasion of his official investiture as knight commander of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta. The resolution congratulating him on his investiture follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, 74TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HOUSE RESOLUTION 99

(Offered by Messrs. Euzzino, DiPrima, Romano, Merlo, Pusateri, Ropa, and Zagone)

Whereas on April 10, 1965, Anthony Paterno, an outstanding civic leader and highly respected American of Italian ancestry will be vested as knight commander into the Sovereign and Military Order of Malta; and

Whereas the Sovereign and Military Order of Malta was founded in the 11th century in Jerusalem, by Blessed Gerald, an Italian Benedictine monk, with the help of some pious citizens from Amalfi; it is the most ancient of all orders of knighthood; and

Whereas it is indeed proper for a man who served as president of the joint civic committee of Italian-Americans with the unflinching spirit of a pioneer, the steadfast devotion of a servant and idealist, the deep-rooted love of a humanitarian; and who has atained the very height of affection he now enjoys in the Italo-American community, be invested into this outstanding worldwide organization; and

Whereas the life of Anthony Paterno is an outstanding example of integrity, individual initiative and solid accomplishment: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we extend our hearty congratulations to Anthony Paterno, upon his receiving this high honor; and extend our best wishes for many more great moments in the service of our people; and that a suitably engrossed copy of this resolution and preamble be sent to Mr. Paterno, the joint civic commitee of Italo-Americans and the Fra Noi newspaper in Melrose Park, Ill.

Adopted by the house, March 24, 1965.

JOHN P. TOUHY,
Speaker of the House.

CHARLES F. KERVIN,
Clerk of the House.

Anthony J. Paterno is a real life Italo-American success story that matches any Horatio Alger dream.

A guiding light for his fellow man, Anthony Paterno is faith in action—his is the unflinching spirit of a pioneer, the steadfast devotion of a servant and idealist, the deep-rooted love of a humanitarian.

Our community has benefited by his hard work, loyalty and love for mankind and his integrity, individual initiative and solid accomplishment, his is a most outstanding example of what one man can achieve in our great democratic society.

At age 18, he made an important decision. Courageous and ambitious, young Tony decided to immigrate to America from his native Sicily.

He arrived in Chicago in August 1923, and immediately sought employment. What he found were sweatshop jobs—backbreaking, long hours, and low-pay employment.

He worked on railroads, in factories, on constructions, and became a barber, insurance agent, plastering contractor, repair man, sold fruits and vegetables, and operated a grocery and meat market and restaurant and then became a pioneer in the pizza business in Chicago.

In spite of the tremendous pressure of his business, Anthony Paterno has always found time to help men of every race, creed and color.

It would be impossible to number all who have been guided by Mr. Paterno in

helping to obtain American citizenship or who have been assisted by his counsel and financial aid, or the many causes and charities that have been aided by his energies and resources.

Just as he is a leading figure in Chicagoland, Mr. Paterno is held in high acclaim in Italy. He has helped hospitals and orphanages in Sicily and other parts of Italy.

Born at Vizzini, Catania, Italy, January 24, 1904, the son of Giovanni and Giuseppa (LoGiusto) Paterno. Married Lena LoGiudice, October 24, 1929. Three children: John, born 1930, died 1960; Josephine, Mrs. Anthony Terlato, and Michelina, born 1947. Five grandchildren.

Past President Joint Civil Committee of Italian Americans, the Italian Chamber of Commerce of Chicago, and the Vizzinese Society.

Awarded third, second, and first stars of solidarity, Republic of Italy, Cavaliere, Cavaliere Ufficiale and Commendatore, Order of Merit, Republic of Italy.

Awarded plaque by the Italian Chamber of Commerce, the Vizzinese Society for devotion and distinguished service to Italian community, 1959; John Scalabrini Award for his liberal generosity to Villa Scalabrini, Italian old peoples home, in 1960; leadership award of Joint Civic Committee, 1961; Amerital-Unico Citizen of Year Award, in 1961.

And now, as the owner of Pacific Wine Co. and Paterno Imports, Ltd., he is recognized as a leader in this industry and also one of the most respected.

Auditors' Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, various proposals have been introduced in this House which would provide the citizens of this city with some fashion of control over their affairs.

I have joined numerous colleagues in an appeal for committee hearings on the home rule proposals. This appeal requests that hearings be held and a home rule bill be reported to the floor of the House.

Although there are innumerable good reasons why the people of this city should have control over their affairs, one of the most poignant was the subject of an editorial in today's Washington Post.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the thoughtful examination of this editorial to my colleagues and request unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

AUDITOR'S REPORT

Children's Hospital is being systematically and deliberately cheated by Congress. The appropriations committees bluntly refuse to pay the bills of the children who are the city's responsibility. Last summer, the hospital told Congress that its annual deficit was approaching half a million dollars in unpaid services to indigent children. Congress grudgingly made a small increase in the payment schedules, covering less than one-third of the deficit. Asked to come a little closer to their obligation, the appropriations committees demanded an audit of the hospital.

The audit has now been published. Having now wasted 8 months and $25,500 to be told once again that Congress is defaulting on its responsibilities, the committees are precisely as wise as they were last summer. And the hospital is several hundred thousand dollars deeper in trouble. One new fact developed by the audit was that, following the Government's lead, the Blue Cross is also paying the hospital less than true cost of care.

"Its generosity," one of the audit reports concluded, "has placed the institution in a position where it must now either curtail many of its services which have been given freely in the past or look to the community for increased support, and to Blue Cross for a more realistic reimbursement, if it is to continue to operate."

Children's Hospital is the only place in Washington where sick children are treated without regard to ability to pay. The emergency room at Children's is the family doctor for thousands of slum children in whose neighborhoods there are not many other family doctors. Another auditor's report said: "Virtually all of its out-patient service, much of its emergency service, and at least 40 percent of its patient days of in-patient services are devoted to the care of children whose families are in financial need."

The deficit at Children's Hospital has two chief sources. The city does not pay the hospital nearly as much as the hospital must spend to care for the children who are indigent and eligible for public help. And, even more serious, the peculiar eligibility rules prohibit the city from paying anything at all for the care of many thousands of other children, equally indigent.

Senator BYRD of West Virginia, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, prevents the city from changing the eligibility rules. And Congressman NATCHER, the chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, prevents the city from paying the full bill even for the eligible children. Three weeks before the auditors' reports appeared, Mr. NATCHER struck out of the city's 1966 budget the small increases in rates that, at President Johnson's request, Congress had reluctantly put into the city's 1965 budget last summer.

Congress reckless vendetta against the city of Washington is driving to the wall one of the country's outstanding centers of pediatric medicine. Congressmen who think that they are saving money may want to read the sections of the auditors' reports that estimate the costs of forcing the hospital to curtail its service.

A "Government Man" Makes Friends in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Delta Democrat-Times of Greenville, Miss., has a keen appreciation of the true relationship between the States and the Federal Government, as he demonstrates in a recent editorial captioned: "A 'Government Man' Visits Us."

There is an important lesson, wittily stated, in this editorial, which is included in the Appendix of the RECORD under unanimous consent.

The editorial follows:

[From the Delta Democrat-Times, Greenville, Miss., Apr. 1, 1965]

A GOVERNMENT MAN VISITS US

A "Government man" came to Greenville and to Mississippi this week. Strangely, no one fell dead in the streets. Women did not swoon and strong men did not blanch. As it turned out, the first visit from a high-ranking U.S. Government official in almost 4 years turned out to be a very pleasant—and hopefully productive—occasion.

It didn't hurt that the visitor, Eugene Foley, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, is a very personable, witty, and intelligent man.

But consider the strikes that the official Mississippi attitude would have us believe he has against him. He is actually a top-ranking Federal appointee. He once worked (whisper) under then Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who we all know has horns. He believes in the positive role of Government in the economy and society in general. He now represents the Johnson administration, which everyone knows "hates" the South.

And yet, there he was, looking just like a human being. What's more, he was encouraging Mississippians to think of that octopus up there as their Government too—to think of it as most Americans in at least 48 of the States do. And he didn't come into the State treating his hosts like pariahs, but as possible partners in the quest for the Great Society.

We don't know what kind of impression Eugene Foley took back to Washington when he left Mississippi after his visits to Greenville, the A. & I. Board in Jackson and Natchez. But we do know that his visit here didn't do any harm, except to a few of our more cherished myths. Let's have some more "Government men" visit down here.

A Longer Look at SNCC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I wrote the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee and suggested that the committee investigate the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee—SNCC. I am today renewing my request that such an investigation be launched, and in support of my opinion that an investigation be made I would like to call to your attention an article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak which appeared in the Washington Post dated April 9, 1965. The committee should certainly give very serious consideration to the charges made by Messrs. Evans and Novak.

The article follows:

A LONGER LOOK AT SNCC

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The presence of Communist elements within the operations of the Student Nonviolent

Coordinating Committee (SNCC) is not really a case of diabolical Red infiltration. In the civil rights battle, SNCC simply has left the door open to all who want to enter.

It would be a miracle if Communists had not attached themselves to SNCC. Instead, SNCC leaders make no secret of their refusal to bar Communists.

And because SNCC is the inspiration for so many idealistic young collegians, this refusal to recognize the danger of Communist infiltration is tragic. By providing ammunition to the segregationists, it poses a long-range threat to the civil rights movement itself (as Communists almost wrecked U.S. labor a generation ago).

Ever since we first wrote of this danger, in August 1963, we have been denounced by angry SNCC defenders challenging us to cite evidence. We do so now, but with these two caveats:

First, extreme radicalism in SNCC is by no means solely or even principally due to Communist influences (for example, black racism is rising inside SNCC). Second, only an infinitestimal fraction of SNCC workers have Communist ties.

But in infinitesimal fraction can be quite influential. Consider the fact that SNCC's legal arm, particularly in Mississippi voter registration, is virtually the same as the National Lawyers Guild, long-time follower of the Communist line. It was this legal advice that helped propel the Mississippi Freedom Party (a subsidiary of SNCC) to extremist positions at the 1964 Democratic Convention.

Two Lawyers Guild members active in SNCC projects—Morton Stavis and Arthur Kinoy—are illustrative of many.

Both have specialized in Communist clients (Kinoy participated in the defense of atom spies Julius and Ethel Rosenberg). Both have belonged to Communist fronts (Stavis took the fifth amendment before Congress in regard to Communist Party membership). Both have been attorneys for the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers (the notorious UE expelled from the CIO in 1950 because of Communist domination).

Moreover, there is a clear connection between SNCC, the UE, and an ultraleftist publication called the National Guardian (which currently spews out the Chinese Communist line).

Copies of the National Guardian are standard equipment at SNCC field offices. SNCC leaders have signed testimonials praising the Guardian. The Guardian's general manager is Russell Nixon, formerly of the UE. At the UE national convention last September, the potentiality of allying labor and civil rights was discussed by Ella J. Baker, a prominent SNCC adviser.

It was Miss Baker, a veteran leftist, who harangued neophyte Mississippi Negro leaders into refusing a good compromise at the 1964 Democratic Convention. She also helps link SNCC with the Southern Conference Educational Fund (SCEF), where she has intimate ties. SCEF, impregnated with pro-Communists, has provided financial and personnel assistance to SNCC.

More ominous are the ties between SNCC and Communist youth groups abroad. A SNCC representative named Reginald Robinson attended the Moscow World Youth Forum last September. SNCC workers plan to attend a Red-sponsored youth rally in Algeria this summer. And SNCC is seeking alliances with young radicals abroad.

John Lewis, SNCC's national chairman, seems to be no Communist. But he is repeating the error of so many liberals of the past who believed they could use the Communists rather than be used.

Statement of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House an expression of sentiment on the events of last month in Alabama and the voting rights bill which, I trust, will soon come before us. As will be noted, 67 faculty members of the Newton, N.J., school system have placed themselves on record in support of the guarantees accorded our citizens by the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution. This expression is set forth in the form of an open letter which appeared in a recent edition of the New Jersey Herald, a fine weekly newspaper published in Newton, N.J. I commend to your attention, too, the editorial entitled "Statement of Faith" in which that newspaper commented upon the open letter.

The letter and editorial follow:

UNEQUIVOCAL SUPPORT

EDITOR, THE NEW JERSEY HERALD:

Standing in the shadows of the Lincoln Memorial during the march on Washington in August 1963, Rabbi Joachin Prinz spoke: "When I was the rabbi of the Jewish community in Berlin under the Hitler regime, I learned under those tragic circumstances that bigotry and hatred are not the most urgent problems. The most disgraceful, the most shameful, and the most tragic problem is silence."

As educators, we, the undersigned, feel we must take a strong stand on the moral and legal issues of civil rights. We totally reject the voting laws enacted under States rights as unjust and lacking both historical and legal justification when those laws ignore other rights guaranteed to the individual in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Article XIV of the U.S. Constitution asserts that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States, and representation of a State shall be reduced when that State limits its franchise." Article XV states that: "(1) the right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude; (2) the Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

No State government or State law has the right to circumvent the law of the land—the Constitution of the United States.

We also, without qualification, renounce any political force that denies the basic civil liberties to anyone. We deplore any local, State, or National Government which violates human freedom, be it in Selma, Ala., or Hanoi, North Vietnam. We cannot be intellectually honest with ourselves if we condemn Peiping and tolerate Philadelphia, Miss.

As a professional group, we add our voices to the national chorus of indignation over the brutal and inhumane treatment of American citizens on Sunday, March 7, 1965, in Selma and again on March 16, 1965, in Montgomery, Ala. There is no place in the United States for police terror.

We humbly, but proudly, add our crying conscience to that of the religious leaders in America and the world. We join with Pope Paul VI of the Roman Catholic Church in supporting Martin Luther King and his Christian policy of nonviolence. We stand shoulder to shoulder with the National Council of Churches in repudiating every form of racial injustice. As teachers, we endorse the stand of the American Jewish Committee in their support of racial and religious equality.

We give unequivocal support to our fellow-Americans, the Negroes, in their quest for the most basic sacrament in a democracy—the right to vote.

Signed by:

H. Ackerman, S. D. Alder, E. Angle, W. Barnhill, L. Beatty, G. Beierle, L. Bertsch, D. Bole, S. Bole, H. Byrne, R. Cantor, K. Childs, E. Cole, B. Cummings, R. Davies, V. Davies, G. Doland, M. Dougnerty, C. Duane, C. Ford, C. Gerth, E. Goble, M. Graebner, C. Guirreri, M. Hanley, J. Herman, E. Hess, J. Hontz, G. Hubbard, M. Jaeger, A. Jones, B. Jones, G. Kaiser, Z. Kiss, F. Kochey, B. LaBone, R. Lawton, F. Linkey, F. Mara, G. Marotta, G. Marshall, M. Mathews, L. McCoy, E. Miller, V. Mills, A. Newlun, A. Osmun, J. Pascoe, D. Proctor, B. Pugsley, P. Reger, J. Rydell, R. Scheer, H. Selover, R. Seplow, A. Shannon, S. Snyder, F. Stanaback, B. Strzelczyk, A. Sutton, T. Taylor, E. Thorne, I. Ward, D. Will, K. Wooden, C. Yeter, J. Zamos, Teachers in the Newton School System.

STATEMENT OF FAITH

Immediately below this in the "Editor's Mail Bag" is an open letter signed by 67 Newton teachers and administrators. In submitting the letter for publication, the teachers said it was circulated in the three schools and all teachers and administrators given an opportunity to sign and subscribe to it. The letter is signed by less than 50 percent of the members of the faculties in the three schools.

The letter is, in effect, a statement of faith, an expression of conscience on the greatest moral, social and religious issues now facing this Nation. In unequivocal terms, the teachers take their stand on the constitutional side of civil rights, and "add our voices to the national chorus of indignation over the brutal and inhumane treatment of American citizens on Sunday, March 7, 1965, in Selma and again on March 16, 1965, in Montgomery, Ala."

It is right that teachers should speak out on these matters. And they have every right to speak out. In fact, they have a duty to do so. To do otherwise would be to abdicate their position of leadership in the community.

The letter signed by the 67 teachers is not an inflammatory or radical statement. It is simply a reaffirmation of the rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and a denunciation of "any political force that denies the basic civil liberties to anyone." Who can quarrel with that? It is a statement of principles to which every right-thinking person in the country can subscribe.

It is regrettable that less than half the teachers saw fit to sign the statement. However, it must be assumed that those who did not subscribe had good and sufficient personal reasons for abstaining. This is a matter of deep personal conviction, and is not one that should involve recriminations or personal abuse. The teaching staff, like any other group of 150 people in our society, is bound to include persons of widely differing opinions.

And those who have the courage of their convictions, and speak out for what is right and lawful deserve the support of the community.

The Reverend Malcolm Boyd Calls for Strongest Possible Voter Registration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last week here in Washington, "Four Plays on Race," were presented during the four-evening period, April 4 through 7. The plays, written by the Reverend Malcolm Boyd, were sponsored by the Catholic Interracial Council, the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity, the Fellowship of the Committees of the United Church of Christ, and the Presbyterian Interracial Council.

I was highly honored to be a patron for these performances. A great deal of human understanding was left with the thousands who witnessed them and who heard the sermons preached by Chaplain Boyd at the end of each evening.

On two of the evenings, Chaplain Boyd devoted his sermon to a question that very much concerns Congress at this time; namely, the pending voter rights legislation. His message on this matter is so strong that I have asked him for a copy of the sermon.

Mr. Speaker, Chaplain Boyd has generously responded to my request, and I take pleasure in sharing with my colleagues comments which were contained in his sermon as it was given at the National Cathedral on April 6 and 7:

The freedom revolution has given American life a redemptive awareness of the very transitory quality of false peace. This is a revolution, posing for every man the question of his own freedom. A light has been cast into a locked room of horrors; there is terror inside it but also the key to reconciliation and peace.

The Selma crisis has most recently demonstrated how deep are the chasms between human persons in America; Negro and white, Negro and Negro, white and white. The depth of hate is matched only by that of a lack of communication. The issue of separation between human persons is illustrated by the 1964 civil rights bill and the pending voter registration bill. These have been necessary to make clear that the direction the Nation is taking is not that of South Africa but, however fumblingly, in the direction of an open society.

A large part of the issue depends on the creation of an atmosphere of trust. We were given heart by the moral leadership of the President's message to Congress and his introduction of a basically strong voter bill. However, our attitude is now one of some shock and disbelief as, at this point, the administration seems willing to settle for less than the strongest possible legislation. There is sentiment in the Nation for the most effective possible bill. The amendments presented by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights would help to make the proposed bill accomplish the ends sought and prove that the Nation does mean to end discrimination.

The basic issue is more important than any mere partisan gains. The issue has to be kept nonpartisan. It further dehumanizes the Negro to wheel and deal in the categorized Negro vote, and this applies to both parties.

To strengthen the bill so that it may be more effective, we ask for the total elimination of the poll tax in State and local elections as well as Federal ones; elimination of the requirement in the bill that a prospective registrant has first to go to a State official before going to a Federal reigstrar; extended coverage of the bill so that it does not apply just to the hard-core States but also to Texas and New York, indeed, to any geographical location; and maximum protection of registrants and voters from all economic and physical intimidation. At present the bill does not protect people who have registered before and people who are actually voting, but only people registering.

Where, in the establishment, is the ground of opposition to strengthening this bill for maximum effectiveness and truly moral usefulness in combating evils? We must ask this question and move creatively, strongly, and immediately—particularly in dialog with our own congressional representatives—against that ground of opposition.

It is too late for closed societies and silence on the part of the good people. Six million Jews died while good Christians kept their mouths, and their ears and eyes, shut. Such a highly respected Negro writer as Lerone Bennette, Jr., has recently warned that if America does not choose authentic democracy now it may find it has drifted into a Fourth Reich.

Amid the holocaust of human pain, the suffering which one man is peculiarily equipped to inflict upon another man, let us pledge ourselves in service, responsibility, and love to our God in a new commitment which cuts below the surface of pop religion, culturally respectable religion, or merely selfish religion. And let us pledge ourselves in an awareness of our shared, brief, sensitive, and vulnerable humanness, to one another.

Mr. Speaker, much national notice has been given Chaplain Boyd and his work. In fact, just a few evenings ago, the respected news commentator, Edward P. Morgan, devoted a principal portion of his broadcast commentary to Chaplain Boyd's "Four Plays on Race."

So that my colleagues may know what Mr. Morgan said on this occasion, I am including excerpts from the news broadcast of Mr. Morgan which was carried on the American Broadcasting Co. Radio Network, sponsored by the AFL-CIO, Friday, April 9, at 7 p.m., e.s.t:

I have just been exposed to a series of four short plays on race presented, significantly enough, not in a theater but within the majestic Gothic mass of the National Cathedral in Washington.

A major obstacle to better understanding of the race problem, so-called, is the difficulty of identifying, or empathizing, to use psychological labels, with the victims. Even with all the good will in the world—and often protestations of good will hide hypocrisy—the average white Northerner has been too aloof to engage himself personally with what is perhaps the biggest domestic issue challenging the American society. And events of the last tortured decade, in the courtroom and on the streets, have worn threadbare the insistent but defensive white Southern rationalization that "nobody really understands the Negro's problems but us."

In some respects, the fact that Malcolm Boyd's four plays on race were given in a church bears more significance than their content. Ordained as an Episcopal priest in 1955 after a decade of dabbling in advertising, broadcasting, movies and public relations from Madison Avenue to Hollywood, the Reverend Malcolm Boyd is an angry man. Much of his anger is directed at what he scornfully calls "pop religion" and one of his plays, "The Community," deals with the tensions within the church—not any particular denomination but the church as an institution. He concludes that the church is dead or alive depending on whether its members are dead or alive and he charges that too many of them have been dead in their lack of commitment and moral response to the race issue. "I know what the gospel says," one of his characters, a white woman, declares, "but I don't intend to hear it preached in church—I want a gentle, loving pastor who will tell me how to live in comfort and spiritual security—until next Sunday morning."

It is never a comfortable exercise to have your conscience, individual or collective, exposed in public and this was what the tempestuous, 41-year-old priest was doing—with some authority because he has participated in freedom rides, sit-ins, and other civil rights demonstrations in the South and elsewhere and he has preached an impatient kind of social and religious evangelism on college campuses across the country.

His perhaps calculated reputation for irreverence had inspired rumors that the plays might be picketed by churchgoers. No such protest materialized though the atmosphere inside National Cathedral during the four-night run might well have shocked many orthodox religionists. Bobbysoxers and slightly older teenagers, black and white, dressed in blue-jeans, t-shirts and sports jackets, or wearing no jackets at all, chanted freedom songs with a passion from the pews and even the pulpit. Folk-singers roused the audiences who in turn contributed some $5,000 toward the cause of racial understanding.

The massive pillars of the cathedral, which soon will look down on the ritual of Easter, seemed to tremble as thousands of voices joined in the verses and chorus of "We Shall Overcome." The participants did not seem to be there for kicks and if the church, which too often has been a citadel of pious complacency and self-righteousness, is indeed becoming a GHQ for the conquest of bigotry and prejudice, we are entitled to observe this centennial day of Appomattox with more hope than sadness.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

Resolution Concerning Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Tennessee has officially gone on record in protest against a proposed drastic reduction in the Federal Government's soil conservation program.

This legislature, in a joint resolution recently adopted, urges Congress to support the restoration of soil conservation district assistance to the level of present and future needs.

Under unanimous consent, this memorial to the Congress is included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 73

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to oppose the proposed drastic reduction in technical assistance to soil conservation districts

Whereas the proposed Federal budget for 1966 provides for a reduction of $20 million in the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service in providing technical assistance to landowners in carrying out soil conservation district programs; and

Whereas this budget also proposes a radical change in the basis for technical assistance which would seriously reduce the amount and the effectiveness of soil and water conservation measures applied to the land; and

Whereas practically every soil conservation district now has insufficient personnel to meet the growing demands of farmland owners, suburban dwellers, and municipal governments requiring technical guidance and assistance in soil and water management problems; and

Whereas this proposed reduction is a strange and questionable form of economy since it would seriously curtail conservation construction work and the sales of conservation materials and supplies representing hundreds of millions of dollars annually in the Nation's business; and

Whereas the Tennessee General Assembly and many units of local government recognize the essentiality of technically sound conservation assistance and make annual appropriations and other contributions in support of soil and water conservation district activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representative (the Senate concurring), That the Members of the U.S. Congress from Tennessee are urged to vigorously oppose the proposed reduction and related changes; and to give their support to the restoration of funds for soil conservation district assistance to the level of present and future needs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Members of Congress from Tennessee and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Adopted March 19, 1965.

WILLIAM L. BARRY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

JARED MADDUX,
Speaker of the Senate.

Approved, March 24, 1965.

FRANK G. CLEMENT,
Governor.

A "Dark and Gummy" Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on April 6, 1965, called the administration's policy on residual fuel oil import quotas as dark and gummy as the fuel itself. I have long fought for the removal of this discriminatory restriction which adversely affects so many users of this product, particularly those in New England and Florida.

The Washington Post editorial appears below:

DARK AND GUMMY

Residual fuel oil is dark and gummy, and so indeed is the administration's policy governing its importation.

In 1959 President Eisenhower was persuaded that there is a happy coincidence between national defense requirements and the protection of domestic coal and petroleum producers against imports of a low-priced fuel that is used in powerplants and large buildings. Imports of residual fuel oil—largely from Venezuela—were subjected to rigid import quotas. Thus a few domestic coal and oil producers gained at the expense of millions of consumers who live on the Eastern Seaboard.

Rumor had it that the Secretary of the Interior was given a green light to begin dismantling the system by lifting the quotas from New England and Florida. But the signal was reversed, presumably in the dark and gummy milieu of pressure politics. Then there is the report of a secret cabinet committee which flatly declared that residual fuel oil controls are not in the public interest. Administration officials deny its existence, but one of its irate authors tells a different tale.

Mr. Udall, whose good intentions appear to have been dashed on the White House steps, has taekn refuge from the crossfire of conflicting interest groups by asking the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning for a searching new study of the relationship between national security and residual oil imports. Until that new and penetrating document is released or blasted loose prospects for consumers will remain dark and gummy.

Men With Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the universities and industry in my own city of Pittsburgh have made great contributions to the scientific and technological progress of that area and of the Nation. Mr. Robert H. Ryan, president of the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania, writing in the excellent publication Pittsburgh Research—Key to Tomorrow, sees a bright future for this area because of the research potential there.

Mr. Ryan's article, "Men With Ideas," is included at this point in my remarks:

MEN WITH IDEAS

(By Robert H. Ryan)

Men with ideas always have found the Pittsburgh area to be conducive to the creative mind and innovation, whether it be education, industry, business, science, or some other field.

It is where the first university west of the Alleghenies was founded, Andrew Carnegie launched his steel empire, Andrew Mellon captained the financial world, Robert Duncan established the first industrial research institute, and George Westinghouse conceived many of his electrical and railway inventions.

At the end of World War II, when the Pittsburgh area needed a face lifting, imaginative civic leaders initiated a vast redevelopment program that provided new highways and parking, housing and office buildings, smoke and flood control, educational and cultural activities, and new industries—many of which were science oriented.

In the years that followed, the new Pittsburgh gained a reputation as a growing, aggressive, and diversified community on the move. The rebirth of the area has been accomplished by major advances in virtually every phase of political, social, economic, and scientific life.

More than ever before, men with ideas are finding encouragement, assistance, and success in the stimulating Pittsburgh scientific environment. This brochure describes Pittsburgh's achievements and capabilities in the research and development field, and provides a working handbook for increasing diversification and interaction among regional organizations.

Altogether, there are 150 research laboratories in the 9 counties that comprise the Pittsburgh area. Most of the facilities are located in Allegheny County, but a great many also can be found in the rapidly growing suburban counties of Armstrong, Beaver, Butler, Fayette, Greene, Lawrence, Washington, and Westmoreland.

Approximately 7,600 professional scientists and engineers are engaged in research and development activities in the southwestern Pennsylvania region. In addition, there are some 6,500 research assistants and technicians.

The total investment in Pittsburgh area R. & D. facilities exceeds $356 million, while the annual research and deevlopment budgets approach $349 million.

This makes research the third leading industry in the Pittsburgh area, being surpassed only by primary metals (with annual production exceeding $1 billion) and electrical machinery ($483 million).

The R. & D. dollar volume actually is greater than that for such basic industries as nonelectrical machinery ($326 million), chemicals and allied products ($250 million), glass ($228 million), and transportation equipment ($149 million).

The Pittsburgh area is the Nation's leading materials research center. The materials barrier that limits most other technologies is being attacked from a variety of fronts—metals, alloys, ceramics, plastics, glass, and electronic and magnetic materials.

In recent years, the region also has become the international hub for nuclear power research and development. The first commercial atomic powerplant was developed and built in the area, and new techniques of power generation are being studied.

Another field that is receiving increasing attention in Pittsburgh is scientific instrumentation, particularly the industrial applications of spectroscopy and related equipment.

The life and space sciences also are objects of a growing number of research projects. Other major research and development fields are chemicals, electronics, machinery, transportation, food, vacuum, oceanography, cryogenics, and education.

The Pittsburgh area has played a vital role in scientific and technological progress, and it will continue to do so in the future. However, there must be an acceleration of research and development effort—in every field and every industry.

Experience has shown that those undertakings with strong scientific and technological roots are most likely to grow and to prosper in the years ahead. Men with ideas must continue to be encouraged and assisted; specialized know-how and facilities must be sought out and utilized; and new growth patterns must be explored and receive community support.

Hon. F. Edward Hébert To Receive Arnold Air Society's Man of the Year Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to invite the attention of the Members of the House to the annual Arnold Air Society and Angel Flight national conclaves here in Washington during the week of April 12, 1965.

On Wednesday evening, April 14, 1,500 young men and women will assemble at the Sheraton Park Hotel. These visitors are students who come to the seat of government representing 170 colleges and universities located in 47 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

These young gentlemen and ladies are touring Washington as delegates to the annual Arnold Air Society and Angel Flight national conclaves, conclaves which began here Sunday and end Wednesday with an awards banquet.

The Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, will present awards to outstanding civilian and military leaders at this banquet. One of the most outstanding Members of this or any other legislative body will receive the Arnold Air Society's highest award. I refer to the Man of the Year Award, which will go to the distinguished, incomparable, highly respected senior Representative from Louisiana, my personal friend, the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT.

The significance of this award can only be appreciated after rendering a few statistics on the Arnold Air Society and Angel Flights. Named in honor of the first Army Air Corps Chief of Staff Gen. Henry H. "Hap" Arnold, the society is a professional honorary service organization of selected Air Force ROTC cadets. Each academic year, more than 5,500 cadets make up the squadrons at 170 colleges and universities throughout the land. Their purpose is to aid in the development and production of Air Force officers through furthering the purpose, traditions, and concepts of the U.S. Air Force.

Each academic year, some 2,500 dedicated young women are selected as members of Angel Flights at many of these same colleges and universities. This honorary service organization promotes the interest of the college man in the Air Force ROTC program. From my review of the 17 Angel Flight delegates competing here for the title of "Little General," I can report that the dedication and scholastic achievement of these young ladies is surpassed only by their beauty.

The majority of these cadets will graduate this summer or next and enter the Air Force as second lieutenants. They are certain to be some of the future leaders of our Air Force and our Nation. Many of these ladies will become future leaders of our democracy in their own right.

Springfield College Students' "Work Week" Project Financially Aids Campus Swimming Pool Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, students at famed Springfield College in my home city of Springfield, Mass., have just completed a "Work Week" project to raise funds for financing a planned swimming pool complex on the campus.

Led by radio-television star Art Linkletter, the Springfield College students began on April 13 to render household services in the Greater Springfield area in exchange for contributions for the swimming pool. This Springfield College project certainly reflects the finest effort by college youth in this country to provide a worthwhile community service while fostering a needed campus project. The students at Springfield College who participated in "Work Week" are to be commended for unselfishly giving their time and effort to this college and community project.

Mr. Speaker, under previous permission I include with my remarks a news story from the Springfield Sunday Republican of April 14 giving details of the Springfield College "Work Week."

STAR SPARKLES

The 235 students who tackled the first 65 jobs Saturday morning and afternoon collected approximately $1,000, a college spokesman announced.

The 550 quota for job requests was reached and the student work-teams have stopped receiving assignments.

The students indicated, however, they would still consider jobs which guaranteed "at least $100 toward the new pool."

The theory behind "work week" is that household jobs will be manned by the students in exchange for a contribution.

Linkletter, who according to one college official has "really put zip into this campus," announced Friday night at a trustee dinner the college has already raised more than $271,000 in its campaign for the natatorium which is expected to cost $450,000.

APPEARS 26 TIMES

The television star, best known for noting "people are funny," made a total of 26 appearances throughout the area in his 30-hour local stay which ended late Saturday afternoon.

He received several large contributions during his travels here, it was revealed, before flying to New York City from Bradley Field at the conclusion of the day's activities.

The "work week" will continue until next Saturday with students participating between 1 and 7 p.m. daily after classes. College authorities and students directing the project hope to receive nearly $10,000 in contributions from homeowners.

OFFER CAR WASHES

Participating in the project by offering car washes for "contributions only" are four service stations in the area. Linkletter visitied one of them, at Allen and Cooley Streets, Saturday.

The showman stopped in at Trinity Methodist Church on Sumner Avenue where in the church swimming pool a New England Amateur Athletic Union meet was in progress.

Before leaving, Linkletter made a social visit to the home of 94-year-old, Mrs. Edward Appleton, of 313 Maple Street. A long-time supporter of Springfield College projects, Mrs. Appleton is the aunt of college trustee, Attorney Julius H. Appleton, of Longmeadow.

Flying Linkletter to New York in his private plane was Norman C. Keith, an oil executive and college alumnus who this year is serving as chairman of the board of trustees.

Small Business Subcontractors Helped Develop Gemini Space Capsule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, an event occurred recently which emphasizes the importance of cooperation between the big and small business sectors of our economy.

The event to which I refer was a special ceremony held at the Small Business Administration honoring McDonnell Aircraft Corp., the prime contractor on the Mercury and Gemini space projects, for its interest in small business.

SBA also honored on this occasion three small business concerns—subcontractors—for playing important roles in developing the Gemini capsule.

More than 5,000 small firms participated in this Gemini project, Mr. Speaker, demonstrating once again the vitality and the diversity and the excellence of this sophisticated sector of small business.

The three small firms honored by SBA on April 6 are Astro Metallics Corp., of Harwood Heights, Ill.; R. E. Darling Co., of Gaithersburg, Md.; and Snap-Tite Inc., of Union City, Pa.

Mr. Eugene Foley, Administrator of SBA, made an eloquent exposition on this occasion on the importance of the healthy interaction of small and large business in our economy.

His remarks were as follows:

REMARKS BY SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR EUGENE P. FOLEY AT AEROSPACE AWARDS CEREMONY, LAFAYETTE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 6, 1965

We often talk about the ingenuity and the excellence and the creativity of small business. But the concept takes on real substance on an occasion like today.

We are here to recognize the important role small business is playing in our rapidly accelerating program of space exploration. And we are here to honor a large business concern that has carefully nurtured and expanded the participation of small business in aeronautics and space technology.

The large business is McDonnell Aircraft, a pioneer in this area of modern technology—prime contractor on the Mercury and Gemini space flights—an employer of 34,000 persons—a firm with facilities valued at more than $90 million.

The smaller concerns are Astro Metallics Corp. of Harwood Heights, Ill., whose president is Albert S. Kepen; R. E. Darling Co. of Gaithersburg, Md., whose president is R. E. Darling, Sr., and Snap-Tite, Inc., of Union City, Pa., whose president is George A. Clark.

The teamwork of McDonnell and these three sophisticated small businesses is symbolic of our economic system. This refutes the concept that holds that to be pro-big business one must be antismall business—or that to be pro-small business one must be antibig business.

These firms epitomize healthy interaction between large and small business. They point up the economics of this interaction—that it is good business for big business to perform certain functions, and for small business to perform others. They underline the complementary roles small business and large business play in our economic system.

They symbolize teamwork and constructive cooperation.

These firms are representative of many other firms. There were more than 1,100 subcontractors signed by McDonnell for the Gemini project—and they all performed well. And there are many other large concerns that have aggressive programs which utilize the services and products of small firms.

But there is no better example in our free enterprise system of this healthy partnership than is represented by these four firms we are honoring today.

The citation we shall present to McDonnell recognizes his efforts to promote "the growth and welfare of hundreds of small firms through utilization of their facilities and skills in the production of America's first two-man spacecraft."

The citations for the presidents of Snap-Tite, Inc., for Astro Metallics, and for R. E. Darling Co. emphasize their "ingenuity and resourcefulness in producing for the first two-man American spacecraft components whose reliability was crucial to the successful orbit and which exemplified the skills of many small aerospace firms."

SBA takes justifiable pride on this occasion because it was the catalyst that brought McDonnell and these three firms together. Specific information on the capabilities of these companies was provided McDonnell when it was seeking subcontractors for various parts of the Gemini contracts.

We feel that this is indicative of our role in helping to fuse the relationship between large and small business, in helping to coalesce the potential for coordination and cooperation that is inherent in our economic system.

As I think of the roles played by the business concerns represented here today, I recall the mythological story of Daedalus and Icarus. Daedalus, you will recall, helped his son Icarus to escape from Crete by helping him fashion wings of wax. When Icarus flew too near the sun, the wax wings melted and he plummeted to his doom.

The technology that assures our astronauts that their wings are more than wax is intrinsic in the technology represented by these small firms here today.

Albert Kepen and his Astro Metallics manufactured the protective beryllium shingles which along with the Gemini's heat shield secured the spacecraft and the astronauts from the melting heat which would otherwise have consumed them when they reentered the atmosphere.

The Darling Co. manufactured the oxygen hoses used by the Gemini astronauts during their flight while the Snap-Tite Co. produced the quick-disconnect couplings linking the oxygen hoses with the oxygen supply.

And so in the capable hands of the technicians in these firms, a myth became a reality, a science fiction novel became a true adventure.

And so big business and small business are in partnership as they make the dreams of yesterday the realization of today.

That is America.

That is the stuff that made this Nation the unique creation that it is.

A democratic society inherently has the inducements that will build the creative genius of man to its peak.

As Franklin Roosevelt said:

"The basic proposition of the world and dignity of man is the strongest, the most creative force now present in the world."

It gives me great pleasure today to recognize, for the presentation of these awards: Mr. Joseph W. Antonides, director of materiel representing Mr. McDonnell of McDonnell Aircraft; Mr. Kepen of Astro Metallics, Mr. Clark of Snap-Tite, and Mr. Darling, Junior, of R. E. Darling Co.

Congratulations to all of you.

Remarks of Harlon B. Carter, President of the National Rifle Association, at 94th Annual Members Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert herewith the remarks made by the president of the National Rifle Association, Harlon B. Carter, at the 94th Annual Members Banquet in Washington, D.C., on March 31, 1965:

Fellow members of the National Rifle Association and friends, today, I was elected president of the National Rifle Association. I am deeply grateful that my first public appearance in such capacity can be in front of this distinguished group of thinking people which, each in his own manner and each to his own depth, has an interest in the National Rifle Association.

The social and political flavor of our times indicates the propriety of a few words this evening to review, and to imprint still deeper in the minds of all of us, what the National Rifle Association is and why it exists. These questions inevitably relate to the possession and to the use of firearms—a concept—a fact—which we must maintain if the objects of our association are to have meaning—objectives as they are written today—as they have been written for decades in our bylaws.

Now there will soon be a million of us—men and women who have pledged that they are citizens of the United States; pledged that they are not members of any organization which has, as any part of its program, the attempt to overthrow the Government of the United States by force or violence; pledged that they have never been convicted of a crime of violence and that, if admitted to membership, they will fulfill the obligations of good sportsmen and good citizens—the obligations of good sportsmanship and good citizenship so clearly stated in the objects of the National Rifle Association, often repeated—but not often enough repeated, as the guiding lights by which men of good character and principle—citizens of good repute—shall set their course as responsible members of the National Rifle Association.

Let me repeat again—and again—what those objects are. And, think now, this is the purpose—these are the objectives—these are the reasons, for the existence of the National Rifle Association of America:

To promote social welfare and public safety; to promote law and order; to promote the national defense; to educate and train citizens of good repute in the safe and efficient handling of small arms; to educate and train citizens of good repute in the technique of design, production, and group instruction; to increase the knowledge of small arms and promote efficiency in the use of such arms on the part of members of law enforcement agencies, of the Armed Forces, and of citizens who would be subject to service in the event of war; and generally to encourage the lawful ownership and use of small arms by citizens of good repute.

I sometimes wonder if—and this is as high a tribute as I can make to the wisdom of our predecessors—I sometimes wonder if these objects, often repeated, seriously considered, and to which we are conscientiously dedicated, shall not, over the years, lead all men of good intentions—but sometimes of little understanding—to know us and to support us.

These objects assuredly offer us a sound foundation for reasoning with men.

A sound foundation upon which to resist legislative effort where conscience and good citizenship so dictates.

A sound foundation upon which to promote legislative effort where there is a reasonable expectation it will hamper criminals rather than law-abiding citizens.

The National Rifle Association is not alone in these beliefs, a fact for which we are grateful.

The National Rifle Association is not alone in its work for these objectives.

We are the serious law-abiding citizens who stand in the forefront of tens of millions of others who enjoy outdoor recreation and hunting or else who believe in outdoor recreation and hunting but who enjoy those pleasures vicariously—prevented from actively doing so by the demands of family, of health, or of employment.

We stand in the forefront of all citizens of good repute who wish lawfully and constitutionally to keep firearms.

We stand in the forefront of those who believe that the police activities and the military activities of our people should be in the hands of the agencies lawfully and constitutionally provided for such purposes.

These beliefs and these concepts indicate the tasks, and they indicate the objectives, to which every law-abiding citizen in America can justifiably dedicate himself—and to which, with a hundred years start, it is appropriate that we be in the forefront.

I thank you ladies and gentlemen. We are happy you can be with us this evening.

Resolution on Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of doing everything possible to encourage Members of this House to support President Johnson's call for voting rights legislation, I should like to renew my own support of that legislation and to cite another organization in

my own district for its energetic effort to this end. I include at this point in my remarks a resolution adopted unanimously recently by the 21st Ward Improvement League of Pittsburgh.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON VOTING RIGHTS

(Adopted by 21st Ward Improvement League, Pittsburgh, Pa.)

Whereas we as a society and individuals aspire to create wider participation in basic and inalienable rights; and

Whereas it is the intent of the Bill of Rights that there be universal suffrage; and

Whereas legislation has been passed including the 1964 Civil Rights Act to implement the intention of the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas Negro Americans in Selma, Ala., and other places still encounter difficulties in registering to vote;

We support President Johnson and call on the Congress to develop and pass new legislation that is aimed at meeting the practical problems that are still being encountered by Negro Americans who desire to become full first-class citizens by participation in the electoral process.

Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., New Director of the Central Intelligence Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the President of the United States for the wisdom he has demonstrated in appointing Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., U.S. Navy Retired, as the new Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Vice Admiral Raborn is one of the great men of our Nation. He has already made tremendous contributions to the security of the Nation and, undoubtedly, his appointment and agreement to serve in this vital position involves great personal sacrifice. This is what one would expect from "Red" Raborn.

The Nation has been fortunate in having John McCone as the Director of Central Intelligence—a man of great achievement, dedication, and high integrity. It is not often that a man of brilliance, dedication, and high integrity follows as a successor in such a vital position.

I know I speak for the entire Committee on Armed Services when I extend to Vice Admiral Raborn our sincerest congratulations, our pledge of full cooperation, and our personal pleasure in knowing that a man of his tremendous ability has agreed to assume this position which entails such extraordinary responsibility.

We look forward to renewing our association with this truly outstanding American. As Director of one of the most important agencies of our Government, Admiral Raborn will frequently report directly to our committee, and, even more frequently, to our Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee.

We anticipate with pleasure our first meeting with him.

The Voting Rights Bill Is Tough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much public discussion and controversy over the adequacy of voting rights legislation now being considered by the Judiciary Committee. Much of the criticism has been more directed toward the achievement of purely political ends rather than the urgent need to assure voting rights for all Americans. Mr. Alexander Bickel, in the April 3 edition of the New Republic magazine, has provided a most valuable analysis of the problem which confronts us and the remedies proposed by the President of the United States.

Mr. Bickel's article follows:

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL IS TOUGH

(By Alexander M. Bickel)

The administration's voting rights bill is a tough measure, make no mistake, the toughest since Reconstruction. It is quite a different article than the Civil Rights Act of 1964. That statute proclaimed broad norms concerning complex and ramified social problems and affecting the daily activities of millions of people, and it necessarily demanded no more than that the country live up to those norms by and large, over time. No more could very well be expected. This voting statute deals with a narrow problem that has been solved in many places and reduced to manageable proportions elsewhere by intensive investigation and litigation over the past 6 or 7 years. Its objective is no longer openly controversial in respectable quarters, as the objectives of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 still are. Not even Governor Wallace openly opposes the principle that qualified Negroes should vote and that Negroes should be qualified by the same standards as whites, although he and others argue on principle against desegregated schools and public facilities, for example.

The President's bill, therefore, could afford to be all muscle, and it is. Furthermore, it is not only the toughest bill since Reconstruction, it is a Reconstruction measure, for it applies exclusively, with one or two incidental exceptions, to the hard-core Southern States and Black Belt counties, where prospective voters are required to pass various tests, and where, as of November 1964, fewer than 50 percent of voting age citizens were registered or voted, a figure well below the average in the rest of the country. The area affected, according to the administration (in addition, quite incidentally, to Alaska and, it seems, some three counties in such places as Maine, Idaho, and Arizona), consists of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, and 30-odd counties in North Carolina. But there is no reason to suppose that the enforcement provisions of the bill will be applied throughout the States affected, say, in Atlanta, or in Alexandria, Va., or, indeed, in Alaska. The Attorney General is authorized to invoke the bill county by county rather than statewide only, and he will enforce it where needed.

Unquestionably, this is a strictly regional measure, but then voting is the one aspect of all the many aspects of the racial problem in the United States which is strictly regional. The right to vote may be impaired in one or another undesirable manner elsewhere as well, but where else is it systematically denied on account of race? The 15th amendment forbids any State to deny the right to vote to anyone "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude," and that is all it does. The President's bill is entitled "A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution on the United States," and that is all it does, and that is why it is a regional measure. The South ought not to be singled out in respect of racial problems that it shares with other parts of the country. But voting is not one of these.

In the area affected, the right to vote may not be denied for failure to pass a reading or writing test, or one of the many kinds of tests requiring an applicant to show that he can correctly interpret, say, a provision of the State constitution, or that he knows and understands the Federal and State Constitutions and like documents. Nor may an applicant be disqualified for failure to prove "good moral character," or because he has not been vouched for by other registered voters. These provisions throw into doubt—they render voidable—all State-imposed voting qualifications except age, citizenship, residence, and perhaps soundness of mind and lack of a criminal record. And this has led to some questioning of the bill on both constitutional and prudential grounds. For—except as they may be applied to discriminate on the basis of race, and except as, for purposes of Federal elections, Congress may regulate the manner of their application—voting qualifications are under the Constitution to be set by the States, not by the Federal Government. And a minimal literacy qualification is not generally thought unreasonable.

But it overstates the necessary or even probable effect of the bill to say that it outlaws the requirement of literacy in the region in which it applies. To begin with, once the Attorney General and the Census Bureau have examined the relevant statistics, and have certified that the statute covers a given State or county, it is open to that State or county to come before a Federal court and prove that it has not in the past 10 years discriminated against prospective voters on account of race. If the court so finds, and if during this 10-year period there has been no other judicial finding (under the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964) of voting discrimination in that State or county, the State or county becomes as free of the provisions of this act as New York or Cleveland. And so it is not only statistics that lead to invocation of this statute, but the fact of past discrimination.

Moreover, even in places where there has been discrimination in the past 10 years, the bill does not outlaw literacy as a qualification for voting. It outlaws existing tests administered by State registrars, on the theory that they are presumably instruments of discrimination, and it empowers the Attorney General to have the Civil Service Commission (the Federal Government's general employment agency) appoint examiners (not necessarily residents of the county in question) who, in turn, are authorized to register voters. It is made fairly clear in the bill that an examiner may register as voters only those persons who "have the qualifications prescribed by State law * * *." The Attorney General and the Civil Service Commission will tell the examiner what those qualifications are. There is no reason to suppose that

they will instruct the examiner otherwise than that literacy is a qualification where in fact it has been, since it would quite likely be unconstitutional to instruct him otherwise. But there is very reason to expect that they will also instruct him that: (1) he need not apply some complex state literacy test, which has in the past been used to discriminate, but may consider anyone with a sixth-grade education literate, or administer a simple signature or reading test; and (2) he need not impose a literacy requirement at all where in fact the State registrar has in the past not applied one to whites who are still on the voter rolls. Properly administered, therefore, the statute will not abolish the literacy qualification for voting where it has existed—but existed not just on paper, rather, in the actual implementation of the State voting law. The statute will abolish only devices, including particular kinds of literacy tests (not qualifications, as such), which have been used to discriminate.

NO CONSTITUTIONAL POWER

The President said at his press conference on March 20 that he would have liked to abolish the literacy qualifications altogether and allow voting upon proof merely of age (18 years, at that) and citizenship, but that he was advised the Federal Government had no constitutional power to impose such a rule. He was correctly advised. Besides, while it is true that in Mississippi, for example, any literacy requirement will disqualify very large numbers of Negroes, and will do so, with painful injustice, because of the State's past neglect of its duty to educate Negroes as well as whites—nevertheless, and apart from the constitutional inhibition on the authority of the Federal Government, one may doubt the wisdom, in Mississippi or anywhere, of enfranchising illiterates.

Qualifications other than literacy imposed by such States as Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi—interpretation and understanding tests, good moral character, vouchers—are no more outlawed by the bill as qualifications than is literacy. But there can be no doubt that Federal examiners will be instructed to ignore them entirely. And that is because, unlike literacy, these additional qualifications and tests can be proved, in the process by which they were enacted—many of them quite recently—and in their consistent administration, to have had absolutely no purpose other than to discriminate against Negroes. They are simply not a bona fide exercise of the power of the States to set voter qualifications. Thus only the other day the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional a Louisiana interpretation test (an applicant must be able to understand and give a reasonable interpretation of sections of the State or Federal Constitution as read to him by the registrar), and indicated its readiness to strike down a similar Mississippi test, as well as a good moral character requirement. Moreover, in the Louisiana case, the Court forbade application of a new citizenship test, unless all whites now registered should be purged from the rolls and required to reregister under it. And in December, in a case from Walthall County, Miss., the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit found that whites were regularly permitted to register without complying with the current and increasingly difficult provisions of the voters' registration statutes enacted by the State of Mississippi on a time schedule that coincided with the indications that more Negroes would make the effort to register. The Court therefore ordered that Negroes also be registered without regard to these increasingly difficult provisions, subject only to a simple demonstration of literacy. There was no constitutional difficulty in issuing this decree, and there will be none when Federal examiners are instructed under this statute to do what the court of appeals and the Supreme Court have done. If a State wishes to challenge the registration of one or more applicants (presumably on the ground that State qualifications have not been observed), it may do so before an examiner, and then in Federal court. The facts of discrimination will then be placed on the record, as in the Walthall County case and in the Louisiana case decided by the Supreme Court, and that will conclude the matter. In the meantime, the challenged Negro voter may vote.

With a single exception, which could have been taken care of by a simple amendment, all that this bill will achieve could have been accomplished under the Civil Rights Act of 1960. That act provided for the appointment of referees, as it called them, where a pattern of discrimination had been proved, and empowered them to register Negroes under qualifications no more stringent than had been applied to whites in the past. A significant difference between the function of these referees and that of the examiners now provided for is that the examiners can register all qualified comers, if the Attorney General so desires, whereas each applicant to a referee had first to prove that he had tried and failed to obtain registration from the appropriate State official. Given the forbidding atmosphere of the typical Black Belt county registrar's office and the many inconclusive delaying tactics available, this presented a serious obstacle to the Federal registration of large numbers of Negroes. It was an obstacle, however, that could have been removed by amendment, and in fact things never got far enough for this obstacle to operate. The reasons why the 1960 act did not work are that a few segregationist judges actively obstructed it; that other Federal judges were too busy, or lacked the necessary single-minded zeal, to administer it effectively; and that even under the best of conditions the judicial process on which this act relied exclusively for the appointment of referees, and for control and supervision over them, is sluggish and prone to delay and complications.

MAKES AN END RUN

The essence of the new statute, and the source of its great promise, is that it makes an end run around the judicial process. It takes the Federal district courts in the South entirely out of the voter registration business. Not even the initial test of the constitutionality of the statute as a whole can come up in a Federal district court in the South. That test will have to be made in the Federal courts of the District of Columbia. It is in the District of Columbia courts also that a State or county will have to try to take itself out of the provisions of the statute by proving that it has been guilty of no discrimination against Negro voters. Challenges to the action of an examiner in registering a Negro will go to Federal courts in the South—not to district courts, however, but to courts of appeal, where the incidence and influence of segregationist judges is much lower. And—what is of the greatest importance—the burden of coming forward to litigate will rest on the State or county, not on a Negro applicant or on the Attorney General, and registration and voting will not have to await the outcome of the litigation but will proceed, following the examiner's initial action, while the judicial process winds its way to a conclusion. Moreover, the facts on which the judicial judgment will ultimately rest will be those found by an examiner—expeditiously, fairly, even sympathetically to the Negro applicant—not by such easily self-blinded Federal judges as, say, Cox and Mize of Mississippi. The findings and decision of the examiner—called a hearing officer for purposes of passing on a challenge to a registration—will be conclusive on the court, as in the case of decisions of other administrative agencies, unless clearly erroneous. These provisions spell action. There are stringent provisions also, including criminal ones, to insure that Negroes who have been registered are actually allowed to vote, and that their votes are counted.

One or two possible objections can be taken to the bill, but they do not go to its heart, which is sound. The statistical standard it employs—50 percent of all persons of voting age—will foreclose application in counties where Negroes are in a minority, and a very high percentage of whites vote, but few if any Negroes are allowed to register. Nor will the bill apply in places where discrimination takes other forms than the use of literacy and like tests. Both these points were made in the House Judiciary Subcommittee hearing by Representatives WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican of Florida, and JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican of New York. Attorney General Katzenbach replied reasonably enough that, freed of the enormous burden of trying to achieve a judicial breakthrough in the most difficult areas, he will be able to use the Civil Rights Act of 1960 to good purpose in these atypical cases.

The prohibition against the continued use by State registrars in the region covered of existing tests and devices, including existing literacy tests, is enforced by criminal sanctions. These are not likely to do much good, given the inclinations of Southern juries, and they tend to give the bill the appearance of outlawing literacy as a qualification. They constitute, therefore, the most serious threat to the constitutionality of the bill, and for very small gains. Hence it would be just as well to omit criminal sanctions as a means of preventing the continued use of discriminatory devices. The Federal-examiner procedure is the most effective means anyway.

A more serious objection is the choice of the Civil Service Commission as the agency to share with the Attorney General administration of the statute. This is an old-line agency, accustomed to other concerns. It may lack the necessary drive. It might have been better to create a new agency and make it dependent on the White House, or place it under the Attorney General. This would have lent more prestige and perhaps more authority to the examiners who are to be appointed—it makes a difference to have a commission hanging in your office which recites that the President has placed special trust and confidence in you—and might have provided greater assurance of zeal. But there were, no doubt, adequate political reasons for making the choice that was made. The present head of the Civil Service Commission has the President's confidence and serves also as a special assistant to him, and as long as the President's interest in the problem remains as evident as it now is, adequate zeal may be expected all around.

The Washington Hilton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, among the great assets of this Federal City are the many fine hotels which serve as hosts to our many visitors. Recently the Washington Hilton, a magnificent piece of modern architecture, was added to the Washington skyline.

In his remarks at the official opening, Mr. Percy Uris, chairman of the Uris

Building Corp., explained why it took nearly 3 years to complete this modern hostelry. His remarks brought to mind a line from Robert Browning, "Works done least rapidly, Art most cherishes." I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading what Mr. Uris had to say about the planning and construction of this newest Washington hotel.

SPEECH BY PERCY URIS, CHAIRMAN, URIS BUILDING CORP., AT WASHINGTON HILTON OPENING, MARCH 18, 1965

On June 25, 1962, a groundbreaking ceremony was held, marking the fact that we were well along with our huge excavation, and were about to get started on the construction of the Washington Hilton. Here we are, on March 18, 1965, with this beautiful hotel ready for occupancy.

When we and the Hilton people had arranged financing and had agreed to go forward with the construction of the hotel on this site, our joint idea was to build a middle-of-the-road hotel having about 1,200 rooms, and large banquet facilities, all more or less as shown on the sketch plans prepared by William Tabler. As the Hiltons and ourselves studied the situation, our philosophy changed. We decided to build the finest practical hotel, so that Washington would have a great hotel, of preeminent quality, here on this Connecticut Avenue site. After about 50 studies by the Tabler office, we changed from the straight line building to the curved gull wing design. We changed the aluminum and glass facade to one of precast stone in 1,800 sections. We added additional bedroom floors. We elaborated the swimming pool design and added the special swimmer's elevator. We added the cabana rooms, the entertainment and hospitality suites, and the tennis club. We changed the basic design of the ballroom from rectangular to elliptical, and moved its location west so as to improve circulation. With the increased banquet facilities, the kitchen facilities were greatly enlarged.

It took a long time to work these things out, which explains the fact that the building took almost as long to construct as it did to wage the Civil War, and of course it cost a great deal more than originally contemplated.

An indication of the extent of the changes may be gained from the fact that the original amounts allotted for architectural and engineering have about doubled. I personally feel that upgrading the hotel, and making it the finest of its kind, will in the long run have its economic reward.

I wish I had the time to give all the credits due to the architects, the engineers, the financial people, the construction committee, our construction organization, the subcontractors, the craftsmen who worked to create this fine structure. Suffice it to say that we are very happy with the result and very proud of the finished building.

In having had long years of experience building various kinds of buildings in different parts of the country, it gives me great pleasure to publicly state that the quality of the workmanship in this hotel is superior in every trade. As an example of what I mean, if you were to examine the plastering work in this building and compare it with that which you find in other sections of the country, I am sure you will note the superiority of the work here. Quality in construction often goes unnoticed because most people's eyes are not trained to see that which goes to make up quality. On the other hand, and in the long run, good quality means less maintenance, less trouble and longer survival. For these characteristics we are deeply grateful to the craftsmen who built so excellently.

No matter how well designed, well equipped and appropriate to location and time the hotel may be, it is never any better than the organization and people that run it. So from this point forward, we look to the Hilton organization, our associate. We fully expect that it will provide the quality of management which will make this great building a success—a success not only in the sense that it provides quality shelter and comfort for guests, but also in giving a proper return to those who have spent their time and risked their capital in the creation of this superb hotel.

For this great city, our Nation's Capital, we are trying to achieve an outstanding hotel, one which will become internationally famous. We expect to accomplish our goals.

I am sure you would find it rewarding to spend a little time to examine the hotel. A staff has been provided to guide those who have the time and inclination to do this. They will be very happy to show you through.

Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Rights Commission has found wholesale violations of the denial of citizens of the right to vote and that these people are being denied self-government.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish at this time to insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of Seattle, Wash., to which I fully subscribe:

RESOLUTION 20205

Whereas the right to vote under reasonable and easily met regulation is essential to citizenship in any democratic government constituted under the principle of "government of the people, by the people, for the people"; the 15th amendment of the U.S. Constitution makes this clear:

"AMENDMENT XV

"SECTION 1. The rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Whereas there are no laws more important than the laws that preserve and promote self-determination; the very foundation of our Government is built upon quicksand if integrity is not practiced in the drafting and administration of such laws; our inheritance bequeathed to us by our Founding Fathers is thrown away if any form of privileged rule is allowed to exist for too long: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Seattle, That all State and local government be urged to recognize, maintain, and protect the right of every individual to vote; be it further

Resolved, That the Federal Government be urged, after reasonable notice to any local government within the United States that the essentials of self-determination are being abridged, to step in if those abridgements are not corrected within a reasonable time, not to govern but to enforce the right of self-government; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson, U.S. Senators WARREN G. MAGNUSON and HENRY M. JACKSON, and U.S. Representatives THOMAS M. PELLY, LLOYD MEEDS, JULIA B. HANSEN, CATHERINE MAY, THOMAS S. FOLEY, FLOYD V. HICKS, and BROCK ADAMS.

Adopted by the city council this 5th day of April 1965, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this 5th day of April 1965.

CHARLES M. CARROLL,
President pro tempore of the City Council.

Filed by me this 5th day of April 1965.

C. G. ERLANDSON,
City Comptroller and City Clerk.

Attest:

I concur in the above resolution:

CLARENCE F. MASSART,
Acting Mayor.

"American" Defined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] has rendered an important service by noting and criticizing the inappropriate and inaccurate definition of the noun "American" as it appeared in the Oxford Dictionary and the Concise Oxford Dictionary.

Certainly, as Representative BINGHAM has pointed out, the two dictionaries' definition of "American" as "a native of America of European descent" is an insult to the millions of U.S. citizens of Africa, American Indian, Asia, Latin America, and other origins.

I believe our colleagues will find the exchange of correspondence between our able colleague and Oxford University Press, as well as a brief article from the New York Times, to be of interest.

APRIL 2, 1965.

The EDITORS,
The Oxford English Dictionary,
Clarendon Press,
Oxford, England.

GENTLEMEN: It has come to my attention that one of the definitions given for the noun "American" in the Oxford English Dictionary, as well as in the Concise Oxford Dictionary, reads "A native of America of European descent."

This definition, which may have been appropriate in the 18th century, is certainly wholly inaccurate today. It represents indeed a virtual insult to the millions of U.S. citizens of Africa, American Indian, Asia, Latin America, Polynesia, and other origins.

I hope and trust that in the next edition or supplement of the Oxford English Dictionary and the Concise Oxford Dictionary this egregious error will be corrected, the offending definition will be omitted and the definition "citizen of the United States of America" will stand by itself.

A minor problem remains with regard to the use of the noun "American" in Latin America. Although the Latin Americans do not refer to themselves as Americans, they prefer to refer to the citizens of the United States as North Americans, and this has become polite usage south of the United States-Mexican border. This, however, is a fine point. Throughout the United States itself and the rest of the world, the noun

"American" is commonly used to mean citizen of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

APRIL 2, 1965.

EDITOR,
The Times, London, England.

SIR: It has come to my attention that one of the definitions given for the noun "American" in the Oxford English Dictionary, as well as in the Concise Oxford Dictionary, reads "A native of America of European descent."

This definition, which may have been appropriate in the 18th century, is certainly wholly inaccurate today. It represents indeed a virtual insult to the millions of United States citizens of African, American Indian, Asian, Latin American, Polynesian, and other origins.

I hope and trust that in the next edition or supplement of the Oxford English Dictionary and the Concise Oxford Dictionary this egregious error will be corrected, the offending definition will be omitted and the definition "citizen of the United States of America" will stand by itself.

A minor problem remains with regard to the use of the noun "American" in Latin America. Although the Latin Americans do not refer to themselves as Americans, they prefer to refer to the citizens of the United States as North Americans, and this has become polite usage south of the United States-Mexican border. This, however, is a fine point. Throughout the United States itself and the rest of the world, the noun "American" is commonly used to mean citizens of the United States.

I have also written directly to the editors of the Oxford English Dictionary to call their attention to the error in the present edition.

Sincerely yours,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 5, 1965.

Representative JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BINGHAM: According to the New York Times of April 3, you are unhappy about the definition of "American" in two dictionaries published by Oxford University Press.

The editing of these dictionaries is done on the other side of the Atlantic, so I won't comment on your point. I am writing rather to send you a copy of a new Oxford University Press reference work that you may find interesting—and soothing? This is the revised edition of "A Dictionary of Modern English Usage" by H. W. Fowler, revised by Sir Ernest Gowers. We are publishing it on May 6. You may find of interest the articles on America and on Americanisms.

I am also sending you some material we put together for book review editors because part of it has a number of items about English attitudes toward the United States and our use of the language.

Sincerely,

FON W. BOARDMAN, Jr.,
Advertising and Publicity Manager.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1965]

DICTIONARY WILL MODIFY DEFINITION OF "AMERICAN"

LONDON, April 6 (Reuters).—The Oxford University Press has decided to modify the definition of the noun "American" in future editions of its dictionaries following a complaint by New York Representative JONATHAN BINGHAM.

Representative BINGHAM, Democrat, of the Bronx, complained to the publishers that both the Oxford Dictionary and the Concise Oxford Dictionary defined an American as "a native of America of European descent." He thought this was virtually an insult to U.S. citizens of other origins.

An Oxford spokesman said today that in future editions the definition would "make it clear that the various people native of, or resident in, America, are not confined to those of American Indian or of European descent."

He said the basis of the definitions in the two smaller dictionaries that Representative BINGHAM complained about could be found in the original Oxford English Dictionary.

There, a distinction was made between all aboriginals of the American Continent, that is, an American Indian, and a native of America, of European descent.

Social Security Amendments of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, it is my very deep and earnest conviction that H.R. 6675 should be overwhelmingly approved.

In a prudent comprehensive design this measure projects three new programs for health insurance and medical care for the aged under the Social Security Act by establishing, first, a fundamental hospital insurance plan to help meet the burdensome costs of hospital and posthospital treatment; second, it establishes a voluntary plan through which doctors' and other medical services are paid for by monthly premiums of $3 matched by an equal Government payment; thirdly, it establishes an expanded Kerr-Mills program for the need which will combine all the existing medical programs for this group into a single new program with greater Federal financial participation.

This measure before us also is designed to more realistically improve our current social security and public assistance programs. The provision to grant a 7-percent increase in social security benefits not only takes into account the advanced living costs that have occurred over the past several years but it will also help to finance the cost of the new voluntary supplementary insurance plan. Indeed a special phase of the bill is to permit an automatic $3 a month deduction from the social security benefits if the individual chooses such coverage.

Other vitally important features of this measure are, in my judgment, the continuation of benefits for children attending school beyond the age of 18 up to the age of 22, as well as the desperately needed liberalization of the earnings limitation, so long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, the most distinguished chairman and diligent members of the House Ways and Means Committee have, after extended hearings and studied deliberations, provided us with a prudent, sensible, modern and acceptable solution to a most difficult and longstanding problem that is of imperative urgency to an increasing number of older citizens and, indeed, younger ones, in this country. This House and this Nation owes them a great debt of patriotic gratitude.

Not the least of the reasons to influence us toward approval of this measure is our common knowledge of the legendary scholarship, prudence and patriotic dedication of the esteemed committee chairman who has presented this measure to us and recommended its passage after so many years of conscientious scrutiny and judgment of this controversial subject. He has told us that he advocates approval of this bill and I quote his words, "with every bit of energy at my command."

Mr. Chairman, the President himself has perhaps summed up better than anyone else the sense and the substance of this measure when he said:

> Compassion and reason dictate that this logical extension of our proven social security system will supply the prudent, feasible and dignified way to free the aged from the fear of financial hardship in the event of ailments.

Mr. Chairman, in the firmest belief that this measure is "good for all Americans" I urge my colleagues here to resoundingly adopt this landmark legislation without further delay.

Martin Luther King Would Hurt Negroes in Drive for Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is now evident that Martin Luther King is more interested in power than in the plight of the Negroes. His insistence on demanding that the State of Alabama be boycotted clearly shows his real intent.

The following editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser of April 4, 1965, sums it up with eloquence:

STARVATION WITH LOVE

We cannot begin to fathom the evident madness of the loving Nobellian in sticking with his plan to throttle Alabama economically.

The ruthlessness of his enterprise is no shock. But he has run into a solid wall of opposition, from the White House to the toot-toot liberal press.

Evidently the reverend doctor, his mind hot like that of Dubois before him, has made a very costly blunder. Millions of Americans are now reappraising King, and he is much diminished.

We cannot confidently prophesy it, but Alabama may now have been presented with a windfall opportunity to redeem much of the corroded past. Negro Alabamians and

white Alabamians have more reason than before to ease the problems of living together.

Well-intentioned whites assuredly want to move away from the small but potent element of dynamiters and riflemen and are pleased that their Governor is acting with vigor. And, we should think, well-intended Negroes will want to move away from King, now in the process of being discredited by his willingness to ruin them and by his Communist associations.

The Negroes of Alabama now have more reason to recoil from King than do the whites. King has now demonstrated that he considers Alabama Negroes as expendable troops in his war.

King is urging punitive thrust that would give the Russians the moon by striking Redstone, he would take school lunches from Negro children along with the white, he would cut Tuskegee Institute's budget along with Auburn's, he would wipe out new job openings for Negro and white alike by turning away new industry, he would cause job layoffs for Negro along with white, he would deprive the blind and dependent welfare clients among Negro and white alike and even those in mental institutions.

The parents of King's wife and probably some other of her relatives live in Perry County. Mrs. Lyndon Johnson has relatives and tenants in Alabama. King says to hell with them, too.

It is thus impossible to understand how King can retain the loyalty of Alabama Negroes when he announces a willingness to take their economic life along with that of the whites.

It is evident that King has uniformly shocked the country with this madness. If he could paralyze Alabama, what State would be next? He has grievances against all of them.

Along with the shock of King's proposals, another significant thing is happening, Governor Wallace is no longer being derided for calling the names of the Communists around King. These rosters and estimates of the depth of their penetration have now become objects of competition by even the liberal columnists.

Communism is not the reason for the Negro revolt and it would have occurred in any event. But their acceptance in the movement has suddenly become a matter of competitive revelation. Evans, Novak, Sevareid, Wilson and Pearson—they are now confirming Wallace.

It is right for Congress to investigate the Kluxers. It will seem equally appropriate to extend this to include Communist infiltration.

Tribute to Michael A. Feighan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, with the thought that some may have missed it, I wish to insert into the RECORD at this point the tremendous tribute to our beloved colleague, MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, which appeared in the March 30 issue of Independent Editorial Services, Ltd. The editor, T. A. McInerny is internationally recognized for his wide range of interests as well as his political sagacity. I know that he voices the admiration that we all have for our friend MIKE and it is a privilege to make his remarks a part of the permanent RECORD of the Congress of the United States.

CAPITOL HILL.—One of the really strong figures in the House who has been coming to the fore is Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio, the second in command of the powerful Judiciary Committee. Congressman FEIGHAN has been returned to Congress since 1942 by his populous Cleveland district. He is a graduate of Princeton and Harvard Law School and has the kind of class that his Ivy League background confers. He is probably the top man in the United States on questions of immigration and while liberal in his general slant on national policy, he is probably the best informed man on Communists and their tactics in the House. He refuses to compromise with them and is continually at war with the parlor pinks who are trying to get Reds into this country on one excuse or other. FEIGHAN is a strong man nowadays at the White House and in the executive branch. Still young and tireless, he is considered to be on his way to greater things.

Natural Resources Council Proposal

SPEECH

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD for April 5, Senator MCGOVERN inserted the speech of New Mexico's distinguished senior Senator [Mr. ANDERSON] before the ninth biennial wilderness conference, San Francisco, Calif., April 2, 1965.

Senator ANDERSON's outstanding record as a great leader in the American conservation movement was cited by Senator MCGOVERN.

Today I wish to join the Senator from South Dakota in noting my admiration of the lasting contribution Senator ANDERSON is making to insure continued progress in this Nation's natural resource endeavor.

I was particularly heartened and gratified by Senator ANDERSON's endorsement of the establishment of a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers as proposed in the Senate by S. 938 introduced by Senator MCGOVERN and in H.R. 4430 which I have the pleasure to sponsor in the House of Representatives.

It seems only yesterday that I discussed the need for such a council with our late President John F. Kennedy during his western "conservation" trip. The need for such a council is no less today than then—rather with the perspective achieved with the passage of only a few years we see the need to be more acute today. I heartily subscribe to Senator ANDERSON's words, and reiterate them to my colleagues, as he said:

We have—as a nation—paid attention to resource problems on a crisis basis. We are alerted to the water crisis, the timber crisis, the pesticide crisis, the strip mine crisis. I have no question that it is the squeaking crisis which gets the oil. But it is the wisest way for a nation to develop and manage its resources for 190 million today and 330 million by the year 2000? I think not.

A council of resource and conservation advisers might help to avoid the potential wastefulness of reaction only in the face of crisis. It might enable decision makers to take more initiative in advance of a severe resource problem rather than after it has ballooned to massive proportions.

The council would be an arm of the executive branch, but it would serve all of Government in much the same fashion as the Council of Economic Advisers. The Council of Economic Advisers does not create national economic policy, but it gathers the information and does the advance thinking essential to the shaping of enlightened policy. It is still up to political leaders to create and implement tax and fiscal policy. By the same token, Members of Congress and Cabinet officers would still be left with the responsibility to make sound conservation policy.

But the council of resource and conservation advisers would help chart the way toward appropriate conservation measures. It would let us know where we stand and where we should be heading.

Address by John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the National Farmers Union Annual Convention, Chicago, Ill., March 17, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent address by Mr. John Baker, Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture was such a cogent statement of some of the problems which face agriculture in this country that I commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress.

It was given before the National Farmers Union annual convention, Chicago, Ill., March 17 and I believe it is an excellent summation of the position that many of us hold.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. BAKER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AT THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION ANNUAL CONVENTION, CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 17, 1965

In the last few years there has been a growing chorus of spokesmen who predict that the days of the family farmer are numbered—and the fewer the days, the better.

I have come to this convention of old friends and associates to bring you one message—and that message is this:

The predictors and manipulators of doom for the family farmer are wrong—dead wrong.

Farm family agriculture will survive because there is no more economic and efficient way to till the land and it is in harmony with the democratic tradition of our country.

If the forces of reason and commonsense prevail, farm family agriculture will not only survive, it will expand and prosper as never before in our history.

I deeply believe that a prosperous and expanding farm family agriculture is absolutely indispensable to a healthy democracy, indis-

pensable to a dynamic economy, indispensable to the building of a permanent peace, and indispensable to the creation of a Great Society.

Fortunately, this belief is shared by many people.

Our President believes this.

Your Secretary of Agriculture believes this.

Jim Patton believes this.

And—most important of all—so do you.

And it is organizations like the National Farmers Union that will help make this dream come through.

We are too practical and we have been in this fight too long to believe that the problems of farm families can be solved overnight or even within the next decade. But I wholeheartedly agree with President Johnson that the job must and can be done in this generation.

Some way must be found to turn back the forces who have a vested interest in eliminating farm families.

And finally, the unfortunate consequences of mistaken farm policies of most of the 1950's must be completely undone before we can expect to make any real progress toward a permanent, prosperous and expanding farm family agriculture.

And I submit, there was much that had to be undone during these past 4 years to clean up the debris of previous mistakes in agricultural policy. One has only to recall where we were in 1961 to appreciate where we are now.

In 1960: Net farm income was down to a low of $11.7 billion; gross farm income—the total money farmers receive and spend to sustain main street—was not increasing as fast as farm costs; per capita—personal income of the farm population was only 54 percent that of the nonfarm population; farm prices had been declining and taxpayers were burdened with excess supplies of commodities; Government farm credit—the only hope for survival for most small farmers—was either frozen or cut back; rural electrification was in danger because there were insufficient funds for new generating and transmission projects—the whole rural economy was sick and this being reflected by the third national economic recession in the past 8 years; the problem of migration of 23 million rural people into urban areas since 1950 was being completely ignored; the social fabric of all rural America—its farm families, its rural communities and businesses, its churches and schools—had been gravely and perilously weakened.

I remember all of this—and so do you—all too well.

It would have been a great deal worse for the valiant legislative fight you and your allies fought during those years.

It was not a pleasant problem for Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and Secretary Freeman to inherit, nor an easy one to cope with. But they have done their level best and progress has been made.

We set out to raise farm income, and we have. For 4 straight years, net farm income has been nearly a billion dollars higher than the 1960 level—cumulative realized gross farm income has been more than $12½ billion more than if the 1960 level had been maintained.

I am aware, as you are, that this increase—though sizable and encouraging—is not nearly enough. Parity of income for most farm families is still a long way off. But may I remind you that this increase in farm income for 4 straight years represents a herculean triumph when you consider that it is a complete reversal of the trend that had been observed for years.

At least we now have a better base to start from as we strive for parity. And parity of income for farm families and parity of opportunity for all people in rural America is the announced and declared goal of President Johnson.

We set about to save and to improve our commodity price support programs. And this we did. The feed grain program and the wheat program were all major improvements and are responsible for raising farm income and reducing surpluses. We recognize that further major improvements and strengthening of these and other commodity programs are necessary. We shall see those improvements made and we shall strengthen present programs and devise new ones that are necessary just as soon as farmers and the public recognize the need for them and give their support for them.

While commodity programs are not the whole answer to the economic problem of farm families, certainly the abolition of commodity programs and a return to the free market—as many people still advocate—can mean instant disaster for much of agriculture.

Separate, independent and non-Government studies of what would happen to agriculture if we returned to a free market, generally agree on the following points:

Net farm income would fall from present levels of $12.6 billion per year to between $6 and $7 billion—a decline of 40 to 50 percent; farm prices for crops would fall 25 to 30 percent; livestock prices would fall by 10 to 20 percent; farm production expenses would continue to rise, further squeezing net farm income; finally, there would be no net cash income above costs at all on many farms; two-thirds of farmers with sales of $20,000 or more, would have their net cash income wiped out.

This situation would not only bankrupt most farmers, it would mean economic and social ruin for much of rural America, and a serious economic setback for the whole Nation.

It would seem that no responsible man in public life, no organization could support or advocate a farm program that would lead to such a tragedy, but the voices of unreason persist and they are powerful.

We have set about over the past 4 years to provide more farm credit at reasonable terms. And this we have done, and more. Many of our farm credit programs were expanded to include rural nonfarm people as well; such as housing community water systems, recreation development and, more recently, our economic opportunity program. This we felt was necessary because the total rural problem is part and parcel of the farm problem.

In the Farmers Home Administration, we have increased the volume of credit assistance to 2½ times the level of 1960; have greatly strengthened the support of family farms; have developed special credit for a wide range of rural community facilities—water systems, recreation areas, senior citizens housing projects.

Increases in all our insured loan programs would have been higher had the authorization been higher. President Johnson has asked for increases in our insured loan programs and he has asked for a new insured loan program for rural housing that will double the volume of loan funds that will be available. Insured loan programs are a proper and effective way of expanding credit resources for rural people without imposing additional burden on the budget.

We set about to strengthen our rural electrification program, and this we did by increasing REA credit for generating and transmission loans. Attacks on REA will continue and will be focused, as in the past, on what the opposition believes to be the most vulnerable parts of the program. But I know that reason will prevail to protect this great program and to insure its necessary expansion. Rural electrification is too vital for the revitalization of all rural America for us to allow it to be hamstrung.

We set about to strengthen and make possible the strengthening and expansion of rural cooperatives as a means of providing farm families and other rural people with an effective tool for more bargaining power in the marketplace. This we have done. Secretary Freeman has reactivated the National Public Advisory Committee on Cooperatives and made it into an effective, functioning body. He has directed all Department of Agriculture agencies to coordinate their efforts in helping farmers to expand and develop cooperatives and co-op research has been stepped up and redirected to significant emerging problems. Merger of cooperatives has been encouraged. Credit resources for cooperatives have been increased. Much progress has been made by local people in 4 years in the use of cooperatives for overall rural areas development. Local REA cooperatives, in particular, have played a major and pioneering role in this field. Rural electric cooperatives and the staff of REA have provided technical assistance on more than 1,400 projects since 1961, often assisting businessmen to go to other Federal agencies and private creditors to help them finance new business ventures that will increase power use and boost the local rural economy. Local REA cooperatives have helped launch 1,459 local projects with the result that more than 135,000 new jobs have been created.

The new Economic Opportunity Act provides a co-op loan program under the Farmers Home Administration to help low-income rural people establish small marketing and supply cooperatives.

Not for years—perhaps never—has the climate and the potential for the expansion and development of cooperatives been so favorable as it is now. Now it is up to farmers and rural people to take advantage of this situation. To make the most of this opportunity is a challenge from which I know your organization will not shrink.

One of our major objectives since 1961 has been and still is a more realistic land-use policy. Passage of the historic Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 helped define that policy and we have made solid, major gains in this all-important area.

Loan programs and technical assistance are being provided to encourage and help farmers shift land out of unneeded crop production into more profitable uses such as recreation and wildlife areas, and woodlots. We have initiated two important new pilot programs to revitalize rural areas through comprehensive planning and growth, rural renewal projects administered by Farmers Home Administration and resource conservation and development projects administered by Soil Conservation Service. And we have significantly expanded the successful watershed protection projects and Great Plains conservation programs.

In 35 years, by the year 2000, we shall have almost twice as many people in this country as we did in 1960—more than 330 million. Our burgeoning population is creating a new race for space, not outer space, but land space.

Within this generation we are going to have to find living room, elbow room, walking room for 100 million more people.

In addition to meeting their demands for food and fiber which farm family agriculture can do, we also have to meet the massive demands for recreational facilities; parks, camping areas, water areas for fishing, swimming and boating, hunting refuges, golf courses.

This means new uses for land, and of course, new and great opportunities for rural landowners and rural people.

As farmers, as rural people, we need not be fearful of these new changes. We should welcome them. These changes need not cause disruption in rural America. Rather they portend a new stability, a new prosperity for our rural areas.

We have devised programs to aid rural people and farm families to make the necessary

shifts in land use and to take advantage of the new opportunities of change. Loan programs and technical assistance are available for land conversion purposes, for recreational development, for watersheds and for community facilities. These are available for individuals for private commercial ventures, to cooperatives, and to community or other public agencies. One of the most significant developments of the past 4 years has been the organization by farmers and ranchers with credit from Farmers Home Administration and other assistance from a wide range of State, local, and Federal agencies of cooperative-type grazing associations by which they can build a strong secure basis for stable operation on their own lands in conjunction with grazing lands of Forest Service and other public land management agencies.

This is all a part of the long-range pattern of this administration to help rural people to revitalize rural America—to strengthen farm family agriculture and to provide parity of opportunity for all rural people.

One of the first steps we must take is to eliminate rural poverty. This we are starting to do. Your Department of Agriculture is charged with a large part of responsibility of carrying on the war against poverty in rural America. It has our highest priority. We are regearing our agencies for the job. The Economic Oportunity Act provided for two new loan programs to be administered by the Farmers Home Administration, individual loans up to $2,500 to increase the incomes of poverty-level rural people, both farmers and nonfarm rural people. The other provides loans to establish small cooperatives for low-income rural people.

In addition, all our agencies are cooperating with the Office of Economic Opportunity at every level. Forest Service, for example, is in the process of providing 43 youth Job Corps sites by June 30 of this year. Two are already completed—26 are in the bid and planning stage. Each camp will provide facilities for about 100 to 200 boys.

The work of the Federal-State extension service is being strengthened and reoriented to put much greater emphasis upon work with cooperatives, on community action in the war on rural poverty, and to assist in the organization and operation of local and area-wide efforts to plan and obtain more rapid economic growth and a higher level of rural prosperity.

The rural areas development movement has active local committees in more than three-fourths of the Nation's rural counties with 107,000 people serving on those committees. In the last 4 years, rural areas development activity has created 412,000 new jobs. Federal training programs have retrained more than 90,000 rural people; and helped them find new jobs.

The Department of Agriculture has created a new Rural Community Development Service to be more responsive to local needs. This new agency will help local people make as effective use of other Federal programs as they now do of USDA programs. We already have experience in doing this. Particularly in the last 4 years in the area redevelopment, manpower development and training, and small business programs. But never before in such a formal way, and never before with a directive from the President to carry out such a function. Our objective is to make all of the programs of the Federal Government completely available in rural areas, to provide not only parity of opportunity for rural areas, but parity of opportunity for each person who lives in a rural area.

Rural housing and community facility loan programs will be expanded to provide new economic muscle in rural areas, to create more jobs, to raise living standards and to make our rural communities more attractive.

Just a few years ago, farm family agriculture was at its lowest ebb, and going lower fast. Lack of economic and social opportunity in rural America was depleting it of the vigor and enterprise of its young people who were moving to the cities.

It was and is the objective of this administration to change all of this. It is the declared and avowed policy of President Johnson and his administration to strengthen farm family agriculture, to eliminate poverty in rural America, to provide parity of opportunity for all rural people. This sounds like a massive job, and it is. But is it not an impossible one. With your help we shall do it. We have the tools, we have the will, we have resources to do it.

With people like you to lead the way, I'm confident of the future for farm families and for the people of rural America.

Thank you.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held Tuesday, April 13, at noon.

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—PUBLIC WORKS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on fiscal 1966 budget estimates for proposed rivers and harbors and flood control projects, having as its witnesses Maj. Gen. Ellsworth I. Davis, President, Mississippi River Commission, and Division Engineer, Lower Mississippi Valley Division, and Maj. Gen. Alvin C. Welling, Division Engineer, South Atlantic Division, both of the Corps of Army Engineers.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

ARMY RESERVE—NATIONAL GUARD REORGANIZATION

Committee on Armed Services: The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee continued its hearings on the proposed reorganization of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve Forces, having as its witness Col. John T. Carlton, executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the U.S.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

OCEANOGRAPHY

Committee on Commerce: Committee held hearings on S. 944, providing expanded research in the oceans and the Great Lakes, and to establish a National Oceanographic Council. Witnesses heard were Representative Hanna; Dr. Harold E. Edgerton, of the firm of Edgerton, Germeshausen & Grier, Inc., Boston; Rear Adm. Denys W. Knoll, Oceanographer of the Navy; Capt. H. A. Arnold, USN (retired), United Aircraft Corp.; Rear Adm. Edward C. Stephan, USN (retired), president of the Marine Technological Society, and former Oceanographer of the Navy; and Dr. Wilbert M. Chapman, a member of numerous National Academy of Sciences' committees and panels on maritime matters.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

D.C. MATTERS

Committee on the District of Columbia: Subcommittee on Business and Commerce held hearings on the following two bills:

S. 1314, relating to the closing of streets in the D.C. in connection with redevelopment or urban renewal projects, with testimony from Lt. Col. E. C. Adams, Assistant Engineering Commissioner, and Roy C. Hoyle, Surveyor, both of the D.C. Government; and Phil A. Doyle, Executive Director, D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency; and

S. 1316, authorizing D.C. Commissioners to enter into contracts for supplies and services, with testimony from Rexford G. Wessells, D.C. Procurement Officer; and Samuel Humes, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

Hearings were adjourned subject to call.

FOREIGN AID, AND NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee continued executive consideration of the proposed omnibus foreign aid authorizations bill, but did not conclude action thereon, and will meet again tomorrow.

Committee approved for reporting the following nominations: Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund, U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and a Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank; William B. Dale, of Maryland, to be reappointed Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund; Palmer Hoyt, of Colorado, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information; Morris S. Novik, of New York, to be reappointed member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information; Morris B. Abram, of New York, to be U.S. Representative on the U.N. Human Rights Commission; and F. Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland, to be U.S. Representative to the Twentieth Plenary Session of the Economic Commission for Europe.

Appendix

Senator Wayne Morse Stresses Quality Education in Address to Salem, W. Va., College Alumni—Senator Randolph Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the 88th Congress has become known as the Education Congress and no legislator has been more responsible for the enactment of education legislation during the past 4 years than Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. As a member of the Subcommittee on Education, it has been my privilege, with Senator RANDOLPH and other colleagues, to serve under Senator MORSE's able chairmanship and to work with him in the consideration and passage of vital education measures.

Among the education legislation which became law during the 88th Congress were the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; National Defense Education Act extension; Vocation Education Act of 1963; impacted areas aid extension; Manpoyer Development and Training Act; and the Library Service and Construction Act of 1964.

And on this past weekend President Johnson signed into law, S. 2362, the Primary and Secondary Education Act. This measure is undoubtedly the most far reaching and needed school legislation in the Nation's history. The thrust of the billion-dollar-plus bill is to aid children who come from families in which the annual income is less than $2,000.

On March 22, Senator MORSE, who guided this bill to passage in our body, addressed the Washington chapter of the Salem, W. Va., College Alumni Association at its annual spring meeting at the Continental Hotel. Senator RANDOLPH, a graduate of that institution and a member of its governing board, presented the Oregon statesman to the attentive and appreciative audience.

Americans of this generation, and the children who will be the leaders of future generations, are and will be indebted to Senator MORSE. His extremely effective leadership in education law ranks him as the "man who was there"—

Said Senator RANDOLPH.

Chartered in 1888, Salem College is a 4-year college of arts and sciences. Enrollment is more than 1,200 students. Among its graduates, Salem claims two Governors of the State of West Virginia, four U.S. Senators, and two presidents of the National Education Association. Dr. Corma Mowrey, a past NEA president, now serves as associate director for lay relations with NEA and was present at this meeting. Dr. Mowrey typifies the concern for higher education embodied in the students, faculty members, and friends of Salem.

The program opened with an invocation by the Reverend George L. Cutlip, alumni director and assistant to the president. William E. Davis, president of the Washington chapter, introduced Salem College President K. Duane Hurley who spoke of the growth and development of the college and its distinctive friendly, personal touch.

Senator RANDOLPH has told me of Senator MORSE's address "Education Legislation and the Small College," in which he gave a thought-provoking admonition against overlooking the major function of the college:

It is not research, but rather, it is the transmission of knowledge, and the drawing forth from the student, so that he may examine and strengthen them intellectually, the basic convictions which comprise his character.

Senator MORSE added:

Knowledge may be value free, but education, almost by definition the matrix of values in which knowledge is embedded. And it is in this realm of matrix formation by the student that colleges such as Salem can function—with greater effectiveness than thre multiversity. At Salem, you will never hear the bitter joke: "Do not fold, mutilate, or spindle the student."

New officers for the Washington chapter, Salem College Alumni Association were elected. They are: Daniel G. Taylor, president; Delbert Flint, vice president; Virginia B. Spicer, secretary; and Lorena Butterfield, alumni news reporter.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that this college is doing an outstanding job of educating young people and preparing them for successful and productive careers. Under the capable administration of President Hurley, Salem College is growing and expanding to meet the ever-increasing demand for excellence in higher education facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks by President K. Duane Hurley be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD together with those of Senator WAYNE MORSE which were given at the March 22 meeting of the Washington chapter of the Salem College Alumni Association.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY K. DUANE HURLEY, PRESIDENT OF SALEM COLLEGE, MARCH 22, 1965

Distinguished guests, fellow alumni, and friends of Salem College, the way our chapter chairman, Bill Davis, has organized and conducted this very fine meeting exemplifies the basic spirit of our college: the friendly, personal touch.

It is wonderful to meet again so many friends among the Washington area alumni. When you add to the group a large number of parents of students, parents of prospective students, as well as such students themselves, along with honorary alumni and Govvernment officials, you have an unbeatable combination. Already I sense the family feeling that always exists at Salem.

Also evident is a deep and abiding concern regarding higher education—a determination that our college will continue to serve effectively in its specific ways, not only meeting the special needs of Appalachia but providing educational opportunities for worthy young people from all parts of the country who might otherwise be denied college experiences.

Although still small by design and intent, Salem College has experienced great growth and development during the past half dozen years. Enrollment has increased from about 200 to over 1,200 students. The former Waldo Hotel in Clarksburg has been obtained as a downtown campus and a complete educational unit is now maintained there, unique in that housing, feeding, recreational and educational services are all provided under one roof. A million-dollar capital expansion program has just been completed on the main campus. The yearly operating budget for the two campuses—Salem and Clarksburg—now runs well beyond a million dollars.

Expansion has been made possible only because of teamwork on the part of those people and groups represented at this meeting—alumni, parents, students, friends, corporations, and foundations, as well as Government agencies. Senator MORSE and his congressional colleagues are to be commended for evolving programs of Federal assistance—both loans and grants—which have materially furthered higher education without jeopardizing the freedom and independence of colleges like Salem.

Salem College is especially indebted to people like Dr. Corma Mowrey, National Education Association associate director for lay relations, and Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH. Both of these distinguished alumni have served with faithfulness and dedication for many years on the Salem College board of directors. Through the years since its founding in 1888, our college has produced an unusually large number of serviceminded graduates, including two presidents of the National Education Association (Miss Mowrey being one); two Governors of the State of West Virginia; and four U.S. Senators, including JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

These people have returned full devotion to their alma mater; and our college's ability to continue to meet the educational challenges of the day can be attributed in no small measure to them.

Our hats are off in gratitude to you, Corma and JENNINGS. Like Senator WAYNE MORSE, your commitment to the welfare of the young people of America is exemplary.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION AND THE SMALL COLLEGE

(Address of Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon)

Mr. Chairman, President Hurley, Senator RANDOLPH, alumni, and friends of Salem College, after that most gracious introduction by my very good friend and most distinguished and hard-working associate on the Education

Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I feel I should completely recast my remarks tonight, change my topic to: "What Is the Role of the Small College?" and answer it by saying, "To produce great public servants like JENNINGS RANDOLPH."

It would be a good speech, too. I could relate how he quietly, but effectively, caused a group of very stubborn House conferees to modify a position they had taken, which Senator RANDOLPH knew would doom the bill. I could tell you how in meeting after meeting, executive session after executive session, he kept after the rest of us to see to it that we did not neglect the needs of the small private college, as we marked up our higher education bills. But most of all, I could have told you of the balance he brings to our discussions as he helps us to focus on, not only our immediate problems, but as importantly, on the problems down the road which lie in wait if we follow one course or the other.

It is this quality of balance and commonsense applied to the abstractions of legislation, which in my judgment illustrates the values which come to the student who was as fortunate as you were to have had the opportunity of attending an institution of learning, small in size of student body, but great in the tradition of producing honorable men, who are equipped to take places of leadership in our society; who are able to assume responsibility; and, who are dedicated to weaving Christian ideals into the very fabric of their daily lives.

Many people look upon me as somewhat of a heretic, in some fields. I doubt, for example, that any medal is being proposed for me at the Pentagon tonight for my position on Vietnam. I rather question that there is solid support in the State Department for my constructive efforts to improve our foreign aid bill. So, too, in the field of education legislation, I know that there are those who deplore the emphasis I strive to give to financial aid for the student, and particularly the average college or university student. The "bricks and mortar men" of higher education have pressing problems which demand solutions. I can understand their difficulties and I am willing to do all that I can to help them meet their needs for classrooms, for libraries and laboratories. But I feel that the headlines which tell of the difficulties faced by the gigantic factories of learning on the Pacific coast are a sad; yes, a truly tragic confirmation of the warnings I have given for the past 4 years that we must not overlook the major function of the college.

It is not research, but rather, it is the transmission of knowledge, and the drawing forth from the student, so that he may examine and strengthen them intellectually, the basic convictions which comprise his character.

Knowledge may be value free, but education, almost by definition provides the matrix of values in which knowledge is embedded. And it is in this realm of matrix formation by the student that colleges such as Salem, of which Senator RANDOLPH is both an alumnus and a member of the board, and Pacific University, of which I was once a trustee, can function, I feel, with greater effectiveness that can the multiversity. At Salem, you will never hear the bitter joke: "Do not fold, mutilate, or spindle the student."

That is why I am glad that this year President Johnson in presenting to the Congress his proposals for higher education assistance has given to student aid a very prominent place; $130 million is earmarked, of the total $250 million cost of his program, which Senator RANDOLPH and I have jointly introduced in the Senate as S. 600, for student assistance. Added to that is some $84 million which now appears in the budget request for the work-study program under the Office of Economic Opportunity which will be transferred to the Office of Education. Thus, $24 million can be made available to help young men and women achieve higher education directly—$70 million of this is for scholarships; $15 million is for the new insured student loan program which should generate from private sources some $700 million in student loan funds; and $129 million is for work-study.

The insured loan program is vital, since it can provide a way for the middle-income families which are the stable backbone of America to finance, at a reasonable rate of interest, the education of their children. It is difficult to stretch take-home pay of $6,000 to $10,000 a year to cover the cost of educating two or more at the same time when college costs are running at the rate of $1,600 to $2,400 a year for each. We cannot, and we must not, price the average high school graduate out of the college opportunity. If we do, or if we price the small college out of being in contact with the average student from the average American family, we lose as a nation.

Education is our best capital investment. The dividends which flow from this type of growth, not only repay in a few short years the initial cost, they continue to contribute for a lifetime, returns to our economy. The Treasury of the United States in the coming decades, I suggest to you, will benefit tremendously in terms of individual and corporate returns which otherwise would not be available.

Title II of S. 600 relates to college libraries; $65 million is earmarked for college library assistance and library training.

Boswell, in 1775, said: "Knowledge is of two kinds. We know a subject ourselves, or we know where we can find information upon it. When we inquire into any subject, the first thing we have to do is to know what books have treated of it. This leads us to look at catalogs, and the backs of books in libraries."

Many of us, I fear, still cling to the nostalgic stereotype of the book-lined room with wide and sunny windows as the location of the student's work. We should be aware that the hardbound book which fits so well the hand is only one of the modern library tools.

Edison, Steinmetz, De Forrest, and others have vastly expanded the library bookshelf for the storage and retrieval of information.

The flashing lights of a computer and the photoreproduction of the microfilm master may well be the model of the future library, that the generation of men and women now entering kindergarten in Huntington will hold in their minds as they seek in the electronic stacks of the law library the cases which they will need for their moot-court pleadings within the next short 15 years.

With every passing day, because of the sheer magnitude of the information which is pouring forth, from every quarter of the globe, in every tongue and dialect on every scientific and scholarly subject, the task of the librarian becomes more difficult.

An article in the Sunday New York Times of January 4 points up the magnitude of the job ahead.

It speaks of the establishment at the University of Minnesota of a center for documentation and information retrieval to control what has been referred to, and correctly in my judgment, as the information explosion.

The article cites statistics which have been presented to our subcommittee. There are 30,000 technical journals now being published. Annually 1,000 more are added. Today, of all scientists who have ever lived, 80 percent are now living; 2 million articles, based on scholarly research, are published annually. The article indicates how the new electronically based technology may be able to lend to college and university librarians helpful tools and techniques.

More than ever, excellence in teaching and research depends on an adequate selection of books, periodicals, scientific journals, and documents. Yet 50 percent of our 4-year institutions of higher learning and 82 percent of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted minimum standards in the number of volumes in their libraries.

Moreover, current national statistics show a decline in the number of college and university library books per student. The reason is that enrollments are increasing faster than per student expenditures for books. Today, an estimated $226 million is needed merely to stock the shelves of our universities with the books needed for the present student and faculty population. Meanwhile, rising college and university enrollments are expected to swell from today's 4.8 to 6.9 million by 1970.

Title II proposes a 5-year program to help institutions of higher education acquire library materials needed for their expanded responsibilities in research, teaching, and student use; to encourage new and enlarged college and university training programs to prepare individuals for service in the projects relating to the improvement of libraries and the library and information sciences.

The proposal is divided into two parts. The first would authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grants to colleges or combinations of colleges for the purchase of books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials.

Institutions submitting appropriate applications would receive a basic grant of up to $5,000. The Commissioner would also be authorized to make supplemental grants, not to exceed $10 for each full-time student. Supplemental grants would be made on the basis of such criteria as size and age of the library collection, student enrollment, and endowment and other financial resources. Only the basic grant would be matched by the institution. Each institution or combination of institutions would provide assurances that their previous year's expenditures for materials would be maintained.

I am sure that President Hurley will be happy to explain to each of you how the checks you make out for Salem can be usefully applied to this and other matching funds. That particular $5,000 from you for library purposes should be a seed corn from which an abundant intellectual harvest can come. It might not be amiss to compare it to the miracle of the loaves and fishes which fed the multitudes nearly 2,000 years ago.

There are other parts to the President's program for higher education, which are designed to assist developing colleges, as in title III of S. 600. Under this 5-year program, funded at $30 million for the first year, the Commissioner of Education could make grants to pay part of the cost of planning and carrying out cooperative arrangements for strengthening the academic programs of some of our institutions. This could be done in a number of ways, through faculty exchange programs, introduction of new curriculums, visiting scholars, working out cooperative education programs which would permit alternate periods of employment and study as in the Antioch plan, and the joint use of common library or laboratory facilities where feasible.

Finally, in title I of the bill, through an authorization of $25 million for the first year, a program for expanding and developing university and continuing education programs is envisaged.

This progrgam is an expanded version of a university extension proposal, S. 3477, which Senator RANDOLPH and I carried through the Senate in the 87th Congress, but which was not accepted by the House of Representatives at that time. It is our hope

that now that it is part of the administration program, the House will be able to better understand the essential merits of the concept.

Hearings on S. 600 are now underway, and I am confident that after the precise language has been worked out, and after such changes as the Congress deems proper are made, the higher education bill can become a statute.

This has been a rather brief review of a fairly comprehensive program, and in the course of it, I may well have told you far more than you may have wished to learn. I plead guilty to the vice of a teacher. I do get interested in my subject and I get carried away to the point where I sometimes forget to hear the bell at the end of the hour. In closing, I can only once again express to you and to the Senator from the West Virginia, my deep appreciation for your wonderful hospitality and the opportunity you have given time to talk with you tonight.

A Classic of Mass Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following column written by Thurman Sensing, which appeared in a number of newspapers across the country:

SENSING THE NEWS

(By Thurman Sensing, executive vice president, Southern Industrial Council)

A CLASSIC OF MASS HYSTERIA

The history of the world is full of indictments which indicate the spread of mass hysteria at particular times. Examples of this were the so-called children's crusades in the Middle Ages in which youngsters were encouraged to march to the East and fight the Moslems. The Abolitionist era in the 19th century was another example. Frenzied promoters of strife overcame the voices of reason, and the Nation was split by a dreadful war—the aftereffects of which America is still feeling a century later.

We have seen mass hysteria in our own time—this very month past. Because certain individuals in Selma, Ala., were alleged to have been denied the right to register to vote, the whole country has been plunged into a strange intoxication. There never really was a problem in Selma that could not have been ironed out in courts of law. If anyone was denied registration who was entitled to it, the laws and the courts offered an abundance of protection. If anyone was unjustly injured, the same courts and laws were their protection.

NOT INTERESTED IN REGISTRATION

But the agitators who masterminded the campaign in Alabama were not interested in securing rights. They were not interested even in registering certain individuals. Their interest, obviously, was in creating trouble—in fomenting strife that, in turn, would spark hysteria from coast to coast. These strategists of hysteria are very skillful, and they accomplished what they set out to do. They produced an electric reaction from Boston to San Francisco. Plane loads of ministers descended on once peaceful communities in Alabama. Two Alabama cities were presented as theaters of war. Students at famous universities were allowed to leave their classrooms, put aside their books, and forget laboratory work, and rush off to demonstrate in Alabama.

In the Nation's Capital, the anarchists had a field day. Only a few months ago the Government and the press were deeply concerned over added security for the President. Mr. Johnson reviewed the inaugural parade from behind a shield of bulletproof glass. But in the scenes of frenzy and beatnik civil disobedience, sit-in artists were allowed to invade the White House. They were permitted to camp out on the sidewalk in front of that famous dwelling. Their supposed "right of assembly" was given precedence over the right of all other citizens. No one else would have been allowed to lie down in a White House corridor or pitch camp in front of a Government building. The normal business of Government was crudely and rudely disrupted by the agitators.

Over all these recent actions is a deep layer of hypocrisy. From Chicago, where the crime syndicates have operated a state within a state for decades, came more than 50 clergymen.

Into Alabama poured clergy from New York State. They went to Alabama to protest the death of a Boston area minister who had gone where he had no legitimate ministry.

In the same week, in New York City, there was a brutal murder of a 17-year-old white youth by four Negro youths in the Manhattan subway. But no one marched in New York City. No students camped outside New York's City Hall. No one demanded that Federal troops be sent to New York or that the New York National Guard be federalized to protect protesters walking through Harlem. The double standard prevailed throughout most of the Nation.

And what was behind the drive in Alabama? Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, senior correspondents for the New York Herald Tribune, candidly reported that the principal agitation group in Selma had been infiltrated by "beatniks, leftwing revolutionaries, and, worst of all, by Communists."

This grim period of national hysteria, which has caused the Johnson administration to try to virtually lynch six Southern States, is a classic of revolutionary warfare. Lenin would smile and approve of what has happened. The greatest country in the world, with important business to transact, has been turned upside down by street demonstrators who know how to create phony martyrs and how to plunge quiet, comfortable communities into scenes from a Russian novel of revolution.

The crisis in Alabama was a synthetic crisis, created for the purpose of promoting strife. The Nation was tricked into stumbling into an emotional trap. Unless it can regain its sanity and prevent future attacks of hysteria, there's no telling what will happen to the Republic.

Winning Essay on "What My Country Means to Me"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, recently the Junior Chamber of Commerce of North Dakota sponsored an essay contest among the schoolchildren of the State. The topic assigned was "What My Country Means To Me."

Winner of first place in this contest, Miss Betty Zettel, of Langdon, N. Dak., has done an excellent job in stating simply and directly what so many of us feel, but often are unable to express.

Miss Zettel, a member of the seventh grade class at St. Alphonsus School, and the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James Zettel, of Langdon, is a fine example of today's youth. The promise held by such young people makes the outlook for our country's future bright indeed.

Since I feel that this essay expresses so well the sentiments all of us feel, I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT MY COUNTRY MEANS TO ME

(By Miss Betty Zettel)

My country means home to me. I think America is the best place in the whole wide world to live. It offers anything and everything any one of us could ever ask for. We have the right to speak or write our thoughts and opinions freely as long as we do not injure others. We are free to worship in any way we please and at any church we choose. We have the right to vote by secret ballot for the men who are to represent us in the government. We have the opportunity to obtain a free education at least through high school, and a chance to develop our abilities and talents. We can start a business, take up a profession, or work at any job we choose. We have the right to own a home, an automobile—in fact, as much property as we wish or can afford to buy. We can move freely about our own State or country. No American has to ask permission to take his family into any State in the Union.

We are free to join any organization we wish and to attend their meetings except, of course, those that work against our country's welfare. We are free to read what we wish and listen to what we wish. We are free to find the facts on any subject. We believe that every person deserves respect as a human being, no matter who he is. We believe in fairplay and in justice for all. Our swift planes and trains, our many schools, our broad farms and busy cities, our bridges, dams, and factories have grown out of the hard work, skill, and sacrifice of early Americans who lived very differently than we do today.

I want to learn all I am able to while I am going to school so I will better understand what is going on in my country. When I grow up, I want to do my share to keep America the wonderful place that it is to live in. America was founded on the idea that human beings are entitled to live in freedom. We believe that our democratic government and our way of life promises more liberty and happiness to more people than any other system of government. We are proud and thankful to be Americans.

Today a serious threat to democracy is communism. I am glad I live in a country which is free from communism. I pray that it will always stay that way. I will never understand how people can live in a place where God has been shut out, I hope someday soon the leaders of these countries will realize how wrong they are and abolish communism forever.

It is easy for us to take our freedom for granted and to believe that we shall continue to enjoy our democratic way of life. But we Americans must remember that the struggle for freedom never ends.

Let us be proud and grateful that we are Americans. Let us remember, too, that we in

turn must believe in and defend our country if we wish to remain a great and free nation. God bless America.

Utah Prepares for Golden Spike Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, one of the great events in the history of this country took place on May 10, 1869, at Promontory Summit, Utah. This was the ceremony at which the famous golden spike was driven, marking the completion of the first transcontinental railway. Members of the Utah Congressional delegation have joined in sponsorship of a bill for the purpose of establishing a national monument at the spot where the joining of the railroads occurred. The centennial of this event will occur in 1969, just 4 years from now. The State of Utah is already making plans to mark this 100th anniversary. It is to be hoped that Congress will take early action on the bill to create a Golden Spike national monument so that a properly marked area, complete with necesary facilities for visitors, can be ready for use during the centennial events.

An editorial appeared in the Sunday, April 4, 1965, issue of the Ogden Standard-Examiner, of Ogden, Utah, the largest daily paper in the First Congressional District, which sets forth with clarity the hopes of the people of Utah for early action on this bill and likewise for a well-planned and successful commemoration of the 100th anniversary of this historic event.

The editorial follows:

TIME NEARS FOR GOLDEN SPIKE FETE—FEDERAL MONUMENT PLANS SHUFFLED

Five weeks from tomorrow the Golden Spike Association of Box Elder County will conduct its 14th annual reenactment of the historic driving of the golden spike at Promontory Summit.

This traditional event has been drawing increased attention in recent years as interest builds toward the 1969 centennial celebration.

The original spike was driven on May 10, 1869.

Just what form the 1969 centennial will take remains to be seen. But, take our word for it, there'll be a celebration that northern Utah will remember for a long time.

This is not to take any credit or attention away from the Box Elder County folks who will put on this year's pageant at Promontory.

If it were not for Bernice Gibbs Anderson and the other faithful members of her Golden Spike Association, this lonely spot at Promontory Summit would not now even have its modest, battered monument.

The summit would have been taken over by weeds.

As it is, the association has kept alive—with its annual reenactment—the memories that occupy such a rich chapter in Utah history.

But it's time these people had some help.

That's what State and Federal agencies intend to provide.

In the lead soon will be the 11-member Golden Spike Centennial Commission authorized by the recent session of the Utah Legislature.

The commission membership is yet to be appointed by Gov. Calvin L. Rampton. He is taking his time working out the group's composition since the centennial law does not become effective until July 1.

It is hoped that the commissioners will be representative of the many groups in our area who have been active in making sure that the historic site is not neglected.

Meantime, there's also activity in Washington, according to reports to the Ogden Standard-Examiner from Senators FRANK E. MOSS and WALLACE F. BENNETT and Representatives LAURENCE J. BURTON and DAVID S. KING.

What's particular pleasing is that despite their 2-to-2 Democratic-Republican split, the Utah congressional delegates are finally burying partisan differences and showing signs of unity on the Golden Spike project.

A proposal has been before Congress for some time for creation of a Golden Spike National Manument that will include a long strip of the old right of way and space at Promontory Summit for a suitable intepretive museum.

There also has been some support for a plan that would have the national monument created by presidential proclamation.

The proclamation was almost issued last year, in time for the 1964 celebration, but ran into a technical snarl within the Interior Department legal division and one of the House committees involved.

Because of the interest expressed by Senators BENNETT and MOSS and Representatives KING and BURTON, the National Park Service recently sent a team from its Santa Fe regional office to take a fresh look at the Golden Spike monument site.

Just what these experts will recommend is not yet known, although their report is expected to be made public soon.

Their suggestions will cover not only what physical form the project should take but just how it should be developed and managed.

There is a possibility that the designation of "national monument" will be changed, in line with a Park Service program to attain uniform nomenclature within its system.

In this case, it would remain a national historic site—but its status would be upgraded.

Whether a monument or a historic site, we don't care—so long as proper attention is secured. In fact, it already is a historic site by proclamation, although on a lowly level.

One consideration by the Congressmen who will study necessary appropriations will be how actively local residents are supporting the Golden Spike Monument and/or Historic Site.

Approval by the Utah Legislature of the Golden Spike Centennial Commission law should be taken in Washington as concrete support among Utahans.

Another way to demonstrate our interest in the long-range plans will be to get behind the Golden Spike Association for the 1965 reenactment on this May 10.

Job Placement Center, Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, in line with President Johnson's equal employment opportunity program, the League of United Latin-American Citizens, in cooperation with the Department of the Navy, has established a job placement center at Houston, Tex. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the remarks made by Mr. Girard P. Clark, Director, Equal Employment Opportunity Program, Department of the Navy, at the opening ceremonies on April 10, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF MR. GIRARD P. CLARK

What we do here today—the dedication of this job placement center for Spanish-speaking Americans—is the product of a year-old dream of the Department of the Navy and the League of United Latin-American Citizens.

We of Navy had long been conscious of the fact that the President's equal employment opportunity program was not for one minority alone, but for all those Americans who are limited in their pursuits by the shade of their skin or the accent of their speech or even by their family names.

The second largest minority group in the Nation is made up of some 5 million Americans with Spanish surnames. The great majority of these Americans live in the Southwest—from Texas to California. Throughout that vast area they suffer the greatest unemployment and underemployment, the least education and the lowest utilization of any group.

Despite these facts, the Federal Government's equal employment opportunity program had practically no meaning for these Americans until 1964. It was little more than a year ago that the Department of the Navy and the leadership of LULAC, working together, pinpointed the problem—the lack of employment recruitment sources—and resolved to do something about it.

The field specialists of the Navy's equal employment opportunity program and the Navy contractors work as a team in implementing the Executive orders. The contractors realize that by recruiting, hiring, and upgrading minority group people, they are not only complying with a Presidential order, they are tapping the greatest unused source of talent and ability in our country. They stand ready to do this—but they cannot be expected to recruit door to door.

It falls then upon our field specialists to give our contractors the advice and guidance they need to do the job. But, until today, there was virtually no agency that our contractors could use that would inform them of any flow of qualified Latin-American candidates for employment.

Now at last, in the city of Houston, we have made our beginning.

The opening of this center is a tribute to the hard work and spirit and vision of the League of United Latin-American Citizens Council—and the other LULAC Councils of Houston. The opening of this center is the climax of a year of planning—it is the beginning of a vital program that, to truly succeed, must spread from the shores of the Gulf of Mexico to the shores of the Pacific—it is the promise of a future where all Spanish-speaking Americans will take their full and proper place in the economic structure of a thriving America.

Whether we succeed in this great endeavor depends on what we accomplish here in Houston. If LULAC, and the employers, and the Federal Government, working together, achieve success with this center—then we really will have made our beginning and we will surely keep our promise.

I could not begin to cite all of the wonderful people who were involved and are involved in making this dream come true. But I do want to pay a special tribute to two men who played a major role in the establishment of this center and are destined to play an even greater role in the future of the Spanish-speaking Americans of the Southwest.

I speak particularly of a leader of great imagination and greater dedication, the national president of LULAC, William Bonilla—and of a leader of the Navy's field program and, for all practical purposes, the field director of Navy's program for Spanish-speaking Americans, Roberto Ornelas.

I am sure many of you heard President Johnson giving his recent speech to the joint session of Congress on the subject of the rights of minorities. In that speech he said:

"My first job after college was as a teacher in Cotulla, Tex., in a small Mexican-American school. Few of them could speak English and I would not speak much Spanish. My students were poor and they often came to class without breakfast—hungry. And they knew, even in their youth the pain of prejudice. They never seemed to know why people disliked them, but they knew it was so because I saw it in their eyes.

"I often walked home late in the afternoon after the classes were finished wishing there was more that I could do. But all I knew was to teach them the little that I knew—hoping that it might help them against the hardships that lay ahead.

"Somehow you never forget what poverty and hatred can do when you see its scars on the hopeful face of a young child.

"I never thought then in 1928 that I would be standing here in 1965. It never even occurred to me in my fondest dreams that I might have the chance to help the sons and daughters of these people and to help people like them all over this country.

"But now I do have that chance and I will let you in on a secret—I mean to use it.

"And I hope that you will use it with me."

Here in this center lies the opportunity for us to do what the President asked—to join with him in helping the sons and daughters of those early students of his and many thousands of others who have perhaps been denied a proper chance.

Let us move ahead, then, with the task that lies before us and with high hopes for the success of this and the other job placement centers which I feel sure will follow.

Farmer Almost Forgotten in Rehash of Old and Present Farm Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the appendix of the record an editorial appearing in the Huron S. Dak., Plainsman which points out very eloquently the very serious shortcomings of the administration's farm bill proposal.

The editorial follows:

FARMER ALMOST FORGOTTEN IN REHASH OF OLD AND PRESENT FARM PROGRAMS

As many farm leaders had feared, the administration's farm program offers little that is new and practically nothing that is helpful to the farmer.

The revised wheat program will shift the cost of wheat supports almost entirely from the Government to the consumer.

The increase of domestic wheat certificates from 75 cents to $1.25 per bushel—estimated to raise the cost of a loaf of bread one cent—will increase the price paid for domestic wheat to the producer from $2 to $2.50 per bushel. This is roughly 100 percent of parity.

But the increase in domestic price is very nearly offset by the abolition of Government-subsidized export certificates, which will subtract 30 cents a bushel from the price the farmer has been receiving for export wheat. He will now receive $1.25 a bushel, the equivalent of the world market price on the farm.

While this change may be welcomed by some as a step in the direction of removing Government subsidies from surplus crops, it will net the farmer an increase of only about 10 cents a bushel for the wheat he raises, or about one-fifth the 50 cents a bushel he lost last year.

The cropland conversion program appears to be the old soil bank under a new name. It completely ignores a pilot conservation program now in effect in 4 counties in South Dakota which would convert some croplands into grazing lands on a limited subsidy basis, and follows the old soil bank concept that land must be taken completely out of production. While the proposed plan would limit the amount of land to be retired in each county, it would provide for entire farms to be taken out of production.

The President asked for an extension of the present feed grain program, with a few minor changes. As no prices for feed grains have been mentioned, it is impossible to assess the effects of this program.

The only sound progress toward the President's announced goals of raising farm income, lowering Government costs and reducing crop production is made in the new wheat proposal, and that does not give the farmer very much. Otherwise the proposed farm plan is nothing more than a rehash of past programs that have lowered farm income to the present 74 percent of parity.

Judge Wahlstrom Guest at White House Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, from Legal Lines, concerning Judge Carl Wahlstrom, who was a guest at a White House ceremony. He was invited to the ceremony because of his knowledge of Abraham Lincoln. We, in Massachusetts, consider him an authority on our great President; and I am glad that President Johnson agrees with us. So I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE WAHLSTROM GUEST AT WHITE HOUSE CEREMONY

(By Carl E. Wahlstrom)

On Monday evening, February 8, 1965, at about 9 o'clock, our doorbell rang. I opened the door and there stood a messenger who handed me a telegram. To receive a telegram was nothing unusual as I receive several of such from lawyers and litigants asking for this and that so I paid no particular attention to this telegram, but finally I did open it. It was from the President of the United States.

I looked into space and then I looked at the telegram and then I sat down. I handed the telegram to Mrs. Wahlstrom. She looked at the telegram and then she looked into space, then she saw me sitting there with a dreamlike look on my face and quickly asked, "Well, you're going, aren't you?" I replied, "It looks like a command, so I'll have to go, I guess, but it upsets my schedule. This is the Lincoln season and I have several speaking engagements.

By tradition I am supposed to be at Classical High School at the birthday, and on Saturday, I am the principal speaker at a meeting of the Lincoln Group of Boston. I wonder how I am going to make it.

Soon I began making plans and made inquiries about planes and trains and found that if I had good luck, I could get out of Washington by plane and take care of my Boston engagement.

However, when Friday night came, all planes were grounded, but in the meantime, being suspicious that something like this might happen, I had canceled my plane reservation and made a reservation to return on the train, the Federal, to Boston which left at 10:20 p.m.

The invitation to dine with the President requested my presence at 1 o'clock. I arrived in due time and joined the others in going to the White House. There were about 100 in attendance. Several I knew and many I knew by reputation, but they were all easy to get acquainted with. After a chance to get acquainted, we were invited to go upstairs. As we did so, we passed the Marine Band dressed in their beautiful red uniforms and playing softly. We were then invited to enter the East Room—that beautifully decorated and well equipped room where so much history has been made.

In that room we found a battery of cameras and sound equipment. Twenty-five cameramen were running around hither and thither. Soon we were on the air. Then everything became quiet and the President and Mrs. Johnson entered. It was a high moment for all of us. There was no applause. The President escorted Mrs. Johnson to a chair and he went directly to the rostrum.

Mr. Johnson spoke in a deliberate, dignified manner. I had seen him in action when he was in Congress when he acted the part of a backslapping, wisecracking politician. That is all gone. The President has made up his mind that he is going to be a good President, a dignified President, a worthy representative of the American people and this he in truth is. His speech was well delivered and was a thoughtfully worked-out address. At the close of the address he was given a great standing ovation and then in a very humbly way he said to us, "After we have dined, won't you join me and we will go down to the Lincoln Memorial together."

We were then invited downstairs to a reception where we all had a chance to shake the hands of the President and our First Lady. Everybody chatted with both of them because they were so easy to talk to. Mrs. Johnson is a short, beautiful woman with a charming smile, very easy to meet. After the reception we were invited to the dining room. Tables for eight were set. I had as my immediate tablemates, first on the right, Gov. Otto Koerner of Illinois, a charming gentleman. We had something in common.

Last year I had visited the World's Fair and was so thrilled with the Lincoln-Illinois exhibit that I visited it 5 times. When I reached home, I wrote a letter to the authorities at the Exhibit complimenting them on

its uniqueness, its beauty and its usefulness. Evidently they were pleased as they sent my letter to Governor Koerner. He, too, I am told, was pleased and ordered it framed and hung at the World's Fair, at the Lincoln exhibit. He remembered the incident and he also spoke of friends of his in Massachusetts whom I also knew. Thus, he and I got off to a good start.

My companion on the left was one Adam Adams, an elderly gentleman representing the Historical Society and the Civil War Commission of Florida. I learned that he had retired from business and asked just what his business had been and to my pleasant surprise he stated, "I used to represent the State Mutual in Florida." I smiled and said that we worked for the same company because I am a director of the State Mutual. That hit him in the right place and we talked about Chandler Bullock, George White and Ladd Plumley, and others. We really became firm friends. There was another judge at the table, a president of a college, and others representing various phases of American life. I had a chance to meet our ebullient Vice President and talked to him on two occasions. I was surprised to find that he was so boyish in his looks and very eager to talk.

At the close of the luncheon, Mrs. Johnson rose and said, "My friends, now that we are together at the White House, let's go together to the Lincoln Room," and we followed her to this famous room, kept exactly the same as it was in Lincoln't day. There was the big oversized bed where prominent guests at the White House have slept. Churchill slept in this bed. It is said that all of them were somewhat disturbed about the Lincoln ghost and Mr. Johnson himself said that he counseled with the ghost as he entered the corridors outside the bedroom.

One story is told of a statesman who was terribly disturbed and could not sleep because he thought the ghost was hovering around. He recalled that he had sleeping pills in his pocket. He took a few and he did not keep the 8 o'clock appointment the next morning with the President. In the room on one of the walls hangs one of the five copies of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address as written by him. He wrote this copy for our own George Bancroft who was born in Worcester and who served as Secretary of the Navy and who was the "father of the Naval Academy." The unique thing about this copy is that it is signed in full—Abraham Lincoln—and dated.

On another wall was a painting of the President done by Douglas Volk, son of Leonard Volk the sculptor, who on the Sunday after Lincoln had been nominated for the Presidency by the Republicans came to Lincoln's home in Springfield and made molds of his face and hands. The mold of the face is the basis of every Lincoln bust which had been made. The story of the hands is rather interesting. When he came to make the mold of the right hand, he found it so swollen that none of the muscles or veins showed and so he suggested to Lincoln that he get a piece of wood or other substance and hold it in a clenched fist. Lincoln went into the woodshed and sawed off a piece of Mary's broom handle, an incident which caused him to get in trouble with Mary later. He held this, the sculptor hoping that it would bring out the muscles and the arteries but it did not. The hand as we have it today shows Lincoln holding a part of the broom handle.

We stayed in the Lincoln Room for quite a time talking and discussing the various pieces of furniture and telling stories about Lincoln. Then we were invited to go out and get into a Marine bus which would take us to the Lincoln Memorial. This was about 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Reaching the memorial we found the place crowded with people. There were a great many Negroes present. We were escorted into the memorial and invited to occupy privileged places near the base of the statue. In due time the President walked down between two lines which we formed. He walked slowly and his face looked as though he was thinking seriously. As he reached the base, a soldier helped him place a wreath thereon.

Then the President did a most significant thing. He stepped back—he raised his head and looked squarely into Lincoln's face.

He spoke not a word, but I knew what he was saying to himself. He was saying, "President Lincoln, you, too, had your troubles. You had your great difficulties but you were a man of patience, vision, courage, and good judgment and you solved the problems of the day. You preserved the Union and at the same time you freed the slaves." Then he dropped his head—he closed his eyes and he was face to face with his God. The President of the United States was praying.

Again he spoke not a word but I knew what he was saying to his God. He was saying, "God, endow me with a portion of Lincoln's wisdom, his intelligence, his patience, his courage and his good judgment so that I, too, can help solve the problems which we face today, so that I, too, can help to make this country and this world a better place in which to live." Slowly he turned—there was a serious look on his face, and slowly he walked out of the memorial and down the steps.

On the steps he was met by hundreds of people who thronged around him. I was sure that he was safe and yet I could not help but think that anything could happen because he was so close to the people. He said nothing but he had a beautiful smile on his face as he reached out both hands and as he shook hands with black and white citizens. We reentered the bus and were told we were going back to the White House but all the ceremonies were over. When we reached the White House and the bus had stopped, we put on our hats and got ready to get off the bus when the door opened and in walked President Johnson.

We removed our hats. He took off his hat and in a most humble manner he said, "My friends, I just came to thank you very much for coming down to Washington to have luncheon with Mrs. Johnson and myself. It has been a memorable occasion and I want you to know that we are very grateful to you." And, then he left. The ceremonies were all over and I prepared to go back home.

I had had a hunch for some reason or other that I might have difficulty in getting a plane. I had a reservation but had canceled it and made a reservation on the Federal, a train which left at 10:20 at night. It turned out that the Washington airport was in a fog. All planes were grounded and everybody rushed to the railroad station. The place was thronged. I was secure because I had my reservation for the homeward trip and I had a room so this gave me a chance to do some reading and writing. There were 15 cars on the train. It was delayed on the way and I did not reach Boston until just 1 hour before the time I was to make my speech.

It's Time the Pendulum Started Its Backswing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times on April 4, contained a statement by the editor, Mr. Nick B. Williams, which describes the reaction many of us have experienced to a disturbing trend in our national "cultural" life. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to commend the following editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

IT'S TIME THE PENDULUM STARTED ITS BACKSWING

(By Nick B. Williams, editor, the Los Angeles Times)

Somewhere around the spring of 1940, I took to reading the plays of Noel Coward, starting with his nearest-to-current stage hit and working backward until I stepped into something he'd written before he found his sense of humor, when he was a very young man.

The play was supposed to be frightfully shocking. I've forgotten most or maybe all of it, but as I recall it, the shocker was that a young man finally learned that his mother was a narcotic addict.

Coming as I did from the jamaica ginger belt, and long after the jake-leg epidemic of the late twenties—a bad batch of the stuff had paralyzed thousands of prohibition era scofflaws—I wasn't as frightfully shocked as a younger Coward had intended, and not nearly as astonished as I was at the awful payoff in Michael Arlen's "The Green Hat," in which an off-stage hero's suicide was attributed to a sense of guilt about a social disease, the medical term for which at the time was taboo, although nowadays it is brandished regularly in every health column in every women's magazine.

And they do tell me, although I am too young to state this categorically, that once upon a time no southern gentleman ever mentioned in the presence of ladies the noun that describes the opposite of cow, unless perhaps he was referring to the celebrated Confederate victory at that creek in Virginia, in which case he whispered the first half of it and ended up strongly by yelling "Run."

The point of all this is that times do change, and moral standards change with them. It is about time for another change, and in an opposite direction.

For in all the arts—stage, screen, painting, literature—varying degrees of depravity have come to be accepted as the prevailing custom of these times. I don't think most of us, or maybe all of us, are any worse morally than we were a few decades ago. But we have grown tolerant of vulgarity and obscenity and filth either on the basis that it amuses or that it is true to life. Or that its technical excellence is justification enough.

It seems enormously debatable to me that being true to life or technically excellent justifies any public display of filth or viciousness. Nor does the emotional impact of such a display make it excusable.

A case in point is the one-act play, "The Toilet," which indeed has been performed in other major cities of the world before it reached Los Angeles. I have not seen it but I have read it—that is, minus the brilliant work of the actors and director—but this play serves no purpose except the titillation of the horribly morbid. True to some pockets of life it well may be, but it is terrible enough that such things do occur, just as Buchenwald occurred, or Selma occurred. But I submit that a public reenactment of the physical details of Nazi bestiality at Buchenwald would be depraving. These are matters for testimony in courts of law, but not for the stage.

Which brings me to a professional issue. I do not think it is enough for critics to explain, however explicitly, that such a play is sordid, and then, in praising the excellence of the acting or the impact of its viciousness, to leave the public with the notion that technical excellence somehow justifies its per-

formance. For that concept could be extended far beyond abnormalities and brutalities, even to the routine alimentary functions that so depressed Jonathan Swift.

Criticism, it seems to me, should be more than the recording of shock power, more than a recognition of skills, more than a recitation of fact. Criticism also should measure comparative worth, as critics have measured Beethoven's or Shakespeare's worth, or Hammerstein's or Steinbeck's, or Michelangelo's or Noel Coward's—and should treat with brief contempt the unworthy.

The ultimate in criticism is silence. And the ultimate weapon of the public should be not censorship or police judgment; it should be the individual refusal to yield to prurient curiosity, and to stay away.

President Johnson's Vietnam Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "President's Vietnam Speech Rates a 'Statesmanlike' Mark," published in the Great Falls, Mont., Tribune of April 8, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S VIETNAM SPEECH RATES A "STATESMANLIKE" MARK

President Johnson's speech Wednesday about Vietnam already is being hailed throughout the world as a constructive and statesmanlike address. We think historians will agree with that assessment.

While emphasizing this Nation will not retreat from its obligations to defend South Vietnam from aggressors, the President declared the United States is ready for unconditional discussions of a Vietnam peace.

He stated he would ask Congress to join in a $1 billion American investment in a massive economic development program for southeast Asia. He urged other prosperous countries and especially Russia to join in the effort to raise living standards of those needy nations.

The President invited international cooperation under United Nations leadership in the program to "replace despair with hope and terror with progress." He pointed out that man today has the awesome power to destroy civilization or to take advantage of our technology to eliminate hunger and want from the world.

Stressing that the United States would not grow tired of living up to its Vietnam obligations or withdraw under the cloak of a meaningless agreement, the President said the central lesson of modern times was that there could be no retreat from aggression. If we surrender one area to an aggressor, we will have to prepare in another country for another aggressive move, he maintained.

"We will always oppose the effort of one nation to conquer another," the President declared after he said "no nation had reason to think we want to annex any land or impose our will on another nation."

We hope the talk leads to immediate peace discussions and an end to Vietcong terrorism and United States and South Vietnam retaliatory raids on North Vietnam.

The President's proposal is a realistic approach to a difficult and almost hopeless problem that has involved the United States in the Vietnam jungles since 1954.

The French were forced to leave Vietnam in 1954 after failing to defeat the Vietcong even though France had 300,000 professional troops and superior air and naval power on the scene. The French simply lacked support of the people.

Prospects for our military program to win general cooperation of the Vietnamese, plagued with political instability, endless governmental coups, deep religious differences, and general tiredness after 20 years of war, are not promising.

Our key hope in South Vietnam is to get the people there to want to govern themselves and to raise their living standards and morale to the point they themselves can discourage any aggressive plays by the Vietcong, North Vietnam, and Communist China.

We can accomplish that better, cheaper, and without the loss of American blood by an international economic aid program than by years of reacting to terrorism with bombs and bullets. The President opened the door leading to peace. It's now up to North Vietnam and Communist China to determine whether the war will continue.

The Excise Tax on Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which was published on February 25, 1965, in the Mount Dora Topic. I believe that the nature of the editorial, dealing as it does with a tax on communications and a question of congressional review, demands that it have a greater reading public than normally would be available to it.

The editorial follows:

HINGE DECISION ON JUSTICE, EQUITY

President Johnson's budget has made it abundantly clear that the Federal Government has no present intention at least—of giving up the lush proceeds of the telephone excise tax. Uncle Sam's total take on the combined local and toll service tax, at 10 percent, will exceed $1 billion in 1965. This is a lot of money, even in Federal fiscal circles; and when you add to that the fact that virtually escape-proof collection, via the telephone companies, doesn't cost the Federal Government anything at all, it is easy to understand why the Treasury loathes to let go of such a good thing.

But the decision of Congress on whether to repeal this unfair and discriminatory tax on the telephone subscriber does not, and should not, turn on such simple reasons of expediency—the large amount, and the sure and easy collection agency. The decision ought to turn on more objective standards of justice and equity.

The telephone excises were, as we have been reminded many times, established as emergency wartime levies, designed among other things to cut down the unnecessary use of overburdened plants during a period when expansion of such customer services interfered with the war effort. It was put on the tax books along with the higher taxes on liquor, jewelry, furs, cosmetics, and other so-called luxuries, which telephone service certainly is not.

Now President Johnson agrees to cut out the nuisance taxes on jewelry, cosmetics, furs, etc., but nothing is said about the much greater nuisance tax on customer use of a much more essential service—the telephone.

What is the big idea? What became of all the political sweet talk during the presidential election campaign, notably by Treasury Secretary Dillon, to the effect that the telephone excise tax was on the way out?

The plain fact is that the telephone subscriber will be in much worse condition than ever before if the President's budget recommendations are adopted by Congress. It will mean that the telephone subscriber is going to be stuck with the excise tax for the indefinite future, if not forever.

What other meaning can we give the words of the President's budget when, after asking for a total excise reduction of $1.75 billion, he adds the following language: "The proposed legislation also will make permament all the taxes that are continued. It will replace temporary legislation under which excises taxes on * * * general telephone service automatically would be reduced or would expire after June 30, 1965."

Under the present law, in other words, it takes an affirmative act of Congress to extend the general telephone excise tax every year or else it would expire. This at least gives telephone companies the opportunity of reminding Congress and the American people every year that they are still being burdened by a so-called war emergency tax 20 years after the war is over. If the Johnson administration budget, on this item, goes through Congress as requested, then even this safeguard is gone for good. The telephone excise tax is likely to be frozen permanently into the pattern of the U.S. tax structure.

There must be a last-ditch, never-say-die effort to retain the annual congressional review of any telephone tax which survives. The administration is most vulnerable here because it is plainly engaged in political doubletalk if not doubledealing by promising to entertain tax repeal last October, and then not only trying to throw it out in January, but also to lock the door after it and throw away the key.

The telephone companies should be able to win on this at least. Congress in its own self-interest should respond to a united appeal to hold on to its own authority of deciding whether to extend this tax every year.

There has to be agreement between the Bell and independents as to what they really want to do. Then both branches of the industry must go right down to the wire without any foot dragging, or separate negotiations, or second thoughts. The choice is clear for the entire industry. To be or not to be a Federal tax collector forever. This must be decided now. Otherwise it will surely be too late.

War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the administration's poverty headquarters here in Washington is now getting organized. Forty-five positions, ranging in annual salary from $18,935 to $30,000, have been established. The top five

positions are noncareer Executive Pay Act positions; and the remaining 40 are under civil service and have been approved by the Civil Service Commission. I ask unanimous consent that a list of these positions, prepared by the Senate Republican policy committee, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Yearly
Director	$30,000
Deputy Director	28,500
1st Assistant Director	27,000
2d Assistant Director	27,000
3d Assistant Director	27,000
An assistant	24,500
Do	24,500
Do	24,500
Do	24,500
Do	24,500
Do	24,500
Do	24,500
Do	24,500
Do	24,500
Another assistant	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Another kind of assistant	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935

Wilkins, Master Rights Strategist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 11, Roy Wilkins, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, marked 10 years of devoted, outstandingly distinguished, and progressive service to the making of democracy in America viable and secure for all its citizens.

All Americans of every race, creed, color, and national origin, and all of the nations of the world whose hope is in freedom, liberty, and justice owe to this man a debt incalculable which will live throughout the entire history of man. No words can express our honoring of him and our profound gratitude. On behalf of the 13th District of Michigan, which I represent, a district dynamic and committed to the highest democratic principles, and for myself personally, I say may God bless, preserve, and continue the creative utilization of Roy Wilkins in this vital cause to which he has given his iron commitment:

WILKINS, MASTER RIGHTS STRATEGIST

(By Claude Lewis)

Just as no one man can speak for all Americans, no one Negro can speak for all Negro Americans. But the man who comes closest to representing America's 22 million Negroes is Roy Wilkins, the 63-year-old executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. Wilkins, a onetime newspaperman who joined the NAACP staff almost 34 years ago, will celebrate his 10th anniversary as head of the Nation's oldest, largest, and most potent civil rights organization on April 11. And these past 10 years have been the stormiest and most tumultuous in NAACP history.

During a statewide voter registration campaign in Mississippi, for instance, two NAACP leaders of the drive were murdered.

The passage of the first went to Mississippi to address a memorial service, and under his direction the association Civil Rights Act in 82 years came in 1957. That year Little Rock, Ark., made headlines around the world as the NAACP helped nine Negro students gain admittance to a previously all-white school. Mr. Wilkins was in constant consultation with Mrs. Daisy Bates, who as Arkansas State NAACP president was the leader in the successful desegregation effort.

In 1961 Mr. Wilkins, as chairman of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, and Arnold Aronson, the conference secretary, helped to establish the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, which provided for broader procedures to enforce antidiscrimination provisions.

ARRESTED

In 1963 Mr. Wilkins was arrested while picketing an F. W. Woolworth store in Jackson, Miss., along with the late Medgar Evers, who was shot in ambush just 12 days later.

"The entire staff of the NAACP has worked very, very hard," Mr. Wilkins said in his office last week. "We've had to. There was a great deal to be accomplished and I believe we've been unusually successful."

Of particular significance is the growth of the NAACP itself. During the last decade, when more civil rights groups emerged than in any other period, NAACP membership nearly doubled, from 240,000 in 1954 to the current 455,150. Over the same period the number of branches in 50 States increased from 1,350 to 1,948.

Although the NAACP's income climbed from $466,065 in 19544 to $1,116,565 in 1964, its work is still hampered by a lack of necessary funds. "We have never had enough money," Mr. Wilkins says with a smile, "but I don't know anyone who has."

"I am especially proud of the youngsters," he goes on. "They have brought a selfless determination and an unusual amount of imagination and energy to the cause. They have become an important part of the movement all over the country."

Under Mr. Wilkins, the NAACP staff has frown from 68 persons in 1954 to 125 now. The organization's official publication, Crisis, has almost quadrupled its circulation to 112,000 over the last decade.

Jim Hicks, editor of New York's weekly Amsterdam News, says Mr. Wilkins' success over the last 10 years stems mainly from the fact that he grew up within the organization. "On balance," says Mr. Hicks, "Roy Wilkins is perhaps the most important civil rights leader in America. He possibly slowed down the tempo of the NAACP during the last 10 years, but he never slowed the pace. I think Roy is running the organization with a cooler motor."

STRATEGIST

"I am convinced that violence is not the answer to the racial problem," says Mr. Wilkins. "The Negro has to be a superb diplomat and a great strategist. He has to parlay what actual power he has along with the good will of the white majority. He has to devise and pursue those philosophies and activities which will least alienate the majority opinion. And that doesn't mean the Negro has to indulge in bootlicking. But he must gain the sympathy of the large majority of the American public. He must also seek to make an identification with the American tradition."

On many occasions during the past 10 years Mr. Wilkins has been discouraged. "There was a time not long ago," Mr. Wilkins says, "that the organization seemed to be attacked from all sides. It was like being on center stage with darts coming at us from every conceivable angle. Some people said we were too moderate, others said we were too militant, some said we weren't doing enough, and still others said we were moving too fast. It almost appeared as though we weren't accomplishing anything. I've got to admit, a couple of years ago I was down in the dumps."

Mr. Wilkins isn't in the dumps too often. But the death of Medger Evers in 1963 had him at an all-time low. "Many of our people have been lost in the battle," Mr. Wilkins said last week, "but some how I was particularly close to Medger. And part of the impact came because I had been to see him less than 2 weeks before his death." Mr. Wilkins paused, then picked a piece of lint off his handsome dark blue suit. "Just like that," he said, dropping the thread into a wastebasket. "Medger was gone. He was a great fieldworker, and a wonderful human being."

Roy Wilkins is proud of NAACP successes. "I think the two incidents which stand out in my mind most during my 10 years as executive director is the success of the Little Rock fight, and the day a few years ago that 24 Negro teachers in Ellery, S.C., listed their NAACP membership when they knew it would cost them their jobs. I have never been more proud of anything in my life. Those teachers showed they believed in the NAACP and they didn't care who knew it. This kind of dedication keeps us going."

MARTYR

Another kind of encouragement came this past Friday after Mrs. Viola G. Liuzzo, a 39-year-old white mother of five children was shot to death on an Alabama road. Mrs. Liuzzo, a member of the Detroit NAACP, was aiding Dr. Martin Luther King's march to Montgomery, when a bullet ended her life.

Mr. Wilkins was deeply grieved at Mrs. Liuzzo's death, but he was impressed with President Johnson's immediate response to the incident. "Like so many of our friends of freedom, Mrs. Liuzzo joined the lengthening list of martyrs in the fight for equality," Mr. Wilkins said. "She earned martyrdom on a lonely Alabama road."

Mr. Wilkins sent a telegram to Mr. Liuzzo offering the deep sympathies of the NAACP and another to President Johnson expressing appreciation of his call to the FBI to work around the clock to apprehend Mrs. Liuzzo's slayers.

Roy Wilkins would like to write a book on civil rights. "There are so many myths circulating that I would like to set the record straight," he says. But he admits that he doesn't know when he'll find the time to write. Someone suggested that perhaps on his retirement he could find time.

"Retirement?" snapped Mr. Wilkins. "How do you retire from freedom?"

"Voting Bill: The Abuse of Power"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Voting Bill: The Abuse of Power." The article was written by the Honorable Henry J. Taylor, and was published in the April 12, 1965, issue of the Roanoke Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTING BILL: THE ABUSE OF POWER

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The intelligent attack on President Johnsons' voting rights bill is based on a fundamental:

Good labels do not constitute good legislation. Neither do good objectives. Any conscientious citizen must want to see voting rights protected, and they certainly need a great deal of protecting the way things stand in our country today. That fact shouldn't even be argued. But finally we must live with the actual law.

The broad and impressive complaint is that the terms of this bill, as written, represent a foray into the jungles of autocratic government.

Whoever the Federal Attorney General may be (and the current one admittedly wrote this bill) becomes of himself the law. Yet our Nation's fundamental intent is to have a government by law and not men.

The problem of fairness to minorities and equal fairness to the majority goes on forever. But autocratic government does not mean a balance of legal rights. It means a confrontation of pure power. And it spreads like a wasting disease.

In time, some sort of protection becomes necessary for everybody. We all need more and more help just to be left alone. More and more people must rely on political friends and accomplices. All life becomes a question of "Who do you know?"

The result is a political paradise, but it is also tyranny's playground.

The bill appears to contradict its own antidiscriminatory claims. Its terms discriminate against about 10 of our 50 States and, in effect, limits its enforcement to these.

It doesn't contend that the other 40 States are pure. Nor are they pure by the bill's own terms. It merely zeroes in on the 10 for reasons so flagrantly political and discriminatory that even Chairman Emanuel Celler of the House Judiciary Committee has called the bill "a hash."

For example, Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach exempts New York State by condoning the State's eighth grade education test. Why? He declares that educational qualification is discrimination in some other States.

Texas, likewise, escapes neatly. Mr. Katzenbach personally exempted it; easy as that. He testified: "Texas is out for the reason that it does not have a literacy test."

Other States among the 10 under attack have no literacy test—but the Attorney General selects Texas for exemption. Why?

Then the Attorney General, Mr. Johnson's appointee, again exempts Texas in applying another provision:

The Supreme Court is supposed to interpret our Constitution. Yet in this bill the Federal Attorney General may (or not, as he chooses, and he chose to exempt Texas) indict a whole or any part of a State as "violating the Constitution of the United States" if 50 percent of the area's people of voting age were not registered to vote on November 1, 1964.

In fact, if 50 percent didn't choose to vote in the last presidential election the Attorney General can make the area automatically guilty of his indictment.

This lets him send in Federal registrars. Attorney General Katzenbach testified that he'll extend his authority to all elections—Federal, State, local—as well as all primaries and even to voting on bond issues, school projects, etc.

The Attorney General (not a court) interprets what he thinks should be the voting laws, ordinances, and practices in the State, county, township, or community. The Federal registrars are there to enforce his interpretation. And they're there indefinitely. What a gold mine for Federal payrollers and campaigners. Racial discrimination, of course, need not even be proven.

Can you imagine a sweeter setup for State and local bosses who are in bed with the administration? How hard will it be for them to keep the Federal registrars out? And imagine the pressure available against political opponents by threatening to send registrars in.

Space doesn't allow disclosing dozens of additional subsurface features buried in the bill—the strange way it treats poll taxes in one State compared to another, property qualifications in one State compared to another, etc.

The trappings of the White House can create their own intoxications. The population explosion may be the problem elsewhere but the power explosion is our problem in Washington.

"Lynching" the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, a brief but penetrating analysis of the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 appeared in the April 12 U.S. News & World Report. Written by David Lawrence, this editorial properly observes that the proposed new law would "bypass the customary judicial process of proving guilt and then imposing punishment, and would set up instead of blanket indictment and punish certain States on the basis of an arbitrary formula of presumptive guilt."

And, as Mr. Lawrence further notes:

The proposed measure does not apply uniformly to the States of the Union. It selects certain States and uses arbitrary yardsticks to punish such States and their subdivisions.

This article is well worth reading by friends as well as foes of the proposal:

"LYNCHING" THE STATES

(By David Lawrence)

Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., Democrat, of North Carolina, a former associate justice of the supreme court of his State, was interrogating Charles A. Bloch, a noted constitutional lawyer, before the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 29. Mr. Bloch, who was testifying in opposition to the proposed voting law, was asked the following question by Senator ERVIN:

"Now I would like to ask you this: The only reason we hear for this bill—which would nullify or suspend section 2 of article I of the Constitution and the 17th amendment and the provision reserving to the States the rights not vested in the United States by the Constitution—is that it requires time to litigate a case in court.

"I will ask you if that is not exactly the same argument, or rather the same 'justification,' a mob uses when it lynches a man? It says: 'We know this man is guilty, and we're not going to waste any time trying him because it will take some time.' Is that not exactly the argument of a mob?"

"Yes," replied Mr. Bloch. "This ought to be called a State lynching law—a law to provide for the lynching of certain States. And that is what it does."

Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, in a statement on April 2, pointed out that Attorney General Katzenbach recently testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee as follows:

"The judicial process, upon which all existing remedies depend, is institutionally inadequate to deal with practices so deeply rooted in the social and political structure."

Like the court-packing scheme of 1937, the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 seeks to do indirectly what cannot be done directly. It would bypass the customary judicial process of proving guilt and then imposing punishment, and would set up instead a blanket indictment and punish certain States on the basis of an arbitrary formula of presumptive guilt.

Today a large majority of Members of both House of Congress are said to be in favor of the bill, which flagrantly violates the Constitution in many respects. For the proposed measure does not apply uniformly to all States of the Union. It selects certain States and uses arbitrary yardsticks to punish such States and their subdivisions.

Thus, the Attorney General would be able to abolish literacy tests in States or localities in which less than 50 percent of the voting-age population was registered or voted in the 1964 election. But the mere fact that there was such a voting or registration percentage does not constitute any proof or racial discrimination.

The administration's proposed law also violates the long-established doctrine that a statute passed by a State is presumed to be constitutional until its enforcement is tested in the courts. States and counties which fall within the 50-percent category of voters and have literacy or other tests would in the future have to go to a special court to get approval of any new voter-qualification law before it may be enforced. This procedure is unique in legal history and disregards the constitutional principle that the courts can decide only actual cases or controversies under specific laws.

The bill, moreover, permits—without a hearing—an arbitrary withdrawal from the citizen of the right to vote, and thus breaks down what is known as "due process of law." A person might have been ill or out of the country and yet, in certain States, he could lose his right to vote if he hasn't voted once in 3 years.

If the new bill becomes law, an illiterate in one State could be permitted to register and vote, while in another State an illiterate could not.

Under the American system of law, a person is presumed innocent until proved guilty by a court or jury. But under the new bill, the Federal Govenment would not have to prove that there had been denial of voting rights before imposing the penalties of the law. The State or its subdivisions would instead have to prove before a special court in the District of Columbia that, in the previous 10 years, there had not been a single

instance of abridgment or denial of the right to vote for reasons of race or color—something that would be virtually impossible to prove anywhere.

The Constitution explicitly gives to the States the right to establish voter qualifications. It does not grant to Congress any power to disregard other articles of the Constitution just because the 15th amendment says that no State shall deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race or color.

The Supreme Court can declare unconstitutional State laws which violate this provision. The courts can punish officials who administer voting laws on the basis of racial discrimination. But can Congress abolish State laws which are constitutional on their face?

So the whole procedure is a roundabout way to avoid customary judicial processes. Instead, certain States in the Union, adjudged in advance to be guilty, must be punished according to capricious devices.

This is truly a system of "lynching" the States.

Importance of the Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State, of Columbia, S.C., has printed in its April 5, 1965, issue a most eloquent and sound editorial against the administration's proposed cutbacks in the Soil Conservation Service. I concur wholeheartedly in the comments in this editorial, which is entitled "Saving the Soil." There is no more important resource to protect and preserve in our country than our soil. The fight against soil erosion in this country, which has been very successfully waged by the Soil Conservation Service, has been one of our Nation's most effective weapons in the war against poverty. It is, indeed, strange that the administration, now sailing under the colors of fighting poverty, attempts at this time to cut back on a program which has done so much to preserve one of our most important natural resources, both for today and for many years in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Apr. 5, 1965]

SAVING THE SOIL

The ways of Federal finance frequently are beyond our comprehension, and the current plan to cut back on allocations for the Soil Conservation Service is a case in point.

Of all the agricultural programs adopted by the National Government, soil conservation seems to us the wisest and most deserving. In the long run, viewed from the standpoint of the Nation's needs, it may prove to be one of the most efficient and most economical ventures ever made in the field of land management.

Only a few inches of topsoil stand between humanity and starvation, and it's plain commonsense to preserve, or conserve if you please, that invaluable resource. When the erosive effects of wind, rain, and flood eat away at the land, the damage is not only to the farmer but to his community and to the country at large.

For 30 years now, the Soil Conservation Service has been battling the forces of nature in an unending struggle to curb the ravages of erosion, and to stabilize (or improve) the land of America. To an unparalleled degree, the work has been carried forward as a partnership between Government technicians and private farmers.

The greatest contribution made by the Soil Conservation Service has been in providing the technical skills and scientific planning which lie beyond the reach of the ordinary farmer. The program itself is largely controlled by farmers and landowners who have banded together in soil conservation districts for their mutual benefit—and that of the entire district.

Multiplied as they are throughout the entire country, these districts have made and are making notable contributions to proper land use and water control. The SCS program does not involve crop controls, Federal grants, or subsidies, or even retirement of farmlands from production. It aims solely at conserving the soil and water resources of the Nation, repairing the damages of yesteryear, improving the land resources of today's farmers, and insuring the availability of farmlands for the future.

If the program can be administered more economically, or if the total costs involved can be reduced, we stand ready to applaud any sensible efforts in that direction. But it seems strange that the services now being offered American farmers as part of the national goal of conservation should be curtailed at the very time that the administration is appropriating new millions for the avowed purpose of "helping the farmer" and overcoming rual poverty.

We get the feeling that there are some loose connections in the thought processes of the agricultural braintrusters of Washington.

Time To Look at the Lemmings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Eric Sevareid recently noted the rising incidences of physical turmoil between urbanized mankind, and prophesied:

Other things being equal, lack of space is very probably doing more harm to physical and mental well-being than lack of leisure, and once this proposition is more fully accepted, sociologists are going to redirect their energies and doctors are going to sit on city planning commissions as they now sit on sanitation commissions.

I find much of interest in Mr. Sevareid's hypothesis. It gives added justification to the calls of America's conservationists for better water pollution control, expanded park and public lands programs, outdoor recreation, realistic zoning, planning, and land use programs, and other activities to improve the qualities of our land for a satisfactory life.

Mr. Sevareid's article follows:

TIME TO LOOK TO THE LEMMINGS

(By Eric Sevareid)

A writer who comes directly to his typewriter after fighting a traffic jam is not entirely to be trusted; his ego, superego, and id are tangled up, their bumpers locked. What follows may therefore be circular (I do my driving in Washington), hence both inconclusive and slightly dizzy. The chief ingredients in my mental compote of the moment are French drivers, lemmings, and March hares; they need some sorting out.

With total lack of surprise I read in the Paris correspondence of my old friend, Waverley Root, that Paris autoists no longer commit merely oral assault on one another but have taken to fist fighting, usually at the end of the day and usually in competition for a parking space. There has been at least one deliberate murder.

French psychiatrists are debating the phenomenon in the public prints; their guesswork was predictable. One suggests it is the overweening sense of power and the intolerance that comes with captaincy of a powerful vehicle. Another reverts to the anthropological theory of territoriality—a car is like a man's home and he will fight for it and from it more quickly and more fiercely than would normally be the case.

Both are possible elements, but surely marginal elements, not fundamental causes. We would wager that the pugilistic drivers are ill—physically, measureably ill—and that laboratory tests would show it. They are ill of the disease that has no encompassing name but may as well be called spacelessness.

There is no particular reason we can think of why lack of parking space, in today's world, could not produce the same symptoms as lack of apartment, subway, bus, sidewalk, or office space is pretty surely producing.

Other things being equal, lack of space is very probably doing more harm to physical and mental well-being than lack of leisure, and once this proposition is more fully accepted, sociologists are going to redirect their energies and doctors are going to sit on city planning commissions as they now sit on sanitation ocmmissions.

The mysteries of the March hare and the Scandinavian lemming seem fairly well understood now, from much recent work by biochemists, among others. Every few years the population cycle produces intense crowding among North American snowshoe hares as they burrow in the snow of the long winter. Around March they can be seen bursting from their confines, leaping in contortions, then falling dead. The March hare is indeed crazy, made so by overcrowding.

It is the same with the lemming horde. Under the snow, their population doubles and triples. The search for food becomes insense. They are unable to sleep. Their sex instinct remains but not the strength to fulfill it. The varied frustrations, the lack of rest begin to produce alterations in liver functions and blood pressure. The central nervous system is directly affected.

Finally, the lemmings by millions break out and begin running. They are not running for the sea, as legend has it; they are not running for anything. They are running away.

Essentially, they are running away from themselves. They are having a mass nervous breakdown, they are sick with the diseases of stress and strain brought on by spacelessness and they run until they die.

Before they break out in their collective, contagious convulsion, they do many abnormal things, including fighting each other far more than usual. Apparently, the blood and glandular changes as measured in the lemmings in their progress toward breakdown are not fundamentally different from those registered by human beings in conditions of anxiety and strain.

Allegedly civilized, urban societies have only recently begun to think about the consequences of crowding in simple terms of the human body. The subtleties of psychiatry may be more irrelevant than we have thought. The human body requires an envelope of space as it requires its skin; exactly how much space we do not know.

Of course thousands and thousands of human beings in a city like New York are ill. They can scarcely walk, drive, sit or stand without an extra effort; they cannot set out for a given destination without some measure of anxiety about their prospects; they can rarely find quiet. They are unintentionally torturning one another simply by existing and there is little they can do about it.

The remedy of higher and higher apartment and office buildings, of more and more highways, tunnels and bridges, to accommodate the increase of people and vehicles is a palliative, not a cure. It merely magnifies the number of the eventual victims in a wider and deeper trap. When we follow this course we are looking to the rainbow when we ought to be looking to the lemming.

County Leadership in Recreation Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, county officials throughout the United States are spearheading programs for recreation development and preservation of our scenic outdoors. On April 2, the Outdoor Recreation Congress for the Pacific Northwest held sessions in Wenatchee, Wash., under sponsorship of Mr. Wilfred R. Woods, publisher of the Wenatchee Daily World.

This regional meeting was an outgrowth of a proposal which was made by a former president of the National Association of Counties, the Honorable M. James Gleason, commissioner of Multnomah County, Oreg. During his term as president, Gleason focused public attention on the problems, potential, and public responsibilities for outdoor recreation through sponsorship of a county recreation congress.

At the recent meeting, the executive director of the National Association of Counties, Mr. Bernard F. Hillenbrand, delivered an address with some suggestions for control of billboards. This subject has been of great interest to me over the years, and I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some excerpts of Mr. Hillenbrand's speech.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME SUGGESTIONS TO CONTROL BILLBOARDS

(By Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director, National Association of Counties, Washington, D.C.)

This outdoor recreation congress is a triumphant occasion. Happiness is everywhere. Thanks to the leadership of the men and organizations participating in this program and thanks to the vision of men like Publisher Wilfred R. Woods of the Wenatchee Daily World, we have come to this beautiful place to rejoice. Later, many of you will begin the happy task of developing the recreational resources of the great Pacific Northwest.

After long effort, we now have the prospects of the tools we sought to get the recreation job done. If we are fleet of foot and can get there before the States, we may get some Federal dollars to acquire new recreation facilities. We have the wilderness program. President and Mrs. Lyndon Johnson are providing national attention and direction to a real America the beautiful program. For county officials and Americans everywhere, prospects were never brighter.

BILLBOARDS

Let us now begin a new battle.

While we are still fresh and spirited and flush with victory, let us now direct our attention to the hideous billboards which continue to stink up nearly every highway in our country.

Nearly every American agrees that billboards generally are a blot on America the beautiful. But many more Americans argue that efforts to control them might interfere with property rights or the rights of private business, or even the rights of free speech.

In this battle, our mission should be to prohibit all new billboards and to eliminate existing billboards over a period of years. We would like to open the public debate by suggesting some proposals that could be effective without hardship to the billboard industry.

STATE CONTROL

The regulation and control of billboards under our Constitution quite properly is, and should continue to be, the responsibility of the respective States. The obvious way to curb billboards is through the State legislature on a statewide basis. The billboard industry, quite naturally and quite appropriately, is well organized and well financed. They certainly have, in the past, strongly opposed any effort to curb or regulate billboards. It is equally apparent, however, that the acceptance of billboards by Americans is wearing thinner by the hour. It seems to us that the more we, as a people, develop the recreational potential of our community, the less we will tolerate billboards.

Hawaii has paved the way and is the only State that prohibits all billboards. This was the result of the organized efforts of women's groups, such as the League of Women Voters, and conservation groups.

It would seem to us that the more sparsely settled Western States would be an ideal place to seek direct statewide action. The number of billboards is fewer than in large urban States, and often Western States have been more progressive and willing to enact constructive legislation than have legislatures generally.

Ideally, statewide action should include a program of both prohibition and elimination. Perhaps the States could do at least some of the job by prohibiting billboards along any new highway right-of-way.

FEDERAL BRIBES

Our second suggestion still envisions statewide action and is directed at Federal aid highways. In 1956, Congress showed great courage and leadership by including in the Federal Aid Highway Act of that year a section providing a small financial reward for any State that banned billboards within a prescribed number of feet from the interstate highway. For various reasons, these bribes have not been too effective. We would suggest that the amount of the Federal bribe be increased and that it be extended beyond interstate highways to include all federally aided highways.

LOCAL OPTION ORDINANCES

In the typical State legislature, it has been the practice to transfer controversial problems back to the localities in the form of allowing them to enact local ordinances. Therefore, our third suggestion is that if statewide action fails, counties be authorized to enact billboard ordinances.

County officials in Merced County, Calif., have shown the way with a May 1959 ordinance which reads in part:

"Any sign, billboard, commercial advertising structure, or statuary which is lawfully existing and maintained at the time this ordinance becomes effective may be continued, although such use does not conform with the provisions hereof;

"*Provided, however,* That no structural alterations are made thereto, and provided further that all such nonconforming signs, billboards, commercial advertising structures or statuary, and their supporting members, shall be completely removed from the premises not later than 15 years from the effective date of this ordinance."

It seems to us that Merced County's approach is completely reasonable. It recognizes that there is a large investment in billboards and that many people make their living through this part of the advertising industry. It allows the investors to gradually, over a 15-year period, to phase out their investment. It allows those who are employed in this line of work to move to other activities in the advertising industry. It also aids the present investors by completely prohibiting new competitive billboards from appearing along the county's roads.

Our first three suggestions are based upon regulation and control. Our fourth and final suggestion envisions special billboard taxes.

The States should enact special taxes on existing billboards, the proceeds of which should be earmarked to acquire new recreation facilities.

Perhaps the theory here is that if the public must endure billboards, they ought to be compensated in the form of additional recreation facilities.

CONCLUSION

In the past, some people who might otherwise favor eliminating billboards have argued that elimination, or even taxation, of billboards might somehow threaten free speech. This argument doesn't seem to me to have merit. We have newspapers, television, radio, and direct mail privileges open to everyone. We can rent halls, address meetings, or write letters to advertise, inform, or persuade.

As a matter of fact, I think that with each of the other means of exercising freedom of speech, we recognize the corresponding right not to hear or read. We do not have to read an editorial, attend a meeting, or listen to radio or television.

With billboards, however, this right not to listen is severely curtailed. For example, there is a billboard in my county that says we should impeach Chief Justice Earl Warren. I am forced to see that every time I pass that road and I have no protection of my right not to see.

Perhaps what is happening is that we are growing up as a nation. We expect more from America and we are getting it.

Many people are pessimistic about eliminating billboards, but all of us who have helped make the recreation dream a reality never believed 5 years ago, or even 1 year ago, that we would succeed so fast.

If we as groups acting in assemblies such as this one—will reason together, we can start in motion responsible efforts to control a blight that is a direct threat to our entire effort to make this "from sea to shining sea," America the beautiful.

Thank you.

Boycott: A Step Toward Anarchy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to bring to the attention of my colleagues the timely article written by Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council:

SENSING THE NEWS—BOYCOTT: A STEP TOWARD ANARCHY

(By Thurman Sensing)

Of all the weapons in the arsenal of the social and political agitator, none is more dangerous—for the user—than the economic boycott. Those who seek to employ it to their advantage often are surprised to discover that it is a two-edged weapon, inflicting injury on whoever picks it up and wields it. Moreover, it is a weapon that, when used or threatened, frequently antagonizes the American public.

The Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., who has proved himself a master of organizing conflict where there previously has been peace, order, and gradual progress, unquestionably overstepped himself when he urged a boycott of Alabama products. His call almost immediately brought an unfavorable response from some of his strongest supporters. The New York Times, for example, which has helped create the King myth as the Gandhi of America, found that it could not go along with a boycott. Indeed the national response has been generally disapproving.

Well it might be, for a boycott is a weapon that can only increase bad feeling in this country and multiply the divisions that already exist as a result of revolutionary street action bordering on civil insurrection. Nor has it escaped the attention of responsible citizens in all sections of the country that a boycott would do severe economic damage to the very group of citizens that Reverend King says he wants to help. How anyone could believe that his effort in behalf of civil rights is sincerely helpful, rather than coldly political, is hard to understand after his boycott proposal.

The boycott proposal is a cynical political deed, for Reverend King surely must know that such an effort could engender counterboycotts—and the trouble would be compounded. Suppose all Americans were to settle their differences in this manner. The pitting of State against State, region against region, and special interest against special interest would produce unprecedented hostility and economic chaos in the United States.

The truth is that the American economy is profoundly interrelated. Alabama's cotton and steel, for example, go into scores of products finished in other States and across the oceans. Alabama could not be made the subject of a special economic attack without attacking the whole framework of the American economic system. The wiser heads in the metropolitan centers, even if they usually praise the street demonstrators and riot specialists, know that this interrelationship is a fact of American economic life. They see the peril in any grave disruption by means of a boycott.

Knowing that his proposal must surely produce dissent from around the country, why did the organizers of the synthetic crisis in Alabama persist in calling for a boycott? The fairminded citizen can only conclude that the people attempting to reduce Alabama to conditions of permanent strife and chaos want to reproduce those same conditions from coast to coast. In short, the fomentors of strife have a vested interest in enduring social conflict in the United States.

It can be seen from examining the case study represented by the Alabama troubles that those who plan marches and seek to produce a huge publicity yield are not interested in securing rights or winning real improvements for any group. They have an interest in producing trouble for trouble's sake. They don't want a specific grievance to be settled. Instead they wish to substitute disorder for order wherever possible.

Some people have wondered why a so-called "dirty word" campaign was started at the University of California last fall. They also have wondered why some of the Alabama marchers engaged in lewdness. These acts undoubtedly were premeditated. They had a purpose; namely, to shock people, to break down established customs, and to promote chaos. What has happened in Alabama—and what is happening in Martin Luther King's boycott proposal, which he persists in going ahead with—cannot be understood apart from a nationwide effort to create a powerful anarchist movement in the United States. The boycott is a key device used by anarchists to shatter a working economy. Every responsible citizen in the United States needs to understand how the boycott plan fits into the overall scheme of breaking down American capitalist society.

Internal Revenue Service Abuse of Tax-Exempt Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Washington Daily News has printed in its April 5, 1965, issue a column by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., pointing up the leftwing bias of the administration in its operation of the Internal Revenue Service. The column is entitled "It All Depends." It shows how the Internal Revenue Service is harassing conservative organizations with tax-exempt status, while it is giving leftwing organizations free rein to engage in political activities and still maintain their tax-exempt status.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT ALL DEPENDS

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

H. L. Hunt, most easily identifiable as the richest man in the world, has "lost his tax exemption," as they say. Specifically, a gift to his pet activity, Life Line Inc., can no longer be listed as tax deductible by the donor. This means Mr. Hunt will have to use aftertax dollars instead of pretax dollars, and the latter, in this case, are nine times as plentiful.

Internal Revenue Service has ruled that Life Line does not qualify as an educational and nonpartisan activity. Why? Because, IRS contends, Life Line's radio broadcasts—that is what it specializes in—are tendentious, and the typical listener gets the message: vote for this guy, against that measure; back this policy, oppose the other.

Internal Revenue has been engaged over a considerable period in cracking down on such organizations as are not in fact "educational" in the sense to be "educational" requires nonpartisanship.

Several months ago, a spokesman of IRS was quoted in the press as saying: "We've done a good job of weeding out the leftwing organizations, now we're going to clean up on the rightwing organizations." And there followed a list of suspect rightwing organizations among which, sure enough, was H. L. Hunt's Life Line, on which the ax has now officially fallen.

I called on IRS at the time and asked politely for a list of the leftwing organizations that had been weeded out of the tax-exempt list. I was politely informed that records of such a character are not maintained (that's PR for are "not made generally available"). However, I was told that I was perfectly free to take the current issue of listings of tax-exempt foundations, compare it with the listing of any previous year, and draw my own conclusions. I thanked the gentleman kindly (and he was, do not misunderstand me, the soul of courtesy), turned the assignment over to a colleague—who advised me that inasmuch as there are over 60,000 listings in the current volume, any cross check would require several hundred hours of research.

In other words, it isn't easy to tell, by citing comprehensive figures, whether Internal Revenue is applying standards of strictness against the right which it is not applying against the left. One is driven to look at individual organizations and wonder out loud why IRS hasn't done something about them.

For instance that great fiasco of 1964, the National Council for Civic Responsibility, whose principal accomplishment, it appears in retrospect, was to make a public ass out of its chairman, Dr. Arthur Larson.

The National Council for Civic Responsibility was founded splashily last summer to make war against the radical rightwing. Two things about it soon became plain:

First, that it was a partisan organization being run not by its flossy public names, but by insiders.

Second, that it sought to have a direct influence on the national election by suggesting that Goldwater was a creature of the kooks.

Sure enough, although the committee had pledged itself to labor on and on, for years and years until the last American who wants to impeach Earl Warren is driven from the American temple, it quietly folded up in January, Lyndon Johnson having been safely tucked into the White House.

Meanwhile, it was sustained by an antirightwing front called the Public Affairs Institute, which, what do you know, is tax exempt. And who should have given the money to Public Affairs with which to pay for Mr. Larson's political committee? The Democratic National Committee's book fund, it transpires.

When will we have an investigation of the Public Affairs Institute, which is prohibited by law from engaging in partisan political activities, but receives money from the Democratic Party?

There are others that come to mind, for instance the American Committee for the United Nations, which pleads for the admission of Red China into the U.N. on tax-exempt dough, even while the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Red China is denied tax deductibility. A congressional committee should look into the question.

Who knows, maybe there will be enough money left in Congress, after we restore Appalachia and land on the moon, to check the 60,000 names in the current directory against

the names in a previous directory, and tell us whoever lost a tax exemption for dabbling in left politics?

Social Security Amendments of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I observe the House today considering legislation to provide for hospitalization through the framework of the social security system and for payment of other medical, surgical, and auxiliary services from the general fund. I know this legislation is going to pass, and it is my principal regret that my beloved, deceased father, former Congressman John D. Dingell, is not with us today to see the House of Representatives take this great step. It was he who joined with the beloved late Senators Wagner and Murray in sponsorship of the first legislation to accomplish this end in the 78th Congress back in the year 1943.

What we are doing today is adequate proof that high pressure lobbying tactics and huge expenditures of funds cannot prevail against the will of the American people where the need is as clear as that which cries for enactment of H.R. 6675.

Our senior citizens have the highest incidence of medical need in every category. Their hospitalization is over twice as long and vastly more frequent than other segments of the society. Their bills for payment of doctors and surgical care and for hospital stays are far in excess of that faced by the usually more affluent younger members of our society. Their ability to meet this crushing burden of health care is less than any other segment of the society. Their median income, per capita income, and liquid assets are far below that of other segments in the society. They fear illness, but they live more in fear of being pauperized by the high cost of illness.

Their circumstances jeopardize their slender savings every time they go to the doctor or to the hospital.

The aged are often preyed upon by predatory and unscrupulous sellers of relatively valueless health insurance. Often, responsible insurers will not accept them. They often find premiums of worthwhile health insurance far beyond their limited means. Where they are able to maintain a policy of health insurance they ofttimes find the policies canceled at the first real evidence of heavy medical need.

I rejoice at the other features of the bill. It is most desirable that we participate in the education of the children of our social security beneficiaries; it is vitally important that we permit earlier retirement at age 60 for widows who might otherwise agonize in a limbo of unemployment and deprivation while awaiting that milestone of age 62 to qualify for benefits.

The social security increases are of great importance; the moneys for liberalization of other parts of the Social Security Act are greatly needed. However, Mr. Chairman, nowhere in the history of the whole amendatory process since the original enactment of the Social Security Act has there been a measure so desperately and vitally needed by the senior citizens of this Nation as that providing for Federal payment of hospitalization and medical care for the aged.

Our whole society and whole economy will benefit.

Our aged will have an opportunity to have adequate hospitalization and medical care. Our young people will know that the health needs of their parents and loved ones are adequately cared for in retirement.

Our private insurance plans, like the great Blue Cross-Blue Shield system and many of the other fine private plans, will be able to offer all a better standard of health, hospitalization, and medical-surgical protection at a lesser cost. They will no longer need to subsidize the high risk cost of the aged, who cannot afford decent insurance.

Doctors and hospitals can eliminate now for the first time a large portion of their so-called charity patients. Ratepayers and beneficiaries of hospital and doctor and nursing home benefits will know that their payments do not go, in large part, to subsidize the cost of some unfortunate age person cared for as a part of the regular charity load of the individual or institution.

My old dad would be proud that the legislation that he fought for since the original H.R. 2861 of the 78th Congress is well on the way to enactment. My dear dad reintroduced that measure in each Congress until his death. This partial realization of his dream means protection of our aged from the most desperate need faced by them.

Communist Infiltration of the Negro Movement and Demonstrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., has printed in its April 11, 1965, issue an editorial which points up a concern that I have been expressing in the Senate for the past few years; that is, Communist infiltration of the Negro movement and demonstrations. The editorial is entitled "Beginning To See the Light."

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEGINNING TO SEE THE LIGHT

Questions are arising in the minds of some newspaper and radio columnists and commentators as to whether the Reverend Martin Luther King is still the actual leader of the so-called civil rights movement or whether he has become a pawn in the hands of fanatical groups which have little or no interest in the advancement of the Negro race but seek to capitalize on increasing national unrest.

Three such commentators are Eric Sevareid, William S. White, and the team of Rowland Evans and Robert Novak.

In one of his commentaries, Sevareid said: "A new chemistry is working in this movement [civil rights]; otherwise so steady a man as Martin Luther King would never have defied a Federal court order as he did in Selma. He did so because he would have lost his leadership had he not done so."

In his column, White wrote: "There are cynical tricksters within the civil rights movement whose interest in true civil rights could not be less, but whose interest in enfeebling us before the world could not be keener."

And Evans and Novak wrote: "Martin Luther King surrendered valuable ground to leftist extremists in their drive for control over the civil rights movement * * * the civil rights movement faces an agonizing internal crisis."

All three have warned, just as we feared, that Communist and fanatic revolutionaries are taking increasing control of street demonstrations and planning for the future.

It is a travesty that the movement in which such groups have become so active and influential has received the blessing of the Federal Government, misguided members of the clergy of all faiths, and other do-gooders. They have all become dupes and aid and abet the extremists in stirring up resentments that will not soon be forgotten.

President Johnson, instead of representing all of the people, has chosen to take sides with a vocal and active minority group. He has encouraged the blatant violation of State laws through so-called peaceful demonstrations that, in reality, were dynamite kegs waiting for some minor incident to light the fuse. And in so doing, he has violated the rights of peaceful, law-abiding residents of the State of Alabama. Martin Luther King has snapped the whip and the President has jumped.

And by sanctioning the lawbreaking, the President has given moral support to Communist and other radical and extreme groups to flock to Alabama where they whipped tension to a fever pitch using the aforementioned clergy and student groups, both white and colored, as their tools.

That even three well-known columnists and commentators are beginning to realize that all is not open and above board in the civil rights movement is encouraging. Perhaps their viewpoints will change even more to the right through the unpopular proposal by King that an economic boycott be imposed nationally on Alabama and its products. That suggestion fell with a dull thud on most of the Negro leaders, not only nationally but in Alabama itself. Could it have been inspired by Communist infiltrators in his movement?

If the national press, television, and radio are beginning to realize what is behind the civil rights movement, if they begin to question why demonstrators are employed rather than legal court action, there is some hope

that normalcy will return to the Negro's fight for civil rights. The national news and communications media has been largely responsible for the hysteria that has gripped the country—it can just as easily remove it by reporting fact for fact and ignoring propaganda. We hope that time will come soon.

Needed Comments on Barzini's Defamatory Book, "The Italians"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege to call attention to an article written by one of America's truly great scholars, Justice Michael A. Musmanno of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. This article makes for interesting and enlightened reading to anyone concerned with the subject it covers, but it will be of particular interest to 21 million Americans of Italian origin.

Justice Musmanno was a judge at the international war crimes trials in Nuremberg; he is a retired admiral in the U.S. Naval Reserve; he was a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature; he is the author of 11 books, 2 of which were made into motion pictures. Although born in America and a graduate of four American universities, he also studied at the University of Rome where he acquired the degree of doctor of jurisprudence. He served as naval aide to Gen. Mark W. Clark during World War II in Italy and, for a time, was military governor of the Sorrentine Peninsula. He thus can speak with authority on Italy and Italians.

In this article Justice Musmanno takes to task Luigi Barzini, who has written a book called "The Italians," in which he libels his own countrymen. It is incredible that a member of the Italian Parliament, as Barzini is, would come to America to cast slurs on his own country and countrymen, spreading propaganda which could do damage to the excellent relationship existing between America and Italy. Under unanimous consent, I wish to have Justice Musmanno's article, which appeared in the Unione in Pittsburgh and Il Popolo Italiano in Philadelphia, printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED COMMENTS ON BARZINI'S DEFAMATORY BOOK, "THE ITALIANS"

(By Justice Michael A. Musmanno)

The time has come for Americans of Italian lineage to raise their voices against a current book which defames, insults, and vilifies the Italian people, as they have never been defamed, insulted, and vilified before. The name of the book is "The Italians" and the author is Luigi Barzini. The book portrays the Italian people as deceivers, cowards, and brutes.

Barzini, the author, says that in Italy it is considered wholly proper to kick a man while he is down. He makes it even stronger. He says that Italians will support that shameful proposition by arguing, "Why shouldn't a man be kicked when he is down? When else, if you please, should one kick a man more advantageously? When more safely and effectively?" Of course, this is an outrageously false statement on the part of Barzini because the world knows that as a general thing Italians have a sympathetic nature and are opposed to cruelty. Naturally, there are exceptions. There are bad people in every nation, but Barzini seeks to generalize all the people in Italy into a mold that does not conform to fact.

He says that the Italian people are "fundamentally bitter, disenchanted and melancholic," that they are a "pessimistic, resigned, and frightened people." Untrue, of course.

Now, Barzini happens to be an educated man, he happens also to be a member of the Italian Parliament. In this book he happens also to be very unreliable, but not every one knows that. Non-Italians assume that Barzini knows what he is talking about. They assume that he speaks with a scholar's analysis, and therein lies the great peril of his book. Eventually, unless his egotistic irresponsibility is exposed, college and high school professors will be quoting him in the schools as an authority on the character and the makeup of the Italian people, and, in consequence, children with Italian names will suffer.

Barzini's book has now been on the best seller list for 27 weeks. One of the reasons for this is that advertisements incorrectly describe the book as one which praises Italy and Italians, because no one could possibly believe that an Italian would betray his own people. But Barzini does exactly that.

Over 20 million tourists go to Italy every year, but Barzini practically calls them idiots for doing so. He says that Italy's climate is bad, that her scenery is second rate, and her historical ruins unexciting. He says further that the food and wines in France are much better. Everyone in the world is enchanted with Venice, whether he has been there or not, but, according to Barzini, this magical city, during certain seasons, "smells of rotten cabbage and stagnant waters."

Now, all this is obvious nonsense and no one would pay the slightest attention to Barzini's disparaging remarks on Italy's scenery. People from all parts of the world would not continue to go to Italy for their vacations if Italy were as described by Barzini. An illustration of Barzini's asininities on the subject of scenery can be gleaned from his criticism that Italy does not have a river as long as the Nile or the Amazon. How would it be possible to lay a 3,500-mile-long river in a country which is only 700 miles at its longest point?

But, I repeat, it is not Barzini's inanities on climate and scenery which damage the Italian name, it is his remarks on Italian character. Barzini portrays Italians as cowards. The history of Italy's wars for independence and for unification is one long eloquent refutation to that base accusation. I served as an American liaison officer with the Italian Army at the front in World War II and I know from personal observation of the Italian soldier's bravery in battle.

There could be no more convincing proof of Barzini's unfairness than the fact that, although he speaks of World War I, he does not mention the Battle of Vittorio Veneto, one of the greatest battles in world military history. It was this battle, in which the Italians defeated Austria and knocked her out of the war, which caused the collapse of the German Army on the western front, hastening the Armistice which brought to an end World War I. Nor does Barzini speak of the staggering sacrifices of Italy in World War I. She contributed to the Allied victory 500,000 dead, and over a million and a half wounded.

Among the absurdities which abound in Barzini's book is his discussion on crimes of passion. He says that the number of people killed in Italy because of love exceeds the number killed in all of Italy's earthquakes, plagues, avalanches, tidal waves, plus all those killed in the wars. From Barzini's description of Italy, one would expect to see massacres in that country which would exceed in ferocity and scope the slaughter of the whites by the Indians in American pioneer days. He says that dismissed employees kill their employers, employers kill themselves, taxpayers kill the tax collectors, students kill their teachers, rioting workers kill policemen, immoral girls are found dead at dawn, drowned in a few inches of water, and so forth and so forth. He says that the automobile wrecks in Italy are the most devastating and spectacular car crashes in the western world and he leaves this bath of blood with the declaration that table manners in Italy are bad.

Barzini writes of Italy as if it were some strange exotic place in a mythical land in seas scarcely even navigated, or even off in untraveled space. The Italy which Barzini describes is a caricature. He says that there is no law in Italy, ignoring that the Roman law, which is the basis of all the law of the Western World, was formulated in Italy.

He ridicules Italian mothers by saying that their manifestation of love for their children is play-acting. He says that when Italian mothers are alone with their babies they treat them with matter-of-fact solicitude, but when somebody enters the room the mother will put on an act, summoning tears to her eyes, crushing the baby to her breast, singing to it and making up poetic pet names. Of course, anyone who has the slightest knowledge of Italian mothers, which Barzini ought to have, knows that they usually are timid about demonstrating love for their offspring when strangers are close by, but will shower uninhibited affection on them when alone.

Another reason why Barzini's book is on the Best Sellers List is that Italian-American doctors, lawyers, engineers, professors, teachers, and students who can afford $6.95 for a book, buy it to learn more about their forebears. They naturally assume that a book on "Italians" will speak of the great figures in Italian and world history. There must be, they assume, a fascinating chapter on Leonardo da Vinci, perhaps the greatest universal genius who ever lived. They are amazed to find that Barzini's treatment of da Vinci is limited to listing his name in a footnote with other illustrious immortals such as Guglielmo Marconi, Amerigo Vespucci, Galileo Galilei, Giuseppe Mazzini.

Instead of reading of virtues and valor which made a Roman empire and created discoverers and explorers which gave to mankind a new world, instead of reading of scientists, poets, artists who conquered the world with the works of their genius, the Italian-American reader reads fictional anecdoes, gross exaggerations, and distortions of reality, all put together by Barzini in order to produce his overall picture of the Italians, as brutes, cowards, ignoramuses, and deceivers.

There is nothing the disappointed Italian-American reader can do to get his money back. The sale has been registered, it is added to the sales in other stores and in other cities, and they all total up to the number which continues to keep a title on the best sellers list.

Then the non-Italian-American reading public, observing that the Italian-Americans are making no protest about the book, assume that the Italian-Americans approve the book as being reliable—and so the great deception goes on and on.

Italian-Americans, who have children and who have been disgusted with Barzini's book because of its untruthfulness, but have not voiced their resentment, will have only themselves to blame if in time their children will

be told in school that Italians are deceivers, cowards, and brutes.

We, who were born in America of Italian parents, owe it to them, if to no one else, to condemn this book which calumniates their character. But we owe also a duty to our brother Americans of other ethnic origins to acquaint them with the facts so that they will not be misled.

The American reading public must be made aware that "The Italians" by Luigi Barzini is not an account of Italians, as they are. It is, on the contrary, a diatribe, a caricature, an irresponsible, vicious attack on an honest, courageous, peace-loving, and God-fearing people.

The Increasing Trend Toward Big, Centralized Government in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed with a broadcast editorial by Harry C. Weaver, president and general manager of radio station WOKE, in Charleston, S.C. The editorial is concerned with the increasing trend toward big and centralized Government in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIAL BY HARRY C. WEAVER, WEAVER BROADCASTING CORP. (WOKE), CHARLESTON, S.C.

We are always filled with amazement when we consider the immense grasp of freedom which the Founding Fathers held.

These men of vision limited government as no government ever before in history had been limited. The government had nothing for these men, but their freedom. That was the way they planned it. No one turned to the Federal Government for old-age benefits, medicare, price supports, aid to education, urban renewal, welfare, pensions, public works, or transportation. None of these things were expected, because, the Federal Government had nothing with which to give them false prosperity. To whom did our forefathers turn for these items that are considered today to be most important? Our forefathers turned to themselves, which isn't a bad idea for Americans to consider right now. Today, we Americans have found our way to the public treasury through our elected officials. It is hard to believe but today half of the American people who voted in the last election receive either a regular or an occasional check from the Great White Father in Washington. This means that we citizens of the 20th century have exactly reversed the attitude of the Founding Fathers of our beloved country toward government in the 18th century.

We Americans cannot point our fingers at our neighbors for we will suddenly realize that our neighbors are pointing their fingers at us. It is staggering when we stop long enough to look at the facts and figures: 16 million schoolchildren get lunches; 2½ million civilians are on the Federal payroll; 4 million workers depend on Federal military expenditures; over 2 million farmers get price support or conservation payments; almost 9 million persons get Federal food handouts.

The average age of the world's great civilizations has been 200 years. These nations progressed through the following sequence: From bondage to spiritual faith, from spiritual faith to great courage, from courage to liberty, from liberty to abundance, from abundance to selfishness, from selfishness to complacency, from complacency to apathy, from apathy to dependency, from dependency to fear, from fear back again to bondage. In 11 years, our United States of America will be 200 years old. What happens to our 20th century civilization depends on you.

There must be an end to the increase in big government, if we hope to be free. Our Government, which was designed to give nothing but freedom to the people, now has 50 million Americans on the payroll—one way or another. We are all voters so we are voting for this expanding bureaucracy by electing Congressmen who will give us back our own money, less the cost of Washington administration. A government that is no longer limited in its power can take as well as give. Our Founding Fathers chose capitalism and freedom. We Americans of today are chosing socialism and the loss of freedom. The twin brother of socialism is communism. The miracle of limited government, as established by our forefathers, can and must be reborn—in our beloved United States of America—if we Americans ever hope to stem the tide of big government that threatens us with more, more, more controlling power from Washington.

Resolution in Support of the Voting Rights Message of President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that a great tidal wave of public opinion is mounting behind the pending voting rights bill. Last week, I was visited by leaders of two labor organizations, Christopher Jackman, secretary of Local 300 of the Paper Box Makers Union, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite & Paper Mill Workers, AFL–CIO, representing 4,500 members in the State of New Jersey, and Winfield S. Chasmar, president of Local 284, Laundry Workers, Cleaners & Dyers Union, AFL–CIO, an organization with some 5,000 members in the Garden State.

Mr. Speaker, both of these great unions have gone on record in support of the voting rights message of President Johnson. I am proud to insert at this point in the RECORD, resolutions endorsed by the membership of these two effective labor unions. The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION OF LOCAL 300, PAPER BOX MAKERS UNION, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF PULP, SULPHITE & PAPER MILL WORKERS, AFL–CIO

Whereas the State of New Jersey enjoys the distinction of having originally sponsored the open primary voting system advocated by President Woodrow Wilson during his tenure as Governor of our great State; and

Whereas this achievement established for New Jersey a reputation for affording its citizens the ultimate in voting rights and aspiration to elected public office; and

Whereas the highest law of our land, the Constitution of the United States, has been systematically and flagrantly violated and disobeyed in most Southern States during the 95 years since the adoption of the 15th amendment, which reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Whereas it is our national shame that racists in the South, and particularly in Alabama, have resorted to clubs, electric cattle prods, guns, tear gas, whips, forced marches, and mass jailings to thwart the Negro citizen when he seeks to exercise his constitutional right to vote; and

Whereas no one knows better than the racists themselves that their days are numbered; that a tidal wave of black and white votes will soon sweep out of office every fanatic and replace them with progressive legislators from both races, thus brushing aside this last ditch attempt by racists to stave off a fight for freedom which ultimately cannot be stopped; and

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson has recommended new voting rights legislation to the Congress, thus fulfilling his state of the Union message promising to submit such proposals to help Negroes gain this precious right to vote, wherever it is denied to them because of race; and

Whereas these proposed new laws would revolve around forceful Federal action and, if adopted, would be enforced by Federal registrars appointed by and responsible to the President; and

Whereas the brutality of southern law-enforcement officers makes it absolutely clear that only massive Federal action can bring democracy to the embattled Negroes and their white allies in the South: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the membership of Local 300, Paper Box Makers Union, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite & Paper Mill Workers, AFL–CIO (representing approximately 4,500 members in the State of New Jersey), That our union does hereby go on record to wholeheartedly endorse and support the objectives outlined by President Johnson in his voting rights legislation submitted to Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the membership of local 300 hereby empowers Winfield S. Chasmar, business manager, to make necessary arrangements to personally appear in Washington, D.C., before members of the New Jersey delegation in Congress for the purpose of presenting this resolution as an expression of our appeal to our elected representatives to support and vote in favor of the proposed voting rights legislation.

RESOLUTION OF LOCAL 284, LAUNDRY WORKERS, CLEANERS & DRYERS UNION, AFL–CIO

Whereas the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, adopted in 1870, guarantees to every citizen the right to vote, as follows:

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Whereas it is our national shame that the Constitution of the United States, the highest law of our land, has been systematically and flagrantly violated and disobeyed in most Southern States during the 95 years since the adoption of the 15th amendment; and

Whereas racists in the South, and particularly in Alabama, have resorted to clubs, electric cattle prods, guns, tear gas, whips, forced marches and mass jailings to thwart the Negro citizen when he seeks to exercise his constitutional right to vote; and

Whereas no one knows better than the racists themselves that their days are numbered; that a tidal wave of black and white votes will soon sweep out of office every fanatic and replace them with progressive legislators from both races, thus brushing aside this last-ditch attempt by racists to stave off a fight for freedom which ultimately cannot be stopped; and

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson has recommended new voting rights legislation to the Congress, thus fulfilling his state of the Union message promising to submit such proposal to help Negroes gain this previous right to vote, wherever it is denied to them because of race; and

Whereas these proposed new laws would revolve around forceful Federal action and, if adopted, would be enforced by Federal registrars appointed by and responsible to the President; and

Whereas the brutality of southern law-enforcement officers makes it absolutely clear that only massive Federal action can bring democracy to the embattled Negroes and their white allies in the South: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Local 284, Laundry Workers, Cleaners & Dyers Union, AFL–CIO, comprising approximately 5,000 members in the State of New Jersey, does hereby go on record at a general membership meeting held on March 25, 1965, at Continental Auditorium, Newark, N.J., to wholeheartedly endorse and support the objectives outlined by President Johnson in his voting rights legislation submitted to Congress; and be is further

Resolved, That the membership of local 284 hereby empowers Winfield S. Chasmar, president, to select a committee of three members of our union to personally appear in Washington, D.C., before members of the New Jersey delegation in Congress for the purpose of presenting this resolution as an expression of our appeal to our elected representatives to support and vote in favor of the proposed voting rights legislation.

The Situation in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the April 7, 1965, issue of the State, of Columbia, S.C., has reprinted in a brief editorial a very succinct and profound statement by one of the most respected military writers in the country on the subject of the situation in Vietnam. The editorial, entitled "Our Involvement," quotes from an important statement by Hanson Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Apr. 7, 1965]

OUR INVOLVEMENT

Hanson W. Baldwin, the military editor of the New York Times and a man well respected in the field of national defense and mutual security, has reduced the Vietnam situation to its essentials in this single paragraph:

"U.S. global prestige and power are intimately bound up with the outcome of the Vietnamese struggle. In Vietnam, we are attempting to formulate an answer to the Communist strategy of creeping aggression, of subversion and insurgency, of what Khrushchev called wars of national liberation. If the might and will of the United States cannot evolve a victorious answer to such tactics, we are undone; the map of the world will gradually become red. And if we will not fight in Vietnam, where—after the series of Communist conquests in the past 20 years—will we fight? Where will we draw the line?"

The Flight of Gemini 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, all America was proud and pleased with the accomplishments achieved recently in the successful orbiting of the *Molly Brown* Gemini capsule, piloted by Maj. Gus Grissom and Lt. Cmdr. John Young. This milestone in America's efforts to explore outer space would not have been possible without the investment of resources—physical, mental, and monetary.

One of the cities in my congressional district, Hayward, Calif., has seen fit to adopt a special resolution in a city council meeting to commend the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and Astronauts Virgil Grissom and John Young for their endeavors. Although Hayward is now in my congressional district, its citizens can take great pride in the dedication and support of the space program of their former Representative, George P. Miller, chairman of the House Science and Astronautics Committee. I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of this resolution:

RESOLUTION 65–127

(Resolution of commendation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and to Astronauts Virgil I. Grissom and John W. Young for their historic flight of Gemini 3)

Be it resolved by the city council of the city of Hayward that said council does hereby congratulate the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the many technicians required for the space program, and in particular Astronauts Virgil I. Grissom and John W. Young for their historic flight of Gemini 3 involving unprecedented orbital maneuvers, a pioneering demonstration of orbit-shifting techniques which will be used by space pilots for landings on the moon; that without the tireless and dedicated efforts and cooperation of all connected with said project this greatest of scientific achievements could not have been attained.

In council, Hayward, Calif., March 23, 1965.

Attest:

EDWARD K. STANTON,
City Clerk of the City of Hayward, Calif.

The Pattern of Coming Events in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, Dr. William S. McBirnie, of Glendale, Calif., has prepared a report based upon a series of interviews he had in southeast Asia in March 1965, and which he has requested I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

THE PATTERN OF COMING EVENTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

It is rather a sobering experience to know that something of great consequence is going to happen, and to know that your own country's Government does not know it.

The odds are all against the likelihood of a private citizen, however careful a student of foreign affairs, pitting his interpretation of coming events successfully against the opinions of the most powerful government on earth, with all of its superb intelligence sources upon which to draw. And to do so might seem presumptuous, or preposterous, to say the least.

Yet that is the position in which this program finds itself. I know, or to be more restrained, I believe I know the pattern of future events in South Vietnam. Evidently the Government does not know. A conference of historic proportions is underway, right now, in Washington. Ambassador Taylor is there for reports, recommendations, and consultations. You, the listeners, may judge for yourselves, or wait for history to prove the accuracy of our analyses and predictions—but this is what this program believes is now to come.

As James Reston writes: "The immediate question is clear enough. The President's decision to bomb North Vietnam has not achieved its objective. It has not persuaded the Communists to stop their infiltration and military subversion in South Vietnam.

"It has committed the prestige and power of the United States in a war against the North Vietnamese Communists, without success, and the question now is whether to increase the military pressure or withdraw.

"The British explored the prospect of a Vietnamese settlement with the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei A. Gromyko, in London, but he brushed them off. The Johnson administration has made many more private inquiries about a negotiated settlement than it cares for political reasons to admit, but these have been rebuffed.

"President Johnson has been in touch with Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, of Canada, who has a representative on the International Control Commission in Vietnam, on the prospect of useful negotiations, but Pearson has had to report to the President that the North Vietnamese are not interested, at least for the present.

"Even the French, who have been leading the campaign for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, concede privately they received no

encouragement either in the North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi nor in the Communist Chinese capital of Peiping.

"The issue, therefore, is not whether President Johnson is ready for negotiations. The North Vietnamese Communists have been rejecting a negotiated settlement for months.

"The issue before the President and his associates, including General Taylor, is, therefore, much mare complicated than the national argument about negotiations would make it seem. In fact, the North Vietnamese insist on seeing the struggle in southeast Asia not as a local war, but as a test of the cold war all over the world" (Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Apr. 1, 1965).

Look carefully at the chain of events:

1. The Vietcong had driven us to the wall, because we were fighting on their terms—not ours. They were expecting a negotiated settlement as the result of their growing victories in their native jungle warfare, fought as it was on their own ground.

2. The President made the right decision, temporarily, to shift the technique of fighting the war on our terms; not theirs—to turn our big weapons on the Vietcong war-related targets in North Vietnam. The Reds did not expect this, and it threw their hopes and plans for negotiation on terms favorable to them back several months. The United States, in effect, had been willing, even anxious, to come to the bargaining table, but armed with much more strength than the Vietcong expected.

3. At this point the United States of America has made a strategic error—too obviously our intention and goal was negotiation, not victory. But there is really nothing to negotiate; not now, at any rate. For the Reds won't negotiate at present on terms unfavorable to them, since we cannot accept less than their retreat. They therefore will not relax their program of terrorism in South Vietnam, nor will they (presently) negotiate, for this would cause them to lose face in the eyes of the world Communist movement.

4. The Reds were all set to announce a big victory on March 10, at the Afro-Asian conference in Algiers, but our atack on North Vietnam upset their timing. So they quietly canceled the Afro-Asian conference, postponing it until June 19, when it is rescheduled. This means that they expect to have a new plan in operation by that time. What plan? This is what I believe that I know, and that the U.S. Government, I fear, does not.

5. The Red Chinese must find a way to get us to the negotiation table when their strength again becomes relatively greater than ours. They never negotiate to make concessions, as we almost always do. This simple principle has not yet penetrated widely into liberal Washington thought, because Socialist liberals are evidently unable to face communism realistically and comprehend its nature and methods. For example: Communism never negotiates differences. It always seeks victory in negotiations, either in part or in whole. This is unvarying Communist procedure. So now they are unwilling to really negotiate on South Vietnam because the increased U.S. strength there gives them no advantage, and they must always find an advantage before they will enter into serious negotiations on any issue, particularly one so important as this.

6. The plan is to wheel large land armies, from China into position, to threaten to flood South Vietnam with waves of soldiers, inundating the South Vietnamese and Americans by sheer numbers. But to make this threat viable they must also demonstrate atomic capability, and have maintained a propaganda campaign in the press expressing their professed willingness, at whatever cost to themselves, to bomb South Vietnam with atomic bombs, as well as to invade in great ground army strength. Then the Reds are counting on the unwillingness of the United States to fight an atomic war, and also knowing the public outcry in the United States over annihilation of all Americans in South Vietnam, they will then have their bargaining cards.

7. Therefore we must expect an atomic development, testing of bombs, the announcement of a surprising stockpile of ready bombs, and the means of delivering them, all, I would think, before June 19, 1965, though the date again may be postponed if the Reds feel it necessary.

8. So the Reds are preparing to shake the world by a two-faceted thrust, and then, confronting us with this thrust, they are counting on world pressure, and public opinion expressed in this country, to get us ready to negotiate from a position of relative weakness.

Of course we are not really weak, just unable to bring ourselves to risk the death of all our troops in Vietnam, and to engage China in an atomic war. Leftwing opinion molders are now softening up public sentiment in this country, hence the ads in newspapers emanating from leftist groups appeals for peace by abandonment of South Vietnam.

9. It will be Russia that will, at the moment of highest tension in the approaching United States-Red Chinese confrontation, step in, offering to negotiate. Red China does not really want war, but they are determined to drive us out of southeast Asia by this threat. Furthermore, they wish trade concessions for all Communist lands, since all are in economic and agricultural trouble. It is, therefore, to get America out of South Vietnam, and to open the West for trade with Red China, that the Russians and the Red Chinese have plotted together the coming confrontation.

As mediator, Russia knows she will get, in return, much in trade concessions for Red China, and in gratitude for bringing about a peaceful settlement she will be granted the relaxation of our trade barriers with the Soviet Union herself.

So now you know what we believe is in the wind. Many things can upset this whole scheme of the Communists, but I believe this is the way their immediate Communist planning is headed. And so I look for: First, the massive threat of war; second, the mediation of Russia, followed by the conference table; third, the resulting sizable trade concessions for both Red China and Russia; fourth, a seat at the United Nations for China—which means the end of free China, since it will involve diplomatic recognition by the United States; fifth, then, a great going out of the tide of war threat, a period of false security based upon the illusion of peace; sixth, and what will this have cost the Soviet Union and China? Just some planning, some propaganda words against each other, to make us believe they are enemies and that Russia is inclined toward friendliness with us as a result of their "phoney split," all of which is a preposterous bluff.

That is all it will have cost the Red bloc, and they will receive everything they want from us and will be in a much stronger economic position to continue the war of subversion and revolution around the world. And most deplorable is the fact that we seemingly do not realize we are being drawn into this Red trap. We are very likely to end up paying for the strengthening of our enemies and underwriting the advancement of communism from its Russian and Chinese bases.

The President's Statement of American Policy and Objectives in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on the night of April 7, at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, President Johnson delivered an elqouent, clear statement of American policy and objectives in Vietnam. The President made it undeniably plain that a prescription for peace in Vietnam does exist. This prescription contains the promise of economic cooperation on a scale that can only lead to the improved social and economic well-being of millions of southeast Asians now embroiled in wars and feuds with their neighbors.

The President challenged the countries of southeast Asia to join together in a massive common development effort in the Mekong River Basin, and promised increased U.S. cooperation and assistance. The Mekong Basin covers 381,000 square miles and touches the lives of 48 million people. The river rises in China and flows 2,600 miles to a large delta below Saigon. The Congress has been authorizing and appropriating funds for feasibility and hydrological studies preliminary to development of this area for nearly 7 years. The foreign aid bill currently being studied by the Committee on Foreign Affairs contains fund authorizations to continue these studies.

This proposal was no "bribe" for peace—it was offered as an alternative to war.

The President made it equally clear that our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and "we will do everything necessary to reach that objective." I fully support the President in his determination that the United States will not be defeated, will not grow tired, and will now withdraw in South Vietnam.

I also support his proposal for a cooperative effort in the Mekong River Basin and other development activities which will "replace despair with hope and terror with progress."

Mr. Speaker, with permission, I include an editorial from the Miami Herald of April 10, "Support for LBJ's Logic," and an excellent article by Bert Collier, Herald editorial writer, concerning "The Mekong Project—What It Means." I direct the attention of my colleagues to both of these fine articles that reflect a clear understanding and support of the President's proposals.

The articles follow:

SUPPORT FOR L.B.J.'S LOGIC

More men and nations evidently like President Johnson's Vietnam proposal than dislike it.

The President's peace bid was "full of lies and deception," says Red China. Senate Re-

publican Leader DIRKSEN wonders whether the Johns Hopkins speech simply sounded "retreat."

These seem to be minority views—the one expected, considering the nature of the animal; the other a dutiful observance of the opposition role in Congress.

Otherwise, Mr. Johnson has many with him. They include Japan, Britain, and France, among other allies or part-time friends; United Nations Secretary General U Thant; neighbor Canada; 17 nonalined nations who asked on April 1 for some such move, and most of Congress. Typical of the latter perhaps is the apt reaction of Senator GEORGE SMATHERS who described administration policy as "the iron hand in the velvet glove."

What it is, of course, is a policy at long last. While we have reservations about some of the phrasing, we welcome the world's general response. For the first time since 1954 when the southeast Asia adventure began, it is clear beyond any doubt where the United States stands.

Yesterday fresh accent was added to Mr. Johnson's promise that "we will not be defeated." North Vietnam, which is the storehouse but not the sanctuary of Communist subversion below the 17th parallel, again felt the sting of American air power interdicting its supply lines.

Even so, the soft glove remains on the iron hand. If North Vietnam will only concede the futility of war and subversion, the whole of southeast Asia can be developed prosperously in peace.

It is a little-known fact that the very countries which have been at one another's throats openly in this area of the world have been working together quietly toward the very goal which Mr. Johnson finds as an alternative to war.

For the last 7 years South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand have been cooperating in the lower Mekong Basin in the building of powerplants, irrigation systems, and pilot farms.

Quite literally southeast Asia could beat its sword into a plowshare should it pursue the course to which Mr. Johnson has called attention so dramatically. His logical plan has found response where logic yet prevails, and this is good.

IT COULD DWARF EVEN OUR OWN TVA: THE MEKONG PROJECT—WHAT IT MEANS

(By Bert Collier)

President Johnson's suggestion that the United States is ready to "invest" $1 billion in the peaceful development of southeast Asia is the most widely discussed feature of his Vietnam policy statement.

Some consider this the proffer of a bribe to the Vietcong if they stop fighting. Some see it as an unwarranted extension of foreign aid which is already in difficulties in Congress.

Actually it is only the enlargement of a program that has been underway for more than 7 years, in which the United States and a score of other nations are cooperating.

The plan has been mentioned before as the means for a just and honorable settlement of the Vietnamese conflict and the start of a new era in the territories that once made up French Indochina.

The President was not specific about the proposal. It was contained in two short paragraphs of his Baltimore address.

"The task," he said, "is nothing less than to enrich the hopes and existence of more than a hundred million people. And there is much to be done.

"The vast Mekong River can provide food and water and power on a scale to dwarf even our own TVA."

Planning to develop the Lower Mekong along these lines has been underway since 1957 under auspices of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. This is the project to which the President offered all-out support, once peace and stability are restored.

The Mekong is one of the world's great rivers. It rises in the Tibetan highlands of China and flows 2,800 miles to the sea southwest of Saigon.

Born as a brawling mountain stream in the rugged Chinese hinterland, it outlines the border between Laos and Burma. Then, after watering all of northwest Laos it separates southern Laos from Thailand, flows through the hearts of Cambodia and builds a mighty delta on the coast of South Vietnam.

A system of dams and water-shortage basins along the river would, according to the plan, transform the economy of the region.

It would improve farming by irrigation and make possible a second crop during the dry season. Controls would eliminate spring floods that take immense toll in life and property. Shipping would be improved.

Most important of all, cheap electric power would allow industrial development.

While Laos, Cambodia, Thailand and South Vietnam would be the principal beneficiaries, Burma would also be helped and Red China and North Vietnam could become customers for power to fuel their own industries.

This is the vision. A great deal of work already has been done. There has been more international cooperation in this program than any other ever undertaken by the U.N.

The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation helped make original reconnaissance studies. A former chief of the U.S. Corps of Engineers headed a team which recommended further investigations.

France gave direct financial assistance and Canada flew aerial photographic missions. Australia and Japan provided engineering teams to locate damsites and make geological surveys.

Others that lent a hand included the Philippines, Netherlands, Pakistan, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Britain, and New Zealand.

International agencies in the picture are the International Labor Organization and the World Health Organization.

Even private philanthropy, such as the Ford Foundation, is making contributions.

A fascinating account of the Lower Mekong project was published recently by Dr. Gilbert F. White, professor of geography at the University of Chicago, a consultant on the program.

"If the Lower Mekong program in its present form does not prove a complete way out of the southeast Asia dilemma," he says, "it at least suggests a route that is challenging.

"This is a way calling for international collaboration in advancing the welfare of peasants who long months ago had enough of terror in the night.

"In such a venture the United States could with honor and deep conviction invest its men, experience, and capital as a member of an international team.

"It is just barely possible that out of this most incredible of places—the swirling political caldron of southeast Asia—may come a new pattern for international action in harnessing nature's riches to achieve peaceful change."

Evidently President Johnson agrees with this premise. He has opened the way for the United States to provide a tremendous assist "as soon as peaceful cooperation is possible."

A Proposal To Insure That the Limits of the U.S. Constitution Are Respected Within the Borders of the State of Alabama

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1965, Arch E. Roberts, major, U.S. Army Reserve, addressed the State Legislature of Alabama on the subject "A Proposal To Insure That the Limits of the U.S. Constitution Are Respected Within the Borders of the State of Alabama." Several of my constitutents thought that Major Roberts' speech ought to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and therefore I ask that it be printed at the close of my remarks.

The speech follows:

A PROPOSAL TO INSURE THAT THE LIMITS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARE RESPECTED WITHIN THE BORDERS OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA

(By Arch E. Roberts, major, U.S. Army Reserve)

Mr. President, Governor Wallace, members of the Alabama State Legislature, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the privilege of speaking to you today on matters of the utmost gravity to the sovereign State of Alabama and to thoughtful Americans everywhere.

My talk will constitute a proposal to insure that the limits of the U.S. Constitution are respected within the borders of the State of Alabama.

I believe that the Alabama syndrome reveals our sister States in the South comprise the target area for a centrally directed revolution which is intended to eventually engulf the entire United States.

I believe that we must determine the causes for this revolution.

And, I believe that "we the people," must do whatever is necessary to "* * * insure domestic tranquillity."

It is no accident that Montgomery, Ala.—former capital for the Confederacy—is the focal point for today's anarchist. In fact, Dr. John A. Morsell, assistant executive director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, declared in Denver on March 20, that 1965 has the "potential of a real revolution."

Ladies and gentlemen, under the guise of a crusade for minority rights Dr Martin Luther King and other trained revolutionaries are engaged in a plan of enflame Americans to a point where our citizens defy legally constituted authority, flout private property rights, and, finally, generate violence, bloodshed and murder

These are techniques of subversion familiar to everyone who has studied the Spanish revolution and other examples of Communist control of populations by mass terror.

It is now apparent that certain agents provocateur, acting in consonance with a master plan, are attempting to create an atmosphere of crisis in the South which will favor the declaration of a state of national emergency.

It can be predicted that a state of national emergency will lead to the implementation

of a series of Executive Orders now in readiness to place control of all phases of our society in the hands of a few "elite directors" in the Federal Government.

We begin to see the emerging outline of a Soviet America.

Within the next few minutes the master plan for this Communist-style revolution will be identified.

More important, I hope to place in your hands a weapon with which to defend the sovereign State of Alabama, a procedure for arresting this incipient revolution, and the legislative act needed to insure that the limits of the U.S. Constitution are respected within the borders of the State of Alabama.

Our examination of the rise and progress of revolution in Alabama, however, must be prefaced by a word on a contributing factor to this terror.

This peril may be attributed, in part, to a false economy in the affairs of our State governments.

Americans have long failed to recognize the responsibilities to preserve Constitutional liberties which were placed in the hands of our State legislators by Constitutional compact. We have, in fact, condoned a system which denies just compensation for public service and which places a "part-time" sentry on the ramparts of freedom.

The preservation of our Constitutional republic now, as never before, urgently demands the attention of full-time legislators. And these spokesmen for the people must receive financial compensation commensurate with their responsibilities.

State legislators must place themselves on a par with Members of the Congress. They must vote themselves a salary of not less than $20,000 per year. And they must convene in the same manner and for the same period of time as does the U.S. Congress in Washington. The State legislatures, being the reservoir of all true political power (as the States are the reservoir of all true national wealth) may thus defend the Constitution and protect the freedoms guaranteed to the people by this Constitution.

Now—let us identify the master plan which has spawned a generation of anti-Americans—a plan which has entrapped our people in a silent revolution and which now threatens the South (and eventually the entire United States) with violent insurrection.

Permit me to quote from Senate Document No. 87, "Review of the United Nations Charter." On page 289 of this Senate report there appears this amazing statement:

"The charter (of the United Nations) has become 'the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or the laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.'"

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

Your attention is further invited to an address by the late John Foster Dulles, former Secretary of State, made before the American Bar Association in Louisville, Ky., April 12, 1952.

"Treaties," said Mr. Dulles, "make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are indeed more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution whereas treaty law can override the Constitution."

Then Mr. Dulles spelled out the new legal posture which members of the American Bar Association would be expected to assume in future interpretation of the United Nations Charter as the "supreme law of the land."

"Treaties," he said, "can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the State and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional bill of rights."

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

The record of usurped governmental power, which Mr. Dulles presumed to sanction, is dramatically demonstrated in the record of hundreds of U.N.-enforcing "treaties" which were surrepitiously "ratified" by as few as two or three U.S. Senators convening in secret during the months immediately following passage of the United Nations treaty agreement.

This astonishing information was initially reported by the Chicago Tribune on December 8, 1952.

In at least one instance, said the Tribune, one Senator convened himself at 6:30 p.m. on the empty floor of the Senate; ratified a "treaty" binding upon every citizen in the United States, and then adjourned himself at 6:31 p.m.

That man was Senator JOHN P. SPARKMAN, of Alabama.

This abuse of privileges prompted Senator Bricker and 53 other alarmed Senators to propose Senate Joint Resolution 1 (the Bricker resolution, June 15, 1953) in an attempt to contain by constitutional amendment the treatymaking powers of the Senate and the Executive agreement powers of the President.

Assurance by the President that such questionable action would be terminated led to the defeat of the Bricker amendment by one vote.

A recently conducted search for these secret treaties, however, has revealed that the total now stand at 3,000 U.N.-implementing treaties.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

Ladies and gentlemen, these interrelated events confirm a chilling fact: The United Nations Charter is the master plan for a Communist-style revolution in America.

Let us expose the fiction that the United Nations is some kind of debating society. The United Nations is not a "debating society"—and it was never intended to be a "debating society."

The United Nations is a subversive organization. Its objective is to overthrow the constitutional governments of the United States (including the State of Alabama), by peaceful means if possible; by force and violence if necessary.

These subversive objectives will not surprise those who know that the United Nations Charter was written by Communists and traitors including Alger Hiss, Leo Pasvolsky, and Phillip C. Jessup.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

The so-called United Nations Treaty is no treaty within the meaning of that word. The U.N. Charter is a constitution for one world government and its aim is to abrogate the U.S. Constitution and to erect in its place the United Nations Charter as the "supreme law of the land."

The United Nations now overtly and arrogantly proclaims its preeminence in the affairs of our State governments. Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, U.N. Undersecretary, marches in the vanguard of defiant mobs who assault your State capitol.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

Of course, the pro-Communist leanings of Mr. Bunche, best-known Negro in the world, are well advertised. In fact, on August 9, 1948, after Alger Hiss had been exposed as a Communist agent, Bunche assured Hiss by letter that, "I want you to know that I am in your corner."

It is now clear that Federal agents acting under what they assert to be a legal use of the limited powers enumerated in the Constitution, have negotiated with foreign governments so as to coerce these United States into a United Nations Treaty agreement. This U.N. Treaty actually constitutes a surrender to these foreign governments of the powers of government and affects a surrender of the rights and liberties assured to the people under the U.S. Constitution.

The extent of this duplicity can now be directly assessed by example.

We have witnessed Supreme Court decisions which overturn the sovereignty of State governments: Example—the reapportionment decision.

We have been burdened with congressional legislation which directly attacks the constitutional premise of private property rights: Example—the Civil Rights Act.

And, now we are confronted by the arbitrary use of Presidential power to override the constitutional guarantees of universal suffrage: Example—the proposed voting law.

These acts by judicial, legislative, and executive agents violate specific articles in the U.S. Constitution, and in the constitutions of the several States, and they are in contradiction to the intent of these constitutions.

These acts are not, however, in contradiction to the United Nations Treaty agreement. They are, in fact, demanded by the articles of the United Nations Charter.

The conclusion is inescapable.

Since its ratification by the U.S. Senate on June 26, 1945, the United Nations Charter has been the "supreme law of the land," and our elected and appointed agents in judicial, legislative, and executive office have conducted our affairs in consonance with the provisions of the U.N. Charter.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

Furthermore, the agony in Alabama promised that the technique of "silent revolution" to change our Government from one of limited and delegated powers to a centralized, totalitarian regime, is to be reinforced by planned violence which will expedite the changeover.

Significantly, the subversion of freedom's bulwark has been accompanied by a thrust to redirect the allegiance of our soldiers to the United Nations banner so as to immobilize U.S. military resistance to the United Nations takeover. The employment of Federal troops in the South is but one example of so-called "counterinsurgency" training to facilitate the invasion.

American soldiers are now trained to control American citizens. Our sons in uniform suppress resistance to United Nations tyranny and aid revolutionary forces which seek to destroy our constitutional republic.

The planners intend to transfer our entire Military Establishment into a United Nations army so as to force all of the nations into line and to deliver them up to a one-world government.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

Now pending in the United Nations is a single plan for redistributing the world's trade and industry, approved in Geneva in 1964 by the solid vote of "emerging" nations. They look at it as a way to guarantee their prosperity.

Seventy-seven "emerging" nations voted in Geneva in 1964 to lay the burden of their welfare upon the industrial member nations while the industrial nations sat on their hands in disbelief. This action of UNCTAD (the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) will be voted on this September in the United Nations General Assembly and probably will pass because of the "emerging" nations bloc vote.

Gentlemen, do you realize that when this action is taken, steel mills in Birmingham and Gadsden, Ala., could be forced by the United Nations to cut back production and even risk the loss of this industry in order to comply with the charter and build the economy of another member nation. Think of it. Your own people forced in the lines of the unemployed because of the articles of

the United Nations Charter. This is no dream, gentlemen, this will happen in every major industry of our country.

The American Legion asks that you be cognizant of this terrible condition within the United Nations structure.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

Americans, of course, have been assured that the constitutional legality of the United Nations treaty agreement is found in article VI of our Constitution. Secretary of State Dulles, remember, stated that, "Treaty law can override the Constitution".

A treaty, however, cannot authorize what the Constitution forbids.

No Federal agent has the power or the authority to modify or to dissolve the constitutional compact.

This fact was affirmed in positive terms in *Reid* v. *Covert*, 1957, in which the United States Supreme Cout declared:

"It would be manifestly contrary to the objectives of those who created the Constitution, as well as those who were responsible for the Bill of Rights—let alone alien to our entire constitutional history and tradition—to construe article VI as permitting the United States to exercise power under an international agreement without observing constitutional prohibitions. In effect, such construction", said the Court, "would permit amendment of that document in a manner not sanctioned by article V. The prohibitions of the Constitution were designed to apply to all branches of the national government and they cannot be nullified by the Executive or by the Executive and Senate combined."

Our Federal Government, however, has clearly demonstrated that the Constitution has been amended, "in a manner not sanctioned by article V".

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

It must be said, too, that the Supreme Court cannot declare a statute of Congress "unconstitutional". The court can exercise only the judicial power conferred upon it by the Constitution. It can no more "unmake" a legislative act that it can make one.

To strike down a legislation act requires legislative power. No court has such power.

The ordinary citizen also lacks the power to overturn breaches of the Constitution.

Only a State, acting in its highest sovereign capacity, can repudiate unauthorized acts of its agents.

Therefore, the proper party to now challenge the validity of the United Nations Treaty agreement is a party to the constitutional compact, a sovereign State—the State of Alabama.

The reason that the people and the States have been burdened with the acts of Federal agents in their surrender of the powers of government to the United Nations is because the State has not repudiated the attempts of its agents to act beyond their authority. These acts had the effect of "law", not by reason of any nonexistent authority of the Federal agents, but because of the authority the State gave to these acts by failing to challenge the attempts of its Federal agents to exceed their authority.

The power to correct these excesses by Federal agents is found in the Constitution.

"We the People of the United States," declares the preamble to the Constitution "in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The preamble thus clearly defines the sovereignty and the authority of the parties to the constitutional compact.

"It is in this sense of the term 'States' that they form the constitutency from which the Federal Constitution emanated," said Martin Van Buren, our eighth President, "and it is by the States, acting either by their legislatures or in convention that any valid alteration of the instrument can alone be made."

As we have seen, however, it is a matter of historical record that the Constitution of the United States has suffered, not merely alteration, but complete abridgement by the passage of the so-called United Nations Treaty.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

This emasculation of our Constitution most certainly was not authorized by the parties to the constitutional compact.

In this respect, State officeholders have a positive duty to enforce the provisions of the Constitution. It is a continuing obligation and may not be met merely by an empty oath taken upon accepting public office.

The language of section 3, article VI, U.S. Constitution, "* * * shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution," imposes a continuing duty upon these officeholders as long as they continue in office.

In like manner, the State at the time of its admission into the Union assumes all obligations to the people of that State, and to the people of the several States which are parties to the same agreement, to insure that all provisions of the Constitution are respected and enforced within the boundaries of the State.

Therefore, in conformity with these duties and obligations, I propose that the legislators of the State of Alabama now do what is necessary to defend the Constitution and to protect the rights of the people.

Events in Washington and in the State of Alabama disclose that we have lost the liberties and the freedoms guaranteed to the people under this Constitution. And we have lost control of the Federal Government.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

I, therefore, suggest that the legislators of the State of Alabama appoint a special committee comprising members of the house and senate to investigate the legality of the action of Federal agents with regard to the United Nations and to provide means for the enforcement of the Constitution of the United States in relation thereto.

I suggest that such committee be authorized and directed to investigate the question of whether the United Nations Treaty agreement entered into by Federal agencies acting as representatives of these United States and of the State of Alabama be within the power and authority granted to said agents under the Constitution of the United States.

I suggest that this committee be further authorized and directed to investigate the question of whether this purported U.N. treaty agreement affects the State of Alabama, or relates to the relinquishment of any of the laws or rights affecting the State of Alabama or its people.

This committee must determine whether there is any change proposed to be made under this United Nations treaty agreement which would deprive the State of Alabama or its people of rights and privileges, or would involve any change in any of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States without the consent of the State of Alabama or of the several States.

And, I suggest that this committee inquire into what measures may be taken by the State of Alabama to enforce the Constitution of the United States and to punish any infraction thereof that may appear to be indorsed by any unlawful use of authority by any agency not sanctioned by the Constitution of the United States.

Upon determining that the United Nations treaty agreement is beyond the authority granted to Federal agents by Constitutional compact, I propose that the legislators of the State of Alabama introduce, "a bill to provide for the enforcement of the Constitution of the United States with regard to the so-called United Nations organization."

I suggest that this statute declare that the agreements relating to the United Nations organization are beyond the authority granted to agencies purporting to make these treaties and agreements, and are, therefore, null, void, and of no effect within the jurisdiction of the State of Alabama, and that any attempt to enforce the provisions of any said treaties or agreements within the State of Alabama is unlawful.

And, lastly, I suggest that any person who shall commit an act in violation of the provisions of this statute shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $100,000, or be confined in the State penitentiary not more than 20 years, or both.

In providing criminal penalties for attempts to enforce acts that have no authority under the U.S. Constitution, the State Legislature of the State of Alabama is not asked to declare "unconstitutional" a treaty that is made with regard to the United Nations. The Alabama legislature is requested to first inquire into the question of whether there was authority to enter into such a treaty. Upon finding that there was not, the Alabama Legislature is asked to provide criminal sanctions for attempts to affectuate in Alabama that which was never in legal existence.

The Legislature of the State of Alabama, by adopting this proposed statute, will clarify and make definite the law in the State and will discharge the State's obligation to insure that the limits of the U.S. Constitution are respected within its borders.

Ladies and gentlemen, the United Nations stands indicted as a subversive organization. Its objective is the destruction of our Christian, constitutional, Republic.

Americans must now join together to expose this evil.

To initiate the action I am prepared at this time to offer to the Alabama State Legislature drafts of the two implementing statutes described in this presentation.

I am prepared to offer into evidence the names and backgrounds of 16 U.S. Government employees, all agents for international communism, who contributed to the authorship of the United Nations Charter.

I am prepared to offer into evidence the listing of 42 Senate reports which detail the subversive activities of the United Nations organization, its agencies, and its personnel.

I am prepared to offer into evidence my 10,000-word documented study of the men and the system which has transferred our Military Establishment to the United Nations.

And, at such time as the Alabama Legislature commissions a committee to investigate the United Nations treaty, I will be pleased to suggest qualified witnesses to offer testimony regarding the usurpation of governmental powers and the surrender of our liberties to the United Nations organization without the consent of the people of the State of Alabama or of the several States comprising the Union.

These witnesses will include constitutional attorneys, general officers of the U.S. Military Establishment, civilian experts on the subject of U.N. subversion, and U.S. Senators.

We must destroy the United Nations banner.

I respectfully await your decision.

Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the poverty program has been examined in a series of articles written by Jo Ann Hardee, of the Detroit News. The fourth article in this series follows:

POVERTY WAR STRATEGY: SPUR LOCAL AGENCIES INTO ACTION

(By Jo Ann Hardee of the Detroit News staff)

WASHINGTON, March 17.—The promise of the $257 million community action phase (CAP) of the antipoverty bill is that it will nudge localities into revamping their existing agencies to better serve the poor.

Its perils are political porkbarrel use of the funds or that Federla officials will succumb to political pressures to "get the money out," granting funds to existing agencies with no guarantees of better service.

SHAKE UP AGENCIES

Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), candidly admits that the purpose of CAP is to "shake up" the structure of existing services. He also admits that, in some localities, the effort is meeting resistance from agencies that are reluctant to change.

"Certainly, we're having trouble," he said. "But if we weren't, we wouldn't be getting the sort of reshaping of institutions that we seek."

A community action program is determined by a local board under minimal standards set by the OEO. Grants can be made to cities, counties or groups of counties such as the 15-member upper peninsula community action program.

DETROIT AN EXCEPTION

They can be made to a single private agency, such as the United Planning Organization here, nonprofit boards with representatives from existing agencies and the community, or, in rare cases like Detroit and Wayne County, a local governing unit.

The OEO's brightest hope is New Haven, Conn., which launched the urban model community action program in 1962 with $2.5 million from the Ford Foundation.

The city recognized that poverty, unemployment, educational lacks, health needs, juvenile delinquency, and poor housing were interrelated and could only be fought on a coordinated basis.

One answer was the neighborhood service center, offering a wide range of social services within walking distance of the poor. This concept has become a model for urban community action programs.

Detroit, for example, will have four such centers.

RIVALS COMPETE

Examples of the difficulty in establishing community action programs are Philadelphia and Washington where there are still struggles between private agencies over which should administer the program.

The political perils are illustrated by the Harlem program where one director was ousted and replaced by an aide of Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, New York Democrat, and chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, which clears antipoverty legislation.

Privately, OEO officials are concerned about Detroit's program, which they believe is too closely tied to the mayor's office and lacks sufficient active involvement of the public schools and private agencies.

PROGRESS REPORTED

But one stated: "Even where we have problems of real involvement by all the pertinent agencies, we've made progress.

"In some cities, there are agencies that haven't spoken to each other in years. It's progress to get them at the same table. We can work from there.

"We have a choice. We can use our own limited resources trying to get community action programs into rural areas where they've never even heard of a community chest.

"Or we can work with communities where there are rivalries between agencies.

NEITHER WAY EASY

"Either way it isn't easy. But with 175 people, we're taking the applications as they come in. We are in no position, right now, to go out and solicit business."

Another OEO official was less optimistic.

"We're failing in CAP," he said. "I'm not saying the CAP programs won't help people. But our goal was a revamping of agencies and the political pressures to get the money out is forcing us to put funds into existing agencies that will go on doing what they've been doing for years.

"After all, the whole point of the Economic Opportunity Act isn't the $727 million in our budget, it's getting better expenditure of the billions that are already going into antipoverty efforts."

GIVES OTHER SIDE

CAP Director Richard W. Boone, formerly with the Ford Foundation, countered: "We are demanding a representative board in each community with members of minority groups and representatives of the poor.

"Our best safeguard against a pork-barrel operation is a representative board that will demand sound use of existing services and Federal funds.

"Some people complain that we are not getting the money out fast enough.

"Since so much depends on the quality of the board in each community, no matter how strong the pressures are, we will not approve a program unless we believe the board is representative."

THIRTY-ONE MILLION DOLLARS GIVEN OUT

Those who complain the CAP is moving too slowly cite its own statistics. Of its $272 million budget, only $31 million has been allocated. Nearly 75 percent of this has gone into technical assistance (planning) grants.

Of the operating programs, most are located in large cities with previous planning experience in coordinated services either through the Ford Foundation or the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act of 1962.

Boone admits that "planning sophistication is naturally further advanced in major urban areas. But we expect those communities that now have planning grants to be coming in with operational programs before July 1. We should have 300 operating programs announced by then."

GOP KEEPS WATCH

The importance of "getting the money out," is shown in the statement of Representative MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, chairman of the House Republican conference and a member of the Appropriations Committee.

"We gave them too much money last year," he said today. "We'll hold them up as much as possible on their appropriation while we see what they've done with the money. They don't know it now, but we're going to send our staff in to investigate their expenditures about May 15.

"They wanted $900 million last year and we cut them to $700 million. This time they want $1.8 billion and we should cut them back to $1 billion."

SPUR RURAL ACTION

While relying primarily on State governments to develop rural community action programs, the OEO and Department of Agriculture recently announced a special task force to spur action in rural areas.

Also speeding action in an area the OEO considers most promising is Project Headstart, aimed at placing 100,000 children from culturally deprived backgrounds into preschool programs this summer.

The program, now budgeted at $17 million, is to be absorbed in community action programs in the fall and allocated $150 million.

It aims at identifying the problems of 3- to 5-year-olds that might inhibit learning. This information is to be passed on to school authorities in an attempt to prevent such children from dropping out of school in later years because of a repeated record of failure resulting from health, emotional, or family problems.

URGE TOUGHER RULES

Some advocates of the Economic Opportunity Act privately state that CAP could achieve better results if Federal demands were more stringent, if the OEO demanded that certain programs, like Project Headstart, be included in all local plans.

Boone disagrees.

"We might achieve more rapid change," he said.

"But it would be presumptuous for the Federal Government to insist it knows more about the needs, priorities, and capacity to meet them than the local community does.

"We don't have all the answers.

"In the second place, stringent Federal demands would cut down on local initiative and there too many Federal programs doing that now."

No Denial of Voting Rights in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, Alaskans are proud that Alaska is free of racial discrimination. The laws of the State make plain that the people believe that all citizens before the law are equal. Just as in all of its actions regarding its citizens, the State makes no distinction, open or hidden, among citizens on election day on the basis of color. There is no denial of voting rights in Alaska.

Newspaper discussion of proposed voting rights legislation, indicating that Alaska would be among the States affected, is based upon erroneous calculations of the percentage of eligible Alaskans who vote. Because Alaska has no State law requiring preelection registration, all those who are 19 and older (voting age in Alaska) are presumably eligible voters. However, this age group includes some 30,000 military personnel, most of whom are not legal residents of Alaska and cast absentee ballots in their home States, instead of being voters in Alaska. Subtracting from the eligible total those who cast ballots elsewhere, then, permits a realistic estimate of the percentage of Alaskans who vote.

In the 1964 election, Alaska's secretary of state, Hugh J. Wade, estimated

that at least 60.7 percent of Alaska's eligible voters did vote. This is a very good record.

Alaska's voting record and liberal voting provisions are very well outlined by Alaska's Gov. William A. Egan in a recent letter to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman, Committee on the Judiciary. In order that those provisions may become known to my colleagues and others, I insert here that letter:

STATE OF ALASKA,
Juneau, April 4, 1965.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to be heard on S. 1564, entitled "A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States." S. 1564 is a tremendously important legislative proposal. I wholeheartedly support its passage. However, due to the press of the current legislative session here in Alaska, I will not be able to appear before the committee, nor will we be able to have others than members of Alaska's congressional delegation at our Nation's Capital at this time.

While it appears from the transcript of the testimony of the Attorney General of the United States, presented to the House Judiciary Committee on H.R. 6400, that the terms of the bill apply to the State of Alaska, the committee will surely be interested to know that by no stretch of the imagination could the bill apply to Alaska.

In the first place, the State of Alaska did not maintain any "test or device as a qualification for voting" on November 1, 1964, nor at any other time. (To "maintain a test or device as a qualification for voting" would be a clear-cut violation of article V, the suffrage and elections article of Alaska's constitution. Article V, in its entirety, follows:

"SUFFRAGE AND ELECTIONS

"SECTION. 1. Every citizen of the United States who is at least nineteen years of age, who meets registration requirements which may be prescribed by law, and who is qualified to vote under this article, may vote in any State or local election. He shall have been, immediately preceding the election, for one year a resident of Alaska and for thirty days a resident of the election district in which he seeks to vote. He shall be able to read or speak the English language as prescribed by law, unless prevented by physical disability. Additional voting qualifications may be prescribed by law for bond issue elections of political subdivisions.

"SEC. 2. No person may vote who has been convicted of a felony involving moral turpitude unless his civil rights have been restored. No person may vote who has been judicially determined to be of unsound mind unless the disability has been removed.

"SEC. 3. Methods of voting, including absentee voting, shall be prescribed by law. Secrecy of voting shall be preserved. The procedure for determining election contests, with right of appeal to the courts, shall be prescribed by law.

"SEC. 4. The legislature may provide a system of permanent registration of voters, and may establish voting precincts within election districts.

"SEC. 5. General elections shall be held on the second Tuesday in October of every even-numbered year, but the month and day may be changed by law."

I personally doubt that the constitution of any other State in our great Nation contains more liberal voting provisions than the constitution of the State of Alaska.

As a practical matter, the American citizens of native and Eskimo ethnic origin in Alaska probably come closer to having a 100-percent voting record among those who are of voting age than does any other specific group of citizens of our 50 States. There are no voting impediments whatsoever placed in the way of Alaska's 8,000 to 9,000 fine American citizens of Negro origin. All that is required for anyone to vote in Alaska's State elections is that the voter be a citizen of the United States who is at least 19 years of age, a resident of Alaska for 1 year, and able to read or speak the English language as prescribed by law.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, Alaska's secretary of state, the administrator of Alaska's elections, calculates that at least 60.7 percent of the citizens of voting age who were qualified to vote and who claim Alaska as their voting residence, voted in the November 1964 presidential election.

Most of the military population of Alaska, of course, maintains voting residence in other States of our Union. And there are certain reasons why a far greater percentage of other Federal employees in Alaska maintain voting residence in other States than is the case elsewhere.

State of Alaska voting records reveal that there have been very few challenges of prospective voters at the polling places over the far-flung voting precincts of the vast area that is Alaska.

There are no prior registration requirements in Alaska for State or national general elections. In Alaska's larger communities, prior registration is required for local municipal elections.

I have no doubt that the State of Alaska can establish, to the satisfaction of the United States Attorney General, that Alaska has never maintained a "test or device." Further, I am confident that we can establish, to the satisfaction of the Director of the Census, that a far greater percentage than 50 percent of the qualified voters claiming residence in Alaska did indeed cast their ballots in both the presidential election of 1964 and in the 1960 presidential election.

I note, in section 4(b) of S. 1564, that the determination of the U.S. Attorney General or of the U.S. Director of the Census is "final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register." I hope these determinations have not already been made and that the State of Alaska will have opportunity to present evidence to the U.S. Attorney General and the U.S. Director of the Census proving that Alaska does not in fact constitutionally, by law, or in practice exercise any voting "test or device." We will also prove that the percentage of Alaska voters participating in the only presidential elections in which we have ever been privileged to take part, numbered far in excess of 50 percent of those persons of voting age and claiming voting residence in Alaska.

Discrimination or denial of voting or other civil rights to any resident of Alaska is prohibited by Alaska's constitution and by strong, effective, implementing statutes of this State. Strong penalties are provided in Alaska law for violation of such statutes.

Therefore, a great injustice has been visited upon our State through the erroneous inclusion of Alaska in press releases on the wire services which have implied that Alaska may not met some of the standards for voting procedures proposed in the provisions of S. 1564.

The official view of the executive branch of the goverment of the State of Alaska is that it is quite likely the provisions of S. 1564, as originally submitted, are not broadly inclusive enough to insure total compliance with the intent of the proposed legislation.

It is obvious from public statements of a number of Members of the U.S. Senate that amendments will be offered to your committee which would accomplish the broadening of authority that may be necessary.

I want to express my sincere appreciation of your kindness in permitting me this opportunity to explain the State of Alaska's position with respect to S. 1564 and H.R. 6400 and in allowing me to present through this communication to your committee the facts regarding Alaska's voting requirements, which are either the most liberal of all the great States in our Union, or at least are among the most liberal voting provisions of all our sister States.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

A Responsible Position on Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by Milburn P. Akers of the Chicago Sun-Times.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 9, 1965]

A RESPONSIBLE POSITION ON ASIA

(By Milburn P. Akers)

It is now up to the Communist bloc to determine whether the rapidly escalating war in Vietnam is to be continued or if peace is to be the lot of southeast Asians, and, perhaps, of the rest of the world. President Johnson's statement that the United States is willing—without preconditions—to try to negotiate peace (a switch in his previously declared position) creates some hope that the conflict can be ended. If the Communists are unwilling to negotiate, or if, in such negotiations, they are their usual intransigent selves, the responsibility for continued war in southeast Asia and its likely enlargement will be theirs alone.

It required a lot of political courage for the President to switch his position. He gains stature as a consequence. Only a week earlier he had repeated his declaration that North Vietnam must abandon its assaults on South Vietnam before negotiations would be worthwhile. That observation may still prove to be correct. Negotiations do not assure a termination of the conflict. Neither do negotiations imply retreat or surrender. Negotiations are merly an effort to determine whether a formula acceptable to both sides can be evolved and peace restored. To decry negotiations is to assert that differences can be settled only by force. Mr. Johnson has taken the responsible position which any reasonable statesman must take in a world living under the continuing threat of atomic war.

He has made it known that peace in southeast Asia "demands an independent South Vietnam, securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationship to all others, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no country."

If, as may be likely, North Vietnam and its Communist allies, whether in South Vietnam or elsewhere, can't accept peace on such terms, all their prattle that imperialist America is intent only on war becomes a proper description of their aims.

Mr. Johnson has restored America's moral position. He has regained a position of strength from which to conduct negotiations. America's role in the world requires that position of moral strength.

The ultimate reaction of Hanoi and Peiping to the President's statement is conjectural,

of course. Both are likely to continue the hypocritical pretense that peace, if it comes, must be made with the Vietcong. That is partly true, but it is far from the whole truth.

The Vietcong, bereft of manpower replacements and supplies from North Vietnam, will ultimately wither. They can't long survive a viable government in Saigon, especially if that government (which, unfortunately, most of them have not been) devotes itself to the welfare of the South Vietnamese people.

Soviet Russia, whose leaders profess to believe peaceful coexistence is possible, will be even harder put to reject Mr. Johnson's new position than Red China, whose leaders frequently assert that coexistence isn't possible. If Mr. Johnson has now further isolated Soviet Russia from Red China, as may prove to be true, the responsibility for continuing the conflict, with all that such continuance entails, becomes that of Red China. For Ho Chi Minh, who heads the Communist hierarchy in Hanoi, has had a good sample of the devastation that can be visited on his country so long as it lacks adequate air cover. That can be given him only by Soviet Russia.

The American air strikes against North Vietnam did not cause Hanoi to seek peace, as some had expected. It is possible, however, that they will be instrumental in causing Ho Chi Minh to take advantage of Mr. Johnson's expressed willingness to negotiate. Another advantage obtained by the President in his newly declared position is that many Americans who have been critical of the extension of the war in South Vietnam with its ever-increasing possibilities of resulting in a major conflict can now fully support his course. He has made a reasonable offer to explore the possibilities of a peaceful settlement. He has regained a moral position from which to conduct come what may. So long as the United States can negotiate from a strong moral position, as well as a strong military one, there is a chance of bringing peace to southeast Asia.

That peace, fortified by the development of the Mekong River Valley, as outlined by Mr. Johnson, is essential if the world is to step back from the brink on which it now totters.

The End of the Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, on April 9, 1865, the Confederate Army of Northern Virginia laid down its arms at Appomattox, a small village not far from Lynchburg, Va.

The Confederate Capital had already fallen. Jefferson Davis and nearly all his cabinet had left Richmond on April 2, and the city had been occupied by Union troops under Weitzel on the following day. On the afternoon of April 2, General Lee had given the order for the evacuation of Petersburg, which was accomplished that night. Lee managed the escape well, getting away with most of his artillery; but his objective, a junction with Confederate forces under Gen. Joseph E. Johnston in North Carolina, was blocked by Union columns. The dwindling Confederate Army was not only trapped but it was almost without food. General Lee rejected a suggestion by some of his officers that the army break into small bands and attempt to slip through the surrounding lines, on the ground that such groups would become mere bands of marauders, would carry the war into areas that had escaped the ravages of war, and would create a situation from which it would take the country years to recover.

On April 7, 1865, Lee, sharing Grant's desire to avoid the useless shedding of blood, asked for terms. On Palm Sunday, April 9, the opposing commanders met in conference in the McLean House in the village of Appomattox Courthouse. Lee and his party arrived first and when Grant and his officers arrived the two generals shook hands in the middle of the room.

These two great soldiers presented a strange contrast. General Lee was immaculate in dress uniform. General Grant had come straight from the field, in the uniform of a private with the shoulder straps of a lieutenant general.

After some preliminary conversation about the Mexican War and the old Army days, Lee turned the conversation to the business at hand. At his suggestion Grant wrote out the terms of surrender. The officers and men of Lee's command were to be released as paroled prisoners, all materials of war were to be turned over to officers designated by Grant, except the sidearms, horses, and personal baggage of the officers. Although he did not include the provision in the written terms, Grant, in response to his opponent's unspoken wish, generously offered to instruct his parole officers "to let all the men who claim to own a horse or mule take the animals home with them to work their little farms." After Lee had read the terms, Grant gave his rough draft of the terms to Colonel Parker for copying in final form, and Lee requested Colonel Marshall to write an acceptance. The signing of the two letters and their exchange completed the negotiations.

With the exception of Abraham Lincoln, the two great generals who met at Appomattox were perhaps the finest figures to emerge from the war. And at no time was their greatness more apparent than on that quiet Sunday afternoon. Lee, "a foe without hate, a friend without treachery, a soldier without cruelty, and a victim without murmuring," in adversity showed a quiet dignity and courtesy that deserves our admiration. Grant, in his hour of victory, evidenced a restraint, a magnanimity, and a fine consideration that have hardly been surpassed.

After Appomattox, several Confederate armies remained in the field. The final terms of capitulation of Johnston's army, similar to those accorded Lee, were signed near Durham Station, N.C., on April 26; Gen. Richard Taylor surrendered on May 4 at Citronelle, Ala.; and on May 26, at New Orelans, Kirby Smith surrendered the Confederate forces beyond the Mississippi. But for practical purposes Appomattox marked the end of the war.

Thus closed our great struggle for national survival. Because of the lack of reliable and comparable records, it will never be possible to assess accurately the cost of the war in life and property; but we know that we paid a fearful price.

If wounded and dying men can be reduced to statistics, it appears that the struggle between the two sections cost a million casualties. Probably more than 200,000 of these were killed or fatally wounded in battle.

Other costs of the war include almost incalculable amounts in direct war costs, pensions, retardation of economic development, ruined homes, fields, roads, buildings, and bridges. Property in slaves was wiped out, the merchant marine was shattered, and we were left with a heritage of hate, extravagance, corruption, truculence, and intolerance. The inability of our leaders to manage the crisis of 1860 and 1861 had borne bitter fruit.

Perhaps no finer words have ever been included in a state paper than words in Lincoln's second inaugural address:

> With malice toward none; with charity for all * * * let us strive to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace.

These words are the true measure of his greatness. A reconstruction in this spirit could easily have changed our history. Tragically, Lincoln was struck down by the assassin's hand. Our Nation was left to pass through the difficult years ahead without the benefit of his wise guidance. Other leaders determined reconstruction policies with a bitterness and vindictiveness entirely foreign to Lincoln's hopes and to the spirit of Grant and Lee at Appomattox.

At last reunion was achieved. In the war with Spain, two World Wars, the Korean war, and the years of peace that have intervened, we have gone forward as one Nation, united by a common heritage. Across the Potomac, in Arlington National Cemetery, thousands of men from both Union and Confederate armies lie buried. Perhaps their best epitaph was spoken by Lincoln in his first inaugural address, when that mighty host was yet alive:

> We are not enemies but friends * * *. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and every patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone in this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union.

Grade School Band Captivates Canadians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, again this year the Waukegan Grade School Concert Band has brought honor and distinction to the Waukegan and Lake County, Ill., community as well as to our great Nation. Recently this group of 84

young musicians—ranging in age from 10 to 14 years—participated in a Canadian tour, presenting concerts in Waterloo, Toronto, Brantford, and the Canadian Capital of Ottawa.

The success of this year's Canadian tour matches, in many respects, the fine concerts which the Waukegan Grade School Concert Band presented last year here in Washington.

The concert presented in Waterloo, Ontario, was part of the Waterloo Instrumental Clinic for 1965 held at the University of Waterloo as a part of the spring convention of the Canadian Bandmasters Association. The host for this program was the Waterloo Music Co., Ltd. The selection presented during this musical tour included compositions of Rimsky-Korsakoff, Mendelssohn, Wagner, and other renowned composers. Each of the Canadian concerts, of course, included a rendition of the Canadian national anthem, "O Canada," as well as our national anthem, "The Star-Spangled Banner."

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend initially the talented and inspiring director of this musical organization, Mr. Bernard H. Stiner, whose patience and painstaking attention to detail and to the individual part played by each of the young musicians culminated in the finished performance which distinguishes the artistry of the Waukegan Grade School Concert Band.

Mr. Speaker, in its issue of March 30 the Ottawa Citizen newspaper had this to say:

> Eighty-four young musicians from Waukegan, Ill., thrilled a large crowd at Glebe Collegiate Monday night with a program ranging from Rimsky-Korsakoff to Sousa.

In the March 31 issue of the New York Times the following report was carried:

> U.S. SCHOOL BAND GROUP WINS APPLAUSE IN OTTAWA
>
> Eighty-four grade school musicians of Waukegan, Ill., won hearty applause from a large Ottawa audience last night. The young bandsmen, completing a goodwill tour of four Canadian cities, played a program highlighting two American composers, Aaron Copland and John Philip Sousa."

Following the band's performance in the Canadian capital, Ronald G. Moxness, press attaché at the U.S. Embassy in Ottawa, stated:

> I have the feeling that the band left following a most successful visit to Ottawa. * * * I thought the band was excellent and I must admit that I marvelled at their skill considering their extreme youth. The phrase used by the Journal 'the precision carried into the band's music' rather summed up their Glebe performance.

Mr. Frank A. Daley, manager, educational services department of the Waterloo Music Co., Ltd., Waterloo, Ontario, stated:

> The impression and the impact made by both the deportment and musical excellence of the Waukegan band was tremendous. I am sure you realized how much the audience enjoyed their concert, and I can assure you that the comments received afterwards were most favourable. You will be interested to learn that we broke all previous attendance records this year—and I am sure that the visit of the Waukegan band had some large part to play in this.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the good public relations and the promotion of international good will which the Waukegan Grade School Concert Band has achieved through this tour. In addition to the opportunities to present fine musical concerts, these young performers from Waukegan had occasion to foster good public relations through their individual contacts with many Canadian citizens. Also the opportunity to visit at the Canadian capitol in Ottawa, to see Niagara Falls, Toronto, and other points of interest in Canada helped to provide memorable and lasting impressions and experiences for these young people.

I want to extend my praise and congratulations to each of the young students who performed as part of the band. In addition, I want to express appreciation to our U.S. Department of State for the facilitative services which were rendered and to the Honorable W. Walton Butterworth, our U.S. Ambassador to Canada, Mayor Don Reid and Deputy Mayor Ken Fogarty of Ottawa, Mr. Nicholas Volk of the U.S. Information Agency at Toronto; to the officers of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., the Seagram Co., and Johns-Manville Corp., for the generous contributions of these companies to the expenses and entertainment of the Waukegan Grade School Concert Band during its Canadian tour.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to extend hearty congratulations to and thanks to the Band Parents Association, its president, Raymond Runge, to Richard Cummings, and to the tour chairman, Donald M. Lonchar, Jr. A Canadian official whose assistance was invaluable was the Honorable R. Alan Eagleson, member of the Ontario Parliament. An accolade belongs to my good Washington friend, Mr. Edward Maginnis. Of course, close cooperation was provided by the principal figure in our cultural exchange program, Mr. Charles Ellison, Under Secretary of State for Cultural Affairs.

A word of praise also belongs to Robert Sabonjian, mayor of Waukegan, who with his wife accompanied the band throughout the Canadian tour; and to the Waukegan News-Sun who staff writer, Karl Luomala, reported faithfully on the success of the band as its Canadian tour proceeded.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud to bring news of this important cultural event to the attention of the Members of the House and to the Nation.

Air Pollution Knows No Boundaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Clean Air Act of 1963. The purpose of this measure is to meet the problems of air pollution which all areas of our country find to be an increasing problem.

Much has been written to alert us of the health hazards from exposure to normal pollution conditions and there is a plethora of statistics available on the number of persons who have died from heavy concentrations of pollutants.

As of this writing we have the Clean Air Act of 1963, which provides grants to State, local, and interstate air pollution control agencies for abatement programs.

However, the present act is insufficient to meet and overcome this urgent health hazard. Moreover, in addition to assisting in the health problems caused by pollutants legislation is needed to assist our cities and States to remove the soot and grime which mars the enjoyment of our ever-expanding urban centers.

Last year when I was serving as a member of the Colorado State Legislature, State Senator Roland Mapelli and I introduced an air pollution bill which was designed to put real teeth into an air pollution control program and to make its requirements regional in scope, a provision necessary to its practical operation.

At that time we noted with great pride that a number of companies which we investigated, were, on their own initiative, spending their own resources for installations of air control systems.

We stated, at that time, that we felt that a special tax incentive was in order inasmuch as these efforts in a great majority of cases were not inurring to the benefit of these companies nor adding directly to their operations but were essentially contributions to the welfare of the community.

It is a real pleasure for me, therefore, to include in this bill this tax incentive provision which in my opinion will operate to the advantage of both industry and the public. However, I feel now, as I felt then, that unless all companies were subjected to State and regional regulations the fact that some companies took air polution control steps on their own initiative would not solve the problem if other companies would refuse, and I feel there is still an absolute necessity for this provision in order to get teeth into such local acts. I am delighted with the efforts exerted in the State of Colorado at this time to make this bill a reality.

While I realize that the tax incentive provisions to industry for installation of pollutant control systems has been before the Congress several times I am hopeful that the climate is ripe for passage in this Congress, partly because we are considering tax reductions generally and partly because it would be a giant step to solving the critical air pollution problem we have been avoiding too long.

The other major provision of this bill is the requirement that all automobiles sold after November 1, 1967, will be equipped with a blowby system to limit emissions from crankcases.

We had occasion in Colorado, last year, to view an exhibit of these control devices which have been made mandatory by the California Legislature for instal-

lation on all 1966 models sold in California.

Obviously, the best way to make meaningful the control of air pollution by automobiles is to have devices installed on all cars. This is especially important in a tourist state such as my own where local control of local automobiles would be fairly meaningless if out-of-State automobiles were allowed to continue to clog the air with uncontrolled combusted pollutants.

The hearings in this Congress on this matter have pointed out very clearly that although there is much to learn, control measures are needed now. It is even greatly to be hoped that the automobile industry will voluntarily give the clean air systems an immediate tryout by installing them on their new models before the 1968 models are on the market, as required in my bill.

It is my fervent hope that an all-out attack on this problem from the Federal Government through enactment of the proposals in my bill to provide, first, tax incentives to industry, the private sector, second, control systems imposed on new automobiles, and third, by increasing State and local responsibility, will result, not only in the alleviation of the air pollution control problem that is increasingly infesting our urban areas but in its elimination in the foreseeable future.

I include herewith a more detailed analysis of the principal provisions of my bill:

AUTOMOTIVE EMISSIONS

1. Contract research on gasoline-powered vehicles to reduce emissions of oxides of nitrogen and aldehydes from the crankcase and exhaust and also hydrocarbons from gasoline evaporation in carburetors and fuel tanks.

2. Conduct research to reduce emissions of pollutants from diesel-powered vehicles.

3. Conduct research to reduce pollutants emitted from jet aircraft and missiles.

4. Conduct research for development of efficient and low-cost methods of collecting and disposing of municipal solid wastes.

5. Carry out program to inform and advise eligible air pollution control agencies and eligible persons of the provisions of this act.

6. Establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

7. Provide that Secretary shall appoint a technical committee to encourage development of improved low-cost techniques to remove sulfur from sulfur-bearing fuels and reduce emissions of oxides of sulfur produced by combustion of sulfur-bearing fuels.

8. Provide that Secretary shall set standards for allowable emissions from gasoline-powered vehicles and require all new automobiles to be equipped with blowby systems from crankcases not later than November 1, 1967.

9. Require imported gasoline-powered vehicles to be so equipped with a blowby system.

10. Set penalties for violations at not more than $1,000 or 6 months' imprisonment or both.

11. Provide controls over air pollution from the exhaust of federally owned automative vehicles.

12. The Secretary will establish criteria for allowable emissions from diesel-powered vehicles.

13. To insure proper inspection and maintenance the Secretary will enter into agreements with and make grants to State agencies to carry out these standards.

14. Provide that Secretary may establish potential pollution sources for Federal agencies and departments having jurisdiction over any buildings, and authorize inspection of such property.

15. Permits appropriations for control devices, where required, on buildings and installations over which the Federal Government has jurisdiction.

16. Permits training of Federal personnel necessary to assure appropriate maintenance and operations of such devices installed on buildings under Federal jurisdiction.

17. Require a thorough study and report by Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to determine effects of air pollutants from all sources on human health. Report to be submitted not later than 2 years from enactment.

TAX INCENTIVES

18. Amends Internal Reveue Code by adding a new section to afford a substantial tax benefit to individuals or private indsutry who would acquire, construct, or install, certified air pollution control devices. The same treatment would apply to water pollution control devices. Amends Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by adding a new section 183 relating to expenditures for such devices. Taxpayer could elect to treat such expenditures as having been paid or incurred in any of the 3 taxable years preceding, or in any of the 5 taxable years following, the taxable year in which such expenses were paid or incurred. A deduction with respect to any air or water pollution control device would not be allowed unless the State or interstate air pollution control agency had certified to the Secretary that such device had been acquired, constructed or installed in conformity with State requirements. This amendment shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963. Allowance is made if the taxpayer realizes income from the operation of any certified air or water pollution control device.

Defenders All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, last night I had the privilege of addressing the opening session of the annual general assembly of the National Society Daughters of the American Colonists here in Washington, presided over by the national president, Mrs. John Y. Richardson.

Many fine, short reports were presented at the assembly by past and present officers of the society.

There was also a special address which I thought truly outstanding because it embodied so much of what we have great need for today. It was a speech expressing the highest ideals, dedication to country, the finest type of patriotism, true appreciation of the duties of citizenship and a marvelous assertion of firm and quiet courage in these times of danger and stress.

This address was made by Mrs. Herbert Ralston Hill, chairman of the society's national defense committee.

Under unanimous consent, I insert her inspiring address at this point in the RECORD and commend it to the general membership:

DEFENDERS ALL

We, Daughters of American Colonists, are of bloodlines that have been nurtured by the very soul and substance of freedom. That freedom was not a gift, but was dearly purchased by our ancestor—men and women of daring and courage—of fierce patriotism and a loyalty often manifested in heroism and other amazing expressions of the human spirit.

These colonial founders of our present federated Republic were confronted with challenges and crises which brought forth the most valorous action and which developed in them a veneration for liberty that has never been surpassed.

They were worthy, and of high character. They stood for principles above life itself.

With such a heritage, why should we not believe unwaveringly in the United States of America, cherish its distinguished history, support its Constitution, obey its laws, respect its flag, and defend it against all enemies?

We love our country and we love the good life which it affords us—the peaceful life which come with achievement and progress, and abiding confidence in our national destiny.

It is the duty of the National Defense Committee of the Daughters of the American Colonists to alert the members of the society to the dangers involving our country's precious security.

The committee attempts to create greater interest in the Government of our Republic.

It encourages a careful study of the Constitution, and seeks greater effort in the support and preservation of this famous document. It calls for special observance of the anniversary of the Constitution in September as well as that of other national holidays.

The national defense policies of our society are enunciated each year in the resolutions adopted at the general assembly.

National defense, in brief, is the protection of that forthright aim which the Declaration of Independence so nobly expresses: "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The national defense is as important in time of peace as in time of actual hostilities. It is particularly vital in these turbulent years when the world is still half slave and half free.

We who meet here tonight have ancestors who escaped from the old world tyrannies generations ago. But among our newer citizens are those who in their own personal experience have known the horrors of serfdom, and of tragic life behind that curtain where no man is free.

The complexity of the many world events in which our country is involved is truly staggering. Problems are mountainous, and solutions are very hard to come by.

As our horizons have widened, our obligations and commitments have become far greater. The limits of the Monroe Doctrine have been extended to the Baltic, to Berlin, to the Bosporus, and to the China Sea.

This country's most important role abroad in recent years has been to encourage and defend freedom and responsible self-government wherever they are permitted to exist.

The world is changing day by day, however. The watch is around the clock. Those natural devices of air, land, and water are no longer barriers against lunar landings, intercontinental rockets, and global propaganda attacks by the enemy.

Perhaps we grow weary at times of the long-standing ideological conflict with communism, and even more impatient in those areas where the conflict is one of actual

hostilities and aggression. We are baffled and frustrated by the many guises of this insidious force, which wears entirely different faces in the various parts of the world in which it pursues its subversive plots.

We sometimes become discouraged with our role as a great nation which seems to be surrendering its peace by installments for a so-called security which in fact is nothing more than an uneasy armistice, and which usually culminates in another advance of the barricades of Red imperialism.

Too often it seems we have been maneuvered into the position of being compelled to decide whether to yield or not to yield, when to yield would mean complete retreat and to refuse might fatefully escalate our involvements.

We dare never forget that one major Communist outpost is now well-established in Cuba, only 90 miles away. We dare never forget that many, many American institutions have been infiltrated by a Red fifth column.

This is truly an explosive era, and we pray that fears of total annihilation will govern the kind of ultimate decisions which will be made by any groups of leaders, in any country, who are aware of the awesome and terrible power that reposes in the hand which can write our release or signal our doom.

World diplomacy is hard put to maintain the peace, and American leadership is mandated as never before to sustain our respect among nations.

To be worthy of that respect—to be recognized everywhere as a people with the highest of purposes and the purest of principles—we must show the world an inspiring example: a nation that is a model of the good and bountiful life—a nation that has learned how to keep and enjoy the fruits of freedom, and that has tried zealously to help preserve the dignity of man.

Such a nation—based on justice and human understanding, and accepting divine guidance—is certain to survive.

Such a nation—rewarding individual achievements and recognizing superiority wherever it appears—is certain to progress and prosper.

History has demonstrated that it is very difficult to defeat the nation which is strong. Only a strong America can be a secure America. Only a productive America can be strong.

Each member of the Daughters of the American Colonists should have a keen personal interest in our Government, and become an astute observer of its form and functions.

Thomas Jefferson has reminded us that our machinery of government is nothing more than the instrument by which citizens convert their will into action. Therefore he urged an intelligent and enlightened citizenry.

We deem it the duty of every American to have a better understanding of today's national defense problems and their possible solutions.

Of supreme importance in a republic is the intelligent exercise of the franchise. It is a solemn expression of individual choice and authority.

Each citizen, by his own thinking and doing, is the real guardian of America's security.

It is your responsibility as a citizen of the United States to be an instrument of service—willing, ready, and prepared to help combat such defense perils as confront us now.

The world is moving at so fast a pace that we no longer can rely entirely on dusty files or library shelves for adequate information and enlightenment. Our reading must include current periodicals, newspapers, and radio and television broadcasts for comprehensive and reliable understanding of what is happening now.

This year each DAC chapter received a basic reading guide and general directives from the national defense committee. And as your chairman has been studying and compiling the reports from the various chapters, it is evident that numerous informed sources of information have also been found in other reading material as well as from your many topflight speakers.

There is nothing static about the national defense programs of DAC chapters. They demonstrate a lively interest in the world as it is today, and an enlightened evaluation of the efforts of our country to maintain a steadfast watch on the several functions of freedom.

I discern neither despair nor false optimism in the present attitude of the various chapters toward these fearsome times. Their attitude is that of realism and it is idealism, and certainly it is neither defeatism nor is it overestimation.

Recorded history demonstrates that each age has had its wishful thinkers as well as its Jeremiahs. Also it has been blessed with its prophets and its sentinels.

Standing in old St. John's Church at Richmond as the Second Virginia Convention opened on March 20, 1775, Patrick Henry declared:

"If we wish to be free; if we wish to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending; if we mean not basely to abandon the struggle in which we have so long been engaged, we must fight. * * *

"They tell us that we are weak. But when shall we be stronger? Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs and hugging the delusive phantom of hope, until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot? * * *

"There is no retreat but in submission and slavery. Gentlemen may cry 'Peace, peace,' but there is no peace. The war is actually begun."

Crucial problems call for crucial remedies. We today—190 years after Patrick Henry's memorable "Liberty or Death" speech—must be prepared for them.

There is an innate spirit of freedom in every true American. There is also an abiding faith in that God in whom we trust.

When Americans are on guard, their homes and their loved ones are as safe as anything can be in this challenging era.

Have faith and courage, defenders all, to meet the unforeseeable tomorrow.

Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor emphasizes the far-reaching effects of the medical care program passed by the House, which the general public should realize, and reiterates the conviction of many Members of Congress and individual citizens that any medical care program for the aged should be based on need and not on universal coverage. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including this significant editorial in the RECORD:

MEDICARE

The administration's bill for medical care for the elderly, along with the antipoverty and the education bills, is considered a key measure in the Johnson program for the Great Society. It expands the role of the Federal Government in providing hospital and nursing home care for all over 65, regardless of need. It represents a far-reaching revision and extension of the social security system.

Like other measures in the Great Society program, medicare would take the Nation further down the road to big government and socialization of responsibilities formerly left to the individual. It may well prove to be a turning point in the American approach to social needs; its consequences will be far reaching, and the public should realize this.

The popular impulse which lies behind this measure is clear. There is no doubt that many elderly people in need of assistance simply cannot afford adequate health coverage. The costs of medical service and especially hospital care have been rising more rapidly than even the cost of living. This has placed a grievous burden on many elderly people.

But with the growing inclination to encourage the Government to assume more and more responsibility for an ever-wider range of what were once private obligations, we believe that there is an increasing need for the United States to consider just where such expanding Federal control will lead.

Much hard and conscientious work has been done on the bill by the Democrats and Republicans of the House Ways and Means Committee. Faced with the necessity of drafting a bill on a difficult and controversial subject, the committee has done a workmanlike job. The bill has the merit of providing an exemption for those who object on conscientious religious grounds to participating in any way in the social security program. The bill also makes provision for those whose religious convictions would not permit them to conform to certain aspects of the program.

The medicare program points squarely in the direction of a socialization of medicine. This, in turn, opens the door to a vast increase in Federal intervention in the private life of the American citizenry.

Experience, particiularly in Great Britain, has shown that government-run medical programs grow more and more costly. Medicare would be financed by raising the social security tax rate. Total Federal payments during the first year of operation have been estimated at $6 billion. It is certain that the individual's social security tax, due to go up as much as $69.90 next year without medicare contributions, will go up more as time goes on. If the bill should be amended later on to include free doctors' bill, drugs, and so on, for all over 65, or if the age limit should be reduced, say, to 60, costs could skyrocket.

We still believe that the answer to the problem to which the bill addresses itself is to handle this challenge on th basis of need, rather than through an effort to achieve universal coverage.

The First Prayer Made in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Clifford L. Bartlett, of Pasa-

dena, Calif., has requested that I place in the RECORD the first prayer made in Congress. It was made by the Reverend Jacob Dutche and is as follows:

THE FIRST PRAYER MADE IN CONGRESS

In Thather's Military Journal, under date of December 1777, is found a note containing the identical "first prayer in Congress" which was made by the Reverend Jacob Dutche, a gentleman of great eloquence. Here it is, a historical proof to the essay published in the last issue of the Bulletin, which was written by Capt. P. A. (Dick) Horton:

"O Lord, our Heavenly Father, high and mighty King of kings, and Lord of lords, who dost from Thy throne behold all the dwellers of the earth, and reignest with power supreme and uncontrolled over all kingdoms, empires, and governments, look down in mercy, we beseach Thee on these American States, who have fled to Thee from the rod of the oppressor, and thrown themselves on Thy gracious protection, desiring to be henceforth dependent only on Thee. To Thee they have appeared for the righteousness of their cause; to Thee do they now look up for that countenance and support which Thou alone canst give. Take them, therefore, Heavenly Father, under Thy nurturing care. Give them wisdom in council and valor in the field. Defeat the malicious designs of our adversaries; convince them of the righteousness of their cause; and, if they still persist in sanguinary purposes, oh, let the voice of Thine own unerring justice sounding in their hearts, constrain them to drop the weapons of war from their unnerved hands in the day of battle.

"Be Thou present, O God of Wisdom, and direct the councils of this honorable assemblage; enable them to settle things on the best and surest foundation, that the scenes of blood may be speedily closed, and order, harmony, and peace may be effectually restored, and truth and justice, religion and piety prevail and flourish amongst Thy people; preserve the health of their bodies and the vigor of their minds; shower down upon them and the millions they here represent, such temporal blessings as Thou seest expedient for them in this world and crown them with everlasting glory in the world to come. All this we ask, in the name and through the merits of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Saviour.

"Amen."

End the Otepka Case Coverup

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 2 years Otto Otepka's career has been in a state of limbo, his name under an official executive shadow, accused of "conduct unbecoming an officer of the Department of State."

He is charged with providing unauthorized persons, specifically the chief counsel of the Senate Committee on Internal Security, with information regarding the State Department's security division. He has said:

My loyalty to my country I put above my loyalty to the Department.

The following lead editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 12 calls for the action which the Otepka situation has clearly demanded from the start. It underscores also the charges I have repeated again and again on the floor of the House and in my committee, that administration officials are covering up facts and denying information to the Congress which we rightfully must have if we are to legislate in the best interests of this Nation.

I commend the Plain Dealer's editorial to the attention of the executive branch:

END THE OTEPKA CASE COVERUP

The State Department should bring the Otto Otepka case out into the open. Too long the Department has been striving mightily to keep the facts from the public.

In September of 1963, the Department fired its chief security risk evaluator on charges of giving confidential information to Senate investigators and of suggesting questions to be asked in an inquiry into the Department's Cuban policies.

The evaluator, Otto Otepka, appealed and is still attached to the Department's payroll as a "surveyor of congressional attitudes on security."

No one, including Otepka, knows what his duties are and it is unlikely that the job will have to be immediately filled if it should become vacant by reason of Otepka's departure, if ever.

Several hearings have been scheduled and postponed at the last moment. Another is slated for May 10 but no one is offering odds that it will be held.

For reasons known only to the State Department, the Otepka case is being kept under the rug where it was swept nearly 2 years ago.

The Department had to change its regulations whereby Otepka could remain on the payroll while his appeal was pending and its phone directory still had him listed as the chief security aid a year after he had been notified he was relieved of that duty.

Also, since the notification, two other Department employees were dismissed after reversing their testimony that they had not wiretapped the chief security evaluator's phone.

All efficiency reports on Otepka have rated him as "highly knowledgeable on communism and subversive efforts in the United States" and have cited his "balance, perception, and good judgment."

If the departmental hearing upholds Otekpa's dismissal, he can then appeal to the Civil Service Commission and then to the courts.

The May 10 hearing should be held to allay the public's suspicions about all the secrecy that has surrounded this case.

The public has a right to know what justification there could be, if any, for firing a public official for giving the Nation's lawmakers the information they might need to cast intelligent votes.

The Community Development Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in December of 1964, President Johnson described our responsibility to the underprivileged people of the world in an address to the United Nations. He said:

Now on a world scale, the time has come as it came to America 30 years ago for a new era of hope * * * hope and progress for that one-third of mankind still beset by hunger, poverty and disease * * *. Any man and any nation * * * that is willing to fight the good fight against hunger and diseases * * * will find the United States of America by their side, willing to walk with them every step of the way.

Last August, my esteemed colleague, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK told you about an American voluntary organization, the Community Development Foundation, which is making it possible for American citizens to "walk every step of the way" with hundreds of thousands of people living in the underdeveloped areas of the world, who are struggling to find a way out of poverty. I would like to report to you today on the dramatic and ongoing improvements in the lives of impoverished people that are being accomplished through the foundation's methods of encouraging self-help, at an extraordinarily low cost to the American citizens who support its work.

Founded in 1959, the foundation has sponsored to date over 3,300 self-help projects in Europe, the Middle East, the Far East, Africa, Latin America, and in the depressed areas of our own country.

In progress reports issued from the many countries where the foundation sponsors self-help programs and maintains field offices, I have read about thousands of miles of road built through rugged mountains by village men with picks and shovels, of schools, medical dispensaries and community centers constructed—simple projects done by village people that break the chain reaction of poverty breeding poverty. The foundation counselors, many of whom are former U.S. Peace Corps people, are the key to the success of the program. They encourage and guide the people who give their labor to the projects which the people believe will bring the greatest benefits to their families and communities. The foundation supplies small cash grants and interest-free loans for materials, tools, and seed. In highly successful programs now in progress in Latin America, the foundation, working with the Agency for International Development and host governments, distributes U.S. food as incentive for the men who contribute their labor to the self-help programs.

But the constantly growing and vastly important village improvements made by the people under the aegis of the foundation program, tell only half the story. What is of special concern to us here in Congress is the way the foundation counselors practice self-help. These dedicated young men—men of vision, understanding, vitality, and confidence—are liberating the dammed-up energies and ideas of people. They travel to remote villages, live with the people, listen to them and find out what it is they want most to do to better the lives of their children. This is not a matter of American largess being handed out to the less fortunate. This is not the United States telling people what they should do to improve their living conditions. These young counselors introduce hope, stimulate self-respect, encourage people to

think about their needs in terms of practical solutions. Projects are firmly rooted in the community's own human resources rather than in extensive financial aid. The major investment in each project is made by the people themselves—it is their manpower, their time, their determination. When a counselor moves on, he leaves much more behind than a dam or a road or a bridge. He has instilled in the people a profound belief in their ability to help themselves. When he goes on to another village, another community, another country, he leaves behind experience in cooperation, in democratic decisionmaking, in local organization and administration, and confidence in the achievement of a better tomorrow. He leaves behind a group of people who have a true picture of what Americans are really like—people who respect us because we respect them.

In a letter, to Glen Leet, executive director of the foundation, dated August 25, 1964, Sargent Shriver, Director of the U.S. Peace Corps, wrote:

I am most interested to learn that your programs are proving successful, * * * and that you will be widening your scope of operations in Latin America * * * you realize, I'm sure, how gratifying it is to me to see former Peace Corps Volunteers successfully making use of their experience by working in community development with your organization.

Foundation methods move people to action—continuing action—whether they are practiced in the rice paddies of Korea, on an African prairie, in a village in Mexico, or a hamlet in Appalachia.

Today the men in the Mexican village of Matehuala and surrounding villages, where there has been practically no rain for 6 years are presently giving all their unemployed time, to digging a reservoir and irrigation ditch and laying pipe to bring precious water down from the mountains to irrigate their lands and furnish clean water for their homes. In a program only 18 months old, Mexican villagers have given over 1,500,000 man-days of labor to 1,676 self-help projects. Two hundred and fifty rural schools have been built, hundreds of miles of roads now connect remote villages to market towns. Community centers and small hospitals have been constructed, orchards planted and improved animal breeding projects undertaken.

It is a partnership program involving the people of the United States, the people of Mexico, AID in Washington, the Mexican Ministry of Health and Welfare and the foundation. The Mexican Ministry of Health and Welfare supplies technical assistance, personnel, and funds for needed materials to the program. Foundation counselors distribute U.S. food made available through AID as daily family rations to honor the village people who are participating in their own development. The villagers are the major partners with their contribution estimated at 78 percent of the total cost of the program to all concerned.

On January 25, 1965, Dr. Jose Alvarez Amezquita, who was Secretary of Health and Welfare for the Government of Mexico, wrote to Glen Leet:

I should very much like to express my great satisfaction for the community development foundation program that the Mexican Government and the foundation initiated. The results could not have been more impressive. Among the terminated activities that stand out vividly are the construction of a bridge in the State of Guerrero, a breakwater in Yucatan, and hundreds of classrooms, health centers and recreation areas all of which are chosen by the people * * * I have no doubt that the food for development program aids a great deal in resolving the communities' basic problems by promoting their improvement sufficiently enough so that afterwards they independently continue activities of incalculable benefit due to the fact that they have been taught the way to do it.

On February 24, 1965, American Ambassador to Mexico, Fulton Freeman, wrote to the foundation director for Latin America, telling him of the enthusiasm of Embassy officials who had just visited foundation-sponsored projects in the State of Guerrero:

The Mexican Department of Health officials commented on the extensive and important work that is being accomplished with an absolute minimum of money input. The Directors of the National Institute of Mexican Youth said they intended to use the CDF approach as a model for similar projects undertaken by their extensive organization. Congratulations on the good work being done by CDF in Guerrero and throughout Mexico.

Foundation counselors are encouraging people in many parts of the world, to use their unemployed time ideas and abilities to help themselves. Half way around the world from Mexico in a foundation-sponsored program in the mountain village of Foustesa in Greece, the need for a school triggered a chain reaction of self-help. When the Foundation counselor came to Koustesa 5 years ago the people said they wanted to rebuild the dilapidated and crowded one-room schoolhouse. They talked with the counselor. The first thing they decided to do was to bring water into the schoolyard and schoolhouse. The Foundation granted funds and the men donated the labor to installing 250 meters of pipe. In addition the villagers built a small reservoir. Encouraged by their success in helping themselves, they went on to repair the school and begin a school library and museum. Using their idle time again, the men planted a school orchard and tree nursery that now provides fruit and walnuts for additional income. Encouraged and guided by the foundation counselor, the people of Koustesa continue to plan improvements. Ideas translate into action. A beekeeping project to provide honey for the children has been started. The men are planning to build a road leading to the schoolhouse. Next on their agenda: a school kitchen addition that will allow the village children to qualify for the government school lunch program. There are 150 people living in Koustesa, 40 of them men, but they are men who have learned to believe in themselves and their ability to gradually solve their problems of poverty.

The process is repeated wherever foundation-sponsored self-help programs are in progress. In Lebanon, the people of two small villages, Hissanich and Kfar Hatta, joined forces to build a 300 meter road leading to barren land they owned jointly. Working together, the villagers have reclaimed 70 acres of land and will plant fruit trees and tobacco this spring.

Now people living in the Korean village of Sa Am Ri can water their crops from the new reservoir built with foundation support to conserve the torrential spring rains for the months of drought. The people of La Touche Pirot, in the heart of ancient Brittany in France, people whose customs and ways belong to the past, will draw water for their cattle, water to drink, to wash in, to cook with—from the new faucets they have installed in the village with foundation aid. In all such self-help programs the small grant or loan from the foundation is multiplied 10 times by the contribution of labor given by the people themselves.

This holds equally true in the foundation's self-help program in the southern Appalachian Mountains in the United States. Foundation counselors, working closely with students, families, community leaders, schoolteachers, and social-workers are currently administering 369 school, community and family self-help activities in Appalachia. In battered one-room schoolhouses which still offer the only educational opportunities for many of the children, parents work together to repair school buildings, renovate interiors, install kitchens for hot lunch programs, plant vegetable gardens and bring in electricity and running water. In community centers, abandoned buildings which the people themselves have renovated with foundation support, the traditional southern mountain skills of rugweaving and furniture-making are being revived to increase the family incomes for people who have lived too long in poverty amidst American affluence.

Mr. Leet said:

Whether in the United States or abroad, the key to the success of the foundation's self-help programs lies in the ability and training of the counselors who work with the people. Several young graduates of the U.S. Peace Corps are now working in the field in Latin American countries. These men will work in the expanding programs overseas and in our own depressed areas here in the United States. Foundation counselors are chosen for their respect and understanding of the cultural traditions, abilities, and needs of the people living in the areas where they work. A special foundation training course includes intensive in-the-field training, study assignments, and problems to be solved in foundation methods and techniques for stimulating self-help.

As the Community Development Foundation expands its work here and abroad, new refinements are introduced. In Mexico, Colombia, and the Dominican Republic, the foundation uses a computer-aided reporting system. The monthly reports sum up each month's work efforts and accomplishments in terms of commodities distributed, types of projects, number of men working, and number of men, women, and children benefited by the projects in each area.

Mr. Leet said:

Governments of developing countries, faced with the tremendous demands for progress of their people, are turning to the foundation, eager to utilize the methods of encouraging self-help we have pioneered. During 1964 a score of countries have asked the

foundation to present plans for joint self-help programs.

Many parts of the world are the proving ground for the thesis supported by the foundation that men and women, no matter how deeply enmeshed in poverty they may be, can progress together when their talents and ideas are used with proper regard for their dignity and the inherent need to give of themselves. Every day the foundation is helping people to understand that they can raise their standards of living, working side by side and at peace with each other, assisted by their own governments, and fortified by the knowledge that people in the United States care so much about their welfare, that they are willing to send funds and trained counselors to guide them in their struggle to insure that the future will be better.

The foundation maintains national headquarters in Norwalk, Conn., and at 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y. Detailed reports on the work being accomplished by the people in each country where the foundation is active are available upon request.

Text of an Address by Representative Gerald R. Ford, of Michigan, at a Testimonial Dinner, April 11, 1965, in Chicago, for Cook County Sheriff Richard Ogilvie, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1965, the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD FORD], was the speaker at a State of Israel bond dinner in Chicago, Ill., in honor of the sheriff of Cook County, Richard Ogilvie. Because Mr. FORD's remarks were so well received by the more than one thousand people in attendance and because I believe his speech is of interest to other Members, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, OF MICHIGAN, AT A TESTIMONIAL DINNER, APRIL 11, 1965, IN CHICAGO, FOR COOK COUNTY SHERIFF RICHARD OGILVIE, OF ILLINOIS

We are here for several reasons this evening. One of them is to salute Sheriff Richard Ogilvie. I join you in applauding him for building a professional police force from scratch, handling the Dixmoor riots with courage, calmness and finesse, and providing an entrenched political machine with strong and healthy opposition.

His dedication is akin to the fine work of DON RUMSFELD, who represents the 13th District in the House of Representatives as a staunch and articulate spokesman for the people back home in Illinois.

I am delighted to be with you for other reasons—first, because of the most worthwhile cause this dinner supports.

Very shortly the State of Israel will celebrate its 17th anniversary. In that brief period of history, a courageous and dedicated people have almost miraculously transformed a largely arid and undeveloped land into a modern industrial nation. As you well know, this tremendous progress has been accomplished under the most adverse circumstances. I commend those who in the face of such adversity have accomplished so much in so little time.

Since the Israel Bond Organization was formed in 1951, Israel's agricultural production has increased nearly six times, industrial production has gone up five times, and exports have risen nine times. More than 1½ million subscribers to Israel bonds should be justly proud of their contribution to this significant growth.

With your aid, Israel has overcome serious economic, social and political problems. It has taken in many thousands of homeless refugees and given them meaningful and productive lives. It has even extended the hand of friendship, in the form of technical assistance, to nations which are less fortunate. On the African continent and in some parts of Latin America, Israeli teachers, irrigation experts, medical specialists and engineers are helping others to cross the barrier from "have nots" to "haves."

But the problems of Israel are not all in the past. While half of the nation is now fully developed, there is still another half that is in a primitive state, relatively speaking. These desert and waste areas must be irrigated, populated and made economically viable. There is still the need to absorb an expected 500,000 additional settlers by 1970. There is still the absolute necessity to go forward vigorously with Israel's present 5-year plan for industrialization.

However, with support such as yours, I have no doubt that the free and democratic State of Israel is well on its way to complete self-reliance and stability.

Another reason for being pleased to be with you is more complicated and subtle. It is because your participation in this cause represents an outstanding example of one of the strengths of the American system.

You have made a considerable commitment of time, effort, resources and emotion to help others with whom you feel spiritual ties.

Too often, I believe, we stress the sameness, the homogeneity of American life, while ignoring the healthy differences and variations that give such richness to the American fabric.

The texture of our Nation, which has contributed to its unparalleled greatness, comes from many ethnic, religious and nationality strains. America, as we know it and love it, is like a good soup. Its full flavor comes from the blending of many ingredients.

Yet from many quarters we hear a great deal of talk about assimilation—especially from the younger generation. And, of course, it is necessary that we should be alike in some ways—in our standard of justice, our concept of democratic government, our common ideal of liberty and freedom.

But, we must also recognize that we can pay too high a price for sameness. We can make our soup blend. There are differences that we cannot afford to lose.

I do not like to believe, and do not concede, that in this country we have Italian-Americans, Irish-Americans, Afro-Americans or Jewish-Americans because the hyphen implies that different groups should be given different treatment. This is wrong.

On the other hand, it is necessary to understand that different groups have added immeasurably to American life because they are different. Out of their differences have grown ideas, a fuller cultural life, and a more interesting and stimulating America. Our national outlook is broader; our character stiffer.

Rather than question in any way those who feel deep emotional ties to other countries—whether it be Israel or Ireland or Italy or Africa—we should salute this as a manifestation of the genius of our Nation. This is part of what we call Americanism. It is one of the things that makes both Israel and America unique in the world. The beauty of Joseph's coat was that it was of many colors.

And so I salute you tonight—salute you for your support of a worthwhile cause—and salute you, my fellow Americans, because you have unselfishly helped pave the road to economic self-reliance for the people of Israel. With pride you can say you have played a major role in Israel's progress. With your head high, you know you have personally shared in an enterprise of historic significance for the survival of the Jewish people and of the spirit of human freedom and dignity to which it is dedicated.

The Removal of the Remains of Roger Casement to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 23, 1965, the remains of Sir Roger Casement, the Irish patriot, were returned to Ireland after having been buried for nearly 50 years in Pentonville Prison in London. The release of the remains follows repeated representations to British governments by successive Irish governments and by all who have exposed the cause of Roger Casement.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in my remarks comments concerning the life and work of Casement on this the occasion of his journey home.

Now his remains are to rest in Ireland. So ends a short but bitter chapter in recent history. And so the right honor is done to a man who well deserved it; a man loved and revered, ignored and reviled, by patriots and others alike. At all events, the government of the Irish Republic has now brought him home to rest and an English government has made it possible. His contemporaries are long since passed and unable to rejoice or to sorrow.

His life demonstrates that, in the last analysis, it is people, and not governments, who make heroes and martyrs; and the verdict on Roger Casement was made by popular acclaim when no other government wanted nor desired to befriend his memory and when his private life was in fierce dispute.

The aforementioned comments follow:

If you persist in treating me as an Englishman, you bind yourself thereby to hang me as a traitor before the eyes of the world. Now as a simple matter of fact, I am neither an Englishman nor a traitor: I am an Irishman, captured in a fair attempt to achieve the independence of my country; and you can no more deprive me of the honors of that position, or destroy the effects of my effort, than the abominable cruelties inflicted 600 years ago on William Wallace in this city when he met a precisely similar indictment with a precisely similar reply, have prevented that brave and honorable Scot from becoming the national hero of his coun-

try. I am not trying to shirk the British scaffold: it is the altar on which the Irish saints have been canonised for centuries.

GEORGE BERNARD SHAW.

LIFE AND WORK OF ROGER CASEMENT

Casement was born at Sandycove, County Dublin, on September 1, 1864. He grew up at Magherintemple, County Antrim, in a period which the effects of the great famine of 1845–47 were still in evidence throughout the country. At the age of 21, he joined an expedition, led by the American General Stanford, into the independent State of the Congo, lately established by Leopold II, King of the Belgians. Casement joined the British Colonial Service in 1891 and between then and 1900 served in Nigeria and Portuguese West and East Africa. In August 1900, he took up appointment as British Consul in the Congo Free State. From May until September 1903, on official instructions, he carried out an investigation of conditions in the Upper Congo where there were large rubber estates. His report revealed the extreme hardships suffered by the native peoples and on its publication in 1904 was acclaimed throughout the world as a great humanitarian achievement.

After the publication of his report, Casement spent a long vacation in Ireland to recover his health, which had been greatly taxed by his exertions in the Congo. During his vacation he came into close contact with the literary, social, and political movements, led by men like Hyde, Yeats, Griffith, McNeill, and Pearse, which had begun to redefine the national identity and to inject new vigor into Irish life. By the end of his vacation, he appears to have been inclining to the conclusion that the only solution to "the Irish Question" was the elimination of the British presence and that political separatism as enunciated by Tone, Mitchel, and the Fenian leaders was the sole, wholly satisfactory objective for the Irish Nationalist.

Casement's next tour of consular duty was in South America. In 1908 he was appointed Consul General at Rio de Janeiro. In 1910, he investigated, with a Commission of Enquiry, the conditions to which the Indian peoples were subjected in the rubber-producing areas worked by the Peruvian Amazon Company in the Putamayo along the upper reaches of the Amazon basin. Here, as in the Congo, his report brought to light a regime of barbarous cruelty and eventually resulted in the winding up of the company.

Years of service in Africa and the Putamayo had taken their toll of Casement's stamina, and in 1913, broken in health, he retired from the consular service and returned to Ireland, where, in November 1913, he became a founder member of the Irish volunteers. In the following July, he went to the United States to raise funds for the training and equipping of the volunteers. While he was there, war broke out in Europe and Casement went to Germany to probe the attitude of the German authorities to Irish independence and to explore the possibilities of military aid for achieving it. An attempt by Casement to form an Irish Brigade recruited from Irishmen in the British Forces held as prisoners of war proved a failure, as did an effort to obtain German agreement to equip the Irish volunteers on a scale adequate to insure the success of a military uprising in Ireland.

Early in 1916, he learned that the uprising was planned to take place the following Easter. In an endeavor to dissuade the leaders from an action which he regarded as doomed to failure, Casement went to Ireland by submarine. On Good Friday, April 21, 1916, he landed on the Kerry coast and a few hours later was arrested by the British authorities. He was brought to London, tried for treason, found guilty, and hanged at Pentonville on August 3, 1916.

CASEMENT'S JOURNEY HOME

The exhumation of the remains at Pentonville on Monday, February 22, 1965, was attended by officials of the Department of External Affairs, the Department of Justice, and the Irish Embassy in London, by British officials, and by the prison Catholic chaplain. The remains were placed in a lead-lined mahogany casket which was sealed and escorted to the Catholic chapel in the prison where prayers were said. The casket remained in the chapel overnight. The remains were conveyed to Northolt Aerodrome from which they were flown, draped in the tricolor, by Aer Lingus to Baldonnel Military Airport near Dublin, on the following day.

The announcement concerning the removal of Casement's body was made simultaneously in Dail Eireann and in the British House of Commons. In the Dail, the Taoiseach (Prime Minister), Mr. Sean F. Lemass, T.D., said "I am very glad to be able to announce to the Dail that I have been informed by the British Prime Minister that his Government has recently decided to meet our request for the repatriation of the remains of Roger Casement.

"As Deputies are aware, it was Casement's expressed wish that he should have his final resting place in Ireland, and it has long been the desire of the people of Ireland, shared by successive Irish Governments, that this wish be fulfilled.

"Mr. Wilson has generously responded to my representations in this matter, and I wish to record, therefore, the Government's deep satisfaction at his decision, which will render possible the fulfillment of Roger Casement's wish.

"This decision, coming as it does so soon after the centenary of Roger Casement's birth, will, I am sure, be universally welcomed as yet another step toward the establishment of the closest and most friendly relations between the two countries."

The Taoiseach stated that the Government had decided that the remains should be reinterred in the burial plot in Glasnevin Cemetery, Dublin, which had been selected by Roger Casement's sister, Mrs. Newman, to whom he was particularly close and who had expressed the wish that her brother's body should lie near those great heroes of the past who fought for Irish freedom. The grave is located in the O'Connell Tower Circle just inside the main gate, which is one of the most prominent sections of the cemetery.

Father James McCarroll, the prison chaplain who attended Casement during his last days, returned from the execution and found in Casement's overcoat in the condemned cell a manuscript which Father McCarroll had almost completely copied when the deputy governor of the prison entered the cell and confiscated both the overcoat and the manuscript. These are Casement's last written words and include the poignant sentence: "If I die tomorrow bury me in Ireland." Now after 48½ years his last wish is being fulfilled.

Announcing his Government's decision to return the remains, the Right Honorable Harold Wilson, O.B.E., M.P., Prime Minister, told the British House of Commons that, "The Government has authorized the removal to the Irish Republic of the remains of Sir Roger Casement. Arrangements have been made for the remains to be transferred to Dublin today." Mr. Wilson said that the Government had completed their examination of the matter and in response to a request from the Irish Government had agreed to the removal of the remains. "The Government of the Republic," he said, "has informed Her Majesty's Government of their decision to reinter the remains in Glasnevin Cemetery, Dublin, and of their intention that they should rest there." In reply to a question, Mr. Wilson said: "This matter has been discussed many times. Everybody is aware of the very great difficulties here and I think we have taken the right decision and this will help to improve understanding between the two countries."

The patriot's remains arrived at 5 p.m., on Tuesday, February 23, at Baldonnel Airport outside Dublin, where they were received by the Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Frank Aiken, T.D.; the Minister for Defense, Mr. Gerald Bartley, T.D.; and the British Ambassador to Ireland, Sir Goefroy Tory; together with army officials and a military escort. After ceremonies at the airport church, the procession moved off to the Church of the Sacred Heart at Arbour Hill where the executed leaders of the 1916 rising are buried. The attendance included President de Valera, the Taoiseach, and the members of the Government.

The remains lay in state at Arbour Hill for 4 days and on Sunday, February 28, were taken to the Pro-Cathedral, where, on Monday morning, the archbishop of Dublin, Most Rev. J. C. McQuaid, presided at a solemn requiem Mass.

On receipt of the news of the repatriation of Roger Casement's remains, President de Valera issued the following statement:

"Every Irishman throughout the country and abroad will be happy to hear that the body of Roger Casement is at last in his native land and amongst his own people. For them he died and as long as this nation exists and Irishmen live, his sacrifice will be recalled and his memory revered."

National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, since the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 is due for House consideration in the near future, I believe the following statement in support of the bill H.R. 6468, presented by a valued constituent, Mr. Bennett W. Cooke, Jr., president of the Coyne Electronics Institute of Chicago, Ill., will be of interest to my colleagues. Mr. Cooke speaks from a background of considerable experience in the field of vocational education and his comments, therefore, are of particular significance.

STATEMENT BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, BY BENNETT W. COOKE, JR., PRESIDENT, COYNE ELECTRONICS INSTITUTE, CHICAGO, ILL.

I am Bennett W. Cooke, Jr. I reside at 855 Bridlewood Road, Northbrook Ill. I am president of the Coyne Electronics Institute of Chicago. Coyne Electronics Institute, founded in 1899 and chartered as a not for profit institution since 1951, offers practical resident technician training courses in electricity, electronics, television-radio, refrigeration, air conditioning, and industrial electronics, running from 16 to 80 weeks in length—and a 2-year technological degree-granting program in electronics engineering technology. Coyne has graduated over a quarter of a million men during the past 66 years, including thousands of Signal Corps men during World War II, veterans of World

War II, Korean veterans, manpower development training students, men from many States and Federal rehabilitation agencies, Indian agencies, and from the Division of International Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I also appear before you as vice president of the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools, vice president of the Central Schools Association and treasurer and trustee of the Specialty Oriented Student Research, Inc., which is a research organization working with Dr. Kenneth Hoyt, of the Department of Education of the University of Iowa, in gathering research information from students in private business, trade and technical school settings throughout the United States and also making followup studies on the same students after they have graduated. This complete and accurate information on private business, trade and technical schools can then be distributed to high school counselors throughout the country, so they will be in a better position to counsel with the high school student and his parents as regards the opportunities that exist in private business, trade and technical schools. I would like to add here that these findings have just been published within the past week and are available from the University of Iowa's Publications Department.

I have also been authorized to speak in behalf of the Indiana Association of Private Vocational Schools, by Mr. Stanley Moore, vice president of that organization.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

We have studied H.R. 6468 entitled "The National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965," and on behalf of myself and all of the previously mentioned associations and organizations, I can say, without hesitation, that we wholeheartedly support this bill and as one voice and one mind sincerely look forward to this legislation being enacted.

REASONS FOR FAVORING LEGISLATION

The private trade and technical schools, which have been contributing so much to the vocational training of young people throughout our country since before the turn of the century, must operate on income that is virtually 100 percent derived from tuition fees. This has become increasingly difficult because of today's constant need for upgrading of facilities, equipment and instruction and these difficulties are compounded by the fact that many, many qualified, intelligent and vitally interested young people are unable to attend our type of schools, offering specialized training, because they can't financially afford it and, in a great many cases, there is no place they can turn for financial assistance. I have read personally over 30,000 individual prospective student comments in the past 3 years and I can assure you that there are a tremendous number of young people who would be able and qualified to take advantage of this sort of specialized training if these loan funds were available to them. As it stands now, the vast majority of these young people are unable to get assistance and therefore drift either into unemployment or low-paying jobs where they are never able to use their real potential. To carry this picture on to its end result: these young people therefore earn less money and pay less income taxes. The schools in turn have less money to work with and are in a lesser position to continue with the vital needs of upgrading and research.

At Coyne Electronics Institute, as well as at other private trade and technical schools, we have a variety of payment plans that we offer our students without which we would have a very small student body indeed. These payment plans all require a downpayment and the balance of tuition is spread over the length of their course, or twice the length of their course, or a plan whereby the student pays his tuition balance after his graduation. As helpful as these plans are, they all, nevertheless, require a substantial downpayment, carry higher interest charges and in the case of out-of-town students, do not provide for months of living expenses.

I would like to bring out at this point a fact that I am sure will be of interest to you. Over the past two-thirds of a century, my school's collection experience on these graduate tuition accounts has been most gratifying. We have realized over 95 percent collection. We attribute this to the fact that these fellows have acquired here at our school the skills that assure them a higher standard of living for the rest of their lives and have been helped toward that goal by reason of being able to put off a large percentage of their tuition payments until after they had graduated and were working in the field making a good salary. I bring this point out because I am sure that your future experience on these student loans will easily parallel that of Coyne's graduates.

Another point that I want to make regarding student loans to young people enabling them to take up training at a private trade or technical school, is this: Our courses are thorough and concentrated so as to fully prepare students to obtain immediate employment in a skillful occupation in the shortest possible time. It is training without frills and without months, or years, spent on subject matter unrelated to the direct matter of their future job success. Therefore, because their training period is relatively short, extremely interesting, and the demand for their skills is great, these persons are much sooner in a position to reach their goal to begin earning money and also to begin paying back their loan (which incidentally is smaller than 4 years of college tuition). Also, it must be noted here that for the previously mentioned reasons there are greatly fewer dropouts than there are in general 4-year college programs. Many of these facts that I have mentioned, and a great many more facts, have been borne out by the University of Iowa specialty student research program that I mentioned earlier.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and committee members, some of the benefits of the approval of H.R. 6468—the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965—are as follows:

1. The program of guaranteed loans will enable a great many young men and women to get technical training in fields that they are best suited for, which they were previously unable to do because of a lack of financial assistance.

2. The outlay of money by the Federal Government on this program will only be a small percent of the financial benefits it will soon realize in income taxes from the greater earnings of those who receive this type of training.

3. The lowering of national unemployment and the filling of the Nation's need for more technically trained people.

4. Helping to reduce enrollment pressures on the 2- and 4-year colleges. Many of the young people who are today applying for admission to a college, actually would prefer and are better suited for a trade or technical program, but up to now they have been unable to get financial assistance in these areas.

5. The trade and technical institutions themselves will benefit by having a larger student body on which they will not be required to handle as much long-term financing and therefore will be in a much better position to fulfill the tremendous requirements in technical education's upgrading, research, and maintenance of high standards. This legislation will, therefore, help to insure the continuation of the finest in training programs by these schools for future generations.

In behalf of all of the private trade and technical schools of America, we wish to express our appreciation for the opportunity of appearing before this committee and to state that we feel this is an excellent bill and we greatly hope that this legislation will be enacted.

Regional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call my colleagues attention to another chapter in the fascinating story, "Pittsburgh Research: Key to Tomorrow," published by the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania:

REGIONAL ACTION

Several years ago, it became apparent that there was need for a regional organization that could concern itself—on a continuing basis—with strengthening the economic base of the nine-county Pittsburgh area.

The area had undergone drastic changes since World War II. Most of the modifications were for the better—a rebuilt and rejuvenated downtown section, more and better housing, smoke abatement, expanded educational opportunities, flood control, new cultural activities, and the beginning of industrial diversification.

But there was need for greater industrial expansion and diversification, particularly in such rapidly expanding areas as nuclear energy, electronics, aerospace, and scientific instrumentation. It became increasingly evident that the Pittsburgh region could no longer depend solely upon the steel, coal, glass, and other materials industries to achieve its growth potential.

In 1962, the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of Southwestern Pennsylvania (RIDC) was reshaped to help the Pittsburgh area seek out new opportunities and to adapt to the forces of change that were bringing about new materials, new processes and techniques, new products, and new markets.

RIDC sought to preserve and to expand employment opportunities; to upgrade the labor force; to broaden the region's industrial base; to provide financial assistance beyond that available through conventional sources to companies; to assist firms in need of new facilities; to accelerate scientific and technological spin-offs; to get the region's total resources working together as a unified economic entity; and to help provide a regional environment conducive to more rapid economic growths.

During its brief history, the Regional Industrial Development Corp. has: created two new vehicles—the RIDC Industrial Development Fund and the RIDC Real Estate Co. Inc.—to assist growth situations through financial assistance and attractive sites, including an industrial park; sought to attract new industries to the region; formed a scientific group to serve as a catalyst in stimulating area companies and developments; and undertaken retraining programs in new technological fields.

The Scientific & Research Advisory Group—composed of 12 academic scientists and engineers and a coordinator—assists RIDC in the identification, evaluation, and advancement of new ideas, products, and companies.

Since its creation, the advisory group has been instrumental in laying the foundation for a rapid transit industry in the Pittsburgh area; staging a regional precision machine work seminar; organizing the MPC Corp. for handling cooperative research projects by Mellon Institute, University of Pittsburgh, and Carnegie Institute of Technology; creating a new company concerned with advanced technologies; and stimulating interaction between educators and the professional societies leading to new courses (such as instrument maintenance), the establishment of precision machine institutes, and plans for a regional high school of science and technology.

It Sounds Ridiculous and It Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the following column by James J. Kilpatrick is meant to be amusing and I am sure many will enjoy the satire. Mr. Kilpatrick's analogy sounds ridiculous and it is when applied to baseball. You just could not run baseball under those rules.

It is just as ridiculous when we try to apply these same rules to our society and to our economy. In the end, the results will be the same as in Mr. Kilpatrick's mythical baseball game.

The column, as printed in the Washington Evening Star of April 12, 1965, follows:

UMPIRE JOHNSON'S BRAND OF BALL

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

It was the opening day of the season, Mets against the Dodgers at Shea Stadium, and the plate umpire, Johnson his name was, had called a little pregame conference down along the foul line.

Most of the new rules had been explained in spring training, not once but a hundred times, and you would have thought the principles of equal strikes and more abundant runs would have been clear by this time. Dr. Stengel couldn't get it straight.

"It is assumed," said the umpire, with great patience, "that any team that wins fewer than 50 percent of its games is the victim of invidious discrimination which is a blatant affront to the conscience of this generation of Americans."

"Quite so," said Casey. "Last season we won 53 and lost 109, which is 40 games out."

"The new rules," said the umpire, "will not permit this. The acid of the Cards shall not be allowed to corrode the soul of the Mets. Neither can a prosperous nation tolerate islands of poverty in a sea of plenty. You therefore begin with 15 games in the win column, and each of your hitters will get one extra strike."

Walt Alston had come with a complaint signed by 20 Dodgers, alleging discrimination. Duke Snider started to argue that with an 80–82 record last season, the Dodgers weren't all that prosperous and were entitled to the same 50 percent presumption, but the umpire cut him off.

So they took the field, with Al Jackson on the mound for the Mets, and Jesse Gonder behind the plate. In the first inning the Dodgers loaded the bases and Willie Davis clobbered one into the stands. He came trotting around third, while a low moan arose from the Mets.

The umpire stopped him 15 feet from the plate. "The challenge facing us is clear and immediate," said the umpire. "You are flouting the Constitution. You are frustrating the intent of the Mets. The hymns of the oppressed have summoned us to justice. Yer out."

Well, sir, the Dodgers came foaming onto the field. Willie was like a wild man. Alston threw himself down on the ground, and Duke Snider howled till they heard him in Brooklyn. The Dodgers had four attorneys suited up. They all charged out yelling that Willie was not guilty of willful denial or abridgment; it was nothing but apathy, indifference, and a fat one down the middle. But the umpire just squinted his eyes and talked them down.

"You are contributing to the creation of conditions," he said, "which are both inimical to our domestic order and tranquility and incompatible with the standards of equal justice and individual dignity on which our society stands. And Duke can go to take a shower."

By the end of the fifth, it was Mets three and Dodgers eight, which wasn't as one-sided as it might appear, considering that in the interests of social justice the umpire had cut the Dodgers down to seven men.

Willie was playing the outfield all by himself, but even with four strikes to the hitter the Mets were looking like last year. The umpire summoned Dr. Stengel to discuss appropriate legislation.

"Unless we act anew," said the umpire, "with dispatch and resolution, we shall sanction a sad and sorrowful course for the future."

"What we need," said Dr. Stengel, "is a few runs."

"The most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American pastime is the run supplement," said the umpire. "It now proposes to add to the rules through direct payment of a portion of the score of needy individuals and ball clubs."

So the umpire took two runs away from the Dodgers and gave them to the Mets, which made it 6 to 5 Dodgers. In the bottom of the eighth the Mets tied it up on Jesse Gonder's homer into short centerfield. It would have been a single in any other game, but the umpire ruled that Jesse had an income under .270 and was entitled to special benefits under the poverty program.

The Dodgers' lawyers charged this was a mere test or device not permitted under the 50 per centum rule. By this time Casey and the umpire were singing "We Shall Overcome" and half the crowd had gone home.

The game finally ended 6 hours after it began, with the score Mets 44 and Dodgers 41, but it wouldn't have ended then if the umpire hadn't decided that all managers over 65 were entitled to a bonus.

This was the program of Metcare, and Casey couldn't have been more pleased. Anyhow, this was how the season began, and it stayed that way all summer. They called it baseball, but what it was, was chaos.

Nationwide Support for H.R. 1096

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following release issued by the National Federation of Independent Business which contains the results of a poll conducted by the federation among its more than 200,000 independent business proprietor members.

This poll demonstrates overwhelming support among small businessmen for my bill, H.R. 1096, which would provide for the separation of Federal employees who deliberately refuse to pay final judgments entered against them.

H.R. 1096 is currently pending before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and I hope that the committee will be able to schedule the bill for early hearing during the current session.

The release follows:

Government employment should not be a sanctuary for deadbeats. That is apparently the attitude of the Nation's independent business proprietors who have just completed a nationwide vote on H.R. 1096 introduced into Congress by Representative ABRAHAM MULTER, of New York.

This bill, which would provide dismissal for Government employees who refuse to pay their debts despite judgments against them, was given approval by a majority of 77 percent, with 20 percent opposed, and 3 percent undecided.

The nationwide voting was conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business, which has received many complaints from businessmen on the problem of collecting from a small minority of Government employees who take advantage of a law which holds their salaries immune from the ordinary processes of attachment, or garnishment to satisfy a judgment.

Commenting on the vote, C. Wilson Harder, federation president said, "While obviously the vast majority of Government employees do honor their obligations, all are given a bad name by the relatively few who refuse to pay, knowing that unlike people in private employment, ordinary processes of collection cannot be used against them."

Granite State Trucker Averts Collision, Wins Praise for Highway Courtesy, Skill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the latest edition of New Hampshire Motor Transport carries an editorial and correspondence relating how a skilled truck-driver, Mr. James Tsetseranos, averted a potentially disastrous accident last February and then came to the aid of the riders in the second car. It is a privilege to pay tribute in the House to Mr. Tsetseranos, his employer, the Auclair Trucking Co., of Manchester, and to the sometimes maligned group he represents. Our country owes a great deal to these "gentlemen of the road." In addition to the vital economic role they play in seeing that goods and commodities are transported safely, they set high standards of courtesy and skill for us all. I congratulate Jim Tsetseranos and commend to my colleagues the following editorial and letters:

THE SPOTLIGHT

Elsewhere in this issue is a short but eloquent letter expressing the feelings of passengers in a car that narrowly escaped a collision.

It is evident that the quick action of Jim Tsetseranos saved a number of people from serious harm. Additionally, Jim took the trouble to stop and change a tire for the frightened but safe ladies.

Our faith in the gentlemen of the highway has never wavered nor are there sound reasons that it should.

Regrettably there are a small group of cowboys who never would be missed, who cast a shadow over the professional driver.

There are many like Jim Tsetseranos of whom we never hear, because to them, to be thoughtful and considerate of other drivers is a part of the day's work.

And so Jim—the industry thanks you and through you all the other swell guys.

AUCLAIR TRUCKING CO.,
Manchester, N.H.

DEAR SIR: Mrs. Hopkins, Mrs. Hazel Cary, Mrs. Virginia Hodgerman, and Mrs. William Broeg were returning from the theater in Boston on February 18, blew a tire, and turned around a couple of times.

Your truckdriver, Jim Tsetseranos, did a wonderful job not to hit them. Then, very graciously, he changed the tire for them.

They wished me to convey to you how much they appreciated same—as I do also.

These are the things that make one realize what fine people we have in this fine State.

Again, please extend to him, their thanks.

Yours truly,

SUMNER P. HOPKINS.

Mr. SUMNER P. HOPKINS,
Greenfield, N.H.

DEAR MR. HOPKINS: I wish to personally thank you for your letter directing our attention to a "good turn" by our driver, James Tsetseranos, on the evening of last February 18.

I have complimented Jim on your behalf and have directed that your letter be placed in his personal file.

It is indeed a pleasure to receive a complimentary letter concerning a driver's action because, too frequently, their gentlemanly actions are taken for granted by the motoring public and go unnoticed and unrecognized by management.

We are proud of Jim and the helpful attitude he displayed in helping your wife and friends.

Truly yours,

AUCLAIR TRANSPORTATION, INC.,
HENRY J. PARISEAU, *President.*

Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a fine group of citizens who live in suburban communities along the Tennessee-Mississippi State line just south of Memphis unanimously adopted a resolution condemning extremism of all sorts.

I would like to join with this group—the Whitehaven-Oakhaven Democratic Club—in urging the Committee on Un-American Activities to include within the scope of its inquiry into the Ku Klux Klan the activities of the Black Muslims, the Minutemen, and other groups which seek to undermine our basic constitutional guarantees through hate-peddling and racism.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED MARCH 29, 1965, WHITEHAVEN-OAKHAVEN DEMOCRATIC CLUB

Whereas democratic values are threatened by Communist tyranny abroad and infiltration on the domestic front; and

Whereas there are organizations in the United States who by acts of violence, terrorism, threats of murder, organizations who ride in the night and use costumes to hide their identity and advocate activities similar to these are a threat to the internal security of our Nation; and

Whereas there are organizations and political parties which have used or have allowed their facilities to be used to spread suspicion for persons in authority in our Government at all levels, and breed hate among our peoples and for our country's leaders; and

Whereas such activities on the part of any organization, be it foreign or domestic, who use, promote, or condone acts of violence, acts of terror, threats of murder, bombings, who spread suspicions and breed hate among people of our community and Nation are detrimental to the security, peace, and welfare of our people and this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Whitehaven-Oakhaven Democratic Club, its officers and members reaffirm our dedication to the Bill of Rights. That freedom and civil liberties are compatible with the security and vital to the national strength of our Nation. That the right to vote is the first principle of self-government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Whitehaven-Oakhaven Democratic Club shall go on record to use its offices and facilities to promote programs in schools and homes to teach respect for our flag, the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights and respect for persons in authority; and be it further

Resolved, That the Whitehaven-Oakhaven Democratic Club deplores and condemns any organization which advocates directly or indirectly acts of violence, acts of terror, threats of murder, bombings, and who ride in the night in costumes to hide their identity or engage in activities similar to these; and be it further

Resolved, That this club make known to the press and to the Congressmen and Senators of Tennessee that we urge a prompt crackdown and an immediate and exhaustive investigation by the House Un-American Activities Committee of any and all racist or hate peddling organizations, such as, but not limited to, the Klu Klux Klan, Black Muslims, the Minutemen, and others for the purpose of drafting legislation to bring them under effective State and Federal laws.

(Adopted March 29, 1965, by unanimous vote.)

TAYLOR L. BLAIR, Jr.,
President.

Minority Heritage—New Series of History Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragic aspects of the bitter unnecessary costs nations around the world pay today as a result of oppressed man's quest for freedom and human dignity comes from the fact that for centuries there has been a calculated blackout in the acknowledgment, publication, and teaching by usual educational sources of the history and contributions of Africans and Afro-Americans to the civilization, culture, and progress of mankind. Outstanding historical works by Negroes over the years have been denied the broad spread publication they merited and have failed to find entry into educational curriculum and libraries of almost all but the segregated Negro school and college.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of profound gratification that I submit for the RECORD the following articles from several newspapers showing the breakthrough in this area made possible by the awakened conscience of America and its increasingly desegregated heart.

The five articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 25, 1964]

NEWS OF THE WEEK IN EDUCATION: FOR MINORITIES, A PLACE IN HISTORY

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

A chronic complaint of minority groups is that schools and textbooks ignore the minorities' own distinctive past and contributions to the majority culture. In theory, the American public schools take pride in their melting pot function. In practice, it is often charged, the stirring of the pot's mixture aims at eliminating the minorities' cultural flavor in order to produce a homogenized blend.

Inevitably, too, the minorities are sensitive about any aspect of literature that presents them in an unfavorable light. Thus, some Jewish spokesmen have fought against the reading of "The Merchant of Venice." Roman Catholics, in the early days of public education, objected strongly to the anti-Catholic bias of history texts, and Negroes have attacked "Huckleberry Finn."

Last week, Doubleday, the book publisher, announced that it will launch a new series of books to give minorities a fair deal in the study of American and world history and literature. Zenith books, as the new series is to be known, will respond first to the demands of the Negro for civil rights by aiming at a fuller understanding of African history and the history of the Negro in the United States. Two volumes are scheduled for January. They are "A Glorious Age in Africa" by Daniel Chu and Elliott Skinner and "Worth Fighting For" by Agnes McCarthy and Lawrence Reddick.

These books are to be followed by others on the Puerto Rican, the Mexican-American, the American Indian, the Chinese-American and other minority groups.

Aimed at the junior high school, the books will be written in cooperation between noted scholars and professional writers. The intent is to offer books with a mature level of content, but written for sixth-grade comprehension.

NEED SURVEYED

Charles Harris, editor of the series and himself a Negro, said that after several years of research and discussion with educators, historians and textbook experts, he surveyed the need and the potential response in leading school districts across the country.

Mr. Harris met with curriculum supervisors, department heads of English and social studies, teachers and principals in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, Richmond, Atlanta, St. Louis, Detroit, Chicago, San Francisco, Oakland, and Los Angeles. Out of these meetings came plans

for special teachers' manuals to accompany the books. The books are to be linked as closely as possible with the junior and senior high school curriculum.

The new venture may come to grips with two problems which have worried both educators and civil rights leaders:

1. Traditionally, many textbooks have been edited with a view to the total market, including the Southern States. Books which have avoided even the term Civil War, substituting for it the War Between the States, could hardly be expected to provide much complimentary detail about the Negro in American life.

2. The self-image of Negro youngsters, already distorted if they attend de facto segregated schools in slums, suffers even more if their own ethnic group is overlooked in a study of the country's and mankind's past. While sporadic efforts have been made to put an end to the all-white pictorial presentation in elementary school primers, the problem obviously is not solved by adding a few Negro faces to illustrations.

NEW SECURITY

There is little doubt that sympathetic treatment of the Roman past or of great Irish leaders or of the heroism of Israeli patriots has given children of Italian, Irish, and Jewish heritage a new sense of security and self-reliance.

Obviously, an excessive swing of the pendulum holds dangers. Unless the new study of minorities becomes part of all students' reading, the various groups could easily emerge with an excess of separatist zeal, without the necessary understanding of others' heritage. The burden remains on the schools truly to integrate the study of history and literature.

Finally, it will of course be vital to the success of the Doubleday series not to confuse full recognition of the minorities' history with sentimental or even propagandistic treatment. Apparently the editors are aware of this: They have instructed their staff that "the approach which is used in writing the books is to take factual historical information and develop readable, vivid, and dramatic stories, while scrupulously preserving historical accuracy and perspective."

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Feb. 14, 1965]

MINORITY HERITAGE: NEW SERIES OF HISTORY BOOKS

(By James Benet)

A new series of history books—that sounds very much like fiction—was described here last week by its editor.

Take the story of how Ali the Great conquered Jenne, a city of legendary beauty set in the marshes at the headwaters of the Bani River.

The city held out for 7 years, 7 months and 7 days. But at last it fell to Ali's troops, which had sacked another famous city and slaughtered many of its people.

But at Jenne the conquerors, troops of the Songhay empire, treated the defenders with courtesy because of their bravery. Ali sat the young king down beside him, and to seal their new alliance he married the young king's mother.

AFRICA

Pretty good story, but—history? Who ever heard of any of those people or places before?

The reason that the account sounds like a lively invention of some author of adventure novels is simple, editor Charles Harris explained, that this is part of the history of West Africa. And Americans are almost totally unfamiliar with it, although about 10 percent of them are of African origin. Similarly, they are ignorant of the histories of other American minority groups.

The Zenith Books series, which Harris is editing for Doubleday, is aimed at ending that ignorance.

CIVIL WAR

The first two books in the series are "A Glorious Age in Africa," and "Worth Fighting For," a history of Negroes in the U.S. Civil War and Reconstruction.

But other books, Harris said, will deal with Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Chinese-Americans, and many other U.S. minority groups.

The books are aimed at secondary school students primarily, and written in approximately a sixth-grade vocabulary since so many minority students are below grade level in reading.

But, Harris said, the first pair of books, published officially January 22, have already had a striking sale to adults in regular bookstores, since so little is available in the field they cover.

SCHOOLS

School districts in big cities are expressing eager interest, he said, and he also expects substantial interest in the South "everywhere but in Mississippi."

School systems that are making progress toward intergration can obtain Federal funds for suitable supplies, he explained, both under the new Civil Rights Act and under other programs such as the National Defense Education Act's support for English teaching.

Doubleday's president John T. Sargent, in announcing the new series last month said candidly that it was aimed at meeting an avalance of criticism of publishers for neglecting minorities in schoolbooks.

"I believe this will signal the beginning of a new trend," Sargent said.

TALENT

Generally the books combine the talents of eminent scholars and practical school people. The general editors are the noted Negro historian, Prof. John Hope Franklin of the University of Chicago, and Shelley Umans, a specialist in reading instruction in the New York City school system.

The authors of "A Glorious Age in Africa" are Elliott Skinner, a Columbia University professor of anthropology and specialist in African cultures, and Daniel Chu, a staff editor for a group of magazines aimed at schoolchildren.

A nine-man advisory board includes the San Francisco school system's specialist in compensatory education, Isadore Pivnick.

BIOGRAPHIES

So undoubtedly the books really are history, all properly certified and carefully written.

But—one of them is to contain the biographies of Peter Salem, Phillis Wheatley, Jean Baptiste Pointe de Sable, Benjamin Banneker, Paul Cuffe, and John Chavin.

Ever hear of them? They were all Negroes who helped to build the Nation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, December 1964]

BOOKS ON MINORITIES PLANNED FOR STUDENTS

A major publishing company is planning an extensive series of history books about American minority groups.

Many city school systems, including Washington's, are considering the books as supplementary texts for social studies classes.

The company, Doubleday, will publish the first two volumes in the series, which bears the name of Zenith books, in January. One will describe Negro history during the Civil War and Reconstruction and the other with the African background of American Negroes.

Subsequent books in the series, which may be expanded to 50 volumes, will deal with Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans Chinese-Americans, American Indians, and members of other minority groups.

The series aims to help pupils who are members of minority groups take pride in their culture and accomplishments as well as to encourage them to value their contributions to this Nation.

The idea for the series originated with Charles Harris, a Doubleday editor. Harris, who grew up in Portsmouth, Va., found in his own schooldays that standard books distorted or obscured the role of Negroes in American history.

Written in a dramatic manner at a fifth to sixth grade reading level the books are expected to appeal to poor readers and to potential dropouts.

"There's hardly anything in regular textbooks that shows Negroes as anything other than a problem," Harris pointed out.

"Our history of Africa destroys the myth that the Negroes who came to this country had no language or culture of their own, and were just savages running around with bones in their noses waiting to be benefited by the 'civilizing' institution of slavery."

Each book has co-authors—a historian and a professional textbook writer. Published in both paperback and hardcover, the books also are expected to interest some adult readers.

Harris visited District school officials last week to describe the series. Joseph E. Penn, supervising director of the District's school history department, is on the advisory board for the series.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Afro-American, Feb. 23, 1965]

EXCELLENT NEW HISTORY SERIES LAUNCHED: BOOK REVIEW

(By Saunders Redding)

"A Glorious Age in Africa," by Daniel Chu and Elliott Skinner. Zenith Books, New York, 120 pages.

"Worth Fighting For," by Agnes McCarthy and Lawrence Reddick. Zenith Books, 118 pages.

Doubleday & Co., perhaps the largest book publishing firm in the country, has established a new division called Zenith Books, which has just issued its first offerings.

The purpose of the new division is to "present the history of minority groups in the United States" and to emphasize the part these groups have played in the growth and development of this country.

Like those that will follow, books so far published are for young—10 or 12 to 16 readers.

Neither the establishment of a new division, nor giving it more or less autonomous control of its policy is a unique departure from publishing practice.

At least a dozen firms have subsidiaries and in general each subsidiary has its own publishing policy.

HARRIS' IDEA

What is unique about the Doubleday venture is that Zenith Books is supervised by a bright, energetic young colored man named Charles Harris.

Indeed, the idea of Zenith Books originated with Harris, and I came to know him 2 or 3 years ago, when the idea was developing. The publication of the first two titles brings the idea to reality.

It was not easily accomplished, and the details of how it was done are unknown to me; but this much is certain—it took more than financial inducements to lure John Hope Franklin, Rayford Logan, Rupert Picott, and Hugh H. Smythe as consultants to Zenith Books.

SOMETHING BIGGER

It took more than the promise of pecuniary reward to induce Elliott Skinner and

Lawrence Reddick to study and apply the special craft of writing for children.

This is not to say that Professors Skinner and Reddick worked alone. It is simply to say that without their work, the two current books would not have been as good as they are, and it is quite conceivable that they might not have been at all.

THREE NATIONS

"A Glorious Age in Africa" is the story of three ancient and great African empires:

Ghana, "the land of gold," which was already fabled during the 10th and 11th centuries, while Europe was still in the Dark Ages;

Mali, whose great King, Musa (which means Moses) developed the city of Timbuktu, where was established one of the finest seats of learning known to the early Middle Ages;

And Songhay, the empire which took up where Mali's development left off, and which played an important part in establishing Islam as the principal religion south of the Sahara.

COURAGEOUS BLACKS

"Worth Fighting For," tells the scarcely more familiar story of the Civil War and Reconstruction, what part the slaves, black freemen and ex-slaves played, and how what they gained through toil and bloodshed was worth fighting for.

The old, honored names—Nat Turner, Tubman, Vesey, Douglass—crop up in this book, and the good stories of courageous black men and noble black women are recounted.

If one can judge on the basis of "A Glorious Age in Africa" and "Worth Fighting For," Zenith Books should have a long and successful future.

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) News, Jan. 30, 1965]

LAUNCH BOOKS ON NEGRO HISTORY

(By George Todd)

If Johnny shows scant interest in reading, don't be too harsh with him. He just might be smarter than you think.

According to a specialist in reading instructions some of the material in his textbooks can be so dull, drab and meaningless to him, he naturally rejects them.

Actually, what Johnny needs is some motivation for reading, said the specialist. He needs something more in the texts—something which he can identify with himself, thus giving him a feeling of importance.

And therein lies the story about the Negro child who goes through American schools learning very little, if anything, regarding the history of his ancestors.

LONG NEGLECTED

For too long the deeds of the Negroes have been neglected and there has been a clamor recently for more diversity in the type of reading material used in our schools.

"The impression on the children in our schools," said Dr. John Hope Franklin at Doubleday's press conference announcing publication of a series of books on American minority groups, "is that only one group made America what it is, and those who can identify with the dominant group get the erroneous feeling of importance. Those not identified with that group become inevitably depressed by their apparent lack of importance."

The first volumes of Doubleday Zenith Books published with the hope of correcting this appalling lack, are "A Glorious Age in Africa," and "Worth Fighting For."

WRITER-HISTORIAN TEAM

Daniel Chu, a professional writer, and Elliott Skinner, professor of anthropology at Columbia University, collaborated on the volume which reveals the magnificent history and heritage of Africa.

Agnes McCarthy, an editor in the Department of School Services and Publications at Wesleyan University and Lawrence Reddick, history and politics professor at Coppin State Teachers College, Baltimore, Md., prepared the other book portraying the Negro achievements before and after the Civil War.

Both volumes come in hard cover and paperback. Each carries vivid illustrations, printed in large type and under 120 pages.

TWO-YEAR SURVEY

Charles Harris, editor of Zenith Books, said the books were written at a sixth grade reading level, but feels that the subject matter can also meet existing secondary school requirements.

As far as acceptance of the first two titles and others to follow in the series are concerned, Harris said a survey be made in the last 2 years indicated there would be great response. Several cities were visited both in the North and the South to get the reaction of board of education officials or directors of curriculum research.

"Many of them said they like the books and will take them, but it might be a question now of setting up the machinery," Harris explained.

URBAN LEAGUE HELP

The National Urban League will help publicize the books through releases to teachers across the Nation, and will use material to further promote the new publications in Negro History Week exhibits next month.

Letter To Correct Mistaken Impression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to a letter I have received from Dr. Richard L. Rubenstein, the distinguished director of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation at the University of Pittsburgh.

The letter follows:

B'NAI B'RITH HILLEL FOUNDATION,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 9, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOORHEAD: On March 30, 1965, Mr. DICKINSON, of Alabama, stated in a speech before the House of Representatives that I left the Alabama freedom march from Selma to Montgomery because of my disgust at the immoral conduct of some of the marchers. Mr. DICKINSON's sources of information are not correct. I did not participate in the march from Selma to Montgomery and, therefore, have absolutely no knowledge of what took place on that march. I did accompany a group of 130 students from the colleges and universities in the Pittsburgh area to Montgomery, Ala., on Monday and Tuesday, March 15 and 16. I can testify that the moral conduct of our students was beyond reproach. They represent the finest traditions of young men and young women at our colleges and universities in the Pittsburgh area.

I would very much appreciate it were you to correct the mistaken impression which has now become a matter of national comment by including these facts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am also writing to Mr. DICKINSON.

With many thanks, I am,
Sincerely yours,
RICHARD L. RUBENSTEIN.

Poverty in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1965, the suffragan bishop of the Episcopal diocese of Washington, the Right Reverend Paul Moore, Jr., preached a sermon to the Washington Cathedral on poverty in Washington.

Bishop Moore graphically described the terrible situation of those in the District of Columbia who live on the margins of society.

I commend his sermon to the attention of our colleagues:

POVERTY IN WASHINGTON

(Sermon preached by the Right Reverend Paul Moore, Jr., suffragan bishop, Episcopal diocese of Washington, at special service of evensong at Washington Cathedral, 4 p.m., Mar. 14, 1965)

The enormity of our poverty is not being dealt with by the citizens of Washington. Though many of us are Christians, though most are enlightened, thoughtful people, though there is more political and social skill gathered here than anywhere else on earth, the human suffering, discrimination, and degradation in our city cries to the heavens.

Perhaps our very sophistication in these matters makes us turn our eyes away from the ghetto, lest we have to admit the failure and to realize that since we cannot blame our lack of know-how, we must blame our lack of will.

I am a newcomer to Washington; yet I have been here long enough to be rehearsed in the Washington reason—or is it excuse—for inaction. "It is Congress, the District Committees which are to blame." "It is the fact that people are transient and have roots at home, elsewhere, which is to blame." "It is the Potomac River and the District line which is to blame."

I acknowledge these are factors which shape the special problem of our city. But let us not be naive; these are not the real problems. Even within these conditions, radical changes can be made. No; these are not so much blocks to action; these are excuses for inaction.

Let us look briefly at the situation. These facts are not news, but if they are repeated often enough, they will be branded into the mind of the citizen until we are aroused to action:

1. In greater Washington there are 50,000 poverty families, 30,000 in the District, 20,000 in the suburbs.

2. There are 337 substandard schoolrooms, and even some new schools are already overcrowded.

3. Employment: No minimum wage law exists in District of Columbia From their attitude toward legislation, it appears the hotel industry and board of trade opposed it. Some men are paid as little as $0.85 an hour—38,000, out of 87,000 in low wage industries, receive less than $1.25 an hour. The blocking of upward mobility on the job in the Negro community causes unemployment on the bottom rung of ability.

4. The welfare regulations are barbaric; They force a family apart at their moment of greatest crisis, the unemployment of the father. Of all the immediate actions possible, revision of the welfare regulations is the most urgent.

5. Unrealistic payments for foster care limit the available families and fill Junior Village to overflowing.

6. Housing: Rent control is needed to prohibit gouging by landlords. The poor pay a disproportionate amount for their shoddy housing. Very little low cost housing is available, so that they are at the mercy of the landlord.

7. Crime: Crime in the District was up 25 percent last year. We rank fourth in crime rate among 16 cities of comparable size. We were highest in robbery by violence.

No one knows all the reasons behind crime, but it is agreed that unstable families, bad education, unemployment, and the psychology of being discriminated against are the most common factors found in criminal profiles. The District is deliberately breeding criminals by neglecting these needs. Let this not be misunderstood. I am for tight police methods and quick convictions and sentencing the guilty. No conditions, however base, allow the condoning of crime.

However, our people must realize that the deliberate neglect of negative social conditions like those in this city is the reason we cannot safely walk the street. If we do nothing about them, we deserve the violence. You cannot have it both ways. If you kept a dog and beat him and teased him and starved him, would you be surprised if he bit your child? Is it any wonder that the human spirit, more sensitive than any beast, will break under the degradation of slum living and become ugly?

Such are facts. But poverty is persons. As Virgil Lowder, of the Council of Churches, recently put it:

"Poverty is a tiny girl in an overcrowded institution for dependent children, starving for love, looking up at a woman volunteer, asking, 'Are you my mommy?' grasping at the trousers of a passing man, crying, 'Are you my daddy?'

"Poverty is a teenage boy, unskilled, ready to go to work, but unable to find a job. He stands hard faced before the judge, his life hanging in the balance because of the crime he committed to express his sense of rejection.

"Poverty is a truck driver, hard working, but unable to earn enough at his part-time job to support his family of 11 children. Advised to leave home in order that his wife might receive aid-to-dependent-children funds, he left his home and the family he loved. He told a friend, 'They have taken my family from me.' A few days later they found his body floating in the river.

"Poverty is a mother with fear-darkened eyes, in a small, cold room, with five crying children huddled about her, not knowing where the next meal is coming from. 'We have rats big like cats in our apartment,' she told me. She ought to know. One of them had bitten her baby."

Poverty can be eliminated. All it takes is the will. Some individuals, surely, have the will, but the community does not.

1. We do not have the financial will. Millions, billions are needed to catch up on the deferred human maintenance of this city. The embassy balls, the glitter of the social life of the very people who make the decisions which hurt our city are made possible by the sweat of the poor. The shining marble, the long vistas, the crown of the Capitol itself, are built by the poor. They deserve a share in this—a share, at least to the extent of three meals a day, a decent room, and education, and a chance for a job. We are not willing to spend the millions necessary to accomplish this.

2. We do not have the political will. Home rule is just around the corner, but with a few notable exceptions, no one has screamed for a vote. No one has marched on the Capitol. No one has laid himself down in front of the Senate subway. Yet in Alabama men die for a vote. Do we need Martin Luther King to come up and give us suffrage?

3. We do not have the religious will. The churches are only beginning, only beginning, to speak of poverty and freedom.

4. Perhaps we do not have the journalistic will. Who is behind our civic disaster? Who calls the shots? Who killed Adams-Morgan? Are those who are against home rule, for instance, willing to come out and say what their real reason may be? Can the newspapers find out who blocks social justice and expose them? In most cities the power structure cannot hide; here it seems to masquerade behind the congressional district committees.

Now Washington is not by any means the worst city in America. But it is the Capital City, and its problems are manageable, compared to Philadelphia, Chicago, or New York. May I make some concrete suggestions:

1. That the community, especially the religious community, become personally involved with the people of the poverty families in whatever way possible, so that they can learn first-hand of rats, and smells, and fear, and pain, and cold. The Urban Institute of the Council of Churches can provide all necessary information for programing on the local level. Their report on poverty contains the most complete available record.

2. That a trained corps of "minutemen" be formed to ready to leap into action on call, to be present at hearings, to demonstrate concern, to vocalize, and pressure those who dare to shake off apathy and act.

3. That the poor organize themselves, as unions did of old, and demand their rights as members of the so-called Great Society. Until they do, they will continue to get only scraps from the table.

4. That the President be called upon to take an even more vigorous interest in his city.

We are conscious today of the crisis in the civil rights movement. The Nation is sick and tired of halfway measures. Civil rights and the fight against poverty are part of the same battle to free God's children from prison.

May each of us today join in this fight.

Judge Lincoln of Amherst; His Final Report, a Classic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as my remarks from time to time here in the U.S. House of Representatives indicate, I have always deplored the continuing movement of authority toward the center of power in Washington. For the record, I should admit that even in the great State of New Hampshire, the Granite State, the second district of which I represent, the trend toward centralization is occasionally manifest.

Not long ago, the court system in our State was reorganized and many small country courts were consolidated. A perceptive and whimsical commentary in this connection by Judge Charles J. Lincoln, of Amherst, N.H., was recently offered for the Town Report of Amherst, N.H. This same report was picked up by Time magazine.

I submit Judge Lincoln's final report as it appeared in the Milford Cabinet and the article from Time and commend them to my colleagues:

[From the Milford Cabinet, Mar. 11, 1965]

AMHERST COURT—END OF ERA: FINAL REPORT OF THE JUSTICES OF AMHERST MUNICIPAL COURT

(Taken from Amherst Town Report)

After some 14 years during which the great wheels of justice ground relentlessly onward, implemented to some degree by the Amherst municipal court, the Governor in his great and inscrutable wisdom, aided and abetted by the great and General Court of New Hampshire, has seen fit to render any municipal court system of this State passé. On July 1, 1964, the Amherst municipal court ceased to exist, its functions having been assumed by the district court. It is therefore fitting and proper that the justices, relieved of the necessity of maintaining the judicial demeanor, render their final report in such form as they jolly well choose, with the full knowledge that since they can't have their names carved in granite on the courthouse cornerstone, because there is no more court, this report will be their final hour.

Over the years there have been the usual run of transient breaches of the peace, such as motorists who made the mistake of being found in charge of motor vehicles while three sheets to the wind, a large number of people who took route 101 to be a drag strip, those who understood stop signs were for other people, and to those who took the position that their cars just couldn't go that fast. These cases contain nothing novel or interesting.

However, there have been a few moments of heightened interest, moments that can now be revealed without suffering the penalties of slander, lack of judicial demeanor and the like. Therefore, this report will concern itself with those matters, the likes of which may never be repeated, and unless set down for posterity herein, may very well pass into oblivion unheralded.

There was the woman who for several months running complained violently to all law enforcement agencies about the unreasonable and dangerous speeders on the Mont Vernon Road. These complaints became so bothersome that the State police set out a roadblock just to keep this lady off their backs. The net result of the roadblock was that the lady who made all the fuss was herself picked up for unreasonable speed driving to the post office, and to crown the lily, was picked up 15 minutes later for the same offense on her return trip. She has since moved from town.

Then there were several so-called domestic matters, in which the wife, bloody and shaken, brought charges against her husband because she just couldn't take any more. Without exception, these matters were dismissed because upon hearing, the sole witness testifying in favor of the erring husband, was the complainant wife.

Then there was the case involving complicated issues of conflict of laws. In this case, a chickenhouse, on the Amherst-Milford town line, was the scene of cockerel carnage such as has never been seen since. It seems some animal frightened the chickens on the first floor of the chickenhouse. They ran from the Milford end to the Amherst end of the house and proceeded to expire there in great numbers. The fracas caused by this activity, frightened the chickens on the second floor of the chickenhouse and they ran to the Milford end of the chickenhouse where they in turn undertook to die in equally vast numbers. The problem arose over which town should pay for the dog damage thus arising. The town of Milford took the position that the first floor hens died in Amherst, the damage was therefore done there, so Amherst should pay. Amherst took the position that the fuss started in the

Milford end, and anyway, the second floor chickens, though they started their flight in Amherst, nevertheless died in the Milford end, and therefore Milford should pay. Though this created an impasse, someone inquired whether the damage was originally caused by an errant dog, or whether it was caused by some extraneous element, like a skunk or a fox (a taxpayer in neither town) rather than a dog, and as far as your justices know, the matter is still "under advisement."

Nor was the courtroom itself devoid of drama. At various times the court has witnessed the collapse of a chair under the weight of a State trooper, the justice got the zipper on his gown caught in his tie and sat out an entire session thus involved, with the tie hanging out like the tongue of a Saint Bernard and during a conference "in chambers" (the kitchen of the town hall) counsel for the respondent was so taken with the leftovers of the school lunch program that serious question was raised about his eating habits.

Aside from the foregoing, and occasional conflicts with the ways and means committee over who had priority in the courtroom—the court or the committee—the time the grange whist night refreshment committee raised a hue and cry over a man the State police had handcuffed to a column in the dining room for safekeeping, things proceeded with reasonable aplomb over the years.

However, vestiges of the Amherst municipal court remain; nobody knows what to do with the pile of old complaints and warrants accumulated over 14 years, and nobody has the courage to throw them away. Perhaps in the distant future, some archeologist, digging in the remains of Amherst, will unearth these artifacts and in learned conference with his colleagues, come to the conclusion that ours was a strange era—nobody threw anything away.

CHARLES J. LINCOLN,
Justice.

[From Time, Mar. 26, 1965]

LEST THE WORLD FORGET

Judicial reform in New Hampshire has done away with the State's many little municipal courts. But Amherst Justice Charles L. Lincoln was worried lest the world forget the drama that took place in his courtroom. Thus, the highlights of 14 years are immortalized in his final report to the town (population 2,501).

"At various times," the judge recalls, "the court has witnesed the collapse of a chair under the weight of a State trooper," while "the justice got the zipper on his gown caught in his tie and sat out an entire session thus involved, with the tie hanging out like the tongue of a Saint Bernard." The court, of course, had some serious cases, not the least of which involved a woman who complained violently about speeding on Mount Vernon Road. When State troopers finally set up a roadblock, "the lady who made all the fuss was herself picked up for unreasonable speed driving to the post office, and to crown the lily, was picked up 15 minutes later on her return trip. She has since left town."

Amherst's judicial landmark was a famous conflict-of-laws case involving a chickenhouse that happened to straddle the Amherst-Milford town line. When some prowling animal frightened the chickens on the first floor, "they ran from the Milford end to the Amherst end of the house and proceeded to expire there in great numbers. The fracas caused by this activity frightened the chickens on the second floor of the chickenhouse, and they ran to the Milford end of the chickenhouse where they in turn undertook to die in equally vast numbers."

Who was liable for damages? "The town of Milford took the position that the first floor hens died in Amherst, the damage was therefore done there, so Amherst should pay. Amherst took the position that the fuss started in the Milford end and, anyway, the second floor chickens though they started their flight in Amherst, nevertheless died in the Milford end, and therefore Milford should pay."

In the end, no one paid. Blame was laid to "some extraneous element like a skunk or a fox (a taxpayer in neither town) rather than a dog, and as far as your justices know, the matter is still 'under advisement.'" So is just about everything else. "Nobody knows what to do with the pile of old complaints and warrants accumulated over 14 years, and nobody has the courage to throw them away." They will doubtless endure for the delight of "some archeologist digging in the remains of Amherst. As for himself, says Justice Lincoln, it feels great to be "relieved of the necessity of maintaining the judicial demeanor."

Soil Conservation Service, Conservation Application in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, conservation is a big word. It covers a lot of ground. When we talk of soil and water conservation we are referring to many things—for conservation is not merely protecting land and water from misuse, or holding it for future use. These are part of land and water conservation, but by no means all.

Conservation is, essentially, using the land and water resources to their best advantage on a long-term basis. Conservation planning looks far into the future, anticipates needs and attempts to foresee problems that sound conservation practices—established now and faithfully carried forward—can prevent. Conservation relies on a thorough understanding of the land and water resources—their potential if respected, and the extent of the loss if they are neglected or ill-used.

Conservation is a complex business, involving many sciences and many practices. Nebraska is involved in most of them.

Soil conservation district cooperators in Nebraska, during fiscal year 1964, built 1,455 farm ponds for a total of some 18,000, seeded 38,945 acres of cropland to pasture, developed 783 acres for wildlife habitat, preserved 1,072 acres for wildlife wetland, and planted 3,835 acres to trees. Conservation cropping systems were applied on 49,176 acres in fiscal 1964, bringing the State's total on the land under conservation rotations to 8,501,547 acres.

Contour farming has been completed on 3 million acres in Nebraska, and 127,000 miles of terracing have been installed throughout the State.

Nearly 46,000 cooperators in Nebraska's 87 soil conservation districts have developed basic conservation plans on 18,800,000 acres of land. Farm and ranch conservation plans are fully applied on 12,250,000 acres. Construction of floodwater retarding structures has grown to an estimated two and a quarter million dollars for fiscal year 1965.

As a result of outstanding local leadership, local tax money amounting to $133,000 is provided in 69 counties to assist local districts in fiscal 1965. At the State level, the Nebraska Legislature appropriated $394,000 for soil and water conservation work in the current fiscal year.

The efforts to build a sound program of soil and water conservation in Nebraska, and the support these efforts have received, attest to the recognized importance of this endeavor at the local, State, and national levels of our society. In Nebraska, as elsewhere, the programs must continue to build if it is to adequately serve the needs of the State and the Nation.

The Future of the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer on April 7, 1965, concerning legislation I introduced in this Congress, H.R. 3414, providing that future directors of the FBI be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and that they be drawn from those who have served for at least 10 years as members of the FBI:

THE FUTURE OF THE FBI

J. Edgar Hoover, longtime Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, is getting no younger. And despite the high esteem in which he continues to be held, despite the demonstrated confidence of seven Presidents, it is obvious that he cannot direct the work of the FBI forever. Ultimately he will retire.

The task of finding a successor of comparable stature and talent will not be an easy one. But the crucial nature of the FBI demands that its directorship not become a political plum to reward one of the faithful of either party.

Toward that end, Representative WALTER S. BARING, Democrat, of Nevada, has sponsored a measure (H.R. 3414) to provide that future directors of the FBI be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and that they be drawn from those who have served for at least 10 years as members of the FBI.

The Baring bill would preclude a frankly political appointment to the FBI directorship. It would also preclude the selection of an outsider unacquainted with the traditions and responsibilities of the Nation's most highly honored and respected Federal agency.

In the course of its history, the FBI has accumulated more information about more Americans than any other institution—public or private—in the Nation. In responsible hands—like those of Mr. Hoover and his colleagues—this information is properly used. In less responsible hands, the FBI's archives could become a weapon capable of unlimited mischief.

The House Judiciary Committee, to which the Baring bill has been referred for several sessions of Congress, has shown no disposition thus far to act on it or to give the full House of Representatives an opportunity to act. The bill's purpose, we think, is too significant to make further procrastination wise or desirable.

"Take a Billion or I'll Brain You"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of President Johnson's major foreign policy speech on Vietnam, a proper interpretation of the new position is in order.

The Chicago Tribune, in a most practical editorial of Friday, April 9, questions the wisdom and practicality of the President's proposal, both in its philosophy as well as the potential costs.

I personally feel that the President's address was an international farce and since the Tribune's editorial so effectively analyzes the speech, I place it in the RECORD at this point:

"TAKE A BILLION OR I'LL BRAIN YOU"

Mr. Johnson's speech was a curious concoction. He started out talking about the war in Vietnam. He wound up talking about the "war on poverty," which in this particular context began to assume global dimensions, with an offer of $1 billion to put TVA's and REA's in southeast Asia.

The first part of Mr. Johnson's address was a commendable expression of American resolution. He said the United States would not flag in the fight to keep South Vietnam out of the hands of the Communists and that there would be no defeat, retreat, or withdrawal. He had some harsh remarks about Red China's activity in goading on Communist North Vietnam's aggression.

The President did not try to sugar-coat the fact that the American response had toughened recently, with heavy air attacks into Communist territory above the 17th parallel. We have power, he said, and "we will use it."

This is the kind of language Communists can understand—probably the only kind they can understand. Mr. Johnson seemed to offer assurance that he had not been sucked in by the propaganda of the commentators and clergymen and professors and certain of his own party followers that appeasement was the only course and that we should cut and run once more.

But then the President shifted gears and offered "unconditional discussions" toward a negotiated settlement. There were no preconditions. He did not ask the Communists first to call off their war or disavow their purpose, which is conquest.

Then came the usual salvationist content we may expect in any Johnson speech. He saw the lions and the lambs lying down together in southeast Asia. As an enticement to peaceful reconciliation, the billion dollars in prospective aid was dangled in front of the good people and the villains alike, while Mr. Johnson dwelt fondly on the wonder-working gimmicks of the New Deal and the Great Society, which could be transported to lands halfway around the world.

A Tennessee Valley Authority along the Mekong River would rise with the help of Mr. Johnson's billion, and an Asian Rural Electrification Administration would light the darkness.

Some Republican skeptics, and even a Democrat or two, said baldly that this was an overture to buy peace and that it would not work. In fact, if war is to be the preliminary to massive infusions of American foreign aid, the proposal might prove to be less of an incentive to peace than an encouragement to further wars in other regions just as backward and poverty stricken as southeast Asia. If war earns a ticket on the gravy train, why not a little shooting to attract bighearted Lyndon's interest?

We are not aware that history offers a single instance to demonstrate that the Johnson formula of a purchased peace has ever bought off an invader. When the Ottoman Turks turned up at the gates of Vienna, they were not turned back by a promise from the defenders, "Go home and we will reward you with a shipload of shish kebab." Nor did Charles Martel deal with the Moors by taking the field at Tours with an offer of a few fat bucks if they'd just retire across the Pyrenees.

Mr. Johnson will discover that the way to deal with Communist imperialism is by showing a good left hook and a strong right cross, not by riffling bills like a bank teller in his cage.

A Builder Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes today to pay tribute to the late A. D. Brochman, from my hometown of Kingsport, Tenn., who was a good friend and neighbor of mine. The memory of Mr. Brockman, one of the pioneer builders of Kingsport, will linger on and on in the hearts of the people of this great city. Love and devotion for its progress was always uppermost in his thoughts, and he truly aided in Kingsport's growth.

Mr. Brockman was a great American, a man who was greatly admired and highly respected by all who knew him. It is with respect that I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the Friday, April 9, Kingsport Times editorial which points out many fine things about his career:

[From the Kingsport Times, Apr. 9, 1965]

A BUILDER GOES

Albert Davis Brockman, who has just passed from the scene in Kingsport leaves behind him a shrinking number of people who remember his great services to his city. Illness had forced him into semiretirement for some years during which he watched others carry on the work.

His service was many-sided but his biggest contribution was to the educational system here. The men who planned and built Kingsport were clearly aware of the fact that one of the cornerstones of any progressive city must be its school systems. They did not fail to see how much the future depended on a strong modern system. And much depended on the school board which would take this work in charge.

Albert—or "A. D." as he was called—became the chairman of that board in the early years and for many years thereafter his life was divided into three parts. There was his work with the schools; his work as a banker; and his private life. And it was said of him that the first became the most important to him. He had time for other things, such as serving his church and serving as president of the Kiwanis Club, and other activities; but his heart was in the schools.

We need not say how well he and his colleagues did the work. It was an ever-expanding job as the city grew and more and more children needed more and more schools. There were problems, especially during the days of the depression. But it is no accident that time after time surveys and checks by national educational groups not only gave Kingsport schools a clean bill of health but high rating.

If we are proud of our schools today—and we may well be proud—it is because they were built on sound foundations through the dedicated services of a group of men, one of the principal ones being A. D. Brockman.

Oddly enough, like so many others of the early builders "Brock" was no tooter of his own horn. If he ever made a public speech we never heard of it. He did his work without fanfare and with no thought of reward or credit. He was that sort of man.

But it is time to give credit. Some time ago in this colunm we suggested that the next time the city of Kingsport had a school to name, it should carry the name of Albert Davis Brockman. We repeat that suggestion now. It is the lease we can do to recognize the long years of service this man gave the city and its schools.

President Has Given Reds a Clear and Vital Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, among those who have joined in commendation of President Johnson's foreign policy speech at Baltimore is the Nashville Tennessean.

In an editorial, "President Has Given Reds a Clear and Vital Choice," published April 8, 1965, the Nashville Tennesean stated that what President Johnson is seeking is "to make clear to the Communists in Hanoi there is a choice and to advance a cautious and ticklish effort to broaden the approach on South Vietnam and thereby to improve the U.S. position with respect to its allies and the uncommitted world."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, Apr. 8, 1965]

PRESIDENT HAS GIVEN REDS A CLEAR AND VITAL CHOICE

In his major foreign policy address to the Nation last night, President Johnson told the world there will be no retreat in Vietnam, but he said that in the interests of peace the United States stand ready to talk without imposing any preconditions.

With one sentence, the Chief Executive has disarmed critics at home and abroad who have argued that the United States has been dogmatic on its terms for discussion of the war; and imprecise on what preconditions might be asked. Heretofore, the Johnson administration has insisted that Hanoi must leave its neighbors alone before there could be any talks.

Some among the 17 nonaligned nations which have urged both sides to talk over the problem have complained that the positions of both have been too rigid. No one can now accuse the United States of rigidity, or of closing doors to mediation efforts.

President Johnson has taken his concern for peace a step further by calling for a "massive effort to improve the life of man" in southeast Asia. He urged U.N. Secretary General U Thant to "use the prestige of his office—and his deep knowledge of Asia—to initiate with the countries of the area, a plan for cooperation in increased development." And he said he would ask Congress for $1 billion as an American investment in the effort, once it is underway.

Although conciliatory in tone, President Johnson made it clear the United States is not suing for peace; that its will and determination is strong as ever. In ringing tones, the Chief Executive said:

"We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of meaningless agreement." Commenting that the United States has no desire to see thousands of Asians or Americans die in battle, and no desire to devastate North Vietnam, the President went on to say that "We will use our power with restraint and with all the wisdom we can command, but we will use it."

Although the President has proffered the opportunity for talks without conditions imposed, there was no great comfort to Hanoi in any "peace at any price" implication. For the kind of peace the President has in mind was clearly stated: "an independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others—free from outside interference—tied to no alliance—and a military base for no other country."

What the President obviously sought to do in his address was to make clear to the Communists in Hanoi there is a choice and to advance a cautious and ticklish effort to broaden the approach on South Vietnam and thereby to improve the U.S. position with respect to its allies and the uncommitted world.

President Johnson's speech marks a subtle shift, not in U.S. objectives or policy in Vietnam but in the realm of diplomacy. The President is, in effect, trying to escalate diplomacy into a wider and more clearly understood effort for peace and order, and to bring into concert a kind of world diplomacy for peace.

So far, Hanoi and Communist China have shown not the slightest indication of wanting to talk peace. In fact, in the past day or two there has been a noticeable hardening of the Hanoi line. But if the Communists want to risk the peril of widening the war more, it is essential this country be on record as seeking peace and the betterment of man and making sure its motives are not misunderstood by the world.

The United States has made it implicitly clear to Hanoi—as well as Peiping and Moscow—that southeast Asia has the choice of bombs and bullets or the prospect of the better life. The Communists must now choose. Whatever their choice may be, neither they nor the world can now say that the United States has left no alternative to bloody conflict.

Political Science Seminars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia, on Monday evening, April 5, led a discussion on "Congress and the Presidency" as part of a series of seminars for primary and secondary teachers of social studies in Arlington County, Va., schools.

Cosponsored by the county school system's division of instruction and the American Political Science Association, this unique program is bringing outstanding leaders from the legislative and executive branches of Government, political scientists, and other experts in the field of public affairs to Stratford Junior High School for a series of eight discussion meetings with about 45 teachers of civics, geography, and history. According to the distinguished APSA executive director, Dr. Evron M. Kirkpatrick, the program is a part of a continuing association effort to improve the quality of teaching about government and public affairs at the grade and high school levels.

Himself a former university teacher, Representative HECHLER made a significant contribution to this important program, and I am advised the association hopes to organize comparable programs elsewhere in the Nation. I am pleased that a school system in my district is participating in this innovative educational experience.

Under unanimous consent, I include the entire program, "Political Science and the Social Studies," in the RECORD so that my colleagues in the House may bring it to the attention of school officials in their districts:

THE ELECTORAL PROCESS

Monday, March 29, 1965: An analysis of the process and the relationship between political, economic, geographic and social factors of the electorate.

Richard M. Scammon: Director of the elections research center of the Governmental Affairs Institute. Mr. Scammon is a former Director of the Bureau of the Census, and the editor of America Votes.

Bibliography

David, Paul T., Goldman, Ralph M., Bain, Richard C., "The Politics of National Party Conventions," Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1960 (paperback).

Polsby, Nelson W., and Wildavsky, Aaron, "Presidential Elections," Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1964 (paperback).

Campbell, Angus, Converse, Phillip, Miller, Warren, Stokes, Donald, "The American Voter," Wiley, New York, 1964 (abridged paperback edition).

Key, V. O., "Public Opinion and American Democracy," Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1961.

White, Theodore, "The Making of the President, 1960," Pocket Books, Inc., 1961 (paperback).

Heard, Alexander, "The Cost of Democracy," University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1960 (paperback).

THE CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENCY

Monday, April 5, 1965: A discussion of the role of the Presidency and the Congress in the system of checks and balances.

Representative KEN HECHLER: A former professor of political science at Marshall University who has also served as associate director of the American Political Science Association and aid to President Truman, Dr. HECHLER is now serving his fourth term as the Congressman from the Fourth District of West Virginia.

Bibliography

Binkly, Wilfred E., "President and Congress," Vintage Books, New York, 1962 (paperback).

Polsby, Nelson W., "Congress and the Presidency," Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1964 (paperback).

MILLER, CLEM, Member of the House, "Letters of a Congressman," Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1962 (paperback).

Peabody, Robert, Polsby, Nelson (editors), "New Perspective in the House of Representatives," Rand McNally, Chicago, 1963 (paperback).

Neustadt, Richard, "Presidential Power," John Wiley, New York, 1960 (paperback).

Rossiter, Clinton, "The American Presidency," Harcourt, Brace & World Harvest Books, New York, 1960 (paperback).

Bailey, Stephen K., "Congress Makes a Law," Columbia University Press, New York, 1950 (paperback).

Burns, James M., "The Deadlock of Democracy," Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1963 (paperback).

POLITICAL PARTIES

Monday, April 12, 1965: An examination of the two-party system in action.

William B. Prendergast: Presently the research director of the Republican conference of the House of Representatives, and minority Sergeant at Arms of the House. Dr. Prendergast is a former research director of the Republican National Committee. He is coauthor of "The States and Subversion."

Bibliography

Key, V. O., "Parties, Politics, and Pressure Groups," fourth edition, Thomas Crowell, New York, 1958.

Greenstein, Fred I., "The American Party System and the American People," Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1963 (paperback).

Herring, Pendleton, "The Politics of Democracy," Rinehart, New York, 1940.

Munger, Frank, and Price, Hugh Douglas, editors, "Readings in Political Parties and Pressure Groups," Crowell, New York, 1964 (paperback).

Lipsit, Seymour Martin, "Political Man," Anchor Books, New York, 1960 (paperback).

THE JUDICIAL PROCESS

Monday, April 26, 1965: An analysis of judicial decision-making.

Max Kampelman: Mr. Kampelman, Washington attorney and the treasurer of the American Political Science Association, is a holder of a law degree from New York University, and a doctorate in political science from the University of Minnesota. Mr. Kampelman is the author of "The Communist Party in the CIO: A Study in Power Politics," and was legislative consultant to the then Senator HUMPHREY from 1948 to 1955.

Bibliography

Cushman, Robert, "Leading Constitutional Decisions," 12th edition, Appleton, Century, Crofts, New York (paperback).

Swisher, Carl B., "The Growth of Constitutional Power in the United States," Uni-

versity of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1963 (paperback).

Hyneman, Charles S., "The Supreme Court on Trial," Prentice Hall, New York, 1963.

Murphy, Walter, "Congress and the Court," University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962.

Lewis, Anthony, "Gideon's Trumpet," Random House, New York, 1964.

Taper, Bernard, "Gomillion versus Lightfoot: The Tuskegee Gerrymander Case," McGraw-Hill, New York, 1962 (paperback).

Westin, Alan F., "The Supreme Court: Views from the Inside," W. W. Norton & Co., New York, 1961 (paperback).

Mason, Alpheus T., Brandeis: A Free Man's Life," the Viking Press, New York, 1946.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Monday, May 3, 1965: An examination of urban problems and proposals for dealing with them.

Norman Beckman: The assistant director of Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Dr. Beckman is an expert in metropolitan affairs. Among recent topics he has written on are: "Our Federal System and Urban Development: Adaptation of Forum to Function," and "The Planner as a Bureaucrat."

Bibliography

Graves, W. Brooke, "American Intergovernmental Relations," Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1964.

Adrian, Charles R., "Governing Urban America," McGraw-Hill, New York, 1961.

Jacobs, Jane, "The Death and Life of Great American Cities," Random House, New York, 1961 (paperback).

Greer, Scott, "Governing the Metropolis," John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1962 (paperback).

Sayre, Wallace S., and Kaufman, Herbert, "Governing New York," Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1960.

Dahl, Robert A., "Who Governs?—Democracy and Power in an American City," Yale University Press, New Haven, 1961 (paperback).

FOREIGN POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Monday, May 10, 1965: A discussion of the present situation and future trends in the conduct of international affairs.

H. Field Haviland: The director of foreign policy studies for the Brookings Institution. Dr. Haviland is a former professor at Haverford College and the author of a number of significant works in the area of international relations, including "The Political Role of the General Assembly and Organizing for Peace."

Bibliography

Morgenthau, Hans J., "Politics Among Nations," third edition, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1962.

Kissinger, Henry, "The Necessity for Choice," Anchor Books, New York, 1962 (paperback); "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy," Anchor Books, New York (paperback).

Claude, Inis L., Jr., "Power and International Relations," Random House, New York, 1962; "Swords Into Plowshares," third edition, Random House, New York, 1964.

Cohen, Bernard C., "The Political Process and Foreign Policy," Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1953.

Westerfield, H. Bradford, "Foreign Policy and Party Politics," Yale University Press, New Haven, 1955.

ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Monday, May 17, 1965: An examination of the problems of organization and management in the Federal Establishment.

Harold Seidman: The present Director of the Office of Management and Organization of the Bureau of the Budget, Dr. Seidman is the author of "The Government Corporation."

Bibliography

Pfiffner, John M., and Presthas, R. Vance, "Public Administration," Ronald Press, New York, 1953.

Simon, Herbert A., Smithburg, Donald, Thompson, Victor, "Public Administration," New York, 1950.

Millett, John D., "Government and Public Administration," McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1959.

Fenno, Richard, "The President's Cabinet," Vintage Books, New York, 1959 (paperback).

Wildavsky, Aaron, "Dixon Yates: A Study in Power Politics," Yale University Press, New Haven, 1962.

Wallace, Robert, "Congressional Control of Federal Spending," Wayne State University Press, Detroit, 1960.

Snow, C. P., "Science and Government," Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1961 (paperback).

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND THE SOCIAL STUDIES

Monday, May 24, 1965: An analysis of the teaching of social studies at the elementary and secondary school levels, and the potential contribution of the discipline of political science.

Evron M. Kirkpatrick: Dr. Kirkpatrick is the executive director of the American Political Science Association. A former member of the University of Minnesota faculty, he is the coauthor of a number of works including: "Elections—U.S.A. and High School Social Studies Perspectives."

Bibliography

Ranney, Austin, editor, "Essays on the Behavioral Study of Politics," University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1962.

Kirkpatrick, Evron M., and Kirkpatrick, Jeane J., "Political Science," in "High School Social Studies Perspectives," Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1962 (paperback).

Van Dyke, Vernon, "Political Science: A Philosophical Analysis," Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1950.

Hyneman, Charles S., "The Study of Politics: The Present State of American Political Science," University of Illinois, Urbana, 1959.

Young, Roland, "Approaches to the Study of Politics," Northwestern University Press, Evanston, Ill., 1958 (paperback).

Agricultural Research Stations, Supporting Continuation of Programs (S. Rept. No. 156)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it was with considerable reassurance and revival of optimism that I read the report last week of the Committee on Appropriations emanating from the other body.

The report is thorough and bears evidence of meticulous study. It also reveals an unmistakable sign of good judgment in opposing the elimination of many long-term agricultural research stations.

While I commend Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND and his colleagues for the entire report, I am especially interested in four items that vitally affect the farmers of my district, and I would like to bring those to the attention of my colleagues by giving them emphasis here as follows:

5. Elimination of research on tung (Cairo, Ga., Bougalusa, La., and Beltsville, Md.), $221,300: The committee recommends that the production research on tung be continued indefinitely at an annual expenditure of $221,300. The production of tung is regional in nature and the hearing record shows that on the average only 50 percent of our domestic requirements of tung is met by U.S. production. In order to step up domestic production of tung, the research program should be continued to cope with various problems of cold resistance, cultural, nutritional, harvesting, and related problems of production.

7. Elimination of research on sugar sorghum (Cairo and Experiment, Ga., Beltsville, Md., and Meridian, Miss.), $75,200: The committee recommends the indefinite continuance of research on sugar sorghum at an annual rate of $75,200. Sorghum is produced in 29 States as silage, sirup, or as a molasses crop. The farm value of the crop is estimated at $80 million. Due to the wide area of production and the need for continuing research, there appears to be little basis for proposing to discontinue this line of research which is effectively conducted at a low rate of expenditure in relation to the value of the crops produced.

8. Elimination of research on rye (Tifton, Ga., Beltsville, Md., and Stillwater, Okla.), $39,800: The committee recommends that the insect research on rye be continued. The annual expenditure is $39,800 and the results apply throughout the rye-producing area. Production of rye has increased over the past 16 years both for forage and grain purposes. Rye is now produced in 31 States with an estimated farm value in excess of $35 million annually.

15. Florida: Quincy—Tobacco insects, $24,400: The committee recommends that the research on tobacco insects located at Quincy, Fla., at an annual expenditure of $24,400, be continued indefinitely.

The demand for wrapper leaf type of tobacco currently exceeds the available supply. The total producer return from this type of tobacco averages $48 million annually and this type of tobacco does not receive any Government price support. This expenditure of $24,400 annually is the only Government program assistance on the shade-grown type of tobacco.

It is obvious that the decision to propose discontinuance of this research project was arrived at hastily, and the alternate proposal to continue the research activity on these particular insect problems at a location several hundred miles distant under so-called controlled conditions does not meet with the concurrence of the committee.

If it is the current and general view of scientific leadership in the Department that research investigations at field locations should be abandoned in favor of controlled environmental research chambers for the conduct of farm research, the committee will need a good deal more justification from the Department before it concurs in such a basic and major change in the conduct of farm research investigations.

Smithsonian Institution Exhibition Series as Outlined by Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary, Before the Interior Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago in our Nation's history, there were

occurring significant events that would culminate in the American Revolution.

It is interesting to note that the year 1965 is also the 200th anniversary of the birth of James Smithson, distinguished Englishman and great benefactor of the Smithsonian Institution which bears his name. The spring of 1965 also marks the bicentennial of the Virginia resolves, drafted by Patrick Henry, which played such an important part in bringing about the Stamp Act Congress which would be held in the colony of New York in the fall of 1765.

I think it is most appropriate that the Smithsonian Institution plans a series of exhibits at the National Museum, and I would like to insert in the RECORD a tentative schedule of these exhibits as outlined by Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, the Secretary, in recent hearings before the Interior Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, with explanatory preliminary comment excerpted from the hearings, as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTE EXHIBITION SERIES AS OUTLINED BY DR. S. DILLON RIPLEY, SECRETARY, BEFORE THE INTERIOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MARSH. Now, in light of Smithson's interest in American history and the efforts of the museum to depict the history of the American people, which I think is one of your fundamental objectives, what efforts are you directing toward commemoration of what many historians consider to be the bicentennial of American ideas, the formative 12 years that would precede the signing of the Declaration of Independence, or Concord Bridge, frequently referred to as the golden years of the American Revolution?

What efforts are you making to observe these bicentennial events at the present time?

For example, the Stamp Act Congress, which met in September 1765, the same month as the birth of Smithson?

Dr. RIPLEY. We have a committee working on the commemoration and celebrations, and I will have to ask them what they are planning to do about this aspect.

Mr. MARSH. Don't you think it would be quite appropriate to begin to focus attention now on the issues, events, and the history of the preconflict era?

Dr. RIPLEY. I do, indeed. I know we have members of our staff who are part of these committees. There have been one or two committees formed to commemorate these particular events, I believe.

Mr. MARSH. Can you make some sort of display in the museum? For example, this spring marks the 200th anniversary of the Virginia Resolves, which precipitated the Stamp Act Congress.

Dr. RIPLEY. It may be we are managing that. We have an active Department of Political History. I will have to ask them.

Mr. MARSH. There is no question in my mind but what we are going to reenact the battles of the American Revolution, including Concord Bridge, and there will be the pageantry and drama, and people will leave the reenactment and some child will ask why did they fire the shot at Concord Bridge, and I think we will realize the bicentenntial of ideas has passed us by.

It seems to me our agency is in a particular position to influence American historical thought and a scholarly examination of these causes and issues that occurred during this period, which actually, as Toynbee said, reflect into the 20th century.

Dr. RIPLEY. Right.

Mr. MARSH. Can you devote some attention to that?

Dr. RIPLEY. I would be happy to put something in the RECORD on what we are doing in this regard.

THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION'S BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATIONS OF EVENTS OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE, 1765–1775, INCLUSIVE

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

The next 10 years will recall many significant episodes in our country's history preceding the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776. It is appropriate that the most outstanding of these that are of national importance be noted in bicentennial commemorations, which will be observed at the Smithsonian Institution by temporary exhibits. For all of these we can display material already in the national collections, supplemented occasionally by loans from public and private donors.

The tentative schedule of historic events, to be celebrated between May 29, 1965, and October 13, 1975, is as follows:

1. Virginia resolutions, May 29, 1765.—Introduced into the Virginia House of Burgesses by Patrick Henry, they represented the first articulate outcry of opposition to the Stamp Act. The resolutions maintained that the General Assembly of Virginia had the sole and exclusive right to levy taxes on the inhabitants of Virginia. During arguments over the Virginia resolutions, Henry delivered his famous "Treason" speech. Henry's Virginia resolutions set the spark which led to the Stamp Act Congress on October 7, 1765.

The exhibit will include the well-known contemporary engraving of Henry's speech in the Virginia House of Burgesses, an actual British revenue stamp of 1765, Patrick Henry commemorative postage stamp, and cultural items referring to Virginia in this period.

2. Stamp Act Congress, October 7, 1765.—The Stamp Act Congress, which began on October 7, 1765, in New York, was represented by members from nine of the colonies, including Pennsylvania, Connecticut, South Carolina, Rhode Island, Maryland, Massachusetts, Delaware, New York, and New Jersey. Reaffirming the earlier arguments of Patrick Henry and others, the Congress maintained that the colonies had the sole right to tax themselves. Petitions demanding repeal of the Stamp Act were prepared for submission to the King, the House of Commons, and the House of Lords.

The exhibit will include material comparable to the preceding, plus a William Pitt halfpenny, a rare William Pitt medallion, and cultural items referring to the nine colonies represented at the Congress.

3. Repeal of the Stamp Act, March 18, 1766.—After nearly a year of intense opposition to the Stamp Act by the American colonies, aided within the British Parliament by the Whigs, the Stamp Act was finally repealed, effective May 1, 1766. The Stamp Act was eloquently opposed before Parliament by Benjamin Franklin, acting as agent for Pennsylvania.

The exhibit will include items associated with Benjamin Franklin, contemporary prints, material referring to Parliament in 1766, and Franklin philatelic specimens.

4. Daniel Boone and opening of the West, 1769.—Daniel Boone explored Kentucky and opened the way for westward expansion in 1769. Four years later, in 1773, Colonel Boone and his family, with five other families, begin the settlement of Kentucky.

The exhibit will include original Boone material, cultural items associated with Kentucky, maps and prints referring to areas involved, and related military specimens.

5. Boston Massacre, March 5, 1770.—Protesting the posting of British troops in Boston, a fray took place in Boston between a private soldier of the 29th regiment and an inhabitant on March 2. On the 5th, the soldiers were pressed upon and in resentment fired upon the crowd. Three of the Bostonians were killed and five seriously wounded.

The exhibit will include the rare Paul Revere engraving of the massacre, Revere silver and other items, military paraphernalia, artifacts related to Boston of this period, both tory and rebel.

6. Boston Tea Party, December 16, 1773.—The Bostonians objected to the British insistence upon taxes by opposing the unloading of a cargo of tea, subject to duty, from an East India Co. ship. The vessel was boarded by a group of patriots who emptied several thousand pounds of tea into the harbor.

The exhibit will include a few leaves of the actual tea that escaped immersion, appropriate contemporary prints, tea-drinking paraphernalia, material pertaining to naval architecture of the period.

7. First Continental Congress, September 5, 1774.—On September 5, 1774, the First Continental Congress assembled in Carpenter's Hall in Philadelphia, to "consult upon the present unhappy state of the Colonies." The Continental Congress was represented by delegations from every colony except Georgia. The purpose of the Congress was to attempt to resolve the differences between the American Colonies and the British Parliament.

The exhibit will include material relating to Carpenter's Hall, the city of Philadelphia in the 1707's, commemorative philatelic items, and personal memorabilia of several of the delegates (John Adams, Thomas Hancock, Charles Thompson, etc.)

8. Second Revolutionary Convention, March 23, 1775.—In a speech at St. John's Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va., Patrick Henry, urging strong colonial defense, used the famous phrase "Give me liberty or give me death."

The exhibit will include Patrick Henry items, prints, material associated with early Richmond, and related political items.

9. Paul Revere's Ride, April 18–19, 1775.—Official courier of the Massachusetts Provincial Assembly and Committee of Correspondence, his famous ride was from Charlestown to Lexington on April 18, 1775, to announce the approach of the British troops. This was the basis for Longfellow's poem, "The Midnight Ride of Paul Revere."

Battle of Lexington and Concord, April 19, 1775.—General Gage, the King's Governor of Massachusetts, detached a body of 800 men to march to Concord and destroy the military stores collected by the Americans at that place. The first battle of the Revolution ensued, which began the contest which dismembered the British Empire and ended in the establishment of independence in our own country.

The exhibit will include appropriate military items, cultural historical items concerned with the Boston, Concord, and Lexington areas, maps, photographs, Longfellow material, and Paul Revere items.

10. Battle of Ticonderoga, May 10, 1775.—Col. Ethan Allen seized the important fortress of Ticonderoga with 230 gallant Green Mountain Bays of Vermont. With the aid of Benedict Arnold he led a surprise attack against the British.

The exhibit will include appropriate military and cultural material, Vermont items, and Benedict Arnold and Allen memorabilia.

11. Battle of Bunker Hill, June 17, 1775.—The Battle of Bunker Hill, fought outside Boston, was one of the most famous battles of the Revolutionary War, and fired the colonists to further acts of heroism in their battle for independence from Britain. Badly outnumbered, and short of ammunition, Massachusetts militiamen fought off successive waves of battle-trained British soldiers. Though Bunker Hill was lost to the British, it cost them dearly, and they soon retreated from Boston, giving the American troops one of the greatest moral victories of the war.

The exhibit will include, in addition to appropriate military and cultural material, items related to the Bunker Hill monument and its dedication, and Boston topography.

12. Mecklemburg Declaration of Independence, May 20, 1775.—Adopted by a convention in Mecklemburg County, N.C., and sent to the North Carolina delegation at Philadelphia, this declaration declared all laws and commissions deriving their authority from the Crown to be annulled.

The exhibit will include cultural material from North Carolina.

13. The U.S. Navy.—On September 2, 1775, Washington authorized Col. John Glover to convert fishing vessels into armed ships. In Congress a committee was appointed on October 5 to prepare attacks against British vessels. "Rules for the Regulation of the Navy of the United Colonies" were adopted November 28 and a marine committee appointed December 14.

The exhibit will be a major display from the Smithsonian Institution's collection of naval material, together with important objects borrowed from public and private collections.

14. The Post Office Department.—On July 26, 1775, the Post Office Department was established with Benjamin Franklin as Postmaster General.

The exhibit will be a major display from the Smithsonian Institution's important collection of philately, together with items from other Government bureaus and private sources.

15. June 14 and 19, 1775.—On the former date the Continental Army was established and on the latter Washington was appointed its Commander in Chief.

The exhibit will be a major one, in conjunction with the bicentennial of the founding of the Navy, the same year.

Strong but Wrong Dosage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of April 12, 1965, which should have the attention of the Members. It should be pointed out to the membership of the House and the Washington Daily News that the problems mentioned in the editorial would be resolved with the adoption of the Ford-McCulloch voting rights bill.

STRONG BUT WRONG DOSAGE

When House Judiciary Committee Chairman EMANUEL CELLER described the voting rights bill written in his committee as "strong dosage," he was not overstating it.

This is a drastic measure indeed. It goes far toward making the Federal Government complete master of all election procedures and reducing the affected States to mere puppets in this regard.

The House group has put into the bill a number of tough features not included in the Johnson administration's original proposal. They would outlaw all remaining poll taxes, provide Federal poll watchers at regular elections, give protection to persons urging Negroes to register or vote, and even bar discrimination at party conventions. Criminal penalties are provided against private citizens as well as officials for interference with voting rights.

The bill reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee is almost as harsh, except that it includes an "escape hatch" for States—such as Georgia, Louisiana, and South Carolina—in which more than 60 percent of those eligible are registered.

Both versions contain the most questionable segment of the administration plan—the "automatic trigger" which would convict States of discrimination on a mere showing that they use a literacy test or similar device and that fewer than 50 percent of adults register or vote.

This is a bad approach to the problem. It discriminates among States, permitting some to use literacy tests but forbidding them to others. It seeks to prove the fact of discrimination by a statistical formula which may not be pertinent.

Yet the best legal minds in Congress and the administration, in weeks of study, have been unable to come up with an approach which would do the job on simpler and fairer terms.

It may be that some of the new tools fashioned by the House and Senate committees are necessary to insure Negroes in some southern areas absolutely fair treatment both in registering and voting. Certainly little would be gained by winning a Negro the right to register and then permitting him to be frightened away from voting.

But why abolish poll taxes in local elections without even an attempt to show they are being used discriminately? And why so drastic a step as to force a complete remodeling of State party conventions?

In any case, as long as these additional weapons are tied to the basic 50-percent formula, they cannot be applied equally to voting practices everywhere—as they should be.

Congress should redouble its efforts to find a substitute for the administration plan. If it is going to rule that literacy tests are unfair in Alabama, it has the obligation at least to consider whether they are not also unfair in New York and Massachusetts. If it is going to convict States of discrimination without a trial, it should seek a means of outlawing the practice on a more substantial basis than a mere numbers game.

Lease Vehicles for Rural Delivery?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, for the attention of the House I recommend the following poetic comment on the Post Office Department recommendation to lease vehicles for rural delivery of mail:

[From the National Rural Letter Carrier]

JUST 50 MILES AWAY

I started out upon my route, the wind was blowing hard.
The drifting snow was piling high, on every road and yard.
My Government leased auto, was serviced well to go.
It was made for competition, but not with mud or snow.
My little booklet told me, if it fails in any way.
We have one waiting for you, just 50 miles away.
Then I hit the snow drifts, for miles there was no end.
I could hear the motor waver, and feel the fenders bend.
When I could go no farther, then I began to fear.
To back I'd block the muffler, forward I'd strip a gear.
I called my substitute, to help me in the fight.
He said "You have the leased car, to help I have no right."
Then I called the lease man, in that far off town.
The message got through faintly, for the lines were falling down.
Then I heard him talking, and this he had to say.
I would like to help you buddy, but I'm 50 miles away.

Then I wired the Government, I wanted their advice.
For to think up a deal like this, they must be very wise.
It may look good on paper, though profits may be small.
It may work in nice weather, in summer and in fall.
But way out in the country, where you're fighting mud and snow,
And the snow just keeps on drifting, when it's zero or below.
Oh, it kind of makes you shiver, as you move upon your way.
Just to know that there's help for you, but it's 50 miles away.

So I wrote the man in Washington, to see what he would say,
If I was stuck and all my help, was 50 miles away.
And in his heated office, the lights were shining bright.
He opened up my letter, to see what was my plight.
He had a consultation, with others there a few.
They must decide among themselves, the thing for me to do.
At last the message came to me, the answer it read thus.
If you can't move, vacate the rig, and come in on the bus.
Then the Army told me how, to quell a snowy bank.
You make a mighty forward thrust, then attack it on the flank.
If all these efforts fail you, then put reserves in play.
For on our map, you have reserves, just 50 miles away.

So if you are a mail man, stuck in the mud or snow.
Do not get discouraged, if your leased car fails to go.
It may make you happy, to know the contracts say,
That you have help a plenty, just 50 miles away.

—ARTHUR CYR, Clyde, Kansas.

Bribery Our New Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include the following editorial by Mr. C. L. Dancey appearing in the April 9, 1965, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

President Johnson's fight-but-talk speech Wednesday reminds me of a statue on a mountaintop in the Caucasus Mountains between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea representing one of the most ancient of peoples still on this earth.

The people are the Khatli, or the "Georgians," and they have miraculously survived in their rugged mountains since the oldest of known times as a unique nation with their own unusual language and most unusual system of writing.

They were the people of Colchis in the ancient Greek legend of the Argonauts. Near the cockpit of the world's greatest and most persistent movements of ancient peoples they have had to fight and survive endless waves of human tides sweeping from Asia into Europe and Africa and the Middle East.

They have had to fight Romans and Greeks, Mongols and Turks, Arabs and Persians, Russians and Tartars, and hosts of ancient barbaric tribes, in order to survive.

The statue is a huge heroic work overlooking their capital city of Tbilisi from its mountaintop. It is the majestic figure of a woman, and her back is to the city as she faces the far horizons.

In her right hand she carries a huge sword. In her left, she holds a wine goblet.

The figure represents Georgia meeting strangers, and prepared equally to properly greet them whether they be friend or foe.

The only difference is, we seem to be a little confused about which "welcome" is appropriate to whom, when it comes to Vietnam.

We offer the choice of the wine or the sword to our sworn enemies, instead of reserving one for friends and the other for foes.

We are operating more like the famous "runner" of bootleg booze from the Canadian border who, whenever he happened to be stopped by an innocent traffic policeman on one of the country roads he used as a route, would surprise the officer at the window by the driver's seat. He would stick a .45-caliber pistol in the policeman's face with his right hand, and hold out a hundred-dollar bill in the other, and say, "Which one do you want?"

When it is that intimate, this is pretty primitive and direct psychology.

It could also remind us of some of the approaches taken by Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson to persuade certain of his colleagues to vote right.

Now, he is trying it out as the tactic with which to defeat the Communist drive for mastery of the peoples of the world.

Of course, the "unconditional" offer for talks is not as weak as it sounds. It is really the Communists who have sought a basic condition—that the U.S. bombers quit flying.

So, what he is really saying is, "We'll talk, but we won't stop fighting, or accept any such limitations as the basis for talking."

It may be a shrewd move to take the heat off us without actually changing what we are doing, in fact.

But whatever its real deep-down purpose, and however it fits into any deceptive general strategy, the fact remains that it seems to proclaim to the world, and will be taken by millions of people, as another demonstration of America's desire to buy her way out of trouble.

In countries where corrupt regimes are rotten with bribery, and unless you have the cash to grease official palms you are a second-clas citizen, the United States and U.S. aid is looked upon as just another form of bribing those same corrupt officials.

We now seem to be confirming to the world that bribery is an official foreign policy of the United States.

It may be a sign of wealth, but it isn't a sign of strength, determination, or reliability.

Once again, whether that is actually what we are up to or not, we seem to be putting on a big show of strength for a brief time—and then trying to buy our way out.

Will that discourage or encourage the planners in Peiping and Moscow? We shall see.

C. L. DANCEY.

Capital Punishment—Take That, Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Mr. Art Buchwald addressed himself to the principles of federalism in the U.S. Government insofar as they affect relationship between the judicial and legislative branches. He had some interesting things to say about the action taken by the House of Representatives in voting down the pay increase for members of the Supreme Court.

The potentialities of the House in acting as paymaster for the Supreme Court are discussed by Mr. Buchwald in his incisive article of March 25, 1965, which I include in the RECORD in the event it was missed by Members:

CAPITOL PUNISHMENT—TAKE THAT, SUPREME COURT

(By Art Buchwald)

Last week the House of Representatives defeated a bill to give the nine members of the U.S. Supreme Court a raise of $3,000, and all I can say is, it's about time. When you think of some of the decisions the Justices have been making in the last few years, it's surprising the Congressmen didn't vote to close down the Supreme Court altogether.

By refusing to give the Supreme Court Justices a raise, Congress was saying, in effect, "we may not agree with what you say, but we'll defend to the death our right to see you don't get any extra money for saying it."

As everyone is aware, the Supreme Court Justices of the United States are only in their jobs because of the money. If you start hitting them in the pocketbook, they'll think twice about making a decision that will offend Members of Congress.

Up until recently the House of Representatives has had little to say about what goes on in the Supreme Court, but everyone hopes that this will soon be corrected. You can't have a government with three separate branches of government all going in different directions, no matter what the Constitution says.

Our Congressmen have shown great patience with the judiciary, but the Supreme Court has insisted on remaining independent, because it thought it was immune to the desires of the legislative branch of the Government. Little did the nine Justices realize that Congress controlled their bread and butter (and pensions) and the Representatives would have to do something drastic to get the Justices in line.

By serving notice on the Supreme Court that it can't expect any raises from Congress until it toes the line, the House of Representatives has done a great service to the country.

Some editorals have been written to the effect that Congress had refused the pay raises to get revenge on the Court for such unpopular decisions as the reapportionment of congressional districts. But anyone who has talked to our Representatives knows they wouldn't stoop to anything like that. Our Congressmen are not out for blood. If the Supreme Court plays along with them, they'll play along with the Supreme Court. But there is no reason to waste taxpayers' money on nine men who are deciding issues differently from the way Congress sees them.

I think after last week we can expect an entirely different Supreme Court from the one we've had in the past. I have it on good authority that the wives of our Justices were counting on the extra $3,000 raise and have told their husbands to be more cooperative with the Members of Congress in the future.

Some wives have asked their husbands to consult with the various congressional chairmen before handing down any important decisions.

In this way they can appease Congress and hope that the House will reconsider their raises in the next session of Congress.

The decision to veto the Supreme Court Justices' raises will, in the long run, have a very salutary effect on our Government, because it will bring the legislative and judicial branches of the Government so much closer together. The ideal, of course, would be to make the Justices answer to a congressional committee for their actions, but that may have to come later.

Broken Law and Broken Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter I wish to call my colleagues attention to the splendid article in the Washington Sunday Star by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, entitled "Broken Law and Broken Freedom," it is a powerful exposé of the shallow sophistry of those who would defy our traditional and constitutional reliance on the rule of law and substitute for it an individual license to do as one believes best. I hope that many will ponder deeply the inexorable logic of Dr. Brown's message and his eloquent defense of the idea that respect for law and love of freedom are inextricably interwoven in the fabric of American society.

The article follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—BROKEN LAW AND BROKEN FREEDOM

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

In these days of tortured turbulence there is nothing that our social order needs more than to realize that to break the law means to break our freedom which makes laws. There is a frightening description in the April FBI bulletin of a scene last Labor Day weekend in a New England State where 7,000 arrogant, profane, and insulting young people stormed from the beach area, drinking and destroying property as they shouted "Kill the cops, let's have a riot." In addition to this attitude on the part of youth in various

parts of the Nation, the amazing doctrine is now being broadcast in the bitter campaign for civil rights that to reach certain social goals lawbreaking is a virtue. The startling thing in the contemporary agitation for the removal of unjust discrimination is that this lawless conception is espoused by some leaders in the realm of morals and ethics as uncontrolled street demonstrators trampled roughshod over legally enacted regulations. Some riders on crusading white horses covet a martyr's halo rather than obedience to laws of which they do not approve.

In an address at Colby College Adlai Stevenson observed: "Even a jail sentence is no longer a dishonor but a proud achievement. Perhaps we are destined to see in this law-loving land people running for office, not on their stainless records, but on their prison records." To break legal enactments by simply appealing to a higher law is to punch a hole in the legal dike which holds back the flood of anarchy.

Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court has pointedly said, "An individual or marauding group who defies the law to strike a blow for the particular kind of freedom they espouse is indeed destructive of the rule of law."

The present-day gospel of "overcoming" by disregarding laws, even on the way to worthwhile objectives, endangers the very cause, as it thus prostitutes unworthy means as a route to desired ends. At the same time it puts in jeopardy other worthy causes waiting for their day in a lawfully constituted court. The Communists shout out in glee to high heaven at the reported attitudes of representative U.S. citizens that a law to which any person objects is like pie crust—made to be broken.

A prominent leader in the civil rights movement has said: "There are just laws, and there are unjust laws. I submit that an individual who breaks the law that conscience tells him is unjust and willingly accepts penalty, is in reality expressing the highest respect for law." That is transparent sophistry.

Let us state unequivocably that this lawbreaking doctrine is not as some allege a Christian view. A recognized modern theologian has commented on the contemporary attempt to make blatant breaking of law an allowable Christian practice. He declares, "The early Christians under the teaching of the apostles were enjoined to obey the laws of the state—a pagan state mind you—whether they held the laws to be just or unjust, so long as the state did not claim for itself the worship and allegiance owing only to God." Whatever may be said for civil disobedience it is certainly not a Christian doctrine as St. Paul in Romans makes clear. Those who claim Abraham Lincoln as their patron saint ought to listen to him as he solemnly admonishes, "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob rule."

There is no magic formula which guarantees to bring about in one day, or a thousand, the equality which is at the heart of democracy. Mad insistence on individual wills and whims crowds out sober obedience. Fiats, not fists, are the effective weapons for righting wrongs. A keen young thinker with splendid university training, gazing with anxious eyes at the present omnious scene, has written, "Once it is stated that law need not be obeyed unless it is good law, the beginning of an end to rule by law has been initiated. If each individual, or group of individuals, decides for himself which laws he will follow, and which laws he will disobey, the entire fabric of law is broken down. The fact is that Negro equality can exist only in the same proportion as respect for laws exist. What a tragedy it would be if Negroes succeeded in destroying our system of law and in the very process destroyed the very thing which can make them free."

But alas, in the present orgy of lawlessness in America, there are many well-intentioned citizens who desperately need to be reminded that broken law is the direct path to broken freedom. The way to alter existing law is the legislative path and not the lawbreaking path. Civil disobedience is a long first step in the direction of an invasion of lawlessness in which order and freedom and liberty would be lost.

Over the headquarters of every cause in this day of social ferment there might well be written the inscription which is lifted up in great letters over the courthouse in Worchester, Mass.—"Obedience to law is liberty."

Discrimination by the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following column by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star of April 12, 1965. How long, Mr. Speaker, are we going to permit the Federal Government to violate the laws against discrimination?

The article follows:

DISCRIMINATION BY THE GOVERNMENT

"Discrimination" is being widely condemned nowadays. Yet the Federal Government itself engages in a certain type of discrimination when it insists on knowing the number of Negroes employed by contractors doing Government work but does not ask for information which might reveal whether any other form of racial or religious discrimination in employment is being practiced.

When a contractor, for example, performs street-improvement work which is subsidized by the Federal Government, it is necessary for the contractor to submit a weekly payroll form which not only itemizes the total number of his employees separated into categories of the skilled, semiskilled and unskilled, but also has a special column to show how many of the total in each group are Negroes.

An Executive order issued on March 6, 1961, and subsequently amended by the Democratic administration, requires the contractor to agree that he "will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color or national origin."

The Federal Government does not, however, require any report on how many Catholics, Protestants, or Jewish persons are employed, nor does it ask the "national origin" of employees—that is, whether they are Italians, Greeks, English, French, Mexicans, Africans, or Asians.

The purpose of the governmental forms is to prevent discrimination, but the Federal Government seems to be concerned only with discrimination involving Negroes. A contractor in a Western State—whose personnel changes from time to time because of the nature of his work—writes to this correspondent:

"You will notice that, in addition to the number of employees, the form requires that the number of Negroes employed must also be reported. This appears to us to be a most flagrantly discriminatory type of inquiry for our Government to make at a time when discriminators are to be punished. Aren't American Indians, Chinese and all other races now being discriminated against by our Government because these people are not included in the reporting requirement? It is difficult to believe that thinking Negroes would want to be singled out in this way as the only people named on a Government questionnaire.

"We are a small organization and we have employed Negro men in past years who have done excellent work and were a credit to our firm. But when several of these payroll forms were submitted last summer we did not happen to have any Negro employees to report. By our answer to this inquiry in the negative, we naturally are concerned about its effect on Government personnel and how it will in turn affect our relationship with the Government in the future."

The Government has not drawn up its report forms to ascertain whether competent employees applied for the jobs and whether a sincere effort was made to hire persons of different races or nationalities. The form simply asks the total number and how many are Negroes. If there is a suspicion that the percentage of Negroes is too small, the Government, of course, can make this a basis for refusing to renew a contract or to do business with the firm in the future.

Naturally, when there are complaints about discrimination on grounds other than race, the Government looks into the matter. But the chief concern of many contractors today is whether, when seeking to do work on any project in which Government funds are used, they will be granted or denied contracts on the basis of how many Negro employees are on their payrolls.

Although the Government now requires lists to be prepared on the basis of white or Negro employees, only last autumn the U.S. Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional certain laws of the State of Virginia requiring a listing of race on voting, poll tax, and real estate assessment lists. In some areas, race is not shown on the records of those attending public schools or employed in local government offices, as it is felt that any listing which includes race would in itself be a discriminatory practice.

So it is surprising to see the Federal Government requiring contractors to classify their employees by race when they seek Government contracts.

Incidentally, if a contractor decides that, in order to make sure he will get a government contract, he must have more employees of a certain race or group and limits his hiring to that group, or dismisses some of his present employees to make room for them, there is no way to fix legal responsibility on those officials in the Federal Government who have indirectly caused such a discrimination to take place.

Ayres Opposes VA Cutbacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, on April 7, 1965, Mr. Robert H. Giles, a most astute and informed editorial writer, prepared a most comprehensive story about the closing of 14 veterans hospitals. This story appeared in the Akron Beacon Journal of that date.

As Mr. Giles mentions in his story, I was of the opinion that Veterans' Administration Administrator, W. J. Driver, had conducted a complete investigation

before making his Presidentially endorsed order.

Subsequent hearings before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee left no doubt that the closing order was completely without justification. The preponderance of evidence by 50 witnesses, heard by our committee, pointed directly at the complete error of the hospital closing order.

I believe that immediate action should be taken by the Presidential Commission so that the anxiety of the veterans concerned might be alleviated.

The fine Akron Beacon Journal story by Mr. Robert H. Giles follows:

AYRES OPPOSES VA CUTBACKS

(By Robert H. Giles)

Two months ago, Representative AYRES, of Akron, was willing to sit out the controversy over the closing of 14 Veterans' Administration hospitals.

"You can't preach economy and then oppose something like this just because of the effect on the local communities," he said then. "Besides, with these hospital operations consolidated into more efficient units, the veterans will get better service."

Now, AYRES has changed his mind and is opposing the President's plan to close the VA installations.

AYRES said he told VA Administrator W. J. Driver, "I would support him if he proved his claim that these closings were necessary and would result in better service.

"But, the VA didn't make its case. Based on the evidence that came before the House Veterans Committee, they weren't going to save the amount of money they claimed and give better service at the same time.

"Apparently it was just a matter of having to cut costs somewhere, and this is the only place they decided to cut it," AYRES told Reporter Philip Meyer of the Beacon Journal Washington Bureau.

AYRES is not alone in having some second thoughts about the VA closings, however. Last week President Johnson announced he was naming a blue-ribbon committee to study whether 11 of the VA facilities should be shut down.

The President said he was taking this step because "controversy has developed over our decision to close several veterans hospitals and domiciliaries."

As recently as mid-February, Johnson refused to compromise on his order to close the hospitals.

Among the facilities to be studied by the Presidential committee is the Broadview Heights Hospital at Brecksville.

AYRES, who has been criticized by veterans groups for his earlier stand, said there is no reason for the new investigation "except that it might provide the administration with a scapegoat."

Local veterans have complained that the Broadview Hospital has a capacity of about 250 patients, although only 90 beds are now used by TB patients. At the same time there is a long waiting list at other VA hospitals in the area.

Is the Attorney General Qualified for the Office He Holds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of his term of office as Attorney General of the United States, it has been apparent that Nicholas Katzenbach is not an impartial legal officer. The height of his impartiality was made clear in his amazing performance on "Meet the Press" last Sunday evening. In this interview the Attorney General conferred on Martin Luther King a high degree of responsibility; found nothing wrong with demonstrations and civil disobedience in Alabama, but deplored it in his own office and in Washington; and could think of nothing illegal in King's demand for a boycott of the State of Alabama.

Such preconceived notions of justice should certainly raise a serious question in the minds of many citizens of the Attorney General's fitness to hold his high office. There are other questions which could be asked—Why was he appointed as Attorney General? What commitment did he make to receive the appointment?

A very interesting column on this subject by Holmes Alexander recently appeared in a number of newspapers.

I include Mr. Alexander's column on the Attorney General as a part of these remarks:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DISPATCH

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—From the 3d of last September till the 28th of this January, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, a tall, talkative, second-echelon lawyer in the Justice Department, hung suspended over the abyss of oblivion.

For those 5 months President Johnson hesitated to elevate Katzenbach, who had been ROBERT KENNEDY's Deputy Attorney General, to the top post. KENNEDY had not only recommended him, but had tried to make Katzenbach's appointment a condition under which he, KENNEDY, would go quietly from the Cabinet. But Mr. Johnson would not dicker. He put Katzenbach through a 148-day novitiate or conditioning period.

How did Nick think? How did he work? Could he make the loyalty switch from the Kennedy clan to the Johnson camp? As a sort of ordeal by torment, Katzenbach danced on the thin air of executive whimsy. If he didn't make Attorney General by the President's pleasure, it was back to obscurity, no name in the history books, no oil portrait on the walls of the Justice Department corridor, no brief moment of the recognition which men call fame.

Only Nick Katzenbach knows the agony of mind which accompanied that period of suspense, or knows what kind of capers he had to cut to please the giver of political immortality. But something can be surmised from the performance which the Attorney General has given on the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The President must have wanted—and demanded—and possibly whipped into shape by methods of suspension—just the man we now behold. The profile of Katzenbach, with the initials of L.B.J. in the corner of the canvas, stands revealed in this bill which the Attorney General drafted and presented to Congress.

What manner of man? The Attorney General is a man with a chin line of expediency. The voting rights bill, he has said, is shaped to demolish the "hard core" resistance to Negro suffrage, rather than to mete out equal justice. It is drawn to punish those few States and counties which fail to fit an arbitrary Federal standard. It strikes at discrimination against Negroes, but it practices discrimination against a minority of the States.

The Attorney General shows a profile of heresy. He is a lawyer-politician without faith in the majesty of law. He told the Senate Judiciary Committee that "the judicial process * * * is inadequate to deal with practices so deeply rooted in the social and political structure." Not merely does he distrust southern courts and judges, he distrusts the American judicial system. This system, as every schoolboy knows, puts the burden of proving guilt upon the prosecutor. The Katzenbach bill goes back to an old French system which puts the burden of proving innocence upon the accused. Any State with a literacy test for its voters is presumed to have cheated unless 50 percent of the voting age population turned up at the polls last November. The bill further presumes that southern courts and judges are corrupt, for it requires each culprit State to appeal its case before a special three-member court in the District of Columbia.

The Attorney General shows the profile of a rank sentimentalist, an uncritical idolator of raw democracy. He believes the right to vote is a human right, not a privilege or duty of citizenship. He is known to assess an illiterate elector, or electorate, as being of the same worth to a democracy as a literate one. He is known to have expressed the opinion that person's names, but never political propositions, should appear on the ballots. This would seem to mean that he trusts voters to elect delegates to Constitutional Conventions, but does not trust them to decide on those propositions which have been (and will be) amendments to the Constitution. The profile here shows the inconsistency of sentimentalism, not becoming in an officer of the Nation.

The Attorney General is a striking figure, and a winning personality, but his public profile looks as if it were made to order at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mig's in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include the following editorial by Mr. C. L. Dancey appearing in the April 6, 1965, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

The appearance of Mig fighters in the actions over North Vietnam have an instinctive reaction in most of us that is not really fitting. Indeed, they point up some very odd facts that run counter to the natural first reaction.

In the first place, there is something about air combat that strikes an emotional chord out of proportion to the real air tactics and strategy in war.

We lost more aircraft in World War II (as well as Korea) to ground fire than in air combat, and so did the Japanese in World War II, for example. Yet, we instinctively regard ground fire as ineffective and air combat as a serious challenge.

Sometimes the opposite is also true. For example, in one small island situation, this editor saw our installations heavily bombed for a period of 3 months—spectacularly. Surely, the returning pilots gave glowing accounts of results. Yet, in fact, we suffered slight damage and few casualties, while shooting down a sizable number of enemy air crews (far more than our own casualties) and destroying far more aircraft in the air than the material they damaged on the ground.

In short, the drama goes one way, but the results can be another matter altogether.

Drama and spectacle, speed and show, can be treacherous guides to actual results.

So, while the appearance of Mig's heightens the drama, it actually makes much less significant change in the situation than it might seem.

Then, we come to the odd facts of detail as to whether their appearance has a political significance that may be bad news.

The Mig's that appeared have been identified as Mig-15 and Mig-17 models. The planes with which we fought, so successfully, against those fighters in Korea are now retired and obsolete. In short, those Red planes are out of date. They are not modern Russian fighters.

If they catch you unaware, laden with bombs, they can do you damage but they are not a match, plane for plane, in direct combat.

That fact, however, is also deceptive, because it is not the role of fighter planes in defense to fight other fighters. It is their job, when possible, to seek out easier victims and pounce on them rather than engage in duels.

We like to think in terms of fighters versus fighters, tanks versus tanks, and such, but it is the business and science of war, in fact, to make tactical use and take tactical advantage with these weapons and that is often the opposite of seeking head-and-head combat.

A final fact put a real twist to the situation.

A much more modern Soviet fighter than those seen over Vietnam is the Mig-21. It doesn't appear to be in Vietnam. There are conflicting reports on whether the Chinese have any of them.

But we know for a positive fact that the India Air Force has them, and even has factories undertaking the manufacture of Mig-21's.

So, it would appear that the most modern Soviet fighters in all of southeast Asia are not in the hands of the Communist aggressors of that region, but in the hands of a free nation that has been trying to defend itself against such aggression.

Which only illustrates that international politics sometimes gets about as scrambled as local politics in Peoria.

C. L. DANCEY.

To Raise the Price of Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, April 7, the Chicago Sun-Times carried a fascinating and concise editorial on the latest farm proposal of the administration.

No doubt, the President will twist enough arms to jam the latest farm proposal through the Congress; but afterward, those who voted for it must in their hearts know it is wrong.

At this point I include the editorial to which I refer as part of my remarks:

TO RAISE THE PRICE OF BREAD

For many years, critics of Government farm subsidy schemes have argued that farmers, consumers, and taxpayers all would benefit if an effort were made to create a freer market for agricultural products.

In one sense, President Johnson's proposals for extending wheat and feed grain controls another 2 years depend more on the open market. Farmers would receive a 50-cent increase in the price of wheat. But the Government would not shell out the added funds. The extra cost would be shifted to the marketplace—it is estimated that this would increase the price of a loaf of bread to consumers about a penny.

A similar arrangement would be made on the rice crop, raising prices 4 cents a pound.

It is estimated that these arrangements will save the Government about $200 million. But they will add about $300 million to consumers' food budgets.

Farmers now receive a support price of $2 a bushel, of which 75 cents comes from processors who pay a form of processing tax through the purchase of marketing certificates. The support price would be raised to $2.50 and the certificate raised to $1.25, the added cost then being passed along to the consumer by the processor.

It has been obvious for years that the great financial burden carried by the Government to subsidize food prices must eventually be eased. The President's program moves toward easing that burden, slightly, but it does not change the fundamentals of the price-fixing system. It does not put more reliance on the marketplace to set realistic prices for food products. It merely shifts part of the subsidy from the general taxpayer to the food purchaser.

Charles B. Shuman, American Farm Bureau president, described the proposal as a "hoax to trap both farmers and consumers." He said:

"There is need for action to help farmers get better prices in the marketplace, but it is quite another thing to ask consumers to pay higher food prices to perpetuate a program designed to keep producers dependent on Government handouts."

The plan maintains a system under which farmers must depend on Government subsidies rather than the working of the open market. As they pay more for subsidized products, consumers may be inspired to question the wisdom of Government manipulation of prices.

Copper Is Golden in Perth Amboy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of America's leading copper refining plants, International Smelting & Refining, a division of the Anaconda Co., is located in the district I represent.

Today's Perth Amboy plant covers 40 acres, has its own dock facilities and employs 1,200 persons.

Middlesex County, N.J., is proud of International Smelting & Refining: the firm's leadership in copper refining; its vast facilities, which produce 40 million pounds a month; and its dedicated employees, many of whom have worked there for years.

On March 28, 1965, William J. Madden wrote an excellent article on this distinguished firm and its great product. The article, "Copper Is Golden in Perth Amboy," was published in the Newark Star-Ledger and follows:

COPPER IS GOLDEN IN PERTH AMBOY

(By William J. Madden)

There is hardly a soul in Perth Amboy who remembers when "we didn't have our copper-refining plant."

Today, the plant on the banks of the Raritan River is International Smelting & Refining, a division of the Anaconda Co.

Before it became International Smelting & Refining, at the end of the last century, the plant was called the Raritan Copper Works, a name by which it is still known today.

Almost from its beginning, the firm became a part of its community. As early as 1898, the generating station at the plant supplied the power for the city's lights, as well as power for the streetcars which ran through the heart of Perth Amboy.

The company's generating station supplied the power for street lights and trolleys in the city until about 1906, when other power-generating facilities went into use.

The establishment of a copper refining plant at Perth Amboy came about through natural processes. First, the copper mined in the West and in South America was coming into the eastern market at Perth Amboy, a focal point because of both rail and water transportation facilities.

Then, the major copper-finishing plants were in the New England area, and within easy reach by rail and water of the refining plants in the Perth Amboy area.

In the early nineties, the New England Electrolytic Copper Co. was operating at Central Falls, R.I. It was one of the pioneer refineries of the United States with a yearly capacity of 30 million pounds of copper.

With the development of the copper industry, it was decided, for economic reasons as well as for the ideal transportation setup, to erect a new and larger plant at Perth Amboy. Ground was broken for the construction of the Raritan Copper Works in 1898 and in March of 1899 production of copper was started at the Perth Amboy plant and the old refinery at Central Falls was dismantled.

The refinery capacity of the new plant was 120 million pounds yearly. In that time the total refinery capacity in the country was only 778 million pounds. (Today, the Perth Amboy plant turns out 40 million pounds a month.)

Improvements in the copper refining industry since the early 1900's have been so great that two of today's modern furnaces, such as those in Perth Amboy, could do the work of all of the 13 original furnaces of earlier times.

Of the original plant built in 1899, little remains. The original buildings have all been rebuilt or remodeled. Furnaces and auxiliary equipment are constantly changing as new and more efficient machinery and methods are developed.

While buildings and machinery change through the years, a large number of the 1,200 workers at the plant have long years of service. Many can recall, or probably remember being told in their boyhood, about how the plant ran the trolleys and lighted the streets.

The plant today covers 40 acres, and in 1960 it constructed its own dock to accommodate oceangoing freighters bringing in unrefined copper and to ship its refined copper to foreign fabricating plants.

The products of the plant include all commercial forms of refined copper, such as wire bars, ingot bars, square cakes, slabs, and billets. The byproducts produced are refined silver and gold, platinum, palladium, selenium, and tellurium.

An important adjunct of the refinery is the electro sheet department, where electrolytic sheet copper is made. This material is used for flashing in the building trades and is the basis for printed circuits.

An interesting feature at the plant is that, while capacity has been greatly expanded, the basic process today is almost unchanged from that of 1900, and the finished copper product is still the "N.E.C." brand which was produced at the start.

"N.E.C." is high grade electrolytic copper of high electrical conductivity and meets

requirements where copper of high purity is desired.

What happens before you see those finished copper gutters on a house, or copper wires on a TV set or radio?

Newly mined copper ore looks like any gray granite rock, and a ton of ore may contain no more than 16 pounds of copper. This ore is crushed to a powder and put through a concentration process which removes much of the granite, resulting in a product containing about 30 to 40 percent copper. This is smelted to remove other impurities and cast into pigs, called blister, each weighing from 600 to 700 pounds. This is the crude copper which is further refined at Perth Amboy.

At the Perth Amboy plant, the pigs are put into a furnace and cast into anodes. These anodes, after being refined, are almost 99.8 percent pure.

Further electrolytic processing produces copper cathodes about 39 inches long, 31 inches wide and about 1½ inches thick. The copper cathodes are then cast into marketable shapes and shipped to fabricating plants throughout the world. Approximately 30 percent of the total refined production is exported to foreign markets.

There have been times, through the years, when copper was somewhat in oversupply. It sold below 10 cents a pound at one time. But since then industrial know-how among copper people has opened new fields for its use, and continued healthy growth is indicated.

Government's Role in Design

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the March-April issue of "Print, America's Graphic Design Magazine," carried an intriguing article about a relatively unpublicized event: The adoption by the State of California of a good design program.

What this means is that an entire State has committed itself to the goal of good design in all its works—ranging from letterheads to bridges. The article quotes the Governor of California, Edmund G. Brown, as saying:

We hope to create a new awareness of the need for excellence of design in State government. Good design is not merely esthetic frosting on the cake, it is functional efficiency, visual beauty and simplicity—a tool that will help our performance on the job.

Late last year, the Governor called on a conference on good design to initiate the program. The conference, which is described in the article, should have widespread application. It should be particularly pertinent to the planning of any additional House office buildings.

The article follows:

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN DESIGN: THE CALIFORNIA EXPERIMENT

(On December 8 of last year, an unprecedented event took place in Sacramento, Calif. It was the Governor's conference on good design—the "kickoff" of a determined, coordinated effort to improve and enhance California's designed environment. Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of this event is that it has received so little publicity elsewhere in the country—particularly in the East, and most particularly in New York City. Of particular significance is the fact that the conference was held under the auspices of the State government, and that it had the active backing and support of Gov. Edmund G. Brown. A full report on the conference—how it came about, what was discussed at the sessions, the hoped-for results—appears below.)

(by Terry Roloff)

The best that can be said about most government-sponsored design—whether Federal, State, or city—is that it is dull and inoffensive. The worst that can be said is that government buildings are infuriatingly difficult to work in, government printing is unreadable, and government graphics are very nearly impossible to understand or adapt.

California means to change all that—at least within its own borders. In a pioneering effort, the State government has initiated a campaign from within to provide the kind of State buildings, graphics, signage, publications, etc., that will reflect the vitality and leadership that California is attempting to assume in other areas.

The first big step toward achieving this goal was the conference on good design held in Sacramento last December. It's important to remember that the conference was arranged, not for designers or semiprofessional culture collectors, but for the men in State government who make the day-to-day decisions that affect the quality of state-sponsored design. Agency administrators, budget officials, purchasing agents, department managers spent a day being prodded, scolded, and encouraged by some of the outstanding men from the world of design.

How did it all come about? Did the program spring full blown from a sudden universal urge to make California beautiful? Or did it take form as a result of prodding from some respected cultural organization—or from a legislator's wife who happened to be taking an art course?

By no means. In fact, the impetus for the program came from several directions over an extended period of time.

During the past few years in California, there has been a push toward more inventive, more creative government. Daniel M. Luevano, now Assistant Secretary of the Army in Washington, was until last year chief deputy director of the State's department of finance. In this capacity, he was in charge of the State development plan concerned with the broader picture of preserving California's environment. He was also charged with coping with the problem of technological conversion for a State much too dependent on defense spending to keep its ever-growing population employed.

Plans were already underway for a Governor's conference on the State's role in initiating new economic resources when a copy of California design/eight was brought to Governor Brown's attention. Published by the Pasadena Art Museum, the book was a catalog for an exhibit of furniture, crafts and products designed by California artists. It served to point up the fact that the State's natural beauty had acted as a magnet, drawing increasing numbers of designers to the west coast. Their talents have become more of an economic force with each succeeding year.

If a technique (i.e., conference) can be used to develop the natural resources of the State, why not also use it to develop its design resources—and at the same time do something to raise the quality of government graphics and architecture? A design conference was added to Luevano's agenda. That was late summer, 1963.

Exploratory meetings were held—but then, in the spring of 1964, Luevano and William Lipman, chief planner for the State, left California for Washington. The project was left in the capable hands of John Stanford, deputy director of the newly created department of general services, which includes the State printing plant and the State architectural offices. A highly cultivated man with an appreciation of good design, Stanford had been concerned about the quality of State esthetics for some time.

Nathaniel A. Owings, a partner in the architectural firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, then appeared on the scene. He wrote Governor Brown suggesting a conference on good design at the very time Stanford was approaching the Governor's office with the same proposal.

During the summer of 1964, the idea germinated, and in the fall Stanford received approval to proceed.

Two separate committees were formed: an advisory committee under the chairmanship of Owings, and a planning committee chaired by Stanford. His chief, Robert Harkness, director of the department of general services, was named chairman of the good design conference.

The advisory committee, meeting separately from the planning group, was free to suggest topics and speakers, to chart direction, and criticize the quality of design in the State. The planning committee, comprised of the State architect, printer, training officer, purchasing agent, and chief of the budget division, laid the plans and assembled the audience.

Since a main purpose of the conference was to argue the thesis that physical environment does make a difference, it was considered essential to hold the sessions in appropriate surroundings. The site chosen was the handsome Mansion Inn, designed by Al Dreyfuss, a member of the planning committee.

Designer Charles Eames, a southern Californian, in India at the time, had agreed to participate in the conference. However, difficulties with flight schedules prevented him from doing so. Robert Alexander, an architect and a member of the advisory committee, filled in for him. Industrial Designer Walter Landor, whose headquarters are in San Francisco, came by plane from South Africa to speak on the subject of government graphics. Arthur Drexler, director of the department of architecture and design of the Museum of Modern Art, New York, and Karel Yasko, assistant commissioner of design and construction for the General Services Administration, Washington, were the other participants.

The conference's essential question involved the State's responsibility for good design and the ensuing costs. Nat Owings, in his keynote remarks, pointed out that every State expenditure in some way affects matters of good taste. "Good design costs no more in first costs," he stated, "and bad design costs much more in long-term damages in its effect upon our general environment."

For Bob Alexander, the hero in design is a bureaucrat with taste. "Every administrator," he stated, "should think about the tone and quality and style of living in his office—the little things, like ashtrays and wastebaskets and signs. A conscious program to design the furniture, the landscaping, the numbering systems, and so on, is one of the most important unfilled areas in architecture today."

When asked if we can afford it, Alexander replied, "We can't afford not to get the best design out of every dollar spent."

A film, "Visual Communication Through Government Graphics," emphasized this point with pictures. Created by Landor's film unit, Communication Films, it also carried the message one step further. Landor pointed out the similarity between the needs of business and the needs of government:

"If the direct competitive aspects of the open market are missing in government administration, the need for creating a favorable impression—or image—with the gen-

eral public is no less urgent. All levels of government must be strong without being oppressive, progressive without being reckless, and so on. Design can't make these things true, nor can it fool people into believing they're true if they are not, any more than design can make people believe a poorly made product is good. However, given an honest and sound government, design can reinforce the message and encourage the respect of the people."

About the recurrent problem of costs, Landor said, "Design should express the progressive spirit of government even at the expense of appearing economical. Both citizens and business are interested in government efficiency, and if you can imply as well as practice efficiency, you imply economy at the same time."

Governor Brown's remarks added up to what Arthur Drexler called one of the most impressive and forceful statements he'd ever heard on the role of the government in improving our environment.

"We hope to create from the conference a new awareness of the need for excellence of design in State government," said the Governor. In exploring the role of the State, he expressed his belief that government, especially in California, has a valid part to play in creating an environment of beauty as well as utility. "Good design is not merely esthetic frosting on the case," he asserted. "It is functional efficiency, visual beauty and simplicity—a tool that will help our performance on the job."

Governor Brown was very specific on the subject of signage: "We must make it our business in this State to get rid of unsightly signs that mar and deface our landscape. The effect of signs in some areas is horrifying. No matter how superior the design of buildings in the approach to a city, a clutter of neon signs and billboards can ruin the effect. I would like to see the enactment of ordinances to control these signs in every city and county in the State."

The Governor announced plans to appoint a Governor's advisory committee on good design, to institute a design award program, to call further conferences on good design, and to initiate a series of seminars for State managers. "Our joint goal," he concluded, "is to identify the State with the best in contemporary design and with the use of design to increase human enjoyment and understanding."

Arthur Drexler came to the conference to speak about architecture. More than that, he led a crowded room of fascinated government officials on an intellectual excursion into the nature of environment.

The proper subject of architecture, he suggested, should not be buildings, but the earth itself. To illustrate, he showed pictures of a 400-square-mile conclave terraced by natives in the Philippines whose society revolves about their effort "to carve the mountains into a manageable and fruit-producing environment."

Carving the earth, said Drexler, has been considered an art form even in the 20th century—specifically by Bruno Taut, one of our most original thinkers. During World War I, Taut proposed, quite seriously, that the warring Europeans engage in a more peaceful pursuit—that of carving the Alps. These, he felt, could be faceted, ornamented with trees made of iron and crystal, and carved with terraces.

Drexler reminded the group that earth carving is carried on today, and anyone can see how very clumsily we do it by looking at a hillside subdivision or a freeway. In our culture, he stated "superhighways have the force, sometimes the catastrophic force, of a river in full flood."

"I like highways," Drexler was quick to point out. "I myself want to see more and more of them." But, like many other people who champion good design, he does not think that "it is enough to landscape the sides of the highways. I do not think that it is enough to get good clear signs, although God knows that would help. I think something much, much more drastic is involved."

He called on State government to delegate money "to play with highway design, to see what you could actually make out of a cloverleaf intersection, not to make it less of what it is, but to make it more of what it is."

Karel Yasko recalled a simple incident which took place in January 1961, during John F. Kennedy's inaugural parade. From a casual observation of Arthur Goldberg's on the sad plight of Pennsylvania Avenue, the traditional route of such parades, grew the Ad Hoc Committee on Federal Office Space, which in turn brought about the President's Council on Pennsylvania Avenue and the "Guiding Principles for Federal Architecture."

This document restates the views of Washington and Jefferson that public buildings should set an example for public taste and should provide visual testimony to the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American Government. It recommends the selection of distinguished designs that embody the finest contemporary American architectural thought, the avoidance of an official style, the encouragement of professional creativity, and the importance of landscaping.

Yasko addressed himself to the problem of translating policies into action: "The first step is to have men in positions of responsibility who will concern themselves with more than practical utility. They themselves may not be knowledgeable in art and design, but they must have an awareness of the need for the highest quality in whatever the Government produces or sponsors. They must be ready to take advantage of expert advice whenever it is available."

Yasko feels that the quality of the administrator is really the key to the quality of design in government. He told about the General Services Administration's Institute for Continuing Education, which will offer a weeklong seminar this spring for Federal decisionmakers much like the shorter conference held in California.

The conference ended with three clear mandates:

1. A permanent advisory committee on design: Although a new committee has not yet been appointed, the old one has met and compiled a list of suggested members which has been forwarded to the Governor's office.

2. The design awards: The California Arts Commission has agreed to select a jury as well as to administer the awards, which will be presented to State agencies that use or develop outstanding design programs.

3. The seminars: An outline—six or seven morning sessions of 4 hours each—has been submitted to the planning committee and the seminars are due to begin shortly.

A few eager department heads have not waited. The department of general services, feeling somewhat responsible for carrying the new design program forward, has retained Landor to redesign stationery, business cards, and a symbol for the department (the new stationery will be adapted for all other departments in the executive branch). The department of agriculture has also asked for a design proposal, and the transportation agency is ready to adopt four new symbols for its department, to be applied to everything from stationery to shoulder patches.

In fact, requests for new trademarks and symbols for various departments of State government are piling up. These have been held up until an overall approach is agreed upon. Then, like a large corporation with one symbol which can be adapted to all of its affiliates, the State of California will have a new graphic face that can be adapted without creating a profusion of conflicting symbols.

The State legislature has not been unaffected by all this design activity. The assembly and senate order a huge amount of printing and reports from the State printing plant each year. Most of this material is not only unattractive but unreadable. With an excellent plant at his disposal, the State printer is eager to show the quality work the State can produce.

Five reports of the more than 40 being printed for the assembly this spring have been put into new formats by five different designers. It is hoped that this experiment will show that a well-designed report will receive more attention both from busy legislators and the public.

In the next few months, the first Governor's conference on good design should begin to show tangible results. By that time, plans for the second conference on good design will be well along.

Senator Jack Javits for President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article on Senator JACK JAVITS, of New York, by Warren Weaver, Jr., has appeared in the Sunday magazine section of the New York Times for April 4, 1965. JACK JAVITS is a rising star whose future looks bright. Why not Senator JACK JAVITS for President in 1966? I believe he would be a fine selection.

The article referred to follows:

PARADOX OF JACOB JAVITS

(By Warren Weaver, Jr.)

JACOB K. JAVITS is a restless politician. One might think that at 60, a national figure in the Republican Party, his recognition in the Senate steadily solidifying, his reelection almost permanently assured, the New York Senator would be comfortably settling into an increasingly important and satisfying niche in the congressional hall of fame.

Well, he isn't. Witness his recent refusal to support Governor Rockefeller for President any longer, an antagonistic public position he need not have taken for at least another 2 years. Witness, again, his flirtation with the idea of running for mayor of New York City, an affair that stubbornly refuses to run its course.

JAVITS' break with Rockefeller's national aspirations had one major purpose: freeing the Senator to maneuver on his own toward a fresh, modern Republican ticket in 1968, conceivably one that might include him as the vice presidential nominee, a choice that would make him the first Jew ever so honored by a major party. He knows the odds are strongly against such an outcome, but he has by no means written off the possibility.

The Senator's interest in the New York mayoralty is another aspect of his current compulsion for political movement. It is entirely possible that a non- or anti-Rockefeller Republican candidate would do better than someone closely identified with the Governor. Perhaps fortuitously, then, JAVITS has not been encouraged by Governor Rockefeller, whose desire to elect a Republican legislature in a special election this fall and reelect himself in 1966 seems to outweigh whatever inclination he has to replace Mayor Wagner with a Republican.

Underlying both these moves by Senator JAVITS is an uneasiness bred of a personal paradox: The liberal Republican has immense influence with the electorate in New York State—and so, potentially, in the Nation—but he has been unable thus far to translate that influence into personal political power.

The figures that excite political restlessness in JAVITS are clear cut. In his political debut in 1946, he carried by 6,000 votes a West Side Manhattan congressional district that had not gone Republican since 1920. Leaving the House in 1954 to seek State office, he was the only Republican to win, beating Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., for attorney general by 180,000.

Two years later he moved from Albany back to Washington as Senator, leaving Mayor Wagner, a pretty fair votegetter in his own right, on the short end of a 458,000 majority. (In all fairness, JAVITS was not unassisted by the fact that the Republican ticket was headed that year by Dwight D. Eisenhower, whose majority in New York State was a record-shattering 1.6 million.)

But the really impressive showing came with his reelection to the Senate in 1962. Then he carried the State by 983,000, a figure exceeded historically only by two presidential candidates, Eisenhower and Lyndon B. Johnson. More significant, he carried New York City; no Republican running on only one ticket had achieved this distinction in a head-to-head contest with a Democrat since Calvin Coolidge in the national campaign of 1924.

What manner of man produced this record? Physically, JAVITS is unimpressive—of medium height, bald, his eyes somewhat protuberant, his ready grin a little toothy. Even at top form, he is not a spellbinding speaker, only a clear, logical, and aggressive one. In personal meetings he is warm and courteous but sometimes a trifle brusque.

And yet he seems to combine in rich measure elements of appeal for almost every voting bloc in the New York electorate. To vote for him gives Republicans a sense of liberalism, Democrats a sense of independence, Jews a sense of identity and pride. Upstate he is accepted, albeit somewhat grudgingly, because he is, after all, a Republican. In New York City he is welcomed as a different kind of Republican. In JAVITS the swelling ranks of independents find a man who is intelligent, broad ranging in his interests, articulate, bluntly honest, hard working and up to date. They all vote for him.

But despite this massive influence with the voters, the Senator's modest personal power is limited to patronage in his own office and a few committee posts—perhaps 30 jobs in all and hardly a basis for a political organization. (As a Republican Senator facing a Democratic administration, he has veto power—and only that—over those few Federal appointments that go to New York: judges, postmasters, and the like.)

Governor Rockefeller has never found it necessary—or, perhaps, prudent—to welcome Senator JAVITS into the inner circles of Republican influence in New York State. The last two times a new Republican State chairman was chosen, JAVITS was not consulted; once he was given the name of his new leader after a reporter had told him about it.

Despite his relative political impotence, JAVITS does have a sort of shadow organization of his own. In every upstate community of any size, he has an agent or two; these are not irregulars but organization Republicans in good local standing. Each of them keeps the Senator informed on political events in his area and helps with arrangements for campaign and speaking tours.

There is a similar group in New York City and the suburban counties. Together there are perhaps 50 key men, who all meet informally once or twice a year with the Senator. But most important of all to the Javits organization is an elite corps of leaders in the New York business community, men with money and power who provide the Senator's strong link with private enterprise philosophy.

Compared with the number of prominent New York Democratic leaders apparently lined up behind Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY—and on very short notice at that—the Javits organization appears thin. There is a simple explanation: the Democrats were badly split, and the "out" faction, eager for a leader, found one with fame, fortune, and popular appeal suddenly cast upon its shores.

Lately the Rockefeller Republican organization has shown signs of serious division at the precinct level, but not in the upper echelons as yet. If this division should widen and deepen, Senator JAVITS might fall heir to the same sort of instant power that Senator KENNEDY appears to enjoy.

Until their recent dispute over the New York City mayoralty, the Senator and the Governor have enjoyed cordial but discrete relations. Rockefeller has never hesitated to call on JAVITS for campaign duty, but he has relied only collaterally on the Senator's advice. When both men were up for reelection in 1962, they ran essentially separate campaigns, only sharing duplicating machines and messenger boys.

There are those who believe that the Rockefeller-Javits relationship never really recovered from that 1962 election night. Then, as the two men sat side by side in a Manhattan hotel suite, the Senator's majority mounted steadily to a brilliant, near-million mark, while the Governor, whose presidential hopes seemed to hinge on a new birth of popularity, did only about half as well, getting less than his 1958 majority.

As a lawmaker, JAVITS has been no Moses, but this is hardly surprising. In only 4 of his 17 years in Congress have the Republicans enjoyed the majority control that enables their members to sponsor bills that became laws. During 2 of those years, he was a freshman in the House, the lowest form of congressional life. During the other 2 years (1953–54) his name was attached to legislation establishing the United Nations in New York City and some major health proposals.

In the Senate since 1957, however, he has had a role in the legislative process that has been productive, if largely invisible to the general public. At his bluntest in committee, JAVITS has prodded through many amendments in closed session that might have failed on the floor. They do not bear his name, but many of the bills that went through his committees bear his mark.

Finally, in his ninth year of seniority, JAVITS has worked his way up to the senior Republican position on the Senate Labor Committee, a key position on a key group. (Ironically, he got there when Barry Goldwater decided not to seek reelection.) This vantage point has substantially increased his influence over some of the most important bills before Congress—Federal aid to education, antipoverty, automation, and right-to-work laws—but he remains a Republican needling a heavily Democratic Senate.

If the contrast between his electoral and political influence has been frustrating to JAVITS in recent years, it has not seemed to curb his dedication to the role of the complete Senator. To the wonder and occasional irritation of his less bustling colleagues, he has gladly assumed the part of the busiest man on the Hill.

Up early in his Massachusetts Avenue apartment, the Senator can usually be found in the House of Representatives gym soon after it opens at 8 a.m. (The Senate gym doesn't open until 10, and it is hard to muster an opponent from among its older, less athletic patrons.) There he plays paddleball—a cross between handball and squash—and steams and showers before breakfast in the House or Senate dining room.

Senators traditionally spend their mornings office tending and in legislative hearings. JAVITS is likely to do more of the former than the latter. He tends to be impatient at the amount of time spent on routine testimony at hearings and prefers to assign an aid to monitor such proceedings. He likes to drop in at a hearing, be briefed on the high points, listen for a few moments, cross-examine the witness pointedly on a key issue and then depart.

This technique has not always improved his relations with his colleagues. Many Senators drift in and out of their committees' hearings, but few seem to have such a sure knack for getting their questions into the press accounts and thus creating the impression of widespread activity.

At noon, when the buzzers sound, signifying that the Senate is in session, JAVITS begins to move toward the floor as though guided by an automatic homing device. As any Washington tourist discovers, few Senators spend much time on the floor. Usually they go there only to deliver prepared speeches, debate a bill of particular interest to their constituents, or vote. Only a major debate will ordinarily draw more than a handful to the Chamber. But not New York's senior Senator.

"JAVITS can't seem to stand it if he isn't on the floor," one of his friends says. "Any time they're in session, he seems to feel someone is going to make a speech he should be answering. He just isn't happy anywhere else."

As a result, he frequently gets into colloquies on the floor with Senators whose only desire was to read a speech into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD uninterrupted. As another result, his staff is kept busy every afternoon, riding the subway between the Old Senate Office Building and the Capitol, running stacks of fresh correspondence over to his desk on the floor. (When one of the rare Senate photographs was taken at the time of the vote on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, most of the Chamber was drawn up in well-laundered formality, but JAVITS' desk had a morning paper on the floor behind it and an overflowing briefcase alongside.)

This is all part of a role JAVITS has envisioned for himself as "the conscience of the Senate." He regards it as his responsibility to see that no charge goes unanswered when it involves Negroes, minority groups generally, civil rights, New York City, the North, injustice or liberalism, particularly of the Republican variety.

It is this compulsion to engage in abrasive combat that has almost certainly denied JAVITS membership in "The Club," the unofficial inner power circle of the Senate, rather than any lack of respect for his attainments or prejudice against him as a Jew. JAVITS simply will not be silenced, even by his closest liberal colleagues, when he feels an important point should be made. A few days ago, for example, he insisted on questioning Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach late into the afternoon in committee hearings, despite a gentlemen's agreement among civil rights Senators that the Cabinet officer be given a rest after lengthy southern cross-examination on the voting-rights bill.

JAVITS himself usually remains on the floor until late afternoon, then retires to the Senate baths for a half hour or so. He is back in his office about 6 p.m., refreshed and ready for more work. Sometime after 9 p.m. he will take the surviving members of his staff to dinner—at the Monocle on Capitol Hill or Duke Zeibert's or the Knife and Fork downtown.

Two or three days a week this routine is varied because JAVITS is due back in New York City for a luncheon speech, political conference, or dinner. Then he flies up and

back, staying overnight with his family in their Park Avenue apartment if he has no early Washington engagements the next morning. On a few occasions, he has been known to make two roundtrips a day. Almost all his weekends are spent in the city.

JAVITS' political style, despite 20 years of development and resounding ballot-box success, still has its highs and lows. Consider a day in his reelection campaign. In mid-afternoon, he drove into Hudson Falls, N.Y., to discover that his appearance there was not in the usual drab hotel room but in an old home that had been converted into a modest but tasteful art museum.

Without the slightest appreciable shift of gears—he had spent the morning in a Schenectady locomotive plant—the Senator delivered a crisp, well-informed and throughful speech on the importance of the arts in American life and the increasing responsibility of government in the field. He found time to mention his own sponsorship of arts legislation in Washington, but he was brief, as well as warm and to the point.

A few hours later at a roadhouse just outside Kinderhook, N.Y., the Dr. Jekyll of the Javits personality reappeared. At a county Republican dinner, he was pompous, didactic, professorial, condescending and, above all, unmercifully long-winded. All the sense of political propriety that had infused his museum speech deserted him. He was overwhelmed by a fancied obligation to tell everyone everything he knows—which he feels, and not without reason, to be a substantial body of knowledge.

The truth is that when Senator JAVITS feels he has the answer to a question, however dimly posed, there is almost nothing that will keep him from delivering it in full. When he knows he understands something, he wants to be sure his audience does, too. The syndrome persists at other levels. For instance, when a writer outlined some questions for a later interview, the Senator, overdue at an important meeting, could not resist answering one or two of them on the spot.

And although he is a most congenial social companion, he cannot see himself as a humorist. He will not preface his speeches with bits of humor, however appropriate. When his staff produces a particularly apposite quip, he is likely to hold up a slip of paper to the audience and announce, deadeningly: "One of my assistants told me I had to read this before the speech." Comedian friends like Joey Adams have offered material; he will not use it.

It is something ingrained in his personality. When his closest friends kid JAVITS a little, he often takes their jokes seriously or else bristles in response. Among the many things that do not amuse him are suggestions that he lacks a sense of humor.

JAVITS, therefore, emerges as a political figure to whom anecdotes simply do not attach themselves. When JAVITS was writing "Order of Battle," his 1964 campaign book, his staff pleaded with him for something light and human; he came up with a stifling story about discovering, on an airplane, that he and General Eisenhower were wearing the same kind of shoes. The book was published virtually without anecdotes.

Chief among his other handicaps is a totally unabashed sense of his own importance. It was completely in character a few weeks ago for JAVITS to tell a meeting of New York Republican leaders that he had achieved a brilliant record in Congress. His judgment, after all, was probably closer to the mark than that of those who took silent exception to it.

Impatient, ebullient, and restless, Senator JAVITS takes a guardedly optimistic view of the future of the Republican Party. He believes the GOP has significant open ground ahead, but only if:

1. It moves forward with new men and new ideas. As an illustration, JAVITS considers Richard Nixon an honorable, estimable man, a good cut above the two 1964 presidential candidates, but not a man who is going to rejuvenate a perilously troubled Republican Party at this juncture.

2. The party calls on the full, not just the financial, resources of what JAVITS calls "the new group of corporate managers"—men like David Rockefeller, Henry Ford 2d, Thomas J. Watson, Jr., George S. Moore, and John Hay Whitney, who the Senator believes, look beyond business to opportunities for public service.

3. The American people are still at heart what liberal Republicans now refer to as moderate Republicans. The critical question to JAVITS is whether the majority of the people still opposed enlarged Federal Government, preferring a growing partnership between Government and the best talent in business.

Implicit in this program is JAVITS basic criticism of the Johnson administration. Although he considers it earnest, practical, and obviously well motivated, he also finds it timid and shallow in its sense of history. He sees the President as a man lacking boldness, a man who tends to walk around rather than grapple with the critical problems of the day.

"This is the crux of why the Nation needs—urgently, burningly—a creative opposition today," he says.

In New York State, Senator JAVITS feels, the Republicans have lost their public identification with the progressive cause, the advantage they gained under Thomas E. Dewey and the early Rockefeller. The Goldwater candidacy, totally unacceptable in New York, was partly to blame. But equally important, in the Senator's opinion, was the failure of Republicans in the legislature to aline themselves with a popular liberal tradition.

New York Republicans will move ahead, according to the Senator, when they become "the big party in New York, broad-gaged, wise, not afraid to move in on big problems." This, too, will have to be a broader party, attracting young people generally, certainly including a large share of the young professionals rising inexorably out of the State's racial minorities.

If the Senator has taken a rather individualistic approach to his political career, his wife, Marion, has steered a strikingly independent course of her own. With the same sort of resolute conviction that characterizes her husband, she has declined to become the pretty political wife, a role for which she is eminently endowed by almost any standard.

Twenty years her husband's junior and once a would-be actress, the crackling, dark-haired Mrs. Javits is dominated by a belief that she must be a person in her own right. She makes only the absolute minimum number of ceremonial political appearances with the Senator and entertains, largely, the peoistration's art bill. She won.

At the same time, she is keenly loyal to her husband and enthusiastic about his political advancement. She personally stormed the White House to badger President Johnson's cultural adviser, Roger L. Stevens, into making Senator JAVITS a cosponsor of the administration's art bill. She won

"At almost every dinner party, Marion sets a new indoor record for the intellectual sitting broad-jump," one of her friends says, "but it's hard to fight her. She simply doesn't think congressional society is as stimulating as the theater, art, and business people in New York City. She's probably right."

However right, Mrs. Javits' sense of independence has created some problems for her husband, not to mention long-distance telephone bills. He has never quite achieved the public image of a politician with a handsome wife and family that his handsome wife and family make him merit. He has lacked an important congressional asset: a Washington hostess. Devoted as he is, he has had to spend more time, briefcase in lap, aboard Washington-New York planes than is good for a 60-year-old man, however fresh from the gym.

Some of his closest friends conclude, however, that the Javits family has made a sound adjustment to a difficult political and personal situation. No matter whether you encounter the Senator at one end of the axis, his striking wife at the other or both of them together, you have a feeling that this is where they belong—at that time, in that company.

And so the Senator gamely shuttles back and forth between Capitol Hill and a city-based family that includes three children: Joy, 16; Joshua, 15, and Carla, 9. One of his favorite weekend avocations, season permitting, is taking them skating at Rockefeller Center. And when he can, he takes a child along on a political trip.

Besides his gym program and skating, JAVITS is a superior amateur tennis player. He may have been the only delegate to the 1964 Republican convention who carried a tennis racket to San Francisco. His typically intense concern for his physical well-being has paid dividends; he packs a trim 170 pounds on his 5-foot-9-inch frame and seems hardly to have changed in appearance in the past 15 years, one of the few recorded advantages of being prematurely bald.

Political advancement did not come as a birthright to JAVITS. His father, an Austrian imigrant, was a tenement janitor on the Lower East Side of Manhattan and a minor Tammany functionary. He died when JAVITS was 14. His mother, from Palestine by way of Russia, could neither read nor write English until she was 55. JAVITS had to peddle lithographic suplies for 4 years between high school and his entry into New York University law school.

The Senator who emerged from his background to become one of New York's most persuasive candidates will not acknowledge that his current political unrest is a natural product of the limitations implicit in being a Senator rather than a a major or Governor—a legislator instead of an executive.

"That whole thing is up to me," he said the other day. "There's no reason why a Senator can't exert a major influence on his party and his country if he has the time and the talent. After all, look at Kennedy and Johnson.

"I don't recognize any limitation inherent in the job. If I need some further prop, such as the mayoralty, to realize my full effectiveness, then that's my fault, not the fault of the Senate. If that's true, I just should have done better."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

To Reform the Immigration, Naturalization, and Refugee Laws of the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, following is a breakdown of H.R. 93, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, which was omitted from my remarks on page 7711 of the RECORD of April 13, 1965:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 93—A BILL TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The first section of the bill provides that the act may be cited by its short title (the "Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965").

The remainder of the bill is divided into eight titles, as follows:

Title I: General;

Title II: Quota system;

Title III: Changes liberalizing visa requirements for nonimmigrant visitors to the United States;

Title IV: The admission of persecuted peoples;

Title V: Changes in provisions relating to ineligibility to receive visas and exclusion from admission;

Title VI: Provisions relating to entry and exclusion; deportation; adjustment of status;

Title VII: Loss of nationality;

Title VIII: Miscellaneous.

TITLE I. GENERAL

Section 101. Definitions: Section 101(a) of the bill amends section 101(a)(27)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (hereinafter, the act), which grants nonquota status to spouses and children of U.S. citizens, to extend nonquota status to parents of U.S. citizens as well.

Section 101(b) of the bill amends section 101(a)(27)(C) of the act to extend nonquota status to all natives of independent Western Hemisphere countries.

Section 101(c) of the bill amends section 101(a)(3) of the act, by deleting language governing the meaning of the term "residence" as it is used in sections 350 and 352 of the act. This is a conforming amendment to section 701(a) of the bill which repeals sections 350 and 352 of the act.

Section 102. Powers and duties of the Secretary of State: This section of the bill amends section 104(a)(1) of the act, relating to the powers and duties of the Secretary of State in administering the act and all other immigration laws. Under existing law the Secretary's authority extends to the powers, duties and functions of diplomatic and consular officers of the United States, but not to the granting or refusal of visas. This section of the bill would extend the Secretary's authority to cover the powers, duties and functions of consular officers relating to the granting or refusal of visas.

TITLE II. QUOTA SYSTEM

Section 201. Determination and allocation of annual quota: Section 201(a) of the bill revises the language of section 201 of the act, making the following changes in the law.

The annual quotas of quota areas would be equal to one-sixth of 1 percent of the entire 1960 population of the United States, rather than one-sixth of 1 percent of the white population of continental United States in 1920 as under existing law. This would change the size of the aggregate annual quotas, which are currently set at 156,987, to approximately 300,000. The minimum quotas would be raised from 100 to 200.

Each quota area would continue to receive the quota numbers it receives under existing law. The additional quota numbers created by the bill, after deducting those necessary to increase the minimum quotas from 100 to 200, would be distributed among the several quota areas in proportion to the actual immigration of immigrants chargeable to each quota area between July 1, 1920 and July 1, 1960.

The Secretary of Labor would be added to the list of officials (Secretary of State, Secretary of Commerce and Attorney General) who are responsible for determining annual quotas for quota areas. The new quotas would be determined as soon as practicable after enactment of the bill and would take effect on the first day of the fiscal year, or next half fiscal year, following the expiration of 6 months after the date they are proclaimed by the President.

Section 201(e) of the act would be amended to reflect the effect of section 10 of the act of September 11, 1957, which terminated the reductions in annual quotas under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

The bill would add a new subsection (f) to section 201 of the act providing for the pooling and redistribution among oversubscribed quota areas of quota numbers unused at the end of a fiscal year. The pool would be on a worldwide basis, no distinction being made on an area or country basis, and would be allocated on a first apply, first considered basis. In other words, immigrants with the earliest registration date on quota waiting lists would be the first to receive immigrant visas from the worldwide quota pool. The preferences would apply to those issued from the pool. Quota numbers from the pool which are not used within a year after they are proclaimed would lapse.

Section 201(b) of the bill amends the heading for section 201 in the table of contents of the act.

Section 202. Determination of quota to which an immigrant is chargeable: This section of the bill abolishes the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions of the act and eliminates the maximum limitation of 100 which applies to subquota areas.

Sections 202(a)(5) and 202(b) of the act contain provisions regarding the quota chargeability of aliens who are attributable by one-half ancestry to peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle. These provisions would be abolished by section 202 (a) and (b) of the bill. In addition section 202(a) of the bill amends the language contained in 202(c) of the act relating to the quota chargeability of aliens born in a colony or dependent area and places it in 202(a)(5). As amended the existing provision limiting the number of persons chargeable from colony or dependent area to 100 a year would be eliminated thus making the entire quota of a governing country available to persons chargeable to its subquota areas.

Section 202(c) of the bill contains conforming amendments.

Section 203 eliminates parents of citizens of the United States from the second preference category. This change conforms the act to the amendment made by Section 101 of the bill making parents of such citizens nonquota immigrants.

TITLE III. CHANGES LIBERALIZING VISA REQUIREMENTS FOR NONIMMIGRANT VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES

Section 301. Nonimmigrant visas: Section 301(a) of the bill amends section 212(d)(4) of the act to authorize the Attorney General and Secretary of State, acting jointly and on the basis of reciprocity, to allow nonimmigrants to visit the United States temporarily for business or pleasure without the necessity of having in their possession a nonimmigrant visa or border crossing identification card.

Section 301(b) would authorize medical officers of the Public Health Service and immigration officers to serve at consular posts overseas in order to examine and inspect aliens seeking to visit the United States temporarily for business or pleasure for whom the requirement of a visa or border crossing identification card had been waived.

Section 301(c) repeals a provision in section 214(b) of the act creating a presumption that every alien applying for a visa or for admission is an immigrant until he proves that he is entitled to nonimmigrant status.

TITLE IV—THE ADMISSION OF PERSECUTED PEOPLES

Section 401. Refugee relief: Section 401(a) of the bill amends section 212(d)(5) of the act (which grants the Attorney General authority to parole aliens into the United States) by adding a new subparagraph (B) which defines the term "refugee" as used therein, and authorizes the President, whenever he finds that a situation has arisen creating a class of refugees, to direct the Attorney General by proclamation to parole into the United States such refugees selected by the Secretary of State. The Attorney General is further authorized in the absence of a Presidential proclamation to parole up to 10,000 such refugees into the United States in a fiscal year upon selection by the Secretary of State.

Section 402. Adjustment of status of certain aliens: Section 402(a) of the bill adds a new paragraph (9)(A) to section 212(d) of the act, authorizing the Attorney General, upon application of an alien paroled into the United States under section 212(d)(5), to adjust his status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence. If the Attorney General is satisfied that the alien has remained in the United States for at least 2 years, is a person of good moral character, and that such action is not contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security, he may record the alien's admission for permanent residence as of the date of the alien's last arrival. The Attorney General must submit a complete report to Congress in the case of each alien whose status is adjusted. Either the Senate or the House of Representatives may pass a resolution disapproving the adjustment of status prior to the close of the following session of Congress, in which case the alien will be required to leave the United States in the manner provided by law. If neither House of Congress passes such a resolution within that

time the alien's status will be adjusted as of the date of his last arrival.

Section 402(b) of the bill authorizes the issuance of 20,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to refugees during the 2-year period July 1, 1964 to June 30, 1966. These admissions are to be in addition to the admission of refugees on parole under section 212(d)(5) and under the "Refugee Fair Share Law" provisions of Public Law 86-648.

Section 402(c) of the bill provides especially for the admission of up to 10,000 "hard-core" refugees (as determined by the U.N. High Comissioner for Refugees) as nonquota immigrants including those who are afflicted with tuberculosis. Such refugees must be otherwise admissable and their admission is to be subject to such terms, conditions and controls, excluding the giving of a bond, as the Attorney General may prescribe in consultation with the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Section 402(d) provides that, except as provided in subsection (c), an alien must meet all eligibility requirements of the act in order to be admitted as a refugee under this section of the bill.

Section 403. Issuance of visas: This section states that any special nonquota immigrant visas issued under the bill, with the exception of those issued under section 402(c), must follow the requirements of section 221 of the act which sets forth the general procedures to be followed in issuing visas.

Section 404. Resettlement of refugees: Section 404(a) authorizes the Secretary of State to make grants to public or private agencies in the United States to assist them in resettling within the United States needy hard-core refugees admitted under section 402(c) of the bill, including the furnishing of care and rehabilitation services. Section 404(b) authorized the appropriation of up to $2,500,000 for this purpose.

Section 405. Immigration and Nationality Act definitions: This section applies the definitions contained in section 101 (a) and (b) of the act to the administration of title IV of the bill.

TITLE V—CHANGES IN PROVISIONS RELATING TO INELIGIBILITY TO RECEIVE VISAS AND EXCLUSION FROM ADMISSION

Section 501. Pardon for crimes: This section of the bill amends paragraphs (9) and (10) of section 212(a) of the act (which declare aliens who have been convicted of or who admit having committed certain crimes ineligible to receive visas and excluded from admission) to provide that an alien shall not be so ineligible or excluded on the basis of a crime for which he has received a pardon.

Section 502. Other excludable aliens: Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section eliminate existing language in the act which gives controlling effect to the opinion of a consular officer or the Attorney General in determining the excludability of certain aliens.

Section 502(a) amends section 212(a)(15) of the act (which declares excludable aliens who, in the opinion of the consular officer at the time of application for a visa or the Attorney General at the time of application for admission, are likely to become public charges) by eliminating language referring to the opinion of the consular officer or the Attorney General.

Section 502(b) similarly amends section 212(a)(27) of the act relating to the excludability of aliens who might be seeking entrance to the United States to engage in activities which would be prejudicial to the public interest or endanger the welfare, safety or security of the United States.

Section 502(c) similarly amends section 212(a)(29) of the act relating to the excludability of aliens who might engage in espionage, seek to overthrow our Government by unconstitutional means, or participate in the activities of certain subversive organizations.

TITLE VI. PROVISIONS RELATING TO ENTRY AND EXCLUSION; DEPORTATION; ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS

Section 601. Inspection and deportation: Section 601(a) repeals section 235(c) of the act, which vests in the Attorney General special authority to exclude aliens for security reasons under paragraphs (27), (28), and (29) of section 212(a), on the basis of confidential information and without inquiry by a special inquiry officer.

Section 601(b) contains a conforming amendment to section 235(b) of the act, deleting a reference to section 235(c).

Section 601(c) of the bill amends section 241(a)(8) of the act (which provides for the deportation of aliens who, in the opinion of the Attorney General, have become public charges within 5 years after entry), by striking out the words "in the opinion of the Attorney General."

Section 601(d) repeals section 241(d) of the act, which applies the grounds for deportation contained in section 241 retroactively to aliens who entered the United States prior to the date of enactment of the act and to events that occurred prior to such date.

Section 602. Grounds for deportation; record of admission: Section 602(a) amends section 244(a)(2) of the act (which authorizes the Attorney General to suspend deportation and grant permanent resident status to aliens who are deportable for certain of the more serious grounds specified in section 241 of the act and who have been in the United State continuously for 10 years and prove good moral character during that time), by changing the test supplied by the Attorney General in determining the effect of deportation on the alien or his family from one of "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" to one of "extreme hardship." This amendment would apply the same test to the aliens affected as is applied to other aliens deportable on less serious grounds.

Section 602(b) repeals section 244(f) of the act which prohibits certain classes of aliens (crewmen, exchange students and professors, and natives of contiguous countries or adjacent islands) from having their deportation suspended and status adjusted under section 244 of the act.

Section 602(c) amends section 249(a) of the act (which authorizes the Attorney General to create a record of admission for permanent residence for certain aliens who entered the United States prior to June 28, 1940) by extending its application to those who entered prior to December 24, 1952 (the effective date of the Immigration and Nationality Act).

TITLE VII. LOSS OF NATIONALITY

Section 701. Loss of citizenship; special proceedings: Section 701(a) of the bill relating to loss of nationality by a citizen of the United States for voting in a foreign election is amended to add the proviso: "If such voting in a political election or such participation in an election or plebiscite is done with the intent to renounce U.S. nationality or to acquire the nationality of a foreign state.

Section 701(b) of the bill repeals sections 350, 352, 353, 354 and 355 of the act, which provide for or relate to the loss of nationality by dual nationals and naturalized U.S. citizents and nationals.

Section 701(c) would make several changes in section 360(a) of the act, which provides for declaratory judgment proceedings for a person claiming U.S. nationality. The existing provision applies only to persons who are within the United States; as amended by the bill it is not so limited. Existing law applies only to persons who are denied a right or privilege as a U.S. national by a department, agency or official of the Government; under the bill the denial is not limited to such a Federal source. The provision presently provides only for the initiation of a declaratory judgment proceeding; as amended by the bill, judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act would also be made available. The bill would eliminate provisions in the existing section stating that no action may be instituted if the issue of the person's nationality arose out of or is in issue in an exclusion proceding. Finally, the existing 5-year period of limitation within which suit must be brought would be eliminated.

Section 701(d) amends section 360(c) of the act by striking out the second sentence (which provides that a final determination by the Attorney General that a person who has applied for a declaration of nationality is not entitled to admission to the United States may be reviewed judicially only in habeas corpus proceedings and not in any other manner).

TITLE VIII. MISCELLANEOUS

Section 801. Powers of immigration officers: This section amends section 287(a)(1) of the act which empowers authorized officers and employees of the Immigration and Nationality Service, without warrant, to interrogate any alien or person believed to be an alien as to his right to be or remain in the United States. As amended by the bill, the interrogation of a person believed to be an alien would have to be based on probable cause.

Section 802(a) Statute of limitation: This section of the bill would add a new section 293 to the act providing a statute of limitation for deportation proceedings, whereby no alien could be deported by reason of conduct occurring more than 10 years prior to the institution of proceedings.

Section 802(b) contains a conforming amendment to the table of contents to reflect the addition of the new section 293 by subsection (a) of this section.

An Alabama Boycott Would Violate U.S. Constitution, Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the Dothan Eagle, Dothan, Ala., April 11, 1965, as well as many other papers throughout our great country, and written by that outstanding writer David Lawrence:

AN ALABAMA BOYCOTT WOULD VIOLATE U.S. CONSTITUTION, ANTITRUST LAWS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Unfamiliarity with the laws of the land is certainly widespread in America today. The mere fact that certain leaders of Negro organizations have proclaimed an intention to call for a boycott by the public of all products manufactured in Alabama tells only part of the story. For what is not generally realized is that there are certain legal consequences which can flow from such an attempt to injure the businesses of private individuals. Not only are damage suits possible to recover any losses, but the Sherman Antitrust Act forbids all combinations or conspiracies "in restraint of trade" that may occur in interstate commerce.

AFFECTED

Unquestionably, in the case of a boycott of products made in Alabama and sold outside the State, interstate commerce is affected, and it is apparent that a combination of per-

sons would be involved. Also, if any companies act in concert not to purchase goods from that State, they could be held liable and suffer penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act.

The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that the making of an actual agreement between members of such a combination is not always necessary to bring about a violation of the antitrust law. The agreement may be implied—just so long as the result is a concerted action to boycott particular companies or their products. The Supreme Court in 1910 declared:

"An act harmless when done by one may become a public wrong when done by many, acting in concert, for it then takes on the form of a conspiracy, and may be prohibited or punished, if the result be hurtful to the public, or to the individual against whom the concerted action is directed."

The courts have also held that the word "boycott" itself could imply a threat to certain individuals or companies if they refused to comply with the demands made upon them. The Constitution provides for the protection of individual rights. A person's business is entitled to protection from all unlawful interference, and damages can be imposed by courts if injury to a business can be proved.

Indeed, the framers of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 relied on the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution in outlawing racial discrimination, and yet a burden on commerce could also result from the proposed boycott. The boycott, too, could penalize innocent as well as guilty persons in Alabama, including Negroes.

It has been said that the proposed boycott would be protected by the right of freedom of speech as guaranteed in the first amendment to the Constitution. But the Supreme Court has ruled that there is no such thing as absolute freedom of speech. Thus, for instance, if someone cries "Fire" in a crowded theater and panic results, the damage inflicted by that individual cannot be disregarded just because it was a spoken word. Likewise, obscenity and libel are not protected by the free speech clause of the Constitution.

The device of the boycott has, of course, been used by labor unions, and in certain respects it is lawful. This, however, concerns a dispute between an employer and his own employees. Picketing, moreover, is limited, and, while pickets may carry signs claiming a business is unfair to its employees and urging others not to patronize it, this does not mean that the same pickets can actually prevent sales of goods.

Pickets also may not interfere with the entrance to or exit from a factory or business by any person. Interference of this kind is subject to action by local police and also to injunctive relief in the courts.

There has been in recent years a trend toward the outlawing of secondary boycott. This involves boycotts of the business of third parties—companies, for example, which buy goods from employers who are engaged in disputes with their workers. Interference of this kind with the business of third parties is punishable.

Broadly speaking, the law does not protect general boycotts which can injure innocent persons. The Constitution stipulates that no one shall be deprived of property without due process of law. A nationwide boycott instituted against products manufactured in a particular State and sold outside that State would, therefore, certainly come into conflict with the Federal laws. Innumerable damage suits probably could be filed against organizations and individuals instigating or participating in such boycotts.

Inadequacies of the British National Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the April 13 Wall Street Journal describes some inadequacies of the British National Health Service. The National Health Service is supported by the vast majority of British citizens, but public attention has begun to focus on the system's deficiencies.

Although the Service costs almost 20 percent of the British government budget, it is deficient in glaring respects. A physician recently charged that conditions for operations in Britain are worse than almost anywhere in the world. Two-thirds of British hospitals were built before 1891.

These and other complaints have caused British physicians to demand pay increases and better hospital facilities. In some areas doctors must treat a maximum "list" of 3,500 patients. The pressure of caring for so many causes standards of treatment to deteriorate.

The lessons of the British experience with state-controlled medicine should be ample warning to us in our efforts to ensure that we obtain optimum health care.

The article referred to above follows:

A REBELLION BY DOCTORS ROCKS GREAT BRITAIN'S FREE HEALTH CARE PLAN—MANY THREATEN TO QUIT PROGRAM IN PAY CONTROVERSY—SURGEONS ASSAIL ANTIQUATED HOSPITALS

(By William S. Rukeyser, staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal)

LONDON.—Britain's Government-run National Health Service is facing the worst crisis of its 17 year history.

Three-quarters of Britain's 23,000 family doctors have threatened to quit the NHS if their demands for better pay and other benefits aren't met by July 1. Conditions in several of the nation's aging, understaffed hospitals have so deteriorated that surgeons are refusing to perform operations in them. Angry charges of profiteering against drug manufacturers in Britain, many of which are American controlled, have culminated in a formal inquiry into relations between the NHS and the pharmaceutical industry.

Money is at the root of all these problems. Declares Dr. George Little, a London physician: "The country has got to say to itself, 'Can we afford a health service of the kind we want?'"

Many here are beginning to question whether Britain, or any nation, has the resources to offer free or nearly free medical and dental care to all comers and still maintain high professional standards. John Cronin, a surgeon and a Labor Member of Parliament, believes the NHS is "crumbling to utter ruin."

FREE CARE POPULAR

Despite its woes, the Health Service is unlikely to disintegrate. Free care is extremely popular with ordinary Britons (97 percent have elected to use an NHS family doctor rather than avail themselves of optional private treatment), and no government would want to take the political consequences of presiding over its demise. But the British are having to reexamine the present setup of the NHS as never before.

The problems of the nation's 3,100 hospitals, almost all of which are run by the NHS, are especially dramatic. Although capital spending on hospitals in the fiscal year ending next March 31 will total $190.4 million, up from $57.2 million 4 years ago, only five new hospitals have been completed since before World War II. Two-thirds of the hospitals in England were built before 1891. Waits of over 6 months for nonemergency operations are common.

In the past 6 weeks increasing numbers of surgeons have been airing their complaints publicly. The wave of grumbling apparently was touched off by Surgeon W. P. Greening, who refused in February to continue operating in a 60-year-old room in London's big Charing Cross Hospital. Mr. Greening, who like all British surgeons prefers not to be called "doctor," said dust and debris from nearby renovation work made the operating room unhygienic. Although the hospital's board of governors agreed the room, which lacks air conditioning, is out of date, it remains in use.

Mr. Greening's criticism was followed by similar complaints from hospitals around the country. One London surgeon told of a suburban colleague who has to wheel his own patients into the operating room. At a hospital in Monmouthshire, an exterminator was called in after rats were sighted at the entrance to the operating theater and scampering along an overhead conduit. Fourteen patients at University College Hospital in London were evacuated when the ceiling of a ward collapsed.

EMBARRASSING THE GOVERNMENT

The suddenness with which the complaints began appearing led Kenneth Robinson, Minister of Health, to suggest that surgeons were trying to embarrass the Labor government. A group of doctors at Charing Cross issued a statement expressing "surprise and shock" at Mr. Robinson's charge. Dr. Denis Buxton Hopkin, a consultant at Charing Cross and Lambeth Hospitals, asserted that conditions for operations in Britain are "worse than almost anywhere in the world."

Hospitals are short of funds for staff salaries as well as buildings. Low pay has worsened a national shortage of laboratory technicians and nurses, and many hospitals are almost exclusively staffed by doctors from former British colonies.

The threat of family doctors to resign from the Health Service arose 2 months ago when the Government offered to increase their pay by $15.4 million a year, instead of the more than $50 million they had asked. The Government offer would amount to a boost of about 10 percent; family doctors currently have average net income of $7,742 a year from their NHS work. (By way of comparison, factory wages average about $2,500 a year in Britain.) The British Medical Association condemned the offer and submitted new demands that would cost the Government $84 to $98 million a year. Demands included a 33-percent pay hike, extra payment for night and weekend work, 6 weeks' annual vacation with the NHS footing the bill for substitute doctors, and low-interest Government loans to finance new offices and equipment.

At first the doctors said they would quit the Health Service April 1. The date was delayed 3 months when Mr. Robinson agreed to change the method of distributing the $15.4 million award to meet doctors' wishes and to negotiate on the other points.

It's widely expected that some solution adequate to stave off mass resignations will be found by July, but the BMA says 1,000 or more doctors may quit anyway out of principle. For those who resign, the association has suggested a private insurance plan under which patients would pay doctors 7 to 35 cents a week.

RISING BUDGETS

As in the United States, medical costs have been soaring in Britain, and this has been reflected in the NHS budget. From $1 billion in 1948, the year the service began, its expenditures have climbed to more than $3.5 billion a year—equal to 12.5 percent of the British budget in the 12 months ended April 1. But despite the increased spending, the Government has been unable to provide the quality of care envisaged when the NHS was set up.

In rural and industrial areas where doctors are scarce, many have to cope with the legal maximum "list" of 3,500 NHS patients. Since doctors are paid an annual fee for each patient on their lists, this increases their income, but it can also rule out anything but the most superficial medicine. A general practitioner in Sunderland, near Newcastle, complains that sometimes he has to see as many as 23 patients an hour at his office. Conscientious doctors find that efforts to keep track of new medical developments often extend their working day to 16 hours.

The shortage of doctors that keeps this physician so busy isn't entirely due to the unattractiveness of working for the Health Service. It's true that part of the problem is emigration—a recent study indicates 20 percent of British doctors work abroad for at least part of their careers—but there are other causes.

A STUDY IN CONFUSION

In 1953 the medical journal Lancet wrote: "The profession is probably becoming overcrowded." This view was shared by many medical men, and at their urging a Government inquiry into the training of doctors was set up. In 1957 the inquiry body recommended "A reduction of (medical) students intake by about one-tenth, from as early a date as is practicable." Only in 1960 did medical spokesmen begin wondering aloud whether a shortage of doctors rather than a glut might not be the real problem. By then the medical schools had dutifully reduced their intake of students. Steps have since been taken to increase enrollments.

In view of the Labor government's reluctance to meet their pay demands, doctors are incensed by its decision to discontinue charging NHS patients for prescription drugs. Patients formerly paid a service charge of 28 cents per prescription; removing the charge is expected to cost the Government over $80 million a year. Remarks Dr. Bernard Taylor, who practices in London's industrial East End: "In 10 years of practicing in the East End I have never known a single case of hardship caused by the prescription charge."

A controversy over the prices the Health Service itself pays for drugs has been brewing for 4 years. It will be investigated by a Government commission headed by Lord Sainbury, chairman of a nationwide chain of grocery stores.

U.S. companies are deeply involved; subsidiaries of Chas. Pfizer & Co., American Cyanamid Co., Upjohn Co., Smith, Kline & French Laboratories, Parke, Davis & Co., Eli Lilly & Co., and other U.S. drug producers have captured an estimated 55 to 60 percent of the British prescription-drug market. The Health Service, much the largest buyer in this market, spent $299.3 million on drugs last year, up from $117 million in 1957.

IGNORING PATENT RIGHTS

British patent law permits Government agencies to cut costs by ignoring patent rights, and in 1961 the NHS began buying the antibiotic tetracycline from European sources at $18.20 per thousand tablets. The tetracycline patent holder, Pfizer, and its licensees had been selling the drug for $168 to $252 per thousand.

Pfizer's protests that the Health Service was undermining research efforts by disregarding the patent were overridden. The Government has agreed in principle to pay some royalties to the patentholders in this and similar cases, but negotiations as to amounts still are going on.

The fact that European "pirates" could sell tetracycline for a fraction of the normal price attracted wide attention in Parliament and elsewhere. Leftwing critics of the drug industry led a chorus of charges that there was prima facie evidence of profiteering. The Association of British Pharmaceutical Industries, a trade group, dismisses much of this criticism as the work of doctrinaire Socialists, though it admits there may have been isolated sharp practices by drugmakers.

Green Bay, Wis.: All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, some cities can boast of an All America athletic team. Some athletic teams can boast an All America City. In Green Bay, Wis., we have both.

Green Bay has long been famed for its Packers—often the football champions of the world and always All America in the highest tradition of this All America sport. And the city's hometown pride in the Packers has known no bounds.

Today it is the city that moves into the spotlight, and while my hometown has always been All America to me, now Green Bay has achieved that distinction nationally and officially. The National Municipal League and Look magazine, cosponsors of the All America Cities Awards, have awarded the title of "All America City" to Green Bay. The honor was won because of the vigorous action of Green Bay's citizens in bringing about major improvements in the city, and thus setting a good example to all America.

I particularly want to congratulate Mayor Roman P. Denissen of Green Bay and his Committee for a Cleaner Green Bay:

Leslie Andrews, chairman; Mrs. Ralph Curtis Smith, secretary; Mrs. Elaine Griffin, treasurer; Peter Dorschel, chairman of river project; F. J. Euclide, director of public works; Arthur Lundquist, air pollution inspector; Ralph Bergman, city planner.

Robert Adams, James Cordry, Robert Blaney, Paul Buehler, Robert Detry, Sgt. Harold Compton, Dr. Jerome Gandt, K. W. Haubenschild, Mrs. Walter Lambert, Mrs. Alvis Kasberg, Mrs. Larry Medd, Chester Miller, George Murray, Bernard Murray, Walter Singleton, A. E. Swanstrom.

Hugh Sargent, James E. Shepeck, Charles Williams, Walter Zahn, Dewey Decker, Fire Chief David Zuidmulder, Mrs. Robert Brandenburg, John Sainsbury, Cletus Weber, Robert Heaslett, Fred Luisier, Kenneth Larson, Jerome Gille, Frank Vandersteen, and Miss Wilma Bancroft.

The All American Cities Awards go each year to 11 U.S. communities. The winning cities are selected by a jury of prominent citizens and experts on government impaneled by the National Municipal League. The 12-member jury is comprised of:

Dr. George H. Gallup, foreman, chairman of the council, National Municipal League, and director, American Institute of Public Opinion; William E. Dauer, president, American Chamber of Commerce Executives; Miss Lois V. Edinger, president, National Education Association; Mrs. Dorothy M. Ford, president, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; George W. Jones, secretary, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO; Mark Matthews, former president, Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Willard V. Merrihue, chairman, Effective Citizens Organization; Vernon C. Myers, publisher, Look; Mrs. Robert H. Rawson, assistant to the president, Greater Cleveland Associated Foundation; Allen H. Seed, Jr., executive vice president, Keep America Beautiful; Mrs. Robert S. Stuart, president, League of Women Voters of the United States; Dr. Donald H. Webster, director, Bureau of Government Research and Services, University of Washington.

In announcing the members of what they refer to as "this fine new term of All America Cities," the sponsors said about Green Bay:

Green Bay, Wis., has a sweeping campaign going to get next to godliness. The mayor's committee for a cleaner Green Bay is winning its skirmish with litter and air and water pollution. "It all started," says the lady chairman, "when I swept my front porch." Green Bay enjoys the mixed blessing of being an industrial town; for every 2,500 tons of coal burned, 150 tons of ash used to cascade onto the city. Pressured, local manufacturers installed expensive electrostatic dust collectors to catch the ash before it left the smokestack. Sulfite liquor, a byproduct of papermaking, once poured into the Fox and East Rivers, which merge at Green Bay. Now, the local paper companies dry it, bag it, then sell it to mining firms and to packers of animal food pellets. In 1950, 75 tons of dust swirled over every square mile of downtown—every month. Thanks largely to a committee-inspired ordinance requiring hard surfacing of parking lots, the dust count is down to 18.2 tons.

In the summers of 1963 and 1964, volunteers worked to get the waterfront cleaned up; dilapidated buildings came down, and boat hulks were removed. Green Bay's educators cagily employ a new kind of little red schoolhouse: the ordinary suburban home converted into primary classrooms. Such home schools make do while the school board waits to see if housing shifts justify traditional buildings.

To the extent that each city, town, village, and hamlet throughout all 50 States improves itself, to that degree is America improved. Thus I am confident that my colleagues in the Congress—all of us together representing all America—share in the pride I feel over the achievement scored by Green Bay

and its 10 All-America teammates of 1965, and join me in extending congratulations:

Bluefield, W. Va.; Columbia, S.C.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Hazelton, Pa.; Hopkinsville, Ky.; Keene, N.H.; Niles, Ill.; South Portland, Maine; White Bear Lake, Minn.; and Winston-Salem, N.C.

Solving the Mystery of Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, the President has declared war on disease, with an especial emphasis on cancer, heart disease, and stroke. Of these dread diseases, cancer is the word that causes the most fear, for the names of its victims are well known and the reason for the disease itself is unknown.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a new stir of optimism among scientists and physicians as they delve into this mystery they felt might never be solved. All over the world projects are underway to discover the cause and cure of cancer.

On many fronts in Memphis, Tenn., the research goes on to prolong life, to restore victims of cancer to a useful place in our society.

Foremost among the research centers is St. Jude Research Hospital, a part of the Memphis medical complex, built by Comedian Danny Thomas. Its goal is to find a cure for leukemia and to cure children stricken with this and other malignancies.

Tonight the Ambassador of Lebanon and Mrs. Ibrahim El-Ahdab will inaugurate the 1965 teenagers march for St. Jude Research Hospital with a reception at the Embassy. In the next few weeks teenagers will be marching in Washington and in other major cities throughout the country to raise money for this star-shaped hospital, this "star of hope" for cancer stricken children.

The stories from St. Jude and other medical centers are sometimes technical, but often the good news is as significant and heartwarming as any breakthrough in space.

Mrs. Ida Clemens, in an article on cancer research in Mid-South, the Sunday magazine section of the Commercial Appeal, defined cancer as "a disease of the cells and growth gone haywire." In another article she told of seven children stricken with neuroblastoma, a type of cancer, getting a new lease on life through a new method of drug treatment at St. Jude.

I would like to include these articles at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Commercial Appeal Mid-South magazine, Apr. 11, 1965]

ONE OF THREE VICTIMS IS BEING SAVED, OTHERS COULD BE THROUGH EARLY DETECTION AND MEMPHIS' LEADERSHIP IN CANCER RESEARCH

(By Ida Clemens)

Humphrey Bogart, Dick Powell, Charles Laughton, Gary Cooper, Jack Carson, House Speaker Sam Rayburn—the names of these cancer victims are widely known. Their wealth and fame came to nothing when cancer came to them.

Yet their lives might have been prolonged if the malignancy had been discovered soon enough for treatment.

More than 1,300,000 Americans are alive today and cured of cancer, the American Cancer Society reports.

"With present knowledge and weapons, one out of three cancer patients is being saved. If ignorance and fear did not stop people from reporting their cancer suspicions early, one out of two could be saved," the society emphasizes.

How long until medical science finds a way to prevent and cure all cancers?

"No one can answer this question," said Dr. Donald Pinkel, medical director of St. Jude Research Hospital. "But it seems inevitable that a cure will be found.

"A concentrated effort is being made all over the world toward understanding the disease. Through understanding will come a rational approach to prevention and cure."

There's a new stir of optimism among cancer specialists everywhere. Scientists who 15 years ago felt cancer might never be solved now are talking about where, when, and what the answer might be.

For one thing, it is becoming clearer just what cancer is—a disease of the cells and growth gone haywire.

"Cells are constantly dividing all through the body. We get a new stomach lining every 3 days," said Dr. Edward H. Storer, codirector of the West Tennessee Cancer Clinic at 21 North Dunlap.

"Normally, the body controls and regulates cell division. For example, a cut heals by cell division. This division stops when the job of healing is done. Cells then divide again as needed, always under control of the body.

"Cancer does not obey the laws of the body. The wayward cells just keep growing and dividing, paying no attention to anything and doing little or none of their once normal duty."

Certain agents (carcinogens) such as some chemical compounds, along with radiation and possibly some viruses, seem to have the ability to alter some body cells and spur them into prolific uncontrolled reproduction. These unnatural cells multiply so rapidly that they destroy or crowd out normal cells and tissues.

While scientists can say what cancer is and how it goes about its destruction, they still can't say "why."

This spurs investigators at St. Jude, the University of Tennessee medical units, in medical centers everywhere, to continual search for new information to add to the arsenal against cancer.

A new technique in treatment of advanced cancer of the liver is being tried in UT's department of surgery by Dr. Joe Akin, under direction of Dr. Storer, associate professor of surgery. The pilot study is supported by a grant from the American Cancer Society.

"We are using fluorouracil, a drug used only for certain types of far-advanced cancer. The drug is familiar but we are trying a new route to get the drug faster and in higher concentration to the tumor and avoid some of the toxic (poisonous) effects."

The drug usually is injected into a vein, once a day for several days. There has been some response to this manner of injection but the drug becomes diluted throughout the whole body, causing some harmful effects on normal blood cells. This limits the dosage that can be given, Dr. Storer said.

"In effort to get the drug to cancerous tissues in higher concentration, it has been injected into the artery leading to the diseased part of the body. This takes specialized equipment and involves some risk because of high blood pressure within an artery.

"The liver is the only organ in the body that has a dual blood supply. Both the hepatic artery and the portal vein carry blood to it. The hepatic artery is being used in other medical centers with some success to treat cancer of the liver. We believe our technique is much simpler and safer.

"Blood from the abdominal organs does not go directly back to the heart. It goes to the liver first by way of the portal vein and then to the heart. We are using the obliterated umbilical vein as an easy route to the portal vein.

"When the umbilical cord is cut after birth, no blood circulates through the vein but it is still there. Under local anesthesia, we make an incision under the skin above the navel, find the obliterated vein and open it up by pushing a catheter tube through it to the point where the umbilical vein joins the portal vein.

"We drip the drug solution through the catheter into the portal vein. The catheter cna be left in place a month if necessary. We let the drug drip around the clock.

"We have been able to give twice the usual dose of the drug without a decrease in white blood cell count. White blood cells are the body's defense against infection."

The technique has been used on four patients at John Gaston Hospital. Their liver cancers were either so located or so massive that they were beyond X-ray or surgery.

Two patients are alive, feeling better and gaining weight, Dr. Storer said. The disease was so far advanced that one patient died before the drug had a chance to be effective. In the fourth patient, the tumor did not respond to the drug.

"There is no hope of cure but we believe, in some cases, the tumor will grow smaller and useful life will be prolonged," he said.

Lung cancer is now the leading cause of death from cancer. The American Cancer Society estimates 52,000 will develop lung cancer this year.

Dr. Paul Henry Sherman, assistant professor of thoraic and cardiac surgery at UT, has designed a preliminary plastic model of an artificial lung.

"Its working capacity has yet to be fully established," Dr. Sherman said. "We face similar obstacles, such as blood clotting, that others are encountering in efforts to develop an artificial heart.

"Right now, our main problem is to duplicate the gas exchange of carbon dioxide and oxygen in and out of the blood through some system that will accomplish the same result as in human breathing.

"If the principles involved in the preliminary design prove workable, a more sophisticated model will be made for experimental use in animals."

Dr. Sherman said he will know in 6 months whether the preliminary system is workable. If not, another system will be tried. His work is supported by a grant from the American Cancer Society.

"Someday we will have an artificial lung that people can wear, just as we will have an artificial heart," he predicted.

An artificial lung would be applicable to some cases of lung cancer. It also would be important to people suffering from noncancerous lung destruction as occurs in emphysema.

The artificial lung field has been the most difficult and slowest to be approached by surgery, Dr. Sherman said. Lung airways involve infection which is extremely difficult to control on a permanent basis. Other internal organs can be kept sterile.

"Another problem is that flow of air in and out of lungs is hard to control because the energy for breathing does not come from the lungs but from the chest muscles and diaphragm. In contrast, the heart pumps its own blood. It has its own energy because it's a muscle. Thus, treatment of destroyed lungs is exceedingly complex."

Until an artificial lung comes along, what can be done?

"We can remove all of one lung for disease or parts of both lungs and the patient can still work. Limitations are severe if both lungs are diseased.

"Lung transplants from one person to another have been done without success. Attempts to replace organs by transplantation have been complicated by the natural defense of the body which rejects most living things foreign to it," Dr. Sherman said. "Some plastic materials are not rejected."

Do viruses cause malignant tumors in human beings? In effort to find the answer, considerable research in this area is being done by scientists at St. Jude and across the Nation.

"That certain viruses can cause cancer in laboratory animals is firmly established but no one yet has uncovered a human cancer virus," a local virologist said.

"We have taken a virus from a frog and found it will grow in fish and chicken embryo cells. This offers opportunity to study how viruses affect different cells. A virus may change one type of cell to a malignant cell or destroy another type. We are trying to find new information on the relationship, if any, of viruses to cancer."

St. Jude Research Hospital is dedicated to seeking a cure for children with leukemia (cancer of blood-manufacturing organs), solid tumors and other childhood disorders, through basic and clinical research.

Dr. Douglas H. Sprunt, chief of UT's division of pathology, believes chronic irritation may play a part in lung cancer.

For 5 years he has studied experimental animals which have been repeatedly injected in the windpipe with viruses, bacterial poisons and chemically irritating substances.

"We have produced two lung cancers in rabbits which seldom, if ever, have lung cancer. I think we'll have several more in the near future," Dr. Sprunt said.

Dr. Richard C. Moon, associate professor of physiology, has produced breast cancer in rats, using chemical agents similar to compounds in coal tars. There is no evidence that these compounds produce cancer in humans, he said.

"We are studying the hormonal relationships which are influential in inducing tumors with these chemicals and attempting to prevent tumor development by changing the hormonal balance of the animal.

"By injecting proper doses of certain hormones, only 50 percent of the animals will develop breast cancer."

The attack on cancer is being pressed by many other Memphis researchers.

[From the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., Apr. 9, 1965]

DRUG TREATMENT GAINS ON CANCER; SEVEN CHILDREN GET NEW LEASE ON LIFE THROUGH EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM AT ST. JUDE HOSPITAL

(By Ida Clemens)

Seven of nine children stricken with neuroblastoma, a type of cancer, are living longer through a new method of drug treatment at St. Jude Research Hospital.

The seven youngsters are doing well and have been free of disease more than a year. The first patient treated has had no sign of disease for 23 months.

"Results look encouraging, but these patients have not been followed long enough to be certain the disease will not recur," Dr. David H. James Jr., emphasized.

Dr. James, who directed the research, is a clinical pediatrician at St. Jude and assistant professor of pediatrics at the University of Tennessee College of Medicine.

Neuroblastoma is the third most common cancer in childhood. Leukemia is first and brain tumor is second.

Two drugs have shown some effect against neuroblastoma. They have been used singly in treatment elsewhere. The results at St. Jude have been achieved by using both drugs concurrently.

The drugs are cyclophosphamide and vincristine sulfate. About half the children treated elsewhere with cylophosphamide alone have shown some decrease in size of the tumor. The effect usually lasted only a few months, Dr. James said, although occasionally, it lasted 1 to 2 years.

"There has been less experience with vincristine sulfate alone but, from pubished reports, 40 to 50 percent of children showed some decrease for 2 to 4 months.

"Since the side effects of these drugs are different and therefore not accumulative, we felt that by using both drugs concurrently we might be able to double the effect on the cancer without doubling adverse side effects. We have had only mild side effects in our patients," he said.

A serious side effect of cyclophosphamide is bone marrow depression. Normal blood cells cannot be formed. Use of vincristine sulfate is limited because it damages normal nerve tissue.

The St. Jude patients suffered from nausea and vomiting, some loss of hair and loss of reflexes of ankles and knees. All side effects were temporary.

Neuroblastoma is a malignant tumor that originates from nerve cells, either from the sympathetic ganglion cells that run along the spinal column or from the inside of the adrenal gland above each kidney.

In 60 to 70 percent of cases, the tumor begins in the upper part of the abdomen but can also begin in the chest, neck or pelvis. It occurs most commonly in the first 4 years of life.

"If this tumor localized in one particular area, it could be cured by surgical removal," Dr. James said. "Unfortunately, in most cases it is not localized when first diagnosed. The reason is that the tumor tends to spread before it causes any symptoms."

In five of the St. Jude patients, the tumor completely disappeared. Two others responded to such an extent that the tumor could be surgically removed.

After responding to the two drugs a few months, the other two patients developed progressive disease and died. The nine patients ranged in age from 3 weeks to 11 years.

The research started in May 1963. Dr. James will report results to the American Association for Cancer Research in Philadelphia, Pa., today. Collaborating in the work were Dr. Donald Pinkel, St. Jude medical director, Dr. Omar Hustu and Dr. Earle Wrenn.

Results of Poll in 39th District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, after I became a Member of the House of Representatives, I gave high priority to preparation and distribution of a questionnaire for the men and women I have the honor to represent.

It was carefully constructed to permit expression of a wide range of opinions. It contains 12 multiple-choice type questions on important issues.

The questionnaire was mailed to all residents of the 39th Congressional District of New York in January and February.

During the weeks following the mailing, my staff and I were amazed—and highly pleased—by the responses. Approximately 10 percent of the citizens who received the questionnaire went to the trouble of filling it out, providing their own stamp and envelope, and returning it to my office.

Almost 12,000 citizens took the time to give thoughtful and discerning replies to the questions. Such a demonstration of responsible citizenship makes me want to try that much harder to be their thoughtful and responsible representative.

Many citizens not only checked the answers most closely in accord with their own feelings—but also added personal comments to further clarify their views.

I personally read each completed questionnaire as they flooded my office—and I feel that as a result I am much better acquainted with the people I represent. Their insights will give me guidance as I ponder complex and controversial issues in the months ahead.

Frankly, I am proud of the men and women I represent. They are very well read and well informed. They take seriously their responsibilities as American citizens. Their demonstration in responding to my questionnaire is eloquent testimony to the strength of our democratic form of government—which is indeed built on the premise of responsible citizenship.

To insure complete accuracy, I contracted with a private firm in Washington, D.C., Data Management, Inc., to tabulate the completed questionnaires.

The results are highly gratifying to me. They show that the people I represent desire a progressive, but prudent and cost conscious, Federal Government, as I do.

All costs incurred in connection with the poll—including printing, tabulating, and distribution of results to my constituents—have been borne by my Citizens Committee in Erie County, N.Y. The total of these costs was more than $1,500.

I especially want to call attention to the responses to two of the questions.

One of my questions sought to determine how my constituents feel about the problems of water and air pollution. More than two-thirds of those responding—69.6 percent—indicated that they favor strong Federal programs to attack these problems.

Another question concerned the desirability of polling constituents in this manner. A tremendous majority of respondents—92.8 percent—said they favor questionnaires.

I am planning to poll the citizens of the 39th district again during my present term in Congress.

I feel other Members of the House of Representatives may be interested in examining the responses—and for this reason I have requested permission to place the results, as compiled by Data Management, Inc., in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Results of poll in 39th Congressional District of New York

DOMESTIC ISSUES IN THE 89TH CONG.

1. MEDICARE

The administration will press for enactment of medicare legislation this session. Which would you prefer:	Percent
(a) The President's program under social security?	34.1
(b) Government subsidized for over 65 citizens (AMA proposal)?	37.4
(c) No Government health insurance program?	20.6
(d) Other response or no answer	7.9

2. EDUCATION

The Johnson administration has asked for an additional $1,500,000,000 for colleges, secondary schools, and research. Do you feel that Federal aid to education should—	
(a) Follow President Johnson's proposals?	44.9
(b) Be geared toward research?	11.3
(c) Be curtailed, with the States assuming a larger role?	34.4
(d) Other response or no answer	9.4

3. POVERTY

Congress will be asked to double the present $784,200,000 appropriation in the "war on poverty." Which do you favor:	
(a) A total program, designed to wipe out poverty?	20.3
(b) Limited self-help program aimed at unemployment?	64.6
(c) No Federal activity in this area?	10.0
(d) Other response or no answer	5.1

4. LABOR

One of labor's primary objectives in 1965 is repeal of the so-called right-to-work sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, allowing the States to pass such laws. Do you—	
(a) Favor such repeal by Congress?	21.5
(b) Oppose repeal; the States should retain this right?	48.0
(c) An amendment requiring a referendum by the States?	15.0
(d) Other response or no answer	15.5

5. POLLUTION

Water and air pollution are gaining increased attention by Congress. As pollution of Lake Erie waters and the air, by our industries, are major problems, do you favor—	
(a) A strong Federal program to attack it?	69.6
(b) A State program?	14.6
(c) Local action only?	6.1
(d) Other response or no answer	9.7

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND THE COLD WAR

1. VIETNAM

With regard to the administration's commitments in South Vietnam, do you favor—	
(a) Escalation of the war?	26.3
(b) Maintain the status quo, encourage a democratic Vietnam?	28.1
(c) Withdraw American military personnel and make South Vietnam neutral?	29.8
(d) Other response or no answer	15.8

2. UNITED NATIONS

Indonesia's withdrawal and the cost of U.N. peacekeeping missions has brought the world organization to a new crisis point in its 20-year history. Should the United States—	
(a) Give unqualified support to all General Assembly decisions?	3.7
(b) Follow a "hard line" regarding paying the U.N.'s bills?	57.8
(c) Expand the U.N. role as an eventual international peace force?	23.1
(d) Other response or no answer	15.4

3. CUBA

The Communist regime in Cuba continues to be a source of unrest and subversion in other Latin American countries. Do you favor an American policy which would—	
(a) Encourage an exile invasion of the island?	20.0
(b) Continue to isolate Cuba economically and diplomatically?	52.8
(c) Ease Cuban-United States tensions while remaining vigilant?	14.9
(d) Other response or no answer	12.3

4. AFRICA

The civil war in the Congo and the problems of the new and emerging nations have raised questions about our African policy. Do you favor—	
(a) Continued economic and technical support for all countries?	14.4
(b) Curtail aid to those countries critical of our policies?	53.1
(c) Refuse any possible military involvement and reduce current aid?	21.8
(d) Other response or no answer	10.7

5. FOREIGN AID

U.S. military, economic, and technical aid (including the Peace Corps) goes to more than 60 nations throughout the world. Do you feel such assistance should—	
(a) Be continued, with more cultural exchanges as well?	39.9
(b) Be eliminated to neutrals and countries like Poland and Yugoslavia?	10.0
(c) Be drastically curtailed, limited to "pro-West" nations?	39.9
(d) Other response or no answer	10.2

IMMIGRATION POLICY

President Johnson has proposed elimination of the quota system in the U.S. immigration policy. The quota system gives larger immigration allotments to some countries than others. (Great Britain, France, and Denmark, for example, have relatively larger allotments than Italy, Poland, and Greece.) Do you favor—	
(a) The President's proposal?	22.3
(b) No changes in immigration policy?	29.0
(c) Modification but not complete elimination of the quota system?	40.9
(d) Other response or no answer	7.8

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is again the subject of sharp controversy. Would you favor—	
(a) Abolition of the committee?	11.9
(b) Transfer of its functions to the Judiciary Committee?	24.9
(c) Retention of the committee in its present form?	45.8
(d) Other response or no answer	17.4

CONGRESSIONAL POLL

Do you favor having your Congressman poll you for your views?	
Yes	92.8
No	1.2
Undecided	6.0

Easy Money Leads to Capital Outflow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for the past few months the administration has been urging the necessity of restricting outflows of private capital in order to lessen the strain on the balance of payments. The Government has created the impression that the private sector alone is responsible for correcting the payments deficit. The facts of the matter are that the Government through its own easy money policies is providing less attractive opportunities for private investment at home than those available abroad. A recent article in the Wall Street Journal summarizes the situation in the following manner:

Outflow of private capital, which enlarges the deficit, last year grew to 6.4 billion from 4.3 billion in 1963 and 3.4 billion in 1962. The stimulus for this growth lies in the presistently greater return available from capital investments elsewhere than in the United States. And one reason for this difference lies in the Government's persistent policy of keeping the money markets of the Nation generously supplied with funds in spite of the very rapid growth in demand for and use of credit in these years of boom.

We thus are faced with the curious situation where the Johnson administration is imposing damaging capital controls to stop an outflow of funds arising in large part from its own shortsighted economic policies.

Under unanimous consent I ask that this article from the Wall Street Journal of April 12, 1965, be included in the RECORD at this point:

THE OUTLOOK—APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Henry H. Fowler, the new Secretary of the Treasury, proclaimed the long-held administration theology when he said the other day that economic growth at home would cure the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments with the rest of the world. He also said the United States needs for the same reason to become even more competitive in world markets. The trouble is that though both aims are desirable they're hardly likely to do the job.

A careful look at the record of recent years demonstrates the point. On the score of economic growth it is difficult to find a better record in this Nation's history than that of the years since 1960 or 1958. The record also looks favorable by comparison with those of other Western industrialized nations, as witness the following table which shows gains in industrial production from 1958 to 1964 in four countries:

United States, 48 percent; West Germany, 57 percent; France, 37 percent; United Kingdom 14 percent.

Among these four, only Germany has grown faster in the years covered. Yet in spite of our rapid growth in those years the deficit in our balance of payments has continued with very little change. Here are the figures, in billions:

Year:	*Deficit*
1958	$3.5
1959	4.2
1960	3.9
1961	3.1
1962	3.6
1963	3.3
1964	3.1

It can be seen that since 1961, though we've enjoyed 3 years of growing economic boom, the deficit hasn't declined at all. The theory has been that rapid growth here would induce foreigners to invest at long term here, but somehow this hasn't worked out.

What the reason may be isn't certain. Perhaps the increases of recent years in prices of securities and of other investments including real estate have discouraged potential buyers from abroad. Immediate returns on investments tend to be smaller here than elsewhere in the world.

The problem of becoming more competitive in world markets faces difficulties too. Actually, we've been getting more competitive, in the sense that our prices have risen more slowly than in most other countries. Here are the price increases that have occurred here since 1958 in comparison with those of the same three countries as in the tabulations above:

[In percent]

	Cost of living	*Export prices*
United States	28	5
Germany (West)	15	6
France	31	20
United Kingdom	18	8

In spite of our advantage of a lower rise in the cost of living, which has been translated into a lower advance in export prices, our exports have risen less than Germany's or France's, though more than Britain's. Since 1958 our exports (excluding military aid) have gone up 57 percent, against 75 percent for Germany, 106 percent for France and 33 percent for Britain.

Furthermore, our imports have risen rapidly too—40 percent. While we strive to become more competitive others are striving, too; and as our economic activity has grown our needs and desires for imports have advanced, as always happens in such cases. Not only do others race us in world markets, with various devices such as tax rebates, but our own purchases of imports tend to race our exports.

Nevertheless, the problem of our payments deficit has existed for enough years to make evident that a general, joint effort is going to be needed to cure it. This becomes especially apparent when the components of the deficit are divided as between the transactions of the Federal Government and those of the private economy. It turns out that in the last few years if adjustments are made for the exports that are financed by foreign aid, both sectors have been operating in the foreign field at a deficit.

For instance, in 1964 about $3.4 billion of of the Nation's total exports of goods and services were financed by Government grants and capital outlays. If this sum is subtracted from private exports of goods and services, the net of all remaining private transactions in the foreign field is a deficit of $1.3 billion out of the Nation's total deficit for the same year of $3.1 billion.

However, this does not fully exonerate the Government of responsibility for any part of the private deficit. Outflow of private capital, which enlarges the deficit, last year grew to $6.4 billion from $4.3 billion in 1963 and from $3.4 billion in 1962. The stimulus for this growth lies in the persistently greater return available from capital investments elsewhere than in the United States. And one reason for this difference lies in the Government's persistent policy of keeping the money markets of the Nation generously supplied with funds in spite of the very rapid growth in demand for and use of credit in these years of boom.

That's why American money has tended to flow abroad, and also why foreign money shows little interest in long-term investments here. That's why it has been necessary for the administration this year to call upon American banks and industries to reduce their investments abroad voluntarily. And it is also why such a voluntary program, though it seems highly successful thus far, cannot be counted on to do the job permanently. American capital needs the help of the American Government in this endeavor.

Naugatuck Valley Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to joint with the Ansonia, Conn., Sentinel in its editorial salute to the city of Shelton which, according to estimates issued by the Connecticut Health Department, now leads the communities of the Naugatuck Valley in population.

This is an area which I represent with pride. Cooperation among contiguous communities in the approach to economic development on a regional basis is stressed in the Sentinel editorial, which also lauds the city of Shelton, "for pressing for the organization of a regional development program." The city of Ansonia is also commended for its response to this proposal.

The editor of the Ansonia Sentinel very sagely points out that "The time has come when each community can no longer afford not to look over the next hill, not to cooperate for regional interests." This is a point worthy of consideration by the leadership of all communities, and with that thought in mind I include the text of the editorial, "The Valley Grows," which appeared in the Ansonia, Conn., Sentinel on April 1, 1965:

THE VALLEY GROWS

Congratulations to the city of Shelton which, according to State health department estimates, now leads the valley communities in population.

It is noteworthy that the population of the five towns in the valley region now totals just under 70,000 people.

President JOHNSON has given clear understanding that the Federal approach to a great many problems, beginning with the economic opportunities program, will be regional. That should be the word to the wise that suffices to encourage the valley communities to get their regional apparatus, lying idle some 5 years, into orderly operation.

If it doesn't, the communities in the historic valley region will find themselves dealt with in a variety of important matters as

peripheral areas to other regions whose own primary needs will naturally come first. If this happens, it will be our own fault. Shelton is to be congratulated for pressing for the organization of the regional development program contemplated 5 years ago. Ansonia is to be credited with its eager response to join. The time has come when each community can no longer afford not to look over the next hill, not to cooperate for regional interests.

The valley did this in obtaining financial authorization of a new State vocational technical school from the 1963 legislature.

It was successful in preventing its being entirely dismembered into several State senatorial districts, although Oxford ought to have remained with the other valley towns also in the common interest.

It has been successful, to date, in getting both Governor Dempsey and the State Republican leadership committed to the valley's most urgent highway need—the linking of our vital Route 8 artery to the Connecticut Turnpike.

These are but a few examples of what can be done for the benefit of each of our communities in areas of regional cooperation without sacrificing any of their individuality.

The formation of the Lower Naugatuck Valley Chamber of Commerce shows the significance the area's industry and commerce attribute to the regional approach. But there are other even more compelling reasons related to the new Federal-State programs which are now developing in many areas which will affect every man.

Location of new industries in any of the valley communities benefits all of them, in jobs and commerce which make all of them prosper. Economic growth of each town benefits us all.

Ansonia's State Representative Joseph B. Buckley has introduced a forward-looking bill which would provide a legal foundation for closer future cooperation among all these independent valley communities in any of the areas they find to their mutual advantage. It deserves support.

Historically, socially, culturally, industrially, businesswise and in many other respects the lower valley is an integral region with interests and needs peculiar to itself.

It is good to see so many elements in these communities awakening to the action that is necessary to guard the valley's common future for the welfare of all its people.

Politics and Beauty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY L. GREIGG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the President for his genuine, far-reaching action to enhance the natural beauty of our land. As evidence of the news media's broad acceptance of the President's position on beautification, I call my colleagues' attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Sioux City Journal on April 4, 1965:

POLITICS AND BEAUTY

Concern for natural beauty and abhorrence for such ugliness as sprawling junkyards are attitudes one might attribute in greater degree to the esthetic-minded late President Kennedy than to his successor, Lyndon Johnson. Not so. The President's vigorous crusade on behalf of the Nation's physical appearance has germinated a change in conservation philosophy from traditional bigness of parks, forests, and seashores to the little problems of beautifying the corners and niches where people live.

President Kennedy thought in traditional, Teddy Roosevelt terms. The new approach nudged into action by the President takes into account boulevards, tiny islands of public domain, housing programs with built-in natural beauty clauses, highway landscaping and antibillboard measures.

The closer look does not detract from such major problems as water and air pollution, and expanding nature's wonderland as public playgrounds.

Why, one might ask, should a President whose background was the dusty soil of rural Texas be so esthetically concerned about flowers along Pennsylvania Avenue? A large part of the answer can be found in the brilliant and practical political acumen of the man from Texas.

If President Johnson seeks a monument to himself, and his Administration personality leaves little doubt of that desire, there hardly could be a better, or less controversial one, than a beautified America.

Rather than debate the degree of political mileage calculated in the President's urging for exploitation of natural beauty, the response should be one of gratitude. Regardless of the fear of Federal interference in such earthy projects as a flower garden. Americans have been given reason to look about them and to consider the incongruity of maintaining beauty and recreation in isolated preserves while the city and towns in which they live perpetuate drabness and ugly scars.

Common Council of City of Buffalo Urges Passage of Smith Water Pollution Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, I introduced legislation which would provide for fast tax writeoffs to industries participating in their own programs of water pollution control.

Specifically, my bill, H.R. 5317, would amend our present Federal tax laws to permit the cost of water pollution control facilities to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes.

The pollution of our Nation's lakes, rivers, and streams is a problem that has assumed monumental proportions. Industry throughout the United States must join with local, State, and Federal authorities to combat the critical problems of water pollution control.

I am pleased to report that a number of large industrial concerns in the 40th Congressional District of New York have already undertaken the construction of their own water pollution control facilities.

The passage of this legislation would provide the necessary practical incentive to other industrial oragnizations in the 40th District and throughout the Nation to undertake similar programs.

On April 6, 1965, the Common Council of the City of Buffalo adopted a resolution urging the passage of my water pollution control bill, H.R. 5317.

It is extremely gratifying to me to have the support of the common council in this matter, and I commend them for their outspoken interest in achieving a satisfactory solution to the problems of water pollution control.

The council's resolution follows:

RESOLUTION: ASSISTANCE ON COST OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITIES

(By Mr. Ramunno)

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify that at a session of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, held in the city hall, on the 6th day of April 1965, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

"Whereas each year the incidences of water pollution along the Niagara frontier becomes more and more hazardous to the health, welfare, and well-being of the people of the Niagara frontier; and

"Whereas the Honorable HENRY P. SMITH III, Representative of the 40th District, introduced H.R. 5317, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing the cost of water pollution control facilities to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this common council memorialize and urge the U.S. Congress, on behalf of the people of the city of Buffalo, to pass the bill known as H.R. 5317 and that the city clerk be authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to both Houses of the Senate and the Congress and to our respective two U.S. Senators from New York State and our Congressman from this area.

"Adopted.

"Attest:

"STANLEY MOLIK,
"*City Clerk.*"

San Francisco's Registered Voters Express Opinions in Congressman Mailliard's Survey on Controversial Legislative Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, some 20,000 of my San Francisco constituents have responded to my annual questionnaire mailed in February to every household containing one or more persons who registered for last November's election in California's Sixth Congressional District.

The following tabulation of the replies may interest my colleagues:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. IMMIGRATION			
Under present law, approximately 300,000 people immigrate to the United States each year based on quotas computed according to the number of Americans of the same national origin living here in 1920. Do you favor—			
1. Retaining the present law?	24	54	22
2. New legislation submitted to Congress by the administration which would gradually eliminate immigration quotas based on national origins and substitute priorities based on needed skills and relationship to present U.S. citizens and resident aliens?	73	15	12
B. MEDICARE FOR THE AGED			
The President has submitted to Congress a bill which would initiate a program of hospital insurance and certain other limited medical benefits for the aged. This program would be initially financed by gradually increasing the present social security tax for employers and employees combined to an estimated 10.4 percent of the 1st $5,600 employee income. Do you favor—			
1. The Administration proposal?	38	45	17
2. Our present system of private medical practice backed by Federal and State aid in behalf of the aged who are unable to pay for needed medical services?	35	35	30
3. A Government-sponsored comprehensive program of voluntary medical and hospital care for the aged financed partly by general tax revenues and partly by individual participants on a graduated premium scale based upon their ability to pay?	35	37	28
C. EDUCATION			
The administration has requested $2,600,000,000 from the 89th Cong. to spend on education in fiscal year 1966. This is twice as much as was spent for this purpose in 1964. Do you favor the following essentially new programs—			
1. Spending $150,000,000 for preschool training of the very young in urban and rural slum areas to give them a better chance to learn when they reach school age?	49	36	15
2. A $1,000,000,000 program of general budget support to elementary and secondary schools concentrated in those school districts with the greatest number of low-income families?	60	26	14
3. A $70,000,000 program of Federal scholarship grants to help 140,000 needy 1st-year college students?	55	29	16
D. VIETNAM			
The war in South Vietnam has become increasingly costly to the United States in terms of men and money. In your opinion, should we—			
1. Maintain our policy of military and economic support for the Vietnamese without the direct commitment of entire U.S. combat units?	22	48	30
2. Intensify our prosecution of the war in Vietnam on the theory that the increased risks involved are justified by the chances of an earlier end to the fighting?	43	35	22
3. Conclude the best armistice or peace treaty available to us under present circumstances so as to withdraw our troops and reduce military expenditures?	43	35	22

Boycott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, recently the New York Times had a very good editorial on Martin Luther King's proposal for a boycott of Alabama. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to this editorial:

BOYCOTT

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King's proposal for a boycott of Alabama is wrong in principle and would be unworkable in practice.

An increase in the number of Negro voters and an end to police brutality in Alabama, which are the goals Dr. King has set for such a boycott, are of course admirable. But they can and should be reached by orderly, lawful methods. Once passed, the voting-rights bill now pending in Congress would bring about a substantial increase in the number of Negro citizens registered to vote.

The Justice Department and individual citizens can, through the courts, combat the misuse of State and local police power to intimidate Negroes. If additional legislation is needed, Congress is the proper place to seek a remedy.

A boycott makes no sense because it hurts the powerless more than the powerful, the innocent as well as the guilty. There is no certainty, for example, that Alabama Negroes might not suffer as much or more from such a boycott as the members of the so-called white power structure. It is also unwise because it injects another element of bitterness and violence into a situation that is already impoverished by rancor and hostility.

As a practical matter, a boycott would probably not work anyway. The economy of Alabama, like that of all the States, is too intertwined with the rest of the Nation for consumers and businessmen to be able to make the necessary discriminating choices.

We are equally dubious about the projected investigation of the Ku Klux Klan by the House Un-American Activities Committee. Everyone already knows all that it is necessary to know about the Klan, which is that its racist notions are nonsense and its members are bigoted riffraff. Even if an inquiry were needed, the committee, with its staff bloated by overpaid time-servers, has never demonstrated any investigative competence. It could only serve as a conduit for material developed by the FBI.

If legislation is needed to control the Klan, the Justice Department can prepare it without the bumbling intervention of this discredited committee, which should have been abolished long ago.

Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Jo Ann Hardee of the Detroit News has reported on the poverty program in a series of articles. The fifth and last article of this series follows:

VIEWS VARY ON BASIC VALUE OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

(By Jo Ann Hardee)

WASHINGTON, March 18.—Both opponents and advocates of the Economic Opportunity Act agree on two points:

It's too early, after only 6 months of operation, to tell whether it will accomplish its goals or fulfill the worst fears of its opponents.

By itself, it is insufficient to strike at the roots of poverty.

Richard W. Boone, director of the community action phase of the antipoverty programs, said today: "How can we judge success? We haven't really begun to touch people's lives."

House Minority Leader GERALD FORD, Grand Rapids Republican, added:

"It was the most poorly drafted legislation passed by Congress in years. It has the potential for political use and for misuse of funds.

"But we haven't had enough experience to be either critical or enthusiastic. Our job, as a minority party, is to give it a fair break, to be vigilant against abuses, attempt improvement and advance our own positive proposals for a wider and more meaningful antipoverty effort."

NOT IN A VACUUM

Supporters of the act—which passed the House 226 to 185 and the Senate 61 to 34—agree with President Johnson that the antipoverty legislation does not exist in a vacuum.

He has proposed companion legislation:

A $103 million additional appropriation for this year's Manpower Development and Training Act, bringing it to $411 million, with $425 million requested for next year.

Representative MELVIN LAIRD, the Wisconsin Republican who head the House Republican conference, has called the Manpower Development and Training Act and vocational education much more vital than the Economic Opportunity Act.

Stating that "poverty has many roots, but the taproot is ignorance," Mr. Johnson has called for $1.3 billion in Federal school aid—emphasizing assistance to poverty-stricken areas. It is now in the House.

TAX CUTS

Economic stimulants, like last year's tax cut and a proposed $1.75 million excise tax cut, are also considered vital in the economic upgrading of the country.

President Johnson's medicare program, now apparently on its way to the White House in broadened form, is another support to

the antipoverty effort, as is his new housing bill which expands urban renewal and includes $200 million in rent subsidies.

A $1.2 billion program to create 32 regional health centers over a 5-year period.

Extension of the minimum wage to cover 2 million additional workers; and overhaul of the unemployment compensation laws.

Most vital to the antipoverty effort is a continued boom in the national economy.

"SUBJECT TO TREMORS"

One official in the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) put in bluntly: "We are painfully subject to tremors in the economy. If it falters, all bets are off."

In addition, a recently formed Republican task force is to develop "proposals to increase the economic mobility of Americans, whether they are in the poverty class or a higher economic bracket," according to William B. Prendergast, research director for the House Republican conference.

"For example, I live in Maryland," he said. "There are many Negroes there who have risen above the poverty level, but find greater economic acceleration blocked. This results in an exodus of talent. And those who stay are restive and frustrated.

"This is the sort of economic opportunity that our task force hopes to find means of creating."

OPPOSITION BILL

Chairman is New Jersey Representative PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., who offered an opposition bill to the antipoverty package.

"Our committee will concentrate on a job-finding program," he said today. "We recognize that job retraining is meaningless unless we have a clear idea of what job demands will be in the coming years.

"And we believe that more opportunity should be available to move people along in the economic scheme, thereby creating more jobs for those with limited skills."

LAIRD seconded FRELIGHNUYSEN, saying: "The record of our job needs is in the want ads of every newspaper. What we must do to eliminate poverty is train our younger people to take advantage of jobs that will be plentiful in the 1970's."

FRELINGHUYSEN added that economic opportunities might mean a tax credit for middle income families with children in college, and LAIRD has already introduced a bill permitting the elderly to earn more income without losing social security benefits.

In a minority report on the antipoverty program, Senators WINSTON L. PROUTY, Vermont Republican, and LEN B. JORDAN, Idaho Republican, recommended their own economic opportunity package which included a tax credit to employers for training the unemployed; Federal assistance in transportation for unemployed workers seeking jobs in other States; a national job inventory kept by the U.S. Employment Service; and "human, not political," need as the criterion for distribution of food stamps.

TALENT IN DEPTH

Aside from the legislative changes, one of the demands for a successful antipoverty effort is what one advocate of the Economic Opportunity Act called talent in depth.

R. Sargent Shriver, OEO Director is conceded—even by his opponents—to be remarkably able to gather a top echelon of capable, honest, and dedicated men.

But Shriver, who is also Director of the Peace Corps, is accused of spreading himself too thin.

He also believes in a "lean staff," and as one disgruntled OEO official said, "it takes money and that means additional staff to spend money effectively."

One example of the leanness of his staff is its most vital section, and the one most open to political misuse, the community action program. Its 175 people must monitor the spending of up to 300 communities by July and handle an expected 1,000 applications.

Another concern is that Shriver may leave.

As one critic put it: "No one questions that the poverty glamour boys are doing as good a job as can be done. But they're all Shriver's men, and what happens when he goes to his great reward as Governor of Illinois?"

The antipoverty effort has been praised and condemned, but even its critics, seeing funds go into every State, find it an exciting concept.

An example is Representative JAMES HARVEY, Saginaw Republican, who said today:

"I opposed the bill, but I'll do everything to make it work."

He added there have been several applications for programs from his district.

Shriver commented: "When some of the critics start to see which way the parade is going they run after it shouting, 'Wait for me, I'm your leader.' "

U.S. CHAMBER'S VIEW

After outlining all the faults of the bill, a spokesman for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which opposed it, summed up the sentiment here:

"We may be trying to formulate an entirely new social pattern in which the income standard is linked to a minimum level of productivity. If we can achieve it, it will be a great tribute to a free society.

"But we can also go into a great political mishmash of sloganism and the worst of big brotherism.

"We will be watching, and others will be watching, to see which way we go."

Presidential Inability and Vacancies in the Office of the Vice President

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession of the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in the fall of 1964 160 million Americans were represented at the polls by many millions voting for a new President. For at least 3 hard months millions of dollars were spent carrying their message of the candidates to the American public. And now in the presidential succession constitutional amendment as now drawn, with a few strokes of a pen and within a few hours, even without the public ever knowing of the transition, you are providing for 7 men to change our Presidency.

With this amendment let us project ourselves 50 years from now, to a time with people none of us now know. One of these 7 men would be the Vice President, who countless times probably had dreamed of being President, and on this occasion would sit in judgment of the man he would replace. The other 6 are probably Cabinet officers, none elected by the people. I only assume they are Cabinet officers, because the constitutional amendment does not say who are the principal officers of the executive department, and in that alone is imperfectly drawn.

The House assumes that all men who would occupy the respective positions of responsibility will act infallibly and in the best interests of the United States of America.

When we passed a proposed constitutional amendment to be sculptured immutably into our Constitution we are saying to the American public that we have considered every conceivable contingency and have found this measure safe.

In order to test its safety we are obliged to consider the worst than can happen in some future time, even beyond our own lines.

In this constitutional amendment in the name of good and with good motives we are perpetrating on some future generation a loophole that could allow a usurpation of power by seven men without the sanction of the American people.

Suppose we had a foreign enemy threatening our country. Suppose further the majority of the Cabinet believe the President of that time is too pusillanimous and that his policies endanger the survival of our country. With perfectly patriotic motives these six unelected Cabinet officers convince the Vice President than the removal of the President is imperative.

At a time when the Congress is not in session the determined Vice President and the six unelected officers then transmit to the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate that the President is unable to act as President. There is no requirement that a reason be given other than that the President is "unable" to act, nor is there a definition of "unable," whether it means mental or physical incapacity, or by the judgment of several laymen, nonmedical men, that for some other reason the President is "unable" to act.

At that point the President can transmit his own message to the Speaker and President pro tempore of the Senate and retain the Presidency.

But let us assume the worst, and assume a conspiracy for a genuine takeover. If the President is kidnaped while traveling abroad or in this country before he can transmit a message that he is able to serve, the Vice President remains acting President with all the constitutional powers and duties, powers that include movement of armies, foreign policy, use of nuclear power, and force.

Again, let us assume that the President is not kidnaped, and does transmit his message of ability to serve. Then, a determined Vice President and six Cabinet officers again transmit this message of inability of the President.

The Vice President then is Acting President of the United States for a minimum of 48 hours and possibly several days more during which time he could issue any number of Executive orders, including the irreversible first steps toward a preventive war. Even today

there are a number of misguided people who believe that our survival depends on a preventive war now.

If we must look to past history, I point out that President Lincoln's Cabinet at one point opposed his policies, and if this amendment had been existing then, and the Vice President had been convinced that the country was suffering by reason of the Presidential policies, President Lincoln might have been removed. I point out also that Vice President Aaron Burr was accused of treason and reportedly wanted to carve out an empire for himself.

I do not believe the scepter of power should ever be removed from the President until the Congress itself, after it convenes within 48 hours, should so remove this power. This is consistent with our present Constitution and the proper separation of officers.

Those who would take the mantle of authority from a President, even for 48 hours, argue that it would be dangerous to the country to have a disabled President even for 48 hours. I believe that the risks are far greater to chance a total change of government.

Our careful consideration on this vital issue is our heritage to our posterity. I favor a presidential succession amendment, but we must not, in the name of expediency, open the door to a greater future danger.

Presidential Inability and Vacancies in the Office of the Vice President

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession of the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have have not spoken before in order to save the time of the committee. I rise in opposition to the amendment.. I should like to comment upon the proposal that an election be held to select a new Vice President. Such an election in the United States, in accordance with a quick computation which I just made, would cost somewhere between $25 million and $35 million. Mr. Chairman, if there were an election for a new Vice President, a member of the opposition party might be elected. We have had some strange and rapid changes in political opinion in America in my time.

I would like to comment on the statement that was made that we might be providing for a presidential dynasty. History does not indicate such danger.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I took the floor not to downgrade my beloved Speaker, the great JOHN McCORMACK. Back where I come from he would be described as "the like of which there is no whicher."

Mr. Chairman, it was my good fortune to serve as speaker of the House in Ohio longer than any man who ever served, until the time of the present speaker. My friend, Speaker McCORMACK, I would rather be speaker of the House of Representatives in Ohio that Lieutenant Governor of that State, and I would rather be Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States than Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

The OAS at 75

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman who feels a particular kinship to the Organization of American States, being a native of Argentina, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in today's Washington Post on the 75th birthday of the OAS.

THE OAS AT 75

Ever since the epoch of discovery, residents of the New World have sensed that their hemisphere was somehow tied together by more than geographic accident. In 1826, Simon Bolivar saw the New World as comprising "independent nations, bound together by a common set of laws which would govern their foreign relations and afford them a right to survival through a general and permanent congress."

The Organization of American States, which today marks its 75th birthday, reflects and enhances that historic impulse. The OAS finds its origins in the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics, created in 1890 as the first venture in Pan Americanism. From that seed grew the OAS, which took its present form in 1948, and the Alliance for Progress, which is the economic and social analog of the hemisphere organization.

Much has changed in 75 years. What is truly remarkable is the extent to which that commonsense of destiny has survived those changes. It is undeniably true that countries with an Iberian heritage differ in fundamental attitudes from countries with an Anglo-Saxon background. It is true that the United States has had to learn some hard realities about Latin American national sensibilities—and that the day has gone forever when a Secretary of State could say (as did Olney) that the United States was "practically sovereign" throughout the New World.

Yet it is not empty hyperbole to speak about the sister republics in the hemisphere. The best proof was offered during the Cuban missile crisis in 1962. When the pinch of pressure was hardest, and when the outcome was far from certain, Latin American members of the OAS were unanimous in supporting the United States in the confrontation with the Soviet Union. There is little question that Soviet behavior was influenced by the common resolve displayed on that critical occasion.

No doubt the OAS is imperfect. It is hampered by twin difficulties. The constitutional inhibitions of the United States, which make this country reluctant to enlarge its grant of authority to the OAS, are one problem. Another is the very diversity and frequent clash of interests that characterize the Latin American countries—making them reluctant to vest more responsibility in a regional group.

Still, progress has been enormous and growth impressive. The Pan American Health Organization, founded in 1902, has become a model of its kind. The Inter-American Development Bank, established 5 years ago, has become a principal instrument in the Alliance for Progress. And the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance, known as CIAP, has brought a small patch of order into the complex and confused economic interrelations of sovereign states.

More progress can be achieved this May at a Special Inter-American Conference in Rio. There are some practical organizational proposals suggested by Secretary General Mora, who is showing a somewhat stronger leadership role than in the past. Certainly the OAS should do more to insure respect for human rights and constitutional government. Annual meetings of foreign ministers are an obvious and useful idea.

Some countries—notably Chile—are interested in even more drastic changes in the OAS structure. Surely debate will be welcomed, because the warmth of the discussion suggests that the system is worth arguing about. On its 75th birthday, the OAS not only survives but flourishes. It may yet show the way to a freer, safer, and more prosperous world.

The Mekong River Development Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take particular note of the paragraph in the President's recent speech on southeast Asia-Vietnam that relates to the Mekong River. In this great address the President stated:

The vast Mekong River can provide food and water and power on a scale to dwarf even our own TVA.

In order to underline the essentials of this extensive undertaking, which affects the four riparian countries of Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, and Vietnam, let me submit a paper prepared by the United Nations Office of Public Information on this subject. It is titled "The Mekong River Development Project," and was published in March 1964.

I understand that additional progress has been made on the project since that time and that aid has been provided by a great many nations. It is very noteworthy that these activities in this disturbed portion of the world have proceeded notwithstanding the existence of warfare in that area. The article follows:

THE MEKONG RIVER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

In any listing of major undertakings for economic and social progress, the Mekong development project would be outstanding for boldness of conception, the scale of international cooperation it has commanded, the complexity of technical problems involved,

and the vast benefits that successful realization of its potential will confer on millions of people.

The Mekong is one of the greatest rivers in the world. From its origin in the mountains of the Tibetan Plateau in China, it sweeps along the border of Burma and runs, in its lower basin, through Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, and Vietnam, into the South China Sea. Of the total drainage area of the river, some 77 percent lies within the 4 countries of the lower basin where 17 million people live.

So far, the Mekong has been untamed. Every year it has inundated millions of hectares of land in the delta. Its great hydroelectric potential has never been developed. Less than 3 percent of the area under cultivation is irrigated. Its navigation possibilities are undeveloped. The lower Mekong has thus been a giant asleep—a source of tremendous potential for power production, irrigation, navigation and flood control, but a source virtually untapped.

The United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) took a special interest in the Mekong as early as 1951. In that year its Bureau of Flood Control, in cooperation with the four riparian governments, initiated a series of field investigations of the Mekong River. Since conditions were then unsettled in the region, extensive field surveys were not possible, and ECAFE's task was limited to an appraisal of the technical possibilities for the large-scale multipurpose development of the river's lower basin.

This in turn led to the organization by ECAFE in 1956 of a team of high-ranking international experts to conduct a comprehensive reconnaissance and field survey of the river's potential resources.

The experts' report outlined the key problems and possibilities of the Mekong and singled out several projects which might benefit two or more countries, and which were recommended for detailed investigation. Priority was also urged for topographic mapping and the collection of basic data on a standard uniform basis.

The ECAFE report stimulated the four riparian countries—Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam—to a realization of the importance to their own economies of developing the Mekong. In October 1957 the four countries established, under the aegis of the United Nations, a Committee for Coordination of Investigations of the Lower Mekong Basin, composed of representatives of each of the four riparian countries and serviced by the ECAFE secretariat.

The Committee's first action was to request the United Nations to send a group of international experts to undertake further comprehensive studies and make detailed recommendations for joint action. The mission, organized under the United Nations Technical Assistance Administration and headed by Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler, of the United States, carried out a 3-month survey of the river, both by land and by air, and submitted a report in February 1958 calling for a multipurpose program of studies and data collection which could lead to a full development stage. The Wheeler report also recommended a 5-year program of investigations at an expenditure of about $9 million and proposed that a high-level international technical advisory board of engineers of worldwide reputation be appointed by the Coordination Committee. The Advisory Board was later set up to consist of engineers from France, India, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

An important step in the furtherance of the Mekong program was made in 1959, with the appointment by the United Nations Secretary General, in consultation with the four riparian governments, of Dr. C. Hart Schaaf as Executive Agent of the Coordination Committee, to provide overall day-to-day management, under the Committee, of the ever-increasing technical and administrative complexities of the project.

The Coordination Committee works closely with ECAFE and reports its progress to annual sessions of the Commission. Its meetings are held several times a year, with the chairmanship rotating annually among the four member countries.

By the end of 1958, field operations in connection with the program of investigations had already started, and in 1959 engineers and equipment had begun to move on to key sites in the Mekong Basin. Since then, hydrologic stations have been established; the work of levelling the main river has been completed; and aerial mapping of the main stream and tributaries areas has been carried out.

As the four riparian countries tackled the task of taming the river, financial, and technical assistance rallied to them from many quarters. As early as 1957, France announced that it was placing the equivalent of $100,000 at the disposal of the Committee. Within a year, the Committee's resources exceeded $4 million; by the beginning of 1961 they had come close to the Wheeler Mission target of $9.2 million; and in March 1962 they totalled over $20 million—enough to launch virtually all the data-collection programs suggested by the Wheeler mission; to begin the planning of 10 multi-purpose projects, 3 of them on the mainstream; and to make a start on construction.

Participating in this complex international venture are 14 countries, 11 United Nations agencies, two foundations, two private companies and the four lower Mekong riparian states.

Resources of manpower, equipment, training facilities or materials have been made available or pledged by Australia, Canada, China, France, India, Iran, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The 11 United Nations agencies which are helping are ECAFE, the Technical Assistance Board, the Bureau of Technical Assistance Operations, the United Nations Special Fund, the ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, WMO, IAEA, and the International Bank. In addition, a Ford Foundation team of consultants has assisted the Committee in its examination of economic and related fiscal, social and administrative aspects of the overall Mekong project; the Asia Foundation has provided a number of travel grants; the Pan-Pacific Southeast Asia Women's Association has offered to participate in social studies; the Shell Oil Co. is preparing a documentary motion picture record of present and future phases of the work; and Price Waterhouse Co., Ltd., have offered to contribute auditing services.

The three mainstream projects are:

(a) At Pa Mong, a short distance upstream from Vientiane where the river forms the international boundary between Laos and Thailand, and which project, with one of the largest reservoirs in the world, would make possible irrigation of about 1 million hectares of land in Laos and Thailand and continuous generation of about 1.5 million kilowatts of electricity, and in addition would increase the value of all other downstream projects;

(b) At Sambor, in Cambodia, which would provide irrigation for 100,000 hectares of land and make possible continuous generation of 400,000 kilowatts of electricity even without Pa Mong, and triple this after the construction of the Pa Mong project; and

(c) At Tonle Sap, which, by utilizing the vast Great Lake of Cambodia for storage and regulation, will on the one hand improve the fisheries of the lake now in danger of extermination; and on the other hand make possible the hydraulic management and reclamation of vast areas in the Mekong delta in Cambodia and in Vietnam.

With reference to the tributaries, the Committee has arranged for the preparation of comprehensive multipurpose project reports on the Battambang and the Prek Thnot in Cambodia, the Nam Ngum in Laos, the Nam Pong and Nam Pung in Thailand, and the Upper Se San and the Upper Sre Pok in the Republic of Vietnam. Of these it is believed that actual construction will commence on the Nam Pong in Thailand before the end of 1962, and may possibly commence on the Battambang in Cambodia and the Nam Ngum in Laos in 1963 or 1964.

As regards navigation improvement, the Committee has instituted a hydrographic survey or mapping of the river bottom of an important stretch of the river from Luang Prabang to the sea. On the basis of this hydrographic survey, the channels will be improved and navigation aids and signals installed. The first such navigation aids are now being placed in position in the delta in Vietnam, and will make possible navigation by night in Phnom-Penh and not merely by day as at present.

Commending the excellent progress made by the Mekong Coordination Committee, the eighthteenth session of ECAFE in March 1962 was able to note with satisfaction that the investigation stage of the Mekong project would soon be followed by the construction of the first multiple purpose project on a major tributary. The Commission "welcomed the worldwide interest shown in, and assistance given to, the Mekong project, an outstanding example of regional cooperation in this United Nations decade of development."

An Agricultural Depression Could Trigger a General Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the chaotic condition of California agriculture must be solved in a few days or California and the Nation will suffer a serious economic loss. Almost every State is closely tied—even dependent upon—California agriculture.

Stephen D'Arrigo, Jr., in a recent letter to the editor of the Salinas, Calif., Californian, makes several points that deserve the consideration of Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz and reiteration for Members.

The text of the letter follows:

To the EDITOR:

The Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, has stated that California must employ all the unemployed Americans before he allows the use of braceros. California agriculture has no quarrel with this. There is no justification for doing less.

However, agriculture does not believe it should become a social welfare agency or do the work of Alcoholics Anonymous. To this end agriculture contributes more than its share in property taxes from which welfare agencies receive their funds.

Nor does California agriculture believe it must hire and provide jobs to those who will not or cannot qualify or maintain the standard and quality of work his fellow American worker is capable of performing. Certainly, no other industry permits this. A mechanic

whose quality of work is poor is not kept on the job. The same applies to engineers, plumbers, electricians, carpenters, salesmen, etc. * * * Even civil service jobs have qualification tests. Why should agriculture be different?

But different it is because agriculture is forced by the Secretary to employ anyone and everyone whether qualified or not. So that there be no misunderstanding or words put into the text of this article other than that intended, let me make it clear that there are many mighty fine American workers. We have our share of such employees as do the other growers. Unfortunately, due to sociological, physical, and other reasons there simply are not enough of this kind of worker and agriculture should not bear the brunt of solving the social and physical problems of the Nation or absorbing the gap in the administration's war on poverty. The President said these problems belong to all of us and agriculture believes it should remain the problem of all of us. We don't want the whole mess shifted onto our backs.

If the principle of total employment is to be applied to agriculture, then we suggest it also be applied to all industries. At present, under the very law agriculture is now seeking relief for its labor shortage, chorus girls are imported temporarily for shows in Las Vegas and other nightclubs while many American girls are unemployed and waiting to get to the "top" in American show business. Foreign ski instructors are in this country temporarily under the same law while American ski instructors must take other jobs if available. Foreign engineers and technicians are in this country on temporary basis under this same law while unemployment insurance is being paid to our own American unemployed engineers and technicians. While row crop farmers are forced to train anyone who can walk, Basque sheepherders are imported under this same law to herd sheep. Cannot Americans be trained for this work?

The American farmer is an ingenious individual. He'll solve his problems and the labor shortage problem is no exception. He simply won't plant what he can't harvest. True, his income will diminish which is a loss to him; but he'll have plenty of company. Teamster incomes will drop with the need for drivers reduced. Suppliers won't need as many employees. Canneries won't need as many cans and cartons and labor to pack what little is grown. Railroad revenues will go down, etc.

We should all pray that the Secretary is right for if he isn't, this Nation will suffer such serious economic losses that it could trigger a depression. Economists agree it was the agricultural depression that triggered the great depression of the thirties.

STEPHEN D'ARRIGO, Jr.

Assistance on Cost of Water Pollution Control Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution which was adopted on April 6, 1965, by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y., relative to assistance in the cost of water pollution control facilities:

RE ASSISTANCE ON COST OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITIES

Whereas each year the incidences of water pollution along the Niagara frontier becomes more and more hazardous to the health, welfare, and well-being of the people of the Niagara frontier; and

Whereas the Honorable Henry P. Smith III, Representative of the 40th District, introduced H.R. 5317, a bill "to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing the cost of water pollution control facilities to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this common council memorialize and urge the U.S. Congress, on behalf of the people of the city of Buffalo, to pass the bill known as H.R. 5317 and that the city clerk be authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to both Houses of the Senate and the Congress and to our respective two U.S. Senators from New York State and our Congressmen from this area.

JOHN A. RAMUNNO.

AID–PEP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. MACKAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Agency for International Development has put into action a new program with a spicy name and a laudable cause—it is called AID–PEP for private enterprise promotion. PEP is designed to put some of the zip of our modern industrial system into Latin America, according to AID coordinator for Latin America, William D. Rogers. The program brings Latin American businessmen into the United States to show them what we do to make industry grow in our underdeveloped or lagging areas. Several groups of Latin Americans have already visited the United States under PEP's auspices, and their response has been enthusiastic. The program has become an important part of the Alliance for Progress, and I am proud to be able to say that a citizen of my district, Mr. H. McKinley Conway, Jr., of Atlanta, is responsible for showing our industrial system to these distinguished visitors. Mr. Conway, publisher of "Industrial Development," and president of Conway Research Inc., arranges and helps conduct the PEP tours, and, I might say, is doing an excellent job.

I am inserting an article from the Washington Daily News dated March 26 concerning this program, and recommend its reading to my colleagues:

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 26, 1965]

PEP PUTS ZIP INTO ALLIANCE PLAN

(By Virginia Prewett)

The Alliance for Progress is getting new zip from PEP. This is private enterprise promotion, a new agency for International Development activity teaching Latin Americans what U.S. businessmen do about their own "underdeveloped" areas.

PEP brings grassroots Latin American businessmen to see how their opposite numbers in the United States make the grass grow green outside our big-city industrial complexes.

"PEP helps put some of the zip of our modern industrial system into Latin America," says William D. Rogers, AID coordinator for Latin America. Mr. Rogers' own conviction that private enterprise must play an important Alliance for Progress role sparked PEP's emergence.

"When you describe the new thing in the United States called area development, Latin Americans just can't take it in," says AID officials. "They have to see it."

NEW METHODS

The cooperative community development programs that are diffusing modern industry to this country's byways are in fact so new that no university teaches their methods. Yet the U.S. Industrial Development Council has 55,000 members representing towns, cities, States, port authorities, railroads, public utilities, banks, and large U.S. corporations which are concerned with area development.

What the Latin American visitors see gives them a jolt. They have learned, for instance, that 10 years ago thousands of towns like Gallatin, Tenn., and Sulphur Springs, Tex., were dying. In Gallatin, a local businessman, W. Dan Calgy, Jr., got busy bringing new plants to town. In Sulphur Springs, Judson R. Perkins became "Mr. Bootstrap." Community action has brought both towns as many new plants as their labor can serve and a new boom. And this has happened all over the United States.

Simon Gonzalez, head of Colombia's Manufacturing Association, said after a PEP tour:

"I've spent 6 years in big U.S. cities. But I never knew what makes the United States great till I saw Sulphur Springs, Tex. If I could take Sulphur Springs to Colombia to show how your people work together, I could transform my country."

VISIT UNITED STATES

Eight parties of Latin Americans numbering from 5 to 15 men have already visited over 100 U.S. communities. They came from El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, Costa Rica, Colombia, Peru, and Brazil. Others are tentatively scheduled from Panama, Paraguay, Nicaragua, and Guatemala. The tours are conducted under contract for AID by H. McKinley Conway, Jr., of Atlanta, Ga., publisher of "Industrial Development."

Mr. Rogers reports that PEP is catching on. Already 36 area development projects have resulted in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Colombia. And more and more Latin Americans want to learn PEP methods.

The Castle Point Veterans' Administration Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the honor bestowed upon the Castle Point Veterans Hospital in my district for their "excellent performance" in a recent agency cooperative study. This progress in advanced study, as reported in "The Gateway-to-Dutchess" papers on April 1, clearly proves my contention that this hospital

is not, as the Veterans' Administration put it when they announced its closing, "obsolete."

The newspaper article follows:

LOCAL HOSPITAL CONGRATULATED

The Castle Point Veterans' Administration hospital has been congratulated by Dr. James H. Matthews, Chief, Clinical Research in Pulmonary Disease, VA Central Office, Washington, D.C., for its excellent performance in participating in an agency cooperative study. The local hospital's clinical laboratory submitted a report which confirmed, in essence, the findings of other institutions also participating in the study.

In October 1964 the VA Tuberculosis Study Control Laboratory, Atlanta, Ga., submitted a number of cultures for evaluation on drug susceptibility. The clinical laboratory at the veterans hospital, in performing the tests, utilized a new type of media which was prepared at Castle Point by the microbiology staff. This was necessary because media older than 4 weeks would be subject to deterioration through aging.

As a result of this development the microbiologist is now able to recover positive findings at the end of 4 weeks. With this reduction in the time required for growth of the bacilli, sensitivity studies which also require an additional 4 weeks are now reportable at the end of 8 weeks in 48 percent of the cases confirmed as positive. This method has proven beneficial by obtaining results in one-half the time previously required.

King's Boycott of Alabama Called "Alarming" Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat entitled "King's Boycott of Alabama Called 'Alarming' Proposal":

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat]

KING'S BOYCOTT OF ALABAMA CALLED "ALARMING" PROPOSAL

Dr. Martin Luther King's call for a national and international economic boycott against Alabama is perhaps the most alarming action this civil rights leader has ever seriously proposed. Could he have considered all the consequences?

Dr. King is asking other Americans to set themselves against Alabama and deliberately discriminate against the goods produced by the more than 3 million Negro and white fellow Americans who happen to live within the geographical boundaries of that State.

It would be the poor Negroes and poor whites of Alabama who would bear the worst brunt of this proposed boycott.

Alabamans are not unlike other Americans in that they are a people proud of their State. Does Dr. King think that the effect of this boycott will be for the millions of whites in Alabama to cry "enough," denounce the Governor they have elected and confess their sins to the Nation?

Rather we would think that every Alabaman, and other southerners, including those now employing their time and sweat to work out some peaceable solution to this racial crisis, would rally around Alabama and reject this implicit denunciation of an entire State—and a region.

Bringing Alabama to her knees is hardly the way to bring her to fuller acceptance of the new rules and laws of this land. Rather the opposite.

Dr. King has lost his perspective—and patience. He must remember that not until 1954 was it illegal to segregate public schools; not until 1964 was it unlawful for motels and major restaurants to keep out Negroes.

Because of the rulings and laws of this past decade, a century of tradition and an entire way of life must be discarded in the South. It is folly to think that such a radical change will not produce tension and, among the ignorant and reactionary, some violence.

As we are all Americans, it should be our objective to keep that violence to a minimum, to understand Alabama's agonizing problem while insuring that she moves into compliance with the law.

To clamp an economic boycott upon Alabama—which we lack the courage to clamp upon the Communist states of East Europe where all rights are denied indiscriminately—would be to declare the elected government of Alabama an enemy of the United States. That act would deal a crippling blow to the Union itself.

Using the example of the murdered Detroit woman and the murdered minister, Dr. King asked the boycott to end what he called the "reign of terror." Two murders by bigots, vicious and reprehensive as they were, do not make a reign of terror. Some of our larger cities, such as New York, can better come under such a definition.

In Alabama, as in every State, there are potential killers, both black and white, stupid, backward, brutal men, easily excitable, who would kill and have killed for little more provocation than the different color of a man's skin. Dr. King knows there are such men in Alabama.

As a man of nonviolence, he should keep his demonstrations strictly within legal bounds—and discourage the participation of unnecessary outsiders, recognizing full well that it is these outsiders who trigger the murderous instincts of the criminal white bigots.

As for the priests, nuns, ministers and students—many of whom have the finest of motives in going to Selma or Montgomery—we suggest that the rights movement has now all the publicity it can handle.

We ask that they recognize the hard fact that their presence serves more to exacerbate the situation and incite violence than anything else, and that God will hear their prayers as clearly from St. Louis as He will from Route 80 in Alabama.

Redtape Required To Obtain Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, few people will believe how difficult it is to obtain farm labor. No other industry is burdened with such barriers. The minimum wage for unskilled workers is $1.40 per hour. None of these workers can earn this much in any other work anywhere in the United States.

The Department of Labor is not oriented to agriculture. Department of Labor officials do not have a thorough understanding of agriculture—especially the growing of fruit and vegetables. The Department of Labor is primarily interested in solving labor, social, and moral problems of the big cities—but is not working for agriculture.

The Department recognizes its lack of knowledge and understanding and is now resorting to polls, questionnaires, surveys, and reports. Even these demands for reports and detailed information demonstrate a lack of understanding of the row crop vegetable industry. By the time the doctors in the Labor Department finish their surveys and examinations and the diagnosis becomes clear, the patient may be dead. Local farm labor specialists should be consulted and their advice utilized.

The California Farmer, of April 3, 1965, explains in an article, entitled "The New Redtape Involved in Getting Labor," the unbelievable difficulties confronting California growers in obtaining help to harvest their crops—which now are beginning to spoil in the fields.

The article follows:

THE NEW REDTAPE INVOLVED IN GETTING LABOR

Albert Tieburg, director of the California Department of Employment, has requested 5,100 braceros under Public Law 414 for use in Monterey County for the next 4 months.

Glenn E. Brockway, regional administrator of the U.S. Labor Department's employment security bureau in San Francisco, has demanded more detailed information before he will make a recommendation to Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz.

Brockway has told Tieburg that the $1.40 wage should be given a chance to prove its drawing power in recruiting Americans before foreign labor is authorized.

Brockway maintains there are American farmworkers available in several other States, and that the California Department of Employment should intensify its efforts to obtain such workers for California through interstate recruitment.

And finally Brockway feels that recruitment in California by special Federal-State teams has produced good results. He says to date these teams have placed 7,177 workers.

"Before I can make a fair and intelligent recommendation to Secretary Wirtz on this request, and on any future requests for farm labor, I must have more detailed justification from the California Department of Employment," Brockway said.

Brockway is asking Tieburg to supply more detailed information on recruitment efforts, retention experience with American workers, working conditions offered, training, housing, crop reports and the basis of the requested duration of need. He emphasized that Congress ended Public Law 78 as an expression of its desire that American farmers use U.S. citizens rather than foreigners in their fields.

"Unemployment in the United States is now 4 million," Brockway says, "and 10 percent of these (400,000) are in California. We have a clear obligation to do everything humanly possible to seek out these men and women and offer them farmwork before we consider labor sources beyond our borders."

In a March 16 letter to Tieburg, Brockway says he must have information not available to him now. He tells Tieburg it would be desirable to have this information on each potential grower-user but says he realizes this is not possible and therefore asks for the information by crops.

Additionally, Brockway asks that this type of information be kept flowing to him currently, so that the period of employment can be limited, and in no case be extended beyond 120 days.

Brockway closes his letter to Tieburg by saying, "In the future, whenever a request is issued to me for referral to the Secretary of Labor with my recommendations, I will

want the type of information indicated below. Greater, rather than less, detail will be most helpful."

In order to evaluate a request for authorization of foreign supplemental farm labor, Brockway says, the request must be accompanied by supporting data covering each of the following items:

Describe fully the recruitment effort made to date by the user with respect to each of the following items: Local recruitment of domestic workers, interstate recruitment of domestic workers, intrastate recruitment of domestic workers. In each case Brockway wants to know when and by whom, where and by whom, and the results.

Then with respect to each item listed above, Tieburg must describe the publicity campaign used to recruit domestics. He is to attach copies of all publicity used, and list all media used with time and place used.

The nature of the hiring authority used is demanded. Under positive recruitment it says to indicate date, place, and time of day of actual positive recruitment. Item b. under this section says (we quote it, but you figure it out): "Delegated authority to hire to public employment office, indicating specific delegation and authority given."

Under the general heading "Retention experience with domestic workers," the following information is requested: With respect to each of recent payrolls (three most recent pay periods, if payroll on a 2-week basis; five most recent pay periods, if payroll on a 1-week basis; covering the most recent 30 days, if on any other payroll basis) show: The number of domestic workers on the last day of each of the above payrolls and the number of domestics hired during the period.

Here is the information under the heading "Working conditions offered": With respect to each of the following items show or describe fully the information requested: Wages. For each activity for which supplemental foreign farmworkers requested show for each of the payrolls in the past 4 weeks (showing the dates of these pay periods).

1. Average hourly earnings, excluding any makeup payments to meet guarantee, computed as total wages earned divided by total hours worked by all employees engaged in that activity. Also show total wages earned and total hours worked on which this computation based.

2. Average hours worked per week computed by counting only those domestic workers engaged for the entire payroll. Include total number of workers and the hours they worked.

Under deductions, Tieburg is to list all deductions from workers' wages, including the amount deducted for each item.

Also requested is a description of each of various types of fringe or other benefits given workers, the value and the eligibility required for those benefits.

Training is to be fully described, covering the nature, timing and duration. Indicate also the length of training period during which the worker is expected to attain average acceptable production and the amount of or method of measurement of that production. This information is to cover both workers and foreman.

Housing is to cover the single-worker type and the family type available and give the capacity and the condition of both as well as the date of the last State inspection.

In addition to the above information on workers a detailed crop report is demanded. We'll not bore you with all the details but here is what is requested for each activity and for each area for which it is proposed to use supplemental foreign farm labor:

They want information as to acreage, production, harvest season and when the season peaks.

They want employment figures. They want the average number of workers used 1960–63, the number used in 1964 and the 1965 estimate.

They want harvest progress information in terms of crates, tons or carloads for the 1959–63 average, 1964 and 1965 covering the second preceding week, preceding week, current week (show date and week ending), cumulative shipments this season to date and the percent of harvest to date.

Under duration of need, Brockway wants the maximum period of employment and the number of supplemental foreign workers required for each activity for which foreign workers requested. Where overlapping or combinations of crops are involved, show date and need for each activity.

Brockway notes that the regulation of the Secretary of Labor prohibit the use by any employer of supplemental foreign farm workers for a period exceeding 120 days, or the employment of any individual alien for more than 120 days in any calendar year.

And finally, the instructions say to describe the basis upon which the labor needs were arrived at.

Growers can only hope that if Tieburg starts now, he'll have the form completed in time for harvesting 1966 crops.

Inaugural Address by Lewis Carnegie Dowdy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 3, 1965, I was honored to attend the inaugural of the sixth president of the Agricultural & Technical College of North Carolina in my hometown of Greensboro, N.C. This great institution of higher learning since 1890 has provided education for many young men and women of the State of North Carolina. It occupies a great place in the tradition of education in our State and augurs well for the future of our people as it continues to improve the mind and body and spirit of the many thousands of young students who share in the learning process.

In his inaugural address, Dr. Lewis C. Dowdy called attention to the vital role the modern college plays in the arena of human thought.

Because of my feeling that Dr. Dowdy's timely and wise remarks should be shared by all who value learning under unanimous consent I include the full text of Dr. Lewis C. Dowdy's inaugural address as part of the RECORD:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

(By Lewis Carnegie Dowdy, sixth president, the Agricultural & Technical College of North Carolina, Greensboro, Apr. 3, 1965)

Thank you Mr. Frazier, Lieutenant Governor Scott, distinguished platform guests, delegates, faculty, students, alumni, and friends, I accept with great humility the responsibilities and the great challenges of the office of the sixth president of the Agricultural & Technical College of North Carolina. I am fully aware of the excellent leadership which my predecessors have provided this great institution. I approach this assignment with immeasurable humility because of the demanding times in which we live and the high expectations you have of this institution. I shall do my best to fulfill your lofty expectations. May I hasten to remind you, however, that, because of the present state of the world and the demands which are now being made upon higher education, no one could approach this assignment without a little fluttering of the heart. What Ben Franklin, as our Ambassador, wrote home of the King of France might well be said of education in our time. Under normal circumstances, he would have made a great king, but he inherited a revolution. Revolutions do have a way of dwarfing our best efforts of normal times, and leaves us feeling as the red queen admonished "Alice in Wonderland." In this country, you must run twice as fast to stand still.

The revolutions of our time—economic, social, political, and scientific, like so many others of the past, strike more deeply at the heart of education. Our real problem is not merely whether we can pass on the culture of one generation to another, or create a new one fast enough. It is whether we can educate a new kind of man adequate to survive at all. The fact is that shrinking space and telescoped time have compressed the world's melting pot of cultures, creeds, colors and conditions of men into a pressure cooker. The revolutions in science and technology have given us one world physically, before the social scientists have readied us to live in this one world intellectually, socially and spiritually. Moreover, the power of the first can, and if higher education fails, may indeed, liquidate the second. This single fact dwarfs all others. It focuses education's final test on the speed and competence with which it deals with human nature, its understanding and transformation in attitude, affection and action as well as mind.

In the light of these developments, I wish to present what I believe to be the three most important characteristics of colleges for our times.

Colleges for our times must be dynamic and aggressive in the arena of human thought. In the contemporary surge of creativity and discovery, knowledge doubles and redoubles. Each new fact or proposition lights new paths for exploration and revelation beyond the anticipation and imagination of the most sophisticated. Long divisions of established related knowledge, characterized for convenience and manageability, are stretched beyond the original concepts. Subsequent splintering into specialization and subspecializations are soon made to seem arbitrary as changed awareness of the grand pattern follows each discovery and insight. The function of our college, the function of colleges of our times, becomes more important as the accumulation of what we know defies the individual mind to contain it and frequently challenges the human mind even to classify it, so that it may be retrieved with the aid of our wondrous new machines.

At the pinnacle of new specializations, new discoveries burst forth and new relationships suddenly reveal themselves. That, which was a research device, becomes the heart of a production machine. That, which was a theory, becomes a fact. The processes of research and development, across the whole spectrum of knowledge, have pushed colleges into a new eventuality in our lives and times. Exploring the unknown has always been at the heart of all that education stands for, but the products of its own efforts have placed upon the colleges immense responsibility for the future of our civilization. All of the worthy goals which we desire for man

in this country—justice, knowledge, human dignity, economic vitality, international harmony, the conquest of space, government by and for the people, find ignorance to be a barrier, but education is the gate through which we can reach these goals.

Colleges which are dynamic and aggressive in the arena of human thought provide experiences which help to perfect the natural powers of the mind, powers which distinguish us from brutes, and when perfected, we are able to lay hold upon the intelligible structure in the nature of things. In addition, these colleges attempt to humanize man by perfecting his reason, which becomes his natural dignity, his real greatness. Then, he loves grounded theory, responsible vision, he moves among ideas, able to apprehend them in their distinctness and to work out their communion. All topics then become his food from the simplest to the highest intellectual vision in science.

Colleges with this characteristic will not relax their energy in the years ahead or fall into a state of complacency. They know that the future demands their ever-increasing effort at academic improvement. They remember that, as Arnold Toynbee said some years ago, "Civilization is a movement and not a condition, a voyage and not a harbor."

It is the distinctive feature of our era to be marked by a raical speedup of this movement of change. Nowhere is this fact more important than in the mission of colleges for our times. With these colleges rest the burden of stimulating and promoting that spirit of intellectual curiosity, which alone can sustain this movement of progress. They are not committed to seeking expression through large student bodies or through a growing complex of buildings.

The true worth of these colleges is measured by the quality of their scholars and teachers, and by the vigor, creative boldness, and precision of their intellectual endeavors, as reflected in the growth of true understanding by their students. The task which they undertake is the hard disciplining of the mind and the aggressive training of individual intelligence and discrimination. College for our times have no place for weakening or debasement of academic standards.

They offer no recreational interlude preliminary to entry into life's cold competitive race. Rather, it offers the stern intellectual training essential for successful competition and provides experiences which harden the intellectual muscles with exacting exercises.

These colleges know that the greatest danger of our society rests in the complacent or stagnant segments of our society, which are possessed with a spirit of frustration that numbs innovations and engulfs us in the valley of desparing lethargy which narrows the horizons of tomorrow. Colleges for our times will not let this happen because they know their responsibilities and they must provide leaders of men who will lead many within our society out of their caves of stagnation into the glorious sunlight of an age of realization and an age of change, movement, and within this change must be found achievement, opportunity, progress, and direction.

Colleges for our times have not been reluctant about experimenting with new ideas. They have faced squarely classroom revolutions and their students are now masters of a new mathematics from Set Theory and Non-Euclidean Geometry to probability and statistical thinking—of new physics, biology, and chemistry, or the language laboratory or the teaching machine. They are demanding—and are ready for—far more advanced work than their predecessors. They have new patterns of organization, new uses for such hardware as televisions, computers and tapes. And they have kept abreast of the new experiments which cut across the country from California to Maine, and across the centuries from the founding of Harvard to the newest institution for higher education in the country.

The second important characteristic of colleges for our times is that they must be conversant with the important problems and aspirations of our society. Education looks to the future, and is inevitably an attempt to shape the future. Today, the road ahead is crowded by the danger of nuclear war, and the enormity of this threat blocks our vision. We have the difficult task of facing this threat, and at the same time looking beyond it. If we fail to look beyond it, the long-term future loses all reality for us, then educational strategies degenerate into spasmotic responses to the alarms of the moment—as they have today. If we free ourselves for a moment from preoccupation with the nuclear problem, we encounter another spector that haunts the modern mind.

When archeologists unearth ancient civilizations that have flourished in the past and now have died, the modern mind, acutely conscious of the sweep of history and chronologically apprehensive, is quick to ask, "Is it our turn now?" It is our turn to provide a new thrust for our society. A revitalization for the youth of our society. And this must come from new ideas which will produce for us a different kind of education; an education that takes persons into account, that seeks, fosters, and builds on the universal human quest.

An education guided by unattainable values, creating its own procedures from insights which reflect detailed knowledge of aspirations, needs, and desires of our society.

In order to do this, we must be aware of the rapid changes which are taking place in the world around us. We must seek to know the changes, study them, analyze them, interpret them and try to understand them.

Colleges for our times are conversant with the important problems and aspirations of our society and are fully aware of the fact that we live in a changing world and that change will be with us always. We must admit that we live in a world characterized by an intricate webb of different economic systems and cultures and that we are dependent upon systems and cultures other than our own. We must not close our eyes to change. This will not stop it. The great social change which has been brought on by the contributions of science and technology is tremendous but many of us have not accepted this in the reorganization of our programs. The success of colleges for our times in producing change in society is contingent upon their willingness and ability to adapt themselves to changes. These colleges must be institutions which change society and which are also changed by our society. If these colleges falter in adjusting themselves to new conditions and new challenges, their ability to give direction to and to affect social change will be diminished on all levels.

As science and technology build our world, as specialization and mechanical refinement create for us a material paradise, colleges for our times must not completely surrender to material accomplishments as desirable ends in themselves. Somehow at the core of man's being, there must be a sense of oneness and wholeness.

Emerson expressed this idea in 1837: "There is one man—present to all particular men only partially, or through one faculty; and you must take the whole society to find the whole man. Man is not a farmer or a professor, or an engineer, but he is all. Man is priest, and scholar, and statesman, and producer and soldier. In the divided or social state, these functions are parceled out to individuals. Each of whom aims to do his stint of the joint work while each other performs his."

It is the function of education to restore to man his sense of wholeness. If we are to have men with a sense of their intrinsic value with the belief that meaning exists in the universe and with a commitment to the mission in life, we must look to higher education to produce them. Such men so educated can make vital again the promise of the American dream, which Thomas Wolfe spoke of when he said, "So then, to every man his chance—to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become what his manhood and his vision can make him—this, seeker, is the promise of America."

Colleges for our times are aware of our loss of individuality as we have become a part of the lonely crowd and our surrender to the social rather than the individual ethics as we have become organization man. In addition, they know that John Galbraith in "The Affluent Society" has said that we have become materialistic and this threatens the stability and integrity of our society. John Keith and Vance Packard have viewed our uniformed housing developments and detected the crack in the picture window and have seen our material possessions as bolstering our uncertain egos and have seen us as status seekers, yielding without reason to the hidden persuaders. Colleges of our times, however, have a program which restores this wholeness to man and ends his desperate search for meaning.

The third important characteristic of colleges for our time is that they have a clear sense of direction and a constant, rigorous evaluation program. A college can be established almost by accident. It can continue to operate by the force of habit, but it can thrive only on purpose that is clear in the minds of all who work with it. There must be clearly defined purposes and objectives which give direction to the development of the institution and which make it possible to develop a coherent and consistent program with a unity apparent to students, faculty, and the clientele generally.

A well conceived statement of purposes suggest directions of development and requires consideration of the future as well as the past. The earmark of a college with clear purposes is that it knows why it is doing whatever it is doing, and it also knows where it is going. A college must do its level best to produce competent graduates, intellectually competent in major branches of human knowledge, vocationally competent in their chosen field of work, socially competent as members of the human society. The concept of competence as a major goal of a college is not utilitarian or narrow. It is simply another way of describing what has been historically called scholarship.

The college graduate should be proud to answer to the name of scholar, since scholarship is a chief aim of a college education. But scholarship has meaning only when it is translated into action as habitual modes of thinking and a lifelong way of living. In our increasingly materialistic society, mere competence without conscience may produce specialists who are irresponsible, technicians who are uncommitted, or educators who are snobs.

Colleges for our times, therefore, should be concerned about the development of graduates of distinctive conscience, ones who have very strong, positive and active ideas about values. Personal commitment to ethical and aesthetic principles of individual and social importance will make a difference in the way one lives. This commitment to conscience, as a major goal of a college means that it must ascribe to intellectual freedom. Teachers without integrity to stand boldly with their own convictions cannot hope that their students will dare to be men and women of personal integrity themselves. Only on the basis of personal integrity can an individual social conscience be built.

Colleges for our times must be able to develop young minds that are powerful in their analysis, accurate in their judgment,

positive in their identification, original and creative in their approach to the solution of problems, and intelligent in the application of knowledge. No aim in higher education should be short of this mark. Colleges for our times have high expectations of themselves and are constantly engaged in brutal scrutiny of their programs. And from this incessant self-analysis, the compass of educational objectives is adjusted for new directions and new expectations on the high seas of educational endeavor.

In summary, therefore, the three most important characteristics for colleges of our times are that (1) they must be dynamic and aggressive in the arena of human thought, (2) they must be conversant with the important problems and aspirations of our society, and (3) they must have a clear sense of direction and a constant rigorous evaluation program.

A. & T. College takes its place today among these colleges for our times. We hope that we can keep before us these three important characteristics. This college is known in every corner of the globe. It commands the respect and admiration of scholars the world over. Its alumni have significant influence, not only in the realm of learning, but also in business, industry, government, and the professions. Its graduates stand tall among some of the most illustrous scholars and citizens of our time, both in this country and abroad. We are, therefore, encompassed by a cloud of witnesses, men and women whose loyalty, intelligence, integrity, usefulness, and influence—nearly 11,000 of them, who carry the torch high for A. & T. College in every corner of the globe.

This college, however, like all colleges, is not perfect. It has not reached its zenith in improvement. The hunger of our aspirations still pain us, and the dreams of our institution have not all come true. In the years ahead, if God be willing, we shall carry forward with all our strength the great work in which we are engaged, building upon the splendid foundation erected by our predecessors, striving for excellence in all we do. We shall be alert to the complex problems, the deep conflicts and the tremendous challenges in the world, and keep before us the vision of bringing light to our youth, knowledge to our people, progress to our State, strength to our Nation, and, hopefully, wisdom to ourselves.

"O Lord God, when Thou givest to Thy servants to endeavour any great matter, grant us also to know that it is not the beginning, but the continuing of the same until it be thoroughly finished, which yieldeth the true glory; through Him that for the finishing of Thy work laid down His life, our Redeemer Jesus Christ. Amen."—Sir Francis Drake's Prayer.

Wisconsin Legislature Opposes Closing of Veterans Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin State Legislature has passed a joint resolution (S.J. Res. 35) memorializing the Congress of the United States to prevent the proposed closing of many veterans hospitals and other veterans facilities.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of the joint resolution at this point in the RECORD.

The resolution referred to follows:

A JOINT RESOLUTION BY THE STATE OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE—S.J. RES. 35

Resolution memorializing Congress to prevent the proposed closing of many veterans hospitals and other veterans facilities

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has recently announced plans to close 11 veterans hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and 17 regional offices throughout the Nation; and

Whereas by closing these facilities in the name of "economy," the Veterans' Administration will throw the cost of providing welfare and health programs for ailing veterans who have no way of traveling great distances to a VA facility upon the local citizenry, and will deprive many veterans ready accessibility to the facilities which might mean the difference between life and death in emergency cases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to prevent the implementation of the recent Veterans' Administration directive to close these hospitals, domiciliaries and regional offices; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration and to each member of the congressional delegation from Wisconsin.

PATRICK GLUY,
President of the Senate.
ROBERT T. HUBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
WILLIAM P. NUGENT,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JAMES P. BUCKLEY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Wipe Out the Klan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. MACKAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, the De Kalb New Era, one of Georgia's strongest weekly newspapers, published an editorial on April 1, 1965, commending President Johnson's decision to make war on the Ku Klux Klan. This newspaper has demonstrated courage on many issues and it often voices eloquently the thoughts and attitudes of many of the finest people in Georgia.

The editorial, entitled "Wipe Out the Klan," is reprinted here in full:

WIPE OUT THE KLAN

It has escaped attention of many American citizens that the Ku Klux Klan is listed on the Attorney General's roster of subversive organizations right along with the Communist Party in the United States. All decent Americans have a contempt for both.

Therefore we applaud President Johnson's decision to make war on the Klan and perform a surgical operation to eliminate it as a cancer on the American body politic. Although we do not always agree with the President's thinking in other realms of civil rights, he has our 100-percent backing in his campaign to wipe out the Klan.

The original Ku Klux Klan, founder in the Reconstruction period following the Civil War, had a noble purpose—to protect the wives and daughters of southerners from outrages. It served that end. After World War I it fell into the hands of those like the late Hiram Evans, of Atlanta, who used it to fill their bank boxes with money from people who hated Negroes, Catholics, Jews, and all minority groups.

Today one is inclined to view the bedraggled splinter groups of the Klan as a joke until some of their rabid members commit murder.

Klansmen wrap themselves in the American flag and pretend to be patriots. Actually they are enemies of law and order.

There are large numbers of Klansmen in De Kalb County. In Tucker the name of the Ku Klux Klan is emblazoned on an office window. In Stone Mountain, Jimmy Venable exercises his wizardry over a splinter group of the Klan. We know the names of others. So do many of their neighbors.

As President Johnson has warned, all honest men who have blundered into the Klan would be well advised to get out before the Federal Government cleans them out.

The Problem of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I recommend for the attention of the House part of a letter I received in response to my questionnaire-newsletter. The writer, Lawrence S. Finklestain, an official of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, has obviously given a great deal of thought to the problem of Vietnam, and I know you will find his remarks penetrating and well reasoned.

The letter follows:

APRIL 5, 1965.

DEAR DONALD: Thank you for your letter of April 2 explaining your vote about the Appalachia bill. I think your reasoning is respectable, even though I am more impressed than you appear to be by the argument that pockets of poverty pose problems for the whole Nation to which a national response is justified. What is the available alternative to the kind of bill which was adopted? I am not sure the analogy is a good one, but would it really be in the interest of the Nation to wait for a national transportation program instead of tackling the glaring weak spots, such as the railroad situation in the New York metropolitan area?

Attached to your letter was your report to your constituents, for which I am indeed grateful, and your questionnaire, for which I heartily congratulate you. I think this is a splendid idea, and I am sure you will get a warm response to it.

The one question I didn't really answer was the one about Vietnam, about which, as you might guess, I have thought a great deal. My general conclusion is that I unequivocally support the administration's contention that we do have an obligation to help the defense of Vietnam, that our effort to do so is consistent not only with our national interests but with the principles to which we subscribe in the U.N. Charter and to the principles of international law, and that our failure to support our undertakings in this area would be corrosive to the will of neighboring countries and their capacity to survive.

Moreover, I agree with the administration that to talk of settlement in circumstances in which the balance of advantage in the field lies with the other side is harmful to our interests and to the interest of those objectives in Vietnam to which we are com-

mitted. I agree also with the administration belief that the will of this Nation can significantly influence the outcome of events. Thus, I support the basic purpose and philosophy of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

However, I begin to have difficulty with the administration over the question of the appropriate and effective means. I sincerely hope that the events prove me wrong, but as of this moment and since the beginning of the new line of policy, I have had serious doubts as to whether air attacks on the north would produce the results that are hoped for, because I have doubts as to their relevance to the real problems we confront. It may still prove to be the case that our air attacks can confront the North Vietnamese with the necessity to pay so high a price to continue their support of insurrection in South Vietnam that they would conclude that the best thing for them to do is to stop. Alternatively, the threat our military action poses to the peace of the region and perhaps of the world may be so great as to invite impartial intervention, making possible a negotiated settlement that takes adequate account of our concern for conditions permitting a viable South Vietnam to emerge and prosper. At this juncture, the latter seems obviously a more likely outcome than the former. However, as you will no doubt already have noted, these are not really alternative conclusions but different forms of the same conclusion, namely, North Vietnamese willingness to stop supporting insurrection in the south.

My doubts stem from the known facts. While it is not true that the South Vietnamese Government has shown itself militarily incompetent, it is true it has not shown a capacity to govern and to attract the support of its populace which are necessary conditions for a viable outcome. It is certainly true that a viable situation in the South requires that the Vietcong use of terror be neutralized. That is a problem which is partially met by relevant military responses. However, it will not be adequately met unless the population wants to support the Government in the campaign. That requires political capability as well as military capability on the part of the South Vietnamese Government.

If I am correct in my judgment that the relevant competence does not adequately exist, serious questions arise. The first is why the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Government (insofar as these are separable factors) should decide to give up a winning campaign. The evidence seems to be that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Government believe it worth their while to persist because they believe that, despite the air raids, they are likely to win. Second, supposing that the air raids do succeed in putting an end to the support the North Vietnamese are giving to the insurrection, what happens then?

I don't see much evidence as to what it is the U.S. Government would expect to have happen in those circumstances. Perhaps, it would be possible to have a foreign presence—U.S. forces, an international commission of control such as those which have supervised the 1954 Geneva agreement, or a U.N. peacekeeping mission of some kind—to try to prevent a resumption of the flow of outside support. In my judgment, such an arrangement would be useful but could never be more than partially effective, given the will to evade the agreements reached, in the circumstances and the terrain of Vietnam. However, even assuming a relatively high degree of effectiveness of such a control arrangement, what would happen among the Vietcong? Why should it be assumed that they too would renounce their objectives? It is worth recalling that, after the 1954 agreement, there was a period of relative calm in the South which led to the outbreak of terror and violence after the passage of some years. Should we not anticipate the same sequence, as the most optimistic situation we can hope for?

I agree, therefore, that there is ground for disagreement among responsible people as to how the United States should behave. If I had access to the information and experience available to those in the Government who make these decisions, I might perhaps agree with them. However, from my existing perspective, I find it difficult to believe that the means that have been chosen are the right ones to achieve the results we would like. My own view is that the correct course of action would have been to continue doing what we were doing, before the air strikes were launched, but more vigorously and more effectively. If an American intervention is needed, it seems to me that it is needed in support of the South Vietnamese effort to contain the guerrilla war in the South and to strengthen the capacity of the South Vietnamese Government to govern and to contribute to the welfare of the people. (Incidentally, I doubt that experience supports the belief that air attacks will actually cut off the flow of external support. I think that requires effective ground action also.)

My conclusion, therefore, is that the U.S. commitment to the support of South Vietnam really requires even more difficult decisions than we have taken. The decision to resort to the air weapon is attractive because it superficially converts the war into the kind of war that we are best at. I wonder whether the real problem is for us to do better at fighting the kind of war we are not so good at, even if that means the politically difficult decision to accept a major commitment of American ground forces to Vietnam. Such a commitment, in my judgment would be more relevant to the real needs. It would be a significant indicator of the intention of this country not to suffer a defeat in the area. It is, obviously, an unattractive decision to have to take, but the situation we confront is in no sense an attractive one.

I recognize, incidentally, that the approach I advocate has a major disadvantage, in addition to the obvious ones that we would surely suffer important casualties and would run some risk of not being adequate to the task. That major disadvantage is that the kind of war I would have us fighting would be very difficult to run without a higher degree of American responsibility for the conduct of the war and hence of intervention in South Vietnamese affairs than now exists. South Vietnam would be an American appendage, with all the political and propaganda disadvantages that would involve, and we would find it very difficult to disengage ourselves from South Vietnam for a long time after the fighting had successfully stopped. However, it should be clear that I don't believe there is any easy way out of this mess, and I think we might well be facing up to the full measure of the trouble we are in and to the responsibility we have accepted.

I'll bet you didn't expect to get this kind of a response when you sent around that printed questionnaire. I apologize for it. I am sure you have a circular file available for such contingencies as this.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE S. FINKELSTEIN.

Teenage Drinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, drinking on the part of teenagers has become a national problem. I have sponsored H.R. 5418, which would raise the minimum drinking age in the District of Columbia for all alcoholic beverages to 21. I have also sponsored House Concurrent Resolution 355 urging my own State of New York to change its law to prohibit drinking by anyone under the age of 21.

The Saturday Evening Post of April 10, 1965, contained an article about this problem which I commend to the attention of our colleagues.

The article follows:

TEENAGE DRINKING

(By Bill Davidson)

Shortly after 7 o'clock one evening last May, Gary Hanlon and another 17-year-old boy left Southbury, Conn., to drink in nearby Putnam Lake, N.Y. For a 17-year-old, New York's minimum-drinking age of 18 is more easily circumvented than Connecticut's minimum of 21; the boys, in fact, had already made three drinking expeditions, across the State line that day.

At 7:34 p.m., a gas-station attendant saw Hanlon's car speed up Connecticut's winding Route 39 at about 75 miles an hour, approaching from the south a dangerous curve known as Taylor's Corner. At the same moment, a New Fairfield, Conn., banker named Louis Tanzella was heading into Taylor's Corner from the north, driving his brand-new automobile at a sedate 35 miles an hour. With him were his wife and daughter.

Hanlon's car couldn't make the curve. It hurtled into the left lane, out of control. Tanzella, seeing the car coming at him head-long, tried to steer up the steep bank beside the road. Hanlon hit him broadside. The crash was heard half a mile away. Tanzella and his wife were killed instantly; their daughter died the next morning. It took hours of work with blowtorches to free Tanzella's body from the wreckage. Scanning the banker's blood-soaked driver's license, a highway patrolman noted that it was Tanzella's 54th birthday.

Hanlon's companion survived the crash; Hanlon did not. "A sample of Hanlon's blood," the coroner reported, "revealed a blood-alcohol level of 0.14, a high reading. It was the equivalent of nearly seven ounces of 86-proof whisky in his system."

The Hanlon tragedy made headlines in the local newspapers, but it received almost no notice elsewhere. A month later, however, a similar case—that of 18-year-old Michael Smith—did get national attention. After drinking 12 Scotches at a party in the affluent New York City suburb of Darien, Conn., Smith wrecked his car; his date, 17-year-old Nancy Hitchings, was killed. The incident gained notoriety not because of the teenage drinking so much as because the parents and other adults who had supervised the party were arrested under an unusual and seldom-enforced law.

For every celebrated case such as Michael Smith's there are a thousand obscure cases like Hanlon's tucked away in police files across the Nation. Perhaps because the statistics are hard to get at, the phenomenon of adolescent drinking has not been intensively researched. In the past 20 years there have been perhaps five major studies by outstanding sociologists, and all have tended to play down the problem.

The studies acknowledge that a good many teenagers drink—as few as 50 percent of teenagers in some parts of the country and as many as 86 percent in others. But the studies maintain that, as one authority put it, "most of them don't drink much." Dr. Selden D. Bacon of the Rutgers University Center of Alcohol Studies likes to point out that more 12- and 13-year-old drunks were admitted to New York City's Bellevue Hospital in 1890 than have been brought in for drunkenness in any recent year. When

learned societies discuss the subject, one speaker or another is sure to elicit chuckles by quoting an anicent Egyptian or Sumerian inscription that laments youthful imbibing in the same alarmed phrases used by the press today.

The social scientists say that since 7 out of 10 American adults (or nearly 80 million people) drink, it should not be surprising if proportionately large numbers of children follow the adult example. Nevertheless, they add, the percentage of teenage drinkers hasn't changed much in the last 20 years. Of the 10.9 million American youngsters between the ages of 15 and 20 who are "users" of alcohol, "only" about 3 percent have difficulty with drink—that is, "only" about 3 percent are prealcoholics or turn to alcohol because of deep-rooted emotional problems.

To the social scientist this percentage is "not statistically significant." To the average American, however, it most certainly is. As one Pennsylvania educator put it: "That so-called statistically insignificant 3 percent means that a third of a million kids are running around the United States capable of killing themselves or innocent people and causing millions of dollars worth of damage. * * * Statistically insignificant? I wonder what the smug sociologists would say if we had an invading army of about a third of a million men loose in our country with the same potential of causing death and destruction."

It is the behavior of this troublesome 3 percent that has stirred most of the new national concern over teenage drinking. The problem drinkers, of course, are not evenly distributed across the country. There are fewer, for instance, in midwestern communities with Baptist-Methodist traditions of abstinence, and more in east and west coast communities where the country-club ethic prevails. But few areas have escaped altogether the rampages of young drinkers.

For example, the much-publicized case of the socially prominent youngsters who ransacked a Long Island mansion after a coming-out party in 1963 was matched several months ago in little Hastings, Nebr., where some 40 boys and girls commandeered a vacant farmhouse for a drinking party. Before the night was over they had wrecked the place in an orgy of wanton destruction. In the exclusive Portola Valley suburb of San Francisco 13 boys—aged 12 to 17 and all from wealthy families—engaged in a yearlong alcoholic spree in which they set a school on fire, shoplifted, broke into a dentist's office to find novocain, robbed houses, and stole the hubcaps and smashed the windows of parked cars.

In California, teenagers often induce derelicts to buy alcoholic beverages for them. Not long ago three boys in their mid-teens paid a bum to buy them a case of beer. After they had drunk with the old fellow for an hour or so, the boys got rambunctious and started to stone his shack. When the derelict tried to chase them away, the youngest boy threw a brick at the old man, hitting him on the head. The police found his body several hours later, his skull bashed in. Capt. W. L. Richey, commander of the Juvenile Division of the Los Angeles police, said, "This is a clear case of where teenage drinking led directly to murder."

More and more concerned Americans are coming to realize that underage drinking frequently leads to murder of a sort—to slaughter on the highways. In the last 2 years more than 10,000 persons have been killed in accidents caused by drunken drivers; and more than 4,000 of those fatalities were caused by teenaged drunks. In 1963 there were 112 such fatalities in California alone.

Social scientists who study adolescent drinking tend to deplore the recitation of statistics like these. They say that since 97 percent of drinking teenagers drink moderately, the misdeeds of the immoderate 3 percent should not be emphasized. Some argue that the 3 percent are emotionally disturbed and would be getting into trouble even if they didn't drink.

Sociologist George L. Maddox of Duke University disagrees. "If a youngster is in trouble," he says, "with drinking he's in worse trouble." Another dissenter is Dr. Robert E. Gould, head of Adolescent Services of the Psychiatric Division at Manhattan's Bellevue Hospital. "With the widespread and socially accepted pattern of teenage drinking in America today," Gould says, "you can never tell when deviant or pathological drinking is going to develop out of emotional disturbances and pressures already within the adolescent. If the soil is ready, problem-drinking will grow out of it."

There are several reasons why teenage drinking has become so widespread and so accepted in recent years.

"This current crop of teenagers," says sociologist Harold Hodgkinson, dean of Bard College, "was born in the period following World War II. Their fathers had recently returned from the horror and boredom and deprivation of military life, and their mothers, too, were suddenly released from the overall tension of war. The result was a feeling of elation and relief, and a compulsion for wanting everything to be pleasant. This led to an unusual relaxation of discipline by parents in the governing of their own lives and also in their rearing of their children. We went through a period of extreme permissiveness in dealing with youngsters; the drinking went along with that. Parents drank more themselves, and as their kids grew up the parents didn't seem to care whether their youngsters were experimenting with alcohol or whether they were setting a bad example for their children."

Richard J. Hughes, who as Governor of New Jersey, has crusaded for firmer controls on teenage drinking, explains the increase somewhat differently. "It seems strange," says Hughes, "to blame a situation like this on the general prosperity we're all enjoying in America today, but I'm afraid that's at the heart of the problem. In the 1930's, during the depression, youngsters didn't have the money to buy beer or whiskey or cars. In the early 1940's most of our young men were at war, and those who reached adolescence after the war were struggling along in family situations in which their fathers were trying to reestablish themselves economically after serving in the military. It wasn't until the 1950's and 1960's that the trouble started. With good times, kids got sizable allowances, or they got well-paying jobs after school. Suddenly they had money to experiment with things like drinking. The wealthier kids got cars from their parents; the poorer kids had enough money of their own to buy a jalopy. So for the first time on a large scale we had that very dangerous combination of inexperienced drinking and inexperienced driving."

(Medical authorities have discovered why the combination of drinking and driving is especially dangerous for young people. "The younger age group," says Dr. Johan Lofthus of Norway, one of the world's leading experts on alcoholism, "has on the whole a lower blood-alcohol level. This seems to mean that the younger people [who drink] tend to get into trouble more easily while driving a car, since they have a lower alcohol tolerance than older drivers.")

A third and important explanation for the surge in teenage drinking is that our adolescents are reflecting the persistent tensions of American society itself. Today's youngsetrs have never known a world at peace. The boys face the military draft and also increasingly bitter competition to get into college or to get and hold good jobs. Many girls, too, face the struggle of getting into college, and many drift into unhappy early marriages. Like the adults around them, these boys and girls often resort to alcohol to help them cope with their tensions.

Even for the vast 97-percent majority of youngsters who drink without incident, drinking becomes what Duke University's Dr. George Maddox calls a natural form of "adult role-playing." Battling to be recognized as adults and not children, the youngsters seize upon drinking as a widely recognized symbol of American adulthood. Maddox points out that when a drinking teenager proves his maturity in more substantial ways, such as marrying happily or acquiring and holding a good job, he is likely to stop drinking.

Nearly all experts agree that "adult role-playing" is the key factor in today's widespread teenage drinking phenomenon. Sometimes it takes extreme forms. In San Francisco, for example, a 15-year-old boy, having observed his parents drinking heavily every night, assembled six of his friends, found a bottle of bourbon in his fathers' liquor cabinet and downed it all at once. Nothing happened, so his friends suggested he try "cocktails." The boy then drank two water glasses filled to the brim with a mixture of Scotch, bourbon and vermouth. An instant later the boy fell to the floor unconscious, and his friends rushed him to Junipero Serra Hospital. He was in danger of drowning in his own vomit, and so a doctor performed a tracheotomy, opening a hole through his throat into his windpipe, enabling him to breathe. Eighteen hours later the boy finally came out of his coma and survived, but just barely. Sixteen normal drinks of whiskey taken at once can be a fatal dose. This boy had swallowed the equivalent of nearly 50.

"Teenage drinking," says Dr. Maddox, "usually follows the old adage, 'Like father, like son.' If the child sees his parents drinking excessivelly and compulsively, he'll believe that's the way adults act, and in his adult role-playing he'll act accordingly. If the parents drink just socially and in moderation, the chances are the child will drink that way too."

Most psychiatrists agree, but they point out that the adolescent's concept of the adult role is also affected by what he reads in books and sees in movies and on television. The fictional drunk is often a romantic figure—the surgeon who could be the best in the world if he didn't tipple; the attractive, comical life-of-the-party drunk; and the very masculine, hard-drinking hero of the James Bond stripe. "The danger of these influences on a teenager who has feelings of inadequacy," says Bellevue Hospital psychiatrist Dr. Robert E. Gould, "is that the youngster will drink as an excuse for his deficiencies, like the drunken doctor; or he will drink because maybe that will make him the life of the party, which he couldn't hope to be ordinarily; or he will drink to prove his masculinity. He doesn't realize that excessive drinking frequently connotes just the opposite of masculinity. Often it is used by adults to cover up latent homosexuality or sexual impotence."

These, in sum, are the major findings of the experts. Do these views coincide with those of the individuals directly involved—the teenagers themselves? In hundreds of interviews all over the United States, startlingly similar opinions were repeatedly expressed by youngsters who had never heard of the experts or their opinions.

Take, for example, these three young residents of Danbury, Conn. Seventeen-year-old Mary Lou Chambers unwittingly documented the adult-role-playing theory when she said, "The kids I've seen drinking hard liquor don't really like it. They take a deep breath and force the stuff down their throats. They're just doing it because they're trying to prove how grownup they are." Paul

Carroccio, 16, seemed to echo Gov. Richard Hughes' speculations about automobiles and prosperity: "Overall," he said, "I think that kids who become heavy drinkers are also heavily indulged by their parents. For example, one of my former friends was given an allowance of $20 a week—at the age of 17. His parents also gave him a new car. When he started in high school, he was a straight A student. Then he began driving over the New York border to drink with his friends. By the time he was 19 he had smashed up a couple of cars, he had dropped out of school, and now his parents have thrown him out of the house." And 17-year-old Dorothy Battista gave a perfect illustration of Dr. Gould's life-of-the-party theory: "This girl friend of mine was very unpopular. She started to go over to New York to drink in bars so boys would pay attention to her. Now she goes with a divorced man, and I think she's beginning to sniff dope. Her grades have dropped so that I don't think she'll ever finish school."

In Chicago, an 18-year-old boy unknowingly admitted drinking to cover up for sexual inadequacy. "I don't know what's wrong with me," he said. "When I go with a girl and it's getting serious, and I have a big date with her, I'll go out with my friends and get drunk and I never make the date."

No social scientist could ask for a better example of drinking to excuse failure than that of the 17-year-old in Lansing, Mich., who said, "You gotta have straight A's to get into any of the good engineering schools. This year, when the cops picked me up for drunk driving after that accident I had, I figured I'd never get into a good school anyway, so I gave up even though I'm sure I could have made it without that black mark on my record."

The interviews with young drinkers compellingly depict the failure of State laws prohibiting the sale of alcoholic beverages to minors. Every single youngster told of the ease with which he was able to obtain whisky, wine, or beer through various stratagems. The situation is particularly acute in the States adjacent to New York, which allows 18-year-olds to buy all forms of alcoholic beverages. Teenage spas have sprung up all along the border—in towns like Port Chester and Brewster, N.Y.—to which adolescents from neighboring States flock to drink. Governor Hughes, of New Jersey, and Gov. John Dempsey, of Connecticut, are leading an intensive and so far unsuccessful campaign to get New York to raise its drinking age, too, to prevent the slaughter of out-of-State teenagers returning home in their cars from drinking bouts across the border.

Recently the New York border situation has deteriorated into near-open warfare, with State-police road blocks sometimes making border crossings as complicated for teenagers as those at Berlin's Checkpoint Charlie. Not long ago a New England Governors' Conference in Boston passed a fiery resolution deploring the "ever-widening impact of personal tragedy," and calling on the New York Legislature to see the error of its ways. Last month Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York reluctantly declared that he would sign a bill raising the State's minimum drinking age to 21, if the legislature passed one; at this writing, the legislature is considering several.

Throughout the Nation there is a trend toward more stringent legal solutions to the teenage drinking problem. In Redwood City, Calif., last January, Municipal Court Judge Roy Seagraves sentenced Mr. and Mrs. James Melton to spend 10 days in jail and a year on probation for allowing their teenage sons to give a beer party. After the death of the Hitchings girl in the Darien tragedy, Judge Rodney S. Elelson levied stiff fines against adults who had served liquor to the teenagers. Ohio now has a law imposing a fine and even a jail sentence on any teenager misrepresenting his age to a bartender through "false identification or other information"; other States are following suit. Several States now suspend a car's registration if a teenager drives it while drunk. This causes the parent as well as the youngser to lose the use of the car, and it is proving to be a serious deterrent.

Complicating the job of controlling teenage drinking are the tavern and nightclub owners in many parts of the country who cater to the teenage trade. On Long Island, for example, there are clubs that aim directly at the teenager with cash to spend. They even advertise on rock 'n' roll stations, assuring listeners that teenagers' clothing is perfectly acceptable and promising the best in wham-bam music. The tough, young crowd they draw suggests that they are favorite rendezvous for local dropouts.

Many places have set up nonalcoholic nightclubs exclusively for young people. These clubs seldom last long. Notable exceptions are southern California's Cinnamon Cinder clubs (there are four of them). Waitresses serve cola drinks and coffee, and certain informal clothing (levis and capris) is outlawed. Still, despite the restrictions, the clubs are always jammed.

The success of the Cinder clubs notwithstanding, it seems strongly apparent to most observers that the best answer to the teenage drinking problem is sanity in the home. Few authorities suggest that parents practice total abstinence. Most psychiatrists believe that social drinking by parents is harmless so long as it does not become a fetish, and so long as the child is brought up reasonably well. The strong family unit, they say, is the strongest defense against problem drinking. It is a recorded phenomenon, for example, that the children of Italian-American and Jewish parents begin sipping wine ceremonially with their families at an exteremely early age. And yet problem drinking is rare in these groups because of the strong parental influence that frowns on excesses of any kind.

"Unfortunately," says Dr. Selden Bacon, of Rutgers, "not too many American parents apply this sort of restraint on themselves, let alone their children. Today, most Americans are afraid to tell anyone he is drinking too much, for fear of being called a square or a bluenose. We're the only nation in the world where it is not a disgrace for someone to be sloppy drunk in public. If parents rid themselves of this attitude, it would immediately reflect itself in their children. The tragedy of the Darien, Conn., incident was not that the boy got drunk and killed the girl in the car crash, but that not a single adult had the courage to stop him when he was getting drunk."

"AFTER 12 CANS OF BEER, I FEEL LIKE A MAN"

"I'm a beer drinker," said the boy, a handsome 17-year-old in beige chino trousers. "I don't like any kind of hard liquor. When I was 15, this friend of mine and I got together after school one Friday afternoon and started drinking vodka and orange juice. I got so sick I couldn't even go to school on Monday. So I stick to beer. I usually drink two six-packs at a time, maybe twice a week. I still feel good after the two six-packs, and I still can drive.

"We got a 21-year-old minimum age for drinking here in California," he said, "but it's a joke. You can buy a fake draft card or driver's license for about $5 right here in town. Most of the time it isn't worth the trouble to do that, though, because liquor's so available. All I'd have to do is call the liquor store down on the corner, and they send a bottle or a case of beer over with a 12- or 13-year-old kid, and you give him a quarter tip, and he doesn't say anything. Or, if you're driving around, you wait until you see a wino, get him to go in and buy it for you, and then you give him a quarter."

Asked how drinking affected him, the boy smiled and ran his hand through his thick, curly blond hair. "After polishing off 12 cans of beer, I feel happy," he said. "I feel like a man instead of a kid. Nothing bothers me, and everything is funny. You know, it builds up your courage and your ego. It's fun. You forget about everything else.

"One night, four of us got together and bought three cases of beer. We started about 5 in the afternoon and kept drinking until 11.30 that night. Tom had his car, but he wasn't sober enough to drive, so he just said to take him home and bring back the car in the morning. We dropped him off at his house, but when we looked back, he was walking in the wrong direction. So we got out and led him back to his house and pushed him through the front door. He told us he woke up on the kitchen floor at 3 in the morning. When he first got up the next day, he almost called the police because he forgot about loaning his car. It was a howl.

"Most of the cops are pretty cool. When they see you drinking beer in a car, they'll make you pour it out, but they won't do anything beyond that. The worst they can do is suspend your driver's license temporarily, but then, of course, you can tell them you have to drive to school. Then they blame it on the parents, but you usually get the license back.

"My parents? All my life they tell me 'no' about drinking, and then I come home and see them so loaded they're bouncing from wall to wall. They worry about me? OK, so they worry. It's too bad. They don't like to admit it, but I'm as grownup as they are."

The Cyprus Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1965, I communicated with Secretary Rusk concerning our policy in the eastern Mediterranean. My inquiry was based on reports of intensified military preparations by military powers particularly in the Cyprus area. It is obvious that the U.S. position in the eastern Mediterranean is to preserve the right of self-determination within the geographical boundaries involved. Our NATO commitments as well as our United Nations efforts are all involved.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the reply I received from Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Douglas MacArthur II. I subscribe to the statement of policy that—

What is needed is a really serious spirit of accommodation which could revive cooperation and ultimately friendship among the nations and communities concerned, and which at the same time could relieve the United Nations and the world from the burdens and dangers which this strike has too long imposed upon them.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 7, 1965.

The Honorable JOHN M. MURPHY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURPHY: Thank you for your letter of April 1 enclosing a letter from Mr. James T. Triveley of Staten Island, N.Y., concerning the situation in Cyprus.

We have noted the newspaper articles cited by AHEPA and agree fully that peace must be preserved between Greece and Turkey. The Cyprus crisis, now more than a year old, has had increasingly serious effects on the security of the eastern Mediterranean, on relations between our two NATO allies, Greece and Turkey and on the Western Alliance. We have actively supported the United Nations peacekeeping force on the island in its delicate and difficult task. It is due both to the efforts of the U.N. and to the efforts of the United States in continually urging moderation and restraint upon all parties that a relative calm has existed on Cyprus over the past 6 months and peace has, in fact, been preserved so far between Greece and Turkey.

Simply preserving the peace, however, is not enough. Our objective is not just peacekeeping, but peacemaking. In addition to our efforts at preventing war, we have firmly supported the U.N. mediation activity and have been alert to every opportunity to encourage movement toward a reconciliation of differences and a start to discussions which could lead to a settlement both equitable and permanent.

Recent days and weeks have seen developments which are in some ways ominous and in others promising. We have noted reports of a buildup of Soviet-supplied arms in Cyprus and a certain bellicosity in press reports from the area. However, we have also noted reports that may indicate more willingness to ease tensions or to entertain some thought of conciliation. We believe this is vitally necessary. As Ambassador Stevenson said before the United Nations Security Council on March 19, "What is needed now is not a stale repetition of charges and countercharges or a grim adherence to every detail of traditional positions but, on the contrary, a really serious spirit of accommodation which could revive cooperation, and ultimately, friendship among the nations and communities concerned, and which at the same time could relieve the United Nations and the world from the burdens and dangers which this strife has too long imposed upon them." This is our policy and it is toward this end that all our efforts are directed.

If I may be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

GOP Comeback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the recent success of the Republican Party in local elections in the State of Illinois, as related in the following editorials of the Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago Tribune, indicates that the GOP is very much alive and can win when capable candidates are offered to the voters and party workers put forth the necessary effort. These elections were clearly a test of strength between the Republicans and the Democrats who have been entrenched in office for many years, and the margin of votes gained by Republican candidates clearly points out that an aggressive campaign can bring victory. The recent results of the local elections in Cook County, Ill., are a good sign for those who believe in a two-party system.

The articles follow:

GOP COMEBACK IN BERWYN

Republicans concentrating on rebuilding their party at the grassroots level should be encouraged by some of the results of local elections in Cook County Tuesday. Berwyn, particularly, made party leaders happy. Fourteenth largest city in Illinois, Berwyn elected its first Republican mayor since 1929. It elected a Republican city treasurer and cut a 14-to-2 Democratic majority in its city council to 9 to 7.

Republicans also were encouraged by a Republican sweep in previously Democratic Niles Township and defeat of the mayor of Skokie, backed by the Democratic organization. The Skokie election, however, may have been influenced by other than partisan considerations.

The Berwyn and Niles Township elections were particularly gratifying to Sheriff Richard B. Ogilvie who is trying to build up the GOP from the precinct level. Berwyn's Republican township committeeman is Harry Magers, who is the sheriff's chief deputy. The new Niles Township supervisor is John J. Nimrod, chief custodian in Ogilvies' office. Niles Township voted 3½ to 2 for President Johnson last November and for Democratic State's Attorney Ward. It voted Republican for Governor by a small margin.

Although Democrats have been strongly entrenched in Berwyn city hall, the voters have been inclined toward the Republican Party recently. President Johnson won in Berwyn by 25 votes last fall but all State and county Democratic candidates trailed. Charles Percy, GOP candidate for Governor, carried Berwyn by 4,743.

Berwyn's mayoral winner, George E. Dolezal, former State representative with a good record in Springfield, won by 4,086 votes. He undoubtedly brought personal strength to the Republican ticket Tuesday. But there were many issues involved, including charges that the Democrats, long in office, were behind the times and inefficient in such matters as garbage collection.

Many voters undoubtedly were moved to vote Republican solely as a protest against the sponsorship by Democrats generally of open occupancy legislation, such as was approved by the house executive committee in Springfield Tuesday. Homeowners do not want to lose their freedom of choice in the sale or rental of real estate. The Berwyn vote should make Democratic leaders in Springfield more aware of this.

Winning in Berwyn gives Republicans an additional 300 political patronage jobs. Thus practically as well as psychologically the vote helped the Republican Party.

WELL, LOOK WHO WON AN ELECTION

The only Cook County suburban election Tuesday which was a clear test of strength between the Republican and Democratic parties was in Berwyn, a pleasant western suburb where the Democrats have been entrenched for many years. They controlled the city council, 14 to 2, and all the other city offices. The Republicans had not elected a mayor for 36 years.

Tuesday's election showed that the GOP is not so dead at the grassroots as its enemies hoped. George E. Dolezal, an attorney and former State representative, was elected mayor, 15,559 to 11,473. The Republicans also won six of eight aldermanic seats being contested, and elected the city treasurer and three township auditors.

Berwyn Township has the same boundaries as the city of Berwyn; so the election was a clash between the Democratic committeeman, State Representative Frank Broucek, and the Republican committeeman, Harry Magers, chief deputy sheriff of Cook County. Broucek had the support of the rich and powerful Democratic county organization; Magers had backing from Sheriff Richard Ogilvie, the only Republican county officeholder.

The Republicans were fortunate in their candidate for mayor, former Representative Dolezal, who made an excellent record while he was in the legislature. He served as chairman of the election laws commission which presented election reform measures scuttled in the house on orders of Mayor Daley.

The Berwyn Republicans conducted a smart and aggressive campaign. They directed voters' attention to the fact that the Democratic township leader, Representative Broucek, is one of the sponsors of Mayor Daley's reapportionment bill which calls for House districts overlapping the city and suburbs. The election therefore was, in part, a referendum on this issue, and the results support the Republican view that there should be no overlapping.

The Berwyn Republicans were handicapped by their lack of jobholders to man the precincts and by a shortage of campaign funds. In these respects the Democrats felt no pain.

The election was a demonstration that the Republicans can win in a community composed largely of homeowners, if the party presents able and attractive candidates, works hard, and capitalizes on the other party's mistakes.

At any rate, Republican is not such a dirty word as some of the analysts of the 1964 election would like to believe.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, as a Nation which fought bitterly for its own independence, we are always happy to join with other countries to celebrate their similar battle for political freedom. But we must feel a special kind of satisfaction on the anniversary of the independence of Greece.

For Greece and its cultural heritage stand at the base of everything we revere in western civilization. Certainly the culture of our own United States owes more to this tiny country than we could ever repay.

The story of Greece's fight for liberation is a stirring tale of courage and resolve. From the day when they raised the banner of revolt against the Turks on March 25, 1821, until the famous battle of Navarino in October of 1827, they faced their more powerful and ruthless foes almost alone, and at times it looked like these courageous descendants of ancient Greece were doomed. The whole civilized world watched the Greek war of independence with keenness and anxiety. But they could not remain in the spectator's role for long. In the fall of 1821, when the Greek position seemed desperate and their foes more ruthless, then European governments stepped in, restrained the Turks, and thus insured Greek independence. In their finest hours the Greeks fought gallantly for their freedom, and the European gov-

ernments rendered a great service to humanity by helping the Greeks in their desperate struggle.

It is with great pride that we join with our 1½ million fellow Americans of Greek origin to celebrate this 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

Social Security Disability and Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been greatly concerned about certain interpretations by the Social Security Administration that have resulted in turning down a relatively large number of applications for disability benefits based upon what is in most instances essentially permanent and total disability.

Under the Social Security Act, the antecedent disability is defined "as of long and indefinite duration" and which prevents the individual from engaging in any substantial, gainful activity.

I believe it is the restrictive interpretation of this latter phrase which has resulted in the denial of many applications that would appear on their face to warrant favorable action.

I have personally known of numerous instances where persons were suffering from some serious heart condition, paralytic shock, or from serious personal injury, or other conditions which left them, not only completely disabled to perform any substantial gainful work, but completely and permanently disabled them from performing any work for the rest of their lives, and yet their applications were not favorably acted upon by social security.

I do not think that this result is in keeping with the intent of Congress, the spirit or the letter of the act, because I think considering the way the act has been written, it would be possible for the agency to make administrative interpretations that would cover cases which on the record and on the evidence would plainly appear to be instances of total, permanent disability without any question.

It is apparent to me that there are other deep-seated problems relating to social security that the Congress will have to continue to consider, such as the adequacy of current benefits. I appreciate, of course, that while that is of greatest moment to the recipients, it is also presenting extremely difficult, challenging problems to the Congress, since we must maintain solvency of the social security trust fund and we cannot take action that will result in impairing this fund in any way.

The alternative is of course to make reasonable adjustments upward of social security benefits and pay the difference out of the ordinary revenue of the Government. This would be a very expensive matter, and when it is considered, together with other matters affecting social security, it can readily be appreciated that the problem before Congress is really one of overhauling the entire social security system to make it more effective and responsive to current high costs of living and the needs of the disabled, social security recipients, and the needs of ordinary social security recipients, who are finding in increasing numbers that their payments are woefully and painfully inadequate to sustain them in advancing years.

These problems cover a great deal of ground and will continue to require to my mind a great deal of intensive and extensive examination, consideration, policy determination and expert draftsmanship such as would be best assured by long committee hearings and painstaking study.

It is clear that the general revision of the Social Security Act is needed and I believe that it would be very unwise to defer this action which also should include the integration of other social legislation related to social security that the Congress may consider and adopt. We cannot allow this great, valuable system to become a sprawling administrative nightmare.

I submit that it is not sound public policy to delay further in vigorously tackling these problems, because with the increase in wages, prices, interest, rents, and the advancing, inflationary spiral which at all costs must be kept within tolerable bounds, that the growing needs of social security recipients will result in serious inadequacies and injustices, if the benefits are not equitably adjusted to meet current costs and standards, and if the Congress fails to coordinate all purposes germane and related to social security in the overall cost to those covered, the employers and the Government.

One approach to these questions might well lie in a careful, massive, prolonged study by some commission of Government authorized by the Congress to review these matters and come up with appropriate recommendations for legislation to be submitted to appropriate commitees of the House. But I urge prompt early consideration of these matters and meanwhile the effective adjustment by Congress of a proper legal formula that will insure prompt, reasonable disability benefits to those eligible members of the social security system, who can show by competent, medical evidence that current disabilities actually disable them from performing "any substantial work for the foreseeable future," and whose condition is tantamount in all practical respects so far as ability to work is concerned, to total permanent disability.

I want to express my thanks to the learned chariman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman MILLS, for his warm interest and his willingness to undertake a study of the problem of providing a suitable legal formula for the determination of disability benefits and for his many other contributions to this cause.

I propose to continue my interest and my labors in these matters in the hope that the Congress may take effective, equitable action in the not too distant future. It is mandatory if we are to make the social security system truly responsive to the needs, entitlements and deserts of the rank and file of the American people and after all, is that objective not our job?

Meanwhile, it is vital, as I see it, for Congress to move with all possible speed with the passage of the social security increases voted by Congress last year.

We must cut all red tape and end all unnecessary delay. The small relief this bill gives is sorely needed by very many fellow citizens who should have had these benefits, these small increases last year.

Resolution of California Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, our National Government is only as strong as the communities that sustain it, and the effectiveness of those communities usually is the result of a few individuals dedicated to civic effort.

Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN and I are particularly proud of one such person, Mr. Norris Nash, of Oakland, Calif., a city which we both have the honor to represent. Mr. Nash is retiring from active business and civic life this month. He has unselfishly devoted his time and leadership talents to literally hundreds of civic and educational organizations in Oakland.

I must heartily agree with Edgar F. Kaiser's commendation that Mr. Nash is a truly great citizen. If all of our communities had people of this rare breed, our problems would be few. Because of his concern for his fellow man, the California Assembly has adopted a resolution of tribute to him. I recommend that recognition of such outstanding local achievement be extended to the national level, and I consider it my privilege to place that same resolution into the RECORD:

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE RETIREMENT OF MR. NORRIS NASH FROM KAISER INDUSTRIES CORP.

(By Hon. Don Mulford of the 16th District, Carlos Bee of the 13th District, Hon. Robert W. Crown of the 14th District, Hon. Nicholas C. Petris of the 15th District, and Hon. William Byron Rumford of the 17th District)

Whereas the industrial and community leader, Norris Nash, will retire this year as vice president of Kaiser Industries and as director of community relations for that corporation; and

Whereas Mr. Nash has performed outstanding service in many national, State, and civic organizations, and is currently a board member of the National Municipal League, a member of the board and executive committee of Action, president of the Oakland Museums Association, a director of the Pacific School of Religion, and a member of the World Trade Club, selected insurance and financial equities, Oakland Symphony

Orchestra Association, international hospitality center, bay area urban league, Fukuoka Society, and the University of California hospitals auxiliary, and is on the advisory committee of the Junior League of Oakland; and

Whereas he is a former regent of the University of California, has been president of the California alumni association, the California alumni foundation, the Oakland Chamber of Commerce, the east bay federation of community chests, the united bay area crusade, the children's hospital of the east bay, and the Oakland renewal foundation, and is a past chairman of the citizen's committee for urban renewal, and a past director of the world affairs council, the regional export expansion council, the Oakland boys' clubs, and the Boy Scouts of America, and is a former member of the Salvation Army advisory committee; and

Whereas born in San Francisco and educated in Berkeley, Mr. Nash is a veteran of World War I, is a graduate of the University of California, and was vice president of Mills Estates, Inc., a corporation for which he worked for 17 years; and

Whereas in 1942 he joined the Kaiser organization as a director of public relations at the Kaiser shipyards in Richmond, 4 years later he was appointed director of special events and sales promotion for the Kaiser automobile plant at Willow Run, Mich., from 1949 to 1954 he was with Kaiser Services as director of customer relations, and in 1955 he was appointed vice president of Kaiser Industries Corp.; and

Whereas Mr. Nash's outstanding talent for leadership, his many achievements in business and in community life, and his wisdom in dealing with pressing problems of vital concern to all citizens have contributed greatly to the progress of this State: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Norris Nash is commended for his many outstanding achievements and for the numerous significant contributions he has made to the well-being of this State, and that it is the hope of this body that he enjoy the fullest measure of happiness and achievement in his well-earned retirement; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly shall transmit a suitable prepared copy of this resolution to Mr. Norris Nash.

JESSE M. UNRUH,
Speaker of the Assembly.

Attest:

JAMES D. DRISCOLL,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

New York County Lawyers' Association's Committee on American Citizenship Endorses Administration Immigration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following report of the Committee on American Citizenship of the New York County Lawyers Association favoring the Celler-Hart immigration bill.

The report is dated March 29, 1965, and gives an excellent summary of existing law and the changes proposed.

The report follows:

REPORT NO. F-1 BY NEW YORK COUNTY LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION ON S. 500 AND H.R. 2580

(Introduced by Senator HART and by Congressman CELLER)

Report of committee on American citizenship on S. 500 and H.R. 2580 of the 89th Congress, 1st session, which seeks to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C.) so as to provide that immigration into the United States be based on date of registration rather than country of birth, and for other purposes.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

Existing statute	*Proposed changes*
1. Section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151) in its present form provides that, with certain exceptions, the annual quota of any quota area shall be one-sixer of 1 percent of the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 attributable by national origin to such quota area, with a minimum quota of 100 for any area. The exceptions are the computation of quotas for quota areas within the Asia-Pacific triangle and for Chinese persons.	S. 500 as introduced by Senator HART and H.R. 2580 as introduced by Congressman CELLER, which are identical, seek to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act in the following respects: 1. It establishes minimum quotas of 200. It abolishes the national origins quota system over a 5-year period in the following manner: It reduces each quota by 20 percent a year; that is, 20 percent the first year; 40 percent the second year; 60 percent the third year; 80 percent the fourth year; so that by the end of the fifth year there are no country quotas. The numbers that become available by the annual reduction in quotas plus all unused numbers of the prior years go into a quota reserve pool. Numbers within the pool are to be allocated on a first-come-first-served basis with certain priorities provided for in subsequent sections. No quota area can receive more than 10 percent of the total (or 16,500), except that during the first 5 years no country shall have its present quota reduced by more than the annual 20 percent authorized. The President may, after consultation with the Immigration Board which the bill sets up, reserve (1) not ot exceed 30 percent of the quota reserve for persons whose admission is determined by him to be required (a) to avoid undue hardship resulting from the reduction of annual quotas and (b) in the national security interest of the United States, and (2) not to exceed 10 percent for allocation to quota immigrants who are refugees from racial, religious, or political persecution or persons uprooted by national calamity or military operations who are unable to return to their usual place of abode. After the 5 years all numbers go into the quota reserve pool and are allocated, according to the priorities, on first-come-first-served basis. The ceiling of 10 percent for any one quota area remains.
2. Section 202 provides that persons attributable by as much as one-half of their ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle (which is, roughly speaking, the entire area of Asia) shall be chargeable, no matter where born, to quota areas within that triangle.	2. It eliminates the Asia-Pacific triangle.
3. Section 101(a)(27)(A) provides that spouses and minor children of citizens of the United States shall be nonquota immigrants.	3. It adds parents of American citizens.
4. Section 101(a)(27)(C) provides that persons born in Canada, the Republic of Mexico, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Canal Zone, or an independent country of Central or South America shall be nonquota immigrants.	4. It adds persons born in any independent island country adjacent to North, Central and South America.
5. Section 201(a) provides that the first 50 percent of any quota shall be made available to persons determined by the Attorney General to be needed urgently in the United States because of their high education, technical training, specialized experience or exceptional ability and to be beneficial to the national economy, cultural interests or welfare of the United States.	5. It changes the words "needed urgently in" to "especially advantageous to."
6. Section 204 provides, among other things, that, in order that a person having the qualifications set forth in Section 201(a) may be classified as such, a petition on his behalf shall be filed by a person, institution, firm, organization or governmental agency desiring his services.	6. It eliminates the necessity for employment assurances and permits the classification on the proof of advantage to the United States and qualifications.

REPORT NO. F-1 BY NEW YORK COUNTY LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION ON S. 500 AND H.R. 2580—Con.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL—continued

Existing statute	*Proposed changes*
7. Section 203(a)(2) provides that 30 percent of the quota shall be available to parents and unmarried adult children of American citizens.	7. It deletes parents from this group. (They would be included in the non-quota category—see (3) above.)
8. Section 203(a)(4) provides for a fourth preference category for married children, brothers and sisters of American citizens.	8. It adds to this category parents of legal residents. It also adds to this category persons "capable of performing specified functions for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exist in the United States," up to 50 percent of "visas remaining available for issuance under this paragraph after the preference to the named relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens is satisfied or exhausted" and provides for employment assurances on their behalf.
9. Section 1 of the act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504) defines a refugee-escapee who may be paroled into the United States under the terms of section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as an alien who because of persecution or fear of persecution has fled from a Communist country or from a Middle Eastern country bounded, among others by Libya on the west, who is not a national of the area where the application is made, and who is within the mandate of the U.S. High Commissioner for Refugees.	9. It eliminates the limitation to persons within the mandate of the United States High Commissioner for Refugees, and extends the western boundary of Middle Eastern escapees to Morocco.
10. Section 2 of the act of July 14, 1960, includes a provision for parole into the United States of 500 persons listed as "difficult to resettle."	10. It eliminates this provision.
11. Section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides for the payment of visa fees.	11. It makes certain changes in the amount of visa fees and the time and manner of payment. 12. Subdivision (c) is added to section 203 to provide that the Secretary of State may terminate a registration on a quota waiting list if an alien fails to give evidence that he intends to use the visa.
13. Section 212(a)(1) excludes aliens who are feeble-minded.	13. It changes the term "feeble-minded" to "mentally retarded."
14. Section 212(a)(4) excludes, among others, aliens afflicted with epilepsy.	14. It eliminates this exclusion.
15. Section 212(f) provides that an alien afflicted with tuberculosis who is the spouse, unmarried child or parent of a U.S. citizen or legal resident or an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, may be issued a visa under terms, conditions and controls prescribed by the Attorney General after consultation with the Surgeon General.	15. It adds to those admissible under these conditions the same category of close relatives with various forms of mental health problems.
	16. It establishes an Immigration Board of seven members, three, including the Chairman, to be appointed by the President, two from the Senate and two from the House of Representatives, to implement provisions of the law, including the setting up of criteria for admission of persons specified in 6. and 8. above; to study and make recommendations with respect to other aspects of the law; to conduct investigations and hold hearings thereon, etc.
17. Section 221(g) provides that no visa shall be issued if a person is found ineligible therefor, with certain provisos.	17. It adds a proviso that, if a person is otherwise eligible to receive a visitor's visa or student visa, the consular officer may issue same after receiving advice from the Attorney General that a bond has been posted to insure the alien's departure and/or maintenance of status.
18. Section 272(a) provides for fines for the bringing into the United States of certain persons who are ineligible for admission.	18. It changes the category of persons to conform to the changes enumerated in 13 and 14 above and other changes made in prior laws over the last few years.

DISCUSSION

1. The national origins quota system is the system under which each country outside of the Western Hemisphere can only have a specific number, a quota, of immigrants admitted to the United States each year. This is allocated so that each country gets as its quota a proportion of the total equal to the proportion of the white population in the United States in 1920 whose national origin, including ancestry, could be attributed to that particular country. The present total annual quota is approximately 157,000.

Great Britain, for instance, gets 65,361 of the total quota of roughly 157,000 (of which it usually uses only about 40 percent). Poland, on the other hand, gets 6,488; Italy 5,666, Hungary 865, and Greece 308 (all of which have heavily oversubscribed quotas).

Under present law, the minimum quota for any country is 100. Moreover, persons of one-half Asian ancestry, unlike all others, regardless of place of birth, are chargeable to the quota assigned to the Asian area from which they originally derived by their Asian ancestry.

The present quota system is discriminatory and is based on the fallacy that persons from one part of the world or of certain colors would be more conducive to the welfare of this country than others. The proposed law provides for the gradual elimination of this system with only a slight increase in the total number of quota numbers available throughout the world; namely, 7,000.

The most important feature of the proposed legislation is the gradual change from the National Origins Quota System of selecting immigrants to another more equitable system. The bill retains a ceiling of approximately 165,000 quota numbers and increases from 100 to 200 the minimum quota for any quota area. The bill proposes that beginning with the first fiscal year after the enactment of the bill, and for each of the 4 succeeding years, the present annual quota of each country will be reduced by 20 percent. The quota numbers thus deducted are to be placed in a quota reserve and are to be made available to prospective immigrants according to certain criteria set out in the law, but not depending on their national origin. Each year as additional numbers are released from national origin quotas, they are added to the quota reserve mentioned above. Since it is recognized that this change will create hardship in countries with very small quotas, the minimum quota is raised to 200, but this will be reduced in the same manner as other quotas.

The bill provides for a quota reserve pool under which all numbers will be allocated by the fifth year. It also provides that quota numbers, not issued during the previous fiscal year, will be made available during the 5 fiscal years following the enactment of the law to quota immigrants from oversubscribed quotas.

The combined number of quota numbers issued to any one quota area may not exceed 10 percent of the total quotas authorized for that year.

Since these provisions might affect adversely the present quotas of Great Britain (65,361), Germany (25,814), and Ireland (17,756) which, because they are current, have no old registrations on file, a provision is made for a readjustment, up to 30 percent of the total quota numbers, to avoid undue hardship because of the reduction in annual quotas.

There is also a provision to allot up to 10 percent of the numbers available to refugees for whom up to now there has been no permanent provision and for whom special laws or Presidential directives have had to provide in case of emergencies.

2. The bill proposes to revoke a number of provisions which have been criticized as being discriminatory with respect to certain races. Among them are provisions which create the Asia-Pacific triangle and require persons who trace as much as one-half of their ancestry back to people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle, an area defined in the law, with a total quota of 100, to be charged to that quota even if born in a more favorable quota area. For instance, a person of Indian origin, born in Brazil, is not nonquota as are other natives of Brazil, but is chargeable to the quota of the Asia-Pacific triangle.

3, 7. By making parents of American citizens nonquota, it furthers the policy which has been growing over the years of uniting families. At the present time, with some of the second preference quotas many years be-

hind, some parents have had to wait a long time to be reunited with their children, while others, whose quotas are open, are able to enter immediately. This change would put all parents on a par.

4. This provision would include, among those entitled to nonquota visas, persons born in Jamaica, Trinidid, or Tobago, or any adjacent islands which may hereafter become independent. At the present time persons born in other adjacent independent island countries; namely, Cuba, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic, are nonquota. At the time of the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act in 1952, those were the only independent adjacent island countries. Now that Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago have become independent, there is no reason not to include them. Furthermore, in the event that other adjacent island countries should become independent, they should likewise become nonquota.

5, 6. It provides for the granting of first preference petitions filed by persons who meet the requirements of the law, but without the necessity of having a specific employer petition for such immigrant. By maintaining the safeguards of high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability, and the special advantages and the benefits to the United States, it would bring to the United States persons whom we need here, but often cannot get because they do not know an employer, nor how to contact one; the employer does not know them nor how to contact them, or the employer does not wish to employ a person sight unseen, or the employee does not wish to bind himself to an employer sight unseen. Furthermore, this would enable the employer to obtain a needed employee at the time he needs him and not a year or more later, for even if the first preference portion of the quota is open at the present time, the processing takes a minimum of 6 months and more often, close to a year; if the first preference portion of the quota is oversubscribed, it may take years to obtain an employee. As is well known, there are certain professions and skilled occupations in the United States for which there is a continuing need, and it is in the interest of our Government, our health, and our economy that this need be filled.

8. Today parents of legal residents are in the nonpreference portion of the quota, giving them no better status than a person who has no close relatives in the United States. In furtherance of the policy of reuniting families, they would be included in the fourth preference category putting them on a par with married children, brothers, and sisters of American citizens.

The provision to give a slight preference to persons performing specified functions for which a shortage exists in the United States is an extremely advisable provision, as there is often a great need in this country for persons who are either semiskilled or have certain skills which do not measure up to the requirements specified in the first preference category.

14. In view of the discoveries of modern science, the elimination of epilepsy as a ground of exclusion has long been needed.

15. This would provide for the admission, under proper safeguards, of persons who have or have had a mental illness and who would otherwise be separated from their families. With the developments in the cure and/or control of mental illness, and the enlightened policy of our immigration laws regarding tuberculosis, as evidenced by the act of September 11, 1957, it is logical and fair that we should go one step further and permit the entry of family members who have or in the past have had a mental illness. This would eliminate the heartbreaking situation which presently exists of requiring a parent to leave one member of a large family in their native country, sometimes because of a mental illness which has been cured, or causing an entire family to remain in their native country in order to avoid separation. Since the admission would be under safeguards, such as requiring institutionalization, hospitalization, giving of bond, etc., this Government would be fully protected.

Respetcfully submitted.

COMMITTEE ON AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP,
HON. MAURICE WAHL,
Chairman.

Private Enterprise in Appalachia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Duke Power Co.'s request to spend almost a billion dollars in Appalachia needs the same backing and support the Appalachia bill received and from the same Federal Government and congressional sources.

The following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal on April 13. I commend it to the attention of the Congress and to the people of the Nation:

UNCREATIVE FEDERALISM

When President Johnson signed the bill authorizing $1.1 billion for Federal programs in Appalachia, he hailed it as a true example of "creative federalism." Yet that same federalism is impeding possibly more significant developments of private enterprise in the same area.

Specifically, a private electric power company in Appalachia is ready to spend $910 million of its own money on two power projects. So far it is being held back from spending a dime by Congress and a Federal agency.

For several years the Duke Power Co., serving customers in North and South Carolina, has been trying to get Congress to approve a proposed $210 million powerplant on the Savannah River. Federal law provides that Congress must sanction any powerplant built on a navigable river or stream. Some Congressmen are insisting that unless approval of a neighboring Federal power project is tied to any bill allowing the Duke project, they won't vote for the latter, though it is hard to see why each should not be considered on its own merits.

The second project, in upper South Carolina, requires only a license from the Federal Power Commission. It would represent an investment of $700 million in an area now qualifying for aid-to-Appalachia funds, but the project is opposed by federally financed rural electric cooperatives on the ground that some day a Federal plant might be built there (none now is planned) from which they could get preferential treatment. Meanwhile the FPC amiably has granted a delay in further hearings on the project at the request of the Interior Department, which also wants to intervene.

Moreover, the Duke projects actually involve more than the $910 million plant cost. An industry rule of thumb is that for every $1 spent to generate power in an area, another $3 is invested by industrial customers there, old and new. That new business is gained by adequate power is reflected in the company's claim that, serving 25 percent of the Carolinas' land area, it has helped to attract 50 percent of the States' new industries in the last 5 years.

So if "creative federalism" is active in Appalachia, it does not seem to be doing much for what could be, by the $3-for-$1 rule of thumb, a revenue-producing private investment of much larger scope. Surely it is a strange niconsistency when federalism—which can create nothing without first taxing the rewards of private initiative—whoops it up for a $1.1 billion handout while it lets creative business, with its own spending program potentially three times as big, go begging.

Accomplishments of the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, many of us serving in the House of Representatives have constituents who have volunteered to go abroad to carry on the great work of the Peace Corps.

All of us are aware of the great accomplishments being brought about through the quiet pursuit of the program of this important agency of our Federal Government.

An article has recently been published in the San Leandro Morning News of San Leandro, Calif., for April 7, which relates the work of Miss Diane Mauzy who is one of these volunteers from my congressional district. The enthusiasm and dedication for her work permeates this article and I am pleased to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I think it is a fitting illustration of what is being accomplished, and also, it is a tribute to the many thousands who are serving their country abroad in the important role of Peace Corps volunteers.

The article follows:

PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER DIANE MAUZY REVIEWS FIRST FEW MONTHS AS TEACHER IN MALAYSIA

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The women's editor has received a letter from Diane Mauzy, a graduate of San Leandro High School, and of San Jose State College with a journalism major. Miss Mauzy is serving with the U.S. Peace Corps. Stationed in Malaysia, the local girl has been making adjustments to a new country, its people and her demanding work as a teacher hampered by language barriers. Miss Mauzy, a highly articulate person, gives an excellent report on the challenges met and accepted by the brave young men and women who are attempting to understand the problems of other lands while presenting a vital picture of sincere, dedicated American youth to the people of another country.)

(By Diane Mauzy)

Time marches on like a well-drilled soldier and seems to trample on all my good intentions to write letters as I go about my work. I hope that all is well with you, yours and your work. I often think of my summer with the Morning News, the lunches you and I used to share * * * something nice to remember as I'm eating my daily menu of fried rice.

I am well settled in by now and still fully enjoying the "luxury" of not living out of a suitcase * * * it is nice to have a place where one can hang up one's clothes.

I have been posted in Sandakan, North Borneo, Malaysia. This is the largest town in Sabah by virtue of its timber industry and trade from the Sulu Sea. There are no

roads leaidng out of Sandakan. The city sits on the edge of the blue sea in a sort of cove with the green jungle forming the backdrop.

Sandakan is separated from the rest of Sabah by jungle, swamp, and high mountain ranges. The town vaguely resembles Hong Kong in the miniature. It is built on softly rolling hills interspersed with picturesque bay inlets that bring fingers of water up into the land.

The population is primarily Chinese, but there are Malays, Bajau, Muruts, and Dusans residing here.

I live by myself in a government house about 1½ miles from the city. I am teaching English at a Chinese primary school called Chi Hwa.

The children in the school are simply wonderful—alive, vigorous, and full of mischief. My students are roughly equivalent to second graders. I have just about conquered the initial discipline problems—the language barrier has played an active role in my adjustment to the students and theirs to me.

Malaysia is not adequate, but I am taking Mandarin lessons presently. This will not solve all my problems of communication as the majority of Chinese here speak Hakka and Cantonese.

I am gradually getting submerged in extracurricular activities. They are considered an important part of Peace Corps service. The neighborhood children have my Sunday afternoons booked for picnic trips to the beach.

I am also engaged in a library project for the Education Department and am trying to devise a method by which I will be able to catalog Chinese books for Chi Hwa School. Shortly I will begin working a couple of hours a week with occupational therapy for the tuberculosis hospital.

Malaysia is a fascinating new country. Everyone has such high ideals and such profound and sincere hopes for a wonderful future. This country is trying to solve all its many problems and burdens in such a hurry—time is just one of the factors that Maylaysia must battle as it seeks to establish itself among the world's nations.

Faced by Communist agitation on its northern border and by Sukarno's confrontation on the south, Malaysia is gamely hoisting the banner of democracy. It is not completely secure, this proud new banner. It will take time, tradition, courage, faith, and stability to make it truly so. But out here Malaysia is a shining beacon for the dignity of man in the seeming wreck of southeastern Asia.

Peace Corps life—it is not all glamour, romance, and adventure. Frustration, boredom, fatigue, and loneliness are part of the routine. Peace Corps work requires a firm mental and spiritual commitment to the task in hand.

At first after one arrives overseas, alone in a strange new land, you have to sit down and ask yourself, "Why am I here?" And then you have to start finding the answers to that question—answers that will give you satisfaction.

There are many adjustments to make—eating alone, people staring at the strange American girl. You cannot talk to them and they cannot communicate with you because you do not speak each other's language.

I dare say most everyone in a new land has their period of adjustment * * * the area here itself seems a million miles away, the isolation at first gave me a bit of claustrophobia and for a time I felt myself sinking into a depression which I carried to bed night after night like a disease, an empty loneliness.

Then suddenly something happens and you begin to appreciate life as never before, your mind begins to tingle, your very skin begins to tingle with the knowledge that gradually you are gaining confidence in your ability to handle the situations as they arise. You begin to see the true beauty of the country, the people seem friendly and not so strange, one begins to see so many places where you can begin to prove your individual worth to yourself and the people of this country.

The assigned job of a Peace Corps volunteer is only a portion of his commitment. The true task, the place where we will make the most worthwhile contribution, lies in personal relationships and human contacts. We must be dedicated to the advancement of understanding and cooperation between all the peoples of the world. This, I believe, is what President John F. Kennedy envisioned when he started the Peace Corps.

Naturally, being human, I expect to find myself frustrated and depressed every now and then, but I think that I am acquiring some glorious new mental vistas and attitudes that will serve me well all my life.

Kennedy believed in people and subscribed to the theory that man could solve his problems by hard work, honesty and courage, understanding and education, sincerity and humility. So when I ask myself why I am a Peace Corps volunteer in Malaysia there are some pretty important reasons even if I get lonely and depressed now and then.

As I become more and more involved in the work here, as I learn the languages and the children learn more English there will be more spoken communications and fuller understanding between us all. This sense of achievement, of mutual sharing will certainly conquer my brief spells of frustration which are based upon some of my personal inadequacies in the field of communication due to language barriers.

The Late Honorable James A. Shanley

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of Judge James A. Shanley, an eminent jurist and former Member of Congress from Connecticut.

Judge Shanley served in this House for a period of four terms, from 1934 to 1942. Those were the years of the first two terms of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, and during this period Shanley identified himself strongly with the New Deal program and was a staunch supporter of much of the reform legislation enacted by Congress at that time. He was a scholar in the field of foreign affairs and an outstanding exponent of effective international law during his service in Congress.

I was privileged to know him intimately and to discuss often with him various matters of mutual interest. He was a man of great intellect, charm, and wit. He was noted throughout Connecticut as a public speaker and toastmaster. He was also highly regarded as a judge and in recent years had the endorsement of both political parties in New Haven.

Connecticut has lost an outstanding citizen. We are all saddened by his passing. I wish to extend my profoundest sympathy to his wife and children in their hour of bereavement.

Statement of Hon. Frank T. Bow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on April 7, 1965, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, received a National Clay Pipe Institute award for his outstanding contributions in the field of water pollution control.

I have had an opportunity to work closely with Mr. BLATNIK as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee, of which he is chairman. He is rightfully recognized as the leading expert in the House on water pollution problems.

The National Clay Pipe Institute is cosponsor of the National Clean Water Campaign, which is being sponsored by another forward-looking organization, the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. I commend both organizations for their leadership in combating water pollution.

Mr. BLATNIK received his award at a luncheon at which one of the speakers was another of my distinguished colleagues the gentleman from Ohio the Honorable FRANK T. BOW.

In an outstanding address, Mr. Bow paid tribute to Mr. BLATNIK and outlined the water pollution problem this Nation faces and the sacrifices required to solve them.

I think Mr. Bow's remarks merit attention by other Members of the House and for this reason I am placing his talk in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Bow's speech follows:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANK T. BOW AT THE AWARDS LUNCHEON, NATIONAL CLAY PIPE INSTITUTE, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, APRIL 7, 1965

I am delighted and impressed with your recognition of leaders in this fight against the formidable and deadly enemy—water pollution.

The efforts of my colleague, JOHN BLATNIK, in this field are worthy of every commendation.

The fine work that Ralph Pickard is accomplishing in Kentucky is an outstanding example of activity at the State level, and he has gone on to a position of national leadership as the spokesman for the States and the architect of interstate cooperation.

And it is indeed heartening to see that a respected, dynamic organization of young men, the Jaycees, is supporting the cause all over the United States.

For this country needs all the help it can get to cope with this serious national menace.

We need all the brains and talent and energy we can muster to make certain that this Nation will have a safe, adequate, and dependable water supply.

We used to think of this as a problem for the future. But the tremendous growth of our population and the ever-growing demand for water for our industrial economy has made it an immediate problem.

The solution cannot be postponed.

Scientists and technicians used to warn of the threat, but we no longer need their warnings. We can see and we can smell, and when we find that one-fourth of the surface

of Lake Erie, one of the largest bodies of fresh water in the world, is filled with a nasty island of slime, we know there is no time for further delay.

And this week hundreds of thousands of tourists are coming to Washington to see our beautiful cherry blossoms—one of the great attractions of the entire Nation. Those blossoms are only a few hundred feet from the Potomac. Just a stone's throw from all of that springtime beauty is a river so filthy that no one dares swim it, so polluted that the health of our downstream communities is threatened. This river could be a tremendous asset for recreation, boating, swimming, fishing, but the sad truth is that anyone who dares to use the Potomac for these purposes risks a bad case of hepatitis, or worse.

This is an appropriate place to discuss water pollution for the problem of the Potomac is similar to that of many of our great rivers, and because the work that is being done here can serve as a pattern for solving the problem on the Hudson, the Missouri, and other streams. Through the cooperation of communities all along the river, and of the States of Virginia and Maryland, the Potomac is in far better condition today than it was 10 years ago, but we still have a long way to go.

Most of you know the facts about our pollution problem, but they can never be stated too often or emphasized enough.

Eighty percent of the Nation's water supply is pumped out of lakes and rivers that are functioning simultaneously as the Nation's sewer system.

The discharge of industrial wastes has increased to 16 billion gallons a day.

Twenty-five percent of municipal wastes are still dumped as raw sewage. Puting it another way, there are over 1,500 communities serving 13 million people that just dump thei rsewage into our lakes, rivers, and streams. Ten of these cities have a population of over 100,000.

Another 31 percent o fthe Nation's municipal wastes are given only primary treatment—removing the solids but doing nothing about contaminants in solution.

Still another 2,700 communities, serving close to 6 million people, don't even have sewers to collect waste materials.

In other words, more than half the municipal waste in the Nation is being permitted to contaminate our water supplies.

And in major cities where we have made adequate preparations to handle the normal volume of municipal waste, the problem is compounded by our failure to separate storm and sanitary sewers. When runoff from bad storms enters the combined sewer systems, untreated waste is carried off into rivers and lakes with a resulting heavy impact on an already serious problem. More than 1,900 communities with a total population of nearly 58 million people have this problem to solve.

I am pleased to note that Washington is well on the way to completing a separate storm sewer system, an important step toward cleaning up the Potomac.

And progress has been made in other respects.

Since 1956 Congress has appropriated $408 million for construction of municipal sewage treatment plants, $370 million of which has been allocated as the Federal share in sewage works with a total cost of $2.2 billion. These plants are serving or will serve some 40 million people.

Current sewage plant construction is moving ahead at the rate of more than $800 million a year.

A great deal of planning and research has been accomplished. The seven river basin projects are a case in point.

Intensive, comprehensive studies, reconnaissance surveys, recommendations for remedial measures, analyzing stream flow regulation, designing mathematical models to predict the impact of waste loads and evaluating proposed water pollution control activities, are being done in these areas.

Research centers in Alaska, Georgia, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Michigan, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Minnesota are gathering data and making surveys. At the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati we are making progress on new, economically feasible techniques for waste water renovation.

There has been progress, too, in interstate cooperation and uniform laws. Congress has given its consent to the formation of seven interstate compacts having substantial powers. The areas include New England, a joint effort by Connecticut, New York and New Jersey, a commission on the Potomac River, a Klamath river basin compact, a Delaware basin compact, a Tennessee river basin compact involving seven States, and Orsanco, the Ohio River Valley water sanitation compact.

Coming from Ohio, I am best acquainted with Orsanco of which Bart Holl is the chairman this year. Orsanco has made great strides toward cleaning up the Ohio River. Today 99 percent of the sewage emanating from communities along 1,000 miles of the Ohio is piped into purification plans. Now we are turning to the problem of Lake Erie, and Governor Rhodes has called a conference of the Governors of the seven Great Lakes States for April 28. They will review the problem and set the course for cleaning up the pollution problem in this vital area.

We have seen the scope of the problem and we have reviewed what has been done and is being done about it. Now, what more should we do?

Congress, as you know, is now working on additional legislation. The Senate had passed a bill that authorizes an appropriation of $60 million for 3 years for demonstration projects and for separation of storm and sanitary sewers. It also increases the amount that may be given a single treatment project to $1 million, and to $4 million for multicommunity projects. Planned metropolitan projects may receive an additional 10 percent above the new limits.

The bill creates a new agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to take over the Federal pollution control enforcement powers now in PHS.

Mr. BLATNIK's bill is more generous, raising the limit on single projects to $1.2 million and on combined projects to $4.8 million.

It authorizes a grant without regard to the dollar ceiling limitations with a full 30 percent to be made per project if the State matches the full Federal contribution. This kind of grant can be made only from the State's allotment of appropriated funds in excess of $100 million.

The Blatnik bill also provides that the allotment of funds to the State in excess of any appropriations over $100 million yearly will be made solely on the basis of population. Finally, it increases the annual authorization for this work to $150 million.

It seems to me that Congress must weigh carefully the impact of this larger authorization on the problem I have described.

Is $60 million for demonstration projects sufficient to tackle the problem of storm and sanitary sewer separation? Do we really need more studies and demonstration projects in this area? Is it not self-evident that combined sewers are a major source of contamination, and that any separation project is certain to alleviate pollution problems? I think this is one area where we could get on with the work with a much larger expenditure.

How about the treatment plant program? Will $150 million per year from the Federal Government do the job, or could more be used to advantage?

We know that there is a backlog of about $2.6 billion worth of waste collection and treatment projects. If our goal is to clean up municipal wastes by 1970, an annual expenditure of $830 million would be required. It seems to me that some careful study should be given to the ability of States and municipalities to match additional Federal funds. If they can do so at a rate greater than $150 million a year, Congress should consider very thoughtfully an appropriation equal to whatever can be used.

Beyond this, there is the problem of obsolescence. Many older systems must be replaced as the years go by; in particular, I might suggest, those systems that are now using inferior though inexpensive pipe. The wise planners who start with good clay pipe will not have that worry.

It may seem strange to some that the ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Committee, the man who is usually talking about cutting the budget, is talking today about larger expenditures. But I have often said that we must learn to distinguish our needs from our wants. We must review Federal programs on the basis of what is required for the Nation, and what may be only desirable.

If we agree that protecting our water resource is perhaps the most fundamental requirement for our future growth and well-being, then I suggest that we can devote maximum effort on this program, foregoing some of the things that are less essential.

Summing up, it seems to me that we have these things to do:

First, we must continue to dramatize and publicize the problem. The President has set the course by using the Potomac as an example of what can and must be done. If the American people recognize the nature of the problem, they will support any effort that is required to correct it.

Second, we must continue our research, but we must also be quicker to put our new knowledge into action. We have studied enough to know pollution when we see it. We know when it gets out of hand. We know what causes it. Now let us work to achieve standards in pollution enforcement measures that will pinpoint sources of pollution quickly and set up methods to correct them with dispatch.

Third, we must encourage the States to enter into interstate programs for control of entire river systems and lakes. Again I will mention Orsanco as an example of what can be done, and Governor Rhodes' Great Lakes Conference as an example of what must be done to tackle the job ahead.

Fourth, we must provide Federal support equal to the maximum capabilities of the municipalities and the States.

Competent authorities have testified that the States may be able to match up to $175 million in Federal funds next year and as much as $200 million in the years following. Certainly this should be thoroughly investigated.

And we should do it all with clay pipe.

It gives me a really deep satisfaction to come here today when you are honoring JOHN BLATNIK, and to join with you in recognizing his leadership in this field. As you all know, JOHN is a Democrat and I am a Republican, and on many issues we have quite different views. I'm certain that would be apparent in any study of the roll-call votes in the House. But there are also issues on which partisanship is not a factor, and we have been discussing one of them today. All of us in the House recognize JOHN BLATNIK as the expert and the leader of the causes and cures of water pollution. I am glad to support him every way that I can, and I am doubly glad to be with you today and to join in this well-deserved recognition of JOHN's magnificent achievement. Generations of Americans are in his debt.

High School Chemistry Teacher Awards Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, we often neglect to consider the great part that American industry plays in the training of scientists. This not only takes place in scholarship grants but also in direct training programs or incentives to existing educational programs.

The chemical industry has made tremendous strides in the past two decades. A major share of our present affluence can be traced directly to these farsighted scientists.

If American industry is to keep its present forward position in this highly competitive world, we must see that fine student chemists receive proper training.

The Chemical Industry Council, concerned with all things for the public good, has inaugurated a new educational policy called the high school chemistry teacher awards program.

Mr. R. E. Hanna of the chemical division of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., at Barberton, Ohio, is chairman of the CIC program in the Akron area. He has informed me that one of the two pilot programs has already been successfully conducted in the Akron, Ohio, district. This pilot program was conducted for the Manufacturing Chemists Association. I wish to commend the members of this association for their excellent work. I also wish to commend Mr. John F. Moore, a teacher at Cuyahoga Falls High School. He was cited by the Chemical Industry Council for his outstanding work in this field.

The Chemical and Engineering News magazine carried a very comprehensive article about this subject.

The article follows:

PILOT PROGRAM HONORS HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER: MCA BACKS LOCAL CHEMICAL INDUSTRY COUNCILS IN ESTABLISHING HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER AWARDS; AKRON AREA HAS FIRST WINNER

The educational gap between chemical theories and their industrial applications may have closed somewhat this month in Akron, Ohio. Eight companies in the greater Akron area recognized John F. Moore as the outstanding high school chemistry teacher in the area. Chosen from a list of nominees representing 14 local schools, Mr. Moore was cited for giving his students an outstanding appreciation of the relationship between chemical principles and their industrial applications. He teaches at Cuyahoga Falls (near Akron) High School.

The outstanding chemistry teacher awards program is the latest activity of the Chemical Industry Council (Akron region). Educational programs designed to aid local schools, colleges, and technological institutions have been conducted before by chemical industry councils in various States. But until recently, these activities have taken other forms. For example, career conferences, plant tours, and chemical caravans have been staged; speakers have addressed student meetings; laboratory equipment has been provided; and industry personnel have substituted for absent teachers.

Chemical industry councils in many States sponsor widely varying educational programs in cooperation with the Manufacturing Chemists' Association. But the Akron CIC-MCA high school chemistry teacher award is the first of its kind.

Encouraged by its successful college chemistry teacher awards program, MCA decided to conduct a pilot awards program for high school chemistry teachers during 1964–65. "High school science teachers generally receive even less recognition for their work than do college science teachers," says Dr. Walter S. Guthmann, chairman of the association's education activities committee.

"Yet it is at the secondary school level that students with capacity for scientific careers are often won or lost. Because the quality of teaching is a deciding factor at this time in students' lives, more must be done to encourage good high school science instruction," Dr. Guthmann adds.

LOCAL

For its first-year pilot effort, MCA sponsored one local activity in the greater Akron area, and a regional program in Texas. The Texas Chemical Council will make its selection within a few weeks. The participating councils were chosen from among those expressing an interest in the project. If this year's pilot programs are successful, MCA plans to expand its efforts to include more councils.

MCA hopes that its program will help fill a need "sorely felt by those in the chemical industry. Whatever the merit of modern chemistry instruction, it concentrates on the theories and principles of the subject and vertiually excludes their industrial applications," says Dr. Guthmann. MCA recommends some priorities in its new awards program in an effort to correct this situation.

PURPOSE

The principal purpose of the program is to promote high school teaching of chemistry with special emphasis on industrial technology. Its other purposes are to:

Honor outstanding high school chemistry teachers.

Call public attention to recognizing the need for good chemistry teaching at the secondary level. There is not only a need for training future scientists, MCA says, but also for preparing all high school graduates for intelligent activity in an increasingly technological world.

Inspire qualified students to choose careers in high school of college science teaching.

The Accomplishments of Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding newspapermen in Wyoming is Bernie Horton, editor of the Cheyenne Eagle. He is a graduate of the University of Wyoming College of Journalism—was at one time the publisher of what may well have been the last remaining handset weekly in the Nation.

For many years, Mr. Horton has worked with the McCraken Newspapers in Wyoming and for the past several years has edited the Cheyenne daily, the Wyoming Eagle.

Few editors have a more objective grasp and an understanding of legislation than Bernie Horton, and I am pleased to include in the RECORD his recent editorial from the Eagle regarding the Manpower Development and Training Act and its effect on the Nation:

TOWARD FULL EMPLOYMENT

The Manpower Development and Training Act was passed only 3 years ago, but already it is proving to be a success.

It has provided employment opportunities for thousands of men and women.

Under this act, more than 300,000 unemployed men and women are being trained.

According to W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, nearly 75 percent of those who have completed their courses have obtained jobs. An additional 60,000 economically and culturally deprived persons have received training in more than 100 special projects.

"These people," said Wirtz in a recent release, "are on the road to becoming productive members of the community, instead of remaining welfare recipients."

Under the program, special effort has been placed on training family breadwinners.

According to Wirtz, 60 percent of the trainees are responsible for families or households. Nearly half of the trainees had been out of work 15 weeks or longer when they entered their courses.

"The worth of the manpower training program," Witz stated, "was demonstrated by a recent independent study which reported that $623,000 in training costs on one program yielded a return of $3,300,000 in benefits."

Every State in the Nation has joined in the program.

But today, 20 million Americans reportedly do not have the skills needed in our technologically advanced society.

President Johnson and the Labor Department have recommended that the Manpower Development and Training Act, due to expire next year, be strengthened and made a permanent program.

Full employment is one of the goals of the Johnson administration and one of the hopes of the entire Nation.

The manpower training program appears to be moving the Nation toward that goal.

Armenian Martyrs Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, this year marks a half century since that infamous day in 1915 when the mass slaughter and deportation of some 2 million Armenians began in Turkey. Since then, April 24 of each year is observed as Armenian martyrs day in commemoration of this great tragedy which almost saw the annihilation of a whole people.

In the long and turbulent history of the Armenian people, the year 1915 undoubtedly stands out as the darkest year. By the end of that year only a handful of Armenians were left, spared miraculously from the scourge that swept over Turkey and destroyed nearly every Armenian community in that country.

Clergymen, intellectuals, businessmen, artisans, old and young, men, women and

children—no was spared, all were slaughtered in cold blood, save for the very few fortunate survivors who lived to tell the world of the massacre of an innocent people.

The noted British historian Arnold J. Toynbee in his book "The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915–16," describes the gruesome events in these words:

Early in February "a decree went forth that all Armenians should be disarmed. The Armenians in the army were drafted out of the fighting ranks, re-formed into special labour batallions, and set to work at throwing up fortifications and constructing roads. The disarming of the civil population was left to the local authorities ,and in every administrative centre a reign of terror began. On a certain date, in whatever town or village it might be, the public crier went through the streets announcing that every male Armenian must present himself forthwith at the government building. In some cases the warning was given by the soldiery or genarmerie slaughtering every male Armenian they encountered in the streets. The men presented themselves in their working clothes. When they arrived, they were thrown without explanation into prison, kept there a day or two, and then marched out of the town in batches, roped man to man, along some southerly or southeasterly road. They were starting, they were told, on a long journey—Mosul or perhaps to Baghdad. But they had not long to ponder over their plight, for they were halted and massacred at the first lonely place on the road. There was complete coordination between Talaat Bey's Ministry of the Interior and Enver Pasha's Ministry of War, for simultaneously the Armenian Labour Battalions, working behind the front, were surrounded by detachments of their combatant Moslem fellow-soldiers and butchered in cold blood."

(Arnold J. Toynbee, in "The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire 1915–16," pp. 638–640.)

It is hardly necessary to add much to this description of what was probably the first genocidal act in modern days, except for the fact that the women and children were either slaughtered, sold into slavery, or retained as servants in Turkish and Arab households.

To this day the people of Armenian descent have never forgotten the tragic events of 1915, nor can they ever forget them. On April 24 of each year they remember the martyrs who were struck down so savagely at the hands of a cruel regime. In this country, where several hundred thousand Americans of Armenian origin live in peace with their neighbors, this sad day of tribute is observed in many communities. Special memorial services are held in the churches and public meetings are dedicated to pay homage to the martyrs of 1915.

On this day, peace-loving Americans of all faiths and national origins join in this observance with bowed heads and heavy hearts laden with sadness at the inhumanities of man. We express our profound sympathy to a dauntless and heroic people, to Armenians in the United States and in other countries, who have risen from the ashes of annihilation to rebuild their culture and heritage. Let us hope and pray that never again will humanity be afflicted with such a tragedy as befell the Armenian people just a half century ago.

The Albatross New England Must Bear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have said it before and I shall say it again that the continuation of restrictions on residual fuel oil is a blow to the industries of New England at a time when other economic pressures continue to rise. These restrictions must be removed.

Recently there appeared in two Massachusetts newspapers articles dealing with this albatross which the administration has seen fit to leave hanging around our necks. I believe that the articles reveal to a great extent the temper of New Englanders in reaction to this discriminatory move.

The articles to which I refer appear below:

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 2, 1965]

L.B.J. RENEGES ON OIL: IT'S NEW ENGLAND'S TURN—BUT FOR WHAT?

(By Peter B. Greenough)

With considerable fanfare last year, President Johnson announced that he would keep his hands entirely off petroleum policy. It would rest, he gave his assurance, solely in the jurisdiction of Interior Secretary Stewart Udall.

If this is still true, then the President must now be washing with a particularly powerful brand of tar soap. It takes that, and kerosene too, to remove the odor of the recent decision regarding residual oil fuel imports.

Udall himself admitted that the White House had something to do with Wednesday's ruling. He also tossed in lawyers from the Justice Department, Budget Bureau, and Interior as justification for denial of a meaningful relaxation of resid controls.

Now, isn't that interesting?

Udall has had this matter under study for over a year. Yet he blames a change of plans on last-minute legal advice.

The Globe hears it differently.

Lee White, White House counsel, is the man to whom the finger points. In other words, L.B.J. himself, who has directly interfered in petroleum matters.

While we're at it, let's review more of the bidding.

Mr. J. was effusive in his campaign promises in Providence, Boston, and Portland last fall.

"It's New England's turn next," he assured one and all. He meant in connection with residual oil.

Some turn. Some promise.

What else, might we ask, does the President owe Appalachia? He's given the area special financial aid considerably over and beyond the rest of the Nation.

Why heed the false arguments about further injury in coal country from residual oil, when this line long since has been torpedoed by the Office of Emergency Planning? Residual, OEP points out is no menace either to national security or employment in West Virginia-Kentucky.

Defense Secretary McNamara reportedly is sitting on a second study fully confirming OEP's findings. Let's see it. Allow the public to judge whether economic good sense or plain political logrolling is involved here.

Representative SILVIO CONTE's reaction best typifies New England congressional sentiment. He feels, in the wake of Udall's ruling:

"* * * duped and conned as smoothly as a hick in a shell game."

We all have, to the tune of $40 million a year. That's Udall's own estimate of what clamps on residual cost New England each year.

Can anything be saved from this sticky mess?

Just possibly. Our 12 New England Senators deserve a White House hearing. They have a score with Mr. Johnson. A face-to-angry-faces confrontation might just cause Udall's decision to be overturned.

Indeed, the President has little to lose by it.

How could he possibly be accused of interfering any further in oil policy than he already has been?

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette, Apr. 3, 1965]

NEW ENGLAND'S DISTRESS

New England business interests—and that also means everyone who works for New England businesses—got a raw deal in Washington this week when the administration refused to eliminate residual oil import quotas for this part of the country.

By importing all the residual oil they needed, New England businessmen could reduce their heating and power costs substantially. One estimate puts the added cost at $40 million annually.

The operation that resulted in the quotas being retained was not a savory one. Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall had already announced that he had worked out a tentative plan to remove the import quotas for Massachusetts, Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Florida.

Then, shortly before a scheduled news conference, word came from the White House that the quotas were not going to be lifted. The official line is that this move did not meet the legal test of "providing for the national security."

Udall had already gone on record, however, as saying he did not believe national security considerations warranted continuation of the program.

All 12 New England senators immediately joined in sending an indignant message to President Johnson, appealing for an end to the quota program. They feel, and rightly so, that this is discrimination against a section of the country which must fight continually to overcome handicaps imposed by distances from sources of supply.

Need for further strengthening of New England's interests in the Nation's Capitol, as proposed by seven House Members—including Representative William H. Bates—thus became even more evident.

Bates and six other Republican congressmen sought congressional approval for a New England regional development commission. They said, when introducing the legislation, that the commission would look into such areas as transportation, tourism, education health, industrial growth, power and seashore matters.

The residual oil ruling was a good example of the need for unity in this six-State area. New England must begin to protect its investments in Federal Government or it is going to see an acceleration of the trend toward using our tax funds to support other parts of the country.

The Appalachia program is one example of this. Representative SILVIO O. CONTE, who represents the western end of this State, brought this program into his reaction to the oil ruling. Protesting he had been "duped and conned," he said New England taxpayers are being asked to pick up their share of the "colossal cost" of the Appalachia program, but "what they are getting in return is a kick in the teeth."

For further illustration of all outgo and little return, we refer to the statement by BATES this week on the aid to education bill.

He said the bill will cost Massachusetts taxpayers $22 million, but other States, particularly Texas, will reap the harvest.

BATES said 26 States will get more money than Massachusetts. The $22 million, he said, represents the difference between what Massachusetts taxpayers will pay—$35 million—and what they will get back—$13.9 million.

Obviously, the Federal Government should do what it can to remove the "pockets of poverty," but it cannot continue to take all it can get from New England without returning a fair share. This corner of the country is reaching a point where it must stand up and fight for everything it can get from Washington.

Call for Boycott of a Whole State Is Alarming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, many thinking people across the country are beginning to wonder about the real motives of Martin Luther King. Is he really interested in the Negroes, or does he have a much broader purpose in mind in calling for continued demonstrations, violence, and a boycott designed to wreck private enterprise in Alabama? Is King working alone in advocating his destructive plans, or is there a hidden hand directing his activities? The people of the United States, including the Negroes, have a right to know what kind of man this is who places himself above the law and makes demands regardless of the misery they may cause the very people for whom he professes so much sympathy.

I think we should ask and demand an answer from the Justice Department: Who is Martin Luther King? Who finances his programs of destruction? What are his allegiances?

Some of the alarm he is causing is clearly seen in the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat which was reprinted in Human Events:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat]

KING'S BOYCOTT OF ALABAMA CALLED "ALARMING" PROPOSAL

Dr. Martin Luther King's call for a national and international economic boycott against Alabama is perhaps the most alarming action this civil rights leader has ever seriously proposed. Could he have considered all the consequences?

Dr. King is asking other Americans to set themselves against Alabama and deliberately discriminate against the goods produced by the more than 3 million Negro and white fellow Americans who happen to live within the geographical boundaries of that State.

It would be the poor Negroes and poor whites of Alabama who would bear the worst brunt of this proposed boycott.

Alabamans are not unlike other Americans in that they are a people proud of their State. Does Dr. King think that the effect of this boycott will be for the millions of whites in Alabama to cry "enough," denounce the Governor they have elected, and confess their sins to the Nation?

Rather we would think that every Alabaman, and other southerners, including those now employing their time and sweat to work out some peaceable solution to this racial crisis, would rally around Alabama and reject this implicit denunciation of an entire State—and a region.

Bringing Alabama to her knees is hardly the way to bring her to fuller acceptance of the new rules and laws of this land. Rather the opposite.

Dr. King has lost his perspective—and patience. He must remember that not until 1954 was it illegal to segregate public schools; not until 1964 was it unlawful for motels and major restaurants to keep out Negroes.

Because of the rulings and laws of this past decade, a century of tradition and an entire way of life must be discarded in the South. It is folly to think that such a radical change will not produce tension and, among the ignorant and reactionary, some violence.

As we are all Americans, it should be our objective to keep that violence to a minimum, to understand Alabama's agonizing problem while insuring that she moves into compliance with the law.

To clamp an economic boycott upon Alabama—which we lack the courage to clamp upon the Communist states of East Europe where all rights are denied indiscriminately—would be to declare the elected government of Alabama an enemy of the United States. That act would deal a crippling blow to the Union itself.

Using the example of the murdered Detroit woman and the murdered minister, Dr. King asked the boycott to end what he called the "reign of terror." Two murders by bigots, vicious and reprehensive as they were, do not make a reign of terror. Some of our larger cities, such as New York, can better come under such a definition.

In Alabama, as in every State, there are potential killers, both black and white, stupid, backward, brutal men, easily excitable, who would kill and have killed for little more provocation than the different color of a man's skin. Dr. King knows there are such men in Alabama.

As a man of nonviolence, he should keep his demonstrations strictly within legal bounds—and discourage the participation of unnecessary outsiders, recognizing full well that it is these outsiders who trigger the murderous instincts of the criminal white bigots.

As for the priests, nuns, ministers, and students—many of whom have the finest of motives in going to Selma or Montgomery—we suggest that the rights movement has now all the publicity it can handle.

We ask that they recognize the hard fact that their presence serves more to exacerbate the situation and incite violence than anything else, and that God will hear their prayers as clearly from St. Louis as He will from Route 80 in Alabama.

Abraham Lincoln: 15 April 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, today, a century after the death of Abraham Lincoln, our Nation is still struggling to realize the noble ideals for which our 16th President lived and died.

Our failure to realize these ideals is expressed eloquently in a poem by Dr. Paul V. Hale of the English Department at the State University College at Buf- at the State University College at Buffalo.

To bring Dr. Hale's poem, entitled "Abraham Lincoln: 15 April 1965," to the attention of my colleagues, I have permission to place it in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The poem follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN: 15 APRIL 1965

(By Paul V. Hale)

Five score years ago the ages claimed you,
Claimed you for their own;
Where moan echoed groan there is silence,
But there is no peace.

We were not there, but we, the unborn,
Bled through your wounds;
Today, through our own, you bleed,
For the evil of civil strife
Hydra-like springs from long-forgotten seed.
Washington, Springfield, Dallas,
Everywhere the spring comes late this year,
And the heavy fragrance of lilacs
Spreads slowly through the cold air.
This is a cruel time,
This is a cruel season,
For there is no peace.

Old leaves blown by the cold wind
Eddy and swirl through Gettysburg.
The branches, like dry bones, rattle
And the green leaves rustle
As they, like sentinels, stand guard
Over the many who have fallen.

Strange names echo in the wind
As we stand silent at Gettysburg with you:
San Juan Hill, Argonne, Corregidor, Iwo Jima,
Normandy, Bastogne, Casablanca, the Arno,
Inchon, Hungnam, Pleiku, to name but a few;
The sun never sets upon our dead.
We can not honor them as you honored these
In consecrating their final resting places
Because our dead were scattered,
Driven by the fury of some cosmic force
To countless, nameless spots
Where they met with destiny and paid our ransom.
Would they be amply repaid to know
Outer space is now only another
A more costly sea?
Would they pardon us for winning wars
And losing the peace?
Would they be proud of us because we have the power
To dissolve ourselves and their remains
Into primordial ooze?
And how would we answer them
If they were to ask:
Who today is free?

A gaunt, tired figure
Casts a shadow over the patient grass
That together with the withered leaves
Works to obscure the rows of granite
That long ago invaded their domain.

Centennial Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Pittsburgh public schools sponsored centennial services recently marking the end

of the Civil War and paying tribute to members of the Allegheny County Bar Association who served in that conflict. These services paid particular honor to Medal of Honor winners from Allegheny County: Francis J. Herron, Thomas R. Kerr, Gottlieb Luty, John C. Mathews, Theodore Mitchell, Milton Mathews, Charles Oliver, Robert L. Orr, Alfred L. Pearson, Archibald H. Rowand, James M. Schoonmaker, and Michael Sowers.

A special tribute was paid to Pittsburgh high school students who are listed on a bronze honor roll plaque at the Fifth Avenue High School Uptown in Pittsburgh. The names of 63 young men, or 25 percent of the school's enrollment, are on this list.

Three Pittsburgh figures noted for their outstanding contributions and research on the American Civil War received albums of the Appomatox Centennial stamp from Pittsburgh Postmaster Edward G. Coll. They were presented to Dr. C. Stanton Belfour, president of the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania, Edgar J. Roth, artist and authority on Civil War history, and Julia M. Cunningham, director of the Pennsylvania Reference Room, Carnegie Library, Pittsburgh.

I should like to extend my congratulations to Commander Joseph A. Borkowski, of the Allegheny County Council, VFW, and all the members of the VFW and to public school officials in Pittsburgh who made this program such a great success.

Joseph F. Manak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the death of Joseph F. Manak in Cleveland this week brought sorrow to a great many homes in the area. Joe Manak was a man who won the admiration of those his life touched, and they were many. My condolences to the Manak family, who can be justifiably proud of the editorial tribute the Plain Dealer paid to him in its April 14 edition:

JOSEPH F. MANAK

Literally thousands of West Side Clevelanders knew the late Joseph F. Manak through one or more of his activities. Sandlot baseball players knew him from his participation and great interest in baseball. For a while he owned the old Norval Theater on Storer Avenue and this made him known to another group. Finally, his work for 50 years at Joseph & Feiss Co., prior to his retirement in 1960, brought him in contact with big and little clothing merchants here and around the country, as well as with the retail purchaser.

Those who knew Joe Manak always will remember him as a big, bustling, friendly man with a great concern for the poor, the weak, the underdog. His death at 82 concludes a long life spent in almost ceaseless effort on behalf of his employer, his friends, and family.

Tribute to Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, people throughout the world were warned by President Eisenhower's tribute to his old comrade, Sir Winston Churchill. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include here this personal tribute delivered by President Eisenhower on January 30, 1965 at St. Paul's Cathedral in London:

A PERSONAL TRIBUTE TO SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

(By General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, delivered Jan. 30, 1965, at St. Paul's Paul's Cathedral, London)

Upon the mighty Thames, a great avenue of history, move at this moment to their final resting place the mortal remains of Sir Winston Churchill. He was a great maker of history, but his work done, the record closed, we can almost hear him, with the poet, say:

"Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me.

* * * * *

"Twilight and evening bell
And after that the dark.
And may there be no sadness of farewell,
When I embark."

As I, like all other free men, pause to pay a personal tribute to the giant who now passes from among us, I have no charter to speak for my countrymen—only for myself. But, if in memory, we journey back two decades to the time when America and Britain stood shoulder to shoulder in global conflict against tyranny, then I can presume—with propriety, I think—to act as spokesman for the millions of Americans who served with me and their British comrades during 3 years of war in this sector of the earth.

To those men Winston Churchill was Britain—he was the embodiment of British defiance to threat, her courage in adversity, her calmness in danger, her moderation in success. Among the Allies his name was spoken with respect, admiration, and affection. Although they loved to chuckle at his foibles, they knew he was a stanch friend. They felt his inspirational leadership. They counted him a fighter in their ranks.

The loyalty that the fighting forces of many nations here serving gave to him during that war was no less strong, no less freely given, than he had, in such full measure, from his own countrymen.

An American, I was one of those Allies. During those dramatic months, I was privileged to meet, to talk, to plan, and to work with him for common goals.

Out of that association an abiding—and to me precious—friendship was forged; it withstood the trials and frictions inescapable among men of strong convictions, living in the atmosphere of war.

The war ended, our friendship flowered in the later and more subtle tests imposed by international politics. Then, each of us, holding high official posts in his own nation, strove together so to concert the strength of our two peoples that liberty might be preserved among men and the security of the free world wholly sustained.

Through a career during which personal victories alternated with defeats, glittering praise with bitter criticism, intense public activity with periods of semiretirement, Winston Churchill lived out his 4 score and 10 years.

With no thought of the length of the time he might be permitted on earth, he was concerned only with the quality of the service he could render to his nation and to humanity. Though he had no fear of death, he coveted always the opportunity to continue that service.

At this moment, as our hearts stand at attention, we say our affectionate, though sad, goodby to the leader to whom the entire body of freemen owes so much.

In the coming years, many in countless words will strive to interpret the motives, describe the accomplishments, and extol the virtues of Winston Churchill—soldier, statesman, and citizen that two great countries were proud to claim as their own. Among all the things so written or spoken, there will ring out through all the centuries one incontestable refrain: Here was a champion of freedom.

May God grant that we—and the generations who will remember him—heed the lessons he taught us: in his deeds, in his words, in his life.

May we carry on his work until no nation lies in captivity; no man is denied opportunity for fulfillment.

And now, to you, Sir Winston—my old friend—farewell.

Passover Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, of all the seasons of the year, Passover is perhaps fullest of religious depth, historical significance, and human warmth and gladness for those who share the precious heritage of the Jewish faith, Jewish history, and Jewish cultural traditions. For men and women of good will in all religious faiths, it is a time when the most sincere best wishes may be tendered to their Jewish friends.

The Passover is a reminder of one of the great events of history, the deliverance from Egyptian bondage of the children of Israel. That momentous deliverance is forcefully brought to mind by the four questions asked and answered at the seder and by the dietary rules that must be followed on this occasion.

The reliance upon divine providence that characterized the first Passover should be our reliance today. In the ceremony of the seder the knowledge and wisdom of Jewish fathers is tested by their replies to their sons' four questions, and the faith and courage of all who participate is stimulated and deepened. In this religious ceremony which is also a family meal, the members of the families are drawn together and renew their bonds of affection, as they resolve once again to live in the warmth of these precious human relationships and religious traditions.

In the singing and storytelling, in the ceremonial sharing of wine, in the beautiful words of the benediction concluding the Passover service, parents and

children and guests are brought together in affection for each other and for God, as blessings are called down upon the whole world in a prayer for redemption, peace, justice, and brotherhood.

The benediction is truly beautiful:

With songs of praise we have lifted up the cup, symbolizing the divine promises of salvation, and we have called upon the name of God. Let us again lift our soul to God in faith and hope. May He who broke Pharaoh's yoke, forever shatter all fetters of oppression and hasten the day when swords shall at last be broken and wars ended. Soon may He cause the glad tidings of redemption to be heard in all lands, so that mankind—freed from violence and from wrong and united in an eternal confidence of brotherhood—may celebrate the universal Passover in the name of our God of freedom.

The American Council for Judaism and Its Bedfellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 6 I placed in the RECORD a report by the New York Board of Rabbis on the notorious American Council for Judaism.

A new instance of this group's unsavory activities is described in the following article from the April 6, 1965, edition of the Near East Report:

BEDFELLOWS

The American Council for Judaism is coming in for severe censure by major American Jewish organizations because it furnished ammunition to the mounting neo-Nazi anti-Israel and anti-Jewish campaign in Germany last month.

The Deutsche National-Zeitung und Soldaten Zeitung—the central neo-Nazi organ in Germany today—featured an anti-Zionist article by Elmer Berger, the Council's executive vice president, on March 5, and another by Bill Gottlieb, the Council's publicity man on March 19.

In these articles, Council officers tried to discredit the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, which had been urging the Bonn government to extend the statute of limitations on war crimes and also to restore arms deliveries to Israel.

Gottlieb's attack on the American Jewish leaders was based on his claim that the Conference of Presidents had "created the impression that the 5½ million American Jews have taken a position against West Germany's intention of discontinuing military aid to Israel."

These articles impunged the representative character and the independence of the Conference of Presidents. Thus, they served the purposes of the anti-Semitic German weekly which has been virulently attacking German parliamentarians who favored the extension of the statute and which has been denouncing an alleged "plot of international Jewry to poison German relations with the Arab world."

The newspaper was later castigated by indignant Bundestag members for its "dishonorable and anti-Semitic propaganda." And on March 25, the Munich public prosecutor launched formal action, charging that the publication was guilty of incitement to race hatred against the Jewish people.

This is not the first time that the American Council for Judaism, rejecting identification with the "Jewish people," has been identified with its enemies.

The American Council for Judaism lost its fight to prevent the restoration of Israel in 1948 but has never ceased to attack Israel and the many organizations which help her.

It is obsessed with its own humbug. It pretends that Zionists assume to speak for all Jews. (They don't.) And it pretends that Zionists claim there is some kind of legal relationship with Israel, involving rights and obligations which prejudice the position of American Jews. (There isn't.) It sets up these strawmen and then mows them down with a massive publicity scythe.

The campaign to weaken the ties between Israel and American Jews has encouraged Arabs to believe that someday Jews will abandon Israel. Thus, Arab propagandists have learned to parrot the Council's disingenuous sophistry: The Arabs really love Jews. It is the Zionists they cannot abide.

Sometimes, the Arabs forget the lines in the Council for Judaism script and confide what is really in their minds. In his angry anti-German speech last month, Nasser said: "If the Jews win this battle, then the Arabs' word is valueless."

Nasser's careless lapse wounded the council right down to the heart of its mimeograph machine. It rolled off a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk (and a publicity release) setting the record straight. It "deplored" Nasser's attack on "the Jews," especially since he had for some years made "careful distinction between Zionists" and "those who are solely Jewish religionists." How inconsiderate of Nasser.

The council will hold its annual conference in Washington late this month. It has invited attendance, greetings and blessing from Capitol Hill and the administration to feed its anti-Israel publicity barrage.

No one ever contends that all American Jews support Israel. Jews do cherish the independence of the individual to think, speak and assemble in freedom, and those who do not support Israel are completely free to express their views and to seek audiences and headlines. But dissenters, if they are moved by principle, must be discriminating and spurn alliances with those who are moved by hate.

And let no one be deceived by the council's pretensions about the size and the significance of its constituency. It is minuscule. And let no one be deluded into accepting the false premise upon which the council mounts its propaganda siege. It is fantasy.

Federal Bureaucracy Holds Back Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the best argument against giving more power to the Federal Government to bring prosperity to some areas of the Nation is provided by the bungling bureaucrats themselves. From their every action it would seem they are much more interested in building the power of the Federal Government and changing our private enterprise system to one of a planned economy than in really helping the poor or making it possible for private enterprise to do so.

The following editorial "Uncreative Federalism" from the Wall Street Journal for April 13, is a case in point. This is the kind of action which caused me to oppose the Appalachia bill:

UNCREATIVE FEDERALISM

When President Johnson signed the bill authorizing $1.1 billion for Federal programs in Appalachia, he hailed it as a true example of creative federalism. Yet that same federalism is impeding possibly more significant developments of private enterprise in the same area.

Specifically, a private electric power company in Appalachia is ready to spend $910 million of its own money on two power projects. So far it is being held back from spending a dime by Congress and a Federal agency.

For several years the Duke Power Co., serving customers in North and South Carolina, has been trying to get Congress to approve a proposed $210 million powerplant on the Savannah River. Federal law provides that Congress must sanction any powerplant built on a navigable river or stream. Some Congressmen are insisting that unless approval of a neighboring Federal power project is tied to any bill allowing the Duke project, they won't vote for the latter, though it is hard to see why each should not be considered on its own merits.

The second project, in upper South Carolina, requires only a license from the Federal Power Commission. It would represent an investment of $700 million in an area now qualifying for aid-to-Appalachia funds, but the project is opposed by federally financed rural electric cooperatives on the ground that someday a Federal plant might be built there (none now is planned) from which they could get preferential treatment. Meanwhile the FPC aimiably has granted a delay in further hearings on the project at the request of the Interior Department, which also wants to intervene.

Moreover, the Duke projects actually involve more than $910 million plant cost. An industry rule of thumb is that for every $1 spent to generate power in an area, another $3 is invested by industrial customers there, old and new. That new business is gained by adequate power is reflected in the company's claim that, serving 25 percent of the Carolinas' land area, it has helped to attract 50 percent of the States' new industries in the last 5 years.

So if creative federalism is active in Appalachia, it does not seem to be doing much for what could be, by the $3-for-$1 rule of thumb, a revenue-producing private investment of much larger scope. Surely it is a strange inconsistency when federalism—which can create nothing without first taxing the rewards of private initiative—whoops it up for a $1.1 billion handout while it lets creative business, with its own spending program potentially three times as big, go begging.

Triumph for Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the story of the successful launching of the "Early Bird" satellite, as told in the Chi-

cago Sun-Times editorial which follows, is another example of the superiority of the free enterprise system. The benefits that will be derived from this new communications system, which eventually will reach one-third of the globe, cannot be fully estimated at this time but surely it should bring greater understanding and unity among the people that will be served.

TRIUMPH FOR FREE ENTERPRISE

The successful launching of "Early Bird," the world's first commercial satellite, is a historic landmark for the free enterprise system.

The Communications Satellite Corp. or "Comsat," as it is commonly called, which launched Early Bird was created by an act of Congress in 1962. Its operating funds came from the sale of stock to the public and from 45 nations which are partners in the project. Comsat was and is, in every sense of the word, a "risk" venture.

When final tests are concluded it is expected that Early Bird will provide 240 high-quality, two-way voice telephone channels for telephone calls between the Western Hemisphere and Europe and transmit television programs as well. It will be able to service about one-third of the globe.

The prospects for profit seem to be good. About 5 million oversea telephone calls are made each year. That figure is expected to grow to 20 million by 1970. Comsat bought its satellite for $2,700,000 from a private U.S. firm. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration provided a rocket and launch facilities for which it charged Comsat $3,300,000. No refund would have been made if the launch had failed. The cost of buying the satellite and putting it in orbit was far below that of installing undersea telephone cables.

Of more importance than profit is the fact that once again the United States has demonstrated that it makes its accomplishments in space techniques available for public use and benefit.

Membership in Comsat is not restricted. Anyone may buy stock, any nation may participate, including the Communist nations, if they wish. It will, however, cost those nations that are not members now a premium in the form of higher rates for the use of Comsat facilities. That is a hard lesson the capitalistic system teaches. Those who come in after the venture is a success must pay more.

The story of this unique concept of public ownership of communications, which Richard Lewis, the Sun-Times science editor, has called "the biggest advance in human communications since the smoke signal," should be told to the world. The Voice of America, the U.S. Information Service, and other Government agencies should broadcast that the free enterprise system has proved to be the best method ever developed for bringing the fruits of progress to everyone.

Speech by Walter Reuther

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my pleasure to be in attendance during the delivery of one of the best talks it has been my privilege to hear in many months.

Several years ago at Aspen, Colo., Institute, it was again my pleasure to hear Walter Reuther appearing on a panel at that time with leaders of industry and of business in discussions profoundly affecting the growth of the American business potential.

Fortunately, in America, there is a common bond between certain captains of industry and leaders of unions regarding challenges in a dynamic society. A challenge began in 1946 with the assurance of 60 million jobs after World War II. It has grown to present abundant years with 70 million employed, with an unprecedented gross national product possible only in this great Nation.

I believe this talk is a record of this challenge and contains a message of wisdom to those who would continue a nation in prosperity. I commend it to my colleagues who may not have been present during its delivery last week:

SPEECH BY WALTER P. REUTHER, INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, APRIL 6, 1965

My good friend, Jack Conway, Mr. Vice President, our many distinguished guests from both branches of the Government, the legislative and executive branches, my colleagues in the labor movement and friends:

First, on behalf of the Industrial Union Department, I should like to extend to each of you a very warm welcome. We appreciate the opportunity of breaking bread with you and visiting with you. And I say to our friends from both branches of Congress that we hoped that they enjoyed the meal because that is your fringe benefit at our expense and my speech to you (as we've told you on other occasions) is the fringe benefit that we enjoy at your expense.

But I should like to point out in all seriousness that our lawyers told us that unless a number of labor leaders availed themselves of the opportunity of addressing the Congressmen here, we might be charged with inappropriate trade-union expenditure under the Labor-Management Act. So we're covering our flanks.

Now, we have come together, as I think we can all agree, at a very critical period in the history of the world and a period of revolutionary change and challenge in our own country. This is perhaps the first time in the history of the human family that any society was subjected to the strains and stresses of two parallel revolutions. We are witnessing the revolution called the great civil rights social revolution and that revolution is being compounded by the fact that it takes place at the very time that we are going through another revolution, the "20th century technological revolution." And these two revolutions compound and complement each other. I believe as one American that the essential source of our difficulty is a crisis in conscience. As a nation, we profess to believe in the values that are built around the worth and the dignity of each human person, and I believe that we believe these things. But unfortunately, in too many areas of our national life we are long on professing these beliefs and we are short in putting them into practice in the areas of the greatest controversy.

It's easy to believe in something when everybody agrees with you, but the test is what do you do in the areas of challenge, in the areas of conflict? In the areas where these two revolutions bear upon these values, they are areas of great challenge and great controversy. The test of the commitment of America to these basic values is how effectively can we develop the economic and social mechanism within the framework of our free society so that we can meet the problems of these revolutions and bring to practical fulfillment their bright promises.

We in the labor movement believe that you cannot solve these complex and challenging problems by slick slogans or by pious platitudes. They will take practical dedication, courage, and a lot of hard work.

What we need to do—as we understand it in the labor movement—is to find a way to achieve in this country that deep sense of national purpose which is necessary to be able to harness the abundance of the 20th century technological revolution and relate that abundance to the basic unmet needs of the human community.

Now the Communists, as we have said many times, do not believe that we are capable of meeting this challenge. They believe that we are a nation composed of economic pressure groups and that we have a relationship that makes it impossible for us to rise above that pressure-group relationship and achieve the sense of common purpose in the absence of war. I believe that we need to demonstrate, not with words but with deeds, that a free society like ours can achieve unity in diversity, and that we can, when faced with the challenges of peace, achieve the same deep sense of national purpose, because we share common hopes and aspirations, as we are always capable of doing when faced with the challenge of war because we share common fears and common hatreds.

I believe this meeting tonight gives the lie to the Communists that we are incapable of achieving a sense of common national purpose, because we have invited to this dinner tonight and we shall be hearing from some of these people—people who represent the three major religious faiths: Catholic, Protestant, and the Jewish faith. We've invited a prominent civil rights leader and a farmer and we've invited George Meany, a labor leader.

In July of 1963 there was a meeting held in New York City. There were 120 odd organizations who gathered that day. They came from church groups and civil rights groups and labor groups and civic groups and fraternal groups and they joined together in forming what became known as "The National Coalition of Conscience."

In February this year in the city of Washington most of the people who participated in the formation and the work of the national coalition of conscience that was related to the civil rights struggle and the passage of the civil rights bill in 1964 came together with a lot of new allies that we did not have in the civil rights struggle. Together that broad coalition of American citizens formed what is called "The iCtizens Crusade Against Poverty." That group was formed to help support and implement the Government's antipoverty program, but to go beyond the Government's program and to have citizens at every level of our society develop and initiate and implement programs beyond the Government's program.

These two coalitions—the coalition of conscience around the civil rights issue, and the citizens crusade against poverty around that issue, represent the broadest coalition of concerned citizens who have ever joined forces in the history of America. I believe that they represent a new and decisive dimension in the social dynamics that are going to shape the forces of change in the years ahead.

President Johnson has called upon America to join together in building the Great Society. I think perhaps the most profound and fundamental thing that he said in that speech before the graduates of the University of Michigan was when he said that in the building of the Great Society, men must be more concerned about the quality of their goals than the quantity of their goods. This is a very real problem. Our society as it becomes more affluent in a material sense must be on eternal guard that we do not

permit the values of the market place to so corrupt the central-core values of a free society. If America gets into a contest of sheer materialism as the measurement of success, then the Soviet Union and the Communists will win that contest because they will be true to their values and we will be untrue to ours.

The quality of a society depends essentially on how a society allocates its resources, both human and material, and relates the allocation of those resources to its set of values. It depends upon what you put first in the relationship of one value to the other. We've said many times that you judge the quality of a society not by what it has but rather by what it does with what it has. We are the richest country in the world. We had a gross national product in 1964 approximating $625 billion. No other nation in the history of the world has had the economic capability of creating that measure of material wealth. And yet measured against that wealth we know that today more than 30 million Americans live in poverty. They are the "have not" Americans, they are the Americans who are denied and deprived and dispossessed. If your skin is black, you are also discriminated against. But the tragedy of poverty in America is not that it is just economic in character. Poverty in America is poverty of the spirit, because people who live in poverty are not only robbed of the economic necessities, they are robbed of that spiritual quality that you can have only as you have a sense of belonging and a sense of worth and a sense of participation. These people are outcasts, and therefore they are robbed both economically and spiritually.

The President should be commended for his program against poverty, and we salute the Congress for enacting that program. It's a good beginning, but we as Americans living in the face of the realities of the 20th century must say to ourselves that while it is a good beginning, it is only a beginning. What we need to do in America is to raise our sights. We need bolder action on the antipoverty front and we need to be prepared to commit resources in the poverty fight equal to the dimensions of the problem we are working to solve.

There are other areas that need affirmative action. There is the broad area of education and there is the area of what do we do for our older people to give them a measure of security and dignity in the autumn of their lives when they're too old to work, but too young to die.

These two areas are really the test of the commitment and the value of any society. What do you do to provide your young people with the educational opportunities that will facilitate their maximum growth and development, limited only as God gave them the capability to grow? And what do you do for your older people after they've carried their share of the world's work? No American who looks at the facts can deny in good conscience the conclusion that we are failing both our children and our old people when you measure what we are doing up against our resources that we have.

In the field of medical care for older people, I challenge anyone to refute this simple statement: We in this great and wonderful land of ours, blessed like no other people has been blessed with material wealth, are doing less for our older citizens in terms of hospital and medical care needs in the autumn of their lives than does any industrialized nation of the world on either side of the Iron Curtain. That happens to be a tragic fact. It's because we let the marketplace decide what should have been a social decision of a society with a heart.

The problem in this area is not that we lack, or that the medical profession lacks, the professional competence to provide high-quality medical care (and I know it very well personally because they have made me whole on a number of occasions—and I've always been grateful for that). But the problem is not lack of medical know-how, the problem is not lack of technical competence, the problem is that our society has not provided a rational and responsible economic and social mechanism so that this high quality, comprehensive medical care can be available to the American people who need that care. That's where it breaks down. And when you get smug about this and when you get taken in by the propaganda of the medical society, just ask yourself how it comes that a country that leads in medical competence ranks 11th in the rate of infant mortality. We are 11th. Ten other nations with less skill and less resources do a better job seeing to it that when the Lord creates a new life that new life has a chance to grow and prosper than is done in this richest of all countries.

And so we say to our friends on both sides of the congressional structure and to our friends in the executive branch of the Government: The hour is late, we are encouraged by what has happened in this session of Congress, but we're going to keep pressing. We know our friends are going to keep working so that both the question of aid to education and medical care for the older people of this country will be taken care of in this session of Congress before you people go home for the summer holiday.

And then we have the civil rights question. We all rejoiced in 1964. We thanked President Johnson for his leadership, we thanked Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY for his leadership and we thanked people in both political parties because the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was not a partisan act. Civil rights is a moral issue that transcends party politics and both political parties deserve full credit, as does the President, for the enactment of that law.

But the record is clear. Back in 1964 we fought for the public accommodation section and we fought for the FEPC section * * * all in the record * * * we said, you're making a mistake if you don't build into that bill the Federal registrars, because all the legal obstructions will be used by the apostles of bigotry to block the achievement of first-class citizenship on the part of millions of American Negroes. And now a year later we're back doing what should have been done last year, and it is our urgent plea in the spirit of that tremendous address that the President made to the joint session of Congress which I believe was one of America's finest hours, we plead in the spirit of that address not to do a halfway job this time. Take the bill and strengthen it so you won't have to come back a second time before you remove all the barriers.

I know something about tyranny. I worked a year in the German underground fighting Hitlerism, and I lived almost 2 years under Joe Stalin. And I've looked ugly policemen with billy clubs in the eye, and I've been pushed around and beaten up and shot. I stood before the Berlin wall, a wall of shame which is the greatest monument to the bankruptcy of communism they've ever built. And I've stood at the wall of hate in Selma and as one American, as one human being, I say to our friends in Congress in this crisis: act in the knowledge that human freedom is indivisible. You cannot defend freedom in Berlin and deny it in Birmingham. And you cannot defend freedom in Saigon and deny it in Selma. It's that simple.

All of us want to get on with America's unfinished work and there is much unfinished work, but the key to all of these great social and economic problems is for America to realize the great unused potential that lies at our fingertips. You can't provide adequate education or security and dignity for older people or abolish poverty so long as we work within the framework in which from 12 to 18 percent of our economic potential goes to waste. Unemployment is still America's basic unresolved problem. In the last 11 years, 34 million man-years—not man-hours but man-years—have been wasted. They are gone forever. That's an irretrievable economic loss.

The year 1964, which we consider to be a relatively good year, was good only if you measure it by the past. Despite the fact that the economists say that was a relatively good year, we wasted $84 billion which was the unused economic potential—represented by idle workers, idle capacity, and the failure to achieve adequate economic growth in the economy. This is the margin of progress. It's the margin of doing those things in education and in housing and in medical care and in resource development and all the other things that are essential if we are to build the Great Society.

But you see the trouble is we always talk about where we've been and where we are in relation to where we've been. What we need to do is start measuring where we are—not from where we came from but where we ought to be going. Because that's the measurement of what we're doing.

We've made progress and the administration and the Congress are entitled to share in that. But that doesn't escape these tragic facts * * * that in 1964 there were still 13.3 percent of white teenagers walking the streets unemployed, and there were 25.9 percent of the Negro teenagers walking the street. That's the measurement of our crisis in this area.

I think the problem is that we have not as a nation in the development of national economic and social policy, fully comprehended the dimension of the technological revolution. We have not understood that the acceleration of the technological revolution requires us to create 80,000 new jobs every week in the next 10 years.

In 1946, the Congress enacted the Full Employment Act which committed this Nation to policies to achieve maximum employment, maximum production, and maximum purchasing power, but we have never achieved those purposes. What the Congress needs to do is to take that concept and bring the Employment Act up to date so it can deal with realities of today and the realities of tomorrow and then enact enabling legislation to achieve the purposes of that Full Employment Act. Until we do, we shall not be dealing effectively with poverty. You can't wipe out poverty within the framework of continuing chronic unemployment. What good is a civil rights bill to a young Negro who can't get a job? And you can't wipe out poverty among older people until you raise the level of social security so the benefits will take them out of the poverty level.

And then there's the minimum wage law. We know that the Congress is going to consider it. We urge strongly that it be improved—not as a pressure group because relatively few organized workers will get the benefit of an increase in minimum wages—but the people who will get the benefits are millions of Americans who now are not covered. Here, again, Congress ought to look at the facts. There are hundreds and hundreds of thousands of workers in America today who are working 40 hours a week but they're getting welfare supplements because their wages are so miserably low. And we believe that you can't deal with this problem excepting as you deal both with the coverage of minimum wage and raise the level to a realistic level which we recommend as the level of $2 per hour for every American wage earner.

Congress should take a look at the wage and hour law. We in the labor movement say that it's economically unsound and morally indefensible to have a situation as is the case now where hundreds of thousands of workers work excessive overtime week after week and month after month—and their

neighbors walk the street unemployed. Something has to be done about that.

This Nation has accepted collective bargaining as the rational and reasonable way for management and labor to work out their problems. If we believe in that, then we believe that 14-B ought to be wiped off the statute books so that collective bargaining won't be interferred with.

But fundamentally the problem is this:

We had the great depression—nothing mysterious about how it happened. We had a maldistribution of income and that is still our basic problem. If we are to deal with the problems and to realize the promise of the 20th century technological revolution, we have to achieve a more rational, a more responsible, and a more equable distribution of the national income. This is not only a matter of economic justice, it's a matter of economic necessity, if we are to achieve our full economic potential.

Our problem today is that by and large we are still wedded to obsolete economic concepts that grew out of a period of economic scarcity. What we need to do as a free people is to create new forms of economic cooperation between labor and management and industry—and out of that cooperation learn to do a better job in harnessing the abundance that automation makes possible and then gear that abundance to the unmet needs of the people of our society. This will require new ideas and new concepts. One of the things that we need to learn to do is to judge new ideas not by their source but by their substance. And we ought to accept them or reject them on their merits. I think that the real challenge is: Is it possible in our free society?

There is no argument in America about whether we believe in a free enterprise economy. This is the only major free labor movement in the world in which that is not a problem. The real problem is: How do we go about it within the framework of a free economy? Believing in the values of freedom and of human worth and dignity, how do we work out an arrangement in which we make compatible private planning for profit and public planning for the people? Because this is the area where we break down.

As one American I have unlimited faith in the capability of free men and free institutions. As one American I am confident that under the leadership of President Johnson we can build the Great Society, we can harness the rising star of science and technology and we can gear this abundance to the needs of the human family so that human progress and human fulfillment can be the proud blessings of all the people who share in the family of our great Nation.

National Prayer Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Miss Barbara J. Mercer, has proposed a National Prayer Day observance in honor of the President of the United States each year. Miss Mercer has tenaciously developed her idea concerning this prayer day. I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which this good lady gave to the San Leandro Marina Kiwanis Club breakfast on April 6, 1965; and, also, I am enclosing an editorial from the California Southern Baptist magazine for April 1, which favorably comments on this program:

ADDRESS BY MISS BARBARA MERCER

Good morning, gentlemen. Thank you for inviting me to breakfast with you and giving me the opportunity to tell you personally a little about my project. In almost a year I have contacted almost every Governor in the land—and many heads of church and state. It has been my privilege to correspond with some of them to the extent that I believe I have made real and lasting friendships.

This project of mine was an idea born right after the heartbreaking assassination of our late President Kennedy. I believe we have delayed this national offering to our President almost too long.

I wrote to President Johnson after his taking the oath of office and told him I would remember him in prayer and that I hoped God would see him safely along the way. I also mentioned I had read his presidential breakfast speech and was much impressed by his statement—and I quote: "No man could live in the house where I live, and work at the desk where I work, without needing and seeking the support of earnest and frequent prayer."

I received an answer to my letter and the President urged me to continue to remember him in my prayers. My reaction to his plea was almost instant. I knew I had to do more than just offer my prayers—why not ask the Nation to stand together in his hours of need. I feel the best thing I can do for my country is to pray for the man who leads it.

Mayor Maltester proclaimed June 12 of 1964 as San Leandro Presidential Prayer Day. Much effort went into the idea and although not too many churches participated because they weren't notified, inadvertently, we did have it established and it was observed in a very quiet manner.

The time for being quiet is over—all year I have worked constantly to enlist the support of the Governors throughout our land, various church dignitaries, fraternal organizations, any and all who would listen.

The book I have shown your president and which is being passed among you this morning is filled with the support letters—all invaluable—but now the demand must be made directly to the Governor.

On June 18, 1964, my very first support letter came from the Salvation Army. On June 24 came Governor Brown's letter supporting the idea and hoping I would succeed in getting religious and civic organizations interested. The letters came in abundance then—among them Pastor Jinks of the First Baptist Church, San Leandro, and one from your chairman of support of churches committee, Kenneth Bailey. Mr. Bailey sent me a copy of his letter to Kiwanis International President Charles Swain. I have never received an answer from him.

But I am asking Kiwanis Club of San Leandro Marina to again enlist the national support of Kiwanis membership, and in doing so, to send a letter requesting Governor Brown to proclaim a statewide observance.

A very fine editorial has just made the California Southern Baptist paper and they have sent a marked copy along with an excellent letter to Governor Brown. Dr. J. Terry Young, editor of the paper, made the first big step toward statewide observance and more requests are needed to flood the Governor's office. I hope I can count on your interest.

We feel that 1 day would be a bit unfair so mayors and heads of church have agreed that a 3-day observance would indeed be proper. So we hope to have proclaimed the last weekend in June—Friday, Saturday, and Sunday—so that all faiths may participate.

I am leaving a copy of the Baptist editorial and its accompanying letter to Governor Brown, along with a copy of his support letter and the mayor's proclamation of 1964. Perhaps the editorial will assist you in formulating your request to Governor Brown.

If there is any question in your mind at all, such as: "Should there really be a presidential 3-day prayer observance," I can only answer this way:

The man who leads our Nation has his aids, his advisers, his assistants. It is human to err and many, many times they do. All their advice must be weighed and studied and only the President can decide what to do. I have seen pictures of our Presidents in the past and President Johnson, seated in the small hours of the morning at their desks—heavily burdened—trying to decide, which aid or adviser was right. Only then does he realize—and I again quote President Johnson: "Prayer helps me to bear the burdens of the first office, which are too great to be borne by anyone alone."

Our beloved Nation was built on the solid foundation of God's word. Thomas Jefferson "swore upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." Today the termites of terrorism, violence, hate, destruction are nibbling at our Nation's foundation—but our Nation will stand firm only if we, her people, stand together with God as our shield. We have too long put God aside—we must return to the "firm reliance on the protection of divine providence"—a most precious last sentence in our Constitution.

Please help, gentlemen, to help our Nation stand secure by standing with me in this call to proclaim a national presidential 3-day prayer observance for the President of the United States.

[From the California Southern Baptist magazine, Apr. 1, 1965]

PRAYERS FOR NATION'S PRESIDENT

A one-woman crusade to establish an annual day of prayer for the President of the United States deserves wholehearted support. Miss Barbara Mercer, of San Leandro, last year proposed such an annual observance. The mayor of the city of San Leandro proclaimed the third Sunday in June as a day of prayer for President Johnson. The idea sparked considerable interest from religious and political leaders in other sections of the country. Miss Mercer suggests that the special period of prayer for the President become a national observance.

Gov. Edmund G. Brown would render the Nation and its Chief Executive a favor by proclaiming the third weekend in June a statewide season of prayer in behalf of the President of the United States. Governor Brown declared last year's limited prayer observance "A splendid idea." A California Congressman is ready to introduce legislation in Congress to create a national observance of prayer for the President if Governor Brown will proclaim a statewide season of prayer. Governor Brown has the unique opportunity to lead our State's citizens in praying for the Nation's No. 1 citizen and of providing a necessary stepping stone toward the creation of a national season of prayer for our Chief Executive. We think Governor Brown should exercise this opportunity and proclaim the third weekend of June as a three-day season of prayer for the Nation's President.

No man in the Nation needs the power of prayer support more than the resident of the White House. The responsibilities and burdens that are upon his shoulders are almost beyond our understanding. The Bible says that we are to pray for those in Governmental posts. An annual season of prayer for our President is most appropriate. Miss Mercer has suggested that the third week of each June—Friday, Saturday, and Sunday—be the date for an annual prayer observance. She suggests a 3-day period so as to encompass

the day of worship for most of the Nation's religious groups. We support her idea and hope that Governor Brown will make California the first State to observe this meaningful season of prayer for the President.

National Society Children of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that on April 23, 24, and 25 the National Society of the Children of the American Revolution will hold its 70th annual national convention here in the Nation's Capital.

A thousand young people between the ages of birth and 22 years who are descended from a Revolutionary patriot will attend.

This is the oldest patriotic youth organization in the United States, having been founded April 5, 1895, by Mrs. Harriet M. Lothrop who served as its president for 6 years.

From the time Mrs. Lothrop retired until the 1930's wives of Members of Congress served as the national president, visiting the State societies en route to and from Washington. Senior leaders were from the ranks of membership of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; National Society, Sons of the American Revolution; and National Society, Sons of the Revolution. Now these leaders still serve in an advisory capacity but there are member officers who carry on much of the work of the organization. Mrs. Nile Faust, of New Hampshire, is the senior national president.

Van Rensselaer Hoffman Sternbergh, of Washington, D.C., is the current national president and will preside at all sessions of the convention. Van is a junior in the College of Business Administration, George Washington University. He is chaplain of the Sigma Nu Fraternity and serves as assistant leader of the Boy Scout Explorer post they sponsor—the only Scout post sponsored by a social fraternity. He was delegate to the Inter-Fraternity Council; he served as editor of its news sheet and received their Top Conductor's Award presented at the council sing. He is currently editor of the news sheet for the Society for the Advancement of Management. Van was one of the top five shots in the District and has shot in many national rifle matches. He has been an Episcopal choir boy, and patrol leader, and is a member of the Order of DeMolay, General Society of the War of 1812, and the Military Order of World Wars, of which his late father was national commander in chief.

Van's background is typical of the children in this society which has as its purpose "the training of the members in true patriotism and love of country, in order that they may be better fitted for American citizenship."

The objects of the society are, first, to acquire knowledge of American history; second, to preserve and restore places of historical interest; third, to ascertain the deeds and honor the memories of the men, women, and children who rendered service to the cause of the American Revolution; fourth, to promote the celebration of patriotic anniversaries; fifth, to honor and cherish the flag of the United States above every other flag; sixth, to love, uphold, and extend the principles of American liberty and patriotism.

Work of the society includes an active conservation program; the donation of scholarships, books, clothing, and money to mountain schools and St. Mary's School for Indian Girls and Bacone College.

They present many flags, flag poles and flag instructions to other youth groups, hospitals, and settlement houses.

They have programs on and encourage the study of American music, literature and the other arts.

They maintain a small museum, open to the public, of Revolutionary articles and some items as recent as 1820. They also maintain one room in Gadsby's Tavern, and the Tomb of the Unknown Revolutionary Soldier in Alexandria, Va. They have assisted with the building of the Bell Tower at Valley Forge and Moore House—surrender house—at Yorktown, Va.

During war times they have loaned their headquarters for use of the Red Cross prisoner of war files, sponsored LST ships, and conducted war bond drives. They furnish prayer books for the children's chapel at the Washington National Cathedral and do many other civic services.

For the sixth consecutive year, Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge will honor the society at their convention with the George Washington Honor Medal Award for their outstanding work in promoting patriotic education among young people.

To encourage others in their youth work, the CAR presents a President's Award each year. This year Standard Oil Co. of California will receive the award for its "Standard School Broadcast," the oldest program of fine music sponsored, without commerical reference, and widely used for classroom instruction.

I feel that at this time when we hear so much adverse criticism of our young people, that it is well to be reminded that there are many dedicated, patriotic young people among us on whom we can depend to uphold the American way of life.

The Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the culture of America is the outward manifestation of our ideals, our aspirations, and our way of life—the reflection of our civilization itself.

This culture of ours is neither exclusive nor of recent development. While in many respects it mirrors our national aims and characteristics, our love of the fine arts, and science, our manners and customs, our inner motivations and impulses, our most profound goals, our loftiest concepts, it is essentially a composite of the past, a clear reflection of the present, and to some extent, probably a forecast of the future.

Our American culture reveals the things that are in our hearts, the preoccupations of our minds, and the deep-hidden stirring of our souls.

From other nations and people principally Western Europe but also many other parts of the world from the time of antiquity to the present, we have derived most of the basic patterns and ingredients that make up our culture.

In the broad sense, our culture embraces our freedoms and the governmental institutions we have developed to protect them, and it includes our dedication to the higher things of the spirit and the strong spiritual promptings which are, and until recently eroded substantially by materialism and other mechanistic philosophies always have been, a primary, fundamental basis of the American dream.

While culture embraces our manners, our social graces where we have them, our humane and compassionate reactions and the niceties and courtesies we display in our relations with others, it goes much deeper into our very system of government, our educational processes and our posture as a nation and a people in a world torn by strife, sorrow, fear, and uncertainty.

Culture is transmitted from one generation to another in the family circle, in the community, in the church, in the school, in the marts of trade and industry, and for the individual it does not necessarily require formal education, although that may be very helpful, and is becoming more increasingly necessary and desirable for the individual, since knowledge is, in the best sense, not only the progenitor, but the preserver and the disseminator, the creator and encourager of culture without which it will languish and wither.

To that end, we must as Americans be concerned more vitally and urgently than ever, though we seem not to be, with the development and spread of learning and the building of its facilities for generating the increase and dissemination of knowledge, because knowledge is the indispensable bloodstream and mainstream of our life and our civilization and the very bulwark of our freedom and the best promise of our future well-being, prosperity, happiness, and peace.

For this reason, and in order to promote the national good, we must constantly strive these days with intensified vigar and militant spirit of devotion and dedication to build and enrich this great heritage of American culture which is so much a part of our country and the differentiating characteristics of our people.

It is with these thoughts in mind that we note the recent progress report of the

Commission on Humanities recommending a National Foundation for the Humanities.

My able, distinguished colleague and valued friend, Congressman WILLIAM MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, introduced in the House the bill embodying the recommendation of the Commission urging that "the United States must not limit its efforts to science and technology, but must give full value and support to artistic activity."

Those words were extremely well and appropriately spoken by my colleague, and I want to associate myself with them in approval and agreement.

I think the important thing now in this field is for the Congress to get a start in promoting this great work which is so closely related to the national interests, and the growth, the development of the Nation, and the well-being, advancement, and happiness of the American people, and in turn the many peoples of the world who have an orientation toward us and may be influenced by the example we set, good or bad. Of course, we intend always that it shall be good and wholesome, constructive and fruitful, for personal liberal, moral, and spiritual integrity and the betterment of mankind.

The role of the specialist in our current day society is vital and must be given closest attention, and we must by all means recognize that the role of the generalist is of preeminent importance, since it is from the pool of individuals trained in the humanities that the bulk of the great, essential, inspirational leadership of the Nation comes.

It is important that both specialists and generalists should work hand in hand, and that individuals of promise, ability, and aspiration be given fullest possible opportunity to secure the very best training and education to which he aspires. The doors to higher education should be open to all who aspire, and special encouragement and assistance must be given to highly qualified individuals who seek either specialized or generalized education.

There must be no invidious distinctions drawn between scientists and generalists—all should have the chance to get the best education of which they are capable. In this process, all should be treated equally and one group or one person should not be preferred over others unless on their merits they are entitled to special consideration. The fit must prevail, but those who earnestly aspire must not be turned aside. One of them may be a Newton, an Einstein, or a Michelangelo.

Five Towns Conference on Religion and Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 28, 1965, I was privileged to participate as an honorary sponsor of the five towns Conference on Religion and Race held at Lawrence High School in Cedarhurst, N.Y.

Residents of our community gathered in great numbers in a meeting publicized as "An appeal to conscience"—in a spirit of reconciliation and constructive concern for the welfare of all men. The purpose of the conference was "to mobilize the religious forces of our community to work for fuller brotherhood and higher attainment of racial justice and to stir the conscience of the people so that they will seek those paths which will make our community more truly reflect God's love in all relationships."

Sponsoring organizations were the Roman Catholic Diocese of Rockville Centre; the Religious Council of the Five Towns and Rockaways; and the Group Relations Committee of the Five Towns Community Council.

Distinguished members of the clergy presided at the different sessions of the conference, which included workshops on education, housing and employment. Community leaders of all faiths participated as panelists and addressed those attending the afternoon and evening sessions.

On many occasions throughout the Fifth Congressional District, I have praised the clergy of all faiths for the leadership which they have exercised in order to achieve a better understanding among all the residents of our community.

They stood in the forefront of the struggle for human rights. This was illustrated at the Five Towns Conference on Religion and Race—a study in community awareness, community interest and community action. I have never been more proud of my community, my constituents, or of our American heritage than I was on that Sunday.

The remarks of Mr. Albert Vorspan, director of the Commission of Social Action of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations were so stirring that I commend the following excerpts from his address to my colleagues:

THE RACIAL REVOLUTION—ACID TEST FOR RELIGION

"Behold how good and how pleasant for brothers to dwell together."

We stand today at the vortex of a racial revolution which will determine, for all the generations yet to come, whether this blessed land will rise to its destiny as a land of the free. I thank God for the racial revolution. I believe that the Negro has become "God's suffering servant," his instrument for human redemption in our sick time. The Negro has become, like the Jew and the Catholic and other minorities at other times, the barometer of our moral health—and national sickness. The Negro revolution has held up a mirror and has compelled us to see ourselves. The Negro has reminded us of the gap between America's promise and fulfillment. The Negro has recalled an affluent and complacent American to a sense of national purpose, to be a sacred cause. The Negro has broken through the tinsel of self-righteous affluence and egocentric complacency. He has taken us by the throat and shaken us awake. He has restored a vision of a good society, a just society, a Godly society—a vision which can put a fire in men's belly and grandeur in our national life. Along with much pain and conflict and difficulty and challenge—the price of social revolution—the Negro has thrust before us the gleaming promise of a new tomorrow.

History will show that, in this decade, religion in America disenthralled itself. The church and the synagogue today are in the march toward racial justice and no power on earth can turn us around again. And we are marching together for the first time in American history, Roman Catholic priests and nuns, Protestant clergy, rabbis, laymen of all faiths. This new partnership is a vast power. It is the power of Judaism and Christianity in action, put to work in the life of our society. This partnership first emerged in Chicago in 1963 at the National Conference on Religion and Race, where the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Council of Churches and the Synagogue Council of America pledged to work together in a non-violent and unceasing war against racial segregation. That partnership lifted the march on Washington from a great Negro protest to a sublime expression of the conscience of a total society.

That religious partnership made possible the passage of the Civil Right Act, because the combined strength of religious groups elevated the issue above the dark arena of partisan politics to the high ground of moral and spiritual commitment. Our churches and synagogues now see race not as just a problem; but as challenge, as opportunity for renewal, and as the acid test of whether or not religion will be alive and relevant to a changing world.

And that same partnership now bears personal witness in Selma, Ala., where clergymen of all faiths have streamed in from all sections of the United States in answer to the irresistable summons of outraged conscience. Let us make no mistake. Selma will be recorded in American history as a triumphant breakthrough in America's struggle against racial tyranny. The martyrdom of Reverend Reeb, together with the living testimony of religious leaders of all faiths, has blasted through the shell of apathy and penetrated to the heart and conscience of the American people. It has inspired the President of the United States to embrace, with the words "We Shall Overcome" on his lips, the Negro revolution itself. It will inspire the U.S. Congress to put teeth into the right to vote. And it inspires us here and now with a new sense of the urgency of our own task.

And now we must lift the civil rights struggle from a negative and narrow fight against discrimination to a far grander and nobler goal: the remaking of America itself. We must convert the civil rights struggle into a genuine social revolution. The Negro, among his many other contributions to America, has made poverty visible. In the bright glare of the Negro challenge, we now see that 38 million Americans have been submerged in another America we did not know existed. We have come to know that the racial revolution cannot be fulfilled unless and until we solve the grinding problem of poverty in this wealthy land. Banish all discrimination tomorrow—as we surely will—the problem of the Negro will not vanish. In some ways, the plight of the Negro will be sharpened. What good is a man's right to go into a hotel if he has neither the money, nor the job, nor the self-esteem to contemplate it? What good is a child's right to integrated education if his spirit has been blasted by the hell of a slum before he even enters school? Our racial problems are connected to deep-seated social problems. Automation wipes out 40,000 jobs every week, and the unskilled Negro is the chief victim. Negro unemployment is twice that of whites.

Some 220,000 examinees for the military draft are rejected each year because of defects of health and education. In New York City alone, 25,000 youngsters drop out of school each year, most of them drifting into the cycle of hopelessness, despair and unemployment which is handed down from generation to generation. Poverty, like wealth,

is inherited in America. In 1950, according to the Great Cities School Improvement Studies, one child out of ten in America's largest cities was "culturally deprived," growing up ill equipped to deal with an urban world of papers and books and conversations and desks and machines.

I was fortunate to have been a part of the historic Selma to Montgomery march and to have engaged in the exhilirating experience of personal witness there and in other storm-tossed southern communities. I can appreciate the wisdom of the words of President Johnson: "Let each of us look within our hearts and our own communities and let each of us put our shoulder to the wheel to root out injustice wherever it exists." We cannot all go to Selma; and the most important contribution each of us can make to racial justice is what we do right here in our own community. This conference today is only the first step in a long journey—but as the late President Kennedy often reminded us, the first step is the crucial one.

But what about the Five Towns? Isn't it fantastic to connect Selma or St. Augustine or Montgomery with the Five Towns? We are all one Nation and racial injustice is a national, not a regional, problem. In our own community we do not have the ghoulish spectacle of tear gas and police dogs and Nazi-like sheriffs. But let us not pretend that the Messiah has arrived on the 5:52. We are not yet an open community. We are stratified along lines of race, economics, and even religion. Most of our neighborhoods are homogenized all white. If we think this is purely accidental, we should accompany one of our Negro neighbors from Inwood as he traverses the obstacle course of hypocrisy, lies, evasions, and humiliation in seeking the simple opportunity of renting an apartment or purchasing a home in the manicured and racially pure sections of Hewlett, Woodmere, Cedarhurst, and Lawrence. We do not resort to violence in keeping the stranger from our gate, but the violence we do to the mind and spirit of the nonwhite often hurts more than clubs—and the violence we do to ourselves and our children, by creating a false sense of racial superiority, is no different morally from the racist gospel taken straight.

We have not held out our hand as a community. We have not held out our hand as employers, welcoming nonwhites not just as menial workers but in jobs where a man can stretch to the limits of his potential of growth. We have not sought out nonwhite teachers to give our children the experience of respect for differences. We have not as a community done much more than cluck our tongues about the profound social and economic problems which place Inwood at the bottom of the poverty ladder in the entire county. Race has been a Berlin wall and few of us whites even know our Negro neighbors as human beings. We have papered over our problems with ameliorative social work and with pious sermons and with Lady Bountiful projects, but we have not—until now—attacked the basic roots of poverty which, when linked with racial discrimination, impoverish and stifle the spirit and the personality.

And let us admit also, these failures to build the city of hope—the community of fellowship, a genuine neighborhood of love and mutual cooperation—these failures are due in some measure, at least, to the fact that many of our religious institutions have been spectators and not participants in the building of a community. We have offered the sermon, but not the deed. We have shrunk from the hard, daily, undramatic work of knitting the fabric of community life. This conference is historic because Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish religious institutions are working in unison for the first time. Perhaps now, in the crucial days ahead, joined in a spirit of reconciliation and constructive concern, the united forces of religion can move the Five Towns closer to that humane and just kingdom of God which is the vision and goal of our respective faiths.

We have work to do right here. In some matters we have already begun to move. Leaders of the community, mobilized by our Five Towns Community Council, are spearheading now a realistic approach to poverty in our community. Prekindergarten nurseries, tutorial projects and "each one teach one" are offering opportunities for personal growth and community development. The Group Relations Committee is working hard to guarantee equality of opportunity in housing, employment, and education. Our community house is a beacon of hope in strengthening the human resources of the community. But our problems, too long neglected, cry out of the depths of the combined intelligence and good will of the total community. The Great Society, like charity, must begin at home. Hearts aching and tormented by events in Alabama can be healed best by the work of our hands here in our own community. For each of us, and our lives, do count. Together we can move mountains. Together, Protestant, Catholic and Jew, Negro and white, we can make this community a model of decency, compassion and justice.

Martin Luther King electrified the march on Washington when he proclaimed his dream for America. Well, with apologies to Reverend King, I have a dream for our Five Towns community. I have a dream of an open community where people will be judged solely on their merits as human beings and not by their color or religion. I have a dream of a community where brotherhood will be a fact of life and not an annual event in February, where each will be enriched by knowing and cherishing his neighbor of another color and another faith and another part of town. I have a dream of a community which will be as aroused by poverty in its midst as by noisy planes overhead, where my neighbor's suffering will be a humiliation to me. I have a dream of a community which not merely obeys the laws of civil rights, but which reaches out its hand to encourage those who need encouragement—who need a fair chance at a good job, a good house, a good life. I have a dream of a community where our schools will not be timid but will seize the opportunity to teach human relations and the great meaning of the civil rights drama of our day. I have a dream of a community where the churches and the synagogues will not be isolated spectators but become houses of prayer for all people, through visits and exchanges across denominational lines, through cooperation in building a better community. I have a dream of a community in which a young man of ideals will not have to go to Mississippi to work for human rights but will be challenged and encouraged to make his contribution here in our community. I have a dream of a community which will be known near and far not for its exclusiveness or its lavish homes or its beach clubs, but for the graciousness of its spirit, the friendliness which binds neighbor to neighbor and goals which animate it. I have a dream of a community in which it will no longer be regarded as a civil rights victory if a man of dark skin moves into our neighborhood. I have a dream of a Five Towns which will glady play its part in building that larger American dream.

In the words of an ancient rabbi: "The matter is urgent. The hour is late. The task is difficult. It is not incumbent upon us to complete the task—but neither are we free to desist from it."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McCarthy, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Smathers, Clark, Pell, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Hon. R. G. Le Tourneau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD some articles about one of the great and outstanding men of our Nation, Mr. R. G. Le Tourneau. Through the years he has contributed much through his creative genius to the welfare of this country. He is still contributing much. Mr. Le Tourneau is a great Christian leader who lives and practices his Christianity. I commend Mr. Le Tourneau on his attainments.

I include the article from the Longview Daily News at this point:

WALL STREET JOURNAL PROFILES MR. R. G.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—A front page article bore the headline "Hang-the-Cost Effort on Inventions Lands Le Tourneau in Black" in Thursday morning's edition of the Wall Street Journal. The article follows).

(By Frank Morgan)

LONGVIEW, TEX.—The company's president sketches machine parts in chalk on the factory floor. His executives ignore cost analysis, efficiency studies and other management tools. "If we can drive it out the door and it does what it's supposed to do, that's it," says one official.

That's the way R. G. Le Tourneau, Inc., does business. In spite of this unconventional approach—and in some ways because of it—this maker of big earthmoving equipment has bounced from near-bankruptcy to comparative affluence within the past 2 years, illustrating in the process some of the advantages and drawbacks of one-man control.

The man is R. G. Le Tourneau, 76-year-old founder, president, chairman, chief designer and, in effect, absolute ruler of the concern headquartered here. "No one argues with R. G.," one executive says. Disdaining lengthy conferences and committee meetings, Mr. Le Tourneau spends much of his 14-hour day whizzing around his plant in an electric cart or bending over a drawing board, designing new equipment.

The company's turnabout is due chiefly to Mr. Le Tourneau's inventive genius—and particularly the success of an enormous gamble he took in developing one of his inventions, the electric wheel. This effort took 10 years and cost $25 million, a staggering sum for a company Le Tourneau's size. No stockholders were screaming for management's scalp, however; Mr. Le Tourneau controls 90 percent of the company's shares, which are owned by a foundation he heads.

The gamble paid off and now the electric wheel is used on all Le Tourneau's road scrapers, dirt loaders, and transports, which sell for up to $212,000 each. Aided by the new wheel, the company is regaining some of the market it once dominated. "In 5 years we'll have one-third of the total industry scraper sales," predicts William B. Barry, eastern division sales manager. The company expects to sell 120 pieces of earthmoving equipment this year, double the 1964 total.

In machines using the electric wheel, a single diesel engine produces electric current, which is fed to a powerful direct current motor and gear box mounted within the rim of each wheel. The power applied to the wheels is controlled from the operator's cab. Mr. Le Tourneau claims that "the steepest grade and the thickest mud can't hold it back." The device makes the most efficient use of available horsepower, he notes, because no energy is wasted on a transmission, clutch, or driveshaft.

Development of the idea began in 1953, when Mr. Le Tourneau sold his patents and three of his five plants to Westinghouse Air Brake Co. for $31 million, with the additional stipulation that Le Tourneau could produce no more earthmovers for 5 years. Le Tourneau then branched out into other areas, building huge "slicing" machines to clear jungles, cranes to remove crashed planes from airport runways, and aircraft carrier decks, log carriers, and offshore drilling platforms. Only the latter, however, showed promise of big sales and profits. In the meantime, Mr. Le Tourneau kept pouring cash into development of the electric wheel.

He was almost too late. By 1958, when the company was permitted to sell earthmovers again, the wheel still wasn't ready. In the next few years, Mr. Le Tourneau sold a few machines with the new device, but it was riddled with bugs. The company lost $1.7 million in 1962, and teetered at the edge of bankruptcy. Weakened by heavy spending to develop the new wheel and other gear, facing creditor lawsuits, and unable to pay a $100,000 electric bill, Le Tourneau appeared sure to collapse.

But Mr. Le Tourneau sacked the attorney who recommended bankruptcy, stalled his creditors, and finally licked the technical problems that were crippling sales. Le Tourneau moved into the black. Its recovery was helped along by another of Mr. Le Tourneau's brainstorms—an offshore oil and gas drilling platform with slanted legs which rest on the ocean floor. Weighing 4,500 tons and selling for $5.5 million, the platforms are more stable than conventional ones with straight legs, customers say. The development has helped Le Tourneau get contracts for 9 of the 18 offshore platforms currently under construction in the United States.

The scripture quoting Mr. Le Tourneau is philosophical about his company's recovery. "The Lord chooses the weak to confound the mighty," he says. Rivals suggest that the company's costly trial-and-error product development measures are risky business indeed, and indicate Mr. Le Tourneau was lucky—this time. "We all have high regard for his genius and inventiveness, from which we've all benefited," says an executive of one competing company, "but mechanical genius and business ability are two different things."

For the present, at least, Mr. Le Tourneau can afford to smile at such observations all the way to the bank. Last year the company posted net income of $4.6 million on sales of $29.7 million.

I include the Wall Street Journal article.

HANG-THE-COST EFFORT ON INVENTIONS LANDS LE TOURNEAU IN BLACK—HUGE GAMBLE ON ELECTRIC WHEEL, UNUSUAL METHODS PAY OFF FOR EARTHMOVING EQUIPMENT FIRM

(By Frank Morgan)

LONGVIEW, TEX.—The company's president sketches machine parts in chalk on the factory floor. His executives ignore cost analysis, efficiency studies and other management tools. "If we can drive it out the door and it does what it's supposed to do, that's it," says one official.

That's the way R. G. Le Tourneau, Inc., does business. In spite of this unconventional approach—and in some ways because of it—this maker of big earthmoving equipment has bounced from near-brankruptcy to comparative affluence within the past 2 years, illustrating in the process some of the advantages and drawbacks of one-man control.

The man is R. G. Le Tourneau, 76-year-old founder, president, chairman, chief designer and, in effect, absolute ruler of the concern headquartered here. "No one argues with R. G." one executive says. Disdaining lengthy conferences and committee meetings, Mr. Le Tourneau spends much of his 14-hour day whizzing around his plant in an electric cart or bending over a drawing board, designing new equipment.

The company's turnabout is due chiefly to Mr. Le Tourneau's inventive genius—and particularly the success of an enormous gamble he took in developing one of his inventions, the electric wheel. This effort took 10 years and cost $25 million, a staggering sum for a company Le Tourneau's size. No stockholders were screaming for management's scalp, however; Mr. Le Tourneau controls 90 percent of the company's shares, which are owned by a foundation he heads.

NEW WHEEL SPURS SALES

The gamble paid off, and now the electric wheel is used on all Le Tourneau's road scrapers, dirt loaders and transports, which sell for up to $212,000 each. Aided by the new wheel, the company is regaining some of the market it once dominated. "In 5 years we'll have one-third of the total industry scraper sales," predicts William B. Barry, eastern division sales manager. The company expects to sell 120 pieces of earthmoving equipment this year, double the 1964 total.

In machines using the electric wheel, a single diesel engine produces electric current, which is fed to a powerful direct current motor and gear box mounted within the rim of each wheel. The power applied to the wheels is controlled from the operator's cab. Mr. Le Tourneau claims that "the steepest grade and the thickest mud can't hold it back." The device makes the most efficient use of available horsepower, he notes, because no energy is wasted on a transmission, clutch, or driveshaft.

Development of the idea began in 1953, when Mr. Le Tourneau sold his patents and three of his five plants to Westinghouse Air Brake Co. for $31 million, with the additional stipulation that Le Tourneau could produce no more earth movers for 5 years. Le Tourneau then branched out into other areas, building huge "slicing" machines to clear jungles, cranes to remove crashed planes from airport runways and aircraft carrier decks, log carriers, and offshore drilling platforms. Only the latter, however, showed promise of big sales and profits. In the

meantime, Mr. Le Tourneau kept pouring cash into development of the electric wheel.

ON BANKRUPTCY'S BRINK

He was almost too late. By 1958, when the company was permitted to sell earthmovers again, the wheel still wasn't ready. In the next few years, Mr. Le Tourneau sold a few machines with the new device, but it was riddled with bugs. The company lost $1.7 million in 1962, and teetered at the edge of bankruptcy. Weakened by heavy spending to develop the new wheel and other gear, facing creditor lawsuits, and unable to pay a $100,000 electric bill, Le Tourneau appeared sure to collapse.

But Mr. Le Tourneau sacked the attorney who recommended bankruptcy, stalled his creditors, and finally licked the technical problems that were crippling sales. Le Tourneau moved into the black. Its recovery was helped along by another of Mr. Le Tourneau's brainstorms—an offshore oil and gas drilling platform with slanted legs which rest on the ocean floor. Weighing 4,500 tons and selling for $5.5 million, the platforms are more stable than conventional ones with straight legs, customers say. The development has helped Le Tourneau get contracts for 9 of the 18 offshore platforms currently under construction in the United States.

The Scripture-quoting Mr. Le Tourneau is philosophical about his company's recovery. "The Lord chooses the weak to confound the mighty," he says. Rivals suggest that the company's costly trial-and-error product development measures are risky business indeed, and indicate Mr. Le Tourneau was luckly—this time. "We all have high regard for his genius and inventiveness, from which we've all benefited," says an executive of one competing company, "but mechanical genius and business ability are two different things."

For the present, at least, Mr. Le Tourneau can afford to smile at such observations all the way to the bank. Last year the company posted net income of $4.6 million on sales of $29.7 million; this year sales are expected to top $48 million, and pretax earnings are expected to be about $9 million (the company will be taxed at standard rates this year after paying only $67,500 in income taxes for 1964 because of loss carryforwards). Order backlog currently stands at $40 million against "almost nothing" 2 years ago, and the work force has risen to 3,000 from only 800 then.

Though competitors can charge Mr. Le Tourneau with taking an occasional risky plunge on a new machine, none can accuse him of lavishness in other areas. His car is a reconditioned Volkswagen, his home a modest ranch-style brick house 200 yards from the plant. Executive offices, which lead out into the plant, are noisy and devoid of all but necessary work furniture. The executive washroom is the same one all employees use, located across from a welding machine on the factory floor.

Intensely religious, Mr. Le Tourneau gives a healthy chunk of his $36,000 salary to his church, Pineswood Alliance Church in Longview, a unit of the Christian and Missionary Alliance Society, and to the Le Tourneau Foundation, to which he also donated the company stock. The foundation operates Le Tourneau College, a 4-year liberal arts institution whose students can work in the plant to help pay their tuition, and finances self-help projects overseas. On weekends Mr. Le Tourneau flies to different parts of the country to tell religious and business groups about his work and his faith, which are intertwined. "Sometimes I have a hard time proving to God I love Him more than these machines," he says.

This article appeared in the Tyler Morning Telegraph:

LE TOURNEAU BOUNCES BACK

(The following editorial is reproduced from the April 5 issue of the Tyler Morning Telegraph, one of the two daily newspapers owned by the T. B. Butler Publishing Co. Calvin Clyde, Jr., general manager, is recognized as one of the most outstanding newspapermen and business executives in the Southwest.)

East Texans should rejoice that business is again booming for one of this region's major industries, that of R. G. Le Tourneau, Inc., in Gregg County. It is an industry that contributes much to the economic well-being of this region.

According to a Wall Street Journal writer who visited the plant recently, it was the persistence and inventive genius of 76-year-old R. G. Le Tourneau who brought the company back on the highroad of sales after a slump in the latter 1950's and early 1960's.

That downturn came after Le Tourneau, manufacturer of heavy earth moving equipment, had sold all his patents and five of his plants to Westinghouse, and had agreed not to produce any more earthmovers for 5 years. But in that period, R. G. Le Tourneau dared to go ahead with a new and revolutionary idea of inventing and developing an electric wheel. Despite the heavy and paralyzing costs and delays in getting the new invention perfected and in production, that goal has been achieved and it is described as a mighty factor in Le Tourneau's regaining prominence in the markets.

"In 5 years we'll have one-third of the total industry road scraper sales," predicts William B. Barry, eastern division sales manager, quoted in the Wall Street Journal.

The company expects to sell 120 pieces of earth moving equipment this year, double the 1964 output. These "pieces" include earth moving units that sell for up to $212,000 each and offshore oil and gas drilling platforms that sell for around $5.5 million each. These platforms are another brainchild of Le Tourneau that has quickened the industry's recovery. The development of this huge drilling facility has helped Le Tourneau get contracts for 9 of the 18 offshore platforms currently under construction in the United States.

A few details on that electric wheel belong here: According to the Wall Street Journal, "In machines using the electric wheel, a single diesel engine produces electric current, which is fed to a powerful direct-current motor and gearbox mounted within the rim of each wheel. The power applied to the wheels is controlled from the operator's cab. Mr. Le Tourneau claims that 'the steepest grade and the thickest mud can't hold it back.' The device makes the most efficient use of available horsepower, he notes, because no energy is wasted on a transmission, clutch, or driveshaft."

The Le Tourneau recovery is a success story with few equals and it is of particular interest, and pride, here in east Texas where the qualities of inventiveness and persistence against adversity are mighty factors in business and industrial success. R. G. Le Tourneau has proved this to be true, and he deserves plenty of applause.

New York's World Trade Center: Vision or Delusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following detailed appraisal of the proposal to build a world trade center in lower Manhattan.

It seems to me that the least that can be said is that no project of this magnitude should be undertaken without a great deal more intensive study.

The views of the Citizens' Inquiry on the World Trade Center, Inc., follow:

THE PROPOSED WORLD TRADE CENTER: VISION OR DELUSION?—AN APPRAISAL

(Citizens' Inquiry on the World Trade Center, Inc., New York, N.Y.)

WHAT IS THE PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY?

The Port of New York Authority is a bistate agency created in 1921 by a compact between the States of New York and New Jersey with the consent of the Congress of the United States. It is run by a 12-member board, 6 of whose members are selected by the Governor of New York and 6 by the Governor of New Jersey. The port authority was created to operate the transportation facilities between the two States. Until the 1962 law providing for the World Trade Center, its activities were essentially confined to the ownership and operation of these physical transit facilities.

THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD TRADE CENTER

The history behind the plans of the port authority for the proposed World Trade Center is important to an understanding of them. The concept of a World Trade Center in New York City first received public recognition in 1946, when the New York State Legislature created the World Trade Corp. to study and take action in the matter. This specially created public body, which was headed by Winthrop Aldrich, reported that the concept of a World Trade Center in New York City was unnecessary and unfeasible. It further concluded that the principal need and most urgent and suitable project was the modernization and rehabilitation of the piers.[1]

The concept was kept alive by the Downtown Lower Manhattan Association and its chairman, David Rockefeller, who, in 1958, commissioned the port authority to study the idea. In 1961 the authority issued a report suggesting that a World Trade Center be built on the East River at about Wall Street. Tentative plans revealed at that time showed a project area dominated by one 76-story building. This site was chosen because of its proximity to the Stock Exchange (which was to be the "cornerstone" of the project in 1961) and because, according to the port authority's own investigation, this was found to be the "most appropriate" site for such a center, for "no other single site was considered to be appropriate when all requirements were evaluated."[2]

In 1961 the New York State Legislature passed a law which authorized the port authority to build a World Trade Center on the lower east side of Manhattan. However, this 1961 statute never really went into effect because the New Jersey Legislature refused to pass such a law. (Since the port authority is a bistate agency, legislation of this nature requires the consent of both New York and New Jersey.)

There now began a battle of special interests. New York State had for some time been under pressure from her sister State to have the port authority take over the Hudson tubes from the near bankrupt Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Corp. As far as the World Trade Center was concerned, New York's Governor Rockefeller was very much in favor of it, and further, he insisted that the creation of the World Trade Center be linked together with the acquisition of the Hudson tubes.[3] On the other hand, the

Footnotes at end of speech.

New Jersey Legislature and both former Governor Meyner and present Governor Hughes, though strongly in favor of having the port authority acquire and modernize the Hudson tubes, were not interested in the creation of a World Trade Center in New York City, particularly on the east side of the city. Moreover, they were vehemently opposed to Governor Rockefeller's suggestion that the two projects be linked together.[4]

An agreement was finally reached, largely due to the influence of Governor Rockefeller. New Jersey accepted the idea of the port authority creating a World Trade Center on the Hudson, rather than the East River, in return for which New York agreed to allow the port authority to take over the Hudson tubes.

In 1962 each State passed virtually identical statutes making the two projects inseparable parts of one unified project. The statutes expressly provide that if, for any reason, one project cannot be consummated the other may not be pursued.

LEGAL CHALLENGES

The constitutionality of the New York statute was immediately challenged in a lawsuit by the small businessmen who operate stores in the area proposed for the World Trade Center, a 16-acre site on the west side of downtown Manhattan, bounded generally by Liberty, Church, Barclay, and West Streets. The businessmen claimed that any condemnation of property in the area would be a deprivation of property without due process of law, in that it would be a taking of private property for other than a public use or purpose.

Although the appellate division of the New York Supreme Court, first department, decided in favor of the businessmen, the New York Court of Appeals reversed this decision, and the U.S. Supreme Court dismissed an appeal for want of a "substantial Federal question."

This first lawsuit ended in late December 1963. Within a month thereafter, the port authority revealed its current plans for the World Trade Center. Unlike the earlier plans in 1961, these plans showed two buildings, each 110 stories in height, in a complex of buildings which would make available an aggregate of 10 million square feet of new business and commercial space in New York City.

The constitutionality of these plans is now under attack in a second lawsuit begun in September 1964, by leading builders, owners, and operators of office buildings in New York City. The realtors claim that, even if the statutes under which the port authority purports to act are constitutional, the action proposed to be taken thereunder is not. They say that the plans of the port authority show clearly that the proposed World Trade Center is merely a real estate venture of giant proportions by which the port authority, under its tax-exempt status, will increase its revenues at the expense of private enterprise. In addition, the Downtown West Businessmen's Association, Inc., has announced that it will challenge the constitutionality of the project in new lawsuits.

This paper, however, is not written to set forth propositions of law, but questions of public policy. We, the people, must decide the public policy questions—we must decide whether the port authority's plans are sound, and wise, and consistent with the traditions of our system of free enterprise and representative government.

WHY THE PORT AUTHORITY NEEDS A WORLD TRADE CENTER

Above, it was indicated that the history behind the plans for the World Trade Center is important. It is more than that: it is critical. It shows that the plans cannot be discussed apart from the facts relating to the takeover of the Hudson tubes.

Footnotes at end of speech.

This takeover will cost the port authority about $15 million per annum. The operation of the tube system cost the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Corp. about $10 million per year. That cost will now be increased by the expense of the program of rehabilitation in which the port authority is necessarily engaged.

The port authority is faced with the prospect of financing a unified project of which the acquisition of the Hudson tubes is an inseparable part. It must finance this project by floating a bond issue. It cannot hope to sell bonds, however, unless the project is sufficiently profitable to insure investors of both the security of their investment and the prospect of a reasonable return. The only solution to this predicament is to make certain that the other part of the project, the World Trade Center, is sufficiently profitable to overcome the anticipated annual deficit of the tube system and to produce an overall annual profit large enough to attract investors.

In short, the only way out of this dilemma is to make the World Trade Center into a gigantic real estate development which will have all the tax advantages available to a tax-exempt Government authority. This solution, however, will create a situation worse than the problem it is intended to resolve.

WHY WE BELIEVE THE WORLD TRADE CENTER IS UNNECESSARY AND UNFEASIBLE

To begin with, a gigantic real estate development in one relatively small area in New York City will not help to promote world trade in the port of New York. It will not do so, because it will not affect the economic factors responsible for reducing this port's share of world trade. It will not reduce the high cost of carrying on world trade in New York City, which results from high labor rates, high storage and trucking charges, and, generally, the high cost of distributing the merchandise brought into the city.

The legislation providing for the creation of the World Trade Center states that its purpose is to furnish "the centralized accommodation" for all the backup services essential to world trade in the port of New York. It has never been shown, however, just how centralization could or would solve the problems of the port.

The chairman and executive director of the port authority have had occasion to take inventory of the principal causes of the relative decline of the port of New York. They have attributed its comparative decline to factors other than the lack of "centralization."[5] Some of the factors to which Austin Tobin, the executive director, has ascribed port decline are rail rate differentials, higher costs of trucking services to and from the port, and the broad growth and economic development of the South and Southwest whose cargoes are naturally "captive" to the gulf and southern ports.[6] Another reason which has often been cited is the deplorable state of New York's old and outmoded piers. This last factor is particularly disturbing in view of the fact that the port of New York has some of the best natural piers and waterways in the world.

Given these reasons for the decline, the port authority never answers specifically just how a World Trade Center—i.e., office buildings—will solve the problems of the port. The one thing it never does is to outline the cause and effect. As far as we can see, therefore, the World Trade Center provides no answer to the very real and concrete problems facing the port of New York.

The answer of the port authority to these facts of economic life is that the proposed World Trade Center will reduce the high cost of carrying on world trade in New York City by centralizing all of the backup services essential to world trade. As the World Trade Corp. pointed out as early as 1948, however, centralization is both unnecessary and unfeasible.

No one can deny that all of New York City is a world trade center. How can there be centralization when practically every business conducted in New York City is in some way connected with world trade? This 13-square block area could never truly combine the thousands of services in the New York area which make the city a world trade center in capital letters. Therefore, it is obviously strange that a major portion of the port authority's World Trade Center complex is planned to hold a shopping center, hotel, extensive parking areas, restaurants, and unrelated businesses that immediately dispel the concept of a tight-functioning machine devoted solely to world trade.

There has never been any spontaneous demand or demonstrated desire for centralization by the prospective occupants—that is, businesses engaged primarily in world trade—of a world trade center. Proof of this was brought out as recently as the week of December 6, 1964, when WCBS television news and the public press reported that after 3 years of intensive soliciting by the port authority, less than 300,000 of the more than 10 million available square feet has actually been leased—and this on a conditional basis. This figure represents less than 3 percent of the total available space. It is also interesting to note that the major portion of this 3 percent figure is being leased by five banks. No less important is the fact that despite their prolonged selling campaign, to date, the port authority has proved unable to interest any new businesses involved in foreign trade in moving their business operation to New York City and locating in a world trade center.

Another aspect of the question of tenants has been the matter of the State offices. Governor Rockefeller suddenly announced this past January 1964, that the State offices in New York City would be moved into the World Trade Center. This proposal has provoked strong reactions from the State legislature as well as from the public information media. A valid question has been raised as to what possilbe connection the State offices have with world trade. Current plans call for these State offices to occupy approximately 2,500,000 square feet of space in the World Trade Center. This means that the State offices would occupy a major portion of one building. In fact, it has been stated that this building would be known as the New York State Office Building. However, WCBS television news has reported on December 8, 1964, that our new Democratic-controlled legislature has indicated that it will strongly oppose any such move.

In view of this obvious disinterest on the part of perspective tenants engaged in world trade, it is clear to us that a world trade center is unfeasible as well as unnecessary. WCBS radio in an editorial examining the question of feasibility had this to say:

"The port authority maintains it will rent all of the trade center space to firms and agencies in the export-import field * * * it was on the basis of what is called a public purpose that the Legislatures of New York and New Jersey empowered the port authority to condemn private land for the trade center. If, however, the complex of export-import industries cannot be attracted to the project, then no trade center is possible, and plainly no public purpose is involved. The taking of private property in that case would amount to willful government destruction * * *."[7]

A FEW OF THE SERIOUS CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSED "WORLD TRADE CENTER"

1. This World Trade Center carries with it a threat to the protections and limitations surrounding the use of eminent domain. It raises serious questions of public policy if flourishing private enterprise is destroyed to be replaced primarily by other private enter-

prise. The following quotation demonstrates this point:

"Government has of course the right to appropriate private land for a legitimate public use, with just compensation. Historically, public use has referred to highways, schools, military installations and the like. To appropriate a man's home or business for a public purpose obviously is something not undertaken frivolously. Certainly to take one man's property to make way for another man's property is something not undertaken at all. This, we submit, is what is being proposed by the port authority for the World Trade Center." [9]

This question becomes even more disturbing in the light of the enabling legislation which allows the port authority to condemn not only the 16-acre site specifically designated for the World Trade Center. The law states:

"If the port authority shall find it necessary, convenient, or desirable to acquire * * * from time to time any real property or any property other htan real property * * * for any of the purposes of this act whether for immediate or future use * * * the port authority may find and determine that such property * * * is required for a public use, and upon such determination the said property shall be and shall be deemed to be required for such public use until otherwise determined by the port authority, and such determination shall not be affected by the fact that such property has theretofore been taken for and is then devoted to a public use; but the public use in the hands of or under the control of the port authority shall be deemed superior to the public use in the hands of any other person, association or corporation." [9]

The above excerpt surely raises a public policy question concerning the application of eminent domain, for the statute clearly enables the port authority in future acquisitions to itself determine what constitutes a public purpose and makes a port authority public use superior.

2. Placing the quasi-governmental port authority in the real estate business represents unwarranted interference with our free enterprise system. Actually, the proposed World Trade Center will hurt business in New York City. It will, leading realtors are convinced, turn the office building boom into a bust by dumping on the market 10 million square feet of new business and commercial space at a time when millions of square feet of such space are already vacant. Since it will have serious effects on the private real estate industry, and will also involve a considerable loss in taxes from the doomed area itself, this project will thus hurt the city's tax base available for public services.

3. The proposed World Trade Center will harm all private enterprise. It will establish a precedent for financing public projects (in this case, a bistate commuter railroad) by having Government agencies enter into competition with private firms in what is, traditionally, the private sector of the economy (in this case, a real estate development). There can be little question as to the ultimate victor in any such competition.

4. Perhaps most important, the proposed World Trade Center will also do great damage to our traditional concept of representative government. This World Trade Center project cannot be considered apart from the agency empowered to create it. Therefore, a brief examination of the nature of the port authority is in order. The port authority is a tax-free body which consists of a 12-member board, all of whom are appointed, not elected by nor directly responsible to the people. Their plans and policies are not directly subject to public scrutiny or consent.

"The New York Port Authority, set up to handle a bistate problem, and like many another authority, ostensibly nonpolitical, has developed a politics of its own, a politics of specialists who may or may not be responsive to the public interest." [10]

The prime concern of a public agency should be the public welfare. But the port authority itself freely admits that the deciding factor in all its undertakings is the element of profit and the protection of the interests of its bondholders.

"A brilliant political invention, the port authority has worked splendidly for 30 years. The only trouble is that it's now doing the wrong job and stubbornly refuses to take on the urgent task it ought to be handling * * *.[11] The port authority, while matching the high level of private business management talent, must also be informed with a superior sense of responsibility to the public it serves. * * *

"However, it turns out that this lofty ideal is secondary to something else; namely, an almost transcendental sense of obligation to the port authority's bondholders. Accordingly, only such enterprises can be undertaken as will enrich it. * * * Beyond all else, this is the number one guiding principle of every port authority action." [12]

An agency of the nature of the port authority may be fine for the physical facilities of the port of New York, such as the bridges, tunnels, and airports which cross State boundaries. It was not intended, however, to act as the government of little enclaves within New York City or to make decisions which will affect the entire economic life of the city. These are powers which should either be confined to the government of the city or delegated to administrative agencies which will depend for their appointment upon the government of the city rather than the government of the State and for their finances upon tax revenues rather than bond money. In this way they would be more sensitive to the desires of the citizens of the city rather than to the wishes of bondholders and other special interests.

Our concern for the preservation of our representative government increases as we note that at no time in the proposal or planning stages of this massive undertaking were the people of this city and their duly elected representatives allowed to examine and evaluate the necessity, desirability, or location of this project. To date, there has still never been a public hearing.

CITY PLANNING: BY WHOM?—FOR WHOM?

This project raises important questions for the future planning of our city:

1. Who is to plan for our city—our city government or independent agencies acting apart from city consultation, approval, and control?

2. For whom is our city to be planned—the ordinary people who live and work here or certain special groups and vested interests?

3. Can the city adopt an effective and long-range plan in view of the actions of an independent agency like the port authority, which, as in the case of this World Trade Center, seems able to change the face of the city at will?

The current plans for the proposed World Trade Center are a case in point. Certainly a law which allows the port authority virtual immunity from city building codes, safety requirements, zoning regulations, etc. is a mockery of city planning. The 1962 law expressly provides that "so long as any facility constituting a portion of the port development project [Hudson tubes and World Trade Center] shall be owned, controlled, or operated by the port authority * * *, no agency, commission, or municipality of either or both of the two States shall have jurisdiction over such facility nor shall any such agency, commission, or municipality have any jurisdiction over the terms or method of effectuation of all or any portion thereof by the port authority * * * including but not limited to the transfer of all or any portion thereof to or by the port authority. * * * [13]

The World Trade Center plans will create new traffic and transportation problems for the city about which Commissioner Henry Barnes has already complained publicly. They will, however, do even more: they will change the face of the city.

We say that this is a change which should be made only by the government of the city as part of an overall plan. We submit that there is something all wrong in having the face of the city changed at the whim of the 12-man board of the port authority, whether it is for better or for worse. Today, for the first time, the concept of such an overall plan is being given serious consideration and is receiving substantial support. The ensuing excerpt clearly states the problem:

The mayor is hemmed in. As he strives to exercise policy leadership, his power is challenged on all sides * * * there are the public authorities. * * * Some, like the Port of New York Authority, handle a whole range of functions. They are eminently useful institutions, but however efficient they may be, they are virtually laws unto themselves and they have severely limited the mayor's ability to rule in his own house and, more important, his ability to plan for long-range development. [14]

THE CURRENT STATE OF THE OPPOSITION

As indicated, considerable opposition does exist. The realtors who are presently challenging the constitutionality of the plans represent the owners of office buildings assessed at more than one-half the total assessment of all such buildings in New York City.

CBS radio in four editorials, Forbes magazine, and the New York Daily News have also spoken out strongly against the port authority's World Trade Center. In addition, architects, city planners, civil leaders, legislators, and union officials have indicated their serious reservations and downright disapproval.

WILL WE HAVE A VOICE IN THE FUTURE OF OUR CITY?

The situation is still in flux. The pending litigation will probably cause postponement of any action on the plans of the port authority for a considerable period of time. In the interim, the New York and New Jersey State Legislatures can be persuaded to repeal or amend the statutes joining the creation of a World Trade Center in New York City with the takeover of the Hudson and Manhattan tube system, so that these two logically independent matters can be considered separately and intelligently.

Last year, in the closing hours of the session of the New York State Legislature, such an amendment was filed too late to be reported out of the committee to which it was referred. It was never killed, however, and met with a most encouraging response. Many legislators, upstate as well as city, expressed amazement at the plans of the port authority and insisted that when the statute authorizing the creation of a world trade center was passed, they had no idea they were authorizing any such action to be taken.

As of now, sponsorship has been obtained for a new bill to repeal the proposed World Trade Center project. This bill will be resubmitted in the 1965 legislative session.

Before the legislators will enact corrective legislation, however, they will have to be persuaded that there is a substantial public demand for such legislation, and before

Footnotes at end of speech.

there is such a demand, the public must be awakened to the seriousness of the threat presented by the current plans of the port authority. It is for this important educational task that we ask your support.

The responsibility belongs to all of us.

---

[1] Directors of the World Trade Corp., under ch. 928, New York Laws, 1946; 1st report, Dec. 31, 1946; 2d report, Feb. 27, 1948; 3d report, Dec. 31, 1948.

[2] Port authority, "A World Trade Center in the Port of New York," Mar. 10, 1961, p. 25.

[3] The New York Times, Mar. 21, 1961, p. 1: 2.

Ibid., Apr. 3, 1961, p. 13: 4.

Ibid., Nov. 2, 1961, p. 41: 4.

[4] The New York Times, Mar. 24, 1961, p. 25:1.

Ibid., Mar. 28, 1961, p. 1: 1.

Ibid., Oct. 20, 1961, p. 20: 5.

Ibid., Nov. 2, 1961, p. 41: 4.

[5] S. Sloan Colt, in a statement reported in the New York Herald Tribune, May 25, 1962, under the headline, "The Declining Port of New York"; Austin J. Tobin, in a speech before the Fordham University School of Business and Alumni Association, Dec. 24, 1962, reported in the Christian Science Monitor under the headline, "New York Port Takes Inventory."

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ralph W. Goshen, WCBS radio editorial No. 310, "WCBS Questions Feasibility of World Trade Center Proposed for Lower Manhattan," Apr. 15, 1964.

[8] Sam J. Slate, WCBS radio editorial No. 182, Oct. 4, 1962.

[9] Ch. 209, New York Laws, 1962, pp. 31, 32.

[10] The editors of Fortune, "The Exploding Metropolis," Doubleday Anchor, 1958, p. 82.

[11] Edward T. Chase, "How To Rescue New York From Its Port Authority," Harper's, June 1960, p. 67.

[12] Edward T. Chase, "How To Rescue New York From Its Port Authority," Harper's, June 1960, p. 69.

[13] Ch. 209, New York Laws, 1962, p. 28.

[14] The editors of Fortune, "The Exploding Metropolis," Doubleday Anchor, 1958, p. 64.

Dams—Not Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD generally two excellent articles that appeared recently in the New York Herald Tribune, commenting on President Johnson's great speech at Johns Hopkins University.

The first, an editorial, very properly rejects the charge that the President was trying to "buy peace" with his advocacy of a vast development plan in southeast Asia. The second article, by David Lawrence, is the more remarkable because it comes from a writer who has, to put it mildly, not always been in agreement with Democratic Presidents.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the validity of the points made in these articles will be established by history, and that the President's address at Johns Hopkins University will go down as one of the most statesmanlike of our era.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 11, 1965]

DAMS—NOT DOLLARS

The assertion by some Americans, in and out of Congress, that President Johnson was trying to buy peace with his advocacy of a vast development plan in southeast Asia is very wide of the mark. Yet it is the familiar charge leveled at the foreign aid program. Because the programs are generally stated, for simplicity, in dollars, Congressmen and the public both tend to forget that what foreign aid means to the recipient is not dollars but dams—and roads, factories, harbor works and irrigation projects.

As President Johnson said: "The vast Mekong River can provide food and water and power on a scale to dwarf even our own TVA." Studies and preparatory work for the plan have been underway for years, under the auspices of the U.N. To complete so grandiose of scheme will, of course, require dollars—and, one may hope, pounds, francs, marks and even rubles. It will also require peace, and a degree of political stability in an area running from Burma to the South China Sea. But above all, it will require cooperation, among the nations of southeast Asia and among the industrialized countries that can give reality to the plan.

It is this complex of needs, rather than any simple purchase of peace with dollars, that gives real meaning to the Mekong River project. For by bringing many nations together for the purpose of raising the living standards of millions of underprivileged human beings the plan could accomplish much for the region and for the world. It would help the Burmese, the Thais, the Laotians, Cambodians and Vietnamese in very practical ways. And by setting up an example of genuine international collaboration, it would reduce tensions and hold up common goals for them and for those who would supply the aid. It is a great concept, difficult of achievement, certainly, but offering hopes far beyond any mere diplomatic horse trade.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 9, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S VIET SPEECH

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson's latest speech on the Vietnam situation is one of the best exposition of American foreign policy that has been presented since the "cold war" began. The advisers who helped to compose it also deserve credit because they acurately assembled the facts that make up the consensus of American thinking today.

The President avoided the mistake made by the United Nations in Korea when consent was given to participate in a cease-fire which never was followed by the signing of a peace treaty.

This time there is no self-imposed restriction upon the United States to withhold military action while peace talks are proceeding. The Communists cannot with impunity, therefore, string out peace discussions year after year while at the same time conducting clandestine violations of a cease-fire agreement.

So when Mr. Johnson declared that he would enter peace talks unconditionally, it means that the United States retains its freedom of action and can punish the enemy and retaliate whenever there are aggressive acts.

The key words in the President's speech are these: "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

Having said this, however, the President made a constructive suggestion along an entirely different line when he called for an international program for development of southeast Asia, starting with a cooperative effort by the countries of that area. He urged Secretary General Thant of the United Nations to use his prestige to initiate such a plan and invited "all other industrialized countries, including the Soviet Union," to become participants. He added: "For our part, I will ask the Congress to join in a billion-dollar American investment in this effort as soon as it is underway."

This move has been wrongly interpreted by some as merely a kind of sop to those who have been criticizing the continuing of the war. Its significance is deeper. This is the first time that the United States in recent years has publicly declared a policy that goes beyond governments and into the hearts and minds of the peoples themselves.

Whether because of timidity or indifference, the United States has not carried on a campaign directly to the peoples of the Communist-dominated countries. It has not endeavored to show them how much better off they would be if they had a free government.

The President's speech doesn't necessarily imply that there is any intention to drive a wedge between the peoples and their totalitarian governments. But the United States, in its information programs overseas and in its policy speeches broadcast abroad, has too long neglected the importance of telling the peoples of the Communist and "neutralist" countries of the willingness of the American people to help them seek a life of individual opportunity and improved economic conditions.

In countries where the hand of the oppressor is stern there is no way to attain the kind of living conditions which prevail in the free countries except by the concerted will of a determined populace.

Too often the idea of revolution is scoffed at in the belief that armies are controlled by the dictators. But, as was evidenced in 1917 in the revolution against the czar, even the army participates in the revolt when public opinion definitely desires it.

President Johnson rightly discussed the need in southeast Asia for homes for millions of impoverished people. He said:

"Each day these people rise at dawn and struggle through until the night to wrestle existence from the soil. They are often wracked by diseases, plagued by hunger, and death comes at the early age of 40.

"Stability and peace do not come easily in such a land. Neither independence nor human dignity will be ever won, though, by arms alone. It also requires the works of peace.

"The American people have helped generously in times past in these works, and now there must be a much more massive effort to improve the life of man in that conflict-torn corner of our world."

This is a welcome note in the outline of American foreign policy. It needs to be followed up by radio and every other form of communication. For history has proved that, if ideas are conveyed to a few, they spread to many by word of mouth, which indeed is the most effective form of communication in existence today. The Communist governments will, of course, reject the proposal for economic aid, but the seed will have been planted among the people.

The President wisely did not discuss details. But he made it clear that the United States wants peace—not war. He also pledged American cooperation to achieve a better life not merely for the free peoples but for those whose rights have been so elegantly abused by their rulers.

The speech was remarkable because of its forthrightness and its scope. Sooner or later

peace talks will begin, and it looks now as if the advantage then will be on the side of the United States.

A Gratifying Example of Dedication by Another Peace Corps Member

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in our RECORD the inspiring story of another ambassador of good will in shirtsleeves. The news item is from the Paterson Evening News of April 13, 1965, and deals with a constituent of whom I am proud, Roy H. Elsenbroek, a member of the Peace Corps.

The closing paragraphs of the article so ably written by Bert Nawyn were particularly pertinent in the week before Good Friday and Easter, as they indicate the fact that religious principles can be translated into meaningful actions.

The article follows:

(By Bert Nawyn)

HAWTHORNE.—If anybody can change the American image abroad it will be Peace Corps members such as Roy H. Elsenbroek, who returned home last week from east Pakistan.

Elsenbroek, a handsome young man of 20 years, tells of his experiences in east Pakistan with enthusiasm changing into a somber mood as he reflects on the privations of the population in that country.

GRADUATE OF EASTERN CHRISTIAN SCHOOL ASSOCIATION

Young Elsenbroek is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Elsenbroek, 122 Westervelt Avenue, and a graduate of the Eastern Christian School Association. He entered the Peace Corps on February 28, 1963, and ended his service 2 years later.

Renewing acquaintances, he plans to become either a missionary to bring spiritual, moral, and physical assistance to deprived people or to enter the U.S. Foreign Service.

Although they have the same government, East Pakistan is separated from West Pakistan by over 1,000 miles. In between them is India.

PRIMITIVE CONDITIONS

A comparatively small area, east Pakistan is about the size of the State of Minnesota. But there the similarity ends. While Minnesota has a population of 3.5 million persons, there are 57 million people crowded into east Pakistan, most of whom have no modern conveniences, no telephones, no television or radio, no sanitary conditions, people who live in villages and hunt leopards with bow and arrow when they prowl too close to the thatched huts.

East Pakistan is on the Bay of Bengal. About 90 percent of the population are Moslems. West Pakistan, where the Government seat is located, is a modern area compared to east Pakistan, where in the larger cities the major products are burlap, jute, fertilizers, and tea crops.

Young Elsenbroek had nothing but praise for the Peace Corps and what it is attempting to accomplish. He said "We came into the country, were welcomed by statesmen and high officials, and then took our place with the lowest class of people, to help them and show them how they could live a better life."

Elsenbroek emphasized, "There are 7,000 Peace Corps members from 18 years to grandparents. I met one man who was 76 years old, doing a good job.

"The Peace Corps in such countries as east Pakistan is changing the American image abroad. We used to send tractors and equipment to people who are illiterate. Many times they were told that this equipment was the gift of a Communist country. Now, these same people find Americans willing to give of themselves to plan a better life. This impresses these people."

Elsenbroek was accepted in the Peace Corps shortly after graduating from Eastern Christian High School, North Haledon. After a 4-day stay in New York City for orientation, lectures, and instructions, he left with 102 other volunteers for Camp Radley, Arecibo, P.R. Camp Radley was named after the first Peace Corps member who died abroad.

SURVIVAL STUDY

At Camp Radley, a month was spent in a rigid survival course which included rock climbing and instruction in survival methods. The main objective of the course was to strengthen physical, mental, and emotional resources upon which the Peace Corps member can draw to achieve the tasks which lie ahead.

From Puerto Rico, Elsenbroek left with 48 other volunteers for Brattleboro, Vt., where a course in "Experment in International Living" was given.

It was here that Elsenbroek learned to speak Bengali, the east Pakistan language. The program for that country was divided into nine parts, consisting of the language program, area studies, international affairs, communism, American studies, technical skills, training, the psychology of effective functioning overseas, and Peace Corps orientation.

At Brattleboro, 20 Peace Corps volunteers dropped out. Disqualification of volunteers went on during the entire training course, which lasted 240 hours.

Elsenbroek left June 11, 1963, for a new life of service to others and adventure, arriving at Dacca, in east Pakistan, on June 14.

"It was like coming into a different world which could not be compared with anything in this country. On a corner intersection was a man selling meat. He had just slaughtered a cow in an open market and was slicing the meat as the people came up to to purchase a piece. Millions of flies swarmed about. The temperature was over 100° and the stench was sickening."

SHORT LIFESPAN

Elsenbroek said that because of the high mortality rate of infants the average life is from 28 to 35 years. He remarked, "These people live on a daily menu of curry and rice. Vegetables are extremely hard to grow because of flooded conditions and the extreme heat, which almost every day climbs up to 120°."

At Chittagong, where he spent most of his time, Elsenbroek worked with engineer Grant Wells, of Michigan. While at Chittagong he received a citation from the Pakistan Government for devising and erecting a cyclone shelter.

East Pakistan each year is devastated by cyclones, with thousands losing their lives. The two Peace Corps members built a 150 person cyclone shelter which was approved by the government. More are now being built.

Peace Corps members in east Pakistan helped the natives build roads, schoolhouses, and other types of buildings. All these were constructed without modern machinery.

For extracurricular activities, Elsenbroek started ball clubs with the children, with whom he soon became a favorite. While in Jamalpur, he started a basketball team for the natives.

What struck Elsenbroek as most impressive is that natives of east Pakistan are concerned with nothing but eating, sleeping and having children.

NO TAXES

He remarked, "People in the villages are not concerned over taxes because they don't pay any, they have no social life, no PTA's, no television, no religious organizations. They lead a very simple life, one of the simplest in the world. They don't complain, because they know of nothing better. Children have wooden carved toys. This truly is primitive life."

Peace Corps members are volunteers who are not paid for their tour of duty. According to Elsenbroek, some are disappointed when they arrive at their destination. He said, "A few of those coming to east Pakistan took the next plane back to the States."

Peace Corps members do not sign up for any specific length of time. Neither does a stint in the Peace Corps exempt anyone for service in the Armed Forces.

Elsenbroek said Saturday that he felt his Christian parental, church and school training was largely responsible in his decision to devote 2 year of his life in the service of others.

He concluded "Throughout the world, the American is pictured as being interested in materialism and what he can get for himself. The Peace Corps shows the world that the American is willing to give himself so that persons in underdeveloped nations might have a better chance in life.

When a Christian enters into this phase of activity, he has before him the sacrifice of one who gave His life on the cross of Calvary. This is why I want to continue in a life of service to others."

Johnson Proposal for Peace in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, on the editorial page of the Baltimore Sun this week, there was an interesting and illuminating editorial regarding Communist reaction to President Johnson's proposals for peace in southeast Asia. The text of the editorial follows:

REJECTIONS

The initial rejection by North Vietnam, Communist China, and the Soviet Union of President Johnson's proposals for peace in southeast Asia were about should have been expected. They should not be allowed to rule out the possibility of peace discussions—but approached in a more roundabout way than a public acceptance of the President's proposition—nor should they be allowed to obscure the point that the President was moving in the right direction.

Communist doctrine, in the capitals of the oddly matched triumvirate of North Vietnam, Red China and the Soviet Union, requires the government officials to pretend that there is no North Vietnamese aggression against South Vietnam, and to claim that aggression is being committed by the United States in its effort to help South Vietnam to maintain its independence. There is reason to believe that the real policy of each of these countries—policy that is affected by old na-

tionalist concerns as well as by the present split between the Chinese and Russian Communists over the leadership of the Communist Parties around the world—may impel each of them to a different approach to the possibility of ending the war in Vietnam. It is possible that these differences will figure in the diplomatic explorations which will continue.

It must be kept in mind, too, that the Communist side will not give up its effort to overrun South Vietnam as long as there is a prospect that it will succeed and will not cost too much. To suggest, as some have, that Mr. Johnson was trying to buy peace by his suggestion for a great economic development scheme, including the Mekong River program, is to turn the facts upside down. The President was suggesting that an investment in peace is better than an investment in war, and that if peace is established all of southeast Asia, including North Vietnam, will benefit. At the same time he was insisting that, while the door is open to peace discussions without preconditions, the United States intends to press its present military effort. Nothing decisive is likely to happen soon. Patience and firmness are essential.

Pan American Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution which designates this day, April 14, 1965, as "Pan American Day."

Today marks the 75th anniversary of the first Conference of American States which was held here in Washington and from which has developed the bulwark of democracy and freedom in our own hemisphere—the Organization of American States.

Throughout the long life of this organization, which is the oldest of its kind in the field of international relations, we have seen the wisdom of its founders and the need for its stated purposes. Among the essential purposes proclaimed by the charter of the Organization of American States are two which are most familiar to us. These are, first that the Organization is to strengthen the peace and security of the continent, and, second, that it is to prevent possible causes of difficulties and to insure the pacific settlement of disputes that may arise among the member states.

In the effective accomplishment of these purposes, this Organization of 21 American Republics has in recent times presented a solid front against the enroachment of any subversive political philosophy, particularly communism, which has threatened and continues to threaten its member states.

Threats to our continental security and solidarity have taken other forms. The Cuban missile crisis and the situation at Panama, of course, were epic examples.

As we rededicate ourselves on this Pan American Day to the principles which affirm the necessity for peaceful, cooperative action through the Organization of American States, let us resolve to bring to the attention of each of its member states the need for legislation such as that which was recently considered within these very Halls. I refer to legislation which provides aid to education of children born to poverty and which promotes the health and economic welfare of older persons. It seems to me that this would advance in a meaningful way one of the least known purposes of the Organization of American States, and that is, the member states shall "promote, by cooperative action, their economic, social, and cultural development."

It is within the Pan American framework of peace, security and an enlightened and healthy citizenry that the member states, individually and collectively, can continue to observe Pan American Day with ever-increasing significance.

A Call to National Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on January 25 and 26 of this year the city of Tucson, Ariz., was the scene of a National Conference on Poverty in the Southwest. Here, for the first time, we saw some of the extent of the poverty suffered by Mexican-Americans, Indians and other minority groups in the States comprising the Southwest.

A number of participants in the conference have prepared a report entitled "A Call to National Conscience." Because of its great importance and relevance to our country's current antipoverty program I want to call this report to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, without objection I shall insert the report in the Appendix at this point:

A CALL TO NATIONAL CONSCIENCE

The undersigned were invited to sit as a "jury" while spokesmen for the poor and representatives of both private and public agencies aired their views on the causes of and cures for poverty in the vast area of the American Southwest. The speakers had assembled at the recent National Conference on Poverty in the Southwest—and their testimony dramatically underscored the delinquency of leadership in and for this area.

THE NATURE OF SOUTHWESTERN POVERTY

We were convinced by the testimony presented there that poverty in the Southwest has characteristics that are unique in the national American scene. The great distances in the Southwest and the economic expansion attendant on two decades of postwar prosperity and population explosion mask poverty in the rural areas, in the cities, in the mountains, and in the desert. The economic expansion of these decades has given few benefits to the poor. In New Mexico an Indian lives on a reservation on less than $400 a year, speaking little English, growing up in a culture that never developed concepts of competition, baffled by the white man's world of aggression and materialism. In Texas a Mexican-American family of 12 subsists on a diet consisting principally of beans and corn, trying to maintain a marginal existence on the fringe of an affluent but hostile society.

We were told of the poverty of hope for the white "Anglo" migrant farmworker who, systematically and deliberately exploited by the big agricultural growers, ekes out a family existence on $1,100 a year. He tries vainly to understand why a nation permits—in fact, invites—foreign laborers to compete under deliberately favored conditions. California growers were described as consistently preferring Mexican bracero labor.

We heard of the poverty of education and opportunity haunting the Arizona Negro who assumed he was escaping discrimination and inadequate schooling in the Southeast, only to encounter them again under more hypocritical circumstances in an area which exhorts its citizens to "stand on their own two feet."

Poverty in the Southwest is represented by some of the Nation's most abysmal housing, and it is perpetuated by an educational system that makes no provision for the special needs of its different ethnic populations. For in the Southwest, as elsewhere in the country, the most acutely impoverished are the ethnic minorities. They include 3.5 million Spanish-surnamed people whose backgrounds may be a blend of Indian, Spanish, Mexican, and Latin-American origins; seeking identity among the recently arrived "Anglos," these people find themselves regarded as aliens. Of the area's 2.2 million Negroes, only those in California have found anything of the better life they sought when leaving the "old South," and even there this "better life" consists largely of better ghettoes and slowly improving education for equal job opportunities. The Southwest includes some 200,000 Indians of varied tribes, nations, and reservations who are shuttled back and forth from rural to urban life by a confusing series of Federal policies.

Several Southwestern cities have trebled in size in the historic population explosion of the past two decades. But Southwestern civic and community leaders have ignored the fact that this population growth would necessitate preventive action against the multiplying economic and social problems confronting the region. And so the same civic leaders have neglected the aggressive social improvisations which the development of a modern, urbanized society makes imperative.

With the spread of technology and the growth of business and industry, the original occupant of the Southwest, still rooted in his native and different culture, has been completely left behind. Educationally unprepared for the technical complexity of modern America, barred by racial, social, and economic discrimination from participation in the very society to which they belong, the poor of the Southwest remain overlooked, unwanted, and ignored—by the Southwest and by the Nation.

THE ATTITUDES

The testifiers at the conference in Tucson revealed conflicts, distrust, and intense competition between the relatively prepared "Anglos" on the one hand and the severally disadvantaged Indian, Negro, and Spanish-surnamed citizens on the other. This situation, aggravated by the widespread apathy of the responsible members of the power structure toward the problem of poverty, seems to us to portend serious social disorders in the future unless extensive social reforms occur. Here, in a five-State population of 30 million, are over 8 million living on annual family incomes of less than $3,000. Possibly only the ethnic insularities and mu-

tual distrusts of the minority groups have so far prevented the coalescence of thought and action necessary to force social reform.

Apparently a Southwestern power elite of mining, oil, cattle, real estate, and agricultural interests tends to sweep social problems under the rug. Testimony indicates that the weight of this elite is arrayed against the economic and political weakness of minority groups and of the poor generally. The press, with certain exceptions, reflects the views of the elite and reinforces its dominance. The press also exhibits a persistent suspicion of social causes and the people involved in them, thus promoting a regional antagonism to coordinated family assistance, suspicion of private philanthropy for social causes, and resistance to public planning. It proclaims that social planning properly resides in the private sector, but it supports only minor endeavors by private agencies. These factors may account for the apparent indifference of private agency directors toward much-needed private and public social reforms. They may also account for the fact that welfare administrators seem to thwart the will of the Congress and of the Nation through welfare policies that, even charitably, can only be described as inhuman.

REGIONAL INFLUENCES

Poverty in the Southwest differs from poverty in other parts of the Nation because the Southwest itself is different. A major factor of this difference is the existence of a 1,500-mile border shared with a nation whose economic standards are 30 years behind ours—a border far more open than most Americans realize. As many as 3,000 immigrants per month enter to become permanent residents. More than 30,000 commuters swarm across the border on a regular basis to work at wages which, while substandard for the United States, make them comparatively well paid residents of Mexico. Many employers, particularly agricultural growers, profit handsomely from this cheap source of labor. This foreign labor force, willing to work at 60 to 90 cents an hour, depresses the southwestern economy which is already suffering from growing automation and excess job applicants.

The relative openness of the border has created another problem—that of "semi-citizens," Mexicans who have lived in the Southwestern States, particularly Texas, for decades. For various reasons they have not become citizens. Many of them have now lost track of the personal papers or witnesses who could establish the vital statistics prerequisite for citizenship applications. Many are old and incredibly poor. Lacking citizenship, they are ineligible for most public welfare or any kind of assistance except charity. They have no homes to return to in Mexico; in this country their lot is a form of aged peonage.

We come then to some suggestions, both general and specific, for attacking poverty in the Southwest. National attention to this region is obviously overdue.

SUGGESTIONS

First, the openness of our international border must be reviewed. Steps must be taken to regulate and reduce the flow of "border commuters." Congress must enact appropriate legislation and the State Department must effect international wage agreements with Mexico. The Labor Department needs its administrative hand strengthened so that it can halt commuters when there is a demonstrably adverse affect on the U.S. labor force. State—and, where necessary, Federal—legislation is needed to apply fair labor standards to the international worker as well as our own citizen. For poverty in the Southwest cannot be separated from poverty in Mexico while the international border remains no more than an inconvenience to commuters. The problem is international in scope and should be approached internationally, even to the extent of contemplating some kind of specific joint Mexico-United States aid to northern Mexico and establishing a minimum wage to the Mexican citizens' service here. It is not enough to treat the symptoms. We must endeavor also to cure or at least ameliorate the sickness, which, in this case, is the perpetual depression that exists in the north of Mexico and spreads into our vulnerable Southwest.

We urge that public welfare agencies, instead of wasting dollars trying to ferret out chiselers, apply that energy and more to rehabilitating the poor and reducing their dependency. The Federal Government must insure that the will of Congress is honored, particularly in Texas and Arizona.

We call upon the Southwestern agricultural States, notably California, Arizona, and Texas, to bring farmworkers under the protective canopy of State labor laws. These should include minimum wage laws; laws securing workers in their rights to organize; laws against discrimination and the like.

We urge grower participation in conquering the age-old problems of seasonal crops and wages while laborers have year-round family needs. We advocate total abandonment of the bracero immigrant labor concept. We request an interstate study of education for those to whom English may be the foreign or second language.

We appeal to the States of the Southwest to reduce the varying harsh residence requirements for old-age assistance eligibility and to achieve some uniformity in their welfare and other assistance programs.

Perhaps most important of all, we plead for a new regional attitude toward social programing not only for, but subject to the ideas of the less fortunate. Perhaps a privately funded regional entity should be created to give voice to the impoverished. The various social agencies of the Southwest both public and private—agencies concerned with health, family planning, education, preparation for employment, and housing—must abandon their aloofness and yield a major portion of their planning and decisionmaking process to the disadvantaged themselves. United funds, community councils, and other similar organizations should concentrate most of their time, funds and attention on the problems of the poor and, as they do so, involve these same poor at the highest levels of policymaking. We believe that a show of patience with the neophyte social planner from depressed areas will produce unheard-of dividends. It is not now being done.

Finally, there should be national respect for the cultural differences of the great Southwest. As one of the participants at the Tucson poverty conference so eloquently stated: "We have given too little awareness to the history of this land which has made us so affluent. In our haste we tend to equate material poverty with spiritual and cultural poverty * * *. The 'Anglo' must realize that many who are poor in the Southwest have rich and priceless traditions—a cultural kind of affluence which we need badly to share. As we undertake to rid the Southwest of poverty * * * we'll be working in a land of great beauty among peoples of great beauty. We must be sure that our efforts in no way erode the great gifts of diversity which we enjoy here—diversity of language, art, dance, ceremony, religion. And the 'Anglo' perhaps must learn better to place himself properly in the history of this region—the last to arrive here—in a sense, the newcomer. We owe to ourselves the obligation not to try to overcome differences but to preserve and honor diversity. For the 'Anglo' affluence itself badly needs the cultural enrichment of the ancient peoples of the Southwest."

Respectfully submitted.

Leonard Duhl, M.D.; Mr. David Danzig; Mrs. Grace Montanez Davis; Mr. D'Arcy McNickle; Dr. Laurence Gould; Mr. Henry Saltzman; Paul O'Rourke, M.D.; Mr. Steve Allen; Mr. Henry Talbert; Dr. Julian Samora; Mr. Bernard Valdez.

MARCH 1965.

One of the Most Charming Institutions of the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most charming institutions of the Great Society is the incomparable Liz Carpenter. The wife of newspaper correspondent Les Carpenter, and a former president of the Women's National Press Club, Liz Carpenter is a delightful and effective press expert for Mrs. Lyndon Johnson and for the White House in general.

Few women in America have the genuine charm and spark which Liz possesses, and an article which appears in the New York Times, April 11, 1965, and is printed below is an indication of the recognition this lady so justly deserves:

FIRST LADY'S LADY BOSWELL

(By Nan Robertson)

(NOTE.—Nan Robertson is a member of the Times Washington bureau who regularly reports White House News.)

WASHINGTON.—It was November 22, 1963, in Dallas. Elizabeth Carpenter, executive assistant to Lyndon Baines Johnson, was riding in a black limousine from Parkland Memorial Hospital to Love Field. Emerging from a daze of horror and shock, she recalls: "I was aware suddenly I was riding along with the Vice President. I started scribbling what he might have to say when we got to Washington. I gave it to him."

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was dead. Mr. Johnson was about to take the oath of office as 36th President of the United States in a hushed, desperately hurried ceremony inside a jet plane parked on a dirty runway.

When the plane reached Washington, President Johnson read the brief speech Mrs. Carpenter had drafted (This is a sad time for all people * * *. I ask for your help—and God's"), then turned to her, "Liz, go with Lady Bird and be of any help to her you can," he said. He left for the White House.

In the car on the way home to the Elms, the mansion the Johnsons had bought from Perle Mesta, the shaken First Lady asked her companion what to expect. "There will be reporters there. They'll want to know your reaction," Mrs. Carpenter said.

"The way I feel about it? It has all been a dreadful nightmare, but somehow we must find the strength to go on," Mrs. Johnson blurted out.

"That is your statement," Mrs. Carpenter said.

Liz Carpenter, since that night, has served as the First Lady's press secretary and staff director (the title became official 2 weeks later)—and as Mrs. Johnson's Boswell.

She sees her role not as watchdog, fending off intruders (the invariable attitude of former press secretaries and aids to President's wives), but as a person hired to accommodate the representatives of public curiosity. She has made the First Lady's deeds and thoughts more accessible than at any time since Eleanor Roosevelt was in the White House.

Mrs. Carpenter is also often funny, a trait that endears her to both Mrs. Johnson and reporters. At the start of the First Lady's whistlestop campaign tour of the South last October, Mrs. Carpenter, who had spent the previous 3 weeks working out the details, tacked a note to the train bulletin board that gave some idea of the hectic time ahead. It read:

"A whistle will blow 2 minutes before the train starts moving. We hope we won't be scattering you over the countryside, but the train does not wait.

"In case you do get left, look for the advance man [the person who makes arrangements in advance at a campaign stop]. He can be easily identified as the happiest man at the depot because all of his problems have just left. See if he can work out your transportation to a nearby town. If he can't, just take out residence, register and vote."

Mrs. Carpenter is also thoughtful of reporters, a rare trait in press secretaries. By the third day of the whistlestop trip, the press car was a rolling slum. Mashed cigarettes, spilled coffee containers, and bread crusts littered the place. None of the 150 sweating typers aboard it had had a bath since leaving Washington because the wash basins in the compartments were eyecup size. As the train rocketed toward Tallahassee, Mrs. Carpenter pinned another note to the board. It said: "On the theory that the press that bathes together stays together, we have reserved three rooms, baths, showers, and 150 towels at the Du Val Hotel in Tallahassee tonight." The gratitude of the train's grimy prisoners was intense.

Mrs. Carpenter's relationship with the Johnson family is unique. She is the White House idea man and stage manager. She is an intimate of the woman she serves, helps write most of her speeches, and plans her schedules. "Liz means something very special to me," the First Lady said recently. She went on, through adjectives like "imaginative," "elastic," and "indispensable," and concluded: "In all her relations with people she is kind—and I like that." The two women are so closely attuned that when Mrs. Johnson, herself gifted with words, is speaking, it is impossible to detect which phrases and thoughts are her own and which Mrs. Carpenter's.

Mrs. Carpenter is devoted to the President and shows it, but she is also one of the few employees, perhaps the only one, who talks back to him. Once, when he bellowed at her over the intercom, "Why don't you use your head?" she snapped, "Because I'm too busy using yours." When piqued, Mr. Johnson has referred to her as "that smart-alecky girl," but he does not stay angry long.

An incident last election day illustrates Mrs. Carpenter's style. The President and his wife had just cast their votes and were leading a horde of reporters on a tour of the little house in Johnson City, Tex., in which he had grown up.

Mrs. Johnson sat on the front porch swing with the President beside her while the two recalled details of their courtship. A battery of photographers pressed close.

Suddenly a short, square woman with a disheveled mop of fluffy gray hair bustled to the front. She held up her hand. "That's enough," Mrs. Carpenter said firmly but kindly, and the photographers stopped.

"Now, Mr. President, would you and Mrs. Johnson come down over here so the photographers can take a shot of you by the rail fence?" she said in her Texas twang, and did not wait for an answer. The President of the United States and his wife rose obediently and followed Mrs. Carpenter. "Not here," she said, "over by the gate." They moved to the gate, trailed by the photographers.

Mrs. Carpenter is bored by what she calls "old brocade" questions about White House fashions and furnishings and other trivia, but manages to keep her good humor. A Chicago reporter, whose style of questioning can be described only as gently implacable, discovered at one of Mrs. Carpenter's briefings that Blanco, the White House collie, had been given to the Presidential family by an Illinois child. She pounced on a possible local angle for a story.

Was it an upstate or a downstate dog? Where did it live? (Mrs. Carpenter giggled at this point and muttered: "Local bitch makes good." She had overlooked one vital detail; Blanco is a male.) The questioning went on. Was it happy at the White House? How did Liz know it was happy at the White House?

"I know because I'm in the doghouse with it most of the time," Mrs. Carpenter said, referring to a recent run-in with the President.

The laughter and easy give-and-take in the east wing of the White House where answers sought and given can be on the light side, but usually full and frank, are in marked contrast to the mood in the west wing, where President Press Secretary George Reedy holds forth. There, in an atmosphere that is often angry and frustrating, reporters rush into Mr. Reedy's office twice a day for 10-minute briefings that offer up a grab bag of scattered items ranging from uninformative monologs to brusque no comments. West wing reporters, accustomed to this, evince astonishment and envy when they first cover one of Liz Carpenter's briefings.

These are much less frequent than Presidential press briefings because they are obviously less important. They take place at the time announced, often last more than an hour and frequently are held in the White House library—accompanied by tea or coffee served from a silver set, a spread of what Mrs. Carpenter calls "something to chew on" and, if it is cool, a fire in the grate. Other briefings are in Mrs. Carpenter's roomy office in the east wing, without refreshments or fire but equally prompt, long, and relaxed.

It is difficult to find a White House correspondent with a complaint about Mrs. Carpenter. One, however, is an expert woman reporter who covers the White House sporadically. "I feel uncomfortable in Liz' office," she says. "I feel I'm being snowed."

If Mrs. Carpenter controls her end of White House news—which, of course, any press secretary does to some extent—she generally manages to do so painlessly. She also has one enormous advantage over any press secretary to Lyndon Johnson, a tempestuous man who insists on bossing everything—her employer is Mrs. Johnson.

The First Lady, a friendly woman who is unfailingly kind even in her tensest moments, has an instinctive sense of public relations polished during nearly 28 years in public life. She was graduated from the University of Texas in 1934 with a bachelor's degree in journalism, and although she had no time to practice it before Mr. Johnson married her, she is sympathetic to reporters' problems and needs. Typically, she chose as her press secretary the first working newswoman ever to hold the post, which carries a salary of something more than $18,000.

Mrs. Carpenter is 44 years old, 8 years younger than her boss, 5 feet 2 inches tall, and hefty. She seems to churn along rather than walk, arms and legs pumping as she bustles through the White House. "She's all rough, tumble and Texas," says one reporter friend.

She was born Mary Elizabeth Sutherland in Salado, Tex., in a big, white columned mansion built by her great-grandfather before the Civil War. "Twenty-four rooms and no bath," she observes. She met her husband at Austin High School, where she was the editor and he was the business manager of the school paper. Both went on to journalism studies at the University of Texas in Austin. She was graduated in June 1942, after becoming the first woman vice president of the student body on a campus that breeds future politicians, and took off without delay for Washington.

Her brother was working there "and it seemed an exciting place to be," she says. "And one of the first things you did was call on your Congressman." She called on hers, Lyndon Johnson, but his wife was manning the office while Representative Johnson was off at war.

Elizabeth Sutherland married Leslie Carpenter in 1944 and the Johnsons were at the wedding. The Carpenters now have a son, Scott, aged 18, and a daughter, Christy, 15.

Among the newspapers Mrs. Carpenter represented in Washington was the Austin American-Statesman, the main paper in Representative Johnson's 10th District: "He was proud of me as a local girl, but we weren't close until the 1960 campaign," she says.

That year, Mrs. Carpenter took leave from the Carpenter News Bureau, which her husband still runs, to assist Mrs. Johnson. The wife of the vice-presidential candidate had begged her to take part "in the great adventure of our lives."

"I thought long and hard about it," Mrs. Carpenter said. "I didn't want to do it—leave Les and the children. And I am petrified of flying. But then I thought it was foolish to let silly fear rob me of this experience." In the next 71 days of barnstorming she covered 35,000 miles, mostly by air.

After the election, she stayed on as press aid and social secretary to Mrs. Johnson; and in addition, in 1961, became the Vice President's executive assistant—a combination which made her feel, she said, "like a two-way stretch." She proved her ability to stage-manage colorful stories with the visit of Bashir Ahmed, the Pakistani camel driver whom Mr. Johnson invited to the United States. Mrs. Carpenter drained the last possible anecdote and catchy quote out of the lively little man.

Since moving into the White House, Mrs. Carpenter has carried her instinct for an angle onto a larger stage: the unprecedented upstairs tours of the mansion; the alfresco press conference on the south lawn; the barbecues on the banks of the Pedernales.

Mrs. Carpenter, unlike the woman she serves, worries constantly about what she calls the reviews of Mrs. Johnson's performances at the White House and on the road. If they have been glowing since that tragic November day nearly 17 months ago, the credit goes both to the remarkable Mrs. Johnson and to her faithful female Boswell.

Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to proceed for

1 minute, revise and extend my remarks to answer a charge by South Dakota Democratic State Chairman Clem Noonan that I would have to answer to the voters of South Dakota in the 1966 election for my vote against the President's medicare plan.

Mr. Speaker, I have already answered. As in former years I sent out a questionnaire to every boxholder in my present congressional district and 83 percent of the people living west of the Missouri River voted against the President's medicare plan in the questionnaire returns that I have just tabulated. By the same token, 84 percent voted for eldercare.

I sent a questionnaire containing the same questions to the 20 new counties being attached to my old congressional district, lying between the Missouri River and the James River, and while the tabulation is not yet complete on the returns from this area sent to everyone in the telephone directory, the vote is almost as overwhelming, with 75 percent opposing medicare and 76 favoring eldercare.

Mr. Speaker, the results of elections can be misconstrued. This is the reason I annually send out a questionnaire because the majority of those interested in good government take the time to give me the benefit of their thinking and their advice, and these results determine my vote.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the people of South Dakota have already spoken, and have spoken very decisively in answering my questionnaire.

Excerpts From Capt. W. N. Ginn's Address Before the 41st Spring Meeting, American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, March 25, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, an address given by Capt. W. N. Ginn at the recent meeting of the American Machine Tool Distributors' Association has been commended to me as containing the kind of knowledge which all Americans need, as a clear explanation of the effort being made by the Navy to modernize its facilities.

The excerpts from Captain Ginn's address, which follow, were condensed by an admirer of his and constituent of mine, Mr. George E. Viereck, and are felt to relate the hard facts involved in the problems with which the U.S. Navy shipyards were faced in trying to carry on in our competitive economy.

Captain Ginn's address, as edited by Mr. Viereck, follows:

The Bureau of Ships' naval shipyard complex is big business. We do approximately $1 billion worth of business each year. We have a capital investment of $1.2 billion. This represents the original procurement value of our land, buildings, and equipment excluding New York and Portsmouth. Of the $128 million invested in industrial productive equipment, $118 million is represented by our major metalworking equipment such as boring mills, drills, gear machines, grinders, lathes, milling machines, presses, punches, shears, etc. This equipment amounts to 11,903 individual pieces. An interesting fact about this equipment, that should get your attention, is that 52.5 percent of this equipment was bought prior to 1944. Only 3 percent of the above machine tool inventory has been procured since 1960. The average age for each of the above pieces of equipment is 21.4 years.

I wish to contrast this figure with the figures contained in an article that I found in the magazine Management Services, January–February 1965 issue. The article was written by the Machinery and Allied Products Institute and is entitled "The Need for Modernization of Aging Industrial Plant."

Despite heavy business capital spending on both expansion and modernization in recent years, the average age of industrial plants today is substantially higher than it was before the depression of the 1930's, and that of equipment is about the same as it was then.

These are the findings of a study recently completed by the Machinery and Allied Products Institute. MAPI computed the average ages of business structures and of equipment separately * * * and found significant differences in their patterns.

The average age of plant rose steadily from about 20 years in 1930 to more than 27 years at the end of World War II. With the postwar construction boom, it declined until 1957 and since then has remained fairly stable at about 24 years.

The average for equipment rose from around 9.5 years in 1930 to a peak of 11.3 years in the midthirties, then dropped after the war to a low of about 8.5 years. In the early 1950's, however, it began to rise again. Since 1962 it has been virtually unchanged at about 9.6 years.

Using the MAPI figure of 9.6 years as the average age for industrial productive equipment in private industry, it becomes painfully clear that our industrial productive equipment, with an average age of 21.4 years, has long since passed the point where it normally would have been replaced if in private industry. In this era of cost effectiveness we can no longer afford to maintain and operate obsolete and antiquated equipment. During the past 5 years, fiscal years 1960–64, the Bureau of Ships has received a total of $5.2 million for procurement and replacement of metalworking machinery in its navy yards.

Based on a 50-percent escalation of the original purchase price of our metalworking machinery to represent replacement costs and the Department of Defense criteria of a 2- to 5-percent annual replacement, the Bureau of Ships requires an average of $3.5 million each year, at the 2-percent rate, to just replace worn out equipment. To keep our shipyards modern requires another estimated $2 million each year to be able to keep up with the changes in the state of the art. More money is required each year for metalworking machinery than the Bureau of Ships has received over the entire last 5 years. This, gentlemen, is the problem. On the horns of this dilemma, the Bureau of Ships has uncomfortably ridden.

A World War II destroyer of 376 feet in length has now grown to 533 feet with a commensurate increase in displacement, draft and complexity. The complexity of communications, navigation and fire control equipment has expanded at a rate undreamed of 20 years ago. The degree of accuracy that was demanded from our productive equipment and production workers during World War II is no longer satisfactory nor acceptable—but bear in mind that over 50 percent of our metalworking equipment being used on a day-to-day basis in our navy yards was procured prior to 1944. We are trying to accomplish today's technical requirements and precision on 21.4-year-old machines. The point that I am trying to make is that the Navy of 1965 can no more be compared with the Navy of 1945 than you can compare a 1965 automobile with a prewar model * * * and as you gentlemen know, the automobile industry is not producing the 1965 automobile on the same machinery or even the same type of machinery that was used to produce their prewar model. The equipment must give us the same advantage that the new equipment has given to the automobile industry.

It is not the Bureau of Ships' desire to increase our navy yards' productive capacity. It is our desire through a true modernization program to reduce the number of machine tools in our inventory, reduce our cost of operations and at the same time improve our ability to produce the quality and quantity of work required by our modern fleet. Everything we do today in the field of fire control, communications and nuclear power must meet quality assurance standards that were unknown to us 10 years ago.

Inconsistencies of Federal Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, whenever a centralized, federalized remote governmental Bureau or Department arbitrarily intercedes and establishes regulations, many shock waves will occur and many inequities will result. No matter how benevolent the motive, one man cannot be right when he attempts, from Washington, to set rules for far away areas.

A prime example is the horrendous chaos and unbelievable injustices being promoted by the Department of Labor in relation to California fruit and vegetable farming.

A letter from Stephen D'Arrigo, Jr., of Salinas, Calif., points this up succinctly. I urge each Member to give thought to these questions. The text of the letter follows:

Hon. BURT L. TALCOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TALCOTT: The Secretary of Labor has announced in effect that his Department is going to get the wages of farmworkers up above the poverty level. It is apparent that the aim of the administration is to make agriculture compete with other industries for its workers. Notwithstanding the fact that agriculture cannot pass the increased cost on to the consumer as the Secretary of Labor has indicated could be done, California agriculture will nonetheless agree with the Secretary of Labor that it is most desirable to raise the level of all agricultural workers throughout the Nation. California agriculture further agrees to the principle of a national minimum wage for agriculture. Once competitors of all the other producing States in the Nation, mainly Florida and Texas, are brought up to our standard, California agriculture can hold its own as long as this minimum applies throughout the Nation. The only one dan-

ger lies in the imports of foreign produce mainly from South America and Mexico.

So having agreed to this principle, that it is most desirable to raise the wages of all Americans to a decent level, California agriculture suggests that the U.S. Government look into its sordid record in the pay of its servicemen. It pays an ensign at sea less than a baby sitter. A Navy lieutenant makes less in 60 hours a week than a New York City policeman or fireman makes in 40 hours. A Navy petty officer on a Polaris submarine earns less per month than a man on the public unemployment rolls in New York State. A recruit in the Army earns $78.00 per month which figures out to the princely sum of 44½ cents per hour for a 44-hour week.

Five thousand families of Air Force personnel are forced to accept relief checks, and 55,000 more are technically eligible for relief but are too proud to accept it. One hundred sixty-nine thousand Air Force personnel receive basic pay below the poverty standard set by President Johnson. An underprivileged school dropout will receive $105 a month in a Job Corps camp, but a skilled seaman with 2 years naval service receives only $99.

Having accepted this principle of decent wages for all, how can our Government remain silent on the question of better pay for our servicemen? Or is it that taxes would have to be increased, and increased taxes is not politically popular? As mentioned above, agriculture can find no quarrel with the principle of decent wages for all.

The Secretary of Labor has also told agriculture that if it paid decent wages, they would not have the turnover problem and that workers would be more willing to stay. For the Secretary's information, the military has been complaining about this very same problem, and I would suggest that he contact the military and advise them of his solution to the problem.

California agriculture cannot pay $1.40 per hour when Texas and Florida are at 90 cents or less. We would be most happy to pay industrial wages as long as our competing States pay the same. It is they with whom we must compete.

With respect to service pay, with whom does Uncle Sam compete that it can't pay our boys a decent wage?

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN D'ARRIGO, Jr.

How Niles, Ill., Earned Its New Title of All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, every year the National Municipal League and Look magazine honor 11 communities whose citizens have put forth extraordinary effort to solve their problems, designating each as an All America City. It is a distinct pleasure to me and, I am sure, to all residents of the State of Illinois, to learn that the village of Niles, located in the 13th Congressional District which I have the honor of representing in the Congress of the United States, has been selected as one of the 11 outstanding communities in the Nation in 1964. I extend my congratulations to the citizens of Niles and to their civic and business leaders on their public spirit and interest which has brought them this well-deserved recognition.

The towns selected for this coveted honor may win because their citizens survived a natural disaster, ousted a corrupt government, improved economic conditions, or undertook to solve other problems that beset American communities at some time during their history. The outstanding effort of the citizens of Niles, Ill., in meeting their problem of rapid growth during the period from 1950 to 1964 and in replacing their local government officials who did little or nothing to provide the necessary community services to keep pace with this growth brought the distinguished award of All America City.

How the village of Niles earned this distinction is described in the following article by Richard Hoffman, writing in the Chicago's American:

HOW NILES, ILL., EARNED ITS NEW TITLE OF ALL AMERICA CITY

(By Richard Hoffmann)

How does a community become an All America City?

First, you throw the rascals out, especially if they're part of a political machine in power for 20 years.

Then you inject helpings of spirit, pride, youth, dedication, integrity, and efficiency, all of which mobilize the community in the pursuit of higher accomplishments.

This, at least, is the formula for success described by officials in the northwest suburb of Niles, one of 11 communities just honored by Look magazine and the National Municipal League as an All America City.

Mayor Nicholas Blase, 36, whose New Era party swept to victory in the 1961 elections, feels the crackdown on gambling which had flourished on an unincorporated strip of Milwaukee avenue between Niles and Chicago gave the people confidence in his administration.

"Everything seemed to spring from that," he said, "and other new projects that followed enjoyed public support."

Blase and Police Chief Clarence "Whitey" Emrikson were both subjected to telephone threats for their campaign against the strip, whose gaudy establishments were finally shuttered when Chicago annexed the area.

Emrikson, also 36, said through 1961 and 1962 he was harassed by anonymous callers who would utter such threats as, "Leave the pinballs alone or your kids will never reach school tomorrow."

"This will be a constant problem," Emrikson says. "There are still people who want the pinballs and the jar games back." Emrikson is the type of police chief who turns down annual gifts of liquor with a polite but firm "no," associates say.

Although to the passerby there is nothing to distinguish Niles from any of the other towns which border commercial strips like Milwaukee Avenue, the community is really in full throttle now.

Citizens for Better Parks pushed through a $705,000 bond issue in 1962 which resulted in two park sites and a new community center and swimming pool.

A $575,000 library will open soon because of the efforts of the Women's Club of Niles, which started a part-time, volunteer book lending program.

A new $198,000 village hall will be dedicated Sunday; a second $375,000 fire station opened in 1962; an $825,000 reservoir opened 2 years ago to increase water capacity by 3 million gallons.

A $3,840,000 "leaning tower" YMCA is under construction next to a replica of the famed tower in Pisa, Italy.

The Tower was originally constructed in 1932 by Robert A. Ilg, inventor and electrical manufacturer, to store water for his private park and swimming pools, which he later donated to the YMCA.

Niles also has changed because of the dedication of men like Trustee Robert Wente. He jumped into the swollen waters of the Chicago River to pull out old bikes and bed springs to speed the river's flow when basements began flooding.

Mrs. Margaret B. Lieske, village clerk, said when she took office she had to sort out 20 years of records filed in cartons.

While Niles has been able to build, it has also cut taxes from 0.370 cents per $100 assessed valuation to 0.362.

Village Manager James F. Pryde says one of the reasons is top personnel.

Blase says the big problem now will be to live up to the All America image.

With village elections coming up April 20, Blase's party has also changed its image. It's now called the Forward Era Party.

The 75th Anniversary of the Inter-American System

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, April 14, 1965, marked the 75th anniversary of formal regional cooperation in the Americas, but the interest of the United States in creating an inter-American system dates far earlier than 1890. In fact, from the very beginnings of our Republic, leading political figures urged hemispheric cooperation to preserve the independence of the New World from European domination and to resolve peacefully tensions among the American nations.

The desire among North Americans and Latin Americans alike for hemispheric cooperation finally came to fruition at the end of the 19th century. In 1889 and 1890 the First International Conference of American States met in Washington. From this conference emerged the first hemispheric machinery for peaceful arbitration of disputes and the first permanent inter-American agency, the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics, later renamed the Pan American Union.

Cooperative efforts in the Americas slowly and gradually grew until the Second World War tested hemispheric solidarity: all the American nations joined forces against the Axis powers. The basis had been laid; solidarity had been tested and proven. In a sense the war was a watershed in inter-American relations, for it sparked intensified efforts at cooperation.

Thus, in the years since World War II inter-American cooperation has been consolidated and inter-American institutions have proliferated into our present-day inter-American system. The

Rio Treaty of 1947 formalized our hemispheric defense structure. The Bogotá Charter of 1948 creating the Organization of American States organized the hemisphere into an actively functioning regional political system.

In the years since World War II the inter-American system has developed into a dynamic instrument of hemisphere solidarity, successfully preserving the collective security of the hemisphere against the No. 1 danger today: Communist aggression. Recently the American nations have turned more and more to a set of problems virtually neglected in the early years of inter-American cooperation: the pressing economic and social problems of the hemisphere. The Inter-American Development Bank and the Punta del Este Charter are cornerstones of a vast cooperative effort to improve living conditions throughout the hemisphere.

The first 75 years of the inter-American system have witnessed a remarkable growth in solidarity, particularly during the last 20. The focus of cooperation has changed with the times: from collective defense against European domination to collective defense against Communist aggression. Political cooperation has expanded into economic and social cooperation. But the goals have not changed: a better life in freedom for everyone throughout the hemisphere. May the next 75 years bear witness to even greater progress through hemisphere cooperation.

Only Man Who Can Arrest a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who represent the State of Arizona are proud that one of our citizens has risen to the position of Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. Senate. Of course, I am speaking of Joseph C. Duke, of Miami, Ariz., who has served the Senate in his present capacity for the past 16 years.

Recently the Buckeye Valley Journal Post, of Buckeye, Ariz., published an article by Columnist Ralph Watkins reviewing Mr. Duke's career and praising him for his accomplishments. In the article Mr. Watkins pointed out that the position of Sergeant at Arms is the only office in the world given power to arrest the President of the United States—that is, on instructions of the U.S. Senate. I might say that I do not expect my fellow Arizonan to exercise this power, at least during the present administration.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I insert the article referred to at this point in the Appendix:

[From the Buckeye Valley Journal Post, Apr. 1, 1965]

POLITICAL SCENE

(By Ralph Watkins)

In politics, there are a few public servants who are known as can do people. There is no task too large or too small for them to tackle and follow through to a successful conclusion.

The U.S. Senate is blessed with one of these rare individuals in the person of their Sergeant at Arms, Joseph C. Duke, of Arizona. Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY calls him the Houdini of Washington because he can produce the almost impossible on short notice.

He is affectionately called "Joe" by all of the U.S. Senators, his friends, and six Presidents dating from Herbert Hoover through President Lyndon B. Johnson. He proudly wears a wrist watch engraved L.B.J., which the President took off his own wrist and presented to Joe in appreciation of their long and pleasant friendship.

Joe's career started in Phoenix where he attended PUHS and was active in the Young Democrats of Arizona. He was extremely bright and was offered a job as teller with the Gila Valley Bank in Globe, this bank was the grandpa of the present Valley National Bank of Arizona). He accepted the job and was doing quite well when he had a better offer from Tom O'Brien of the mine. He accepted this offer and did well.

At this time, in 1930, the depression had hit and everyone was trying to cut expenses, even Joe. A good friend asked him if he would join the volunteer fire department in Miami where he could get his room free by sleeping upstairs over the firehouse. He made his application to join and was accepted. He moved in but spent most of his spare time at the police station next door just visiting and learning the ropes.

One night one of the officers was killed. This left an opening which was offered to Joe. The police job paid $188 per month and he could still live in the fire house.

It was considerably more than he could make at the mine so he accepted the new challenge. He might still be an officer or possibly chief of the Miami Police Department if he hadn't tried to keep peace and order among a bunch of drunk Mexicans. In trying to do his duty, he was shot through the stomach. Dr. Nelson Brayton arrived just in time, and Joe gives the doctor full credit for saving his life.

While convalescing, he wrote his good friend, Senator Henry Ashurst in Washington, making an application for a more peaceful job on the Senator's staff. The Senator had just lost one of his most valued assistants by death and this left the perfect opening for Joe. He arrived in Washington in 1931 and worked as clerk and administrative assistant to Ashurst as long as he was in office.

He then moved over to Senator CARL HAYDEN's office, and later to become the Senate's bill clerk, a job so important that the Republican Senators requested that he stay on the job even through the 80th Congress which was Republican controlled.

Joe decided that he would like to be Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. Senate when the Democrats gained control with Harry Truman in 1949. He started lining up his votes among the Senators, but it was necessary that he be nominated by his own Senators, CARL HAYDEN and Ernest McFarland. CARL didn't want to lose Joe, consented if McFarland would nominate him.

Mac made a slip of the tongue and nominated Joe Doaks. He was elected January 3, 1949, and served until the Republicans took over under Eisenhower. He was out 2 years, but was reelected January 5, 1955, and is still there.

His job gives him control of 14 departments and 900 people. He is the only man in the world who has the power to arrest a President, and this must be done on instructions from the U.S. Senate.

Watch your TV screen, the next time you see the President going in or coming out of a joint session of Congress, the dapper, youngish-looking man with horn-rimmed glasses immediately in front of the President is our Joe who has done so much for Arizona and the country as a whole.

President Johnson Looks Beyond the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's speech on Vietnam last week clearly pointed out the divergent aims of the United States and Communist China in regard to southeast Asia.

President Johnson forcefully stated this country's commitment to peaceful change and economic progress. On the other hand, Communist China has given no indication that it is willing to abandon its policy of aggression in southeast Asia. The President's offer of extensive development aid for Asia stands in marked contrast to China's continuing role of encouraging and supporting insurgency wars in southeast Asia.

A column by Max Freedman, in the Chicago Daily News of April 10, eloquently emphasizes this long-range commitment of the United States. I have unanimous consent to place Mr. Freedman's article in the RECORD:

JOHNSON LOOKS BEYOND THE WAR

(By Max Freedman)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson, in his address at Johns Hopkins University, has done much more than open up a new and constructive phase to American policy in Vietnam. He also has proclaimed an American commitment to resist Chinese expansion anywhere in southeast Asia.

Until now, for what has appeared to be weighty and sufficient reasons, the administration, from Dwight D. Eisenhower to Mr. Johnson, has steadily identified North Vietnam as the aggressor, as she certainly is and as this administration would never deny. China's appetite for aggression, however, has been given far less emphasis.

This technique died at Johns Hopkins. After weighing all the risks, the President decided to look beyond the war in Vietnam and to concentrate attention on China's threat to southeast Asia.

In this wider context he gave a pledge, an unlimited and unconditional pledge, to resist Chinese military aggression, alone if necessary, and as long as may be necessary.

Any country in southeast Asia attacked by China's power, either directly or through puppets and guerrillas, and willing to fight for its freedom and independence, can be assured that American help will be offered in response to an appeal for assistance.

That is the stark and far-reaching implication of the principles asserted in the President's address. Washington is ranged directly against Peiping in a more blunt and deliberate manner than many of us would have believed possible before Johns Hopkins.

This firm stand has been taken by the administration, after long and careful deliberation, because it has decided that China can be deterred from a continued career of aggression only if she realizes that she must overcome prompt and massive resistance by the United States.

Perhaps this warning will fail. In a situation overflowing with uncertainties, it is

quite possible that China will ignore the warning or will be provoked by it.

But China now stands on less solid ground. Her rulers know that the United States will forbid easy military conquests, and the threatened nations of Asia, no longer defenseless and alone, can have new confidence in resisting the encroachments of communism.

These must be considered two securities for peace, even though they will be brushed aside and will count for nothing if Peking is blind to reason and is covetous of conquest and aggression. Then a time of sorrow and upheaval will truly face mankind.

Meanwhile, beginning with Vietnam, the President has given fresh hope and opportunity to all of southeast Asia.

The rulers of North Vietnam have a clear choice. They can wreck their country in a suicidal contest with American power; and China and Russia will then find it much easier to degrade North Vietnam into a pathetic puppet than to respect its status as an independent country.

That is one choice—ruin, devastation, the loss of effective independence. It is the fate that awaits North Vietnam while she follows the present course.

But President Johnson gave North Vietnam another choice. It is a choice sanctioned by reason, by justice, and by generosity.

North Vietnam cannot only join with other nations in conditions of equality to obtain a fair and honorable and guaranteed settlement, she can also benefit from the economic and social aid that can quicken southeast Asia with progress in many fields now beyond its reach.

The President wants the United States to make an initial contribution of $1 billion to that international program in which the United Nations will exercise an important influence.

While China threatens aggression, this country offers massive help. The contrast will be visibly clear to every government and people in Asia.

Let us note that the President invited Russia, and other industrialized nations, to unite in making the international program a great success.

He was silent about China. That too will be remembered and appreciated by Asia's rulers. For China will be welcomed in this international project when she renounces aggression and abides by the commitments of a good neighbor. Once again that is a choice for Peiping to make.

The President at Johns Hopkins held out before the independent nations of southeast Asia the chance, with international aid, to root out the grievances and injustice that give Communist guerrillas their sinister opportunity.

He also should take the lead now in building a stronger system or regional security to replace the discredited SEATO alliance.

Choosing his time well and his words with wisdom, President Johnson has given North Vietnam a chance to end the war and southeast Asia a chance to enter a new age of hope. It will be a supreme tragedy if the promise of Johns Hopkins is not amply fulfilled.

Verrazano Day 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on or about April 17, 1524, 441 years ago, an adventurous Florentine navigator sailed his ship into New York Harbor and sent a small boat through the Narrows to explore what we call today Upper New York Bay. The name of the navigator was Giovanni Verrazano.

Long before the voyages of Raleigh, Hudson, and the Pilgrims, Verrazano and his intrepid companions came to the shores of North America, explored these shores, and reported their findings to Europe. For centuries, Americans remained ignorant of this exploit. The name they gave to their continent evoked the voyages of Amerigo Vespucci. They set aside a day to commemorate the discoveries of Christopher Columbus. But neither of these great explorers—who contributed so largely to the renown of Italian navigation—came to the shores of what today is the northeastern coast of the United States. It is to Verrazano that credit belongs for first exploring this coast.

Belatedly, Americans have come to recognize the achievements of Verrazano. In 1909, a statue of Verrazano was unveiled in Battery Park in New York City. In 1964, a suspension bridge across the Narrows of New York Harbor was completed, bearing appropriately the name of Verrazano. It is my hope that one day all our citizens will be acquainted with the exploits of Verrazano, and that his name will be set alongside those of Columbus and Vespucci when the glorious history of Italian navigation is evoked.

With Courage and Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Friday morning, April 9, 1965.

The editorial follows:

WITH COURAGE AND REASON

President Johnson's address at Johns Hopkins University—directed to America and the world, to our friends and our enemies—was a masterful presentation of U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

It is a policy that calls for continuing courage in the defense of a far-off land against the aggression of a brutal invader. It is a policy that summons the forces of reason in quest of peace even though the foe is notoriously unreasonable and seemingly committed to the path of war.

The President balanced a strong pledge to defend freedom in South Vietnam with an equally strong promise to seek a fair peace through "unconditional discussions." He capped it all with a billion-dollar offer of economic development aid to southeast Asia that ought to serve as a persuasive inducement to end the war and reap the harvest of peaceful progress.

While there were overtones of idealism in his speech the President also faced the hard truths and the harsh realities—something that many of his critics have been too timid to do.

"We must deal with the world as it is, Mr. Johnson said. "The first reality is that North Vietnam has attacked the independent nation of South Vietnam. Its object is total conquest * * * To abandon this small and brave nation to its enemy—and to the terror that must follow—would be an unforgivable wrong."

It was on this note that Lyndon Johnson rose to the pinnacle. His policy is based on what is right rather than on what is expedient. His firm voice of compassion for the victims of Communist terror in South Vietnam comes as a refreshing breath of hope in a world where many people and many countries are all too willing to pass by on the other side and leave the oppressed and the tormented to their horrible fate.

President Johnson emphasized that "we will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

This was a well-deserved rebuke of those who clamor for negotiations on any terms. What they really are seeking is a way to surrender.

If Hanoi is ready to talk peace, it has an open invitation. America's terms, as stipulated by Mr. Johnson are eminently fair and clear: "An independent South Vietnam, securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others."

Whether the Communists will consider these terms acceptable is another matter. It takes two to negotiate.

Senator Dodd's Leadership

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of the pending drug bill, H.R. 2, and am very anxious to compliment and congratulate the distinguished committee for its fine work in bringing this very desirable, constructive legislation to the floor of the House for appropriate action.

I am also very anxious to compliment and congratulate the very distinguished Senator from Connecticut, our former great and esteemed colleague, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, for his tremendous contributions in so ably developing and pressing for this necessary, vital legislation.

Many of us here know of the long-sustained interest and effective work of Senator DODD in this field, and those of us who know him well and served with him here in this great body well understand his very high purpose and the dynamic impact of his great ability, patriotism, and spirit of dedication upon many of the great issues confronting the Congress.

The country and his great State, and its wonderful people, are fortunate indeed to have such a wise, inspired, sagacious leader representing them in the other body, and I believe that this drug bill, which is to a great extent the product

of TOM DODD's deep concern, will do much to alleviate some of the shocking conditions currently extant in the Nation, raising speculation and doubt regarding the future health, strength, stability, and soundness of some of our youth and our people.

I am very proud that I serve in this great Congress with a brilliant, far-sighted, courageous leader like Senator TOM DODD, and that I can call him my dear, admired friend.

School Bill Big Great Society Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that the education bill has become the working law of the land, it is gratifying to know how greatly our Nation will be altered in the years to come because of its enactment.

Those of us who worked for final passage of the bill can take particular pride in having preserved its main strength—direct aid to students.

The future of America is limited only by the economic and mental future of her citizens. Tomorrow's problems will not be solved by reliance on old formulas, old theories, old conceptions of poverty, deprivation and limited abilities. Americans today must do more than take their place among the people of the world who have learned the rudiments of reading and writing.

President Johnson sees 190 million Americans as individuals, with individual capacities for growth. He has stressed the need for far-reaching programs to help those individuals who, through lack of education and training, cannot help themselves. The President's devotion to this concept of the worth of every individual reinforces our ability to see that each of us participates directly in the wealth and progress of our country.

The enormous wealth of achievement which will be realized as a direct result of this historic education bill can be felt in classrooms and communities all over America.

The President has called on us to lend our skills to insuring the freedom of opportunity to every man, woman and child in the 50 States. Now, in fact and in our lifetime, we can provide direct assistance to those millions less fortunate to develop their abilities for the enrichment of all. The wonder is why we waited so long to turn our attention to this great cause.

Following is an article written by Mr. James McCartney, which appeared in the Chicago Daily News recently about the education bill and the hope it has stirred in communities across the length and breadth of the land. I bring it to the attention of my colleagues today so that they may share its reaction of approval and applause for a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Apr. 10, 1965]

SCHOOL BILL BIG GREAT SOCIETY VICTORY

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—We're off on the road to that Great Society.

Suddenly, in two smashing and unprecedented victories, President Johnson has taken giant strides toward achievement of his major legislative goals.

Friday night his education bill—after nearly 20 years of frustrating and often angry debate on similar measures—went rocketing through the Senate. The vote was 72 to 18.

It was only Thursday that the President's health-care-for-the-aged bill passed over its steepest hurdle, in the House, by the eye-popping vote of 313 to 115.

That, too, was an impressive achievement.

The education bill now requires only a Presidential signature to become a reality.

The health care bill, which is just about as revolutionary, is not expected to encounter serious trouble in the Senate.

The President was so confident concerning the prospects for the education bill that he left town before the final vote.

He did not think it was necessary to stay handy to the telephone to apply his velvety technique at persuasion in case it should be close.

The President has done more than simply show that he can accomplish legislative feats that previously have seemed impossible.

He goes one better than that.

He makes it look easy.

Republicans aren't quite sure how to react.

They seem, at times, simply stunned.

It can't be said that the President is totally responsible for the success of the education bill.

Surely, it is his bill, but there is no evidence that it was Lyndon Johnson who came up with the brilliant concept—at least from the legislative point of view—that made it possible to pass the bill in Congress.

This is the concept, essentially, that the major part of the money in the bill—$1 billion—should go to help children of the poor, regardless of whether they attend public or private schools.

In terms of historic perspective, the passage of the bill is simply a marvel.

The first serious effort to pass a general education bill after World War II was made in 1948. By 1950 the discussion degenerated into a bitter and acrimonious fight over church-state relationships.

Over the years bills foundered in every imaginable way. They were tied up in committees, boxed in by powerful congressional committee chairmen, sometimes passed in one House of Congress and stopped in the other.

But once the magic concept came from the White House this year, on January 12, the atmosphere was different.

A successful solution had been found to the church-state controversy. Groups which had bitterly opposed one another in previous hearings were suddenly nodding and smiling.

Even Republicans who are famous for their conservatism found themselves unable to stand in the way of the bill's passage. Some finally helped boost it along its way. Others voted for its passage.

The story behind the passage of the health care bill is nearly as dramatic, although it tends to be more the story of a single man.

That man is Representative WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee.

For years he stood as an opponent of health care for the aged under social security.

Whether it was President Johnson's seemingly limitless powers of persuasion, or a slow process of educational conversation that changed his views this year, the public at present does not know.

He modified his views to the extent that he became willing to accept a social security-style system of prepayment. Then he hurried hearings through his committee.

A final touch in the legislation was to add a package of voluntary provisions which the aged may sign up for if they wish.

The final package includes, essentially, a hospital care plan under a social security style system of prepayment, plus a voluntary health insurance system to cover doctor bills.

Report to Kansas on H.R. 6675

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my report to the people of Kansas on H.R. 6675:

REPORT TO KANSAS

The House of Representatives, on April 8, passed the administration's hospital and medical services bill. Although President Johnson has recommended that Congress enact a limited hospital care program—the Ways and Means Committee, apparently with the President's blessing came forth with one of the most far-reaching medicare programs ever to reach the floor of the House.

Let's not kid ourselves. When this bill becomes law, the soundness of the social security pension program will be in real jeopardy.

It has always been my feeling that we have a responsibility to provide hospital and medical care for all our people, young, and old, who are in need of such assistance. We have a responsibility to assist our senior citizens who are able to care for their ordinary expenses of living, but who live in constant fear of a major illness, which might wipe out their savings, and force them to become public charges—and such assistance should be given without embarrassment or humiliation to those who need help.

Hence, the real issue before the Congress during the debate on H.R. 6675, insofar as I was concerned, was not whether we should provide assistance but how we should provide assistance.

The administration bill was brought to the floor under a closed rule which permitted 10 hours of discussion but denied to House Members the right to offer amendments, to remove objectional provisos, clarify ambiguities or improve it. Hence, a Member was required to vote "yes" or "no" on the whole package. With a single exception, the minority was permitted to offer one amendment in the form of a motion to recommit. Under these circumstances, the minority offered the Byrnes bill as an alternative proposal.

The administration program and the Byrnes alternative both included the provisions of H.R. 11865 which passed the House last year (and I supported it) providing for (a) an increase in social security benefits, (b) lowered the retirement age to 60 years for widows, (c) provided social security benefits for those over 72 years of age, and (d) continued benefits to dependent children up to 22 years of age if in school. Both bills provided for a voluntary insurance program for medical (physicians) care. Both bills provided for hospital care. In fact, the Byrnes

proposal was far more liberal since it provided for catastrophic illnesses and medicinals—these were not included in the administration's bill H.R. 6675.

The major difference in the two programs, was not so much in the benefits provided, but in the method of financing. The administration bill provided that hospital care for those over 65 should be paid through an additional payroll tax attached to social security by those who now pay social security but who would not be entitled to any benefits until they reach 65. The Byrnes proposal which I supported provided that those over 65 should pay one-third of the hospital and medical care insurance premium (average $6.50 per month) and the Government would pay two-thirds of the cost out of the general fund of the Treasury. It was the same program provided by the Government today for Members of Congress and Federal employees.

It was agreed by some that if we could give aid to the nations all over the world, if we could pay benefits to labor, industry, and agriculture, if we could assist Federal employees, then we could subsidize the medical needs of the aged to meet their medical costs. The question has also been raised why should a worker with two dependents and earning $3,600 per year be required to pay an income tax of $214 and also hospitalization costs for a person on retirement who has an income of $3,600, pays no income tax and contributes nothing toward the hospital care program.

I supported the Byrnes proposal. I could not in good conscience support the administration proposal which in my opinion undermines the whole social security structure and places unnecessary additional burden on those who now pay social security.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH HOSPITAL CARE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY?

Most of us have always considered social security as a program under which we would receive a pension at age 65—which combined with our life savings—would make it possible for us to maintain a decent standard of living during our years of retirement. When the program was first enacted in 1937, it held out much promise. But since then what has happened to social security?

Through the years we have so expanded and enlarged upon the original intent that, like Government bonds, it is rapidly losing its attractiveness. We now have on the books commitments to pay out approximately $625 billion to those on retirement or covered by social security. We have in assets around $305 billion. If all payments into the fund were to stop—we would be $300 billion short to meet present commitments.

Instead of building up reserves, as private pension programs do, we have actually been paying out approximately as much as we have been taking in. We have continued not only to increase the social security rate, but also the earnings base upon which the tax is paid. In 1954, when disability payments were added, we were told OASI trust funds would climb to $28.5 billion by 1965—actually the fund is now estimated at around $19 billion, $7.5 billion short. And now we are enlarging the program by adding hospital care, increasing cash benefits and reducing the age requirements for widows.

Have pension payments kept pace with the increased social security payments made by the worker? The answer is "No." In 1939, an employee who earned $550 per month paid $30 per year into the Social Security fund. He could look forward to receiving $58 per month on retirement. Today an employee earning the same amount pays $174 into the social security fund and his maximum social security benefit is $127 per month. By 1973, an employee earning $550 per month will pay $353 annually into the social security fund, and he will receive a maximum pension check of $168. In other words while the cost has gone up 480 percent—the workers retirement check has increased only 119 percent.

What is there about social security that is attractive to the young man who is about to enter the labor force for the first time? One must remember that these are the workers upon whom we must depend to pay into the fund so that those over 65 may secure these benefits. A young man, 21 years of age, entering the labor force next year and paying the full amount of social security until 65, could have deposited the same amount in a building and loan at 4½ percent, and he would accumulate by retirement time an estimate of $42,000. If we add the employer's share, it would be $84,000. His retirement checks under social security would total $2,004 per anum. If he invested $42,000 at 5 percent, he would earn $2,100 annually and still leave an estate of $42,000 at his death.

Can we keep expanding the social security program by adding hospital care, medical care, increasing benefits to those over 65, and charge it to social security? Yes, if those who pay into the fund are willing to stand for an increase in the payroll tax and the earning base upon which the tax is paid. It should be remembered, however, that the social security tax by 1971 will be as burdensome as the income tax. For example, take a man earning $5,000 per year with a wife and two dependents—in 1971 his income tax will be approximately $290 and his social security tax will be $260. These, of course, will be increased when demands are made that Congress grant further increases in social security benefits to meet living costs, and as hospital and medical services increase in cost.

A hospital care program for those over 65 financed by a payroll tax attached to social security not only does serious damage to the social security pension program, but it also inflicts the most unfair tax in our whole taxing system. The president of the corporation pays on the same basis as the plant janitor.

In closing may I repeat what I said in the beginning—I believe in providing hospital care and medical care for those who are in need. I want to help those who can care for themselves, but live in constant dread that one serious illness will place them on relief. But I want to do it without wrecking the social security pension system for those who are between the age of 21 and 65 and are required to foot the bill. I do not want to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. That is why I favored the financing provided by the Byrnes alternative and opposed the administration bill.

Pan American Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with other Members in expressing appreciation for the fine leadership of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Foreign Affairs Committee. His fine work has been a credit to our State and to our country. Americans of every political persuasion owe him a debt of gratitude for his outstanding contribution in this area of foreign affairs.

James A. Farley: Truly a Pro's Pro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank Conniff which appeared in the New York Journal-American on April 5, 1965:

JAMES A. FARLEY: TRULY A PRO'S PRO

(By Frank Conniff)

One of the nicer tints brightening the political spectrum during recent years is the universal admiration and affection exhibited toward James A. Farley, a pro's pro who has been to the wars without losing his integrity or his self-respect.

Although he scrupulously shuns donning the toga of an elder statesman, audiences, especially those of a Democratic Party tinge, seem intent on communicating their vast esteem for him at every opportunity. He is still much too vigorous to hold still for the wise man role, but people seem dedicated to placing him in a niche removed from the less seemly facets of public life.

Largely by coincidence, this writer has many times this winter been at affairs where the introduction of Jim Farley brought a heartfelt and spontaneous response. The standing ovation bit is the most overdone feature of the banquet circuit these nights—a claque of about three stands up and the rest of the room is ashamed not to follow suit—but in the case of Big Jim the roaring tribute strikes one as emanating from a deep desire to convey the audience's high regard for the man.

There is something heartening about all this: a feeling of events coming full circle to honor the man for his many contributions devoid of the sniping that marred the unhappy years. Deep down, we suspect Jim Farley believes he has never been given proper credit for the role he played in helping enact President Roosevelt's New Deal into law.

Not too many years ago, critics dismissed him as a "conservative." This was in the days when one's attitude toward Soviet communism determined your classification as a "liberal" or a "conservative."

Those who viewed communism tolerantly and believed the United States could accommodate itself to all things Russian automatically were designated as "liberals." Others who, like Jim Farley, looked at Soviet Russia with suspicion, were branded "conservatives," although their support of liberal welfare measures had been a long standing commitment.

But that's raking over a long-gone ideological dispute which Josef Stalin settled by his unabashed aggressions following World War II. We would do well to bear the old feud in mind, however, in the current Vietnam controversy. Those who believe the United States has committed its honor to the defense of South Vietnam are not necessarily trigger-happy reactionaries; nor are those who call for instant negotiations automatically appeasers of aggressive communism.

We are not trying to adjust a halo on Big Jim's shiny pate, because he operated according to the rules of political warfare, which can be pretty rugged at times. What he has proven is that you can survive in this rough game and still abide by the canons of decency, respect for opponents and trust. He managed to do it, and it's a shame not

enough of the new breed have pondered his example.

Now he has come into the years of full recognition and his story reads very pleasantly over the long haul. Prestige-wise, we would say he is ranked only by President Johnson and Harry S. Truman in the Democratic Party. Vice President HUMPHREY, Senator BOB KENNEDY, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to mention of a few of the later generation, have years to go before the accumulate the record of public service, adherence to ideals and party loyalty built up by Jim for more than 40 years.

As we say, it's one of the nicer things we've seen recently, the spontaneous salute of admiration and affection showered on James A. Farley whenever people get the chance to demonstrate how they feel about him.

Conference at Soviet Embassy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. I. E. "Pappy" Schechter, publisher and editor of the Park Forest Reporter, Park Forest, Ill., attended the National Editors Association Conference held in Washington. As part of the program, he and his fellow newsmen had an opportunity for a press conference at the Soviet Embassy.

It isn't very often that Communist diplomats expose themselves to proper scrutiny by the U.S. press. Mr. Schechter's report of the interview is so fascinating that I felt it deserved widespread review.

I place it in the RECORD at this point:

"Nyet" may be the most popular Russian word in the American lexicon, yet in all candor we must admit that during our 1-hour news conference at the Soviet Embassy in Washington recently, Red diplomats were affirmative, skillful at responses, suave in their mannerisms. One couldn't help coming away with a feeling that the confidence they exuded regarding political and economic matters was based on their true feelings, not on a false sense of security.

The event was a first in Russo-American relations. The 130 newsmen who attended the 4th annual National Editorial Association Government Relations Workshop were the first news group of this size to be invited to the Soviet Embassy to query their diplomats.

In the absence of Ambassador Dobrynin, his chief aide, Consul Alexander Zimchuk, undertook to answer all queries. His comments were firm and even though we sensed the uselessness of pursuing inquiry, he could hardly be classed as equivocal. Obviously, he must have answered similar queries before.

Here are some random questions and answers:

Question. Why is your government insisting that the United States get out of South Vietnam?

Answer. You are violating the treaty of 1955, when Indochina was partitioned. At that time a free election was promised in the nation. Only a dictatorship has existed since then. The United States has no right to arm South Vietnam and send its troops.

Question. Didn't you do the same thing in Cuba?

Answer. No. There was no civil war in Cuba. We sent missiles to Cuba at the request of Chairman Castro. We also removed them and our men when it looked like they could cause an all-out war. We are basically a peaceful nation.

Question. There are signs that Russia is going capitalist. Can you explain your latest efforts to increase production by employing standards long used in this (capitalist) nation?

Answer. The Soviet Union will never go capitalist. We have embarked on an incentive program. This is not a profit motive, just a means to increase our production. It may interest you to know that our gross national product has increased 8 to 10 percent while the United States can boast of only 4 or 5 percent.

Question. Can you explain the split between your country and Red China?

Answer. Our differences with the Republic of China are purely ideological. (He never used the word "Red" in describing a Communist nation; acting bullish, perhaps?) We are not nearly as estranged as you are led to believe. Furthermore, it's obvious that your government and some of its western partners don't see eye to eye on many matters either.

Question from this correspondent. What about the controlled press in your country? Is there anything like the type of newspapers we represent—suburban weeklies, semi-weeklies and small town dailies, who reflect the attitudes of America's grass roots? We can and frequently do criticize our governments and officials and show our editorial independence to a remarkable degree.

Answer (Comrade Zimchuk bristled a little. A slight tic on the left side of his face began a more rapid action). Our press is not controlled. Yes, we have papers like yours in our communities. But they carry mostly social news—something like a company house organ. Our major papers are national ones. Remember, we do not have private ownership of the press.

Question. Can your community papers criticize?

Answer. Yes, if there's a grievance toward a factory superintendent, for example, a letter to the editor will be accepted to be printed.

Question. What was behind the ouster of Khrushchev.

Answer. Chairman Khrushchev sent his resignation to the Presidium, the same body which elected him to his high office. (Before this response could draw a followup query, the Counsul recognized another outstretched hand.)

Question. Do you expect that Russo-U.S. tensions will ever cease?

Answer. Yes, but it's hard to predict when. At the present time we are negotiating the opening of legations in major cities of your country. This may help you to understand us better.

Question (this one on the lighter side). Do you have anyone in Russia who compares with James Bond?

Consul Zimchuk didn't appear to understand the question. He exchanged a few words in Russian with an aide and then asked to have the query repeated.

His answer, We're somewhat old fashioned in Russia, we still believe in Sherlock Holmes, brought down the house.

The camaraderie was spreading. It was easy to see that the Russians could parry with the best of them.

Question. If I went to Russia, my travel would be restricted, why?

Answer. I don't know why, my own travel here is plenty restricted.

Question. How did you react to the U.S. orbit conquest of Grissom and Young?

Answer. It was a great achievement.

Question. Did you celebrate it in the embassy?

Answer. No, we didn't even celebrate our own triumph in space a week earlier.

The hour went by rapidly. Most of us concluded that these diplomats could not be embarrassed. Their answers slick, yet positive, didn't create fury—only sound. It was the kind of afternoon we would enjoy repeating. Even though the answers weren't satisfying, the intellectual vying is good mental therapy.

Settlement in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, One of the major concerns of our country today is our position and attitude regarding the conflict in Vietnam. I am therefore pleased to insert an editorial from the Denver Post of April 8 on the President's position:

PRESIDENT EXPANDS CHANCES FOR PEACE

President Johnson took the firm, positive course in his address to the Nation on American policy in southeast Asia. It was clearer than any previous statement on that difficult and frustrating subject, and it held more hope for decent, peaceful settlement in South Vietnam.

The speech was obviously the product of thorough analysis and painstaking preparation. It was not merely the response of a sensitive political leader angry at his critics, as some had suggested it might be, but rather a responsible, detailed policy statement, framed for world consumption.

There was in it something for all interested parties. There was, of course, repetition of the administration's determination to continue in strong support of South Vietnam. Military attacks against the North Vietnamese will continue for now, he said, "because they are a necessary part of the surest road to peace."

The enemy and his allies, as well as those at home who feared this determination might falter at a critical juncture, will mark this statement well.

But while saying that the United States would not grow tired and withdraw "under the cloak of a meaningless agreement," the President announced his willingness to enter "unconditional discussions" on a Vietnam settlement.

If this was not a radical departure from previous statements in which he has said that the government in Hanoi would have to indicate readiness to cease aggression against its neighbors before we would talk about negotiations, at least it was a far more direct expression of our willingness to seek peace.

The President for the first time appeared to be going at least half way in the quest for peaceful settlement in Vietnam. His statement was a major effort to gain the diplomatic initiative in southeast Asia. At the same time, it was clear that the other half of the distance would have to be covered by Hanoi, or Peiping or Moscow, or by all of them together.

But the willing hand he extended to friend and foe on the subject of peace also held the promise of dramatic and massive American aid.

He called for a large-scale cooperative effort "to improve the life of man" in conflict torn southeast Asia while pledging a

$1 billion assistance program. And, significantly, he invited North Vietnam to "take its place in the common effort just as soon as peaceful cooperation is possible."

He is soon going ahead to name a special team to inaugurate U.S. participation in economic aid programs in southeast Asia—without waiting for response from Hanoi.

This is in the Johnson pattern: expand the Great Society, as it were, into the most trouble-stricken area of the world, and ask the enemy to help you.

It could, in the long run, work.

Meanwhile, the speech from the campus in Baltimore answered the President's doubters and his critics about where the nation stands on the issue of South Vietnam. At the same time it pledged American aid on an unprecedented scale while expanding on American willingness "to bring about the bright and necessary day of peace."

Johnson's "Idea War" Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Friday, April 9 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times:

JOHNSON'S "IDEA WAR" WEAPON

President Johnson has cut through the confusion of the Vietnamese war and made a point that must be made clear to every Communist in southeast Asia, whether he be a guerrilla in the rain forest or a high official in Hanoi. Continued warfare is futile and senseless. Peace will bring a better life for all. The choice is up to the Communists. If they choose continued warfare, the United States has a total commitment—"we will not be defeated" Mr. Johnson says.

The United States will stay in South Vietnam and continue to slug it out with the Communists, if that's the way they want it. But the United States also is willing to engage in "unconditional discussions" to stop the bloodshed and to help all of southeast Asia to a better life.

The billion dollars the President says the United States is willing to put into the backward area for economic development was quickly termed a carrot—part of the classic carrot and stick approach. It also has been labeled a bribe or an attempt to buy friends with dollars, to get out of a sticky mess in South Vietnam.

This is a superficial viewpoint. It ignores fundamentals. Marshall plan aid could have been described as a bribe, too. So can all forms of foreign aid. But they also are acknowledgments that it takes more than firepower to fight the Communists.

The battle against communism is also a fight against an idea. Ideas cannot be fought with guns. They must be fought with other ideas. Americans win this part of the battle when they convince the people in underdeveloped countries that capitalism and the democratic way can do more for them than communism.

President Johnson once again has put in perspective both types of warfare against the Communists.

Communism promises the people a better material life. But they would lose the right to govern themselves.

The United States and other free nations stand ready to help poorer nations build a better life and enjoy the fruits of modern science and invention. They would retain their political independence.

Mr. Johnson has reminded the people of North Vietnam as well as South Vietnam that they have an alternative to war that would mean more than the end of bloodshed—it would mean a better life, better than ever before.

In offering unconditional discussions, the President lets it be known that discussions can begin even while the fighting goes on. The United States will not accept the Communist condition that the United States withdraw troops from Vietnam before any talks begin. On Wednesday, before Mr. Johnson talked, Soviet President Anastas I. Mikoyan repeated that the first step toward peace was withdrawal of U.S. troops. It may be significant that yesterday he did not mention this in discussing Vietnam.

Perhaps Mr. Johnson might have made the "unconditional discussion" speech a few weeks ago and if the Reds had agreed to talk, have saved many lives. But a few weeks ago, the United States would have made the offer from a position of military weakness. Today, with the North Vietnamese taking punishment from the air and the battles in South Vietnam going against them, the United States makes its offer from a posture of strength and has given convincing proof that it "will not be defeated."

The Soviet Union still prates about the "aggression" of "American imperialism" against North Vietnam. But no reasonable person anywhere could read Mr. Johnson's speech and conclude that America wants to dominate the people of southeast Asia. It wants to help them govern themselves.

Secretary General U Thant, of the United Nations saw President Johnson's position as a favorable response to the recent appeal of 17 nonalined countries to bring about a political settlement of the Vietnam war. It was "positive, forward looking, and generous." This seems to be the attitude of most non-Communist countries.

Mr. Johnson has challenged not only the Communists but the Communist system to show whether they are sincere in their protestations that they stand for peace and for a better life for the common man. The world awaits their answer.

The Pittsburgh Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to another chapter in the story of "Pittsburgh Research: Key to Tomorrow," published by the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania. This chapter is entitled "The Pittsburgh Story," and I include it as part of my remarks:

THE PITTSBURGH STORY

The Pittsburgh area has much to offer—in scientific and technical talents, laboratory facilities, and research and development effectiveness.

The contents of this brochure are convincing evidence of the high level of scientific and technological activities in the nine-county area. They also point out the numerous opportunities for interaction among industrial, governmental, and institutional organizations in the region.

The Pittsburgh area has achieved an R. & D. balance in scientific disciplines, industrial fields, laboratory sizes, source of support, and nature of research. It has the professional manpower, specialized equipment, and supporting services necessary for creative investigation and enterprise.

Always strong in the materials field, it also has become the center for nuclear power research—and is making significant contributions in a variety of other fields—chemicals, machinery, electronics, medicine, and instruments.

Most of the research is of an applied or developmental nature, but a surprisingly large amount of basic research is underway. Unlike many other parts of the Nation, an unusually high percentage is funded by industry, rather than Government, thereby providing greater economical stability.

The R. & D. activities range from small one- and two-man operations to some of the largest research laboratories in the Nation. The Pittsburgh story, however, is more than generalities.

Getting to Work and Back

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I recommend for the attention of the House the third article in Consumer Reports' informative and thorough series on the cost and convenience of metropolitan transportation, "Getting to Work and Back." Since many of our major urban centers are facing key decisions on mass transportation, I know my colleagues will be interested. The article follows:

GETTING TO WORK AND BACK

(By Ruth and Edward Brecher)

Before a new expressway or transit route can be built, it must be planned. Most of the planning has been done by highway engineers employed in State highway departments. The plans have been designed to get people from place to place in their own automobiles—with relatively little concern for the areas through which the roads run or for other means of transportation. Since most of the money for new urban expressways has come from Washington, and most of the planning from the State capitols, local communities have had relatively little voice in their own transportation futures.

But a change is underway. The 1962 amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act declares that, beginning in July 1965, plans for new urban expressways shall be drawn up with "due consideration" of their probable effect on the cities through which they run, and shall be "properly coordinated with plans for improvements in other affected forms of transportation."

There are teeth in this amendment, moreover. For the bulk of the money for new urban expressways—90 percent in the case of Interstate System routes—is allocated by the Secretary of Commerce; and, beginning in July, the Secretary is forbidden to give approval to new urban freeway routes "unless he finds that such projects are based on a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process carried on cooperatively by the States and local communities."

In other words, no more freeway funds will be coming from Washington after July unless an areawide planning study is underway. Federal funds to assist in comprehen-

sive regional planning are available through the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The new planning studies are being sponsored by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, and the BPR has established a laudable framework for them. The Bureau is insisting, for example, that planners give full consideration to all transportation facilities, "including those for mass transportation," instead of just to new highways; the factors analyzed are to include "zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations, building codes, etc."; and area planners are instructed to consider "social and community-value factors, such as preservation of open space, parks and recreational facilities; preservation of historical sites and buildings; environmental amenities; and aesthetics."

The boundaries of the new planning areas are based on Census Bureau maps; in general, each city or cluster of cities with its suburbs is considered a single area. Each local government within the area is expected to participate in the planning process. "The State highway department," the BPR states, "will be expected to show by suitable evidence that scrupulous efforts have been made to carry out the intent of the act with respect to cooperative action by all political subdivisions. If there is an unwillingness on the part of a local political unit within the entire urban area to participate in the transportation planning process in such area, a determination shall be made as to whether the percentage of the urban area affected is such as to negate an effective planning process for the whole area"—and thus warrant curtailment or withholding of Federal highway funds.

An exciting feature of both the BPR and HHFA approaches is that Washington is not dictating solutions to local problems, but rather insisting that local machinery be established to solve them.

WHERE THE CITIZENS GROUPS COME IN

The mere establishment of these new transportation planning studies, of course, is no guarantee that urban transportation problems will be more effectively solved in the future than in the past. As CU noted in February, the new planning projects could prove to be mere facades, behind which the same old highway engineers will continue to make the same old highway-oriented decisions from a regional planning office. Here is where a vigilant citizens group comes in. It can start by asking questions.

Is your community, for example, properly represented on the body that is preparing a comprehensive plan for your urban area? Is your spokesman an impartial representative concerned primarily with the community—or is he a highway contractor, a gasoline company executive, or someone else with a personal ax to grind? If your local government office can't answer these questions, you can get the name and address of the body making the transportation study for your urban area from the State highway department; and you can then check with the planning agency itself to learn whether your community has an authorized spokesman. If it doesn't, urge your local officials to establish effective liaison with the agency at once.

Next a citizens group should ask the local representative to explain how the planning agency is going about its task. Planning a sound transportation network for a metropolitan area is so complex a job that planners necessarily make use of electronic computers to aid them in their work. What counts is how they are used—what questions are asked and what data is given the machine to use in arriving at its answers.

The first primitive attempts to use computers in transportation planning were woefully inadequate. The planners divided an urban area arbitrarily into 10-block or 20-block zones and determined by a survey what trips were being made by the residents of each zone. These trip data were fed into the computer along with population predictions, automobile ownership trends, land-use trends, travel time figures, and other such statistics. The computer then produced a set of desire lines showing how many people would want to drive from A through B to C a decade or two hence, and multilane expressways were bulldozed through to carry the anticipated traffic. Local protests were ignored, on the theory that the computer knows best. This approach may still survive in a few local projects.

A much better approach, however, is now in common use. The computer no longer dictates an expressway plan; instead it is fed alternative plans, and their cost and adequacy are compared. Thus, planners, elected officials, and local voters can make the final choice on the basis of the helpful findings emerging from the computer.

Despite this improvement, there remain many pitfalls. One results from the fact that computer estimates of future traffic are generally based on recent trends toward an automobile-dominated society. Thus the worst features of our past decade of urban chaos are projected into the future on an inflated scale.

Moreover, many of the planners in control of the urban planning projects were trained in automobile-oriented university engineering schools; and many are former employees of highway planning departments. Thus the alternatives with which they are most familiar are expressway alternatives. They are less likely to program for the computer a thoroughly detailed evaluation of a modern, highspeed rapid-transit system like the San Francisco BART system, described in the February Reports (with its 80-mile-an-hour top speeds, scheduled speeds of 50 miles an hour including stops, abundant and convenient peripheral parking, average platform waits of only a minute or two at rush hour, comfortable seats, low noise levels, air conditioning, and other amenities).

Finally, the computer is generally asked about getting travelers from neighborhood A through neighborhood B to neighborhood C. The rights, wants, and needs of the residents of neighborhood B are seldom consulted in advance, much less reduced to a form that the computer can assimilate. But this lack can be remedied. And citizens groups can provide the drive if it is not initiated by the regional planning office. How they can participate is very well illustrated by what is now going on in the Boston area.

HOW BOSTON IS DOING IT

Under the Boston Regional Planning Project (BRPP), a thorough transportation planning study is currently underway in the Boston area, comprising the city itself and scores of its suburbs. This study is supported by the Massachusetts Department of Public Works and Department of Commerce & Development. Its director is a community-minded regional planner, Donald M. Grama. And its incomparable virtue is that Graham. And its incomparable virtue is that community representatives before rather than after the computers are put to work. Researchers for this series of reports attended a meeting called by BRPP, one of a series of 10 for representatives of 6 suburbs 30 miles northwest of Boston. The meetings were held in the evening so that ordinary citizens could participate. Graham himself presided.

The communities represented learn from one another at these meetings. "My town isn't interested in better rail service to Boston," one representative may remark. "Our commuters own at least two cars and drive one in."

A representative from a neighboring town disagrees. "How do you know your commuters wouldn't be delighted to sell their second car and take the train if more comfortable, convenient, and speedy service were available?"

"My town's a mess every morning and evening when the trains come in," someone remarks. "The cars around the station tie our downtown district up in a knot until it looks like Boston."

"My town, too. Why not tear down both miserable old stations and build a new one in the country halfway between?"

"Good idea. Then we would have enough room to park near the station instead of five blocks away."

Out of such local exchanges, new ideas—and new projects—are born. BRPP is holding a similar series of meetings in each of its 18 districts. Later these expressions of local concern and need can be included among the data fed into the BRPP computers.

The meetings work in the other direction, too. The BRPP men bring news of projects that may affect local interests. A new freeway is being planned around Boston, for example—even further out than the famous Route 128, once touted as the solution to the area's traffic snafus but now itself congested. Where should the interchanges along the new beltway be located? One suburb may welcome an interchange because of the boom in land values it will generate; another may be horrified by the destruction to a settled community the interchange will bring. If neither knows of the plans, neither can speak up while there is still time.

Some traditional planners are appalled by Graham's cards-on-the-table approach. They warn that if plans become known in advance, land speculators will reap windfall profits; and they predict that if so much time is allowed for opposition to mobilize, nothing will ever get built. Graham disagrees. Windfall profits are only possible, he point out, when knowledge of plans is limited to a few insiders who can then prey upon the ignorance of their neighbors. And he predicts that if the BRPP plan is devised from the start with adequate consideration for community needs and wants, support rather than opposition will be engendered through most of the area.

"The way to recognize a sound urban-area planning program," Graham told CU, "is by its approach to your own community. Do the planners come in with a completed plan and try to sell you on its merits? Or do they come in with an open ear to learn in advance your community's needs and wants—and then try, with the help of their computers, to reconcile your needs and wants with those of the rest of the area?"

Where official planning projects fail to do their work well, a citizens group with sufficient determination—and the necessary talent—can do a great deal of investigating and publicizing on its own. A CU subscriber Ernest Ratterman, has reported one unusually comprehensive effort of a few years ago in Cincinnati.

Concerned with the traffic jams and commuter delays that were plaguing the city of Cincinnati back in 1957, Ratterman and a handful of his friends—most of them professional engineers like himself—asked why a high-speed rapid transit system could not be built with a modest investment to operate along an existing, little-used railroad right-of-way into the city. As a contribution to the city's progress, this citizens group, headed by Alvin L. Spivak, submitted a study of the possibility, including "data on costs for rights-of-way, electrification, new trackage, purchase price of rolling stock, operating costs, and income." Then, they organized themselves as the "Rapid Transit Study Committee" and published their full report. "We dug deeply into Cincinnati's transportation picture both past and present," Ratterman recalls. "As engineers we were able to present well-thought-out plans and ideas to generate interest in our goals. * * * At no

time during our many presentations did we encounter any dispute about our facts or questioning of our conclusions about Cincinnati's transit needs. Ordinary citizens * * * showed their eagerness for something new and better in urban transportation. What they lacked, however, was a strong, coherent leadership which could achieve action on their wants."

Inevitably, the Cincinnati committee came into conflict with the local highway lobby. One issue that evoked the clash was a controversial plan to build a four-level underground parking garage in the downtown district.

"Building such an enormously expensive facility struck us as foolish," Ratterman writes, "unless it could be planned to accommodate mass transit facilities at some future date. We made proposals to the city council on this subject and even developed plans for using the first deck of this garage as a central point of a modern downtown subway system integrated with surface lines to the suburbs. We studied the downtown parking facilities and their location, cost, utilization, rate structure, and financing. These studies cast grave doubt on the feasibility of the proposed new structure.

"But we soon learned that politics rather than facts would decide the parking-garage issue. Our proposals and recommendations were graciously received by the city government—and blissfully ignored.

"We were handicapped rather seriously * * * by being unable to garner the support of some business and professional groups. Individuals in these groups privately lauded our work and expressed envy of our freedom of expression; but the groups themselves were dominated by many conscious and some unknowing supporters and members of the highway lobby. * * * The expressway and parking plans which the city had developed, and the ease with which Federal funds could be secured to finance the expressways, blocked serious consideration of more effective approaches to the city's transport problems. One city councilman told us candidly that, until the Government passes out transit money as it passes out expressway money, there would be no rapid transit in Cincinnati."

The Cincinnati committee broke up in 1961 when Spivak, Ratterman, and several other key members moved to other cities. Cincinnati still lacks a rapid transit system. But Ratterman does not regret the effort expended on the project. "I am sure other members would agree," he writes, "that it was a great personal experience."

Such a committee if launched today, it should be added, would have working in its favor many factors that the Cincinnati committee lacked from 1957 to 1961. Among these factors are:

San Francisco's successful adoption of the BART plan for high speed, comfortable, convenient rapid transit of a quality that should exceed any now available in the United States. When it is in operation, the precedent may engender a demand for better transportation in other areas.

The likelihood of Federal funds for transit systems (see last month's article in this series) so that cities will no longer be faced with a Hobson's choice between Federally-supported freeways and transit systems that must be financed at home.

The existence of area-wide planning programs, which at least provide a forum for presenting ideas.

Finally, even some urban interests that would normally form a part of the highway lobby now realize that mass transportation must be improved and expanded to unclog the expressways. The Jenney gas station chain with 600 filling stations in the greater Boston area, to cite one example, has taken full-page advertisements urging public support of transit expansion there. The Standard Oil Co. of California and the California State Automobile Association both endorsed San Francisco's BART transit plan.

With such new factors affecting the situation, committees like the one in Cincinnati should have a considerably better chance of success in the future.

Some are already at work. Examples are the District of Columbia Rapid Rail Citizens Committee, the Bergen County (N.J.) Transit Association, the Intermunicipal Group for Better Rail Service (New Jersey), the Westchester Commuter Association (New York), and the Committee for Better Transit of Greater New York. Also important are the long-established planning groups such as the Regional Plan Association of Greater New York. If there is a sound organization of this kind in your community or region, by all means join and support it.

If a city's residents do not value it they are of course free to move out. But much of the shift to the suburbs today is not the result of an innate dislike of the cities. Rather, it is being forced on families and business concerns alike by the failure of the cities to solve their most pressing problems, including the transportation. Thus, willy-nilly, we are drifting toward a future of urban sprawl.

At least four major North American urban areas—San Francisco, Montreal, Toronto, and Philadelphia—are bucking this trend toward sprawl by investing in high quality rail transportation that will link city to suburbs for balanced growth. The residents of other areas may prefer different patterns. If so, they are free to plan differently, but let them get what they really want, not merely what the requirements of automobile transportation dictate.

The new comprehensive planning projects now underway or soon to be launched in every urban area make it possible to plan for the future of people, rather than just for automobiles. Let us make the most of this opportunity.

THE STAKES ARE HIGH

Much more is at stake in such local efforts than merely an opportunity to get to work and back a few minutes faster or for a few cents less each day. The entire future of American cities hangs in the balance.

An increasing number of people today, looking at our blighted central cities and traffic jams, have concluded that large cities are obsolete. They therefore envision a future in which all of us will both live and work in suburbs, surrounded by vast parking lots, and linked together by multilane freeways along which we can all whizz in uncongested private-car luxury.

One objection to such plans is that they leave out of account the many services that people want and need but that each suburb cannot possibly supply for itself—a symphony orchestra, to cite a striking example.

Right To Be a Bum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the remarks of Mr. Paul Harvey, made on his news broadcast on February 27, 1965. I think the emphasis he has correctly placed on freedom is one which each of us should consider carefully in preparing his legislative program. There is plenty of security in a jail cell but I have never heard of anybody beating down the doors to get in.

[Excerpt from Paul Harvey News, Feb. 27, 1965]

RIGHT TO BE A BUM

I had meant to confine this next just to generalities. And embellish it with some fervent plea for the preservation of the Republic. Then I got to thinking about a parttime dishwasher I know, who's a bum the rest of the time, and I tried to figure what's his stake in all this free enterprise. How about the ragpicker, or even that good-natured old janitor in the North Western train station, what's his percentage?

If he votes right and puts up a fight for freedom, what's his cut? "The Government can't give you anything which it has not first taken away from you." He's heard that. But he has nothing anybody can take away from him. So who's he to worry about whether the Constitution gets chopped up or the flag hauled down?

He's got nothing they can tax and nothing anybody'd want, so why shouldn't he take a bottle of cheap wine from the precinct committeeman and just vote the way the man says.

I had meant to talk about the American heritage, and I got to thinking about Joe the bootblack. What has he inherited? Well, I've been asking around. And the rest of you tune out, now. And dial in 3 pages later. Because right now I aim to talk just to Joe the bootblack. And to Lennie, the part-time bum.

You know, I think that's what's wrong with the fervent flag wavers in this country. We spend too much time talking to one another. But Joe and Lennie and Paul Harvey understand one another, too. Because they've all been flush and they've each been hungry and any one of them knows what it's like to work a hard 17-hour day for $1 packing or sacking or stacking somebody else's groceries. So we can speak the same language, and it's that language we're going to use here. The kind that'll be understood by Lennie and Joe and the vast mass of unorganized, unterrified human beings whose two-by-four house or third-floor walkup is as close to the silk as they're ever going to get. The rest of you just excuse us for a bit—if you will.

A while back a chap named Dean Russell made a speech out in Billings, Mont. Probably talking to a gathering of folks who already agreed with him. I'm going to try to remember how he compared the American Negro slaves and the American Indians.

For a lot of years now we've been voting for the men who promise us Government aid—of all kinds. We figured we wanted the Government to guarantee to look after us. Well, sir, in the early American slave States the law specified that the slaves must be taken care of. The constitutions of the slave States generally specified that the slaveowners must provide their slaves with adequate housing, food, medical care, and old-age benefits. And the Mississippi constitution contained this additional sentence: "The legislature shall have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves (except) where the slave shall have rendered the State some distinguished service."

Now get this—The slave was guaranteed food, lodging, medical and old-age care, but the highest honor the State of Mississippi could offer a man for distinguished service was to set him free from this security. The State's highest reward was to give a man the personal responsibility of looking after his own welfare. Freedom to find his own job or to be a bum if he liked.

Do you see why that's so important, just the right to be a bum? And so the slaves eventually found freedom to earn money they could keep, to save for their own old age and then they weren't slaves any more.

Let us, on the other hand, take the American Indians. These we made wards of Government. These we gave security. We took away their freedom and gave them security. So they have become steadily less self-supporting. I speak of the average, of course, not the spectacular exception. In 1862, most American Negroes were slaves. Look at the remarkable progress in just one lifetime later. Today the average American Negro is self-supporting, self-respecting, and responsible. Today the average American Indian, it is said, will actually die of starvation unless he is fed by the Government.

So we have to hire 13,000 Federal employees to take care of 380,000 reservation Indians. That's one Federal employee for every 30 Indians. This has nothing to do with the color of a man's skin or the shape of his cheekbones. The Negro was free to work or loaf; to starve or to win a potfull. The Indian was secure. There was no reason for him to educate himself or learn to manage his own affairs or to be productive. It's no fault of his; it's ours. Just as it's going to be our fault, Joe and Lennie, our fault if we let them repeat this tragic error on us.

Simply because some arrogant would-be masters are convinced that today's Americans are too ignorant or too worthless to be trusted with their own destiny. They actually think that we would literally starve in the streets unless the Government looked after our welfare. Welfare! Man, this is where we came in. They're on the way to buying and selling us again!

Now maybe you see what I started out to say. You—you're a gandy dancer, you're a hod carrier, a trolley pilot, or you take tickets at the ball park. What have I got to lose, you say? Why shouldn't I take their offer of free medicine, money for work I don't do or crops I dont' grow? Why not?

Here's why not, and don't ever forget this. "If your Government is big enough to give you everything you want, it is big enough to take away from you everything you have."

And don't tell me you've nothing to lose. That's what they thought in Britain, too. But already in Britain, elected leaders can force the citizen to work wherever the government decrees they are most needed. Force!

In Russia, where this kind of security got a slight head start, they'll make him work—if necessary in leg irons.

You've nothing to lose, you say, because you're a bum? That, sir, is a priceless privilege. In Russia you would be whipped or shot for it. It is your American right to be a bum. That is part of being free.

So for Heaven's sake don't let them peddle this absurd security idea as something new. It was written into the Code of Hammurabi over 4,000 years ago. The Romans called it "bread and circuses" to keep the crowd pacified while their sons died.

Karl Marx called it "socialism." It's where the state makes laws for your own good whether you like them or not. And Russia will imprison those who object.

It can't happen here?

Wait a minute, mister—it has happened here. Don't tell me you're still 100-percent free or I'll tell you about the owner of a small battery shop in Pennsylvania.

They told him he had to kick in money for his own social security. He didn't like the idea of being forced to buy insurance, and resisted. The State confiscated his property.

Still he refused to obey.

So the State preferred criminal charges against him. And the Government gave him the choice of conforming or going to prison. An enemy of the State because he had refused to pay social security. He paid. His 6-month prison sentence was suspended.

From now on, Lennie and Joe, get this straight. You do have plenty to lose. Whenever some of us try to warn you that big Government wears brass knuckles we're not trying to get you to fight for any other man's mansion. We're trying to protect your equally important right to be a bum.

Listen and remember. The guaranteed gifts are just bait, nothing more. They'll offer the rewards of 1864—a free meal, a free roof, a guaranteed job, and then—

We're trapped into being somebody's slaves again.

New Vietnam Blueprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, an interesting editorial on the situation in Vietnam and southeast Asia was published in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on April 11.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this informative editorial:

NEW VIETNAM BLUEPRINT

(By Melvin K. Whiteleather)

What is your primary interest, to better the lot of the people or to make revolution for revolution's sake?

This is the question President Johnson put to Ho Chi Minh, the North Vietnamese Communist boss, with last Wednesday's proposal to end the war in Vietnam and embark on an imaginative effort to lift up the whole of southeast Asia.

U.S. effort to bring the struggle in Vietnam to a close has centered on Ho Chi Minh, rather than on Peiping or Moscow. To bombing north of the 17th parallel is now brought the additional pressure of the cooperative scheme benefitting all of North Vietnam's neighbors.

North Vietnam can be included if it is willing to stop attacking South Vietnam. But if it doesn't, President Johnson gave emphatic notification that Ho Chi Minh stood to see his territory and people injured rather than improved.

AN ALTERNATIVE TO WAR

The United States no longer is just bombing; it has put its weight behind a constructive plan and those around the world who have been calling for an alternative to destruction, now have one. There was wisdom in choosing the Mekong River development skeleton plan already in existence and in inviting U.N. Secretary General U Thant to take the initiative in getting the plan off the ground and expanding it. The 21 countries already contributing to that development plan and the authority of the U.N. are brought into a direct relationship to the struggle in Vietnam. Thus it is not just a raw U.S. "imperialist" plot.

Except for countries with a revolutionary bias, this relationship should lean toward a settlement suitable to the Saigon government. The 17 nonalined countries, led by Yugoslavia, which made a plea for peace negotiations to all parties concerned, can hardly be opposed to a development scheme that would touch a whole section of Asia and 50 million persons. The 17 need not accept at 100 percent face value the claim that the Vietcong is a tool of Hanoi in order to press for a settlement of the struggle that would leave the Saigon government in control of its own territory.

PRESSURE PUT ON OTHERS

The Johnson proposal definitely has put the pressure on the other side, relieving the United States of onus that had been building up over the bombing in North Vietnam. Unimportant as the whole affair was, there is no doubt that the use of nonlethal gas by the South Vietnamese army, supplied by us, sharpened world opinion against us. British Prime Minister Harold Wilson's path in defending our purposes and practices has now been eased and the critical Japanese have been given something else to think about.

The President's proposal hit Red China hard and Peiping is striking back with the full force of its propaganda machine. Southeast Asia blooming under other than Chinese influence is the last thing Peiping wants to see happen. The region is regarded as a Chinese preserve, and beyond that, for such a plan to get moving with U.S. dollars and moral backing would be a far cry from bringing U.S. imperialism to its knees, as Peiping says it must be brought. For the United States to put the United Nations and a cooperative plan to the forefront cuts straight across Communist propaganda.

MOSCOW'S DILEMMA CONTINUES

Peiping in its fury is losing sight of its only recent adoption of the Russian argument that any settlement in Vietnam must be between the United States and the Vietcong's political arm, the National Liberation Movement. It seems that after all, Red China does have a stake.

Mr. Johnson has not eased Moscow's dilemma a bit. On one hand the Russians might be pleased to see southeast Asia developed independent from China, and the President suggested that the Soviets should contribute to the scheme, but on the other hand there is the commitment to helping all revolutions. Russian irritation over its dilemma has been manifested the past few days by the worst cold war polemics that have been heard in the U.N. in a long time. These took place in an obscure committee where ordinarily nothing ever happens.

Peiping will do its utmost to prevent Ho Chi Minh from nibbling at the President's proposals. No one expects Ho to run up a white flag in broad daylight, but he has been given an opportunity to work his way out of his box with a certain amount of face saving.

The signals are still warning that a big attack on a Dien Bien Phu scale is in the making with the expectation that the South Vietnamese and Americans can be done in with one big swoop. If this is tried and fails, Hanoi may be ready to listen to U Thant.

Manned Space Flight's New Phase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert B. Hotz' editorial in the April 12 issue of Aviation Week & Space Technology aptly describes the new era that our space program is entering. Mr. Hotz' analysis clearly describes the value of the Gemini program to our national security and to the Apollo lunar landing in this decade. He compares the current status of the Soviet and United States space programs and his reflections concerning this are important to all Americans:

MANNED SPACE FLIGHT'S NEW PHASE

The flights of the U.S. Gemini and the U.S.S.R. Voskhod spacecraft herald a new phase of manned space flight.

The Vostok and Mercury flights were aimed at determining man's ability to survive during prolonged space missions. The era begun by Gemini and Voskhod will determine his ability to operate spacecraft for a variety of useful purposes, many of them not even dimly discernible at present. This period in manned space flight is similar in many respects to the early years of World War I, when the airplane was suddenly transformed from the stunt and racing machine of the prewar era into the fighters, bombers and observation aircraft that dominated the western front.

The Voskhod and Gemini spacecraft are aimed at similar goals to extend the capability of manned space vehicles to a series of basic functions, such as:

Maneuvering in space: The technical feasibility of this has been demonstrated in the flight of Gemini 3, but a major effort remains to develop this maneuverability into an operational capability.

Extravehicular activity: This has been successfully demonstrated by the Soviet cosmonaut, Alexei Leonov, during the flight of Voskhod 2. It is a keystone in the process by which large structures can be erected for functioning in space.

Rendezvous and docking: Both Gemini and Voskhod are scheduled to demonstrate this function soon, using different techniques.

BROAD CAPABILITY

In this area, the achievements of whoever is first to accomplish a new feat in space will continue to attract major public attention. But the real significance of this second phase of manned space flight lies not so much in short chronological gaps between the first and second achievements, but rather in the broad capability being developed and the speed and certainty with which it is applied to specific operational tasks. For example, it is relatively unimportant that Cosmonaut Leonov did the first extravehicular maneuver in space if a Gemini astronaut expands this operational technique within a few months. Nor will the historic first maneuvers—both in changing orbits and changing orbital plane—of Gemini 3 retain much significance if the Soviet Voskhod accomplishes these same feats later this year. The interval between these two types of spacecraft demonstrating rendezvous and docking is not likely to be long or particularly significant.

Although both the United States and U.S.S.R. are committed to an attempt to land the first men on the moon, we believe that the most important aspect of this second phase of manned space flight, and of the third and operational phase that will certainly follow, will be in near-earth orbits. With the heavy U.S. commitment of resources to the Apollo lunar landing mission, it may appear to be both expedient and safe to defer the development of earth-orbital operational capabilities until after the financial and technical peak loads of Apollo have passed. We think this procedure could be a dangerous mistake.

The Soviets obviously have chosen the earth-orbital approach to their lunar landing mission. Therefore, they necessarily must develop rather fully their hardware and operational techniques in this area as a vital prelude to their lunar landing attempts and not as a postlude, in the manner of current U.S. planning. They also have made little attempt to conceal their primary military interest in the development of manned spacecraft operations in the earth-orbital area.

Thus, it is entirely possible that unless U.S. policy is drastically changed soon, the Soviets may have an opportunity to achieve the technical surprise in space that they so narrowly missed in the race to an intercontinental ballistic missile.

OPERATIONAL GOALS

If the United States had gone directly from Mercury to the Apollo program, there would be no chance to thwart this possibility of disaster. Fortunately, the Gemini program was conceived and properly expanded to provide not only a spacecraft system for developing the vital earth-orbital techniques but also for applying them to achieve operational goals. Gemini has been severely criticized in the daily press and the Congress for its rising costs and lagging schedules without much understanding of how the goals of this effort have been extended and its scope broadened. We think that in the years just ahead these same critics will switch to praise and thanks for the existence of the Gemini hardware and operational concepts as the national need for them becomes painfully apparent to all.

Now, the U.S. space policy planners are facing a decision on how best to develop fully and swiftly an earth-orbital operational capability during the same period that Apollo needs the hardest push to achieve an early lunar landing.

Because of the existence of the Gemini program it is still possible to do both without serious danger of being confronted with a major military surprise by the Soviets in the next few years. But some hard decisions are required almost immediately if this opportunity is not to slip from this Nation's grasp. National Aeronautics and Space Administration can contribute to this goal by pushing developmental testing of Gemini systems as a top priority. The Air Force should be able to develop the required operational capability by pushing its military orbital laboratory program based on Gemini hardware as fast as technically feasible. But nothing can be achieved without some swift decisions in the Pentagon and White House on the course of a sound military space program. The time is growing late.

ROBERT HOTZ.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the farmers, businessmen, and community leaders in the First District of Idaho anxiously awaited the announcement of the agricultural message and recommendations of President Johnson. In the past years, they have been plunging deeper into debt, hoping for better programs and prices. Since the date of H.R. 7097's introduction, I have received many letters about the wheat provisions of that bill, most of which could be called "less than enthusiastic". All are in accord with the stated objective of putting farm income into balance with that of other industries, but many are skeptical about the success of H.R. 7097 toward that end. One-hundred percent of parity for wheat domestically consumed is applauded widely, and most farmers would like to be assured of this absolutely. The discontinuance of export subsidies and certificates is not opposed, but nearly every one agrees that a 4-year program is necessary, rather than the 2-year proposal. Diversion payments are necessary to reduce surplus production, but many say that a strategic resurge of wheat, based on 50 percent of our annual domestic and export needs would be wise. Continuance of the feed grain program is regarded as a very important element for equitable farm returns, but the elimination of oats and rye from the base very adversely and inequitably affects many farmers in my area. Overall, I think the observation of a very astute farm reporter is accurate:

The present provisions of the farm bill will probably be condemned by faint praise.

A good analysis of the present provisions of the farm bill were made by a very highly regarded newspaper editor in my district. Under unanimous consent I included it in the RECORD:

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Apr. 7, 1965]

MR. JOHNSON'S NEW FARM BILL

President Johnson's first major farm bill presented to Congress Monday offered no sweeping changes in philosophy—simply higher support prices for wheat and rice, with citizens paying more of the costs in grocery bills rather than taxes.

Despite prompt and vigorous criticism from the heads of two major farm organizations, the President's proposal is likely to be fairly popular with wheat and rice farmers. It probably will be accepted without much complaint by most consumers—who tend to object more to taxes than to higher prices for goods. And it will help ease the strain on the Federal budget, if Congress approves it—which seems likely for that reason alone, if no other.

The new bill did not develop an earlier hint by the President that farm legislation might be offered which would emphasize benefits to small farmers, rather than across-the-board subsidies to small and large producers alike.

Such an arrangement is economically feasible, perhaps under some variation of the controversial plan once presented by former Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan. That plan called for direct Federal subsidies to farmers proportioned on the basis of need, with consumers getting the benefit of lower costs of food products sold on an open, unsupported market.

However, this approach probably is not politically feasible. The "family-sized farm," which for many years was the foundation of American agriculture, is fast becoming a rarity. Farmers who work sections instead of acres also have their economic troubles these days—and vigorously insist upon their full share of any benefits provided by Government through direct subsidies or price supports.

Mr. Johnson's farm bill naturally did not satisfy the quarreling leaders of two of the Nation's big farm organizations.

James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, which generally represents small farmers looking to Government for aid, declared that "the major deficiency is the failure of the bill to provide the income that farm families and rural Americans need if they are to survive * * * It is high time that the direction of agricultural policies be given back to the Department of Agriculture or to people with experience in farming."

Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which generally reflects the big-farmer view that the law of supply and demand should be allowed to function in agriculture, whatever the results to "submarginal" farmers was even more caustic.

The President's bill, he said, was "a hoax designed to trap both farmers and consumers." The proposals, he said, "would make farmers more dependent on Government subsidies for their livelihood, and at the same time raise the price of food to consumers, especially those with low incomes."

The gulf between these spokesmen obviously is too great for any farm bill to bridge. One wants higher price supports or subsidies to insure the survival of small farmers, with taxpayers footing the bill. The other wants an open market in agriculture without Federal subsidy and with many small farmers liquidated if necessary in a drastic "readjustment" based on survival of the fittest.

Neither alternative is politically acceptable to most farmers or consumers. As long as the wide gulf exists in farm opinion, any administration will be forced to seek some middle ground. Despite his earlier hints, this is what the President did.

Under the proposed bill, wheat grown for domestic use would be supported by Government at full parity prices—at about $2.50 a bushel instead of the present $2. Other wheat grown within acreage allotments would be supported at about $1.25 per bushel—which is about the world price.

The Government would eliminate present export subsidies on wheat to be sold abroad. It would require millers to pay $1.25 a bushel for domestic-use wheat, or 50 cents more than the present price. Millers and bakers would pass the extra cost on to consumers.

While the price of wheat has had little relation to the price of bread in recent years, the change probably would increase bread prices about a penny a loaf. A similar program would increase retail prices of rice from 5 to 7 cents a pound.

Thus, the wheat and rice growers would earn substantially more. Consumers would pay more at the supermarkets. The Federal Government would save some $200 million per year.

Wheat and rice farmers might gain more than additional income from the arrangement. They might be exempted from some of the irate complaints from taxpayers about the cost of Federal price support programs—even though the taxpayers would be paying farmers more as consumers.

The Federal Government would save sizable sums in an arrangement which once again illustrates Mr. Johnson's tendency to shift Federal expenditures from long-established agricultural programs to some of the newer, long-neglected problems of the Nation's population centers and poverty pockets.

The consumers would pay prices for wheat and rice which would be artifically high in terms of world markets, but still a bargain as compared with other products they buy.

The new wheat-rice program proposed by the President isn't a dramatic new approach to the chronic problems of agriculture. Perhaps no such approach is possible unless farmers unite behind common objectives or until population pressures or wider world trade abolish the problem of crop surpluses.

The new bill does seem to represent a politically shrewd innovation to offer some relief to wheat and rice farmer—and the Federal Treasury—with consumers paying the bill in pennies instead of tax dollars.—B. J.

A New Look at Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in the April 22, 1965, issue of the New York Review of Books, the Washington journalist, I. F. Stone, has written an incisive review of two new books on Vietnam: "The New Face of War" by Malcolm W. Browne, and "The Making of a Quagmire," by David Halberstam. Mr. Stone's review is a welcome addition and insight into the complex problems facing this war-torn area. I urge all my colleagues to read the following review:

[From the New York Review of Books, Apr. 22, 1965]

VIETNAM: AN EXERCISE IN SELF-DELUSION

(By I. F. Stone)

("The New Face of War," by Malcolm W. Browne, Bobbs-Merrill, 284 pages, $5; "The Making of a Quagmire," by David Halberstam, Random House, 312 pages, $4.95.)

The morning I sat down to write this review, the Washington Post (March 25) carried the news that Malcolm W. Browne had been arrested and held for 2 hours by South Vietnamese Air Force officers at the big U.S. air and missile base at Da Nang. The incident is symbol and symptom of the steady degeneration in the conduct of the Vietnamese war. These two books by two newspapermen who won Pulitzer Prizes last year for their coverage of the war, Browne for the Associated Press, David Halberstam for the New York Times, record the agony of trying to report the war truthfully against the opposition of the higher-ups, military and civilian. The books appear just as the war is entering a new stage when honest reporting is more essential than ever, but now restriction and censorship are applied to black it out. Da Nang, the main base from which the was is being escalated to the north, was officially declared "off limits" the day before Browne's arrest and newsmen were told they could not enter without a pass obtainable only in Saigon, 385 miles to the south. "Newsmen," the dispatch on Browne's arrest said, "doubted such a pass existed." The incident occurred only a few days after the highest information officer at the Pentagon claimed that its policy on coverage of the war was "complete candor."

What makes these books so timely, their message so urgent, is that they show the Vietnamese war in that aspect which is most fundamental for our own people—as a challenge to freedom of information and therefore freedom of decision. They appear at a time when all the errors on which they throw light are being intensified. Instead of correcting policy in the light of the record, the light itself is being shut down. Access to news sources in Vietnam and in Washington is being limited, censorship in the field is becoming more severe. Diem is dead but what might be termed Diemism has become the basic policy of the American Government. For years our best advisers, military and civilian, tried desperately to make him understand that the war was a political problem which could only be solved in South Vietnam. Three years ago the head of the U.S. mission spoke of the war as a battle for the "hearts and minds" of the people, and primarily the villagers, whose disaffection had made the rebellion possible against superior forces and equipment. To win that battle it was then proposed to spend $200 million to bolster the Vietnamese economy and raise living standards. Though much of this money seems to have been frittered away, it was at least recognized that the military effort was only one aspect of the problem. Now we have adopted Diem's simple-minded theory that the war is merely a product of Communist inspiracy, that it is purely an invasion and not a rebellion or a civil war, and that all would be well—in Secretary Rusk's fatuous phrase—if only the North let its neighbors alone. This is the theory of the white paper and this is the excuse for bombing North Vietnam.

While the war expands, the theory on which it proceeds has narrowed. Washington's "party line" on the war has been shrunk to rid it of those annoying complexities imposed by contact with reality. The change becomes evident if one compares the white paper of 1965 with the blue book of 1961. The blue book was issued by the Kennedy administration to explain its decision to step up the scale of our aid and the number of our "military advisers" in South Vietnam. The white paper was issued by the Johnson administration to prepare the public mind to accept its decision to bomb the north and risk a wider war. The change of policy required that rewriting of history we find so amusing when we watch it being done on the other side.

Four years ago the blue book told us that the basic pattern of Vietcong activity was "not new, of course." It said this followed the tactics applied and the theories worked out by Mao Tse-tung in China. It said much the same methods were used "in Malaya, in Greece, in the Philippines, in Cuba, and in Laos." If there is "anything peculiar to the Vietnam situation," the blue book said, "it is that the country is divided and one-half provides a safe sanctuary from which subversion in the other half is supported with both personnel and materiel." This implied a conflict which was doubly a civil war, first between the two halves of a divided country and then between the Government and Communist-led guerrillas in one-half of that country.

The white paper disagrees. It abandons complexity to make possible simpleminded slogans and policy. It declares the conflict "a new kind of war * * * a totally new brand of aggression * * * not another Greece * * * not another Malaya * * * not another Philippines * * *. Above all * * * not a spontaneous and local rebellion against the established government." [Italic in the original.] The "fundamental difference," the white paper says, is that in Vietnam "a Communist government has set out deliberately to conquer a sovereign people in a neighboring state." This implies that there is no popular discontent in the south to be allayed, no need to negotiate with the rebels. The war is merely a case of international aggression and the aggresor is to be punished by bombardment until he agrees to call off the invasion. The rebellion can be shut off, all this implies, as if by spigot from Hanoi. The truth about the war has been tailored to suit the Air Force faith in "victory by airpower." This was Goldwater's theory and this has become Johnson's policy.

Browne's book sheds some sharp light on the white paper's thesis. The white paper says the war is "inspired, directed, supplied and controlled" by Hanoi. But Browne reports that "intelligence experts feel less than 10 percent and probably more like 2 percent of the Vietcong's stock of modern weapons is Communist made." He also reports that "only a small part of Vietcong increase in strength has resulted from infiltration of North Vietnamese Communist troops into South Vietnam." An astringent examination of the white paper and its supporting appendixes will show that it really proves little more than this, despite the sweeping headline impressions it was intended to generate. Browne also tells us that "Western intelligence experts believe the proportion of Communists (in the National Liberation Front) is probably extremely small." He describes it as "a true 'front' organization appealing for the support of every social class." Browne declares the front a "creature" of the Vietnamese Communist Party and says it has "strong but subtle ties" to the Hanoi regime. For many Vietnamese, nevertheless "the front is exactly what it purports to be—the people's struggle for independence." This is what our best advisers tried to tell Diem. This is what our bureaucracy now refuses to see rather than admit past error and defeat, preferring to gamble on a wider war.

The really terrible message in these books is not that the bureaucrats have tried to deceive the public but that they have insisted on deceiving themselves. The Vietnamese war has been an exercise in self-delusion. David Halberstam tells us in "The Making of a Quagmire" that when the first Buddhist burned himself to death, Ngo Dinh Diem was convinced that this act had been staged by an American television team. The Buddhist crisis, as Halberstam describes it, "was to encompass all the problems of the Government: its inability to rule its own people; the failure of the American mission to influence Diem. * * * Observing the Government during those 4 months was like watching a government trying to commit suicide." The stubborn insistence of the South Vietnamese dictator on insulating himself from reality spread into our own Government. The most important revelation these two books make is the unwillingness of the higher-ups in Saigon and Washington to hear the truth from their subordinates in the field.

South Vietnam swarmed with spies, but apparently they were only listened to when they reported what their paymasters wanted to hear. Halberstam says that at one time Diem had 13 different secret police organizations. Browne provides a vivid picture of how our own intelligence agencies proliferated. The CIA, Special Forces, the AID mission, the Army, the provost marshal, the Navy, and the U.S. Embassy each had its own operatives. But they were not, in Browne's words, "one big happy family." On the contrary they "very often closely concealed" their findings from other agencies "because of the danger that the competitors may pirate the material and report it to headquarters first, getting the credit."

All this fierce application of free enterprise to the collection of information seems to have been of little use because of a top level political decision. "Ever since Vietnamese independence" (i.e., 1954), Browne reveals, "American intelligence officials had relied on the Vietnamese intelligence system for most of their information." This was "because of Diem's touchiness about American spooks wandering around on their own." In the interest of preserving harmony, "somehow the intelligence reports always had it that the war was going well." We circulated faithfully in orbit around our own satellite. Diem's men told him what he wanted to hear, and ours passed on what he wanted us to believe. Halberstam confirms this. In those final months before Diem's overthrow, "CIA agents were telling me that their superiors in Vietnam were still so optimistic that they were not taking the turmoil and unrest very seriously." John Richardson, then CIA chief in Vietnam, displayed a kind of infatuation with Diem's brother Nhu and his wife. Halberstam describes a lunch with Richardson in 1962, shortly after the New York Times sent him to Saigon, in which the CIA chief dismissed Nhu's notorious anti-American remarks as simply those of "a proud Asian." As for the tigerish Mme. Nhu, Richardson thought her "sometimes a little emotional, but that was typical of women who entered politics—look at Mrs. Roosevelt."

A persistent Panglossianism marked our entire bureaucracy up to and including the White House. General Harkins, our military commander in South Vietnam, said "I am an optimist and I am not going to allow my staff to be pessimistic." Halberstam describes a briefing at his command post after the battle of Ap Bac in January 1963, the kind of set-piece battle for which our military had long hoped and which they first described as a victory though it turned out to be a disastrous defeat. With "the government troops so completely disorganized that they would not even carry out their own dead," "a province chief shelling his own men" and "the enemy long gone," General Harkins told the press a trap was about to be sprung on the enemy!

The enemy was the press. When the facts about Ap Bac could no longer be concealed, headquarters became angry "not with the system" that brought defeat, Halberstam writes, nor with the Vietnamese commanders responsible for it "but with the American reporters who wrote about it." Adm. Harry Felt, commander of all U.S. forces in the Pacific, gave classic expression to the bureaucratic attitude toward the press when he was angered by a question from Browne. "Why don't you get on the team?" the Admiral demanded.

When Halberstam, Browne, and Neil Sheehan,[1] then with the UPI, visited the Mekong Delta in the summer of 1963 and saw for themselves the deterioration of the war, their reward for reporting it was a campaign of denigration. Rusk criticized Halberstam at a press conference. President Kennedy suggested to the publisher of the New York Times that Halberstam be transferred to some other assignment, a suggestion Mr. Arthur Hays Sulzberger, to his credit, rejected. The bureaucracy counter-attacked through Joe Alsop, who insidiously compared the reporters on the scene to those who a generation earlier had called the Chinese Communists "agrarian reformers." The New York Journal-American wrote that Halberstam was soft on communism. A friend in the State Department told Halberstam, "It's a damn good thing you never belonged to any left wing groups or anything like that because they were really looking for stuff like that." Victor Krulak, the Pentagon's top specialist on guerrilla warfare, was vehement in his criticism of the press:

"Richard Tregaskis and Maggie Higgins had found that the war was being won, but a bunch of young cubs who kept writing about the political side were defeatists." The official attitude was epitomized by Lyndon Johnson, then Vice President, on his way back from Saigon in 1961. He had laid the flattery on with a shovel, calling Diem "the Churchill of Asia." Halberstam reports that when a reporter on the plane tried to tell Johnson something of Diem's faults, Johnson responded, "Don't tell me about Diem. He's all we've got out there." A brink is a dangerous place on which to prefer not to see where you're going.

The hostile attitude toward honest reporting is made the more shocking because reporters like Halberstam and Browne, as their conclusions reveal, were critics not of the war itself but only of the ineffective way in which it was conducted. The forces for which they spoke, the sources on which they depended, were not dissident Vietnamese but junior American officers. Their books disclose little contact with the Vietnamese. The battle between the press and the bureaucracy arose because the newspapermen refused to report that the war was being won, but there was not too much reporting of why it was being lost.

For Halberstam the war was a lark, a wonderful assignment for a young reporter; his pages reflect his zest and are full of graphic reportage, though also marked by some egregious errors, such as locating Dienbienphu in Laos and attributing the origin of the agrovilles to the French whereas they really sprang from Nhu's mystical authoritarianism. For Browne the war was less romantic. The life of a wire service reporter on call 24 hours a day in so tense a situation is no picnic. His book is written in flat agency prose. Both men acquitted themselves honorably, in the best tradition of American journalism, which is always to be skeptical of any official statement. But both books are marked by that characteristic intentness on the moment; the idea that the past may help explain the present appears only rarely. There is no time for study, and American editors do not encourage that type of journalism in depth which distinguishes Le Monde or the Neue Züricher Zeitung.

This defect is most damaging in reporting on the origins of the revolt against Diem. The average American newspaper reader got the impression that this was brought about by esoteric and long-distance means, by Communist plotters activated from Hanoi to engage in that mysterious process referred to in our press as "subversion." This is the closest modern equivalent to witchcraft. Halberstam's account of the origins is better than Browne's, but the real roots of discontent are touched on only peripherally. We get a glimpse of them in Halberstam's report that General Taylor after his first mission in 1960 recommended "broadening the base of the Government, taking non-Ngo anti-Communist elements into the Government; making the National Assembly more than a rubber stamp; easing some of the tight restrictions on the local press." The prescription was for a little of that democracy we were supposed to be defending, but Diem would not take the medicine. The accumulation of grievances, the establishment of concentration camps for political opponents of all kinds, the exploitation and abuse of the villages, the oppression of the intellectuals, the appeal of the 18 notables in 1960, and the attempted military coup that year, "the longstanding abuses" which finally led to the revolt, are not spelled out as they should be[2] and would be if U.S. reporters had more contact with the Vietnamese. In a flash of insight Halberstam writes:

"Also, though we knew more about Vietnam and the aspirations of the Vietnamese than most official Americans, we were to some degree limited by our nationality. We were there, after all, to cover the war; this was our primary focus and inevitably we judged events through the war's progress or lack of it. We entered the pagodas only after the Buddhist crisis had broken out; we wrote of Nguyen Tuong Tam, the country's most distinguished writer and novelist, only after he had committed suicide—and then only because his death had political connotations; we were aware of the aspirations of the peasants because they were the barometer of the Government's failure and the war's progress, not because we were on the side of the population and against their rulers."

This accounts for how poorly these reporters understood the central problem of land reform, how few realized that from the standpoint of the peasants, particularly in the delta, Diem's land reform policy, like his hated "agrovilles" and our equally unpopular "strategic hamlets," seemed to be mechanisms for reinstating the rights of the landlords who had fled during the long war against the French. Diem's downfall and the rebellion's success were largely due to the fact that he tried to do what even the Bourbons in France after the Revolution were too wise to attempt. He tried to turn back the clock of the revolutionary land seizures. In the name of land reform, many peasants found themselves being asked to pay rent or compensation for land they had long considered their own.

This lack of contact with the Vietnamese people and this fellow feeling for the junior officers who were sure they could win the war if only headquarters were different, also accounts for the weak way both books fizzle out when the authors try to supply some conclusions. Both oppose negotiation and neutralization. Halberstam is indignant with the indifference to Vietnam he encountered

[1] See the vivid account in his preface to Jules Roy's agonized and eloquent "The Battle of Dienbienphu," Harper, $6.95.

[2] The best account is by the French historian, Philippe Devillers in "North Vietnam Today" (Praeger, 1962) edited by P. J. Honey.

on his return home. He believes Vietnam a legitimate part of our global commitment. He feels we cannot abandon our efforts to help these people no matter how ungrateful they may seem. For the ungrateful majority, the American presence had only succeeded in polarizing the politics of the country between authoritarian Communists and authoritarian anti-Communists; the former, at least, have the virtue of being supported by native forces. The anti-Communist minority was grateful, of course, and feared that with American withdrawal they would be treated as mercilessly by the National Liberation Front as Diem had treated veterans of Vietminh after 1954, although a specific provision of the Geneva agreement forbade persecution of those who had fought against the French.

The files of the International Control Commission from 1955 onward were full of complaints that ex-Vietminh had been thrown into concentration camps or executed without charge or trial. In any eventual settlement in Vietnam, the future of minorities must certainly be a matter for concern, but the notion that we have a mandate from Heaven to impose on an unwilling people what we think is good for them will strike few Asians or Africans as an object lesson in democracy. Browne's feeble ending is even worse. "Perhaps in the end," he writes, echoing the cliches of the counterinsurgency experts at Fort Bragg, "America will find it can put Marx, Lenin, Mao, and Giap to work for it, without embracing communism itself." This was the delusion of French military men like Colonel Lacheroy and Colonel Trinquier, who returned from Indochina thinking they could apply Communist ideas in reverse to the pacification of Algeria. When frustrated, they tried to turn their borrowed techniques of conspiracy and assassination against De Gaulle and the French Republic. To apply Communist methods in reverse, the favorite formula of our counterinsuragency experts does not make them any less unpalatable or dangerous to a free society. The basic tactic confuses the effect with the cause. To see wars of liberation, the Pentagon's dominant nightmare, simply as a reflection of conspiracy, to overlook the social and economic roots which make them possible, to prescribe counterconspiracy as the cure, is not only likely to insure failure but it tends to shut off debate on peaceful alternatives. Here the growing tendency of the Johnson administration to make it seem disloyal to question the omnicompetence of the Presidency is reinforced by the natural tendency of the Pentagon to see doubts about resort to force as unpatriotic. There is the danger here of a new McCarthyism as the administration and the military move toward wider war rather than admit earlier mistakes.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Senate

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1965

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, a Senator from the State of Maryland.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1965.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, a Senator from the State of Maryland, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. TYDINGS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 1965

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Tuesday, April 13, 1965, the Chair declares the Senate adjourned until 12 o'clock noon, Wednesday.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 23 seconds a.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order of Tuesday, April 13, 1965, until Wednesday, April 21, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

Appendix

Tribute to State Senator Ray W. Rigby, of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, there are some who say that service in either house of a State legislative body is a training program for future national office. This may be true, Mr. President; but I feel that such a claim falls far short of the mark. To find truly outstanding men willing to take the time and effort to serve their neighbors in the State legislature is a most difficult task. When a young man comes along for the first time and then distinguishes himself in his first term of office, it is a noteworthy event. Such a man is State Senator Ray W. Rigby, of Idaho's Madison County. This young Democrat served so diligently, intelligently, and cheerfully during the past session of the Idaho State Legislature that he was named "Outstanding Legislative Freshman" by the men and women who are our most telling critics, the news people who cover the capital.

Senator Rigby's contributions during 74 days of regular session and the subsequent special session have been reported in the Rexburg, Idaho, Standard of March 30; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSMEN NAME RIGBY OUTSTANDING FRESHMAN

Senator Ray Rigby, Democrat, of Madison, was named the outstanding freshman of the Idaho Legislature at an Idaho Press Club banquet following the recent special legislative session in Boise.

Senator Rigby was selected by capitol correspondents as winner of the "Best Contribution by a Freshman" Award, it was learned here.

The freshman Madison County senator served on four committees during the 38th regular session, which last 74 days, and the special session, which lasted 7 days. These were the judiciary and rules committee, the education committee, the local government committee, and the irrigation and reclamation committee. He also served on a special liaison committee between the legislature and the Idaho State Supreme Court.

Senator Riby also was recognized possible future timber for the Governor post.

Political writer John Corlet, of the Boise Idaho Statesman, said that the Madison senator was a definite possibility for the Democratic nomination for Governor.

One of the noteworthy pieces of legislation passed at the recent legislative session, Senator Rigby believes, is the condominium law, which establishes a new concept in property ownership. He helped draft this law. He also helped push through the senate the Narcotic Drugs Regulatory Act, which is aimed at giving law enforcement better power to deal with situations like that which occurred in Madison County last summer.

Other outstanding legislation, in his opinion, included the establishment of a court coordinator and court study plan for court revision, the creation of the water resources agency, which was created by a compromise bill Senator Rigby helped draft; the sales tax and its accompanying relief measures for income and property taxes, increased aid to education, several measures approved by the Madison Fish and Game Committees, the creation of a State government organized study to determine ways of creating better efficiency in the State government, the urban redevelopment law authorizing procedures to rid cities of degenerated areas.

Senator Rigby feels that "certainly one of the most far-reaching actions of the 38th legislature was the act establishing a uniform method of assessing property, which will take a few years to get into effect, and which is intended to equalize the ad valorem tax burden on all properties."

He noted that there was "very little support to the move to repeal parimutual betting" and that Idaho drivers' licenses will soon be issued with colored photographs of the license holders.

He also personally drafted and carried through the senate a memorial to the U.S. Congress asking that Congress appropriate funds for the Fremont Dam project. This memorial was approved without dissent.

"The two school districts in Madison County benefit greatly from the new appropriations because the districts have a lot of students for a small taxable area," Senator Rigby noted. The Rexburg district will receive an additional $108,994.92. Sugar-Salem will receive an additional $34,739.42.

America's Stake in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD today my statement which was presented to a conference on water and peace sponsored by the Zionist Organization of America in Chicago on April 4.

I believe that this is a subject which deserves the widest discussion and it is my hope that our own Government will take a more active role in helping find a solution to this very serious problem.

I believe the Zionist Organization of America deserves great credit for leading the way in an orderly discussion of this very important subject.

Mr. Speaker, my statement, which was read in Chicago by Mr. Milton J. Silberman, follows:

AMERICA'S STAKE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored that I have been asked to speak to you on two of the most important issues facing not only the United States, but also the countries of the Middle East—peace and water.

One might wonder, at first blush, how peace and water can be so thoroughly related in the Middle East. I am very happy that the Zionist Organization of America has arranged this discussion today so that we may be able to put this entire subject in its proper perspective.

We, of course, have been seeking many ways to maintain peace in the Middle East. But I think we can all agree the task is becoming increasingly more difficult with the obvious lack of cooperation from Nasser and the Arab States.

While it is wise for us to discuss today the basic factors which we hope could lead to peace in the Middle East, it would be a great tragedy if we were to be blinded to the immediate problems at hand. This is one reason why the House of Representatives quite properly placed a ban on any further foreign aid to Nasser until he ceases his aggressive moves against Israel. I regret that the Senate found it necessary to somewhat temper the House action, but even with the Senate amendment it is significant that the House has demonstrated its patience is wearing thin with the arrogance of Nasser.

I believe the Congress must also recognize the realities of life in the Middle East by approving, as quickly as possible, legislation barring Nasser and the Arab States from boycotting American industry which does business with Israel. This attitude by the Arab States is contemptible, and one has a right to ask how much longer will the U.S. Government continue to tolerate such impudence.

We are aware that Israel has never been, in my judgment, in greater danger, and it would be my hope that the U.S. Government will again reaffirm its unequivocal determination that any act of aggression by the Arab States against Israel is an act of aggression against the United States and the Western democracies. We cannot permit an act of miscalculation by the Arab States to plunge the Middle East into open warfare. Nasser has been riding high, and it is my hope that the United States will make it crystal clear exactly what our position is.

This Nation is now historically committed to the proposition that Israel's independence must be maintained at all costs.

It is within this framework that we today undertake a discussion of water and peace in the Middle East.

President Kennedy enjoyed recalling the old Chinese proverb that even a journey of 1,000 miles requires a first step.

I would suggest that resolving the water problem in the Middle East might indeed provide the first step in the long and arduous road toward finding a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

The problem of maintaining the present shaky peace in the Middle East is, as I am sure you are all aware, one of the most delicate issues facing the American policymaker. We as Americans are concerned with a great number of related objectives—all of which have some bearing on whether or not this most important goal is achieved. For example, we want to maintain access to the essential transportation routes which traverse this area; we want to limit the in-

fluence of the Soviet Union; we want to make sure that the oil of this region continues to flow to Europe, for the latter's economic strength depends upon it; we want to help in creating political stability in the individual countries; we want to see an accommodation between Israel and its Arab neighbors, and, perhaps most important in that it can materially assist in achieving many of the above, we want to see the economic development of this area proceed as rapidly and as intelligently as possible.

Now, an indispensable element of the future development of this region, as well as of many others, is a sufficient supply of fresh water. However, Israel is perhaps more than others aware of this necessity. With a growing population, little naturally arable land, and an announced policy of industrialization, the problem of water is of the utmost importance. Large quantities of water are needed; for irrigation of land presently uncultivated because natural rainfall is insufficient, for large and complex industrial enterprises, for consumption by the population, and, for purposes of recreation and a great variety of other uses.

There are at present only two possible sources of additional water for Israel, as well as the other Arab States of the area, because they too lack sufficient quantities of this necessary resource. The first consists of a more rational utilization of presently available sources, as for example, the Jordan River. The second consists of artificially increasing the supply, as for example, through extensive desalinization projects.

The Jordan River is the major river in the area of the Middle East where Israel is located. It has its origins in Lebanon, Syria, Israel, and Jordan. After meandering through the Sea of Galilee and an age-old trough, it finally makes its way into the lowest spot on earth—the Dead Sea. By the time it has arrived at its destination, the Jordan River has become more a river of minerals and salts than one of water. Both Israel and Jordan are "mining" the Dead Sea for this extensive mineral content. But what of its waters farther upstream? Here they are fresh, and could provide all of the riparian countries with sufficient water to irrigate many thousands of additional acres. Israel as well as the Arab States are aware of this, and have at various times proposed plans for the utilization of these precious waters before they are lost to the Dead Sea. So far, however, extremely complex psychological and political fears and disagreements have prevented the creation of any overall regional approach to the apportionment of the Jordan River waters. Consequently, both Israel and the Arabs have gone about the construction of their own diversion projects.

I think it is extremely important to note at this point that construction of diversion projects by the Israel Government along the Jordan River is in line with the broad plan included in the Johnston proposal. It was Eric Johnston who in 1953 proposed the Jordan Valley plan for water power and irrigation projects to benefit the Arab States as well as Israel. We are well aware of the wrecking tactics used by Nasser to upset the carefully worked our Johnston proposal. But I think that this conference should not lose sight of the fact that President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and today, President Johnson are formally committed to the Johnston proposal for distribution of water resources in the Middle East.

I know of nothing which has occurred since Eric Johnston first proposed this plan which has either changed the American position or would justify any change in American position. What is needed today is a bold reaffirmation by the United States of the Johnston proposal and then, if necessary, a complete assurance of assistance by the United States if Israel decides to unilaterally complete this proposal.

We are well aware of the tension that such action will produce in the Middle East, but I am quite certain that development of this program would help lead toward a partial solution of the water problem. Firmness on our part at this time in supporting Israel, in my judgment, will bring the Arab States into line even though we know the extent of mischief and actual brutality that they are capable of generating in their protest.

But the free world has tried to work both sides of the street on this very difficult problem too long. It is my hope that we will take a decisive position in supporting Israel on this matter at this time.

So much for the waters from the Jordan. The United States has also embarked upon the second of the possible means of increasing the available water supply of the Middle East; namely, desalinization schemes. Because the issue of the insufficient water looms so large as a source of both present and possible future friction between Israel and the Arabs, we have undertaken discussions with Israel for mutual programs to discover an economical way to desalt sea water.

The first step was taken last June when Prime Minister Levi Eshkol and President Johnson established a joint survey team to conduct technical surveys in order to define the scope and requirements of the program. On the basis of the economic and engineering studies which were carried out, the Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, the Acting Secretary of the Interior, the Israel Ambassador, and the Coordinator of Israel's water desalting project signed a principles of understanding agreement in October. Both Governments have issued invitations to American engineering and consulting firms to participate in the second step: a detailed engineering study for a large desalting project in order to meet Israel's pressing demands for more fresh water.

This international effort to develop an inexpensive and feasible method of desalinization of sea water may one day prove to be one of the greatest technical feats of human engineering. Huge tracts of the earth's surface could be made productive if only sufficient supplies of fresh water could be brought to them. In this way, one may hope that not only will the problem of insufficient food for much of the world's population be alleviated, but also that disagreements over a limited supply of water will loom less large in an overall settlement for areas such as the Middle East.

American policy has in recent years shown a greater awareness of the aspirations of the peoples of the Middle East, as well as a willingness to assist those who desire our help in building for the future. It is our hope that by continuing to maintain a balanced and constructive relationship with the whole area, and by cooperating in mutual development schemes such as I have outlined, both the problem of water and that most precious of all goals—peace—may eventually be solved in at least this corner of our globe.

But ours is not an easy road to travel in the Middle East. Nor is it easy for our ally Israel to continually turn the other cheek when the Arab States repeatedly renege on their agreements—agreements executed in good faith by both Israel, the United Nations, and the United States.

It is my belief that peace can be brought a little closer to reality when the water problem is resolved in the Middle East. It would be my hope the United States will stand firm in supporting the moderate proposals of Israel in bringing about such a solution. It is only a firm position that the Arab States understand. I am sure in our firm and resolute support of Israel lies the only road to peace in the Middle East.

Price Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial of the Wall Street Journal of April 19, 1965, on the issue that price stability and equilibrium in the balance of payments constitute an indispensable prerequisite for sustained development.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 19, 1965]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—A GREEK HAS THE WORDS FOR IT

If a nation wants a satisfactory rate of economic growth, it must reconcile itself to "a little" inflation and some difficulties with its balance of international payments. So, anyway, runs the reasoning prevalent in Washington and certain other world capitals.

In that context it is interesting to browse through "Monetary Equilibrium and Economic Development," a book published by Princeton University Press and written by Xenophon Zolotas, governor of the Bank of Greece. For Mr. Zolotas has no patience at all with the idea that a nation can inflate itself into long and sustained economic growth.

"The maintenance of relative price stability and equilibrium in the balance of payments," he declares, "is not only compatible with a rapid and sustained development process but is, in fact, an indispensable prerequisite of it." Mr. Zolotas is concerned mainly with his own underdeveloped Greece, but his assessment also applies to more "advanced" nations.

The European banker cheerfully concedes that for "a certain limited period" rapid economic growth can go hand in hand with inflationary monetary policies and a persistent deficit in the balance of payments. Sooner or later, however, lax financial policies will begin to cut into a nation's economic growth, a process that can become cumulative.

One reason is that a nation at some point runs into shortages of some types of material and manpower, as is already beginning to happen in the United States. A government which nonetheless continues the stimulus of artificially easy money, high spending and budget deficits may contribute less to the growth of the economy than it does to the growth of price inflation.

Inflated prices, of course, can only worsen a nation's balance-of-payments problems by making its exports relatively less marketable abroad. In the United States, it's worth noting, those payments problems have stemmed in large part from "expansionary" domestic financial policies; the economy has been flooded with so much money that investors and businessmen generally have been pushed into finding new outlets for funds overseas.

If a government in that situation merely forces businessmen or investors to bring a lot of their money home, the result can hardly help but be new pressure for domestic price inflation. Nor is the result likely to be different when, as is the current U.S. case, the governmental tactic is chiefly "persuasion" instead of outright compulsion. And more inflation means more pressure on the balance of payments, and so on.

Mr. Zolotas does not suggest that governments should give up trying to spur economic growth—far from it. What he is urging is that, for the sake of economic growth among other things, a government should pursue a policy of financial moderation.

This means, as we read his views, that a government should gear its creation of money and credit to realistically attainable estimates of future economic growth. He would look askance, in other words, at a condition such as that of the United States, where bank credit for several years has been growing a good deal faster than the economy.

A policy of financial moderation, by lessening fears of inflation, would promote business confidence—which is, after all, essential to economic growth. By eliminating artificially low interest rates, the policy also would encourage more investment at home instead of abroad.

A government following a policy of moderation in its own spending can open the way to beneficial tax reductions, not just those that increase budget deficits. In that way private resources are freed to boost the growth of the economy instead of the growth of the government.

As a government grows, Mr. Zolotas implies, so does its estimate of its ability to guide the economy to endless expansion. The result in Greece is a growth-impeding "multitude of uncoordinated and often contradictory measures which have accumulated over a long period of time and are now piled up in a chaotic whole."

Although Mr. Zolotas deals mainly with his native land rather than the United States, this Greek obviously has the words for it, too. Were Washington but listening, the advice is a gift not to beware but to be heeded.

Proposed Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to reaffirm and reemphasize my support of the Constitution of the United States and particularly in reference to the 15th amendment which assures the right to vote to all citizens regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

While this may seem a superfluous and unnecessary statement to make, I do so in view of the recent fervor and wave of emotionalism concerning efforts to implement the provisions of the 15th amendment.

I do not believe that there is great difference among the people of the United States as to the meaning of the 15th amendment, and the desirability as well as the necessity for enforcing it whenever the rights of any of our citizens to vote are denied or abridged. It seems, however, that any objection or criticism voiced against the pending proposal made by the President of the United States causes an immediate inference that the individual making the criticism is not sympathetic to the 15th amendment or willing to support enforcement of it.

I recognize that the 15th amendment provides for its enforcement by the Congress and I am willing to support legislation to achieve this. In fact, I will support legislation far more extensive in character than the proposal made by the President, if such action is required.

However, I think we should make every effort first to establish just what is required. The President's bill obviously was hurriedly written under the stress of great emotion. It is fraught with inconsistencies and inequities and therefore must be thoroughly studied and debated.

We must make certain that in our effort to prevent violation of the 15th amendment we do not "burn down the barn in order to get rid of the rats." I am afraid that this is what the proposal made by the President does as it now stands and certainly we can all agree that two wrongs do not make a single right.

Among my objections to the proposal offered by the President is that while it attempts to protect the rights of citizens under the 15th amendent, it violates article I, section 2, as well as the 17th amendment of the Constitution, which specifically provides for the States to set the qualifications of voters.

The present bill, in my opinion, denies due process and equal protection of the law, as guaranteed by the 14th amendment, to a large segment of our people in the States to which it applied. Further, it would seem that the bill as written inflicts punishment without judicial hearing and is therefore a "bill of attainder" in violation of section 9 of article I of the Constitution.

It seems that there should be some way of preventing unfair application of voter qualifications without eliminating the qualifications entirely. While we all agree that there should be equal right to vote I think we likewise can agree that there should be a reasonable requirement of intelligence. However, if the separate States do not care to make this minimum requirement they are not required to do so by the Constitution but neither are they prevented from so doing.

Another serious deficiency in the President's proposal is that it uses an arbitrary, and, in fact, punitive formula by which we would enforce the 15th amendment. The formula assumes, that discrimination exists in some six States in this Nation, but not in the other States. Its double application would make it necessary for Federal registrars to come into my own State, Virginia, and register an illiterate voter because less than 50 percent voted and we have a literacy test. But in New York State, where a literacy test is also required, the same illiterate voter would not be allowed to register because New York's literacy test is not questioned since more than 50 percent of the adult population voted in the last election there.

It has been observed that because of the literacy test embodied in the Constitution of the State of New York, thousands of Puerto Ricans, who are literate in Spanish but not in English, are disfranchised. Under the administration's proposal this practice is perfectly legal. The question could well be asked about other States, particularly the State of Texas, where less than 50 percent of the adult population went to the polls in 1964. But Texas is not included in the legislation because a literacy test is not used. Could public apathy and lack of a strong two-party system in Texas have been responsible for less than 50 percent participation—or could there have been discrimination which should bring the State of Texas under this bill, which certainly should be seeking to enforce the 15th amendment equally for all citizens regardless of where they live?

Mr. Speaker, I will support a proper proposal that will implement and enforce the provisions of the 15th amendment equally and uniformly throughout every State of this Nation without prohibiting reasonable provisions requiring minimum intelligence and standards of citizenship. The present proposals do not meet these standards.

Tribute to Earl J. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. PEARSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Earl J. Johnson, chief of the worldwide news operations of United Press International, retired not long ago. Kansas is proud to claim Mr. Johnson as a native son, as he was born, raised, and educated in Kansas. We congratulate him at the conclusion of a unique and distinguished career.

I ask that an article, appearing in the New York Times, saluting Mr. Johnson, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIEF UPI NEWS EXECUTIVE RETIRES

(By McCandlish Phillips)

Within a century Kansas has produced two unusual news editors. One was William Allen White, of the Emporia Gazette, who became famous in the English-speaking world. The other is an editor virtually nobody but newsmen know.

White was born at Emporia in 1868. He won renown as an editorialist and interpreter of Middle Western small town culture.

Earl J. Johnson came out of the grain and livestock center of Winfield, Kans., where he was born at the turn of the century. He caught on as a wire service reporter in Chicago in 1921, and found it "precisely my dish right off."

Last week he retired as chief of the worldwide news operations of United Press International.

THIRTY YEARS ON THE JOB

For 30 years he was editor of the round-the-clock wires that never cease their rapid clacking. Reporters and editors under him in 265 bureaus fed a continuous flow of news to 6,066 newspapers and radio-television stations in 114 nations and territories.

Mr. Johnson's aim was to make the news report "digestible, even if not appetizing," as he edited the service through World War II, nuclear bombings, Korea, Vietnam, and the emergence of satellites and men in orbit.

Five long days a week—roughly from 9 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.—Mr. Johnson's post was in his office at 220 East 42d Street, with the UPI's wire always running at his left hand. The top foreign and domestic reports rolled out on yards of yellow paper at 3,000 words an hour.

On the job, he said in an interview last week, "you sort of tie in with the leased-wire system, and you and it seem to become all part of the same nervous system."

Mr. Johnson lived close to the office—a 4-minute ride by taxi in an emergency—at 455 East 57th Street. The apartment had two tie-lines direct to the office, one in his bedroom and one in the library.

Said a man who used to run the late-night desk at United Press here: "A story would be breaking and Johnson would call and ask two or three questions and would have you nailed right to the wall. He knew everything going on in the world and he would go immediately—immediately—to the crux of the matter and how you should get at it."

In Mr. Johnson's view, "the main thing is to stay flexible and on top of the news. The emphasis in the news shifts from hour to hour, and there's never a point at which you can stop and say, 'that's that.' Unlike a newspaper, here you never have a complete product."

Anywhere in the world, a reporter who was really coming in with a good job on a fast-breaking story was likely to get "a cheer" from the boss: A short message—"Well handled. Terrific performance." or "You hit that one right on the nose."—signed E.J.J.

Because of Mr. Johnson's singular ability to inspire enthusiasm in reporters, a great many young men were willing, as one old hand put it, "to knock their guts out for 3 years for Earl Johnson and good old team for $30 a week" before moving on to bigger news jobs elsewhere.

TOOK A JOB AT 17

The war draft was on in 1917 when he quit high school to take a job with the Winfield Courier (3,000 copies daily). The Courier found itself with "an overage editor and one or two women," so the draft-proof lad of 17 became "quite a wheel covering city hall, the courts, and the chamber of commerce.

At the University of Kansas he became the campus correspondent for the Kansas City Journal, the morning paper, and the Kansas City Post, the evening paper.

"The Post was a very flashy paper, and they paid $7.50 a column," Mr. Johnson recalled. "So, if you discovered that the girls in some sorority were shaving their legs because some doctor told you he'd gone over to treat a cut, they'd take it and run in right down page 1."

At 22 he headed the Cleveland bureau of the United Press, then went back to Chicago as night editor in 1925. He ran the European service as "Hitler was coming up and things were beginning to bubble" in 1933–34, and became editor of the entire service in 1935.

Mr. Johnson, an articulate, undramatic, "deeply inquisitive man with a curiosity that ranges over the whole field of human experience," as a former UPI foreign editor put it, showed a capacity to work fast and remain "completely unflustered" in the midst of any crisis.

AN ABLE CONVERSATIONALIST

With a ready wit and an almost bottomless store of anecdotes, Mr. Johnson was able to converse on a staggering variety of subjects. As one former subordinate put it:

"He would talk with you about the most abstruse point of religious doctrine that you could think of. Then when the next guy walked in, he would talk with him about the bawdy houses of Cairo."

At one time Mr. Johnson had working under him a foreign news analyst who made a habit of leaving the office several times a day to drop into a nearby tavern.

One day the analyst's absences were longer and more frequent than usual. His wife telephoned Mr. Johnson next morning to say the man could not come to work because of a cold.

"I know," Mr. Johnson replied. "I saw him catching it yesterday."

Associates knew Mr. Johnson as "a real stripped-down kind of pro" who never projected his own personality into his work. Yet he savored deeply the romance of journalism.

"Surely these have been golden years for newsmen, and the end is not in sight," he wrote in a final weekly memo to editors. "Yesterday a man walked among the stars. Tomorrow he will step onto the moon."

After 44 years of facing "a deadline every minute," Mr. Johnson will not cover that story. He and his wife are having a house built at Southampton, L.I., far from the endless chatter of the teletype machines.

Uncreative Federalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Wall Street Journal of April 13 there appeared an editorial entitled "Uncreative Federalism." On April 15 another editorial entitled "The Veneer of Pragmatism" appeared. Both of these editorials should be of real interest to the Members of the House:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 13, 1965]

UNCREATIVE FEDERALISM

When President Johnson signed the bill authorizing $1.1 billion for Federal programs in Appalachia, he hailed it as a true example of creative federalism. Yet that same federalism is impeding possibly more significant developments of private enterprise in the same area.

Specifically, a private electric power company in Appalachia is ready to spend $910 million of its own money on two power projects. So far it is being held back from spending a dime by Congress and a Federal agency.

For several years the Duke Power Co., serving customers in North and South Carolina, has been trying to get Congress to approve a proposed $210 million powerplant on the Savannah River. Federal law provides that Congress must sanction any powerplant built on a navigable river or stream. Some Congressmen are insisting that unless approval of a neighboring Federal power project is tied to any bill allowing the Duke project, they won't vote for the latter, though it is hard to see why each should not be considered on its own merits.

The second project, in upper South Carolina, requires only a license from the Federal Power Commission. It would represent an investment of $700 million in an area now qualifying for aid-to-Appalachia funds, but the project is opposed by federally financed rural electric cooperatives on the ground that some day a Federal plant might be built there (none now is planned) from which they could get preferential treatment. Meanwhile the FPC amiably has granted a delay in further hearings on the project at the request of the Interior Department, which also wants to intervene.

Moreover, the Duke projects actually involve more than the $910 million plant cost. An industry rule of thumb is that for every $1 spent to generate power in an area, another $3 is invested by industrial customers there, old and new. That new business is gained by adequate power is reflected in the company's claim that, serving 25 percent of the Carolinas' land area, it has helped to attract 50 percent of the States new industries in the last 5 years.

So if creative federalism is active in Appalachia, it does not seem to be doing much for what could be, by the $3-for-$1 rule of thumb, a revenue-producing private investment of much larger scope. Surely it is a strange inconsistency when federalism—which can create nothing without first taxing the rewards of private initiative—whoops it up for a $1.1 billion handout while it lets creative business, with its own spending program potentially three times as big, go begging.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 15, 1965]

THE VENEER OF PRAGMATISM

The education bill President Johnson signed Sunday is offered as, among other things, a monument to his administration's professed pragmatism. By so completely stressing the educational plight of children from poor families, public argument for the bill painted it as neatly tailored to attack a specific pressing problem, not the sweeping aid-to-education proposals liberal Democrats have pushed in prior years.

The argument, while it proved an effective sales pitch, seems based far more on illusion than reality. A few largely political concessions helped create an impression the bill was pragmatically designed to meet particular needs. In substance, though, it would take real effort to devise a program departing less from the old doctrinaire proposals.

A more specific approach would respond to an important criticism of most Federal aid programs—that they spread themselves so thinly they end up almost completely ineffective. Moreover, there are unquestioned educational problems related to poverty in certain areas. Some rural school districts do not have the funds modern education so often demands. In big cities the exodus to suburbs has eroded tax bases just as the growth of slums created huge educational demands.

The current act's proponents stressed these needs, pointing to that part of the measure's fund allocation formula based on the number of students from poorer families. A specific aid for the poor, this approach is indirect enough to begin with. Certainly there are poor students everywhere; but most districts can help their own without outside help. In most schools a good education is already there for the taking by either rich or poor. Giving such districts aid intended for the impoverished merely takes it away from those with real needs.

Even this modest attempt to help poorer districts, though, was largely undermined by a second item in the allocation formula giving more help to States which already have high per pupil expenditures. The formula gives to the poor districts with one hand and takes away with the other.

The upshot is that Federal aid will go to 94 percent of the Nation's counties. Only some 10 percent of its funds will go to the four Southern States most often cited as educationally backward. Less than 20 percent will go to the 24 largest cities with distinct urban problems. Moreover, it gives local districts large latitude in spending which doubtless means that the funds will often go into general coffers rather than specific programs for the poor.

So it seems the Nation now has the general educational aid proposed so often in the past. Underlining the departure from pragmatism, this innovation comes just at a time local districts have pretty well validated the con-

tention that the need is far from widespread.

Current school enrollments reflect the peak of the "baby boom" which originally engendered the pleas for Federal help. Yet, as our Mr. Sullivan pointed out on this page recently, the average class size per teacher is at a low record low. Teachers' salaries have increased at twice the national average in the last decade. Local districts are building classrooms at a rate 15 percent above the Government's own estimate of need.

Choosing this time to press for what amounts to general aid certainly seems to indicate only the most rigid thinking. The only strong evidence of pragmatism in the education act comes in its clever political opportunism. It gives parochial schools just enough aid to quell their opposition, but not enough to inflame their opponents. It creates an impression of aiding the poor, but courts votes from other districts by actually broadcasting Federal funds.

Unfortunately, it may be true that this is typical of what passes for pragmatism in the current administration. Under analysis, it seems nothing more than the old doctrinaire formulas covered with a deceptive political veneer.

President Johnson's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial relative to President Johnson's farm program. This editorial was published recently in the Independent, an Anderson, S.C., newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Independent, Anderson (S.C.), Apr. 12, 1965]

PRESIDENT TAKES STEPS TO BRING FARMER IMPROVEMENTS HE DESERVES

The trouble with the American farmer is that he's just too efficient.

He can produce enough food to feed himself and 45 other people whereas, by contrast, the collectivized peasant-farmer of the Soviet Union can manage to do no better than to feed himself and seven others. The American farmer surpassed that level at the turn of the century.

The American farmer does well by the American consumer, whose food bill now amounts to only 18 percent of his income, while in the Soviet Union the figure is 53 percent, and in the United Kingdom and France it's 30 and 32 percent, respectively. Mississippi Senator JAMES EASTLAND estimated recently that if, in 1965, Americans were paying the same percentage of their income for food as they paid in 1935, they'd be shelling out another $24.6 billion for food.

But the American farmer has done less well by himself. While the incomes of most other segments of the economy have been rising within the last several years, his has been falling. His enormous efficiency, as President Johnson pointed out in his message to Congress the other day, has left him "working harder and enjoying it less." His prices are 5 percent lower than they were 15 years ago, and the parity index, which stood at 100 percent in 1949, stands today at about 75 percent. That means the farmer's dollar is worth only three-fourths of what it was worth 15 or 16 years ago.

The President is proposing a number of adjustments in present commodity programs which, he expects, will improve things considerably. His aim is to see that the farmer gets more for his work while the consumer is getting more for his money—and if the Federal Goverment is able to save some money in the process, so much the better.

Mr. Johnson's proposed farm bill is concentrated on four commodities—rice, wheat, feed grains and wool; a cotton program will come later. Basically, the programs are designed to increase domestic support levels, with somewhat larger price supports for small producers of rice and wool than are received by the big producers, while providing lower prices for export markets.

To a degree, the President's farm plan involves a shift of the cost of the support burden from the Federal Treasury to the consumers, but the displacement—as far as consumers are concerned—will be scarcely noticeable, whereas the added income for farmers will be significant and welcome.

The direct relationship between the price of commodities on the farm and the price in the grocery store is, as the President pointed out, a thing of the past. Marketing charges now account for nearly two-thirds of retail food prices. "A 50-cent increase in the price of a bushel of wheat, for example, will increase the cost of a loaf of bread by little more than 1 cent," Mr. Johnson declared.

Following the suggestions of a recent Presidential study panel, Mr. Johnson is suggesting a long-term crop adjustment program which could assist elderly farmers to retire, help ease the transition for those small farmers who want to quit operations themselves and, in the process, retire about 50 million acres from production.

There's nothing radical about any of these ideas, which is just as well, and there's nothing sacred about them, either. Congress will take a long, hard look at all of them, as it should. But the direction seems sound. The American farmer is not looking for special favors, but he wants—and he is entitled to have—an equal chance.

Cigarette Debate Still Smoking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, because of the great concern expressed over cigarettes of late, I believe it is timely to include in the RECORD the informative article by Charles Bartlett appearing in the April 13 issue of the Washington Post. As usual, Mr. Bartlett's analysis of this important matter is masterfully done and I am proud to insert it in the RECORD:

CIGARETTE DEBATE STILL SMOKING

(By Charles Bartlett)

Congress appears ready to require cigarettes to be labeled as hazards to health but the reform spirit may not be strong enough to require that the warning be projected into the wonderful world of cigarette advertising.

This world in which freshness, taste, and flavor abound is protected on both sides of the Capitol by agents of the 22 States in which tobacco farmers abound. The latent perils medically ascribed to cigarettes seem less persuasive at present than the momentum of an industry with annual gross sales exceeding $7 billion.

The hearings have been partially distorted by an effort to convince the legislators that the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee erred in its finding that cigarette smoking is "causally related to lung cancer in men" and bears some relationship to other lung diseases. A parade of dissenting doctors and scientists has gone before the Senate and House committees.

Congress is ill equipped to make medical judgments, particularly upon the mountain of evidence that was analyzed by the advisory committee, as impartial and qualified a panel as could be assembled. These findings are supported by similar studies in Britain, Italy and Sweden, and by a recent poll of American physicians. Of the 62,000 doctors responding to the poll, 95 percent described smoking as a health hazard and only 2.8 percent maintained that it was not.

The tobacco industry wants national legislation in order to avoid the complexities of State legislation. It will accept a labeling requirement, which will ward off lawsuits by victims of lung cancer. But the industry does not want to be forced to include the health warning in its advertising, as the Federal Trade Commission proposes.

Some Senators ask why advertisers should not similarly be obliged to warn against the danger of detergents if you drink them or of automobiles if you crash them. The answer is that those advertisers are not trying to induce people to drink detergents or crash automobiles. The cigarette ads, on the other hand, specifically entreat the consumer to take a step known to be hazardous.

The cigarette companies maintain that the value of their television advertising will be negated by a necessity to include the health warning. But many have noted from the tobacco sales figures that this advertising, doubled by some companies since the concern over cigarettes arose, has managed already to negate the impact of the warning by the Surgeon General's Committee.

Congress' dislike to intrude upon freedom of advertising is challenged in this case by the potency of the cigarette advertisers, who currently sponsor 55 television programs on 3 networks. Against this propaganda, the warning by the advisery committee will be no more likely to stand than the words of England's King James I, who denounced smoking in 1604 as "a custom loathsome to the eye, harmful to the brain, dangerous to the lungs."

Now marked as more hazardous and habit-forming than alcohol, cigarettes enjoy a freedom from advertising restraints that Congress took away from alcohol in 1935. The Treasury Department supervises liquor advertising in a way that has kept it off television and free of the romantic and social inferences that figure in the cigarette ads.

The tobacco industry has just begun to police itself with a code that bans testimonials by celebrities along with other misleading appeals to youth. This is evidently a sincere effort, but it does not come to grips with the basic issue of whether the public interest is served by urging people to smoke without warning them that their health may be damaged.

President Johnson has stood aloof from this issue. Aids say this is not because two close friends, Abe Fortas and Earle Clements, have been retained by the tobacco companies or because of his own television properties. The President's aloofness is ascribed to the fact that intervention will bring problems with powerful legislators from tobacco States.

The House is expected to pass a bill that will defer to the wishes of the tobacco industry. The Senate is uncertain because of the zeal of Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, and the optimism that Sen-

ator WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, the cigar-smoking chairman of the Commerce Committee, will prove reluctant to leave the health of the young within reach of the admen.

Lexington, Ky., Keeps Clay's Memory Fresh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Star of April 17, 1965, entitled "Lexington, Ky., Keeps Clay's Memory Fresh," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This article was written in connection with the Consultation on Church Union, which met in Lexington last week, and it pays tribute to the town, its people, and the memory of a great Kentuckian, Henry Clay.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 17, 1965]

THE HUMAN SIDE OF RELIGION: LEXINGTON, KY., KEEPS CLAY'S MEMORY FRESH

(By Caspar Nannes)

The memory of Henry Clay, the great Kentucky Senator who ran for President three times, is still very much alive in Lexington, Ky., where the Consultation on Church Union met last week.

There is a large and attractive Henry Clay High School plus many other institutions and places of business using the statesman's revered name. Nearly 100 student band members of the high school came to Washington last Sunday to take part in the Cherry Blossom Festival parade along Constitution Avenue.

Recently, Clay's still-beautiful home in a fine residential section of Lexington was designated by Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall as "a registered national historic landmark."

DESIGNED BY LATROBE

It is good this was done, for the building and the surrounding estate are visual monuments to the glories of an earlier period in our country's life. Born in Hanover County Va., Clay came to Lexington in 1797 when a young man of 20. About 1805 he bought land for his home. Seven years later he added to it, so that he owned about 400 acres when Benjamin Latrobe, architect of the U.S. Capitol, designed the building.

Taking cognizance of the many majestic ash trees on the grounds, Clay named his home Ashland. A great deal of the ash woodwork in the house came from the trees on the estate.

Ashland is two stories high in the center, with wings of one story on either side. Today it is partially covered by ivy, adding a special charm to the 18th-century style of architecture. The building, set back from the street, is surrounded by well-wept gardens, 50 kinds of trees and numerous walks.

Four Presidents—three while in office—visited at Ashland. They were James Madison, James Monroe, Martin Van Buren and Abraham Lincoln. The last came before he was elected President. His wife, Mary Todd, was born in Lexington, knew the Clays intimately and visited them frequently. After moving to Springfield, Ill., and marrying Lincoln, she brought him to Lexington for a visit.

Daniel Webster and Marquis de Lafayette also were among the great figures to stay at Ashland. The latter visited Clay in 1825.

FURNITURE REMAINS

Ashland has been kept very much as it was in Clay's time. Much of the original furniture, some of which had been brought from France, is still in the home.

Statues, statuettes, and portraits of Clay are everywhere. A huge oil portrait, copied by Andrews in 1852 from the John Neagle painting which belongs to the Union League of Philadelphia, hangs at the top of the stairway at the second floor.

Probably best remembered for his Missouri Compromise of 1821, Clay played a leading role in laws still influencing our Nation. Among them were legislation for good roads, stabilizing the national currency and laying down fiscal policies that still affect the banking system.

Recently Members of the U.S. Senate voted to honor the five most influential Senators by having their portraits painted and hung near the Senate Chamber. Those chosen were Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Robert M. LaFollette, Robert A. Taft, and Henry Clay. It was reported Clay received the highest number of ballots.

TWO MORE KENTUCKIANS

Press rooms are too often uncomfortable, poorly lighted places set aside by conventions as an afterthought. But those at the Phoenix Hotel during the Consultation on Church Union were light, airy, and spacious.

Perhaps this came about because the two rooms were named after famous Kentucky figures—Stephen C. Foster and John C. Breckenridge.

Foster's fame is still fresh as his beloved songs—"My Old Kentucky Home," "Old Black Joe," "Swanee River" among others—are still sung.

Breckenridge, one of three candidates who opposed Lincoln in the 1860 presidential election, has receded into history for most people, but his importance receives tribute in Kentucky.

SOLDIER HONORED

Another home having historic associations stands a few streets from the heart of Lexington—the Morgan house. Set in a quiet neighborhood near Transylvania College, oldest school of higher education west of the Alleghenies, the building of gray stones, white doors, and narrow elongated windows is enclosed by a low iron fence. Behind the house is a small garden with shade trees and red brick walks.

Outside the house a plaque has been erected. It states this is the "Home of John Hunt Morgan, 'Thunderbolt of the Confederacy'; born, Huntsville, Ala., June 1, 1825; killed at Greenville, Tenn., September 4, 1864; lieutenant, Kentucky Volunteers in the Mexican War, 1846–47; major general, CSA (Confederate States of America), 1861–64."

A legend still heard in Lexington is that on one occasion Morgan rode his horse into the livingroom of the house, leaned down to kiss his mother goodby, and then galloped the animal out the other side as pursuing Union soldiers came on the scene.

Presidential Inability and Vacancies in the Office of the Vice President

SPEECH

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases when the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 1, as amended because I believe the U.S. Constitution is not only ambiguous, but defective, on the subject of presidential disability and that we, as a nation, have been extremely fortunate that our Presidents have been able to discharge their constitutional responsibilities. The office of Vice President was made vacant due to the tragic death of President Kennedy and there has been no procedure for filling it.

In support of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the American Bar Association and its affiliate, the National Forum, I submitted a bill of my own, House Joint Resolution 236, for not only does my bill support House Joint Resolution 1, it calls attention to the problem relating to the period of time before a disabled President should resume the powers and duties of his office.

I know the people of my district would want me to speak out in favor of such an amendment to the Constitution because they are very aware of the problems created by the tragic death of President Kennedy. I was encouraged by the fact that my remarks—made at the many meetings throughout my district prior to my election—on the Senate resolution passed during the 88th Congress engendered much public interest and support.

In my testimony before the House Judiciary Committee I made no references to history. This had been most carefully documented and repetition is unnecessary. I merely wanted to emphasize that prudence requires this representative body to act now to submit to the State legislatures an amendment to correct a defect known to us for many, many years.

In addition to supporting the overall effort, I wanted to point out to the committee what I considered to be a danger in the event a President would transmit to the Congress his written declaration that no inability exists. The aforementioned resolution originally provided that the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President, with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive department, or such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmits within 2 days to the Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

My question was: What could happen within that 2-day period in the event an incompetent President resumed the duties of his office and issued orders affecting the security of the Nation? While I agreed that the President should be able to regain the powers and duties of his office easily when his inability ceases to exist, nevertheless, the Vice President should have time to file a written declaration with the Congress before the presumption in favor of the President's ability is restored.

To accomplish this, I provided in my resolution that the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office on the third day following the transmittal of such declaration to the Congress unless, prior to the end of the third day, the Vice President, with the appropriate consent of executive department heads, transmits to the Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. I used 3 days on the theory that the President's written declaration could be submitted on Friday and Congress might not be in session over the weekend.

However, during the committee deliberations the majority adopted language, as set forth in section 4 of House Joint Resolution 1, which I find to be satisfactory and will correct for the most part that which my resolution points out as needing clarification.

I support this resolution and urge its passage.

Farmers Can't Tailor Production to Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. PEARSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Clifford R. Hope, formerly a Congressman from Kansas, and the esteemed chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, continues to serve Kansas in a number of ways. In his widely read column published in the Salina Journal, Cliff Hope explains in a few short paragraphs the problems of agriculture in general, the plight of the farmer, and the effect of pending Federal legislation on the agriculture of western Kansas.

I ask that this concise, informative article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS CAN'T TAILOR PRODUCTION TO DEMAND

(By Clifford R. Hope)

Most of the economic problems which affect farmers today have come about because farm capacity for production has increased faster than effective demand for farm products.

The greater part of the benefits of this increased capacity and efficiency has gone to consumers. Our people as a whole are spending a smaller part of their income for food than ever before in this or any other nation.

The farmer's trouble is that he is unable fully to participate in our economic system, where prices in general are based on supply and demand. Other producers are in a position to equate production with market demand. They produce what they think they can sell. Even if they miscalculate, they can make adjustments before too much harm is done.

Labor, through organization and legislation, has seen to it that workers get their share of increased efficiency in industry—not only in wage increases and protection against unemployment, but in retirement provisions and other fringe benefits. This fits in with our general economic system and strengthens it.

NO WAY FOR FARMERS

But 3 million widely scattered farmers competing with each other, whose production depends on the vagaries of the weather and the uncertainties of plant and animal diseases, and whose products are for the most part perishable, have no way to use the devices available to other producers to adjust supply to expected demand.

The principle of using the instrumentalities of government to do those things which need to be done, and which people cannot do for themselves, has been accepted and used since our birth as a nation. This is the basis of our Government farm programs. Some have succeeded, some have failed. It has been a matter of trial and error. A lot has been learned by experience.

Perhaps the most important lesson has been that each commodity or group of commodities has its separate problems. That is easily illustrated in western Kansas where four-fifths of our farm income is derived from three commodities—wheat, cattle, and feed grains. While all three of them may be, and frequently are produced on the same farm, there are differences in both production and marketing which put each in a different category as far as farm programs are concerned.

CATTLE FUTURE GOOD

For many years cattle have been produced almost entirely for the domestic market, although byproducts like hides and tallow have been exported. Traditionally, the policy has been to afford some protection from imports by duties on both live cattle and beef. Sanitary regulations have also had the effect of restricting imports. Recently enacted legislation has imposed quotas on a moderate scale. This, together with increasing world demand, has reduced imports considerably below the levels of a year or so ago. Domestic prices are also more stable. While there will always be ups and downs, the future for cattle in western Kansas looks good.

Until recently, feed grains have been grown mostly for domestic consumption. Since they are largely fed on the farms where grown, or in the same area, market prices are not as important as livestock prices although they are necessarily related. Hybrid corn and sorghums, together with expanded use of fertilizer, better farming practices and irrigation, have substantially expanded production.

EXPORT FEED

New markets in Western Europe and Japan have increased feed grain exports tremendously. Prospects for further expansion are good. During the past year or two it has been possible to export without a subsidy.

Voluntary acreage diversion programs in recent years plus exports has resulted in diminishing the carryover to reasonable proportions. It is expected that the 2-year program now in effect which also provides for substitution between feed grains and wheat will be extended during this congressional session.

REALISTIC PLANS

As to wheat, the programs offered under the McGovern and Young-Carlson bills in the Senate and the Purcell bill in the House, all of which extend the present voluntary program with some improvements, are expertly tailored to meet today's problems. It is understood that the administration bill will be similar.

The wheat and feed grain bills which I have mentioned and the quota legislation on beef imports, while differing in many particulars, have two important things in common. One is that each deals realistically and effectively with the special problems of the commodity affected. The other is that taken together, they constitute a consistent overall program for most of our agricultural activities in western Kansas.

Oklahoma's Kay Bass Named Nation's Outstanding Cotton Ginner of 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Mr. Kay Bass, of Durant, Okla., who is one of my constituents and also one of my best friends, was recently named "Outstanding Cotton Ginner of 1964" by the National Cotton Ginners' Association.

This is the highest honor possible for a member of the cotton ginning industry. I have known Kay Bass for many years. While I knew of his great abilities as a cotton ginner only by repuations, I have always known personally of his great human abilities. He is a man of character, intelligence, and affable charm. I am proud of his receiving this great honor and enclose for all Members an article which appeared in the April 10 issue of the Cotton Gin & Old Mill Press:

NATION'S TOP GINNER IS PRODUCER AND MERCHANT

Kay Bass, of Durant, Okla., is well aware of the problem when the cotton merchant tells the ginner the mills want a better quality cotton. He's equally familiar with the ginner's dilemma when he tells the grower to get cotton to the gin in the cleanest possible condition.

You see, Kay Bass is all three—grower, merchant and ginner. And he has combined all three into a successful business. His work in the ginning industry earned him the Horace Hayden Memorial Trophy as the Nation's Outstanding Cotton Ginner of 1964. This is the highest recognition given a member of the industry by the National Cotton Ginners' Association.

Bass has a background in merchandising cotton that dates back to his childhood. "I sampled cotton for my dad from the time I was able to cut a bale," he added. "That's when they brought cotton in by wagon to the square.

He admits he bought his first gin to stay in the cotton business. He bought an interest in the gin at Kenefic, Okla., north of Durant, in 1956. They later bought a gin at Coalgate.

Bass went to work in 1933 with the Cotton Co-op Association buying cotton in the Hobart area. He pasesd the Government classer's examination in Oklahoma City and returned to Durant in 1937. He classed cotton for the Government program in 1938, and operated his own f.o.b. business from 1938 to 1956. "That's when I saw the handwriting on the wall," he explains, "and got into the ginning business."

He merchandises the cotton he gins. From the producers' viewpoint—and he qualifies with 450 acres of cotton—Bass believes the small acreage producers may be on the way out. "Looks like the 15- to 25-acre farmer is a thing of the past. His cost of production is so high." Bass compares the operation with a small business in town. They major factor is volume.

"This loss may force some gins to close up," he adds. "There's no question we are

going to have to sell cotton cheaper." Cost of production must be lowered, and insect control is one of the major items, he says. One of the two gins in 1963 sold $40,000 in insecticides which represented the grower's profit.

Bass encourages his customers to follow all modern practices to obtain efficient production. The gin office at Kenefic is open year-round to provide customer services. "We try to keep up with the latest information and are trying our best to help the farmer to raise cotton. If we don't do this, we're in trouble."

For example, Bass delayed stripper harvesting of his tenant-produced crop last year to reduce the number of green bolls. The heavy harvest of green bolls was costing some of his customers as much as cent and a half a pound.

The gins also employ an entomologist who checks the fields of customers once a week during the season. "He make us money," Bass says.

The extra services, which include a fertilizer plant, help keep the gin in business. And Bass echoes the obvious opinion of many ginners when he adds: "A cotton gin just is not worth a dime if you can't gin cotton."

But he is more optimistic about his own interest in the cotton industry. "Any man in the cotton businesss this long is hooked. You can't get away from it. I can't."

That's Kay Bass. He doesn't want to get away from ginning, either.

The Bank Merger Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of April 21, 1965, entitled "The Bank Merger Bill"; and an editorial from the New York Journal-American of Thursday, April 15, 1965, entitled "Antitrust and the Banks—This Bill Needed."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, April 21, 1965]

THE BANK MERGER BILL

Because banking is a highly sensitive, complex and nationally interdependent business, it has long been under control, regulation and supervision by the Federal Government.

For more than a century the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency has been an integral part of the national banking system.

In 1913, the Federal Reserve System was established to provide, among other major functions, additionally effective supervision of banking in the United States.

To further protect depositors (and the banking system as a whole) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was created in 1933, under a subsection of the Federal Reserve Act.

Under these pertinent laws, three Federal supervisory agencies must give their approval to consolidations or mergers of national banks.

Under the Bank Holding Act of 1956, as amended, the Federal Reserve must also pass upon certain acquisitions of bank stock or assets by bank holding companies, and approve mergers or consolidations of bank holding companies.

In other words, specific provisions of relevant laws repose in these competent agencies the responsibility of deciding whether bank mergers applied for would serve necessity and convenience of business and depositors in a phenomenally expanding population's economy.

However, to "make assurance doubly sure," Congress in 1960 passed a Bank Merger Act, specifying that control of mergers should be exclusively in control of the Federal supervisory agencies.

Even into this triple-protected and regulated area, the U.S. Supreme Court intruded, when it ruled (in the Philadelphia National Bank and the Lexington Bank cases) that the mergers were in violation of antitrust laws. More recently a lower Federal court, at the instigation of the Justice Department, followed the High Court's lead, and ruled that the Manufacturers-Hanover merger, in New York, was illegal.

The Federal courts not only usurped the responsibility of three executive agencies, but "vetoed" the will of Congress, as expressed in the Bank Merger Act of 1960. The reaction, in Congress and among the business and banking community, was instantaneous and wrathful.

Virginia's A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, lost no time in responding to the challenge. On April 6 he introduced Senate bill 1698 to reconfirm and amend the Bank Merger Act of 1960. It serves notice on the Justice Department, that—

"No proceedings shall hereafter be instituted or prosecuted under the antitrust laws, including the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act against any bank insured under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, by reason of or respect to any merger, consolidation or acquisition of stock * * * consummated before May 1960, pursuant to approval of the appropriate State or Federal bank supervisory authority.

Prompt passage is called for to let the Justice Department and Federal courts know "who's boss on the Hill."

[From the New York Journal-American, Apr. 15, 1965]

ANTITRUST AND THE BANKS—THIS BILL NEEDED

(By Leslie Gould, financial editor)

The Supreme Court being what it is today—a lawmaking body as much as it is the law-interpreting arm of the Government—the Congress is being asked again to spell out in words of one syllable its intent as to authority over bank mergers.

This is necessary because of Supreme Court decisions in bank mergers in Philadelphia and Lexington, Ky., and the U.S. district court finding in the Manufacturers Hanover Bank merger in New York.

In the first ruling ever on application of the antitrust laws to commercial banks, the Supreme Court, five to three, held in 1963 the merger of the Philadelphia National Bank and the Girard Trust Co. illegal under the Clayton Act.

On another precedent-setting decision, the Supreme Court, April a year ago, held a merger already consumated was illegal. This was the 1961 merger of the First National Bank & Trust Co. and the Security Trust Co., of Lexington. Last month the U.S. district court in Lexington ordered the merger undone.

The decision holding the Manufacturers Trust and Hanover Bank merger violated both the Sherman and the Clayton Antitrust Acts was made by U.S. District Judge Lloyd F. MacMahon in New York on March 10, last.

FILES SUIT 7 MONTHS LATER

The two banks were merged on September 8, 1961, after the Federal Reserve Board of Governors had approved the plan 2 days before. The New York State superintendent of banks had approved it on May 23, and stockholders had voted on March 8. The Justice Department, although it had 7 months notice—since stockholder approval—waited until after the merger became effective on September 8 to file its antitrust suit.

The court actions in these mergers so infuriated Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, that he has introduced Senate bill 1698 to exempt bank mergers approved under a 1960 bill sponsored by him and passed by the Congress, and signed into law.

In introducing his bill, the Virginia Senator blasted the Supreme Court, saying:

"The Supreme Court in the Philadelphia and Lexington cases has rewritten the antitrust laws and has nullified the intention of the Congress in passing the (1960) Bank Merger Act.

"My bill will reinstate the original purpose and intent of Congress when it passed the Bank Merger Act. Since, in my judgment, the Supreme Court has erroneously interpreted antitrust laws and the Bank Merger Act, my bill is drafted so as to be applicable not only to future mergers but to all mergers heretofore consumated pursuant to appropriate regulatory approval including mergers now under attack by the Department of Justice under the antitrust laws."

UP TO APPROPRIATE AGENCY

Senator ROBERTSON's bill would place bank mergers in the same category as mergers in other regulated industries approved under other statutes which delegate to the specialized agencies the responsibility for enforcement of antitrust policy. The Senator points out:

"This is the case with railroad mergers," adding:

"I am sure no one here (in the Senate) would want to turn over the problems involved in the New York Central-Pennsylvania Railroad merger to the antitrust division and the district court under the antitrust laws."

BILL COULD CLEAR AIR

When the 1960 Bank Merger Act was passed, the then Senator L. B. Johnson said:

"It provides for a thorough review by the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency * * * and with the benefit of any information which may be supplied by the Department of Justice in the report required from them, of mergers by asset acquisitions and other means which are now and will continue to be exempt from the antimerger provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Antitrust Act."

The Robertson bill will clear up the confusion and misunderstandings resulting from the court rulings. As things stand today, any bank merger—no matter how long ago consumated—can be attacked by the antitrust lawyers.

Distinguished Wisconsin Attorney Answers False Statements in Hate Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, many of us last fall were astounded by

the proliferation of hate books which flooded the newsstands and sought to becloud the issues and confuse the American people.

A thoughtful speech delivered by Mr. Bruno V. Bitker, chairman of the Wisconsin Governor's Committee on the United Nations, called "The Tract That Attacked," was presented on January 29, 1965, and has been distributed by the League of Women Voters.

I recommend this statement to all who wish to keep the record straight. I believe Mr. Bitker has performed a most useful public service by carefully compiling the facts so that reasonable people can refute the wild and unsupported claims of the hate groups who seek to undermine the confidence of the American people in their institutions.

The speech follows:

THE TRACT THAT ATTACKED

There have been those who opposed the United Nations from its very beginning. There are those who philosophically stick to the comfortable thought of isolating this country from the world—a fortress America. Others, for a variety of reasons, have objected to our participation in any international organization.

The force of this opposition has flamed and faltered over the years. But for a brief period in 1964 it took on the appearance of scholarliness through the publication of a paperback book entitled, "None Dare Call It Treason." Because 1964 was a presidential year, the book managed to ride the wave as a campaign tract. It was, however, a nonpartisan treatise, attacking Republicans and Democrats alike, including some of the most distinguished Americans high in the administrations of Eisenhower and of Kennedy. In the 1964 campaign, both candidates, President Johnson and Senator Goldwater, had announced support of the United Nations.

Every charge ever made against the U.N. was made again, directly or by implication, in the book. All of them have long ago been shown to be groundless. But they now appeared in a seemingly respectable format, apparently well documented with footnotes and references. Startling as it sounds, more than 6 million copies were distributed during 1964. With such a number of potential readers, even those who recognize the tract for what it is should have the charges measured against the facts as they relate to the U.N.

CHARGE—THE U.N. WAS CONCEIVED IN SIN AND PRODUCED IN CONSPIRACY

The general overall implied charge is that the U.N. was actually organized as a part of a Communist plot to take over the world. The basis for this charge is that Alger Hiss, as a Communist agent, secretly drafted the U.N. Charter as a part of the Red scheme. It is a fact that, prior to his conviction of perjury, Hiss was an employee of the State Department. As such he undoubtedly participated in preliminary discussions about the proposed organization.

History may grant to many men the honor of inspiring the United Nations. Winston Churchill played a great part, as did others in the war period. Our own President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, took the lead in pressing for a new international organization that might prevent the horrors of another world war. The United States was determined to avoid repeating the mistakes which had kept it out of the League of Nations. After President Roosevelt's death in April 1945, while the U.N. was still in the discussion stage, one of President Truman's first acts as the new President was to direct our Government's representatives to bring about, if possible, the creation of the United Nations.

Implicit in these charges against the U.N. is the conspiratorial manner in which our country's representatives operated. Now who were our country's representatives in this undertaking?

The American proposals were prepared by a planning committee established by Secretary of State Cordell Hull. The first U.S. draft was written by Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles; Isaiah Bowman, president of Johns Hopkins University; James T. Shotwell, Columbia University historian; Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of Foreign Affairs; Benjamin V. Cohen, counsel for the Department of State; and Clark M. Eichelberger, director of the League of Nations Association, later the AAUN. They and the Secretary of State conferred frequently with eminent private citizens, with Members of the U.S. Congress, and with a wide cross-section of the American people to ascertain their views.

At the San Francisco Conference in July 1945, where the charter was finally drafted, Alger Hiss held an administrative post. He was Secretary of the Conference. As Secretary, he dealt with the organizational and housekeeping problems of the Conference, such as arrangements for meetings, providing translators, furnishing duplicating machinery and similar facilities. He was not a member of the U.S. delegation and did not have a vote on any question before the Conference.

THE U.S. DELEGATION AT SAN FRANCISCO

The U.S. delegation at San Francisco was headed by Edward R. Stetinius, Jr., then Secretary of State, as chairman, and Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State, as senior adviser. In addition, the U.S. delegation consisted of: Tom Connally, Democrat, U.S. Senate; Arthur H. Vandenberg, Republican, U.S. Senate; Sol Bloom, Democrat, House of Representatives; Charles A. Eaton, Republican, House of Representatives; Comdr. Harold E. Stassen, U.S. Navy, later Governor of Minnesota; and Virginia Gildersleeve, dean of Barnard College.

Twenty-nine principal advisers, from various departments of the Government, accompanied the delegation. Forty-two national organizations sent consultants to the Conference. Among those were: American Bar Association, American Federation of Labor, American Legion, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Council on Foreign Relations, Federal Council of Churches, American Jewish Committee, National Catholic Welfare Conference, National Association of Manufacturers, National Grange and many of the recognized service and community organizations.

When the charter was presented, after its adoption in San Francisco, to the U.S. Senate for ratification, the Senate did so by a vote of 89 to 2. This reflected a national endorsement that was almost unanimous.

CHARGE—THE U.S.S.R. CONTROLS THE U.N. ARMY

The basis of the charge that the Soviet Union controls the U.N. army is that the U.N. military staff committee is controlled by a Communist and therefore the Communists control the U.N. army. In the first place, there is no U.N. army. There are special and local U.N. police forces for specific limited purposes. But there is no regular U.N. police force or army.

The U.N. Charter provides for the creation of a group to assist the Security Council on military questions in the maintenance of international peace. Such a committee was established in 1946 and it has met more than 500 times since then. For the first 2 years the committee met daily in an effort to agree on plans for an international force, including land, sea and air contingents. High ranking officers, representing the five permanent members of the Security Council, frequently in full uniform, gathered in a designated room in the U.N. headquarters.

After 1947 it became obvious that the five powers could not agree on any means of creating a regular U.N. police force. Thereafter the committee limited its meetings to one every 2 weeks. It has continued this schedule to the present day. The meeting is called to order, the agenda is adopted, the minutes of the last meeting are approved, the date of the next meeting is set, and the meeting is adjourned. That's the story of the Soviet controlled military staff committee.

CHARGE—THE COMMUNISTS CONTROL SPECIFIC U.N. PEACEKEEPING FORCES

Although there is no permanent U.N. peacekeeping force, different forces have been provided, on a voluntary and ad hoc basis by member states, for each separate peacekeeping operation in which the United Nations has been engaged. With the exception of the U.N. action in Korea, for which the United States contributed the major portion of the troops, the U.N. forces have been drawn, not from the Great Powers, but from the smaller countries. The U.N. emergency force in the Middle East, for example, consisted of troops from Brazil, Canada, Columbia, Denmark, Finland, India, Indonesia, Norway, Sweden, and Yugoslavia. The Congo operation involved 20,000 men from 29 different countries, none from the big nations. The latest police force is in Cyprus. It was assembled with much difficulty and consists of troops from Canada, Sweden, Ireland, and Finland.

THE COMMANDERS OF POLICE FORCES

When the U.N. Security Council, under the leadership of the United States, in 1950 authorized U.N. action to repel North Korean aggression against South Korea, the Council set up a unified command and requested the United States to appoint the commander of the U.N. forces. The first head of the U.N. command was Gen. Douglas MacArthur; succeeding commanding generals (Ridgway, Clark, Hull, Taylor, Lemnitzer, Magruder, Meloy) were also designated by the United States from the U.S. Armed Forces.

The commanders of all other U.N. peacekeeping forces—in Egypt, Suez, Lebanon, the Congo, Yemen, and now in Cyprus—have been from the small nations. The latest commander appointed by U Thant (Jan. 25, 1965) is Maj. Gen. Sysemo Sarmento, of Brazil, to lead the U.N. emergency force in the Middle East.

CHARGE—THE U.N. CONTROLS THE MILITARY FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

The U.N. General Assembly can recommend police action. It can request member states to contribute troops, but the decision to furnish troops rests with each national government. The United Nations cannot require the United States to put its Armed Forces into action.

The Security Council might direct the use of force for the maintenance of international peace and security. But since the United States, as one of the permanent members of the Security Council, has the power of the veto, the Council could not require the use of force without the concurrence of the United States.

Even if the United States did not exercise its veto power, the approval of the U.S. Congress is required for the transfer of U.S. forces to the U.N. The U.S. President does not have the authority to hand over U.S. Armed Forces to the United Nations at will.

The U.N. Participation Act of 1945 authorized the President to negotiate special agreements making armed forces available to the United Nations Security Council. But the act specifically states that such agreements "shall be subject to the approval of the Congress." The U.N. Participation Act

does authorize the President to detail Armed Forces personnel to serve in a noncombatant capacity, but sets a ceiling of 1,000 as the number of such personnel that might be detailed at any one time even for such purposes.

CHARGE—A U.S. DICTATOR IS EMPOWERED TO DISBAND U.S. MILITARY FORCES

In 1961, the Congress of the United States creatd an agency called the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Agency is in part under the direction of the State Department, but also reports to the Congress and to the President. Its Director is William C. Foster, a distinguished American industrialist.

The Agency is to seek agreements under which nations could safely reduce armaments. The United States has proposed that armaments be reduced in graduated stages under strict international supervision and control, while at the same time the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations be built up. Although the law authorized the Disarmament Agency to negotiate disarmament agreements, it did not give the Disarmament Agency or the U.S. President or anyone else blanket authority to reduce U.S. Armed Forces or to place the security of the United States at the disposal of the United Nations.

Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act provides: "That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

Thus, any disarmament treaty negotiated by the President could become effective only through congressional action or Senate ratification, as required by the U.S. Constitution. Even the limited treaty banning the atmospheric testing of bombs came into force only after approval by a two-third vote of the U.S. Senate.

CHARGE—THE SOVIETS CONTROL THE U.N. SECRETARIAT

The key position of the Secretary General has been filled by a Norwegian, Trygve Lie; by a Swede, Dag Hammarskjold; and now by a Burmese, U Thant.

As of May 1, 1964, there were 19 posts in the Secretariat at the Under Secretary level or of comparable importance. Of the 19, 1 is from India; 1 is from the U.S.S.R.; 4 are from the United States; 1 is from the United Arab Republic; 1 is from France; 1 is from Yugoslavia; 1 is from Nigeria; 1 is from Greece; 1 is from New Zealand; 2 are from the United Kingdom; 1 is from Brazil; 1 is from Czechoslavakia; 1 is from Panama; 1 is from Burma; 1 is from China (Taiwan).

As of the same date, May 1, 1964, there was a total of 1,389 professional and executive positions at the U.N. Of that total, Americans held 255 or about 18 percent plus. If clerical staff is counted, the proportion is much higher. The U.S.S.R. citizens in executive or professional positions was less than 6 percent.

CHARGE—UNESCO IS A PART OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

Since its founding 19 years ago, UNESCO has been a favorite target for those attacking the U.N. The most frequently repeated charge that UNESCO is part of the world Communist movement is through international control of education in the United States and elsewhere. UNESCO is charged with infiltrating and influencing U.S. public schools by brainwashing children and teaching "one worldism."

Ever since World War II, heroic efforts have been made to teach the whole world how to read. UNESCO was created to advance education throughout the world, as well as to further a better and more tolerant understanding among nations and people. If these objectives are un-American or against our national interest, then we do not understand the spirit or basic philosophy of our country.

"TOWARD WORLD UNDERSTANDING"

One of the publications of UNESCO is entitled "Toward World Understanding." This booklet is alleged to contain the master plan for domination of American schools.

The volume is a collection of views of participants in education seminars. The charge that this booklet serves to foster "world government" in any way in the United States could not possibly be deduced from a reading of it by any reasonably minded person, It is true that the phrase, "world understanding," appears frequently. This phase, of course, refers to a better mutual understanding of the peoples of other lands. Certainly such understanding is greatly needed in the world today. It is hard to conceive in what way it is inconsistent with the American way of life or the teaching of American citizenship.

Such a furor was raised over this particular booklet that a special committee of the American Legion undertook a study of it. It reported that it was about "as subversive as the tales of Hans Christian Anderson."

UNESCO'S charter, like that of the U.N. itself, specifically prohibits the Organization from intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of its member states. Accordingly, UNESCO restricts itself to providing assistance only upon a direct request from the government of the member state concerned. The United States has never requested any UNESCO assistance for its public educational system. In the field of education, UNESCO's assistance is concentrated in the newly developing countries.

UNESCO publications (there are over 3,000 of them) are for sale in this country as in any other member nation. Any teacher, like any private citizen, may buy them. But no attempt has been made by UNESCO to force its materials on any teacher or any school board which, in our country's tradition, is responsible for the selection of any classroom materials. So far as can be determined, these materials have never been so used in the United States.

UNICEF

The attacks on UNICEF, the Children's Fund, have always been beyond comprehension. The organization was originally created upon Herbert Hoover's recommendation. He had gone to Europe immediately after World War II to survey the needs of the people in the war-ravaged countries. It was apparent that the children were the war's worst sufferers. To meet the emergency needs of children, the special agency, UNICEF, was created within the U.N.

In the first few years of its existence, UNICEF concentrated its aid to the children of the European countries that were most cruelly devasted in the war.

Many of these countries eventually fell behind the Iron Curtain. In 1950 UNICEF moved its emphasis from the war emergency areas to meeting the long-term health and nutrition needs of children in the underdeveloped countries, in Africa, in South America and in the Far East.

Are there children in Communist countries helped by UNICEF? Yes, of course. Children are children, including children in Poland and Yugoslavia, the two remaining European countries whose babies and mothers are receiving such aid. Should infants be required to take loyalty oaths? Ridiculous.

UNICEF believes, and the United States endorses this principle, that children who are starving or ill because of lack of medicine or medical care are entitled to help regardless of what kind of a political regime under which they happen to live. If a government requests assistance, if it agrees to accept certain responsibilities set by UNICEF, including freedom of the UNICEF staff to check on the distribution of supplies within the country, then assistance is forthcoming. It is given without regard to race, or religion, or political belief or national status.

Now what kind of a Communist takeover conspiracy is that?

THE POPULATION EXPLOSION VERSUS YOUNG DEATH

We hear much about the population explosion and dangers therefrom are alarming. The statistics of newborn life are startling. It has been estimated that three children are born into the vast human family every second of the day. By midnight tonight, more than 260,000 children will have come into being.

But the statistics of young death are equally startling. There are more than 1 billion children alive in the world today. Of that number, 850 million are faced with the evils of hunger, of poverty, of ignorance, of fear, of disease. In most families of mankind, childhood is not a time of play. It is a time of premature suffering and dying. In the new countries half of the children die before their fifth birthday. They are victims of what we would consider as anachronistic scourges such as leprosy, yaws, trachoma, and malaria. In our own country these diseases have become medical curiosities. It is said that there are very few doctors in the United States that have treated or even seen a case of smallpox.

The U.N., through UNICEF, seeks to improve these miserable conditions. It is for this purpose that UNICEF has carried on the trick-or-treat fundraising program on Halloween and has raised money through the famous greeting card and note paper program.

CHARGE—THE U.N. IS ATHEISTIC AND OPPOSES ALL RELIGIONS

The members of the U.N. include representatives of all the major religions on the face of the earth. No one is required to observe any religious practice or to prefer one religion over another. U.N. meetings open with 1 minute of silence for prayer or meditation. It is true that the U.N. Charter does not mention God. But neither is God mentioned in our own U.S. Constitution. Like the United States, the U.N. permits every man to be guided by his own conscience.

Perhaps the best response to this charge is the extensive support of the U.N. by the major Christian churches, Protestant and Catholic, as well as by Jewish congregations. Over 30 religious organizations, representing all faiths, maintain permanent observers accredited to the U.N.

The support of the Catholic Church has been widely publicized by the late Pope John XXIII in his universally proclaimed encyclical, "Pacem in Terris." Recently, Pope Paul appointed Msgr. Alberto Giovannetti as the Vatican's permanent observer to the U.N. He headquarters at the Holy Family United Nations Parish, 324 East 47th Street. The Protestant Church Center for the U.N. is at 44th Street and U.N. Plaza, directly across the street from the U.N. The Jewish Center for the U.N. is being constructed at the Sutton Place Synagogue and will complement the Holy Family Parish.

"GET THE U.N. OUT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED STATES OUT OF THE U.N."

One of these days some major issue before the U.N. is going to be resolved in a manner unsatisfactory to this country. It is then that the hue and cry to "Get the United States out of the U.N. and the U.N. out of the United States" will again be heard.

New York City may not be the most logical place to house the organization. It was due to the generosity of the Rockefeller family in making the valuable tract of land in New York available that served as an inducement

to establish the headquarters of the organization in the United States.

Most specialized agencies of the U.N. are headquartered elsewhere. The International Court of Justice is at The Hague; UNESCO is in Paris; WHO is in Geneva; FAO is in Rome; and so on. The original buildings of the League of Nations in Geneva are now extensively used by the United Nations for a variety of meetings. Several years ago the Soviet Union suggested moving the U.N. Headquarter to Moscow because of some incidents of discrimination against several African Ambassadors in New York.

The U.N. could establish its headquarters outside of the United States. There are those who would not only move the U.N. out of the United States but who would have us get out of the U.N. and construct a solid wall between ourselves and the peoples of the Communist world. They want a wall of implacable hostility and rigidity, a Berlin wall in reverse.

Obviously, this is impossible in the 20th century. We cannot stop the world and get off. A major effort of our foreign policy is to carry into world affairs what we have learned here at home: how men and women of different national backgrounds, of different religions, of different regions, of different cultures and colors, and of different politics, can somehow manage their lives without murdering each other most of the time.

The existing international organization through which we seek these objectives is the United Nations. These are the purposes spelled out in the U.N. Charter. The Preamble and the first two articles of the charter are but a restatement of our own Declaration of Independence. That is why such an overwhelming number of Americans are proud of the fact that no nation in the world has given more positive leadership or greater support to the U.N. than has our own country.

Most human beings prefer peace to war, and practically all of them would rather be alive than dead. Yet in every part of the world, men and women have been brought up to regard war between nations as something inevitable. But was is obsolete. Nuclear war, if it is ever waged, may prove to be incompatible, not only with civilization, but perhaps with human survival.

Yes, we could move the U.N. out of the United States, but we cannot move the United States out of the U.N. Like it or not, we are in the world to stay. It is the one existing international organization where men of all nations can meet and talk and disagree, but where hopefully they can finally resolve their differences without a war that nobody wants.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of articles on Vietnam by J. A. Dear, who has been on the ground in South Vietnam and in the area of operations. Mr. Dear is president of Dear Publication & Radio, is a distinguished correspondent, and his reports will be of great value to the Congress and to the committee. The reports have appeared in many papers. I send to the desk the series of articles from the Henderson Gleaner-Journal, Henderson, Ky., for insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM: THE WAR WITHOUT FRONTLINES

(By J. A. Dear)

EDITOR'S NOTE.—J. A. Dear, president of Dear Publication & Radio Inc., is on a tour of the Far East. This dispatch is the first of a special series on Vietnam where Dear observed the war first hand.

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—Almost every night the heavy air of this hot city throbs with the sound of artillery and mortar fire in the suburbs.

Duc Hoa, only 12 miles from the center of the city, is thought of in Washington as a striking example of how successful the pacification program can be. But in fact Americans go there by day and leave at sundown.

Saigon, which hasn't been painted in years, retains an aura of seedy elegance. Coupled with the bustle of a booming black market and a vigorous night life, this dulls the sense of danger. Most Americans check their guns when they come to the city.

WAR IS EVIDENT

But everyone is very conscious of the war, which can be grim. In the north, for example an army officer with the Special Forces was caught by the Vietcong, who skinned him.

At the lonely outposts of the Special Forces life is difficult and dangerous. The lot of Army men serving as advisers to the regional and popular forces of Vietnam—our fellows call them Roofpoofs—is no better. There is more safety at the larger installations, perhaps, but everywhere outside Saigon the paraphernalia of war is visible.

Not counting the men of the 7th Fleet, American forces in Vietnam total about 27,000. We have never fielded a finer team. Almost without exception they are optimistic, and take the view that withdrawal would be an unmitigated disaster for the United States. Incidentally, personnel of the State Department and Information Service are equally competent and dedicated, and for the most part, as optimistic.

But all are baffled. This is a war without frontlines. The enemy, until he chooses to show himself, is indistinguishable from friend. Arvin troops—American argot for the regular Army of Vietnam—are brave and endure high casualties without flinching. (Their losses, until recently, averaged more than 1,000 weekly.)

RED STOOL PIGEONS

Beyond doubt, however, Arvin is riddled with Communists who tip off the Vietcong before offensive strikes get underway. It is a rare occasion that we get advance warning of Vietcong operations.

Moreover, we have to do everything at once. Government stability in Saigon is a precondition for military success, which in turn depends on active assistance from the peasants, whose support hinges on the reintroduction of effective local government and a viable local economy. Of course that is an impossibility without military success and sensible guidance from Saigon.

American Economic Aid (Eusom) is channeled to the local level. But a portion of every dollar the United States commits to support the government of Vietnam in fact supports the Vietcong. For example, aviation gasoline is transported to Pleiku, headquarters of the Arvin 2d Corps and a base for American helicopters, via highway 14 from Saigon. The commercial contractors who haul this gas pay a road tax imposed by the Vietcong, which controls the highways. A study to determine how much help the Vietcong gets from us has been undertaken. (We have also begun a study, through the Rand Corp., to see what motivates the Vietcong.)

In some areas the Vietcong governs. Our grip on the central highlanders is tenuous. The coastal areas below the highlands are threatened. As inland towns and hamlets are cut off, thousands of refugees flee to the coast.

We budgeted enough money to care for 100,000 refugees this year. Already the camps are bulging with nearly 200,000 of them. Whether this is an insidious tactic of the Vietcong or an expression of people who are voting with their feet, no one knows.

REFUGEES POUR IN

With increasing frequency refugees of another category are stumbling to our lines. Mostly old men, women, and children, some horribly wounded, they are the survivors of American jet strikes against targets in Vietnam south of the 17th parallel. These are the villages that are humming with hate and fear, where the children are sullen and silent.

Air strikes against North Vietnam have raised the morale of American and Arvin forces. What else they have accomplished is at this point a matter of conjecture.

[From the Gleaner-Journal, Henderson, Ky., Apr. 3, 1965]

"WE'RE HOLDING OUR OWN" IN VIETNAM

(By J. A. Dear)

KIEN BINH, VIETNAM.—Far below, the cluster of steaming hamlets fade into the sameness of the landscape, a blur of delicate green, sluggish rivers, and countless canals.

We have just said goodby and good luck to Maj. Ralph Waara, leader of the five man American advisory group at Kien Binh. This is delta country, one of the great Asian breadbaskets, whose people eat better than the Chinese, the Koreans, the Filipinos, the Japanese. Yet the delta is a stronghold of the Vietcong, and some areas, Ca Mau, the Yumin Forest, the Plain of Reeds have never been under the effective control of the Saigon government.

When a helicopter drops down at Kien Binh side gunners hunch over their machine guns. "Yes," said Major Waara, "it's not so bad now." Gesturing toward a scratchy patch of land, "they used to shoot at us from there." Armed men stand guard over the plane.

Some nights the Vietcong fire mortars at Major Waara's command compound. But gradually Government forces are pushing out from their shaky toehold. Their aim is to pacify the region by the end of the year.

CAPTAIN GETS CREDIT

Capt. Nguyen Van Huynh, a babyfaced officer of 32, who was deflected from his studies for the priesthood by war, should get the credit for whatever success the Government is having, according to Major Waara.

"He's a remarkable man," said Waara. "Without him I don't think we'd be here. Puts out patrols at night. You know, they have a price of 500,000 piasters on his head."

(That's about $3,600 at the black market rate.)

The 55,000 people of Kien Binh live in an area of about 20 by 12 miles that is divided into 55 districts—10 of these districts are controlled by the government, 24 by the Vietcong, and 21 by no one. To conduct this campaign, Captain Huynh has 780 men, 200 of them fairly well trained members of the regional force, and 580 of them village volunteers of the popular force.

"We're holding our own and maybe better," said Major Waara. That's the assessment of most American officers everywhere in Vietnam. They note that the Vietnam, after getting clobbered in several engagements, is ducking set battles. But everyone agrees the Vietcong has the capability of striking hard. The question is when, and one theory is that the tempo of the war will increase with the advent of the rainy season.

SAFER IN LARGE TOWNS

Life in the larger towns where corps headquarters are set up—Vietnam is divided into four military districts—is easier and safer. Helicopters and advisory officers, are concentrated around the headquarters. But nobody's living it up, exactly.

Asian cities are poor, dirty, and disease ridden. (Many cases of the plague have been reported.) Since dependents were sent home life goes on without women, for the most part. (Queenie's and the place next to it are off limits.)

But even at headquarters area there is danger. At Pleiku, headquarters of the 2d Corps in the central highlands, about 100 Vietcong slipped through the scrub to attack Camp Holloway on February 7.

NATIVES ARE WARNED

Apparently every native in and around the camp knew the attack was coming, but we were unwarned. One informant from the Montagnard village where the Vietcong set up its mortars would have prevented the surprise. Local help at the base left promptly at sundown, and the cyclo drivers in Pleiku refused to take personnel back to the base.

"The apathy of the people is more of a problem than the Vietcong," one officer ruefully admitted. And after 20 years of war it does seem to be true that a majority of the population of Vietnam is uncommitted to either side.

This adds to the strain and perhaps the danger. But where there are as many guns as there now are in Vietnam, there is danger. On a passenger flight from Danang to Saigon there was only one item of cargo: a dead marine in a green sack off my left boot. He was shot and killed as he returned to his lines in the hills above the airbase by a fellow marine.

[From the Gleaner-Journal, Henderson, Ky., Apr. 4, 1965]

VIETNAMESE ARMY NOT STRONG ENOUGH TO COPE WITH VIETCONG

(Third of a series)

(By J. A. Dear)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—No American out here faults the fighting spirit of Vietnamese Army troops (Arvin).

On more than one occasion Arvin troops have continued attacking until wiped out. And remember, this is an army that is underfed, underled, seldom paid, gets no leave. Its nine regular divisions are served by 500 doctors; that means there are only 200 doctors to care for a civil population of 16 million.

Having said this, the truth can be set forth. Arvin is riddled with Vietcong agents; staff work is very poor; there is no personnel setup at all except for the bureau of psychology warfare, which should be concerned with the enemy. Some political generals are incompetent, but the most serious shortage is of qualified junior officers. Approximately one-third of the companies composing Arvin are shaky. Above all, there simply are not enough government troops in the field to cope with the Vietcong.

REPLACEMENTS WERE FEW

Part of the trouble has its origin in Saigon. As a result of the coups and demicoups, Arvin received almost no replacements until recently. Because about 40,000 men were lost in operations, this means a badly wounded Arvin had to face an enemy that has been continually nourished by supplies and men from the North.

The first coup, which led to the murder of Diem, had the greatest impact. During the sorry interval between Diem's death and the present regime of Dr. Quat, effective government came to a stop. Since this is a political war for the hearts and minds of people effective government at every level is essential.

The legitimacy of the present government is questionable, but American officials are not anxious to explore this murky area. Another violent coup might destroy our excuse for being here. We are here at the invitation of the Vietnam Government; there must be a government to be the guest of.

MANY POLITICAL FACTORS

The political factors of immediate consequence in Vietnam are generals, Buddhists, Catholics, and two other religious sects, the Hoa Hao and the Cao Dai. The Cao Dai, which venerates Christ, Buddha, and Victor Hugo, once fought Diem and the Communists. Fortunately, the Communists assassinated its leader, and now the Cao Dai is with the Government.

Prime Minister Quat is confident that only a few dissidents in the religious groupings oppose his government. He is also confident that a promising economic program has been evolved, and he is sure military leaders appreciate the importance of governmental stability.

At present there is no single military strong man on the scene. Big Minh of the first coup may return, but a five-member armed forces council now advises Dr. Quat.

KY IS COLORFUL COMMANDER

General Ky, colorful commander of Vietnam's air force, is one of the most important members of the council. General Thi, commander of I Corps, is an influential general though not a member of the council. General Co of II Corps, called "dancing master" because of his fondness for this pastime, is another name to remember. Incidentally, Co's acute criticism of the deployment of the Special Forces led to the development of new tactics.

The traditional enmity of the Vietnamese and Montagnard has caused serious trouble in the central highlands. Saigon has made concessions, but not before Y B'Ham Enoul, former Saigon deputy in the highlands, skipped to Cambodia after fomenting an abortive uprising.

Most encouraging of all, said Dr. Quat, is that "your country has settled on a policy for Vietnam, for a month ago you had none."

ASSUMPTIONS ARE PLAYING THEIR ROLE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA BATTLE

(Fourth of a series)

(By J. A. Dear)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—What are the considerations and thinking on which our policy here is based?

These are the assumptions: Southeast Asia is vital to American security. If Vietnam falls to Communist aggression, southeast Asia is lost.

In spite of obvious apathy to the war, the people of South Vietnam are by no means committed to the Communist regime in the north. There are hostilities between these regions we can exploit.

Likewise, there are differences between the Tokinese and Chinese that can be exploited. Even the most ardent Communist in Ho Chi Minh's government probably hopes North Vietnam can escape Chinese occupation.

Ho Chi Minh is indeed dependent on Red China. But to give his regime room for maneuver he plays Peiping against Moscow. If we hit him too hard, we push him into the hands of the Chinese. If we don't hit him hard enough, he has no incentive for easing his campaign against Vietnam.

If we threaten the destruction of Ho Chi Minh, we practically assure intervention by the Russians and the Chinese. Because of the parities of the situation, Moscow cannot stand on the sidelines if a Socialist state is threateded with destruction.

EQUATION CHANGES EVERY DAY

Thus, the air strikes against North Vietnam involve nice calculations. Further, the equation changes every day. So much for the assumptions.

Hanoi's support of the Communists in the war here is no longer disputed, even by Hanoi. But the amount and importance of the aid received from the North is a matter of dispute.

The Ho Chi Minh trail, so called, traverses difficult terrain. It has not been photographed for television because cameramen cannot get equipment to it.

The triple-ply jungle—there are trees, with secondary growth above them, and beyond that an additional growth that is rooted in the trees themselves—cannot be penetrated more than 75 yards in one day by a young man in excellent physical condition. An athlete would be hard put to make more than 3 miles a day on known trails through this growth. And a trail unused for 6 days disappears.

TRIP TAKES ABOUT 60 DAYS

It is agreed that a Communist trooper from the North will not reach I Corps or II Corps, the northern military districts of Vietnam, in less than 30 days. Probably the trip takes about 60 days.

Now, what is the capacity of the Ho Chi Minh trail? One estimate is 1,000 men and 40 tons of equipment per month. Considering the nature of the country, this does not seem unreasonable, though some say it is too low by half.

It is admitted that anyone who has traveled the trail must rest up before combat. Also, Communist arms and men reach Vietnam by sea.

But this aid—and here we are back to assumption—is crucial. Without it the Vietcong would lose vital momentum and the Saigon Government would triumph.

That is the rationale underlying our policy.

THERE IS A WEAPON WE HAVE YET TO USE IN VIETNAM: FOOD

(Fifth of a series)

(By J. A. Dear)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—Nothing is lost until it is lost, in my opinion, unless you walk away.

In a nutshell, that's my thought about the miserable war.

Also, the other guy has real problems. Suppose you had to group 1,000 men for a battle 100 miles away, knowing that your communications were poor, that you didn't control the roads or the air, that your only transport was manback, that equipment had to be toted piecemeal; that your security hinged on the silence of everyone in villages your men had to sleep in, that your enemy could mobilize murderous firepower in minutes, and that you would face annihilation if caught in the open country? Well, that's the way it is for the Vietcong.

PROBLEMS OF OWN MAKING

For all that, we have problems too, and some of them of our own making. The most serious is that which results from our decision to embrace a strategy of terror.

That's what bombing is. It doesn't discriminate between soldiers and/or women and children. Especially, I have in mind American air strikes in South Vietnam. We are killing innocents almost every day. (Twenty-three structures and five water buffalo were destroyed, etc.)

Morality aside, can you think of a worse way to win the hearts and minds of people in a political war? Neither can I.

If we must be terrorists, let's be effective. And there is a weapon at hand we have not touched. Food.

NO WHEAT WITH A-BOMB

The technical achievements of the Communist world, including Red China, are impressive. But you can't grow wheat with an A-bomb.

Red China has the A-bomb, but not the wheat. At least she wouldn't have the wheat if Australia and Canada didn't sell it to her.

Why not stop this trade, if necessary by buying the entire wheat surplus of these allies? An accommodation with China might then be possible.

And we could abandon the strategy of terror that manufactures islands of humanity humming with hate and fear of Americans.

COULD HELP ECONOMY

At the same time, we could be breathing life into the economy of Vietnam, which is a surplus food country. Through Hong Kong, the showcase for Red China, go the water chestnuts, bamboo shoots, and so forth, that Chinese expatriates everywhere love. Vietnam could fulfill this need, given the chance.

We could do ourselves a good turn in Vietnam by becoming interested in education. That is what brought us victory in the Philippines, but the lesson has been forgotten.

In Danang I saw a French Lycee. But nowhere in Vietnam did I see an American school. If our interest is long term, why don't we think about schools and teachers?

SCHOOLS IN SAIGON

At the moment it would be impossible to establish American schools in the hinterlands. But a start could be made by bringing bright teenagers, with their parents' permission, to a first-rate academy in Saigon.

Though it will go against our Army's grain, we should consider lengthening the tour of our personnel here to 2 years. As I have said, we have never fielded a finer team than that we have in Vietnam. But considering the time for phase in and phase out, personnel spend only 9 months in action. By the time they have a grasp of the situation, they're up for reassignment. True, this system spreads counterinsurgency experience through the services. But it's victory, not experience, that we're after.

Finally, a word about the posture of the West in the Far East. Resorts in Formosa and South Korea, citadels we created, enjoyed a reputation that would attract the court of Elagabalus.

CALL GIRLS ON SCOOTERS

The playland of South Korea is closely guarded by house detectives who are charged with seeing to it that every room with a man has a woman in it before midnight. In the paradise of Formosa call girls arrive by motor scooter.

Journalists of the Philippines paint a different picture of Red China. It is a moral country, and its cities are unbelievably clean for Asia. In the battle for minds and hearts, this counts.

It would be a pity if our great country gets lost in the thoroughfares of life by forgetting this simple fact.

[From the Gleaner-Journal, Henderson, Ky., Apr. 11, 1965]

TO VIETNAMESE FARMER, WAR IS HELL

(By J. A. Dear)

TOKYO.—One reason so many Japanese are so critical of our Vietnam policy is that our effort to save the Saigon government from Communist aggression is not saving the people and their society from destruction.

The likelihood that what is to be saved by war will be destroyed in the process is a favorite irony of history. England entered the Second War to save Poland from Nazi Germany with the result that Poland became a fief of Moscow.

To understand what the war is doing to Vietnam, it is first necessary to consider the economy of the rural areas. About 70 percent of the farmers in Vietnam work holdings, which they do not always own, of less than 12 acres. Of the farmers who do own their lands, about 65 percent own less than 12 acres.

In the delta, the richest agricultural area of Vietnam, between 60 and 70 percent of the farmers are now in debt, and probably are falling deeper in debt every month. The plight of Farmer Tran Vannam, cited by Kenkichi Konishi of the Mainichi newspapers is typical.

The Tran family of six owns a delta farm of about 5 acres. They once owned a much larger farm, but gave it up because of the Vietcong. About 3 acres of the present farm are under rice. The other 2 acres had flourishing fruit trees, but these were cut down to enable Government forces to protect a bridge more easily.

Farmer Tran was not reimbursed by the Government for the loss of these trees. His family is able to live off the land, he sells the balance of his rice crop, and ekes out his existence in the off season by working as a laborer in the village. His total effort produces a yearly cash income for the family of 18,000 piasters—about $122.

INFLATION HURTS PIASTER

At this point it must be noted that in theory $230 is the dollar equivalent of 18,000 piasters. But inflation—war—has destroyed the integrity of the piaster. During the time I was in Vietnam the dollar equivalent value of the piaster decreased 7.8 percent. For families that must limit monthly purchases to an average of $4 this is murderous.

But the picture really is worse than painted thus far, for Tran's princely income of $122 yearly doesn't come in at the rate of $10 per month. In most months the income is about $2.25. So he has to borrow, and the going interest rate is from 5 to 10 percent a month.

He is already in debt to the Government and to other members of his family. Thus the prospects of additional debt is frightening, so frightening in fact that he often sells rice futures to escape the high interest rate. But he is caught, anyhow, because he can't get a decent price on these sales.

FACES FINANCIAL DISASTER

Of course, any serious sickness is catastrophic to a man as close to the cloth as Tran, and he has tuberculosis. The medicines he must buy drive him nearer financial disaster. Still, he is an optimist.

He dreams of another orchard that will make his small farm profitable again. In 5 or 6 years he hopes to be out of debt. He is hard working, literate, anxious that his children be educated, in every way a worthy man. In happier times he might make it. Times being what they are, he will die.

Tran is tough. Many others have long since succumbed to despair. Remember, the Delta is a fortunate region.

PEOPLE ARE WELL OFF

Parts of it are controlled by the Vietcong, and have been for a long time. But the people of these areas cannot be better off. Government forces, backed by American personnel and technology, are powerful enough to destroy the economic viability of any Vietcong area. Thus all of rural Vietnam is an area where the forces of the government and the Vietcong wage a ferocious war in a sea of human misery. Every day wavelets of misery wash into the overcrowded villages and cities, multiplying the danger of epidemic disease, drowning hope.

If the Communists win Vietnam, Red China will be encouraged to go after Laos, Cambodia, Siam, Burma, and Indonesia. And what is to stop them?

Surely no national leader in his right senses will ever again be anxious to save his country from Communist aggression by fighting a war in his country that will destroy it. Not after the lesson of Vietnam.

That is one reason why the airstrikes against North Vietnam make sense. The Communist leaders will not be as ready to embark on their adventures if it is brought home to them that all the damage will not be confined to the country in which they choose to wage war, that their own lands will be devastated.

For too long now Red China has been permitted to forget a simple fact: War is hell.

Vietnam Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon addressed the Commonwealth Club of California on the subject of "Vietnam." Excerpts from that speech, as published by the Commonwealth, follow:

"STOP REDS IN VIETNAM OR FACE BIG WAR FOR PHILLIPPINES 4 YEARS HENCE," SAYS NIXON

(From address by Hon. Richard M. Nixon, former Vice President of the United States)

Today the most difficult decision facing President Johnson is South Vietnam, the most difficult decision he will make during his Presidency, I believe, at home or abroad. And it is the most important decision for the United States and the free world.

There are times when the loyal opposition should support an administration. Lyndon B. Johnson needs this support not only because of the validity of his policy but because there is a deep division in his own party.

Our greatest danger to the future of our policy on Vietnam is because the Democratic party is divided. Forty-five Democratic Senators have indicated opposition.

UNITED STATES DEFENDS WORLD—AGAIN

The interests of America, the free world and of South Vietnam are being served by the present policy.

Some claim the United States has no legal right in South Vietnam and that we are involved in a civil war. Some say the war will not be won because the Vietnamese are not willing to do what is necessary.

Others believe that, even if the war could be won, the risks are too great. Many suggest another way out—negotiation—neutralization.

Lyndon Johnson should answer each of these objections now. He might well have done this before now. Not enough people know why we should support the South Vietnamese.

First, who is responsible for the war? If it were not for support of the Guerrillas by North Vietnam there would be no war; no war, at least, which would require our support. If it were not for Chinese support for North Vietnam there would be no war requiring American support.

COMMUNIST CHINA THE REAL FOE

This is a confrontation—not fundamentally between Vietnam and the Vietcong or between the United States and the Vietcong—but between the United States and Communist China.

This must not be glossed over because if we gloss it over we underestimate the risks and do not understand the stakes.

Those who question our presence ignore certain facts. In 1954 a convention was signed in Geneva guaranteeing South Vietnam its independence. The North Vietnamese are there as lawbreakers. We are

there as law enforcers, by invitation of the South Vietnamese Government.

What are the risks, the stakes? First, the fate of 15 million Vietnamese. Two hundred thousand Vietnamese casualties in the fight against communism over the years, prove they have the desire and will to keep their country free and independent.

NEED FUNDAMENTALS

In Vietnam today there is determination of the people to save their freedom—provided they have the conviction they will win.

These are fundamental reasons the stronger course of action will be more effective than may seem today.

Fifteen million people are worth saving but many argue that this is not enough to risk major confrontation and Chinese Communist intervention.

If South Vietnam falls, through U.S. withdrawal, political settlement, or neutralization (which is surrender on the installment plan), there is no doubt that Cambodia (already on the brink) will go; that Laos, practically gone now because of our gullibility, will go; that Thailand (which wants to be on our side but has held her independence by being on the winning side) will go; that Burma, an economic basket case; and that Indonesia will go.

SUKARNO'S OVERRIPE MELON

Indonesia will follow Sukarno and Sukarno once said that because of the American failure in Asia, the Communists were the wave of the future and he would be on the winning side.

Indonesia has half the world's tin, half the world's rubber. It is only 14 miles from the Philippines where guerrillas and Huk activity have begun again—guerrilla activity easily supported by Indonesian Communists.

In 3 or 4 years, then, we would have the necessity of saving the Philippines. Could we avoid a major war to save the Philippines?

Japan is the biggest prize in Asia, a miracle of economic recovery, the only possible economic counterpart to China. Strong neutralist forces are now growing in Japan. If southeast Asia goes Communist, Japan will eventually be pulled irresistably into the Red orbit.

If the United States gives up on Vietnam, Asia will give up on the United States and the Pacific will become a Red sea. These are the stakes. And this is the reason the Johnson administration has decided to win in Vietnam—no more, no less.

AGAINST RED COLONIALISM

The possibilities of winning? How could it be possible that, where 300,000 Frenchmen on the ground failed, 25,000 Americans can expect success? But when the French were in Vietnam they were fighting to stay in—while the United States is fighting to get out.

The Vietnamese had very little interest in fighting to preserve French colonialism. The Vietnamese have a very great interest in fighting against Communist colonialism. That's why they fight with a will today.

THAT RISK OR GREATER RISK?

Risks must always be weighed. There is a risk of Russian intervention. This risk is small due to the logistic problems involved, and because the Soviets are not particularly interested in seeing the Chinese Communists succeed in their foreign policy objectives for Asia.

A greater risk is Chinese Communist intervention. Some say this is inevitable, that the Chinese Communists would come in to save North Vietnam from defeat. That is subject to serious question.

Comparing the situation now with Korea in 1950, there are major differences. Now Russia and Communist China are opponents. Then they were allies.

China without Russia is a fourth-rate military power. And that is the situation China must confront if it decides to intervene. That is probably the reason Communist China is talking big but acting little, without risking a confrontation with the United States, at this point, over Vietnam.

Adding it all, we must assume that Communist China might intervene. What should our decision be, weighing that risk and that possibility? It must be the same, because it is a choice not between that risk and no risk—but that risk and a greater risk.

NINE PINS IF UNITED STATES PULLS OUT

In the event that Vietnam falls, and in the event that the balance of southeast Asia falls, in 4 to 5 years, the United States would be confronted inevitably with a war to save the Philippines or in some other area in Asia and we would be confronting a China stronger than she is now. China today is diplomatically and militarily weaker than she will ever be in the future.

Today China has a minimal nuclear capability but that capability increases daily. It is a risk we must weigh. Do we stop Chinese Communist aggression in Vietnam now or wait until the odds and the risks are much greater?

The United States must make a decision as to what our goals are to be. Our goals are presently limited to winning the war, without unconditional surrender, without destroying North Vietnam, without destroying Communist China. It is a limited objective but one which must be achieved.

ROAD OF "GOOD INTENTIONS"

What are the alternatives? Many well-intentioned people have suggested, Why not negotiate? Negotiation is a good word. All wars are ended by negotiation. But to negotiate now would mean that the United States could negotiate only surrender, coalition government, a division of South Vietnam or neutralization, which is surrender on the installment plan.

Negotiating with the Communists now would be like negotiating with Hitler when he had France practically occupied.

We must negotiate independence and freedom for Vietnam. We cannot do that now. Once we have gained the military advantage, once North Vietnam and Communist China are convinced they cannot take over South Vietnam, then we can negotiate the freedom and independence of South Vietnam. Until then, we cannot.

Neutralization? Neutralism, where Communists are concerned, means only three things: we get in, we get out; they stay in, and they take over. That is why we can't agree to a neutralization of South Vietnam. The choice we have is to get out completely or to stay in until we achieve freedom and independence for Vietnam.

The future is our main problem. The world has been given the impression that this is our war; that we are there unilaterally for our own selfish purposes. We are there for our purposes, true, but we are there because the freedom of all Asia, not just Vietnam, is involved.

NIXON PROPOSES ASIAN COUNTERFORCE

Several suggestions can be made for future policy. Once the war is won in Vietnam, we must recognize that it will only be the winning of a single battle as far as the Communists are concerned.

It took Mao 20 years to conquer China. This is Mao Tse-tung's theory of a long war. He lost many battles, but he won the long war. If Vietnam is lost to Communist China, the long war will be stepped up in Indonesia or somewhere else.

There must be a counterforce, an alternative to Mao's long war. Let me make several suggestions. There is no question as to Communist China's purpose and plan. They have one, and they are determined. But free Asia does not have a plan. It does not have a purpose. It is necessary to mobilize free Asia's economic and military resources so there will be the lasting alternative of peace under freedom as against the long war of communism.

JOHNSON PROPOSAL INCOMPLETE

President Johnson started down this road when he suggested an Asian economic plan. Let's go further; we need a conference of free Asian nations, including South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Malaysia, Burma, Indonesia, Taiwan, the Philippines, Japan, South Korea, and possibly Australia and New Zealand.

Such a conference would have three major objectives: One, economic development—a Marshall plan for Asia; a Marshall plan involving industrial development, free trade areas, and all other aspects which mean economic development for the whole area.

The difficulty is in stopping there and that is all that is suggested by the administration. Economic strength alone is not enough to stop communism, for in South Vietnam, economic conditions are much better than in the North.

Second, in Europe, the Marshall plan could not have succeeded economically unless it had the NATO military shield. There needs to be a military alliance of free Asian nations to stop any Communist aggression against freedom.

The third step is to meet the problem of indirect aggression. There should be something like the Caracas resolution of 1954 that in event of a revolution with Communist-support from abroad (as in Vietnam), all nations involved would band together to resist conquest by indirect aggression.

Now that we've stepped up military activity in Vietnam, we need to step up our diplomatic offensive in all of Asia.

We need a charter for freedom for the Pacific—an alternative to the seeming inevitability, at least to many in Asia, of Chinese Communist domination.

MOBILIZE FREE ASIA'S ECONOMY

Often overlooked today is the fact that the economic power of the nations cited is twice as great, as that of Communist China today—if it can be mobilized, if it can be united; if the United States can support it.

There is no question but that this could be the great step forward which would stop Chinese Communist aggression and the inevitable takeover of the heartland and peripheral areas of Asia as well.

I spoke of the stakes—southeast Asia, Japan, the Pacific—but they're much greater than that. A great debate is going on in the Communist world and what happens in Vietnam will determine its course. The debate is between the hardliners in Peiping and the so-called softliners in Moscow. The softliners (oversimplified), because of a risk of confrontation with the United States, are not supporting revolutions to the same extent that they did. The hardliners say "we must step up our tactics and support of revolution all over the world."

In the event the hardliners succeed in Vietnam, that will be the green light for aggression in Africa, Latin America—all over the world. If they are stopped in Vietnam, that will be a lesson just as Korea was a lesson on the use of overt aggression.

It will be a lesson to the Communists attempting to take over a nation through indirect aggression that the United States and the free world have an answer to it.

So what is involved here is not just Asia, but a battle for the whole world and because that is so, risks must be taken—risks which, I believe, in the long run will bring peace and freedom. But the alternatives could be war and loss of freedom.

In 1938, immediately after Munich, Winston Churchill said: "The belief that you can

gain security by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion." He was right about Czechoslovakia in 1938. And today, with regard to Vietnam, the belief that we can gain security by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion. In this year when we honor Churchill the man, we will do well to heed Churchill's principles.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question. Will you be a candidate in 1968?

Answer. The Republican Party must get off the floor fighting. But Republicans must fight Democrats and not each other. To win in 1966 the party must be unified. Until we get the party off the floor, don't talk of 1968.

Question (William Nigh). Use of gas in Vietnam?

Answer. Under the circumstances it was proper. But when the President said he was not aware of its use he gave impression we were wrong to use it, and that field commanders could make decisions of this consequence without his knowledge. He should have said: (1) This was not gas used in World Wars I or II which nations have opposed; (2) it was used not by United States, but by Vietnam; (3) it was used in attacks on villages in which Vietnamese could not tell who were guerrillas and who the guerrillas' victims; (4) so instead of blasting out friends and foes indiscriminately, Vietnamese used tear gas so they could separate guerrillas from loyal citizens. It was humane warfare and President should have said so.

Question. (W. F. Bramstedt). Can we win without a major land war?

Answer. Depends on the extent to which the Chinese Communists choose to intervene. They are basically cautious in military policy—e.g., could have taken all India but they stopped. I don't believe the Chinese will intervene. Strategically and logistically, this is no Korean type of war. We must assume the risk. Some think China should be recognized and taken into the U.N. Chinese communism is in its aggressive, virulent stage. The Soviet Union was not tempered in its foreign policy by entrance into the U.N. It has been tempered only by the power of NATO and the U.S. confrontation in Cuba.

Question. (J. C. Russell). Johnson administration now doing what Goldwater advocated?

Answer. It's easy to say "I told you so." Johnson needs Republican support, he has been learning a lot since the campaign—but we don't want him to learn so much he gets reelected.

Question. (R. J. Jajalich). What if the United States asked to leave? (Col. James S. Hughes). Effects of Diem's murder?

Answer. If any future government gets in through a coup or anything but as representatives of the people—and if it's pro-Communist—we should stay in. Murder of Diem was a major U.S. mistake. Diem and his family were sometimes crosses to bear but since 1956 he had stood strongly with the United States. We supported the coup but did not expect him to be murdered. You can't set such things in motion. A free Asian leader told me shortly after Diem's death: "It is dangerous to be a friend of the United States—it pays to be a neutral and sometimes helps to be an enemy." U.S. policymakers must understand that American-style democracy is not necessarily the answer where traditions are different.

Question. (Ivor R. Parfott). De Gaulle's attitude on Vietnam question?

Answer. De Gaulle's attitude is first French and then European: (1) If you were French would you want to see the United States succeed where you had failed? (2) Europeans see clearly the Communist danger in Europe but have a blind spot on Asia. In the East particularly we are afflicted the same way.

Question. (Stanley Brooks). Proposed changes in the new civil rights bill

Answer. When faced with a volatile situation you can't delay action over 7 years for an amendment to the Constitution. There should be action but action of right kind. Voters should be literate but literacy test should be fair. Republican platform of 1960 considered a sixth grade education as sufficient qualification. The present law applies only in those States won by Republicans in 1964—bill should be extended to all the country.

Abuse of the Sick Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a series of articles written by Lisa Hobbs recently appeared in the San Francisco Examiner which comprise a shocking exposé of the treatment of our sick and elderly citizens in some convalescent and nursing homes in California.

Because I believe these articles should be brought to the attention of the leadership in this Congress and the executive branch, I am inserting them in the RECORD as separate extensions of remarks. I am not including the third article in the series since it deals primarily with State legislation.

I am indebted to my constituents, Miss Violette Hofmann and Mrs. Frank H. Schryver, for bringing these articles to my attention. I sincerely hope the appropriate individuals will consider the possibility of corrective legislation.

The first article follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Mar. 14, 1965]

BUREAUCRACY'S VICTIMS: ABUSE OF THE SICK AGED

(By Lisa Hobbs)

Scandalous abuses are being heaped on the sick aged of California by a multimillion-dollar bureaucracy.

The powers of this bureaucracy have become so diffused in the mass of related and unrelated Federal, State, and county regulations that gross abuses of the aged are now inherent in the system's functioning.

The rise of California's newest industry—the nursing and convalescent homes—is an offshoot of this bureaucracy's attempt to deal with one facet of the problem of an aging population.

In a 3-week survey of nursing and convalescent homes in the city and East Bay, the Examiner found:

Elderly persons, unheeded, crying to be turned over.

One aid doing all the household cleaning, cooking, and nursing for up to 10 bed patients.

Grease encrusted stoves and filthy kitchen floors.

Constant reference to the sick aged as being like children.

Total lack of privacy for those paying up to $500 a month.

Debasing humiliations for lower economic aged.

These abuses are widespread throughout the State but the most scandalous fact is that for years the city of San Francisco has been dumping its sick aged into State mental asylums to die—whether mentally ill or not.

According to the department of mental hygiene's report to the legislature in 1963, the city's rate of commitment to a State mental hospital was 600 per 100,000 population. Eighty percent of these persons died within the first 3 weeks.

While San Francisco was committing 600 per 100,000 population, Los Angeles was committing only 54 per 100,000 and Alameda 300. Eighty percent of those committed were over 65 and were being committed for the first time.

Bureaucracy—the same style bureaucracy that controls the nursing-convalescent home situation today—not only allowed this but actually condoned it.

Purely economic reasoning lay behind the dumping of these aged persons into mental hospitals to end their days. By removing them from the county hospital where they were receiving medical assistance to the aged (MAA) under the Kerr-Mills bill, the city of San Francisco was freed of its 25 percent share of MAA costs for that patient. It is an old solution, however, being used long before the Kerr-Mills bill was introduced.

The procedure involved was a brief court commitment proceeding while the words "with psychosis" were added to the doctor's original diagnosis of "chronic brain syndrome." This syndrome covers everything from confusion to senility.

Officials of the department of mental hygiene are forced to play their part in the scandal, because the law requires them to accept into mental hospitals all patients committed by the court, whether mentally ill or not.

Dr. Robert Hewitt, chief deputy director of the department in Sacramento, said there are a substantial number of people in our State hospitals who do not require hospitalization, who are not mentally ill, and some of whom should never have been committed to our care.

This solution was practiced for years with the knowledge and tacit approval of the city and county of San Francisco, county hospital authorities, State mental hospital authorities, and the State department of mental health.

By setting up a honeycomb of regulations governing building and architectural requirements of housing for the aged, the State has paid a ritualistic tribute to the physical well-being of the aged.

Yet in those areas where the aged can be most easily victimized—all those areas in which they struggle to maintain a sense of value and dignity as human beings—the State has done nothing to protect them.

Instead, with slipshod regulations and ineffectual controls, the State has left the aged sick to suffer countless indignities at the hands of unskilled guardians, called nurse's aids, vocational nurses, or practical nurses.

Just as victimized are the families of the sick aged, in those cases where families exist. The expense is crippling, the load of doubt and guilt devastating.

I visited scores of homes where the price of a room for "a loved one" was plucked from the air. Only twice was I given a printed card with rates. Elsewhere, a score of little feelers as to the "loved ones" means—whether she was receiving old age assistance social security, a veteran's pension, a railroad pension—always preceded the final figures.

And the final figure was never cheap. No home will accept a patient receiving medical assistance to the aged if there is a change of selling the bed for a higher, private fee.

Twice it was intimated that if the "loved one" came in on MAA rates (which pay a maximum of $9.10 a day) a subsidy payment to bring the rate to $350 a month would have to be made privately to the nursing home operator.

This is illegal but there is little the State can do to police such arrangements.

Because the State rate covers two categories of care—basic care at $7.35 a day and extended (or bed) care at $9.10 a day—it is in the operator's financial interest that as many patients as possible are kept in bed rather than being helped and encouraged to remain ambulatory.

The taxation aspects also offer an inducement to the family to keep the old folks bedridden rather than up and around. The entire cost of keeping a bed patient in a nursing home is tax deductable. If the loved one remains ambulatory, however, the deduction is only 40 percent.

Tragic Lives in Nursing Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the second of a series of articles written by Lisa Hobbs for the San Francisco Examiner regarding the deplorable conditions in some convalescent and nursing homes in the State of California:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Mar. 15, 1965]

ABUSE OF SICK AGED: TRAGIC LIVES IN NURSING HOMES

(By Lisa Hobbs)

"I can hear the traffic and see part of the sky out the window but it gets so lonely at times I go to sleep hoping I won't wake up.

"Sometimes in the morning I weep when I realize I'm still alive. I try and not let the nurse see me, she gets nasty. When you get old, people say you're senile if you complain.

"I do try not to be sorry for myself. But I never thought I'd end up like this, dependent on strangers and no use to anyone. When I want something personal, like a drink of water or a bedpan, I dread having to ask. I keep putting it off, the girl's always so busy."

FAMILY LIFE

The speaker was a 71 year old widow of an oil company accountant. Until 3 years ago, she lived in her San Francisco home and was an active churchgoer and worker and an integral part of her children's family life. She was "granny" to eight grandchildren, from time to time a baby-sitter, took place of honor at traditional family gatherings.

ONLY ALTERNATIVE

Then a slick pavement and a permanently damaged hip changed all that overnight. The road downhill was fast. Nursing care was required after hospitalization; the home had to be sold. One son lived out-of-State, another in Los Angeles. The only child living locally, a daughter, had a small home, four children and could not take on the responsibility.

Nor did the widow, wishing to remain independent as long as possible, wish to "impose" herself on any of her children. She chose the only alternative—a nursing home in the avenues.

"I pay $350 a month. It's the best I could find within my means. I don't know what I'll do when my savings run out."

The setting in which the pride and income of this widow are daily depleted is little different from scores of other avenue homes in the city, modern bungalows on low-rent Oakland sidestreets, or old Berkeley homes with smart facades—all with a State license to operate as a convalescent or nursing home.

Brown smudges from handprints rim the doorways and mark the walls, and dust covers the not so hard to reach places on the layered paintwork. In the bathrooms the tiles rarely seem to fit and often the baths are so bone dry it's anyone's guess when they were last used.

BLARING TV

Everywhere the air is heavy with the smell of deodorizers and, as if covering the "guests" terrible silence, a television set perpetually blares.

In all the homes visited I found only one that had any fresh-cut flowers. Like the modern graveyard, the decorations are plastic and covered with dust. Every room, with its 6 vinyl plastic chairs for 10 patients, to the rickety "sunroom" at the back that overlooks a garden that never gets finished, smacks of a cutrate operation.

In a 3-week Examiner survey of bay area nursing homes, I never met a volunteer visitor, pastor, or priest, and only once did I meet a doctor. That was in a home where the fees started at $500 a month.

FEE RANGE

Fees in these homes range from $280 (the maximum allowed by the State department of finance to medical assistance to the aged patients) to $500 and up. A fair average would be $350. This might or might not include such personal items as the cost of linen (for incontinent patients) and assistance with feeding ($1 a meal). This monthly board rate would not include doctor's visits, drugs, therapy, or any minimal medical services.

Because of the hodgepodge regulations and poor policing by the State department of public health, these homes have become a mint for unscrupulous operators.

I was 12 minutes in one sunset district home with 10 beds before I could locate a "nurse."

FOOD DEBRIS

A walk through the kitchen showed the refrigerator door wide open, two quart carton of milk which had turned warm on the table, and egg shell and other debris littered on the floor around an open garbage pail.

Dinner, set on trays without any protective covering, consisted of what I came to recognize as standard convalescent home fare—a fluffy white bread sandwich, potato salad, and gelatin dessert.

When the "nurse" arrived—she said she was a registered vocational nurse—she showed me a vacant bed, explaining how everyone in the home received loving care. In doing so she took me through a room where an elderly man was on a bedside toilet. His anguished protests were completely ignored.

A room in this haven costs a minimum of $300 a month.

PRIVATE ROOM

A Berkeley home offered a slightly more expensive room, for my "loved one," $350 a month, because it was a "private room," that is, it had a thin wire cable strung across the ceiling separating one bed from another with a piece of plastic shower curtain.

In the backroom of the same home, with no sunlight and little air, lay two men. The nurse explained that one was formerly a successful businessman whose family had predeceased him; in the nurse's eye his presence added "quality" to the home. He looked on indigently, but helplessly, as the nurse marched me without warning into his room.

The other man was tied by his wrists to the bed. The nurse—anyone employed at a convalescent home has this title even if they failed nurses' aid school—dismissed the old man's restraints has being "doctor's orders." The code specifically outlaws this kind of restraint under any circumstances.

In the small kitchen, where the grease and dust had found permanent havens in every corner, although the center of the floor was clean, the lunch trays were laid out. Cream in the coffee cups left a rim when moved, attesting to the length of time since it had been poured.

GARAGE MECHANIC

In a Richmond home, the proprietor took me into a private bedroom where the occupant, an elderly man, sat reading a newspaper. Stripping the bed to prove the hygienic standards of his operation, the proprietor (a garage mechanic until he stumbled on something better) pointed out a plastic sheet.

"He wets every night," he said. "They get just like children."

Unheard Cries in Nursing Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the fourth of a series of articles written by Lisa Hobbs for the San Francisco Examiner regarding the deplorable conditions in some convalescent and nursing homes in the State of California.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Mar. 17, 1965]

UNHEARD CRIES IN NURSING HOMES

(By Lisa Hobbs)

The feeling of total abandonment which makes the aged sick indifferent about living any longer isn't the result of cutrate material standards but cutrate treatment as human beings.

Violations of human dignity are an integral part of the convalescent-nursing home system.

They are expressed in patients crying unheeded for a bedpan, in the television set roaring while the patient struggles for sleep, in aids barging into patients' rooms without their permission, the laughing references to the aged as being "like children" and the brisk teasing of patients before strangers.

These and similar assaults on the dignity of the aged sick can be directly traced to the fact that no education or training whatsoever is required either to run or own a home for the aged sick.

Only after a home has 25 beds are the services of a registered nurse required during an 8-hour daytime shift. For six or less beds, the State will issue a license to own or work in such a home to anyone "qualified by experience."

MEAN ANYTHING

This qualification "by experience" can mean anything. It not only includes nurse's aids but even janitors if they've worked around a hospital. The State health department has no resources to check all former employment claims in an industry that has such a gross turnover of transient labor.

For instance, the turnover of employed help in August 1964, was 42 percent.

Because of the State health department code, the only things an operator can cut back on, either to increase profits or just cut even, are labor, food, and clean linen.

The laws allow not only for ample cutting back but, in sections 293 and 294 governing the employment of both "nursing" and "supervisory" staff, foster the air of contradiction and confusion in which fringe operations thrive.

Sections 293 states that nursing homes with more than 6 beds but less than 60 shall have "awake and on duty at all times" one nurse "qualified by experience" to care for the type and number of patients.

Sections 294, which deals with "supervisors" states that 10 beds or less require a registered nurse or somebody "qualified by experience" to supervise.

It further states that homes with 11 to 25 beds must have a registered nurse, licensed vocational nurse or "someone that meets the department's approval."

Section 293 says that nursing homes licensed for 60 to 99 beds shall have at least 1 nurse licensed as a registered nurse in California on duty at least 8 hours a day, and other nurses who are "qualified by experience" covering the other two 8-hour shifts.

This means a home with 99 aged sick can be legally without a registered nurse 16 hours a day.

A survey of the results of the contradictions between sections 293 and 294 indicate that operators have solved the problem nicely by ignoring section 293 and choose to have supervisors—but no staff.

The Examiner survey indicated beyond any doubt that organized chaos surrounds every phase of the nursing-convalescent home industry.

A large part of this chaos is the direct result of the fact that medical assistance to the aged rates are fixed by the State department of finance and administered by the State department of social welfare in homes that are the sole responsibility of the State department of public health.

FIXED RATE

Further, while operators of other institutions receiving reimbursement for a wide range of services being received by their MAA patients, operators of nursing and convalescent homes receive a fixed rate.

This fixed rate has effectively blocked any solution to the most widespread and humiliating single burden of old age—incontinence.

The State finance department will authorize payments for 4 catheters a month regardless of the doctor's orders, which might specify 10. But if the nursing home operator wants to introduce a bladder retraining program, which involves expense, the State will not reimburse this expense.

A further curiosity exists in the fact that putting a catheter in a patient instantly puts the patient into MAA's extended care category—$2 a day more than the basic rate. At the same time, the State will not pay either for disposable diapers or excessive sheet changes, tempting the operator to cut costs with infrequent linen changes and placing further strain on the relationship between operator and patient.

The MAA eligibility clause provides another cause for both cut-rate standards and psychological stress.

A patient entering a county hospital becomes eligible the first day for MAA, the Federal Government paying 50 percent, the county 50 percent.

If you enter a nursing home or any private institution where the State must assume 25 percent of the cost, eligibility occurs only after the expenditure of $3,000 or a 30-day wait, whichever comes first.

This means that the sick aged who are not sick enough to be in hospital but require some minimal medical care must either stay in the county hospital or go without the required care until they become eligible.

COSTS RISE

Even more conducive to unsatisfactory care for the sick aged is the fact that the rate fixed by the Department of Finance is totally unrelated to the cost of individual care, the range of services provided, and the quality of these services.

The construction standards of the public health code have driven the costs of building and operating a rest home sky high. New homes cost an average of $5,700 a bed to build, but the State department of finance froze the rate back in 1962.

This has put the operators of the "grandfather" homes, which do not have to meet the building standards, at a tremendous advantage. While the new homes struggle to break even if they adhere to the code, the old substandard operations flourish.

What has been the result of these legal discrepancies in terms of patient care?

Dr. Leon Lewis is former chairman of the advisory committee on the aged for the State social welfare department. He is one of the best-known specialists in rehabilitation in the United States and is a former professor at both Stanford and the University of California, in Berkeley.

He says: "I believe most of these homes are a medical curse rather than a benefit. Most people who go there deteriorate and quickly go to pot. It's true of all of them with only one or two exceptions."

North Hills Clergymen Pledge Work for Equal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a group of clergymen in my home city of Pittsburgh have issued a significant statement pledging their efforts for equal rights and opportunities for all persons.

I include, as part of my remarks, a report on this statement, published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, April 12, 1965:

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINE MINISTERS AND PRIESTS SIGN STATEMENT—NORTH HILLS CLERGYMEN PLEDGE WORK FOR EQUAL RIGHTS

A group of 139 Protestant and Catholic clergymen in North Hills have signed a statement urging equal rights and opportunities for all races, nationalities, and religions, and an end to racism.

"The House of God must be open to all peoples, and if we discriminate we deny the essential nature of the church as the fellowship in Christ," the statement said.

The statement, formulated by the North Hills Ministerial Association, was circulated through Allegheny County north of Pittsburgh and in a portion of Butler County. It was signed by 49 Roman Catholic priests and 90 Protestant clergymen, representing a total of 105 churches. The Protestant denominations are United Brethren, United Presbyterian, Protestant Episcopal, Christian, Baptist, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational.

The statement called for equal rights in voting, law enforcement, education, employment, housing, public accommodations, and cultural advantages. One portion of the statement called for freedom for all people to live where "their economic means and their personal wishes permit."

The statement called upon the churches to "cease from being followers and dare to lead."

The committee said the purpose of the staement is "to further create a climate in the North Hills suburban area where people of all races, creeds, and national origin might live together in harmony and peace.

The ministers represent congregations in Ross Township, McCandless Township, Bellevue, Etna, Millvale, Aspinwall, West View, Northside, Glenshaw, Wexford, Natrona Heights, Tarentum, Mars (Butler County), Sewickley, Allison Park, Creighton, Fox Chapel, Bakerstown, Gibsonia, Cheswick, Laurel Gardens, Zelienople (Butler County), Wildwood, Leetsdale, Gilenfield, Springdale, and Harwick.

The Reverend Robert Ruble, of Berkeley Hills Lutheran Church, Ross Township, was chairman of the Racial Statement Committee. Other members were the Reverend E. L. Parks Jr., Ingomar Community Methodist Church; the Reverend Carl M. Roemele, St. Alexis Roman Catholic Church, Wexford, McCandless Township; and the Reverend Wilson H. Yost, Parkwood United Presbyterian Church, Allison Park.

The action of the North Hills ministry followed by less than 3 months, action by 54 South Hills clergymen who signed a fair housing pledge. That statement called upon "all persons to help bring about fair and democratic practices in housing."

TEXT OF PLEDGE

Following is the pledge signed by the North Hills ministers:

"We the ministers and priests of the Christian churches of the North Hills area believe that the racial situation is one of our most serious domestic evils. All forms and types of racism must be eradicated with all diligence and speed. For this purpose we appeal to the consciences of the Christian people of the North Hills area.

"Our Lord Jesus Christ teaches that all men are brothers. His gospel makes no room for the arbitrary distinctions and expressions of racial or group prejudice.

"The House of God must be open to all peoples, and if we discriminate we deny the essential nature of the church as the fellowship in Christ."

DEMANDS FOR JUSTICE

"The minimum demands for justice in the social order include the recognition of equal rights and opportunities for all races, nationalities and religions in voting, law enforcement, education, employment, housing, public accommodations; cultural advantages. We of the church confess with deep penitence that our deeds have not always measured up to our creeds. We call upon all peoples and groups of our area to practice fair employment practices and policies, and to render services to the public without racial segregation or discrimination.

"We support all Government laws established for the maintenance of equal rights and we urge their enforcement. A society that denies all but the most menial of jobs to a significant number of its minority race members is wasting its most precious resource—its people."

PLEA TO CHRISTIANS

"We believe that Christians must insist that all people have the freedom to reside wherever their economic means and their personal wishes permit. Therefore, we urge all who buy and sell property as individuals or through brokers to do so without discrimination as the law requires. Our churches should call upon their members to help provide the atmosphere for people of all races, religions, and social levels to live together in peace and harmony.

"We recognize that in these days of tension we need a deeper spiritual undergirding for the tasks that are ahead. We therefore call upon our people to pray for the guid-

ance of the Holy Spirit as we seek in penitence to implement what we believe to be the will of God. We humbly call upon our people to join with us in prayer, to the end that we may be able to do the full will of God in all human relations. We call upon our people to work and pray for the rule of justice in which voting rights and equal protection of the law will everywhere be enjoyed; public facilities and private clubs serving a public purpose will be accessible to all; equal education and cultural opportunities, hiring, and promotion, medical, dental, and hospital care, open occupancy in housing will be available to all. To implement this goal let us give our support and cooperation to such worthwhile agencies as share similar aims.

"In making this appeal we affirm our common religious commitment to the essential dignity and quality of all men under God. We dedicate ourselves to work together to make this commitment a vital factor in our total life. We call upon all peoples to work, to pray, and to act courageously in the cause of human equality and dignity, while there is still time, that past injustices will not be used as excuses for new ones; to eliminate racism and social inequalities permanently and decisively; to seize the historic opportunity the Lord has given us for healing these age-old evils in the human family and to do this for the glory of God. Let the churches cease from being followers and dare to lead.

"Committee:

"Rev. ROBERT RUBLE,
"*Chairman.*
"Rev. ELMER PARKS,
"Rev. FATHER ROEMELE,
"Rev. WILSON YOST."

The following North Hills clergymen signed the statement concerning racial prejudice:

ROSS TOWNSHIP

J. F. Mawhinney, Mellwood United Presbyterian; William G. Lewis, Christ Protestant Episcopal; Arthur C. Boll, North Hills Christian; Roy G. Getty, Donald J. Sotak, Richard Granday, St. Sebastian (Catholic); Herbert Hall, North Hills Community Baptist; Robert Blair Ruble, Berkeley Hills Lutheran; T. F. Henninger, Robert J. Boyle, Bernard Hrico, St. Teresa (Catholic); G. F. Hinkle, McKnight Village Methodist; William M. Aber, Hiland Presbyterian; A. W. Stremel, Christ Lutheran; Clifford Wood, St. John's Lutheran.

M'CANDLESS TOWNSHIP

James F. Donald, Stephen L. Polley, Northmount U.P.; Luther Fackler, LaVern D. Rasmussen, St. John's Lutheran; Fred Park, E. L. Parks, Jr., Ingomar Community Methodist; R. S. Bolt, Heritage U.P.

BELLEVUE

Richard A. Madsen, Northminster U.P.; John H. Piper, Bellevue Methodist; P. T. Pullen, Ben Avon Methodist; Howard I. Cooper, Forest Avenue U.P.; William D. Bradley, Emmanuel Lutheran; James M. Barnett, Belvue Presbyterian; Vincent Kmiecinski, Peter Gross, oJhn P. Skaj, Sacred Heart (Catholic); Clement A. Roach, James D. Sullivan, St. Ann's (Catholic); David C. Casto, Epiphany Protestant Episcopal; Zygmunt V. Szarnicki, Thomas J. Hanlon, Michael P. Hinnebusch, Assumption (Catholic); William D. Wolfe, Trinity Lutheran; William Smith, Ben Avon Presbyterian.

ETNA

F. K. Morris, Emmanuel Lutheran; David Phillips, Calvert Memorial U.P.

MILLVALE

Charles T. Behl, Sebastian J. Schiffgens, St. Anthony's (Catholic); Robert Gumbert, Millvale Methodist; Earl H. Miller, St. John's Lutheran.

ASPINWALL

Paul S. Montgomery, Aspinwall United Presbyterian Church; Joseph A. Rossenbach, St. Mary's (Sharpsburg) (Catholic); Raymond A. McCalligan, St. Joseph (O'Hara Township) (Catholic); William D. Savage, St. Scholastica (Catholic); Earl W. Lighthall, Aspinwall Methodist; Dominic J. Olivera, Ernest C. Paone, Madonna of Jerusalem (Catholic).

WEST VIEW

E. Charles Patterson, Albert C. Koser, George Chortos, St. Athanasius (Catholic); Dwight G. Townsend, West View Methodist; V. B. Vandersall, West View Presbyterian; Robert Deal, West View U.P.; Charles W. Rampp, St. Luke's Lutheran; Robert J. Wennerstrom, Mount Calvary Lutheran.

NORTHSIDE

Philip A. Campbell, Edward A. Heinrich, John P. Maloney, Nativity (Catholic).

GLENSHAW

G. Mason Cochran, James Marshall, Thomas J. Mori, Glenshaw Presbyterian; John M. Leggett, Church of our Savior Episcopal; Floyd P. Duff, Bethel Lutheran; Willis Hacker, Glenshaw Valley Presbyterian; Stephen N. Schneider, Francis Z. Jurewicz, St. Mary's (Catholic); Ralph E. Roos, Francis A. Glenn, St. Bonaventure (Catholic); J. Robert Henderson, John A. Simpson, Elfinwild U.P.; Walter C. Koehler, Bethlehem Lutheran.

WEXFORD

Carl M. Roemele, Francis M. Rodgers, St. Alexis (McCandless Township) (Catholic); William Gleditsch, Pleasant Hill U.P.; Fred Cassell, Wexford Community U.P.; Charles S. Loney, Salem Methodist; Clarence B. Daniels, Trinity Lutheran.

NATRONA

Leo R. Burchianti, Joseph P. Sullivan, St. Josephs (Catholic); Phillip E. Wilson, Natrona Methodist.

NATRONA HEIGHTS

Theodore F. Moehring, Calvary Lutheran; Benjamin Nevin, First Baptist; Francis Tennies, A. M. Deemer, Natrona Heights Presbyterian; Robert M. Friday, Michael F. Carmody, Warren W. Metzler, Blessed Sacrament (Catholic).

TARENTUM

E. J. Siess, First Methodist; Francis J. Haas, Sacred Heart (Catholic); John H. Elkins, First Congregational; Robert E. Andreen, First Presbyterian; Joseph G. Malinak, St. Clement (Catholic).

MARS

Sidney S. Robinson, Jr., St. Christopher's Episcopal; Charles P. Schafer, St. Kilian (Catholic).

SEWICKLEY

Raymond A. Must, Paul J. Savage, St. James (Catholic); David E. Martin, Fairmount Presbyterian; Philip M. Hastings, Shield Presbyterian; Harry T. Hutchinson, Sewickley Presbyterian; Kenneth H. White, Sewickley U. P.; R. W. Cartwright, Little Hill Evangelical United Brethren; E. Earl Anderson, St. Paul's Lutheran.

ALLISON PARK

Joseph R. Grosko, Herman J. Heilman, St. Ursula (Catholic); Charles G. Skuce, Keith Brown, Memorial Park Community U.P.; R. G. Krouse, Epworth Methodist; Thomas L. Hayes, St. Thomas-in-the-Field (Episcopal); Wilson H. Yost, Parkwood United Community Presbyterian.

CREIGHTON

J. F. Regis, Ragan, Holy Family (Catholic); W. T. Hill, Vermont Baptist.

FOX CHAPEL

James Curtis Roof, Fox Chapel U. P.; W. L. Jones, Fox Chapel Methodist; Bickford Lang, Fox Chapel Presbyterian; Donald McGarrah, Pine Creek Presbyterian.

BAKERSTOWN

Richard A. Morledge, Judson Wiley III, Bakerstown Presbyterian; Ward Elliott, Bakerstown Methodist.

GIBSONIA

Marvin D. Ackerman, Trinity Lutheran; Kenneth L. Duncan, Gibsonia Presbyterian; Howard E. Pusey, Hampton U. P.

CHESWICK

Richard K. Kennedy, East Union U. P.; Donald Power, Resurrection Lutheran.

LAUREL GARDENS

Walter Wist, Faith Lutheran.

ZELIENOPLE

James C. Biller, St. Ferdinand (Cranberry Township) (Catholic).

WILDWOOD

Francis R. Stifter, St. Catherine (Catholic).

ASPINWALL

Charles E. Miller, Aspinwall United Lutheran.

PERRYOPOLIS

Logan L. Kuhns, St. Paul's Lutheran.

LEETSDALE

E. K. Rumberger, St. Matthews United Lutheran.

GLENFIELD

R. E. DeLong, Glenfield Methodist.

SPRINGDALE

D. C. Robbins, Springdale Methodist.

HARWICK

John J. Scanlon, Our Lady of Victory (Catholic).

The statement also was signed by William E. Hankey, president, and Howard F. Riesz, assistant to the president of the Western Pennsylvania-West Virginia Synod, Lutheran Church of America.

Additional Expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, President Johnson indicated that the Federal Government was drafting legislation to regulate the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. He also indicated that a congressional investigation of the Klan would be appropriate.

In my view, any investigation of the Klan should be carried out by the legislative committee of the Congress concerned with civil rights and Federal criminal legislation—in this case, the House Judiciary Committee—to determine what changes are needed in existing laws. Investigation for investigation's sake serves no useful purpose. In any case, no additional money is needed by the House Un-American Activities Committee should they wish to make an independent inquiry into the activities of the Klan.

Resolutions of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently I received from the secretary of the Senate of Pennsylvania and from the chief clerk of the house of representatives in Harrisburg copies of two resolutions which were introduced in those respective bodies.

These resolutions were of consequential interest to me, and I felt that they might be of interest to the other Members of this Congress as well.

They are as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

The closing of the Olmsted Air Force Base at Middletown, Pa., will add to the unemployed of central Pennsylvania about one-fourth of the total to be made unemployed by the recent order of Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, closing certain installations throughout the United States. About 12,000 families will be seriously affected by the order.

In addition to the economic suffering of the unemployed the Commonwealth and the political subdivisions of the area will be adversely affected by the resultant additions of poverty-stricken families to relief rolls, etc., and the economy of central Pennsylvania will grind to a low point in the years to come because of the loss of the annual $73 million payroll of the base.

National defense expenditures in Pennsylvania constitute only one-third of the amount spent in New York and only one-eighth of that spent in California. The phasing out of the Olmsted Base will lower the share of the Commonwealth to less than 3½ cents of each national defense dollar.

Olmsted Air Force Base is the only base operated by the Air Force in Pennsylvania. Its closing may result in inadequate protection for Pennsylvania and Northeastern United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara be urged to rescind the order directing the phasing out of the Olmsted Air Force Base at Middletown; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

Attest:

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

History, science, and the demonstrated individual worth of immigrants from all countries of the world establish that our immigration laws are obsolete. The discriminatory National Origins Act should be repealed and corrective legislation enacted by Congress. To exclude a skilled or gifted person because the country of his birth has a small quota is both undemocratic and wasteful.

This is a Nation of immigrants in which citizens of many cultures and ethnic origins live and work side by side to make the American ideal of equality for all men a reality.

Immigrants represent less than 0.25 percent of the total work force. Those entering the labor force have talents and skills which are in short supply in our economy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to repeal the National Origins Act and that it pass corrective immigration legislation to demonstrate to the world that we believe all men to be equal under law; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Members of Congress from Pennsylvania, and the chairman of the Committee on Immigration.

No Appeaser—Johnson's Record of Firmness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's brilliant and courageous speech at Johns Hopkins University has once more underlined our Nation's desire for a just and lasting peace in Vietnam, southeast Asia, and throughout the world. At the same time his proposal for "unconditional discussions" is based on a strong, determined military policy to resist aggression from the Hanoi Government and to carry out U.S. commitments to the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the noted columnist, Roscoe Drummond, has written of the effect of President Johnson's Johns Hopkins speech in an outstanding article in the Washington Post for April 12, 1965. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this most timely and informative article in the RECORD and commend it to our colleagues of the Congress.

The article follows:

NO APPEASER—JOHNSON'S RECORD OF FIRMNESS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It is reasonable that the Republican supporters of President Johnson's strong policy in Vietnam should show some worry that his proposal for "unconditional discussions" may lead into an appeasement trap.

This is a fair warning. It is an honest warning. There is such a potential danger.

But I see nothing in the President's talk-and-defend proposal which contains the merest flicker of appeasement. I see nothing in the mood or substance of his Johns Hopkins speech which suggests any naive softness in the administration's position.

If Mr. Johnson's willingness to talk rested on a record of weakness and indecision, it would be untenable and perilous.

Since it rests on a 2-month record of firmness and decisiveness in action, it is prudent and constructive.

It needs to be understood that while the President has put no conditions on our willingness to seek a settlement, there are conditions on the kind of settlement which we will accept.

The conditions to a settlement by negotiation are: (1) An end to Hanoi's aggression and (2) the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack.

"We will never be second in the search for such a peaceful settlement," Mr. Johnson declared.

That is wise—and it is sound as long as it rests on the commitment that the defense will continue and the military pressure mount until the aggression ends, talks or no talks.

It does rest on that commitment. And it rests on a sequence of military actions which demonstrates firmness of purpose which will mount as much and as long as necessary. This is why willingness to talk and defend simultaneously is safe.

It is winning for the United States just about the maximum world support for the military course we are having to pursue to defend South Vietnam and which inevitably scares the timid.

It is also winning for the United States a tremendous increase in support from neutral countries because the President has succeeded in putting the onus for not being willing to talk on the aggressors.

The Johns Hopkins speech could not have been safely delivered 2 months ago, even a month ago. Then it would have caused Hanoi to conclude that it was an act of softness and evidence that they had the United States licked. It would have caused Saigon to fear the worst, to suspect that we were courting an excuse to scuttle and run.

Mounting military pressure—with every evidence that it will continue as long as needed—and a proposal to talk are the ingredients of constructive diplomacy.

Some are suggesting that the offer of a substantial American investment in a collective U.N. aid program for the southeast Asian nations is an idle and foolish bid to buy peace. That misses the point entirely.

The prospect of outside help in development, after so much internal and international strife, means, for example, that South Vietnamese will not only be fighting for freedom but for progress toward a better life. It also means that, as long as the Hanoi-Communist aggression continues, it will be increasingly clear to others that Hanoi is fighting against both freedom and progress.

Maurice Perlin: The Strange Case of the Judge Who Decided To Lead Instead of Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of America's outstanding labor journalist, Mr. Victor Riesel, recently wrote an excellent column about one of Chicago's most highly respected labor leaders, Maurice Perlin, president of Local No. 1031, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

I am taking the privilege of placing Mr. Riesel's column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today so that those who are often too quick to criticize the American labor movement and its leaders can see what a high caliber of men labor's leadership includes in its ranks.

Mr. Perlin epitomizes the best in the American labor movement. I am proud that he is a Chicagoan.

Mr. Speaker, the article by Mr. Riesel is as follows:

STRANGE CASE OF JUDGE WHO DECIDED TO LEAD INSTEAD OF RULE

(By Victor Riesel)

CHICAGO.—If anyone is searching for the hero of a saga which could be titled the "Incorruptibles," the man can be found in this city of the untouchables.

Eight months ago this man, Maurice Perlin by name, was chief justice of the Illinois State Court of Claims. Today he is a labor leader. After almost 5 years on the bench he left voluntarily to become president of one of the Nation's biggest local unions.

Ministers and priests have led labor, as have lawyers and matinee idols—but never before anywhere in the world has a chief justice of an important court stepped down to become a union official.

Judge "Maury" Perlin did. Thus he is now among the handful of the new breed who will some day replace the elders, who wonder where they can find the men to meet the new unionism needed for the age of space and automation.

Now 51 years old, Perlin is president of the unique and huge 30,000-member local No. 1031, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Perlin gave up the security and peace of the bench for the turbulence of the labor front because he has a touch of the missionary in him. For years he had worked closely with his late predecessor Frank (Flo Ziegfeld) Darling as legal counsel and mentor of the thousands of men and women whose skills sped much of the electronic equipment to America's defense forces during the big war and the Korean conflict.

Because of the union's strategic position in the electrical field, and because it is the largest local in the Midwest, and because it could play a powerful role if ever captured by mobster or subversive forces, Darling and Perlin always were on the alert for intruders and infiltrators.

Of course, the Commun'sts attempted to move in. The party used its best operatives. They worked their way into membership. They would come to meetings and put on talkathons in an effort to weary the rank and file and to keep them away from future decisionmaking gatherings.

Darling and Perlin then hit on the strategem of extravaganzas. They put on big-time musical shows. They got Jimmy Durante and Ethel Merman to cavort and sing at the meetings. The union soon became as newsy in Variety as in the labor press.

The membership poured out to the meetings in such numbers that sessions had to be run over 2 and 3 nights. The Communists were beaten.

But the musicals still run on. Even today local No. 1031 is the only union which runs meetings on Saturday nights.

In a city where thugs machinegunned their way into unions and would collect bribes in open umbrellas, local No. 1031 remained clean and progressive—concerned over the prosperity of its members' employers as well as with its members' welfare.

When the union's 46,000 followers fell to 30,000, Darling and his lawyer, Perlin, fought the trend by battling for the inflow of Government orders and against the inflow of foreign competition from Japan and West Germany.

The moment came when Perlin moved into other fields—and in 1960 he was named chief justice of the Court of Claims.

Last August Frank Darling died in a Houston hospital, after serious surgery. The union executive board called an emergency meeting. They elected Judge Perlin president and then went to him with their offer.

The leadership of labor was a challenge. He resigned from the bench. On March 9, he stood for office in the general election and was overwhelmingly chosen.

Today Perlin is training his staff in the new unionism. He has called in Government experts to teach labor law, psychology, and the techniques of peaceful collective bargaining. He has called on the industry to take the lead in working with labor on special projects.

He has called on his own labor colleagues to study the results of the latest electronic research in universities as well as Federal and private space laboratories—so that the union can help the industry prosper and create more jobs.

"Research and development of new products can be pushed forward by our people," he has said. "This could mean new profit for management and new jobs for our members. It is the most effective method of preventing further loss of business to foreign competition. If we can't meet their abysmal wage rates and low-cost production we can beat them with better products and new ones. We can work together."

Obviously Judge Perlin has remained undiscovered too long.

Landmark in Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the 88th Congress was hailed as the education Congress but historians some years hence may be hard pressed to decide whether it was the 88th or the current 89th that should be called the education Congress. Approval of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 marked an historic turning point for American education. I call the attention of Members of the House to a recent editorial on this act in the Philadelphia Inquirer:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Apr. 12, 1965]

LANDMARK IN FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

President Johnson, alert to the historic importance of the occasion, made some history of his own when he signed the Federal school aid bill Sunday in the rural schoolhouse in Texas he attended as a boy. It was a fitting touch to a precedent-shattering chapter in the evolution of education in America.

The $1,300 million aid measure was approved 263 to 153 in the House of Representatives and 73 to 18 in the Senate—remarkable margins considering that every previous effort to pump Federal funds into the mainstream of public education at the elementary and secondary levels had failed on Capitol Hill.

Most of the money, more than a billion dollars of it, is to go to public school districts under a formula supposedly geared to the war on poverty. However, approximately 94 percent of the Nation's school districts, including many of the wealthiest, will share the loot. The amount of help to the really impoverished districts will be disappointingly meager in most cases.

Fortunately, the worst flaw in the original bill was corrected. As first written, the measure failed to include many families on relief in large cities of the North in computing the degree of poverty in a school district. All children from families on relief will be counted in the formula as finally enacted.

Other sections of the measure—providing aid, directly or indirectly, to nonpublic schools—are headed for certain challenges in the courts. The litigation may go a long way toward clarifying constitutional questions of church and state.

Pennsylvania stands to receive in excess of $60 million in all parts of the school aid package. Bear in mind, though, that the measure signed into law Sunday is only the authorization bill. School boards, eagerly calculating how much Federal funds they will get, are cautioned to remember that all figures are tentative until Congress actually appropriates the money.

Stanley I. Posner, a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 31, Mr. Stanley I. Posner, of Washington, D.C., was laid to rest by his wife, relatives, and friends. It was my privilege to have known Stanley for 15 of the 20 years I have been in Washington, D.C., and rarely have I met such a man. He was truly a philanthropist in every meaning of the word, for his first great concern was for his fellow man. From this concern stemmed the founding of the organization known as FULSA—Friends of United States of Latin America—which carried on relief work in Central America, concentrated in Costa Rica.

At his funeral service, eulogies were delivered by the Ambassador from Costa Rica to the United States, the Honorable Gonzalo J. Facio and Dr. Gerstenfeld, of the Washington Hebrew Congregation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include these two eulogies which bespeak of a truly great American, Stanley I. Posner:

EULOGY FOR STANLEY I. POSNER

(Remarks by Ambassador Gonzalo J. Facio at the funeral services for Mr. Posner, Washington Hebrew Congregation, Washington, D.C., March 31, 1965)

I speak on behalf of the Government of Costa Rica, and for the many who mourn Stanley Posner.

Stanley was my intimate friend for many years.

He was a devoted friend of my country. Today in Costa Rica and at our Embassy, by order of my Government, the national flag flies at half mast. For we join today with his beloved ones in sharing the grief for a great man whom we consider the dearest adoptive son of Costa Rica.

Of Stanley Posner it can be said truthfully that he gave of himself for his friends and for the causes to which he untiringly devoted his declining strength.

Though we associate the Alliance for Progress with the name of one of America's great Presidents, I would like to believe that Stanley Posner was its precursor. The society, which he established many years ago, known as Friends of the United States of Latin America, was the forerunner of many of the ideas that are now accepted throughout the hemisphere.

Rarely can it be said of another person what we now say of Stanley Posner: that his life was well spent, that his works were

fruitful, that his indomitable courage remains an inspiration to his friends.

My dear Lillian and children Elizabeth, Lawrence, and James and sister Minna and brother Harold and all who are tied to Stanley Posner with the bonds of the flesh or of the heart.

We have gathered around the earthly remains of your beloved to speak a word of homage and to find some vision of God's comfort.

In one of the psalms of sacred Scripture we read these noble lines: "Lord who shall sojourn in Thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell upon thy holy mountain? He that walketh uprightly and worketh righteousness and speaketh truth in his heart. * * * That hath no slander upon his tongue nor doeth evil to his fellow, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbor. He shall never be moved."

The ancient psalmist was trying to define the ideal man: He must be a man who not only knows the truth but speaketh it in the privacy of his heart, a man whose sense of truth arises out of the very core of his being, a man who not only never stoops to slander but walks uprightly and works righteousness, a man whose sense of the truth of the heart is ever dedicated to the righteous service of his fellow man. That kind of man may move around in the worldly path and be doing many a task of life but beyond the overt deed there is the abiding stability of the sacred. He dwells in a holy mountain of noble meditation. He sojourns in a tabernacle of the divine.

One always sensed that about our beloved Stanley. He did not stoop to slander because he was too busy facing the truth of the moral challenge of the world. His brilliant mind was to achieve the highest of academic honors but it was a mind that grappled with the legal framework of human labor and human barter and human relations that makes for a free society. From the time when he attended a meeting of the bar at Lima, Peru, and he became inspired with the vision for the American continent of a common citizenship and common market that would go beyond the unity of ancient imperialism, that would achieve the higher unity of a new age of freedom; ever since that time he gave himself to many an act of simple goodness, from the reaching out with his friends to scholarships for some who sought to see deeper into the community we can share; to using many a device to bring new medical supplies to the healing of the sick.

Here was the goodness of man in all its purity. Here was the noblest truth of man in all its integrity and charity. Here was the man who ever walked uprightly in the sacred task of working righteousness, as befits the vision of the ancient psalmist. Here was the worthy man who sojourned in the tabernacle of the divine. Here was the noble soul who dwelt upon a holy mountain.

Let us all meditate in gratitude to God for the years he has shared with us, whereby he brought the witness of his noble heart to lift up the vision and to deepen all that makes for our fulfillment. All of you will in the quiet of your own prayers feel the truth of what he has meant for you. I will ever remember him for the dedicated family he symbolized to a rabbi; for his radiant goodness; for his warm and kindly encouragement for all he shared in the walls of this temple; for the words of praise and the deep sincerity of his prayer that transforms the walls of this building into a true sanctuary of the living God. For all of these each of us will ever be grateful.

The leaves have their time to fall, the flowers their time to fade, the stars their time to set. The time has come for the soul of our beloved to set into the great beyond. Let us now say of him as said our fathers through the ages: Boruch Dayan Ha-emes: Blessed is the good God who sent this soul to live in our midst and now has taken him to his eternal nest. Zecher Tsadick Livrocho: The memory of the righteous is an eternal benediction. Amen.

Achievements Inventory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, it pleases me to have included in the RECORD the splendid article by Joseph V. Machugh that appeared in the March issue of Association Management. The article reflects a creative and imaginative approach to the solution of significant problems. I believe the concepts he expresses are sound, meaningful, and realistic with potentially far-reaching repercussions in both government and industry.

The article is as follows:

ACHIEVEMENTS INVENTORY

(NOTE.—During World War II, the chairman of a Federal agency was asked to appear before a congressional committee to report on the agency's activities and achievements. It was not to be a hostile inquiry, but rather a fact-finding session. The chairman, believing he had built a commendable record of accomplishments, directed his supervisory staff to submit statements of their respective contributions to the overall record. Most of the resulting statements indicated (1) the staff did not know precisely what they had done; or (2) they did not know how to express themselves clearly; or (3) they had not done anything at all. After much emergency work, the chairman finally compiled a record of his agency's activities and was prepared to go before the committee.

(Afterward, having learned a lesson from the last-minute effort, the chairman instructed his staff to begin keeping a continual record of achievements. From this emerged the concept of a "constant inventory of achievements." Joseph Machugh, author of this article, believes so strongly in the merit of the concept that for the past several years he has made it his personal campaign to urge its adoption among Members of Congress, Government officials, and business leaders. Because of the nature of the association executive's position, Mr. Machugh feels that the idea has particular value in the field of association management.)

(By Joseph V. Machugh)

"Resting on oars" while a race is in progress is a luxury none can afford in today's fast-moving and keenly competitive society. All too often we strive valiantly to attain some goal and, on reaching a plateau along the way, we pause to bask in the reflection of what has been done.

Knute Rockne's fighting Irish, once unbeaten for several successive seasons, faced a relatively weak team just prior to meeting their most formidable challenger. Rockne thought his presence was unnecessary that Saturday. Instead, he scouted the next opposition. The result was the upset of the season: Notre Dame was defeated by a mediocre team. Returning to South Bend, the players were fearful of what their famous coach would say. The wily Swede made no reference to their inglorious defeat as he pushed them through a week of hard practice but, when the players' suitcases—submitted for inspection before leaving for the big game—were returned, on the inside of each was taped a copy of a local editorial: "Overconfidence Caused It."

UNIVERSAL APPLICATION

That lesson has universal application. Expressed in other words: Half-way to objectives is no success at all. Continued effort is imperative if success is to be genuine and permanent.

How does one measure success? Perhaps a most convenient measure: by achievements. And what is an achievement? My definition: a significant job, well-done.

Achievement is a continuing process—like polishing brass aboard ship. If you have worthwhile goals, and you move toward those goals, that effort constitutes major achievement. Goals, plus planning for their attainment, are part and parcel of your job as an association chief. Yet, what is the use of eminently desirable goals and superb planning if those objectives are neither reached nor substantially approached?

It might be wise for every association executive to consider building what I characterize an "achievements inventory" and tell that achievements story to his membership—constantly. Association executives should be able at all times to enumerate, clearly and succinctly, their own achievements. This is self-evident. Yet, in practice how many—without advance warning—could answer satisfactorily this question: Since assuming your present post, what have been your 10 most outstanding achievements?

If an achievements inventory is deemed desirable, there are two best times to initiate it: first, the day after you begin as chief executive, and second, now.

WHO SHOULD BUILD THE INVENTORY?

Lack of objectivity is the most likely handicap for the achiever who would tell his own story. There is inherent difficulty in self-appraisal; even mirrors do not reproduce accurately. They reflect persons or objects in reverse instead of as they are. So, ideally, compilation and narration of an achievements inventory is a dual task, calling for cooperation and teamwork by those who do and those who tell about it. If best results are to ensue, the achiever achieves and the narrator compiles and narrates—imaginatively. Direction of inventory-building logically falls squarely on the shoulders of the narrator, under usual circumstances.

Neither task exceeds the other in importance. One complements the other, although of course, doing must precede recounting.

LOCATION OF ACHIEVEMENTS PROJECT

This writer is convinced that the only location for the compiler/narrator of an achievements inventory is in the office of the achiever, reporting directly to him. In an association, this would be, of course, to its chief executive. If there are constructive achievements, they are his accomplishments. If a bad record exists, blame will be his. In most associations, there must necessarily be delegation of authority to subordinates; but the chief executive must inevitably accept final responsibility for success or failure.

HYPOTHESIS

Assume this hypothetical situation: an association executive is engrossed in a vast maze of emergency and routine activities, in the midst of which budget limitations require the dismissal of a longtime aid who has not carried his weight. The disgruntled aid is aware of a vulnerable spot in the association's public image and tips off the trade press, leading, at the most inopportune moment, to a smear charge that dam-

ages both the association and its chief executive. Answers to that charge may take weeks to prepare. We all know that answers to charges often appear on back pages to be read by few, while the original charge received wide circulation. The result is severe damage all around.

PURPOSE SERVED BY AN ACHIEVEMENTS INVENTORY

A fully operative and continuing achievements inventory would serve these purposes:

1. It would enable an association chief to answer promptly and adequately any inquiry, friendly or hostile, into significant aspects of association activity emanating from official, public, or private sources. This includes answering charges promptly in the next issue of the press, before hostile sentiment can crystallize.

2. Such self-examination and soul searching would enable association errors to be found and corrected quietly without undue publicity or recrimination.

3. Even if no major error were disclosed, economy and efficiency of association activities would improve, outweighing the relatively modest expense of inventory building and maintenance.

4. It would provide ready, abundant, and valuable source material for policy statements and speeches by the association chief or by members who need reliable, factual information around which to construct their speeches.

5. It would establish a more satisfactory relationship with the association membership, generating enthusiastic support and greater willingness to pay regular dues.

HOW TO DO IT

The mechanics of inventory building fall logically into two separate but related parts: (1) short range and (2) long range. The objective of the first is to ascertain as quickly as possible 20 or 25 outstanding achievements and to organize an account of them simply, briefly, clearly, and convincingly. The longer project would involve a similar compilation, along with a study of the functions, structure, purposes, problems, and future needs of the association.

The initial period might best be spent examining association charts, major breakdowns of functions and responsibilities, annual and other significant reports and in personal discussions with the more active staff subordinates. Only with the help of such persons could the compiler secure the information needed for the inventory. Without staff cooperation, efforts to build an effective achievements story are doomed to failure.

During both projects, care should be taken to analyze the nature and substance of every activity submitted for consideration as a major achievement. Is it an achievement? Why? Is it significant? Why? Where does it belong in order of significance? Why? Where is the documentation and proof of its significance? Is it challenge proof?

A vast part of most associations' activity is aimed at developing or maintaining a good public image. An achievements inventory aims straight at that same target. The whole concept is designed to improve the association's overall effectiveness, no matter how well the job has been done in the past. And remember, execution is the end product and by far the most important aspect of the inventorying process.

One warning: Do not search too assiduously for accomplishments where they don't exist or where their merit is slight. Get only the wheat and ignore the chaff.

A wise course to pursue is to conduct a pilot experiment to determine if a more lasting project should be adopted.

Almost any association, regardless of size, might find value in the general idea embodied in an achievements inventory project. Such an inventory might help you do a better job as an association executive, as well as provide that inner satisfaction stemming from recognition of having made an enduring contribution to the success of your association.

In summary, an achievements inventory is a means of maintaining a record of accomplishments. It is useful to both the association and its chief executive. The latter should always give credit to the association. For, if he is responsible for those results, his membership will know it (if he's kept them informed)—and modesty will strengthen his standing among members.

Yet, like that brass-polishing job aboard ship, the tasks of an association chief are endless, and there will always be still more to do tomorrow. Nonetheless, continual effort is the secret of lasting success, and it is measured in achievement.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. January 28, 1965.

To Whom It May Concern:

Joe Machugh's "Achievements Inventory" deserves thoughtful consideration by the management community. It is the product of a lifetime of energetic pursuit of a goal—devising a system of orderly tabulation of man's achievements as a means of realizing man's fullest potential.

Joe Machugh has devoted the best years of his life to perfecting the "Inventory of Achievements," and it behooves all of us to spend sufficient time to realize its value to the business world.

Sincerely,

BOB WILSON,
Member of Congress.

Mr. JOSEPH V. MACHUGH,
Achievements Inventory,
Key to Success,
Washington, D.C.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1965.

JOSEPH V. MACHUGH, Esq.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: For several years I have had keen interest in the concept of an "achievements inventory" which you have urged constantly be adopted and implemented in both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

I am delighted to record my commendation of your most recent adaptation of the foregoing concept in "Achievements—Key to Continuity of Success."

It is my reasoned conviction that the principles and underlying thoughts of your achievements approach would be invaluable for every Member of the Congress and executive in the Federal departments and agencies who desire to leave a lasting record of their official activities. I am also confident the concept has comparable application in every area of private industry activities.

The best of good wishes to you in this unremitting effort truly in the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. BRYAN DORN,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1695.

JOSEPH V. MACHUGH, Esq.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: For several years I have been familiar with your "achievements inventory" concept. I know that you have discussed this matter at length with innumerable Members of the Congress and at Cabinet level as well.

Your current article, "Achievements—Key to Continuity of Success" reflects a creative and imaginative approach to the solution of significant problems, I believe your basic concepts are sound, meaningful, and realistic, with potentially far-reaching repercussions in governmental activities and in privte industry. They are essential to orderly conduct of business which requires careful thought about details and the long-range record of what has been accomplished.

I feel confident that implementation of the achievements concept in either or both of the above areas of activity will blend into modern, managerial concepts—leading to most effective contributions to the success of any organization, executive or legislative, whether on the National, State, or local scene.

With every good wish.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Member of Congress.

Presidential Inability and Vacancies in the Office of the Vice President

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my voice in support of House Joint Resolution 1. In my opinion, this proposal is the soundest means for providing for the orderly and democratic succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency of the United States in case of the death or disability of the President of the United States.

Further, this proposal would define within the framework of the Constitution, the powers and the duties of the Vice President upon the death or disability of a President. I also feel that this proposal adequately safeguards the return of the powers and duties of the Presidency to the President who has seen in his wisdom to relinquish these powers and duties due to a disability.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I feel that this proposal would maintain the fine and traditional concept of our American system of government by providing for the recommendation of the Vice President by the President, and the approval of both Houses of the Congress if a vacancy were to occur in the Vice-Presidency.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Senate met at 9 a.m. and, pursuant to order previously entered, immediately adjourned (without transaction of any business) until noon Wednesday, April 21.

Page 7939

Nominations: On April 14, pursuant to previous authorization, Senate received nominations of Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., USN (retired), of California, to be Director, and Richard Helms, of D.C., to be Deputy Director, both CIA.

Page 7934

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: Five public bills, H.R. 7549–7553; three private bills, H.R. 7554–7556; and two resolutions, H. Res. 344 and 345, were introduced.

Pages 7937–7938

Bill Reported: One report was filed as follows: S. 701, to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962 (H. Rept. 252).

Page 7938

Speaker Pro Tempore: Heard the reading of a communication from the Speaker designating Representative Boggs to act as Speaker pro tempore on April 19.

Page 7936

Condolence Resolution: Adopted H. Res. 344, providing for expressions of sympathy and condolences on the death of Senator Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina. Representatives McMillan, Rivers of South Carolina, Dorn, Ashmore, and Gettys were subsequently appointed by the Speaker pro tempore to serve on the funeral committee.

Page 7937

Program for Thursday: As a further mark of respect to the memory of Senator Johnston the House adjourned at 12:05 p.m. until Thursday, April 22, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

Appendix

Control Data Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the computer industry of the United States is one of the most vital and fastest growing industries we have. The needs of present and future America are greatly tied in with this growth.

We also require a tremendous growth in educational opportunity in this country to meet the needs of our young people and the needs of a more technicalized era.

When these two needs—a growing and healthy computer industry and more trained technicians—are joined together it is a boon for educational opportunity.

Control Data Corp., headquartered in Bloomington, Minn., in the Third Congressional District, is about to embark on this vital educational venture through the establishment of the Control Data Institute. Mr. Speaker, this to me is an excellent example of industry not only seeking growth but also providing another channel of education for our young people.

At this point I insert in the RECORD a statement from Mr. William C. Norris, the president of Control Data, announcing this institute:

CONTROL DATA CORP. NEWS RELEASE

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—William C. Norris, president of Control Data Corp., today announced the establishment of a computer training school known as Control Data Institute. He said that the institute will be an integral part of Control Data Corp. and will operate on a tuition basis. Site of the institute in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area will be announced in the near future.

The purpose of the Control Data Institute will be to train high school graduates to qualify for positions as electronic technicians in the computer industry. The institute will provide training in computer technology, and students will use control data computers in their course work.

Elaborating on the need for establishing Control Data Institute, Norris said that "the computer industry is the greatest growth industry yet, as nowhere in industrial history can one find a comparable one if a composite of size, rate of growth, and ultimate potential is considered. At the present time, the needs and projected new applications for computers make it impossible to predict a plateau for it, so employment in the industry will continue to grow for many years." Norris cited Control Data—today a worldwide enterprise with over 9,000 employees—as an example of such growth.

By way of illustrating Control Data's continued efforts to obtain talented people, Norris referred to the company's intensive recruiting program carried out on the campuses of the Nation's colleges and universities. He also cited the hundreds of courses taught by Control Data each year to keep its employees abreast of the latest developments in the computer industry. "In many cases," he said, "these courses for our employees are taught by key Control Data engineers, whose experience and creative imagination are today responsible for many advances in computer technology." Many of the engineers who design and build Control Data computers will also conduct classes in the institute.

Named to the post as director of Control Data Institute is Swen A. Larsen. Having long experience in the computer industry and in the education profession, Larsen was formerly president of the Institute of Computer Technology.

Larsen said that Control Data Institute will maintain a high quality of instruction in computer technology. He added that students of the institute will work with Control Data's computer systems and will use the latest instrumentation equipment in laboratory work. In addition, students will receive instruction in writing computer programs that tell the computer what to do.

Larsen pointed out that the course work will prepare graduates for positions as engineering-electronic technicians. Typical of these positions in the computer industry are: customer engineering technician, unit and system checkout technician, design and development technician, quality assurance technician, sales support technician, computer operator, and junior programer.

Larsen said that many part-time jobs in Control Data's Twin Cities operations will be made available to students who, upon making application, can qualify. He said these part-time jobs will enable qualified students to defray some of their expenses, and to work in an atmosphere and on the type of equipment which they will encounter after graduation.

Upon completion of the course work, graduates of Control Data Institute will exercise complete freedom to seek employment wherever they choose. However, Larsen indicated that Control Data would offer employment opportunities in the United States and overseas for many of the graduates.

Classes of Control Data Institute will begin in September 1965, with the length of the course being approximately 1 year in duration. Present plans call for other beginning classes to follow at 60- to 90-day intervals.

Admiral Raborn Member of South's Hall of Fame for the Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, each year the magazine Dixie Business, which is published by Hubert F. Lee, in Decatur, Ga., selects an outstanding American for the South's "Hall of Fame for the Living." It is of timely interest that in 1963 the magazine selected for this honor Adm. William F. Raborn, U.S. Navy, retired, who recently was named Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I ask unanimous consent that the announcement of this award, as printed in Dixie Business, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH'S HALL OF FAME FOR THE LIVING

(By Hubert F. Lee)

For distinguished service to the Nation and to the South, the editors of Dixie Business have named Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., USN, retired, to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living.

William Raborn is responsible, with his special Manhattan-type task force within the Navy, of 45 officers and 75 civilians that we have a Polaris missile.

Another member of the South's "Hall of Fame" honor group, Dr. James Killian, Jr., in 1955 headed a committee of scientists whose report to the National Security Council led to the Polaris project being undertaken.

Rear Adm. E. M. Eller, U.S. Navy, retired, in letter dated August 30, 1961:

"I notice with interest your Hall of Fame for the Living. If the ballot can be extended, I recommend you add Admiral Raborn, father of the Polaris ballistic missile submarine: one of the greatest steps forward in the security in history."

Adm. David L. McDonald, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, in reply to letter re Admiral Raborn:

"There is no doubt that Admiral Raborn is a great American—one whose contributions to this country and to the preservation of its security will long be remembered.

"I am sure Admiral Raborn would be honored by his addition to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living honor group.

"I certainly would be proud to recommend him for any honor which citizens of our great country might desire to pay him."

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri (first Secretary of the Air Force and himself one of the leaders considered for the A Great American Award):

"There never was a better American or a more able one than Vice Admiral Raborn."

Dan Haughton, president, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif. (born in Alabama and on the South's Hall of Fame honor group):

"I was glad to see Admiral Raborn added to the 'Hall of Fame for the Living' and added to the list of nominees for 'Man of the South.' He is a wonderful person and his Navy career was certainly one of dedication and service to our country.

"Representative CARL VINSON is an outstanding choice as 'A Great American' for 1964. His lifetime of service to his State and country makes us all proud we are Americans. Mr. Baruch is a great American in any year also."

Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, Republican, a master mason and ruling elder of the First Presbyterian Church of Marshfield, as well as a Purple Heart hero of World War II on June 27, 1961, told the House:

"Men like Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh Burke, and Chief of the Polaris project, Rear Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., faced and accomplished the possible in a little time and took a bit longer on the impossible. These men had the courage to make deci-

sions, to eliminate bureaucracy, to build a superior armed services—research—private enterprise team, and to keep in mind the big picture, the whole package."

Although Washington bureaucrats would have hired a big staff for 6 months to write job descriptions for a still bigger basic staff, Admiral Raborn was no such bureaucrat. Within 10 days after his arrival as head of special projects, he had twisted Parkinson's law into reverse, hired his basic staff of 50 people, and was slicing leadtime in two. His men did not dillydally with long unnecessary redtape memorandums for the office down the street, but instead they "hot handed" their question in person to the person who could give them a prompt satisfactory nswer.

"Red" Raborn built teamwork within his steering task group:

Lockheed solved the problem of shutting off thrust at the right moment so that the missile would hit the target.

General Electric produced the remarkable fire control and guidance system.

Aerojet-General Corp. tested large quantities of solid fuel which did have adequate thrust.

Westinghouse helped in solving the launching problem.

Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics, and other companies, busily constructed the submarine.

Sperry Gyroscope Co. took MIT research and put together a navigational system containing more than 1 million parts.

No wonder Admiral Raborn wrote this for the guidance of many working under him:

"I must be able to reach down to any level of special projects activity and find a plan and a performance report that logically and clearly can be related to the total job we have to do."

WORKING IN CLOSE TEAM HARMONY

In his reply, when informed of his selection, Admiral Raborn gave credit to his team of workers:

AEROJET-GENERAL CORP.
El Monte, Calif., October 15, 1963.

DEAR HUBERT: I was utterly flabbergasted at the high honor. Actually, I am quite humble * * * unexpected award.

It is not necessary for me to mention to you, I am sure, that no one does anything by themselves and I am mindful at this time of the tremendous number of men and women who have contributed so much to our country's well-being working in close team harmony.

In this connection I am pleased to see the name of Mr. Daniel J. Haughton, president of Lockheed Aircraft Corp. on this honored list. His contribution to our country is unexcelled in modern-day times.

Again, all good wishes and sincere appreciation.

Sincerely,

R. M. RABORN.

Lost Art of Hawaiian Tapamaking Rediscovered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, like so many arts that have been lost in the onrush of civilization, the making of tapa cloth from the bark of wauke plants was all but forgotten.

However, through the perseverance and patience of Mrs. Malia Solomon, who devoted countless hours to research and experimentation, this great Hawaiian art has been rediscovered. The people of Hawaii and of the Nation and the entire human race can be thankful for having in their midst such inventive individuals as Mrs. Solomon.

The inspiring story of this ingenious person is told in an article appearing in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of April 7, 1965, which article I now insert in the RECORD by unanimous consent:

AFTER 5 YEARS OF INTENSIVE RESEARCH: ISLAND WOMAN "TAPS" LONG-LOST ART OF TAPAMAKING

The old Hawaiian tapa makers' secret felting process, extinct for nearly half a century, has been tapped.

The victorious detective, Malia Solomon of Ulu Mau Village, gets the credit and the spoils.

Malia's spoils don't look like much. A skimpy, scroungy, colorless piece of barkcloth.

Her potential second and third feats look like even less two soppy balls bundled in banana leaves and fermenting in foul-smelling sea water contained in a tin can to keep the mice away.

Every morning she tenderly unwraps each ball's leaves to see if either one is ready for final beating on a basalt stone.

"Last week the second ball seemed ready," she said, "so I beat it half out. But it didn't feel like the first one. The seams wouldn't flatten. I had to put it back in to soak.

"The ball has to have enough adhesion," she said. "That's what makes Hawaiian tapa superior to other Polynesian tapas that you see in all the local souvenir shops. Theirs are just pasted together into big pieces instead of felted."

Though the results need refining, they represent success that Malia dreamed about during 5 years of intensive research.

Besides exuberance, the half-Hawaiian malia displays yards and yards of intricately patterned museum pieces of tapa, which made the worthiness of her quest to recreate her ancestors' art seem obvious.

"I'm so proud of the ingenuity of those old natives," she beamed.

And just as proudly Malia shares their secret process.

Her source, she said, was a manuscript written by Samuel M. Kamekau in early missionary days and retranslated recently by a linguist and scholar named Dorothy B. Barrere. She found the early description, which had been unsuccessfully translated before, in the Bishop Museum archives.

She said she also found about a half dozen other translations, including one 273-page book entitled "Ka Hana Kapa" (Kapa was the old Hawaiian word for tapa).

"It's too bad that none of these methods worked," she said. "I tried every one."

Kamekau said to first strip the inner bark of the young wauke, Hawaii's paper mulberry plant, and soak it in sea water.

"I found that the word 'young' was very important," Malia said. "The bark gets brittle and difficult to strip with age."

The soaking period was not specified by Kamekau, so Malia tried 6 days with her first tapa project.

Kamekau's next direction was to scrape the bark clean, but he did not specify how. Malia said turtle shells worked well for her.

She continued following the manuscript and placed her clean bark on basalt stone to "beat it to smithereens." Then she squeezed the bedraggled bark into the ball stage to await final beating.

"To make tapa, you need a love of work and great patience," Malia recalls an old Hawaiian gentleman saying when she asked him if he remembered how a couple of years ago.

She said the reason why no one bothered to try recreating the art during the past half century "was probably that it was so laborious. I guess they figured who wants to make tapa, when you can buy synthetic fabrics in the store."

Tapa was used by the old Hawaiians, Malia said, "for fabric, candlewicks, sandals, blankets, just about everything.

"Now anybody lucky enough to have a piece would probably use it mostly for ceremony."

Tapa can be sewed on a machine or washed, she said. But prescribed washing should be in running stream water rather than an automatic washer, she prudently added.

What will Malia do with the tapa made at Ulu Mau Village?

She won't manufacture it, she said. "Who would want to, I ask you?

"I'm going to make it for appreciation," she said, "as soon as I can get more wauke."

When tapa making became extinct, in Hawaii she explained, so did cultivated wauke.

Malia's own wauke patch of over 100 plants at the village was started with transplants she made after a field trip through the Polynesian islands in 1961. She brought her original slips back from Western Samoa.

"My babies are very prolific now," she said. "But I'm stifled by nature."

It takes 18 to 24 months for wauke to mature, and Malia's next plants will not be ready for stripping until a year from now, she said.

Malia is impatient to rediscover the art's finer aspects. So her immediate research project becomes finding out where all the wauke has gone—long time passing.

The Medicare Bill—Statement by Edward P. Morgan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. MONDALE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a distinguished member of the fourth estate for whom I personally hold a high degree of respect, Edward P. Morgan, recently discussed on one of his nightly broadcasts the House-passed medicare bill. Mr. Morgan's incisive and informative commentary is timely and, therefore, deserving of careful study by Members of the Senate and the public.

Mr. Morgan's basic point is that the philosophy underlying this proposed legislation is one of the most reasonable expressions of pluralistic progress ever written into American law. Under this legislation, Government and business will be engaged in an undertaking which will substantially eliminate one of the costliest drains on family income—medical care for the elderly. Of even greater importance in the long run, however, is the fact that in so doing, Government and business will be engaged in a cooperative venture providing greater protection for the nonelderly, financed through private insurance agencies now able to offer better policies at reduced rates, because the great risk involved in insuring the aged has been eliminated.

I commend this statement to the attention of my distinguished colleagues, and request unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEDICARE BILL

It may not be exactly what the doctor ordered, but the medicare bill now at long last plowing majestically through Congress is a far more progressive and meaningful measure than anybody would have thought possible a couple of years ago. Major credit for its improvement goes to a native of Kensett, Ark., who, until very recently, was accused by some proponents of blocking the legislation—Chairman WILBUR MILLS, of the House Ways and Means Committee.

What the wily MILLS did was to hold out for a separate, identifiable fund that could be financed under social security without weakening the fiscal integrity of that 30-year-old system. Then he borrowed a Republican proposal for coverage of doctor bills and came up with a broader, stronger bill. A widely accepted master of the mystery of insurance tables, MILLS is confident the measure is sound, particularly because its rates were deliberately set high to protect the elderly against rising hospital costs. Indeed, he says the hospital insurance may be overfinanced, but if so, it will be revised downward later.

If the measure goes into effect as now written, on July 1, 1966, some 19 million Americans then 65 or over could immediately qualify for hospital benefits. Roughly 80 percent of their physicians' and surgeons' fees would also be covered if they subscribed to a voluntary program not included in the original bill. They would pay $3 a month for this insurance, the Government's share of which would come out of the Treasury's general fund. Hospital insurance for the elderly will be financed by compulsory increases in the payments by employer and employee into social security.

This $6-billion package represents, as one reporter put it, the biggest bundle of social security benefits ever devised but the philosophy behind it may be more important than its size. Opponents, with the AMA, the American Medical Association, in the forefront, argue this is creeping socialism but one thoughtful, influential member of the Ways and Means Committee, Democrat AL ULLMAN, of Oregon, maintains the bill is the best guarantee against socialized medicine ever developed. His reasoning runs roughly as follows: Medical care for old people is one of the biggest drags on the American family budget. Private companies have not been able to provide adequate coverage at premiums within reach for the risks involved. But with that drag now largely lifted by medicare, the insurance industry will be able more adequately to expand group and other protection plans for the nonelderly, thus easing the pressure for more Federal legislation. As one social security expert puts it hopefully, this is the uniquely American pluralistic approach of Government and business moving in to solve a problem.

If this theory works in practice, and its potential seems plausible, one of its beneficial side effects could be to reorient the pathetic and muddled thinking of the AMA, which is already in dutch with many of the doctors for whom it pretends to speak. Recently no less a distinguished figure than Walter F. Perkins, past chairman of the Johns Hopkins Hospital board in Baltimore accused the AMA of wild talk and "distortions of the truth" in opposing medicare. Last month the Congressman who sponsored AMA's own so-called eldercare bill, Democrat A. S. HERLONG, Jr., of Florida, publicly accused the association of a misleading advertising campaign to push the measure. In what might be called ingrown cross-fertilization, the AMA among other things, managed, directly and/or indirectly, to plant "canned" editorials with an AMA slant in a number of newspapers across the country and then cited these, in effect, as spontaneous proof of wide "grassroots support" of the AMA stand.

In the March 22 issue of the fortnightly publication Medical Economics, Dr. Walter E. O'Donnell, of Gloucester, Mass., writes that the AMA is "given to bizarre public spasms of self-righteousness accompanied by pronouncements that consign to perdition all those who oppose." Now, Dr. O'Donnell notes, "the 200,000 members of the AMA will have to live with a far-reaching (medicare) program that their association played little or no role in shaping." He does not, however, single out the AMA as the scapegoat but asks, rather, "where are the medical moderates?" The real culprits, he adds, "are those physicians, like me, who have regarded the perennial contest of Big Government versus Big Medicine as a spectator sport."

It seems that moderates in medicine, like moderates in civil rights and other fields, have failed to be militant enough on behalf of reasonableness. Medicare, as it stands, is not an unreasonable bill. In an area of desperate need it can be one of the social boons of the century. But it is far from perfect. Its imperfections can be remedied by approaches of reason and good will, if the AMA and other groups and individuals involved will stride along with the times instead of being possessed of the creeps about socialism.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying goodnight from Washington.

United States To Hold Rein on Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have seriously considered the influence which the Federal Government is going to exercise over State and local governments in the administration of the many welfare programs passed in this session of Congress.

I have found no better explanation of this concern than the article written by Richard Wilson and appearing in the Evening Star of Monday, April 19, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 19, 1965]

UNITED STATES TO HOLD REIN ON PROJECTS

(By Richard Wilson)

Nothing in this law, says the education enactment, shall be taken to mean that public support is being given to the teaching of religion or to teaching methods or curriculums in other fields.

No funds are to be expended under the hospital care program for paying ordinary doctor bills. No programs are to be developed under the antipoverty program without local cooperation. In the area and urban development programs a benevolent local-Federal partnership shall prevail.

The Johnson legislation and programs are filled with disclaimers, exceptions, and "caveats" unnumbered and all designed to quiet apprehension that a new breed of Federal administrators will swarm over the Nation setting standards and preempting local and State functions.

But they are coming by the thousands, the voting registrars, the education specialists, the poverty fighters, the urban experts and city planners, the beautifiers, the hospital administrators, the housing experts, the welfare specialists.

It will be a Great Society, a Great Society of new administrators, advisers and specialists probing into local and State practices, customs and institutions, setting standards, demanding conformity to Federal plans, stemming or releasing the new flood of cash that soon will be flowing out of Washington.

President Johnson has forecast a new era of local and Federal cooperation. He never misses an opportunity to tell new Government appointees that they are the people's servants and not their masters.

But discretion beyond measuring is being lodged in the hands of Washington administrators in the housing, education, welfare, and urban development fields to determine the nature and extent of local and State compliance with Federal standards.

Local officials are becoming eager and greedy. Mayors Wagner of New York City and Daley of Chicago moved fast to grasp control of the antipoverty programs in their respective cities. They recognized its patronage potential, and, with the sure instincts of big city politicians reared in the Tammany and Kelly-Nash tradition, took over programs to help the poor before somebody else got control of them.

Local officials who are mounting the tiger now with such eagerness will have to think later how to dismount. When they begin to think about it they know they will never dismount, that the degree and extent of Washington's intervention in local affairs will continue to expand and, in the end, the local officials will be inside the tiger.

This is a new chapter in an old story. The book had been closed and locked for a long time on social reform and national development directed from Washington but now it is open again. Once the book had been unlocked by President Johnson, Congress flung it open to gobble up as fast as possible the chapters that had lain unread since the New Deal.

The strangest part is that Johnson has been a restraining influence on a congressional majority which wished to move at a faster and wilder pace than he.

Restraint may also be his chief problem with the new crop of Federal administrators and enforcers lest they become a swarm of locusts upon the land.

As the new Federal squadrons form, perhaps they should be briefed on some events of the past: Harry L. Hopkins' use of the WPA for political purposes in Roosevelt's day, the scandals of the Truman administration, the Goldfine-Adams sensation, the Billie Sol Estes and Bobby Baker cases, the internal revenue scandals and other events which show the fallibility of small men handling great power.

In the end, much of the success and acceptance of the new programs will depend on the integrity and judgment of those who carry them out.

Teaneck Friendship Day II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on Sunday, April 25, the community of Teaneck,

N.J., will hold "Teaneck Friendship Day II." This interfaith home-visitation program brings neighbors of different races together for an afternoon or evening of conversation. The first visitation day was held last November.

Many of our problems in civil rights and human relations can be solved when we realize that those of other races are simply people, who share our own hopes, frustrations, and everyday problems. By bringing neighbors together informally, Teaneck Friendship Day is opening new avenues of communication, resulting in a new awareness of common interests and new aproaches to common problems.

I commend the committee of clergy and laymen and the residents who have made this program work in Teaneck. Father Henry Goodwin, pastor of St. Anastasia's Roman Catholic Church, and Frank E. Hall are cochairmen of the committee, and John Dunican is the coordinator.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a thoughtful editorial by Bill Caldwell, published in the Record, of Bergen County, and an article written by Fanny S. Mach, and published in the Teaneck Sunday Sun, describing the warm success of the first Teaneck Friendship Day.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bergen County (N.J.) Record, Nov. 31, 1964]

TURNING POINT: FRIENDSHIP DAY I

As long as we think of people as a problem, it can be laid down in the form of an iron rule that the problem will be unsolved and insoluble. The Negro problem can't be solved—not in that form, the form of a faceless abstraction walking around in a suit of clothes. Nor can the Russian problem or the Vietnamese problem or the problem of migrant workers—to declare it a problem is a way of holding it at arm's length.

As some 600 good neighbors will be demonstrating tomorrow in Teaneck's first observance of what will be an annual Friendship Day, when a problem is translated into people it's no problem at all. Some 200 white families will go visiting some 100 Negro families. The auspices are impressive. The committee sponsoring the visits is supported by 14 churches in the community. The families that go calling in the afternoon will meet at 2 p.m. in St. Anastasia's Roman Catholic Church. Those choosing the evening for their call will meet at 7:30 p.m. in the Jewish Community Center. Mayor Feldman has assisted in the planning. Clergymen of the faiths participating will take part in the modest orientation meetings preceding the visits.

One impressive aspect of the Friendship Day proceedings is even now of record, in such statement of support as comes from the Reverend Aloysius J. Welsh, archdiocesan coordinator of interracial justice programs, Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Newark:

"The heart of the question is moral and religious. The denial of fair housing, of equal employment opportunity in hiring or promotion, of the same quality of education because of race or color, is sinful. Millions of Americans know far more about foreign problems than they know about Negro conditions in their own country. I see in Teaneck Friendship Day a well planned effort to bridge the isolation of man from man because of race. * * * The open doors of the Negro home should find a response in the open hearts and open minds not only of those participating but of all of us. God bless the planners and participants."

"One of the great needs of our time is that of establishing communication across racial and ethnic lines," said the resident Methodist bishop of New Jersey, Prince A. Taylor, Jr., "and I feel that this is an excellent place to begin." The Reverend Henry D. Goodwin, O. Carm., pastor, of St. Anastasia's, observed correctly that when the scope of opportunity to know each other is narrowed so is the scope of concept and understanding and belief. The Teaneck program is an extension of last April's series of Home Visit Days in dozens of towns across the country. Ridgewood had a warm and fruitful series of visits a month or so ago. One of these days we shall perhaps come to comprehend with wonder and relief that in our town, any town, we have no problems—only people, only us.

[From the Teaneck (N.J.) Sun]

SUN SIDELIGHTS

(By Fanny S. Mach)

Teaneck had one of its shining days Sunday. The days have not been consistently bright for our town lately, and this was a welcome change. It was a day on which to be in the fullest sense neighbors.

They called it Friendship Day, and the clergy of all faiths united in this effort to "build bridges of understanding." Our Negro neighbors threw wide their doors to welcome their white neighbors, and hundreds of our residents sat together, talked—and listened. The good old-fashioned custom of the Sunday visit never was so well experienced by both guests and hosts.

The day was one of those late Indian summer days, bright and crisp. It suited the purpose and mood of Friendship Day perfectly. Heaps of red and orange leaves were piled on the streets. Chrysanthemums perked up many a flower bed, with their brilliant hues sharp against the background of evergreens. And, from all reports, there was much warmth exchanged by the people of good will who played both roles, hosts and guests.

It was a gay crowd that gathered in the cafeteria of St. Anastasia School in the afternoon to be given their hosts' names and addresses. So many of the faces were familiar. So many of the people who lend leadership to our community were taking part in this friendly new experience. Many had brought their children, all the way from one who was carried by a fond mamma to teenagers. Teaneck's AFS visitor from India was there with her Teaneck "parents" and "sister."

The crowd that gathered that night at the Jewish Community Center was smaller, but the smiles were just as warm, and the anticipation as high. Here and there we heard comments from some who had paid calls in the afternoon—all enthusiastic.

Mayor Matthew Feldman, who had visited one home that afternoon with his wife, described it as "one of the most exhilarating experiences I have had since I came to Teaneck.

"Our experience was a very pleasant one. We visited Mr. and Mrs. Jack Wright of Irvington Road, in their tastefully decorated home, and became so engrossed in our conversation that before we knew it it was past 6, and according to the original plan the visits were to last from 2 to 4. Friends of the Wrights dropped in—they seem to be the sort of people whose friends frequently drop in—and the talk continued apace.

"We felt privileged to meet such interesting neighbors, with whom we found so much in common. We hope to see them soon in our home, to return a truly enjoyable visit.

"Many others share our enthusiasm. All around us, we have heard talk of reciprocal visits, of invitations already extended. The ice has been broken. Let us continue."

How the Legislature Succeeded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas Legislature has completed its work for this session and through harmonious and coordinated efforts a progressive record has been written. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include below an editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Eagle which lauds the impressive record of the legislature, the legislative leadership in the Kansas House and Senate, and the direction and leadership of the Governor.

I want to call attention to the legislative accomplishments of the Kansas Legislature for two reasons.

First, many of my colleagues are well acquainted with the Governor of Kansas, William H. Avery, who served with distinction in this House for 10 years. Second, I believe the Kansas Legislature continues to demonstrate the importance of a State facing up to its traditional responsibilities.

The Kansas Legislature this year has written a significant record in the field of education and it has met its responsibility of congressional reapportionment with fairness. In addition, it demonstrated courage and fiscal responsibility by providing for the financing of new and expanded programs.

Mr. Speaker, there are too many local and State governments over the Nation which wait for the Federal Government to solve their problems for them. They might take a lesson from my State of Kansas, and ease the burden on the Nation's taxpayers.

The editorial follows:

HOW THE LEGISLATURE SUCCEEDED

The progressive record of the 1965 legislature is a tribute to leadership. Without strong guidance and occasional pressure, both from the Governor and from legislative leaders, much of the most creditable of this session's legislation could not have been accomplished.

The legislative leadership in both houses was new, as was about a third of the membership. In the house, Speaker Clyde Hill, Republican, Yates Center, exerted a firmness and control that has not been equaled for some years. He listened willingly to proponents of all points of view, and the unaccustomed attention he gave to Democratic members was especially noticeable. But there never was any question of who was in charge. With the able assistance of the majority leader, Bill Fribley, Republican, Crestline, and some other veterans, Hill ordered the business of the house and kept it moving.

In the senate the change was of another kind. It is no reflection upon the acknowledged leadership ability of former Senator Paul Wunsch to say that as president pro tem he exercised absolute control. In this session, with the combined leadership of Senator Glee Smith, Republican, Larned, as president pro tem, and Senator Frank Hodge, Republican, Hutchinson, as majority floor leader, there was a new atmosphere of thought and ferment which undoubtedly accounts in large part for the willingness to

consider, and even to act upon, controversial and forward-looking bills.

Probably most important of all was the strong direction that came from the Governor's office. For the first time in the memory of many legislators the Governor not only proposed legislation, but he actively fought for it.

Governor Avery presented an ambitious program—one to which he had largely committed himself during the 1964 campaign. But he would have achieved little of it without the second step—he showed the legislature how it could be financed. And by accepting this responsibility for increased taxes instead of passing the buck to the legislators as so many previous Governors have done, Avery won their respect and gained many successes.

In addition he chose two experienced and knowledgeable men to serve as his liaison with the legislature—Odd Williams and Laurin Jones. Thus the Governor was aware at all times when one of his programs was in trouble, and he knew where the trouble lay. He spent many hours discussing differences with individual legislators, and he argued forcefully and well for the things he wanted. The result was that he got most of them.

Since education played so large a part in this session, much credit also must be given to the efforts and ability of the two men who headed the education committees—Senator Joe Harder, Republican, Moundridge, and Representative John Bower, Republican, McLouth. Both worked long and hard and were unyielding in their determination to insure legislation that would accomplish an improved system of schooling in Kansas on all levels.

Even the voters deserve some credit. For this legislature has an unusual number of able and responsible members, both new and old, and without them, of course, the best leadership in the world could have accomplished nothing.

The United Nations and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The U.N. and Vietnam," published in the New York Times of April 4, 1965.

I shall not comment on it because it is an eloquent expression of approval of the speeches made by the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.N. AND VIETNAM

The administrative's attitude toward United Nations action on Vietnam seems ambivalent, to say the least. A few days ago Assistant Secretary Harlan Cleveland spoke favorably of United Nations aid in opening Vietnam negotiations and in policing an ultimate settlement. The next day the State Department took pains once again to deny that it was encouraging Secretary General Thant to play any role.

Washington's strange course not only makes it difficult for the United Nations to help, but downgrades the world organization. It compounds the damage the State Department inflicted on the U.N. last winter by its tactics on the Soviet debt issue. Those tactics—as Senator AIKEN, dean of Senate Republicans, pointed out a few days ago—have weakened the United Nations just when its help is badly needed in southeast Asia.

"International events of recent weeks," the Vermont Senator said, "seem to have overwhelmed the capacity of this Government for affirmative action, except in the military field." His trenchant comments on the U.N.'s peacekeeping role—and on Washington's efforts to force Moscow and Paris to pay for operations of which they disapproved—received the immediate endorsement of Majority Leader MANSFIELD. They deserve serious attention.

The American attempt to force the Russians to pay up or lose their General Assembly vote under article 19 of the U.N. Charter "collapsed like a punctured balloon," Senator AIKEN said—and not simply because a majority of the member nations were reluctant to go along. The main reason, in his judgment, was that the United States, after taking a tough line, "backed away" from a winning vote. It did so not only for fear of a Soviet withdrawal, but because such a vote would have set a precedent contrary to American national interests.

"The United States now recognizes," Mr. AIKEN said, "that if it were in the position of the Russians or the French, it would probably react in the same way * * * (the United States) is unwilling and unable to force the United Nations to abide by article 19 * * * (because it) is not willing to have article 19 applied to itself when its vital interests are involved."

What both Senators AIKEN and MANSFIELD were getting at was the explosion of new nations that has more than doubled U.N. membership to a present 114. A decisive two-thirds vote in the Assembly could now be made up of countries which possess only 10 percent of the U.N.'s population and pay less than 5 percent of its budget. As a result the United States shares the Soviet desire to increase the role of the Security Council, where the major nations possess a veto.

The real issue behind the financing of peacekeeping operations, as Senator AIKEN points out, "involves the readjustment of power and influence between the greater powers and the lesser nations rather than a struggle between the Soviet bloc and the West."

There is a problem of U.N. solvency—$110 million is needed to save the world organization from bankruptcy. And there is a need to work out new methods of authorizing and financing future peacekeeping operations. There is also a need for a Soviet financial contribution, which Moscow has acknowledged. But there is no need to force the U.S.S.R. to comply with article 19 by paying the exact sum Washington says—and Moscow denies—it owes.

As Senator AIKEN observed, President Johnson now "has a magnificent opportunity to put the United States back into the lead in international diplomacy by putting the United Nations back into business." And his first move should be to "instruct his representative to the United Nations to reconcile our position with the Soviet and French position on the assessment of members for peacekeeping functions—a view which may shock some, but a position which would definitely be in our own national interest * * *. Article 19 is dead as a doornail anyway."

It is essential to move now not only in the long-term interests of the United Nations but precisely because a vigorous U.N. could play a vital role in extricating the United States and the two Vietnams from their present tragic predicament.

School Aid Bill Can Be Most Meaningful of Any

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of our Nation's truly great newspapers, the Nashville Tennessean, has carried an editorial which describes the impact that the recently enacted Elementary and Secondary Education Act will have on my home State of Tennessee and the Nation. The President and the Congress are to be commended for the reasons so well described in this excellent editorial.

The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Apr. 11, 1965]

SCHOOL AID BILL CAN BE MOST MEANINGFUL OF ANY

Congress has now passed and sent to the President a $1.3 billion blueprint for aiding the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. It was a major victory for President Johnson, and it could well be the most meaningful legislative action of this session.

Both Tennessee Senators ALBERT GORE and ROSS BASS voted for the legislation. Senator BASS was presiding officer for part of the session which produced approval of the measure.

In the House, Representatives MURRAY, BROCK, DUNCAN, and QUILLEN voted "no."

The measure passed is not perfect, and there are several areas in which refinements could doubtless be made. Neither is it a landmark in terms of policy, since the Federal Government has been aiding education since the Land Grant College Act. It is a milestone, however, since a general bill of this kind has been the subject of congressional wrangling for some 20 years.

The two major obstacles to previous legislation have been constitutional questions about providing aid to parochial schools and the issue of racial segregation in public schools. The latter issue has become all but moot. In this case the religious issue has been skirted by providing aid only through public channels. Parochial pupils may benefit by attending some classes in public institutions on a "shared time" basis and from use of school libraries, and teaching aids. But the books and aids remain public property.

The main emphasis of the school aid program is on helping students in economically burdened areas. One billion sixty million dollars will go to help school districts with projects to better educate children of poor families; $100 million will be used to ease the widespread need for more and better school libraries. Another $100 million will be earmarked to set up educational centers to provide specialized programs that individual schools cannot afford.

It is estimated that more than 90 percent of the Nation's 26,000 school districts would receive funds. Tennessee's share of this might well amount to $30 to $35 million.

The bill contains provisions throughout requiring States to submit their plans for using the new aid, but forbidding Federal officials from attempting to dictate local school policy. It also bars use of any funds for supporting religious instruction or worship.

The greatness of any nation must rest in large part on the education of its youth. Now, in the swift pace of technological

change, this Nation cannot afford to neglect any of its children in whose hands the future must be shaped.

There was a time in the development of this Nation when brawn could find its own place in the scheme of things. That day is passing. Now it is imperative that the new generation be given full opportunity to develop its skills, talents, and creativity that will not be just desirable, but mandatory in the years ahead.

President Johnson has every basis for being pleased at passage of the bill which can be a broad step toward the victory of enlightenment over darkness.

Address by Vice President Humphrey at the Azalea Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, one of the most spectacular festivals annually celebrated on the east coast is the International Azalea Festival, at Norfolk, Va. Norfolk, now the largest city in the Old Dominion, and one of its most progressive, has developed an Azalea Park which rivals, if it does not excel, the famed Azalea Gardens of the historic city of Charleston. Thousands of tourists are attracted to Norfolk at this season of the year, to witness that inspiring spectacle of the rebirth of nature; and added interest will be given to this festival this year through the participation of our distinguished Vice President, Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address which Vice President HUMPHREY delivered at the Azalea Festival luncheon today, in Norfolk.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AZALEA FESTIVAL

(Address by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, International Azalea Festival luncheon, Norfolk, Va., Apr. 22, 1965)

My friends, it is my honor to be invited to address this International Azalea Festival luncheon. For this great festival celebrates not only the well-being and prosperity of Virginians and Americans, but celebrates also this country's commitment to interdependence among nations.

Today I would like primarily to discuss with you our well-being at home—and then to place that domestic well-being in the context of the role we Americans play in the world.

Today, our democratic society faces great challenges. We are being challenged both at home and abroad by great political, economic, and social forces.

Will we be able to meet these challenges:

Can democratic government provide for the general welfare:

Is freedom incompatible with responsibility?

Is democracy as a system able to provide rapid and just progress for the hungry and disaffected on our planet?

Must the fulfillment of the individual be subordinate to the welfare of the whole?

We will meet these challenges if we preserve, direct, and utilize all this country's vast human resources. We will meet these challenges if we realize the full potentialities of this country and each of its citizens.

This administration and this Congress, acting out the will of the American people, are providing to the world our answers to these challenges.

We are building a solid, lasting base for American health and growth.

Health and growth built on a strong and flourishing economy—and we have just celebrated our 50th consecutive month of uninterrupted prosperity, I might add.

Health and growth which can give us the means to provide a social system with justice at its heart.

Health and growth to provide sustained American leadership in the world.

President Johnson told this Congress, on the first day of its session, that: "Our Nation was created to help strike away the chains of ignorance and misery and tyranny wherever they keep man less than God means him to be."

We are not afraid to say it: We will work until every citizen of America has equal opportunity to make a better life for himself and his children. Only when this equality of opportunity is achieved can we truly find the freedom we seek.

Today in this country we are making great strides toward achieving that goal.

There are two basic forces at the heart of our progress:

First, the vigorous leadership of Lyndon Johnson.

Second, the unprecedented peacetime unity of our Nation which now exists.

There is another word for this unity. It is consensus.

Consensus is voluntary agreement based on constructive dialog, mutual respect, and understanding. In consensus, we Americans are breaking through.

United we stand. And united we gain.

We gain together as a great national consensus says all Americans shall have equal voting rights. And that consensus today is truly national, not regional.

We gain as our Nation agrees that all Americans shall have an education which can give them the opportunity to live themselves.

We gain in agreement that all Americans shall have adequate medical care;

That we should make our cities better places in which to live and work in safety and health;

That we should preserve this Nation's beauty, history, and natural resources;

That we should give the aging hope for life and work;

That we should open our doors again to immigrants who can enrich and lend new vitality to our national life;

That we should help our urban and rural Americans alike adjust to technological revolution and social change;

That we should not drop the torch of international leadership;

That we should make whatever investment is necessary to realize our American dream.

That investment will be great. But it will be less than the cost of illiteracy—of school dropouts—of poverty—of discrimination—of disillusion and bitterness—of isolation in the world. Far less.

For example: We spend $450 per year per child in our public schools, but we spend $1,800 a year to keep a delinquent in a detention home, $2,500 a year for a family on relief and $3,500 a year for an inmate in a State prison.

We must make the investment necessary so that all in our society may be productive. Poor and uneducated people are poor consumers. They are a drain on our economy. They are wasted resources.

With continuing support of the American people, we will continue now and in the years to come to make the basic investments necessary to answer "yes" to our future.

We will continue to forge a strong economy, unmarked by recessions. We will continue to search for and develop tools to overcome the so-called business cycle.

We will continue to explore outer space and inner mind in development of knowledge for use by all the world.

And we will continue to defend and preserve the precious peace with strength and perseverance.

We will maintain our strong and active faith in the ability of freemen—developed to their fullest—to build a better life for themselves and for others.

Now, before closing, would like to direct a few personal words to you about America and its role in the world.

For a long time we Americans have stood for the belief that the world need not destroy itself by war, and that we Americans can help others, too, find a better society.

We hear many voices these days saying that America is overextended in the world—that other people's problems needn't be our problems—that we ought to close up shop overseas and enjoy our blessings here in the good old United States of America.

My friends, when that time comes, this Nation is doomed. Who in the world will work for democracy if we do not? Who in the world can preserve the peace if we do not? Who in the world can set the example, can offer the needed hand, if we do not?

We live in a time when everything is complex, when there are no more rapid or easy answers. We live in a time when we must retain our patience as never before.

Have we the patience, for instance, to work and bleed 5,000 miles from home for months and years ahead—without any guarantee of final success? I can tell you that the forces of totalitarianism have that patience.

This is what the Great Society is all about. It is the recognition that vacations abroad, fur coats, and electric toothbrushes are not enough. It is the recognition that we stand for something not seen before in the world.

We stand for the dignity and fulfillment of individual man and woman.

We stand for the chance for each man to make something better of himself.

We stand for free speech and government of the people.

We stand for peace without conquest.

We stand for the belief that others in less fortunate places should have opportunity for the blessings of abundance and should be free of tyranny. We stand for the pledges made by men and women who left the old ways and fought a living out of the soil of a new continent.

As President Johnson expressed it in his historical speech at Johns Hopkins University:

"We will not be defeated.

"We will not grow tired.

"We will not withdraw."

We will stand, at home and abroad, for the pledges made and efforts expended by Americans who came before. We must love freedom and justice enough to practice them.

America is still the last, best hope on earth.

A New Offer on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the now famous speech by President Johnson

stating that we remain ready for "unconditional discussions" on the Vietnam situation was criticized by the Communist powers and by a few Americans prior to the time that it became apparent that it placed the United States on the diplomatic offensive; but, I have not seen many, in depth, interpretations of the situation by those who approved which weighed the various factors involved as well as did an editorial in the Des Moines Register on Friday, April 9, 1965. So that those who receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will have an opportunity to read it, I am inserting it in the RECORD. It is as follows:

A NEW OFFER ON VIETNAM

In one heartfelt outpouring Wednesday night, President Johnson put together the two contrasting sides of U.S. policy in the Vietnam war. One is the determination not to accept defeat, open or disguised, and the other is willingness to make peace, today or 10 years from now, on generous terms.

The President himself called his speech a review of a position stated "over and over again 50 times and more—to friend and foe alike." Yet in impact and emphasis, and in certain details, it was new.

New was the little phrase in connection with possible peace talks: "We remain ready—with this purpose—for unconditional discussions."

Previous statements usually have given the impression that the United States had a condition—that it was not willing to start discussions until North Vietnam had given some sign it was stopping its help to the Vietcong fighters in South Vietnam.

The U.S. "purpose" in any such discussions is "an independent South Vietnam"—not the reunited Vietnam called for in the 1954 Geneva agreements. The President defined this independent South Vietnam as one "securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others—free from outside interference—tied to no alliance—a military base for no other country." This would mean an ultimate end to U.S. intervention no less than North Vietnamese.

Another new detail in President Johnson's talk Wednesday was the way he spelled out his hopes for peaceful cooperation in economic development for the whole of southeast Asia. He referred directly to the U.N. preliminary work already going on and said the first step would be for the southeast Asian countries to get together on a plan. He hoped Secretary General U Thant would work with them to initiate the plan.

New also was the figure of $1 billion which he said he would ask Congress to put up as the "American investment in this effort when it is underway."

Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam have been working on the preliminaries of just such a plan for 7 years now, in spite of civil wars, diplomatic breaks, coups, and foreign interventions, under United Nations auspices. North Vietnam could be brought in to the benefit of all. It would be the logical place to use some of the power generated by a dam in Laos.

Late in March, when President Johnson first held out the olive branch of cooperative peaceful development as an alternative to war and mutual destruction in Vietnam, the proposal had the weakness of seeming a thing of words, without any U.S. planning to make it a reality.

On April 7, the President remedied this weakness by announcing that Eugene Black, former president of the World Bank, will head a team to get the U.S. part of the job started—not even waiting for peace. Black is a superb choice, a man of demonstrated ability in this very difficult field of developing the underdeveloped. His appointment is a convincing sign to other countries that the offer of economic aid is not mere propaganda.

President Johnson is sensitive to world opinion, to U.S. opinion. He knows how much alarm and disapproval has been stirred up by his bombing raids into North Vietnam. He remains convinced that the raids are a necessary part of keeping South Vietnam from collapsing.

But he understands also that war is hell—for the long-suffering Vietnamese people, the brave Vietcong fighters as well as the U.S.-backed South Vietnamese. Since February, North Vietnam, too, is suffering direct hits as well as the drain of blood and treasure from intervention in the South.

Neither side can win the way things are going. Both can win, if President Johnson's olive branch is grasped.

Proposed Reduction in Funds for Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently I received a thoughtful and thought-provoking letter from the President of the Minnesota Farmers Union, Edwin M. Christianson.

Mr. Christianson's remarks pointedly and powerfully define the irrational and unfounded basis upon which the proposed reduction in funds for the Soil Conservation Service and the agricultural cost-sharing program is predicated. Furthermore, Mr. Christianson's remarks eloquently dramatize the stake which each American has in the encouragement of sound conservation practices.

Of particular salience, I think, is Mr. Christianson's recommendation that the President direct the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare and publish annually a "soil fertility balance sheet."

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Christianson's letter be printed in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA FARMERS UNION,
St. Paul, Minn., March 30, 1965.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The national inventory of soil conservation needs which was made public this week by the Department of Agriculture presents some very impelling reasons why the ACP and SCS funds should not be reduced, but why they ought to be increased.

The proposed budget reduction of $100 million for ACP would be false economy considering the vast amount of work needed. Similarly, the proposal to charge farmers for $20 million of the cost of SCS technical services would certainly hinder the program.

Without question, in the light of the low income prevailing on many farms, the need to absorb more of the cost of soil conserving projects would cause many farmers to delay work which is needed in the public interest. If the cuts are made, reliable estimates are that ACP and other farm conservation project starts may drop by as much as 50 percent.

Much of the work done under ACP and SCS does not result in immediate cash benefits to the owner of the land. It is done to retain and improve the land capability for the future. Therefore, the public has a stake in assuring that conservation measures be undertaken by individual farmers and they ought to provide a substantial incentive for doing so.

The soil and water conservation inventory shows that nearly two-thirds of the rural land, near to 900 million acres, is in immediate need of conservation treatment. In this USDA study, you will find a projection of the trend of cropland into nonfarm uses, which will, by 1975, amount to 2½ million acres in the Lake States and 20 million acres nationally. This will throw an additional burden on the remaining crop acreage.

The soil and water conservation inventory is a study of major importance in putting our conservation needs in perspective. In our opinion, however, it is not enough for such a study to be made and published once in every 5 or 10 years. We believe that the time has come for Congress to direct and authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to calculate and publish annually a national "soil fertility balance sheet" so that the people of the Nation will have the opportunity to know what progress is being made.

Soil and water conservation is vital to all of us.

Sincerely,

EDWIN CHRISTIANSON,
President.

The Republicans React in a Very Curious Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's recent Baltimore speech on Vietnam held out the promise of economic assistance to southeast Asia as a means of settling that area's problems. There has been criticisms from responsible quarters and spokesmen of this possible approach.

In an editorial published Friday, April 9, 1965, the Nashville Tennessean raises a very basic question which those who find fault with the President's offer of economic assistance as an alternative to war must answer: Are we to put a greater value on American dollars than we do on American lives?

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the editorial from the Nashville Tennessean at this point:

THE REPUBLICANS REACT IN A VERY CURIOUS WAY

Some of the Republican reaction to President Johnson's speech has been, to say the least, disappointing.

Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN said the President "offers a billion-dollar lure as a step toward peace in Vietnam." And he asked, "Do we actually buy peace with an American aid program?"

Aside from Mr. DIRKSEN's rather loose interpretation of the Johnson speech, can it be that the Republican Senate leader is putting a greater value on American dollars than he puts on American lives?

This Nation now is and has been expending its treasure and its blood in supporting South Vietnam. If that war should suddenly escalate into a major clash of land armies and the intervention of Red Chinese forces into Vietnam, Senator DIRKSEN can be assured that a billion dollars will be a small part of the eventual cost and that America will weep over the totals of dead.

It takes a very casual interpretation of Mr. Johnson's speech to come up with the idea that it was somehow a plea which was suing for peace, or an offer to buy peace from Hanoi at the price of a billion dollars. And it is even a stranger interpretation that glosses over the words of the President and finds a no-win policy or a trumpet sounding retreat.

For the President said: "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of meaningless agreement. We will use our power with restraint, and with all the wisdom we can command. But we will use it."

If Senator DIRKSEN hears this as an uncertain trumpet, he is tone deaf.

If it has suddenly become a sign of weakness to urge warlike leaders to beat their swords into plowshares; if the olive branch has all at once become a symbol of retreat, then this Nation and all humanity are riding the tumbrel cart downhill.

President Johnson said to all southeast Asia that there is another road to the future besides that of destruction, of bombs and bullets and blood. But Senators DIRKSEN and TOWER and Representative GERALD FORD leave the impression they would rather achieve peace the hard and bloody way.

Therein is illustrated the difference between the statesmanship of peace and the politics of opposition.

Castro's Real Coup in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, a very perceptive and enlightening article on the methods Castro employed to entrench and solidify communism in Cuba is contained in the April 1965 issue of Report magazine. The article, "Castro's Real Coup in Cuba," was written by Alberto Martinez Piedra, a neighbor and friend. Mr. Piedra was formerly a professor of economics in Havana and currently teaches at Catholic University in Washington, D.C. Knowing that the analysis contained in this article would be of interest to my colleagues, I include it under unanimous consent at this point in the RECORD.

The article referred to follows:

CASTRO'S REAL COUP IN CUBA

(By Alberto Martinez Piedra)

When Fidel Castro came to power in January 1959, everybody thought his long struggle for victory had been achieved. Castro himself knew differently. For himself, and for the few others who knew he was a Communist, it was just the beginning.

Communism did not come to power when Castro emerged from the hills and seized the rule from Batista. It came to power afterward and right before everyone's eyes. The amazing story of Castro's real takeover is one of deception, division, and destruction played out in the midst of the Cubans themselves, and all too often with anti-Communists as the unwitting allies of Castro's clever game. It is a tactic which continues today in Castro's relations with the rest of the hemisphere.

According to classical Communist doctrine, a country goes over to socialism because of the inherent injustices of a capitalist society. Exploitation leads to class war; capitalism destroys itself; finally the people triumph.

In the same way that the Red Army disproved this theory in the Communist takeovers in East Europe after World War II, Castro himself demonstrated that communism triumphs because a few men who know how to play with power can deceive the people.

For over a year after gaining power the bearded hero of the hills talked about liberation, progress, truth, social justice, defense of democracy, religious freedom and the right to vote. For more than a year this rhetoric camouflaged his real objective and was made to serve his real aims: to destroy all existing values and institutions in order to achieve absolute control and build a new order, Communist style. Castro's greatest coup was not against the Batista regime; it was against the Cuban people themselves after Batista had fled.

What was the strategy? Deception coupled with the old maxim divide and conquer. Time and again, Castro would find some issue whereby he could divide various elements in the press, in industry, among business men, the church, landowners or the educational establishment, and then rally some to his side in order to undo the others in a process of undoing all.

In 1959, for instance, Castro brought a Spanish priest from Paraguay and put him on radio and TV to denounce the Franco regime in violent language. The Spanish Ambassador protested. But Castro was after bigger game. When representatives of many of the religious orders protested—some precisely on the grounds that a cleric should not mix in politics—Castro quickly labeled them opponents of his regime and subservient to a foreign Facist power.

The bait had been taken and the campaign of villification was one which ended in the expulsion of all Spanish priests and nuns. Castro knew that the church was his ultimate enemy: this was only the first of his many moves which has left only 120 priests on the island to take care of nearly 7 million inhabitants.

The same tactic was used to get rid of the newspaper El Mundo, owned by an Italian. The press was particularly vulnerable to this strategy that relied on the selfish idea that another man's troubles are not my troubles—and sometimes can even be to my profit.

Castro could not afford to have any group united against him and least of all in the press. When Batista's army was disbanded Castro had a force of only 1,500 men. Boy scouts were being used to direct traffic. Castro himself had to go on TV day in and day out, sometimes for hours at a time. But until he was strong enough he needed a deceived press to give him its support.

An exile, formerly connected with Bohemia magazine, says that Castro used to visit the magazine's offices three times a week, but the visits declined as the strength of the army increased. Castro knew how to play favorites so that as he moved against one publication after another, those that remained would always feel "safe."

But getting rid of the "bourgeois" press was always a piecemeal process, never a massive blow that would show his hand. And when the attack came it was rarely from Castro himself. Union toughs would smash the machinery of an afternoon paper over some minor grievance. The morning paper would find its position improved. When a foreign-owned paper would be accused of being anti-Cuban, the others would congratulate themselves on their illusory safety as nationals.

Castro's second thrust against the church was once again not on any religious issue; that would have rallied opposition. Distinguishing between good Christians and bad ones, he would praise the Sisters of Charity as good religious women following the true calling of Christ. They devoted their lives to healing the sick and helping the poor.

But by appearing religious himself in this way, he subtly advanced a purely social interpretation of religion and thus opened his attack on the Jesuits, the Augustinians, and others involved in the education of the "upper classes."

His target was the vital field of education and particularly the University of Santo Tomás de Villanueva. With Law 11, passed in January, 1959, Castro voided all degrees and credits of Villanueva granted since the University of Havana had shut down in 1956. The charge was that Villanueva had not supported Havana University's protest against Batista by closing its doors too.

With rumors that the administration of the university had considered declaring its grounds and buildings American property, Castro had new ammunition. With a charge of "anti-Cuban" in hand, he went on to develop antagonism between clergy and laity over the question of Villanueva, duping many into supporting the regime's attack on the main nonstate university and the Augustinians who ran it.

The closing of the university in 1961 constitutes one of the saddest episodes in the early days of Castroism. Those who had criticized the Augustinians soon found that they were following their brothers into exile, and the church's activity in higher education was stamped out.

Lay organizations were prey to manipulation by the regime in order to weaken the church. The JUC (Juventud Universitaria Catolica), for example, with prompting from the government, denied that there were any Communists in the University of Havana, actually a Communist stronghold. Their ill-considered statement only added to the confusion already felt by many Cubans.

Distinctions and divisions between "conservative" and "liberal" Catholics were pressed for all they were worth. "Progressives" were opposed to "reactionaries" and "antirevolutionaries." Those who supported the aims of the revolution were said to be in line with the true teachings of the Gospel.

Magazines like La Quincena were applauded, while any that criticized Government measures were denounced as counterrevolutionary. The distinction was only transitory, the purpose being to confuse and to divide the faithful into antagonistic groups.

All the while the regime pretended to be on the side of religion. But strange devotions were fostered in a Machiavellian manner to further confuse and mislead. The veneration of the spurious San Lazaro was encouraged and the road to his shrine was modernized, above all because he was a poor man in the Gospel parable who lived to see the condemnation of the heartless rich man. Propaganda, not religion, was the aim; but the religious spirit of the people could be used—and twisted in the process.

The final stroke was to try to create a Cuban National Church, independent from Rome and "faithful to the true teachings of Christ," which, according to the revolutionary government, the priests and religious

had forgotten to practice. The government got a few of the clergy to attend the conference for this purpose, but made the mistake of inviting Bishop Boza Masvidal, the new auxiliary bishop of Havana, a native. The bishop torpedoed the plan and so kept almost all of Cuba's priests loyal, an action that took him a step closer to exile.

Castro worked to create the same kind of divisions throughout the entire society. Since there was no "class war" in Cuba, he had to create it. Early in 1959 he passed two laws that completely disrupted real estate business and which were calculated to set the masses against the "easy living," "nonproductive" and "parasitic" rentiers. One decree simply cut all rents in half; another put an absurd ceiling price on the sale of land and then forced all owners (with a few technical exceptions) to sell on demand.

The move aroused hardly any opposition from intellectual or businessmen not directly affected. To many it appeared simply as a bungling and insane gesture by a new government of amateurs and destined soon to be repealed. The mess was indeed cleared up, but in a way they hardly expected: a year later Castro declared that rentiers were no longer owners, and all rents were to be paid to the government—toward a mythical "eventual" purchase.

In a similar way Castro made use of the agrarian reform law of May 1959, to destroy first the foreign landholders, then those who held large blocks of land and finally even small landholders. Again, he attacked one group at a time, so that others would not protest until it was too late. Now few "independent" farmers exist, and the state-owned, state-run farm has become the dominant agricultural unit.

What were the elements of Castro's success? The first and most important was deception. Castro knew what his goals were from the beginning. When he admitted in 1961 that he had been a Marxist-Leninist all along, he also declared that he deliberately avoided saying this in the beginning because he knew he wouldn't be able to generate support.

Castro knew what he intended to do; but by concealing his aims while working for them all the time, he perhaps more than any other successful Communist revolutionary—even the Red "agrarian reformers" of China—was able to take advantage of the combination of good will and selfishness that exists in every society.

A free society—and for that matter, even a Communist one—will always have a great variety of opinions, groups, divisions, and subdivisions and even antagonisms. Castro's second great tactic was to develop these into outright clashes. One by one, each of these groups could be isolated and then eliminated, while Castro was only apparently favoring the rest. The Communist doctrine of class war is pure myth, but it becomes a "reality" for purposes of destruction under the pressures of selective agitation and deception.

The tactic only works because there is enough good will in a liberal society to believe that piecemeal isolation of one "bad" element somehow marks progress. And there is always enough bad will to be found that can close its eyes to the destruction that ensues, the "good" always believing they are safe. What is not realized is that such distinctions between bad and good are not part of the Communist vocabulary. They are only means by which the Communist is able to divide and conquer.

And Castro is using these same tactics today. Now that he has secured absolute control in Cuba itself, he is sparing no effort to export the revolution to all of Latin America. Terrorism in Bolivia may seem merely destructive. But in the Communist strategy and propaganda it is aimed at pitting "the people" against their "detested fascist rulers," just as arson in Puerto Rico is aimed at "foreign domination of capitalist overlords in the United States."

And of all the deceptions and divisions that are created and encouraged—rich against poor, foreigner against native, owner against worker, big business against little, right against left—those involving the church are at once the saddest and most pernicious. Castro has added a new string to Lenin's lyre in pretending to speak in the name of the Gospel, playing upon the vast variety in the church's activities and organizations. By turning religion exclusively to social concerns, its heart is cut out, true charity and the unity that goes with it is smashed.

The state of the church in Cuba today stands as witness to what communism means both in its tactics and in its goals. There is no persecution, it is claimed—as long as religion is confined to the clouds "where it belongs."

But the church is forbidden to teach; the more than 300 Catholic schools have been seized by the government; all religious programs have been banned from radio and television; and even though churches are still open in Cuba, as the propaganda takes care to assert, the number of priests has been reduced to a handful that is far too few to minister to the needs of a population that is overwhelmingly Catholic. The church in Cuba today has joined the honorable ranks of the churches of silence behind the Iron Curtain.

But the cry of the church in Cuba is not merely a lament for itself; it is the cry of witness against what communism is trying to do everywhere. For the Cuban Church to cease to occupy its honorable position, declared Bishop Boza Masvidal, "communism would have to cease being atheistic and enslaving," and both are equally impossible.

"Research: Key to Tomorrow"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks another chapter in the story of Pittsburgh, "Research: Key to Tomorrow":

RESEARCH MANPOWER

More than 14,000 research scientists, engineers, and technicians are employed in the Pittsburgh area. Of this total, 7,600 are professional staff members. They represent all the disciplines, ranging from the design engineer to the theoretical physicist. Almost all perform or are available for contract research.

In addition to their R. & D. activities, Pittsburgh area scientists and engineers enjoy an active professional life through the local sections of more than 60 scientific and technical societies.

Among these organizations are the American Chemical Society with seven active subgroups, the largest local section of the American Nuclear Society, and the world headquarters of the Instrument Society of America.

The societies sponsor a multitude of professional programs, many of which are joint projects. Typical activities include short courses in solid-state devices and process control by the Institute of Electrical & Electronic Engineers, PERT seminars by the American Institute of Industrial Engineers, a lecture series on space sciences by the American Institute of Aeronautics & Astronautics, and a unique high school engineering physics course sponsored by six societies.

Pittsburgh also is the annual site of such highly regarded national and international conferences as the Pittsburgh Conference on Analytical Chemistry and Applied Spectroscopy, Pittsburgh Diffraction Conference, ISA Conference on Instrumentation in the Iron and Steel Industry, and the National Conference on Open Hearth and Basic Oxygen Steel.

Looking Back and Ahead in Wake of House Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing in the Washington Report on the Medical Sciences, published by WRMS, and edited by Mr. Gerald G. Gross.

I am sure this excellent commentary on the passage of the medicare bill, H.R. 6675, merits careful consideration.

The article follows:

LOOKING BACK AND AHEAD IN WAKE OF HOUSE VOTE

It really began a quarter century ago, when organized medicine's hostility to a small medical group formed to serve some government employees on a prepaid basis led to conviction of AMA and fellow defendants on charges of violating antitrust laws. The conviction stood up clear to the U.S. Supreme Court. But AMA was now on its way to save the country from socialized medicine. Today, millions of lobbying and propaganda dollars later, the Nation is at the brink. Credit those dollars, if you will, with delaying the day; but credit them, too, with the power of backfire.

The House has passed medical eldercare under social security. Senate passage this spring—possibly as a present for AMA on the eve of its annual meeting in New York City, June 20–24—is a virtual certainty. It will be a big climax, yet it will be but the first step. In time eldercare will give way to true medicare, with no ages barred. Only this time AMA persistence in its strange opposition strategy will be an accelerant, rather than an effective obstruction tactic.

In recent years particularly, AMA has enjoyed exquisite success in antagonizing the press, alienating those in Congress who would be its friends, and picking the wrong horses. Membership dues have gone from $0 to $45 a year to raise a war chest that would stave off Federal intervention in providing and financing medical care. But any gains that may have accrued were offset by Dearborn Street aloofness to legitimate inquiries, occasional arrogance, designation of a pat, patronizing, palaverous doctor to be spokesman—at least temporarily—and failure to recognize that AMA's refusal to take leadership on health legislation weakened its position as a pleader for the antieldercare cause.

Attempting to show that organized labor was not solidly behind social security medical care, AMA engaged the president of an international union to address its banquet in Atlantic City. He said he was against Wagner-Murray-Dingell. Not long afterward he was in the penitentiary (though not because of that declaration).

On May 25, 1960, your correspondent, delivering Alpha Omega Alpha lecture at University of Nebraska College of Medicine, predicted onset of Federal subsidization of health services. Based on events and circumstances in which organized medicine was anything but a disinterested bystander, he made this prediction before 1960 and he has made it since. In Omaha, as elsewhere, audience reaction was one of a sort of resentful, if not belligerent, silence, as though the utterance mothered a wish. This is another attitude that has hastened the day.

NEXT 90 DAYS COULD BE A TIME FOR INVENTORY

In the course of lengthy House debate Wednesday and Thursday on H.R. 6675, AMA was slammed around a bit for its negativism and yet not even its severest critics employed the invective that has been heaped on King-Anderson bill and its predecessors. No one tagged AMA's motives as "a fraud and a hoax," a label once applied to President Kennedy for his sponsorship of social security eldercare—a characterization that was an important addition to the backfire arsenal. Rather, the atmosphere seemed to be one that could be summed up in the words: Cooperation of America's doctors is a must if this huge $6 billion program is to work, so here's hoping they take a new look.

Passage of Medicare Bill Is a Legislative Milestone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on April 8 of this year the House of Representatives approved the historic bill to provide medical care for the elderly under social security.

On April 10, the Nashville Tennessean in an editorial, "Passage of Medicare Bill Is a Legislative Milestone," stated final approval of this bill by the Congress will signal a "historic point in social legislation."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the editorial from the Nashville Tennessean at this point:

PASSAGE OF MEDICARE BILL IS A LEGISLATIVE MILESTONE

House passage of the program for medical care for the elderly under social security is a legislative milestone. If the Senate approves this measure, it will mark a historic point in social legislation.

Medical care for the aged has been one of the top priority items on President Johnson's must list. It was one of the early goals of the Kennedy-Johnson administration.

For several years, the proposal has been the center of great controversy. The American Medical Association has spent millions to bring about its defeat.

But for all the furore and outcries raised, a central fact has been that both sides have agreed that the aged needed protection against the rising costs of being sick. Several factors have given the problem increasing concern.

The number of elderly in our population is large and it is growing. As a group, it is the most economically vulnerable, and it is the most likely to sustain long and serious illnesses. There are nearly 20 million people in the United States who are 65 years or older. Many are dependent on small pensions, social security, or inadequate life savings. To these older people, the costs of medical care for serious illness can be catastrophic, financially.

The measure passed by the House is a much broader one than was conceived originally. In brief, it would:

Increase social security payments to the aged by 7 percent; broaden medical assistance under existing welfare programs, and liberalize other social security benefits.

The key feature is the right of persons over 65 to a maximum of 60 days hospitalization and 20 days nursing home care. The patient would pay the first $40, the rest would be paid for him.

Available to the elderly who want it is a supplementary and entirely voluntary program of insurance, which would defray expenses of doctors' bills and other expenses not covered by the basic plan. This supplementary insurance plan would apply only to those who want it and would be financed by a $3 a month premium from those joining the program and by matching funds from Federal general revenue.

The bill includes a general liberalizing of other old-age, survivors, and disability benefits. Pensioners would be able to earn more and still collect a retirement check; widows could retire at an earlier age; children would be given survivors benefits until age 22 instead of the present 18.

All in all, it is a major package which is a big step forward in behalf of the older citizens of this Nation. House action by a 236-to-191 vote adds optimism that Senate passage will come by June at least.

Warsaw Ghetto Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, although the history of mankind is unfortunately liberally sprinkled with dictatorships of the right and the left, as human beings we may still take pride in the fact that there have always been men who have been willing to risk all in order to counter them.

One of the most recent tyrannies was that which existed in Germany from 1933 to 1945, when the Nazis under Adolf Hitler attempted to establish their "thousand year Reich." April 19, 1965, was the anniversary of one of the most tragic uprisings against that dictatorship: The revolt of the Warsaw ghetto in 1943, when 40,000 Jews decided to confront the German war machine. Inadequately equipped, almost completely untrained, and overwhelmingly outnumbered, their defiance of the SS and the Gestapo was in the true sense of the word a tragedy, because despite the knowledge of certain defeat, they never hesitated.

The Warsaw ghetto was officially established in November of 1940: 100 city blocks were surrounded by brick walls 10 feet high and barbed wire fences, and the Jewish population was completely cut off from the rest of the city—indeed, the world. Despite the starvation, misery and death which followed, Jewish community life continued: soup kitchens, child care centers, schools, lectures, musical events, and a host of other activities were carried out. Perhaps most important for posterity, daily reports on activities, scientific papers, and complete archives were maintained. It is from these that we have our information on life in the ghetto; they provide a moving and memorable record of the courage and determination of the unfortunate people to preserve and maintain their Jewish traditions and way of life against the Nazi holocaust.

But, their actions provide us at the same time with a more meaningful and wider lesson: that no tyranny, no matter how ruthless and inhuman, is ever able to extinguish the desire of man to live in freedom. The Warsaw ghetto will forever live as an example of how guns, barbed wire, starvation, and torture are, in the long run, unable to compete with dedication and determination to the cause of liberty.

Republican Task Force on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the members of the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture have expressed grave concern over the rapid increase in U.S. farm debt. It is our feeling that the American farmer is literally being crushed under this enormous burden of debt. With farm mortgage and short-term debt increasing far out of proportion to income, the farmer's economic situation is rapidly deteriorating.

We on the task force are continuing our research into the agricultural situation for the purpose of arriving at a better understanding of what is wrong with present and past programs which have not served the best interests of the American farmer, taxpayer or consumer. Such a thorough understanding is most essential as a background for any and all considerations of the farmer's economic problems. Preliminary research into the farm debt situation has revealed some alarming facts.

Unfortunately, administration farm programs have accomplished the exact opposite of their stated objectives. Since 1961, net farm income has remained virtually at the same level, while total farm debt has increased nearly 50 percent. Total farm debt today is actually greater than the entire Federal budget in 1948.

U.S. farmers in 1961 were indebted $1.97 for every dollar of realized net income. This year, after 4 years of current farm programs, the farmer will owe a whopping $2.86 for every income dollar. To further illustrate what this means, in 1929, on the eve of the great depression, the farmer owed only about $2.30 for each income dollar. The farmer's best postwar year was 1947, when the ratio

was 49 cents debt for every dollar of income.

USDA STATISTICS JUGGLING

Statistics juggling by official agencies of the Federal Government clouds the issues, and hides the real problems of agriculture. USDA attempts to show an improvement in farm income prove to be a complete fallacy when we review all of the factors involved.

Our task force took a look at a USDA report on farm income which states that:

With a continuing decline in farm numbers * * * realized net income per farm from farming was at a record high of $3,642 in 1964, compared with $3,504 in 1963.

Using the same method of comparison for farm debt, the task force came up with a far more dramatic figure: "Total debt per farm from farming was at a record high of $9,502.30 in 1964, compared with $8,301.15 in 1963." Thus, while income per farm went up 3.9 percent, debt per farm went up 14.4 percent. But, unlike USDA, we do not use this method of comparison, for it is neither accurate nor valid, and is definitely misleading.

This is pointed out in an article by a USDA Economic Research Service specialist who criticized USDA's use of this method by noting that:

The very rapid decline in the number of farms has boosted the arithmetic means of a variety of farm * * * statistics, but it does not necessarily follow that farm incomes of persons remaining in agriculture have improved.

It is easy to see what is realy happening to farm income. USDA figures show that last year production expenses increased $200 million, while cash receipts from marketings went down by the same amount. At the same time, prices received by farmers declined 2½ percent. These are the results of rising farm costs, including larger interest payments, and a further weakening of the marketplace.

Less than 6 percent of U.S. farmers today actually receive a parity of income. Internal Revenue Service statistics for 1962 tax returns show that profits of operators in agriculture, forestry and fisheries whose annual receipts totaled less than $10,000 averaged one-third less than operators in service activities. Profits of the few with receipts of $100,000 or more averaged less than one-half of the profits realized by operators of service activities in the same economic class.

DEBT GROWS FASTER THAN REAL ESTATE VALUES

While some have argued that increases in farm real estate values have offset mounting farm debt, an examination of the facts proves otherwise. During the last 2 years alone, total farm debt grew 23.1 percent while the value of farm real estate grew 9.8 percent. Obviously, farm debt is increasing at a much faster pace.

The comparative balance sheet of agriculture clearly reveals that rising real estate values have not offset losses in the farm economy. Total farm liabilities in relation to total farm assets have almost doubled in the past 10 years. This means that the proportion of the farmer's equity in his land, livestock, and equipment is getting less and less. From 1961 to 1964, this rate of decline was one-third greater than from 1958 to 1961.

LITTLE HOPE IN FARM BILL

This all adds up to a rather disturbing picture. The farmer is being forced more and more to use credit as a substitute for income. When there are no more assets left upon which to borrow, what will he do? It is no wonder that tax returns show the number of farmers reporting a net loss went up from 29.8 percent in 1962 to 34 percent in 1963.

Many looked hopefully toward the President's farm bill, but in its present form it offers little hope for increasing farm income.

The amount of research required in this area is enormous, and it will be some time before our Republican Task Force on Agriculture studies progress to the point where they can be used as a basis for any legislative recommendations.

If there is no objection, we would like to submit tables that illustrate the statistics presented to you today.

The tables follow:

Approximate total farm debt

[In billions]

Year:	
1947	$8
1950	12
1953	14
1956	17
1959	21
1962	26
1965	36

Approximate total realized net farm income

[In billions]

Year:	
1947	$18.0
1950	14.0
1953	13.5
1956	12.5
1959	12.0
1962	13.0
1965	13.0

Waste of Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Platteville Journal, Platteville, Wis., dated April 15, 1965:

WASTE OF MONEY

If Postmaster General Gronouski wants to know why his department is running in the red, he should take a look at what's going through the mail for one of the reasons.

A few days ago the Journal received a heavy cardboard carton 26 inches long, by 20 inches wide, by 1 inch thick. Inside were two thin U.S. Government advertising mats. We get mats like this from private concerns, but not in big heavy cartons.

These mats were sent by the Federal Government to the Journal, and, no doubt, to all the other papers in the United States giving us the privilege of running their bond advertising for nothing.

This material comes regularly, and we know of only one editor who doesn't know where to file it.

The mats and the big cartons are paid for by the Federal Government—and you know who that is.

The postage? Well, that came with the compliments of Gronouski and his Department. Had it been paid, it would have cost 46 cents coming from Chicago to Platteville. There are about 285 weekly papers in Wisconsin and quite a bunch of them in the United States.

As we said in the beginning: "If Postmaster General Gronouski wants to know why his Department is running in the red * * *."

Guns, Laws, Rights, and You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing in the National Wildlife magazine published by the National Wildlife Federation entitled "Guns, Laws, Rights, and You." This fine article points out in a calm and reasoned fashion the simple ineffectiveness of unworkable gun laws in preventing crimes of violence. It gives statistical basis upon which this type of legislation can be shown to be without effectiveness and without basis in logic and reason.

It is fortunate that the publication of one of the largest sportsmen's and conservationists' organization should present such an article on this type of furor by a group of unwise fanatics who seek to deprive law-abiding citizens of their ancient right to use and enjoy firearms for lawful and legitimate sporting purposes.

The article follows:

GUNS, LAWS, RIGHTS, AND YOU

For more than 300 years, a man with a gun has been an heroic symbol of America: A Pilgrim hunting for meat and defending his family with a flintlock. A Minuteman turning from his plow to pick up a long rifle. A buckskin-clad mountain man leading the way west with a Kentucky rifle. The pictures come instantly to mind.

These vignettes have a deep meaning for all Americans, for our hardy pioneer forefathers used their trusted firearms to win our hostile continent, gain our precious freedom, and defend both from enemies on all sides.

But a much less heroic image of a man with a gun is also a symbol of America: Frontier bandits and gunslingers terrorizing honest pioneers. Prohibition-era gangsters striking fear with machine guns. Contemporary criminals using guns to rob, assault, and kill.

These vignettes are also a part of America—a blot further blackened by the nightmare of a president senselessly murdered—by a man with a gun.

These two widely contrasting American images have become the battle standards of a furious conflict now being waged over the American citizen's right to own and use guns.

On the one side are the gun owners. It is estimated that every other American household owns at least one firearm. The Nation's total is 80 million—perhaps as many as 100 million guns of all types. Gun owners are hunters, sport shooters, and collectors, as well as the many who keep a gun in their home or place of business for protection. And of course both law officers and many criminals have guns. But, to the vast majority of gun owners, guns are normal, useful, desirable things.

On the other side are those who dislike and fear guns. What they really fear, of course, and quite reasonably, is not the gun but the person who may use it to harm them or to force his will on them. So they seek to protect themselves by making guns harder to get. And they want to make crimes easier to solve through laws requiring registration of guns and gun owners. These people are mostly law enforcement officials and other well-meaning people, although there is a sprinkling of subversives, disarmament crackpots, and super-protectionists among them.

The enthusiasm and effectiveness of the antigun group waxes and wanes, and every well-publicized firearms death, by accident or intent, adds to their dosier of arguments and to their public support. More than 300 gun control bills have been proposed to State legislatures and Congress since President Kennedy's assassination. Most ignore a little known fact: We already have on the books many laws regulating possession and sale of firearms. Have they deterred crime?

The progun and antigun groups disagree violently on this, and on many other points. Unfortunately, extremism on one side breeds extremism on the other until the private citizen in the middle can hardly hear the facts for the slogans.

The progun and antigun debaters use everything from statistics to philosophy in their attempts to prove their points: The progun debaters argue that the armed citizen is a deterrent to crimes like burglary and robbery. But antigun debaters point to crime statistics to dispute that argument: In South Carolina, where it is illegal to manufacture or sell handguns, few residents own them at least in theory. Yet California, where it is legal to buy and own handguns, has a burglary rate twice as high as South Carolina.

One valid-sounding antigun argument is that the homeowner and businessman should leave protection to the police. Commonsense says no. It takes minutes at best for the police to reach the scene of a distress call—if there's a chance to call at all.

A popular progun argument is that the armed citizen is important to national defense. Many military men do insist that, despite our awesome nuclear capabilities, the object of warfare is still to win ground and hold it, and that is done by men with guns. Therefore, training and ability with small arms is, and will be, a basic requirement for military preparedness.

The use of weapons, whether pistols or ballistic missiles, must be given thought. To fight, men must be dedicated to principles like freedom, or to the defense of their homes or countries. Hungarian Freedom Fighters threw rocks at tanks; but if firepower had been the only determining factor, the American colonists could never have mounted a revolution.

The antigun people scoff at such arguments. They claim the rifleman, especially the citizen soldier, is about as important in modern warfare as a mule on the modern farm.

The progun element gets in another lick by reminding us that in 1940—not so long ago at that—when Britain graced for the expected Nazi invasion, hundreds of thousands volunteered for home guard duty. But years of tight firearms controls and restricted hunting opportunity had disarmed the population. Cheers and church bells greeted the timely arrival of a convoy of ships from the United States, hastily loaded with small arms, including many rifles, shotguns and handguns donated by sportsmen.

And so the arguments rage. Big emphasis of the anti-gun group is on crime. We do have a serious crime problem, and guns do play a role.

There were 8,500 willful killings in 1963, 54 percent committed with firearms. There were over 100,000 robberies, 59 percent of them by armed persons, although not all were armed with guns. There were almost 150,000 aggravated assaults—with intent to kill or commit serious injury—but only 12 percent with guns, and 88 percent with other weapons.

To sum up: A shocking 4,590 persons met death by willful gunshot in 1963, and 18,000 were injured.

Of course, we should not overlook the fact that automobiles killed 43,000 persons that year—almost 10 times more victims than guns. Home accidents killed 25,000; 20,000 died in falls. Drowning and fire killed more people than guns. This has nothing whatever to do with guns, but helps keep this whole picture in perspective.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover flatly states that "the easy accessibility of firearms is a significant factor in murders committed in the United States today."

Guns are certainly the deadliest weapons readily available to the public. They kill quickly, efficiently, and from a distance, while killing with a knife or a club or bare hands is difficult and dangerous. In the 12 percent of aggravated assaults where guns were used, 21 percent of the victims died, compared with only 3 percent in all other assaults.

We take for granted that most willful killers are criminals. Indeed, they shot and killed 108 law officers alone in the past 3 years. But only 12 percent, or 1,100, of our killings last year were "felony murders," committed in the course of other crimes like burglary and robbery.

A staggering 31 percent of our killings are committed within family groups, and another 51 percent during altercations outside the family but largely between persons who were at least acquainted. The majority of these two types of killings were acts of impulsive rage.

"A readily accessible gun enables the perpetrator to kill on impulse," notes Hoover. "With no such weapon available, the killer's rage may subside and better judgment prevail. And too, if the assault is made with another weapon, it may not be fatal, since the victim has a better chance to escape or defend himself. * * *"

What kinds of guns are used to kill people? About 70 percent are what police call concealable firearms, pistols and revolvers that can be carried to and from the scene of the crime unobserved.

Can we then reduce firearms crimes by controlling handguns? The antigun group cite statistics that would lead you to believe we can.

Nationally, guns account for 54 percent of our willful killings. In the 18 States where there are few or no restrictions on handgun purchases, 65 percent are with guns.

But in the seven States which require some form of permit to buy a handgun, only 42 percent are with firearms.

In New York and South Carolina, which have the toughest handgun controls, only 32 percent of killings are with firearms. In New York City, only 27 percent.

And that brings up New York's famed Sullivan Law, which since 1911 has provided the strictest control over handguns in the United States. The Sullivan law is a bureaucrat's dream—and a nightmare to any New Yorker who wants to own a handgun for any purpose. The purchaser must file a 4-page application for a permit to own the handgun; he is fingerprinted and photographed; he provides three character references; he is interviewed by a police official; he pays a $3 to $5 fee. He must go through a renewal routine every year to keep his license. He must meet stringent rules for safekeeping of the gun, which must remain in a specified location at all times.

The law, amended every year since its proposal, has become so complicated that many sportsmen have sold their handguns—too much bother to own them. The law has certainly kept down the number of legal handguns in New York City; there are only 17,000 licensed owners among the 8 million residents, mostly guards, watchmen, and others who use guns in their work.

After 54 years, the Sullivan law's effectiveness is still being debated. We do know that the State has a murder rate of 3.8 per 100,000 population, slightly below the national average of 4.5, but only half of Alabama's 10.2. The State robbery rate is 45.9 per 100,000—7.2 below the national average of 53.1, but less than one-third that of top-ranked Illinois, 188.5 The State aggravated assault rate is 85 per 100,000, above the average, but still only half that of leading North Carolina with 174.3.

New York City, when compared with our other nine largest cities, has the lowest robbery rate, third lowest murder rate, and fifth lowest aggravated assault rate. Handgun control sounds like the answer.

But statistics do not always tell the whole truth. Milwaukee, the Nation's 11th largest city is lowest in murder, robbery, aggravated assault, and burglary, yet the city has neither a license or permit system nor a handgun registration law, and no compulsory record is kept of handgun owners by any police authority.

It is reasonable to conclude that firearms restrictions have little effect on crime rates in general, but do seem to reduce gun crime. But this is achieved at a high price, pro-gun enthusiasts point out: Violation of the rights of law-abiding citizens; hindering legitimate sports; injuring an arms industry vital to the national economy; and reducing the capacity of the individual to defend himself.

Most New York sportsmen, businessmen, and homeowners will tell you that the cure is not worth the medicine.

The unpleasant truth, too, is that blanket restrictions on gun ownership have little effect on criminal gun ownership, because the professional criminals steal their guns or get them through underworld channels. Even if they buy them illegally in sporting goods stores, ordinary penalties for gun law violations are no deterrent to robbers and killers. Laws should be aimed at illegal firearms use, not at the guns themselves. They must be strengthened to impose tough penalties on felons, narcotics addicts, drunkards, juveniles, and other irresponsible persons who own or use guns illegally.

Is firearms control the answer to our crime problem? Or does the real answer lie in stricter law enforcement with formidable penalties for armed crimes? Here are two votes for the latter course:

Surprisingly, one is the much condemned British Firearms Acts. In addition to limiting gun ownership, the acts specify harsh and certain punishment for crimes committed while armed. And these laws are enforced by able police, backed up by nononsense courts and juries. As a result, the criminal leaves his gun home, the police go unarmed, and the citizen thinks twice before trying to settle his arguments with a gun. There is every indication that the British criminal has been more surely disarmed by his own hand, out of fear of punishment, than by any law controlling the availability of firearms.

Another example: In an experiment called Operation 25, New York City police selected the tough 25th precinct in Manhattan, and raised the strength of its force from 244 to

613 for a 4-month period, with all the additional policemen on foot patrol. By the end of the test period, felonies were down 55 percent; robberies down 70 percent; burglaries down 65 percent; street "muggings" down 90 percent. At the same time, case clearance improved by 75 percent. The heat went on, and the bottom fell out of the crime rate.

The big trump card of the progun debators is that the second amendment to the Constitution flatly states, "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." At least 35 State constitutions have similar guarantees.

Actually, our rights predate the Constitution. Ancient common law holds that a man may arm himself and fight to defend his castle and its inhabitants and contents.

Students of human rights insist that there is another, still more important, right involved. It is the "right to revolution." Before you flinch at that harsh term, remember that every democratic government on earth was born of armed revolution after tyranny. Revolution is the last resort of an oppressed people, and firearms are primary tools of revolution. If our Government turned tyrannical tomorrow, armed Americans would surely try to do something about it. But not if they had no guns because a registration system had permitted the tyrant to find and confiscate them. Every modern dictator has disarmed his subjects that way.

This fear of confiscation, and the knowledge that a bureaucrat with the power to issue a permit will also have the power to deny one, are the big progun arguments against permits and registration, and legitimate ones. (It is ironic that, in the absence of a national registration system, a hypothetical tyrant—or invader—would probably use the membership files of the organizations most opposed to gun registration.)

Should we have a strong Federal law controlling the sale and registration of all firearms?

J. Edgar Hoover, though a leader in the fight to reduce availability of firearms, especially handguns, says no. He flatly asserts: "The numerous ramifications of gun control are so varied and complex that regulatory measures must be at State and local levels."

But Mr. Hoover goes on to say that "the public has a right to expect that the distributor and the purchaser of weapons, so deadly and easily concealed as handguns, meet certain regulations and qualifications."

So the argument finally boils down to one of handgun control. Few, if any, of the responsible antigun people have any intention of taking away your deer rifle or duck gun, or of making you register it. Even New York has no restrictions on shoulder guns, which is why the Sullivan law has withstood hundreds of attacks on constitutional grounds.

Unfortunately, not all of the antigun people are either responsible or well informed. One well-meaning sociologist proposed that all guns should be kept in a public repository, and checked out like library books for specific purposes and periods. He also suggests that the gun owner be required to wear some distinctive article of clothing while going armed.

Some subversives work quietly with the antigun people toward their ideal—a disarmed or disarmable population unable to oppose their kind of revolution. They are most dangerous in that they are unidentified infiltrators in more well-meaning groups.

A few protectionists have taken the antigun side in the hope that closer gun control will reduce the hunting that they do not believe in. However, most informed protectionists are beginning to understand that legal, controlled hunting is not only desirable, but necessary, to the management of our wildlife community today.

Finally, this must be said: It is doubtful that a single one of the 300 new bills for gun control could have prevented the assassination of President Kennedy. Secret Service agents agree privately, and reluctantly, that there is no sure way to stop a killer who will use a long gun or who is willing to trade his life for the life of his victim. The only way to keep the President safe would be to keep him constantly in a bulletproof, bombproof shelter. President Kennedy would have scoffed at such a suggestion, and President Johnson already has. Mental defectives, of course, should be given treatment, kept under surveillance, and denied firearms of any kind. But again, it is a case of regulating the person, not the gun.

Out of all these arguments on firearms problems and rights, these truths appear to us, and are our policy:

We believe laws should prohibit sale of firearms to felons, drug addicts, habitual drunkards, juveniles, and mental incompetents. We believe laws should invoke strict penalties against the possession of firearms by criminals and irresponsible persons. We believe laws should permit responsible, law-abiding adults to own and use firearms for legal purposes. We believe laws should not require law-abiding adult citizens to register shotguns and rifles (Federal statutes already require manufacturers and dealers to keep records on the sale of handguns, rifles, and shotguns). We believe laws should not grant authority to any jurisdiction, police or otherwise, at any government level, to prohibit the purchase or ownership of firearms by law-abiding and responsible citizens.

Statement by Meany on Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following statement by George Meany, which appeared in the AFL-CIO News of April 17, 1965, reiterates organized labor's firm stand in opposition to aggression and effectively refutes those who call for peace at any price:

STATEMENT BY MEANY ON VIETNAM POLICY

In his address of April 7, President Johnson offered to open the door to unconditional discussions on the crisis in Vietnam. Those who have been urging our Government to appease the Communist aggressors against the Vietnamese people have seized upon the word "unconditional" to conclude that our country's policy toward the conflict in Vietnam is now being basically changed. They would interpret the President's address to mean that we are now ready to appease the aggressors.

Organized labor in our country has steadfastly opposed appeasement of all aggressors—Mussolini, Hitler, Stalin, Mao Tse-tung, and Khrushchev alike. In continuation of this policy we have time and again supported President Johnson's firm rejection of all proposals to appease the aggressors against the people of South Vietnam.

Fortunately, the course outlined by the President, the national aims spelled out in his address, his determination to help the South Vietnam people maintain their independence—all these clearly add up to anything but appeasement, anything but wavering or weakening in America's commitment to freedom for South Vietnam.

Those who strive and struggle for peace will be greatly encouraged by President Johnson once again making it clear to all Communist aggressors that "we will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of meaningless agreement."

American labor welcomes President Johnson's reaffirmation of America's determination to achieve through diplomatic and economic as well as military measures "an independent South Vietnam securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationship to all others, free from outside interference."

This forceful reiteration of the basic aim of our Nation's policy in southeast Asia should eliminate all doubts as to American military action having any other objective than to provide a firm foundation for the peace, freedom, and economic development of this war-torn region.

We are confident that the people of North Vietnam, if permitted, would gladly accept President Johnson's proposal that they join with their neighbors in a great effort to improve their conditions of life and work rather than continue to suffer and sacrifice in a terrible military conflict which can never be of any advantage to them. Any rejection of this generous American offer can only aggravate their misery and suffering. This is the cruel fate which befell the people of the captive nations of Europe when their masters in Moscow prevented their benefiting from the Marshall plan aid.

The people of South Vietnam, Berlin, and every other area in the shadow or terror of Communist aggression can draw encouragement and strength from the President's timely assurance that the United States " will always oppose the effort of one nation to conquer another nation." We share the President's realization that this course must be pursued "because our own security is at stake."

We also welcome the President's emphasizing that "the central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied" and that, in Vietnam or in any other part of the world where our country bears an international responsibility, " we fight because we must fight, if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure."

Wisconsin Senate Passed Resolution on Western District Judgeship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include Wisconsin Senate Resolution 18, relating to the vacancy in the Federal judgeship for the western district of Wisconsin, in the appendix of the RECORD at this point:

SENATE RESOLUTION 18

Resolution relating to the vacancy in the Federal judgeship for the western district of Wisconsin

Whereas except for a brief interim appointment, the Federal court for the western district of Wisconsin has been without a judge since January 13, 1963; and

Whereas this unreasonable delay deprives the citizens of the western district of Wisconsin of due process of law in the Federal courts; and

Whereas there are any number of qualified candidates for the position: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, That President Lyndon B. Johnson is hereby advised of the concern of the citizens of Wisconsin over the vacancy in the western district of Wisconsin; and, be it further

Resolved, That the citizens of Wisconsin speaking through their elected representatives, the Wisconsin State Senate, urge President Johnson to fill the vacancy without further delay.

PATRICK GLUY,
President of the Senate.
WILLIAM P. NUGENT,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Historic School Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 will benefit all Americans. It will also benefit our children and our children's children. I call to the attention of Members of the House the following editorial on this landmark legislation from a recent issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

HISTORIC SCHOOL BILL

Of all the legislation that has been enacted by Congress since Lyndon Johnson became President—and there has been a considerable body of it—none more plainly bears his personal imprint than the Federal aid-to-education bill which cleared the final legislative hurdle in the Senate last Friday.

As the first successful product of nearly 20 years of effort in Congress to provide broad Federal support for public schools, the new measure is a testimonial to the remarkable political generalship of Mr. Johnson. While passage of the bill was undoubtedly aided by the heavy Democratic majorities in both Houses, skilled leadership from the White House was clearly helpful in enabling the measure to weather House floor debate with only a minor revision and Senate floor debate with not a comma changed.

This demonstration of political virtuosity does not mean, however, that the legislation is without fault. Its various provisions for public aid to parochial school students raise important questions among sincere people as to whether the constitutional barrier between church and state is being breached. And the bill contains no clearcut method of getting these questions squarely before the Supreme Court. In order to avoid a paralyzing battle among proponents of various views, the language of the measure was intentionally made fuzzy—a technique which may give rise to additional problems, although the hope is that these may be met by amendments next year.

Whatever its shortcomings, the aid to education measure is of momentous social significance. Though it is aimed primarily at upgrading the education of children of low-income families, funds from the act will be channeled into an estimated 94 percent of the Nation's 26,000 school districts. Though the first year's $1.3 billion authorization for building construction, teacher salaries, instructional materials, special education, and other projects, will amount to a fairly small fraction of the total annual outlay for public education, future Federal allocations are expected to rise, reaching $2.4 billion a year by 1968. This infusion of Federal support can hardly fail to have an uplifting effect on overcrowded and underequipped public educational facilities, not only directly raising their quality but hopefully also generating new support at local and State levels, from which the bulk of financing will still have to come.

Some inferences as to the role of Federal aid in Pennsylvania may be drawn by comparing the anticipated allocations under the new statute with present State and local school expenditures. Total public spend- for elementary and secondary education in Pennsylvania now runs to more than $900 million a year. About $62 million in Federal aid statewide will be added to this. The Pittsburgh school district's annual budget is some $40 million. Pittsburgh's share of Federal aid will be a roughly estimated $3 million.

Since regulations for the distribution of funds under the new law have not yet been drawn, no one can yet say whether Federal dollars for schools in poverty-stricken areas will enable the Pittsburgh School District and others to readjust their budgets so as to spend more for other needs. But Pittsburgh Superintendent Sidney P. Marland hopes there will be an across-the-board gain for education. Pittsburgh schools need whatever help they can get to achieve their long-term objectives of (1) building 20 new schools under a 5-year $50 million construction program, (2) hiring 600 new teachers to help reduce class sizes eventually to a desirable 26 or 27 pupils, (3) improving vocational and counseling services.

To the extent that the historic Federal aid statute can help Pittsburgh and other hard-pressed districts to achieve such goals, it will indeed be contributing to what President Johnson has visualized as the Great Society.

Opinion in the Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the night of Sunday, March 28, 1965, was a most noteworthy occasion.

On that night, the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH gave a dinner party to a dear friend and colleague, Congresswoman FRANCES BOLTON.

I was so proud to have been included in this intimate group of family and friends. FRANCES is a most remarkable person and a valiant woman and I am happy to be privileged to insert in the RECORD the transcript of an interview between these two great public servants.

The interview follows:

OPINION IN THE CAPITAL

(Produced by Florence Lowe)

(A Metropolitan Television Broadcasting Production (WTTG, Washington, D.C.) March 28, 1965)

Guests: Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine, and Representative FRANCES BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio.

Reporter: Mark Evans, vice president in charge of public affairs for Metromedia, Inc.

This program will also be broadcast on:

TV: WNEW, New York, N.Y.; WTVP, Decatur, Ill.; WTVH, Peoria, Ill.; WTTG, Washington, D.C.; KTTV, Los Angeles, Calif.; KMBC, Kansas City, Mo.; Eastern Educational Network (13 stations).

Radio: WIP, Philadelphia, Pa.; WHK, Cleveland, Ohio; KMBC, Kansas City, Mo.; WNEW, New York, N.Y.; Armed Forces Radio Network.

Mr. EVANS. In the 87th Congress, there were 20 women, 2 in the Senate and 18 in the House of Representatives. Now, in the 89th Congress, there are still 2 lady Senators, but only 10 women in the House of Representatives. Representative BOLTON, how do you account for this?

Mrs. BOLTON. Oh, the men.

Mr. EVANS. What's your opinion, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH?

Mrs. SMITH. Oh, I think one reason is, that there aren't enough qualified women who run for office.

Mr. EVANS. Metromedia's "Opinion in the Capital" is honoring Representative FRANCES BOLTON on her silver anniversary in the Congress of the United States. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH is our special guest to pay tribute to her long-time friend.

Representative BOLTON, I detected a little bit of sarcasm in there when you said the men are responsible for the lack of women.

Mrs. BOLTON. Well, you see what the men did. They gerrymandered various districts on the Democratic side. They didn't do that on our side.

Mr. EVANS. Did they gerrymander women out?

Mrs. BOLTON. They gerrymandered women out, which I thought was too bad * * * they were fine women.

Mrs. SMITH. But, where were the women while they were doing this?

Mrs. BOLTON. Well, they were only Democrats mind you, I wouldn't know just where they were.

Mr. EVANS. I think there should be a very fine distinction drawn here. There is a very great difference between politicians who are women and women in politics.

Mrs. BOLTON. Oh, that's interesting.

Mr. EVANS. I certainly think you are both women in politics. You're women first but I wonder why neither of you have ever married again.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thought one marriage was enough.

Mr. EVANS. Well, you had a very good one then?

Mrs. BOLTON. I had a very good one.

Mr. EVANS. Margaret, have you ever thought of this?

Mrs. SMITH. Yes, indeed, I thought of it very seriously, back along—I haven't lately, I've been too busy. I haven't had many offers.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I'm sure this may provoke some. Are there problems in this? Being in politics and leading this kind of life that would lead to another marriage?

Mrs. SMITH. I don't think there are too many problems. I don't know any reason why a woman couldn't be married and serve in public office as well as a man in public office being married. I think men and women work together, whichever way it is.

Mr. EVANS. Both of you came in, and this is probably a very cruel thing to say, but you both came in the back door of politics. Your husbands were in politics and you inherited the kingdom and have held them admirably since.

Mrs. BOLTON. But remember, we had to be elected to it.

Mr. EVANS. I know that, subsequently.

Mrs. BOLTON. That's not just inheriting it.

Mr. EVANS. No, I agree, but originally you inherited it.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes. No, oh no. We had to be elected.

Mr. EVANS. I thought you had to be appointed.

Mrs. BOLTON. No, no. No appointments in Ohio.

Mrs. SMITH. The Senate vacancies are filled by appointments in some States. But, the House is always by election, and we were both elected. I must say I think FRANCES had a tough election and campaign the first time. I'm sure that I did.

Mr. EVANS. Would you have agreed with your husbands politically?

Mrs. BOLTON. I never agreed with him.

Mr. EVANS. Did you like politics?

Mrs. BOLTON. No, I didn't like it at all. You see, the difficulty was that we had a son who had just broken his neck and was desperately ill for many years. Every time there was an emergency, my husband wasn't there. He was up at the House, or he was off somewhere. So, politics to me, wasn't a very appealing thing.

Mr. EVANS. What convinced you to get into politics?

Mrs. BOLTON. Well, when he died, all the Ohio men thought I knew everything he knew and thought he'd brought all his troubles back home, which, of course, he never did, and they suggested that I finish out his term. Then, I learned that they were saying amongst themselves, "Of course, she won't stay long." So, being a woman, I decided I'd stay.

Mrs. SMITH. You've certainly done a job at it.

Mr. EVANS. Recently, a woman in the Congress, and I won't mention her name because she's from the opposition party, made a comment to the effect that more women didn't get into politics because they cannot make decisions.

Mrs. SMITH. I think that's a rather ridiculous attitude. I know of few women who don't make decisions. Women have to make the decisions. They have to make the decisions all the way through life. They certainly have to make the decisions as far as the budget is concerned in the family.

Mr. EVANS. How about the decisions you have to make, Senator SMITH and you Congressman BOLTON, you are now dealing in monumental things, the figures that deal in the millions and billions. Mrs. BOLTON, you're a 24-year veteran of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, I'm ranking now. I began at the bottom.

Mr. EVANS. All these monumental problems resting on your shoulders. Are they? Is a woman up to all this?

Mrs. BOLTON. Why, we're more than up to it. I think we take it more simply, more fundamentally than the men, so we don't get quite so excited. I don't. I find the men around me, on the committee, get terribly upset by this and that. I may be upset, yes, because some things I don't agree with at all, and one is troubled. But I don't feel all excited about that trouble.

Mr. EVANS. Well, let's take a specific example. There has been a recommendation from the Senate committee that's the counterpart of your committee, and he has recommended that there be a separation of the funds that are used for economic aid.

Mrs. BOLTON. I had the pleasure of dining the other evening, across the table from Senator FULBRIGHT, and it was a very interesting dinner, of men, and we were there to listen to their opinions and of course, the Senator spoke first. He made it very clear that he thought it was ridiculous to have the two together, that they should be separated immediately. When it came to my turn, I said, "I'm so sorry, I don't agree with the Senator at all," and we had it out a little bit across the table. It was delightful.

Mr. EVANS. You thought they should not be lumped? Can you tell me why?

Mrs. BOLTON. Because I think that the billion dollars that goes from our committee, our authorization, to the Department. I don't think it would be feasible in the $50 billion that defense has. It would be lost. Who would care about it? Who would know where it went? It's terribly important where it goes.

Mr. EVANS. Do you feel the same way about it, Senator?

Mrs. SMITH. No, but I would be prejudiced. I've majored in defense affairs through the years and I have a pretty high respect for the defense of the country.

Mrs. BOLTON. So have I.

Mrs. SMITH. And the way that this money is used. I don't know what I would do if I were placed in the position of having to decide.

Mr. EVANS. I'm glad to find that there is some friction between you two.

Mrs. BOLTON. Not friction, just a difference of opinion.

Mr. EVANS. Are there many things on which you differ?

Mrs. SMITH. This particular one—of course, FRANCES BOLTON has majored in foreign affairs through the years, and I've majored in defense affairs. So, there is a reason for our differing on this. I don't know that we differ on many things, we don't very often have arguments.

Mrs. BOLTON. On fundamental things, I don't think we disagree at all.

Mr. EVANS. One of the great moments for women everywhere in my estimation, is when a woman from Ohio stood before a great convention, and nominated her friend——

Mrs. BOLTON. Seconded it——

Mr. EVANS. Seconded the nomination for the lady from Maine.

Mrs. BOLTON. I tell you Mark, that was the high point of my life.

Mr. EVANS. First woman ever to be nominated for President.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, and to have the privilege of seconding MARGARET'S nomination for the Presidency was the highlight of my life.

Mrs. SMITH. If it was, FRANCES, you must know what it meant to me, because it was one of the finest things that could have happened to me, a woman who was a serious candidate for President, to have another woman in this world, where they say women don't get along and don't support each other.

Mr. EVANS. It would be normal for you to be envious of her.

Mrs. BOLTON. That's right.

Mr. EVANS. And you weren't a bit?

Mrs. BOLTON. Not a bit. Proud of her.

Mr. EVANS. Senator SMITH, have you had any afterthoughts, have you changed your thinking? Have you come up with any suggestions along political lines as a result of your running for the Presidency?

Mrs. SMITH. Yes, I think it was a wonderful effort. I wouldn't do it any differently if I were to do it again. I'm very pleased that I did. If not for any other reason than historical purposes, it was good. I've come up with a good many ideas and I don't think this is the time to go into them. I'd like to discuss them someday with you. For several years, I have introduced legislation for a direct presidential primary, a national primary with a runoff. That, too, I'd like to talk about some day.

Mr. EVANS. I'd be happy to do it. Mrs. BOLTON, you are in the House of Representatives on the Foreign Affairs Committee and there is now a suggestion by Representative LINDSAY to invite the Secretary of State to appear before the entire House to be cross-examined on foreign affairs. Do you like it or don't you?

Mrs. BOLTON. I don't like it particularly because I don't see that we'd get anywhere with it. After all, that's a British institution. It may be good but I'm not at all sure that it fits into our way of doing things.

Mr. EVANS. What do you hear from your respective constituencies on what's going on in the South, now. You come from the great State of Ohio which I'm sure has many problems of its own. Are you getting much mail regarding this?

Mrs. BOLTON. Very little. Almost none.

Mr. EVANS. Do you think people are apathetic about the whole situation?

Mrs. BOLTON. No, I don't think they are exactly apathetic. I think they are very fearful about it. They don't understand it. Because, up with us, we've never had any problem. We've had integrated schools, always. We're very troubled.

Mr. EVANS. How about you, Mrs. SMITH?

Mrs. SMITH. I've had very little mail. I think that, what I do hear, back in the State, is that they thought the last time we acted on civil righs legislation, that everything was ready to go and could be administered through the administration. This is a great surprise to them and I think they haven't quite decided what it means. I personally thought that we gave this administration what it asked for and I was a little surprised that it needed another——

Mrs. BOLTON. I agree with you on that, MARGARET.

Mr. EVANS. How about the marches? Do they understand the reason for the marches in your State?

Mrs. BOLTON. I don't think so. I don't think they think enough about them. Of course, we had one man killed under a bulldozer, which was very tragic. I think they are very enthusiastic over doing everything they can—I think everybody feels they should do something. Perhaps that's the only way they can express it.

Mr. EVANS. What the they concerned with? What does your mail indicate?

Mrs. BOLTON. They are concerned with Vietnam.

Mrs. SMITH. Medicare, some on education.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, some on education. They do not want Federal control of education.

Mr. EVANS. How about Vietnam? What's their major question.

Mrs. BOLTON. They don't see why the President doesn't tell us frankly, what's really going on; what does he propose; what do we have to do? Now, we've sent Marines over—what does that mean? Is it going to be followed?

Mr. EVANS. Are these your words?

Mrs. BOLTON. No, that's my mail.

Mr. EVANS. Is that your attitude, too?

Mrs. BOLTON. Not entirely.

Mr. EVANS. What's your attitude?

Mrs. BOLTON. I don't think I should discuss it. I really don't tonight, Mark.

Mr. EVANS. How about you, Senator?

Mrs. SMITH. Well, I think it's very encouraging to see the administration be more firm on their actions in Vietnam. I think there is quite a noticeable difference between the days of the campaign last year and today. It seems changed about the time of the election. I think this is encouraging. I wish it weren't there, but it is there and we can't forget it and I have great admiration for the people who stay firm and give the people the true facts.

Mr. EVANS. Mrs. BOLTON, how do you maintain the vigor in your life. I'm not going to ask how old you are, but it's printed.

Mrs. BOLTON. Oh, I am 150.

Mr. EVANS. You don't look a day over 90, no, this sweet lady, she defies the calendar.

Mrs. BOLTON. That's good.

Mr. EVANS. I just think you ought to share it with other people.

Mrs. BOLTON. You share it. You sit on your head. Everybody tells me that's why I'm so young. I stand on my head.

Mr. EVANS. Is this coincidental—that you stand on your head—or have you always this joie de vivre?

Mrs. BOLTON. I didn't have it years ago. I'm so terribly healthy, Mark.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I've been reading part of a book and so has Senator SMITH about you, "The Long Way Forward."

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, but that book stops at the most exciting moment of my life. What David Loth did I think is wonderful, but I went to Africa and there's not a bit of it in there, he stopped just before that.

Mrs. SMITH. I shall always remember when you returned from that trip.

Mr. EVANS. Let's get back to politics before you two embrace each other.

Mrs. SMITH. I'd like to get back to another question and ask FRANCES BOLTON if she doesn't think that the exercise she's had through the years, not only standing on her head, but exercise generally, had a great deal to do with your stamina.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think it's absolutely imperative if one wants to really live. Physical fitness is tops.

Mr. EVANS. You don't want to tell us how old you are?

Mrs. BOLTON. I'd just as soon. I've got my 80th birthday coming up.

Mr. EVANS. I'm proud of you.

Mrs. BOLTON. Why, that's nothing.

Mr. EVANS I know it's nothing, but I think its real noteworthy when you can do what you do. What kind of day do you put in?

Mrs. BOLTON. I've been going since 6 this morning. But, why not?

Mrs. SMITH. The remarkable thing, Mark, is that Frances Bolton is so modest in all of this. FRANCES BOLTON did a life's work before she went into Congress. She brought up a family, she had a home, and she did so much and then at 55 years old, to go into Congress, to run the election, the campaigns that she's had.

Mr. EVANS. She's had some tough ones too, hasn't she?

Mrs. SMITH. She certainly has.

Mrs. BOLTON. They've been wonderful, though. If you loved people as much as I do. It gives me my chance every 2 years, to have an excuse to go down to have suppers and things in the playrooms and the basements and everywhere, it's wonderful.

Mr. EVANS. One of the things that impresses me though, and I hope it doesn't embarrass you, you are well-to-do. You don't have to do this.

Mrs. BOLTON. I couldn't help that.

Mr. EVANS. I know, it was thrust upon you, but you've got to be brave. You don't have to do this.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes I do. There's a compulsion about it. I couldn't sit around and do nothing. I come from a line of people who have always served their country. I couldn't possibly stay home and do nothing.

Mrs. SMITH. Yes, but you don't have to work at the rate you do.

Mrs. BOLTON. Oh but, that's just me. I have to.

Mr. EVANS. The theme of your biography dwells pretty much on the fact that you were kind of ignored, kind of left out, I'm not sure whether that's true. In spite of all of this, you'd think the kind of life you led would be enough to keep you from this. Did you burst when you were finally free?

Mrs. BOLTON. I think there was a certain amount of bursting in it. It takes you a long while to come from a deep sense of inferiority and I'm really a timid person * * * nobody believes that, but it's true.

Mr. EVANS. I'm sure Senator FULBRIGHT doesn't.

Mrs. BOLTON. Of course, he doesn't, but BILL and I are old friends. It's taken me a long while where I can be relaxed with people and just kind of be myself.

Mr. EVANS. Let's get on to party politics here. You are both members of the loyal opposition. Are you pleased or displeased with the way things are going? Do you think they are headed upward? Would you classify yourselves in the same ranks? You're both moderates; is that a fair statement?

Mrs. SMITH. I coined that word in my 1948 campaign, you may remember.

Mr. EVANS. I know you did. Will you buy that label?

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, I think so.

Mr. EVANS. Let me get a consensus, here, on where the Republican Party is headed?

Mrs. BOLTON. May I speak on it from a different angle? I think it's terribly important for the continuance of freedom in this country that we have a two-party government.

Mr. EVANS. I don't think even the Democrats will disagree with you. They just want to win.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think that it's very important that we realize how much it will mean when we once get together. Of course, I find the Democrats fighting too, but I think we haven't learned how to have a big battle, disagree, and then stick together and punch through something.

Mr. EVANS. Even if you get together, you're a minority party.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, 140. But back in 1936 there were only 89 left after the Roosevelt sweep.

Mr. EVANS. I mean registrationwise in the country. Now where do you go in your estimation?

Mrs. SMITH. I think, in my direct-primary proposal, it would help. I think it would get more people interested and I think that's very, very important. I think Frances has hit upon something that's most vital and that is that the Republicans, as I've seen them through the years, think that they have to agree on all issues and basically, we should have a statement of principles and agree on perhaps, four or five issues, and then let the people go their own ways on other issues. Perfection is not to be expected in a party. We have great minds, we have issues. I'm not at all discouraged. It does look rather hopeless but I think that if we would start now. We've just had the inauguration and we can't do anything to destroy the administration as long as they're in but I think that doesn't prevent us from getting ready for 1968. This is the time—not to wait 3 months before the convention and come out with a candidate.

Mr. EVANS. Are you telling me that they should concentrate on a man? Several men?

Mrs. SMITH. Yes. I think it would be well, and I think we have many—men and women in the country who are qualified—who have personalities. I think it's very important for a man or a woman to have a partner who likes the game—who is willing to get into it. It's going to take a great deal of energy—a great deal of courage—a great deal of time.

Mrs. BOLTON. And a great deal of wisdom.

Mr. EVANS. In the State of Maine, there's has been a real reverse—an about-face in politics. Maine used to set the pattern in republicanism. You now have a Democratic Senator and a Democratic Governor.

Mrs. SMITH. No, we have a Republican Governor.

Mr. EVANS. Oh. That's right. But, there has been a substantial change in Maine politics. Is this fearsome to you?

Mrs. SMITH. No. If you look at the registration figures, there has been quite a change. There have been large numbers of people registering as Democrats in Maine, and a large number of Independents. I think that, but there were many thousands of people in this last campaign that stayed at home. One hundred and fifty thousand registered people who stayed at home from the polls. How it's divided, I don't know.

Mr. EVANS. You write a completely new book in politics in honoring this lovely lady but I think it's significant that we point out that she turns all her political contributions down. She will not accept a nickel from people for her political campaigns. (Mrs. Smith.)

Mrs. BOLTON. But isn't that the way it should be?

Mr. EVANS. I'm sure it is but I'm not sure it's very practical for most people.

Mrs. BOLTON. I've always loved the way she would go into a town and say, "Well, here I am." "Look me over." With no money attached, at all.

Mr. EVANS. Have you two ever jointly sponsored any legislation?

Mrs. SMITH. I don't know.

Mrs. BOLTON. The only thing we ever did together was the rose.

Mrs. SMITH. Yes, that was a very worthy one.

Mrs. BOLTON. It was your rose.

Mrs. SMITH. We didn't get very far because about the time we were suggesting the rose we found that almost every State in the Union has a flower and each State thought that that flower should be the national flower.

Mr. EVANS. You ran into a man named DIRKSEN in favor of a flower.

Mrs. SMITH. Oh yes, marigolds, and his colleague in Illinois wants the corn tassel.

Mr. EVANS. The corn tassel?

Mrs. BOLTON. Imagine. Of course, with goldenrod, everyone would have hayfever.

Mrs. SMITH. I think, FRANCES, why don't you tell Mr. EVANS about your contribution along the line of nurses and hospitals and health, because we did do something together there.

Mrs. BOLTON. Well, we did work together there, we worked very hard. I've always worked with the nurses. During the first war we established the Army School of Nursing, with Mr. Baker, who is a great friend of mine.

Mr. EVANS. Were you a sponsor of that?

Mrs. BOLTON. No, but I worked behind the scenes and bumped everybody off who was in my way. We finally got our school established which lasted quite a long while. Then when the second war came along, two or three of the nurses and I went to see the Surgeon General and we said we were quite ready to staff the school again. "Over my dead body the Army will do any nursing," he said. Oh, we were crushed. We now have nurses very well established in the services.

Wisconsin Legislature Passes Joint Resolution on Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the text of the Wisconsin Assembly Joint Resolution 56 memorializing the Congress to adopt legislation assuring all U.S. citizens their constitutional right to vote without discrimination on account of race or color in the RECORD at this point:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 56

Joint resolution relating to the recent denial of voting rights and police brutality in Alabama

Whereas the right of all Americans, regardless of race, color or creed, to participate in the election process is basic to the democratic process; and

Whereas it is urgent that all Americans be able to vote in all elections; and

Wheras recent denial of Negro voting rights and the shameful police brutality in Alabama against those protesting the denial of such rights has aroused the conscience and produced a sense of outrage among all Americans; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the legislature urges the Congress of the United States to speedily adopt legislation to assure to all citizens of the United States their constitutional right to vote without discrimination on account of race or color; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Wisconsin delegation to Congress.

ROBERT T. HUBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JAMES P. BUCKLEY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
PATRICK J. GLUY,
President of the Senate.
WILLIAM P. NUGENT,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., 6 Wesley Circle *N. Mex.*
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* 6417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McCarthy, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, ———, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Smathers, Clark, Pell, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, ———, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, ———, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

The Armenian Massacres in Turkey in 1915

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of Armenians in Turkey in 1915 marks the saddest event in the long and turbulent history of the Armenian people. That event, unprecedented in the annals of modern history, in one fell swoop did away in a most cruel manner with nearly all of the 2 million Armenians in Turkey, and it remains the blackest page in Armenian history.

For centuries Armenians had suffered under alien yokes in their historic homeland, and since the early 16th century endured the heavy yoke of Ottoman sultans. While making the best of a very bad situation, under almost unbearable conditions, they had hopes of improving their second-class citizen status through some reforms. In the latter part of the last century, and especially in the years after the turn of the 20th, they did their best to have such reforms instituted in areas where they constituted a large part of the population, especially in the old Armenian provinces in eastern Asia Minor. They naturally hoped that through such reform measures their life, liberty, and property would be guaranteed against the brigandage of wild Kurds and unscrupulous government officials. But the Turkish authorities did not welcome and would not institute such reforms; and the more the Armenians petitioned, insisted, and pressed for such reforms, the more the Turks opposed any such measures. In 1913, however, the Turks agreed, upon the insistence of certain European governments, to make certain improvements. But they felt that this was imposed upon them at the instigation of Armenian leaders, and therefore they felt they had to teach the Armenians a lesson. The First World War gave them the opportunity to do this.

Soon after the outbreak of that war, the Turkish authorities proceeded to carry out their hideous plan of exterminating the Armenian population of Turkey through deportation, starvation, and wholesale massacres. In less than a year they succeeded in their ghastly task while European friends of the Armenian people were involved in the war and therefore unable to help. It is the 50th anniversary of that tragedy that is being observed this year, with sadness and solemnity, in all Armenian communities throughout the world, commemorating the martyrdom of more than 1 million Armenians.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate committee approved second supplemental appropriations.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 8045–8074

Bills Introduced: Four bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1808–1811. Page 8047

Senator Sworn In: Senator Donald Russell, of South Carolina, was sworn in to fill the vacancy created by death of Senator Johnston (until special election to fill such vacancy in term ending January 3, 1969). Page 8045

World Health Organization: Vice President appointed Senator Williams of New Jersey to the 18th Assembly of the World Health Organization to be held May 4–21 at Geneva. Page 8046

Flood Aid: Senate passed with committee amendments (motion to reconsider tabled) S. 327, providing assistance to Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods. Pages 8057–8060

Voting Rights: Senate continued to debate S. 1564, to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the U.S. (right to vote). Pages 8074–8086

Nominations: Senate received the following nominations: One judicial, two Navy in the rank of admiral, numerous Air Force, and numerous Coast Guard. Pages 8086–8088

Program for Monday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 2:42 p.m. until noon Monday, April 26, when it will continue consideration of S. 1564, voting rights. Pages 8045, 8086

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL 1965

Committee on Appropriations: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported with amendments H.R. 7091, second supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965. As approved by the committee, the bill would provide a total of $2,257,869,415, an increase of $139,536,332 over the House-passed figure of $2,118,333,083.

RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Committee on Commerce: Committee continues hearings on S. 457 and S. 1459, to prohibit the Federal Power Commission from taking jurisdiction over any nonprofit cooperative, with testimony from Alex Radin, American Public Power Association; Charles A. Robinson, Jr., National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; Harry Nelson, Minnkota Power Cooperative, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Floyd Wheeler, Dairyland Power Cooperative, LaCrosse, Wis.; Henry Templeton, Harmon Electric Association, Hollis, Okla.; A. D. Mueller, Indiana Statewide Rural Electric Cooperative; E. A. Geesen, Colorado Rural Electric Association, Denver; Harry H. Nuttle, representing Choptank Rural Electric Co-op and Delmarva Generating Cooperative, Denton, Md.; and William C. Wise, Midwest Electric Consumers Association.

Hearings were adjourned subject to call.

WILD RIVERS, AND ST. CROIX WATERWAY

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Committee continued its hearings on S. 1446, to reserve certain public lands for the creation of a National Wild Rivers System, with testimony from Eugene W. Weber, Deputy Director of Civil Works for Policy, Corps of Army Engineers; William Prime, member of 1963 U.S. Kayak Team, New York; Tom Kimball, National Wildlife Federation; Donald Brightman, Adirondack-Hudson River Association; B. L. Orell, Forest Industries Council; Robert G. Field, American Whitewater Affiliation; Stewart Brandborg, the Wilderness Society; Spencer Smith, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources; Dr. Jackson M. Anderson, American Association for Health, Physical Education & Recreation; Larry Hobart, American Public Power Association; Anthony W. Smith, National Parks Association; and W. P. Simons, of Yellow Spring, W. Va.

Committee also held hearings on S. 897, providing for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway in Minnesota and Wisconsin, with testimony from Senators Mondale and Nelson; Lt. Gov. Patrick Lucey, who was accompanied by other officials of the State of Wisconsin; Paul Thuet and Mrs. Geraldine Thomssen, both representing "Save the St. Croix Committee, Inc.," and Robert Collins, all of South St. Paul; John A. Beale, State Forester of Minnesota; Lester Brower, City Administrator, Stillwater, Minn.; Lyle Eckberg, Oak Park Heights, Minn.; J. W. Hoffmann, Northern States Power Co., Minneapolis; and Edward C. Crafts, Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior.

Appendix

Falcon Foundation Scholarships to the Air Force Academy—Presentation of Portrait of General Spaatz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Falcon Foundation has been established to lend prep-school support in the form of scholarships for those seeking appointment to the Air Force Academy, in Colorado.

One of these scholarships is not quite a year old, and it is a matter of some pride to those of us in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that it was named for one born a Pennsylvanian who went on to become a key figure in the aerospace power of the United States. This scholarship bears the name of Gen. Carl A. "Tooey" Spaatz, whose birth was in Boyertown, and he became the first Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force at the end of his long and distinguished career.

In the case of the Gen. Carl A. Spaatz Scholarship, the Falcon Foundation is given by Litton Industries $1,000 annually, on which the award is based. The first winner is Cadet Gerald Raymond Johnston, 17, of Willow Grove, Pa., who will graduate from Marion Institute, in Marion, Ala., this spring, and will enter the Air Force Academy this June. He will be the first of a long line to participate in the heritage of General Spaatz.

On the night of April 19, at the Air Force Academy, Litton Industries' President Roy L. Ash made a presentation to Maj. Gen. Robert Warren, the Academy Superintendent, of an original sketch of General Spaatz, for permanent hanging at that institution.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. Ash be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROY L. ASH, PRESIDENT, LITTON INDUSTRIES, BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., BEFORE THE FALCON FOUNDATION, AT THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY, APRIL 19, 1965

Mr. President, General Warren, distinguished guests, while General Spaatz and I were separated by so many levels of rank during World War II and I did not get to know him personally then, I have come to know him well as a comember of the board of directors of Litton Industries, a responsibility he has held since 1955.

His lifetime has been one of "firsts."

Well before World War I—and after a brief time in the infantry—General Spaatz, then a second lieutenant, decided that the way to go for him was up. He put wings to his heels by going to the early aviation school at San Diego, Calif. To many laymen, and even to the military of that day, this was an obviously foolish decision which would lead to nowhere.

Not even the foolishest of the foolish then would have predicted that, in that same city, two generations later, our first astronauts would view the awesome powerplants which would make their flights possible right through the atmosphere into outer space itself.

Immediately following this San Diego air training, General Spaatz served with Brig. Gen. John J. "Black Jack" Pershing in his punitive expedition into Mexico as a member of this country's first aero squadron. Next, the Pershing parlay took him into France as a flying member of the American Expeditionary Forces.

General Spaatz' three aerial kills against the Germans earned him the Distinguished Service Cross, and more than that, gave him the conviction of the tremendous potential in the reach and scope of airpower—a lasting conviction to which he was to dedicate his capabilities for the benefit of all America.

In his step-by-step pursuit of his goals, he commanded the "question mark" endurance flight during the first week of January 1929. He kept that flimsy aircraft up for 150 hours, 50 minutes and 15 seconds. It would make slapstick comedy today to witness the Rube Goldberg arrangement of barrels, funnels, and hose used in the awkward refueling operations necessary to bring this record-setting experiment off successfully.

But, from this "first," like the 12 seconds of powered flight at Kitty Hawk 25 years earlier, airpower has achieved a recognizable milestone. Aerial refueling was a means of lengthening the legs of airpower, and it was also proved that man could function effectively for sustained periods in the most confining of environments. In just these few years later we are not only extending these legs many times farther—for both worldwide flying operations and then off into space—but now are sealing our astronauts into even more confining spaces. The Spaatz' "first" was truly a first.

In World War II, General Spaatz helped prove for all time the validity of the role of airpower. He was a leader in the development of allied airpower and, in Europe, came to command the whole of the U.S. Strategic Air Forces there. After cessation of the war in Europe, he assumed command of the U.S. Strategic Air Forces in the Pacific, which carried out those missions directly responsible for the ending of the war there.

When it came time for the surrender of the enemy in the various theaters of the world, it was General Spaatz who ranged the globe to participate in the acceptance of the separate surrenders.

But, in the character of the man, it is even easier to understand how he would help mold the potential of airpower to peacekeeping in the era that ensued. The strategic air strength that we know was to be built in the aftermath and apathy which followed the end of a great conflict, when the political pressures were for reduction of costs and of strength. When the Air Force became a separate service, he became its first Chief of Staff.

Then, in 1948, as he stepped down from the highest responsibility the Air Force can give, he could still sight down the gun barrel a long way ahead. In his valedictory to the uniform he had served so long and so well, and to the cockpit in which he had lived, experimented, and fought so many hours, he said there was no priority higher than to get on with building for America an intercontinental ballistic missile.

We feel at Litton Industries that the man we know who had been so many times a first is—one way or another—bound to last forever, and in fact, the Falcon Foundation does allow General Spaatz to last forever. In 1964, just 50 years after General Spaatz was graduated from West Point, we, at Litton Industries, established a Falcon Foundation scholarship in his name. It lends preparatory school support to applicants for the Air Force Academy. We think it will never fail to be an inspiration to the young men who receive it.

The first recipient—Gerald Raymond Johnston, of Willow Grove, Pa., now in the Marion Institute, in Marion, Ala.—will enter the Air Force Academy in June 1965.

Litton Industries commissioned another notable from World War II—the great combat artist of Yank magazine, Howard Brodie—to do an impression of General Spaatz which could be hung here at the Air Force Academy. He did this impression, and I now present it for your inspection—and to Maj. Gen. Robert Warren, the Superintendent of the Air Force Academy.

Through him, I commit it to the permanent possession of this fine institution—which is dedicated to furthering and exploiting the aerospace goals for which men like Gen. Carl A. Spaatz paved the way.

Polish Girl Leaves With Warm Aloha for Isles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, recently our fair State of Hawaii had as a guest, a 16-year-old Polish girl. She was not on an ordinary vacation or visit, but was in Hawaii for an operation which saved her life.

I mention this not only because it demonstrates the ability and prowess of Hawaii's doctors, but also because this young lady's association with Hawaii and its people exemplifies the experience of many with the aloha spirit of which we are so proud.

An article, which appeared in the Hawaii Tribune-Herald of March 29 tells of the great aloha spirit which was experienced by this young lady and of her reaction to it.

The news item follows:

POLISH GIRL LEAVES WITH WARM ALOHA FOR ISLES

HONOLULU.—"As long as I live, I will always remember with warmest feelings the act of kindness that saved my life."

This was the message Malgorzata Downarowicz, 16-year-old girl from Poland, con-

veyed to the people of Hawaii when she left for home.

The high school sophomore gained a new lease on life when she successfully underwent a delicate operation for removal of a nonmalignant tumor from her neck in Queen's Hospital.

It was performed by Dr. Ralph B. Cloward, the Honolulu neurosurgeon who lectured on this surgical technique in Warsaw, Poland, a few years ago.

Many groups here extended their helping hands to bring the girl to Honolulu for the lifesaving operation. Doctors said without the operation she eventually would have died.

Honolulu Rotary Club members raised $2,200 to pay for the plane trips of Malgorzata and her mother, Dr. Maria Downarowicz.

Dr. Cloward performed the operation free; Queen's provided hospital care at no charge, and the two stayed at a Waikiki hotel as guests of the management.

They left via Pan American to San Francisco and expected to be home in 10 days after stops at New York, London, Paris, and Warsaw. They live in Melchow, a town several miles from Warsaw.

Ernest W. Albrecht, mid-Pacific manager of Pan American, said that about 20 people including local Polish people were at the airport to bid the pair farewell.

At the airport, Malgorzata received a red, white, and blue lei (the colors of the American flag) to express the love of the people of America who made her trip possible.

Her mother was given a red and white lei, the colors of the Polish flag, to symbolize the friendship that exists between the Polish and American people.

In an interview, Malgorzata said she feels fine now and suffers no pain.

She recalled that before the operation she suffered from severe pain. "My whole body ached. I had to take pills every day to deaden the pain.

"But, I feel great now."

She added that she knew everything would come out all right following the operation because "I had great confidence in Dr. Cloward."

Malgorzata said she was a bit sad in leaving Hawaii, but was very excited about returning home in good health again.

Considering herself very fortunate, she said she was greatly overwhelmed by the help offered by complete strangers.

"The Poles are known for their gentleness and hospitality," she said, "but you can't compare this Hawaiian spirit with that of anything else in the world."

Indiana Man Earns Praise in Tornado Relief Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Charles A. Howell, of Hagerstown, Ind., is a township trustee, Wayne County Democratic chairman, and a personal friend. It was therefore, with great interest that I read a release, from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, recounting the extraordinary service rendered by Charlie Howell to the stricken individuals and communities of Indiana. As director of school lunch and commodity distribution, Mr. Howell set out with a truckload of foods from the USDA warehouse in Indiana; and, by long hours and hard work, in the 3 days following the disaster, he had supplied some 25,000 pounds of USDA-contributed foods to an estimated 5,000 people in need of help.

The tornado disaster of Palm Sunday was a great blow to the State of Indiana. But courageous people are beginning to plan, to rebuild, to pick up the pieces. To Charlie Howell, I extend my congratulations on behalf of those whom he has helped. I ask unanimous consent that the Department of Agriculture account be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY FREEMEN PRAISES INDIANA WORKER FOR TORNADO AREA FOOD DISTRIBUTION

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today commended the Indiana school lunch and commodity distribution State director for personally bringing practical food help to several thousand victims of the Palm Sunday tornadoes.

The Secretary said the actions of Charles A. Howell, who in the 3 days following the disaster brought several large truckloads of U.S. Department of Agriculture donated foods to communities and farmhouses in the swath of the killer wind that devasted parts of northern Indiana, "typifies the selfless dedication demonstrated by hundreds of local, State, and Federal workers during this widespread disaster."

In a letter of commendation to Mr. Howell, Secretary Freeman said, "Your actions during this emergency are a vivid example of what the Federal-State partnership in this distribution of our Nation's agricultural abundance means. I know that the several thousand people whom you and your small crew so capably served during your 3 days of dawn-to-midnight expeditions join me in this sincere commendation and expression of heartfelt thanks."

Mr. Howell, who resides on a farm near Hagerstown, Ind., has been director of school lunch and food distribution activities in the Hoosier State for 6 years. Married and the father of three children, he is also a grandfather. For the past 12 years, he has been a township trustee in Wayne County. Mr. Howell is an ex-serviceman, having served in Europe.

Following is an account of Charles A. Howell's 3-day accomplishments in getting USDA-donated foods to victims of Indiana tornadoes, pieced together from reports of Consumer and Marketing Service food distribution fieldworkers and telephone contact with Mr. Howell:

With communications lacking and without knowledge of what he might encounter, brawny Charlie Howell, an employee of the State with the formal title of school lunch and commodity distribution director, early Monday started off with a truckload of assorted USDA foods picked up from storage in Indianapolis. Following the tragic path of the tornado, he drove to Lebanon, one of the first towns hit. Here he left donated foods at the National Guard Armory, where Guard cooks had set up mass feeding operations for about 200 persons.

On the road again, Charlie Howell stopped in small communities and even single farmhouses, to leave food wherever he found need. One stop was in the small rural community of Elizaville, where he left food at the town hall with Red Cross volunteers who were struggling to provide help for shocked and dazed tornado victims.

Then on to Russiaville, where more than one-third of the 1,300 population was homeless. The Salvation Army needed so much food that Charlie Howell dropped the remainder of his load and returned immediately to the Indianapolis warehouse to reload his truck. His second foray through tornado-hit communities ended at midnight Monday near Kokomo.

Early Tuesday morning, Charlie Howell was off again with another truckload of USDA food, loaded on at a warehouse in Kokomo. Tuesday and Wednesday followed the same pattern as the previous day, through tornado-hit communities of Greentown, Marion, Lynn Grove, Wyatt and Elkhart, among others. By midweek, Mr. Howell and his crew had brought foods to all stricken communities.

In all, Charlie Howell and his truck brought something like 25,000 pounds of USDA-donated commodities to some 5,000 people who needed this help.

Other foods in school lunchrooms and in distribution centers in those townships participating in the needy family donation program were made available to disaster agencies to help relieve human suffering.

Some 300 people are receiving USDA foods at Lynn Grove in the Fort Wayne area, where the National Guard has set up mass feeding facilities, and at least another 300 are being fed at Wyatt where the Salvation Army is using both a stationary and a traveling kitchen.

About 1,000 at Dunlap, 800 at Mulberry, over 400 at Marion, 350 at Greentown, 300 at the Jefferson school near Goshen also are receiving USDA foods. From Crawfordsville to Berne, and from Koontz Lake to Elkhart, USDA foods are helping to feed the thousands of victims left homeless and destitute by the twisters that whipped through the peaceful Hoosier countryside on Palm Sunday, 1965.

In Perpetual Childhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 21 an article appeared in the Wall Street Journal, entitled "In Perpetual Childhood," which very forcefully presents the results of the welfare legislation which is being railroaded through the Congress by the President, who seems to be serving as well as majority leader in both the House and the Senate.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 21, 1965]

IN PERPETUAL CHILDHOOD

Although not all parents practice it, most would readily acknowledge their duty to prepare their children for the hardships as well as the rewards of life; in a word, to guide them to maturity. It is instructive to observe how the prevailing theory of Government stands this fundamental obligation on its head.

Governments everywhere, and not least in these United States, increasingly assume the parental role but are inherently incapable of providing parental wisdom. Call it the welfare state or the Great Society or what you will, it is almost as if the whole idea were to ward off maturity, or, as Tocqueville foresaw more than a century ago, to keep men "in perpetual childhood," with minimal need to act and think on their own.

The more obvious purpose, to be sure, lies in the lower reaches of politics: To garner

votes by sowing money in every possible field, to build power by promising solutions to all problems. But that process of Government aggrandizement cannot go unaccompained by some weakening of individual will. It is necessary only to note how placidly many Americans today accept Federal intrusions that would have been unthinkable a generation or two ago.

Federal largess, moreover, is by no means the sole agent of the alteration, even at a time when the subsidies are proliferating at a remarkable rate. There is also a pervasive pseudo-philosophy preached both in and out of Government, a creed of irresponsibility.

In this dark dogma security becomes the paramount value, overriding thrift, prudence, self-reliance, self-respect, intelligent accommodation to the complexities of existence and often indeed simple morality and honesty. People are not merely to be helped when in need; they are to be supported no matter what they do or do not do.

It could hardly be more symptomatic of the attitude that in our era serious discussion is granted to the proposition that income should be divorced from work, which means everyone should have a guaranteed and comfortable income regardless of whether he chooses to work. That, if anything could be, is a headlong flight from adult responsibility and straight into the arms of the all-mothering State.

To look askance at the trend is not necessarily to bewail an impending despotism, at least in the usual sense. As Tocqueville also perceived, the dangers confronting democracies are more subtle. In a degenerated democracy, the central authority is not wholly exploitative but wishes the people to be happy, so long as they don't think, and it actually tries to supply their wants and necessities.

To function at all the "tutelary power" must nonetheless cover the surface of society with a network of small, complicated rules, minute and uniform, through which the more original minds and the most energetic characters cannot penetrate, to rise above the crowd.

Thus, in Tocqueville's view of the danger, "the will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent and guided. * * * Such a power does not destroy but, * * * it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the Government is the shepherd."

How near or far the American democracy is today from that denouement, and what could realistically be done to prevent its materializing—these are questions without answers. What is clear is that we have already moved some considerable distance toward that society of sheep and that the pressure of much public policy and preachment seeks to push us further toward it.

Apart from diminishing the dignity of man, one of the unhappy aspects of the flight from responsibility is that it is a delusion. In our world no one and nothing can guarantee security or wash away all sorrows and difficulties. Time and again, the Federal Government has proved its incompetence to solve the myriad problems it takes on.

But no matter what a government attempts, it cannot forever shelter a people from the abrasive realities of personal, economic, and moral imperatives. To the extent a State succeeds in keeping a citizenry in perpetual childhood, it can only assure them a more painful awakening to manhood.

Dereliction in Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, individual editorial writers around the Nation are beginning to realize and to speak out publicly about the lack of discussion in this House on some of the most important and complicated issues before us. Unfortunately, it comes too late at this time but perhaps the fact that individual voices are being raised will help convince some that fair and full discussion is far preferable to steamroller tactics.

The thing which is most puzzling to me is that in view of the huge and workable majorities which the Democratic Party has in this and the other body, that they are compelled by some force to prevent scholarship and full and fair discussion. One wonders why, in view of their large numbers, they cannot allow the minority time and other opportunities to try to explore complicated legislation, the results of which many of us do not know. Generosity on the part of the majority would seem to be politically wise as well as legislatively sound. Their unwillingness to play fair is both disappointing and not able to be understood. Hopefully columnists, editorial writers, commentators and scholars of the legislative process will do some interviews in the weeks and months ahead to find out why the majority party Members feel so insecure that they have to rush their legislation through without adequate discussion and debate. This is one concrete recommendation that I have to make today in view of what has been happening here during recent weeks and what we are told will happen in the weeks and months ahead.

Following is an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 6, 1965, which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues:

DERELICTION IN DEBATE

It's tempting merely to chuckle about partisan politics when Republicans complain, as one of them did other day, that "the Great Society has turned into the great steamroller." But when a northern liberal Democrat supports the substance of that complaint, perhaps it's time to listen.

To wit, Representative EDITH GREEN's searing commentary on both the administration's primary education bill and the tactics used to speed House approval of that measure. The lady from Oregon noted that while her fellow Democrats brag of guarding minority rights, their benevolence evidently doesn't extend to congressional minorities which question official infallibility. She observed, "It seems to me we have in the House a determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement."

The debate did seem curiously restricted for a proposal with such far-reaching implications. Also, the bill is such a Rube Goldberg contraption that, as Mrs. GREEN said, more debate was needed simply "to let the House know what is actually in the bill." The measure is so confusing that at one point even its sponsors couldn't agree on what its language allowed. Still, its backers seemed intent on passing it without change, and treated most amendments peremptorily, without record votes and often without discussion.

Such arrogance might be understandable if the amendments were merely political or trifling. Instead, may of them dealt conscientiously with the bill's fundamentals, such as the fact that while its ostensible purpose is helping the disadvantaged, its systems of allocating Federal funds heavily favors already wealthy States.

The majority even brushed aside bipartisan attempts to facilitate judicial tests of the bill's constitutionality. The proposal intentionally walks close to the constitutional line on church-state questions, and Federal courts often evade jurisdiction on this issue by finding that no one is directly enough affected to bring suit. One proposed amendment might have helped simply by encouraging judicial review; another definitely specified who would be eligible to start constitutional tests.

Since the bill fosters a multiplicity of approaches to aiding children in church schools, it has endless opportunity for chaos unless the constitutional questions are resolved quickly. Not surprisingly, the judicial review provision was backed by the National School Board Association, which represent boards covering 95 percent of the Nation's pupils. The House majority chose to avoid the whole constitutional issue.

Simple by closing its ears to serious questions, the Democratic majority achieved the victory of having its measure passed practically untouched. This bit of vanity means, among other things, that some disadvantaged children will get shortchanged, and the Nation's school boards will have to struggle with the tough questions the House was afraid to face. As with so many past Federal programs, the price for dereliction in congressional debate will be paid by those the program purports to help.

Duties and Responsibilities of Trial Judges—Essay by Hon. Gordon W. Chambers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Honorable Gordon W. Chambers, judge of the city court, Richmond County, Ga., has written an excellent essay on the great duties and responsibilities of trial judges. I ask unanimous consent that his essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDICATURE

(By Gordon W. Chambers)

"Judici Satis Poena est Quod Deum Habet Ultorem."—1 Leon, 295.

A thousand defendants are tried by an active criminal court judge in a relatively

short space of time and each of them only once, but they in turn try civilization, the law, justice, and the judge a thousand times. Prisoner and judge pass judgment on each other.

Society must be protected, and with certainty, for its own preservation and more thought should solidify itself in behalf of the law abiding rather than sentimentalizing in behalf of the law violator.

It would be trite to emphasize in detail the terrific responsibility of a judge issuing orders, warrants and commitments, holding hearings at chambers, to say nothing of extrajudicial conferences, trying civil issues, making rulings and adjudicating subject matters of contract or tort involving immense sums of the "root of all evil," money, and even more so on the criminal side involving "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." It almost staggers the imagination, one defendant's emotional life and social history with its ramification of heredity and environment, status, health, economics, character, and personality, all indicative of the record of the cause. The effect is being tried. Yet, we all know the victimized individual's right and the public interest must also be protected by the exercise of a certain and equal justice tailored to history, status, record, and offense; just as we know in spite of our sympathies a mad dog must be destroyed, a contagion must be quarantined and that we must give some of our property (taxes) to preserve the rest of it and withal contihue to civilized order of government and society. Multiply this a thousand times and you have some idea of a year in the life of a jurist.

A judge doesn't forget what he knew as a man. His conscience is not concerned with its own approval or persuaded by its disapproval of a statute. He applies the law, construes and interprets, in all cases to the end that in truth justice will ensue in accordance with legislative intent. The jury establishes the facts under rules of evidence enacted in search of the truth and to make sure as human experience can make certain that the jury's final verdict reflects the truth as they found it to be. From the filing of civil petition, warrant or indictment in criminal accusation, through demurrer, plea and answer, every ruling "His Honor" makes, every construction and interpretation, every judgment rendered or sentence pronounced places the judge on trial.

Still, these judges are more powerful than President or potentate within the limits of their court's jurisdiction geographically and the subject matter. Therefore, they should be thrice more humble and lose themselves completely in applying the power of their office to the law of the land which is the last defense of democratic institutions and the rights of society.

Treating life as it is, the great Greek lawgiver, Solon, said, "No, I have not given the people the best laws; I have given them the best laws that they will stand for." There is a practical equation measured by our own enlightened progress with civilization. Always growing apace and trying to make things better and as they should be.

Elected judges must have something more than mental attainment and judicial temperament. They have to possess political sagacity, character, and personality to capture the public imagination or interest the same as any candidate aspiring to be mayor or alderman. Necessarily they have to meet and know all classes of people making up the electorate and it is essential that they be friendly if they hope to serve these people an equal and fearless universal justice. This can be done regardless and heedless of human perversity without compromise of soul, heart, mind or conscience.

The judge being a human being, he can feel friendly toward every living creature and this includes sinners as well as saints, denizens, and also, citizens of the ecclesiastical clergy. It is entirely a matter of personality and strength of character. A minister and a judge, certainly those of the Christian faith, can be friendly to sinner and saint without granting immunity to any citizen for reaping what he has sown. Hate the sin if we will, but never the sinner. Before independent courts of justice there are no such things as friends or foe. "His Honor," is very dear to a judge.

Politically there are diverse views as to electing a judge for a limited tenure or appointment by leigislative, executive or other committee for a rather lengthy period or life. Much can be said pro and con, but with all its imperfections the popular vote can terminate incompetence, which is very hard to do under life tenure by impeachment. The idealistic theory of unlimited tenure has proved impractical in State governments and from time to time it is censured in the Federal system.

The duties of a judge invokes, if not imposes, a cruel responsibility touching as it does the quick of a dedicated conscience, which challenges a brave indifference to any personal effect, ambition or status. God must bless with some mystical gift those judges defiant of the political demagog or boss, deaf to the cries of the mob and immune to subtle influence or treacherous flattery such as press slanted propaganda or half truth vocally. These mystically endowed wearers of the robe can look into the mirror and see nothing there but duty. They have God as their avenger and this is enough for them. They face their responsibility without tremor or fear. Socrates and his hemlock come to mind and the cross transfixes the heart.

Taxes and College Tuition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, as one of many Members who has introduced legislation during the past 5 years to obtain tax relief for parents sending children to college, I was encouraged by an editorial in Forbes magazine, April 15, in behalf of tax credits for college expenses.

The article follows:

TAXES AND COLLEGE TUITION

Why not?

Who would, could sensibly oppose a reasonable program for some degree of tax credit for college tuition?

Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman all advocated various Federal programs to encourage and finance higher education. President Johnson is even more all-out in his enthusiasm for substantially stepping up our investment in learning. Every State university has been growing enormously, straining State exchequers to meet the cost of educating more eligible millions of young people.

Fortunately, most Americans agree that putting money into schooling and scholarship is the wisest, soundest type of investment. Much has been done by many governmental agencies, foundations, corporations and other private groups to provide scholarships for those with college ability but not family means.

In point of fact, those who now have it the toughest are the family breadwinners who are earning too much to qualify on a poverty basis for scholarship aid, but too little to meet the heavy burden of their youngster's college costs. Tuition, board, lodging, books, clothes and assorted sundries for a college year are figured to average over $2,000. If there is more than 1 child in college—and the average American family now has 2.39 children—the strain on the family income, even if it is well over $10,000 a year before taxes, is frequently prohibitive.

A number of proposals to permit a tax credit are in the congressional hopper, some of them having been introduced for many years. It is high time the advocates got together on one measure and put it through. The postwar baby crop is now of college age and the squeeze between rising costs and larger numbers is really on and really hurting.

With a President and a Congress and a people all sympathetic to the family financial problem and all warmly committed to the value of higher education, it surely should be possible this year to enact a meaningful college tuition tax-credit measure.

Our Position in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The World Now Knows Precisely How It Can Have Asian Peace," published in the Atlanta Constitution of April 8, 1965; also an article entitled "U.S. Concept Is All Wrong," written by Walter Lippmann and recently published. Both the editorial and the article deal generally with the same subject.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Apr. 11, 1965]

THE WORLD NOW KNOWS PRECISELY HOW IT CAN HAVE ASIAN PEACE

President Johnson greatly enlarged the possibility of peace in Vietnam Wednesday night by spelling out what the United States will not do, and what it will do.

If the war must continue, then "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw * * * Armed hostility is futile * * * our resources are equal to any challenge * * * our patience and determination are unending * * * We will use our power with restraint * * * But we will use it."

That much needed stating once and for all, and it was so stated.

What the United States will do, if North Vietnam is ready to call off its war; and permit "an independent South Vietnam" to live as it wishes, "securely guaranteed" and "free from outside interference" by anybody, was spelled out with a clarity, in advance of any negotiations, that may be unprecedented in modern diplomacy.

The United States for its part will accept a South Vietnam "tied to no alliance," and serving as "a military base for no other country." That would mean withdrawal of American troops, which North Vietnam has been demanding as a precondition to negotiations.

And when North Vietnam is ready to talk over these essentials, then the United States is ready "for unconditional discussions."

It was that clear.

What if North Vietnam isn't ready to talk? The President's threat was unmistakable: "We have no desire to devastate that which the people of North Vietnam have built with toil and sacrifice * * * But we will use our power."

And what if North Vietnam does wish to make peace? For the first time President Johnson specifically included North Vietnam as a prospective beneficiary of massive development aid for southeast Asia, which could secure its independence from China, among other things. He asked U Thant to organize the development effort among all southeast Asians. He specifically mentioned harnessing of the Mekong which serves all of southeast Asia. He put a billion U.S. dollars on the barrelhead to start the underwriting, and he invited the rest of the world to join in—specifically including Russia—lest anybody think this was an oily American effort to buy southeast Asia away from communism per se.

In a very shrewd way, though, it did represent an effort to buy southeast Asia away from China. Russia can afford to join us hugely in the development financing. China lacks the resources. Russia doesn't want to see China take southeast Asia. Neither does North Vietnam want to be taken by China. The President figures they can all add.

So there it it. It couldn't be clearer. With extraordinary candor, the President has opened a way to a peace desirable to everyone but China—and closed the way to any further doubt about American will if North Vietnam chooses war.

U.S. CONCEPT IS ALL WRONG

(By Walter Lippmann)

WASHINGTON.—Why is it, it is time to ask, that our position in Asia has declined so sharply though we are widening and intensifying the war in Vietnam?

According to the so-called domino theory, the United States would lose the respect and support of the peoples of Asia if, in confronting Chinese communism, it showed itself to be a paper tiger and refrained from military action. For 3 months, since February, we have applied this theory ever more vigorously. And what are the results? Quite contrary to what was predicted: today the United States is not only isolated but increasingly opposed by every major power in Asia.

With the exception of Japan, which has a government but not a people who support our policy, all the Asian powers are against us on this issue—not only China and Indonesia, but the Soviet Union, India, and Pakistan. The crucial fact is that, although the Asian powers are by no means at peace with one another, what they do have in common is an increasingly vociferous opposition to the escalated war we have been waging since February. India and Pakistan, India and China, China and the Soviet Union are quarreling to the point of war with one another. But they are united in condemning our February war.

GENERAL OPPOSITION

The administration should put this fact in its pipe and smoke it. It should ponder the fact that there exists such general Asian opposition to our war in Asia. The President's advisers can take some comfort, but mighty little, from the fact that alined with us is the Thailand Government in Bangkok, which is independent though weak; the government in Seoul, which we subsidize; the government in Taipei, which we protect; the government in Saigon, which governs something less than half of South Vietnam. Pondering the matter, we must, alas, put into the other scale the ominous, rising anti-Americanism in the Philippines.

The dominoes are indeed falling, and they are falling away from us.

What is the root of all this swelling anti-Americanism among the Asians? It is that they regard our war in Vietnam as a war by a rich, powerful, white, Western nation against a weak and poor Asian nation, a war by white men from the West against nonwhite men in Asia. We can talk until the cows come home about how we are fighting for the freedom of the South Vietnamese. But to the Asian peoples it is obviously and primarily an American war against an Asian people.

In my view the President is in grave trouble. He is in grave trouble because he has not taken to heart the historic fact that the role of the Western white man as a ruler in Asia was ended forever in the Second World War. Against the Japanese the Western white powers were unable to defend their colonies and protectorates in Asia. That put an end to the white man's domination in Asia which had begun in the 15th century.

ULTIMATE VICTORY

Since then, despite our ultimate victory over the Japanese Empire, the paramount rule has been that Asians will have to be ruled by Asians and that the Western white powers can never work out a new relationship with the Asian peoples except as they find a basis of political equality and nonintervention on which economic and cultural exchanges can develop.

This great historic fact is an exceedingly difficult one for many westerners to digest and accept. It is as hard for them to accept this new relationship with Asia as it is for many a southerner in this country to accept the desegregation of schools and public accommodations. The Asia lands who still instinctively think of Asia in prewar terms are haunted by Rudyard Kipling and the white man's burden and the assumption that east of Suez are the lesser breeds without the law.

Until we purge ourselves of these old preconceptions and prejudices, we shall not be able to deal with Asian problems, and we shall find ourselves, as we are today in Vietnam, in what the German poet described as the unending pursuit of the ever-fleeting object of desire.

Armenian Martyr's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, on the 50th anniversary of the Turkish massacre of the Armenian nation, the Governor of the State of Maine, His Excellency John H. Reed, issued a proclamation setting Saturday, April 24, 1965, as Armenian Martyr's Day. I think it is appropriate that Members of the 89th Congress be informed of the action by the State of Maine.

The proclamation follows:

ARMENIAN MARTYR'S DAY PROCLAMATION

STATE OF MAINE

Whereas 50 years ago, on April 24, 1915, the Government of Turkey ordered the massacre of the Armenian nation which before its termination was to take the toll of 1 million lives, with an additional 1 million displaced, ill, and in want; and

Whereas the beginning of the Armenian martyrdom marked at the same time the opening of the many important contributions to the Allied war effort in World War I by the Armenian nation, affectionately termed "The Little Ally" by Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America; and

Whereas the sacrifice of the Armenian nation in the cause of virtuous government, freedom, justice, and human rights serves to remind us that mankind is ready to perish in the interest of noble causes; and

Whereas in this anniversary year of the 1915 genocide of the Armenian nation it is significant to remember those men, women, and children who perished in violence, to honor their memory and pay tribute to their self-sacrifice:

Now, therefore, I, John H. Reed, Governor of the State of Maine, do hereby proclaim Saturday, April 24, 1965, as Armenian Martyr's Day, and urge that proper recognition be accorded to this solemn occasion.

Given at the office of the Governor at Augusta and sealed with the great seal of the State of Maine, this 15th day of April 1965, and of the independence of the United States of America, the 189th.

By the Governor:

JOHN H. REED.

Indianapolis Times Praises Secretary Fowler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler made an address before the recent meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It was his first major speech since assuming the post of Secretary, and it received a warm reception by the newspapermen who were there.

The Indianapolis Times was among the newspapers which commented favorably in its editorial pages on this address. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial of April 21, which was published in that newspaper under the title "Fowler's Economics Lecture," may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Times, Apr. 21, 1965]

FOWLER'S ECONOMICS LECTURE

In his first major speech as the new Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler last weekend delivered a lecture on economics to a meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. The lecture made unusually good commonsense.

Here are some of the points Fowler made:

There is no one theory on which economic progress can rest. We gain by a host of practical policies which are "pragmatic rather than dogmatic, balanced rather than extreme, resilient rather than rigid."

The Government by itself cannot fashion any cure-alls or solutions for economic problems; the prime mover has to be the private economy.

The Government's responsibility lies in sound tax policies which stimulate business rather than hamper it, in a "rigorous" control of Government spending, and in monetary practices which permit suitable long-term credit and make for price stability.

There is such a thing as "excessive" growth in the economy, which can promote inflation. This is to be avoided.

Fowler's statements were in contrast to some of the high-flown ideas we so often hear from Government officials, or even private economists, who talk as though a single pet theory of their own could provide instant prosperity, who never are influenced by the failure of these theories, who complain our national growth has been lagging, who think the Government, merely by spending, can solve everything.

The Treasury Secretary thinks the reductions in sale or excise taxes President Johnson is about to propose will provide an incentive for price reductions and at the same time bolster private purchasing power. But he warned against anything but "prudent" tax cuts—which, for one thing, simply would further the perennial round of Government deficits. Fowler, almost uniquely for a Washington official, seems to think these are bad business.

If the policies Fowler outlined are to be Government policies the next 4 years, then the country can indeed look forward to a burgeoning economy. We hope the spenders and theorists in Congress and elsewhere in the Government will refrain from meddling.

Additional U.S. Aid to Nasser's Egypt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, on April 21, there appeared in the Los Angeles Times an editorial entitled "Additional U.S. Aid to Nasser's Egypt?" the full text of which follows:

ADDITIONAL U.S. AID TO NASSER'S EGYPT?

Can Gamal Abdel Nasser be serious in his reported request for $500 million in U.S. aid to Egypt over the next 3 years? Ah, indeed he can. Like the patricide who seeks mercy from the court because he is now an orphan, Nasser has always shown an incredible impudence in his dealings with the United States.

Being slow to anger and quick to forgive may well be a commendable virtue, but it is one that has definite limits in international relations. The House recognized this in January when it voted to halt further surplus food shipments to Egypt. Under executive prodding this stand was abandoned.

But the House vote reflected a widespread feeling that in Egypt's case the United States has run out of cheeks to turn, just as it has run out of libraries for Egyptians to burn down.

Most of the $1.2 billion in U.S. aid to Egypt since 1952 has consisted of surplus food, mostly grain. The United States doesn't want to take this food out of the mouths of hungry fellahin. But an end to U.S. wheat sales, which Nasser has said he expects and has planned for, wouldn't have to do this.

The serious shortages of food and other consumer necessities in Egypt haven't occurred simply because Egypt is a poor country with a too rapidly growing population. The shortages exist because the Egyptian Government has squandered countless millions on needless, unproductive, and largely malicious enterprises of no value at all to the Egyptian people.

Nasser has had no trouble finding the money to sustain a 50,000-man army in Yemen, or to supply Congo rebels, or to subvert other governments, or to pay off on $1 billion worth of Soviet arms. With limited resources, he has chosen which courses to follow.

The State Department argues about the need to maintain a U.S. influence in Egypt. What influence? Nasser daily grows chummier with the Communists and meddles more openly in the business of other nations. He has worked, independently or as a Soviet agent, against free world interests at a score of points.

It is impossible to see why the United States, through aid of any kind, should contribute to the furtherance of these policies. The answer to any Egyptian aid request is written in Nasser's own record.

The opinion expressed is precisely that which I hold on this subject, and it is shared by my constituents, as indicated in their many letters to me over the past months.

In view of Nasser's past performances, and particularly his grossly insulting actions and speeches during this last year, I simply cannot see how the U.S. Government can possibly give favorable consideration to any further request for U.S. aid to the United Arab Republic without a strong, positive indication of a sincere and definite about-face in position and policy.

So far as I can determine, the continued discretion granted to the President early in this congressional session has had absolutely no effect in what appears to be our continually deteriorating relations with the United Arab Republic. A firmer approach to the problem through the executive branch might serve some useful purpose. There can be no question, however, that it appears more advisable to exert pressure for a policy change through provision for prohibition of further assistance in the foreign aid authorization bill now under consideration by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I earnestly caution my colleagues to watch this development closely, and unless some more effective presentation evinces a promise of improved relations, I urge them—on both sides of the aisle—to stand resolute to the position originally adopted by the House in its vote on January 26 of this year, and to do what we can to convince the other body that such position has proved to be correct.

Wisconsin: Mother of Circuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the attached article.

Wisconsin is best known as "America's Dairyland," but it is also the "Mother of Circuses." The greatest of all, Ringling Bros. Circus, was spawned in Baraboo, Sauk County, hometown of the Ringlings. In this circus city is the Circus World Museum, operated by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. It is a tremendous tourist attraction, luring increasing numbers every year to see this authentic circus of yesteryear.

It is so aptly described in the Northern Natural Gas Co.'s Transmission magazine, that I submit it herewith in the hope it will prove of interest to those who read this RECORD:

BARABOO'S CIRCUS WORLD MUSEUM

Often, when one thinks of a museum, he is vulnerable to thoughts of a cavernous hall, musty and dusty.

Most museums are not like that, but none shatters this image more than the Circus World Museum in Baraboo, Wis., some 30 miles northwest of Madison.

Cloaked in bright colors and noisily alive, the museum is owned and operated by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, and annually it attracts more than 125,000 persons during a mid-May to mid-September season.

Director C. P. "Chappie" Fox, author of five books dealing with the circus life, describes the hubub of activity simply:

"This is the way it's supposed to be. The circuses of yesteryear were like this. Everything has to be authentic. Sure, there are easier ways to do many of the things we perform and construct here, such as the rehabilitation of circus wagons, but if it isn't authentic the public resents it and we're in trouble."

To do the museum justice, it takes a minimum of 4 hours to see and do everything. A thorough inspection would fill an entire day.

Before the features of the museum are described, it is probably best to answer the following question at this time: Why in Baraboo, anyway?

Wisconsin is probably best known as America's dairyland. It also is the "Mother of the Circuses." Of 100 circuses which emerged from various communities in Wisconsin, the greatest of all, Ringling Bros. World's Greatest Shows, was spawned in Baraboo, hometown of the brothers.

The famed Ringling Bros. Circus was born on May 19, 1884, under meager circumstances—in terms of both finance and talent. After a small parade through Baraboo, the customers were treated to acts of juggling and tumbling and the antics of a clown, all under a tent 40 by 95 feet.

Sympathetic and apparently footloose farmers used their wagons and horses to transport the circus to the next town. In a matter of 20 years Ringling Bros. was challenging Barnum & Bailey for circus supremacy.

Ringling Bros. wintered in Baraboo from 1884 to 1919, but when Barnum & Bailey was acquired, off-season headquarters were moved to Bridgeport, Conn.

Once the circus left town, lore was left to the oldtimers. In the 1940's John M. Kelley, for many years legal adviser for Ringling Bros., retired to Baraboo.

He talked up the idea for a circus museum, and tried long in vain to sell it to the citizens. Finally, after much preaching, the spark ignited in the mid-1950's and Baraboo's businessmen got behind the plan. Circus World Museum, Inc., was organized and a successful fund drive was culminated in 1958.

That same year the city of Baraboo bought one of the nine Ringling Bros. buildings which lined Water Street a couple of blocks from the downtown section. The building was turned over to the museum, and several businessmen banded together to construct two more for concessions. Word began to spread. Soon circus memorabilia began filtering in—circus wagons, costumes, vintage posters, and many others.

On July 2, 1959, the museum opened, complete with parade. Forty thousand saw the

parade; 10,000 crowded past the exhibits. Among celebrities on hand was Actress Rhonda Fleming, star of the movie, "Big Circus," which premiered at the Al Ringing Theater in Baraboo that day.

With the museum on sound financial footing, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin took over the operation. During the past 6 years, 3 additional buildings have been purchased, and the size of the grounds has been increased to where it now totals 15 acres.

The museum has a fantastic wealth of articles on display. There are authentic circus wardrobes, photographs, and art work of performing horses, intricate wood carvings, photographs of current circus acts and personalities, flamboyant examples of circus advertising and lithographs, colorful circus wagon wheels, photos of famous sideshows, and a history of the circus in Wisconsin.

Perhaps the most fascinating display is a miniature circus built by John Zweifel. It is an exact replica of the Ringling circus of 1956 containing 25,000 individual pieces, most of which are animated. The Circus World Museum also owns 40 colorful circus wagons, the largest collection in the world.

Supplying real flavor is a steam calliope which blasts out in concert every half hour. Twice a day, under a smaller size version of the "big top," trained animal acts take to the ring, including three elephants, 12 ponies, dogs, clowns, and acrobats. Twice a day a seven-car circus train on 800 feet of track is unloaded by eight Percheron horses and a chain-driven truck just as it was done in the old days.

Roaming the premises are a goat pulling a wagon in which children can ride and an even-tempered, nonspitting llama named Lloyd.

Another of the top attractions is a 25-minute tour of Baraboo in an open carriage pulled by a jeep where points of historic interest related to the circus are described.

New at the museum in 1965 will be an 85-foot railroad advertising car used by the advance men to beat the drums for the coming circus. The car is the last one actually used by Ringling Bros. & Barnum & Bailey. In the car will be a graphic history of circus printing and design including a pastemaking boiler. The car will even be outfitted with bunks used by the advance men.

Another innovation this year will be a newly acquired side show of memorable circus freaks of the late 1800's, all molded of Fiberglas and housed under a 20- by 40-foot tent.

The Circus World Museum relies entirely on its admissions and donations to stay in the black, and museum officials are quick to point out that the admission price takes care of the entire tour with no hidden fees within the gates.

Of course, not all donations come in the form of cash, but they are equally if not more valuable. "Chappie" Fox explains: "As the fame of the museum has spread, we have received articles and collections from all over the country. We try to work most of them into displays, but one of the greatest values is that it provides an important research function, a key area of our operation."

The Circus World Museum makes a significant economic contribution to Baraboo, a city of 7,500.

First of all, it has an annual payroll of over $40,000, employing 15 persons during the summer and 9 during the winter.

Of more importance is the tide of visitors each year. After this season they will number close to a million since the opening in 1959.

Fox describes the impact: "Bankers in Baraboo have told me that the average visitor to the museum spends anywhere from $3 to $5 in town in addition to our admission. Multiply that by a million, and you have a pretty impressive figure."

Peace and Promise in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the military events in South Vietnam have thus far overshadowed what could be the most significant international cooperative project yet undertaken in the world.

The Mekong River plan has been in the planning stage for some time. This exciting and challenging idea could become reality if a peaceful settlement can be reached in the war in Vietnam. President Johnson has pledged a billion dollars for this cooperative project, and I am certain that the United States stands ready to do even more if called upon for assistance.

In a Washington Star editorial of April 21, 1965, the promise and potential of this enterprise were eloquently described. I take this opportunity to bring the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

THE PROMISE OF THE MEKONG

Although nothing much can come of it until there is a peaceful and guaranteed settlement of the war in Vietnam, there is great promise in President Johnson's offer of large-scale American aid to improve the lot of all the peoples of southeast Asia, including the North Vietnamese. He will ask Congress, he says, to approve "a billion-dollar American investment in this effort" as soon as it gets underway as an international cooperative enterprise. The investment should prove to be good.

The enterprise, as a matter of fact, has been in the planning stage for some years past. Under the leadership of the United Nations, no fewer than 21 countries, a dozen specialized U.N. agencies, and several private business organizations and foundations have been contributing millions of dollars and invaluable brainpower to it. The first objective is to begin translating the plans into action, with a view to developing the immense potentialities of the 2,600-mile-long Mekong River, which is one of the world's greatest.

This river, which has it source in Tibet and empties into the South China Sea, has a basin that covers 381,000 square miles, which is much larger than France. The riparian states directly affected are Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and South Vietnam, and it is noteworthy that these four—despite their bitter political antagonisms—have long been working together in support of efforts to harness the Mekong for their mutual enrichment. The economic and social betterment of 50 million human beings is involved, and at least another 50 million will be helped if the basin's potentials are effectively exploited.

In President Johnson's words, "The task is nothing less than to enrich the hopes and existence of more than 100 million people. * * * The vast Mekong River can provide food and water and power on a scale to dwarf even our own TVA." Experts have estimated, for example, that the Mekong's waters can be used for irrigation effective enough to increase rice production 500 to 600 percent. Clearly, in terms of agriculture, industry and things like rural electrification, the river's harnessing promises to be beneficently revolutionary.

The Asians are well aware of all this, and great numbers of them—assuming that they hear the Voice of America—must be encouraged by what the President has pledged. Actually, of course, the $1 billion he has mentioned seems conservative. It probably would be but the start of a much larger American contribution in the event of a genuine international cooperative effort—more or less like the Marshall Plan that saved Western Europe—to stem the Red tide and keep southeast Asia free.

Great Society Question Marks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times has performed a noteworthy service in bringing to public attention some of the serious questions which exist in connection with the administration legislative program.

In an editorial entitled, "Great Society Question Marks" the Times poses questions that must be faced about the far-reaching role the Federal Government would assume at the National, State, and local levels of government under various programs enacted by the Congress and proposals under consideration.

I believe the editorial will be of interest to Members of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

GREAT SOCIETY QUESTION MARKS

As the 89th Congress completes its first 100 days, President Johnson is getting high marks for the impressive volume of Great Society measures which are becoming law.

Whether it is sound legislation, taking Americans along a route they actually want to travel, is another question.

One thing is clear: Under Mr. Johnson's leadership the Federal Government is assuming an unprecedented role of leadership, even dominance, in areas traditionally in the local and State bailiwick.

Under measures already signed, Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools will become a reality for the first time—with Washington keeping a veto power over how the money is used.

The so-called Appalachia bill breaks new ground, too, in taxing citizens everywhere to subsidize economic recovery and development in one region.

Federal responsibility for medical care for the aged is asserted in the multibillion-dollar medicare bill which has passed the House.

Still pending are White House proposals to pay rent subsidies to middle-income families, to inject Washington into city planning and to double the antipoverty program.

Each of these measures represents an effort to deal with real problems which must be met at some level of government. The question is which level.

Great Society champions argue that local and State governments have proved unwilling or unable to do the job, and that Washington has the responsibility to move in—which it is now doing.

What is alarming is that such a momentous shift in American government could take place with no true national dialog, and so little public recognition that it is even taking place.

Problem one is that so much legislation is being passed so fast that no one is quite sure what jokers may be in the deck.

Another trouble is that, in a sense, no opposition party exists. Republicans are outnumbered more than two to one in both houses. And many, understandably, are too concerned with rebuilding the party image to take a vocal antispending stance.

Normally, the Democrats would soon fall out among themselves, and a dollar-conscious business community would raise an outcry.

President Johnson, however, heads off such criticism by calling in potential opponents and hearing their views while the legislation is being drafted. Thus, a consensus is reached, with little fanfare, before the bill even reaches Congress.

This is remarkably astute politics, and it makes for deceptively smooth government. But it smothers the kind of public discussion essential to healthy democracy.

What, for example, will be the future costs of medicare, aid to education and the antipoverty program? No one knows—except that the present price tag is only a starter

Another foot-in-the-door tactic is to leave legislation purposely vague in order to skirt opposition. The idea is, "pass it now and fix it later."

Mr. Johnson will have his problems later in the form of soaring budgets, higher taxes, court tests, and administrative waste and confusion. By that time, however, there may be no turning back from the welfare state, L.B.J. style.

The Posture of Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following essay, entitled "The Posture of Neutrality," which was delivered at the graduation ceremony at Hollywood High School on Thursday, January 28, by Miss Nancy Knight. I am not only deeply impressed, but greatly encouraged by the sentiments expressed in her paper, for the very survival of our great Republic depends upon the youth of today.

The essay follows:

THE POSTURE OF NEUTRALITY

Recently, a major metropolitan newspaper published the results of a public opinion poll. The question: Are you in favor of Federal aid to education? The significant conclusion, obvious in the results of this poll, did not lie in the percentage of those who reacted negatively or those who responded affirmatively. Standing out like an ominous flare at the scene of a highway disaster was the frightening fact that more than one-half of those interviewed expressed no opinion at all. These are the neutrals, those who lack sufficient interest to examine, to evaluate, and to take a stand. Progress, whether it is achieved by an individual, a nation, or the universe, always is the product of active involvement. In this great period of social upheaval and change, to what extent are we involved? Are we to be spectators or participants?

History has proven that men who cling to their positions of neutrality have stunted the growth of new ideas and impeded progress. Those who fail to take a stand do not fulfill their obligation to society.

Pontius Pilate is a classic example of a neutral. In his capacity as Roman provincial governor, he was called upon to decide whether Christ should be put to death. The Bible records his evasion of responsibility in Matthew 27: 24 which reads, "He took water and washed his hands before the multitudes, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just man." Pontius Pilate's conscience dictated a course of action. He believed that Christ was an innocent man, but was afraid to resist the majority.

Neutrality may lead to national tragedy. History is filled with events that demonstrate the folly of apathy. For example, the Western powers, although they had promised aid to the point of intervention, if necessary, did nothing when Hungary was invaded by the Russians on October 23, 1956. The Hungarian people lost their freedom because of Western neutrality. To those now living in enslavement, neutrality is far more devastating than war.

Hitler's Third Reich, with all of its atrocities, never would have been possible if men of principle had taken an active stand to prevent it. Less than 5 percent of the German population were Nazis. Hitlerism flourished because of what the remaining 95 percent did not do. The swastika flag flew over more than half a continent because of the refusal of larger nations to become involved.

The inertia of neutrality can also lead to disaster in the destiny of an individual. In May 1964, in the predawn darkness of the middle-class community of Kew Gardens, N.Y., Kitty Genovese was murdered while 37 witnesses stared from their windows but would not call the police or otherwise intercede. Primarily concerned with their own comfort and safety, these 37 witnesses refused to involve themselves. Their neutrality nourished crime and resulted in the death of an innocent girl.

When people take a stand and dedicate themselves to their beliefs, they are then accepting their responsibilities as human beings. The posture of neutrality is neither positive nor negative. It is passive. Neutrality is the doctrine of doing nothing. Any situation of importance requires doing something constructive.

Consider the people of Judea in their great moment of decision when the Syrian King Antiochus ordered them to discard their heritage, abandon their God, and worship the graven images he had placed in their temple. Would not their acceptance have been far easier than the savage battle that ensued? Yet, the Jewish people, though apparently hopelessly outnumbered, did take a stand and did win. It is in celebration of this refusal to remain neutral that the world Jewish community now annually celebrates the happy holiday, Hanukkah.

Or—remember Joan of Arc? She was only 18 years old and unable to read or write, thus being a perfect candidate for neutrality. Instead, she elected to assume military leadership in the fight to save her country. As a result of her efforts, France was saved.

Three hundred and forty-four years later, on December 16, 1773, a band of Bostonian men refused to tolerate the punitive tax on tea which was imposed by the British. To dramatize their protest, they disguised themselves as Mohawk Indians. Brandishing hatchets, they boarded 3 British ships in the harbor, broke open 342 cases of tea, and dumped the contents overboard. This act caused severe new restrictions on Massachusetts from British Parliament. An attempt was made to starve out the citizens of Massachusetts, but their refusal to remain neutral had inspired the people in the other colonies to come to their aid with food and supplies. Instead of neutrality, there was organized action, leading eventually to our Declaration of Independence.

Neutrality is stagnation. Like the automobile whose gearshift is in neutral, a society which is neutral goes nowhere. Civilization can move forward only if it is geared to move forward. The engine may be running, but the vehicle will not advance if the engine is merely idling. Those of us who are graduating tonight are prepared for a constructive contribution to our society. Those who have educated us have done their best to equip us with sound motivations. But—only we can shift gears. Only we can choose our destinations. We can move in reverse, we can idle and go nowhere, or we can move forward. As free men, we have the right to change destinations. As human beings, we will encounter hazards such as stop signs and detours. But always we must avoid the stagnation of neutrality.

The distinguished American poetess, Edna St. Vincent Millay, was approximately the same age as we candidates for graduation when she wrote one of her most famous poems, "Renascence." She closes her lyrical rhapsody with this expression of the futility of neutrality.

"And he whose soul is flat—the sky
Will cave in on him by and by."

NANCY V. KNIGHT.

Future of the U.S. Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix I am submitting an interesting talk by Mr. William B. Rand, president, United States Lines, at launching of the SS *American Resolute*, at Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa., on April 15, 1965.

Members who share my concern as to the future of the U.S. merchant marine may find these remarks thought provoking.

The talk follows:

Mrs. Mailliard, Miss Mailliard, Congressman MAILLIARD, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to welcome you who are joining with us today in the launching of our newest ship—the SS *American Resolute*.

It is particularly pleasant to meet Mrs. Mailliard and to congratulate her on the perfect swing she displayed in smashing the traditional bottle of champagne and sending the *Resolute* into her natural element a few short hours ago. I must add, also, that she was most admirably supported in her christening role by lovely Miss Toni Mailliard.

In nudging the *Resolute* into the Delaware, Mrs. Mailliard closed the logbook on a particular, and I might say spectacular, class of cargo liners. For this 13,000-ton vessel is the last of five sister ships, which have the distinction of being the first vessels in the entire American merchant marine to have been designed and built from the keel up as fully automated ships.

The SS *American Resolute* is an electronic marvel. The technological advances built into this vessel are such that a single officer on the bridge can control her 18,750 horsepower engines as easily as a Sunday admiral can manipulate his outboard on a postage stamp lake.

A simple turn of a wheel set in a console on the *Resolute's* bridge can dictate the speed of the ship, fast or slow, ahead or astern.

The bridge installation, however, is really an extension of the ship's main controls, centered in a huge console in the engine room.

But many of you guests here today are shippers, and I'm sure you are more interested in just what a ship like our *American Resolute* can do for you, rather than what makes her run.

Well, to begin with, she can help you pinpoint vessel transit time to a much more precise degree than heretofore.

This is made possible by the easy, 21-knot service speed of the new ship. The vagaries of weather which are often a factor in delayed ocean transit time, are greatly offset by a reserve speed of some 4 knots built into the *Resolute* and her sister ships.

Our fast new Challenger-class ships are today crossing the Atlantic in 6½ days which cuts 3 to 4 days from the old running times.

Speed and efficiency are the key notes throughout the entire ship. Like her 4 sisters and 11 predecessors of conventional design, she has automatic, pushbutton hatch covers, high-speed electric winches. Two of her six hatches have triple hatch openings permitting the spotting of cargo directly to final stowage point without need for shunting or man handling once aboard. These hatches are served by a 70-ton, heavy-lift boom.

The *Resolute* and his sisters have a 700,000-cubic-foot cargo capacity a striking feature of which is 151,000 cubic feet of refrigerated space. This latter area is equivalent to the capacity of 43 railroad cars and is easily accessible to expeditious cargo-handling devices such as forklift trucks.

I said earlier that the launching of the *Resolute* closed the book on the group of ships, which we call our *Challenger II* class.

It did, but it also signaled the start of a new breed of ship even more advanced as far as automation and speed are concerned than the *Resolute*.

We have contracted to build in this same yard five "Super Challengers" which will be powered by 26,000 horsepower turbines giving a cruising speed of 23 knots and a fantastic top speed of some 27 knots. They will be the fastest freighters ever to put to sea.

Additional features of these new ships will include a push-botton cellular arrangement for stowage of containers and powerful booms providing lifts of 30 tons, 70 tons, and 140 tons. They will have a 760,000 cubic foot cargo capacity.

The *American Resolute*, the 15 new ships that have preceded her and the score or so more vessels that we plan to build at an overall cost of nearly $400 million are a concrete indication of the confidence my company has in the future of the American merchant marine.

However, I must confess that that confidence I refer to has been somewhat shaken by certain events of recent years. There is no longer any semblance of a clear policy on the national level as to the future of American shipping—as a matter of fact, we are living today in a climate of confusion such as we have never experienced before. We, who operate American-flag ships, cannot make a maximum contribution to national maritime policy when it is so uncertain as to what that shipping policy is and whose responsibility it is to determine that policy.

We know, however, what we are doing and we think it constitutes a constructive contribution toward a sensible national policy to develop a sound and healthy merchant marine. For example, we know we are pursuing a ship replacement schedule that is saving the Government money and attempting to buy the United States the best performance at the most economical cost. Already, it can be seen that the decision to build bigger and faster vessels to replace our aging fleets of wartime construction has enabled us, through the reduction in number of units, to reduce the operating subsidies the Government is paying to support U.S.-flag shipping. The payoff on this program increases every year with the substitution of these new vessels for the old. We estimate in my company an approximate saving to the United States of 15 percent of the operating subsidy based on a comparison of 1964 performance of five Challengers in a trade that once required six C-2's. Add on top of this, the saving in future subsidy costs of the automation features now being built into these vessels—a saving which has been estimated to mean $2 million less subsidy expense over the life of the vessel—and I think that you can see the fact that we have been at work for years in our planning to try to get the Government a greater return for each subsidy dollar spent.

Another contribution we are making—and would dearly love to increase—is our contribution to conserving American dollars toward a more favorable national balance-of-payments position. The American merchant marine annually contributes almost $1 billion directly to the favorable side of our balance of payment—without the American-flag fleet this amount and another billion to pay for the shipping services our exporters would still have to buy, would represent an additional $2 billion deficit in the Nation's payments balance. This contribution is a plus factor of the greatest significance to our Nation right now and will probably remain so for a long time.

Another accomplishment in which we take some pride in having played a big part is the great expansionary performance of American exports, the single most vital means of earning dollars for the Nation. The whopping big $6.8 billion 1964 trade surplus represents approximately a one-third increase over the 1963 surplus, this performance notwithstanding some strong denunciations of liner rate making policies by critics who contend these policies discriminate against American exports. We recently addressed a letter to hundreds of the Nation's leading industrial companies, part of which letter sought comments of protest on this issue of allegedly discriminatory rates. The response has more than reinforced our own belief that the charge is incorrect. We find that what the shipper really does need—rates to keep him competitive in foreign markets—we have been setting, with his interests and his voice, a very strong factor in the determination of the rate.

In all these things we have done I feel we have been fighting a real uphill battle, succeeding not because of our critics but in spite of them. Our present regulatory policy toward the shipping interests of other nations has created an almost impossible climate on the high seas and in the capitals of the major shipowning nations. Regulations by the United States of its foreign commerce, must take into account the rights, interest, and sovereignty of other nations—and our public officials are going to have to face up to this fact. Other governments have different philosophies regarding international shipping and, so long as there is no wherewithall to apply and enforce our laws across the board, on all parties, these laws and regulations operate to the detriment of the one controllable segment of carriers in our foreign trade—the American merchant marine. We have said it many times and we will say it again—we are not against regulation per se but only against ineffective unilateral regulation which traps us in the middle of the great debate on how an international business should be conducted. It seems certain that the United States is bound and determined to regulate the shipping of its foreign commerce in order to eliminate the abuses, real and imagined, which are believed to exist. It seems equally certain that the major shipowning nations are going to oppose any regulatory action that they feel will endanger the economic welfare of their own lines.

An irresistible force meeting an immovable object? I hope not and sincerely wish the clamor of voices and conflicting policies could be stilled long enough to give reasonable men and interested parties time to cope with this problem.

But this is too serious a note on which to end an occasion of great pleasure and significance to the American merchant marine generally and United States Lines particularly. We feel strongly that the partnership in maritime endeavors epitomized by governmental policy over the years must and will continue, and more and more ships like the *American Resolute* will take their place as leaders in the free world's trade routes.

Faster Pace in the Space Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in Life magazine of April 9, 1965, focuses sharply on our past and current achievements in our national space program. The editors of Life point out the evolution of our space program to a valuable and well-planned effort. The comments on the security value of the space program describe well our present status and the alternatives for the future. This editorial puts in perspective the space race at its present point in time and is a valuable critique on the importance of our continued effort in this field.

With unanimous consent the editorial follows:

FASTER PACE IN THE SPACE RACE

These weeks are so crowded with "firsts" and "breakthroughs" in space that man's progress there seems more hectic and jumpy than it really is. First came Russia's Voskhod II and Leonov's somersault; then the U.S. Gemini, with Grissom's and Young's changes of course in midflight; then Ranger 9 with its extraordinary closeups of the moon. And this week Early Bird, the bundle of audio and video channels which NASA is launching for the Communications Satellite Corp., is aimed to give U.S. private enterprise and intercontinental telephone users a stake in the busy welkin.

The first Sputnik was less than 8 years ago, but already the space age has reached what President Johnson calls an "early maturity." Each technical advance is a planned and measured consequence of the previous one; Mercury fed Gemini and Gemini feeds Apollo; each hero stands on the shoulders of predecessors who are also his contemporaries. Since 1958 no fewer than 94 U.S. space flights have left the cape, 59 of them fully successful. At first the ratio of successes was 1 in 2; in the last 2 years it has been 16 to 1.

There are still a few worried critics, such as the New York Times, who think the space effort is a distorted use of U.S. resources at a time when we still have terrestrial problems to solve. That is now surely the view from the caboose. Our space program is, as Johnson puts it, "a national asset of proven worth and incalculable potential." Its cost is leveling off at about $7 billion a year. One hopes this includes enough to land us on the moon before the Russians—and what's wrong with wanting to be first? But Gemi-

ni and Apollo (landing target date 1970) provide a safe and sensible program worth sticking to, in any case. Our next unmanned moon shot after Ranger, for example, will be Surveyor, a complex of mechanical eyes and hands that will make a soft lunar landing and send back landscape views, soil analysis and other instrumented information.

There are other worried critics like General LeMay who fear that the Soviets, retaining their early lead in several sectors of spacefaring, may achieve a critical military advantage—for example, through a first manned orbiting platform. The U.S. military now has a 20-percent share in our whole space program and could no doubt have more if anyone could describe a more acceptable military mission in space. The one generally agreed on is defensive intelligence and communications, in which the United States already excels. Our program, though less dramatic than the Russian, has already milked the heavens of a lot more new information than theirs.

The first beneficiary of this information has been U.S. technology and industry. Most NASA money involves private contractors, and of the 300,000 men now employed in the moon program only 15,000 are Government employees. And all U.S. industry gradually feels the challenge of the new thoroughness and precision, of the unprecedented tolerances and complexities, that success in space demands.

This challenge is now with us for good. Even before Apollo meets the Moon, we will face gigantic choices for the next adventure. Shall we concentrate on intensive study and mapping of the Moon? Or on the "inner space" nearer Earth, peopling it with orbiting laboratories, rescue stations, etc.? Or on the outer solar system, whither we already have launched a flyby mission, Mariner IV, on its 7½-month trip to Mars? Or shall we pursue all three lines at once?

The choice will be determined in part by comparative costs and by the Russian competition, which still has overtones of secrecy and military menace. But it will also be determined by what we learn from what we are already doing. Our program, which may or may not be overtaking the Russian, is well past its own first period of jumpy desperation. We can stick to it in confidence.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, although U.S. policy in Vietnam has been under heavy attack from various sources and for a variety of reasons, there is reason to believe that recent U.S. actions have placed the responsibility for the continuance of the conflict on Hanoi and Peiping, as is pointed out in the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times, and the article by the knowledgeable observer of world affairs, Mr. Milburn P. Akers:

VIETNAM

The failure of the Communists to move toward peaceful settlement of the Vietnamese conflict has been disappointing. First North Vietnam and then Red China rejected the appeal of 17 nonalined nations to accept President Johnson's proposal for unconditional discussion to end the war. Red China talks threateningly of Chinese organizations sending their own people to fight if the U.S. escalates the war further. Premier Kosygin of Russia calls for a cessation of bombing in North Vietnam.

Such public reactions were to be expected but Washington obviously hoped that some private soundings toward peace talks might come from the other side. None apparently has.

These developments have brought demands from some Americans that the United States change its posture. They argue that since bombing of North Vietnam did not move the Vietcong Communists toward a less aggressive attitude in the war and toward peace talks, easing off or stopping the bombings for awhile might so move them. It would let them save face.

We believe Defense Secretary McNamara and Secretary of State Rusk make a better and more pragmatic analysis when they argue that stopping the bombing would do the cause of peace more harm than good. It has raised South Vietnamese morale and lowered the morale of the Vietcong. It has brought heavy political and military pressure on North Vietnam. It has slowed infiltration. Stopping the bombing would be interpreted as a defeat for a major U.S. military undertaking and could cause the collapse of the South Vietnam Government.

When Mr. Johnson offered unconditional discussion—to be carried on without a cease fire—he offered a billion dollars to help southeast Asia to a better life. His speech was promptly labeled the "carrot and stick" approach. Those who deplore the heavy military commitment the United States continues to make in Vietnam would have the President drop the stick but still offer the carrot.

The main purpose in Vietnam must not be forgotten, however. It is to prevent the spread of communism. In the circumstances and as long as the Communists refuse to enter peace talks, the stick as well as the carrot must be used.

Communism is an idea that must be countered by better ideas for improving man's lot. That's the carrot. But communism in South Vietnam is also aggression from North Vietnam and this must be countered by force. The United States has announced it will put more money and men into the ground war in South Vietnam. This is to prove to the Communists that he meant it when Mr. Johnson said, "We will not be defeated." He also meant it when he offered unconditional discussions to stop the bloodshed. When the Reds believe him on both counts, perhaps they will be moved to the talking stage. But they are hardly likely to be moved toward a peaceful attitude by a lessening of America's militant attitude. They never have been in the past.

REDS BEAR VIET RESPONSIBILITY

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Now that Red China and North Vietnam have rejected the appeal of 17 neutral nations for discussions intended to resolve the southeast Asian conflict there should be no confusion as to responsibility for its continuance. For this is the same appeal which President Johnson accepted in his unconditional discussions speech at Johns Hopkins University.

This column has been critical of the U.S. role in South Vietnam ever since the late President John F. Kennedy switched that role from a passive to an active one. And it has been equally critical of the roles of Red China and North Vietnam. Throughout the Eisenhower administration the American role was limited to economic assistance and a military assistance group of less than 685 men which devoted itself to training the South Vietnamese army.

During 1961, Kennedy's first year in the White House, the Vietcong began an intensified campaign, one which threatened the existence of the Saigon government of President Ngo Dinh Diem. On October 26, 1961, Kennedy pledged "that the United States is determined to help the Vietnamese preserve its independence, protect its people against Communist assassins and build a better life."

On December 11, 1961, the U.S. aircraft ferry-carrier *Core* arrived in Saigon with 33 U.S. Army helicopters and 400 air and ground crewmen assigned to operate with the South Vietnamese army.

On December 20, of the same year, the New York Times reported that uniformed U.S. troops and specialists were operating in battle areas with South Vietnamese forces and had been authorized to fire back if fired upon. Two thousand U.S. military men were then in South Vietnam.

The escalation of the war in South Vietnam had begun. It has gone on steadily since. It should be noted that Kennedy, as he switched the U.S. role from passive to active, did so as the consequence of greatly intensified Vietcong activity. Each escalatory step by the United States has come as a consequence of one by the Vietcong.

Soviet Russia on January 10, 1962, in a note to Britain, charged the United States with aggressive interference in South Vietnam, a charge which the British rejected with the statement that "the tension in South Vietnam arises directly from the pursuance by the North Vietnamese * * * of seeking to overthrow the established government by force."

Few, if any, newspapermen who are stationed in Saigon, or who have visited there since the conflict began, would deny that British assertion of 1962. I was in South Vietnam in January and February of 1963 and saw plenty of evidence to convince me of the fact of North Vietnamese aid of the Vietcong and of its direct participation in the conflict.

By the time Lyndon Johnson succeeded Kennedy in the White House the United States had more than 12,000 fighting men in South Vietnam. The new pattern had been set although the United States generally continued to maintain the fiction that it was still acting only in an advisory capacity and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, making periodic trips to Saigon, continued to report that a successful conclusion of the war in South Vietnam was in the offing. The direct assaults on military installations by the Vietcong began after Mr. Johnson's succession and the policy of retaliation by air strikes commenced. Today, the United States has more than 40,000 military personnel in South Vietnam.

As earlier stated, this column has for 3 years or more been critical of U.S. policy in South Vietnam. But it has never failed to point out that North Vietnam and Red China are, in fact, the agggressors; that the Vietcong, if only, as some contend, a group of indigenous patriots in rebellion against the Saigon government, could not long maintain themselves in the type of war that has been waged against them. Hanoi and Peiping bear at least as much responsibility for the situation which exists in southeast Asia as does the United States. In my judgment they bear more. And since their rejection of the 17-nation plea for negotiations—a plea accepted by President Johnson—they now bear the entire responsibility for the continuance of that conflict.

This column many times urged negotiations to end the Vietnamese conflict. It has been critical of President Johnson as well as the Hanoi and Peiping regimes for not having sought a resolution of the conflict long ago. Now that Mr. Johnson has agreed to such negotiations and Hanoi and Peiping have refused to participate in them there is little the United States can do other than to wage the war to victory.

Publisher E. M. "Ted" Dealey of the Dallas Morning News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Longview Daily News, April 10, 1965. Also I include an article that appeared in the Longview Daily News, April 4, 1965. As one who was a member of the Subcommittee on Newsprint and Brands and Grade Labeling, I can attest to the wonderful work Mr. "Ted" Dealey did in helping to bring about the realization of a newsprint industry in east Texas.

I have read the Dallas News all of my life. I regard it as a very splendid newspaper and I know Mr. Dealey has made a tremendous and most outstanding contribution to the success of this great paper; his leadership has been excellent, indeed.

The articles follow:

[From the Longview (Tex.) Morning Journal, Apr. 4, 1965]

FIFTY YEARS ON THE NEWS

(The following editorial is reproduced from the April 1 issue of the Dallas Morning News.)

The publisher of the News, E. M. (Ted) Dealey, today completes 50 years of service to this institution. For him, this newspaper, for his colleagues past and present, it has been a rewarding association.

A half century in one journalistic home is no mean accomplishment. Newspapering has been Ted Dealey's life—but more important, a newspaper has. To the News he has devoted every energy. To the News he has pledged every talent and dream.

Active as ever, Mr. Dealey will be at his desk this morning carefully examining the pages of a product to which he has contributed so substantially and making certain that it remains true to its ideals and continues the heritage of a glorious past.

Fifty years ago this spring Ted Dealey was studying in the School of Philosophy at Harvard University where he earned a master's degree in 1 year. His father, the late G. B. Dealey of the News, wired him offering him a job.

He reported on April 1 as secretary to President C. Lombardi. He was a reporter and staff correspondent until 1924, distinguishing himself in covering some of the State's most hotly contested political races. He was Sunday editor and editorial writer 1924–28, assistant to the publisher 1928–32 and vice president from 1932–1940. In the latter year he was named president when G. B. Dealey became chairman of the board.

When G. B. Dealey died in 1946 Mrs. Dealey became chairman of the board, and upon her death in 1960 Ted Dealey was named publisher and chairman of the board. Today he retains the title of publisher and J. M. Moroney, Sr., is board chairman.

It is a distinguished career, and his colleagues offer their heartiest congratulations.

We who labor with words in the news and editorial divisions know him best as a superb writer, an artisan with an individualistic style that combines fact and literary incisiveness with color and zest.

The devotion Ted Dealey has given his task is part of a spirit which has characterized the News since its establishment in Dallas 80 years ago this fall. Those who are gone dreamed big dreams, met trouble and crisis as a challenge and conquered adversity in full stride. We acknowledge their contribution with deepest gratitude.

The News is what it is because of diligence and loyalty, from the highest to the humblest. Tomorrow is another assignment to be faced confidently and with assurance to our readers, to Dallas, and to Texas that the high aims of our heritage will be preserved in perpetuity.

[From the Longview (Tex.) News, Apr. 10, 1965]

A GREAT TEXAN

It is with a deep sense of personal appreciation that we salute today our honored contemporary and friend, the distinguished E. M. "Ted" Dealey, publisher of the great Dallas Morning News, who on Thursday rounded out 50 years with his newspaper which represents the oldest business institution in Texas.

To some of us, this is much more than just an ordinary anniversary. There is historic stature, accompanied by a roll of the drums of recognition of accomplishment, in this occasion which is both personal for Ted Dealey and public for Texas people and for the proud profession of journalism.

As an east Texas publisher, it has been no secret that we have admired our big city friend across the years. We have tried in our own way to emulate the fine example of institutional leadership and responsibility of this great man who belongs not only to Dallas—though he is an institution in his own right there—but belongs as well to Texas, the Southwest, and the Nation.

Ted Dealey was born in Dallas in 1892, only 7 years after his pioneering father and outstanding leader and builder, the late George Bannerman Dealey, established the Dallas Morning News there on October 1, 1885, as an affiliate of the Galveston News. He officially began his career with the News on April 1, 1915.

This gallant son has followed well the brilliant trail blazed by that giant of journalism. Serving as reporter, general newsman, editorial writer, president, board chairman, and publisher whose first love always has been writing. Ted Dealey long has been recognized as a national figure in his own right. Today he ranks with the alltime journalistic greats of the world.

His executive leadership at the Dallas News since 1940 has shown itself in the fact that daily and Sunday circulation has more than doubled, advertising linage has almost tripled, and newsprint usage has nearly quadrupled. Sharing with him in these accomplishments in recent years has been his illustrious son, Joe M. Dealey, who has risen through the ranks to the presidency.

He helped to create a brandnew Texas industry—newsprint production. He helped unite southern publishers in establishing a papermill at Lufkin to make newsprint from southern pine, and we are proud that our own Longview newspapers were among the first to contract to buy and use the first experimental rolls of paper from that mill.

It is a matter of record that the crisp and powerful writing of Ted Dealey, plus his determined backing of his chief staff people, has had a leading role in giving Dallas clean and progressive government and in helping to create and encourage in Texas a public and governmental climate in which business and industry could expand and prosper.

Mr. Dealey takes pride in, and his able staff is inspired by, his daily interest in both the news and business affairs which he heads up as publisher. At 72, he is a striking figure, neat of dress, trim and erect, walks and works with vigor. His counsel in city and State affairs is avidly sought. His contributions to public progress cover many fields. The honors that have been accorded him are countless.

Here truly is a son of Texas whose life and work, across half a century of service, always has and today continues to typify the dauntless courage, the venturous spirit, and the great heart that is the high heritage of the Lone Star State.

We here in Longview and east Texas, as do others of his friends everywhere, wish him well at this milestone point in his distinguished career. To us, there is only one Ted Dealey—that's Texas Ted.

CARL L. ESTES.

Hon. Geo. L. Dickinson, of Longview, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial and article about Mr. George L. Dickinson.

Not so long ago Mr. and Mrs. George L. Dickinson visited me in Washington. It was a happy privilege to be with them here.

I wish to second and affirm all which has been written about Mr. George L. Dickinson in an editorial that appeared April 16, 1965, in the Longview Daily News. We all shall miss this very splendid young man. To his folks and his friends I express my sincere sympathy:

[From the Longview (Tex.) Daily News, Apr. 16, 1965]

LIVING SERVICE

The life of George L. Dickinson, for whom funeral services were held Friday morning at the First Christian Church, was in a degree truly remarkable a life of service to his fellow men, his community, his church, and his country.

Here was a young businessman who, though stricken by illness at age 45 when many men are just beginning to be of real service to others, had already served with distinction and honor in the business and professional groups to which he belonged, in the civic and community organizations with which he was identified, in official public capacity, and in high places of leadership in his church.

A resident of Longview since 1932, he was the son of one of Longview's best known and most highly respected couples, the Reverend and Mrs. George D. Dickinson. He was active in the First Christian Church where his father was minister for many years after coming to Longview from Garland, serving on the board of deacons and in various other capacities, including a period as president of the Loyal Men's Bible Class.

As a young man, George L. Dickinson early assumed an active role of civic and community service and proved himself a most effective leader. He served with distinction and rose to the presidency of the Longview Junior Chamber of Commerce. He went on to serve as director of the Greater Longview United Fund, the Longview Chamber of Commerce, and the Pinecrest Country Club. He was a member of and active in various capacities in the Knights of Pythias lodge, and the State and National associations of independent insurance agents.

His most distinguished public service was as a member of the Longview City Commission, where he served from 1951 until 1958 and retired without seeking reelection. Here he provided enlightened and firm leadership and was a dedicated and effective commissioner who kept himself well informed on local needs as well as opportunities for expansion and growth of the community. He made an unusual and continuing contribution to Longview's progress during those years of public service.

It was in appropriate honor and tribute to former Commissioner Dickinson that City Manager Harry Mosley and the present city commission closed the city hall Friday during the funeral service.

In the honorable and useful business of insurance, where he was associated with his father and Guy Harrison in the Dickinson-Harrison Insurance Agency, young Dickinson was a good businessman, a concerned and helpful counselor to individuals and businesses alike. He served in such a way that he became fast friends with those with whom he came in contact in a business way.

Longview has suffered a great loss in the passing of a young man so dedicated and effective in service in so many fields. To his wife, Mrs. Eloise Dickinson, daughters Elaine and Carol, son Logan, and to his parents and sister, we express our deep sympathy.

For all of us, there is a lesson in the life and work of George L. Dickinson. Not only did he live service in all his activities, but he conducted himself in such a way that the service he rendered is now and will continue to be a living and active force for good in his community, his country, his church.

CARL L. ESTES.

[From the Longview (Tex.) Daily News, Apr. 14, 1965]

GEORGE DICKINSON, 45, DIES IN DALLAS

George L. Dickinson, 45, Longview insurance executive and former member of the Longview City Commission, died about 11 a.m. Wednesday in a Dallas hospital after an illness of more than 6 months.

Funeral services directed by Rader Funeral Home are pending.

Dickinson only recently had been discharged from Good Shepherd Hospital where he had suffered a bout with virus pneumonia. Before that, he had been ill in a Dallas hospital. Death occurred at the Bristol Hospital in Dallas.

Dickinson served as Longview city commissioner from 1951 until 1958 when he decided not to run for reelection. He was a member of the First Christian Church and also of that church's men's Bible class.

He was a former director of the Greater Longview United Fund and the Pinecrest Country Club and a member of the Longview Elks Lodge.

During World War II, Dickinson established an enviable record as a navigator in the U.S. Air Corps and was sent on many missions over enemy territory from his base in England.

Born in Garland, he came to Longview with his parents, the Reverend and Mrs. George D. Dickinson, and graduated from Longview High School. He attended Texas Christian University.

Upon his return from service in World War II, he entered the insurance business with his father. Later, he formed a partnership with Guy Harrison in 1951 and remained active in this business until his health failed.

He was a member of the Longview Association of Independent Insurance Agents and the Texas State Association of Independent Insurance Agents.

Survivors include his wife, Eloise; two daughters, Carol and Elaine Dickinson; one son, Logan; his parents, the Reverend and Mrs. George D. Dickinson; one sister.

Where Is American Government Going?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the April 1965 issue of the CPA, membership bulletin of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Inc., contains an interesting article pertaining to the general outlook for government in America.

The article was written by Mr. Lyman L. Bryan, director of the Washington division of the institute.

I believe Mr. Bryan's comments about what lies ahead will be of interest to Members of Congress and under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the article for inclusion in the RECORD:

WHERE IS AMERICAN GOVERNMENT GOING?—OUR MAN IN WASHINGTON TAKES A LONG LOOK

Our Government is changing fast; is it changing for the better?

Every accountant in America has pondered this question. Government helps finance his clients. It taxes and regulates them. It confers and regulates the accountant's right to practice. It asks him (and his clients) questions he would resent even if his mother asked them. It does all of this because the total public interest is invoked, and the retention of this situation, as reflected at the polls, implies that this is clearly the will of the people.

In this environment, what will the accountant's tomorrow be like? Whether we like it or not, what will tomorrow bring in American government? This writer has a cloudy crystal ball, usually hidden in a dark cellar. It has been brought forth only at the editor's insistence, aimed at 1984, and this column represents my personal view of what it foreshadows.

However, to check my personal impressions, I submitted my guesses to several people, whose caliber of experience with government I respect, in both political parties. With one lone dissent, their impressions generally agreed with my own. These commentators included a former White House assistant, an aid to a prominent House leader, a conservative businessman, a well-known author of textbooks on American government, a liberal educator, two executive directors of national businessmen's associations, an engineer, and an economist. I had stressed candor, and while several excellent but markedly differing letters resulted, Republicans and Democrats generally agreed that what I had written was a fair and accurate projection of the kind of government which is likely to exist in 1984.

Here is what the crystal ball seems to show:

1. Increased national economic planning: This kind of central planning probably will not follow the classic European pattern, where outside cadres of the "intellectual elite" have held forth. More likely it will be conducted by a White House secretariat, using outside advisers, and be subject to executive and congressional checks.

2. Continuing expansion of Federal, State, and local bureaucracies: Total governmental employment grows at all levels, but in recent years State and local government expenditures have grown much more rapidly than Federal. At all levels, elected and appointed officials have played a decreasing role as compared with career employees; in the Federal Government, civil service employees increased from 69 to 85 percent of the total between 1941 and 1961.

3. Expanding influence of the executive branch: Presidents and Congresses come and go, but the objectives of agency programs remain generally constant. This provides stability in program, but is accompanied by interim delegation to the executive branch of Government by the Congress and voters.

4. Sharp increases in urban and suburban influence: This will (and already has begun to) influence major Federal legislation. Decreased rural and smalltown influence is underway.

5. Decentralization to State and local governments: More Federal grants to States, but with less Federal financial control. (Put another way, more Federal money, but more State control—the Federal highway program is a prototype.)

6. Immense technological emphasis: Federal control over scientific decisions, through grants to business and educational recipients, is already extensive. Federal use of computers may also stimulate large-scale correlated responses—on the part of regulated enterprises.

7. Increased governmental expenditures: This is a sure thing. It may be accompanied by reduced reliance on top-level accounting experience within government, as compared with the influence of other experts such as economists and engineers. The number of CPA's in government has never kept step with the pace of expenditures, so it is quite possible that other disciplines will help fill the vacuum. If accountants are to reverse this trend, they must show themselves more interested in government in the future.

8. A total increase in the Government role: This will have an impact on all elements of society, affecting business clients and accountants in varied ways. This would suggest a growing need for accountants to be closely aware of Federal, State, and local government actions.

The date George Orwell picked for the title of his frightening book about a government-dominated society, "1984," was chosen as a reasonable target date for my predictions in the hope that at worst things will not be nearly as bad as he pictured them. But if the nightmare of "Big Brother is watching you" is to be avoided, accountants and all other alert citizens must take a much more active part in the governmental process.

The difficulties of the task were once sharply summarized by the French revolutionary, Danton, the night before he was beheaded. Said Danton: "Tomorrow, I shall sleep in glory * * * but one had better be a poor fisherman than meddle with the art of governing men."

LYMAN L. BRYAN,
Director, Washington Office.

Freedom Crusade Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a situation that has not made headlines but, nevertheless, involves a serious curtailment of religious and ethnic freedom. I am referring to the treatment accorded Christians in Constantinople—Istanbul—and I want to go on record in support of the following proclamation by

Hon. Eugene H. Nickerson, county executive of Nassau, Long Island, N.Y.:

PROCLAMATION ON FREEDOM CRUSADE WEEK

Whereas the Christians of Constantinople are being expelled and persecuted and their properties are being confiscated without compensation; and

Whereas the hierarchy and the clergy of the ancient and venerable Eastern Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Constantinople are being persecuted, deprived of the right to exercise their churchly and religious functions and some of the hierarchy are being exiled unjustly; and

Whereas the people of cyprus are seeking the rights to establish a democratic government where all the citizens will have equal suffrage, equal protection of the laws, religious freedom and equal educational, economic, and social opportunities; and

Whereas the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, otherwise known as the Order of AHEPA is seeking redress and a solution of these problems in accordance with the American principles and traditions originally enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and which, ever since, have become the cornerstone of the ideals, beliefs, and traditions of the American people and Government: Now, therefore,

I, Eugene H. Nickerson, Nassau County executive, do proclaim the week of May 9–15, 1965, as Freedom Crusade Week in Nassau County, N.Y.

I endorse the basic principle of U.S. foreign policy on self-determination for all peoples and earnestly urge our Government to fully implement and support this policy of self-determination for the people of Cyprus.

I further urge our Government to do all in its power to bring about freedom of religion in the Republic of Turkey.

I further urge our Government to do all in its power to stop the persecution and exiling of the Christian people of Constantinople.

I further urge on all our citizens of all creeds to participitate in the AHEPA Crusade for Freedom Week for Constantinople and Cyprus, and to pray for a just solution of the problems and the establishment of a just and permanent peace in these ancient places where civilization was born and where all our great religions were first promulgated and established.

Calhoun Bust Presented to U.S.S. "John C. Calhoun"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our beloved Dr. Robert C. Edwards, president of Clemson University, on March 10, in Charleston presented to the Polaris submarine *John C. Calhoun* a bust of South Carolina's greatest statesman. At the presentation ceremony aboard the U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun*, Dr. Edwards made a brief but very appropriate address. I commend Dr. Edward's superb address on that occasion to the Congress and to the country:

REMARKS OF R. C. EDWARDS AT THE PRESENTATION CEREMONIES ABOARD THE U.S.S. "JOHN C. CALHOUN"

Congressman RIVERS, Admiral Daspit, Admiral Loughlin, Commander Axene, Commander Thurtell, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we are delighted to have such a splendid audience for this historic occasion. We are especially grateful to Congressman RIVERS for his presence here today. Having recently assumed the chairmanship of the Armed Services Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, we appreciate fully the importance of the tremendous responsibilities that rest on his shoulders and the demands made upon his time. It is a great relief to me personally to know that during this most perilous and critical period in our history that we have directing the affairs of this most important congressional committee a man of such outstanding knowledge, ability and dedication as Congressman RIVERS. It was my happy privilege to listen to his marvelous address at the commissioning ceremonies of this great ship on September 15, 1964, at Newport News.

Clemson University, for which I speak, has a unique interest in the ship on whose deck we stand. This ship bears the name of one of South Carolina's—and the Nation's—most illustrious sons, John Caldwell Calhoun.

Clemson University, named for Calhoun's son-in-law, Thomas Green Clemson, whose vision and generosity created the institution, stands on land which was the John C. Calhoun plantation.

The house, called "Fort Hill," was Calhoun's home for the last 25 years of his life, and is beautifully preserved as an historic shrine at the center of the Clemson campus. Calhoun's spirit, as well as Clemson's, pervades the very air each Clemson student and teacher breathes and constitutes an inspiration to all of us there.

This spirit is an inspiration, too, to the officers and men of the U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun*.

This is the joint heritage which Clemson University is proud to share with the U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun*.

No American was ever more dedicated than was Calhoun to the purpose for which this ship exists—the defense of our country.

For 39 years Calhoun served the Nation as a Member of both Houses of Congress, as a Cabinet officer under two Presidents, and as Vice President of the United States.

From 1811 to 1817 he was a Member of the National House of Representatives from South Carolina. As acting chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he stood with Henry Clay and others who for their patriotism were called "War Hawks"—a name which has become a badge of distinction again in these troubled times. He stood for strong defense of American rights against depredations of the British, from whom we had only a few years before won our independence.

In his devotion to the protection of the security of this country and the traditions that have made it great, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS is truly the John C. Calhoun of 1965.

I remind you of those solemn words of Mr. Calhoun when he said, "The honor of a nation is its life. Deliberately to abandon it is to commit an act of political suicide." So he introduced the resolution declaring war on Great Britain in 1812, and his views prevailed.

From 1817 to 1825 he was Secretary of War in the Cabinet of President James Monroe. He reinvigorated many aspects of military administration and clarified the command situation. One historian from another region of the country says, "he gained, as he deserved, a lasting reputation as one of the ablest of War Secretaries."

From 1825 to 1832 he was Vice President of the United States in the administration of President John Quincy Adams and the first administration of President Andrew Jackson.

From 1833 to 1843 and again from 1845 to his death in 1850, he was a U.S. Senator from South Carolina, standing with Henry Clay and Daniel Webster as a towering figure in the Senate's history.

In 1844 and 1845, between his two periods of service as Senator, he was Secretary of State, holding the highest Cabinet office under President John Tyler.

Such, in barest outline, was the career of John C. Calhoun on the stage of national affairs.

It is appropriate that this ship should be named for him and that Clemson University should help to perpetuate his memory.

Our university, like the statesman whose home it now occupies, is dedicated to public honor and to public service. We are basically a scientific and technological institution engaged both in the research and the teaching so needed by South Carolina and the Nation in this scientific age. This gives us another special interest in a ship embodying the most advanced of technologies. Our university has a military tradition, too, and our sons have served with distinction in every war since Clemson was founded.

For all these reasons, Clemson University is pleased today to present to the Navy for display in this ship a bust of John C. Calhoun.

This bust, an excellent likeness, was once the property of Thomas G. Clemson and has been in the home that was Calhoun's and later Clemson's.

Commander Axene, will you please come forward?

It is with pride and with great pleasure that I deliver to you this bust to the ship as a gift from Clemson University, knowing that the U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun* will add new luster to a long-revered name.

Aid of the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have been dwelling on the importance of education. The need for people to be well educated increases each day, for without it—employment will be practically nonexistent and, without it, the leisure time, automation, and technological developments furnished all, will not be enjoyed to its fullest extent.

As a cosponsor of the legislation setting up a National Foundation for Arts and Humanities, I should like to call the Members' attention to an editorial appearing in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette on April 21, recommending passage of this bill:

AID FOR THE ARTS

When the American Symphony Orchestra League met in Pittsburgh recently, its delegates sounded a new policy note for their organization. Reversing a stand taken as recently as 1962, when 60 percent of the members said they favored independence of orchestras from Government money, the league this year decided to endorse Federal financial support for the arts.

As an organization representing 900 major metropolitan and community orchestras, the league made known its new position at a significant time. Congress, too, has changed its mind in the last 10 years. When President Eisenhower in 1955 proposed a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, Congress turned a deaf ear. President Kennedy in 1961 recommended a similar agency, but was rebuffed. The Senate in 1963 passed a Ken-

nedy administration bill to provide Federal aid for the arts, but the House refused to go along. Finally, in 1964, with the support of the Johnson administration, Congress enacted a law creating a National Council on the Arts, an advisory body composed of a chairman and 24 members appointed by the President. Earlier this month the Council—made up of members representing art, sculpture, literature, music, theater, opera, the screen and television—held its first meeting and Chairman Roger L. Stevens announced that the organization wanted to deliberate longer before issuing a magna carta for the arts.

Meanwhile, Congress this spring has been busy on another item of legislation in the field of the arts, this time to set up a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities. The earlier objective of providing Federal support for the arts has now been broadened to include the humanities, a step which was initiated by Pittsburgh Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD when he introduced last summer a bill to establish a National Humanities Foundation, an agency intended to match the National Science Foundation and to aid a wide range of humanistic subjects—among them history, philosophy, law, and literature. The latest version of Representative MOORHEAD's bill, which has now been approved by a House Education and Labor Subcommittee, calls for a National Arts and Humanities Foundation which would administer Federal endowments of $5 million each for the arts and the humanities, plus an additional $5 million for each endowment to use in matching private donations. In the Senate, similar legislation is being considered in Senator CLAIBORNE PELL's Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee, where favorable action is expected in the near future.

With solid support coming from the administration, from academic circles and from such organizations as the Symphony League, the Arts and Humanities Foundation bill appears to have a good chance of enactment. If this new source of encouragement for music and other half-starved artistic endeavors and for humanistic studies should finally be established, it would help to redress the cultural balance in our society, which tends to emphasize science and technology to the neglect of creative pursuits that are equally important but that do not have the glamor of a race to the moon.

Dodge and Columbia County, Wis., Boards of Supervisors Oppose Soil Conservation Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, after spending the week of the Easter recess in my home district viewing the damage sustained within my district from both tornados and floods, I am convinced more than ever that the administration proposal to reduce appropriations for soil and water conservation programs would be a serious blow to conservation practices throughout the country.

While the headlines have dealt with the serious flood conditions in Minnesota and western Wisconsin, much Wisconsin farmland is flooded each spring in the small headwater rivers and water basins. Here is where emphasis on conservation practices is most needed and this is where the cutback in funds would be most seriously felt.

Throughout my district I have found farmers and city dwellers alike concerned about this prospect of reduced conservation efforts. This is reflected in the resolutions adopted by the Dodge and Columbia County Boards of Supervisors. The board of supervisors, of course, are the governing bodies of the counties and represent not just the farmer but the town and city dweller as well. These resolutions in my judgment reflect the views of the vast majority of citizens in my district. Accordingly, I include these resolutions of the Dodge and Columbia County Boards of Supervisors in the RECORD at this point:

"RESOLUTION OPPOSING A CUT IN SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS, WHICH WOULD DIRECTLY AFFECT ASSISTANCE TO THE COLUMBIA COUNTY SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

"Whereas the Columbia County Soil and Water Conservation District program has recognized the need for continuation and expansion of district assistance to landowners in conserving our natural resources; and the inventory of conservation needs has pointed out the large amount of work still needed in our district; and the requests for district assistance increases each year, with a corresponding increase in the application of conservation practices; and district assistance to landowners is vital in keeping our soil on the land, our streams and lakes silt free, our rainfall on the land where it falls, beautification of our county, and protection of our tax base; and the proposed cutback in appropriations for Soil Conservation Service technical assistance to districts would curtail our help to landowners; and the proposed revolving fund would place an additional burden on the stewards of our national resources: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Columbia County Board of Supervisors affirm the need of continued soil and water conservation practices and that Federal appropriations be continued to meet present and future soil and water conservation practice needs."

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
County of Columbia, ss:

I, Natalie Sampson, county clerk in and for said county do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors on the 31st day of March, 1965.

NATALIE SAMPSON.

"RESOLUTION 4

"Resolution to the Honorable Board of Supervisors of Dodge County, Wis., members

"Whereas the agricultural conservation program of the Federal Government has contributed immeasurably to the prosperity of the national economy and the beautification of the American landscape and the promotion of the conservation of natural resources; and

"Whereas it is proposed that $100 million be cut from the agricultural conservation program cost sharing funds; and

"Whereas it is proposed to establish a revolving fund through which landowners would be charged a total of $20 million for Soil Conservation Service technical assistance to districts: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Dodge County Board of Supervisors register its opposition to cutting $100 million or any part thereof from agricultural conservation program cost sharing funds and to the establishment of a revolving fund; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the county clerk of Dodge County be and hereby is authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, Governor Knowles, Senators PANZER, PROXMIRE, and NELSON, Congressman KASTENMEIER, and Assemblymen Nitschke and Doughty.

"All of which is respectfully submitted this 20th day of April 1965.

"Adopted April 20, 1965.

"JOHN O'DONOVAN,
"Chairman, Dodge County Soil and Water Conservation District."

I, Walde H. Mueller, clerk of Dodge County, Wis., do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Resolution 4 passed at a meeting of the Dodge County Board of Supervisors on April 20, 1965.

WALDE H. MUELLER,
Dodge County Clerk.

A Revivified United Nations Is Needed in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the peacemaking potential of the United Nations should be put to work in Vietnam.

Recently, I introduced a concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 386, to revivify the United Nations and make it available for a role in southeast Asia. The resolution would remove the congressional requirement that the United States keep the General Assembly in a paralyzing impasse over the application of article 19.

In an article in the Evening Star on April 19, 1965, columnist Max Freedman pointed out the opportunity for the United Nations to make a contribution to peace in Vietnam. I include his excellent article hereafter.

I include also an editorial from The Nation of April 26, 1965, on the need for a vital United Nations organization.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 19, 1965]

U.N.'S DUTY IN VIETNAM STALEMATE

(By Max Freedman)

UNITED NATIONS.—Without publicity and solely with the desire to promote conditions favorable to a peaceful settlement, the United Nations has taken a watching attitude in the Vietnam situation. In the process it has provided yet another proof of how the United Nations can cast its influence into the scales of peace when more direct agencies of diplomacy find it almost impossible to operate.

In his Johns Hopkins address, President Johnson tried a bold experiment in public diplomacy. He appealed for an honorable end to the fighting, while pledging the United States to continue the military pressure on North Vietnam.

In general, it may be said that the appeal impressed only those who are willing to heed the arguments of reason. Our major allies and by far the largest part of the neutral world have welcomed the President's initiative. But there the favorable response ends.

Communist forces in South Vietnam have given no sign they are ready to drop their weapons. With varying degrees of hostility but in each case with open suspicion, the Governments of North Vietnam and China and Russia have returned dusty answers to the President's message.

Equally disappointing has been the response to the British effort to establish contact with the Communist side by the methods of private diplomacy. The imaginative and constructive offer of the British Government to send Patrick Gordon Walker, the former Foreign Secretary, to the embattled area has thus far produced no visible result. China in particular has been critical of the British role as prejudiced and tainted since it is an axiom of Chinese policy that in the Vietnam war Great Britain is an agent of American policy.

Perhaps France, which like Britain has recognized the Peiping government, may have better access to China's rulers. But even that is highly doubtful, and in any event deeply rooted American suspicions of France would first have to be overcome before there could be an effective French intervention.

Confronted with this bleak response to the President's appeal, alike in public and in private diplomacy, many Americans are eager to put their trust in the more belligerent passages of the Johns Hopkins speech. They are saying that the bombing and military raids must be continued, probably on a more intensive scale, until the Communists come to their senses and accept peace.

These Americans, large in numbers and outspoken in their advocacy, have never placed much faith anyway in the force of world opinion. Force alone is enough for them. They regard world opinion as a mythical thing or as a fraudulent invention that can be manipulated to meet the convenience of the interested governments. But the State Department does not accept this cynicism; nor does President Johnson; nor do millions of Americans who cannot shake their conviction that there must be something profoundly wrong with American policy whenever it cannot be defended and explained in open debate at the United Nations.

The President deemed it wise and essential to state his commitment to a peaceful settlement when faced with an appeal of conscience from only 17 neutral nations. The cry of the neutral world would become much louder and more insistent if the President should ever drift into the folly of regarding his pledge of peace as a dead letter. The search for a negotiated settlement must remain therefore as a fixed and urgent priority of American policy, regardless of the changes and chances in the military struggle and regardless of the clamor to impose a solution by military means.

Under the charter of the United Nations, Secretary General U Thant has an inescapable duty to do what he can to compose the crisis in Vietnam even though China and North Vietnam are not bound by the principles of the world organization. The situation in Vietnam is quite plainly a threat to world peace and therefore comes within his jurisdiction and is a proper matter for the concern of the United Nations. The Secretary General, as a former leader of Burma, has the most detailed knowledge of the whole problem of Vietnam and can make an important personal contribution to its study and resolution.

Some weeks ago the Secretary General was denounced by large sections of American opinion for a personal statement on Vietnam which was well intentioned but blunderingly phrased and sadly misunderstood. But this experience has at least freed him from the suspicion of being the creature or agent of American policy and given him the chance to use the full prestige of his great office for peace. Behind the scenes and against great odds he is now quietly preparing the United Nations for the time, still distant unfortunately, when it can bring peace in Vietnam closer to the agenda of diplomacy.

[From the Nation, Apr. 26, 1965]

THE REDISCOVERY OF THE U.N.

Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, like certain other consorts of royal ladies is a very conscientious fellow, and well informed on all sorts of industrial and governmental matters. When, the other day, he was called on to speak at the University of Michigan, he gave much better value, in return for his honorary degree, than is usual on such occasions. Democracy, he pointed out, is not for the indifferent, for those who feel that those in authority should solve the problems and leave the citizen to his own concerns. Perhaps this was true once, Prince Bernhard went on, "but the problems which face those in authority, whether in parliament or in government or in other high stations in life in our modern world, prove to be beyond their powers of solution since they involve the whole of mankind."

Prince Bernhard was not speaking particularly of the United Nations, but this statement could hardly have been more apropos in that connection. Indeed, after the impasse at the last session of the General Assembly, it is clearer than ever before that an international body, even when limited to an ancillary role, is indispensable to the solution of international problems. The U.N.'s past failures and frustrations are the strongest testimony to its value: when it failed, the reason was that it intervened in situations so desperate that intervention seemed imperative, and it was defeated by the very nationalistic passions it had been founded to control.

Discerning observers see this clearly, and have no intention of writing off the U.N. Its vitality will be restored to the extent that the great powers cease using it as instrument of their cold war objectives. "International events of recent weeks," Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, told his colleagues late in March, "seem to have overwhelmed the capacity of this Government for affirmative action, except in the military field." He was referring to Vietnam, but then he reminded the Senate that when the United States had turned the screws on the Russians (and the French) in an effort to stigmatize them as delinquent debtors in the Congo operation, he and other Senators had sought to learn from the Department of State what the American reaction would be if the General Assembly were to send a U.N. force into some area in which American interests were involved on the other side. Would the United States pay up? The State Department would not even discuss the question and, considering what its policies have been, the evasiveness is understandable.

When the Russians stood fast, the United States decided that to wreck the U.N. would not be in our interest. Representative HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, has recently given several practical reasons for revivifying the U.N. as speedily and thoroughly as possible. If the Vietnam conflict does not expand into a general war and the belligerents are eventually dragged by self-interest to the negotiating table, the U.N. will be needed to further peacemaking efforts, to administer the aid program envisioned by President Johnson, to supervise an election if one is agreed on, and to take care of other contingencies that may arise. Mr. REUSS suggests that the United States should cease its futile invocation of article 19 of the U.N. Charter. The Aiken and Reuss moves may have administration backing. If not, they should have.

President Johnson's "100 Days"—A Remarkable Record of Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a most informative article in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report describes the remarkable record of achievement by President Johnson and the Democratic 89th Congress during the 1st 100 days of this session. According to the article "nothing to touch it has been seen since F.D.R.'s first 100 days." Those who carefully examine the record certainly agree.

The U.S. News observations are much like the comments that I made last week in my own newsletter. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the U.S. News article and my April 22 newsletter at this point:

L.B.J.'S "100 DAYS"—A RECORD PILING UP

It's one success after another for Lyndon Johnson. That has been the record of the 1965 session of Congress to date. Bills that have been bogged down for years are sailing through now. Nothing to touch it has been seen since F.D.R.'s first 100 days.

Not since the first 100 days of Franklin Roosevelt back in 1933 has a President enpoyed the success with Congress that Lyndon Johnson now is enjoying.

In that preiod 32 years ago, the Nation was emerging from a financial panic with people united in a demand for action. The rapid-fire enactment today of new laws of major importance is coming at a time of high prosperity and of national contentment.

The Johnson record, as a result is being cited by some of the President's aids as even more impressive than the Roosevelt record.

In quick succession, Congress has taken these actions:

Gold backing for deposits with Federal Reserve banks was ended without so much as an argument. The vote: 300 to 82 in the House; 74 to 7 in the Senate.

A billion-dollar development program for the 11-State area in the East known as Appalachia sailed through the form the White House asked. The vote: 257 to 165 in the House, and 62 to 22 in the Senate.

An aid program for local schools starting at $1.3 billion a year passed both Houses of Congress without a single major change from White House plans. In this case fundamental issues of policy and constitutional principle were involved. The vote: 263 to 153 in the House, 73 to 18 in the Senate.

For years, Presidents have tried to get from Congress approval of a plan for meeting costs of hospital care for elderly people under social security. Always they met defeat. Lyndon Johnson is about to achieve success where others failed. The House has voted medicare, 313 to 115. The Senate, having approved plans in the past, will join in, and could even broaden the plan.

It's the same story with a law to provide Federal supervision of local elections to assure Negroes the right to register and vote

in areas where they now meet discrimination. Action by the Congress has been blocked in the past. It is about to be taken now.

Congress also is about to approve and submit to the States an amendment to the Constitution providing for an appointment to the Vice-Presidency if that office becomes vacant. It also provides for a line of action if a President is assassinated, dies or is disabled while in office.

The House approved this plan April 13 by 368 to 29. A similar measure went through the Senate unanimously.

Excise taxes are to be reduced by more than $1.7 billion later in 1965. In this case, Mr. Johnson may have difficulty restraining the urge in Congress to make larger reductions than he wants.

The success story carries all along the line.

The "poverty war" will be given $1.5 billion more to spend. A battle is mounting over the way this money is being used, but critics are saying that, politically, money is money in congressional districts.

There will be the usual approval of foreign aid and approval for a wide range of other White House proposals.

What the President wants: The record suggests this: Nearly anything President Johnson really wants from the 89th Congress he can get. In the Senate today are 68 Democrats and 32 Republicans. In the House there are 294 Democrats and 140 Republicans, with 1 vacancy.

In 1964, during the year when he served out the term of the late President John F. Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson started to make the record that is being developed fully in 1965.

That year, the new President pried loose a tax-cut bill that had been tied up in the Senate Finance Committee while Mr. Kennedy was in office.

President Johnson, too, got through Congress a new law governing civil rights of Negroes—a measure that had been bogged down earlier in Congress and had blocked action on most of the other legislative plans of the late President.

Now the President's program seems to have clear sailing.

There is some doubt that Congress will grant the President's request for a new Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development, but a large part of his urban program is likely to be enacted. Also headed for passage is President Johnson's plan to improve water resources and to help cities control air and water pollution.

The President, in fact, has outlined as broad a program for expansion and improvement as Mr. Roosevelt proposed for recovery from depression. And the record of Mr. Johnson's 100 days during the present session of Congress suggests that, with huge Democratic majorities in House and Senate, the President will push most of his projects through.

In the 32 years which have passed since the first 100 days of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, there have been innumerable discussions about the achievements of the Congress in those short 100 days. The actions taken way back then were considered to be fantastic, as indeed they were. Few people, even the most knowledgeable ones, expected a later Congress and administration to match the output of the great 73d Congress. To the delight and surprise of nearly all, the 89th Congress has given the 73d a run for its money.

The United States was in the depths of a horrible economic depression when F.D.R. took office. The people wanted relief and action and they got it in the form of the NRA, the Bank Holding Act, the Bank Moratorium, and the Emergency Relief Act, to mention the major bills passed. The administration was great, and so was the Congress.

In 1965, when Lyndon B. Johnson took office, he had with him a tremendous popular mandate and an overwhelmingly Democratic Congress, but there were no really great legislative demands from a people enjoying relative prosperity. The President had his own program, however, and he wasted not a minute in making his recommendations to what has turned out to be an eager and responsive Congress. The results have been nothing short of sensational in President Johnson's first 100 days.

The first measure of importance to travel the whole distance and become law was L.B.J.'s program for poverty stricken Appalachia. The Senate acted first, and then the bill was placed in the hands of the extraordinarily skillful Representative ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama's only liberal Member. JONES steered the bill through without a single amendment—a splendid and unusual achievement.

The Appalachia legislation will help not only the States directly involved but will benefit the whole Nation as the economy of that poor area improves. New markets will open, and thousands of men will be put back to work to take their places as taxpayers and customers. Their children will receive better educations and, hopefully, be prepared to enter the job market equipped to be employed.

The President's next legislative victory ended a fight of nearly 100 years within the 100 days when the great education bill sailed through the Congress. In this instance, the bill originated in the General Education Subcommittee of the House. From the time it left our subcommittee, all the way to the President's desk for signature, not one comma in it was changed. In this case, the bill was handed to the colorful and able Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. He duplicated Representative JONES' feat of passing the bill unamended. Several of my earlier newsletters have discussed the education bill in depth, so I shall say only that the entire Nation will benefit permanently from the education program.

Following the education bill, the House passed a massive revision of the social security law including President Johnson's medicare program. Only a year ago, the Senate passed a medicare program, but it failed to get out of Committee in the House. Many feel that the last Congress would have defeated medicare if it had reached the House for a vote. We will never know, but it's safe to say that the margin would never have been within a hundred votes of what it was in the 89th Congress. As time goes by, I shall make available to my constituents the many details of the medicare and social security programs. They are marvelous, in my opinion.

As we break for a few days' rest, we are confident that a voting rights bill will be ready for action upon our return. A great national demand has built up favoring this legislation, and I suppose that we can thank Alabama's Governor George Wallace and his red-neck pals for that demand. There have been many martyrs in the cause of equal rights who shall be remembered long after the Wallaces have been forgotten. Their monument will be the real emancipation of the southern Negro. The red-neck monument will be the shame they brought to their neighbors and to the Nation.

Before it leaves office, a long time from now, the Johnson administration will have done much more than its sensational 100 days have already brought forth. The administration recognizes the needs of the people and of the country and intends to meet those needs. There will be mistakes, too, for this is the nature of things. I predict though a favorable balance sheet in the history books and am honored to have a small part in the making of that history.

Citation for Dr. Paul Hamilton Allen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, recently, Dr. Paul Hamilton Allen, a respected and well-known botanist for the United Fruit Co., passed away. Dr. Allen had devoted his life to horticulture and botany, living with his wife, Dorothy Osdieck Allen, within the tropics. His contributions to these fields were many and he was recognized as the leading authority on palms. As a result of his work the number of known species of palms was more than doubled.

On March 26, at the annual meeting of the Fairchild Tropical Gardens in Miami, Fla., the Robert H. Montgomery Palm Medal was awarded, posthumously, to Dr. Allen. Dr. Walter H. Hodge of the National Science Foundation, in presenting this award to Mrs. Allen, read a citation describing the life and work of this dedicated scientist.

I call the attention of my colleagues to this citation, the text of which follows:

ROBERT H. MONTGOMERY PALM MEDAL CITATION FOR PAUL HAMILTON ALLEN

It would be hard to say when the late Paul Allen saw his first living palms. It is doubtful that it was in his native Oklahoma. More likely it was as a student at the Missouri Botanical Garden whose conservatories in the thirties were at their horticultural zenith. Soon he was to see palms in their native haunts in Panama. The garden was initiating a modern flora of that botanically important isthmian country and, as an impressionable young man, Paul Allen had the great good fortune to be included in a plant collecting trip to that land. As any good botanist could have predicted he was thrilled and excited by the great green world of the tropics. In 1936 he returned for good with a new wife, Dorthy Osdieck of Kirkwood, Mo., who was to love the tropics with as much zest as her young husband. Except for a brief respite in 1953, when Paul served as director of the Fairchild Tropical Garden, the Allens lived their married life within the tropics.

His first job was to manage the Missouri Botanical Garden Tropical Station based in the Canal Zone. Palm collecting was part and parcel of the overall task of assembling the herbarium collections and associated data on which the Panama flora was to be based. Paul Allen's success is demonstrated in the account of the palms prepared for this flora by Liberty Hyde Bailey in 1943. Prior to 1936 only 37 species of palms were known from Panama. Paul's field efforts more than doubled this number and in so doing 13 new Panamanian palms were discovered, 5 of which very appropriately honor the name of this superb and discriminating plantsman.

In subsequent years Paul Allen developed a special affection for the palms along with his other major plant love—the orchids. Under the kindly aegis of a new employer, the United Fruit Co., he studied the flora—including the palms—of Costa Rica, Honduras and El Salvador. During this time several new palms were named by him—primarily in the genera Roystonen and Cryosophila. In the fifties a new young society devoted to these principes of plants was formed. Paul Allen served the Palm Society

as charter member, director, and mamber of its editorial board.

For all those things, and more, it is especially appropriate that this garden—devoted as it is to palms and to tropical plants in general—should elect to honor one who epitomized in his own life's work what the Fairchild Tropical Garden itself attempts so successfully to do. In awarding the Robert H. Montgomery Palm Medal posthumously to Paul Hamilton Allen it is particularly fitting that his wife Dorthy—his loyal and able helpmate—and talented botanical artist as well—has found it possible to come here from St. Louis to receive it. I hope that this belated presentation will demonstrate in a small way the sincere appreciation and affection many of us have had for Paul Allen and for the outstanding contribution that he made during his lifetime to botany and to horticulture.

Armenian Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, half a century ago, on April 24, 1915, the government of the Turkish Empire as an ally of the Central Powers, commenced a systematic plan of massacre of the Armenian nation which took the terrible toll of more than 1,500,000 lives and left more than a million displaced, exiled and horribly scarred men, women and children as victims of the first modern genocide.

This was not the first genocide in the infamous history of the barbaric Turks, who, true to their Mongol heritage, destroyed and burned everything in their path.

The people in the Turkish-occupied Armenia had existed in the numbness of a virtual state of slavery since 1375, when the last Armenian kingdom in Cilicia fell prey to the invading Memlouls.

The Armenocide of 1915 not only destroyed lives, but thousands of cities and towns and centuries-old monasteries. Churches were destroyed and burned. Countless old manuscripts bibles and valuables of art together with savings and property were destroyed. This destruction totaled more than $35 billion.

The Armenians were condemned to death because they had willed to live on their ancestral soil as a free Christian nation.

Since this horrible massacre, the same pattern has been followed by Communist, Fascist, and Nazi dictators.

Genocide must be branded for the crime that it is. Any one responsible for this brutality shall ultimately be brought to justice. Persecution of defenseless minority peoples must be stopped. The world must be alerted that the atrocities which have been committed against the Armenian people will not be repeated.

The Armenian martyrs of 1915 contributed strongly to the victory of America and its Allies in World War I and prompted President Woodrow Wilson to say "The Armenians are our little ally."

It should be noted that of all the nations who participated in the grand alliance of 1915–1918, the Armenians were perhaps the smallest of these, but the Armenians suffered more casualties than any of the other states of that alliance.

The American people have an obligation to these people which could be fulfilled by revising the Immigration and Nationality Act. We Americans must provide a haven for the fair share of these homeless people and other refugees and escapees who have fled or have been displaced by forces of tyranny.

Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the proclamation of the city of Cleveland designating Sunday, March 7, 1965, as "Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel Day," and the addresses of Meyer Feldman, former counsel to President Johnson, and Rabbi Israel Porath, president of the Orthodox Rabbinical Council of Cleveland, at the golden jubilee dinner of the Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel held in Cleveland, Ohio, on March 7, 1965:

CITY OF CLEVELAND PROCLAMATION DESIGNATING SUNDAY, MARCH 7, 1965, AS "YESHIVATH ADATH B'NAI ISRAEL DAY"

Whereas the Jewish community of Cleveland is observing on March 7, 1965, the 50th anniversary of the founding of Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel; and

Whereas the city of Cleveland is pleased to number among its citizens graduates of this oldest Jewish Orthodox educational institution and shares with them an interest in its progress; and

Whereas this pioneering educational venture in Jewish life is serving our community and Nation in a most effective way by integrating human knowledge with a high moral purpose and spiritual ideal.

Now, therefore, I, Ralph S. Locher, as mayor of the city of Cleveland, do hereby proclaim Sunday, March 7, 1965, as "Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel Day" in Cleveland, and urge the citizens of this community to take cognizance of the record of accomplishment of Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel, and join in commemoration of its 50th anniversary.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the corporate seal of the city of Cleveland to be affixed this 18th day of February 1965.

RALPH S. LOCHER,
Mayor.

CHANCES AND CHALLENGES, 1965

(Address made by Meyer Feldman, former counsel to the President, at the golden jubilee dinner of the Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel, Mar. 7, 1965, Cleveland, Ohio)

It is a privilege to join you in celebrating your jubilee dinner. In the half century since your founding, you have given thousands of students a deep and abiding sense of the continuity and vitality of Judaism.

Today, as you mark 50 years of progress in Hebrew education, it is appropriate to use the occasion to survey past accomplishments as a method of stimulating us for the future.

Fifty years ago—before World War I—Jewish education in the United States was a highly individual, haphazard kind of undertaking.

Two million Jews had come to the United States. Most were from eastern Europe. They tried to transplant the Jewish educational system with which they were familiar—the Heder, the Talmud Torah, and the Yeshiva.

Jewish education was improvised along these lines. It was chaotic, unstable, and unrewarding. School buildings, equipment, and discipline were poor. Attendance was irregular. Qualified teachers were scarce. One survey of conditions 50 years ago declared:

"The demand for Jewish education is comparatively small.

"Small as the demand is, the means and equipment are far too inadequate to meet it.

"Wherever that demand is met, there is a lack of either system or content."

A survey published in 1918 found only 23 percent of New York's Jewish children were receiving any Jewish instruction at all; only one-eighth of these were in school buildings "worthy of the name," and in most of these schools half the children dropped out every year.

Yes, when your school was founded there was little to celebrate in Jewish education.

As we celebrate your 50th anniversary it seems to me we have at least three other causes for celebration.

First, there is a vastly increased interest in Jewish education.

The turning point came at just about the time Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel opened its doors.

At just about that time the Bureau of Jewish Education was created. Comprehensive plans were made to advance Jewish education on a communitywide basis. The Hebrew Principals Association and the Jewish Teachers Association were organized. Perhaps most important—this activity began to attract able and dedicated teachers.

Our second cause for celebration lies in the advances in education now being made in Israel. All of Israel's leaders recognize that the future of their nation, their security, their spiritual destiny, and their entire pattern of development rest upon their educational system. Disparate cultures, poverty, a flood of immigration (larger, proportionate to population, than any the world has known) and the primitive beliefs, have placed enormous demands upon its educational structure.

While Israel's population tripled, its school population increased sixfold.

Despite these handicaps, enormous progress is being made at all educational levels.

There is a vigorous program of preschool education for culturally deprived children. Last year, 5,000 of them received free nursery education to give them a headstart. This is a key feature of our own antipoverty program.

Vocational schools, with the support of such farsighted organizations as Histadrut, Hadassah, WIZO, Misrachi, and ORT have made remarkable progress. We, have sent our experts to Israel to learn how they teach the blind to weave cloth or, even, to run computers.

In the field of higher education it has been said that, pound for pound, Israel possesses the greatest abundance of talent in the world. It has five excellent universities and no mediocre ones.

The new imperative in American education gives us our third great cause for celebration today. For 82 years there has been a fruitless effort to enact general Federal legislation for primary and secondary schools. Always,

the effort was defeated by bigotry, religious prejudice or suspicion of Federal power. This year we have an education bill that will be signed into law.

It is a bold program. It is a new program. It will proclaim a new era in American education.

It is based upon the simple axiom that we can raise the level of all American education by raising the bottom.

When this idea was first considered there was no doubt in my mind that it would cause a violent dispute in the Jewish community. I was not disappointed.

Some Jewish leaders testified the new education bill would "undermine public education," or "gravely threatens" the public school system. Others applauded the bill as "a major step forward in meeting the educational needs of the schoolchildren of our Nation."

I can readily understand the concern over the preservation of our constitutional concept of separation between church and State. The most tragic chapters in Jewish history admonish us to enforce that separation. No matter where the land or what the era, State control over religion invariably results in oppression of Jews. From the Crusaders to the modern atheistic tyranny in Russia Jews have always been persecuted whenever the State sought to impose a religious doctrine.

However, I cannot agree that the education bill now before the Congress jeopardizes our interests. On the contrary, it offers hope for all Americans—especially the poor, the underprivileged, the handicapped, and the exceptional.

There is an explosion of knowledge all around us. Its limits are not yet in sight. It demands the kind of educated America the bill will help create.

But it is not learning alone, as President Wilson once pointed out, that gives education "a place in the public annals of the Nation. It is indispensable," he said, "that the air of affairs should be admitted to all its classrooms * * * the air of the world's transactions, the consciousness of the solidarity of race, the sense of duty of man toward man."

One of the supplementary benefits of Yeshiva teaching is the interest it inspires in Jewish traditions and Jewish life.

And today we have more need than perhaps ever before of an informed Jewish community. As we look at the world from our privileged sanctuary in this beloved land we see:

A Russia where 3 million fellow Jews are being deprived of their religious, cultural, and economic rights.

A Jordan grown belligerent despite every effort at peaceful solutions to irritations along its 500-mile border with Israel.

An Egypt sharpening its instruments of war against Israel in Yemen and the Congo. I could go on. Revolve the globe in any direction. You will be unable to find a place where peace is gaining ground.

We live in perilous times. The crisis in Vietnam is familiar reading on the front page of every paper in the country. Less familiar is the growing crisis in the Near East. It cannot—and should not—be ignored.

The Arab nations surrounding Israel have, for the first time, joined their military forces under a unified command.

They have obtained financing for military equipment from oil-rich members of the unified command.

They have a diabolical plan for the diversion of Israel's vital water resources—and have actually embarked on this project.

Recent news reports say the Arab nations have obtained large supplies of tanks, submarines, and bombers from the Soviet Union—and that they are building sophisticated weapons like guided missiles.

Perhaps most important, Arab morale was strengthened to dangerous proportions by their success in getting West Germany to halt arms shipments to Israel.

Knowing these things, however, is not enough. In a democracy the obligation of citizenship includes the expression of opinion.

Those of you who have had the intellectual discipline of the Yeshiva are well equipped to assert your opinions.

It was Thornton Wilder who said "Every good and excellent thing stands moment by moment on the razor-edge of danger and must be fought for." Peace in the Near East is a good and excellent thing. Today it stands on the razor-edge of danger. Therein lies the challenge to you.

Again, let me express my best wishes to you and my admiration for your extraordinary contributions to Jewish life during the past 50 years.

Thank you.

REMARKS BY RABBI ISRAEL PORATH, PRESIDENT OF THE ORTHODOX RABBINICAL COUNCIL OF CLEVELAND AT THE GOLDEN JUBILEE DINNER OF THE YESHIVATH ADATH B'NAI ISRAEL, CLEVELAND, OHIO, MARCH 7, 1965

The attainment of 50 years of existence is an important milestone in the annals of any establishment, and certainly much more so in the history of a communal educational institution. The term Jubilee comes from the Biblical "Yovel" which designates the completion of each half century, that used to be celebrated with solemn rituals in the ancient land of Israel.

The Torah commands, "You shall sanctify the 50th year." "You shall proclaim it by the blast of the Shofar throughout your land. The 50th anniversary shall be unto you a year of jubilation."

In the life of an individual we are told in Pirke Ovoth, The Ethics of Our Fathers, "at the age of 50 one is considered mature for advice and consultation." It is a period not only to rejoice, but mainly to take account, to review past achievement, as well as failures, to reevaluate the works and the results of the years gone by, so as to realize and recognize by what ways and means one is to utilize the potentials for the future.

In the area of Jewish education which is tonight our main concern, times have changed considerably during the past decades, and for the better. The founders of the Yeshiva were newcomers, laymen who escaped from the European terror of oppression, in search of security and freedom. They were at great disadvantages. They could hardly master the language of the land. They could hardly adjust themselves to the habits, customs and to the American way of life.

They have not been professionals. They were simple and honest people. They had to work very hard to earn their decent livelihood by the sweat of their brow and the labor of their hands. But with all the odds against them, and with all their personal financial worries, they possessed a spiritual endowment of inherent faith in providence, and loyalty and reverence to all which is dear and sacred in Jewish law and tradition. They did not live by bread alone. Within their inner recesses they kept a burning desire for the promotion and transmission of our religious heritage to posterity.

So they banded together, a group of hard-working laymen, but animated by spirit, full of zeal, sincerity, and perseverance and established the Yeshiva for Cleveland-born children, to get a basic training in the knowledge of Torah and in the practice of Torah living.

They carried the whole burden on their own shoulders. There was, as yet, no Jewish community fund to subsidize them. They had to wander and go out soliciting and collecting donations from synagogue to synagogue, and from meeting to meeting, from individual to individual. The same was true about the Sisterhood who invested time and energy to raise the monthly budget to pay the meager wages to the Melamdim. It was a painstaking and backbreaking task. But they persisted and kept on working without complaint.

Now looking back in retrospect, we realize what simple, honest, and unselfish dedication can accomplish. When looking around nowadays and seeing Cleveland-born young and middle-aged intelligent men who are members of and active in the Young Israel, the Hebrew Academy, the Mikva Association, and practically in every area of genuine Orthodox activities, you may be sure that 90 percent of them had been pupils of Yeshiva Adath. They are now the backbone of Orthodox Jewry in Cleveland.

To you members of the alumni and parents of pupils present here tonight, I want to say a few words. The Yeshiva is your religious alma mater. Today, the Yeshiva is in a much more advantageous situation than ever before. The Yeshiva has special classes for girls as well as for boys, a thing that was lacking in previous years. The Yeshiva is now an arm of the Bureau of Jewish Education. It enjoys the recognition and the substantial cooperation of the federation. It has a trained staff of devoted teachers under the supervision of efficient principals and educators. Its board of education consists of the members of our United Orthodox Rabbinate, and the Roshai Yeshiva of Telshe. And you have a very effective PTA organization able, ready, and willing to undertake any worthwhile enterprise for the good and welfare of the Yeshiva Adath.

Tonight you start the first festival of the jubilee year. Others will follow. It is now up to you. Go out in full strength and proclaim it a year of concerted effort to make the good name of the Yeshiva even better. Sanctify the 50th jubilee. Proudly convey the message of Jewish learning and practice throughout the breadth and length of our Jewish neighborhoods.

And as we read yesterday at the Sabbath morning service, when Moses saw all the work that was being done in accordance with Heavenly prescriptions, he gave them his benediction saying:

"May it be His will to bestow His blessing upon the work of your hands. And may His pleasantness be upon us to establish our works." Amen.

Alumni Award to Edna H. Mack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending this year's spring convocation at Gardner-Webb College. When alumni awards were presented for distinguished service, among those receiving an award was Edna H. Mack, of Toledo, in my own Third District in Washington. It gives me great pleasure to place in the RECORD at this time this award:

Born in nearby Gaffney, S.C., Edna Elizabeth Humphries Mack, came to Boiling Springs High School for her secondary education. In 1929, she graduated with a bachelor of arts degree from Limestone College.

She has, in addition to her undergraduate work, studied at George Peabody College for Teachers, at Western Washington College for Teachers, and at the University of Washington. Following graduation from Limestone, she began her long teaching career, teaching the upper elementary grades in Cherokee and Spartanburg Counties, S.C., for 14 years. For several years, she was a Sunday schoolteacher as well as pianist in Macedonia Baptist Church, Gaffney, S.C. At the present time, Mrs. Mack is teacher-librarian of Toledo High School, Toledo, Wash., where for 4 years she was class sponsor and where since 1958 she has sponsored the library club and the national honor society. A longtime friend of hers said that Mrs. Mack's "quiet, unassuming way has won for her many friends wherever she has studied, taught, or lived."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Dean Rusk Before the American Society of International Law, Washington, April 23, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include not only a notable but a great and timely address delivered on April 23, 1965, by Hon. Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State, in Washington, D.C., before the American Society of International Law.

Secretary Rusk's comparison between the basic conditions of today and of pre-World War II, which he well summarized "Surely we have learned over the past three decades that the acceptance of aggression leads only to a sure catastrophe," is appropriate, timely, and correct. This part of his able address might well be termed "Lest We Forget."

The address follows:

I

When this distinguished society was founded 59 years ago, the then Secretary of State, Elihu Root, became its first president. With the passage of time, the Secretary of State has been elevated to a less demanding role, that of honorary president. Secretary Root himself not only established the precedent of becoming president while Secretary of State; he also superseded it by continuing to serve as your president for 18 years. The proceedings of the first meeting indicate that Secretary Root not only presided and delivered an address, but that he also selected the menu for the dinner.

The year 1907, when the first of the society's annual meetings was held, today appears to have been one of those moments in American history when we were concentrating upon building our American society, essentially untroubled by what took place beyond our borders. But the founders of this society realized that the United States could not remain aloof from the world. It is one of the achievements of this society that, from its inception, it has spread the realization that the United States cannot opt out of the community of nations—that international affairs are part of our national affairs.

Questions of war and peace occupied the society at its first meeting. Among the subjects discussed were the possibility of the immunity of private property from belligerent seizure upon the high seas and whether trade in contraband of war was unneutral. Limitations upon recourse to force then proposed were embryonic, as is illustrated by the fact one topic for discussion related to restrictions upon the use of armed force in the collection of contract obligations. The distance between those ideas and the restrictions upon recourse to armed force contained in the Charter of the United Nations is vast. It is to these charter restrictions—and their place in the practice and malpractice of states—that I shall address much of my remarks this evening.

II

Current U.S. policy arouses the criticism that it is at once too legal and too tough. Time was when the criticism of American concern with the legal element in international relations was that it led to softness—to a "legalistic-moralistic" approach to foreign affairs which conformed more to the ideal than to the real. Today, criticism of American attachment to the role of law is that it leads not to softness, but to severity. We are criticized not for sacrificing our national interests to international interests, but for endeavoring to impose the international interest upon other nations. We are criticized for acting as if the Charter of the United Nations means what it says. We are criticized for treating the statement of the law by the International Court of Justice as authoritative. We are criticized for taking collective security seriously.

This criticism is, I think, a sign of strength—of our strength, and of the strength of international law. It is a tribute to a blending of political purpose with legal ethic.

American foreign policy is at once principled and pragmatic. Its central objective is our national safety and well-being—to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." But we know we can no longer find security and well-being in defenses and policies which are confined to North America, or the Western Hemisphere, or the North Atlantic Community. This has become a very small planet. We have to be concerned with all of it—with all of its land, waters, atmosphere, and with surrounding space. We have a deep national interest in peace, the prevention of aggression, the faithful performance of agreements, the growth of international law. Our foreign policy is rooted in the profoundly practical realization that the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter must animate the behavior of states, if mankind is to prosper or is even to survive. Or at least they must animate enough states with enough will and enough resources to see to it that others do not violate those rules with impunity.

The preamble and article 1 and 2 of the charter set forth abiding purposes of American policy. This is not surprising, since we took the lead in drafting the charter—at a time when the biggest war in history was still raging and we and others were thinking deeply about its frightful costs and the ghastly mistakes and miscalculations which led to it.

The kind of world we seek is the kind set forth in the opening sections of the charter: a world community of independent states, each with the institutions of its own choice, but cooperating with one another to promote their mutual welfare * * * a world in which the use of force is effectively inhibited * * * a world of expanding human rights and well-being * * * a world of expanding international law * * * a world in which an agreement is a commitment and not just a tactic.

We believe that this is the sort of world a great majority of the governments of the world desire. We believe it is the sort of world man must achieve if he is not to perish. As I said on another occasion: "If once the rule of international law could be discussed with a certain condescension as a utopian ideal, today it becomes an elementary practical necessity. Pacta sunt servanda now becomes the basis for survival."

Unhappily a minority of governments is committed to different ideas of the conduct and organization of human affairs. They are dedicated to the promotion of the Communist world revolution. And their doctrine justifies any technique, any ruse, any deceit, which contributes to that end. They may differ as to tactics from time to time. And the two principal Communist powers are competitors for the leadership of the world Communist movement. But both are committed to the eventual communization of the entire world.

The overriding issue of our time is which concepts are to prevail: those set forth in the United Nations Charter or those proclaimed in the name of a world revolution.

III

The paramount commitment of the charter is article 2, paragraph 4, which reads: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

This comprehensive limitation went beyond the Covenant of the League of Nations. This more sweeping commitment sought to apply a bitter lesson of the interwar period—that the threat or use of force, whether or not called "war," feeds on success. The indelible lesson of those years is that the time to stop aggression is at its very beginning.

The exceptions to the prohibitions on the use or threat of force were expressly set forth in the charter. The use of force is legal—

As a collective measure by the United Nations; or

As action by regional agencies in accordance with chapter VIII of the chapter; or

In individual or collective self-defense.

When article 2, paragraph 4 was written it was widely regarded as general international law, governing both members and nonmembers of the United Nations. And on the universal reach of the principle embodied in article 2, paragraph 4, wide agreement remains. Thus, last year, a United Nations Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning friendly relations and cooperation among States met in Mexico City. All shades of United Nations opinion were represented. The committee's purpose was to study and possibly to elaborate certain of those principles. The committee debated much and agreed on little. But on one point, it reached swift and unanimous agreement: that all States, and not only all members of the United Nations, are bound to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. Nonrecognition of the statehood of a political entity was held not to affect the international application of this cardinal rule of general international law.

But at this same meeting in Mexico City, Czechoslovakia, with the warm support of the Soviet Union and some other members, proposed formally another exemption from the limitations on use of force. Their proposal stated that: "The prohibition of the use of force shall not affect * * * self defense of nations against colonial domination

in the exercise of the right of self-determination."

The United States is all for self-defense. We are against colonial domination—we led the way in throwing it off. We have long favored self-determination, in practice as well as in words—indeed, we favor it for the entire world, including the peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. But we could not accept the Czech proposal. And we were pleased that the Special Committee found the Czech proposal unacceptable.

The primary reason why we opposed that attempt to rewrite the charter—apart from the inadmissibility of rewriting the charter at all by such means—was that we knew the meaning behind the words. We knew that like so many statements from such sources, it used upside down language—that it would in effect authorize a State to wage war, to use force internationally, as long as it claimed it was doing so to liberate somebody from colonial domination. In short, the Czech resolution proposed to give to so-called wars of national liberation the same exemption from the limitation on the use of force which the charter accords to defense against aggression.

What is a war of national liberation? It is, in essence, any war which furthers the Communist world revolution—what, in broader terms, the Communists have long referred to as a "just" war. The term "war of national liberation" is used not only to denote armed insurrection by people still under colonial rule—there are not many of those left outside the Communist world. It is used to denote any effort led by Communists to overthrow by force any non-Communist government.

Thus the war in South Vietnam is called a war of national liberation. And those who would overthrow various other non-Communist governments in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are called the forces of national liberation.

Nobody in his right mind would deny that Venezuela is not only a truly independent nation but that it has a government chosen in a free election. But the leaders of the Communist insurgency in Venezuela are described as leaders of a fight for national liberation—not only by themselves and by Castro and the Chinese Communists, but by the Soviet Communists.

A recent editorial in Pravda spoke of the "peoples of Latin America * * * marching firmly along the path of struggle for their national independence" and said: "the upsurge of the national liberation movement in Latin American countries has been to a great extent a result of the activities of Communist Parties." It added: "The Soviet people have regarded and still regard it as their sacred duty to give support to the peoples fighting for their independence. True to their international duty the Soviet people have been and will remain on the side of the Latin American patriots."

In Communist doctrine and practice, a non-Communist government may be labeled and denounced as "colonialist," "reactionary," or a "puppet," and any state so labeled by the Communists automatically becomes fair game * * * while Communist intervention by force in non-Communist states is justified as "self-defense" or part of the "struggle against colonial domination." "Self-determination" seems to mean that any Communist nation can determine by itself that any non-Communist state is a victim of colonialist domination and therefore a justifiable target for a war of "liberation."

As the risks of overt aggression, whether nuclear or with conventional forces, have become increasingly evident, the Communists have put increasing stress on the "war of national liberation." The Chinese Communists have been more militant in language and behavior than the Soviet Communists. But the Soviet Communist leadership also has consistently proclaimed its commitment in principle to support wars of national liberation. This commitment was reaffirmed as recently as Monday of this week by Mr. Kosygin.

International law does not restrict internal revolution within a state, or revolution against colonial authority. But international law does restrict what third powers may lawfully do in support of insurrection. It is these restrictions which are challenged by the doctrine, and violated by the practice, of "wars of liberation."

It is plain that acceptance of the doctrine of "wars of liberation" would amount to scuttling the modern international law of peace which the charter prescribes. And acceptance of the practice of "wars of liberation," as defined by the Communists, would mean the breakdown of peace itself.

IV

Vietnam presents a clear current case of the lawful versus the unlawful use of force. I would agree with General Giap and other Communists that it is a test case for "wars of national liberation." We intend to meet that test.

Were the insurgency in South Vietnam truly indigenous and self-sustained, international law would not be involved. But the fact is that it receives vital external support—in organization and direction, in training, in men, in weapons, and other supplies. That external support is unlawful, for a double reason. First, it contravenes general international law, which the United Nations Charter here expresses. Second, it contravenes particular international law: The 1954 Geneva Accords on Vietnam, and the 1962 Geneva Agreements on Laos.

In resisting the aggression against it, the Republic of Vietnam is exercising its right of self-defense. It called upon us and other states for assistance. And in the exercise of the right of collective self-defense under the United Nations Charter, we and other nations are providing such assistance.

The American policy of assisting South Vietnam to maintain its freedom was inaugurated under President Eisenhower, and continued under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Our assistance has been increased because the aggression from the north has been augmented. Our assistance now encompasses the bombing of North Vietnam. The bombing is designed to interdict, as far as possible, and to inhibit, as far as may be necessary, continued aggression against the Republic of Vietnam.

When that aggression ceases, collective measures in defense against it will cease. As President Johnson has declared: "* * * if that aggression is stopped, the people and Government of South Vietnam will be free to settle their own future, and the need for supporting American military action there will end."

The fact that the demarcation line between North and South Vietnam was intended to be temporary does not make the assault on South Vietnam any less of an aggression. The demarcation lines between North and South Korea and between East and West Germany are temporary. But that did not make the North Korean invasion of South Korea a permissible use of force.

Let's not forget the salient features of the 1962 agreements on Laos. Laos was to be independent and neutral. All foreign troops, regular or irregular, and other military personnel were to be withdrawn within 75 days, except a limited number of French instructors as requested by the Lao Government. No arms were to be introduced into Laos except at the request of that government. The signatories agreed to refrain "from all direct or indirect interference in the internal affairs" of Laos. They promised also not to use Lao territory to intervene in the internal affairs of other countries—a stipulation that plainly prohibited the passage of arms and men from North Vietnam to South Vietnam by way of Laos. An International Control Commission of three was to assure compliance with the agreements. And all the signatories promised to support a coalition government under Prince Souvanna Phouma.

What happened? The non-Communist elements complied. The Communists did not. At no time since that agreement was signed have either the Pathet Lao or the North Vietnam authorities complied with it. The North Vietnamese left several thousand troops there—the backbone of almost every Pathet Lao battalion. Use of the corridor through Laos to South Vietnam continued. And the Communists barred the areas under their control both to the Government of Laos and the International Control Commission.

To revert to Vietnam: I continue to hear and see nonsense about the nature of the struggle there. I sometimes wonder at the gullibility of educated men and the stubborn disregard of plain facts by men who are supposed to be helping our young to learn—especially to learn how to think.

Hanoi has never made a secret of its designs. It publicly proclaimed in 1960 a renewal of the assault on South Vietnam. Quite obviously its hopes of taking over South Vietnam from within had withered to close to zero—and the remarkable economic and social progress of South Vietnam contrasted, most disagreeably for the North Vietnamese Communists, with their own miserable economic performance.

The facts about the external involvement have been documented in white papers and other publications of the Department of State. The International Control Commission has held that there is evidence beyond reasonable doubt of North Vietnamese intervention.

There is no evidence that the Vietcong has any significant popular following in South Vietnam. It relies heavily on terror. Most of its reinforcements in recent months have been North Vietnamese from the North Vietnamese Army.

Let us be clear about what is involved today in southeast Asia. We are not involved with empty phrases or conceptions which ride upon the clouds. We are talking about the vital national interests of the United States in the peace of the Pacific. We are talking about the appetite for aggression—an appetite which grows upon feeding and which is proclaimed to be insatiable. We are talking about the safety of nations with whom we are allied—and the integrity of the American commitment to join in meeting attack. It is true that we also believe that every small state has a right to be unmolested by its neighbors even though it is within reach of a great power. It is true that we are committed to general principles of law and procedure which reject the idea that men and arms can be sent freely across frontiers to absorb a neighbor. But underlying the general principles is the harsh reality that our own security is threatened by those who would embark upon a course of aggression whose announced ultimate purpose is our own destruction. Once again we hear expressed the views which cost the men of my generation a terrible price in World War II. We are told that southeast Asia is far away—but so were Manchuria and Ethiopia. We are told that if we insist that someone stop shooting that that is asking them for unconditional surrender. We are told that perhaps the aggressor will be content with just one more bite. We are told that if we prove faithless on one commitment that perhaps others would believe us about other commitments in other places. We are told that if we stop resisting that perhaps the other side will have a change of heart. We were asked to stop hitting bridges and radar sites and ammunition depots with-

out requiring that the other side stop its slaughter of thousands of civilians and its bombings of schools and hotels and hospitals and railways and buses.

Surely we have learned over the past three decades that the acceptance of aggression leads only to a sure catastrophe. Surely we have learned that the aggressor must face the consequences of his action and be saved from the frightful miscalculation that brings all to ruin. It is the purpose of law to guide men away from such events, to establish rules of conduct which are deeply rooted in the reality of experience.

V

Before closing, I should like to turn away from the immediate difficulties and dangers of the situation in southeast Asia and remind you of the dramatic progress that shapes and is being shaped by expanding international law.

A "common law of mankind"—to use the happy phrase of your distinguished colleague, Wilfred Jenks—is growing as the world shrinks, and as the vistas of space expand. This year is, by proclamation of the General Assembly, International Cooperation Year, a year "to direct attention to the common interests of mankind and to accelerate the joint efforts being undertaken to further them." Those common interests are enormous and intricate, and the joint efforts which further them are developing fast, although perhaps not fast enough.

In the 19th century, the United States attended an average of one international conference a year. Now we attend nearly 600 a year. We are party to 4,300 treaties and other international agreements in force. Three-fourths of these were signed in the last 25 years. Our interest in the observance of all of these treaties and agreements is profound, whether the issue is peace in Laos, or the payment of United Nations assessments, or the allocation of radiofrequencies, or the application of airline safeguards, or the control of illicit traffic in narcotics, or any other issue which States have chosen to regulate through the lawmaking process. The writing of international cooperation into international law is meaningful only if the law is obeyed—and only if the international institutions which administer and develop the law function in accordance with agree procedures, until the procedures are changed.

Everything suggests that the rate of growth in international law—like the rate of change in almost every other field these days—is rising at a very steep angle.

In recent years the law of the sea has been developed and codified—but it first evolved in a leisurely fashion over the centuries. International agreements to regulate aerial navigation had to be worked out within the period of a couple of decades. Now, within the first few years of man's adventures in outer space, we are deeply involved in the creation of international institutions, regulations, and law to govern this effort.

Already the United Nations has developed a set of legal principles to govern the use of outer space and declared celestial bodies free from national appropriation.

Already nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union, have agreed not to orbit weapons of mass destruction in outer space.

Already the Legal Subcommittee of the United Nations Committee on Outer Space is formulating international agreements on liability for damage caused by the reentry of objects launched into outer space and on rescue and return of astronauts and space objects.

Already the first international sounding rocket range has been established in India and is being offered for United Nations sponsorship.

To make orderly space exploration possible at this stage, the International Telecommunications Union had to allocate radio frequencies for the purpose.

To take advantage of weather reporting and forecasting potential of observation satellites, married to computer technology, the World Meteorological Organization is creating a vast system of data acquisition, analysis, and distribution which depends entirely on international agreement, regulation and standards.

And to start building a single global communications satellite system, we have created a novel international institution in which a private American corporation shares ownership with 45 governments.

This is but a part of the story of how the pace of discovery and invention forces us to reach out for international agreement, to build international institutions, to do things in accordance with an expanding international and transnational law.

Phenomenal as the growth of treaty obligations is, the true innovation of 20th century international law lies more in the fact that we have nearly 80 international institutions which are capable of carrying out those obligations.

It is important that the processes and products of international cooperation be understood and appreciated; and it is important that their potential be much further developed. It is also important that the broader significance of the contributions of international cooperation to the solving of international problems of an economic, social, scientific and humanitarian character not be overestimated. For all the progress of peace could be incinerated in war.

Thus, the control of force in international relations remains the paramount problem which confronts the diplomat and the lawyer—and the man in the street and the man in the ricefield. Most of mankind is not in an immediate position to grapple very directly with that problem, but the problem is no less crucial. The responsibility of those, in your profession and mine, who do grapple with it is the greater. I am happy to acknowledge that this society, in thinking and debating courageously and constructively about the conditions of peace, continues to make its unique contribution and to make it well.

Comprehensive Land-Use Planning and the Public Domain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, at a recent Public Land Management Conference of the National Association of Counties, Mr. Irving Senzel, Chief of the Division of Lands and Minerals in the Bureau of Land Management, in Washington, D.C., made a very interesting and comprehensive statement concerning land use and planning in the public domain.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mr. Senzel be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPREHENSIVE LAND-USE PLANNING AND THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

(By Irving Senzel, Chief, Division of Lands and Minerals, Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.)

To get started right I'd better clarify a bit the title of my assignment. I believe that we all have a fairly consistent understanding of what we mean by land-use planning. That leaves "public domain" and "comprehensive" to be discussed.

PUBLIC DOMAIN

By "public domain," I refer to the lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management—some 180 million acres in the Western States and more than 250 million acres in Alaska. Other Federal lands no doubt also affect the nature of your land-use planning. However, my topic today is limited to BLM holdings.

COMPREHENSIVE

I can't get away so easily with the word "comprehensive." I can't use it entirely as I wish. This word is asserting itself more and more in Federal legislation and in the literature on planning. My understanding of the word as used in the law and literature can be approached somewhat as follows: Planning is not comprehensive if it omits consideration of any fact that pertains to your problem. The other way around, comprehensive planning requires consideration of every pertinent fact.

This is a large order and, for all intents and purposes, is really impossible. Comprehensive planning therefore, means to me an earnest attempt to consider in your problem as many related facts as possible. This adds a feeling of comfort to an otherwise forbidding task. It also recognizes that planning is a human endeavor, starting with the best you can do now and becoming bigger and better as you proceed.

COMPREHENSIVE LAND-USE PLANNING

Why is "comprehensive land-use planning" particularly pertinent to the public domain? The basic reason is that the lands are owned by a sovereign, the people of the United States, and this landlord is a peculiar type of landlord. It seeks to use its lands, not for profit, but for specific public benefits. It seeks to manage or dispose of its lands in what it calls "the public interest."

This may be to foster the economy, encourage industry, further public education, protect watersheds, and many others, in various combinations. These objectives are more or less clearly stated in the great body of law known as the public land laws and in many other laws related to them.

Comprehensive land-use planning for the public domain therefore means consideration of the many policies and programs enacted by the Congress and the activities of many Federal agencies carrying out the program. What has this to do with counties, and States and other State subdivisions? One reason is that the Congress has prescribed that many of its objectives must be accomplished by or through State and local governments—highways, wildlife, flood control, curbing or urban sprawl, acquisition and preservation of open space—to mention a few.

It would not do for the Federal Government and the States and local governments to work at cross purposes in its day-to-day activities. Comprehensive land use planning therefore requires consideration of the activities of all governmental levels.

COORDINATION REQUIRED

It is fairly easy to go on to show that comprehensive land-use planning is multidimensional. It requires coordination among agencies, coordination of various functions within agencies, coordination among governmental levels, coordination among areas.

Here again we get into what seems an impossible task—unless we take a reasonable view and again do the best we can. One way we can make the job manageable is to carefully delineate zones of major attention for each of the participants involved in a particular planning problem or situation.

Let's relate this view to comprehensive land-use planning by BLM and by the counties in relation to the public domain. In this situation, we can make a distinction between two classes of lands. One class is the lands which can be expected to be retained in Federal ownership for a given period for multiple use management. The other class would be the lands expected to be transferred to non-Federal ownership within a given period.

Many factors go into the determination of which lands fall in each class. The new public land legislation (Public Laws 88-606, 88-607, and 88-608) however gives us general guidelines for making these determinations. Our proposed regulations attempt to harmonize these guidelines with those in other laws and to create a background for evaluation and decision.

PRIMARY INTEREST FOR COUNTIES

This differentiation into two classes makes comprehensive land-use planning for BLM and for the counties much more manageable. The counties' prime interest is in the lands destined for disposal. They, of course, also have an interest in the other class too. On the other hand, the BLM's prime management interest is in the retention category. However, it also has important responsibilities in the disposal process.

A PRACTICAL APPROACH TO PLANNING

If each party will give, at the beginning at least, its prime attention to its prime area of interest, it can concentrate its initiative and its energies where they will yield the greatest return.

Each will then take a secondary or coordinating role in the land class of its secondary interest.

This approach will have another benefit. None of us can undertake now all the planning that is needed to do the best job possible. We must establish priorities, on the basis of taking most urgent things first. The approach I describe will permit selection of areas of most immediate attention. And the areas selected by each party for primary attention need not be the same.

Automatically each of us would be giving its major attention to areas of most concern to him. Thus in disposal areas, counties would concentrate their land-use mapping and zoning administration. BLM would participate as an interested property owner. In management areas, BLM would concentrate on plans for resource protection, management, and development. The counties would participate to the extent of their interest.

Admittedly, this is something less than comprehensive in an ideal sense. However, it meets the test from a practical point of view.

This approach would eliminate the need for total involvement in each other's planning processes. Cooperation would be needed only at those points where interests coincided. Where interests diverge, coordinated activities would cease. Otherwise, we'd be interfering in each other's business for no good purpose.

Doing things this way would also simplify machinery for coordination. For example, we can differentiate the various things which require close cooperation from those that merely require exchange of information. We'll have to work very closely on such things as sales under the new law and on planning for highway networks and their maintenance. Our recreation development plans would have to be harmonized to some detail. On the other hand, our range development plans will often be not more than general interest to you.

CONCLUSION

Finally, and perhaps most important, this plan for planning will not interfere with the more comprehensive aspects of our comprehensive land-use planning. In fact, it can coordinate with it and work within its framework. You can proceed with your 701 planning, your comprehensive recreation planning under the Land and Water Conservation Act, your general zoning program, and all the other types of planning you have to do without having to wait on us. We can proceed with our long-range planning and with our budgetary process without waiting for you or complicating your work. We have already undertaken pilot studies and other experimental work to see if this idea is sound. First evaluations, which we received from county and BLM officials the day before yesterday indicate that it will work and that it will benefit all of us.

Problems We Face in International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, for years the prime Communist objective has been to drive this country to isolationism and force us to abandon our commitments throughout the world. The results of such a course would be disastrous to us as a nation and to the entire free world.

Dr. You Chan Yang, former Korean Ambassador to the United States and now executive vice president of the Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation, Inc., addressed the Political Study Club on April 10 and discussed the problems that face us in international affairs today.

Dr. Yang's remarks make it quite clear that disunity and retreat spell death, but if we unite and stand fast, we need have no fear for the future.

ADDRESS BY DR. YOU CHAN YANG, FORMER KOREAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE POLITICAL STUDY CLUB, APRIL 10, 1965

Madam President Miller, officers of the Political Study Club, and distinguished guests, it is a privilege and a pleasure to address you today on a subject of paramount importance—a subject which is touching all of our lives. At the time Dienbienphu was about to fall, I went to the State Department and offered one division of Korean troops to assist the beleaguered French. Concurrently, Chiang Kai-shek made a similar offer of free Chinese forces. We planned to launch an offensive to divert Red Chinese supplies and forces from the Indochina front. The result of my effort was disappointing in that State advised me that no troops were desired but that, as an alternative, President Syngman Rhee was wanted in southeast Asia to serve as a symbol and rallying point for the people of the free world. President Rhee with heavier and more pressing commitments in his own country was unable to acquiesce to the American request.

Over the years the main Communist objective has been to drive the United States to isolationism, to force this Nation to abandon its international commitments and to withdraw its stalwart forces from their posts throughout the world. This Communist policy has been manifested by the notorious "Yankee go home" placards which have been displayed and by the same infamous message scrawled on walls and pavements. As a related tactic Communist agents have infiltrated institutions of higher learning all over the world and have enrolled students in cells espousing American isolationism and have indoctrinated innocent but well-meaning young men and women in ways and means of violent behavior against the United States. Over the years, denigration of the United States has been the principal topic of the Kremlin-Peiping axis and is now promulgated by each of them independently of the other.

On both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains we have witnessed systematic attacks organized and led by Communists against American embassies, libraries, privately owned property, and the nationals of this country. For what purpose? The objective of these actions is again to force the United States into a posture of isolationism as a result of sheer disgust and revulsion.

Basic Communist aims are the withdrawal of economic and military assistance and the confinement of the American people to this continent. Under these circumstances the way would be paved for the Communists to continue their implacable steps toward world domination and to conquer without bloodshed by propaganda, infiltration and subversion. Should this day ever come, the security of the United States will have been obliterated. The final goal of the Communists is to dominate the industrial capacity, the natural resources and the productivity of America. If the United States permits the Communists to advance further toward their goal, this Nation will be woefully weak and helpless in the face of the ultimate onslaught.

The recent Communist attack upon the U.S. Embassy in Saigon with the attendant loss of life by unarmed civilians was heinous. We cannot accept such operations. There is a law of man's relationship to man and also a law of war. Honorable men do not violate either. There is a code of ethics, and there is a code of international relations with respect to the property and persons of a foreign government accredited to a resident government.

The allies of this great Nation around the world must recognize the fact that they have everything to lose and nothing to gain if the United States withdraws into isolationism. In this atomic age disunity spells death, but the unity of strength and determination of the free world will insure life and security.

For the record here and now, I should like to congratulate your great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, for his courage and determination, sometimes in the face of congressional discord and other times in the face of poignant tragedy brought on by the loss of American lives in Vietnam. He has stood steadfast in his noble determination to oppose the further encroachments of communism and to preserve an area of Asia as a portion of the free world. The example of the President has been emulated by the leaders of his administration and by such dedicated patriots as Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut. Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, has given steadfast evidence of his bipartisan support of the national determination enunciated by the President.

Let us examine for a moment the propriety of U.S. actions as contrasted with those of the Communists. Recently when American lives were lost and $30 million worth of aircraft were destroyed on the ground, were there anti-Communist demonstrations in the United States and elsewhere in the world? Why not? Are they scared? The Com-

munists deface an embassy or wreck a library and achieve millions of dollars worth of international publicity for their cause. The Americans make a diplomatic protest and in contrast receive the replacement of broken window panes and defaced walls. This is not quid pro quo. They reap a propaganda harvest and this great Nation receives, in the minds of their stooges, only another black eye.

Permit me to portray for you what will undoubtedly happen if peace is negotiated in Vietnam. In 1954 the Communists requested the convening of a Geneva Conference to settle the Korean question at a political level. At that time it was evident that a malevolent political trick was about to be perpetrated. This was manifestly evident to the Korean Government which declined to attend the conference. The terms of reference did not include plans for reunification of the country or the establishment of a free democratic government. At the specific request of the U.S. Government, I did attend as one of the representatives of the Republic of Korea.

However, I made one request that, after 2 months of negotiation with the Communists and if basic issues were not resolved for which the conference was called, the United States and Korean delegations would withdraw. The U.S. Government assented to this request. After a brief 2 weeks the U.S. delegation was convinced that the Communists did not come to Geneva to settle the Korean question but alternatively to lay the groundwork for further aggression in Vietnam. You are aware of the results of the debacle in Geneva. Korea today is a divided nation as is Vietnam, and 11 million residents of this latter nation have been brought under Communist domination and tyranny. It is good to know that the United States was not a signatory to this agreement. The so-called Geneva modus vivendi serves as but another example of the manner in which free nations are tricked into appeasement and concessions to the Communists.

Since 1954 it has come to my attention that many sincere and honest Americans favor the neutralization of Vietnam. They and all Americans should appraise the situation of a neighboring country—Laos. The experience of the Laotians serves as a frightful reminder of the fact that no neutrality could exist in the land immediately adjacent—Vietnam or anywhere else.

During the course of my stay in your Nation, I have traveled the length and breath of this great country, urging steadfast opposition to communism. Had the Korean war been won, there would be today no problem with the Communists in Korea, Vietnam, or in other nations of southeast Asia. The Korean war is the only war in which the United States has participated in its history which was not concluded by a decisive victory for your Nation. A stalemate in Korea has resulted in encouragement to the Communists to carry out their aggressive designs upon not only Indochina but also the Middle East and the continent of Africa.

After signing a cease-fire agreement in Korea, the United States is still maintaining 60,000 soldiers in a rugged line facing the ever-hostile Communists across a so-called demilitarized zone. The attitude and conduct of your troops has been punctiliously correct. On the other hand, the Communists continuously violate the armistice agreement and endeavor to infiltrate spies, saboteurs, and provocateurs into the free Republic of Korea. Viewed in the light of the correctness of American conduct, Communist provocations are each day becoming more intolerable.

What is the solution to the delemma with which the free world finds itself faced? It is not to be found in appeasement, concessions, or retreat either before a propaganda blast or after a politically motivated military assault.

We of the nations of the free world must be willing to hold hands in fellowship and determination to preserve our way of life. We must have understanding, appreciation, mutual respect, and an unshakeable determination to make secure what we hold dear. When a coach dispatches a football team to the field, he does not instruct the representatives of his alma mater not to cross the 50-yard line. No such restriction has been, and I doubt ever will be, placed upon the predatory forces of communism. They are out to win and to win for keeps. Unrealistic restrictions should not be imposed upon the forces of the free world who today, tomorrow, or 5 years from now may be called upon to defend their wives, children, and homes.

One of your greatest Presidents said freedom is for those who are strong enough and are willing to fight for it. Your forefathers set the pattern in 1776. If you remember to stand up and be counted, your precious freedom will be cherished by you and your children. I thank you.

Establishment of a Greek Theater in Ypsilanti, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the establishment of a Greek theater in Ypsilanti, Mich., is nearing reality. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a newspaper article describing this unique theater be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE DETROIT FREE PRESS, APRIL 23, 1965, BY CURT HASELTINE

Ground will be broken early this summer in Ypsilanti, Mich., for the first Greek theater to be established outside of Greece since Euripides.

Although the exterior of the $4 million structure will be modern classic, the seating for 1,900 and the stage arrangement will be patterned after the classic theaters of Athens and Epidaurus.

The theater, designed by Architect Harry Weese & Associates of Chicago, will be located on the banks of the Huron River in downtown Ypsilanti.

The Ypsilanti Greek Theater group was organized in 1963 to provide a cultural center but the germ of the idea goes back more than a century to the man who gave Detroit its street plan.

Judge Augustus Woodward named Ypsilanti in 1825 in honor of Gen. Demetrius Ypsilanti, the "George Washington" of the 1820 Greek revolution against Turkish domination.

A statue of General Ypsilanti erected there in 1928 by the international order of AHEPA is the focal point of an annual pilgrimage commemorating Greece's fight for freedom.

Now the Ypsilanti Greek Theater, scheduled to open in 1966, will present classic Greek plays in English using specially commissioned translations to recapture the theatrical strength of the original plays.

The theater will not be devoted solely to Greek classic plays, but will also present folk songs and dances, operettas, musical comedies, and concerts.

It is also expected to serve in the interim periods between festivals as a civic auditorium for lectures and conventions.

The building will include a smaller theater with a seating capacity of 250 to be used as an auditorium for smaller groups. Plans also include a permanent library and study center with a collection of Greek art and sculpture with regularly scheduled exhibitions.

Alexis Solomos, for 14 years artistic director of the Greek National Theater in Athens, will serve as the first resident artistic director of the Ypsilanti Greek Theater.

A local fund drive toward the $4 million cost has already raised $200,000. Interest has also been shown in the project by the Greek and French Governments as well as AHEPA, the nationwide Greek organization of America.

The movement expects aid from the Greek Government and private individuals, and cultural organizations in Greece. The French consulate in Chicago has expressed interest in having French attractions in the festival cycles. AHEPA has agreed to a fund solicitation by the Ypsilanti Greek Theater among AHEPA members.

Mrs. Clara G. Owens, a teacher on leave of absence from the Wayne public school system, is the president and moving force behind the theater project. Stephen T. Spilos of Detroit is a vice president; Nicholas T. Georges, Detroit, treasurer.

The Ppsilanti site for the Greek theater is only 30 miles from Michigan's largest city by freeway (I-94); near the Eastern Michigan University campus and barely 10 minutes' drive from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, and less than a half hour from Greenfield Village, which is visited annually by more than 1 million travelers.

Further indications of success can be seen in a broad national renaissance stirred by the Lincoln Center of the Performing Arts in New York City, and the planned John F. Kennedy Memorial Center for the Arts in Washington, D.C.

It is felt that the Greek theater can do more for Ypsilanti than the Shakespearean festival has done for Stratford, Ontario, and that it can become a major U.S. cultural attraction for tourists from overseas.

Ku Klux Klan Disloyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following column by a fine newspaperman, Ralph McGill. I hope that loyalty to the country will increasingly prevail against the disloyal activities of the Ku Klux Klan:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 15, 1965]

FORMER KLANSMAN A GOOD PROPHET

(By Ralph McGill)

Bill Hendrix, of Oldsmar, Fla., after many years as a Klansman of high rank—such as, grand dragon and wizard—publicly announced retirement as head of the Southern Knights of the Ku Klux Klan in early January 1961.

He had to choose between loyalty to his country and the Klan, he said. And since the Klan had become an enemy of his country, by turning to dynamiting and other

forms of lawlessness, he felt that an honest American had no choice save to get out. He did.

Now, in 1965, Bill Hendrix has written the House Un-American Activities Committee offering his cooperation and suggesting the committee schedule a meeting in the Tampa or St. Petersburg area.

In this letter to the committee Mr. Hendrix said:

"While in Atlanta, Ga., in 1959 at a national Klan rally, those of our group withdrew from Klan activity and requested all Klan groups to disband. Later we gave out a story to Ralph McGill and he printed the story which had nationwide attention.

"We still say the Klan must operate outside the law under its present programs * * * I believe if you will look on your records you will find that the Southern Knights of the Ku Klux Klan has a long record. * * * We disbanded because we found that a Klan group could not operate without going outside the law. The very name Klan to many people today means working outside the law and many of the new Klan leaders know nothing about the law and care less.

"We believe that the southern politicians are to blame for the plight of the South and that such as Faubus, Barnett, and Wallace are wrong and are the cause of most of the unlawful actions now being practiced in the South."

In a postscript to the copy of his letter to the House committee, former Dragon Hendrix suggests that the original statement of withdrawal might be published. It is at hand.

Worried because a criminal element was obtaining control of some Klans, Hendrix said, 6 years ago:

"I can no longer agree to such things as bombing and burning schools and churches. * * * Twenty years ago when I joined the Klan I took an oath that I would obey and uphold the Constitution of the United States and its political subdivisions. All Klan members took that oath. * * * I stated frankly that under the law I saw no way out but to accept the court orders on segregation.

"'I am certainly for segregation' I told the Klansmen, 'and have said so from the public platform for more than 20 years. But, I am not going out and bomb and burn schools and commit crimes some people in the Klan are proposing. We of the Southern Knights hold the honor of not ever having had a member in trouble for violating the law. I want all you Klansmen to remember that you and I took the same oath. * * * I have held every office in the Klan and I know that the Klan is going to get lawless.'"

There is not room for all Hendrix's statement and letter of almost a decade ago. But he was a good prophet. The Federal Bureau of Investigation found ties with Klans in the bombing and killing of Sunday school children in Birmingham, in the horrible murder and hiding of the bodies of the three young civil rights workers in Mississippi, in the killing of an unoffending and unarmed woman on the highway between Selma and Montgomery, and in many other violent crimes.

Time was when decent men did get into the Klans. Most of them long ago saw, as did Bill Hendrix, that the several Klans were headed toward actions no decent American could condone. They got out.

We trust the House Un-American Activities Committee will use what help Hendrix can offer. Certainly the Klan, as President Johnson has said, and as the record demonstrates, is un-American in effect and action.

Management of News in the Southeast Asia Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in his Saturday column for April 24, Dolph Simons, Jr., publisher of the Lawrence, Kans., Journal-World, comments in a very telling way on the management of news in the southeast Asia area.

I hope Mr. Simons continues to hit this critical subject—and I intend to share his comments with the Congress. Freedom of the press, and accurate news reportage, are essential to our national purposes all the time—just as much in time of war and danger as in time of peace.

Mr. Simons most recent column follows:

THE SATURDAY COLUMN

(By Dolph C. Simons, Jr.)

Reports issued the past 10 days at the American Society of Newspaper Editors meeting in Washington and at the American Newspaper Publishers Association's annual convention in New York can't help but make the public wonder if it is being told the truth or is being fed propaganda about the war in Vietnam.

There is no question but that U.S. officials in Washington and Saigon have tried their best to color, distort, and censor the news coming out of the Asian country. They have refused to allow American reporters into certain military areas, they do not allow American military personnel to talk to reporters and they have tried to attach misleading importance and evaluations to many situations. This is happening at both ends of the war, at the Pentagon and in Vietnam.

Unfortunately, the American public doesn't seem to concerned about this dangerous attempt by the Government to control the news even though American casualties are increasing week by week.

It is difficult to understand this lack of interest about Vietnam, since there's no question that America is going to become more and more involved, more men will be killed, the cost to American taxpayers will keep soaring, and there is the possibility this "limited" war could plunge Uncle Sam into an all-out war with China or Russia.

American newsmen are trying their best to report the war, but our own officials are not allowing the public to know what is going on. George Beebe, president of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, pointed out the American public is not getting either "the full story or the true story" on the Vietnam war.

To make matters even worse, the U.S. Information Agency has been given the assignment of handling the press briefings in Saigon. This is an American propaganda agency set up to try to make the United States look good throughout the world, and here it is serving as the official voice of what is going on in Vietnam. USIA controls the military briefings and has set up regulations about news policies regarding air strikes, and the ground rules under which American newsmen have to operate. The Pentagon and the White House evidently not only approve of this controlled news, but are encouraging it.

How can the public have confidence in its Government and statements of its officials, whether it is about Vietnam or the cost of medicare, if Government spokesmen think it is all right to spoon-feed the public in the field of news? Various well-qualified spokesmen in Washington and New York hit hard at deliberate attempts by our Government to mislead the public by either withholding news or telling only part of a story.

When an elected Government official thinks he is powerful enough to control the news, censor the news and deliberately mislead the public, it's time to watch out. This is what happened in other countries prior to the ruthless takeovers of such men as Hitler, Peron and others.

The press is trying to report the news in Vietnam and to inform the public on what is actually taking place. American citizens are going to have to become more concerned over this censorship and voice their opinions to Representatives and Senators to bring about a change.

Reapportionment in Ohio—Issue No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, in Ohio, next month, an election will occur which will determine to a large degree the civil rights of Ohio citizens, white and Negro, for many years to come.

The election in question concerns reapportionment of the State Legislature in Ohio, and is known as issue No. 3. This issue is a nonpartisan one, Mr. Speaker, and is concerned with the essential right of the majority of the people of Ohio to receive a majority of the legislative seats in the legislature. Compared below are the last three Ohio House of Representative election contests:

[In percent]

Year	Percentage majority party vote statewide	Percentage of House seats won by the majority party
1960	53	39
1962	53	36
1964	58	45

We see here, Mr. Speaker, that for the last three elections, the majority party, as indicated by the vote of the people of Ohio, received a minority of the seats in the legislature.

If this had happened in any of the undemocratic nations of the world, where electoral systems are rigged by tyrants and demagogs to assure minority rule, we would be shocked. The citizens of such countries would look upon their electoral systems as unworkable shams,

and would finally lose faith in their leaders and in democracy.

We in the United States, despite our traditions of freedom, democracy, and majority rule, have suffered for many years in our States under rigged and basically undemocratic systems. We suffered until finally the Supreme Court found it necessary to declare the doctrine, "one citizen, one vote." The Court found that the U.S. Constitution basically requires an electoral system under which a majority of the voters would actually elect a majority of the representatives in our States.

Now the State of Ohio proposes a reapportionment amendment, which has been widely publicized as a reform, but which is in fact the worst kind of political outrage.

Why do I say this? Let me recount how the proposed amendment to the Ohio constitution was conceived and submitted to the people.

Within days after the previous legislature in Ohio was voted out of office in November 1964, it was called back into session, into a lame duck special session. Responsible to no one, desirous of protecting the old system of minority rule against the newly elected legislature, the very legislators who had been repudiated at the polls proceeded to put issue No. 3 on the ballot for May 1965.

The story of how they did it should shock every believer in American democratic processes.

First, there was no reason to hold such a special session. Only 2 months later the new legislature would meet, and could have dealt with this problem.

Second, the leadership of the entrenched minority which had been defeated by the voters only days before, decided upon their tactics in secret, and drafted a resolution which was to be placed on the ballot as an amendment to the Ohio constitution.

They held hearings, Mr. Speaker, on a resolution which was not printed for distribution, the details of which were known only to a favored few. Most of the members of their own group did not know what was in the resolution. The opposition party was not told, nor was the public.

Then came the vote on the issue. Though it seems unbelievable, copies of the bill were not given to the members of the legislature who were being asked to vote.

What is issue No. 3 like, Mr. Speaker? Let us consider it in the light of our magnificent political tradition of "the rule of law and not of men." The Legislative Service Commission of Ohio, realizing that documents such as the Ohio constitution must not be open to manipulation, issued a study on September 10, 1964, which said in part that "the constitutional provisions should be as explicit and extensive as possible in prescribing actions for future apportionments." Does issue No. 3 measure up to that requirement? It does not.

First, there is proposed by issue No. 3 the establishment of an apportionment board—made up in part of men who hold elective office—will be permitted to draw the lines of legislative districts without any exact formula. This board could determine by itself, within a wide range, the very size of future legislatures. It would design legislative district lines which would cut across county lines in determining noncity districts, and no rural or city district is safe from the worst kind of gerrymandering.

Second, the phrases which deal with some of the most important aspects of the bill are so elastic as to permit, and even to assure the worst kind of backroom political manipulation.

For example, one phrase states that:

> Districts shall (b) * * * as similar in economic and community interests as possible.

What does that mean? It can mean virtually anything the board wishes it to mean.

Another phrase states that a county which has a population "less than but substantially equal to a ratio" may receive one representative. I looked in the dictionary for a definition of "substantially," Mr. Speaker. The definition was "ample to satisfy." Ample to satisfy whom? Could such a phrase ever satisfy any lawyer working with the simplest legal paper? Of course not.

Still another phrase states that previous district lines "shall be respected to the fullest extent possible." How far will that be? No one can know.

And those who propagandize for issue No. 3 say that if Ohioans do not vote for the amendment, it will be up to the Federal courts to settle the matter. This, too, is the ugliest kind of falsehood. We have a legislature now sitting, Mr. Speaker, and it is likely that it will be sitting after May 4. It is a legitimate legislature, and there is no reason why it can not do the job of giving Ohioans a decent amendment to be voted on in the November elections.

In the past few months we have witnessed brutalities in Selma and Birmingham which have aroused the conscience of America. Negroes in Alabama have sought only the chance to vote, and to have their vote count. They had the election systems rigged against them, and all Americans protested. But the same kind of outrage is being proposed in Ohio, Mr. Speaker. The electoral system will be rigged so as to frustrate the right of the people to vote—and to have their votes count equally.

The people of Ohio, Mr. Speaker, believe fully in the democratic processes. They want an electoral system in which every man's vote counts as much as the next man's—no more and no less. They want an electoral system which will mean true majority rule, that will mean that a party winning a majority of the votes will win a majority of the seats in the legislature. They are sick and tired of sleazy political gimmicks like issue No. 3, and at the polls on May 4, they will defeat issue No. 3.

Union City After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 23, 1965, the Jersey Journal, a leading newspaper published in my district, took editorial notice of the 40th anniversary of the consolidation of Union Hill and West Hoboken into the city of Union City.

Like much of the district which I have the honor to represent, Union City is not new. As the editorial mentions, it has been plagued by most of the ills that beset 19th-century cities attempting to function in our 20th-century world.

Today, under the able leadership of Mayor William V. Musto, Union City is undergoing a renaissance. The future has never looked brighter for this city. On this 40th anniversary, I salute Union City and its capable chief executive, William V. Musto.

I think the Union City story should interest all members who serve an urban-industrial area.

The editorial follows:

UNION CITY AFTER 40

It is 40 years since Union Hill and West Hoboken were consolidated into the city of Union City.

A recent Jersey Journal feature story recalls still-visible reminders of the old names. Most prominent is Union Hill High School. Before he retired last year as superintendent of the city's public schools, William G. Fiedler foresaw the school's eventual replacement with a centralized high school (also incorporating Emerson High School, which has serviced the old West Hoboken section).

Until 8 years ago, due to differences in debts incurred before consolidation, seperate tax rates were maintained for Union Hill and West Hoboken.

Union Hill was a nickname due to its geographic location atop the Palisades. Its official name was the Town of Union.

Union City was the "union station" of the trolley car era. Its center was Transfer Station, at Summit Avenue and Seventh Street, in the West Hoboken section. Another major transfer point was at 48th Street, next to the old Pastime Theater (since renamed) in Union Hill.

Not until after World War II was the trolley eliminated from such narrow streets as New York and Bergenline Avenues, two of the city's major thoroughfares.

Union City had a big silk industry, too. The industry's decline threw thousands out of work in the late 1920's. Further ratables were lost with the cutting of the Lincoln Tunnel approach through the center of the city.

Today, Union City is being revitalized under Mayor William V. Musto's "Operation Rehabilitation." After years of effort, the city obtained air rights to permit construction of business and apartment buildings over the tunnel cut. A tour through city streets shows much other evidence of a city on the move.

And, after 40 years, consolidation is still a timely word. Mayor Musto seeks the con-

solidation of all Hudson County into one big city as the best answer in groping with urban problems. He would settle, for now, for a North Hudson-wide consolidation.

Union City has weathered the storms of the past 40 years—and this gives much promise for the future.

Dr. Stewart G. Fletcher Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased, as I am sure my fellow Westmorelanders were, to read the editorial in the Latrobe Bulletin, entitled "A Distinguished Honor," which follows:

A DISTINGUISHED HONOR

A distinguished honor has been bestowed upon Dr. Stewart G. Fletcher, vice president and technical director of Latrobe Steel Co.

He is the president-elect of the American Society for Metals, assuming his post in October.

Not only is it a distinction for Dr. Fletcher, it is a significant honor for his company and for the Greater Latrobe area.

The American Society for Metals is one of the foremost professional organizations in the world and one which has high qualifications for membership.

To become its chief executive officer is an outstanding honor.

Composed of the leading men in the metals industry in America, the ASM is ever so particular in selecting its president.

Although they are not written as such, the ASM has certain qualifications for its president. He must be an individual who is highly respected in his field, has an outstanding record in his field, is representative of the ideals and objectives of the ASM and is capable of contributing to the metals industry through his expert knowledge.

Obviously, Dr. Fletcher fits these prerequisites, as attested by his election to the organization's highest office.

There are 125 local chapters of the ASM in the United States and Dr. Fletcher's duties as president will require him to visit most of them, during which time he will deliver technical papers relating to the metals industry.

Latrobe Steel Co. is one of the leading firms in the specialty steel industry. And Dr. Fletcher has been part of the effort which has placed Latrobe Steel among the leaders in this industry.

He is one of America's outstanding researchers in the metals business, and has been acclaimed for a number of developments in the manufacture of specialty steels.

Unquestionably his superiors and his fellow workers at Latrobe Steel are proud of Dr. Fletcher.

The Latrobe district should be equally as proud.

Congratulations, Dr. Fletcher.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to publicly congratulate Dr. Fletcher for al. the citizens of our community who share in this honor and award of achievement.

Mr. Speaker, this honor is shared by the Latrobe Steel Co. and all its employees and officers who have been associated with Dr. Fletcher whose contributions have made Latrobe Steel one of the top leaders in this industry.

Absentee Voting by Servicemen—A Bill To Amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the question of servicemen's voting was raised during the press conference held by Secretary McNamara. Since 1950, Mr. Speaker, I have carried out everything within my capacity to encourage servicemen voting and to facilitate their voting. The services know this, or should know it. The proper committees involved have been questioned and have been requested to pass my resolution. Action was taken on one occasion but this action was limited.

Finally, after much prodding on my part, the Department of Defense issued a directive on absentee voting. They can do it now if they desire—and the following resolution is explanatory of the proper method.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a copy of my resolution together with the following letter to the Secretary of Defense and I hope that he will see that a good directive is issued and put into operation.

The letter and resolution follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1965.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was very happy that I took the time to listen to your press conference on April 26 and I commend you for your informative and concise answers.

One of the questions raised at your press conference was one involving servicemen's voting to which you replied you would look into this issue. In an endeavor to be helpful, I wish to call to your attention that for many years I have been deeply concerned regarding servicemen's right to vote. One of the resolutions I introduced in the 86th Congress recommended "in hand" delivery of military ballot applications to all members of the Armed Forces.

For many years I have introduced the enclosed bill to provide for "in hand" delivery of military ballot applications to all servicemen. This application would be an ordinary postal card which when signed by the serviceman would be returned to his home State and a commission would see that he received his proper absentee ballot in order to vote. By "in hand" delivery I mean that the same method of giving the serviceman his personal mail would be followed in giving him a post-card application. In 1955 a Federal Voting Assistance Act was enacted into law but it only pertained to national elections. Under this act a serviceman could request an application from his commanding officer. You can imagine how few boys in far-off lands would make this request.

New York State has a division for servicemen's voting which is bipartisan. The Democratic director of this division, the Honorable Neil M. Lieblich, who is a personal friend as well as a neighbor of mine, has over the years helped me submit this problem. Unfortunately, Mr. Lieblich is very ill at the present time. Commissioner Lieblich came to Washington on many occasions and spoke with Mr. Platt, deputy coordinator of the Federal voting assistance program of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), and I am sure that their file is as voluminous as mine on this subject.

The latest action on this was that Mr. Platt informed me that the Department of Defense issued a directive providing that in all general elections occurring on even-numbered years, a Federal post card application for an absentee ballot would be issued by delivery in hand to all Armed Forces personnel of voting age. However, there is a problem involved in that there being no general elections in odd-numbered years in many States, no provision is provided for delivery of applications to residents of those States of the Union which do conduct general elections in odd-numbered years.

I am so bold to suggest that one of your people look into the absentee ballot program for the State of New York and study this procedure with a view toward issuing a directive in line with this method as I feel it is a foolproof one.

Military ballots are important as it as been found that with the increase in servicemen voting many close elections have been decided by this vote.

I plan to speak on the House floor regarding this matter and your comments on this subject would be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

_____.

H.R. 1045

A bill to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203 of the Act entitled "An Act making recommendations to the States for the enactment of legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes", enacted August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 589), is amended by striking out "made available" in the second, third, and fourth sentences of clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof, in each of such sentences, "delivered in hand".

Inadequate Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the United States recently sent two men around the earth in 90 minutes. But we cannot deliver a letter in some areas in this country in less than 2 weeks or maybe longer. I think there is quite a contrast in the type of management exhibited by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Post Office Department. It would appear that the Post Office Department is lagging behind the space age.

The American people applauded our space shots, but they are not applauding our present mail service. This is evidenced by the hundreds of letters I have received since I requested hearings into the problem of inadequate and inefficient postal service.

I bring to the attention of my colleagues a few more of the many letters

I have received from postal patrons in every part of the United States:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *April 6, 1965.*

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: After having read March 23, 1965, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I decided perhaps I could top all the letters for slow delivery.

Enclosed is outside of letter mailed November 10, 1964, as you can see. This letter was received in Tempe, Ariz., just 14 days later and a distance of approximately 9 miles. In my opinion 2 days would have been ample time for delivery.

Any improvement that can be achieved through your efforts will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

WESTPORT, CONN.,
April 22, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I understand that hearings "on the quality of U.S. mail service" are to be held in Washington and I wish to register with you my protest about the exceedingly poor quality of the service.

Everyone's mail is important but when one is engaged in a great variety of community projects, as I am, it is especially so. Deadlines of various kinds are commonplace in my activities—notices of meetings, reports, immediate answers, etc.—and prompt mail service is imperative.

I could give you a list of instances that would fill several pages where my mail has been anywhere from 2 weeks to 6 months overdue, in no larger an area than my own county plus the two adjoining counties of New Haven and Hartford.

In addition, the condition of magazines, periodicals, packages, etc., is often deplorable. A package of printed stationery which I ordered from New York was delivered to me so badly crushed that it was unusable, even though the box had been enclosed in the customary outer mailing carton.

I hope that something constructive will develop from your committee's work. It is about time we had better service.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ——— ———.

SANTURCE, P.R.,
April 3, 1965.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: I read in the New York Times of your subcommittee's investigation of the mail service. I do hope you will be able to include Puerto Rico in this investigation. As you may know, service here is impossible. It can take 3 weeks for a first-class letter to go from Arecibo to San Juan (50 miles away). Two weeks can be the time for an airmail letter to reach San Juan from Buffalo, N.Y.

I have written to the postmaster here but have never received a reply. Perhaps my letter never reached him.

The service here is so slow and erratic that the smallest improvement would be welcome.

Yours truly,

Mrs. ——— ———.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: An article in U.S. News & World Report said you were a member of the House Subcommittee on Postal Operations and with others listed near the article. I, too, have a "gripe" on the way our mail is handled. I sent cookies to my Air Force son when he was in England and they came through nicely—about 8 years ago. Now I have another son in California, and each time they reach him not as cookies—just crumbs. A parcel sent to Glenview, Ill., to another son, was crushed, precious colored slides of the grandchildren lost, as well as other articles in the box. We pack them well, wrap securely, use 3M tape they use on huge cartons—but the box is so crushed, things slip out between the tape strips.

Again, it takes 3 days for a letter from here to Minneapolis—just across the river from us. It all must be in the handling at the post office. I can't understand it.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ——— ———.

OSWEGO, N.Y.,
April 10, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been following through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD your fight to achieve a better, more efficient postal system. I wholeheartedly endorse your aims.

In the last few years, especially, the quality of the postal service has noticeably declined. Our family has had several distasteful experiences with service, but I would like to mention just one.

I am a member of the Columbia Record Club. It uses a procedure whereby a dated card is sent the customer every month. If this card is not returned before the date printed on it, you receive the "current selection," which may or may not be the record you desire. Two months ago I received a card which I returned promptly with a check for the record I desired. But apparently the card never arrived there because I never received the canceled check. I received a record I did not desire, and am forced to pay for it.

Please carry on the good work.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Voting Bill Evils Compounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding editorial on voting rights.

Printed on the same editorial page and continued on the opposite page was S. 1564, the Senate committee voting rights bill of 1965. The editor refers to this bill in his editorial.

This editorial, taken from the April 14, 1965, issue of the Knoxville Journal, Knoxville, Tenn., and written by Mr. Guy Smith, editor, contains a great deal of food for thought and should receive the careful study of each Member of this Congress:

VOTING BILL EVILS COMPOUNDED

On this and the opposite page of today's issue is reproduced the text of a bill—(S. 1564)—"to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States." It will be recognized by readers as a revision by the Senate Judiciary Committee of the original version sent to Congress by the Justice Department with the blessing of the President.

The Judiciary Committee voted the bill out in twice its original wordage but in a version which compounded both the unconstitutional and discriminatory—so far as the States made its target are concerned—features of the original model.

Some readers may ask themselves the question as to why the Knoxville Journal since March 15 has devoted so much space in this column and in other columns to this legislation. We printed the text of the original version as submitted by the President, ready-written by U.S. Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach. (This represented an unusual procedure because ordinarily the President outlines his objectives and delegates to Congress the function of actually drawing a measure to fulfill them.) Subsequently we published the text of an alternative bill introduced in the House by Republican Representatives GERALD FORD and WILLIAM MCCULLOCH. Today we are providing for readers a text of the revised bill as approved by a majority of the Senate Judiciary Committee. To answer the question raised at the beginning of this paragraph: We have devoted all this space to this bill for the benefit of the minority of our readers who will take the trouble to examine the provisions of any piece of legislation because this bill is not only the most radical but is also the most blatantly unconstitutional measure ever seriously considered by a U.S. Congress.

LAUNCHED ON EMOTIONAL CREST

Launched at the crest of emotions generated by brutality of police and State troopers in Alabama, the legislation was suspect from the outset.

Attorney General Katzenbach testified on March 23, 1965, before the Senate Judiciary Committee "the judicial process upon which all existing remedies (for discrimination against minority groups in their voting rights—EDITOR) depend in institutionally inadequate to deal with practices so deeply rooted in the social and political structure."

This was a significant statement for any lawyer, but especially for the chief law enforcement officer in the Federal Government, to make in disparagement of the Nation's judicial processes.

It was especially noteworthy in view of the strides which have been made during the past decade by Federal courts in advancing school integration and other objectives designed to give the Negro his long withheld rights to citizenship.

What the Katzenbach statement meant, as the bill sent to the House originally bore out, was that the Johnson administration had adopted the impatience of Rev. Martin Luther King with constitutional processes and now intended to have a bill enacted that would, in its judgment, do the job no matter to what extent it contravened the provisions of the Constitution. The administration decided to take this step, it will be noted, with deliberate purpose, because every objective of the bill, the text of which is printed elsewhere on this page, is already on the books as a result of legislation enacted by Congress in 1957, 1960, and 1964. The difference now is that the President has committed himself to a course of action which will substitute determinations by the U.S. Attorney General for adjudications by the Federal courts. Such substitution will give him greater political powers than those of the President himself, but presumably it will apply them only in 10 or 11 States including Tennessee. The other 10 States made targets of this bill are Texas, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, parts of North Carolina, and perhaps Alaska.

NOTEWORTHY REVISION

The most noteworthy revision in the text of the bill under discussion as printed on

forms of lawlessness, he felt that an honest American had no choice save to get out. He did.

Now, in 1965, Bill Hendrix has written the House Un-American Activities Committee offering his cooperation and suggesting the committee schedule a meeting in the Tampa or St. Petersburg area.

In this letter to the committee Mr. Hendrix said:

"While in Atlanta, Ga., in 1959 at a national Klan rally, those of our group withdrew from Klan activity and requested all Klan groups to disband. Later we gave out a story to Ralph McGill and he printed the story which had nationwide attention.

"We still say the Klan must operate outside the law under its present programs * * * I believe if you will look on your records you will find that the Southern Knights of the Ku Klux Klan has a long record. * * * We disbanded because we found that a Klan group could not operate without going outside the law. The very name Klan to many people today means working outside the law and many of the new Klan leaders know nothing about the law and care less.

"We believe that the southern politicians are to blame for the plight of the South and that such as Faubus, Barnett, and Wallace are wrong and are the cause of most of the unlawful actions now being practiced in the South."

In a postscript to the copy of his letter to the House committee, former Dragon Hendrix suggests that the original statement of withdrawal might be published. It is at hand.

Worried because a criminal element was obtaining control of some Klans, Hendrix said, 6 years ago:

"I can no longer agree to such things as bombing and burning schools and churches. * * * Twenty years ago when I joined the Klan I took an oath that I would obey and uphold the Constitution of the United States and its political subdivisions. All Klan members took that oath. * * * I stated frankly that under the law I saw no way out but to accept the court orders on segregation.

"'I am certainly for segregation' I told the Klansmen, 'and have said so from the public platform for more than 20 years. But, I am not going out and bomb and burn schools and commit crimes some people in the Klan are proposing. We of the Southern Knights hold the honor of not ever having had a member in trouble for violating the law. I want all you Klansmen to remember that you and I took the same oath. * * * I have held every office in the Klan and I know that the Klan is going to get lawless.'"

There is not room for all Hendrix's statement and letter of almost a decade ago. But he was a good prophet. The Federal Bureau of Investigation found ties with Klans in the bombing and killing of Sunday school children in Birmingham, in the horrible murder and hiding of the bodies of the three young civil rights workers in Mississippi, in the killing of an unoffending and unarmed woman on the highway between Selma and Montgomery, and in many other violent crimes.

Time was when decent men did get into the Klans. Most of them long ago saw, as did Bill Hendrix, that the several Klans were headed toward actions no decent American could condone. They got out.

We trust the House Un-American Activities Committee will use what help Hendrix can offer. Certainly the Klan, as President Johnson has said, and as the record demonstrates, is un-American in effect and action.

Management of News in the Southeast Asia Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in his Saturday column for April 24, Dolph Simons, Jr., publisher of the Lawrence, Kans., Journal-World, comments in a very telling way on the management of news in the southeast Asia area.

I hope Mr. Simons continues to hit this critical subject—and I intend to share his comments with the Congress. Freedom of the press, and accurate news reportage, are essential to our national purposes all the time—just as much in time of war and danger as in time of peace.

Mr. Simons most recent column follows:

THE SATURDAY COLUMN

(By Dolph C. Simons, Jr.)

Reports issued the past 10 days at the American Society of Newspaper Editors meeting in Washington and at the American Newspaper Publishers Association's annual convention in New York can't help but make the public wonder if it is being told the truth or is being fed propaganda about the war in Vietnam.

There is no question but that U.S. officials in Washington and Saigon have tried their best to color, distort, and censor the news coming out of the Asian country. They have refused to allow American reporters into certain military areas, they do not allow American military personnel to talk to reporters and they have tried to attach misleading importance and evaluations to many situations. This is happening at both ends of the war, at the Pentagon and in Vietnam.

Unfortunately, the American public doesn't seem to concerned about this dangerous attempt by the Government to control the news even though American casualties are increasing week by week.

It is difficult to understand this lack of interest about Vietnam, since there's no question that America is going to become more and more involved, more men will be killed, the cost to American taxpayers will keep soaring, and there is the possibility this "limited" war could plunge Uncle Sam into an all-out war with China or Russia.

American newsmen are trying their best to report the war, but our own officials are not allowing the public to know what is going on. George Beebe, president of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, pointed out the American public is not getting either "the full story or the true story" on the Vietnam war.

To make matters even worse, the U.S. Information Agency has been given the assignment of handling the press briefings in Saigon. This is an American propaganda agency set up to try to make the United States look good throughout the world, and here it is serving as the official voice of what is going on in Vietnam. USIA controls the military briefings and has set up regulations about news policies regarding air strikes, and the ground rules under which American newsmen have to operate. The Pentagon and the White House evidently not only approve of this controlled news, but are encouraging it.

How can the public have confidence in its Government and statements of its officials, whether it is about Vietnam or the cost of medicare, if Government spokesmen think it is all right to spoon-feed the public in the field of news? Various well-qualified spokesmen in Washington and New York hit hard at deliberate attempts by our Government to mislead the public by either withholding news or telling only part of a story.

When an elected Government official thinks he is powerful enough to control the news, censor the news and deliberately mislead the public, it's time to watch out. This is what happened in other countries prior to the ruthless takeovers of such men as Hitler, Peron and others.

The press is trying to report the news in Vietnam and to inform the public on what is actually taking place. American citizens are going to have to become more concerned over this censorship and voice their opinions to Representatives and Senators to bring about a change.

Reapportionment in Ohio—Issue No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, in Ohio, next month, an election will occur which will determine to a large degree the civil rights of Ohio citizens, white and Negro, for many years to come.

The election in question concerns reapportionment of the State Legislature in Ohio, and is known as issue No. 3. This issue is a nonpartisan one, Mr. Speaker, and is concerned with the essential right of the majority of the people of Ohio to receive a majority of the legislative seats in the legislature. Compared below are the last three Ohio House of Representative election contests:

[In percent]

Year	Percentage majority party vote statewide	Percentage of House seats won by the majority party
1960	53	30
1962	53	36
1964	58	45

We see here, Mr. Speaker, that for the last three elections, the majority party, as indicated by the vote of the people of Ohio, received a minority of the seats in the legislature.

If this had happened in any of the undemocratic nations of the world, where electoral systems are rigged by tyrants and demagogs to assure minority rule, we would be shocked. The citizens of such countries would look upon their electoral systems as unworkable shams,

and would finally lose faith in their leaders and in democracy.

We in the United States, despite our traditions of freedom, democracy, and majority rule, have suffered for many years in our States under rigged and basically undemocratic systems. We suffered until finally the Supreme Court found it necessary to declare the doctrine, "one citizen, one vote." The Court found that the U.S. Constitution basically requires an electoral system under which a majority of the voters would actually elect a majority of the representatives in our States.

Now the State of Ohio proposes a reapportionment amendment, which has been widely publicized as a reform, but which is in fact the worst kind of political outrage.

Why do I say this? Let me recount how the proposed amendment to the Ohio constitution was conceived and submitted to the people.

Within days after the previous legislature in Ohio was voted out of office in November 1964, it was called back into session, into a lame duck special session. Responsible to no one, desirous of protecting the old system of minority rule against the newly elected legislature, the very legislators who had been repudiated at the polls proceeded to put issue No. 3 on the ballot for May 1965.

The story of how they did it should shock every believer in American democratic processes.

First, there was no reason to hold such a special session. Only 2 months later the new legislature would meet, and could have dealt with this problem.

Second, the leadership of the entrenched minority which had been defeated by the voters only days before, decided upon their tactics in secret, and drafted a resolution which was to be placed on the ballot as an amendment to the Ohio constitution.

They held hearings, Mr. Speaker, on a resolution which was not printed for distribution, the details of which were known only to a favored few. Most of the members of their own group did not know what was in the resolution. The opposition party was not told, nor was the public.

Then came the vote on the issue. Though it seems unbelievable, copies of the bill were not given to the members of the legislature who were being asked to vote.

What is issue No. 3 like, Mr. Speaker? Let us consider it in the light of our magnificent political tradition of "the rule of law and not of men." The Legislative Service Commission of Ohio, realizing that documents such as the Ohio constitution must not be open to manipulation, issued a study on September 10, 1964, which said in part that "the constitutional provisions should be as explicit and extensive as possible in prescribing actions for future apportionments." Does issue No. 3 measure up to that requirement? It does not.

First, there is proposed by issue No. 3 the establishment of an apportionment board—made up in part of men who hold elective office—will be permitted to draw the lines of legislative districts without any exact formula. This board could determine by itself, within a wide range, the very size of future legislatures. It would design legislative district lines which would cut across county lines in determining noncity districts, and no rural or city district is safe from the worst kind of gerrymandering.

Second, the phrases which deal with some of the most important aspects of the bill are so elastic as to permit, and even to assure the worst kind of backroom political manipulation.

For example, one phrase states that:

> Districts shall (b) * * * as similar in economic and community interests as possible.

What does that mean? It can mean virtually anything the board wishes it to mean.

Another phrase states that a county which has a population "less than but substantially equal to a ratio" may receive one representative. I looked in the dictionary for a definition of "substantially," Mr. Speaker. The definition was "ample to satisfy." Ample to satisfy whom? Could such a phrase ever satisfy any lawyer working with the simplest legal paper? Of course not.

Still another phrase states that previous district lines "shall be respected to the fullest extent possible." How far will that be? No one can know.

And those who propagandize for issue No. 3 say that if Ohioans do not vote for the amendment, it will be up to the Federal courts to settle the matter. This, too, is the ugliest kind of falsehood. We have a legislature now sitting, Mr. Speaker, and it is likely that it will be sitting after May 4. It is a legitimate legislature, and there is no reason why it can not do the job of giving Ohioans a decent amendment to be voted on in the November elections.

In the past few months we have witnessed brutalities in Selma and Birmingham which have aroused the conscience of America. Negroes in Alabama have sought only the chance to vote, and to have their vote count. They had the election systems rigged against them, and all Americans protested. But the same kind of outrage is being proposed in Ohio, Mr. Speaker. The electoral system will be rigged so as to frustrate the right of the people to vote—and to have their votes count equally.

The people of Ohio, Mr. Speaker, believe fully in the democratic processes. They want an electoral system in which every man's vote counts as much as the next man's—no more and no less. They want an electoral system which will mean true majority rule, that will mean that a party winning a majority of the votes will win a majority of the seats in the legislature. They are sick and tired of sleazy political gimmicks like issue No. 3, and at the polls on May 4, they will defeat issue No. 3.

Union City After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 23, 1965, the Jersey Journal, a leading newspaper published in my district, took editorial notice of the 40th anniversary of the consolidation of Union Hill and West Hoboken into the city of Union City.

Like much of the district which I have the honor to represent, Union City is not new. As the editorial mentions, it has been plagued by most of the ills that beset 19th-century cities attempting to function in our 20th-century world.

Today, under the able leadership of Mayor William V. Musto, Union City is undergoing a renaissance. The future has never looked brighter for this city. On this 40th anniversary, I salute Union City and its capable chief executive, William V. Musto.

I think the Union City story should interest all members who serve an urban-industrial area.

The editorial follows:

UNION CITY AFTER 40

It is 40 years since Union Hill and West Hoboken were consolidated into the city of Union City.

A recent Jersey Journal feature story recalls still-visible reminders of the old names. Most prominent is Union Hill High School. Before he retired last year as superintendent of the city's public schools, William G. Fiedler foresaw the school's eventual replacement with a centralized high school (also incorporating Emerson High School, which has serviced the old West Hoboken section).

Until 8 years ago, due to differences in debts incurred before consolidation, seperate tax rates were maintained for Union Hill and West Hoboken.

Union Hill was a nickname due to its geographic location atop the Palisades. Its official name was the Town of Union.

Union City was the "union station" of the trolley car era. Its center was Transfer Station, at Summit Avenue and Seventh Street, in the West Hoboken section. Another major transfer point was at 48th Street, next to the old Pastime Theater (since renamed) in Union Hill.

Not until after World War II was the trolley eliminated from such narrow streets as New York and Bergenline Avenues, two of the city's major thoroughfares.

Union City had a big silk industry, too. The industry's decline threw thousands out of work in the late 1920's. Further ratables were lost with the cutting of the Lincoln Tunnel approach through the center of the city.

Today, Union City is being revitalized under Mayor William V. Musto's "Operation Rehabilitation." After years of effort, the city obtained air rights to permit construction of business and apartment buildings over the tunnel cut. A tour through city streets shows much other evidence of a city on the move.

And, after 40 years, consolidation is still a timely word. Mayor Musto seeks the con-

solidation of all Hudson County into one big city as the best answer in groping with urban problems. He would settle, for now, for a North Hudson-wide consolidation.

Union City has weathered the storms of the past 40 years—and this gives much promise for the future.

Dr. Stewart G. Fletcher Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased, as I am sure my fellow Westmorelanders were, to read the editorial in the Latrobe Bulletin, entitled "A Distinguished Honor," which follows:

A DISTINGUISHED HONOR

A distinguished honor has been bestowed upon Dr. Stewart G. Fletcher, vice president and technical director of Latrobe Steel Co.

He is the president-elect of the American Society for Metals, assuming his post in October.

Not only is it a distinction for Dr. Fletcher, it is a significant honor for his company and for the Greater Latrobe area.

The American Society for Metals is one of the foremost professional organizations in the world and one which has high qualifications for membership.

To become its chief executive officer is an outstanding honor.

Composed of the leading men in the metals industry in America, the ASM is ever so particular in selecting its president.

Although they are not written as such, the ASM has certain qualifications for its president. He must be an individual who is highly respected in his field, has an outstanding record in his field, is representative of the ideals and objectives of the ASM and is capable of contributing to the metals industry through his expert knowledge.

Obviously, Dr. Fletcher fits these prerequisites, as attested by his election to the organization's highest office.

There are 125 local chapters of the ASM in the United States and Dr. Fletcher's duties as president will require him to visit most of them, during which time he will deliver technical papers relating to the metals industry.

Latrobe Steel Co. is one of the leading firms in the specialty steel industry. And Dr. Fletcher has been part of the effort which has placed Latrobe Steel among the leaders in this industry.

He is one of America's outstanding researchers in the metals business, and has been acclaimed for a number of developments in the manufacture of specialty steels.

Unquestionably his superiors and his fellow workers at Latrobe Steel are proud of Dr. Fletcher.

The Latrobe district should be equally as proud.

Congratulations, Dr. Fletcher.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to publicly congratulate Dr. Fletcher for al. the citizens of our community who share in this honor and award of achievement.

Mr. Speaker, this honor is shared by the Latrobe Steel Co. and all its employees and officers who have been associated with Dr. Fletcher whose contributions have made Latrobe Steel one of the top leaders in this industry.

Absentee Voting by Servicemen—A Bill To Amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the question of servicemen's voting was raised during the press conference held by Secretary McNamara. Since 1950, Mr. Speaker, I have carried out everything within my capacity to encourage servicemen voting and to facilitate their voting. The services know this, or should know it. The proper committees involved have been questioned and have been requested to pass my resolution. Action was taken on one occasion but this action was limited.

Finally, after much prodding on my part, the Department of Defense issued a directive on absentee voting. They can do it now if they desire—and the following resolution is explanatory of the proper method.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a copy of my resolution together with the following letter to the Secretary of Defense and I hope that he will see that a good directive is issued and put into operation.

The letter and resolution follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1965.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was very happy that I took the time to listen to your press conference on April 26 and I commend you for your informative and concise answers.

One of the questions raised at your press conference was one involving servicemen's voting to which you replied you would look into this issue. In an endeavor to be helpful, I wish to call to your attention that for many years I have been deeply concerned regarding servicemen's right to vote. One of the resolutions I introduced in the 86th Congress recommended "in hand" delivery of military ballot applications to all members of the Armed Forces.

For many years I have introduced the enclosed bill to provide for "in hand" delivery of military ballot applications to all servicemen. This application would be an ordinary postal card which when signed by the serviceman would be returned to his home State and a commission would see that he received his proper absentee ballot in order to vote. By "in hand" delivery I mean that the same method of giving the serviceman his personal mail would be followed in giving him a post-card application. In 1955 a Federal Voting Assistance Act was enacted into law but it only pertained to national elections. Under this act a serviceman could request an application from his commanding officer. You can imagine how few boys in far-off lands would make this request.

New York State has a division for servicemen's voting which is bipartisan. The Democratic director of this division, the Honorable Neil M. Lieblich, who is a personal friend as well as a neighbor of mine, has over the years helped me submit this problem. Unfortunately, Mr. Lieblich is very ill at the present time. Commissioner Lieblich came to Washington on many occasions and spoke with Mr. Platt, deputy coordinator of the Federal voting assistance program of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), and I am sure that their file is as voluminous as mine on this subject.

The latest action on this was that Mr. Platt informed me that the Department of Defense issued a directive providing that in all general elections occurring on even-numbered years, a Federal post card application for an absentee ballot would be issued by delivery in hand to all Armed Forces personnel of voting age. However, there is a problem involved in that there being no general elections in odd-numbered years in many States, no provision is provided for delivery of applications to residents of those States of the Union which do conduct general elections in odd-numbered years.

I am so bold to suggest that one of your people look into the absentee ballot program for the State of New York and study this procedure with a view toward issuing a directive in line with this method as I feel it is a foolproof one.

Military ballots are important as it as been found that with the increase in servicemen voting many close elections have been decided by this vote.

I plan to speak on the House floor regarding this matter and your comments on this subject would be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

_____.

H.R. 1045

A bill to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203 of the Act entitled "An Act making recommendations to the States for the enactment of legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes", enacted August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 589), is amended by striking out "made available" in the second, third, and fourth sentences of clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof, in each of such sentences, "delivered in hand".

Inadequate Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the United States recently sent two men around the earth in 90 minutes. But we cannot deliver a letter in some areas in this country in less than 2 weeks or maybe longer. I think there is quite a contrast in the type of management exhibited by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Post Office Department. It would appear that the Post Office Department is lagging behind the space age.

The American people applauded our space shots, but they are not applauding our present mail service. This is evidenced by the hundreds of letters I have received since I requested hearings into the problem of inadequate and inefficient postal service.

I bring to the attention of my colleagues a few more of the many letters

I have received from postal patrons in every part of the United States:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *April 6, 1965.*

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: After having read March 23, 1965, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I decided perhaps I could top all the letters for slow delivery.

Enclosed is outside of letter mailed November 10, 1964, as you can see. This letter was received in Tempe, Ariz., just 14 days later and a distance of approximately 9 miles. In my opinion 2 days would have been ample time for delivery.

Any improvement that can be achieved through your efforts will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

WESTPORT, CONN.,
April 22, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I understand that hearings "on the quality of U.S. mail service" are to be held in Washington and I wish to register with you my protest about the exceedingly poor quality of the service.

Everyone's mail is important but when one is engaged in a great variety of community projects, as I am, it is especially so. Deadlines of various kinds are commonplace in my activities—notices of meetings, reports, immediate answers, etc.—and prompt mail service is imperative.

I could give you a list of instances that would fill several pages where my mail has been anywhere from 2 weeks to 6 months overdue, in no larger an area than my own county plus the two adjoining counties of New Haven and Hartford.

In addition, the condition of magazines, periodicals, packages, etc., is often deplorable. A package of printed stationery which I ordered from New York was delivered to me so badly crushed that it was unusable, even though the box had been enclosed in the customary outer mailing carton.

I hope that something constructive will develop from your committee's work. It is about time we had better service.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ——— ———.

SANTURCE, P.R.,
April 3, 1965.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: I read in the New York Times of your subcommittee's investigation of the mail service. I do hope you will be able to include Puerto Rico in this investigation. As you may know, service here is impossible. It can take 3 weeks for a first-class letter to go from Arecibo to San Juan (50 miles away). Two weeks can be the time for an airmail letter to reach San Juan from Buffalo, N.Y.

I have written to the postmaster here but have never received a reply. Perhaps my letter never reached him.

The service here is so slow and erratic that the smallest improvement would be welcome.

Yours truly,

Mrs. ——— ———.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: An article in U.S. News & World Report said you were a member of the House Subcommittee on Postal Operations and with others listed near the article. I, too, have a "gripe" on the way our mail is handled. I sent cookies to my Air Force son when he was in England and they came through nicely—about 8 years ago. Now I have another son in California, and each time they reach him not as cookies—just crumbs. A parcel sent to Glenview, Ill., to another son, was crushed, precious colored slides of the grandchildren lost, as well as other articles in the box. We pack them well, wrap securely, use 3M tape they use on huge cartons—but the box is so crushed, things slip out between the tape strips.

Again, it takes 3 days for a letter from here to Minneapolis—just across the river from us. It all must be in the handling at the post office. I can't understand it.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ——— ———.

OSWEGO, N.Y.,
April 10, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been following through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD your fight to achieve a better, more efficient postal system. I wholeheartedly endorse your aims.

In the last few years, especially, the quality of the postal service has noticeably declined. Our family has had several distasteful experiences with service, but I would like to mention just one.

I am a member of the Columbia Record Club. It uses a procedure whereby a dated card is sent the customer every month. If this card is not returned before the date printed on it, you receive the "current selection," which may or may not be the record you desire. Two months ago I received a card which I returned promptly with a check for the record I desired. But apparently the card never arrived there because I never received the canceled check. I received a record I did not desire, and am forced to pay for it.

Please carry on the good work.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Voting Bill Evils Compounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding editorial on voting rights.

Printed on the same editorial page and continued on the opposite page was S. 1564, the Senate committee voting rights bill of 1965. The editor refers to this bill in his editorial.

This editorial, taken from the April 14, 1965, issue of the Knoxville Journal, Knoxville, Tenn., and written by Mr. Guy Smith, editor, contains a great deal of food for thought and should receive the careful study of each Member of this Congress:

VOTING BILL EVILS COMPOUNDED

On this and the opposite page of today's issue is reproduced the text of a bill—(S. 1564)—"to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States." It will be recognized by readers as a revision by the Senate Judiciary Committee of the original version sent to Congress by the Justice Department with the blessing of the President.

The Judiciary Committee voted the bill out in twice its original wordage but in a version which compounded both the unconstitutional and discriminatory—so far as the States made its target are concerned—features of the original model.

Some readers may ask themselves the question as to why the Knoxville Journal since March 15 has devoted so much space in this column and in other columns to this legislation. We printed the text of the original version as submitted by the President, ready-written by U.S. Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach. (This represented an unusual procedure because ordinarily the President outlines his objectives and delegates to Congress the function of actually drawing a measure to fulfill them.) Subsequently we published the text of an alternative bill introduced in the House by Republican Representatives GERALD FORD and WILLIAM MCCULLOCH. Today we are providing for readers a text of the revised bill as approved by a majority of the Senate Judiciary Committee. To answer the question raised at the beginning of this paragraph: We have devoted all this space to this bill for the benefit of the minority of our readers who will take the trouble to examine the provisions of any piece of legislation because this bill is not only the most radical but is also the most blatantly unconstitutional measure ever seriously considered by a U.S. Congress.

LAUNCHED ON EMOTIONAL CREST

Launched at the crest of emotions generated by bruitality of police and State troopers in Alabama, the legislation was suspect from the outset.

Attorney General Katzenbach testified on March 23, 1965, before the Senate Judiciary Committee "the judicial process upon which all existing remedies (for discrimination against minority groups in their voting rights—EDITOR) depend in institutionally inadequate to deal with practices so deeply rooted in the social and political structure."

This was a significant statement for any lawyer, but especially for the chief law enforcement officer in the Federal Government, to make in disparagement of the Nation's judicial processes.

It was especially noteworthy in view of the strides which have been made during the past decade by Federal courts in advancing school integration and other objectives designed to give the Negro his long withheld rights to citizenship.

What the Katzenbach statement meant, as the bill sent to the House originally bore out, was that the Johnson administration had adopted the impatience of Rev. Martin Luther King with constitutional processes and now intended to have a bill enacted that would, in its judgment, do the job no matter to what extent it contravened the provisions of the Constitution. The administration decided to take this step, it will be noted, with deliberate purpose, because every objective of the bill, the text of which is printed elsewhere on this page, is already on the books as a result of legislation enacted by Congress in 1957, 1960, and 1964. The difference now is that the President has committed himself to a course of action which will substitute determinations by the U.S. Attorney General for adjudications by the Federal courts. Such substitution will give him greater political powers than those of the President himself, but presumably it will apply them only in 10 or 11 States including Tennessee. The other 10 States made targets of this bill are Texas, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, parts of North Carolina, and perhaps Alaska.

NOTEWORTHY REVISION

The most noteworthy revision in the text of the bill under discussion as printed on

this page is that in section 4(b) which reads as follows (provisions added by the committee are single quoted):

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply in any State or in any political subdivision of a State which (1) the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device, and with respect to which (2) the director of the census determines (A) that less than 50 per centum of the persons, other than aliens and persons in active military service and their dependents, of voting age residing therein were registered in November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the Presidential election of November 1964 and '(B) that according to the 1960 census, more than 20 per centum of the persons of voting age were nonwhite; or, (3), notwithstanding the foregoing (1) and (2), the director of the census, determines, by a survey made upon the request of the Attorney General that the total number of persons of any race or color who are registered to vote in any State or political subdivision is less than 25 per centum of the total number of all persons of such race or color of voting age residing in such State or political subdivision.'

"A determination or certification of the Attorney General or of the Director of the Census under this section or under section 6 shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register."

This is the section which can trigger enforcement action which is to empower the U.S. Attorney General to take over registration and voting in any State covered by this sly voting formula.

The triggering process does not depend, however, upon court action but throughout the bill is replete with such phrases as "if the Attorney General determines." This means that enforcement of the law becomes a matter of choice, or whim, or personal belief on the part of one man rather than upon a showing of fact before a court of jurisdiction. For that matter, a court of jurisdiction is specified in the bill, in that cases arising out of enforcement processes can be heard only by a Federal court located in Washington. No ordinary Federal court or three-judge panel of Federal judges elsewhere in the Nation can pass upon legal questions growing out of this measure.

DISCRIMINATION ON LITERACY TESTS

It will also be noted by the reader that the new bill permits literacy or other tests already on the books in 30 States to stand while, in the target States listed above, no person is barred from participation in voting even if he is a convicted felon or an admitted moron. In other words, Federal registrars would presumably register and vote thousands of persons in the 10 or 11 States named who could not possibly exercise the voting franchise in any of the remaining States of the Union. This is as iniquitous a form of discrimination as that which has been practiced against the Negro in Alabama and Mississippi for many years.

If, in truth, constitutionality is not a factor in the deliberations of Congress in a voting rights bill, then we may appropriately continue to contend for a bill which would meet the following three requirements:

1. Strike down eligibility requirements for voting in all States.

2. Establish a uniform system of registration in all States based primarily on the voter's ability to sign his own name.

3. Include a new provision which would upon complaint of a certain number of citizens call for a Federal investigation of voting practices in such areas as Chicago, with appropriate penalty provided for buying and selling votes, or the use of coercion related or unrelated to Federal grants of relief or other handouts.

With the exception of the third contention in the above, what we are advocating was pretty well embodied in the GOP bill introduced in the House as an alternative to the Johnson bill.

The point made here is that, if we are to have under all circumstances a bill which is unconstitutional, then let it be unconstitutional with reference to all States rather than to just 11 or 12.

The Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government and other similar organizations have cited countless instances in which the first bill submitted by the President would violate the Constitution. This revision, as we said above, compounds such violations. The trouble with these objections and all similar ones is that President Johnson and the majority in Congress are no longer concerned about constitutionality. Nor presumably is the majority of the Supreme Court which on March 15 attended a joint session of Congress and were observed on television to nod approval and applaud when in broad strokes the President outlined the bill he would send to Congress and solemnly demanded of that body immediate action.

Dams Are for People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, recently, I expressed to my colleagues the conviction that construction of Marble and Bridge Canyon Dams in Arizona, as part of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, will not drown the Grand Canyon. In fact, ample evidence is available to show that no such destruction will occur.

On the contrary, construction of the dams will make more accessible to tourists magnificent vistas that can now be enjoyed by only a small handful of adventurers.

Subsequent to my statement Mr. Rich Johnson, president of the Central Arizona Project Association, prepared some remarks and a map which clearly demonstrate the need for Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams. Mr. Johnson further illustrates with great definition that construction of the dams will have no deleterious effect on the Grand Canyon.

I urge my colleagues to study Mr. Johnson's observations with the care and thoughtfulness they certainly deserve.

The remarks of Mr. Rich Johnson follow:

DAMS ARE FOR PEOPLE

There is opposition to construction of Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dam on the Colorado River. It is inspired primarily by the Sierra Club and the National Parks Association. Both of these private organizations are dedicated solely to the preservation of scenery without regard for the other basic needs of people which must be met by wise development of the Colorado River's resource potential.

The attacks made on Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dams are intended to arouse emotional reaction among people who are poorly informed or misinformed concerning the need for and the true nature of the two dams.

If successful, the opposition will block an essential water supply development desperately needed by 23,000,000 people in the 7 States of the Colorado River Basin.

Facts do not support the arguments used to oppose Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dams.

Here are some of the facts needed by the public for understanding why the two dams should and must be built:

NO DAMS IN THE PARK

The site for Bridge Canyon Dam is at the headwaters of Lake Mead, above Hoover Dam, on the Colorado River. It is 80.8 river miles below the western boundary of Grand Canyon National Park, and 53.7 miles below the western boundary of Grand Canyon National Monument.

The lake behind Bridge Canyon Dam will be completely within a narrow canyon that varies from 1,500 to 3,000 feet in sheer cliff depth. At no point would water rise to more than one-third of that depth, and the lake's extreme upstream reach would end well below Kanab Creek, which is a few miles inside the park's most inaccessible area.

The beautiful Havasu Falls are well above the lake's highest level. The only difference Bridge Canyon Dam would make is that more people would be able to visit the falls to enjoy them.

Bridge Canyon Dam and its lake will enhance the value of both Grand Canyon Monument and the park, by making some of the river's most spectacular scenery accessible to a greater number of people by boat.

The National Parks Service reports that "* * * the Bridge Canyon Reservoir would become a new recreation attraction of the region. This wild and presently relatively inaccessible area would be opened to large numbers of people who will want to take boat trips on a fjordlike reservoir set in the incomparable scenery of the Grand Canyon."

THE PRIVILEGED 400

The Sierra Club represents the right of the 400 people who shot the rapids by boat in this part of the river in 1962, and opposes the right of the 500,000 people who the Park Service believes would enjoy the area each year if Bridge Canyon Dam is built. To protect the right of the 400 the Sierra Club would also prevent development of the river's resources so desperately needed by millions of people.

The site of Marble Canyon Dam is above Grand Canyon National Park completely outside the park's boundaries. No water will be diverted from the river at that point. The purpose of the dam is to generate hydroelectric power as a contribution to the financial feasibility of the Lower Colorado River Basin project. To serve this purpose, the water let down from Glen Canyon Dam above must pass through the turbines at Marble Dam and thus continue its flow through Grand Canyon National Park.

The National Park Service officially commented in 1963 that Marble Canyon Dam would have no appreciable effect on Grand Canyon National Park.

With both Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dams built, there will be 104 miles of wild streamflow between them.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, one of the most ardent and effective champions of conservation and wilderness preservation since Theodore Roosevelt, endorses construction of both Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dams.

Opponents of these two dams charge that they are unnecessary because the power to lift and deliver water from the river can be generated at even less cost by steam-powered turbines than by water-powered turbines for which the dams must be built.

Two false ideas are involved in this argument against Bridge and Marble Dams.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER REQUIRED

First. The electricity is not needed simply to operate water pumps. It is required also for sale at a rate sufficiently above the cost of producing the electricity to make a substantial contribution toward repayment of

construction costs of both the water delivery and system and the dams and generators. If this is not done, the cost of the water to the users would be so high that the economy of the area would suffer.

Second. In the power market steam-generated power and hydropower generated at dams are of a very different kind and value.

Steamplants require the burning of some fuel such as coal to heat water in a boiler, thus generating steam which then turns the electric turbines. Efficiency demands that this kind of plant be kept in operation once it is started. Great heat is required, and if the steam is not used to turn the turbines the heat and the expensive fuel are wasted.

Some electricity is always in use, and this market demand is called the baseload. Steam generation of base load electricity is well suited to this kind of demand.

But demand for electricity is not the same at all times of the day or the year. In a predictable pattern the demand rises above the baseload, or average. When this happens it is essential that more power be generated immediately, and that when the demand again falls back to the baseload the supply be reduced to that level.

HYDROPOWER WASTES NO FUEL

The generation of electricity by water flowing through a turbine can be started simply by opening a control valve, and stopped simply by closing a valve. There is no waste of fuel or water.

Electricity produced by water power fills a special need in the market, and distributors pay a higher price for it in order to satisfy their customers. The free enterprise economic law of supply and demand is involved.

Thus, hydroelectric power produced at dams by the power of falling water provides more money than can possibly be provided by fuel-fired steamplants to help pay for water projects and hold the costs of water at a level which its users can afford to pay.

In the desert southwest water is the most basic need of people; more important than electricity. But the two resources developed and used in a financial partnership support and complement each other to the best possible advantage of the people who live in the region.

Electricty generated by fuel-fired steamplants does not meet the requirements of the partnership under existing conditions.

The real issue is further confused by opponents of Bridge and Marble Dams with the argument that water shortages in Arizona, California, and the whole southwest can be met by desalting sea water.

DESALTED SEA WATER NO SOLUTION

There are no facts to backup such a claim. There is no known process at this time by which sea water can be desalted at a cost which permits general widespread use.

The goal of the sea water desalting program in the Department of the Interior is to reduce the processing cost to 30 cents per 1,000 gallons. This goal has not been reached. But if it ever is reached, it means that the cost of desalted sea water would be more than $98 per acre-foot at the oceanside plant site.

This water delivered into Arizona would cost a minimum of $200 per acre-foot in combined processing and delivery costs. At that cost it would be unusable.

Feather River water delivered to the Los Angeles area by the project now under construction in that State will be sold at $75 per acre-foot. It is far cheaper to move large volumes of water long distances from areas of surplus than it is to desalt sea water, and there is no evidence at present of any real breakthrough in the technique of desalting that would reduce the cost to a level competitive with the cost of transporting existing fresh water even over great distances.

Desalted sea water is economically practical only by coastal cities which have no other source of fresh water available. It holds no promise of solving water problems of any inland area in the foreseeable future.

Pilot's Skill Averts Red China Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, acts of valor stir our hearts and quicken us with pride for the achievements of our American military force. Recently there was averted in the troubled Far East by the personal bravery and trained skill of a single man an incident with the most serious implications.

News Reporter Bob Considine has told the story well, and I request permission to insert in the RECORD at this point the article which appeared in the Baltimore News American on March 30, 1965, entitled "Marylander Is Hero—Pilot's Skill Averts Red China Incident."

MARYLANDER IS HERO—PILOT'S SKILL AVERTS RED CHINA INCIDENT

(By Bob Considine)

NEW YORK, March 30.—In the troubled skies of the Far East last week the professional skill and rare courage of a U.S. Air Force fighter pilot averted what could have been an extremely dangerous international incident. The drama took place at an altitude of 5 miles when two F-105 Thunderchiefs were making a routine flight from Kadena Airbase, Okinawa, to Taiwan for a maintenance check.

Lead pilot was Capt. Marvin L. Montgomery of Winter Park, Fla., a veteran jet man fresh from combat in Vietnam. Wingman was Capt. William B. Burkitt, of Madison, Md.

After passing their second reporting point en route to Taiwan Captain Montgomery failed to make his required position report. Burkitt radioed across the 150 feet that separated the two fighters and asked why. There was no reply. Burkitt edged his Thunderchief in for a closer look.

Montgomery was unconscious. His head drooped over his controls. His fighter, which was traveling at nearly 650 miles per hour, was on automatic pilot. His position had changed. He was headed for Red China. No amount of urgent shouts into his earphones roused the stricken pilot.

Burkitt radioed Okinawa. A flight of F-4 C's scrambled and two airborne KC-135 jet tankers changed course and headed for the strange and frightening scene in the sky. Then Burkitt nuzzled his wing against that of his stricken buddy and tried to change his dangerous course. But every time he managed to pull off this incredibly delicate feat, the automatic pilot put Montgomery's plane back on its original course.

Desperate now, Burkitt tried another maneuver, one based on the aerodynamic principle of disturbed airflow. He moved his Thunderchief to the opposite side, the China side, of his flight leader. Then very delicately, he overlapped wings with the derelict, moved several feet ahead and began a series of very slow turns.

The disturbed airflow over the unconscious Montgomery's wings sucked the wing down a degree or two for short periods, but the automatic pilot would then "correct" the change. Yet bit by bit Burkitt was able to overcome the corrections and the unconscious pilot's plane's course was altered enough to head him out for the open sea.

In the course of this excruciating maneuvering the two F-105's plunged into a thick overcast. The last 10 minutes of the turning operation was flown in weather so bad that Burkitt had to perform his dangerous wing locks while flying on instruments. He led his unconscious buddy until his own tanks showed empty on their gages and barely made a rendezvous with the tankers. When Burkitt landed back at Kadena his eyes were red and moist and his face drawn with fatigue.

"I would have gotten out of the cockpit and walked across that wing to help Monty if it were at all possible," he told his division and wing commanders, Maj. Gen. A. P. Clark and Col. Robert Cardenas. "Monty was one of my best friends. I did everything I could. But I couldn't save him."

The two had flown together in the Air Force for 12 years.

An immediate air search of the estimated impact area turned up no evidence of the 20-ton supersonic tactical fighter and its unconscious pilot.

Without Burkitt's remarkable intervention, Montgomery's plane would have plunged into Red China, with imponderable consequences.

Capt. William B. Burkitt comes from the First District of Maryland, so I take special pride in the courage he has displayed; but all America must share with his native State admiration and appreciation for this act of great personal risk and bravery.

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, the commemorative address given by Hon. Stanley F. Reed, Associate Justice, U.S. Supreme Court, retired, on the occasion of the 23d annual celebration at the National Jefferson Memorial, Tidal Basin, Washington, D.C., on April 13, 1965, celebrating the 222d anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, 3d President of the United States. This celebration was sponsored jointly by the District of Columbia Society, Sons of the American Revolution, and the National Park Service, National Capital Parks, U.S. Department of the Interior.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

In grateful remembrance of the contributions of Thomas Jefferson to our country, we gather today at this memorial to mark the 222d year of his birth. By this imposing edifice, erected near those commemorating Washington and Lincoln, our Nation attests its appreciation for the services of this outstanding patriot, whose contributions to the United States enabled him to direct that his tomb should bear the inscription: "Author of the Declaration of Independence; of the

Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom; and father of the University of Virginia."

Jefferson's family, like other tidewater Virginians of the early 18th century, pushed west toward the mountains and the grasslands of what is now Albemarle County, the site of Monticello, his beloved home. His father died when he was only 14. However, the boy secured a good education for that period, including 2 years of study at William and Mary. This was followed by reading law with the distinguished George Wythe at Williamsburg. Through Wythe, he came to know Governor Fauquier and other political personages of the Capital City. From these contacts arose an early interest in public affairs.

Thomas Jefferson came into prominence in his youth. Of strong features and resonant voice, a handsome figure of a man, well over 6 feet, Jefferson soon was recognized as a leader of men in a State where his contemporaries were Patrick Henry, Madison, Monroe, and Washington. He radiated "calm self-reliance and courage which all instinctively recognize and respect." The problems of the day called for such qualities.

Jefferson at 30 was elected to the House of Burgesses of Virginia.[1] A question there arose as to the transportation to England for trial of colonials charged with opposition to the British Crown. Different colonies had feared deprivation of other "ancient, legal, and constitutional rights."[2] To bring them together on such mutually important matters, three or four members, including Jefferson, cooperated to secure the establishment by the Burgesses of a "Standing Committee of Correspondence and Inquiry," to work in harmony with similar committees from other colonies for mutual protection. Thus colonial cooperation became a reality.

Incidents galling to the Colonies multiplied until 1776. Burdens of taxation for the British exchequer grew.[3] Stamp Acts and Troop Quartering Acts were put into effect. Diverse interests in trade, large infusions of non-English blood from Europe and Africa, emphasized political differences between England and her American colonies. Desire for freedom grew. In Virginia, the British Governor, Lord Dunmore, put his offices aboard an English man-of-war to avoid heightened interference from his angered citizens. The idea of intercolonial union spread. Patrick Henry and James Otis declared, "Government is a contract between king and people." Any violation discharges the other party.[4] The Boston Massacre followed, then the Tea Party, Lexington, Bunker Hill, and organization of American forces. "Common Sense" by Thomas Paine was published.

The Continental Congress at Philadelphia entrusted the drafting of the Declaration of Independence to Thomas Jefferson. The Liberty Bell rang out. Never were the aspirations of mankind for freedom more eloquently expressed. "These United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, Free and Independent States" and for the support of this Declaration, "we mutually pledge to each other, our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor."

In October Thomas Jefferson returned to the House of Delegates to lead the adjustment of Virginia from its status as a British colony to that of an independent State. Jefferson was chosen its Governor.[5] Soon the new Nation commissioned him as Minister to France, succeeding Benjamin Franklin. "Note," said Mr. Jefferson, modestly, on his arrival, to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, "I come to succeed Benjamin Franklin. No one can replace him."[6]

Mr. Jefferson's services in France during the period of the Continental Congress received commendation from all quarters. Immediately upon his return George Washington asked him to be the first Secretary of State. He filled that post with distinction.

Jefferson aided Washington in guiding our Nation safely through the international crises arising from the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars. During those years France, Spain, and Great Britain, as well as we, had conflicting claims and interests concerning the country west of the Mississippi and particularly that "long and narrow slip of land called the Island of New Orleans." No permanent adjustment was then reached—only temporary shipping privileges for the United States being secured. Later, Jefferson as President, familiar with the problem, was to make one of his greatest contributions to the Nation in securing for a modest sum the Territory of Louisiana.

Mr. Jefferson resigned as Secretary of State the last day of 1793. He and John Adams were the two candidates for the Presidency to succeed Washington. While the electoral vote was close, Jefferson, under the then constitutional procedure, receiving next to the highest number of votes for President, became Vice President.

There being no available guide to parliamentary practice, the new Vice President undertook to devise one—Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Law.[7] This work served as the basis for subsequent treatises on the subject. It is not surprising, with his accomplishments in mind, that President Kennedy, while receiving our Nobel laureates at the White House looked them over and quipped, "I see before me probably the greatest concentration of talent and genius in this house except for those times when Thomas Jefferson ate alone."[8]

President Adams being a Federalist and Mr. Jefferson a Republican, naturally a cleavage arose over the alien and sedition laws. Mr. Jefferson brought about the adoption of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, driving hard at the alleged usurpation of State power by those laws. This exacerbated the relations between Adams' party, the Federalists, and Jefferson's, the Republicans (since then rechristened the Democrats).

In the election of 1801 Jefferson narrowly triumphed over Aaron Burr. In his inaugural address, Jefferson used those famous phrases: "We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it." "Equal and exact justice to all men * * *"; "the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns * * *"; "the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, * * *"; "a jealous care of the right of election by the people"; "freedom of religion; freedom of the press, and freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus * * *."

Those precepts guided Jefferson in his administration and through his life. The legacy he left us, of the belief in the democracy he advocated as the strongest force to preserve the rights of the individual, still guides our Nation.

Without limiting our gratitude, it is no disparagement of our other Founding Fathers to say that the eloquence of Adams, the pen of Jefferson, the sword of Washington are the notable individual contributions to the winning of our rights and our freedom. John Adams, breathing his last in Massachusetts on July 4, 1826, said with satisfaction, "Thomas Jefferson still lives." Actually, Adams was mistaken. Jefferson had passed away at the dawn of that fateful day.

We who are gathered here to commemorate Jefferson's services through the great truths of liberty and freedom which he so expressively enunciated and vitalized, can now correctly declare, "Jefferson still lives" through his words and work that continue to influence and aid us in maintaining our country as a free and independent nation.

---

[1] 1 Randall 76.
[2] 1 Randall 79.
[3] 3 Channing 1.
[4] 3 Channing 34.
[5] 1 Randall, c. 7.
[6] 1 Randall 415.
[7] 2 Randall 356.
[8] Reader's Guide, February 1965, p. 10.

Voting Bill Planned in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a column by Mr. Henry J. Taylor in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Richmond, Va., of April 18, 1965. Mr. Taylor reveals that the so-called voting-rights bill now under consideration in Congress actually was planned in Moscow as far back as 1956. This is a documented column, and I hope that it will be widely read.

Mr. Taylor, former Ambassador to Switzerland, is an outstanding American and a distinguished author, journalist, and economist.

Although those of us who understand the methods of Communists are not surprised to learn of these facts, the information contained in this column will no doubt astonish and shock many American citizens.

The column follows:

It's astounding, but true, that the Communist Party, U.S.A., actually planned the Johnson administration's Voting Rights Act of 1965.

This is not to argue the merits and demerits of this bill. That's a different topic. Federal intervention may be needed, and this bill is pending. But the veil should be lifted on a fact of history, certainly unknown to our public and probably unknown even to most Congressmen and Senators who will vote "Yes."

They will be voting a 1956 project designed in Moscow.

Soviet attention to our legislation has always been much more constant and effective than we supposed. The pen of Lee Pressman—who later confessed to having been a Communist—trails all through our initial agricultural act and the labor legislation sponsored by the original Congress of Industrial Organizations, of which Pressman was an official.

Well, the Red shadows still breathe and glow.

Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko is the Kremlin's top specialist on American affairs. He knows our country like Mickey Mantle knows the Yankee Stadium. Nobody in the Soviet hierarchy even approaches his staying power. He has survived every purge because of his knowledge of the United States.

I encountered Gromyko's expertness again and again during Geneva conferences. In fact, I came to know this Red leader when his concentration on our country began a full 21 years ago. This was during the 1944 Dumbarton Oaks Conference called to design the United Nations.

He's acquainted with a surprising quantity of American political, trade union, and industrial leaders on an after-hours conversational basis. Some, like Bernard Baruch, whom he respects, always have had his number, but nothing chills this cold man in his search for leverages against our internal stability and especially our legislation.

Gromyko's bland, sphinxlike personality reminds you of a magician who comes on stage without tables or props—just a handkerchief hidden in his hand. Then for 20 minutes he pulls unexpected things out of it.

For example, in an airplane flying the Atlantic Gromyko once suddenly recited to me the foreign-born percentages in our chief trade unions and in our 12 largest cities, and then mentioned in passing that more Czechs live in Chicago than in any city except Prague.

Or listen to Gromyko on another occasion. "Mr. Taylor," he said, "what you Americans call 'law' is really a form of politics."

He didn't just say that. He thinks that. Such are the notes he plays when he calls the tune for Kremlin policy inside our country.

This means Gromyko calls the tune for the Communist Party, U.S.A. In December 1956 that party began a program which it named the "Lincoln project." Its target date for fulfillment should interest us today—1965.

At its inception in 1956 the plan was published in Philadelphia by the respected American Flag Committee and read:

"To implement the Lincoln project, the Communist Party's Central Committee will begin to dispatch agents to 11 Southern States next month (January 1957) to work with local party leaders in surveying 20 counties, any one of which might be ideally suited as a target for disorder early in 1965.

"This survey will continue through 1957, the Central Committee making the choice of 20 counties * * * with the final selection to be made on the estimated most favorable conditions prevailing in 1965.

"The legislation which the party will seek from Congress in 1965 has already been prepared by its legal staff. It provides for elimination of all educational requirements, including minimum literacy tests, as qualifications for voting in Federal, State, and local elections; voids residence with respect to counties, municipalities, and other political subdivisions within a State; and establishes a system of direct Federal supervision and control of the local, county, State, and Federal elective process."

Evidently the House and Senate will pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965 after debate and amendment. To repeat, its merits and demerits are another matter. Nevertheless, penetrating—and exposing—the Soviet's secret interest in any legislation is important to our lawmakers and our public alike. The Lincoln project and the example of this bill is a revelation of the ghostly Reds' eternal presence.

Proudly We Hail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was very honored to receive from my constituent, Art La Cour, a most attractive and inspiring booklet which he has produced entitled "Proudly We Hail." It is the story of our national anthem in words and pictures. I believe that Mr. La Cour has performed a useful and valuable service in reminding all Americans of the proud history of our Nation's anthem.

He inscribed the first copy "To President Lyndon B. Johnson with great respect," and I have been pleased to forward it to the President.

Opposition To Curtailment of Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a strong opponent of the proposed move to close 32 Veterans' Administration facilities, I commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars upon the resolution adopted at its Eastern States conference during the weekend of April 3. The VFW and other Veterans' organizations have presented facts and substantiating evidence in favor of retaining these veterans' facilities.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this resolution which follows:

VFW EASTERN STATES CONFERENCE RESOLUTION URGING CONTINUED EFFORTS TO OPPOSE CURTAILMENT OF VETERANS' BENEFITS

Whereas the administration has been unable to justify, after lengthy hearings before both Houses of Congress, its January 13, 1965, directive ordering the closing of 11 VA hospitals, 17 regional offices, and 4 domiciliaries; and

Whereas the President, at a press conference held on April 1, 1965, stated "I must in frankness say that some doubt in my mind has resulted from reading their (congressional witnesses) statements;" and

Whereas the President has finally become aware of the national resentment, through hundreds of thousands of letters of protest, against this unwarranted and insidious attack on the veteran population of our country; and

Whereas the uncompromising opposition of the American people to this doctrine must be continued and increased in intensity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Eastern States Conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, comprising the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia, in convention duly assembled in the city of Brewer, State of Maine, on April 3, 1965, That the hundreds of thousands of members call upon our national organization, its ladies auxiliary, and its entire membership of 2 million men and women, other veterans groups, all veterans and their families, to join with it in staging mass meetings and other demonstrations, in addition to letters and petitions to the President and the Congress, thus demonstrating to the President and the Congress the unyielding opposition of the American people to any curtailment of veterans' benefits.

Approved by the Eastern States Conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States meeting in Brewer, Maine, April 3–4, 1965.

The Eastern States conference consist of representatives from the following States: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia.

The Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, a recent letter to the editor which appeared in the Marshfield, Wisc., News Herald on April 22, 1965, merits the attention of all my colleagues who are seriously concerned about the agriculture policies of the current administration. The letter was written by Robert P. Graff, a member of the National Farmers' Organization.

Under unanimous consent, I include the letter to the editor in the April 22 edition of the Marshfield News Herald in the RECORD.

The letter referred to follows:

NFO MEMBER WRITES

Editor, News-Herald: "Farming alone cannot * * * provide a decent living * * * for more than a million farm families." This statement is from the recent budget message delivered to Congress by President Johnson. Since there are currently 3.6 million farmers, this amounts to an undated eviction notice to 2.6 million farmers signed by the President of the United States, the leader in the war on poverty, the founder of the Great Society.

It is downright disturbing that such a significant statement indicating future farm policy by the Federal Government should go unnoticed and unchallenged in the rural press. Why not devote some space to the lifeblood issue of our times—the survival of American agriculture as we know it today?

At this time of the year, with the figures on our income tax forms still fresh in our minds, farmers should be acutely aware that something is wrong with agriculture today. Figure out for yourself how much you have invested in your farm and personal property and multiply this by the 4 percent you could have collected in interest on this amount from your local bank. Then subtract this amount from your net income and you will find how much you made last year on your labor as well as your family's labor.

If this looks small, divide by 52 and find out how much you and your family received for 7 days labor each week last year. This figure may only startle you but it should make most farmers hopping mad to realize that the average welfare recipient in the large cities received more than that for not working and with no investment in the future of America and whose sole preoccupation seems to be in enlarging his stable of dependents in order to fatten his welfare check.

My object in writing this was to get other farmers to think of the problems of agriculture as being as near as their own front door but, more hopefully, to provoke them to the point of investigating the program of the National Farmers' Organization which, I believe, holds the only hope for the future of the family farm.

Help yourself by helping your neighbor work for a healthy agriculture through col-

lective bargaining, put profit back in our rural areas so that a farmer will get a decent day's pay for a hard day's work, fight the war on poverty from the bottom up and before the casualties outnumber the survivors. As un-American as it may sound, the NFO believes that the farmer can solve his own problems without the aid of Federal subsidies. Do you know what I'm talking about? If you don't, why don't you find out?

ROBERT P. GRAFF,
Stetsonville.

Representative Reuss Speaks Out on U.S. Policy Toward Central Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, recently my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative HENRY S. REUSS, spoke on U.S. policy toward central Europe at a special symposium on foreign policy issues held at Marquette University, Milwaukee.

His remarks received widespread attention in the press and by the public because of their pertinency to important events of our day. His statement was based in substantial part on a visit he made to central Europe in the fall of 1964. During that trip he had an opportunity to go behind the Iron Curtain and see and hear firsthand about changes taking place within the Soviet bloc countries.

One of his conclusions is that the Germans and Poles must be reconciled if a just, lasting, and peaceful settlement is to be achieved in Europe. He has pledged his personal efforts to achieve this goal.

Because this speech by Representative REUSS gets to the heart of many problems and issues in our policy toward central Europe, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and insert it into the RECORD at this point:

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY FOR CENTRAL EUROPE—A CONGRESSIONAL POINT OF VIEW

(Remarks by Representative HENRY S. REUSS, at the Marquette University Symposium on U.S. Foreign Policy, Life Sciences Building, Milwaukee, Apr. 10, 1965)

No one can visit central Europe nowadays without observing that the days of the monolith are over.

The solid bloc of Communist states taking their cue from Stalinist Moscow in all their affairs is a thing of the past.

The two dominant members of the erstwhile bloc, the less aggressive Soviet Union and the more militant Red China, are fundamentally split.

The rest of the Communist world is coming apart at the seams. Nationalism is stirring in central Europe. Policies of liberalization in economics and more individual freedom are departing from the old centralization and harsh repression.

The Iron Curtain still stands. But, excepting the frontier through divided Berlin and Germany, the differences between the countries it separates are less sharp.

With countries of the East as well as the West asserting themselves and going their own ways, Europe is tending to be again a Europe of nations, not of blocs.

The countries of central Europe obviously don't have free rein. Their independence is limited by Soviet power and the Kremlin's willingness to use it.

So far the successors of Khrushchev have not shown any disposition to backtrack on the de-Stalinization he began, or to take the cold war steps that would be needed to recreate the unity of the bloc.

The United States should look at what is happening in central Europe very carefully. Changed policies are needed to meet changed circumstances.

I

Last fall, in a trip which took me to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany, and Yugoslavia, I hade a chance to see and hear firsthand about the changes in eastern Europe.

All over eastern Europe I was told about the revolution in economic thinking that is taking place.

Czechoslovakia will start on a new economic program of decentralization this year, and hopes to have it completely effective by 1970. The new scheme is largely the creation of Dr. Ota Sik, director of the Economic Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.

When I visited his office in Prague, he must have seen my eyes rest on the set of Karl Marx' works on the shelf behind his desk:

"Are you wondering about what Marx has to do with my country's new economic program—balanced budgets, sound money, economy in government, decentralized decisionmaking by the individual enterprise, use of the price system, and profit by the individual firm to determine how resources are allocated? You see, Marxism is a dynamic and revolutionary system. It did not stop evolving with Marx' death. Your hero is Thomas Jefferson, who built his society on a sturdy yeomanry and feared the masses that would populate your cities—yet you have no difficulty in adapting Jefferson to your world of today. Why can't we adapt, too?"

Dr. Sik anticipates that the new system will cause some dislocations. He expects it to face resistance from those factory managers who fear competition because of their own failings. But the program has party support, he said, and he believes it will succeed.

Yugoslavia's brand of socialism is extremely pragmatic. It is apparently willing to discard almost all Socialist trappings except the collective ownership of the means of production.

In the Government's 1965 financial plan, 900 billion dinars is earmarked for basic capital investment. But only 250 billion is to be made by the Federal Government. The rest will be supplied by the Yugoslavian banking mechanism.

Banks charge interest, and are prepared to lend to whatever enterprise can pay the interest charge. "Do you mean to say that Government-controlled banks would invest in a frivolous and unnecessary project, just because the firm wanting the loan is able to pay the interest charge?" I asked Dr. Nikola Mincev, general director of the Yugoslavian Institute for Economic Planning.

"Certainly," he replied. "We have learned that even the best plan cannot deal with every aspect of a living society. For instance, a nongovernmental group is building a brandnew football stadium in Belgrade just across the street from a perfectly good existing football stadium. But we prefer one football stadium too many to rigid planning that prohibits everything someone believes isn't the best use of resources.

"Prices, interest, and wages are increasingly being set by market forces rather than by Belgrade. The purpose of our 7-year plan is to create an atmosphere and to set guidelines, not to tell an independent producer what to produce, or how much to sell his product for, and how to invest his profit."

Hungary has also embarked on a course of economic liberalization. When I visited the Agricultural Research Station at Martonvasar near Lake Balaton, Dr. Sandor Rajki, the vigorous young geneticist who heads up the station, described the current Hungarian system of fostering household plots for farmers and of providing profit incentives for cooperatives. "Now the Russians seem to be coming around to our point of view," he added with satisfaction.

Each country claims the new economics as its own. "We in Yugoslavia differ sharply from other Communist countries," said Dr. Jose Brilej, leading member of the Yugoslav Parliament and president of the Executive Council's Committee for Foreign Economic Relations. "We no longer draw economic plans in the classical Marxist sense."

"Czechs think things out carefully, but once they decide upon a course they move ahead on it steadily," said Dr. Miroslav Ruzek, chief of the U.S. desk at the Czech foreign office. "We have recognized the defects of our older system and have decided to make changes. We will now go further than the other countries of Eastern Europe."

And Professor Imre Vajda, economist of the University of Budapest, told me, "Hungary is 2 years ahead of the Czechs in decentralizing our economy."

Will all this economic liberalization lead to liberalization generally—in speech, the press, an independent Parliament, trade and travel? Everywhere the answer I got was yes. In Prague, Dr. Ruzek talked about economic liberalization as a "process to broaden and deepen democracy, and to cultivate public opinion."

Members of the Czech Parliament with whom I met were quite proud of the fact that they were no longer entirely a rubber stamp.

What did they mean? I asked. They replied that they had recently overturned a Government position on the tax on motor vehicles. I checked, and found they had indeed.

And the giant statue of Stalin in Prague has come down. A new generation of younger party leaders is coming to power.

In Hungary, the ruthless suppression which followed the unsuccessful uprising of October 1956, has given way to a more moderate course.

Liberalized travel regulations permitted more than a quarter million Hungarians to travel to the West during the last 2 years. Practically all returned. Indeed, a high Hungarian official of whom I asked, "When will you tear down your barbed wire checkpoints at the border?" replied that he thought they could do this soon if conditions continue to improve.

Food is good and plentiful in Hungary: Hungarians have one of the highest caloric intakes in the world, and a high rate of ulcers. Voice of America and Radio Free Europe broadcasts go unjammed. The Ford Foundation has a cultural exchange program, with both Ford and the Hungarians doing the selecting of Hungarian students.

In Belgrade, Dr. Slavko Komar, Member of Parliament and chairman of its Committee for the Economic Plan, thought that decentralization—he felt that "de-etatization" would be a more accurate term—would lead to more political freedom, too.

Just as there has been liberalization in economic arrangements, and more opportunity to enjoy human rights, so Eastern Europe is showing less dependence on Moscow.

Yugoslavia, defected in 1949 and has not been a bloc member since.

Rumania recently told Russia that she rejected the role as supplier of raw material to the other Communist countries, and would build her own industries if she chose.

Albania, while still Stalinist at home, broke relations with Moscow 3 years ago and sides with Communist China.

Bulgaria and East Germany alone seem to remain firmly under Moscow tutelage.

II

Greater freedom for the East Europeans in their economic life, in the exercise of their human rights, and in their relationship with Moscow seems to me to be what we want.

In the first place, it means a more tolerable life for the Hungarians, the Czechs, the Slovaks, and the other bloc peoples.

Quite apart from the welfare of the East Europeans themselves, liberalizing their regimes hastens the day when an overall European settlement can be attempted.

The problem of a divided Berlin, and of a divided East and West Germany, can only be settled in the context of an all-European settlement. Such a settlement will be a whole lot easier if nations are not too sharply divided along the old Iron Curtain, if there are some real possibilities of a troop thin-out and arms control for all of Europe, if trade is expanded so that the economies of middle Europe are oriented both East and West, if human rights are protected at least in a rudimentary way.

What can the United States do to hasten the process of liberalization in Eastern Europe? Based upon my on-the-spot observations last fall, the most important single action we could take is in trade. Trade between the United States and Eastern Europe is practically nonexistent today by reason of two policies:

1. Except for Poland and Yugoslavia, the United States denies most-favored-nation treatment to imports from Eastern European countries. This means that U.S. tariffs on most Eastern European goods are prohibitively high.

2. There is an almost complete embargo on goods moving from the United States to Eastern Europe.

This restriction is meant to limit the war potential of Eastern Europe. And, because almost anything useful to a modern nation increases its strength in war, the restriction has become very broad.

By our almost total embargo we accomplish two things, neither of which is in our best interest: (1) we help to keep the economies of the Eastern European countries oriented to and dependent on the Soviet Union, and (2) we lose business while the Eastern Europeans get the goods from the British, French, or Germans.

Thus the embargo hurts principally the United States; economically through the loss of business; politically, through the loss of an opportunity to influence the orientation of Eastern Europe.

I believe that Congress would be wise to give the President more flexibility on both aspects of trade. We should permit the President to remove the discrimination, where he sees fit in our tariffs against Eastern European goods. Equally, we should permit the President discretion, on all but really military and strategic goods, to lift the embargo on shipments to Eastern Europe.

But we would make a mistake if we granted governmental long-term (5 years or more) credits. This would be equivalent to giving the Communist bloc foreign aid.

Concessions by us should be used to encourage more independence from Moscow, and more political and economic freedom. Concessions should surely not be granted all at once, or to every country. And in the event to too much backsliding, restrictions have to be reinstated.

Along with trade liberalization can come increasing cultural and social exchanges. On balance, we are better off opening these windows in the Iron Curtain than we are keeping them tightly closed.

This increased exchange of goods, people, and ideas between West and East can pave the way for the middle Europe that we seek when the nightmare ends and the Iron Curtain disappears. That middle Europe envisages a Germany peacefully reunited; a Poland and the other lands to the east secure in its borders and protected against German revisionism; and a whole region in which the brotherhood of man dominates life and thought.

In our democracy, ideas about foreign policy can originate among the people as often as they do in Washington. Here in Milwaukee the Poles and the Germans have lived amiably side by side for a century. Nowhere else in the world have these two diverse peoples collaborated more fruitfully to build a commonwealth. Here a Lewandowski heads our school of art, and a Klotsche our State university; a Zablocki represents the south side, and a Reuss the north.

So here in Milwaukee it is fitting to propose that the United States adopt as a cornerstone of its European policy the reconciliation of the Germans and the Poles (together with their neighbors the Slavs and Magyars). I am prepared to work long and hard at this reconciliation. It must go hand in hand with our other efforts for a just, peaceful and lasting settlement in Europe.

In the last 15 years, the age-old animosity between Germany and France has been largely healed. In the next 15 years, let the United States play the same healing role toward ancient hatreds between East and West. If the Germans and the Poles can be brothers on either side of the Menomonee River, they can be brothers on either side of the Oder.

Let our European policy rise above the tiresome parochialism of the Common Market, the excessive concentration on NATO, the distracting business of always reacting to President de Gaulle's latest breathtaker. Let us instead raise a standard to which men of good will everywhere may repair: the reconciliation of Germany and Poland, and then of West and East.

Teenagers Bridge East, West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess in my home district it came to my attention that the spirit of ecumenism is at work among teenagers there, who are bridging the gap between religion and cultures in a youth pilot project conducted by young Presbyterians and members of the Eastern Christian Church.

I would like to call the Members' attention to an article in the Record of Hackensack, N.J., by Wilma Supik, religion editor, which aptly describes this worthy venture in brotherhood.

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, Apr. 24, 1965]

RELIGION IN SUBURBIA—TEENAGERS BRIDGE EAST, WEST; GREEK ORTHODOX, PRESBYTERIANS IN DIALOG

(By Wilma Supik, religion editor)

Last night at the Greek Church of the Ascension in Fairview a group of wide-eyed Presbyterian youth, accustomed to simple rites, looked on as Orthodox Christians liturgically reenacted the burial of Christ.

Yesterday was Holy or Great Friday for Eastern Christians, and the Paramus teenagers were attending the lamentations service as part of a Presbyterian Greek Orthodox ecumenical youth pilot project.

The interchange, which began on April 4 at the manse of Trinity United Presbyterian Church, Paramus, is being sponsored by the United Presbyterian Church Commission on Ecumenical Relations, Youth Department; and the Department of Youth Work of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America.

A NEW EXPERIENCE

Over a period of a month, the young people will have met on six occasions, at services, in study, and in fellowship. About 30 high school youths are participating, and, according to the Reverend Robert Hugh Reed, pastor of Trinity Church, are undergoing a new experience in ecumenism.

On the Greek Orthodox Palm Sunday—which was the Western Easter Sunday—the Reverend Socrates Tsamutalis, pastor of the Fairview Church, explained the meaning of Orthodox Holy Week to the visiting youths. Earlier, the Presbyterian teenagers attended the Greek Palm Sunday services. At an April 11 session Father Socrates explained Greek Orthodox belief to his young guests and also took them on a tour of his church, showing them the church icons and holy books.

"WHO IS JESUS?"

Greek Orthodox youth are also learning about Protestantism in this first project of its kind in the United States. At the opening session in Paramus, Pastor Reed, for years active in the Protestant unity movement and in Catholic-Protestant dialog, discussed the common sources of revelation—the Bible and tradition. After the talk, the youth broke into small buzz groups, probing questions like: What is the Christian faith? Is the Christian faith important to mankind? What is the Bible, what does it say, what does it mean to teenagers? Who is Jesus, what did he do?

The Greek Orthodox youth also attended a Presbyterian Holy Week service at Glen School, Ridgewood, on Maundy Thursday. Pastor Reed outlined the service of the Last Supper, and Greek youth saw how their new Protestant friends receive the sacrament of holy communion.

MAY 2 WRAPUP

Supervising the pilot project have been the Reverend Kyoji Buma, executive secretary of the Office of Youth Relations, United Presbyterian Church, and John Maheras, director of the Youth Department of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America.

Also participating in concurrent exchanges have been youth of the First Presbyterian Church, Lyndhurst, and St. Nicholas Church, Newark; and the Claremont Presbyterian Church, Jersey City, and St. Demetrios Church, Jersey City.

On May 2 the Presbyterian and Greek Orthodox young people will get together at the Paramus manse to take stock of their pioneer project.

Both Father Socrates and Pastor Reed know the youths have learned much about the others' traditions. They are also hopeful that the encounter with each other will bring them all closer to Jesus Christ.

"The Feigner"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following poem entitled "The Feigner," by Harold Hufford, who is retired as a staff member of the National Archives:

THE FEIGNER

I've never seen the Rockies
With their crowns of shining snow;
Nor have I seen our national parks
With their wonders all a'glow;
I've never taken too much time
My land's beauties to applaud,
But, dear friend, I'll have you know
That I have been "abrawd."

Why bother with the breadbasket
That feeds the world and me?
Why stay with good "Old Glory"
As it waves unfurled and free?
I take these things for granted,
And my feelings stay unthawed,
But they warm up away from home,
So, perforce, I go "abrawd."

America just treats me swell,
And provides fine living, too;
I fare much better here, you know,
But I don't like the view;
I spend my dough in foreign lands
That our coffers much have gnawed,
Where they also spend my taxes
That have, likewise, gone "abrawd."

The Pilgrims and the pioneers
Looked forward, up, and out;
They came to this new country
O'er the ocean's trackless route
To find a new life, rich and free,
From Old World ways unlawed,
To build the greatest of great nations,
And so they came abroad.

But, now, soft offspring lolling free,
Midst fruits of their hot sweat,
Feel that this Nation's getting old,
And like spoiled children fret;
So, like the aged who dwell on youth
Of which they're often "jawed,"
They think 'way back to ancient times,
So they go back "abrawd."

I think as they—home's commonplace;
I must acquire veneer;
I must try to be exotic,
And foreign things revere;
And talk about old castles, chefs,
And strange foods that I have "chawed,"
I must feign that "cultured touch,"
So, I must go "abrawd."

Nonchalant, with half-closed eyes,
I'll tilt my head with ease,
And in soft voice I'll utter words
My vanity to please;
A club or two may beckon me
And it o'er them I'll "lawd,"
A'tellin' 'bout that "Pizzah Towah"
A'leanin' "hahd" "abrawd."

And, furthermore, you can be sure
That it will be great fun
A'tellin' 'bout spaghetti fields
A'wavin' in the sun!
Of how I "blew" that Matterhorn
Whose notes us all have awed,
And of grape juice a'squirtin' up
Twixt trampers' toes "abrawd!"

Oh, what a mixed up world this is—
How we do deprecate
The countless blessings here at home
That we don't appreciate;
We've got to climb that fence so high
Into other fields to laud
What they have got, ignore our own,
So, we must go "abrawd."

To "go abroad" means other things
Such as "to go astray;"
And with our dollars flowing out
Let's reduce this needless play
Of tryin' to feign a finish that
Could be no more than fraud,
And keep some dollars here at home
For enough have gone "abrawd!"

HAROLD HUFFORD.

JUNE 1961.

Human Relations and Human Rights in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, I am deeply proud of the statement of priniciples that this body recently joined in endorsing regarding human relations and human rights in Alabama. As I have repeatedly maintained on the floor of this House and elsewhere, people of my State are in overwhelming majority fairminded and law abiding Americans, and among the finest citizens of this land. Bad press sustained over a long period of time has created the false impression that the criminal acts of a vicious minority within the South are representative of the whole South. In forceful answer to this libelous image and in confirmation of my own appraisal of my fellow Alabamians, the business community of Alabama spoke up last week in no uncertain terms. The statement of priciples included herein was signed by many local chambers under the leadership of the State chamber of commerce, Alabama Bankers Association, Associated Industries of Alabama, and Alabama Manufacturers Association. It is with deep pride and profound gratitude to the businessmen of Alabama that I place in the RECORD the full text of this fine statement:

"WHAT WE BELIEVE AND WHERE WE STAND"

In light of recent developments in Alabama, we feel that the business community has an obligation to speak out for what it believes to be right.

The vast majority of the people of Alabama, like other responsible citizens throughout our Nation, believe in law and order, and in the fair and just treatment of all their fellow citizens. They believe in obedience to the law regardless of their personal feelings about its specific merits. They believe in the basic human dignity of all people of all races.

We intend to continue working diligently for the full development of Alabama, the welfare of its people, and the maintenance of conditions favorable to the creation of an economy which will benefit every citizen.

For these reasons, we feel that we must publicly declare and reaffirm what we believe and where we stand.

First, we believe in the full protection and opportunity under the law of all our citizens, both Negro and white. Just as we feel every Alabamian inherently has the right of protection, so does every Alabamian have a responsibility to uphold the law. We deplore equally public demonstrations which violate the law, and the actions of those who take the law into their own hands. There are proper procedures for expressing protest in a lawful manner, just as there are procedures for restraining those who would violate the law.

We believe in the basic American heritage of voting, and in the right of every eligible citizen to register and to cast his ballot. We believe, however, that qualification of prospective voters, when properly and equitably administered, is a constitutional responsibility that must be preserved.

We believe in obedience to the law, even though some may question the wisdom of particular laws. Such a law is the recently enacted Civil Rights Act of 1964, which many of our citizens feel contains many unjust and improper provisions. We do, however, have an obligation to abide by it, and this we will do. Where injustices or inequities are indicated, we will seek relief through proper and legal channels.

Our State is faced specifically with compliance with title VII of this law which goes into effect shortly. This provides for nondiscrimination in employment and will call for some adjustments. While many of our employers have been in compliance with these provisions for some time, we call on business leaders all over the State to provide leadership in this matter.

We believe that communication between different elements of our society must be maintained. We urge leaders of both races to improve avenues of communication and understand. While this has been done successfully in many local communities, we suggest that consideration be given to the establishment of positive new vehicles for communications between the races throughout all the State.

We believe that an expanding economy will benefit all of our people. This will provide more jobs and greater income, thus raising the standard of living for all of our citizens—both Negro and white.

We believe that an ever increasing level of education is an important objective. This will better equip our citizens to take advantage of job opportunities and to become qualified voters.

We believe in Alabama, have confidence in its future, and call upon all of its citizens to join together in working for the attainment of these objectives and the solution of the many problems facing us.

Alabama State Chamber of Commerce; Alabama Bankers Association; Associated Industries of Alabama; Alabama Textile Manufacturers Association; Birmingham Chamber of Commerce; Mobile Chamber of Commerce; Montgomery Chamber of Commerce; Huntsville Chamber of Commerce; Alexander City Chamber of Commerce; Andalusia Chamber of Commerce;; Anniston Chamber of Commerce; Cullman Chamber of Commerce; Decatur Chamber of Commerce; Florence Chamber of Commerce; Gadsden Chamber of Commerce; Jasper Chamber of Commerce; Muscle Shoals Chamber of Commerce; Opelika Chamber of Commerce; Sylacauga Chamber of Commerce; Troy Chamber of Commerce; Tuscaloosa Chamber of Commerce; Association of Huntsville Area Contractors.

Judge Sidney C. Mize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday morning, April 26, 1965, in his beloved hometown of Gulfport, Miss., a great jurist and a noble man, Judge Sidney C. Mize, a district Federal judge for 28 years, died at the age of 77.

Judge Mize was truly one of the finest characters that it has ever been my pleasure to know. My acquaintance with him began in the late 1920's when he was an outstanding member of the bar of

Harrison County and I was a young district attorney. That acquaintance grew into a long friendship which will always be a pleasant memory.

Few men possess more than one outstanding virtue but Sidney Mize was the beneficiary of many. He was an outstanding lawyer and jurist; possessed of a keen mind; a noble Christian character; devoid of the common sins of man. Moreover he was a devoted husband and father and a friend to mankind. He was the most democratic Federal jurist I have ever known. He was compassionate to the extent that he was sometimes criticized because of his leniency in meting out punishment to those who were convicted of crimes in his court.

Mr. Speaker, one Benjamin H. Hill in 1874 paid an everlasting and well-deserved tribute to the inimitable and illustrious Gen. Robert E. Lee. Among other commendations were the following:

He was a foe without hate; a friend without treachery; a soldier without cruelty; a victor without oppression; and a victim without murmuring.

He was a public officer without vices; a private citizen without wrong; a neighbor without reproach; a Christian without hypocrisy; and a man without guile.

He was obedient to authority as a servant, and royal in authority as a true king.

He was gentle as a woman in life; modest and pure as a virgin in thought; watchful as a Roman vestal in duty; submissive to law as Socrates, and grand in battle as Achilles.

Mr. Speaker, as a longtime, intimate friend, I can truthfully state that these tributes to the great Lee could well and appropriately apply to my departed friend, Sidney C. Mize. His loss to his family, his State, his Nation, and to the law, as well as to his friends will be most difficult if not impossible to replace.

More Caution, Less Speed Badly Needed as Congress Rushes Welfare Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Lauderdale, Fla., News of April 20:

MORE CAUTION, LESS SPEED BADLY NEEDED AS CONGRESS RUSHES WELFARE LEGISLATION

When Congress buckles back down to work following its short Easter recess it is to be hoped that many of the legislators will return to Washington in a somewhat more thoughtful mood than has been indicated up to now during the current session.

From what has happened since the session convened last January, this Congress has given no indication whatsoever that it has a mind of its own in deciding what is good and what is bad in the way of legislation. It has been under the thumb and under the influence of President Lyndon Johnson to such an extent that already the term of "rubberstamp" is not only deserved, but is somewhat conservative in describing the manner in which the legislators are breaking all speed records in doing the exact bidding of the White House.

If the Nation was faced with some kind of an emergency situation which demanded quick subservience to White House demands there might be some excuse for the way Congress has been performing. But there is no domestic emergency facing the country. The Nation is in a healthy and prosperous condition and under this circumstance there is no need for Congress to cast aside its traditional constitutional role in our system of checks and balances and to act like a trained seal jumping through a hoop every time the President snaps his fingers.

Consider, for instance, the manner in which the medicare bill was ramrodded through the lower House. Here was a bill that will greatly affect virtually every person in this country in one way or another. It will sharply increase the social security taxes of millions of wage earners and will initiate a Government welfare program of such magnitude that once it is put into effect there can be no turning back.

How much debate was given to this measure in the lower House? The debate lasted just a couple of days and was conducted under ground rules which barred any amendments to the proposed bill and which left House Members in a position of either approving the bill exactly as it was presented or of being labeled as a foe of our senior citizens.

Under the circumstances there weren't too many House Members courageous enough to stand up and buck the steamroller tactics employed by administration lieutenants. So, like a trained chorus of "yes men," a great majority of the House Members meekly voted their approval of a precedent shattering piece of legislation which will require an outlay of a minimum of $6 billion a year to start with and the cost of which in future years nobody can even accurately predict.

The medicare bill, however, is but one example of this almost frantic haste by House Members to kneel at the throne of President Johnson. The new Federal aid to education bill is another piece of legislation with precedent-shattering and tremendously costly ramifications. It marks a radical departure from previous aid to education bills in that for the first time in our history it puts the Federal Government in the position of doling out Federal funds to private and public schools alike. In past years the argument in Congress was long and bitter on this point but this time the congressional skids were greased to the extent there was virtually no opposition.

Then we have the voting rights bill which was spawned in an atmosphere of political expediency and which carries with it so many obnoxious and punitive assaults against traditional rights long held by the individual States that its constitutionality is sharply in question. Yet, here again, the virtually mesmerizing influence of President Johnson on the Congress is being used with such apparent success that only a mere handful of southern legislators seem willing to stand up and oppose what amounts to nothing less than the imposition of a Federal dictatorship over certain of our States in setting what standards they must use in passing out the privilege of voting. Under this autocratic bill an illiterate who could legally be deprived of the right to vote in New York State could not legally be deprived of that right in the State of Virginia. This doesn't make a particle of sense nor does it add up to justice or fair play, but who cares about such things as these when there are political payoffs to be made and minority groups to be wooed?

It has been estimated that this present session of Congress has already enacted or has just about cleared for sure passage enough new legislation of the welfare state type to increase spending next year by $5 billion and over the next few years by some $30 billion.

That the Nation may not be able to afford this kind of spending seems to make no difference to many of our Congressmen. The Great Society philosophy is to spend now and worry about how to pay for it later and those in Congress who are inclined to question this philosophy are warned what to expect if their opposition brooks White House displeasure.

This Nation was never meant to be run by a dictator in the White House, yet President Johnson has already become the closest thing to a de facto dictator this Nation has ever had. It's time, we think, for the Congress to take a breather in this business of rubberstamping the President as more caution and less haste may serve the Nation far better in the long run than imposing more of the Great Society upon us in the quickest fashion possible.

JACK W. GORE.

A Bill To End Capital Punishment in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am the sponsor of H.R. 559 to abolish capital punishment in the District of Columbia. This bill has been referred to my subcommittee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and I hope to be able to schedule hearings on it in the very near future.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial supporting H.R. 559 which was broadcast over Station WTOP here in Washington on April 14 and 15, 1965:

A BILL TO END CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

This is a WTOP editorial.

Congressman ABRAHAM MULTER's bill to end most capital punishment in the District of Columbia is short and to the point. Its key phrases is as follows: "The punishment of murder in the first degree shall be life imprisonment. A person convicted of first degree murder and upon whom a sentence of life imprisonment is imposed shall not be eligible for parole until the expiration of 20 years from the date he commences to serve his sentence."

Sometime in May, Representative MULTER—who is chairman of House District Subcommittee No. 3—hopes to hold public hearings on his proposal, taking testimony from a wide range of witnesses, including the District Commissioners. We support abolition of capital punishment; we think hearings on the Multer bill should be held as quickly as feasible; we hope that the evidence presented at that time will lead Congress to do away with virtually all executions in this Federal city.

District law provides the death penalty for murder, rape, and for causing death by placing obstructions on a railroad or street railway. Federal law which applies nationwide—not just for the District—provides capital punishment for a variety of offenses, including treason, wartime espionage, and kidnaping. These, of course, are distinct from crimes falling under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

It is our present view that the District should be exempted from all capital punishment, except possibly for treason and war-

time espionage. The time has come, we think, for Washington, D.C. to join the 12 States which already have renounced a barbaric form of retribution posing as law enforcement.

This was a WTOP editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

Chelmsford Man Teaching English in Ethiopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to hear of the activities of our Peace Corps volunteers. From the fifth district in Massachusetts many young men and women have joined the Peace Corps and have performed exemplary service for their country and for the people they serve abroad.

One such student is Peter Goodwill of Chelmsford, Mass. Mr. Goodwill is teaching in Ethiopia in the province of Adis Quala. He teaches English and also assists with intramural sports. At present he is engaged in developing a textbook for use in the classroom on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Goodwill is an outstanding example of the commitment of modern youth to the progress of people all over the world. He is a credit to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Goodwill, who encouraged his participation as a volunteer, and to his community.

I would like to call the attention of the House to Mr. Goodwill's activities by inserting a recent article that appeared in the Lowell, Mass., Sun in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

CHELMSFORD YOUNG MAN TEACHES ENGLISH IN ETHIOPIA

(By James Goldsmith)

CHELMSFORD.—When Peter Goodwill told his parents the next 2 years would be the longest summer of his life he was not just giving them a philosophical opinion—in fact, this young man, who is working for the Peace Corps in Ethiopia, realizes the days will be long and the assignment difficult.

Mr. and Mrs. John Goodwill of South Chelmsford, the boy's parents, hear from their son regularly and learn about Ethiopia, its climate, people and its future. This young man is teaching seventh and eighth grade children English in a Province named Adis Quala. He left the States in January for Ethiopia with 130 other corpsmen and is busy teaching from 9 a.m. to noon and then classes are dismissed until 2:45 p.m. because of the heat. They are resumed until 5 p.m.

Mr. Goodwill's 30-day vacation during the summer will be much like your 2-week vacation; he will travel and learn more about his host nation so that he will be more qualified to teach the youngsters. There are also Peace Corps projects like building roads, buildings, and good will among the Ethiopians, most of whom are Christians.

One of the interesting points that Mr. Goodwill brought out in a letter is the children who he is teaching softball, naturally try to kick the ball rather than catch it as they are used to playing soccer. He is gradually learning Arabic so that he will be better able to communicate with his students. One of the greatest needs, according to this young corpsman, is for books which can be used in teaching English. He uses 200 books including encyclopedias but more books are needed; i.e., not above the English level of a sixth grader in America and down to the level of a second grader. Story books and reference material are badly needed.

This corpsman is working with three other volunteers on a 60–70 page book which can be used in the daily classes. When Mrs. Goodwill was asked why her son chose to join the Peace Corps she replied that, "when Peter was in his senior year at Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, he met several people who represented the Corps and his roommate is now doing volunteer work in Brazil and another friend is working in Africa."

He graduated from Chelmsford High School in 1957 where he played football, basketball, and baseball. He was captain of the baseball team in his senior year and was class treasurer. Later, Mr. Goodwill attended Cushing Academy where he played football and was given the Ideal Cushing Student Award. At Drake, where he graduated in 1964, he was president of his fraternity. In September last year, he went to UCLA for 3 months' Peace Corps training and spent 2 weeks home at Christmas before embarking on his assignment.

Obviously, his athletic ability coupled with his educational background and desire to help other people less fortunate than himself were important factors in his selection for this work. When asked what her son intended to do at the end of his 2-year assignment in Ethiopia, Mrs. Goodwill replied that he may reenlist, attend law school, or take a civilian job.

When asked if the corpsmen were well received in Ethiopia, Mrs. Goodwill said that, at first, they were not well received but now the Ethiopians are asking for more corpsmen to help them attain a better standard of living. When the Moslem or Christian Ethiopian goes shopping he or she doesn't go to the nearest shopping center; rather they go to the open marketplace and do their weekly shopping as they pass from one stand to another.

One of the human interest sidelights of Mr. Goodwill's story was told in the classroom when one of his students asked the teacher if he had a sister. Mr. Goodwill answered "yes" and the student asked if she would like to write. Even though this seems like a small thing to do, it can show that the people in America do care about people in other lands. Thus, if you would like to adopt a pen pal in Ethiopia, Mrs. Goodwill will pass along your name to her son and, perhaps, a rewarding experience can be forthcoming for both you and a small child.

Elimination of Federal Excise Tax on Passenger Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two resolutions recently passed by the Buffalo Automobile Dealers Association, Buffalo, N.Y., concerning the Federal excise tax on new automobiles.

I also wish to include a résumé on the amount of taxes a person pays who owns and drives an automobile. Althought these figures are for Erie County, N.Y., they could apply to almost any county in the United States.

RESOLUTION I

ELIMINATION OF FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON PASSENGER CARS

Whereas the Buffalo Automobile Dealers Association, Inc., is comprised of 101 franchised new car dealer members representing all domestic and most imported makes of vehicles, located in Erie County, N.Y.; and

Whereas President Johnson has called upon Congress to repeal or reduce Federal excise taxes by $1.7 billion, effective July 1, 1965, in order to "increase purchasing power and stimulate further growth in the economy"; and

Whereas a Federal manufacturers' excise tax of 10 percent is now levied on all new automobiles manufactured for sale in the United States; and

Whereas automobiles have been subject to varying percentages of excise tax over the years since 1917 on a temporary basis, and presumably to help finance military objectives and to restrict their purchase so that all the basic metals, materials, and manpower normally used in their manufacture could go toward the war effort; and

Whereas the need for such restrictions and restraints no longer exist, and in fact their removal would greatly implement the avowed aim of the President; and

Whereas the excise tax on automobiles is discriminatory and not neutral in that it places an additional $1.8 billion burden on purchasers of a recognized necessity, and at a rate twice the rate imposed on most nonluxury consumer durables (the rate of tax on such other durables were reduced from 10 percent to 5 percent in 1954; the excise taxes on such luxury items as furs and jewelry have been reduced 50 percent since the Korean conflict); and

Whereas the automobile is the daily producer of vast tax revenues for local, State, and Federal coffers from the minute it goes on the highway until it goes to the junkyard (see attached list of tax revenues which it is conservatively estimated the automobile owners in Erie County alone will pay in 1965); and

Whereas the elimination of the excise tax on automobiles will lower the price of some 20 million new and used cars now purchased annually, thus lowering the cost of living, lead to increased employment opportunties, the creation of new jobs in industries related to the production and servicing of automobiles, add to the Nation's economic health and to the gross national product; and

Whereas the automobile—the greatest continuing tax producing consumer durable the country has—would, in addition, by its expanding numbers and greater use, generously continue to fill the tax coffers by constant payment of the many other user taxes to which the automobile is daily subject: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Buffalo Automobile Dealers Association in meeting assembled this 13th day of April, 1965, urges the immediate elimination by the U.S. Congress of the Federal manufacturers excise tax of 10 percent on passenger cars as being in the best interests of the citizens of this county, of this State, and of the national economy; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the resolution, requesting and urging support for the elimination of this tax, be forwarded to each U.S. Senator from the State of New York, and each Representative from the County of Erie, State of New York.

Unanimously approved.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, BUFFALO AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
W. A. DIETRICH, *President*.

RESOLUTION II

RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF AUTOMOTIVE EXCISE TAX REPEAL

Whereas the Buffalo Automobile Dealers Association, Inc., is composed of 101 franchised new car dealers representing all domestic and most imported makes of vehicles in Erie County, N.Y., and

Whereas numerous bills have been introduced in the Congress to repeal or substantially reduce the Federal excise taxes at the urging of President Johnson—there being some bills calling for the repeal or reduction of the present 10 percent excise tax on new automobiles, and

Whereas the proceedings of Congress are widely covered in the press and other news media, and

Whereas the Federal excise tax on new passenger cars averages $225 per car, and is so large an amount as to cause a prospective purchaser to delay purchase until final legislative action is taken on the reduction or removal of Federal excise taxes, thus threatening a serious disruption of our automotive industry, as well as affecting the national economy, and

Whereas knowledge by the public of the fact that any repeal or reduction of the Federal excise tax on passenger cars would be made retroactive to a certain date, would serve to minimize the postponement of contemplated purchases of such vehicles and lessen the probability of serious adverse effect upon the economy: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Buffalo Automobile Dealers Association in meeting assembled this 13th day of April, 1965, urges either the immediate enactment of legislation providing for refunds to purchasers of the Federal excise tax paid by them on new passenger cars purchased prior to the effective date of enactment of legislation, if any, repealing or reducing said automotive excise tax; or, in lieu thereof, an assurance, at the time that public announcement is first made of consideration by Congress of legislation to repeal or reduce Federal excise taxes, that if Congress later repeals or reduces the automotive excise tax, such repeal or reduction will be made retroactive to the date of the first public announcement of consideration by the Congress of legislation to repeal or reduce Federal excise taxes: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, requesting and urging support for such action by the Congress, be forwarded to each U.S. Senator from the State of New York, and each Representative from the County of Erie, State of New York.

Unanimously approved.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, BUFFALO AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
W. A. DIETRICH, *President*.

ESTIMATE OF VARIOUS USER TAXES WHICH PURCHASERS AND OWNERS OF MOTOR VEHICLES IN ERIE COUNTY WILL PAY IN 1965

Excise tax rates: New cars, 10 percent; replacement parts and accessories, 8 percent; motor oil, 6 cents per gallon; tires and tubes, 10 cents per pound; gasoline, 10 cents per gallon.

All, plus 3 percent Erie County sales tax, license plate fees, throughway tolls, operators' licenses, etc.

It has been carefully estimated, on the basis of approximately 350,000 vehicles in Erie County, that the owners thereof will pay, in 1965, the following taxes:

Excise, new cars	$12,000,000
Gasoline tax on average annual mileage of 9,635 with consumption of 774 gallons per vehicle at tax of 10 cents per gallon for 270,900,000 gallons	27,090,000
Erie County sales tax thereon	800,000
License plates at average of $23.20	$8,120,000
Excise on oil, parts, tires, tubes, etc.	2,000,000
Erie County sales tax at 3 percent—cars	4,500,000
Erie County sales tax at 3 percent—parts, accessories, etc.	516,000
Total estimated	55,026,000

Descalation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to include at this point two editorials from the New York Times—one from the edition of April 22, and the other from Sunday's edition of April 25.

These articles, in my opinion, emphasize the need for our country to continue and, in fact, to intensify our efforts to seek real peace in Vietnam. We can and we must make progress toward peaceful settlement of this tragic situation, and it is up to us to lead the way in bringing forth new proposals for further discussions and negotiations that might result in achievement of a peaceful solution to this conflict.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 22, 1965]

DESCALATION NEEDED

The war in Vietnam is to be stepped up, Washington now says. In other words, the U.S. Government is going to continue to bomb, send in more Americans, spend more and commit more lives, money, destructiveness and power—and take more risk. In return, the hope is that Hanoi will act to curb the Vietcong guerrillas in South Vietnam, if it can, and will refrain from sending in more men and arms and orders to the south. The hope also is that Peiping and Moscow will hold off from their own particular methods of escalation.

Those who have all along feared that the course the war has been taking since early February would force the United States into an even greater commitment, leading to ever greater danger to Asia and to the world, are unhappily being proved true prophets. Once a war begins, forces take over which seem beyond control. In Vietnam, on both sides, one step is leading—as if inexorably—to another and then another. Continuance of the present process by the opposing forces could lead to catastrophe.

Nothing is more important for Americans today than to face these hard truths before it is too late. And it is vital that the channels of communication, of opinion and of dissent be kept open—on the floor of Congress, in the press, in the country at large—in the face of a growing tendency to ridicule or to denounce the opposition and to demand unswerving support of further escalation in the name of patriotism.

Bitterness and emotionalism are increasingly entering the discussions on Vietnam in the United States. This is a deplorable development, and so is the polarization of opinion in every country and between blocs of countries. It is as if the battlelines were being drawn all over the world—but for a major war that need not and must not take place.

President Johnson's offer of "unconditional discussions" was a splendid move on the diplomatic-political front, in the effort to achieve a peaceful solution of the quarrel. While it deserved a far better response from the other side than it has yet received, it did mark, as we have previously noted, a beginning to an interchange among the combatants—subtle and indirect, but nevertheless a beginning.

But the continued bombing of North Vietnam makes progress toward a peaceful settlement—however far off it must necessarily be—more difficult rather than less harder rather than easier. We think that as a followup to the President's fine declaration in Baltimore, a descalation of the war is needed, rather than the escalation that we now see imminent.

It is at least worth the effort to see whether a scaling down of the bombing might not evoke a corresponding scaling down of North Vietnamese aggression in South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese incidents in the south are easily measurable; if a diminution of American bombing of the north should lead to a diminution in the rate of incidents in the south, a major step would thereby be signaled toward the "unconditional discussions" offered by the President.

Of course, there might be no such response at all, and if there were not, the bombing would be resumed. But at least a descalation such as we suggest would afford the opportunity to the other side of making a gesture toward peace without losing face. It might lead, ultimately, to a cease-fire and a truce.

President Johnson launched a very tentative but real peace offensive at Johns Hopkins. He has not yet given this policy enough time but the continued bombing has tended to cast some doubt on the sincerity of the U.S. desire for negotiations.

This is clearly a moment of crisis—for Vietnam, for the United States, and for the world. Less bombing, not more, offers some hope of peace—without any weakness of American resolution. By taking such an attitude the United States would show strength as well as wisdom.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 25, 1965]

AS THE WAR ESCALATES

The pace of the war in Vietnam is accelerating. Time is a relative factor, so that 10 days in this April have been like 10 weeks last year and 10 months in previous years. There is an awareness now—in the world as well as the United States—that the drama is building toward its climax. There is a sense of grim determination on one side and defiance on the other. And there is also the sense that the world may be moving toward a still distant holocaust that is, however, visible on the horizon.

Fortunately, nothing that has not yet happened is inevitable. The debate going on among Americans, and in other countries, is evidence that the situation is as fluid as it is complex. Power alone, in the form of guns and bombs, cannot solve the Vietnamese conflict for either side.

President Johnson showed his realization of this fact by his offer of "unconditional discussions" and a sort of Marshall plan for southeast Asia. However, this offer was accompanied by the steady explosion of bombs in North Vietnam. After a conference of the U.S. leaders in Honolulu in the past week it was announced that the war was

to be stepped up. As the war escalates, so do destruction and danger.

It is easy for the United States to double or treble its Air Force; to send in three divisions instead of one; to spend $2 or $3 or $10 on military might in place of $1. If that would solve the Vietnamese problem, there would be no need to worry. But it would not. On the contrary, it would simply lead to further escalation on the other side, and thus vastly increase the peril.

This is why thought and discussion must turn toward other possibilities. One suggestion, which this newspaper supports, is a "descalation" of the bombing of North Vietnam, a deliberate reduction in the air missions and their size. Hanoi would then be expected correspondingly to reduce the incident rate in South Vietnam. If there were no response to the American peace gesture, the bombing could be resumed.

Another possibility now moving toward the top of official consideration would be to utilize a proposed conference on Cambodia in Phnom Penh to bring together the nine powers which signed or accepted the 1954 Geneva agreements on Indochina. Thus, Americans, North Vietnamese, South Vietnamese, Chinese Communists, Russians, and others could talk quietly about Vietnam without commitments.

Washington, Hanoi, Peiping, Moscow and other capitals have come out in favor of the 1954 accords as a basis for negotiations. But it is doubtful that the agreements as such could settle all of today's problems. The time, the circumstances, the power factors, the climate of opinion are all different in 1965.

Nevertheless, "a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954," to cite President Johnson, may be possible—if there can be agreement on what the essentials are.

Some details of the 1954 agreements have theoretical possibilities, depending on their interpretation. For instance: no "troop reinforcements"; no "new military bases"; respect for the "sovereignty, the independence, the unity, and the territorial integrity" of Vietnam; no "interference in internal affairs"; "free general elections by secret ballot."

Diplomacy has been sorely lacking in the Vietnamese affair. The United States has the support of some governments whose interests are linked, or are parallel, to ours; but it is not much exaggeration to say that the world outside our borders is against what we are doing in Vietnam.

It is not too late to seek new policies. It is much too soon to lose heart for negotiations. Orientals need have no monopoly on patience. There is nothing to lose by holding open doors to peace—or opening new doors. A greater war is not the way to peace.

Soil Conservation Service Small Watershed Program in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, no natural resource conservation effort is more important to Nebraska than the small watershed program, authorized by Congress in 1954 as Public Law 566.

Yet the program's potential has been hardly more than tapped. Great and lasting benefits are possible under it, extending beyond watershed protection and flood prevention to water supply and outdoor recreation developments, and fish and wildlife conservation.

Gage County provides an example of outstanding watershed work in Nebraska. Five watershed projects are authorized for operations and three more are in the planning stage. A countywide recreation development is planned as part of the program. Benefits of $1 million are seen when current projects are completed.

In Gage, as in other counties, such as Lancaster, Otoe, Pawnee, and Saunders, the watershed protection and flood contral program has brought a more stable agricultural income, a reduction in highway maintenance costs, urban protection against floods, and gully stabilization.

Much more needs to be done, a fact made clear by these figures:

Nebraska has 247 small watersheds, 187 of which have problems that could be solved by project type work offered under the watershed protection program. Assistance in watershed projects has been requested by 73 communities.

Sixty-four watershed project applications have been approved by the State and sent to the U.S. Department of Agriculture for approval. Twenty projects are in the operations stage, and an additional 13 are getting planning help. An estimated $18 million of Federal funds will be spent in completing projects under construction.

The backlog of applications waiting to be acted on is large. Nebraska's case in this respect mirrors the Nation generally. Federal funds are limited. But more communities should indicate an interest in cooperating in watershed protection projects, and support an expansion of this vital conservation work in this State and across the country.

Henry J. Kaiser Active at 82

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, whether life begins at 82 may be a moot question, but certainly 82 should not be the age of retirement. I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the Honolulu Advertiser:

KAISER JUST CAN'T STAY IN LOW GEAR

(By Bob Krauss)

Eighty-two-year-old industrialist Henry J. Kaiser, ordered by his doctor to stop working 16 hours a day, is as happy about it all as a bear with a thorn in his foot.

"Every day the doctor asks me how many hours I've worked," he snorted yesterday as we drove around Hawaii Kai on an inspection trip in a black-upholstered, air-conditioned Jeep Wagoneer.

"What do you tell him?" I asked.

"The truth," Mr. Kaiser said glumly.

For a long time Kaiser's local doctor has been trying to get him to slow down. But the industrialist, whose worldwide empire is worth over $2 billion, refused to listen until a recent 3-week mainland business trip.

During 1 day of this trip Kaiser arose at his usual 7 a.m., flew in his private plane over a proposed new 87,000-acre Kaiser development near Los Angeles, then continued on to Oakland to spend the rest of the day in continuous business sessions.

Several days later, after he had kept on working, the doctor laid down the law, "Stop working so hard, or else."

"He's been pretty good about it," said Executive Assistant Robert C. (Bob) Elliott yesterday. "Since he came back he's been working at home instead of going to his office at Hawaii Kai."

Yesterday was the first time since his return that Kaiser has ventured off his 7½-acre Portlock estate. He looked very fit in a white sports shoes, white slacks, and a lightweight shirt.

"I want to see the fill," he barked at Jim Nolan, an aid, at the wheel."

"The fill" is a former swamp that is being built up with cinders and coral dredged from the nearby fishpond to serve as land for an addition to the Hawaii Kai Shopping Center.

"They've taken compaction tests. We'll have them by Friday," said Nolan. Kaiser nodded.

Then we bounced back over the bulldozer tracks to a new 750-house subdivision where Kaiser has just spent $1 million installing utilities. Along the way we talked about Kaiser Jeeps. "We sold 200,000 of them last year," he said.

From there we bumped along over a dirt road past a new Hawaii Kai recreation area where workmen were putting finishing touches to an Olympic-sized swimming pool and tennis courts.

We rode along past more swamp that is due for dredging and filling as a marina, then back to the highway where Kaiser pointed out the future location of a large apartment building which will go up at the entrance to Hawaii Kai.

"There's so much work to be done here, so much expansion that is coming," he said. "This year we built 1,000 houses. That's a lot of houses. But not when you think of what's coming. The population of California is 18 million today. In the year 2000 it will be 41 million. That will have a great effect on this area."

"Mr. Kaiser," I said, "I interviewed you about 10 years ago concerning your work schedule. You said you took a notebook to bed with you so you could jot down ideas during the night."

"I don't do that anymore," he answered.

Nolan said, smiling, "Now he picks up the phone and has somebody else take the notes."

"What time do you get up and what time do you go to bed?" I asked.

"I get up at 7 o'clock in the morning and go to bed at midnight," Kaiser answered.

In the back seat, Elliott said, "Before Mr. Kaiser began working from his home * * *."

"Don't call it a home, call it a jail," Henry J. interrupted grumpily. "I don't consider it work. They do but I don't."

I said, "Well, I think you've earned the right to slow down a little."

"What do you want to slow down for?" Henry J. wanted to know. "I don't want to slow down. Now I have 75,000 employes in 125 factories in 27 countries. * * *" His voice trailed off as if he were lost in a wandering thought.

Elliott filled in for him. "The Kaiser Medical Plan now has over 1,200,000 members and there are more than 60 Kaiser hospitals and clinics."

Henry J. came back to us. "I'm going to work this Christmas. Edgar is coming with his family and we'll discuss medical research." Under his breath, he added, "The doctor doesn't know it, yet."

"Mr. Kaiser, have you ever entertained any thoughts about retiring?" I asked.

His voice was curt, "No." Then he added more pleasantly, "I don't see any sense in it as long as you are able to think and give others an opportunity to do things."

As we drove up to the entrance to Kaiser's estate, where an electric eye slides open the iron gate, he said to Nolan, "Be sure and give me those plans for the marina, I want to rest some more."

The USIA, Art and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the U.S. Information Agency has decided to stop its sponsorship of American art at the two most important international art exhibitions, the biennials at Venice, Italy, and São Paulo, Brazil.

This decision is somewhat astounding when one considers the record the United States achieved in the two exhibitions in which the USIA participated. In 1963 the American artist Adolph Gottlieb won first prize at São Paulo, and in 1964 Robert Rauschenberg won top award at Vienna.

Whether or not one appreciates modern art, it must be admitted that winning these two prizes is an outstanding accomplishment and can do the American image among the other nations of the world no harm.

It was not long ago, I remember, when the cultural accomplishments of the United States were represented in a German students' parade by a huge, familiar soft drink bottle. The art awards at the biennials have helped to impress the people of the world that our Nation stands preeminent in the arts just as we do in science and technology.

In the face of all this, however, the USIA has decided to quit. It seems a little like a poker player leaving the game after winning two big hands.

Apparently the USIA made the decision in the name of economy. It will cost approximately $111,000 to sponsor the American exhibit at the 1966 Venice biennial and $69,000 for the 1967 São Paulo showing. I am loath to believe that economies could not have been achieved somewhere else which would have allowed continued participation.

After all, every other nation participating thinks it worthwhile to underwrite the cost of its artists' exhibits. Further, private sources have previously attempted to sponsor the U.S. show, with a notable lack of needed funds—and certainly less success than the USIA.

The situation recently was described by Mr. Frank Getlein in his art column for the New Republic. Mr. Getlein, editorial writer for the Washington Star, believes that the USIA terminated its sponsorship of the exhibits principally out of fear of congressional criticism.

USIA officials were, in other words, trying to save us Philistines from ourselves.

Believing that Congress is not antagonistic toward art, Mr. Speaker, I urge that the USIA take another look at the situation to see if the money can be found which would allow continued participation by the agency in these biennials.

At this point, I would like to include the article by Mr. Getlein which appeared in the April 3 New Republic, and urge the attention of my colleagues to it.

The article follows:

ROGER AND THE RABBITS

There used to be a migratory farmworker named Lenny who, in moments of stress, would ask his buddy, "Tell me about the rabbits, George." And George would spin an implausible yarn about the good times to come when the pair would own their own little piece of ground and Lenny would get to take care of the rabbits. And while the story lasted Lenny never noticed that they were out of work and starving, that the rain was coming down or that the angry mob was getting closer.

It is just possible that Roger Stevens, who is shaping up as this country's answer to André Malraux, is really charged with telling us about the rabbits. Stevens, who is chairman of everything in government having to do with the arts, from the John F. Kennedy Center to the new advisory council, is the man L.B.J. instinctively thinks of when he thinks of art and the reason is plain enough. Stevens is second only to the master himself in conjuring up visions of America as the Athens on the Pedernales in the golden time to come even as the men arrive from the finance company to carry off the icebox.

The other day, for example, Stevens enthralled the Nation with a word picture of live theater in every shopping center, or at least in the larger ones. Why should people in Oshkosh have to journey to New York and pay exorbitant prices to see "Mary, Mary" and other works of theater art? Why indeed? Under the Stevens plan they can stay at home, drop in at their neighborhood shopping center and catch "Barefoot in the Park" between the dry cleaners and the supermarket. What's more, it can be done with a $3 top. The sets can be standard and built by local carpenters, thus spreading around a little prosperity and cutting down rehearsal time and shipping costs. There'll be plenty of free parking—eventually, no doubt, it'll be drive-in live theater. And best of all, it won't really cost any money. It can all come out of FHA insured mortgages. The Government provides only the financial confidence needed, not the actual cash.

This general approach has been criticized by some as an over-concern with buildings and a simple unawareness of what goes on or could go on or ought to go on inside the buildings. Fair comment. It is also fair comment to note the characteristic belief that in the arts you really can get something for nothing, that you can carry on like Pope Julius without every laying out any money at all. But it is preeminently futurism, the story of the rabbits.

For while Stevens was staging his chain-store theater scheme, the men from the finance company were closing out one brief and staggeringly successful fling of the American Government in American art. Early in the New Frontier, Stevens' predecessor of fewer title, August Heckscher, persuaded the United States Information Agency to take up the job of American representation at the two most important international art exhibitions, the biennials at Venice and at Sao Paulo. Before that, for decades, the United States had been represented by various methods. The pavilion at Venice, for example, had been built and run by a New York art dealer, Grand Central Galleries, which eventually turned the building and the job over to the Museum of Modern Art, which more often than not farmed out the exhibition to some other institution. This practice contrasted with that of all other nations represented in both shows, for in all cases the capital investment and the expenses were laid out by the several governments. The feeling of foreigners seemed to be that nations as such had a direct interest in their own art both at home and abroad. Until Heckscher, this was beyond the grasp of American Government officials. Now it has eluded them again.

The record of USIA participation has been spectacular. In 1963 they went to Sao Paulo and came out with the first prize, awarded to Adolph Gottlieb. In 1964 they went to Venice and came out with the first prize, given to Robert Rauschenberg.

In recognition of this remarkable record, top USIA officials, presumably working in close collaboration with the Bureau of the Budget under the Johnsonian anti-frill principle and in permanent holy terror of the Congress, dropped the program completely. The 1965 participation of Sao Paulo, since work has already begun on it, will be allowed to take place. But after that, nothing, in either show. It is the opinion of the budget-composer that the responsibility should be given to the American "art community."

Well, of course, there isn't any American art community in that sense. The lobby doesn't exist. If a Government agency or a secretary to the Senate majority wants to do business with the aerospace or vending machine industry, there is a "community" organized and ready for bids. Not so in art. What the budget really means is that the Great Society, in its actual working, doesn't give a damn about American art and is not about to. The "great socialites" will be glad to hit up Mary Lasker for a few free tulip bulbs to plant along the mall. They will also accept as gifts or long-term loans any approved contemporary art that an artist or dealer wants to present free for hanging in our embassies around the world. A recent breakthrough will apparently allow the executive offices to participate in the same free load, even if the artists haven't been dead 20 years. And in the manner devised by Napoleon, we may expect more medals all around as other artists are tapped to join Willem de Kooning as Great Society painter. But money? No.

The money required is about $80,000 a year to finance American participation in both shows. This would come out of a USIA budget of over $170 million and is thus pretty tiny as these things go. Since the budget was drawn up and submitted before the agency decided to close out various of its sacked libraries, it may be presumed that money could be found even without specific budgetary listing in the event that Congress or the Presidency suddenly decided to back up the golden words with one golden deed.

It used to be standard practice to blame Government indifference or hostility to art on Congress and there was a presumption that Congress was, in however crude a manner, fairly representative of the country's feelings on the subject. Those feelings, if we can believe anything we read, are in the process of change and it is probably true that Congress is less hostile to art than ever. Unfortunately, as far as the USIA programs are concerned, we shall never know. All we know is that whatever the feelings of Congress, the feelings of this agency are negative.

The Museum of Modern Art unloaded the program in the first place because its board felt representation was properly a function of the Government—as it is in all other countries showing art in Venice or Sao Paulo—and because the expenses, tiny for

the USIA, were becoming overwhelming for a single museum. The Modern, therefore, is not going to constitute itself the "art community" and pick up the ball from where USIA's economy fiends have dropped it. The American Federation of Arts in theory could represent the "art community," but in this case almost certainly won't. There is some interest within the Smithsonian Institution, the art apparatus of which—under the title of the National Collection of Fine Arts—is showing a vitality unimaginable a couple of years ago, but the obstacles are formidable since representation of art abroad can hardly be called either research or the instruction of American citizens.

There is an excellent chance that the America of the Great Society will be simply unrepresented at the major international exhibitions after 1965, unless, perhaps, Roger Stevens can work out a no-cost method of getting art shows into shopping centers and shipping a shopping center over as a sample of our culture.

First Anniversary of Establishment of United Republic of Tanzania

SPEECH

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first anniversary of the establishment of the United Republic of Tanzania. On this important day, I want to extend my warmest congratulations to that rising young African nation, to its President, Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere, and to the people of Tanzania. The 26th of April is Union Day in this African nation, rather than Independence Day, because it was on this day just one year ago that the two new African nations of Tanganyika and Zanzibar embarked upon the enormous project of combining their two countries into a single nation.

Nature started Tanzania off with the basic fundamentals with which to build a nation—above all, a vigorous people, important values and traditions deeply imbedded in their society, a variety of mineral and agricultural resources having important developmental potential, and exciting touristic possibilities. Starting with their present endowments, Tanzanians, like our own Nation nearly two centuries ago, have set about working out for themselves the physical, political, and cultural foundations for a thriving new nation.

They, and they alone, have the heavy responsibility for deciding the real future of their nation—the kind of government they want in the longer run; the type of society they should develop as they mature as an independent people in today's world; how much they want to keep of the old and the traditional; how much they would like to bring in of the new and the modern. They must determine how to get the schools, the teachers, the doctors, the hospitals, and the formidable array of other assets they want and need.

As this young nation of Tanzania struggles to create a unified and prosperous nation, we Americans may well feel both nostalgia and admiration. A hundred and seventy years ago and more, we, too, were a small, very new nation going through much of the same struggle with many of the same problems as this young nation now celebrating its first birthday. So today, I ask my fellow Americans to join me in expressing our friendship for the nation and peoples of Tanzania, as they pass this important milestone in their country's history.

He'd Defoliate the Jungle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the startling resemblance which our actions in Vietnam bear to the recommendations of Senator Barry Goldwater has been noted by more than one writer. It is certainly fair to conjecture as to whether or not the courses of action which we are now taking were contemplated by the strategists of the Democratic Party, even while their spokesmen were loudly crying "warmonger" in the late months of 1964. A "before and after" picture of the situation is clearly defined in the column entitled "He'd Defoliate the Jungle" which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of April 1965. The article follows:

HE'D DEFOLIATE THE JUNGLE

As the Democrats never wearied of telling us, Barry Goldwater was a dangerous man. He would spread the fighting in Vietnam, bomb across the 17th parallel into Communist territory, and—horror of horrors—he even thought of defoliating the jungle. Why, before you knew it, we might find ourselves in a—well, in a war.

But, as Art Buchwald has comfortingly pointed out, we were spared all that, and things are in the calm, competent hands of Lyndon Baines Johnson, who would never think of dropping a nuclear bomb on an innocent little girl plucking daisies. What a relief it is.

But somehow this fellow Goldwater must have snuck by the Secret Service men and got into the White House and pressed the panic button, for here we are informed, with every evidence of pride, that U.S. airmen have tried to start the biggest jungle barbecue in history.

Having first doused the whole forest with chemicals to kill shrubbery so that the fire would burn more swiftly, a fleet of 75 aircraft swept back over the Boi Loi jungle and splattered tons of petrol, jellied gasoline, and incendiary bombs on the woods, starting an immense fire aimed at rooting out the entrenched Communist forces infesting the forest.

The fire was intended to defoliate an area 50 miles square, and got off to a roaring start which caused one happy American military spokesman to chortle that "it was going great." It burned steadily for 12 hours, but then the heat of the flames produced a thunderstorm which doused the biggest conflagration since the Chicago fire. We suppose that this will not discourage Dr. Strangewater from trying again, for, as a certain reckless politician once said, "When you remove the foliage, you remove the cover."

Well, we must join Mr. Buchwald in rejoicing that we have a man in the White House who would never do such things.

A More Accurate Look at the Rayburn Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, for some time now since the Rayburn House Office Building has been opened to the press and public, a deluge of criticism has been heaped upon it. The press reports would lead one to believe that the 169 senior Representatives who sought tenancy in the modern building were thoroughly disenchanted and straining to get out.

A more accurate picture of the situation is reflected in an editorial which appeared in our congressional newspaper, Roll Call, on April 22.

The author of the article, Roll Call editor and publisher, Sidney Yudain, is probably one of the most astute reporters of the Capitol scene, having been participating in, observing and interpreting congressional activities for some 15 years. The phenomenal 10-year success of Roll Call and its acceptance by the Congress as its "official paper" is due in large part to its grasp of congressional sentiment and feeling, often beyond the reach of other publications.

I believe Mr. Yudain has done a service to the Congress and to the public in pointing out that aside from a few annoyances common to every new home occupant, Congressmen are, as a whole, well pleased with the beauty, efficiency, and setup of their new functional offices. I believe that Mr. Yudain also voices the prevailing opinion of the taxpaying citizens when he points out that upon visiting these offices they are consumed with pride in the facilities provided for their elected Representatives.

The editorial follows:

IN THEIR HEARTS

Now that the rumbling and grumbling over the Rayburn House Office Building has risen to a crescendo, let's take a good, honest look into what the situation really is.

No doubt the building is expensive. No one denies that costs mounted throughout the construction due to unforeseen changes. Even after construction, myriad faults were found and corrected at additional expense.

But now the lucky 169 Congressmen and a variety of committees have moved into the spacious quarters. What is the honest-to-goodness reaction of those actually occupying the building?

Some few are discontented about some facets of their new quarters. But in their hearts, they know they've never had it so good.

Most of the Representatives are tickled pink over their new quarters. Some staffers

aren't satisfied with their lodging, but then, the offices were built for efficiency first. And with the bountiful filing space, the machine rooms, and roach-free surrounding, staffers are likely to grow to like their new homes almost as much as their bosses like theirs.

The Congressmen's suites are beautiful and impressive, yet not gaudy or ostentatious. Whoever propagated the idea that servants of the people had to be ensconsed in hovels less attractive than the lowliest business executive?

Constituents generally are pleased and impressed with their Congressmen's quarters. After all, as employers of these governmental representatives, they take pride in seeing them comfortable and outfitted with the tools they need to work in their behalf.

Sure, a lot of money was spent, and some of it was wasted. But we have to admit that the end result is a building that represents the majesty and the glory of this rich Nation, a respect for the high office of a U.S. Congressman by the countrymen who benefit by his labors.

Let's have a Rayburn Appreciation Week. Perhaps it could coincide with Let's Be Honest Week.

Pittsburgh Research: Key to Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of Members of the House to two more chapters in the interesting story "Pittsburgh Research: Key to Tomorrow." These deal with research facilities and research results.

PITTSBURGH RESEARCH: KEY TO TOMORROW

RESEARCH FACILITIES

Pittsburgh is known as the research headquarters for such industrial giants as the United States Steel Corp., Westinghouse Electric Corp., Aluminum Co. of America, Gulf Oil Corp., and Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

Considerably more research activity is going on in Pittsburgh. More than a hundred other industrial laboratories, three major universities, two outstanding Federal research facilities, and one of the leading research institutes are in the area.

The area has the most modern pilot plant facility in the food industry at H. J. Heinz Co.; the Nation's newest rapid transit research center at Westinghouse Air Brake Co.; the world's largest manufacturer-distributor of laboratory instruments and reagent chemicals at Fisher Scientific Co.; and a pioneering research and development center for astronomical and missile tracking telescopes at the J. W. Fecker division of American Optical Co.

Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory is the Nation's pacesetter in nuclear power reactor design and fabrication research. The U.S. Bureau of Mines has the most complete research facilities in the mineral industries at its Pittsburgh laboratories.

Each year, Pittsburgh's research and development capabilities are being expanded even further with new or enlarged facilities, such as the new space sciences center at the University of Pittsburgh, process laboratory at Crucible Steel Co. of America, high voltage laboratories at Westinghouse Electric Corp. and McGraw-Edison Co., and the most modern research complex at Alcoa.

RESEARCH RESULTS

The effectiveness of Pittsburgh's research and development efforts has been demonstrated repeatedly through significant basic discoveries, the development of new products and processes, and unique applications of existing knowledge.

University of Pittsburgh scientists, for example, have been responsible for the first industrial applications of spectroscopy, advanced bomb release mechanisms, and the Salk polio vaccine.

Research at Mellon Institute has led to the founding of a number of industries, such as synthetic rubber, plastics, and petrochemicals, and many large companies, including Union Carbide Chemicals Co., Plaskon Co., and Dow-Corning Corp.

Pittsburgh industrial laboratories also have contributed to technological progress. Their developments have covered such varied areas as nuclear power, super alloys, missile tracking systems, high voltage transmission, and scientific instruments.

In the 1963 I–R 100 competition sponsored by Industrial Research magazine, the Pittsburgh area was responsible for 10 of the 100 most significant technical products of the year.

Products cited were: variable transmission glass by Mellon Institute and Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.; martensitic stainless steel by Crucible Steel Co. of America; distillation gas analyzer and BTDA cross-linking agent for epoxy resins by Gulf Research & Development Co.; neutron gamma spectrometry plates and a low-cost laser by Semi-Elements Inc.; and self-lubricating materials, superconducting MHD generator, high intensity light source, and an epoxy laminate by Westinghouse Electric Corp.

Medicare Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Apr. 10, 1965]

MEDICARE VICTORY

Passage by the House of the $6 billion health care-social security bill is a triple victory. First it is a personal triumph for President Lyndon B. Johnson, who wanted positive action before Easter. Second, it is a success for the backers of progress in the field of social legislation. And third, it is a vindication of faith in the principle that government should help citizens take care of themselves.

The 313 to 115 House vote in favor of the bill, almost a 3-to-1 margin, indicates supporters have done their work well. The Senate is expected to follow with similar favorable action, putting into law the greatest expansion and revision of the social security system since the depression.

Under the measure, U.S. citizens over the age of 65 would have access to a hospital plan financed under social security by payroll tax increases. The elderly also would be afforded the opportunity of an insurance plan they can afford, a $3 a month optional program to pay for doctor bills and some other medical expenses.

In addition, the measure would liberalize social security old age benefits.

President Johnson described the triple victory accurately. He said: "This demonstrates once again the vitality of our democratic system in responding to the needs and will of the people."

It also proves the wrongness of the opposition of the American Medical Association which continues to be reluctant to support fulfillment of these needs and this will.

Gardner "Pat" Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in any generation a man with the courage of his convictions and the daring and wit to express them is a rare phenomenon.

When a man of foresight and vision dares to differ with the majority of his neighbors and friends, he is frequently subjected to ridicule and even outright malice. Only the strong will persist and carry a principle to its conclusion. Such a man was Gardner "Pat" Jackson, whose death on April 17 takes from us a crusading journalist.

Pat Jackson's zealous championship of the underdog brought him hardship, and even physical suffering, but it also brought him the admiration and gratitude of countless people.

I would like to include a summary of Pat Jackson's career and an editorial in tribute to him which appeared in the Washington Post in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 22, 1965]

GARDNER JACKSON

Gardner Jackson—he was Pat Jackson to everyone who knew him—represented an essentially romantic and crusading tradition in journalism and in politics. The role of detached observer was not for him. He was a part of all that he experienced, a profoundly involved mover and participant. Thus, as a young newspaperman in Boston during the 1920's, he became involved in the Sacco-Vanzetti case and took a leading role in that bitter controversy. As a reporter in Washington during the earliest days of the New Deal, he soon found himself caught up in the excitement of its reforms and directly engaged in its internal struggles. The same course characterized his relations with the turmoil in the labor movement of the 1940's.

To every cause with which he was connected, Pat Jackson gave himself unstintingly. He brought to all that he did an extraordinary exuberance and commitment, a sense of ardor and of passionate conviction. His death at 68 takes from the Washington scene a most colorful and attractive figure. If he belonged somewhat more to an exciting past than to the present, he belongs none the less richly today to those who shared that past with him and cherish him as one of its authentic heroes.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 18, 1965]

STORMY CAREER ENDS FOR GARDNER JACKSON

(By Willard Clopton, Washington Post staff writer)

Gardner (Pat) Jackson, 68, once called "the champion of lost causes" for his zealous

support of the underdog, died early yesterday at Washington Hospital Center.

In 45 years as a newspaperman, public official, and union executive, Mr. Jackson crusaded for such causes as Sacco and Vanzetti, the southern sharecroppers, the Spanish Royalists, the American Indian, the bonus marchers and civil liberties in general.

His persistence cost him several jobs, his inherited wealth, and the sight of one eye.

Born in Colorado Springs, son of a Western railroad magnate, Mr. Jackson had lived in Washington more than 30 years. His home was at 1410 29th Street, NW.

One morning in 1921, when he was a fledgling reporter on the Boston Globe, his wife Dorothy, looked up from the paper and said, "Pat, there's something strange about this trial down in Dedham. Why don't you see if you can find out anything about it."

The trial was that of Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, two immigrant Italian anarchists accused of a payroll robbery and murder the year before.

Mr. Jackson became curious about the lack of hard evidence against the two and was soon convinced that they were on trial mainly for their political beliefs. He did much to bring the case to national attention.

He began giving more and more of his time to the case and in 1926 quit the Globe to become secretary of the Sacco-Vanzetti Defense Committee.

After the two were executed in 1927 he returned to the Globe, but came to Washington in 1930 to become correspondent for several Canadian papers.

Three years later, he was recruited by the New Deal as assistant consumer's counsel in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, set up to help farmers hurt by the depression.

While Agriculture Secretary Henry A. Wallace was concentrating on aiding farmers who owned their lands, Mr. Jackson and some other aids began focusing instead on the problems of tenant farmers.

Their divergent interests led in 1935 to the "Wallace purge," in which Mr. Jackson and the others were fired.

Several years later he was re-hired by Agriculture Secretary Claude Wickard, but in 1943 again was dismissed after pushing too hard for expansion of the Farm Security Administration, which focused its efforts on helping the small subsistence farmer.

An element in both firings was a suspicion that the outspoken official had leaked inside information to the press.

Mr. Jackson had by this time become a confidante of official Washington and his counsel was sought frequently by Cabinet officers, Supreme Court Justices, even the White House.

For several years in the 1930's and 1940's, Mr. Jackson did organizational work for the CIO, first under John L. Lewis and then under the late Philip Murray. He was active in helping to eliminate Communist influence from the organization after World War II.

In 1944, he was attacked outside a Greenwich Village restaurant and suffered a vicious beating, which caused him to lose the sight of one eye. The assault was believed linked to his anti-Communist activity.

The son of William S. Jackson, banker and owner of the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad, Mr. Jackson lived in Colorado until coming East to attend Amherst College.

After 2½ years there he entered the Army, which assigned him to a machinegun company in Georgia until after the end of World War I. He spent a year afterward at Columbia University before joining the Globe.

In the 1940's, Mr. Jackson spent 2 years covering Washington for the now defunct newspaper, PM. In recent years, he had been a freelance writer and labor consultant.

Mr. Jackson is survived by his wife; three sons, Gardner, Jr., and Geoffrey of Boston and Everett of Cape Cod; a daughter, Mrs. Raymond Smith of Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y., and seven grandchildren.

A memorial service will be held at 11 a.m. Monday at Gawler's Funeral Home, Wisconsin Avenue and Harrison Street NW. Burial will be private.

Mr. Whitten and "Silent Spring"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, much attention has been directed to the pesticide problem. One of those responsible for a greater awareness on the part of the public to the dangers inherent in the use of such chemicals was the late Rachel Carson, author of "Silent Spring."

Her warnings led to reviews and revisions of the methods used in pest control, and it has been conclusively proved that the indiscriminate use of such insecticides and pesticides has resulted in widespread pollution and damage to fish and wildlife.

I was interested, therefore, in reading an editorial which appeared in today's New York Times, and I am inserting it herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the contents of the same might be available to my colleagues and to those who read the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

MR. WHITTEN AND "SILENT SPRING"

The report of the House Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, criticizing the late Rachel Carson and her book "Silent Spring," comes as no surprise. Last August, about the same time that he launched his so-called investigation of the pesticides problem, Chairman JAMIE L. WHITTEN of this group described as a "witch hunt" the official concern about chemical residues on foodstuffs.

In his position as chairman of the subcommittee which passes on the billions spent in the Federal farm programs, Mr. WHITTEN has acted through the years as the Department of Agriculture's extension agent to Congress. The Department's pest-control officials, already wounded by Miss Carson's barbs, have been hurt further by the mounting evidence that some of the chemicals they used and so strongly endorsed have been polluting the environment and causing widespread damage to fish and wildlife.

The findings of Mr. WHITTEN's investigators collide sharply with those of the White House Science Advisory Committee, which in May of 1963 issued a report corroborating Miss Carson's warnings and calling for drastic changes in Government pest-control and pesticide procedures.

Fortunately, under prodding by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, the Department has been shifting its research emphasis to biological controls and other nonchemical methods. Some Federal agencies that engage in insect control operations, notably Mr. Freeman's own Forest Service, have been changing to safer methods, abandoning in large measure the use of persistent, pollution-causing compounds such as DDT.

Now it will be necessary for Secretary Freeman to be alert to see that some of his departmental bureaucrats do not seize upon the Whitten report as an excuse to revert to old errors.

Merit Means Most for Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, we have now had sufficient time to observe the appointments of Cabinet members by President Johnson and have had an opportunity to note the type and caliber of individuals that he has called upon to serve in leadership capacities in his administration.

It becomes clear that President Johnson is setting a premium on ability and experience. The American public has also had an opportunity to evaluate these selections and an editorial in the Beaumont Enterprise, an outstanding newspaper published in southeast Texas, reflects the opinion of most thoughtful Americans about the members of the Johnson Cabinet:

OUTLINE OF A CABINET

Henry Hamill Fowler, new Secretary of the Treasury, joins John Connor, Secretary of Commerce, and Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Attorney General, as Cabinet appointees of President Johnson. Now the outline of the Johnson Cabinet—as distinguished from the Kennedy Cabinet which Johnson inherited—emerges.

The most significant characteristic of the administration leaders is the fact that they are men who can get the job done. Whatever else they are seems second to that. (Doubtless that is why Johnson has retained so many Kennedy men so long.)

That Fowler was such a man has already been proved in business, politics, and government. As Under Secretary of the Treasury in early 1964, his aid in helping to guide the tax reduction bill into law was especially noteworthy. Of course, that he was a loyal Democrat was not overlooked. But Johnson's is not a Cabinet in which politics is an overriding factor.

Conner, former head of a drug manufacturing firm, was registered as a Republican in 1960, though he campaigned for Johnson in 1964. And Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense and undoubtedly a bona fide member of Johnson's Cabinet, though he was a Kennedy appointee, was and perhaps still is a Republican. In fact, more than one member of the GOP, including David Rockefeller, New York banker and brother of New York's Governor, was considered for the Treasury post before Fowler was selected.

It is evident, also, that Johnson is not concerned with gathering around him in the Cabinet old acquaintances. In fact, some of his Texas cronies were rejected for the Attorney General's post in favor of Katzenbach, unknown in Government less than 5 years ago and probably unknown to Johnson until even more recently. However, as Deputy Attorney General under Robert Kennedy, the former law professor proved his capability, and the word from Washington is that Johnson believed he had earned the privilege to succeed Kennedy.

That a Cabinet post can be earned and that it is not necessarily a partisan post, and that the best qualified, not best friends, should hold the top jobs are commendable ideas, carried on from the Kennedy government, but not always evinced in former administrations. We hope future appointments will be made as wisely.

Our Day of Conformity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, the Pensacola, Fla., Kiwanis Club held its annual public speaking contest for the members of the 4-H Club. The winner in the boys' division was Eddie Seales, a 17-year-old student at Ernest Ward High School in Escambia County, Fla. I feel that this young man has presented some most important views in his statement, and I think that his speech is extraordinarily good. I am extremely proud of Eddie Seales, pleased with his recognition of the many problems which confront our great Nation, and highly gratified by his devotion to make these United States a better place in which to live. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I submit herewith this young man's speech for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The speech follows:

OUR DAY OF CONFORMITY

Ladies, Kiwanians, guest fellow 4-H'ers and fellow contestant, in our present day world of hustle and bustle, conformity is sweeping our country. While more and more people want to take seats in the grandstand, fewer and fewer people want to sweat it out down on the field. People today do not want to get involved in anything that might give them a little responsibility or cause themselves a little inconvenience. It seems to me that we are looking for everything to be made simple and easy for us. In the past quarter century noninvolvement has become an accepted way of life for many American citizens.

In New York City—not too many weeks ago—a woman was stabbed several times in the presence of a number of people and not a single person offered to come to her rescue. No one bothered to even call the police. Most of them stated that it was none of their business and why should they stick out their necks? I wonder how those people felt after they had witnessed such a crime and did not even offer to defend this poor victim. I wonder if they slept well after it happened. They probably justified it in their own minds with a lot of cowardly excuses. It seems to me that the consciences of most people today seems to play a very small role in their everyday activities.

Today we are living in a country quite different from the one that our great ancestors loved so much. Some parents have successfully defended in court their children's right to ignore the American Flag Salute. Faculties and student bodies have found it distasteful to publicly take an oath of loyalty to their country, and our Government has taken away the privilege of reading the Bible in our public schools.

These United States was once the greatest exporter of ideas the world has ever known. We created and sold abroad the idea of individual dignity, responsibility and freedom. We created the idea of government of the people, by the people and for the people. But now most people seem to think that an honest man is either a fool or a liar. Many people say, let Jack do it, or what's in it for me?

Today we have a very thought provoking race problem that affects every citizen in this Nation. However, there has been a race problem almost since the beginning of time and almost everyone has a different opinion about it. This country has gotten to the point that Congress or the Federal Government feels that only they have the knowledge, understanding and wisdom to settle the problems of local people in their own local communities. The Supreme Court takes away laws from one group in order to satisfy a few fanatics. They raise a little fuss or lay down in the streets and the Supreme Court or Congress comes forth with a new law in order to keep them happy, content and satisfied. Our rights are gradually being taken from our reach. The Constitution upon which this country was founded has very little meaning any more.

Here in the United States we also have freedom of the press. This is good and very well taken advantage of. The news media publishes only what they can sell. Very often the truth is twisted until there is very little truth left in it. One area of the country releases one story and another area releases just the opposite view to please its readers. I am sure it must be hard to release a news article without being prejudiced toward one group of people over the other.

Nowadays if you love your country you are considered a square. Someone has gone far enough to describe a square as the person who never learned to get away with anything or perhaps he is the Joe who volunteers when he doesn't have to. He is burdened down with old fashioned ideas of honesty, loyalty, courage and thrift. This person may already be on his way to extinction.

It seems to me that the force of government is now directed toward the security of the weak rather than to the encouragement of the strong. In business someone has said that the way to survive is to emulate the turtle by growing a hard shell and never sticking your neck out. Just as a young man in the army was taught by his fellows to keep his mouth shut, his bowels open and never volunteer.

Arnold Toynbee, a famous historian once said that of the 21 notable civilizations, 19 perished not from external conquest; but from the evaporation of belief within.

Today too many of us are still sitting it out rather than sweating it out. Too many of us haven't got the "guts" to stand up and be counted. Responsibilities and problems roll off nice and easy and we travel along the paths with the fewest bumps, being careful to stay in the middle of the road, because that's where the most comfortable ruts are.

Too many of us know the short cuts and too few of us actually know or care where the path leads, too few of us dare to leave the path because the path is always the easy way and the way most people go.

When Ben Franklin was told that the war for independence was over he made this remark: "Say rather the war for the Revolution is over—the war for independence has yet to be fought." And today 179 years later—the war for independence has still to be fought.

Thank you.

The Future of the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have included in the RECORD the graphic statement of the mounting demand for stronger action to combat water pollution of the Great Lakes. As the author of one of the most important amendments to the Water Quality Act of 1965, my colleague and friend, the gentleman from New York, RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, is fast distinguishing himself as a real fighter for clean water. The 39th District of New York can be justly proud of the bright, industrious leader that they have sent to Congress. I hope that he will long serve them and us.

The statement follows:

THE FUTURE OF THE GREAT LAKES

(By RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, U.S. Representative, 39th District, New York, at junior chamber of commerce banquet, Cordon Bleu Restaurant, Buffalo, N.Y.)

Tonight, I would like to share with you some of my thoughts on a problem that I regard as the most urgent of our times.

The problem to which I refer, in a word is, water.

Water is the lifeblood of this Niagara frontier. Without Lake Erie, there would be no Buffalo—there would be no Erie County—as we know it. Without Lake Erie many of us would not even exist today. For without it, our forebears would not have had an economic reason to come here, marry, and settle down. In my own case, this is so. It was in 1822 that my great, great grandfather came here to work on the Erie Canal. Since then, all six generations of my family have, at various times, in one way or another, earned their livelihoods from activities connected with the lake.

Water is vital to our commerce * * * to our manufacturing plants * * * to our recreation. Most important, water is vital to sustaining life. Water truly is Buffalo's most precious resource. Lake Erie is like a great goddess, brooding over the vast metropolis she spawned. Brooding indeed, for we have been extremely careless with this precious resource.

Lake Erie is so terribly polluted that it is in danger of becoming worthless for many purposes. And Lake Erie problems are compounded by the fact that the level of the lake is at the lowest point in many years.

Pollution of fresh water supplies is not a problem that is peculiar to Buffalo—or to Lake Erie. This is a national problem.

As the late Rachel Carson observed in her well-known book, "Silent Spring."

In an age when man has forgotten his origins and has neglected even his most essential needs for survival, "water along with other resources has become the victim of his indifference."

Our Nation uses about 300 billion gallons of water per day—out of a total manageable supply of 1,200 billion gallons a day. And our consumption is rising fantastically. It is estimated that by 1980 the United States will be consuming 600 billion gallons of water per day—twice as much as we using now.

We no longer can afford to be indifferent about our water.

The problem in Lake Erie isn't something that is going to reach a critical stage 10, 15, or 20 years in the future. The problem is critical now. We should have acted before this.

Already, some experts are wondering whether it is too late to save Lake Erie.

I am not that pessimistic. I certainly am not about to throw up my hands in despair. But I do believe that we need to pledge all our skills, all our imagination, to seeking solutions to this perplexing problem.

During my campaign for election last fall, I talked a lot about pollution. During the 3½ months I have been a Member of Congress, I have been trying very hard to do something about it.

I have sponsored legislation in the House of Representatives that is designed to

strengthen the role of the Federal Government—and enhance the Federal-State-local partnership—in fighting water pollution in western New York and elsewhere.

My communications with the people of Erie County show that 70 percent of the citizens in the 39th Congressional District agree with me that a strong Federal program is needed.

Yet, the deeper I get into water, the more I question whether even a strong Federal program, intermeshed with State and local programs, will in the long run be adequate to solve all the problems of Lake Erie.

Let's take a quick look at some vital geographical factors.

Lake Erie touches the borders of four States—New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan. A huge portion of Lake Erie's shoreline lies in the Province of Ontario.

Lake Erie is not just the concern of the United States. The fortunes of this body of water are of immense importance to both the United States and Canada.

The fortunes of Lake Erie also are closely tied to the other Great Lakes—Ontario, Huron, Michigan, and Superior. And these other lakes, in turn, affect the well-being of millions of people in other States and other Provinces.

Therefore, it seems to me that when we reflect on the problems of Lake Erie, we must do so in the context of the entire Great Lakes Basin.

Within this huge basin reside 27 million people. Touching these lakes are 15 cities with populations in excess of 100,000.

Pollution is a serious matter in the Great Lakes, but it is not the only problem. Another problem that probably is just as serious is the level of the lakes.

As I reminded you earlier, Lake Erie is at its lowest level in many years. This is a problem that is shared by the other Great Lakes.

Man can be blamed for pollution—but he is not responsible, at least not in a significant way, for rising and falling lake levels. Nature causes this fluctuation, but man must somehow learn to live with it—or perhaps try to do something about it.

Many people—myself included—are disturbed by the present low level of Lake Erie. It dropped almost 5 feet from 1952 to 1964.

This is a serious matter—but it is less shocking when viewed from a long-range perspective.

Lake Erie was lower in 1936 than it is today. When you look at records for the past 100 years, you discover up-and-down trends in rainfall in the Great Lakes Basin—and that the level of the lakes generally follows the precipitation patterns.

Present problems don't stem from the fact that anything unusual is happening to lake levels. Rather, our difficulties stem from our increasing dependence on the lakes.

As more and more people depend on the lake for more and more pursuits, it becomes increasingly necessary that we receive a so-called normal amount of rainfall to keep the lakes at a so-called normal level.

Nature, unfortunately, doesn't operate that way. Wild fluctuations from the "normal" are in themselves normal.

One hundred years ago a sharp drop in the lake levels was inconvenient. Today the same occurrence could prove disastrous.

The problems of pollution and low lake levels are not separate and distinct. They very definitely are linked.

It is obvious, I think, that when the amount of water in a lake decreases, pollution problems are increased.

There are some who think that the ultimate answer to pollution in Lake Erie lies in seeking means to develop faster turnover of the water in the lake.

Preventing pollutants, in the form of municipal and industrial wastes, from entering the lake is an obvious necessity. And the legislation I have sponsored in the House of Representatives is designed to check the flow of wastes into Lake Erie. In time, with local and State cooperation, this can be done.

But—even if this program is completely successful—there are serious doubts that it will succeed in actually abating pollution in Lake Erie. Scientists say that stopping wastes from entering the lake will only prevent the Lake Erie problem from becoming much worse.

There are various possibilities for actually abating pollution—none of them simple or cheap.

Scientists have discovered that the oxygen supply has been depleted in a vast portion of Lake Erie by algae—which apparently are prospering because pollutants, in the form of nitrogen and phosphorus, have given them an abundant food supply. So, one step in controlling pollution would be to dredge the algae from the lake and bury it in adjacent ground. Another would be to recharge the lake's water supply.

More water for the Great Lakes would abate pollutants by flushing them out. The infusion of more water, on a controlled basis, would make it possible to stabilize and regulate lake levels and more water would provide for the increasing needs of the growing United States and Canadian populations in the Great Lakes Basin.

How could such a solution be brought about? Where would we get the water to permit faster turnover in Lake Erie? The only source for the vast quantity of water that would be needed to implement such a scheme is our northern neighbor, Canada.

The ultimate solution lies in diverting water into the Great Lakes from rivers that flow into Hudson's Bay.

The political and economic problems of such a grand scheme are enormous. The technical difficulties that would be encountered stagger the imagination.

The costs, obviously, will run into many, many millions of dollars. And they should be shared by the United States and Canada in proportion to the benefits each would receive. It is obvious that both nations would realize enormous benefits from such a vast project. But only Canada has the water that both countries need.

The problems would be gigantic—but the benefits very probably would be equally gigantic.

We must recognize that we face some very serious handicaps in making sweeping, long-range plans for the Great Lakes.

Basically, these handicaps fall into two categories. On the one hand, we have a multitude of legitimate and reasonable vested interests, both public and private, in the lakes. On the other hand, we have a multitude of agencies that in one way or another are involved in the management of the lakes.

A good many entities—the State of New York, for instance, have both a vested interest and a hand in management.

Sadly lacking is any agency with the authority and the capability to look at the problems of the Great Lakes from an overall perspective and chart overall goals and the means of attaining them.

The need for such an agency is clearly indicated when we consider the deep interdependence of the water users on the lakes. The Chicago area, for instance, depends on Lake Michigan in various ways and would like to divert more water from the lake. Chicago's needs cannot be argued, but if Chicago diverts more water, this will affect the level of Lake Erie at Cleveland, aggravate the pollution problem at Detroit, and reduce power-generating capacity at Niagara Falls. Lower levels in harbors mean that shipping firms cannot load their boats to full capacity—thus increasing shipping costs per ton.

The principal coordinating agency for the lakes is the International Joint Commission, which was created by a treaty between the United States and Canada in 1909. The International Joint Commission's sphere of interest extends all across the long boundary between our Nation and Canada.

I definitely am not critical of the International Joint Commission. This is a distinguished body with many accomplishments to its credit.

The difficulty with the International Joint Commission, as presently organized, is that it lacks effective teeth. The International Joint Commission is an instrument of the United States and Canadian Governments and is empowered to inquire into and coordinate matters referred it by the two Governments.

We might expand the powers of the International Joint Commission or some other agency or agencies. Or we might create a new body. And this is what I propose: A new international agency whose sole concern is the Great Lakes.

One model we might consider using for guidance in establishing a planning and development body for the Great Lakes is the Arctic Institute—a creation of the United States and Canada that has been notably successful.

Setting up a similar institute for the Great Lakes was one of the possibilities suggested by Michel Chevalier in a distinguished treatise he wrote. Mr. Chevalier, who is from Montreal, wrote the paper in connection with research he has been conducting at the University of Pennsylvania.

The Arctic Institute was incorporated in 1945 in both the United States and Canada. Legally, it is two separate bodies. But it shares the same Board of Directors and the same staff.

Strictly speaking, the Institute has no direct link with either Government. But, in fact, senior officials of both Governments have been active in the Arctic Institute.

The Institute is considered the authoritative body on research and planning on the Arctic.

The problems of the Arctic and the Great Lakes are scarcely comparable. But I think there is a possibility that an agency modeled after the Arctic Institute might be a way to grapple with the problems of the Great Lakes.

In any case, present planning facilities for the Great Lakes are inadequate. Something needs to be done—and what we should be doing now is considering various alternatives.

I was heartened by the statements of President Johnson and Canadian Prime Minister Pearson following their recent meeting at Camp David, Md.

They discussed the problems of the Great Lakes—including pollution and water levels—and they considered possibilities of working out an agreement between the two nations to help solve these problems.

It is not my purpose tonight to propose any final solutions.

But I want to stress that the Great Lakes, and the Canadians and Americans who depend on them, face some grave problems. And I also want to stress that as things now stand we do not have the means to cope with these problems. I am hopeful that talks between the executive branches of both countries will lead to agreements and, possibly, to a new United States-Canadian treaty.

My purpose tonight is to focus public attention on the problem in order to stimulate public discussion in the United States and Canada. For it will be public opinion finally that will persuade both governments to reach an agreement for joint, long-range research, planning and development of the future uses of the Great Lakes.

We dare not wait. The threat that the world's largest supply of fresh water will become one vast dead sea is too ominous.

The time for action is now.

Knock on Wood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist, Joseph Alsop, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 16, 1965.

Despite unjustified criticism, it should be apparent that President Johnson's policy in Vietnam is having the desired effect.

The article follows:

KNOCK ON WOOD

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—In a bitter, hard-fought war, and especially in a guerrilla war, nothing is rarer than a reliable firsthand report on the problems and state of mind of the other side. Nothing like this has been forthcoming, in all the many weeks since the first American air attacks on North Vietnam.

Now, however, a remarkably vivid glimpse through the bamboo curtain has suddenly been provided by a series of articles in the Leftwing Paris weekly, "L'Express," by a French newspaperman who has specialized in Far Eastern affairs, Georges Chaffard. These pieces, first spotted in this country by the astute Crosby Noyes, are so encouraging that one hastens to knock on wood as one reads them.

The encouragement is all the greater because a more unexpected source of encouragement could hardly be imagined. Chaffard is even further to the Left than "L'Express" and a hopeful appraisal of American policy in southeast Asia is an unheard of intellectual commodity among European Leftwingers.

Chaffard's appraisal is based, furthermore, on the kind of firsthand observation from which Americans are debarred. On this round, he did not visit Hanoi, but he quite recently spent much time there. On this round, he went to Cambodia, and thence moved up to join the Vietcong in the jungle, and to talk with the leaders of the so-called liberation front at their hidden jungle headquarters.

The headline put on Chaffard's articles by "L'Express"—"The Vietcong Now Fear Defeat"—is a good summary of the total impression conveyed. The first point that Chaffard emphasizes is the way the American decision to carry the war to the north has completely upset the strategy of the Communists, who never believed that this was possible.

Point two is the degree to which this decision has changed the climate. "American determination," says Chaffard, has caused everyone to reflect a bit.

Second thoughts have been especially common in the group of greatest importance to the Communists—the wavering people in the middle who were getting ready to back the Communists because they expected the Communists to win in the end.

Third, Chaffard describes the Vietcong as being forced, by the new American decision, to redouble their efforts at the very moment when American air and other operations are significantly reducing the flow of military supplies and other urgently needed aid from North Vietnam. Chaffard's emphasis on the effectiveness of the U.S. effort to slow the supplyflow amounts to news of the first order; for no one had been sure that this effort was having any effect at all.

Fourth, Chaffard reports Vietcong withdrawal, now in progress, from very large and important areas of South Vietnam, for the purpose of regrouping in the less vulnerable mountainous regions north of Saigon. He actually compares this withdrawal with the Communists' pretended departure from South Vietnam in 1954.

Fifth, Chaffard describes the Vietcong in the south as seriously troubled by the war weariness of some of their adherents. And he portrays the North Vietnamese as fearful, above all, of just the kind of carefully targeted bombing that President Johnson has ordered, which will destroy the fruit of "10 years of desperately hard work and sacrifice."

To this, one must add with great emphasis that Chaffard nowhere predicts abandonment of the struggle by the guerrillas in the south, nor does he forecast acceptance by the North Vietnamese of terms that would also be acceptable to the United States. Instead, he quotes defiant statements by the liberation front and the northern Communist bosses.

He also says, however, that the "facade of intransigence is not lacking in cracks," whether among the guerrillas or in North Vietnam. He shows evidence that in some quarters in the north, negotiations to end the struggle are already desired.

In sum, he does not say that the U.S. effort is succeding now, or assert that it is going to succeed later. But he specifically credits the U.S. effort with getting almost exactly the results that have been hoped for, at this particular stage, by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and his planners in the Pentagon and in Saigon.

President Johnson's policy and its implementation to date have not previously received a stronger implied endorsement from a more curious or more convincing source. That does not mean the Vietnamese war will be easily terminated. Much rougher times, perhaps quite serious reverses, may now lie ahead. But it does mean that what Chaffard calls "American determination" is neither empty nor ineffectual.

The Lonely War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, for more than 2 years, I have been advocating the application of veterans benefits to our fighting men who are serving in combat zones, such as Vietnam.

The situations there are as grave and arduous as those experienced by servicemen in World War II and Korea and these men are to be commended for the gallant way in which they are struggling in southeast Asia and provided with the rewards of a grateful Nation.

This situation is brought home even more clearly than ever in an article by Charles W. Wiley in the May 1965 edition of the American Legion magazine. Mr. Wiley describes the life of American servicemen in the Mekong Delta with clarity and compassion. I would like to share this with my colleagues by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE LONELY WAR IN VIETNAM

(By Charles W. Wiley)

(NOTE.—An intimate report on the lives of four GI's at an isolated outpost of the Mekong Delta portrays the new kind of war.)

Americans serving in the field in Vietnam are fighting the most terrible and loneliest war that the United States has ever been in. Outside the cities and large military bases, the GI is in danger every minute of every day. He can never relax. At night he must fight a more-or-less conventional guerrilla war. During the day he must be constantly on guard against a terror attack. It isn't even entirely safe in Saigon or at our largest bases.

This is a new kind of war in Vietnam, unlike anything that we've experienced before. There's no "front" in the sense that we ordinarily think of one—a frontline; then support positions (mortars, etc.) farther back; then, often miles from the first line, artillery; and finally a safe rear area for reserves, rest, command, and supply services. The American military sleeping in the barracks in the big hotel that was blown up in Saigon a couple of months ago were about as "far back" as you could get. Out in the more conventional combat areas, what stands for a normal frontline, are a number of isolated positions, frequently encircled as well as infiltrated. There, infantry, support units, and artillery are all jammed together, sometimes side by side. Each unit is normally somewhat in the position of the Lost Battalion of World War I with respect to its disposition. The enemy is everywhere—and nowhere.

Even worse than the fact that there is no fixed front is the fact that there is no way of distinguishing friend and foe. When an American goes down a country road or walks through a village marketplace, every single person whom he passes may be the enemy. The peasant in the field, peacefully working with a hoe, may be a Communist terrorist with a submachinegun hidden in the grass 10 feet from him. After the GI has passed he may—or may not—get shot in the back. The Vietnamese riding through town on a bicycle may have a hand grenade in his pocket. So might the shopkeeper, or one of the shoppers, or the pretty girl with the wide straw hat and colorful native dress.

Americans have a wry joke about identifying the Communist Vietcong (commonly known as VC): "It's easy to tell a VC from a friend. The VC is the one who shoots at you."

But often by the time the difference is clear it's too late.

Let's look at our GI's in the cities and villages, and then visit a lonely outpost where I spent last Christmas.

GI's are especially good targets for terrorists because they are usually much taller than the average Vietnamese and stand out in any crowd. Even if all they are doing is going to eat in a local cafe, Americans almost always go in small groups or at least in pairs, and in addition to sidearms generally carry automatic weapons and grenades. They never walk side by side, but move instead in a stagger formation, changing the distances between them from time to time, never taking the same route twice in a row. This changing of patterns is very important in making ambush planning more difficult for the VC.

But there are limits to these defense maneuvers, and the GI's all know that the VC can, if willing to take a calculated risk, set up a trap at any time.

To add to their security problem, they are followed everywhere by crowds of happy Vietnamese children. As part of their voluntary job of being good-will ambassadors, the Americans always return greetings from local people. They smile and carry on conversations with friendly Vietnamese while keeping alert for terrorists.

It's a tough job—and one that lesser men would make easier for themselves. The GI's could hide within well-defended positions during the day, but the United States would lose face if it were shown that Americans were frightened by the VC. Vietnamese morale would suffer, so our boys keep the U.S. flag flying by purposely making themselves targets.

This business of being diplomats and good neighbors at the same time that they may be in combat or ambushed, at any moment of the day at any place in Vietnam, is remarkable in itself.

Air Force and Army units stationed at Tan Son Nhut Airbase near Saigon have adopted the Thanh Man Orphanage were war widows and their children have joined hundreds of parentless youngsters. Doctors and a dentist from the base hospital go regularly to treat the children. The GI's provide food and have distributed clothing sent from their families in the United States. During off-duty hours, the Americans have helped construct new buildings. One major project was digging a well for fresh drinking water. Servicemen contributed $2,500 with additional money coming from collections at church services held on the base, for just this one undertaking.

Marine and Air Force units at Da Nang have been involved in similar activities. An orphanage adopted by the Air Force has so impressed the Vietnamese that the Communists issued orders for the assassination of one U.S. doctor who had taken special interest in the project.

Many U.S. personnel have made it a routine to make fatherly visits to Vietnamese war orphans. During the last Christmas holiday season, American units all over Vietnam held parties for the local children. Many of them knew nothing about Christmas, but understood and appreciated the good will and gifts given by the Americans.

One who has almost made a career out of being a good Samaritan is U.S. Navy MM1c. Philip G. Ambrose, from Philadelphia, Pa. He volunteered to extend his tour of duty in Vietnam so that he could carry on his one-man good will mission. Ambrose has "adopted" six Vietnamese military hospitals, plus Vietnamese Army and Navy units. "OK, Joe," as Ambrose is known by the Vietnamese passes out gifts of all kinds supplied by donations from the United States and money taken from his own pocket.

This is not to say that every single American serviceman in Vietnam is a great guy. There are a few—especially in the bigger cities and at larger bases—who behave badly. But most Americans in Vietnam, including most of the support cadres, are dedicated to defending the United States and helping the people of that war-torn country.

I spent the Christmas holidays with four typical U.S. Army advisers in the field. They were attached to the 1st Battalion of the 7th Division, Army of Vietnam (abbreviated ARVN, with the abbreviation converted to the word "Arvin" by Americans in Vietnam who use it when referring to members of the South Vietnamese armed forces—an Arvin soldier). The battalion was stationed in the town of Mo Cay, Kien Hoa Province. It is in the Mekong Delta area, about 50 miles southwest of Saigon, the scene of some of the heaviest fighting in Vietnam.

The Americans were Capt. Roger D. Harms, age 27, of Shenandoah, Iowa; 1st Lt. Kraig U. Hansen, 25, Manhattan, Kans.; Sgt. Ralph M. Shoemaker, Jr., 28, Chattanooga, Tenn., and Sgt. Herbert J. Huston, 30, Marina, Calif.

All four were career men who decided long ago to make defending the United States a full-time job. They were the only Americans in Mo Cay. Captain Harms, an Infantry officer with 10 years' service, came up through the ranks. Lieutenant Hansen, an engineer, trained as an airborne ranger. He was graduated from West Point in 1962. Seregant Shoemaker had 8 years' service in the Infantry. Seregant Huston first spent 4 years in the U.S. Marines, including duty in Korea during the war there. An airborne ranger, he had 8 years of Army service when I visited Mo Cay.

All volunteered to fight in Vietnam. Captain Harms had two boys, aged 2 and 6, and a baby girl born after he left the United States. Sergeant Shoemaker had boys of 5 and 8, and another baby was scheduled to be born while he fought in Vietnam. Sergeant Huston had a 3-year-old son. Of the four, only Lieutenant Hansen was single.

All of them volunteered to fight in Vietnam because they believe that it's their duty to defend the United States, and that the frontline of our defense is in Vietnam. Or as Sergeant Shoemaker put it, "We would rather fight for our country and families here than in our own backyards."

All were proud of being professional soldiers of the United States, and deeply resented any confusion between professional soldiers and mercenaries. They chose careers as military men primarily to serve their country. Army life as a means of earning a living and as a source of adventure were secondary reasons. They did not join the Army to make money, and were bitter about those who claim that professional soldiers could not compete with civilians for jobs.

All four were gentlemen. They were not the type described in cheap blood-and-guts novels. Although they walked with heads held high, befitting men who are proud of their uniform, they did not swagger. Sometimes one of them let go with a mild cussword, but even though they usually were far from anyone who understood English, they did not use foul language.

The Arvin battalion held Mo Cay and a small strip of ground around the town. The total defense perimeter was about 1 square mile, bounded on two sides by narrow canals. The entire area was surrounded by a barbed-wire fence and defense positions.

Outside the town itself the VC was in almost complete control at night except for a few outposts along a key highway leading to the next province. During the day the VC more or less melted away, but it was still unsafe to leave the town other than with a full battle-ready military unit. Daylight ambushes in the countryside, or even along the road, were common, and helicopters were frequently shot at while landing or taking off at Mo Cay in broad daylight.

We at home have read a good deal about the shooting down of some of our helicopter men. To them too it is a unique and lonely war. There is no such thing as being over friendly or enemy territory, and any flight is a "milk run" only if when it is over nothing has happened. The helicopters can even be in battle and not find it out for a while. While Vietcong machineguns (which are deadly at low altitudes) reveal themselves promptly when using tracers, the Vietcong has also developed a system of concentrating tracerless, small arms fire against choppers. The loud noise of the helicopters' engines and whirling blades can sometimes drown out the sound of such gunfire. During a previous flight on the same day that I rode with him, a gunner first learned that his copter had been fired at when he discovered that the heel of his boot had been shot off.

The situation in December in the Mo Cay area was illustrative of the really big problems of the war in Vietnam. The Arvin and American advisers had the responsibility of keeping the local economy moving and improving normal civilian conditions, so that we were always fighting to defend—to keep the roads clear, to keep trade and commerce running, etc. The gates of Mo Cay were kept open to allow peasants and townspeople to carry on normal business—even though it also meant allowing Vietcong terrorists to enter.

We also had to defend the people, because Vietnamese civilians were frequent targets of the Communists whose goal is to so terrorize and demoralize the population that the Vietnamese will eventually surrender on any terms as a means of stopping the torture of their bleeding nation.

The Vietcong, on the other hand, do not defend anything, they only destroy. Under these ground rules, the Communists have a tremendous advantage: they pick the time and place to fight the war. They can mass the necessary forces at the point of contact, while the Arvin are stretched in a long thin line that can be cut at all but the strongest points.

The Vietnamese soldiers, depite reports to the contrary, have conducted themselves well. It is true that Arvin officers sometimes lack initiative, and some Vietnamese have failed to meet the deadly challenge of combat. But the problem of limited initiative is largely due to war weariness, intensified because for a long time there seemed to be no real determination to win a victory against the Communists on the part of the free world. Stepped up U.S. participation and the State Department's white paper on Red aggression of February 26 is the sort of stuff that can make even better fighting men of the Arvin. The failures in combat have been largely among paramilitary units such as home guards. The nonprofessional Vietnamese soldiers have behaved like similar men in armies throughout history; some good, some bad—some excellent, some terrible. The Arvin regulars have done a very commendable job, and Americans who have served in the field with them almost always have high praise for their fighting ability. The four U.S. Army advisers in Mo Cay, and every other American combat veteran that I spoke to in Vietnam, were favorably impressed with these Asian soldiers.

Nuygen Van Duc, who received news of his promotion from captain to major on Christmas, commanded the Arvin battalion at Mo Cay when I was there. He was a 20-year veteran, rated by the Americans as an excellent officer and a fine person. One interesting sidelight is that he was especially kind to the Christians under his command during the Christmas holidays, although he is a devout Buddhist.

The four GI's in Mo Cay lived in a house only a few feet from the defense perimeter where two canals meet. At the closest point it was only about 100 feet across the canal, the other side of which was Vietcong territory. The house had been hit frequently by enemy small arms and mortar fire. The roof was holed, and there were enemy mortar shell fragments in every square foot of the yard. Because they were often in the middle of combat as soon as they jumped from their beds at night, the Americans slept in special uniforms—black pajamas. These are the best, most convenient camouflage for night fighting. (When I complained because they didn't have any black pj's for me, I was chided for my poor sportsmanship. Or as Sergeant Shoemaker put it, "The Vietcong have to have something to shoot at, don't they?")

As is usual in Vietnam, the four men who represented America in Mo Cay served their country as both soldiers and diplomats. They were diplomatic in the way in which they gave suggestions, and they were very well liked by the Arvin officers and enlisted men. They ate local dishes—with chopsticks—and could even speak some Vietnamese. During my short stay with them I saw many examples of their good work.

Action in the Mo Cay area was frequent—and often bloody. On the night before Christmas Eve a VC battalion carried on an all-night attack against a small outpost defended by only 17 Arvin. When the battle was broken off by the Communists at dawn, there were only three Vietnamese boys left standing. But they had held their post.

The day before Christmas, before it was dark, midnight Mass was held at the local Catholic Church. Although none of the four GIs was Catholic, they, and the Buddhist battalion commander, went to the Catholic Church to pay their respects to the priest and worshippers. Then they went to the little Protestant chapel for the same purpose. As dusk blended into darkness, they made their final Christmas Eve calls—the inspection of key defense positions around the perimeter in readiness for night warfare.

Soon after dark, firing started all up and down the Mekong Delta. VC mortars whizzed into Mo Cay. The Americans joined the Arvin gun batteries. They helped direct answering fire in the Mo Cay area, and stood by with advice as lonely outposts in the jungle phoned in to report their condition under attack. Distant flares in the jungle night pinpointed the attacks on perimeter posts from one horizon to the other. The action didn't stop for more than a few minutes at a time all night. During a lull in the fighting, a GI taught English to a Vietnamese soldier as other Arvin sang carols.

Came the dawn and all was quiet. It was Christmas. The town awakened to a "normal" day. I photographed the large pile of used artillery shell casings in front of the Americans' house, all taken from a single gun. I was unable to count the casualties in Mo Cay. In the early daylight hours the Americans caught a little sleep, then awoke to take up their daytime role as armed civic guests in this crazy war.

One of the town's big events took place when a local girl was married. Guests seated at the honor table with the bride's father included these four American fighting men.

Out in town, wherever the GIs drove, smiling children stood along the road waving and shouting "Hello" and "OK." When they went abroad on foot, within a few minutes large crowds of happy youngsters walked along with them. The GIs played with the children, taught them English, gave them presents and otherwise behaved like doting grandparents. Although they were friendly to all, the Americans had several favorites, among them a handsome boy of 12 or 13 who worked at a little cafe the GIs had nicknamed "Howard Johnson's." They had practically adopted a pretty little girl of about 10 who was mute. Her beautiful eyes spoke for her, however, when she was with the gentle warriors from the other side of the world.

On Christmas night it was Christmas Eve all over again. The Delta was alive with artillery—muttering, growling and flashing as 18 separate fire fights developed along the Mo Cay perimeter.

On the day after Christmas I left Mo Cay. The same helicopter that took me out brought in New York City photographer Dan Bucher. The next day all 5 Americans were wounded, Bucher almost fatally, by a hand grenade thrown into "Howard Johnson's" by a VC terrorist.

The GIs had known from intelligence reports that they were marked for assassination, but they continued to make daily appearances throughout the area to keep up local morale and confidence in the Americans. They also knew that the cafe, which was the best of only a couple of eating places in town, was the most likely site for such an attack. They had taken precautions, but the ways in which they could alter their routine were limited when it came to the restaurant. "We have to eat," they had explained to me the last time I'd been in the cafe with them. So the VC knew that if they waited long enough there would be an opportunity for an attack.

When it came it was vicious. In keeping with their terror tactics, the grenade was thrown at the Americans while they were surrounded by Vietnamese children. The handsome little boy who worked in the cafe was blown apart by the blast and was dead when Captain Harms reached him a few seconds later. Fifteen other youngsters were wounded.

The GIs, all of whom received shrapnel wounds, ran outside after the terrorist, but lost him in the narrow streets. When they returned to give first aid to the children, other VC hiding in the area opened fire on them with small arms. They were driven off by Arvin soldiers.

When word of the attack reached me I went to a Saigon hospital where the five wounded Americans had been taken. Bucher, the photographer, was on an operating table, still in critical condition 2 days after the attack. The four GI's were somewhat dazed from their experience, but agreed to a tape-recorded interview.

"Would you volunteer to fight in Vietnam if you had to make the choice over again?" I asked them. Here are the exact answers:

Lieutenant Hansen: "Yes. The only difference that this makes is that once you've seen civilians—especially the little kids—hurt like this, it makes it a more personal thing than it was previously."

Sergeant Shoemaker: "I agree with the lieutenant. When we first came over here, I think that all of us came over for one purpose. We volunteered to come here to defend our own country. But now I think that it's much more personal."

Captain Harms: "You bet I agree. It's the same job, and nothing's changed at all—except that everybody just feels a little bit closer to the whole situation."

Sergeant Huston, quietest of the four, replied with a soft—but firm—"Yes."

When I asked where they wanted to be stationed after they were released from the hospital and returned to active duty, Lieutenant Hansen answered for all:

"Well, I think we are going right back to Mo Cay, the same place, to take up our old jobs where we left off."

A month later, I learned from his parents that Lieutenant Hansen was back in Mo Cay. The others? I don't know. I think they're back there.

These GI's are representative of the American fighting men in Vietnam—in the air, on the sea, and serving on small teams (sometimes only a single GI) in lonely village outposts where they are picking up the check for our freedom. The majority of them resent those at home who would sell out Vietnam. They believe it would be a terrible defeat for the United States, and many think that it would be immoral. One GI pleaded, "How could we face the Arvin, and say that we were running out on them? How could we face ourselves? Do you think anyone else would trust us after that?"

In my experience, the men who had seen the most action felt that way the most strongly. "If we can take it, why can't the people at home?" they asked.

Some of the people at home can take it. When the parents of Navy Lt. Cmdr. Robert H. Shumaker were informed that he had been shot down and captured during a raid on North Vietnam, they assured newsmen that their son would conduct himself in a manner befitting a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy (class of 1956). The Soviet news agency, Tass, inadvertently confirmed their confidence when it reported on the captured flier's forced appearance at a Communist bayonet-point news conference. Tass said that Shumaker refused to show remorse for his actions and had repeated the hackneyed Pentagon version of the war. In other words, on the loneliest assignment of all, he stood up to the fanatical Communist captors who held the power of life or death over him.

Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, and Rear Adm. Robert O. Canada, Jr., Medical Corps, U.S. Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House the outstanding leadership that exists today in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy.

We have had many great Surgeons General of the Navy in the past and we have had many great Deputy and Assistant Chiefs of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery but, today, the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Navy is headed by two of the most distinguished physicians in America, the Surgeon General, Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, and the Deputy Surgeon General, Rear Adm. Robert O. Canada, Jr.

Admiral Brown is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons and a diplomate of the American Board of Surgery. He has had an outstanding career in medicine from the days he received his degree from the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine as a doctor of medicine in 1933.

Admiral Canada has also had a most illustrious career from the day he received his degree as a doctor of medicine from the University of Virginia.

I commend the wisdom of those in authority who selected these two outstanding physicians for the positions they now hold.

I would like to include in my remarks, the complete biographies of Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery and Surgeon General of the Navy, and Rear Adm. Robert O. Canada, Jr., Deputy and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery and Deputy Surgeon General of the Navy:

REAR ADM. ROBERT B. BROWN, MEDICAL CORPS, U.S. NAVY

Robert Bruce Brown was born in Meadville, Pa., on June 29, 1908, son of Robert X. and Marion Rose (Canfield) Brown, both now deceased. He attended Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. (1925–29), from which he received the degree of bachelor of science; was awarded the degree of doctor of medicine from the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, in 1933 and in 1941 received his doctor of science (in surgery) from the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Medicine. During the period 1933–35 he interned at the hospital of the University of Pennsylvania.

He had two fellowships at the University of Pennsylvania, the first in thyroid and neurosurgery with Dr. Charles Frazier 1935–36) and the other in general surgery with Dr. E. L. Eliason (1936–41). At the medical school there, he was assistant instructor in surgery (1935–36); instructor in surgery (1936–46) and associate in surgery (1946–51). From 1941 to 1946 he was also assistant in surgery at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia General, Presbyterian, and Doctors' Hospitals.

strengthen the role of the Federal Government—and enhance the Federal-State-local partnership—in fighting water pollution in western New York and elsewhere.

My communications with the people of Erie County show that 70 percent of the citizens in the 39th Congressional District agree with me that a strong Federal program is needed.

Yet, the deeper I get into water, the more I question whether even a strong Federal program, intermeshed with State and local programs, will in the long run be adequate to solve all the problems of Lake Erie.

Let's take a quick look at some vital geographical factors.

Lake Erie touches the borders of four States—New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan. A huge portion of Lake Erie's shoreline lies in the Province of Ontario.

Lake Erie is not just the concern of the United States. The fortunes of this body of water are of immense importance to both the United States and Canada.

The fortunes of Lake Erie also are closely tied to the other Great Lakes—Ontario, Huron, Michigan, and Superior. And these other lakes, in turn, affect the well-being of millions of people in other States and other Provinces.

Therefore, it seems to me that when we reflect on the problems of Lake Erie, we must do so in the context of the entire Great Lakes Basin.

Within this huge basin reside 27 million people. Touching these lakes are 15 cities with populations in excess of 100,000.

Pollution is a serious matter in the Great Lakes, but it is not the only problem. Another problem that probably is just as serious is the level of the lakes.

As I reminded you earlier, Lake Erie is at its lowest level in many years. This is a problem that is shared by the other Great Lakes.

Man can be blamed for pollution—but he is not responsible, at least not in a significant way, for rising and falling lake levels. Nature causes this fluctuation, but man must somehow learn to live with it—or perhaps try to do something about it.

Many people—myself included—are disturbed by the present low level of Lake Erie. It dropped almost 5 feet from 1952 to 1964.

This is a serious matter—but it is less shocking when viewed from a long-range perspective.

Lake Erie was lower in 1936 than it is today. When you look at records for the past 100 years, you discover up-and-down trends in rainfall in the Great Lakes Basin—and that the level of the lakes generally follows the precipitation patterns.

Present problems don't stem from the fact that anything unusual is happening to lake levels. Rather, our difficulties stem from our increasing dependence on the lakes.

As more and more people depend on the lake for more and more pursuits, it becomes increasingly necessary that we receive a so-called normal amount of rainfall to keep the lakes at a so-called normal level.

Nature, unfortunately, doesn't operate that way. Wild fluctuations from the "normal" are in themselves normal.

One hundred years ago a sharp drop in the lake levels was inconvenient. Today the same occurrence could prove disastrous.

The problems of pollution and low lake levels are not separate and distinct. They very definitely are linked.

It is obvious, I think, that when the amount of water in a lake decreases, pollution problems are increased.

There are some who think that the ultimate answer to pollution in Lake Erie lies in seeking means to develop faster turnover of the water in the lake.

Preventing pollutants, in the form of municipal and industrial wastes, from entering the lake is an obvious necessity. And the legislation I have sponsored in the House of Representatives is designed to check the flow of wastes into Lake Erie. In time, with local and State cooperation, this can be done.

But—even if this program is completely successful—there are serious doubts that it will succeed in actually abating pollution in Lake Erie. Scientists say that stopping wastes from entering the lake will only prevent the Lake Erie problem from becoming much worse.

There are various possibilities for actually abating pollution—none of them simple or cheap.

Scientists have discovered that the oxygen supply has been depleted in a vast portion of Lake Erie by algae—which apparently are prospering because pollutants, in the form of nitrogen and phosphorus, have given them an abundant food supply. So, one step in controlling pollution would be to dredge the algae from the lake and bury it in adjacent ground. Another would be to recharge the lake's water supply.

More water for the Great Lakes would abate pollutants by flushing them out. The infusion of more water, on a controlled basis, would make it possible to stabilize and regulate lake levels and more water would provide for the increasing needs of the growing United States and Canadian populations in the Great Lakes Basin.

How could such a solution be brought about? Where would we get the water to permit faster turnover in Lake Erie? The only source for the vast quantity of water that would be needed to implement such a scheme is our northern neighbor, Canada.

The ultimate solution lies in diverting water into the Great Lakes from rivers that flow into Hudson's Bay.

The political and economic problems of such a grand scheme are enormous. The technical difficulties that would be encountered stagger the imagination.

The costs, obviously, will run into many, many millions of dollars. And they should be shared by the United States and Canada in proportion to the benefits each would receive. It is obvious that both nations would realize enormous benefits from such a vast project. But only Canada has the water that both countries need.

The problems would be gigantic—but the benefits very probably would be equally gigantic.

We must recognize that we face some very serious handicaps in making sweeping, long-range plans for the Great Lakes.

Basically, these handicaps fall into two categories. On the one hand, we have a multitude of legitimate and reasonable vested interests, both public and private, in the lakes. On the other hand, we have a multitude of agencies that in one way or another are involved in the management of the lakes.

A good many entities—the State of New York, for instance, have both a vested interest and a hand in management.

Sadly lacking is any agency with the authority and the capability to look at the problems of the Great Lakes from an overall perspective and chart overall goals and the means of attaining them.

The need for such an agency is clearly indicated when we consider the deep interdependence of the water users on the lakes. The Chicago area, for instance, depends on Lake Michigan in various ways and would like to divert more water from the lake. Chicago's needs cannot be argued, but if Chicago diverts more water, this will affect the level of Lake Erie at Cleveland, aggravate the pollution problem at Detroit, and reduce power-generating capacity at Niagara Falls. Lower levels in harbors mean that shipping firms cannot load their boats to full capacity—thus increasing shipping costs per ton.

The principal coordinating agency for the lakes is the International Joint Commission, which was created by a treaty between the United States and Canada in 1909. The International Joint Commission's sphere of interest extends all across the long boundary between our Nation and Canada.

I definitely am not critical of the International Joint Commission. This is a distinguished body with many accomplishments to its credit.

The difficulty with the International Joint Commission, as presently organized, is that it lacks effective teeth. The International Joint Commission is an instrument of the United States and Canadian Governments and is empowered to inquire into and coordinate matters referred it by the two Governments.

We might expand the powers of the International Joint Commission or some other agency or agencies. Or we might create a new body. And this is what I propose: A new international agency whose sole concern is the Great Lakes.

One model we might consider using for guidance in establishing a planning and development body for the Great Lakes is the Arctic Institute—a creation of the United States and Canada that has been notably successful.

Setting up a similar institute for the Great Lakes was one of the possibilities suggested by Michel Chevalier in a distinguished treatise he wrote. Mr. Chevalier, who is from Montreal, wrote the paper in connection with research he has been conducting at the University of Pennsylvania.

The Arctic Institute was incorporated in 1945 in both the United States and Canada. Legally, it is two separate bodies. But it shares the same Board of Directors and the same staff.

Strictly speaking, the Institute has no direct link with either Government. But, in fact, senior officials of both Governments have been active in the Arctic Institute.

The Institute is considered the authoritative body on research and planning on the Arctic.

The problems of the Arctic and the Great Lakes are scarcely comparable. But I think there is a possibility that an agency modeled after the Arctic Institute might be a way to grapple with the problems of the Great Lakes.

In any case, present planning facilities for the Great Lakes are inadequate. Something needs to be done—and what we should be doing now is considering various alternatives.

I was heartened by the statements of President Johnson and Canadian Prime Minister Pearson following their recent meeting at Camp David, Md.

They discussed the problems of the Great Lakes—including pollution and water levels—and they considered possibilities of working out an agreement between the two nations to help solve these problems.

It is not my purpose tonight to propose any final solutions.

But I want to stress that the Great Lakes, and the Canadians and Americans who depend on them, face some grave problems. And I also want to stress that as things now stand we do not have the means to cope with these problems. I am hopeful that talks between the executive branches of both countries will lead to agreements and, possibly, to a new United States-Canadian treaty.

My purpose tonight is to focus public attention on the problem in order to stimulate public discussion in the United States and Canada. For it will be public opinion finally that will persuade both governments to reach an agreement for joint, long-range research, planning and development of the future uses of the Great Lakes.

We dare not wait. The threat that the world's largest supply of fresh water will become one vast dead sea is too ominous.

The time for action is now.

Knock on Wood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist, Joseph Alsop, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 16, 1965.

Despite unjustified criticism, it should be apparent that President Johnson's policy in Vietnam is having the desired effect.

The article follows:

KNOCK ON WOOD

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—In a bitter, hard-fought war, and especially in a guerrilla war, nothing is rarer than a reliable firsthand report on the problems and state of mind of the other side. Nothing like this has been forthcoming, in all the many weeks since the first American air attacks on North Vietnam.

Now, however, a remarkably vivid glimpse through the bamboo curtain has suddenly been provided by a series of articles in the Leftwing Paris weekly, "L'Express," by a French newspaperman who has specialized in Far Eastern affairs, Georges Chaffard. These pieces, first spotted in this country by the astute Crosby Noyes, are so encouraging that one hastens to knock on wood as one reads them.

The encouragement is all the greater because a more unexpected source of encouragement could hardly be imagined. Chaffard is even further to the Left than "L'Express" and a hopeful appraisal of American policy in southeast Asia is an unheard of intellectual commodity among European Leftwingers.

Chaffard's appraisal is based, furthermore, on the kind of firsthand observation from which Americans are debarred. On this round, he did not visit Hanoi, but he quite recently spent much time there. On this round, he went to Cambodia, and thence moved up to join the Vietcong in the jungle, and to talk with the leaders of the so-called liberation front at their hidden jungle headquarters.

The headline put on Chaffard's articles by "L'Express"—"The Vietcong Now Fear Defeat"—is a good summary of the total impression conveyed. The first point that Chaffard emphasizes is the way the American decision to carry the war to the north has completely upset the strategy of the Communists, who never believed that this was possible.

Point two is the degree to which this decision has changed the climate. "American determination," says Chaffard, has caused everyone to reflect a bit.

Second thoughts have been especially common in the group of greatest importance to the Communists—the wavering people in the middle who were getting ready to back the Communists because they expected the Communists to win in the end.

Third, Chaffard describes the Vietcong as being forced, by the new American decision, to redouble their efforts at the very moment when American air and other operations are significantly reducing the flow of military supplies and other urgently needed aid from North Vietnam. Chaffard's emphasis on the effectiveness of the U.S. effort to slow the supplyflow amounts to news of the first order; for no one had been sure that this effort was having any effect at all.

Fourth, Chaffard reports Vietcong withdrawal, now in progress, from very large and important areas of South Vietnam, for the purpose of regrouping in the less vulnerable mountainous regions north of Saigon. He actually compares this withdrawal with the Communists' pretended departure from South Vietnam in 1954.

Fifth, Chaffard describes the Vietcong in the south as seriously troubled by the war weariness of some of their adherents. And he portrays the North Vietnamese as fearful, above all, of just the kind of carefully targeted bombing that President Johnson has ordered, which will destroy the fruit of "10 years of desperately hard work and sacrifice."

To this, one must add with great emphasis that Chaffard nowhere predicts abandonment of the struggle by the guerrillas in the south, nor does he forecast acceptance by the North Vietnamese of terms that would also be acceptable to the United States. Instead, he quotes defiant statements by the liberation front and the northern Communist bosses.

He also says, however, that the "facade of intransigence is not lacking in cracks," whether among the guerrillas or in North Vietnam. He shows evidence that in some quarters in the north, negotiations to end the struggle are already desired.

In sum, he does not say that the U.S. effort is succeding now, or assert that it is going to succeed later. But he specifically credits the U.S. effort with getting almost exactly the results that have been hoped for, at this particular stage, by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and his planners in the Pentagon and in Saigon.

President Johnson's policy and its implementation to date have not previously received a stronger implied endorsement from a more curious or more convincing source. That does not mean the Vietnamese war will be easily terminated. Much rougher times, perhaps quite serious reverses, may now lie ahead. But it does mean that what Chaffard calls "American determination" is neither empty nor ineffectual.

The Lonely War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, for more than 2 years, I have been advocating the application of veterans benefits to our fighting men who are serving in combat zones, such as Vietnam.

The situations there are as grave and arduous as those experienced by servicemen in World War II and Korea and these men are to be commended for the gallant way in which they are struggling in southeast Asia and provided with the rewards of a grateful Nation.

This situation is brought home even more clearly than ever in an article by Charles W. Wiley in the May 1965 edition of the American Legion magazine. Mr. Wiley describes the life of American servicemen in the Mekong Delta with clarity and compassion. I would like to share this with my colleagues by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE LONELY WAR IN VIETNAM

(By Charles W. Wiley)

(NOTE.—An intimate report on the lives of four GI's at an isolated outpost of the Mekong Delta portrays the new kind of war.)

Americans serving in the field in Vietnam are fighting the most terrible and loneliest war that the United States has ever been in. Outside the cities and large military bases, the GI is in danger every minute of every day. He can never relax. At night he must fight a more-or-less conventional guerrilla war. During the day he must be constantly on guard against a terror attack. It isn't even entirely safe in Saigon or at our largest bases.

This is a new kind of war in Vietnam, unlike anything that we've experienced before. There's no "front" in the sense that we ordinarily think of one—a frontline; then support positions (mortars, etc.) farther back; then, often miles from the first line, artillery; and finally a safe rear area for reserves, rest, command, and supply services. The American military sleeping in the barracks in the big hotel that was blown up in Saigon a couple of months ago were about as "far back" as you could get. Out in the more conventional combat areas, what stands for a normal frontline, are a number of isolated positions, frequently encircled as well as infiltrated. There, infantry, support units, and artillery are all jammed together, sometimes side by side. Each unit is normally somewhat in the position of the Lost Battalion of World War I with respect to its disposition. The enemy is everywhere—and nowhere.

Even worse than the fact that there is no fixed front is the fact that there is no way of distinguishing friend and foe. When an American goes down a country road or walks through a village marketplace, every single person whom he passes may be the enemy. The peasant in the field, peacefully working with a hoe, may be a Communist terrorist with a submachinegun hidden in the grass 10 feet from him. After the GI has passed he may—or may not—get shot in the back. The Vietnamese riding through town on a bicycle may have a hand grenade in his pocket. So might the shopkeeper, or one of the shoppers, or the pretty girl with the wide straw hat and colorful native dress.

Americans have a wry joke about identifying the Communist Vietcong (commonly known as VC): "It's easy to tell a VC from a friend. The VC is the one who shoots at you."

But often by the time the difference is clear it's too late.

Let's look at our GI's in the cities and villages, and then visit a lonely outpost where I spent last Christmas.

GI's are especially good targets for terrorists because they are usually much taller than the average Vietnamese and stand out in any crowd. Even if all they are doing is going to eat in a local cafe, Americans almost always go in small groups or at least in pairs, and in addition to sidearms generally carry automatic weapons and grenades. They never walk side by side, but move instead in a stagger formation, changing the distances between them from time to time, never taking the same route twice in a row. This changing of patterns is very important in making ambush planning more difficult for the VC.

But there are limits to these defense maneuvers, and the GI's all know that the VC can, if willing to take a calculated risk, set up a trap at any time.

To add to their security problem, they are followed everywhere by crowds of happy Vietnamese children. As part of their voluntary job of being good-will ambassadors, the Americans always return greetings from local people. They smile and carry on conversations with friendly Vietnamese while keeping alert for terrorists.

It's a tough job—and one that lesser men would make easier for themselves. The GI's could hide within well-defended positions during the day, but the United States would lose face if it were shown that Americans were frightened by the VC. Vietnamese morale would suffer, so our boys keep the U.S. flag flying by purposely making themselves targets.

This business of being diplomats and good neighbors at the same time that they may be in combat or ambushed, at any moment of the day at any place in Vietnam, is remarkable in itself.

Air Force and Army units stationed at Tan Son Nhut Airbase near Saigon have adopted the Thanh Man Orphanage were war widows and their children have joined hundreds of parentless youngsters. Doctors and a dentist from the base hospital go regularly to treat the children. The GI's provide food and have distributed clothing sent from their families in the United States. During off-duty hours, the Americans have helped construct new buildings. One major project was digging a well for fresh drinking water. Servicemen contributed $2,500 with additional money coming from collections at church services held on the base, for just this one undertaking.

Marine and Air Force units at Da Nang have been involved in similar activities. An orphanage adopted by the Air Force has so impressed the Vietnamese that the Communists issued orders for the assassination of one U.S. doctor who had taken special interest in the project.

Many U.S. personnel have made it a routine to make fatherly visits to Vietnamese war orphans. During the last Christmas holiday season, American units all over Vietnam held parties for the local children. Many of them knew nothing about Christmas, but understood and appreciated the good will and gifts given by the Americans.

One who has almost made a career out of being a good Samaritan is U.S. Navy MM1c. Philip G. Ambrose, from Philadelphia, Pa. He volunteered to extend his tour of duty in Vietnam so that he could carry on his one-man good will mission. Ambrose has "adopted" six Vietnamese military hospitals, plus Vietnamese Army and Navy units. "OK, Joe," as Ambrose is known by the Vietnamese passes out gifts of all kinds supplied by donations from the United States and money taken from his own pocket.

This is not to say that every single American serviceman in Vietnam is a great guy. There are a few—especially in the bigger cities and at larger bases—who behave badly. But most Americans in Vietnam, including most of the support cadres, are dedicated to defending the United States and helping the people of that war-torn country.

I spent the Christmas holidays with four typical U.S. Army advisers in the field. They were attached to the 1st Battalion of the 7th Division, Army of Vietnam (abbreviated ARVN, with the abbreviation converted to the word "Arvin" by Americans in Vietnam who use it when referring to members of the South Vietnamese armed forces—an Arvin soldier). The battalion was stationed in the town of Mo Cay, Kien Hoa Province. It is in the Mekong Delta area, about 50 miles southwest of Saigon, the scene of some of the heaviest fighting in Vietnam.

The Americans were Capt. Roger D. Harms, age 27, of Shenandoah, Iowa; 1st Lt. Kraig U. Hansen, 25, Manhattan, Kans.; Sgt. Ralph M. Shoemaker, Jr., 28, Chattanooga, Tenn., and Sgt. Herbert J. Huston, 30, Marina, Calif.

All four were career men who decided long ago to make defending the United States a full-time job. They were the only Americans in Mo Cay. Captain Harms, an Infantry officer with 10 years' service, came up through the ranks. Lieutenant Hansen, an engineer, trained as an airborne ranger. He was graduated from West Point in 1962. Seregant Shoemaker had 8 years' service in the Infantry. Seregant Huston first spent 4 years in the U.S. Marines, including duty in Korea during the war there. An airborne ranger, he had 8 years of Army service when I visited Mo Cay.

All volunteered to fight in Vietnam. Captain Harms had two boys, aged 2 and 6, and a baby girl born after he left the United States. Sergeant Shoemaker had boys of 5 and 8, and another baby was scheduled to be born while he fought in Vietnam. Sergeant Huston had a 3-year-old son. Of the four, only Lieutenant Hansen was single.

All of them volunteered to fight in Vietnam because they believe that it's their duty to defend the United States, and that the frontline of our defense is in Vietnam. Or as Sergeant Shoemaker put it, "We would rather fight for our country and families here than in our own backyards."

All were proud of being professional soldiers of the United States, and deeply resented any confusion between professional soldiers and mercenaries. They chose careers as military men primarily to serve their country. Army life as a means of earning a living and as a source of adventure were secondary reasons. They did not join the Army to make money, and were bitter about those who claim that professional soldiers could not compete with civilians for jobs.

All four were gentlemen. They were not the type described in cheap blood-and-guts novels. Although they walked with heads held high, befitting men who are proud of their uniform, they did not swagger. Sometimes one of them let go with a mild cussword, but even though they usually were far from anyone who understood English, they did not use foul language.

The Arvin battalion held Mo Cay and a small strip of ground around the town. The total defense perimeter was about 1 square mile, bounded on two sides by narrow canals. The entire area was surrounded by a barbed-wire fence and defense positions.

Outside the town itself the VC was in almost complete control at night except for a few outposts along a key highway leading to the next province. During the day the VC more or less melted away, but it was still unsafe to leave the town other than with a full battle-ready military unit. Daylight ambushes in the countryside, or even along the road, were common, and helicopters were frequently shot at while landing or taking off at Mo Cay in broad daylight.

We at home have read a good deal about the shooting down of some of our helicopter men. To them too it is a unique and lonely war. There is no such thing as being over friendly or enemy territory, and any flight is a "milk run" only if when it is over nothing has happened. The helicopters can even be in battle and not find it out for a while. While Vietcong machineguns (which are deadly at low altitudes) reveal themselves promptly when using tracers, the Vietcong has also developed a system of concentrating tracerless, small arms fire against choppers. The loud noise of the helicopters' engines and whirling blades can sometimes drown out the sound of such gunfire. During a previous flight on the same day that I rode with him, a gunner first learned that his copter had been fired at when he discovered that the heel of his boot had been shot off.

The situation in December in the Mo Cay area was illustrative of the really big problems of the war in Vietnam. The Arvin and American advisers had the responsibility of keeping the local economy moving and improving normal civilian conditions, so that we were always fighting to defend—to keep the roads clear, to keep trade and commerce running, etc. The gates of Mo Cay were kept open to allow peasants and townspeople to carry on normal business—even though it also meant allowing Vietcong terrorists to enter.

We also had to defend the people, because Vietnamese civilians were frequent targets of the Communists whose goal is to so terrorize and demoralize the population that the Vietnamese will eventually surrender on any terms as a means of stopping the torture of their bleeding nation.

The Vietcong, on the other hand, do not defend anything, they only destroy. Under these ground rules, the Communists have a tremendous advantage: they pick the time and place to fight the war. They can mass the necessary forces at the point of contact, while the Arvin are stretched in a long thin line that can be cut at all but the strongest points.

The Vietnamese soldiers, depite reports to the contrary, have conducted themselves well. It is true that Arvin officers sometimes lack initiative, and some Vietnamese have failed to meet the deadly challenge of combat. But the problem of limited initiative is largely due to war weariness, intensified because for a long time there seemed to be no real determination to win a victory against the Communists on the part of the free world. Stepped up U.S. participation and the State Department's white paper on Red aggression of February 26 is the sort of stuff that can make even better fighting men of the Arvin. The failures in combat have been largely among paramilitary units such as home guards. The nonprofessional Vietnamese soldiers have behaved like similar men in armies throughout history; some good, some bad—some excellent, some terrible. The Arvin regulars have done a very commendable job, and Americans who have served in the field with them almost always have high praise for their fighting ability. The four U.S. Army advisers in Mo Cay, and every other American combat veteran that I spoke to in Vietnam, were favorably impressed with these Asian soldiers.

Nuygen Van Duc, who received news of his promotion from captain to major on Christmas, commanded the Arvin battalion at Mo Cay when I was there. He was a 20-year veteran, rated by the Americans as an excellent officer and a fine person. One interesting sidelight is that he was especially kind to the Christians under his command during the Christmas holidays, although he is a devout Buddhist.

The four GI's in Mo Cay lived in a house only a few feet from the defense perimeter where two canals meet. At the closest point it was only about 100 feet across the canal, the other side of which was Vietcong territory. The house had been hit frequently by enemy small arms and mortar fire. The roof was holed, and there were enemy mortar shell fragments in every square foot of the yard. Because they were often in the middle of combat as soon as they jumped from their beds at night, the Americans slept in special uniforms—black pajamas. These are the best, most convenient camouflage for night fighting. (When I complained because they didn't have any black pj's for me, I was chided for my poor sportsmanship. Or as Sergeant Shoemaker put it, "The Vietcong have to have something to shoot at, don't they?")

As is usual in Vietnam, the four men who represented America in Mo Cay served their country as both soldiers and diplomats. They were diplomatic in the way in which they gave suggestions, and they were very well liked by the Arvin officers and enlisted men. They ate local dishes—with chopsticks—and could even speak some Vietnamese. During my short stay with them I saw many examples of their good work.

Action in the Mo Cay area was frequent—and often bloody. On the night before Christmas Eve a VC battalion carried on an all-night attack against a small outpost defended by only 17 Arvin. When the battle was broken off by the Communists at dawn, there were only three Vietnamese boys left standing. But they had held their post.

The day before Christmas, before it was dark, midnight Mass was held at the local Catholic Church. Although none of the four GIs was Catholic, they, and the Buddhist battalion commander, went to the Catholic Church to pay their respects to the priest and worshippers. Then they went to the little Protestant chapel for the same purpose. As dusk blended into darkness, they made their final Christmas Eve calls—the inspection of key defense positions around the perimeter in readiness for night warfare.

Soon after dark, firing started all up and down the Mekong Delta. VC mortars whizzed into Mo Cay. The Americans joined the Arvin gun batteries. They helped direct answering fire in the Mo Cay area, and stood by with advice as lonely outposts in the jungle phoned in to report their condition under attack. Distant flares in the jungle night pinpointed the attacks on perimeter posts from one horizon to the other. The action didn't stop for more than a few minutes at a time all night. During a lull in the fighting, a GI taught English to a Vietnamese soldier as other Arvin sang carols.

Came the dawn and all was quiet. It was Christmas. The town awakened to a "normal" day. I photographed the large pile of used artillery shell casings in front of the Americans' house, all taken from a single gun. I was unable to count the casualties in Mo Cay. In the early daylight hours the Americans caught a little sleep, then awoke to take up their daytime role as armed civic guests in this crazy war.

One of the town's big events took place when a local girl was married. Guests seated at the honor table with the bride's father included these four American fighting men.

Out in town, wherever the GIs drove, smiling children stood along the road waving and shouting "Hello" and "OK." When they went abroad on foot, within a few minutes large crowds of happy youngsters walked along with them. The GIs played with the children, taught them English, gave them presents and otherwise behaved like doting grandparents. Although they were friendly to all, the Americans had several favorites, among them a handsome boy of 12 or 13 who worked at a little cafe the GIs had nicknamed "Howard Johnson's." They had practically adopted a pretty little girl of about 10 who was mute. Her beautiful eyes spoke for her, however, when she was with the gentle warriors from the other side of the world.

On Christmas night it was Christmas Eve all over again. The Delta was alive with artillery—muttering, growling and flashing as 18 separate fire fights developed along the Mo Cay perimeter.

On the day after Christmas I left Mo Cay. The same helicopter that took me out brought in New York City photographer Dan Bucher. The next day all 5 Americans were wounded, Bucher almost fatally, by a hand grenade thrown into "Howard Johnson's" by a VC terrorist.

The GIs had known from intelligence reports that they were marked for assassination, but they continued to make daily appearances throughout the area to keep up local morale and confidence in the Americans. They also knew that the cafe, which was the best of only a couple of eating places in town, was the most likely site for such an attack. They had taken precautions, but the ways in which they could alter their routine were limited when it came to the restaurant. "We have to eat," they had explained to me the last time I'd been in the cafe with them. So the VC knew that if they waited long enough there would be an opportunity for an attack.

When it came it was vicious. In keeping with their terror tactics, the grenade was thrown at the Americans while they were surrounded by Vietnamese children. The handsome little boy who worked in the cafe was blown apart by the blast and was dead when Captain Harms reached him a few seconds later. Fifteen other youngsters were wounded.

The GIs, all of whom received shrapnel wounds, ran outside after the terrorist, but lost him in the narrow streets. When they returned to give first aid to the children, other VC hiding in the area opened fire on them with small arms. They were driven off by Arvin soldiers.

When word of the attack reached me I went to a Saigon hospital where the five wounded Americans had been taken. Bucher, the photographer, was on an operating table, still in critical condition 2 days after the attack. The four GI's were somewhat dazed from their experience, but agreed to a tape-recorded interview.

"Would you volunteer to fight in Vietnam if you had to make the choice over again?" I asked them. Here are the exact answers:

Lieutenant Hansen: "Yes. The only difference that this makes is that once you've seen civilians—especially the little kids—hurt like this, it makes it a more personal thing than it was previously."

Sergeant Shoemaker: "I agree with the lieutenant. When we first came over here, I think that all of us came over for one purpose. We volunteered to come here to defend our own country. But now I think that it's much more personal."

Captain Harms: "You bet I agree. It's the same job, and nothing's changed at all—except that everybody just feels a little bit closer to the whole situation."

Sergeant Huston, quietest of the four, replied with a soft—but firm—"Yes."

When I asked where they wanted to be stationed after they were released from the hospital and returned to active duty, Lieutenant Hansen answered for all:

"Well, I think we are going right back to Mo Cay, the same place, to take up our old jobs where we left off."

A month later, I learned from his parents that Lieutenant Hansen was back in Mo Cay. The others? I don't know. I think they're back there.

These GI's are representative of the American fighting men in Vietnam—in the air, on the sea, and serving on small teams (sometimes only a single GI) in lonely village outposts where they are picking up the check for our freedom. The majority of them resent those at home who would sell out Vietnam. They believe it would be a terrible defeat for the United States, and many think that it would be immoral. One GI pleaded, "How could we face the Arvin, and say that we were running out on them? How could we face ourselves? Do you think anyone else would trust us after that?"

In my experience, the men who had seen the most action felt that way the most strongly. "If we can take it, why can't the people at home?" they asked.

Some of the people at home can take it. When the parents of Navy Lt. Cmdr. Robert H. Shumaker were informed that he had been shot down and captured during a raid on North Vietnam, they assured newsmen that their son would conduct himself in a manner befitting a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy (class of 1956). The Soviet news agency, Tass, inadvertently confirmed their confidence when it reported on the captured flier's forced appearance at a Communist bayonet-point news conference. Tass said that Shumaker refused to show remorse for his actions and had repeated the hackneyed Pentagon version of the war. In other words, on the loneliest assignment of all, he stood up to the fanatical Communist captors who held the power of life or death over him.

Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, and Rear Adm. Robert O. Canada, Jr., Medical Corps, U.S. Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House the outstanding leadership that exists today in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy.

We have had many great Surgeons General of the Navy in the past and we have had many great Deputy and Assistant Chiefs of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery but, today, the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Navy is headed by two of the most distinguished physicians in America, the Surgeon General, Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, and the Deputy Surgeon General, Rear Adm. Robert O. Canada, Jr.

Admiral Brown is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons and a diplomate of the American Board of Surgery. He has had an outstanding career in medicine from the days he received his degree from the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine as a doctor of medicine in 1933.

Admiral Canada has also had a most illustrious career from the day he received his degree as a doctor of medicine from the University of Virginia.

I commend the wisdom of those in authority who selected these two outstanding physicians for the positions they now hold.

I would like to include in my remarks, the complete biographies of Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery and Surgeon General of the Navy, and Rear Adm. Robert O. Canada, Jr., Deputy and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery and Deputy Surgeon General of the Navy:

REAR ADM. ROBERT B. BROWN, MEDICAL CORPS, U.S. NAVY

Robert Bruce Brown was born in Meadville, Pa., on June 29, 1908, son of Robert X. and Marion Rose (Canfield) Brown, both now deceased. He attended Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. (1925–29), from which he received the degree of bachelor of science; was awarded the degree of doctor of medicine from the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, in 1933 and in 1941 received his doctor of science (in surgery) from the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Medicine. During the period 1933–35 he interned at the hospital of the University of Pennsylvania.

He had two fellowships at the University of Pennsylvania, the first in thyroid and neurosurgery with Dr. Charles Frazier 1935–36) and the other in general surgery with Dr. E. L. Eliason (1936–41). At the medical school there, he was assistant instructor in surgery (1935–36); instructor in surgery (1936–46) and associate in surgery (1946–51). From 1941 to 1946 he was also assistant in surgery at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia General, Presbyterian, and Doctors' Hospitals.

Reporting for active duty in the Navy in 1942, he was assigned to surgical service at the naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pa., where he remained for several months. After duty afloat on board the U.S.S. *Solace*, he reported in 1943 as chief of surgery at the naval hospital, Annapolis, Md.

In 1945 he served as chief of surgery on board the hospital ship *Tranquility* and from later that year until 1950 was assistant to the chief of surgery at the naval hospital, Philadelphia. He next joined the U.S.S. *Repose*, which operated in the Korean area of hostilities. "For meritorious service as chief of professional services and as chief of surgical service in the naval hospital on board the U.S.S. *Repose*, in connection with operations against enemy aggressor forces in Korea from September 20, 1950, to July 12, 1951," he was awarded the Bronze Star Medal. The citation further states in part:

"Throughout this period, Captain Brown rendered outstanding services to his patients and directly supervised the surgical treatment of all casualties admitted to his section. Exercising exceptional professional skill and a thorough understanding of the scope and importance of his assignment, he was largely responsible for the excellent care given to the more than 8,000 patients admitted to the hospital and was greatly instrumental in saving the lives of many of the stricken men."

In 1951 he reported as Chief of Surgery at the Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Md., and while so assigned also served as clinical (adjunct) professor of surgery at Georgetown University School of Medicine. In March 1960 he assumed command of the naval hospital, Bethesda. His selection for the rank of rear admiral was approved by the President on August 7, 1961, and in February 1962 he became commanding officer of the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda. From August 1, 1963, until July 1965 he was Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery for Personnel and Professional Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D.C., after which he served as Deputy and Assistant Chief of that Bureau. On February 15, 1965, he was sworn in as Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery and Surgeon General of the Navy.

In addition to the Bronze Star Medal, Rear Admiral Brown has the following service medals: Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with one star; American Campaign Medal; World War II Victory Medal; National Defense Service Medal; Korean Service Medal; United Nations Service Medal; Expert Rifleman Medal, and the Expert Pistol Shot Medal. He also has the Korean Presidential Unit Citation.

His official home address is 704 Chestnut Street, Meadville, Pa. He is married to the former Jane Richardson of Pitman, N.J., and has a daughter, Joan Brown.

Dr. Brown is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons and a diplomate of the American Board of Surgery. He is a member of the Philadelphia County, the Pennsylvania State, and American Medical Associations; the Society of University Surgeons; the American Surgical Association; the International Surgical Society; the Philadelphia College of Physicians; the Halsted Society, the Eastern Surgical Association; the Society of Vascular Surgery; the Southern Surgical Association; the American Association for the Surgery of Trauma; and associate member, Clinico-Pathological Society, Washington, D.C.; and Philadelphia Academy of Surgery. In 1962 he received an honorary doctor of science degree from Allegeny College, Meadville, Pa., and in 1963 was awarded the Founder's Medal by the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States.

He is also a member of the following honorary fraternities: Sigma Xi; Phi Beta Kappa; and Alpha Omega Alpha.

REAR ADM. ROBERT O. CANADA, JR., MEDICAL CORPS, U.S. NAVY

Robert Owen Canada, Jr., was born in Grottoes, Va., on July 16, 1913, son of Mrs. R. O. (Mary Crawford) Canada and the late Dr. Canada. He attended Augusta Military Academy, Fort Defiance, Va., and received the degrees of bachelor of science from the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, and doctor of medicine from that university's school of medicine. He was commissioned lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy on July 16, 1938, after completing his internship, and was subsequently advanced in rank to that of rear admiral, to date from July 1, 1964.

Ordered first to the U.S. Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Va., he served as ward medical officer there from August 1938 to April 1940, then reported to the U.S.S. *Salinas* (AO-19) for duty as medical officer. He was serving in that capacity when the *Salinas* was torpedoed off Iceland by a German submarine on October 30, 1941, prior to the outbreak of World War II. Detached in December 1941, he served until March 1944, as officer in charge of the naval unit at Fitzsimons General Hospital, Denver, Colo.

During the latter period of the war, he was again at sea serving as senior medical officer of the U.S.S. *Pasadena* (CL-65) from her commissioning in June 1944, until November 1945. The *Pasadena* operated in the Pacific combat area from September 1944 until August 15, 1945, participating in the capture and occupation of the southern Palau Islands in September and October 1944; with the 3d Fleet in the Leyte operation (including Luzon attacks) and the Luzon operation (including attacks on Luzon, Formosa, the China coast, and Nansei Shoto); with the 5th Fleet in the assault and occupation of Iwo Jima, made on Nansei Shoto and the Okinawa operation (including the assault and occupation of Okinawa Gunto); and 3d Fleet operations against Japan. She was in the Tokyo Bay area during the Japanese surrender and subsequent occupation of Japan.

Returning to the United States, he reported in December 1945, to the naval hospital, Sampson, N.Y., where he served as assistant chief of medicine until March 1947. He then had graduate instruction at Cornell Medical School, New York, N.Y., and in October of that year was detached for duty at the Navy Department, Washington, D.C. There he served as head of the tuberculosis control section, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, until August 1950, when he was transferred to the naval hospital, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., as assistant chief of medicine and head of the chest disease section. In June 1952, he reported as chief of medicine at the naval hospital, Charleston, S.C.

In June 1955 he was detached from Charleston for similar duty at the naval hospital, Oakland, Calif., and in February 1959 reported as Chief of Medicine at the Naval Hospital, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md. In June 1961 he became Commanding Officer of the Naval Hospital at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla., and in February 1962 returned to the naval hospital, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md. He commanded that naval hospital for 2 years and in February 1965 was designated Deputy and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

Rear Admiral Canada has the American Defense Service Medal with bronze "A"; the American Campaign Medal; Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with one silver star and one bronze star (six operations); the World War II Victory Medal; Navy Occupation Service Medal, Asia Clasp; National Defense Service Medal; and the Philippine Liberation Ribbon with one star.

Married to the former Julia Dent Salter of Anniston, Ala., Doctor Canada has one son, Robert Owen Canada III. His official residence is Grottoes, Va.

Doctor Canada is a diplomate, American Board of Internal Medicine; a fellow of the American College of Physicians and the American College of Chest Physicians; and a member of the American Thoracic Society and the American Medical Association.

Clearing the Backlog of Jury Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, so many of my colleagues are members of the legal profession, and crowded dockets are so common to all the State courts, that I am sure there will be wide interest in the writings on the situation in Illinois by the Honorable Benjamin Wham, judge of the circuit court, law division.

I am extending my remarks to include an article by Judge Wham in the January 1965, issue of the Illinois Bar Journal and one in the Chicago Bar Record of November 6, 1964. The former follows:

ILLINOIS POINTS THE WAY TO REDUCTION OF CASE BACKLOG

(By Judge Benjamin Wham, circuit court, law division, 1 North Wacker Drive, Chicago)

The battle of the backlog has resulted in a number of suggestions for their reduction: eliminate jury trials (this overlooks the fact that provisions for jury trials are imbedded in constitutions, and many citizens do not want them removed); modernize practice acts and rules to eliminate archaic provisions brought here by early settlers; use of electronic methods to insure that cases are placed at issue promptly; and others.

IN ILLINOIS

It became all too clear in Illinois that improved practice acts and rules did not bring about a reduction in backlogs.

Thus Illinois adopted a modern practice act and up-to-date rules in 1933 and constantly improved them. Yet the backlogs grew steadily.

Further, Illinois has had in its practice act and rules provision for a number of ways to terminate cases, other than by regular jury verdict: nonappearance of plaintiff at trials is grounds for dismissing for want of prosecution (D.W.P.); nonappearance of defendant is ground for the complaint being taken as confessed and judgment being entered for the plaintiff; verdicts may be directed for the defendant at the close of the plaintiff's case, and, at the close of all the evidence, a verdict, as to liability, may be directed for either side; issues of liability and damages may be split; on posttrial motion a verdict may be set aside and judgment entered for the opposite side; time for selecting juries may be shortened; and others. Yet the backlogs continued to grow.

What really broke the logjam in Illinois was the judicial amendment which became effective January 2, 1964. It combined all courts into one, the circuit court, under the rule of the Illinois Supreme Court. A chief judge is selected in each county—the largest being Cook County. Its chief judge is Hon. John S. Boyle. The former independent

courts are now divisions of the circuit court: Chancery, probate, criminal, divorce, civil jury, and others. The head of the civil jury division is Hon. Harold G. Ward.

Thirty-four judges were assigned to the civil jury division. Jurors were made readily available. A judge is assigned only one case at a time. When it is completed, the judge calls for another.

At the outset of a trial another effort is made to settle the case (pretrials have already been had). If not settled at once, this objective is not lost sight of—many cases are settled during trial.

In the first 6 months (Jan. 2, 1964 to June 30) 2,576 cases were completed, an average of over 75 cases per judge.

One judge completed 192 cases. As there are about 20 civil jury trial days per month, this was an average of 32 cases per month and 1.6 cases per trial day.

Four other judges completed over 100 cases in the 6 months.

We conclude that juries are not necessarily a handicap; that modern practice acts and rules are not the complete answer; and that the full answer must include organization and a dedicated bench and bar.

Following is the article from the Chicago Sun Record:

THE BACKLOG OF CIVIL JURY CASES: HOW CAN THEIR DISPOSITION BE EXPEDITED?

(By Hon. Benjamin Wham [1])

Bar associations, judges, trial lawyers, law school faculties and other leaders in this field have been searching for ways to reduce the growing backlog of pending cases and especially those civil cases in which a jury trial has been demanded.

It should be noted that at least two ways have been found to reduce this backlog somewhat: a requirement that the plaintiff demand trial by jury when he files suit, and the other is the increases in the cost of such demands.

SHOULD WE ABANDON JURY TRIALS?

This question should perhaps be preceded by the preliminary questions whether we can do so, and if so, how soon? The jury system has long been regarded as the bulwark of individual rights. It is so embedded in our constitution that a major educational program would no doubt be required to eliminate it. Do we really want to do this?

Due to these questions let us look at a method which is in increasing use.

THE JURY AS AN AID TO SETTLEMENT

The Illinois judicial amendment is now in force and unites all courts from the Illinois Supreme Court down to the lowest court under the jurisdiction of the supreme court. In Cook County, Hon. John S. Boyle, is chief judge of the combined court and Hon. Harold G. Ward is head of the law division and the jury section. Juries are available for all civil jury cases and may be held by a judge on a standby basis for immediate use if the parties show no sign of settling. In the latter instance the trial is started promptly but the court, having sowed the seeds of settlement in he first conference, loses no opportunity to renew the discussion. Naturally, if a party wants a trial he is entitled to it and gets it.

The writer disposed of 23 cases in 20 jury days in January 1964. A table of these cases showing the method of disposition and time devoted to each appears in the footnote.

As may be observed, four cases went to verdicts, six cases were settled before trial, nine cases were settled at various stages of trial, in one case a verdict was directed, in two cases defendants were defaulted and damages proved up, and one case was dismissed at the request of the plaintiff because he could not proceed. Thus 15 out of 23 cases were settled, and, 3 of the 4 which went to verdicts as well as the remaining cases were disposed of in a minimum of time.

I suggest the jury was helpful in obtaining these results. This is the first experience most plaintiffs have had with juries.

Suddenly they see a jury selected which appears to be bent on doing justice to both sides. They begin to wonder if they would do better to negotiate further with the defendants. This is true of defendants also. Many are insured and the insurance companies are concerned with keeping the amount involved down.

If settlement is not made prior to trial, the most likely time is after the plaintiff has testified and has been subjected to cross-examination. Perhaps they have over a period of years built up an expectation of how well they would do on the witness stand; but now they wonder, even worry.

Occasionally a plaintiff completely upsets all calculations. Thus in one case the plaintiff, a middle-aged woman, had been a waitress in a small restaurant for many years. There was nothing in her history or appearance to set her apart. Yet on the witness stand she showed the personality and qualities of a lady. She was proud of her work. She wanted to continue to do this work, and was not asking for special consideration. But the jury obviously wanted to help her. A substantial verdict resulted.

The reverse may be true and circumstances may favor defendants. Experienced counsel are alert to recognize the changing signs and act accordingly. This double hearing may add to the total time. May it also result in a higher verdict? We seem to have noticed, when the jury has both liability and damages before it, there is a tendency, when liability is in doubt, to assess lower damages to compensate for such doubt.

SPLITTING ISSUES

In negligence cases there are two distinct issues, liability and damages. Liability must be proved before damages may be determined. A verdict for the defendant should be directed by the court if no liability has been proved; but the trial court must in so directing use sound judgment based on the manifest weight of the evidence. Otherwise the question of liability should be left to the jury.

If there is failure to prove liability, then there is a distinct saving in time in not having introduced damage evidence, including medical. If the question of liability is left to the jury and it finds for the defendant, that ends the case. However, if the jury finds for the plaintiff, then evidence must be introduced as to damages.

Federal courts have split issues with some satisfaction. I understand some courts in Illinois are splitting issues. However, the writer has met much opposition and gnashing of teeth from plaintiffs' attorneys. I recommend a court rule or statute in any State in which this device is used.

The Illinois Judicial Conference, composed of all circuit judges in Illinois, has just approved this procedure and submitted it to the Illinois Supreme Court for decision. The proposal suggests that if adopted, the Illinois rule should be modeled after the Federal Court rule.

The Federal rule contains this qualification: "in a proper case." We suggest this is important because it would appear that many cases are not proper for this procedure; for example, it may be difficult to separate liability from damages.

In a proper case, as suggested, this procedure will save time if a no-liability verdict is returned. If liability is found, another hearing on damages is required.

JURY SELECTION

Much time is unnecessarily devoted to pury selection. This may be justified when the case has been widely publized or involves unusual facts and large damages. In the ordidary negligence case these elements do not loom large. The principal search is for jurors who can be fair and impartial. What accidents have they and their families and close associates had? What lawsuits have they or their families and close associates been parties to? Is or has their work been in the field of claims for damages?

Much of this information should be elicited from all 12 prospective jurors in a few questions asked either by the judge or the attorneys. Any juror affected should be asked to indicate that fact so he may be interrogated individually. It should be unnecessary to ask all these questions of each prospective juror unless there has been some indication by him in answers to broader questions.

On the other hand, there are still a number of trial lawyers who have selected jurors over many years and who would be greatly annoyed if such new methods were introduced. This writer has even been told by attorneys that one of their younger partners was on trial but would be available at the opening of court the next day. At the suggestion that we proceed to select a jury such lawyers often reply that this would be beyond their comprehension, i.e., to have a jury selected by other than the trial attorney. Perhaps a rule or statute would help as to this matter.

The author has been trying out ways of shortening jury selection. The method now in use by him is to limit each side to 20 minutes for each of the three panels making 1 hour per side or 2 hours per jury. We have met no opposition so far. Often the attorneys cooperate so well that they select the jury even more quickly.

OBJECTIONS

Objections serve a useful purpose as they often avoid errors. What should the court do when there is a constant barrage of objections? Perhaps counsel may even frequently request hearings in chambers where extensive arguments may be made.

The writer's experience indicates that these objections will lessen and perhaps the case settle down to customary procedure, if the court will be of good cheer, modulate his voice as an example, and rule rather promptly.

We need hardly say that lawsuit is not a contest to choose the best lawyer but is a serious matter to both parties. Dean Pound once suggested that each party should be allowed to tell his story without too much interference.

As there are many precedents which industrious counsel may find but are not always prepared to present, and the court cannot adjourn so he may research minor questions, we suggest the court, out of his experience, both judicial and practical, rule on the basis of what appears to be fair under all the circumstances. We say this because we believe it is important for him to rule rather promptly.

If the court has committed error, and that includes errors of counsel, the posttrial motions, which must be made before appeal, give the court, as our appellate courts have said, an opportunity to correct such errors. In such motions, the court has more time and can ask counsel for briefs as well as oral arguments.

We suggest that the above procedure will lead to prompt termination of cases with fairness to the parties.

Needless to say, other suggestions for shortening jury trials have been and are being made.

FOOTNOTES

We use the writer's completions for 1 month because he only knows the specific details of this list. It should be said that other judges similarly engaged are disposing of a somewhat greater number of cases.

[1] Judge, circuit court of Cook County.

1. *S.* v. *H.*: Verdict, 4 days.
2. *R.* v. *V.*: Verdict directed, 1 day.
3. *M.* v. *K.*: Default and prove-up, one-fourth day.
4. *F.* v. *H.*: Settled, one-fourth day.
5. *O.* v. *D.*: Partial trial settled, one-half day.
6. *J.* v. *C.*: Attorney for plaintiff withdrew, default, and prove-up, one-fourth day.
7. *K.* v. *M.*: Verdict, 2 day.
8. *S.* v. *C.*: Partial trial settled, one-half day.
9. *G.* v. *E.*: Partial trial settled, one-half day.
10. *Z.* v. *P.*: Settled, one-fourth day.
11. *S.* v. *M.*: Plaintiff's attorney withdrew as plaintiff could not proceed, at plaintiff's request case dismissed, one-half day.
12. *L.* v. *B.*: Partial trial settled, one-half day.
13. *P.* v. *S.*: Settled, one-fourth day.
14. *S.* v. *F.*: Settled near end of evidence, 2 days.
15. *H.* v. *H.*: Verdict, 1½ days.
16. *L.* v. *N.*: Settled, one-fourth day.
17. *M.* v. *M.*: Settled, one-fourth day.
18. *B.* v. *C.*: Partial trial settled, 1 day.
19. *C.* v. *C.*: Verdict, 2 days.
20. *F.* v. *H.*: Partial trial settled, 1 day.
21. *F.* v. *C.*: Settled, one-fourth day.
22. *J.* v. *H.*: Partial trial settled, 1 day.
23. *G.* v. *G.*: Partial trial settled, 1 day.

Conservation's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on this day 30 years ago—April 27, 1935—this Nation heeded the harsh lessons from vanished civilizations. We recognized the certain and grim fate of peoples who waste the land. We decreed that America for generations to come shall be a land of plenty and a beautiful land.

Three decades ago, the Congress of the United States decided to make the conservation of this Nation's most basic and precious resource—the soil—a national responsibility and a national policy.

The Soil Conservation Act—Public Law 46 of the 74th Congress—was passed by unanimous vote.

Our Government entered a partnership with our farm people.

Today, 30 years later, we are abundantly blessed. We are the best fed nation on the face of the earth. Our lands are conserved, they are protected, they are improved and enriched, and they flourish.

Mr. Speaker, history is replete and tragic with accounts of the deterioration and degeneration of peoples who have neglected and wasted the soil.

Babylon, once a rich and bounteous land, is now desolate; the famous stables of Nebuchadnezzar were discovered in recent years by excavations deep into deposits of sand and debris. The promised land which 3,000 years ago flowed with milk and honey now lies in ruin. North Africa was the granary of Rome in the days of its glory, but today most of north Africa is a desert.

In north Syria among Leppo, Antioch, and Hama lie the skeletons of the flowering villages of Biblical times, the lands about them eroded and desolate. Archeologists dug 18 to 28 feet to reach the tops of the magnificent buildings of the once great city of Antioch where the Apostle Paul struggled to establish one of the first Christian churches.

Looking back across the years, Mr. Speaker, it would seem that we must conclude that no nation ever established a policy more intimate to and promising of its future than was done by the Congress 30 years ago.

I am happy to count myself among the 21 Members of Congress still serving who were in office when the historic vote was taken in 1935 to make conservation a national policy.

In those dark days when the land was being despoiled by wind and water no one in the Congress voted against the measure, and the Soil Conservation Service came into being on a wave of hope that the chaos sweeping over the countryside would be ended with the development of sound soil and water conservation practices. That hope has been justified by the Soil Conservation Service in 30 years of progress.

The original supporters of the Soil Conservation Act remaining in Congress are few in number. But soil and water conservation has, over the years, added new friends in every Congress.

This congressional support has made possible numerous programs and projects designed to meet particular conservation needs. These include the Small Watershed Act, the Great Plains conservation program, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and other soil and water conservation programs which have brought this effort into larger perspective.

I have watched the Soil Conservation Service grow and acquire new responsibilities and stature. I have noted with great satisfaction that this essential Government service continues to be a dynamic agency, bringing new forces into play in behalf of every one of us who depends upon Mother Earth for our sustenance.

Mr. Speaker, in view of what conservation means to this generation and to the generations to follow, it is a matter of consternation to Members of this House that the administration now has submitted to the Congress a proposal that would withdraw the Government from full participation and leadership in the conservation movement.

The proposal would require farmers and ranchers and other rural landowners to pay for technical help in installing soil and water conservation systems—help they have received free from the Soil Conservation Service through the soil conservation districts. It would cut the Soil Conservation Service budget for technical assistance by $20 million, with this cost being saddled upon the soil conservation districts and their cooperators.

Mr. Speaker, it is unthinkable that anyone in this Nation would harm a work that has such a tremendous impact on the welfare of this Nation. It is unthinkable—in view of the increasing demands that industry, cities and our people generally are making on our land and water resources—that anyone could ignore our Nation's conservation needs and say: "Let the farmer take care of them."

We all would lose, for farmers do not have the financial resources or the technical knowledge to do the job without help. We would lose what we have invested in soil and water conservation over the years.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot—we shall not—let this happen.

We Americans are consecreated to the soil. Our accomplishments in these years since April 27, 1935, are many and rewarding.

Mr. Speaker, my message today—on this anniversary—is that our job has just begun—that care of the soil must never cease—so long as the sun shines, the rains come and the winds blow.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Urban Renewal Success of Raymond Rebsamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine article—published in the Arkansas Gazette—about Raymond Rebsamen.

Mr. Rebsamen is one of the leading businessmen of my State. He is also one of the public-spirited men who devote so much of their time and talents to the public welfare.

I join my constituents in congratulating Mr. Rebsamen on his fine contributions to urban development and other public purposes.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REBSAMEN: HE MADE RENEWAL WORK

(By Jerry Dhonau)

Raymond Rebsamen, it is said, is fond of telling how the Urban Progress Association was founded.

Arthur Phillips, who is chairman of the board of the M. M. Cohn Co., invited him to lunch one day in 1959 to talk about how plans for downtown renewal were lagging. They ate barbecue and drank buttermilk and decided to do something about shifting redevelopment into action.

Rebsamen gathered a small group of civic and business leaders at his home later. They talked over and formed the association to help the city government execute the elaborate plan that became the Central Little Rock urban renewal project.

Six years later, as even a casual downtown visitor can see, Rebsamen and his associates have been eminently successful. Rebsamen stepped down Tuesday after 6 years as president of the Urban Progress Association, but he insisted that Little Rock was just beginning to rejuvenate itself and nobody could know where the progress would end.

"Our past is interesting," he said. "But yet, it too will become eclipsed and be dimmed by what is yet to come. I'm confident that the achievements of those who follow us may well relegate our progress to date to that of Kitty Hawk in this exploding era of urbanization."

Although the most active part Rebsamen and the association have played in urban renewal was the Central Little Rock project, Rebsamen was speaking of the whole renewal program. Since urban renewal was approved by the voters and instituted 15 years ago by the Little Rock Housing Authority, 15 percent of the city's land area has been turned upside down. In these locations, slums have been wiped away and open spaces and handsome new buildings have appeared.

This has meant an expenditure of $31 million in construction either completed or announced on land bought and cleared through urban renewal and sold for redevelopment. It also has meant $11 million spent in rehabilitation and remodeling by private property owners within project areas.

The 10 projects undertaken have drawn Federal grants of over $30 million. The housing authority itself has spent $4,400,000 on site improvements (streets, curbs, gutters, storm drainage and the like).

These figures show that over $46 million has been spent in the construction industry alone, creating 500 new jobs that have been sustained for the last 10 years.

IT PAYS OFF IN ANOTHER WAY

Urban renewal also has started paying off in another way. Including the Granite Mountain project (which is over 95 percent complete), five projects totaling 285 acres have been completed.

Of the 285 acres, 50 acres have been converted to parks, playgrounds and schools, none of which produce any property tax revenue. Even with this, the tax that governmental agencies—the county and school district as well as the city—receive from the nine urban renewal areas averages 707 percent more per project than before. The average of tax by acre is even more—1,239 percent.

"I challenge you to illustrate any expenditure of public funds which is bringing better returns," Rebsamen says.

The record is considered pretty impressive. National publications have featured Little Rock's urban renewal program. Delegations from other cities have come to look.

The philosophy behind urban renewal at Little Rock through the years has not been that, as some have proposed, of creeping socialism, but the cure of a basic human problem that Rebsamen set as the goal for urban progress: "A city in which no child will go to school from a slum." In addition, it has, indeed, been good for business.

WHAT IS BEHIND HIS SUCCESS?

How has Rebsamen been the most effective force in the business community behind a city government trying to execute the urban renewal projects?

Mostly, say some of his associates and acquaintances, it is through his enormous prestige within the business community ("he motivates others—that's how he's effective") and the drive that has made him successful in business. ("When he decides a project is good for the city then there's no stopping him.")

He was particularly active in pushing for Federal approval of the central Little Rock project, making several trips to Washington and elsewhere to see Federal officials and explain the plans and the need.

Rebsamen also has gone all over the Nation making speeches about urban renewal. He has studied it and is considered to be the most knowledgeable man in Little Rock outside of the housing authority on urban renewal.

Rebsamen, who is 67 and heads several highly successful businesses including an insurance company and automobile dealership, has little time for business leaders who won't participate in efforts to solve community problems.

"I get a little tired of some citizens who sit on their ivory towers and deplore what 'they' are doing * * * or not doing * * * to his city," Rebsamen says.

The end of urban rejuvenation at Little Rock is not in sight.

"The procedure for bringing a city up to date is slow and it is difficult," he says. "But we have come to know that if the city is to survive—to serve its intended functions—then it must be continuously streamlined and modernized."

HOUSING AUTHORITY TALLIED UP SCORE

While Rebsamen and the association have given substantial and unofficial assistance in geting plans put into effect, the planning and execution have been done by the Housing Authority. The authority, which has received considerable national recognition for the job it has done, tallies up the projects this way:

Philander Smith: 9.6 acres, all of it sold to Philander Smith College for campus expansion. This wiped out the $1,250 annual property tax on the acreage. But in the year before redevelopment the share that the city got out of the property tax was only $246.72, less than it cost the city to make five fire runs there during the year. The net project cost was $205,928.

Dunbar: 40 acres in a zigzag pattern between Izard, High, 15th and 19th Streets. The property tax went up from $6,328 to $23,318. The project cost $1,943,851.

Livestock show: 80 acres. Although 16 acres was sold to the Arkansas Livestock Show Association for off-street parking and playgrounds, both tax exempt, the tax yield jumped from $3,161 to $18,611. The project cost $934,735.

West Rock: 53.69 acres and includes what now are the highest priced apartments in the city—in the $400 to $600 a month range. Taxes increased from $3,165 to $42,398. The project cost $747,156.

Granite Mountain: 102 acres, mostly residential. Taxes have increased from $1,615 to $25,268. The project cost is estimated at $1,496,173.

High Street: Planning started in 1958 and the project is still in progress, including $640,000 worth of site improvements. Taxes on the 268 acres have increased from $103,612 to an estimated $110,082, although 156 dwellings were eliminated, a school was built and land was set aside for the East-West Expressway. The project cost is estimated at $6,884,445.

Central Little Rock: Planning started in 1960 and completion is expected in 1972. It is the first urban renewal project in the Nation involving the central core of a city—508 acres between the Arkansas River and 15th Street and Broadway and the freeway. Several major buildings have been completed, are under construction or are planned. The property tax just on land where three major developments are planned is expected to increase 875 percent. The net project cost is estimated at $19,987,223.

University Park: Planning started in 1961 and the project is underway over 282 acres. It was planned right after the area was annexed to the city and its estimated cost is $4,036,307.

Coliseum: Planning started in 1961 and completion is expected in 1967. It covers 196.8 acres. It is the first of four projects to be carried out within the South End General Neighborhood Renewal area and the cost is estimated at $1,200,000.

Capitol view: Planning started in 1963 and completion is expected in 1968. The area of 216 acres is generally west and south of the capitol grounds and part of the project will be devoted to expansion of the grounds, such as the site for the new revenue department building.

The Unfair Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with the growing interest across the Nation in bringing about a repeal of our excise taxes, I want to call attention to the need to do away with this tax on dues and initiation fees of recreation clubs. The May 1965 issue of Golf magazine carries a well written article by the publisher, Arnold E. Abramson, entitled "The Unfair Burden," and should be carefully considered by my colleagues:

THE UNFAIR BURDEN—HOW MUCH LONGER MUST THE GOLFERS OF AMERICA BEAR UP UNDER THE GROSSLY UNJUST TAX ON CLUB DUES AND INITIATION FEES?

(By Arnold E. Abramson)

For the past 22 years, a Federal excise tax of 20 percent on club dues and initiation fees has drained millions of dollars from the golfers' pockets and has caused considerable hardship to many small membership golf clubs. When the tax was increased to the 20-percent level in 1943, it was deemed a necessary and justifiable measure in view of the fantastic cost of financing the massive war effort. In 1954, most of the excise taxes were reduced to the prewar level. In 1960, the 20-percent cabaret tax was cut to 10 percent. But the club dues tax has remained in force as an unfair and discriminatory measure against golfers and other club members.

The U.S. Golf Association has waged a spirited campaign over the years to have the tax reduced to 10 percent. Last summer, Clarence W. Benedict, USGA president, Joseph C. Dey, Jr., its executive director, and Lynford Lardner, Jr., USGA general counsel, appeared before a hearing of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C., with an appeal on behalf of America's golfers. No action was taken by the committee at that time and the future of the appeal is clouded.

Golf magazine is calling on its readers to support the efforts being made by the USGA by bringing to the attention of the members of the Ways and Means Committee the grassroots sentiment in favor of reducing this totally unfair tax. An avalanche of mail from the voting public, it is felt, could produce favorable congressional action.

In order to present the readers of Golf with a clear picture of the history of the tax and its discriminatory character, the memorandum prepared by Mr. Lardner for the USGA on this subject is reprinted as follows:

"A tax upon club dues was first imposed in 1917 as part of the general excise tax legislation of World War I. This tax has always been considered part of the taxes on admissions and been treated in a similar manner. In 1941, the rate was temporarily increased to 11 percent and in 1943 it was again increased with many other items to 20 percent. In 1954, most excise taxes were cut back to their pre-World War II level of 10 percent. This reduction included most admission taxes and taxes on luxuries such as jewelry and furs.

"The House Ways and Means Committee included the club dues tax in this general reduction. The Senate, however, took exception to this proposal; and the dues tax, along with taxes on cabarets and admissions to horse and dog races, remained at 20 percent. When, in 1960, the cabaret tax was cut to 10 percent, this reduction was justified in the Senate report on the ground that the 20 percent rate was discriminatory and that high taxes had restricted employment of musicians and other entertainers. These same arguments are at least as favorable to reduction of the club dues tax.

"The continuation of the discriminatory 20-percent club dues tax is not justifiable on revenue grounds as the club dues tax accounts for approximately $70 million, or less than one-tenth of 1 percent of total tax revenues. The tax has evidently been continued at its high discriminatory rate because of an erroneous belief that the tax is imposed on a luxury of the upper income groups and a failure to understand the positive contributions of private clubs.

"A much more exact analysis of the incidence of the club dues tax and the economic status of club members is contained in the memorandum of C. Lowell Harriss, professor of economics, Columbia University. A few general comments, however, are appropriate. Golf courses are not the playgrounds of the privileged few. More than 6 million Americans play over 15 rounds of golf annually, to say nothing of the very large number who play less frequently. (The most recent figures announced by the National Golf Foundation indicate that this total has increased to 7 million.—Ed.) These figures make golf one of the most popular adult participation sports in the United States. There are over 7,000 golf courses in our country, half of which are owned by private clubs and 2,400 of which are semiprivate. Indicative of the modest character of most private clubs is the fact that over half are only nine-hole courses, which are principally located in small towns. A large number of private courses are located in the less populous and less affluent areas of the country. Representative of the nine-hole courses which account for over half the private clubs in the United States are the 84 private courses in Iowa communities of less than 5,000 which were the subject of a 1955 study. These clubs, representing 75 percent of the private courses in Iowa, had an average membership of 153, and annual dues per member of less than $50.

"Average dues figures are not available and what samples are taken are usually heavily biased in favor of the metropolitan 18-hole courses. Some indication, however, may be found from the number of club members. It is estimated that there are 3.4 million club members, which means the average dues tax paid per member is approximately $20, meaning that the average dues are $100. This is a further indication that the vast majority of the clubs are within the means of the middle class.

"The importance of golf as a sports activity was perhaps best expressed by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY in the July 1964, issue of Golf, where he pointed out the importance of interesting young people in golf and stated:

" '1. Golf promotes mental and physical tone. It encourages what America needs most—a habit of pursuing excellence—a constant striving to meet and surpass one's highest standards.

" '2. Golf brings our young people exactly where they should be for many, many hours—to the fresh outdoors, to sunshine, clean air, green grass.

" '3. Golf builds men and women. It builds sportsmanship in the best sense.

" '4. Golf is a lifetime sport. Almost uniquely, it is good for health at virtually all ages. Because of this fact, it helps resolve one of the most widespread dilemmas faced by sportsminded Americans as they grow older:

" 'What sport can I turn to, now that high school and college athletics are just a fading memory?

" 'One of the best answers is: Golf.'

"Golf is one of the few active outdoor sports in which persons of nearly all ages and abilities can participate. It affords wonderful opportunities for outdoor exercise, sufficiently arduous to be beneficial without being overly strenuous.

"The demand for these public facilities far exceeds the available supply. Overcrowding on public courses is notorious. A public links golfer in most metropolitan areas, for example, must wait for several hours to play a public course on a weekend or holiday. On some public courses in California over 100,000 rounds of golf are played each year—this amounts to one foursome teeing off every 10 minutes for 12 hours each day, 365 days a year.

"The 9-hole courses in rural areas, such as the 84 clubs in Iowa communities of less than 5,000, are supplying public recreational facilities at private expense. In metropolitan areas, private courses are reducing the burden on public courses. Unfortunately, the private courses' growth is not keeping pace with the demand for golf courses; in fact, there has actually been a decline in private golf courses since 1931. Local governments have nearly doubled the number of municipal courses since 1931 in recognition of their obligation to provide public recreational facilities. The inadequate tax base of most local governments, combined with the expense of establishing a course in a metropolitan area, has meant that demand far exceeds supply.

"The cost of establishing an 18-hole golf course in a metropolitan area is staggering. Land costs in these areas are rapidly becoming prohibitive. Aside from land costs, it requires from $15,000 to $25,000 per hole, or well in excess of a quarter million dollars, to construct an adequate 18-hole golf course (without provision for any clubhouse facility). After initial construction, annual maintenance cost averages $3,000 per hole, or about $54,000 for an adequate 18-hole golf course. Adding to the cost of public golf facilities is the loss of property tax revenues, the magnitude of which is indicated by answers to a survey of one-fourth of our member clubs from which we estimate that the amount of local property taxes and assessments paid by all of our members in 1963 aggregated about $30 million.

"Encouragement should be given to the establishment and continuation of private clubs in order to give some relief to hard-pressed local governments.

"Private golf clubs also serve a valuable function as substantial employers of unskilled and youthful workers—two categories currently presenting serious unemployment problems throughout our country. Total payroll and employment figures for private clubs are not available; but it is generally recognized that payroll constitutes two-thirds of the cost of course maintenance. An analysis of the expenditures by 66 Metropolitan New York clubs for the year 1960 shows that they spent more than $11 million on payroll alone.

"Private golf clubs employ over 250,000 boys as caddies each year. Employment of these caddies represents a particularly valuable contribution by private golf clubs because older boys represent approximately 25 percent of our Nation's unemployed. It is difficult to imagine a more wholesome type of employment for teenage boys than caddying, which involves outdoor work in the company of responsible adults. The caddies' earnings often help finance their future education; and, in addition, various golf associations provide caddies and former caddies with direct scholarship assistance. Last year 1,000 boys were the recipients of caddie scholarships covering college tuition and housing having an average value of $4,000 for a 4-year period or an aggregate of nearly $1 million annually.

"It is inconsistent for the Federal Government to attempt to alleviate unemployment by aiding distressed industries while at the

same time imposing a discriminatory tax burden on private clubs employing a large number of persons whose employment opportunities are severely limited.

"The ability of private golf clubs to continue providing such recreational facilities is being jeopardized by their growing financial difficulties. Since 1931, there has been a 20-percent decrease in the total number of private clubs. Many of these were victims of the depression; but many others simply have been unable to overcome the squeeze between rising costs and the financial limitations of their members' pocketbooks. In nearly every year from 1931 through 1956, there was a decrease in the number of private golf courses. An annual survey by the accounting firm of Horwath & Horwath, which specializes in club audits, shows that in 1962 private golf clubs in general were in greater financial difficulty than in 1961 and could not even cover the depreciation on their facilities. Most of the clubs surveyed were being compelled to increase dues and fees in order to survive financially. The clubs covered by the survey are large 18-hole courses, located in the major metropolitan areas; and it is likely that the financial condition of smaller clubs is even more grave. Indicative of the adverse impact of the dues tax on the growth of private clubs is the fact that during this same period, 1931-63, while private clubs were decreasing, the number of semiprivate courses, which involve considerably less taxable dues, grew from 700 to 2,868—a more than 300-percent growth.

"In appraising the effect of the dues tax, it should be borne in mind that the tax not only constricts existing clubs (many are sorely tempted to solve their financial troubles by converting to residential subdivisions) but also deters the establishment of new clubs to meet the increasing demand now overburdening municipal courses.

"The USGA's basic position is against the discriminatory aspects of the club dues tax. However, if there is to be a widespread elimination of excise taxes, we believe the elimination of the club dues tax is justifiable. The revenue produced by the tax is small and it has posed an administrative problem for both the taxpayer and the Government. The definition of dues has proved troublesome because of the Internal Revenue Service's attempt to apply it to service charges, and the clubs devising more ingenious ways to obtain funds from their membership without raising dues. In addition, the exemptions for capital improvement funds and some swimming clubs have added considerably to the complexity of this section.

"The U.S. Golf Association does not ask for special treatment for club dues, but only that they not be discriminated against. The large club dues tax is an excessive burden to the vast majority of clubs, which are modest operations and continually find themselves in financial difficulties. The large benefits provided by these clubs justify at least a neutral tax policy toward them."

"How the Handicapped Are Overcoming Barriers to Employment in My Community"—Essay by Miss Marybeth Meffert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, too often in recent days we have heard unkind words spoken about the attitudes and ideals of our younger people. It is said that they are too glib, too shallow, and without concern for the real world around them.

An outstanding young woman who is proof to the contrary is Miss Marybeth Meffert, who graduates this year from Boise High School, in my own State. Miss Meffert has submitted the winning essay on behalf of the Idaho employ-the-handicapped program. Her insight, empathy, and understanding of the problems besetting the physically handicapped, and her recognition of their ability to do highly productive work, do justice to one far older than Miss Meffert.

I ask unanimous consent that her prize-winning essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD; and I commend it to all Americans.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"HOW THE HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY": IDAHO'S FIRST PRIZE WINNER—1965 ABILITY COUNTS CONTEST

(By Marybeth Meffert, Boise High School)

Not many years ago, the handicapped were seldom seen working competitively with the able bodied. They were isolated, kept away from social contacts, and rejected by society. Employers did not know how to measure the potentials of a handicapped person, and unfortunately they often drew their own conclusions, based on ignorance and prejudice—negative ones.

The handicapped themselves deserve all the laurels for breaking through the barrier of misconceptions and the biased opinions of the ignorant. It was not easy. It took the courage and determination of individuals who refused to give up; who said, "I will," when society said, "You can't." Often through sheer willpower alone, severely disabled persons proved to society that they could take their place in the community as valuable and self-reliant citizens.

Any handicapped person should be able to be employed if he is given the necessary training and proper job placement. Proper job placement is especially important when considered from the viewpoint that anyone, even an able-bodied person, is handicapped if he is placed in a job situation for which he is not equipped. A disabled person should not be considered handicapped in respect to his job if he is capable of doing the work.

Here in Idaho, Live, Inc., has placed approximately 40 handicapped persons per year on the competitive labor market since 1949. Given the chance that time, training, and proper job placement afforded, these individuals have proved themselves to be competent and resourceful.

This year, 13 blind students are attending Idaho colleges. Their textbooks are records with the labels printed in braille. These young people have amazed their fellow students and the members of the faculty with their self-sufficiency. They have also earned the admiration of their school, their community, and their State. They are young men and women who, in spite of their handicap, are learning to take their place in the world of tomorrow.

Handicapped persons are at more of a disadvantage in States such as Idaho than in areas where there is a great deal of manufacturing. Being made up mostly of rural communities, Idaho has little industry, which has often proved to be a source of employment for the handicapped. In communities such as ours an imaginative approach must often be used to find work for a disabled person.

But there are jobs, and for each of these jobs there is a handicapped person who can successfully fill the position. A blind, partially deaf man skillfully handweaves rugs, though his eyes will never see their beauty. A woman who cannot stand because of an orthopedic hip ailment sits, and her fingers fashion lovely wind chimes. A man in a wheelchair sits in the courthouse, administering driver's license tests. A rodeo rider proves to be tough competition in the calf-roping event, despite his two artificial legs. It was not easy for these people, nor is it easy for the other handicapped like them who are striving for independence though they are disabled. These individuals are living testimonies to the fact that handicapped people can lead useful, productive lives.

Once employers would not hire the disabled because it disturbed them to have a handicapped person around. Handicapped individuals who have proved their capabilities deserve the credit for changing employers' opinions. Now the nearly unanimous viewpoint of employers is: "I do not object to hiring the handicapped if they can do the work."

Employers who give the handicapped a chance to prove themselves are seldom sorry. Statistics show that the handicapped make the most reliable employees, having less absenteeism than others.[1]

Because of the fine examples set by handicapped workers, the barrier of employer prejudice is quickly melting away. In this way disabled persons are helping society to overcome its handicap—crippling prejudice and blinding misconceptions.

Yet there is more to be done. Here in Idaho there is a waiting list of handicapped people who need jobs. There are inadequate funds to meet the needs of the State in giving these people the training they need and seeing that they obtain suitable jobs. Progress has been made, but it is not enough. Obstacles have crumbled and fallen away. but there loom more barriers ahead that are yet to be overcome. Judging by the past record of the handicapped in my community, I feel sure they will remain dauntless and undefeated no matter how formidable those barriers may be.

[1] Wishik, Samuel M., M.D., "How To Help Your Handicapped Child" Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 219, p. 23.

Address by Hon. Hervey G. Machen Before Graduating Class of Southeastern University, Washington, D.C., April 24, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, a neighbor of mine, John P. Maurer, president of Southeastern University here in Washington told me about the inspirational remarks relating to the problems of today made by my colleague, the Honorable HERVEY G. MACHEN, Representative from Maryland's Fifth District, made at the university's annual dinner-dance for the 1965 graduating classes last Saturday evening, April 24.

Southeastern University is completing its 86th year as an operating service of the YMCA of Metropolitan Washington.

It is proud to number Representative MACHEN as a distinguished alumnus. The Congressman received his LL.B. in 1939 and his LL.M. in 1941.

Congressman MACHEN's remarks follow:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN HERVEY G. MACHEN, DEMOCRAT, OF MARYLAND

Many years ago I walked the path many of you are now taking by working and going to school at the same time in an effort to make a career and a place in American society. You and I are fortunate that we have had the opportunity, desire, and drive to work and attend school at the same time.

As we all know, there are thousands and thousands of poverty-stricken Americans who cannot or do not have this same chance not only to be gainfully employed but to use spare time—hours that would have been spent in leisure or with our families—to attend school for a better education and improved career opportunities.

Similar opportunities are denied many thousands of people because they either lack initiative as a result of being entrenched in poverty for so many years that all hope of ever climbing out of the well was lost, or for a variety of other causes, such as the breakup of the family unit which I see as becoming a critical problem today and just plain apathy on the part of local citizens themselves.

To conquer this cancer called poverty is where we—in Congress—and you—the citizens—must concentrate our efforts today. To guarantee that every American has an equal opportunity to a decent education and career and the initiative to take advantage of these opportunities is the goal of our generation. We are dedicated to building a new society for our country—a society and a way of life that will be a model for the world and a springboard for even better things for future generations. This feat cannot be accomplished overnight; nor can it be accomplished in a hundred or a thousand days because our society is not malleable like clay; and poverty, lack of education and initiative and generations-old institutions cannot be wiped out with a wave of the magic wand. Instead, our efforts are to be more like a builder constructing a grand new edifice, and we in the Congress are now providing you with the tools and the building blocks.

Let me cite a few of the ones that Congress has already provided: First there is the war-on-poverty bill, known as the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. There is the aid-to-education bill and the Appalachian public works aid program to help bring the economy of that mountainous region into the 20th century.

Now I must caution you that these measures alone are far from the final answer. We already have mass welfare and relief programs which have been underway for decades. It is apparent that they are grossly inadequate. We have some private organizations which are carrying out their own antipoverty programs in various ways. But I sincerely hope that the sun has set on the belief that poverty can be conquered by merely handing out money to every open hand and mouth. It is my strong feeling that now we on Capitol Hill have mapped a course for an attack at the very roots of poverty by means of a comprehensive community program to be carried out primarily by the local citizens and those stricken by environment and circumstance.

The community-action program is the backbone of the antipoverty campaign and calls for participation and coordination by citizens—not bureaucrats—through their service organizations, schools, churches or civic associations. The success of our war on poverty lies in the hands of the citizens who—with the tools we in Congress have provided—must now go to work.

You who are here tonight have exhibited that incentive which is so necessary for success in almost any endeavor. This same incentive can and should be turned toward action against poverty in your own community where you could work through your churches, schools, service organizations, and citizens associations to implement what Congress has already done.

An excellent example of voluntary citizen participation is a growing program in Beltsville being carried out by a high school teacher and several students who are working with preschool youngsters who may be qualified as culturally deprived. This group is operating on its own initiative and with whatever funds it can raise locally for material. I feel their work is inspired and should be strongly encouraged and cited as the type of local voluntary antipoverty campaign which is striking at the roots of this cancer. I know there are a few other groups I could mention like the one in Beltsville. By this time next year I sincerely hope there will be hundreds of them.

I do hope you do not feel that we in Congress have placed the sole responsibility for the war on poverty with a brandnew growing bureaucracy which is already enmeshed in redtape and controversy. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 specifically calls for community action programs and major participation by local groups and citizens. This is where you and your friends fit into the picture.

If these broad new programs are nothing more than a bureaucratic power grab which is fed by citizen apathy, then I can see nothing but disaster for the antipoverty campaign and for the people we are trying to help. But I am optimistic that this will not happen as long as you do your share in this great effort. In this complex society what we really will have to do is concentrate on rebuilding family responsibility and church and community responsibility. This can be done only by the individual and not by the Federal Government or any of its programs.

Tonight should be a happy occasion for you who are graduating. It was for me when I was working my way through law school years ago. I want to close by saying that in this brief message it is my earnest hope that I have been able to impress on you some of the duties incumbent on you if we are to create a truly Great Society. I wish you all the best of everything.

The Future of Pennsylvania's Urban Communities—Address by Governor Scranton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on April 20, 1965, Gov. William W. Scranton, of my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, delivered a most moving and eloquent address to a joint session of the Pennsylvania General Assembly, in Harrisburg, on "The Future of Pennsylvania's Urban Communities." The problems and needs of our cities and urban areas are among the most important challenges facing America today; and I ask unanimous consent that Governor Scranton's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE ON THE FUTURE OF PENNSYLVANIA'S URBAN COMMUNITIES

(By Gov. William W. Scranton, before a joint session of the General Assembly. Harrisburg, Pa., Apr. 20, 1965)

Mr. Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the general assembly, my fellow Pennsylvanians, we come here today in behalf of the 9 million Pennsylvanians who live in our big cities, our suburbs, our smaller cities, our growing towns.

We seek to design an effective local-state partnership to build better communities in a better Pennsylvania.

We shall talk of people—and of their homes and their schools, and of their fight against juvenile delinquency, and of their struggle for good communities, for public health and public safety.

And when we have finished, Pennsylvania will be on her way to another chapter of greatness.

Four thousand years before the birth of Christ, somewhere in the lush valleys of the Mideast, ancient man staked out a permament site for what had been a wandering village of nomadic tribesmen.

And thus was born the first city.

Its name has long since been forgotten, but the legacy of problems and paradoxes which it initiated lives on to challenge man to this very day.

For of all human creations none is more perverse than the urban community. It gives with one hand, and takes away with the other.

Cities exist, for example, to provide otherwise impossible opportunities for economic advancement. Yet, they also spawn the cruelest poverty.

Cities are for the common safety of their inhabitants. Yet, they simmer with crime, delinquency and violence.

Cities are for health and happiness. Yet, there are places in Philadelphia where babies die at three times the normal rate.

Cities are for convenience. Yet, the suburban commuter is one of the most inconvenienced men in all America.

Cities exist so that man can savor and supplement his cultural birthright. Yet, even the basic education of the young becomes more difficult each year.

So, man creates urban communities to nurture and shape his civilization, but he must wage a perpetual struggle lest they succeed only in twisting and brutalizing it.

And the enemies of the urban community are legion.

Overcrowding. The sordid press of too many people into rundown, shoddy neighborhoods. The monotonous crush of stone, steel, and brick, until God's green earth is blotted out and it almost seems as if man was made to serve the buildings.

The squalid ghettos of penned-in humanity, ill equipped by ignorance, prejudice, and disease to break the chains of poverty.

Overrapid growth. And, even in more prosperous communities, the failure to provide community facilities in sufficient quantity or quality to serve a burgeoning population.

Or lack of growth. And the growing cobwebs of decay it spins off.

One or more of these malfunctions of modern society has taken its toll through all the urban communities of Pennsylvania. The big cities, the suburbs, the smaller cities, the towns—none has completely escaped, and all are endangered in the future.

Juvenile delinquency in Pennsylvania's urban communities has increased as much as 30 percent since 1959.

Over 300 Pennsylvania communities still dump raw, untreated sewage into the streams and rivers of our State.

Though the average density of population in Pennsylvania is only 252 persons per square mile, there are neighborhoods in Philadelphia where nearly 63,000 human beings per square mile are squeezed in.

Each year, some 20,000 children in Pennsylvania's urban communities drop out without completing grade and high school.

There are sections of our larger cities where the unemployment rate surpasses 20 percent, and among young people in certain neighborhoods it rises to more than 60 percent.

And, in Pennsylvania, over 65 of every 100 single-family urban homes are older than 25 years—and that's 16 percentage points higher than the national average and higher than any of our neighboring States.

All this is clear testimony that Pennsylvania's urban communities have deep problems that must be solved.

And the government of this Commonwealth must be prepared to become a full partner with the local communities in the labor that lies ahead.

We have started.

First, we recognized that for the individual communities of Pennsylvania to be strong and prosperous it was necessary for the State generally to be in that condition.

So, 2 years ago we made a new beginning.

It has been startlingly successful.

The sleeping industrial giant that was Pennsylvania has been aroused from slumber and now strides rapidly forward to new heights.

By last October, you will remember, Pennsylvania's unemployment had been toppled below the national average. And this past winter was the best economically of our generation. In March, for instance, unemployment in Pennsylvania was at its lowest point for the month since the Korean war.

And—perhaps most significant of all—the economic improvement of Pennsylvania has been at a faster rate than that of the Nation generally.

These figures reflect the growing economic strength of the Commonwealth—a strength that has spilled over into every section of the State and into our local communities.

What is more, this new wave of prosperity, in harness with sound management of the State government, has made it possible for the Commonwealth to greatly increase its contribution toward the vital services which are provided our citizens on the community level.

The budget I presented to you earlier this year provides for an almost 30-percent increase in the State contribution to local school districts, as compared to the year before we made the new beginning.

And we have been able to dramatically raise the State's contribution in a score of other fields—from libraries to industrial development, from urban renewal to hospitals—that are of fundamental importance to our local communities. And in the case of urban renewal we presently have before the general assembly a request to increase next year's budget by another $2 million.

We take quiet pride in our on-going participation in the redevelopment of the Delaware River Port area; in the full State payment for the first time in history toward the cost of local sewage disposal; and in the imaginative new approach to public assistance which has had dramatic success in getting people off the dole and into useful employment. And, the allocation of funds to the communities for open spaces under Project 70 has also moved rapidly along. Concurrently, as part of the same war against uncontrolled urban sprawl, the State planning board is swiftly completing a total statewide plan for open spaces. And in the all-important task of attracting new industry and new jobs we have forged the most successful State cooperation with local communities that has ever existed anywhere. Clearly, this effort will continue and be expanded.

But now there is much more to be done.

And that is why I come here today to propose a new era in the relationship of our State and our communities.

I propose a dynamic new partnership of State and local governments to make the urban areas of Pennsylvania the most livable, the most progressive in all the Nation.

Such an alliance requires that we adopt two broad and bold approaches.

The first of these is to assure that the local communities are strong enough to carry their end of the partnership.

And, second, the State government must embark on a series of new and expanded programs that hit as rifleshots at the most serious problems facing local communities today.

Consider the first of these two approaches:

Local communities are creatures of the State. In fact, the relationship historically has been almost that of parent and child. But a wise parent knows that when the child has reached maturity he must be given more of a voice in the conduct of his own affairs and those of the family.

For the communities of Pennsylvania that time has come. And to effect it I offer four specific proposals.

First, I ask the general assembly to create a new cabinet-level department of community affairs.

This will give the communities of Pennsylvania a fair voice and a long overdue voice in the highest councils of the State government.

At long last, 9 million persons who live in Pennsylvania's urban areas—whether big city, suburban area, smaller city, or growing town—will have a major department of the Government interested specifically in the experience and problems of urban living.

The enabling legislation, which will shortly be put before you, will call for the transfer of some existing State agencies into the new department.

These will include the bureau of community development from the department of commerce, the public service institute from the department of public instruction and the functions of the bureau of municipal affairs and the bureau of land records from the department of internal affairs.

The new department will also assume the Commonwealth's responsibilities for coordination of the antipoverty and Appalachian programs.

Because the need is so urgent, I will ask you to make the department's creation effective immediately. But to provide for an orderly transition, I will ask that transfer of functions from the department of internal affairs not be made effective until January of 1967.

When finally assembled the new department will have under its jurisdiction all of those programs and areas of responsibility which are of paramount importance to the urban communities of Pennsylvania.

These will include not only the compilation and dissemination of statistical and professional information of importance to the communities, but also such programs as urban renewal, mass transportation and community planning.

In addition, the new department will have jurisdiction over the Commonwealth's efforts to encourage the development of housing for our citizens. For that purpose the Pennsylvania Housing Agency, which was activate by this administration, will also be transferred to the new department.

Summed up, the department of community affairs will provide a clearinghouse for solving the common problems of Pennsylvania communities, an opportunity for those communities to be fully represented in the State government, and a one-stop agency to carry out the programs which are of vital importance to the urban areas of the Commonwealth.

The second great need, if our local communities are to develop the strength they ought to have, is for the general assembly to enact sweeping reforms in the election laws of the Commonwealth.

Fair and honest elections are imperative at every level of American politics, but nowhere more important than in the conduct of local government which, after all, is still the front parlor of our Republic.

If local elections are controlled by any force other than honest men casting honest ballots, local government will soon perish amid the complexities of the modern world.

I will, therefore, put before you legislation to reform the conduct of elections in Pennsylvania.

It will call for a new method of selecting election district officials and will provide for their training. It will reform the existing absentee ballot law. And it will provide improved procedures to guarantee every citizen's right to vote without coercion and to have his ballot honestly counted.

The third need to strengthen our local communities is for more of them to voluntarily enter into regional planning and related activities with their neighbors.

The independence of local communities traditionally has been highly regarded in Pennsylvania. And that independence, if not misused, can be a force for good. But surely it is self-defeating for any local community to arbitrarily refuse to cooperate across municipal lines when certain problems can only be solved by a cooperative approach.

The State planning board is currently conducting reconnaissance surveys of each region of the State. These, plus the other work of the planning board, will identify common regional problems which will only yield to regional solutions.

I am requesting the planning board, therefore, to make its studies and all other possible aid available to the local communities. And I urge our communities to undertake the widespread practice of voluntary, cooperative regional planning and related activities.

And, finally, the fourth proposal I am making to strengthen our local communities is this:

We need to strip away all of the old, outmoded restrictive State law which has piled up over the years. Nearly two centuries of legislative accumulation overcontrols our communities, stifles their initiative, and reduces their ability to produce viable local governments.

First and foremost, we must remove from the State constitution itself some of the old-fashioned and unnecessary restrictions and anachronism which it forces on local government.

A constitutional amendment to accomplish just that is already before the general assembly as part of this administration's constitutional reform package. I urge you to pass it speedily.

Furthermore, we need to reexamine the whole body of local government restrictions enacted through the years by the general assembly.

I am appointing, therefore, a high-level and bipartisan task force—including representatives of State and local governments, of the general assembly, of local government associations, and of other interested groups—to begin immediately the task of reviewing existing law.

When this task force completes its labor, the results will be presented to the general assembly, along with recommendations for change, repeal, and modernization.

These four proposals then: Creation of a department of community affairs, reform of the election laws, encouragement of regional

planning, and clearing away unnecessary State restrictions on local government—these four proposals can make Pennsylvania's urban communities strong enough to carry their half of the dynamic local-State partnership I am proposing.

But to provide for strong communities is to meet only part of the challenge.

The government of the Commonwealth also must now take on an ever more fierce determination to strike out at the common enemies of its communities and itself.

I propose, therefore, that we undertake new programs aimed at five great problems facing our communities, but which are beyond their ability to tackle alone.

These five great problems are: education, housing, crime and delinquency, mass transportation, and health.

First, education.

In 1 week I will put before you the results of an exhaustive 2-year effort which untangles the present maze of State subsidies for the support of local schools.

I mention it today because the new system will be of great benefit to the schoolchildren of Pennsylvania's urban areas.

The details will come in the education message, but in broad outline the schools of our urban areas can expect three major benefits:

1. The new subsidy plan will propose a multimillion dollar increase in total State aid, and much of this will go to schools in urban areas.

2. The new formula will correct inequities which have stood for many years against the fair sharing of State aid, and many of these inequities have been suffered by urban school districts.

3. The new plan will provide special subsidy help to those urban areas where the heavy density of population, with all its attendant difficulties, is creating acute educational problems.

Besides the new subsidy formula, there are two more vital educational measures I urge you to enact. One will give youngsters from the slums a fair chance at an equal start. The second will replace wornout school buildings in our heaviest populated areas.

The first program is already before you. In my original budget requests I included, and I urge you now to act favorably on it, a request for $1 million to provide preschool training for children from the slums.

These are the children who, without special early help, will drop out of school before the eighth grade. Their deprived backgrounds guarantee that without this preschool training they will not be able to keep pace with more fortunate children. I believe they deserve our special help.

The second program—to replace wornout school buildings in our heavy populated centers—will be detailed in next week's education message.

In a nutshell, however, what I will suggest is that the State heavily invest, through its long-term borrowing capacity, in the modernization of Pennsylvania's most outmoded school buildings.

In Philadelphia alone, there are 99 school buildings which are more than a half century old. Some of them are firetraps. Nearly all of them contribute to second-rate education. I propose that we do something now about this condition.

The second great need of Pennsylvania's urban communities is housing.

I am concerned about the general level of new home construction in Pennsylvania.

We know that the average age of housing in Pennsylvania is older than the national average and older than our neighboring States. And we know, too, that the number of new housing starts in the Commonwealth has been down in some recent years.

Obviously, the decades of economic plight in Pennsylvania, reflected in what until recently was an unemployment rate far higher than the national average, did have and might still be having an adverse effect on the housing industry.

But what no one knows is whether this completely explains the less than ideal construction level. We must find out.

I shall name, therefore, a cabinet-level group to work in close touch with the homebuilding industry to determine what the Commonwealth might do to stimulate the private construction of housing. If indeed there is need for governmental action, it shall be promptly made known to the general assembly.

Meanwhile, there is one vast segment of Pennsylvania's housing need that we can and should move immediately to meet.

We need nearly 30,000 middle-income homes and I propose an imaginative and unique program through which the Commonwealth will stimulate private enterprise to fill that need.

These homes would sell in the $10,000 to $17,500 price range and would be purchased by Pennsylvanians at the $3,600 to $8,000 annual earnings level.

The largest single obstacle now preventing these families from owning their own homes is the income requirements under presently available financing.

The detailed program I will shortly put before you will remove that obstacle by lowering the interest on mortgages and thus reducing the family income needed to meet monthly payments.

The money to finance this plan will come from bonds issued by the Pennsylvania Housing Agency. The mortgages it finances will be fully insured. The bonds will be repaid over the years as the mortgages are reduced by the families purchasing the homes.

In all, this proposal means more homeowning Pennsylvanians, stronger communities, and a shot in the arm to a vital segment of the State's economy. And, finally, it is worth mentioning that it would put Pennsylvania far in the lead of any other State in the imaginative coupling of public and private capital to fill the middle-income housing need.

The third great urban problem which I propose we tackle is crime and juvenile delinquency.

You will soon have before you a new plan to improve Pennsylvania's outdated system of corrections and rehabilitation for adult criminals. But today I want to concentrate on juvenile delinquency, which is of particular concern to the urban communities.

I urge you to enact a $3 million proposal which, added to our existing effort, will provide Pennsylvania with a juvenile delinquency program second to none in the Nation in its ability to rehabilitate young delinquents and at the same time protect society from youthful lawlessness.

Here are the details:

1. We will provide within a matter of months, to fill what is an emergency need, institutional facilities for an additional 600 juveniles.

2. We will double the present State contribution toward local juvenile police units.

3. We will double the present State contribution toward juvenile court and probation services.

4. We will increase the professional staff working on the effective placement of offenders in institutions and other aspects of correction.

5. We will increase by 50 percent our efforts at juvenile gang control.

6. We will establish, perhaps at the Pennsylvania State University, a badly needed training school for those who work in the field of delinquency and control.

The fourth great problem of our urban communities lies in the field of mass transportation.

Several weeks ago the administration presented to the general assembly what is Pennsylvania's first major program in this important area. I urge you to adopt it without delay.

When you do, you will have made it possible for us to help unclog the transportation arteries of our communities: by helping to purchase needed transit equipment, by aiding in projects designed to ease the current inadequacies of commuter trains, by participating in programs to encourage public use of mass transit systems, and by establishing a State agency to specialize in mass transportation problems.

If you now provide for this program, which was developed after consultation and study across the State, you will have given Pennsylvania an immediate start on solving a grave problem that can only grow worse if ignored.

And, finally, the fifth great area of need for our communities which I ask you to meet lies in the field of public health.

I ask you specifically to do two things:

First, authorize local communities to establish district health offices so that through cooperation they can better meet the public health needs of Pennsylvania.

Second, provide $2 million as the State's share in a program with local and Federal financing to make available $10 million in community centers for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded.

These two proposals have within them the potential to make our communities healthier, happier places in which to live. Even more important, their potential to relieve human suffering and need is gigantic.

So, there you have it. An ambitious, but very practical plan to weld a dynamic new partnership between the State and local governments.

The formula is very much to the point: Provide strong local governments and then back them with the resources of the Commonwealth.

In behalf of the 9 million Pennsylvanians who live in Pennsylvania's urban communities, I ask you to adopt it.

If you do, we indeed shall have better communities in a better Pennsylvania.

In fact, as we have now begun to do so often, we can in this, too, lead the Nation.

A Citizen's Tribute to Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, since the Congress of the United States not long ago designated Sir Winston Churchill as an honorary citizen of the United States, I think my colleagues would be interested to know about a moving tribute to him from the city of Paterson, N.J., which is in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Harry B. Haines, who is the publisher of the Paterson News, originated a type of memorial which directly involved the participation of the schoolchildren of the city, whose world was so greatly shaped by the late and beloved British leader.

Mr. Haines conceived the idea of a condolence message to Lady Clementine Churchill and the people of Britain signed by the schoolchildren of the city.

The response was so great that it became necessary to make a signature book which was ultimately signed by 16,000 boys and girls of the city's public, private, and parochial schools. The book itself was an attractive work of art in royal blue embossed with the seal of the city of Paterson in gold. On its front page it carried the seal of the Churchill family.

The book was delivered to the U.S. Ambassador in London by Brig. Gen. Robert J. Goewey, commander of the Eastern Transport Air Force of the Military Air Transport Service at McGuire Air Force Base, and the Ambassador has transmitted it to Lady Churchill.

In these days when so much is spoken despairingly about juvenile delinquency, it is heartening to witness such a splendid demonstration of juvenile decency. I think that Mr. Haines and the Paterson News are to be congratulated on their worthy project.

The condolence message signed by the 16,000 schoolchildren reads as follows:

To Lady Clementine Churchill and the People of Britain:

As you and your great nation mourn the passing of your beloved husband, world statesman and honorary citizen of these United States, Sir Winston Churchill, we, the 15,000 students and educators of the public and parochial schools of the city of Paterson, N.J., United States of America, offer our tribute to his memory and a prayer for your comfort and strength.

Over each of the 3,000 miles this message has traveled, our hearts and minds reach out to you and reflect on your wonderful 57-year union in holy marriage to this peerless man whose matchless courage and superb inspiration carried the free world to victory over tyranny.

Your invincible partnership, through peace and war, has helped to make this world a better place for all.

The spirit of your beloved husband has outlived his mortal life. The impact of what he has contributed to Great Britain and to the world will outlast the pyramids.

In every time of crisis, in every age of uncertainty and despair, God has given to mankind one man above all others to guide His people through their trying ordeals.

Such a man was Sir Winston Churchill, whose life and deeds will ever serve as an inspiration to all who follow for centuries.

In grateful salute to his deathless memory and in earnest prayer for your continued good health.

THE SCHOOLCHILDREN OF THE CITY OF PATERSON, N.J.

Tribute to State Representative T. F. Terrell, of Pocatello, Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of the truly outstanding lawmakers in my State of Idaho is giving up his seat in the house of representatives to take a new position. Ordinarily, this would be of concern only to those of us from Idaho. But this man, State Representative T. F. Terrell, has for 12 years served his neighbors with such distinction that his loss to the lawmaking body of Idaho is going to be sorely felt. I am honored to be numbered among his close personal friends over the years, and I can attest to his courage in meeting oftentimes unpleasant, but needed, measures, when he felt they would benefit all Idahoans. He has done this on many occasions, at risk to his political career. This has not deterred him; and improved Idaho education and sounder fiscal foundations can be largely credited to his foresight and courage.

The Idaho State Journal editorially regrets his leaving his lifelong home of Pocatello, for his new position, and pays tribute to Representative Terrell. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial of April 11, 1965, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENTLEMAN FROM BANNOCK

Few men have ever left a vacancy in this community as State Representative T. F. Terrel will when he departs 3 weeks from now for a new position in Boise. And that is because few men have contributed as much to this community as he has.

Terrell, who has lived here for virtually all of his 44 years, leaves at the end of this month to become the first director of the new State public employees retirement system. He was selected from among 50 applicants. He takes with him more than 20 years' experience in the insurance business, but he has more to offer Idaho than mere vocational background. He has shown a talent for public office. He is a person who has a gift for both the broad view of things and attention to detail.

However, what he undoubtedly will accomplish after he leaves is of less concern here than what he has accomplished already. The legislative system is such that rarely can one man take full credit for any single action, but Terrell deserves more credit than many for the accomplishments of the remarkable session just ended. He ran for election as a sales tax advocate in the mid-1950's at a time when other candidates didn't dare mention the unpopular plan in Bannock County. Terrell felt it was the only honest answer. It is no accident that Bannock County, the home of Tommy Terrell, is today considered a stronghold for the tax and the progressive Idaho its massive revenue can bring. The budgets of the public schools, the State institutions and the other branches of Gem State Government are more nearly adequate today because of Terrell and other legislators of equal vision.

Those are accomplishments any man could take pride in, but Terrell leaves a gap in this community for an even more important reason. The political stage requires performers of every kind, and most prominent among their numbers are the spirited spokesmen for the many shades of political philosophy. Their opposition to one another, their conflicts, produce the consensus that could not come about in any other way. But among them must be the less inflamed who can draw the conflicting elements together and produce the compromise. Terrell, a man of tact with a low boiling point, has served that function as much as any other legislator in the last 10 years.

And the reason is simple. It is the practice in a legislative body for the lawmakers to preserve dignity and reason by referring to even their worst political enemy as "the gentleman" from such and such a county. In Terrell's case, the term is more than parliamentary formality.—B.H.

A Society of Sheep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a great society was founded in the United States of America when the Declaration of Independence was approved, when our forefathers were willing to lay down "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor" to perpetuate liberty. This was the new idea of government. This was a society which guaranteed all men a way of life which would enable them to attain fulfillment of all their dreams according to their willingness to work, to strive, to learn, to accomplish. This was the great society which gave the greatest number of human beings a better way of life, greater opportunity and has contributed more to all mankind than any other system ever devised by man.

Now we are being asked to abandon the kind of society through which we have achieved our present greatness. We are being presented a bogus system, billed as the Great Society, but which in actuality we are being asked to become a society of sheep, blindly following a Judas sheep. Under the promise of security of relieving us of all responsibility, aand of holding out the hope of reward without achievement, the people are being led to the slaughter of constitutionally limited government, the end of private enterprise and the substitution of a Socialist state where the uncommon man must conform to the norm of mediocrity.

Mr. Speaker, it is not yet too late to return this Nation to belief in and the practice of the principles upon which it was founded.

The Federal Government cannot, and should not, assume responsibilities which freemen must assume for themselves. The Federal Government cannot, and must not guarantee food, clothing, housing, jobs, medical care, and all the necessities of life as well as the luxuries for all regardless of what the individual is willing to do for himself. God grant that we never live in a society that is deaf to the plight of those who suffer misfortune through no fault of their own, but we should pray also that we never encourage the shiftless, the lazy, the dishonest to reap the rewards produced by the labor of the industrious, the ambitious, the builders.

Lyndon Johnson's so-called Great Society can result in only one dismal end: the destruction of individual freedom in America and throughout the world.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 21, 1965, points out the fallacy of governmental practices

which seek to treat the people as perpetual children:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—IN PERPETUAL CHILDHOOD

Although not all parents practice it, most would readily acknowledge their duty to prepare their children for the hardships as well as the rewards of life; in a word, to guide them to maturity. It is instructive to observe how the prevailing theory of Government stands this fundamental obligation on its head.

Governments everywhere, and not least in these United States, increasingly assume the parental role but are inherently incapable of providing parental wisdom. Call it the welfare state or the Great Society or what you will, it is almost as if the whole idea were to ward off maturity, or, as Tocqueville foresaw more than a century ago, to keep men "in perpetual childhood," with minimal need to act and think on their own.

The more obvious purpose, to be sure, lies in the lower reaches of politics: To garner votes by sowing money in every possible field, to build power by promising solutions to all problems. But that process of Government aggrandizement cannot go unaccompanied by some weakening of individual will. It is necessary only to note how placidly many Americans today accept Federal intrusions that would have been unthinkable a generation or two ago.

Federal largess, moreover, is by no means the sole agent of the alteration, even at a time when the subsidies are proliferating at a remarkable rate. There is also a pervasive pseudo-philosophy preached both in and out of Government, a creed of irresponsibility.

In this dark dogma security becomes the paramount value, overriding thrift, prudence, self-reliance, self-respect, intelligent accommodation to the complexities of existence and often indeed simple morality and honesty. People are not merely to be helped when in need; they are to be supported no matter what they do or do not do.

It could hardly be more symptomatic of the attitude that in our era serious discussion is granted to the proposition that income should be divorced from work, which means everyone should have a guaranteed and comfortable income regardless of whether he chooses to work. That, if anything could be, is a headlong flight from adult responsibility and straight into the arms of the all-mothering state.

To look askance at the trend is not necessarily to bewail an impending despotism, at least in the usual sense. As Tocqueville also perceived, the dangers confronting democracies are more subtle. In a degenerated democracy, the central authority is not wholly exploitative but wishes the people to be happy, so long as they don't think, and it actually tries to supply their wants and necessities.

To function at all the "tutelary power" must nonetheless cover "the surface of society with a network of small complicated rules, minute and uniform, through which the more original minds and the most energetic characters cannot penetrate, to rise above the crowd."

Thus, in Tocqueville's view of the danger, "the will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent and guided * * *. Such a power does not destroy, but * * * it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the government is the shepherd."

How near or far the American democracy is today from that denouement, and what could realistically be done to prevent its materializing—these are questions without answers. What is clear is that we have already moved some considerable distance toward that society of sheep and that the pressure of much public policy and preachment seeks to push us further toward it.

Apart from diminishing the dignity of man, one of the unhappy aspects of the flight from responsibility is that it is a delusion. In our world no one and nothing can guarantee security or wash away all sorrows and difficulties. Time and again the federal government has proved its incompetence to solve the myriad problems it takes on.

But no matter what a government attempts, it cannot forever shelter a people from the abrasive realities of personal, economic, and moral imperatives. To the extent a state succeeds in keeping a citizenry in perpetual childhood, it can only assure them a more painful awakening to manhood.

Attack on Filth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, I introduced H.R. 7465, a bill to set up a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials.

I think that the magnitude of the problem posed by the availability of pornography, is obvious to anyone who casts his glance on any newsstand in America. On all sides we are assailed by blatant, hard-core pornography. The danger that this filth poses to our teenagers and subteens is a clear and present one. In every corner of this Nation, decent citizens are demanding that action be taken to prevent these peddlers of filth from putting their dirty wares in the hands of our youngsters.

Last week, my bill received strong support from James O'Neill, Jr., the widely read columnist of the Washington Daily News. In his hard-hitting way he has taken issue with those who argue that the right to sell filth is guaranteed by the Constitution. I would like to include at this point in the RECORD, Mr. O'Neill's column on April 21, 1965:

ATTACK ON FILTH—OBSCENITY PEDDLED ALL OVER TOWN STAGGERS THE MIND

(By James O'Neill, Jr.)

There is a bill before the House to establish by Presidential appointment a Commission to look into the matter of obscene and obnoxious matter being pushed out by all sorts of media to titillate the youth of America and to acquiesce to the constant and insatiable demands of the lovers of prurient material.

At this distance one cannot but admire such a bill, though whether it will be effective in a Nation governed by such a magnificent Constitution as ours is a matter which will have to be closely investigated.

The bill was introduced by Representative DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Democrat, of New Jersey, who asks a study group of 15 members, drawn from the motion picture industry, Congress, Government agencies, the clergy, publishers, and radio and television, who would begin a full study of the obscenity trade "in order that a concentrated attack at all levels of government may be made" to ward off the "ever-increasing bombardment of our young people by unscrupulous purveyors of filth."

Well, sir, if the Commission is established and the President makes his appointments, I trust the members will feel free to call upon me to furnish some of the information I have at the tip of my tongue, for I have not been wandering the streets of this lovely town for 20 years with my head in the sand.

APPALLS

The filth which is offered, advertised, and sold all over town is something to stagger the mind. Heaven knows, I am no pure, lily-white young thing who shocks easily. I've been over the course. But what is peddled these days, in the open and with full knowledge of even those who get a regular shoeshine, appalls a grey-haired, tired old party like this one.

But I wonder if commissions and investigations and all the rest can do much to control the outpouring of filth?

All of a sudden some gentleman in a civil liberties group stands up and hollers "what about free speech? How are kids going to learn how rotten some things are without we should have dirty books, filthy movies, and television shows which are designed to be shown to the young to advise them of the delights of a detergent soap opera?"

BLESSING

And then the gentlemen will consider the words of the civil liberties folk and shortly a blessing will be paced on the dirty movies, because they are guaranteed free expression, and the idiot box will add a few more hideous programs, and the book publishing finks will shoot out 50 more titles, with paperbacks covered with naked broads.

Responsible theater management, tasteful advertising men, writers more interested in their craft than the fast buck made on a hunk of garbage and shopkeepers with some guts are more important than commissions or investigations.

However, I heartily concur with the efforts of Representative DANIELS. I only hope his Commission is fruitful.

With a house full of growing sprats I can easily see the dangers of the sort of idiocy which the Congressman seeks to eliminate. A good, healthy sex life is as important as a good diet or a good job, but what is offered in some areas to our young is neither good nor healthy.

I trust the Congress passes Representative DANIELS' bill. And if he needs me, I shall offer more hot advice than a mother-in-law.

Seizure of Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, 1965, Mr. Edward P. Morgan, commentator for the American Broadcasting Co., discussed the increasing tendency of big Government to invade the privacy of American citizens. These comments were carried on the evening news, sponsored by the AFL–CIO.

As the Member who, on April 5, 1965, first exposed the practice of seizing and searching first-class mail by two agencies of the Federal Government, I am indebted to Mr. Morgan for his further comment before a national audience.

The transcript of his remarks follows:

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS

Even in an open society like ours, the big brother of bureaucracy can rear his head with ugly arrogance unless he, too, is watched. The Federal Government has been caught invading the public's privacy a little too aggressively of late and it is time to list a bill of particulars and raise a loud cry of rightful indignation. The bureaucracy is not only watching us, sometimes through peepholes, it turns out, but listening in increasingly on our conversations, probing the sexual history of stenographers and other citizens applying for Federal jobs, telling people where they cannot travel and even, in some instances, seizing and reading their first-class mail.

Day before yesterday it was revealed that the State Department had refused permission to editors of 13 college and university newspapers to send student journalists on Easter vacation assignments to report on life in Cuba.

In their written request campus editors from Yale, Harvard, Princeton, and other prominent schools had said: "A knowledge of the conditions within Cuba is prerequisite to our forming intelligent opinions as to our relations with that country. As student editors in a free and democratic society, we consider the freedom to travel a necessary condition for the freedom to learn."

Their request was rejected by the Department's Administrator of Security and Consular Affairs, Abba P. Schwartz, on the questionable technicality that they were not "legitimate newspapermen" and implying that anyway, their presence would somehow impede U.S. efforts to isolate Castro's dictatorship from the rest of the hemisphere.

To which the New York Times angrily replies:

"The right to know and the right to travel—except in wartime—ought to be sacred * * * Americans should be swarming over the island with magnifying glasses. * * * The American public in general has a right to know what is going on in Cuba; and so—obviously—does every segment of our society, including the residents of college campuses and the readers of college newspapers."

In a recent report by the House Committee on Government Operations critical of the use of lie detectors by the Federal Government, Representative CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey, termed compulsory polygraph tests unconstitutional, said they should be discontinued immediately until proved "infallible." Recalling his own testimony that a 17-year-old girl, just out of high school had been subjected to humiliating questions about sexual matters when she applied for a typist's job with the National Security Agency, GALLAGHER charged that "the threat of outright voyeurism runs throughout too many of the cases that have come to my attention regarding the use of the lie detector."

A Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, headed by Missouri's Democratic Senator EDWARD V. LONG, investigating Federal invasion of privacy, questioned the use of mail covers—a process of checking on—without opening—the mail received by a person under suspicion of some criminal violation. The subcommittee was also concerned about a Post Office Department practice of spying on employees through peepholes. Last month, Chairman LONG said Postmaster General Gronouski had agreed to improve controls over mail cover procedure and plug up the peepholes—which had been used to prevent depredation of the mails by postal workers.

But on April 5, still another practice came to light. Congressman DURWARD G. HALL, Republican, of Missouri, revealed on the floor of the House that the Internal Revenue Service was opening the first-class mail of delinquent taxpayers. He charged a "collusion" involving the Treasury, the Post Office Department, and the Director of Internal Revenue had resulted in 14 such "levies" since 1962. Today HALL's office said the Post Office now admits 34 cases are involved. One person—a "tax deviate" might be the bureaucratic term for him—allegedly had all his mail withheld for a month. Revenue Commissioner Sheldon Cohen wrote HALL citing one case in which a delinquent had been "persuaded" by seizure of his mail to pay up his tax liability in full.

The Government argues this practice is legal. But several Members of Congress, Missouri's HALL foremost among them, maintain it is an outrageous violation of privacy, comprising, in effect, unwarranted search and seizure and demand new legislation specifically outlawing the practice.

On Tuesday a somewhat contrite Government lawyer, Deputy General Counsel Harvey H. Hannah of the Post Office, told Senator LONG's committee, "we've been doing it wrong, no question about it."

Manifestly, the Government has been doing a lot of things wrong in respect to the private rights of citizens. Human beings, unhappily perhaps, are not always saints but if somebody isn't constantly watching the Government agencies, watching their foibles, there can be the Devil to pay.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

Should Tobacco Industry Be Subidized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the Congress and the Nation an editorial which appeared in the Star Valley Independent of Afton, Wyo., on April 8, 1965. Its timely praise of the gentleman from Wyoming, Congressman RONCALIO, for his stand against tobacco subsidies reflects the growing public awareness of the folly which the Government practices by continuing to subsidize tobacco production in the face of the mounting toll of life and health which has been traced to tobacco products. Both the gentlemen from Wyoming and the Star Valley Independent have my highest respect and commendation for the stand they have taken. The editorial follows:

SHOULD TOBACCO INDUSTRY BE SUBSIDIZED?

The comments of Congressman TENO RONCALIO in voting against a bill to amend the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco we believe will be of interest to our readers and are worthy of editorial comment. He states:

"Our Government supports the price of a commodity that cannot possibly be classified as beneficial to humanity. With one hand of the Government spending millions of dollars in research which links smoking with cancer and other diseases, it seems that the other hand should not subsidize the tobacco industry. The economy of these tobacco-growing States should be shifted into healthier channels by incorporating the job-creating provisions of the poverty and Appalachia programs already enacted."

While we don't necessarily agree that the administration's poverty program would take care of the economy problems of the tobacco-growing States, we do agree that the tobacco industry should not be subsidized, and would join in in encouraging some sort of realistic approach to shifting the land to other uses by the tobacco farmers, Government, and all others concerned.

Hon. Oren Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this week the American Good Government Society honored one of our most dedicated and able colleagues by presenting its 1965 George Washington Award to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Unfortunately, because of a longstanding commitment for a speaking engagement, I was unable to be present at the dinner at which our good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, OREN HARRIS, received this award. However, in making the formal presentation, our former colleague, the Honorable Harold O. Lovre, quoted a tribute which I paid to our chairman of the occasion of the hanging of his portrait in the committee room.

What I said then is still true. OREN HARRIS has been a chairman of tremendous balance and judgment whose fairness is a hallmark of his character that has been noted time and again by every member of our committee whether he sits on the majority or the minority side of the committee table.

This is borne out in the presentation speech of Harold Lovre, a former Republican Congressman, which I include here under leave to extend my remarks:

I am delighted to have the singular privilege of presenting one of the 1965 George Washington Awards to a grand American who epitomizes sound constitutional government in its finest form.

My pleasure is enhanced by having known him personally since 1949, and having served with him in the Congress of the United States. Over those year, I have watched him in action in the committee room and on the floor, and I earnestly believe him to be one of the greatest legislators and public servants of our time.

He has achieved this high standing largely because of his unswerving dedication to the principles laid out for us long ago by the revered founders of this glorious Republic. He is sincere of purpose. He is loyal to his people and his country. He drives himself to the limits of his endurance, and he has an uncommon capacity for looking objectively and in great depth at all sides of an issue. His judgments, when finally passed, reflect logic, a keen sense of fair play and, above all, the courage of his convictions.

Born in Arkansas, he received his law degree in 1930 from Cumberland University in Tennessee. Three years later he became deputy prosecuting attorney of Union County in Arkansas. Then he was elected prosecuting attorney of the 13th Judicial District of Arkansas, where he served until 1940.

In that year, the people of his district elected him to represent them in the Con-

gress of the United States and they have been reelecting him ever since.

He currently is in his ninth year as chairman of the important 33-member House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Established in 1795, this is the oldest continuous committee of the Congress, and has the broadest jurisdiction of any committee in the House.

Among other things, this great committee deals with legislation affecting communications, securities, petroleum, natural gas, and public health.

It also handles all matters relating to commerce and transportation, which are the lifeblood of any nation, and under his chairmanship we have developed a remarkable transportation system that is the envy of all the world.

Chairmanship of such a committee is a man-sized job, but the gentleman from Arkansas does not stop there. He also directs the activities of four subcommittees and, in addition, heads the special investigative subcommittee which looks into and exposes such things as rigged TV quiz shows, payola, and similar unfunny funny business.

His work has carried him all over the world. In 1957, for example, he headed a study and investigation in connection with the International Geophysical Year which took his delegation to both the North and South Poles, including a week in Antarctica observing the scientific expedition of the National Science Foundation, which was established by his committee. More recently, the committee took a leading role in the authorization and development of the Telstar communications satellite.

He has been given awards and accorded honors too numerous to mention, so we are by no means the first group to recognize his outstanding service.

While he is human enough to cherish all of these awards, I suspect that he might be most proud of something that was said about him sometime ago on the occasion of a presentation of his portrait to the committee. Among those who volunteered a few remarks that day was the Honorable WILLIAM SPRINGER, a ranking Republican on the committee.

BILL SPRINGER's remarks that day paint a vivid picture of the gentleman we honor tonight, and here is what BILL said:

"I came on the committee some 8 years ago. OREN at that time was about third, or fourth, and I was sitting at the small table down near the end.

"As the years passed, I came to have a tremendous respect and admiration, for not only the mind of this man, which is keen in itself, but also for his thoughtfulness in his treatment of the other members of the committee, and, especially since he has been chairman, of those of us who have been across the aisle.

"I think our committee has been in many respects a nonpartisan committee. I don't know that I could use the word 'bipartisan,' although we seem to bring a lot of legislation the the floor which comes with the approval of both parties * * * but certainly it has been a nonpartisan committee * * * and largely through the chairmanship of OREN HARRIS, we have made exceptional progress in the past 3 or 4 years.

"It takes that kind of chairman, if you are going to get real legislation coming out of a committee where the economics of American life and the competition between the various economic segments is so keen. Only a chairman with tremendous balance and judgment could accomplish what he has in the time he has been chairman of this committee."

In those few words, BILL SPRINGER just about said it all, and I shall make no effort to gild the lily.

Therefore, I shall now exercise what I consider a very high privilege and present on behalf of the American Good Government Society the 1965 George Washington Award to the Honorable OREN HARRIS of Arkansas.

A Sound Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of interest and concern around the country about the kind of voting rights legislation which Congress will pass this year. Now that there has been time to study and evaluate the President's proposal in this area, there is a broad concensus developing that Congress should fashion a more appropriate, precise, and effective bill to deal with discrimination wherever it exists. There is strong support, too, for preserving traditional basic literacy requirements which are recognized as essential to having an informed electorate.

One of the leading newspapers in our State of New York, the Rochester Times-Union, recently examined the many factors important to this issue and supported a reasonable course of action. I would like to submit for the RECORD a copy of the Times-Union editorial of April 19, entitled "Here's How To Get Sound Voting Rights Bill."

AS WE SEE IT—HERE'S HOW TO GET SOUND VOTING RIGHTS BILL

When President Johnson made his dramatic appearance before Congress last March 15, the issue seemed simple enough.

The time had come to guarantee to Negroes the right to vote in areas where that right had been systematically denied. New legislation was needed so that the Federal Government could enforce the century-old provisions of the 15th amendment in all elections.

Since then, however, Congressmen have been arguing over the language of a bill.

Some southerners want no legislation at all. Some northern liberal Congressmen have been tossing in amendments which would wipe out almost all State voting qualifications, including those in Northern States like New York which do not discriminate against Negro voters.

Serious doubts have been raised, even by some pro-civil-rights lawmakers, about the constitutionality, not to mention the wisdom, of procedures spelled out in the administration bill and in the liberal amendments.

Some kind of voting rights bill is needed. But legislation now proceeding through Senate and House committees includes highly dubious provisions which would:

1. Trigger a takeover of local elections by Federal registrars if voting statistics in the 1964 presidential election indicated discrimination against Negroes.

2. Abolish literacy tests and other voting qualifications when the Federal registrars run elections, and abolish any poll taxes for local elections in Southern States.

In the first case, the argument is that statistics showing low voter participation in elections may indicate not only discrimination but geographic problems or just plain voter apathy, perhaps as the result of one-party rule.

It's also argued that the percentage figure set as a trigger in the administration's bill excludes many States and counties from its coverage, even though discrimination exists there. Mr. Johnson's home State of Texas is in this category.

In the second case, it is argued that the U.S. Constitution gives States the right to set voter qualifications, and that these cannot be removed except by constitutional amendment. The most recent illustration of this point was the 1964 ratification of the 24th amendment to abolish State poll taxes in Federal elections.

As cartoonist Conrad cleverly indicates below, a voting rights bill may founder in a filibuster or in the courts, to the delight of southern segregationists, unless these objectionable provisions are removed.

A sensible new approach is provided in a voting rights bill sponsored by more than 50 House Republicans, including Representative BARBER B. CONABLE, JR., of the Rochester area.

It would set up Federal registrars to enforce Negro voting rights in any State or political subdivision if as few as 25 persons complain to the U.S. Attorney General that they are qualified to vote but have been prevented from doing so because of race or color.

This would establish a legal pattern of discrimination. Other Negroes wishing to vote then would be registered if they simply affirmed their belief that they would be denied the right to vote if they applied to local authorities.

As Representative CONABLE explains it, this law would protect Negro voting rights in any area of the country, not just those with large Negro populations where States have a particularly bad record of discrimination.

It would rest Federal action on the solid legal foundation of complaints, not on statistics subject to controversial interpretation.

The GOP bill would make a sixth-grade education satisfactory proof of literacy. And it would rule out voting qualifications which provide that would-be voters must have a voucher from another registered voter.

But such other State-imposed qualifications as residence or ability to read and write would be preserved by Federal registrars, provided they could be applied equally to all voters and did not discriminate against Negroes.

Republican-sponsored bills don't have much chance in today's Democratic-dominated Congress.

But if the Democratic congressional leadership wants a bill that will guarantee voting rights while avoiding constitutional pitfalls and assuring responsible voting, it should adopt the principles of the Republicans' substitute legislation.

If in an emotional stampede, Congress accepts an everything-but-the-kitchen-sink approach, it may wind up with a bill that could do more harm than good in solving the voting rights problem.

If I Were the Devil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

IF I WERE THE DEVIL

(An excerpt from a sermon entitled "Four Foundations of Freedom," by Rev. Kenneth W. Sollitt, minister of the First Baptist Church, Midland, Mich.)

If I were the Devil and wanted to turn American into a Communist hell, I think I would do something like this:

I would cultivate among the people the idea that the individual is nothing, the indiscriminate mass of people everything. I would also seek the convince Americans that God and Christian ethics and an honest desire to make one's way in the world are old fashioned.

I would get elected to office on the promise of helping everybody at someone else's expense.

Then I'd treat the Constitution as a sort of handbook on the philosophy of government to be referred to only if it served my purpose.

I would increase the size and scope of government in every way possible, going into every conceivable business in competition with established enterprises, paying the State's business losses out of the treasury. I would try to keep hidden how this could lead at the right time to the nationalization of industry.

I would thus create a government strong enough to give its citizens everything they want. Thus I could create a government strong enough to take from them everything they have.

By a combination of inflation and taxes I would rob the very people I pretended to help until, if they ever should want to return to freedom, they couldn't—but would be dependent on the state.

Next, I would gradually raise taxes to 100 percent of income (we are one-third of the way now)—so that the state could have it all. Then I'd give back to the people enough to keep them alive and little enough to keep them enslaved.

In the meantime I would take from those who have and give to those who want until I killed the incentive of the presently ambitious man and satisfied the meager needs of the rest. The police state would then be required to make everybody work—and the transformation of America from a republic to a second-rate Communist nation would be complete.

Do you see in this similarities to what we have been doing for 30 years?

Pressure for a Bad Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is evident the President is determined to get his voting rights bill through Congress, by whatever means, as a punitive measure against the South. Every effort to improve the bill is being thwarted and ridiculed in most of the news media.

I hope the Congress, in at least this instance, will have the courage to stand up to White House pressure and refuse to be stampeded into passing bad legislation. We should have adequate debate on the bill and full opportunity to amend it on the floor if the committee refuses to allow improvements before it reaches us.

In the following column, written by Marshall McNeil, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, the need for a better bill is eloquently explored:

SOME OF THE BAD FEATURES—A BETTER VOTING BILL IS NEEDED

(By Marshall McNeil)

WASHINGTON.—With the Senate now debating the voting rights bill, it should be pointed out that the means proposed in it for enforcing the 95-year-old guarantees of the 15th amendment to the Constitution are clearly open to argument and hopefully, to change.

The bill's terms are drastic, some think the most drastic ever proposed to a Congress by a President.

But after nearly a century when constitutional voting-rights guarantees have been evaded, violated, or ignored in several States, mostly southern, the contention can be sustained that drastic means are required.

However, to insist upon drastic remedies to correct old faults does not mean they have to be unfair, punitive, sectional, or violative of other sections of the Constitution.

Several sections of the bill can be so variously described.

There is the provision which allows the elimination of all voting qualifications in the States, allowing persons who are not required to understand "any matter" to cast their ballots if they are otherwise eligible. For the Federal Government thus to uphold the idea that all illiterates are qualified electors is clearly open to question.

There is the provision that outlaws the poll tax in State and local elections. It is most difficult to prove that the poll tax has been an instrument of racial voting discrimination; and if it is not discriminatory, it cannot be outlawed under the 15th amendment.

There is the provision which brings under terms of the bill any State where less than 50 percent of the residents of voting age were registered voters last November 1, or less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the last presidential election.

Irritated and frustrated by court delays in earlier efforts to enforce voting rights, the administration's bill, as revised by the Senate Judiciary Committee, is framed to permit executive action to guarantee these rights.

But in so doing it has conferred unusual, maybe even dangerous, powers on a political appointee, the U.S. Attorney General. A vindictive man in that job might misuse these unique new powers.

For these reasons, among others, the country should welcome the Senate debate that started Thursday.

Even though 66 of the 100 Senators—46 Democrats and 20 Republicans—are cosponsors of the measure, they should open their ears and minds to proposals for making the bill as fair as possible.

Full and free debate—even bordering on filibuster, if necessary—will help to illuminate the issue and the proposed remedies to the Nation.

Then, after the country—and the Senate—understand what it is doing, the result is most certain to be a better bill.

And a better bill is needed.

"Youth Wants To Know"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, when the need for a better understanding of the crucial issues of the day is so essential to the American people, it is gratifying to know Theodore Franik's award-winning public affairs television series, "Youth Wants To Know," is regularly presented to the greater metropolitan area of New York City over WABC–TV. It is seen and heard in other cities throughout the country on other commercial and educational stations.

On Saturday, April 3, Dr. Albert Bowker, chancellor of the City University of New York, appeared as a guest on "Youth Wants To Know." The questions and answers proved so dynamic and spirited that I commend the full text of the transcript of Dr. Bowker's appearance for reading by all Americans. The frank, unvarnished answers of Dr. Bowker to the student's penetrating questions on the crucial subject of education was an enlightening experience for all.

The education of America's young people is one of the most critical issues in the United States and this lively question-and-answer session permitted our students, the ones most deeply and directly concerned, the opportunity to discuss education and their future with an expert in education.

Dr. Bowker has an outstanding educational and professional background. Prior to becoming chancellor of the City University of New York, Dr. Bowker began his professional career as a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and received his Ph. D. from Columbia University after serving as a research assistant in mathematics and statistics. Dr. Bowker was a professor in mathematics and statistics at Stanford University and served for 5 years as the dean of the graduate division of Stanford University. His membership in professional, academic, and honorary societies is too extensive to enumerate in detail. Included among them are past president of the American Statistical Association and past president, Institute of Mathematical Statistics.

I would like to add a personal note here. Theodore Granik, who produces "Youth Wants To Know" for WABC–TV and for other commercial and educational television stations, is, I repeat, an old and dear friend of mine. I was the first guest on his "American Forum of the Air" 37 years ago, the progenitor of "Youth Wants To Know." On many a night Ted and I struggled to bring these programs into being and my colleagues in the House and Senate have joined me in recognizing the proud record created by both these programs.

From my vantage point of 43 years in Congress, I say to Ted and Dr. Bowker, "Well done."

At this time I should like to include in the RECORD a complete transcript of Dr. Bowker's appearance on "Youth Wants To Know":

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW

(Created and produced by Theodore Granik, Apr. 3, 1965)

("Youth Wants To Know" presents Dr. Albert Bowker, chancellor of the City University of New York.)

MODERATOR. "Youth Wants To Know"—the searching, provocative questions of today's young people, created and produced by Theodore Granik.

Question. Dr. Bowker, must members of college faculties publish or perish?

Question. Dr. Bowker, are American colleges and universities today adequately preparing our generation for the cybernetic revolution?

Question. Dr. Bowker, how far should the educators allow free speech to go on campus?

MODERATOR. In just a moment, Dr. Albert Bowker, chancellor of the City University of New York will answer these and other penetrating questions on "Youth Wants To Know."

(Announcement.)

MODERATOR. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome once again to Theodore Granik's "Youth Wants To Know." Our guest today, Dr. Albert Bowker, who is chancellor of the City University of New York, began his work in statistics and mathematics as a research assistant in the math department of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where in 1941 he received his B.S. degree. After a Ph. D. from Columbia University in 1949, Dr. Bowker was consultant in the Statistical Engineering Section of the National Bureau of Standards. His professional career also includes classroom and administrative assignments at Stanford University, where he was until last year, dean of the graduate division of that university. He is now, as I said, chancellor of the City University of New York.

Dr. Bowker, it's a pleasure, sir, to welcome you to "Youth Wants To Know."

Dr. BOWKER. Thank you. So far, I'm glad to be here.

MODERATOR. I said, sir, that you began your early work at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the research department. Actually, it began earlier than that, in Washington at Woodrow Wilson High School, I understand.

Dr. BOWKER. That's right. I'm a local boy.

MODERATOR. So, panel, here you have an opportunity to ask Dr. Bowker a little close at home. Now if we might, let's meet our panel of questioners, and we'll begin with Ted.

(Panelists: Ted Winfield, McLean High School; Farley Newman, Yorktown High; Steve Dansker, McLean; Sherrill Burke, McLean; Axel Adamyet, Yorktown; Barbara Travers, Yorktown; Alice Justice, Yorktown; Nina Sara Brenningkof, Yorktown; Sandy Blade, Yorktown; Becky Kibret, Yorktown; George Tyson, Yorktown; Bob Hand, Yorktown.)

MODERATOR. Thank you, panel. Dr. Bowker, I think it's interesting to note that Axel Adamyet, who said a moment ago he was from Yorktown High School, is actually, I believe, an exchange student. Correct, Axel?

AXEL ADAMYET. Yes. I'm a foreign exchange student from West Germany. I'm in the American field service program, and I've been here since August last year.

MODERATOR. Well, it's a pleasure to have you on our panel, and this is your opportunity to ask about American education from an expert.

AXEL ADAMYET. Thank you.

MODERATOR. Now if we might, let's begin our questioning of Dr. Bowker with Alice.

Question. Dr. Bowker, are American colleges and universities today adequately assuming their role of preparing our generation for the cybernetic revolution in the future?

Dr. BOWKER. I don't know exactly what you mean. Certainly one of the great strengths and great movements in American higher education has been the development of technology and science and instruction, particularly since World War II. Whether we know all the social and political implications of these developments is perhaps not so clear, but it's certainly very much on everyone's mind.

Question. Within this cybernetic revolution, do you think we will ever develop computers that will be capable of programing other computers?

Dr. BOWKER. Oh certainly.

Question. Is there any possibility that students will be assigned to colleges by computers?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I don't know what you mean by assigned. I think people will go to the college of their choice, but whether they get in or not may be computed on the basis of scores, and things of that sort.

Question. How far do you feel, Dr. Bowker, that these computers can go? You indicated an affirmative answer to the fact that computers might program computers. Do you feel they will be applied completely to education, or will there still be an individual element in the system of higher education?

Dr. BOWKER. Well I hope. Certainly a person-to-person relationship is critical in education. Most people think so. At the same time I think there will be a great growth in teaching devices of all sorts, including television, I might say, which has not been as yet fully realized.

Question. Isn't modern technology primarily applicable to the sciences? Can it be used in the humanities?

Dr. BOWKER. Anything you can learn by rote you can learn by machine. Language instruction is very susceptible to gadgetry.

Question. If this cybernetic revolution takes place, what will be the use of education?

Dr. BOWKER. I don't see anything in the future that is going to replace the human brain or the human being.

Question. Well, I mean, if nobody has to work, why get educated? I mean, what would be the purpose of being educated at all?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I don't think it would be that no one has to work. Indeed, in a certain sense education for leisure and for scholarship might be considered more important than education for specific vocational purposes.

Question. Dr. Bowker, in our effort to accelerate the sciences and mathematics, do you believe we have neglected the humanities?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I think somewhat. There's been a good deal of increase in languages, and I would say language instruction today and competence is much greater than it was 20 or 30 years ago in institutions of higher education. It may seem strange to you. And there's been a tremendous growth in interest in the arts and music, and so forth, in universities. The humanities—philosophy and literature, and so forth—have not, I should say, made the same forward thrust as science and the other fields have.

Question. How would cybernetics affect the relationship between science and automation?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I don't know quite what you mean.

Question. For instance, between the biologist and the engineer.

MODERATOR. How would technologic advances affect that relationship between those two areas? I think that's what she means.

Dr. BOWKER. Well, certainly—well, not a great deal—certainly the techniques of one science now are very much used in another, and chemistry and a lot of the—for example, one of the most important subjects for a modern biologist—the equipment that's coming along from engineers is used a lot in medicine and biology today. But I think that although certain things evolve from one discipline to another, the actual pursuit of knowledge is increasingly specialized. But I don't think we are reading research scientists who are generalists very much.

Question. Sir, getting back to the humanities and technological education, do you believe that a liberal arts education adequately prepares one for a career now, seeing as the society has become more and more technical?

Dr. BOWKER. I think—well that's a complicated question. Obviously, no, and it isn't intended to. There are many things you can do directly with a liberal arts education. But more and more I think professional and specialized education is being put into graduate schools, or into community colleges for the people who do professional or technical training short of a 4-year program.

Question. Has the President's request for a community college—does it reflect a national trend, do you suppose, in education?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, yes. The President has asked for a new 4-year public college, and a new community college in Washington, D.C. And this is really one of the few areas in the country where students are not eligible for low-cost public education. I think in general there's been a big move of State universities and State institutions into cities. My own institution is expanding, but of course we've been in New York a hundred years. But the University of Massachusetts has just gone into Boston, the University of Wisconsin into Milwaukee. Cleveland has public education. This sector of education—the 4-year public institution, and the community colleges are growing very rapidly in cities around the country. And it's, in my view, high time that Washington had such institutions.

MODERATOR. The universities in New York, particularly your institution, is unique, is it not, in the fact that the citizens of New York have free—the youngsters have free tuition—which I don't think the President is proposing for the District?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I believe they're either free or very low cost, yes. I think the general trend is to have community colleges very low cost or free around the country, and they are.

MODERATOR. As a matter of fact, you're involved right now with the controversy surrounding this free tuition problem?

Dr. BOWKER. Yes. Well of course the city colleges have been tuition free for a hundred years, and the public colleges in the rest of the State are now charging tuition—a small one, but still tuition. And this is one of the very explosive and emotional political issues in New York. The city government is firmly committed to a free tuition policy, and all of us associated with that institution, and as you know, when I say that institution, we have 10 colleges, are firmly committed to it. But this is one of the controversial issues in New York State. It's more an upstate-downstate argument, perhaps, than anything else.

MODERATOR. This doesn't make education a bargain does it, Doctor?

Dr. BOWKER. No, certainly the standards of these institutions, like City College, Hunter College, Queens, and so forth, Brooklyn, are known throughout the country. When I was a graduate dean I was always glad to take a graduate of those colleges, I can assure you. They're very—indeed they are the leading source of Ph. D.'s in the United States.

Question. How do the new colleges recruit their teachers besides raiding other universities? Or what attracts the new teachers—salaries or possibilities of research?

Dr. BOWKER. I think both—salary, reasonable physical conditions, possibilities of, if not research, at least a scholarly life of some sort, are important. Graduate work is expanding very rapidly, and though there are some growing pains, we think we'll be able to man most of the colleges planned with competent faculty. They won't all be the best in the country, of course.

Question. Well, you just mentioned—Axel just mentioned, as a matter of fact—the possibility of new avenues of research attracting new teachers. I'm wondering, do colleges plan to change their attitudes—some of them have this attitude now that they would be more inclined to favor professors who would be resident professional scholars rather than resident professional teachers. What's the

possibility of the latter thing opening up in the future?

Dr. BOWKER. Well I think this is one of the issues that is being debated very hotly right now. Most institutions, certainly all those that I've been associated with, and that would include Stanford, which is a very active graduate school, and the City College system, which is starting graduate work, but is primarily an undergraduate institution, give a lot of weight to teaching ability in promotion and in hiring. I think this whole thing has been a little bit exaggerated. However, some of the institutions which aspire to become simultaneously great universities and great colleges do have a conflict.

Question. Federal aid and Federal subsidies usually mean Federal regulation and Federal control. Do you think that increased Federal aid to colleges will result in interference in college affairs by the Federal Government?

Dr. BOWKER. Well apparently they that have been established so far, and they really are enormous, if you look at the amount of aid given to science, have not tended to have the Government have much leverage or influence over the colleges. So far, it's been more the other way around, I think. The university community has become very influential in the Government.

MODERATOR. Dr. Bowker, you, sir, are a statistician as I noted. Do you feel that we can believe the statistics that we read to the effect that students—perhaps these students—will not be able to get into college within the next 10 years, and not receive an education?

Dr. BOWKER. Unless we expand fairly rapidly, there's going to be a shortage. It depends on how many people we think should go. Nowadays something on the order of half of the high school graduates aim for further training. And in order to keep up that standard with the growth in population, we have to move pretty fast between now and 1970. The next 2 years aren't so bad. This June is the worst of all—that's ever been in the history of the country.

MODERATOR. Wait until June after next panel.

Question. What about the possibility of making college education tax deductible in order that more well qualified students can afford to go to college?

Dr. BOWKER. Well I have tended to favor that, but most people don't, the argument being that a Federal policy should really concentrate on the lower economic group, and that the people that are around worrying about tax deductions are probably not in that group to begin with.

Question. Dr. Bowker, how far should educators allow free speech to go on campus?

Dr. BOWKER. Well I think that most educators and college officials believe that students should be given very very wide latitude in discussing any social or political or economic question. There is perhaps less latitude generally associated with moral questions. And certainly freedom of speech on campus does not mean freedom to say things that would not be tolerated off campus.

Question. Doctor, do you think there is a moral decay on our campuses today?

Dr. BOWKER. No. No, I think indeed if any thing the student of today is more serious and more purposeful, perhaps more dedicated to study and to social issues than when I was a boy.

Question. Doctor, do you feel that some of the demonstrations and riots on campuses today are due partly to the fact that the college leadership is not closely involved enough with the students' affairs?

Dr. BOWKER. There's been some failure of communication on some campuses, I think. There is an estrangement of young people as represented both by group activities and by the fact that a lot of students move around from college to college now. It seems to be a restless period. Those are some reasons I think.

Question. Well I know that one of the complaints of undergraduates at many of the large universities is that their own undergraduate education receives a certain deemphasis because of their association with a larger and perhaps more famous graduate and professional schools.

Dr. BOWKER. Well I don't think a place like Berkeley, for example, has changed very much in 20 or 30 years. It is a big institution, so is the University of Wisconsin. A student, though, in an institution like that usually finds some community of a smaller sort with which he will identify, maybe a resident's group, maybe a club, a fraternity, a group of majors in his own department, and so forth. And I think that the educational institutions today are very much concerned about building—taking a series of steps, so that there will be a community in which students will become in more contact with faculty and other kinds of adults.

Question. In general, sir, is the university today a mere brain factory or an educational community?

Dr. BOWKER. Well hopefully it's an educational community of students and faculty. As I say, building a sense of community, I think, is one of the difficult jobs. In our institutions, for example, we don't have any residencies, so we have all kinds of steps that we take to build this relationship with the students when they're there during the day. In the residential colleges, in some senses, it's easier.

Question. Doctor, do you feel that conformity is becoming a strong factor on today's campuses?

Dr. BOWKER. It doesn't look so to me. Quite the reverse.

Question. Sir, are students going to college today to receive an education or are they using colleges as an employment agency?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I think some of both. Certainly for any new economic group in this country, education has been a major source of social mobility. And I think the fact that education is so widespread does give opportunities for poor people to become professionally trained and really to improve themselves. And that's an important function.

MODERATOR. Dr. Bowker, part of the President's War on Poverty is involved with education. This seems to be the core of it. Do you feel that higher education has any part to play in helping these people who are supposedly economically deprived?

Dr. BOWKER. Yes, really an extraordinary amount. In fact, I think if you look at the California educational system we can see that with the community colleges, junior colleges, the State college and the university, they have extraordinary importance in giving opportunity to large numbers of people who wouldn't have it in a State which doesn't have as big an educational plant.

MODERATOR. It shouldn't be limited, in other words, to vocational schools and such.

Dr. BOWKER. No indeed.

Question. Back to this factor of conformity or nonconformity on campuses. Is this really an unhealthy factor—the nonconformity?

Dr. BOWKER. No, I don't think so.

Question. Dr. Bowker, you said that morals were not declining. And if not, why is everybody screaming so much about it and why are all these articles being written, and this sort of thing?

Dr. BOWKER. I think that every generation has said that the younger generation is going to the dogs, and this has been true since Roman times. This is a standard fact of life.

Question. Well one thing here, I don't think morals is as pressing a problem, I think—I know my parents don't—as the fact that students are having more and more difficulty in getting into college. I'd like to know, how can a large university, such as your own expand their facilities to accommodate the growing numbers of students who seek admission, and yet keep their campuses from losing a personal touch which is vital to students environment?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, of course, we don't have one single large campus. We have 10 campuses, and our biggest college—City College—is about approaching what we consider the optimum. One thing we intend to do is try to start additional institutions fast enough to keep the scale in human terms. In a lot of places—the University of California, for example, is experimenting with all kinds of things—house plans, faculty associates, and a number of devices, in order to try and keep the communication up.

Question. Doctor, do you feel that the recent demonstrations, such as the one at Berkeley, give the students a powerful weapon of intimidation to gain whatever they want from the administration of the college?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, no administration is terribly happy with large demonstrations like that. I think certain things were gained by the students there. I doubt if there's much more to be gained by this technique.

Question. Sir, what are the most important problems considered by the administration and the faculty of a college when faced by a demonstration such as just happened in Berkeley?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I think first to see if the demonstration does focus around a legitimate issue. I think most people feel the big failure has been to keep the channels of communication open with the students, so that issues such as the issue which started that riot—the banning of political demonstrations from inside the gate—would not reach riot proportions before they were resolved and discussed. I think that is perhaps the main conclusion to be drawn from that particular incident.

Question. Sir, as evidenced by the Berkeley demonstrations, would you say that the students today have too many liberties and that it's causing the detriment of their own education?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I think Berkeley was hurt by that. But I wouldn't say that was a general proposition.

Question. Dr. Bowker, do you approve of the honor system, such as they have at the Air Force Academy?

Dr. BOWKER. No, I've never been very enthusiastic about that.

MODERATOR. We have one honor, excuse me, Bob, that we always have to adhere to and that's time, Dr. Bowker, and our time is almost up, but we will have time for a few more questions, panel, in just a moment right after this message.

(Announcement.)

MODERATOR. Dr. Bowker, we do have a couple of minutes for some more questions, and I know there are some. Steve, I think you had one.

Question. Dr. Bowker, I asked you at the beginning of the program a question. Must members of college faculties publish or perish?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, in the trade we say we think the big problem is most of them don't do either.

Question. What about foreign students? Are you in favor of more foreign students in the United States in our colleges and universities?

Dr. BOWKER. Yes, I think they have a great value. Perhaps they should be wider spread. They tend to concentrate in a relatively small number of institutions.

Question. Sir, would you like to see the Federal Government take a more active role in education?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I think it's inevitable, if we're to have the kind of educational system we have here, largely because of the

limited taxing ability of States, and the better taxing ability of the Federal Government.

Question. Sir, what would you do about aid to foreign students? I believe there was an incident in which students from Iceland were going to the Soviet Union for higher education because they could not pay the cost of going to school in the United States.

Dr. BOWKER. Well there are a good many thousands of them here. I wasn't aware that their financial support was a critical problem. But certainly we have many programs that support them. They probably could stand some expansion.

Question. Sir, don't you feel that we should take care of our people at home first, perhaps work more on financing the education of the people in this country, to our underprivileged in this respect, before we go overseas to help out more?

Dr. BOWKER. Probably you're right, it should be given higher priority than it has been given. Yet there are great benefits, I think, to education in associating with people of different cultures.

Question. Dr. Bowker, as a mathematician, would you explain the difference between the old mathematics and the new mathematics now being taught in high school?

Dr. BOWKER. Yes. I think the new mathematics is more general and has much more the sense of mathematics. The older mathematics was more rote and drill.

Question. Sir, do you feel that the scholastic and social pressures in college today are such that the average or below average student is forced to cheat to succeed?

Dr. BOWKER. No. But this is one of my reasons for lack of enthusiasm for the honor system.

MODERATOR. Dr. Bowker, sir, it's been a pleasure. It's been a very quick half hour and a most interesting one. Thank you for being our guest.

Dr. BOWKER. Thank you.

MODERATOR. Thank you sir, and to you panel for some interesting questions, and you ladies and gentlemen for being with us. This is Bob Johnson inviting you to join us next week at this time for "Youth Wants To Know."

Cornell University—A Symbol of Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as a graduate of Cornell University and of its Law School, it has been a matter of especial pride to me that, for the past 2 years since congressional redistricting in New York, I have had the opportunity of representing Tompkins County, (N.Y.), and, thus, the Cornell community here in the House of Representatives.

It was with pleasure, therefore, that I noted the following editorial commenting upon Cornell's centennial year as set forth in the New York Times edition for Tuesday, April 27, which—under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous material—is hereinafter set forth:

CORNELL AT 100

Cornell University, which received its charter 100 years ago today, has marked its centennial year by underlining its commitment to, and involvement in, the full range of intellectual endeavor. Earlier in the year the focus was on the arts, when Cornell took over Lincoln Center in this city for an entire week of performances and discussion; this week, on the Ithaca campus, leading scholars will appraise the contemporary world's reliance on the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities.

It is a measure of the Nation's growing maturity that hundred-year anniversaries of its universities are getting to be less than extraordinary occasions, although few have been marked by the special quality of Cornell's celebration. What gives this observance extra significance is the place occupied by Cornell in America's educational history.

Cornell is Ivy League, the trademark of higher education's exclusive sector; but it is also a land-grant institution. It is thus a participant in the homegrown tradition which represents American faith in the university's capacity to serve intellectual as well as pragmatic ends of the open society. Although the amount of land-grant money was small, it made Cornell a partner in that great enterprise out of which the State university systems were also born.

Today the Ithaca campus combines the best of private university development with units of the State University of New York. Thus Cornell stands as a symbol of cooperation between the American systems of private and public higher education.

National Volunteer Fireman's Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed by the city manager of Alexandria, Va., in my congressional district, that the Alexandria City Council has officially expressed its approval of House Joint Resolution 350, which would provide for authorization for the President to proclaim the week beginning on the first Sunday in August as "National Volunteer Fireman's Week." I am pleased to include herewith a copy of the Alexandria city manager's letter to me, as well as the resolution adopted by the city council. It is my sincere hope that communities across the Nation will join Alexandria in this effort to honor some of America's unsung heroes:

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
April 21, 1965.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am pleased to forward to you the enclosed copy of a resolution adopted on April 13, 1965, by the City Council of the City of Alexandria, Va., in support of House Joint Resolution 350 which authorized and requested the President to proclaim the week beginning on the first Sunday in August of each year as "National Volunteer Fireman's Week."

Sincerely,

ALBERT M. HAIR, Jr.,
City Manager.

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Whereas Alexandria has long had the services of volunteer firemen who have made valuable contributions in preventing and fighting fires; and

Whereas Alexandria is known for its historic interest in firefighting equipment and in volunteer fire companies, particularly since George Washington organized a volunteer fire company in Alexandria; and

Whereas the Honorable JOEL T. BROYHILL, Congressman from Virginia, has introduced House Joint Resolution 350 which authorized and requested the President to proclaim the week beginning on the first Sunday in August of each year as "National Volunteer Fireman's Week": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Alexandria, Va., does hereby endorse the House Joint Resolution 350, introduced by the Honorable JOEL T. BROYHILL, requesting that the President proclaim the week beginning on the first Sunday in August of each year as "National Volunteer Fireman's Week" in recognition of the unselfishness and devotion to duty of the volunteer firemen of the United States in protecting lives and property in their communities; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk of the city of Alexandria, Va., be directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Given under my hand and seal this 13th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1965.

FRANK E. MANN,
Mayor
(On behalf of the City Council of Alexandria, Va.).

Attest:

PATSY ALTIZER,
Clerk.

Address of Massachusetts Attorney General Edward W. Brooke Before the National Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, this noon, the distinguished attorney general of Massachusetts, Edward W. Brooke, addressed the National Press Club. He gave one of the most sensible and forthright analyses of the current political situation that I have heard.

The attorney general, who must be ranked among the Nation's leading political figures, pointed out that the real loss in the 1964 election was not to the Republican Party, but to the American people because of the failure of that campaign to provide a meaningful debate of issues.

He pointed out that we are paying for what he called "our fling for the sake of the American political neurosis" in terms of vacillation and lack of clarity in our current policies.

I think that every thinking American should have an opportunity to read Attorney General Brooke's superb address and for that purpose, I wish to include the text in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS OF MASSACHUSETTS ATTORNEY GENERAL EDWARD W. BROOKE, BEFORE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 28, 1965

"After the fall" of the GOP last November, "the winter of our despair" was filled with analysis, psychoanalysis, dissection, and diagnosis, studies in depth, critiques, surveys,

polls, research reports, factfinding, one-man and any-man opinions, searching looks which were meant to penetrate and describe what has been called, from time to time, "the agony of the GOP," "a party in crisis," "the GOP struggle for survival," "dialectic Republicanism," "the Republican election trauma," "can the elephant forget?" and the "Republicans after the debacle," with each report usually coming to the brilliant conclusion that the Republican Party was in a bit of a mess.

As a Republican, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of those who contributed in such a thoughtful and well meaning way to starting us off on the long road back and if they have run out of salt for our wounds, I would be glad to replenish their supply.

I am not trying to minimize the extent of rethinking and the tough policy and leadership decisions that will be necessary for the GOP to win elections again. It's not every year that a party loses over 500 seats in State legislatures across the Nation along with key Senate and House seats.

But I do not foresee the 1964 Goldwater candidacy as the Republican's albatross, relegating the party to minority status for years to come. Neither do I believe it represented a strictly indigenous attitude of the Republican Party.

The American concept of conservatism is not confined to one political party. The particular attitude which dominated the 1964 Republican Convention has lain under the surface of American political activity for 20 years, since the inception of the cold war.

It has been the reservoir of frustration resulting from our necessary international role, and the repository of fear, mistrust, and insecurity which are products of the social and economic adjustments since the war.

If the election was supposed to offer a choice, it was 20 years too late, and if we wanted the candidates to embody that choice, the American public missed its chance in 1952 when it failed to match Adlai Stevenson and Robert A. Taft, two articulate representatives of opposing philosophies.

The possibility of a liberal-conservative confrontation passed from the sublime to the ridiculous and 1964 witnessed a campaign billed as a great confrontation of America's past with its future, between two men who were probably personally in more general agreement on more issues than any two opposing candidates in recent history.

Frankly, I am less concerned about the supposed "cost" of this election to the Republican Party than I am about its cost to the American people.

It deprived us of the necessary and serious exchange of views on the alternative ways of dealing with the difficult problems this country faces, both at home and abroad; of exploring the meaning and extent of our involvement in South Vietnam; of debating and examining the proposed programs to eradicate poverty, to provide medical care for the aged, aid to public, private, and parochial school education and the myriad other problems that majorities of both parties recognize and are committed to resolve.

In short, the American people were deprived of the opportunity to judge a campaign that bore some relation to the real world and its very real problems.

Instead, we watched TV spots with people tearing up their social security cards; the projected image of a choice between good and evil, black and white, war and peace—not that it wasn't ripe for presentation along those lines and the obvious image for the party in power to exploit, but what was the result after the Nation went through the motions of registering their choice. What was the result after the computers predicted the winner within one-tenth of 1 percent accuracy 10 minutes after the polls closed? What had happened, or rather what had not happened?

The administration, the incumbent, had not been put to a test; he had not been challenged; he did not have to defend the policies and programs he had set before the Nation and was proposing for the future. What did he have to defend them against? His program for aid to education against no program? His background as a leader in civil rights against that of his opponent?

We did not learn very much about the way the President would react under the pressure of an articulate and well-directed opposition to whom the public was listening and to whom he would be expected to reply.

Discussion of the whole area of foreign policy took place under a mushroom cloud which prevented the public from giving serious consideration to what else the President must do besides refrain from "pushing the button."

We are facing some of the consequences of the lack of public debate in this area right now. The public was ill informed and unprepared for our present policy in Vietnam and the temper of the man who is directing it. The campaign was supposed to have been between a dove and a hawk. The dove won. So, what's he doing acting like a hawk?

The campaign distorted the issues and the candidates, and in the end, not only did Goldwater lose, but Johnson lost and the American people lost. Why? Because the presidential process failed to work. It failed to force a presidential candidate to win the Presidency. It was left to him by default and we didn't accurately judge the man who won.

Our fling for the sake of the American political neurosis cost us more than the election and I am more distressed by that than anything else.

In terms of practical politics, the Republican Party need not ask of Goldwater and the ensuing election disaster, in the words of an old popular song, "Is you is, or is you ain't my baby?" It's our baby, all right, although many of us question the parentage.

At least there is one thing upon which all Republicans can agree, and that is that the party's major task between now and the 1966 congressional elections is to project a positive Republican image in keeping with the true traditions of the party.

In 18 months the Republican Party will again face the electorate, and we must face the electorate with a constructive record of accomplishment.

I suggest with pride that the Republican congressional delegation has distinguished itself in the two critical areas of foreign and domestic policy with honor and good judgment.

Senator DIRKSEN and Representatives FORD and MCCULLOCH have played and are playing an admirable role in the effort to write an effective and problem-solving voting rights bill.

Almost without exception, the Republican congressional delegation has given loyal and valuable assistance to the President in regard to the crisis in Vietnam.

In the matter of foreign policy our responsibility as Republicans, as the loyal opposition, is a particularly important one and a particularly delicate one.

The Republican Party has a special obligation in the Vietnam crisis and in all other foreign policy crises to insist that the minority voice, the voice which challenges administration policy is heard.

If there is anything that is more troubling than the problem of Vietnam itself, and the role of the United States in Vietnam, it is the increasingly hysterical and thoughtless tone which has characterized public discussion about Vietnam.

I think, in such a crisis, that the minority party, the Republican Party must be the undeviating ally of the press as you and your colleagues seek to supply the Nation with the facts about Vietnam.

It is no reflection on the good faith, the good intentions, or the ability of those charged with the execution of U.S. policy in Vietnam to remind them and the Nation that the public and the minority party also have a vital role to play in this crisis.

All need to know the plain truth about what is happening in Vietnam. We need to know the good news and the bad news. We need to know our strengths and our weaknesses.

When overzealous, oversensitive men—civilian or military—attempt to impose a news blackout from Vietnam, try to conceal what is happening there and elsewhere in southeast Asia, I submit that the Republican Party has the responsibility to speak out loudly and clearly in favor of your right to gather the facts and the public's right to know them.

A party that controls neither the White House nor the Congress is in a difficult position to take the lead in offering new ideas and programs to deal with such problems as health, housing, education, transportation; the increasingly important and complex problems of our growing urban centers.

A party's programs and goals in these areas are formulated at its convention and hammered into its platform.

Unfortunately the Republican Party's 1964 platform committee and its product did not impress upon the American public the commitment and resolve of the party as a whole; to devise thoughtful and effective programs to meet the needs in these areas.

This lack of a realistic and meaningful action program for the party is the major obstacle to our presenting the Republican Party to the American people in 1966 as a serious alternative to those presently in power.

When I was asked by reporters on election night, what I thought might be done to begin to overcome the disasterous defeat we had suffered, I suggested then, and still believe, that, it was important to hold a national Republican convention or conference, in this off year, to formulate a sound Republican position on the host of foreign and domestic problems which confront the Nation.

There is precedent for such an off year conference in both the Democratic and Republican Party.

I am of the opinion that a conference of this nature would go a long way toward chystallizing both leadership and policy within the party, giving new direction and vigor to our coming election efforts.

It has been asked, "what good is a political party unless it is serving some great national purpose?"

Out of power the Republican Party must be an articulate and informed opposition and when we assume national leadership the party must pursue our goals at home and abroad with programs that show a deep concern for the individual. If the Democrats call themselves the party of the people, then we are the party of the individual, concerned with the place and dignity of man; his rights and his welfare, his future in a free society. A party demonstrating this concern will deserve the support of the American people. A party demonstrating this concern will win the support of the American people.

The Growing Threat of Soviet Seapower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the 1965 annual report of the Shipbuilders

Council of America carries a most interesting and revealing article entitled "The Growing Threat of Soviet Seapower."

I recommend a close analysis of this succinct article to each of my colleagues for I feel we have been lax in recognizing the significance of Russia's advances:

THE GROWING THREAT OF SOVIET SEAPOWER

Also included in last year's report was an official assessment of the condition of the U.S.-flag merchant fleet prepared by the Deputy Chief of Naval Operation (Logistics). This showed that our merchant fleet is in even more critical shape than the naval fleet. Over 90 percent of the dry-cargo ships and 55 percent of the tankers in the fleet will shortly reach the end of their economic lives simultaneously. There has been no improvement in this situation.

In addition, the active fleet, which numbered 1,950 ships totaling 22.4 million deadweight tons in 1951, has contracted steadily and now is composed of only 900 ships aggregating 13 million tons.

Any significant improvement of the future outlook for the private shipyards must await official recognition of the deteriorated state of this Nation's seapower resources. This day of reckoning cannot be delayed or postponed much longer. Time is running out.

Budgetary expediencies adopted for too many previous years account for the alarming block obsolescence problems which now afflict our naval and merchant fleets. Our shortsighted policies also have taken their toll on the private shipyard industry, as evidenced by the fact that 18 private shipyards have been forced to close their gates permanently during the past 10 years.

Of necessity, our national planners ultimately will have to face up to the block obsolescence or this Nation will lose its sea power capability by default. We believe the former alternative will prevail. Hopefully, the required remedial action will be taken before further contraction in the size of the private shipyard industry occurs.

The sharp contrast in the priorities which Russia and the United States have assigned to seapower again was all too evident during 1964.

Russia's naval strength continued to grow and her enormous merchant fleet expansion program was further accelerated. In this country a welcome increase in naval ship construction occurred. However, the volume of new orders fell far short of the level required to prevent further magnification of the U.S. Navy fleet's alarming block obsolescence problem. The construction of merchant ships, as has been noted, continued at such a low level that the quantitative and qualitative deficiencies of the American merchant marine were further accentuated.

As a naval power, Russia is second only to the United States. The U.S. Navy's fleet is better balanced and possesses more versatile striking power. Russia, whose naval stratgey stresses the submarine as the major element of her fleet strength, boasts the largest submarine fleet in the world. "Janes Fighting Ships," the authoritative naval journal, says the U.S.S.R. fleet comprises more than 430 submarines—a growing number of which are nuclear-powered attack and missile-firing types. The U.S. Navy has only 175 submarines, of which 51 are nuclear-powered units. As a point of reference, Hitler, in the early stages of World War II, decimated the Allies' supply lines with a total fleet of only 57 submarines.

The remarkable expansion of the U.S.S.R.'s merchant fleet stems from a series of continuing shipbuilding programs, which since 1950 have increased the fleet size from 432 ships of 1.8 million deadweight tons to 1,200 vessels totaling 8 million tons today.

Currently underway is a 5-year plan (1965–70) which is programed to increase the merchant fleet's tonnage to 15 million deadweight by 1970.

By mid-1966 Russia's merchant marine, which already possesses more ships, will surpass the American fleet in terms of total tonnage. More importantly, the Russian fleet will be composed predominantly of new, efficient vessels while the U.S. merchant marine will be composed overwhelmingly of obsolete ships in the 25-year-old bracket.

The U.S.-flag fleet has been contracting steadily for the past 15 years. In 1951 it numbered 1,955 active vessels totaling 22.4 million deadweight tons. Today, this Nation has only 900 ships aggregating 13.5 million tons in active service.

The accompanying table, which compares the level of shipbuilding activity generated by the American and Soviet merchant marines, vividly reflects the contrasting maritime objectives.

Because Russian shipyards are heavily engaged in naval construction, 3.9 million of the 6.5 million tons of shipbuilding will be built outside of Russia.

Merchant ships building or on order

	Number	United States, deadweight tons [1]	Number	U.S.S.R., deadweight tons
Mar. 1, 1962	61	878,000	225	[2] 2,263,400
May 1, 1963	47	697,660	236	[3] 3,032,100
May 1, 1964	47	725,400	441	[3] 3,461,800
Nov. 1, 1964	43	650,000	673	[3] 6,450,000

[1] U.S. data: Shipbuilders Council of America.
[2] U.S.S.R. data: Marine Engineering/Log, New York, N.Y.
[3] U.S.S.R. data: Fairplay Shipping Journal, London, England.

Better Explanation of United States Vietnam Policy Than Anything Administration Has Put Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the April 24, 1965, issue of the Economist of London has a better, clearer, and more enlightening explanation of the U.S. position and policy in Vietnam than anything put out by anybody in the Johnson administration. I commend the Economist explanation to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress:

ALL WARS ARE FILTHY—BUT THE VIETNAM ONE IS GOING TO BE SETTLED BY CAREFUL PERSEVERANCE, NOT BY WRINGING ONE'S HANDS

That "filthy Fascist war" in Vietnam, as Mrs. Anne Kerr called it in Trafalgar Square on Monday, has reached a stage where high-pitched simplicities like Mrs. Kerr's have long since been overtaken by events. The honorable but confused member for Rochester and Chatham presumably wants the Americans to stop bombing North Vietnam, thus returning matters in South Vietnam to where they were at the beginning of February (which was two-thirds of the way down the slippery slope to a Vietcong victory). So do the rather haphazard collection of her fellow Labor Members of Parliament and other Labor Party supporters who assembled at the annual jamboree organized by the cooperative movement at Blackpool on Sunday. On the other side of the hill, there may be men in Washington who still believe the war will be ended by somebody in Peiping flicking a switch and turning off the flow of revolutionary current that runs through Hanoi to the Vietcong. But it ought to be plain that the positions taken by the United States and China in the past 11 weeks virtually rule out both these extreme possibilities. Neither of the two great patron powers is in a mood to throw in the sponge completely without a major struggle.

What has been happening in the 11 weeks since the Americans started bombing North Vietnam is a gradual narrowing down of the range of likely outcomes, though the range still runs from the tolerably acceptable to the very undesirable. The central question is the part the rebels in the south will play in any future political settlement. Most people, looking at the guerrilla wars of the last 20 years, suspect that the Vietcong rebellion is probably too well established to be totally extirpated. It is entirely possible, on the other hand, that if it can be cut off from its sources of nourishment in the north it can be brought under control, as a fire sometimes is, without being actually put out. In that case the rebels' share in a future political settlement can probably be kept small enough for South Vietnam to remain outside the Communist camp. Other small countries with half-assimilated Communist minorities, like Finland and Burma, have managed to do just that, though the trick is harder to turn in Asia than in Europe. But if the attempt to cut the Vietcong off from its northern roots fails, it will pretty certainly be the Communists who dominate the final settlement. The only question then will be the speed with which it happens, and the degree of humiliation inflicted on the United States in the process.

(It might alternatively, as the optimists hope, be the beginning of a general retreat north of the 17th parallel, but nothing else the Communists have been doing confirms this hopeful reading.) The attempt at a showdown might come at an American base like Pleiku or even, if the Vietcong is ready to "try a Dienbienphu," at the Marines' laager at Da Nang. One rather hopes it will; Da Nang, on the coast, is not Dienbienphu in its pocket of hills, and the Americans are not the French. Or, alternatively, the attack might take the form of an attempt to cut communications between Da Nang and the south across the middle of the country.

If a major Vietcong offensive in the wet weather that begins soon does succeed in capturing an American base or cutting South Vietnam in two, the result will be more or less a foregone conclusion. Morale in the south, which has been rising in the last few weeks, will drop again; the old routine of coups d'état will be resumed; and the Americans will find themselves frighteningly near the end of the gangplank. If, on the other hand, the outcome is a big battle that the Vietcong loses, it will be North Vietnam's turn for an agonizing reappraisal. For the North Vietnamese would then face the prospect of being steadily bombed to pieces while the rebels in the south slowly pulled themselves together, regrouped, and thought out their tactics afresh. In that event the Americans' tactics would have been triumphantly justified: by forcing the Vietcong into a decisive battle before it was really ready, they might in effect have won the war.

The North Vietnamese have made it clear that the American bombing is not yet hurting them enough to persuade them to stop helping the rebels in the south. However, it is certainly hurting them enough for them not to want it to go on indefinitely. This gives them a powerful motive for urging the Vietcong to have a last great fling at winning the war in the south as soon as possible. The reported withdrawal of rebel forces from the southernmost part of the country may well be the sign of an impending last fling further north.

But it is quite likely that the rainy season will bring no decisive victory for either side. In that case the range of possibilities will narrow still further, and the conflict will settle down into a war of attrition that might drag on for a long time. The outcome of this war of attrition will depend, first, on the extent to which the recent rise in South Vietnamese morale can be put to practical use (Mr. McNamara, the American Secretary of Defense, has been arranging in Hawaii this week to train an extra 100,000 South Vietnamese troops). It will depend, second, on the extent to which the flow of aid to the Vietcong from the north can be diminished. If the North Vietnamese can be jostled into reducing the supply of recruits and arms in the hope of limiting the aerial pounding they have to take—or if they simply cannot get the supplies through because the bridges are down and the railway broken—time will probably work on the side of the Americans and the South Vietnamese. The Vietcong, deprived of its northern support, would gradually be cut down to its proper size as a native southern rebellion, and the way might at last be open to a political settlement that is not merely a case of the Communist north swallowing the south.

In this long and delicate operation, timing will be very important indeed. The sensible idea has been put forward—and informally approved of by the United States, Russia and Britain—of holding a conference about Cambodia's problems during which the interested parties could draw the conversation round to Vietnam. Cambodia said primly on Tuesday that any such conference should deal with Cambodia alone, but delegates in conference corridors have a way of getting round difficulties like that. No conference held in the near future is likely to produce a clear-cut solution of Vietnam's problems, unless one side or the other changes it position in a hurry. But informal conversations would be useful as a means of delaying the moment when either the Chinese or the Russians might feel obliged to involve themselves more directly. (Both have lately as good as said—the Russians on April 17 and the Chinese on April 20—that they will not send volunteers to North Vietnam unless the American bombing goes beyond its present limits.) Better still, the conversations could provide a way of delicately discovering what mixture of military stick and diplomatic carrot would be most effective in getting the North Vietnamese to cut down their aid to the Vietcong.

Senator FULBRIGHT called on April 18—echoing an earlier suggestion by Canada's Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson—for a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. The trouble with this course is that there is no evidence that the North Vietnamese would interpret it as anything but a sign of American vacillation; and, if an openly announced pause failed to bring a response from Hanoi, and the bombing started again, there would be a natural reluctance in Washington to repeat the experiment later on, when a halt might well be more fruitful. But these objections do not apply to a privately dropped American hint, whispered on the back row of a Cambodia conference, that the bombing might just stop for a week or so, without any public announcement whatever, to give the North Vietnamese a chance to reply in kind with an equally unpublicized halt in their assistance to the Vietcong. The same whispered conversation might include a spelling out of President Johnson's remark on March 25 about the conditions in which "the people and Government of South Vietnam" should be "free to settle their own future." This would begin to define the terms under which the southern rebels, once they were confined to real southerners, could join in the political dialog.

Shrill denunciation is simply no longer relevant to the Vietnam problem. The need now is for a careful use of military strength and diplomatic ingenuity, of determination coupled with an awareness of the value of treading cannily. The evidence suggests that President Johnson knows what is called for. One hopes the other side does too.

Right-To-Work Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert H. Feldkamp, one of the Nation's outstanding political writers, recently commented in his column in the Akron Beacon Journal about my position in regard to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The column follows:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By Robert H. Feldkamp)

Representative AYRES, of Akron, has decided to vote for repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—which may raise some eyebrows.

The is the controversial section permitting States to enact their own right-to-work laws—laws which bar compulsory unionism.

AYRES, a Republican, confides he will be taking a position contrary to that generally expressed by his party on the touchy subject of right to work.

Couple AYRES' position with the fact that he is the ranking Republican on the House Education and Labor Committee—where the repealer will first be considered, most likely this session—and it adds up to smooth sailing once the bill is thrown into the hopper.

This is doubly significant because labor has wanted to repeal 14(b) for nearly 20 years, but could never muster the strength in Congress.

This time, with AYRES' help, repeal is imminent.

AYRES and ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, the New York Democrat who heads the Education and Labor Committee, are working together.

POWELL, in fact, is part of the reason that AYRES will support repeal.

The New Yorker knows that the bill probably will pass easily once it is reported out of committee. Democrats hold an overwhelming edge in Congress and most will go for it. And of the 435 House Members, only 124 come from the 19 States now having right-to-work laws—so no great opposition will develop there.

POWELL knows that his greatest bargaining power comes while the bill still is in committee. So do labor chieftains, who dearly want repeal.

AFL-CIO President George Meany has a pledge from President Johnson—in return for a lot of help from labor during the last campaign—for help in killing 14(b).

Meany, however, must contend with POWELL and that is what is happening now.

POWELL, a Negro, long has been unhappy about the virtual exclusion of Negroes from union apprentice training programs. AYRES also has said publicly that qualified Negroes should be allowed into these programs.

Meany, it is understood, has promised POWELL he will do all he can to break down these racial barriers—in return for fast committee action on 14(b).

This is where the matter now stands, and is part of the reason AYRES will line up with the Democrats.

He knows, too, that the Southern States now having right-to-work laws are using them as a magnet in attracting northern industries.

"Come on down," these Southern States are saying, "and you won't have to face compulsory union shops."

AYRES also remembers 1958 in Ohio of course, when Republicans who favored right to work were overwhelmed by labor-backed Democrats in almost every instance.

"The people of Ohio spoke out on this then, and were very clear," he says.

Mr. Speaker, I do not differ from the conclusions as drawn by Mr. Feldkamp; rather, I would elaborate and give the background of my position.

In 1958, when a right-to-work amendment was placed on our Ohio ballot, I publicly stated that I would not vote for it. I further stated that I felt that the U.S. Congress should face this issue.

Let no one feel that this is a reversal of position. I am a firm supporter of the Taft-Hartley Act and took a major part in the conference that brought about the enactment of the Landrum-Griffin Act.

I have always supported labor legislation that would provide the proper climate for fair bargaining. Excess of power by either party can but lead to disaster for both. I have always kept in mind that the general public had a great interest and that interest should have proper consideration.

There might be some who would infer that any movement to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act would be an attack on that act itself. This is untrue.

There comes a time when experience brings about a review of some sections of what might be considered a very fair law.

Just a short time ago, I called for a review of the election provisions of the Landrum-Griffin. In two recent national union elections, loopholes in that law was found to exist—loopholes that permitted fraudulent or confusing action. The right of union members to conduct fair elections is paramount.

The Landrum-Griffin Act was drawn so as to give protection to union members that might, on occasion, be beset by autocratic leadership. It is a fine law but improvements, in this one direction, might be made. I would still protect the Landrum-Griffin Act as I still would protect the Taft-Hartley Act.

An organization that is disputing the repeal of section 14(b), falsely charges that this repeal would force every employee to join a union and pay dues. To clear up this misconception, I am detailing the actual effect of the repeal of section 14(b).

As I recently covered this subject in a speech, I do now include excerpts from my remarks pertaining to this subject:

IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH PROPOSALS TO REPEAL SECTION 14(b)

Section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley authorizes the States to limit or completely prohibit any form of compulsory union membership arrangement. Nineteen of the fifty States

have enacted such statutes, popularly known as right-to-work laws.

There seems to be a widespread misconception that in the 31 States which do not have right-to-work laws union membership is compulsory for employees in organized enterprises. This is utterly erroneous.

Compulsory union membership results exclusively from voluntary contracts entered into between employers and labor unions during the course of free collective bargaining. Nothing in either Federal or State law compels an employee to join a union or an employer to consent to an agreement with a union which would require his employees to join the union as a condition of retaining their jobs.

In other words, compulsory union membership, where it exists, is a result of free and voluntary agreement between employer and union, and is not a requirement imposed by law. If 14(b) were to be repealed, thus nullifying State right-to-work laws, nevertheless, no employee could be compelled to join a union in order to hold his job, unless his employer voluntarily agreed to including such a requirement in his contract with the union.

If section 14(b) were to be repealed, the provision in the Taft-Hartley Act permitting union security arrangements would then apply uniformly in all of the 50 States.

Again there seems to be a widespread misconception that this would have the effect of imposing unrestricted compulsory union membership on all employees in organized enterprises. This, too, is erroneous. The provision in Taft-Hartley permitting employers and unions to agree to union security arrangements is an extremely limited one.

The closed shop, which requires the employer to hire only those job applicants who are already members of the union, would still be unlawful. And employees required to join the union after getting their jobs [this is known as the union shop] could not be deprived of their jobs even if they lose their membership in the union, unless such loss of membership were the result of a refusal to pay their dues or initiation fee. Loss or denial of union membership for any other reason would not be a lawful reason for the employee's loss of his job.

Hence, apart from the requirement to pay union dues and initiation fees, the employee required to join the union would have no other obligations to the union as a condition of holding his job.

Repeal of 14(b) would leave the fundamental scheme of the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts unchanged.

The Wagner Act which remained on the statute books substantially unchanged from 1935 to 1947, was limited to protecting employees against any attempt by their employers to interfere with their membership in or activities in behalf of their unions. No other safeguards for employees were provided, nor were there any protections provided for employers against any type of union misconduct.

The Taft-Hartley Act, passed in 1947, provided protections for employers against certain types of union conduct such as secondary boycotts, certain types of picketing, jurisdictional dispute strikes, etc. Moreover, the closed shop was completely outlawed, and only the limited type of union shop described above was permitted even in those States without right-to-work laws. None of these new safeguards would be affected in any way by the repeal of 14(b).

In 1959, the Landrum-Griffin Act became law. This strengthened the ban on secondary boycotts, outlawed hot-cargo contracts, and prohibited organizational, recognition, and extortionate picketing. These additional safeguards for employers and employees would not be changed by repeal of 14(b). Moreover, the new provisions establishing a bill of rights for union members, protecting union funds against misuse, erecting certain safeguards for the conduct of union elections, similarly would remain unaffected by repeal of 14(b).

Thus it is plain that repeal of 14(b) would result in no fundamental or significant modification in the structure and safeguards which the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts have made available to rank-and-file union members, employees, and employers.

Operation Yorkville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the author of H.R. 980, the bill overwhelmingly approved by this distinguished body, to stop the free flow of unsolicited obscenity through the mails, I would like to call attention to an interfaith group in New York City which has done an extraordinary job of fighting smut in that community. I am speaking of Operation Yorkville. The efforts of this outstanding group of interested citizens have alerted others throughout the United States to the dangers of the availability of obscene and pornographic material to our young people.

This interfaith campaign is organized to protect the parental-civil right to stop the traffic in pornography among children by expressing community standards.

I am certain my destinguished colleagues join in commending this very worthwhile organization for their untiring efforts in the war against obscenity.

The following articles taken from the March issue of the Operation Yorkville Newsletter point up the problem which exists and show what can be done and what is being done about this most serious problem:

LETTER POWER (LP) IS PEACEFUL PROTEST—PROTEST AGAINST THE VIOLATION OF YOUR RIGHTS TO EDUCATE AND PROTECT

The problem of the traffic in pornography among children is your problem, and only you can begin the cycle which will result in the protection of your parental-civil right to educate and protect.

Police will not arrest, district attorneys will not prosecute, many judges will continue to rule in favor of pornographers—unless you protest.

Letter writing is protest, peaceful but forceful protest. Letter writing can be the power of the people, which when applied, can tip the scales of justice in favor of innocent children.

The cycle is simple, but effective. Letter protests to the press (to one newspaper, so that the greatest force will be directed to one point) will result in conflict in the press—conflict between parents and pornographers. Conflict will result in news; news will stimulate editorial coverage; editorial coverage will spur law enforcement, prosecution, and judgments, which will reflect regard for your rights and, in so doing, protect the innocent from perversion.

You can help start the wheels of justice turning. You can use the machinery of peaceful protest—use your letter power. Begin writing your newspaper as soon as possible.

MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN AND THE PUZZLING DEFENSE

As the last 1964 issue of the Newsletter was going to press, Justice William J. Brennan, of the U.S. Supreme Court was busily defending his opinion in the June 22 "Lovers" and "Tropic of Cancer" decisions.

Mr. Justice Brennan, in the June 22 opinion, defined community standards (a test since 1957 in obscenity cases) as a national standard, referring to society at large, thus indicating that the test for obscenity should rest on the lowest possible common denominator of morality.

In a November 15 speech at the Louis Marshall Award Dinner of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City, Justice Brennan chose to defend his position and succeeded only in compounding the confusion which the Court's June 22 decisions created.

Mr. Justice Brennan quoted from Leclercq: "The jurist is above all interested in social good, in rules to be observed in view of that good; the moralist is preoccupied with the good of the individual." He quickly went on to say, "It is not necessary to accept the proposition as invariably true to recognize its validity in some cases." He hurried on to demonstrate, that he is aware that there is such a thing as a public, social morality, even indicating that it is at a higher level than his June 22 opinion would have us believe: it is a mistaken notion that judges are not as fully conscious as men of religion that our institutions reflect a firm conviction that we are a religious people * * *. Judges in fact daily administer innumerable laws which enact moral standards fashioned by theologians. But there are constitutional limits to the legislative power even in the areas of religion and morality.

Operation Yorkville submits that Justice Brennan's June 22 opinion does not reflect a firm conviction that we are a religious people, and raises a question as to his ideas of the individual good and even the social good. Further, the Court's reading of the Constitution has seemed strained and overdoctrinaire in the area of publications. Why? Mr. Justice Brennan went on in his speech: "The line between protected and unprotected portrayal is dim and uncertain." This, in spite of the fact that we are a religious people. Mr. Brennan's opinion has helped render the line even dimmer and more uncertain. Where to now, Mr. Justice Brennan?

NEW YORK ACADEMY OF MEDICINE RELEASES NEW VD REPORT—CITES SALACIOUS LITERATURE AS CAUSE OF TEENAGE VD RISE

In a report released on February 4, the New York Academy of Medicine outlined steps to aid in the eradication of venereal disease in 7 years. The plan called for public sex education programs.

The Committee on Public Health of the New York Academy of Medicine, noting that the incidence of venereal disease among teenagers has increased more than 200 percent between 1956 and 1963 (on a nationwide basis), said that education on prevention of infection should be directed to teenagers in the form of sex education. "The fact is that teenagers are receiving an enormous amount of sex education—of the wrong kind. A large part of this education is derived from salacious literature.

"This kind of literature, which is motivated by the desire for profit, makes vice attractive. It is intentionally sex-arousing and therefore conduces to illicit intercourse and promiscuity which, in turn, helps to spread venereal disease. Health forces in the campaign against venereal disease should recognize the magnitude of distribution and financial resources of publishers of salacious literature and should recognize this type of material as a powerful competitor, the committee believes. Health forces should oppose salacious literature and counter with oppor-

tunities for sound sex education. Though at the present juncture, it must be stated that the forces for sound sex education and sex hygiene are outmanned and outfinanced by the producers of salarious literature."

OPERATION YORKVILLE RECEIVES $1,000 GIFT FROM CARDINAL SPELLMAN

Francis Cardinal Spellman, Catholic archbishop of New York, donated $1,000 to Operation Yorkville last month to further and continue the work of Operation Yorkville. In a letter to Rev. William T. Wood, S.J., cofounder of Operation Yorkville, Most Rev. John J. Maguire, vicar general of the archdiocese of New York said: "As an evidence of the appreciation of His Eminence for the accomplishments of Operation Yorkville and of his desire that the work continue, I enclose a check for $1,000."

LAWYER SAYS "TROPIC" RULE NOT BINDING

Philadelphia Lawyer John B. Gest, in a letter to a New York paper, said that the opinion of Justices Brennan and Goldberg in the U.S. Supreme Court June 22 decision is not binding because it is not the opinion of the Court. This is the opinion which defined "community standards" as "national standards." Mr. Gest quotes Judge Scilleppi, of the New York Court of Appeals, as saying, "This part of the Roth test, therefore (community standards) has not been finally settled by the highest court."

Mr. Gest declared, "It should be clear, then, that the real meaning of the 'Tropic' case is that the book had not been proven obscene, judged by 'community standards' in Florida, since, as pointed out, the rule of community standards has not been changed.

"I have talked to lawyers and librarians," Mr. Gest said, "who take the view that 'Tropic of Cancer' has received the equivalent of a national clearance by the Supreme Court, making it unassailable as obscene in any court in the Nation. This is wrong. The decision should not be considered binding outside the State of Florida.

"The important conclusion to be reached is that State and Federal courts should continue to make their own findings as to community standards and that existing decisions banning the 'Tropic of Cancer' and other obscene publications should be considered valid and binding unless and until reversed on appeal."

PICKETS PICKET PICKETS PICKETING OPERATION YORKVILLE, ETC.

It was a snowy, sleety, slushy February afternoon in New York when Operation Yorkville had the honor of being picketed by a long-haired group calling themselves "The League for Sexual Freedom."

"Sex, sex, sex," shouted the pickets, marching dauntlessly on with the sleet and the rain in their long hair, when up popped a group of pickets to picket the pickets. "Sick, sick, sick," shouted the pickets picketing the pickets. The picketers' pickets were a short-haired group identifying themselves, with literature, as the "U.S. Nationalist Party."

"Sex, sex, sex," and "Sick, sick, sick," went ringing through the canyons of East 84th Street, while Operation Yorkville members obliviously went about their work, work, work. According to press reports, 10 uniformed policemen and a number of plainclothesmen and detectives separated the two groups with barricades, and waited wetly in the icy rain and slush for pickets and picketers' pickets to go home, home, home.

AND A PAGE 1 EDITORIAL IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

Shortly after the picketing of Operation Yorkville headquarters, an editorial appeared on page 1 of the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader. Entitled "Sex, Sex, Sex; Sick, Sick, Sick," the editorial said: "Did any of our readers ever think they would see the day when marchers, chanting 'sex, sex, sex' would be allowed to picket a Catholic school, in this case a school in Yorkville, a section of New York City, because it is the headquarters of an antismut campaign called Operation Yorkville? This newspaper can think of no more commendable action than fighting obscene literature. * * * One of the great difficulties in the drive against obscene literature is the apathy of so many good citizens, who prefer to look the other way while a flood of printed filth corrupts the minds and the morals not only of our young people but of adults as well."

The editorial, written by the newspaper's publisher went on to tell the story of the pickets and the pickets of the pickets, and said: "What happened in front of that Catholic school in New York City is simply a symptom of the moral sickness of our day. Material might and prosperity will avail us nothing and will be destroyed unless we root out this moral cancer."

Communist-Oriented Groups Well Financed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, while our national leaders, including the President and the Attorney General, keep assuring us that the civil rights movement of Martin Luther King has no Communist connections, there continues to be disturbing evidence that Communist activity is on the rise and many of the leaders of the recent demonstrations and violence are strangely intermingled with Communist groups.

It seems to me the President, the Attorney General, and certainly Members of Congress should be greatly disturbed about the significance of how well financed is a new Marxist direct action group described in the following story by Victor Riesel which appeared recently in the Birmingham News:

LEADER IN NEW LABOR PARTY CALLS FOR SELF-DEFENSE UNITS

(By Victor Riesel)

NEW YORK, April 23.—Money—lots of it—appeared to be the least of the problems of the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist movement launched here Sunday as the Progressive Labor Party (PLP).

From somewhere came ample funds to keep 110 delegates at the founding convention here for a week at the rate of almost $2,000 a day in expenses.

From somewhere came additional thousands of dollars needed to bring in party activists from California, western New York, and Kentucky.

From somewhere came funds for the printing and distributing of tens of thousands of leaflets, booklets, and a 48-page convention discussion document in New York and Washington, D.C., over the April 17 weekend.

And whatever the mysterious sources are, they're also providing thousands of dollars monthly for maintenance of a network of headquarters. The PLP people claim headquarters in Berkeley, San Francisco, Chicago, Buffalo, Louisville, Ky., and Williamsport, Pa. These, in addition to three major offices here in New York.

Apparently there is no doubt of the gold flow. PLP leaders are planning to publish not only a Marxist-Leninist quarterly, a national newspaper, and a series of anti-imperialist booklets, but also a slick magazine fashioned after the pro-Chinese Communist Revolution now issued in Paris for the European Continent.

Thus, there is no reason to doubt that the avowedly Communist Progressive Labor Party—pro-Maoist and pro-Castro—will find the money for its action program.

And those of us seeking clues to this direct action planned by this tough coalition of young people find the specifics in the militant, disdainful program advocated by the PLP's most powerful leader.

He's the 32-year-old William Epton, arrested last August on charges of advocating criminal anarchy. His arrest came after the Harlem riots. His aggressive eight-point action program should be a signal to white and Negro communities alike.

The tenor of his words, the implications of his call to action can be measured by his feeling that the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King is too moderate to be followed by the Negro people.

Epton, a vice president of the new party, calls for the launching of self-defense units to protect the organizations and activities he outlines from "attacks by the ruling class and their representative arm, the police and other paramilitary units."

Epton demands the revival of something not encountered inside labor for decades. He urges the creation of trade union caucuses or organizations within the trade union movement that would represent the interests of the black workers and guarantee them [the interests].

He calls for tenant, house, and block committees to struggle in low-income areas.

In the image of the depression day militancy, he urges organization of unemployment councils to demand jobs and bring the unemployed together.

He wants "political councils" set up to "take effective control of their communities."

He demands immediate establishing of "farmworker organizations of sharecroppers and tenant farmers" so they could "demand agragian reform, and land to the landless."

Then Epton wants all these units to "come together into a nationwide coalition" in "an all-black liberation front led by the black working class."

Wherever Epton spoke of his action program, he was cheered by the PLP people. There can be no doubt of the organization's efforts to concentrate on farm and factory labor.

Two of Epton's fellow vice presidents were not identified but were described as former steelworkers from Buffalo. There are units on the waterfront and on the rails. These are made up of young people. The party is made up of young people.

Hon. James A. Farley Describes President's Voting Rights Speech as "One of the Greatest in Modern Times"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and Democratic national chairman, has long been recognized as the country's most astute political thinker. For many years it has been his privilege as a friend of

Presidents to view the changing legislative and political scenes from a vantage point unavailable to others.

Recently while en route home from a Caribbean trip General Farley gave a highly informative interview to the San Juan, P.R., Star in which he discussed the President's message on voting rights and his approach to the other important problems confronting the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of this interview with General Farley herein for the benefit of our colleagues and all others who are interested in public affairs:

JIM FARLEY HAILS L.B.J. SPEECH ON RIGHTS AS ONE OF GREATEST

(By Nat Carnes)

James A. Farley, who managed two of Franklin Roosevelt's presidential campaigns, Sunday called President Johnson's civil rights speech last month one of the greatest in modern times.

"I think history will recognize it as such," the 76-year-old politician said during an interview shortly after his arrival at San Juan International Airport.

"He completely summed up the situation as it really is affecting people," Farley said, "and then the President tried to point out to the people of Alabama that the law must be observed."

Farley compared the Johnson speech in its importance to Roosevelt's banking address soon after he took office in 1933 during the depression.

FAMOUS QUOTE

"You'll remember the time when Roosevelt said, 'all we have to fear is fear itself,'" Farley recalled.

Currently chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., the politician-businessman planned to continue a 2-week Caribbean and South American trip to Miami yesterday.

"No, I don't think you can compare Johnson and F.D.R.," he said. "They are two different Presidents serving under different circumstances.

"When Roosevelt came into office people were out of work * * * it was a domestic problem. Johnson is more involved in international difficulties."

"Mr. Roosevelt was extremely fond of Johnson and Mr. Roosevelt played a very important role in Johnson's first bid for Congress."

Farley didn't believe that Johnson would be influenced by the Roosevelt philosophy, and that the President will "let his own experience dictate his moves."

"He (Johnson) fully realizes the importance of his position, and he is highly conscious of how history might deal with him as his own man, and that's all right."

A friend of Presidents for over 30 years, Farley said: "I have a great deal of confidence in Mr. Johnson, and he is particularly fortunate to have a wife like Lady Bird."

NO QUARREL

On politics, Farley said he felt Johnson would win the next election against the Republicans, but then added "I have no quarrel with the GOP and how they feel about their party.

"Sometimes parties remain in power too long.

Farley split with Roosevelt in 1940 when he urged him not to seek a third term, and then assumed his present position with the Coca-Cola Co.

"I'm a rabid Democrat," he said, "and I would like to see a change about every 20 years."

The Importance of Preserving the Small, Nonintegrated Fabricators in the Steel Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perceptive and knowledgeable of those economists who have worked with dual distributional problems is Dr. Walter Adams, professor of economics at Michigan State University.

His recent analysis of the importance to our consumers and our economy in preserving the independent steel fabricators is one of the outstanding expositions of the essential role of small business which I have encountered.

I know that it will prove of great interest to many of my colleagues. I, therefore, offer it for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRESERVING THE SMALL, NONINTEGRATED FABRICATORS IN THE STEEL BUSINESS

(By Dr. Walter Adams, professor of economics, Michigan State University)

1. In the steel industry, it is particularly important to preserve the small, nonintegrated fabricators as part of the supply complex. In so doing, there is no implication of subsidizing inefficiency. Rather, these firms are indispensable if the public is to be protected against an arbitrary elevation of costs, prices, and profits by the integrated giants of the industry. After elimination of their maverick competitors these oligopolists will enjoy the opportunity to extract perpetual excess payments from the public at large.

2. It is one of the cornerstones of economic experience and analytical principle that markets with only a few sellers will soon degenerate into oligopolistic or monopolistic pricing practices. These are a direct consequence of the absence of direct, vigorous, dynamic, and, above all, independent competitive effort. Industries characterized by just a few sellers tend to show these features in their pricing. Such markets in many cases also tend to exhibit either stagnation in new product development, or to waste research and development talent in pointless and misleading product differentiation. The big firms, insulated from the truly competitive spur of independent action, devote themselves to product changes that will present little or no threat to existing patterns of production and distribution, and tend to entrench their preferred position in the existing markets.

This behavior is not unethical, or irrational; but it is objectionable from the standpoint of public policy. The presumption of such policy is that the larger the number of competitors, the more likely the goals of competition, in terms of production at minimum cost, and realization of soundly based progress, are to be achieved.

3. In some industries, the requirements of technology in relation to the market make it difficult to preserve a large number of firms without sacrificing the possibility of efficiency gains from bigger plants. If there are too many companies in the market, each may have to operate at less than optimum capacity, with the result that the overhead is spread over an unduly small output, thus raising its cost.

This possibility poses a dilemma for policymakers. In some industries, it would seem that technical requirements so limit the number of sellers that the can insulate themselves from the forces of competition. Yet attempts to increase the number of sellers will fail because the existing firms can drive newcomers out of business by cutting prices, and taking advantage of the lower costs that can be realized with larger volume.

4. If competition cannot function as an effective institution, a substitute should be found. Normally, our economy turns to price and investment regulation through some kind of public utility control, or even public ownership. But it is important to determine whether the circumstances in any given industry actually call for abandoning reliance on competition.

Most integrated steel firms are large. Nevertheless, their size can be attributed to many forces other than the drive for greater technological efficiency. Examination of the corporate history of United States Steel, Bethlehem and Republic—to name the big three—shows that merger, rather than internal expansion, has been the major determinant of growth, and hence the prevailing pattern of concentration in the industry.

Steel technology itself, though it necessitates heavy investment in associated blast furnaces, basic steel facilities, and rolling mills—to save transport and heat—by no means dictates the formation of enterprises as large as the biggest 5 or 10 steel firms; indeed, a single unit with total investment of perhaps $250 million would suffice. A scientific inquiry concluded that the steel ingot industry, technologically, could support some 40 firms.

5. The concentration in the steel industry results therefore from market considerations, from the drive to corral raw materials so that they should not be monopolized by another firm in the industry, from the desire to insulate oneself from the thrusts of a competitor by mustering a retaliatory power that will give him pause; and by a response to appropriation of the after-market by other large firms. In short, if basic steel is in the hands of a small number of firms, and some of these push forward to the semifinished and fabricated level, then every basic steel producer has to move forward, in self-defense, becoming larger in the process.

Consequently, the steel industry has become characterized by vertical integration. Just as clearly, this integration has not been a result of the pressure of underlying forces of efficiency; on the contrary, it has been dictated by the strategy of maneuver among large companies intent on attaining goals of stability and security—goals which, in a truly competitive system, can never be realized. Given the drive to forward integration, and assurance of an outlet for the basic and semifinished steel, the big integrated firms of necessity come into conflict with the nonintegrated firms at the higher stages of production.

6. Technological requirements do not handicap the small steel fabricators. Engineering studies and experience alike demonstrate that small firms—with assets less than 1 percent of those of the large companies—can as effectively produce fabricated products. They can make wire, fabricate concrete mesh, woven wire fence, bale ties, chain link fence, automatic baling wire, galvanized fencing, as cheaply as their giant competitors. This has been demonstrated in recent years as, squeezed between falling

domestic prices for the products, and higher prices for the raw material (wire rods), the independent fabricator have survived by purchasing foreign wire rod, and making do with a precarious reliance on both domestic and foreign sources of supply.

There has been proof in the competitive market, therefore, that the independent fabricators of wire products, who are numerous and small, can compete for the very same customers as the big companies—and get the business. They can be more flexible in terms of delivery dates; more personalized in the service they render; and more efficient in their application of managerial personnel to the problems of the mill. These inherent advantages of a well-managed small firm make it possible for these fabricators to overcome whatever disabilities they may suffer because they must depend upon outside sources for their wire rod, and cannot coordinate their fabricating operations directly with the rod rolling mill output.

7. The independent fabricators, then, have sound economic justification for their continued presence in the wire products market. They perform, moreover, a key role in that market because of the vertically integrated nature of their giant competitors. The big steel firms, with their heavy investment in, and commitment to, the semifinished and fabricated materials, must inevitably adopt a statesmanlike and security-conscious attitude toward the competitive process. Decisions about innovations in productive technique, adoption of new machines, pricing response to imports and to domestic competition, must all be made against a background of the articulated, vertically integrated structure of the giant firm. Response must be appraised not merely with the particular product in mind, but more important, in the light of the effect of a price change on the whole vertical structure. While the independent fabricator, dependent, for example, upon the sales of concrete mesh for 30 percent of his revenues, may meet a price challenge immediately and directly, or adopt an innovation on packaging wire as soon as he hears of it—under the dire threat of imminent bankruptcy or cash shortage, the giant firm can delay, and consider the effect of changes in marketing strategy on other units in its system.

The independent fabricator, in short, functions as the competitive institutional system intends that he function: he is forced to greater efficiency, without delay, and without reservations, because he must so react in order to survive. But the giant firms fail to transmit the competitive signals in undistorted fashion, because their larger structure determines their reaction. Moreover, they have the resources, because of their size, to resist for long periods of time the competitive pressures that, on smaller firms, would long since have brought a response.

8. The imperviousness of the giant firms to the requisites of the competitive system was clearly illustrated in the gap that appeared between the price of domestic wire rods and the price of imported wire rods during the period 1958–63. Even though wire rods were being imported in rapidly increasing amounts, the integrated steel firms actually raised the domestic price. Only a greater concern for the possible effect of a cut in wire rod prices on the price of wire and other products can explain this behavior, which cost the vertically integrated firms a large share of the noncaptive domestic market for wire rods.

When the prices of wire products coincidentally dropped, the nonintegrated fabricators were driven to secure a minimum amount of foreign wire rods, or perish. It is incontestable, therefore, that the pricing policies of the integrated firms threw a clinker into the functioning of the competitive machine. Independent fabricators unable to get foreign rod would have been forced out of business, and many of them suffered financial difficulties. Prices of products reflected an artificially high level of wire rod prices, until belated competition reduced them. The integrated firms were enabled to draw from the ultimate consumer an excess profit, or subsidy, of earnings on the obsolete and excessive capacity in wire rods.

9. It is easy to see the consequences if the vertically integrated firms are able to further jeopardize the position of the independent fabricators. The big firms will be left in undisputed possession of the field, and will be in a position to dictate the shape and behavior of the wire-rod wire-products price structure. Considerations of long-run corporate policy, rather than the forces of competition, will determine margins, and timing, and amount of price changes. We will have an oligopolistic managed economy. The persistence of the independents is necessary, in the public interest, as the only means—short of regulation of public ownership—of injecting a suitable measure of fluidity into the steel price structure.

The VISTA Volunteer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, during a recent visit to Baltimore, I had the opportunity to view a permanent training center for VISTA volunteers, or the Domestic Peace Corps workers as they are popularly called.

The Baltimore Training Center, which is operated by the University of Maryland School of Social Work under the direction of Dr. Daniel Thursz, is doing a unique and commendable job in training these dedicated volunteers.

When I visited a field training operation, I had the opportunity to meet a volunteer from Phoenix, Ariz., Mrs. Ann Quinn, who was working with needy individuals in a housing project operated by the Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Administration. Mrs. Quinn, despite her busy training, still had the incentive to do some creative writing. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert three poems composed by Mrs. Quinn which are indicative of both the spirit and sensitivity of our VISTA volunteer:

THE VISTA VOLUNTEER

We will go where we're needed
(When others pass by.)
Where roads have been rough
And hills have been high—

We will go with compassion
To those who are lost
To help them build bridges
So life's streams may be crossed.

We will go without question
and have love to share
With the sick and the lonely
And they'll know that we care.

Then when we get weary
We'll recall with a sigh—
"But for the frace of my God,
There go I—"

—ANN QUINN.

THE SOCIAL WORKER

If you can look beyond an unclean face
And see the lonely heart that cries within;
If you can understand a mind disturbed—
See the sickness of a soul compelled to sin.

If you can feel compassion for the weak
And never mind what color he may be—
Or where he goes to church, or if he does,
Or whether he can walk, or talk, or see.

If you can love a sick and lonely child
Though that child can never love you in return
If you can still be patient and serene
When you try to teach, and find he cannot learn.

If you can smile, and never show despair
And never judge by monetary worth,
You have a unique mission to fulfill
You are God's special Angel here on earth.

—ANN QUINN.

INNER CITY

I know that I shall never see
A slum as lovely as a tree
With trash and litter everywhere
Left by those who just don't care.
Filthy clothing on a line.
Broken bottles, stench of wine—
Children playing in the street
Where prostitute and pickup meet—
Derelict and addict too
Lonely souls whose friends are few
Form a common melting pot
And there they stay, decay and rot.
Their future's past; they have no hope
Their only friends are wine and dope
God sends beauty when He can.
But slums and such, are made by man.

—ANN QUINN.

Mayor Tom Wilmoth, of Longview, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding and public spirited men of Longview, Tex., is its new mayor, Hon. Tom Wilmoth. I have known Mr. Tom many years. He has done much good for his city, his area, and countless individuals. I wish him the very best as the new mayor of Longview, Tex.

SALUTE TO MR. TOM

An announcement of the election of Tom Wilmoth as mayor of Longview, was hailed with enthusiasm throughout the community and received with interest by the area.

Mr. Wilmoth is a man of unusual ability, integrity, honor and honesty. From the standpoint of business and character, he is solid and substantial.

Quiet and unassuming, this fine citizen is a dedicated worker in the vineyard of progress. Calm under pressure, he is highly respected for the thoroughness with which he weighs all problems and invariably comes up with the proper solution. His sound judgment has been an important factor in the tremendous growth Longview has enjoyed during the time he has served on the city commission since 1956.

Mr. Wilmoth has the confidence of his fellow members of the commission and the public. He has earned that confidence by his broad knowledge and forthright dealings and by his ability and performance, both as a municipal official and a citizen.

Father of two sons, Roy and Dan Wilmoth, and a daughter, Mrs. Glen (Bettie Jo) McNeill, the veteran city executive is a member of the First Baptist Church and the Rotary Club and has consistently been identified with Longview's progress, industrially and otherwise.

Mr. Wilmoth was born in Lowell, Ark., on January 31, 1890. When he was a year old his parents moved to Tuskahoma, Okla., capital of the Choctaw Nation. He lived there until 1919, and it was there he married Miss Pearl Overby. The two sons were born in Tuskahoma.

The Wilmoth family moved to Rogers, Ark., and remained in that city 3 years before establishing their residence in Camden in 1921. During the 10 years he was in Camden, Mr. Wilmoth was a member of the city council 4½ years. He came to Longview in 1931 and has been in the construction business since that time. His scope of operations has covered northeast Texas, with some large contracts, mostly commercial buildings, outside the State. Associated with him on some of his big jobs has been one or both of his sons, each of whom decided to follow him in the building business.

Tom Wilmoth is a man of courage and conviction. While delegating responsibility he asks for accountability. He is highly qualified as an executive and administrator, as is demonstrated by the success he has enjoyed in several fields of endeavor.

We are proud to have had Tom Wilmoth as a friend during the last three decades. He ha proved to be a stalwart citizen in contributing in every way possible to the continued growth of his city. Progress has always been foremost in his mind. It is ingrained in him. Both as an individual and a member of the city commission, he has worked tirelessly for the upbuilding of his community. It has been our privilege to have had him as a coworker in numerous industrial campaigns and other programs that have been very beneficial to the city and area.

It is encouraging to see the leadership of our city government pass from the capable hands of E. K. Bennett, who has served us well as mayor, to another able leader, Tom Wilmoth.

It is with great pleasure, "Mr. Tom," that we join with your legion of friends throughout Longview and the Southwest in commending you and congratulating you on being elected to the city's highest and most important office. It is a fine honor, and we are happy and proud it has been bestowed upon you as a reward which you so richly deserve.

We predict that Longview will continue to move forward at a stepped-up pace during your administration. You have the assurance of our fullest cooperation, and in making that promise, we are confident we bespeak the attitude of the majority of the citizenry.

—CARL L. ESTES.

Herbert J. Miller, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every so often our Government is greatly benefited by the fact that a young man agrees to serve in an appointed capacity and brings with him new ideas, courage, and a will to get the job done. Such a man was Mr. Herbert J. Miller, Jr., better known to his friends as "Jack" Miller who served as Assistant Attorney General and headed the Criminal Division of the Justice Department. But, the sands of time drift on, and these men go with it to greater things.

I do not believe that Jack Miller could receive a nicer tribute to the work he has done than the editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star for April 27. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this editorial, join with his many friends in wishing him the best of luck in his return to private law practice, and to commend him publicly for a job well done.

WALL OF SILENCE

Much of the strength of organized rackets rests in the assurance that "nobody talks." In the hierarchy or crime, it is seldom the men at the top who fall into the hands of the police. Their underlings, however, frequently do. The testimony of these minor, often less culpable, criminals—if they could be persuaded to give it—offers a primary hope of reaching and prosecuting the bosses.

Means of compelling this type of testimony is a major goal of the commendable new anticrime bill the Justice Department will soon send Congress. In essence, the Department is seeking the right to grant immunity in return for such testimony in certain selective cases. A guarantee of immunity from prosecution, on the one hand, would remove the grounds for a fifth amendment plea against self-incrimination. And beyond that, under the proposal, criminals who refused to testify, or who lied, would be subject to contempt of court or to perjury charges.

Grants of immunity already are authorized in limited areas by existing law. They are too limited, however, to be effective in more than a fraction of the Government's drives against organized crime.

The development of the new immunity bill was a fitting final act by Herbert J. Miller, Jr., who has just returned to private law practice after 4 years of exemplary service as head of the Justice Department's Criminal Division. During the tenure of Mr. Miller, who incidentally was one of the first Republicans tapped by President Kennedy for high office in 1961, the annual number of racketeer convictions by the Federal Government increased by an incredible 1,000 percent. His participation in the continuing Federal anticrime war will be sorely missed.

Tour Booth Jobs Urged for Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, various committees of Congress have conducted, in the past, extensive studies on problems of our senior citizens. One recurring problem that besets our elderly citizens when they no longer have their jobs to attend to, and families to raise, is one of idleness—a sense of not being needed.

This distress is no stranger to my elderly friends in my hometown of Fond du Lac, Wis. But, Mr. Speaker, a group of these solid senior citizens formed a new community service organization known as the Voyageur Club.

The twofold aim of this club is to put retired people back to work and to promote area tourist attractions by providing information and service tc travelers.

Of side interest to my colleagues will be one of the Voyageur objectives of promoting the Ice Age Scientific Reserve, authorized by the last Congress to be part of the national park system.

In the belief that this group deserves national recognition, and also that my colleagues would find the idea of this organization useful to groups in their own districts, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a recent report in the Milwaukee Journal on the Voyageur Club:

TOUR BOOTH JOBS URGED FOR RETIRED

FOND DU LAC, WIS.—A new group here would like to put retired people back to work operating tourist information booths. A retired Fond du Lac man said the idea was tested successfully last summer and he thinks persons over 65 are particularly suited to the job. Victor Broome, 67, is secretary of Voyageur, a travel service which is in the process of becoming incorporated.

Members include numerous area business and professional men, Representative RACE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and a representative of the Fond du Lac County Board.

TO PROMOTE FOREST

The group hopes to promote the Kettle Moraine State Forest and the Lake Winnebago area as tourist attractions. In the process they hope to spawn the tourist information bureaus staffed by retired persons who would like to perform some work.

Broome said that until last year there was no tourist information service for the jam of vacationers who passed through here along Highway 41 bound for the northern woods.

To prove the need and the ability of retired people as person-to-person salesmen, he set up his own experimental booth last August in a drive-in restaurant on Highway 41 here. Edward Patterson, operator of the Dog 'N Suds Restaurant, provided the facilities and enthusiastic support.

INQUIRIES PLENTIFUL

Although Broome tried to plug such nearby attractions as the Kettle Moraine Forest, he helped plan trips as far north as Canada.

Broome said that in the 3 weeks the service was operated "inquiries ran so high there just couldn't be any question the service was needed."

Also convinced were area business and professional people who helped organize the Voyageur group last November.

This year the service will open at the drive-in May 1, staffed by three retired persons who will work in shifts. Broome also hopes to sell souvenirs produced locally by other retired persons.

Broome said a main concern of the Voyageur group was the Kettle Moraine State Forest, destined to become part of a national scientific reserve. It appears, he said, the area will not be able to handle the increasing influx of tourists.

Exploring the problem, Broome recently interviewed officials of the Everglades National Park in Florida about accommodations for visitors.

Broome said he was amazed at the large part private enterprise had played in development of park facilities, notably motels and concessions. The Voyageur group hopes for private investment in campgrounds, motels, and other tourist services in the Kettle Moraine area.

Remove Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry P. Harwich, the publisher of the Dorchester Argus-Citizen, Hyde Park Tribune, Mattapan Tribune, Jamaica Plain Citizen, New Boston Citizen, and the Milton Record-Transcript is one of the most outstanding citizens of the Hyde Park-Milton area of my district and readers of these newspapers look forward to his own personal comment on various topics which appear weekly. On April 22, 1965, he selected excise tax revision and elimination as his editorial and it appeared in all the above-mentioned newspapers. I believe it is a most informative and well-written article which I include below for my colleagues' review.

The subject of the reduction and eventual elimination of the excise tax on communication services is one I and a great many of my constituents are concerned about. This tax affects 151,637 telephone customers in my congressional district and elimination would mean a direct savings to them of $2,341,733.

Telephone excise tax hits hardest at low-income levels. Bureau of Census figures for 1960 show that of households with telephones, 20 percent—or approximately 7,800,000—had incomes of less than $3,000 per year; 53 perecent—or approximately 21 million—had incomes of less than $6,000 per year. Only 41 percent—or approximately 5,500,000—had incomes of $10,000 and more per year. Statistics reflect that the telephone excise tax takes a higher percentage of any income before taxes than any other excise tax in the families with incomes of less than $4,000.

I have introduced H.R. 6734 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on telephone services. This measure was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and it is expected that executive sessions should take place sometime during mid-May. Extensive hearings were held during the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

Following is the editorial by Mr. Harwich:

REMOVE EXCISE TAX ON TELEPHONE BILLS

(By Harry P. Harwich)

There isn't a red-blooded person in this great country—from Maine to California or Washington to Florida—who is not thoroughly convinced of the merits of that tongue-in-check adage, "Nothing is more certain than death and taxes." But, as is fitting of a red-blooded American, there isn't a citizen to be found who does not rally to fight unjust taxation as our forefathers once did.

The excise tax which is levied on our telephone bills is one such "unjust tax." Because it is in this category the phone tax is, with each passing year, being subjected to ever-increasing attack by Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public.

One does not have to search very deeply to discover the prime reason for such severe objection of the added tax burden of the excise tax on telephone service. Basically, it is due to the fact that the telephone is the only household necessity which is so maligned by the Federal tax structure. Electricity, gas, and water—the other three household necessities—are all free from the burden of an excise tax. This, we agree, is as it should be, for such utilities are a most integral part of our American way of life.

Why, then, should the telephone subscriber be crushed with the highly discriminatory excise tax? Why, also, is the inflationary tax of 10 percent of the fixed telephone service charge hanging over the already overtaxed heads of the people?

To answer these questions one must understand the history of the telephone excise tax.

To begin with, the telephone service tax is essentially a wartime tax which was instituted at a crucial time and devised to raise necessary funds as well as to curtail the use of the telephone during such emergency periods.

The first Federal excise tax on telephone service dates back to World War I when an additional charge was levied against long distance calls. This law was repealed in 1924.

In 1932 Congress saw fit to reinstitute the telephone excise tax on long distance calls to help defray the cost of public works and other Government programs during the depression years. From that day to this the excise tax has been with us.

The charge has undergone a face lifting at various times. In 1941 local calls were subject to the additional tax at 15 percent and long distance calls at 25 percent. Fifteen years later, 1954, the tax was altered to 10 percent on all calls and it has remained at this level since.

Congressional records bear out the fact that the telephone excise tax was intended to be a temporary thing. But, like the poor relation, it has overstayed its welcome as far as the public is concerned.

For all intent and purpose, the telephone is grouped in the same category as such nonessential items as furs, jewelry, cosmetics, diamond stickpins, mink stoles, lipsticks, etc. The aforementioned are all wonderful things—but, every one of us can get by without them. Does the same hold true for the telephone?

Imagine the unexplained necessity of a telephone at the time of family illness. Think of the trust you must place in this household essential when a crisis arises within the home. Reflect on the indispensability of this utility in a thousand and one instances. Now, is the telephone as much a necessity as your electricity, gas, and water? Is it a luxury which you and I can well live without?

There is no question as to the unjust and unwarranted, discriminatory, and discouraging aspects of the excise tax which weighs like an albatross on the neck of every subscriber in the United States whether doctor, lawyer, or Indian chief—housewife, cleric, or business tycoon.

The abolition of this tax, which poured some $1 billion into the U.S. Treasury coffers in 1964, would bring a $14 per year saving to the average telephone customer. Each year the people have been balked by the wait-till-next-year pitch—and each year the people become a little more restless than the year before.

The sand has just about run out of the timeglass as far as the telephone excise tax is concerned. Now is the time for you, and you, and you, to stand up and be counted in our ranks as being opposed to this unjust taxation.

What can you do? Join us in writing to your Congressman and Senator, as well as President Johnson, and voice opposition to the telephone excise and support for its revocation. The telephone users have more than carried their share of the load in this levy, which was designed to lift a country in distressing times.

America is in a bounding, bursting, and bountiful era—the Great Society—and the shackles of a wartime tax such as the telephone excise should be removed from Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public.

A Bill To Aid State and Local Law Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, one of our Nation's most important problems is the prodigious increase in its crime rate. The President pointed out in his message on crime to the Congress that since 1940 the crime rate in this country has doubled. Since 1958 it has increased five times as fast as our population.

Measures designed to aid in stemming the increase in crime have recently been passed or proposed in the Congress. Our efforts in combating poverty and in improving education, health, housing, and recreation will contribute greatly to eliminating the causes of criminal activity.

The crime problem will require long-range planning, but it is also a matter of immediate concern. We must act to combat the present threats to the security of our homes and places of business.

Although crime is a matter of grave national concern which deserves the best effort of the Federal Government, the principal enforcement responsibility still rests on State and local governments. That burden is great and becoming heavier. The cost of operating our police departments has risen by 50 percent in the last 5 years alone.

For some years, the Federal Government has been providing valuable assistance to local law-enforcement agencies. The FBI assist them with training activities and the FBI National Academy in Washington gives comprehensive instructions to State and local career law-enforcement officers yearly. The Federal Government also provides support for short-term vocational training for police officers and more extensive training in related fields through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Treasury Department provides instruction for narcotics enforcement personnel through the Bureau of Narcotics Training School.

These have been highly successful programs, but additional efforts are a necessity. We must provide additional assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers, and we must improve capabilities, techniques, and practices in the prevention and control of crime. To this end, I am today introducing for appropriate reference a bill

designed to bolster present training programs.

The need for State and local law-enforcement training programs has long been recognized in my State of Colorado. In 1962, Mr. A. S. (Tony) Reeder, at the request of Gov. Steven McNichols, formed a committee of three chiefs of police, three sheriffs, and the administrative head of the Colorado State Patrol. The committee decided to divide the State into eight areas and to hold open hearings to which local chiefs of police, marshals, sheriffs, city councilmen, county commissioners, city managers, and other interested parties would be invited.

Investigations were conducted concerning which of the following were most urgently needed to upgrade law enforcement in Colorado—the establishment of a State central police records bureau, a State police identification bureau, or a State crime laboratory. As a result of these eight meetings and the correlation of information that had been obtained, it was agreed that the most urgent need of law-enforcement facilities in our State was a law-enforcement training program.

Maj. Gen. Joe Moffett, of the Colorado National Guard, suggested the plan of combining a Colorado law enforcement training academy with the new National Guard complex that was proposed for Camp George West near Golden, Colo. The committee agreed that this was the most feasible plan. They estimated the cost constructing and equipping the law-enforcement academy at $313,000.

The committee proposed that the academy would house the Colorado State Patrol training facility and would afford a basic training, inservice, and administrative and specialized training to all municipal, county, and State law-enforcement officers in the State.

A questionnaire was then sent to all law enforcement administrators in the State. Fifty-three county sheriffs out of sixty-three reported that they would support and use the academy facilities. Of 151 city chiefs of police and marshals, 91 reported that they definitely would use the academy and 28 reported that they would use it when sufficient financial reserve could be obtained, either from local government or from State or Federal Government. These results represent a definite commitment from 2,441 full-time male officers, 130 full-time female personnel, and 1,691 Reserve and auxiliary officers.

There is at present a bill before the Colorado House of Representatives which would provide for the establishment of a training academy along the lines proposed by the committee. This bill has previously been approved by the State senate. There is, however, the problem of how sufficient funds can be secured to implement such a bill.

Recent speeches in the Congress have emphasized how education, health, welfare, and other endeavors have caused State expenditures to rise at a phenomenal rate, causing State finances to be strained enormously. In my own State of Colorado, the property tax, which is the State's primary basis for local and county financing has reached the point of regressiveness and is a major burden to orderly local government and a detriment to economic growth. Yet the need for a training program for our police and sheriffs is an absolute necessity in my State as it is in many States.

The bill I am introducing would provide for the assistance to the States or local agencies to establish programs and facilities giving professional training and education to law enforcement personnel toward the end of increasing the security of persons and property and to promote respect for the law.

I trust that with the assistance given in this bill and the incentive that will be provided by its enactment, for my own State as well as the other States throughout the Union, will provide a training facility for law enforcement personnel that is necessary to increase safety in our streets and security in our homes and places of business.

Governor Shivers Stresses Potential at Marshall Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the RECORD a report of a speech by former Governor Shivers in Marshall, Tex. Governor Shivers emphasizes the great future this area of Texas has. I fully concur with him and commend him on his interest and his efforts to help the great east Texas area.

The article from the Longview, Tex., Daily News, follows:

SHIVERS STRESSES POTENTIAL GROWTH AT MARSHALL DINNER

(By Sam Paris)

MARSHALL.—"This area of the State has the greatest potential for growth of any section of Texas," former Texas Governor Allan Shivers told a capacity crowd at the 1965 Marshall Chamber of Commerce banquet here Tuesday evening, "and all you have to do is continue to distinguish between selflessness and selfishness for the future to be even brighter than most predict."

Shivers, attending the annual chamber banquet in company with his wife, spent the afternoon preceding the dinner in social relationship with numerous local citizens and also played golf. He arrived at the rooftop dining room of Hotel Marshall with a healthy glow imprinted on his forehead by a warm east Texas sun.

"I personally think that the future growth of Texas lies in the eastern part of the State, here where you have the water and natural resources with which to build.

"I want to help this area, including Marshall and Harrison County, not only because I have made investments here but simply to see an area with such abundance prosper and grow," the former Governor continued.

"I believe firmly that this area will grow with the people here tonight—who have accomplished so much during the past year—working for the progress of the city."

Shivers said leaders in his hometown of Woodville have been "trying to do the same thing you have been doing, and towns up and down Texas and Louisiana have been changing the basis of their economies.

"When I was growing up, cattle and cotton were the backbone of our economy in the State, and then we all remember when oil became the prime basis of economy. In the future, with such work as done by men here tonight, I predict that the population of Marshall and Harrison County will double by 1975."

The speaker digressed from his look into the future to state that the freedom of the individual outweighs the rights of property. He said that in actuality property has no rights but "people have many rights, and without those rights there would be no property from which the individual could create wealth." He related an incident in Austin where a purported leader stated that people making "all of the money shouldn't be spending it for cars and cigarettes and other things but should turn it over as taxes to the Government because the Government can spend it best."

"I, for one, like to see people do well," he stated.

Shivers interspersed a personal tribute to Miss Margie E. Neal, of Carthage, former State senator, on her 91st birthday in the near future." And Miss Neal promptly replied that she "would be 90 on my next birthday, not 91." Miss Neal was the first woman to serve in the Texas senate.

Shivers also paid special and warm tribute to District Judge Sam Hall, Sr., and Mrs. Hall, who attended the dinner meeting to see their son Sam Hall, Jr., relinquish the chamber presidency to Max Lale, local resident and staff assistant in plant relations at Thiokol Chemical Corp.

Shivers' comments were augmented by the answers he gave to newsmen during a press conference preceding the dinner.

On school affairs in the State, he stated that he believes that the movement to increase teachers' pay will be successful this year, but that he could not favor either bill now under consideration. Instead, he said, he likes features of both bills. He said the governor's bill and the bill backed by the Texas Teachers Association could be blended to give both an immediate raise across the board and also include a provision which Gov. John Connally has advocated, calling for a gradual scale of salary increases during the next 10 years.

Shivers congratulated area leaders on the development of navigation districts during the past few weeks "because those plans lead to more communication and much more speed is needed in this day and time."

The former Governor also placed his stamp of approval on recent legislation creating oil property pooling under law. He said pooling regulations will benefit small landowners and at the same time give incentive to producers and drillers in their development of new oil fields in what is known as town-lot areas.

On reapportionment, Shivers stated that he hopes the State legislature will solve the problem and not permit congress to enter the troubled field.

Shivers ended the news conference with his opinion surrounding the war in South Vietnam. He insisted that America must choose a course which will not permit a retreat in the face of communism. He said this Nation must continue to confront Red China and the Soviets in any eventuality.

The Research Spectrum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, pinpointing Pittsburgh research as the key

to tomorrow, I call the attention of the House to another chapter in the story as published by the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania.

Today's articles cover the research spectrum and materials.

THE RESEARCH SPECTRUM

A decided advantage to the establishment of new industries is the diversity of the Pittsburgh area's research and development efforts.

Pittsburgh research laboratories are especially strong in the materials, nucleonics, chemicals, electronics, and instruments fields, but they also are engaged in a variety of other R. & D. activities.

Many of the larger companies—such as Westinghouse Electric Corp., United States Steel Corp., and Gulf Research & Development Co.—are active in almost all the principal fields. More often, however, the research and development efforts are more specialized—tailored to a company's product line in a single field or two.

Pittsburgh's three major universities—and Mellon Institute—conduct research in most of the disciplines. Although much of this work is of a basic nature, many of the programs have applications that merit industrial scrutiny.

This section discusses some of the principal R. & D. areas, major laboratories, specialized equipment, interesting projects, and significant results of Pittsburgh's scientific and technical efforts.

The description is far from complete, but serves merely to illustrate the nature, growth, and direction of research and development in the nine-county area. More detailed information about each company's R. & D. activities can be found in the research directory on pages 33 to 47.

MATERIALS

Historically, Pittsburgh has been a materials center. More new materials and processing techniques have been developed in the area than in any other section of the United States.

Although the region's research and development activities have been broadened considerably, new and better materials and processes still command the largest volume of R. & D. efforts.

These activities range from research in such traditional areas as steel, aluminum, coal, refractories, ceramics, and glass, to pioneering work in alloys, nuclear fuels, and exotic materials.

Basic studies into the nature of metals and alloys are conducted at Mellon Institute, Carnegie Institute of Technology, and University of Pittsburgh, as well as industrial laboratories.

On the applied research scene, Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp. is improving upon its vacuum melting technique breakthrough; MSA Research Corp. is experimenting with new liquid metals; and Universal-Cyclops Steel Corp. is studying ways to fabricate refractory metals in an inert atmosphere.

Semi-Elements, Inc,. is developing single crystals of metals; Harbison-Walker Refractories Co. is working on extremely high temperature refractories; Magnetics, Inc., is producing new magnetic materials; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. is exploring deep-diving structures made of glass; and Nuclear Materials & Equipment Corp. is perfecting new nuclear fuel materials.

Some of the most diversified materials research is being carried on at companies primarily in other fields, such as Westinghouse Electric Corp., which is involved in semiconductor, nuclear fuel, and other advanced materials research.

The largest and most numerous Pittsburgh materials laboratories are engaged in metals and alloys research. Among the extensive metallurgical facilities in the area are those of United States Steel Corp., Aluminum Co. of America, Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Latrobe Steel Co., Crucible Steel Co. of America, Dravo Corp., Blaw-Knox Co., Vanadium-Alloys Steel Co., Universal-Cyclops Steel Corp., St. Joseph Lead Co., Pittsburgh-Des Moines Steel Co., Firth Sterling, Inc., MSA Research Corp., and Copperweld Steel Co.

The Pittsburgh area also has a heavy R. & D. concentration in refractories, ceramics, and glass. Some of the better known facilities are the Carborundum Co., Harbison-Walker Refractories Co., McDanel Refractory Porcelain Co., Du-Co Ceramics Co., Findlay Refractories Co., Kennametal, Inc., O. Hommel Co., Saxonburg Ceramics, Inc., Nuclear Materials & Equipment Corp., Pittsburgh Corning Corp., Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., American Optical Co., and American Glass Research, Inc.

All aspects of coal technology are explored at the Bureau of Mines, Consolidation Coal Co., Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., Koppers Co., United States Steel Corp., and Pittsburgh Chemical Co.

Improved polymers and coatings are R. & D. objectives at such companies as Pennsylvania Industrial Chemical Corp., H. H. Robertson Co., Koppers Co., Mobil Finishes Co., Mobay Chemical Co., Neville Chemical Co., Thompson & Co., Watson-Standard Co., and Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

Victory Memorial Hospital in Brooklyn Continues To Provide Unexcelled Services After 60 years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, for many years the Bay Ridge community in Brooklyn has been considered one of the most underhospitalized areas in the city.

One of the leaders in the struggle against sickness and suffering has been Victory Memorial Hospital, Bay Ridge's only nonprofit, voluntary hospital. This magnificent institution has proven effective and compassionate medical care for the sick and needy, of all races and creeds, for over 60 years. Founded in 1904, Victory Memorial today serves well over 5,000 patients each year, and the quality of medicine and surgery practiced in the hospital is unexcelled anywhere.

Throughout its history, Victory has responded to the call for expanded facilities in the community and its new 62-bed wing which opened in 1962 has been the key factor in enabling the hospital to meet the mounting demands for medical care in Bay Ridge. The importance of this new facility is reflected in the fact that in 1961 Victory Memorial admitted 3,186 patients. By 1964 this figure increased by 70 percent.

Significantly, Victory Memorial also is providing a major medical service for the residents of Staten Island, now that the Verazano Bridge has linked that borough with Brooklyn. Scores of emergency as well as routine cases have been brought to the hospital from Staten Island, and in general, Victory is providing valuable assistance to a neighboring county.

Last month, at the hospital's annual meeting of the board of trustees, George A. Aliano, an attorney and distinguished civic leader, was elected to an unprecedented 16th consecutive 1-year term as president of Victory Memorial. As a result of his dedicated efforts and the close cooperation of the entire board and the professional and nonprofessional staffs, the hospital has witnessed steady and healthy growth over the past several years.

I think it is noteworthy to point out that Victory's west wing was dedicated to the 134 south Brooklyn men killed in action in World War I and that the east wing was dedicated in memory of those servicemen from Bay Ridge who gave their lives during World War II and the Korean conflict.

It is in the name of these heroic men that Victory Memorial carries on its humane and essential programs in the unceasing war against disease and travail.

Harry Truman, Man of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 13, 1965, carried an editorial tribute to Harry S. Truman which rates with the best ever written about the great man from Independence, Mo.

The theme of this editorial is that Former President Truman grows in stature with the passage of time because his decisions in the years of world crisis immediately following World War II have taken on added luster under the test of time. Few leaders have been fully appreciated during their lifetime and many have been maligned by the second guessers of history. But the swift passage of events, trying the mettle and courage of free people everywhere in our world, have adequately justified the Truman years in little more than a decade.

Under leave previously granted, I insert in the RECORD, the editorial:

HARRY TRUMAN, MAN OF DECISION

As time passes and as we see the recent past in fuller perspective, former President Harry S. Truman grows in stature.

We realize that Mr. Truman built the very foundations of America's new, powerful foreign policy after World War II, and mobilized all the free world behind it.

Tonight Mr. Truman will go to the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City. There Freedom House will present to him its Freedom Award on the 20th anniversary of his first day in the Presidency.

It will be a reunion for the doughty Missourian. Most of his last Cabinet will be there. So will many men who played important parts in the dramatic and momentous years, 1945 to 1952, when Mr. Truman and they were together winning a war, rebuilding a world and trying to find paths to permanent peace.

No President since Mr. Truman has made more than minor changes in the foreign policy for which he took full responsibility. The Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the Berlin airlift, the Korean intervention, the revival of war-stricken nations—these are still the chief girders of America's free world leadership.

On each of these policies Mr. Truman made the final decisions. So he did on dropping the nuclear bomb, too.

He consulted others, but in the end, on the lonely spot of the ultimate decisionmaker, he stuck to his resolute policy: "The buck stops here."

The late Cleveland mayor, Tom L. Johnson, once said with rueful humor: "A good executive is one who can make decisions, and is sometimes right."

Mr. Truman made some of the most crucial decisions any President, and any man in world history, has had to make. And we honor him because he was right so much of the time.

Vietnam Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune has once again contributed distinguished reporting and thoughtful, sober comment on the Vietnam situation. On April 18, Barnard L. Collier filed a story from Johnson City, Tex., which vividly describes the President's delivery to the press of his Easter message, and the following day the Herald Tribune commented on the situation editorially. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include these two articles:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 19, 1965]

BRICKBATS THROUGH THE WINDOW

The United States, in President Johnson's words, "tried to open a window to peace." But the Communists responded, m·ich as Communist-inspired mobs have responded to American overtures, by heaving brickbats through the window. On the very day that Mr. Johnson was repeating his offer of unconditional negotiations, the Soviet Union announced that Mr. Johnson "does not seek to explore avenues leading to a peaceful solution of the Vietnamese problem."

What are those avenues? The Communists of Red China, North Vietnam and the Soviet Union know only a single avenue: one which leads the United States out of Vietnam. And that avenue, Mr. Johnson has again and again made plain, the United State will not tread—until a peaceful solution is reached.

In other words, the Communists do not want unconditional negotiations but unconditional surrender of the Saigon government. The United States, for its part, cannot sacrifice the people who have been fighting on against the imported revolt that is intended to bring about the end of their independence. Once that independence is assured, the United States is prepared to leave South Vietnam.

The Soviet communique, after the Moscow talks between the Russians and the North Vietnamese, leaves the suspicion that the Soviet Union will take a hand in escalating the war. The reference to Soviet "volunteers," while veiled and "iffy," could imply that Soviet troops will man Soviet antiaircraft missiles in North Vietnam, since sites for such weapons are apparently under preparation. On the other hand, the communique can be interpreted to be a threat, a warning, that may or may not be implemented.

But what the Soviet communique clearly is not is an affirmative answer to President Johnson's offer to negotiate. Until such an answer is forthcoming, the more or less well-intentioned Americans who have been demonstrating against their country's policy in Vietnam as a threat to peace are delivering their message to the wrong address.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 8, 1965]

JOHNSON RENEWS VIET PLEDGE: ALWAYS READY FOR PEACE TALKS BUT "NO POWER CAN FORCE US OUT"

(By Barnard L. Collier)

JOHNSON CITY, TEX.—In a somber Easter message, President Johnson warned yesterday that "no human power is capable of forcing us from Vietnam." But he still held out the offer of unconditional peace talks with the Communists "next week, tomorrow, or tonight."

After the President spoke, the Soviet Union announced that it will permit Russian "volunteers" to fight in Vietnam if "U.S. aggression against the Democratic Republic of (North) Vietnam is intensified" and if Hanoi requests such aid. The Moscow statement charged that the United States is "extending aggression and does not seek to explore avenues leading to a peaceful solution."

The Soviet announcement in a Soviet-North Vietnamese communique, appeared not to have been in response to the President's statement.

The President spoke from the porch of the LBJ Ranch. He was as serious as reporters have seen him in months.

"If the price of victory in Vietnam is blood and men, we are willing to pay that price," he declared.

"They want no talk with us," he said grimly, summing up Communist reaction so far to his April 7 peace talk proposals. "But our offer stands. The window to peace is still open."

In an implied appeal to America's allies and to neutrals to press for peace talks, he said he hoped that "a mounting crescendo of world opinion, weary of war, opposed to aggression, will finally find a way to reach the ears of those now deaf to calls for peace."

Hours earlier, U.S. planes had lashed highways and a railroad in North Vietnam for the second straight day—and South Vietnamese planes dropped 100,000 leaflets carrying the President's April 7 peace talk proposals and his picture on the North Vietnamese city of Dong Hoi.

The Moscow communique, issued after talks between North Vietnamese Communist party secretary Le Kuan and Soviet officials, said Russia would "continue rendering all necessary assistance" to the North Vietnamese against United States aggression. A Soviet antiaircraft missile site is reported under construction near Hanoi, Russians are in the country and high-altitude surface-to-air (SAM) missiles are believed on the way.

Moscow has spoken previously of "many volunteers"—a Communist euphemism for trained troops—anxious to fight in Vietnam but gave no indication whether they would be permitted to go. The new announcement—with the provisos that the United States intensifies the war and North Vietnam asks for the help—was the furthest the Soviets have gone on the "volunteer" question.

The communique specifically scoffed at the President's April 7 speech as showing that "the United States is still keeping a course for the extension of acts of aggression and does not seek to explore avenues leading to a peaceful solution of the Vietnamese problem."

In Washington, Secretary of State Dean Rusk announced that the United States had "thought long and soberly" about suspending the raids on North Vietnam that began February 7 but had concluded that such action "would only encourage the aggressor and dishearten our friends."

Prime Ministers Lester Pearson of Canada and Lal Bahadur Shastri of India, among others, have suggested that the North Vietnamese might respond by relaxing their guerrilla war if the raids were suspended. But Mr. Rusk, in a statement, said that "we have tried publicly and privately to find out if this would be the result, and there has been no response."

President Johnson in his message expressed regret "that the necessities of war have forced us to bomb North Vietnam." But he emphasized that the raids have been directed at military and strategic targets, "at concrete and steel and not human life."

"I understand the feelings of those who regret that we must undertake air attacks," Mr. Johnson said. "I share those feelings.

"But the compassion of this country, and the world, must go out to the men, women and children who are killed and crippled by the Vietcong every day in South Vietnam. The outrage of this country, and the world, must be visited on those who explode their bombs in cities and villages, ripping the bodies of the helpless."

He added soberly:

"Let us remember that the people of South Vietnam, and the Americans who share their struggle, suffer because they are attacked—not because they are attackers."

The President, who was flanked by Mrs. Johnson and Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, began his message by saying: "This has been a week of tragedy, disappointment and progress."

"On this, of all weekends, we must feel a deep sadness that men must still die and families still be left homeless in the brutality of war," he said. He expressed sorrow for the death of Joseph W. Grainger, the U.S. aid official whose murder by his Vietcong captors was disclosed last week, and for "all the others, on both sides, who found this week to be their last."

A strong theme of the message was the President's expressed disappointment—at the rejection of his April 7 proposal for unconditional peace talks on Vietnam, at the continued loss of American and Vietnamese lives and at the angry censure, in some parts of the world and among some Americans, of his orders to bomb North Vietnam.

The April 7 proposals have been denounced by Hanoi, Peiping and Moscow. Red China and North Vietnam also turned down visits to their capitals by former British Foreign Secretary Patrick Gordon Walker, on a diplomatic sounding mission, and indicated to United Nations Secretary General U Thant that visits by Mr. Thant would serve little purpose.

"We tried to open a window to peace," Mr. Johnson said, "only to be met with tired names and slogans—and a refusal to talk.

"They want no talks with us—no talk with a distinguished Briton—and no talk with the United Nations. They want no talk at all—so far. But our offer stands. We mean every word of it.

"The window to peace is still open. We are still ready for unconditional discussion. We will impose no conditions, of any kind, on any government willing to talk. Nor will we accept any. On this basis we are ready to begin discussion next week, tomorrow or tonight."

Mr. Johnson ended on a dead-serious note. "It is not easy to engage in a struggle whose beginning is obscure and whose end is not

in sight," he said. "Peace, like war, requires patience and the courage to go on despite discouragement.

"Yet we must go on. For there is a world to lose, a world of peace, of order and of expanding promise for all who live therein."

He then murmured "thank you" to the assembled reporters, walked over to put his arm around Mrs. Johnson and kiss her on the forehead and disappeared into the ranchhouse. Reporters could remember no other time when he had not lingered after a formal statement to banter with the press.

Helicopter Service in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 24 the President's budget message called for an end to Federal subsidies in support of passenger helicopter operations throughout the country. I question whether such immediate withdrawal of support is the wisest move at this point in the development of helicopter service.

To quote a New York Times editorial of February 6:

Any Government subsidy must, of course, be submitted to unremitting review. But it would be most unfortunate and shortsighted to stop the subsidy of helicopter passenger service at this stage. For one thing, the Pan Am heliport itself, because of its great convenience, should encourage an immediate increase in passenger use to make trips to airports in 5 to 10 minutes that might require an hour or more by highway. If, as likely, the proposed new fourth major airport in the area is situated even further away, the helicopter's time advantage will be enhanced.

While the helicopter service would probably be unable to exist this year or next without support, it seems that the great increase in recent years of public support and usage points to a time in the very near future when such service would be able to pay for itself. New York Airways when it started its operations 12 years ago carried approximately 25 passengers daily. Today that figure is up to 1,000 daily. As recently as 1958 subsidies received were 72.9 percent of all revenues received by New York Airways. In 1964 other commercial income had grown so that only 45 percent of all revenues came from Government subsidy. In 1965, this will drop to 34.8 percent and in subsequent years it will fall to 23.6 percent, finally in 1970 to 3.5 percent.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has proposed a plan for ending subsidy which takes account of this attenuating need as well as the requirement of Government economy. This program would gradually phase out aid to the heliports between now and 1970 and offer only the barest subsidy needed to match increasing profits.

I support this plan because I believe it will enable the needed convenience of helicopter service to survive, yet will call for the minimum of Federal funds necessary to do this.

We must remember that we have a large investment in this service. The Federal Government has spent $46.7 million in the past 11 years in fostering the growth of the program. To cut off aid now would be to nip it in the bud and render our previous investment useless. The Civil Aeronautics Board program would call for a small amount of additional funds to complete our investment and would allow that investment to reap the dividend of self-sufficient service that was our original goal and which promises to be an imminent reality.

Partners of Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent account of an interesting program undertaken between my own State of Maryland and the State of Rio, Brazil.

Senor Ronald Hees and Senor Durval Goncalves arrived in Maryland on March 20 as representatives of the Partners of Alliance program, jointly sponsored by the State Department and the Agency for International Development. This was a followup to a trip taken to Brazil by three members of the Maryland Partners Committee. These two men from the State of Rio came to assist in the promotion and development of the partners relationship in Maryland and to stimulate interest in the many areas of assistance and exchange in which programs are underway.

Between March 20 and April 3, Senors Hees and Goncalves covered a tremendous amount of territory. They visited various secondary schools, the University of Maryland, several business establishments, and hospitals. They also took a trip to the Eastern Shore and to Westminster, appeared on two Baltimore television programs and attended a dinner given by Gov. J. Millard Tawes.

As a result of their numerous visits, Senor Hees and Senor Goncalves were provided with insights into problems which are acute in Maryland as well as in Rio. The people of Maryland also gained an insight into Rio's problems and responded immediately. For example, after meeting with the two men, students of Canton Junior High School in Baltimore donated a check to the program. The students of the University of Maryland, too, have responded by initiating an exchange under which they are going to attend the University of Rio to undertake a program of improving the level of education and health of slum dwellers. In turn, a school in Rio is being named for Governor Tawes.

These two Brazilian visitors established many valuable contacts so that the Partners of Alliance program will proceed with increased effectiveness. It is evident that an even closer relationship has been cemented between these two great communities.

At this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD two articles from the Baltimore, Md., Sun of March 31, 1965, concrening this program:

RIO PICKS TAWES FOR SCHOOL TITLE

ANNAPOLIS, April 10.—Governor Tawes has been advised that a school is being named for him in the State of Rio de Janeiro.

Rio is a sister State of Maryland in the Partners of Alliance program initiated by the State Department.

Gov. Paulo Torres of the State of Rio advised the Maryland Governor of the honor planned for him. Tawes had given a dinner in Annapolis recently honoring two members of the State of Rio Partners Committee who were visiting Maryland.

Governor Tawes expressed appreciation in a letter to Governor Torres and said he hoped the naming of a Rio school for a Maryland citizen will "help to cement the close relationship" being developed between the two States.

STATE GROUP AIDS BRAZIL—MARYLAND DOLLARS HELP PROVIDE SLUM AREA SCHOOLS

Maryland dollars are helping put slum children in school in the State of Rio in Brazil, a Brazilian visitor said yesterday.

This is one of a number of projects aided by Marylanders in the Partners of Alliance program, sponsored by the Agency for International Development. Maryland is 1 of 20 States which has been linked up with a Latin American counterpart.

At a press conference, Ronald Hees, 33, said the enlargement of one school and the building of another in the slums of Niteroy, the capital of the State of Rio, has enabled many slum children to attend school.

TOTAL OF $1,300 GIVEN

Money to help enlarge the one and help build the other came from the Maryland committee. A total of $1,300 was given.

The chairman of the Maryland committee, appointed by Governor Tawes, is Albert Berney, president of Hamburger's Men Store. Other officers who attended the press conference are Wallace Lanahan, vice chairman, president of Stein Bros. & Boyce, investment bankers; and Julian Stein, secretary, a public relations counsel.

Mr. Stein said that the Maryland help was designed to "help the Brazilians help themselves."

Birthday of Tanzania

SPEECH

OF

HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 year ago today, on April 26, the new African Nations of Tanganyika and Zanzibar embarked upon the enormous task of forging the two countries into a single nation.

To the people of that new nation, Tanzania, and to its President, Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere, I wish to extend my best wishes for the future, and congratulations for what has been done in 1 year.

All Americans must feel admiration for the daring concepts that were given reality a year ago. Our own history of a

struggle toward a concept which many said could not be attained, makes it obvious to us that this young nation has many trials and tribulations in the days ahead. That it will come through successfully and attain the destiny ordained for a people loving freedom is the hope of all Americans on this day.

Robert Uihlein Receives Milwaukee Press Community Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday it was my distinct pleasure to have attended the annual Gridiron Dinner of the Milwaukee Press Club.

On that occasion, the Milwaukee Press Club presented its 1965 award for community service to Mr. Robert A. Uihlein, Jr., president of the Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co.

Mr. Uihlein has richly merited this recognition for his many contributions to the city of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin. Among specific civic deeds has been the outstanding support which he, his family, and his firm have given to Milwaukee's proposed Center for the Performing Arts. Further, his sponsorship of the annual Fourth of July parade has made Milwaukee the place to be in the United States on Independence Day.

In addition to the citation presented to Mr. Uihlein, awards were presented to newspaper men and women in the community for outstanding journalistic achievement.

In order to bring the accomplishments of Mr. Uihlein and the members of the Milwaukee press to the attention of my colleagues, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point excerpts from news stories on the Gridiron dinner which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel on Monday, April 26.

UIHLEIN DECLARES "CITY ON THE MOVE"

Milwaukee was described Sunday night as a "community which is really on the move" by Robert A. Uihlein, Jr., president of the Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co. Uihlein made the remarks after receiving the Milwaukee Press Club's 1965 award for community service at the club's ninth annual Gridiron Dinner in the Wisconsin Club.

"I'm very excited about the way Milwaukee is moving these days," Uihlein said. He specifically mentioned the downtown urban renewal underway and new businesses which have started.

"Wisconsin, and more particularly Milwaukee, is on the way to great things. It's fun to be a member of a great community like Milwaukee," he concluded.

Uihlein, 49, was honored for his contributions to sports and cultural activities as well as for his role in the brewing industry. He was cited for his support of the proposed Center for the Performing Arts, to which his firm and family have contributed $1 million; his sponsorship of the city's annual Fourth of July circus parade and fireworks display and numerous other cultural and sporting events.

The dinner, at which events of 1964 were lampooned through song and playlet, was attended by many governmental figures. Included were Governor Knowles, Lieutenant Governor Lucey, Attorney General La Follette, State Treasurer Dena Smith, Representative ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Milwaukee, Representative DAVIS, Republican, of New Berlin, Mayor Maier, County Executive Doyne; Fred H. Harrington, president of the University of Wisconsin; Associate Justice Thomas Fairchild of the State supreme court and others.

WRITING AWARDS, 10 CATEGORIES

Best newspaper story by a rewrite man, "Wild Bank Robbery," James G. Wieghart, the Sentinel.

Best single news story, reported and written under deadline pressure, "School Boycott," Laurie Van Dyke, the Sentinel.

Best single news story, reported and written without immediate deadline pressure, "Posed as Negro," H. W. Quick, the Sentinel.

Best single story or series on a specialized field of knowledge, including stories on science, business, agriculture, homemaking, art, books, religion, medicine, travel, etc. "The Computer Age," Bob Blackwell, the Sentinel.

Best single feature story, "Expressway Signs," Paul G. Hayes, the Journal.

Best single sports story, "Car Race," Mike Kupper, the Journal.

Best single editorial or editorial cartoon, "Labeling Ludicrousness," Thomas A. Blinkhorn, the Journal.

Best example of continuous reporting on a single subject, in series form or as individual stories, "Public Schools and the Negroes," Ralph Olive, the Journal.

Best single story or series of articles making a contribution to the welfare of the community or State, "Death Rides the Highways," Frank A. Aukofer, the Journal.

Newspaper headline award, based on submission of no more than six headlines with stories attached, Leonard Scheller, the Journal. (The judging took into account how accurately and interestingly the headline summed up the story, plus the writer's versatility.)

PHOTOGRAPHY, FOUR CATEGORIES

Spot news photography, "River Drama," Robert Boyd, the Sentinel.

Documentary photography, "Buck Fever," James Stanfield, the Journal.

Sports photography, "Stock Car Race Crash," Ron Overdahl, West Allis Star.

Feature photography, "Student Requirements," James Stanfield, the Journal.

TV AND RADIO NEWS

Best television spot news, "School Boycott," WITI-TV.

Best television documentary or series, "Our War Babies Go to College," WITI-TV.

Best radio spot news, "Bank Holdup," WOKY radio.

Best radio documentary or series, "Douglas MacArthur Obituary," WTMJ radio.

Best radio-television editorial, "Stand on Police Brutality Charges," WITI-TV.

Brown Bomber Social and Athletic Club of Staten Island, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Brown Bomber Social and Athletic Club of Staten Island, New York, N.Y., held their annual dinner on Sunday, April 25, and the proceeds of this dinner will be donated to charitable organizations.

Mr. Christopher Moody was chairman of the dinner and justice of the criminal courts, Alfred J. Cawse, was the recipient of the achievement award given each year to an outstanding citizen for his contributions to the Borough of Richmond. George "Timmy" Allen, senior in McKee High School was the winner of the sports award as Staten Island's outstanding high school basketball player. Councilman Robert G. Lindsay and Justice Frank Paulo, surrogate of Richmond County, were other guests of honor. Borough president, Albert V. Maniscalco, expressed the greetings of the city of New York and introduced me as principal speaker.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN M. MURPHY BEFORE THE BROWN BOMBER SOCIAL CLUB, APRIL 25

Ladies and gentlemen, tonight, I want to talk to you briefly about education; but don't get in a panic and start looking for the exits; I'm not here as a professor—a calling, incidentally, that someone once described as getting paid to study the sleeping habits of students—but I do want to leave a few thoughts with you on education as an opportunity and as a challenge.

As you know, only 2 weeks ago President Johnson—once a teacher himself—signed into law the $1.3 billion aid-to-education bill, the greatest single advance in the war on ignorance that this country has ever made. It was an honor and a privilege for me to contribute my vote to the passage of this bill through Congress.

As the President said when he affixed his signature to this historic measure, "It will bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most; put the best educational equipment and innovations within reach of all students; advance the technology of teaching and the training of teachers, and provide incentives for those who wish to learn at every stage along the road to learning."

Specifically, the bill is aimed at breaking the cycle of ignorance and poverty by giving special help to children from low-income families. Its main section authorizes the grant of $1.06 billion to the States for the benefit of about 5 million children in families earning under $2,000 a year.

It will provide additional millions to aid school libraries and buy publicly approved textbooks for children in public, private and parochial schools; to start a 5-year program for the establishment of educational and cultural centers such as science laboratories and reading clinics, and to aid educational research and training designed to improve the quality of teaching in grade and high schools.

But let me put it in human terms:

We Americans always pride ourselves on the availability and quality of our public education. For most of us, it is available and it is of good quality. But to hundreds of thousands of families in areas where poverty was and is a bitter reality—and these families and areas know no color line and no State lines—public education often is just barely available and too often of substandard quality.

For instance, recent educational research has shown that alarming numbers of these disadvantaged children are hopelessly behind, scholastically, by the time they struggle into the third or fourth grade. They must have preschool training in order to start on even

terms in the first grade with their more fortunate classmates. But less than half of this country's school districts have kindergartens, and only a hundred or so have public nursery schools.

The aid-to-education bill will fill this urgent need.

Thus, we are on the road to the time when opportunity for education will be a reality for everyone, regardless of color or economic level to the time when no man or woman will be tied to a deadend job, or doomed to a lifetime of idleness and handouts, simply because the door to educational opportunity was locked by circumstances to the time when those in middle life will no longer have to wonder, as millions do now, what they might have accomplished if only they had had a chance.

I think we can now say, with confidence, that the goal of equality of opportunity is in sight. But opportunity alone is not enough to it, we must bring dedication, responsibility and, above all, the surge of challenge.

In fact, I sometimes wonder, in our preoccupation with opportunity, if we have not neglected the qualities that are necessary to take advantage of it.

In the postwar years, hundreds of thousands of veterans, their educational opportunities wiped out by the great economic depression of the nineteen thirties, flocked to college campuses to study under the GI bill of rights. Education was the watchword, the theme of the nineteen forties then, a decade ago, began the industrial revolution brought about by automation, a revolution that is continuing. Again, education was the cry young people were told, and rightly so, that there would be no place for them in the world of the future unless they were trained in the skills demanded by modern technology.

Over these years, the educational picture of this country has undergone a dramatic change. Today, the college graduate is no longer a member of a small and elite minority, as he was for so many years. And the vast majority of our young people complete high school now, even if not all of them go on to college let me give you an example—in just the past ten years, the high school dropout rate has been cut 98 percent, and the curent drive to keep our young people in school is cutting it even more.

It is a heartening picture, certainly but there is a flaw in it. Once, a college degree was virtually a guarantee of a job, if there was a job to be had. To too many young people, a degree became an end in itself, a passport into business or the professions where, by natural progression and with little effort on their part, they would ultimately arrive in the high tax brackets.

Unfortunately, this attitude persists and it persists in the face of a totally changed picture. Today, every applicant for a desirable job has a college diploma; no others need apply. So, the personnel manager is no longer impressed by college credentials; one school is very much like another, and the competition for a given job now narrows down to the individual and his basic attitude.

The door of opportunity has been opened for him, educationally, but has he the qualities that will enable him to walk through that door?

Is he simply looking for a job, a secure corner in which to sit and grow gray while he counts the years to retirement and another secure corner, this one in the sun? Or is he looking for challenge, a chance to put his educational opportunity to work for his firm, his community and himself?

If he is only a job seeker, his chance of exchanging that college degree for a secure corner grows slimmer every day. In today's business world, an employer looks for potential—the potential of growth—not only for his firm but for his community. The day when business took no active part in the community around it is long since gone; today, a business leader is also a community leader, and the qualities demanded in one are demanded in the other.

These qualities, in my view, are first, enthusiasm—the drive to do a job well regardless of its relative unimportance; initiative—the spirit needed to originate action on your own; responsibility—the ability to meet obligations or to act without superior authority or guidance; and service—the willingness to devote time and effort to build and improve your community.

Without these qualities, the door of educational opportunity is a revolving one that will bring you right back around to where you went in. Now, through the administration's aid-to-education bill, opportunity soon will be within the reach of everyone. But Government can do no more than open the door; you must make your own way along the path to the rewards of accomplishment and service that lie beyond it. Thank you.

Address by Bruce Catton at Appomattox Courthouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on April 9, 1965, we observed at Appomattox, Va., the 100th anniversary of the end of the War Between the States. This centennial observance was marked by very simple yet impressive ceremonies, coupled with the dedication of the restored Old Appomattox Courthouse. This fine building has just been completed by the National Park Service and is part of the Mission 66 program for restoring the Appomattox setting where the war was brought to a close.

Thousands of people from all over the country came to Appomattox on this occasion and the address of the day was delivered by Mr. Bruce Catton, author of "A Stillness at Appamattox" and one of the outstanding authorities on the war.

The occasion called for a reverent, sober reminder of the climactic moment 100 years ago and Mr. Catton delivered a most appropriate address. He set the scene in a most dramatic manner and called his listeners to a renewed dedication of the fundamental principles on which our Nation was founded. His remarks on that occasion are worthy of the attention of all Americans and it is my privilege to include his address herein with the hope that it will be studied with interest and care.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY BRUCE CATTON AT APPOMATTOX COURTHOUSE, APRIL 9, 1865, THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE SURRENDER BY GEN. ROBERT E. LEE OF THE ARMY OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA

We are met here today to commemorate the centennial of a great moment in American history—the moment when Gen. Robert E. Lee in this place surrendered the Army of Northern Virginia to Gen. U. S. Grant.

That was the final act in an unforgettable story—the story of the American Civil War, in which the people of our country struggled for 4 years, at immeasurable cost, to work out the basis on which they would go forward to greatness.

The cost of that war has been paid in full. As we look back to the dramatic scene in the McLean house 100 years ago, we are no longer torn by the fierce emotion that possessed the men and women of that generation. At the same time, we are compelled to realize that we are studying something profoundly tragic. What happened here was the closing scene in an enormous drama wherein men were compelled to contend with a force greater than themselves. As Abraham Lincoln said, neither party in that war had looked for a struggle so long and so costly or for a result "so fundamental and astounding." During those war years the American people had been at grips with fate itself, serving an end larger than they could understand.

Such a struggle is the essence of tragedy. Yet we need to remember one saving fact: the final note of a great tragedy is not a note of denial or despair. No man arises from Hamlet feeling that the answer to the drama he has seen is frustration or futility. On the contrary, it is precisely from the greatest tragedies that we get our most significant and uplifting experiences. For although tragedy does show man contending against fate, fighting a battle which perhaps he must lose, it also shows us that he has something unconquerable and magnificent within himself; and it is that magnificence of the human spirit—the conviction that it is the unconquerable something in man that finally matters—which at last stays with us.

There is a spirit in man that triumphs even in the hour of despair. Grim and terrible as the story of our Civil War is we at least know that great men were involved in it—great men whose living example is part of our heritage today.

Two of the greatest of these, of course, were Robert E. Lee and U. S. Grant, and on this centennial anniversary it is worth our while to recall what happened here when they met.

The scene at Appamattox Courthouse is one of the great dramatic moments in the American story. Quite properly, it was underplayed; nobody tried to strike an attitude or intone notable words for the record, and the two principals, Grant and Lee, behaved with quiet dignity and a deep sense of responsibility. Their meeting was proof that these leaders of rival armies would thereafter have one common country, and on April 9 they served that country well.

Their armies had their final confrontation that morning. Lee was fleeing from the broken siege lines at Petersburg, trying desperately to reach some safe spot where his army could get supplies, regroup, and prepare for fresh battles. Grant's army had overtaken it and had put troops in front of it, and on the morning of April 9 the Army of Northern Virginia was at bay, drawn up on open fields near Appomattox Station. It was surrounded, it was exhausted and it was badly outnumbered: and now the Federal Army was ready to drive home a shattering charge that could end only one way. The blue troops were in line, ready, just beginning to move—when suddenly, out of the Confederate lines, came a young officer on horseback, bearing a staff with a white flag, galloping toward the Yankee line. The movement was frozen, the guns stopped firing, the officer was taken off to headquarters; and then the war was over, there was no charge and no killing, there was a truce, and all that remained was a meeting between Grant and Lee.

So Grant and Lee met in the parlor of Wilmer McLean's house at Appomattox Courthouse: the courtly southerner of aristocratic lineage, gray and knightly in his best uniform, presentation sword belted at his waist, and the middle-westerner whose father was a tanner and who never managed

to look like anything but a run-of-the-mill soldier, wearing a mudsplashed uniform and no sword at all. Lee was accompanied by a military aide, and Grant admitted several of his generals to the room, but all of these people were here chiefly as spectators, essentially, the only actors present were Grant and Lee.

This was undoubtedly the hardest monent of Lee's life, and Grant tried to smooth the way, making smalltalk; Lee himself had to call the meeting to order, so to speak, by remarking that they knew what they were there for and had better get down to it. So Grant scribbled out the terms in pencil, while Lee waited. Finishing the job, Grant passed his orderly book over for Lee to read.

As Lee read, he discovered that this was not grim old "Unconditional-Surrender" Grant who had been writing. Lee's army must be surrendered, but it was not to be paraded off to a northern prison camp; the men would lay down their arms, turning over flags and guns and all military property, and then they would be free to go to their homes, with a saving clause that protected them against any end-of-the-war reprisals. Once these soldiers got home, said Grant's document, they were "not to be disturbed by the U.S. authorities so long as they observe their paroles and the laws in force where they may reside." With Grant's weighty signature under this sentence, Confederate soldiers who had fought so hard against the U.S. Government could not be hanged, imprisoned, or otherwise prosecuted as traitors. The vengeance a victorious government might want to inflict after 4 years of civil strife was ruled out, once and for all.

Lee raised one point. In the Confederate service, cavalry horses (and some artillery horses as well) were not government issue: they were owned by the men who rode them. The written terms said that these horses must be given up. Could not the terms be softened?

Grant remarked that he had not known the soldiers owned these horses, and he did not think he could change the written terms. However, most of the soldiers who were being surrendered were small farmers, they would need horses if they were going to go home and make a living, so he said he would instruct the officers in charge of receiving captured property to give a horse or a mule to any Confederate soldier who claimed to own one. In that way, he said, the men could "work their little farms" once they got back to them. Lee said this would have a very good effect, it was agreed on, and on this homely note the ceremony ended. Lee left the room, mounted his horse, received a salute from the Federal officers who stood by, waiting, and rode off into legend; and Grant went off to his own lines, angrily stopped the firing of jubilant salutes that had just begun (reminding his soldiers that the "Rebels" were now their fellow countrymen once more) and saw to it that wagonloads of bacon and hardtack were sent into the Confederate camp so that Lee's half-starved soldiers might have something to eat. The big surrender scene was over. As far as Grant and Lee could determine it, the Nation could begin healing the dreadful wound the war had left.

That is the note this scene at Appomattox leaves with us—the attempt to heal the wounds. I would like to remind you that one essential part of it is something General Lee did before this meeting took place.

After he had made up his mind to meet General Grant, but before the final arrangements had been made, General Lee quietly spoke a few words that were fully as important for the future of the country as the surrender ceremony itself. To him, as he prepared to meet Grant, came a trusted lieutenant who urged him not to surrender but simply to tell his army to disperse, each man taking to the hills with his rifle in his hand: Let the Yankee handle guerrilla warfare for a while and see what they can make of that.

Lee replied that he would have none of it. It would create a state of things in the South from which it would take years to recover. Federal cavalry would harry the length and breadth of the land for no one knew how long. He himself was "too old to go bushwhacking"; even if the Army did break up into die-hard bands of irreconcilables, he said "the only course for me to pursue would be for me to surrender myself to General Grant." This was the last anybody heard about taking to the hills. The officer who suggested this course wrote that Lee "showed me the situation from a plane to which I had not risen, and when he finished speaking I had not a word to say."

The unquenchable guerrilla warfare this officer had been hinting at was perhaps the one thing that would have ruined America forever. It was precisely what Federal soldiers like Grant and Sherman dreaded most—the long, slow-burning, formless uprising that goes on and on after the field armies have been broken up, with desperate men using violence to provoke more violence, harassing the victor and their own people with a sullen fury no dragoons can quite put down.

On November 7, 1864, President Jefferson Davis strongly hinted at this kind of warfare when he told the Confederate Congress that "there are no vital points on the preservation of which the Confederacy depends. There is no military success of the enemy which can accomplish its destruction. Not the fall of Richmond, nor Wilmington, nor Savannah, nor Mobile, nor of all combined can save the enemy from the constant and exhaustive drain of blood and treasure which must continue until he shall discover that no peace is attainable unless based on recognition of our indefeasible rights."

What Mr. Davis was talking about obviously was an evocation of the revolution which the Confederacy had long denied. A Confederacy that abandoned its cities and no longer relied on any fixed bases would survive—if it survived at all—by guerrilla warfare, counting military coup in terms of crossroads ambushes and the shooting of traitors, living in the desperate hope that the victors would eventually be poisoned by hatred and terror.

The Civil War might very well have ended that way, because civil wars often do end in such a manner; but because of Lee's decision on the last stage of the road to Appomattox, this war was not going to have that kind of ending. The conquered South was not going to become another Ireland or Poland, with generation after generation learning hatred and the arts of back alley fighting.

General Lee ruled it out, not only because he was General Lee but also because he had never seen this war as the kind of struggle that could go on that way. He understood the cause he served with complete clarity. The South had meant neither revolution nor rebellion; it simply desired to detach itself and live in its own chosen part of an unchanging past, and Mr. Davis had defined it perfectly when he said that all his people wanted was to be left alone. Borne up by that desire, the Confederacy had endured 4 years of war, and it was breaking up now because this potential for inspiring the human spirit had been exhausted. With unlimited confidence the Confederacy had fought an unlimited war for a strictly limited end. To go on fighting from the woods and the lanes and the swamps might indeed plague the Yankees and infect a deep wound beyond healing, but the one thing on earth it could not do was give the South a chance to be left alone with what it used to be.

So Lee met with Grant and agreed to surrender the men who had followed him so long and so valiantly, and then he returned to his camp, making his way through the broken ranks of men who were trying numbly to adjust themselves to the blow that had fallen. After a quiet conversation with some of his officers around the campfire he told an aide to draft a farewell order to his army. The first version did not quite suit him, and he struck out a few lines that seemed likely to keep hard feelings alive. At last he had what he wanted and next day it was published to the troops:

"After 4 years of arduous service, marked by unsurpassed courage and fortitude, the Army of Northern Virginia has been compelled to yield to overwhelming numbers and resources. I need not tell you brave survivors of so many hard-fought battles, who have remained steadfast to the last, that I have consented to the result from no distrust of them. But feeling that valor and devotion could accomplish nothing that could compensate for the loss that must have attended the continuance of the contest, I determined to avoid the useless sacrifice of those whose past services have endeared them to their countrymen.

"By the terms of the agreement officers and men can return to their homes and remain until exchanged. You will take with you the satisfaction that proceeds from the consciousness of duty faithfully performed; and I earnestly pray that a merciful God will extend to you His blessing and protection.

"With an increasing admiration of your constancy and devotion to your country, and a grateful remembrance of your kind and generous consideration for myself, I bid you all an affectionate farewell."

That was the end of it. Lee himself returned to Richmond, Grant started back for Washington, and a day or so later the Confederates formally paraded and gave up their arms and their flags, receiving a salute from the waiting Federals, giving a salute in return. Then the men who had been paroled broke ranks, and the Army of Northern Virginia went away from its last parade ground.

It would, of course, be easy to make too much of the general air of reconciliation. Lee's soldiers were hard passionate fighters, they did not enjoy defeat, they were not ready to start loving their enemies with sentimental fondness, and there were wounds that would be a long time healing. And yet by any standard this was an almost unbelievable way to end a civil war, which by all tradition is the worst kind of war there is. Living for the rest of their lives in the long gray shadow of the lost cause, they were nevertheless going on toward the future. General Lee, who had set the pattern, had given them just the right words: "unsurpassed courage and fortitude * * * steadfast to the last * * * the consciousness of duty faithfully performed." Pride in what they had done would grow with the years, but it would turn them into a romantic army of legend and not into a sullen battalion of death.

Here is how the legend worked. Fifteen years after the surrender, one of Lee's veterans—a soldier from South Carolina, who had been in the worst of it from beginning to end—sat down to write his memoirs, a little job of writing that did not get published until many years after its writer was dead. Looking back, he seemed to see something that was worth everything it had cost him, something indeed that a man would almost like to get back to if he only could. He wrote, remember, as one who had been through the mill and not as a starry-eyed recruit, and this is how he put it:

"Who knows but it may be given to us, after this life, to meet again in the old quarters, to play chess and draughts, to get up soon to answer the morning rollcall, to fall in at the tap of the drum for drill and dress parade, and again to hastily don our war gear while the monotonous patter of the long roll summons to battle? Who knows but

again the old flags, ragged and torn, snapping in the wind, may face each other and flutter, pursuing and pursued, while the cries of victory fill a summer day? And after the battle, then the slain and wounded will arise, and all will meet together under the two flags, all sound and well, and there will be talking and laughter and cheers, and all will say: 'Did it not seem real? Was it not as in the old days?' "

The worst experience on earth could be remembered that way, with a still youthful veteran dreaming about foes meeting under two flags and one all-embracing destiny. No civil war in history ever ended quite like this. Instead of leaving an indigestible legacy of hatred and bitterness, this one left a great legend and a long remembering. The story of the lost cause became a positive asset to the united country. What was left of the passionate desire to create an independent southern nation spiralled off into a myth that contained, and still contains, a beautiful residuum of truth. In place of unending rancor and continued backwoods warfare that would have destroyed forever the central force of the American dream, we got this legend that has helped us: the legend of a great leader and great followers who did their utmost for something they believed in, accepted defeat when it came, and enshrined their broken hopes in a romantic story which helped the country to put itself together again.

That is our abiding legacy from Appomattox. We have a memory that unites us; the memory of brave men who fought each other to the limit of endurance and then struck hands across a silent battlefield and asked—is not this as it was in the old days? We have one country now, bought at a terrible price, cemented everlastingly together because at the end of our most terrible war the men who had fought so hard decided that they had had enough of hatred.

National Gallery of Art Calendar of Events May 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Calendar of Events for the National Gallery of Art for the month of May 1965. We Members of the U.S. Congress and the residents of our Nation's Capital, as well as the many people from our country and visitors from abroad are very fortunate to have such an outstanding gallery of art.

The National Gallery of Art has an excellent permanent collection, and the many fine works of art that are lent to the Gallery from time to time make our visits there very worth while.

If you have not visited the Gallery or seen the exhibit lately, the Gallery tour is well worth while.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, MAY 1965

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Collections: Paintings and sculpture from the Andrew Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are on the main floor. The Garbisch American primitive paintings, Kress Renaissance bronzes, and Widener decorative arts are on the ground floor.

New exhibition: The Chester Dale bequest. An exhibition of the complete collection, including 80 paintings not previously shown in Washington. Opening May 6.

New publications: Catalog, 18th and 19th century paintings and sculpture of the French school in the Chester Dale collection. Composed of 152 pages, 9 inches by 6 inches; with introduction by John Walker; 4 color plates, 126 black and white illustrations; $3.50 postpaid.

Catalog, 20th century paintings and sculpture of the French school in the Chester Dale collection. There are 104 pages, 9 inches by 6 inches; with introduction by Maud Dale; 4 color plates, 86 black and white illustrations; $3 postpaid.

Catalog, paintings other than French in the Chester Dale collection. 64 pages, 9 inches by 6 inches; 2 color plates, 51 black and white illustrations; $3 postpaid.

Lectures: A series of three Sunday lectures on the Chester Dale collection will begin on May 9 and continue through May 23.

Lectour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these lectour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, APRIL 26, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 2

Sculpture of the Week: Jacopo Sansovino; "Bacchus and a Young Faun," (Andrew Mellon Collection) West Hall Tuesday through Saturday 12:00 and 2:00; Sunday 3:30 and 6:00.

Tour of the Week: Precursors of Modern French painting in France, Rotunda; Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, Rotunda; Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Holbein and Henry VIII"; Guest speaker: Roy Strong, assistant keeper, National Portrait Gallery, London; Lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: Twenty-second American Music Festival; Howard Lebow, pianist; East Garden Court 8.

MONDAY, MAY 3, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 9

Painting of the week: Ralph Earl, "Daniel Boardman;" (gift of Mrs. W. Murray Crane) Gallery 67; Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Precursors of Modern French Painting Outside France. Rotunda; Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda; Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Naturalism in Barbizon Painting"; guest speaker, Robert L. Herbert, professor of art history, Yale University, New Haven, Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: 22d American Music Festival: Carolyn Reyer, mezzo-soprano, Ralph Zitterbart, pianist, East Garden Court 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, MAY 10, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 16

Work of art of the week: "Medici Ware, XVI Century." Ewer (Widener collection) Gallery G–3, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: The Chester Dale collection up to 1860, Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Classical and Modern Art," guest speaker: Otto J. Brendel, professor of art history, Columbia University, New York, Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: Twenty-second American Music Festival: Aeolian Trio, East Garden Court 8.

MONDAY, MAY 17, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 23

Painting of the week: French School, 1572, "Prince Hercule-Francois, Duc d'Alençon," (Samuel H. Kress Collection) Gallery 41, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: The Chester Dale collection 1860 to 1890, Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Postimpressionism in the Chester Dale Collection"; guest speaker, Leslie Judd Ahlander, author and critic, Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: Twenty-second American Music Festival: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor, Church of the Reformation Cantata Choir and Soloists, East Garden Court 8.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, 737–4215, extension 272.

MONDAY, MAY 24, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 30

Sculpture of the week: Verrocchio. "Giuliano de'Medici" (Andrew Mellon Collection) gallery 2, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: The Chester Dale Collection 1890 to the present; Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday film: "Michelangelo," (produced by Prof. Carlo L. Ragghianti), courtesy of the Italian Government, (Commentary in English), Lecture Hall, 4.

Sunday concert: 22d American Musical Festival; John Celentano, violinist, David Renner, pianist; East Garden Court, 8.

U.N. Charter 20 Years Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the San Francisco Chronicle for its thoughtful editorial entitled "U.N. Charter 20 Years Later."

In it, they recall the confident anticipation which gripped San Francisco and the world 20 years ago as nations met in the San Francisco Opera House to create a "perpetual world alliance for the preservation of peace."

In it, they also remind us of the task which yet remains ahead and of the difficulties with which the United Nations must daily cope.

I join with the San Francisco Chronicle in urging that invitations to the 20th anniversary ceremonies commemorating the founding of the United Nations be extended to the surviving delegates to that historic Conference.

It is my pleasure to insert in the RECORD at this time the full text of the San Francisco Chronicle editorial:

U.N. CHARTER 20 YEARS LATER

Twenty years ago today, President Harry S. Truman, less than two weeks in office, took the stage of San Francisco's War Memorial Opera House for a role in history which, he duly noted, belonged to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He opened the United Nations Conference on International Organization.

In the stead of his profoundly mourned predecessor, President Truman bespoke the shining hopes of a war-weary world as he bade the delegates of 50 nations to bring forth a durable successor to the League of Nations, a perpetual world alliance for the preservation of peace, security and international cooperation.

With the European war rushing to its end and with victory over Japan clearly visible, the participating nations assumed the task with confidence that was almost light-hearted. San Francisco surrounded them with an air of festivity. No one doubted that the great statesmen here assembled would devise a millennium, a system to satisfy mankind's highest desires and guarantee a world of universal good will and harmony, of international law, where strong nations would defend rather than prey on the weak and the rich would assist, not exploit, the poor.

The charter that emerged has proved its ability to fend off wars, establish a code of international law, relieve famine and carry economic aid and technical assistance where needed. It has safeguarded human rights. It has also had its failings. On the eve of its 20th anniversary, the United Nations is sorely in trouble. One member has withdrawn and others openly despise it. Several deny their financial obligations. Its doubled membership has brought embarrassments. Its machinery creaks and frequently stultifies it. Its peacekeeping operations are poverty stricken and it is haunted by the specter of bankruptcy.

Thus the 20th anniversary of the signing of the charter, to be held in San Francisco this June, demands an outpouring of public enthusiasm and support, a demonstration of faith in the U.N. ideals and competence. The charter was forged by the long and tireless efforts of the world's greatest statesmen. Many of those who contributed to its ideas and its language are still among the living, though some are retired or no longer prominent in government. Their presence at the upcoming observance would be both fitting and useful.

We urge that invitations be extended to surviving delegates—to Anthony Eden, Lester Pearson, Mme. Pandit and others, not excepting Vyacheslav Molotov—to the end that at least one member of each original delegation be on hand. Thus might the high hopes and bold intent of the charter framers be honored, and the aspirations of the Atlantic Charter and of Dumbarton Oaks be made to run anew through proceedings of the United Nations, which remains man's best hope for peace and strongest bulwark against tyranny, poverty and disease.

Anniversary of Katyn Massacre and the Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the Polish American Congress calling attention to the fact that today is the anniversary of Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791.

I am pleased to participate again in these proceedings and express my admiration for the Polish people and my sincere hope that they will soon be free from the yoke of Communist slavery.

The Polish American Congress has further called to the attention of the Members of Congress and people of the Nation the fact that this year marks the 25th anniversary of the discovery of the Katyn massacre perpetrated by the Soviet Union and the 20th anniversary of the Yalta agreement.

I wish to place in the RECORD the statements of the congress on these two events as a reminder of Communist treachery.

The statements follow:

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KATYN MASSACRE

The Katyn massacre which shocked the world as one of the most brutal acts of genocide in World War II took place 25 years ago in a forest near Smolensk in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish American Congress and the Polish National Alliance, recently presented a study of this international crime. Mr. Rozmarek stated in an address delivered in New York City:

"The basic facts of the Katyn massacre are well known to world public opinion.

"The first news of the mass graves at Katyn was announced by the German radio on April 13, 1943. In the next few days, citing personal documents, identification cards, letters, and newspapers found in the graves as well as quoting expert opinion of the pathologists, the Germans accused the Russians of mass murdering Polish officers and intellectuals in the month of March of 1940.

"On April 15, 1943, Radio Moscow not only denied the accusations made, but, in turn, charged the Germans with this hideous crime of genocide.

"On April 17, 1943, the Polish Government-in-Exile in London appealed to the International Red Cross at Geneva to conduct an impartial investigation and determine the actual facts of the Katyn crime.

"Nine days later, on April 26, 1943, the Soviet Union severed diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in London, denouncing it falsely as acting in collaboration with Nazi Germany."

With the quoted dates as the background, the following facts were ascertained and established:

The bodies of 4,423 Polish officers, scientists, professors, chaplains, lawyers, and students were found in three mass graves in the Katyn forest. Their last place of imprisonment had been the military prisoners camp at Kozielsk.

Held in another camp at Starobielsk were an additional 2,290 Polish officers, while 6,570 officers were interned in the third camp near Ostashkov. These prisoners of war from the Starobielsk and Ostashkov camps disappeared without a single clue or trace as to their whereabouts. The conclusion is thus inescapable that they met with the same fate as that which befell their fellow officers of the Kozielsk camp. It has not been established as yet whether they rest in some unidentified up to the present time mass graves, or were simply heretofore drowned at sea.

Thus, 14,283 Polish officers and intellectuals, taken as prisoners of war by the Soviets in September of 1939, were brutally and inhumanly murdered in one of the most shocking crimes of genocide in the history of mankind.

The second in the series of dates and facts relating to the crime of Katyn forest is to be found in the United States, due largely to the efforts of the Polish American Congress.

On September 18, 1951, the House of Representatives appointed a Select Committee To Investigate the Katyn Massacre. Headed by Representative RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana, the committee was composed of Representatives DANIEL L. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; Foster Furcolo, of Massachusetts; Thaddeus Machrowicz, of Michigan; ALVIN O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin, and Timothy P. Sheehan, of Illinois.

After a scrupulous and detailed investigation of the pertinent documents and the hearing of testimony of hundreds of duly identified witnesses, the committee stated in its two reports, one of July 1, 1952, and the second of December 22, 1952, that beyond the slightest shadow of doubt, Russia stands accused of the Katyn massacre, and likewise that Russia planned other crimes of genocide against Poland as early as the year of 1939.

The committee asked the President and the State Department that this indictment with all of the documentary evidence be filed with the United Nations General Assembly, and that, eventually the case be brought before the International Tribunal in The Hague.

These facts should have shocked the conscience of the entire world, and brought about an awareness to the western nations of the true face of communism.

It is a fact of crime, of deceit, of falsehood, and of treachery, which cannot be hidden behind the facade of scientific and technological progress of Russia. Science in itself is not wisdom. Wisdom is based upon moral and spiritual values, not upon a calculated and conquest motivated progress of essentially neutral sciences.

At the time of the discovery of the Katyn massacre, the West seemed to have been hypnotized by Russia and her wartime so termed "cooperation."

Indeed it is truly a sad commentary upon our times, that to this day, the West in its dealings with the Soviet Union, seems to be suffering as yet from strange post-hypnotic misconceptions and illusions. They weaved around as yet under an illusory doctrine of so-called coexistence.

Stalin's Russia was deceiving the West with its promises of cooperation.

Present day rulers of Russia are deceiving us now with a false promise of peaceful coexistence.

The peaceful coexistence of the free nations of the world with whom?

Is it to be a coexistence with evil, mass murders and treachery?

YALTA—THE PLACE AND DATE OF A TRAGEDY

On February 11, 1945, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill of Britain and Premier Joseph Stalin of the Soviet Union concluded their conference in the Crimean resort of Yalta, signing a joint communique which has become known to the world as the "Yalta Declaration."

The communique summed up fateful East European decisions that were made at Yalta without the participation or consent of the nations concerned—especially Poland, as the historic key to East European peace and stability.

Beneath the high sounding words of the Yalta Declaration, a foreboding pattern soon became evident. It was a pattern of Western concessions to the Soviets on specific geographical and political issues while still proclaiming lofty principles of freedom and democracy. The basic blunder of Yalta was the confirmation of the Teheran (1943) decision to divide Europe into military zones. Actually, the wording supposedly dictated by war exigencies, was a coverup for a secret agreement on the "spheres of influence" as-

signed to the Western Powers and to the Soviet Union. This is the immoral act, for which the free world is still paying and will pay for years to come in the expenditures and frustrations of the cold war.

The fate of east-central Europe, and thus the fate of more than 100 million peoples was sealed. When Roosevelt and Churchill agreed at Yalta that the Soviet military zone of occupation should extend to the Elbe River. In accepting Stalin's notion that the countries of east-central Europe should have a government "friendly disposed" toward Russia, the Western Powers showed complete lack of awareness of the fundamental conflict between real freedom and the Soviet concept of a government by Communist tyranny. Thus, by accepting this notion, Roosevelt and Churchill automatically, though, perhaps, unknowingly, annulled the high principles of democracy and national independence proclaimed in the Yalta Declaration.

The abandonment of Poland to the control of the Polish Communist Party, which was tantamount to a Russian takeover of Poland, foreshadowed the way in which the principles of Yalta would be distorted in the rest of east central Europe. The Yalta declaration promised "to assist the people in any European liberated (from the Nazis) state to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment, through free elections, of a government responsible to the will of the people". The actual result, through Russian cunning, was to foist Communist minority groups on unwilling majorities in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Rumania. Instead of peace and stability in Europe, which is a prerequisite for world peace and order, we have the Iron Curtain extending from the Baltic to the Alps.

Europe, a cultural and historical entity, was split in half. It was made half free and half enslaved by the shortsighted Yalta decision, on the part of Roosevelt and Churchill.

It is the fault of the Yalta decision that today, the barbarian forces of the East are threatening the heart of Europe from the banks of the Elbe.

Multiple Listing Service of the Brooklyn Real Estate Board Renders Outstanding Service to Buyer and Broker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the Brooklyn Real Estate Board's multiple listing service from the Bay Ridge area, which pioneered multiple listing service in New York City 8 years ago, performs a commendable service for the prospective homebuyer, as well as for real estate brokers who are participants in this organization.

Through the use of this service the persons seeking to purchase a home can save considerable time, effort, and expense, and also, from the standpoint of the broker-participant, sales action is accelerated. This is how the multiple listing service assists the prospective homebuyer.

While there may be many houses on the market which meet all the buyer's specifications, the individual realtor cannot be thoroughly familiar with all of them.

However, each of the 50 members and more than 200 of their salesmen are able to offer the customer a choice of every house available on any given day.

The shopper can narrow his choice down to a few dwellings by looking at the listing sheets and photographs in the broker's office. He is then shown just the few dwellings which will fill his specific needs.

Although the listing sheets and pictures do not get into the hands of all members for approximately 5 days from the time it was listed, the average time expired from listing to sale in Bay Ridge is 32 days. This is the direct result of the realtor listing the property at a realistic selling price.

Persons who wish to sell their homes also enjoy the benefits, by obtaining an estimate of a fair market value. A photograph of his home is taken and distributed with his listing. This generates widespread interest and attracts many prospective buyers. Appointments to show the house are made at the seller's convenience.

These extra services provided by the multiple listing service costs the homeowner nothing more than the regular brokerage he would pay to the realtor who sells his house.

There is a growing awareness of the advantages such listing services offer brokers in today's varied real estate market.

During the past year, members of the Bay Bridge service have been invited to address various real estate boards throughout Brooklyn and Long Island, to help them organize their own listing service and exchange views.

Helping to guide the programs of multiple listing service are its capable committeemen, who include:

John A. Salvatore, chairman; Vincent F. Lucadana, cochairman; Robert J. Stapleton, legal consultant; Zenon L. Post, education; Joseph P. Alessio, budget director; Thomas A. Meagher, education; A. A. Bongiorno, program chairman and James B. Manzi, and John B. Swift, past presidents of the Brooklyn Real Estate Board.

The Historical Background of the Transylvanian Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues illumniated the present plight of the Hungarian minority in Transylvania and suggested some specific steps the administration could take to ameliorate its position in the course of American-Rumanian economic and cultural negotiations.

To understand the problem fully, we have to ask the question, however, how did the question arise, what are the historical-political facts that had led to the emergence of the present tragic situation?

Transylvania forms the eastern part of the Danubian Basin, a land surrounded everywhere except in the northwest by the Carpathian Mountains in the east and south and the Bhari—Bihor—Mountains in the west. Transylvania, a country of scenic beauty resembling Switzerland, is rich in mineral resources, including coal, iron, alloy metals, natural gas, and hydroelectric power, and its economy is well suited to the development of chemical and steel industries. As a matter of fact, the Communist Rumanian government built its industrialization plan around the Transylvanian resources as the pivot.

Magyars—Hungarians—live in Transylvania at least since the end of the ninth century. Historical research showed about 70 percent of the river and place names to be of Hungarian etymological origin, and only about 5 percent of the same names have Rumanian origin. In the 13th century, as Transylvania remained an exposed outpost of the kingdom, the Hungarian kings settled German Saxons and accepted the first Rumanian immigrants from the south into Transylvania. However, except in two counties, Rumanian mass immigration began only in the 16th and 17th centuries when Rumanians fled from the Danubian principalities of Moldavia and Valachia into Transylvania in the wake of Turkish raids, incessant civil wars, and cruel taxation by their Fanariot princes. The high altitudes and dense forests of the Carpathians provided a secure refuge for them, and the Westernized state system offered a more humane and civilized life.

Transylvania, however, failed to escape the Turkish wars either. Though never a Turkish province like the Danubian principalities and Central Hungary, Turkish raids in the 17th century and wars with the Habsburgs decimated its Hungarian population living in the valleys and on the central plateau. The mountaineer Rumanians herding their sheep suffered considerably less from marauding soldateska.

Despite the heavy blood losses, the 16th and 17th centuries were the golden age of Transylvanian culture and political power. An independent principality only loosely connected with the Hungarian Kingdom ruled by the Habsburgs, Transylvania was ruled by the three political nations, Hungarians, Szekler—old Hungarian frontiersmen—and the German Saxons. Rumanians were in the 15th and 16th centuries still in such a minority that when the nobility made the pact in 1437 they were not recognized as a nation.

One of the first princes of Transylvania, Stephen Bathori, became also King of Poland for more than a decade and under Gabriel Bethlen and George Rakoczi I, Transylvania was internation-

ally recognized as a belligerent on the French side in the Thirty Year's War. Several hundred Transylvanian students were also studying at Western universities, and German, Italian, and even French teachers were teaching at Transylvanian colleges.

With the reconquest of central Hungary by the Habsburgs, helped by Hungarians and soldiers from many Western nations in a last crusade, Transylvania could no longer continue as an independent principality as it had always been regarded at home and abroad as a part of the Hungarian Kingdom.

Between 1091 and 1867, except for 1848–49, Transylvania was administered by the Habsburgs as a grand duchy belonging to the Hungarian Crown. The governor was usually a Hungarian nobelman from Transylvania, but there existed a separate Transylvanian chancery in Vienna, usually stuffed by Austrians and Saxons. The Habsburg rule promoted the Saxons and even the Rumanians, but not the Hungarian majority which had to fight in order to continue its role in the Diet and the local administration.

The major accomplishment of the period was the education of the Rumanians and the subsequent awakening of national consciousness among them and among the Hungarians and Saxons as well.

The Hungarian princes of the Reformation period already translated the Bible into Rumanian and tried to convert the Greek orthodox Rumanians to protestantism. They failed to achieve much success. The Roman Catholic Church was temporarily more successful after 1701 when the orthodox clergy accepted the supremacy of the Pope in exchange for keeping their own Greek-Rumanian rites. In the Union of Gyulafehervar (Alba Julia) the Rumanian clergy became Uniate and soon its seminaries, especially the one at Balazsfalva (Blaj) were to become the cradles of Rumanian national consciousness. It was there that the idea of Daco-Roman origins of the Transylvanian Rumanians was conceived on the basis of Hungarian Renaissance Hungarian historians who tried to show as many ties between the Latins and the Hungarian King, Mathias Hunyadi (Corvinus). By 1848 national consciousness was well developed among all nationalities in Transylvania. The Magyars (Hungarians) wanted the abolition of the separate Habsburg administration of Transylvania and favored a political union with Hungary proper that would have its liberal constitution and freely elected, responsible government. They also wanted to abolish serfdom for all nationalities alike. The German Saxons favored the continuance of the status quo that enabled them to influence Transylvanian affairs to an extent incommensurate with their number that hardly exceeded 10 percent at that time.

The Rumanians were by now well provided with nationalistic leaders, including the Greek Orthodox Archbishop Andreas Saguna and the half insane, cruel guerrilla leaders around Avram Lancu. When in September 1848, the Vienna court decided to revoke the laws of April 1848, resulting in the political union with Transylvania and the liberal political reforms, it promised autonomy to the Transylvanian Rumanians in order to gain their military alliance against Louis Kossuth's Hungarians. Subsequently, some of the southern Transylvanian Rumanians rose under Iancu against the Hungarians, committing grave atrocities and massacres among the Hungarian population, only to be chased by Kossuth's armies into the mountains a few months later.

In 1849, just before the combined Austrian-Russian invasion ended the Kossuth regime, Rumanians, and Hungarians seemed to have come to an agreement on the nationality question but, of course, this remained dead paper because of the collapse of Kossuth's Hungary.

During the coming 17 years Hungarians and Rumanians alike were suppressed by the absolutist Habsburg regime. Thus by 1867 despite the realization of the political union between Transylvania and Hungary proper, the Rumanians were willing to accept the situation especially after the passing of the very liberal nationality law of the Hungarian Government in 1868.

Much has been written about the post-compromise period of Transylvania both by Hungarians and Rumanians. Eliminating the obvious propaganda on both sides, it must be said with J. Cabot Moore "The Racial Conflict in Transylvania" that the 50 years were years of development, culture, and progress. Even industrialization was begun and the cultural accomplishments in literature, architecture, sculpture, and theater were impressive. Politically, however, especially the last 15 years before the First World War were years of increasingly acute nationality conflict. Rumanian deputies in the Hungarian Parliament fought almost all the administrative and educational measures of the Government as Magyerizing and anti-Rumanian and the Liga Culturalea of Rumania sent money and agitators into Transylvania where the new Rumanian savings banks succeeded in buying up more and more land. At the same time, there were administrative abuses against the Rumanians on the Hungarian side, and both sides became bitter toward each other. Yet, it must be said that the expansion of public and parochial schools enabled Rumanians to educate their children in their mother tongue—there were 13 colleges, several hundred high schools, and 2,800 grade schools where Rumanian was the language of instruction in 1914 in Transylvania.

The number of Rumanian deputies in the Budapest Parliament, though lower than proportional representation would have accorded it, was considerably higher than later on the number of Hungarian deputies in the Rumanian Parliament after 1920. The Hungarians scolded the Rumanian politicians both for their preference to Vienna—A. Popovici in 1912 was the author of the most detailed book on how to reorganize the monarchy on ethnic basis—and for their suspected irredentist motivation and connections with the Rumanian kingdom. The Rumanians, in turn, complained about highhanded Hungarian administration, and the failure to receive autonomy in the Rumanian areas.

The outcome of the First World War drastically changed the fate of Transylvania. First, Rumania, a German ally, changed sides in 1916 and attacked Austria-Hungary. In return for such a switch, the Allied Powers promised Transylvania and other parts of the Hungarian kingdom to Rumania. Yet, Rumania was defeated by the German and Austro-Hungarian armies and had to sign a peace treaty in May 1918, at Bucharest which restored the prevailing frontiers. On November 7, 1918, several days after the armistice of Austria-Hungary with the Allies, Rumania again declared war on the nonexisting state, and proceeded to occupy Transylvania. Resisted only by one volunteer division of Szeklers and Hungarians, Rumanian advance remained still very slow, and only in March 1919, could they occupy Transylvania after the Allied High Command forced the Hungarians to withdraw.

On December 1, 1918, the Rumanians of Transylvania, after some bitter debate, voted for the incorporation of Transylvania into the Rumanian kingdom, a step which was not followed by the Hungarians and accepted by the Saxons only after personal guarantees of the Rumanian leaders that the peace conference already assigned Transylvania to Rumania.

In the peace treaty of 1920, Rumania was given substantially the same area as promised to her in 1916. Minority protection clauses were included into the treaty. They were never kept fully but at least prevented an even more intense persecution of the Hungarians. About 150,000 Hungarians were forced to leave and the rest became second-class citizens.

Yet the Transylvanian Rumanians also had a sorry lot as their brethren from the Rumanian Kingdom took over. Some of the leaders, Vajda-Voevod, Maniu, Goga were the bitterest critics of the new regime, though certainly they were not friendly toward the Hungarians. Corruption, political and financial, flourished encouraging extremist movements on the right—Iron Guard—and aggravating the situation of the Hungarian minority, still numbering 1.6 million. The land reform hit the Hungarians as Rumanian estates were usually excluded under false pretexts, the language requirements were made too severe so that civil servants of Hungarian descent, even in the railroad and post offices were always in the danger of being fired, as they often were, Hungarian students were seldom allowed to pass the Rumanian university and high school exams, administrative abuses were numerous and schools were closed right and left.

By 1936 many a volume of the League of Nations was full with the complaints and proceedings of the Hungarian minority in Transylvania. It is interesting to note that though Rumania was a French ally, the League of Nations ordered at least partial relief in 40 percent of the cases of complaints.

By 1940 the situation changed internationally. Rumania abandoned the Anglo-French guarantee in the wake of France's surrender to Hitler's armies and Hungary pressed for a revision of the frontiers. The Soviet Union, under the secret protocol of the German-Russian Treaty of August 23, 1929, that led to the partition of Poland as well, demanded Bessarabia back from Rumania in June 1940. Rumania had no choice but to yield to the Soviet demand. Hungary's turn was next, but the subsequent negotiations led into a deadend street. War seemed to be imminent between the two countries, and Germany and Italy did not want any war while they were concentrating their activities against England and stepped in at Rumanian request. The result was the second Vienna award of August 30, 1940.

The decision restored about 40 percent of Transylvania to Hungary, including most of the Hungarian-inhabited areas and some Rumanian areas as well, as there could not be a clear-cut ethnic division of the province. Yet the solution was not regarded by anyone as final. The Germans used it as a bait both to the Rumanians whom they promised restoration of northern Transylvania if they act as loyal allies, and to the Hungarians whom they promised Southern Transylvania as well if they follow the Fuehrer to "final victory." The British and Soviet Governments, in turn, promised the northern part of the province to that state which leaves the Axis Powers first.

As Rumania was the more easternmost German ally, she changed sides first on August 23, 1945, and the armistice provided for Rumanian administration of northern Transylvania. Yet, the atrocities of the returning Rumanian Armies and guerilla bands were such, that the Red Army itself expelled the Rumanian administration from the region and established a Russian military government. Only after the Yalta Conference, when upon Molotov's pressure the Rumanian king appointed a pro-Communist government, was the region returned to Rumanian administration, a decision confirmed by the Paris Peace Conference of 1947. It is interesting to note that the State Department was in favor of returning some of northern Transylvania to Hungary in 1946 and it was only the Soviet veto at Paris which prevented the United States to provide for such a frontier revision. The reason for the Soviet veto was that Rumania was already in the Soviet orbit, while Hungary was still holding out, to be absorbed later.

My colleague from New York gave us an insight into the persecution of the Hungarian minority since 1956. While it is true that during the days of the Stalin rule in Russia, the Rumanian Communists equally persecuted Rumanians and Hungarians if they were anti-Communists, one should not forget to mention this persecution of anti-Communist Hungarians either. According to Hungarian sources, documented in every individual case, between 1945 and 1964 there were not less than 278,000 Hungarians killed or deported to Dobrudja in Rumania. Most of the cases occurred in the late forties and early fifties, in order to break the Hungarian middle class and smallholders, the two mainstays of the Hungarian minority which were declared "class alien." The churches were also severely attacked, the orders dissolved, and the Roman Catholic Bishop of Gyulafehervar (Alba Julia), Aron Marton, and hundreds of priests jailed. The Greek Uniate Church suffered an even more grievous fate. It was by decree united with the Orthodox Church, though it had about 1 million adherents in Transylvania and several bishoprics and large clergy. Today, they are separated from Rome and also curtailed in their jurisdiction by the Communist government.

This is the background to the "Transylvanian Question," which was known to us already since the end of the First World War. Until Communist rule perishes in Rumania and until Rumanians and Hungarians find the secure basis for coexistence, there will be no peace in this long-suffering area of Europe. A solution of the problem is even more urgent as the colored world has now received its independence and the map of the world is changing in accordance with the wishes of its populations. Only in the Soviet orbit everything remains politically the same. Minority protection and perhaps also a friontier revision—there are 1.65 million Hungarians in Rumania, and about 60,000 Rumanians in Hungary only—are demands of the hour if a reorganization of the region after the end of Communist rule is ever to take place.

Resolution of Central High School, Newark, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of our colleagues a very fine resolution on H.R. 6400 adopted by the student body and faculty of Central High School, Newark.

It is most heartening that our young people today possess so keen an interest in public affairs and so strong a sense of justice and humanity. Their commitment to the democratic principles upon which our Nation was founded presages a new and greater concept of American freedom and equality under law.

The resolution follows in full:

Re H.R. 6400.

To: The Honorable JOSEPH G. MINISH.

Whereas a major part of the task of government under the Constitution and laws of this Nation, which most directly and intimately affects the lives and people of our Nation, is performed by or with the cooperation of its several and varied constituencies; and

Whereas it is generally recognized that responsive and effective government is vital to the strength of our whole system of self-government in the State and Nation; and

Whereas full involvement of all Americans in our processes of government is recognized as a necessary ingredient of the Democratic way of life, which we display to our allies and the world; and

Whereas at long last, the conscience of America has focused upon the need to remove the stigma of less than full citizenship imposed upon millions of Americans: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the student body and faculty of Central High School, Newark, N.J., urge and implore that you vote for bill H.R. 6400.

You persuade to your point of view those among you who hide behind archaic and outworn methods of delay which will thwart the ends which you desire and humanity demands.

This resolution should take precedence over all other businesses of government.

Respectfully yours,

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT COUNCIL.

ANGEE MORSE, *President.*

LOUIS MOLINA, *Vice President.*

HAROLD W. TAYLOR, Jr., *Adviser.*

When Is a World Trade Not a Trade Center?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for some time now the New York Port Authority has been making plans to build a huge complex in Lower Manhattan which it calls a world trade center. But no one seems able to justify this project.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial broadcast by WCBS in New York on April 20 and April 21, 1965, concerning this proposal:

WHEN IS A WORLD TRADE CENTER NOT A TRADE CENTER?

So much of what is wrong with New York City is underscored by official reaction, or lack of it, to the port authority's plan for a giant trade center on Lower Manhattan.

Here we have a project that would dislocate or wipe out hundreds of small businesses, deprive thousands of their jobs. Yet on the central question of need the city administration remains silent.

Why?

The question is a simple one. Does New York City need a world trade center? Is it a feasible undertaking?

Why can't we get straight answers to absolutely basic questions of the project's function and practicability?

For example—the port authority insists it will centralize in the trade center's twin towers firms engaged in oversea commerce. Yet after a year of beating the drum for tenants, the authority has managed to come up with nonbinding commitments for only a third of its proposed commercial office space. And it's having no better luck with the most important of the Government agencies it hopes to attract—the U.S. Bureau of Customs. With justice, the port authority has called Customs' tenancy the "cornerstone" of the project, and has said repeatedly the Bureau will be an occupant. Yet to this date there is no hard evidence that Customs desires, or would be allowed by Congress, to participate. Even on the

matter of tax payments to the city, there's confusion. The port authority claims it's worked out a deal giving the city more in the way of tax revenue than the site now accounts for. A highly placed spokesman for the city denies any agreement exists.

The trade center concept has been described as the key to a revitalized port. And because reversing the port's declining fortunes would yield wide public benefits, the port authority was empowered to condemn the land it needs for the scheme. But if the port authority fails to centralize firms and Government agencies engaged in oversea trade, then it will also have failed to create a trade center. That much is obvious. What then of the small businessman forced to make way for a so-called public project? How would his eviction have served the larger public good? What would be the effect of millions of square feet of new office space thrown onto an already-glutted open rental market?

Before 13 blocks of New York City real estate are bulldozed under by the port authority, Mayor Wagner owes it to business, big and small, to provide some answers.

Steel Imports and Dual Distribution: The Plight of the Independent Wire Drawer and Fabricator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, dual distribution is rapidly becoming one of the chief factors threatening the existence of many small businesses in a growing number of industries. As a result, it is increasingly imperative that each of us understand the forces at work here.

One of the most clear cut and painfully instructive examples of the plight of small businessmen confronted with dual distribution is that of the independent wiredrawers.

Recently, I have received a position paper describing the situation in the wiredrawing industry from Mr. F. C. Muntwyler, president of the Independent Wire Drawers Association. It contains a most incisive analysis of the results of dual distribution upon small independent businesses. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

INDEPENDENT WIRE
DRAWERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: A prime example of the inequities of dual distribution is fully described in the position paper of the Independent Wire Drawers Association entitled: "Steel Imports and Dual Distribution: The Plight of the Independent Wire Drawer and Fabricator." The present situation in the steel wire and wire products industry aptly illustrates the need for remedial legislation, such as you have sponsored, to assure that the market power of integrated producers in dual distribution industries is exercised in the public interest.

Very sincerely yours,

F. C. MUNTWYLER,
President.

STEEL IMPORTS AND DUAL DISTRIBUTION: THE PLIGHT OF THE INDEPENDENT WIRE DRAWER AND FABRICATOR

The plight of the independent, nonintegrated steel wire drawing and fabricating industry is a prime example of the anticompetitive market power which can be exercised by integrated producers in a dual distribution industry, and aptly illustrates the need for remedial legislation to assure that this market power is exercised in the public interest.

The basic raw material for the steel wire and wire products industry is hot-rolled carbon steel wire rod. In the United States wire rod is produced by 15 vertically integrated steel mills; and 93 percent of U.S. wire rod capacity is controlled by 12 of these producers, including such industry giants as United States Steel, Republic, and Bethlehem. Steel wire and wire products, however, are produced by both the major integrated producers of wire rod and by many small, independent, nonintegrated wire drawers and fabricators, who are dependent upon the integrated producers for their wire rod—the classical dual distribution situation.

There is nothing inherently evil about this situation so long as a normal relationship exists between wire rod, wire and wire product prices which permit an adequate margin for converting wire rod into wire, and wire into products. Beginning in 1955, however, the behavior of these prices has not been normal, instead these prices illustrate how the integrated producers in a dual distribution industry can apply anticompetitive price squeezes to their nonintegrated competitors.

The case of a typical fabricated wire product, welded wire concrete reinforcing mesh, graphically illustrates the double price squeeze experienced by the independent wire drawer fabricators. Prior to 1955 most nonintegrated producers purchased their wire rods from domestic integrated steel mills at an average price of approximately $144 per ton. At that time welded wire mesh sold for around $202 per ton which permitted the fabricators a small markup on the wire drawing and fabricating process. But the major steel producers raised wire rod prices in 1955, 1956, 1957 and again in 1958. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, wire rod prices rose more than any other steel product during the postwar period. The price of the finished product did not increase proportionately, instead it actually decreased. A point was reached, in many areas, where the raw material was selling at a higher price than the fabricated wire product. For example, during 1963 hot-rolled carbon steel wire rod (seven thirty-seconds inch to twenty-one sixty-fourths inch) was sold, f.o.b. Sparrows Point, Md., for $144.50 per net ton. Yet, the same integrated steel mill was selling welded wire mesh for $141.50 per net ton, f.o.b. Sparrows Point.

Obviously, the independent producer could not purchase wire rod from the integrated producers at $144.50, clean and draw the rod into wire, fabricate the wire into welded wire mesh and then compete against a price of $141.50. As a matter of survival the independent producer had to turn to imported wire rod.

As a result of the double price squeeze applied by the integrated mills, wire rod imports increased from 47,800 tons in 1955 to 910,000 tons in 1963. These imports are consumed almost entirely by the independent wire drawers, and it is estimated that imports account for about 50 percent of the noncaptive wire rod market. The integrated mills did not even attempt to meet this import competition in the marketplace, rather they sought the protection of the U.S. Antidumping Act. Fortunately for the independent producers, the Treasury Department found Japanese wire rod prices were "not less than fair value," and the Tariff Commission dismissed the complaints against wire rods from West Germany, Belgium, France, and Luxembourg on the grounds of "no injury to a domestic industry." Now the intergated producers are seeking to drastically amend the Antidumping Act to insure success in any future complaint against imported steel.

The cold statistics for this period elegantly portray the plight of the independent wire drawer and fabricator:

[Price per short ton]

	Imported wire rod [1]	Domestic wire rod [2]	Welded wire mesh
1959	$122.60	$148.17	$199.54
1960	127.60	148.17	180.93
1961	115.40	148.17	173.71
1962	104.40	148.17	168.13
1963	97.20	148.17	155.62

[1] Open-hearth quality. Imported Thomas quality usually quoted $4 to $10 less than open-hearth quality.
[2] Open-hearth quality.

Source: Average import wire rod and welded wire mesh prices based on reports from independent wire drawers. Average domestic wire rod prices from Steel magazine, and from reports by independent wire drawers.

Early in 1964 the major integrated producers, with much publicity, announced a price decrease on common quality wire rod to $122.50 per short ton. This was an empty gesture as far as the independent wire drawers were concerned—the price of domestic rod gives them a margin of less than $20 to clean the wire rod, draw the wire and fabricate the mesh, plus carry overhead and profit. Fabricating costs on welded wire mesh average about $40 to $50 per ton.

Here are some further current examples of abnormal pricing in the dual distribution steel wire and wire products industry which illustrate the anticompetitive market power exercised by the vertically integrated steel producers:

1. The vertically integrated steel producers did not decrease the price on the heavier sizes of wire rod (nine thirty-seconds inch, eleven thirty-seconds inch and thirteen thirty-seconds inch) which sells for $143.50 per short ton, f.o.b. mill (Midwest). The vertically integrated steel producers did, however, decrease the price $20 per short ton on the wire drawn from this heavier wire rod. In the Midwest the following price decreases were made:

Steel wire, ¼" to ⅜", reduced from $175.80 to $155.80 per short ton f.o.b. mill.

Steel wire, .192" to ¼", reduced from $173.80 to $153.80 per short ton f.o.b. mill.

Steel wire, .177" to .192", reduced from $169.80 to $149.80 per short ton f.o.b. mill.

2. The same situation exists with wire products fabricated from the heavier wire rod. In Florida, the vertically integrated steel producers sell nine thirty-seconds inch wire rod for $150.20 per short ton, delivered; yet 6-by-6 4/4 welded wire mesh (a product fabricated from 4-gage wire, which is drawn from nine thirty-seconds inch wire rod) is sold by the vertically integrated steel producers for $150 per short ton delivered.

3. The vertically integrated steel producers sell common quality carbon steel wire for a higher price than some wire products fabricated from common quality carbon steel wire. For example:

A. WEST COAST

Welded wire mesh 6-by-6 10/10, $139.83 per short ton, f.o.b. mill.

Common quality 10-gage steel wire, $149 per short ton, f.o.b. mill.

(B) MIDWEST

Welded wire mesh, 6 by 6-6/6, $137.98 per short ton, f.o.b. mill.

Common quality 6 gage steel wire, $146 per short ton, f.o.b. mill.

(C) FLORIDA

Welded wire mesh, 6 by 6–10/10, $135 per short ton, f.o.b. mill.

Common quality 10-gage steel wire, $160 per short ton, f.o.b. mill.

The eminent steel economist, Prof. Walter Adams, of Michigan State University, recently said that without the independent wire drawer "We would have an oligopolistic managed economy (in the steel wire industry). The persistence of the independents is necessary, in the public interest, as the only means—short of regulation or public ownership—of injecting a suitable measure of fluidity into the steel price structure."

It is apparent from this brief analysis of the steel wire and wire products industry that the vertical oligopoly power of the integrated steel producers has tended to keep prices artificially high, which, in turn, has contributed to this Nation's adverse balance-of-payments position by forcing independents to buy imported steel.

The independent wire drawers have displayed direct, vigorous, and dynamic competitive effort—this competitive effort is in the public interest of maintaining a free competitive marketplace. If the integrated steel producers had followed the example of the major auto producers by meeting import competition directly in the marketplace rather than running to Washington, there would have been no need for the independents to use imported steel, and the industry, the public, and the Nation would have benefited.

The Roosevelt bill would require fair pricing behavior in dual distribution industries. The Roosevelt bill is not an indirect subsidy for inefficient independent producers; in the fabricating segment of the steel industry scientific evidence proves that independent fabricators one one-hundredth the size of their integrated rivals have been capable of competing effectively with the giants—whenever allowed to do so in free and open competition.

The independent wire drawers and fabricators do not want special favors or subsidies from the Federal Government—all we ask is preservation of the marketplace—free from squeeze tactics and monopolistic sharpshooting.

Young Americans for Freedom—Vietnam Policy Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the John R. Pillion chapter of Young Americans for Freedom, in Buffalo, N.Y., endorses the strong position taken by President Johnson in dealing with the Vietcong Communists.

In support of the President's action, the members of this chapter have circulated petitions in Buffalo which already include more than 1,000 signatures. These petitions, together with the Vietnam policy statement of the Young Americans for Freedom, are being forwarded to the President so that he can be apprised of this group's efforts in support of the course he is pursuing in this troubled area.

Under leave to extend my remarks, their Vietnam policy statement follows:

VIETNAM POLICY STATEMENT

Young Americans for Freedom is proud of President Johnson's strong and effective actions against the Communists in Vietnam.

There are many influential parties exerting maximum pressures on the President to retreat and negotiate in Vietnam. In this morning's newspaper, we read of Democratic Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee, urging the President to temporarily halt air strikes against North Vietnam because he is "pessimistic about the outcome of the situation in Vietnam if there is no attempt at negotiations." This is not an isolated case. Students and Communists have marched on Washington to picket the White House; college professors and university senates have sponsored rallies and marathon teach-ins urging withdrawal; Senators WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, have delivered vehement tirades against the President's southeast Asian policy of containment; Senators FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, and GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, have made severe attacks on Mr. Johnson; and other powerful agitators continue a furious onslaught of peace-at-any-price propaganda. Moreover, such irresponsible conduct is increasing at a shocking pace.

Americans must assure Mr. Johnson that he is not alone in the cause of freedom. It is our patriotic and moral duty to stand by our President in this hour of great crisis.

We must not relent our traditional duty to defend liberty. We must not capitulate even in the face of defeat. We must not succumb to threats of a full-scale war. We must not forsake the people of southeast Asia to the barbarous invasions of the Attilic Red Chinese. We must not abandon the South Vietnamese to the inhumane atrocities of communism.

The American people's will to fight for freedom—not only for ourselves, but for all the people of the world—has been demonstrated in the past and must be reasserted now.

Outstanding anti-Communists such as Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, and our own Congressman THADDEUS J. DULSKI are to be congratulated for their stanch and resolute positions in this crucial situation. As they know and have repeatedly said, we must win—we can win—and we will win.

KENNETH K. MAHER, Jr.
Chairman.

LOUIS MARANO,
Director of Young Americans for Freedom.

California State Senator Introduces Resolutions for Study of Nature's Destructive Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California, gave a speech in which he suggested that the great ingenuity and resources of the aerospace team in California should be channeled to provide some sources or at least unravel some of the unknowns concerning the destructive forces of nature such as storms, earthquakes, fires, and floods.

State Senator Alvin C. Weingand recently announced that he plans to introduce resolutions in the State legislature to accomplish this purpose.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Senator Weingand's press release which indicates the great promise of this approach to some of the problems which have plagued mankind for many years.

The press release follows:

CALIFORNIA STATE SENATOR INTRODUCES RESOLUTIONS FOR STUDY OF NATURES DESTRUCTIVE FORCES

Senator Alvin C. Weingand announced today he will introduce resolutions calling for studies by California aerospace firms into the mysteries of the destructive forces of nature—storm, earthquake, fire, and flood.

Senator Weingand, Democrat, of Santa Barbara, said the legislation represents an expansion of the State's pioneering efforts to direct California aerospace industry talent to pressing State problems.

It would authorize preliminary feasibility studies into the causes, control, and prevention of natural phenomena as well as into the long-range forecasting of State recreational needs.

'I believe that if the genius of California's space age talent can find ways to rocket a man to the moon, it can also begin to give us some answers to help us control the destructive forces of nature," Senator Weingand said.

"Despite the marvelous accomplishments of modern science, we are still all but helpless before these natural phenomena.

"The toll in California alone in lives and property from forest fires, floods, and earthquakes is appallingly high year after year.

"I am hopeful that the preliminary investigations my resolutions would authorize will suggest some answers. I am hopeful they will help us move toward realizing man's ancient dream of truly mastering the elements and controlling them for his own benefit."

Governor Brown commended the senator "for his interest in this highly important undertaking."

The Governor said studies under contracts already let into four other problem areas—transportation, information collection and control, waste management, and criminal control—"are proceeding extremely well."

"They are proving that the systems analysis approach can be applied to unsolved and expensive problems here at home, and they are justifying my original hope in proposing them," the Governor said.

"Our aim in these undertakings is twofold. We want to mount a more effective attack on some of the problems we face in California and the Nation that have too long defied the necessary scientific or engineering solutions. At the same time, we can assist the State's aerospace industry to convert part of its activities to nondefense pursuits.

"Our hope ultimately is that California, which now dominates the aerospace scene nationally, will become the research and development center of the Nation in an economy turning increasingly to peaceful pursuits."

The five resolutions authorize the administrator of the resources agency to coordinate the efforts of agency departments in cooperation with the aerospace industry to investigate and seek solutions to the various problems.

Excerpts from the resolutions:

On earthquake cause and prediction: "California has experienced a large number of earthquakes, three of which were of a general magnitude similar to the 1964 Good Friday earthquake in Alaska.

"The occurrence of an earthquake of this general magnitude in a densely populated

area of California would be catastrophic not only to man's works, but to man himself, physically and psychologically.

"Many disciplines of knowledge should be directed to the study of earthquake cause and prediction and on man's proper response to the knowledge so developed."

On forest fire control and prevention "The problems of wild land fire prevention and control have been greatly intensified during the past 20 years by California's population growth and economic expansion resulting in human use of the 37 million acres of wild land and timber.

"Completed research projects lead to the conclusion that direct study of production relationships appear to be an essential prerequisite for further progress toward determining proper economic production goals for fire prevention and fire control programs, operations, and organization."

On flood control planning: "The great floods of December 1964, caused economic and personal damage to vast areas of the State, which demonstrate the need for improved methods of forecasting and controlling floods.

"Present criteria and procedures utilized in evaluating the justification of expenditures for flood control works may not properly account for the long-range impact of a major flood on the economy of an area."

Edward R. Murrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to the following article in today's New York Times, a fitting tribute to an unusual man, Edward R. Murrow.

The article follows:

EDWARD R. MURROW, BROADCASTER AND FORMER USIA HEAD, DIES

Edward R. Murrow, whose independence and incisive reporting brought heightened journalistic stature to radio and television, died yesterday at his home in Pawling, N.Y., at the age of 57.

The former head of the U.S. Information Agency had been battling cancer since October 1963. He had been in and out of the hospital ever since, and death came 3 weeks after he was discharged from New York Hospital for the last time.

The ever-present cigarette (he smoked 60 to 70 a day), the matter-of-fact baritone voice and the high-domed, worried, lopsided face were the trademarks of the radio reporter who became internationally famous during World War II with broadcasts that started, "This [pause] is London."

Later, on television, his series of news documentaries, "See It Now," on the Columbia Broadcasting System from 1951 to 1958, set the standard for all television documentaries on all networks.

President Johnson, on learning of Mr. Murrow's death, said that all Americans "feel a sense of loss in the death of Edward R. Murrow."

He was, the President said, a "gallant fighter" who had "dedicated his life as a newsman and as a public official to the unrelenting search for truth."

Mr. Murrow died at his home on the rolling hills of his 280-acre Pawling farm shortly before noon.

He is survived by his widow, the former Janet Huntington Brewster; a son, Charles Casey Murrow, a freshman at Yale University; and two brothers, L. V. Murrow, of Washington, and Dewey Murrow, of Spokane, Wash.

A funeral service will be held on Friday at 2 p.m. at St. James Episcopal Church, 865 Madison Avenue, between 71st and 72d Streets. Burial is to be announced.

In many years of receiving honors and tributes, the most recent was conferred on Mr. Murrow on March 5, 1965, by Queen Elizabeth II, who named him an honorary Knight Commander of the Order of the British Empire.

On September 14, 1964, President Johnson awarded him the Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian honor a President can confer on an American citizen.

Mr. Murrow's career with the Columbia Broadcasting Co. spanned 25 years. It ended in January 1961 when President Kennedy named him head of the U.S. Information Agency.

In October 1963, a malignant tumor made the removal of his left lung necessary, and 3 months later he resigned as head of the Agency. Last November, Mr. Murrow again underwent surgery.

BROUGHT CONTROVERSY INTO HOMES

Mr. Murrow achieved international distinction in broadcasting, first as a radio correspondent reporting from London in World War II and then as a pioneer television journalist opening the home screen to the stimulus of controversy. No other figure in broadcast news left such a strong stamp on both media.

In an industry often given to rule by committee, Mr. Murrow was always recognized as an individual, whether in the front lines of the war, in the executive conferences of a network or, in what he enjoyed most, in planning his next story. His independence was reflected in doing what he thought had to be done on the air and worrying later about the repercussions among sponsors, viewers, and individual stations. The fruits of his determination are shared today by newsmen at all networks; they enjoy a freedom and latitude not yet won by others working in the medium.

Mr. Murrow was a realist about fame. He could not walk a block in New York without pedestrians turning for a look or a bore trying to strike up a conversation. But in the context of television he knew the value of adulation. "It can get a lot of things done," he once remarked. That was his concern.

In the last war, Mr. Murrow conveyed the facts with a compelling precision. But he went beyond the reporting of the facts. By describing what he saw in visual detail, he sought to convey the moods and feelings of war.

Had a London street just been bombed out? The young correspondent was soon there in helmet, gray flannel trousers and sport coat, quietly describing everything he saw against the urgent sound patterns of rescue operations.

Or he would be in a plane on a combat mission, broadcasting live on the return leg and describing the bombing he had watched as "orchestrated hell."

He flew 25 missions in the war, despite the opposition of top executives of the Columbia Broadcasting System in New York, who regarded him as too valuable to be so regularly risked. In the endless German air raids on London, his office was bombed out three times but he escaped injury.

Mr. Murrow, never fevered or high-blown, had the gift of dramatizing whatever he reported. He did so by understatement and by a calm, terse, highly descriptive radio style. Sometimes there was a sort of metallic poetry in his words.

"BLOOD ON THE PANES"

In one memorable broadcast he said that as he "walked home at 7 in the morning, the windows in the West End were red with reflected fire, and the raindrops were like blood on the panes."

For a dozen years, as radio's highest paid newscaster, he was known by voice alone to millions of his countrymen. "This (pause) is London," was his matter-of-fact salutation, delivered in a baritone voice tinged with an echo of doom. Later it was, "This (pause) is the news."

Then television added to the distinctive voice an equally distinctive face, with high-domed forehead and deep-set, serious eyes. Mr. Murrow's casual television manner was superimposed on a quite obvious native tension.

As the armchair interviewer on "Person to Person," Mr. Murrow carried out a gentlemanly electronic invasion of the homes of scores of celebrities in the 1950's from Sophie Tucker through the evangelist Billy Graham.

The darkly handsome Mr. Murrow, his brow knotted and two fingers holding his ever-present cigarette, sat in the studio facing a greatly magnified television image of his subjects at home. He would make what one writer called "urbane small talk" with them, generously admiring their children and perhaps inquiring exactly where that handsome vase on the side table had been acquired. It was not momentous, but it was interesting.

SERIES OF DOCUMENTARIES

From 1951 to 1958 Mr. Murrow also did a series of news documentaries under the title "See It Now." In the 1953–54 season the telecast studied the various aspects of the impact of the emotional and political phenomenon known as McCarthyism.

Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin, was then conducting his crusade against alleged Communist influence. Some regarded it as a hard, honest search for subversives by a zealous patriot; others saw it as a demagogic opportunism, the exploitation of a real issue for the purpose of gaining political influence by intimidation.

The debate over Senator McCarthy, was supercharged with emotion and fervent belief. Since commercial television thrives by giving little offense, the medium had given the matter gingerly treatment.

Mr. Murrow and his long-time coeditor, Fred W. Friendly, broke this pattern decisively on Wednesday evening, March 10, 1954. Using film clips that showed the Senator to no good advantage, the two men offered a provocative examination of the man and his methods.

The program, many thought, had a devastating effect. McCarthyism did lose public force in succeeding months. "The timing was right and the instrument powerful," Mr. Murrow said to the telecast later.

DECIDED TO GO AHEAD

Jack Gould, television critic of the New York Times, wrote that "Mr. Murrow decided to go ahead with the program at a time when passions in the broadcasting industry were running wild on the issue of Communist sympathizers and dupes. It was the autonomy of the Murrow-Friendly operation, often the source of internal controversy within CBS that got the vital show on the air."

That autonomy was a singular thing in network broadcasting. It was based on Mr. Murrow's immense prestige, initially gained when he became one of the first radio war correspondents and built a superb news staff for CBS in Europe.

Mr. Murrow, one writer said, "has achieved a position at CBS that is outside, and basically antithetical to, the corporate structure of authority" and he thereby enjoyed a large measure of "freedom from authority of all

kinds." He ran his own news island within the network for many years.

"See It Now" employed five full-time camera crews and they went anywhere in the world. A sponsor paid $57,000 a week for the show, but Mr. Murrow did not limit himself to that if he thought a better show could be done for more. The network paid the difference.

"They come to me, the vice presidents, and say, 'Look, there's so much going out of this spout and only so much coming in.' And I say, 'If that's the way you want to do it, you'd better get yourselves another boy,'" Mr. Murrow once said.

REDUCTION IN AUTHORITY

When "See It Now" became "CBS Reports" in 1958–59, the network diffused the responsibility for documentary telecasts and Mr. Murrow's authority was reduced. "He was blocked," one friend wrote, "in his raging desire to get the network he loved onto new paths of glory."

On "Small World," from the fall of 1958 to 1960, he brought top world figures together by remote telecasting and moderated their continent-spanning discussions. But it was known that he was not very happy at the network then.

Egbert Roscoe Murrow was born on April 25, 1908, at Pole Cat Creek, N.C., a "mixture of English, Scotch, Irish, and German" descent. He changed his first name to Edward in his second year at college.

His father, a tenant farmer, moved to Blanchard, Wash., where his son grew up in the great Northwest and worked on a survey gang in the timberlands during summer vacations.

In 1930 he graduated from Washington State College with a Phi Beta Kappa key. He became president of the National Student Federation that year, a job that paid $25 a week with a basement office in New York.

In 1932 he became assistant director of the Institute of International Education. He met Janet Huntington Brewster, a Mount Holyoke graduate, on a train that year and 2 years later they were married in the bride's hometown, Middletown, Conn.

HIRED IN 1935

In 1935, Mr. Murrow was employed by CBS as director of talks and education. Part of his work was to address important groups on the potential of radio as a medium of education.

He was in New Orleans in 1937, attending a meeting of the National Education Association, when he received an unexpected call from headquarters asking if he would go to Europe.

His answer—"yes"—was the decisive turn of his career. He later said that it had led to his having "a front row seat for some of the greatest news events of history."

The young man, then 29, became the network's one-man staff in Europe, a pleasant life. He arranged cultural programs and interviewed leaders. Though his office was in London, he traveled extensively, typically visiting Rome for a week to arrange a Vatican choir broadcast.

As war began to seem inevitable he hired William L. Shirer, a newspaperman, to cover the Continent. Both he and Mr. Shirer were arranging musical broadcasts when Hitler marched into Austria.

Mr. Murrow flew to Berlin and chartered a Lufthansa transport to Vienna for $1,000. He rode a streetcar into the city in time to watch the arrival of goose-stepping German troops.

For 10 days he was allowed to broadcast, and he described the nation's swift transition to a subject state. Life changed drastically for the young newsman. At home, millions hung on his and Shirer's words.

HE HIRED THE STAFF

As news chief for CBS in Europe he hired the men who were to become the network's famous roster of war correspondents—among them Eric Sevareid, Charles Collingwood, Howard K. Smith, Richard Hottelet, Cecil Brown, and Larry LeSueur.

"I'm hiring reporters, not announcers," Mr. Murrow told "the shop" (as he usually called New York headquarters) when CBS executives complained that he was hiring men who sounded "terrible" on the air. Their on-the-scene reports reached into farm and city homes from New England to the Pacific States, bringing the realities of war close.

One former staff member recalled the instruction Mr. Murrow gave to his newsmen.

The reporter must never sound excited even if bombs are falling outside, Mr. Murrow said.

Rather, the reporter should imagine that he has just returned to his hometown and that the local editor has asked him to dinner.

"After dinner," Mr. Murrow counseled "your host asks you 'Well, what was it like?' As you talk, the maid is passing the coffee and her boyfriend, a truckdriver, is waiting for her in the kitchen and listening. You are supposed to describe things in terms that make sense to the truckdriver without insulting the intelligence of the professor."

Mr. Murrow's wartime broadcasts from Britain, North Africa and finally the Continent gripped listeners by their firm, spare authority; nicely timed pauses; and Mr. Murrow's calm, grave delivery. One observer wrote that his voice always "conveyed the impression that he knows the worst."

He was the first allied correspondent inside the Nazi concentration camp at Buchenwald. Near 300 bodies, he saw a mound of men's, women's and children's shoes.

"I regarded that broadcast as a failure," he said. "I could have described three pairs of those shoes—but hundreds of them. I couldn't. The tragedy of it simply overwhelmed me."

Returning to the United States in 1946 after 9 years overseas, he became a vice president of CBS in news operations. He soon found executive tasks—in-and-out baskets, memos, conference, and the rest—wearisome. He was away from the microphone for 18 months. "I wanted to be a reporter again because I needed the dignity and satisfaction of being a reporter," he said.

CARRIED FOR 13 YEARS

On September 29, the former war correspondent went on the air with his evening radio report, "Edward R. Murrow With the News." It was carried by 125 network stations to an audience of several million people nightly except weekends for 13 years.

Unlike most news commentators, Mr. Murrow did not allow his sponsor to break into the news with a middle commercial. When he had finished giving the news and doing what he called the "end piece"—the graceful essays that caused him to be regarded as "the social philosopher of radio correspondents"—the closing commercial would be read. To hold the audience, Mr. Murrow would then come back with a brief "Word for Today," usually a quotation appropriate to the news that had gone before.

His sign-off on both radio and television was a crisp, "Good night, and good luck."

By 1949 Mr. Murrow was earning $112,000 a year, which jumped to about $240,000 when he became the only major radio news personality to make a full successful switch to television. "Hear It Now," the radio historical documentary series he started in 1948, also made the transition to television, becoming "See It Now," which ran for 7 years.

Mr. Murrow often expressed a preference for the radio medium over the television medium. He enjoyed the speed with which radio could cover a breaking news story, but more particularly he preferred the absence of any intrusions between a commentator's thoughts and his audience. In radio the merit of an opinion alone held a listener's attention, he noted, while in television pictorial considerations had a strong influence.

Mr. Murrow and his wife occupied a 10th-floor apartment at 580 Park Avenue and a log house in Pawling, N.Y., with acres thick with pheasant and ducks, a trout stream, and nine holes of golf nearby.

Off camera Mr. Murrow was a convivial companion, given to a whisky sour at lunch, a relish of journalistic shoptalk, and amusement and exasperation over the ways of the television business. He appreciated humor if it had style and from years on the air instinctively leaned to the short sentence. On hazardous missions overseas he was usually the coolest passenger.

If Mr. Murrow had one private concern about his professional life it was that he might slip into the role of the television news prima donna reading the words of some anonymous rewrite man.

An often chaotic schedule necessitated some measure of assistance in script preparation but he felt it was his obligation to be in the field more often than not. His restlessness was always in evidence.

WON FOUR PEABODYS

Mr. Murrow won the Peabody Award for excellence in broadcasting in 1943, 1949, 1951, and 1954. William S. Paley, president of CBS, called him "a man fitted for his time and task—a student, a philosopher, at heart a poet of mankind and, therefore, a great reporter."

In a similar vein, Carl Sandburg, the poet, inscribed a photograph of himself, "To Ed Murrow—reporter, historian, inquirer, actor, ponderer, seeker."

Mr. Murrow was more modest in his self-assessment. "My father did not go so far as to say that there's something dishonest about a man making a living by talking, but he did think there was something pretty dubious about it," he once remarked.

Mr. Murrow became the Nation's chief tactician in the propaganda war when President Kennedy chose him as Director of the U.S. Information Agency in January 1961.

The appointment ended a 25-year association with CBS—he had been a member of its board of directors from 1947 to 1956—and removed Mr. Murrow from the domestic broadcasting scene. His salary was $21,000 a year.

From Washington, he directed the output of prodigious amounts of news and propaganda, sending the Nation's message in manifold forms to all the nations of the earth. He emphasized plain speaking and straightforward reporting in 789 weekly hours of broadcasting and in the daily 10,000-word wireless file of news to newspapers in 100 cities overseas.

PROFESSIONAL EMPHASIS

Mr. Murrow aimed at putting a more professional emphasis on Voice of America broadcasts, with shorter, crisper reports. Because he believed that explained verity was more persuasive than sheer propaganda, he told Agency writers to report the facts in perspective, the bad as well as the good.

He defended the Agency's policy of distributing news of racial flareups in this country, saying such events could not be kept a secret and arguing that there was no choice but to present the facts with balanced interpretation.

"We cannot make good news out of bad practice," he said with typical pith when Senators criticized his staff for not depicting things as generally rosy.

At one point, Murrow the reporter came into a singular conflict with Murrow the propagandist. Before joining the Agency, he had narrated the telecast "Harvest of Shame," a chilling documentary on the exploitation of migrant farm laborers in the United States.

The British Broadcasting Corporation bought the film from CBS. In an unusual

intervention by a Government official, Mr. Murrow telephoned the BBC and asked that the film not be used.

The BBC announced that it had bought the film in good faith and added, with what must have seemed stunning irrelevancy to Mr. Murrow, that it had "the greatest faith in Murrow," meaning the reporter.

WAS A CHAINSMOKER

When the film was shown, a London critic wrote: "The documentary blazed fiercely with Murrow's incomparable indignation * * * fury backed by hard fact on film."

As the Nation's best-known chainsmoker—he smoked 40 to 50 cigarettes a day—Mr. Murrow once sat through a half hour televised roundtable discussion without lighting a single cigarette. A reporter called the USIA to see if he had quit smoking. "His ashtrays are still full," he was assured.

Mr. Murrow was frequently mentioned in 1962 as a possible Democratic candidate for the U.S. Senate, but he said that he had never "had a horizon of more than 90 days."

In a congressional hearing in 1962, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, called Mr. Murrow's estimate of the cost for use of communications satellites by the USIA "obviously ridiculous." Mr. Murrow replied calmly, "I respectfully suggest that the Senator's estimates have no claim to any higher validity."

LEADERS OFFER TRIBUTES

Besides President Johnson's tribute to Mr. Murrow, there were a number of others.

Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. representative at the United Nations, said that "few voices in my generation were better known. He brought into the homes of millions many of the great events of our time. Ed Murrow served the cause of truth gallantly, even as he served his fellow countrymen and his Government."

Mayor Wagner said that Mr. Murrow had "served his Nation and the cause of freedom throughout the world with brilliance and devotion. I was honored to count him among my friends."

Mr. Paley, now chairman of the board of CBS, said that the newscaster was one of the Nation's "most dedicated and eloquent spokesmen.

"No one will ever be able to fill the unique place Ed Murrow held in broadcasting—as a great journalist, as the originator of an overseas reporting organization, unequaled anywhere * * * as one who set standards of excellence that remain unsurpassed."

The two other television networks also issued statements.

David E. Lilienthal, former head of the Atomic Energy Commission, said, "He stands with Churchill as proof that only one man, be he brave enough, can turn the tide against tyranny and fear."

Increasing Manufacturing Inroads in Retail Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter by Mr. George Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, concerning my bill, H.R. 566, which is designed to prohibit the sale of tires at the retail level by the manufacturers. Following Mr. Burger's letter is an article, "Anatomy of Industry Concentration," from the April 1965 edition of the National Independent which also concerns this increasingly serious problem.

The letter and article follow:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., April 14, 1965.

Subject: H.R. 566.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is our opinion that the purpose of the above bill which you have sponsored in this Congress, and in other recent Congresses, is important if there is to be any free enterprise in the rubber tire industry. The wresting of control and the increasing inroads by major tire manufacturers in the retail field is alarming, and their increasing ties with major petroleum companies is playing no minor role in the distribution of tires through their filling station operators throughout the Nation.

It is to be noted that in a recent publication it was stated in substance that the proposed legislation now pending in the Congress that tire sales be made only to independent dealers will be killed as the big oil companies and tire manufacturers who have the power to block it are in opposition.

It will be well to review the attached article which appeared in the National Independent, April issue, "Anatomy of Industry Concentration." It is an indication of what is taking place right at this moment due to the ties existing between major rubber companies and major petroleum companies in the sale of tires; and the net results of such operations which are reducing the numbers of small producers and, more important, independent dealers of all descriptions nationwide.

Bear in mind that at the moment the major tire manufacturer involved has announced plans to acquire the smaller rubber company. Even more important, there is now pending in the Supreme Court action regarding the relationship between Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. and Atlantic Refining Co., which case is awaiting the Court's decision on the Government's findings. It is to be noted also that similar cases by the Government between other major rubber and major oil companies are still pending for final court action. If the decision of the High Court is against the Government, it will mean the increasing need for Congress to approve the above bill at the earliest possible moment.

I believe it would be of interest to you and your colleagues if you could find it convenient to insert this letter and the attachment in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

ANATOMY OF INDUSTRY CONCENTRATION

The record shows that the Lee Rubber & Tire Corp, withdrew as a serious competitor among the remaining tire manufacturing companies about 3 years ago when the firm's management lost control to a New York syndicate headed by a financier sometimes described as a "shrewd raider" of corporations. It wasn't long before the firm went on the auction block.

For all practical purposes, however, the 50-year-old Pennsylvania-based tiremaker's real troubles began after monopoly business was given a free reign—and that happened years ago.

Now that Goodyear has picked up Lee's option here is another instance where any Government action on the antitrust front, if it comes at all, would amount to closing the barn door after the horse is stolen.

"America is at the crossroads. It must face up to the alternative paths lying ahead. Will it follow the road to monopoly * * * or the road to a restoration of competitive free enterprise?"

These words were written in 1962 by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, then chairman of the House Small Business Committee which had produced a voluminous report on a decade of merger activity among the largest U.S. corporations.

A few years later and America in 1965 apparently has yet to make a decision regarding increasing industry concentration. Still hanging fire is the question of whether this country will act in time to preserve, in PATMAN'S words, "the American ideals of opportunity for small, locally oriented companies to enter business and thrive and grow."

The rubber tire industry, too, is at the crossroads. Within the short space of 4 years three independent tire manufacturers have disappeared from the competitive scene and have been reduced to the status of mere divisions of major producers. The loss of Dayton, Seiberling, and Lee might be compared to a former burst of merger activity when prior to World War II Goodrich bought Brunswick, Diamond, Hood, and Miller, the U.S. Rubber Co. was permitted to acquire Fisk and Gillette, and Goodyear was allowed to absorb Kelly-Springfield.

What's wrong? PATMAN said in 1962 that "despite the noble efforts designed (by Congress) to preserve opportunity for small, local enterprise, big business has grown apace * * * and has fashioned new techniques of controlling markets and enhancing its powers."

He warned at that time of a move toward "a new phase of industrial domination and control of American industry" which threatens to turn independent small businessmen into "clerks and hired hands."

For those interested in cold, hard statistics the HSBC reported that the Nation's top 500 industrial firms gobbled up some 3,404 other companies in the space of 11 years. Many of these merged firms were former competitors. This activity was most prominent in the dairy products, paper, chemical, aircraft, and retail food fields.

The Borden Milk Co. is an outstanding example of a nationally known firm affected by the merger virus. During the period 1951–61 Borden acquired no less than 121 smaller competitors. Federal Trade Commission observed that the firm was sweeping the country clean of competition. (In this respect it is interesting to note a press release of HSBC of March 11, 1965. A subcommittee of the small business panel will conduct another investigation "to determine whether large dairies are taking unfair competitive advantage of smaller operators.")

SOME QUESTIONS FOR DEALERS, SMALLER PRODUCERS

Here are some questions dealers and smaller tire producers ought to be asking as the onrushing trend toward consolidation and concentration makes itself felt in the rubber tire industry. What will be the impact of recent mergers on market control? Are the dominating tire makers' making survival difficult or impossible for the remaining smaller producers (at present there are nine left)? Is the growing scarcity of smaller producers placing restrictions on independent retailers by limiting their choice of suppliers? And are the large integrated tire makers by virtue of their activity in the retail field drying up opportunity for independent retailers?

By posing these questions we do not mean to infer we have the answers; no more, apparently, than the Congress and antitrust agencies have them.

We do, however, have a fair idea of the conditions in industry which produce concentration and monopoly.

TBA MONOPOLY STRAPPED LEE

The failure of Lee Rubber & Tire Co., for example, can in large measure be traced to that company's loss of business to the TBA monopoly enjoyed almost exclusively by the major producers. We turn to FTC Docket No. 6486, dated March 9, 1961, in the matter of Goodyear's TBA contract with Atlantic Refining Co. There are ample instances found in these FTC allegations to substantiate this claim. Furthermore, it should be noted, the U.S. Court of Appeals in Chicago on April 24, 1964, upheld FTC's case and denied Goodyear's petition to set aside the Governments order to break the TBA contract.

"The success enjoyed by Goodyear * * * in selling to Atlantic has been purchased at the expense of competing TBA suppliers," FTC noted. The "competing supplier" in this case happened to be Lee.

Returning to the docket we read this description of events which led to Lee's loss of business (between 1948 and 1950 Atlantic's sales of TBA was $22 million) to Goodyear, the major company which now has an option to buy the smaller company.

"Sometime in 1932, Atlantic commenced to purchase 'Lee' tires from the Lee Rubber & Tire Corp., and to resell such tires to its wholesale and retail petroleum distributors." Note that under this plan Atlantic bought, warehoused, shipped, and sold the tires to its outlets. Thus the oil marketer was competing in the market by performing a distinct economic service. And note too that an Atlantic spokesman commenting on the arrangement with Lee, said: "We receive a good gross margin in keeping with the duties left to us."

Also note that Atlantic's dealers were satisfied with the arrangement. The oil firm conducted a brand-preference survey among its dealers in 1948 and 1949 and got following result: "67 percent of the Atlantic dealers contacted indicated that they would rather obtain their TBA requirements from several sources rather than a single source, the principal reason given therefor being price advantages and the variety of brands."

Notwithstanding, negotiations for exclusive TBA contract between Atlantic and the major tire producers were set in motion. One result was that operations under the so-called "sales commission" plan with Goodyear commenced on an experimental basis in Atlantic's Newark, N.J., section in June 1950. It proved successful to Atlantic and Goodyear. But not for Lee and other small competitors.

Subsequently, Atlantic gave Lee the boot and took on the Goodyear TBA line. An Atlantic official boasted to his superior: "We are relieved of the purchasing function * * * do not warehouse or deliver any merchandise, we are not involved in the handling of accounts, we do not issue catalogs or price books nor do we have to provide point-of-sale promotion helps." All that Atlantic had to do, he commented, was to "assist in the selling job as well as in the dealer training and merchandising task, and for this effort receive a commission which * * * has been averaging well over 9 percent."

Lee vigorously protested the loss of its right to compete in an open market for this business, but in vain. FTC puts it this way: "The sales gain accruing to Goodyear * * * was accompanied by a corresponding loss in sales by Lee" even though Lee had opened new factory branches in Hartford, Conn., Providence, R.I., and Syracuse, N.Y., to accommodate this business. Within nine months after Atlantic began sponsoring Goodyear TBA Lee dourfully reported that only "25 percent of the Atlantic business will be salvaged this year (1951)."

Lee sales VIP's wrote bitter letters to Atlantic complaining of the methods employed to grease the shift from Lee to Goodyear at Atlantic's outlets. But these missales were exercises in futility.

Another unrewarding dividend derived from such TBA agreements must be pointed out, and that is the devasting effect they have on smaller tire producers who need to build a strong network of distrbution through independent dealers. You can assess their chances at success in this vital area when you consider that even the tire distributors of the majors with TBA ties are eliminated in competing for the business of "captured" gas stations. FTC illustrates this point when it charged that "competition among Goodyear wholesalers for the business of Atlantic accounts has been eliminated through the assignment of each Atlantic account to a designated supply point." While there were 1,155 Goodyear dealers in the Atlantic marketing territories assigned to Goodyear only 128 of these dealers were tapped as "supply points." The remainder of Goodyear dealers, like dealers handling smaller company lines, "are substantially foreclosed from access to Atlantic accounts."

Multiply this effect on free competition by the number of TBA agreements in force between the major tire and oil firms and you get an indication of what is involved.

Proposal for Peace in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

A VIEW OF THE NEWS—GETTING INVOLVED IN VIETNAM

(By Clarke Ash, associate editor of the Miami News)

What can one Miamian do to end the mess in Vietnam? John R. Bethea doesn't know for sure but he aims to find out.

Bethea is a young (33) social science instructor at the University of Miami who believes teachers should become involved in world events.

Currently, he is looking for ways to spread the word about a promising plan to get the United States out of the Vietnam conflict without abandoning the country to the Communists.

The plan is not Bethea's. It was advanced by a fellow educator at the University of Chicago, Dr. Gilbert F. White, professor of geography. After first appearing in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, it is being distributed by the American Friends Service Committee, whose pamphlet came into Bethea's hands.

Essentially, White's plan would substitute a massive, multination economic assistance program for the lone military hand the United States is playing today. About 20 nations would be involved in both an economic and military venture which would help stabilize not only Vietnam but also Laos, Cambodia, and other troubled countries of southeast Asia.

RED ATTITUDE

What makes anyone think the Communists would hold still while all this is going on? No one knows that they would, of course. But optimism springs from the fact that they are already cooperating to some degree in a little-known development program of vast potential on the southern Mekong River Delta.

Some 20 nations are working there with remarkable unanimity of purpose on a program begun in 1957 by the U.N. Economic Commission. The plan has such vast popular support that so far the Communists have kept hands off.

Dr. White suggests that the present project, now in the planning and engineering phase, be greatly expanded by the participating nations. The Mekong is to this region what the Mississippi is to the United States, the Nile to northeast Africa, the Amazon to South America, with huge untapped potential for hydroelectric power and agriculture. The benefits of its development would extend all the way to Red China. It would be to the advantage of the nations supplying the economic assistance to join in a multination police force to assure political stability while the project was underway.

This is but a sketchy outline of a proposal which Bethea can propound in detail and at length. He believes that if enough people can be sold, their combined voices will be heard in Washington.

RIGHT DIRECTION

Maybe Washington is already tuned in. Last Thursday, President Johnson emerged from a Cabinet meeting with the announcement that the United States would consider a sort of "Marshall plan" of economic and social assistance for Southeast Asia if peace were restored in Vietnam.

The President did not mention the Mekong River development specifically, but the idea would seem to mesh with his thinking. If he has any trouble selling the public on this new direction, Mr. Johnson should have an ardent supporter in Dr. White and his convert in Miami, John Bethea.

A PROPOSAL FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM [1]

A peaceful and honorable resolution of the conflict in South Vietnam and Laos may be found in a bold plan for land and water development which already unites factions in four nations of southeast Asia. For 7 years, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam have been working with little publicity and without disagreement on a huge development program. These four countries, which do not cooperate in anything else, have reached accord on development of the Lower Mekong Basin.

Work already is underway in drawing engineering designs, moving earth for dams, building powerplants, cultivating pilot farms, and training village technicians. Even guerrilla troops have not halted field work.

If the United Nations were to designate this area for international development according to the plan already drawn by the four nations, there is a strong possibility that peace could be achieved in a common pursuit of agricultural and industrial growth. This is a solution to southeast Asian violence which would make sense to peasants in rice fields and to American taxpayers * * *. The United Nations might be expected to provide a blue-helmeted watch and ward service for those sectors of the project area where security is threatened. It could do this on the invitation of the country concerned. Cambodia and Tailand would have no immediate need beyond protection of their borders. Laos and South Vietnam would find it essential in the areas where civil unrest has been intense * * *.

This type of agreement would be fundamentally different from the cease-fire that is

[1] Excerpts from "Lower Mekong,' by Gilbert F. White, professor of geography at the University of Chicago. The article was published by the "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists," December 1964, and reprinted by the American Friends Service Committee, 1185 Sunset Drive, Coral Gables, Fla.

envisioned under a neutralization treaty. The four countries, the United States, North Vietnam, and other interested nations would commit themselves primarily to advance a great development program for the welfare of the people * * *. It would substitute a development goal for an indistinct battle line, and it would permit the United States to withdraw gracefully in favor of an international force committed to that goal. Financial obligations of the United States would in the future be linked with contributions of money and people from other nations.

A PROPOSAL FOR SOLUTION OF THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

In addition to the obliterating threat of a nuclear war, there are two other overriding issues which threaten the security of all societies. One problem is the unrest and instability of two-thirds of the world's population, which is suffering from malnutrition or worse. Much of this unrest is caused by the fact that these people are beginning to smell the "aroma" of what might be theirs if they could only develop economically. Second, it is common knowledge that there exists in the world an enormous variety of young, emotional national states. These nations have learned well from the history of the older Western nation states. Understandably these young nations make on occasion what might seem to be, from our viewpoint, inappropriate and unrealistic demands.

However, one consistent and valid demand made by these nations is that it be possible for them to achieve a reasonable degree of economic stability. Economic stability is for many of these countries the essential prerequisite to social and political stability. When feasible, the program of development should be an international cooperative venture.

Thus, with the background given by Gilbert White's article, it seems reasonable that the United States might offer to allocate a significant portion of its yearly foreign aid appropriation to the existing international economic venture in the Mekong River Delta. This action would promote long range political and social stability. This type of positive action would meet a common need of all emerging countries—economic development. The project by its very nature would promote regionalism and provide an example of cooperation among small nation states.

The obvious fact is that world peace is the responsibility, militarily and economically, of all nations. The United States should offer to redirect its energies from military to economic development if a group of nations would agree, with the consent of the South Vietnam Government, to bring into South Vietnam a sufficiently large force to help that Government and people maintain their political and territorial integrity.

This plan does not hope that South Vietnam will finally become either capitalistic or socialistic. The end result for all of the small countries in this area will probably be a mixture of both economic systems. This plan does involve the determination that no single country will dominate the peninsula known historically to the westerner as French Indochina. Most nations, including many of the emerging nations, should be willing collectively to resist aggression of this kind.

This plan is an honorable alternative to the present U.S. course of action. In the positive sense of being creative, the Mekong River Delta project promises regionalism and long-range social and political growth.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

JOHN R. BETHEA.

MIAMI, FLA.

How the Handicapped Are Overcoming Barriers to Employment in My Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the prize-winning entry of Miss Melody Jean Smith of Reno, Nev., in the 1965 national "Ability Counts" contest sponsored by the Presidents' Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Miss Smith won fourth place and will be presented with her award at the opening ceremonies of the committee's annual meeting on April 29.

The essay follows:

HOW THE HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIER TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY

(By Melody Jean Smith, Reno High School, Reno, Nev.)

Addressing the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped in April of 1964, President Johnson said, "I am convinced that it is morally right—socially just—economically sensible—and administratively feasible to open the door of employment opportunity to handicapped but job-qualified Americans." Many handicapped individuals in my community have opened that door—the door which leads to their employment and to their acceptance as productive members of society.

That a moral imperative endows every human being with dignity and worth is unquestioned in our society, yet complete social justice has not been attained. There are still many prejudices against handicapped individuals.

Achieving social justice for these handicapped is never the work of a single individual or a single agency. Hundreds of people and many facilities are involved in overcoming barriers to the employment of the handicapped: rehabilitation counselors, physicians, psychologists, social workers, and prosthetic experts; plus rehabilitation centers, workshops, hospitals, and schools. The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped has a network of governors' committees and local committees carrying information and inspiration to every part of the country. The work of these groups has resulted in modification of the hiring practices of employers.

One of the great steps made in the past few years has been the removal of architectural barriers such as steep flights of steps and narrow doorways that cannot admit employees confined to wheelchairs. Last year when my community's new multimillion-dollar bank building was completed, Mr. Albert Alegre, the building manager, stated, "The handicapped were considered when this building was planned." A ramp leads to the building's automatic doors, and the elevators, drinking fountains, and restrooms of the interior are easily accessible to the handicapped. A newly built Employment Security Office Building and an almost completed city hall also have street level entrances accessible to the handicapped.

Federal-State agencies working as partners in action have made rehabilitation and placement of the handicapped administratively feasible. Disabled persons are referred to the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation from many sources: doctors, schools, welfare agencies, and employment services. Medical data, case study, and an appraisal of the client's ability enable the counselor to work out an individual rehabilitation plan. The services may include medical care, the supplying of artificial limbs, training, transportation, and maintenance during rehabilitation, the supplying of occupational tools and equipment, and job placement.

In my community by means of a grant from the Max C. Fleishmann Foundation, funds from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and contributions from individuals and organizations in Nevada, a much-needed occupational training center is being initiated. This center will provide necessary training for disabled people in order that they may become self-supporting.

The money spent for the construction and operation of this training center is well spent, for rehabilitation of the handicapped is economically sensible. In Nevada, 113 persons were rehabilitated during the fiscal year 1963–64. These individuals had earned $62,088 annually before rehabilitation; after rehabilitation they were earning $491,296 annually, an increase of over 600 percent. It is estimated that during the rest of their lives they will pay back about $10 in income tax for every dollar invested in their rehabilitation.

Hiring the handicapped is also economically sensible for the employer. Publicized studies show that properly placed handicapped persons are equally or more productive than their fellow workers and that they have better attendance and safety records.

Many handicapped persons in my community have overcome the characteristic barriers to employment—social, architectural, prejudicial—and are now proving that "ability counts." Although Mr. Howard McKissick is a disabled veteran, his consistent reelection to the post of county commissioner attests to his efficiency and the voters' gratitude. Mrs. Lillian Barnum, who lost her legs when she was eight, is a dedicated worker for the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. In spite of the loss of his right arm, Mr. Howard Farrell is an excellent accountant for the Internal Revenue Service. Mr. Maynard Yasmer, severely crippled by polio, necessitating his being confined to a wheelchair, has achieved distinction as a rehibilitation counselor.

These people are among those who have overcome barriers to employment in my community. Many more need help. This help is being provided by the many agencies and individuals that concern themselves with this problem. Through diligent work, my community is learning that it is "morally right—socially just—economically sensible—and administratively feasible" to rehabilitate and hire the handicapped.

Firearms Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1965, I introduced a bill, H.R. 6346, to amend the Federal Firearms Act. These amendments on firearms are not designed to cause injury to the sport-loving public, nor those engaged in legiti-

mate sports activities involved in the sale, importing, and manufacturing of firearms. On all levels of law enforcement, responsible experts have deplored the absence of laws limiting the use of guns. This Nation has witnessed a chronology of violence which documents better than any statistics the fact that there is a serious misuse of firearms going on at the present moment.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join ranks with distinguished Americans, led by U.S. Senator THOMAS J. DODD, in the effort to secure congressional legislation in this area.

I call your attention to an editorial entitled "A Parting Shot" which appeared in the Washington Post today, Wednesday, April 28, 1965:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 28, 1965]

A PARTING SHOT

For 77 consecutive days—11 full weeks—this page has carried an editorial about guns. It has done so because of a belief that the almost uncontrolled distribution and availability of firearms in the United States presents a senseless peril to public safety and because of a strong desire to bring this peril to public notice. This kind of effort to arouse public opinion constitutes, we think, one of the first functions of a free press.

The stream of editorials has produced, in unprecedented volume, a responding stream of letters to the editor—most of them critical of the editorials, many of them insensately angry. Some of the editorials were meant to be informative—to document the danger and to describe what seemed to us appropriate legislative remedies. Some were frankly meant to be provocative—to arouse a sense of outrage by recounting tragedies reported as commonplace in the news pages every day. Some were meant to rebut the standard arguments of the National Rifle Association and other opponents of the President's recommendations for firearms control. Some were meant to be sardonic or shocking—and seemed, perhaps, no more than smart aleck.

Since we propose now to declare a moratorium, or temporary cease-fire, on the subject, it seems opportune to recapitulate our reasons for wanting effective firearms control and to restate the kinds of control we deem effective. Guns are indubitably dangerous. About 5,000 homicides and more than 8,000 suicides are committed through the use of guns every year in the United States. Many of these killings could have, and perhaps would have, been accomplished by other means; but guns made them easy.

To begin with, guns contribute to crime. Possession of them emboldens many to undertake assaults or robberies; and it leads to many fatalities which might not have resulted if these crimes had been undertaken with less lethal weapons. In a 3-year period, according to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, 168 law-enforcement officers were murdered in the performance of their official duties. Firearms were used in 162 of these killings, with revolvers and automatic pistols accounting for 131 of the deaths and rifles and shotguns for 31; knives, clubs, and other weapons were responsible for the remaining 6.

Even more tragic, in a way, is the death toll from guns used by those not intending to commit crime—the killing of children by demented parents, the killing of wives and husbands and lovers and relatives and neighbors in pointless quarrels, the killing of youngsters by other youngsters who did not know the gun was loaded, or by sheer accident or carelessness, the killing, altogether at random, of innocents who happened to be at hand when some drunk or fool was skylarking with a gun. Not a day passes in any major American city without some such tragedy.

For these reasons, we want to prevent, or at least diminish, the possession and easy acquisition of guns by criminals, drunkards, juveniles, drug addicts, and the mentally ill. We are convinced that this can be done—to the vast betterment of the general welfare—without preventing the legitimate enjoyment of firearms for hunting, collecting, target shooting, and, where necessary, self-defense by responsible, law-abiding, qualified adults.

Nationally, we urge adoption of the bills introduced by Senator THOMAS DODD to implement President Johnson's gun control proposals. In brief, these would rigidly limit the importation of guns—mainly castoff military weapons—from abroad; prohibit mail-order sales of firearms to individuals by limiting firearms shipments in interstate commerce to shipments between licensed importers, manufacturers and dealers; and help States to control the firearms traffic within their borders by requiring that any gun purchaser be a bona fide resident of the State in which the gun is purchased.

Locally, we urge the registration of all firearms; the limitation of ownership to persons over 21 years of age who have not been convicted of a crime, who have not been adjudged mentally incompetent and who have demonstrated by test a knowledge of the rules of safety for handling firearms. In addition, because pistols are peculiarly dangerous and peculiarly susceptible to employment in the commission of crime, we urge that the possession of a pistol be narrowly limited to bona fide collectors, to target-shooters whose use of them will be carefully controlled by regulation, and to persons who, in isolated places and special situations, are adjudged in accordance with fixed standards, to have a genuine need of them for self-protection.

There is nothing in these proposals, we think, which infringes on the constitutional right to keep and bear arms as that right is related to the maintenance of a well-regulated militia. There is nothing in these proposals which interferes with participation by responsible adults in the great and popular sports of hunting and target shooting, or in the hobby of gun collection. The frontier is gone in the United States. Americans today live increasingly in crowded urban centers where the indiscriminate possession of guns has become a deadly danger.

In a country where four Presidents have fallen assassinated by gunfire and where guns exact a terrible toll in death and tragedy every year, sportsmen can fairly be asked to incur minor inconvenience for the sake of the general welfare. It is time for America to come of age. Disarmament needs to begin at home.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Senator Randolph Stresses Strength of Citizenship Responsibility in Address to Student Body in Law Day, U.S.A., Commemoration at Morgantown, W. Va., High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Friday, April 23, it was my privilege and challenge to speak before the student body of the Morgantown, W. Va., High School in observance of Law Day, U.S.A. Scott Davis, dedicated principal, and his capable teaching staff, were also present.

Established in 1958, Law Day is celebrated on May 1 and is now a permanent national event. It is a time for Americans to reaffirm their loyalties to the United States and rededicate themselves to the ideals of equality and justice. It has been said that "the trouble seems to be that too many people think the law should be enforced, and not enough think it should be observed." The purpose of Law Day is to change this idea.

In our country May Day is a commemoration of the laws which make us free men, a contrast to the communistic celebration which emphasizes military force.

Mr. President, I addressed 1,600 high school students assembled by the Key Club, of Morgantown High School, in coordination with the Monongalia County Bar Association. The program included remarks by Key Club President-Elect Sam Marino, current President Roger Warsewich, and Vice President Gary George.

Representing the Morgantown civic leaders and the Monongalia legal group were: Mayor Arthur Buehler; Albert Morgan, president of the bar association; Robert Goodwin, chairman, Law Day committee, bar association; Robert Creel, vice president, Kiwanis; Steve Gatrell and Albert Tennant, faculty advisers of the Key Club; and Rev. Jerry Rector, campus minister, of West Virginia University.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this address, "Citizenship and the Rule of Law," to the Morgantown High School students be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENSHIP AND THE RULE OF LAW

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, Morgantown High School, Law Day, Morgantown, W. Va., Apr. 23, 1965)

It is indeed a pleasure to be here in your high school to join in your observance of Law Day.

This is a relatively young celebration—younger than any of you. May 1, 1958, was the first time that Law Day was observed. President Dwight D. Eisenhower issued the first proclamation designating May 1 as Law Day, U.S.A.

Because the leaders of our country felt that Law Day was a day worthy of commemoration, Congress passed a joint resolution in 1961 designating the first day of May as a permanent national observance. This resolution stated that Law Day, U.S.A. "* * * is set aside as a special day of celebration by the American people in appreciation of their liberties and the reaffirmation of their loyalty to the United States of America: of their rededication to the ideals of equality and justice under law in their relations with each other as well as with other nations; and for the cultivation of that respect for law that is so vital to the democratic way of life."

May Day itself has traditionally been a notable occasion for centuries—dating back to pagan celebrations. The Maypole and the Maypole dance date back further than some of the codes of law which are forerunners of the law to which we pay tribute today. Perhaps some of you would prefer the traditional dances of yesteryear to the speechmaking of today—but, if it were not for the rule of law which exists in our land today, even dancing, traditional or otherwise, might be impossible. Many of you have read that the "twist" was outlawed by the Communist leaders, along with Western jazz. As Americans we do not believe in such arbitrary restrictions. Can you imagine the President and the Government of the United States denying you the right to do the frug and the watusi?

And dancing is but one of many individual activities which is regulated behind the Iron Curtain. I have no doubt that if our President did seek to outlaw social dancing, considerable opposition could be found within the White House itself with his two daughters as its leaders.

On May 1 we express formal tribute throughout our land to the faith of every American in the rule of law and its supremacy in the lives of all freemen. One of the reasons that Law Day, U.S.A., came into being was to provide a dramatic contrast to communism's May Day. What better contrast can be made to the missiles and troops parading past Red Square in the Communist celebration of May Day than the peaceful observances, such as ours, that will take place throughout the country? The Communist rule is a rule of force. Under Red rule the rights and liberties of the individual seem to be secondary to the interests of the all-powerful state and the few men who govern it.

What is the rule of law that we commemorate? It is our system of laws that protects the rights of people, assures the freedom and dignity of the individual, and enables impartial courts to settle disputes fairly. The rule of law derives its principles from our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and our legal system created by our Constitution to safeguard the rights set forth in these documents.

What are the first words that come to your mind when you think of the United States of America? Democracy? Freedom? Government by law? What is government by law? Do we need it? Let's imagine a football game where there are no rules. It would be havoc.

So in everyday life we must have rules and laws and penalties for their violation. Suppose in this same football game the referee made his own rules, judging each player by his own whims? It wouldn't be much of a game. Government without law can result in dictatorship, with each leader determining what is lawful. The same rules might not apply equally to everyone. With each new leader there might be a change of law. The result would be instability. Citizens would have no standards to guide them.

Our laws come from the people, and through our legislatures. They reflect the belief of most of us as to what is right and necessary for the orderly conduct of our society. If we don't like a law, we can attempt to change it. I receive letters every day from people who want to change laws; yet, they abide by them until they can be changed. The rights of all Americans depend on our respect for the law. You cannot play a football game without rules nor can we have a working society without laws and respect for the rule of law.

We live under a system, fortunately, where supremacy of the law exists. Our unique constitutional structure in which the separation of powers is accomplished and the rights of our individual citizens are defined, has resulted in the elevation of law to a position of supremacy as a component of our democracy. The supremacy of law has great significance today at the international level.

Destruction, in this nuclear age, could conceivably be accomplished in a matter of minutes—by pushing a button. The world and the hope for world peace seems now to have only one hope of survival and that survival can only be accomplished if we turn to the rule of law as a means for bringing peaceful solution to problems between nations.

The theme for this year's Law Day is "Uphold the Law—A Citizen's First Duty." You, as students, may be able to accomplish little as arbiters of the international crises we face today; you can, however, contrbiute individually to a greater society in the exercise of your responsibilities as citizens.

What do your duties as a citizen include? First, the duty to obey the laws, the duty to respect the rights of others, the duty to inform yourself on issues of Government and community welfare, the duty to vote and to serve on juries (when you are old enough), to serve and defend your country, to assist those that enforce the law, and the duty to practice and teach the principles of good citizenship.

As young citizens you may have unfortunately given the rule of law a negative emphasis, thinking of it as a series of prohibitions. But, law can be an instrumentality of man and a positive force for social order.

The law prohibits you—yes—but it also protects you. For example, it protects you here at school; your cafeteria is regulated by certain health and sanitation laws applying to public eating places. You are protected as you sleep at night by building codes and fire prevention laws. Law can be restrictive, but its values far outweigh its restrictions.

It is essential under our system of government that we abide by the restrictions of law which are protective and essential and we must assume the responsibilities of citizenship. Every American citizen, including each student in this high school, should make every day Law Day by doing whatever he can each day to foster respect for law and order and insure the many blessings of liberty we enjoy in this Republic.

In Praise of Randy Matson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the great new stars on the American sports scene is a young man from my hometown, Pampa, Tex. He is Randy Matson, the 20-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Matson, of Pampa, and a student at Texas A. & M. University. Randy was a silver medal winner in the Olympics last fall in Tokyo—and on Friday, April 9, he threw the shot 67 feet, 11¼ inches to establish a new world's record.

Randy's goal is to toss the 16-pound shot past the 70-foot mark, the goal that stands as the shotputter's equivalent to the 4-minute mile.

There is no doubt in my mind nor among his many other friends and neighbors in Pampa that he will accomplish this feat, and will also break the discus record for good measure.

Ron Cross, the city editor of the Pampa Daily News, wrote following Randy's feat in setting the new shotput record that Randy has been "breaking records and collecting trophies" since he was 12 years old.

A fellow who never progressed beyond high school track but still had a few medals for memories could get an inferiority complex visiting Randy Matson's home in Pampa.

Cross wrote:

The Texas A. &. M. sophomore has more medals, ribbons, plaques, and trophies at 520 West Browning than you can look over in a reasonable amount of time.

Randy Matson was featured in the sport section of the current Time magazine. An excellent article on an excellent subject, pointing up that Randy Matson has the great qualities America has always admired, the championship character that goes with championship performance.

We are all so very, very proud of Randy.

The Time article, entitled "The Champ From Pampa," is as follows:

THE CHAMP FROM PAMPA

Into the shotput circle at Texas A. & M. University stepped Randy Matson, 20, cupping a 16-pound steel ball in one huge hand as if it were an egg. Sucking in his breath, he tucked the ball behind his right ear, crouched low, and tapped the ground once, twice, three times with his left toe. Then, with a prodigious grunt that could be heard a full 100 yards away, he hurled himself across the ring. The shot sailed through the air and bit into the dirt, 67 feet, 11¼ inches away. "That one felt pretty good," sighed Sophomore Matson. It should have: by 1¼ inches he had broken Dallas Long's world record in the shotput.

BIG MAN AROUND TOWN

His feat this month came as slight surprise to anyone who knew James Randel Matson—including Dallas Long. By the time he was 18, Charlie Matson's boy was already a big man around the Panhandle town of Pampa, Tex. Naturally—he stood 6 feet 6½ inches tall and weighed 210 pounds. He also averaged 15 points a game for Pampa High's basketball squad, ran 50 yards for the winning touchdown against archrival Amarillo High, and was practically a one-man track team—heaving the 12-pound shot 66 feet, 10½ inches, hurling the discus 192 feet, 3 inches, running 100 yards in 10.3 seconds. More than 100 colleges made him offers, and the University of Southern California assigned Old Grads Long and Parry O'Brien to take the prize prospect in tow. They proudly showed him the library, the dormitories, all those longlegged girls. Pity. They should have spent more time showing him the gym.

They did at A. & M. in College Station, Tex., where the gym is a big attraction. The nearest bottle of liquor is 7 miles away, and the sidewalks seem to roll up of their own accord at 6 p.m. "I wanted a place where I could study and train and nothing else," explains Shotputter Matson, a gentle giant who calls everybody "sir" or "ma'am" and hardly goes anywhere without bringing along his pet shot in a brown bowling bag. As far as he's concerned, the M in A. & M. stands for Emil Mamaliga, 44, an assistant coach for the varsity swimming team, who started Randy lifting weights to build up his rangy frame. "You can't fire a 16-inch shell from a PT boat," Mamaliga insisted. "You have to have a big, heavy ship." By last fall's Olympics in Tokyo, Matson tipped the scales at 260 pounds, astounded everybody by flinging the shot 66 feet 3¼ inches. As it turned out, Randy had to settle for a silver medal when Long managed 66 feet 8½ inches on his fourth toss.

A STRING OF FIRECRACKERS

Long, 24, wisely retired on the spot. Last February in Dallas, Matson smashed the world indoor record with a put of 66 feet 2¼ inches; earlier this month in Austin he warmed up for his outdoor recordsmasher with a toss of 67 feet 9 inches. "I've never seen anything like it," exclaimed Stanford's venerable Coach Payton Jordan, who worked with Randy at the Olympics. "His foot explodes, his calf explodes, his thigh explodes, his hip, his back, his shoulder, his triceps, and right out to the very tips of his fingers. It's like a whole string of firecrackers going off"

Matson's goal is 70 feet, the shotput equivalent of the 4-minute mile in 1954, and he's getting closer every day. Then what? Well, if he gets bored, he can switch to the discus. Two weeks ago, just for kicks, he hurled one 201 feet 5½ inches—a foot farther than Al Oerter's winning throw at the 1964 Olympics.

Pastor Sees Freedom Threatened in Negative Attitude Toward Deity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed by an article published in the Washington Post of April 24, 1965, about the Reverend Richard Stephenson, pastor of Columbia Baptist Church, in Falls Church, Va. I do not know Reverend Stephenson, but his comments in this article, written by Kenneth Dole, are most apropos, and I feel that they merit the attention of the Members of Congress.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Pastor Sees Freedom Threatened in Negative Attitude Toward Deity," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1965]

WASHINGTON CHURCHMEN: PASTOR SEES FREEDOM THREATENED IN NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD DEITY

(By Kenneth Dole)

Admitting he may be guilty of oversimplification, the Reverend Richard M. Stephenson, a brilliant scholar who has built up the largest Baptist church in northern Virginia, asserts all philosophies fall into two categories:

Either they declare salvation is of God or they declare it is of man.

Asserting that because Americans, affected by "mental laziness and the desire to be comfortable at all costs," are yielding to the latter persuasion, American freedom is threatened, he says.

The churches, infected by "a spirit that will not trade comfort for a cross," are coming close to being "only defenders of the status quo" and are not energetically combatting the secularistic trend through Christian evangelism, he points out.

The pastor of the Columbia Baptist Church, Falls Church, turns to Woodrow Wilson and the Founders of the Republic to support his belief that freedom depends upon God rather than man. From Wilson's last public address, he quotes: "Our civilization cannot survive materially unless it is redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ, and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit."

Thomas Jefferson wrote, "God, who gave us life, gave us liberty." And Mr. Stephenson adds, "only a vital religious faith" can preserve our liberties.

Then he affirms:

"Democracy as we know it depends on religion, the Christian religion. Let us not bend over backward to satisfy the godless cry of every humanist and every atheist that cries out over a supposed infringement of rights.

"If it is intolerant to have faith in God and to insist that our institutions and government be conducted upon basic religious foundations, then let us be intolerant. If our democracy should vanish it would be because we have not been sufficiently Christian."

Through positive language like this, Mr. Stephenson has illuminated and stimulated the thinking of his nearly 2,500 members, attracted also by his cordial, humorous makeup.

Telling of his courtship, during his first pastorate in Fort Myers, Fla., he divulges how he used a borrowed book to advance his suit. He heard that Noralee Mellor, a Presbyterian, had a certain book, a college annual, he needed, and he called at her home to borrow it.

That was in 1948, and he has not returned it yet. Several times he went to Miss Mellor's house to return it, and each time he told her, "You know, I forgot to bring that book with me." Without the book he booked her for good; they were married the next year.

"Maybe someday I'll come across that book and bring it back," he says with a smile.

The son of a Southampton County (Va.) peanut grower and Baptist Sunday school superintendent, Mr. Stephenson decided on the ministry in his last year at Hampden-Sydney (Va.) College. "I didn't see a blinding light or burning bush; I just had an inner conviction that this was what I was to do."

He had been valedictorian of his high school class, and graduated from college magna cum laude. He was president of the Students' Christian Association and a member of two honorary fraternities. He completed his preparation for the ministry at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville.

Mr. Stephenson has held many offices, including president of the Baptist General Association of Virginia. His extracurricular activities have not prevented him from tripling his church membership since 1950, nor from devoting himself to his family.

Perhaps he was thinking of his two young daughters and son when he preached recently on God's plan for young people. He spoke of the tremendous decisions each young person is forced to make.

"Youth whispers its great messages," he said, "points to its great goals, calls for hard labor and application, for clean living and the avoidance of that which will hurt or defile the soul."

Prohibiting the Use of Mail Covers and the Maintenance of Lists of Addressees Receiving Communist Political Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to prohibit the use of the device of mail covers and the maintenance of lists of addressees receiving Communist political propaganda.

I introduced this legislation because I believe American citizens have a right to personal privacy. I do not believe our postal officials should have the authority to keep or release lists of names of persons who are writing to a certain citizen or of those to whom he writes. That is possible under the present mail cover system.

Furthermore, I do not believe the Post Office Department should keep or release lists of those postal patrons who wish to receive second- and third-class mail that has been determined to be Communist political propaganda mail from abroad. Their names should not be subject to inquiry just because they have made a request to receive such material.

I would like to quote a recent statement by Jerome J. Keating, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers:

> The sanctity of the mails is the last bastion of personal privacy.

I wholeheartedly agree, and for that reason I have introduced legislation to halt the use of mail covers and prevent the maintenance of lists of those persons who do wish to receive certain Communist mailings for personal or professional reasons.

During testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure recently, Mr. Keating covered the subject of the use of mail covers and at the same time defended the honor and honesty of our dedicated postal employees. I am in complete agreement with Mr. Keating's position on both of these matters and would call his statement to the attention of my distinguished colleagues. Under unanimous consent I include in my remarks Mr. Keating's testimony as it appeared in the April 1965 issue of the Postal Record:

KEATING DEFENDS HONOR OF POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES—NALC LEADER'S TESTIMONY PROTESTS PEEPHOLES, COVERS

"It is not the peepholes that are responsible for the high degree of honesty in the postal service—it is the people."

This ringing affirmation of the integrity of postal workers was the keynote of the testimony of Jerome J. Keating, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, when he testified, on February 24, 1965, before Senator EDWARD V. LONG's Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure. The Missouri Senator's committee is investigating alleged intrusion by Federal agencies into the personal privacy of American citizens, and Keating had a great deal to say about post office "peepholes" and the use of mail covers.

In regard to the observation galleries (or "peepholes"), the NALC president pointed out that they exist in 5,260 postal buildings in which 20 or more people are employed. "What happens in the 39,340 other postal facilities which house fewer than 20 employees?" he asked. "Are these unfortunate post offices and stations dens of iniquity where thievery is commonplace and depredation a way of life?"

Keating scoffed at this suggestion, venturing the opinion that dishonesty runs higher in the larger installations where peepholes exist than in the smaller offices, where they do not exist. He said that human beings are basically either honest or dishonest, and that a dishonest employee is not going to be dissuaded from his normal inclinations just by the off chance that a post office inspector may be possibly staring at him at that particular moment through a spyhole.

Out of a total work force of almost 600,000 people, only 590 postal employees (including postmasters and supervisors) are accused of dishonesty in an average year. This is a record of integrity almost completely unparalleled in our modern society, Keating said. He contrasted it with the record in the banking business, where about one-eighth of all the banks in the country are victimized by their own employees and officers in the course of a given year.

Proceeding from the theoretical to the practical, Keating pointed out that Department figures show that it costs approximately $2.5 million a year to build and maintain these spying devices, more than 10 times the amount that is recovered from employee depredators. In addition, the observation gallery system necessitates that lights be kept close to the ceiling, so they wont obstruct the view of peeping inspectors. This causes eyestrain and inefficiency among employees. Also, post office machinery and cases often have to be arranged specially to afford the inspectors a better view. This leads to inefficient arrangements, interfering with the flow of the mail.

"Peepholes are an anachronism in the labor management climate of 1965," the NALC president said, "They degrade the inspector by converting him into a kind of Peeping Tom, and they degrade the postal employee by treating him like some caged and untrustworthy animal."

THE "MAIL COVER"

As for the mail cover system, Keating attacked it as a violation of the sancitity of the mails. He argued that this procedure of writing down the names and addresses of people writing to a certain citizen, and those to whom he writes, should be strictly limited to the categories involving national security and the security of the mails "and as much as possible within those two categories."

He cited all the sneaky new electronic devices that are easily available to the public for overhearing conversations through walls, or even when held a block away, as well as other examples of spying apparatus. "The sanctity of the mails is the last bastion of personal privacy," Keating said. "We should protect this bastion of personal privacy down to the last ditch."

He added that letter carriers are so imbued with the philosophy that a personal letter is sacrosanct that it goes against their conscience and every instinct they have to be forced to cooperate in a mail cover. "They feel sullied and besmirched when they have to do so," he declared. "They don't like to do it, and I don't blame them one bit."

Earlier, Chief Inspector Henry B. Montague (whom Keating hailed as a personal friend and "the most humane and capable man to serve in the position he now occupies during the 41 years I have been in the service") defended the peepholes and mail cover as essential tools of the Post Office inspector's trade. He claimed that 72.5 percent of all arrests for depredation are achieved because of use of the peepholes. (Keating, on the other hand claimed that during more than four decades of postal service, he has only known one case where the peepholes were directly responsible for an arrest.) Montague also said that the use of mail covers was essential in tracking down fugitives from justice, in cracking pornography cases, in apprehending spies and subversives, etc.

Senator LONG, and the counsel for the committee, Bernard Fensterwald, Jr., gave Chief Inspector Montague a rough inquisition lasting about 3 hours. (Senator LONG overrode Montague's objection to the term peepholes, incidentally, by saying: "They're holes, aren't they? They're used for peeping, aren't they? That makes them peepholes.")

Another contretemps occurred when the chief inspector gave his honest opinion that peepholes had never been used to spy into ladies' washrooms or swing rooms (where female employees change their clothes). Patrick J. Nilan, legislative representative of the United Federation of Postal Clerks then testified that peepholes were in use that very day in the female swing room in the Minneapolis Post Office. This was news to the chief inspector who said the offending apertures would be blocked up immediately. (It has later transpired that other ladies' swing

rooms—notably in San Francisco—are still accessible to spying inspectors.)

The insistent questioning of Senator LONG, Mr. Fensterwald, and Cornelius Kennedy, minority counsel for the committee, brought forth the fact that a "mail cover" is permitted by the inspection service upon the request of almost any law enforcement agency, right down to a justice of the peace in a small community. It was also developed that a "fugitive from justice" could be construed as a man who had failed to pay a traffic ticket, and couldn't be found by the traffic court.

When testimony is heard from all witnesses, the Long committee is expected to come forward with some concrete suggestions as to how the privacy of the individual can be protected from indiscriminate snooping by his Government, or from any extension of the "big brother" syndrome so dramatically portrayed in Orwell's "1984."

EXCERPTS OF STATEMENT OF JEROME J. KEATING, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE, FEBRUARY 24, 1965

I want to state, first of all, that I am grateful for the opportunity of coming before you today and expressing my views, and the views of our members, on two subjects which intimately and seriously concern the dignity of the postal service and the sanctity of the mails, as well as the principle of personal privacy, which I consider an essential element in any democratic society.

Before proceeding with this statement, I would like to go on record as saying that—although over the years I have often disagreed with the Postal Inspection Service—I have nothing but admiration and a warm regard for the present Chief of the Inspection Service, Mr. Henry B. Montague.

I have known Mr. Montague for many years. I consider him to be the most humane and the most capable man to serve in the position he now occupies during the 41 years I have been in the postal service.

I find I must disagree with Mr. Montague's official position on both the matter of peepholes in post offices and mail covers, but I do so without rancor, and with full regard for the fact that we both approach these subjects from widely different points of view.

I would like, if I may, to discuss the subject of observation galleries and catwalks, better known as "peepholes" first.

OBSERVATION GALLERIES

These ancient devices are an anachronism in the labor-management climate of 1965. Moreover, as I shall demonstrate, they are a wastefully extravagant anachronism. They interfere with the efficiency of postal operations, and they are injurious to employee morale.

Observation galleries—or peepholes—are, most unfortunately, standard equipment in almost every postal facility in the Nation with 20 or more employees. It is estimated that about 5,260 postal buildings now contain them out of a total of 44,600 buildings altogether. Ever since they came into being around 1875, they have been a sore point with postal employees. The National Association of Letter Carriers has crusaded against them ever since we were organized, 76 years ago.

We were delighted and relieved last December when Postmaster General John A. Gronouski finally closed down the disgusting devices by which the inspectors could spy upon postal employees while performing their natural functions in post office washrooms. These degrading devices had a seriously detrimental effect upon employee morale for many years. It was argued that, if this restraint upon the felonious intents of postal employees were eliminated, wholesale theft and depredation would run riot in every post office in the land.

Of course, no such thing has happened.

Now that there is some hope that the spyholes will be eliminated from the workroom areas and the swing rooms of post offices as well, the same scaremongering arguments are being set forth.

I don't think these arguments have any merit whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that a human being is basically either honest or dishonest. If he is dishonest by nature, the fact that, by some chance, a postal inspector might possibly be observing his actions from behind a one-way glass window will not deter him from yielding to his natural inclinations. This kind of a threat does not act as a deterrent any more than does the threat of capital punishment acts as a deterrent to would-be murderers and rapists.

I recall reading that, in 18th century England, when convicted thieves were executed publicly and most painfully, common pickpockets used to have a field day working among the spectators at the foot of the gallows. If a man is a thief, he will continue his trade until he gets caught, and he always believes that he is smart enough to avoid detection.

THE 590 OF 600,000

During an average year, approximately 590 postal employees—of all ranks and stations—are arrested for suspected dishonesty. This is out of an entire employee force of almost 600,000 persons.

This is a record of honesty and integrity almost unparalleled in any walk of life in the 20th century. It is unmatched in either private industry or in Government.

I would like to contrast this figure with the fact that during 1960—a typical year—1,771 banks—or about one-eighth of all the banks in the United States—were victimized by their own employees. In that typical year, 152 bank presidents were caught with their hands in the till. In fact, 58 percent of all the thefts were perpetrated by bank officers, and only 42 percent by bank employees.

But, the inspection service says the reason the degree of honesty is so high in the postal service is because they have the peephole system to keep employees honest.

I might point out that only 5,260 postal facilities with 20 or more employees are burdened with these archaic spying devices. What happens in the 39,340 other postal facilities which house fewer than 20 employees? Are these unfortunate post offices and stations dens of inequity where thievery is commonplace and depredation a way of life?

I am sure you will find that this is not the case. I have never seen any figures presented by the Inspection Service on this subject, but I feel in my heart that the same degree of honesty prevails in the smaller offices as in the larger offices. If there is any difference at all, I would hazard a guess that the degree of honesty is even higher in the smaller offices and stations where no peepholes exist.

It is not the peepholes that are responsible for the high degree of honesty in the postal service—it is the people.

I have said, Mr. Chairman, that this system is an extravagant anachronism. It has been estimated that it adds as much as 25 percent to the cost of a new building to provide it with observation galleries and peepholes, although Chief Inspector Montague now says that this cost is much lower. We are informed that it costs the Department almost $2.5 million a year to build and operate this spying system, or about 10 times the amount recovered from postal depredations.

In addition, these galleries eat up usable space. They require false walls, false ceilings, special soundproofing, special materials.

When galleries are installed in existing buildings, the problems are even greater, and even more expensive. Usually the mechanical equipment has to be shifted around so as to make room for the galleries. This not only costs a great deal of money, but it also interferes with the efficiency of the operation.

Wherever there are observation galleries, lighting fixtures are often placed high above the workroom floor, close to the ceilings, so they will not obstruct the vision of the inspector at his spy hole. This means that the employees must work with inferior lighting, to the detriment of their eyesight and efficiency.

And, of course, the effect on employee morale is very poor. We all like to think of the postal service as an honorable profession, filled by men and women who are respected in their communities, and who take pride in their occupation. This is the ideal. But the glow rubs off of the ideal to a very great extent when a postal employee knows that he is subject to surreptitious observation, like a convicted felon in Sing Sing, or like a croupier or a blackjack dealer in a Nevada gambling house.

The Inspection Service does an outstanding job of apprehending depredators. They do it through the use of decoy letters and by their own specialized system of narrowing down the number of suspects to the one guilty person. They do not need these peepholes. They degrade the inspector by converting him into a kind of Peeping Tom, and they degrade the postal employee by treating him like some caged and untrustworthy animal.

The postal service would be far better off if these nefarious devices were prohibited by law. The National Association of Letter Carriers sincerely hopes that these anachronisms will be banished from all postal buildings.

MAIL COVERS

In regard to mail covers, we feel that this practice should be confined to cases involving the national security and the safety of the mails.

The sanctity of a first-class letter is an American invention. The Continental Congress, in 1789, declared that the privacy of personal letters should be inviolate. This was a revolutionary idea at the time, and it arose because the English Crown had ordered postmasters in the American colonies to open and read personal letters in the hope of uncovering incipient sedition. The Americans so resented this practice that they insisted upon prohibiting it when they brought forth a new nation upon this continent.

I have no idea how widespread the practice of using mail covers is. However, I do know of cases in the past when it has been used as a retaliatory measure.

Certainly the use of the mail cover system for other than security or the safety of the mail is both reprehensible and unjustifiable. The system permits the Inspection Service or other law-enforcement agencies to go on "fishing expeditions" to develop derogatory information against someone whom they only vaguely suspect of some form of wrongdoing.

Surely this is contrary to the tradition and the practice of the common law.

We live in an age when personal privacy is under constant attack. Telephone tapping has become a commonplace. Hidden, recorders no bigger than a tie clasp will take down your every utterance without your being aware of it. National magazines print advertisements for devices which will let you listen in on whatever goes on in the room next door, or even in the next block. They solicit orders for cute gadgets that will let you spy into another room without the slightest possibility of detection. Unless we stop this terrible trend everywhere, big brother and all the little brothers will all have complete access to our most innermost thoughts and desires.

The sanctity of the mails is the last bastion of personal privacy in our modern life.

We should protect this bastion of personal privacy right down to the last ditch.

When members of the National Association of Letter Carriers must cooperate in operating a mail cover, they feel sullied and besmirched by what they have to do. They are so imbued with the philosophy that a personal letter is sacrosanct, that it goes against their conscience, and every instinct they have. They do not like to do it.

I don't blame them one bit. In cases involving the national security, there is some justification for this practice. There is also some justification when the safety of the mails is involved. But the practice should be restricted to those two categories—and should be restricted as much as possible within those two categories. This is a practice that should be used most sparingly and most cautiously, because it endangers one of the most precious principles in our democratic way of life.

"Confederate Air Force" Protests Unauthorized Use of Its Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mercedes, Tex., is the headquarters of an organization called "the Confederate Air Force," which is composed of former World War II pilots who dedicate themselves to the preservation and exhibition of World War II aircraft.

Last year, I was fortunate to visit the headquarters of this group, and I was very impressed by its dedication to its purpose and the pride it has in its organization. These men own some very rare World War II aircraft, and fly them at their own expense, at air shows over the Nation.

It is not surprising that the "Confederate Air Force," of Mercedes, Tex., was disturbed by the unauthorized use of its name by airplanes which dropped leaflets on civil-rights marchers in Alabama; and the group has registered a protest against such misrepresentation.

So that the denial of any connection between this action and the "Confederate Air Force" may be given wide distribution, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I received about this matter, along with a telegram sent to me, and an article published in the March 23, 1965, issue of the Valley Morning Star, of Harlingen, Tex., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, telegram, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARTER, STIERNBERG, SKAGGS & KOPPEL,
Harlingen, Tex., April 5, 1965.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: You will remember that on one of your visits to the valley last year I took you by the headquarters of the Confederate Air Force at Mercedes.

This organization is nonprofit in character and is composed of former World War II pilots. Their only purpose is the preservation and exhibition of World War II aircraft.

In connection with the Selma, Ala., civil rights march, the national press recently reported that certain leaflets were dropped by an aircraft on the civil rights marchers. These leaflets, apparently threatening economic reprisals against the marchers, were signed "Confederate Air Force."

The local members of the Confederate Air Force have issued various statements, and I enclose a clipping explaining their position. They would greatly appreciate it if it were possible for you to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of their denial of implication in the Alabama incident.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JACK SKAGGS.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH:

The Confederate Air Force emphatically denies any connection with the dropping of leaflets today in Selma or any place else, for that matter. We would like to locate the pilot or get the aircraft numbers of the plane used, and we will file charges against the pilot for falsely representing himself as a member of the CAF. We have but one purpose, and that is the preservation and enshrinement of World War II aircraft and the pilots that flew them and helped keep this Nation free. We are a patriotic organization; we are nonpolitical in nature and have no affiliation whatsoever with any of the white supremist groups. We do not have a single member in the Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi area, nor do we have any aircraft closer than 1,500 miles from Selma. The Confederate Air Force deeply regrets its implication in this issue.

Col. BOB KENNY,
Public Information Officer, Confederate Air Force.

[From the Harlingen (Tex.) Valley Morning Star, Mar. 23, 1965]

DENY "RAID"—CONFEDERATE AIR FORCE ANGERED BY UNAUTHORIZED USE OF NAME

MERCEDES.—Angry denials flew from Rebel Field, headquarters of the Confederate Air Force, Monday, after it was reported a Confederate Air Force plane "bombed" civil rights marchers in Alabama with white supremacist leaflets.

"We're attempting to get the license number and name of the pilot, who is liable for suit for misprepresentation," Col. Bill Adams, Rousseau, Minn., newspaper publisher and a CAF public information officer, said.

"A stigma could be attached to the CAF. We don't desire any publicity of this sort."

Col. Lloyd Nolen, of Mercedes, pointed out emphatically the valley-based organization "is a patriotic group of volunteers dedicated to establishing a permanent flying museum of World War II fighter aircraft."

Nolen said the CAF name is copyrighted.

"We've got our attorneys checking into it," Nolen added.

Adams noted members specifically are forbidden to use CAF planes in political or business activity.

He said the CAF has no members in the Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia area and also has no light planes such as reportedly was used in dropping the leaflets.

"All of our planes are fighter planes of World War II," he said. "Someone has taken it upon himself to misrepresent the CAF."

U.S. Censorship Policy in Viet Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern over the effects the administration's censorship policies regarding news from Vietnam will have. This could create a very severe problem in conduct of foreign affairs, as nothing can so quickly weaken the resolve of a country as lack of confidence in the actions its government is taking.

This lack of confidence can quite easily grow out of a lack of information on just exactly what the United States is facing in southeast Asia.

The following column by David Lawrence, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 27, 1965, points out the fact that there is a clear distinction to be made between withholding military information that could benefit our enemies, and a policy of censorship that seems to seek to stifle press coverage on all aspects of the Vietnam situation.

U.S. CENSORSHIP POLICY IN VIET ASSAILED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Editors at their annual meetings in New York and Washington in recent days have been discussing the policy of the Johnson administration in dealing with the news emanating from the battle areas in Vietnam.

What seems to have aroused most of the criticism is the clumsy way the administration has been handling the problem, rather than the objectives sought. For everyone agrees that, when American lives are being risked in a war, the press should cooperate in withholding any information which might possibly get to the enemy and impair the effectiveness of this country's military operations.

Both in World War I and in World War II there prevailed what was called a "voluntary censorship," and the press effectively withheld military information that could possibly benefit the enemy. The press was fully acquainted with the dangers of letting the other side know anything about plans, including the departure of planes or ships to secret destinations.

There would be no difficulty at all today if the administration here were to allow these matters to be handled solely by the military, so that only information relating to troop movements or air and naval operations would be temporarily suppressed. What seems to have stirred up the controversy is that the administration has put in the hands of a propaganda-agency officer the task of acting virtually as a censor.

Not only is he permitted to withhold information about certain diplomatic activities but he also seems to be able to prevent the newspapermen from covering the Vietnam war in the places where they ought to be permitted to go.

In the major wars of history, our military authorities have always provided facilities for war correspondents. These newsmen spend much of their time with the fighting forces,

but do not send out dispatches which could possibly transmit any important information to our adversaries.

The assigning of a member of the staff of the U.S. Information Service—established by Congress as a propaganda organization—to deal with the press at Saigon and to withhold military information is not in line with historical precedent or custom. It is not surprising, therefore, that newspaper editors have severely criticized such a procedure.

Secrecy is of the utmost importance, but it should be confined entirely to military matters. The press should be free to make its own comments whenever it wishes, provided it does not disclose military plans. But even the news of military operations should not be permanently suppressed.

There comes a time, after the event, when it is proper for a disclosure to be made so that the American people will know what has really happened. The timing of such an announcement might well be within the discretion of the military authorities, but to hold it back indefinitely contradicts basic American practice in dealing with the press during a war.

It has been argued by some of the newspaper editors that they cannot comment effectively on military operations if they are not permitted to get the facts of what actually is happening. Thus, sometimes equipment will be unsatisfactory and certain types of guns or planes will have been used which are not suited for the operations in which they are employed. All this is something which can better be examined, perhaps, by committees of Congress, though critical articles written on the spot in war areas often point up the necessity for such investigations.

Perhaps the whole controversy would not have reached the climax that it has in recent weeks if there had not been a prelude; namely, an era of so-called managed news at the Pentagon. This has left an unfortunate blemish on the record. For when the only news given out is designed to accomplish a political purpose, confidence on the part of the public in the accuracy of what is printed is bound to wane.

Fundamentally, there is no sound reason for suppressing the news of military operations altogether. The only issue is when such announcements should be permitted. Also, criticism of military operations should be carefully weighed by newspapermen, lest they disclose data which the enemy should not be allowed to get.

There have been sharp comments from Government officials concerning the dispatches written by correspondents in Vietnam who have been merely exercising their right to express opinions on the diplomatic aspects of the war. There has been, to be sure, a lot of news from various countries on the delicate subject of peace negotiations, and this, in some instances, the administration would probably have preferred to see handled with more caution. But the right of the press to discuss nonmilitary news is inherent in a system such as has long prevailed in America during war and peace.

Water Quality Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, we come this afternon to the close of a debate which has certainly been a distinct compliment to this House. This bill has received the unanimous support on both sides of the Committee on Public Works, and is a piece of legislation which reflects with great credit upon the Committee on Public Works and its distinguished chairman. However, Mr. Chairman, this is a piece of legislation that reflects with great credit upon the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, JOHN BLATNIK, the father and the foremost exponent of clean water in America.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased, coming from the State of Ohio, to add my support to these needed amendments to this program and to note with pride the splendid spirit of bipartisan unity that made the amendments to the original S. 4 bill possible.

Mr. Chairman, we have shown by amendment and by the remarks here during the debate this afternoon that there seems to be agreement that the Federal Government in its attack upon water pollution must proceed cooperatively, with State and local governments and with the vast American industry as well as in cooperation with every agency throughout the land interested in winning ultimately the fight for clear water.

This bill is void of any accusatory tone and is, indeed, a constructive, intelligent approach which has already brought a response from State governments. Now at the moment of the adoption of this bill I am proud to announce to the House that there is in the Great Lakes region, about to be reconvened a five-State regional conference of State Governors to join with the Federal Government in streamlining America's program for clean water. I am proud to participate in this debate and to support this bill.

Inventors Sign Away Patent Rights Before They Invent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in relation to H.R. 5918, a bill which I have introduced that would make it unlawful for an employer to require a patent assignment from a prospective employee as a condition of employment, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article in the Los Angeles Times of April 13, 1965. This article, written by Mr. Richard L. Vanderveld, takes an objective look at the situation today's employed inventor finds himself in.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting the text of the article at this point in the Record:

INVENTOR GRUMBLES GROW OVER SIGNING AWAY OF THEIR RIGHTS

(By Richard L. Vanderveld)

Scientists and engineers are beginning to raise voices against gun-to-the-head renunciation of patent rights.

Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, is pressing for greater Government control of inventions conceived under Government-funded programs.

Industry argues all will lose if its creative energies are repressed.

These are the main sides to a question—who should get the fruits of invention—that is exciting warm debate in the councils of labor, industry, and Government.

As matters stand, industry is in the driver's seat.

Although patents are issued only to individuals, it's reckoned that about two-thirds of all patents these days wind up as corporate property through contractual assignment of rights by employees.

Also, the Defense Department, the biggest bankroller of research programs, has followed a policy of letting private firms in its hire take title to inventions and requiring only a royalty-free, nonexclusive license for the Government.

Some other Federal agencies, including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, have not been so liberal toward industry on the patent question. The result has been confusion and some agitation for a unified policy.

A number of the country's leading legal minds in the patent area gathered recently at Lake Arrowhead and plunged into trends and issues affecting the employed inventor.

Gerald D. O'Brien, head of the NASA patent section, sounded the keynote of the conference with this observation.

"The current trend toward the acquisition by the Federal Government of exclusive rights in inventions made under Government-sponsored research and development contracts tends to diminish markedly the traditional incentives which serve as stimuli to the employed inventor."

Other speakers, expressing much the same idea, may have felt obliged to please their hosts, but the barking was too loud and articulate to be wholly devoid of bite.

The conference was sponsored by the Council of Engineers and Scientists Organizations—West under the auspices of the UCLA Institute of Industrial Relations. The council represents five independent unions of engineers, scientists, and technicians in southern California.

This group is supporting legislation which would make it illegal to have employees sign agreements relinquishing rights to inventions as a condition of employment. This is viewed as an extreme position—subject to compromise.

The sponsor of the bill, Representative GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., Democrat, of California, was present at the Arrowhead conference. He said it stood little or no chance unless its beneficiaries got behind it.

COMPANY TAKES RISK

Industry insists contractual assignment of patent rights is justified. Its reasoning is that when a company hires a man to do inventive tasks and gives him the tools it's taking all the risks and the man is only doing what he's been paid to do when he invents something.

Any compensation beyond salary for an invention in this situation is strictly out of the goodness of industry's discretionary ("ex gratia" in legal parlance) heart, it's explained.

Industry also claims technical types by and large don't aspire for wealth anyway, that they're more than happy to be left alone

with test tubes, centrifuges, and wind tunnels, draw a reasonable salary and bask in acclaim of their associates. And this idea is not too vigorously contested by scientists and engineers themselves.

In a report extolling the U.S. patent system, Du Pont phrased it this way.

"In Du Pont, contributions are recognized through salary increases and bonuses. For creations of extraordinary worth, bonuses are very substantial.

"The benefits to the inventor are not to be judged purely in monetary terms, though. Working in such companies as Du Pont, he has elaborate equipment at his disposal and has an opportunity to work full time at the business he likes best, the business of technical innovation, discovery, and invention."

The Du Pont study also suggested the little man working alone hasn't much hope any more. "Invention is now very much an institutional endeavor," it said.

The conferees at Lake Arrowhead went into the change from an individualistic to a collective research environment, the implications of the ever-increasing complexity of modern science.

They discussed the difficulties of apportioning credit to various members of a research team for purposes of reimbursement.

DISTRUST FEARED

They also acknowledged fear in some quarters that money could bring avarice into the laboratory, sow distrust among colleagues, and undermine cooperative effort.

But John C. Stedman, University of Wisconsin law professor and one of the country's foremost patent authorities, told the Arrowhead conferees much could be done to broaden award and incentive programs.

Referring to the billions of dollars being spent by the Government on research, Stedman said:

"There is some speculation that the public is not getting its money's worth. There are fewer inventions and patents in proportion to the people engaged in research and the money spent on it.

"There is concern that engineers and technicians are not putting out their best effort and are not being used to the best advantage. Some feel they are too far removed from the incentives in terms of patents, profits, and prestige."

Indianola, Iowa, Tribune Comments on the First 100 Days of the New Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been criticized in recent years for delay and inaction on important pieces of legislation. But that criticism, however justified, has not been heard in the last few months.

Because of the constructive legislative record made during the first 100 days of this session, the Congress has gained a reputation for action. This has not gone unnoticed by the press or the public.

As an example of the editorial comments on the record of the Congress thus far, I commend to my fellow Members an article by Mr. Earl Godwin from the April 19, 1965, issue of the Indianola Tribune of Indianola, Iowa.

The editorial accurately reflects, I think, the new spirit behind the legislative work in the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the editorial:

CHANGING ATTITUDES

(By Earl Godwin)

After the election of John F. Kennedy as President of these United States, news analysts speculated that his first 100 days in office could be expected to resemble the same period under Franklin D. Roosevelt. Roosevelt's first 100 days in office saw Congress produce more major legislation than any other similar period. The Kennedy administration was not without some very productive and far-reaching legislation, but it fell short of the high goals expected by some observers, and the first 100 days did not live up to advance predictions.

Although Lyndon Johnson has been in office much longer than 100 days, he has just about finished that much time since taking the oath of office as an elected President. The Congress that was elected, along with Mr. Johnson, last November, is just over 100 days old. Without the commotion and fanfare that usually goes with major happenings, this Congress is producing some of the most sweeping social legislation to move through Washington this century. Other Congresses have passed one, or perhaps two, such major bills in their 2 years of existence, but this session promises to go much further. Already passed is a bill that extends, for the first time, substantial Federal aid to local elementary and high schools. This marks a major breakthrough in an area that has long been unapproachable on the Federal level.

Action is pending now on major changes in the Nation's voting laws, and will undoubtedly be completed in the near future. This is a measure that will have drastic and long-range effects upon the political makeup of a large portion of our country. As recently as 4 years ago, it would have been insane to predict the passage of such a bill as is about to emerge from Congress, even though it is 100 years overdue. Today, it is moving through Congress as though it is the normal course of events. Times do change.

The same could be said about other items, most notably the so-called medicare measure. The question has shifted from whether or not such a bill shall pass, to what coverage shall be afforded by the legislation. Legislation that was impossible only 4 years ago is now accepted as a reality. Large attacks on poverty have been launched, with other programs in the mill. A realistic Presidential Succession Act even seems within the realm of possibility this year.

The list could be expanded quite a bit from these mentioned. In some respects, it is hard to comprehend the overall effects of the legislation that is being written. Our country seems to go for years at a time with little or no major change, and then suddenly leap convulsively forward. Just now, we seem to be in the middle of one of the most dramatic changes ever.

A Better Postal Service, a Better America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for the past 8 years I have continually fought for better postal service in the United States. To this end I have stressed the Post Office Department must have enough personnel to properly handle the mail and adequate appropriations to give the American people the type of postal service to which they are entitled.

In this regard, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, entitled "A Better Postal Service, a Better America," published in the Postal Record of April 1965.

This editorial was written by the very distinguished president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Jerome J. Keating. He is a veteran of our postal service and knows whereof he speaks:

A BETTER POSTAL SERVICE, A BETTER AMERICA

(By Jerome J. Keating)

We are in hearty accord with President Johnson's objective to build a Great Society to make life a little better for the people in America who are having difficulties eking out a proper economic existence. In this area economists, social workers, and labor leaders have always been gravely concerned about the effect that mechanical and scientific advances have upon jobs for our working people.

In the early years factory workers fought against mechanical innovations. Mechanization, automation, and now cybernation are expected to reduce the number of jobs that are available for the person wishing to earn a living. All of these innovations, however, have meant increased production, better standards of living, and the creation of new jobs in other areas. The number of new jobs have not kept pace with the lost jobs and population increases.

Stuart Chase, writing prior to and during the depression of the 1930's, analyzed what was happening in the United States of America and what would be necessary to cushion the shock of unemployment. He pointed out that the new methods would mean a tremendous reduction in the number of jobs available for the working people in America, and predicted that more and more people would leave productive enterprises and enter into the service enterprises. He predicted that there would be expanded services in this Nation of ours as a result of our increased productivity. In some areas this prediction has been entirely accurate. Many new industries that specialize in personal services have been developed.

However, the reverse has happened in the postal service. Service has not been extended—service has been reduced. It is very difficult for people who work in the postal service to understand a government moving in two separate directions—on the one hand, it is creating programs which have as their basic purpose establishing new jobs and putting people to work; on the other hand, putting a ceiling on the number of people that can be employed in an essential industry like the Post Office Department.

Five percent of the total working force in America was unemployed in the month of February 1965; 900,000 of these unemployed people had been jobless for 15 weeks or more; and half of the total had been idle for 26 weeks. In addition to the totally unemployed, there are 2 million workers in America who work less than 35 hours a week—not because of the establishment of a shorter workweek, but due to the fact that people are employed on a part-time basis.

At the same time, personal consumption expenditures in 1964 rose by 6.5 percent to a total of $399.3 billion. This is evidence that there is substantial prosperity in many elements of our economy; it is ironic indeed that so many American people cannot find employment.

The Government is spending a substantial amount of money retraining people and

creating jobs to put them to work. Actually, the Government could take care of a substantial part of this unemployment by hiring people who are needed in the postal service, and this at a savings to the Federal budget.

In the postal service, we have had the Whitten rider which has placed a ceiling upon the number of people that we need to properly handle the mail; we have had the Bureau of the Budget ceiling; we have had the ceiling imposed by inadequate requests by the Post Office Department for the necessary amount of money to give the American people the postal service they should have. All of these ceilings have made for poorer service and have added to the total of unemployed in this country.

It seems to be entirely consistent that the Government should reverse the policy of artificial ceilings and hire the approximately 50,000 people who are necessary to provide good postal service. The needs of the Nation would indicate more jobs and the Federal Government has recognized this by creating programs to employ more people. Would it not be more consistent with good procedure to hire the necessary people for the work that should be done, remembering that the Post Office Department is necessary to our economy? The volume of sales and the volume of business is dependent upon good mail service. The Postmaster General recognized the importance and responsibility of the Post Office Department in a speech delivered to the United Rubber Workers Legislative Institute on March 17, 1965. In discussing the need for observation galleries, he stated:

"Each year, we carry through the mails literally trillions of dollars worth of money, negotiable checks and goods; post office money orders, stocks, dividends, utility bill payments, social security and Veterans' Administration checks, bank deposits, and charitable contributions. I have a sacred trust to see that this material is delivered safely and to protect the sanctity of the seal."

We do not share the Postmaster General's opinion on the need for observation galleries in post offices, but we do feel that he has a sacred trust to see that the mail is delivered safely and to protect the sanctity of the seal. We also believe that he has a further trust to see that the mail is delivered promptly with the greatest dispatch possible, and that the best of service should be maintained through the maintenance of adequate collection service and delivery service of both letters and parcel post.

Must Reason Perish?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my attention was drawn to an arresting article which appeared in Paris in Le Figaro, on March 25, 1965, captioned, "Must Reason Perish?" written by Mr. A. N. Spanel, the founder and chairman of International Latex Corp.

This is at once an appeal to reason and a brilliant defense of the traditional bonds that exist between the United States and France; historic bonds in freedom's cause sealed with the precious blood and lives of the best manhood of both our nations.

Mr. Spanel convincingly elucidates that a genuine Western unity must be rooted in aggregate strengths and shared purposes; and that the long-advertised Communist plan for world dominion can never be realized by them "without the unwitting collaboration of the free world itself"—a collaboration which unhappily is now measurable by the very dimension of the divisiveness that exists between France and the United States.

I am persuaded that heads of states in this world will long remember the essence of this paragraph in his article:

A great French diplomat and historian, Andre Francois-Poncet, wrote recently, in Le Figaro of March 11: "No one will be able to convince us that it is a good bargain for France to exchange American friendship for Soviet or Chinese friendship."

Here is a timely and important presentation for the American and French people. It is noteworthy that the following conclusion was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 12, 1961:

It is a certainty that no private citizen in American history has given so much of himself and of his company in thought, effort, and treasure, in order to establish stronger bonds between the people of the United States and France, as Mr. Spanel has since 1939.

Freemen everywhere will join in prayer that Mr. Spanel's plea for Western unity will be given top priority, now.

I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include this article by Mr. Spanel in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MUST REASON PERISH?

(By A. N. Spanel)

We live in an era of crowding change. The tempo of history has never been more rapid, the shifting patterns formed by the kaleidoscope of events have never been more startling. Yet there are values that do not change—values which provide the points of reference, stars to help chart the course, for those in any country called upon to steer the ship of state.

Most important among these fixed points in our Western civilization, the North Star for our guidance, has been human freedom. This is the central value for which the best blood in America, France, England, and other leading nations has soaked the earth, generation after generation, in Europe, Asia, and the Americas.

Let no one scoff at this as a mere truism. All the great principles we live by are truisms, haloed by centuries of thought, experience, and sacrifice. If we forget them or belittle them, we risk not only our lives but our souls.

Under all the political noise of our time, the defense of freedom wherever it may be menaced is still the paramount objective. People born into our civilization and nurtured on its greatness know this instinctively. And never has this knowledge been more vital than in our own generation, confronting the life-and-death challenge of world communism.

This is the writer's fundamental premise. We believe that a flourishing freedom, rooted in both faith and strength, is indispensable if we would safeguard all the values we cherish. We believe, moreover, that its preservation cannot and must not be the dedicated task of any one nation—not even if it is history's most powerful nation militarily and industrially.

To be specific, we believe that without the full participation of France in this task, France with all she symbolizes in thought, culture and human spirit, the decline of the West would be inevitable.

CRUCIAL CHOICE

We must ask ourselves: What are free men to believe and live by? Shall it be the pronouncement that "We have no perpetual allies and we have no perpetual enemies, our interests are perpetual"? Unfortunately this century-old piece of cynicism is currently caricatured in a Western "alliance" in a sad state of divisiveness, shadowed by hostility and mutual suspicions on both sides of the Atlantic.

Or shall it be a genuine Western unity, resting on shared strengths and purposes in freedom's cause? A unity that, when necessary, compasses even the sacrifice of immediate self-interest for the long-term self-interest of our common destiny?

In this context and for more than 25 years we have tried to interpret France and the French people to the United States—and the American people to France. In this long endeavor we have spared neither ourselves nor our substance in order that the enduring values for both nations might be made more visible through the fogs of irritations and misunderstandings.

Why have we done this? Because of a deep sense of the decisive importance of Franco-American friendship and solidarity for the fate not alone of our two peoples but of the whole world of freedom. What is at stake is not merely an "alliance" in the formal, legalistic sense but a traditional community whose common appreciation of freedom has been sharpened and shaped by united struggle against looming dangers.

NOISY DIPLOMACY DAMAGING

More than ever, we are rooted in the conviction that the basic values of freedom and human dignity, for which Frenchmen and Americans have paid so much in blood and treasure, must not be allowed to perish. A few months ago, as the dictates of Western unity were being more perilously obscured, we wrote in these columns:

"It is as though we were living in some other age and not in the present nuclear one where unity spells life—and disunity, death; where aggregate free world strength may save this world, and weakness born of disunity, bring on its destruction.

"What are the answers to some of the issues that are making a mockery of the Western alliance? They are certainly not to be found in the angry propaganda blasts to which people are subjected here and in Europe. Nor can differences between allies be resolved in atmospheres of noisy diplomacy designed to 'marshal' public opinion."

These words were written, as we said then, because "free-world nations on both sides of the Atlantic were supporting their own interests and views with a stubbornness that defies reason and consequence." We repeat them because that suicidal trend has become, if anything, more emphatic and irrational.

The tragic irony of it is that, despite surface changes and tactical moves to confuse us and to disarm us psychologically, the Communist commitment to the liquidation of freedom has remained inflexible. The Communist world remains faithful to its Mein Kampf for global dominion. It is today what it was from the beginning: a clear blueprint for the attainment of one Communist world.

And the Communists know—what too many of us seem intent on forgetting—that their plan can never be realized without the unwitting collaboration of the free world itself. Their strategy remains what it has always been: to subvert, divide and rule.

THE VALUES WE KILL

In the face of this ever-present threat, this great historic challenge to freedom, how utterly trivial are the bickerings, the commercial competition, the seeking for spheres of influence which more and more seriously are splintering our world.

A great French diplomat and historian, André François-Poncet, wrote recently, in Le Figaro of March 11: "No one will be able to convince us that it is a good bargain for France to exchange American friendship for Soviet or Chinese friendship."

By the same token, no one will convince Americans that anything which undermines what M. François-Poncet called "the sacred tradition of the age-old bonds between France and the United States" can be less than a disaster for both countries.

We stand at a crossroads of history where we dare not, if we still cherish human freedom as our principal value, allow considerations of short-term profits and prides to take precedence over the age-old imperatives of our common cause.

Every American schoolboy knows a wise statement made by Benjamin Franklin, an unflinching friend of France, as the Founding Fathers gathered in Philadelphia to sign the immortal Declaration of Freedom. "We must all hang together," he said, "or assuredly we shall all hang separately." That warning is as relevant for the free world peoples today as it was for the 13 American colonies in 1776. Our freedom is indivisible, and only the shortsighted or the frivolous would knowingly take part in its division.

What Americans call "isolationism" has become an anachronism in the shrunken, interdependent world of our times. Let us be clear on the fact that it is no less anachronistic for France than for the United States.

The View From Abroad Regarding the Employee Inventor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, during the recent symposium held on April 8, 1965, celebrating the 175th anniversary of the U.S. patent system, some of the most pertinent remarks dealing with the problem of the employed inventor and his legal relations with his employer were made by Dr. Fredrik Neumeyer.

Dr. Neumeyer, who is a citizen of Sweden, is one of the leading patent scholars in Europe, and has been making a special study of the employee-inventor's status for a number of years.

Formerly the head of the patent department of the Swedish State Telephone & Telegraph Administration, he has written on the subject in various European and international periodicals, and lectured on it in several European countries. In 1962 the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary published a study prepared by Dr. Neumeyer in the form of a committee print entitled "The Law of Employed Inventors in Europe."

In view of this extensive background, I am sure that my colleagues will find Dr. Neumeyer's remarks at the symposium related to the employed inventor to be most illuminating. Dr. Neumeyer is currently spending 1 year in the Department of Economics, Princeton University, as a visiting fellow. He is now working on a study concerning the legal and practical situation of employed inventors in the United States.

The text of his speech on April 8 is as follows:

I was asked to say some words about the view from abroad regarding the employee-inventor. I have to start out with some very short remarks as to the general situation in this country which always will have an impact on all of us in the Western World.

Every reader of a newspaper in this country knows what gigantic amounts of money are now spent by Government, industry, and universities, to keep scientific research going. We hardly react when we read that the President estimates Federal expenditures for the coming year at more than $15 billion (of which $6.9 billion will be spent on space projects). Industry-financed research and development was already in 1961, up to $4.6 billion (with more than $870 million spent in chemical and electrical industry each).

If we have a look upon who is going to carry out this work and to create all these new weapons, machines, vehicles, products, and systems for new power, more speed, better food or medicines, we see that the Federal Government (in 1962) employed totally more than 144,000 scientific and technical personnel, of which more than 50,000 were so-called R. & D. personnel. Private industry occupied at the same time totally more than 850,000 scientists and engineers, of which more than 303,000 were R. & D. scientists and engineers.

When we learn that by far the largest share of research performance in industrial firms is devoted to projects "advancing new scientific knowledge with specific commercial objectives" and to the translation of research findings into actual products and processes, we understand readily that there must be a steady stream of engineering innovation, often in the form of inventions which can be protected by patents.

Now, it is just as obvious that the vast majority of all these creative persons are employees of some kind. They work either for a Government agency, for an industrial corporation, or for a university as employer. The mutual relations between the employer and the inventing employees are not regulated by Federal statutory law in this country (except for certain specific rules regarding Government employees) and there exists an almost unlimited freedom of contract in the field (limited only by the Statute of Frauds or eventually by the antitrust laws).

In spite of the fact that the research activities in which inventions can be created do not have the same size in Europe as they have in the United States, European countries have laid down considerable efforts to regulate the legal relations between employers and employees making inventions. These efforts go in certain countries back to times before the turn of the century and the basic problems have been observed since the early days of industrialization. More than a dozen countries had promulgated legal provisions regarding rights and obligations of employed inventors. I would say that we have five different main systems which have been used to solve these problems in Europe.

I

The first and historically the earliest system was the insertion of provisions concerning employee inventors into patent law. This solution was adopted by Austria, Finland, the Netherlands, Italy, Canada, and Japan (in chronological order). A similar form of regulation was adopted by the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries through the enactment of laws regulating inventive activities based, of course, on the socialist economic system. Laws following the general principles of the Soviet concept of labor and of the place of inventive activity in planned industrial production were issued in Yugoslavia in 1948, in Bulgaria, Rumania, and the German Democratic Republic in 1951, in Poland in 1951–52, in Hungary in 1953, and in Czechoslovakia in 1957.

II

The second type of system was that adopted in Switzerland, where provisions concerning employee inventors were inserted into the law concerning contracts and the employer-employee relationship, the so-called law of obligations.

III

The third method consists in passing a special law devoted exclusively to the rights and obligations of employee inventors and their employers, and the legal problems arising from these relations.

The first modern law of this type was issued by Sweden in 1949, followed by Denmark in 1955 and the Federal Republic of Germany in 1957. In the course of the unification of law which is being carried out in the Nordic countries special enactments regarding employee inventors, based on the Swedish and Danish models, are being prepared in Finland and Norway.

IV

The fourth type of legal solution relies mainly on precedents established by courts and by official boards specially instituted to give guidance in the matter. This method, which is exemplified by the United Kingdom and the United States, must naturally be based on individual cases of legal conflict, either between two private parties or between a private party and the Government. Hence it cannot cover the whole field consistently and comprehensively, since the rules originating from these decisions depend necessarily on a number of accidental circumstances. From a detailed study of common law and judge-made law it is, however, possible to distinguish certain basic principles applicable to employee inventors, in the United States, akin to the principles operating in other countries.

V

Finally there are some countries where the relations between employee inventors and their employers are regulated by collective agreement, in some cases alongside one or other of the four methods outlined above, but more typically in countries where there is at present no specific legislation on the subject (e.g., in France). Collective agreements are, as a rule, concluded only for a limited period and may vary from one industry to another.

The oldest regulation by patent law (of the classical type) was in Austria. The Austrian Patents Act of June 11, 1897, contained the following provision:

"Workmen, salaried employees and civil servants are considered to be the authors of inventions made by them in service unless otherwise stipulated by agreement or by service rules. Any provision in contracts or service rules by which a person employed by an enterprise, or a civil servant, is deprived of the reasonable benefit of an invention made by him in service is without legal effect."

The Swiss legislator has brought the problems of inventions made in the course of employment under the law of contracts, which in turn is part of the Swiss federal commercial law. In 1911 the first Federal Law of Obligations, which had been promulgated in 1881, was basically revised and reissued as Book V of the Swiss Civil Code. In title X of this book we find a section 343 regulating inventions made by employed persons. This section provides as follows:

"Inventions made by an employee in the course of his work belong to the employer if inventive activity is comprised in the service duties of the employee or, where this

is not the case, if the employer has expressly retained a right to them.

"In the later case the employee is entitled to reasonable special compensation if the invention is of considerable economic value.

"When assessing this compensation regard must be had to the assistance given by the employer and to the use made of his property."

This single provision within the framework of a very extensive law leaves a number of problems untouched; some of these may be solved by the general law, which in Switzerland may mean the individual laws of 22 different cantons.

No statute concerning employees' inventions exists in the United Kingdom. Since, however, Great Britain was among the first European countries to establish the modern factory system in which the question of employees' inventions arises and to enact a law for the protection of inventions, the earliest judicial decisions regarding the origin, ownership, and use of inventions produced by employee inventors and their compensation date from the beginning of the 19th century. Disputes had to be brought before the courts for decision according to common law and the principles of equity. Many of the early questions in this field were answered according to the rules governing relations between "master and servant" and conditions of labor contracts (express or implied) as deduced from the judicial decisions of many centuries' standing.

An early British court problem (1825, 1834) concerned, for instance, the authorship of an invention where it had to be decided whether or not the servant was merely carrying out the instructions of his master, being no more than a tool for putting his master's idea into the tangible form which is the subject of a patent. Another basic question analyzed and decided by the courts was: Who is a servant? A skilled chemist, although his employment involved manual labor, was held not to be a servant. A contractor, being a person who has entered into a contract to execute certain specific work, is subject to the orders of his employer only to the extent that the terms of his contract so provide. He is not under the control of his employer.

Within this short program I can only add that practically any existing European law or court in this field, as a rule, considers seven questions as basic ones:

1. To which group of employed individuals (what category) does an employee belong?

2. What type of intellectual work has been produced by employees?

3. Has title or part of the title to inventions been acquired by the employer?

4. Which principles of compensation for such inventions have been used?

5. Which category of employee-inventions does apply?

6. Is it stipulated how controversies and differences of opinion in this field are to be settled?

7. What rules apply to inventions made by employed inventors after their employment has finished?

With these remarks I may just have opened the view through a small window, a view known more or less to experts in American corporations and Government agencies with wide international connections and interests. There is more to study and think about for people interested in an increased output of employee inventions and better labor relations everywhere.

President Makes Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, most military experts agree that with the current international balance of power between the Soviet Union and the United States, that a nuclear war could now only start by mistake or miscalculation. There perhaps is another way. If the Soviet Union commits itself indelibly to the North Vietnamese; and if North Vietnam is committed to the Vietcong; and if the United States remains committed to the people of South Vietnam, it could happen that a second nuclear war could be precipitated, not by the great powers, the United States and the Soviets, but by minor political segments in southeast Asia who are too inculcated with the stubborn mandarin personality to envision the results of this action extending beyond the Gulf of Tonkin.

My hometown paper, the Vallejo Times Herald, recently editorialized on this matter as follows, and pointed up the need for the U.S.S.R. and the United States to negotiate on their own terms forthwith.

PRESIDENT MAKES SENSE

President Johnson's speech to the world this week on the Vietnam situation reflects good sense. In effect, the Chief Executive was summing up what he considers the goals of the United States and the free world in that section of the globe. He also recognized the inescapable fact that the free world is destined to coexist with the Communist world or neither will exist.

The far-reaching suggestion by the President that the Soviet Union join with the United States in helping to develop this backward region of southeast Asia is a bold step. From a coexistence viewpoint, he is asking the other major power in the world to assist in insuring the freedom and development of southeast Asia and at the same time he has widened the breach between the Russians and the Chinese. His failure to specifically include Red China in his proposals indicates that he believes the Chinese are not yet ready to sit down and talk as a mature, sensible nation. These Chinese activity in Korea, their vilification of the United States and their growing criticism of the Soviet Union makes them a suspect participant in any peace talks.

President Johnson demonstrated the determination of the United States to carry on the war against the Communists if peace talks could not bring about a settlement in that area. He cited the U.S. position that the maintenance of Vietnam as a free and independent state is essential to the peace of Asia. He made it clear that the United States, under no circumstances, would withdraw from that area—only if a peace settlement with built-in guarantees can be reached.

The President and the rest of the Nation are wary of warfare, but the Nation generally is convinced that retreat in the face of Communist incursion can be fatal. Since former President Truman laid down the guidelines for containing Communist encroachment in all parts of the world, the United States and the free world have followed this no-retreat policy successfully.

Mr. Johnson, in reiterating this policy, has made it clear that in peace or war, the U.S. position in southeast Asia will remain firm.

An American Basketball at Moscow University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read a United Press International report today from Indianapolis, Ind., that the U.S. All Stars defeated the Soviet Union Nationals by a score of 78 to 73 in a basketball game that attracted nearly 14,000 fans. It was also noteworthy that last night's victory gave the American team a 4-to-1 edge in the five games played with the touring Russians.

I call this to the attention of my colleagues because of a pleasant experience which developed from a meeting I had with an American student at the University of Moscow when I was in Russia last November on a study mission with the Europe Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I enjoyed a pleasant conversation at the Prague Restaurant in Moscow with Mr. Edward Milton Ifft, of 239 Alameda Road, Butler, Pa., a member of the University of Moscow basketball team who informed me that the pleasure of his association with the university team was alloyed by the fact that the team played with a basketball produced in Red China.

Upon my return to the United States I related this experience to Mr. John B. Colt, export manager of A. G. Spalding & Bros., Inc., Chicopee, Mass., who agreed with me that it is not fit and proper for an American to be playing the American game of basketball with equipment produced in China and he thereafter forwarded as a gift a "Made in America" basketball to Mr. Ifft.

This week I have received from Mr. Ifft a very interesting letter which gives evidence that this basketball is being worked into a game of goodwill which could, ultimately, lead to possible exclusion of Red Chinese-made balls from the basketball courts of Moscow. I presume that in the current series of exhibition games here between Russian and American teams American-made equipment is used exclusively and I suggest that Russian coaches should be encouraged to advocate greater use of American equipment in practice sessions.

Given a choice I would prefer to play ball with the Russians than with the Chinese under American rules and with

American equipment and it is conceivable that out of this relatively minor experience there could develop a new phase in East-West relations. I have expressed my thanks to Mr. Colt and to Mr. Ifft for their participation and I am sure that all of us would welcome the opportunity to encourage and to develop a familiarity with American equipment on the part of Russian athletes.

Mr. Ifft has assured me that the American-made basketball which was sent to him by Mr. Colt will have a "long and useful career here at the Moscow University" in spite of the fact that his initial effort to have it used was not successful because of the reluctance of the opposing team to use an unfamiliar ball.

I am including here the letter I received this week from Mr. Ifft, together with my initial letter to Mr. Colt and his reply:

FEBRUARY 10, 1965.

A. G. SPALDING & BROS., INC.,
Meadow Street, Chicopee, Mass.

GENTLEMEN: During a recent trip to Moscow I made the acquaintance of one of our American students who is studying at the University of Moscow. He is a basketball player and a member of the University of Moscow team. However, in describing his experiences with that group he told me that his pleasure was alloyed by the fact that they were playing with a basketball produced by the Red Chinese.

It occurred to me that under the circumstances you might consider making a good American basketball available to Mr. Edward Milton Ifft, APO 664, Box M, New York, N.Y. not only to give him satisfaction, but to prove the superiority of American-produced athletic equipment.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

A. G. SPALDING & BROS. INC.,
Chicopee, Mass., February 19, 1965.

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: Thank you very much for your interesting letter of February 10th telling us of one of our American students studying at the University of Moscow.

I agree with you entirely that it is not fit and proper for an American to be playing the American game of basketball with equipment produced in China.

We are going to send to him a contribution of a really fine basketball just as soon as we determine from him whether their sport is played indoors or outdoors, as this would make a difference in the type of ball which we would supply.

My sincere thanks to you for bringing this matter to our attention.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. COLT,
Export Manager.

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MONAGAN: I am one of the American students you met at the Prague Restaurant in Moscow several months ago. At your suggestion, the Spalding Co. has sent me, free of charge, one of their basketballs to present to the Moscow University team, of which I am a member. I presented the ball to the team just before a game last week. Our players were quite impressed and were ready to use it immediately as the game ball. Interestingly enough, the visiting team was a bit afraid of a new and unfamiliar ball and we ended up using one of the usual Chinese balls. Nevertheless I have no doubt our basketball will have a long and useful career here at Moscow University.

I am very glad you followed up your idea, as it was indeed a fine gesture. Thank you very much for allowing me to join with you and the Spalding people in helping, in some small way, to increase the considerable reservoir of goodwill toward us which exists among the ordinary Soviet people.

Yours truly,

EDWARD M. IFFT.

Oklahoma Publisher Evaluates Rayburn Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding editors and publishers of Oklahoma, Mr. Ed Livermore of the Sapulpa Daily Herald, visited Washington recently for a series of editors' meetings.

Mr. Livermore is well known as a man of conservative and fiscally sound views. He described his reaction to the Rayburn House Office Building in his regular column, "The Editor's Notebook," for April 12, 1965, as follows:

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

(By Ed Livermore)

Congressman TOM STEED has taken a bit of ribbing about his part in the huge new Rayburn Office Building for Members of Congress. STEED served as chairman of the committee which approved the plans, contract, and specifications of the building.

A couple of weeks ago we took a tour of the building and visited several of the congressional suites. Frankly, we were surprised. We figured on finding something like the Taj Mahal, with congressional staffers tiptoeing around on belly-deep carpet. It wasn't quite that way.

In fact, we'd say the office accommodations in the Rayburn Building were not a bit beyond those you'd find for any $30,000 per year employee. And that's the salary you pay your Congressman these days. The working space and accommodations for staff members is a vast improvement over those archaic quarters in the Old House Office Building. But they weren't as good as you'll find in any of a dozen oil company offices in Tulsa. And the furniture was far from elaborate. The offices we visited seemed already just short of crowded for space.

Of course, the cost of constructing anything in Washington is unusually high. Five different unions are involved in delivering a lone typewriter table from the street level to an upper story. You can imagine what the building trades do in a situation where they get anything they want. With 190 million of us footing the bill, the sky's the limit. Walls of the Rayburn Building are thick enough to withstand anything short of an atomic blast, and the building will be there for at least a century, thank goodness. As to the operators for the automatic elevators, they were there and on the job. There's no denying that.

We didn't find a single gold doorknob, nor a room outfitted in silver mosaic. Being only a "common John" taxpayer, we fail to understand all we should about construction. But we'll wager they didn't waste one-tenth the dough on the Rayburn Office Building that was shot down the rathole on the Aswan Dam, and we've heard precious little out of the New York Times about that bit of economic ignorance.

One way to look at it—if we spent money foolishly at least American taxpayers got a hunk of it, thus making it just a detour on the way back to the tax office.

Article II of American Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, over the years there has been great interest manifested, discussions and controversy on the construction of the Constitution protecting rights of people.

One of the most controversial issues and sensitive problems today is with the sale, transportation, and ownership of firearms. For the last several years bills have been introduced in the Congress dealing with this subject matter. There were a number of bills introduced in the last Congress and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but due to the heavy schedule of the committee and the circumstances, hearings were not held. In this 89th Congress several bills have been introduced, some of which have been referred to our committee. Attention has also been given to this subject in the Senate.

Much has been said and written on the subject in the public press and other media. Mr. Alex Washburn, editor of the Hope Star, a daily newspaper in my native county and district, has written an interesting editorial in his daily column in which he points out some of the interesting and important questions in connection with this issue. I commend it to you and the Members of the Congress and invite your attention to it. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include it with these remarks in the RECORD.

ARTICLE II OF AMERICAN BILL OF RIGHTS

The first 10 amendments of the Constitution of the United States are known as our "Bill of Rights."

Article I guarantees freedom of speech and press and the right to petition—but right behind it is article II which declares: "The right of the people to bear and keep arms shall not be infringed."

It is important to know that our forefathers gave such prominence to arms among the common people because at this moment Congress is debating a Johnson-backed proposal to regulate all traffic in weapons.

Ostensibly the administration measure is supposed to halt the sale of weapons through mail-order houses, but the National Rifle Association asserts it goes far beyond this and is an infringement upon the rights of the people.

Harlon B. Carter, president, announced after the ARA convention last weekend that while his group opposes the administration bill it will support laws imposing heavy penalties for crimes committed with firearms.

The ARA speaks with the voice of commonsense. The administration is put in the foolish position of saying that because there are motor accidents therefore the sale of

automobiles should be prohibited. But ARA argues in effect: "Nonsense—make and enforce severe penalties against irresponsible drivers."

Government has taken away from the private citizen the right to own gold.

Now it proposes to forbid the private ownership of firearms.

It is a paradoxical situation which reminds me of what I saw in Mexico City years ago (1940). The government of then-troubled Mexico had thousands of police, but so little confidence in their loyalty that they wouldn't permit the policemen to carry guns.

But our situation is vastly worse, because in our country the suspected ones are not the police but the people.

Centerville, Iowa, Newspaper Cites Need for Constitutional Amendment on Presidential Disability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, on April 13 the House of Representatives gave its approval to a constitutional amendment that provides for the orderly transfer of executive power in case of Presidential disability.

The amendment also contains provisions to insure that the office of Vice President will not be come vacant in the event of a President's death, as has occurred 16 times in this Nation's history.

The Senate, on February 19, approved an amendment similar in intent but different in wording. Both versions of the amendment have been sent to a conference committee, and I am hopeful that the differences in the two proposals can be resolved to the satisfaction of both Houses.

Of course, great care should be taken in drafting a constitutional amendment. The wording should be such that no doubts are cast on the meaning or intent of the provisions. Any constitutional amendment, before it leaves the Congress, should be as close to perfection as is possible.

At the same time, there is no reason for undue delay. I sincerely believe that the vast majority of Americans are in favor of an amendment on Presidential disability and continuity. And I am equally certain that if such an amendment is approved by the Congress it will be ratified by the States.

As evidence of the popular support for this amendment, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the April 22, 1965, issue of the Centerville Iowegian of Centerville, Iowa. The pending amendment, as the editorial points out, deals with vitally important constitutional questions that should have been resolved long ago.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the editorial:

DISABILITY PROGRESS

It is of no small importance that a proposed constitutional amendment to deal with presidential disability has passed its first major hurdle on the way to adoption. Until now Congress has been far too lackadaisical about this and the related problem of assuring that the office of Vice President shall not be vacant.

Both matters are encompassed in the bill approved by an overwhelming House majority. The public interest would be served if the Senate would now speedily pass a similar measure and thus get the amendment proposal to the States for ratification. Though there is little doubt of ultimate approval, no undue delay is warranted.

This is underscored by the fact that events of recent history—President Eisenhower's severe illness while in office, and the assassination of President Kennedy—have clearly shown the gaps in our present basic law on these questions. As things stand, the Constitution does not provide clearly for procedure in case of presidential disability and makes no provision at all for filling a vice-presidential vacancy at the time it occurs. Current law on presidential succession, which places the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate next in line, is quite unsatisfactory.

The measure approved by the House is a rational approach to handling these problems. The Senate bill, though it differs procedurally, is similar. There has been some objection that these proposals are too detailed, that any amendment should instead be written in the broadest possible language to permit flexibility under changing conditions. But since the present inadequacy of law on these points springs in part from a failure to spell out the matter in detail, the present approach seems wise. Let us hope that the matter can be brought swiftly to a conclusion.

Estes Kefauver Memorial Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago this body lost one of its most distinguished former Members and the people of the State of Tennessee lost one of their ablest and most outstanding Senators at the death of Estes Kefauver.

He left the Congress with an excellent record as a legislator and champion of the common man. He left Tennessee a better place in which to live, do business, and raise a family because of his efforts in our behalf.

Estes Kefauver was a man of many talents and interests. One of these interests was in the field of conservation and water resource development. Much of the work that has been done for Tennessee by the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Corps of Engineers, and other waterway programs was advanced significantly by Senator Kefauver.

He was especially valuable in securing congressional approval for the J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir named in honor of the late Member of this body from Nashville.

Today the Corps of Engineers is developing a 416-square-acre park on the Priest Reservoir in Davidson County, Tenn., on the Hamilton Creek embayment between the communities of Una and Smith Springs. This park will be developed for picknicking, boating, fishing, and other recreational activities.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to name this park the "Estes Kefauver Memorial Park" in honor of the late Senator from Tennessee who did so much for this project in Nashville and similar projects across Tennessee.

Our Irish Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, at the annual St. Patrick's Day dinner of the Irish-American Social Club held in Waterbury, Conn., on March 14, 1965, the Reverend William Hart, M.S., of the LaSalette Seminary in Cheshire, Conn., delivered one of the most scholarly and moving addresses that I have ever been privileged to hear. Combining great industry, profound scholarship, and exquisite literary skill, Father Hart produced a literary masterpiece which will long live in the minds of those who had the good fortune to hear him.

In order that this product of Father Hart's skill and devotion may have the broader audience which it deserves, I place it in the RECORD following these remarks.

"THE CURSE

For the lady who threatens to leave if I talk more than 30 minutes. A curse from "Righteous Anger": "May she marry a ghost and bear him a kitten, and may the High King of glory permit her to get the mange."

A curse I particularly like by my favorite Irish dramatist, J. M. Synge.

"Lord, confound this surly sister,
Blight her brow with blotch and blister,
Cramp her larynx, lung, and liver,
In her guts a galling give her.
Let her live to earn her dinners
In Mountjoy with seedy sinners:
Lord, this judgment quickly bring,
And I'm your servant, J. M. Synge."

OUR IRISH HERITAGE

Right Reverend Monsignor, Your Honor the Mayor and Mrs. McNellis, distinguished Member of the U.S. Congress, Mr. MONAGAN and Mrs. Monagan, friends; this evening I choose to speak to you about two great periods in Irish history: Catholic Ireland of the "Celtic Twilight" and Christian Ireland of the 19th-century "Irish Literary Revival." Though almost a thousand years separate those two periods, taken together they form the most significant part of our Irish heritage, a heritage we may not ignore without loss to ourselves and to Western civilization.

We are our heritage. To know it is to know ourselves. To know ourselves is to realize our mission in today's world and to prepare for our destiny in tomorrow's. So the piper here calls the tune and he plays "Ourselves To Know."

What is said here tonight bears witness to the power of the faith, the honor of the Republic, the nobility of the arts. What is said, gratefully acknowledges our debt to the Protestant patriot Anglo-Irish of the revival. Finally, all is said that we may foster in our young an informed interest in and an honest love of Ireland.

P. H. Pearse, leader of the Easter Week insurrection of 1916, was a schoolmaster and a poet. His little poem "I Am Ireland" will be my guideline. Listen to it.

"I am Ireland.
I am older than the old woman of (Bare).[1]
Great my glory, I that bore Cuchulain the valiant.
Great my shame, my own children that sold their mother.
I am Ireland.
I am lonelier than the old woman of (Bare)."

GREAT MY GLORY

Early Irish saga literature reveals a pagan Celtic world of barbaric splendor: wild with the heroic deeds of Conchubar, Cuchulain, Ossian and Finn; sad with the tragic beauty of Deirdre, the children of Lir and the sons of Tuireen; dark with the dread druid's pagan superstition; a world of kings roaring drunk at the mysteries of life and death; queens laughing and weeping in the wind's rage; warriors bare-fisted fighting the ocean waves; poets loving the land, the hills, the cliffs and clouds; old men talking in a dark night of Samhain and waiting for better days.

Into this Celtic world of a hundred-hundred kings came Patrick in 432 with bell, book, candle, cross and shamrock to win the five-fifths of Ireland: Ulster, Munster, Leinster, Connaught and Meath, to the three personed—one God. Into the Celt's natural virtues of courage, piety, imagination and zeal, Patrick poured the grace of the supernatural and the miracle of the Irish was worked. Almost overnight the island of kings and warriors became an island of saints and scholars.

Within a century of Patrick's death a tidal wave of monasticism rolled over Ireland. From Enda's lonely monastery perched on the cliffs of Inishmore far out in Galway Bay to Kevin's Bed in Glendalough, from Finnbaar's in Cork to St. Brigid's in Kildare, and beyond Clonmacnois across the sea to Columcille's Iona and Aidan's Lindisfarne on the English coast—Irish monasticism flourished. Theirs was a penance and prayer so fierce and austere that today historians chill to read what heroic and often puritanical virtue flamed on the lonely coasts of Connaught, Donegal, Derry, and Meath. From the ridge of the world those great Celts set out in their frail boats, exiles for Christ, sailing to the Orkneys, the Faroes, even to Iceland. Through England, France, Italy, and the Germanies their restless, sandled feet stirred the dust and leaves while their hearts quickened souls to the word of God. Jewels in a Tara brooch, their monasteries treasured and preserved the wisdom of the ages while barbarian hordes thundered the forests and plains smashing the lamps of learning, darkening the plain with ignorance, sinking man in the muddy instincts of the brute. The monastic roll call of these warrior exiles is a Gaelic litany of brilliants: Aidan of Lindisfarne, Colum of Iona, Colman of Luxeuil, France, Gall of St. Gall, Switzerland, Fursa of Perrone, Cilia of Wurzburg and Fergal of Salzburg.

GREAT MY SHAME

Yet, as so often happens, while these men grew hard and thin in exile, back home their brother monks grew fat and soft, and the sheep ran wild. Even though a man like Malachy of Armagh, and orders like the Cistercians and Augustinians initiated countless reforms of Irish life and morals, still a little more than a century after Brian Boru's Good Friday victory over the Vikings at the Battle of Clontarf in 1014, down in Rome overzealous Irish reformers were complaining to Pope Adrian IV about "the enormities of the vices of their people." (Informers in our midst even then.) It was a sorry day. Henry II of England had long been trying to hoodwink the Pope into letting him add Ireland to his English empire that he might proclaim, as he said, "the truths of religion to a rude and ignorant people." Henry got what he wanted. A Papal Bull called on the Irish to receive Henry as their lord. The Irish, naively thinking they were just exchanging one high king for another, gave him the Gaelic greeting of "a hundred thousand welcomes."[2]

MY OWN CHILDREN THAT SOLD THEIR MOTHER

Shame. With Henry's permission the renegade Dermot of Leinster raised an army of Anglo-Normans, mostly Welsh and Flemings, and with Strongbow (Richard de Clare) stormed Waterford, struck across the mountains to take Dublin and then sat down with Henry to divide the land between the Normans and a few native kings who paid tribute to the Crown. With sword and castle the Normans maintained the land given, but in the end through marriage and custom the Irish absorbed them. Eventually the Normans became ipsis Hibernicis Hiberniores—more Irish than the Irish themselves. Not so the English.

Till the advent of Henry VIII, Gaelic Ireland managed to survive by rebellion, conflict, the intrigue of politics and by war itself. With Henry, however, and his brilliant bookish, bastard daughter "Bad Bess," all hell broke loose in a religious war: Protestant England and Catholic Ireland. Pius V issued a papal bull depriving Elizabeth of her claim to rule either Ireland or England. From that time on the Irish cause and the Catholic faith were indissoluble linked. Nevertheless Elizabeth wore the crown and poor Erin, the crownless queen, sat in the dust, chained hand and foot, her broken sword fallen, and mournful memories lying heavy on her heart.

Under Elizabeth 210,000 acres of Irish lands went over to English Protestant owners and tenants for planting. On Christmas Eve 1601 O'Neil and O'Donnal were crushed at Kinsale. Gaelic Ireland was finished. What Elizabeth had begun, Oliver Cromwell completed. He performed the autopsy and conducted the requiem. Before that monster left Ireland, famine, plague, deportation, and wholesale slaughter cut the population in half. 850,000 Irishmen disappeared. The Irish papist landowners who didn't go to heaven, hell, or Connaught, went in bondage to Boston and in black slavery to the West Indies. Twenty million acres of the best Irish land were given outright to Protestant settlers. By 1691 the "wild geese," the Irish aristocracy and the best fighting men, had flown to the Continent. The conquest was complete. Gaelic Ireland was a corpse.

I AM LONELIER THAN THE OLD WOMAN OF BARE

All that makes a people a people the new colonists set out to destroy: the land, the people, the culture. A fundamental schism was created in Irish life: Catholic Ireland and Ascendancy Ireland, the Connaught cabin and the Big House. A Protestant nation was born and it was built on the infamous penal code that denied every Catholic Irishman the three things most dear to every freedom-loving man: (1) the effective ownership of his land, (2) an active voice in his country's government and public life, (3) the free exercise of his faith. For all Irishmen, Catholic and Protestant, the penal code was a catastrophe.

That situation forced the Protestant Ascendancy to create an Anglo-Irish culture of their own—if they could; but the competition with England was too strong. Too many of their best minds—Sheridan, Swift, Goldsmith, Burke—gravitated to London. The 18th century made it abundantly clear to the Big House that if there was ever to be a distinctly Irish culture again, the Anglo-Irish alone could not provide it. With London as the political and cultural capitol, to be Anglo-Irish could mean nothing.[3]

I AM IRELAND

By the end of the century, 1798, Catholics and Protestant, Irish and Anglo-Irish, finally realized that Irishmen would never win their civil, religious, and cultural rights—that Ireland would never be free—until Irish and Anglo-Irish put aside their religious differences and united on republican principles. This was part of the conviction that inspired the insurrection of 1798 under the leadership of Protestant Wolfe Tone. The insurrection failed. Tone was sentenced to death. Death took him but not before the torch had been passed to William Orr, to the Sheares brothers of Cork, to Robert Emmet, to Russell and others. While these Anglo-Irish patriots were dying for Ireland at the very time that their own class was losing more and more of its political and economic power, Irish Catholics for the first time in a century were finding leaders in their own ranks.

A young lawyer, a man of the people, a Gael of the Gaels, Daniel O'Connell, came walking out of Kerry. He found his people slaves, he left them men. In 1829 Daniel O'Connell, the first Irish Catholic member of the British Parliament, won the Catholic Emancipation Act. Civil rights returned to the people. Fifty years later, after the great Famine and the abortive 1848 revolution of the Young Irelanders, Michael Davitt won back the ownership of the land. At long last the right to ownership, the right to worship. One right to win back—the right P. H. Pearse proclaimed from the Easter footsteps of the GPO in 1916—the right "to national freedom and sovereignty," to the "Irish Republic as a Sovereign Independent State."

Great my glory, I that bore Cuchulain the valiant. Great my shame * * *. The future was bright. Charles Stewart Parnell, champion and chief of the Irish, was leader of the Irish Party in the British House of Commons. He was well on the way to winning home rule for Ireland when politics and not ethics, money and not morals, had Captain O'Shea on Christmas Eve 1889 file divorce proceedings against his wife citing Parnell as corespondent. When the divorce was granted the following November, Parnell was ruined. Clergy and mud-cabin laity, English liberals and Irish turncoats tore him to pieces. In a year he was dead and so it seems was the hope for home rule. Politicians saw his marriage to Kitty O'Shea and his death as ignominy for them and Ireland. Not so the writers of the Irish revival. To them Parnell was still the chief, the slain prophet, like to the heroic Cuchulain in his loyalty to land and clan, like to Cuchulain even in his marital infidelity. Thus the Anglo-Irish writers filled their poems and plays with the memory of valiant Cuchulain and in that way caused the driving spirt of Parnell to live on so that later, looking back, Yeats could ask:

"What stood in the Post Office
With Pearse and Connolly?
What comes out of the mountain
Where men first shed their blood?
Who thought Cuchulain till it seemed
He stood where they had stood?"[4]

Never would the writers have been able to do so much for the freedom of the people and the nation had not their own scholars and historians of the Royal Irish Academy begun the study of ancient Irish literature.

---

[1] I'm not sure of the spelling or punctuation because I took this from a phonograph recording.

[2] Cead mile failte.

[3] This paragraph is a partial paraphrase and condensation of ideas expressed by Vivian Mercier and David Greene in their introduction to "1,000 Years of Irish Prose" (New York: Grossett and Dunlap, 1961, pp. xi-xii.

[4] From "Easter 1916."

Petrie, O'Curry, O'Donovan, O'Grady, Joyce, and Hyde opened up the ancient literary heritage with their many translations of Irish texts into English. Thus Yeats, Synge, Lady Gregory, and AE, reading and realizing the scope and grandeur of Celtic Ireland were able in their plays and poems to recreate for readers of modern English, a literature and mythology which had been dead for nearly a thousand years. Through their works they excited a new respect for the Gaelic past and drew this forth to a new respect for the Irish peasantry—the rightful heirs of old Ireland. Once again the country people became conscious and proud of their heritage. Farmers and herders, fishermen and tradesmen, beggars and ballad singers, began to realize that the greatness of the past was here with them in the present. Self-respect, pride of blood and love of nation, dignity and personal worth—all that England had robbed, surged back full tide into Irish hearts. Men reasoned: if the simple life of a farmer or fisherman could on the stage be made the stuff of great tragedy and riotous comedy, then there must be true value in that humble life. If our writers and dramatists can stand with the best, then why not we? If greatness is ours, then we can fight and die for that one gift without which there is no lasting greatness—the freedom to be the masters of our own destiny. "There are many things more horrible than bloodshed; and slavery is one of them." [5]

At the head of the literary revival stood William Butler Yeats. He was its priest and its soul. The Abbey Theater was his church and his pulpit. It was a people's theater, an Irish theater, because it was involved in the people's cause. The language, the rhythms, the emotions, the imagination, the life and hope of Irish peasant life became the heart of the Abbey.

Irish history, old and new, came alive on its stage. Out of the Celtic world came "Deirdre" to the call of "AE." From the famine, Yeats brought forth "The Countess Cathleen" and from the insurrection of 1898 the lovely "Cathleen Ni Houlihan"; both were Ireland and "she had the walk of a queen." While Lady Gregory brought back the romantic days of "Gods and Fighting Men," J. M. Synge captured the living tragedy of the western isles in "Riders to the Sea" and boldly portrayed the laugh and tear, the sneer and beer, at the heart of Connaught life in "The Playboy of the Western World." As the Irish would have it, the sure test of an Abbey success was to have a riot in the theater. One riot went on for a week.

Well, riots and all, we owe a great debt of gratitude to the writers not only for their contribution to the nationalist cause but also for having initiated an honest criticism of Irish life. Gone was the romantic conception of "Ould Ireland" as always heaven, holy, and honorable. When she walked like a queen they said so; and when she talked like a bitch they said so. Gone too was the 19th century "stage Irishman," that vile caricature of the national character whom G. B. Shaw described as "generous, drunken, thriftless, with a joke on his lips and a sentimental tear always in his eye" and indulged by English audiences "because he flattered their sense of superiority." Again, Yeats and Synge must be thanked for paving the way and providing the models that the present generation of Irish authors could feel were native to Ireland and worthy of imitation. They cleared the way for O'Casey, O'Connor, O'Faolain, O'Flaherty, Clarke, Joyce, Stephens, Behan and a host of others. Finally, those Anglo-Irish writers are to be thanked for the nobility they brought to their art and the consequent glory to Ireland. Though their art was national in that it revealed the ideals and identy of a nation, it was not propaganda. They did not adulterate art, they ennobled it. While Yeats introduced a new method of acting and speaking, while Willie and Frank Fay raised shopkeepers and gasmen to the stature of renowned actors, while Synge and Lady Gregory fashioned a new poetry and Irish rhythms for their plays, the world stood in awe to see so much genius burst upon it, in so short a time, and from so small a place.

Thus today students in American universities and people of culture everywhere "are interested in modern Irish literature not because it either flatters or lessens the Irish in the eyes of the world, but because its achievement is formidable and significant. It produced two dramatists of genius in Synge and O'Casey, the most original and most controversial novelist of our generation in Joyce, and William Butler Yeats, whom T. S. Eliot described as 'the greatest poet of our time.'" [6]

What is our Irish heritage? It is faith in God and trust in His divine providence. It is faith's power to make the weak strong and the timid bold; the power to inspire courage and to march on in the face of a thousand difficulties. It is the Irishman's simple trust in God's providence and His holy will. The hierarchy of our own archdiocese is witness to the continuity of our Irish Catholic faith: O'Brien, Donnolly, Hackett, and Hines. The three cardinals of our eastern seaboard are a triumvirate of Gaelic aristocracy: Cushing the warrior, Spellman the statesman, Sheehan the educator. Finally in a world that has made a business and a neurosis out of security and insurance against every eventuality but eternity itself, the Irishman's simple trust in divine providence is the one voice calling that it is still God's world.

What is our Irish heritage? Commitment to and involvement in the body politic of the Nation and the world. Only a people who have lived the slavery, injustice, degradation and chaos of a captive nation know the priceless value of freedom, justice, equality, and order. Only a people of 700 years captivity can adequately appreciate the terrifying emotional forces and passionate beauty of a captive race violent to be free. No wonder that Ireland, schooled so long in the struggle for sovereignty, should raise up children dedicated by faith and blood to the preservation of the inalienable rights of man, committed to the due process of law, and anxious for the health of the entire community. This is the political heritage come down from Wolfe Tone, from Emmet, from O'Connell, Davitt, Parnell, Connolly, Pearse, and J.F.K.: courage, patriotism, dedication. Any wonder then that so many Irish are in government: Dempsey the Governor, the boy from Tipperary; Mulrevy, the attorney general, Bailey and Quin and more? Any wonder that the distinguished Representative of the Fifth Congressional District should be the recipient of the Award from Captive Nations? Any wonder that the mayor of this city should spend himself and be spent in the hundred daily seeming trivialities and serious realities heaped on the shoulders of a public servant? He knows only too well that setting the table properly can be as important as the dinner itself; that the simple name chosen for a civic endeavor can be as important as the endeavor itself. Lastly, our Irish heritage is literature. We are a people with a touch of the poet; a taste for the beauty that is a reflection of the divine; a love of nature that has Irish coins struck not in the image of man but in the image of the salmon, the stallion, the deer, the greyhound. No need to repeat the distinction won by the Irish in poetry, prose, and the theater.

There is need only to emphasize the truth that Irish life: religious, political, cultural, has always fought for the spiritual values, the enduring supernatural.

As a race, that has been our destiny: to defend the primacy of the spirit; to assert that man is in the image of his Maker and not the chance creature of blind evolution and revolution. In a world: standarized, mechanized, commercialized, vulgarized, materialized, automated, and ZIP-coded—the Irish sound the trumpet to the free, the beautiful, the natural and the supernatural, the humane and the spiritual.

The Irish heritage: the power of faith, the honor of the Republic, the nobility of the arts.

In the spirit of an Irish battle, I began with a curse; now I close with a toast.

"THE MIDLAND TOAST

"Long roads and stony ditches
And here's to nice girls
And to hell with riches."

"THE CONNACHT TOAST

"Health and long life to you,
The woman of your choice to you,
Land without rent to you,
And death in Erin."

[5] P. H. Pearse, "The Coming Revolution," November 1913.

[6] Mercier and Greene, p. XXIII.

Gold and Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting statement on gold and the balance of payments which was written by Mr. Bryan Stevens, a resident of my congressional district.

The statement follows:

GOLD AND SANITY

(By Bryan Stevens)

The time has come to bring some degree of sanity and objectivity to the current public discussions of gold and the U.S. balance of payments. Columnists, politicians, and bankers have discussed the issue from many points of view, but none have offered much more than opinion, and very little of the opinion is supported by evidence.

There are two main aspects to the so-called gold problem. The first is the simple quantitative fact that there is not enough gold in the world to carry the burden as medium of exchange in international trade. The second aspect is in the history of U.S. gold policy. A review of U.S. policy since 1933 will show the inevitability of the reduction of U.S. gold reserves to around $5 to $7 billion over the next 5 to 10 years.

The story of gold goes back into antiquity. During the Middle Ages it served as a medium of exchange, but when the new economic conditions of the 14th and 15th centuries brought about a widespread system of money transactions, the gold supply was found to be inadequate for this purpose. It was then that the fabled alchemists began their attempts to transmute lead and other metals into gold. Long before the turn of the 20th century there was no longer enough gold even to serve as an international monetary reserve. The belated result was a worldwide demonetization of gold in the 1920's and 1930's. The problem became more acute during the period ending in 1959 as new gold production was less than half the increase of

world monetary reserves. The rate of disparity has accelerated in the last 5 years.

During the 1920's the dollar and the British pound sterling temporarily solved the gold shortage, but this ended in disaster in 1929–30. After World War II, the entire burden fell upon the dollar—a burden that cannot long be borne by the dollar alone.

The second consideration in the gold controversy is the history of U.S. gold policy. In 1933 the United States went off the gold standard. Shortly after, the price of gold was pegged at $35 per ounce by act of the Congress. This price was somewhat above the market price of gold at the time, and the United States began to acquire gold at a rapid rate.

U.S. gold reserves in 1933 were $4,036 million. One year later, at the new price of $35 an ounce, the reserves had doubled for a total of $8,238 million as other nations, business organizations, and individuals sold their gold to the U.S. Treasury.

By the mid-1930's, preparation for World War II was beginning. The United States became the arsenal of democracy. European nations turned to the United States for munitions of war. Foreign currencies rolled into the United States, and were converted back to the buying countries for gold. By 1940, the U.S. gold horde had reached $21,995 million, an increase of 500 percent in 7 years.

In the post-World War II period, purchases from the United States for rebuilding European economies, and the paying off of debts owed to the United States brought the U.S. gold reserves to a peak of $24,564 million in 1949.

As the European powers began to achieve stabilization of their economies around 1957–58, U.S. gold reserves began to diminish, for these powers began to buy back the gold they had sold to the United States in the 1930's and 1940's, as the expansion of international trade throughout the world increased the need of all nations to increase their gold reserves. In addition many new nations made their appearance on the international scene. They too required gold reserves. A more normal international distribution of the world gold supply began to develop. That trend is still in effect, and will probably continue over the next few years.

It seems ridiculous to assume that postwar recovery and reconstruction of the war-torn countries, and the tremendous expansion of postwar international trade could take place without being accompanied by a redistribution of the world gold supply, which in 1963 was only $42,285 million.

The recent propaganda effort by France in publicizing the purchase of several hundred million dollars' worth of gold from the United States is inconsequential. It was an attempt to panic the financial and business community in the United States in order to discourage American investment abroad. With less than $1 billion claim on U.S. gold, when France owes the United States more than that in long-term loans, it is obvious that the effort was an attempt to embarrass the United States in order to slow U.S. private investment in French and European industry.

To actually do damage to the American financial structure, even if it were possible, would drag the rest of the Western economies down, also, including the French economy. The French Government was and is aware of this fact, and it is aware of its own limitations in this respect. Otherwise the attempt would never have been made. The French business community would never have allowed it.

There is, however, a real problem. The American dollar cannot expand with the pace of the expansion of international trade. The dollar can carry the burden of acting as the international medium of exchange and reserve for only a few more years. There must be some effort now to call a conference to develop an international banking and clearinghouse system and an intergovernmental currency before international finance is strangled.

A Wyoming Valley and an Airplane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in my current copy—April 1965—of the AOPA Pilot, I was pleased and proud to note an article, entitled "A Wyoming Valley and an Airplane." This magazine is the official publication of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association.

The article tells of the Intermountain Manufacturing Co., of Afton, Wyo., and the high performance of its product—the CallAir agricultural spray plane. This airplane has been the subject of much recent national attention. In addition to the presently cited article, the CallAir was presented along with color cover pictures in the May 1964 issue of Flying and the March 1965 issue of the AOPA Pilot. These articles prove that industry cannot find a better home than in Wyoming.

Hunting, fishing, room to expand, a labor supply of happy and historically conscientious hard-working people, the intellectually stimulating pure air of Wyoming, the beauty of the Rocky Mountain area, nearness to such fabulous recreation areas as Wyoming's Yellowstone and Teton Parks—all this couples with a most favorable tax base.

Take heed, leaders of industry, the following article may provide a most important example of how you can grow with Wyoming:

A WYOMING VALLEY AND AN AIRPLANE

(By Frank A. Tinker)

(NOTE.—Mutual cooperation of Afton townspeople and CallAir help preserve an agriculture plane factory and the economy of Star Valley, Wyo. Young workers resist lure of big city and stay home.)

Afton, Wyo., is almost a typical western valley town, which is to say that it's a better place than most to live in. Situated in the middle of the State's western Star Valley, it has depended historically upon agriculture, lumber, and its excellent cheese for economic health. Across the main street hangs a huge arch comprised entirely of elk horns, giving some idea of the hunting available in the mountains nearby.

But this alone is not what makes the rather remote town unique. At its southern extremity squats a heterogenous collection of buildings, some old and some still under construction. From this rude complex emerges, in numbers, a fine agricultural aircraft.

"Here?" ask the summer tourists as if our whole automobile industry did not originate in a rural woodshed. "So far from everything?"

Yes, here. And not far at all from things that really make living pleasant. For Afton builds the CallAir agricultural plane, whose gross sales last year topped a million bucks.

A few years ago Afton was also regrettably typical of many other communities in all sections of the country. As the valley paper's assistant editor explained, "The dairy farms had kept us going as long as milk was heavily subsidized. When that ended the farmers either upgraded their production or were forced out."

A sad number were in the latter category. Although many would have rather stayed, particularly younger men, in order to earn a living they had to abandon the small family farm and head for the metropolitan regions and the faceless existence of a city wage earner. By the early 1960's the population of the area had declined by some 20 percent. Stores in Afton stood empty, the ominous signs of ghost town status were visible, and Lincoln County itself was declared a depressed area.

Worst of all, it appeared that the aircraft plant, small in size but large in its effect on the local economy, was about to close for good even in the face of a burgeoning demand for good agricultural planes.

The first Call plane had been built in the 1930's by Reuel Call (AOPA 88470), native of the area, who placed his factory here for the good reason that it was his hometown. In those days competition was not so fierce and perhaps the construction of aircraft was more a labor of love. Later, type certificates were issued to the standard Call passenger plane and the Interstate Cadet, which were sold to a limited general market without a great deal of promotional whoop-la.

But in 1953 a young A and E machanic named Herb Andersen arrived in Afton from Los Angeles and signed on with the company. Being short on funds and long on love for aircraft, a chronic combination, Herb lived for a time in the factory loft. A box of crackers and a bottle of milk, gulped alternately, provided what breakfast was needed—and could be afforded. After hours, he worked on the job of redesigning the Call plane into an aerial applicator. Call finally saw the model which Herb had made, was moderately impressed, and the A-5 was eventually put into production. Since that time the name CallAir has meant ag planes to most people.

Not long after, Herb Andersen went on to Mooney and would up as vice president in charge of production. In 1960 Piper enticed him away to help with their new facility in Vero Beach, Fla. Meanwhile, back in Star Valley, the Call operation had been incorporated, the management had changed hands, and the company had gone into a severe decline. So severe, in fact was this setback that CallAir had closed its doors, passed into receivership, and its assets were scheduled to be liquidated at public sale. It looked as though the end of the line had arrived not only for a name in aircraft but for one of the few remaining props to the valley's economic structure.

This was a crisis which faced—and faces still—similar areas from Pennsylvania to Oregon. One thing it had, however, which some of the others may have lacked, was a group of resident businessmen who retained faith in the small business concept which had sustained CallAir through many lean years. Long before Federal offices, with appropriate fanfare, had set up the many redevelopment agencies for certain areas, these citizens had instituted some of the same self-help features which later became standard Government procedures. One of these was an investment fund, the Star Valley Development Association, which now came to the assistance of CallAir.

First, it was ascertained that if sufficient private local capital was forthcoming a Small Business Administration loan could also be obtained. Second, and perhaps most important, in order to assure investors of a salable product and an efficient operation, it was recognized that capable and imaginative management had to be obtained. A call went out to Herb Andersen, on the assumption that the Afton life and the challenge

at CallAir, which had now become the Intermountain Manufacturing Co. (Imco), would compensate for the smaller financial returns offered. Carl Petersen (AOPA 229386), who had assisted in the original drawings and flight testing of the old Call aircraft, was persuaded to sign on as sales manager and given a free hand in merchandising.

At the receivership sale there was exactly one bid, which was that of the local combine. The money which the association gave went to stock purchases, backing bank notes, and direct loans to the company. The Small Business Administration loan helped to meet current expenses and obtain materials. There were, in addition, enough usable parts and supplies on hand to form a backlog for the new company.

The outlook, however, was anything but cheery. CallAir's buildings, when Herb Andersen moved in, were full of junk and their water pipes were frozen solid. Local hope may have been high, but faith was scarce. There was available in the meager budget just $30,000 and 6 months to get a redesigned plane approved and on the market.

Back to the loft. The small staff worked and lived at the plant. When the day's labor went beyond endurance, they rested on the floor before starting again. But the old CallAir A-5 gradually gave way to the reworked A-9. This prolonged brain-busting session began in April of 1962, continued through the summer, and reached its apex that fall. It was November when the A-9 was given its certificate under part 8. Armed with promising data on the new plane, Carl Petersen took off for an applicators' convention in Texoma and the home staff held their breath.

A week later the company had orders for nine of the new craft and they were in business. The first A-9 came off the Afton line in January 1963, and for the next few months one was made every 2 weeks. In March, this climbed to one plane a week. As the A-9 became better known and its sales pitch reached far markets, orders came in an encouraging crescendo. After a year the production line was turning out a plane every 4 days; in July of last year it became two a week. Now it is one A-9 every other day, all spoken for at the time of production.

Along with the rise in output, of course, went an increase in employment. This now stands at about 75 full-time production workers and will reach 100 some time this year under present plans. In a village which numbers about 1,300 persons and a valley with a total population of 5,500, such a payroll obviously can mean the difference between complete stagnation and at least comfortable stabilization. The year 1963 saw gross sales of about $500,000. Last year this passed an even million, and 1965's projected income is $1,750,000.

Such sales, obviously, have hinged on the economical production of a plane which can hold its own in a competitive market, one which is both attractive and efficient. Neither the writer nor AOPA are in the business of plugging any particular brand of aircraft, but to give some idea of how an aircraft is sold and a community therby benefited, here are some of the features which were considered essential to the new CallAir:

First, the old arrangement which placed the hopper beside the pilot in the wide cockpit may have had some good points, but visual appeal was not one of them. The 170-gallon hopper thus was shifted to a safe place below and in front of the pilot, allowing the pit itself to be narrowed.

Control of the older plane, although good, required considerable control pressure. Through redesign of the fuselage and wing, including the addition of Hoerner tips, this was lightened to the point that pilots used to the former product have a tendency toward overcontrolling the A-9.

Pilot safety, a key selling point in all agcraft these days, became a fetish at CallAir. "We want the pilot to be assured of survival in all ordinary application accidents," says Herb Andersen. "Except for diving the plane deliberately into the ground, he's pretty close to that right now."

Fuel tanks were moved to the wing, reducing the danger from fire. An emergency dump valve allows the hopper to be emptied in 5 seconds. A fuel warning light and bell are activated when the pressure drops to 1 pound, giving the pilot 15 or 20 seconds to switch tanks. The chrome-moly birdcage over the pilot will support four and a half tons without bending. Wire cutters are mounted on gear and windshield, and the aft control section was altered so that a wire cannot catch in the gap between vertical stabilizer and rudder. The spruce main spar is itself considered a safety factor, since it shears completely when excessive force is applied rather than transmitting loads to other parts of the structure.

These and other improvements seem to have accomplished much of the purpose. In the past 2 years 10 CallAir planes have been demolished in application accidents, several in South America where pilot experience is often low. Yet in producing this impressive pile of junk the only serious injury to a pilot has been a broken leg and some burns.

Then there is the matter of spare parts. CallAir uses no dealers or distributors. Each A-9 owner is given an easy-to-read parts manual, from which he can order direct from Afton. The procedure has been streamlined, and airfreight speeds many deliveries. When Carl Petersen, who spends much of the year bouncing from one sales prospect to another in an A-9, ruined a wing in Memphis, Tenn., it took just 2 days to get a replacement to him.

These are the kind of selling points which make any applicator do more than glance through a brochure, and which eventually mean that Star Valley may provide a good home for more people. It is a continuing fight which can never be relaxed, as the small CallAir management staff well know. This past year, when Jim Robertson had finished his outstanding job of converting standard Cessna products into STOL craft, he received a summons from CallAir to do somewhat the same for the A-9. This was deemed particularly advantageous to the company, since about half of their production now goes overseas, often to countries where strips are short and terrain steep. Flight tests are now being completed on the new full-span lift flap, which permits the A-9 to operate with its full payload of 1,350 pounds from a 1,000-foot strip. At the same time, full certification under part 3 is being pushed, primarily for the benefit of oversea trade. In addition, a two-seat trainer version is under development.

Obviously, there are economic handicaps to locating in Star Valley, primarily those of freight costs. The company's Lycoming engines come from Pennsylvania, spruce wood from Oregon, machined parts from Florida, and aluminum from California. To offset these costs, however, is that of Wyoming labor.

"We certainly aren't exploiting cheap labor here," says Herb Andersen. "Rather, we have designed our production around that which is most valuable."

In doing so, he has faced the same bugaboo which concerns many similar manufacturers. This is the huge gap existing between college-trained engineers and completely unskilled laborers. There seems to be no middle ground nowadays. A skilled machinist, for instance, is a rarity; semiskilled operators, who can seldom set up their own machines, have taken their place and limit their field to one task. This is middle-cost labor, potentially abundant in places like Star Valley where a high school education is the average and inherent skills and intelligence high. To set up a completely automated plant with high-cost labor would involve considerable capital and require expensive training of a limited number of persons, probably at the manufacturer's expense.

"To be successful in this locale, I believe an operation such as ours must be designed around our semiskilled labor," Andersen concluded. "We take persons with no experience in industry, train them for specific jobs, and plan our production with this situation in mind."

Pay here is understandably lower than in metropolitan areas, averaging about $350 a month. But the exodus from Star Valley was not only stemmed by such wages; former residents have actually returned from higher paying jobs in places like Los Angeles.

"Sure, I made a hundred dollars more there," one lad reported. "But it cost me half that much just getting back and forth to work."

And what about the hours wasted in such travel, and such an environment? Significantly, only one CallAir employee left in 1964, and one was fired.

Here may be the crux of the matter. More and more Americans are growing weary of watching the mirage of high pay disappear into the mists of high living costs. Many have attachments to places like Star Valley, or would like to have such attachments. There are advantages both to employee, employer, and to the country in avoiding the pileup of our population in megalopolis.

In order to avoid this, smaller communities must come up with marketable products. General aviation manufacturers, perhaps more than any comparable segment of industry, have managed to do this.

Mooney is located now in Kerrville, Tex.; Meyers in Tecumseh, Mich.; Bellanca in Plainview, Tex.; even the giant—Piper—is in Lock Haven, Pa., and Vero Beach, Fla.

Certainly there are limits to this success. Only in Government reports do such stories appear in simple black and white. Star Valley will be hard pressed for some time to come to hold its population and will depend on a sawmill sponsored by the same private development group as much as on the aircraft plant.

But the general picture has improved immeasurably in the last 2 years. Today, the world's population, like it or not, is booming. Food production is becoming more and more of a problem which must be met with aerial application methods. It is of more than local interest that this problem, international in scope, will be solved at least in part by the production of planes in a Wyoming valley. And, in helping to solve this larger riddle, the people of Star Valley have gone a long way toward solving one of their own.

Population Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my concern with the problems of population growth I would like to insert the following article written by Sid Moody, of the Associated Press, and printed in the Kalamazoo Gazette of April 18, 1965.

This article clearly explains the imminence and enormity of the world pop-

ulation problem. I believe this essay offers badly needed understanding of this important field:

POPULATION CRISIS: WORLD'S NO. 1 PROBLEM—ONCE TABOO SUBJECT NOW OF VITAL CONCERN

(By Sid Moody)

She wore a pair of men's shoes, muddied from the yard and its skeletons of junked cars. She rocked shyly in a tiny chipped chair as she cradled her youngest in her lap. A safety pin did duty for a broken zipper. The sun, angling through the open door of her cabin, caught her blonde hair when she looked up to speak.

She was a mountaineer's wife, in Kentucky, with six children. But she was everywoman, too. A world symbol, a world headache and, maybe, a world heartache.

She did not know it, but she was speaking for many millions when she looked, nervously but with the resolution of a mother's love, across the doorway and told of her harsh decision.

"I thought about it a lot, and I decided it's more of a sin to bring children into the world that you can't take care of than to stop having them."

Her name was Ruby Gray, 25, wife of a man with a game leg who hasn't worked in months and who supports his family with food given free by the government. She is also the child of a gathering world crisis: overpopulation.

Ruby Gray embodies it all: too many children, dwindling food for them, no means to buy more. In their despair Ruby Gray agreed to her husband's decision to have himself sterilized. That was their private decision. It will not be the world's. But the problem is the same and the world with sudden awareness had come to see its immensity, complexity, its urgency.

POSSIBLE SEEDS OF WORLD WAR III

The problem is an unbalanced equation in which billions of mouths do not equal nutrition, health, work to sustain life in decency. It is a problem that holds in its relentlessness the possible seeds of world war III.

Can mankind's greatest gift become his greatest curse? It is a heated argument. But now it is being argued.

There is some—but not much—opinion that the unprecedented world burst of population is a base upon which to build a utopia of consumption and prosperity. Others see it as a burden of such pressing weight as to condemn the world's poor to lives of static futility—or worse.

And while the argument goes on among experts of economics and demography, the science of population, the governments of the world have seemingly overnight been moved to action.

Reversing an earlier position, the United States has offered on request to help foreign birth control programs with advice—but not contraceptives. The United Nations reflects increased world concern in considering what role it should play in family planning. Several countries have widespread birth control programs underway.

Science has made several major breakthroughs in contraception, and a family planning expert exhibited the other day a new contraceptive he felt could change the history of the world. No one has quite been able to say why it works, just as no one can accurately forecast where the surging birth rate, rightly called an explosion, will end. Hence the argument.

The argument has a bitter arithmetic, questioned by some, admitted to be only an educated guess by many. But the figures are there.

Babies are being born faster than a person could name them. There are 192,000 births every day, according to the United Nations, over 60 million a year, more than the population of Great Britain. At the current 2 percent annual rate of increase, world population in 600 years will be one person per square yard. Anthill arithmetic. An impossibility. But where will it stop? And how?

POPULATION MAY DOUBLE BY 2000

U.N. projections for the year 2000 show a world population, now 3.3 billion, of about double that. Mexico, with a current population of 40 million, will have 71 million by 1980 at its present 3.1-percent rate of increase, one of the world's highest. It will be 13.5 billion in 200 years if the same rate is sustained, says the National Academy of Sciences. It took all of history for the world population to reach 1 billion by the 1840's.

The reason for the swift change in population is twofold: high rates of birth, especially in the underdeveloped nations, and a steady drop in the death rate which accelerated astoundingly after World War II due to the developments of science.

Because of this postwar surge, a high percentage of the world's people is young. In Latin America over 40 percent of the people are under 15, noncontributors requiring education and food supplied by their producing elders. But if almost half the population is not producing and the country is already poor, as most of the Latin American nations are, how can this huge segment be supported?

That is the immediate crux of the population problem; not how can the underdeveloped nations achieve the promise of rising expectations they feel their new independence entitles them to but how, in fact, to keep their standard of living even at its present marginal level?

The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations says that up to half of the world's people suffers from hunger and malnutrition. By 1975, says the FAO, world food supplies will have to be increased by a third "merely to sustain the population at its present unsatisfactory level." A reasonable improvement would require a 50-percent increase by then and a tripling of food production by 2000.

Should famine come, surely the great food producing nations would not stand idly by. But it would require 20,000 freighter shipments a year to take care of India's current food deficiency.

The Population Reference Bureau in Washnigton, a statistic-gathering organization, estimates that if all the huge U.S. food surplus were distributed to the world's hungry, it would provide each person the equivalent of 2 cups of rice every 17 days.

But overpopulation is not only a matter of hunger. It is economics, the economics of too little for too many. A country with an annual 3-percent increase in population must increase its national output by that much yearly just to stay in the same place. But it takes an estimated 9-percent increase in capital investment to produce a 3-percent increase in national income and where is the investment to come from in unindustrialized countries?

Under India's first two 5-year plans, national income was increased $8.9 billion. But in the same period population increased 85 million, so per capita income went from $59.64 to only $69.30.

Philip Hauser, University of Chicago sociologist, notes that even if the world's wealth were equally distributed, per capita income would only come to $223.

If the have-nots are to have highways and schools and factories and hospitals, they must have money. And much of what little they have is spent on just staying alive. Ceylon, for instance, spends about $50 million in valuable foreign exchange each year to buy rice.

In 1959 President Dwight D. Eisenhower said the U.S. Government had no business in the field of population control. Yet last January, President Johnson said in his state of the Union address:

"I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity of world resources."

The Agency for International Development had already begun giving advice on population problems and helping foreign nations, on request, with fertility control.

Similarly, Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser said as recently as 1962 a nation's population was one of its main natural resources. Overpopulation is now considered by the Egyptian Government to be a matter of life and death. Faced with a doubling of population in 27 years, Egypt has begun distribution of birth control pills.

India allocated $56 million for a family planning program in its current 5-year plan, five times the amount in the last one.

"We must stabilize the population at no more than 700 million," says Deputy Health Minister D. S. Raju. "Beyond that we will not be able to cope even all our measures to improve the economy work out."

South Korea, with help from the Population Council, is trying to cut its birth rate a third by 1971 through new birth control clinics.

Japan, where birth control has been national policy since 1949, has had 20 million legal abortions in the last 15 years as the birth rate fell from 34.3 in 1947 to 16.5 last year.

In Latin America, dominantly Catholic, birth control is nonetheless a topic of increasing concern. "Up until very recently," said an Argentinian physician, "It was bad manners to talk about the whole issue. Things have changed in the past year."

RED CHINA UPS MARRIAGE AGE

Even in the Communist world population has drawn official attention. Marx preached—and the party line still does—that overpopulation is a capitalist plot perpetuated by industrialists to insure a ready market of cheap, surplus labor. Under socialism everyone works, so the gospel of Marx goes, hence the problem simply evaporates. Except it hasn't.

Red China, which in the next 15 years will add an estimated population almost equal to that of the United States, has raised the official marriage age and imposed rationing restrictions on parents who have more than three children.

Even in the Soviet Union, where birth control is legal, orthodoxy has softened. "Marxist-Leninists have no objection against humane measures over decreasing the birth rate," a Government official said recently.

The U.N. General Assembly now has before it a report of the U.N. Population Commission which said the organization "must play a wider and more active role in population fields than it has played up to the present." Recommendations included increased U.N. aid on request in compiling census statistics, research into fertility and the effects of population on society.

"The common view of governments," said a U.N. official, "is that the population problem is acute. The difference of opinion is what to do about it."

In the United States the amount of public and quasi-public activity in fertility control has spread quickly and widely. In Corpus Christi, Tex., the Federal Government has given $8,500 to run birth control clinics in poor areas. Oregon is considering a State welfare department request for $135,000 to buy birth control devices. Nineteen counties in Tennessee have family planning clinics. Only one had them a year ago.

Twenty-five family planning projects have applied for Federal funds, and Sargent Shriver, Director of President Johnson's antipoverty program, says if the clinics have local support, the money will be approved.

The stated purpose of much of this is to reduce the rapidly growing amout of welfare to mothers with many dependent children. It is less expensive to give birth control services, the argument runs, than to spend money to support impoverished children.

Nationally, aid for dependent children is costing a reported $1.5 billion a year for 4 million children compared to $639 million for 2.2 million youngsters in 1955.

Despite the urgency of the world population problem, a relative pittance is being spent on it.

"Just listing the causes of death would fill a huge volume," says Robert Cook, director of the Population Reference Bureau. "There is only one cause of life." Yet for the billions spent on mortality control, only a few millions go to study the very source of life. The Ford Foundation, probably the biggest single source of funds in fertility research, awarded grants totaling $3 million last year.

Yet, it is through research, many feel, that some way will be found to the perfect birth control device, one that is cheap, easily used, long lasting and could meet Roman Catholic Church objections that any mechanical interference with procreation is a sin against natural and moral law.

In recent years the church has softened its position by permitting couples a measure of natural birth control, the so-called rhythm method. And now, confronted with radical new developments in birth control as well as the growing crush of population, the church has shown itself to be anything but a monolith. A dialog has moved into the open, one in which conflicting opinion is strongly held and remarkable for its outspokeness.

CHURCH HASN'T CHANGED STRICTURES

The church has not changed its strictures against birth control. But a papal commission has begun studying the whole area of fertility and population. And, as Pope Paul VI said last year:

"[Birth control and population] is an extremely grave problem. It touches on the mainspring of human life. It is necessary to face attentively this development. And this is in fact what the church is doing. But meanwhile we say frankly that up to now we do not have sufficient motive to consider out of date and thus far not blinding the norms given us. Therefore, they must be considered valid at least until we feel obliged by conscience to change them."

If that statement reads less than dogmatically, the addresses by three liberal cardinals last October at the Ecumenical Council sounded almost revolutionary.

One, Cardinal Seunens, of Belgium, said, "Of course there is no question of modifying or challenging the truly traditional teaching of the church. But no one epoch can boast of having fully perceived the unfathomable riches of Christianity."

He urged the council to "meet the immense problem posed by the present demographic explosion. The matter is difficult but the world is waiting. I beg you, my brothers, let us avoid a new Galileo case. One is enough for the church."

Patriarch Maximos IV, of Antioch, spoke of "hundreds of millions of human beings condemned to a life that is without hope" and torn between their faith in the church's teachings and their inability to support more children.

"Are we not in the right," he said, "to ask if certain official positions are not to be attributed to outdated conceptions?"

Where its introspection will carry the church is impossible to say. But one of the factors the church must be aware of is a seeming gulf in certain areas between its theory and the practices of the faithful. Italy, almost universally Catholic and where contraceptives are illegal, has one of the world's lowest birth rates. Why? "There are two things Italians do not regard as sinful," said a non-Italian priest, "missing Sunday Mass and using contraceptives."

In heavily Catholic Chile, a doctor has estimated that between 35 and 49 percent of pregnancies end in abortion, a sin.

Dr. C. Lee Buxton, Yale physician who is fighting to repeal Connecticut's birth control law, received a letter from a young Catholic father.

"I have a very personal interest in birth control because for lack of it in one way or another I lost a wonderful wife and mother of six children. She was only 31 years old when she died 8 hours after our last child was born. What do people who find themselves in our predicament do? Man and woman living together in a life of matrimony are also living a life of sin because they use means to prevent further childbirth. Is the health of your wife and children to be disregarded?"

In 1951 Pius XII, in affirming the legitimacy of regulation of offspring through the rhythm method, said, "I may even hope that science will succeed in providing this licit method with a sufficiently secure basis."

Maybe it has.

Two new contraceptives—the pill and a little plastic curlicue called an interuterine device—IUD—have brought worldwide population control to the point of possibility. And they have raised profound questions for theologians.

Dr. John Rock, a Catholic gynecologist who was a leading developer of the pill, notes the pill does not kill the female egg but simply interrupts its monthly cycle.

"Should this be stigmatized as temporary sterilization?" Rock asked in his controversial book on birth control "The Time Is Now." What is the difference between a conscious effort to avoid conception by rhythm and use of the pill? Both, he says, are in exercise of the intellect vis-a-vis nature to safeguard the family.

And, he says, "the frustration of nature, far from being immoral is man's vocation."

Both Catholics and Protestants condone birth control for various social, medical and economic reasons. "They disagree on methods, not objectives," he says.

Apart from its philosophical implications the pill has come into widespread use throughout the world. Widespread ignorance, however, has frustrated its maximum effectiveness. The wife must maintain sufficient motivation to take it daily. Science hopes to find a better pill that can work over longer periods. Or a pill or injection to sterilize temporarily the male.

IUD SAID 98 PERCENT EFFECTIVE

The IUD is another breakthrough. An official of the Population Council pulled one from his desk drawer the other day. "It only costs pennies to make. But I say, and I believe, that this little piece of plastic is going to change the history of the world."

For reasons that medicine does not fully understand, the IUD is 98 percent effective in preventing pregnancy. It can readily be inserted in the uterus—and taken out should pregnancy be desired.

Because it is cheap, effective, does not require continuous motivation, the IUD is receiving scrutiny from many of the world's underdeveloped nations including South Korea, Pakistan, Ghana, Nigeria, Egypt, Tunisia, India, Jamaica and Malaysia.

In the city of Taichung on Formosa an intensive pilot project by Nationalist Chinese health officers with help from the Population Council has indicated such a concerted effort could reduce the birth rate eventually by almost half. The program is being extended to rest of the country.

There are dissenters, not only as to the morality of mass birth control but its effectiveness.

Asks Monsignor Knott: "What scientific evidence exists to prove that (birth control) programs in the past have succeeded? No contraceptive program to date has been accepted in any effective manner by people in the backward parts of the world."

A spokesman at the Population Reference Bureau agrees to the extent that reaching and motivating people presents one of the most difficult aspects of the population boom.

"The $64,000 question is how do you get the word to people, that the third child is enemy to the first and second?"

The task may not be insurmountable. A survey in Guatemala, for instance, showed that 91 percent of parents wanted to space their families. "The requests by mothers for sterilization are truly incredible," said Dr. Roberto Santiso, head of the department of gynecology at Latin American hospital in Guatemala.

Under the South Korean program, 90 percent of couples interviewed wanted less than four children but had more than five.

Many thousands of men have been voluntarily sterilized in India under its family planning program.

"The most significant preliminary finding of Taichung," said the Population Council, "is that people do not have to be motivated. The program suggests that a planned effort inspired fertility control—not so easily or as fast as death control—but nevertheless substantially."

The motivation does not come from an awakening to the landslide of humanity some fear is forming. The motives stem from a source as personal as the purpose of procreation itself: the family.

"From the Indian village to Scarsdale, N.Y.," says an officer of the Population Council, "it is the economic welfare of the family, not the health of the mother or the world, that's primary. Scarsdale wants to send its children to Harvard. The more children, the remoter their all going to Harvard is. The Indian just wants to be able to feed them. What we are after is to have people have as many children as they want—when then want."

SURVIVE ON GOVERNMENT FOOD

Back in Kentucky a county doctor ground his jeep into four-wheel drive as the vehicle wallowed through mud up to its axles. It took an hour to reach the two-room hovel where Dora and Everett Canada and their seven children live.

They survive on Government food and whatever Mrs. Canada and the children can make sawing wood or plowing the scraggly fields of their neighbors with their one mule. Canada has been unable to work for 2 years, even if there had been work.

Over the swaybacked bed where three of the children slept was a fragment of a page from "The Night Before Christmas" showing a rosy-cheeked ma and pa sleeping blissfully waiting for St. Nick. The page had been tacked over a crack to keep out the raw late winter wind.

Mrs. Canada, 39, but who looked 20 years older, knew about population explosions.

"My mamma had 11 kids. I never wanted as many as that, but I didn't know there were ways to use your head knowledge to stop from having them. It makes me feel so bad toward myself."

The Canadas have the same answer the Grays had. He is going to be sterilized under a privately financed program operating in the Kentucky hills.

And history will have its own answer, too.

"The reduction of births will happen, some day, somehow," says Alfred Sauvy, a French demographer.

True. A cup holds only so much water. The issue is whether the trend will turn voluntarily because of the efforts of man's intelligence—or because the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse did, indeed, ride again.

Percentage increases of food supply needed during 1958–80 to meet anticipated requirements in various regions of the world

Regions	Percentage of projected population growth, 1958–80	Per capita increase of food supply to provide a minimal satisfactory present diet	Total increase of food supply, 1958–80 required to meet present food requirements and population growth	Rate of annual increase needed, 1958–80	Recent annual rate of increase in food supply
Underdeveloped countries	56	33	107	3.4	2.7
Latin America	85	5	94	3.1	2.5
Far East	55	41	86	2.9	3.0
Near East	62	17	90	3.0	3.1
Africa	36	28	55	2.0	1.3
Developed countries	28		28	1.2	3.6
World (average)	48	14	69	2.4	2.9

POPULATION BILL FILED BY REPRESENTATIVE TODD

Third District Congressman PAUL TODD, JR., Democrat, Kalamazoo, has introduced a bill to focus attention on the population explosion problem. His bill calls for Assistant Secretaries in the Departments of State and of Health, Education, and Welfare to coordinate Federal research and information dissemination efforts. The bill also authorizes President Johnson to call a White House Conference on Population Problems.

Now in the hands of the Government Operations Committee, TODD's bill is drawing support from some Michigan Republicans, notably National Committeeman John B. Martin, and praise for his courage from Representatives ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, of Bay City, and JAMES HARVEY, of Saginaw.

Warsaw Ghetto Uprising: A Commemoration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, April and May this year mark the 22d anniversary of a great and tragic event. It was during this period in 1943, from April 19 to the end of May, that a few thousand Jewish survivors of the Warsaw ghetto staged a desperate last-ditch resistance to the Nazi campaign of extermination and for a brief time and against overwhelming odds demonstrated a type of courage and heroism that the world has not very often seen.

When the Nazis and Russians moved into Poland at the opening of World War II, Poland was divided for another time. Forthwith the Nazis rounded up the Jewish population and forced many of them into the Warsaw ghetto, swelling its numbers to about 450,000. In the summer of 1942 the Germans began their campaign to exterminate the Jews. And during July and August of that year they systematically removed the Jews from the ghetto, placed them in prisons, and eventually destroyed them in their crematoriums.

As the numbers of the imprisoned Jews dwindled, the survivors were determined to stage a last-ditch resistance against the Nazis. Open resistance began in January 1943, but on April 19, the eve of the Jewish Passover, the Nazis attacked en masse and in desperate fury, and with tanks, artillery, and troops, they set out to destroy the ghetto completely. For a month the battle raged and even in the summer token resistance could still be detected, but the ghetto was reduced to rubble by the end of May and most of its inhabitants either killed or shipped off to concentration camps.

It is well for us to commemorate the anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising; for here is a tragic demonstration of man's courage in the face of a fearful and overpowering enemy. But more important, Mr. Speaker, such commemorations can serve as a continuing reminder to us all of the extremes to which man can go when his soul has become filled with racial prejudice and racial hatred.

In recognition of this fact, the Essex County Warsaw Ghetto Commemoration Committee has arranged a memorable commemoration for Sunday evening, May 2, at the Weequahic High School Auditorium in Newark, N.J. The event is being sponsored by 55 Jewish and non-Jewish organizations and will be attended by 2,000 persons, including State and local officials and representatives of religious groups. Among the distinguished speakers will be Dr. Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress; Mr. I. Goldberg, director of the New Jersey Service Bureau for Jewish Education; and Mr. Kenneth Gibson, cochairman of the Business and Industrial Coordinating Council. Three local choral groups will participate. There will be a dramatic presentation of "The Witness" followed by a candlelighting and memorial service.

As we mourn this tragedy, may we be inspired to a greater dedication to our Judeo-Christian ethic.

Our Continuing Struggle in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, today it was my sad duty to write a letter of condolence to the widow of one of my constituents killed recently in Vietnam—Capt. Kenneth L. Dean, Jr., U.S. Army. This morning, Captain Dean was laid to rest at his alma mater—the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He was killed on April 20 as a result of gunshot wounds while accompanying a Vietnamese Army unit engaged in a fight with the Vietcong. When he attempted to move a Vietnamese soldier, he was hit by hostile small arms fire. At the time of his death, he was a first lieutenant and was recently posthumously promoted to the rank of captain. His widow, Mrs. Sheila Dean of Dobbs Ferry, has received two Government citations—one from the President and an Army Honorary Service Award.

Captain Dean died defending freedom and honoring our commitments to free nations to protect them from the spread of world communism. While his death is a deep loss to all of us, his widow and other Americans can find some comfort in knowing that he did not die in vain. His life, and those of other American servicemen killed in Vietnam, were given to afford the people of Vietnam the opportunity to once again become free from intimidation and harassment by the forces of aggression. He died so that one day the Vietnamese will be able to decide their own future.

His tragic death could have been prevented if the Vietcong and the Chinese Communists had accepted President Johnson's offer to achieve peace in that strife-torn area through unconditional negotiations. The gauntlet has been tossed and for the moment it appears that world communism will accept nothing less than the total destruction and control of their smaller and peaceful neighbors.

The President, in his speech at Johns Hopkins University earlier this month, placed the responsibility for the quest for peace squarely upon the Communists. Their failure to respond clearly indicates their desire for continued hostilities. These forces have been accurately identified as the perpetrators of continued bloodshed in Vietnam and their unwillingness to discuss this matter at a bargaining table demonstrates their continuing desire to establish a totalitarian empire in southeast Asia.

There is so much which can be done in this area to assist all peoples to gain a healthier, better educated and more prosperous and peaceful life. As I stated in this distinguished body earlier this month, this war certainly grows as much as anything from the frustrations of hunger and deprivation. The responsibilities of all nations in southeast Asia, and most particularly in Vietnam, are to build rather than destroy, to educate rather than subvert, to heal rather than wound, to cultivate rather than plow under. The quest for peace is the goal for which we are all fighting.

Mr. Speaker, let us never forget the sacrifice of Captain Dean and the other gallant Americans who have shed their blood in this quest for peace. All Americans, and all the peoples of the free world, should stand in honor to Captain Dean and his comrades and pay tribute to their enduring contribution to world peace through the giving of their lives.

The United States Stands Firm in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us can be proud of our President in his determination to protect the people of South Vietnam until the aggressors agree to sit down at the peace table.

We cannot and must not allow the North Vietnamese Government to conquer her neighbors because of our failure to defend their right of self-determination. Abandonment of our policy in Vietnam would be submission to the will and whim of the Chinese Communists everywhere.

Those who demand our withdrawal in the face of aggression recognize this fact in their refusal or inability to offer an alternative to our present policy.

The following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of April 28, 1965, supports the position of our Government in what is truly a war that we do not want, together with an article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, of the same date demonstrating the support the President has with regard to our policy in Vietnam.

The articles follow:

THE PRESIDENT'S REPLY

President Johnson set out yesterday to answer the vociferous critics, both at home and abroad, of his policy on Vietnam, and also the Communist aggressors, who seem not yet to believe he means what he says. He did so clearly and convincingly.

He upheld his decision to bomb North Vietnam by explaining that his previous policy of restraint was misconstrued as weakness and therefore served to encourage the Communists in their attacks. He replied to criticism of the bombings by pointing out that air attacks were restricted to legitimate targets such as bridges and munition dumps, thus to reduce the power of the Communists in the north to take the land and the lives of those who are resisting them in the south.

He recalled some of the lessons of history—the lesson of Munich, where retreat encouraged Hitler to advance; and the lessons taught by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, who stopped aggressions by standing firm. These evidently had receded in the mind of President de Gaulle when he went before the television cameras almost at the same time President Johnson did. The French leader declared himself against foreign intervention in the internal affairs of another state, yet he refused to endorse the American effort to turn back intervention.

It should now be doubly clear, following Mr. Johnson's speech at Baltimore, that the United States will not retreat; that it will continue to hit the enemy both in the north and south, without recourse to nuclear arms; and that it will continue to fight until the Communists are convinced that armed attack will not yield domination over others.

Once convinced of that, they may be ready for a negotiated settlement. And when they are, they will find the United States ready. The President extended to any of their governments (as distinct from the rebel Vietcong in South Vietnam) another invitation to come to the conference table at any time and any place.

They can have peace if they want it; or continued war and punishment if they insist on them before they are persuaded that they have nothing to gain by their present course of aggression.

FIRM POLICY BACKED—PRESIDENT MAINTAINING HIS CONCENSUS ON VIET

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—There is every reason to believe President Johnson will widen and hold a decisive consensus in support of a strong policy in Vietnam.

He has one special asset. He is occupying his usual stance at the center. His policy is wedded to neither extreme. He rests on two pillars: clear determination to defend as long as the aggression continues; clear willingness to talk whenever Hanoi will start talking.

There are other factors which contribute to the President's support:

The Gallup poll shows that the minority which wants Mr. Johnson to step up the war more than balances out the minority which wants him to quit.

His senatorial, newspaper, and professional critics can offer no acceptable alternative. They are prepared to accept Chinese Communist domination of all southeast Asia. This is an alternative the American people will not accept without trying to do something about it.

The President has the backing of many Democrats in Congress (his offer of "unconditional discussions" won the approval of the ADA) and most Republicans. His Republican support runs the whole gamut from Barry Goldwater to the GOP leadership in Congress, including Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN and Representative GERALD FORD.

Despite the honest, emotional student pickets and the college teach-ins, this leaves Mr. Johnson in a strategic position. And here is the evidence:

The Gallup poll finds that 29 percent of the country would like to see the United States withdraw completely from Vietnam, stop the fighting whatever the effects, and start negotiations whatever the outcome. It also finds that 31 percent of the country favors stepping up military activity, and going the full distance of declaring war.

The President embraces neither extreme. He does not propose to withdraw or even cease defending. But he will start talking even while defending. He does not seek a solution by military means alone, but he will use military means until Hanoi is willing to use the conference table.

Where does this leave Mr. Johnson with respect to a public consensus? To obtain further evidence of the public's attitudes toward the handling of the situation in Vietnam, Dr. Gallup put this question to the people in the same survey cited above: "Do you think the United States is handling affairs in Vietnam as well as could be expected, or do you think we are handling affairs there badly?"

The result was that by a ratio of more than 2 to 1 the Amercan people approve of the Government's handling of the situation. As the air raids on the North have become more intense, public opinion has remained firm in its support because 2 months ago support for the President was at the same 2 to 1 ratio.

If there is any threat to the President's expanding and holding this consensus on Vietam, it would only come, I think, from any sign of weakening in his policy.

Republican support is crucial to the Johnson consensus. The President knows it. This is why he has been so appreciative in private and on the telephone for what Senator DIRKSEN has done in his behalf. He wishes that some Democrats were even half as helpful.

But the President knows that at any sign of appeasement, intended or accidental, Republican support would vanish like a rocket into outer politics. As they did to President Truman over Korea, the Republicans can never call this "Johnson's war," but they could fight and possibly win election if it ever turned into "Johnson's appeasement."

The President is determined that it won't.

Law Day, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, our American history has been marked by a valiant struggle for equal justice under law and the preservation of individual liberty and dignity.

Recent events throughout the world and within our own borders make it clear that this struggle is far from over—that our commitment to the concept of individual liberty and freedom under law is constantly being challenged.

The American legal profession, of which I am proud to be a part, is making an outstanding effort to give citizens a deeper awareness of this continuing challenge and to alert us to our responsibilities as free, law-abiding people.

One means of doing this is the annual observance of Law Day, U.S.A. on May 1. The theme of this year's observance, "Uphold the Law—A Citizen's First Duty," is designed to direct public attention to the rights and duties of citizenship.

As Americans, we enjoy wide freedoms, guaranteed by law, which distinguish our society from a totalitarian system. But with these rights and freedoms go individual responsibility which all Americans must exercise.

While we enjoy the right to equal protection of laws, equal justice in the courts, and the right to be free from arbitrary search or arrest, we are bound to obey the laws which give us these rights and to respect the rights of our fellow Americans.

We are privileged to be able to choose our public officers in free elections, but as members of a democratic nation, we are charged with the responsibility of voting in elections.

We are indeed fortunate that we live by a government of laws, where legislation is subject to the perfecting process of judicial review.

The eighth annual observance of Law Day, U.S.A. will focus national attention on our rights and responsibilities as citizens of the greatest Nation in the world—a Nation whose greatness stems from our dedication to rule of law.

The legal profession is to be commended for its work in helping Americans to understand more fully the value of our system of liberty under law. As we observe Law Day, let each of us commit ourselves to the fulfillment of our responsibilities as beneficiaries of that liberty.

Address by Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to the address made by Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force, at the Arnold Air Society's 17th national conclave awards banquet, on April 14. The Secretary entitled his speech "The Profession of Progress." It is an excellent speech. It was grand occasion—made even more memorable by the presentation of the Man of Year Air Award to our beloved colleague, Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT. Congressman HÉBERT is the first person to receive the Man of Year Award, and no person could be more deserving of being singled out for this honor. I congratulate Secretary Zuckert on his fine speech, and pay tribute to Congressman HÉBERT and the honor bestowed upon him by the Arnold Air Society.

Under previous leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point the RECORD the speech by Secretary Zuckert and urge that each of my colleagues read it:

THE PROFESSION OF PROGRESS

(Address by Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force, Arnold Air Society 17th national conclave awards banquet, Washington, D.C., Apr. 14, 1965)

General Markey, Chairman RIVERS, General Power, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. BATES, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, Bob Hope has done a lot of things for the Air Force, but I think he probably did the maximum when he put his writers to work 100 percent on General Markey's introduction.

We have Chairman RIVERS up here—chairman of our Armed Services Committee in the House—along with Mr. HÉBERT and Mr. BATES, acting ranking minority member, both of the same committee.

This is a rare occasion for me, because it's probably the first and last time I'll ever sit on the same side of the table with them.

I have a very good speech here which was written by me and my associates. It's called "The Profession of Progress," and I recommend it to you. But I don't feel like giving a prepared speech tonight, because my friendship and kinship with the Arnold Air Society and its members makes a prepared speech seem inappropriate.

This is the third conclave I have attended of the five which have been held during my term as Secretary of the Air Force. In addition, I've had the opportunity to meet with Arnold Air Society members in my office—for example, we had a meeting there a few months back.

If I may be permitted, there's a certain somber note for me today. This morning I went to Arlington Cemetery where I attended the funeral of a major general of the U.S. Air Force: Commander of the 17th Air Force, John K. Hester. He died in a jump, a parachute jump, his fifth and last qualifying jump.

I've been amazed at how many people have said to me: "What's a major general in the Air Force doing jumping?" I looked over from that hill, to that beautiful springtime beginning foliage, looked down toward the Pentagon, over the city of Washington and I thought about that. What was he doing? I thought about you, the members of the Arnold Air Society, and I thought about tonight.

What was he doing? He was doing his duty. He was jumping because one of the jobs of the U.S. Air Force is support of the U.S. Army; transporting troops to places where they can fight; putting them out of airplanes onto the ground with parachutes.

John Hester, whom I first knew 20 years ago, was trying to make sure that he, as an Air Force man, understood what the people he was supporting went through in jumping from an airplane to their destination, the battlefield.

I thought of a lot of things this morning. I thought of how indispensable people are, people's bravery, people's nobility. The individual counts for so much even in a large organization such as ours.

And I thought of the demands on the military profession, the profession you in the Arnold Air Society are interested in. This profession not only demands that we plan for the wars ahead, that we have the vision to see technological developments in an untold variety of fields; it also demands—importantly and as far ahead as we can see—skill in the air and in the management of airplanes, bravery, and the willingness of a man to die—sometimes for a cause ad sometimes for progress.

I thought of Vietnam where our people are dying, where people are fighting in a strange inchoate type of conflict, the product of these times, the thing we paradoxically call the cold war. This is part, just part, of the demands of this profession which you are interested in entering.

And then—and I speak sincerely—as I stood on that hill I thought of tonight, the opportunity of talking to you. Tonight we honor the past, survey our present, and anticipate our future. It is fitting that we do so, because after all the man who gave this society its name is truly representative of the Air Force's great past as well as the author of its present and the prophet who foresaw so much of its future.

I had the privilege of knowing "Hap" Arnold. Today I thought: Where do you stop when you start recounting his accomplishments? He was an air pioneer; he was a great builder of the Air Force; he was a great leader; and he was a great administrator. He built the greatest fighting machinery that the world had ever seen. Yet with all that, he was, in addition, a great prophet of research. He understood that the racing technology would have indelible, illimitable effects upon aerospace power and the Air Force. His name of course, is but one of those who share that great past: Vandenberg, Spaatz—you could name them by the hour.

What about our present? We have an Air Force that is making a tremendous contribution to the strength of this country. Its versatility, its ability to meet war at any level of conflict, is one of the great sources of strength of this Nation today. We have powerful weapon systems like the B-52 and the Minuteman Missile, a solid propellant missile that has become operational in an amazingly short span of time. Not far behind is the Titan III, a giant booster rocket which will be our workhorse in lifting very heavy payloads into space.

The Air Force today is a force improved significantly over what it was only a few years ago in many respects. For example, our airlift capability has increased 200 percent. And our tactical forces, in number and quality, are vastly increased.

What about the future of the Air Force? Certainly we don't see all of the outlines clearly; what weapon systems; what will we be using for aircraft in the late-1970 time period; what will there be in space. We do know, however, not only with our hearts and with our minds, that we will continue to build upon the foundations that we have now, and we will produce weapon systems that will be fully adequate to meet our future responsibilities.

There is no doubt in my mind that space is a medium of the future. If you ask me tonight exactly how, and in what way, I can't tell you. But I know that if we unharness the ingenuity of people, we will progress into that medium just as we have progressed before.

There is always a tendency to believe that we have reached a plateau—a plateau of opportunity, a plateau of technological progress. Nothing could be further from the truth. Progress is as remorseless as life itself.

We have only broken the surface in many fields of knowledge. We will look much further into the potential of lasers and the marvels of electronics. We will learn much more about metallurgy, optics, thermodynamics, astrophysics and other branches of study as yet unnamed. There will be great advances in communications, guidance, and propulsion. We will need knowledge in all fields of science and technology to produce the weapon systems of the future. Ahead lie great and new dimensions of challenge and times of opportunity for man, not only in the scientific and technological, but in every form of human endeavor.

This is why I envy the members of the Arnold Air Society here tonight. We look to you as an important segment of the military profession in that future of challenge and opportunity. Past, present, and future, it is a profession dedicated to the public interest; a profession devoted to the survival of all that we believe constitutes civilization; a profession that demands so much in dedication and subordination of self and more in diversity of skills than any profession I know.

I am honored that your society—our society—has asked me to sponsor an award "for outstanding contributions to the furtherance of professionalism in the Department of the Air Force." Believing as I do so strongly in professionalism as the might and main, head and heart of progress, this is the award I would choose to bear my name. I am told that it will be awarded for the first time at your conclave next year.

Thank you for permitting me to spend this rewarding evening with you.

David G. Osterer Receives the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma in Recognition of His Distinguished Service to Mankind

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am privileged to insert the highlights of the decoration ceremony, held on November 19, 1964, at the Westchester Country Club, when the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma of the Fundacion Internacional Eloy Alfaro of the Republic of Panama was conferred upon the Honorable David G. Osterer. This honor was given Mr. Osterer in recognition of his

distinguished service to humanity, charity, ethical conduct in the business world, comparative religions, and in further recognition of his efforts toward the establishment of international peace.

The ceremony was opened by an outstanding address delivered by Dr. Herman A. Bayern, of Yonkers, N.Y., the American provost of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. In his speech, Dr. Bayern set forth the aims and purposes of the foundation and explained why Mr. Osterer was unanimously voted to receive this high honor, as well as setting forth the achievements and accomplishments of Eloy Alfaro, President of Ecuador from 1895 to 1901 and 1906 to 1911 and promoter of hemispheric solidarity.

Mr. Speaker, I present the investiture speech delivered by the Honorable Albert Conway, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York:

INVESTITURE SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE ALBERT CONWAY

Judge McCullough, my colleague and toastmaster, Dr. Bayern, and the fine committee that has put in many hours to arrange this affair, guests and friends. This is a meaningful occasion. The purpose of making awards is not merely to honor an individual or reward him for his service, but to encourage others to follow by example.

Briefly, I would like to talk to you about David Osterer and the nature of this man. His friends at first suggested an elaborate dinner affair, which he refused because he felt it would place a tariff on people to see him honored, since it was not for a cause to which funds would go. He accepted the idea of public presentation when it was suggested to him that the purpose of a public presentation was to encourage others by example, whereas anonymity would not.

As a matter of fact, he has any number of honors he even refused to refer to. Our honored guest is known nationally and internationally in certain circles and is beloved, admired, and respected by many because of his charitable and civic activities. The place he has won in the business world alone—because of his ethics and principles—merits this high honor.

The board of dignitaries of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation were very happy to unanimously vote him its highest honor—the Eloy Alfaro Foundation Grand Cross—and he now joins those famous Americans who likewise distinguished themselves in the service of humanity. Briefly, to delve into Mr. Osterer's background, I discovered that he is a dynamo.

He was not born on the East Side. However, he was a product of New York public schools, graduated from Brooklyn Law School, (LL.B. cum laude). It is also interesting to note that while attending law school, Mr. Osterer worked 10 to 12 hours a day in the State of New Jersey, attended Brooklyn Law School and lived in the Bronx.

He engaged in the general practice of law until the early forties, at which time he became active in industry. He participated in the organization of the Induction Heating Corp. Subsequently, he became chairman of the board and executive vice president. He is one of the founders of Hydra-Power Corp. Later, while president of New Rochelle Precision Grinding Corp., he conceived of and was one of the founders of New Rochelle Termatool Corp., which is now a subsidiary of American Machine & Foundry.

It is interesting to note that while under his stewardship, the Induction Heating Corp. received the Army and Navy E for its outstanding contribution to the war effort and the Termatool Corp., the E Award for its contribution to international trade.

Mr. Osterer has been the recipient of a number of testimonials from employees, and lectures from time to time on personnel and management policies, among other honors, he holds the Humanitarian Award from the United Cerebral Palsy Association of Westchester County, N.Y. He is currently a member of the board of the Harrison Community Center and a member of the board of the St. Agnes Association—as well as having been "entrusted" with the key of the city of New Orleans while being made an honorary citizen.

During his military career, he rose from the rank of private to major in the New York Guard. The man who can testify to this is Colonel Lopaus, who is with us tonight.

Mr. Osterer has always demonstrated the quality of leadership and devotion to public service. His belief in man has been practices with success. He has been "stiff necked" and rebellious against following the beaten paths in business and has been equally "stiff necked" and rebellious when pursuing the course of principle. A picture of Mr. Osterer can be derived not only from his activities, but from his writings and sayings which reflect a concern for the dignity of man. For example, he has written * * * "There is more potential drive in man than horsepower in machines."

This evening, we signally honor a man who knows a depth of concern for his fellow man and who, because of this concern, has led an exemplary life. His unwavering faith in the ideals of mankind and his tireless effort in the advancement of charitable service and humanity richly merits the honor he receives tonight.

On behalf of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, of which I have been an earlier recipient and in the language of the foundation's board of dignitaries * * * "In recognition of his distinguished service to humanity, charity, outstanding ethics in the business world, comparative religion, and in further recognition of his efforts toward the establishment of international peace" * * * I am honored to confer this diploma and Grand Cross on an outstanding citizen and a friend of all, the Honorable David G. Osterer.

Judge Conway then conferred the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and diploma upon the Honorable David G. Osterer, assisted by American Provost Dr. Herman A. Bayern.

The Honorable David G. Osterer then acknowledge the receipt of this award, as follows:

"Judge Conway, Judge McCullough, Reverend Clergy, Dr. Bayern, Mr. Gerner, ladies and gentlemen, I hope you will not consider the nature of my acceptance of this distinguished decoration as a display of immodest modesty.

"I cannot bring myself to believe, however, that I was chosen by a process of competitive elimination. I know and you know that there are thousands of Americans who have devoted themselves to the service of community and humanity and who are equally, if not more deserving than I am for such recognition. It is just that I was lucky enough to be noticed.

"So it is with a feeling of gratitude—mingled with a sense of being lucky, and as symbolic of all those who serve, that I accept this decoration.

"I feel it important to make further comment. If there is any basis to the concept of the true partnership of marriage, then any moneys I have expended, any service I have rendered, any anxieties I have experienced (and there is anxiety entailed in the service of causes), all has been equally shared in the giving of my wife, Marti.

"This Foundation, which bears his name, was decreed by the President of Panama in order to perpetuate the philosophies and purposes to which Gen. Eloy Alfaro devoted his life. I think it is only fitting and proper that I make expression relative to the purposes of the Foundation, which constitute my beliefs as well.

"The history of mankind reveals that the cavéman's community of concern was his cave, his mate, his offspring, and the surrounding elements and animals he had to contend with in order to survive. He did not know, nor did he care about what was happening on the other side of his mountain.

"When man evolved to the tribe his community of concern was not only the tribe and its welfare, but the surrounding tribes, their problems, their weaknesses, their strengths, their purposes and their intentions.

"And so evolution continued until today. Man's community of concern is global, and happenings anywhere in the world (particularly with instantaneous communication and almost immediate impact) affects man in his community of residence, wherever in the world that may be.

"We are today confronted with a truism that we must recognize and deal with.

"That there is no area—whether it be in the community of our residence (city, State, or country—take Harlem for instance), or whether it be in a far distant land, that has not proved to be an area fertile for the growth of the root and the weed of destruction.

"I thank you, Msgr. James T. McDonnell, Rabbi Aaron Singer, Rev. Alfred S. Powerll, for gracing this dais. I thank John Mann, president of the United Cerebral Palsy Association of Westchester County, N.Y., and my colleagues for your courtesies. I thank Dr. Herman S. Bayern in the name of the foundation for the recognition that you have extended to me, and to Henry M. Gerner, a member of the foundation. I thank Judge Frank McCollough, whom I have known both as a legislator and as a judge, as one who has never turned his back on causes he deemed right, for your good offices as chairman. And I thank Judge Albert Conway upon whom the State of New York has conferred its highest judicial honor—chief judge of the court of appeals—for the deference that you have shown me tonight.

"I thank the committee, whose generosity—more so graciousness—has made tonight possible.

"To you, my friends, who have so honored me with your presence tonight, I extend my deep gratitude."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I insert an editorial which appeared in the Gannett newspapers in the State of New York. The following editorial appeared in the Daily Argus, Mount Vernon, N.Y., on Monday, November 23, 1964:

AN HONOR FOR MR. OSTERER

Chances are that few in Westchester are familiar with the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama or that they even knew it existed until Thursday night when it honored David G. Osterer of Harrison with its Grand Cross and diploma.

But there are a great many people in Westchester who know and admire David Osterer and there are many more who are better off because he is the man he is.

The foundation, named after a former President of Ecuador, works toward improving the health of the peoples of the world and promoting the establishment of peace. It has numbered individuals among those chosen for its honor.

Its citation of Mr. Osterer reads: "In recognition of his distinguished services to humanity, charity, ethical conduct in the business world, comparative religions and in further recognition of his efforts toward the establishment of international peace."

Mr. Osterer is a man of deep religious conviction, close family ties, and wide charitable instincts.

Out of the regard for his own fine and healthy children and his conviction that man does not exist to serve himself alone, he came to accept the presidency of the United Cerebral Palsy Association of Westchester some years ago, when it had fallen on bad times.

Badly disorganized, perhaps because it was caught up so in the emotional problems of the parents of the afflicted children who tried to keep it afloat, the association was given a firm hand and strong leadership. Mr. Osterer brought into it many distinguished and influential Westchester people and put their talents to work. The result has been an ever-widening and increasing beneficial program for those stricken with cerebral palsy.

Mr. Osterer is an industrialist, and a successful businessman. The NBC is only one phase of the variety of activities which capture his energetic attention, but he is summed up to those who know him in the philosophy with which he approached the challenge of raising and disbursing funds for the UCP. "The public dollar is a public trust" is his slogan and he never let his colleagues forget it. His award is well deserved.

Polish Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 2, 1965, Americans in communities throughout the Nation will celebrate the 174th anniversary of Polish independence. I join my colleagues in paying special tribute to the framers of the Polish Constittuion of 1791. The people of Poland and those Americans of Polish descent can be proud of this rich heritage of freedom which stemmed from the adoption of their constitution. This document was inspired by the American Declaration of Independence and it included within its framework the fundamentals of freedom written into the U.S. Constitution several years earlier. It is fitting and proper that we remember each year this document of freedom which symbolizes with our own the will of man to achieve liberty.

While the people of Poland have been less fortunate than we in preserving their freedom in their homeland, they have preserved in their efforts to regain liberty each time it was taken from them by war and political partitions. In addition to their brave resistance to tyranny at home, they have sent to our own shores their sons and daughters who have made a major contribution in our own struggle to maintain the institutions of democracy. Americans of Polish descent who live in Cleveland as well as in other American communities, have been stable, prudent, and reliable citizens. They have contributed in every line of endeavor. They have been a part of the greatness of our country.

It is to be hoped that a relaxation of artificial barriers which exist in Europe will permit greater communication between citizens of the free world and Iron Curtain countries. Communism cannot long survive in its present tyrannical form if it is thus exposed to the free exchange of ideas which would result from increased personal contacts between citizens of our countries.

The 50th Anniversary of the Armenian Massacre

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time of the 50th anniversary of the cruel and inhuman Armenian massacre of infamous history it is most fitting that the U.S. House of Representatives should suspend its business in order to express its great horror and deep sorrow concerning this awful example of man's inhumanity to man and to pay just tribute to the faithful and courageous people of Armenia.

Back on the 24th day of April in 1915 and during the following several weeks, thousands of Armenian leaders in all walks of life were arrested throughout the Armenian communities, by Turkish authorities, in the middle of the night and deported in groups to distant areas and a great number were murdered with extreme cruelties.

At the same time young Armenians who had been faithfully serving in the Turkish Army were disarmed and murdered by their Turkish fellow soldiers under the orders of their officers.

Having decimated, in this frightful manner, the country of its leaders and fighting men the Turkish Government then next proceeded to deport the entire Armenian population in historic Armenia to distant, desolate regions in Turkey.

Nearly 2½ million Armenians, mostly old men, women, and children, were forced to abandon their homes, their businesses, their belongings, their churches, and schools to form caravans for a terrible journey which reached from the Armenian Plateau to the hot sands of the distant Arabian Desert.

It is estimated conservatively that 1½ million weak and defenseless human beings died in the course of that indescribably inhuman journey from hunger, thirst, exposure, or at the murderous hands of cruel gendarmes and Turkish and Kurdish ruffians all along the way.

Mr. Speaker, the full extent of this most barbarous happening of unprovoked and senseless murder and rapine of even innocent women and children will never be known but even a summary account of only a very small part of such a baseless and brutal political crime is more than enough to cause any decent civilized human being to be filled with horror and revulsion.

However, the most amazing and remarkable thing in this long and excruciating visitation of persecution, injustice, and extreme suffering is that the Armenian people retained their faith, their courage, their beliefs, and their hopes and survived as a Christian nation.

It is unhappily true that their national existence is even now dark and discouraging, under the domination of brutal atheistic communism but, by our recognition here this afternoon, we express our determination and our conviction that neither we nor they will ever despair about their future liberation.

Those of us who have lived among American-Armenians as friends and neighbors know full well why the native people of Armenia will never give up their fight for freedom. The American-Armenians have been second to no other nationality in accepting their share of the burden and contributing their full measure of sacrifice to the development and progress of this country.

In private life the American-Armenian is an honest, industrious, cooperative citizen in his community.

When our Nation has been attacked by armed aggression, the Americans of Armenian origin have distinguished themselves in all ranks of our Armed Forces, and may be justly proud of their military record here.

In the fields of business and professional life in America, the Armenian descendant has exhibited the highest qualities of character and accomplishment.

Having lived and worked among Armenian-Americans practically all my life, I can personally state my own conviction that the spirit of the homeland, as evidenced by the descendants, will never be defeated by any type of barbaric persecution.

As a fellow-American, I take heart and courage from their example and the example of the valient people in their native land.

The struggle of Armenia today is essentially the same struggle in which the United States and all other Christian nations are now fiercely engaged against the most ruthless enemy the civilized world has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, as we, then, today salute the martyrdom, the faith, the courage and the dedication of the Armenian people let us here renew our pledge to persevere in our common fight against the modern Communist enemy until the free cause of the United States, Armenia and all other peace-loving nations is achieved and may the Almighty speed that happy day.

Pittsburgh Director of Public Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the city of Pittsburgh, which I have the

honor to represent, has an able new director of public safety; Mr. David Craig. As a former law partner of Mr. Craig, I am pleased that KDKA, the Westinghouse radio and television stations in Pittsburgh, praise his appointment. I include a recent KDKA editorial as part of my remarks:

GOOD START FOR MR. CRAIG

David Craig seems to be stepping into his new job at city hall with a clear idea of the problems he now faces. Mr. Craig has just taken over as director of the department of public safety. His first public statement had some things in it which point to some badly needed improvements, and we were very happy to hear them.

We have repeatedly criticized the Pittsburgh Police Bureau for its poor public image. We pressed for an investigation of the bureau on the grounds that something drastic had to be done to raise its standing in the eyes of the public. We harped on this idea, because there is a definite connection between public confidence in the police and the ability of the police to keep law and order.

In the minds of many Pittsburghers, the police are tarnished with the suspicion of incompetence and dishonesty. Some of the suspicion is probably deserved, but we also believe that the police are no different from any other group of people. Most of them are honest and trying to do a good job. The problem is to get the public to understand this.

Mr. Craig indicates he is fully aware of that problem. In his first statement as public safety director, he said he will work hard on building the prestige of the police. He mentioned training for police officers in handling civil rights cases, a better public information policy, and promotion of more courtesy by traffic officers. He also says he wants to establish his department as a key organization in the Pittsburgh renaissance—a positive force for improvement, not just a defense against crime.

It could be that the most positive force in the Public Safety Department right now is Mr. Craig's own attitude, and we congratulate him for it. If he can put his ideas to work, he will be making Pittsburgh a better place, and a safer place, to live.

VA Closings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, all too often Federal administrators are inclined to ignore the people most concerned and most affected by their decisions. Almost equally often these people could have contributed much in terms of wisdom, insight and successful implementation of needed changes had they been advised.

The cries which arise after the announcement of these decisions are many times not the cries of hurt because some tangible injury has been inflicted, but rather they are the cries of hurt dignity and pride by interested people when they had not been afforded the common courtesy of notice, or the opportunity to be heard.

The unannounced "final decision" strikes a strangely unfamiliar chord in our democratic society.

Recent cases in point include the closings of Veterans' Administration facilities, the closings of Department of Agriculture facilities and, most recently, the rerouting of railway postal services.

Because of the manifest magnitude of these misfires, I am proud to read into the RECORD an editorial from the Sheridan, Wyo., Press, with which I heartily agree. This editorial, entitled "Good Sense and Good Government," is as follows:

GOOD SENSE AND GOOD GOVERNMENT

Closing of Federal facilities is frequently accomplished by a method best described as the sudden procedure. That is, facility closing is announced before anyone has a chance to be heard.

Studies made by Federal bureaus are done on the quiet. Usually local interests know nothing about them and are not consulted. Often Congressmen know nothing of these studies. Then by the sudden procedure it is announced that certain facilities are to be closed.

Such procedure is highly questionable as a matter of public relations, and as a matter of democratically arriving at just decisions. Governmental departments should be all means be considering methods to make the best use of the tax dollar, and giving the best service possible. But the job somehow seems half done if the Congressmen of a State, and if spokesmen for local interests have been ignored.

Closing of Federal facilities should include studies and recommendations made by the agency involved, studies and recommendations on the part of Congressmen involved, and study and recommendations on the part of States and localities involved.

There is beginning to develop in the case of Veterans' Administration facility closings an idea, which if expanded, might well be followed in connection with all proposal to close Federal facilities.

President Johnson has announced appointment of a Special Advisory Committee to study the closures. A Senate independent offices subcommittee is already at work and has revealed information which does not entirely agree with that of the VA.

Study committees, if they function to hear the Department making a proposal, if they hear the Congressmen involved, and if they hear spokesman from the specific localities involved, could provide an essential service—a means of communication between Government and people. Such procedure would be fair to all concerned, and would provide necessary overall information upon which to base a final decision.

It is important that Congressmen and spokesmen representing localities involved be heard. Too often recommendations from Federal agencies overlook essential considerations, which can best be found by listening to local spokesmen.

We would recommend this procedure because it will uncover much more information upon which to base a decision, because it will give localities themselves a chance to be heard, and because it makes good sense and means good government.

Mr. Speaker, never before have we had so many current examples of inconvenience and waste resulting from "final decisions" being announced by our administrators before considering all of the factors involved and consulting all of the people concerned.

I hope they will classify this as a lesson learned.

Are the Unsuspecting Being Duped Into Supporting the Communist Cause?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of organizations operating in the United States through American agents and engaged in the business of selling gift certificates and other merchandise to those of our citizens who wish to send such items to friends or relatives living behind the Iron Curtain.

Under the usual practice, standard gift packages of food can be ordered for delivery abroad, or specific items ranging from bicycles to grand pianos can be ordered through a catalog reference for similar delivery, or gift certificates can be purchased to be mailed abroad so that the intended beneficiary can do his or her own shopping. American dollars are, of course, used in each instance, with the actual purchase being made from state stores where the same exist, or through such other retail outlets as may be available behind the Iron Curtain, and the presumption is that most, if not all, of such goods are of Communist manufacture.

To a certain extent, the humanitarian purposes which the advertisements of such services emphasize are actually achieved. However, it would be wise for those of our citizens using such services to remember two things: First, at a time when there is a mounting concern within the United States over our balance-of-payments problem, this is an effective device whereby Communist nations may build up not inconsiderable dollar credits. Second, and perhaps even more important, this type of activity could very easily place American citizens with friends or relatives living in Soviet bloc countries in a rather compromising position in that they may feel encouraged to act almost as subagents for such a trade practice because of the vulnerability of their faraway loved ones.

According to the Department of Justice there are nine such organizations in this Nation transmitting American dollars to the Soviet bloc. All are registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The names of these services and the amounts transmitted within recent periods are as follows:

First. The Pekao Trading Corp., 25 Broad Street, New York, N.Y., transmitted a total of $10,505,585.53 to Bank Polska, Kasa Opieki, Poland, during the period beginning August 23, 1962, and ending August 23, 1964.

Second. The Package Express Co., 1530 Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., transmitted a total of $2,673,421.10 to Vneshposyltorg, U.S.S.R., during the period beginning August 24, 1962, and ending August 24, 1964.

Third. Utsch & Associates, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York, N.Y., transmitted a total of $5,547,110.42 to TUZEX Stores,

Prague, Czechoslovakia, during the period beginning January 1, 1963, and ending December 31, 1964.

Fourth. Central Parcel Service, 220 South State Street, Chicago, Ill., transmitted a total of $386,653.26 to Vneshposyltorg, U.S.S.R., during the period beginning December 31, 1962, and ending December 31, 1964.

Fifth. Cosmos Parcels Express Corp., 45 West 45th Street, New York, N.Y., transmitted a total of $1,907,722.65 to Vneshposyltorg, U.S.S.R., during the period beginning January 10, 1963, and ending July 10, 1964.

Sixth. Globe Parcel Service, Inc., 716 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa., transmitted a total of $1,801,315.55 to Vneshposyltorg, U.S.S.R., during the period beginning December 31, 1962, and ending December 31, 1964.

Seventh. Gramercy Shipping Corp., 118 East 28th Street, New York, N.Y., transmitted a total of $8,363.96 to Vneshposyltorg during the period beginning March 25, 1964, and ending June 25, 1964.

Eighth. Joseph Brownfield, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y., transmitted a total of $2,805,391.90 to Monimpex, Hungary, during the period beginning November 29, 1962, and ending November 29, 1964.

Ninth. U.S. Relief Parcel Service, Inc., 245 East 80th Street, New York, N.Y., transmitted a total of $2,255,000 to Monimpex, Hungary, during the period beginning November 29, 1962, and ending November 29, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my point in bringing this information to the attention of my colleagues to pass judgment, in any way, on this particular activity. However, I do believe that this is a matter that the Congress ought to be aware of as it considers ways and means for dealing with our balance-of-payments problem, and that the appropriate legislative committees of this or the other body might well take it upon themselves to review this activity in order to insure that none of our citizens are misinformed or misled in any way concerning such gifts and the full implication thereof to all the people of the United States.

George Washington Good Government Award to Hon. Oren Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, April 25, at the annual George Washington dinner given by the American Good Government Society, celebrating the 176th anniversary of the inauguration of the First President of the United States, the society's 1965 George Washington Awards were presented to the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HRUSKA, and our distinguished colleague in the House, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable OREN HARRIS.

The award, in the form of a scroll, was presented to Congressman HARRIS by former Congressman Harold O. Lovre, a trustee of the American Good Government Society. In making the ward, Mr. Lovre hailed him as one of the greatest legislators and public servants of our time. Said Mr. Lovre:

He has achieved this high standing largely because of his unswerving dedication to the principles laid out for us long ago by the revered Founders of this glorious Republic. He is sincere of purpose. He is loyal to his people and his country. He drives himself to the limits of his endurance, and he has an uncommon capacity for looking objectively and in great depth, at all sides of an issue. His judgments, when finally passed, reflect logic, a keen sense of fair play and, above all, the courage of his convictions.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the inscription on the scroll presented to Congressman HARRIS and his acceptance remarks at this point in the RECORD:

Lawyer and statesman, has served the people of Arkansas and the United States almost 30 years: first as prosecuting attorney, and then as Representative in Congress for 25 years, and the last 8 of these as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

His broad knowledge and clear understanding of commerce, gained in long years of work with his able colleagues, have made him an outstanding committee chairman. This all-important work includes such diverse elements as transportation of every kind; public safety in trade, in food and drugs, and in less air pollution; financial underwriting and stock exchanges; communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and TV; and interstate movement of natural gas, oil, and electric power.

Representative HARRIS' character, ability, industry and judgment have won him the high regard of his colleagues, and of the host of citizens whose affairs make up the work of his committee.

Arkansas can be justly proud of her illustrious son.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN OREN HARRIS ON ACCEPTANCE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD, AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 25, 1965

Mr. Lovre, Mr. Chairman, fellow colleagues, honored guests at the head table, and friends all, let me express my deep and sincere appreciation for being here tonight as one of the recipients of the George Washington Award of the American Good Government Society.

I don't know whether or not it is simple coincidence but it's interesting to note that this is the 13th annual awards banquet. It honors a man who originally started out leading 13 colonies. I started my political career as prosecuting attorney for the 13th Judicial District of Arkansas. I am looking forward to my 13th term in Congress, and as if that weren't enough, my lovely wife Ruth, who is here with me this evening, celebrates her birthday on the 13th. Another interesting fact about tonight's awards presentation, and I am sure that it, too, is coincidental, has to do with my good friend, Senator HRUSKA, and the State from which he comes. Although we appear here tonight as equals, I am mighty happy to say that was not the way things ended up in the Cotton Bowl last January between Arkansas and Nebraska.

After those introductory remarks by my good friend and former colleague, I thought of the story of the widow upon hearing the remarks of the preacher at her husband's funeral. She leaned over and said to her son, "Boy, step up there and see if that is your paw in that wooden box."

At any rate, I feel like the confused and excited recipient of an award who said, "I don't know whether I appreciate it or not but I sure deserve it."

Seriously, to be selected as the recipient of this George Washington Award is a tribute and honor I shall ever cherish. To be included with so many great and distinguished Americans honored by this patriotic organization, one of whom is seated at the head table tonight—my close personal friend, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, of my State—and a third member of our Arkansas team, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, who was unable to be here tonight, but who sends his regards in a nice telegram, is a recognition I have never expected or dreamed of.

I am deeply grateful and humbly accept your generous accolade in recognition of 25 years of service as a Member of the Congress of the United States. It is my fervent hope and prayer that I may continue to serve our country during this pathway of life that will justify your confidence.

As Harold has already told you, back in 1940, a lot of good people in Arkansas elected a young district attorney as their Congressman. I suppose they thought that anyone who had made it through the depression, survived the confrontations of a district attorney, and who had the nerve to proclaim that he could be elected to Congress ought to have a fling at it for them in Washington.

Regardless of the reasons, however, I am profoundly grateful that they gave me the opportunity and that they have done me the signal honor of serving in this great institution during these years.

Many of those same good folks have come to Washington and are here tonight to share this occasion with me. As I look out over this gathering, I see so many friends from Arkansas, and permit me to express my thanks and appreciation for your being here.

I fully recognize that whatever success I may have had, or the contributions I may have made toward better government, have come through the assistance, cooperation, and confidence of the people from my district. This occasion tonight must in a large measure be shared with my lovely wife, Ruth, other members of the family, and the people of my district and State. It is to them that I give the major credit.

I want to pay my compliment to the American Good Government Society, an organization whose heritage and contribution to our Nation, the principle of constitutional goverment, and the strength of our society, speak for themselves.

The problems of government are always intense and, therefore, in need of constant concern on the part of the people. By constantly calling attention to these problems, your organization provides a practical service of great consequence to all Americans.

As a student of government, I am convinced that the most exceptional governmental system yet conceived by man is ours as originally established under the Federal Constitution in 1787. Prime Minister Gladstone, perhaps the greatest in the history of Great Britain, said of our Constitution that it was "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

As observers of political events, we are familiar with the fact that controversy has raged for 177 years, since the adoption of our Constitution, over the question of its basic purposes.

And yet, the fact is clear to us all that the supreme issue in American life today as in the past is whether or not our political system with its remarkable institutions and their traditions shall be maintained in the face of great and continuous pressure from without, as well as from within.

If we are to resist these pressures, we must first insure a basis of stability without which all government is subject to di-

vision, confusion, and turmoil. The first step—the primary consideration—toward stable conditions is, of course, good government, the constant guarantee of law and order, and freedom from chaos.

To Americans good government is better known perhaps than to any other people in the world. Yet, even here there are examples of the opposite from time to time in all levels of our system.

Moreover, to us—to all Americans—good government has come to mean far more than honesty, efficiency, and competence on the part of public officials, which is important and imperative. In the eyes of our people the true measure is in terms of achievement, achievement along the lines on which our Government was organized, instituted, and ordained.

Under our unique governmental arrangement, the people chose to create a Federal authority to whom they granted certain powers, dividing the rest between the State governments and the people themselves—the last retaining full sovereignty in the moral realm of personal liberty.

And yet, no sooner was the vehicle of American democracy in motion than disputes arose as to the interpretation of the rules set forth in the Federal Constitution. In consequence of this, the struggle over constitutional interpretation has raged along endlessly from the foundation of the country until this present day.

The voice of the Federal Government is louder today in the operation of our national tasks than ever before in history. There is always a need to keep the balance between Federal, State, and personal authority, and when the scales tip too far in one direction, there must arise a force to strike and rectify the condition.

To such a purpose we must be dedicated in order to preserve democratic tradition. Let us in our day have cause to rejoice in the fullness of our service, knowing full well the value of vigilance to the cause of freedom.

It is with this profound sense of humility and deep appreciation that I receive this token of esteem, which I shall cherish throughout my life.

The 1965 Sylvanus Thayer Award—Citation James Bryant Conant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Association of Graduates, U.S. Military Academy, has awarded the 1965 Sylvanus Thayer Award to Dr. James B. Conant. The presentation will be made Saturday, May 1, 1965, and the citation follows:

THE 1965 SYLVANUS THAYER AWARD—CITATION
JAMES BRYANT CONANT

James Bryant Conant has played a major role in advancing the welfare of the United States in peace and in war for almost half a century, and his endeavors are as vigorous today as they have been in the past. He served as an officer in the Army Chemical Warfare Service in World War I, then became professor of chemistry and later president of Harvard University. During World War II, as Chairman of the National Defense Research Committee and Deputy Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, he played an important role in initiating the Manhattan Project that developed the atomic bomb; later he was a key figure in the success of that project. After the war he served as a member of the General Advisory Committee of the Atomic Energy Commission, as U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, and as U.S. Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany. For a number of years now, he has been the foremost authority on education in America and in the world. As scientist, educator, and statesman, this distinguished citizen has long served the United States and the world unstintingly in the highest positions of responsibility and influence.

Through his long and dedicated duty to his country, Dr. Conant has greatly enhanced its honor and its strength. Accordingly, the 1965 Sylvanus Thayer Medal is hereby awarded by the Association of Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy to James Bryant Conant.

LESLIE R. GROVES,
Lieutenant General, U.S. Army, Retired, President.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include some pertinent information about the background and life of Dr. Conant:

JAMES B. CONANT

Few living Americans rank with James Bryant Conant in the breadth and depth of service he has given to his country.

In recent years Dr. Conant has been directing his energies toward the improvement of educational opportunities for the youth of America, and school systems across the country are already realizing the benefits of his probing studies. This commitment to our public schools had its beginning when, as president of Harvard (1933–53) Dr. Conant sponsored the Harvard National Scholarships. A measure of the fame he has achieved as an educator is the more than 30 honorary degrees that have been conferred on him by colleges and universities at home and abroad.

But Dr. Conant's successes in other fields are equally impressive.

As a professor of organic chemistry he was chairman of his department at Harvard, and won international recognition and many awards for his research work on the structure and characteristics of chlorophyll and on the nature of hemoglobin; and during World War I he served as a major in the U.S. Army Chemical Warfare Service working on the development of poison gases.

In 1941 Dr. Conant was summoned to Government service again and for 8 years served as chairman of the National Research Committee. In this capacity he played a major part in the development of the atomic bomb; was scientific adviser to the Manhattan project; and, in 1947, was adviser to the American delegation to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission.

Although he continued as president of Harvard, he again accepted a call from Government in 1950 to join 24 other prominent men on the Committee on the Present Danger; that is, the naked aggression of communism. As the committee's spokesman, he presented the Conant plan, outlining the obligation of young men for active military service, the same plan that was the basis for the proposals adopted by Secretary of Defense Marshall.

Dr. Conant was named U.S. High Commissioner for Germany in 1953 and in 1955 became U.S. Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, a post he held for 2 years.

As a member of President Kennedy's Committee on Youth Employment in April 1963, Dr. Conant headed a committee panel that called for "bold and imaginative" action to help the country's 800,000 youths who were facing desperate job problems. Later that same year, the President named him as one of the small, select group that was to receive the new Presidential Medal of Freedom.

As late as January of this year, President Johnson selected Dr. Conant as a member of the National Advisory Council for his antipoverty program.

A New Englander whose American ancestry dates from 1623 in Salem, James B. Conant was born on March 26, 1893, in Dorchester, Mass., a suburb of Boston. He is married to the former Grace Thayer Richards and has two sons, James Richards and Theodore Richards, both of whom served in World War II.

Crime, Voting, and Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, law enforcement and the increase in crime in the District of Columbia has attracted nationwide attention for the past several years. The House recently passed H.R. 5688, a bill to provide for more effective law enforcement in the District.

The Shelby Daily Star of Shelby, N.C., carried a very fine editorial on April 12, 1965, on crime in the District and the need for legislation to strengthen law enforcement. I believe my colleagues will find the editorial to be of great interest, and I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CRIME, VOTING, AND PUNISHMENT

An omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia and a voting rights proposal aimed at selected Southern States and a few others hit by mistake form one of the great legislative paradoxes of our time.

The crime bill languishes on a bed of irrational complacency. The voting measure is accorded star billing and is pampered and petted. The voting bill carries the unequivocal blessing of the President of the United States. The crime bill does not.

The record on both is interesting.

House bill 5688 (a 1965 twin of an omnibus crime bill passed by the House in 1963 only to die in the Senate) passed the House of Representatives March 22 on a 250-to-131 rollcall vote. The measure, as far as can be determined, has been virtually ignored by the Senate since then.

This district's Congressman BASIL L. WHITENER, as chairman of the responsible subcomimttee of the House District of Columbia Committee, is a major architect of this legislation, which is designed, in his words, to "bring the enforcement of law back into focus" within the District of Columbia.

Stern focusing is long overdue. Federal Bureau of Investigation statistics show that major crimes in the District of Columbia between 1957 and 1964 increased by a staggering 94.1 percent. The increase between 1963 and 1964 alone was a frightening 25 percent. The District of Columbia experienced an average of 84 criminal offenses daily during 1964. And, yet, with all the fantastic increases in crime, the population of the district's penal institution at Lorton actually decreased between 1957 and 1964 from 1,932 to 1,456—a drop of 25 percent. District of Columbia criminals are performing more but paying less.

The House of Representatives through House bill 5688—would attempt to stem the

tide by nullifying the Mallory and Durham rules of evidence, by permitting investigative arrests, by adding robbery to the existing list of crimes of violence, by setting mandatory and minimum sentences for certain crimes and by providing temporary and permanent measures for controlling the distribution of obscene publications and other materials.

The President's solution, as spelled out in a March 8 message to Congress, calls, basically, for better training for law enforcement officers and the creation of a commission to study the crime problem. He wants a probing of the root causes to be found in the "environment around us" or "deep in the nature of individual men."

Specific recommendations for handling symptoms of root causes escaped him on March 8, although he was specific as the mischief on March 15 about how the symptoms of voter registration discrimination might be attacked.

The President's position is about in line with past congressional resistance—backed by the Justice Department—to a toughening of the fiber of District of Columbia law enforcement. A minority committee report on H.R. 7525 (the 1963 forerunner of House bill 5688) criticized the approach of WHITENER and others with the argument that the bill should attack the "roots of crime in social and economic misery" rather than punish "the criminal symptoms of this misery."

In addition, the opposition—backed by the Justice Department—argues that it would be unconstitutional to detain a suspect for investigation, to make robbery a crime of violence, to place the burden for proving insanity upon the defense rather than upon the prosecution as presently provided for under the Durham rule.

Yet the present leader of the Justice Department has so little regard for constitutional grounds and due process where the President's voting bill is concerned that he actually told the Senate Judiciary Committee, while testifying in defense of the measure, that "the judicial process, upon which all existing remedies depend is, institutionally, inadequate to deal with practices so deeply rooted in the social and political structure."

Katzenbach was saying, in effect, that, despite the very obvious constitutional limitations (once argued for by Senator Lyndon Johnson) upon the Federal Government's right to meddle with local and State election machinery, the symptoms of random registration shortcomings justifies wide-ranging unconstitutional means.

All of which seems to mean that the Attorney General feels that the Constitution is to be zealously upheld and stretched to ridiculous lengths in the criminal field and flagrantly violated in other areas, depending, of course, on whose ox is about to be gored.

The ironies of the parodox are astounding, and frightening.

Endorsement of Farm Program Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 13 in Kansas City, Mo., the Missouri Farmers Association called a meeting of leaders of national farm organizations, the producers of all major food and fiber commodities, and their commodity organizations. The purpose was a detailed discussion and review of the administration and other farm program proposals. The group consisted of representatives from all over the Nation.

It was my pleasure to participate in the discussions and to address the group during their session. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman also attended and addressed the group. I placed his remarks in the RECORD for April 15, 1965.

The statement adopted by this gathering in Kansas City is a most significant endorsement of the administration's agricultural proposals. I ask my colleagues to read the statement, which follows, and give their serious consideration to the views contained therein:

This meeting has assembled, from California to New York and Texas to Minnesota, the producers of all major food and fiber commodities, their commodity organizations and all national farm organizations.

The expiration at the end of this crop year of the legislation on the books prompts us to the unanimous declaration that the farm programs must be extended, strengthened and improved.

Since the beginnings of the farm programs 40 years ago, we have heard much talk about the need for parity and equality for the farmer. For the first time, we see and we are heartened by the administration's proposal, in specific legislative form, of a program which will provide a means of obtaining 100 percent of parity.

This bill will provide a basis for assuring that our agricultural commodities are fully competitive in world markets, within the terms of our international agreements.

This group endorses the direction and approach embodied in the Food and Agricultural Act of 1965. We hope that other commodities and other legislative needs will be taken into account by the Congress as the bill is deliberated and moves through the legislative process. To this end we pledge our strong support and urge the Congress to act favorably and promptly.

Up From Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter today from Portia Washington Pittman, the daughter of the late Booker T. Washington, the founder and for many years president of Tuskegee Institute at Tuskegee, Ala.

Mrs. Pittman's father was one of the great leaders of the Negro race. His many contributions to the advancement of his people and in the cause of better race relations have been unequaled in our history.

In 1901, Booker T. Washington published his autobiography entitled "Up From Slavery." The book is the classic story of the American Negro and his hope for the future. Justice William O. Douglas who wrote the foreword to the 1963 edition of "Up From Slavery" said that "it tells the story of minorities the world over who seek equality under the sun. It has an appeal which is more universal than when first published."

Mr. Speaker, I feel that everyone should read "Up From Slavery." Booker T. Washington's message of tolerance and his hope for the dignity of man is as important today as it was in 1901.

Portia Washington Pittman has many of the characteristics of her father. She believes in toleration, moderation, and has faith in the future of her people. I place the letter I received from her and the paragraph from her famous father's book, "Up From Slavery," to which she refers in her letter, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 29, 1965.

Congressman BASIL L. WHITENER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On page 161 of my father's autobiography, "Up From Slavery," second paragraph, is stated his philosophy, and its simple truth holds today.

We have in our South many splendid men and women of both races, and it is to them we are to look for guidance and justice.

It is unfortunate that the image of the South is being destroyed by the other group, but I have confidence that these problems will in time be solved—especially by leaders like yourself, and it is to you and others in your same category upon whom we are depending for direction.

It is a privilege to have known you and your fine office force.

Sincerely yours,
PORTIA WASHINGTON PITTMAN,
Daughter of Booker T. Washington.

Paragraph 2, page 161, "Up From Slavery," by Booker T. Washington:

"The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercises of these privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house."

Our Kids Filled the Breach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written in the Nation's press these past few weeks about the struggles of the people of Minnesota against the worst flood in our State's history. But no report I have seen sums it up quite so well as one sent to me by Roy V. Aune, acting director of the Minnesota Department of Civil Defense. Mr. Aune discusses the wonderful cooperation demonstrated during this time of crisis in our State, particularly the outstanding job done by our young people. It is a refreshing story which I would like inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

OUR KIDS FILLED THE BREACH

When the history of the Minnesota flood of April 1965 is written, the context will be well documented with the names of such organizations as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Salvation Army and, of course, the American National Red Cross, all of which contributed heavily to the tremendous efforts expended during the flood fight.

The well-versed historian, however, will be hard put to come up with specifics on the tremendous contributions made by the Mennonites from Mountain Lake, the Seventh-day Adventists, the many other churches and schools, and the innumerable ladies' auxiliaries.

Of all of those that served as the disaster struck, none were more resolute, none more dauntless than the Minnesota teenagers.

They had no high-flying banner to wave, no shining insignia to flash; they were recognizable only by their youth and the determination with which they were obsessed.

Of the 6,000 unpaid, unsung volunteers that slogged in the mud at the dikes in Mankato, literally thousands had not yet seen their 20th birthdays; many not their 15th.

Those young people worked to the point of exhaustion in the mud and rain, catching a few hours' sleep only to join the battle with the renewed vigor that only comes with youth.

While the younger ones filled the sandbags with blistering hands, the older or more sturdy types struggled with the weight of them to the top of the dikes—girls as well as boys.

This was not going on only in Mankato. A coast-guardsman was quoted as saying that if it wasn't for the kids in Minnesota, there wouldn't have been a volunteer dike raised in the State. The teenagers in every affected city and town carried the fight to the rivers. It was seen in Rockford, in Henderson, in Wabasha, and in East Grand Forks.

Our kids filled the breach left open by the lack of adequate control measures.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the April 21 edition of the Berkshire Eagle has been called to my attention. The editorial comments on our civil defense program and the measure of protection that can be added to our defense efforts through fallout shelters. I commend the full text of this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

THAT LUMP IN THE RUG IS CIVILIAN DEFENSE

A disconcerting commentary on our reluctance to acknowledge the distasteful realities of the nuclear era can be found in the mercurial story of the civil defense program over the past 15 years.

If one were to chart the ups and downs of public concern about civil defense it would make a pretty accurate cold war fever chart. When things get tense abroad, the concern spurts. When the tension eases off, civil defense is quietly swept under the rug until the next crisis occurs.

Obviously this irrational attitude results largely from the odd mixture of fatalism and blind optimism with which the public regards the possibility of nuclear war. But a good deal of blame also must be placed upon the Washington policymakers who have blown hot and cold on the civil defense question with bewildering inconsistency. The attitude of the Johnson administration is a good case in point.

In his defense message to Congress 3 months ago, the President said that "without fallout shelter protection for our citizens, all defense weapons lose much of their effectiveness in saving lives." In February, Secretary of Defense McNamara said that fallout shelters "should have the highest priority of any defense system" and estimated that a $5 billion investment in shelters could save 30 million civilian lives in the event of a sneak attack.

Yet this year's defense budget, prepared by Mr. McNamara and submitted to Congress by Mr. Johnson, is the first since 1960 which fails to provide funds for a fallout shelter program.

The ostensible reason for this omission is the administration's feeling that there is no point in asking Congress for appropriations that won't be approved; and on the record, this pessimism as to the attitude of Congress is probably justified. The late President Kennedy tried for 3 years to get an adequate shelter program through Congress and was thrown for a total loss, first by a House Appropriations Subcommittee and subsequently by Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

But quite evidently fear of congressional rejection is not the sole reason for the Johnson-McNamara failure to go to the mat in behalf of civil defense. There is also a reluctance to add $5 billion to the budget. And there is a fervent desire to avoid triggering a repetition of the 1961 wave of public hysteria which occurred when President Kennedy (in an effort to persuade Khrushchev that we meant business in Berlin) suggested that every American "take steps to protect his family in case of nuclear attack," thus fostering a spate of fly-by-night shelter construction companies as well as a preposterous national debate over whether one might shoot one's neighbors at the shelter door.

But whatever the administration's motives for putting the civil defense question on ice, the deferment is exceedingly hard to justify in the light of Mr. McNamara's own testimony as to the number of lives that an adequate shelter program could save. "If the program was an urgent one last year," one congressional proponent recently remarked, "it is an urgent one this year." The logic of this is, unhappily, irrefutable.

The 40th Anniversary of the Lions Club, Miami Beach, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Lions Club of Miami, I am only one of hundreds who will offer their congratulations and tribute to the Miami Beach Lions Club on the occasion of its 40th anniversary.

As an example of the spirit that animates those who hold dear the purple and gold banner of Lionism, I may cite the resolution of Florida's Lions which I had the honor to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives on March 26. The resolution "recommended and requested that all Lions, Lions Clubs, and Lions districts in the State of Florida, and Florida Lions while assembled in the next Florida Lions State convention, do favorably consider the adoption of this active program of American citizenship and patriotism. We pledge ourselves individually and collectively to take vigorous and positive action by encouraging, participating, and helping to develop educational programs designed to emphasize the American way of life to include our traditions, ideals, and religious freedoms, as well as our political and economic rights as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and to insure that our children, and the public are informed of the nature of the international Communist conspiracy to conquer the world."

The Lions Club of Miami Beach is only 10 years younger than Miami Beach itself, which celebrated the 50 years since its incorporation as a city on March 27. Of course, Miami Beach was already a going concern when the incorporation papers were signed in 1915. At that time there were plenty of hotels and bathhouses and a furious activity in construction. The man behind much of the activity was Carl G. Fisher who had planned and was building this beautiful resort city. He put up hotels, golf courses, polo fields, and playgrounds. Miami Beach has developed in 50 years from Fisher's plans and plats to a lovely city which entertains 2 million vacationers each year. For its own citizens it provides the services and joys of a true community.

The Lions Club of Miami Beach has had more than its share in the growth and development of this community. How could it have been otherwise, since Lions are men who are interested in good will and good fellowship, instead of distrust, fear, and hate. As the largest service club organization in the world, Lions International has achieved a truly outstanding record everywhere, but it is its achievements here in Miami Beach that we wish to honor on the 40th anniversary of our own Lions club.

Some of the entries for the early years in "The Lion" show how busy the Lions club of Miami Beach was, and describe the nature of the activities that it undertook in those days so long ago. In the April 1926, issue, it was noted that the club "arranged for the extension of streetcar lines; placed two signs of 'welcome' at the city's entrances, and assisted in the collection of subscriptions for the Miami University."

In the May 1926, issue, there was reported "a joint meeting with Miami club to meet President Benjamin F. Jones. Continuing the investigation of the school system with the idea of having the schools taken from county control and placed in the hands of a local board. Assisting the chamber of commerce in their advertising campaign."

The same spirit of dedication to country, community, and human welfare that

inspired the founders of the Miami Beach Lions club remains part of the club's greatness today. It deserves every salute that it will receive on its 40th anniversary.

Significance of Effective Resource Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Ford Shepherd, vice president of Mead Corp., made a timely and excellent speech to the 30th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference in Washington on March 8, 1965.

I commend this great address to the attention of the Congress and the people of the country.

SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECTIVE RESOURCE USE

(Remarks of Ford T. Shepherd, vice president, the Mead Corp., presented to 30th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, Washington, D.C.)

It is, I think, a singular distinction for a representative of the paper industry to have a part in your 30th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference.

Your theme, "Statesmanship in Our Changing Environment," focuses directly on a national situation requiring, I believe, new and concerted considerations as we reach midpoint in the "fabulous sixties."

Other speakers this morning have staked out the tremendous dimensions of "public responsibility for resource policy."

My subject, "The Significance of Effective Resource Use," presents an opportunity to discuss some results we have been able to achieve in our industry, and more importantly, these results furnish some needed direction for meeting the challenges facing us in the vast area of effective use of our natural resources.

As we all know so well, our natural resources have not always had the full appreciation of all our people. This accounts, in some measure, for the slowness with which we have approached the utilization of some of our greatest resources in the first place, and then in the maintenance, in the renewal, in the conservation of our resources' capability to contribute to our well-being, to our growth and development, to our environment.

In our drive to better our standard of living, we Americans, blessed as we are with so much in natural resources, have not always taken the time to count these blessings.

The early settlers of this country decided that progress in civilization was to be made and that blood and sweat and the resources at hand were expendable in attaining that civilization. This must have been the beginning of the American ambition—the American drive.

Evidently, those who followed in the pioneering of this great country believed the same way for they, too, concentrated their efforts on growing and developing as individuals, as communities, as States and as a nation.

The history of the United States is, indeed, a record of resourceful people using the resources provided by Providence to become the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

Small wonder, then, that in the lifetime of those of us here assembled, we have witnessed and participated in the continuation of the American drive to secure the biggest, the best, the most of the material things of life.

The significance of effective resource use is a story the South can tell so well and so proudly these days. From Virginia to Texas, the land of "cornbread and cotton" that was, is now the largest forest region in the United States. I've even heard it called the "pulpwood capital of the world."

Those of you who live in the South and especially those who are engaged in forestry there know all about the "miracle" in the southern forests and the importance of that natural resource to your economy.

What better lessons in effective resource use can be found than the record of the South?

The Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association wrote a little book about this "miracle in the southern forests" and I want to relate the story it tells:

"In 1935 the Nation's No. 1 economic problem was the South. In the depression-wrought pessimism of the midthirties even many southerners believed it, too, and prophets preached a message of more economic doom yet to come.

"In the 1960's the whole Nation knew how wrong was its 1935 view of the South's economic potential. What had happened? The most startling and yet one of the least known factors was the 'miracle' which had occurred in the forests. Gone were the acres upon acres of sunburned stumps, remnants of virgin pinelands, for the South was growing more wood than was being used. A simple analogy tells the story: The South started 1935 with 12 trees, cut 15 trees in the next quarter century, yet still ended up with 13 trees in the sixties.

"Who disproved the prophets of death for the southern economy and the forests? Who led the 'miracle makers'?

"They were the hundreds upon hundreds of professional foresters—pulp and paper industry foresters, State and Federal Government foresters, men who came to landowners as missionaries of forestry, men who urged fire prevention, scientific selection of trees for harvest, reforestation and other measures to achieve increased forest productivity, men who promised a market for trees which otherwise would never have been sold.

"Backed by an assured market, the miracle-working foresters spread their messages well: More than 12 million idle acres were converted into profitable forests; cooperative forest fire control covering 9½ of every 10 acres of southern forests was instituted—more than double the coverage of 1935; the pulp and paper industry through continuing research learned how to utilize more kinds of trees and to use more of the wood from each tree."

This miracle of the southern forests has continued and since 1962 the pulp and paper industry has pumped well over a billion dollars into the economy of the South each year. That's over $20 million a week. It is almost $3 million every day in the week, Sunday included. This is $121,016.50 an hour pouring into the economy of the South every hour of every day.

And, all of this through the utilization of the resources of the southern forests which the 1935 prophets declared " * * * would not long be important to the South's economy."

Paper industry management does not claim that accomplishment as its own. But our industry furnished the incentive and a considerable part of the leadership for others to accomplish it.

I feel sure everyone will agree that this is a dramatic example of effective resources use. We will agree, too, that only conservation-minded, industrious, and resourceful people could have accomplished the miracle of the forests and led the way in the South.

We in the paper industry are always profit conscious—we have to be—and our conservationist attitude in the use of wood is no exception. We just can't make a profit and waste trees—or any of our resources—at the same time. Profit consciousness and wastefulness simply are not compatible.

The significance of effective resource use stands out also in the experience of the paper industry in the management of another great natural resource—water.

Water as the principal component of our manufacturing process is just as important to us as wood is as our principal raw material. Both are essential. Indeed, these two natural resources are the life blood of our business. Without either one, we could not supply your needs for paper.

We require almost 5 billion gallons of water per day for separating cellulose from the nonfibrous constituents of wood, for making paper and paperboard from wood pulp, for steam generation and for cooling purposes.

And all but 5 percent of that tremendous volume is returned to the stream. Our net use or consumption is small by comparison to our intake.

And, just as interesting is the fact that the runoff of rain on the 50 million acres of woodlands owned or controlled by our industry amounts to six times as much water as the total intake of the paper industry for all purposes.

The industry's efforts in conservation of our water resources are highlighted by the fact that our water use per ton of product has been cut in half in the last 20 years. This trend of decreasing water use per unit of production is continuing. However, our greatest gains in this area are still in the future, I am confident.

The industry's sensitivity to the importance of effective water resource use and our positive attitude toward management of our water resources was demonstrated first in 1939 when the Sulphite Pulp Manufacturers' Research League was formed in Wisconsin and then, early in 1943 when 16 companies established the National Council for Stream Improvement in the pulp, paper and paperboard industry.

The industry's record of performance in forestry and water resources to date is well established. It speaks for itself.

Now I would like to speak directly to the point that has much to do with the effective use of our water resources. It is indeed one of the great challenges of the "fabulous sixties" and, of course, I refer to the problem of stream pollution.

As conservationists you are concerned with all phases of natural resources restoration and management which includes the maintenance of the quality of our water resources.

And we, who are in the paper industry, are concerned with the availability of water both quantitatively and qualitatively for the purpose of carrying on our business.

You and we are dependent on the economic growth and development of all those things which contribute to our way of life, our well being and the growth of our national progress.

And, being people, we enjoy the same pleasures—fishing, camping, boating, etc.—and we are concerned with all phases of resources restoration and management. In short, all of us are conservationists.

Fundamentally, then, there is every reason to believe that we are in agreement on the multiple needs for our water resources. And yet, when the question of stream pollution comes up, the conservationists are on one side and industry is on the other side.

The debate doesn't go very far before the sole issue is "industry or fish," "sparkling, crystal clear water" or "filthy, contaminated, polluted water." In short, it is black or white and that's all there is to it.

Why must it be that way? Why can't we recognize the "gray area" in between the black and the white?

Dr. Edward J. Cleary, who has guided the Ohio River Water Sanitation Commission since its birth 16 years ago, said a short time ago in a discussion, "The Challenge of Water-Quality Management":

"On the one hand there are some who would tolerate an attitude of unconcern about stream pollution until a nuisance is created.

"At the other extreme are those who assert that users of water should return it to the streams as clean as 'technically' possible.

"Perhaps you might agree that somewhere in between these viewpoints on public policy—which range from acceptance of foulness to aspirations for pristine beauty—that an accommodation should be sought.

"Our 'effluent' society is not confronted with a choice of absolutes—of clean water versus dirty water or of fish versus factories. What we are faced with is the challenge of making an efficient adjustment to conflicts in water use."

And, in the Senate Public Works Committee document—"A Study of Pollution—Water," June 1963, we find two facts which, in my judgment, summarize this whole situation:

"The waters of our Nation constitute one of our greatest natural resources and are involved in all aspects of economic growth and well-being.

"Oversimplifying a very complex situation, the water resources problem confronting the United States from now on is one of making its relatively fixed supply meet a rapidly increasing demand by providing the right quantity of water of the right quality at the time and places where it is needed."

"Providing the right quantity of water of the right quality at the time and places where it is needed" is the job facing all of us. It is the great challenge of today and tomorrow.

The sixties and the seventies, too, will indeed be fabulous if we can turn this challenge into an accomplishment.

The Senate document I referred to outlines the responsibilities involved for the States, the local governments, the industries, the universities, and the Federal Government.

What are some of our shortcomings?

Well, one of them is our lack of understanding of each other's needs for water resources. We've all been too busy with our own problems to learn about those that affect our neighbors.

The greatest progress is being made in the abatement of water pollution in those areas or regions where the benefits, as well as the burdens, of the water resources are being considered in total.

The resulting attack on solving the problem is summed up in the words: "sensible management."

Regional water quality management is the result of the attitudes, plus the considerations, plus the realistic plans, of the people who are directly involved and want to solve the problem.

In my judgment, it can't be done by edict: it can and should be done by the constructive action of the people in the water resource areas and regions.

Effective resource use was never more important than it is right now. This is our common goal.

The paper industry has been a leader in stream improvement research and development. Accomplishments to date have been outstanding.

The magnitude of the industry's remaining problems will be a severe test of our scientific and engineering resources, our production resources, and our financial resources.

We believe we have the leadership capability for our part of the job.

To Be Judged by History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a mostly timely and pertinent editorial on the subject of China appeared in the Tuesday, April 15, edition of the Blue Island Sun-Standard. In view of its timely nature, I wish to place it in the RECORD at this point with the hope that Members will find these comments useful as they periodically review the Chinese situation:

TO BE JUDGED BY HISTORY

To every American, China should be a subject of top interest. Her actions and how the United States deals with them will have much to do with the hopes and prospects of all free people and with the world's success in avoiding the ultimate conflict of nuclear war.

What does China want? What are her strengths and weaknesses? What is the outlook for the United States and the West in Asia? The answers to some of these questions are outlined in a recent issue of Time magazine. Like most nations who have declined from a peak of power which they enjoyed at some point in history, China would like to extend her borders and her dominance of trade in adjoining countries along the lines which existed during the 1700's under the Manchu dynasty. Then, China included all of Mongolia, Korea, and Taiwan and held almost complete commercial and political control of the Rice Bowl countries of the Indochinese peninsula. Time magazine observes that since that time, "history has not favored Chinese ambition. First the colonial powers of Europe, then the Japanese conquerors early in World War II, and finally the United States—after assuming France's responsibilities in 1961—denied China control over the rice bowls of Indochina."

There is honest difference of opinion over whether we should face war with China in Vietnam. But the question is plain: "Can the United States and its allies retain their foothold on the rim of Asia, or must they eventually give way to China's insistent pressure?" Militarily, the West holds most of the chips. At sea and in the air, overwhelming force is lined up against China. U.S. forces in the Far East number over 220,000.

The 7th Fleet, with 120 ships, 650 planes, and 64,000 men can move quickly into action at any point, backed up with the 48-missile strategic nuclear punch of 3 Polaris submarines. The U.S. Air Force maintains 32 tactical squadrons of strike aircraft based from Japan to the Philippines and two squadrons of Strategic Air Command's B-52's stationed at Guam. On 24-hour notice, sizeable forces can be flown into Thailand. In any real showdown, the United States could probably count on the support of some 550,000 well-trained and equipped South Korean troops and Chiang Kai-shek's tough 600,000-man force.

Against this, China can bring to bear its sheer size and its immense infantry amounting to some 2.5 million troops, with 12 militiamen in reserve. These figures make it abundantly clear why no one talks seriously about conducting a land war on the mainland of China. Chinese troops are well-equipped with small arms but short on transport and armor. Her air force of 2,900 planes is largely made up of obsolete Mig-15's and 17's and except for some 28 submarines, she has no naval power.

As the military picture sums up, we do not have the human resources to face China on land, and China does not have the technical capacity or volume of equipment to face us at sea or in the air. It would seem that the winning hand will most likely go to the side with the greatest tenacity and patience. It is not likely that China anymore than Russia wishes to meet head on the full military power of the United States, but they will continue to foment and support all types of popular revolt and so-called wars of liberation as a cover up for Communist takeovers. In recent testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, Robert McNamara said: "The road ahead will be difficult, and continuing sacrifices will be required of our people, both in money and in lives. But the challenge must surely be met." Our success in meeting it will be judged by history.

Picketing White House by Unsightly Group of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely letter from Charles A. Orahood, a resident of my district and principal of the Charlottesville, Hancock County, High School:

CHARLOTTESVILLE, IND.,
April 27, 1965.

Representative RALPH E. HARVEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington,, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HARVEY: I have just returned from a trip to Washington, D.C., with a group of 71 seniors. We had the pleasure of visiting outstanding points of interest in our Nation's Capital. Our last place of interest was the White House. While the students toured the White House, I stayed with our tour escort and observed the dastardly, slovenly appearing group of so-called college students picketing the highest office of our land.

I spoke to the security officers, three of them, protecting this group or at least preventing trouble. They did not relish this assignment. This group had a reserved place on the walk and the free people had to detour around the group. This group had their bed rolls and had slept on the sidewalk all night, which I understand is a violation of a local ordinance.

It is difficult to teach young people patriotism, loyalty, and responsibility when this is observed.

I feel it is time that our Senators and Representatives face our issues squarely. I am speaking of freedom of speech and the other freedoms. I was taught that freedom does not permit license but brings about responsibility of the individual. We are becoming so tolerant that we are beginning to stand for very little.

As a school principal, I have instructed my teachers to open the day with the Pledge of Allegiance and a reference to Scripture. This I believe, along with the majority of Americans. We speak of church and state separation yet the school aid bill is including parochial schools indirectly. This is confusing to me especially after the previous Supreme Court ruling of church and state separation.

Our students were thrilled to sit in the galleries of the Senate and House, to visit the Lincoln Memorial and other interesting points, climaxed by a White House visit. As we boarded our buses, our last view was a group of dirty appearing, mixed up, cowardly, probably Communist-inspired beatniks. It is my opinion and the unanimous opinion of our group that a situation like this needs to end rapidly.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. ORAHOOD.

Pittsburgh: A City Reborn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the lively magazine Advocate, published by the Retail Clerks Union, has published an excellent story in its May 1965 issue on my home city. I include the article, "Pittsburgh: A City Reborn," as part of my remarks:

PITTSBURGH: A CITY REBORN

When Charles Dickens visited Pittsburgh during the last century he described it as "hell with the lid lifted." But the city is proudly showing its face to the sun these days. The overhanging blanket of smoke has been banished, the grimy accumulation on the city's buildings has been sandblasted away, and a building program of heroic dimensions is transforming the city's skyline.

Before the rehabilitation Pittsburgh had fallen victim to its own riches. Throughout its history coal and three rivers, the Monongahela, Allegheny, and Ohio—have been the city's greatest benefactors. The reckless exploitation and neglect of these resources, however, had inundated the city under smoke and disastrous floods. Pittsburgh's emergence as a city reborn started with the control of these age-old enemies.

The battle against floods began in 1936, stirred by the infamous Saint Patrick's Day watery devastation. A series of 10 major flood control projects was planned to protect Pittsburgh and other cities along the rivers. Eight of the projects are completed, and a ninth is under construction.

A NEW LOOK

Meanwhile, revolutionary smoke control ordinances, plus the investment of millions of dollars in filtering devices by industry, gave Pittsburghers a new look at the sun. Of all Pittsburgh's changes, the clean air program has been the most striking.

Conquest over smoke and floods sparked a new spirit of civic enterprise which was soon to be translated into the rebuilding of a new and modern city.

The symbol of the entire city is the Golden Triangle. Here, where the Ohio River starts, once stood Pittsburgh's most blighted area. It is now the brightest civic spot with a park, skyscrapers, new hotels, and broad bridges.

Standing on the eastern fringe of the Golden Triangle is the Civic Auditorium which was dedicated in September 1961. This is the site of this year's AFL–CIO union industries show—the impressive showcase of union crafts and skills and the superior products and services of fair employers. Between May 21–26, the 50,000-square-foot exhibit hall will be crammed with visitors viewing 350 entertaining and educational exhibits.

Pittsburgh is a particularly appropriate place for the union-industries show, since it is one of the famous places in American labor history. As a leading manufacturing and distribution center, it has one of the Nation's largest concentrations of union men and women.

DIVERSIFIED INDUSTRY

The industry most closely associated with Pittsburgh is, of course, steel. But there is a much greater diversity of industry than most people realize. Nearly 6,000 different products are manufactured in the four-county area which makes up the Pittsburgh standard metropolitan statistical area. And to help produce this myriad of goods requires the services of nearly a quarter-million men and women whose combined income exceeds $1.8 billion a year.

Approximately 146,000 persons are employed in the retail and wholesale trades in the four-county area. Retail sales are presently more than $4 billion a year. RCIA Local 1407 represents the organized store employees serving this vast retail market. Secretary-Treasurer Theodore P. Homitz is the executive officer of the dynamic local union that represents employees of the major downtown department stores as well as other segments of the retail industry.

EARLY HISTORY

Geography and energy are the two great forces that have shaped the city. The city's history began in 1758 when the British erected a fort on the point of land where the Golden Triangle now stands. They named the stockade Fort Pitt in honor of William Pitt, then Prime Minister of England. The area is closely linked with George Washington, who conducted a military survey for Governor Dinwiddie of Virginia, and who fought with General Braddock in the French and Indian War in the area.

It was near Pittsburgh that the British forces finally triumphed over the French and determined the destiny of the United States as an English-speaking nation.

In the first years of the 19th century Pittsburgh was the most important town in what was then the Western United States. It had constant communication by packhorse trail and express riders with the populous cities on the Atlantic seaboard. Along this trail came endless caravans of new settlers. Westward the emigrants followed the forest trails into Ohio and the Great Lakes region. The channel of the Ohio carried thousands to Kentucky and adventurous boatmen were taking Pittsburgh products to distant French markets in Louisiana. Ships were built here and Pittsburgh products were sent direct to European ports without breaking cargo.

After coal was discovered, Pittsburgh became the hearth of America. The first blast furnace was built here, and its steel production amazed the world.

THE CITY TODAY

Today Pittsburgh is known as an education, health, cultural, and research center. More than $100 million has been spent recently in strengthening the colleges and universities in the city, another $60 million has been invested in Pitt's new Health Center, which in addition to providing for the finest in patient care in rehabilitation, has already produced far-reaching scientific achievements, including the Salk polio vaccine.

In an era when research holds the key to future growth, Pittsburgh has emerged as one of the greatest industrial research centers.

The Pittsburgh area is the site of the world's first full-scale plant utilizing the power of atomic fuel to produce electricity.

The city's renaissance, of which it is so proud, will continue as a source of pride for many years to come, as well as serving as a model for urban renewal and redevelopment everywhere.

Town Hall Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, some of the prominent citizens in my district revived the idea of having a town hall meeting last week in the Dayton Public Library as a means for discussing some of the foremost issues of the day with my constituents. Their thought was that this type of public forum has been long overdue and, judging from the response and success of the meeting, I would agree.

Among those in attendance was Mrs. Harold E. Hayes, president of the League of Women Voters of the Greater Dayton Area, who presented a statement on behalf of the league. Mrs. Hayes' statement dealing with some of the serious issues that confront us, I believe, is noteworthy and I take this opportunity to bring her remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF MRS. HAROLD E. HAYES ON BEHALF OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE GREATER DAYTON AREA

The League of Women Voters of the Greater Dayton area appreciates this opportunity to present to Mr. Love the considered views of our members on some of the important issues that face the United States today.

Foremost among these issues is that of U.S. foreign policy which has long been a major concern of the league. Our studies have convinced us of the need for international cooperation to keep the peace and promote the development of a prosperous economy in this complex and diversified world.

The United Nations, it seems to us, is the best instrument yet conceived for this purpose. During the last 2 years our members have taken a new, hard look at this organization, examining its strengths and weaknesses with a friendly but critical eye. Our conviction has been sharpened that U.N. financing is a collective responsibility of all member nations and that peacekeeping efforts should be strengthened. Our support for economic development, a strong Secretary General, a truly international civil service, and greater use of the World Court has been reaffirmed. We have agreed to support the one nation one vote principle and negotiations under U.N. aegis to reduce the risk of war.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC AID

The LWV of the United States supports U.S. policies which promote world economic development, maintain a sound U.S. economy and further international and regional cooperation. The economic reality of this position is that in this interdependent world the few rich nations cannot continue to prosper unless the purchasing power of the many poor nations is broadened and increased. The political reality is that if the United States, the richest nation in the world, is indifferent to the needs of the less fortunate nations, they in turn will be indifferent if not hostile to the values which we hope will be widely shared.

We believe that the United States should continue to sponsor foreign assistance programs long range in scope, adequately financed, effectively coordinated and administered and which emphasize cooperative efforts by developed countries and maximum self-help by developing countries.

We believe that enough money should be appropriated for these programs to underwrite development loans and grants, technical assistance and U.S. contributions to international organizations in proper proportion our own great resources.

Private investment of U.S. capital in the less-developed countries can be an important supplemental means of helping these countries reach self-sustaining growth. The league, however, favors protecting these investors by continuation of governmental assistance, such as preinvestment surveys and investment guarantees.

TRADE

The league believes that a liberal U.S. trade policy will best serve the political and economic interests of this country and of its citizens collectively and individually by paving the way for political harmony with other nations, stimulating economic growth at home and abroad, and expanding the opportunities for consumer choice among a wide variety of products. We support a flexible effective and efficient trade policy based on the public interest rather than on special or sectional interests. We endorse systematic reduction of trade barriers, and broad, long-range Presidential authority to negotiate trade agreements on and across-the-board basis.

WATER

The league has been supporting legislation to improve water quality advance water research, and increase the effective partnership between States, cities, and the Federal Government in planning and financing water resource development and pollution control.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The LWV of the United States has a long record of support of self-government for the District of Columbia. We place a high value on our own participation in local government affairs and have a hard time understanding how it is that our fellow citizens in Washington, D.C., have been compelled to live under the frustrating conditions that exist in the National Capital. We hope that you will support S. 1118, which would provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate in the House of Representatives.

Hon. Barratt O'Hara

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make this statement congratulating my good friend and colleague, BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, on his 83d birthday.

Soldier, educator, Governor, and now, legislator—where is the location of the fountain of youth that he has discovered and used to such good advantage?

Forthright and courageous—a man of dominant will, who could face down the devil, if necessary.

A champion of the disadvantaged, both individual and national, it has been my great privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs where he has made a great and outstanding record upholding the rights of the Democratic African countries as chairman of that subcommittee. He has continually shown his friendship for that small Western-oriented country in the Middle East known as Israel.

May his breed continue; and may he, as the leader he has always been, continue to show us the light for many years to come. And may we again have the privilege next year of celebrating his 84th birthday.

Cutting Costs With Carpets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have been most impressed with the tremendous technological gains our carpet industry has made in the last few years. Carpets are no longer considered a luxury item but are now recognized by experts as a desirable and economical floor covering. The manufacture of floor coverings which wear longer, look better, absorb noise and reduce cost of maintenance has enabled this industry to expand their markets to many new areas thought impossible only a short time ago.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend our distinguished leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, his special committee and the Architect of the Capitol for their foresight in authorizing the installation of carpet in the new Rayburn Office Building. These carpets have created a dignified and wonderful environment, but most important of all, the Government can maintain these floors at a higher appearance level and at the same time save money on maintenance costs. You will be interested to know that they have installed the carpets over concrete slab, thereby eliminating the necessity of installing other expensive types of floor covering. I am convinced that the savings in maintenance costs alone will be more than enough to pay for the carpets and installation within a very short period, and in addition, the carpets have made each office a more efficient and desirable place in which to work.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the dynamic progress which the carpet mills in my district have made. Our research and development programs have been fascinating and the end results have been fantastic. South Carolina is considered one of the leading carpet centers in the world and our plants there are providing employment for thousands of people. They are making a lasting contribution to the industrial growth and welfare of my district and my State.

The installation of carpeting has been for many years an accepted practice in hotels, motels, and many offices, but in the last few years research has proved beyond any reasonable doubt that carpets are an economical and desirable floor covering in schools, hospitals, dining rooms and many other public areas. You will be interested to know that a carpeting is now being designed especially for kitchens. Research conducted at schools where carpeting has been installed shows that the carpeted area cost approximately half as much to maintain at a higher appearance level when compared to other types of floor covering. The savings derived from the use of carpeting in schools throughout the Nation has been most impressive.

The Bender Building, here in Washington, D.C., has installed carpeting in all its corridors and elevators consisting of approximately 1,729 square yards. Based on their own study, the owners estimate their maintenance costs alone have been reduced by $10,000 annually. On the basis of the desirable results obtained from this pilot project, this corporation is installing carpeting in their new office building located at 18th and G Streets NW. Carpeting will be placed in the corridors, elevators and all office space. It is my understanding that a substantial savings in maintenance costs will be made through this use of carpeting.

Acoustical qualities of carpet are another important factor which have gained recognition in the past few years. Dr. Harris of Columbia University, who has performed extensive acoustical research on carpeting, found that controlling noise at its source was far better than allowing noise to be created and then trying to control it with acoustical tile. He estimated that noise could be reduced in a room by as much as 50 percent through the use of carpet. The U.S. Bureau of Standards has estimated that sound-conditioning properties of carpet were not only 10 times greater than any other flooring product, but actually increased the efficiency of many acoustical products used on ceilings.

The Federal Housing Administration has given carpeted floors a higher rating for their ability to reduce impact noise in apartment buildings. A publication by the Federal Housing Administration points out that the rapid rate of apartment buildings currently in progress in cities throughout the Nation, plus the trend to lightweight structures and increasing noisiness of our environment, "have led to a growing number of complaints to the FHA of inadequate sound isolation in multifamily dwellings." In every series of tests reproduced in the report, the floorings using carpeting—with and without padding—surpassed other floor and ceiling combinations in their ability to reduce impact noise. Also, the carpeted floors tested exceeded the FHA recommendations for minimum noise control in every case.

You will also be interested to know that leading architects throughout the Nation are recommending carpeting in schools, hospitals, apartments and other public areas as a desirable and economical floor covering.

I have been intrigued with the expanded use of carpeting in public schools and the favorable reaction by pupils and teachers as well as the tremendous savings made through reducing maintenance costs. I would like to insert an excerpt from the American Carpet Institute's newsletter concerning a maintenance contract for schools:

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES LABORATORIES, INC., NEWSLETTER REPORTS ON CARPET PLAN NOW OPERATING IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

The current issue of EFL College Newsletter, fifth in a series published for college administrators by Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., reports on a carpeting program developed and operated by the School Research & Service Corp., 5201 Kenwood Avenue, Buena Vista, Calif.

Erwin Somogyi is president of the corporation which offers carpet to schools and colleges at no initial cost with a 5-year maintenance contract.

The newsletter reports: "Via the wonders of American enterprise, seven California public schools opened this fall, their interiors graced by 30,000 square yards, or almost 6 acres, of wall-to-wall carpeting that won't set them back a nickel initially. The carpet is not a gift. The secret ingredient—as they say in the soap commercials—is maintenance."

The report explains that schools contracting for 5 years of maintenance services get carpeting, installation, and service in the same package. This is made possible, the newsletter states, by two factors:

"(a) With carpeting, less maintenance is required than when the schools had hard surface flooring; (b) the contractor, using special equipment and techniques, is able to perform the work with greater efficiency than the schools' custodial staffs. Where a school formerly required eight men to do the job, the contractor can cut it to five. The savings on the cost of the three men amortizes the carpeting. The arrangement, therefore, is not possible without the carpeting."

The report explains that carpets used are of a high quality of the same type installed in Shaker High School, Newtonville, N.Y., and that colors, quality, installation, and care conform to specifications set up by the schools. Arrangements are made for renewal of the 5-year contracts, an option to buy the carpet, or termination of the contract after 2 years with carpet leasing or purchasing.

The newsletter quotes Frank L. Mattox, assistant superintendent of business, La Puente Union High School District: "A thorough cost study was made prior to entering into the carpet and custodial services contract * * *. We found that there would be no material increase in cost by contracting the service. We have been in operation in a new high school under this contract for about 1 month and our experience so far has been in line with our estimates. It would appear that by contracting this service, including the carpeting, we will experience no increase in cost of any significance. We plan to evaluate this program during each of the 5 years of the contract period."

This is impressive evidence of the overwhelming merits of carpeting and is full justification for expanded use of carpet in all Government buildings including hospitals, rehabilitation centers, nursing homes, housing for senior citizens and housing financed by FHA.

I have outlined only a few of the outstanding features of carpet which justify it as an economical floor covering. I am indeed pleased that carpeting has been installed in the new Rayburn Office Building and I would like to commend the carpet industry for the outstanding progress they are making in designing and manufacturing carpets which will contribute to making the new Rayburn Office Building a beautiful and more desirable place in which to conduct our business.

Russia's Guilt at Katyn Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD at this point an article written by J. K. Zawodny, which appeared in the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune, April 20, 1965, entitled "Russia's Guilt at Katyn Forest":

RUSSIA'S GUILT AT KATYN FOREST

PARIS.—Twenty-five years ago, during World War II, occurred the largest annihilation of prisoner-soldiers since Genghis Khan. In the early spring of 1943, German forces occupying a former rest area of Soviet security police in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk discovered bodies, eventually numbered from 4,400 to 4,800, of some of the missing Polish prisoners in mass graves. Each had been shot through the head; the hands of many had been tied behind them; a number of the bodies had bayonet wounds.

Germany immediately accused the Soviet Union of responsibility for the massacre and proceded to exhume the bodies, arranging for an international medical commission from German-occupied and neutral countries and a separate German Medical-Judiciary Commission to examine the bodies in order to establish the time of the massacre.

COUNTERCHARGE

The Germans contended that the Poles had been killed by Russians in 1940, before the German Army had invaded the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union almost immediately charged that the Germans were responsible for the deaths, because the Poles had been captured from the Russians when the German forces occupied Smolensk; the Poles, maintained the Soviet Union, had been employed near Smolensk building roads from the spring of 1940 until July 1941, when the Russians lost control of the prisoners, who were captured and then shot by the Germans.

At the time of the discovery of the graves the Poles believed no one. Poland in September 1939, had been attacked simultaneously from the east and the west by the Soviet and German Armies. Both took hundreds of thousands of Polish prisoners, and both had applied genocide on occupied Polish territory.

After Germany invaded Russian June 1941, and the Soviet Union became one of the Allies, the Russians signed an agreement granting amnesty to Polish citizens "deprived of their freedom" in the Soviet Union. A valiant Polish officer thus freed, Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, was to command a Polish army composed of former prisoners of war in Russia. After a time, when the army had gathered and counts were complete, 15,000 men—of which 8,300 to 8,400 were officers (about 45 percent of the Polish officer corps)—had not appeared.

STALIN'S SUGGESTION

Cross-checking revealed that the missing had been interned in three Russian prisoner-of-war camps until the early spring of 1940. At that time the camps had been evacuated and a small group of men from them had been gathered into a fourth camp or held in special prisons. The rest had not been seen since then. The men from the fourth camp, about 400 in number, were able to give much information which later provided some clues to the motive for the massacre. In fact, one witness, still alive, was saved literally minutes before execution.

General Anders organized a search office for the prisoners; all available information was gathered and collated. Inquiries in the Soviet Union at all levels produced conflicting statements and a suggestion from Stalin that the men had escaped, possibly to Manchuria.

The exhumations in Katyn Forest revealed the dead men all to have been from one of the three camps—Kozelsk.

From German-occupied Poland a Red Cross medical commission was permitted to investigate the graves at the same time the international commission did so. Into the Polish Red Cross commission the Polish underground managed to infiltrate several members to assess the evidence independently.

Finally, when the German Army withdrew and the Soviet Army reoccupied Katyn Forest, a Soviet commission investigated the graves. The international Polish Red Cross and German commissions placed the time of the deaths as the winter of 1940. The Soviet commission, in its report, stated that the men had been killed by the Germans in August or September.

COATS, BOOTS, ACID

All available evidence can be evaluated as follows:

1. The Poles were searching for these men from 1941; the Soviet officials could have reported that they had been taken by the Germans, rather than give the evasive replies which they did until the graves were discovered.

2. Heavy overcoats, tightly buttoned, on all but a few bodies, refute the time of year stated by the Soviet report as the time of the murder, as does the absence of bugs and insects in the graves.

3. The excellent condition of their boots, with soles almost unworn, indicates the fact that the men could not have been employed in roadbuilding for more than 1 year, as the Russians claimed, but were killed shortly after their capture.

4. The Polish, International, and German commissions unanimously agreed that the layers of bodies were literally fused together by a sticky acid produced by the process of decomposition and that this acid, together with the pressure, caused the bodies to leave mutual impressions upon each other which had not been disturbed from the time of death, destroying the Soviet thesis that the bodies had been removed from the graves previously by the Germans in order to remove some documents and insert others.

RUSSIAN ROPES

5. The latest date on the documents (letters, diaries, camp newspapers from Kozelsk) found on the bodies was May 6, 1940.

6. Young spruce trees had been planted on the graves. Microscopic analysis of the trees indicated they had been planted 3 years earlier, or in 1940.

7. The men in the graves were grouped in the same order in which they had left Kozelsk in the spring of 1940. (They had left camp in 20 separate groups.) Those remaining in camp made lists of the departing groups. These lists were kept and were taken out of the Soviet Union. The lists verify the grouping. Had the men been employed in roadbuilding for more than a year it is unlikely that they would have remained in the same order for that period.

FALSE DOCUMENTS

8. The rope, meticulously cut into pieces of uniform length, with which some victims had been tied, was unquestionably of Russian origin. Wounds on the bodies of younger men were from four-cornered bayonets, a type used only by Russians at that time.

9. The Soviet Government blocked an investigation by the International Red Cross which the Germans had requested.

10. All the commissions except the Soviet concluded on the basis of autopsies that the bodies had been in the graves for at least 3 years, again pointing to the time of the massacre as the spring of 1940.

11. The ammunition used was of German manufacture; however, it was verified that it had been exported to Poland, the Baltic States and the Soviet Union before 1939.

Points 6 through 10 were not handled in the Soviet report. No foreign medical representatives attended the Soviet investigation and even Polish Communists were excluded. The report claimed to have found on the bodies already searched documents with dates to June, 1941; however, as the report prepared by the Polish Government-in-exile states, all these had either been "issued by the Soviet authorities or passed through their hands" and concerned persons known not to have been in Kozelsk.

At the Nuremberg trials the Germans were indicted and prosecuted by the Soviet Union (which had taken the responsibility for prosecution in "crimes against humanity in Eastern Europe"), itself not cleared of suspicion in the crime.

No judgment was rendered, and the Katyn case disappeared from the trial, as did the file concerning it, marked "top secret" from the offices of American military intelligence.

What of the other 10,000 men? They have never appeared, but their fate can be surmised from that of the men from Camp Kozelsk.

CONGRESS INVESTIGATES

It was the American Congress which brought the affair to light again. A special committee was established in the House of Representatives which questioned about 200 persons and studied documentary evidence from 1951 to 1952. It unanimously concluded that the Soviet security police had perpetrated the crime, and it recommended that judicial proceedings against the perpetrators be instigated.

The motive for killing the prisoners will perhaps never be postively established, but a number of clues and some evidence point to the fact that the men were murdered because they were not susceptible to indoctrination and were members of the Polish military and professional elite, which, by prevailing standards of Soviet officialdom at the time, made them automatically enemies of the Soviet Union.

Twenty-five years have passed. The present Soviet Government, as evidence of good faith and dissociation from the bloodbaths of Stalin and Beria, should admit the responsibility for the mass murder, reveal where the remaining 10,000 men are buried, allow the return of all 15,000 bodies to Poland for honorable burial, compensate the families of the men killed, and punish the guilty who still live.

Mr. Speaker, J. K. Zawodny, author of "Death in the Forest," an assiduously documented study of the Katyn Forest massacre, wrote this article, pulling together the painfully gathered known facts of a mass murder that was appalling even amid the horrors of World War II.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

The Role of Business in the Poverty War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 30, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a real war on the roots of poverty will require the participation of many different segments of our society. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, recently gave a most informative address on the role which business can play in the war on poverty. I ask unanimous consent that this address, delivered before the Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPORATE WEAPONS IN THE POVERTY WAR

(Address by G. Keith Funston, president, New York Stock Exchange, before the Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches, Philadelphia, Pa., Friday afternoon, Apr. 23, 1965)

I must admit to feeling both grateful and wary in speaking on the subject of poverty before the Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches. Grateful because this is a problem of broad current interest to churches, to church members, to business organizations, and to the Nation at large.

The wariness crept in after a friend warned I'd be facing an overly expectant audience. "They plead poverty all the time in my church," he complained. Let me emphasize at the outset, then, that I can give you no advice on wiping out a church deficit.

Rather, I speak as president of an exchange whose members deal in the stock of more than 1,200 corporations—a position that has permitted me to observe the contribution these companies make to our national economy—a contribution which, of course, has an all important impact on the problem of employment and its antithesis, poverty.

I also speak from some self-interest in wishing for the well-being of Americans, for our central securities marketplace prospers in proportion to the health of our economy. Much of our effort at the exchange is bent toward expanding public share ownership in American business. We have seen the number of share owners grow from 6.5 million in 1952 to 17 million 3 years ago at the time of our last share owner census and to perhaps several million more today. All the more reason then, even beyond the humanitarian aspects, that we wholeheartedly support coordinated action in raising the living standards of those in poverty who still remain outside the mainstream of our dynamic economy.

Corporations also have an important stake in the war on poverty. Providing economic opportunity for the impoverished and unemployed results in better-trained and more productive citizens. This in turn means more customers with more dollars to buy the goods and services offered by American corporations. Thus, all businessmen have a self-interest in eliminating poverty. The public interest and their self-interest are identical. When such mutuality of purpose exists, real progress is possible.

While poverty in the United States today is not as prevalent as in other years within our memory, its presence is made more appalling by contrast with the prosperity that surrounds it. I am reminded of the beggar seen standing in Battery Park one day in early spring. The first buds graced the trees and the new grass had come to life. Birds winged overhead. A bright sun made of the whole scene a brilliant canvas on which the beggar stood, tin cup in hand, a string supporting a card suspended from his neck. On the card were the simple words: "It is spring—and I am blind." Poverty is indeed a sad condition in any season, but in the spring of a Nation's prosperity it is tragic.

Poverty may extend to 20 percent of our families, according to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, which bases its estimate on a total family income under $3,000 a year.

Such weeds of want in our garden of plenty result from many and complex situations, and their eradication points to a long and concerted national effort. As noted in a resolution last year by the National Council of Churches:

"The elimination of poverty requires many deliberate steps by many different segments of our society—by people of good will acting individually and through voluntary religious and welfare associations, by employers and others in the private sector of our economy, and by citizens and taxpayers acting through their government."

What I would like to examine with you today are the steps to deal with the problem that are taken and can be taken by business corporations. The corporate community is not new to the war on poverty. It has been doing battle for years, drawing on a vast arsenal of weapons bearing such familar labels as jobs, wages, fringe benefits, research, educational grants, on-the-job training, and taxes paid.

These are not secret weapons, and it is noteworthy that they conform with the objectives toward which the Fedarl Government has earmarked most of its billion dollar antipoverty budget: employment and education.

Looking at what corporations are doing in these areas, we come first to the oldest and most effective remedy for poverty—the creation of jobs. By expanding their operations, corporations have contributed to a growth in employment that brought the civilian labor force in mid-March to a seasonally adjusted total of more than 71 million, the highest ever.

Jobs generate wages, and wages are a potent weapon against poverty. In 1964, an average of about 66 million full and part-time wage and salary workers were employed in nonagricultural industries. They earned about $330 billion in wages and salaries. Another $30 billion was paid out in employer social security contributions and payments to health, insurance and pension plans.

New jobs are created by corporations through expanding their productive capacity, reducing their costs and broadening their marketing appeals. One benchmark of this overall effort is the money corporations expend on new plant and equipment. Over the decade, from 1955 through 1964, business spent a total of $364 billions or an average of $36.4 billion a year, on expansion and modernization, substantially more than the total value of all private plant and equipment in the United States at the end of World War II. This helped create millions of new jobs.

Another benchmark and probably the most important seed money, in terms of new jobs, is the money corporations invest in research. Research has been credited in a study by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology with stimulating a large share of the growth in the gross national product since 1900. Today's new and better technology can be traced to research financed by corporations. This spending has now reached $13 billion a year, nearly 100 times as much as was expended in 1940. Out of this research comes not only jobs, but new products and sometimes entire new industries.

Emerson once said: "Progress is the activity of today that is the assurance of tomorrow." Through their multibillion-dollar annual investments in research, corporations are seeing that this progress continues.

Like research, education is also an activity of today that holds assurance for the future. Here, too, corporations have been making an important long-term investment—an investment in people. A Department of Labor survey reports that some 3 million workers were receiving training within industry in the spring of 1962. Current estimates put the amount to be spent by corporations this year in the area of education at $4.5 billion—half what it costs to run the Nation's colleges and universities. Corporate expenditures per trainee are often two and a half or three times the national average for conventional educational institutions.

Liberal scholarship funds are extended by many corporations to their employees and to the families of employees. Further, corporations have a long history of giving aid to colleges and universities. Last year, such contributions totaled about $250 million. One of the leading organizations helping to raise funds for the support of America's colleges and universities is the Council for Financial Aid to Education. In the course of serving as a director of this active group for the past dozen years, I have noted a steady and encouraging growth in corporate support of education. One-fourth of this support is coming, however, from about 80 companies out of the thousands in our Nation. The council has its sights set on doubling the corporate contribution, and greatly broadening the base of the number of companies making gifts to the colleges of their choice.

The important role of education in alleviating poverty is dramatized in statistics which show the unemployment ranks heavily weighted with the unskilled and the least educated. Unemployment among college graduates last year was about 1½ percent, while the rate for workers with less than 8 years of schooling was about 8 percent. Among nonwhites (mostly Negroes), who compose about 10 percent of the labor force, the unemployment rate was almost 10 percent.

The urgency of education and on-the-job training is not lost on corporations. As technology increases, as automation progresses, higher skills are required in the average industrial job. More skilled jobs are available, and fewer nonskilled jobs. In certain respects there is a race between technology and education. Leading business companies have made the role of educator very much a part of the private enterprise system. Education is, of course, the job for many segments of the community, public and private, but corporate business is contributing an important, and often overlooked, share.

Jobs, wages, research, education, all are ways in which corporations are fighting poverty without most people being aware of it. Even less noticed, but nonetheless effective, are the taxes corporations pay to help defray the cost of Government projects, including the billion dollar Federal war on poverty. In 1964, corporate tax payments to the Federal Government came to about $31 billion, and State levies swelled the tax bill still further. Uncle Sam is a principal stockholder in the earnings of most all of America's larger companies.

To review such a list of contributions to the national economy—jobs, wages, research, education, taxes paid—is a graphic reminder of the fact that corporations play the largest role in creation of wealth, and thus by definition in the reduction of poverty. It follows therefore that a major contribution that corporations can make to the sruggle against poverty is to stay healthy, by operating at a profit. For unless private enterprise is healthy—and, yes, profitable—the additional jobs and the tax revenues needed in the long run will not be forthcoming. I think we can all agree therefore that the indispensable condition to permanent success in the war on poverty is a strong and expanding private economy that can create more jobs, pay out more wages, finance more plant expansion, underwrite more research, support more education, and pay its fair share of taxes. Only more jobs will permanently conquer poverty, and only an expanding private economy will provide sufficient jobs.

Vital as all this is, however, we now can afford to do more. Our affluence enables us to launch an attack on the kinds of poverty which have special characteristics and which also require specific countermeasures. Let us look at some of these problem areas.

It is disheartening in our socially enlightened times to consider the number of youths who wander our streets with little on their hands but time and little on their minds but trouble. In many cases, there does not exist even the motivation for finding work because their home lives have been conditioned to long-term unemployment and dependency on the public welfare.

Purely from the standpoint of their cost to society, I have read that $40,000 of public funds must be expended over a lifetime to keep these victims of poverty alive at the very lowest subsistance level.

Yet, it is not the cost that worries us, it is the lost opportunity that poverty respresents. Doles are of little avail in enhancing our output, our productivity, or permitting the maximum fulfillment of our Nation's human resources. Of more value are jobs—jobs that can help erase the twin ills of hopelessness and apathy that beset the poverty stricken. You who go into so many dwellings on missions of mercy are aware that employment brings more than money to a home—it provides self-respect and dignity. And it instills in the children in that home a realization of the need and value of earning a livelihood that would otherwise be absent.

Hopefully, many of these young victims of poverty will get a new lease on life through Job Corps training centers that are being operated by a number of private corporations as part of the Federal antipoverty program. The companies' aid was enlisted because of their extensive experience in training people for particular jobs.

It is expected that some 35,000 youth between the ages of 16 and 21—many of them school dropouts and illiterates—will enroll in the Job Corps during 1965, and that about 20,000 will graduate this year. Their training will encompass such subjects as basic reading, communication skills, practical mathematics, citizenship, history, human relations, basic business methods, clerical courses, instruction in truckdriving, and forestry.

Once trained, the overriding challenge is to find employment for these young people. At the New York Stock Exchange, in addition to our normal recruiting, we plan to help the Job Corps program to the fullest extent we are able. Although our total payroll is only about 1,700, and our turnover is limited, we plan to consider for employment in nontechnical jobs qualified graduates of the Job Corps who receive a certificate of recommendation from officials in charge of that program. In such cases, we would regard the Job Corps recommendation as a substitute for the customary high school diploma.

Still another way that businessmen can and do help fight poverty is by providing leadership in programs at the community level. For it is here—in the village, the town, the small city, and the neighborhood of the metropolis—that the real victories will come. Churchmen know this all very well. Poverty on a national scale is hard to define, and even more difficult to combat. But reduce it to people on a block, to a family across the tracks, to some children in a church organization and you have a problem capable of personal action.

To help organize assistance at the local level, a large number of industrialists, as individuals, have formed the Business Leadership Advisory Council in support of the Government's poverty poverty program. As part of its credo, the council stated:

"The economic opportunity program is essentially a businessman's kind of effort. Helping the poor help themselves is its keystone. It does not offer handouts; it offers opportunities. It is concerned with creating the conditions under which a child born in poverty can have the chance to help himself, to compete on equal terms with others not poor. This is the historic promise of American life. It has provided the impetus for American economic progress from the beginning."

With so much public and private support being directed at the elimination of poverty, there is an obvious need for pinpointing areas of need. This job is being undertaken by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, with Edwin D. Canham, editor in chief of the Christian Science Monitor, as chairman.

According to Mr. Canham, this group is making an intensive, hardnosed study into key areas of the poverty problem including needs of the aged, the sick and disabled, the minority poor, the uneducated, and the unemployed. They expect to begin publishing a series of reports shortly.

I do not envy the task force its job of preparing a subsequent report on the basic causes of unemployment and underemployment, but I welcome their effort. There is so much we need to learn on this subject. There are doubts raised about the very statistics of unemployment—whether the figures produced are truly reflective of the extent of unemployment. Some say the unemployment problem results from a slow rate of growth, which in turn is charged to a lack of demand. Others trace it to an imbalance which has developed between the skill and educational requirements of the new jobs and occupations in contrast to the qualifications of the workers who are unemployed. Others say we need to increase incentives for job providers, and decrease incentives for persons to stay on welfare.

But whatever the causes, it is incumbent on the private sector to find solutions. For as Secretary of Labor Wirtz observed at a symposium on employment sponsored by the American Bankers Association last year, the matter of employment must be left to the strengthening of the private economy.

Job retraining and the providing of a modicum of education is just a partial answer to this challenge. The big task is to put as many individuals as possible into the mainstream of our economy, a goal that depends on accelerated economic growth and expanded job opportunities. It is a continuous task to which business has long been making a major contribution and which today presents an even greater challenge for the future.

Businessmen have a stake in insuring that any steps taken in the poverty program are not temporary, but will contribute toward permanent alleviation of the problem. When we train or retrain the technologically unemployed worker, when we do all the things that are now in the poverty program, we make one solid assumption: that there will be someone there to hire these people and to use these new skills on a permanent basis.

The individual, the business community, and society as a whole suffer from the direct and indirect consequences of poverty—including physical and mental diseases, delinquency and crime, and loss of productive capacity. It has been estimated that the eradication of poverty would increase our gross national product as much as $15 billion annually, as well as lower the cost to the general taxpayer for welfare.

In summary, then, corporations fight poverty with many weapons, particularly jobs, wages, research, education, and taxes paid—all of which come from the arsenal of free enterprise. We can measure their success in the growth of our work force, the expansion of our productive capacity, and the gains in our national income and wealth. But the battle is not done. We have now attained a stage of affluence permitting us to focus our attention on those particular causes of poverty most resistant to general attack and solution.

I have attempted to sketch some of the tasks that lie before us—the necessity of providing jobs for the millions of young people who are coming out of our schools and colleges as well as out of the Job Corps camps—the necessity through education for fitting more and more Americans—old as well as young—for the labor skills needed by the economy.

The task of enlarging economic opportunity for those now being bypassed by the mainstream of economic growth is not an easy one. It will take great effort, much study, fresh approaches, money, and talent. Corporate America, I am sure, is already enlisting in this campaign. If our economy remains healthy and continues to grow, corporations can and will play a still larger role in solving this national problem.

No one profits from poverty, least of all corporations—for it is anathema to the very economy in which they operate. The corporate community will continue to fight poverty with all its resources—as must we all.

For it is indeed spring—and we are not blind.

Citizens and Public Officials—Partners or Rivals?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Arthur Naftalin, mayor of Minneapolis, recently made a forceful speech

calling for partnership between government and private agencies. He spoke at the Citizens Conference on Community Planning in Philadelphia earlier this year.

Mayor Naftalin is a member of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Urban Health Affairs, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the executive committee of the American Municipal Association, the Continuing Conference of Public Service, and the board of trustees of the National Institute of Public Affairs.

A University of Minnesota graduate, Mayor Naftalin was secretary to Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY in 1945–47 when the latter was serving as mayor of Minneapolis. He has held an associate professorship of political science at the University of Minnesota, was consultant to the International Cooperation Administration, Michigan State University project in Saigon in 1957, and commissioner of administration, State of Minnesota, from 1954 to 1960 when he became mayor.

I believe that Mayor Naftalin's address deserves the attention of many of us in Government service, and I therefore include excerpts from his address herewith in the Appendix:

CITIZENS AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS—PARTNERS OR RIVALS?

In case there is any suspense concerning the title of my talk, I will tell you at the start, so you won't leave the meeting in doubt, that I think citizens and public officials must be partners and not rivals.

* * * * *

When I was elected mayor in 1961 I had been in office only a day or two before I was facing a parade of problems in the health and welfare fields. I found that the perfectly natural thing to do was to call the Community Health and Welfare Council of Hennepin County and ask for help. What do I do about an appointment to the welfare board? Who is the proper person in the community for this or that appointment?

The next day there would be a health problem, the next day one in human relations, and so it went. It soon developed that whenever we were in trouble, the directive from me was: "Call the health and welfare council." And, that's the way it's been going ever since.

* * * * *

One of the crucial problems we face as we consider the role of social planning is: How do we get people in our community—leaders in commerce, industry, labor, the professions, education, religion—to see that we are a nation in conflict, that new values are emerging which clash with old values, that these conflicts and clashes are the outgrowth of a dynamic technology which is basically altering the world in which we live?

In other words, it is imperative that the indispensability and the inevitability of social planning be understood by all leadership elements in our communities.

We are in conflict on many levels and in many ways. The overall community is in conflict with the neighborhood. The central city is in conflict with the suburbs. The State is in conflict with the Federal power. Municipalities are in conflict with the State. And this is because our society seeks to respond to both the old and the new; it seeks to serve both the community and the neighborhoods; it seeks to preserve the status quo and still accommodate itself to emerging new groups demanding full participation.

It is apparent, if we reflect on these problems for a moment, that there are only three forms of social action.

The first is the historic approach of America—individual action. We have gloried in our tradition of individual initiative; we hallow the frontier virtue of each man taking care of himself, each man providing for his family and participating in a small neighborhood wholly with his own resources. This has been our pride and it has been a great strength in our national life. It has helped us discover and appreciate the values and qualities of the individual human being. This appreciation lies deep in our history—it is related to puritanism, to the Protestant ethic, and its finds continued emphasis in our religious and political life. We exhort each other to be masters of our own destinies and not to rely on our neighborhood or our government.

But, individual action—whatever its historic value—is not adequate for modern society, however adequate it may have been in frontier days. By himself, however gifted, the individual is increasingly helpless. He is more and more dependent upon society.

There is no way for the individual to work through a complex economy such as ours, and have a place in it, except as he is educated by the community; and, except as the community provides an economic and social organization in which there is a place for more and more people.

We came soon in our history to recognize the need for another form of social action, namely, the joining of our voluntary efforts in the service of the community. Thus emerged many forms of voluntary group action, often spontaneous and usually directed toward helping those in need. This was action in response to problems that were larger than what could be handled by individual action. From this need have come charitable drives, united funds, community health and welfare councils. These, too, are hallowed as being in the tradition typified by our national memory of the threshing bee, when neighbors got together to help each other during the harvest. It is the frontier response when need or tragedy strikes a neighbor. It is still an important value in American life.

The threshing bee, the volunteer fire department, the united fund, the community health and welfare council are all efforts by the people in the community, without prodding or compulsion, with compassion and concern for others, to say, "We'll help our neighbors and we will do this on a voluntary basis." But, in my view, it isn't enough, in this modern world, to leave the action we need to voluntary impulses of individuals, even working in concert.

The third great line of action is, of course, government. Historically, in America, we have looked upon government as a last resort. We have, in fact, regarded government action as a kind of evil. We look upon governmental assistance and public assistance and public direction as admissions of failure. There has never really been in this country an acceptance of public assistance programs. If you will reflect for a moment, I think you will agree that even today we malign the AFDC program and other assistance programs. We're often suspicious of any effort on the part of cities, or counties, or States, or the Federal Government, to help people through what we call "handouts." Even the terms we apply to these programs are often negative and critical.

* * * * *

There is now a long and growing list of Federal programs which are based on social planning on the part of local communities and on the part of nongovernmental agencies. I am thinking, for example, of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. At the start of this program it was recognized that we could not cope with juvenile delinquency by treating it as a problem for Government alone.

The program needed the voluntary participation of community agencies and a willingness, on their part, to participate in planning programs at the local level which would lead to effective implementation of the larger national effort.

The same is true in area hospital planning and in other public health programs. There is growing recognition that public health needs cannot be met by fiat or dictation from the Federal or State level. The growing effectiveness of urban renewal programs is due partly to the increasing insistence by the Federal Government that neighborhood groups and community organizations participate in their planning. It is true also in many other areas of government action such as the manpower development and training program of the Department of Labor, the many programs in the National Institute of Mental Health and, most recently, the Equal Opportunity Act or Anti-Poverty Program.

* * * * *

Community health and welfare councils, as citizens' organizations, have the power to instigate governmental programs and to initiate private voluntary programs. They have the power and the muscle to develop the kind of public interest that will help government fulfill its proper responsibilities.

Of pivotal importance to the success of governmental action is the increased participation by lay citizens in the planning and implementing of government-sponsored health and welfare programs. Governments at all levels are now placing increased responsibility on local citizenship and involvement. I would point, in this connection, to the close relationship which has developed between the Health and Welfare Council of Hennepin County and the city of Minneapolis because I feel this is illustrative of the kind of work that must be increased all over the country.

For example, our local health and welfare council responded with alacrity to a request of mine and appointed a countywide economic opportunity committee. This committee is functioning smoothly and competently, providing us with a proper joining of governmental and voluntary resources in the fight against poverty. Its existence rules out the possibility of rivalry or competition among public or private agencies that have an interest in the antipoverty program. The success of the program in my city will depend upon our ability to mobilize our local resources, not only for community action projects under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act, but for all phases of the comprehensive fight against poverty.

Our success will be measured not in terms of what we get in the way of Federal largesse but rather in terms of the community's capacity to mobilize its resources on a broad basis, involving all the people in our community. If we are not able to do this the best plans and intentions at the Washington level will not be successful in the antipoverty effort.

A second major relationship between the city and our council is in the field of youth development. Immediately after passage of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act in 1961 I asked the health and welfare council to undertake sponsorship of a youth project and to apply for Federal support under the new act. It responded and as a result, Minneapolis has one of the major youth development projects in the country—a project that involves high-level citizen and governmental leadership. It has, in my view, the proper blending of the two—voluntary action with governmental action.

This project has already given us a comprehensive analysis of the problem of delinquency, as it exists in Minneapolis and the

surrounding area, and we know now, in a way that we never knew before, what our agencies, both public and voluntary, can do to make programs in this area more meaningful and effective.

A third major relationship between the council and the city government has been in our vast community renewal program. Some of you may know that Minneapolis enjoys one of the largest renewal programs in the Nation. We have continuously had the support of a contractual relationship with the council, providing us indispensable assistance in controlling and eliminating environmental blight.

A fourth relationship involves a specialized aspect of our renewal work. It is one in which I take special pride because I have seen, day after day, the effects of this excellent program. This is a working relationship between our housing authority and the council in the field of housing for the elderly. We are enormously proud of what Minneapolis has done in this area. We have over 1,500 units of low-rent public housing for the elderly, and I think it is fair to say that this activity has been so successful that it is today wholly removed from controversy and is widely applauded by everyone. It has brought to our community great physical and social improvements along with better housing for a large number of our older people.

Here again the council has served us well, not only by joining in the planning but, in helping to shape constructive community attitudes. At the moment, I might add, the council is working with our housing authority in the planning of a most attractive, highly functional senior citizens activity center which, while it won't be limited to residents of the projects for the elderly, will be, essentially, a center of service for the people who live in them.

Finally, just within the last few weeks, our board of county commissioners announced plans to construct a new correctional facility for delinquent girls. This projects grow out of an intensive study which the council made some time ago.

I have described these relationships in some detail because I feel that what we are doing in Minneapolis is precisely the kind of relationship that is dispensable for any community seeking to cope with its social problems.

Government is aware that by itself it cannot meet these problems. It needs the reinforcement and support, the planning and direction, the mobilization of voluntary efforts, that only an agency like the community health and welfare council can provide.

Now, having said all this, I want to turn to what I call the caveats in community planning. First, I believe councils should enlarge their scope. The ills we've mentioned here are so interrelated, so intertwined, and cover such broad areas of welfare, race relations, and poverty, that the effective council must view its field of activity as covering the full range of the community's social relationships. Social planning cannot be effective in isolated segments. It must be comprehensive and involve fully both sides of the partnership axis—the community and the government.

A second point is the need to broaden the base of the council's participation. Our community health and welfare councils tend to become too much oriented to the middle class. As we seek to enlist people of influence and people of leadership, we tend to overlook the fact that there is a growing disjunction between the upper 80 percent in our population and that lower dispossessed, deprived and denied 20 percent. It is extremely important that councils reach not only into the power structure but also into the neighborhoods for active participants. Councils must seek out these people and make sure they participate in policy discussions and insure that, through them, the entire community becomes aware of the pattern of community life—what the ills are, what the deficiencies are, and what the alternative programs to action may be.

Third, and this may sound contradictory, the council must insist upon the active participation of top leaders in business, labor, and the professions. Do not be content with second- and third-echelon representation. Demand that the community's leaders make the community's welfare needs a top-priority concern. As time goes on and as our problems become more complex, as demands upon the time of community leaders grow, many of them seek to withdraw or avoid deep involvement in the problems of the community. This is a great loss. It is especially difficult for the central city as more and more of the leaders in industry and the professions—even labor leaders—move to the suburbs, and turn their backs upon the central cities, because it is, of course, in the central city where the social ills are most manifest.

* * * * *

Here I must deliver my most serious warning and it is that we cannot expect community health and welfare councils to do their work unless they are adequately staffed. All of the exhortation, all of the developmental work will come to naught if the council does not have adequate staff and high-quality staff.

There are no miracles in social planning. Social planning demands the gathering of hard facts and information, the blending of diverse viewpoints, the shaping of programs that will work, the staging and evaluating of pilot projects; and then, by means of skillful public relations, selling them to the community. All this is not accomplished by wishing, it requires competent staff at every turn.

A further need must be emphasized—this is the development of a greater awareness of governmental programs on the part of those involved in voluntary activity. I am often surprised to discover the degree of ignorance on the part of well-educated and presumably sophisticated people concerning, for example, the categorical aid programs. They are often strong in judgment about the evils of public "handouts" but they have no real understanding of the public assistance programs, their objectives and the complexities in their administration.

Councils can and must educate those in positions of leadership with respect to governmental programs. More than 80 percent of all the money spent in the health and welfare field is spent by Government. Your success as councils will be measured only in part by what you do as organizations and more largely by what you accomplish by way of influencing and affecting governmental action. You must always be prepared to assist in the filling of positions on welfare boards or on governmental advisory commissions and in helping Government obtain the help of community leaders.

Thus it is that Government and the voluntary agencies face their common objectives side by side. Those of us in Government can make an effective impact only through mobilization of the resources of the community—the human resources.

* * * * *

Now there are two mechanisms for mobilizing people: One is through Government, the other is through voluntarism. We've got a wide range of governmental and voluntary agencies but there must be an agency to guide and direct the others.

In my mind that key agency is the community health and welfare council. Across the country many councils have already responded to this appeal and are moving with force and vigor to mobilize the best brains of their communities and the most effective individuals so that an impact can be made totally and fully and in a fashion that brings into the closest possible harmony the Government and the voluntary agencies.

In the end we will begin to find solutions as we achieve a relationship that is a genuine partnership.

Medical Care for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 30, 1965

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, as you know, our colleagues in the House of Representatives recently passed, and sent to the Senate, for our consideration, the measure providing for a medical program to care for our elderly citizens. This bill, in addition to containing the basic provisions of the President's proposal, also adopts the most desirable aspects of the so-called elder-care proposal. As a recent editorial in the Chattanooga Times stated, this measure "represents a landmark of progress toward assuring adequate medical care for those in the age span likely to need it the most."

I request unanimous consent that this editorial be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GOAL NEAR REALIZATION

Extension of federally financed welfare benefits to cover the major costs of hospital and medical care for Americans over 65, an issue in Congress for 20 years and a prime objective of Democratic administrations since 1960, is now virtually assured.

The House passed the administration-backed bill on Thursday, 313 to 115. The Senate is almost certain to follow suit, when the measure comes up, having approved a somewhat less liberal program last September. That bill died for want of House acceptance.

As it stands now, however, the House-approved plan is far more than the familiar medicare proposals of recent years, which provided for hospital and nursing care for social security beneficiaries over 65 years of age.

To be sure, this feature has been retained, and will be financed by recurring increases in social security levies. But the benefits have been extended to cover all persons over 65; the costs for those not under the present social security system will be borne from general tax revenues.

Advocates of medical care have, in addition, picked up on proposals first sponsored by Republicans and broadened the program to include a supplementary plan for medical care insurance. Participation would be voluntary; those who desired the protection would pay $3 monthly premiums, matched by Federal grants, to finance the benefits. Generally, these would cover 80 percent of medical costs over and above an annual $50 deduction.

Funds for both the basic and the supplementary programs will be placed in special trusts, lessening the strain of indeterminable demands on the social security system year by year.

As written, the bill also broadened the medical aid to the aged program, which is

handled by the States on a matching Federal aid basis, and included material increases in current social security benefits under other programs.

Added together, the first year's cost is estimated at $6 billion, of which only about one-half represents benefits under the new medical care program.

The bill does not present a perfect answer to a very real problem. Difficulties are certain to arise, as for instance, the likelihood of more and more persons seeking early hospitalization in already overcrowded institutions. And we would have preferred an optional arrangement whereby individuals could have requested their social security hospitalization benefits in cash for the purchase of insurance as they chose.

The plan, however, does have the right framework of the social security system for the basic provisions, plus the desirable feature of voluntary participation in the extended coverage. As such, it represents a landmark of progress toward assuring adequate medical care for those in the age span likely to need it the most.

Anniversary of Armenian Massacre

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, half a century ago the people of Armenia suffered perhaps the first attempt at genocide in modern times. The Government of the Turkish Empire instituted a plan which led to the massacre of 1 million people and uprooted from their homes another 1 million. This terrible crime against humanity has gone virtually unnoticed through the years; in fact, Hitler, in 1939, contemptuously asked:

Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?

To reemphasize that sad history Armenians in the United States have established a commemorative committee on the 50th anniversary of the Turkish massacre of the Armenians. I congratulate them on this effort, for the terrible episode they commemorate should be ever present in our minds as further evidence of man's inhumanity to man. We must ever be aware that such terrible things can happen.

In recent days we have learned of wholesale murders in the Dominican Republic. In another part of the world we rightly fear that our withdrawal from Vietnam would lead to the mass murder and persecution of those who have gallantly fought to defend their land.

Even this terrible trial was not the end of troubles for the people of Armenia, for after becoming a free country in 1918, Communists invaded the army and labor unions and attempted an uprising, which was suppressed. Thereafter Russia made a secret deal with Turkey whereby Turkey would attack Armenia from the south and Russia would begin harrassing action on the north. In 1920 Russia offered Armenia a treaty, which amounted to an ultimatum. Despite a guarantee of sovereignty, Russia took over on December 2, 1920. The Russian treatment of the Armenians was so cruel that on February 19, 1921, an outraged people threw out the Communist government and established their independence.

Upon reorganization of the independent Republic, Prime Minister Simon Veratzain appealed to the free world to help keep Armenia free. No aid came, however. In August 1921, great concentrations of Soviet military forces broke down Armenia's military resistance.

So the troubles of the Armenian people have been many, but at least in the commemoration of their great tragedy in 1915, we can perhaps renew our belief in the freedom and dignity of man and rededicate ourselves to prevent further occurrences of genocide wherever and whenever they may occur.

Law Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 30, 1965

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, tomorrow, Law Day will be celebrated throughout our country. In connection with this national observance, the selectmen of Lincoln, Mass., one of our fine, old New England towns, have prepared and issued a proclamation reaffirming our faith in our system of laws and independent courts. Their proclamation is brief, to the point, and timely in its emphasis on the important stake each of us has in working to insure that justice does prevail. I am glad, therefore, to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the proclamation, which was published in the Fence Viewer, the weekly newspaper published for the towns of Lincoln and Sudbury, Mass.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"LAW DAY" PROCLAIMED

LINCOLN.—Although proclamations of special days are numerous at the State and national level, the Lincoln Board of Selectmen have traditionally proclaimed only a few of these for recognition by the town. One of these is Law Day, May 1. The selectmen's proclamation, signed by Chairman Elliott V. Grabill, Russell L. Haden, and Harold E. Lawson, follows:

"PROCLAMATION

"It is always fitting that every citizen give thought to reaffirming faith in our systems of law and independent courts. Our democratic system of life and government is based on delegation of decisionmaking and acting. The laws of the land, constantly changing, are our accepted and agreeable definitions of how we comport ourselves.

"It is not easy to change laws or to contribute to an equal and rational enforcement which treats all citizens equally. It is hard, dedicated work to bring about justice within the framework of our laws.

"Our democracy is firmly based on citizen acceptance of this harder way which requires diligent effort and a positive and imaginative approach to solutions. Toleration of violations which can only spread rips the societal fabric and destroys that discipline which constitutes democratic education.

"We, therefore, selectmen of Lincoln, do hereby proclaim Saturday, May 1, 1965, as Law Day U.S.A. in the town of Lincoln and call upon the citizens of the town to recognize this special day.

"Dated at the town of Lincoln this 5th day of April 1965.

"R. L. HADEN
"HAROLD E. LAWSON
"ELLIOTT V. GRABILL."

Credit Unions a Deterrent to Loan Sharks—New York Times Article by Sal Nuccio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, prior to the beginning of the credit union movement in this country, a workingman who found himself short of funds to meet a financial obligation or to overcome a personal crisis, such as pressing medical bills, often turned to loan sharks in order to obtain the necessary money. These loan sharks often charged interest rates of 50 to 100 percent or, in some cases, even higher. When the borrower received his pay check, a representative of the loan shark operation was right at hand to make certain that the borrower made prompt payment, and it was not uncommon for borrowers who were late with payments or missed payments to receive threats from the loan sharks and, in numerous cases, physical violence was inflicted by the loan shark operators.

However, credit unions have helped greatly to bring about the end of loan shark operations. No longer is a workingman required to deal with these moneygrabbers but, instead, can work out his financial difficulties with a reputable, locally owned and operated credit union.

Recently, the New York Times published an excellent article on the value of credit unions to the working community. In order that every Member may become fully acquainted with the operations of credit unions, I am including a copy of the New York Times article:

PERSONAL FINANCE: VALUE OF CREDIT UNIONS

(By Sal Nuccio)

The young man was desperately concerned with the economic future of his wife and three children.

Misfortune and lack of credit knowledge had plunged him deep into debt. And the $186.88 in monthly payments on loans totaling $4,200 was considerably more than his $135 weekly salary could sustain. Falling behind in payments, he was about to take "just a small stop-gap loan," when his wife persuaded him to bring his problem to "the credit union at your office."

There, through family financial counseling, the couple saw a way out of their crisis. Not an easy one, by any means, but one with which they could live. Found qualified, the

husband was granted a single long-term, relatively low-cost credit union loan sufficient to eliminate all other debts. The credit union dealt with his creditors, minimizing the penalties of loan prepayment.

Repayment of the one large loan came to about $104 a month, deducted from his paycheck at the rate of $24 a week. It included nominal savings as well as interest and loan amortization. The ray of hope was that, after 5 years, the family would not only be out of debt, but also would have about $900 in savings.

But a credit union is not just a rehabilitation center for the financially disabled. It is of special benefit—in terms of dividends and often of supplemental life insurance—to the provident, whose savings make up the fund from which other credit union members may borrow.

In essence, a credit union—a State or federally chartered nonprofit corporation—is a group of people who agree to save their money together and to make loans to each other at low interest. It is organized by members of a particular group, such as employees of a company, members of a fraternal order, church, or labor union, or residents of a closely knit community. The members elect officers and committeemen and set policies at annual meetings.

More than 15 million people belong to the Nation's nearly 22,000 credit unions, which have a total of $9 billion in assets. The effectiveness to an individual of a credit union lies in the creative blending of the basic features, which are:

Savings plans: Regular savings, often by payroll deduction, are encouraged. In most credit unions, the allowable maximum savings (called "shares") in an account is $5,000, and the average return, or "dividend," is 4 percent a year, compounded semiannually.

Life insurance: Most credit unions provide life insurance without extra charge. Each savings dollar, usually to a maximum of $2,000, is matched with a dollar of insurance on the life of the individual account owner or the first-named owner of a joint account, provided that he or she is between the ages of 6 months and 55 years.

Under 6 months, or between 55 and 60 years it is 75 percent, and between 60 and 65 it is 50 percent. The protection does not depreciate, in that a depositor retains 100 percent coverage on money deposited before age 55, or 75 percent on money deposited between ages 55 and 60, and so on.

Loans: Personal loans are made "for provident or productive purposes." While the maximum allowable interest charge is 1 percent a month on the unpaid balance, many credit unions charge three-fourths of 1 percent. Some charge less, but they generally do not provide loan protection insurance, which automatically pays the debt—up to $10,000—if the borrower dies or becomes permanently disabled.

A monthly interest rate of 1 percent on the unpaid balance comes to an annual "true"—or actual—interest rate of 12 percent, and is equivalent to a 6-percent advance-discount loan for 1 year from a bank. The three-fourths of 1 percent monthly rate equals an annual true interest rate of 9 percent, and compares with a 4.5 percent discount loan.

The borrower generally will find the credit union's rates competitive, especially in that they usually represent the total cost of the loan and insurance provision.

In one instance, a high-salaried executive decided he wanted the life insurance protection afforded by a credit union account, but did not care to divert $2,000 to it in one lump sum. He borrowed the $2,000 from the credit union, immediately deposited it in an account and agreed to repay the loan in 100 weekly payroll deductions.

The result was $2,000 of life insurance from the account and $2,000 of life and disability insurance on the loan, which reduced as the loan was repaid. Over 2 years, the $175 interest cost of the loan was nearly offset by the $162.83 in dividends on the savings, at 4 percent a year, compounded semiannually.

Buying privately, a man of 30 would pay about $11.40 a year to age 65 for each $1,000 of term life insurance (generally has no cash surrender value). Buying at 40, the cost is about $14.60, and at age 50 it is $20.

Another case involved a 55-year-old father of a girl about to enter college. Concerned that his premature death might end her education, he borrowed $5,000 from his credit union and deposited it in an account. He periodically drew on the account as tuition bills came due, and, as in the preceding illustration, the cost of the loan was offset in part by savings dividends. Including the maximum of $2,000 of life insurance on the account, the father had a total of $7,000 of insurance, which reduced steadily as the loan was repaid—and as his daughter progressed through college.

The young man had started into debt safely and innocently enough with a $2,500 home-improvement loan from the credit union. Uninsured damage to his auto brought him to a commercial bank for a $600 loan, and medical expenses in excess of his health insurance coverage brought him to one and then another consumer finance company for an $800 loan at each. Further, there was imprudent use of a revolving charge account, on which a fixed amount is paid monthly until the outstanding debt is paid. The interest rate of 1.5 percent monthly on the unpaid balance put the actual annual interest at 18 percent.

When he went to the credit union, the unpaid balance and monthly payment on each loan was as follows:

Credit union	$2,000	$56.34
Commercial bank	600	30.00
Finance company	800	40.27
Second finance company	700	40.27
Charge account	100	20.00
Total	4,200	186.88

In the actual case, the man was able to secure a credit union loan of $4,200, with the credit committee's approval, consolidating all debts. He provided three substantial comakers willing to assume the debt, if he defaulted. However, it also could be secured with a wife's income or other assets, such as the cash value in a life insurance policy.

In general, effort is made to provide the largest possible loan that a man could secure, and then to eliminate or reduce the most burdensome of loan payments. This means that a debtor may not be able to obtain a large enough credit union loan to pay off all other obligations.

The Bank Merger Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 30, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bank Merger Chaos," published in the Lorain, Ohio, Journal, of April 23, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANK MERGER CHAOS

A bill (S. 1698) has been introduced in the U.S. Senate by Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON of Virginia, to do what the Bank Merger Act enacted by Congres in 1960 was intended to do.

The original measure was designed to put the decision on bank mergers in the hands of Federal banking supervisory agencies which have the specialized knowledge necessary to regulate the banking system intelligently.

No lesser a person than President Johnson, then a Senator, thought that the 1960 legislation solved the important and delicate problem of handling mergers by having them accepted or rejected on solid financial and economic grounds. On the day the Bank Merger Act was passed he stated:

"The bill establishes uniform and clear standards, including both banking and competitive factors, for the consideration of proposed bank mergers."

Almost as quickly as the act was adopted, the U.S. Supreme Court upset it by repudiating approved mergers at the behest of the Justice Department, thus in effect giving merger-approval power to this department. The congressional plan was thwarted by judical legislation.

In a recent decision the Court ordered dissolution of an approved merger in the Manufacturers Hanover case, forcing an end to a union made 3½ years ago in good faith and in accordance with the act of 1960.

Senator WILLIS, who is chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and by virtue of this post well aware of the lack of a coherent merger policy, has proposed to make the issue clear. His bill provides: "The authority to approve mergers, consolidations, and acquisitions of stock or assets and assumptions of liabilities, herein conferred on the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the corporation shall be exclusive and plenary, and any banks participating in a transaction approved or authorized under the provisions of this section shall be and they are relieved from the operation of the antitrust laws."

Banking is too sensitive a segment of the national economy to be buffeted by Justice Department legal attacks and court reversals after the parties to a proposed merger have acted in good faith and with approval of the Federal agencies authorized to decide the question.

The agencies have the knowledge and the facilities to reach a proper decision, and once made it should stand. Congress can still bring order out of the legalistic chaos which now surrounds bank mergers. Adoption of the Robertson bill should do the trick.

Barratt O'Hara's Birthday

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy this morning to join my other distinguished colleagues to pay tribute to BARRATT O'HARA on his birthday. I have known my distinguished colleague for a period of a quarter of a century. He has always been a fighter in the public interest. In Illinois, we refer to him as the boy wonder of Illinois politics.

He has served his country in war and peace. He is the only Member of Con-

gress that is a veteran of the Spanish American War. At the early age of 30, he served our State as Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, the youngest in the history of our State. He led the fight for the passage of the State's first minimum wage law. He reentered military service during World War I and at the termination of hostilities, he resumed his law practice. In 1948 he was elected to the Congress of the United States. He served in the 81st Congress, the 83d, the 84th, the 85th, the 86th, the 87th, the 88th, and 89th Congresses with honor and distinction recognizing the needs and wants of the vast majority of the American people.

To my 83-year-old young friend, I say to you that America is stronger because of you.

Tribute to Dr. Gordon Seagraves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 30, 1965

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, at a time when there is so much adversity in southeastern Asia and so much worldwide attention to, and concern over, the acts of violence in that area of our world, the simple acts of humanity and brotherhood of one man, who dedicated his life to his fellow men of the same area, may escape notice. Yet, just recently one such person died while still attempting to minister medicine, kindness, and the Christian ethic to the people of Burma. As a recent editorial in the Greenville Sun, of Greenville, Tenn., stated:

Dr. Seagraves took the idea of the Peace Corps to Burma long before it was ever discussed in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial tribute to Dr. Gordon Seagraves be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GORDON SEAGRAVES, A REMARKABLE MAN

Dr. Gordon Seagraves, a practicing Christian doctor, has literally given his life for his fellow man in far off Burma. He died this week.

Born of missionary parents in that country, he spent the last 40 years ministering to the ills of the people of that country and manning a Christian outpost in an area where Christianity is almost unknown.

The first time I saw Dr. Seagraves was at a small field hospital deep in the jungles of Burma during the Ledo Road campaign in the spring of 1944. A vigorous, outspoken man who wore a major's insignia on his shoulders, he was ministering to Chinese casualties in a field hospital.

He probably never would have been considered a great surgeon in the eyes of modern experts. But he was the only surgeon in that area and except for him hundreds and maybe thousands would have died before medical attention could be given.

A few months later when northern Burma was liberated and Dr. Seagraves returned to Namhkam where his hospital and headquarters had been occupied by the Japanese for 2 years, I visited him for a day and watched literally hundreds of people being treated in his clinics.

It was the most unusual hospital I have ever seen. Kachin headhunters from the mountains of the Tibet border would come and bring an entire family with all their possessions while a senior member of the family was being treated. There must have been several thousand people in the area who belonged to the families of those actually under treatment. The men would sit around little bashas and smoke while the women did most of the work of feeding and caring for the family.

Late in the afternoon there was always a softball game and Dr. Seagraves would take part in it along with nurses, patients, and other personnel. Sometimes a visitor would be asked to pitch.

Church services were held regularly and many of the northern Burmese became practicing Christians due to the influence of Dr. Seagraves and his family.

Dr. Seagraves took the idea of the Peace Corps to Burma long before it was ever discussed in this country. His work survived in spite of Government opposition, harassment from natives and others who may have been jealous of him and his work, and a lack of funds which was always a serious problem.

He gave his life and all his labor to the people of that area. The Burma Government may never recognize his service, but we hope that his fellow Christians in the United States will continue to give assistance to the work which he started so long ago.

Hon. Lawrence Wood "Chip" Robert, Jr., Receives the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma, in Recognition of Distinguished Public, Private, and Philanthropic Service, for and in His Efforts Toward the Establishment of International Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 30, 1965

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on April 14, 1965, in New York City, the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and diploma of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama, was awarded to my warm personal friend, Lawrence Wood "Chip" Robert, Jr., of Atlanta.

This is the highest honor of the foundation, and it is well-deserved recognition of "Chip" Robert's outstanding humanitarian service.

I am particularly happy to make note of this special occasion, since it again gives me the opportunity to pay tribute to one of Georgia's outstanding and dedicated Americans, my good and dear friend, "Chip" Robert, Jr. "Chip" is an outstanding engineer and architect, and is known all over the world. He rendered outstanding service for all our Presidents, and we in the State of Georgia are very proud of him and his charming wife, "Evie" Walker Robert. Unfortunately, my duties in Washington, D.C., prevented me from participating in this award ceremony.

I ask unanimous consent that highlights of the procedure of the award ceremony be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the procedure was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The invocation was delivered by Henry E. Alexander, American deputy provost of the foundation, who afterward introduced Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost, in the following language:

"It now gives me a great pleasure at this time to introduce Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost. His worldwide humanitarianism has brought him honors from many nations and honorary doctorates from many colleges. He is associated with many fraternal organizations, and he is a representative of MONY. Dr. Bayern will make the presentation address, honoring Mr. Robert, Jr.:

"When Franklin D. Roosevelt died just 20 years ago, I was reminded of my personal efforts to help him make sufficient recovery, so that he could run for Governor of the State of New York, for two terms, and President of the United States for four terms. I took an outstanding bracemaker to his then summer cottage in Marion, Mass., June 1926, who made him braces of leather and steel, for both his back and both limbs.

"Major Bowles, Mr. Waldo Mayo and "Chip" Robert, Jr., and I helped provide funds for the Warm Springs Foundation, directly and indirectly, when over 6,000 dinners, balls and other functions started the campaign to raise sufficient money to permit polio research. Mr. Robert, Jr., paid a great part in this worthy cause, for which we are all grateful.

"We are gathered here today to honor a great humanitarian, public spirited citizen of the world, educator, architect and engineer, a dedicated leader who helped elect and reelect former President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as a top-ranking member of the Democratic National Committee, and who served in the Treasury Department during his administration.

"You, Mr. Robert, Jr., were awarded the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross by the unaimous vote of the board of dignitaries of this foundation, in recognition of your outstanding service to mankind, charity, education, ethical conduct in the business world, comparative religions, architecture and engineering, and in further recognition of your untiring efforts toward the establishment of international peace, and finally because your merits and accomplishments comes within the framework of aims and purposes of this foundation.

"The Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, named after the soldier-patriot-statesman-martyr, the former President of Ecuador, at the turn of the century, is for the perpetuation of principles of justice, truth and friendship among peoples and nations, and seeks to promote moral values with personal integrity, for which Gen. Eloy Alfaro devoted his life.

"The philosophy of President Alfaro (1842–1912), known as the Abraham Lincoln of South America, was based principally on service to his fellow human beings and to the cause of international peace. The public and private activities of the Honorable Lawrence Wood "Chip" Robert, Jr., comes within the framework of this kind of service to mankind. In recognition of this fact, the ruling body of the foundation grants you its highest honor—the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and diploma.

"You know, my dear 'Chip' Robert, Jr., that you join a goodly and select company of fellow Americans, who have been similarly honored in the past. They include President Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President HUBERT

H. HUMPHREY, Senators MANSFIELD, RUSSELL, DIRKSEN, the late former Presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, and Herbert Hoover, former Presidents Harry S. Truman, and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the late General of the Armies, Douglas MacArthur, Gen. Eugene McAuliffe, U.S. Army, retired, Gen. Willis D. Crittenherger, Maj. Gen. Robert E. Condon, U.S. Air Force, retired, J. Edgar Hoover, Governors Rockefeller and Harriman, Hon. Robert Moses, Lieutenant Governor Malcolm Wilson, along with James A. Farley, who typify the caliber of men who hold this honor."

Mr. Alexander then made the investiture, reading the diploma, translated from Spanish, as follows:

"THE AWARD

"Eloy Alfaro International Foundation—'Thus One Goes to the Stars'—recognizing the special value of the service rendered by the Honorable Lawrence Wood Robert, Jr., in support of the objectives of this institution, he has been awarded the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. In witness whereof, this diploma, with the seal of the foundation, is presented in the city of Panama, Republic of Panama, on the 14th day of April, 1964." (Signed by the officers of this foundation, the three sons of the late Ambassador Colon Eloy Alfaro, and the grandsons of Gen. Eloy Alfaro, President of Ecuador at the turn of the century).

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE WOOD "CHIP" ROBERT, JR.

"Dr. Bayern, Hon. Henry E. Alexander, and friends, I am overwhelmed and deeply appreciative of receiving this great honor, which has just been conferred on me by two old and true friends, Dr. Bayern and Mr. Alexander for their part in this ceremony. I feel very happy that I now join such a distinguished select group of fellow Americans, many of whom have been good friends of Evie and I.

"To be the recipient is indeed a high honor, and I shall regard it as an inspiration to accelerate my efforts in carrying out the high ideals and principles of the aims and purposes of the Eloy Alfaro Internaitonal Foundation of the Republic of Panama. I shall be glad to continue my efforts to promote world peace through prayer to divine providence.

"I wish to again express my personal appreciation and gratitude for both Dr. Bayern and Mr. Alexander, in conferring this Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross on me, and I hope and pray that we may have peace in our time."

Captive Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice in support of the bipartisan effort to establish a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

It is true that there have been some welcome changes in the Captive Nations, and even in the Soviet Union itself which indicate a degree of relaxation in police state rule. There has also been some reduction in Soviet economic denomination of the captive nations, however, the captive nations are still occupied or surrounded by Soviet armies. Their economies are still largely dominated and controlled by the Soivet Union.

The Sino-Soviet dispute has temporarily given the captive nations some degree of bargaining power, and indeed the Soviet Union has made gestures toward giving them some independence. But how deep do the changes really go? This Committee would help the Congress and the Nation in keeping abreast of these changes, and would also symbolize to the world that the American people are still aware of the fact that the captive nations are involved in a struggle to free themselves from Soviet imperialism and colonization.

Edna H. Mack Receives Distinguished Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending this year's spring convocation at Gardner-Webb College. When alumni awards were presented for distinguished service, among those receiving an award was Edna H. Mack, of Toledo, in my own Third District of Washington. It gives me great pleasure to place in the RECORD at this time this award:

Born in nearby Gaffney, S.C., Edna Elizabeth Humphries Mack came to Boiling Springs High School for her secondary education. In 1929, she graduated with a bachelor of arts degree from Limestone College. She has, in addition to her undergraduate work, studied at George Peabody College for Teachers, at Western Washington College for Teachers, and at the University of Washington. Following graduation from Limestone, she began her long teaching career, teaching the upper elementary grades in Cherokee and Spartanburg Counties, S.C., for 14 years. For several years, she was a Sunday school teacher as well as pianist in Macedonia Baptist Church, Gaffney, S.C. At the present time, Mrs. Mack is teacher-librarian of Toledo High School, Toledo, Wash., where for 4 years she was class sponsor and where, since 1958, she has sponsored the Library Club and the National Honor Society. A longtime friend of hers said that Mrs. Mack's quiet, unassuming way has won her many friends wherever she has studied, taught, or lived.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

J
11
R
v. 111
app
May 3-28

Appendix

"Head Start" Admits Child to Wonderful World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, many critics of the Nation's war on poverty have delighted in pointing up problems in the organization of this massive new Federal program. It is refreshing to read of the successes of the war, such as a recent article about the new Operation Head Start in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Apr. 25, 1965]

HEAD START ADMITS CHILD TO WONDERFUL WORLD

(By Clayton Braddock)

The frail, sad-eyed little boy was withdrawn and shy. His eyes, set wide and white against his dark skin, reflected the turmoil he felt inside.

But then he saw the huge aircraft lift gracefully from the long runway and slowly disappear into the sky.

The boy's imagination and part of his fears soared with the big jet. It was the first one he had ever seen.

"He changed. He became a leader. He just took over the whole bunch," said Mrs. Annette Roberts, principal of Hamilton Elementary School where the boy now attends first-grade classes.

That eye-opening experience took place last summer when 34 children from impoverished homes in the Hamilton High School area were introduced to the world in a "readiness" program for preschool children.

It is this kind of child—to whom the world is a big scary expanse a few blocks from the gloom of poverty—which the $50 million Federal program, Project Head Start, will try to help.

A Memphis-Shelby County committee has applied for $1,183,191 to launch a program for 7,170 preschool children in poverty-bound areas of the city and county.

A few small programs have been set up in individual schools in the past two summers, but with limited funds and personnel these training classes could only reach a few children. Project Head Start hopes to reach all of them, white and Negro.

The average Memphis-Shelby County resident can't truly understand the need for preparing these youngsters for that first big step into formal education—the first grade.

For nearly all 6-year-olds, the first grade the first big venture away from mother, is an awesome experience. But for some, those from poverty-stricken or "culturally deprived" homes, it is a long journey across a dark void.

"Most of them have never had a box of crayons," said Louis Porter, principal of Pope Elementary School where a readiness program was set up last summer. Similar programs at individual schools were set up at Hamilton and Hanley Elementary Schools last year.

"Many live four blocks from the Mississippi River and have never seen it. They have never been to the zoo, although it is within walking distance.

"They have never had a pair of scissors in their hand. They have had no playthings like a ball. Never played an organized game or had any organized association with other children.

"The daily newspaper is a surprise to them. Not to read it, but just to see somebody reading one. It's unusual to have somebody react to them. Many of them have never heard music.

"They have never been concentrated on by adults. They have no idea how to take a page and turn it. They don't know which side is up. It's a big job for them just to learn how to sit in a desk."

Words, conversation—common experiences in many children's lives—are missing quantities in the life of an impoverished child, explained Mrs. Roberts, who guided the readiness program at her school.

"There is never anybody to sit down and carry on a conversation with them. The parents live very narrow lives. Their vocabularies are meager and so are the children's.

"I don't think people recognize what a tragic thing this is for a little child.

"It's the rockbottom people who are the worst. We polled the community around our school and really got those people at the bottom. And they were hard to get. They themselves don't know how important it is for the children.

"Some of those little ones were so withdrawn. They did not look like they lived in a world of people."

More than 90 percent of all the Memphis children who will be eligible to attend the project Head Start classes now live in densely populated poverty pockets, one big area along the Memphis waterfront from the Wolf River south to just north of Kerr and jutting east to Bellevue.

Two smaller pockets are along the Wolf River in North Memphis bordered on the south by the Louisville & Nashville Railroad.

Most of the families in the areas earn less than $3,000 a year and many earn as little as $1,000. Others earn next to nothing and are on welfare rolls. Often there are many children and a woman is the sole parent.

The 5-week preschool class at Hamilton took in 34 children. After 5 weeks of exploring their neighborhood, going to the zoo and the airport, playing games with other children and toys and doing a hundred things they had never done before, life was different for them, Mrs. Roberts said.

"Out of the 34, only 3 scored low enough on the readiness examination to be considered a poor risk for passing. If they hadn't come to the class half of them would have been a poor risk."

In Memphis schools 2 years ago, 1,433 first graders failed. That was only 12 percent of the total number of first graders, but it cost $401,240 to send them back through the grade.

"The children with poor backgrounds come into class completely unequipped. They are just babies. They aren't ready to read, or do numbers or learn words because of a lack of contact with people," said Mrs. Roberts.

"By the time they are used to what is happening in class the year has gone. They are just getting used to sitting in a class.

"I think preschool training is more profound than just learning. The children have already been in the world long enough to have a concept of themselves—and it's not going to be very good.

"This (preschool training) does something for a child's self-concept. It does something to his thinking and it's bound to last. Then he can move on and be successful."

The Memphis-Shelby County application for funds won't come up for approval until some time in May.

If it is approved 7,170 children—6,000 in Memphis—will be eligible to attend 8-week classes in 83 schools in the city and county this summer.

The children, in the age group 5½ to 6, will be divided into classes of 15 students, each class with 1 teacher and 1 teacher assistant. Assistants may often be neighborhood mothers and not always with a college degree.

There will be little formal learning and the school day of 4 morning hours will be spent mostly in making field trips all over the city and county and becoming familiar with routine classroom procedure and materials.

Before the children start the summer session each will be given complete health and dental examinations and certain treatment if necessary. During the school period they will be given at least lunch and often breakfast for those to whom that meal is a rarety.

No program, no matter how large, can make budding scholars with only a breakfast and a trip to the zoo. But several thousand Memphis and Shelby County children will get a break—a head start—in the crowded race for education.

"If we didn't feel that we had some chance to win over their condition it would be bad," said Mrs. Roberts.

The preschool classes at both Pope and Hamilton kept the children together with the same teacher in the first grade, to give them continuity.

With the help of Project Head Start, if it is approved, the same teachers—and others in 83 schools—will be teaching their brothers, sisters, and friends.

President Johnson's Johns Hopkins University Address on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, the Chattanooga Times recently published an excellent editorial in support of the President's address, at Johns Hopkins University, concerning Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I commend it to all Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S PATH

President Johnson's masterly address in Baltimore, beamed to friend and foe alike, spelled out the two elements essential to the conduct of a responsible foreign policy: Power, with the willingness to use it; and principle, with its unyielding commitments and its continuing regard for human values.

They can bring us peace, the goal of all rational men; they can sustain us in any war necessary to defend freedom.

We are in Vietnam, he said, because we have given our word to help the South Vietnamese protect their right to choose their own path, "and I intend to keep that promise."

Our objective is fixed—an independent South Vietnam. Conditions for an ultimate settlement are clear—a nation "free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no other country."

For this purpose, he said, we remain ready "for unconditional discussions," the one really new point he defined in his recapitulation of our southeast Asia policy.

The enemy's objective is just as clear. North Vietnam whose "trained men, supplies, orders and arms" are the "heartbeat of the war," wants no less than the "total conquest" of its neighbor. And behind Hanoi is the "deepening shadow of Communist China" for whom the conflict is part of "a wider pattern of aggressive purpose."

We will use America's awesome power with restraint and wisdom, but "we will use it," to achieve a victory for freedom. We will not be defeated, or grow tired, or withdraw "either openly or under the cloak of meaningless agreement."

From this position of strength and determination, the President extended a hand to help and sounded a note of hope for a region sorely in need of both. Peace would permit a vast cooperative program of development, in which North Vietnam would share, he went on, and the United States would be asked to invest a billion dollars in the program under the aegis of the United Nations. Three years of military effort at the present level would cost us more.

In a particularly moving passage, Mr. Johnson said naked power is not the impressive thing in national policy or in human aspirations, although it may be necessary at times. A dam to produce power is impressive, he said. So is "a rich harvest in a hungry land," and the "sight of healthy children in a classroom."

"I know how difficult it is for reason to guide passion, and love to master hate," he said. "The complexities of this world do not bow easily to pure and consistent answers. But the simple truths are there just the same. We must try to follow them as best we can."

President Johnson makes it clear this is the path along which he would lead. And this Nation, as purposeful as it is powerful, as dedicated to principle as it is capable of military success, can follow him in unreserved support for his efforts to end the war in Vietnam or to fight it out to victory.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, for 174 years now all free people throughout the world, friends of Poland or those slightly connected with this great country, have been celebrating Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791. Time and again we have discussed here on the floor of the House the merits of this great European charter as one of the most democratic constitutional documents ever drafted. Unfortunately, for well over a century, the people of Poland were unable to benefit from it, for as we all well know, the country was partitioned by three great powers: Russia, Prussia, and Austria. For barely 20 years of full independence, between the two Great Wars were the Polish people able to enjoy their freedom, their liberty, and their way of life, guaranteed them by this Constitution.

After 20 years of full liberty, the independent Polish nation was once again invaded. On the one hand bloodthirsty armies of Hitler's Third Reich crossed the Polish frontiers and within 1 month had the entire country in complete control, murdering or executing all opposition. On the other hand Hitler's allies, the Soviet Union, marched into Poland from the East and within 3 months of its occupation deported some 1½ million people, who were shipped to the farthest regions of the U.S.S.R. and put into the infamous slave labor camps. More than 14,000 Polish officers were massacred by the NKVD, and in the years that followed the Soviet occupation of Polish soil, some 2 million Poles disappeared, never to be accounted for, bringing the total of Poles slaughtered to some 7 million souls.

In July of this year the Polish puppet regime will loudly celebrate the 21st anniversary of Poland's "liberation," one of the most tragic events history has known. This Polish tragedy has no comparison, and some specific examples of how it came about and is maintained are worth keeping in mind.

On July 22, 1944, a handful of unknown people who called themselves the Committee of Liberation formed a new Polish Government in Lublin, backed up by Stalin's Red Army and the NKVD. The Polish Home Army was being liquidated, and a few unknown members of underground units who came into Poland with the Soviet army were made heroes overnight. Half of Poland was handed over to Stalin, and the deal was accepted by the three great powers. Alien to Poland, hordes of Communist Gauleiters took over the country, throwing into jail everyone who openly opposed the Soviet-inspired action.

Poland, which has only one party, the Communist Party, has its movements called PAX. Its leader, Stanislaw Piasecki, a prewar Fascist who headed the ultranationalist Falanga Party, leads today the pseudo-Catholic movement, the aim of which is to split the Polish Catholics and undermine them from within. Piasecki, who managed to split the Polish clergy by forming an anti-Vatican priesthood of the so-called patriotic priests, is the only Pole in Poland who manages to run his own free enterprise organization—profitmaking stores, small industry, and an export house known as "Inco," not to speak of a chain of the so-called Catholic press which fully supports the Red regime with all its criminal elements. None of the various PAX establishments pays any income tax. How this highly controversial character, who until 1939 advocated "a free-of-Jews Polish Nationalist Home," came back into a Communist-run country is no mystery to those who know a little about the workings of the Kremlin. After having been arrested by the NKVD, Piasecki, a highly intelligent individual, managed to convince Sverov, Beria's deputy, that his PAX movement would achieve the Soviet aim, to split the Poles. He was released and aided in getting back to Poland, where his power today is unlimited.

And now, the latest twist by the regime which calls itself a democracy: Last March the Wrocalaw Weekly, of the PAX group Catholics, published an interview with General Berling, chairman of the Polonia Committee, an organization aiming to bring closer ties with Poles abroad. Berling, asked by the correspondent about the tasks of the recently-created Polonia Committee attached to the Union of Fighters for Freedom and Democracy, had this to say:

> The tasks are very important and very fundamental. We want to establish permanent contacts with the Polonia centers throughout the world. First of all, we would like to establish contacts with the Polish veterans' organizations abroad. We would then enable our countrymen living abroad to become acquainted with the real life of Poland, with its great achievements and its great plans for the future.

The real scope of the Polonia Committee was shown by the following words:

> We would like to draw the Polonia into the all-national front of building up the prestige of our Fatherland and of maintaining vigilance against everything which threatens Poland with hostility. * * * We envisage the organization of common political activity aimed, for instance, at unmasking the revisionist drives of antipeace elements. * * * We shall organize celebrations of the national anniversaries of great historical events; care for the places where Polish blood was shed during the last war. We shall organize an exchange of periodicals and publications containing integral information, excursions, visits of emigre families to Poland, summer holidays in Poland for children from abroad, etc.

On the day of the 174th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, I would like to ask the chairman of the Polonia Committee whether his committee is going to celebrate this great day. I would like to ask him whether his committee will care for all the places where Polish blood was shed—will it include the Katyn Forest? I would like to ask why, in a recent visa application form issued by all Polish consulates, he has included the following question, which speaks for itself and understandably may give pause to emigree families hoping to visit Poland:

> In case of earlier permanent residency in Poland, give the last address, place of work, and position, when and on what grounds and by what documents the departure followed?

And finally, I would like to ask the chairman of the Polonia Committee whether he realizes that the hostility of Poles abroad is directed, not against Poland, the Polish nation, and what the Poles stand for, but merely against a re-

gime which has installed itself against the will of the people.

Until the chairman realizes that, his system is doomed to ultimate failure, for the day must and will come again when Poland will in truth be free.

America's Meaning to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, to those who would doubt our youth, question their faith in America, or their ability in time to build yet a stronger, better America, I would call attention to some young men and women visiting Washington, D.C., this week.

All are State winners in the Independence Hall Essay Contest of 1965.

Our Washington State winner is Miss Genevieve Gwynne, who was sponsored by the Lakewood, Wash., Junior Chamber of Commerce. Dr. Robert Backer was chairman.

I ask unanimous consent to have Miss Gwynn's winning entry printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT MY COUNTRY MEANS TO ME

(Submitted by Genevieve Gwynne in the Independence Hall Essay Contest, 1965, under the sponsorship of the Lakewood, Wash., Junior Chamber of Commerce, Dr. Robert Backer, chairman.)

What is America?

America is people. These people are gurgling babies, "twisting" teenagers, problem-faced adults, and frail elderly people. They are Indians, Orientals, Europeans, Negroes, Yugoslavians, and many others. They may be employers, employees, or self-employed. They are wealthy, poverty stricken, brilliant, dull, joyous, melancholy, and indifferent. Perhaps they are doctors, the Christ-like custodians of human life; lawyers, the aids to the oppressed, in the pursuit of justice; miners, who wrest our Nation's wealth from the bowels of the earth; or military men and women, peacemakers to the four corners of the world. Whatever the race, color, job, or disposition of these men and women, they have one thing in common; they are the fortunate God-blessed people living under democracy!

America is resources. It is fertile valleys, lush forests, desert lands, mountain peaks, and snowy fields. It is green grass, a bed of comfort on a lazy summer day. It is alfalfa, wheat, barley, rye, and grain, a bounteous harvest for a hungry man. It is the brush lands, displaying the lovely cactus blossoms in the scorching summer. America is a panorama of beauty and plenty bestowed upon God-favored children.

Most of all, however, America is freedom; freedom protected by the Constitution; freedom to speak, freedom to think, a cherished freedom. It is the right to get up on a Saturday or Sunday morning and go to mass, to the synagogue, or to the community assembly. It is the freedom to elect Senator Smith instead of Senator Jones. It is the privilege to purchase Browning's Bread and Wonder Peanut Butter. It is the freedom to write a book on why you do not like President Luther. It is the kind of freedom that makes one want to leap in the air, shout for joy, and then yearn to share.

America is many challenges: It is a challenge to protect and defend—our missiles, rockets, and bombs assist the free nations of the earth in the battle against the growing threat of communism. The atom is being harnessed for the good, instead of the destruction of mankind. It is a challenge to progress and develop—America is a leader in the space race, and is constantly developing new scientific equipment. It is a challenge to limit and destroy—America must limit and destroy poverty, which breathes its terribly polluted breath on one-fifth of the population of our Nation—America must limit unconquered diseases, which daily claim so many. America must destroy crime, which lurks around ever corner in forms of racism, greed, graft, and lust.

Finally, America is hope, the hope of the world. Americans should be extremely greatful for all the things that God, in His infinite generosity, has wrought in them. They should be dedicated and loyal to their country, and do their share in helping keep the peace throughout the world.

Do It Yourself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in these days when so many are inclined to let "George" do it, "George," in many instances, being the Federal Government, we have a unique example in the Ozarks of individual citizens rolling up their sleeves and doing a job that had to be done to make their area a more attractive place for tourists to visit.

These hearty folks literally are tearing a 40-foot-wide roadbed out of a mountainside for 6 miles, to develop what could become one of Missouri's most beautiful and fascinating lake country drive.

I hope that many potential tourists will visit the Missouri Ozarks soon not only for its breathtaking scenery, but also for an example of individual "do-it-yourselfism"—almost unparalleled in the age of "handouts."

Attached is a newspaper article from the Springfield Daily News of April 20, 1965:

USE BORROWED MACHINERY, CHEAP DYNAMITE: "DO IT YOURSELF" CREWS BUILDING JOE BALD ROAD

(By George Whittington)

KIMBERLING CITY.—Ozarkers, be they homegrown or adopted, are a breed of their own and up on the rim of the world above this resort town they're proving it with perhaps the greatest do-it-yourself project ever undertaken by a handful of hardy folks who know what they want and how to get it.

They're blasting, cutting, leveling—literally tearing—a 40-foot-wide roadbed out of a mountainside for 6 miles to develop what could become one of Missouri's most beautiful and fascinating lake country drives.

Furthermore, they're doing it without the services of either county or State engineers, without the burdening costs of contractors, and simply on their own initiative plus a lot of personal energy.

It's almost literally a million-dollar-baby project being done on a dimestore budget. But when it's finished, which it will be, barring a major disaster, it could well be the setting for a Hollywood spectacular.

The project is, in practicality, the rebuilding, widening, and in some cases relocating, of Joe Bald Road, a sort of mountain trail officially designated as Lake Road 13–35, that twists, turns, dips, and climbs around Bald Joe and Dead Joe Mountains, from Missouri 13 to Bittersweet Lodge, a lake resort on one of Table Rock Lake's prettiest bays.

But although Joe Bald Road has existed a long time, the term "building" isn't exaggerated, insofar as the current work is concerned.

Joe Bald, or Lake Road 13–35, had become almost impassable by last fall, when overworked Stone County road crews simply couldn't meet the task of making it at least a passable drive. The encroachment of underbrush, the continual washing of rain and other weather, had made unpaved Joe Bald so bad that the hardiest motorist found himself pulling to one side and stopping when another car came by.

That's when Jack Williams, John Ketchum, James F. "Jim" Barrett, Emil "Pappy" Anderson, Dave Sloan, Clyde Stewart, Oscar Hawkins, Jack Turner, and a passel of other people finally got together and decided that since nobody else would do the job, they'd do it themselves.

Naturally, they had their personal axes to grind—they either lived along the Joe Bald Road, or they owned property there, or they hoped to build homes high on the ridge with the potentially beautiful view of Table Rock down below.

It wasn't just happenstance that below Joe Bald's twisting, tortuous route, the White and the James Rivers met long before Table Rock Dam was built, and that one of the earliest trading posts in the Ozarks was located.

And it wasn't just happenstance that a lot of people from outside had come into the area, recognizing its natural beauty.

But it might have been happenstance that some of those people, like Lee Ball, of Springfield; Cecil Johnson, a farmer; and others with grading or building equipment, were among people with an altruistic attitude toward Joe Bald Road.

So, when the local people got together to form the Lake Road 13–35 Improvement Association, they had some sources upon whom to call for assistance. Johnson, Stewart, Turner, Ball, and others all came up with some sort of equipment to lend the project—graders, bulldozers, pneumatic drills for boring into Bald Joe's limestone, big "cats," and other equipment. The only equipment still needed are a sheep's foot roller and an earthmover.

Furthermore, they and many others were willing to ante up a bit for other items needed, things like dynamite, refencing of some stretches where fences had to be relocated, and the purchase of concrete culverts.

But the work was up to the men themselves, men like Jack Williams, elected president of the "Lake Road 13–35 Improvement Association," and they still didn't have that big hunk of highway money that agencies like the State highway department might have had for such a project.

So they had to make-do, so to speak.

And they had to see that old Joe Bald kept the flavor of the Ozarks, while enhancing that flavor as much as possible.

For instance, along the route is the old "Message Tree," a huge oak with a fence gate bulletin board on which old timers pinned notes to their neighbors when they couldn't see them personally. The Message Tree, it seems, might have to fall to progress in the

rebuilding of Joe Bald. But, standing at a fork in the road, it still bears such notes as: "Cecil, your hogs are out again." (Cecil isn't identified.)

Then, too, there's the "hanging tree" along the way. Folklore has it that in the days of the Bald Knobbers, some folks got themselves hanged from its lower branches. The hanging tree definitely stays, by the way.

The roadbuilders also ran into problems such as the aging Ozarker who didn't much care whether he belonged to the association, but whose land was needed for widening. He agreed to give a few feet on the west side if the do-it-yourself builders would rebuild his fence.

They put up a mile and a half of fencing for him.

Also, there was the other independent Ozarker who figured he could give a few feet of his property along the roadway, along with some trees, if they'd "cut me some wood."

The hardy road workers took 1 day off to cut the trees on their desired right-of-way, and chopped it up for the landowner.

When they couldn't afford a complete stock of dynamite, too, they learned that a mixture of dynamite and fertilizer, brand unnamed, did a right good job of blasting out the limestone from the mountain. Then they used the blasted stone to fill sections of the road, as much as 10 feet in spots, to level some of the dips.

And all the while, they kept an eye out for beauty, the beauty of that big, sprawling stretch of Table Rock Lake below, dotted with an island, in the spot marking the confluence of the White and the James.

Although none among them claims the title of "landscape architect," they've managed to cut back the underbrush on the east and north side of the road—depending upon the twist of turn—in just such a way that the lake is always there, with its beauty.

And the mountainsides are there, too, Bald Joe and Dead Joe with their filigree of foliage, and Bread Tray, which oldtimers say is "hanted," all lending their touch to the rim-of-the-world landscape.

They're worked now, these businessmen, farmers, retired folks—Ozarkers—through the snows of winter and the rains of spring, and they've got the foundation laid, replete with 39 culverts along the 6-mile route. Meantime, according to Jim Barrett, their "kitty" is growing toward the day when they'll blacktop old Bald Joe.

And when they do, Ozarks visitors are in for a real treat, thanks to a lot of "do-it-yourselfers."

The Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, the State of Tennessee has long been proud to have one of the chief centers of nuclear research located in Oak Ridge. While it started out as a producer of the first atomic bomb, today the emphasis is on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy—uses dedicated to saving lives, rather than to destroying them; to creating a more livable world, rather than to unleashing destructive force. Recently, one of Oak Ridge's finest assets, the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies, which is composed of 40 southern university members, was awarded by the U.S. Department of Labor, a contract which will enable it to expand into new fields and to broaden its scope considerably. The Oak Ridger recently printed an excellent editorial explaining this new area. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OAK RIDGE INSTITUTE OF NUCLEAR STUDIES BREAKTHROUGH INTO SOCIAL SCIENCE

The $86,000 contract awarded to Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies (ORINS) by the U.S. Labor Department is significant far beyond that amoount. The contract opens the door to ORINS becoming not just the central organization for the nuclear activities for 40 southern universities. It could well be the beginning of ORINS being "central" for all programs that these universities want to do, or are asked to do, jointly.

ORINS did not seek this Department of Labor project. Rather, the Department sought ORINS. It wanted an organization that has experience with Government contracts. It wanted also an organization that has its finger on the educational resources of the South. ORINS was a natural.

ORINS has been asked to spend the next 6 months convincing itself, and in turn the Department of Labor, that it can administer a total manpower institute for the South. The expectation is that, indeed, ORINS will find that it can do the job.

This project is, of course, entirely apart from nuclear energy. And thereby lies much of the excitement. For while nothing should be taken away from ORINS fine nuclear programs, here then is an opportunity for the Institute to branch out into the broad area of social science.

The proposal to change ORINS' name, therefore, to "Oak Ridge Associated Universities" now makes sense considerably beyond the theoretical. Here then is a specific example showing what ORINS might do as an all-encompassing organization in which the universities of this rich and potential region pool their resources.

Actually, this broadening of ORINS' activities has not begun quite as suddenly as it might appear. It has been envisioned almost since ORINS' inception by men like W. G. Pollard, ORINS' executive director. The science-humanities seminars held the past several summers have been forerunners. It is good to see that yet another of this type of "brain picking" session is scheduled—this summer in July. These are always refreshing sessions as they bring to the city a new type of scientist. (The evening series last year was particularly stimulating.)

Funds for the preliminary manpower study and the anticipated manpower center are all part of new and rather vast Federal appropriations available through such programs as the area redevelopment program, the antipoverty bill and, in particular, the Appalachia aid bill.

Here, surely, ORINS' location is a factor. Oak Ridge is very much a part of Appalachia. How fine that now there is this specific way by which Oak Ridge may be able to render direct assistance to Appalachia's special problems. (Margaret Mead should hear of this.)

The ORINS announcement is some of the most positive news that the community has received in many a month. For it portends not only an economic life, but also the likely coming to Oak Ridge of a number of social scientists. And this can only have an enriching influence on the city—an influence that could attract many other similar nonnuclear projects.

Results of Questionnaire Mailed by Hon. John F. Baldwin, of California, to Residents of the California 14th District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, 3 months ago I mailed a questionnaire to practically every family of registered voters in the California 14th Congressional District. We have received a very heavy response to this questionnaire, and my office has been deluged with returned completed questionnaires and accompanying correspondence. Many citizens not only answered the questionnaire, but also wrote detailed comments on the bottom or back of it, or on supplementary sheets. I have spent many hours personally reading all of these comments, and they have been most helpful. I feel very strongly that a Congressman can better represent his constituents if he knows the views of his constituents on important issues pending before Congress, than if he makes no effort to ascertain these views.

The tabulation of the questionnaire has been completed, and the results are summarized below. This involves 29,220 questionnaires which were returned. This is more than the number of people who are contacted by the Gallup Poll when it takes nationwide polls.

1. The President has proposed that Congress pass legislation authorizing a hospital care program for people over 65 to be financed through an increase in social security withholding taxes. Would you favor this proposal? Yes, 12,304 (42.1 percent); no, 13,910 (47.6 percent); undecided, 3,006 (10.3 percent).

2. In both Indonesia and Egypt, U.S.-built libraries have been destroyed by mobs, and the dictators heading these countries have made strong anti-American statements. Do you believe the United States should continue to provide foreign aid to these two countries? Yes, 1,942 (6.6 percent); no, 25,133 (86 percent); undecided 2,145 (7.4 percent).

3. Would you favor the creation of a Redwoods National Park in northern California? Yes, 24,364 (83.4 percent); no, 2,538 (8.7 percent); undecided, 2,318 (7.9 percent).

4. A constitutional amendment is pending in Congress designed to offset last year's Supreme Court decision which held that both houses of a State legislature had to be apportioned according to population. This amendment would provide that one house of a State legislature should be apportioned according to population, but that the other house can be apportioned on some other basis, as determined by the people of the State. Would you favor this constitutional amendment? Yes, 17,611 (60.3 percent); no, 6,864 (23.5 percent); undecided, 4,745 (16.2 percent).

5. Do you believe that U.S. price supports on tobacco should be terminated? Yes, 20,706 (70.9 percent); no, 3,375 (11.6 percent); undecided, 5,139 (17.5 percent).

6. A constitutional amendment has been proposed to give the President the power, when there is no Vice President such as during last year, to appoint a Vice President subject to ratification of both Houses of Congress. Would you favor this constitutional

amendment? Yes, 21,891 (74.9 percent); no, 5,609 (19.2 percent); undecided, 1,720 (5.9 percent).

7. Under section 14B of the Taft-Hartley Act, the individual States have the right to pass right-to-work laws to ban the compulsory union shop in those States. Twenty States have passed such laws. A bill has been introduced in Congress to repeal section 14B, thereby making it illegal for a State to pass a right-to-work law. Would you favor repeal of section 14B? Yes, 7,935 (27.2 percent); no, 18,615 (63.7 percent); undecided, 2,670 (9.1 percent).

8. Do you believe that the Federal budget for the next fiscal year should be a balanced budget? Yes, 21,447 (73.4 percent); no, 2,754 (9.4 percent); undecided, 5,019 (17.2 percent).

9. Do you believe that United Nations members who are 2 years delinquent in dues or special assessments should be deprived of the right to vote in the U.N. General Assembly as provided by the U.N. Charter? Yes, 26,353 (90.2 percent); no, 1,251 (4.3 percent); undecided, 1,616 (5.5 percent).

10. Do you believe the United States should sell surplus farm commodities to Soviet Russia and other Communist countries at subsidized prices which are lower than the prices at which U.S. consumers can buy these commodities? Yes, 3,062 (10.5 percent); no, 24,481 (83.8 percent); undecided, 1,677 (5.7 percent).

11. The AFL-CIO has proposed the enactment of legislation to increase the Federal minimum wage from $1.25 per hour to $2 per hour. Would you favor this proposal? Yes, 9,511 (32.6 percent); no, 16,606 (56.8 percent; undecided, 3,103 (10.6 percent).

12. Do you believe that a greater effort should be made, at all levels of Government, to maintain law and order in our Nation? Yes, 27,006 (92.4 percent); no, 894 (3.1 percent); undecided 1,320 (4.5 percent).

13. Do you believe that admitted members of the Communist Party should be invited to be speakers at publicly operated universities and colleges in this country? Yes, 6,363 (21.8 percent); no, 20,751 (71 percent); undecided, 2,106 (7.2 percent).

Robbing Peter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in the April 26, 1965, publication of Barron's, there is an excellent and critical analysis of the social security bill now pending before the Senate.

This article penetrates the veneer and the label of "medicare," and presents a story which few American people realize.

I commend the article to my colleagues:

ROBBING PETER—A CRITICAL LOOK AT THE PENDING SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—"Because social security recipients have been getting benefits 10 times as great as what they have paid in, people seem to think we have a special machine here which turns out $10 bills for $1 bills," says a top official of the Social Security Administration.

Since the SSA possesses no such wondrous device, it is counting on future contributions in excess of benefits to make ends meet for its old-age, survivors and disability insurance. The present benefits-contributions ratio will grow even more unfavorable if the Senate enacts the social security bill, H.R. 6675, recently passed by the House.

The benefit-payment ratio for persons already obviously is responsible for much of the enthusiasm for the bill, which contains not only medicare, but also a 7-percent increase in cash benefits. Retirement contributions, however, have been stepped up even more.

PUBLIC IGNORANCE

Says one official: "Continued general support for the social security system hinges on continued public ignorance of how the system works." He adds: "I believe that we have nothing to worry about because it is so enormously complex that nobody is going to figure it out."

Barron's hereby takes on the job.

The SSA worked up the following table, which purports to show that benefits in every age group exceed contributions.

	Retiree age 71	Worker now age 50	18-year-old future worker
Total contribution	$1,290	$5,832	$10,212
Retirement benefits	13,422	14,094	14,205
Wife's and widow's benefits	9,363	9,831	9,909
Total benefits	22,785	23,925	24,114

The table warrants close scrutiny. Based on maximum contributions and benefits, it includes only amounts paid by employees, even though employers pay matching amounts for their benefit. It also excludes interest which the money could have earned for the contribution if it had not been tied up in social security funds.

This approach, however, is far from realistic. To cover the true situation, the table would obviously have to include both interest and the employer's contribution. Starting with the 71-year-old retiree, and calculating interest at 3 percent (approximately the average national rate during the period of his contributions) would produce a figure of $3,373, against benefits of $22,785. Actually, he can expect to live to 79 to collect this amount. The 7-percent increase in cash benefits under H.R. 6675 would raise his benefits to $24,379. His contributions, of course, would not thereby increase, since he no longer makes any.

As for the 50-year-old worker, by including the employer contribution and interest at 3 percent during 1960 and 4¼ percent thereafter (again, the national average for the period) his total payments come to $22,856, against benefits of $23,925—if he lives long enough. The actuarial table used by the Internal Revenue Service for taxing annuities indicates he can expect to live to only 75½, whereas SSA has assumed he will live to 79.

The new bill would require this worker and his employer to contribute an extra $4,240 for retirement. At the same time, the bill's 7-percent increase in cash benefits would mean an extra $1,667 for him. Thus, if H.R. 6675 becomes law, the 50-year-old worker can expect to make contributions of $26,012, including interest, against benefits of $25,592.

As for the 18-year-old, including the employer's contribution and figuring interest at 4¼ percent for the latter's 46-year working life (assumed by SSA) gives a total of $61,596, against $24,114 in benefits. For this contribution the worker could purchase from a private company a monthly annuity of $463 for life, after retirement. His maximum benefit under social security would be $254 a month.

MONTHLY ANNUITY

Under the new bill, H.R. 6675, employer-employees retirement contributions for the 18-year-old, with 4¼-percent interest, would come to $84,300. The 7-percent increase in cash benefits would bring the latter to only $25,802. For this amount, the worker could purchase from a private company a monthly annuity of $634 for life. His maximum benefit under social security would be $312 a month.

The benefits figured may be high under both present law and the pension bill because SSA has assumed the youngster will retire at 67 and live to the ripe old age of 79. But the Internal Revenue Service actuarial table assumes that an 18-year-old today can expect to live to be only 71.9. SSA, in any case, has adopted a policy of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Obviously, those who are urging Congress to be still more generous are thinking chiefly of the people already retired or close to retirement. Few of these enthusiasts realize, however, that OASDI has been in operation for only 28 years and that, therefore, no one has paid social security taxes for his whole working life of 46 years. The system took in an additional 10 million people as recently as 1951, when new legislation covered farm and domestic workers. Another 7½ million members were added only 10 years ago, when coverage was extended to some self-employed. H.R. 6675 would take in still others, including waiters and additional professional workers.

A REAL BONANZA

For the 20 million retirees collecting today, social security is a real bonanza. For those who turned 65 a few years after entering the system, it represents a windfall. For new workers, however, today's largesse will be a crushing burden because, in order to pay Paul, SSA must rob Peter.

Neither SSA officials nor members of the Ways and Means Committee make any bones about the prospect that future contributions will pay the bill. This, they point out, is the great difference between social insurance and private pension plans. The latter should have enough in the till to fulfill all obligations without counting on any new entrants. But under a compulsory system, the experts explain, they can count on the taxes on new workers coming into the system. SSA officials insist that an employer's social security taxes are "for the social good," not for the individual good of the worker on whose earnings they are based.

Whether SSA will be able to sell this idea remains to be seen. Ray M. Peterson, vice president and associate actuary of the Equitable Life Assurance Society, has his doubts. Says he: "We may expect from sophisticated, market-oriented employers and from labor union experts increasing dissatisfaction with the disparity between what OASDI promises and what could be secured under a private plan."

Some dissatisfaction already is becoming apparent. Students at Northern Illinois University have formed a Young Citizens Council, to combat exploitation of young taxpayers under the social security program. Commented the Chicago Tribune; "They think it only fair that the young taxpayer who is getting set on a job and starting to raise a family should pay lower social security taxes than older persons who have to pay only a few years before they start receiving benefits."

Nobody knows the exact debt young workers will have to pay. Back in 1962, when the SSA last figured out its unfunded liability for OASDI, it totaled $321 billion. Now the experts think it may come to $330 billion or more. Just for present members, according to SSA officials, passage of H.R. 6675 would mean an additional liability of $40 to $50 billion for increased cash benefits and another $35 billion for medicare.

At the end of last year the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund totaled $19.1 billion, compared with a high of $22.5 billion 8 years ago.

The story is even worse for the disability insurance fund. When Congress created it in 1956 to finance disability payments, authorized then for the first time, much was made of the fact that the DI fund was set up separately from the OASI fund. Congress developed a habit, however, of enlarging disability benefits more than it enlarged the fund. Last year disbursements exceeded receipts by $188 million, and the fund shrank to $8 billion at the end of the year. By 1969, under present law, it is expected to fall to $81 million.

The following table shows how the combined unfunded liability has increased since 1956:

[In billions]

	Taxes plus trust funds	Value of benefits	Unfunded liability
1956 act	$217	$485	$269
1958 act	254	543	289
1960 act	276	587	311
1961 act	304	625	321

INCREASED BENEFITS

The unfunded liability has risen even though both the tax rate and the taxable earnings base have grown over the years. One difficulty, of course, is that each time Congress raises contributions, it also increases benefits.

When the system started out in 1937, the maximum earnings base was a mere $3,000, and employer and employee each paid a tax of 1 percent. The rate was to go up to 1½ percent each in 1940, to 2 percent in 1943, 2½ percent in 1946, and 3 percent in 1949. To reduce the burden of social security during World War II, however, Congress temporarily suspended the scheduled increases. By 1950 the combined tax went to 3 percent, and the following year the base went up to $3,600. In 1954 the rate rose to 4 percent, and the following year the base rose to $4,200. In 1956 Congress provided for the first cash benefits for disability, and the following year the rate went up to 4½ percent. In 1959 the rate became 5 percent, and the base $4,800. The next year the rate increased to 6 percent. Another quarter percent was added in 1962. In 1963 it went up to 7½ percent.

Congress has always felt that the tax rate must not exceed 10 percent. This ceiling, however, has been pierced in H.R. 6675. The following tables show what would happen to the combined tax rate and maximum contributions, under present law and under H.R. 6675.

Combined employer-employee contribution

[Percent]

Year	Present law	H.R. 6675	(1)
1965	7.25	7.25	
1966	8.25	8.70	0.70
1967	8.25	9.00	1.00
1968	9.25	9.00	1.00
1969–70	9.25	9.80	1.00
1971–72	9.25	9.80	1.00
1973–75	9.25	10.70	1.10
1976–79	9.25	10.80	1.20
1980–86	9.25	11.00	1.40
1987 and after	9.25	11.20	1.60

[1] Portion of H.R. 6675 tax required for basic health insurance program.

Combined maximum contributions

Year	Present law	H.R. 6675 without medicare	H.R. 6675 with medicare
1965	$348	$348.00	$348.00
1966	396	448.00	487.20
1967	396	448.00	504.00
1968	444	448.00	504.00
1969–70	444	492.80	548.80
1971–72	444	580.80	646.80
1973–75	444	633.60	706.20
1976–79	444	633.60	712.80
1980–86	444	633.60	726.00
1987 on	444	633.60	739.20

Even these conrtibutions do not assure the actuarial soundness of social security. In its last annual report, the board of trustees figured things out on the basis of high-, low-, and intermediate-cost estimates, and on both a 75-year and perpetuity basis.

On a high-cost and perpetuity basis, benefits will come to 10.83 percent of payroll, and contributions will total 9.11 percent, producing an actuarial imbalance of 1.72 percent. On the intermediate-cost estimate, however, contributions will total 9.11 percent and benefits 9.35 percent, leaving an imbalance of 0.24 percent, just within the limit of 0.25 percent which Congress has considered acceptable. Figured on a 75-year rather than a perpetuity basis and on intermediate costs, contributions will total 9.10 percent and benefits 9.09 percent, leaving the miniscule positive balance of 0.01 percent. With low costs and a 75-year basis, it is possible to show a positive balance of 1.13 percent. The figures, in short, can be juggled to show whatever one wants.

The Ways and Means Committee has chosen the figures which show a positive balance of 0.01 percent. It says H.R. 6675 would shift this "to a lack of balance of 0.08 percent, which is below the established limit within which the system is considered substantially in actuarial balance?

However, if the past is any key to the future, contributions will have to rise and liberalizing of benefits will follow, in a dizzy spiral. As employers' social security payroll taxes go up, their operating costs will rise. With increasing amounts deducted for social security, employees are likely to ask for wage increases to maintain their take-home pay. Faced with these twin developments, employers probably will raise prices. With higher prices, however, social security checks won't go so far, and beneficiaries again presumably will pressure Congress to boost monthly benefits.

In H.R. 6675 Congress seems to feel that it can slow down this process by giving up financing solely through social security taxes. For persons over 65 who are not eligible for medicare benefits from the general funds of the Treasury. The latter also would be used to match $3 monthly benefits, it would finance voluntary contributions from persons over 65 who want insurance to cover doctor bills.

Some observers feel that the introduction of general Government contributions is the first crack in the dike of financial controls maintained by payroll taxes. They expect some future Congress to decide that if workers and employers object to more than a 10-percent levy, the Government could keep on liberalizing social security and make up the difference from the Treasury's general funds.

SSA officials maintain, however, that there is a limit to how much the social security system can obtain from the latter source without necessitating an increase in the income tax.

The Ways and Means Committee has made much of the fact that H.R. 6675 sets up a separate fund for medicare benefits. Representative GERALD R. FORD, Republican, of Michigan, contended during the floor debate on H.R. 6675, however, that the trust funds will not be inviolate. "I need only point out to you that in this bill now before us is a provision increasing the allocation of funds to the disability trust fund to the detriment of the OASI fund," he declared.

Congress is aware as anyone that there is no such thing as a free lunch—or free retirement or medical benefits. It is, however, much more concerned with the voters of today than with the youngsters who will pay their bills in the future.

This is an appropriate time, then, to recall what the Ways and Means Committee said 10 years ago: "We should take sober warning that, in our zeal to provide ever greater benefits and to provide against an ever wider area of need, we do not destroy the very system which we have created."

The 1965 Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to write a weekly news column for a number of newspapers in my congressional district. I always try to write on a subject which is of current interest and certainly a most appropriate subject at this time would be the voting rights bill. Therefore, believing that the Members of the House and others would be interested in my views on this subject, I include in the RECORD the text of my column on this legislation:

CONGRESSMAN TOM PELLY SAYS REPUBLICANS OFFER A BETTER VOTING RIGHTS BILL

The importance of the role of the minority in Congress is shown in the Republican alternative voting rights bill. This Republican bill would apply wherever discrimination exists whereas the administration's bill would apply only to a limited number of States which employ literacy and other tests. The absolute exclusion of Texas from the coverage of this bill has been widely noted.

The Republican susbtitute bill would not penalize the innocent—the States and localities where discrimination does not exist. In contrast, the administration's bill would impose undue burdens on areas such as Alaska and parts of Maine where discrimination is known not to exist.

The Republican proposal is not limited by the straitjacket of an arbitrary percentage formula. The administration bill, on the other hand, would reach only those States and their subdivisions having literacy tests where less than 50 percent of its people registered or voted in the 1964 election. States or local communities coming within this arbitrary formula might or might not be practicing discrimination.

Under the Republican alternative, a Federal examiner would be appointed by the

67 354 A A 30

Civil Service Commission. When the Attorney General received 25 or more complaints from residents of a county alleging denial of the right to vote on account of race or color, the examiner would immediately determine if these persons were qualified to vote. Challenges by the State could be made to a Federal hearing officer, appointed by the Civil Service Commission, within 10 days, and the hearing officer would be required to render his decision 7 days thereafter.

Determination by the hearing officer that 25 or more persons were denied suffrage because of race or color would establish a pattern of discrimination. Immediately, thereafter, the Civil Service Commission would appoint such additional Federal examiners and hearing officers as necessary to register all other persons within the country subject to discrimination.

This minority bill provides that examiners shall disregard literacy test requirements for persons who possess a sixth grade education. But, Federal examiners under this bill would apply to all other persons a State's literacy test, provided it was fair and nondiscriminatory. In contrast, the administration's bill would require the complete elimination of literacy tests in a few States or their subdivisions, caught in its net, no matter how reasonable the tests or how fairly applied.

Our Republican bill would not overturn the constitutional principles by requiring States to establish their innocence whereas the administration's bill does do this by presuming a State or political subdivision, covered by the bill, guilty of discrimination until it receives from a Federal court in the District of Columbia a declaratory judgment that it has not violated the 15th amendment in even one instance in the past 10 years.

Our bill would not invalidate laws or ordinances of State and local government in contravention of established constitutional principles. The administration's bill on the other hand would require States and their political subdivisions, covered by the bill, to come to a Federal court for validation of their future laws and ordinances relating to voting requirements. Such is required by this administration bill even though the laws and ordinances of the State and local community have never been found to be discriminatory.

The minority Republican alternative proposal offers a constitutional, comprehensive, effective, speedy remedy for the evil of disenfranchisement of any citizen because of race or color. It would eliminate voter discrimination quickly and wherever it might exist.

So, as I say, this legislation point up the value of a responsible, constructive minority under our two party system. Nothing I have said, however, should indicate any real hope on my part that our minority viewpoint will prevail.

The majority party is riding high and is not asking for our help. So I fear our Republican contribution, in this case, will be limited to a role of writing a legislative record containing our alternative suggestions to improve a voting rights law and thereby bringing both side of the issue to the attention of the American people.

Why Crime Marches On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Star of May 2, a very interesting editorial appeared, entitled "Why Crime Marches On." The increase of crime in the Washington area is almost unbelievable. It seems to me that unless our form of government proves itself capable of controlling crime, then it is only natural that our citizens will consent to a police state in which at least crime will be controlled, despite all of the undesirable features of such a government.

The editorial follows:

WHY CRIME MARCHES ON

President Lyndon Johnson has made several fine speeches about the right of the people to be secure in their homes, in their places of business, and to walk the streets without fear of the criminal element. He has also offered the observation that "crime will not wait while we pull it up by the roots."

Whatever this last comment may mean, it has become painfully clear that Mr. Johnson's Department of Justice is not about to pull crime up by the roots—at least not in the Nation's Capital—nor does the department seem eager to move at all on the anticrime front.

For a year or more the Department of Justice has been making noises about coming up with anticrime legislation which it would recommend to Congress. Last year Mr. Katzenbach, who was then Deputy and who now is Attorney General, supported a proposal which would permit limited interrogation of suspects, subject to certain safeguards. Now, he is backing away from that position, and it appears that the Department, in the long interval, despite assurances to the contrary, has not drafted any bill which it is willing to support. This is the only inference one can draw from the request by Deputy Attorney General Clark that the Senate District Committee give him several more weeks or months in which to work up legislation.

The almost certain meaning of this, if the committee grants the request, is that there will be no legislation at this session of Congress. For if its introduction is delayed for a matter of weeks or months, and if its provisions do not suit him, Senator MORSE will kill any bill with a filibuster. The Oregon Senator might even get some help in this from Senator BOBBY KENNEDY, who did quite a job of heckling Commissioner Tobriner. It's too bad that Mr. KENNEDY didn't do more about crime in Washington while he was Attorney General.

It seems evident that people of this city must look to the whole Congress for relief. The question of crime in Washington has been studied, studied, and studied again. It is inconceivable that still more study is needed.

Unless Congress takes the bull by the horns, however, the people of Washington will not be secure in their homes, their places of business or on the streets and most certainly crime will not be pulled up by the roots in our city.

The Federal Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, those who were so certain that the new Federal aid to education bill would not interfere with local school control are having what may be a rude awakening.

I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star on the subject, which is as follows:

THE FEDERAL DOLLAR

When the drive for Federal aid to public education was getting underway there were many assurances that no strings would be attached. Federal aid would not mean Federal interference or control of public schools. That is one myth which has very quickly gone up in smoke.

The Office of Education, headed by Commissioner Francis Keppel, has just announced detailed programs to which all school districts must subscribe if they want to share in the $1.3 billion which Congress is providing for education. These programs require satisfactory proof of desegregation, which was not required by the Supreme Court's school decision. They also apply to integration of teaching staffs and school transportation. They do not touch curriculums, but there is no reason why this area might not be brought under the Federal arm in future years.

The regulations, drafted by HEW, are said to be based on court decisions, and allegedly are necessary to implement the requirements of title VI of the Civil Rights Act. This would appear to be correct, although there is some dispute on the point.

What is important now, however, is the illustration that those who want the Federal dollar must be willing to submit to the Federal authority. These rules and regulations, going beyond any court requirement that we know of, will hit hard in the Deep South. Whether officials of school districts in the pine woods of Alabama or in the Mississippi Delta will comply remains to be seen. It is in these areas that the monetary help is needed most. But the local officials may elect to forgo the dollars rather than yield voluntarily to the Federal demand for integration. But theirs will not be an easy decision. For they must know that if they resist the dollar lure, the Federal courts, in the end, will by one means or another compel them to desegregate their schools.

A Farmer's Wife Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Alice Pearse Bean, wife of a Washington State farmer, "spoke up" May 8 in the Saturday Evening Post magazine, pleading for less Government interference in the life of the farmer. She argues persuasively.

As a farm bill dealing with wheat, feed grains, rice, and soybeans is now before the House Committee on Agriculture, Mrs. Bean's article is especially timely.

Here is the text:

GET THE GOVERNMENT OFF THE FARM

(By Alice Pearse Bean)

It is no wonder that city people think of us farmers as a vociferous bunch of hicks, holding out gold-plated cups for an ever larger handout. Year after year the Government pays us more and more attention, meddling in our lives so much it seems the bureaucrats must think they have squatter's rights on the farms, including our 151 second-rate acres at Mica in Washington State.

I don't blame the city people for their opinion, but I'd like to point out to them that we didn't ask for most of that legislation, and we don't want it. When the farmer prays these days, he asked for deliverance. Deliver us from the Congressmen who tell us what we must do and the bureaucrats who smile and they tell us how we must do it.

Never having seen our lawmakers at work, I can only imagine what takes place. All too frequently one of them proposes that something be done for the "poor farmer," and they stampede to get out of the cloakroom and onto the floor of Congress so they can vote "yes." The latest effort, called the Wheat-Cotton Act, is a grand culmination. More controls, more meddling, and our miniscule wheat acreage allotment reduced by one-tenth—which for small farmers like us makes it practically invisible to the naked eye.

The city dweller is no doubt confused by terms like acre allotment, soil bank, crop-diversion payments, feed-grain programs, etc.—because we are almost as confused ourselves. I do not pretend to understand it all, since I am merely an old-fashioned, bread-baking, chicken-plucking type of farm housewife. But I do know that we farmers don't need what we're getting—more and more "assistance" from the Government. We need less, or even none, ungrateful though that thought may be.

Our farm, located 17 miles from Spokane, is exactly what the Secretary of Agriculture has in mind when he describes marginal land, better left to the rabbits and gophers. It is also the place where my husband and I have chosen to live after having tried city life. We accept the hardships and shortcomings because this is where we want to bring up our two small children. On our land, we raise the crops that suit our soil, climate and available machinery: a trickle of wheat, a dribble of oats and a dab of barley; five to eight beef cattle for market, plus one for the freezer, and enough chickens and eggs for our own use. Our average gross is about $1,200 to $1,500. The net would qualify us for the President's war on poverty were it not that my husband works, whenever he can, at his trade of carpentry. The farm barely manages to make the yearly mortgage payment, and there is nothing left to invest in improvements.

With this small and inferior type of operation we are not makers or shakers of legislation. Yet we small farmers are said to produce most of the wheat surplus. To prevent us from getting even more troublesome, the Government limits us to a wheat allotment which varies from 14 to 17 acres. The way it worked last year, we took our wheat to the mill and were paid $1.33 per bushel. Then the bureaucratic figuring got started. The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service calculated our average yield per acre over the previous 5 years and multiplied this by the number of acres we were allotted this time. On 45 percent of the total, the Government paid us an extra 70 cents a bushel and on the next 45 percent 25 cents a bushel. The remaining 10 percent we are allowed to sell for whatever we can get—if there is a market for it. With all its legislation the Government does not seem to have been able to control the fact that we have had only one good wheat crop in 10 years of farming.

Now if that is as clear as our clay mud, it should be emphasized that it is only the barest skeleton of the program. Elaborate instructions come in a constant flood—we must plant such and such to qualify for not planting something else. It is as if our farm were run by someone who wanted to see how complicated he could make our lives without solving any of our problems.

In the fall the Governments sends us a notice of how many acres of wheat we can plant the following year. Spring brings buds, birds, and also a ubiquitous employee of the Government to measure our poor plot of wheat. In many cases he is a small farmer who has found it necessary to augment his income by working for the Government. It is a healthy, outdoor life, so he usually has a wonderful tan. He usually smiles a lot. Invariably the first thing he asks is whether my husband is at home; for some reason this never fails to raise my hackles. He carefully measures the seeded land, sometimes with the aid of aerial photographs, sometimes with clever little steel spikes with a loop in the top through which a string is threaded. Sometimes the farmer gets to hold the string. If we are underseeded, then the Government man is happy. But if even a tenth of an acre too much land has been seeded, the extra wheat must be destroyed. I concede that the farmer gets to make a choice here. He can plow under or mow.

But it is still not settled. Plowed, mowed, or whatever, the excess area must be measured again, and this time the farmer is billed for the cost of the return trip the smiling fellow makes.

Some of us who grow wheat regard the current Wheat-Cotton Act as a bitter pill administered because of the way we farmers behaved in 1963. Few urban dwellers took notice, but a referendum was held among farmers. Quite simply it was a question which could be answered "Yes," we wanted to continue with rigid controls; or "No," we did not. The vote was overwhelmingly "no."

In most cases farmers voted down controls for two reasons. First was the way the Secretary of Agriculture presented the program. He made it very clear that either we went along with his program or we would suffer the dire consequences, such as a price of only a dollar a bushel for wheat. Second, we can't see where the Government is doing much for small farmers like us. One neighbor recalls that in 1944 he got $1.50 a bushel for wheat, while a new tractor cost $1,200; last year a tractor cost $3,500, and wheat was $1.33.

Among our lawmakers, however, a numbness seems to have set in. Instead of reading the "no" message we sent them loud and clear, they ignored it and gave us the Wheat-Cotton Act. Such disregard for the expressed will of the people concerned, in my opinion, is not only thickheaded but insulting.

This interpretation of the farm program is a result of my experience with it, as a housewife very personally involved in farming. It takes a certain sort of person to choose this kind of life, and believe me, it is not the expectation of big handouts or profits that keeps the American farmer down on the farm and induces him to till the soil, empty the pans when the roof leaks, pluck the chickens and jam the strawberries. He has to do jobs which most other people pay to get done. Not only is he the plumber, electrician, appliance repairman, welder and carpenter but often the family barber. Our boy is eight and has yet to make his first trip to a barbershop other than the family kitchen.

The farmer also must be a gambler. He must be willing to mortgage everything but the shoes on the children's feet to plant peas, fertilize them, spray for weevils, only to see two days of hot wind shrivel it all to a disaster.

And yet a farm, with all its restrictions and frustrations, provides the way of life we want. When my husband and I lived in town, we saw that the only sign of recognition between one house and the other was the venetian blinds in one picture window winking at the ones next door. On the farm we cherish the privacy that allows us to step outside the back door without buttoning our shirts (or pants even, if so inclined), and yet the concern we feel for neighbors is far warmer and more satisfying than what we encountered in urban life. There was the time, for example, when the water pump stopped functioning. There is nothing more calculated to bring all farm operations to a screeching halt than absence of water. Cows bawl and pigs squeal. In spite of the urgency of his own work—it was seeding time—our neighbor came to our aid and did not leave until our fixtures gushed again. Naturally we helped him when his water system froze in the winter.

Another reason for living on a farm is purely economic. The four of us can eat very well indeed on $20 a week spent at the grocery store. The fact that I make and bake our own bread may not mean any great saving in the grocery bill, nor do I knead and mold for the sheer joy of it all. Quite simply, my husband prefers homemade bread, cakes, and pies. A general willingness to cater to a spouse's likes and dislikes is a characteristic of farmwives, and I cannot believe it does anything harmful to the cause of marital stability. Even though my daughter, who is 9, has never had a coat that was not a product of my engineering on a second-hand sewing machine, we manage to dress fairly well, and there are many advantages for children on the farm beyond such obvious ones as not having to use the street for a playground. It would be interesting to know what proportion of our farm youth turns to delinquency, but I think it is unlikely that many do.

We are told that it is a policy of the Department of Agriculture to preserve the family farm. Well, we are a family and this is a farm. The kind of life we live obviously is not for everyone. But it is our way of life, freely chosen with its hardships and risks. What we resent is the fact that some technocrat, with his "big brother knows best" attitude, decides what we, here on our land, with the dirt under our fingernails, shall plant.

Of course we would be delighted to receive $2 a bushel or even more for our wheat. The extra money would go a long way toward repairing the barn, which has a decided list to starboard. But it isn't desire for more money that makes us denounce the farm-control programs. What we question is whether it is either good business or morally right for the Government to pay us even $1 for wheat that nobody wants, and for which all of us must ante up not only the initial cost but also the cost of storage.

We have considered refusing to participate in the program; after all, it is voluntary, and to refuse to go along will not bring the Gestapo to our door. Yet the impact of this stand for our principles would hardly be felt across the county road in front of the house. Moreover, such a stand could mean we'd be exiled from the Government program forever. The message was delivered to a neighbor who asked at the ASCS office, after the referendum, what would happen if he didn't sign up for the control program. He was told he would be suspended from any future allotment program. This looked to us like "voluntary" compulsion.

Suppose price supports were removed. I do not think farmers would be so stupid as to go on producing grain for which there was no market. Speculatively, I would say that my husband and I would consider feeding cattle, hogs or sheep. A wholesale increase in meat production would probably depress the price to the producer, but if this resulted in a lower price at the meat counter (as it should), a lot of people would eat more meat.

Somehow, by digging in, we would survive with such old-fashioned qualities as thrift, industry and perseverance.

As it is, we grow all the wheat we are allowed to, and accept all the payments the Government will give us. We farmers have lost the freedom to plant what we want, and we accept the subsidy as compensation for

the loss of our rights—and a poor bargain it is. Our subsidy—less than $200 last year—naturally helps, but it doesn't make a critical difference to a family that's been on a pay-as-you-go basis as long as we have. As long as businessmen who denounce Government accept subsidies to their industries, and as long as artists denounce the organization man and accept foundation grants, so also will we continue to accept the Government's money, and go right on trying to bite the hand that feeds us.

But the Federal controls do worry us. If the Government can dictate what we can plant, is it not conceivable that someday the Government will be able to forbid us to farm our 151 acres of rabbit tracks at all?

From Vietnam: A Letter to Dallas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention of the House to a very warm and moving letter from a young man who is serving our country in Saigon. This letter appeared in the April 29 issue of the Dallas Times Herald along with an article by Jim Lehrer. This young man tells a story which needs to be told again and again so that our people realize what we are fighting in Vietnam.

President Johnson has emphasized many times that the reason we are in South Vietnam is to halt the bombings and murder of South Vietnamese men, women, and children by the Vietcong who are directed from Hanoi. The South Vietnamese are brave and courageous people. They have suffered casualties at rates higher than we have ever experienced in our history. However, this young man says more than I can say about the wisdom of supporting President Johnson's policies in Vietnam.

The above mentioned follows:

FROM VIETNAM: A LETTER TO DALLAS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following letter was received by the Times Herald from Bobby Dalton, a Dallas man now stationed with the U.S. Navy in Vietnam.)

To: Managing Editor, Dallas Times Herald.
From: Bobby Dalton, GmG3, U.S. Navy.
Subject: Vietnam.

SIR: I realize that this letter may seem silly to you, but I would like to tell you something that I've observed while in Vietnam.

I am a sailor stationed here for 2 years. The normal tour is one year, but I extended an additional year. For the first time in my life I feel that I'm helping accomplish something. People who live in the United States don't know how lucky they are. Some just don't care what happens in this country.

The only thing is, this is the time to stop retreating for the sake of the Communists.

I do not ever want to see a war like we will be faced with. It would be horrible. But then I say stop letting the Communists push us. They openly send arms and troops into this country to overthrow the present government. Then because Americans come here to help at the request of the government of Vietnam we are called aggressors. If you could meet some of the people here you would understand better. They have fought the Viet Minh and now it is the Vietcong. This has lasted for more than 10 years. Some of the people don't care any more. Sending of sons to fight and maybe get killed seems only natural.

They make a big thing of it when an American is killed or wounded. But the United States just does not realize how many Vietnamese are killed or disabled daily here.

Sir, I saw the American Embassy 5 minutes after the bomb exploded. Anyone who objects to our policy in this country should have seen it. I truly believe they would change their mind. When that car exploded it was as effective as firing OO buckshot into a crowded room. These were not soldiers killed here. Most of them were civilians, women and children, also.

What has to happen to wake people up to this threat? It will not end here. If this country falls, then will come the next and the next.

Sir, I'm not a crackpot or crazy. It is just that I never realized what was happening until I saw it firsthand. I hope that my younger brother and sister who are 16 and 6 never have to go through what these people do.

I've finished letting off a little steam. I'm sorry if I bothered you too much. I am a resident of Dallas and my mother lives there. I want to see my family again as do all servicemen here want to go home.

I hope President Johnson sticks to his guns because he is right.

Sincerely yours,

BOBBY C. DALTON,
GmG3 Headquarters Support Activity.
SAIGON.

(By Jim Lehrer, staff writer)

Bobby Dalton's mother isn't surprised that her son wrote a letter to the Times Herald from Vietnam.

"He's a sensitive, sincere boy who speaks when he has something to say," said Mrs. Alva Dalton, Wednesday.

A switchboard operator at the downtown YMCA, Mrs. Dalton said her 22-year-old-son has had a lot to say about the war in Vietnam.

"After the bombing of the American Embassy in Saigon 4 weeks went by without a letter * * * and then finally one came," she recalled.

Mrs. Dalton said Bobby told of being close by the Embassy and racing to the scene immediately.

"He said he counted 15 bodies and he picked up a girl and carried her out. She died before he could get her to an ambulance."

"'Mother, I actually tracked out human blood'," she quoted her son as writing.

Mrs. Dalton said Bobby's sensitivity, in fact, may eventually end his career in the Navy, which began 3 years ago.

"As a result of his experiences at the Embassy and elsewhere in Vietnam his blood pressure has risen," she said. "The Navy may not let him re-enlist because of it."

Bobby was born in Corpus Christi, said Mrs. Dalton, but grew up in Chandler and Tyler. He finished the 11th grade at Chandler High School and then went on to get his high school diploma in the Navy.

Mrs. Dalton and two of her other children, Alva, Jr., 15, and Joanna, 6, moved to Dallas 3 years ago. They live at 530 Sunnyside in Cockrell Hill. Alva is a student at Crozier Tech High School.

Mrs. Dalton said Bobby has kept her well informed—except for that one 4-week break—with letters and pictures from Vietnam.

"He never goes anywhere without a camera or two," she said. "He's sent us many photographs and even two reels of movies he has taken over there."

His affinity for writing, she said, he just picked up on his own.

"He's always been a bookworm. He reads everything."

She is, of course, anxious for her son to come home. So is Joanna, the little sister. Asked Wednesday, how long her brother had been gone, the girl sighed:

"Weeks and weeks and weeks * * * I don't know when he's coming home."

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, is a very important document. Its adoption and promulgation marked a turning point in Poland's Central Government, and the date has become a Polish holiday.

The Polish people had the misfortune of losing a good part of their country late in the 1770's to their greedy neighbors. Certain Polish leaders felt that if they had a strong central government, capable of uniting all elements in the country and strengthening its fighting capacity, future calamities could be avoided. They were thoroughly dissatisfied with their absolutist, monarchial form of government. The king had too much power, and was incapable of using it effectively because of certain crippling defects in the old Diet—legislative assembly. The discontent was widespread among liberal leaders and also among the mass of the people. These liberal, democratic and patriotic leaders took upon themselves the task of drawing up a constitution which would improve, if not revolutionize, the Government of Poland. The result was the Constitution of May 3, 1791.

The Constitution drastically reduced the arbitrary powers of the king, and made Poland a constitutional monarchy. Heretofore the king could exercise his authority only through a council. The powers of the upper chamber were curtailed, and those of the popularly elected lower chamber were strengthened. The peasantry was freed from its bondage and placed under the protection of the law. Religious toleration was assured to all citizens, and freedom of speech was guaranteed. These features made the Constitution a democratic instrument and represented a great forward advance in popularizing the Government. It was hailed as such throughout the country, and even many liberal leaders abroad praised the Polish leaders.

On the 174th anniversary celebration of the Polish Constitution Day one can hardly overlook the 25th anniversary of the Katyn Forest massacre of many thousand Polish officers by their heartless captors early in the last war. Incidentally, in this connection, it is also worth recalling that this is the 20th anniversary of the Yalta agreement. Lastly, I would also like to stress the fact that almost 1,000 years ago, in the year

966, Poles adopted Christianity as their faith and founded the most powerful Christian power in eastern Europe. In taking note of all these occasions, I gladly join all friends of Poland and of freedom.

Must Papers Be Grim? A Chuckle Would Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, no newspaper column receives more careful attention by people in public life than the weekly column of John S. Knight.

That distinguished editor covers the national and international scene with great forthrightness. He constantly treats his subjects with the deep seriousness that they merit.

As Jack Knight is a fellow townsman of mine, it has been my privilege to spend many wonderful hours in his company. I have found him to be a truly dedicated, patriotic citizen but one who has always maintained a good sense of humor. He has never assumed the mantle of a pontificating editor. He has ever retained that quality of fellowship that has characterized the great editors of our Nation.

The John S. Knight column, not only appeared in his own newspapers, the Akron, Ohio, Beacon Journal; the Miami, Fla., Herald; the Detroit, Mich., Free Press; the Charlotte, N.C., Observer; and the Tallahassee, Fla., Democrat but in over 100 other newspapers as well.

It follows;

MUST PAPERS BE GRIM? A CHUCKLE WOULD HELP

(By John S. Knight)

The Nation's editors journeyed to Washington a few weeks ago to brush up on journalistic techniques and hear from the mighty men of Government who regulate our daily lives.

On the whole, it was not an illuminating experience. Other than a panel on civil rights sparked by Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenback, the program was dull, uninformative and humorless.

Vermont C. Royster, editor of the Wall Street Journal and newly elected president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, found the discussions of journalism—past and future—"dreadfully depressing."

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, who can ordinarily manage a fast quip or two, delivered himself of a Democratic stump speech which I feared would never end. Later, HUBERT HORATIO had the grace to apologize to the program chairman for laying an egg.

Henry Fowler, the new Secretary of the Treasury, said nothing in a good many words. The same applied to Commerce Secretary Connor. As "Bunny" Royster remarked: "You could have switched one speech for the other and nobody would have known the difference."

Admittedly, oratory is a dying art. Yet a man should get more for the price of his luncheon ticket than chicken, peas, melting ice cream and cold coffee.

It was enough to drive an editor back to the bar and his racing form to bone up on the Kentucky Derby.

The suspicion lurks, however, that if any important Government pronouncements are to be made, L.B.J. will make them. So the public relations boys—and every Federal bureaucrat has them in depth—protect their immediate bosses with prepared speeches which have about as much zing as an oververmouthed martini served in a warm glass.

Happily for the ASNE, President Vermont Connecticut Royster is a North Carolina boy with a sense of humor. His parents must have had it, too. So, as the Republicans used to say, just wait until next year.

In these days of grim headlines and sad stories depicting the ills of humanity, editors should strive for a better mix. I learned that word last week at a shoping center press party when the owner referred repeatedly to the proper tenant mix.

I gathered it meant that an efficiently planned center should have something in it to please every customer. Like a newspaper, perhaps?

Today's press is certainly cheating the reader in the humor department. Our editors have strong views on Vietnam, mental health, juvenile delinquency, the imbalance of payments, world government, the United Nations, civil rights, and the John Birch Society.

Yet there is precious little in our newspapers to make a man laugh. And he wants to, you know.

I read an amusing story the other day about a St. Bernard dog, the kind that wears a cask of brandy around his neck and saves mountain climbers in the Alps. This particular dog couldn't climb his way out of a dry swimming pool, so the owners had to call upon the fire department to make the rescue.

Not too funny, perhaps, but better reading than the spate of stories about rapes, murders, and accidents which confront us with increasing number and regularity.

Today, every writer wants to be a pundit and deal only with significant news. This is the age of the specialist in journalism, and so we have them in politics, government, education, science, social welfare, and the cultural arts.

It is a trend I do not decry. Newspaper readers are better informed today than ever before. Reporters and special writers have the background and the ability to make involved subjects readable and understandable. Through investigative reporting, they disclose chicanery, corruption, and incompetency wherever it may exist.

Your daily newspaper is the public's best protection against the excesses of government at all levels. It is not unmindful of the growing interest in art, the theater, and the beautification of our cities. The newspaper is a superbly packaged compendium of the things which interest you.

And yet, I sense the need for more warmth in our pages and the humorous feature stories which sparkle like stars in an otherwise forbidding night.

The popularity of sports pages gives testimony to the fact that we are all, in a sense, escapists. Few there are who have no heroes in the world of sports. Breathes there a man with soul so dead who does not revel in the golfing exploits of Jack Nicklaus or a lady who has never read of Kelso, the wonder horse of this generation?

Of course, there are also humorous aspects to the news which rival "Today's Chuckle."

Barry Goldwater, for instance, presented himself to the Anglo-American Press Association in Paris by saying: "If you don't know who I am, I'm the trigger-happy, war-mongering SOB who has been asking the administration to do something about the supply routes in North Vietnam. Now, you're a statesman when you do that."

Or my friend Don Maxwell, editor of the Chicago Tribune, who has called upon Fidel Castro to confess his errors, renounce communism on May 1 and join the free world.

Editor Maxwell said in an open letter to Castro: "Repent. Make good your promise to the people. The Chicago Tribune will publish your May Day confession in full."

To date, the Cuban dictator has not replied to this generous inducement. Perhaps Fidel is holding out for the editor's job.

The histrionic performances of EVERETT DIRKSEN, Senate minority leader, are always good entertainment. The U.S. News & World Report asked him recently: "Some polls report that a large share of the people regard the Republican Party as the party of big business. Do you think that's true?"

DIRKSEN replied: "Well, now. How interesting that Henry Ford and his associates on tax matters all joined up as a committee for Mr. Johnson last year. They were all Republicans, but went over to the Democrats.

"Now if big business is an odious tag, the Democrats have got it. But Henry will be back in my office when the bill to cut excise taxes comes up."

And then comes Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, who says unions should be prepared to use strikes or boycotts to force employer compliance with a new Federal ban on job discrimination against Negroes.

Why is this funny? Well, simply because some of the unions which Mr. Meany presumably controls have long been notorious discriminators against Negro applicants for membership.

Finally, I read somewhere that U.S. war correspondents in South Vietnam are barred from entering the PX's and officers' clubs but that the shapely ladies of Saigon are always welcome.

It seems the reporters cannot be trusted to print the truth, but the girls are considered loyal to the cause.

The item is not amusing but it shows how far bureaucracy will go to louse up a war.

Some days the news is pretty depressing and a fellow would like to get away from it all.

Yet Charlie O., the mule mascot of the Kansas City Athletics is hamming it up, green fairways beckon the ardent golfer who practiced putting on the living room rug all winter and the bum predictions on the Kentucky Derby are still good for a laugh.

Richard Monckton Milnes once said: "The sense of humor is the just balance of all the faculties of man, the best security against the pride of knowledge and the conceits of the imagination, the strongest inducement to submit with a wise and pious patience to the vicissitudes of human existence."

In a word, humor helps and we need more of it.

This Is What I Firmly Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George P. Smith, of the Cuyahoga River Reclamation Commission, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, is one of the most sincere and devoted conservationists of the Nation. John Smith has spent a lifetime of effort in attempting to arrest the pollution of our streams and waterways located in the Buckeye State.

Recently, Mr. Smith has authored the following lines entitled "This Is What I

Firmly Believe." It is certainly indicative of the zeal of George P. Smith in the entire subject of water pollution, and sums up most appropriately America's needs to beautify and to conserve in a bit of thoughtful prose.

THIS IS WHAT I FIRMLY BELIEVE

Man in his thoughtlessness,
Man in his unfairness to God,
Man in his ungratefulness to God,
Man in his greediness, is killing what God has given him, and if not stopped, will kill himself.

The elimination of pollution of our waterways is so very, very vital, that it means the survival of man, animal, fish, bird, and vegetation.

Opportunity Legislation for the Indian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an explanation of a poverty bill and opportunity legislation for the Indian people. This is a piece of legislation I have been sponsoring for several years and one which would solve the Indian problem.

Not only is this legislation that would solve the Indian problem but it would provide integration of the Indian people; a people now segregated by action of the Federal Government itself.

This editorial was prepared by Bob Hill, of radio station WNAX, Yankton, S. Dak., a station which serves the entire Midwest. It was aired on Wednesday, April 14, 1965. Because of the excellent job done by Mr. Hill, I want to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where it can be read and the program studied by Members of Congress and the public generally.

The editorial follows:

Have you ever heard of anyone speak of the Indian problem? Can we say what it is specifically—put our finger on it? Congress E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota, says there is only one solution to what we refer to as the Indian problem—and that is jobs, salaries and opportunities—both on and off the reservation.

BERRY says the whole problem arises from the fact that the Indian people were found on the land, and it was decided that we should make farmers and ranchers out of them. Farming and ranching requires a very high degree of skill, and the fact is—according to BERRY—there is only enough land on any reservation to provide a living for about 10 percent of those living in the area. The question is: What can we do for the other 90 percent? He says we must either take them off the reservation, train them under his trades training and on-the-job training program, and then help them locate in nearby cities. Or we induce industry to go into the reservations to provide the jobs.

All Indian reservations are located in remote areas. Transportation of the raw material in and the finished product out is so high that business couldn't compete unless they have some kind of concession and the only kind of concession that the Government can offer is a tax concession.

Again this year Congressman BERRY has introduced a bill which would provide a 10-year tax exemption for any industry that will come onto the Indian reservation and establish a plant with more than 50 percent of their employees being Indian. It also authorizes the tribe to assist by helping to build the building, and if necessary, to help in purchasing machinery and equipment.

This idea—called Operation Bootstrap—was borrowed from Puerto Rico, once called a stricken land—a land with no hope. Then they passed a law called Operation Bootstrap—a law in which the Puerto Ricans could lift themselves up by their own bootstraps. There was a 10-year tax exemption, and here's what happened: Six hundred factories put into operation created 100,000 new jobs, gross production increased from 287 million to 1.2 billion, average family income rose nearly 400 percent to the highest of any Latin America country except oil-rich Venezuela, the infant death rate is cut in half, and the life expectancy of the Puerto Rican people rose 50 percent.

Congressman BERRY believes the same thing could be done on every Indian reservation. He says: "We talk about crime on the reservation. Of course, it's because the people have nothing to do and nothing to think about. And the little relief check they get isn't quite enough for them to live on, to say nothing of providing anything for their children. But with a job they would have something to live for and could hold their heads up before their children."

You may be wondering if Operation Bootstrap would work with the Indian people the same as it did for the Puerto Ricans. You'll be interested to know that the manager of the Bulova Watch Co. testified at a hearing that at their plant in Rolla, N. Dak., where they employ almost entirely Indian help—the incident of absenteeism was less than 1 percent. In all their other plants it was 9 percent.

What we call the Indian problem is our problem. We believe that Operation Bootstrap—Indian style—would do much to solve that problem. If you live in South Dakota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Iowa, or Minnesota or anywhere else in this area where this editorial is heard, we would like to know what you think about a plan to help some of our people pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. We still have time.

Washington State Urges Action on Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington State House of Representatives has called for the United States to deal from strength in this year's negotiations with Japan by the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission.

In a resolution recently adopted by the house, it notes that many State citizens fish in Alaska waters and are affected by foreign encroachment on North American salmon stocks.

Mr. Speaker, believing that the Members of the House are interested in this important matter, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of this resolution:

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Whereas the United States, Japan, and Canada are presently renegotiating the North Pacific Fisheries Treaty; and

Whereas many citizens of the State of Washington fish in Alaskan waters and are vitally concerned with the terms of the treaty; and

Whereas the Governor of Alaska has been strongly protesting foreign encroachment into our North American stocks of salmon; and

Whereas agencies of the Federal Government and the Members of Congress from the State of Washington have indicated interest in the situation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives, That we offer our support to our sister State of Alaska and to our congressional delegation, and that we express the hope that the problems that have arisen in connection with our fisheries may be successfully resolved at the forthcoming meetings of the North Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Members of Congress from the State of Washington.

Adopted April 22, 1965.

Strategic Pacific Marine Base Once Nearly Lost in Economy Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, out of my continuing concern over this Nation's defense readiness, I want to direct my colleague's attention to the following article written by Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired. It appeared in the San Diego Union on Monday, March 22, 1965, and lucidly illustrates that our national budget-cutters are not always the best judges of what is needed for national security:

STRATEGIC PACIFIC MARINE BASE ONCE NEARLY LOST IN ECONOMY MOVE: SAVED FOR TODAY'S ASIAN CRISIS

(By Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC, ret., director of national security and foreign affairs, Veterans of Foreign Wars)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. base on Okinawa made it possible for the 7th Fleet to put Marines ashore when they were needed at Da Nang in South Vietnam.

The 3d Marine Division is based on Okinawa. This puts the amphibious "fire brigade" close to the Asian tinderboxes at which Moscow and Peiping are throwing matches. Okinawa's central location makes it the pivot of U.S. power in the western Pacific.

It is hard to realize that less than 10 years ago the Marines almost lost Okinawa.

That the base was saved only at the last minute, is a little known story, even in Washington.

It began in 1955. I was the legislative assistant to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, an assignment that gave me a "ringside seat."

In 1955, after strategic studies by the Pentagon, Congress appropriated funds for a permanent base for most of the 3d Marine Division and some supporting aircraft on Okinawa. About $39 million was involved. A special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee went to Okinawa to check on the project. It supported the decision to put the Marines on Okinawa.

Contracts were let. Heavy equipment arrived. Construction began. Then in 1957, something happened. Economy experts in Washington decided that a Marine base in Okinawa really was not needed after all. The Pentagon issued orders to stop construction and terminate contracts. The Marines were getting a one-way ticket out of the western Pacific.

They would have been withdrawn if it had not been for two people: the late Senator Styles Bridges, Republican, of New Hampshire, and Representative Carl Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia, then chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. Both knew that the Communists were not through with aggression in Asia. Both knew that cancellation of the base on Okinawa would be a disastrous mistake.

As the Marines picked up their packs to leave Okinawa, these two powerful Members of Congress picked up their pens to keep them there. Both wrote directly to the late Charles E. Wilson, then Secretary of Defense.

Bridges asked: Would not cancellation of the Marine base on Okinawa be construed as a weakening of our determination to resist Red encroachment in southeast Asia?

Vinson was just as blunt. He said that since the Pentagon had testified the base was necesary, and since Congress appropriated the funds on the basis of that testimony, the cancellation cast doubt as to Pentagon construction planning. He said the full Armed Services Committee would investigate the matter.

Wilson, a practical man, met with top Pentagon officials to show the letters from Bridges and Vinson. He then told Marine Corps Commandant Randolph McC. Pate he was reversing the cancellation order and releasing funds to continue construction.

What are the lessons of all this?

First, budget-cutters are not the best judges of what is needed for national security.

Second, it is another example of what our Nation owes to the wisdom and courage of Bridges and Vinson.

The Marines should find a couple of buildings, roads or camps on Okinawa and give them two illustrious names.

Prayer for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in these trying times of both the hot and cold wars and with the various, far-reaching decisions facing this Congress, many of us find solace and guidance in prayer.

On Thursday, April 29, 1965, the Red Bank Register in Red Bank, N.J., which is published by my good friend, Mr. M. Harold Kelly, carried an editorial which I feel will be of great interest to all of us here today. It was an editorial concerning an invocation delivered by Msgr. A. C. Dineen, rector of St. Agnes Church, East 43d Street, New York City, at a bureau of advertising dinner at the American Newspaper Publishers Association convention in New York.

The article follows:

PRAYER FOR AMERICA

Msgr. A. C. Dineen, rector of St. Agnes Church, East 43d St., New York City, delivered the invocation Thursday night at a Bureau of Advertising dinner at the American Newspaper Publishers Association convention in the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City.

What he had to say in a brief invocation contained great meaning—and aroused interest and favorable comment from those who attended the dinner. Many said they never have heard an invocation that carried such a deep message and provided such inspiration.

Msgr. Dineen's invocation is titled "Prayer for America" and we would like to share it with our readers.

It follows:

"DEAR FELLOW AMERICANS: Save us, O God, from the sin of worrying, lest stomach ulcers be the badge of our lack of faith.

"Give us clear vision that we may know where to stand and what to stand for—because unless we stand for something, we shall fall for anything.

"Since we strain at gnats and swallow camels, give us a new standard of values and an ability to know a trifle when we see it. As Shakespeare put it: 'Much ado about nothing.'

"Help us to see that it is better to fall for a cause that will ultimately succeed than succeed in a cause that will ultimately fail.

"Save us from hotheads that would lead us to act foolishly, and from cold feet that would keep us from acting at all.

"Save us from accepting a little of what we know to be wrong in order to get a little of what we imagine to be right.

"We pray that the people of America, who have made such progress in material things, may now seek to grow in spiritual understanding. For we have improved means, but not improved ends. We have better ways of getting there, but we have no better places to go. We can save more time, but we are not making any better use of the time we save. We need Thy help to do something about the world's true problems—the problem of lying, which is called propaganda; the problem of selfishness, which is called self-interest; the problem of greed, which is often called profit; the problem of license, disguising itself as liberty; the problem of lust, masquerading as love; the problem of materialism, the hook which is baited with false security.

"Hear our prayers, O God, for the spiritual understanding which is better than political wisdom, that we may see our problems for what they really are. 'In God we trust.'"

Press Release by Senator Nelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin's junior Senator and the Nation's outstanding champion of conservation ideas and programs, made an announcement today which I feel should be brought to the attention of all my colleagues in this body.

He announced that the Senate Appropriations Committee has approved five key budget requests which offer bright new hope for Great Lakes area conservation and resource development.

None of these five projects, involving a total of $15,144,400, was included in the budget bill reported by this body.

I wish to make known my agreement with Senator NELSON that these budget requests are absolutely vital.

The ultimate approval of these projects probably will rest with a Senate-House conference committee.

So that all my colleagues will be familiar with these new budget requests, I include Senator NELSON's press release of today in the RECORD:

PRESS RELEASE BY SENATOR NELSON

Senator GAYLORD NELSON said Monday that the Senate Appropriations Committee had approved five key budget requests which offer "bright new hope for Great Lakes area conservation and resource development."

The committee voted for funds to expand the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, bolster the Great Lakes fishing industry, finance Wisconsin water research, and buy a huge tract of lakes and recreational forest just over the State line.

"If these committee successes can be steered through the House of Representatives, we will have won a great victory for the Great Lakes region," NELSON said.

Senator NELSON, in letters to Senators and in appearances before subcommittees, had fought for the budget increases which he said were absolutely vital. Senator PROXMIRE and other Great Lakes senators also backed the budget increases. The committee, of which Senator PROXMIRE is a member, granted every one of the requests.

They would:

1. Buy the Sylvania tract—18,000 acres of virgin forest and lakes in northern Michigan, bordering northeastern Wisconsin—for $6,099,400.

2. Clear the way for a big expansion of the Forest Products Laboratory several years hence by granting $190,000 for immediate planning.

3. Release $430,000 to help Great Lakes fishermen, hurt by the sea lamprey and last year's botulism disease scare.

4. Appropriate $5,600,000 to implement the Commercial Fisheries and Development Act of 1964, to finance research and disaster aid.

5. Appropriate $2,825,000 to finance the newly established "water resource research institute" at the University of Wisconsin and 36 other land-grant universities, as authorized but not financed last year.

These projects were not included in the budget bill as it came to the Senate from the House of Representatives.

NELSON said he was reasonably confident that the Senate as a whole would back up the Senate Appropriations Committee decision on all five. Then a fight must be made to win approval in a Senate-House conference committee, NELSON said.

Senator NELSON called the privately owned Sylvania tract "a midwestern Shangri-la." He said it would be a tragedy if the Federal Government did not seize the opportunity to buy it for long-range public enjoyment. The tract is in the estate of the late Larry Fisher, a multimillionaire, and is in danger of being subdivided and logged off.

The U.S. Forest Service proposes to make it a national recreation area. The area is dotted with crystal clear lakes and huge timber.

Senator NELSON had made a major fight on the Forest Products Laboratory item, noting that this $190,000 was the key to preserving carefully developed plans to double the Laboratory's staff of scientists.

In the last Congress, the Wisconsin Senators won final approval of a $4 million new wing on the Laboratory. Bids are now being taken and construction will start soon. Once that new wing is occupied, the present lab building must be extensively remodeled at a cost of $2,750,000. Then the development plan calls for construction of another $5.7 million wing.

This great expansion program, totaling almost $13 million, is to be completed by 1972, by which time the scientists' staff is to increase from 150 to 325.

NELSON felt it was crucial to win the $190,000 this year to keep Congress committed to the expansion timetable.

NELSON emphasized that the Forest Products Laboratory, the Nation's No. 1 research center for the industry, would play a major role in the development of Appalachia, the northern Great Lakes area, and other forested areas with economic problems. He also said it would help take up some of the slack caused by the phasing out of Truax Field Air Force Base at Madison.

When the Commercial Fisheries and Development Act was approved last year, $5.5 million was authorized. The 1966 budget, however, recommended only $2 million and the House added $2 million to this.

NELSON contended that a series of setbacks reduced the Great Lakes commercial fishing industry to the verge of bankruptcy.

Wisconsin would receive $24,500 to $4.9 million designated for research and development and States bordering on the Great Lakes would receive $468,700 under the revised appropriation. As recommended in the administration budget, Wisconsin would have received only $9,500 and the Great Lakes States $181,700.

The $430,000 approved for revitalizing Great Lakes fishing was less than the $1.43 million requested in a letter last week by NELSON, the Great Lakes Conference of Senators, and the Midwest Fisheries Council. The House, however, had refused to appropriate anything for this purpose.

The $2.8 million appropriation for water resource research institutes was approved by the committee early last week and then passed by the Senate.

The money would allow 37 centers to be established and thus fulfill the goal of a research center at a land-grant college or university in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico.

The House had cut $855,000, which would have prohibited establishment of a center in each State. Centers have already been established in 14 States.

The University of Wisconsin Center will bring together and improve the existing programs for research, publication, and education in the field of water resources.

Our Scrap Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we are often prone to take for granted some of our most effective and important agencies and services and I was reminded of this when recently I read an editorial in the Ansonia, Conn., Evening Sentinel, under the title "Are Scrap Yards Necessary?"

Mr. Burton Albert of Albert Bros., Inc., Waterbury, Conn., has recently written to me calling my attention to publicity given to the problem of disposing of scrap iron and steel. Mr. Albert reports that various epithets have been hurled at the scrap industry in general.

I believe that the editorial published in the February 8, 1965 edition of the Ansonia Sentinel makes clear the position of importance held by the scrap industry and makes known the vital importance a well-placed and well-organized scrap yard has in any modern community.

ARE SCRAP YARDS NECESSARY?

One of the things that is banished in most city planning is the scrap yard. It isn't beautiful, but it is a vital industry and a necessity?

Scrap processors take what many people consider waste—iron and steel scrap—and prepare it as a raw material for new steel.

The finest steel is made in electric furnaces from 100 percent scrap. Other grades commonly used are half scrap and half pig iron in their formula. A ton of scrap can be used in place of 2 tons of iron ore, a ton of coke and half a ton of limestone. It is an essential raw material in producing defense materials as well as steel for civilian needs.

The scrap industry collects ferrous scrap from the junk collectors and prepares it for the steel producers' needs.

Each year this country generated 33 million tons of scrap.

Without the junk segregator and the scrap processor, most of this scrap would be left lying around. Cities can collect and incinerate garbage and trash at relatively low cost. If there were no junkyards or scrap processors, how many cities would undertake collecting scrap? Or would know what to do with it if they did?

Community planners all over the country have been getting rid of the scrap industry by making no provision for it in their plans.

Once a metal yard has to move, it isn't easy for it to find a new location because it is usually zoned out of the possibility of relocation. It's one of those things that's not "desirable" and yet few things are more necessary to the national economy.

Planning officials will have to come to the realization that they must make some provision for suitable locations within their overall plans. Regulations, such as proper screening and even landscaping are, of course, essential.

But putting the scrap people out of business entirely is not only hard on these enterprises, it generates new problems which will come to a head during the next few years.

Monsignor Cyril Anid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 9, 1965, the Right Reverend Archimandrite Cyril Anid, pastor of St. Ann's Melkite Rite Church, will be honored on his retirement at a testimonial dinner.

Monsignor Anid was born in Bierut, Lebanon, in 1885, and underwent seminary training at the Seminary of St. Ann in Jerusalem. He was ordained into the priesthood on September 14, 1911. He remained at St. Ann's Seminary, where he served as a professor of Greek and Arabic languages. At the outbreak of World War I, the seminary was forced to close its doors for political reasons. He returned to Bierut, where he assisted in school and parish work.

In December 1919, while visiting his family in New York City, he was urged by the Syrian Catholics of Paterson to render spiritual services to them. The following year, with the approval of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church in Rome, Monsignor Anid was assigned to minister to the needs of this growing community. Masses were at first held in the chapel of the Church of St. John the Baptist and later in the basement of St. Michael's Church.

With the acquisition of property on Marshall Street, Monsignor Anid was instrumental in the construction of St. Ann's Church in 1922, a church constructed in the Byzantine architectural design. Under his tutorage, a parish hall was constructed adjacent to the church in 1947, for use as a social center. A rectory was constructed in 1963.

The Most Reverend James J. Navagh, DD., bishop of Paterson, heads the list of dignitaries from around the world who will be there to pay tribute to Monsignor Anid.

Honorary chairmen are Rev. Maxim Chalhoub, the new pastor, and his assistant, Rev. Albert Gorayeb. General chairmen are Charles Ablahani and George Dipsey.

I personally have come to respect and revere this kindly and warm man. His friendliness to all and his good cheer have been unfailing. Combining humanitarianism with wisdom, he has been a guiding light for many.

I am sure that I represent the entire community when I wish Msgr. Cyril Anid many years of good health and contentment in his retirement. We pray that his years will be golden ones.

"We Are Unconquerable, Except by Ourselves"—Oddfellows' Pilgrimage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the Independent Order of Oddfellows held the annual pilgrimage to the Tomb of the Unknowns on May 2, 1965. Our sovereign grand master, the Honorable Kermit R. Cofer, of Water Valley, Miss., delivered the address for this occasion. His splendid remarks are in all things worthy of a place in the RECORD. With unanimous consent I place the same as a part of my remarks, and copied in full in the Appendix:

ADDRESS OF KERMIT R. COFER, SOVEREIGN GRAND MASTER, AT THE TOMB OF THE UNKOWNS, MAY 2, 1965

Deputy Sovereign Grand Master James Main, Congressman DOWDY, General Commanding Raymond Volk, President Lady Smith, International President Ione McCauley, brothers, sisters, and friends, in deep solemnity and reverence, we, the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, are come to this hallowed shrine. Once again, we are assembled in our annual pilgrimage to the Tomb of the Unknowns, here to pay our tribute of love and respect, here to acknowledge our unending obligation to these unknowns and to all whom they represent, of whom they are the reminder. Here, in the midst of the rows upon rows of markers in these silent fields of the dead, we bow our heads and hearts in simple thanks; we raise our voices in praise of these and of them.

Shortly distant from this spot stands also the Canadian Monument, erected in Canada's memory and honor of U.S. soldiers who gave up their lives in service of the Canadian Army, and it is a part of our program of this day to stand there for a moment in tribute of them, also.

Were, however, this assembly, this event, and this alone, the length, breadth, and depth of our affection, our tribute, our love, our debt, then, it is here submitted, our coming, just once in the year, to this sacred ground would be hypocritical sham and mockery. In truth, what we do and say here is only eloquent witness to our love and appreciation keenly felt throughout the year. Better than assembling here, their deeds are engraved deeply, permanently, lovingly, in the inner recesses of our hearts.

These and all whom they represent were born as we were born, were bold to hope, optimistic to plan, loved to live, sang, played. But they counted as nothing life and these things when the time came to stand or to fall, and faced and went to their death as to a night of rest and accepted their supreme sacrifice as their finest hour. No timid, timorous, shrinking coward among them, their courage, their daring, their accomplishments are emblazoned upon the pages of history, and our days are the convincing witness of their triumph.

Each of the battles wherein they, with bravery and heroism, participated is an everlasting chapter, and an important one, in the continuing conflict which is ours to preserve the things which are dear to our hearts and for which they died. It was for such purpose—the preservation of these things—that each of them arose, and for the success of which each laid upon the altar all that he had and all that he was. These whose memory we honor this afternoon died that we might live, they who had as much right to live as we have. It cannot be thus true, without the inseparable companion truth that, because they perished in our stead, and since we live because they died, there is a duty, a responsibility, which we owe to them, and that duty we cannot shrik, no matter how negligent or indifferent we may become in the discharge of duty owed to self.

For what then did they die? And what would they have cherished? And what did they hold holy?

Whether it be described as right to worship, freedom of speech, right to chart out the plans or their lives for themselves, or the right to love and be loved, it is all wrapped up, one way or another, in the word "freedom." We are become for them the guardians of that freedom as well as possessors of it for ourselves.

Ours have been wars for freedom. Toward this goal, and it alone, we have geared, mobilized, and fought.

For them, for ourselves, and for the generations to come, we must stand—firmly, with dedication, with resolution—for freedom and all things implicit in it. We must be alert to act for the right without counting the cost, for to pause for that purpose is to lose.

When free men speak freely, democracy, justice, and fairplay prevail, and there is found no drilling ground for the "isms" in our midst.

On an occasion such as this, it is understandable to suppose that some reference will be made to communism. Here, almost within the hearing of our voices, is the Nation's Capital. With the sympathetic understanding of our brothers and sisters in Canada and Latin America, and spread throughout the world, of whom I am also honored to be sovereign grand master, those of us who are citizens of the United States believe that it is the best country in the world and that ours is the best system of government in the universe. Just across the Potomac River, our leaders and our representatives are feverishly engaged in unending preparations for the defense of our land. They are thus engaged—and in some measure or other, and in one sense or another—we are all participating in the undertaking—because not all nations of the world are lovers of peace or are engaged in the pursuit of it. A poet has aptly, beautifully written that, "For more than guided missiles, all the world needs guided men."

Herein, it is believed, lies the explanation of why we are busy with our defenses. In it may be found the time when we may turn our thoughts and efforts to matters promoting the common welfare of all our people. When the world's leaders all come to submit themselves to guidance by the Supreme Creator, our Maker and Preserver, then will come to pass the wonderful and wonderfully prophetic lines of Alfred Lord Tennyson:

"The war drum throbb'd no longer
and the battleflags were furl'd
In the parliament of man, the federation
of the world."

We are inclined, however, to blame all our woes, threats, dangers, difficulties, upon the unguided, Godless hands of communism. There is as well another danger and this one is within. In this era, when, erroneously, but truly, many believe they are entitled to a breathing spell, when money comes easy, and we believe that getting it is the chief end of man, while men worship at the altar of unreality, emptiness, and false values, and in this time of lazy thinking and total inactivity insofar as our God-given right and heritage are concerned, we need—before it is too late—to give deep and long consideration to the question as to which way we are headed, and what will be the end of our way. We need to ask ourselves, Do we genuinely want freedom? Are we willing to pay the price for it?

"The tumult and the shouting dies,
The captains and the kings depart—
Still stands thine ancient sacrifice,
An Humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—Lest we forget!"

Firm and unwavering faith in, and submission to, the power and the will of God set this country on its way, and these things—faith and submission—made us strong, and brought us along our way as a prosperous, united nation. In God we trust, and one nation under God—these have been and are our motto, and we are great and strong because of the trust in Him and we remain one nation under God because of that trust.

No more stern reality of history exists than the fact that more nations decline and fall and are submerged because of internal indifference than through the power of the outside enemy. We are invulnerable to the attack of any enemy, unless we be that enemy or on its side. We are unconquerable, except by ourselves.

Are we alert to the dangers of the day? Or are we too busy with idleness to know or to care? In the good times of today, are we forgetting God and our dependence upon Him? Or are we holding Him in reserve for the day when we think we may need Him?

We pray the prayer, and may we keep on praying it:

"Our father's God, to thee,
Author of liberty,
To Thee we sing;
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King."

I thank you.

A Basic American Right: The Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a parody on the President's speech when applied to the principle of the right to work and the repeal of section 14–B of the Taft-Hartley Act.

On that basis the President said, in part:

I speak tonight for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy. * * * There, long suffering men and women peacefully protested the denial of their rights as Americans. * * * There is no cause for self-satisfaction in the long denial of equal rights for millions of Americans. * * * For with a country as with a person, "What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul." * * * Those words are a promise to every citizen that he shall share in the dignity of man.

The President went on to say:

This dignity cannot be found in man's possessions or his power or his position. It rests on his right to be treated as a man equal in opportunity to all others. It says he shall share in freedom, choose his leaders, educate his children, provide for his family according to his ability and his merits as a human being.

Not according to his membership in a union.

To apply any other test—to deny a man his hopes—

His job—

because of his color or race, his religion, or the place of his birth—

Or because of nonmembership in a union—

is not only to do injustice, it is to deny America and to dishonor the dead who gave their lives for freedom. * * * Yet the harsh fact is that in many places in this country men and women are kept from voting—

Working—

because they are Negro—

Not union.

Yes; it seems that the principles expressed in President Johnson's eloquent

plea for voting rights retain the same integrity and may be identically applied to another basic American right—the right to work.

The First Decoration Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the address delivered at the Memorial Day services on last May 30th by a resident of Wyoming, Pa., Mr. Richard G. Lyons, at the services held at the Wyoming Cemetery, was a real contribution to the early history of that part of my congressional district.

Mr. Lyons' address follows:

THE FIRST DECORATION DAY

(Speech, Memorial Day services, May 30, 1964, delivered by Richard G. Lyons, Wyoming Cemetery, Wyoming, Pa., dedicated to Richard Duffy, GAR veteran, discharged from Union Army April 1864)

"The dearest spot
In all the world
Is a small piece
Of earth
That forms that hallowed
Resting place
Of those who gave
Us birth."

—CATHOLIC LIGHT, May 28, 1964.

In this day and age where the traditional virtues—of honor, duty, and country that General MacArthur made so emphatic are not to be loudly proclaimed, I would like to add one other word—"community," and I want to say congratulations to so many of you community minded citizens who I have been here year after year.

In 1961 a young President of the United States at his inauguration made this statement: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." We can apply that same statement to our own community and I will try to point out why you and I should be proud of this community and its traditions.

The starting of this tradition of gathering here on May 30 in the Wyoming Cemetery to honor those who have passed on, cannot be pinpointed from a search of old newspapers, or in the local libraries because someone was lacking in traditional instinct and failed to record the earliest Decoration Day of the two Wyomings. Here are a few things I can tell you about Decoration Day—it was born in Pennsylvania 100 years ago today.

It happened in a small farming community of Boalsburg on a sunny May 30, 1864. Teenager Emma Hunter gathered a bouquet of garden flowers and took them to the community burial ground to the grave of her father, a colonel who had been fatally wounded the summer before while commanding Pennsylvania's gallant 49th Regiment at Gettysburg. At the same time a Mrs. Meyers came to the cemetery with a corsage of wild flowers to place on the grave of her 19-year-old son, Joe, who had fallen during the first day of fighting at Gettysburg. There at the cemetery the two women met for the first time—the grieving mother, mourning the loss of her son, the tearful daughter almost too young to understand the cause for which her father had given his life. The two women in their common grief found solace and close bond of friendship as they knelt in that little burial ground where Mount Nittany stands guard over the eternal sleep of their loved ones.

From her bouquet, Emma took a few flowers and placed them on the grave of the boy whose life had been cut so tragically short in the great War Between the States. Mrs. Meyers, in turn, placed at the colonel's grave some of her freshly cut blossoms. Neither of the women realized that this simple gesture would have any further significance outside their own personal gift—but before they parted, the young girl and the woman agreed to meet at the cemetery on the same date the following year, and then honor not only their own loved ones, but also all others who might not have anyone to kneel and pray at their lonely graves.

In the ensuing months the entire community heard and was touched by the pact between the two women. And when May 30, 1865, arrived, what had been planned as an informal meeting of two women became a community service with all Boalsburg gathered together.

Dr. George Hall, a local clergyman, preached a sermon and the townspeople decorated every grave in the cemetery with flowers and flags. The custom became an annual event in Boalsburg, and one by one neighboring communities adopted a similar ceremony to observe Decoration Day each May 30.

In 1868 Gen. John A. Logan, Commander of the Grand Army of the Republic issued General Order No. 11 officially proclaiming Decoration Day, May 30, as a day set aside to pay respects to all who have died, as soldiers or civilians, in defense of their country. And the simple ceremonies began by the two grieving women in Boalsburg, Pa., became one of the Nation's most important holidays, dedicated to those who, in President Lincoln's words, "gave that last full measure of devotion" for freedom and for their country.

Order No. 11, page 87, VFW Manual.

I would like to be able to give you a description of the first Decoration Day services in Wyoming, but we will have to settle for an eyewitness account of the Decoration Day services held in 1895. Remember the two boroughs were then known as the East Ward and the West Ward.

The GAR headquarters for the Wyoming area was the third floor of the Hertz Building, corner of Eighth Street and Shoemaker Avenue in the West Ward. All those who participated in the Memorial Day services met at GAR headquarters and marched from the meeting hall to the Methodist Church and then proceeded to Wyoming Cemetery. It was a warm day. Puddles of water dotted West Eighth Street, but the puddles did not hinder the marchers. They were accompanied by one musician, Harry Shoemaker, setting the pace with a muted drum.

The names of Rhoades, Ash, Wolfe, Rinker, Morgan, Smith, Felts, Shoemaker and Wright were in the line of march on this day and many succeeding Memorial Days.

No doubt, I have missed many names, but the source of my information was a little girl at that time in the primary grades of the local school. I pay her a special compliment for a splendid memory. The GAR Post was known as the Lieutenant Charles E. Reilay Post No. 567, GAR, Department of Pennsylvania. According to records it is now the property of the Wyoming Methodist Church. Lieutenant Reilay was the only commissioned officer of the post; he died in the Battle of the Wilderness. Other personnel listed were of the grade of private. William Carey, Jr., honorary member of the GAR who kept the post's records for many years, has listed only the post officers of 1928 in his record. They are:

Commander, John Felts.

Senior Vice Commander L. G. Wildoner; and Adjutant J. I. Shoemaker. May I deviate, for a moment, to illustrate how records can take on a different meaning. The phrase "War is hell" is attributed to General Sherman. It's partially true, here is what really happened. On General Sherman's march through Georgia he and his aides were ambushed from both sides of the road by rebel forces, who had killed a woman carrying a baby in her arms during the crossfire. It was an accident. When General Sherman saw that the woman was hit, he immediately dismounted and went to her aid. As he removed the baby from her lifeless arms he said: "O God, war is hell." Need I say any more to prove this point? Getting back to Lieutenant Reilay, records reveal he was one of the finest officers in the service of our country and many tributes were paid to him for his foresight and courage—the members of the GAR prove this by selecting his name for their post. He was held in the highest esteem by his war buddies and all that knew him and admired him for these fine traits. Over at the flagpole is the soldiers' plot. The markers reveal that all buried there are veterans of the War of the Rebellion except one and he is what is known as a retread; that is, he served in World War I and II. The name on the marker is Ralph Hornby, a fine soldier in both wars; and I'm sure well known by many here today. May I suggest each of you visit this plot of ground at the base of the flagpole. They resting there were all proud of their community. Your service organizations are proud of this community and yearly place over 1,000 American flags on servicemen's and servicewomen's graves, in this area. This phase of the yearly project is increasing. We will be calling for help—don't be a slacker.

Special mention should be given to some of the organizations that have at least 50 years' service in the Memorial Day services of the two Wyomings.

Pennsylvania State Police.

Suttons Band, led by John Sutton and later by Mr. John Cotter.

The council of both boroughs and the school boards.

For over 40 years' service, the VFW.

Paul Oftedahl, bugler approximately 28 years.

Also the American Legion, Boy Scouts, and Girl Scouts. Cubs, Brownies, and schoolchildren, auxiliary police, fire company, ambulance unit, Eagles, Red Men, Rotary, Lions, New Frontier Club. I was unable to learn how many parades Miss Morris, Miss Hooper, or Mary Yetter participated in, but you know girls' reaction to such a question. Special mention should be made of the clergy who were always on hand—and the details who yearly place flowers and markers on the graves from the service organizations. The speakers always fine citizens who spent hours getting a Decoration Day message ready. If I've missed anyone I apologize.

The slogan for the Civil War was: "From the flag never a star shall fall" and members of post 567, GAR, fought in every major engagement of the rebellion to prevent the stars from falling.

One great American in the past year has given his life to carry out the ideals of 100 years ago and prevent the stars from falling. I'm referring to John F. Kennedy, President of the United States and Commander in Chief of all Armed Forces. May he rest in peace. I'm sure he will rest in peace and all our forebears will rest in peace if we remember to carry out the traditions of our country and our community, which they loved so dearly.

Thank you. Lord willing see you in 1965.

The Anatomy of Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, for anyone with ears to hear and eyes to see, it is evident that a malignant sore is gnawing at the foundations of our society.

While this sore has many different names, and takes on various disguises, common to them all is the element of extremism.

All of us who love our country have an inherent obligation to help heal this sore. An awareness and understanding of this ailment are essential to those who would be healed.

Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times recently published an editorial entitled, "The Anatomy of Extremism." The message of this editorial fulfills the essential requirements of understanding and awareness of extremism.

I commend the Los Angeles Times for speaking out so lucidly on this subject. I also commend to the attention of my colleagues this editorial and place it at this point in the RECORD:

THE ANATOMY OF EXTREMISM

Periodically, in the history of this Republic, there have emerged during times of stress extremist cults and movements of various stripe. They often rally under patriotic banners. But they are dedicated nonetheless to assaulting by word and deed certain basic institutions and tenets of American society.

In the 1840's and 1850's the Nation suffered, and survived, the "know nothings." In the 1930's, amidst the fear of the great depression, both Fascist and Communist organizations flourished. At other times, in less organized ways, we have endured other divisive, truly un-American movements, which preached hatred of class or race or religion or democracy.

These have not been nor are they today welcome experiences. Living through them has sometimes left scars. In every case, however, the fundamental strengths of our political and social structure have readily absorbed the attacks of internal foes.

This is not to minimize or discount the inherent threat posed by organized extremist movements. These are ugly, intolerable manifestations whenever and wherever they occur.

Whether of right or left, extremists are a departure from both the ideal and practice of American National life. And when hate, which so easily is expressed through violence, is the chief mark of extremism, the aberration is even more alarming.

We live now, as we have for some decades past and as we no doubt will for some time to come, in an uneasy world. Fears, real and imagined, vague and precise, surround us. Within and without our borders, great and unusual transformations are taking place.

Old values are questioned and sometimes discarded without being replaced. What once were sureties making for stability—of belonging, of participation, of individual worth—now seem frequently in doubt.

In this changing climate a sense of frustration, a feeling by the individual that life is wasted or spoiled, can be easily nourished. Widespread frustration, with all its ambiguities, is the commonest breeding ground of extremis. It is from among the frustrated that the zealots, the "true believers," are recruited for extremist movements.

Regardless of the cause to which he dedicates himself, the extremist in every case seems motivated and compelled by an inner turmoil, for which he invents elaborate and high-sounding rationalizations. This is true whether he is a college youth eagerly enlisting in a far-left crusade, or a goon marching in a bedsheet, or a man in a business suit conspiring to take over a PTA—or a local police force.

The raw material for making extremists has always been with us and, given human nature, always will be. The existence of this fortunately limited element in our midst is not itself alarming. Extremism in any form, thanks to the basic commonsense of Americans, has never yet grown in to a mass movement.

What is alarming is the chance that passivity, preoccupation, and apathy on the part of the overwhelming majority of decent Americans will permit one or more extremist movements to assume a strength far out of proportion to its size. Then it may prove too late to do anything about it.

This has happened in other countries.

Despite the phrases they mouth or the flags in which they wrap themselves, extremists can be readily identified. For what distinguishes them all is a basic hatred and contempt for American society as it exists today. That hatred, however disguised, gives extremists cohesion and motivation. It is their strength, but it is also their undoing. For such sick hatred ultimately is self-destroying.

Given a vigilant, concerned public, the process can be accelerated.

"Top Typical Teen": Miss Mary Jo Smith, of Coolidge, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, surely every Member of this House has wished at some time that our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was equipped to reproduce photographs.

Were it possible I would offer to you today the smiling countenance of the "Top Typical Teen" of last week's National 4-H Conference.

She is Miss Mary Jo Smith, of Coolidge, Ga., in Thomas County. Pridefully I report that this is in the Second District of Georgia.

Seventeen magazine, assisted by cooperative extension service leaders, picked her to represent 2¼ million fine boys and girls. She was presented at the National 4-H Conference General Assembly here on Wednesday night.

This lovely young high school senior was selected for her exceptional 4-H leadership and citizenship achievements; her church, school, and community activities, and her personal charm and poise. She will be featured this fall in an illustrated article by Seventeen in its auxiliary publication, Seventeen at School.

Mary Jo was among 235 delegates in Washington from 50 States, Puerto Rico and Canada who participated in assemblies and group discussions at the 4-H Center and also enjoyed the many wonders of our Nation's Capitol City.

In Georgia, Mary Jo lives with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Franklin I. Smith on an 850-acre crop-beef-dairy farm and attends high school at nearby Thomasville. In this latter city, famous over many years for its annual Rose Show, Mary Jo reigned the previous week as queen of the festival. She also is now State 4-H council president, and Dr. Tommy Walton, the State leader, says she is an excellent one. "In 1963 she helped us lead a 4-H people-to-people goodwill tour of several European countries," he said.

Mary Jo and the other Georgia delegates to the General Assembly had a great time here in Washington last week. They are Linda Grace Smith of Fort Gaines, Kenneth Gordon of Hogansville, and John H. Newell, Jr., of Whitesburg.

Mr. Speaker, may I be pardoned for also pointing with pride that Linda Grace is also from my district?

These fine young people were also accompanied to Washington by district leaders Gene Grimes of Tifton and Roger Carr of Watkinsville.

They met Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson at the White House. Later Mary Jo enjoyed sighting with Miss Connie Freeman, daughter of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman. She also introduced a fellow Georgian, Secretary of State Dean Rusk to the General Assembly and appeared on several television shows.

It is a pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to recognize the wonderful accomplishments of these great young Americans. How refreshing to compare them with the kooks and beatniks.

Unmasking the Ku Klux Klan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, the first statement which I made as a Member of this body was to applaud the suggestion of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] that the Ku Klux Klan be investigated. That inquiry by the Committee on Un-American Activities will soon be underway.

In my remarks on February 1, I recalled the action of the Commercial Appeal in turning the spotlight on the Klan almost a half-century ago. The newspaper's crusade brought it a Pulitzer Prize in 1923 and its action was a major factor in the peaceful race relations we have enjoyed in Memphis while many of our sister Southern cities have been embroiled in turmoil.

Now the Commercial Appeal is again helping unmask the Klan. Calvin Alley's skillful cartoons have shown the ludicrous nature of these hooded creatures. Its editorial writers have pointed out the injustice that these harbingers of hate do to the people of good will in the South.

In a penetrating series of articles, Mr. Morris Cunningham, chief of the Com-

mercial Appeal's Washington Bureau, recently reported the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. Unfortunately this organization is again stirring in our midst. His fine articles perform a great service in showing the people of the South the danger that lies in this group. I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the first two articles in this series.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Apr. 25, 1965]

FBI LIFTS HOODS OF KLAN'S KNOCKOFF SQUADS

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—The FBI has infiltrated the Ku Klux Klan and has identified members of so-called "knockoff squads," the Commercial Appeal has learned.

The speedy arrests in the slaying of Mrs. Viola Liuzzo on an Alabama highway last month were a credit to the FBI's careful spadework.

One of the men in the car from which the fatal shots are said to have been fired has emerged as a paid FBI informant.

Informants and persuasion of Klansmen to inform played a part in arrests in the slaying of three civil rights workers in Mississippi last summer, and in arrests in the highway killing of Lt. Col. Lemuel Penn, a Washington Negro educator, in Georgia last July.

KKK "knockoff squads" are small groups whose plots and violent deeds are kept secret from rank-and-file Klan members.

Hard-core Klansmen willing to join these groups and to resort to violence are said to be comparatively few in number. But investigations indicate they are responsible for a substantial part of the racial violence in the South within the past year.

The knockoff squads range in size from three to a dozen men. They plan their deeds outside of regular Klan meetings.

There is a loose understanding that knockoff squads can be called from a distant locality to perform an act of violence.

Today's Klansman is far different from his counterpart of a few decades ago. He has little love for the traditional trappings and rites of the hooded order. It matters little to many whether they have robes or not. And the only reason for hoods is to hide their identities from other members at the time of law violations.

This is even more true since the Klan has become aware of infiltration by the FBI. Normally, FBI agents do not do the infiltrating. They employ undercovermen who, for rewards both monetary and otherwise, join the Klan and spill its secrets to Federal agents. Such apparently was the case with Thomas Gary Rowe, Jr. in the Liuzzo case.

While some attacks by Klansmen are known to have been planned in advance, other instances of violence are believed by authorities to be spur-of-the-moment deeds. The shooting of Mrs. Liuzzo is cited as an example of unplanned violence.

In their self-appointed role as vigilantes, KKK terrorists are known to be responsible for a wide range of violence, including beatings, bombings, killings, and floggings.

While convictions have been rare, Federal authorities are convinced of the validity of their evidence. It has been painstakingly gathered and speaks for itself.

Terrorists are emboldened, Federal authorities say, because of a belief they have community support and will not be punished for their misdeeds. State prosecutions frequently fail or are not initiated. In some rural areas local law enforcement officers are KKK members.

Far more dangerous numerically than the Klan are the Klan's sympathizer's. Agents in one State laid a carefully planned trap for a "knockoff squad" one night, only to see the plan go awry because a telephone operator who was friendly to the Klan overheard a conversation about the trap.

Federal prosecutions often are impossible because only State laws have been violated. For instance, murder is a State but not a Federal crime.

KKK activists are known to accumulate firearms and ammunition, and sometimes even explosives. There is a practice in the use of firearms. In a few communities hunting and fishing clubs reportedly are fronts for Klan activities.

During the revival in the 1920's the KKK was a vast, cohesive organization of an estimated 4 million members.

Today's KKK, a vastly different conglomeration, is splintered into 14 organizations with a total of about 9,000 members.

By far the largest is the United Klans of America, Inc., Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. It is headed by imperial wizard Robert M. Shelton, and has an estimated 4,600 members. From its headquarters in Tuscaloosa, Ala., it operates in North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, South Carolina, Florida, and, to a lesser extent, Tennessee and Mississippi.

Next largest is the White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan of Mississippi with an estimated 2,000 members. It has headquarters in Laurel, Miss., and is said to be headed by a 40-year-old pinball and juke box operator who has denied any connection with the Klan. He reportedly was elected imperial wizard, the top job, in February 1964 and reelected in December 1964.

More than 300 leaders of the White Knights reportedly held a statewide meeting in a forest glade in Simpson County last November 15 and ordered a suspension of all violence.

The order reportedly was inspired by pressures from State and Federal authorities and bad publicity growing out of the slayings of the three civil rights workers near Philadelphia—Michael Schwerner, Andrew Goodman, and James Chaney.

The FBI has said more than half of the 21 persons arrested in the slayings were members of the White Knights.

Ironically, Shelton and the United Klans took the spotlight during the early stages of the investigation at Philadelphia.

Shelton arrived on the scene a few days after the civil rights workers disappeared and announced he was making his own investigation of the affair. He labeled the whole case a hoax.

The Klan had been dead in Mississippi up until about 2 years ago. By then, it had become evident to all that the respectables among the professional segregationist groups were losing ground.

It was then that organizations such as the Citizens Council began losing the rougher element of their memberships to activist groups like the Klan.

In Neshoba County, crosses were burned several months before the civil rights slayings, including one on the Courthouse lawn. Klan literature flooded the county and was even posted on the courthouse bulletin board.

The White Knights were organized February 15, 1964, at Brookhaven, Miss., by 200 disgruntled former members of the Original Knights of the KKK who were dissatisfied over the original knights' financial dealings.

Membership is open to any white, Protestant, American-born male. The cost is a $10 membership fee plus another $10 for a white robe. Robes are distributed by a Crystal Springs, Miss., Klansman.

Much of the violence in Mississippi last year, particularly bombings, has been attributed to Klansmen.

The FBI believes Michael Schwerner, called the Goatee at Klan meetings, was the principal target in the Philadelphia slayings and that Andrew Goodman and James Chaney was killed only because they were with him.

The White Knights are said to have their own investigators whose reports provide information for Klan action.

[From the Memphis (Tenn) Commercial Appeal, Apr. 26, 1965]

LAW OFFICERS IN KLAN FIRED, GIVING WARNING TO OTHERS

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—Authorities concerned with curbing Ku Klux Klan violence have welcomed the firings of local and State law enforcement officers who have joined the Klan.

While police membership in the KKK in recent years has never been widespread, it has been a troublesome impediment to law enforcement where it has existed.

The presence of law enforcement officers in Klaverns has encouraged and comforted the Klan's "knockoff squads" and others bent on violence.

Dismissals of officers who have become Klan members serve as warnings to other officers who may hold unrevealed sympathies for the Klan.

Gov. Paul Johnson has warned that no Klansman will be permitted to serve on the Mississippi Highway Patrol.

Last year probably marked a high point of law enforcement officer membership in the KKK in the southern States. Dismissals have reduced the number since then.

At one time more than a score of city, county and State law enforcement officers in Mississippi were known to be KKK members law enforcement officers were a special target of Klan recruiters.

Four Louisiana State policemen, at least one sheriff, sevral deputies, and a local chief of police were reported to be Klan members in Louisiana.

Often, Klansmen apply pressure to county sheriffs to "keep the niggers under control or we'll take over."

In some case literature is distributed "accusing" the sheriff of cooperating with the FBI. "I am sure have been," said one, "and I'm going to keep right on."

With leaders frequently competing, KKK organizations are constantly changing. At the last count there were 14 active KKK organizations in the South consisting of more than 250 Klaverns, or local chapters. Total membership is estimated at 9,000.

The largest is the United Klans of America, headed by Imperial Wizard Robert Shelton, numbering 4,600 members, and headquartered in Tuscaloosa, Ala.

Next largest, as noted in the previous article, is the White Knights of the KKK of Mississippi, with about 2,000 members, practically all in Mississippi.

Third largest is the Original Knights of the KKK, which has about 1,500 members in Lousiana. The leader is Roy E. Davis. Headquarters are in Jonesboro, La.

Most of the KKK membership in the mid-South is in Mississippi's White Knights. The Association of Arkansas Klans has about 50 members.

The KKK, in this era of its latest revival, has made no headway in Memphis. Recruiting attempts have failed. Claimed organizations exist only on paper.

What KKK membership that exists in Tennessee is mostly the the vicinity of Chattanooga and in the area between Chattanooga and Knoxville.

In 1923, the year the Commercial Appeal won a Pulitzer Prize for its reports on the Klan, the KKK backed a slate of candidates in the city election but won only a badly divided city judgeship race. The late Mayor Rowlett Paine and other anti-KKK candidates won.

Day of Recognition for Firefighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, among the unsung heroes of America are our firefighters who so often risk their lives to save another person's life or property.

In 1964, the State of Washington proclaimed May 4 as a "Day of Recognition" in an effort to provide public acknowledgment and appreciation of the service rendered by its firefighters.

The Washington State Legislature has now joined its sister States in petitioning the Congress to enact the necessary legislation to establish May 4 of each year as a "Day of Recognition" for firefighters in the United States of America.

It is my privilege to include Senate Joint Resolution 4 which passed the Washington State Senate on April 21 and the Washington State House of Representatives on April 22, 1965.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 4

To the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas the fire service is a department of government that is called upon at any time of day or night to render emergency assistance to unfortunate citizens who may be faced with disaster from the ravages of fire; and

Whereas too often the firefighters, who risk their lives to save the life or property of another, receive little or no public acknowledgment of the value for the service they render; and

Whereas in 1964, the State of Washington did, by proclamation of the Governor, make an effort to provide such public acknowledgment and appreciation of the service rendered by its firefighters in setting aside May 4th as a day of recognition; and

Whereas such day was looked upon with favor by both the public and the many fire departments in the State with the result that much attention was called to the dangers of fire and to the fire prevention aids that can reduce the incidence and severity of fires; and

Whereas reduction in loss of life and property from fire is the goal toward which all good citizens and firefighters are continually working to accomplish; and any project which aids them to reach their goal is a worthwhile public service; and

Whereas the State of Washington wishes to share with its sister States an idea which it believes can be for the benefit of all the people of the United States; now, therefore your memorialists respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to enact the necessary legislation to establish May 4 of each year as a "Day of Recognition" for firefighters in the United States of America; and be it

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

Law Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 1, we observed Law Day. Originally proclaimed by President Eisenhower, the annual observance of Law Day has made an important contribution to public understanding of the rule of law in our society.

In a thoughtful article in the Lowell, Mass., Sun on Friday, April 30, Ralph Jacobs pointed out how important is the observance of law in the United States—not only of the statutes and the letter of the Constitution, but of the unwritten law of respect for authority, of the right of free choice, and of the other commands that make up the fabric of legal authority in our society.

Under leave granted, I include his article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LAW DAY—FREEDOM VERSUS EFFICIENCY

(By Ralph J. Jacobs)

Tomorrow is Law Day, USA, a special day of observance for the American people. It was so designated in 1961 by the Congress of the United States and as this great body framed it, "for the cultivation of that respect for law that is so vital to the democratic way of life."

Americans are free because of their willing obedience to law, not only the written but the unwritten. Compassion, kindness, and unselfishness and many other qualities which cannot be enforced, and which depends on man's own free choice are musts without which men cannot exist together. The wonderful thing about it all is not how much money this one has and how little the man down the street has, in fact no man in America need be asharmed of being poor, if he is useful. More important is his disposition, his enthusiasm, his spirit as it were.

It was probably Plato who first put it into words: "Freedom is no matter of laws and constitutions; only he is free who realizes the devine order within himself, the true standard by which a man can steer himself."

It may be true that our type of government is inefficient, and in the light of recent Supreme Court decisions many will agree that not the least of these inefficient methods is our catching, prosecuting, and imprisoning those who in fact do break the law. But it would seem that we can put up with a lot of inefficiency better than we can endure even a little tyranny.

The framers of our Constitution had quite a big decision to make between freedom of mankind or efficiency. It seems they chose freedom. They set up the Government of the United States to prevent tyranny. They abandoned all those simple, effective methods and set up a terribly complicated, long drawn out and expensive process.

They created the giant debating society of Congress and a complicated methods of electing two bodies of the Congress, totaling more than 500 people, to argue among themselves; the President of the United States: after the Congress completes its debating it puts it in the hands of this third party who is to carry out Congress' desire whether he likes it or not.

And the Supreme Court where nine elderly men may take years to decide whether the two wrangling factions in Congress which told the President what to do in the first place had the power to tell him that or not.

It would seem that under our constitutional form of Government, which limits governmental powers, that every American should become even more aware of his responsibilities of citizenship and assume those responsibilities at all time.

Tomorrow is a good day to begin. Law Day, USA, should be observed in a dignified and significant manner. We can reaffirm our dedication to the rule of law and reason. And it would seem, considering the great news stories of the past year, that it should begin in the home where parents can strengthen and foster a greater respect for law and order, the policeman on the beat, and the blessings enjoyed by Americans everywhere under the rule of law.

May 3 in Proud History of Poland

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next all Americans will join with their fellow Americans of Polish birth or descent in celebrating the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

May 3, 1965, which is Monday next, will remind us of several significant dates in Polish-American history.

Three hundred and fifty-seven years ago on September 1608, the first Polish settlers landed in Jamestown, Va. The annals of John Smith attest to the fact that these Polish settlers were a most valuable asset to the struggling young colony. They brought their strength, their willingness to work, and their love of freedom to a settlement which needed and welcomed their sturdy qualities.

May 3, 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution, Poland adopted a Constitution which marks that country as a pioneer of liberalism in Europe. It eliminated with one stroke the fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. It proclaimed the sovereignty of the people, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany.

The Polish Constitution of May 3 proclaimed:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the State, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

The year 1966 will mark the one thousandth anniversary of the baptism of the Polish nations. One thousand years ago Poland linked her destiny with that of the west. During a period equal to one-half our Christian era, Poland linked her destiny with that of the west and became

an integral and creative force in its culture.

The people of Poland have since the days of Jamestown and through the centuries events to the present furnished the bone and sinew of American Growth. At Jamestown, Poles, cheered and supported John Smith. During the Civil War her soldiers fought on the side of the Union while her daughters nursed our soldiers on the battlefield. Throughout the years these sturdy pioneers of freedom have been a source of strength to the country of their adoption. Today, Polish Americans have set their purpose to the ultimate liberation of their homeland. In their hopes and in the attainment of their prayers all Americans join.

In Name of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, there are those who loosely and irresponsibly charge that the Johnson administration has acted to disarm or weaken the arms of the United States. Such charges are fantasy. The truth is reflected in the following editorial comment of the Sacramento, Calif., Bee of Friday, April 23, 1965, which I include under previous leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

IN NAME OF PEACE

The capacity of the United States to wage war—anywhere, anytime, under any condition—is so fantastic it almost defies comprehension. Again this reassuring if frightening power was spelled out by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara in a recent interview with U.S. News & World Report, published in Washington, D.C. And the inventory went somthing like this:

By June 30, the United States will have a total of 1,270 long-range missiles and 935 intercontinental bombers. In terms of missile strength alone, this Nation has a superiority of approximately 3 or 4 to 1 over Russia.

Moreover, the nation has some 416 Polaris missiles in submarines. And of these, 60 percent are under the sea, on station, at all times, capable of striking any enemy power within minutes.

In terms of seapower, the United States has not even a near rival. Its superiority is beyond any question. In terms of airpower, no nation or combination of likely enemy powers could begin to compare with that of the United States.

Which leads, then, to the question: Does this give us clear security? McNamara answered: "There is no question about our security today and our security for the future. The weapons systems we have in being are the result of research and development programs initiated as long ago as 10 to 15 years and we believe that the programs we have under way are more than adequate to assure our superiority in the years ahead."

Nothing is permanent, and tomorrow's promise of security is only that—a promise. McNamara more than any single individual is aware of the need to police constantly our defenses, seeking more awesome weapons. And this strangely in the name of peace.

Foreign Aid in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the foreign assistance bill will soon be before the House for consideration. The Agency for International Development has prepared a summary presentation to Congress on the proposed mutual defense and development program for fiscal year 1966 to provide Members with a complete analysis of the program.

Knowing of the particular interest this year in the foreign aid program in what it is accomplishing and what it hopes to accomplish, I would like to insert in the RECORD an excerpt from the summary volume which is an excellent statement on foreign aid direction:

AID IN PERSPECTIVE

Our investment in the recovery of Western Europe and Japan is completed and the returns are plainly visible. We now have prosperous and militarily strong allies. They no longer need help, but share with us in helping others.

Our investment, through foreign assistance, in the continued independence and the progress of the less-developed countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America is still under way. Of necessity, this is a long-term investment because development is a much more difficult challenge than recovery.

We undertook to help, not because success was certain or imminent, but because help from outside offered the only hope of success either for those countries trying to withstand Communist pressure, or those trying to break the bonds of age-old poverty without resort to the harsh disciplines of Communist dictatorship.

The destiny of the hundreds of millions of people in the less-developed countries is of immediate concern to us. In helping them, we act in our own self-interest. But it is also true, as President Johnson has said, that "the pages of history can be searched in vain for another power whose pursuit of that self-interest was so infused with grandeur of spirit and morality of purpose."

There is no lack of evidence that progress in Asia, Africa, and Latin America is difficult. But there is also clear evidence that progress is possible, given serious effort on the part of the country involved and practical help from the outside.

EMPHASIS ON DEVELOPMENT

A decade ago, the immediate threat in the great arc of Asia from Turkey to Korea was the threat of direct and continuing Communist pressure. In response, two-thirds of our aid was military assistance, and a great part of our economic aid was defense support to help threatened countries survive in the short term.

Today, survival is still directly at issue only in Southeast Asia; elsewhere in Asia, development goes forward behind a defensive shield built up by our military assistance programs. The ratio of our aid has been reversed: two-thirds of our foreign assistance is now economic, and all but 15 percent of that provides capital and technical assistance for long-term development and progress toward self-support.

The increased emphasis on long-term development has been accompanied by a sharp reduction in supporting assistance grants, used primarily to keep other countries afloat in an emergency, generally by paying for necessary imports. Supporting assistance has been reduced from a level of more than a billion dollars as recently as 1960, to less than $400 million proposed for fiscal 1966.

Since 1960, supporting assistance has been ended for 18 countries: Greece, Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Israel, Guatemala, Colombia, Ecuador, the Republic of China on Taiwan, Iceland, Spain, Yugoslavia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Libya, Mali, and Tunisia. Supporting assistance in two more countries, Morocco and Burma, will be discontinued at the end of the current year.

THE SIGNS OF PROGRESS

In the years since 1950, the less developed countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America have increased total production at an average of over 4 percent a year; increased industrial output at an average of 8 percent annually (except for Latin America, which averaged 6 percent); and increased the value of their exports from $19 to $29 billion between 1950 and 1962, despite falling world prices for primary products.

Since 1958, the less developed countries have increased their investment in education an average of 15 percent annually.

Great strides have been made in health: Reported cholera cases dropped from 211,943 in 1950 to 32,827 in 1960, and cholera deaths from 130,481 to 12,806 in the same period.

By 1963, 700 million of the 1.4 billion people who live in the less developed world's malarious areas were protected by malaria eradication programs; for more than 300 million of these the threat to malaria has been completely eliminated.

The most significant sign for the future, however, may well be the growing determination of the less developed countries to help themselves and their increasing competence in the task.

For every dollar of U.S. bilateral assistance, the 20 major U.S.-aid recipients in Asia, Africa, and Latin America allocated an average of $6 for development from their own limited resources.

The U.S. contribution (including Public Law 480 surplus agricultural commodities) represents less than one percent of the GNP in a country where per capita GNP now exceeds $3,000 a year. The developing countries' own contribution to their progress represents about 12 percent of GNP, in countries where GNP per capita averages about $145 a year.

THE CHALLENGE TODAY

In Latin America today, widespread poverty, rapidly rising population, and political unrest remain continuing threats to orderly progress. But the war on poverty in Latin America is beginning to move. A major development effort, matched by substantial U.S. assistance under the Alliance for Progress, is beginning to show results.

In the Near East and south Asia, ancient hostilities and new political disputes still trouble the region. Yet its three largest countries—Turkey, Pakistan, and India—press forward with sustained development efforts, financed primarily from their own limited resources. With our help, Greece and Israel have reached the threshold of economic self-support.

In the Far East, Vietnam and Laos are still locked in bitter conflict with Communist insurgents, and our help is essential to their continued resistance. But Korea has survived a runious war with our help, and now mounts an increasingly effective development effort. AID assistance to the Republic of China or Taiwan can end this year, for China can now progress on her own.

In Africa, a few countries like Tunisia and Nigeria start with the leadership and experience to mount substantial development effort, matched by substantial assistance from Western Europe, the United States, and

international agencies. But in most African countries the immediate needs are for more trained leadership and the forgoing of national unity. The tragic turbulence in the Congo illustrates what could happen elsewhere, if the hopeful beginnings are permitted to falter.

Much has been achieved, but there is still a long way to go. Vietnam and the Congo are plain evidence that the Communists will still feed civil strife wherever they find an opening. The Communists' growing belief in the importance of the less-developed world is spelled out clearly by the sharp increase in their activities this past year, which pushed Communist aid commitments to $1.3 billion—the highest level in their history.

Tribute to Edward R. Murrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, of the many fine tributes paid to the late Edward R. Murrow, one of the best was that of Paul Long of KDKA, Pittsburgh.

I include the text of his broadcast, April 27, as part of my remarks:

Ed Murrow died today. And although his passing came as no surprise, it came as a definite shock to the Nation in general and to the broadcasting profession specifically. For in the opinion of many of us, he was the greatest practitioner of the art in the short history of the industry. He got his start as an obscure correspondent for CBS in the days before the big war, and he assembled a staff of newsmen which made CBS preeminent in the field as long as he was there. In the war years he reported the Battle of Britain from a rooftop each night the Germans came over to drop their bombs. His casual style was the classic of understatement under fire. As bombs dropped in his neighborhood, and the antiaircraft fire erupted, he spoke as if he were describing a peaceful scene in the countryside. His broadcasts always began: "This is London. Off to my left far away in the distance I can see just a faint red angry snap of antiaircraft bursts against the steel-blue sky. The first flight is now almost directly overhead—now you'll hear two bursts a little nearer in just a moment (pause—two explosions). There they are, that hard, stony sound."

Ed Murrow flew many missions over enemy territory in British and American planes. As a colleague of his, Howard K. Smith, said today: he flew those missions long after they were novel or even necessary. He felt that he had to experience combat in order to report the story of combat. His wartime broadcasts reflected his personal involvement in the war, which may be why they were better than the others. After the war he came home to become a vice president of CBS in charge of news. But he was unhappy as an executive and asked to get back on the news desk. He tangled with the late Senator Joe McCarthy at the height of his power, and his famous program on the subject of McCarthyism marked the beginning of the decline and fall of the Senator as a major political influence in the Nation. The program was made up mostly of film clips of McCarthy speeches in which the Senator came off with his image very tarnished. Murrow signed it off that night this way: "The actions of the junior Senator from Wisconsin have caused alarm and dismay amongst our allies abroad and given considerable comfort to our enemy. And whose fault is this? Not really his. He didn't create this situation of fear—he merely exploited it, and rather successfully. Cassius was right: 'the fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars but in ourselves.' "

After that broadcast, McCarthy was censured by the Senate—The famous Army-McCarthy hearings in the Senate marked the further decline of the Senator, and he died a short time later. Ed Murrow was appointed to head the U.S. Information Agency by President John Kennedy. He lasted 18 months in that job. Then he underwent surgery for lung cancer. When he came out of the hospital a new man was in the White House, and Murrow had 1½ years to live. He left the hospital 3 weeks ago to go back to his big farm in Pawling, N.Y. That's where he died today, just 2 days after passing his 57th birthday. He had been honored before his death by the British Queen, by the American President, and by the men from all over the world who appreciated excellence and skill in the broadcasting profession. Now we can pay him no more honors. We can only mourn his passing.

Iowa Newspaper Points Out Why Federal School Aid Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, one of the major legislative accomplishments of the Congress thus far is passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

This new law represents a recognition of the vital importance of education to this Nation. Furthermore, the wide support given the education bill when it was before the Congress indicated the growing realization that Federal aid to local school districts is not a luxury but an economic necessity.

In this connection, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members a thoughtful editorial from the April 26, 1965, issue of the Monroe County News of Albia, Iowa.

As the editorial points out, Iowa is one of the many States where high property taxes have hindered the full development of local school systems. In fact, about 89 percent of local school revenues are derived from property taxes.

State aid, of course, is one method of helping local school systems. But, as the editorial notes, funds from the State budget in Iowa are badly needed in areas other than education. Thus the need for Federal aid is obvious.

Iowa, under the new Federal aid-to-education law, is authorized to receive more than $20.5 million for the initial year of the program. These funds, if appropriated, will not solve all the State's educational problems. Nevertheless, much of the Federal aid will help broaden the local tax base and, at the same time, provide the funds needed to improve education programs.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the editorial from the Monroe County News:

[From the Albia (Iowa) Monroe County News Apr. 26, 1965]

WHO WILL PAY?

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce in a news release mailed last week pointed out the soundness of the Federal investment in vocational rehabilitation programs.

The news story pointed out that 120,000 physically and mentally handicapped persons were rehabilitated last year with Federal assistance, and that more than 500,000 have been rehabilitated during the past 5 years.

An estimated 70 percent of these rehabilitated citizens were, as a result, gainfully employed for the first time in their lives. The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration estimated that they will pay in taxes $5 to $7 for every dollar spent for their training and assistance. Many, moreover, will be off the welfare rolls.

While the chamber of commerce, however, sees the sound economics of vocational rehabilitation, it is apparently blind to the sound economics of other types of education. Mailed in the same envelope was a news release which concluded, "Wholesale Federal help (for education) does seem unnecessary."

This release states that while educational expenses will continue to increase, so will the ability to pay the costs at a local and State level. This is not necessarily the case. To the extent that State and local government will be unable to invest in education this society will be passing up an opportunity to receive returns similar to those offered by vocational rehabilitation—unless Federal assistance is increased. Assistance, of course, will be increased under the Federal Aid to Education Act passed this year, and we can expect increasing Federal participation in financing education.

There can be a number of reasons why State and local government will be unable or unlikely to finance increasing costs of education, and through their failure pass up an outstanding investment opportunity.

In Iowa, for example, taxing bodies are in a bind. Local districts in some cases are levying property taxes at rates close to practical limits. The alternative short of Federal aid is increased State taxes. Federal taxes have generally preempted sources of taxes not now used by the State, and additional taxes which may be levied by the State are needed nearly as badly in areas such as mental health services.

In the neighboring State of Missouri districts can levy more than 30 mills only after a two-thirds vote of residents of the district. Smaller levies must be approved by a simple majority. Even when a sufficient source of taxes is present, an inadequate vote means the investment in education won't be made unless the Federal Government assists.

The question of local, State, and Federal financing of education is, on its most fundamental level, a question of who will pay the bill. Local and State taxes are regressive in nature, with lower income families paying a larger percentage of their income than do higher income families. The opposite is true of Federal taxes.

Most Iowans favor more State financing of schools. A major argument for increased State aid is that many high school graduates will live in an area other than the one in which they were educated. The area to which they move has a substantial responsibility and stake in their education.

The same argument applies to Federal aid to schools. If adults living in Iowa attended school in a State which failed to prepare them for useful citizenship, it is Iowa rather than their home State which is assisting the adults. If an adult living in Iowa was educated in a State which did an exceptional job of preparing the person for useful citizenship, Iowa has a responsibility for reimbursing the person's home State.

Address by Postmaster General Gronouski to Polish Constitution Day Rally in Jersey City, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, 1965, is a great day for Jersey City and particularly for those of my fellow citizens of Polish extraction as we celebrate the 174th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

The day, which is always one of the great events of the year in Jersey City, was highlighted by the presence of the Honorable John A. Gronouski, the Postmaster General of the United States.

It is a high privilege and great honor to include in the RECORD the remarks of Postmaster General Gronouski which were delivered at ceremonies held in Jersey City in front of the Hudson County Administration Building.

Mr. Gronouski's remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, POSTMASTER GENERAL, AT THE POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY RALLY, ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, JERSEY CITY, N.J., MAY 3, 1965

I am honored to be here today on the anniversary of the great Polish Constitution of 1791.

I feel this is a kind of homecoming for me.

Besides the obvious importance of the occasion, I feel a sense of real kinship with the Polish-American citizens of Jersey City. It was my honor, last October, to act as guest of honor of the Pulaski Day parade in New York City, and I want to tell you that yours was one of the finest contingents of the day.

And so I am pleased to meet with you once again.

Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, once wrote: "The disease of liberty is catching. I think it is catching in our time, and I want it to spread the world over. Our function is to maintain its vitality here, maintain our example here, so that as it starts to spread throughout the world, we will be the nucleus of a great army of people the globe around who desire to follow the same road we follow."

Only a few years later, on May 3, 1791, the Polish people adopted a Constitution of their own, one of the early efforts by any European nation to establish the principles of justice and self-rule. The keystone of that Polish Constitution was a clause which read: "All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the State, the civil liberty, and the good order of society on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

Under this constitution, many class distinctions were eliminated. Personal privileges were extended to most of the people. Peasants were placed under the protection of the law. And the policies toward the serfs were liberalized to an extent greater than any that then prevailed on the European Continent.

But as revolutionary as these concepts were, they were consistent with the Polish tradition. Poland, for centuries, was the rampart of civilization. She had defended the Christian culture against the barbarians. And she had fought side by side with all the defenders of freedom.

As the eastern outpost of western civilization for hundreds of years, she has withstood the onslaught of the barbaric hordes, and as Europe emerged from the Dark Ages, led it to Christianity, culture and political development.

And then, on this date, 174 years ago, the patriots of Poland brought this tradition to a climax by adopting a constitution. They stirred the hopes of the entire European Continent with these heroic words: "Free from the disgraceful shackles of foreign influence; prizing more than life, and every personal consideration, the political existence, external independence and internal liberty of the nation whose care is entrusted to us * * * we do solemnly establish the present constitution."

It is no accident that this great Polish document was written only 4 years after the American Constitution, or that they were so similar in content and spirit. The "disease of liberty" of which Thomas Jefferson spoke was indeed catching. The same spark of freedom that ignited into the American Revolution burned no less brightly in the hearts of the Polish people. Our Revolution was theirs, and to these shores came two of the greatest champions of liberty the world has ever known—Casimir Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciuszko. Pulaski expressed the spirit of freemen in words that will ring forever in history: "Wherever on the globe men are fighting for liberty, it is as if it were our own affair." He gave his life in witness of that conviction.

The rest is history: a triumph for America—tragedy for Poland. Today, after nearly 2 centuries of struggle, of invasion, of foreign domination, of partition—and always of bravery—the Polish people still are striving for national independence. But the spark of freedom remains.

And the role of the United States remains the same as Jefferson conceived it—to maintain the vitality of freedom here at home and, by example, help spread it throughout the world. If anything, this responsibility is greater now than at any time in our history.

Today, we have an opportunity here in the United States to redress a wrong in the name of liberty—and in the spirit of the Polish Constitution. And that is to strike the disgraceful national quotas system from our immigration laws.

Throughout our history, this Nation has occupied a unique position in the minds of people the world over. For here was sanctuary for the oppressed. Here people could come and worship as they pleased. Here people could come to escape the chains of tyranny. Here people could come to opportunities undreamed of in their native lands. In short, here people could come and be free.

But the sad fact is that today, many cannot come and they do not understand why. And neither do I.

I do not understand why a person from England, regardless of his qualifications, is 12 times more acceptable to us than a person from Italy, and 9 times more acceptable than one from Poland. But that is indeed the case. Since 1924, our immigration law has been based on a system which allows 25,000 immigrants from Germany every year, but only 120 from Spain; 60,000 from England, but only 3,000 from Greece. And the stated purpose of that law is to preserve the racial and ethnic composition of the population of the United States.

This is a national disgrace: a humilating and cruel policy that this administration intends to correct.

It is humiliating because it discriminates against the individual and treats him as part of a mass. It judges men and women not on the basis of their worth but on their place of birth—and even, in some cases the place of birth of their ancestors.

What kind of policy is this for a land which takes its name after Amerigo Vespucci? What kind of fairness does this reflect for generations of Americans who came here from Italy in the spirit expressed by Americans like Philip Mazzei, in words later adopted by his friend Thomas Jefferson, that "All men are by nature created free and equal to each other in natural rights"?

What kind of humanity does this demonstrate to our millions of citizens of Polish and Italian descent, whose continued contribution to our common country is evidenced simply by a rollcall of the Medal of Honor winners, or of political or economic or scientific leaders like Senator MUSKIE, Senator PASTORE, or Enrico Fermi or A. P. Giannini, or Jan Paderewski?

This is to say nothing of the heartbreak caused by such policies. The sad fact is that the current system separates families coldly and arbitrarily. It keeps parents from children and brothers from sisters for years—and even decades.

For too long we have perpetuated a discriminatory and senseless policy against immigrants of many nations, and what makes it even worse is the fact that we have been the losers as much as they. By placing the major emphasis on ethnic background, rather than skills, we have been depriving our society and our industrial complex of a fresh source of talent. We have, in effect, been discriminating against ourselves. As President Lyndon B. Johnson has said, "In establishing preferences, a nation built by the immigrants of all lands can ask those who now seek admission: 'What can you do for our country?' But we should not be asking: 'In what country were you born?'"

President Johnson now seeks to reestablish basic democratic principles in our Nation's immigration policies. In his message to Congress outlining the changes needed in our laws dealing with immigration, the President has made clear the administration's resolve to eliminate the national origins quota system which defies the basic ideals of the American tradition.

The President's bill has one objective: to insure that immigration to the United States is accomplished under a system that is just, humane, and in the best interests of all the American people.

This bill is just. It would admit immigrants on the basis of their special skills and knowledge which would make their citizenship advantageous to the Nation. It would bring to America new scientists, scholars, engineers, doctors, and technicians—all of whom would significantly contribute to our national advancement.

This bill is humane. It would give preference to immigrants who are close relatives of American citizens and permanent residents and establish a policy of reuniting families. Under this bill, parents of American citizens could obtain admission to our shores without waiting for a quota number.

This bill is in the best interests of the American people. It would not remove existing laws and safeguards against the admission of undesirables or permit excessive and unregulated immigration.

The main thrust of this bill is aimed at the discriminatory system of national origins quotas. We are, in the truest sense, a nation of immigrants. And we cannot uphold our basic objectives of freedom by denying citizenship to some on the basis of geography or ethnic origins.

President Johnson has asked the Congress to reform the inequities of our current system of immigration. By so doing, he has proposed a bill that will strengthen our national purpose and sense of justice.

Four Presidents have called attention to the serious defects in our immigration laws. President Johnson has presented a bill which will eliminate a blight on our national honor and restore dignity and fairness to our policies on immigration.

A nation which has taken upon itself the task of spreaking freedom throughout the

world, by example, can afford nothing less. Nor can we, as the spiritual heirs of the great Polish Constitution of 1791, accept anything less.

Thank you.

Charles Rozmarek, President of the Polish National Alliance and Polish-American Congress, Pays Tribute to President Johnson for His Bold and Determined Action in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish National Alliance and the Polish-American Congress, yesterday paid glowing tribute to President Johnson during the annual observance of Polish Constitution Day in Humboldt Park in the city of Chicago.

Mr. Rozmarek told a massive audience of more than 150,000 people assembled to honor the 174th anniversary of Poland's Constitution of 1791 that President Johnson's "firm decision to defend South Vietnam will be assessed by historians as one of the most important moves of the current decade."

Mr. Rozmarek represents the largest single Polish-American fraternal organization in the world, with a membership in excess of 350,000 and assets of $125 million.

As president of the National Polish-American Congress he represents 14,000 individual Polish-American fraternal, social, religious, and civic organizations throughout the United States.

In effect, Mr. Speaker, Charles Rozmarek reflects the hopes and aspirations of some 10 million Americans of Polish descent in this country.

I submit that it is most significant when this responsible national leader of so large a segment of our American population firmly and unequivocally expresses his support for President Johnson's bold and heroic foreign policy in Asia.

Mr. Rozmarek delivered his remarks while introducing Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY who was escorted to Humboldt Park yesterday by Chicago's highly respected and dedicated mayor, Richard J. Daley.

The tremendous ovation given to Mr. Rozmarek's endorsement of President Johnson and a similar ovation given to Vice President HUMPHREY following his bold speech signifies how thoroughly the more than 150,000 people who attended yesterday's ceremony in Chicago stand behind Mr. Johnson and the Vice President.

I should like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to include excerpts of Mr. Rozmarek's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

Mr. Rozmarek's remarks follow:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY CHARLES ROZMAREK, PRESIDENT OF THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE AND OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, DELIVERED AT POLISH CONSTITUTION OBSERVANCE IN HUMBOLDT PARK, CHICAGO, SUNDAY, MAY 2, 1965

While the danger of Communist aggression lurks everywhere along the Iron Curtain from Berlin to Cuba, and while a hundred million people of East-Central Europe, including Poland, must suffer Soviet enslavement, today the test case of our resolution in defending freedom is in Vietnam.

Much more is involved in Vietnam than the fight against Communist internal aggression. The fate of not only southeast Asia but also of Indonesia, India, the Phillipines and even Japan depends on our military strength and firmness in Vietnam.

Were we to show any display of American weakness or vascillation, we would become a contributing factor in opening the floodgates to the spread of communism throughout the world.

Red China and Soviet Union are eager to restrict our power in the Pacific. They know that if they achieved their goal in the Far East they would force the United States into a weak defensive position in other parts of the world—in Europe, in Africa, and in Latin America.

Therefore, President Johnson's decision to defend South Vietnam is reassuring. In implementation of this wise decision, he has ordered the Marines to land in Da Nang and has directed the Air Force and Navy planes to destroy the supply lines and radar installations in North Vietnam.

This method of fire and bombs is the only language the Communists are capable of understanding. It may force them to agree to negotiations. If this should come to pass, we would then be ready to negotiate a workable settlement from a position of strength.

On last Tuesday President Johnson said, in a televised press conference, that as long as the Communists "bombed South Vietnam and as long as they bombed our embassies and killed our women and children and Vietnamese soldiers, we are justified to slow down that operation to make them realize that it is very costly and that their aggression should cease."

We all cheered these words. For we realized that had this wisdom been applied in the Korean war to allow MacArthur to bomb Communist privileged sanctuaries beyond the Yalu River, we would not only have achieved complete victory in that tragic and costly struggle in Korea but our boys would not have to fight today in Vietnam.

It is important to note that Chiang Kai-shek has pleaded that the Nationalist Chinese be permitted to have their hands unshackled so that they could fight the Red Chinese.

It is my opinion that the United States should take advantage of Chiang's offer. With the help of the Nationalist Chinese, we could save American lives, restore peace in Vietnam, and arrest the spread of Communist oppression in Asia. This is our last chance to save the peace before Red China becomes a nuclear power.

In this race between liberty and disaster, I am convinced that President Johnson's firm decision to defend South Vietnam will be assessed by historians as one of the most important moves of the current decade.

We are proud that President Johnson is rebuilding our foreign policy on a strong military basis and on diplomatic firmness. This is also strengthening our American image abroad.

As Americans, we wholeheartedly support our President's bold and prudent course of action in the defense of freedom.

Randy Matson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the April 30 edition of Time magazine on a young man currently attending my alma mater, Texas A. & M. University.

This is a young man with a purpose and a goal which I hope he will achieve in the not too distant future:

THE CHAMP FROM PAMPA

Into the shotput circle at Texas A. & M. University stepped Randy Matson, 20, cupping a 16-pound steel ball in one huge hand as if it were an egg. Sucking in his breath, he tucked the ball behind his right ear, crouched low, and tapped the ground once, twice, three times with his left toe. Then, with a prodigious grunt that could be heard a full 100 yards away, he hurled himself across the ring. The shot sailed through the air and bit into the dirt, 67 feet 11¼ inches away. "That one felt pretty good," sighed sophomore Matson. It should have: by 1¼ inch, he had broken Dallas Long's world record in the shotput.

BIG MAN AROUND TOWN

His feat this month came as slight surprise to any one who knew James Randel Matson—including Dallas Long. By the time he was 18, Charlie Matson's boy was already a big man around the Panhandle town of Pampa, Tex. Naturally—he stood 6 feet 6½ inches tall and weighed 210 pounds. He also averaged 15 points a game for Pampa High's basketball squad, ran 50 yards for the winning touchdown against archrival Amarillo High, and was practically a one-man track team—heaving the 12-pound shot 66 feet 10½ inches, hurling the discus 192 feet 3 inches, running 100 yards in 10.3 seconds. More than 100 colleges made him offers, and the University of Southern California assigned old grads Long and Parry O'Brien to take the prize prospect in tow. They proudly showed him the library, the dormitories, all those long-legged girls. Pity. They should have spent more time showing him the gym.

They did at A. & M. in College Station, Tex., where the gym is a big attraction. The nearest bottle of liquor is 7 miles away, and the sidewalks seem to roll up of their own accord at 6 p.m. "I wanted a place where I could study and train and nothing else," explains Shotputter Matson, a gentle giant who calls everybody "sir" or "ma'am" and hardly goes anywhere without bringing along his pet shot in a brown bowling bag. As far as he's concerned, the M in A. & M. stands for Emil Mamaliga, 44, an assistant coach for the varsity swimming team, who started Randy lifting weights to build up his rangy frame. "You can't fire a 16-inch shell from a PT boat," Mamaliga insisted. "You have to have a big, heavy ship." By last fall's Olympics in Tokyo, Matson tipped the scales at 260 pounds, astounded everybody by flinging the shot 66 feet 3¼ inches. As it turned out, Randy had to settle for a silver medal when Long managed 66 feet 8½ inches on his fourth toss.

A STRING OF FIRECRACKERS

Long, 24, wisely retired on the spot. Last February in Dallas, Matson smashed the

world indoor record with a put of 66 feet 2¼ inches; earlier this month in Austin he warmed up for his outdoor record-smasher with a toss of 67 feet 9 inches. "I've never seen anything like it," exclaimed Stanford's venerable Coach Payton Jordan, who worked with Randy at the Olympics. "His foot explodes, his calf explodes, his thigh explodes, his hip, his back, his shoulder, his triceps, and right out to the very tips of his fingers. It's like a whole string of firecrackers going off."

Matson's goal is 70 feet, the shotput equivalent of the 4-minute mile in 1954, and he's getting closer every day. Then what? Well, if he gets bored, he can switch to the discus. Two weeks ago, just for kicks, he hurled one 201 feet 5½ inches—a foot farther than Al Oerter's winning throw at the 1964 Olympics.

Uphold the Law: A Citizen's First Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I received this morning the May issue of the FBI law enforcement bulletin and turned at once to the monthly message by J. Edgar Hoover, always an outstanding contribution. Mr. Hoover's message for May is on the theme of Law Day, "Uphold the Law—A Citizen's First Duty." I commend it to the attention of all who read the RECORD.

The article follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR TO ALL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS

Woodrow Wilson once said, "The first duty of law is to keep sound the society it serves." In our day, this becomes an increasingly harder task because of society's indifference to its first duty—upholding the law.

In an effort to make our great heritage under law more meaningful to Americans, May 1 each year has been proclaimed Law Day, USA, the theme this year, "Uphold the Law—A Citizen's First Duty," is most timely and germane to much of our Nation's internal strife.

In the recent past, we have seen the rule of law flouted from college campuses to riot-torn metropolitan streets. It is mocked by those who use the cause of legitimate petition and assembly as a facade behind which to plunder, loot, and destroy property. Likewise, and even more regrettable, the rule of law is debased by reckless and callous enforcement powers which stoop to brutal and unnecessary force in handling crowds and demonstrations.

When officers violate their oath of office and the ethical standards of law enforcement, they disgrace their profession. Their acts jeopardize the public respect and confidence which diligent and dedicated men have given their lives to perpetuate. They place an extremely heavy burden on their associates and invite shame, ridicule, and disrespect for their department, community, and State.

This is not to say, of course, that all charges of excessive force by officers of the law are true. Many times, persons strike and assault policemen and resist lawful arrest to such an extent that great force is necessary to bring the violators under control. In such instances, some individuals are quick to charge brutality when the facts show the officers acted within their rights.

Americans should view with alarm the growing lack of respect for law and order. We have seen what occurs when extremists are encouraged by irresponsibility on the part of those charged with maintaining law and order. On the other hand, who is to say what damage is done to the impressionable minds of our young people who witness, or are urged to join in, activities in which participants defy constituted authority with no apparent misgivings and go unpunished. Abuse of the law is a dangerous practice for freedom-loving people, and there can be no exceptions to compliance, for we know "Where law ends, there tyranny begins."

Freedom, justice, and the individual dignity of man are concomitants to the rule of law. Disrespect for this concept is a tragic weakness which undermines the American traditions of honesty, integrity, and fair-play. It is a weakness which must be eliminated from our society and, above all, from the ranks of law enforcement.

Law enforcement may take exceptional pride in knowing that its significant role in perpetuating law and order has not been overlooked. The week of May 9–15 has been set aside as Police Week and May 15, as Peace Officers Memorial Day. As we pause to observe these memorable dates, let us remember that we shall fail our responsible trust unless love and respect for the rule of law abide in the heart of every man behind the badge.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

MAY 1, 1965.

Greetings to a Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 83 years ago, a great American and statesman was born, our colleague and my very dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois, BARRATT O'HARA. BARRATT O'HARA was the youngest lieutenant governor of the State of Illinois, at the age of 30, in the administration of Gov. Edward F. Dunne.

BARRATT O'HARA has distinguished himself as an editor and radio commentator. He is not only a veteran of World War I but the only Spanish-American War veteran currently serving in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. O'HARA has given to the Nation invaluable service as a legislator. He is one of the most voluble men I have ever known, his eloquence, his nobility, humility, and idealism constitute an example and an inspiration to his colleagues. His alert mind and his heart are big, and his friendship is truly a thing that I shall always treasure.

It has been my privilege to be a member of the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Foreign Affairs Committee under the chairmanship of Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, and the impact of Chairman O'HARA's wisdom, judgment, and legislative talents in behalf of Africa will undoubtedly continue to grow from strength to greater strength.

Congratulations, BARRATT, and I pray and hope you will continue to serve this great body for many more years to come.

Fishermen Threaten Boycott of Japanese Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, Pacific Coast fishermen, whose livings and livelihoods have depended on Alaska's Bristol Bay Red Salmon runs, are up in arms at Japan's unwillingness to protect and conserve these Pacific Coast fish on the high seas. Now, as a result, an organization called the Congress of American Fishermen has been set up to initiate, in retaliation, a Nationwide boycott of Japanese goods.

During the Easter recess, I was invited to make the principal speech at a meeting to launch this Nationwide campaign.

For years, our fishermen have sacrificed to preserve American fishery resources, by limiting their catches, and by not using nets on the high seas. This whole program of conservation is now threatened by Japan's refusal to cooperate.

As a matter of background information on problems of our American fishing industry, under unanimous consent, I include at this point the text of my remarks delivered in Seattle on April 21, at a meeting of these fishermen:

FISHERIES PROBLEMS IN GENERAL AND IN THE NORTH PACIFIC IN PARTICULAR

I am proud to represent our Pacific Northwest fishing industry in Congress. I am proud to work with men—dedicated men—like George Johansen of the Alaska Fishermen's Union; John Wedin, editor of the Fishermen's News; and other leaders too numerous to mention. I am proud of the fishing industry and the men and women who have sacrificed to conserve our fishery resources. I am proud of Seattle's being a major home of the fishing fleet, and I am proud, too, of the University of Washington and its College of Fisheries here in Seattle, which has produced leaders in the field of fisheries, like Donald McKernan, Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. I am proud to have worked for more than 12 years with our senior Senator, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, on fishery problems. But I am ashamed that with these men, and all that talent, and with all our interest, the industry is so distressed and neglected.

Administration after administration, of both political parties, has had nothing but kind words for you—you are being killed with kindness.

My subject today is "Fisheries Problems in General and the North Pacific in Particular."

In 1964, for the second time in history, and the second year in a row, more than half of the total U.S. supply of seafood was imported. The imports accounted for approximately 60 percent of the supply.

Some 130,000 fishermen and 90,000 shore workers were employed in catching and processing fishery products in the United States.

More than 300,000 persons were employed in allied industries. About 11,500 vessels of 5 tons or more and 60,000 other boats were in use in 1964. More than 4,000 wholesale and manufacturing plants processed fish for market. All of which makes this industry important to the Nation's economy.

THE STATE OF OFFSHORE FISHING

A year ago last March, 13 West European countries agreed to a modified 12-mile offshore fishing limit.

On January 4, 1963, Canada declared a 12-mile fishing limit with historic rights to nations that had fished inside this limit.

In May, Congress enacted a law banning fishermen in vessels of foreign powers inside U.S. territorial waters. But that is about the only action the United States has taken.

For fishing legislation is like Mark Twain's remark about the weather—everybody talks about it, but nobody does anything about it. At least, our Government doesn't.

For example, the New England fishery has been ruined by cheap foreign imports, caught and processed by modern facilities financed by foreign aid. The Boston fleet today is only half the size it was in 1945. The only answer of our Government is like "throwing a bone to a dog"—a subsidy to construct a few half-million-dollar modern fishing vessels—all of which might help one or two companies, but very few fishermen. No administration supports a tariff to protect our American standard of living, even though the Tariff Commission found the New England industry to be damaged by low-priced imports and that tariff protection was justified.

Since 1951, the American fisheries industry has continued to decline. The total catch of edible fish species has dropped more than a half-billion pounds. So has the average price per pound received by fishermen.

Meanwhile, the number of these American fishermen has shrunk one-fourth. In San Diego, for example, the tuna fleet has dropped in the past 10 years from 800 to 200 vessels.

The number of documented fishing vessels is down one-fourth, while the number of new documentations has shrunk two-thirds.

In our country, there are many coastal communities dependent almost entirely on harvesting the sea for the livelihood of the people. Puget Sound has some of these areas, where the problem is often one of too much fish and too low a price.

Compare this to the 11-State Appalachia depressed area, where coal is the basic industry. There is a similarity in that both have suffered due to failure of the Government to protect these industries. Lately, in the case of coal, the Government has recognized the problem and has enacted programs to help the coal miners.

No such consideration, however, has been given the fishermen—although, of course, there are differences.

The demand for products of the sea has increased and there are no substitute competitive products.

While American fisheries are declining, the American people are eating more fish and shellfish. The reason is that 45 percent of the edible fish consumed in our country is imported.

Much of these imported products, both edible and inedible, are from fish harvested from water contiguous to our shores.

Waters over our Continental Shelves, because of their great production, attract the fishing fleets of Japan, the Soviet Union, and many other nations.

World fisheries production has doubled in the past 10 years and much of this production is from sea life in waters adjacent to America.

Every maritime nation in the world, except ourselves, has shared in this expansion of the fishing industry. This has raised the standard of living and the economy of the lesser-developed countries of the world, while fishing localities in America—such as Puget Sound—suffer increasing economic distress.

GOVERNMENT INDIFFERENT TO INDUSTRY NEEDS

This need not be if our Federal Government would act to protect our fishing industry. Our industry and American fishermen could prosper, and with some Government protection, could revive and contribute to our living standard and employment.

I know of no better example, to cite, of administration callousness to the interest of Americans, as against foreign nationals than the attitude of the Department of State in connection with my bill to prohibit foreign freezing, packing, and other processing of fish in our territorial waters.

The State Department opposed enactment of this legislation, although its purposes was to protect American cannery workers from Japanese floating canneries, where wages are 30 cents an hour.

Another example is the opposition of the administration to legislation introduced by me to prohibit imports of foreign fish harvested on the high seas by methods that violate good conservation practices, to protect our fishery resource.

We have had opposition, also, to the Pelly-Magnuson bill to allow the crews of fishing vessels to bargain as to the dockside price of fish.

Altogether, every way we turn, legislatively, to try to help th fishermen, it seems that we get a cold shoulder from our own Government.

Very recently, Donald L. McKernan, Director of the Federal Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, said that Russia will take over much of America's offshore fishing waters by 1970 if the United States does not do something about it.

He said that Russian, as well as Japanese fishing fleets will be attracted to the West Coast's offshore waters, because our fishermen are letting a huge potential fishery go by default. He was referring to anchovies and hake, both for food and for industrial use.

Don McKernan is a highly-respected biologist, and is recognized as an expert; but what he failed to say, although, of course, he knows it full well, is that in order to compete with these foreign trawling and processing operations, Americans must accept 30 cents an hour—and they cannot live on that.

The only solution offered by the Federal Government so far is replacement and modernization of our fishing fleet, through a construction subsidy. Canada is subsidizing her fisheries operations and fishing boat construction, but I cannot see that she is solving her fisheries problems. What she is doing is helping her fish-boat builders. As for us, it seems to me we want less fish and a price that covers production cost.

At least, it seems to me we could keep our foreign competition from fishing within the 12-mile limit, along the lines of what Canada did recently.

New Zealand has just joined the list of nations that have expanded their jurisdiction over fisheries from 3 miles to 12 miles offshore. She became alarmed at the presence of Japanese fishermen off her coasts, and acted promptly.

The roadblock to protection of our international fisheries, of course, and any solution to the problems of the industry, lie in our State Department.

This is because competitive nations have now moved in on many of our traditional grounds with their modern, efficient fleets.

Wherever he looks, the U.S. fisherman sees growing threats to his security and many actions by his own Government add to his frustration.

One example is the giveaway of the East Bering Sea halibut fishery, in 1962, to the Japanese, when that fishery had been restricted, by treaty, to the United States and Canada. The lack of wisdom in this concession to a nonconservationist fishing nation became immediately apparent when the halibut resources became depleted in one season.

FOREIGN FISHING INDUSTRIES GET U.S. AID

Many of the imports which enter the U.S. market come from producers who have been aided, directly or indirectly, by the U.S. Government.

In 1962, the statement was made in the U.S. Sentae that up to that date, $115 million in foreign aid, and another $182 million in U.S.-owned foreign funds, had been rendered by the United States to foreign fishing industries.

Let me cite some examples; under U.S. direction, shrimp were discovered in Korea, a processing plant was set up with U.S. funds, and as a result, shellfish exports from South Korea jumped from $3 million in 1956 to $10 million in 1962—and these exports were mostly to the United States.

The United States also developed a shrimping industry in Pakistan, spending at least $2 million; most of the output, of course, comes to America.

We loaned $5 million to the Chilean fishing industry, for construction of 18 fishing vessels.

The United States has aided the Philippine Republic, and Brazil; we have no available funds for sufficient research vessels for ourselves, but we furnished U.S. funds for one for West Africa.

In all, we have given fishery development assistance to nearly 30 countries, when our own research financing has been insufficient.

I referred to the opening of the halibut grounds in the 1964 fishing season, halibut fishermen from Canada, the United States, and Japan were able to catch only about one-third of the catch quota. Now the fishing season in that area, under the Halibut Commission recommendation, would be limited to only 7 days.

Many countries have unilaterally declared broad fishing limits up to 200 miles offshore. But our Government will not even declare a 12-mile limit, similar to that declared by Canada. Meanwhile, foreign fishing fleets are winning historic rights in this 12-mile coastal area.

Fishery product imports now enter this country with only nominal tariffs, but even these are presently under threat of being further cut or reduced

I voted against the Trade Extension Act the purpose of which was to reduce tariffs. I did so in the interest of protecting our fishermen; and now I am the author of legislation to stop foreign dumping on this score.

Last January, addressing the National Canners Convention at San Francisco, William C. Herrington, Special Fisheries Assistant to the Secretary of State, said:

"I am not going to attempt to give you solutions to any of our numerous high seas fishery problems; I would like a little more time for that."

How much time does our State Department want? You know what their problem is—the big picture, and exports like cotton. Fishermen are expendable, but not the cotton industry.

Do you know what the fishermen and other taxpayers in America pay in the way of subsidy to the cotton interests?

To start with, the growers get a subsidy; during the 12-month period ended in August 1964, it amounted to $39.3 million.

Then, since that subsidy to growers increases cotton prices, we subsidize exports of cotton, at a rate of 8½ cents a pound. During the same period, this subsidy amounted to $2.3 million.

Then, since the subsidized cotton is converted into textiles and exported by Japan, for instance, back to this county, we give a third subsidy to domestic textile manufacturers, in theory, to allow them to compete with textiles made from our own subsidized raw cotton. These latter payments went to 300 textile manufacturers, and cost the taxpayers a total of $223,841,676.31 for the same 12 months.

The State Department would willingly sacrifice a comparatively small fishing industry in the interest of that so-called big

picture along with other industries which want to sell their materials to Japan.

THE NORTH PACIFIC SALMON PROBLEM

Now, let me discuss the salmon problem, which involves, as far as the international situation goes, both conservation and jurisdiction.

Our principal quarrel here is with Japan, and involves the principle of abstention, where one nation supports a second nation in the latter's conservation effort. Chiefly affected is the Bristol Bay red salmon run, whose far-ranging migrations in the high seas has made them vulnerable to Japanese destruction.

Since the expiration of the 10-year minimum term of the North Pacific Salmon Convention, Japan has sought the elimination of the abstention for conservation provisions, to make more of this run of reds accessible to her high seas operation, which includes use of the 10-mile small mesh nets that kill the immature salmon, and relentlessly render useless the conservation sacrifices of American fishermen.

There have been negotiations; but recently, when leaders of our industry met in Washington, it was apparent that our State Department's policy was to defer and delay, while our fishery leaders urgently pleaded for firm and immediate attention, before this year's fishing season.

I say it is about time—no, it is time—for our Government to assert its firm intention to protect our salmon on the high seas. It is time we shocked the administration into action.

Very simply, I propose that the fishermen peacefully petition for redress of grievances. Instead of a boycott, I suggest that you and your brothers on the gulf coast, and on the Atlantic coast, and up and down the Pacific coast peacefully demonstrate, until, and if, future circumstances may call for extending such action to picketing imports, or to a boycott of Japanese goods.

In other words, I would delay the boycott that has been suggested to such time as the Japanese fishing fleet may actually commence taking our Bristol Bay red salmon. By June 1 it will be known whether or not the Japanese intend to harvest our Pacific coast fish as against Asiatic runs of salmon on the high seas. In fact, this is the intention of the Congress of American Fisheries.

Meanwhile, it seems to me that the voice of the Pacific Northwest fisherman should be heard, by petition to the President and to the Department of State. Your indignation should be registered strongly enough to be heard both in Washington, D.C., and in Tokyo.

There is no other way I know of to let the Japanese government recognize the seriousness of our problem. There is no other way I know of to stir the President, the State Department, and the entire Congress, into taking action to protect your rights.

Let us get the support of organized labor from the Seafarers' International Union, the culinary unions, and all others affiliated with the great brotherhood of fishermen.

Let's demonstrate peaceably, and petition in English and in Japanese, if necessary.

The time to act is here.

Captive Nations Committee

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my able and distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and others of my colleagues in urging immediate and favorable action on the resolution creating a special House committee on the captive nations.

Too long have we delayed the authorization for this committee, the very creation of which would hearten the suffering peoples of the captive nations and which in its hearings and its findings could be expected to bring under the limelight of the world and to the condemnation of all free nations the horrible and intolerable conditions forced upon the captive nations by a captor who knows no mercy and has respect for neither the laws of God nor the rights of men.

There should be no further delay. The creation of the special committee for captive nations should be a must on the agenda of every Member of this body, who loves freedom and abhors tyranny.

Student Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, this is the season of the year when parents, public officials, prospective commencement speakers, school officials, and others concerned with the present and future of our young people are likely to give special thought to this subject, to reflect on the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency as well as the contrasting record of youthful interest and participation in civic and school activities.

It is also the time of year when, on many school and college campuses around the country, students are demonstrating their sense of responsibility, their feeling of obligation to the student community, their active interest in helping to make campus life more meaningful and fruitful, by seeking election to class or campus office.

By doing so, these young men and women are once again refuting the easy charge that students these days "could not care less." They obviously do care, and by caring enough to do something about their own condition, they are also preparing themselves better to understand and more fully to participate in public life as adults.

As an example, Mr. Speaker, a young constitutent of mine, Calvin E. Newman, a student at American University here in Washington, is a candidate for president of the class of 1968. Mr. Newman has a platform, and since it seems to me to be representative of the kind of thoughtful and constructive programs which student candidates are advocating, I include it as a part of my remarks.

I hope Mr. Newman and his fellow candidates everywhere this spring will find the experience of campus politics to be exciting and profitable but most of all to be an opportunity for useful service to their fellow students and their schools.

Mr. Newman's platform follows:

PLATFORM OF CALVIN EDWARD NEWMAN, CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT, CLASS OF 1968

1. To unify the class:

(a) A class forum coordinated with the class council. Meetings of the council will be publicized in the Eagle, the university newspaper, with a summary of what has been accomplished at previous sessions, and what the members hope to accomplish at the next session. The student body en masse will be afforded the opportunity to take an active part in the procedure.

(b) Installation of FM radios in all dormitories on all floors. Five-minute programs will be broadcast each day during the 5-day week and for a half hour on Saturday, bringing a daily summation of class activities to all members of the class. Proctors on each floor will be responsible for tuning in the program at the designated time.

(c) Opinion sheets to be distributed to all members of the class on all important issues. The results of these sheets will give student government a definite base with which to work with the administration.

(d) Suggestion boxes to be installed in strategic places through which the student will be afforded the opportunity to address correspondence to a specific member of student government. This will serve two purposes: (1) It will give the student's interest a chance to be articulated. (2) It will give the member on student government a feeling of definite constituency.

2. To give our class and our school the facilities most other universities have.

(a) The institution of a football team.

3. To establish a system of tenure. At this time tenure is granted only according to the administrations will, not according to academic priority or seniority.

Rev. Arthur E. Hiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Lowell, Mass., the Matthews Memorial Church paid tribute to its pastor, the Reverend Arthur E. Hiley, on the occasion of his voluntary retirement as pastor after 28 years of devoted service.

Reverend Hiley has a unique history with the Matthews Memorial Church. He attended the church as a boy growing up in Lowell, he was married in the church, his children were baptized and married in the church, and he was ordained there in 1927.

In addition to Reverend Hiley's ministry, he paid heed to community needs. He is a member of the Lowell Board of Health, and has participated actively in civic and religious affairs in the Greater Lowell area.

Prior to his pastorate in Lowell, Reverend Hiley held pastorates in Pascoag, R.I.; Methuen, Mass.; and Fall River, Mass. Both in Fall River and later in Lowell he served as president of local ministers' associations.

The esteem with which Reverend Hiley is held in Lowell was evident yesterday as he was tendered a warm reception attended by the mayor of Lowell, the chairman of the Lowell Ministers' Association, the president of the Greater Lowell

Council of Churches, and many more community and religious leaders. All of Lowell is in his debt for his fine example and dedicated service.

Many Misinformed on Pending Immigration Revision Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have recently become aware of much public misinformation about the pending immigration bill. Some of this misinformation may come from persons who oppose the bill but who have not studied it themselves or do not understand it very well.

I have prepared an outline that is designed to correct mistaken notions which have been circulated about the bill and to provide accurate information on its purposes and anticipated effects.

COMMON MISAPPREHENSIONS ABOUT H.R. 2580

I

Claim: The bill would bring in an excessive number of immigrants and thereby aggravate our population problems.

The facts: The effect of the bill on our population would be quite insignificant. Our population is now increasing at the rate of about 3 million a year. The total number of quota immigrants now authorized is 158,000 a year and under the bill would be about 166,000, an increase of 8,000 per year. Actually, because the bill would authorize the use of quota numbers that now are authorized but unused, it would result in an increase in immigration of about 60,000 a year. This figure is, however, only about 2 percent of the present natural increase in our population and obviously can have little practical effect on population growth.

The old days of large-scale immigration to this country are a half-century past, and no one has suggested any legislation to bring them back. The administration's bill certainly would not have that effect; it is designed to deal primarily with the basis on which immigrants are chosen and leaves their number little changed. If at some future time the amount of immigration were to become a real problem from the standpoint of our population or anything else, Congress always has the power to curtail immigration further, and probably would do so.

II

Claim: The bill would let in hordes of Africans and Asiatics.

The facts: As pointed out above, the bill would not let in great numbers of immigrants from anywhere at all. Persons from Africa and Asia would continue to be quota immigrants, as they are under present law, but would be treated like everyone else. With the ending of discrimination by place of birth, there will be some shift of immigration to countries other than the ones in Northern Europe which are now favored by the national origins systems, but quota immigrants will have to compete and to qualify to get in, and quota immigration will not be predominantly from Asia and Africa. This is because there are many factors besides quotas that limit immigration, factors that the bill will not change. Actually, many countries in Africa do not use their present quotas of 100. The simple fact is that nations differ greatly in the number of their people who have the occupational attainments, or the family ties in the United States, to obtain a preference. There are also marked differences in wealth, earning power, and education which have a determining effect upon the numbers of people who could prove they would not be public charges if they came here, and who could meet the other prescribed tests for admission. Indeed, very few people from some areas can even pay the cost of tickets to come here. Because of practical and legal factors such as the above, quota immigration under the bill is likely to be more than 80 percent European.

Moreover, all countries will be limited by the bill to a maximum of 10 percent of the total quota immigration, so that no country could take up an excessive share of the overall quota. It should be noted that, in order to relieve hardship and for reasons of foreign policy, it would be possible under the bill to restore present quotas in some cases. This would, at least theoretically, allow the 10-percent limit to be exceeded in the cases of Great Britain, Germany, and Ireland. They happen to be the only countries whose present quotas exceed the 10-percent figures. The conclusion is plain—there would not be any flood of immigrants from any country, any continent, or from all of them put together.

III

Claim: The bill will lead to an increase in unemployment and in welfare rolls.

The facts: There is no real evidence to support this claim, and there is much evidence to disprove it.

First. Out of the 60,000 additional immigrants a year who would enter under the bill, only 24,000 would be workers. This number of additional workers is miscroscopic in relation to the U.S. work force—24,000 against our present work force of over 77 million, or about 1 to each 3,000 workers—hardly a drop in the bucket as a practical matter.

Second. For each additional worker admitted, the national economy will benefit from the admission of other persons who are consumers but not workers—elderly parents, women, children—in a ratio of workers to consumers that is as good or better than the ratio in our country today; these consumers should strengthen and not weaken the employment situation.

Third. The bill makes absolutely no change in the provisions of the present law, by which the Secretary of Labor can keep out immigrants who would take work from Americans or depress wages or working conditions here. The Secretary of Labor has testified that enactment of the bill will not increase unemployment.

Fourth. Every immigrant under the bill will have to satisfy the public charge test of present law before he can get a visa. This test was proven, during the depression, to be effective in keeping out those likely to become a public charge, and it will continue to keep out persons who will be unable to get jobs or will be prospects for welfare rolls. Finally, the improved preference structure of the bill will help stimulate business and should thus reduce unemployment through better selection of immigrants with outstanding talents—men like Steinmetz, the electrical genius; Giannini, the banker; Sikorski, the inventor; Fermi, the atomic pioneer. Such immigrants, instead of taking jobs from Americans, help to create whole new industries that make thousands of new jobs for our people.

IV

Claim: The bill would result in the admission of Communists, other subversives, or other undesirables.

The facts: The bill makes no change whatsoever in the safeguards of our present immigration laws which prohibit the admission of Communists, other subversives, security risks, narcotic addicts, persons with criminal records, illiterates, and other undesirables. Persons with mental afflictions also will continue to be generally excluded, except that if the afflicted person is an immediate relative of a family that can guarantee adequate and safe care here, without public expense, to the satisfaction of the Public Health Service and of the Attorney General, he can be admitted. This is true under present law for an immediate relative excludable for tuberculosis if adequate safeguards and guarantees are provided. Admissions of this kind are based on the humane policy of favoring family unity, provided the public is fully protected.

V

Claim: Under the bill an immigrant would no longer have to prove he has a job waiting for him.

The facts: This claim shows a misunderstanding of both the bill and the existing law. Under the present law immigrants generally do not have to prove that they have a specific job waiting for them. The bill makes no changes in this regard.

Under existing law, the only immigrant who must prove specifically that he has a job waiting for him is the immigrant who is seeking first preference. The law now provides for giving first preference within a quota to immigrants who can show extraordinary qualifications. This is a fine idea which in theory should strengthen and benefit our country, but in practice the present provision does not work well for two reasons:

First. Due to the national origins system, the preference is given only within a quota for a particular country. As a result, immigrants from undersubscribed countries can easily enter without having any special qualifications, while those from oversubscribed countries may be kept out for years no mater how much

they could do for our country. For example, a housemaid from a favored country may enter quickly while outstanding doctors and scientists from oversubscribed countries are kept out. Since the housemaid does not seek a first preference, she need not prove a personal job offer, while the doctor, even if he proves that a particular hospital wants him badly, must still wait.

Second. The present provision does not work because it tends to favor applicants with personal connections in this country rather than just extraordinary talents. This is true because no matter how outstanding an individual may be, most employers will rarely promise a job without an interview. Therefore, the applicant who cannot get here for an interview will usually get a job offer only if he is lucky enough to have good connections with the employer. The bill would eliminate the need for such connections and also place of birth as a factor in granting a first preference, which would be granted solely on proof of exceptional qualifications that would be especially advantageous to this country. People with such high qualifications will have no problem in obtaining employment. Naturally, no matter how high the qualifications of a first preference applicant, they could not be found especially advantageous to this country if he would displace an American from a job. And the applicant would also have to satisfy all the eligibility tests that other immigrants must meet.

Before You Leave This World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of my good friends who is active in civic and community affairs, Mr. Nathan E. Jacobs, has reduced his philosophy of life into a simple but beautiful poem, which I should like to share with my colleagues, as follows:

BEFORE YOU LEAVE THIS WORLD

When God put us on this earth,
He set no price upon its worth,
He asked us for no guarantee,
Nor did He tell us it was free.

He bade us welcome on that day,
And then He taught us how to pray.
He told us by our daily deed
Work would provide for what we need.

We needn't be captain of the team,
Although to many it may seem
The fastest way to Our Lord's grace,
But to Him every man has his place.

He said: These things I ask of thee—
Love God, respect the law, everyone be family;
Make of this earth a better place
Than when you came into the human race.

—NATHAN E. JACOBS.

False Guide for Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lawrence Fertig, author of the book "Prosperity through Freedom", had an article in the San Francisco Chronicle on April 30 which expressed some fundamental conclusions in regard to the handling of our unemployment figures as well as the unemployment situation as it exists throughout the country.

Mr. Fertig's column follows:

FALSE GUIDE FOR DEFICIT SPENDING

(By Lawrence Fertig)

Unemployment still hovers slightly under 5 percent, according to the latest Government estimate. This estimate is not just one among as number of important figures—it is a crucial statistic. For according to the newest economic theory it is the guidepost to our entire economy. Until there is full employment (currently defined as less than 4 percent jobless) Federal deficits must be employed as a "stimulant" and the budget must under no circumstances be balanced.

If the Federal Government is to pour out billions each year in an effort to reduce the unemployment figure below the accepted 4-percent rate, it is essential to ask some basic questions about this statistic—about the unemployment estimate that conditions our entire national life.

Year-after-year deficits would create a host of problems—ranging from the threat of rising prices to a depletion of our dwindling gold and an international monetary crisis.

Here are the questions that require an answer. Is our current estimate of unemployment scientifically accurate? Is avoidable unemployment actually being created by our own national policies? Is adherence to an irrelevant and inaccurate statistic (unemployment) endangering the entire economy by building up a huge inflationary potential? In other words, do we really know what we're doing when we gear Federal deficits to an unemployment figure of 4 percent?

One answer was recently given by Arthur F. Burns, formerly chief of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers. He pointed out in a recent article in Harvard Business Review that there are more jobs available today than there are unemployed jobseekers. In that case, he says, "there is no deficiency of aggregate demand." Under these conditions any government which plans government deficits and easy credit is simply toying with inflation. Unless it is related to jobs available, the unemployment figure by itself is misleading.

Also misleading is the official U.S. unemployment statistic now taken as an infallible guide. This is arrived at by a sampling of 26,000 households in the United States—not by any head count of those actually unemployed.

Also, aren't we guilty of creating unemployment and then complaining that unemployment must be cured with monetary gimmicks? The highest unemployment (23 percent of the total) is among teenagers. The law says that a teenager cannot be hired for less than $50 a week plus fringe benefits. This prevents many teenagers getting jobs from employers who cannot profitably pay that rate. At some lower rates of pay many new jobs would be opened up. But new pressure is on for an $80-a-week minimum wage.

Since it is only natural for employers to economize on labor when the cost is excessive, any rise in minimum wages would create still more unemployment in this group.

The minimum wage directly affects the unskilled, the physically handicapped, and the not-too-competent. Since all these people constitute such a large percentage of those unemployed, and since the minimum wage curbs their job opportunities, isn't it evident that we are actually creating unemployment despite our good intentions?

As for creating Federal deficits until the trigger-point of a 4-percent unemployment rate is reached, here is what a leading "liberal," Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, said in his book, "Economy in National Government," published some years ago: "In a period when unemployment is less than 6 percent there is no real supply of workers ready to go into productive activity. Instead the unemployed are primarily either the hard core of the perennially unemployed, such as the handicapped, or the transitionally unemployed for whom job opportunities exist * * *."

Senator DOUGLAS now repudiates the 6-percent figure and favors the 4-percent figure. When we reach 4 percent might he and others advocate 2 percent?

NAS Panel Completes Its First Assignment in Relationship With Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, the Committee on Science and Astronautics met with a group of distinguished scientists, eminent in both the physical and social sciences, who had completed a yearlong study for our committee in regard to appropriate levels of Federal support for basic research.

This has been one of the channels, but only one, through which the Science Committee is carrying forward its duties. I might add that the detailed planning for this work was undertaken by Mr. DADDARIO, of Connecticut, the able chairman of our Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, and Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky of Harvard, former Presidential Science Adviser, who has been serving as chairman of the Committee on Science and Public Policy for the National Academy of Sciences.

The attached article, written by Daniel S. Greenberg, was published in one of the Nation's most highly respected scientific journals, Science magazine, April 30, 1965. I believe it will be useful and enlightening to all Members of the House.

The article follows:

ACADEMY AND CONGRESS: NAS PANEL COMPLETES ITS FIRST ASSIGNMENT IN NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH CONGRESS

For the first 101 years of its existence the National Academy of Sciences generally

maintained a cordial but distant relationship with the U.S. Congress.

The Congress had little reason to avail itself of the Academy's services as scientific adviser to the Federal Government. The Academy, repelled by the harshness and stridency of congressional politics, preferred to work with the executive agencies, and didn't seek to develop ties with Congress. But when budgetary and political pressures began to affect seriously Federal support for science, both the Academy and Congress showed more inclination to work with each other. Last year this new attitude resulted in a formal contract for the Academy to provide counsel for the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. The contract was shortly followed by the committee's first assignment for the Academy, a request for answers to two questions: (1) What level of Federal support is needed to maintain for the United States a position of leadership through basic research in the advancement of science and technology and their economic, cultural, and military applications and (2) What judgment can be reached on the balance of support now being given by the Federal Government to various fields of scientific endeavor, and on adjustments that should be considered, either within existing levels of over-all support or under conditions of increased or decreased over-all support?

The vagueness of the questions and their essential unanswerability inspired a fair degree of despair behind the Academy's marble facade. But there were the questions, reasonable ones from the point of view of legislators who must appropriate money, and the Academy accordingly turned to the task of answering them. The assignment was given to the Academy's Committee on Science and Public Policy, which set up a 15-member ad hoc committee, which in turn decided that, rather than seek a consensus, it would give the House Committee the separate views of all 15 members. Those views were delivered last Monday in a 310-page report, "Basic Research and National Goals." Except for a few humble and carefully circumscribed attempts, the papers don't try to answer the unanswerable, but they do provide some of the most provocative and best informed discussions yet to appear any place on the economic and political problems of Federal support for science.

Harvey Brooks, dean of applied physics and engineering at Harvard, provides a lucid analysis of the difficulties involved in trying to employ dollar amounts as a measure of scientific activity. Noting, for example, that the National Science Foundation reported Federal support for basic research to be $1.6 billion in fiscal 1964, Brooks asserts:

"It turns out that nearly half of this amount was spent by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and that approximately 80 percent of the NASA expenditure was for the design and procurement of scientific space vehicles, the operation of tracking ranges, and payments to military missile ranges for putting the vehicles into orbit. A significant part of the oceanography budget," he continued, "goes into simply keeping research vessels at sea, without any science." These costs, he conceded, are necessarily incurred in the conduct of basic research, and are therefore legitimately chargeable to basic research. But, he noted, "A basic research budget that rises annually by 15 percent may appear to be adequate or even generous, but if most of the cost increase is merely to insure the availability of certain new facilities, then the increased budget could actually be supporting the activities of fewer scientists. The situation would be a little like building a new department store that was so expensive to keep open that it was necessary to fire all the salesmen."

Brooks went on to point out that "much of the planning for new research facilities that took place in fiscal years 1962 and 1963 was based on an implicit assumption of continuing expansion of research budgets. Now, in fiscal 1964 and 1965, when these facilities are just coming into operation, the expenses of merely making them available—without any science—are confronting fixed or even declining operating budgets for basic research."

To avoid this dilemma, Brooks recommended segregating the costs of major scientific equipment—such as accelerators, oceanographic vessels, and space vehicles—to distinguish them financially from the costs of performing research. In regard to Brooks' proposal it might be argued that the pie is still the same size, no matter how it's sliced. But in terms of congressional attitudes, the proposed budgetary distinctions might be extremely significant. When research budgets are lumped together, Congress tends to pay attention to overall growth, rather than to the financial problems of any particular segment; it is therefore tactically difficult to plead poverty when the overall sums are rising substantially.

The panelist who was most provocative and most out of step with his colleagues was Harry G. Johnson, Chicago economist. Addressing himself to the contention that science should be supported because of its cultural value, Johnson stated:

"The argument that individuals with a talent for research should be supported by society, for example, differs little from arguments formerly advanced in support of the rights of the owners of landed property to a leisured existence, and is accompanied by a similar assumption of superior social worth of the privileged individuals over common men. Again, insistence on the obligation of society to support the pursuit of scientific knowledge for its own sake differs little from the historically earlier insistence on the obligation of society to support the pursuit of religious faith, an obligation recompensed by a similarly unspecified and problematical payoff in the distant future. At the more popular level, the interest in scientific accomplishment represents a leisure time activity, more elevated than following professional sport and less culturally demanding than the appreciation of artistic endeavor, and hence peculiarly appropriate in the affluent mass society."

Johnson said that "there is no disputing that basic research has played a significant part in the growth of the U.S. economy," but he said that it was difficult, if not impossible, to determine the extent, and like most of his colleagues on the panel he declined to attempt to answer the questions posed by the House committee.

Among the few panelists who attempted to provide direct answers to the House committee's questions were Brooks and George Kistiakowsky, of the Harvard chemistry department. They took the position that a minimum annual increase of approximately 15 percent in university research support is essential to meet national requirements. Brooks also suggested "that 10 to 15 percent of the applied effort might be a good rule of thumb for the basic research effort." John Verhoogen, University of California geologist, suggested that in "little science"—designated by research costing less than $20,000 a year—"ideally every scientist who is capable of raising a valid scientific question and contributing significantly to its solution" should be supported. He estimated that this would apply to at least 50,000 scientists. As for "big science," there was general agreement that because of its costs, there was a necessity to pick and choose among possibilities. And there was also general agreement with a view most forcefully advanced by Edward Teller, of the University of California, that graduate science training places insufficient emphasis on applied science.

One area of considerable agreement among the panelists was the view that the future of basic research in the United States is becoming closely tied to the fortunes of the National Science Foundation, and that increased support for NSF is essential if research is to thrive.

Alvin Weinberg, director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, warned that Government agencies with narrowly defined technical objectives have been reducing their support of basic research because of budgetary pressures. "Whether or not basic physical science continues to flourish," he said, "will therefore depend largely on whether or not Congress encourages the growth and vigor of the Foundation. Expansion of the National Science Foundation is perhaps our country's central political problem related to the support of science."

The House committee for which the report was prepared received it with a warm statement of appreciation. Chairman GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat, of California, said: "It is my belief that this report represents not only genuine achievement and utility in itself, but a significant milestone in congressional methods of gathering talented, objective assistance to its use."

It appears, however, that the academy, whose panelists labored with great diligence to produce their papers, is not so certain that a lengthy compilation of individual views is actually the best way to serve the requirements of busy Congressmen.

The introduction to the report disclaimed any group responsibility for the views of the individual authors, stating that "neither the other members of the ad hoc panel, nor the committee (on science and public policy), nor the academy assumes responsibility for the opinions expressed, except where explicitly stated." In explaining why it chose to present 15 papers rather than a committee report, it offered the statement that "it has been traditional for groups of this kind to develop a consensus as a basis for unanimity in the public statement of their findings addressed to the executive branch of the Government. We concluded that, in view of the nature of the legislative process, this may be less desirable in a response to a request from a congressional committee."

Just why this should be the case wasn't made clear. But it is possible that the Academy is still uneasy about its new relationship with Congress and wants to feel its way before committing its prestige fully. One thing in favor of a closer relationship is the scientists' respect for Representatives EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Democrat, of Connecticut, chairman of the House committee's Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. It is generally agreed that DADDARIO has been running his subcommittee in a responsible and intelligent fashion, and that the subcommittee is developing into an important channel of communication between the scientific community and the Congress.

Members of the Academy's Panel on Basic Research and National Goals who participated in the preparation of the report to Congress are:

George Kistiakowsky, Harvard University, chairman; Lawrence R. Blinks, Stanford University; H. W. Bode, Bell Telephone Laboratories; Harvey Brooks, Harvard University; Frank L. Horsfall, Jr., Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research; Harry G. Johnson, University of Chicago; Arthur Kantrowitz, Avco-Everett Research Laboratory; Carl Kaysen, Harvard University; Saunders MacLane, University of Chicago; Carl Pfaffman, Brown University; Roger Revelle, Harvard University; Edward Teller, University of California, Berkeley; John Verhoogen, University of California, Berkeley; Alvin M. Weinberg, Oak Ridge National Laboratory; and John E. Willard, University of Wisconsin.

When Will the South Be Forgiven?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like like to include an article by Paul Harvey, "When Will South Win Forgiveness?", as it appeared in the Gadsden, Ala., Times, April 29.

Mr. Harvey raises a most interesting point. When will the South be forgiven for whatever fancied sins it has committed? Why do well-meaning and well-intentioned people see absolutely no wrong in the double standard they use in judging identical incidents and attitudes occurring in both the North and the South?

For the past 4 months my State of Alabama has been pilloried, degraded, ridiculed, suffered an onslaught of thousands of people bringing with them violence and hate. This has been done, it is said, because Alabama and the South practice segregation, the whites of the South will not accept, it is said, the Negro as a social equal and he is denied the right to a good education. I cannot deny that some of these things are true. I cannot deny that there are those in the South who have prejudices and are unreasonable in their attitudes. But I assure you that history will record that we have also made notable advancement in the South, especially in the field of education. In many counties of the South, for a nearly a hundred years, the local white people have borne the burden of educating the Negroes. Look at the record of what strides we made in this area, and it has not been easy because many of these counties are poor and with an overwhelming Negro population the tax base has been low. We tried and we accomplished, not as much as we would like to accomplish; not as much as many of our critics feel we should have accomplished, but we made a respectable advance. Later, Mr. Speaker, I shall develop this progress in a statement to the House.

Now, what of the North.

Strict segregation was practiced right here in the Nation's Capital until a few short years ago. Here Negroes attended segregated schools and many of their schools were inferior to the white schools. Negroes were excluded from Washington theaters, restaurants, hotels and discrimination was practiced in hiring even by the Government. Many of the religious leaders and politicians who marched on Selma were in Washington at the time. Did they speak up? Did they march on the Capitol? Did they spew hate against the National and Washington leaders, businessmen, and citizens? Did they cry for vengeance?

You know the answer. They did not. By what standard of morality can those who today cry for the blood of the South, excuse their acceptance of similar and even worse conditions which existed here.

No, I'm not suggesting that because there is injustice in the North that injustice should be excused in the South. I just want to say that we are striving to correct whatever injustice there is in the South and all we ask that we be judged by the same standard our judges use in testing their own actions in their own States and communities.

Mr. Harvey's article follows:

WHEN WILL SOUTH WIN FORGIVENESS?

(By Paul Harvey)

How long before the South will be forgiven?

The South lost a war 100 years ago and is still paying for it.

We forgave Germany twice in half that time.

In the 20 years since Germany fought us the last time, we've forgiven them and sent them $4 billion.

In the 20 years since Japan lost its war with us, we have forgiven Japan and sent the Japanese $2½ billion.

It has been 100 years since Alabama and Georgia and Misissippi lost their war and Washington is still forcing those States to pay to Washington six times as much as they receive in "aid."

The economic jealousy which was, in large part, responsible for the uncivil war is still apparent in the present North-South cold war.

Southern Negro slaves had security but fought for freedom. Today they have freedom, seek security.

We have forgiven Germany and Japan and Spain and Mexico and everybody who ever waged war on us—except the Confederacy.

We have even promised North Vietnam reparations in advance—a billion dollars aid per year if southeast Asians will stop the war at the 17th parallel.

The Southern United States, entirely willing to accept a cease-fire at the Mason-Dixon line and peaceful coexistence wherever, is still occupied by "the enemy."

The Southern States have surrendered unconditionally. They are no threat to the security of their neighbors. They have no territorial ambitions beyond their borders. Indeed, you never even hear of a retired southerner moving north. They mind their own business, contributing more than generously to the U.S. Treasury.

Washington would not think of meddling in the internal affairs of West Germany or Italy or Japan. It would be inexcusably bad manners. It would engender resentment. It would likely set the stage for another military confrontation.

Yet Washington approves and applauds the invasion of our own South by Yankee mobs and supports their continuing invasion with Federal troops.

Granted, the South made a mistake. It lost the war. But many others have lost many wars and Washington has generously helped the fallen to their feet, sponsored their reconstruction, reestablished their independence.

How long before the South will be forgiven?

Not one of Uncle Sam's former enemies has become a better friend. Not one has stuck with him through peace and war, feast and famine, as has this one.

Uncle Sam has no ally on whom he can count as surely as on this splendid, energetic, dynamic segment of himself.

Isn't it time to stop the masochistic punishment?

Isn't three generations of spitting on Johnny Reb's grave enough?

How long before the South will be forgiven?

Worldwide Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be considering again the foreign aid authorization and appropriation bills on the floor of the House. Dr. John H. Adler, Director of the Economic Development Institute, has put in succinct terms the present conditions and trends of worldwide economic development.

In particular, Dr. Adler has given us a careful, balanced, and farsighted explanation of the need for the Western World to increase its commitment to the economic development of the less-developed areas. Morally, humanely, and politically we cannot allow the developing nations to be arrested in their promising economic development. To do so would be to attempt to return to the 19th century assumptions in a 20th century world.

We in the Congress must do our part to insure that the commitment of the United States to this economic development is strong and clear at all times.

I include the full text of Dr. Adler's remarks before the Economics Roundtable Session of the 51st National Foreign Trade Convention in New York on November 18, 1964, so that they may become a part of our consideration:

THE PROGRESS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(Talk by Dr. John H. Adler, Director, Economic Development Institute, World Bank, at the Economics Roundtable Session of the 51st National Foreign Trade Convention, November 18, 1964, New York City, N.Y.)

In the last 15 or 20 years we have all learned a great deal about economic development, which we think of as something that is really new. The Articles of Agreement of the World Bank which were written at Bretton Woods a little over 20 years ago, referred to the economic development in the less developed areas of the world as a major objective. The documents establishing the United Nations also referred specifically to the problems of development as a major task for international action. This is significant because it indicates a new departure, in contrast with what has happened before, say, for the last 250 years.

We have had development and economic growth for a long time—certainly for the last 250 years. But it didn't go under that name; it used to be simply called progress. However, this progress was confined to the countries of Western Europe and to the countries which the League of Nations used to call countries of recent settlement—meaning the United States, Canada, Australia, South Africa, and perhaps also such places as Argentina. It is difficult to find in the literature of the 19th century any indication that economic development, as it took place in Western Europe and the other parts of the world just referred to, would also be something to be expected in the colonial territories as they were called at that time. In those days people made placid assumption that economic growth was something that was a specialty of what we now call the West; that for the rest of the

world stagnation or simply no growth was the normal thing to be expected.

Since then things have changed. This, I think, is a major departure of the last 20 years: economic development now is taking place all over the world. It is taking place continuously and without any significant wavering. If I were to put my remark in quantitative terms I would say that economic growth has proceeded in the last 15 years or so at a rate of something like 4 percent per annum. Now, 4 percent doesn't mean really very much in our daily reckoning; there isn't very much difference between 3½ percent or 5 percent or 4 percent. What it means—and this is maybe a better way of putting the same proposition—is that in the last 17 or 20 years the total income of the underdeveloped areas of the world has just about doubled. This, I suggest, is a major accomplishment of the era in which we live. We don't always realize that this is taking place, because we are constantly concerned and preoccupied with difficulties here and there, with one country after another running out of funds, one country after another having problems with its development programs and so on.

But, after everything is said and done, what is happening still adds up to a large measure of accomplishment, an accomplishment which I don't think can any longer be considered as simply a temporary deviation from the normal situation of no growth, but must be considered as something that has permanently changed the economic history of the world.

IS DEVELOPMENT FAST ENOUGH?

Now, in order to evaluate whether this 4 percent has been much or little, it is not enough to refer back to past history and say it is more than ever happened before—because as we have seen nothing happened before—but we have to relate it to some kind of objective criterion. In order to do that you have to relate first the growth rate of 4 percent to the population growth which, of course, offsets to a considerable extent this accomplishment. Population growth in the underdeveloped parts of the world has in recent years been running at a rate of something like 2 percent, or perhaps a bit higher. So we are left with a rate of income growth per capita of 1½ percent on the average.

The question then is whether this 1½ percent per capita growth rate is adequate. The answer is a matter of judgment—judgment as to what is considered a "significant" rate of growth: what do people feel when their family income goes up by 1, or 1½, or 2 percent per year?

One way of looking at this problem is to see how long it takes for a family, for a social class, for a group, to achieve a doubling of its income. You can read in any compound interest table that a 1-percent rate requires approximately 70 years to double in income. Well, I suggest that 70 years is too long a time to wait for such doubling of income. It takes almost three generations. There, 1 percent would not be enough.

What then would be enough? I would suggest something in the order of 2½ percent might be a reasonable standard and an adequate accomplishment, because it means that per capita income doubles within 28 years, a period which is well within the life span of a generation. It means that, on the whole, people are twice as well off as their parents and four times as well off as their grandparents.

This, then, I would consider a reasonable and adequate rate of growth. Have we achieved this? On the basis of the previously mentioned figures the answer is no, but we have come close to it. We have come close to it on the average, and we have reached it in important parts of the world. In some countries we have done even better.

Let me now go on to try to see why this has happened. Why has it happened only the last 20 years? Why didn't it happen 50 years ago? Obviously, the fact that many countries have become independent has something to do with the development accomplishments in such parts of the world as Africa. But a variety of other circumstances also have had something to do with it. Perhaps the most important factor is that in recent years underdeveloped countries have obtained considerable assistance in the form of capital movements—support through grants and loans on conventional and nonconventional terms.

THE ROLE OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

These capital movements as estimated by the OECD, have in recent years, added up to something in the order of $8½ billion a year, and last year they came to $9 billion. These figures include public and private grants and loans from all sources advanced to the underdeveloped countries of the world. (I should add at this point that my concern is exclusively with what is known as the free world—I plead ignorance to speak about the area of the world behind the Iron Curtain).

How important has the contribution of the advanced countries of the world to the underdeveloped countries been? From the point of view of the advanced countries taken together this flow of capital and grants has been somewhat less than 1 percent of the gross national product. Only one country, perhaps two, have contributed to this flow in one form or another more than 1 percent of the gross national product.

From the point of view of the recipient countries, however, this contribution has been a major factor in the availability of resources for development purposes. In order to appreciate its significance, we must look at it in the context of the resources of the recipient countries. Total investment in the underdeveloped countries has probably been in the order of $24 billion a year. This figure is of course uncertain, particularly since it is made up of many national figures that are uncertain, and there are all kinds of problems of adding them up at unrealistic exchange rates, but if you add and subtract and correct you still come out with a figure of this general magnitude. If you relate that then to the flow of foreign assistance in the broad sense, of $8½ billion, you find that approximately one-third of the investment resources of the underdeveloped world have come from the advanced countries.

In some countries this proportion has of course been much larger and in others it has been smaller; and in some places the foreign contribution to capital formation was insignificant. But, when you take an average this is where you come out.

If you then compare this one-third contribution to aggregate economic growth with population growth rates you come to the rather startling and perhaps not very pleasant conclusion that if it hadn't been for the flow of the capital from the advanced countries to the underdeveloped countries, an increase in the per capital income would not have taken place.

This is obviously one of those gross overstatements which, in order to make it correct would need many more footnotes than you would wish to listen to. They would keep you here for much longer than you would care to stay.

But, like all such overstatements, there is an element of truth in it and the element of truth simply is that from the point of view of the recipient countries foreign assistance, including the flow of private capital has been a major element in making growth possible. This is not to say that the underdeveloped countries themselves have not done well because, after all, two-thirds of their capital formation have come from their own resources and one should not play up the one-third coming from abroad without paying respect to the achievement of the countries to mobilize, under very difficult circumstances, two-thirds of their total.

UNSOLVED PROBLEMS

Let me now go one step further and indicate now what the major problems are which economic development is facing at this juncture. There is some indication that the rate of growth of the underdeveloped world has been slowing down in recent years. I do not want to exaggerate this since I believe that there are some hopeful signs that the decline in growth rates, which took place 2 or 3 years ago, is coming to an end and that perhaps an increase of growth rates may be in the making. But, it is quite clear that the problems that have caused this slowing down still have to be solved, if the development process is not to run up against recurring—and growing—resistance.

There are three major problems which have arisen. In the first place, economic development has not only been uneven as between regions and countries, but it also has been highly uneven within most economies of the world.

Specifically, it turned out—contrary to the expectations of some of my colleagues in the field of economics—that industrial development and the development of social overhead capital, the kind of investment with which the World Bank is very much concerned, seems to offer less of a problem than the remaining sector of the economies, namely, agriculture. This is where the real difficulty seems to lie. In many underdeveloped countries the agricultural sector has been sadly lagging behind, to the point that in a number of countries an agricultural production per capita is smaller than it was 10 or 15 years ago. Depending upon which of the latest reports you read, you find that food production the world over has just about kept pace with the population growth or, according to some more pessimistic estimates food production has already fallen behind the population growth.

Unfortunately, it is not easy to devise an answer to this most difficult problem, largely I suspect, because we have not adequately dealt with it. We have not done enough to find a solution to the problem, partly because the underdeveloped countries themselves have been so much concerned with industrial development as compared with agriculture, and partly because the advanced countries have been reluctant to focus on agricultural development because there is a danger of their being accused of keeping the underdeveloped countries from becoming industrialized.

Somewhat related to the field of agriculture, but perhaps of importance if looked at from a different angle, is the second problem, and that is that the foreign exchange proceeds of the underdeveloped countries have not kept pace with the growth of the countries themselves. This is clearly shown in all trade statistics—one of the few pieces of reliable information that is regularly available.

These statistics show that in the last 20 years world trade has expanded at a rate never before achieved and that we now have much more international trade than we have ever had before. But they also show that most of the expansion has taken place in trade between the advanced countries and from the advanced countries to the underdeveloped countries, while exports from the underdeveloped countries have not significantly risen.

Why? In my opinion, the answer is: only to a lesser extent because the underdeveloped countries have not managed their affairs efficiently. It is well known that many underdeveloped countries have neglected the export sectors of their economies and there are many things that have been done wrong. But even after some of the blame is put on them, you still cannot escape the conclusion that the trouble with exports from many

underdeveloped countries is that they simply are in the wrong kind of business. They are in the wrong kind of business in the sense that they have to sell commodities for which demand doesn't rise very fast.

Look at coffee. Look at cocoa. Look at natural rubber. Look at basic foodstuffs and industrial raw materials and you find that these commodities are constantly under pressure. They are under pressure because the demand for them rises only very slowly. Some of the commodities are under pressure because more and more synthetic substitutes come into the picture and some are under pressure because the advanced countries themselves have managed to produce them more cheaply.

The third problem that plagues underdeveloped countries that I want to mention follows directly from the second. Because of the slow growth of the export earnings, many of the underdeveloped countries are now facing a serious debt problem. In the early postwar period underdeveloped countries found it relatively easy to get loans and private investment from advanced countries. This is no longer true because these loans and investments were made in the expectation that the export earnings of the underdeveloped countries would keep pace with their growth. This, as I said before, was not the case and as the result many countries now face debt problems of serious proportions. I am not saying that the underdeveloped countries are bankrupt; far from it. But I do say that a number of underdeveloped countries have growing difficulties meeting their debt service obligations, particularly in the next 3 or 4 years.

The situation is acute in the next 3 years or so, because many of the underdeveloped countries have incurred—I should add, with the encouragement of many of their suppliers—debts which are simply too short to be paid off comfortably. It is clear that one should not finance a major industrial installation or a big powerplant on 5- or 6-year credits—but this is exactly what has happened. Some countries found it easy to secure short and medium-term accommodations from suppliers or financial institutions. They now have what the people concerned with debt service call a "debt bulge." Over the next 3 years some of the countries I have in mind face the prospects of having to set aside something like 25 to 30 percent of their foreign exchange earnings to meet their debt service obligations.

Clearly, this is not a comfortable position to be in—for two reasons. In the first place, it means that they have to forego imports which are essential to maintain their development process. Second, under these conditions, it becomes inadvisable for the countries to incur further debts and for lenders to lend them at conventional rates.

The result of all this is that if development is to continue the need arises of providing more capital to underdeveloped countries on terms which are benignly called "nonconventional." I am referring to grants and loans on very generous terms.

THE OUTLOOK

This then is the story of the progress of development so far. If I may, I will take another minute or so to say what the outlook appears to be. In spite of the difficulties which I indicated and because of the accomplishment which I mentioned before, I believe the outlook is rather favorable for the continued growth of the underdeveloped countries. It is inconceivable that the underdeveloped countries will now again slow down and sink back in the morass of underdevelopment. I believe that they will do everything in their own power to continue the growth process which they have started on and I also believe that the advanced countries will continue their support of this development process.

It is certainly not an accident that in one of the last speeches during the American presidential election campaign, President Johnson went on record with the following proposition: that he considers it unthinkable that the advanced countries can continue their own growth as they have done in the last few years and for many decades before, while at the same time the underdeveloped countries are falling behind. I believe this is inconceivable, not only on moral and human grounds, but also on political grounds. It is inconceivable to live in a world in which you go back to the 19th century situation where one-third of the world was advancing while the rest was standing still. This, I think, is the overriding argument for the continued support through capital and technical assistance, advice, and guidance to the underdeveloped countries of the world. The recognition of this has gone very far among all the advanced countries; it is an assurance that this development will continue.

Law Day, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Rotary Clubs of Wilkes-Barre, Pittston, and Scranton held a joint meeting on April 27, 1965, to commemorate Law Day, 1965.

The principal speaker on that occasion was Judge William M. Fay, of the U.S. Tax Court, Washington, D.C.

The selection of Judge Fay as the main speaker was indeed a most appropriate one because he was born in Pittston and is a member of one of the most distinguished families in my congressional district. Many Members of the House will remember his late brother, Maurice Fay, who was the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia under President Harry Truman.

As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I include the fine address delivered by Judge Fay at last week's joint meeting of the Rotary Clubs in observance of Law Day.

Judge Fay's address follows:

Mr. Tomascik, distinguished Rotary members, and guests, it is a genuine pleasure to be here today and to have the opportunity to address this gathering. I appreciate, too, the kind words of introduction. What you have said is far more complimentary than that to which I am usually accustomed. I was a guest at a dinner party in Washington last week and my dinner partner confided to me that having a Tax Court judge at a social function was somewhat like inviting an undertaker to a wedding.

I feel it is somewhat presumptuous of me to appear on the heels of the distinguished Ambassador of Liberia, who addressed your Wilkes-Barre club last month. However, I am consoled by the fact of having received the invitation from Congressman DAN FLOOD. I couldn't presume to question his judgment. I think most of us would agree that when any aspect of Luzerne County is involved the Congressman's instinct is impeccable.

The particular purpose that brings us together today is to commemorate Law Day. Unlike most other days set aside to recognize matters of national interest, Law Day has no facile symbol to identify its celebration—no firecrackers, no turkeys, no shamrocks. And rightly so. For the significance of Law Day is too broad, its observance too reflective. The wards of law which are freedom, human dignity, justice, and order cannot be expressed in a single profane sign.

Law Day witnesses and signifies our dedication to the principles of Government under law. However, respect for the law, I believe, is the real meaning and essence of Law Day—which must be common to every day or else our society will disintegrate. Although it can be said that law is the cement of civilization, respect for the law is the brick and stone that builds the sturdy wall. It is lack of respect for the law that saps our national strength.

The duty of the private citizen to uphold and respect the law will become an increasingly important concern in this decade—a decade in which all Americans will have to face the inevitable growing pains of adjusting to a mature society. In the last few years we have become increasingly aware of the emergence of various groups and organizations whose baneful goals offend the very basis of democracy. True, our nation has never been without dissenters—and dissenters are both the price and the glory of a free society. However, they speak and act more boldly today. In a sense, such groups are merely symptomatic of our Nation's adolescent disharmony. However, we must not be led into believing they are innocuous. To the unwary, the anarchy they preach is a heady brew. Their raucous voices and their pernicious deeds tend to nurture a lax attitude toward the law. Such groups must be dealt with in a manner commensurate with the threat they pose. We are all aware that the bad habits of youth, if unchecked, form the character of the adult.

In practical terms, what is the proper respect due the law? I believe it is simply this—that the decisions of courts, in the final analysis, must be followed, however much we, as individuals, believe them to be unwise or unfair. Respect for the law means our allegiance to it, notwithstanding any personal opinion, hereditary instinct, national impulse or geographic tradition to the contrary.

Our Nation is so constituted as to comprise within its structure the mechanism for modification and change in accordance with the popular will—that is, by electing representatives who will work for change in the law and by selecting executives who will enforce the law effectively. If we disagree with the law and irresponsibly assail and defy it, we challenge the foundation of our own society.

Instead of all the words I might say to you about the noble mansions of the law, I believe I might serve you best if I take this opportunity to give you a brief introduction to an aspect of the law with which probably few of you are acquainted—that is, the Tax Court of the United States.

What is the Tax Court? What is it supposed to do? What can it be expected to do in the Federal tax field? The Tax Court is an integrated, centralized court with its headquarters in Washington, D.C. It's a legislative court, as contrasted with the Federal courts of general jurisdiction which are created under article 3 of the Constitution. It derives its powers, its functions, its jurisdiction, and its duties from Congress. It had its beginning in 1924, and since 1926 there have been no substantial legislative changes, except in 1942 when its name was changed from the Board of Tax Appeals to the Tax Court of the United States. The court exercises solely judicial functions by hearing and determining controversies between taxpayers and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with respect to deficiencies asserted in income tax cases of individuals and corporations, as well as deficiencies in estate and gift tax cases. Resort to the Tax Court pro-

vides an umpire to maintain the proper balance between taxpayer and Government in the interpretation of our Federal tax laws.

The court is composed of 16 judges, who are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The chief judge is in charge of all of our administrative matters. The other judges literally "ride circuit" by holding trial sessions in some 55 cities throughout the United States. The remainder of their time is devoted to the preparation of written findings of fact and opinions in the cases which are tried.

The power to assign cases is vested solely in the chief judge and the case itself is heard and decided by the judge to whom it has been assigned.

Before a Tax Court trial begins, what happens? First, the taxpayer receives a formal claim from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that the taxpayer has underpaid his taxes. Presuming the taxpayer disagrees with the Commissioner's tax claim, he can either pay the tax and sue for its recovery in the district court in his locality or in the Court of Claims in Washington; or he can, without payment of the tax, initiate a proceeding in the Tax Court by filing a petition. This petition is a formal document in the nature of a complaint. After that, the Government's attorneys answer the petition and suit is joined.

When these preliminary steps have been completed, the time and place of trial are set. A calendar or listing of cases to be tried is issued and a judge is sent out to hear them. We sit as judge and jury.

To many of you, presiding at a Tax Court trial may seem to have all the verve of an accounting lecture; however, I assure you this is not so. I know of many occasions which might have been appropriate from the pen of the late Ian Fleming, one of which I will relate. Several years ago, while holding court in Chicago, I had the opportunity to hear a case involving one of the more prominent figures in that city's underworld social register. The case involved a claim by the Government of several million dollars of taxes. Counsel for the taxpayer heard that the Government had assigned an agent to follow me each day as I walked between my hotel and the courthouse to the trial. When taxpayer's counsel received this erroneous information, he informed the Government of his client's indignation at this wasteful expenditure of public revenue. It seems as though hi sclient had rather thoughtfully assigned two of his own men to insure my safety, apparently with the thought in mind that if anything happened to me, including a stubbed toe, the underworld society might be blamed for the accident.

When the trial of a tax case is concluded and briefs submitted, a written findings of fact and opinion is prepared. This becomes the opinion of the court, unless the chief judge directs that the case be reviewed by the full court. The opinion in each case heard and decided is studied by the chief judge. By this procedure, conflicts in the decided cases are reduced to a minimum. Cases dealing with new legal principles, or those reversing prior opinions as well as those which require difficult legal distinctions are typical of the cases considered by the full court in conference. One may feel that our conference procedure is cumbersome but such thought is quickly dispelled when one is aware of the fact that our court disposes of 5,000 cases each year. At our court conferences, which are held approximately every other Friday morning, we have a free and open discussion of the issues and cast our votes on each case. Any judge who disagrees with any opinion adopted by the conference is free to file a concurring or dissenting opinion setting forth his own views. It is not possible to overemphasize the importance of our conference procedure—I also find it difficult to describe to you the thoughtful consideration that is given to these court-reviewed opinions. The questions are of nationwide importance and merit the highest degree of consideration.

The question is often asked—why is the Tax Court a "traveling court"? The answer is simply that is the way Congress set it up—so that taxpayers may have a reasonable opportunity to appear and contest the claimed deficiencies with as little inconvenience and expense to them as possible. In some of the smaller cities where we do not have our own courtroom we use a Federal district or court of appeals courtroom.

A plethora of cases presented to the Tax Court involve highly complicated legal questions which are entangled in the perplexing mazes of the tax statutes. But I shall not bore you by discussing any of these complex and difficult problems. In most of our cases there is a lot of real human drama, especially in the courtroom. Many Tax Court litigants are big names in business, in sports, the arts, and even in crime—and probably no other court in America hears more about the private lives of these people. Certainly few other judges can go to work in the morning with less danger of monotony than those of us who sit in the Tax Court. Let me illustrate my point by mentioning one or two of the interesting and unusual cases submitted to our court.

A very early case in Tax Court history involved a wealthy woman who wanted her husband, a sea captain, to stay around home and take up permanent shore duty. She drew up a contract and in it she gave the captain half of her income. He in turn renounced his seafaring life and promised to take up no other work involving travel. After that, the wife paid taxes on only one-half of her income, and deducted the rest as an ordinary and necessary business expense. While we agreed that her "captain might be dear," we held he was not deductible.

However, it cannot be said that Tax Court judges have lost sight of true love. A recent opinion involved a young heiress with an annual income of several hundred thousand dollars from trusts, who married a French lad named Jacques Adrian Marie Dubois de la Begassiere. They spent 1 year honeymooning on the bride's yacht traveling around the world. The case involved some rather ridiculous questions of tax law dealing with domicile and residence during their year of heavenly bliss. In the opinion Judge Kern wrote:

"The instant case is unusual because of more exotic circumstances. We are concerned here with the young, beautiful, and charmingly naive petitioner, and her suave, handsome, and attractive husband. Their interest was focused on the pleasures arising from love, youth, and money. It is obvious that they had little interest in the more mundane affairs of life which usually trouble the young married couple. They were under no compulsion to "settle down" after the wedding and honeymoon and consider the problems presented by more prosaic circumstances, such as membership in the local Lutheran Church or the Masonic Lodge [and, parenthetically, I might add the Rotary Club]. * * * Jacques met the young, beautiful heiress while she was making a tour of South America. They fell in love. They became engaged. They were eager to be married. He bought a one-way ticket to the United States and followed her home with appropriate speed and ardor. He cared less what type of visa he possessed. * * * Joyce had no reason to abandon her residence in the United States and it was only natural for Jacques to make her residence his. Obviously, he wanted to be with her and it was not unnatural for him to wish to live near the principal of her trusts."

I also recall a case where a wealthy lawyer claimed depreciation on a rare antique cocktail table in the library of his home. The problem was whether it was used in his business. The attorney argued, in effect, that cocktails and clients were as successful a combination in the practice of law as are golf and patients in the practice of medicine. Our court, rather puritanically, balked at allowing the depreciation, but the court of appeals, taking a more sophisticated view of 20th century mores, reversed us, thus establishing the simple principle that "a lawyer, to be a good mixer, needs a cocktail table."

Another case illustrates the interplay between tax law and the mores of our times. In one, a young lady reported, as a gift, the receipt of a large amount of securities from a married gentleman friend. Upon evidence that the gentleman had paid for the young lady's divorce and that the two often took weekend trips as man and wife, the court found that the securities constituted payment for services rendered and therefore income to the young lady.

APPEAL PROCEDURES

Of course, the losing party in the tax court has a right to appeal the adverse decision to 1 of the 11 U.S. Courts of Appeal, and thereafter and finally to the U.S. Supreme Court. And as we all know, the Supreme Court has the last word on any question, and that includes all questions that are given birth in the tax court.

Has the Tax Court succeeded? We hope so and we think so. And so did the late Robert Jackson, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, who said in a noted tax case:

"I still think the Tax Court is a more competent and steady influence toward a systematic body of tax law than our sporadic omnipotence in a field beset with invisible boomerangs."

That is the story of the U.S. Tax Court and the meaning and essence of Law Day. In closing, I regret I can't offer you something tangible to sweeten the pill of taxation but I do suggest to you that we might find some comfort in a thought expressed by Mr. Justice Holmes. He remarked, "I like to pay taxes. With them I buy civilization." Most of us would agree that taxes are the price of civilization and certainly civilization is worth the price. Those of you in business similarly would agree that business overhead is necessary to turn over a profit and profit is unquestionably desirable. But, as businessmen and as citizens, it is the rare individual indeed who takes delight in the expense of overhead, whether it be for profit or for civilization. However, it is significant to note that not even the most radical groups which have any substantial following in this country have asked that Federal income tax be repealed. Unquestionably, the great majority of Americans are convinced that income taxation is essential to sustain this Nation's strength and vitality.

As you are undoubtedly aware, tax law itself has grown vastly more complicated. The courts, as a result, have had more interpreting to do. Moreover, Federal taxes gradually have reached out so that today they affect nearly every activity and nearly every person in the Nation. Consequently, the number of lawsuits has increased rapidly. This increased burden falls heavily on the U.S. Tax Court. From the bench, the law presents a static ratio—that is, as many cases are won as are lost. Regardless of how we decide, there is at least one aggrieved party for every issue. Furthermore, we can never uniformly satisfy either the taxpayer or the Government. However, partisan popularity has never been a proper judicial goal—we can only hope and promise to discharge our duties honestly and fairly as the law directs.

Not by Popular Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Not by Popular Demand," from the Wall Street Journal, issue of April 30:

NOT BY POPULAR DEMAND

Rubberstamp or wise instrument in the national interest? How you view Congress, at roughly midpoint in the session, as it speedily enacts President Johnson's domestic program is naturally going to depend on your assessment of his policies.

But whatever anyone's views, an underlying question is whether last fall's election actually was a popular mandate for all this hectic Capitol Hill activity in the areas of education, medicare, voting rights, depressed areas, poverty, and the rest. And if not, then how well is the Nation being served?

A persuasive argument can be made that the mandate Mr. Johnson received in November was, if anything, for the status quo as against Goldwater policies that seemed like abrupt departures from it. In any case, the campaign provided scant discussion of the administration's legislative plans, still less of their formidable costs; the voters were given little basis for judging those plans and costs. Many of them, indeed, professed a general impression that the President as a candidate sounded fairly conservative in matters of Federal spending and expansion.

Rather than some nebulous popular mandate for the program now unfolding, more plausible explanations for the congressional acquiescence suggest themselves.

It's not only that Mr. Johnson commands topheavy majorities in both houses and has well-publicized ways of getting his way with Congress and others. That doesn't fully account for the eagerness in his party, and sometimes in the opposition party as well, to give him what he wants—or more—with few serious questions asked.

There is also a feeling, perhaps, that the man does possess vast power of a kind not lately exercised in the White House, and that it would be not only unpolitic but futile to proffer much opposition. To the extent the feeling exists, it bespeaks a climate that is hardly the most wholesome in the history of the Republic.

A further possible reason for the congressional pace is indicated by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois: Years of spadework on some of these measures. "When we advocate a worthy cause, public opinion is finally changed or aroused in its favor. This in turn reflects itself in the election of people who support the major issues or by a change in the views of those who had previously opposed them."

Putting the matter somewhat less charitably, it might be remarked that when certain proposals hand around Congress long enough, the time comes when they are finally passed in part through sheer inertia or boredom. Measures like sweeping aid to education and social security medicare certainly fall into that category of old and weary legislative ideas.

In disassociation with Senator DOUGLAS, we doubt very much that public opinion is particularly aroused in favor of such bills, lobbies, of course, are, and other groups specially formed to put the heat on Congress; so are at least some members of the segments of the population that hope to benefit from whichever handout is under discussion. But we would guess that public opinion in general is more apathetic that anything else about the whole range of the Johnson administration's domestic policy.

It's a pity, too, because some of the things being done in this Congress will have far-reaching consequences which we or our posterity may well come to wish could be undone. Whatever else may be said of education aid, medicare, antipoverty, area redevelopment and the numerous other programs, they represent huge new assertions of Federal dominance. Each fresh intrusion, moreover, easily becomes a precedent for yet another.

Not the least cause for concern is that the Government's cost estimates are in many cases only droplets compared with the tidal waves to come as the programs continue and grow. So it may sound mildly reassuring to hear the President announce the expectation of a $1 billion reduction in the Federal deficit this fiscal year, but it tells practically nothing about the cost of Government now or in the immediate or farther future. The Government has yet to give an honest accounting of even the probable costs of the Great Society.

This, we submit, is not the status quo many thought they were voting for in November, nor even a logical extension of the New Deal, which after all was trying to combat a deep depression; too often present policy consists of radical new departures and new infringements on individual freedom of action and constitutional safeguards.

If that society of great Government actually were what the majority had voted for, it would be their privilege, however, regrettably employed. It seems closer to the truth, though, that Congress is reacting to Executive power and its own political appetites, not responding to popular demand.

Maybe the lawmakers will apply some brakes before the session is over, but so far most of them appear incapable of distinguishing between the mood of the Nation and the insatiable demands of the spenders and special pleaders for Federal hegemony.

Agate Fossils Beds National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to know that the House has passed legislation which will result in the establishment of the Agate Fossils Beds National Monument.

This action will insure the preservation of some of the outstanding paleontological sites known to man. Examples of Miocene animal life will be preserved for future generations. Mr. Speaker, we must know much about ourselves from studying our past and I know that this area in my State of Nebraska will be available to add to our ever increasing store of knowledge of our history.

I want to congratulate those who have worked so hard and given so much of their time and energy to preserving this site for us including the two generations of the Cook family and Father Robert O'Neill.

I testified for this bill before the National Parks and Recreation Committee of this House and am happy that the House acted to preserve our history.

Poor Ol' South Still Unforgiven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent article by Paul Harvey he makes a comparison of the United States relations with Germany and our present policy concerning the South.

I have found his article to be very interesting, and I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

POOR OL' SOUTH STILL UNFORGIVEN

(By Paul Harvey)

How long before the South will be forgiven?

The South lost a war 100 years ago and is still paying for it.

We forgave Germany twice in half that time.

In the 20 years since Germany fought us the last time, we've forgiven them and sent them $4 billion.

In the 20 years since Japan lost its war with us, we have forgiven Japan and sent the Japanese $2½ billion.

It has been 100 years since Alabama and Georgia and Mississippi lost their war and Washington is still forcing those States to pay to Washington six times as much as they receive in "aid."

The economic jealously which was, in large part, responsible for the uncivil war is still apparent in the present North-South cold war.

Southern Negro slaves had security but fought for freedom. Today they have freedom, seek security.

We have forgiven Germany and Japan and Spain and Mexico and everybody who ever waged war on us—except the Confederacy.

We have even promised North Vietnam reparations in advance—a billion dollars aid per year if southeast Asians will stop the war at the 17th parallel.

The Southern United States, entirely willing to accept a cease fire at the Mason-Dixon line and peaceful coexistence wherever . . . is still occupied by "the enemy."

The Southern States have surrendered unconditionally. They are no threat to the security of their neighbors. They have no territorial ambitions beyond their borders. Indeed, you never even hear of a retired southerner moving north. They mind their own business, contributing more than generously to the U.S. Treasury.

Washington would not think of meddling in the internal affairs of West Germany or Italy or Japan. It would be inexcusably bad manners. It would engender resentment. It would likely set the stage for another military confrontation.

Yet Washington approves and applauds the invasion of our own South by Yankee mobs and supports their continuing invasion with Federal troops.

Granted, the South made a mistake. It lost the war. But many others have lost many wars and Washington has generously helped the fallen to their feet, sponsored their reconstruction, reestablished their independence.

How long before the South will be forgiven?

Not one of Uncle Sam's former enemies has become a better friend. Not one has stuck with him through peace and war, feast and famine, as has this one.

Uncle Sam has no ally on whom he can count as surely as on this splendid, energetic, dynamic segment of himself.

Isn't it time to stop the masochistic punishment?

Isn't three generations of spitting on Johnny Reb's grave enough?

How long before the South will be forgiven?

Peace for Sister Faiths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years our country has worked to achieve peace in the Middle East. There may be some germ of a beginning for peace in the proposals recently put forward by President Bourguiba of Tunisia. Although the specifics of his proposal do not appear acceptable, it is encouraging that an Arab leader feels that a modus vivendi in the Middle East can be achieved.

Another plan which is extremely important is that proposed by Emanuel G. Scoblionko, president of the World Council of Synagogues. Mr. Scoblionko has urged that steps be taken to create an international committee to study the best method of establishing communication between Jews and Moslems since the religious tenets of the two are so close. In his inaugural address as president of the council, Mr. Scoblionko said:

I have for many years been disturbed by the spirit of alienation that divides the world's great religions. It seemed to me that at least the faithful, of whatever faith, who profess submission to one Father in Heaven, should sense a brotherly bond of kinship. All mankind is a family. We should, I felt, do away with whatever estrangement that exists and learn to live as a family. What better place to begin than with Islam, a direct descendant of Judaism, so many of whose adherents are first cousins to the Jews?

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following excerpts from a recent address made by Mr. Scoblionko which was published in the winter 1965 issue of the United Synagogue Review:

TOWARD JEWISH-MOSLEM HARMONY

(By Emanuel G. Scoblionko)

The Jews of America have done much to create a spirit of rapproachement with Catholics and Protestants. There exists today a far finer understanding and cordiality than existed only a decade ago. Let us as Jews now step forward and seek similar understanding and cordiality with other great religions.

Judaism is an ancient faith, the oldest living faith. Judaism is the mother religion of Christianity and Islam. We have made progress in our relations with one; let us now press forward toward better relations with the other.

Islam today has hundreds of millions of adherents in many nations of the world. Moslems worship one God. Moslems recognize the sanctity of our Bible. Moselms revere and venerate the founders and prophets of Judaism. Moselms acknowledge holy shrines sacred to Jews, such as the Cave of Machpelah. The Moslem calendar includes Nebi Musa, a holiday in honor of our Moses. Moslems name their children Ibrahim for our Abraham, Yussuf for our Joseph, Musa for our Moses, Haroun for our Aaron, Daoud for our David, Suleiman for our Solomon.

Moslems honor the major principles of the Jewish faith. Moslems esteem justice. Moslems judge men not by what they have but by what they are. Moslems teach fear of God and love of man.

These common qualities that pervade our two sister faiths cry out for closer bonds between Islam and Judaism. For many years, indeed for many centuries at a time, the destinies of Jew and Moslem were inextricably intertwined. The great Maimonides, who died exactly 760 years ago yesterday, was court physician to a Moslem prince. For centuries, Jewish scholarship and Moslem scholarship flourished side by side. Often when one community prospered, so did the other. And in our own day we see that when one is persecuted by godless nations, so is the other. We have shared and are sharing in adversity what we shared in good fortune.

As in individual families, there have unfortunately been periods of strife between the two sisters, but I am convinced that had there been close and determined efforts to nourish a sense of comradely understanding between us, many of the discordant stresses in the Middle East probably would have been averted.

Just as there is now better understanding with Christianity, so is it our duty to seek with all our hearts to create closer harmony with Islam. Eschewing political rivalries, let us as representatives of our religions seek to come together for the common purpose of enhancing the spiritual welfare of all the adherents of our two great faiths.

Let us not seek to dominate each other, to convert each other, to surpass each other; let us seek only to respect each other, to esteem each other, to love each other. With the true earnestness that becomes us as religious leaders, let us join together for harmony, respecting our theological differences but stressing our spiritual similarities and concentrating on our spiritual commonalities.

Let us take the first step toward each other as Moslem, as Jew, as child of God. As such a first step, I urge the creation of an international committee to study the best method of establishing communication between Judasim and Islam. Such a committee would survey the history of Moslem-Jewish relations and report on the opportunities that can most favorably be found or made to seek a working religious relationship between Moslem and Jewish religious leaders. And I hope that this modest beginning will prove in time to be the historic first phase in a Moslem-Jewish concord that will help bring the luster of peace to our troubled world and particularly to the Middle East.

In this era of peace under peril, religious leaders of all faiths are under a holy obligation to make every effort to resolve matters of moral moment in controversies among nations. Let us teach peace. Let us practice peace. Let us gain peace of mind through peace. And let us so live that the entire world will one day find its goal in the slogan of the World Council of Synagogues, O come let us walk in the light of the Lord.

Electricity is Key to Democracy's Salvation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in offering unconditional discussion in an effort to achieve peace and turn the energies of this Nation and those who would be our enemies from the path of war to the purposes of peace has wisely suggested the development of an important natural resource. The value of such development is discussed in the following editorial from the Sacramento, Calif., Bee of April 24, 1965, which I include under previous leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

ELECTRICITY IS KEY TO DEMOCRACY'S SALVATION

This Nation's highly successful rural electrification program, which has played such a vigorous part in the determination to build a better and more abundant life, may provide the key to southeast Asia's future.

President Lyndon B. Johnson in his major foreign policy speech called for greater cooperative effort for development of the 2,600 mile Mekong River which runs through an area inhabited by some of the world's poorest people. He said he will ask Congress for a $1 billion investment in an effort to put the vast potential of this river to work providing food, water and power to enrich their lives.

The project, under the sponsorship of the United Nations, is under way. The United States is one of 21 nations helping plan power plants, dams, experimental farms and irrigation programs.

As a part of this venture, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is providing nearly 50 experts from throughout the Nation to give technical help in developing cooperative rural electrification, rural industries and community facilities. Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the association, said cooperative electrification of the rural communities of underdeveloped nations would help the people raise their standard of living, improve their morale and serve as a bulwark against communism.

Low-cost electricity has been the mechanism by which the standard of living of so many in the United States has been elevated. U.S. Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, of California, in a speech to the association's annual meeting recently, said in a few decades the rural electrification program has brought about a revolution in the techniques of farming, invigorated rural industry and—contrary to almost everyone's prediction—paid for itself. Kuchel added:

When men of the future look back on the last half of the 20th century, let us hope they will be moved to say: "There was a generation which was a good steward of the earth and its bounty."

There is hope that the application in the backward nations of this country's ability to relieve the back breaking drudgery of daily living will be the salvation of democracy throughout the world.

The Water Quality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week the House of Representatives debated and passed by a unanimous record vote the Water Quality Act of 1965. This legislation strengthens and reaffirms our national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution.

All of the functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the area of water pollution control will be

invested in a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. The creation of this new Administration is extremely important in that it will give identity to the vigorous program which the Government will undertake to see that every possible step is taken to clean up the Nation's waters.

One of the most vital features of this bill is its recognition of the serious problem created by combined sewer systems in urban areas. The cost in time, money, and public convenience to separate combined sewers is beyond the ability of the Nation to pay, and so this bill provides for an expenditure of $20 million annually for grants to demonstrate new or improved methods to point the way toward a more economically feasible solution, primarily in the area of providing adequate treatment of waste water from combined storm and sewer systems.

The Water Quality Act also makes significant changes in the construction grants provisions for sewerage treatment works. The Federal ceiling on grants has been increased from $600,000 to $1.2 million for single projects and for multicommunity projects to $4.8 million. The 30 percent of total project cost limitation remains unchanged. One of the new features of the bill is that it makes provision for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to increase the Federal share by 10 percent of the basic grant for a project when the project is certified as being in conformity with a comprehensive plan developed for the metropolitan area in which the project is located.

The bill also expresses the urgent desire of Congress that the States assume and exercise their responsibility to define adequate standards of water quality. States which do not perform this responsibility will not be eligible for Federal funds under this act.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this legislation is in the finest tradition of Federal incentives to local and State governments to help them fulfill their responsibilities. In this connection, there is now underway in my district a grass roots campaign to arouse and enlighten our citizens to the great injury they do to themselves and their children by permitting pollution of our waters to continue. Dedicated and knowledgeable people are attempting to spread the word that water pollution is wrong, unnecessary, illegal, and, in a very real sense, immoral.

An indispensible ally in this kind of effort can be found in the news media, and without their assistance, no campaign to establish basic understanding of a problem can be successful. Recently, the Syracuse Herald-Journal, a newspaper long dedicated to the betterment of the community which it serves, has published a series of excellent articles by Gene Goshorn on the major pollution problem in the 34th district. Mr. Goshorn has done a first-rate job of producing highly readable articles, which at the same time contain technical information about the nature and extent of Onondaga Lake's pollution. I believe that these articles will make a significant contribution toward a general understanding of what is required of the citizens of Syracuse and Onondaga County.

Mr. Goshorn's articles follow.

THE WATER QUALITY ACT

(NOTE.—Cleanup of Onondaga Lake has been talked about for years. This series will discuss a dream that study shows is not pie in the sky: a lake suitable for swimming, boating, and other recreation.)

(By Gene Goshorn)

Onondaga Lake, potentially more dangerous to health than a bottle of poison, lies foreboding at the doorstep of a half million people and a billion-dollar community.

As every schoolboy will tell you, it is polluted with human and industrial waters.

Five million gallons of raw sewage a day, it has been estimated, overflow into Onondaga Creek and Harbor Brook out of dirty and partly broken-down city sewers to reach the lake.

ADDITION FROM CREEK

Nine Mile Creek, the lake's biggest tributary, carries human and industrial wastes into the 4½-square-mile cesspool.

More potentially dangerous bacteria live in Onondaga Lake, tests show, than can be found in Lake Michigan beside one of the Nation's largest cities, Chicago.

This despite the tons of antiseptic chlorine put into the lake each day by Solvay Process Co., and each summer by the Metropolitan Syracuse Sewage Treatment Plant and the Ley Creek Treatment Plant.

"No community which seeks to grow could be comfortable beside a sewer," says Economist Max Bloom, of Syracuse University.

COMFORTABLE FOR YEARS

Yet Onondaga County appears to have been comfortable for many years. Perhaps it has been economics.

Syracuse is a city today largely because of Onondaga Lake. Solvay Village likely would not have developed if not for Solvay Process Co., which needs up to 110 million gallons of lake water a day to cool equipment used to make soda ash and other chemicals.

Syracuse grew out of the salt industry that had the swampy lakeshore lined, row on row with salt drying sheds.

The "best use" today for the northwest two-thirds of the lake, State officials said in 1953, is "bathing and any other uses except as a source of water supply for drinking, culinary or food processing purposes."

BEST USED

The southeastern third and a quarter-mile section of the mouth of Nine Mile Creek was classed "best used" for fishing and any other uses except for bathing or as a source of water supply for drinking, culinary or food processing purposes.

The State says Onondagans should be able to fish or swim in the lake instead of being content with an occasional boat ride across its polluted water or a picnic within smelling distance of its littered shoreline.

No one swims in the lake today and pollution tests show no one should. Few people fish in it and those who do must be content with carp, catfish or suckers instead of the old lake delicacy, Onondaga whitefish.

Onongada whitefish, a specie all its own which once appeared on fashionable menus in New York, is as extinct today because of pollution as the saber-toothed tiger.

SHATTUCK'S VIEW

Three hundred thousand people might be attracted to Onondaga Lake if it were clean enough for swimming, County Park Commissioner J. Howard Shattuck thinks.

With swimming, the county's Onondaga Lake Park might have attracted a million people last summer instead of the estimated 700,000 it did attract.

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal, Apr. 26, 1965]

WHAT WATER POLLUTION IS: ONONDAGA LAKE OFTEN LACKS OXYGEN

(By Gene Goshorn)

Water pollution, like women, comes in various forms. Anything going into Onondaga Lake which helps to make it unsuitable for fishing and swimming—its "best uses"—is pollution.

The State calls swimming waters class B and fishing waters class C. Trout streams are classed CT. If it's to be used for swimming and fishing, Onondaga Lake must average not less than four parts of oxygen in every million parts of water.

This level of oxygen is a State standard for swimming and fishing water.

One type of pollution is called BOD. It stands for biochemical oxygen demand. It's an indirect measure of how much organic material, such as human waste, is in the water.

Onondaga Lake often has enough oxygen in the water for swimming and fishing, but other times it almost disappears.

LOSS OF OXYGEN

Sudden loss of oxygen in the water has been blamed on heaving of huge amounts of undecomposed organic matter on the lake bottom, heaving of a big layer of hydrogen sulfide (smells like rotten eggs) in the water, and the death of large amounts of algae, small water plants which produce oxygen when alive but use it when dead.

BOD is important because it uses up oxygen in the lake. Normal raw sewage from commodes and other sources has a BOD count of about 200.

BOD counts in the lake as taken by the Syracuse University Research Corp. range from nothing to 150.

The most important pollution in Onondaga Lake is bacteria, as expressed by coliform counts.

Bacteria is needed to make cheeses, and the human body couldn't digest its food without thousands of bacteria. These are the good bacteria.

BAD BACTERIA

Coliform counts in water are used to indicate the presence of bad bacteria which would cause eye, ear, and nose infections in swimmers and possibly worse.

Coliform standards from State to State vary from 50 to 3,000 for swimming areas. New York States has no standard, but State officials say it probably would be 600 to 1,000.

Coliform counts in Onondaga Lake are terrific in comparison, ranging in Syracuse University Research Corp. tests to as high as 260,000 at the Harbor Brook outlet in the fishing section of the lake.

The coliform count in the swimming area of the lake was found to range, in August and September, from 4,500 to 8,300.

The 4,500 coliform count is 90 times the count allowed in swimming areas in Utah and Washington and 5 to 7 times the likely New York limit.

An estimated 56 million gallons of raw sewage are produced in the Onondaga Lake drainage basin each day. How many gallons reach the lake untreated or only partly treated is an estimate no one in authority will make.

Industrial pollution also has turned Onondaga Lake into a 4½-square-mile cesspool. Yet, ironically, it is industrial pollution that is credited with keeping the organic lake pollution from making the biggest stink in local history.

CALCIUM CHLORIDE

Tons of dissolved calcium chloride and floating white wastes have poured into the lake from Solvay Process Co. since the company started in 1884.

The lake also naturally is very salty, containing one-fourth of 1 percent salt, about half as salty as normal seawater. If and when the lake is cleared of pollution, swimmers will find a mouthful of its water disagreeable.

But millions of people swim in the ocean and it's twice as salty as the lake.

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal Apr. 27, 1965]

WITHOUT CLOSING SOLVAY PROCESS—LAKE CLEANUP CALLED POSSIBLE

(By Gene Goshorn)

Closing Solvay Process Co.—the county's third biggest industry with an $18 million payroll—is not the price of swimming and good fishing in Onondaga Lake.

Solvay often has been held as a club over those who have tried to rid the lake of pollution for 30 years. "Cleaning up the lake will drive Solvay out of town," it has been said.

Scientific evidence collected by Syracuse University Research Corp. and others confirms something everyone already knew:

Solvay, with its 2 square miles of sterile white waste towering 70 feet into the air and draining into Nine Mile Creek, has pollution problems.

LIVE TOGETHER

But it also shows, scientists report, that Solvay and a clean lake can live together; that the problems can be solved.

The company claims it has spent much time and money unsuccessfully trying to find a use for the waste, composed largely of chalk (50 percent), calcium chloride and hydroxide (22 percent), salt and sand.

Solvay officials say the company can't afford to pipe the wastes 12 miles and bury them in the massive Solvay limestone quarries at Jamesville.

So the wastebed runoff—water so laden with dissolved calcium chloride, calcium hydroxide, and salt that fish can't stand it—mixes with Nine Mile Creek and runs ugly and chalk white to the lake.

But there's more to Solvay's problems than meets the eye.

KILLS BACTERIA

Solvay draws 110 million gallons of lake water daily for cooling purposes. It treats the water with 30 times the amount of chlorine in your drinking water, to eliminate slime.

The chlorine—undesirable in clean water—helps Onondaga Lake by killing bacteria which may carry disease. This is what Solvay means when it says the water is "purer."

But on the other hand, engineers report the cooling water comes out of Solvay 27 degrees warmer than when it goes in. This warms the already-warm lake and helps bacteria grow.

Dr. Daniel F. Jackson, Syracuse University expert on lakes, thinks Solvay could solve the water problems by reusing and cooling water over and over instead of using the lake.

SETTLING POND

The wastebed runoff problem could be reduced, technicians feel, by building a settling pond near the mouth of Nine Mile Creek to settle out the chemical particles that make the creek white.

Chemical processes also have been suggested to remove the dissolved solids in the water. "The high amount of dissolved solids in the lake is a reflection of Solvay's responsibility for limiting the fishlife," Jackson said.

Data checked with water quality guide, a widely used pollution guide, tend to confirm this.

Elimination of human wastes and other organic pollution in the lake, while cutting Solvay's need for expensive chlorine, would increase Solvay's cost in another way, Jackson says.

BOTTOM SLUDGE

There is a massive layer of hydrogen sulfide dissolved in the lake, Jackson said, because of the mass of organic wastes on the bottom. Bottom sludge is reported up to 12 feet deep.

The hydrogen sulfide layer contains no oxygen, and Solvay needs unoxygenated water to keep its cooling tubes from corroding, Jackson said.

As the lake was cleaned and the hydrogen sulfide disappeared, Solvay would have to spend money to deoxygenate its cooling water.

Beyond Nine Mile Creek at the waste beds, where even fish who survive upstream pollution cannot live, scientific data shows that all but the more delicate fish could get along.

That is, they could get along if other types of pollution were reduced.

WHITEFISH, TOO

Lake trout are out of the question at this time, but Dr. Jackson believes they can be brought in when organic pollution is controlled.

While Onondaga whitefish is extinct, Jackson says, it could be replaced by Cisco whitefish if we can curtail the organic pollution.

We should also be able to get yellow perch, largemouth bass, and white bass, a salt water fish. The lake is about half as salty as seawater.

Speaking of the lake in general and Solvay in particular, Jackson said, "Solvay, raw sewage, half-treated sewage, and industrial wastes all at once were too much for the lake."

"But the lake is becoming adjusted," he said, and can be brought back.

TREATMENT PLANTS

Meanwhile, coliform bacteria counts indicate the lake may be twice as polluted as Lake Michigan off Chicago. And Chicago is many times larger than Metropolitan Syracuse.

Syracuse dumped raw sewage into the lake for 100 years until 1925, when a simple primary treatment plant was opened. It never worked properly.

In the early 1950's, Syracuse dumped in raw sewage again for 4 years until the State complained that the lake was visibly polluted. The present Metropolitan Syracuse treatment plant was opened in 1960.

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal, Apr. 28, 1965]

'INTERCEPTOR' SEWER LINES NEED CLEANING, REPAIRING TO CUT POLLUTION

(By Gene Goshorn)

Syracuse City can keep 1.8 billion gallons of raw sewage out of polluted Onondaga Lake each year by cleaning and repairing its "interceptor" sewers report.

These sewers are massive engineers pipes which supposedly catch sewage and storm water before it flows into Onondaga Creek and Harbor Brook, and carry it to the Syracuse Metropolitan Sewage Treatment Plant.

But every day, for every 38 to 40 million gallons of waste and storm water going to the plant, engineers estimate 5 million gallons overflow directly into the creeks—and thereby into the lake.

County Sanitation Commissioner Uhl T. Mann says the city sewers are the lake's biggest polluter. And he says it won't be solved until sewage and storm water flows in separate sewers instead of one "combined" sewer.

But many engineers report, "Make the sewers we have work correctly and they can handle most of the problem."

Engineers working for the city in 1961 found enough grit and silt in the interceptor sewers to cover a football field a yard thick. City records show less than a twentieth of it has been removed.

Mayor William F. Walsh announced Sunday that the city will use urban renewal Federal aid to build a new trunk sewer—with separate pipelines for sanitary and storm drains—in Harrison Street at a cost of $680,000.

Citywide sewer separation, based on estimates from other cities reported in Engineering News-Record, might cost $35 to $89 million.

The city alone could never tackle such a costly program, officials report. State or Federal aid would be needed. But no studies ever have been made of what separation actually would cost, what effect partial separation would have and what alternatives are available.

O'Brien & Gere engineers in 1961 urged the city to launch a $425,350 interceptor sewer repair program. After 4 years, $70,000 has been spent.

A sewer cleaning program is "vital." O'Brien & Gere said, "as it is the lack of cleaning that results in the most serious pollution."

A $45,000 yearly investment in sewer cleaning, Public Works Commissioner Raymond Dodge reported, has removed 205¼ cubic yards of the 4,500 cubic yards of grit and silt O'Brien and Gere found. The cleaning program was started in 1963.

First on the list for cleaning, Dodge said, is the Harbor Brook interceptor from State Fair Boulevard to the sewage treatment plant, last cleaned in 1949.

The city can only catch up on the grit and silt problem by contracting the work out, Dodge said. City manpower and equipment are limited.

The O'Brien & Gere report urged replacement of the 35-year-old Kirkpatrick Street Pumping Station, which it found to be unsafe, inadequate and in poor operating order.

The city has removed the danger of explosion by spending $3,270 for improvements, Dodge said. The station is to be replaced in 1969.

The city interceptors, when cleaned and repaired, can handle all the city's sewage and storm water 355 days of the year, engineers report.

The remaining 10 days—the time of heavy spring rains—raw sewage will continue to overflow into the creeks and from there into the lake, engineers report.

County sanitation commissioner Mann says those 10 days are critical, as a gallon of sewage flowing into the lake today won't flow out the other end for 7 to 10 months.

Sewer separation—separating human and industrial wastes from storm waters—would handle the problem but can't be tackled by the city alone without outside aid.

But for a fraction of the cost of separating sewers, engineers report, the city can clean and repair the sewers it has and eliminate 1.8 billion gallons of sewage a year from the lake.

Syracuse for a solid century and as recently as 1950–54 dumped raw sewage into Onondaga Lake.

As a result, the lake bottom is covered with a thick, soupy sludge of undecomposed organic matter, dirt and industrial wastes. This provides much food for Escherichia coli and other types of bacteria to get healthy and strong.

The first general State antipollution law for water was passed in 1903. More have been passed since, but they're all rather toothless.

Syracuse has one man working part time in the health department to enforce these laws. He works on pollution control when not working as department radiologist.

Before John North went on this job, the city's senior plumbing inspector handled water pollution control because the city's pub-

lic health engineer post had been vacant 5 years.

The State health department isn't much better off, with 5 men trying to handle the problems of 13 counties. "We can't give much more than administrative aid," regional engineer Howard Gates said.

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal, Apr. 29, 1965]

WHO POLLUTES ONONDAGA LAKE? COMMUNITIES, HOMEOWNERS, AND INDUSTRY BLAMED

(By Gene Goshorn)

The list of who's polluting Onondaga Lake includes communities and individual homeowners as well as industry, city sewers and septic tanks, sewage treatment plants, and lake bottom sludge.

The district State sanitary engineer, Peter Guala, says there has been definite progress since the State seriously got into water pollution control here in the fifties. Guala predicts a breakthrough in 3 years.

Meanwhile, the State and Syracuse health departments list the following today as contravening standards in Onondaga Lake or in 85.4 miles of streams emptying there:

Syracuse sewers, the county-operated Ley Creek sewage treatment plant, the Camillus Village sewage treatment plant, Carrier Corp. Geddes Street plant, Crouse-Hinds Co., James Rock Spring Restaurant.

Also, a papermill discharging wastes into section of Nine Mile Creek classed as trout stream, 17 houses in Chlorine and Fabius Streets, Liverpool Village (occasionally bypasses sewage into lake), Orchard Village.

And, failing septic tanks in the Clay-Cicero Sanitary District area, to be solved by sewer district; a substantial amount of oil from unidentified Oil City company, a city meatpacking plant, storage warehouse, and other building in Water Street and an Onondaga Street laundry.

COOPERATE

Guala said all but one polluter is cooperating in correcting their problems. He said the uncooperative polluter has been referred to Albany for legal action, but loophoes in State law make crackdown a slow and difficult process.

Solvay Process Co. technically is not polluting Nine Mile Creek with its chemical wastes, Guala said, because it is classified as an F stream in that area.

The State says the best use of an F stream is "sewage or industrial wastes or other waste disposal."

A State chemist will take samples this summer, Guala said, to see if Solvay is violating the lake classification at the mouth of Nine Mile Creek.

The lake there was classed C for fishing in 1953 to accommodate the Solvay Co., Guala said, but the chemical wastes may violate the C standard.

The rest of the lake in that area is classed B for swimming, though scientific tests show no swimmer should try it.

SUBMIT PROPOSAL

Guala said Crouse-Hinds is expected to submit soon a final abatement proposal for plating acids and cyanide which now drain into storm sewers leading to Ley Creek.

Carrier Corp. is drawing up a revised abatement plan to handle sanitary and industrial wastes it pumps into Harbor Brook, according to the regional State engineer, Howard Gates, and the Syracuse health officer, John North.

Camillus Village is renovating its inadequate 160,000-gallon treatment plant, Guala reported.

Liverpool's sewage bypass problem will be corrected, County Sanitation Commissioner Uhl T. Mann reported, with evenutal construction of the $400,000 Bloody Brook Trunk Sewer.

The Orchard Village plant, overloaded, will be enlarged, Mann said.

The State Exposition dumps 5 to 10 million gallons of chlorinated sewage into the lake each summer, Mann said, and dumps in smaller amounts continually as sports and other events are scheduled.

BAD SHAPE

Ley Creek is "in pretty bad shape," Guala reported, partly because the 25-year-old Ley Creek Sewage Treatment Plant pumps 10 million gallons of partly treated sewage into it each day.

Mann, who runs the plant, freely admits the plant is 40 percent overloaded. Mann said major area industrial expansion—including treatment of Bristol Laboratories wastes—is responsible.

Normal sewage has a BOD count of about 200. Sewage entering the Ley plant averages 461 BOD, Mann reported, highly concentrated sewage. What comes out averages 194 BOD—just under normal sewage.

High BOD goes hand in hand with high bacteria counts and low amounts of dissolved oxygen in the water. BOD, biochemical oxygen demand, indicates the amount of organic material.

OPTIMISTIC

Mann said he has been experimenting to find a way to lower the Ley plant BOD for 3 years. He is optimistic about a new process being tried. But there are skeptics after 3 years.

Beyond the Ley plant, some bacteriologists and engineers interviewed believe secondary sewage treatment must be added to the big Metropolitan Syracuse Sewage Treatment Plant.

This $11 million plant—built after the town of Geddes refused to let Syracuse dump sewage sludge into Solvay wastebeds—now uses the already-polluted lake as an oxidation pond to—in effect—provide secondary treatment.

But secondary treatment in the plant, scientists report, would remove nearly all the BOD and bacteria before it gets into the lake. But Mann fears algae blooms, big growths of microscopic green plants.

Secondary treatment by electrolysis, a process used successfully in Europe, may be the answer, in the opinion of Dr. Daniel F. Jackson, Syracuse University expert on lakes.

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal, April 30, 1965]

LAKE CLEANUP WOULD YIELD 3-TO-1 RETURN

(By Gene Goshorn)

Cleanup of Onondaga Lake is the key to $50 million in industrial, commercial and community development, a top local planner has estimated.

The cost: perhaps $15 million in private and public funds, not including the cost of separating Syracuse's storm and sanitary sewers. Separation needs special study.

Private investors report that a three-for-one return on an investment is great in any language.

Yet Onondaga County as a whole today is not making the investment. If it is, its top public officials haven't got the message.

"Onondaga Lake is probably the greatest potential asset in the urban area," the Syracuse-Onondaga Post War Planning Council said in 1945.

"A city founded by water, made prosperous by water and water-borne salt, has filled in its canals, polluted its streams and turned its back on a lake that leads to the sea," planner Chloethiel Woodard Smith said last year. She meant "city" in a broad sense.

"The sources of pollution which have contaminated the waters of the lake can be eliminated as soon as the public demand is strong," the Onondaga Parkway Report stated.

That report was written in 1928.

Water pollution authorities interviewed for this series, while there is some disagreement, are largely agreed that these steps should be taken soon:

1. Clean and repair Syracuse interceptor sewers to sharply reduce a major source of raw organic pollution, such as tiolet flushings.

2. Instead of spending $5 million to pipe Metropolitan Syracuse Treatment Plant effluent to the Seneca River, add secondary sewage treatment to cut down the 8 tons of dissolved waste solids pumped into the lake daily by the plant.

3. Push improvements at the Ley Creek Treatment Plant, which is pumping 10 million gallons of inadequately treated industrial and domestic sewage into Ley Creek daily.

4. Encourage and possibly aid Solvay Process Co. to reduce the tons of dissolved chemicals which run off into the lake daily from its wastebeds. A settling pond has been suggested.

5. Support legislation to close loopholes in State antipollution laws. For example, officials discovering a polluter today can't act until a full year has elapsed—enough time for the polluter to ruin a creek or stream.

6. Chlorinate sewage treatment plant wastes beginning in February instead of May each year. Tests indicate bacteria can live 5 months or longer in the warm, slightly alkaline water of the lake.

This means that many bacteria pumped into the lake each February, March, April, and May are still there during the recreation season of June through September.

7. Increased enforcement of existing pollution laws should be provided, with larger staffs in the State and Syracuse health departments.

Everything can help, from the housewife using "biodegradeable" detergents instead of those which suds all the way to the lake, to taxpayers approving bonds for sewers.

New and different approaches to the lake are needed, says Dr. Daniel F. Jackson of Syracuse University, chairman of a scientific group seeking answers to lake pollution.

Electrolysis is the ideal secondary treatment for Metropolitan Syracuse sewage treatment plant wastes, for example, Jackson explained.

Electrolysis will use the lake's natural saltiness to advantage, produce cheap chlorine to kill bacteria, reduce the chemicals which cause "algae blooms" and be less expensive than other types of treatment, Jackson maintains.

Perhaps the greatest problem facing the lake is the apparent lack of concern that exists. "Public officials don't care because the public doesn't care," a conservationist said.

No one expects to drink Onondaga Lake water. But good swimming and fishing and new parks, marinas, motels, homes, and industries which need clean water are possible.

"Onondaga Lake was a priceless gift to this section," businessman H. H. Franklin said in 1928.

"It is difficult to imagine the state of mind which has permitted the almost utter destruction of its value to Syracuse."

Alleged Voting Irregularities in Arkansas

SPEECH

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I request that following my remarks several articles dealing with the alleged voting irregularities in the State of Arkansas be included in the RECORD.

Particularly interesting is the record of Governor Faubus' home county of Madison which reportedly in 1954 gave the Governor the votes of 100.4 percent of the eligible poll tax holders.

One article reveals that in 1961, voters in predominantly Republican Venus Township showed up at the polls to find no ballot box, no poll books, and no tally sheets, among other missing items. Evidently some of them managed to vote in neighboring townships, but one Republican official was quoted as mourning the overall loss by saying, "60 votes may not seem much, but they mean a lot in Madison County."

A number of these news stories recount the frustration of Republican officials in their efforts to copy the voting records following last fall's election. Three attempts were made in November, but the Madison County clerk, Charles Whorton, refused the Republicans each time. On November 25, a suit was filed in Madison County chancery court to produce the records. After two postpostments, the suit was heard on December 9 and a writ of mandamus issued. Immediately after the hearing the records were requested, and the request was repeated 5 days later. Then, Whorton appealed the court's decision to the State supreme court.

Republicans filed suit again, and again there were two postpostments before it was finally heard on January 6. Republicans lost the suit as Chancellor Thomas Butt ruled that the party had not supplied sufficient evidence to prove the records had been denied. So, a formal request, in writing, was made on January 8. Three days later, Republican officials returned to the clerk's office, and one of them allegedly was struck on the side of the head when he asked to see the clerk.

Relying on chivalry, as one reporter put it, four Republican women went to the clerk's office the next day and were refused in their request to see the records. On January 13, these same women tried in vain to see the Governor himself. That night all of the voting records were stolen from the clerk's office. A short time later, a reward of $1,000 was made for information leading to the arrest of the thieves, which prompted the Marked Tree Tribune to comment:

> Somehow we don't think the reward is the highest bid offered for those records, and we don't look for them to turn up anytime soon as a result of that offer.

An editorial in the Arkansas Gazette summarized the situation by stating:

> Public records ought by any rational standard to be available for copying as well as for inspection. The reason they are public records is so that interested parties can make inquiry into public business. If an election is not public business, nothing is. If Republicans are not interested parties in a general election, no one is.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot vouch for the validity of all of these charges. But I do feel that when such a volley of accusations is made by reputable persons and papers, they should be brought to the attention of the House for possible investigation by one of the committees. Certainly it is an appropriate matter for the Congress to look into while it is considering the voting rights bill.

The articles and editorials referred to follow:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, June 28, 1961]

ELECTION TROUBLE IN MADISON COUNTY: REPUBLICAN VOTERS FIND NO BALLOTS

HUNTSVILLE, June 27.—Voters in Madison County's predominantly Republican Venus Township showed up at the polls this morning only to find there were no election materials and no ballot box.

By late this afternoon election judges and clerks from the township still were unable to locate the materials and voters were having to vote in neighboring townships.

There seemed to be no explanation as to why the materials were missing or where they were—or why additional materials could not be obtained. There also was some concern among Republicans over whether it was legal for Venus Township voters to ballot in other precincts.

There are about 70 eligible voters in the township, Republican officials said, and about 60 of these are Republicans.

The GOP ran a writein candidate, Essie Barker, of Hindville, against Governor Faubus' son, Farrell, in the Madison County representative race today. Returns tonight showed Farrell Faubus way ahead.

Madison County is Mr. Faubus' home county. About half the county's voters are Republican.

"Those 60 votes may not seem much but they mean a lot in Madison County," a Republican spokesman said.

Sheriff Noah Leathem, a Democrat, said the Venus Township voters were voting in Bowen Township.

"There wasn't enough interest to hold an election at Venus," he said.

J. Dwight Steele, of Huntsville, Republican county chairman, said on hearing Leathem's statement, "No interest, huh?" He laughed, then said, "I'll have to reserve my comment on that."

Steele said that if the polling place had been changed he had not been notified. He said several voters, two election judges, and a clerk appeared at the polling place this morning.

The sequence of events in Venus Township, pieced together by telephone calls to Steele and others at Huntsville went something like this:

When the voters and the election officials, two of whom were Republicans, found no ballot box and no election materials (poll books, blank certificates, tally sheets and envelopes) they contacted Steele and asked him if he knew where the materials were.

The officials were told to check with Sheriff Leatherm and County Judge Clarence Watson. Both of these men said they knew nothing about the situation. Steele said Venue election officials were led to believe the election materials had been given to an election judge—Dewey Reynolds (a Democrat) to take to the polls.

Reynolds, who had not appeared at the polling place was found at his home. He told the officials that he had informed the county election commission he would not serve as a judge and said he didn't have any idea where the materials were.

Steele said the officials then returned to the courthouse at Huntsville and "contacted two or three people but nobody seemed to know where they (the election materials) were."

Some of the Republicans asked Judge Watson and Sheriff Leatherm how they could get additional election forms and a ballot box to open the polls in the Venus precinct.

"The sheriff said he didn't know anything about it." Steele said, "and the judge said it wasn't any of his business."

The Republicans then contacted the party's general counsel, Graham Hall of Little Rock, and asked him what to do about the matter.

Hall told them that as far as he was able to determine, the voters who were unable to secure ballots in their own precinct should vote in neighboring precincts or at the county clerk's office.

[From the Union Labor Bulletin, Arkansas AFL–CIO publication]

VOTING SCANDALS IN ARKANSAS POINT TO NEED FOR NEW LAW

Only about a third of Arkansans 21 and over vote in the most exciting of State elections, but some persons make up for the poor showing.

They vote two and three times. Some vote without knowing it. Some vote in two States at the same time. Some rise from the grave to cast a ballot.

In Stone County, for instance, 310 of the 3,441 residents who paid their poll taxes last fall, aren't on the poll tax list in the county clerk's office.

It's just a matter of honest error, Sheriff Cullen Jake Storey says of the 9-percent discrepancy between the list and the poll taxes sold.

"I've never seen a list yet that checked out 100 percent. There's always going to some names left off—by the collector, the clerk, or the printer."

Sheriff Storey, who is running for reelection, managed to sell poll taxes to 92.5 percent of the Stone County residents listed as 21 and over by the Federal census in 1960. Since the Stone County population dropped by 173 between 1940 and 1950 and by 433 between 1950 and 1960, it can be assumed that the percentage of adults who bought poll taxes last fall should be even higher than 92.5. Sheriff Storey did a remarkable job of selling poll taxes considering that, in the State as a whole, only 60.7 percent of the adults counted in the 1960 census paid the tax.

NOT UNUSUAL

There is some evidence to show that the Sheriff is right when he says errors in the poll tax list are in no way unusual.

In Lafayette County, Jack McClendon was astonished to find in 1962 the name of one of his employees, a Negro woman named Mrs. Margarine Turner, listed twice as "Margarine Turner" and "Margene Turner." Mrs. Turner was equally astonished.

They turned to another page in the book and Mrs. Turner spotted the names of her seven brothers and one sister. She said they had no business in the poll tax book because none of them had paid the poll tax. One of the brothers had lived in Texas 15 years and the sister had lived there 7 years.

The prosecuting attorney, Royce Weisenberger, of Hope, later found two affidavits to which someone had signed Mrs. Turner's name. The affidavits were used to buy poll tax receipts in her name through the mail. But Mrs. Turner didn't use the mail to pay her poll tax; she paid it in person at the courthouse.

On June 27, 1961, in Madison County, voter's showed up in the predominantly Republican Venus Township at the polls and found no election materials and no ballot box. By late afternoon of the election day, the judges and clerks were still unable to locate the materials and voters were having to vote in neighboring townships.

About 60 of the 70 eligible voters in the township were Republican.

"Those 60 votes may not seem much but they mean a lot in Madison County," a Republican spokesman said.

In December 1961 the Women's Emergency Committee for Public Schools learned from precinct workers that the returns for precinct C of the Third Ward should have been 191 votes for Ted Lamb and 21 for Dr. James

G. Stuckey. The returns had given Ted Lamb 95 votes and Dr. Stuckey 96.

On May 8, 1964, Dale D. Swain resigned from the Morrilton City Council, charging that democracy in Morrilton, Conway County, and Arkansas had failed.

In a letter to the council, Swain said that he had "watched in helpless disgust as the needs of the citizens of Morrilton have been bypassed and ignored in favor of the demands of the few. * * * Thus has democracy in Morrilton, Conway County, and Arkansas faltered and finally failed."

The Lonoke County grand jury returned no indictments after investigating the August, 1960 Democratic runoff primary for State senator, but concluded "there were many irregularities if not criminal acts committed, but they were of such a general and inconclusive nature that we did not feel any one or few persons could be singled out * * *."

One of the recommendations the grand jury made was that a voter list and certificate of judges and clerks should be posted at each polling place.

At Texarkana, a department store manager was indicted for altering ballots in the July 1960 Democratic primary.

The permanent voter registration law now being sought wouldn't eliminate all the election fraud in Arkansas. But it would help.

Each voter would have to appear in person before the county clerk to register. He would sign his own name in the registration book and the signatures would be checked when he went to vote.

No longer could poll taxes be bought for persons not present and without their knowledge.

EIGHTY CASES REPORTED OF SHODDY, ILLEGAL ELECTION PRACTICES

Illegal and shoddy election practices were reported across the State in this summer's primaries and are cause for alarm the director of the new Election Research Council, Inc., said Monday.

John H. Haley, a Little Rock lawyer who directs the group founded recently to make a detailed study of Arkansas election procedures, said some 80 reports of violations had been received from election officials, voters, poll watchers and legislators.

"Many of the reports have been confirmed," Haley said, "and I must say that our election process is in a sorry state."

He said he intended to forward reports of more flagant violations to the prosecuting attorneys for investigation.

Haley listed seven of the most common election violations of State law reported to the organization:

1. Lack of voting booths in nearly every precinct in the State, even though voting booths are required by law.
2. Widespread double voting.
3. Shoddy and haphazard counting of ballots.
4. Electioneering so close to the polls as to violate the law.
5. Failure to post voting results.
6. Illegal issuance of poll tax receipts.
7. Allowing unauthorized persons to aid in counting ballots.

"Perhaps most disturbing, because most common," Haley said, "is the obvious indifferent attitude of a number of election officials—indifference to what the law is, and indifference to that trust with which they are charged, that of seeing that the wishes of a free electorate may be expressed."

STATEWIDE REPORTS

Haley said reports have come from all over the State by mail, telephone and through personal contacts.

"By and large," he said, "the majority of reports about election irregularities point to the fact that there is slipshod administration."

Haley said that so long as there is disregard for the conduct of elections efforts to study and codify the laws will serve no purpose.

He said that lawyers, working with the council, are preparing a series of brief weekly articles illustrating violations of the law with actual examples orbserved at the polls this summer.

Haley also strenuously denied that the Election Research Council, Inc., is associated with any political candidate. He said an editorial in Monday's Gazette that indicated the belief that Winthrop Rockefeller had some role in setting up the council is in error.

"There is no money in this organization other than contributed by the board of directors," Haley said. "We have not received a dime from any candidate for political office."

He said that private individuals have indicated a desire to contribute, and are in the process of doing so.

The board, besides Haley, includes State Representative Hardy W. Croxton, of Benton County; Mrs. E. E. Elkins of Fort Smith, State president of the League of Women Voters; former State Senator Sam Levine of Pine Bluff, and Field Wasson, a lawyer and vice president of the Bratt-Wasson Bank at Siloam Springs.

Haley said the council welcomed inquiries and recommendations, which may be addressed to Post Office Box 1385, Little Rock.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Aug. 20, 1964]

ABSENTEE BALLOTING MADE TO ORDER FOR ELECTION CROOKS

(By Karr Shannon)

It is easily possible for illegal absent ballots to be of sufficient number to win an election—in county, district, or State. In fact, the State's laws setting forth the ways and means of absentee voting couldn't be more appropriate for election crooks if they had been designed solely for the purpose of vote stealing.

Section 3.1110 of the Arkansas statutes reads as follows: "Any person who expects to be absent from his voting precinct on the day of such election, or primary, may appear before the county clerk, cast his vote and seal the same. Said voter shall execute an affidavit stating, among other things, his residence, if in town or city, as accurately as the same may be done; said affidavit to be made on a form prepared by the county clerk and attached to said ballot, declaring the same to be his ballot, and said ballot and said affidavit signed by the voter."

Section 3.1111 adds: "Any person not in the Armed Forces being absent from his or her regular voting place, and in or out of the State of Arkansas, may apply by letter to the county clerk for a ballot, as provided herein, and it shall be the duty of said clerk to forward said person a ballot for the purpose of voting, and accompany the same with a statement that they are necessarily away from home, and will not vote again in the primary. Any person in the Armed Forces, being absent from his or her regular voting place, and in or out of the State of Arkansas, may apply by letter to the county clerk for a ballot, as provided herein, or any member of the family of said person or persons in the Armed Forces may apply to the county clerk for a ballot, and it shall be the duty of said clerk to forward said person a ballot for the purpose of voting, and accompanying the same with the statement that they are necessarily away from home, and will not vote again in the primary * * *."

WHAT ABOUT POLL TAX?

This law, passed in 1927, does not require the clerk to mark or stamp the voters' poll tax receipt, as is required of a judge at each precinct voting place; it doesn't even require the clerk to ascertain that the voter has a poll tax receipt. It doesn't require a man or woman writing the clerk for an absentee ballot to prove possession of a poll tax receipt. (The State constitution was amended in 1944 to permit those serving in the Armed Forces to vote without having paid a poll tax.)

There is little but a moral code and conscience to prevent an absentee voter from voting again, on the day of election, at a precinct voting place. His poll tax receipt does not show that he has voted an absentee ballot. Fact is, hundreds of unscrupulous persons may vote absentee ballots—and never leave town; they vote again on election day. There has been ample evidence to prove that people living outside the county, with established residence, still vote absentee ballots in the home county. Some have lived for years outside the State and are no longer citizens of Arkansas, but they still vote "back home" via absentee ballot. They must sign an oath, but a false oath means nothing to a person unscrupulous enough to knowingly cast an illegal vote.

RESPONSIBLES DUCK

Since the clerk is not required to make investigations of an applicant's voter qualifications, even to finding out whether or not he or she has a poll tax receipt, our absentee ballot system is wide open for graveyard voting, multiple voting, and even to the voting of persons who never existed.

Absentee balloting seems to grow more corrupt with each election. The steady increase in the number of absentee ballots cast, especially in sparsely populated counties, apparently arouses no suspicion, no interest. Grand juries do nothing about it. Sheriffs and other law-enforcement officers do nothing. Prosecuting attorneys register no alarm, certainly no aggressiveness. When such matters are brought to the attention of the State's attorney general he invariably finds some way to sidetrack or duck the issue. When the Governor is approached he seems to be vitally unconcerned.

Our absentee balloting system, as it functions, is the core of election corruption. The very laws are so designed as to invite and encourage corruption. The laws should be made stricter; the penalties for violation should be more severe; enforcement agencies should be alerted to action. If this cannot be done, then next year's legislature should repeal—in toto—the absentee ballot laws.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Nov. 7, 1962]

FBI GETS SEVERAL COMPLAINTS ABOUT IRREGULARITIES IN VOTING

The FBI said last night that it had received several complaints of voting irregularities in yesterday's general election in Arkansas, and would forward them to the Justice Department in Washington for a decision on whether to make an investigation.

A spokesman for the Little Rock FBI office said that most of the complaints concerned the handling of absentee ballots and the alleged refusal of some election officials to allow poll watchers inside the polling places. The spokesman declined to say what counties the complaints came from.

After the July 29 Democratic primary, complaints were received by the FBI that poll watchers were denied access to polling places in Conway and Mississippi Counties. A report on the matter was sent to the Justice Department, where it died, presumably because no violation of Federal election laws was involved.

U.S. Attorney Robert D. Smith, of Little Rock, said after the July 29 primary that Federal election laws dealt primarily with fraud—anything that would deprive an elector of his right to vote or of an honest count of his ballot—but did not cover matters that had no direct bearing on the results of the election.

The question of whether poll watchers may be present in a polling place during the time

of the voting is one for interpretation by the State supreme court, Smith said, since it involves State election laws. There is considerable difference of opinion among Arkansas election officials about whether poll watchers for a candidate may be in the polling place during the day, or only while the ballots are being counted.

[From the Gazette State News Service, Dec. 2, 1964]

HEARING DELAYED IN GOP VOTE SUIT

HUNTSVILLE.—Chancellor Thomas Butt of Fayetteville has continued until 10 a.m. next Monday a hearing on a suit asking that Madison County Clerk Charles Whorton, Jr., be ordered to allow Republican workers to copy the county's voter lists.

The suit was filed last week by Joe Gaspard, of Fayetteville, a fieldworker for the State Republican Committee. A hearing was to have been held Monday but Whorton's attorney was out of town.

Gaspard said that Whorton allowed Republican workers to look at the voter lists last week but that Whorton said he wasn't required to allow the workers to copy them.

[From the Times Echo, Eureka Springs, Ark., Dec. 3, 1964]

HEARING DELAYED IN GOP VOTE SUIT

Chancellor Thomas Butt, of Fayetteville, has continued until 10 a.m. next Monday, a hearing on a suit asking that Madison County Clerk Charles Whorton, Jr., be ordered to allow Republican workers to copy the country's voter lists.

The suit was filed last week by Joe Gaspard of Fayetteville, a field worker for the State Republican committee. A hearing was to have been held Monday but Whorton's attorney was out of town.

Gaspard said that Whorton allowed Republican workers to look at the voter lists last week but that Whorton said he wasn't required to allow the workers to copy them.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Dec. 11, 1964]

ODD CONTEST

It is an odd contest Democrats and Republicans are waging in Madison County. At stake is not office, honor or any other generally accepted political prize. The Democrats, in the person of County Clerk Charles Whorton, Jr., instead require the Republicans to contest for the very public records of more conventional competitions.

The Republicans finally got the Democrats into court last week, and procured an order permitting them to copy county voter lists. Even after the order had been issued, Mr. Whorton denied the Republicans access to the lists, explaining that he was planning to appeal the judge's order. The Republicans also asked to copy absentee ballot applications, and were denied permission to do so. They'll go back to court in quest of this permission.

There appears slight legal question in the case: Public records ought by any rational standard to be available for copying as well as for inspection. The reason they are public records is so that interested parties can make inquiry into public business. If an election is not public business, nothing is. If Republicans are not interested parties in a general election, no one is.

In the nature of things, a county clerk ought to be primarily an administrative officer who keeps records and performs other essentially nonpolitical functions. Democracy is in a sorry state when a county clerk has to be taken to court before he will furnish his political opposition full access to election records.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Dec. 23, 1964]

MADISON CLERK APPEALS ORDER TO OPEN LISTS

HUNTSVILLE.—Madison County Clerk Charles Whorton, Jr., has filed notice that he intends to appeal a Chancery Court order telling him to allow Republican field workers to copy the voter lists for the November 3 election.

Whorton filed a notice of appeal to the State supreme court and posted a supersedeas bond Thursday, and Tuesday a State Republican official charged that the appeal was simply a delaying tactic.

Joe Gaspard and Otto Smith, the field workers, filed suit after the election, asking for a writ of mandamus to order Whorton to allow them to copy the records. Chancellor Thomas F. Butt issued the order December 9.

Whorton's appeal will mean that the order is suspended until the State supreme court rules on the validity of the order.

Odell Pollard, counsel for the Arkansas Republican State Committee, issued a statement saying that the appeal was "simply a delay tactic that could prevent Gaspard from copying the lists for as long as 7 months if the county clerk asks for and receives a time extension."

State law requires that voters lists be kept for only 6 months after the election. After that, the records may be destroyed.

Pollard demanded an explanation for what he called the secrecy of Whorton and a few other clerks who had denied Republicans copies of voter lists.

Whorton denied that the appeal was a delaying tactic. He said he had made voter lists and other records available to the Republicans and that they had examined them. But he said he would not let them photograph the records.

"I don't know whether they can do this under the law, so I decided to let the courts decide," the Associated Press quoted Whorton as saying.

"I have not refused them anything," he said. "I have shown them everything they asked to see. This is just harassment."

Bob Scott of Rogers, attorney for Gaspard and Smith, said that Whorton had denied the Republicans even the chance to look at the records several times before the lawsuit was filed. After that, he said, Whorton allowed them to look at the records but not to photocopy them.

Scott said that the chancery court order authorized them to make photocopies of the records.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Jan. 15, 1965]

MADISON PROBE ASKED OF BAR—COUNTY SITUATION BLASTED BY HALEY

"Madison County has not become the laughingstock but has made itself the concern of the entire State," Chairman John H. Haley of the Election Research Council wrote Thursday night.

In a letter to Bruce Bullion of Little Rock, president of the Arkansas Bar Association, he commended to the bar a study and investigation of the "disgraceful situation" in Madison County.

He reviewed the efforts that he personally, and other organizations, including the Republican Party, have made in efforts to examine the November 3 voting records in Madison County, all to no avail thus far.

Now the records have been stolen. "The theft appears to have but one purpose: To conceal from the public the crimes which a study of the records would have revealed," Haley wrote.

He said the Election Research Council had evidence in the form of affidavits that nonresidents of Madison County voted with illegal absentee ballots in the November election.

[From the Arkansas Democrat, Jan. 11, 1965]

IN MADISON COUNTY: REPUBLICAN WORKER SLUGGED, SHOVED, SPOKESMAN CLAIMS

A Republican fieldman was reported slugged today as he sought to ask Madison County Clerk Charles Whorton, Jr., questions about voting records.

Truman Altebaumer, executive director of the Arkansas Republican Party, said that Carl White of Springdale, a GOP fieldman, was shoved and hit by an unidentified man in the Madison County clerk's office.

Legal action "is being contemplated" in connection with the incident, Altenbaumer said.

Four GOP fieldmen have made hourly calls in Whorton's office since Friday in an effort to ask his permission to copy public voting records, Altenbaumer said.

The four began the around-the-clock vigil after repeated unsuccessful attempts to contact Whorton, according to officials.

Altenbaumer said that the Madison County sheriff was in the hallway nearby during the incident this morning but refused to take any action.

White quoted the sheriff as saying: "I didn't see a thing.

The Republicans set up their seige Friday but Whorton was not in his office. He was on his chicken farm near Huntsville repairing a watering system.

"We're pretty busy today we have chancery and probate court," Whorton said today.

Chancery Judge Thomas Butt dismissed the GOP suit last week, saying the Republicans had not proved that they had been denied permission to photograph the absentee records.

Earlier, Butt had ruled for the Republicans in a suit in which they asked permission to photograph county voter lists. Whortion appealed Butt's ruling to the Arkansas Supreme Court. He said he wanted a final court decision on whether it is legal to photograph voter records.

"All I want is a ruling," Whorton said today. "I'm not trying to be snotty about it. I think I'm entitled to a ruling."

Whorton has been Madison County clerk for 10 years, "I'm the best little county clerk we've got in this county," he said jokingly. "My people think so, too. The local Republicans think so, too."

Of the Republican fieldmen, Whorton said, "Every time I talk to them they're either suing me or telling the newspapers a lie."

The Republicans said they left a written request to photograph the records last Friday, but Whorton said today he had not seen any request.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Jan. 9, 1965]

REPUBLICANS WAIT TO GET PHOTOS OF VOTE RECORDS AS CLERK TENDS CHICKENS

HUNTSVILLE.—Four Republican Party fieldmen waited outside the Madison County clerk's office Friday, trying to photograph voting records while the clerk worked to repair a watering system for his chickens.

The Republicans were continuing their battle to photograph voting records in Governor Faubus' home county. They have twice taken the case to court, winning once and losing once. The county had the highest percentage of absentee voting of the State's 75 counties in the general election.

County Clerk Charles Whorton, Jr., was at his farm outside Huntsville. He said he was working on the watering system for his broilers. He said he was unaware of the presence of the Republicans until contacted by newsmen by telephone.

Whorton said he did not know when he would go to the office.

The Republicans vowed to wait throughout the day and return Monday morning until they could catch Whorton.

Chancellor Thomas F. Butt dismissed a GOP suit Wednesday seeking a court order to photograph absentee voter records. Judge Butt said the Republicans had not shown that they had been refused permission to see the records.

Earlier, Judge Butt had ordered Whorton to allow the GOP fieldmen to photograph

voter lists, but Whorton appealed to the Arkansas Supreme Court, saying he wanted a final court ruling on whether such records could be photographed.

Truman Altenbaumer, executive director of the Republican State Committee, said Friday that the four fieldmen went to Whorton's office to make a formal request to photograph the absentee records, subject of the dismissed suit.

Whorton was not there, and Harrell Hughes, one of the fieldmen, said he left a written request.

Then Hughes and Otto Smith, Joe Gaspard, and Carl White took up posts outside the clerk's office, waiting in shifts of two for Whorton to appear.

[From the Commercial Appeal, Dec. 25, 1965]

EFFORTS MAPPED FOR VOTER LISTS—ARKANSAS GOP DETERMINED TO GET MADISON COUNTY PUBLIC RECORDS

(By Carl Crawford)

LITTLE ROCK, Dec. 22.—State Republicans said Tuesday they will "exhaust all remedies—civil and criminal" in courts to get access to public records in Gov. Orval Faubus' home county of Madison.

The State GOP office here lambasted County Clerk Charles Whorton, Jr., at Huntsville for denying Republicans the right to photograph voter lists there.

Governor Faubus' executive secretary, Clarence Thornbrough, said, "We'll have no comment on that—that's Republican business."

Joe Gaspard, a GOP fieldman, said he was denied access to the records at Huntsville. Madison was one of three Arkansas counties which registered more voters this fall than the 1960 Federal census showed there were citizens of voting age.

Republicans emphasized they were not asking to see anybody's vote, just a look at the official list of persons registered to vote and the list of those who voted or applied for an absentee ballot.

"Those lists are public records and have been available for copying in many other counties," the GOP State committee said. "However, in Madison and a few other counties this privilege has been denied—for reasons not yet revealed by the officials who made the denials."

Republicans took Mr. Whorton to court a few weeks ago and, after a short delay, obtained an order forcing him to open the voter lists. However, the Madison County clerk posted bond and appealed to the State supreme court.

"This is simply a delay tactic that could prevent copying the lists for as long as 7 months," said Odell Pollard, of Searcy, State GOP legal counsel.

"We need the lists of voters to aid us in making a detailed analysis of the last general election," Mr. Pollard said. "This will help us prepare a more effective program for reaching the general public with our principles of government."

Winthrop Rockefeller, defeated by Governor Faubus November 3, has pledged to run again in 1966.

[From the Arkansas Democrat, Jan. 12, 1965]

MADISON DOOR SHUT IN WOMEN'S FACES BY DEPUTY CLERK

Four women representing the Arkansas Republican Party arrived in Huntsville today in an attempt to see the county clerk and the door was slammed in their faces.

The four's journey into Madison County was the latest effort by the State Republicans to gain permission to copy or photograph absentee voting records.

The deputy county clerk, Mrs. Rena Stewart, saw them coming and shut the door in their faces.

The women knocked on the door and Mrs. Stewart opened the office.

"I know who you are and what you're doing here," Mrs. Stewart told the visitors.

One of the Republican women, Mrs. Mildred Norman, of Little Rock, told the deputy clerk, "This (courthouse) is a public place and we're here on public business.

The four women planned to remain at the courthouse until it closed today. It was not known whether they will remain in the area and try again Wednesday.

This information was called into the GOP headquarters at Little Rock by the women. Truman Altenbaumer, executive director of the State Republican Party, released it to the Democrat.

The other three women on the trip are Mrs. Leona Troxell of Rose Bud (White County), Mrs. Marta Mathews of Heber Springs, and Mrs. Verna Cobb, of North Little Rock. All four volunteered to make the trip.

The Arkansas Republican Party has been trying to copy or photograph the Madsion County absentee voting records since the middle of November and Charles Whorton, Jr., county clerk, recently received a court order to turn over one set of records but has appealed the order to the Arkansas Supreme Court.

Mrs. Troxell, president of the Arkansas Federation of Republican Women, volunteered for the Huntsville mission, saying, "Surely they won't attack a woman."

The Republicans did not want to send their male field representatives back to Huntsville without police protection.

White said he was struck in the county clerk's office by an unidentified man as he approached Whorton to ask permission to see the voting records. He said the man pushed him, hit him with his fists, and picked up a paperweight and threatened him.

A Republican official at Little Rock said legal action is being considered in connection with the assault on White.

FAUBUS REFUSES TO SEE GOP WOMEN WHO WANT MADISON VOTE RECORDS

The four Republican women who say that absentee voting records in Madison County were denied them went to the Capitol Wednesday to complain to Governor Faubus.

Mr. Faubus said he regarded the visit as a publicity stunt and refused to see them.

Furthermore, he said, county controversies are not a part of the responsibilities of a State administration.

The Governor said in a prepared statement: "If you had contacted me in a proper manner, I would have conferred with you. I do not wish to be a part of a publicity stunt, as you invited the press and appeared here before I knew anything of your presence."

The statement was distributed to Mrs. Mildred Norman and Mrs. Verna Cobb, both of North Little Rock, Mrs. Leona Troxell of Rose Bud (White County), president of the Arkansas Federation of Republican Women, and Mrs. Marta Mathews of Heber Springs, by C. R. Thornbrough, the governor's executive secretary.

The Governor remained in his private office a few feet away behind a closed door. Mr. Faubus was holding a staff conference with his department heads when the women arrived.

The State Republican Party office notified news media that the women were enroute to the Capitol. Thornbrough noted this although he avoided saying point-blank who called the press.

"We didn't," declared Mrs. Norman. "We understood the Governor is available to the public. I heard him say on television that he is available to see any citizen at any time."

"Shameful," commented Mrs. Cobb after she read the Governor's statement.

Mrs. Norman said the group wanted to see Mr. Faubus because he was from Madison County and his influence could get the absentee voting records open to them for inspection. They also want to photograph the records, which they say are public and should be open to all.

[From the Araknsas Democrat, Jan. 17, 1965]

HERE'S LONG STORY BEFORE MADISON'S VOTE LISTS VANISHED

A step-by-step account of Republican efforts to copy Madison County voting records has been released by GOP officials.

The effort began in November. Last Thursday, the records vanished from the courthouse at Huntsville. The sheriff said they had been stolen.

Following is the chronological summary of events in the continuing controversy:

"November 4, 1964: John Haley, chairman of the Board of the Election Research Council and two colleagues went to Huntsville to check absentee ballots. Haley talked with County Clerk Charles Whorton and asked him to let him see the absentee ballot applications for the county. Whorton replied that they were locked up and that he did not want to open the safe with so many people around. When Haley insisted, the men allegedly were threatened and told to leave town.

"November 16: Dotson Collins, Madison County chairman for the Republican Party, went to the county clerk's office and requested permission to copy the absentee voters' list. He was told that he could see the list, but couldn't make a copy.

November 23: Joe Gaspard and Otto Smith, GOP fieldmen, went to the county clerk's office to ask for: 1, access to list of voters in November 3 general election; 2, list of persons applying for absentee ballots, and 3, applications for these absenteen ballots. After the first request, they were told by the county clerk that they could have no records.

"November 25: Gaspard and Smith filed suit in Madison County chancery court for writ of mandamus (which is an order from the court requiring the county clerk to produce the records). A hearing was set for 10 a.m. November 30.

"November 30: Arrived for hearing to find that Whorton's attorney was out of town. Case was postponed and rescheduled for December 7.

"December 7: Gaspard and Smith with Attorney Bob Scott (of Rogers), and witnesses arrived for hearing. The case was postponed on a technicality and rescheduled for December 9.

"December 9: The suit was heard and a writ of mandamus issued, requiring county clerk to show the voters' list. Judge Thomas Butt refused to act on the other two points, saying that they had not been a part of the original request. Immediately after the hearing Smith and Carl White, a national committeeman fieldman, requested the other records.

"December 14: Gaspard and White again requested the same records in writing.

"December 16: The first case was appealed by County Clerk Whorton to the State supreme court.

"December 17: The second suit was filed and set for hearing at 10 a.m. December 23.

"December 23: The suit was reset after the sheriff said he couldn't find Whorton in time to serve the summons 2 days before the hearing.

"December 30: Whorton did not appear for the hearing. Hit attorney reported that he was ill, and after Scott's insistence presented a doctor's statement. Hearing was postponed until January 6.

"January 6, 1965: Chancellor Thomas Butt ruled that the Republican Party had failed to provide sufficient evidence that the county clerk had denied access to the records.

"January 8: A formal request, in writing, was made and left with Mrs. Rema Stewart in the county clerk's office by Harrel Hughes, a GOP fieldman. Whorton was not there, but the county judge, the sheriff, and the

county assessor were present. The county judge told Mrs. Stewart: 'You haven't heard a word he (Hughes) said.' Hughes and three others with him, (Smith, Gaspard, and White), turned to leave, and the judge said 'You're going to have a * * * long wait.'

"January 11: The four fieldmen (Gaspard, Hughes, Smith, and White) returned to the clerk's office. When White asked permission to see the clerk, after the men had been ignored for approximately 45 minutes, he was hit on the side of the head by an unidentified assailant.

"January 12: Four volunteer GOP workers, Mrs. Leona Troxell, of Rosebud, Mrs. Martha Matthews, of Heber Springs, Mrs. Verna Cobb and Mrs. Mildred Norman, both of North Little Rock, went to the county clerk's office to request the records and were refused.

"January 13: These women went to the Governor's office to enlist his aid and were refused audience.

"January 14: Announcement came that the records had been stolen from the county clerk's office sometime during the night of January 13."

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Dec. 8, 1964]

VOTER LISTS

A hearing on an effort by Republicans to copy Madison County voter lists has been postponed by Chancellor Butt, of Fayetteville. The lawyer for Charles Whorton, Jr., the Madison County clerk, was out of town Monday, the date the hearing had been scheduled. It has been reset for tomorrow.

We do not pretend to be versed in the law but it seems outlandish that any sort of court action should be required to permit Republicans, or any other interested parties, to make copies of official voter lists.

If election records such as voter lists and absentee ballot applications are not now fully public records, corrective legislation should be an early order of business in the next legislature. The stake, after all, is the right of citizens and political parties to inquire into the conduct of elections.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Apr. 14, 1965]

THE MADISON RECORDS

Charles Whorton, Jr., the Madison County clerk, has told the State supreme court there's no reason to rush a decision on whether absentee voting records can be viewed and photocopied by interested citizens.

Whorton noted that the records Republicans want to photocopy have disappeared; which they sure have, from the unlocked vault in Whorton's office and out an unlocked back door to the courthouse. They disappeared while Mr. Whorton was contesting in court the right of Republicans and other citizens who wanted to see the records had been put off by Mr. Whorton, threatened with jailing by county officials, threatened with violence by courthouse hangers-on and, in the case of one Republican hired hand, clouted on the ear.

Mr. Whorton suggests that the supreme court take its time in deliberating his appeal, and pledges that if the voting records are recovered he will notify the supreme court at once. Jolly of him but we hope the supreme court will move with all deliberate dispatch to establish the right of citizens and taxpayers to view and copy public records. We are no more hopeful than we take Mr. Whorton to be that the Madison County records will turn up but a supreme court decision early on could prevent another protracted court fight in some other county—during which burglars might conceivably strike again.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Jan. 13, 1965]

RESORT TO CHIVALRY

By a more or less natural progression, the right to full access to public records in the Madison County courthouse has come to hinge on the presumed chivalric constancy of the courthouse's distinctly shaggy habitants.

The Republican position is that the courthouse crew would never hit a lady, not even if failure to do so should imperil the secrecy of the legally public absentee voting records that the Republicans want to examine.

A Republican hired man who entered the courthouse Monday to petition for a look at the records alleges that he received a clout on the ear.

There were no disinterested witnesses to the alleged slugging: One of the troubles with Madison County is that a disinterested witness is as rare there as a gentleman of the western school in the horde of Ogotai Khan. The "furrin" press was not on hand, having itself been repulsed by threats of violence on its last known visitation, election day, November 3.

The appeal to chivalry may solve the problem and win the Republicans a chance to look at the records but we continue at least mildly skeptical. A Republican or any other enemy agent trying to find out how a Madison County election has been conducted runs essentially the same risks as a Negro trying to register to vote in Mississippi, with the difference that the Federal Department of Justice is not maintaining even sporadic oversight over the performance of the courthouse ring and its hangers-on at Huntsville.

That no more prosaic remedy than the appeal to chivalry suggests itself is a measure of how encompassing the ring has proved to be. A grand jury inquiry? Heh! An appeal to the Governor for State troopers to keep the peace and insure the physical safety of visitors to the courthouse? Heh! Heh! Heh!

We admire the Republican ladies immensely, and wish them all the best in their storming of the courthouse. While their faith in Madison County chivalry is surely not misplaced, they may wish to couple some discretion with their faith, and go decked in crash helmets.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Jan. 15, 1965]

QUIET, PLEASE

Restrain, faithful reader, those dark sniggers about the burglary of the Madison County Courthouse. It was shockingly inefficient of the Madison County management to leave the back door of the Courthouse and the door to the county clerk's vault both unlocked. But there is good reason to believe that the burglary itself stemmed from the purest of humanitarian motives. It was, we suspect, committed by gentle souls whose sole motive was the avoidance of bloodshed. It was an outside job, in the spirit of the Mahatma.

One of the things that became clear early on in the Republican inquiry into the Madison County general election was that somebody could easily get bad hurt, and maybe even killed, if the Republicans and the other snoopers didn't go away and let Madison County's Democratic Courthouse ring rest quiet on its triumph of November 3. Indeed, by Monday, a GOP fieldman already had suffered what he alleged was a clout on the ear while standing watch at the Courthouse in an effort to intercept the county clerk, and thus lay the groundwork for further legal proceedings. Much earlier, there had been stern cautions from Madison's county officials and cruder warnings from Courthouse hangers-on.

Whoever carried off the election records Wednesday night they might have saved the Courthouse Democrats one embarrassment or another, but he may also have saved some poor Republican's life. We trust that the humanitarian aspect of the mission will be borne in mind when, as surely will happen, the Madison sheriff's office and the Arkansas State Police have tracked down the malefactors and they stand before the bar of justice, naked to the harsh punishments which this State traditionally imposes upon those who defile democracy at its source.

EXPLANATION

After one of the more eloquent silences in his career, Governor Faubus got around Friday to discussing the theft of election records from the Madison County Courthouse.

He explained that Repubican inquiries into absentee balloting in the State are a scheme to build Winthrop Rockefeller a list of out-of-State voters for 1966.

As Mr. Faubus said, compilation of such a list would be "a pretty smart move."

We have no information on whether the Republicans are looking for vote fraud in the course of compiling a list or compiling a list in the course of looking for vote fraud. What we do know is that they by now have quite a list of absentee voters, along with quite a list of irregularities in absentee and other balloting. Nor does burglarizing a courthouse to frustrate Republican politicking go down more than marginally better than burglarizing a courthouse to frustrate Republican inquiries into vote fraud.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Jan. 15, 1965]

GOVERNOR HAS NOTHING TO SAY

Governor Faubus wouldn't comment Thursday on the disappearance from a vault in the Madison County Courthouse of some voter lists that Republicans want to see.

Mr. Faubus, whose home is in Madison County, attributed the repeated failure of Republican workers to see the lists as sheer stubbornness on the part of county Democratic officials.

As for the disappearance of the records and the effect this might have on the county image, Mr. Faubus had no comment. He said he wanted to avail himself of the facts before he made any statement.

He promised a statement later.

[From the Marked Tree Tribune]

THE HIGHEST BIDDER

There's a flyer out these day's offering a $1,000 reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of the party or parties responsible for the theft of the voter records in Madison County, Ark. Somehow we don't think the reward is the highest bid offered for those records and we don't look for them to turn up anytime soon as a result of that offer.

Apparently much was at stake in that tawdry development. It must have been, if the Governor of the State would refuse to see a delegation of women protesting the Madison County clerk's refusal to make the records public—and if a circuit judge would refuse to back up a court order he had given to make those records public—and if another court would dawdle along about an obviously unnecessary ruling on whether the law forces the clerk to make those records public.

The Madison County story ranks alongside the Conway County story in its involvement of the justice of the courts with the fortunes of political machines, at both county and State levels. We'd call both real horror tales when viewed in the perspective of the democratic processes.

Obviously $1,000 is peanuts when compared to the control of a county, much less a State. Any concrete evidence that might rock the pleasure boats of the men in positions of power has to be concealed—or discredited through the use of some agency of government, including the courts if they are available for such perversion.

It might be well to keep in mind that what is being bid for here is a vestige of our freedom and our rights as citizens in a State that supposedly operates on democratic principles. To allow such precedents to go unchallenged is dangerous business.

It is time the responsible citizens of Arkansas entered their own bid in this deadly game. Their elected representatives in the general assembly should be flooded with protests. You can johnny well bet that if some professor in a State educational institution were accused of Communist leanings, the legislature would jump at the chance to investigate him—why not an investigation of practices that smack of demagoguery in the lowest Communist or Fascistic tradition?

We realize that such an investigation is not forthcoming at the moment because it would be a real political liability for any man to lead it, in view of the current State administration. But the people represented in the legislature, who care about retaining a semblance of integrity and democratic action in our State, could make it a political liability not to act.

These citizens could outbid both the Democratic Party's administration in this State and the Republican Party with a bunch of 5-cent stamps and phone calls in the interest of some precious commodities called individual freedom and fair and impartial justice.

[From the NLR Times, July 1, 1964]

THE FEAR OF VOTING BOOTHS

Why are people scared of voting booths? Mayor Laman said he thought they were a great idea. An ordinance was drawn up to appropriate $2,438 to build 50 of them. The city council has been considering it for a month but they still haven't taken any action on it. The mayor, who, apparently, has cooled off a bit on the idea, said that he can't even get an alderman to introduce the ordinance. Little Rock's city officials turned thumbs down, saying they'd rather spend their money on voting machines, which are other things that politicians also are afraid of. Then there's the Pulaski County Election Commission. It was one of their group, Dr. Wayne Babbitt, of North Little Rock, who came up with the idea in the first place. Excellent suggestion, said the other election commissioners when they heard about it, and they posed for pictures alongside a pilot model of the booth.

What's wrong? What's the holdup? Well, one excuse is that booths might delay the voting process even more. But this is ridiculous since the voters wouldn't have to use the booths if they got tired of waiting; they could take their ballots over to the windowsill, or rest them on the fender of a firetruck just as they've been doing all these years. And there's another reason—one that people don't like to talk about. Dr. Babbitt is a (don't look now) Republican. Any ideas advanced by Republicans are even less popular with incumbent Democratic politicians than those put forward by women, college professors, and editorial writers. Then, there's the problem of money. The political parties, who are responsible for the primary elections, have said that they certainly won't foot the bill. The city thinks the election commission ought to pay. But the election commission doesn't have any money. So if the county pays, it'll have to be paid by the county judge, and the election commission is afraid he won't like this. The only thing really clear about this is the law:

"All officers upon whom the law imposes the duty of designating polling places shall provide in each room designated by them as a polling place one booth, or compartment, for each 100 electors, or fraction of 100, voting there at the last preceding election, and furnish the same with a table, shelf, or desk for the convenience of electors in preparing their ballots."

Some people—those who are tired of people looking over their shoulders when they vote, tired of politicians' refusing to do anything to improve election procedures and turning their backs on carelessness and law violations—would like to know what happens next. If anything.

[From the Pine Bluff Commercial Appeal, July 1, 1964]

NEW LIFE AND OLD LAW

Jefferson County Clerk E. Allen Sheppard has refused to let a Republican field worker take a look at the list of voters who cast ballots in last year's general election.

The Republican, Marion R. Farmer, quoted the law to back up his request. Mr. Farmer cited Act 353 of 1947:

In every election held in this State, the two clerks * * * in each precinct * * * shall, each, make and keep an accurate list, in duplicate, of all persons voting in such precincts * * *. The original of such list filed with the county clerk shall be kept on file by said clerk in his office and shall be a public record subject to inspection by any candidate or any other person interested therein, but no candidate or other person shall be permitted to take the same out of the clerk's office.

Mr. Sheppard did not take issue with Mr. Farmer's law, but the county clerk felt that the request was too unusual to be granted without a court order.

Said Mr. Sheppard: "I'd rather be on the safe side * * * I never had anyone in 16 years ask to see the list that was made at each precinct at the time the voters went in to vote." So Mr. Sheppard suggested that Mr. Farmer get a court order.

If the Republican Party continues to grow in what has been a one-party State for so long, then a number of political practices that are now unusual may become commonplace—like checking the list of voters in separate precincts to see if anyone voted twice.

According to Mr. Farmer, checking the completed list would "help us determine if one person has voted in more than one box, more than one county, and even in more than one State."

One indictment of the hold that one-party politics has on this State is that a simple check like this one, specifically authorized by law, should be unusual enough to require a court order.

In this instance, the one-party system has led to keeping public records private until a court says otherwise. Being on the safe side, in this instance, has come to mean not obeying the law until the court says so.

The county clerk's hesitation in this case is understandable. The State has had a one-party system for so long that a request from the Republican Party for a look at the voting list ranks alongside the sight of a dinosaur grazing on Barraque Street.

One advantage of a two-party system would be to inject new life into some voting safeguards too often followed only in the lawbooks.

[From the Pine Bluff Commercial Appeal, Aug. 19, 1964]

THOSE IRREGULARITIES

The genteel call them election irregularities. Legislators pass laws against them. The Governor has snubbed them as unworthy of his attention.

But they still keep appearing. This time in Hot Springs, according to Prosecutor David Whittington. Mr. Whittington says he was turned up two cases of fraudulent voting in the Democratic primarily runoff last Tuesday.

Election procedure is the basis of effective government in a republic—that is a truth as obvious as it is ignored by the present State administration, which has persistently refused to investigate charges of ballot box fraud in Conway County.

Now the blight has appeared in Hot Springs, according to both Prosecutor Whittington and the chairman of the Democratic Central Committee in Garland County.

This ought to be grist for the newly formed Election Research Council. Incentives for better voting laws abound in the State of Arkansas. The voter registration law on the November ballot represents one needed reform. The research council may not have to do extensive research to come up with more. Like a politician-proof secret ballot, for instance.

Certainly action is needed from some quarter. In the past, the State administration has adopted a policy of incredible patience toward violations of the law in Garland County. To quote the words of a ballad the Rockefeller people are singing:

"I'm a rovin' gambler,
I've gambled all around;
And for nine long Faubus years
Hot Springs has been my town."

It would be equally farcical if the State waited as long to act in this matter.

What this State needs is a Governor who can manage to get around to enforcing the law before the statute of limitations becomes a factor in the case.

Orval Faubus says he is "a little suspicious" that the Election Research Council is connected with Winthrop Rockefeller.

The Governor has a point: The Election Research Council says that it is in favor of honest elections. Winthrop Rockefeller says that he is in favor of honest elections.

Mr. Rockefeller actually has gone on record in favor of the concept: "I believe that honest elections are essential to the preservation of a democratic society, and that conduct which interferes with this process should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. I will do all in my power to eliminate election frauds and abuses in Arkansas, so that the true 'will of the people' shall govern our State in the best tradition of democracy."

That suggests that the newly formed Election Research Council is in cahoots with Mr. Rockefeller. It proves that the council is engaged in an open conspiracy, together with every citizen of the State who believes in fair and honest elections, to prevent election frauds in Arkansas.

No one could make this charge stick against Orval Faubus, who has steadfastly refused to investigate those election irregularities in Conway County.

The Governor has gone so far as to assure citizens that the crime of double voting is at an absolute minimum.

That may say a good deal more about Orval Faubus' tolerance than it does about what constitutes an absolute minimum.

[From the Pine Bluff (Ark.) Commercial Appeal, Aug. 20, 1964]

OFFICIAL SAYS VIOLATIONS NECESSARY TO SPEED VOTE

(By Brenda Tirey)

The chairman of the Jefferson County Election Commission said yesterday that certain violation of election laws are necessary and practiced to speed vote tallying.

Garland (Pete) Brewster, Jr., commission chairman and also chairman of the Jefferson County Democratic Central Committee, told a reporter for the Commercial there were violations but defended them.

Brewster also said he thought the election laws ought to be overhauled so that they could be compiled with more easily.

The reporter's interview was prompted by a report released by the Election Research Council, a nonpartisan organization of Little Rock. The report said there had been gross violations of the laws in the recent Democratic primary.

John Haley, director of the council, said that the more flagrant violations around the State were lack of voting booths, double voting, counting ballots in a way to invite miscounts, electioneering around the polls, illegal issuance of poll tax receipts and use of unauthorized persons to help count ballots.

Brewster said there were no real voting booths used in Jefferson County, but that there were tables with partitions to separate the voters at all polling places.

The law requires three judges and two clerks at each polling place. When the votes are counted one judge is to read the results

from a ballot while a clerk writes them down. Then a second judge reads the results and a second clerk is to write them down. The third judge verifies the vote.

"If we used such a procedure at elections, which are held on Tuesday, we'd still be there Thursday," Brewster said.

In Jefferson County, the ballots are divided equally among the election officials and each counts the votes by himself, Brewster said. Any judge or clerk has a right to challenge the results, he said.

"It would be impossible to get judges and clerks if you had to count like that (according to law)," Brewster contended.

Are any unauthorized persons used to count ballots?

Brewster said that sometimes when there had been a heavy vote, he had sworn in two or three persons at 6:30 p.m. to help count ballots at the heaviest boxes.

"All I care about is that the candidates and issues get an honest count," he said.

He said the caliber of people who were used as judges and clerks here insured that there would be honest counts.

"I have never known of an instance of double voting or use of an unauthorized poll tax here," Brewster said.

He said he doubted that many changes would be made in the election procedures because of the council's study.

The council said it had six fieldmen to watch the polls during last month's primaries. Brewster said he didn't know if any of them were here.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Aug. 23, 1964]

THE LITTLE THINGS

Nothing is more natural than that a man who had once received the votes of 100.4 percent of eligible poll-tax holders should have his own rather specialized view of minor election irregularities. Governor Faubus, who got that kind of a vote in the Madison County runoff primary in 1954 (while Francis Cherry was getting another 1.6 percent), suggested on Tuesday that while double voting was intolerable such minor violations of the law as failure to post the count at the polling place and electioneering too close to the polls must be viewed, if we understood him, philosophically.

"These things don't influence the outcome of the election or question the honesty of election officials or the correctness of the vote." the Governor explained.

Well, no, we don't suppose they do, except maybe once in a while. But an election judge who was planning to run himself up a revised set of returns on the long drive to the courthouse would be a pure fool to leave an unrevised set of returns on the wall of the polling place, now wouldn't he? And maybe that's one reason posting of returns outside the polling place is required by law. The problem with forgetfulness on the point is that it raises the suspicion of fraud. Nor does it seem to us that this kind of an irregularity ought to be so terribly difficult to correct. The count does eventually get to the courthouse in just about every case, along with the ballot box and the other paraphernalia of the election. It oughtn't be a terrible strain on precinct election officials to make sure that the posted copy just as surely finds its way onto the wall of the polling place. But we can expect that some election judges and clerks will go on forgetting this precaution so long as the State's Governor suggests that it ought not to be taken very seriously.

Passing out campaign literature too close to the polling place is another of those little things that can be presumed to count. The prohibited area around the polling place—100 feet in all directions—is of course arbitrary. But without rigid observance of such an arbitrary restriction, what is to keep electioneering and campaign materials from being passed out in the polling place itself—perhaps by the judges and clerks, as is alleged to have been the case with stickers for a write-in candidate for Congress in an election of relatively recent memory.

In running off honest elections, it's those little things, along with the big ones, that count.

[From the Pine Bluff (Ark.) Commercial Appeal, Oct. 16, 1964]

WHO NEEDS POLL WATCHERS?

James L. Bland, who is managing Orval Faubus' sixth campaign for Governor, stopped in Pine Bluff Tuesday night to deliver a campaign speech.

Mr. Bland whiles away the time between campaigns as director of the State employment security division. This sort of biennial migration from the State capital to the campaign trail is an accepted, if not acceptable, practice among the men Orval Faubus has appointed to high office in the State.

Another of the Governor's campaigners, J. Orville Cheney, acts as State revenue commissioner during the off-season.

That such blatant conflicts of interest inspire little criticism indicates (1) the enormity of the Governor's indiscretions that do draw criticism; and (2) the apathy that 10 years of Faubusism has encouraged.

But back to Mr. Bland and Tuesday night: In a gesture of largesse befitting the frabjous machine, Mr. Bland announced that the Democrats were not going to use poll watchers in November.

The machine's performance in some Arkansas counties may explain why. Madison County, for example: In the second primary of 1954, Orval Faubus received the vote of more than 100 percent of all poll tax holders in the county. Who needs poll watchers with a response like that?

Lest anyone think that this display can be explained away by the enthusiasm of Madison County for a home-grown product, there is the case of Stone County, where a grand total of 3,441 poll taxes have been sold. Which is pretty impressive when one considers that the county's poll tax list contains only 3,131 names.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Little Rock (Ark.), Feb. 28, 1965]

LEGISLATIVE SOLUTION FOR ELECTION PROBES

The legislature has finally acknowledged the diligence of the Election Research Council and the Republican Party in inquiring into election irregularities.

Too predictably, the legislative response is to seek to hamstring further inquiries of the kind.

House bill 575 by Representative Hilburn of Lawrence County, would prevent public inspection of voting records, limiting such inspection to people involved in election contests.

Mr. Hilburn is sometimes more candid than perhaps he realizes. His bill would, he says, prevent troubles such as have occurred in Madison County and Howard County.

In Madison County, trouble took the form of a burglary, wherein election records were carried out of an unlocked vault and then through the unlocked back door of the courthouse. The Republicans who had been trying to get a look at them never did, and now presumably never will.

In Howard County, the Election Research Council claimed last weekend, signatures have been forged on seven absentee ballot applications, and on other absentee voting papers.

The Election Research Council has since been the target of bitter criticism in the State senate and the ERC chairman, John Haley, has made an appearance before the Howard County Grand Jury. There have been conflicting accounts of what Mr. Haley told the grand jury. The grand jury has branded the charges of election irregularity as false and has alleged that they were politically inspired. Yet it has not explicitly denied the Election Research Council's central allegation, that voting forms were signed by people other than the voter, in violation of the law.

One of the questions unanswered is how the grand jury discovered, in its session with Mr. Haley, that his organization was politically animated. An even larger question is what difference this should make. It would be far better if factfinding on election irregularities could be performed by groups and individuals without political bias, and our belief is that the Election Research Council is acting without political bias. But what matters is that the elections be cleaned up, and in any irregularity in any field the most likely complainant is the aggrieved party. In the field of voting, that is the defeated candidate or the "out" party.

In proposing that examination of election records be permitted only in election contests, Representative Hilburn is really proposing that election conduct be left in the condition it was in before the Republicans developed serious pretensions as a second party and before the Election Research Council came into existence. This condition does not strike us as satisfactory and we are dubious that it strikes most Arkansans as satisfactory. Election irregularities are not something dreamed up by the Republicans and the Election Research Council. They are presumed to exist by virtually every Arkansan of our acquaintance; they are one of the richest sources of reminiscences by veteran politicians; they are abundantly confirmed by the factfinding the Election Research Council and the Republic Party have done in the past 6 months.

We do not call to mind a single grand jury investigation or election contest in court that has not produced incontrovertible evidence of irregularity.

Nor is there any mystery why the irregularities have continued: Their perpetrators have not been prosecuted.

In the Sceeton-Gunter contest of 1960, diverse and massive irregularities were found to have occurred in both Prairie and Lonoke Counties. Yet only two election officials were ever convicted—and these two for having bet on the election.

The Election Research Council's inquiries into last November's election have produced only embarrassed silence on the part of prosecutor after prosecutor.

In Jefferson County, the Pine Bluff Commercial conducted its own investigation, and alleged that a number of absentee ballot applications and other documents had been forged. The Commercial published some of its evidence—in the form of photostats of the documents. But there has been no action even to inquire into the charges.

The pattern will, we think, continue for a while—perhaps until prosecutors are called upon, in their campaigns for reelection, to explain their inertia.

But we don't think Arkansans will stand for clapping a lid on election inquiries by the Republicans and the Election Research Council. Let the legislature try it, and it may take more irregularities than can be dreamt on to get the same bunch back in 1967.

[From the Morrilton (Ark.) Democrat, Mar. 4, 1965]

FAULKNER JUDGE TELLS GOP: Go!

Faulkner County Judge T. D. Reedy has ordered Republican Party representatives to refrain from copying election records from the November general election.

Gene Young, of Morrilton, a GOP representative, had gone to the Faulkner County courthouse Monday and obtained permission to copy the records from County Clerk L. J. Merritt.

Young and a friend were almost through copying the absentee applications when Reedy appeared and ordered him to get out and take his equipment with him.

"There'll be no picture taking in this courthouse without the permission of the county chairman. I'm the county judge so just bow out now until you hear from me," Reedy was quoted as saying.

Reedy also told Young: "I'm going to see a lawyer about what you're doing."

The GOP has experienced some difficulty in copying the public records in some counties since the November 3 election. In Madison County, for example, a GOP representative was assaulted and the records were reported "stolen" by the county officials.

A SMALL STEP FORWARD

(NOTE.—In the wake of a Poinsett County Grand Jury investigation of alleged voting irregularities in the county, the Marked Tree Tribune had this to say.)

Poinsett County took a small step forward toward honest elections last week when a grand jury saw fit to stay in session over a week considering evidence regarding voting irregularities.

It was obviously a bit disappointing to those persons who had spent countless hours gathering evidence regarding those obvious irregularities that the grand jury's report turned out to be only a vague wrist slap rather than a call for more vigorous action in the courts.

But we have to view even the mild action of the grand jury as a real bit of progress in this county, where for so long there has been absolutely no check on the manner in which elections were conducted, either in the primaries or in the general election.

After all, a grand jury did look into the matter. It even went so far as to admit in its report that evidence of voting irregularities existed and that "there was evidence indicating the possibility of forgery and making false statements."

So a small step has been taken. The grand jury handed the ball back to the electorate to be sure, when in its admission of evidence of irregularities it preferred not to indict but to leave "corrective action for problems of this nature" * * * to the "responsibility of the electorate."

There is nothing to keep responsible members of the electrate from picking up that challenge on a nonpartisan basis. Reams of evidence exist for them to examine in meetings if they choose to do so. We suggest the formation of an organization for this purpose and are quite willing to share all the information at our disposal with persons interested in such an undertaking.

Corrective action on the part of the electorate is possible but it must organize before such action can become a reality.

Israel Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to pay tribute to that little nation in the Middle East—Israel. Its struggle for existence will continue and its fight for recognition will continue with the help of the people of the United States. Israel is a firm ally of the free world in that region of the world, the Middle East. She can be depended upon and her independence must be assured. I know you do not need to be told of the marvelous progress which the hard work, dedication, and zeal of the Jews in Israel has accomplished in the relatively short period of time since independence. Let me, therefore, speak briefly on the relations which have existed between Israel and the United States in that same span of time.

We are all aware of the great interest which has been demonstrated by Americans for Israel and its growth and development. From the moment when then-President Harry S. Truman recognized the newly formed nation with the 2,000 years of history behind it, to the present day when the programs of technical cooperation between the two countries have progressed toward the frontiers of knowledge itself, the record has been a happy and beneficial one.

As Americans who have assisted the economy and development of this brave country in the hope that it would become a substantial and progressive member of the family of nations, let me say that the achievements of Israel in this sphere have been nothing short of miraculous. Our economic aid and technical assistance, totaling $1,024.4 million, has been small in comparison to the constructive uses to which it has been put, and Israel's noteworthy achievements are a shining example of what responsible leadership and intelligent planning can do with such help. If only other countries would follow Israel's lead.

I do not believe that it is an exaggeration to say that American-Israeli friendship and cooperation will continue to expand into new areas. And, that both nations will benefit from such cooperation. Take just one recent example: the agreement for mutual research into the problem of large-scale water desalinization. While it is evident to everyone that Israel sorely needs new water resources, and that the successful outcome of these programs will be of great benefit to Israel, consider also the benefits which will accrue to the United States and the world. Here in this country, for so long the land of unlimited resources, we are beginning to feel the pinch of limited fresh water supplies. We also have extensive areas of land which could be cultivated if there were abundant sweet water. So it is that both Israel and the United States can, and will, benefit from mutual programs for developing economical processes for desalinating sea water which we in the United States have only recently begun.

This is only one brief, although important, example of what I mean. But it is a concrete demonstration of the good relations which exist between Israel and the United States, and a marvelous omen for the future.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of the Poles is marked with calamities and misfortunes. This was especially so in the late 18th century when their freedom and independence was in jeopardy. In 1772 they had already lost a third of their country to Austria, Prussia, and Russia. In order to forestall the repetition of such a disaster, Poland's leaders aimed at strengthening the Government of Poland by reforming and overhauling its governing machinery. In 1788, a committee of the Diet—the assembly—began to draw up a constitution. In the course of 3 years this was completed, and the resulting document, the Constitution of May 3, 1791, was promulgated on that day. For the Poles that date became memorable and the Constitution a historic document.

This Constitution introduced many radical changes in the Government of the country. Poland became a constitutional monarchy, with a responsible cabinet type of government. The powers of the lower chamber were enhanced and those of the upper chamber drastically reduced. The barriers separating the nobility from other classes were practically eliminated. The authority of landlords over the peasantry was reduced, and religious toleration was guaranteed. These liberal provisions made the constitution a truly democratic document. Its promulgation was hailed both by Poles and by their friends in many lands. From then on the date of its promulgation became a Polish national holiday. Unfortunately, the Poles did not have the chance to put their new Constitution into force and reap its benefits, but today all Poles take just pride in the fact that their leaders were the first among other national leaders in Eastern Europe to draft and promulgate such a liberal and democratic constitution. That historic document testifies to their genuine democratic aspirations. In the celebration of the 174th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day I gladly join hands with all liberty-loving Poles.

Columbia, S.C.: Twice Winner of All-America City Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the odds of a city winning an All-America City Award is indeed slim—11 in 20,000—but Columbia, S.C., has again claimed this distinguished honor.

I congratulate my fellow South Carolinians. They can be rightfully proud of their capital city. As you know, this award is presented to only 11 cities throughout the country each year.

In a presentation speech on April 28, Miss Patricia Carbine, assistant managing editor, Look magazine, emphasized how sharp the competition is for cities being considered for this recognition.

Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I include

her remarks so that Columbia's achievement will be recorded for all America:

SPEECH OF MISS PATRICIA CARBINE, ALL-AMERICA CITY AWARD PRESENTATION, COLUMBIA, S.C., APRIL 27, 1965

Governor McNair, Senator RUSSELL, Mayor Bates, ladies and gentlemen, tonight for the second time you become officially a member of the distinguished company of All-America Cities. I am honored and delighted to take part in your celebration.

When Bert Combs was Governor of Kentucky and was putting through some needed reforms in the State, he told of meeting a friend on the street one day who berated him for what he was doing. "Bert," the friend said, "I voted for you in the last election, but I don't like your so-called reforms, and I wouldn't vote for you again if you were St. Peter."

The Governor thought for a minute, and then replied, "My friend, that's good. Because if I were St. Peter, you wouldn't be in my district."

We don't go so far as to say that the All-America Cities are always on the side of the angels, but we do think that their haloes are a little shinier than the average. In 1951, you proved that you had earned an All-America City title; and again, in 1965, you have shown that you deserve it.

My mission here is as simple as it is pleasant. As a representative of one of the sponsors of the award to Columbia, I bring you the congratulations of Look magazine—my own, and those of Look's editor-in-chief, Gardner Cowles, and of its publisher, Vernon C. Myers, who served on the jury that picked you.

Just 16 years ago—in 1949—our esteemed cosponsor of the awards, the National Municipal League, announced the first team of winners. Since that time, the annual contest has grown into something rather big—almost a national institution.

Some of you know that it's not easy to win the award you are receiving tonight. I am thinking particularly of the three gentlemen—Mayor Bates, Mr. McNayr and Mr. Lyles—who presented Columbia's case to the jury in San Francisco last fall and who heard the stories of their fellow contestants. They were all good stories—the competition was just about as keen as it comes.

Theoretically, the chance of a city winning an All-American City Award is slim—11 in 20,000. That is because there are only 11 awards, but there are about 20,000 communities in the United States that could make an entry of some kind into the contest. Not that all of them do, we're happy to say.

Columbia's chances, however, were better than that. You were already off to a head start. The charter reform, which brought you your All-American City Award in 1951, put the city government on a sound and efficient basis, giving you more time and energy to work on other improvements.

Then, in 1957, you may recall that you won another Look-sponsored award—the Community Home Achievement Award. At that time, you were taking the first steps in the urban rehabilitation and residential improvement programs that today have blossomed into full-scale renewal of blighted areas.

Then, in 1962, Columbia won honorable mention in the All-American Cities contest for continued work in urban rehabilitation, for a good start at peaceful integration, and for other beginnings that have now become realities.

Every city thinks its problems are unique—that nobody knows the trouble it's seen, as the old hymn goes. And in a sense, they're right. Perhaps the individual problems are not without parallel, but the combination is always unique.

In Columbia, you had slums—so has every other city of any size across the Nation. In Columbia, you had a State law blocking the usual approach to urban renewal through Federal aid—so has every other city in your State.

In Columbia, you have seen irreplaceable historic buildings threatened by decay and the march of progress. So have many other of our older cities. Your problems connected with urban blight, metropolitan planning, desegregation—all these were old stories to the All-American Cities jury.

What was new was the way you were handling them. Unable to get Government money for urban renewal, you decided to go it alone. This has taken more time, and much, much more citizen cooperation, but you are succeeding. And who knows? A crash demolition program might not have given your historical and cultural buildings commission the time it needed to rescue and restore the beautiful old homes and buildings.

Also new and heartening is the progress you have made in race relations, in contrast to many other cities of the Old South. As Mr. Lyles pointed out in his address to the All-American Cities jury, "with little more than kind hearts, commonsense, and persuasion," your biracial human relations committees have "worked wonders for Columbia."

In a democracy such as ours, there is only one possible solution to the civic problems that confront us. Whether we live in a Maine seaport town like South Portland, or a big Texas metropolis like Fort Worth, or in historic Columbia, S.C., the one and only cure is an alert, informed, responsible group of citizens.

In addressing Congress this past March on the critical state our cities are in, President Johnson said: "Let us be clear about the core of this problem. The problem is people and the quality of lives they lead."

This is exactly what the All-American Cities program is about. It goes directly to the core of the problem. Your award—the All-American City Award to Columbia—is in recognition of your quality * * * and of the quality of action you have taken to meet your problems.

Look is very proud of you. And we are honored to be associated in this program with the National Municipal League, an organization which for more than 70 years has been a powerful champion of quality in government and in citizenship.

Congressman RIVERS may be planning to tell you more about the league. But because an award of this kind is measured in part by the character of those who bestow it, I should like to say a few words about the other sponsor.

Many of you may wonder why a national magazine whose function is to print stories and articles should go to so much trouble year in and year out to encourage local communities to improve themselves. Actually, there are two reasons.

First, as a magazine with over 7½ million circulation, we feel a great responsibility, which we try in many ways to discharge as a good citizen should. Sponsoring the All-America Cities Awards is one of these ways.

The second reason is rather personal. We like the All-America Cities. Look's greatest interest is in people—what they do, what they feel, what they believe, what they want. It's a never ending story which we try to tell with warmth, understanding, and with some of the wonder we feel. We know that fellow citizens, working together in their community for a commond end, can achieve remarkable results. We have seen it happen time and again. And we are seeing it happen here in Columbia.

Columbia has chosen her destiny, and she displays it on bright, new signs along every highway into town: Twice All-America City.

From the bottom of my heart I congratulate you on the destiny you have chosen.

Newton, Iowa, Daily News Comments on Freer Exchange of Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, within the last 10 years there has developed a strong trend toward freer world trade. With the passage in 1962 of the Trade Expansion Act, the United States committed itself to such a policy.

The reduction of national trade barriers, which is an expression of the free enterprise system on a global scale, has not proceeded without difficulties. But, in any movement as complex as this, problems are to be expected.

One of the great benefits of freer world trade is that, by lowering barriers to commercial transactions between countries, we also reduce the barriers to the free exchange of ideas.

An editorial from the April 26, 1965, issue of the Newton Daily News of Newton, Iowa, comments on the "freer exchange of influence" at work in the world today and I think my fellow Members will find this editorial of interest.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the editorial:

FREER EXCHANGE OF INFLUENCE

We don't hear quite so much these days about the world becoming Americanized—except when President de Gaulle gets up to speak.

But if certain things associated with America—automobiles, refrigerators, a faster tempo of life—are spreading in other countries, they are not, in the opinion of one businessman, so much American as they are expressions of a new prosperity in these lands.

Said Marion Harper, Jr., president of Interpublic, a group of advertising companies, to a recent meeting of American and European government officials:

"We should not be surprised to find that people everywhere would rather be mobile (behind a wheel) than tied down; that they would rather be in touch with sources of information and entertainment than be isolated, and that they would rather have choices in food, shelter, clothing, and cultural interests than be limited, generation after generation, to basic staples of subsistence living."

Moreover, if there has been an Americanization of living patterns and business practices in Europe, there has also been a Europeanization at work in America, at least in the past.

Europe gave this country the basic disciplines of trade, banking, insurance, as well as the applied sciences, and much of the technology of manufacturing and agriculture.

In the 19th century Europeans invested heavily in American railroads and factories—a form of colonialism from which we benefited greatly.

In the days when sailing ships were the only means of contact between the two continents, America and Europe evolved along different lines. Today, with burgeoning consumer markets and a shrinking globe, these two worlds of business are being brought into daily touch with each other.

What is taking place, then, is an interchange of influence, rather than one nation conforming to the ways of another.

The key consideration, in Harper's view is for each country to develop a flourishing economy that will afford opportunities both to its own businessmen and those of other countries to compete in serving and expanding its markets.

Vice President Honors Gov. Frank Morrison and Dr. Abe Greenberg at National Conference of Christians and Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, it was 20 years ago this week that we witnessed the end of World War II in Europe. This war bares testimony to man's inhumanity to man. The calculated and systematic destruction of countries, races, and nationalities passes all understanding of peaceloving people. We have resolved that never again shall such destruction be brought upon the face of this earth and to this end have created the United Nations.

The U.N. alone cannot prevent man's barbarious acts to each other. Each of us must in our own way fight hatred, injustice, and prejudice wherever possible. To do this people have joined together in organizations to foster brotherhood. The National Conference of Christians and Jews is one such organization.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to set before this assembly remarks of the Vice President of the United States honoring two great citizens of Nebraska, Gov. Frank Morrison and Dr. Abe Greenberg, for their tireless efforts in fostering brotherhood among the citizens of Nebraska and this Nation. My hope is that the timely remarks of Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY will inspire us to labor for a better understanding among people of this Nation and the peoples of this world.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, OMAHA, NEBR., MAY 2, 1965

We gather tonight to honor two great citizens of Nebraska: Gov. Frank Morrison and Dr. Abe Greenberg.

Dr. Abe Greenberg, one of the founders of the local chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, is known to all of you for his kindness, generosity, and strong character. His powers of healing have been devoted not only to the body, but also to the minds and hearts of his fellow citizens.

Gov. Frank Morrison, my close and personal friend, adds the National Brotherhood Award to a long list of awards and recognitions he has received for his distinguished service to his fellow man, his city, his State, and his Nation. You know him for his service, but also for his human warmth.

The common trait these honored men possess is their strong and active belief in the brotherhood of man.

For we are all brothers in this world. What each of us does affects someone else. No single action is isolated or unrelated to some other action.

On this day, in this week we are all reminded of man's interdependence.

It was just 20 years ago this week that we witnessed the end of World War II in Europe. That war, as no other in modern times, testified to man's potential for barbarism and inhumanity.

But it was also 20 years ago this week that men assembled in San Francisco at the United Nations Conference on International Organization to draw up the U.N. charter.

"We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war," began their preamble.

The 20th century can be enrolled in history as the century of war. Or it can be enrolled as the century of peace.

This century has been the first in which wars have been fought on a world scale. But it is also the first century in which peace has been sought on a world scale.

We have perfected for the first time in history means by which man can finally destroy himself. But we have also, for the first time in history, argued that world peace can be achieved on a level of reality.

Some say that war is inescapable and inevitable. Some, such as Hegel, have said that war is a necessary purgative for the "corrosive influences of peace."

But we Americans, in this time, abhor such theory. We believe that corrosion stems not from peace, but from tyranny, hate and injustice.

Let us then be known in history as seekers of life and liberty and makers of peace. Let our Government be known as the government Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, and the Federalists looked toward in their fundamental propositions: "As anarchy leads to war, government establishes peace, and just laws preserve it."

Yes, we Americans as people, and we Americans as a force in the world must pursue peace. But what sort of peace shall it be?

Is it to be the peace of domination? This peace is easy indeed to achieve, for it is based on control of the weak by the strong. It need not be based on any principle higher than that of "might makes right."

Is it to be the peace of permissiveness? This peace too can be bought most cheaply. For it leaves the outside world to its own devices. It justifies sacrifice of the small and weak. It justifies aggrandizement of the powerful and greedy. It justifies international irresponsibility—all on the premise that affairs not within our own borders are not our affairs.

Is it to be the peace of balance-of-power? This peace has existed before. It depends on pepetuation of a delicate power relationship. It depends on the "status quo." It has often also meant in the past "dividing up the world" at pleasure of those at each end of the balance.

All of these peaces can and have been achieved, at least temporarily, throughout history. But they have never lasted.

For they have not been based on justice or humanity. They have not responded to the needs of men and women seeking fulfillment for themselves and their children. They have not taken into account the spark that burns in all men and says: "Be free."

On this 20th anniversary of war and of peace, I reaffirm this Nation's determination to work toward true peace in the world—peace with justice, peace with opportunity, peace with liberty.

In the United Nations we have established institutional framework which works toward such peace. But the U.N. alone will never achieve it. Its achievement will depend on the determination and will of free nations, and of all men.

There are today opportunities to buy an easier peace—a peace of domination, or of permissiveness, or of balance of power. But we reject these.

We stand now, as generations of Americans stood before us. In the words of Jefferson:

"Honor, justice and humanity forbid us tamely to surrender that freedom which we received from our gallant ancestors, and which our innocent posterity have a right to receive from us."

We Americans at home must make America live up to its heritage.

We must, in the world, defend the right of others to perfect themselves free of coercion and tyranny.

With strength and patience, we will succeed. When that day comes, this century indeed can be known as the century of peace.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, great historic documents are the expression of lofty ideals conceived and formulated by men of vision and foresight, often becoming landmarks in national histories and leaving their permanent impression on national character. The Polish Constitution of May 1791, is such a document and reflects the liberal and progressive character of Poland's leaders in the late 18th century.

This memorable and historic Constitution embodied many democratic ideas, and represented a decisive advance over anything previously attempted in Poland. By its provisions Poland abandoned its antiquated, medieval system of government and adopted one with many modern features. Autocratic Poland became a constitutional monarchy. The most startling innovation was the abolition of the liberum veto by which any one member in the Diet—the national assembly—could veto any measure, preventing the enactment of any legislation. The new Constitution did away with this obstructive feature, and thereby paved the way for new legislation. The powers of the upper house were reduced and those of the popularly elected lower house were increased. Freedom of conscience and of free speech were guaranteed. These democratic features made the Constitution of May a model progressive instrument, and as such it was widely hailed both in Poland and Poland's friends everywhere.

Through such a drastic overhauling of Poland's Government, its valiant and liberal leaders hoped to save their fatherland from eventual dismemberment. Unfortunately that in itself was not sufficient to save Poland. Soon after the proclamation of this Constitution Poland's foes attacked her, and brought her independent existence to an end for more than a century. Unhappily the Poles did not have the good fortune to live at peace under their new Constitution, but they have looked upon it as a memorable, almost sacred, document embodying their unrealized dreams and long-cherished hopes. The ideals embodied in that Constitution, Mr. Speaker, are as alive in the hearts of the Polish people on this 174th anniversary celebration of its promulgation as they were in 1791.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate continued consideration of voting rights bill.

House passed 15 miscellaneous bills.

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 8891–8925

Bills Introduced: 11 bills and 2 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1870–1880; and S. Res. 104–105.

Pages 8894–8895

Bill Rereferred: Committee on Banking and Currency was discharged from further consideration of S. 1681, to provide for uniform, fair, and equitable treatment of persons, businesses, or farms displaced by Federal programs, and the bill was then rereferred to Committee on Government Operations. Page 8904

Printing: Senate adopted S. Res. 105, authorizing printing of additional copies of part I of the hearings on fiscal 1966 authorizations for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Page 8942

Food Marketing: Senate passed without amendment and cleared for President H.R. 5702, extending for 1 year the date on which the National Commission on Food Marketing shall make its final report to the President and the Congress. Pages 8955–8958

Voting Rights: Senate continued on S. 1564, to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the U.S. (right to vote).

Pending at adjournment was modified Ervin amendment (to Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amended committee substitute for the bill) to provide for instituting by Attorney General of action against a State or political subdivision alleged to be violating voting rights on account of race or color in the district in which the capital of the State, or political subdivision in question, is located, rather than in the District of Columbia.

Pages 8925–8937, 8953–8955, 8959–8961

Nominations: The following nominations were received: Hugh F. Owens, of Oklahoma, to be member of SEC; John A. Schnittker, of Kansas, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture; Alan S. Boyd, of Florida, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation; Wilbur J. Cohen, of Michigan, to be Under Secretary of HEW; Warren W. Wiggins, of Colorado, to be Deputy Director of the Peace Corps; Charles S. Murphy, of Maryland, to be member of the Civil Aeronautics Board; and LaVern R. Dilweg, of Wisconsin, to be member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission; and one judicial. Page 8962

Quorum Call: One quorum call was taken today.

Page 8925

Program for Tuesday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 6:35 p.m. until noon Tuesday, May 4, when it will continue on S. 1564, voting rights. Page 8961

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Committee on Armed Services: Committee continued its joint hearings with the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, on S. 1771, fiscal 1966 authorizations for military construction, with testimony on proposed funds for Navy construction from Rear Adm. Harry Hull, Director, Shore Activities Development and Control Division, Office of Chief of Naval Operations, and Rear Adm. Peter Corradi, Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Hearings continue tomorrow on the Navy title of the bill.

PACKAGING AND LABELING

Committee on Commerce: Committee resumed its hearings on S. 985, to prevent unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of commodities distributed in interstate commerce, having as its witnesses Lee S. Bickmore, president, National Biscuit Co., New York City; Dwight D. Townsend, Cooperative League, Washington, D.C.; Edward J. Hekman, president, United Biscuit Co. of America; Lyle C. Roll, president, and Norman Bristol, general counsel, Kellogg Co., Battle Creek, Mich.; and Melville Ehrlich, an attorney, on behalf of Potato Chip Institute International.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

Appendix

Washington Post Editorial Commends Senator Daniel B. Brewster for His Advocacy of State and Local Participation in Planning the Development of the Potomac River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, under the energetic leadership of President Lyndon Johnson, our Nation is preparing to launch a comprehensive program of conservation and beautification. With encouragement from widespread sources our citizens are becoming increasingly aware of the need for imaginative action to preserve and enhance the environment of natural beauty and abundance which has been handed down to us by our forefathers.

It is gratifying to note that as a part of his message to the Congress on natural beauty, President Johnson included an eloquent plea for the careful development of the Potomac River Basin. He recommended that the Potomac serve as a model of scenic and recreation values for the entire country. He suggested the institution of programs to clean up the river and keep it clean.

In a more recent message on the Nation's Capital, the President accurately stressed the regional nature of many of the problems which confront Washington, D.C. The problem of beautification and conservation in the Potomac River Basin is such a regional problem. The solution should rightfully come as a result of cooperative and constructive action which embraces the efforts of State and local interests as well as those of the Federal Government.

The able senior Senator from Maryland, the Honorable DANIEL B. BREWSTER, has advocated what is, in my judgment, a reasonable approach in achieving workable responses to the problems of the Potomac. Senator BREWSTER suggests the formation of an interstate commission to develop and protect this historic watershed.

Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague and friend from the Free State for this forward-thinking and reasonable proposal. He has again demonstrated the fairminded and cooperative attitudes which one cherishes in a good neighbor. West Virginia, Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia are, in a real sense, good neighbors who must work together to solve those problems which mutually affect them as part of the Potomac River Basin.

West Virginians are vitally concerned with the future of that basin. The headwaters of both the North and South branches of the Potomac spring from the mountains of West Virginia, and the river has played an important role in the historic and economic development of our State. I assure my colleagues from Maryland and Virginia, and the residents of the District of Columbia, that I am responsive to the need for cooperative action at Federal, State, and local levels to insure the development of the Potomac River Basin in the most reasonable, workable and effective manner possible.

Mr. President, an editorial in the May 3, 1965, Washington Post presents cogent comment on the plan to beautify and develop the Potomac River Basin. It is heartening to note that the writer has recognized the contributions of Senator BREWSTER in focusing attention on the need for local participation in any comprehensive planning.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "Plan for the Potomac" be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed.

[From the Washington Post, May 3, 1965]

PLAN FOR THE POTOMAC

Secretary Udall's planning for the Potomac River is off to an unpromising start. Three months ago President Johnson declared that the Potomac would be made "a model of scenic and recreational values." Apparently a plan is now being drafted behind closed doors in the Interior Department.

Four States share the Potomac watershed, but none of the Governors has been asked to take part in the planning. None of the Congressmen has been asked for his views. None of the local governments in the basin, of which there are many dozens, has been asked to take part. Secretary Udall seems not to realize it, but he stands in the peril of repeating the error of the Army's Corps of Engineers, whose 1963 plan for the Potomac, in nine fat volumes, is now quietly collecting dust. The corps began by deciding all the questions of values and politic; by deciding, in our behalf, what the people of the Potomac watershed ought to want and how much of it they ought to have. They then designed the plan to their own specifications. The Interior Department's value judgments will differ from the Army Engineers' but, like every large Government agency, it will reflect its own political history and specialized concerns.

Secretary Udall ought to be aware that the State and local governments of the region have already formed a very strong impression of his intentions. Right or wrong, they believe that he intends to work out his own plan in secrecy over the summer and drop it, in finished form, on the President's desk next fall. They believe that this plan will be oriented strongly toward recreation and conservation at the expense of other necessities, and that it will demand a very substantial expansion of Federal land holdings and Interior's responsibilities in the Washington area.

A far wiser course was suggested by Senator BREWSTER, of Maryland, when he urged Mr. Udall to consider an interstate commission to develop and protect the Potomac. It is a concept with wide support on both sides of the river. As Clive DuVal of Fairfax County, who is running for the legislature, correctly pointed out last week, "A comprehensive interstate compact creating a commission with authority to act is the best way to assure sound development of the river in tune with the wishes of the people of this area."

Creating a powerful and broadly based interstate commission would take several years. But the planning for the river can usefully be carried forward now, if the Interior Department will bring the Governors and the local officials into the process. Consultation is not merely a political concession; some of the State governments command expertise quite comparable to Interior's. The watershed cannot afford another collision between Federal and local interests. If Mr. Udall wants the Governors to support the Potomac plan next year, he can usefully ask them to help draft it this year.

Report to Massachusetts: Optimism for New England and Its Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, early in April, seven Republican Members of the House introduced legislation to provide a New England Regional Development Commission. The purpose of the Commission would be to conduct a complete study of the region's resources, needs and institutions for future growth.

I was delighted to read that last week the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Senator SALTONSTALL, testified before the Senate Committee on Public Works on behalf of such a commission. Senator SALTONSTALL pointed out the tremendous potential for growth in New England, but the tendency of recent years for the region to lag behind in terms of new investment and new employment.

The Senator's declaration of the need for regional planning in New England is an important one. I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the Senator's report to Massachusetts in which he reported on his Public Works Committee testimony:

REPORT TO MASSACHUSETTS: OPTIMISM FOR NEW ENGLAND AND ITS FUTURE

(By U.S. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts)

Last Tuesday, I testified before the U.S. Senate Committee on Public Works to point

out the need for establishing a New England Regional Development Commission to help our economy in Massachusetts and New England.

I think that such a regional development commission should be composed of a representative from each of the New England States and one from the Federal Government. Its purpose would be to study the economy of our Commonwealth and region in order to come up with a program for New England economic growth and development.

The economy of Massachusetts and the rest of New England is at a crossroads. We can regard it as a benefit as well as a burden that our area is the oldest industrial section of the United States. As the oldest, New England possesses a fine base of industrial and business development. It has an abundance of skilled workers with the know-how to perform the highly technical work necessary in our complex economy. We have seen this ability applied in the development of our fine electronics industry. We have been helped economically by growth among the service industries, construction, trade and government, as well as the finance, insurance and real estate businesses. In 1964, these industries helped create record employment highs.

We in Massachusetts and throughout New England have the finest educational institutions in the country. They are the sources of new and imaginative ideas and provide the talent necessary for our future development. I hestitate to name these educational institutions for fear of hurting anyone's feelings. But, I am a Harvard rooter of long standing.

Yet, in spite of these advantages, our economy is also burdened by age. Many of our plants and equipment are old and outdated. Too often in the past we have failed to adapt as quickly as we might to the changing needs of our economy. Our failure to do this has resulted in a loss of markets for our products because of the difficulty in changing over machinery and equipment.

Statistics show that this condition has contributed to a generally lagging economic growth in Massachusetts and New England, compared to other sections of the country. Since 1940 we all know that there has been a substantial national redistribution of economic activity. Between 1940 and 1960, employment in the Far West more than doubled; in the Southwest and Rocky Mountain States, employment increased approximately two-thirds. Compared to these figures, there was only a one-third increase in New England.

In 1962, Massachusetts ranked ninth among the 14 leading industrial States, the same position held in 1959. However, Texas, No. 10, with a higher rate of growth, threatens to displace Massachusetts in the future. While Massachusetts growth in manufacturing was higher than the national average, it was lower than 7 of the other 13 leading industrial States. During this period, Massachusetts was second to Maine among the New England States in manufacturing growth.

From 1953 to 1962, Massachusetts ranked 10th in the Nation for manufacturers' expenditures for new plants and equipment. While Massachusetts ranked first in New England for such expenditures, New England ranked sixth out of nine national geographic regions. This comparison empasizes the need for stimulating our growth.

Between 1960 and 1963 our State was the eighth largest in the Nation in terms of manufacturing employment; nevertheless, it had the greatest decrease in such employment among the 14 leading industrial States. During this time, only Connecticut among the New England States showed an increase, and this came largely from the airplane industry.

Now turning to business growth figures, we see that Massachusetts and New England have also lagged. Between 1958 and 1963, Massachusetts had a 19.8-percent increase in wholesale trade establishments. New England had a 22-percent increase, but along with two other regions, this was the lowest percentage increase among the nine regions of the United States.

Between 1958 and 1963, Massachusetts had a 19-percent increase in retail sales. This placed us first among the New England States. However, New England ranked seventh among the nine national geographic regions.

These figures show how important it is for us in Massachusetts and New England to make a study of our economy. We must first recognize the problem before we attempt its solution. This is a "must" if we are to develop an intelligent, workable plan for future economic growth and development of our whole area.

Legislation is pending in Congress to set up regional development commissions and establish a program of economic assistance. Let us work in a united way to get legislation that will help us the most.

The economic interests and many of the problems of Massachusetts and the other New England States are not the same. But, there are more similarities than differences. I am strongly of the opinion that our combined efforts are necessary to study, evaluate and solve these problems.

We New Englanders face different problems than those of the Appalachia region of the United States which was, as you remember, the subject of economic assistance legislation during the present session of Congress. A regional development commission will be aware of these differences. Attention can be given to our recreation, research and service industries to determine how these expanding industries can be more helpful in providing economic growth.

A thoughtful commission will be helpful in considering the problems which currently face our textile, rubber and shoe industries. Changing patterns of defense business, along with the entire problem of defense conversion present a challenge for careful examination. Ways must be developed if we are to improve our economy through selected urban development, education, and transportation programs.

I am, like you, optimistic about the future for Massachusetts and New England. Look at what has been done in Boston. The new Prudential Center, the West End redevelopment project and the Government center have already had a considerable impact upon business expansion.

The economic interests of Massachusetts and the other New England States are tied together. An improved economy in one can mean expanded markets for the others. Through joint planning efforts on the part of all our New England States, manufacturing and business enterprises can be improved and expanded. New enterprises will be attracted to Massachusetts and New England.

I believe that for the regional development commission to be most effective, it should make its reports available to the respective New England Governors, the appropriate committees of the Congress as well as to Federal officials. In this way, the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the commission will be available to national and State officials who are able to recommend legislation in the Congress or respective States. This will insure full use being made of the commission reports.

I hope that legislation will pass the Congress this year which will result in a realistic and beneficial program of economic assistance for all New England.

Proposed Elimination of the Army Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, William F. Buckley, Jr., the editor of National Review, and a noted newspaper columnist and author, has written a very interesting and important article about Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and his efforts to run around the Constitution and the Congress and, in effect, abolish the Army Reserve, by his own edict. The article points up the important challenge which the distinguished Representative HÉBERT, of Louisiana, has hurled at the Secretary on the authority which the Constitution vests in Congress to make such a decision. Representative HÉBERT, who is chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee looking into this McNamara proposal, has put his finger on a most important question; and I am glad that Mr. Buckley has pointed this up for consideration by the reading public.

In view of the importance of this matter, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "McNamara at the Bar," dated April 17, 1965, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCNAMARA AT THE BAR

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

A congressional committee headed by Mr. HÉBERT, of Louisiana, is midway through hearings freighted with tension, on the question of the proposed elimination of the Army Reserve. The tension is for various reasons. For one thing, there is the cadre of officers and men who have devoted a significant part of their lives in the services of an idea—the Army Reserve—who have now heard the doctor recommend euthanasia. It is difficult, after years of service, to be told that economy, or managerial tidiness, or whatever it was Mr. McNamara's computer disgorged, justifies the elimination of an active service which for years, and in several crises, proved itself an impressive means of buttressing the national security. All the more difficult if you believe for the best of patriotic reasons that Mr. McNamara's computer is on this occasion, as on a few others, disposing of people, ideas, and traditions, on the basis of ill-digested data.

An important additional point of tension. Some of the most responsible members of the Army will tell you privately that the despotic habits of Mr. McNamara have had the effect of paralyzing witnesses whose word might be of great usefulness to the committee in considering McNamara's proposal. The example is fresh before the minds of the highest officials of the armed services of Admiral Anderson, whose term of office as chairman of the Joint Chiefs was terminated in 1963 by President Kennedy in punishment for his singing his own beliefs, which were contrary to Mr. McNamara's, before a congressional committee in 1962.

And the third point of tension is Mr. McNamara's style, which caused the chairman

of this committee, in a moment of uncontained exasperation last December, to mutter that Mr. McNamara evidently believes not that the Congress of the United States is a necessary evil, but that it is an unnecessary evil. Mr. McNamara provoked this particular outburst by calmly announcing his intention on December 12 to do away with the Reserve, without so much as a by-your-leave in the direction of Congress. The Reserve, having been set up by Congress (in 1920), it is the opinion of certain Members of Congress, most specifically including Mr. HÉBERT—who is chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee and primarily responsible for transmitting enlightened recommendations on military policy to the House of Representatives—that it is ultimately their business, not Mr. McNamara's, whether to dispose of the Reserve. But Mr. McNamara, with his genius for diplomatic ineptitude, let it be known that in the opinion of Army counsel (which is not at all different from saying in the opinion of himself) he has all the authority he needs to implement the proposed resolution. It was ruefully that his spokesman, the Secretary of the Army, had to admit under questioning that unless the Congress appropriates money with which to effect the proposed amalgamation, said proposed amalgamation isn't going to take place, unless Mr. McNamara sells his Ford stock and pays for it himself.

Tension enough, then, for a dozen congressional investigations; and everything points, ultimately, to that haunting question: Are we really prepared—all the men, women, and children in the United States—to simply turn over our defense policy to Robert McNamara, subject to the pleasure of the President—whose faith in him appears to be, if not unthinking, at least unlimited? Suppose McNamara is wrong? Not merely about the Reserve, but about the manned bombers, the moon program, the oversea bases. Hell—literally, hell—there would be to pay. How are we to inform ourselves about Mr. McNamara's performance, if he succeeds in intimidating all his subordinates, lifetime students of the discipline of war, among whom we must suppose resides a relevant sum of knowledge about, and experience in, military and strategic matters which Mr. McNamara, for all his agility, has presumably not been able to surpass during his 4 years in office?

How many of our four-star generals really agree with Mr. McNamara that it is wise to abolish the Reserve? Are not his present arguments flimsy? He wants to unify management; and he proposed to do away with the Reserve, which is managed by a single command, and turn management over to the 50 State Governors who command the National Guard. He wants to save 150 million bucks—but how many million dollars will it take to retrain for effective service replacements for that 85 percent of the Enlisted Reserve who, a poll reveals, would decline to join the Guard? The justification for the merger is superficially plausible. Perhaps a profound case can be made for it, but how are we to measure the relative profundity of the case for amalgamation, if we do not have the means of measuring the profundity of the opposition's case? And how can we measure it, when the hot breath of Mr. McNamara licks, and paralyzes officers seated before a congressional committee, who never quailed before the machinegun fire of the enemy they fought in two vital wars?

Mr. HÉBERT has an important job to perform. Mr. McNamara may be the greatest military genius since Alexander the Great. But then again he may not be—and if he isn't, who, if not Mr. HÉBERT, is going to start finding out for us? The Russians?

Yazoo City Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the national observance of Library Week, I am glad to have the opportunity to call the House's attention to one of the many fine libraries in the State of Mississippi.

The B. S. Ricks Memorial Library at Yazoo City, Miss., has contributed for many years to the culture and recreation of citizens of Yazoo County. It is undoubtedly one of the oldest libraries in the Nation, having been organized in 1834.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article on the Yazoo City Library which appeared some time ago in the Clarion Ledger-Daily News, published in Jackson, Miss.:

YAZOO CITY LIBRARY OFFERS MANY SERVICES

(By Bonita Appleton)

YAZOO CITY, MISS.—Ask the folk in this combination delta-hill town about the wonderful world of books and if they don't know it's not because they lack the opportunity to learn.

Yazoo City has one of the best smalltown libraries in the State. Picked arbitrarily to be featured today as a fine example of an excellent library, the B. S. Ricks Memorial Library is one of the oldest in Mississippi and one of the newest in outlook.

Organized in 1834 when 14 men met to form the Manchester Library Association, the Yazoo City Library today has more than 30,000 books for selective reading, offers a triple handful of services to everybody in the area, and has recently been the recipient of a fund-raising campaign that means even more books and services to patrons.

The library also manages and operates the Yazoo-Sharkey Bookmobile, on loan from the Mississippi Library Commission. Driven by Thomas Scott of Rolling Fork, the bookmobile offers more than 3,000 people a choice of 2,500 books, 5 days a week.

The Yazoo Library is housed in a building given in 1900 by the late Mrs. Fannie Ricks in honor of her husband, a Yazoo City businessman and planter.

It is one of the libraries not given money by Steel Magnate Andrew Carnegie. Carnegie was approached about financing the Yazoo Library but correspondence with him showed he felt it was "doing fine and not in as bad shape" as other libraries he also was not helping.

FREE SERVICE

"The Yazoo Library Association has $5 a year dues although the library gives free service to all adults and children in the Yazoo County and city area," said Mrs. B. Frank Williams, head librarian.

The library also receives financial support from the county, the city, rental property, dues and fines, gifts and memorials, and the Yazoo School Board.

The B. S. Ricks Memorial Library in Yazoo City is strategically located near the downtown area, right next door to Main Street Elementary School. An air-conditioning and heating unit is also being installed in the recently renovated building.

"We have a reference room, used by high school students, which features a college and career corner," said Mrs. Williams as she conducted a quick tour through the building. "The college and career corner includes catalogs from every college that will send them to us and the career information is kept strictly up to date."

The main room includes interestingly arranged books in brandnew shelves (the shelves are due to arrive this week), and original captains' chairs and old directors' chairs will be placed in the reading area near the periodical rack.

"The library has a regular subscription to 50 indexed magazines with 10 additional magazines not indexed," Mrs. Williams said.

"Those chairs have been in the library for years and years and we wanted to keep some of the historical flavor of the building."

Also strategically spaced throughout the main room of the library are old-fashioned rocking chairs. "Some of those chairs have been here since 1905," Mrs. Williams commented.

The children's reading room, originally just a corner in the main room, has been moved into a larger room and students from Main Street Elementary School next door make scheduled trips to the library Monday–Friday from 1:30 to 3:30 each day.

"After 3:30 students from the junior high school and high school come in," Mrs. Williams said. "The high schools have libraries and this library supplements their work."

LITTLE CHANGE

There had been little change in the operation of the library in some 40 years until last year when the junior auxiliary became interested in the operation of the facility.

"Mrs. M. P. Derden, who retired in April, had held the library together by sheer willpower and dedication," said Mrs. Williams. "If it hadn't been for her during all these years we wouldn't have a library." Mrs. Derden was assisted by Mrs. Natalie Magruder Mobley.

The junior auxiliary raised $11,000 to redecorate the library and went to the city council and board of supervisors and obtained additional funds. They also went to interested people in the area and offered a life membership to the Yazoo Library Association for $100.

"This has made our renovation and purchase of new books possible," said Mrs. Williams.

The renovation includes a new history room which also will serve as a meeting room of the Yazoo Library Association. The Yazoo County home demonstration clubs is making drapes and covering chairs for it.

"We put our board members to work," said Mrs. Williams as she introduced Mrs. Herman Decell, busily at work cataloguing local history.

Included in this local history was a section of WPA history written in 1930, pictures of a 1927 flood, a 1904 fire, a 1927 chamber of commerce picture, and copies of the centennial edition of the Sentinel, published in the 1800's.

One of the most valued possessions of the library is a ledger written in a fine Spencerian script which—instead of today's modern card catalog—lists every book the library owned in 1838.

SERVICE SET UP

Set up for service, the B. S. Ricks Memorial Library offers telephone spot reference questions, reference work within the library, takes reservations for books that the library owns, maintains a reader interest file, renews books by phone, sends books to those unable to visit the library, gives help in program planning to clubs and organizations, sets up and

maintains book displays inside and outside of the library.

In addition, the library sopnsors a discussion group led by Thomas Campbell III, which meets on the first and second Thursday of each month.

Special signs are being constructed to use on Yazoo City streets to direct traffic to the library. In addition, an auto-page for book returns when the library is closed has been installed nearby.

Employees at the Ricks Memorial Library include Mrs. Williams, Mrs. Catherine Miller and Mrs. Birdie King, general librarians, Mrs. Merle MacDonald, on loan from the Mississippi Library Commission, Miss Mary Love, general librarian and office worker, and Emma Barnett, a diversified occupations student from the high school "learning to be a librarian."

Refuses El Paso Post, Off Payroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, the following newspaper account by Sarah McClendon for the El Paso, Tex., Times on April 5, 1965, is of interest to all Members of Congress:

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times, Apr. 5, 1965]

REFUSES EL PASO POST, OFF PAYROLL

(By Sarah McClendon)

WASHINGTON.—John R. Norpel, Jr., skilled investigator in catching international Communists, went off the payroll of the U.S. State Department Friday because he refused to accept reassignment from security tasks at the Department in Washington to door knocking in routine rookie investigations of Government employees in Southwestern States with headquarters in El Paso. He would have traveled from Brownsville to California.

Norpel, one of the team of top-notch security evaluators working under Otto Otepka, has recently been assigned to the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs along with other Otepka men, who were told their jobs was to keep watch over 36 Latin Americans in Washington in various agencies.

LIMITED OPERATION

This job was a limiting operation, inasmuch as the security men, who formerly had the job of deciding which persons were or were not security risks in Government, were told they could not go out and actually investigate the 36 Latins but must wait until State Department people brought them information.

Norpel now joins Otto Otepka as a State Department employee who has been stripped of responsibilities in the security field.

Some half dozen other associates of the two men who also worked in the security office as evaluators of information and results of investigations have all been reassigned out of the office and put to work on meaningless tasks.

Otepka, who has been appealing his dismissal from the service after he replied to questions on security asked by a Senate subcommittee, is still getting paid. He gets $19,000 a year for reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD daily and evaluating Congressmen's speeches.

Meanwhile, as the security team of the State Department gets reassigned out of this field, sent overseas on different types of service, has offers dangled before them to go to graduate colleges or gets demoted, like Norpel, the persons who might need to be investigated as security risks are escaping such scrutiny. This could mean a complete breakdown in security for the United States, it has been cited by members of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Norpel now intends to fight his case for retention of jobs, pay, and assigned duty in his career classification, which is in a top intelligence job. He has employed a lawyer.

Norpel, before he received Friday's notice that he was off the payroll, had protested the reassignment to El Paso formally with State Department superiors.

"I don't mean I would not like to be employed in El Paso," he said. "Don't let the good people there think that. It is that I do not want to go there and do the kind of work that I did when I first joined Government service, before I spent 10 years with the FBI, and then service at the State Department."

CITED

Norpel's record shows that he was cited several times for accomplishments in the field of government investigation by J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI and once won a cash award. He is classified at the Department of State as a personnel security specialist who has had experience as, investigative specialist, administrative officer, special program officer. He was making $13,265 per year. He has a law degree from Temple University.

Norpel's orders to El Paso came at a time when the State Department is reported to have serious need for qualified evaluators in the office of security's division of evaluations, a need so acute that recently investigators "from the field," a term meaning subsidiary offices over the Nation, have been detailed to Washington where they are unfamiliar with the work to be done.

William J. Crockett deputy under secretary of state for administration, said early this year that the reason Norpel was being sent to El Paso was because "the need of trained investigators in our field offices at this time is critical."

CANCELED SPACE

Yet, February 1, 1965, the office of security had sent a memorandum to the General Services Administration office in the State Department advising that space should be canceled in the Federal building in El Paso by the office of security. Later, suddenly Al Rico, assistant executive officer for State office of security asked to withdraw the memorandum. Finally, one official asked the security office if they did or did not want the office of security matters in El Paso. Finally the department said again it did want the office.

G. Marin Gentile, deputy assistant secretary for security U.S. State Department, wrote Norpel Friday on orders of Crockett that "since you did not report to duty in El Paso April 2, 1965, you are absent without leave. You will be continued in absence without leave until you report for duty at your station in El Paso."

Great Society?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a constituent which in my mind was certainly meritorious. Accordingly, after contacting her and obtaining her permission, I am reprinting her letter for the benefit of other Members of Congress.

This young lady some way or another has captured the basic philosophy which made this country great. This is most unique in today's society when so many seem to feel that the solution to all problems is to sit down, face the east, and hold out their hands for help from Washington. I wish to publicly congratulate Miss Joyce Fletcher who wrote as follows:

CONGRESSMAN DEVINE: I have recently read that the latest step in President Johnson's Great Society is to give rent supplements to people living in substandard housing so they can move to better housing. I understand a single person making up to $5,200 a year is eligible. I think this is a little absurd. If a single person is making that much money, why is he living in substandard housing to begin with? Sir, I make $4,000 a year. I live in a pleasant three-room apartment which costs $85 per month. This would make me eligible for a rent supplement which I feel would be totally undeserved. I have a fairly decent standard of living, although there are things I want but can't afford. So what. I'm putting myself through school at nights, and even saving money and investing some. In addition I have had rather high medical expenses. In the last 2 years I've spent close to $2,000 on medical expenses. If I can get along without help from Uncle Sam why can't someone who is making as much or more than I, do it also?

This type of legislation bothers me. I know there are people who need help, and I want them helped. But there has to be some commonsense used.

I am constantly amazed at my Government's fiscal policies. Is it true that this is what the American people want? Do you have any answers for me?

Groundbreaking Ceremonies for $15 Million Expansion Program for the Long Island Jewish Hospital, New Hyde Park, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 11, it was my pleasure to attend the groundbreaking ceremony which inaugurated the $15 million expansion program of the Long Island Jewish Hospital, New Hyde Park, N.Y.

The major of New York City, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, was also present and read an official proclamation announcing April 11 as "The Long Island Jewish Hospital Day." He referred to this hospital as the guardian of community health both for its wide range of services and the excellent quality of those services. More than 750 guests heard the mayor extend congratulations to Mr. Jack S. Liebowitz, president of the hospital, to Dr. Peter Rogatz, executive director of the hospital, to the sincere, devoted, and hard-working trustees and to the excellent medical staff. He acknowledged the success of the hospital's three-

way program of patient care, medical training, and research during the 11 years since its inception. The mayor publicly acclaimed the Long Island Jewish Hospital for having been deemed worthy of accepting the responsibility for the management of over 1,300 beds at the Queens General Hospital Center.

Mr. Liebowitz outlined the new health facilities which will be available to the 3 million Long Island residents. An open heart surgical suite, expanded service for premature babies, a psychiatric inpatient service and an enlarged intensive care program for treatment of the critically ill were but a few of those mentioned.

Nassau County Executive Eugene H. Nickerson commented that, while the hospital spans the Queens and Nassau County line and most of the 22-acre tract is in Queens, he has always proudly claimed the Long Island Jewish Hospital as a Nassau Hospital. He also stated that almost half of all those who come to the various clinics for out-patient treatment are Nassau County residents.

Mr. Irving Mitchel Felt, president of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, told the assembled guests that the Long Island Jewish Hospital's building program is part of the federation's $180 million City of Life Building Fund program.

Dr. Peter Rogatz, executive director of the Long Island Jewish Hospital, cited the hospital's achievements during the past decade: a comprehensive program which includes 48 different clinics, a division of nuclear medicine, the only adolescent clinic and the only premature nursery center on Long Island. Dr. Rogatz concluded his message with the promise to incorporate the best ideals of medicine and the best goals of our democratic society into every aspect and every program of the Long Island Jewish Hospital.

All those attending this memorable groundbreaking ceremony were privileged to hear Mr. Richard Tucker of the Metropolitan Opera Company sing an inspiring rendition of our National Anthem, accompanied by the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy Band.

The need and demand for more and better health services are at an all-time high in this country. Our population is growing and our lifespan increasing. We in government must do all we can to encourage those in the medical profession to continue their research, ever mindful that each new advance will benefit us all, regardless of where we live. Incorporated in the expansion plans of the Long Island Jewish Hospital are the Samuel and Lena Schwartz Research Center and the Evelyn and Saul L. Epstein Teaching Center, vital cores from which we can anticipate improvement in the health standards of our Nation.

LIJH has come a long way since a group of farsighted community leaders met to discuss the creation of a hospital that would answer the health needs of the rapidly growing suburban area. The need: An institution with a superior blending of comprehensive patient care, high quality teaching, and imaginative research. The Long Island Jewish Hospital has met this need.

On reaching its present eminence, unique for a voluntary hospital of its size, LIJH stops a moment—not to rest—but to reflect upon the accomplishments of the past and to lay even broader plans for the future.

More than most institutions, the Long Island Jewish Hospital, from the beginning, has believed in its own future and has followed its own course. It was a courageous beginning, made possible through the help of the trustees and staff members who dedicated their effort, skill, and vision to founding a hospital with emphasis on excellence. Only the best would do.

So the Long Island Jewish Hospital charts its course today. The excellent patient care, the range of research investigation, and the teaching of young doctors and doctors-to-be all serve to carry out the broad concepts of the founding fathers. Patients represent all races, creeds, and colors—no one is turned away.

Above all, the Long Island Jewish Hospital looks to the future; it moves ahead, wants to accomplish greater things in its service to mankind. The LIJH, with the support of an enlightened and generous community, looks forward with confidence to the next decade, and the decades that follow.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, 22 years ago the world witnessed one of the greatest displays of raw courage ever seen anywhere.

For 42 days the heroic Jewish residents of the Warsaw ghetto held off the massed might of Nazi Germany. In many cases fighting with their bare hands the Jews withstood every attack the Nazis could make until finally the last gallant outposts were overwhelmed by flamethrowers and saturation bombardment.

Probably never in history has the world been given a better opportunity to witness the indomitable spirit of the Jewish people that has enabled them to survive every kind of persecution.

It is to be remembered that a handful of Jews who managed to escape from the sealed-off ghetto through the Warsaw sewer system and ultimately joined the underground who were then fighting to throw off the Nazi yoke. Of these, a few lived to become part of the movement which established the long awaited national Jewish state in Israel.

On Thursday, April 29, 1965, the American Zionist Organization and 30 other national and metropolitan Jewish organizations held commemorative exercises in New York City. It is fitting that they held these services to remind us of the heroism of the gallant Jews who for 42 days held off the greatest military machine ever assembled in the history of mankind by one nation.

We must always keep this event fresh in our memory, lest we forget.

For a Marine in Vietnam, Unity on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I would that all might pay heed to the patriotic words that a mother of a U.S. Marine serving in Vietnam would have us hear. While her message was directed to Ben Maidenberg, executive editor of the Akron Beacon Journal, I am certain that we can all benefit by taking the content of her letter to our hearts and minds.

Our President has set a course of action in the Far East. The great majority, myself included, are in full support of that operation and believe that it should only be concluded when successful. There can be no partisanship when the enemy challenges.

This distinguished mother, Mrs. Leonard Powell, of Barberton, Ohio, has brought forth a document that might well be the creed for all Americans. They rank well alongside the quotation that she gives from our late great President, Abraham Lincoln.

As one who has a son serving in the Armed Forces in the Far East, I can understand the feeling of Mrs. Powell. I can but echo her wonderful words. I, too, hope that my son, and all other sons, do not feel that we are not united in support of their activities.

Since Mrs. Powell wrote her letter, a new front has opened. Here, close to our shores, Communist influences would create a new nation under their domination. Again I unite with our President in his actions.

I can but agree with Mrs. Powell that the world could misunderstand any disunity in our ranks.

I am afraid, however, that there are those who would foster such a misunderstanding. Let us by our actions here, refute them.

The United States of America is a nation that always has shown great concern for the lives of our people. We abhor war but we love freedom. We must and shall maintain this freedom.

Mrs. Powell's letter, as published in the Akron Beacon Journal, follows:

FOR A MARINE IN VIETNAM, UNITY ON THE HOME FRONT

To the EDITOR:

As the mother of a very young marine stationed 35 miles from the North Vietnam border, I am very much concerned with the

criticism of and demonstrations against the use of our American military in the southeast Asia conflict.

These can surely cause our enemies to draw the wrong conclusions and keep them from negotiating peace.

As much as I would like to have my son home, I am sure he knows why he is there.

He knows, as did the founders of our great country, that God lives.

He knows that communism depends largely upon substituting the state for God.

He knows there is a threat to his political and individual freedoms.

He knows that as precious as life, is his heritage of these freedoms.

He knows communism cannot live in just one country.

He knows that if he has to fight, he is fighting for democracy. He knows the enemy is fighting to make the world safe for communism.

He knows that throughout the ages, men have died for freedom.

"This love of liberty which God has planted in us," Abraham Lincoln said, "constitutes the bulwark of our liberty and independence. It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts, our Army and our Navy.

"Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere. Destroy this spirit, and we have planted the seeds of despotism at our very doors."

I only hope my son does not know we are not united on the home front.

MRS. LEONARD POWELL.

A Resolution Concerning Establishment of a National Lakeshore Park in Porter County, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for the creation of a national lakeshore park along the southern shores of Lake Michigan in Porter County has been before the Congress for some time.

The swimming, bathing, and recreational facilities on the southern shores of Lake Michigan, especially in the area known as the Indiana Dunes, has been enjoyed and used as a recreational center for generations. Gradually industry will usurp the total area of the beautiful sand dunes and perfect natural shores of Lake Michigan in this area unless the Federal Government takes steps toward the establishment of a natural lakeshore park.

I am submitting a resolution passed by the Common Council of the City of Hammond, Ind., at a recent meeting:

RESOLUTION 3453R

A resolution concerning establishment of a national lakeshore park in Porter County, Ind.

That whereas it has been brought to our attention that certain bills, identified as S. 360, H.R. 51, H.R. 3833, and similar measures are pending in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States and that their purpose is to appropriate certain lands for the establishment of a national lakeshore park along the shores of Lake Michigan in Porter County, Ind.; and

Whereas there is a great need for a national park and recreation center in the State of Indiana, and more particularly in the Dunes areas in the northern part thereof: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Hammond, Ind., That we are in favor of the above identified bills for the purpose of establishing a National Lakeshore Park along the shores of Lake Michigan, Ind., and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our U.S. Senators and Congressmen as well as our State officials with the the request that they make every effort to provide the cities of Indiana with this much needed facility.

GEORGE W. CARLSON,
President.

What Is Wrong With America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, most Members of Congress share an increasing concern over a few misguided youths of today. We know also how most young Americans feel about the small group of beatniks that stain the image of their age group. It is a national tragedy, I feel, that the energy and creative talents of these young iconoclasts are being wasted.

Mr. Bill Casteel, in the April 29 Athens, Tenn., Post-Athenian, has written a timely and provocative editorial on this subject, and under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHAT IS WRONG IN AMERICA?

(By Bill Casteel)

What's happening to this country of ours—this country made great by a mutual respect for law and order—this country made great by stern discipline by our educators—this country made great by an unbending love and devotion to that flag called Old Glory?

Almost daily there is a riot on the campus of some college or university. Students cloaking themselves behind various freedom of expression and freedom of speech movements take command of institutions and actually gain support from faculty members.

Beatnik-type beards are allowed to flourish on the faces of young college men in colleges where it was once considered taboo to grow as much as a moustache.

What has happened that makes so many young people feel they have to do this or that for this or that cause?

Granted, there are many inequities in the American system. In the field of race relations there is much to be done on the parts of both races. Perhaps some of the laws established by colleges and universities are a bit strict for the 20th century liberal. And maybe the United States is wrong by having men and ammunition in the Vietnam war.

Still, none of these inequities should provide the beatniks with licenses to destroy and ruin college buildings. None of these inequities should be sufficient to allow a college campus to be turned into a beginners school for Greenwich Village. That kind of abstract living is all right but the taxpayer should not have to finance it.

And if the beatniks who patrol the White House in protest of our actions in Vietnam don't like the way we're handling the situation then perhaps a visa or two could be provided. I personally don't love this idea of Uncle Sam taking a chunk out of my paycheck for income taxes but I haven't been moved to march on the IRS.

The sense of values of the Nation is changing. Once it was considered all-American and noteworthy if a man worked hard and provided a good home for his family. Once it was of primary importance to get as much education (in the classroom) as possible.

Today the picture is different. It's far more popular (and newsworthy we might add) for a man to walk off his job, let his family go hungry and march off to Washington to protest our men in Vietnam or fluoride in the water in Timbuktu. And the student is better rounded if he plays hooky to grow a dirty-looking beard, screams "down with college regulations" and speaks out for a cause.

Gee, I wish I could grow a beard. Think of the soap one could save. And if some questionable "cause" did come up, I could join in without having to show my face.

I asked what is happening. I don't know. And I'm afraid to really find out.

A National Cemetery at Fort Custer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan Legislature has adopted a resolution recommending that the Congress establish a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich. I agree wholeheartedly with this resolution and have introduced a bill, H.R. 6998, which would accomplish this purpose.

It would indeed be fitting and proper that a portion of the historic land at Fort Custer be dedicated as a national cemetery by the U.S. Government in honor of its veterans who would choose to be buried there and, under unanimous consent I include this proposal in the RECORD:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

A concurrent resolution memoralizing the Congress relative to the establishing of a National Cemetery at Fort Custer

(Offered by Representatives DeMaso, Mrs. McCollough, Cyril H. Root, Spencer, Erlandsen, O'Brien, Jacobetti, Wagner, Arnett, Esch, and Little.)

Whereas through the recent action of the national Defense Department, many areas at Fort Custer are being deactivated and the various parts of the fort are being disengaged for other activities; and

Whereas there is a great need in the State of Michigan for a national cemetery for the veterans of the State of Michigan and surrounding territories; and

Whereas it would be fitting and proper that a portion of the land at Fort Custer, which was the scene of training for so many thousands of American soldiers, be dedicated as a national cemetery by the U.S. Government in honor of its veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress is hereby respectfully urged to create a na-

tional cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Michigan delegation to the Congress.

Adopted by the house April 1, 1965.

Adopted by the senate April 1, 1965.

BERYL I. KENYON,
Secretary of the Senate.
NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Through Foresight Now the United States Can Still Lead the World in Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have just read an excellent editorial in the Journal of Commerce for Friday, April 30 entitled "Clippers, Jets, and A-Ships." It makes a persuasive case for the need of the United States to have superiority in the field of international transportation.

The editorial calls attention to the leadership that came from the superior Clipper sailing ships saying that—

In the field of transportatioin, as nearly everywhere else, technical superiority makes for competitive superiority. It generates business. And it makes the going tough indeed for those who do not achieve it themselves.

Through the years, the International Air Transport Association has worked for the establishment of just and economic fares. From the beginning with the Bermuda agreements, fares have been constantly lowered. Efficient transportation and service has improved. Here is one of the fine examples of business and government working together. It has proven that competition can work and that free enterprise cannot only do a good job but is also interested in seeing that the public interest is served.

This is proof that American carriers have led the way and with our encouragement in the years that lie ahead, we will continue to lead.

The editorial follows:

CLIPPERS, JETS, AND A-SHIPS

In his book, "The Maritime History of Massachusetts," Samuel Eliot Morison gives a graphic picture of the China trades in the heyday of the American clipper ship.

"So vastly superior was the speed of the American clippers," he wrote, "that British firms in Hong Kong paid them 75 cents per cubic foot freight on teas to London against 28 cents to their own ships. Crack British East Indiamen humbly awaited cargo in the treaty ports for weeks on end, while one American clipper after another sailed proudly in, and secured freight almost before her topsails were furled. By the time the British builders were learning the first rudiments of clipper designing, the Americans had made further progress."

Those days are so long gone that many tend to forget the lesson to be learned from them. It is not merely that the U.S. clipper builders produced superior designs and gear. It is that in the field of transport, as nearly everywhere else, technical superiority makes for competitive superiority. It generates business. And it makes the going tough indeed for those who do not achieve it themselves.

In more recent years American aircraft manufacturers did much the same thing, as did the airlines that pioneered transocean flying, such as the scheduled service inaugurated between San Francisco and Manila in 1935 and then the transatlantic services that followed 4 years later.

Having achieved a notable lead they generated a good deal of business for themselves and have since acted as a powerful influence in keeping air fares low enough to generate even more traffic.

This is a point to be borne in mind when considering a problem as difficult as that posed by Alan F. Schoedel's definitive series of recent articles in this newspaper on prospects for a nuclear-powered American merchant fleet.

As a result of rapid technological improvements since the *Savannah* was completed in 1962, we are now close to the day when atomic-powered cargo liners can be acquired and operated at costs which would make them competitive, perhaps even economical, assuming that the Federal subsidy program is continued more or less on its present basis. A number are already under study. Estimates of how many could be profitably employed range anywhere from 50 to 150.

The greatest single advantage embodied in the nuclear merchant ship of the future is its speed. Operating at 30 knots it would enjoy an advantage comparable to that of the clippers in the China trade back in the 1840's. A less promising factor is the cost of building so many such vessels in relation to the seeming indifference of many legislators and some sections of the administration itself to shipping.

The real question, though, is not whether the United States can afford to embark on such a program. It is whether the United States can afford not to embark on it.

That the nuclear merchant ship is on the way is virtually certain. That the mercantile power first employing them in substantial numbers will get a great jump on its competitors is equally so. It is therefore unrealistic to assume that if the United States doesn't inaugurate such a program that nobody else will. The technology available to American shipbuilders and operators is, by the very nature of things, also available to others, or will be in relatively short order.

So those in the industry, in Congress and in the administration who are pondering the alternatives must consider not merely whether the United States should invest in getting ahead of the field, but whether it should risk being left behind, and perhaps a long way behind. It can, of course, be argued that this country could begin turning out nuclear ships as soon as it became apparent that others were moving in this direction. But to hang back until others have taken advantage of the technical advances already registered here is to scuttle the opportunity to achieve a real lead. In other words, if the ships are ultimately to be built anyway, they ought to be built when their appearance will do the most good.

It is also important that American carriers who are in a position to render a superior type of service be given sufficient leeway in conducting their business to take full advantage of what they have to offer.

If the trend toward Government control of international freight rates continues, the advantages available to the more enterprising operators will be curtailed if not altogether eliminated in the doubtful interests of uniformity. This goes not only for ships but for airlines. We are not speaking of the powers of all governments, including our own, to disapprove of international air fares, once they have been agreed through the International Air Transport Association. These are legitimate enough. But the bill now before Congress (H.R. 465) that would empower the Civil Aeronautics Board to prescribe precise rate levels unilaterally both for American and foreign air carriers serving this country on international routes is quite another matter.

The effect of this would be to make air fares a matter between governments. It would leave little scope for an enterprising airline. It would, in fact, leave little scope for enterprise.

College Tax Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, at the same time that post high school education is becoming ever more important, the cost of higher education is rising to the point where the average family is unable to afford it.

Our national concern with improving the quality and breadth of our educational system is a matter of record. We spend millions annually to improve facilities, broaden curriculum, and generally prepare students for better jobs and higher training. We do this because we believe in the value of an intelligent, aware, and capable population and because our national future depends on it.

Yet as we are increasing the opportunities, the group of students who are qualified but financially unable to take advantage of them, is increasing. An editorial in the Valley News, the daily newspaper of Lebanon, N.H., points out the increasing interest in a proposal which I have introduced in the Congress this session as H.R. 6025. The measure is designed to alleviate financial sacrifice and to encourage college attendance by giving a tax credit of 20 percent of the costs of tuition, fees, and books.

This is a grassroots Federal aid to education plan, helping where it hurts without necessitating expensive administration, the setting up of costly Government bureaus and offices. It is a simple way to ease the high cost of education and a small enough investment to make in the future of our Nation.

I commend this editorial which was published on April 17, 1965, to my colleagues and urge favorable action on tuition tax-credit legislation:

THE COLLEGE TAX CREDIT

Before President Johnson's college-aid program clears Congress, battle almost certainly will be joined on an issue which refuses to die—the college tax credit. The idea is a simple one: parents of college students would be permitted to deduct from their Federal tax payment the costs of tuition, books, supplies, and equipment. A maximum credit of

$300 or $400 is provided under most of the bills now before Congress.

Only with strong White House pressure was the tax credit scheme defeated in the last Congress. During Senate debate on the tax reduction and reform bill, one amendment setting up a tax credit plan was rejected by a 45 to 48 rollcall vote when three cosponsors voted against their own proposal, and a second was rejected by an even closer 47 to 47.

This year President Johnson has proposed that the Government set up a guarantee program for private loans to college students and pay part of the interest charge. This, he said, would be "a more effective, fairer and far less costly way of providing assistance than the various tax credit devices which have been proposed." But the Congress already is concerned over the high delinquency rate in the repayment of student loans under the present Defense Education Act.

The tax credit plan has the advantage of simplicity. One problem is that it would not benefit all taxpayers, most particularly those with incomes so low that there is no tax against which to take a credit. But sponsors say this is true of other tax relief provisions, and that this is a plan for the "average family" in America.

Many officials of private colleges favor the credit, but officials of State-supported schools are less enthusiastic, arguing that the plan would shift support for higher education from private endowments and public appropriations to the students themselves through higher tuition. Be that as it may, the tax credit plan has a solid following in Congress, especially among Republicans, and is far from dead.

Our Policy in Southeast Asia and Comments on the General Political Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, almost daily the news from Vietnam gets worse. There are those who cry peace at any price, but the professional pollsters report that the majority of the American people support a firm policy in southeast Asia. Yes, the people support continued opposition to the Vietcong, but my mail clearly indicates that they do not approve the President's proposal to spend $1 billion in an effort to buy peace. Rather than to develop my own arguments on this point, I submit a letter from a constituent of mine. This good lady gets right to the heart of the issue and also includes some very pertinent comments on the general political scene.

The letter follows:

JACKSON E. BETTS,
Congressman, Eighth District, Ohio,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JACKSON BETTS: After the President's speech of last night concerning Vietnam, I felt I should write you to let you know of my feelings. The political situation hasn't upset me enough to cry since election night. Perhaps you can tell me that I misunderstood the message; that my ears didn't hear what I thought they did, my eyes didn't see what I thought they saw. I thought I heard our President say if we gave our Asian enemies $1 billion worth of goods and services, they would suddenly become peace-loving, law-abiding brothers, be happy minding their own business, and leave all others alone. I thought I saw many people standing and applauding this idea as though it were a marvelous new innovation.

Ever since I was a little girl it has seemed tragic to me that there had to be so many evil people trampling over others. Wouldn't it be wonderful if everyone could and would love one another, be unselfish, and peaceful? What a beautiful world this would be. We hope things will be better for our children and better still for their children. Maybe someday these things can be. But they aren't now and can't be just because we wish them to be with the help of our money.

We work hard for the money the Government loves to throw away. It's our money, and I feel we should have some say about how it is to be spent. I'm sick of statistics that keep shouting how the average wage earner has half his pay left after essentials. We spend the first half for groceries, the other half for house, insurance, electricity, etc. And we are average. Maybe I can be a patsy for Washington bureaus that want to use my money to buy up farm surpluses so I have to pay more for the product at the store; and so they can sell butter and wheat to Communist countries for less than American citizens have to pay. But when it comes to using my money to subsidize the enemies of our country to make them more difficult to defeat, I simply must protest. Let's not be crass enough to blame this on God, turning the other cheek, brotherly love, all that jazz. God gave us minds, but he left it to us to decide how to use them. Someone has their thinking button switched off.

Anyway, how can we supply anyone anywhere with $1 billion worth of anything when we are going in debt much more than that already for just 1 year? This is beyond my comprehension. Suppose there was a very needy family in my neighborhood. Also suppose, too, that we were in debt for our next 3 years' income. How could I go to that family and say, "Please take our income for the next month, we have so much." Even if I could, would they appreciate it? Would it accomplish miracles for them?

Please tell me this situation isn't so. I would be glad to hear I am wrong.

Another thing, recently I was displeased to read disparaging remarks concerning Congressmen who have the gall to vote on legislation according to their conscience or what they believe is the right thing. At the same time much praise is abounding for the President who is not above using means that are not cricket to get his way. Is this democracy? If Congressmen are not going to hold their own, it will be the same as not having a Congress.

Poor Thomas Jefferson and Ben Franklin. I hope they can't see what's going on today. If they can, I hope they have some means to straighten things out.

Most sincerely,

_____.

Mr. Kermit Gordon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the recent edition of the Berkshire Eagle comments on a man whom I know we have all come to respect. I am speaking of Mr. Kermit Gordon, who recently left the post of Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The article highlights the many accomplishments of this outstanding man who was once professor of economics at Williams College in the First Congressional District of Massachusetts. It also expresses the hope that we have not seen the last of Mr. Gordon in public life. I concur in this sentiment, as I am sure many of you do. May I commend the full text of this article by Mr. Edward J. Michelson to the attention of my colleagues.

BROOKINGS POST FOR KERMIT GORDON TO PUT HIM IN INFLUENTIAL SPOT

(By Edward J. Michelson)

WASHINGTON.—It is taken for granted that Kermit Gordon will be tapped for occasional assignments by President Johnson after leaving Government in June to become vice president of the influential Brookings Institution. The intention of the one-time Williams College economics professor to resign has been known for some time by correspondents closely following the Executive Offices building, which houses the Budget Bureau, the Council of Economic Advisers, in which Gordon first served in 1961, and the vice president's downtown office, among other units.

The Washington Post comments, "The only consolation in Gordon's departure is that he will remain in Washington * * * a moment's ride from the White House." This is the widespread view here of Gordon's standing in the administration. He is known to have been equally at home on the banks of the Pedernales as the sands of Hyannis.

The Brookings Institution is an independent, nonprofit, and nonpartisan research organization in the social sciences founded by Robert S. Brookings, a St. Louis businessman. Brookings retired at the age of 45 in 1897 to devote himself to philanthropy.

The present organization was chartered in 1927 in Washington under its present name comprising the Institute of Economics (founded in 1920), the Institute of Government Research (founded in 1916), and a research-training division (opened in 1924 as a graduate school of economics and government). It operates on an annual budget of close to $4 million, having a resident staff of about 150, supplemented by many others in the universities working on Brookings projects. Support comes from philanthropic foundations, endowment, and gifts from private individuals and corporate foundations. Government grants and contracts account for about one-fifth of the operating budget. Work for the Government is done on request, with the proviso that the institution will be free to publish its findings without restriction, as in all other of the Brookings research projects.

Current head of Brookings is Robert D. Calkins, who has been its president and executive head since 1952 and who is given credit for expanding and beefing up a quasi-moribund research institution into one of the most resepcted private research agencies operating in Washington. Prior to coming to Brookings, Dr. Calkins was dean of Columbia University's Graduate School of Business. Since Dr. Calkins is now 62 and nearing retirement age, it is the supposition around Washington that Gordon, who is not yet 49 and who knows his way around the foundation offices, will be a candidate to head the organization.

In commenting a year ago on what criteria Brookings uses in deciding what research it will undertake Calkins said:

"Our criteria are fairly simple: the problem shall be an important public problem; it shall be researchable; the problem should be an economic, governmental, or foreign policy problem that is related to our current

efforts; funds and qualified personnel should be available or obtainable; and the anticipated results should be useful in contributing to public understanding. Brookings is, in a sense, an entrepreneur; it brings research needs, funds, and talent together to facilitate research on specific public problems. But since our uncommitted funds are limited, our projects depend in considerable measure on what can be financed, and this in turn depends upon foundation interests."

Prior to the announcement of the Gordon appointment to the important Brookings post there was some grumbling when he was mentioned for Secretary of the Treasury, as a man being considered to succeed C. Douglas Dillon. The Bureau of the Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers have had increased influence in the past 4½ years in policy formulation and in pressing for expansionary fiscal policies. Like his Budget Bureau predecessor, David Bell, Gordon was reprimanded by Chairman BYRD of the Finance Committee for failing to regard an unbalanced budget as tainted with original sin. In both cases, Senator BYRD opined the men should be driven from the garden.

Actually there has been little serious criticism of Gordon. His views on farm policy are shared by more conservative personages in Government who are troubled by the enormous Department of Agriculture budget and the ineffectiveness of anachronistic price-support programs in making marginal farms viable or controlling production of basic commodities. Sooner or later, the changes he supposedly advocated will have to take place.

The power of the Budget Bureau will be in evidence in weeks to come on Capitol Hill as appropriations bills emerge from committees for consideration in the Senate and House. Public works, foreign aid, independent agencies, and countless other activities depend on Congress for funds, but it is the Budget Bureau which makes the estimates or "ceilings" on Federal program costs, and which impounds appropriations if they exceed what the administration regards as sufficient money.

In the case of Appalachia and other antipoverty projects, the President relies on the Budget Bureau to insure against boondoggles or pork barrel. The revelations appearing in this and other newspapers about certain ill-fated ventures aided by the Area Redevelopment Administration tend to become lessons learned in the executive offices, where a relatively small work force studies ideas and proposals which are not only politically feasible but also devises means of making them workable.

But all this official concern will be behind Gordon after June 1 when he moves over to Brookings in their fine quarters on Massachusetts Avenue. Then he will be able to do a study on the high price of spiritus frumenti when purveyed privately as against the prices charged by State liquor stores—a subject which he once warmly explored in the "Letters" column of this newspaper when he was a young assistant professor of economics at Williams hard by the Vermont line.

Aeroquip: Example of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, with the Federal Government encroaching on almost every aspect of our lives, it is encouraging indeed to know that private enterprise occasionally—although far too seldom—can win out. An honest, ambitious, energetic, ingenious young man starting out in business is far from assured of success these days. Horatio Alger did not have a hundred Federal rules and regulations and taxes and insurance and forms in quintuplicate—not to mention competition from the Government itself—to plague him. It is, therefore, refreshing to hear a modern-day success story of a small business that not only managed to survive but to flourish. Such a story, deserving of attention, has recently come out of Jackson, Mich., and, I, under unanimous consent, include the following editorial from the Jackson Citizen Patriot of April 25 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AEROQUIP: EXAMPLE OF FREE ENTERPRISE

This week Aeroquip Corp. is celebrating its 25th anniversary and a quarter century of growth and is being properly honored by its hometown of Jackson.

The Greater Jackson Chamber of Commerce has adopted a resolution praising Aeroquip as "an outstanding example of economic success under the American free enterprise system" and for "its important and beneficial impact on our community."

Certainly the story of Aeroquip, which is told in full detail in a special section of today's Citizen Patriot, is dramatic.

It is a story which should be familiar in America, but which too often is overlooked.

It all began with one man, an idea which would fill a need, and few investors with risk capital and foresight to see the potential in Peter F. Hurst's hose coupling.

The worth of the product quickly was proved. Expansion under good management followed. Now, 25 years later, annual sales exceed $77 million. Most important, 3,700 persons in Jackson and other Aeroquip locations have jobs which would not have existed without the magic combination of an idea, capital, and good management.

We dwell on the Aeroquip story, not only because it is a Jackson-based firm which has contributed so much to the economy here, but because it is the perfect antidote for so many of the misconceptions about the free enterprise system which exist in many minds.

In a speech before the Daughters of the American Revolution last week, Mrs. Mary G. Roebling, chairman of the board, Trenton, N.J., Trust Co., referred to free enterprise as "The new frontier for the heirs of the pioneers."

She suggested that the DAR ask President Johnson to designate 1 day each year to be known as "Free Enterprise Day" and urge the Governors of the 50 States to join in the movement.

But, you ask, doesn't everyone know about free enterprise and how it works?

Perhaps not. Mrs. Roebling cited a national survey among students from the seventh grade through college. More than 60 percent believed that in some fields so much power is concentrated in the hands of so few companies that it is bad for the Nation.

More than 63 percent of the seventh graders believed the government should control large companies' profits. Fifty-seven percent of the high school students and 74 percent of the college freshmen agreed. In a later survey of adults, 42 percent went along with the idea.

Among students preparing to be teachers, only half understood that a business cannot function without a profit. Of college students majoring in education, only 20 percent got any exposure to economics at all.

When asked why people work, only 6 percent of the young persons interviewed answered: "Because they like to."

Does this, Mrs. Roebling asked, "suggest a leaning toward paternalism, toward security rather than freedom or initiative? And these are Americans, not children brought up as the heirs of socialism."

You can verify the results of the abovementioned survey, and others which produced similar results, just by listening and reading.

How many times have you heard or read that "the big companies and the bankers control the economy of America" and that "the little fellow doesn't have a chance" or that "free enterprise is dead or dying and we need more government controls?"

Now let's come back to Aeroquip and to Jackson and to dozens of other communities throughout the Great Lakes industrial belt.

Peter Hurst and his few backers with a thousand dollars apiece were only a speck on the industrial scene 25 years ago. Even today, the company is not large as industrial corporations go. But it has prospered and grown through the years, using its profits to give fair returns to stockholders and creating jobs. It is one of many hundreds of similar companies which have grown and are prospering in this period when free enterprise is supposed to be dying or falling into the hands of giant corporations and banks.

But what of the future?

Can the Aeroquip story be repeated here or elsewhere in the next 25 years?

The answer must be "yes"—but with an "if." If, that is, the free enterprise system is permitted to function.

In Jackson today, one can find many small plants which began, as did Aeroquip, with a man, an idea, and a few hundred or thousand dollars. There have been failures, to be sure, as there always will be.

It is entirely possible that a plant operating in a backyard garage today will be marking its 25th anniversary with sales in the millions, by 1990.

Again, consider the big "if" mentioned above.

The need for new ideas and men and capital to transfer them into marketable products never ceases.

Technological progress seems to feed on itself. The more inventions that pop out of men's minds the greater becomes the demand for new ideas—and the greater the opportunity for the heirs of the pioneers to explore the new frontier of free enterprise.

The frontier may not be exactly new, but it is one which, given the chance, will expand indefinitely. It always will offer new territory to conquer and provide rich rewards, not only for the men who seek them, but for all Americans as well.

Keep the 3397th in Chattanooga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, there is an outstanding military organization in Chattanooga, Tenn., in danger of being eliminated by the proposed Defense Department's merger of the National Guard and Reserve forces. The 3397th Garrison unit is at 100-percent fighting strength, it has continually received the highest proficiency awards by the Secretary of the Army, and it is acknowledged as one of the best qualified to perform its mission in the whole 3d Army area.

In the Defense Department consolidation, 4 reserve garrisons will be maintained and 14 eliminated. From every standpoint—efficiency, ready status, and capability, our national defense demands that the 3397th be one of the four retained.

I know most of the 108 officers and 250 enlisted men in this superior unit can vouch for their abilities and dedication to fulfilling their responsibilities.

I have contacted Secretary of Defense McNamara, Chief of Army Reserves General Sutton, and have secured the assistance of the ranking members of the House Armed Services Committee. In addition, I have been in communication with Tennessee's Senator GORE, and we are working together on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to show the broad community respect and support for this outstanding Army group, with unanimous consent I place an editorial from the May 1, 1965, Chattanooga Times, a column "Looking Backward" from the April 29 Times, an article from the April 17 Times, and a background paper on the 3397th U.S. Army Garrison printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

U.S. ARMY GARRISON (3397), CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

The presently designated U.S. Army Garrison (3397) was organized 16 years ago as the 3060th complement post, camp or station training (small). The mission of the unit in event of mobilization is to activate and operate a military installation. In general the unit would command the post of camp X and provide for the efficient and economical operation, administration, training, service, and supply of all individuals, units, and activities thereon, except those functions and command responsibilities specifically retained by the U.S. Continental Army commander, the Army commander or the head of a Department of the Army agency.

During the 16 years the unit has been in existence it has grown from a complement of 25 officers to its present authorized strength of 106 officers, 1 warrant officer, and 250 enlisted men, an aggregate of 357. Since 1964, the garrison has been at 100 percent strength, and unlike many Reserve units, the demand for men of draft status to fulfill military requirements has not been an important factor in filling the unit to full strength. Within the unit structure, the unit has all the officers and enlisted men in the various services to make the unit self-supporting.

The U.S. Army Garrison (3397) has made significant accomplishments since its establishment and particularly since 1962. The unit was awarded the Secretary of the Army Superior Unit Award for the year 1963–64 for proficiency in training. This award is the highest that a Reserve unit can receive in peacetime and should be forthcoming for the year 1964–65 inasmuch as performance was higher during the training year.

The inspection ratings received during this past training period are:

Type of inspection:	*Percentage rating*
IG, rating superior	96.84
Annual field training, rating superior	97.70

Other significant statistics regarding the performance of the unit for the year 1964–65 are:

	Percent
Strength attainment	100.00
MOS qualified	90.98
Annual field training attendance	96.61
Weapons qualifications	99.40

The U.S. Army Garrison (3397) is considered ready for immediate call to active duty. Sights and standards are high, the morale and esprit de corps is outstanding as is readily reflected in the enthusiasm and ability exhibited by both officers and enlisted personnel in performance of the assigned duties and functions in the accomplishment of the unit mission.

The enthusiasm and ability of both officer and enlisted men is further reflected in the individual efforts of the men of this unit. (1) All officer personnel are pursuing Army extension course study or are enrolled in an Army school; (2) The commanding officer, S/1 and S/2 are graduates of Command and General Staff College; (3) 31 unit officers are attached to Chattanooga USAR School (3293) and attend required meetings in addition to unit meetings. The breakdown of courses being pursued:

Command and General Staff, 5th year	3
Command and General Staff, 3d year	8
Command and General Staff, 1st year	10
Artillery, 1st year	4
Infantry, 3d year	4
Signal	2
Total	31

(4) Thirty-one enlisted men are enrolled in USAR MOS schools; (5) Active participation in pistol and rifle match competition.

Of the 18 garrison units in the United States currently on the troop list, in addition to the U.S. Army garrison (3397) only 3 other garrison units were cited in General Order 7, Department of the Army, dated March 8, 1965, to be awarded the Secretary of the Army Superior Unit Award for the year 1963–64. Of the current 18 garrison units, 4 are to be retained in accordance with the proposed troop list. The U.S. Army garrison (3397) is not one of the units on the proposed troop list. The retention of the U.S. Army garrison (3397) with its past superior performance would logically appear to be in the best interest of the United States insofar as mobilization posture, economy or efficiency is concerned.

[From the Chattanooga Times, Apr. 29, 1965]

LOOKING BACKWARD

The appeal to save the U.S. Army Reserve Garrison (3397) located in Chattanooga has been sent to the Commanding General of the 3d U.S. Army, at Fort McPherson, Ga., by Col. Creed Bates, chairman of the Army Advisory Committee for the Chattanooga area.

The committee met recently, heard Col. Alvin Blumberg explain that though the garrison had received highest honors, it was slated to be shelved in a reorganization plan. The resolution contained in the report to the commanding general was prepared by a committee headed by Robert Maclellan.

Colonel Blumberg has received a letter from Senator GORE supporting the position of the local Reserve garrison. Senator BASS is reported favorable to the Chattanooga position, though official word has not been received from him.

Congressman BILL BROCK has appealed to Maj. Gen. William Sutton, Chief of Army Reserves, who replied that the plan as proposed would indeed inactivate Garrison 3397, but the selection of the four garrisons to be retained was based on geographic location and mobilization missions. Congressman BROCK then appealed to Defense Secretary McNamara.

Whether the commanding general of the 3d Army can do anything is a problem, though certainly Garrison 3397, located in his Army area, is a garrison to be proud of.

Colonel Bates' report to the commanding general of the 3d Army follows:

FORT MCPHERSON, GA.

LT. GEN. C. W. G. RICH,
3d U.S. Army,

DEAR SIR: A meeting of the Chattanooga Army Advisory Committee was called at 10:30 on April 16, 1965, in the Provident Board Room for the purpose of discussing proposed changes in U.S. Army Reserve and in particular their effect on the U.S. Army Garrison (3397) of Chattanooga.

Colonel Blumberg, commanding officer of the 3397th, outlined the activities of the unit. He stated that the U.S. Army Garrison (3397) has been a top priority unit for a number of years and is presently at full strength, fully qualified, and ready. Colonel Blumberg also pointed out that under General Order No. 7 Department of the Army dated the 8th of March 1965, the Chattanooga U.S. Army Garrison (3397) was awarded the Secretary of Army Superior Unit Award for the year 1963–64 and was one of the four such units in the Nation to receive this award. He further stated that should this unit be deactivated and it became necessary in case of war to open new camps, millions of dollars of training and experience would be thrown away as well as other untold millions of dollars in time possibly being wasted through the lack of a well-trained unit to assume this task.

After further discussion by the committee, it was agreed that if four Army garrisons are to be retained, the best units should be the ones to be retained. Assuming that the Secretary of the Army Superior Unit Award is a criterion of excellence, then the only possible fair solution would be the retention of the U.S. Army Garrison (3397). Based on the above, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by the committee:

Resolved, That the U.S. Army Advisory Committee recommend the retention of the U.S. Army Garrison (3397) as one of the garrisons to be retained under the proposed reorganization of the National Guard and Army Reserve. This recommendation is based on the demonstrated training readiness, strength, and operating ability of this unit over the past several years culminating in the receipt of the Secretary of the Army Superior Unit Award for the year 1963–64; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the commanding general 3d U.S. Army, Atlanta, Ga., and that a copy of this resolution be furnished the Honorable ROSS BASS, U.S. Senator from the State of Tennessee; the Honorable ALBERT GORE, U.S. Senator from the State of Tennessee; and the Honorable BILL BROCK, Representative, the Third District of the State of Tennessee.

Sincerely yours,
Lt. Col. CREED F. BATES,
Chairman.

FOR RETENTION OF UNIT 3397

Senator ALBERT GORE has joined Representative BROCK, and the Chattanooga Army Advisory Committee for the 3d Army area, in urging retention in service of the 3397th Garrison Unit (Reserve) of Chattanooga.

In a letter to Col. Alvin E. Blumberg, commander of the garrison, Senator GORE says: "I have advised officials in the Pentagon of the very fine record of this unit and have urged that it be retained in the new structure provided there is a requirement for units of this type to meet the mobilization needs of national security."

Committees of Congress are looking into the proposed consolidation of the Reserve forces with the National Guard. The proposed merger as outlined by the Defense Department reduces to four the total of 18 Reserve garrisons now in force, and the Chattanooga unit, though outstanding in efficiency, in not among the four to be retained.

During the 16 years the Chattanooga garrison has been in effect, it has grown from a complement of 25 officers to its present authorized strength of 108 officers and 250 enlisted men. Since 1964 the garrison has been at 100 percent in strength.

The Chattanooga garrison was awarded the Secretary of the Army Superior Unit Award

for proficiency in training, the highest award a garrison can receive in peacetime. The inspection rating received during the past training period was "superior" with percentage rating of 97.70 percent in field training.

Of the 18 garrison units in the United States, only three others beside Chattanooga received the Secretary of the Army Superior Award. Still, Chattanooga is not one of the four scheduled to be retained. Should not excellence count?

Defense requirements permitting, as we believe they do, the retention of U.S. Army Garrison 3397 is in the best interest of the United States insofar as mobilization posture, economy, or efficiency is concerned.

LEADERS PROTEST DECISION TO DROP UNIT OF RESERVES—ADVISORY GROUP OPPOSES ELIMINATION OF ARMY GARRISON 3397—APPEALS TO 3D ARMY—TECHNICAL QUALIFICATION MAKES IT UNLIKELY IT WILL BE MERGED

U.S. Army Garrison 3397, the Chattanooga area's largest Army Reserve unit consisting of 357 officers and men, is scheduled for elimination under Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's merger plan, the Times learned Friday.

Asked for verification of the report, Col. Alvin E. Blumberg, garrison commander, said he has been "verbally advised" that the garrison is "not on the list of those to be retained" under the merger plan but that he has received no official orders nor even any written communication on the subject.

WON'T JOIN GUARD

The garrison commander also declared that "in my opinion, in view of the technical qualifications of the garrison personnel there is little likelihood of the personnel being otherwise absorbed." This was in answer to a question about whether the garrison might be merged with Tennessee National Guard units.

Colonel Blumberg said he was invited to meet with the Chattanooga Area Army Advisory Committee Friday morning in the board room of the Provident Building to discuss the possible elimination of the Reserve garrison. The members present registered their opinion that the outstanding Chattanooga garrison should be kept in operation and a resolutions committee was appointed by Col. Creed F. Bates, chairman, to prepare a special resolution to be sent to the commanding general, 3d U.S. Army, with headquarters at Fort McPherson, Ga.

Colonel Blumberg told the advisory committee the Chattanooga garrison was one of 4 of the 18 garrisons in the United States to be cited in General Orders 7, Department of the Army, dated March 8, 1965, as having been awarded the Secretary of the Army Superior United Award for 1963–64. This award is the highest that a Reserve unit can be given in peacetime and Colonel Blumberg said in his opinion it should be awarded again this year to Garrison 3397 "inasmuch as performance was higher during the training year 1964–65."

The other garrisons cited for the award were the 1117th, 5016th and the 6212th.

The resolutions committee, headed by Robert L. Maclellan, will prepare a formal resolution to be sent to the commanding general of the 3d Army.

"Perhaps the unit is no longer needed in the modern defense establishment," Colonel Blumberg told the advisory committee, "but the mission of an army garrison to activate and operate a large army post or camp for training of additional troops is something that is always with us."

He said the Chattanooga garrison is at full strength, fully qualified, and that millions of dollars in training and experience would be thrown away if the unit is abolished.

Members and guests at the meeting of the Chattanooga Area Army Advisory Committee were Thomas C. Ervin, the Reverend James D. Niedergeses, John W. Cameron, Rabbi Abraham Feinstein, James W. Hunt, Charles K. Peacock, Col. John Neligan, Jr., USAR; Dr. Robert C. Robertson, the Reverend Donald R. Fauble, Dale Engstrom, Alfred Mynders, Maclellan and Colonel Bates.

Campus Revolts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, Art Buchwald has done it again. Satire often gets the message through more effectively than straight reporting.

Perhaps some of our immature, nonconformist, dissatisfied misfits who may never find their niche in society, might get just a slight ray of light:

[From Columbus Dispatch, Apr. 26, 1965]

STUDENT REVOLT BLAMED ON LACK OF INSTRUCTORS

(By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—There has been a great deal of discussion about campus revolts spreading across the Nation.

The question is why, and I think I've got the answer. The reason the college students are doing so much demonstrating is that there is no one in class to teach them anymore.

Almost every full professor is either writing a book, guest lecturing at another university, or taking a year off to write a report for President Johnson.

Therefore, he has turned over his course to a graduate instructor who is either working on his Ph. D., traveling on a Fulbright scholarship, or picketing in Montgomery, Ala. So he in turn has turned the class over to one of the brighter students who is never there because he works on the college newspaper, is a member of the student senate, or is a delegate to his national fraternity.

When the students arrive at class there is no one in the front of the room, so usually a Socialist student takes over the class and tells the students it's about time they revolted.

The students pour out on campus heading for the administration building to protest to the chancellor of the university who, unfortunately, is away trying to raise money for a new business administration building.

The vice chancellor is at the State capital testifying on a new education bill and the dean of men is at a convention in Phoenix, Ariz.

The dean of women is addressing a garden club in the next State, and the only one left in the administration building is the chief of campus police.

So he arrests the ringleaders of the group (those standing in front) and this plays right into the students' hands because now with the arrests they have something to demonstate about.

In the meantime the chancellor flies home to see if he can settle the matter. The students demand the release of the demonstrators. He is about to do this when the board of regents votes to back the chancellor in meting out punishment to the ringleaders.

The faculty, made up of visiting professors from other schools, votes to support the students and the chancellor finds himself in an impossible position.

He therefore resigns and accepts a grant from the Ford Foundation to make a study of higher education.

The State politicians call for an investigation of the student demonstrations to discover if they were Communist inspired.

Finally, the Governor makes a statement pledging full support for law and order.

By this time the demonstrations start petering out and students return to class. But even the Socialist student is not there. He's been booked on a lecture tour to talk about free speech at other universities.

So everyone decides to go to Washington and picket the White House over its policy on Vietnam.

The Taxpayer: Unwitting Victim of Withholding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, there is a dangerous philosophy with us today that says that the answer to all ills is more Government spending. For every problem, the Government will buy a solution and set up a new agency to administer it and hire high paid officials to plan and oversee it.

The bills, however, must eventually be paid by someone and it is the taxpayer who ends up paying them. But the withholding system, by which we pay a small portion of our income taxes out of each paycheck, makes the reckoning fairly painless.

A recent editorial in the Concord Monitor, one of New Hampshire's leading newspapers, suggests that it is this painless system that is responsible for the rising high level of Government spending and our resulting high tax rate. Since we never see the money, we are not so conscious of the amount we pay each year.

Perhaps if we had to write a check each April 15th for the total amount of our last year's taxes, and realized that this total is often more than we have earned so far in the current year, the philosophy of Government spending as a cure for all would be more carefully reconsidered by the voting taxpayer.

I commend the editorial which was published in the Concord Monitor on April 9, 1965, to my colleagues:

FUNNY FELLOW, THE TAXPAYER

The taxpayer is a funny fellow.

If the tax he pays is concealed in the price of something, or deducted before he gets what's left of his pay, he has no complaint.

If he is entitled to an income tax refund, he acts almost as though Uncle Sam was doing him a favor by making restitution of money he has forcibly borrowed from the taxpayer.

If, on the other hand, Uncle Sam has not withheld enough of his pay to meet income tax obligations, the taxpayer feels he has been betrayed. The thought that he still owes Uncle Sam something, and must ante up for it out of his take-home pay or savings is repugnant, and he works up a great hate for those bumbling bureaucrats in Washington.

He, the taxpayer, still doesn't object to the tax, but only to the painful process of paying a portion of it which didn't get deducted in 1964, because of a tax cut, of all things.

There was a time, not so long ago, when Uncle Sam didn't compel employers to withhold taxes of their employees. At the end of the year the individual made out his return, figured his tax, and was permitted to pay it himself, in installments. That made a taxpayer tax conscious. And it kept the tax rates down.

Back during the New Deal all this changed. Beardsley Ruml thought up the idea of payroll deductions to meet tax obligations. F.D.R. bought the idea quickly and it has proved a blessing to the Government, if not to the taxpayer.

The Government got 2 years' taxes in 1 when the change was inaugurated. It took in millions it otherwise would have had to borrow elsewhere. It collected taxes from many taxpayers who previously hadn't been filing tax returns. But the principal accomplishment was to make the income tax an indirect tax, painless to the taxpayer.

Beardsley Ruml has gone to his reward, exhausted by this and other inventive thinkpieces and long service for Macy's Department Store. But the heritage he left undoubtedly is the payment of more taxes by Americans than they would submit to if they still paid income taxes directly.

One reason property taxpayers make so much noise is because they know how much they must pay and nobody deducts and takes care of their tax obligation almost unbeknownst to them.

When one knows what taxes he pays he becomes more interested in what his taxes buy.

Lincoln College in Lincoln, Ill., Celebrates Its 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the year 1965 marks the 100th anniversary of the founding of Lincoln College, Lincoln, Ill. Originally known as Lincoln University, this institution is the first and only one to be named for Abraham Lincoln while he still lived, and was chartered by the Legislature of the State of Illinois on February 6, 1865. On March 4 of that year letters were addressed to President Lincoln advising him that the college was being founded and named in his honor. A copy of the letter of Col. Robert Latham, vice president of the board of trustees, reads as follows:

LINCOLN, ILL.,
March 4, 1865.

His Excellency A. LINCOLN,
President of the United States.

DEAR SIR: By request of the president of the board of trustees of Lincoln University, whose address this will acompany, I write to inform you more fully of the university and of the prosperity of our town, believing you feel a lively interest in it, on account of its being named for you before Presidential honors had any influence. Lincoln contains about 2,800 inhabitants. Houses are going up almost daily and it is expected that there will be from 100 to 200 dwelling houses go up this season, mostly of a good quality, business has increased fully in proportion to the inhabitants. Our people although not very wealthy, are very enterprising, and are very anxious, in fact determined to make the university a success. Messrs. Wyatt Gillett and I donated 10 acres of land, that we were offered $6,000 for, and $3,000 in cash to it, several other persons $1,000 each, and nearly all the citizens something. The friends of the town propose to build one wing of the building. And the church propose to endow it with $200,000 as soon as $100,000 endowment fund is raised, they to go on and finish the buildings. The school to commence as soon as this wing of the building is completed and $50,000 endowment fund is raised.

Our greatest difficulty will be to get sufficient funds to build a house that will do justice to the name and place.

Hoping that we will have the pleasure of seeing you in our own beloved Illinois ere the summer passes,

I am very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,

R. B. LATHAM.

Twelve years earlier when the city of Lincoln was founded, the proprietors named the town for Mr. Lincoln before he became famous.

The founding of Lincoln College was a direct result of the Civil War. The Cumberland Presbyterian Church whose memberships were principally located in the Cumberland area of the south, had nevertheless strong memberships in certain northern areas that had been settled by southerners. The town of Lincoln was one of these. Therefore, when the synods of Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church decided to locate a college in the then great northwest, the town of Lincoln made a strong bid and the church commissioners decided to accept the city's offer.

The ground for the first building, University Hall was broken on February 12, 1865, according to legend. The construction of this building proceeded rapidly and in September of 1865 the late President's great friend and political supporter, Gov. Richard Oglesby, of Illinois, delivered the dedicatory address for the laying of the cornerstone. By 1866 the building was completed and classes began in November of that year. Classes have been held in this historic building each year since that time, making it one of central Illinois' oldest collegiate structures in continuous use.

The college began its instruction with a 4-year liberal arts program. Strong church connections were maintained through the decades until 1929 when, because of reduced financial circumstances and because of increasing interest in the 2-year junior college program, Lincoln College became a 2-year institution.

Since 1929 Lincoln College has continued to function as a leading 2-year, coeducational institution specializing in a liberal arts program designed to serve the special interests of college freshmen and sophomores. Most graduates transfer to a wide variety of 4-year institutions after 2 years at Lincoln College. Since 1950 the college has grown from less than 100 students to an enrollment of 500 in 1965.

In addition to the transfer program of the regular academic year, the college has pioneered in a summer program of review courses for students who need additional preparation to their high school training for successful college achievement. This has proved to be highly successful for a large number of students.

As part of the observance of the centennial year, the college held the dedication of Harts Memorial Science Hall on September 27, 1964. This new facility contains the most modern laboratories and equipment for physics, chemistry, and biology, as well as offices for staff members and the academic dean. A new general college library is on the ground floor.

On February 6, 1965, the exact 100th anniversary of Lincoln College's charter, a centennial convocation was held on the campus in which a symposium of distinguished persons gave addresses. Sister Mary Ann Ida, president of Mundelein College, spoke on the future of education for women; Prof. John Hope Franklin of the University of Chicago spoke concerning the future of education for underprivileged citizens; Prof. Robert J. Havighurst of the University of Chicago spoke concerning the future of liberal arts colleges, and Prof. Norman J. DeWitt of the University of Minnesota spoke concerning liberal arts colleges and the future of the traditional academic disciplines. Over 100 delegates from the leading colleges and universities were present. Ten leading educators and citizens were awarded honorary degrees at this time, and in addition to the four symposium speakers this included: Milburn P. Akers, editor, Chicago Sun-Times; President Robert G. Bone, Illinois State University; Richard G. Browne, executive director, Illinois Board of Higher Education; President Nelson Glueck, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion; Richard Paul Graebel, minister, First Presbyterian Church, Springfield, and President Sharvy Umbeck, Knox College.

The final event of the centennial year will be the 100th anniversary commencement to be held June 13 at which time Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH will be the speaker. A special committee is preparing a centennial history of Lincoln College which will be published in September as the final commemorative act of the centennial year.

President Raymond N. Dooley, when asked about the future of the college, said that it appears to be very bright, indeed, always providing that we continue to follow the ideals and examples of simplicity, sincerity, and service exemplified by our great mentor, Abraham Lincoln.

As the Representative of the 22d Congressional District of Illinois, I know that I express the views of the people in my district in wishing Lincoln College the very best in the second 100 years of its existence. It is serving a great need to the children emerging from the high schools in the Middle West. I know it will have the good wishes of my colleagues in this body as it goes about its job of educating young men and women in preparation for their responsibilities in the greatest country on earth.

Theta Sigma Phi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I had the privilege of introducing as the main speaker for the matrix table of the Theta Sigma Phi luncheon in Cleveland, the distinguished senior Senator from Maine, MARGARET CHASE SMITH.

Theta Sigma Phi, the professional organization for women in journalism and communication, works to maintain a free and responsible press with high professional standards, to unite women engaged in the communication fields, to recognize distinguished achievement of women in all media and to encourage young women to take up careers in journalism. The organization includes professional journalists, honorary members who have achieved national distinction in letters and communication, and students and alumnae of journalism schools.

That you may know something of this exceedingly constructive group, I am including with these few words my introduction of Senator SMITH and her very excellent address to the Theta Sigma Phi:

INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH BY CONGRESSWOMAN FRANCES P. BOLTON AT THE THETA SIGMA PHI CONFERENCE LUNCHEON

Madam Chairman, delegates to the Theta Sigma Phi Press Conference, and friends, with great joy I am here to introduce a most unusual woman, who exemplifies what the women of America really stand for. She has won the admiration of all who know her, for with radiant courage she has borne heavy burdens and responsibilities all her life.

Before her marriage, she was a teacher, an executive in telephone, newspaper, and woolen companies, and was a nationally syndicated columnist for more than 5 years.

In 1940 she took her husband's place in the House of Representatives. For 9 years we worked closely together, learning to respect each other deep down in the inner reaches of friendship. Then she became Senator and is now in her third term—the only woman to have served in both Houses of the Congress. She has won every election and built an outstanding reputation for her State of Maine.

Both on the House Committee on Naval Affairs and on the House Armed Services Committee she drew Presidential commendation for the contribution she made. In the Senate she has served with distinction on the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, Space, Government Operations, Rules, District of Columbia, and the Republican policy committee.

A lieutenant colonel in the Air Force Reserve, she is the acknowledged champion of Reserve legislation in Congress, having been cited for her service by the Air Reserve Association, the National Guard Association, and the Reserve Officers Association.

Nine extensive trips throughout the world have given her firsthand knowledge of the problems of many countries and an understanding of the personalities with whom we must deal. Few politically trained people in history have conferred with as many leaders. Her calm objectivity makes her singularly prepared to deal with important issues and make great decisions.

Last summer it was my privilege to second the nomination of this remarkable woman as Republican presidential candidate, the first woman in the history of our Nation to achieve this high position.

With very great pleasure I present to you, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH.

REMARKS OF SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH

It is always a great pleasure to join in tributes and recognition to FRANCES BOLTON. She so richly deserves them. She is a credit to her Nation—a credit to her State—a credit to Cleveland—a credit to her family—and a credit to womanhood.

I not only have the deepest admiration for her but I tremendously envy her. I wish so much that I had her ability and her talents. This envy of mine is not tinged in any manner with a green tone for I have very deep affection for her.

To me FRANCES BOLTON is a symbol of the finest things in a human being. Recently someone quipped that "man is the link between the apes and human beings" making the inference that attainment of the status of human being would not be reached until sometime in the distant future of many centuries. If there is any validity to this quip, then I am sure that FRANCES BOLTON is one of the rare exceptions of those who have attained the status of being a human being.

If I can serve any worthwhile purpose in life, it would be to emulate FRANCES BOLTON—her warm concern for her fellowman, her wisdom, and her courage and dedication to moral and spiritual principles. Today I am going to attempt some emulation of her moral and spiritual dedication by discussing a matter that is of growing concern to me and many others.

I hope that it is of such concern to you, and that my words will so impress you, that in the very key roles and positions that you individually fill you will yourself repeat the message wherever you appropriately can. If when I have finished I have exposed myself as being a "square," then I will at least have partially accomplished my attempt to emulate FRANCES BOLTON for the magnificent "square" that she is.

A Washington radio-discussion commentator, who prides himself on being called "controversial," on his nightly 2-hour program not long ago called our current era the "goof-off age." I don't know that I completely agree with him, but I do know that there is much truth in his allegation, and even if his colorful characterization is a bit extreme, it is more accurate than extreme.

My way of putting it would be that we live in a time when there is a disturbing and distressing "glorification of the pragmatist" in the extreme. We see it in all walks of life—in all ages—in private life—in public life—in business—among workers—in Government.

But before saying any more, let us first take a look at pragmatism, an "ism" that is far more prevalent and widespread than communism and is among us daily more than almost any other "ism" you can mention. What is pragmatism, this doctrine of the glorified pragmatists? Its philosophy is the doctrine that practical results are the sole test of truth and that the end justifies the means.

In today's growing, but tragic, emphasis on materialism, we find a perversion of the values of things in life as we once knew them. For example, the creed once taught children as they grew up was that the most important thing was not in whether you won or lost the game but rather in how you played the game.

That high level attitude that stresses the moral side no longer dominates in this age of pragmatic materialism that increasingly worships the opposite creed that the end justifies the means or the attitude of get what you can in any way, manner or means that you can.

But let's get a little more earthy on what this means. You will remember the days when we were told by our parents that more important than winning or losing was how you played the game. It was the means rather than the end that was important and stressed.

With the pragmatist, it is just the opposite—for the stress is on winning or grabbing the ultimate objective, no matter how you do it and no matter what means and tactics you resort to in order to get that objective.

Gone too much is the reverence and honor of playing the game fair and square regardless of the final outcome. Too prevalent now is the derisive attitude toward the square, who is foolish enough to conduct himself by the concept of the Golden Rule and that of earning his way instead of cutting corners the easy and cheap way.

For too many Americans are constantly looking for the easy way to do things—for the short cut—for the quick way out of a problem.

Too many Americans are trying to reduce with quick, easy shortcut methods such as the various goopy diet drinks, instead of the natural way by eating less and by working harder.

There is too much of a tendency of shrinking from the development of self-reliance—of not learning how to do things ourselves. Instead of the once normal and natural pride of do-it-yourself projects, there is too much of the attitude that by not knowing how to do something, someone else will do it for you.

Too often, if a conscientious worker concentrates on his work instead of watching the clock and thus has a greater work output, he or she gets in dutch with fellow workers who don't concentrate and put forth their best effort.

The conscientious, productive worker becomes unpopular and incurs the wrath of the other workers because they feel that they are being shown up in their less conscientious and productive work. There is too much of the slowdown attitude on the part of too many workers.

Do you remember when the motto of "service with a smile" had a real meaning? Do you remember when the customer was treated with courtesy and good service instead of merely tolerated with disdain and annoyance with being around?

Do you remember when there was pride in how the job was done, in how the service was rendered—instead of the pragmatic attitude of not caring about the way the job is done or the service rendered, but rather in just getting rid of the customer.

But this alarming attitude is not just among workers and in business. It exists also in public life—in our Government. For the trend is away from urging the development of self-reliance of our individual citizens. It is toward the Federal Government making the citizens more reliant upon the Federal Government—toward a policy and attitude of "let George do it" and "George" being the Federal Government.

It is a trend away from freedom and liberty toward a selfish and materialistic individual security—a weakening or loss of spiritual values for a blind grab for materialism.

The emphasis is more on how many press releases a mimeograph machine can turn out to create the image of a Senator getting things done for his State and constituents on what has become constant and routine Federal Government grants—on the thinly disguised battle of the press releases by which Senators and Representatives try to outscoop each other on getting credit for so many things for which they deserve no credit.

Yes, this philosophy of pragmatism that worships form and subverts substance—by which the important standard is creating the impression of what things seem to be rather than what they really are—has even permeated our homes and our private lives. We are living at such a rapid pace that we try to do too many things.

Too many of our young men and women are in college to attain a college degree not for the knowledge and learning that such a degree is supposed to symbolize—but rather the social status and background and the society value that it provides.

Again it is the emphasis of form over substance. Again it is the glorified philosophy of pragmatism, which is unconcerned with the means and totally intent upon the end—in which knowledge is of relative unimportance in the attainment of the degree.

There are two sides to this glorified modern pragmatism. The side of the pragmatism coin I have thus discussed is the selfish side with the attitude of "I'll get mine in whatever way I can and by any means I can." The other side of the pragmatism coin is the creed of "not getting involved."

The way that this not getting involved creed is expressed in the modern lingo of the pragmatists is to play it cool and cozy and not to stick one's neck out by taking a stand or openly espousing a principle. Playing it cool and cozy, you don't make anyone mad because by not taking a stand you never disagree with anyone.

Playing it cool and cozy means doing no more than you have to do and doing no more than your boss tells you to do—instead of making the mistake that the "square" does when he puts forth a little extra effort and takes some initiative to do a better job than the minimum requirements.

Most everyone has seen how too often these minimum doers strangely work their way to high positions—how by the system of mediocrity that rewards such minimum doers as they merely gravitate to the higher positions created by vacuums. They gravitate to those positions because they are not a threat to others like the "squares," who make the special effort, take the initiative and actually excel. "So play it cool and cozy, man—relax."

Unfortunately, this pragmatist creed of "not getting involved" has permeated far too many of our adults who know better. Do you remember the case of the 37 GI prisoners of the Chinese Reds in Korea who let another GI throw two diarrhea stricken fellow GI prisoners out in the snow to freeze to death—who didn't lift their finger to stop this certain death?

Why? Because they didn't want to get involved. This is a forceful illustration of the statement many of you will recall of the only thing necessary to insure the triumph of evil is for enough good men to do nothing.

We must reject the pragmatist cynicism that the sin is not the crime but rather getting caught is the crime. We must reject the pragmatic condoning of wrongdoing merely because everybody's doing it. We must develop self-discipline instead of surrendering to self-indulgence. We must do things because in our heart we know they are right—rather than not doing them because the mob might condemn us.

We must not be mental mutes with our voices stilled because of fear of criticism of what we say.

In this "age of the twist" or the "twisted age," we constantly complain about the decline in the value of the dollar—but rarely do we mention the more important decline—the decline in our moral and spiritual values as contrasted to our materialistic values.

Of course, today's dollar is only a fraction of the worth of the dollar 25 years ago. But that is not really important for, despite the inflation, most of us have a much higher materialistic standard of living than we did a quarter of a century ago even if today's dollar is only a fraction of the worth of the dollar 25 years ago.

But we certainly don't have a higher moral standard of living—or a higher sense of nonmaterialistic values. Take the schoolboy who worked at the neighborhood grocery store back in the early thirties from 6 in the morning until midnight sacking potatoes and sugar, lifting and carrying heavy boxes and sacks, on the constant go for 18 hours. He was proud of that check for 75 cents that he got.

It was not the amount of the check—the mere pittance of 75 cents for an 18-hour day—but it was the sense of achievement that that check symbolized. That schoolboy was proud that he had earned that check—and that pride gave him the incentive and the motivation for self-discipline and self-reliance that is so lacking today.

Too many schoolchildren—too many teenagers—today don't have that same sense of achievement value, that same sense of pride of earning. They don't have it because they are given no chance in the present-day system of high allowances and luxuries that spoil their sense of values.

In short, if our Nation is to regain the moral fiber that it once had, and it must have if our way of life is to survive, then we must dethrone the glorified pragmatists who advocate cutting corners, who preach the propaganda of expecting something for nothing, who espouse the doctrine that the end justifies the means, and who caution against getting involved on matters of principle.

We have got to untwist this twisted age and get back to respect and practice of fundamental truths and basic moral and spiritual values. And we have to start not with the next fellow, but with each of ourselves individually in a frank, even if agonizing, self-reappraisal aimed at self-discipline and self-reliance. We must start with ourselves—and the place we must start is right in our own homes.

Are You Sick, Too?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Columbus, Ohio, Citizen-Herald, Robert Ruark offered a column on malady which was most interesting. Seems like a number of our syndicated columnists are now becoming nauseated by the ultraliberal dosages of Socialist-type medicine prescribed by the Johnson administration and the rubberstamp Congress.

The column follows:

SICKNESS: THE WHOLE WORLD IS IN PAIN

(By Robert C. Ruark)

Having just risen from a bed of pain, and enfeebled by the effort, it seems to me that everyone I know is sick, has just been sick or is about to be sick. People are sick in London, sick in Paris, sick in New York.

Some call it virus, some call it flu, some call it grippe, but I call it a sickness of the times, compounded of bombs, smog, fog, traffic jams, water pollution, taxes, politics and the threat of wars nobody gives a damn about.

I pick up the paper and everything on the front page gives me the fainting fantods. Bombs, I think, make me sicker than anything else, whether they are dynamiting embassies or planting bombs in Alabama. Stars used to fall on Alabama; now it's bombs.

I am sick of Sukarno and fed to the teeth with the Ku Klux Klan. I am wearied by adverse trade balances and Socialist governments, and especially I am sick of student demonstrations. I am sick of sit-ins and marches of any sort whatever the cause, worthy or unworthy.

Mobs, I think, make me sickest, whether it's a mob in Morocco—I missed that one by a hair—a mob in Moscow or a mob in Montgomery. A mob is a mob—whether they blow up an embassy, tear down a USIS library, march on Washington, or just convene to bleat for peace if they have to kill you to achieve it.

Mobism is a sickness of its own, and no wonder everybody catches everybody else's colds. It seems to be we have become a world of mobs.

I am sick of doctors who won't make house calls, plumbers who won't plumb, builders who won't build, repairmen who won't repair, waiters who won't wait, taxis that won't carry people at 4:30 and apartments that have walls so thin you can hear a cockroach burp.

Television commercials largely give me the acute heaves, and the last issue of Harper's Bazaar induced a violent jaundice of the nervous system.

I am sick of words like "escalate," "disadvantaged," "helilift" and "military advisers." To me "dialog" used to be what you read in a book or heard in a play. Now it's a prearranged conference between people who hate each other and want to play Armenian rug-peddler with somebody else's country.

It is nearly impossible to get a phone connection with the new dial system, and long-distance is a disaster. I am sick and tired of getting up sick and tired. I am sick of subway riots, aimless rapes and killings, and youth movements of any size, shape, race, religion or color.

Strikes give me a pain in a place one generally uses in sit-down strikes. I am sick of Vietnam, North and South. I am especially sick of the hypocrisy we indulge in when we pretend we are advising the loyal wogs against the disloyal wogs.

You may have India and its problems, and throw in Mao and all the heathen Chinese. John Birchers are very little less painful than the people who fight them out loud. I moan with pain when I think of the Afro-Asian bloc in the United Nations, and the pitiful efforts the U.N. makes to pretend that it's useful in "keeping the peace."

Ceylon rhymes with cholera in my lexicon, and the Middle East deserves itself as an ailment. I would be sick of King Farouk if he hadn't eaten himself to death. I wish he could have lived to marry Madame Nhu. I am sick of everybody named Nguyen anything.

I am sick of science, sick of space shots, sick of astronauts, and sick of people who put bombs in aircraft because they're mad at their mothers. I am also sick of psychiatrists, homosexual playwrights, bad actors and worse plays. I am ill from pills.

You might say I am sick of the century, and when they blow it up, we won't have lost very much except confusion. I tell you, man, I ain't been feeling very well lately. It's probably caused by a prevalence of people.

Classy Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, many of us were concerned over the administration of the antipoverty program last year when legislation to establish the so-called war on poverty was enacted. The Owosso, Mich., Argus-Press illustrated graphically some of the problems connected with the Women's Job Corps aspect of the antipoverty program in its editorial, "Classy Poverty," on April 9, 1965.

Since it points out that the instruction of Job Corps trainees in basic education, homemaking, and citizenship would cost about the same as sending a boy to Harvard or a girl to Radcliffe, the trainees are surely traveling in fancy company.

I feel that this editorial should be read by my colleagues and by the public in order that all might realize that the fight against poverty can never be won merely by quoting slogans or establishing expensive programs which raid the pockets of taxpayers with little tangible result.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial, "Classy Poverty," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CLASSY POVERTY

There's one thing you have to say for the Women's Job Corps of the Government's poverty program. It is traveling in classy company.

It is being mentioned in the same breath with Radcliffe College for women and Harvard University for men—and you can hardly get any classier than that.

Linking of the three names began when Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, of Ohio, ripped into the Women's Job Corps project as outrageously expensive.

LAUSCHE charged that the program to teach Job Corps trainees basic education, homemaking, and citizenship would cost taxpayers nearly $8,000 per year per girl—twice the cost of sending her to one of the Nation's leading colleges.

"Nuts," retorted the Office of Economic Opportunity, although naturally not in that language. It would cost only $6,000 a year to train a girl.

"Also," commented the OEO starchily, "we find the cost of parents and the school of sending a young woman to a place like Radcliffe College (Cambridge, Mass.) for a 9-month academic year is $8,000, compared with our $6,000."

OEO then took another look at its figures and issued another statement—this one to the effect that actually it would cost only $4,650 to train a girl in the Women's Job Corps program, whereas it costs $6,410 a year to send a young man to Harvard.

"The heck it does," retorted Harvard, although, of course, not in those words. A young gentleman, said the college, could attend Harvard like a young gentleman should for as little as around $3,500 a year.

Where all this leaves the taxpayer or the puzzled parent of a Radcliffe or Harvard student is a little hazy. But it does point out how classy poverty can be when Uncle Sam gets into the act.

Any girl who finds herself hobnobbing in the news with a Harvard man or a Radcliffe girl can't be doing too poorly.

Tragedy at Duncannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1965, the quiet little town of Duncannon, Pa., was shattered when a prominent citizen, Byron L. Halter, shot his mother-in-law, his wife, and his daughter, then traveled to another county and took his own life.

His troubles were later found to be a complex of financial setbacks. The tragedy, however, confronted the publisher of the Duncannon Record, Richard A. Swank, with a problem far beyond that ordinarily pushed upon a weekly newspaper editor: The victims were his family, all of his family except his own wife and two daughters, for those who died were his mother, his only sister, his niece, and his brother-in-law.

Out of the experience came the following editorial, written the day after the editor buried all four victims in a common ceremony and in the family plot that overlooks the confluence of the Susquehanna and Juniata Rivers. It was written with a hope that within its fabric could be found a consolation for others who have had to come face to face with the sometimes sudden finality of life. Somehow I am sure it will fulfill its purpose for many of those who will have the privilege of reading it:

IN APPRECIATION

For over 20 years I have had the weekly task of writing one or more paragraphs for bereaved fellow townsmen who, faced with the death of someone they loved, found themselves inadequate to convey their gratitude for the understanding shown them by sympathetic friends and neighbors. I have always felt an emptying of some part of myself in penning these simple words; have time and again tried to put within the brief phrasing a truth of feeling—and always have failed because there are not words of enough value to bring welling from the depths of sadness and despair the overwhelming message that a town such as ours can show to those stricken in grief.

This week I must again try to find those words, but this time for myself and for my family.

Those who live in my town know so well the tragedy that has befallen us. But to those friends and readers of this newspaper who live beyond this area, and who have not read the daily newspapers or heard television and radio that covers local news, I must explain that out of the night that surrounds us all some strange convolution was followed in my brother-in-law's mind—something from which he could not save himself—that resulted in his taking not only his own life but that of my mother, my sister and my niece. Only his family and my family can truly share the grief together. And the sympathy that has come to us from the town should and must be given to the members of his family, who are as much deserving of condolence as mine.

While the enormity of his act has left us all shattered, the horror which he must have faced can leave me with only compassion for his plight. His action was certainly beyond his comprehension because in all our many years together I never knew him to be anything but a kind man and a thoughtful man and a man who deeply desired to do good things in this life.

For the last 5 days I have sought every avenue of my own mind to find an answer for what has happened, and while I have not truly found it the seeking has brought me to an acceptance of the fact. I know that I will continue to search for an answer and in the search I will be encouraged by the very fact that long ago I chose to live in a small town and not to seek my future in a place beyond the place of my birth. For from this soil can be drawn an element that can anchor the soul as firmly as the rocks of Peter's Mountain. This past week I have been vindicated in my choice of home because from my neighbors and friends I have drawn deeply of reassurance and comfort and I have watched my wife and my children over and again find solace in the words and acts of my fellow townsmen.

Fine books of etiquette tell us that to truly thank some person for an act of kindness one should write a personal note. It is impossible for me to do that because I would have to write 2,000 letters.

Throughout our mourning we have been lifted up time and again by words of encouragement whether they were on the finest silk-lined and engraved paper or on a torn out notebook page penciled in ungrammatical innocence. We have had letters from prominent persons and from the most humble and they have all contained the same message of love.

As I write these words and as I look back over them I know they sound embarrassingly sentimental but I shall not erase them for public tears can be proud tears when supported by the evidence at hand.

Here I must insert a special paragraph in praise of the Pennsylvania State Police. As a newsman I have often stood on the sideline of tragedy and have tried to report what has happened to other people. I have seen the efficiency of the State troopers before, but I have never had the knowledge of how understanding they can be while in pursuit of their duties. Their disregard for long hours, their patience in the face of unforseen and unpredicted happenings in a case that can frustrate and try the patience set them aside as a special breed of men. Our experience with the troopers brought us in contact with at least 20 different men from rookies to captains. Never once were we subjected to anything but kindness and understanding. In those 20 men we met 20 gentlemen.

This adversity has taken half my family, for my brother-in-law and myself shared a common interest. For over 25 years we have laughed together and played together and watched our children being born and growing up and have faced many things side by side. As in most families not every occasion has been all bubbly and roses, but in responsibility we shared. He was a kind father and husband, he loved my mother as his own. Each of us must have some complexity; fate led him to a rare and single act of violence.

My sister was an unsophisticated person. She was a good housekeeper, a faithful worker in the church, a person who had many friends in the community, most of them of lifelong standing. A well-polished floor, a line of white clothing flapping in an early morning breeze, a clean sink and a roast or a pie in the oven were her evidences of talent. What faults she might have had were her own and rarely harmed anyone else. Her pride was her daughter and her love was great enough to encompass compassion for stray cats and other bits of life kicked about by a sometimes thoughtless world. Her presence will be sorely missed in a number of community circles.

My niece was full of the enterprise of youth. The whole world faced her and she was only beginning to feel the surge of talent with which she would challenge it for a place of importance. These talents were noticeable in the bits of writing she had

attempted, in the sense of line and proportion and color she could place within an illustration, in an appreciation of music and theater and all the other things that youth must find fresh in its own generation. Her classmates have lost a part of themselves just as they are about to don the mantel of graduation. I hope that her brief presence among them has been of some inspiration, that her death will illustrate the fact they all must face—that the world into which they are about to step must be filled with understanding for each other and for tolerance of all things they may not immediately comprehend.

In my mother I have lost my most avid reader. No matter how I might put these words on paper she would say they were right. I could not write a bad poem or a stilted essay or a stupid story—to her they were all good, they were perfect. In my office the files of this newspaper are bound and shelved for the past 20 years. If ever I lost one it could be replaced by calling at her home—she saved them all. No matter how ill she ever felt, out of whatever sadness she might have had, if a neighbor called or a friend inquired she could summon, somewhere in the conversation, a witticism or a remark that would turn pain to sunshine. Whatever she asked of the world was not for herself but the ultimate use of her children.

I am not a strong churchman in the sense that I attend services every Sunday. I take no pride in making that statement. But in this moment and in the moments of the past few days I have drawn a surprising amount of strength from the church. I make no promises that I will change my habits, I seek no compromise with my God. But I know deeply that this strength goes back to a childhood when I was impressed with the habits of keeping Sunday as it should be kept—and this was the rare bit of discipline that was strongly enforced by my mother. Perhaps she did not know it at the time but she was laying a foundation for which I am grateful today.

Mostly I am writing these words to express my feelings and to purge the poisons I hope will cleanse my soul. But partly I am writing them for all the other people who before me and after me must face the fact that life terminates, but that within the fabric of desolation can be found new hope, new considerations and new lessons. For all of it is so much like Robert Frost said in the following stanzas:

"Whose woods these are I think I know.
His house is in the village though;
He will not see me stopping here
To watch his woods fill up with snow.

"My little horse must think it queer
To stop without a farmhouse near
Between the woods and frozen lake
The darkest evening of the year.

"He gives his harness bells a shake
To ask if there is some mistake.
The only other sound's the sweep
Of easy wind and downy flake.

"The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep,
And miles to go before I sleep."

—R.A.S.

Hon. Charles F. Moore, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, it was recently brought to my attention that Hon. Charles F. Moore, Jr., of Orleans, Mass., a former special consultant to President Eisenhower, had been elected to the board of selectmen of Orleans.

Mr. Moore has had a most distinguished career. He was a former vice president for public relations of Ford Motor Co. During 1964 Mr. Moore was deputy director for Gov. Nelson Rockefeller's campaign for the presidency.

It is refreshing to find a person of this experience and background that realizes the tremendous importance of local government.

Mr. Moore should be commended for his interest and participation in the affairs of his community. All too often local offices are denied the attention and effort they deserve. When men of high purpose and dedication occupy local offices, the best traditions of democracy are well served.

MOORE BIG WINNER IN SELECTMAN RACE

Charles F. Moore, Jr., whose family roots on the Cape go back to the mid-1700's, was elected selectman Wednesday, defeating incumbent Richard H. Adams.

The vote was Moore, 1039; Adams, 432.

Moore also won out in the contests for assessor and member of the board of public welfare and health.

Moore held leading posts in public relations fields, including vice presidency of the Ford Motor Co.

A Dartmouth graduate, he was at one time a newspaper reporter in Boston, and served as public relations director for the Globe in the 1940's.

In 1946 he served as executive assistant to Governor Bradford.

During his service with Ford he was asked to join President Eisenhower's staff as a special consultant.

Upon retirement he planned to return to the Cape, but was named deputy director of Governor Rockefeller's campaign for the Republican presidential nomination.

Moore staged a strong campaign against the incumbent.

Stumping the town, he declared: "I have an ideal here—the importance of dedicated and experienced people entering politics on the local level."

The Selma, Ala., Situation

SPEECH

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to those who have already protested against the outrageous speech delivered on the floor of this House last week by a Member from the State of Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON].

I think, Mr. Speaker, that my experience as a judge in one of America's large cities has made me fairly shockproof. I assure you that rarely do I hear or read anything that moved me to such great disgust as the speech given after the conclusion of the day's business on Tuesday last.

A generation ago, long before I was a Member of Congress of the United States, one of the most vicious anti-Catholics ever elected to public office used the high office of U.S. Senator from Alabama to deliver tirades against the church of which I am a member.

Conditions have improved in the United States and I am sure that most Members of Congress only dimly remember that jewel of the Ku Klux Klan, J. Thomas Heflin. Since his time, Catholic baiting has been confined to fringe-type hate groups. All of us get occasional letters from such sick individuals, but the most casual glance at such messages indicates the authors are people who are capable of harming no one but themselves.

But, Mr. Speaker, when attacks are made in the Congress on members of the clergy, then I am worried.

I am proud of the fact that many religious leaders from my own State of New Jersey were among those who marched on Montgomery. A partial list of names of New Jersey clergymen who took part in the march from Selma to Montgomery is indicative of the high caliber represented and is clear proof that the allegations of the Member from Alabama are without foundation.

The list follows:

Rev. Donald C. Crispin, Newark.
Rev. Harold Story, Newark.
Rev. Richard Given, Livingston.
Rev. John Wilcox, Caldwell.
Rev. Charles Peat, Roseland.
Rev. Gerald Mills, West Caldwell.
Rev. Robert Jacoby, Bloomfield.
Rev. George Booker, Bloomfield.
Rev. Russell Looker, Bloomfield.
Rev. Henry Strock, Millburn.
Rev. John W. Thomson, Millburn.
Rev. James Cortelyou, Newark.
Rev. Paul Robinson, Newark.
Rev. Brian Hislop, West Orange.
Rev. Horace Hunt, Jersey City.
Rev. J. R. Randall, Newark.
Rev. Joseph Sherer, West Orange.
Rev. Horace Sharper, Newark.
Rev. Jay H. Gordon, Newark.
Rev. John W. Collier, Jr., Newark.
Rev. Ken Jefferson, Newark.
Rev. Robert E. Johnson, Newark.

I am alarmed that the Member from Alabama would submit without any real scrutiny these alleged and entirely unsubstantiated allegations of misconduct by religious leaders. The good name of this House and of the Congress of the United States has been hurt by this low-level attack.

Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that a Member from the State of Alabama should attack those whose only crime was attempting to extend democracy to the State of Alabama, a State where every effort possible has been made to subject the Negro minority to an inferior status. While we may hope that the Member from Alabama is the last such orator, he certainly is not the first.

What does surprise me is that the Member from Alabama should choose to allow attacks upon nuns to foul the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. While there is much in the southern tradition which needs changing, we in the North have always admired the tradition of chivalry which is a part of the so-called southern way of life. Thus, this attack upon these holy women is surely a new low. If his remarks are typical of the new South, then I am afraid for the future of the State of Alabama.

Unmasking the Ku Klux Klan—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, The Commercial Appeal is continuing to expose vicious activities of the Ku Klux Klan. This is a crusade which began in the 1920's. I request unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD, the third article in a series by Morris Cunningham, chief of the newspaper's Washington bureau, and an editorial from the Commercial Appeal, "KKK—Problem for the South."

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Apr. 27, 1965]

SHAKY MORALS, AND MINDS, MARK MANY IN THE KLAN

(Last of three articles)

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, April 26.—FBI agents, who come from all parts of the Nation, have found nothing to admire in today's Ku Klux Klansmen.

"In many instances their mortality and personal conduct are deplorable," an FBI spokesman said. "In other instances personal integrity is nonexistent or suspect. And in some cases there is a real question as to the stability of the mind."

The FBI, through years of infiltration and investigation, has become the Nation's topmost authority on today's nebulous, splintered, often ragtag KKK organizations.

In many instances leaders have been found to be lacking in essential qualities of leadership and rank-and-file members often are illiterate or have only meager educations.

Sometimes lack of knowledge produces humorous situations.

In the late 1950's a constable in Arkansas was recruited by an organizer for the Association of Arkansas Klans. At the initiation the constable learned for the first time that only Protestants could belong to the KKK.

"That leaves me out," said the constable. "I'm a Baptist."

One of the dangers in the Klan is the appeal of its glamor, which many don't realize faded into oblivion long ago.

Yesterday's Klansman galloped through the night on horseback. Today's Klansman rides in the back of a pickup truck with a rifle or shotgun at the ready.

A Mississippi farmer recently walked into the office of a leading attorney and threw down a packet of poorly printed, Klan-type literature which characteristically was filled with half completed sentences and misspelled words.

"What do you think of that? Sounds pretty good to me," said the farmer.

"You're out of your mind," said the lawyer. "Take that stuff out and burn it."

The farmer did.

Sometimes, there is no humor at all in a Klansman's lack of mental capacity or achievement.

For instance, there is the mid-South KKK member who has been known to carry a pistol, has access to explosives, and who was mustered out of military service as mentally deficient.

Or take the healing art practitioner, who has been in and out of the KKK, and is suspected of abortion.

The KKK organizations of today, reduced to about 9,000 members, are a far cry from those that existed years ago.

Today's Klan groups are poorly financed and members often bicker over money matters.

At a meeting of the Association of Arkansas Klans in 1959, a member turned in his card in disgust. He protested the Klan's only interest was in getting money.

In Georgia last year a Klan organization split up in a dispute over money. One faction took over the organization. The ousted former leader went off and formed another organization.

Investigations indicate that most anyone who has the customary $10 initiation fee, is white, and Protestant, can join the Klan.

A man diagnosed at Kennedy veterans hospital in Memphis as being afflicted with a mental ailment, dementia praecox—simple type, had no difficulty in joining the KKK. In fact, he moved to another state, joined the Klan, and became a leader. At the hospital he told physicians he had become so accustomed to hearing voices he no longer "bothered to turn around."

Here are reports on a few other Klansmen:

Arrested for making obscene telephone calls, fined, and placed on probation.

A garage mechanic who supplements his income by bootlegging whisky.

A man who received a bad conduct discharge from military service for fighting, drunkenness, and other lapses of character.

It would be a mistake, however, to say that all Klansmen fall in these categories. A few have money and position in their communities. Some have good educations.

In Natchez, Miss., say Klan opponents, some "pretty respectable" people are members of the Klan. In fact, they are so "respectable" they cannot believe racial misdeeds in their midst are coming from a militant branch of their own organization.

[From the Commercial Appeal, Apr. 27, 1965]

KKK—PROBLEM FOR SOUTH

The core of the Ku Klux Klan of the 1960's is dedicated to violence and death.

In character, Klan membership represents the dregs of society.

At its peak, KKK enrollment in the South is small. But it does include some law enforcement officers.

Depending on terror, the Klan has attempted to extract the price of vengeance on civil rights advocates.

These are among the facts which emerges from a series of articles by Morris Cunningham, Washington bureau chief of the Commercial Appeal. Among the most shocking of his revelation is the "knockoff squad," the small gestapo-like unit which takes the law into its own hands, and which moves from State to State when summoned to do violence. These squads differ little in nature from the gun-for-hire hoodlums who did the bidding of racketeers in the 1920's and 1930's.

The Ku Klux Klan is professional gansterism at its worst. By playing on the emotions of segregationists, it has more support than its methods warrant, just as bootleggers did in the days of prohibition.

This is not speculation. Klan organization and procedure are well-advertised through Federal Bureau of Investigation infiltration. The difficulty has not been in making arrests, but in following through with prosecution.

Until the South realizes the grip of the KKK, and the low degree of its morality, it cannot free itself from this stigma. Law enforcement needs to brand its own corrupt members and disown them. Politicians and courts must meet the problem head on instead of dodging it.

There is little doubt that the South can handle the KKK if its people are willing to treat gangsters as such. It takes courage. But the question is not whether one sympathizes with the demonstrators for civil rights; rather it is whether the southerners believe in law and order.

Community Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2986) to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] mentioned in his comments what he believes is the need for expanded programs for the schools of public health. The bill carries in this extension, Mr. Chairman, authorization at the same level that we have had for the last 3 years. As I mentioned in my earlier remarks, a similar bill has passed the Senate already. It does carry an increased authorization for schools of public health to $5 million, which is twice the amount of the authorization we have now and which is provided in this bill. Should we go to conference—and I suppose we will—we will have an opportunity to consider further expansion of this program if it can be shown that the need justifies it. Certainly I, for one, would give it most careful consideration and would certainly be solicitous of the desires of the gentleman from Massachusetts and others who are vitally interested in this program.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I have great confidence in the chances of this amendment receiving favorable action on the part of the conference committee. I am very pleased that my chairman indicated his willingness to consider further evidence that might be helpful in reaching this conclusion. In that regard I have two pieces of correspondence from the Harvard School of Public Health which I will bring to his attention and to the attention of my colleagues. At the appropriate time I will ask permission to have it inserted in the RECORD at this point.

HARVARD SCHOOL OF
PUBLIC HEALTH,
OFFICE OF THE DEAN,
Boston, Mass., March 2, 1965.

Hon. HASTINGS KEITH,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEITH: The administration bills, H.R. 2986 and H.R. 2984, introduced by Chairman HARRIS and now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, are extremely important to the Harvard School of Public Health. I hope that you will support both of these measures.

I also respectfully ask you to consider the merits of a proposal by the Association of Schools of Public Health that H.R. 2986 be amended in committee so as to increase the

annual authorization for Hill-Rhodes formula grants from $2.5 to $5 million. As you know, these grants help offset the costs incurred by graduate schools of public health in the comprehensive training of professional public health personnel for our entire Nation.

Since Senator LISTER HILL, John F. Kennedy, PAT MCNAMARA, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, and Irving Ives sponsored the initiating legislation in 1957, the Hill-Rhodes formula grants program has had strong bipartisan support in both branches. The Congress has recognized the fact that the Nation depends on the 12 U.S. schools of public health as the only source of comprehensively trained public health physicians, dentists, engineers, nurses, and others to serve in Federal, State, and local health agencies and institutions. There is a serious national shortage of such personnel. The costs of their training are relatively high, both for the students and the schools.

The U.S. Public Health Service traineeships provide tuition and living stipends for students. The Hill-Rhodes formula grants provide partial reimbursement to the schools for teaching costs which cannot, of course, be paid from Federal funds restricted to research purposes. Doubling of traineeship funds for this year and provision for further increases in succeeding years are expected to increase student enrollment appreciably in the schools. Although this will add to the schools' teaching load and costs, H.R. 2986, as written, would renew the expiring Hill-Rhodes program without any increase in the Federal share of such costs beyond the $2.5 million authorized during the past 5 years.

The National Conference on Public Health Training (attended by 91 of our country's experts in health in 1963) recommended that the annual authorization for Hill-Rhodes formula grants be increased to $5 million. This proposal is endorsed by the Association of Schools of Public Health and by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers. I know of no opposition to that recommendation. For amplification of the case outlined in this letter, I enclose a copy of the letter of February 26, 1965, to Chairman HARRIS by Dr. Myron E. Wegman, president of the Association of Schools of Public Health. He points out that an increase in the amount earmarked in section 314(c)(2), PHS Act, for formula grants to schools of public health would not have the effect of raising the existing ceiling on the overall authorization.

It is most important to differentiate between formula grants to States and formula grants to schools of public health. Both are authorized in section 314(c) of the Public Health Service Act which would be renewed without change by H.R. 2986 as introduced. While it is understood that the question of increasing formula grants to States is to be studied during the coming year, no one, in or out of Government, has questioned the justification of increasing the formula grants to schools of public health in connection with renewal this year.

My colleagues and I would be deeply grateful for your support of the proposal that H.R. 2986 be amended in committee to increase the authorization in section 314(c)(2), Public Health Service Act, from $2.5 million to $5 million.

We are most appreciative of the close attention which you always devote to legislation concerning health and for your consistent efforts to strengthen graduate education in public health.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. SNYDER, M.D.,
Dean.

HARVARD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
OFFICE OF THE DEAN,
Boston, Mass., April 27, 1965.

Hon. HASTINGS KEITH,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEITH: We are grateful for your efforts in committee to increase the authorization for formula grants to schools of public health in H.R. 2986. Since the Senate version (S. 510) would increase the authorization from $2.5 to $5 million, we assume the matter will be taken up in conference. Perhaps you would be willing to urge the House conferees to consider the merits of the Senate position on this item. The main points:

(1) The formula grants reimburse the 12 schools, in part, for teaching costs incurred in training personnel for public service in the 50 States and at Federal and international levels.

(2) The schools will need more teaching funds next year because the Congress has provided for more Public Health Service trainees to enroll in the schools.

(3) The number of accredited schools of public health may increase during fiscal 1966 and this would have the effect of reducing the proportionate shares of formula funds for the existing schools, unless a larger amount is made available.

(4) The proposed increase in formula grant funds for schools of public health will not affect the existing overall authorization under section 314(c).

(5) The formula grants to schools of public health are not involved in the review of formula grants to States.

Your continued interest and help in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

With best wishes.

JOHN C. SNYDER, M.D.,
Dean.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I shall be happy to have this information. On page 12 of the report is a table which indicates the schools of public health and the number of students sponsored at each of these great institutions throughout the country over that period of time.

Mr. KEITH. I thank the gentleman and simply point out that these have been additional programs under the legislation passed last year which would in a way limit the amount of funds available for the programs at these schools.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Commerce Committee for his statement that he intends to approach this matter sympathetically in conference, because I think that everyone is well aware that schools of public health have not only provided very useful and valuable service, to train students not only within their own boundaries of their own States, but residents of all States. More importantly the cost under most of the tuition and other programs is far less than the real cost of the program to the school. I think it would be very worth while that the conferees on the part of the House consider very sympathetically any approach by the Members of the other body to justify a larger appropriation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. The committee realizes—and I do personally—full well the contribution this program has made and the importance of it to our public health program. Certainly we intend to give it our attention.

Fight on Poverty as Viewed by National Association of Social Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include excerpts from the address of my distinguished constituent, Alan D. Wade, at the meeting of the Advisory Council on Public Welfare on April 30, 1965, in room 5051, north building, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Wade spoke for the National Association of Social Workers and in his address included the recommendations of that organization. The address, in part, follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. ALAN D. WADE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS, TO THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. Chairman and members of the council, I am Alan Wade representing the Division of Social Policy and Action of the National Association of Social Workers. I am also vice chairman for social policy and action of the Chicago area chapter of the association.

I am employed as associate professor of the School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago. As both a teacher and through my activities with the Chicago chapter, I have been involved in study of, and action to improve, our public welfare program in Illinois.

The National Association of Social Workers is the professional association for the field of social work with over 45,000 members and 167 chapters throughout the United States and in Puerto Rico. Our members are employed in a wide variety of health, welfare and recreation agencies—governmental and private. Membership in the association now requires a graduate degree from a university affiliated school of social work.

* * * * *

The issue of poverty has always gripped the human imagination. It was not, however, until the early years of the industrial revolution that society became deeply self-conscious about it. It was the stubborn existence of stark poverty in the midst of great affluence and the growth of the middle class that first led men, in the early 19th century, to raise searching political and economic questions concerning its haunting presence. It has been said, in fact, that it was in relation to the problem of poverty that men first began to attempt to cope systematically with the meaning of life in a complex society.

Today, in the United States, we have once more discovered, or rather rediscovered, poverty. Its presence is more intriguing, more embarrassing, and more demanding of solution than at any time in the past. * * *

The profession of social work is committed to the principle that democratic society exists for the benefit of its individual members.

* * * * *

For years our association has supported the provision of income as a matter of right with the full expectation that the means test in public assistance would disappear as the anachronism we believe it to be.

The principle of money payments to preserve the dignity of the recipient, the development of social services, and the provision of the right of the client to appeal arbitrary or capricious administrative decisions—these and many other pillars of public assistance policy were formed and defended through the years by the members of the social work profession.

* * * * *

The facts and figures with regard to grant levels are too well known and too widely publicized to require repetition here. Suffice it to say that the national average of less than $140 per month per AFDC family—only slightly more than half the $3,000 annual income level suggested by the President's Council of Economic Advisers as the benchmark for the poverty line—can hardly serve to promote the golden purpose of maintaining and strengthening family life.

* * * * *

Statistics describing the distribution of family personal income in the United States indicate that those families ranked in the lowest quintile of family income in 1935 received 4.1 percent of the total income available to all families, while, by 1961, this amount had increased to only 4.6 percent. This, despite an approximate fourfold increase in public-assistance expenditures.

In addition to the low grant levels, inadequacy of coverage of poor families by public assistance helps explain its limitations as an income redistribution factor. Of the 9.3 million families headed by persons with income under $3,000 per annum in 1962, only 4.2 million were receiving public assistance. This reflects not only the bare subsistence levels of the grants, but also the extreme reluctance of public assistance to provide supplementation to families whose heads are marginally employed, or employed full time at extremely low wages. (Economic Report of the President, transmitted to the Congress, June 1964.)

What is the reason for this state of affairs? They are many, but two stand out: the firm grip of what we have earlier referred to as the mythology of public assistance, and the hospitable host that these myths have found in our State legislatures and local governmental units.

* * * * *

In 37 of the State legislatures, the upper house is controlled by less than 50 percent of the State population. In every such instance, control rests in the hands of men whose rural political base tends to separate them from the pressing demands of our modern cities. The inference here is not that these men and the political forces that they represent are evil. We only wish to urge upon you the insistent fact that we cannot wait for a shift in the balance of power in our State legislatures before enabling our 35 million or more American poor to get their fair share of the wealth of our society.

* * * * *

It is clear to the members of our association that we in this Nation have come to a fork in the road concerning the direction of public assistance. Modern industrial organization, with its dependence on a money economy, creates special hazards for those individuals who are either unable to enter the labor market or for whom remunerative work is not available. While these hazards have been present for generations, unprecedented changes in the organization of production through specialization of skills and automation threaten not only to accelerate and to multiply them, but to change their very nature by the development of an inceasingly unstable relationship between man and the marketplace. Some go so far as to suggest that the traditional link between work and income are being rapidly dissolved.

* * * * *

The perplexing and unenviable task facing this distinguished Council is to make recommendations as to the nature of public welfare programs that can best meet this challenge. Our association suggests two possible directions that might be taken.

The National Association of Social Workers at its November 1964 delegate assembly adopted the following position with reference to a national income maintenance program:

"This organization favors the passage and implementation of Federal legislation that would insure: (1) income as a matter of right, in amounts sufficient to maintain all persons throughout the Nation at a uniformly adequate level of living; and (2) the provision of payments in the most dignified and efficient manner possible."

These goals might be reached in one of two major ways. First, we can build on what is good in our present programs. Second, we might abandon our present programs, and develop wholly new ones. These two approaches have one factor in common: Each would require a major expansion in the role of the Federal Government. Before briefly discussing what each of these directions might entail, we must give attention to an apparent paradox that arises. We have suggested expanding the role of the Federal Government and at the same time pointing out the clear and present dangers of paternalism and governmental domination of individual human rights.

* * * * *

It is our suggestion, then, that the strengthening of the influence of the Welfare Administration's Bureau of Family Services, in several key areas, would actually serve the purpose of strengthening State programs by releasing the States and the localities from a portion of their current preoccupation with saving money at the cost of human dignity and decency. With this in mind, we turn to recommendations for strengthening the Federal role that fall under the general heading of preserving but improving present programs.

IMPROVEMENT OF PRESENT PROGRAMS

Recommendations under this head fall, in turn, into three major categories: Raising the level of living; strengthening individuals and families; and assuring quality of medical care.

Raising the level of living

First, and by far the most important, Federal standards for assistance should be set that would be relatively uniform through the Nation, and that would set forth the minimum income needed to maintain families at a level of living deemed to be in the public interest. While the setting of such a minimum presents some technical and political complications, it would seem that a nation that can work out ways of putting men on the moon ought to be able to discover a rational method for doing this. As a beginning, one might suggest the adoption of a scale related to the Council of Economic Advisers' poverty level of $3,000 for a family of four. A step, though we believe a halting and inadequate one in this direction, might be the requirement that the States publicize and meet their own standard of need.

Second, alter the present grant-in-aid formulas so as to provide for more nearly equal treatment among the categories, and to enable the Federal Government to assume a larger proportion of the financial burden for all programs.

Third, alter the current categorical structure by providing inducements to the States to combine all State programs into one single assistance program, thereby assuring against discriminatory treatment of the most vulnerable program, AFDC. An important step in this direction was taken with the passage of title XVI of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962. But the next logical step must be taken, and quickly.

Fourth. Make elimination of residence requirements a condition for the receipt of Federal grants-in-aid for public assistance. The arguments in favor of such a proposal are so widely recognized and so unassailable as to require no repetition here. See, for example, the recommendation made in the 1960 report of your predecessor Advisory Council on Public Assistance.

Fifth. Eliminate relative responsibility except spouse for spouse and parent for minor child.

Sixth. Extend the same possibilities for exemption of earned income from the determination of the public assistance grant for AFDC that were extended in 1962 to the adult categories, and provide inducements to the States to take advantage of this possibility. With the current emphasis on job motivation and preparation for work experience in the Economic Opportunity Act, it is incomprehensible that, for example, teenagers in public assistance families in general find it impossible to improve their own standard of living or that of their families through employment.

Seventh. Enact Federal legislation making it possible for the States to include all assistance, including general assistance, under the combined public assistance program suggested under No. 3 above.

Strengthening individuals and families

First. Secure legislation which would provide construction assistance to schools of social work, Federal fellowships and scholarships and teaching grants.

Second. Offer inducements and consultation to the States for the large-scale introduction of simplified methods for the determination and review of eligibility for assistance. Much of what is now being done by caseworkers could be taken from their shoulders by the use of automated accounting procedures.

Third. A further extension of the above recommendation could result in the separation of the eligibility determination process from the provision of social services. If this were encouraged generally, or if individual States were encouraged to experiment with such a program on a systematic basis, the vast reservoir of human service potential that we are convinced resides only partially tapped within our public welfare personnel could be released for the provision of services to clients.

Fourth, Increased Federal attention, including the possibility of a congressional investigation, should be devoted to the constant reports received by members of our association concerning violations of constitutional and human rights of public aid recipients and denial of due process of law. * * * The right to assistance has become a mockery for many. It must become a reality.

Medical care for needy persons

Our association has actively supported for a number of years the provision of health care for the aged through contributory social insurance and endorses generally H.R. 6675 passed by the House of Representatives on April 8, 1965.

However, the association is concerned about the quality of medical care that would be provided children particularly under the proposed new title XIX, grants to States for medical assistance programs, sections 1901–1905 of H.R. 6675.

* * * * *

Our position essentially is that while we support in principle the extension of medical

care to persons not covered as in this proposed new title, we have to register our conviction and concern that these individuals be assured of care comparable to other sections of the population covered under social insurance or other forms of social insurance.

* * * * *

The principle of an adequate annual income for all Americans as a matter of right will receive increasing public attention in the next few months and years. More and more Americans will be asking the question: Is it right, in a society that does not have enough work for all, to insist that one have work in order to live decently? Substantial and thorough revision of our current public assistance programs, along the lines that I have presented here, could be somewhat similar in effect to a guaranteed annual income.

* * * * *

Still another approach—one favored incidentally by persons of differing political persuasion—is the negative income tax. Here, the income tax system would be employed for the distribution of funds to bring families that qualify up to a level of living deemed to be in the public interest.

This approach would seem to have the great advantages of efficiency and economy in the use of the almost universally respected Federal income tax system for the distribution of benefits. A national decision to embark on such a program would, of course, represent a new start, and would smybolize a complete break with our poor law past. Eligibility would be based on need alone, with the arbitrary judgments of administrators reduced on an absolute minimum.

We have suggested that our public assistance programs are in serious trouble, and that the job of reforming them so as to meet the requirements of a modern mass democracy is a difficult, though perhaps not an insurmountable, one.

* * * * *

The members of the National Association of Social Workers stand ready, as always, to place our resources at your disposal as you seek to find answers to this question that will be of the greatest benefit to the total community. We thank you for this opportunity to state our views.

The L.B.J. Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Barney Nover, chief of the Washington bureau of the Denver Post, did at Washington, D.C., on April 28, 1965, deliver an outstanding address at the Animal Health Institute. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD as I know it is of great interest:

THE L.B.J. PRESIDENCY

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the Animal Health Institute, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure and a privilege for me to address your organization on its silver anniversary. During the past quarter of a century you can look back on a great record of progress in the field of improving animal health and, in the process, helping mankind.

When your organization held its first convention back in 1940, it took faith and courage to plan for the future as you did then. 1940 was a terrible year, a year when the fate of all free countries hung in the balance. One country after another in Europe had been overrun by the Nazis. By midsummer England stood alone, beleaguered and soon to be terrorized by massive Nazi air assaults. Most of the experts were convinced that she could not hold out long—the odds against her were just too great. But she had the redoubtable Winston Churchill as leader, and his words moved like any army with banners.

The experts were wrong—England did hold out. And with the help of her great people and of her dominions and empire, with the help of the United States and also with the help of Hitler's mistakes, England and the rest of the free world survived the Nazi onslaught.

We are going through some immensely disturbing times again. The war in Vietnam, the menace of Red China, the decay in the authority of the U.N., the war threat in Malaysia, the problems of the Middle East, Sukarno, Nasser, Castro. All these add up to a multiplicity of headaches and dangers.

But when we look back 25 years, it should be clear that we are, for all the problems we face, far better off than we were in 1940.

But 1940 was not only a year of great crisis, it was also a watershed. Among other things, it saw the assumption by the United States of the responsibility of world leadership—at least the beginning phase of this tremendous development. And from that day to this—from the Presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt to that of Lyndon Baines Johnson—no administration, let me repeat, no administration, Republican or Democratic, has shown any inclination to close the door on these responsibilities; although a lot of people, getting tired of endless crises, have been urging such a course.

This continuity in policy subscribed to by successive Presidents could not have persisted if it did not have the support, in one way or another, of the great majority of American people. It had that support. And back of it there was the leadership from the White House and that is where, under our Constitution, the direction of foreign policy lies.

My assignment tonight is to talk about the Presidency, particularly the Presidency of Lyndon Johnson.

Since I became a Washington correspondent in 1936, I have lived under five Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and now Johnson—and have had a chance to see each of them at close range.

You can hardly imagine five more distinct personalities—men of more different backgrounds, education, accent, philosophy. But appearances can be deceptive. You remember that old story of the two cockneys who had spent a night going from pub to pub in London? Finally, the pubs closed down and the two cockneys decided to go home by London tube. They found themselves in a car practically empty except for a fine-looking gentleman at the other end. Looking at him, one of the cockneys said to his pal: "That chap over there, he's the archbishop of Canterbury."

His pal looked across the car and replied: "No. He's not the archbishop. I'll bet you a quid he's not. Go over and ask him."

The first cockney lurched across the car, took off his cap and said: "I beg your pardon, Your Grace, are you the Archbishop of Canterbury?"

The man replied in a Missouri drawl: "What in hell are you talking about?"

The cockney lurched back to his friend and said: "The bet's off, he's noncommittal."

When it comes to our public servants, and that is particularly true of our Presidents, few Americans are noncommittal. We have strong feelings about them, and usually express them with great vigor.

Even George Washington, during his second term, had his bitter detractors. We know how vehemently Abraham Lincoln was attacked, and the hatred in some quarters manifested toward Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and so many others. But they also had large numbers of passionate supporters. That is the way it is with strong Presidents, regarding whom few are neutral or indifferent.

I shall never forget the night of November 22, 1963, when, together with a large number of my colleagues, I stood on the White House lawn awaiting the arrival of Lyndon Johnson who, only a few hours before, and under the most tragic of circumstances had become the 35th President of the United States.

I knew many asked themselves and asked each other: would the new man, who was not too well known despite the fact that he had been in public life for many years—would the new man be equal to the back-breaking task that was now his?

The helicopter bringing the new President from Andrews Air Force Base (where the Presidential plane—Air Force One—had alighted at the end of its flight from Dallas) came down, its cabin brightly lit. On one side of a table sat Secretary Rusk, Secretary McNamara, and McGeorge Bundy, the Presidential adviser; on the other side was Johnson, and as the plane landed I noticed that Johnson was speaking animatedly to his advisers. He gave every impression of knowing what he was about. In the midst of that vast grief I felt, as did all of us, suddenly reassured.

Lyndon Johnson had already taken charge and he has remained in charge ever since.

Up to now he has enjoyed a remarkable honeymoon. It has lasted all through the 14 months when he was serving out the balance of the late President Kennedy's uncompleted term. The honeymoon continued during the political campaign despite the Baker case and the Jenkins' tragedy. By and large, as the latest polls show, there is still a lot of it left, despite Vietnam, in which his course has been under sharp attack, oddly with greater vehemence from elements that generally support him, than on any other matter.

Not long ago President Johnson celebrated his first 100 days in office under the 89th Congress. During those 100 days the record he piled up in terms of legislation, asked for and approved, was as impressive—probably even more impressive, given the circumstances, than that made by Franklin D. Roosevelt during his first 100 days.

This legislation, including passage by the House of the medicare bill, which is certain to pass the Senate as well; the bill to help the distressed Appalachian area, the school aid bill, which both Houses approved, and there is every reason to believe that Congress will also approve a far-reaching voting rights bill.

Yet the 89th Congress is only really beginning and without any question a very large budget of important matters will be adopted before Congress adjourns next summer or autumn.

The fact is, of course, that sooner or later (and probably sooner than later) the Johnson honeymoon will end. No one knows this better than Johnson himself, for no one in our lifetime has been more completely aware of political realities. He doesn't have to put a moist finger up in the air to know which way the winds are blowing. Politics, and I use the term in its broadest and best sense, is his passion, his avocation, as well as his vocation. He has no hobbies beside that. The late Frank Kent of the Baltimore Sun once wrote a book with the title, "The Great Game of Politics." It was a fine book; but applied to what has been happening lately, the title is misleading. Politics, as Johnson sees it, is no game—it is the means by which, in a political system, our political system, we get things done that need getting done.

As I sat in the galleries of the House and the Senate these last 3½ months, I have understood better than I did at the time,

just what was the real meaning of some of the puzzling things Johnson did in his campaign.

I traveled with the President during the last 5 weeks of that campaign. It was an eye-opening but also exhausting experience. It was evident to all of us that he was going to win in a walk and Johnson knew it. And yet, right up to election, he campaigned as though he needed every single vote he could garner, in the hope that in that way he would manage to squeeze through.

A lot of his friends were worried, they remembered the massive heart attack of 10 years before. They were afraid the exertions of the campaign might prove too much for him. They told him that with the election in the bag, there was no reason why he should knock himself out, and they urged him to slow down. My recollection is that once in the campaign he did cancel a few speeches and a picnic in Texas instead of barnstorming. He made a so-called nonpolitical speech on the Vietnam crisis. This was after an attack had been made on American destroyers in the Tonkin Gulf, but after 5 days he had enough of his leisure and so he took to the hustings again.

In retrospect I am now convinced that Johnson knew exactly what he was doing by his extraordinarily energetic campaigning, and why. And I am now convinced that, from the viewpoint of his objective, he was right.

The fact is that at no time was the President running scared. He is the greatest student of polls, the greatest connoisseur of polls the White House has ever had. These polls came to him from every State and during the campaign he knew them by heart. He had blowups made of them to exhibit to friends who visited him at the White House, and he carried a lot of them in a collapsible card case, the kind some people use to carry their credit cards. They were his credit cards—good, as it turned out, for 4 years in the White House. But don't think for a moment he accepted all of them at their face value. I remember, after I had sent him the poll my paper had taken of opinion in Colorado, and later the poll we took in Wyoming, the President told me they were too favorable. Colorado and Wyoming, like most of the mountain States, had originally been regarded as safe Goldwater territory. They had voted for Nixon in 1960. Johnson was skeptical about the seeming overturn. The polls showed he would poll over 60 percent of the vote in both States. The day after the election, when he spied me in the crowd, he pointed his finger at me and said: "That poll of your papers, it was all right."

But being sure he would win, why did Johnson campaign as strenously as he did?

We have the answer in what happened during the 100 days. Johnson felt that it was not enough for him merely to win, even to win by a comfortable margin; he felt that both for reasons of foreign policy as well as for domestic reasons; he had to win by a landslide, and as big a landslide as possible.

He had succeeded an immensely popular President whose name and personality had impressed the world. The tidal wave of grief that swept the world after John F. Kennedy's assassination was bound to make world opinion, and even American opinion, more critical of the new President. Johnson was bound to live, for a greater or longer period, in the shadow of his immensely beloved predecessor. But Johnson reckoned that the best way he could establish himself on his own was to receive a clear, unequivocal mandate from the American people.

That was one reason why he rushed around as much as he did during the campaign.

Another reason was to bring as many Democrats in on his coattails as he could. The bigger the Democratic majority in the House and Senate the more certain that his legislative program would get through.

Johnson also worked as hard as he could to win a landslide because, while he wanted and sought the support of all—Republicans and Democrats, labor and industry, Negroes and whites, liberals and conservatives—he did not want to be specially beholden for his victory to any particular group or element of the population. He wanted his majority to be made up from all sections, from all classes, from all ranks and, to a remarkable degree, he succeeded.

But the very magnitude of his victory, while it enables him in this honeymoon period to employ his truly tremendous political skills to put through his many-sided program, also has its long-range dangers.

One of these dangers we can now dismiss as a phantom. Johnson's tremendous victory led to no swelling of his ego, already pretty well developed. Woodrow Wilson used to say that in Washington one of two things happens to a public figure, he either grows or swells and, he added, most of them swell.

Election night I spent in Austin, Tex. As I watched the fantastic returns coming over television, I wondered what effect the heady news contained in the statistics would have on Johnson. But neither that night, nor the next day, when all the correspondents traveling with him had been invited to the LBJ Ranch, did I sense any sign of swelling. The President had HUBERT HUMPHREY, the Vice-President-elect with him that day of victory. Johnson was obviously very happy and there was every reason why he should be happy. But there was no sign of crowing. As the most consummate politician of our times, he was too smart, too clear-eyed to crow.

He knew that his November 1964 victory would in all likelihood not be exceeded or even matched by what would happen in the election of 1968 when, God willing, he would be certain to run again. And, considering what had happened in so many midterm elections, he could not be sure that in 1968 the Republicans would not stage a real comeback, and the Democratic majority in the House would not then be sharply whittled down.

The Republicans certainly are aware that, from the viewpoint of their party fortunes, 1966 is far more important for them now than 1968.

That is why the drive for a landslide last autumn was succeeded this year by an extraordinarily ambitious legislative program sent piecemeal to Congress and a brilliantly worked out strategy to get as much of it enacted as possible.

Beset as he has been by a multitude of difficulties and dangers in the foreign field, he has driven hard and continuously to put over his great domestic program, knowing that if he is to do so it must be done soon.

The going is certain to be harder—much harder—after the election of 1966 and the probability that year of a reduced Democratic majority. And, while anything is possible, it is unlikely that in 1968, Johnson, if he is again a candidate, as he probably will be, will achieve anything like the sweep he did last year.

Johnson knows that, and that is why he is determined to enact into law as much of his program as possible, as soon as possible. A program designed, so far as its domestic aspects are concerned, to eliminate those pockets of poverty and ignorance and deprivation which continue to exist in ours—the most affluent society in the history of mankind, with more people and a larger percentage of people enjoying the benefits of affluence than ever before, but not all.

It is a grim fact that the great domestic reforms—first of Woodrow Wilson, then of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the New Freedom of Wilson, the New Deal of Roosevelt, had to be put aside before being completed because of a world crisis with our country finally plunged into a world conflict.

Is history about to repeat itself? Here in Washington and throughout the Nation gloomy voices are being raised, warning that we are now on the brink of war and must turn back before it is too late. We must clear out of Vietnam, clear out of a situation which we should never have got into in the first place and tend to our knitting at home.

I am sure that Lyndon Johnson would like nothing better than to do just that, if he could, but he knows it is not as simple as all that—as simple as his senatorial and academic and collegiate critics believe it is.

Perhaps the Eisenhower administration, when it all began, should not have got into the Vietnam mess in the first place. But given the global responsibilities of the United States, perhaps that was impossible even then.

Others less extreme than the let's clear outers say: Let's negotiate a settlement with North Vietnam and Red China, possibly be reconvening the Geneva conference that followed the French defeat at Dienbienphu, but as the old saying has it, it takes two to hold a conference and the offer made by President Johnson in his Johns Hopkins speech has so far had no takers.

The hope of the administration is that, if sufficient pressure is put on North Vietnam, its belief that it was winning the war will fade, though this may take time and they will finally decide that negotiation is better than destruction.

All decisions are inevitably based on gambles, possessing all the information that is available, which doesn't necessarily mean that all of it is trustworthy or absolutely accurate. But just the same the best there is. The President decided some time ago that while prepared to negotiate he would not surrender or scuttle and run.

Nobody knows better than he that the inauguration of the Great Society which he wants to see established here might have to be postponed indefinitely, if no tolerable solution of the Vietnam crisis is found. My own feeling is that the course which the President is pursuing is the right one.

In any event, it is going to be exciting and interesting to watch the L.B.J. Presidency unfold. As I said earlier, his honeymoon which is now well in its second year isn't going to last forever. It may end abruptly because of developments in Vietnam. A turn in the economic tide which has been running strongly and happily for a record number of months would inevitably turn some of his supporters sour. And there are aspects of his Great Society program, particularly the war on poverty, where it may be difficult to avoid scandals although I have great faith in the wisdom and ability of Sargent Shriver to keep things straight.

The American Presidency is a very remarkable institution. We have had strong Presidents and we've had weak ones—doers and drones—but none of the 35 who achieved that high eminence were corrupt or venal although some, like Harding and Grant, were surrounded by corrupt and venal men and none aspired to be a man on horseback. I think all Americans have reason to be proud of that fact. Somehow when a man gets to the White House—and closes the door that shuts out the world, if other than in a figurative sense he can ever do that, the past crowds in on him. Washington and the ghosts of John Adams, the first occupant, of Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson, of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy and all the others are all about. And he is ever-conscious of the fact that he and the Vice President, alone of all the multitude of officials, are elected by all the people and is responsible to all of them.

Partisan critics of Lyndon Johnson have cited with glee the positions he took as Senator and the position he is now taking as President on such matters as civil rights. They have accused him of inconsistency and in one sense they are right. But when John-

son was a Senator he represented Texas and its special interests and its particular viewpoint, and now he is President of the United States.

It is now 17 months since Lyndon Johnson assumed the Presidency. Since there are no constitutional obstacles in the way of his serving as President for 9 years, and there is a good chance that no political obstacles will bar the way to that achievement either, 17 months would hardly seem long enough to judge the L.B.J. Presidency.

A lot can happen. His popularity would certainly plummet downward and so would his capacity to get things done either in foreign affairs or in the domestic field. If the Vietnam situation should lead to a disastrous war—an American Diembienphu—as many a Jeremiah is predicting, some of his great ideas (I am thinking partiularly of the war on poverty) which have enormous capacity for good may bog down in the morass of local politics. But these and other dangers, many of them at present clouds no bigger than a man's hand, may reverse the tide of opinion regarding the present administration. There is no way of knowing how Johnson would react to ill fortune. His egotism is great (although certainly not unjustified judging by his remarkable record of accomplishment) his skin is acutely sensitive, but he is a man of tremendous self-control. Barry Goldwater could not have been more wrong than when, in explaining why he had chosen Bill Miller as his running mate, said, "I picked Bill Miller because he drives Lyndon nuts." Miller did not drive Johnson nuts, though he tried, because Lyndon for all his thin skin wouldn't permit himself to be driven nuts. He's tough. At his press conference yesterday, in answer to a question as to whether he agreed with the charge that our Vietnam policy has lost us all our friends, the President replied in effect that our allies understand our position—our enemies oppose us—but in any event we intend to continue our present course regardless of whether it means losing friends or not.

This is the reality of power—the power which the United States possesses in the world of today—the power which, as Chief Executive, Lyndon Johnson must exercise. He is not afraid of power. But I don't believe he has ever, or ever will, exercise it for its own sake. I am sure his greatest ambition is to go down as a great President—one who has left the Nation better than when he began.

In any event it is going to be an exciting 3 years. And then—in all likelihood if his health holds out—another four.

Harral Allen, of Ada, Okla.: Conservationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, citizens of Oklahoma and friends of soil conservation everywhere suffered a grievous loss recently in the untimely death of Harral Allen, of Ada, Okla.

Mr. Allen, a pioneer leader in the conservation field, was president of the Oklahoma Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts in 1957–58. In the critical early days of the Public Law 566 program he did as much as anyone to apply the commonsense and practical experience that made it a success.

The Sandy Creek Conservancy District in Pontotoc County is only one of the monuments to his work. In the many places throughout the land where the upstream conservation program will bring a sounder use of our resources, the influence of Harral Allen will be felt.

The Ada, Okla., Evening News announced his death April 17 as follows:

Albert Harral Allen, 59, died suddenly Saturday about 4 p.m.. An ambulance was called to his home at 504 West 21st, but the widely known Adan was dead on arrival at Valley View Hospital.

Funeral services had not been set Saturday night, but will be announced later by Criswell Funeral Home.

Harral Allen, son of a pioneer industrialist here, is perhaps best known as a dedicated conservationist. He held as a true ideal that mankind must make best use of soil and water, and leave the land better, if possible, for succeeding generations. He persevered, usually at his own expense, at this task, and constantly sought better laws at both National and State levels for conservation.

He was born in Ada on May 30, 1905, to R. W. Allen and Lean Morgan Allen. His father founded the Ada Milling Co., Ada's first major industry, in 1901. Later he established the R. W. Allen Feed Co., which stood for several decades near the present division headquarters of the State highway department.

Harral Allen was educated in the Ada public schools, and graduated from East Central State College. His interests then—and all his life—were in science. All sciences fascinated the mind of Harral Allen, both biological and physical sciences.

He taught in Ada schools, and was a successful science teacher in Ada High School.

He married the former Miss Louise Spangler on October 16, 1931, at Pauls Valley. The couple has had a wide circle of friends here through the years, and reared two fine sons.

SURVIVORS

In addition to his wife, Harral Allen leaves his two sons: Tom Allen, Houston, and Jerry Allen, of the home at 504 West 21st; two sisters: Mrs. J. H. Shaw, Ada, and Mrs. Lola Dean, Cleburne, Tex.; two brothers: E. A. Allen, Yakima, Wash., and Dewey Allen, Ada.

Harral Allen was a member of the board of supervisors of the Pontotoc County Soil and Water Conservation District. He served as chairman for several years.

In 1957–58, he was president of the Oklahoma Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts. His influence in conservation spread over the Nation.

In an editorial, "He Built a Great Monument," which appeared April 20, the Ada Evening News paid tribute to his career as a conservationist:

HE BUILT A GREAT MONUMENT

Every thinking man wants to leave something worthwhile to his family, and to society. Not many are gifted enough or determined enough to create outstanding accomplishments.

But Harral Allen was.

A scientist, a philosopher, but at the same time a practical man with bread and butter ideas, he saw the need for leaving to society in this county and over the State the means of stopping the loss of our greatest material resource, the fertile land, and turning the trend into improving it.

Harral Allen had an inborn love for the land. He got his love for the land both from his father and from his observation of what was taking place in this county and, in fact, over most of the State.

He saw the fine soil that had been built up over the centuries on the hillsides and in the valleys mishandled so it was being lost through wind and water erosion.

When the opportunity came at the urging of himself, the farseeing statesmen like the late Robert S. Kerr, and of course thousands of others over the Nation, to do something about it, he was ready. He headed the drive to get the first conservancy district in this part of the State started on Sandy Creek, west of Ada.

The idea at first was hard to sell. Landowners hesitated to surrender any control of the land even to their neighbors. Often over a cup of coffee, Harral told us of the difficulty he was having. He held no ill feeling against those who did not want to go along with saving the soil in the Sandy watershed, but he felt somehow he was not getting the real meaning over to them. We did what we could to encourage him. Others did the same. After many months of a seemingly unappreciated labor of love, the tide began to turn. He was happy. He began taking the message to others outside the Sandy watershed in this area, in the entire State and even to the Congressmen and Senators in Washington. He must have made a dozen trips to the Nation's Capital to plead for better care of the soil from which future generations must live. He had strong support by Senator Kerr and Congressman TOM STEED and finally by most of the lawmakers.

Not all the essential work on Sandy has been done. In fact, there will be bits of touching up from here on. But the dream he had was close to reality when his labors ceased on Saturday, April 17. And what a monument he had built.

We do not mean to imply his service to mankind was limited to the land. For years he was an inspiring teacher in Ada, and the memory of him lingers in the minds of hundreds of men and women. Both father and Harral did much for the First Christian Church of Ada.

Others are left to carry on the gospel of better water and soil control, men like Uel Bumpers and many more. But the State of Oklahoma owes more than it will ever show to three native sons of this county. They furnished the spark that set off a real program of land conservation. This is beginning to pay off, and the real benefits will show up more and more in the decades and centuries ahead.

Without in any way downgrading what hundreds of other native sons have done about this important phase of making Oklahoma a better State, it would be correct to say great monuments of stone should be erected, and mental monuments held in the hearts of all, to:

Robert S. Kerr, Harral Allen, and TOM STEED.

Grit's Distribution Reaches Record High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, upon learning that my home is in Wiliamsport, Pa., several of my colleagues in Congress have told me that they are former newspaper carriers of the nationally known and distributed Grit, famed product of Williamsport. Grit is the largest and most complete independent family weekly in the world. It was founded in 1864

by its first publisher, Dietrick Lamade, and has appeared weekly under the management of the Lamade family since that date. For 81 years Grit has been an "elevating, refining force, devoted to the best interests and welfare of the American people. It seeks to inform, entertain, teach highest moral and social principles, improve thought and inspire achievement."

Diligent adherence to these stated principles has resulted in the tremendous growth and increasing circulation of Grit. A recent article notes new records. I am proud to call it to the attention of the many famous graduate carriers of this fine weekly, including past and present Members of the House and the Senate. We salute the management of "America's Greatest Family Newspaper" and wish it continuing and increasing success.

GRIT'S DISTRIBUTION REACHES RECORD HIGH FOR ALL EDITIONS

Distribution of this week's issue of Grit will total more than 1,170,000 copies—an all-time high for any issue in the newspaper's 83-year history.

Several other records are being set this week.

For the first time, distribution of Grit's national edition, which is circulated all over the Nation outside of Pennsylvania, topped the 1 million mark with this issue. More than 1,001,000 copies of the national edition were printed. The Pennsylvania edition also set an all-time high with more than 125,500 copies distributed.

The Williamsport edition also set a new record this week, with a distribution of more than 44,200 copies in a 50-mile radius of Williamsport.

SUBSCRIPTIONS SET RECORD

Grit also reached an all-time high in mail subscriptions this week, with 138,362 for all editions. More than a million copies are distributed by more than 30,000 sales boys in more than 16,000 cities, towns, and villages throughout the United States.

The newspaper's mounting circulation taxed the capacity of the company's old newspaper press in the main building at Third and William Streets, and in 1963 printing of Grit began on a new four-color web offset press located in a new building at 1 Maynard Street. Full production began with the issue of April 7, 1963. Since that time all copies of the National and Pennsylvania Editions of Grit have been printed at the new plant on the new press. Printing of the Williamsport edition began there October 20, 1963.

NEW GAIN FOR READERS

Grit's color press, with a potential of 60,000 copies an hour and an average running speed of 45,000 an hour, is adequate to handle comfortably the newspaper's increased circulation.

For the last 2 years, readers of the National and Pennsylvania editions of Grit have enjoyed full-color illustrations as well as full-color and single-color advertisements. Beginning with the issue of September 27, 1964, Grit's Pennsylvania edition was made a part of the Williamsport edition, so that local readers could also enjoy the full-color illustrations and advertisements.

Harry Karns' Fast Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, we are under attack, and if words could kill, most of us—Democrats and Republicans, alike—would be lying in the aisles right now without our heads on our shoulders.

The weapon of the attack is the sharp-edged wit of a new nationally syndicated columnist, Harry Karns, whose column, "Fast Life," is certainly the most impartial one on the political scene today. He gives us all the devil.

Harry Karns is headquartered at the Long Beach Independent, Press-Telegram in Long Beach, Calif., and his "Fast Life" missiles are distributed by Newsday Syndicate.

It was sort of difficult getting used to "Fast Life" to begin with, for a person has learned to expect political columnists to follow a particular line. But then I began to understand what "Fast Life" is all about. It is actually an objective, detached commentary which does not believe that one side is always right and the other always wrong, but which deals with each issue on its merits and with each political figure according to his position at a particular time.

It occurs to me that this objectivity is a very healthy attitude to assume toward politics and that many of us might do well to adopt it more often. But enough of the sermonizing—I am sure you want to see the blood.

Here are some items selected at random from "Fast Life."

FAST LIFE

(By Harry Karns)

L.B.J. calls his spending program a "barebones" proposal. By the same standard, you would have to call Jackie Gleason a barebones comedian.

A group of Republicans have formed a booster organization which they call "The Committee of '68." How they'll do depends a lot on whether that apostrophe stands for an 18 or a 19.

Washington is the drinkingest city in the United States. And some pretty funny things go on there even when everybody's cold sober.

The conservative Republican Congressman believes in the old virtues—and in new dams in the home district.

The Government has launched a campaign to control goofballs. Several Senators were indignant until they learned that goofball is the slang name for a kind of drug.

Henry Cabot Lodge visits the uneasy nations of the Pacific to see how they feel about our latest Vietnam policy. Have you noticed that when things get hot out there, Lyndon assigns a Republican to take the temperature?

Republican Representative LAIRD laments that the U.S. Government has "come to the dangerous brink of one-party government." And what is worse, it's the other party.

L.B.J. orders a news service ticker installed in his office. Perhaps, like the rest of us, he's getting curious as to what this administration is going to do next.

Flood Control: The First Aim of TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am certain we are all aware of the terrible destruction which has been wrought by the floods throughout the midwestern section of our country during the past few weeks. There is no terror quite like that of a rampaging river relentlessly inundating everything in its path. Until the mighty rivers of the Tennessee Valley were harnessed a few years ago, we, too, experienced terrible floods. I know all of our colleagues are most distressed over the loss of lives and tremendous property damage caused by the surging Mississippi. With this in mind, I would like to call your attention to an editorial which appeared in the April 19, 1965, edition of the Paducah, Ky., Sun-Democrat.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the editorial from the Sun-Democrat:

[From the Paducah Sun-Democrat, Apr. 19, 1965]

FLOOD CONTROL: THE FIRST AIM OF TVA

We are reminded by the devastating floods in Minnesota and the thousands of acres of flooded lowlands in this area of the vital role played by TVA in controlling floods throughout the Tennessee River Valley.

Without TVA, the city of Chattanooga, Tenn., this year would have received an estimated $43 million in flood damage due to a crest which would have been 10 feet above flood stage.

Partially due to the storage of water behind Kentucky Dam, the city of Paducah was spared the expense of putting up its floodwall closures and operating its floodwall pumps at a saving of several thousand dollars.

Smaller cities throughout the Tennessee River Valley and some others in this immediate area were spared the ravages of flood by the manipulation of TVA dams and storage basins. And it was all done so deftly and quietly that few were aware that the sixth largest flood of the Tennessee Valley Authority era was gushing downstream to empty into the already swollen Ohio River at Paducah.

When flood conditions reached serious proportions in the upper Tennessee River Valley during the latter part of March, TVA started releasing six times the normal amount of water that goes through the gates of Kentucky Dam to create needed storage space. A flood was moving down the Ohio River toward Paducah as this was being done, but the TVA discharge from Kentucky Dam was

timed to move well ahead of the anticipated Ohio River crest.

When the Ohio crest arrived, most of the gates at Kentucky Dam were closed and the 180-mile long Kentucky Lake quickly rose 8 feet. It was this holding action which held the Ohio crest below damaging flood level at Paducah and other western Kentucky towns.

Due to the importanec and the many benefits of its controversial power generating activities, many people are apt to forget that TVA was created primarily for flood control purposes and that flood control is still its first and most important responsibility.

One needs only to look at the havoc and destruction wrought by the floods in Minnesota to be reminded of, and be made humbly grateful for, the great flood control work that is being done by TVA.

Dirty GOP Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I share the belief of those who feel that the Republican congressional campaign committee has overstepped the bounds of acceptable criticism and fair-play in its statements about our colleagues who voted against the authorization of expenses for the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

A number of our colleagues have expressed themselves on this point. I rise today to call the attention of the House to an editorial which appeared in the Detroit News. The editorial, which was carried under the headline, "Dirty GOP Politics," takes the Republican congressional campaign committee to task for its criticism of our colleagues who opposed the authorization of funds for the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Like the Detroit News, I deplore the "technique of guilt by association" employed by the Republican campaign committee. The following are excerpts from the News editorial:

DIRTY GOP POLITICS

It is one thing to differ with a political opponent's vote. It is quite another thing to question his loyalty and patriotism because of his vote. Unfortunately the Republican congressional campaign committee does not always make this distinction.

After the House of Representatives voted 359 to 29 in favor of $370,000 budget for the Un-American Activities Committee, the GOP organization issued a press release attacking the Democrats who voted against the motion. The contention was that the negative vote lined them up "with every subversive organization in the county which is trying to abolish the committee.

Admittedly, some subversive organizations are opposed to the Un-American Activities Committee. But so are some completely patriotic civil liberties organizations.

The Republican committee is using the old McCarthyite technique of guilt by association. It is also trying to revive the moth-eaten charge that the Democrats are soft on communism.

The episode helps to explain why the Republicans are still a small minority in the House.

Friends and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I am dubious of the long-range benefits of our foreign aid worldwide program. I have opposed foreign aid bills and appropriations since 1950 partially because of their effect on our national economy; and it frightens me to think about what the repercussions will be in foreign countries when, through dire necessity, we are forced to discontinue such worldwide spending. I believe these programs will eventually wreck the economy of our country—we may never find a stopping place.

The enclosed excellent editorial from the April 28 edition of the Lafayette Sun is inserted under unanimous consent, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

FRIENDS AND FOREIGN AID

Nations are composed of human beings, and humans being what they are, usually perform and react like humans.

This may sound silly, but we mention this in order to emphasize those human characteristics that enter into this country's foreign aid program. It is a fact of life that people rarely like being indebted to another. That applies to nations. Pride and the sin of rank ingratitude makes this country's proffered hand of assistance and support for other nations come in for some clawing from all sides.

The staggering sum of $110 billion has been dished out to other countries, enemies and so-called friends alike, since 1945. The taxpayers have footed this bill, and what have they received in return? Mostly antagonism, ingratitude, and trouble.

This newspaper has always been for aiding nations that need our help financially and militarily if they are sincerely trying to make for their people a better way of life, and defend their country from aggression. But our foreign aid program has now become a worldwide sneer for most of those countries who get it. This does not mean that they are not around often with their hands out. They are just exercising that human trait that we spoke about earlier in this dissertation.

This huge outlay from the sweat of the American brow has not halted communism and it has not won friends and influenced nations to see our way of democracy. Then why is it continued on an ever-increasing scale? Bureaucracy is the answer to a large extent.

Congressman PASSMAN recently stated:

"There are 71,416 individuals, including participants, on its payrolls. * * * No program in the history of mankind has had as many paid lobbyists as the foreign-aid program. * * * [It] is not in reality a Presidential program * * * It is a bureaucratic program. The President has too much to do to be able to familiarize himself with the many ramifications, misrepresentations, and claims of accomplishment by the paid bureaucrats, government lobbyists, spenders, and recipients."

So we can see that foreign aid, the costly boondoogle that is sapping America's strength and creating enemies right and left, has become a Frankenstein just like the bureaucratic Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare and other Departments with their hundreds of thousands of employees. And these employees are constantly lobbying and presuring Congress and the President for more and more.

It matters not whether we have a Democrat or Republican administration. The mushrooming continues, and one is inclined to wonder if it will ever come to an end until our country faces the greatest crisis of its history.

Foreign aid on a business like basis to nations sincerely trying to improve their economic lot is not begrudged by most Americans. The bureaucracy and squandering of money to any and all dictatorships should be stopped. Only the American people themselves can do it. Each day it continues the stronger it becomes. Every bureau ever created dedicates itself to perpetuation from the hour it is born. Foreign aid is no different.

Oklahoma To Remember Fort Towson and Fort Washita in Ceremonies on June 22 and 23

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the final act of surrender of the Civil War will be the subject of a memorial and pageant to be conducted by the Oklahoma Civil War Centennial Commission at Fort Towson, Okla., on June 23, 1965.

The war in Indian Territory was bitter and hard-fought. Indian against Indian, the Confederate forces under Brig. Gen. Stand Waite, the first American Indian to attain the rank of regularly commissioned general officer, held out to the last. For several weeks, as June came to the Indian country, he refused to believe the rumors coming up from New Orleans that his beloved Confederacy had surrendered and General Lee had laid down his arms.

On June 23, after seeing the Choctaw forces under Chief Pitchlynn surrender the day preceding, General Waite signed a formal surrender and parole at his Fort Towson headquarters with Lt. Col. Asa Matthews, who had been dispatched to the Indian country for the purpose of attempting to secure the surrender of the Confederate Indians.

Elaborate ceremonies are planned for the morning of June 23 at Fort Towson. The ruins of this once important frontier military post, then in the Choctaw Nation and located only several miles northeast of the modern town of the same name, are gaunt and impressive. Occupied throughout the war by Confederate Forces, the post was never again occupied by Federal troops. With its day of glory as the scene of the last Confederate general officer to surrender, it soon passed into forgotten limbo.

On June 22, the Oklahoma Historical Society will dedicate the completely rehabilitated Fort Washita, a once important military post established in 1842 by Gen. Zachary Taylor. The afternoon of June 22 will see the actual firing at Fort Washita of Confederate field artillery, conducted under the direction of

modern artillerymen from Fort Sill, Okla.

For both events, the commission has prepared special cachets, and covers will be dispatched from Fort Washita and from Fort Towson. Those wishing to have covers cacheted may send the same to the Oklahoma Civil War Centennial Commission, 1108 Colcord Building, Oklahoma City. Covers should be clearly marked for either "Fort Washita" or for "Fort Towson."

Mr. Speaker, I extend to all Members an invitation to come to Oklahoma and take part in these festivities marking the end of the Civil War.

Firmness in Vietnam Is the Only Right Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, firmness with flexibility to negotiate, if the opportunity presents itself, as proposed by President Johnson, appears to be the proper and sound policy to pursue in the Vietnam crisis.

In amplification on this policy and position, under unanimous consent, I place my remarks contained in my recent newsletter—Capitol Comments—in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This newsletter, dated May 3, entitled "Firmness in Vietnam Is the Only Right Course" follows:

[From Capitol Comments]

FIRMNESS IN VIETNAM IS THE ONLY RIGHT COURSE

(By JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

Our country's stand in Vietnam is uppermost in the thoughts of Congress, as it is in every American home.

Nine months have elapsed since Congress, by concurrent resolution, voiced virtually unanimous bipartisan support of our Government's firm policy against Communist aggression in southeast Asia. Not a single Member of the House and only two Members of the Senate voted against this resolution.

Declaring that the peace and security of southeast Asia are vital to our country's national security interests, the resolution called for "all necessary measures to repel an attack against the forces of the United States and prevent further aggression."

Congressional support of President Johnson remains overwhelmingly strong because he is carrying out this policy with notable fidelity and resolution, and also because it grows increasingly clear that this is the right policy for the United States.

Our Government has demonstrated in every possible way that the United States is ready to go to the conference table the minute the Communists cease their aggression. At the same time, our country is making it crystal clear that there will be no negotiations as long as aggression continues.

Meanwhile, both military and diplomatic pressures are being vigorously applied to convince the Communists that continued aggression is neither wise nor profitable. These pressures are being used with great skill, and with carefully measured restraint to prevent escalation of the conflict if possible.

This policy of measured response—of "firmness with moderation, readiness for peace with refusal to retreat"—will continue to be pressed with unflagging zeal, President Johnson this week emphasized at his news conference.

There are certainly risks in this course, but the dangers in an alternative policy—the course of appeasement and retreat—are enormously greater.

President Johnson summed up the matter in these words:

"This is the clearest lesson of our time. From Munich until today, we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of lasting peace. * * * Wherever we have stood firm, aggression has been halted, peace has been restored, and liberty has been maintained. This was true under President Truman, under President Eisenhower, under President Kennedy, and it will be true again in southeast Asia."

Yukon River Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, in the Atlantic Monthly for May 1965 there appears an article by Paul Brooks roundly condemning the idea of a dam and hydroelectric project at Rampart Canyon on the Yukon River in Alaska. Incidentally, in an editors note, the Atlantic Monthly joins forces with Paul Brooks by calling the project ill conceived.

This eagerness to prematurely arrive at condemnatory conclusions is reflected in the title of the article: "The Plot To Drown Alaska." I call it premature because the six-man task force, named by Secretary of the Interior Udall to analyze the 1,000-page field-level report prepared after 5 years of studies and investigations by all segments of the Department of the Interior concerned, as well as the Corps of Engineers, has just begun its work. Until the task force completes its work, and the Secretary of the Interior publishes his conclusion, we will not have the overall official determination pertaining to the multiple aspects and relative merits and demerits of this great hydroelectric resource.

Commenting upon this derogatory article is a sane and sensible editorial appearing in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner of April 28, 1965. The text of which is as follows:

THE PLOT TO WHAT * * *?

Last summer conservationist-author Paul Brooks took a trip through the Yukon Flats.

"Flocks of mallards congregated near the shore, and somewhere from a slough echoed the cries of red-throated loons," Brooks recalls in an article coming out in the May issue of Atlantic Monthly.

"Though in August we were too late for the nesting season, we saw more and more waterfowl as we approached the flats: Pairs of widgeon, small flocks of white-fronted geese, and two sandhill cranes, long necks outstretched and wings beating slowly as they flew directly overhead."

Emotionally Brooks made a strong case against having a lake and dam there to generate low-cost electricity.

Factually, he slipped up because either the comprehensive Rampart project reports of the Interior Department were not available to him when he wrote the piece, or he didn't pay much attention to them if they were available.

Brooks describes at length two preliminary reports, but Interior's massive 997-page study, conducted under the multiple-use concept, is disposed of in one paragraph.

His article is called "The Plot To Drown Alaska." Considering that Alaska covers 586,400 square miles and the Rampart impoundment would cover 10,000 square miles, the title is a telling clue as to the slant.

The author says alternate waterfowl habitat is "not specified." He should read the fish and wildlife report on impact and measures to mitigate losses.

He spoofs the thought that Rampart could pay for itself. The projections say it would.

The whole concept of economic resource development evolving from the availability of low-cost power is dismissed ("Clearly the importance of mineral deposits in Alaska has been seriously exaggerated") and no mention is made of the existing prohibitive costs.

Brooks gets in a plug for another dam (Devil Canyon), where the cost would be 6.36 mills per kilowatt hour as compared to 2.01 at Rampart, according to the field report. He also mentions "cheap nuclear power" (computed in the report at 5.5 mills for power production alone).

Mention is made of timber destruction, but not of logging the basin.

An abbreviated summation of benefits from the dam overlooks the potentials for flood control and a fresh water fishery.

And so on.

But one must allow an author his subject, and it is when he is discussing what he terms "primitive values" that Brooks is most persuasive. "This is wild country, and its values are wilderness values." Few will challenge this statement, and it is this rather than the projections and figures that gives the underlying weight to Brooks' thesis.

Brooks intimates the conservationist does not like to be regarded as "the enemy of prosperity." Yet neither do those favoring "prosperity" like to be regarded as enemies of wildlife. When the known losses and the known benefits of the project are analyzed, such charges are oversimplified and therefore meaningless.

If Rampart were envisioned merely with the almighty construction dollar in mind, we would agree it should not be built at the expense of wilderness values. But as studies over the recent years have recognized, the case is far greater than that.

Articles for national magazines are usually written and scheduled considerably in advance of publication. The Department of the Interior's comprehensive report, including studies by the Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Alaska Railroad, Geological Survey, was published only a little over 2 months ago.

Since there may not have been time to incorporate these findings in the article about drowning Alaska, we trust the editors of Atlantic Monthly will see fit to bring the case up to date by publishing a sequel.

Paul Harris, Founder of Rotary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this poem, written by my constituent, Vernon B. Hampton, is a tribute to Paul Harris, the founder of that unique organization, Rotary International. This is a special tribute paid to Rotary by Mr. Hampton on the 60th anniversary of the founding of the organization.

The poem follows:

PAUL HARRIS—FOUNDER OF ROTARY

(An original poem by Rotarian Vernon B. Hampton)

A salute to Rotary International and a special tribute to its architect in Rotary's 60th year, 1965.

Great movements find the man,
The man the hour
When world events are shaped,
And new paths opened for mankind
In history's onward march.

In 1905 the man and hour met
Unheralded,
Unnoticed in Chicago's busy mart
Where teeming multitudes
Toiled at their daily tasks,
Heedless of others,
Hardly heeding self:
The rush of life left little time for living.
What was the gain where none enjoyed the game?

A lonely man was young Paul Harris there,
Wanting a friend, companionship,
Instructive intercourse,
A chance to serve his fellow men.
Suiting the action to his need,
Four kindred souls at his behest
Began the great adventure.
A circle drawn,
A simple meal, a fruitful talk,
Warmed by one brotherhood.

Idea into action,
That spelled R-o-t-a-r-y.

So struck the hour,
And a new light lit our world.
Down history's corridors
The sounding gong resounded
As Rotary was born,
Simply,
With dignity,
With promise.

The pioneer of service clubs,
Rotary was first to meet a modern need
For a society of men of diverse callings,
Classified by their vocations,
Desired by Rotary for their worth in civic leadership,
Success in business or profession,
Personal attributes and fellowship.
Rotary offered to all, its high ideals
And a program for accomplishment,

And challenged the world at large
To raise its sights,
Reorient its thinking:
To dignify the role of man in every station,
Encourage enterprise,
Promote research, advance the cause of peace.

Leaders of local fame and world acclaim
Became Rotarians,
Proud of an invitation
Into Rotary—Hallmark of leadership.

The emblemed wheel became a passport far and wide,
Symbol of action,
Mark of accomplishment.

Mottoes are ideals sloganized:
"Who profits most serves best
His craft, community, mankind."
This early concept found its complement
In "Service above self,"
The Founder's aim for all Rotarians.
"Live and help live" made living worth the while.
As conscience aroused is energy empowered,
Rotary's collective force
Became a whirlwind of good works
In paths of service.

Paul Harris knew the score:
In many lands he had been seen poverty and ignorance.
Helping his fellow men became a passion,
Learned in his boyhood home
Where love and faith in God
Fashioned the man-to-be.
The spirit of Vermont possessed his soul:
New England lakes gave him serenity,
Majestic mountains, goals of high resolve,
Meadows bequeathed their beauty, streams their calm;
Snow-silenced winters, time for contemplation.
Tempered and tried in youth,
He grew to manhood modest, patient, wise,
Enduring as the granite hills of home,
Endowed with zeal to serve, not to be served.
No protense marked his modest mien,
And friends in converse found his epigrams and wit
Enjoyable, lighting the moments of companionship
With warmth and wisdom.

As Rotary expanded,
Crossed boundary lines, seas, continents and hemispheres,
Paul's global dream became reality.
Not easily, for there were times of stress:
When inhumanity to man seemed paramount
And war engulfed the world;
When poverty, disaster, selfishness,
Aggressive national ambition,
"Broaden our understanding," he told Rotary,
Still prevailed.

"Strengthen the bond, rebuild, renew.
These gains will come," he said prophetically.

His steady hand from 1905 to 1947,
Helped guide the craft launched on life's tortured seas.
Never alone,
After the dim days when Rotary began,
Strong men of Rotary upheld his arm,
Against the setting sun,
When weary toil and travel took his strength.
And always by his side, part of the Rotary van,
Was Bonnie Jean, beloved wife,
His Rotary Ann.

Grateful is Rotary that Paul Harris lived so long,
To firm the movement in the mold he formed in faith.

A living monument, Rotary—
No lengthened shadow,
But a tel-star on the world,
Joining the clubs in one,
Communicating.

Progress unparalleled is seen,
In Rotary's 60 years;
Its growth phenomenal,
Its program rich and timed to current needs:
An annual harvest of good works and leadership,
Thousands of times repeated.

The human mind scarce comprehends the global impact
That Rotary has had on the world's millions
In three score years.
These forces of fraternity
Have breached estranging walls of custom, time and distance,
In Friendship's name,
And made one world of many.
For Rotary, the Past is prologue, future limitless,
As Paul would have it be.

A few days before his death
Paul wrote a friend:
"I still can appreciate
The press of a warm hand
And the smile of a friendly face."
Nearing eternity
His Godward thoughts still felt the warmth of friendship.
Essence of Rotary. Beautiful epitaph.

EPILOGUE

Spirit of Paul Harris, invisible,
Brooding benignly
Over the broad expanse
Of Rotary International,
Watching the child of his dreams—
His creature,
His image,
His masterpiece.

Our Future Water Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the availability of adequate water supplies has long been a major concern in southern California and remains so today. The phenomenal population growth in the entire Pacific Southwest has resulted in steadily increasing demands on the water of the Colorado River—the veritable lifeline of the Basin States—and the trend continues unabated. It is estimated, for instance, that the population in southern California alone will be 16.6 million by 1980, about a 65-percent increase over today's count. So, the obvious need now, as we look toward the future, is to seek water supplies from other sources. The Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, a great Hearst newspaper with the largest afternoon circulation in the country, treats that subject intelligently and objectively in an editorial, published April 13, 1965. I am therefore pleased to insert in the RECORD that editorial, and a related letter to the editor, which appeared in the same newspaper on April 20, 1965:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald-Examiner, Apr. 13, 1965]

OUR FUTURE WATER SUPPLY

Things are looking forward in the plans of the Pacific Southwest to obtain future water supplies from the Pacific Northwest's Columbia and other rivers for the semiarid portions of the Western States of this area.

Almost all of the water authorities, chambers of commerce and other civic organizations in California, Arizona and other water-thirsty States are in solid agreement on the proposed compromise on water between California and Arizona.

Bills now in Congress would authorize the long-controversial central Arizona water project, with assurances to California of 4.4 million acre-feet of Colorado River water annually, until completion of works to import an additional 2.5 million acre-feet annually into the Lower Colorado River from outside sources.

The outside sources of course is the real rub in the matter. Outside sources means only one thing, that water must be imported and transported by canals from such points as the Columbia River, the Snake River in Idaho or possibly even from both points.

What are the prospects for this proposed water importation? At this stage they appear to be looking up, at least slightly.

Just recently, U.S. Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall announced in Washington that he has strong hopes for eventual agreement between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest for such a plan.

He said he does not regard such an agreement any more difficult than last year's west coast power intertie agreement by which power developed at Bonneville Dam will be sold and transported to California.

The Secretary said that once it has definitely been determined how much water is wasted annually when it flows into the Pacific from the Columbia River, the people of the Northwest States probably can be brought to realize that they can give up some of this wasted water.

Present estimates are that more than 150 million acre-feet of water from the Columbia run off annually into the Pacific and that of this huge amount of water waste not more than 5 million acre-feet would amply supply the southwest States bordering the Colorado River for many years into the future.

The position of the Pacific Northwest is, of course, highly understandable. The people of those States are anxious to make certain that diversions from the Columbia or Snake Rivers will never jeopardize their own water supplies in the future.

However, they are not making this a matter of stubborn refusal to consider the Southwest's needs.

Indeed, only recently the State of Oregon authorized a $1.2 million study of that State's future water needs and of the surplus water they must have in the future for irrigation, fish, wildlife and recreation, and needs for urban and industrial expansion.

Oregon, Washington and Idaho should be thoroughly assured through ironclad contracts that no water would be allowed to be diverted to the south when it becomes apparent that his water supply will be necessary to the Northwest's needs.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald-Examiner, Apr. 20, 1965]

FUTURE WATER

We could not agree more fully with the points you made in your recent editorial about "Our Future Water Supply."

It is encouraging to be walking in step with Arizona toward a solution for our Colorado River problems, and to be doing so with the support of Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall.

We share Secretary Udall's hope that an agreement about Columbia River water will be no more impossible to reach than was the agreement concerning the power intertie with the Pacific Northwest and Canada.

It may be worth repeating the other point of your editorial as well, that we in southern California believe the future of Washington and Oregon and Idaho should be protected. When we talk about the possibilities of transferring surplus water from the Columbia River, we are talking about only surplus water which now is wasting and which later will still not be needed.

PHILIP CORRIN,
President, Colorado River Association.

Polish American Observance

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, citizens of Polish origin in this country will join with their brethren in many nations of the world on May 3, in celebration of a great Polish national holiday—the Polish Constitution Day. The valiant struggle of the Polish people for national independence has inspired all people who cherish freedom and the dignity of the individual. The 3d of May Constitution declared the fundamental faith of a liberal people, a faith which still burns today in their hearts despite the chilling oppression of a Communist state.

The Polish 3d of May Constitution states that truth which is the cornerstone of all democratic governments, and which echoes the basic tenets of our own Constitution adopted just 2 years before. Its words are:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Thus the philosophies of government of the American and free Polish people are strongly linked.

Other significant dates in Polish history will also be marked by this year's May 3 observance. Among these is the 25th anniversary of the Katyn massacre, the coldblooded mass murder of thousands of Polish officers and intellectuals in a forest near Smolensk in the Soviet Union. One of the most brutal acts of genocide the world has ever known, it is a vivid reminder and warning of the inhumane nature of totalitarian government.

I salute the members of the Polish American Congress, representing nearly 10 million Americans of Polish descent, for the work they have done to make the observance of Polish 3d of May Constitution Day an impressive and memorable event.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House are saluting today the great contributions which Poland has made in the course of democratic history. The drafting of the Constitution of May 3, 1791, was a unique statement of freedom and of the rights of the people in that part of Europe. It deserves to be remembered and to be recalled wherever freemen gather.

Poland, by its geography, has been under constant pressure from other powerful nations. It has been forced to accept the tyranny which is imposed on it today, but the ideals which were embodied in that Constitution of 174 years ago have been kept alive by Poland's many brave sons and daughters throughout the world, as well as at home. The great gatherings of this past weekend have shown how many long to see a free and constitutional democracy flower there again.

It is well that we look back and study the language of that 1791 Constitution—language that set limits on the power of rulers, and imposed responsibilities on the cabinet chosen to administer the nation. It was a farsighted document that breathed freedom and human dignity. I join my colleagues in calling the attention of our people to this great, if tragic, anniversary.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Lowell, Mass., I attended the commemoration exercises of Polish Constitution Day, which is today, May 3.

The ceremonies were conducted in accord with the proclamation of Gov. John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts, who urged "all citizens to mark this observance with suitable ceremonies in schools and public assemblies throughout the State, and to keep in mind the brave history and current tragic plight of Poland."

These moving ceremonies in Lowell were attended by a great many citizens of Greater Lowell, both those of Polish descent, and friends and admirers of the struggle of the Polish people.

Mr. Fred Witkos did an excellent job as master of ceremonies at the flag raising ceremonies. The raising of the American flag was conducted by Edward Wojas, commander of the Polish-American Veterans, and the raising of the Polish flag by Wladyslaw Weglarz, commander of Polish Army Veterans. The buglar was Edward J. Sudol.

Inspiring addresses followed by Mayor Ellen A. Sampson, of Lowell, and State Representative John Janas. The flag raising ceremony was followed by a parade under the direction of Stephen Pacula, parade marshal. A pageant was later held at Liberty Hall in Lowell where the address was delivered by State auditor, Thaddeus Buczko.

The entire day's events in Lowell were moving tribute to the great concern of Americans of Polish ancestry and their friends with the struggle that still goes on in Poland for freedom and justice.

Under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the Governor's proclamation of Polish Constitution Day:

A PROCLAMATION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS BY HIS EXCELLENCY JOHN A. VOLPE, GOVERNOR, 1965

Whereas Poland promulgated the first democratic constitution to be adopted by any European nation on May 3, 1791, a constitution which proclaimed the rights of man, declared that the purpose of the state was to serve the people, enabled all Polish citizens to hold office, abolished serfdom and granted other essential freedoms; and

Whereas the first observance of Poland's democratic constitution was held in 1891, the year which marked the 100th anniversary of this memorable document; and

Whereas the anniversary of the constitution was celebrated annually by the patriotic

Polish citizens until the fateful September of 1939, when Poland was invaded by the Nazi German armies; and

Whereas, although Constitution Day can no longer be observed in Poland, it is still marked in the thoughts and lives of Polish people elsewhere in the world, through the inspiration of such great Polish patriots as Sobieski, Kosciusko, and Pulaski, who befriended our young country in its fight for freedom: Now, therefore,

I, John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in accordance with Chapter 172 of the Acts of 1953 do hereby proclaim as Polish Constitution Day, May 3, 1965, and urge all citizens to mark this observance with suitable ceremonies in schools and public assemblies throughout the State, and to keep in mind the brave history and current tragic plight of Poland.

Given at the executive chamber in Boston, this 29th day of March, in the year of our Lord, 1965, and of the Independence of the United States of America, the 189th.

JOHN A. VOLPE.

By His Excellency the Governor,

KEVIN H. WHITE,

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The Buffalo Eye Bank & Research Society: 20 Years of Service to the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on May 6 the Buffalo Eye Bank & Research Society, Inc., will celebrate its 20th anniversary. One of the first services of this type in the United States, the Buffalo Eye Bank has been a pioneer in the field and has made many important contributions to the development of eye-banking throughout the country. Furthermore, through its primary mission, the supplying of eyes for transplantation, it has deeply affected the lives of thousands of individuals from all parts of the Nation. For these reasons the 20th anniversary of the Buffalo Eye Bank is an event of more than simply local or regional significance. In honor of this occasion and in recognition of the hard work and dedication of the many citizens of Buffalo who have made the eye bank a success, I would like today to tell you a little of its history and its splendid accomplishments.

As many of you know, Lions International has a special and longstanding interest in sight conservation and work for the blind. Therefore, it is not surprising that members of the local Lions Clubs around the country were particularly excited by reports of successful corneal transplants that were being published in 1944 and 1945. The Buffalo Host Lions Club gave a great deal of thought to the ways it might be able to help the medical profession with this promising new development. After considerable discussion, it was decided that since there would be a tremendous need for eye donations, the club could perform a valuable service by soliciting such donations and finding ways to expedite eye shipments. That is how the Buffalo Eye Bank came into being.

When the eye bank was founded in 1945, there was only one other in existence, and it had been in operation only a few months. Therefore, since there was no well-established, experienced organization to which it could turn for guidance, the Buffalo Eye Bank had to develop its own standards and techniques. One of the first problems was how to insure the safe transportation of eyes to various hospitals. To meet this difficulty, the president of the Buffalo Eye Bank invented an eye shipper which immediately proved to be quite popular and is now in use in eye banks and hospitals throughout the United States and Canada. The importance of this device would be hard to overestimate for, as we can readily understand, very few emergency transplants could be performed if doctors were forced to rely on their own communities exclusively. In this type of surgery, timing is all-important. Eyes can be stored for only a few days; moreover, an injured patient can be kept waiting just a short time. In order that all donated eyes be used and in order that every possible patient be helped, the eye shipper is essential. For that alone the Buffalo Eye Bank deserves a great deal of praise.

The founders of the Buffalo Eye Bank felt that their most important task was to build up a large file of eye pledges. With the vigorous and enthusiastic help of local Lions Clubs, the eye bank has carried on an impressive public education campaign and has now accumulated more than 60,000 donor signatures. This month another of its regular bi-annual drives is being held, and the eye bank hopes to surpass even the 6,000 new pledges obtained in 1963.

While providing eyes for transplantation is its major service, the Buffalo Eye Bank & Research Society, as its name suggests, has wide interests and goals. From the beginning it realized the importance of continued research in eye surgery, and in 1949, with the cooperation of the University of Buffalo and financial support from the Lions Clubs, it dedicated a research and pathology department at the university. Three years later local Lions Clubs again aided the eye bank, this time in assembling a large and comprehensive ophthalmic library. While these volumes are the property of the Buffalo Eye Bank, the organization has wisely and generously placed them in the University of Buffalo Medical School library so that they will be easily accessible to students and researchers working in this field.

Two other services of the Buffalo Eye Bank have been quite helpful to groups attempting to establish similar organizations. One of these is its manual on eye bank administration. The other is its catalog of special equipment and supplies which is the only catalog of this kind and which has filled a real need for our country's growing network of eye banks.

We in Buffalo are very proud of the eye bank, not only for what it has done for people in our community but for what it is doing for the Nation. The Buffalo Eye Bank has played an active role in the foundation and development of the Eye Bank Association of America and serves as one of its six regional collection and distribution headquarters. It has pledged itself to continue to work for expanded eye-banking services and more efficient means of communication in the hope that with each succeeding year an ever-growing number of people will have their vision restored.

Today there are more than 80 eye banks in operation in the United States, and together they help restore sight to approximately 3,000 persons a year. While this is an accomplishment to be proud of, we must not forget that, according to official estimates, there are at least 30,000 more of our fellow citizens who are either totally or partially blind who could benefit from transplants—if corneas were only available. That is why it is so important that all of us who have been blessed with two good eyes take that simple but important step of signing an eye donation pledge. I can think of no legacy a man or woman could leave that would cause more joy than the gift of sight to someone who had lived in darkness—and no satisfaction greater than the knowledge that one's gift would so immeasurably enrich the lives of others.

For its 20 years of leadership and outstanding humanitarian service, we join today in congratulating the Buffalo Eye Bank & Research Society and its legions of loyal supporters, especially the Lions Clubs of the Buffalo area. We are grateful for the eye bank's many contributions, and we wish it continued success in the years ahead.

We also want to express our personal good wishes to Mr. Rudolph Spitzer of Kenmore, N.Y., whose vision and drive have helped make the Buffalo Eye Bank & Research Society the great institution it is today.

Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of farmers and others in the field of conservation has meant a more beautiful as well as a more bountiful America. Conservation, together with other programs to provide increased parks and open space, promises to give us still greater beauty as we built upon past accomplishments in making wise the use of the land.

We have seen it everywhere in Nebraska—green grass to replace eroded gullies, well managed farm and ranch lands to replace water-scarred and wind-seared fields, conservation ponds and lakes for water management, water supply and recreation facilities on farms and in small watershed projects. All these things have meant a more beautiful Nebraska while saving the land from

mutilation and destruction and improving the rural economy.

A beautiful landscape has universal appeal and is becoming all too scare. The rural countryside beckons the tow-weary Americans seeking restful surroundings. What the countryside provides is the responsibility of all of the people. The ugly signs of rural poverty still are around us. Impoverished farm and ranch lands still deprive the Nation of a greater beauty and a greater prosperity which can be had.

Nebraskans, through their efforts to conserve and develop the soil and water resources of the State, have restored much natural beauty to the landscape and have assured the lasting beauty of many acres. But we must continue our efforts and make our State and Nation still more beautiful and more prosperous. And only the determination of the people can make it so.

United States Has No Easy Choice in Vietnam Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to President Johnson's critics the following editorial from the April 28, 1965, edition of the Sacramento, Calif., Bee which sets forth very clearly what the Johnson administration is attempting to accomplish in Vietnam. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial:

[From the Sacramento Bee, Apr. 28, 1965]

UNITED STATES HAS NO EASY CHOICE IN VIETNAM DILEMMA

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., historian and former Kennedy-Johnson presidential aid, made clear during a Sacramento talk that American policy in Vietnam must find a middle course between withdrawal from the area and escalation of the battle into a full-scale war.

Speaking before a community forum sponsored by the Bee, KFBK, and KOVR-TV, Schlesinger said President Lyndon B. Johnson is pursuing a middle course aimed at getting Hanoi to negotiate.

This is the only sensible goal. The dilemma arises not from arguments about the logic of the goal of eventual negotiation but rather from the frustrating fact there is no road to the accepted goal which seems to assure success.

Schlesinger stated Hanoi has made it plain that at this time there appears to be no chance it will accept Johnson's offer to negotiate because "they think they are going to win the war anyway." Therefore, Schlesinger said, we will have to convince them otherwise.

This is the heart of the problem. How do we convince them? Schlesinger questions the effectiveness of air power, contending World War II demonstrated the use of air power actually increases a people's will to resist. And aircraft have not proven particularly effective in guerrilla warfare.

Nevertheless Schlesinger said full commitment would be a mistake because it would require use of ground forces on a far larger scale than did Korea, in less favorable terrain and with more vulnerable supply lines.

The present bombings in the north are valid as a tactic only to the extent they lead to the goal of negotiations.

The problem in Vietnam has no easy answer. Withdrawal and abandonment of commitments are out of the question. It would be equally wrong in a moment of frustration to start bombing population centers in the north or to become committed to a land war in Asia.

The only hope is that America's restraint, combined with a demonstration that it will not withdraw under pressure, will induce the North Vietnamese to consider negotiations. All avenues should be used to make clear the desire to find a peaceful solution. The decision after that is up to Hanoi.

Some Civil Rights Leaders Not Interested in Helping Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it has been apparent for some months that many of the leaders of the so-called civil rights movement are more interested in controversy than in solution. There are those whose principal purpose seems to be in continued strife, in increasing tensions between the races, and in fostering hatred of the white man in the hearts of Negroes.

There is no secret that this has been the goal of the Communists from the inception of the Communist conspiracy to dominate the world and to destroy the United States. Every Communist blueprint has outlined a program for encouraging racial unrest in the United States with the rope that an eventual Negro revolution would cause the collapse of this country. There is no mystery, then, why so many of the leaders of the current demonstrations in the South, here in Washington and on many of our college campuses are known Communists or those who have a close affinity to Communist organizations.

The following column by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak which appeared in the Washington Post, clearly indicates how some of the leaders of the demonstrations encourage hate, violence, and lawlessness:

INSIDE REPORT: THE TWO FACES OF CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

DEMOPOLIS, ALA.—Although the newspaper headlines from here last week told of clashes between Negro demonstrators and tear-gas-tossing police, the more important struggle in Demopolis was waged between moderates and radicals inside the civil rights movement.

In this Black Belt city of 8,500 (where whites outnumber Negroes by less than 50 persons) the two faces of civil rights glare at each other with increasing hostility, as elsewhere in the Deep South.

One face in conciliatory, seeking to reach an accommodation with the white power structure. The other face is revolutionary, skeptical that "Mr. Charlie" (the white man) will concede anything.

This conflict has ironic overtones in Demopolis. Mayor Ed Bailey, a segregationist who realizes a new day has come to the South, has made more concessions than any other mayor in rural Alabama. Yet the civil rights radicals—not the moderates—control events here and have turned Demopolis into the South's current trouble spot.

Doubly ironic is the fact there is only one civil rights organization active here—the Reverend Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC). But the SCLC itself is split between radicals and moderates, its own fieldmen here traveling separate paths.

This was graphically illustrated at a civil rights mass meeting one recent Sunday in the Morning Star Baptist Church.

Directing the meeting was the Reverend Samuel Wells, of Albany, Ga., a stout, worried-looking SCLC organizer. Under his supervision, young middle-class Demopolis Negroes, dressed in their Sunday best, softly revealed results of negotiations they and Wells had conducted with Mayor Bailey.

The results were impressive, indeed. SCLC has won more in Demopolis during 6 days than in Selma (45 miles to the west) during 6 weeks. Bailey had agreed to multiple demands by the Demopolis Civil Club (an SLCL-sponsored group organized by Mr. Wells) aimed mainly at better jobs for Negroes.

But as the civil club officers recounted their negotiations, a dozen young men and women (both white and Negro) seated on the church altar seethed in anger.

Dressed in disheveled work and sport clothes, these were the fieldworkers of SCLC's militant youth branch. Supposedly, they got orders not from Mr. Wells in Demopolis, but from the Reverend James Bevel—most militant of Dr. King's lieutenants—by telephone from Slema.

Mr. Bevel's field commander in Demopolis, a northern Negro named Gerald Turley, moved to the pulpit. Dressed in sweaty T-shirt and blue jeans, Turley stirred the crowd for the first time with his gravel-voiced eloquence.

Though Mr. Wells and the Voters League wanted a halt to demonstrations, Turley shouted, "We're going to be on the streets. We're going to die in the street if need be."

Henry Wershaw, a young white SCLC worker from New York, was even more explosive. "If the white man won't let you have your freedom, you're going to have to take it," he yelled.

The upshot came the next morning. In negotiations at city hall, Bailey agreed to much more than Selma's officials have gotten—city government supervisory positions for Negroes and guaranteed sales jobs in Demopolis stores. Nevertheless, Turley sent Demopolis teenagers (kept out of school against the wishes of the Civil Club) marching through the streets.

Bailey would have issued a parade permit, but Turley refused to ask for it. To maintain the principle of law and order, Bailey told police to stop the marchers. The result: Tear gas and national publicity.

Indeed, national publicity—not jobs in Demopolis stores—was what Turley was seeking. Believing that the white man is unworthy of trust, the civil rights movement's revolutionary wing believes in agitation, agitation, and still more agitation to bring out the worst in the white man. Such is the rationale of the Gerald Turleys.

But Gerald Turley will leave Demopolis sometime soon. When he does, the Demopolis Negroes will be left to reach permanent understanding with the white establishment. That's why many of them feel today that Turley's radical tactics, coming after—not before—the whites had been forced to the bargaining table, have done more harm than good.

Anniversary of Adoption of Polish Constitution

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the great nation of Poland on the 174th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

This anniversary is particularly meaningful to me because my parents of blessed memory came to this country from Poland, my mother, in the year 1871 at the age of 2, and my father in the year 1883 at the age of 14.

The United States of America was indeed a land of opportunity and promise to my parents. They were married here on Thanksgiving Day 1890 and were blessed with seven children. They celebrated their 61st wedding anniversary in 1951 and when my father passed away in 1952 and my mother in 1953 they were survived by 7 children, all married, 15 grandchildren, and 26 great grandchildren. Their descendants have made and are making a contribution to our American way of life. They served in our Armed Forces. Each in his own way and each in his own community is active in business the professions and in community and philanthropic affairs. And now, Mr. Speaker, one of their sons is privileged to sit in this House, the most distiguished legislative body in the world. Such is the way of life in our Nation.

The Congress of the United States remembers Polish Constitution Day and salutes the many Americans who are proud of their Polish heritage and recalls the document outlining the principles of democracy which was adopted by a nation which in 1791 had experienced more than a century of cruelty and repression.

The courageous people of Poland are again experiencing a period of oppression and cruelty under a Communist government not of their own choosing. The people of Poland will continue their fight for freedom and liberty and one day, we pray that will be real soon, they will once again regain the precious rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—the rights they won in 1791, in a bloodless revolution.

A land which gave birth to such great artists as Chopin and Paderewski, who are speaking to peoples throughout the world in the international language of music, is a land which should be a free land, a land of liberty.

The Congress will this year consider an immigration bill of great importance to people in many lands throughout the world, who seek admission to this land of promise and opportunity. Let us also this year join with the people of Poland in their desire to find a new life within their own country by gaining freedom from the oppression of communism and once again make Poland a land of liberty.

Good News From Secretary of the Treasury Fowler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a statement at a meeting of the Cabinet last month, Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler cited improvement of the international monetary system as the major task for the Treasury and the financial authorities of the rest of the free world in the next few years.

Secretary Fowler's intention to give major emphasis to this effort is good news indeed because a sound international monetary system is indispensable to continued economic growth and prosperity throughout the free world.

Because of their importance, I include the full text of Secretary Fowler's remarks:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT A MEETING OF THE CABINET, THE WHITE HOUSE, APRIL 8, 1965

Day by day, it is becoming increasingly clear that our national security and our capacity for effective diplomatic action throughout the world are directly related to the strength of our currency. A strong currency is an essential underpinning for our worldwide responsibilities.

We are, therefore, determined to keep the dollar strong by balancing our international accounts. Our balance-of-payments program is proving very successful—and I am fully confident that the measures adopted will continue to do the job as long as we need them.

We have been gratified with the response of the American financial and business community, and we have achieved a favorable impression abroad. But we must remember that our position depends upon our ability to sell enough of our products in competitive world markets to cover both our imports an our other public and private outpayments. We must continue to screen carefully dollar expenditures abroad on government account. If we can attract foreign capital and foreign tourists, this will help. In addition, with our European friends, we will need to develop the lasting answers to the marked differences between our own large supplies of capital for investment and the deficiencies that appear in Europe and exert their attraction on American funds.

The success of our program, along with the promise of the improvement offered the British position by measures announced in the budget last Tuesday will, in growing degree, provide grounds for increasingly fruitful discussions of the international payments system.

Our determination to keep the dollar strong is an essential prerequisite to the successful negotiation of sound improvements in the international monetary system to adopt it to the changing requirements of an expanding free world economy. We have not been standing still amidst changing conditions. Discussions have been taking place among international experts seeking, for example, to evaluate various possibilities of supplementing the means of international payments when supplies of dollars abroad prove thin. And these studies are in any case an essential forerunner of any agreement on the path that ought to be taken.

Like Secretary Dillon before me, I think the greatest challenge in this area is to work out a steadily improving international monetary system, so as to facilitate a continuing expansion of trade and economic development in the free world. That, I believe, is the major task facing our Treasury and the financial authorities of the rest of the free world in the next few years. I approach this task with an open mind and a willingness to study all practical proposals.

Pie Dufour Cites Navy's Civil War Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Charles L. "Pie" Dufour of New Orleans is a Renaissance man of the fourth estate.

Pie's interests are catholic, and he reflects this fact in his column in the New Orleans States-Item and the Times-Picayune. The field of history, nevertheless, is probably Pie's favorite. And in this field, he is a figure of stature in his own right: author of several historical books, lecturer, educator, and past president of the Louisiana Historical Association.

In his column of April 4, Pie commented on the completion by the Navy Department of the five-part "Civil War Naval Chronology." Pie called the chronology "one of the notable permanent contributions to come out of the Civil War Centennial."

In view of this heady praise, I feel sure that my colleagues will be interested in this completed work by the Department of the Navy. It is therefore a pleasure to include Pie's column in the RECORD herewith:

[From the Times-Picayune, Apr. 4, 1965]

CIVIL WAR PROJECT COMPLETED BY NAVY

(by Pie Defour)

A couple of weeks ago, I told you about the launching of a monumental historical project by the Navy Department with the publication of the first of 15 projected volumes on the "Naval Documents of the American Revolution."

Today I want to tell you about the completion by the Navy Department of one of the most important contributions to the literature of the Civil War; namely the five-part "Civil War Naval Chronology."

The Naval History Division of the Navy Department undertook, as its participation in the observance of the Civil War Centennial, now drawing to a close, to publish each year a chronology on the Civil War at sea a century ago.

The project, started on a modest basis in 1961, immediately became a major one, and now, with the issuance of part V, covering naval events of 1865, the work is completed. It includes a total of 627 pages of text and pictures, with a day-by-day story of the naval events of 1861–65.

Invaluable as a reference work, delightful just to browse in, and full of fine pictures and reproductions of significant documents,

the "Civil War Naval Chronology" is certainly one of the notable permanent contributions to come out of the Civil War Centennial.

"One should not study the Civil War, or any war, from a single standpoint of land campaigns or sea operations," writes Adm. E. M. Eller, Director of Naval History, in a perceptive foreword to part V. "Together land and sea make up the combined military power of a nation. Either can be a great blessing by itself in this jungle world where ruthless men ever resort to brute power. Yet together in combined operations their strengths multiply rather than merely add. For example, while navies can achieve many successes by themselves, a mighty virtue indeed is the added capability warships give of concentrating a nation's total power at the point of decision.

"Further advantages exist in the inherent capabilities that exist afloat of mobility, flexibility, speed of concentration and attack.

"The influences of the sea pervaded the Civil War and inevitably shaped the outcome like a floodtide that reaches all shores. This was true dramatically in a few large battles, as in Farragut's decisive passage of the forts of the Mississippi that with the fall of New Orleans brought the certain defeat of the South. It was similarly true in hundreds of other events * * * Union strength afloat contributed in many ways to the North's victory and to disaster for the South."

The "Civil War Naval Chronology" will enable any student of the Civil War to follow stage by stage, month by month, year by year for the 4 years of bitter warfare, the naval operations of both the Union and Confederate Navies.

When the project of a Civil War naval chronology was first planned, a maximum of 250 pages—about 50 pages a year for 5 years—was envisaged. But, as will be seen by the following, the project quickly developed to almost three times the original projected length:

Part I, covering the naval events of 1861, was only 41 pages long, and cost only 25 cents at the Government Printing Office.

Part II, listing sea operations of 1862, had 117 pages and cost 60 cents.

Part III, the largest of all, required 169 pages to record the war on the water in 1863. This part of "Civil War Naval Chronology" cost $1.

Part IV, costing 75 cents, told the naval doings of 1864 in 151 pages.

Part V, just issued at 75 cents, has 149 pages to record the naval activities of 1865.

Individual copies, or the complete set of five parts, may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402. The cost for all five parts is $3.35. The complete work thus becomes one of the biggest bargains in Civil War literature. An index to the five-part chronology is scheduled to be published at a later date.

The chronology "team," under the direction of Admiral Eller, consisted of Dr. William J. Morgan, head of the research section, and Lt. Richard M. Basoco, USNR. They were assisted from time to time by others on temporary assignments when the workload became too heavy.

In the closing words to his prefatory comments to part V, Admiral Eller neatly sums up the outcome of the war and what might have happened:

"The North's superiority afloat indeed was so overwhelming and so well exploited that perhaps nothing the South could have done could have overcome it and prevented defeat.

"On the other hand, had the South foreseen the inevitable fatal results of the North's sea superiority and taken dynamic action at the outset * * * some of the early irreversible disasters like New Orleans might have been averted or long delayed. Consequently the war might have ended in a stalemate and a divided nation. That it did not seems surely an act of providence in the stirring history of the great American dream of liberty that today, reaching across all seas to all men by the power of ships, seems even more than ever "the last best hope of earth."

Two-Front War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President is receiving overwhelming support from the public for the strong position he has taken in Vietnam and now in the Dominican Republic.

Despite shrill outbursts from members of the President's party it is evident that there is great grassroot support for a firm foreign policy.

An editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times is typical of the kind of support the President is receiving:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, May 4, 1965]

TWO-FRONT WAR

The role of the United States in the Dominican crisis has expanded and changed in the past week. It began as protection for American citizens. It has changed to the more difficult task of halting a Communist attempt to take over the Government of the Dominican Republic.

The record of evacuations should put down the criticism voiced by some members of the Organization of American States. The United States has taken more than 3,000 persons of 30 nations out of the danger zone. More than 5,000, including 1,500 Americans, remain to be evacuated. President Johnson prevented, and is preventing, what might have been a massacre of innocent persons.

Some of the criticism of the U.S. action in moving a powerful military force into the Dominican Republic is founded, without doubt, in the old fears of imperialist American intervention in Latin American affairs.

Those fears belong to the past. They are not valid today. But still they remain. They should have been eased by President Johnson's speech on Sunday evening. Mr. Johnson pointed out that the leaders of the Dominican revolt had been displaced by Communists, many of them trained in Cuba. If those Latin American nations which criticize the United States for its attempt to contain Communist subversion in one of their sister nations have an alternative to such subversion they should speak up. Certainly Venezuela, which has suffered greatly at the hands of Cuban attempts at subversion, should not be critical. Venezuela should have been one of the first to defend the U.S. move to halt the Communists in the Dominican Republic.

President Johnson acted correctly in the newest crisis in the Caribbean. If the United States must fight the Communist attempts to overthrow the Government of South Vietnam it must fight the Communist attempt to take over the Government of the Dominican Republic. The Communist objective is the same in both areas.

The United States has asked that other Latin American nations make their armed forces available to keep the peace in the Dominican Republic. This is a flat counter to the charges of "aggression" made by the Communists. President Johnson has assured the OAS that the United States does not back any man or faction in the Dominican crisis and that the United States will act in conformity with OAS decisions.

The OAS should take advantage of the U.S. offer to be the OAS instrument in working for peace and the restoration of a stable non-Communist government in the Dominican Republic. By doing so the OAS would serve notice (as President Johnson has done) that Communist attempts to subvert governments in the Western Hemisphere will be met with instant and unified resistance.

Polish Constitution Day: A Tribute

SPEECH

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Today, Mr. Speaker, we are commemorating the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. This is a great day for the Polish people, and it is a day that they commemorate with a feeling of pride and a sense of honor. This feeling comes not from the fact that this Constitution had had any practical effect upon the political system of Poland, because the Russians had invaded Poland, crushed the Polish opposition, and destroyed the Constitution before it could really have become deeply engrained in the Polish system of government. Rather this feeling comes from the fact that this Constitution represents the totality of Polish aspirations for freedom and democracy. The Constitution was not long lasting. This is true. But what lived on in the Polish tradition were the ideals of this Constitution. And so even today this Constitution is a source of inspiration for all Poles.

To speak of the Polish historical experience is to speak of a series of great tragedies that have befallen this much-respected and much-honored people. At the beginning of World War II, Poland was invaded and partitioned by the Nazis and the Soviets. In the spring of 1940, the Soviets killed off the flower of Polish leadership when it murdered thousands of Poland's soldiers at Katyn. In the closing days of World War II, Poland found her territory occupied again by the hated Soviet Russians. And in those days the Russians destroyed what hopes of freedom were possible by grossly violating the Yalta agreement that had called for free and unfettered elections. In the process of imposing their tyrannical system, the Soviets also imprisoned the leaders of Poland's underground government.

We call to mind today these tragedies, Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the anniversary of the May 3 Constitution. To Poles everywhere and to the members of the Polish-American Congress, a body that has kept alive American concern for Poland, I extend my congratulations and join with all of my colleagues in this Chamber to salute Polish people everywhere in their continuing struggle to throw off the yoke of tyrrany.

Representative Race Urges Labor Support of President on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last weekend my distinguished colleague from the State of Wisconsin, the Honorable JOHN A. RACE, spoke to a convention of the Wisconsin State Council of Machinists at Port Washington, Wis.

In his remarks he urged strong support by the members of organized labor for the policies of the Johnson administration in Vietnam. He pointed out that labor's record of opposition to aggression and appeasement of aggressors is a long and honorable one.

Representative RACE made an eloquent and moving plea to his audience to recognize the Communist aggression in Vietnam as a calculated threat to their personal freedoms and the liberties of their children.

Because of the pertinency of this address to the events of the recent days, I am pleased to insert it into the RECORD at this point and urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

AN ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN A. RACE, TO THE WISCONSIN STATE COUNCIL OF MACHINISTS, PORT WASHINGTON, WIS., APRIL 30, 1965

I have been a delegate to these State council sessions for many years as a representative of my home lodge 1402 of Fond du Lac. Participation in these conferences, I am sure, sharpened my interest and broadened my horizons in the human affairs of my brothers—not only members of this great machinists union—but my countrymen, and brothers of the world.

I urge you to take advantage of these conferences. Learn from the experts here all you can about our union, the labor movement, and the best methods of achieving our goals.

Most of your work at this conference will be related to collective bargaining—your lodge's relationship to management—and legislation at the State and national levels that support our position.

I think I know what you expect me to talk about tonight. I think you anticipate, and you have every right to anticipate, that I will talk to you about labor legislation and the condition of the American working man.

Legislation like repeal of 14–B of the Taft-Hartley Act, revisions in unemployment compensation, increase and extension of the minimum wage law.

These issues are vital to you—and rightly so.

Other legislation even more important to you is the aid-to-education bill and the social security amendments contained in the so-called medicare bill.

I am sure I surprise none of you when I report that I voted in favor of the education bill which the President signed into law April 11. I also voted in favor of the social security, or medicare bill, which passed the House 313 to 115.

But I want to talk to you tonight about something even more important than labor legislation, than the education bill, than the social security amendments. You know where I stand on these issues anyway.

I am going to talk about the policies of this Government in the most serious crisis before the world today. This is more important to labor than labor law, because the working man, like the farmer, or the banker, or the bureaucrat, or the used car salesman is first an American. And the immediate interests of his country, and the cause for which it stands, come foremost in his mind and his heart.

I plan to talk to you tonight about the overriding issue of our time—and that is, which concept is going to prevail for our children and our grandchildren and future generations?

Revolutionary communism which denies the freedom of the individual?

Or our own free democratic society where the individual—and yes, the majority of individuals—is going to be master of his own destiny?

We, as members of the International Association of Machinists, have a proud history of being in the forefront battlelines opposed to communism.

We do not have to take a backseat to the Johnny-Come-Lately-Birchers—the Minutemen—or anyone else in love and loyalty to our country.

As pointed out in the recent editorial of our newspaper, the Machinist, * * * "Labor's record of opposition to appeasement of aggressors is long and honorable. Organized labor fought Mussolini, Hitler, Stalin, Mao Tse-tung, and Khrushchev. We now oppose Communist aggression against South Vietnam."

As a member of organized labor, as a Member of Congress, as an American, I support the policies of President Johnson on Vietnam.

I don't support them merely because he is President and I am a Democratic Member of Congress, though I think there is much to be said for the principle that all Americans ought to support the President in foreign policy matters unless he is clearly wrong.

I do not support him on the grounds that we don't know enough to have an opinion on the subject, because I feel the essential facts are available to the American people.

Moreover, I do not support the President because I feel superior to those who oppose him.

We in organized labor agree with President Johnson that the central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied.

"We fight," as the President said, "because we must fight if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure."

I have been studying our position and policy in Vietnam.

And I have been thinking about it—as, I am sure, you have.

Maybe some of you are confused over the rightness or wrongness of our actions in Vietnam. Maybe some of you—God forbid—are indifferent. Maybe some of you don't think we should be there. Maybe some of you have not thought about Vietnam in terms of a threat to your own peace and freedom in this country.

To you I address my remarks tonight. And I do so with the greatest sense of urgency.

A review of our newspapers reveals a deep division among our editorial writers and columnists. Some say we should not even be in Vietnam, while others urge an escalation of the war there.

A deep division of opinion also can be noted among our educators, religious leaders, and yes, even among Members of Congress.

And over Holy Week and Easter, thousands and thousands of young people from all over this country congregated in Washington to demonstrate against our Vietnam policy.

Let me try to put Vietnam in clearer perspective.

Let me try to help you understand a little more clearly that Vietnam is important to you—and why.

First of all, let me try to bring Vietnam a little closer to home.

I wonder how many of you could tell me the approximate population of Vietnam. You have been reading about Vietnam in your newspapers for years.

Why don't all of you, right now, make a mental guess of Vietnam's population.

Latest, reliable census figures for Vietnam place the population at 31,517,000 persons.

Roughly, that is the combined population of Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana.

The Vietnamese population is divided with about 16 million persons in North Vietnam, and 15 million in South Vietnam.

These 31 million persons live in a country, smaller in size than the combined land area of Wisconsin and Minnesota.

I mention these facts only to dispel a common belief that Vietnam is some little spot of jungle in southeast Asia, populated by a few thousand—or even a couple million—people living in huts.

North Vietnam shares its border with Communist China.

South Vietnam is like a finger stretching into the great, free area of southeast Asia with some 200 million persons not under Communist domination.

Communist success in South Vietnam would gravely threaten the freedom and independence of the rest of southeast Asia—including Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Burma, Malaysia, Indonesia, India, and the Philippines.

There are more people living in those independent nations than in the entire United States.

We are in Vietnam for a very simple reason.

In 1954 and in 1962 the countries involved sought to negotiate the problems of that harassed and unhappy part of the globe. Negotiations were held and solemn agreements were entered into. Those agreements have been systematically and continually violated by the Communist regime in North Vietnam virtually since the day they were signed.

The North Vietnamese have been engaged in aggression against the territory and people of South Vietnam for several years. The evidence of this is overwhelming, and it has been made available for the American people to judge.

The heart of the problem in Vietnam is the infiltration of trained military personnel and war material from North Vietnam into South Vietnam.

The infiltration over the years has added tens of thousands of trained troops and saboteurs which are the hard core of the so-called Vietcong.

It is true that many people in South Vietnam are terrorized into cooperation, or at least passiveness. But there is no case at all to back up the assertion that this is essentially a civil war, or that there is mass support for the Vietcong in South Vietnam except where and when the Vietcong terror activities force the local people to cooperate.

In this connection, it is significant that the major type of Vietcong activity has been—not armed attacks against the troops of the South Vietnamese Government—but terror attacks against South Vietnamese civilians.

In December, 1964, for example, there were 96 Vietcong armed attacks as compared to 1,719 acts of terrorism and 318 acts of sabotage.

If the Vietcong effort is, as they claim it is—"a Vietnamese people's struggle against imperialism"—murders and kidnapings of

civilian men, women and children is a hell of a way to carry it out.

With friends like the Vietcong, the Vietnamese people hardly need enemies.

We are told that this is a civil war—that infiltration is not aggression—that this is a situation of Vietnamese fighting Vietnamese, or at least Asians fighting Asians, and we should not get involved.

Is infiltration aggression?

In June 1950, thousands of North Koreans marched together over the border into South Korea. The world knew this was an invasion, and the free world, acting through the United Nations, reacted against it.

The only difference in Vietnam is that instead of thousands of northerners marching south all at once, they have come in smaller groups over a longer period of time.

Korea proved that Communist aggression cannot succeed by blatant, large-scale military action. Profiting from that mistake, they now seek to make aggression succeed in the form of covert infiltration.

But aggression remains aggression, and our own self-interest as well as our obligation to the people of South Vietnam demand that we aid those who are defending themselves and who have asked for our assistance.

Let's examine some of these other arguments I mentioned.

This is a civil war, we are told, because Vietnamese are fighting Vietnamese. Yes, and Koreans were fighting Koreans in 1950, and there are, here and there on the globe, other countries split into Communist and non-Communist halves.

In 1776 our forefathers, who were British subjects, were fighting British subjects in the cause of liberty. And our ancestors welcomed foreign intervention to preserve our freedom against assaults on it by people who spoke our language and shared our heritage.

But, we are told, here we have Asians fighting Asians and white men shouldn't get involved.

If there is one principle for which the labor movement has stood in this country and around the world it is that human freedom is no less important to one group of men than to another because of color.

Are we really to believe that it is the authentic voice of progressive, liberal America that tells us that an Asian's independence and freedom and well-being are not worth a white's man's time to defend? I can't believe that.

The events within this country in the past few years and especially the past few months have reawakened in most American hearts a deep awareness that skin color doesn't establish the value of a man's liberty, and that any man's enslavement chains us all.

I cannot believe these things and then come to the conclusion that the Asian's right to be left alone is totally unrelated to the American's right to be left alone. Of all arguments I have heard against our policies in Vietnam, I find this disguished racism the most obnoxious.

But it is so far away, we are told. Why bother?

Secretary of State Dean Rusk replied to this argument the other night in Washington and I want to quote him:

"Once again we hear expressed the views which cost the men of my generation a terrible price in World War II. We are told that southeast Asia is far away—but so were Manchuria and Ethiopia."

These, of course, were the far-away starting points of aggression which led this country into the Second World War.

Some of you here tonight may know the jungles of the Philippines, Burma, Okinawa, Iwo Jima, and Saipan from your own experiences during World War II. Some of you may have left buddies buried there.

History indicates that if initial aggression had been met firmly at Ethiopia and Manchuria, World War II never would have occurred.

From those failures and from history we have learned a lesson that we can now ignore only at our peril, only at the price of our own destruction.

Remember what President Johnson said in his address to the Nation from Johns Hopkins University?

"The central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied. To withdraw from one battlefield means only to prepare for the next."

I am not trying to scare you.

I am not here tonight as a prophet of doom and gloom.

I am taking this opportunity you gave me tonight to try to aid in the understanding of why I do—and why you should—support President Johnson in his firm, brave stand in South Vietnam.

My Brother Machinists, I have been one of you for more than 20 years.

I love my State of Wisconsin, as you do.

I love my country, as you do.

I love my freedom, as you do.

I want peace, and hate war, as you do.

The people of the Sixth District of Wisconsin have elected me to the highest council of our country. With this trust must go the responsibility of doing my very best to promote, protect, and preserve their interests—which are your interests.

All the legislation accomplishments in the field of labor, social welfare, and human values, are not going to be worth the paper they are written on, if we do not preserve our fundamental rights of freedom and liberty.

We are in Vietnam, then, because aggression is taking place. It is part of a perfectly conscious, perfectly open test by Hanoi and Peiping of America's will to resist this kind of aggression.

In a recent statement, a North Vietnamese Communist army general said, "South Vietnam is the model of the national liberation movement of our time * * *. If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated everywhere in the world."

I repeat the phrase—"Everywhere in the world."

Not just Vietnam, not just southeast Asia, not just Asia. But the world.

The last time dedicated young men sang about today owning their homeland, tomorrow the entire world, they wore swastikas and followed an insane housepainter perilously close to world domination.

It took history's most brutal war to stop them.

The harsh reality of Vietnam is that our own country's security is threatened by those who have embarked upon a course of aggression whose announced purpose is our own destruction.

And yet, we hear some Senators and Congressmen calling for what amounts to our surrender to aggression in southeast Asia. Similar calls for cease-fire have been heard from editorial writers, educational and religious leaders—and thousands of young people picketing in front of the White House.

There surely is room for differences of opinion in this country.

I respect the rights of all those persons to disagree and to disagree loudly with President Johnson's firm stand in Vietnam.

But I think they are wrong. And I hope you do, too.

In the face of history and logic, President Johnson could do no less than to make the price of aggression as painful and costly as possible.

And that is the most vital and first reality of Vietnam—that North Vietnam has attacked the independent nation of South Vietnam, with total conquest its objective.

Whether we like it or not, history has led this great Nation of ours, at this time, to a point of unchallenged leadership among the free peoples of the world.

It was not always so.

But we as a nation, and as alert freedom loving machinists and Americans, must accept that role of leadership.

And what does that role mean for us?

In my judgment, it means standing up to be counted—in whatever form it may take in your home lodge, your shop, and your community—not only to support, but to promote the firmest, strongest check to aggression.

As a matter of enlightened reality, we should demand it.

If Vietnam is allowed to fall to aggression by inches, Laos will not be far behind. And then Cambodia, Thailand, Burma, Malaysia, India, and the Philippines. Two hundred million people.

This is the price—if we fail in South Vietnam.

And this is especially so, if it is our nerve that fails. A purely military defeat would be a bad thing. It would encourage our enemies and discourage others.

Its bad effects would reverberate among the nations and echo off the continents. Such a failure would be disastrous.

But, in my judgment, a failure of nerve, a loss of will to make the fight, would be even more disastrous.

If we try and fail in Vietnam, we will know that we have not yet developed the capability to resist this kind of aggression. And develop this capability we can and must do, given the time—which we may not be given.

But if we lose the will to resist, we can never again ask anyone, anywhere, to depend on our word.

Organized labor, and especially the members of the Machinists Union, have never been wilting violets when it comes to meeting threats to our most precious rights to freedom and liberty.

I appeal to you tonight to recognize the Communist aggression in Vietnam as a calculated threat to your own personal freedom, and the freedom of your children and grandchildren.

Failure to achieve this recognition by the citizens of this Nation encourages the Communist aggressors in Vietnam and on other freedom fronts of the world.

Success in achieving this recognition, as the necessary basis for determined efforts in repelling aggression, can and will halt aggression. At least here and now on the test chosen by the Communists in Vietnam.

An end to the fighting, of course, is our immediate goal. The President of the United States has made an offer of unconditional discussions.

In his words:

"There may be many ways to this kind of peace—in discussion or negotiation with the governments concerned—in large groups or in small ones—in the reaffirmation of old agreements or their strengthening with new ones."

There are no strings attached to this offer. I fail to see why the opponents of the President's policies must continue to demand that we continue to retreat from the position embodied in that eminently reasonable offer.

These opponents of what we are trying to do in that part of the world demand negotiations. We have tried negotiations twice before, and we are willing to try them again.

Now they demand that we withdraw, that we stop our military actions, that we disinvolve ourselves, and at the same time that we exercise rigid control over the way in which the South Vietnamese Army conducts itself.

American labor, I am proud to say, has supported the President's hand in this crucial struggle. Just 2 months ago, the executive council of the AFL-CIO adopted

a firm resolution pledging our full support to the President, and calling upon organized labor everywhere to show understanding and support of that policy.

We must understand—and never fortget—that the greatest prize and greatest goal of the Communists, is conquest of the United States of America.

Whether it be Vietnam, Berlin, Korea, or Cuba—they are just the first step toward the Capitol of the United States. At the moment, it is Vietnam.

The sooner and clearer this is understood by the people of this blessed land, the less chance communism will have of ever taking the second step.

A-Frames From Shimbeks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the great services which the youth of this country is contributing to the world is the lending of their minds and efforts to the Peace Corps. The group's magazine, Volunteer, recently included an article, entitled "A-Frames From Shimbeks," about volunteer work in Sierra Leone. One of the volunteers there is Mike Bradbury of New Milford, Conn.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the RECORD at this point:

A-FRAMES FROM SHIMBEKS

When group V volunteers (generalists in construction) arrived in Sierra Leone in May 1964, several of us became involved in trying to help solve a pressing problem; shortage of primary schools.

The need was to build schools, build them quickly, and at a low cost.

What was required was a schoolbuilding design that could be reproduced throughout Sierra Leone. After traveling over the country and studying the local buildings we struck on an idea based on the farmer's shimbek.

The shimbek is a temporary structure that is placed in the fields for the farmer and his family to live in while farming that plot of land. It is made of bush poles lashed together and erected in the shape of a pup tent, then covered with palm leaves to keep out the rain. With this as a start we designed an A-frame building (after a design often used in U.S. churches and vacation homes), confident that the design would not be a radical departure from what was already a common structure here. The model was 32 feet wide at the base by 40 feet long, with the apex about 25 feet above the ground. The sides, at a 60° angle, were covered with corrugated metal on 2-by-12 timber frames 8 feet on center and purlins (horizontal roof beams) at 4 feet on center.

Every 8 feet along the sides was designed an opening of 4 by 6 feet to provide ventilation and light. Above each opening was a sheet of 2- by 6-foot corrugated Fiberglas to give additional light. Ventilation was increased by a raised section of metal at the apex. We had two basic concerns about the design of the structure—both had to do with the large amount of metal that would be needed. First, would the large area of metal cause overheating inside the building? Secondly, would the metal amplify noise caused by the torrential rains of Sierra Leone? Both worries proved unwarranted, as we had designed these problems out of the building. The extralarge openings on the sides for ventilation solved our heat problem, and the steep slope of the metal allowed the rains to hit at such an angle as to make the noise minimal.

GREAT FUTURE WAS PREDICTED

To finish the building we would place local stone on the end walls up to a height of 10 feet; above the stone bush-boards (rough-sawn wood) would be placed on a board-and-batten fashion. The side openings were also to be given shutters made of the local bush-boards. These final touches would give a textural and color relief to the stiff and somewhat monotonous metal.

When the design was completed, it was shown to all the local men of note, from area-government officials to the paramount chief of the chiefdom in which the building would be constructed. All of these men showed great enthusiasm for the first A-frame in Sierra Leone. A great future was predicted for the building. Other structures were envisioned using this same design—schools, hospitals, dispensaries, and warehouses. An immediate start on construction was urged. The town of Naima, in the Eastern Province, was selected for the first building.

Two volunteers, Mike Bradbury (New Milford, Conn.) and Norman Tyler (Benton Harbor, Mich.), were given the job of supervising construction which began early in June 1964. The voluntary labor force was large: about 200 people came to the site daily from the surrounding villages to help with the school. Within 2 weeks the people had put in the foundations and the footings for the entire building.

A shortage of materials delayed work periodically, and we failed to meet the self-imposed 2-month deadline. Still, within 10 weeks the main structure was completed and stones were gathered for the walls at the ends of the building. Bill Atkins (Rockland, Mass.), a volunteer bricklayer, moved in to give our helpers a few lessons in stone masonry. In 2 days he helped put up a good portion of one wall and then returned to his own project. Suddenly we noticed the labor force was getting smaller and smaller. It was necessary to have the chief remind the people that more workers were needed. Finally, after 3 months under construction, the stone walls were completed and the board-and-batten started above the stone. Without notice, one day we were without workers. Even the prodding of the chief became ineffective. All of us, including the chief and other local authorities, were completely baffled. A week passed, then another. Still no workers.

Finally, the chief called for Mike, Norm, and me and explained the difficulty. To the people, the end walls of stone and wood were distasteful. Their complaint was that the walls were too rough, quite unlike the smooth surfaces of the mud on their homes. The board-and-batten also met a similar fate. The appearance to the people, instead of being a textural and color contrast, was one of untidiness. Though we talked and talked and proved and reproved the structural soundness and economic advantages of using these local materials, as well as explaining our aesthetic reasoning behind using the stone and wood, we could not change their ideas. Objections had not come from the "big men" of the area, but rather from the workers on the project. We were surprised and deflated.

The board-and-batten was removed to be replaced by metal and the stone walls were covered both inside and outside with cement, making a smooth wall. The building is now completed at a cost of about $1,100 ($300 over the projected cost) and ready for occupancy.

In retrospect we find that we have learned a great deal both from a construction-technique standpoint and from dealing with different aesthetic values. Specifically, we have found that it is imperative in a project such as a school to get the construction done rapidly so that interest can be maintained, to have materials on the site to make this goal possible, and to make sure that materials and the design of the building are suitable to the people involved.

American Legion Group Commends Members of Congress Supporting House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion association of the Detroit, Mich., area has just submitted a resolution adopted by its un-American activities committee commending the 359 Members of the House who supported House Resolution 188 authorizing the continuation of the efforts of the House Un-American Activities Committee in combating communism. This commendation includes all of the Representatives in Congress from Michigan on the Republican side of the aisle.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Whereas the Communist movement in America is a continuing threat to our great country and the many freedoms that are an integral part of our way of life; and

Whereas Communists use any form of aggression, warfare, subversion, or political infiltration to embarrass, harass, and to destroy America and the things she stands for; and

Whereas the December 1964 issue of "Political Affairs," a monthly directive organ of the Communist Party, published a draft resolution which, it says "expressed the viewpoint of the leadership of the Communist Party" on vital national issues. Included in this draft resolution as a key struggle, is that now familiar Communist theme, "the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee"; and

Whereas the House Un-American Activities Committee has for years been a faithful watchdog committee to preserve and protect our America through highly specialized research; loyal, determined investigation, often in the face of personal abuse; and through recommendations for action through executive or legislative means, often serving the legislative needs of committees other than itself; and

Whereas on February 25, 1965, the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States did pass House Resolution 188 with 359 affirmative votes to appropriate funds for the continued activity of the House Un-American Activities Committee: Now be it

Resolved, That the 359 Representatives supporting House Resolution 188 be commended for their action to continue the ceaseless fight against Communist subversion or subversion by any other group or groups advocating the destruction of America and her freedoms; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Members of Congress and to appropriate news media.

Adopted unanimously by the Un-American Activities Committee, the Detroit Districts Association, the American Legion of Michigan.

JOSEPH JONES,
Chairman.

Intervening for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the brickbats being thrown at the administration as a result of our landing troops in the Dominican Republic, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the May 2, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

INTERVENING FOR FREEDOM

In announcing the Soviet call for a Security Council meeting on the United States Dominican intervention, Tass yesterday echoed the cries of the anti-Yanqui, of the automatic anti-interventionist, of Castro and his acolytes—and also of many an American who, nose buried in the history of an earlier era, was quick last week to shout "gunboat diplomacy."

According to Tass, the Marine landing was "yet another attempt to keep in power a reactionary, an antipopular dictatorship regime, which suits the United States, and to suppress the strivings of the people for freedom and independence * * *. There can be no justification for the invasion of the territory of a sovereign state by the American Armed Forces."

The charge of "gunboat diplomacy" is, in the common pejorative sense of the phrase, as unjustified in this instance as the gunboats of old are obsolete and as the Tass charge is false. True, American Armed Forces landed on a neighbor nation's shores. True, the protection of U.S. and other foreign lives seems to have been more an excuse than a reason—a device designed to give juridical legitimacy to a move made for reasons of high policy. But what matters most in this case is the purpose, and the context.

The purpose was not to grab territory, to extend U.S. influence, or to install a Latin American dictator of our choosing. We have no right and no reason to intervene or to take sides in a clash between those who favor the restoration of President Bosch and those, headed by Gen. Wessin y Wessin, who oppose it. The record proves that we supported Dr. Bosch during the time he was in office and that we demonstrated our strong disapproval of those, including Gen. Wessin y Wessin, who overthrew him.

We do, however, have a duty to ourselves, to other American republics and even to the Dominican people to take precautionary measures which might prevent a group of Communists from exploiting chaos to repeat what happened in Cuba. If that was undertaken unilaterally by the United States, it was not by choice but by necessity. It was due to the failure of the Organization of American States, following the Castro betrayal, to create an inter-American force which might act swiftly to deal with such an emergency as arose in the Dominican Republic.

Latin-American governments instinctively rush to the nonintervention article 17 of the OAS Charter whenever they fear the "colossus of the North" is overstepping itself in hemisphere affairs. But this time, while citing the article, they have been strikingly moderate and reserved in their reaction.

The reason must be that many, at least, understand and sympathize with the purpose of President Johnson's action, and recognize that Castro has introduced a new element that requires new responses. Through his betrayal of his own revolution, followed by his persistent campaign to organize—and subvert—revolutions in other countries, Castro has made revolution in Latin America an international exercise. Whatever its trappings, a Castro-inspired revolt is not a domestic product. To be effective as an organization for the common defense, the OAS has to devise means to prevent the new-style Havana-directed burrowing under national boundaries, as well as the old-style crossing over them.

President Johnson has sought diligently to prod the OAS into converting the unilateral American intervention into a multilateral OAS intervention. This, if successful, could be the first step toward creation of a permanent force that would make future unilateral action unnecessary. It should be.

Meanwhile, conditions have to be established in the Dominican Republic which will enable its sorely tried people to walk the streets in safety, and to choose their own government—without fear that they are being delivered into the hands of a secretly plotted tyranny, a tyranny which the Soviets, who so piously protested to the U.N., would dearly like to see imposed.

Gen. Milan Stefanik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

GEN. MILAN STEFANIK, 1880–1919

On May 4, 1919, the newly created Czechoslovak Republic suffered the loss of its Minister of National Defense in the person of the youthful but extremely able, energetic and gifted Gen. Milan Stefanik. This gallant soldier was the third member of the famous triumvirate that had given final shape to the new state (the other two being Thomas Masaryk and Eduard Benes). General Stefanik's intimate association with these two outstanding Czechoslovak leaders, and his inestimable services, were duly appreciated, and his role in reconciling his Slovak kinsmen to the idea of the Czechoslovak state was never forgotten by either Masaryk or Benes.

General Stefanik was the son of a Protestant clergyman, and his first interest was in scientific studies. In his student days he showed remarkable aptitude and much liking for astronomy, and long before the war he was associated with the Astronomical Observatory in Paris. There he had befriended many influential Frenchmen, especially prominent politicians, whose services he enlisted for the Czechoslovak cause during the war. As a matter of fact, his first and most signal service to the Czechoslovak people was to act as a successful intermediary between Masaryk and Benes, on the one hand, and many French statesmen, on the other. Thus as a military leader and as a statesman, his tragic death in an airplane crash was a double blow to the Czechoslovak Republic 46 years ago.

Congressional Reform: Agenda and Prospects—An Address by Dr. George B. Galloway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a most informative and comprehensive review of the field of congressional reorganization by the Nation's leading expert in the field, Dr. George B. Galloway, of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

As we all know, Dr. Galloway was the staff director of the LaFollette-Monroney committee in 1945, the pioneer effort that produced the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. He is the author of many books and articles on Congress and also the author of the official "History of the United States House of Representatives," published several years ago as a House document.

Dr. Galloway's recent address, "Congressional Reform: Agenda and Prospects," was delivered at the 10th Southern Assembly, which met in Biloxi, Miss., in January. The meeting was sponsored by Tulane University in cooperation with the American Assembly, Columbia University.

The American Assembly is currently sponsoring such 3-day regional meetings throughout the country to bring together leading Americans from all walks of life and political viewpoints to discuss the subject "The Congress and America's Future." The 26th American Assembly, held at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y., last October, produced a broad series of recommendations for streamlining the work of Congress and has since published a series of working papers in this field, edited by Prof. David B. Truman, of Columbia University.

As the recently established Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization begins its important work, it is encouraging to know that the complex questions involving the operation of Congress are also being discussed by interested citizens who likewise have a stake in the outcome of the joint committee's deliberations. The reports and recommendations of these American Assembly conferences will, I hope, have the serious attention of the members and staff of the joint committee.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the work of the American Assembly and as an indication of the high caliber of participants in their sessions, I insert at this point the text of Dr. Galloway's excellent address:

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: AGENDA AND PROSPECTS

(Address by George B. Galloway before the 10th Southern Assembly)

INTRODUCTION

We meet here today at a time when representative government is on the defensive all over the world, and when it has been eclipsed by dictatorships in many countries.

Looked at from a worldwide view, the "parliamentary crisis" of the 20th century has been developing and deepening for many years. Speakers at meetings of the Interparliamentary Union allege that we are living in an age of legislative decline. They refer to the great fragility of representative institutions, to the fact that several parliaments have been dissolved, and that, in certain countries, the prerogatives of parliaments have been greatly restricted. Many national parliaments in the present age are nothing but rubberstamps, representing only one party, and therefore only the opinion of the government in power.

In his famous Romanes lecture in June 1930, Winston Churchill remarked that it has been generally accepted until recent times that the best way of governing states was by talking. In England the parliamentary conception was still dominant and representative institutions still held the field. But in many states "Government of the people, by the people, for the people" had proved to be an illusion. "Democracy seems ready," he said, "to yield up the tangible rights hard won in rugged centuries to party organizations, to leagues and societies, to military chiefs, or to dictatorships." Nevertheless, said Churchill in 1930, "representative institutions still command a consensus of world opinion * * *. It should be the duty of faithful subjects to preserve these institutions in their healthy vigor, to guard them against the encroachment of external forces, and to revivify them from one generation to another from the springs of national talent, interest, and esteem."

What has happened to representative government since Sir Winston uttered these prophetic words? With the advance of science and technology, the growth of the welfare state, and the multiplication of public problems, there has been a tremendous increase in the workload on Congress and in the duties of Members. Meanwhile, these same forces—plus the need of secrecy and speed in decisionmaking—have led to a loss of legislative initiative to the Cabinet and have upset the equilibrium between parliament and the executive. With the development of means of mass communication, the President has entered into direct contact with the people over the heads of legislators. And in many countries representative government has been replaced by dictatorships, or has yielded its traditional leadership to powerful personalities and pressure groups.

If the influence of Parliament on public affairs appears to be on the decline, what is the explanation? Speaking at the 53d Interparliamentary Conference at Copenhagen last August, Mr. Emile Blamont, Secretary General of the French National Assembly, suggested some reasons for this situation. In a world dedicated to efficiency and realism, he said, "parliamentary debates give the impression of being governed by obsolete rules. The public feel that these debates are obscure and needlessly long, that decisions by assemblies are made too late and that parliamentary proceedings have a disorderly and slightly empty character." Furthermore, he said, "the information available to members of Parliament is no longer adequate to enable them to confront the very complex subjects which are submitted to them, nor the problems which they have no longer to decide, but of which they do have to approve the solution."

Concern about the performance of our own Congress derives both from these circumstances and from some distinctive features of the American system: the constitutional separation of President and Congress, the decentralizing effects of federalism, and the structure and procedural practices of the House and Senate—including such matters as the dispersion of power in Congress, the powers of the House Committee on Rules, "extended debate" in the Senate, and the seniority rule.

We hear much talk about strengthening the effectiveness of Congress. How can its "effectiveness" be defined and measured? In terms of its enactment of progressive legislation? Or in terms of how well it blocks the passage of progressive legislation? The answer depends on your political philosophy, on what you want Congress to do.

Some criteria for evaluating the performance of Congress may be suggested. (1) How well does it perform its basic modern functions: the legislative function, the oversight function, and the representative function? (2) How about the character of congressional leadership: is it centralized or dispersed? Is the leadership in a position to control the legislative process? (3) How about the character of congressional procedures: do they facilitate majority or minority rule? (4) How about the urgent legislative proposals of the President: does Congress act upon them with reasonable dispatch or only after protracted delays?

CRITICISMS OF CONGRESS

The congressional reformers of 1965 remind us that 19 years have passed since the La Follette-Monroney committee investigated Congress and filed its famous report. Despite the improvements that were made by the Legislative Reorganigation Act of 1946, they feel that the job was not finished then and that it is time for a second look. The terms of reference of the joint committee were limited and the reform program it produced in 1946 was pruned in the House of Representatives. Meanwhile, the 1946 act has revealed defects in operation and new conditions have developed that call for correction. Since 1946 two States have been added to the Union, there are 50 million more Americans, the space age has dawned, and the daily work load of the average Congressman has doubled.

While Congress is still operating under time-worn procedures—Senate rules have not been revised since 1884—the Presidency has been modernized and equipped with a Council of Economic Advisers, a National Security Council, a Central Intelligency Agency, a National Aeronautics and Space Council, an Office of Emergency Planning, an Office of Science and Technology, and a Cabinet Secretariat. By contrast, power in Congress is widely dispersed among the titular leaders and three hundred committee chieftains.

What criticisms of Congress are being made by Members and commentators? Although the Reform Act of 1946 streamlined the congressional committee structure, an amazing proliferation of subcommittees has since taken place, leading to multiple committee assignments and scattered work load. Although the 1946 act authorized expansion of staff aids, there have been complaints from minority party members that the professional staffs of the committees are not fairly distributed. Although the act sought to strengthen the power of the purse in several ways, some Members assert that Congress has lost control of the pursestrings. Quarrels between the chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees over the meeting place of conference committees and over the power to initiate appropriation bills have led to protracted delays in the passage of the regular annual supply bills.

Critics allege that power on Capitol Hill is so scattered and dispersed among the chairmen of three hundred autonomous committees that the leadership cannot control the legislative process. They say that legislative sessions start off slowly and end in a jam. They blame this condition on filibustering in the Senate, the dilatory tactics of committee chairmen, and the failure of the leaders to schedule the business ahead on a sessional basis.

Other critics claim that the investigative function of Congress has been abused by some investigating committees and that legislative surveillance of the conduct of the administration needs to be strengthened in various ways. They also complain that the seniority system of selecting the chairman of congressional committees makes party government in Congress virtually impossible and renders the President powerless to fulfill the pledges of the party platform. For the chairmen of the great legislative committees cannot be controlled by the majority party since it does not control their selection.

Several Members of Congress, in both Houses and both political parties, believe that the time has come for a fresh look at its internal machinery and methods. They have proposed that Congress set up a joint committee of its own Members to study how our National Legislature can be made a more effective third branch of government.

Senator CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey, a leading reformer of our own day, in reply to a questionnaire, received 200 letters from political scientists around the country commenting on his proposal for congressional reorganization. Virtually all the replies to Senator CASE's inquiry applauded his idea for a broad study of proposed reforms. These themes kept recurring in this correspondence: The decline of Congress in relation to the executive branch will continue to be the object of public criticism until it undertakes essential reforms in its machinery and methods; immediate action in such areas as conflicts of interest and budgetary reform is desirable; the alleged lack of a sense of personal and party responsibility in Congress is a basic defect, as well as its alleged subordination to local and sectional interests; reduction of the powers of committee chairmen, adoption of modern rules of committee and floor procedure, and elimination of the Senate filibuster are urgently needed. How to obtain majority rule is regarded as a central problem of Congress today, while stronger national political parties is considered by many as the key to reform.

The Case bill identifies 12 problem areas on which his study would concentrate. These problem areas cover such matters as the scheduling of congressional business; the structure, staffing, and operation of congressional committees; the workload of Congress and its committees; rules and floor procedures; conflicts of interest; the term of office of Representatives; legislative oversight of the administration of the laws; strengthening of the congressional power of the purse; and the operation of the lobby law.

THE 1964 PLATFORM PLANKS

In 1964 the platforms of both of the major political parties dealt with the subject of congressional reform. The Democrats declared:

"The Congress of the United States should revise its rules and procedures to assure majority rule after reasonable debate and to guarantee that major legislative proposals of the President can be brought to a vote after reasonable consideration in committee."

The Republican plaform pledged their party to—

"Effective budgetary reform, improved congressional appropriation procedures, and full implementation of the antideficiency statute;

"A wide-ranging reform of other congressional procedures, including the provision of adequate professional staff assistance for the minority membership on congressional committees, to insure that the power and prestige of Congress remain adequate to the needs of the times."

REFORM PROPOSALS OF DSG

After the elections last November the Democratic study group—a block of House liberals—sought to mobilize their forces in favor of eight congressional reform proposals.

First, they decided to move in the Democratic caucus against two Members who worked for the Goldwater-Miller ticket: Representatives WILLIAMS, of Mississippi and WATSON of South Carolina. In the event, these two Members were demoted on their committees, but they were not barred from their committees or from the party caucus. Second, they considered reviving the traditional practice of requiring caucus approval of the slate of committee assignments proposed by the committee on committees. This was done in a separate caucus on January 18, 1965. Third, they decided to support a revision of the party ratios on all House committees (including Appropriations and Ways and Means) so as to reflect, as nearly as possible, the 68-percent Democratic Party ratio in the House in the 89th Congress. This has since been done. Fourth, they agreed to support the establishment of a Democratic policy or steering committee by the caucus so as to provide machinery to discuss and implement leadership policy on legislative proposals coming before the House. This is in process of being carried out.

Fifth, they agreed to support an amendment to the rules of the House to establish a "21-day rule" providing for Speaker recognition of the committee chairman (or the ranking majority member of a committee who favors the bill) to call up a measure for House consideration if it has been reported favorably by a standing legislative committee and if it has been before the Rules Committee for 21 days without having been granted a rule. This amendment was approved by the House. Sixth, they agreed to support the establishment of a Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization to consider proposals to modernize House and Senate procedures and to update the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Resolutions to this end have been introduced in the House. Seventh, they decided to support an amendment to the House rules to provide Speaker recognition of the committee chairman (or the ranking majority member of the committee who favors the bill) to offer a privileged motion to send to conference by majority vote a bill that has been passed by the House and Senate so that differences between the two versions of the measure may be resolved. This amendment was approved by the House. And, eighth, they agreed to support an amendment to the House rules to provide for a discharge petition with 175 signatures on major measures that are part of the majority party's legislative program, retaining the present requirement of 218 signatures on other measures. This amendment was not proposed in the Democratic caucus.

Thus, it will be seen that seven out of the eight reform proposals of the Democratic Study Group have been adopted or are in process of execution. Their success reflects the changed composition of the House as a result of the 1964 congressional elections. It also reveals a new balance of power in that Chamber where the so-called conservative coalition had been in control of the situation for a quarter of a century. The new House rules, approved on January 4 by a vote of 224 to 201, were largely the product of the DSG. The expectation is that they will weaken the blockade powers of the House Rules Committee and strengthen the power of the Speaker to expedite the legislative process. Whether he now exercises it or not, Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK will have more power than any Speaker since "Uncle Joe" Cannon.

SENATOR CLARK'S PROPOSALS

One of the most persistent and articulate advocates of congressional reorganization today is the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, JOSEPH S. CLARK. In his book, "Congress: The Sapless Branch," published last year, Senator CLARK makes a powerful and persuasive case for congressional reform. His reform proposals have all been made by previous writers, but his case is presented with special verve and is informed by his own first-hand observations and experiences in the Senate. The central problem of Congress, as he sees it, is the "establishment":

"Within broad limits and subject to some exceptions the congressional establishment consists of those Democratic chairmen and ranking Republican members of the important legislative committees who, through seniority and pressures exerted on junior colleagues, control the institutional machinery of Congress. They use this control to prevent a fair hearing and a vote on the merits of the President's program.

"It is important to note that the views of the congressional establishment are not shared by a majority of their own colleagues who, left to their own devices, would be prepared to bring the Congress into line to cope with the necessities of our times.

As remedies Senator CLARK proposes both internal and external reforms. Internally they involve: (1) changing "party leadership structure so that within both parties and in both houses a majority will decide party policy and enforce party discipline"; (2) changing rules and procedures in both houses "so that a majority can act when it is ready to act"; (3) substituting "cooperation for competition" in relations between houses and with the executive; and (4) establishing and enforcing high ethical standards.

External reforms proposed by Senator CLARK include generalized suggestions for more competition between the parties, with emphasis on developing national party policies and more widespread participation in financing party politics, reform of the electoral college, further removal of restraints on the right to vote, and election of all Members of the House and Senate at the time of presidential elections for four-year terms.[1]

Senator CLARK has been urging revision of the Senate rules since the summer of 1960. His latest speech on this subject was delivered in the Senate on September 23, 1964, and consumed 42 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In it he set forth and explained some 27 proposals for specific changes in the rules of the Senate. Senator CLARK's reforms are not popular among his colleagues and to date only one of his proposals has been adopted: permitting standing committees of the Senate to meet during the morning hour without sepcial leave.

MONRONEY RESOLUTION

On January 6, 1965, Senator MONRONEY introduced a concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Forty-seven other Senators joined him in sponsoring this resolution which is almost identical to the La Follette-Monroney resolution of 1945 which led to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. "Now that 20 years have passed," said Senator MONRONEY, "the Congress is again in need of major reorganization * * * the American people expect the Congress to improve its performance. * * * There is a strident and persistent demand for improved congressional practices." In a supporting speech the Senator outlined more than a score of major and minor problem areas which, he felt, call for study and improvement.[2]

[1] As summarized by Franklin L. Burdette in the Public Administration Review, December 1964, pp. 264–265.

[2] EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Monroney-Madden resolution (S. Con. Res. 2 and H. Con. Res. 4) were subsequently adopted on Mar. 9 and Mar. 11, 1965, and the joint committee has been appointed. Hearings are scheduled to begin on May 10, 1965.

CAUCUS REFORM

During the first 50 years of Congress, down to 1839, the House of Representatives elected its officers by secret ballot. The secret ballot encouraged independent voting, free from fear of reprisal, and enabled the real will of the majority to prevail. In 1839 the House switched its method of leadership selection from the secret ballot to "viva voce" voting. This was a response to the growth of political parties in the age of Jackson. Open voting was sought for purposes of party discipline.

During the 20th century the secret ballot has frequently been used by the House Democratic caucus to select its candidates for the officers of the House. The Democratic caucus journals show, for example, that the caucus balloted for the officers of the House on the eve of the 80th, 81st, and 84th Congresses. In the absence of contests for the top leadership posts, the caucus has nominated its candidates for Speaker and floor leader by acclamation. The secret ballot in party caucus has also long been used to fill vacancies on the Democratic side of the Ways and Means Committee.

In 1959 the House Republican caucus replaced JOE MARTIN as minority leader by CHARLES HALLECK in a secret ballot vote. Again in 1963, Representative FORD was elected chairman of the Republican conference over Representative Hoeven by secret ballot. And in 1965, Representative FORD defeated Representative HALLECK for minority leader by a secret ballot vote of 73 to 67.

This use, early and late, of the secret ballot in leadership selections suggests that it could be extended to the choice of the chairmen of the standing committees of Congress as a democratic alternative to the seniority custom. The history of the secret ballot and its power to reform Congress have recently been set forth in a book entitled "Illegitimate Power" by Laurence G. Kraus. Kraus suggests that the House Democrats set up a caucus committee to study and recommend new rules for their party caucus. The study committee would seek answers to such questions as these: When should the caucus meet? Should the caucus leader be selected by secret ballot and should majority support be required? Should he have the right to name his own committeemen and committee chairmen? Or, should the caucus control all committee assignments, and should all caucus contests be settled by secret ballot? How long should a Congressman serve on a committee before he can be named chairman? What should be the qualifications for election to the caucus steering committee? Should the system of regional caucuses be revised with leaders elected by ballot? Should the subcaucuses play a part in developing committee assignments? What about the regional whips? What of caucus eligibility requirements; what happens to those members of the party who endorse the opposition candidate in a presidential election?

MODERNIZING CONGRESSIONAL INFORMATION

Modern electronics have enabled industry and the Military Establishment, and some parts of the executive branch of the Government, to store and retrieve knowledge and to automate their activities through the use of computers. For example, the Internal Revenue Service is now using computers to check the accuracy of income tax returns. But Congress is still operating with the simpler tools of the preautomation age.

The question may be raised: Can Congress, faced with an increasingly onerous and technical workload of complicated problems, make use of modern technology to modernize and manipulate the information it needs for sound decisionmaking?

I suggest that Congress could use computers in the following ways:

1. To expedite the review of the executive budget and the legislative phase of the budget process.

2. To schedule committee meetings and hearings.

3. To provide the leadership of the legislature with a current picture of the status of all pending legislation—the equivalent of a national or military command center.

4. To save time on quorum calls and floor voting by an electric voting system.

5. To keep track of the payroll accounts of employees of Congress, and

6. To maintain an up-to-date telephone directory for the legislative establishment.

In addition, it has been suggested that such equipment could be used to catalog and index congressional documents, to store information on Federal contract awards (by subject, by contract recipient, by congressional district), to inventory research and development facilities and manpower, and trends in Federal budgeting to show rates of growth of program components together with data on original enabling authority and points of decisionmaking when funding levels were either increased or decreased.

CREATION OF A LEGISLATIVE-EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The functional and physical separation between the legislative and executive branches of our Government has caused rivalry, suspicion, and hostility between Congress and the President at intervals throughout our national history. Conflict is a built-in feature of the American system of government.

I suggest that the coordination of Congress and the Executive could be institutionalized by the creation of a Legislative-Executive Council. Such a Council would consist of congressional leaders and members of the President's Cabinet. It would violate no essential American tradition and would require no constitutional amendment. The idea of such an organ in the National Government was first suggested by Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., in the July 1943, issue of the Atlantic Monthly. His State of Wisconsin had such a council as early as 1931. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 contained a provision for a joint Legislative-Executive Council when the measure passed the Senate. Its elimination on the House side was believed to be due to the influence of the Speaker who perhaps thought that his power might be reduced by it. Its defeat was a keen disappointment to American scholars in the field of politics.

The Council could be created by a joint resolution of the two Houses and an Executive order of the President. Its membership would presumably consist of the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, the majority party floor leaders of the two Houses, chairmen of major committees, and designated Cabinet members. Meetings would be held regularly to consider the formulation and execution of national policies. The Council might be held responsible for planning and scheduling the legislative program in consultation with the President.

PUBLIC ATTITUDE TOWARD REFORM

Public sentiment toward congressional reform seems to be mixed. On the one hand, evidence of influential support for improvement in congressional procedures is seen in the report of the 26th American Assembly, held at Arden House last October, and in the report of a conference on congressional reorganization held at Dartmouth College last spring and attended by several Representatives. In recent weeks public backing for congressional reform has apparently been growing in intensity, judging by widespread news coverage and editorial support throughout the country. Pressures are building up inside and outside Congress so that there is now a healthy demand for rather sweeping reforms.

On the other hand, it can hardly be claimed that there has been a sustained public demand for an overhaul of the national legislature. The general public often seems to be indifferent to congressional performance. At the end of 1963, to be sure, there was widespread public criticism of Congress on the ground that it had consistently blocked President Kennedy's legislative program. Today, according to the Harris Survey, there has been a marked shift of attitudes so that 64 percent of the public now thinks Congress has done an excellent or good job. This improvement in the "image" of Congress is presumably due to the impressive legislative record of the 1964 session which has been attributed, in turn, to the persuasive powers and skills of President Johnson.

This different experience of two Presidents with the same Congress suggests that perhaps there is some truth in Pope's famous couplet—"For forms of government let fools contest, what'er is best administered is best."

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: SUMMARY STATEMENT

Suggestions for congressional reform have been advanced in recent years by Members of Congress, political scientists, civic groups, journalists, and commentators. An inventory of these suggestions, made last year by Congressional Quarterly News Service, ran to 60 pages. There is much overlapping and duplication among these proposals, but a review of them indicates that, for the most part, the objectives of the reformers are threefold:

1. To centralize and strengthen leadership in Congress.

2. To promote majority rule; and

3. To facilitate the performance of the modern functions of Congress.

How would the reformers achieve these aims? Boiled down at the risk of oversimplification, they would centralize and strengthen the leadership by (1) transferring the scheduling function from the Rules Committee to the majority leaders of the House; and (2) providing for the appointment and removal of the chairmen of congressional committees by the majority leadership, subject to the approval of the majority caucus.

They would promote majority rule by (1) providing for majority cloture in the Senate; (2) reviving the 21-day rule in the House, to be invoked by the Speaker; and (3) authorizing a majority of the Members of the House to send a bill to conference.

They would facilitate the performance of the legislative function by (1) reducing the workload on Congress in various ways; (2) saving congressional time by electric voting, germane debate, staggered committee and Chamber sessions, joint hearings, and other devices; and (3) improving legislative staff aids by expanding professional committee staffs and the Legislative Reference Service.

They would facilitate the performance of the oversight function by (1) expanding the staffs of the supervisory committees; (2) service audits of executive agencies by the GAO: and (3) by strengthening the power of the purse.

They would improve the performance of the representative function by (1) scheduling congressional sessions so as to allow regular recesses for contact with constituents; (2) provide administrative assistants for Representatives such as Senators have; (3) requiring all Members to disclose their financial interests and pressure group affiliations; and (4) lengthening the term of office of Representatives to 4 years.

PROSPECTS FOR REFORM

The prospects for congressional reform have not seemed bright, considering the formidable obstacles to change. These obstacles include apparent public indifference to congressional performance and the satisfaction of legislative leaders with existing arrangements. They also include those interest groups in the country whose influence in Congress might be jeopardized by new forms and practices. The local orientation of members, their preoccupation with errand running and routine chores, attachment to traditional procedures, the fragmentation of power in Congress and opposition to centralized leadership—are all factors that make for resistance to change.

Some political scientists believe that internal congressional reform depends on external reform in the party system and that external reform in the party system depends, in turn, on the expansion of party competition into many more legislative districts, equitable apportionment, and recruitment by the parties of better legislative candidates.[3] They point out that legislative vitality and self-sufficiency have suffered serious setbacks during the 20th century. In totalitarian states legislatures have lost their functional independence, while in the United States, Congress is said to have lost its former coequal position with the executive and judicial branches. The problems of modern government have become so technical and complex that the initiative in policymaking has shifted from Congress to the Executive. "Legislative reform culminating in steady majority rule would threaten established legislative ways; it would upset the traditional balance of power within the legislature; almost certainly, it would strengthen the Chief Executive's influence upon legislation."[4] In short, the alternatives are to continue traditional arrangements and procedures or to reinvigorate the party system. Basic reforms, it is believed, will come slowly, if at all, and in small doses.

---

[3] See William J. Keefe and Morris S. Ogul, "The American Legislative Process: Congress and the States" (1964), ch. 14.

[4] Ibid., p. 485.

Remarks of Peter W. Rodino, Jr., for the Italian-Tribune Awards Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, my good friend and colleague, PETER RODINO, was the principal speaker at a dinner in New Jersey sponsored by the AMICIS—Active Member Italian-American Community Interest, at which awards were presented to five outstanding Italian-Americans by the Italian-Tribune, a fine weekly newspaper. His moving speech, which was climaxed by a letter of commendation from our great President Johnson, is one I would herewith like to bring to the attention of my fellow Members:

REMARKS OF PETER W. RODINO, JR., FOR THE ITALIAN-TRIBUNE AWARDS DINNER

Mayor Conte, Mr. Caputo, Mr. Tuzzolo, reverend clergy, distinguished honorees, ladies and gentlemen, Marc Anthony's famous oration—when he came to bury Caesar, not to praise him—is one of the great speeches of literature.

At the very beginning of the speech, the friend of the slain Caesar seeks to gain the

sympathy of a hostile crowd in the Forum. He does so by pointing out:

"The evil that men do lives after them. The good is oft interred with their bones * * *"

That apparently was the common fate of man, whether high or low in rank, in those ancient days before the decline and fall of the empire. Fortunately, civilization has marched forward. And we have learned to appreciate and to remember the good men do. And this wonderful banquet tonight offers fresh proof of our progress.

We are gathered here this evening for the second annual Tribune awards dinner. We are here to pay tribute, with the AMICIS, to the good deeds, to the contributions and achievements of five outstanding members of the Italian-American community.

They richly and abundantly deserve the recognition and honor we are bestowing upon them. And the impact of their good works will live on, even after them.

Father Ruggiero, our outstanding citizen, for his significant and monumental accomplishments through 30 fruitful years of ministering to his flock at St. Lucy's, Mrs. Immacolata Gili, our woman of the year, for her unselfish efforts in the cause of charity, Vic Di Filippo, who has earned a coveted place in our hall of sports, Tom Longo, a football star at Notre Dame, and Jim Le Pore, a gridiron standout at Essex Catholic, who have been selected for scholastic awards. Yes, they deserve the recognition and honor we accord them. And even more. For by their accomplishments, by their high standards of excellence, they have imparted quality and bright luster to the entire Italo-American community. For this, each of us owes them continuing thanks.

And in speaking of the Italo-American community, let us not forget that we are a nation of immigrants. The seeds of America's greatness were planted by immigrant hands and watered with immigrant sweat.

With hope in their hearts, they came in search of liberty and freedom, our fathers and our fathers' fathers. They left the tiny villages and hamlets of their birth to undertake the long, and arduous journey through lonely mountain passes and across a strange sea—to a new start, in a new world.

Whether we are 1st, 2d, 5th, or 10th generation Americans, I believe it is good for all of us to remember this humble and hazardous arrival. And history has shown that we are no less patriotic because we still cherish the traditions of our forebears and find enjoyment and delight in the festivals and foods which they enjoyed.

And whether we are 1st, 2d, 5th, or 10th generation Americans, we have not lacked the courage in facing unknown and untold dangers, because we carry with us the power to dream bold Columbian dreams.

We do not forget that the tired and the poor, the downtrodden and the oppressed, the lovers of liberty and the seekers of freedom came from the old world to the new in quest of dignity, equality and opportunity. They brought with them their religion and their culture, their arts and their crafts, their skills and their ambitions. And with bare and bleeding hands they pushed the frontiers of freedom forward, and they helped to make America great. And they became part of its epic of greatness.

They became God's priests and missionaries, lawyers and doctors, businessmen and bankers, artists and musicians, teachers and professors, workers and executives. In time of war, they proved their patriotism, fighting and dying for the adopted nation they loved.

Yes, they came, from the old world to the new. With warmth in their souls, the Columbian dream in their hearts and a determination to succeed in their minds. With straining muscles and oozing sweat, they built the roads and highways, the railways and skyscrapers, and cities, large and small, and for good measure they threw in all their love and loyalty and devotion. And they became intertwined in the fabric of their adopted land, and they enriched the tapestry of American heritage.

They labored unselfishly that we who followed them could inherit the priceless gifts and treasured traditions of a free and prosperous nation—and as inheritors of this rich legacy—be its guardians and trustees, to protect and preserve for those who come after us.

In the spirit of this dramatic history, it is only right that we take modest pride in the achievements of the award winners we are honoring here tonight, just as we share pardonable pride in the landmark accomplishments of the Fermis of atomic science, the LaGuardias, the Celebrezzes and the Pastores of politics, the DiMaggios of baseball, and the Comos and Carusos of song.

It is one thing for members of the Italian-American community to honor their own. It is another thing for those outside the community to acclaim our fathers and mothers, our sons and daughters and kinsmen for their meaningful contributions to a better America and a greater America.

And so I am particularly pleased and highly honored to bring this message from the White House, Washington, April 22, 1965:

"To the Members and Friends of the AMICIS:

"It is a pleasure to once again join your fine Congressmen PETE RODINO and JOE MINISH in extending to you my warm greetings and good wishes.

"I highly commend your enthusiasm to keep alive the cherished traditions brought to our shores by the men and women of Italian origin. Through your many contributions toward this end, you have both preserved and enriched a bright and enduring part of our American heritage.

"You have my cordial regards for your continued success in the years ahead.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON."

Fort Custer Should Be National Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, we in Michigan feel there is a great need for a national cemetery in our State. A number of veterans organizations and patriotic groups are urging that an area of Fort Custer, which is being deactivated, be set aside for this purpose. I lend my support to this proposal.

Under the unanimous consent granted me I submit House Concurrent Resolution 12 of the Michigan Legislature calling upon Congress to create this national cemetery:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress relative to the establishing of a national cemetery at Fort Custer

Whereas through the recent action of the National Defense Department, many areas at Fort Custer are being deactivated and the various parts of the fort are being disengaged for other activities; and

Whereas there is a great need in the State of Michigan for a national cemetery for the veterans of the State of Michigan and surrounding territories; and

Whereas it would be fitting and proper that a portion of the land at Fort Custer, which was the scene of training for so many thousands of American soldiers, be dedicated as a national cemetery by the U.S. Government in honor of its veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress is hereby respectfully urged to create a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Michigan delegation to the Congress.

Adopted by the senate April 1, 1965.

BERYL I. KENYON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Adopted by the house April 1, 1965.

NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The Slums Revisited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Young Republicans Club, a group I once served as president, has undertaken a series of reports on the slums of New York City. The first of these reports, titled "The Slums Revisted," is a devastating documentary of the shambles into which segments of New York have fallen and the apparent inability of city hall to do anything but issue still more pledges and promises.

The pledges and promises seem to be issued every 4 years, when elections are scheduled; the stench and filth of the slums is with us, before, during, and after the elections. Much can be done. For example, the report points out:

The Mitchell-Lama law has made available self-liquidating loans upon which the city could make a handsome profit of 20 percent and still erect adequate housing to replace our slums. In almost 10 years since the passage of the Mitchell-Lama law, the city program has produced only 6,427 housing units as against 75,000 units a year which it could quite easily construct through various means.

The report offers some incisive answers to the continuing question of why so little has been done in New York City when its needs are so great.

The report should interest all Members representing urban areas, for the conditions described can be found in most of our large cities. I commend the New York Young Republicans Club for an admirable report, and I commend the report to my colleagues:

THE SLUMS REVISITED

(A special report of the Committee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the New York Young Republican Club)

Ordinarily, housing problems are not within the purview of groups or committees on civil rights and civil liberties. However, the festering slums and decay which, by inaction at least, have been sanctioned by New York City's administration are one of the

factors at the root of this city's increasingly serious civil rights problems. Discontent, frustration, and desperation thrive in the squalor of slums. Disrespect for law and for government burgeon in an atmosphere where slum lords are permitted to disregard with impunity building, health, fire, and other ordinances, let alone the basic ordinance of decency. Job opportunities and even educational opportunities suffer when homelife centers all too frequently around stamping out roaches and rats, fighting the numbing chill of winter's cold, and hoping that tonight for a change there will be hot water. These, of course, are the problems which go toward making up, in part at least, the civil rights problems in this city. For it is the minorities—the Negro, Puerto Rican, etc.—who are denied equal opportunity, who are also denied the basic right to live in habitable housing.

This, then, is the first of a series of in-depth reports based upon studies conducted by the Committee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the New York Young Republican Club on the subject of housing. We have confined ourselves herein to those buildings and blocks which Mayor Wagner personally inspected in 1961 and as to which in that mayoralty election year he made specific pledges.

CHAPTER I. "THE SHANTIES IN OUR HOMETOWN"

In 1961 the residents of East Fifth Street between Avenues B and C in Manhattan referred to their block as "Korea." Four years later the residents of that block still call it Korea and other words far more aptly describing the block—festering slum that it is.

According to the New York Times of August 15, 1961, Mayor Robert F. Wagner visited East Fifth Street between Avenues B and C and pronounced with much fanfare his utter disgust at the sight he saw. For example his inspection of 629 East Fifth Street on August 14 of that year—a mayoralty election year—resulted in the pious utterance that he was disgusted by the peeling paint, the refuse-littered entranceways and the utter shambles. The mayor then promised, in the presence of newspapermen and city officials, that if it was the last thing that he would do, the entire Fifth Street block between Avenues B and C would be rehabilitated immediately. It was a sign of the times and of the year.

On April 3, 1965, almost 4 years later, East Fifth Street between Avenues B and C was revisited. To enter that block on a bright April afternoon was to pass from the warm "spring of hope" into the "winter of despair." To enter 629 East Fifth Street was to enter a mausoleum of decay and despair.

Four years after his pious promises of rehabilitation forthwith, Wagner has done nothing to redeem his pledge. East Fifth Street between Avenues B and C is, if anything, a far worse shambles now than it was then. The building around which Mayor Wagner centered his inspection trip—629 East Fifth Street— is a typical example of the degration which, thanks to the mayor and to his city administration, human beings are required to live in.

From the outside, 629 East Fifth Street resembles many of the slums which dot our city. Abandoned furniture lies in the entranceway with roaches stumbling forth from their nests in a torn mattress and an abandoned club chair. The metal doors which cover a basement areaway lie open and exposed, a beguiling invitation to any child or passerby and a threat for the unwary. A garbage can filled beyond capacity with empty beer cans stands at the entranceway of a ground floor apartment-store which houses a poolroom packed with mankind searching for a moment of enjoyment and escape.

The entranceway to 629 East Fifth Street is in every sense a gateway to despair—shattered panes of glass in the doors, falling plaster and filth are the sights which one first sees.

The entranceway is without a light fixture—perhaps it is better that no one see what awaits them inside. The stairwell is a disgustingly filthy areaway of falling plaster, chipped paint, broken banisters and refuse. Beneath the stairwell are paint and turpentine ready to ignite a holocaust, and empty liquor bottles indicating that there are those who in a stupor might well cast a careless match into those paint cans. These visual manifestations seem insignificant when one finds that tenants have been without water for the disposal of wastage, that hazardous wiring dots the building and that the tenants must live with the knowledge that they are sheltered by damaged roof beams. We did not have to ask too many tenants about the conditions of this building for there is an announcement in the hallway—an order of the department of buildings dated April 2, 1965. It directs that the premises be vacated on April 8, 1965, because of the lack of water for the disposal of wastage, the absence of lighting in the halls, missing treads on the stairs, damaged roof beams, hazardous wiring, etc. All this is in violation of provisions of the administrative code.

Four years ago Mayor Robert F. Wagner pledged that he would forthwith rehabilitate 629 East Fifth Street. By order of the department of buildings, the mayor's refusal to redeem his pledge now culminates in an order which may well throw the tenants of 629 East Fifth Street into the streets. The tenants of 629 East Fifth Street whom we interviewed asked one question, Where shall we live now?

However, 629 East Fifth Street is not atypical on this block of despair. At numbers 625–627 East Fifth Street, the backyard was filled with trash and the walls decorated by chipped paint and the stairways with refuse. At 638 East Fifth Street panes of glass in the doorway were shattered and the odor was beyond belief. We could go on at length with further examples and photographs but no useful purpose would be served by further sickening illustrations. Suffice it to note that most of the East Fifth Street residents whom we saw bore that same look of despair and frustration which has marked the wretched and the hopeless in the shanty towns across this Nation and throughout the world. The two little girls who walked down the street collecting empty whiskey bottles to sell to a junkman and searched for empty soda bottles to turn in at the corner store certainly should have had better things to do for themselves.

Four years ago Mayor Robert F. Wagner pledged to the press with much fanfare that he would rehabilitate East Fifth Street between Avenues B and C. Is this the kind of rehabilitation which Robert F. Wagner had in mind?

Our reinspection of "Wagner's slums" next brought us to 307, 310, and 311 East 100th Street. The New York Times of July 27, 1961, reported that the mayor, as then was his custom, denounced conditions at those houses and that his honor was shocked by the filthy conditions in which the tenants of those buildings then were forced to live. The normal pledge to rehabilitate was of course made by our mayor.

At 311 East 100th Street a fresh bright mosaic work in its doorway. Indeed, we were so impressed by this surface appearance that we almost passed on. However, the nagging feeling persisted that all might not be what it seemed to be on the surface and so we entered. Upon entry, the prospects were far from pleasing. The back hall was crammed with uncollected garbage and other trash, the halls were a filthy spectacle and the odor was not too much different from East Fifth Street.

At 305 East 100th Street, the front hall was without a light fixture and peeling paint hung in sheets from the walls. Trash and an old bed spring decorated the back hall, and a littered yard provided a playground for children.

As we started to leave the vicinity of 305–311 East 100th Street, a little man ran up the block to inquire whether we might be interested in renting an apartment in one of the various buildings, pronouncing proudly that they contained a large icebox and the rent was cheap. Two members of this committee had themselves once lived in and on the fringes of Harlem. But the slums of yesteryear were not one fraction the equivalent of "Wagner's slums." We refused the little man's offer. The rent could not be cheap enough and the icebox large enough.

On July 24, 1961, as reported by the New York Times, Mayor Robert F. Wagner deplored conditions at 300 West 106th Street as terrible. The normal pledges of rehabilitation were, of course, uttered to the press by the mayor of all the people.

On April 3, 1965, the halls of 300 West 106th Street reeked of urine; flies swarmed in numbers and sizes beyond belief and roaches were abundant. Of course the walls displayed the falling paint. One tenant said he had come to America to seek a golden opportunity. He said that 300 West 106th Street was not what he had in mind. A man leaning—perhaps more properly resting—against the wall of the third floor elevator indicated that he was a veteran, wounded in Korea. He begged for a handout, pleading that someone should help him. That was the promise of Robert F. Wagner in election year 1961. That man resting against the third floor elevator at 300 West 106th Street thinks that that promise has not been redeemed. We agree.

His honor, the mayor, as was his custom in that election year, visited several other buildings on the West Side of Manhattan. The July 19, 1961, New York Times stated that Mayor Wagner threatened stern action against landlords of West 84th Street buildings between Amsterdam and Columbus Avenues. On March 22, 1965, Woody Klein, a courageous reporter of the New York World-Telegram & Sun, who had submitted himself to the indignities of these slums in an effort to uncover the truth of Wagner's city, wrote that 84th Street was the "same old West Side story." He reported that in 1958, after Rev. James A. Gusweller had campaigned vigorously against housing abuses, a cleanup campaign was announced. In 1961, following a small riot on West 84th Street, Mayor Wagner had declared an all-out war on the slum forces that have invaded the West Side and he directed a shock attack on the neighborhood and for a cleanup. As reported by Woody Klein, that war lasted until election day. Woody Klein's reports, and those published in the Friday, February 5, 1965, issue of the New York Times, demonstrate that the situation on West 84th Street is not too different today. Our inspection confirmed that conclusion. Addiction, alcoholism, and thefts persist today in that street and in many near it.

The housing problem on West 84th Street has in part, at least, been solved. It is always solved in terms of visible solutions when one takes the expedient of tearing down half the block or more. A few show houses have been preserved, with gleaming brass work (the result of a massive GI party), fresh coats of paint and prominent signs proclaiming names and addresses of the exterminators who pay regular visits. Those houses are a testimonial to the fact that a job can be done if there is a will and a desire. However, they are also a testimonial to the fact that in this city of crises it pays to advertise. In Wagner's New York it seems clear—and West 84th Street is a glaring testimonial to this fact—

that the only way to get action seems to be to demonstrate long enough and loud enough so that some crisis results which, in turn, may start a crusade and that in turn some day may result in some action from a city administration which does not care.

As we have pointed out above, this is the first of a series of reports on "Wagner's slums." In the reports which will follow at regular intervals we shall set forth in detail our recommendations for action in the hope that some day, perhaps, our mayor may be persuaded to act. There are solutions and they are simple. One easy solution is to find out the names of those city inspectors whose responsibility it is and has been to keep close check upon buildings where there are violations and then to find out whether those inspectors found out about those violations, and took appropriate action. If they did not, then an effective city administration would know what to do about those inspectors.

There are a host of other solutions to these problems. An effective city administration could and should without too much trouble erect housing sufficient to support an additional population of upwards of 1½ million persons in Staten Island, Queens, and the Bronx. The funds for such construction are available through private, public and Mitchell-Lama funds available through the auspices of the State of New York. Since its enactment, the Mitchell-Lama law has made available self-liquidating loans upon which the city could make a handsome profit of 20 percent and still erect adequate housing to replace our slums. In almost 10 years since the passage of the Mitchell-Lama law, the city program has produced only 6,247 housing units as against 75,000 units a year which it could quite easily construct through various means.

More can and will be said by this Committee on what can and should be done. The point of this initial report is, however, simply this: as long as this city is governed by a mayor who makes pledges and then lacks the integrity and ability to redeem those pledges, a mayor who by his deeds (or more properly the lack thereof) demonstrates that he has no real concern about the problems of the poor and down-trodden, a mayor who is beholden for campaign funds to real estate interests, as long as this situation continues no real progress can or will be made in "Wagner's slums."

Respectfully submitted.

STANLEY THOMAS,
Chairman.
BURTON J. AHRENS,
CLAY MAITLAND,
Committee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.
CHARLES G. MOERDLER,
President, New York Young Republican Club.

The Pittsburgh War on Poverty Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed with the House Committee on Education and Labor a statement on the pattern we have developed in Pittsburgh for our antipoverty program. Because of the nationwide attention directed at the war on poverty and the difficulties experienced in some communities, it seems to me that the experience of my own city of Pittsburgh may well prove valuable, not only as a pattern for other cities, but for members of the Education and Labor Committee and for Members of Congress in general, in their evaluation of the program and in determining the character of further legislation to implement the program. The Pittsburgh antipoverty program, drawing heavily on the earlier Pittsburgh renaissance, has brought together private, public, religious, governmental, labor and business leaders to work out an harmonious, coordinated attack on poverty. Mayor Joseph Barr has provided me with a summary report on the organization established in Pittsburgh and the progress achieved so far. I have included his report as part of my statement to the committee.

Mayor Barr's report follows:

CITY OF PITTSBURGH, PA.
April 30, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOORHEAD: It has been 5 months since Pittsburgh's community action program was originally funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Because of the national attention focused on the antipoverty program at this time, I am sending you a report on the status of the Pittsburgh program and where we expect to go in the months ahead.

As you know, we in Pittsburgh began working on a community action program many months before the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act. Members of my staff joined with professional and staff persons from community agencies specializing in education, health, employment, and welfare programs to develop the outline of a program. The ideas and schemes they developed were then taken into the neighborhoods and discussed and tested with people who would be on the receiving end of these programs.

Almost from the beginning, there was general agreement as to where our emphasis should be placed. Our goals were threefold:

First. To develop an expanded and specialized education program for youngsters, particularly, the very young, from deprived neighborhoods.

Second. To meld together a range of health, welfare, adult education, housing, and employment programs in neighborhood service centers, again in the disadvantaged areas of the city.

Thirdly. To try to coordinate all of these services, education with health and welfare, in a manner never attempted before in the Pittsburgh community.

As you know, in the past each of these activities has been administered by a different level of government or through private agencies, with no conscious effort at coordinating these efforts, and certainly with no conscious attempt to involve the poor themselves.

Therefore, it was decided to form a new agency, a nonprofit corporation called the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc., which would serve as coordinator for this program.

Perhaps because we started our planning early, or because of the cooperative feeling that has traditionally marked Pittsburgh's way of doing things, or perhaps because of sheer good fortune, we were able to establish this new agency with little or no friction or opposition.

The Board of the mayor's committee consists of 14 members, strictly nonpartisan, broadly representative of our community, representing local and State government, educational institutions, social agencies, labor, business and minority groups. (List of board members attached.)

It is a hard-working board. The members serve without pay. The important point to be made about the program they direct is that for the first time we have been able to consolidate a range of city, county, State and Federal agencies as well as business, labor, voluntary groups, educational agencies and the poor themselves, into a unified approach in attacking the problems of poverty on a broad-based, nonpartisan level.

How well it succeeds remains to be seen, but we are encouraged by our beginning.

I know there has been considerable discussion about the importance and necessity of involving the poor in the planning and execution of poverty programs. I thought it might be of interest to know what efforts we have made in that regard.

The Pittsburgh community action plan is operating—or will shortly be operating—in eight neighborhoods: the Hill District, Lower North Side, East Liberty-Garfield, Homewood-Brushton, South Side-West End, South Oakland, Lawrenceville, and Hazelwood.

In each of these neighborhoods, a broad-based citizens' committee, heavily representative of the poor themselves, is given a voice in the creation, operation, and evaluation of all programs operating in their neighborhoods.

To insure direct involvement of the citizenry, the mayor's committee has established the following procedure. We have written into all contracts with the agencies providing services in the neighborhoods, the right of analysis and review by the citizens committees. To the extent possible, this is intended to insure that the activities and programs carried on under the auspices of the mayor's committee are understood and approved by the people who are intended to benefit from these programs.

In short, we have tried to involve the poor at every level of the program. They are represented, we believe, adequately at the board level of the mayor's committee itself, and also on each of the eight citizens groups operating in the neighborhoods.

To repeat, these groups have a major role spelled out in formal contracts, to give guidance and direction in the programs. By the time all eight neighborhoods are organized, hundreds of low-income persons will be serving on boards and committees that will review, evaluate, and develop services in the poverty program.

They are the key to our program, to insuring that the agencies with whom we contract, must produce high quality services, or be replaced by some other agency that will.

Our program as developed thus far calls for the employment of 209 subprofessionals. Our contracts require that these subprofessionals, wherever possible, come from the poor and indigent in the neighborhoods to be served.

More than half of the 209 subprofessionals who will earn between $4,128 to $5,568 have already been hired and the overwhelming majority of them have been from the ranks of public assistance, unemployment compensation, or underemployed.

The mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc., has thus far received $1,500,000 from the Office of Economic Opportunity. The mayor's committee staff is a small one, with a total personnel budget of less than $70,000 to administer and coordinate this far-ranging program.

Of the $1,500,000, more than half, or $800,000, has been allocated to the Pittsburgh Board of Public Education and the Catholic School Board to carry out preschool classes, reading clinics, tutorial programs, special classes for helping the mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed, cultural enrichment, and other compensatory education programs. Both the public school and parochial school

programs are in operation and reaching approximately 15,000 children within the city.

We recognize that the gains and progress from such programs will be slow in coming, but we're convinced the major emphasis should be where it will do the most good, with the very young.

In each of the eight neighborhoods, there will be a coordinator with full responsibility for developing a unified service pattern, new programs and involving the citizens of neighborhoods in full participation in the programs.

The mayor's committee has signed contracts with five private agencies, with one group, ACTION-Housing, Inc., serving as coordinator in four neighborhoods.

A special feature of the neighborhood service centers are the neighborhood employment centers. No longer do the unemployed and poor have to make the trek to a downtown office for job help. Employment centers are now open in six neighborhoods and run, in many cases, by persons who live in those areas. They provide neighborhood contact with the unemployed and will sign up young adults for the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, manpower development training and all other services normally provided by the State bureau of employment security. Staff from the State bureau of employment security are working in these centers supported by subprofessional staff hired from the neighborhoods.

We have assigned VISTA personnel to these employment centers in three neighborhoods, to try to make contact with delinquent and antisocial youth and attempt to interest them to take advantage of this wide range of employment possibilities.

We are in the early stages of a housing improvement program, developed by ACTION-Housing, Inc., in three neighborhoods. This program is aimed at helping families to achieve healthy, respectable, modest housing. We expect additional VISTA volunteers to work in the other designated neighborhoods.

We have contracted with a number of family service agencies to bring help to families in trouble. Intensive service workers have been hired to canvass each neighborhood, to find families in trouble, to help them, or to help them get to the services that they need.

This is a brief, partial report on the Pittsburgh program to date. It represents many hundreds of hours of work by many persons—yet we recognize we have barely touched the surface of the poverty troubles locally.

The mayor's committee has already approved and submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity a number of additional new proposals amounting to $650,000. Each of these program components have been approved by the participating neighborhood citizens' committee, the particular agencies, and ultimately by the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc.

We have submitted to Washington our proposal to help preschool youngsters this summer as part of the nationwide Project Head Start. If approved, we plan to provide a comprehensive educational, health, and social service program for nearly 1,200 boys and girls ages 4 and 5, to help prepare them to enter school next September. Pittsburgh's project head start will be made available to deprived youngsters in more than 55 school centers.

This plan, once again, is the culmination of excellent preparation and cooperation by a number of groups, particularly the Pittsburgh school board, the Catholic school system, the University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of Public Health, and other public and private agencies. Here, too, the plan was submitted, reviewed, and approved by citizen groups in all neighborhoods in which the program will operate.

Each day our agency receives proposals from groups and churches and agencies, all of whom want to help in this all-out effort. Not all of the proposals are feasible or of equal merit, but in the main they are all sincerely inspired. This encourages us.

At the same time, I think it can be fairly said that our committee has no illusion about the size of the job ahead.

We recognize that no one agency or activity is going to produce instant solutions to age-old problems. Nor are we promising a panacea for all the social ills of this community.

But through the aegis of the Office of Economic Opportunity, we have been able to bring to the deprived families of this community the hope that their future can be better if this program will work.

This is not a progress report in the usual sense, for not enough time has elapsed for significant achievements to be made. But it is a progress report in the sense that Pittsburgh at least regards the war on poverty as one that must be waged—and the Economic Opportunity Act as the arsenal from which we draw our weapons for this struggle.

At this point, we in Pittsburgh are convinced that the community action program concept clearly offers challenging new possibilities to those communities who are willing to unify their local resources, to bring new hope and increased opportunity to our less fortunate fellow citizens.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH M. BARR,
President, Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc.

MAYOR'S COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES, INC.

BOARD MEMBERS

From Pittsburgh:

Hon. Joseph M. Barr, mayor of the city of Pittsburgh.

Byrd R. Brown, attorney.

Hon. Patrick T. Fagan, president, city council.

Robert Ferguson, senior vice president, Pittsburgh National Bank.

Howard R. Hague, vice president, United Steelworkers of America.

Most Rev. Vincent M. Leonard, Vicar-General, Catholic Diocese.

Hon. David Olbum, Judge, Common Pleas Court.

Mrs. Frankie W. Pace, vice president, Citizens for Hill District Renewal.

Robert B. Pease, executive director, Urban Redevelopment Authority.

J. Stanley Purnell, assistant to president, T. Mellon and Sons.

William H. Rea, president, Oliver Tyrone Corp.

Rev. James J. Robinson, minister, Bidwell Presbyterian Church.

Rev. J. A. Williams, minister, Temple Baptist Church.

From Harrisburg:

William P. Young, secretary, labor and industry, State Capitol.

THE PURPOSE, FUNCTION, STRUCTURE, AND ROLE OF CITIZENS' GROUPS AS A COMPONENT PART OF PITTSBURGH'S COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

I. The neighborhood citizens' group will be a channel of communications between the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc., and the neighborhood. It should be an innovator in developing a program suitable to the neighborhood and its functions will include the review and evaluation of all programs to be carried out in the neighborhood. These activities will enable the neighborhood citizens' group to develop self-sufficiency so that it will not only benefit from the distribution of funds under this program but also be a full partner in the development and execution of the community action program under the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc.

II. The neighborhood citizens' group shall be formally constituted in each neighborhood. It should have officers, bylaws, and specific meeting times. The neighborhood coordinator will serve in a staff capacity to the neighborhood citizens' group.

III. Each of the neighborhood citizens' groups will be formally recognized by the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc., when it is determined that the citizens' group meets the following criteria:

(A) It must be representative in terms of residence, business, and commercial institutions, race, income, sex, low-income persons, and other existing neighborhood groupings. It must be committed to increasing the representative character of the group.

(B) It must be familiar with the proposed community action program and committed to its basic goals.

(C) It must be an advocate for the poor in its neighborhood and also committed to developing a good system of communication with the poor.

(D) It must be composed of officers and a membership prepared to commit a great amount of effort and time.

(E) It must clearly understand the powers and responsibilities of its undertaking as outlined in this policy statement and in the overall community action program.

(F) Through its membership or through attendance at meetings, it must directly involve a sizeable proportion of the residents of the neighborhood.

(G) It must further demonstrate its ability to reach and involve people in the neighborhood through the raising of funds each year to assist in carrying out its functions.

IV. Each citizens' group shall review each proposed program in the neighborhood with the proposed contractual agency. The Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc., shall not approve a program to which the citizens' group has any objection until an opportunity has been afforded to the citizens' group to present its objections to the mayor's committee. The mayor's committee shall make the final decision as to the adequacy of the proposed program.

V. The contractual agencies, through their staffs, shall be required to meet regularly with the citizens' group and shall submit semiannual reports to the citizens' group evaluating their programs.

VI. Each citizens' group shall be consulted in all evaluation of the community action program conducted by the mayor's committee by its own staff or by independent evaluating teams. Reports of all evaluations made by or for the mayor's committee shall be submitted to citizens' groups at the same time as they are submitted to the contractual agencies.

VII. Each citizens' group shall continually evaluate all CAP programs operating in its neighborhood. It shall compile a semiannual evaluative report to the mayor's committee on the operation of all the contractual agencies in the neighborhood. All evaluations by citizens' groups shall be submitted to contractual agencies and to the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc.

VIII. Each citizens' group shall meet at least twice yearly with the staff and members of the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc.

IX. The mayor's committee considers the neighborhood citizens' groups as the official representatives of the mayor's committee at the neighborhood level. The citizens' groups will be consulted by the mayor's committee in determining the renewal of contracts with the various contractual agencies operating in the neighborhood.

X. Citizens' groups should accept the responsibility for the development of coordination of all services in the neighborhood to be accomplished through the neighborhood coordinator.

XI. The citizens' groups shall be evaluated by the mayor's committee on an annual basis for renewal of its formal designation.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD COORDINATORS TO THE CONTRACTUAL AGENCIES FURNISHING SPECIALIZED SERVICES TO THE NEIGHBORHOODS

The Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc. hereby adopts the following policy relative to the relation of neighborhood coordinators to the contractual agencies furnishing educational, employment, housing, health, family welfare, legal, and other specialized services for the neighborhoods. This policy, it is believed, will help achieve a workable, effective neighborhood program, and will help insure that the Pittsburgh community action program meets Federal, State, and local requirements for coordination and involvement of neighborhood people, including low-income families.

1. Each contractual agency will recognize the coordinating and leadership responsibilities of the neighborhood coordinator.

2. Before launching any program in a specific neighborhood, the contractual agency will plan the specifics of the program with the neighborhood coordinator and the recognized citizens' group with which he works.

3. The neighborhood coordinator and the citizens' group will recruit and train a responsible neighborhood committee to serve as citizen liaison arm to each contractual agency operating in their neighborhood. The membership of each committee will include low-income people. The committee will be a standing committee of the citizens' group and will concentrate its attention on the facets of neighborhood life of concern to the contractual agency it is assisting. This assistance will include: communications with the neighborhood, people, suggestions for improved or new programs, evaluation of services, and other help as needed.

4. Each contractual agency will designate a chief staff representative for the neighborhood who will be under its supervision. He will maintain regular communication with the neighborhood coordinator.

5. The contractual agency and its representative will work in cooperation with the neighborhood coordinator in their dealings with other contractual agencies or other aspects of the program in the same neighborhood. All matters of jurisdiction and coordination involving two or more agencies will be worked out with the neighborhood coordinator.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses received President's message on Vietnam.

Senate continued consideration of voting rights bill.

House passed Labor-HEW appropriations bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 8965–9012

Bills Introduced: 21 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1881–1901; and S.J. Res. 76.

Page 8967

Bills Referred: 10 House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Page 8965

President's Message—Vietnam: President transmitted message to Congress requesting appropriations of an additional $700 million to meet military requirements in Vietnam—referred to Committee on Appropriations. Pages 8963–8964

Hammarskjold Memorial: Senate adopted H. Con. Res. 305, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to designation of a grove of redwood trees as a memorial to the late Dag Hammarskjold. Page 8995

Vietnam Appropriations: By unanimous consent, it was agreed that when the bill providing special appropriations of $700 million for Vietnam military requirements is reported to the Senate, it shall immediately be made the pending business until disposed of; that there be 5 hours allocated to debate thereon, including any amendments, the time to be equally divided; and that immediately upon completion of consideration of such appropriation bill, Senate shall return to consideration of its unfinished business, S. 1564. Page 9022

Voting Rights: Senate continued its consideration of S. 1564, to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the U.S. (right to vote).

Majority leader announced the tentative intention of filing motion to invoke cloture on the bill on Monday, May 10. Pages 9012, 9014–9023

Program for Wednesday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 6:14 p.m. until noon Wednesday, May 5, when it will continue on S. 1564, voting rights.

Pages 9023, 9039

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

NASA AUTHORIZATIONS

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences: Committee began, in executive session, to mark up S. 927, fiscal 1966 authorizations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, but did not conclude action thereon, and recessed subject to call of the Chair.

APPROPRIATIONS—D.C.

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee began hearings on H.R. 6453, fiscal 1966 appropriations for the District of Columbia, receiving testimony from Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner, who was accompanied and assisted by other Commissioners and officials of the D.C. government.

Subcommittee will meet again tomorrow to hear D.C. officials on funds for recreational and educational facilities in the District.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Committee on Armed Services: Committee continued its joint hearings with the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, on S. 1771, fiscal 1966 authorizations for military construction, with testimony on proposed funds for Navy construction from Rear Adm. Harry Hull, Director, Shore Activities Development and Control Division, Office of Chief of Naval Operations, and Rear Adm. Peter Corradi, Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Hearings continue tomorrow on the Navy title of the bill.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Banking and Currency: Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization began hearings on titles II and IV of S. 1648, providing financial assistance for public works programs to alleviate unemployment in

Appendix

The "Hide-and-Seek" of Reserve Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I trust that Members of the House are well aware that a subcommittee of which I am the chairman, of the House Armed Services Committee, has been conducting hearings for several weeks now on Department of Defense's proposal to merge the Army Reserves into the National Guard.

As Alice in Wonderland remarked, in Lewis Caroll's classic, the more the subcommittee looks into the situation, "the curiouser and curiouser it gets."

In this regard, I would like to call attention to an excellent résumé of the subcommittee's hearings which was in the May 1 issue of the Journal of the Armed Forces. This article, aptly entitled "The 'Hide-and-Seek' of Reserve Merger," was written by the Journal's distinguished editor, Louis R. Stockstill.

Under unanimous consent, I am pleased to include the article into the RECORD herewith:

THE "HIDE-AND-SEEK" OF RESERVE MERGER

(By Louis R. Stockstill)

On the surface and to the average citizen (perhaps even to the average member of the Armed Forces), the Pentagon plan to merge the Army Reserve and National Guard could, and possibly does, sound unassailable.

It promises staggering benefits. The Defense Department says the plan will save millions of dollars, thousands of men, an enormous array of war machinery and, in the process, produce a stronger, better managed, better equipped Reserve, geared to the needs of today and tomorrow.

And this elite force, the Department of Defense argues, would replace an outmoded, overmanned, underequipped, double-managed structure built around a discarded post-World War II concept calling for total mobilization in the event of another, all-out, global war.

The plan and the promise constitute a grand design. And if the story ended there, the blueprint could be executed tomorrow with near unanimous enthusiasm and loud huzzas.

But, on Capitol Hill, where committees of both Houses have been probing all aspects of the proposal, some striking anomalies have emerged.

Not the least of these is the disclosure, little by little, of the furtive atmosphere in which the plan was put together. At times, details have bordered on the ludicrous; depicting high officials engaged in a game of hide-and-seek with no one quite certain who is "it."

This was particularly evident in the testimony of Maj. Gen. J. W. Kaine. Although General Kaine is Chairman of the General Staff Committee on Army National Guard and Reserve Policy, he wasn't officially informed about the plan until December 8, 4 days before the Pentagon press conference at which the proposal was made public by Secretary of Defense McNamara.

Earlier, General Kaine said he had heard rumors about the plan and had called Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, head of the National Guard Association, to inquire what if anything he knew about it. General Cantwell, he said, denied any knowledge of the plan.

Subsequent, General Kaine learned that General Cantwell had, in fact, been briefed on the concept "some days previously" but on a "close-hold" basis which prevented him from discussing it.

Congress is legitimately disturbed by this evidence of stealth, and particularly dismayed that the Pentagon would maneuver two senior officers into a position which would cause one—in the unvarnished language of Representative PORTER HARDY, Democrat, of Virginia—to "lie" to the other.

In the same pattern, and generating even greater congressional concern, the Army ignored the so-called "section 5" committees in developing the plan, and elected not to call on them to discuss the proposal until after it had been announced by Secretary McNamara.

Since the section 5 committees are charged by law with responsibilities in this area, Congress would have been galled by the action under any circumstances. But the House Armed Services Committee is doubly outraged by the act because it cautioned the Department of Defense less than 3 years ago to cease utilizing the section 5 groups after new policies are blueprinted and to bring them into the planning phase early in the game.

Most Members of Congress who are familiar with the specific language of the statutes governing the Reserve Forces, feel that the Department of Defense not only chose to sneer at the House committee's admonition, but to deliberately misinterpret the legal requirements by which the Department is bound.

Even if the letter of the law had been observed, however, numerous House and Senate Members are strongly of the opinion that the merger plan constitutes a structural and policy shift of such far-reaching import that Congress (with clear-cut constitutional responsibilities in the area) should have been called on to assess the proposal legislatively.

Instead, Secretary McNamara elected to execute the program administratively. To compound what senior Congressmen consider this "cardinal mistake," the Pentagon Chief rubbed a little salt in the already-raw wounds by informing the legislature there is nothing to stop him from going ahead with the merger unless the Appropriations Committees choose to limit Department of Defense spending in such manner as to require continued maintenance of both the Reserve and Guard.

This raised blood pressures in the legislative committees whose leaders are understandably angered by even the smallest hint that the purse string committees have any authority except to appropriate funds to carry into effect laws written by the legislative groups. Even though the Appropriations Committees frequently impose limitations on the expenditure of funds, the legislative committees have never become reconciled to this practice, and no Cabinet officer endears himself to the majority of the Congress by suggesting that he condones such action.

Secretary McNamara already had generated congressional animosity toward the proposed merger, however, even before he was called to the Capitol to answer preliminary questions about the plan.

During the December 12, 1964, Pentagon press conference in which he outlined the proposal, the Secretary tossed out the information that he also was taking steps to remove key Government officials, including Members of Congress from Ready Reserve status. The decision, affecting Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps reservists, as well as the Army, was unrelated to the merger plan, and has since been modified. Yet, as the Defense Department could have reasonably expected, it captured headlines around the Nation and—some Congressmen think—created the impression that Mr. McNamara was going to save millions of taxpayer dollars by shooing a crowd of freeloading legislators away from the public trough; thereby providing a stronger Army Reserve.

Whether this was the Defense Secretary's intention or not, numerous House and Senate Members believe it was. They credited Mr. McNamara with skillfully stage managing the news conference to create exactly the headlines which resulted.

Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana, who chairs the House Armed Services Subcommittee which has been probing the merger proposal, has labeled the coupling of the two unrelated subjects as "clever propaganda."

Representative WILLIAM H. BATES, Republican, of Massachusetts, told Mr. McNamara in a closed-door session that "Members appricate the advertising." What he really meant, of course, is that they do not appreciate the advertising.

The Pentagon Chief, in responding, said the merger was an Army problem exclusively, and the elimination of congressional Ready reservists was a "completely separate" matter.

Mr. BATES said, "When I read the statement in the Boston papers, I thought that was the only action you were taking, just the one that got the headlines."

Whatever Secretary McNamara's aim when he linked the two problems at his press conference, the end result was that he made Congress look bad. If this was his intention, it was a strategic blunder. If it is not what he intended, it is difficult to understand why the Secretary or his advisers failed to calculate the effect the announcement would have on the headlines.

Congress also has voiced concern about the speed with which Mr. McNamara bought the Army proposal.

Army Secretary Stephen Ailes has testified that Secretary McNamara had nothing to do with originating the plan and that he (Mr. Ailes) first presented the proposal to the Pentagon chief on December 11. Mr. McNamara announced his backing for the plan less than 24 hours later.

Here, too, there is an element of mystery. General Kaine testified that when he was called to the Pentagon to be briefed on the proposal on December 8, Secretary Ailes told him the press conference "already had been set."

General Kaine's testimony recalled to Chairman HÉBERT that he had been informed on or before the 8th of December that the plan would be unfolded at a press conference on the 19th (a date subsequently pushed up because of advance disclosure by the Reserve Officers Association of certain elements of the proposal).

The congressional hearings have not disclosed how it was possible to schedule a press conference before Secretary McNamara had even seen the plan. It can be expected that the Secretary will be asked to explain.

The oddity of this and other previously discussed aspects of the proposal, although they have little if any bearing on the merit or lack of merit of the merger, have not created the most favorable atmosphere for congressional consideration of the proposal.

At the same time, Congress has uncovered problems which raise specific questions about the validity of the plan, itself.

One, which has not been publicized but which could touch the very nerve center of the controversy, relates to Negro reservists and the authority of State Governors.

During Senate Preparedness Subcommittee hearings, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine, made some initial inquiries on the subject. She was told by Secretary McNamara that he recently had received a report from Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, that all Army National Guard units are now fully integrated.

Mrs. SMITH asked that information be furnished for the record giving a full breakdown of the number of Negro officers now serving in the National Guard in each of the Southern States.

The information subsequently supplied by the Department of Defense disclosed that no Southern State currently has a single commissioned Negro National Guardsman.

Under the merger proposal, neither commissioned nor enlisted reservists can transfer to the National Guard without the approval of the Governor of the State. Thus, unless the States in question should abruptly alter their present practice, the administration could be placed in the position of bolstering segregation.

With the Nation's attention already sharply focused on civil rights problems, this could be the Achilles heel of the entire merger proposal if someone decides to make an issue of it when the plan comes up for debate (as it inevitably must) on the House and Senate floor.

Just before Congress went into Easter recess, Chairman HÉBERT issued a statement recommending that, during the lull, Secretary McNamara review the record of the House hearings. The chairman said he thought Mr. McNamara would find "many reasons to pause and reconsider" the merger.

The Hébert committee resumed its consideration of the plan in a closed-door session immediately after the recess, and was due to hold a second executive session with Army Chief of Staff Gen. Harold K. Johnson as the Journal went to press.

It was expected that Secretary McNamara will be called to testify during the first week in May.

Historic Annapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, 1 week ago today, the Department of the Interior announced the recommendation of its Advisory Board on National Parks and Historic Sites that the historic district of colonial Annapolis be included in the program of registered national historic landmarks. The area to be included contains pre-Revolutionary buildings constructed on narrow streets which provide a charming view of an 18th century town. The area includes the Maryland statehouse, the oldest statehouse still in use in the United States, a Statehouse which once served our Nation as the Capitol of the United States. No other statehouse has ever had this distinction. That year was 1784. This year is 1965, and ther are many who wish to preserve this historic piece of our American past.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a fine article—written by J. William Joynes—on the planning and preservation of Annapolis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News-American, Apr. 18, 1965]

ABOUT 1,400 SEEKING A BETTER FUTURE FOR ANNAPOLIS

(By J. William Joynes)

"Hysterical Annapolis," is what some call the 1,400-member preservation society which is trying to save the city that often acts as though it has no desire to be saved.

Yet an architect and planning consultant, John Carl Warnecke, whose firm has been involved in development of Honolulu and Sacramento, recently warned the citizens of Maryland's capital city:

"If Annapolis doesn't strengthen the values it has, it will simply share the weakness of every suburban town in America."

"A better life can be realized," he said, "by building on the values of historic Annapolis.

"It can be a town where the daily routine is pleasurable, instead of filled with frustrations and marked by disorder." But he added: "The success or failure of any program will be determined by the local residents and what they want."

A chart on the wall of the Slicer-Shiplap House, however, lists the "obstacles and checkmakes" to any such future for the city which numbers more colonial-period buildings than any other area of comparable size.

The 1720 home, within a stone's throw of the Annapolis waterfront, which some would fill in for a parking lot, is the office of the dues-paying society formed 13 years ago to preserve the character of the old, historic area of the city.

The obstacles:

The city where the Continental Congress met in 1783 has no ordinance defining its historic district.

Historic Annapolis, Inc., a nonprofit group, is unable to provide architectural advice to assure good preservation to those willing to accept it.

Cultural groups are unaware of the purpose of modern preservation and believe Historic Annapolis, Inc., is absorbed with the dead past.

Present owners of many biuldings important to the Historic Annapolis program are uninterested in preservation.

Properties owned or leased by national commercial chains are eyesores.

Utility poles, hanging signs, billboards, and advertisements painted on houses are ugly.

Historic Annapolis, Inc., cannot buy important Annapolis buildings that come on the market.

The Annapolis business community is blind to the economic contributions of tourism and preservation.

Many local people believe Annapolis is an old, dirty, and obsolete city.

The U.S. Naval Academy does not recognize the Maryland capital city as a historical and educational center.

If Historic Annapolis, Inc., was given $10 million, there is no assurance that the city would accept the preservation society's program.

The checkmates to these obstacles are listed simply as research, public relations, community education, demonstration, and finances. But there is a lot more behind each.

Right now the Maryland capital, with the oldest State capitol still in legislative use, seems on the threshold of achieving the combined amenities of Annapolis that Mr. Warnecke says are unique.

The 1965 session of the Maryland General Assembly approved a bill to save from destruction a house built in 1763 by William Paca, one of Maryland's four signers of the Declaration of Independence and an early Governor. The house now forms part of Carvel Hall Hotel.

The house of delegates adopted a resolution requesting the mayor and city council and the citizens of Annapolis to regard any proposal that threatens destruction of the old city as an irreparable loss to the country and to urgently adopt a preservation ordinance to provide protection of the historic district.

The National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior has indicated that this month it might designate the old area of Annapolis as a national historic district that best exemplifies an American seaport of the colonial period.

The Maryland Senate adopted a resolution hailing this prospect as "a matter of much pride for Annapolis and the entire State of Maryland," and urges public officials and all residents of Annapolis to do all within their power to maintain the architectural integrity and present atmosphere of this fine old city."

But if the Maryland Legislature has officially recognized the historical significance of the city at long last, the Annapolis preservation group still has much to achieve with its own citizens.

The main problem, as most see it, is to foster better understanding.

"We're not trying to thrust our opinions on others," says Mrs. J. M. P. Wright, president of the historic group. "Let the town speak for itself—it's here."

Mrs. Wright, an off-and-on lifelong resident of Annapolis, is the wife of a retired naval officer.

"There is tremendous economic value to this city," says Gilbert Crandall, a native Annapolitan and graduate of St. John's College, who is chief of the tourist division, Maryland Department of Economic Development.

"The right kind of planning and preservation would boost the property value. It would attract new business as well as tourists. Manufacturers try to pick out nice, pretty towns. They don't want ugly places to locate.

"If only more people could see this," he adds.

One of those who have failed to see this—at least until recently, when it passed an ordinance limiting new buildings to 45 feet in height—is the mayor and Annapolis City Council, which last year issued permits for a 10-story motel on the Annapolis waterfront and a 7-story office building near the statehouse.

Historic Annapolis, Inc., feeling that a high-rise motel would dominate the city's skyline and damage the historic environment, had to raise some $2,000 for legal fees and court costs to fight the action.

The proposed office would have blocked a view of much of the town from the state house, where George Washington resigned

his commission as commander in chief of the Continental Army after the Revolution. A tour of restored Cornhill Street, once a slum and redlight district, raised the funds necessary to stop this particular modern encroachment.

Along Main Street, the principal shopping thoroughfare, some buildings have been refurbished in a manner in keeping with their historical period. The 1779 Maryland Inn is in such a process. The 1858 Opera House on Maryland Avenue has been converted into attractive offices. The 1820 city hall and firehouse is now a bookshop.

But other merchants have refused to cooperate in any way, resolutely reject any architectural advice.

On one recent occasion, for instance, an 1830–40 brick building was placed on the market for $65,000. The preservation society raised the money in 2 months, only to be refused the sale. The building at Francis and Main Streets is now a pile of rubble.

Other reasons are cited as setbacks also:

Some businessmen, say historic Annapolis members, depend almost solely on the Naval Academy. These built-in businesses have no concern for Annapolis, the town that was old when the Naval Academy was established as the Severn School.

Annapolis also has been compared with Georgetown, Md., once a dilapidated community on the fringe of Washington. When Washington government officials made it a bedroom community and restored many antique homes, values soared. Now whenever an Annapolis property comes up for sale, out-of-town speculators eagerly seek it in hopes that Annapolis will become the Georgetown of the Severn.

Warnecke referred to these efforts as a "few developers to reap shortrun profits for themselves at the expenses of longrun benefits for the entire community."

"If we could save our energy from these fights," says Mrs. Wright, "and feel free of the burden of raising money to fight court cases, we know we could contribute a great deal of good for the community."

Still the 1,400 members who pay $3 to $10 annually to support the work which they often feel is unwelcome and unappreciated have some notable accomplishments to their credit since the first 400 banded together in 1952.

It raised $23,000 to save the Charles Carroll-Barrister home and moved it to St. John's College campus.

It obtained $33,000 to buy the Slicer-Shiplap house, which now serves as its headquarters, and restore its exterior.

And it has obtained $75,000 from grants for a study of the market house and waterfront area which once made it one of the most important ports in Maryland.

Right now the preservation society is undertaking its biggest task—to raise $250,000 to save the William Paca house on Prince Georges Street, which makes up part of Carvel Hall Hotel.

Already it has raised $25,000, although the fund drive has not officially opened.

The State will purchase the newer addition to the hotel, made famous in a novel by the American Winston Churchill, which will be torn down to provide space for a cultural center and mall.

Tradition says that the circles and radiating streets of Annapolis inspired Pierre L'Enfant's plan for the new Federal City of Washington.

Wamecke, in his recent address, said that Annapolis can provide an example of an alternative way to build for contemporary living, "an opportunity to demonstrate to the Nation the value of our heritage and how we can preserve and build upon it."

Historic Annapolis, Inc., has been saying this since 1952. It hopes other Annapolitans will soon see it, too.

John I. Taylor, Great American, Will Be Missed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday a man who many of us counted as a true friend succumbed in Oklahoma City after a long illness. John I. Taylor was one of the best known and most respected leaders of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

My friendship for John Taylor might be considered rather short in the span of time because I came to know him and respect him only after he came to Washington in 1960 to serve as assistant legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation. But, during this relatively brief period, I had the opportunity of getting to know him as a truly great American whose strength of character and integrity was founded on a reverent belief in God. He also had the power of his convictions based upon a lifetime working near the soil as a farmer and representative of important farm organizations.

John Taylor could always be depended upon to be honestly helpful when any Member of Congress has the occasion to discuss legislative issues with him. He will be sorely missed by me and, I am sure, the other Members of Congress.

John Taylor lived life to its fullest and contributed substantially to making life more full for all with whom he came in contact. He seemed to have taken seriously the words of the poet William Cullen Bryant:

"So live, that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan which moves
To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go not, like the quarry slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
Like one that wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the AFBF Newsletter carries an announcement of John Taylor's death. For the information of his many friends, I am inserting that announcement at this point:

JOHN I. TAYLOR, LEADER IN FARM BUREAU, DIES

John I. Taylor—one of the best known and most respected of Farm Bureau's State and National leaders—died last Tuesday in Oklahoma City after a long illness.

Mr. Taylor served for many years as president of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau and as a member of Farm Bureau's national field crops advisory committee.

In March 1960, he joined the Washington staff of the American Farm Bureau Federation as assistant legislative director. His primary responsibility was in the field of land and water use.

During his 5 years in Washington, Mr. Taylor won the friendship and respect of man Senator, Representatives, officials of the executive branch, and representatives of natural resources groups.

He made a major contribution to the development of a wilderness bill, which Farm Bureau supported and Congress passed last year.

Mr. Taylor was a native of Pittsburg, Kans., and a graduate of Baker University. He began farming in Kansas in 1914 and operated farms and ranches in Oklahoma since 1924, except for a period in the early 1930's.

Mr. Taylor was elected president of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau in 1942 and served until 1953. He also served as president of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Co. In 1947 he helped to organize and became the first president of the Oklahoma Agricultural Advisory Council. He was a member of the first Oklahoma legislative study council.

He was a member of the special wheat committee named by AFBF President Edward A. O'Neal in 1943. He was a member of the AFBF national field crops advisory committee from its establishment in 1946 until September 1959, and twice served as the committee's chairman.

Mr. Taylor cooperated in the Nation's first complete upstream watershed development, the Sandstone project in Oklahoma.

At the time of his appointment to the AFBF staff on March 14, 1960, he was engaged in organization work for the National Cowboy Hall of Fame.

Mr. Taylor is survived by his wife, the former Joy Wallace, and two sons, J. Joseph and James C. Funeral services were held last Thursday at the First Presbyterian Church in Elk City, Okla., where he was an elder.

The Tower Substitute for the Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the Dallas Morning News of Friday, April 30, published an editorial on the Tower substitute for the voting rights bill which my colleagues may find of interest. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 30, 1965]

TOWER SUBSTITUTE

The News has said in the past, and will say again, that a new voting rights law is unnecessary. This is not to deny that discrimination has been practiced in some States to prevent members of minority groups from registering to vote and casting ballots. Nor do we maintain that fraud, trickery, and irregularities in voting have been entirely eliminated.

But there is ample law already on the books to deal with these problems, if State, local, and Federal officials would use the authority they already possess to deal with them. It appears, however, that this is not to be done. Caught in an emotional whirlwind and under heavy pressure from all sides,

Members of Congress seem determined to enact a new voting rights bill.

If we must have another law on the subject, at the very least that law should be constitutional, fair and aimed carefully to correct the problem at hand. It should not be of questionable constitutionality, punitive or so aimed that it is likely to create new problems and evils.

This is what Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas, is trying to achieve by offering a substitute for the administration's voting-rights proposal. His substitute may not be perfect, but it is a great improvement on the original.

Senator TOWER strongly supports the principle that the right to vote must be guaranteed to all citizens without discrimination. He also believes that the Constitution clearly grants to the individual States the right and responsibility to set voter qualifications. Finally, he believes that, while the Federal Government has no authority to establish or limit such qualifications, it does have the power, under the 15th amendment, to insure that whatever qualifications are established by the States must be equally applied and administered without discrimination.

The administration's voting-rights bill, says TOWER, would both exceed the limits of constitutional power in attempting to deal with part of the problem and fall short of exercising legitimate authority by ignoring other problems with respect to voting rights.

The administration's bill is excessive in that it would strike down voter qualifications and provide for Federal officials to take over the election and registration machinery in a handful of States. But it is deficient, and discriminatory, in that it would exempt most States from this type of regulation, even though denial of voting rights exists in those States, but in a lesser degree. It totally ignores voting abuses which are not directly related to discrimination on the basis of race.

TOWER's substitute bill would insure that the States could continue to set voter qualifications, but would provide the Federal Government with ample authority to guarantee that those qualifications are used fairly, uniformly and without discrimination. His substitute would also provide additional machinery for dealing with fraudulent voting in Federal elections. This is certainly a major improvement.

While on the subject of fraud, it is well to recall that, nearly 100 years ago, in 1871, Congress enacted a reconstruction voting-rights law which was very similar to, though did not go quite as far as, the administration's currently proposed law. The 1871 legislation led to so much election fraud, corruption, and other abuse that Congress was forced to repeal it in 1894.

Freedom for Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Indiana Order of Ahepa, Chapter No. 78, unanimously set out the following resolution supporting the self-determination for the people of Cyprus, and also urged the freedom of religion for the Republic of Turkey.

I am also including along with the resolution, a letter which I received from the Reverend Father Louis T. Greanias, pastor of St. Nicholas Hellenic Orthodox Church.

The resolution and letter follow:

RESOLUTION OF THE INDIANA ORDER OF AHEPA, CHAPTER No. 78

We, the members of the Gary, Ind., Order of Ahepa, Chapter No. 78, endorse the basic principle of U.S. foreign policy on self-determination for all peoples and earnestly urge our Government to fully implement and support this policy of self-determination for the people of Cyprus.

We further urge our Government to do all in its power to bring about freedom of religion in the Republic of Turkey.

We further urge our Government to do all in its power to bring about and to stop the persecution and exiling of the Christian people of Constantinople.

We further plea to reprimand the Turkish stand, and object to this inhuman expulsion of the Greek minority in Turkey, and for the denial, oppression, and stifling of religious freedom in Turkey and particularly against the seat of Eastern orthodoxy of the world in Constantinople.

Sincerely,

SPIRO CAPPONY,
President.

ST. NICHOLAS HELLENIC
ORTHODOX CHURCH,
Oak Lawn, Ill., May 4, 1965.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MADDEN: I am sure that you are aware of the fact that the Government of Turkey is persecuting the ecumenical patriarchate and the Greek minority of Istanbul. The Turkish Government is using the events in Cyprus as an excuse, for a long-planned program, to expel the Greek Orthodox from Istanbul. His All Holiness, Athenagoras A', is the spiritual leader of the Eastern Orthodox and his see has been in Istanbul (Constantinople) since A.D. 325. All Orthodox (over 200 million) look to the Phanar for spiritual leadership.

Too long our national leaders have kept quiet in the matter of this religious persecution. We speak about human rights, yet in matters such as this we keep silent.

As a priest, and one of the 5 million Greek Orthodox in this country, I urge you to be one of the leaders who will seek to redress this wrong and protect one of the strongholds of the Christian world. Our Nation, giving much financial help to Turkey, should insist that the ecumenical patriarch and the Greek minority not be persecuted and that the Treaty of Lausanne (of 1923) be enforced and strengthened.

Trusting you will find it right to help correct this injustice.

With every good wish.

Father LOUIS T. GREANIAS,
Pastor.

P.S.—I was formerly in Hammond, Ind., for 12 years at St. Demetrios.

Bank Merger Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the May 2, 1965, issue of the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., contains an editorial endorsing S. 1698, a bill recently introduced by the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. The editorial is entitled "Bank Merger Confusion," and I commend it to the attention of the Members of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times and Democrat, May 2, 1965]

BANK MERGER CONFUSION

When the owners of two banks wish to merge them, it may be for one—or more—of many reasons. One bank may be doing one kind of business predominantly, while the other may be in an entirely different line.

The loan limits of each bank alone may be too small to serve the needs of business in the community, whereas the larger limits of a merged bank might be adequate.

One bank may have a management succession problem. Or there just may not be enough business to absorb the overhead of two separate managements.

Regardless of the underlying reasons, it seems safe to assume that a bank merger is not adverse to the public interest unless it creates a monopoly. Even so, there might conceivably be circumstances where the noncompetitive factors favoring a particular merger might outweigh the resulting decrease in competition, if any.

In any event, the public agencies charged with the duty of examining and supervising banks are best able to decide whether, on balance, any merger is beneficial to the public or not.

Indeed, this is exactly what they were told to do by Congress when it enacted the Bank Merger Act of 1960. This act definitely gave the proper supervisory agencies the right to say the last word on all proposed bank mergers. They could ask the advice of the Department of Justice, but they weren't required to take it.

Not so, said the U.S. Supreme Court in the Philadelphia and Lexington, Ky., cases in 1963 and 1964, respectively, and in March 1965, a Federal district court in New York followed the same reasoning in an opinion which held that a bank merger consummated in September 1961, violated both the Sherman and Clayton antitrust laws.

Thus, the courts in effect gave the Department of Justice the last word on bank mergers, even those which took place 3 or more years ago. Bankers could well ask, "Who's in charge here—our supervisors or the Justice Department?"

Fortunately, there is a solution. Congress still makes our laws, even though the courts, under the guise of interpretation, sometimes seem determined to rewrite them.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, has introduced a bill, S. 1698, which in clear and unmistakable language makes bank mergers exempt from prosecution under the antitrust laws if they have been approved by the respective supervisory authorities.

As a matter of fairplay, everyone is entitled to know who his boss is. And Senator ROBERTSON's bill is a step in the right direction.

Oceanography in San Diego, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, oceanography in America is finally gain-

ing notoriety and momentum after years of being treated as the stepchild of the scientists' world. I am very proud of the advances contributed in this area by my home area of San Diego, Calif., and I ask my colleagues and the many citizens across the country who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to look at the outstanding record exemplified in the following article, entitled "Oceanography in San Diego, Calif.":

OCEANOGRAPHY IN SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Since Cabrillo discovered its huge natural harbor in 1542 San Diego has been identified with the sea.

Beautiful bays, broad beaches, and recreation centers form a part of its character. Another part involves its commercial and scientific interests. This booklet is designed to provide a glimpse of the many factors which makes the San Diego of today an ideal site for firms concerned with oceanography.

HALF A CENTURY OF EXPERIENCE

Nature began developing San Diego as a setting for oceanographic research about 20 million years ago. That was when the geography of the area began to take its present shape. Beaches and bays were formed and deep canyons cut into the shallow shore area to provide, in one location, an extreme diversity of water environments.

It was at the turn of the century that the exceptional adavntages of the San Diego area were discovered by scientists and oceanographic pioneers. In 1903 a zoology field station was established which was later to become Scripps Institution of Oceanography. And it was only a few years later—1906, to be exact—that a military communications facility was located here—the beginning of the Navy Electronics Laboratory on Point Loma. Since that time, military, commercial, and educational organizations have been centering their oceanographic interests and activities here.

A CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE SEA

Over the past years, San Diego has become a "Cape Kennedy" for ocean exploration. Its geographical position has made it an excellent jumping-off place for trips to arctic and tropic waters. Commercial fishermen make it their home base for long trips to the fishing grounds of South America. Manufacturing firms harvest the giant kelp, agar, and other plants, and minerals along its coasts. Universities and research firms find varied environments which permit a broad spectrum of study within a short distance of the classroom or laboratory. Military services find the conditions and facilities needed for the development and testing of new underwater devices. Together, these individual efforts form an intense interest in, and a fertile climate for, the study of the sea.

NATURAL RESOURCES

When Magellan named this the Pacific—"Peaceful" Ocean—he was describing perfectly the entrance to the sea at San Diego. Here, the largest and deepest of the oceans is steady and calm. Winter just means slightly cooler days and a water temperature in the low 50's. There is no season or schedule of operational days to contend with; for the most part, oceanographic projects go on 365 days a year.

The bottom: Off southern California there is a wide continental borderland, very rugged, and sloping seaward gradually to a depth of a mile. There it ends in a steep slope, beyond which the depth is 2 miles or greater. On the continental borderland is a series of ridges running northwest and southeast with elongated valleys between. The tops of some of the ridges project above the sea surface and form the long, narrow, high offshore islands. Where the ridges are not quite so high, they form several banks and lines of submerged rocks. In the valleys are basins which would be separate lakes if the sea level sank several thousand feet. The bottoms of some of these are more than a mile below sea level and more than half a mile below their own rims.

A number of submarine canyons have their heads close to shore, and can be traced, in some cases, to depths greater than 3,000 feet. On the tops of ridges and banks, the bottom is ledgy or composed predominantly of coarse material.

Coastal currents: Down to a depth of 300 feet, the California Current, several hundred miles wide, flows south along the coast north of Point Conception. South of the point, it flows in a southeasterly direction, mostly on the seaward side of the islands, at varying speeds, sometimes as high as half a knot. Nearer the shore a number of eddies are usually found, with the water circulating around them—usually at lower speeds. Very close to shore, from Ensenada to Santa Barbara, the flow is often northward at low speeds (especially in winter), and farther north this is known as the Davidson Current. Currents near shore are dependent on the positions of the eddies mentioned above and change direction frequently as the eddies form, shift position, and decay from week to week.

Water characteristics: The water of the surface varies in temperature from the 70's in summer to about 50° in winter. In protected areas the range is greater, and far from shore the summer temperatures are somewhat less. A remarkable feature is that, especially in spring and summer, water from a depth of 300 to 500 feet rises slowly to the surface to replace water blown offshore by the prevailing winds. This cooler water is primarily responsible for the mild summers of the coastal areas. And, because of the nutrients it carries, it greatly increases the local productivity of the sea—its capacity to support and encourage marine life.

Marine life: The waters off southern California support an abundance of marine life of many varieties. Along shore are the spectacular kelp beds, the agar weed harvested by diving, and many other interesting and often beautiful plants. Abalone and spiny lobster are taken by divers and fishermen. There are great pismo clams on the open beach and razor clams in the bays. Microscopic plant life is abundant. The small animals that feed on these plants in turn support commercial fisheries for anchovies, mackerel, and albacore, and, in good years, sardines. Sport fishing for barracuda, yellowtail, bonito, yellowfin tuna, and skipjack is usually good. Some years warm water encourages the more tropical fish to appear in numbers, while albacore are taken nearer or farther from shore, depending on the approach or recession of cooler water.

Mineral deposits: In San Diego, salt is produced by solar evaporation of sea water at a rate of 80,000 tons a year. No other mineral is at present mined from the sea here. Submarine oilfields are highly developed just outside the boundaries of San Diego County. On the continental borderland are many million tons of phosphorite which have so far resisted being mined at a profit, but are waiting only for improvements in technology and/or an increase in the price of phosphate rock produced on land. In the deeper water are the deposits of managanese with copper, nickel, and cobalt in the form of crusts and nodules which are also under consideration as a minable resource.

TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Both research and advanced industries operate best in a scientific environment. In addition to San Diego's ideal coastal setting, oceanographic programs enjoy the advantages of excellent academic support, association with firms in related fields, availability of extensive laboratory and field facilities, immediate access to a broad variety of technical suppliers, the accumulated technology of more than half a century of work in this field.

Academic support: Scripps Institution of Oceanography, a division of the University of California, offers both undergraduate and graduate courses in oceanography. Master's and doctor's degrees are offered. Undergraduate courses in oceanography and graduate courses in related fields are offered by San Diego State College, the University of San Diego, California Western University, and the University of California at San Diego. All colleges and universities in San Diego provide academic programs which can be pursued by personnel of local firms and organizations. San Diego institutions also are interested, and actively involved, in cooperative research programs with industry. In addition to the schools mentioned above, San Diego has five junior colleges and a number of technical schools.

Ocean-oriented activities: Of San Diego's community of advanced industries and research and development organizations, more than 50 have a direct interest in oceanography. Firms doing general oceanographic research on a contract basis for the Government and private organizations include Convair Division of General Dynamics, Lockheed-California Co., Bissett-Berman Corp., and Marine Advisers, Inc. Institutions concerned with oceanography, in addition to Scripps and NEL, include the Institute for Comparative Biology, San Diego State College, the Zoological Society of San Diego, and the Natural History Museum. Seawater conversion studies and projects involving a variety of approaches to the problem are being conducted by Havens Industries, Narmco Research and Development Division of Whittaker Corp., General Atomic Division of General Dynamics, and Geoscience, Ltd.

Related programs: More than 30 percent of all the tuna consumed in the United States comes through this port. Westgate-California Corp., located here, is the world's third-largest tuna processor. From San Diego, tuna boats range as far south as the coast of Chile, and north to Canada. This is the headquarters of the American Tuna Boat Association and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. Recently built Sea World—entertaining as well as educational—has provided an excellent laboratory for research programs, especially concerning mammals. These programs are conducted by the Mission Bay Research Foundation.

Food from the sea comes from plants as well as animals, and this is the location for firms such as Kelco Corp. and American Agar. The products they find in abundance along this coast are the giant kelp (*Macrocystis pyrifera*) and a bottom plant, agar (*Rhodophyseae*).

Research facilities: The variety of research facilities available to firms and institutions located here is too extensive to be thoroughly covered in this booklet. Chemical, biological, and neutron activation analysis services are offered right within the community. Computer time may be contracted for through institutions or private firms. Computer installations include eight IBM 650's, two IBM 1401's, two IBM 350 Ramacs, IBM 7090, IBM 704, IBM 105, Remington Rand SS-80, Burroughs 220, National Cash Register 304, and Control Data Corp. 1604 and 160. Environmental test facilities such as Convair Marine Sciences Towing Basin are availabe for contracting to other firms and to Government agencies for test programs.

Libraries: The accumulated knowledge of the work done in this field is available to firms in San Diego through the library facilities of the various firms and institutions. The Scripps Institution library contains over 38,000 volumes, 70,000 reports and re-

prints, 2,000 serials and a large collection of charts. University of California at San Diego has in excess of 175,000 volumes and 5,000 periodicals. NEL library shelves hold approximately 30,000 books, 30,000 scientific publications, and 80,000 technical reports, plus several thousand maps and charts and an extensive microfilm collection.

To aid firms and Government agencies in keeping pace with developments in the ocean sciences, Mission Bay Research Foundation has established the Oceanic Coordinate Index. Every 69-day period, journals covering the ocean sciences are indexed by computer. Articles are microfilmed and copies are made available to subscribers. Reports and proceedings of meetings will be added to the index as required. The index is published in San Diego.

Support facilities: Piers, docks, ships, and shipbuilding are part of the environment in San Diego. Oceangoing vessels, from dories to commercial freighters, are built here by firms such as National Steel and Shipbuilding, Kettenburg Boat Works, Campbell Machine, San Diego Marine Construction, and Tatco Shipbuilding Corp. Builders, chandlers, repair and service firms provide the complete support required for comprehensive oceanographic work. Diving firms oriented to the commercial as well as the recreational market are located throughout the county. Firms specializing in underwater photography and the development of underwater photographic equipment are also headquartered here.

HUMAN RESOURCES

For the past half century, San Diego has been attracting top scientific and technical people until, today, it has one of the highest concentrations of oceanographic talent in the world. Advanced programs in oceanography and related fields have, of course, been a key factor in drawing people to this community. Also important in recruiting and holding top talent have been San Diego's academic-cultural environment, beautiful year-round climate and variety of recreational activities.

The more than 6,000 scientists and engineers in this community also have extensive opportunities for graduate work at the University of San Diego, San Diego State College, California Western University, and the University of California at San Diego.

Average age of residents is 26.7 years. Educational level is high (the average educational attainment in San Diego is 10.7 years) and the area's school system is ranked among the finest in the Nation. Labor unrest is minimal, indicative of a realistic and healthy labor-management relationship.

Kansas State Chamber of Commerce Supports Legislation To Provide Credit for Equivalent State Taxes for Amounts Paid Under Federal Stamp Tax or Conveyance of Realty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, I introduced H.R. 7478, which seeks to amend the Internal Revenue Code so that any State which has a State stamp tax on the conveyance of realty will receive a credit on the Federal stamp tax for that purpose. This will permit States which impose such a tax to have an additional source of revenue. It will not increase the taxload for the individual, but simply shift the tax from a Federal levy to a State levy by means of a credit.

The Kansas State Chamber of Commerce had pledged its support of this legislation and is encouraging the chambers of commerce of the individual cities in Kansas to support the bill, also.

An item expressing this support was carried in the March–April edition of the KCCE News, the official publication of the Kansas Chamber of Commerce executives. Under leave to extend my remarks, this item follows:

PROPOSED CHANGE IN FEDERAL STAMP TAX ON CONVEYANCE OF REALTY WARRANTS SUPPORT

In connection with its study of overlapping taxes, the National Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has recommended that the Federal stamp tax on realty conveyances be repealed, effective after a 3-year period during which States might enact such taxes to take over this revenue source. Some groups, including the Kansas State Chamber, have endorsed the general idea but suggested an alternative procedure—amending the Federal law to provide a credit for amounts paid under equivalent State laws.

A bill to provide the credit for equivalent State taxes (H.R. 7478) was introduced by Representative CHET MIZE, of the Second Kansas Congressional District, on April 14, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. We believe in this proposed legislation and suggest that local chambers throughout the State urge their Congressmen to support it.

Mr. Hosmer's Plan To Retain Sound U.S. Coinage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], recently suggested a plan to avoid the application of Gresham's law during the forthcoming transition period to reduced intrinsic value coins. On April 19, the Phoenix Gazette editorially commented on the suggestion as follows:

THAT "FUNNY" MR. HOSMER

All things being equal, we can assume that the Great Society's team of trained-seal economists will now proceed to make Representative CRAIG HOSMER, (Republican, of California), a figure of fun for his suggestions that depleted, and non-radio-active uranium—a dab of it—be substituted for silver in our coins.

In a massive wave of propaganda, the administration has endeavored to "prove" to the citizenry that it is immaterial whether our coins have any intrinsic value or not. "It's what they will buy that counts" is the noble, if somewhat irrational, logic that is spouted in defense of this theory.

Quite apart from the fact that Representative HOSMER's suggestion is practical from a production and usage standpoint, it is an encouraging indication that there is at least one legislator in Washington who, despite the Great Society's bland dismissal of 3,000 years of historic precedent, deosnt believe that Gresham's law has been mysteriously repealed while we were all out to lunch.

This economic axiom holds that bad money drives out good, and that resorting to coins with little, or no, intrinsic value will simply compound our silver crisis by luring all existing coins underground. This has been the fate of every debased currency in the history of the world, the administration's "tut-tutting" notwithstanding.

By pegging the price of depleted uranium at a price comparable to silver, this debasement would not occur and, since the United States has the only supply of such material, we would not be subjected to foreign machinations calculated to undermine its value.

Because all of these stamps Representative HOSMER as being old-fashioned enough to fear the consequences of the Government's fondness for "funny money," his suggestion will undoubtedly be laughed into oblivion. But we would feel more comfortable if there were more of his type prowling the Washington scene these days.

Registration of the Abraham Lincoln Home and the Lincoln Tomb as National Historic Landmarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1965, in a ceremony marking the registration of the Abraham Lincoln Home and the Lincoln Tomb as national historic landmarks, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the State of Illinois, the Honorable PAUL FINDLEY, delivered an address at the Lincoln Home in Springfield, Ill. I am pleased to insert this stirring and significant tribute to Mr. Lincoln into the RECORD and urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

ADDRESS OF HON. PAUL FINDLEY, CONGRESSMAN FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Distinguished guests, my fellow citizens, I am grateful to have this opportunity to take part in the marking of the Abraham Lincoln Home and the Lincoln Tomb as registered national historic landmarks.

I am here because the divine providence whichever attended Lincoln gives me the privilege of representing the Lincoln district in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Lincoln said: "Here I have lived for a quarter of a century and have passed from a young to an old man. Here my children were born."

Lincoln was speaking, of course, of Springfield, the broader home, but this structure was where he and his family lived most of that quarter century.

He entered this home a little known struggling lawyer. He emerged the President-elect of the United States.

Before he entered he had widened the frontiers of the United States with his own ax. After he emerged he saved this widened Nation from internal destruction and in this chore the sword replaced the ax.

A roughhewn product of prairie timber, Lincoln possessed intelligence, perception, and wisdom exceeding Solomon.

A man of limited means—this was the only home he ever owned—Lincoln enriched our national storehouse beyond calculation.

A man of great physical proportions and strength, he resorted to the pen in order to accomplish the greatest feat of his life, striking the irons of bondage from his fellow man.

Although he was not identified by membership with any church, he displayed Christ-like attributes in his own lifetime, and in memory he has become a towering secular saint.

Long ago he surpassed Washington as first in the hearts of his countrymen.

His travels were limited to the area between the Mississippi River and the Atlantic coast, but his fame has spread far beyond. He is today the best known and most revered world figure in all history except Christ himself.

He is the preeminent hero of mankind.

And this was his home.

We stand on hallowed ground. This is the rare and rich homestead in which Lincoln the man, the husband, and the father accumulated and refined the resources which enabled him to climb to that highest of all pinnacles in service and achievement.

Conservation Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the fight to conserve our Nation's great natural resources requires the concerted efforts of all segments of our society. One of the most important phases of the conservation battle is an informed public opinion.

When informed of the facts of individual conservation needs, citizens of this country have made their desires for action known to public officials at all levels of government. In recognition of this service and in honor of a great press leader for conservation, the Scripps-Howard newspapers have established the Edward J. Meeman Award to newspapermen who have advanced the cause of conservation.

It pleases me to point out that one of the winners of this award is from my home State, Mr. William P. Lindley, associate editor of the Birmingham Post-Herald. Mr. Lindley was cited for his editorials to preserve Birmingham's park space. Another winner is well known to many of us concerned with conservation matters, Mr. William Steif of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance here in Washington.

The following article lists all the winners and indicates the wide range of the conservation effort in the Nation's press:

AWARD WINNERS HELP PRESERVE THE GREAT OUTDOORS

Winners of the first Edward J. Meeman Conservation Awards to newspapermen for distinguished work in writing on conservation published in 1964 were announced today by the Scripps-Howard Foundation. The awards are accompanied by cash prizes totaling $5,000.

First prize of $1,000 went to Stuart O. Hale, outdoor writer of the Providence, R.I., Journal and Evening Bulletin.

Six second-place awards, each worth $500, were made to:

Fred V. H. Garreston, Oakland, Calif., Tribune; Marving Garrett, the Fort Worth Press; Anthony Higgins, Evening Journal, Wilmington, Del.; Fred Jones, the Pittsburgh Press; James W. Kimball, Minneapolis Tribune; and William Steif, Scripps-Howard newspaper alliance, Washington.

Ten third-place awards of $100 each were awarded to:

Alexander Brook, Kennebunk, Maine, Star; Joseph C. Jahn, Suffolk County (Long Island) News; Charles E. Jones, Times Record and Roane County Reporter, Spencer, W. Va.; Thomas Koenninger, Centralia, Wash., Daily Chronicle; William P. Lindley, Birmingham Post-Herald; Frank E. Moore, the Daily Facts, Redlands, Calif.; Don Oakley, Newspaper Enterprise Association; Keith Ozmore and Jim Carroll of the former Houston Press, an award to each; and Mel Ruder, Hungry Horse News, Columbia Falls, Mont.-

BOND ISSUE WON

In his top prizewinning entry, the judges said, Hale "used almost every news, feature, and editorial department of the paper in an appeal to the people of Rhode Island to approve a $5 million green acres bond issue. This was climaxed by the appearance on the Sunday before election of a 12-page special magazine, with color pictures and without advertising, in which all editorial matter was gathered and written by Hale. The theme was 'Little Time Remains To Save What We Have.'"

The bond issue carried overwhelmingly against strong opposition.

One of Hale's stories imagined a teacher of the near future taking her class to a museum. "In glass cases were stuffed, four-legged creatures. 'These are animals,' she said. 'Once they were quite common here but they live only in some sections of the midwest now'."

Following are capsule descriptions of the six second-place winners:

DIRECTS PROGRAM

Garretson was recognized for his role in what is now known as the "Save the Bay" conservation drive. "His hundreds of stories," said the judges, "have caused unparralleled interest in keeping what's left of San Francisco Bay as nature created it, and great strides were made in 1964."

Without his perception, the bay was headed for an eventual future as just another mud flat.

Garrett's honor stemmed from his work as director of the Texas-wide soil and water conservation awards program of the Fort Worth Press, now in its 20th year, in which the press, with the help of cosponsors, has distributed cash awards and trophies totaling more than $150,000. He also "writes and fights in every field of conservation." Garrett's stories focused on farmers' struggles to rebuild the wornout soil of Texas.

Chief among the many efforts of Anthony Higgins was his campaign to nail down for the acquisition of green space, some of the moneys to be received by the State of Delaware on capital gains of General Motors stock divested by the Du Pont Co. on order of Federal courts. Success came when the legislature authorized $3,250,000 from the fund to buy lands, waters and marshes. This can be matched with an equivalent sum from the land and water conservation fund.

Higgins has been a leader in the fight to make Assateague Island a national seashore.

Jones was honored for his series, "What Project 70 Means to You." It was a major factor in the passage of Pennsylvania's biggest conservation program by only 113,000 votes out of 2.2 million cast. The project was so-called because it provided for the expenditure of $70 million by 1970 for conservation.

Jones also did much of the work which put a model strip-mining law on his State's books, and in 1964 acted as a watchdog to see that the law was enforced.

DEFENDS FOREST

Kimball was cited for wielding "a trenchant pen which came to the defense of a wonderful region. The region was the Superior National Forest where on January 12, 1965, Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman issued an order withdrawing two-thirds of this area from timber-cutting. Kimball had written that this area wasn't being preserved as most conservationists supposed, and demanded real protective measures.

"Without Jim Kimball, this could not have taken place," wrote Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY.

Steif covers the all-important national conservation front in the Nation's Capital and during 1964 lost no opportunity to bring conservation issues to public attention through stories and editorials. He played an important part in Scripps-Howard's successful campaign for the wilderness bills, spotlighting efforts to put loopholes into the measure. He pointed out the need for creation of a land and water conservation fund and for saving the remnants of the coastal redwoods in California.

Walker Stone, editor in chief of Scripps-Howard and a trustee of the Scripps-Howard Foundation, announced that response to the awards was so enthusiastic that the trustees have approved a second competition. Entry deadline is February 15, 1966.

Conservation for the purposes of the Meeman Awards is limited to soil, water, forests, vegetation, wildlife, scenery, and open space. Edward J. Meeman, editor emeritus of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, is conservation editor of Scripps-Howard.

Let's Remove the Auto Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, one of the gravest responsibilities of our Government today is to insure the continued growth and vitality of our economy.

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson wisely called for a substantial cut in excise taxes, so as to boost the economic growth rate by leaving more actual spending power in the hands of the American consumer.

It seems to me that a very good place to begin would be to remove the burdening impediment imposed by the 10 percent excise tax on automobiles. I have today introduced a bill for this purpose.

Few people realize just how truly vital a part of our economy the automotive industry is or how significant a drag on our total economy these taxes constitute.

Let us consider a few elemental facts:

One dollar out of every five spent in retail establishments in the United States is spent for automotive products.

Of every six American businesses, one deals in automotive goods or services.

Of every seven workers in this country, one is employed in the highway transport industries.

Of every five U.S. families, four own automobiles.

To most of these families, the automobile is not a luxury. It is not merely a useless bauble or status symbol. It is a necessity. It takes one of the largest single shares of the family's income, and a Bureau of Public Roads study shows that of all automobile trips taken by the average family, nearly half are for the specific purpose of earning a living.

Except in the case of pure luxuries or commodities in short supply, the excise levy long has been recognized as the most regressive form of taxation.

In considering the move to eliminate this tax, we should examine its origin. Excise taxes were imposed during World War II and the Korean war in an effort to discourage consumer demand for certain consumer goods and services.

It then was the official national policy to discourage unnecessary travel. Remember the patriotic slogan which asked: "Is This Trip Really Necessary?" But now contrast this with the situation today when the President is deliberately trying to encourage domestic travel through his "See America" program.

In an effort to ease the wartime burden on our transportation facilities, taxes were imposed not only on automobiles but on rail, bus and airline fares.

Yet in 1962 the 10-percent tax on rail and bus fares was eliminated, and the 10-percent rate on air travel was cut in half.

Thus automobile transportation alone still must bear the peak excise tax levies imposed as a result of wartime emergencies. This seems neither reasonable nor fair.

It is not fair to the 7.5 million persons who buy new cars each year. Each will have to pay, on the average, $225 in excise taxes.

Nor is it fair to the 14 million people who annually buy used cars, because experience has demonstrated that when taxes are eliminated on new autos, the price of used cars also drops. In England in 1962, a reduction of 12½ percent in the price of new automobiles promptly brought about a 10-percent reduction in the prices of 2-year-old cars.

Clearly it is not fair to the automotive industry, which presently accounts for approximately 15 percent of our gross national product and gives employment to 10 million Americans. Certainly we should not, as a matter of competitive equity, continue to handicap such an important segment of our economy by making it the only industry in the transportation field which still must bear the full weight of wartime excise levies.

Lastly, it is not fair to our Nation as a whole, for by keeping these and similar taxes in effect, we are simply stifling our own national economic growth.

As we all remember, the Congress last year enacted an $11 billion reduction in personal and corporate income taxes. At the time, economic experts told us that we could expect a stimulus to the economy of about three times the amount of the annual reduction. And experience is proving them right.

Elimination of the 10-percent excise tax on new cars could be expected to amount to a reduction in taxes of about $1.7 billion a year. Using the same multiplier formula as was applied to the income tax cut, this $1.7 could be expected ultimately to add about $5 billion to our gross national product.

At present the Congress is considering what sort of health warning, if any, should be applied to packages of cigarettes. I do not know how this particular question finally will be resolved. But if such a warning is required, it might be appropriate to impose on all excise tax documents a similar precautionary statement: "Warning: Continued use may be injurious to our country's economic health."

Let us eliminate this tax and unleash the pent-up buying power it represents.

"Buy It, Fly It"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, May 1, the Fleet Reserve Association commenced their successful and commendable Operation Red, White, and Blue for the fifth year. The idea was first conceived by Parker J. Stahnke, FTC, U.S. Naval Fleet Reserve, a member of the La Mesa Branch 139, Fleet Reserve Association, in my congressional district. I believe that the significance of May 1 as their starting date is greater this year than ever before. May 1 is known as May Day. The international distress call for oceangoing vessels is also May Day. The celebration of the Communist world occurs May 1.

The flag I have had flown to present them was flown over the U.S. Capitol as a symbol of our determination to thwart the aims of aggression everywhere. I am hopeful that the Communists will find our May Day, devoted to creating greater respect for our flag, a "May Day" signal of distress for aggressors who futilely hope to divide and conquer the free world.

It is fitting and appropriate that we regularly observe Loyalty Day on May 1, as it gives us an opportunity to recall just what the history of our glorious flag has been and why it is important that we fly the flag, not only from public buildings but from private flagstaffs as well.

To me it is a source of pride that the people of San Diego County have purchased 250,000 flags. The Fleet Reserve's nonprofit program, I know, was largely responsible for stirring up interest in owning and displaying the flag, and I want to add my appreciation and thanks for their fine program.

I am hopeful that this year their idea will spread further and faster than ever before, so that by Flag Day on June 14, millions of Americans will own and display their Nation's banner. "Buy It; Fly It;" that should be the credo for all of us who realize that the courageous men in Vietnam are fighting today, just as the heroes of Iwo Jima, Normandy, Belleau Wood, and San Juan Hill fought, to preserve the right to fly this flag in freedom. We have the right. Let us do it and show the world that Americans know what freedom means.

Poland's Constitution of 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Monday, May 3, 1965, carried an editorial on the occasion of the 174th anniversary of Poland's Constitution of 1791.

I certainly agree with the thought and sentiment expressed in the editorial, especially that part that states:

So long as there is an individual with Polish blood in his viens anywhere, the cause of Poland will not be lost.

The editorial follows:

MILESTONE IN POLAND'S STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

Another 3d of May, comparable to America's Fourth of July, has come to Poland, but little or no progress has been recorded during the past year to advance the cause of independence in this enslaved land. But we may be certain on the basis of Polish tradition there has been no diminution of hope on this important milestone in the history of Poland.

For it was on May 3, 1791, just 174 years ago today, that the Sejm or Diet adopted the Constitution which proclaimed to the world that all power in civil society is derived from the people, thus striking a blow for freedom not only in the land of Pulaski and Kosciuszko, but in other countries of Europe, then as now, under the heel of tyrants.

The Constitution of 1791 of Poland was modeled after the American and French documents, but its impact was shortlived, for in 1796 Poland was partitioned a third time by its powerful neighbors. Not until 1919, after the First World War, was Poland able to cast off its chains and enjoy two short decades of freedom before the madmen in Berlin and Moscow deprived it of its independence again. And when Hitler went down in ignominious defeat, Stalin, through force and conniving, imposed his will on the stricken country, installing a puppet regime, which continues in power in Warsaw.

Thus, the struggle of 30 million Poles at home, 7 million Americans of Polish extraction, and other millions, scattered around the globe, goes on. Successive generations of Poles have carried on and the present one is meeting its obligations in full. So long as there is an individual with Polish blood in his veins anywhere, the cause of Poland will not be lost.

The people of Poland have demonstrated repeatedly that time always works for them. For example, 123 years elapsed between the third partition of Poland in 1796 and its restoration in 1919. That is a long time to dream and to struggle, but the people of Poland persevered and they will again, if

necessary, although it is fervently hoped the delay will not be nearly so long in the current eclipse.

The new masters of the Kremlin know the liberation of Poland is inevitable. The only question is the timing.

So long as Poland is enslaved or, for that matter, any country, the United States is in jeopardy.

Let's Stop Blatant Evasion of Our Tariff Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the intelligent plea of Mr. Gil Dietz, of the Muscatine, Iowa, Journal, in an article published on April 7, 1965.

Continued violations of our tariff laws has created serious economic problems in Muscatine and Washington Counties in southwest Iowa.

The article follows:

LET'S STOP BLATANT EVASION OF OUR TARIFF LAWS

(By Gil Dietz)

Buttons without holes pose a serious threat to the present button industry of Muscatine.

The buttons without holes are Japanese and Italian gimmicks which have found a loophole in the U.S. tariff laws.

It works this way:

Unfinished plastic button blanks may be shipped into this country under a tariff schedule which is only about one-fourth as high as that which is charged for finished buttons.

Button blanks are round disks of unpolished plastic with flat plane surfaces. They must be tooled, buffed, and drilled with thread holes to be finished for use as buttons. These are the processes now done in the Muscatine button factories.

About 3 years ago, the foreign manufacturers of plastic button blanks discovered a loophole in our tariff laws. They found they could do the shaping of the button and the buffing in their own factories—everything except for the drilling of the holes—and still export them to the United States under the same law tariff as that charged for button blanks. They are not taxed as finished buttons simply because the holes haven't been drilled.

The U.S. Tariff Commission has called buttons without holes "rate avoidance devices."

Most of the work has been done on these buttons before they reach the United States. A button factory isn't needed to complete the process. Any jobber could set up a hole drilling operation to complete the imports and he would be in the button business.

If button manufacture becomes nothing but the operation of hole drilling machinery, this industry and its employment is likely to disappear.

An example of this peril (according to the Button Division of the Society for the Plastics Industry) is the stated intention of a very large Italian button manufacturer to double its production and massively enter the U.S. button market with the tariff avoidance device, and to ship hole drilling machines to the United States as a part of the program.

The buttons without holes were unknown in 1960. Some 50,000 gross were imported in 1962. The number jumped to 1,800,000 gross in 1963, and 4,320,000 gross in 1964.

The button industry now employs about 350 persons in Muscatine. Several thousand persons were employed years ago when buttons were made from shell, but employment has been reduced gradually due to a combination of factors. Fewer people are employed here now in the making of buttons because of the imports, and because of the conversion to plastics and modern technology which has revolutionized the industry. Some shell buttons are still made here, but most of the local work is in the high-speed machine production of plastics.

Because of their cheap price, the foreign-made buttons without holes are a serious threat to what remains of the local button industry.

Nevada: Scenic Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, the State of Nevada is known far and wide as the State which draws millions of tourists each year who come to try their luck on the gambling tables. It is also known as the Silver State, out of whose mineral-rich land came the gold and silver which helped finance the Civil War and build the city of San Francisco. But there are other attractions in the State which offer a myriad of activities to whet the taste of any palate.

This address is timely because we are all concerned about the great outflow of American dollars abroad. Americans take trips to Europe, Mexico, and Canada each year, leaving behind the treasures of historic value in these United States. President Johnson and many of you have expressed interest in a "See America First" campaign, so in this respect, I would like to point out some of the attractions of Nevada which would delight the tourist.

Nevada has a culture rich in the heritage of the West. It is a land of contrasts where lush evergreens and mountain lakes and streams bend to meet the low desert valleys. From its hills, gold and silver were drawn and great cities arose, literally, overnight. Today, remnants of these cities stand as ghost towns. Among them are Virginia City, home of the Comstock lode, and Goldfield, Tonopah, and Manhattan.

Recreation areas abound—the many lakes and streams provide good fishing and boating as well as other water sports. Lake Meade, a short drive from Las Vegas, offers great bass fishing. It is one of the largest manmade lakes in the world. One of the world's highest lakes is a short distance from Reno. Lake Tahoe's beautiful setting was compared to Italy's Lake Como by Mark Twain. He said Tahoe was far more spectacular. Pyramid Lake, also close to Reno, is a mysterious body of water, which is said to have a secret outlet to the Pacific. In its center is a perfect pyramid formation and the lake's situation in the center of the barren desert gives it the austere appearance of Egyptian terrain. The Walker, Mohave, and Topaz Lakes also provide good water sports.

Nevada is a hunter's dream. Antelope hunting is permitted on a limited scale. Deer hunting is also in great abundance through most of the State. Duck hunting is great sport, especially near the wildlife refuges of Fallon, Overton, and Yerington. Other game and waterfowl are also abundant.

For the camper, either the cool Sierra Nevada Mountains or the warm desert provide for rugged outdoor living.

To the skier, the mountain areas near Reno and Las Vegas offer some of the best skiing in the country. Large, modern lifts sweep the skier as high as 11,000 feet.

For general sightseeing, all of the State has a wide diversity of offerings, depending on the tourist. In eastern Nevada, Lehman Caves provide one of the world's largest collections of stalactites and interesting fossil remains. This part of the State also includes the oldest living thing in the world—the bristlecone pines—which date to the time before Christ. Near here is Mount Wheeler Peak, one of the tallest peaks on the continent. Scenic Mount Wilson Canyon, near Yerington, is a camper's paradise.

In the Black Rock Desert, geysers spout warm water. Old pioneer trails are still in evidence in the Red Rock Canyon. Hoover Dam offers one of the most spectacular sights in the country. It is cut into a red rock gorge and for many years stood as the highest dam in the world. Death Valley, one of the continent's lowest points is a marvel, a beautiful desert scene beyond comparison. Other breathtaking sights are Cathedral Gorge, Beaver Dam, and the Valley of Fire. The Beowawe Geyser is the largest active geyser outside Yellowstone Park. Also of wide interest are the active copper pits and iron ore mines in eastern Nevada.

The Indians and their heritage are well preserved in the State. Many of the tribes live on well-kept reservations and still practice their native artistic skills of basket weaving and blanket making. Near Las Vegas, petroglyphics have been found in their original form.

And, of course, the cities of the State are vacationlands in themselves. Reno, proudly boasting itself as "The Biggest Little City in the World," is set in a beautiful valley in the magnificient Sierra Nevada's. Las Vegas, the State's largest city is in a hot, dry climate—perfect as a health resort. Carson City, the State's capitol is rich in history. Boulder City is a green oasis in the desert. Gardnerville and Minden are the "Garden Spots" of the State with their green bountiful lands. Fallon and Yerington are seats of productive and beautiful farmlands. Both are sheltered by high mountains in the midst of valleys and winding rivers. Ely and Elko call the hunters and campers to the rugged outdoors.

This is only a small part of the great scenic wonder of the State of Nevada and only one of the many States which

has its splendor to share with the people of this land and of other countries. Nevada is only one of 50 reasons why Americans should make a special effort to see America first. Thus, our money would stay at home and our citizens would find greater appreciation for these United States.

Those Right-To-Work Myths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, if my mail these days is a typical reflection of mail being received by my colleagues, they are being fed more bunk than substance on 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

President Johnson aptly described 14 (b) in his state of the Union message as a device which results in conflicts that divide Americans in the various States.

Small, selfish interests have carefully developed and propagated hobgoblin myths about 14(b).

My own progressive State of Wisconsin has not so much as given a nod to the misnamed "right to work" law permitted by 14(b) of Taft-Hartley. And, I daresay, the workingmen of my State, among whom I am proud to number myself, enjoy more freedom and more real benefits, than workingmen in most States that have enacted misnamed "right to work" laws.

The do-gooders who proclaim they are defending the rights of the workingman, when they protest repeal of 14(b), do protest too loudly.

The Machinist, the weekly newspaper of the International Association of Machinists, of which I am a member, presents in its May 6 issue a full page of facts pertinent to right-to-work myths.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include that report in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks:

THOSE RIGHT-TO-WORK MYTHS

Myth: These laws protect a worker's right to work.

Fact: Even the stanchest supporter of these laws ducks away from this claim—he lets the misleading title catch the flies. A right-to-work law protects no one's job; it creates none, and it contains no provision whatsoever relating to employment as a right in itself.

Myth: A right-to-work law brings industry into a State.

Fact: This is a way of saying that States should compete with one another until the State which achieves the dubious distinction of having the poorest conditions, lowest wages, and weakest unions is rewarded with new industry. The fact is, stable industries want no part of such a State nor of such a law. Stable industries locate where people have money to buy what they make. Whenever a business is attracted by the lure of cheap labor and a right-to-work law it reflects no credit to the community, contributes little to economic progress, and can be lured away just as easily by a gimmick elsewhere.

Myth: Right-to-work laws protect the civil rights and widen the job opportunities of Negroes and other minorities.

Fact: The high-sounding label provides no civil rights, employment rights, nor any other right. In all 50 States the boss does the hiring. Most of the 19 right-to-work States are in the South. Did right-to-work help? Actually, right-to-work helps block union contracts which provide job security, seniority, and other protections for all workers. The most active supporters of these laws are also the most violent opponents of equal rights and equal opportunity.

Myth: Right-to-work brings labor peace.

Fact: One of the surest ways to bring about unrest and dissention among a plant's workers and unending conflict between a union and management, as well as turmoil in the community, is to enact a right-to-work law. With such a law there can be no assurance of unified, responsible unions. There can be no guarantee of industrial peace. And strikes, work stoppages, and internal chaos are the fruits of these laws. Most large corporations and most industrial relations experts are strongly opposed to such laws because they bring not peace, but conflict.

Myth: Right to work gives workers the right of choice.

Fact: Such a law actually denies the right of choice to the worker and his union by forbidding them to even propose a union security provision to the company during negotiations. The door is closed. There is no choice. The employees made a free choice when a majority voted for a union, and that union must now represent them all equally. But in a right-to-work State the workers are forbidden to negotiate for across-the-board support to the union, even though all must—by law—benefit equally.

Myth: Right-to-work laws are popular with workers.

Fact: The original Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 contained a requirement that union security contracts would be allowed only where a majority of the workers voted for them—after having first voted for a union. The union security election victories proved to be so overwhelming and embarassing that Senator Robert A. Taft, the bill's coauthor, had the law amended to eliminate the requirement. By then, 96 percent of the workers polled, in thousands of elections, had approved the union shop.

Myth: Those who support right-to-work laws seek only to correct abuses in unions.

Fact: The supporters of right-to-work laws do not seek reform but rather the elimination of unions. They know, however, that a sledgehammer approach would receive little popular support. But right-to-work laws lead toward the same result. In the name of "reform" they undermine unions by destroying the right to establish union security by contract. This deliberate sabotage aimed at fragmenting the union's strength.

Myth: Right-to-work laws make unions responsible to their members.

Fact: A union's responsibility is to provide all of the workers in its shop with the best possible wages and conditions. The stronger, more united a union is, the greater will be its responsibility and its achievements. But where a union is weak or its ranks torn by the dissention that comes where responsibility is not borne by all of the workers involved, it cannot do its best. Right-to-work laws promote irresponsibility.

Myth: Citizens of States with right-to-work laws have advanced their labor standards at a faster pace than the rest of the country.

Fact: In unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation, minimum wages, child labor laws, fair employment practices laws and equal pay laws. These States have actually lagged—and are not closing the gap—behind the rest of America. Right to work goes hand in hand with low incomes, low wages, and poor working conditions.

Myth: If a State wants a right-to-work law, it should be of no concern to the rest of the Nation.

Fact: The United States is a vast, complex industrial unit in which each of us is dependent upon the rest. It is not a collection of small sovereign nations, each going its separate way. Thus low purchasing power in one State has a direct effect on the number of washing machines built in another. Further, the low level of one's State's income has a direct bearing on how much money is spent on education—all of which is felt by the entire Nation when that generation becomes adults. For example, in 1962 of the 19 States having right-to-work laws at the time, 17 spent less on education than the national average.

Right to work is a fraud on every American and a blight on the entire Nation.

Poland's Proud Anniversary

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with all my heart in the acclaim of the people of Poland, their dedication to freedom and their high accomplishments that marks this anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Four of the Members of this body from the great State of Illinois are of Polish blood and descent: Congressmen DERWINSKI, KLUCZNSKI, PUCINSKI, and ROSTENKOWSKI. And this is a reminder of the tremendous contribution men and women of Polish blood have made in the building of our cities and our States and the cathedral of our democracy from the very earliest days.

Three hundred and fifty-seven years ago on September 1608, the first Polish settlers landed in Jamestown, Va. The annals of John Smith attest to the fact that these Polish settlers were a most valuable asset to the struggling young colony. They brought their strength, their willingness to work, and their love of freedom to a settlement which needed and welcomed their sturdy qualities.

May 3, 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution, Poland adopted a Constitution which marks that country as a pioneer of liberalism in Europe. It eliminated with one stroke the fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. It proclaimed the sovereignty of the people, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany.

The Polish Constitution of May 3 proclaimed:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

The year 1966 will mark the 1,000th anniversary of the baptism of the Polish nation. One thousand years ago Poland linked her destiny with that of the West. During a period equal to one-half our Christian era, Poland linked her destiny with that of the West, and be-

came an integral and creative force in its culture.

The people of Poland have, since the days of Jamestown and through the centuries of events to the present, furnished the bone and sinew of American growth. At Jamestown Poles cheered and supported John Smith. During the Civil War her soldiers fought on the side of the Union while her daughters nursed our soldiers on the battlefield. Throughout the years these sturdy pioneers of freedom have been a source of strength to the country of their adoption. Today, Polish Americans have set their purpose to the ultimate liberation of their homeland. In their hopes and in the attainment of their prayers all Americans join.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to commend the people of Poland and their American brothers on the anniversary of the Polish Constitution signed on May 3, 1791.

The country of Poland had been severed by Russia, Prussia, and Austria and after that partitioning, Polish leaders felt a sense of urgency to find a means to prevent future national calamities. They needed a format for the Government designed to unite and strengthen their country.

To this end, in 1788, a committee of the National Assembly, the Diet, was formulated to draw up a constitution to improve the Government. This commissioned body was comprised of liberal, freedom-seeking, patriotic men. Discontentment among the tired and disgusted masses in monarchial Poland was great. This state acted as a catalyst; thus 3 years later, a constitution was signed.

This first Democratic document in Eastern Europe, signed on May 3, 1791, reduced the arbitrary powers of the King by channeling his authority through a council. The powers of the upper Chamber of the Assembly were reduced and those of the popular-elected lower Chamber were liberalized and fortified. The peasantry were freed and placed for the first time under the protection of the law. Separation of the middle and lower classes from the nobility was minimized. The authority of the landlords over the peasantry was reduced. Equally as important, the liberum veto whereby one Member of the Diet could veto any measure was abolished thus assuring passage of more legislation. This constitution also created the first type of cabinet government. Perhaps one of the most important provisions was freedom of religion, conscience, and speech. Thus, Poland became the pioneer of democracy in Europe by proclaiming the sovereignty of her people.

Old Sanborn Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the world is full of surprises, to be sure, but the report of a scientific surprise which reached me recently is worthy of calling to the attention of this body. For background information may I point out that the ensuing article, entitled "Old Sanborn Field," was written by one of my constituents, Clyde H. Duncan, associate agricultural editor of the College of Agriculture, University of Missouri. The article was contained in a publication, Harvest—An Anthology of Farm Writings, by Wheeler McMillen, formerly editor of Farm Journal. Mr. Wheeler, it is reported to me, decided to include Old Sanborn Field in his collection because "this story about Old Sanborn Field is priceless and must be included in my anthology. It cannot be lost to posterity."

Old Sanborn Field, located on the campus of the University of Missouri, is considered one of the most important experimental fields, and because of the scientific surprise the 8-acre plot has special significance.

I commend the article to the Members of the House of Representatives:

OLD SANBORN FIELD

(By Clyde H. Duncan)

The little professor through the years, with soil auger in hand and with students following behind him at a dogtrot, had almost worn a path from his classrooms in Waters and Mumford Halls to "Old Sanborn," the small 8-acre experimental field within this city's (Columbia, Mo.) boundaries.

His actions were by no means unusual in this placid community long accustomed to professors, where education is the common currency. If he had been carrying a blunderbuss instead of the soil augur, it would hardly have caused an eyebrow to raise.

Now it was 1945 and "Bill" Albrecht, as farmers and fertilizer folks knew him and not as "the professor," was standing in this same old field. His sleeves were rolled up, his collar wilted down under the rays of an August sun, hot enough, he says now, to fry a pan of catfish. He was taking one more soil sample but now there were no students with their staccato firing of questions. He had more time for meditation and that's just what the task in hand required. He was on a special mission, one of his many very special missions.

Presently, he came to plot 23. He stopped suddenly, gave it a cursory survey. He could recite its history backwards and forwards, every year of its existence since 1888, or since J. W. Sanborn, the stormy, crotchety dean, had established this land as rotation field. During all these 57 years this plot had been unfertilized, Albrecht knew, and had constantly been cropped to timothy alone.

He had a hunch, and perhaps even a good scientific reason, for taking a sample from this particular area. He wanted it for a friend who was interested in the new wonder drug research now daily making the front pages. This friend had written him tersely, "Please send me a good representative sample of Sanborn Field. I'm playing a hunch that the old field is loaded with fungus." Maybe those weren't his exact words but they are close enough.

So, from plot 23, Dr. William A. Albrecht, then chairman of the Department of Soils of the University of Missouri, carefully shoveled up a sample of good earth which, through all the long years dating back well into the last century, had known no other crop but mule forage. Many thoughts, as they always did, rushed through Albrecht's scientific brain as he walked back down College Avenue with his soil sample to Mumford Hall and the lab. There, he was a familiar figure with crucible, test tube, or retort in hand, always talking fast and gesturing faster to some freshman student about how to concentrate on his studies, or to some doctoral candidate on such subjects as collodial investigations.

Now, back in his lab on this August day, 1945, less important things, such as conferences with professors and meetings with fertilizer executives, could all wait. He had something more important to do. He had this package of soil to mail, without delay, to his oldtime colleague and former University of Missouri faculty friend, Dr. Benjamin M. Duggar, the botanist.

"What has Albrecht sent me this time?" Duggar no doubt said on receiving this bit of Missouri crust. "He's probably outdone himself this time."

The botanist was to find that his own words were truly prophetic, and that Albrecht had outdone himself and all other men up to that time for the laboratory soon was to reveal that the sample from plot 23, Sanborn Field, University of Missouri, contained the first golden mold from which aureomycin was obtained. Thus, this was the beginning, the starting point, of the now world-renowned antibiotic similar to penicillin.

It would be awhile before all the story of this day's events would be completely written, if ever, Duggar and Albrecht knew. But one thing they did know, as scientists, that soon the fruits of this day's labors would be put to work saving millions from untimely deaths. They know, too, or strongly suspected, that it would prove the arch enemy of certain death-dealing viruses as well as both gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria.

One now can easily visualize Dr. Duggar looking a bit bewildered after this famous discovery, serving as he was then as consultant in mycological fungus research and production for American Cyanamid's Lederle Laboratories. One can almost hear him saying, "Albrecht has more wizardry and magic than Houdini. Imagine, of all the places he might have spaded the soil for a sample, he picks just the right one that happened to be loaded with aureomycin."

Dr. Duggar, no doubt, was awed by this unusual discovery. It is doubtful, though, if it surprised the professor, who had become accustomed to seeing Sanborn Field produce the out-of-the-way and the unusual so much so as to establish for it a peculiar niche in the literature of agriculture. Rebellike, this tiny field seemed never to stick to the script.

Dr. Albrecht, as a director of all of the Sanborn Field research, had seen these same acres produce face-reddening facts. For instance, he knew that back when everyone was talking and preaching crop rotations evidence from Sanborn Field had proven that such practices under certain conditions could not be beneficial but actually very harmful. This man of classroom and laboratory, a born teacher, knew, too, that contrary to early admonitions that legumes left the soil better than they found it, wasn't always true. Legumes, overdone could, instead of leaving the soil with an abundance of stored nitrogen, leave it as impoverished as a sharecropper's land following a lifetime of following a one-crop system. Sanborn Field also had taught the research men that fertilizers applied without rhyme or reason could be almost as bad as no fertilizer at all.

Albrecht knew these things, because he knew Sanborn Field, those few little acres that the unimaginative had once tried to turn into a parking lot, but which were capable of producing more scientific surprises than a clown in a circus. It was this knowledge which mothered a remark by him when the soil sample that had produced the then newest of the wonder drugs was presented in special ceremonies at the Smithsonian Institution on October 15, 1958.

He declared at that time, his friends say, that it was very doubtful if any other plot of land, comparable in size on the face of the earth, has produced as much genuine knowledge and wisdom for humanity's use in combating physical suffering and hunger as have the hallowed acres of Sanborn Field.

The Nonlethal Gas Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following essay, which makes a lot of sense, is found in the American Security Council's Washington report for May 3, and was authored by Dr. Stefan Possony of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace:

THE HUMANIZATION OF WAR

(By Stefan Possony)

The utilization in the Vietnamese war of nonlethal gases may turn out to be a significant milestone in the history of armed conflict. According to Washington, nonlethal gases were made available by the United States to Vietnam and were used by Vietnamese troops upon a decision by the Vietnamese command. Secretary Rusk stated that the nonlethal gas employed belongs to the class of tear gases. Less authoritative Washington sources stated that the gas causes attacks of nausea and diarrhea lasting a few hours. This gas supposedly can be bought on the open market and is normally employed for riot control.

Whatever the nature of the gas itself, it seems doubtful, under the circumstances, that company-grade commanders were authorized to order the use of gas of any kind as they would order rifle or machinegun fire.

It seems, rather, that we should congratulate President Johnson and Secretary McNamara on a decision which, in one way or the other, they must have made deliberately and which, potentially, could be one of the most humanitarian decisions of all times. I hope that they will have the courage of their own convictions and will not give in to the anti-American and antigas propaganda barrage.

Thus far, American leaders have handled the propaganda attack by declaring that the gas would continue to be used whenever required, namely in riotlike circumstances. Yet, it would be far better if the United States were to decide to employ nonlethal gas systematically and on a large scale as one of our primary means of bringing the Vietnamese war to a close.

What is the background for opposition to chemical weapons?

In 1915, the Germans who were unable to break the British and French lines by the traditional means of artillery, infantry, and cavalry, resorted to gas attacks. The chemical weapon came as a complete surprise to the Allies. Actually, the initial effectiveness of gas also surprised the German general staff which originally was committed merely to the experimental use of the weapon. Because the gases were deadly, and because there was no defense, nor a capability for retaliation, the Allies feared that the Germans had achieved technological superiority. In their desperation, Paris and London unleashed a furious propaganda campaign branding the employment of poison gas as barbarous and inhuman. The American press took up the theme and soon the world found itself in a paroxysm of moral protest.

The Germans remained undeterred. But since they had only rudimentary gas warfare capabilities and had not thought through their tactics, they were unable to win any decisive victories. Within a year, just by the time the Germans were in a position to make really effective use of the weapon, the British and French had developed adequate defenses and were using chemical ammunitions of their own. From then on gas shells belonged in the standard arsenal. This should have ended the propaganda excitement, but opposition to gas warfare continued unabated and gradually grew stronger.

Granted that there is a different psychological reaction to gas than to lead and steel, criticism on humane grounds still was unjustified because chemical ammunition allowed the attainment of military objectives by inflicting only a quarter of the fatalities that were caused by high explosive shells. Granted also that the effects of gas on human skins, respiratory organs and mucous membranes often lingered and that some indirect effects (for example on kidneys) could last for decades, it was nevertheless true that most gas casualties recovered completely, that gas crippled only small numbers (mostly in the form of blindness), and that shrapnel was an immeasurably more deadly killer than gas. The fact is that the lethality of the gas shell was far less than that of the high explosive shell. The foremost utility of gas, therefore, was not that it inflicted casualties but that it reduced the opponent's tactical flexibility and mobility and that it affected the morale and psychology of hostile troops.

To give one concrete example of survival: Adolf Hitler was heavily gassed by the end of World War I. To the disadvantage of all other survivors of that conflict he was promptly cured and left the hospital to start a political career. For another 27 years, Hitler was able to operate at a high level of effectiveness; he died by suicide, not as a result of poison gas.

The eagerness with which, after World War I, Britain and France signed the Geneva Convention outlawing gas warfare was due to the backfire of their own propaganda. If humanitarianism really had been used as a standard of judgment, high explosive weapons should have been outlawed instead of chemical munitions. The United States, incidentally, did not become a signatory to the Geneva Convention; nor did the U.S.S.R.

Whether or not it would have been advantageous during World War II, for one or the other side, to resort to gas warfare remains an open question. The military knew all about the poor lethality of the weapon on the battlefield. Since there were adequate defenses at least against gases affecting the lungs and eyes, none of the high commands thought it worthwhile to press the point. Toward the end of the war, the Germans invented the so-called nerve gases which are believed to be far more deadly than earlier types; but by then they had no suitable means of delivery and the allies possessed more than adequate means of retaliation. Thus, there was no obvious overriding advantage to gas warfare in the European theater.

By contrast, if chemical weapons had been used in the Pacific against Japanese held islands—which had to be seized through amphibious assault at a high cost in American lives—U.S. casualties could have been kept to a minimum. It is to be presumed that the utilization even of lethal gases may have permitted large numbers of Japanese soldiers to survive. If nonlethal gases had been used, the casualty rates very well may have been reduced drastically on both sides. The use of nonlethal gases, therefore, was indicated for humane, and also for many solid military reasons. Unfortunately, fear of public opinion precluded utilization of the chemical capability and caused thousands of Americans and Japanese to die.

No one in his right mind ever has criticized the pacifist desire to abolish war. But wars continue to occur and the United States continues to be involved. Furthermore, we have now entered a period when it is most likely that an increasing number of so-called pacification missions will have to be executed in order to stop bloodshed and the indiscriminate slaughter of civilians. Why, in any of the operations in which American and U.N. forces will be engaged, should fatalities be inflicted which can be avoided? In fighting guerrillas American forces often will be meeting enemy soldiers who are opposed to communism, who are fundamentally friendly to the democratic cause, and whose death is not at all in our interest. On the contrary, our tactical and political interests would be served best if those potentially friendly soldiers were captured and converted.

As a general principle, if a military objective can be attained through the employment of weapons that inflict a minimum rather than a maximum number of fatalities, it would be the preferred moral and humane course of action to fight with the more benign arms. The employment of nonlethal weapons would be particularly wise if such a choice would yield desirable political byproducts.

The attitude of self-styled pacifists and ritualistic critics of gas warfare is logically and morally indefensible and can be explained only by the example of Pavlov's dog who reacts to the sound of a bell by salivating regardless of whether food is offered or not. The so-called humanitarians are reacting to the word "gas" but not to the reality which is symbolized by this abstraction. Opposing nonlethal gas on the grounds that any gas is objectionable is like opposing a protective serum that produces temporary discomfort on the grounds that it is a killing poison.

In the present concrete case, the United States has no particular reason to assume that the North Vietnamese population is supporting the Communist regime enthusiastically. The Vietcong, undoubtedly, include well-indoctrinated and disciplined Communists but it is unlikely that most Vietcong soldiers are lastingly hostile; quite a few of them probably are serving against their will. Under the circumstances, while we must make every effort to prevent the enemy from hurting our ally or prolonging the conflict, we have no interest whatever in killing North Vietnamese soldiers or civilians. Our present interest is to break up the Vietcong, to deprive them of their resources, to lessen their will to fight, to halt the flow of their supplies, and to stop the guerrilla offensive.

The employment of nonlethal gases imposes upon us the duty to devote sophisticated attention to the psychological aspects of our strategy. The unfortunate fact is that, as so often before, we have once again demonstrated that our technological capabilities exceed our psychological talents. Did we again follow our routine of forgetting about propaganda? Or did we entrust the planning and execution of psychological operations to unqualified personnel? Or did the advice of qualified personnel go unheeded? On the basis of considerable personal experience, I

can assure our defense officials that psychological operations can be highly cost effective by themselves and are well suited to enhance the cost effectiveness of all hardware weapons.

Instead of being apologetic about our use of temporary incapacitators, the United States should adopt the policy of employing nonlethal weapons of all kinds whenever this is militarily opportune. We must insure that this American policy will be understood by our enemies. The time has come when the United States should take long delayed initiatives to enlarge our capability of waging war with a whole spectrum of nonlethal weapons. Washington should commit itself to develop modern technology for the increasing humanization of armed conflict and for the downward escalation of violence.

Let those who oppose nonlethal weapons state unequivocally that they prefer to kill people instead of keeping them alive. And let the United States make the case for nonlethal warfare honestly, clearly, and openly before the entire world. We could hardly have a better case.

"Jibaro" With a Fresh Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the brightest, most hopeful and sparkling personalities in the freshman corps of the 89th Congress is our colleague, SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, the new Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico. In the brief span of the first 100 days of the new Congress, the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. POLANCO-ABREU] has made the acquaintance of most of his fellow Members, and I can say that he has impressed us with his vigor and ability. Although he is young in age, he has already achieved the wisdom and ability of a statesman, and I predict that there are great things in store for our colleague, whom we have come to know as "CHAGUIN."

When I was in Puerto Rico recently, there appeared in the April 18 issue of the San Juan Star—the only English-language newspaper in the island—a Sunday feature reviewing our colleague's first 100 days in Congress. It was entitled "A 'Jibaro' With a Fresh Approach." I learned that a "jibaro" in Puerto Rico is a person from the rural countryside. The article is, I think, a fine characterization of our distinguished colleague, and I am sure that our fellow Members will be interested in reading it.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, the article follows:

POLANCO'S FIRST 100 DAYS—A JIBARO WITH A FRESH APPROACH

(By Walter S. Priest)

("As POLANCO himself once observed to a newsman, the job of nonvoting Resident Commissioner, powerless as it seems, is anything the incumbent wants to make it. With the decentralization of power which Muñoz himself ordered, the Resident Commissioner's job has assumed a new place in the political firmament.")

WASHINGTON.—For reasons long lost to American political mythology, the first 100 days of a new President are highly significant. During this brief period, the Chief Executive supposedly proposes his program, learns who his friends and enemies in Congress are, and stamps his personality on his administration forevermore.

The first 100 days of a freshmen Member of the House of Representatives are unlikely to be as earthshaking. Chances are they pass quickly in a confusion of endless marble hallways, instructions from party chiefs and wrong telephone numbers before the Member sinks into legislative limbo as the lowest ranking member on a committee he didn't want anyway.

Such was not the fate of a self-styled jibaro from Puerto Rico, however. When SANTAGO POLANCO-ABREU's first 100 days ended on April 14, Puerto Rico's new Resident Commissioner was acting more like a President than a junior lawmaker. Already, the impeccably dressed man with the firm handshake and the warm smile of the practiced politician has been adding new dimensions to an office which has languished in the shadows for 20 years.

Close friends confide the 44-year-old attorney was less than overjoyed when the Popular Democratic Party, reportedly acting at the urging of doña Inés de Muñoz Marín, tapped POLANCO to succeed retiring Resident Commissioner Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern. After all, largely by his own efforts he had earned the powerful post of Commonwealth House speaker following the death of Ernesto Ramos Antonini. Former Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín's decision to step aside left several inviting vacuums of power in both party and government. POLANCO, a trusted troubleshooter for Muñoz in the Dominican crisis of 1963, was also identified with the rising young expansionist wing of the Popular Democratic Party. In short, Puerto Rico was a warm and friendly place. Washington was cold and remote, and the complexities of the Federal establishment a little forbidding, especially to a jibaro even if you pay him $30,000 a year.

The very things, however, that made life in Puero Rico so inviting were today becoming important determinants in shaping POLANCO's position. As POLANCO himself once observed to a newsman, the job of a nonvoting Resident Commissioner, powerless as it seems, is anything the incumbent wants to make it. Under Muñoz' highly centralized administration the scope was severely limited. Muñoz was his own Governor, Ambassador, Resident Commissioner, and political plumber rolled into one. With the decentralization of power which Muñoz himself ordered, the Resident Commissioner's job has assumed a new place in the politfcal firmament. While POLANCO would be the last to admit it, he is building the office into a steppingstone to the Governorship. This would be true whether he liked the idea or not. The Popular Democratic Party today lacks the manpower in its younger echelons who combine the insight into Federal and Commonwealth affairs of a Muñoz. In 4 or 8 years the exception will be POLANCO.

Few of these hindsight observations were running through the minds of newsmen whom POLANCO invited to a first informal chat over cocktails at Washington's Madison Hotel early last January. For both sides it was a chance to measure one another's character. As the evening wore on, it became plain POLANCO was interviewing the newsmen. It was equally clear to them that here was a Resident Commissioner who enjoyed the undefinable essence of politics whether practiced in Washington or San Juan, a man who enjoyed debate, new concepts and approaches. If during the discussion veterans of the Puerto Rican beat were prone to smile a bit at his insistence he would stump the country to acquaint Americanos with Puerto Rico, they erred badly. They were hearing the first tentative expressions of what has become the keystone of POLANCO's policy as Resident Commissioner and perhaps the most crucial aspect of United States-Puerto Rican relations for the next decade.

As a practical matter, when he completes his trip to California and Washington States later this summer he will have traveled some 8,000 miles on behalf of a mission of awesome difficulty. From a political point of view, the "mission" is no less than establishing for Puerto Rico an importance in "domestic" U.S. affairs equal to its well-known role in "foreign policy." Logic insists the two are inseparable. But logic has never been a dictator in Washington.

POLANCO's burden was thrust upon him by the kind of ironic situation only Puerto Rico seems able to produce. Basking for nearly a decade in the warmth of mainland public relations too successful in chanting the "miracle" of Commonwealth progress, "bootstrappery," and showcase" imagery, Puerto Rico committed the most unpardonable sin in Washington politics. It became a bore.

The biggest bore of all was its preoccupation with "status." The infinite legalisms, the "culture" and "identity" debates cause the mind to boggle and the eye to go glassy. As one member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee once put it: "You're eating regularly, aren't you? So what's the problem?"

POLANCO has plunged in to show that eating regularly is only one facet of the Puerto Rican condition. But first a common ground for discussion must be found. Puerto Ricans are so far ahead of Americanos in their thinking on socioeconomic problems of status, they don't even inhabit the same planet.

It is this search for a common denominator that has led POLANCO to transform the office of Resident Commissioner into what is a center for a communication program. A part of the effort showed recently in a series of press conferences with newsmen representing various regional papers. They were offered State by State statistics on the jobs generated by Puerto Rican purchases in various U.S. markets. But this is only a part of the effort.

Far more important is POLANCO's desire to transform himself and his office into honest broker for all political persuasions on Puerto Rican questions. This has involved thrusting himself and Puerto Rico into mainland issues. In his maiden statement to the House, which came during debate on the education bill, POLANCO made it clear he would speak out on national questions. "I am not," he later added, "simply going to talk and talk. They do not want to hear the same fellow every day.

"My basic aim is to interest Members of Congress in Puerto Rico; to create a climate in which they will have confidence in my opinion about Puerto Rico; to let them know the importance of the special political relations between Puerto Rico and the United States in relation to the entire hemisphere.

"Perhaps I can pave the way for the time the Status Study Commission makes its report."

To the effort he calls opening the door psychologically POLANCO applies his talents as a listener and politician's intuitive grasp of the possible. Like himself, he finds, the average Congressman must concentrate on his district almost to the exclusion of everything else.

If this tends to insulate the average lawmaker's mind, the alternative is even more unprofitable. Defeat at the polls. Therefore POLANCO takes Puerto Rico's case to the lawmaker, scheduling at least 5 meetings a week with various Members, 200 during the session, and traveling with them if they invite him to their districts.

Although he has some personal doubt the Resident Commissioner should sit automat-

ically on the House Interior, Agriculture, and Armed Services Committees to the exclusion of others, he attends meetings regularly. The fact they may have no legislation involving Puerto Rico does not matter. He goes.

"If you're interested in my problems, I'll be interested in yours," POLANCO observes.

POLANCO's ability to mix with the Washington whirl often obscures the deeply introspective side of his nature. In any moment his face can change from that of the convivial politician to a man tortured by self-doubt. The frown that follows connotes great spiritual struggles in progress in this lawyer's neatly compartmented mind. His tendency is to worry a problem into submission; if one approach seems wrong, try another.

Although he spans two generations in Commonwealth politics, POLANCO hates to be classified ideologically. However, he does subscribe to the "dynamic" concept of Commonwealth. "You have to consider the historical moment of 1940 and 24 years later. Puerto Rico is different because, after all, the world is different too."

"This special relationship, it should have a dynamic of its own. The best way to classify me is that I want a more perfect compact to insure a more perfect union with the United States."

Once a Stacom report is in, he thinks Puerto Ricans will go to a plebiscite but doubts Congress would bind itself in advance to any particular commission finding. What would be valuable, he believes, is for the commission to issue "a profound intellectual statement that relations are legitimate from the constitutional point of view. That would be a good step now."

His introspective side has led him into extensive private research on the history of U.S. political institutions, including Congress, which he now admits he understands better than he did as Commonwealth house speaker. The results show in the speeches rattling out of his office since early February.

He possesses the talent of targeting his audiences to perfection. For the highbrow staff of the Brookings Institution or Institute of Puerto Rico in New York, which voted him its Citizen-of-the-Year Award, he talks about "cultural pluralism." For the Society for International Development (SID) or the Pan American Liaison Committee of Women's Organizations, he stresses economic issues.

He has lectured New York's Puerto Ricans over the radio on the administration's civil rights bill and encouraged a group of 150 Puerto Rico-bound youths in Wooster, Ohio, to unbridle their imaginations and "see for themselves."

In every case listeners are led to break new intellectual ground without casting completely loose from their familiar thought patterns or encountering confusing or radical ideas. The adroit interweaving of fact and concept has already won editorial praise in several areas and in Congress.

At the same time, POLANCO will not duck a fight for diplomacy's sake. When Columnist Marguerite Higgins penned a series of acid columns on "communism" in Puerto Rico, POLANCO fired back promptly. Editors of nearly every paper publishing the articles received a polite but firm letter setting the record straight.

Transformation in the Resident Commissioner's policies is reflected in the trappings of office as well. Last week, painters and sanders directed by POLANCO's charming wife, Viola Orsini, were stripping the gloomy magnificence from his quarters above the office of Puerto Rico at 2210 R Street. Pearl white walls and varnished natural wood floors now sparkle in the living room. POLANCO's intention is to turn his home into a center for Puerto Rican life in Washington, a truly radical departure from his predecessor. But it must have caught on. For the first time in anyone's memory Luis Muñoz-Marín was staying in the Resident Commissioner's quarters and apparently enjoying it despite the flying plaster. To POLANCO's delight he can now talk politics on into the night with a man he greatly admires.

POLANCO frankly confesses the intense social life of official Washington "is just too much for me." Work days, which include Saturdays, find him up at 7:15 a.m., reading the Washington Post and New York Times. After a quick breakfast he descends to his first-floor office and works until 9 a.m., when he leaves for his cramped congressional quarters in the Old House Office Building. If meetings of his committees are scheduled for the morning he usually attends and then walks over to the House chamber to hear the debates. Afternoons, starting at 3 p.m., are devoted to callers and conferences. At around 6 p.m., when most offices close, he starts dictating letters and reading up on the next day's work until around 7 p.m. Chances are the unavoidable social entanglement presents itself about that time and that means home for dinner again around 8:30 p.m. About Washington social life, Mrs. Polanco has little to say except that it's part of the business.

Shortly after his arrival, POLANCO boldly announced plans for redecorating his quarters included hanging a genuine Puerto Rican hammock in a shaded nook.

"It will look like I'm sleeping but I'll really be thinking," he quipped. He could have saved the defensive distinctions and even the trouble of hanging his hammock. By the look of his appointment book he won't use it until next year anyway. Such is life for a man with a "mission."

Sweeney Calls for an End of U.S. Policy of Appeasing Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, as Congressman at Large from the State of Ohio, I today call upon the U.S. Department of State to end a policy of appeasing Nasser and the Arab States in their continuing efforts to rob the Republic of Israel by diverting the headwaters of the Jordan River.

The world has stood in admiration of the Republic of Israel and her creative achievements since her conception. Centuries of neglect and waste resulted in the vast creation of desert lands; and, when Israel came into being, she made these lands begin to bloom again by the wise use of her water resources.

The Arabs, now, are attempting to dry out Israel and turn the land back to desert. No American foreign policy expert should support this Nasser-conceived plot to destroy this thriving civilization, from which humanity derives so much benefit.

I predict violence will flair up at any time concerning the Nasser move to deprive Israel of water.

As an American legislator, I cannot remain silent in the face of Arab provocation endangering peace. Now is the time for the U.S. Department of State to engage in a pact with Israel to conclude a mutual security pact declaring Israel as our sole, true friend and responsible and reliable ally in the Middle East. We should supply Israel with defense weapons she needs to meet the aggression of Saudi Arabia and Nasser's anti-Israel allies.

Successful Economic Policy: A Three-Way Partnership Between Business, Labor, and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, in his first major speech as Secretary, recently addressed the annual convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Secretary Fowler cited the unparalleled economic growth and prosperity experienced by this country during the past 4 years. He points out realistic fiscal policies. And he cites the spirit of cooperation between business, labor, and Government, which has prevailed during the Kennedy administration and the administration of President Johnson as being responsible for our success.

I deem the remarks of Secretary Fowler, a native Virginian and a highly experienced Government administrator, to be of great importance to all Americans and of special interest to the Congress. I, therefore, include the full text of Secretary Fowler's speech:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS

I am particularly happy to make this, my first fullfledged speech as Secretary of the Treasury before a group that plays so vital a role in informing the American public about the complex and critical issues that confront our Nation.

As I do so I am conscious that I observe a precedent set 4 years ago when my distinguished predecessor and good friend, Douglas Dillon, made his maiden economic address as Secretary of the Treasury before this very same group.

In that address, he set forth a twofold program to bring us closer to our economic goals: First, a complete overhaul of our tax system to augment incentives, initiative, and effort in the private sector of our economy, and second, an overall monetary approach to assure the ample availability of long-term credit so essential to domestic growth while maintaining short-term rates at levels high enough to prevent any excessive outflow of dollars abroad. These policies, he declared, would lead us—and I quote, "to a period of growth and prosperity during the sixties' such as this Nation has never known."

Next month, the economic expansion that began in February of 1961 will become the longest in the entire history of our Nation—except for the expansion that included World War II. There could be no better testimony to the success of our economic policies over the past 4 years.

As Under Secretary of the Treasury I was privileged to participate in the first formation of those policies, and to assist at every major stage of their development, adoption, and execution. I am convinced we must continue to build upon those policies, improving them as we can and adapting them to meet new problems and new needs. But policies cannot be static in a world as rapidly changing as ours. The problems and prospects we face today could scarcely be more different from those we faced 4 years ago.

According to the Gallup poll published yesterday, the American people consider economic problems the least important facing the Nation—in contrast to the people in many countries abroad who cite economic problems as their most important. And the latest quarterly report on consumer attitudes by the University of Michigan finds consumer confidence in the Nation's economic outlook at its highest level since 1956. The business community continues to demonstrate through its investment plans and behavior that it shares this same solid confidence in our economic prospects. But while our grounds for confidence are indeed firm, we must never make the cardinal mistake of taking continued progress as a foregone conclusion. For continued progress rests on the continued success of proper Government policies and private effort. And to judge what those policies and that effort must be if we are to sustain the current upsurge, we must understand what they have been in the past, how the best features can be conserved and built upon for the future. It will be our purpose to appraise the past as a basis for the future.

Certainly, the expansion we now enjoy was far from a foregone conclusion 4 years ago.

Then we were just emerging from our fourth postwar recession, acutely aware that each of the three prior recessions had been followed by shorter and weaker recoveries, and that the previous recession had produced the largest peacetime budget deficit in our history. Unemployment was intolerably high. Business investment was far less than we needed to generate more vigorous and viable economic growth and maintain a strongly competition position in world markets—including our own home market which was becoming increasingly open to import competition. At the same time, a series of balance-of-payments deficits—averaging, on the basis of regular transactions, almost $4 billion a year from 1958 through 1960—had made us vulnerable on the international front.

We were firmly convinced that the only final answer to our problems on both the domestic and international fronts lay in reinvigorating the private sector as the prime mover in the achievement of our economic goals. The private economy simply could not do its job as long as incentives were dulled and it continued to labor under excessively high wartime tax rates—rates originally applied to restrain strong inflationary pressures that accompanied wars and emergencies.

Our first step was to redouble the incentives for greater private domestic investment in new plant and equipment—investment that had been lagging for far too long and whose strength was essential if we were to have a firm foundation for sustaining uninterrupted economic growth for any long period of time. The Revenue Act of 1962 granted a tax credit of 7 percent on new investment in machinery and equipment, and in that same year the Treasury reformed and liberalized the tax treatment of depreciation. Together with the cut in the corporate tax rate contained in the Revenue Act of 1964—amounting to some $2.7 billion at current income levels—these measures have raised the profitability of a typical investment in new equipment by more than one-third.

We complemented our initial move to accelerate private investment by reducing substantially personal income tax rates across the board, thereby cutting more than $11 billion—at current income levels—from the tax load borne by individual taxpayers, thus providing a massive increase in private demand.

To these tax measures for expanding the role of our private sector, we joined a rigorous program of control over Government expenditures—a program that has reached new heights of intensity and effectiveness under the leadership of President Johnson. In his administrative budgets thus far—those covering fiscal years 1965 and 1966—President Johnson has held total expenditure increases down to an average of $1 billion a year, $2 billion or two-thirds, less than the average annual increase of $3 billion over the previous 10 years.

The response of the private economy to these policies has been magnificent. From the first quarter of 1961 to the quarter just ended, our gross national product has grown by an average of more than 5 percent a year, in constant prices. The unemployment rate has fallen from 6.9 percent in February of 1961 to 4.7 percent last month—a 7-year low. At the same time, we have gained some 5 million jobs, including 1.7 million in the last 12 months. Particularly significant is the 600,000-job gain in manufacturing over the last 12 months, bringing total manufacturing employment back around the peak level of 17½ million for 1953, despite the tremendous technological advances in laborsaving devices in this period. Profits have reached new highs each year, for a total gain of over 60 percent in profits after taxes. Business investment in new plant and equipment has recovered sharply from its tendency during the 1950's to lag or decline. This year's planned expenditures for plant and equipment stand, according to the latest official survey, at $50.2 billion, or more than double the level of a decade ago. And the $14.5-billion growth in those expenditures for the 5 years 1961–65 exceeds by $4.1 billion the increase for the entire decade of the 1950's. And, after taxes and in constant dollars, average per capita income has grown by an average of 3⅓ percent a year. And these have been real gains—preserved by a record of price stability unmatched by that of any other major industrial country.

Our resurgent economic performance since early 1961 has added more than $100 billion in real terms to our national output—a total that far exceeds the entire added output during the same period by all of Western Europe. As a yardstick, one might remember that this added slice on our national cake in the last 4 years exceeds the entire gross national product of France and Belgium. In fact, the increase alone in our national output over the past 4 years surpasses the total national output of any other nation of the free world—and continues to widen the already enormous distance that separates our ability to produce from that of the Soviet Union.

These are the gains, and the policies, upon which we must build—for they offer us solid ground from which we can move confidently into the future. These, however, are not the only gains the past 4 years have brought us. For underlying all these is an achievement whose importance is impossible to measure and equally impossible to overemphasize.

I speak of the remarkable degree of cooperation, understanding, and mutual confidence that has gradually emerged over the past 4 years between business and labor and Government. As we have pursued policies to fashion a better balance between the public and private sectors, business and labor and Government have moved together in a growing partnership for progress. They have discovered that by pulling together they can achieve much more than by pulling apart. They have become more concerned about working together toward greater abundance for all and less concerned about who receives the greater marginal advantage—and the result has been greater wage income for the workingman, greater profits for the businessman and the investor, and greater revenues for meeting the demands on Government at lower tax rates for the taxpayer. And these results merely suggest what accomplishments the future may hold as, more and more, we bring to bear the full resources of this Nation in a concerted attack upon the problems that confront it.

An essential ingredient in this better understanding between business, labor, and Government is national leadership. No man in our long national history has done more or labored with greater intensity to bring about this understanding than the man in the White House. He works at it night and day. And his example is one for all of us to follow if we are to sustain our recent advances and cope with the emergent problems of our time.

We are fortunate that the problems before us today are vastly different from those that loomed ahead 4 years ago. For those early problems—domestically, at least—were largely the product of our failure, while our problems today issue, in large part, from the very success of our labors over the last 4 years.

Despite the sure progress we have made in creating more jobs we have yet to reach our interim goal of 4 percent unemployment. To reach that goal, we must sustain a steady growth in demand—a growth to which Government fiscal policies have made, and will continue to make, a vital contribution.

The prudent amount of excise tax reduction we have scheduled for the last half of this year, while improving our tax structure, will also help sustain our economic momentum by expanding private purchasing power. At the same time, it will offer new incentives for price reductions. But the excise tax reduction must be a prudent amount—not an excessive one that will interrupt the movement of the last 2 years from large budget deficits toward balance as the economy moves forward to the objective of full employment with balanced budgets or surpluses.

While our economy is still not operating at full potential, we may approach the point where growing demand alone cannot make the inroads upon unemployment we want without undermining the gains in efficiency we need or exerting a strain upon our prices. This means growth in demand must be accompanied by a broad and growing attack on so-called hard core, or structural, unemployment. Through such programs as manpower retraining and the Job Corps we are just beginning to mount such an attack.

In addition to the compassion we share with all for those who lack opportunity, there are hard-bitten financial and economic reasons why the Treasury was and will continue to be in the forefront of those supporting the efforts of the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity in this area.

The need to reduce structural unemployment and the need to preserve price stability are two of the paramount challenges we face in the domestic economic field. And any effective answer to these challenges cannot come from Government programs alone—it must come, on the contrary, from the joint effort of Government and the private sector. In this country we have long been familiar with private programs to train or retrain the unskilled and to place them in productive jobs. But surely there is enormous room, and need, for more programs of this kind. And most critical of all is the need for private industry to seek ways of synchronizing its recruitment policies with these retraining programs, whether public or private. The time has come for America to take the same private initiative and ingenuity that have fashioned the most power-

ful economic machine in history and apply them, more and more, to the task of helping the many poor or disadvantaged in our society who do not fully share in its abundant life.

At the same time, nothing could be so foolish or so wasteful as to expend our talents and our resources in trying to sustain our economic upsurge and extend its benefits to more and more of our citizens, if we fail to protect our hard-won gains against inflation. The policies of this administration will continue to support strong and sound, but not excessive, growth in our economy and in the availability of credit essential to that kind of growth. For its part, the Treasury will continue to manage the public debt prudently—seeking to place any increase in that debt in the hands of private savers rather than in commercial banks, where it might contribute to inflation.

But continued wage and price stability must depend in the future, as it has in the past, upon the determination of American business and American labor to avoid wage rises that outdistance our gains in productivity and price rises not justified by actual cost increases. Wage and price stability is vital to both our balance of payments and our domestic economic progress—and it is to American business and American labor that we must look to maintain it.

On the international financial front, as in our home economy, we can meet the challenges before us with the full confidence that we deal from a position of growing strength. As President Johnson pointed out in his balance-of-payments message earlier this year, we have the world's most productive and efficient economy, the world's largest supply of gold, the world's strongest creditor position, and—by virtue of our fine record of price stability—the world's most favorable trade position.

Therefore, let there be no confusion: our balance-of-payments problem bears no kinship to the classic pattern in which, because it cannot compete successfully, one country cannot sell as much goods and services as it buys. Our commercial trade surplus last year stood at $3.7 billion—over $1 billion larger than it was 4 years ago, and more than twice the size of West Germany's, the next largest in the world. And our private investments abroad exceed the total of foreign investment in the United States, plus all other liabilities to foreigners, by some $18 billion, a figure that grows larger every year.

Moreover, the hard-won improvement in our competitive position, the balance-of-payments measures that we have employed over the past 4 years, and our rising returns from private foreign investment, have brought us some $3.5 billion worth of balance-of-payments improvement—enough, all else aside, to have given us virtual balance in our payments last year.

In a climate of wage-price stability, our tax measures to heighten incentives and encourage greater productivity at home, along with numerous direct aids to exports, have helped make American business a formidable competitor indeed in markets abroad—as our huge trade surplus demonstrates.

We have also reduced by almost $500 million the annual balance-of-payments cost of a foreign aid program of far larger dollar dimensions. Today, 85 percent of our foreign aid commitments are spent for American goods and services. In spite of rising costs abroad, we have cut $700 million from our net military expenditures abroad.

Despite these improvements we had, as you know, a balance-of-payments deficit last year of $3 billion—largely the result of swelling private capital outflows that last year amounted to $6.4 billion, $2.5 billion more than in 1960 and $2.1 billion more than in 1963.

The President's new program calls for redoubling all our prior balance-of-payments efforts. But most important, it asks our businesses and banks to cut down on the flow of our capital abroad—until new arrangements in the international monetary system and improved capital markets abroad offer assurance that uninhibited capital flows will not endanger the dollar. Over the next few weeks we will have some fast hard figures to show exactly how successful that voluntary effort has been thus far. But we have only to look abroad and see how much dearer and scarcer dollars have become to recognize what good results that effort has already yielded.

I have no doubt that this voluntary program will succeed. And surely there can now be no doubt in anyone's mind—here or abroad—that American Government and American business are determined to bring our balance-of-payments deficits to a swift and sure end. End them we must, and end them we shall.

We do not, however, conceive of the voluntary program as a final or fundamental solution to our balance-of-payments problem. Nor do we join with those who would have us hide within a tight protective shell of direct controls or rashly risk harm to our domestic economy by applying a hard brake to credit expansion. On the contrary, the more lasting solution to our balance-of-payments problem must continue to come from our unflagging efforts to make our economy continually more competitive in world markets and continually more attractive and more accessible to foreign capital. It must come, as well, from European efforts to improve their own capital markets—markets whose deficiencies become more apparent as our interim measures to halt excessive capital outflows take firmer and firmer hold.

Our very success in moving toward lasting balance in our payments has begun to throw into sharper relief a potential problem in our international payments system—a problem that will require concerted attention in the months ahead. For the United States can no longer afford to furnish steady increaes in international liquidity through deficits in our international payments. As those deficits dwindle, it will become more and more urgent that we progress toward some agreement with our foreign friends on ways to strengthen the international monetary system and assure ample liquidity for expanding world trade.

Thus, on both the international and domestic economic fronts, we do not suffer from any lack of challenge, or any lack of opportunity. But there is no challenge and no opportunity before us which we are not far more able to meet than we were 4 years ago. If we continue to build upon the progress and the policies of those years, we can look forward in all sober confidence to sustained economic progress on all fronts far into the foreseeable future.

Our failures during the fifties taught us that we cannot fashion successful economic policies by remaining in thrall to some abstract theory, or by adhering to some doctrinaire dictum of the past. They taught us the folly of exclusive or excessive reliance upon one policy instrument for a single solution to all our problems.

The success of the past 4 years has demonstrated how our various instruments of economic policy—tax policy, expenditure policy, monetary policy and many privately woven policies, as for example, the avoidance of unstabilizing action in the field of wages, prices and inventories—can work together, in proper proportions and with sound balance, to move us simultaneously toward multiple economic goals. Each policy instrument has its strengths and its limitations under given conditions. The task is to coordinate these instruments in ways that respond to the needs of a complex and rapidly changing economic scene.

To succeed in that task requires that our approach be pragmatic rather than dogmatic, balanced rather than extreme, resilient rather than rigid. It requires that the public and the private sector of our economy work as partners in the pursuit of our national economic goals. We have seen what surpassing accomplishments can come from following this path. If we but continue to follow it, I see no end to those accomplishments.

Are Machines Supposed To Make Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, fear of automation is one of the most reactionary attitudes prevalent today. We must learn how to make machines improve our standard of living rather than trying to slow down the progress of the machine age.

A most thought provoking article on the subject appeared recently in Challenge, the magazine of economic affairs. I commend it to my colleagues:

ARE MACHINES SUPPOSED TO MAKE WORK?

(By Louis O. Kelso [1])

(The purpose of the machine is to eliminate work; the more work it eliminates, the greater its success. If the economy no longer needs our personal toil, there is another way for us to be economically productive.)

Not long ago I helped interview several potential executive trainees, fresh out of business school, who were applying for a scholarship to spend a summer in Europe studying business, industry, and politics. "Which of these alternatives do you consider most desirable?" I asked one of them. "Maximum production with maximum employment? Or maximum production with minimum employment?"

"The first, of course," he snapped.

"Very good," I nodded. "Now suppose we change the word 'employment' to 'toil'? Would your answer still be the same?"

The boy looked puzzled. " 'Toil' and 'employment' don't sound the same," he said at last, "but I guess I'll stick to what I said."

I aimed for the moment of truth. "Now suppose you are the president of Standard Item Manufacturing, Inc. You're sitting in your office when the door flies open to admit your youngest, most ambitious junior executive. 'Sir,' he exclaims, 'I have been thinking about the antipoverty war and how our company can do its part to help. I think I have it. I want to tell you about a sensational new plan with which Standard Item can turn out the same number of items per year with twice our present number of employees.' "

"I guess I don't go on that trip," said my candidate, looking stricken. Naturally he went. It would have been unfair to blame the boy for stubbing his logic on the glaring incongruities of the manpower myth when they go unchallenged in the highest councils of business and state. The manpower myth is our official faith, although like the Roman gods, it is more honored in public utterance than in private observance.

---

[1] Louis O. Kelso, a San Francisco attorney, has authored several books on economics. Mr. Kelso wishes to have acknowledged the contributions of his assistant, Patricia Hetter, as coauthor of this article.

According to this myth, people produce all our economic goods and services, and people are becoming more and more productive every day. Our economy has become the wonder of the world because of our manpower resources, and these manpower resources, with the negligible assistance of nearly a trillion dollars worth of productive capital, will produce even more magnificent wonders tomorrow. As a recent U.S. Government publication put it—artistically staggering the lines to suggest a paean to the economy in blank verse:

"Our manpower potential is great enough,
With an improving technology,
To increase the production of goods and services
By about 50 percent from 1960 to 1970.
We begin the 1960's—
With a gross national product of $500 billion.
We can reach a level of $750 billion by 1970."

Naturally since people are producing all this opulence, the way to reach even greater heights of future opulence is to have as many people as possible "fully employed." "Heigh-ho, heigh-ho, off to work" they go—fathers, mothers, grandmothers, uncles, brothers and cousins, all just one big happy labor force pitching in to produce an ever bigger gross national product.

As an explanation of what is going on in our economy, of course, all this is sheer nonsense. It treats the most sophisticated and complex collection of capital instruments ever assembled in the world as if they were extensions of man himself, or magic helpers, or natural resources functioning gratuitously like the sun. It pretends that machine output is human output, or what is even more misleading, that it is the output of the machine operator himself. And this fiction, to use a polite word, is the launching pad for an even more curious delusion: the notion that human labor is, through technological advance, becoming more and more productive. Any humble truthlover stubborn enough to challenge this assertion is de facto antilabor, if not downright antihuman.

But calling a cow's tail a leg does not make it a leg, as Abraham Lincoln used to say. Similarly, calling people productive does not make them so. "If us working guys were really producing everything, we wouldn't either be unemployed or scared stiff of losing the crummy little jobs we've got," a San Francisco delivery man told a friend of mine the other day. This flawless logic has yet to escalate up to the policy floor.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers could learn a thing or two from this knight of toil. As one of the Nation's 4 million known moonlighters, he works literally night and day to maintain a rather bleak living standard. The family's furniture, bought on time, goes in and out of hock. "I've got to run all the itme to keep from slipping back," he said. He spoke for millions of his fellow Americans, dependent on their labor in an economy which has less and less use for it. Nor is this the language of rising productivity. It is just the opposite.

An inventor in the automotive industry used to say that machines were designed by geniuses to be run by dopes. That is much nearer the truth than the claim that the genius of the machine resides in the operator. The industrial revolution broke down crafts which had previously required years of arduous apprenticeship and experience—crafts so exacting that they were properly called arts—and reduced them to a simple rote that could be performed by untrained women and even children.

As sorry as we feel for those helpless victims, crushed by the violent impact of technology on a world that had not the slightest comprehension of what was happening to it, we cannot say that they were more "skilled" or "productive" than the craftsmen they supplanted. They themselves entertained no such notion; certainly the factory owners did not. Like good management today, they knew to a penny what they had spent on capital instruments; nor did they labor under the delusion that the purpose of such capital investment was to create jobs or utilize the manpower resources of their day. They were not obliged to bow to the manpower myth, for the simple reason that it had not been invented yet.

The manpower myth is a relatively recent arrival to our ideological pantheon; its striking resemblance to Marx's labor theory of value is probably coincidence. Historically, we Americans understand very well the value of capital; it is what our forebears came to America for. Generations of life in Europe had schooled them well in the hard truth that labor without capital means subsistence toil. "O God! that bread should be so dear, and flesh and blood so cheap," is the laborer's cry, not the capital owner's. Americans know this, or used to. But the overwhelming success of our capital insrtuments has temporarily made us lose our nerve.

The manpower myth is our collective attempt to wish away the automation crisis; it is our hopeful whistle in the graveyard of full employment.

Even 5 years ago, reports from industry were at least candid. "For every $5,000 worth of investment, you can get rid of one worker," confided one AFL–CIO official to the press, while the vice president of a major steel company artlessly babbled: "It costs $25 a day for every steelworker that walks through that gate. Naturally, there is a great incentive to eliminate that cost." But this was before the automation curtain. As the sixties came in, it descended with a heavy metallic clank.

No longer does one hear such vulger expressions as "eliminating labor." The process is now called "creating jobs." Nobody knows how many jobs are being "created" by automation. Nobody wants to know—officially. Corporation executive, politician, and labor leader publicly adopt the stance of the three wise monkeys. Management tells nothing, the politician hears nothing, and the labor leader sees nothing. Privately, of course, they are in a flap.

Standard Item plans to install the Triple Whammy computer system, thereby increasing its production by 125 percent and (blast of public relations bugles) creating 6½ new jobs. How to conceal the fact that the Triple Whammy will simultaneously wipe out 124 old jobs keeps the PR department walking the floor nights. The union negotiating committee has not been sleeping well either. Its problem is how to force Standard Item to admit that 124 thumpingly redundant employees are absolutely indispensable on the scene of production, and how to convince its dwindling membership, and the public at large, that unions are equally so and that the productivity of the obsolete 124 has gone up. This situation, repeated on a smaller or grander scale in virtually every industry in the country, has led to an economic farce. It is now being solemnly enacted by a full cast of distinguished national characters, who are beginning to look as if they had sleepwalked on stage in their nightshirts, or were enacting an American version of the Kabuki dance.

The political personages, of course, are in most imminent danger of losing face. Congress, in its wisdom, has decreed how goods and services in the second half of the 20th century are to be produced. They are to be produced through full employment of the labor force. This is another way of declaring that economic goods and services are created mainly or entirely by human labor. A century ago, reality would not have so rudely contradicted the congressional edict. Then labor was the most important factor of production. When roadbuilding was a job for picks and shovels, the traditional sign "Men at Work" told most of the truth. With today's vast array of construction machinery, "Machines at Work" would be far more honestly descriptive—with perhaps, in parenthesis, "Men Also Present."

The congressional idea of how goods and services ought to be produced is at variance with the facts of technology as well as its logic. Let us seek this logic in the most simple class of machines, the household appliances.

Suppose we are reading the evening's news; the following advertisement catches our eye:

"SENSATIONAL NEW SISYPHUS MAKES HOUSEHOLD CHORES TAKE TWICE THE TIME

"Why waste your potential? Why read, watch TV, play golf, pursue hobbies, and other timekillers when the Sisyphus machine can keep you fully employed up to 16 hours a day?

"Scrubbing, cleaning, cooking—now, they all take longer. Thanks to sensational new Sisyhus, you can spend almost all your waking hours in meaningful, productive work.

"Sisyphus ends that retired feeling. Banishes boredom. Makes you sleep like an ox. Best of all, Sisyphus gives you that inert satisfaction of knowing that you are using 96.5 percent of your womanpower potential.

"Remember Sisyphus means work.

"(Only $89.50. President's Council of Economic Advisers seal of approval.)"

The original Sisyphus was condemned to push a stone up a mountainside for all eternity; this was the Greek idea of hell. Even today, committed as we are to the manpower myth, the Sisyphus machine would be something less than a bestseller. Men do not invent machines to make toil.

Embarrassing as it is to have to state such a commonplace, the purpose of the machine is to eliminate work; the more work it eliminates, the greater its success. Americans, in particular, have always delighted in their laborsaving devices. However enthusiastically our Government goes in for creating jobs in principle, we may be sure this policy will never get as far as the Patent Office.

When our Secretary of Labor asserts: "I think we are all absolutely dependent on technological development for full employment," he is using Sisyphus-machine logic. Full employment is the antithesis of technological development. They are horses pulling in opposite directions. We have only to imagine them both tied to our economy to envision the final result.

If job-oriented thinking is unrealistic now, it will be even more so in the future. What about the men and women whose jobs are being automated? How are they to produce their livelihoods? This is the momentous question technology is forcing on us, but we can only chorus helplessly with Secretary of Labor Wirtz: "We don't have any well-worked-out answers." And as long as we insist on looking at automation through the pink spectacles of the manpower myth, we are not likely to have any.

We must relinquish the manpower myth. We must cut the anthropomorphic umbilical cord and admit that capital instruments independently exist. The fact that they will probably always require some human attention does not change their essential separateness. Then we must admit that the goods and services machines produce are just as truly goods and services as those human labor produces; just as moral, just as real, just as useful, just as legitimate. Many things go into the excellence of a fabric, an automobile engine, a haute couture dress, but human sweat is not one of them. In a current fashion advertisement, a pedantic gentleman tells a pretty woman that the "extraordinary textured pattern" of her white robe was put in without needles or thread or even a sewing machine. "I couldn't care less if they did it with chemistry. It's the look I love," is her pragmatic reply. Human

labor adds to the cost of a product, but it is no mystical enhancer of value. The question is not whether a thing was produced by the human factor or the nonhuman factor; it is whether we like it, find it useful, and want it.

Every economist should repeat firmly to himself every night before he falls asleep: "There are two factors of production. There are two factors of production. There are two factors of production." When this truth has percolated through enough craniums, the answer to the automation crisis will suddenly be as obvious as the machines themselves.

If the economy no longer needs our personal toil, there is another way for us to be economically productive. We can own the capital instruments that are doing the producing. If technology is obsoleting the human factor, and increasing the productivity of the nonhuman factor, isn't this just commonsense?

But there is a difficulty. Labor power is diffused throughout society by nature; everybody gets it at birth. But nobody comes into the world owning capital. Property is a social arrangement, conferred by custom and law. Even in the slave-owning societies of the past, the master could not extract the labor power of his slaves and concentrate it in his own person. Capital is different. Theoretically, one person could own it all. And under our present financial customs that decree "he who has, gits," ownership of capital is automatically invested in a very small fraction of our total population.

Most of us, like the San Francisco delivery man, owe instead of own. And the less the economy needs our labor, the less able we are to "save" our way to capital ownership. Thus the very people who most need to own capital have the least chance of ever getting any.

This is the paradox in which the solution to the automation crisis must be sought. We must adapt our financial machinery to enable people without savings to buy and pay for the machines that are automating their labor. Dividends—like wages—are income. Dividends could also be a source of mass purchasing power if stockholders were the people with unsatisfied economic needs and wants—i.e., if there were many of them instead of few, if their holdings were of sufficient size to produce significant income, and if corporate earnings were actually paid more fully to stockholders. Standard Item's current quarterly dividend of $1.75 represents, of course, only a fraction of what the stockholders would receive if the earnings represented by his capital were not diverted by corporate income taxes and other government and corporate policies.

Years ago an automobile executive showed Walter Reuther Detroit's first mechanized assembly line. Reuther's crack is now famous: "But will those machines buy cars?" When we have buried the manpower myth, perhaps we can at last supply the logical riposte that did not occur to the executive. "No, Walter, it is the owners of machines who buys cars. And given enough of them—assuming they receive the income their private ownership entitles them to—they can buy everything the machines can turn out."

The Future of Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, a very significant area of my district is the city of Dayton. As you know, Dayton is the birthplace of aviation—the reference, of course, is to the great work performed there by the Wright brothers, Orville and Wilbur, who were the first men to successfully achieve heavier-than-air flight.

My district's contributions to the development of aviation are noteworthy and much too lengthy to enumerate here. Suffice it to say the long-term friendly, successful, and productive relationship between Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and the city of Dayton is a remarkable example of the civil-military team that has kept our Nation great and free. I am proud to represent such a district.

Located at Wright-Patterson is the Aeronautical Systems Division of the Air Force Systems Command. Probably no other element in our Government has as important a role in aviation as ASD and no individual a greater influence than Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, commander of the Air Force Systems Command. General Schriever, who needs no introduction here, recently addressed the Air Force Association seminar on aeronautics in the district of my distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Chicago. The general talked about the future of air transportation. I strongly urge all Members to read his speech and for that purpose I place it in the RECORD at this point:

THE FUTURE OF AIR TRANSPORTATION

(By Gen. B. A. Schriever)

Today I want to discuss some of the things that the future can produce in the way of improved air transportation systems for both military and commercial applications and the basic ingredients needed to achieve those improvements. Since the early fifties, I have felt that we have only scratched the surface in exploiting the potential of air transportation.

In the perspective of history, air transportation assumes a role of great importance to the future of our society. It is clearly apparent that the means of transportation have always played a significant role in mankind's affairs. When land transportation was man's primary means of travel, population centers grew up along major trade routes, and military conflict centered around control of strategic land areas. Military operations themselves were largely influenced by the use of land transportation. The advent of ships produced great changes; river ports and sea ports became powerful centers of political and commercial strength. Naval warfare, and the maritime support of land warfare, emerged as important factors in political and military strength. In ancient times, the Roman Empire gained much of its strength from land armies and control of overland trade routes; Great Britain built an empire largely through her naval and commercial fleets. Coming closer to home, this city of Chicago is to a large degree a product of the railroad system and the Great Lakes shipping system.

During World War II, airpower became a dominant military factor, but aeronautical technology had not advanced far enough for its full exploitation. Air transportation played a relatively minor quantitative role in the overall logistics system which moved countless tons of cargo and numbers of troops during World War II. In those instances where air transport had to be used, however, as over the Hump into China, it demonstrated its flexibility and because of its speed made a significant contribution.

Only during the past 20 years has airpower evolved from a system which offered tactical mobility within a combat theater to one which now also offers strategic mobility on a global scale. We should no longer consider air transport in terms of operating exclusively to area commands or theaters as distinct from engaging in operational missions within a combat area. These are simply phases of airlift, and in terms of tasks, timing, and control are one and the same.

But the evolution of airpower as a force of global dimensions has only begun to exploit the tremendous potential of air transportation. I believe that air transportation can provide the United States with a new dimension in truly global strategic maneuverability—the capability for shifting military forces rapidly on a global scale, and in providing logistic support to forces anywhere in the world.

One of the Western World's strategic disadvantages vis-a-vis the Communist bloc, according to many military theorists, stems from the difference between interior and exterior lines of communications. On a global basis, the Communist bloc operates with interior lines of communications; their military and logistics centers are inside the periphery of the points of confrontation between East and West. The United States, on the other hand, must use exterior lines of communications involving great distances from the military and logistics centers in the continental United States to the existing and potential areas of confrontation.

Two of the disadvantages of our exterior lines of communications are the long reaction times imposed by our existing modes of transportation; and the necessity to maintain military forces in many locations throughout the world. I believe that the proper future exploitation of aeronautical technology can largely erase these disadvantages by producing new types of aircraft which will provide the United States and our Allies with true global mobility. These new kinds of aircraft, products of the technologies now emerging from our research and development laboratories, can provide both a vital addition to national security and a major step forward in our economic growth.

Before going into detail I would like to make it clear that we must consider air transportation, both in its military and commercial applications, as a total system and as part of a larger system in which it operates.

Air transport is only one part of the system, which also includes such elements as air traffic control, loading and unloading equipment and procedures, and local transportation to and from airports. As a matter of fact, air transportation affects the whole distribution system, including supply and support activities, warehouses, size of inventory, and so forth. A number of American business firms have proved that a really effective distribution system, which uses air, ground, and sea transportation in a coordinated effort to distribute goods on time throughout the world, has quite an impact on business volume and profit.

In the same way, the Air Force discovered a number of years ago, that the use of airlift for high value logistic and maintenance items, such as aircraft engine spares, could produce substantial savings. The old way which used surface transportation, required us to store spares in oversea depots. Many spares were required, and supply pipelines were long and slow. The use of airlift enabled us to use centralized depots and to reduce drastically the number of spares required. In just 2 years the airlift of spare engines produced a saving of $475 million by allowing us to buy fewer spares. Since 1959, airlift has enabled us to cut our aircraft spares inventory by 59 percent.

Historically the development of the aircraft itself has usually been ahead of the development of the supporting elements. As a result, the air traveler may find that the most time-consuming parts of his journey are the trips to and from the airport, board-

ing procedures, and the wait for takeoff or landing clearance. This is a situation which must be improved if air transportation is to reach its full potential. I was very glad to learn recently that the aircraft companies are showing some real foresight in this area. Some of them have assigned people whose only responsibility is to find ways of improving ground support facilities.

A systems approach should be taken in our future planing for transportation—a system which should include land and sea transportation modes, the terminals which will be the major seaports and airports, and the communications and control systems which tie them all together. We have found in the past—in the ballistic missile program for example—that although the vehicle itself was the central factor, an effective system is produced only when all of the supporting facilities, supplies, personnel, training, communications, and the like, and considered in substantial detail.

First, let us consider the new aircraft which technology can provide. The Military Air Transport Service (MATS) is presently expanding its jet-powered equipment through the procurement of new fanjet C-141's. The C-5A transport aircraft is just entering its development phase for delivery to MATS in a few years. These new transport aircraft—the C-141 and C-5A—are a step in the right direction toward large payload, long-range airlift capability. However, technical advances such as high-strength materials, high-temperature alloys, laminar flow control, and new engine design have been identified that can produce future aircraft which will be three to four times more efficient than even the C-5. These kinds of aircraft will significantly improve our ability for the rapid oversea deployment of military forces.

Our present deployment times for the forces of the U.S. Strike Command are measured in weeks and months. We should be able to reduce the deployment times to hours and days. In the future, we should be able to deploy our forces directly from the continental United States to the combat zones, nonstop, at high subsonic speeds of over 500 miles per hour. The key to this kind of capability will be the development of large, efficient aircraft which can operate from fairly primitive airfields when necessary and which have an unrefueled radius of action of 5,000 to 10,000 miles. This would mean, of course, a range of 10,000 to 20,000 miles.

Such aircraft could deploy our forces to any spot on the globe in a matter of hours using airborne delivery techniques such as parachute drop of supplies or the newly developed technique of inflight, ground-level cargo extraction, as well as normal operations in the landing fields.

The airplane itself will depend upon the successful development of the technologies you are hearing about in today's seminar—new materials for new aircraft structure; new, more efficient propulsion systems; and improvements in aerodynamics. These developments can produce cost decreases as well as the necessary performance improvements, since the initial costs will be offset by high payload characterists and low operating cost per ton-mile.

But much more is required than just new aircraft. We must develop our traffic control systems and navigation systems which will permit the accurate dispatch and control of the aircraft from the continental United States. Such systems can be developed by utilizing the technologies in microelectronics, automated data processing, long-range communication, and inertial navigation. Experiments are already underway to adopt inertial systems to automatic, precision navigation of aircraft. These all-weather navigation systems will certainly include provisions for the so-called blind landings in all weather conditions.

Another area of development which promises future improvements is in the handling of cargo. The Air Force has done a great deal of work to simplify and expedite cargo handling. Aircraft are provided with built-in ramps to truck-bed-height cargo compartments so that military vehicles can use the roll-on, roll-off loading and unloading technique. Palletized and prepackaged cargo modules can be moved quickly from truck to aircraft at the load point and from aircraft to truck at destination. I am also happy to say that this Air Force-developed air cargo system is already fully compatible with the standard existing surface transportation media. Full-sized standard truck, train, and ship containers fit directly and easily into these standard Air Force airplanes.

Much interesting work has been done using computers to reduce complex loading problems to simplified lists of loading operations. Whole infantry divisions can be "practice loaded," using these computer techniques, and "airlifted"—hypothetically, of course—to any point in the world. These computer runs tell us how many aircraft sorties are required and the optimum load for each of the hypothetical cases. Equally important, they can come up rapidly with the most effective flow plan for the dispatch of varying types of aircraft over multiple routes. They can be used to compute ahead of time the precise load and the schedule for each aircraft required in a large-scale deployment. To take advantage of these computations, we will develop operational procedures to utilize the computer outputs.

The major advantages of airlift in global deployment are its speed and its accessibility to any land area. Airlift can play an important role in complementing sealift for permanent lines of communications. In many strategically important parts of the world, surface transportation facilities between the seacoast and inland areas are either nonexistent or very primitive. The same aircraft that are used for the initial deployment can remain in the combat theater as intratheater airlift between the coastal logistics beachhead and the inland combat zone. Vertical takeoff and landing aircraft can be especially useful in this role in primitive areas where airlift could conceivably be from a beachhead to a jungle clearing.

The transportation job for military deployment and resupply will not be completed by the large transports moving men and equipment into the combat zone support airfields. There is a strong requirement for tactical mobility within the combat zone. The assault transport aircraft fulfills this role. VTOL assault transports can be developed to move military forces and supplies from support airfields to forward areas where they will be employed. The use of VTOL aircraft promises to free air mobility from most of the constraints imposed by the need to operate from airfields.

The same aeronautical technology which will produce these new transport aircraft can also be used for a long-range, long-endurance aircraft which could perform a variety of military roles. Some which come to mind are a strategic missile carrier which could patrol the air over international waters; a command and control center which would serve as an airborne command post during times of tension; and a reconnaissance aircraft utilizing the most up-to-date techniques in intelligence gathering. One can even envision such a large aircraft acting as a standoff missile launcher of tactical missiles.

All of the advances I have mentioned for the military air transport—low cost, long haul airplanes; automated air traffic control; automatic navigation; improved ground handling equipment and techniques—all of these improvements can be applied directly to produce a truly revolutionary period in commercial air transportation. I am convinced that the next major breakthrough in international commerce will be low cost, long haul air transportation. I recognize that there are problems involved in translating military systems into commerical systems. But these problems can be successfully attacked and solved, if there is adequate long-range planning now for the requirements and opportunities of the years ahead.

Using the systems approach in planning, the United States can integrate the very efficient, high subsonic speed transport airplane into a future transportation system that will have as much impact as did the introduction of steamships, railroads and automobiles in the past. Such an airplane, coming out of the development of military air transport technology, can reduce air freight costs to a point economically competitive with ship, rail and truck transportation for a substantial amount of shipping.

Along with the improved aircraft will come improvements in air traffic control, navigation, and all-weather operation similar to those I cited earlier for the military air transport system. Here the utilization of satellites for communications, navigation, traffic control, and weather forecasting could take advantage of space systems in a support role for future air transport operations.

With the combination of automated accounting, electronic data processing, fast communications and fast, low cost airlift, the possibilities will exist for an entirely new system for the distribution of goods. The amount of goods scattered throughout warehouses and in the distribution "pipeline" can be reduced sharply by maintaining a central stock of goods quickly accessible to an air terminal. The Air Force, in using such techniques with existing aircraft, has cut the cost of spare parts stockage in half. This amounts to a savings of around $800 million to the taxpayer. And we have only scratched the surface.

My personal view of the air transportation system of the future is an optimistic one, but it is technically realistic, providing the proper technologies are exploited on a national scale and providing the proper planning is done. Our future military air transportation system can—and I hope will—provide U.S. military forces an entirely new dimension in rapid global strategic maneuverability.

Commercial air transportation will benefit from the military example and experience. In 10 or 20 years, the big passenger market will be in low-cost, 500-miles-per-hour air travel. The businessman will use the faster, supersonic transport where time commands the premium, while the subsonic transport will offer the average traveler fast, convenient service at prices one-third to one-half of those today. Population and industrial centers will gravitate to locations made convenient by air transportation.

Commercial goods will flow from manufacturing centers to retail distribution networks relying on fast, efficient air freighters. The development of these more rapid distribution systems will prove of great benefit to the businessman by cutting down on his inventories, warehouses, and delivery times. The use of central depots could reduce the amount of handling that would be required if many scattered storage facilities were required. As a result, a whole new concept of distribution might come into being, bringing substantial savings in time and money.

The air terminal of the future may become the center of a transportation network which will provide fast, efficient flow of goods and people. Just as other transportation methods have influenced the locations of populations and commerce, air transportation will have a major influence on where and how the population and commerce of

the future develops. Just as our past and present great cities have been major seaports, riverports, railway centers and highway centers—future generations will know great cities as major airports.

These are just some of the possibilities for the future of air transportation. Technology promises to make them attainable in the years ahead, if we make the necessary decisions today.

Proposed Drastic Reduction in Technical Assistance to Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago last month, the Congress of the United States, without a disenting vote, enacted Public Law 46 which declared soil and water conservation to be a national policy and created the Soil Conservation Service to implement the new policy. Out of this historic legislation has grown one of the most successful and popular partnerships betwen a government and its people that I have known about.

Throughout the Nation some 3,000 locally organized, locally governed soil and water conservation districts have entered into compacts with their Government to share the responsibility of rehabilitating and conserving the country's vital soil and water resources. Ninety-five of these districts are in my home State of Tennessee.

For nearly 30 years, the farmers have done the work of installing and maintaining conservation measures while the Government, for its share, provided technical assistance for planning, designing, and laying out these practices.

In Tennessee, nearly 63,000 farmers have taken advantage of the opportunities that this partnership provided. In view of the national interest in soil and water resources, this has been an equitable arrangement. It has been a good investment for both parties. It has been a good investment for the farmer because it made it possible for him to rehabilitate and stabilize the productive capacity of his basic resources, it strengthened his economic base, and enabled him to take full advantage of and participate in the phenomenal technological advancement in agriculture that have occurred over a period of time that corresponds almost exactly with that of the partnership. He learned that with proper care he could improve and increase the productive capacity of his soil while he used it indefinitely.

It has been a good investment for the Government because it assured an abundance of food and fiber for all its people for the present and for generations to come; it very greatly broadened and solidified the national economy; it created a corps of highly trained, skilled, and dedicated conservationists, engineers, soil scientists, agronomists, and other agricultural technologists unequaled anywhere in the world or in history.

All this has been accomplished at a phenominally low cost to the Government. A cost in 30 years of only a small fraction of the cost of landing the first man on the moon.

Now, after 30 years of this successful and profitable partnership, and through some curious reasoning, the Budget Bureau proposes to wreck the program by summarily lopping $2 million off the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service and substituting a revolving fund arrangement, whereby thin-pursed farmers would be required to pay 50 percent of the cost of technical services that are unavailable elsewhere and without which they, and with them, the Nation, cannot continue an effective conservation program.

I think we all will agree that it would be a foolish farmer indeed who grinds his seed corn into corn meal. In like manner, it would be folly for this Congress to be a party to sacrificing an essential soil and water conservation program at home, while at the same time spending billions on space exploration, moon shots, and aid to people in foreign countries who stone our embassies, burn our libraries, and insult us in the streets.

This Budget Bureau proposal would, in my State alone, cost the Government some 60 to 75 trained, highly skilled conservation technicians, because farmers could not possibly raise the estimated $600,000 needed as their share of the revolving fund. It would cost contractors and suppliers hundreds of thousands of dollars in lost business. It would start anew accelerated runoff and erosion from farmland because farmers would be unable to get the technical assistance they need. These farmers least able to pay would suffer the most.

The Tennessee State Legislature, in its most recent session, adopted a concurrent resolution, approved by the Governor, memorializing this Congress to oppose the Budget Bureau proposal. This resolution has already been entered into the records of this Tennessee General Assembly. This resolution was introduced by the Honorable J. I. Bell, of Savannah, Tenn., who has long been a leader for progressive practices in all farm matters in Tennessee, and I give it my wholehearted endorsement. I also want to express my strong opposition to the proposal by the Budget Bureau as being detrimental to the best interests of the Nation and its farmers.

The resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 73

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to oppose the proposed drastic reduction in technical assistance to soil conservation districts

Whereas the proposed Federal budget for 1966 provides for a reduction of $20 million in the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service in providing technical assistance to landowners in carrying out soil conservation district programs; and

Whereas this budget also proposes a radical change in the basis for technical assistance which would seriously reduce the amount and the effectiveness of soil and water conservation measures applied to the land; and

Whereas practically every soil conservation district now has insufficient personnel to meet the growing demands of farmland owners, suburban dwellers, and municipal governments requiring technical guidance and assistance in soil and water management problems; and

Whereas this proposed reduction is a strange and questionable form of economy since it would seriously curtail conservation construction work and the sales of conservation materials and supplies representing hundreds of millions of dollars annually in the Nation's business; and

Whereas the Tennessee General Assembly and many units of local government recognize the essentiality of technically sound conservation assistance and make annual appropriations and other contributions in support of soil and water conservation district activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Members of the U.S. Congress from Tennessee are urged to vigorously oppose the proposed reduction and related changes; and to give their support to the restoration of funds for soil conservation district assistance to the level of present and future needs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Members of the Congress from Tennessee, and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Adopted: March 19, 1965.

WILLIAM L. BARRY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

JARED MADDUX,
Speaker of the Senate.

Approved:

FRANK G. CLEMENT,
Governor.

Mental Illness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it was not until 1948 that Congress took a direct and substantial interest in helping the mentally ill. In that year the National Institute of Mental Health was established with an initial appropriation of $250,000. The appropriation for this year is over $200 million.

The emergence of the cause of mental health from ignorance and despair is a remarkable story, and it was told in an outstanding address by Charles Schlaifer to the Eastern Nebraska Association for Mental Health. Mr. Schlaifer, a former resident of Omaha, is an honorary fellow of the American Psychiatric Association; a trustee of the New York State mental hygiene facilities fund; secretary treasurer of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health; a founder and cochairman of the National Mental Health Committee; a founder and member of the board of directors of the National Association for Mental Health; and a director of the Mental Health Foundation and the Children's Day Treatment Center and School.

In his talk, Mr. Schlaifer said:

The greatest enemies to the eradication of mental illness are two: Patience on the part of good people and indifference on the part

of the rest of society. If we are to go forward, we cannot be patient and we must drive out indifference.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Schlaifer's address contains much that should be of of interest to Members of Congress, for the treatment and cure of mental illness is one of our many responsibilities in an increasingly complex society. Accordingly, I submit Mr. Schlaifer's speech for inclusion in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES SCHLAIFER ON MENTAL HEALTH

Thoreau once said, "If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away."

It is true that I have been far away, and have been marching to a distant drummer, but that distant drummer, I have discovered, was really here in Omaha—in Nebraska.

If I had to state the one purpose of my life, I would have to say that it was all for this night, to sit with you, to join with you in helping to do something for those who cannot help themselves, the mentally ill.

All of life begins with two people, and it is in this sense, in this purpose, in this time, that you have joined hands to help resolve one of this Nation's, and one of the world's, gravest problems, mental illness.

The absence of mental illness would be the absence of frustration, of fear, of hate, and of anger. Remove those Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse and we would not be in danger of marching toward Armageddon.

Therefore, you and I, who have become aware of the fact that it does make a difference if someone is well or not, have taken on a burden, a burden that is perhaps not weightless, but is also not witless.

Nebraska, I must say, is one of the more fortunate States. Dr. Alexander Young, father of Dr. Young, was one of the handful of founders of the American Psychoanalytic Association. Because of people like Dr. Cecil Wittson, because of your Governor, because of your State legislature, Nebraska has developed a unique program, and an outstanding one, in comparison with other States.

But even this is not enough.

When I appeared before the Congress of the United States in 1948, as one of the first ever to testify for the need for funds for the establishment of a National Institute of Mental Health. I felt the need to present to the Congress figures and facts, not just emotion. So I gathered what figures I could and came up with such statistics as 550,000 mental patients, 55 percent of the hospital beds of America occupied by mental patients, etc., etc. You're familiar with all of those figures now. I was concerned that one of the members of the congressional comittee would ask me where I obtained my figures. Fortunately, he did not.

In the next year, however, many prominent doctors and public leaders used my figures in speeches and articles, so that when I went back before the Congress the next year, I was able to quote from all of these eminent men, stating that Dr. So-and-So has said, etc., so that these figures since then have become standard operating procedure, buried in the footnotes of history.

Two interesting sidelight on this same subject developed several years later. The Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health retained the Research Department of the University of Michigan to do a study on the economics of mental illness. These results were published in one of the volumes, and the figures they came up with were almost identical to our original figures of years ago. I had become a footnote in our own study.

But, ladies and gentlemen, figures are not really important to me and should not be to you. It is not important whether there are 550,000, or 55,000, or 55, or only 5 patients. So long as there is one person in a mental hospital, in the United States, not receiving proper care and treatment, we have a responsibility, a responsibility to see to it that that person receives the best care and the best treatment known to modern science. And there should be an Association for Mental Health to see that it is done.

That is why no matter what is being done in Nebraska and no matter how much we commend it, that much more must and should be done.

Clemenceau once said that "War is too important to be left to the generals" and so I say, mental illness is too serious to be left to the doctors. It is not up to the scientists and the doctors, it is up to us, the laymen, to do something about this problem. It is up to impatient people, such as you and me, who do not ask, who do not implore, but who demand care and treatment and prevention of illness for our fellow man.

Life is action and the use of one's powers and to use them to their height is our joy and our duty. So it is the one end that justifies the means.

In order to understand the present, and plan for the future, it is necessary, it is vital, to look at the past.

Archimedes once said that given a place to stand and a lever long enough he could move the world.

I want to tell you about a little lady who found a place to stand and a lever, and who moved the world.

In 1834, Dorothea Lynde Dix was teaching school in Boston, Mass. She became ill and was told by her doctor that she had but a year to live. She was just 35 years old.

Because she was not a sedentary person, she went on Sundays to teach a religious class at the women's jail in Boston. She discovered that a group of women sitting in the back, chained together, disheveled, in rags, were not criminals, but were mentally ill. Their only crime was that they were sick.

She went to her doctor, Dr. Howe, and asked: "Doctor, what can we do about this?" And he replied, "It is your problem, you saw it, you do something about it," and she said, "But you told me I only have a year to live." His reply was, "Make that year do."

A Russian poet once said that, "Silence, when a person sees a fault, is a lie."

Dorothea Lynde Dix saw the fault and did not lie.

Dorothea Lynde Dix did not live for just one more year, she lived for 50 more years. She died at the age of 85, and this is what she accomplished. This little frail woman, all alone.

She lived to see the establishment of 127 mental hospitals in the United States. She traveled through 17 States, appearing before legislatures, Governors and committees, and caused laws to be enacted, establishing mental hospitals in each of these States.

She said, "I beg, I implore, I demand pity, for the protection of these, our outraged, suffering, fellow human beings, and I commit you to this sacred cause."

She was not content merely to do this, so she traveled to England and aroused the people there.

She went to the Vatican and awoke the Pope to awareness of the terrifying conditions in which the mentally ill of Vatican City were kept.

He called this American protestant lady "A modern Santa Teresa."

She went to Constantinpole, the capital city of the Turkish Empire and did the same.

She came back to the United States and lobbied before the U.S. Congress, to create our first national mental hospital, St. Elizabeths, in Washington.

For 6 years, she appeared before committee after committee of the Congress, and finally got the Congress to pass an act setting aside 12½ million acres of western lands. The moneys from the sale of these lands were to be set aside for care, treatment, and research for the mentally ill, the deaf, and the blind.

Franklin Pierce, President of the United States, vetoed this bill and set back progress in these areas for a hundred years.

Imagine what would have happened in our country had Franklin Pierce not vetoed this bill. Hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars would have been set aside for the care, treatment, and research for these illnesses.

Tonight we would not be meeting here for the same cause, because much of it would have been eradicated.

As all of you know, the land grant colleges of the United States were created by a similar land grant bill. Is there anyone in the United States who doubts what this did for education in our country?

Is it because we have refused to look at mental illness? Are we still afraid?

But to get back to our history: Clifford Beers, a brilliant Yale graduate, became mentally ill. He was sent to one of those state hospitals in Connecticut that Dorothea Lynde Dix helped create.

He was one of the fortunate ones who was discharged. But what he saw, and what he experienced, caused him to be as aroused about the problem as Dorothea Dix had been.

Clifford Beers wrote a book, "The Mind That Found Itself," in which he said, "Madmen are too often man made." And through the interest this book created, he and a group of professors, alumni of Yale University, started the National Mental Hygiene Committee, the first group in the United States to do something about the mentally ill.

The year was 1909 and it is historically important because it was the first group of citizens to be concerned not only with bettering conditions in mental hospitals, but equally concerned with prevention, with clinics, with education. It was as concerned with keeping people from getting ill, as it was with helping them after they became ill.

But, again, as a guiding spirit drops by the wayside, the interest lags too. As with the death of Dorothea Lynde Dix, the death of Clifford Beers caused a lag in the work of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene.

In 1948, a man by the name of Albert Deutsch, a crusading journalist, wrote a book called "The Shame of the States," in which, by word and picture, he described the kind of care and treatment the mentally ill in the United States received.

A more terrifying, terrible document of man's inhumanity to man had never been published before. There rose a great hue and cry in the land, and many became aroused, but not much was done about the problem. People clucked their tongues and then forgot.

The same year that Albert Deutsch wrote his book, another book was written called "The Snake Pit," describing one person's experiences in a mental hospital.

I was fortunate enough to have been associated with the making of this film, and so I discovered the problems of the mentally ill firsthand. When I saw how great this problem was and how little was being done about it, I became committed to this cause.

I was invited to come to Washington as the first layman to testify before a congressional committee concerning the establishment of a National Institute of Mental Health.

That year we were able to convince the Congress to appropriate $250,000. The next year $2½ million. This last year the Congress of the United States appropriated over $200 million for 1 year's activities of the National Institute of Mental Health. What progress in only 15 years.

When I first went to Washington I found, as Dorothea Dix had found, "It was a very lonely place," because no national associations for mental health, nor psychiatry, nor

psychology, nor medical, nor nurses, nor social workers, would come to appear before the committee.

I will not take your time to go over all of the history of those lonely years of going to Washington, but I will say this, that we found ears to listen and hearts to feel. Members of both Houses, of both parties, listened and acted.

The Congress of the United States deserves the thanks and appreciation of every person in this country who is concerned with the betterment of his fellow man and himself.

Let me just tell you a few things that were accomplished by just a few people going to Washington to speak to the Congress, to the legislative leaders, to Government officials.

First was the establishment of a National Institute of Mental Health in the U.S. Public Health Service.

When the Institute was founded there were only 17 States in the United States that had any kind of mental health program. Today every State has one.

The Institute was, and is, responsible for 90 percent of all the research that goes on in the field of mental illness and health.

It was and is responsible for the training of psychiatrists, psychoanalysts and allied disciplines all over the United States.

It was and is responsible for the establishment of new psychiatric medical education for the general practitioner.

It was and is responsible for the establishment of the research center at Bethesda, Md.

All of this, I might add, without one bit of Federal control.

Parenthetically, here I would like to add that modern psychiatry was driven out of Hitler's Germany, Mussolini's Italy, Stalin's Russia. Mental health and dictatorship do not go hand in hand. They are implacable enemies.

It is only in a democratic society, even though sometimes it moves slowly, that we have been able to do anything toward the idea of mental health for everyone. Europe developed modern psychiatry, but America democratized it.

It is most interesting to note that in one of the early years when I testified before the congressional committees, one of the Senators asked me why I was so interested in mental health.

I replied that just that week, in New York, a young girl, sitting on a bench on the campus of Columbia University, was killed by a sniper's bullet. A young man, the same week, was killed by a sniper's bullet while walking in a park. The sniper was found to have been emotionally ill—he did not even know the people whom he shot.

I told the Senator that one of the reasons I became interested in mental health was because I did not want my daughter being shot some day by a mentally ill person. I went on to tell the Senator that two and a half million men and women had either been rejected or discharged from the armed services in the Second World War because of mental illness and they were wandering the streets of our country. I said "who knows, Senator, whether some day some sick person might shoot you or me, or someone very close to us."

It is such a terrifying quirk of fate to know that the same year that I gave this testimony, Lee Oswald was being judged by a school psychiatrist in New York as a potentially dangerous schizophrenic.

Need I say more?

To complete the history up to the present, in 1955, by unanimous act, Congress created the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health.

It is one of the proudest satisfactions of my life that I was a founder, and served as secretary-treasurer, the only lay officer of this Commission, from its inception.

The Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health was charged by Congress with studying the entire field of mental illness and health, appraising and evaluating, and making recommendations to the Congress and and to the President. This work has been completed.

Twelve major volumes have been published, including the final one, "Action for Mental Health," in which 36 national organizations, concerned with the Nation's welfare, running the gamut from the American Medical Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Legion, the Department of Defense, etc, agreed to and endorsed the recommendations.

These recommendations were made to the President and to the Congress of the United States, resulting in President Kennedy's new program for mental health and mental retardation, new legislation in the Congress, a national conference called by the American Medical Association, a conference of all the Governors of the United States, and a new and different emphasis on care and treatment of the mentally ill, as well as prevention.

Now it is 1964, mental health is no longer a phrase—it has meaning, it has substance, it has purpose, it has become part of the warp and woof of the very fabric of our lives.

But this is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. It is only the end of the beginning.

Malebranche once said, "If God held in one hand truth and the other the pursuit of truth, he would say, 'Lord, the truth is for Thee alone, give me the pursuit'." This is why you and I are gathered together, for the pursuit of the truth.

The truth is that with all that has been done, the mentally ill in the United States are not a great deal better off than when Albert Deutsch wrote "The Shame of the States."

When only 20 percent of those in mental hospitals in the United States have even minimum standards of care and treatment, it is still "the shame of the States."

It is still "the shame of the States," that there are those in hospitals who do not receive any treatment whatsoever.

It is still "the shame of the States," when we do not have enough doctors, psychologists, nurses, social workers, to use the tools and methods we know will help almost anyone who is mentally ill today.

Ladies and gentlemen, I could go on with these indictments, but let me put it this way: these hospitals have no defenders, but they endure despite the attacks made upon them.

They endure, as Arthur Fleming said recently, "Because citizens permit them to endure." He and others have stated that the mentally ill must not remain pariahs. He also calls for full and complete support on every portion of the joint commission study.

The greatest enemies to the eradication of mental illness are two: patience on the part of good people and indifference on the part of the rest of society. If we are to go forward, we cannot be patient and we must drive out indifference.

The Bible says, "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." It is up to us to bring hope back to the mentally ill.

The Sermon on the Mount said, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." It is up to us to put that into effect.

And may I add here, that this is not done with money alone.

Albert Einstein said, "Good things are not created just with money. No wealth in the world can itself help humanity forward. Can anyone imagine Moses, Jesus, or Gandhi with the moneybags of a Carnegie?"

Dorothea Lynde Dix took the mentally ill out of the jails. Let us take them out of the hospitals and let us keep them out.

In Spain there is a sign over the entrance to a mental hospital which reads: "Neither are they all, those who are here, nor are they all here, those who are."

Our Government is going to spend $5 billion or more to try to reach the moon. I am not against that. I am for it. I am for our country to be the best in everything it can, but what would it avail us to reach the moon if we have not reached out to each other?

May I ask that we all now reach out for each other. Let us join hands.

Stop Commercial Piracy Involving Patent Holders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation addressed to the problem of the encouragement of patent infringements by the Federal Government, causing the erosion of American patent rights and presenting a situation which calls for legislative action by the Congress. The commercial piracy which is being engaged in by certain foreign producers of drugs must be stopped, otherwise it would deter the expenditure of funds for research and development of new drug products so vital for the maintenance of the health of the people of our Nation.

Purchasing agencies of the Federal Government until very recent years bought patented products only from the patentholders or their licensees. Now, certain procurement agencies of the Federal Government have begun to engage in a practice which has now been applied to the products of many areas of American industry, which results in a violation of the rights of American patentholders or their licensees.

In recent years, several purchasing agencies of the Federal Government have bought tetracycline and other drug products covered by U.S. product patents, from unlicensed sources for use in the United States in direct and deliberate violation of these patents. These sources have been located in Europe or have prepared forms from bulk drugs imported from abroad.

These Federal agencies have attempted to justify their actions by giving a new twist to an old statute—title 28, United States Code, section 1498. The owner of a U.S. patent, as the law is now interpreted, cannot put a stop to the Federal Government's violation of his patent rights—he cannot obtain an injunction from the court against the Federal Government, even at the end of successful litigation, and his right to claim damages in the Court of Claims is an inadequate remedy. There is no similar legal loophole for local governments which violate patent rights.

When the statute was originally enacted, its sole purpose was to give an injured patentholder a right of action where none had heretofore existed. As the statute was amended in 1918, it contemplated at most access by the Gov-

ernment to inventions during wartime emergency situations.

It was never intended to give blanket authorization for Government agencies to violate U.S. patents. The net result has been a serious erosion of the rights of U.S. patent owners.

Those who attempt to justify the violation of U.S. drug patents by Government agencies, on the ground that the prices quoted by infringers are lower than those quoted by the U.S. patent owners, fail to consider other factors. Their reasoning fails to take into consideration, the fact that foreign and domestic patent infringers, have had to bear no research costs for discovering or developing the drugs covered by the patents they are infringing; and they are attempting to exploit established markets established by extensive advertising and promotion and for which they have spent nothing to maintain. In addition, foreign producers of drug products, pay wages that are about one-fourth of the rates prevailing in the United States, and generally speaking, it may be assumed that they have lower production costs.

Our Government's purchases of unlicensed foreign-made drug products or unlicensed dosage forms made from foreign bulk drugs have been facilitated by the fact that some foreign countries provide no patent protection for either drug products or processes. As a result, foreign concerns have developed quite a business out of copying the developments, products, and inventions of the American drug industry. It does not seem plausible that we should encourage this brand of commercial piracy.

The American free enterprise system is strengthened by our patent structure, a right protected by the U.S. Constitution to advance science by protecting inventors. More drugs have been discovered in the United States under the protection of a strong patent system than in any other country. Foreign countries with no product or process patent protection in the drug field have produced no important drug discoveries.

With respect to drug products, it is important to note that as the costs of research and development are amortized, prices of drugs are lowered, prices quoted by manufacturers to Federal and local government agencies are less than 50 percent of the prices quoted when the product was first introduced and that prices to the trade generally have declined by about 43 percent.

Purchases of unlicensed drug products by the Federal Government are not in the public interest and may well be characterized as "penny wise and pound foolish." American drug research will be discouraged by such purchases, and this may eventually be deterimental to American health. Purchases of unlicensed foreign-made drug products, or unlicensed dosage forms prepared from foreign-made bulk drugs, will cause loss of jobs by American workers as a result of the manufacture of such products by low paid foreign workers in foreign countries; encourage dumping of foreign-made products in the United States at prices lower than those charged in the regular foreign market; unfavorably affect our balance of international payments; and reduce tax revenues for our Federal, State, and municipal governments.

There is an important issue at stake in the matter of governmental purchases of drug products in violation of the protection afforded by U.S. patents. The laws of the United States have provided a strong patent system for the precise purpose of encouraging long and expensive research work of the very type which led to the discovery of drugs such as tetracycline. We cannot stand aside while erosion occurs to patent rights which help to provide the funds necessary for the continuance of important medical research, the kind of research that has made the United States the world leader in the discovery and development of lifesaving products.

Purchases of patented products by the Federal Government from unlicensed sources have been extended to the products of many industries and herein lies the danger to American patent holders. Research-oriented American industry should be protected. Otherwise the effect may well be to discourage research in many industries, including the drug industry.

It is unfair to have the U.S. Patent Office issue a patent to an inventor or discoverer of a new product, and have another agency of the Government, violate that patent. This, however, is exactly what is happening. Federal legislation appears to be the only way to stop this moral wrong.

Continued violation of U.S. patents by the Federal Government can have the following effects:

First. Discourage research by American companies.

Second. Loss of jobs for American workers.

Third. Encourage dumping of foreign-made products in the U.S. market.

Fourth. Reduce American tax revenues.

Fifth. Adversely affect U.S. balance of payments.

Sixth. Encourage local governments to violate U.S. patents.

Legislative action appears to be the only means by which the existing situation can be corrected.

The proposed legislation provides authority for the Secretary of Defense to purchase products in violation of U.S. patents when the national security of the United States requires it.

Foreign Aid Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives today expressed the Nation's overwhelming support of our President's recent actions in the face of the continuing Communist threat. This is also an appropriate time for us to recognize the positive role our foreign aid program plays in assisting the President in supporting freedom and assure him of our support of his requests for the foreign aid program of fiscal year 1966.

The proposed program further reflects the determination of the President and the Congress to increase its effectiveness by emphasizing selectivity, self-help, the role of the private sector, continued improvements in management of our assistance, and multilateral coordination with the aid programs of other developed countries. The following excerpt from the summary presentation to Congress, prepared by the Agency for International Development, on the proposed mutual defense and development program for fiscal year 1966, discusses in detail the objectives of this year's bill:

AID IN PERSPECTIVE: THE OBJECTIVE IN FISCAL YEAR 1966

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 set our assistance goals. Consistent with that act and its objectives, the program for fiscal year 1966 will intensify the concentration of our aid and our insistence that aid be tied to self-help and performance; improve the quality of assistance through greater reliance on private skills and resources; continue tightening the management of assistance; and increase reliance on multilateral aid coordination, and seek to put more free world aid on a multilateral basis.

The $3,380 million request for fiscal year 1966 is the lowest request in the history of the foreign assistance program.

This minimum request reflects a determination to present to the Congress the lowest aid budget consistent with the national interest. It takes full account of the increasing efficiency of the assistance program, and the increasing availability of assistance funds from international agencies in which the costs are shared among a number of countries.

It represents the smallest burden on the American taxpayer: one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product (compared with 2 percent of gross national product at the height of the Marshall plan), and 3.5 percent of the Federal budget (compared with nearly 12 percent 17 years ago).

CONCENTRATING ASSISTANCE

The program proposed for fiscal year 1966 will intensify the concentration of U.S. assistance in countries of priority need and best performance.

Of a proposed total of $1,667 million in development assistance (technical cooperation and development loans), two-thirds is presently planned for seven countries which are engaged in strong, self-help, development programs: Brazil, Chile, Nigeria, Tunisia, India, Pakistan, and Turkey.

Of a proposed $380 million in supporting assistance, nearly 90 percent is planned for four countries whose security or stability depends on continued U.S. support: Vietnam, Laos, Korea, and Jordan.

Of a proposed $1,258 million military assistance program, nearly three-quarters is planned for 11 countries now maintaining 3.5 million of their own men under arms in defensive forces rimming the Communist world.

In recognition of the priority the United States places on the progress of our Latin American neighbors and in response to the momentum achieved under the Alliance for Progress, Latin America will again be the scene of our most intensive assistance effort. The $596 million planned for Alliance countries during fiscal year 1966 represents nearly

a third of total AID country assistance and a per capita aid level of $2.73, by far the highest of any region.

EMPHASIS ON SELF-HELP

Foreign assistance can add an important margin of resources and skills to the self-help efforts of other countries. But it cannot spare others the need to make the major effort themselves.

Self-help was formally made a criterion for aid in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Since then, AID has led the way among free world donors in relating assistance to sound self-help measures.

At the simplest level, this means cost-sharing in any AID-assisted project, with the U.S. contribution of experts or American commodities related to the host government's carrying its share of local costs.

* * * * *

Performance in development, however, is more than a matter of sharing project costs. It involves every major aspect of a country's development effort: tax policies, budgeting, exchange controls, government actions that affect the climate for private initiative, the relative emphasis being given to agriculture, industry, education, health, and the like.

In countries to which the United States is giving substantial development assistance, self-help and the measurement of satisfactory performance is a complex matter. Overall country performance must be thoroughly reviewed and taken into account. In some instances, assistance agreements are entered into which contain specific provisions as to what an aid recipient will or will not do.

* * * * *

In measuring self-help, AID is concerned with performance that directly affects economic growth and social development. Assistance is not tied to political conformity or the way a country chooses to vote in the United Nations.

But when countries divert their scarce resources into arms in order to mount political adventures against their neighbors, they waste substance badly needed for the welfare of their own people.

The United States cannot afford to provide major assistance to countries that choose to make their own development a minor concern.

The minimum appropriations requests for both fiscal years 1965 and 1966 reflect AID's determination to limit assistance to those making the best use of it. The 1966 request leaves no room for the support of marginal activities or for costs that aid-receiving countries are able to carry themselves.

IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF ASSISTANCE

Many efforts are underway to make better use of the tremendously productive and diverse skills and resources of the private sectors of the American economy.

For example, the agricultural revolution in the United States was sparked by the Nation's great land grant colleges and universities, which provided both a research and a training base for the agricultural extension network that helped to make American agriculture so productive.

In the developing countries today, it is proving very difficult to raise farm output. As a result, food supplies are lagging behind demand in several countries and serious shortages could develop in a few years' time unless strong measures are taken quickly.

Surplus American food, provided through the food-for-peace program, can help greatly, but the ultimate answers lie in improving these countries' ability to buy food from abroad and, most important, in making their farms more productive.

The United States is relying heavily on the same institutions that transformed American agriculture to apply their skills and experience to the difficult agricultural problems of the developing nations. Through more extensive contracts with the land grant universities and colleges and broader use of Department of Agriculture experts provided through interagency agreements, AID will increase emphasis in its fiscal year 1966 programs on agricultural development in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

* * * * *

ENCOURAGING PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Private investment puts management skill as well as capital to work in the less-developed countries, and encouragement of more private American investment in Asia, Africa, and Latin America remains a priority objective in the AID program.

Since the establishment of AID in 1961, there has been a dramatic growth in programs available to American investors through AID, and a significant improvement in the management of existing incentive programs.

More developing countries have undertaken formal agreements with the United States which enable AID to extend investment guarantee coverage to new American private investments in these countries. * * *

The handling of investment guarantee applications was streamlined in 1964, and the 468 sepcific risk contracts written during the calendar year. * * *

Increased use is being made of the investment survey program initiated in 1962, under which AID will share the cost of studying a potential investment opportunity overseas.

AID complied a catalog of more than 1,200 recent economic and feasibility studies made in the less-developed countries—the first such listing ever to be made available to potential American investors. * * *

The Congress has been asked to approve a tax credit for investments in the underdeveloped countries, which is expected to provide further inducement for American investors to risk the uncertainties of ventures in the less-developed countries and act to increase the flow of U.S. private capital to them. The proposal would grant a tax credit against the total tax liability of an investor equal to 30 percent of his new investment in underdeveloped countries.

Before the close of fiscal year 1965, the Agency expects a report from its Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise which is reviewing current programs and will suggest new or more effective means to encourage greater private participation in economic development.

Strengthening the private sector

The developing countries that have made the best progress are those in which private initiative and private enterprise have been encouraged to play a vigorous role in national growth.

AID has long provided technical assistance to private industry, encouraged government measures that improve the climate for private initiative and helped to strengthen productivity councils and trade associations designed to raise standards and performance in private industry.

One of the greatest bottlenecks to growth in both the private industrial and agricultural sectors has been a shortage of credit on reasonable terms. To ease this, AID has emphasized the establishment of thrift institutions and intermediate credit institutions such as development banks, housing and farm credit banks. * * *

Another continuing handicap in the growth of private enterprise in the less-developed countries is a shortage of experienced managerial help—people skilled in management, marketing, and production control. With strong encouragement from AID, the International Executive Service Corps was established under private auspices during 1964 to provide the help of experienced American businessmen to entrepreneurs in the less-developed countries. * * *

Finally, AID commodity loans have become an increasingly important factor in the growth of private enterprise in countries such as India, Pakistan, Chile, and Brazil. They are made available to countries with sound development programs, and they make it possible for private enterprise to import a wide variety of American goods and equipment needed to maintain or expand existing plants, repair or increase the supply of farm equipment, and the like. * * *

TIGHTENING MANAGEMENT OF ASSISTANCE

AID is continuing its drive for efficiency and economy in the management of assistance. The Agency has reduced the number of employees, raised performance levels, cut operating costs, and instituted improved management procedures.

In fiscal year 1964, the Agency reduced direct-hire staff by 1,140—from 16,782 at the beginning of fiscal year 1964 to 15,642 by the close.

Further reductions are being made through improved operating procedures and continued improvements in job performance.

AID has increased attention to the professional improvement of its staff, setting high performance standards, rewarding competence, and weeding out ineffective employees. Procedures initiated to this end include a new performance evaluation system, field visits by headquarters staff to review personnel procedures on the spot, and an improved initial selection process.

We expect to take further steps in this direction, in the context of a program designed to strengthen the personnel capabilities of all foreign affairs agencies of the Government.

Rotating the foreign aid staff between headquarters and field assignments is important to the achievement of a common well-knit staff operation. Experience has also underscored the value of assigning new Foreign Service Reserve appointees to headquarters operations before they undertake a first oversea tour. To this end, we are requesting broadened authority to appoint Foreign Service Reserve officers to initial duty in Washington, without the existing limitations on the number, duration, or purpose of such assignments.

* * * * *

IMPROVING THE FREE WORLD AID EFFORT

The United States strongly supports the principle of multilateral assistance for development. We will persist in our efforts to channel more free world aid through multilateral agencies and we will increase our own contributions to international institutions as rapidly as other members do so.

Use of multilateral agencies

There has been a steady increase in the amount of economic assistance provided through international agencies such as the World Bank, the International Development Association (IDA), the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), and the European Development Fund (EDF).

The multilateral share of the total free world aid flow has increased from 12 percent in 1960 to 17 percent in 1963; in the past 4 years, the multilateral agencies have increased the amount of their capital assistance to the less-developed countries by 50 percent, to a total of $1.4 billion in new commitments in 1963.

The U.S. share of official contributions to multilateral agencies now ranges from 30 percent of World Bank subscriptions up to 43 percent of the subscribed ordinary capital of the IDB. (The United States does not participate in funding the EDF and other European multilateral assistance programs.)

Coordinating bilateral aid

The United States has been a leader in seeking improved international coordination of bilateral aid. The United States was in-

strumental in the formation of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the central review body for major free world aid donors.

We have participated from the outset in the aid consortia and consultative groups set up by the World Bank and by the OECD for India, Pakistan, Turkey, Greece, and more recently, Colombia, Nigeria, Sudan, and Tunisia. During fiscal year 1966, 85 percent of all AID development loans in Asia and Africa will be committed through these multinational consortia or consultative groups.

All U.S. assistance to Latin America is provided within the international framework of the Alliance for Progress. The Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress (CIAP) is rapidly becoming a most useful forum for the coordination of assistance to Latin American countries.

The activity of the CIAP, and the World Bank's expressed willingness to expand its role as a sponsor of multinational consultation will greatly strengthen the international framework within which a substantial portion of U.S. bilateral aid is already being provided.

The U.S. share in the total free world aid burden has declined with the rise of other free world aid. By 1963—the last year for which complete figures are available—the U.S. bilateral share declined to just under 50 percent of the $8.1 billion total in new aid commitments, a drop from 56 percent the previous year.

Working primarily through the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD, the United States is pressing other free world donors to continue enlarging their efforts.

The problem of terms

The most pressing problem in the common aid effort remains the terms on which aid is extended, and the effect these terms are having on the debt burdens of the recipient nations. Some improvements have taken place. But the aid terms of most other free world donors remain significantly harder than ours. In most cases their interest rates are higher and their maturities are shorter.

* * * * *

The debt repayment burden of the less-developed countries now totals nearly five billion dollars annually and is rising by 15 percent each year. The DAC has established a working party to study the problem, and to work actively for better terms in both official and private credits. Unless the debt service burden can soon be substantially reduced, the effectiveness of new assistance will be sharply reduced and the development prospects for a number of countries will dim.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with those who have paid tribute to the great Polish Constitution of 1791, Polish Constitution Day being properly observed on May 3, and to call attention once again to those enduring precepts of democracy that prompted the Polish Constitution, precepts which had just 2 years earlier prompted our own Constitution of the United States.

During the intervening years, Mr. Speaker, fate has not treated Poland and the United States with equal favor, and Poland has from time to time been and is now subjected to the tyrant's hand. Throughout, however, the spirit of liberty has remained alive in Poland, and is deeply instilled in the hearts and minds of Poles wherever they live.

I know that the occasion of constitution day heightens the courage of every Pole, and all freedom-loving people, to look to the ultimate triumph of freedom and justice, when, as the Polish Constitution of 1791 so aptly puts it:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

The Population Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, in a further attempt to bring to the attention of my colleagues the seriousness of the rapid growth of the population of the world, I submit the following editorial from the Kalamazoo Gazette in response to the introduction of my bill, H.R. 7072:

POPULATION EXPLOSION: A LOOK TO THE FUTURE

"According to the United Nations, there are over 60 million births each year—more than the population of Great Britain. At the current 2 percent annual rate of increase, world population in 500 years would be one person per square yard."

These startling figures—startling that is to those who may have read them for the first time—appeared in yesterday's Gazette. They were superimposed on a photograph used to illustrate a comprehensive discussion by Associated Press Writer Sid Moody of the current and future problems arising from the number of people on the face of the earth.

People.

"Can mankind's greatest gift become its greatest curse?" he asked. And he discussed new developments in birth control and the changing attitudes of governments and religions toward this subject.

It is an article that should be saved and studied. For the problem of supporting an increasing population already is acute in a number of countries and is becoming acute in more.

Mr. Moody reported that the "dialog" on birth control has "moved into the open." He described the discussion of the topic on which conflicting opinion is strongly held as "remarkable in its forthrightness."

Possibly this is the most encouraging development.

To ignore the population problem is to turn one's back on reality. To discuss it can point the way to possible solution.

Our Michigan Legislature, for example, currently is considering a "family planning" bill which, if pending amendments are adopted, would allow welfare agencies to extend birth control assistance and information to unmarried women and permit social workers to initiate discussion of birth control with welfare recipients.

And in Washington, Third District Congressman PAUL H. TODD, JR., Kalamazoo Democrat, has introduced a bill which would declare it the policy of Congress to assist in population control both in this Nation and throughout the world.

It is a bill which has drawn bipartisan support, including what the Gazette's Washington bureau described as enthusiastic endorsement from Republican National Committeeman John B. Martin, of Grand Rapids.

"While a major part of the problem is in the other countries of the world," Martin wrote TODD, "it is nearly as acute here in the United States when we realize that the population of this country will increase by 44 percent in the next 15 years on present projections."

It is a problem that must be faced.

The Liberty (?) Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Frank W. Stefano worked throughout his whole life for the welfare of people. As president of the Federal Civil Service Employees Local No. 14, as Seventh District commander of the VFW, Department of Minnesota, and as legislative chairman for the Clarence LaBelle Post No. 217, Frank Stefano worked long and hard for positive liberal programs.

Frank Stefano died recently, but before he died, he wrote a resolution which was submitted to and passed by the Seventh District, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, Department of Minnesota, on April 25, 1965.

The resolution he wrote exposes the pernicious nature of an attempt to amend the Constituion which has been misnamed the "Liberty Amendment."

Because this resolution is characteristic of Frank Stefano's dedication to a strong and vital America, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit it at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION SUBMITTED TO THE SEVENTH DISTRICT, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DEPARTMENT OF MINNESOTA, ON THIS 25TH DAY OF APRIL 1965 AT SPRING LAKE PARK

Whereas the liberty amendment memorialing the Congress of the United States was submitted to the 64th session of the Minnesota State Legislature. It is known as senate file No. 1009, house file No. 748;

Whereas section 1 "states that the Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprises except as specified in the Constitution;"

Whereas the above sentence of 26 words was devised to shut down some 700 Government agencies and activities;

Whereas the liberty amendment does not discriminate between good, bad, or indifferent. It says that all must go—about 700 agencies. We have a Federal banking system that insures our bank accounts, social security, veterans benefits, hospitalization, GI bill, compensation, pension, GI insurance,

health benefits, old-age benefits, unemployment insurance, and many more that are not specified in the Constitution. All must go, states the liberty amendment;

Whereas this amendment was passed in 7 States: Wyoming, Texas, Nevada, Louisiana, Georgia, South Carolina, and Mississippi. In 1965, it is to be submitted to 26 more States, including Minnesota;

Whereas if the veterans were alert in the above States, this amendment would not have passed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Seventh District, Department of Minnesota, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, go on record as opposed to the liberty amendment on the 25th day of April 1965, at Spring Lake Park; also be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be submitted to the department encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which is to beheld in Grand Rapids, Minn., June 16–19, 1965, and that all posts be informed of the danger of the liberty amendment; and be it further

Resolved, That should this resolution pass the department encampment, it should be submitted to the national encampment, August 13–20, 1965, at Chicago, Ill., so that all posts in the United States can be alerted to this dangerous amendment.

"Hello Man"—Speech of Mrs. Scott Carpenter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, all Americans can be very proud of the achievements of our astronauts in pioneering the exploration of outer space. We often think of the families who stand behind these men and of the wives who patiently stand by them during their long hours of training and who courageously wait with the world for their safe recovery when they make a flight.

Recently, I had occasion to read a speech prepared by Mrs. Scott Carpenter which very eloquently sets forth her feelings as the wife of an astronaut. I think that all of us can find a very heroic philosophy in the words of Mrs. Scott Carpenter, who speaks as the wife of one of those giving such fine service to our Nation:

HELLO, MAN

I'm not sure what motivates a person to make a speech; it may be the need to communicate, or the expression of an idea, plus the incredible flattery of being listened to. In any case it is somewhat of an ordeal for me. I start worrying about it the minute I've reluctantly said yes. In a few days, some 6 to 8 weeks before the due date, a letter comes from the program chairman asking me "Please" for the title, a two-page summary; and what flight will I be taking out of Houston? And really, the only thing I've ever kown for sure in my life is that I may wash my hair tomorrow.

My mind becomes blank. I am terror stricken that I have lost the ability to think of something new and meaningful. I begin to wake in the middle of the night having been nudged into consciousness by a half-formed idea and I lie there arguing with myself, should I get up and write it down or shall I trust it will still be generating in the morning? I usually get up. I also check the doors, read the Latin American section of the current Newsweek and end up with two Oreo cookies and one-half glass of milk. Then a week before the event I assemble my notes and scribblings on the dining room table, move the Mynah bird to the back porch, and take the phone off the hook; the house is quiet with the children in school. The mornings take on a quiet luster as I strive for the words that will be my only communication with a room of strangers.

Before my husband became involved in this work I hadn't had time to develop a philosophy or plan a way of life. We were too busy living. We had five babies in 7 years. We made appalling mistakes but we worked very hard to survive, and I have grown self-reliant from the heartache of constant goodbys.

Because the bright light of publicity has focused so sharply on our men it has tended to surround the wives with a kind of aura of superbravery and stoicness and exaggerates us as people out of all proportion; if we were to believe our mail and the sentiments of women who grasp our hands at teas we would never get back to household chores. I assure you the men were selected carefully, the wives came along for the ride.

At the beginning of the program, not previously having known each other, we were lumped together as a group of women, never called by our right names but things like the "tall blond one," "you with the blue hat," or "second from the left." We were stringently correct and good to each other, we smoothed over our differences, made allowances for idiosyncrasies and teased each other about them. And we had a thousand laughs which more than anything else helped maintain our sense of values in the face of this growing thing in our lives. Slowly the bonds of loyalty grew till now I love them—these women in different ways from different reasons.

After one of the flights a woman's club in North Carolina wrote an indignant letter to the White House accusing the Government of, in effect, brainwashing us to show no emotion. It was sent to me and here in part is the answer I struggled over. "Dear ladies, the President has forwarded your letter to me and asked me to give you the very best answer I can. First, let me say NASA has never instructed us in any way. Actually in our lives as servicewomen, there have been many times more difficult for us than this one flight day. It is unfortunate that the only glimpse you get of a wife is that brief appearance before a collection of microphones and bobbing cameras. You mention that it is humanly impossible to have 'no feeling, no emotion' and you are right. I'm sorry you miss the hugs and kisses, the hand clappings, the hard grateful smiles—for it is emotional. Then the joy sometimes turns to frozen faces when the woman steps outside to have that emotion recorded by a blur of peoples' faces", end of letter.

On the morning of a flight the good people of this country turn on their radios and TV sets to keep track of the countdown. For the first time, the names and faces of the men begin to meld together and form a person. And these good people say to each other in their homes and on the street "How can they stand lying up there on that thing—don't you know the wives are a wreck?"

I would like to remind them of the length of time that has already ticked off, from Gus Grissom's 15 minute suborbital to the 4 hour Gemini flight—4 years. That's a lot of lonely bedtimes. So at T minus 10 and counting, while you are holding your breath—they wait expectantly and confidently. Man in the capsule—woman on the ground, are glad he is there and that the weather is good.

Although space flight captures the money, the imagination and the greatest glory, there are more dangerous worlds and more interesting fields to the men who inhabit them. Every man has his dream. A friend of ours is investing and risking his money in a complex of buildings and apartments, another hopes to breed the finest thoroughbred quarter horse in the southwest. My sister's husband is a marine—he flies a helicopter in Vietnam and he's fiercely proud of his 130 combat missions; no one here knows his name. And a politician—marvelous word, "politician"—is drudging away in committee trying to hack out the very best bill he can.

But it is possible, though sociologists may never prove it, that our scientific explorations have helped men out of the security conscious doldrums of the fifties—have helped erase that castrating word "togetherness," have helped establish this new climate of involvement. This poem, in my son's literature book, expresses it more lyrically:

"THOSE THAT GO DOWN TO THE SEA

"Men have loved the ships they took to sea
Loved the tall masts, the prows that creamed with foam
Have learned, deep in their hearts how it might be
That there is yet a dearer thing than home.

"Ashore these men are not as other men
They walk as strangers through the crowded street
And see again a wide and blue lagoon
And a lone ship that rides there with the moon."

—DAVID MORTON.

I know very little about the rosy Woman's Day world of 50–50 marriages—my man chose another way and I am committee to his world and life on his terms. Don't mistake it for "sacrifice," a word that makes me clutch my gloves a little tighter. Rather, women who live on these terms give their men a gift—the freedom to do what they would with their lives. So then with no more than a generous nod to those of us who also serve, there is this remaining truth; it is still men who lead us to bed, men who stand or fall behind our flag, men who dominate our planet.

To help pass away the long months of waiting for a husband to come home from a war, my sister and her 2½-year-old Mike came to spend a month with us. He tolerated me as long as the meals were put out on time, he played riotous games with our children but he adored Scott. Yet he remembered enough of his own daddy not to call him by the very personal possessive word our children were privileged to use. And in the evening when Scott drove into the garage, gunning the engine as a signal, Mike would race down the hallway shouting ahead, "Is it you? is it you?" tug open the door and hold up his arms—"Hello man."

Address Delivered by Gov. George Romney, of Michigan, at the Associated Press Annual Meeting Held in New York, April 10, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Governor Romney at the annual meet-

ing of the Associated Press, New York, N.Y., on April 10, 1965:

ADDRESS OF GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY, OF MICHIGAN

World leadership is something relatively new for the United States. In record-breaking time—less than 2 centuries—we have risen from a weak and struggling nation to history's strongest.

Fortunately, America is prepared for world responsibility—provided we use our unique principles and institutions.

America is more than just another nation.

I believe that the hand of the Creator guided the formation and development of our country. As George Washington said in his First Inaugural Address:

"No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the invisible hand, which conducts the affairs of men, more than the people of the United States. Every step, by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation, seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency."

This Nation is a result of a revolution that was radically different from any other revolution before or since. Most revolutions merely transfer governmental power from one group to another, sometimes for worthy ends and sometimes not.

But the American Revolution created a whole new society, based on the conviction that if the people hold the power—if the people are in the driver's seat, rather than some narrow group or clique or interest—the result will be more progress for more people.

Vesting ultimate power in the people themselves was promised on belief in a Creator, who endows each individual with inalienable rights to develop his own gifts through his own free choices as a morally responsible individual.

Because of our Revolution's unique character, we have developed unique political, social, and economic institutions—all of them based upon the belief that divided power, distributed into many hands, is the surest guarantee of the people's right to choose, and the surest road to progress for all people.

When I was a boy growing up, hardly anyone doubted that it was a question of time until the American principles of freedom were adopted everywhere—until the dynamic forces unleashed by the American Revolution spread around the world.

Today, however, we are beset with doubt and confusion on every side.

We are beginning to question whether there really is anything distinct about America, whether we have any special claim to a unique purpose in the world.

We are coming more and more to think and act like other nations—turning to Government and money and materialism to solve our problems here at home, and playing the tired old game of cynical power politics internationally.

We are losing touch with the root sources of our greatness, with the spiritual principles whose application has set America apart from other lands.

The inspired American Revolution, which for generations has been a bright beam of hope to Americans and to the world, is sputtering feebly.

I believe that America's great hope and opportunity lies in rediscovering the uniqueness of our institutions—in tapping anew the limitless power for human progress of our revolutionary principles. I believe that America's hope and opportunity, which is the world's hope and opportunity, is for a rebirth of Americanism in America, through a modern application to today's problems of our proven American principles.

As a concerned American and concerned Republican, there is no shortage of disturbing national problems that I could discuss:

The decline in religious conviction, moral character, and wholesome family life. This threatens us most.

The increasing trend to substitute government and money for individual responsibility, family responsibility, and voluntary cooperative brotherhood in solving our mounting human and social problems of juvenile crime, adult immorality and debauchery, and senior citizen aimlessness.

The accelerating concentration of power in Washington, which is fast nullifying our constitutional division of governmental responsibility. Most of those who oppose this trend ignorantly or negatively refuse to recognize that, to stop it, obsolete State constitutions and local governmental charters must be modernized so that State and local governments can perform their constitutional functions effectively.

The extent to which the Great Society is a paternalistic cloak for a "Great Government" that is already beginning to further weaken the voluntary root sources of our Nation's real strength.

The extent to which we need to beware of those who have a fervent but false desire to help the unfortunate, over whom they first gain mastery and then enslave.

The greatest need in our Nation's history to stimulate individual citizens, families, and private institutions in playing their roles adequately.

The decline in world respect for the United States of America.

Together, these trends are the most threatening in our entire history.

But of our political, social, and economic institutions, paradoxical as it may seem, our economic institutions are probably least understood by Americans and others. We are woefully ignorant of the unique character of our economy and the revolutionary changes which have taken place within it.

From the beginning, we had a free, privately controlled economy, but when the industrial revolution burst upon us, economic power began to concentrate in fewer and fewer hands. As industrialization and urbanization increased, we were well down the road toward the division of society into two classes, which Marx had prophesied was inevitable under capitalism: The proletarian have-nots, and the bourgeois "haves."

But late in the 19th century, in a great revolutionary upheaval of our economy made possible by popular control of our political institutions, this country stopped short in its drift toward monopoly capitalism and cartelism, which had distinguished the economy of Europe.

Our modern economic revolution began with the passage of the antitrust laws—a unique American experiment in dividing and distributing economic power just as we had already divided and distributed political power. It established the principle of competition, exalted the power of the customer, and forced owners and managers of business enterprises to compete for the economic favor of the people—just as political parties and leaders must compete for the political favor of the people. It put the consumer in the driver's seat. As a result, our economy became as much of, by, and for the people, as our Government was of, by, and for the people.

Our economic revolution didn't end with the passage of the antitrust acts, any more than our political revolution ended with the Declaration of Independence. Theodore Roosevelt fearlessly enforced the competitive principle of the Sherman Act, and thus created the national economic climate within which America's unique and advanced economic system developed.

The elder Henry Ford gave most impressive, practical shape and enlightened form to the principle of economic competition. The contribution for which he fought in the economic field was comparable to the contribution of the Declaration of Independence in the political field.

What Henry Ford did was to dramatize a radically new American economic concept. He not only said that customers, rather than capitalists, should shape the economy through their choices in the marketplace—he said that workers ought to be customers.

After all, it would be possible for independent capitalistic operations to compete for the favor of a relatively few customers—those who could afford to pay as much as the traffic would bear, and who were probably capitalists themselves. Ford's great contribution was to share progress first and foremost with customers, and also with workers. He did this through building a dependable low-priced car, and through revolutionary decisions to offer a $100-price rebate and double his workers' wages to $5 a day. He called it progress sharing and profit sharing.

Few people realize how truly revolutionary these decisions were, and how they have shaped the American economy. One living French historian, Father R. L. Bruckberger, who understands America as few Americans do, sums up the significance of Ford's approach this way:

"How I wish I could find words to impress the reader with the importance of that decision of the $5 a day. It meant infinitely more than a mere raise in wages for the $5 a day not only undermined the whole capitalist structure but cut away the ground from under Marxist revolution. What Marx had dreamed, Ford achieved. But he achieved it only because he was far more of a revolutionary than Marx or Lenin. Ford exploded the whole idea of the famous, supposedly immutable 'iron law' of wages on which Ricardo believed capitalist economy was founded and which was to provide every proletarian revolution with a springboard."

And Bruckberger adds:

"Henry Ford broke the mainspring of capitalism and Marxist revolution, as the mainspring of a watch is broken. After Ford, the systems of capitalism and Marxist revolution were rendered as useless as blunted and obsolete tools."

Ford's own minority stockholders, capitalists that they were, did not take kindly to these revolutionary goings-on. They could not see any goal for a business enterprise other than making and taking profits. They could not see either the fundamental rightness or the practical advantage of putting customers first, and turning workers into customers. Their reasoning was simple: This is a capitalistic system. The economy is run by and for the capitalists—the owners. Progress is to be shared with stockholders and with nobody else—not with customers, and certainly not with workers.

Not only did Ford's minority stockholders protest against his revolutionary practices, but they took him into court to make him stop—and what's more, they won.

During the trial, in 1922, a significant exchange took place between Ford and the attorney for the stockholders. It shows with perfect clarity the sharp divergence between two economic systems—narrow capitalism, and the American system of "Consumerism" which Ford helped bring into full flower.

Stevenson, the attorney for the stockholders, asked, "What is the Ford Motor Co. organized for except for profits, will you tell me, Mr. Ford?" And Ford replied:

"Organized to do as much good as we can, everywhere, for everybody concerned, to do as much as possible for everybody concerned, to make money and use it, give employment and send out the car where people can use it, and incidentally to make money."

Stevenson: "Incidentally, make money?"

Ford: "Yes, sir."

Stevenson: "But your controlling feature is to employ a great army of men at high wages, to reduce the selling price of your

car, so that a lot of people can buy it at a cheap price and give everybody a car that wants one?"

Ford: "If you give all that, the money will fall into your hands; you can't get out of it."

Losing this lawsuit, of course, didn't stop Ford. He simply bought out his stockholders and went ahead and proved his theory. And the American economy has never been the same again.

What Ford proved was that, to achieve general, balanced, and dynamic economic growth, you have to rise above mere greed—you have to put the people first. He proved that, to convert technological progress into more sales, more employment, and more profits, you have to share your progress first with customers and you have to make customers out of workers. And he proved that, by following this rule there is virtually no limit to our ability to produce and to progress.

But while Ford and others proved these revolutionary principles in practice, our understanding has not kept up with our achievements. In the late 1930's the New Deal's Temporary National Economic Committee concluded that our economy was overexpanded.

The New Deal answer to the economic inequities that existed—and there were plenty of them—was to expand the power of Government to help those who needed it, and to bring about a better balance in the relationship of labor and capital, through enactment of new collective bargaining legislation. The New Deal answer has been replayed time and time again under different labels—"Fair Deal," "New Frontier," and even "Great Society."

Now, I do not question the good intentions of all these deals, frontiers, and societies—or even the appropriateness of many of their solutions to some of the economic problems that have confronted us in the past and face us still today.

But all of them have looked to a collective-bargaining standoff, power conflict between capital and labor, and to reliance primarily on direct or indirect governmental action to assist the disadvantaged—and this isn't good enough. As a result, we now face new and tough problems.

In the process of improving the balance between capital and labor, we have created two Frankensteins. In major industries, we have touched off vast power struggles between monopolistic union and monopolistic employer organizations.

I realize that newspapers are confronted with the opposite—excessive union fragmentation. But in our major industries, more and more, corporate and union power centers are skimming the cream off our economic progress. The customer is increasingly the forgotten man. Economic progress is passed on more and more to workers and stockholders, and less and less to customers, who must be the principal beneficiaries of progress if all are to benefit. To a considerable extent this process is concealed by Federal fiscal policies and by inflation.

This is the primary reason why progress from automation is well on the way to being a curse rather than a blessing. Instead of benefiting all as customers and raising living standards, production, and employment for all, automation is bringing widespread hard-core unemployment and pockets of poverty. Our Nation is being split into two Americas—one, affluent, booming, and often complacent; the other, squalid, hopeless, embittered, and increasingly dependent on Government. These inhabitants of the "Other America" not only aren't in the driver's seat—they aren't even in the car.

The governmental programs of the Great Society do not have the answers to these growing problems. They have merit only as they can help certain individuals who lack education, skills, and training for productive employment. But they do not begin to solve the problems of automation and hard-core unemployment. They do nothing to put the people, as consumers, back in control of our economy. And they have the fatal defect of crippling the private, voluntary efforts which are essential to a full realization of their lofty goals.

Surely it is absurd to say that, with the most productive economic and social system on earth, which has succeeded in giving meaningful employment to 95 percent of our national work force, we can take care of the other 5 percent only by casting aside the diversity and free choice which have brought us nearly to our goal, and turn instead to Government to finish the job. Should we not rather seek fuller expression of our voluntary, progress-sharing principles so all Americans can participate, contribute, and develop?

We will never end hard-core unemployment, or win our final victory against poverty, or restore opportunity to disadvantaged Americans, or protect pensions and savings from erosion, until we put the customer back in the driver's seat. It cannot be done by continuing recent fiscal policies. It cannot be done by permitting the power conflicts between monopoly unions and monopoly employers to constantly increase the economic role of government. If we continue down this road, free collective bargaining and our free economy will be replaced by some form of statism.

We must end the narrow economic conflict between unions and employers and reestablish their greater mutuality of interest by making partnership through progress sharing our national goal.

Employers, unions, and government must again put the customer first, rather than last. We can't have progress and prosperity for labor, in terms of improved wages, hours, working conditions and the rest—and we can't have progress and prosperity for owners and managers, in terms of secure investments and adequate returns—unless they are willing to share their progress and prosperity first with customers. If we really want progress, the first beneficiaries of progress must be the people—all the people—in their capacity as customers.

I believe that America is overdue for another great leap forward in our economic system if we are to fulfill our domestic and worldwide economic role. The antitrust laws established the principle of competition as the hallmark of the American economy. Henry Ford lifted the workers of America from the proletarian depths to which Adam Smith, Ricardo, and Marx consigned them, by exalting them to the status of customers, who could call the shots in our competitive economy. Today, we must go even further.

It is time not only to enable workers to be customers, but to be part, personal owners and full team members of American enterprises. Only by replacing conflict with teamwork can we achieve our system's potential for economic progress—and for progress sharing.

America needs an economic program to do for the urban, industrial society of the 1960's what Lincoln's Homestead Act did for the rural, agrarian society of the 1860's. That was progress sharing. It gave people opportunity and choice. It gave them a stake in a propertied society, at a time when land was the primary kind of wealth. It put ownership directly into the hands of those who labored, and gave them an incentive to greater productivity. It permitted the people as a whole to contribute to the Nation's economic progress, and to share in that progress more nearly on the basis of their contribution.

Corporate stock today plays largely the same role in our economy that land did 100 years ago. Pioneering programs for voluntary stock-sharing have enjoyed remarkable success on a limited basis. What is needed now are specific new governmental policies to encourage such voluntary efforts, and stimulate the spread of progress sharing throughout the American economy.

Progress sharing must replace selfish national emergency, collective-bargaining power struggles that only government can resolve. National economic policy must be reshaped, and tax monetary policies should be revised, to stimulate management and labor teamwork for the principal benefit of customers.

But most Americans are still talking about our 20th century economy in 19th century terms. We still call it a capitalist system. But how many of us, I wonder, know the definition of capitalism? One dictionary definition is, "The concentration of capital, as when in the hands of a few." Another is, "An economic system in which capital and capitalists play the principal part." Around the world, capitalism is usually considered as an economic system in which the economy is controlled by the few—in which the few benefit from the efforts of the many.

Are these adequate definitions of the American economy? Sure, private ownership is an essential part of our economic system, and we must not try to do without it, but ultimate control of the economy does not rest with the owners.

The genius of our consumeristic system is that ultimate control has rested with the many, through the free and daily economic balloting of customers in the marketplace.

Lack of understanding of our economic principles not only holds back progress here at home, but it plays right into the hands of our enemies abroad. When we tell people of the world that our system is capitalistic, we are telling them just exactly what our enemies want them to hear. In the battle for men's minds, we make the job of the Communist pitchmen just that much easier.

As Father Bruckberger has pointed out:

"I hold it very much against you that you insist upon using the word 'capitalism' to define your economic and industrial structure. You who are the greatest travelers in the world should ask yourselves what people outside America think of the word 'capitalism.' To them, capitalism stands for imperialism, for the exploitation of the poor by the rich, for colonialism. It is a dishonored word, and one that breeds terror * * * why * * * do you persist in clinging to a word which makes it so easy for Communist propaganda to impale you on the horns of that absurd dilemma; either capitalism and poverty, or socialism and the liberation of the poor."

Brezhnev and Kosygin, no less than Khrushchev, believe that communism will bury capitalism, as capitalism buried feudalism. But what they do not understand—and what we have failed to tell the world—is that Americans buried capitalism long ago, and moved on to consumerism, which is a higher form of economic organization. However, communism, in reality, is nothing but a return to feudalism in modern nationalistic dress.

Now, I am convinced that too many Americans are living in a dream world—ignorant, confused, or uncertain about our own system, and even more ignorant of the world around us. Too many of us think that we can drowse along forever in our comfort and security.

But let's face some facts about America in relation to the rest of the world.

First, we are locked in the greatest struggle for survival in all history with deadly, dedicated enemies. Either they will destroy us, or we will change them.

Either we will survive, or we will sink.

And, second, we affluent Americans, along with a few others—principally some Europeans—are an island in a sea of abject poverty, hunger, disease, and human misery.

On a world basis, we are like billionaires living in a few mansions in the middle of a vast ghetto. We don't begin to realize the depths to which the impoverished peoples of the earth have sunk, and that they are still sinking. We don't begin to understand the revolutionary expectations of the have-not peoples. And we don't begin to comprehend the intensity of their envy of the things we have—or the lengths to which they will go to get the things we have, even if they have to try to take them from us by force.

Ironically, the people who want to get what we have, don't have the faintest notion of the principles and institutions which enabled us to get what we have. All they see are the things on the surface—the big cars, the food surpluses, the easy life, the material bounties of America.

Basically, it's nobody's fault but our own that we have lost the respect and admiration of the have-nots. We haven't told our story adequately, and too often our own actions have tended to belie our words. And meanwhile—paradoxically and tragically—the Communist atheistic materialists are succeeding in convincing most that they are more idealistic—more interested in helping people—than we are.

But some will ask, "Why should we care what a bunch of poverty-stricken, disease-ridden underdogs think of us? Why should we try to make them respect us? Who needs them?"

Well, I'll tell you who needs them. America needs them. Because as surely as you're sitting here, unless we change the world's false notions of what we are, and share our principles and our progress with those who want, they will join with our enemies and destroy us. The motivation of brotherly concern for those who are in need ought to be enough to stir us into action. But, realistically, that's not enough. We need the further motivation of the plain unvarnished fact that our own survival is at stake. The hour for adequate action is desperately late.

Now, what is the course which we should follow? I believe that our future in the world, like our future here at home, depends on finding a more accurate and effective expression of our revolutionary American principles. I believe that partnership through progress sharing, internationally as well as domestically, should be the key to a revitalization of our economic policy at home and abroad.

I believe that America must undertake an effort in the international economic field which is so dedicated and so massive that it will overcome the suspicion of the other peoples of the earth. We must help them to help themselves, in developing their natural and human resources as we have developed ours. We must help them to realize their expectations quickly, without losing their freedom and independence.

Our leadership must be based on example, persuasion, and partnership, rather than on compulsion, exploitation, and domination. Americans must learn, before it is too late, that other nations—whether they are relatively rich or abjectly poor—do not want our domination or our handouts, and yet they desperately need our help.

I believe we will make a vast mistake in American industrial expansion abroad unless we put our foreign operations on a partnership basis, rather than under the absentee ownership and control of an American board of directors. It is only right and reasonable that other nations consider their markets theirs, not ours, and it is time we woke up to the resentment and bitterness we arouse even in Europe when Americans move in and take over before local enterprise can grow and organize for effective competition.

I believe that there is a vital and much larger role for private economic institutions to play in international economic development, just as there is an important role for Government to play. Government, of course, should have the responsibility for military aid, and should shoulder the load of humanitarian relief along with private philanthropic efforts. But our foreign aid programs must be revised.

To be effective, most of the economic development aid which flows from this country to the other nations of the world should be in the form of private investment, rather than governmental handouts. People-to-people and company-to-company relationships breed fewer resentments, and accomplish more than government-to-government arrangements ever can. Only on this basis can management, sales, research, production, and other essential know-how be made available.

Governmental policies and programs can facilitate this kind of economic development in several ways.

First, our Government should exercise all the diplomatic influence at its command to persuade other nations to create an economic, political, and social climate in which there can be constructive investment by American enterprise on a basis of partnership with local enterprise.

Second, Government can provide incentives for partnership investment abroad, and help to channel it into the right areas of the world. An example is development of obstacle-free international trade bridges on a company-to-company and industry-to-industry basis, such as now exist in the agricultural implement industries of the United States and Canada, and are being established for the automotive industries of our two nations.

Tariff-free exchange of production between foreign and domestic companies, limited to equal production values flowing in each direction, are even more desirable in our relations with developing nations than with advanced, industrialized countries. It would encourage and speed development of basic manufacturing skills in those countries which do not now possess them. It would give to the consumer in each country the advantages of the unequaled volume production which we have been able to build up in this country. By pooling our volume with their volume, the same goods could be sold at lower cost on both sides of the border than is possible today. In this way we can share our historic economic progress.

And third, our Government should develop an adequate program of international partnership investment insurance to greatly accelerate investment in South America, Africa, and Asia because of the high risk involved, particularly in unstable, developing nations. Such investment is affected with a vital national interest.

But spreading the American economic revolution around the world is not a task which we should be content to undertake alone. We proved what could be accomplished by a massive unilateral progress-sharing effort almost two decades ago, when we undertook the Marshall plan. Today, we should enlist our allies in a massive joint progress-sharing effort to build the economies of underdeveloped and impoverished nations. Rather than antagonizing our newly prospering allies, we should work with them to build new markets, and thus help to build the kind of world in which we all would like to live.

We will only do this if we first recognize these things:

1. Our economic principles can work as well for others as they do for us. West Germany and Japan are postwar examples.

2. The fastest road from poverty and starvation for undeveloped nations is not collectivism or socialism, but individual responsibility and competition in progress sharing on the basis of partnership. Our economic principles lifted our forebears from poverty, misery, filth, and disease.

3. We must move quickly, or it will be too late. We must not wait until we face additional modern guerrilla warfare such as that in southeast Asia. We must move now and we must move adequately even if it hurts—even if it requires some personal and national sweat and sacrifice.

Above all, Americans must recognize that policies of economic nationalism and economic imperialism are as out of date today as the crossbow and the catapult. It is a basic truth that you never really possess anything unless you share it. And, unless we change our policies and our fundamental attitude toward the rest of the world, the resentment of the awakening giants of the earth will surely turn against us in our selfishness and softness, and destroy us.

We want a world of peace and freedom. We want an end to hunger and disease everywhere. To win that world, we must live and export our revolutionary ideals, our dreams, and our basic political and economic principles of free choice.

We must share our progress with the world—not through handouts, but through partnership and brotherhood.

Bring Calm and Peace Back to Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, my home State of Mississippi has been under a great deal of embarrassment and harassment due to outsiders. No matter what their intentions, good or bad, they have organized resentment among the Negro and white races. No fact emerges more clearly from events of the past several years than the disappearance of the American political tradition and the decline of the moral authority of the Christian church.

When 30,000 bishop-led demonstrators can so intimidate the President as to send him into a steamrolling appeal to Congress for new laws before laws enacted had hardly been tried, something tragic has happened to the American political system. It is the Christian faith, and not the Constitution by which the bishops and clergy are ordained. When they abandon the expedition of the Christian Scripture with which they are supposedly familiar, for the interpretation of the political and constitutional principles for which they have neither been trained, commissioned, nor paid; they are destroying not only the fabric of Christianity in American living, but the political foundation as well. I would plead with my colleagues to help us in every way possible to keep these outside agitators from our doors.

With peace and harmony free of outside agitation, the State of Mississippi will continue to prosper and grow to even greater heights than it has grown in the past, and it will be able to handle its own growing pains. The State of Mississippi is not only home, but it is the greatest place in the world to many God-

fearing, freedom loving Americans of all races. As a matter of fact, a few other States might well take note of some of Mississippi's achievements in the fields of health and hospital development, education, crime rate, public welfare, and industrial development.

I commend to my colleagues the following articles, one of which appeared in the Eastern Idaho Farmer, Idaho Falls, Idaho, March 22, 1965, by Mr. Vardis Fisher. This article concerns the false image with which the State of Mississippi has been plagued for the last few years. The other is an article by Mr. Paul Harvey, noted Chicago columnist, entitled "How Long Before the South Will Be Forgiven."

The articles follow:

[From the Eastern Idaho Farmer, Mar. 22, 1965]

WRITER CONTENDS IDAHO COMPARISON WITH MISSISSIPPI IS ABSURDITY

(By Vardis Fisher)

A member of Idaho's Legislature, known as a conservative Republican and loud in his praise of Smylie, has sent me a news sheet from a radio station on which it is stated that a University of Idaho professor of psychology says Idaho "is highly inadequate in the field of competent mental health personnel"—that it ranks 41st in psychiatric services. I'll return to that statement. The legislator wrote in ink on this news sheet, "Not enough money. In many categories, Idaho rates with Mississippi. Are we that bad?" He underlined the word "that" twice. I read his comment to my wife and she said, "Mississippi is a dirty word." Yeah, pore ole Mississippi. Because some brutal men down there committed murder, the whole Nation has been clobbering this State, though murders just as brutal are committed every day in States where self-righteous critics make the big noise.

I don't know where this legislator got his information, but I suspect it was from some of the higher-and-higher-tax lobbyists. Possibly from Crowley and the IEA. So let's see just how bad Mississippi is—and for the fun of it we'll compare this State in various categories with New York, where if you ride a subway or walk in a park, you risk your life. And where there are more of Mississippi's critics than in any other State. You'd think that before the people of a State heap abuse on those of another State, they would at least make it safe to walk across Central Park in broad daylight.

In 1963, Mississippi ranked 50th (lowest) in per capita income, at $1,379. New York was fourth highest with $3,000. In per thousand of income spent on health and hospitals, where was Mississippi? I see a lot of hands up all over New York State and they are all wrong. Mississippi was first in the Nation in amount spent per thousand of income. Where was New York? Fifth. Where was L.B.J.'s good old Texas? 43d. For education where was Mississippi per thousand of income? Seventeenth. New York, which gives off more squawks per capita than any other State was far down the line at 43. Per thousand of income, New York was 43d at $46.10, Mississippi was 17th at $63.11, and Texas was 31st at $53.56. Good old Massachusetts? It wasn't where you think it was—absolute bottom at $36.68. And the four next lowest were New Jersey, Connecticut, Illinois, and Rhode Island—and not Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Florida as you might have guessed.

In public welfare where was Mississippi? Seventh highest. Texas as 26th and New York 28th. How do they rank in the total of all spending per thousand of income? The national average was $140.73. New York was 31st at $144.19, and Texas was 35th at $136.80. And Mississippi was seventh at $182.89. So what did he mean by asking, "Are we that bad?" It isn't what a person or a State spends that we should look at, but at what they can afford to spend. Are you going to compare the man with earnings of $2,000 a year with L.B.J. who borrowed a hundred thousand to pay on his income tax?—or with any other multimillionaire? Are you going to compare Mississippi with its per capita of $1,379 with Nevada, with $3,372—or Idaho with $1,934, with Delaware with $3,250, or California with $2,980? If so, then tell John Doe, earning $5,000, to spend as much on health and welfare and education and automobiles and vacation as Elizabeth Taylor with $2 or $3 million.

Compared to what the people can afford to pay Government and so-called public services, highways and schools and parks, and all the rest of it, Mississippi ranked high in the Nation. Sixth, in fact. So what do these people mean who keep saying (I have heard it said for years) that Idaho is as bad as Mississippi? Do we have a right to expect our legislators to get the facts before them before they start spending our earnings (as Gooding County's Senator Fredericksen put it) as if money is going out of style? Do we as taxpayers have that right. I would think we have, if we have any rights left at all.

The fact is that compared to what they can afford to spend, the much abused people of Mississippi are overspending. Are we Idahoans as bad as that? Yes, we are now. I'll tell you just how bad when I get the facts for 1965.

HOW LONG BEFORE THE SOUTH WILL BE FORGIVEN

(By Paul Harvey)

How long before the South will be forgiven?

The South lost a war 100 years ago and is still paying for it.

We forgave Germany twice in half that time.

In the 20 years since Germany fought us the last time, we've forgiven them and sent them $4 billion.

In the 20 years since Japan lost its war with us, we have forgiven Japan and sent the Japanese two and a half billion dollars.

It has been 100 years since Alabama and Georgia and Mississippi lost their war and Washington is still forcing those States to pay to Washington six times as much as they receive in "aid."

The economic jealousy which was, in large part, responsible for the Civil War is still apparent in the present North-South cold war.

Southern Negro slaves had security but fought for freedom. Today they have freedom, seek security.

We have forgiven Germany and Japan and Spain and Mexico and everybody who ever waged war on us—except the Confederacy.

We have even promised North Vietnam reparations in advance—a billion dollars aid per year if southeast Asians will stop the war at the 17th parallel.

The Southern United States, entirely willing to accept a ceasefire at the Mason-Dixon line and peaceful coexistence wherever—is still occupied by "the enemy."

The Southern States have surrendered unconditionally. They are no threat to the security of their neighbors. They have no territorial ambitions beyond their borders. Indeed, you never hear of a retired southerner moving north. They mind their own business, contributing more than generously to the U.S. Treasury.

Washington would not think of meddling in the internal affairs of West Germany or Italy or Japan. It would be inexcusably bad manners. It would engender resentment. It would likely set the stage for another military confrontation.

Yet, Washington approves and applauds the invasion of our own South by Yankee mobs and supports their continuing invasion with Federal troops.

Granted, the South made a mistake. It lost the war. But many others have lost many wars and Washington has generously helped the fallen to their feet, sponsored their reconstruction, reestablished their independence.

How long before the South will be forgiven?

Not one of Uncle Sam's former enemies has become a better friend. Not one has stuck with him through peace and war, feast and famine, as this one.

Uncle Sam has no ally on whom he can count as surely as on this splendid, energetic, dynamic segment of himself.

Isn't it time to stop the masochistic punishment?

Isn't three generations of spitting on Johnny Reb's grave enough?

How long before the South will be forgiven?

Pittsburgh Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point further information on Pittsburgh research, covering such fields as nucleonics, chemicals, electronics, and instruments:

PITTSBURGH RESEARCH

NUCLEONICS

Nuclear technology has made rapid strides in the last decade, particularly in the commercial and industrial applications of atomic energy.

The Pittsburgh area has played an important role in this movement, making contributions in atomic power, radiation, and particle studies, and nuclear materials and instrumentation.

Westinghouse Electric Corp. has been a leader in nuclear power research. It helped to develop and build the first commercial nuclear powerplant at Shippingport; it operates the nation's leading center for nuclear reactor design and fabrication; and is working on the Nerva nuclear rocket engine.

In the radiation and particle research fields, research is centered around the cyclotron and 18-million-volt Van de Graaff accelerator at the University of Pittsburgh, 450-million-electron-volt synchrocyclotron at Carnegie Institute of Technology, and accelerators at Mellon Institute, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Gulf Research & Development Co., and Magee-Women's Hospital.

Companies specializing in nuclear research and products include: Nuclear Science & Engineering Corp., nuclear technology; Nuclear Materials & Equipment Corp., fuel materials and fabrication; Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Specialties, Inc., nuclear magnetic resonance instrumentation; Beta Radiation Co., beta radiation sources; Penn Nuclear Corp., nuclear metals and fabrication methods; and Semi-Elements, Inc., neutron gamma spectrometry plates.

CHEMICALS

Chemical research in the Pittsburgh area ranges from basic studies into the nature of matter to finding new applications for petrochemicals.

Much of the fundamental work is conducted at the three universities and Mellon Institute. It was Mellon that spawned the

plastics, synthetic rubber, and petrochemical industries.

The largest chemical research and development facility in the area is Gulf Research & Development Co. It conducts research into every aspect of petroleum.

Other major chemical laboratories and research areas include: Mobay Chemical Co., urethane polymer materials; Callery Chemical Co., high-energy boron chemicals; Pittsburgh Chemical Co., industrial chemicals; Neville Chemical Co., polymers and specialty chemicals; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., coatings, plastics, and adhesives; United States Steel Corp., coal chemicals; and Koppers Co., plastics, adhesives, and epoxies.

Pennsylvania Industrial Chemical Corp., Clover Chemical Co., Pennsylvania Refining Co., Sonneborn Chemical & Refining Co., and Waverly Oil Works Co., also have extensive research and development facilities in the region.

Among the other types of chemical research conducted in the area are: water conditioning, Calgon Corp.; ion exchange resins, General Ionics Corp.; liquid and solid propellants, Flame Research, Inc.; surface, colloid, and polymer chemistry, M-K Research & Development Co.; insulating varnishes, Sterling Varnish Co.; and high-pressure work, Pressure Chemical Co.

A longtime leader in the electrical industry, Pittsburgh also is emerging as a key research and development center in electronics.

Westinghouse Electric Corp., which pioneered many of the electrical innovations, is spearheading much of the new solid-state, microelectronic, computer, and related research.

However, considerable research in both the electrical and electronic fields is being conducted by other companies—as well as institutions—in the nine-county region. Radio Corp. of America, for instance, is involved in the study, design, and development of mobile communications, radiomarine, audiovisual, and broadcast transmitter equipment.

Femco, Inc., is concerned with remote control, automation, and microwave equipment; Siltronics, Inc., is active in computer components and electronic devices; Marshall Elevator Co. is working on the solid-state design of control, communication, and logic systems; Magnetics, Inc., is producing components, amplifiers, and devices; Donart Electronics, Inc., is investigating thin films and electronic instruments; Eagle Drug & Chemical Corp. is carrying on silicon solid-state device and microelectronic circuit research; Norbatrol Electronics Corp. is developing control systems using silicon controlled rectifiers; and Power Components, Inc., is studying solid-state devices.

Quite a few firms—including Nuclear Science & Engineering Corp., Milletron, Inc., Nuclear Materials & Equipment Corp., Latronics, Inc., and Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Specialties, Inc., are working in the electronic instrumentation field.

Scientific and process instrumentation is one of Pittsburgh's growth industries. Although such research has been carried on in the area since 1870, the number and types of laboratories engaged in the development of instruments have mushroomed.

Four of the oldest and largest instrument companies are the Fisher Scientific Co., Mine Safety Appliances Co., Burrell Corp., and J. W. Fecker Division of the American Optical Co.

Each has made numerous contributions to the advancement of instrument technology. Fisher Scientific Co., for instance, developed the first electrically heated and controlled ovens, the first unitized gas analysis apparatus, and early chromatographic, calorimetric, and polarographic instruments.

Among the more recent scientific instruments emanating from the Pittsburgh area are: the first commercially available nuclear quadrupole spectrometer and pulsed nuclear resonance spectrometer, Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Specialties, Inc.; the first American scanning electron microscope and superconducting MHD generator, Westinghouse Electric Corp.; the first commercial Mössbauer effect analyzer, Nuclear Science & Engineering Corp.; and the first automatic gas chromatography distillation analyzer, Gulf Research & Development Co.

Other leading instrument companies in the region include Research Instrumentation Co., Pitchford Scientific Instruments Corp., Bacharach Industrial Instrument Co., Hagan Controls Corp., Nuclear Materials & Equipment Corp., Latronics, Inc., Milletron, Inc., and Research Appliance Co.

Kansas: Midway, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star of May 2, Charles Yarbrough, Star travel editor, presents an appealing word picture of Kansas as a fascinating historic tourist objective. I include it in the RECORD for the interest of my colleagues, and join with all other Kansans in inviting all Americans to stop and visit in Kansas this year:

KANSAS HAS THE LAST LAUGH; SLOW DOWN AND SEE WHY

(By Charles Yarbrough)

KANSAS CITY, KANS.—Hindsight, especially in Kansas, has had ample time to jeer at the monumental goof of Daniel Webster.

At the time the United States was browsing the French bargain basement for the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, the great statesman glowered at the prospect and questioned "what do we want with this vast and worthless land"?

The disgruntled Spaniard Coronado felt even more so in the early 1540's when he failed to find the fabled gold of Quivira in Kansas—or in Colorado for that matter.

History comes welling and the mistakes of Webster and Coronado become obvious as you roll across Kansas, but you have to have time and curiosity to explore a land prominent in perils and hardships of the pioneers.

LAND OF PLENTY

From Pueblo, Colo., to Kansas City, it is 607 miles by the recent Mobil economy run routing; a long day's drive.

The inclination with the average auto vacationer is to get it over with. The Kansas Turnpike's 80-mile speed limit is tempting.

Resist—and tarry.

Here, the land Webster called "worthless" is what historian George Bancroft has termed "The miracle of the age." It is a land of plenty—plenty of space, wealth: legend and history; recreation areas.

It is also a land that in the 1880's had more interstate roads than most States have now. History will click off a few—the Santa Fe Trail, the Chisholm Trail, Pony Express Road, Oregon Trail, and route of Butterfield's Overland Dispatch Line.

Nine miles west of legend-cloaked Dodge City, the wagon ruts of the Santa Fe Trail are still visible.

It would be difficult to interest the average tourist in Kansas' great bounty of wheat and cattle; of oil and gas and of the great herds of cattle which now roam the old buffalo ranges.

The fact that Kansas is the geographical center of the continental United States will scarcely raise an eyebrow.

EXPLORING IS GOOD

But in the 207-mile width of the State, easily accessible, are points of interest and recreation you can enjoy with only a slight massage of the curiosity.

Dodge City sprawls across the highway, prosperous and happy that it has shed its one-time description as the "wickedest little city in America"; happier still that television has kept it alive in a cleaner sort of way.

You can visit storied Boot Hill and the Long Branch Saloon; prowl the colorful replica of Front Street as it was in the roaring 1870 days of Bat Masterson and Wyatt Earp.

Abilene, with its new Eisenhower Museum isn't too far off the main East-West Highway. In Atchison is a plaque where Lincoln delivered his Cooper Union speech in 1859. Amelia Earhart's birthplace overlooks the Missouri River from one of Atchison's bluffs.

In Brookville, the cattlemen's hotel of the 1870's still operates.

LANDSCAPE VARIES

The landscape, if you range far enough, holds Mushroom rocks and Pyramid rocks; countless lakes for swimming, boating, and fishing, and the last, unchanged Pony Express station stands at Hanover.

In all directions the land is rich in Indian battle history. Kansas was once the home of at least a dozen different tribes and it was the Sioux who named it "Kanza," meaning "swift wind."

The Sioux were mighty perceptive.

Lewis and Clark tromped through Kansas on the way west in 1804, and Zebulon Pike went through 2 years later on the expedition where he found in Colorado, only incidentally, the peak he said no one could climb and which was later given his name.

Osawatomie was John Brown's headquarters in the dark and bloody days before the Civil War. A State park is named for him; contains one of his log cabin residences, his statue, and a museum.

There's a log cabin 17 miles northwest of Smith Center where "Home on the Range" was written.

Markers and monuments keep the memory of Kansas' violent past active for today's tourist. Indian massacre mementoes are plentiful.

Medicine Lodge, which was named long before antiliquor crusading Carrie Nation made her home there, had a bank robbery in 1884.

Leader of the desperadoes was the marshall of Caldwell, who with three companions, was taken from jail and hanged from Hangman's Tree, now symbolized in the Medicine Lodge city park.

For a more peaceful scene, the weird Gypsum Hills of eroded towering mesas and buttes, are not far south of Medicine Lodge.

DALTONS, TOO

There's a monument in a vast field southwest of Bazaar, recalling the spot where Notre Dame football coach Knute Rockne was killed in a 1931 plane crash.

Three members of the early outlaw gang known as the Dalton brothers have a headstone near Coffeyville, where they fell while trying to rob two banks at the same time.

And if you're looking for irony, there is a spot near Independence where the Osage Indians signed the Treaty of Drum Creek.

The agreement moved them out of Kansas and back to Oklahoma—where oil was discovered on their land to make them some of the richest people on earth.

Education a Basic Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we cannot solve the problem of poverty in America by adding to the relief rolls or simply instituting greater public makework programs. The Government cannot create wealth. This can be done only through production of goods and services. The ultimate solution to ending poverty is to expand our private economy, encourage the investment of risk capital for the creation of more jobs, and the education of the unskilled to meet a growing labor demand in a healthy and expanding economy.

The root cause of poverty is ignorance. It follows, therefore, that the cure for poverty is education. As I pointed out in the debate on the aid-to-education bill when the Green amendment was being considered, the best way we can help the underprivileged in the South, the majority of whom are Negroes, is to make education available to children of the poor. It is no secret that the Negroes, who make up the overwhelming population of many counties in the South, have lacked educational opportunities in many instances. No matter what the causes which contributed to the lack of educational opportunities, it is imperative that we make a start on improving education if we have any hope at all of winning the war on poverty.

Richard Wilson, in a column in the Washington Evening Star of May 3, makes an excellent case for education instead of relief.

The column follows:

POOR NEED EDUCATION, NOT RELIEF

(By Richard Wilson)

Anyone with eyes knows that a great deal of nonsense is talked in the Johnson administration about poverty in this country.

Quantitative and qualitative estimates on the degree of poverty are politically inflated. Standards of poverty are challengable. Causes of poverty are controversial.

Included among the poverty stricken are the handicapped, those who may be only temporarily in bad straits, alcoholics, people who own their own homes, cars, and television sets and live respectably on modest pensions, graduate students who soon will be making good incomes and many other classes falling within the $3,000 per year qualification.

Conversely, to argue that poverty does not exist or that living standards are too low for too many would be to ignore an obvious problem which needs immediate attention.

But to attribute this condition solely to faulty workings of the economic system is very wrong because the conditions of poverty would still exist in some of the above mentioned groups in the most perfect society.

More than this, the policies of the Government itself may tend to perpetuate conditions of poverty as in the case of an agricultural program which inexorably and unavoidably hastens the decline of the family farm as the source of a decent living.

Social maladjustments of one kind or another, racial discrimination, low educational standards, lack of skills, physical and mental defects, illness, temporary bad luck, age—these are the more readily recognizable conditions of poverty.

The poverty fighters always get confused. They begin to think about equality, median and average incomes, and a general leveling of the economic status of the country. Thus they promote a popular delusion among the ill informed and the Government reliant that the great man in the White House will usher them into a life of comfort and ease.

It should be better understood that in the war on poverty, as well as the school aid program, the big battles will have to be fought by government and people at the State, local, and neighborhood level; and by business, organized labor, and nonprofit organizations.

President Johnson's recent announcement of poverty program accomplishments—250,000 in the Jobs Corps, 45,000 needy students in 800 colleges, 125,000 in adult education programs—sound impressive but barely scratch the surface of the basic programs.

When the question is looked at more deeply, it is found htat even the social security program reaches only superficially into the basic problems.

Maximum social security payments go only to those who have earned a lifetime income well above the arbitrary poverty line of $3,000 per year cash income. Payments received by most beneficiaries fall well below the poverty line.

As another measure of what the Federal Government is doing about poverty, it is interesting to note the vastly greater private and institutional efforts.

Private charitable contributions now exceed $8.5 billion per year. Annual cash benefits under private employee benefit plans runs to $4.5 billion, medical benefits under private insurance have risen to $7 billion annually.

Private philanthropy for institutional care, family counseling, day care and emergency relief has nearly doubled in the last 10 years.

It is safe to say that nearly one-fifth of the total output of the U.S. economy is devoted to health, education, social insurance, and welfare.

The Johnson antipoverty program represents only a small part of this total, and some of it is not directed at poverty primarily but at the development of regional economies mainly through road building.

In the long run, the answer to curing poverty rather than relieving it may lie in education and in lifting the children of the poor out of the environment in which their parents are hopelessly locked for specialized education in residential schools.

Some would say that the Government would be attempting to break up the American family by such methods and adopting Sovietized remedies for American problems. But, since we are doing so many other things, a pilot project on this line might be worth a try.

Fort Custer National Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Michigan State Legislature relative to the establishing of a national cemetery at Fort Custer. I have introduced legislation for this purpose, H.R. 7383.

The resolution of the Michigan Legislature follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

(Offered by Representatives DeMaso, Mrs. McCollough, Cyril H. Root, Spencer, Erlandsen, O'Brien, Jacobetti, Wagner, Arnett, Esch, and Little)

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress relative to the establishing of a national cemetery at Fort Custer

Whereas through the recent action of the National Defense Department many areas at Fort Custer are being deactivated and the various parts of the fort are being disengaged for other activities; and

Whereas there is a great need in the State of Michigan for a national cemetery for the veterans of the State of Michigan and surrounding territories; and

Whereas it would be fitting and proper that a portion of the land at Fort Custer, which was the scene of training for so many thousands of American soldiers, be dedicated as a national cemetery by the U.S. Government in honor of its veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress is hereby respectfully urged to create a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Michigan delegation to the Congress.

Adopted by the senate April 1, 1965.

BERSYL I. KENYON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Adopted by the house April 1, 1965.

NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

We Must Act Now To Establish a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, recently several of my distinguished colleagues have spoken eloquently in this House of the problems of the Hudson River and the urgent need to find solutions for these problems before irreparable damage is done to this matchless American natural resource.

I cannot too strongly state my firm belief that we must act now by establishing a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway as proposed in legislation which I and 10 of my colleagues have introduced.

The battle to save the Hudson Highlands may well be a watershed in the history of conservation in America. The passage of the proposed legislation can have great significance not only for the Hudson and other great American rivers, but for other natural resources threatened with destruction or despoilation by thoughtless short-range projects and by official ignorance and apathy.

One of my colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER], in his remarks, touched upon a problem of the Hudson which troubles many of us who are concerned with developing our irre-

placeable and fast-vanishing natural resources in the best interests of all the people. He pointed out that Federal legislation was urgently needed to protect the Hudson from the uncontrolled authority of the Federal Government itself.

Mr. Speaker, at the moment, at least five Government agencies—the Federal Power Commission, the Atomic Energy Commission, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the General Services Administration, and the U.S. Coast Guard—have the power to make crucial decisions about the use and development of the river. This power is unrestrained by any obligation to respect the wishes of State or local governments or the people who live, work, and own property along the river. In point of fact, none of these agencies has any binding obligation to consult with any other.

Many of the projects that are advanced by these agencies serve the public interest admirably and several of the agencies are noted for the care with which they move on projects and the concern they show for public interest and welfare. But even in these cases, the care is largely due to the high purpose of the administrators and is more an act of grace than of legislative policy. This is a very serious problem indeed. And it is a problem that besets many other areas as well.

To be sure, these agencies almost invariably are required to give public notice of their plans and not infrequently to schedule public hearings at which the public interest may be represented. But the very agency charged with holding the hearings is the same agency charged with the development of the projects to be considered.

Thus, in the most recent case involving the Hudson, the controversial Consolidated Edison plant at Storm King Mountain, it was the Federal Power Commission—the agency charged with the promotion of electrical power—that was asked to weigh issues of conservation, land use, and other concerns of public policy. However, well-intentioned the judge, no reasonable man would expect him to render a just and equitable decision in a case to which he himself was a party.

Mr. Speaker, how can the private individual, ill financed and ill equipped, represent his own interests in such a proceeding against the giant adversaries of great wealth represented by modern industry? How can he defend himself in a strange court, miles from his home, faced with puzzling administrative procedures and enormously technical material?

Federal Power Commissioner Charles R. Ross, in his excellent and humane dissent from the Commission majority in the Consolidated Edison-Storm King Mountain case pinpointed the difficulty:

A regulatory commission—

He said—

can insure continuing confidence in its decisions only when it has used its staff and its own expertise in a manner not possible for the uninformed and poorly financed public.

In short, the public is at the mercy of the good will of the Commission.

In the absence of legislation controlling these practices, this can result in serious abuses of the public interest. This is as true for the Long Island wetlands, as it is for the Hudson River. But the most burning indictment is the history of Federal Power Commission procedures in the Storm King Mountain case. This history is set forth in a brief presented to the Federal Power Commission by the great American advocate, Lloyd K. Garrison, on April 8, 1965, in an application for rehearing on the license granted to Consolidated Edison.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this House and the American people should have a chance to read the story set forth in section IV of the remarkable document filed by Mr. Garrison:

POINT IV

(In a case like this, in which all the resources of a powerful utility are pitted against the unorganized public, the Commission has a duty to receive relevant evidence regarding feasible alternatives, even though it is offered after the hearings have been closed.)

In this case Consolidated Edison's studies of the Storm King Mountain project began in late 1959 or 1960 when the company's attention was drawn to the site by executives of the Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp.

It was necessary for Consolidated Edison, in order to go through with the project, to obtain from the village of Cornwall its water supply in the form of a natural reservoir on Storm King Mountain. This reservoir would then be deepened, widened, and dammed to contain the huge volume of Hudson River water which would be pumped up into it.

The acquisition of Cornwall's reservoir was facilitated early in 1963, the same year Consolidated Edison first applied to the Commission for a license. An amendment to the New York village law, introduced by an assemblyman from Cornwall, which became effective April 16, 1963, permitted a village to "sell, transfer, or lease properties constituting its water supply and distribution system, or any part thereof, for a fair consideration, to any person or public corporation for any use other than the supply or distribution of water for potable purposes upon a determination by the board of trustees of the village that the properties to be sold, transferred, or leased are no longer necessary for water supply or other village purposes."

Consolidated Edison indicated to Cornwall officials that when the project was built large additional tax revenues for Cornwall would result. The company offered to pay to have new water transmission and filtration systems built, to provide the city with a park, and to pay fees and costs which Cornwall might incur in working out the details of the changes.

Throughout this period, the public remained in ignorance of these preparations.

Consolidated Edison filed its initial application for the Cornwall project with the Federal Power Commission on January 29, 1963. On March 12, 1963, the Secretary of the Federal Power Commission issued a public notice that an application had been filed for a proposed project. It was described as follows:

"The proposed project will consist of four earth and rock filled dams forming an upper storage reservoir located in a natural basin at the crest of the Hudson Highlands on the west bank of the Hudson River."

It should be noted that the Hudson Highlands run for approximately 50 miles, with many natural basins at crests along the way.

The notice not only failed to identify the location of the project; it also omitted any reference to the long overhead power lines which would be an integral part of the project. In short, the notice was clearly insufficient to alert what Commissioner Ross so aptly describes as the "uninformed and poorly financed public" to the true nature of the project, the dangers that would be inherent in it, and the damage it would cause.

The notice fixed April 29, 1963, as the last day upon which protest and petitions might be filed, but the notice, though dated March 12, 1963, was not published until March 20, 1963. During the period of 40 days from the publication of the notice to the deadline for protests and petitions, the "uninformed and poorly financed public" was presumably expected to locate the project, detremine its effect, gather information and financial support, learn the administrative procedures of the Commission, and move to protest. The applicant, on the other hand, had had more than 3 years in which to prepare.

The notice not only contained a minimum of information and a minimum of time for intervention; it also was publicized with as much secrecy as the law would permit. It was published once in the Federal Register in Washington, D.C., and once a week for four consecutive weeks in a small newspaper in Goshen, N.Y., a town of 3,000 people located more than 10 miles from the actual site of the plant and more than 50 miles from New York.

On September 13, 1963, Consolidated Edison filed an amendment to its application making substantial technical changes in the proposed operation of the plant. Gradually information about the project began to spread; some protests were made; and on January 22, 1964 the Commission directed that a public hearing be held on February 25, 1964.

The opposition at this time consisted mostly of individual citizens. They had no organization. In fact they were for the most part unaware of each other and could not coordinate their activities. Moreover, those few who could afford to formally oppose the project had barely 34 days in which to obtain representation, gather material, file interventions and prepare a case.

On February 6, 1964, the first of the formal petitions to intervene was field with the Commission by the Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference. The conference was an organization hasitly formed by Nature's Conservancy and the New York-New Jersey Trail Conference, two conservation organizations. Participating in the conference were some 32 cooperating groups, for the most part small local nonprofit organizations.

The conference's petition was granted on February 14, 1964, only 11 days before the hearings were to be held. On February 17, 1964, the town of Cortlandt filed a petition to intervene, and subsequently during the proceedings this petition and the petitions of Philipstown, the town of Putnam Valley and the town of Yorktown were filed and granted by the Commission.

Beginning on February 25, 1964, 2 days of hearings were held in Washington, D.C., far from the site of the plant and the homes of the persons most directly affected by it. Despite the fact that the Commission indicated its intention to hear only statements of interest and not formal evidence, Consolidated Edison used the opportunity to put before the Commission what it characterized as a prima facie case and, in effect, challenged Scenic Hudson to deal then and there with this complex and highly technical material. Scenic Hudson objected to this unwarranted broadening of the hearings, but was overruled by the Commission.

On March 10, 1964, the examiner made his formal report to the Commission, summarizing the testimony and declaring that in his opinion, based upon the evidence so far introduced, the license should be issued. This early statement of the position which the Commission was lated to adopt was made before Scenic Hudson or any other intervenor

had had any reasonable opportunity to develop expert testimony.

Consolidated Edison then filed a motion to terminate the proceedings, answers to which were filed by Scenic Hudson and Philipstown. On March 27, 1964, the Commission issued an order denying Consolidated Edison's motion and setting April 20, 1964, as a date for further hearings.

In this order, the Commission, in effect, offered the opposition 24 days in which to deal finally with the case which Consolidated Edison had put forward, to anticipate what other material the company's experts might introduce, to prepare their own case and obtain expert witnesses, if possible, and to familiarize these witnesses with the questions at issue.

This would have been a formidable task for a well financed, highly organized group. It was beyond the capability of the unorganized public groups represented before the Commission in this action. At Scenic Hudson's motion, agreed to by all parties, the hearing date was extended 14 days to May 4, 1964. The few witnesses which Scenic Hudson was able to obtain in the limited time available and in the light of the reluctance of experts to testify against a powerful utility, were at a disadvantage in not having an adequate opportunity to familiarize themselves with the previous testimony and to assemble all the needed information.

In spite of these handicaps, the hearings served a useful purpose. For the first time public attention was drawn to the many questions raised by the application. This led the Joint Legislative Committee on Natural Resources of the State of New York to interest itself in the issues. After several months of study, the committee requested the Commission to withhold action, and scheduled hearings near the actual site of the Cornwall project. The Commission rejected the request of the joint committee, as it did the requests of several U.S. Congressmen from New York State.

On November 17, 1964, the Commission held the last of the public hearings, which consisted of oral argument. The record was then closed.

The joint legislative committee on natural resources held hearings at Bear Mountain State Park on November 19 and 20, 1964. A total of 107 witnesses were heard, the large majority objecting to the Cornwall project. Only a very few had been heard by the Federal Power Commission.

The committee's report, which was critical of the project and the proceedings, was issued on February 16, 1965, shortly before the license was granted to Consolidated Edison.

At the committee hearings, new testimony was brought forward, much of it of a technical nature, and was given wide publicity. As a result large numbers of people learned about the project and its effects for the first time. Many who discovered that their interests were to be injured by the project took the only course available—they filed formal petitions of intervention with the Commission asking that new evidence be heard. Formal petitions included:

1. Long Island Fishermen's Association, Inc.: Petition filed December 24, 1964; denied January 13, 1965.

2. Cortlandt Conservation Association: Petition filed December 24, 1964; denied January 13, 1965.

3. Power Committee of the Community Council of Hilltop Village Cooperative 24: Petition filed January 7, 1965; denied January 13, 1965.

4. Power Committee of the Community Council of Hilltop Village Cooperative 24: Petition for rehearing filed February 1, 1965; denied February 19, 1965.

5. National Party Boat Alliance: Petition filed January 8, 1965; denied January 18, 1965.

6. Council of Brooklyn Organizations, Inc.: Petition filed February 1, 1965; denied February 5, 1965.

7. Village of Freeport: Petition filed February 3, 1965; denied February 5, 1965.

8. Village of Freeport: Motion for rehearing filed March 9, 1965; intervention granted to the extent of allowing testimony on fish screens at May 4, hearing.

9. Congress of Puerto Rican Municipalities: Petition filed February 3, 1965; denied March 3, 1965.

We submit that under the circumstances that have been outlined above, these petitioners, who acted promptly as soon as they understood all that was involved, should have been permitted to intervene, and the record should have been opened up.

Mr. Speaker, it is well to note that the decision made by the FPC in this case has ramifications that extend far beyond the areas immediately affected by the plant and the transmission lines. Fishermen who earn their living from Long Island Sound may well suffer grievous economic harm if the spawning grounds of the unique Hudson River race of striped bass are destroyed. Is any one commission of the Federal Government to be permitted to make decisions of such importance affecting issues far outside its competence? Are we to lose the valuable natural properties left in our stewardship for future generations to the fragmented authority of Federal bureaus? Or will we act now, as the people demand, and bring these various interests under the restraining hand of Federal authority charged with representing the interests of all the people?

We must act to establish a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway.

Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co. Buys 50 Percent of Harper's Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in our highly developed society mass communications play a vital role and thus bear a heavy responsibility to this society. Magazines and newspapers in this country share the responsibility, along with other forms of communication, of educating and informing the public.

In Minneapolis, we have been particularly fortunate to have responsible newspapers, the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, now edited by John Cowles, Jr. Though I have not always agreed with the positions of the newspapers, nor they with mine, I can say we in Minneapolis are the beneficiaries of a fine tradition in newspapers.

Just this week it has been announced that the newspaper has purchased a half interest in Harper's magazine, an equally fine publication. I am pleased to insert the announcement appearing in the Minneapolis Star of April 29:

STAR & TRIBUNE CO. BUYS INTO HARPER'S

NEW YORK, N.Y.—The Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co. has acquired half interest in a newly formed company that will publish the 114-year-old magazine, Harper's.

John Cowles, Jr., a vice president of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune, Co. and editor of the Minneapolis Star and the Minneapolis Tribune, will be president of the new firm, Harper's Magazine, Inc.

The previous sole owner of Harper's, Harper and Row Book Co., owns the other 50 percent of the shares.

John Fischer will continue as editor-in-chief of the magazine. He also will be executive vice president and chief operating officer of the new company.

Among members of the board of directors will be Otto A. Silha and Philip Von Blon, vice presidents of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.

Howard W. Mithun, vice president and secretary of the Minneapolis company, will be secretary of the new corporation. Clarence B. McCue, treasurer of the Minneapolis company, also will serve as treasurer of Harper's Magazine, Inc.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Weirton Steel Co. Commended for Its Program of Air and Water Pollution Control—Senator Randolph Participates in Dedication of New Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Friday, April 30, 1965, a remote control switch activating a huge electrostatic precipitator at the Weirton Steel operation of National Steel Corp. was formally placed in service. This facility was installed to control air pollution from the open-hearth furnaces in Weirton, W. Va. As a member of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, it was my privilege and responsibility to participate. The switch was thrown, the button was pressed, then came the satisfaction of seeing the redbrown plumes of smoke billowing from these open-hearth furnace stacks transformed within 2 minutes into clean air, leaving the precipitator stack.

State of West Virginia officials and National Steel Corp. executives present were aware that far more than a simple action of that moment was associated with this undertaking. Members of the West Virginia Air Pollution Control Commission, State Agriculture Commissioner Gus R. Douglas, and Samuel Kusic, representing an active State air pollution control body; Mr. C. G. Tournay, president of Weirton Steel Co., and his staff, representing an enlightened industrial management; and several million dollars, representing the cost of this facility; all working together were necessary to achieve this transformation. Let the record reflect, Mr. President, that when these basic ingredients are present, air and stream pollution problems, no matter how complex, can and are being solved at the State and local levels of government. These factors are effective in West Virginia. Other State and local officials at this significant ceremony were State Senators Chester R. Hubbard and William Tompos of the First District; members of the house of delegates, George G. Griffith and George Di Tokash of Hancock County; and Mayor Frank A. Rybka, of Weirton.

Prior to the ceremony, Weirton Steel officials explained in some detail to these guests, the full extent of their current air and stream pollution control progress. They discussed their new "mill of the future," under construction, consisting of a 300-ton basic oxygen process, a vacuum degassing unit and a continuous casting installation. For the first time in this country, these three units will function in unison to make a superior steel product, thus the name, "Mill of the Future." These facilities require large amounts of water for cooling, scale removal and dust collection—over 50 million gallons of water per day. The water treatment facilities planned by Weirton Steel will fit their name for this "Mill of the Future." They will recirculate 90 percent of this water through complex filters, oil and scale basins, clarifiers, and finally, polishing pressure filters. As water is returned to the Ohio River, it will meet the most stringent requirements for water quality.

Before the basic oxygen process effluent is released to the atmosphere, this air will be washed in a wet scrubber and another clean stack will mark the Weirton horizon. All of this at a cost of many millions of dollars.

The company management also discussed with us a new sulfuric acid disposal facility to completely eliminate the discharge of waste sulfuric pickling acid to the Ohio River. This installation, on which operating costs equal $1,000 per day, will collect and neutralize all sulfuric acid wastes from the Weirton Steel plant. At the same time, there is a complete remodeling of the cold rolling tandem mills to recirculate rolling solutions and install oil collection and removal basins to prevent rolling oils from entering the Ohio River. These installations represent current projects to reduce air and stream pollution at Weirton. Much more has been done and much more will be done. National Steel officials told me during this visit, that their current budget commitments at Weirton Steel for control of air and stream pollution equaled approximately $10 million. This has been committed by an industrial company working with local and State officials with no involvement of Federal authorities.

The Weirton Steel plant occupies a significant place in the economic, social, and civic life of the northern section of our State, where it employs almost 13,000 persons. Leadership in many aspects of civic affairs is exercised by company personnel, and it is noteworthy, in this respect, that the former president of Weirton Steel, the Honorable Tom Millsop, served as a mayor of that city and was responsible for much community progress and a strong sense of community purpose.

If all industrial management officials were as progressive and as civic minded as are those of the Weirton Steel, and if all State and local officials were as conscious of their responsibilities in the field of pollution control as are those now serving in West Virginia, the Congress would perhaps not need to act on Federal standards for air and water quality.

As legislators we must recognize that these large expenditures for cleaning our air and water and for the beautification of America do not result in any financial return to industry. On the contrary, they result in substantial costs.

As legislators, therefore, in addition to enacting abatement legislation based on enforcement authority, we should create an effective incentive for the continuation, acceleration, and expansion of abatement projects constructed at the initiative of industry. We can do so by supporting legislation that will give tax recognition to amounts expended by industry to improve the quality of air and water—our invaluable natural resources.

As I stated in my remarks at Wierton on April 30, it is my hope that the Congress will act during this session on legislation which would give to industry an accelerated writeoff of investments in pollution abatement equipment. As a cosponsor of S. 1670, which is now pending before the Senate Finance Committee, I believe that society as a whole should bear some of the cost of such equipment which is necessitated by the increasing industrialization of our country and the growing population density. For these reasons I shall press for early action on the Clean Air Act as well as legislation to bring some relief to those companies which seek to implement the goals of that legislation.

Retreat in Asia Would Be Avenue to Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial of April 28, 1965, entitled "Policy Firmly Stated: Retreat in Asia Would Be Avenue to Disaster," the Nashville Banner calls for support of President Johnson's policy in Vietnam.

Asserting:

> President Johnson obviously has assessed the case, and is adhering to a policy course dictated by the realities..

The editorial adds: "There can be no wavering on that course of duty outlined," by President Johnson and reiterated in his news conference of April 27, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, under leave I request permission to insert the editorial from the Nashville Banner in the RECORD and com-

mend it to the consideration of my colleagues:

POLICY FIRMLY STATED: RETREAT IN ASIA WOULD BE AVENUE TO DISASTER

President Johnson firmly restated yesterday the U.S. policy in Vietnam; its purpose clearly defined, and underlined with the note of courage that forbids retreat. It was not a provocative discussion, but explanatory for any element on this side, or elsewhere in the world, needing the explanation.

There can be no wavering on that course of duty outlined. With evaluation of the crisis there as definitive as it was perceptive, the President warned that yielding by surrender would bring greater threats, and ultimately all-out war. He was on solid ground in reminding of the costs of retreat in every instance of that—from Munich to the present.

America is not the aggressor in Asia. Its military intervention there, solicited by South Vietnam, is for free world security, to which national policy and its alliances are committed. The increasing responsibility assumed has been in the light of communism's military threat—raised by both North Vietnam and Red China, their combined purpose the conquest of all Asia.

Halfhearted or fainthearted measures will not stem that murderous tide. Once a battle has been joined, there can be no substitute for victory.

President Johnson obviously has assessed the case, and is adhering to a policy course dictated by the realities. He has answered effectively the critics who—in this engagement, as others—have advocated the panic and pullout course, and whose policy concept would make every sacrifice to date a sacrifice in vain.

There are those, on the other hand, who have assessed the murderous realities of the Communist dogma—seeing it for what it is; and have believed for years that there would be no peace, security, nor guarantees of the preservation of freedom, until communism has been clobbered by somebody.

Whatever the course we pursue in meeting that threat to the free world and to the United States as our prime consideration, it won't be cheap. But it will be infinitely more expensive, in blood and substance, if the enemy is permitted to continue aggression and conquest unchallenged.

The President engaged in no rhetorical definitions avoiding references to the term of "war." That is the reality, declared or not. It is a war precipitated by the enemy, and must be won.

Mr. Johnson has stated clearly the willingness to discuss a settlement, and yesterday reiterated it. Nevertheless, with equal clarity he spelled out the course that will be pursued if the enemy persists in the campaign of murderous aggression.

It was time to junk the no-win policy which has encumbered the security operation since World War II.

America wants peace—but peace at any price is the avenue to disaster and to free world annihilation.

Heading Off Castroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Heading Off Castroism," which was published on April 30, in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Apr. 30, 1965]

HEADING OFF CASTROISM

Since that fateful day 3 years and 11 months ago, when Dictator Rafael Trujillo stepped from his car at an intersection and was gunned down by assassins, ending 30 years of absolute power, the Dominican Republic has wobbled precariously between a leftist Castroite takeover and a rightwing coup by the fallen Trujillo's heirs.

Soon after his death, as President Balaguer struggled to satisfy demands for reform, the United States deployed a dozen warships off Ciudad Trujillo and sent Marine fighter planes skimming along the coast to help Balaguer persuade Trujillo's brothers it would be a mistake for them to pick up his mantle. It worked. Soon Ciudad Trujillo was renamed Santo Domingo.

Since then, the little country has managed one democratic election. But the winner, moderate and weak President Juan Bosch, lasted only 7 months before some of the military got fed up with his tolerance for the left and booted him out. The rest of the time, one or another junta, council, or strongman has kept things rocking along in this forlorn land, where two-thirds of the people are illiterate, and life is sustained by sugar exports and American aid.

Fidel Castro, sniffing opportunity near his doorstep, has helped to keep the pot boiling through the Communist 14th of June movement. On Tuesday, as a fumbling army coup aimed at restoring Bosch faltered halfway to power, the Fidelistas moved in, armed "the people," and military revolt became general chaos. An air force general, a stanch anti-Communist, Wessin y Wessin, rallied the country's best armed forces but could not immediately retake the capital. With American lives in danger, the President sent Marines and airborne troops to rescue them and protect U.S. property.

The wheel has come full circle. In 1961, we showed the flag to chase away the Trujillo tribe. Now, according to Congressmen briefed at the White House, our forces are there, at least in part, to try to head off the Castroites, should they look like coming out on top of the shapeless insurrection.

Any such intent must be officially denied, of course, for the Charter of the Organization of American States rules out any armed intervention by one state in the affairs of another under any grounds whatever. Wisely, the United States lost no time in convening the OAS, and it now appears that the OAS will assume the leadership in seeking a cease fire. It should also sponsor whatever military or other action is needed to restore order.

Our intervention, of course, gives communism everywhere something new to denounce, and it risks protracted involvement of our forces in the Dominican Republic. But another Communist state in the Caribbean cannot be tolerated, and the President's action meets this threat head on.

Investigating the Ku Klux Klan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, as we all know the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been at the center of controversy through the years. It is so again today as preparations are being made for its investigation of the Ku Klux Klan.

It is not my purpose today either to praise or criticize the committee. Among its members are friends for whom I have the highest regard, and in any case I could not begin to match the words already expressed by others, either in approving or disapproving specific actions or the overall conduct of the committee.

Nonetheless, I have been asked by constitutents having strong feelings about the committee and its work to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the April 16, 1965, issue of Commonweal, the respected journal of Catholic thought. Entitled "Gambling on House Un-American Activities Committee," the article questions the merits of the forthcoming Ku Klux Klan investigation. I am sure it will be of interest to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, the article follows:

GAMBLING ON THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

The favorite reading material of the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, if we accept the example of Imperial Wizard Robert Shelton, are the reports on subversion in the country issued periodically by the House Un-American Activities Committee. That the Klan should now be the subject of an investigation by the selfsame committee may be temporarily gratifying, then, if only for the irony. But in light of the House Un-American Activities Committee's history, the reckless charges, misuse of power, arrogant disregard of individual rights—all of which in this country have become synonymous with its initials—it seems the height of gambler's folly to expect that anything worthwhile will come of it.

The White House stated its preference for the House Un-American Activities Committee, over the responsible House Judiciary Committee, on the ground that the former is above suspicion of leftist tendencies, even in the South, and that a condemnation of the Klan coming from it will carry just that much more weight. However, to qualify as free of the Communist rot that supposedly is infecting the country, at least in the minds of white southerners, is merely to mark the measures of one's removal from reality. That is precisely why the House Un-American Activities Committee is untrustworthy for the serious task of investigation that the Klan's activities in the South demand.

The House Un-American Activities Committee has ignored extreme rightist and racist groups in this country for decades, even when some of them, the Klan for example, have been listed by the Attorney General's Office as subversive. Its obsession with ferreting out Communists has led it into actions that have brought discredit not only on it, but to some degree on the whole investigative function of Congress. To set it on the Klan trail now will not somehow suddenly transform it into a model agency of government. Instead, it sets a poor precedent by which the competence of official investigative agencies is determined by their political color. If the whole idea is simply to match prejudices, then the exercise of congressional authority may soon become accepted in theory, as it occasionally is in practice, as arbitrary.

This is particularly foolhardy in the present instance, for in investigating the Klan, the whole civil rights movement in the South will necessarily come under the House Un-American Activities Committee's capricious

scrutiny. With five of its nine members southerners, including its chairman, EDWIN E. WILLIS, of Louisiana, we have put ourselves in the unlikely position of hoping that Martin Luther King, Jr., weathers the committee's hearings better than Mr. Shelton.

"President Johnson's Grip Is Strong in Resisting Red Aggression," Writes Carl W. McCardle in Wheeling, W. Va., Intelligencer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, editorial support for our Chief Executive in coping with foreign problems, is strong in West Virginia.

In the March 30, 1965, issue of the Wheeling, W. Va., Intelligencer, there was an especially cogent column by Carl W. McCardle, of the Intelligencer staff, titled "Johnson's Grip Strong in Resisting Red Aggression." I ask unanimous consent that portions of this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON'S GRIP STRONG IN RESISTING RED AGGRESSION

President Johnson is keeping a cool and steady grip on the throttle in resisting the Communist aggressors against South Vietnam.

And he wants our allies to know that America is going to keep the pressure on the Reds for as long as it takes to make them leave their sovereign neighbors alone, accompanied by safeguarded assurances to that effect.

The NATO Council Headquarters is in Paris, which is also the capital of unlimited French grandeur contained in the personage of the one and only Gen. Charles de Gaulle, President of France.

He has been agitating for another East-West conference of some sort. The United States quickly rejected it, because it would have had at the core of a negotiated settlement, "neutrality" for Vietnam, together with Cambodia and Laos. All three are former French Colonies which used to be known as French Indochina. It has been demonstrated that "neutrality" makes a country an easy prey for the Communists, particularly in Asia.

It has required patience and courage of a high order for President Johnson to keep on with what he knows is right, which is that the only way to stop Communist aggression is to stop it where it happens to be currently pushing its evil threat; namely, in Vietnam.

Mr. Johnson has made a sound judgment in Vietnam. If we were to leave, and the Reds were to go on from Vietnam and take southeast Asia, the rich rice bowl of Asia, then the dark cloud of Communist tyranny would develop that continent and with this lost freedom, there would also be dissipated whatever prestige the United States has in that vast and vital area.

When the President made the determination that henceforth the aim would be to repulse a Communist aggressor and push him back where he was supposed to be in Vietnam, the President doubtless knew that he was embarking upon a course that would not be without risks, and that the road might be long.

The sole aim of the President is to make the Reds stop their aggression against South Vietnam, with secure proof that they will go back up north of the dividing line at the 17th parallel in Vietnam—as decreed in the 1954 Geneva accords, and to stay there. Then the U.S. forces could safely go home.

For too long the Communists, knowing that they or the United States did not want to get involved in a general war, have taken advantage of that circumstance to gobble up or at least to saw in half any sovereign country they thought they could with immunity seize.

Now, whether the Reds want a widening of the war is wholly up to them.

Until the Communists are ready to halt their aggression in Vietnam, the United States is going to keep the pressure on and intensify it, if necessary. They will come to the realization that America is now ready to back up its diplomacy with our power, the mightiest on earth. Mr. Johnson, who had to postpone his planned trip to Europe because of the mounting crisis in Vietnam, has shown that he knows how to use power, neither recklessly nor timidly. The United States has the power and the patience and, at last, the will, to see to it that this time the Reds will not succeed in their aggression in Vietnam.

The chief of the North Vietnamese Red Army has been quoted as saying: "If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, this means that it can be defeated anywhere." Take out the phony Red application of the word "imperialist" to the United States, and it could be that the Red general has sized it all up pretty well.

There is a quotation, the origin of which I do not know, that I might cite to end this essay:

"Fear knocked at the door.
Faith answered.
And there was no one there."

OAS Should Act Swiftly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the May 1, 1965, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times, there appeared an excellent editorial on the Organization of American States.

I wish to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as I firmly believe my fellow Members will find this editorial of interest.

The editorial follows:

OAS SHOULD ACT SWIFTLY

The Organization of American States will meet today to discuss what action it should take in the crisis in the Domincian Republic.

The responsibility facing the OAS seems clear. That body of 20 nations should immediately appoint a committee and send it to the troubled area to work for a cease-fire and the restoration of peace and security.

The OAS should also conduct a painstaking and thorough investigation of the revolt against the recognized government in the Dominican Republic. The charge of Communist subversion agitated from outside the nation has been made by responsible officials of the Dominician Republic and others. Those charges should be investigated and if true the matter should be brought before the U.N.

Some members of the OAS have voiced disapproval of President Johnson's action in sending Marines into Santo Domingo. That reaction, which grew out of the fact that the United States did not consult with the OAS before taking action, is unjustified. President Johnson has made it clear that the Marines are not an occupying force. They are there only to protect and evacuate American citizens. The rapid deterioration of the situation and the rebel attacks on five Latin American embassies should be sufficient demonstration that the action taken by the United States was necessary.

By working swiftly to negotiate for a cease-fire and restore order the OAS can refute the charges made by Soviet Russia, Red China, and others that the U.S. action was one of aggression. The United States can cooperate in this refutation by removing its troops as soon as peace is restored.

The Dominican Republic has suffered greatly under more than 30 years of dictatorship. It needs economic aid, which the United States has been providing, and it needs the understanding and assistance of its sister nations in the Latin American community. The OAS can extend that help by acting to restore order and assuring this troubled nation a period of calm while it works out its problems.

Los Angeles Calvary Methodist Church Wesleyan Service Guild Scholarship Fund To Sponsor May 16 Young Saints Concert Revue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, last year I had occasion to enjoy an excellent musical program by a small group of entertainers known as the Young Saints, who also presented me with their widely acclaimed record album "Didn't It Rain."

This same group of singers, dancers, and musicians are to be featured again on May 16, 1965, when the Los Angeles Calvary Methodist Church Wesleyan Service Guild presents the Tommy Roberts-Evelyn Freeman Workshop of Performing Arts in a benefit concert revue.

The program, to be a benefit for the guild's scholarship fund, will be given on Sunday, May 16, at 3 p.m., in the Wilshire Ebell Theater at 4401 West Eighth Street, Los Angeles.

In the interest of drawing attention to this most worthy cause, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent notice printed regarding this benefit concert revue:

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CALVARY METHODIST CHURCH

The Calvary Methodist Church Wesleyan Service Guild presents the Tommy Roberts-Evelyn Freeman Workshop of Performing Arts in a spectacular concert revue, featuring the Young Saints, at the Wilshire Ebell

Theater on Sunday, May 16, at 3 p.m. for the benefit of the guild scholarship fund.

The Young Saints is a group of singers, dancers, and musicians from high schools, junior colleges, and colleges of the Los Angeles area, the end result of over 4 years of intensive search for and auditioning of young talent.

The program will spotlight compositions by ASCAP writers Tommy Roberts and Evelyn Freeman who have written for and appeared with such stars as Peggy Lee, Frankie Laine, and Louis Prima. Also included in the program are selections from their world-acclaimed record album "Didn't It Rain."

Highlight of the show will be an "a go-go" section with the Young Saints doing the songs and dances of today, and a jazz segment featuring some of the top studio and jazz musicians on the west coast, which will include special music by Buddy Collette, Shorty Rogers, Benny Carter, and Ernie Freeman, who is also guest conductor.

Broadway will be represented by a musical salute to Rogers and Hammerstein and on the serious side, the premiere performance of a choral and orchestral setting of the Scriptures (Isaiah 52: 7) by Tommy Roberts and Evelyn Freeman and an orchestral fugue written especially for the Los Angeles Neophonic Orchestra.

Tickets are available at the Wilshire Ebell box office, 4401 West Eighth Street, Los Angeles; telephone Webster 9-1128.

Indiana Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, several communities in Indiana and the Midwest were struck on Palm Sunday by vicious, killing tornadoes. The result was the worst disaster in Hoosier history. As of May 4, 136 residents of Indiana had died from injuries suffered in those tornadoes. In addition, 131 Hoosiers remain hospitalized. Estimates of the total damage to public and private property in Indiana as a result of the tornadoes exceed $75 million.

The response of the President of the United States to this catastrophe which struck Indiana and other parts of the Midwest was to fly immediately to the scenes of destruction. His appearances gave clear reassurance to storm-shocked citizens that their Government would stand by them in time of need.

Although Indianapolis and surrounding parts of Marion County in my 11th District of Indiana were not directly affected by the tornado damage, Indianapolis City Councilman Max E. Brydenthal recognized the importance and timeliness of the concerned gesture made by President Johnson in visiting our State. Accordingly, I place in the RECORD at this point, the text of Mr. Brydenthal's statement delivered at a regular meeting of the city council of Indianapolis, Ind., April 19, 1965:

STATEMENT OF MAX E. BRYDENTHAL, CITY COUNCILMAN, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Tonight I feel like an American 10 feet tall. I am proud, too, to be a Democrat. I am delighted when someone refers to me as a politician and thank God we have a man like Lyndon Johnson in the White House.

Indiana was struck by the worst tornado in history on Palm Sunday when a series of tornadoes ripped through the State leaving death and destruction in its path. When the full impact of the catastrophe was realized and the news reached our Capital City, our President did not lose much time deciding to fly to the disaster area to see for himself the full extent of the violence on those unfortunate families.

This is the second time President Johnson has visited Indiana under adverse conditions. Time has not completely healed the economic scars resulting in the permanent shutdown of the largest employer in the South Bend area which he viewed on his first visit. His personal regards and heartfelt feelings for those who were afflicted by this adversity makes me proud to be called a politician.

Those who attended the march at Selma say that after the march was over they were recognized anywhere they went about the city by the mud on their shoes. President Johnson was reportedly scheduled to stay in the disaster area for only 55 minutes. On returning to his plane, 2½ hours later, his shoes bore the sign of one who cared. They were covered with mud as he walked through this disaster.

Now, you can understand why I feel like an American 10 feet tall, proud to be a Democrat and my head is high and my chest is out when I am referred to as a politician.

Mr. Chairman, I move this council send a letter to President Johnson thanking him for taking time out of his busy schedule to walk among those people in Indiana who had this misfortune.

The Role for Private Resources in Aid to Foreign Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly effective and mutually beneficial means of helping the developing countries is through utilizing American private resources in our aid programs overseas.

Private participation in the aid programs takes many forms—from university technical assistance to business investment guarantees. At the same time this involvement of the American private sector encourages the growth of private initiative and enterprise in the developing countries, hastening progress to self-supporting, independent economies.

The following account, taken from the Agency for International Development's summary presentation to Congress, explains the varied means by which the aid program in 1966 will provide an even more important role for private resources in foreign assistance:

PRIVATE RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT

AID continues to encourage greater private participation in our assistance programs and stronger, more vigorous private sectors in the developing countries themselves.

The AID program already includes substantial participation by American private business, institutions, and groups. About one-fourth of AID's technical assistance is provided by American universities, business firms, and private associations on contract, and this role is being enlarged further. American engineering and construction firms overseas are supervising the design and construction of some $4 billion in capital projects AID is helping to finance in the developing countries. Under the Partners of the Alliance program launched in the spring of 1964, 25 American States and communities are consulting with Latin American nations and communities and arranging to provide scholarships, technical assistance, investments in joint ventures and other kinds of assistance; eight more partnerships will soon be underway. Private firms, labor unions, and local governments, as well as universities, provide training for some 6,000 participants a year; the value of training services donated for these programs has been estimated at more than $10 million.

During the coming year, significant expansion is expected in a number of AID activities designed to encourage greater American private investment in the less-developed countries, and to increase the flow of development assistance from private American relief agencies, nonprofit associations, labor unions, civic groups, and business organizations.

Among the major developments expected during fiscal year 1966 are these:

The report of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid on ways to increase private participation in international development.

A continued sharp increase in the use of AID investment guaranties by American investors. In fiscal year 1964, AID wrote three times as many guaranty contracts and issued twice as much coverage as in any preceding year.

Increased use of the AID investment survey program, which is helping to generate new private American investment in less-developed countries.

Placement of volunteers overseas by the new International Executive Service Corps, operated and supported by American business and assisted by AID.

An expansion of the role of American voluntary agencies in promoting self-help and development work, in addition to straight relief work in the underdeveloped countries.

Increased State and local participation in AID's partners in the alliance program through which Americans at the State and local community leadership level work directly with their counterparts in Latin American countries on specific development problems.

ENCOURAGING PRIVATE U.S. INVESTMENT

AID continuously seeks ways to improve the flow of U.S. private assistance to the developing world, spurred by the conviction that the demand is great and the need is urgent. The Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid has been reviewing AID's private enterprise programs and considering new initiatives. The Committee will report by June 30, 1965.

* * * * *

In making investment plans, the U.S. businessman is able, with AID's help, to: (a) obtain information on investment opportunities in less-developed countries; (b) survey proposed projects; (c) protect himself against certain risks not generally present in developed countries; and (d) obtain loans for projects. Thus, the overall purpose of AID's private investment programs is to facilitate productive investments in the less-developed countries and to make them more attractive in relation to alternative possibilities.

Investment tax credit proposal

To encourage a greater flow of direct U.S. private investment into the less-developed countries, particularly in manufacturing industries, the executive branch has proposed an oversea investment tax credit. This is a

saparate legislative proposal which provides for a tax credit against the U.S. investor's total tax liability of 30 percent of the value of new investment in certain trades or business in eligible less-developed countries. For purposes of calculating the credit, reinvested earnings over 50 percent would also be considered new investment. The Less-Developed Country Investment Credit Act was introduced in Congress in July 1964 by Congressman HALE BOGGS and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, but no further action was taken prior to adjournment. The bill is expected to be reintroduced in the 89th Congress.

Rates of return on investments in foreign industrialized nations are, on the average, substantially higher than on investments in most less-developed countries. If enacted, the legislation will redress this imbalance and should increase U.S. investment in productive facilities in the developing nations.

Information programs

Businessmen's Information Center: The Center, established in AID Headquarters in Washington a year ago, provides a central source of information on all AID programs of interest to the business and investment communities. * * *

Catalog of Investment Information and Opportunities: Last May AID issued the Catalog of Investment Opportunities, a unique collection of more than 1,200 economic and technical feasibility studies of interest to potential U.S. and foreign investors. * * * The index, distributed free, lists the studies by country and by industry. Detailed abstracts of each study can be purchased and are also available for review at AID, at the Department of Commerce and its 42 field offices and in U.S. Embassies in the major industrialized countries. Copies of the complete studies are for sale at cost.

* * * * *

In addition to identifying specific investment opportunities, the catalog is a valuable central repository of basic investment information which will increasingly be consulted as the first step in the preparation of investment projects in the less-developed countries.

Investment surveys: Through the Businessmen's Information Center and the Catalog of Investment Information and Opportunities, AID is bringing more and better information about investment in less-developed countries to the attention of the U.S. businessman. The investment survey program goes 1 step further—AID shares with the potential investor the financial risk of a detailed feasibility survey. Designed to translate generalized interest (which may have been stimulated by the catalog or other AID publications) into the development of specific projects, the program is proving of particular interest to medium- and small-size firms. Often it is precisely these firms which have the expertise most needed by developing economies.

* * * * *

Investment guarantee programs

Investments in less developed countries are often exposed to political and commercial risks which are extraordinary in that they are not generally factors in investment in developed countries. AID's investment guarantee programs are designed to meet this problem. Ranging from the specific political risk guarantees through extended risk coverage to the 100 percent housing guarantee authority, the common denominator is the desire of the U.S. Government to give private U.S. capital the necessary protection to do a job it is uniquely equipped to do.

Specific risk guarantees: The oldest AID program to assist the U.S. investor is the specific risk investment guarantee program, offering protection against losses caused by inconvertibility of currency, expropriation, and war, revolution or insurrection. Outstanding guarantees have doubled over the past 2 years and are expected to double again over the next 2 years. From the inception of the program in 1948 through December 31, 1964, 1,261 guarantee contracts covering $2.2 billion had been written for specific political risks; of this amount $1.8 billion was still outstanding.

* * * * *

In 1963 the Congress added $1 billion to guarantee issuing authority, bringing it to a total of $2.5 billion. Guarantee contracts are now being issued at an increased rate. The number of preliminary applications for insurance has jumped dramatically.

* * * * *

Before these guarantees are issued, the government of the host country must approve the investment; such approvals are now flowing in at a rate of 20 or 30 per month. If the present rate of foreign government approvals and contract issuance continues, additional authority will be needed in fiscal year 1966. The Congress has been asked to increase present authority of $2.5 billion by an additional $2.5 billion for the period fiscal year 1966–67. This increase of $2.5 billion of authority for the program for the next 2 fiscal years is essential to insure that the minimum anticipated demands of U.S. investors can be met.

The specific risk programs operate only in those countries which agree to institute them. During calendar 1964, six new bilateral agreements were signed and four countries broadened their original guarantee agreements. Altogether, guarantees are available in 63 developing countries, covering the specific risks of convertibility and expropriation. Of these, 44 countries have signed agreements covering war risks and 39 have also agreed to institute the extended risk program.

Extended risk guarantees: Extended risk investment guarantees are designed to give greater protection to investors in developing countries than that afforded by the specific risk program. Emphasis is on economic development projects which further social progress and the development of independent business enterprises.

In other than housing projects, the guarantee assures against a loss of not more than 75 percent of any loan investment. AID expects to use this authority to encourage the flow of long-term loan financing to the developing countries from institutional sources, such as insurance companies, pension funds, banks, and Edge Act corporations. Because of the extensive protection provided by such guarantees, they will be used for equity investment only in cases involving high risk which are of particular importance to the U.S. Government. In most such cases the coverage will run to 50 percent of the new investment.

* * * * *

Latin American housing guarantees: Section 224 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, authorized the guarantee of up to $250 million of private U.S. investments in self-liquidating demonstration or pilot housing projects in Latin America.

As of December 1964, 10 projects comprising 12,000 dwelling units guaranteed at $61.5 million were under construction, with 3,600 units completed; 5 more projects, totaling 6,000 units with guarantees amounting to $30 million, are getting underway; and 13 additional projects with 11,000 dwelling units guaranteed at $68 million are under active consideration and awaiting final document submission and review. The remainder of the $250 million in guarantee authority will be utilized this year in projects now under preliminary review by the Federal Housing Administration.

While AID believes that the demonstration purpose of the present program will be fulfilled with the use of the existing $250 million in guarantee authority, there is a continuing need for a modified housing guarantee program. The Latin Amercan population growth is the highest in the world and the pressure for housing is intense. At present, there is a 4-million dwelling unit shortage and long-term financing at reasonable rates has previously been nonexistent.

Therefore, AID is recommending an extension of the program in a modified form with an additional $100 million of guarantee authority to cover the following new kinds of loan guarantees:

(1) To local mortgage financing institutions such as savings and loan associations.

(2) For housing projects for lower income families or projects which will strengthen cooperatives, labor unions, and other institutions important to the Alliance for Progress.

(3) For projects (for homes having a unit cost, wherever practicable, of not more than $6,500) where there is substantial local financial participation not derived from external sources.

Loans to private enterprise

Dollar loans to private borrowers: Because of the growing availability of funds from alternative free world sources it has become increasingly possible for qualified projects to obtain dollar financing from sources other than AID, such as private lenders, intermediate credit institutions, the Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), the World Bank, and the International Finance Corporation (IFC).

However, during 1964 AID made 10 loans totaling $61.4 million, to U.S. and foreign private borrowers for projects in less-developed countries, chiefly in the field of industrial development.

Lending to intermediate credit institutions: The creation and stimulation of credit facilities is a keystone in building a strong private sector. AID dollar and local currency lending to intermediate credit institutions therefore continues to increase. Some of the intermediate credit institutions are privately owned, some governmental, and others of mixed ownership. In every case, however, the subloans are to be made exclusively to qualified private borrowers.

During 1964, 19 dollar loans amounting to $100.5 million were authorized to 19 institutions in 15 countries. Eighty of these funds went to Latin America. Industrial development banks, with $62.2 million, received the largest share, followed by housing credit institutions ($17.8 million), and agricultural credit assistance and ($13.6 million). A total of $6.9 million went to cooperatives, the first AID loans to this form of credit institution. In addition to dollar loans, local currency credits equivalent to approximately $8.8 million were made available to development banks during this period.

Cooley loans: An integral part of AID's private enterprise program, these loans, financed from local currencies generated from sales under title I of the food-for-peace program, continued to be in great demand during 1964. Loans may be made to U.S. firms or their branches, subsidiaries, or affiliates for industrial development and expansion. Foreign firms are eligible if the proposed project will expand markets for U.S. agricultural products. This source of financing is available for fixed capital assets and also, subject to availabilities and local regulations, for permanent working capital.

* * * * *

Other local currency loans: New techniques are being developed to increase the supply of local currencies available for financing private investment. A Private Investment Fund created under World Bank and AID auspices, was set up in Colombia in 1963. The peso equivalent of a portion of an AID dollar commodity import (or program) loan was credited to the Fund and earmarked for medium- and long-term in-

dustrial development loans to private U.S. and local borrowers. The program has proved highly successful and it may prove possible to apply the same technique in other countries.

BUILDING LOCAL ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS

Even under the most favorable circumstances, external capital, public or private, cannot supply more than a fraction of the skills and money the less-developed countries need. The bulk of the effort and the investment must come from within the country itself. Because the basic institutions necessary for vigorous growth are often lacking or seriously deficient, AID helps to develop them by analyzing obstacles to effective private sector development and recommending methods by which the countries themselves can overcome them.

Frequently AID-financed technical assistance is needed to supply essential elements in the complicated pattern of private institutions which developed societies take so much for granted. A major task of the AID missions, increasingly emphasized in the Agency's programing, is to develop a rational, integrated "mix" of private sector technical assistance projects.

These projects range from basic vocational and business training to technical assistance in the creation and administration of stock exchanges. During fiscal years 1963–65 AID will have helped establish or improve more than 20 industrial development corporations, 10 investment promotion centers, industrial parks in 5 countries, over 40 productivity centers serving 18 countries and more than 200 training institutions in over 40 countries. In addition, AID is conducting a wide range of projects to improve tax legislation and administration, to develop investment codes and incentives, to set up business advisory services, and to train personnel in the identification, development and presentation of investment projects. Technical assistance has also been given to savings and loan institutions, cooperatives, credit unions, and development banks.

* * * * *

PRIVATE RESOURCES IN THE AID PROGRAM

AID is increasing its use of private institutions, business firms, universities, and service organizations to carry out technical assistance activities in the developing countries. As of September 30, 1964, AID had 1,225 contracts with such groups, totaling about $415 million, for technical assistance in 76 countries.

Universities

American colleges and universities held more than $230 million in AID contracts for research, surveys, training and technical assistance as of September 30, 1964. Over $170 million of this amount was for technical assistance by 67 universities in 41 countries.

During the past year, at the request of AID, a special task force under the chairmanship of John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corp. of New York, conducted an intensive study of the relationship between the Agency and the Nation's institutions of higher education. The task force recommended a number of measures to revise and improve the role of the universities in foreign assistance. AID has begun to implement these recommendations. For example, the basic AID-university contract has been rewritten to provide for participation by the colleges in planning and preparing projects and programs, rather than serving simply as executors or administrators of programs designed without their participation.

* * * * *

Cooperatives and thrift institutions

Since enactment in 1961, of the Humphrey amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, AID has strongly emphasized assistance for the development of farm credit and marketing cooperatives, credit unions, savings and loan institutions, and housing and electric power cooperatives to help organize capital and individual effort at the grassroots level.

For technical assistance in these fields, the Agency has relied heavily on contracts with private American institutions including the Credit Union National Association, the National League of Insured Savings Associations, the Cooperative Association, the National Farmers Union, the Foundation for Cooperative Housing, and the International Cooperative Training Center. Since 1962, the number of AID-financed technicians assisting cooperatives has quadrupled; the number of participants trained has tripled; and a series of short-course programs (1 day to 1 month) in cooperative techniques has reached more than 27,000 trainees.

Progress has been particularly marked in Latin America. Since 1960, 78 savings and loan associations have been organized with AID assistance in Chile, Ecuador, the Dominican Republic, Peru, Venezuela, and Guatemala. These associations have enlisted 204,000 members, mobilized $55 million in savings, and have made loans of $99 million for the purchase of new homes.

Credit unions in Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela now number 1,160, with 630 more awaiting charters. These credit unions have 335,000 members, $13.7 million in savings, and $18.3 million in loan volume. A new credit union development program was recently started in the Central American countries.

Labor

AID contracts with the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), spearheaded by the AFL–CIO, have permitted effective labor participation in assistance to Latin America.

The AIFLD has trained 275 inter-American labor leaders in the United States and 8,500 of them in Latin America. Free labor institutions have been set up in Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Jamaica, Nicaragua, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. These national institutes are supplemented by seminar programs in Argentina, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, and Trinidad-Tobago.

Training in the United States

Each year approximately 6,000 people whose efforts are critical to the success of economic and social development activities abroad, including many AID-assisted projects in various countries, are brought to the United States for study or specialized training. Many are technicians; some are young students requiring college education; others are established leaders or specialists desiring additional observation or training in their specialized fields. All are expected to return to their countries and engage in specific tasks connected with developmental programs.

* * * * *

The participant training program depends heavily on the cooperation of hundreds of American colleges, business firms, labor unions, and local government units to provide the technical skills which participants require. With the exception of tuition and fees charged by academic facilities, most of the training is provided without cost. The contribution of these institutions in uncompensated services to the training program has been estimated to exceed $10 million.

In addition, a network of about 30,000 unpaid volunteers in international hospitality organizations across the Nation assists AID participants during their stay in the United States. The newly reorganized AID Office of International Training is placing increased emphasis on the need for participants to acquire more extensive knowledge of the United States and its people over and above their formal training. * * * Approximately 150 local and 21 national organizations (a majority of them are members of the National Council for Community Services to International Visitors), assist by receiving participants, arranging housing and transportation, and offering other community services.

ENCOURAGING NONGOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE

AID is not only increasing the use of private resources within the AID program, but acting wherever possible to expand nongovernmental assistance efforts and the growing programs of State and county groups. One promising new development which AID strongly encouraged is the privately organized and managed International Executive Service Corps.

International Executive Service Corps

The International Executive Service Corps (IESC) is a nonprofit, private American corporation, recently formed by a group of leading businessmen. It is designed to provide local private enterprise in the developing nations with American managerial knowledge and talent not available through existing channels. Although AID strongly encouraged the establishment of the corps, carried out much of the initial planning, and is providing interim partial financial support, the direction and control of the IESC comes wholly from private business.

* * * * *

State and country resources

Since late fiscal year 1964, through its Partners of the Alliance program, AID has been acting as the catalyst in establishing and sustaining wider private involvement in the Alliance for Progress. Teams from U.S. communities travel to Latin American areas to develop with local counterpart groups a program of mutual interest based on identified needs and available resources. Twenty-five active partnerships have developed and eight more will be activated as quickly as country program support arrangements can be completed. Several foundations and other organizations are collaborating in generating project assistance support.

* * * * *

Role of the voluntary agencies

Through private voluntary agencies, the American people have maintained a long tradition of help to the needy overseas. Registered American voluntary agencies now maintain 600 American citizen representatives overseas at their own expense, employ about 5,000 local personnel and work closely with voluntary counterparts in the host countries. Their work demonstrates the effectiveness of voluntary service and strengthens the growth of voluntary effort in the recipient countries.

Since World War II, Federal assistance in several forms has been available to agencies registered with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. Registered agencies are eligible to receive surplus agricultural commodities for use in their oversea programs. These surpluses are donated and the cost of shipping them overseas is paid for through the Government's food-for-peace program. In addition, the AID budget includes an annual amount earmarked to pay for the ocean transport of the registered agencies own privately donated supplies; for each $20 in supplies privately donated for the oversea work of such agencies as CARE, Church World Service, Catholic Relief Service, and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, AID provides about $1 to pay for shipment overseas.

AID provides the staff for the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, and AID's field controllers help the staffs of American relief agencies monitor the distribution of surplus foods and fibers overseas. In fiscal year 1964, 17 agencies were provided $330 million in surplus food and fiber (including the cost of oversea shipment) for their oversea programs, in addition to AID payments of

$5 million for shipment of $117 million of the agencies' own privately donated relief supplies.

An expanding role: The American voluntary agencies have long recognized, however, that relief work—however necessary—is not enough, and have sought to extend their programs into self-help, community development, and training activities that get at the roots of hunger, poverty, and disease.

Most Federal support has been available for this change in emphasis. A $75,000 AID contract with the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service helps to run a technical assistance clearinghouse for voluntary agency projects. Through AID, limited amounts of excess property—jeeps, machine tools for vocational training and the like—have recently been made available for voluntary agency programs overseas.

* * * * *

Disaster relief: American voluntary agencies also play an important role in the Nation's oversea disaster relief activities. During 1964, there were 63 instances in which the people of the United States extended their sympathy and help to disaster victims in other lands. In 44 of these cases the registered American voluntary agencies participated in U.S. assistance. They provided prompt and effective distribution of relief foods, medicines, medical supplies, temporary shelters, blankets, water purification, and personnel. Although the cost and value of materials and services provided by voluntary agencies to disaster victims cannot be accurately determined, it was in excess of $336,000. The American National Red Cross responded either directly or through the League of Red Cross Societies in 14 instances. Some $110,000 in supplies made available by the ANRC were shipped to the disaster victims through the coordinated efforts of AID and the Department of Defense.

Address of Hon. Whitney Gillilland, Member, Civil Aeronautics Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Air Freight Forwarders Association is the national trade organization of the airfreight forwarding industry. The association's membership is responsible for about 90 percent of the airfreight handled by the entire industry. During the 15 years of its existence, the association has contributed greatly to the development of high standards of business conduct in the airfreight forwarding industry.

On April 9, I was privileged to attend the association's eighth annual dinner and convention at the Americana Hotel in New York City.

Mr. Alvin B. Beck, who has led the association as its president during the past year, presided at this conference. The group was addressed by the Honorable Whitney Gillilland, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. His remarks indicate both the esteem in which this industry is held by the regulatory agencies, and the contribution which it makes to our national transportation system.

Mr. Gillilland's address follows:

REMARKS BY HON. WHITNEY GILLILLAND, MEMBER, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, BEFORE THE AIR FREIGHT FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION, APRIL 9, 1965

It is with a great deal of satisfaction that I appear before you tonight. As you may recall, I was with you in 1960 and I have been looking forward to another pleasurable evening since that time. I would now like to extend to you, and your distinguished guests, the greetings and good wishes of my fellow Board members.

This, I believe, is a most advantageous time for me to be with you since my research indicates that there have not been any green orders recently issued by the Board which have been particularly distressing to your industry. I, therefore, feel I am free to bask in an atmosphere of good will, at least temporarily.

As you know, it is characteristic of the U.S. regulatory system and also our judicial system that decisive action by an agency or a court seldom, if ever, pleases everyone. For example, when the Civil Aeronautics Board acts, in most situations, the decision will be hailed by one party as outstanding in that it encourages and develops air transportation, recognizes and preserves the inherent advantages of air transportation, fosters sound economic conditions, improves relations between and coordinates transportation by air carriers, and others such as airfreight forwarders, and is eminently in the public interest—and by the adversary party condemned as an action of unparalleled stupidity that unjustly discriminates, unduly prefers, results in unfair and destructive competitive practices, and effectively destroys the sound national air transportation policy. Nevertheless, and despite the well-justified and intelligent praise based upon a recognition of the Board's wisdom on the one hand and the unjust criticism, on the other, I hasten to assure you that the Board's decisions are honest views of its interpretation of the statutory guidelines as applied to each case and the Board's understanding of the public interest.

Reasonable men, of course, may differ in particular cases on policy matters and legal interpretations.

The Board, I am sure, is well aware of the contributions that your industry has made not only to the shipping public but also in the generation and development of aircargo. I sincerely hope that you can continue to make, and even increase, this contribution so that it will not only be advantageous to you, but also to the direct carriers, and to the shippers. After all, there is a common goal that we all share and strive for and that is the development of the most effective national transportation system.

In 1948, as a result of the first airfreight forwarder investigation, 58 airfreight forwarders were issued letters of registration which temporarily exempted them from the provisions of the act in order to authorize operations as indirect air carriers. In that case the Board, based upon a voluminous record, decided to give your industry a green light to start operations as indirect air carriers. At that time the Board had no statistical data available relating to actual airfreight forwarder operations but believe an experiment, limited by time, was justified so that essential operating experience could be accumulated. The Board reasoned that it would then be in a position to develop a sound and permanent policy with respect to airfreight forwarders. During the experimental period the Board maintained a close and constant watch over the progress of the industry, not only to prevent practices that might prove detrimental to the development of a sound transportation system, but also to insure the development of a complete and reliable record of experience upon which your contribution to air transportation might be properly appraised.

Then in 1955 the Board, with 7 years of operating experience to rely upon, reexamined in depth the role of airfreight forwarders in the domestic air transportation system. As you well know, it was concluded that the airfreight forwarder authorizations should be renewed for an indefinite period. Although some parties made strong arguments against renewal for an indefinite period, significantly no party opposed renewal per se. The Board was not impressed by the allegations made against an indefinite renewal, and concluded that there had been a substantial and increasing acceptance of the forwarder services by the shipping public; the forwarders had handled many shipments at rates lower than charged by the direct air carriers; the forwarders had provided efficient ground handling services, extensive personal solicitation, and advertising for airfreight; and these had benefited the shipping public and stimulated the development of air transportation. Further, the Board noted that the operations had not required Government subsidy and apparently had not had an adverse impact on the direct carriers.

We are all aware that airfreight is becoming increasingly important and as a result the related problems presented to the Board are becoming more numerous and complex. There has been a substantial growth in the transportation of airfreight in recent years. This growth has been accelerated by the advent of the jet age with its tremendously increased lift capacity for both passengers and freight. I do not think, however, that the rate of growth of airfreight has kept pace with the increase in the volume of available lift capacity.

We can expect, however, that with the rapidity of the technological advances in aircraft design and economics that there is bound to be a lag. The job of both, the indirect and direct carriers, is to narrow this gap as expeditiously as possible. In 1949, the first full year of airfreight forwarder operations, the combination and all-cargo carriers generated 105 million ton-miles of airfreight, whereas, for the 12 months ended January 1965, there were 809 million ton-miles, or a 674-percent increase. In 1949 the amount of freight revenue was $20,881,000 and for the 12-month period ended September 1964 (the latest figure available) it was $143,675,000, or an increase of 588 percent. I realize, of course, that the airfreight forwarder industry does not, and cannot, take credit for all of this, but nevertheless you have been an important part of it and you have contributed significantly to it.

In 1955 the record in the renewal case indicated that the airfreight forwarder industry handled approximately 8 percent of the total domestic airfreight tonnage carried by the direct air carriers. Based on the latest figures available the airfreight forwarder industry is now handling over 25 percent. This is a substantial increase and you should be very proud of it.

I certainly would not profess to tell you gentlemen, airfreight forwarders and direct air carriers, nor would the Board, how to go about your business of selling and developing airfreight. You both have made exceptional progress and I congratulate you upon the results. You have had many years of experience in selling airfreight and you are far closer to the needs and problems of the shipping public. However, it seems to me that the average shipper is primarily interested in service. I think—to the shipper—service may be even more important than lower rates, and by service I mean that the shipment of his products be guaranteed to any point in the United States, indeed, anywhere in the world, within the time limits, and with the specialized handling he requires, and at the lowest possible total cost.

Now this can be accomplished by fast, reliable, and convenient pickup and delivery services, and a close working relationship with the direct carrier. In essence this is

coordination, and I firmly believe the ability to offer a coordinated service is the freight forwarder's bestselling tool.

We hear quite a good deal today about the need for intermodal coordination of transportation. This was spearheaded by the President's transportation message to Congress of April 5, 1962, wherein the President requested the Chairmen of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Federal Maritime Commission to meet at frequent intervals to discuss regulatory problems affecting the various modes of transportation, and to seek coordinated solutions in the form of legislative or administrative action that will improve the regulatory process. Pursuant to this request, interagency committees were formed to study terminal area and freight forwarder matters. As a direct result of these studies the Board, on April 28, 1964, adopted a new part 222 of economic regulations relating to the determination of zones for aircargo pickup and delivery services. The Board, in the preamble of part 222, stated that on the basis of an extensive and detailed study it had reached the following conclusions with respect to pickup and delivery service in terminal areas:

1. Full development of aircargo transportation depends in large measure upon efficient surface transportation.

2. Effective customer-oriented pickup and delivery service is best accomplished when it is under the control of either the direct air carrier or the airfreight forwarder.

3. The contol can be maintained by the operation of trucks directly by the air carrier and the airfreight forwarder, or under contract with local cartage agents.

4. There should be a reasonable amount of freedom for the direct air carriers and airfreight forwarders to establish pickup and delivery services and to test their adequacy and economy.

At the same time the Interstate Commerce Commission was investigating this matter and both proceedings were coordinated through the joint efforts of the Commission and the Board. The ICC decision reaffirmed its prior findings that the incidental-to-air exemption was not subject to definition by a rigid mileage formula and that motor carrier traffic, to come within the exemption, must move on air billing and, except in an emergency, within terminal areas established by air carriers in tariffs filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board.

In the same case the Interstate Commerce Commission also established standards which airfreight forwarders must meet if they are to participate in combined air-surface transportation extending to points beyond the scope of the incidental-to-aircraft exemption. The criteria were designed to enable airfreight forwarders to receive shipments from and tender them to motor carriers without having to obtain authority from the Commission to operate as surface freight forwarders. The Commission thus reversed a longstanding position which you had represented to them as a deterrent to effective service to the shipper.

The reason that these new standards were established, was that the Interstate Commerce Commission recognized that an increasingly large volume of airfreight was being handled by airfreight forwarders, and a substantial portion was moving to or from points beyond the published terminal areas of air carriers. In these situations the shipper is normally charged the airfreight forwarder's rate for service between the terminal cities, and the motor carrier's rate for service between the terminal city and the ultimate origin or destination point. Significantly, and while imposing certain limitations in connection with transfers to surface carriers, the Commission stated:

"In reaching the conclusion that these limitations on the airfreight forwarder's participation in surface transportation are necessary we should point out that we are fully cognizant of the advantages which might accrue to the shipping public from a forwarding service able to assume complete responsibility from actual origin to ultimate destination."

I am aware of your position that the general 25-mile limitation is too restrictive. The point I make, nevertheless, is that both the Board and the ICC recognized your need for greatly increased flexibility of operations, and that the ad hoc rule to permit the expansion of the terminal area in individual cases was adopted with this in mind. I trust that, properly administered in the light of the criteria set forth in part 222, this procedure can give you flexibility which should contribute substantially to your growth and that of aircargo.

I have previously referred to coordinated service as the prime requirement of the shipper. It seems to me that it is in offering this coordinated service that the airfreight forwarding industry can make its greatest contribution—a contribution which results from the nature of the operating authority granted, as well as from the obligations imposed upon you by the Board. You possess an operating authority not limited to any route pattern and you have freedom and flexibility from any fixed requirement to use any particular direct air carrier. You can serve any point in the United States, or in the world if you hold international authority. The effect of this unrestricted authority is to permit you to serve all the aid traffic needs of a particular business no matter how widely distributed its consignment or procurement points. You can do this under your own single-air waybill and under your own single-carrier responsibility. In many cases you have become the traffic department of a shipper relieving his personnel of the responsibility of route and carrier selection, pickup and delivery arrangements, tracing, documentation, and so on.

Because you have authority to select any direct air carrier and any schedule means that you are governed solely in the selection of a carrier and a schedule by your shipper's need. Therefore, it is your responsibility and duty to seek the fastest and lowest cost air movement to meet your customer's time requirements. This should be an advantage to the shipper in the ordinary situation and even more so in those cases where there is a substantial airport buildup of freight, and equipment failure of the direct air carrier, or a change in airline scheduling.

Because, then, of these inherent assets in your authority it would appear that you can be an increasingly effective force in coordinating the transportation requirements of the shipper and in promoting the growth of aircargo.

A Summary of the Proposed Foreign Aid Program for 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, in line with President Johnson's expressed determination to "impose the smallest assistance burden on the American people since the beginning of the Marshall plan in 1948," the foreign aid request for fiscal year 1966 is highly selective and represents the results of careful review and analysis.

In the interest of creating a wider general understanding of the President's request, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the following summary presentation to Congress on the fiscal year 1966 program:

AID IN PERSPECTIVE: SUMMARY OF PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROGRAM

Requirements for the fiscal year 1966 "Mutual defense and development program" have been carefully reviewed, including a thorough study of the situation and prospects for each country receiving U.S. assistance. On the basis of the best estimates that can be made at this time, minimum fund requirements will be $3,579 million. Of this amount, $199 million can be met from estimated loan repayments, carryover, recoveries, and reimbursements.

New appropriations of $3,380 million will be required for the balance. However, new authorizations will be needed for only $2,016 million of this amount, since authorizations enacted by the Congress in 1961 for "Development loans" ($1.5 billion) and for the "Alliance for Progress" ($600 million) for fiscal year 1966 are sufficient, as is the continuing authorization for State Department administrative expense.

By appropriation account, the President's request for new authorizations and appropriations for fiscal year 1966 is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Authorizations	Appropriations
Development loans		780
Technical cooperation	210	210
Alliance for Progress (development loans, and technical cooperation)		580
Supporting assistance	369	369
Contributions to international organizations	155	155
Contingency fund	50	50
American schools and hospitals abroad	7	7
AID administrative expenses	55	55
State administrative expenses		3
Total, economic	846	2,210
Military assistance	1,170	1,170
Total, military and economic	2,016	3,380

The President is also requesting a special standby authorization for "Military or supporting assistance" to be used only in Vietnam and only in case funds are needed to protect vital U.S. interests.

In view of the rapid growth in the investment guarantee program and the sharp increase in applications, the President is also asking the Congress to provide authority for AID to issue additional investment guarantees in the following amounts (no additional appropriations are necessary):

For specific risk guarantees, to increase the present issuing authority of $2.5 billion by an additional $2.5 billion.

For Latin American housing guarantees, to increase the present issuing authority of $250 million by an additional $100 million for the next 2 years.

PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966

The total program for fiscal year 1966 is slightly larger than the fiscal year 1965 program, reflecting primarily a rise in requirements for the Alliance for Progress. A summary by funding category of actual obligations in fiscal year 1964, current estimates for fiscal year 1965, and proposed fiscal year 1966 programs, follows:

Mutual defense and development program

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1964 commitments	Fiscal year 1965,[1] estimated	Fiscal year 1966 proposed
Development assistance	1,616	1,573	1,667
Development loans	836	814	840
Alliance for Progress loans	479	435	508
Technical cooperation	208	236	231
Alliance for Progress technical cooperation	93	88	88
Military and supporting assistance	1,703	1,700	1,688
Military assistance	1,236	[2] 1,223	1,258
Supporting assistance	360	421	380
Contingency fund	107	[2] 56	50
Other assistance and administrative expenses	193	212	223
Investment surveys	1	1	1
American schools and hospitals abroad	20	18	7
Contributions to international organizations	116	134	155
Administrative expenses	56	59	60
Total	3,512	3,485	3,579

[1] $300,000,000 of funds appropriated by the Congress for fiscal year 1965 are reserved in accordance with title I of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1965 (Public Law 88-634). Funds may be released from the reserve on a determination by the President that the release is in the national interest. It is now estimated that these funds will be required.

[2] Military assistance estimated fiscal year 1965 program includes an anticipated transfer of $50,000,000 from the contingency fund.

REGIONAL EMPHASES IN FISCAL YEAR 1966

Development assistance is the prime focus of U.S. aid efforts in the Latin America, Near East and south Asia, and Africa regions. In each of these regions, development assistance will account for at least 88 percent of proposed fiscal year 1966 AID programs. In Latin America and the Near East and south Asia, development assistance is concentrated in development lending. In the Africa region, development assistance is about evenly divided between development loans and technical cooperation funds.

The following table summarizes development assistance programs proposed for fiscal year 1966 in each region.

In the Far East region, emphasis continues on military and supporting assistance, to help threatened countries defend themselves against Communist aggression and subversion. Even in the Far East, however, efforts are continuing to shift from security support to development where possible:

Development assistance by region

[In millions of dollars]

	Latin America	Near East-south Asia	Africa	Far East
Total AID regional program	610	771	218	390
Development assistance	596	736	192	84
Development loans	(508)	(690)	(100)	(50)
Technical cooperation	(88)	(46)	(92)	(34)
Development assistance as percent of AID regional program	97	96	88	22

Informed Public Necessary for Better Legislation on Banking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Foster Dowell, professor of economics and public management, and chairman of the Economics Department of Oklahoma City University, has written the following article on the need for an informed public for better legislation on banking. I am pleased to have the opportunity to bring Dr. Dowell's thought-provoking remarks to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

INFORMED PUBLIC NECESSARY FOR BETTER LEGISLATION ON BANKING

(By E. Foster Dowell, Ph. D.)

A realistic approach to the relations between Government and the banking business requires a new approach to the problems of Government and business in general. Denunciation of governmental activity in business has been singularly unsuccessful in preventing the increasing penetration of our economic life by the various governmental agencies. A more practical procedures would be to accept the present situation as a starting point and to develop standards to determine (a) those areas in which business or Government does, or can, operate more efficiently and (b) on this basis, what are the desirable relations between Government and business in the various areas of our economy.

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC ROLES

This viewpoint would stress the management and economic effects of the national debt rather than its size. It would raise questions such as "Are the quality of management and the relevant conception of competition more important to our banking structure than the questions of concentration, branch banking and conditions of entry?" It would provide standards by which we could make more intelligent decisions on issues such as public versus private power and public versus private institutions of higher education; and it would give us yardsticks with which to assess such activities as State-owned docks, terminals, liquor stores and systems of workmen's compensation and municipal ownership of water, electric and bus systems, convention halls, and airports.

Any practical program of the relation of Government to the banking business must consider carefully the dual roles of banks today (a) as private business enterprises and (b) as public institutions. This viewpoint separates the problems of banking common to any business from those problems arising from its special and distinctive relationship to Government and the economy. It applies to banking the distinction, well known to economists, between microeconomics, which deals with individuals, firms and industries, and macroeconomics, which concerns itself with the problems of the economy as a whole.

Some of the activities of the bank as a business include such matters as entry into the field, competition, profit and loss, charges for product and service, branch banking, recruitment and training personnel, automation, legal problems, and community and governmental relations. On the other hand, those areas in which the banking system functions as a public institution and has a distinctive relationship to Government and the economy are exemplified by: (1) the creation and supply of money and credit, (2) economic growth and the development of both particular private businesses and the entire community or region, (3) the planning and execution of the economic policies of Government, and (4) such specific areas as the business cycle, price levels, employment, the effect of interest rates on domestic economic growth and the balance of payments, the relation of monetary policy to fiscal policy, the management of the national debt and the marketing of Government securities, and the structure and operations of the Federal Reserve System.

This peculiar relation of the banks and the banking system to the Government and the economy has three very important results for bankers:

1. They cannot, in their own programs and thinking, separate monetary policy from fiscal policy.

2. The future of the banking system of the United States will rest to a great degree on its ability to develop an adequate modern system of governmental relations.

3. The success or failure of the individual bank and banker will depend to an increasing degree on the ability to develop at the grassroots a broad-visioned and forward-looking program of economic education and governmental relations.

WIDESPREAD MISCONCEPTIONS

Governmental policy and legislation in a democracy rest upon that ill-defined, and often vague, thing known as public opinion. Public opinion, governmental policy, and legislation relating to banks and the banking system are based on the ideas and images, correct or incorrect, in the minds of many persons concerning: (a) our economic system, (b) the relations of Government and business, and (c) banks and bankers. Unfortunately, the incorrect ideas, which are as influential as correct ideas but, in addition, do great harm, are very widespread concerning these things and many others.

Some of these misconceptions, selected at random, are as follows:

1. Our profit system and the nature of wealth and profits: Profits are immoral, and are usually the result of exploitation and dishonest methods. "No honest man could make that much money."

2. The relations of Government and business: Governments create wealth. Business and businessmen are not to be trusted. Government should own or heavily regulate most business. Science and the public service offer greater opportunity for a satisfying life than business.

3. Banks and bankers: A bank charter is a license to make money. It takes brains for a banker to fail in a field where success is so certain. A banker is a plutocrat with an easy job and short working hours who takes advantage of other people's lack of money.

It takes one idea to drive out another idea and a correct idea to drive out an incorrect idea. The major remedies for incorrect ideas about our economic system, Government and business, and banks and bankers are:

1. Communitywide broad based programs of education concerning our economic and political systems.

2. A widespread broad-visioned and widely circulated program of the role of the banking system in our Government and economy.

3. A clearly defined program of governmental relations by the banking industry.

4. The conduct, public activities, and public image of bankers.

A NEED FOR ENLIGHTENMENT

Banks and bankers have a terrific vested interest in economic education, and the

banking industry should have a well-defined economic education program of its own. This article confines itself to tentative suggestions concerning some of the elements of such a program, which include:

1. Support of the economic education movement at the National, State, and local levels by the banking profession through money, contributions of personal time and experience, and urging the support of others.

2. Banks working for adequate funds for education at all levels, and better salaries for qualified teachers.

3. Close cooperation among the American Bankers Association, Financial Public Relations Association, the American Economic Association, the American Finance Association, the National Education Association, and other educational groups, the universities and colleges and local school boards to develop a program of banker assistance to education through panels of bankers willing to lecture or appear in classrooms on invitation and through aid to education in other ways.

4. The conduct by banks of programs on economic education and citizenship training for their own employees, and their advocacy of such programs for all businesses in their community.

5. Greater participation by individual bankers in activities of government at all levels, Federal, State, and local. The gains are worth the risks and the assets will exceed the liabilities.

6. Increasing use of qualified bankers as writers and speakers in professional groups, the universities and public life.

7. Particular attention by the banking profession to agencies of economic planning at all levels with a view to their technical competence and proper community development.

8. Providing in the regular publications of the banking profession, such as the FPRA Journal and the American Banker, a column on economic education and what the banks are doing to advance it.

For one who is not a banker to suggest a governmental relations program for bankers and finance and public relations officials would be a fine example of the adage that "fools rush in where angels fear to tread." However, it is maintained with deep conviction that only by re-examining their programs in the light of criteria similar to those presented here can groups such as the FPRA and ABA produce a practical and workable program of governmental relations for their profession in the modern world. This is a task worthy of the highest ability in the banking business—and one that will yield rich dividends.

Your Constitution and Yours To Defend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of a speech made by one of my young constituents, Gary Boye, of Sidney, Nebr. Gary won the district contest of the Nebraska State American Legion oratorical contest when he presented this speech recently.

Today, when so much is heard about juvenile delinquency, it is good to know that there are many fine young men and women of whom we can be proud.

The speech follows:

YOUR CONSTITUTION AND YOURS TO DEFEND

(By Gary Boye)

"For government depends on men rather than men on government."

William Penn gave us this thought over 250 years ago and certainly we can say that our Government's foundation depended on men. Men who knew right from wrong. Men who knew the right materials with which to build this foundation; the right materials and how to use them. Our Government's foundation depended on men whose magnanimity consisted of 100 percent commonsense. Our Government's foundation depended on men in 1787, depends on men in 1965.

When the framers of our Constitution had completed their task 178 years ago, after the 55 delegates had finished 4 long, hard months of work, 4 months in the heat of a Pennsylvania summer, working, debating, compromising 5, 6, sometimes 7 hours a day—at this time with each stroke of the pen they said: "Here. Here is your Constitution. Here is your way of life. It is yours to know. It is yours to use, to respect, and, if necessary, this Constitution is yours to defend."

Your Constitution and yours to defend.

No, you can't say, "Not I. I'm not involved." But if for no other reason than being a citizen in these United States, you are involved, just as Woodrow Wilson was involved in World War I and certainly, he didn't shirk his responsibility. We can't look back through the pages of history and say Abraham Lincoln is to blame in the War Between the States; or John Kennedy backed down in October 1962, during the Cuban crisis. And you cannot let them down. Blood, tears, and sweat; work and pain have made our Constitution an actual operation and not a dead document. And if you do let them down, you are erasing this work of Washington and Jefferson and Madison; you are forgetting the men in Flanders' Field and Arlington and you—you are saying America and Americans are separable.

At the end of the original document of the U.S. Constitution lies subscribed 39 names, and 39 lives for the defense of its principles. Now I ask you to place your signature here at the foot of this document and to give your lives for the defense of these very same principles.

Your Constitution and yours to defend—to defend first of all with courage, courage which excels that of Edmond G. Ross.

Who was he? Practically no one, the Congressman that nobody wanted. Yet it is his one heroic deed that has all but been forgotten that saved the basic principle of the Presidency, for it was Edmond G. Ross' single vote that acquitted Andrew Johnson from impeachment charges. This man surrendered friendships, position, fortune—everything that made life desirable, in order to follow the dictates of his conscience, resulting in crossing his party line. Give your Constitution such a courageous support for it is yours to defend.

The Constitution is yours to defend, second, with pride. Such a pride should not stem from a sense of nationalism alone. Nor should it come from a halfhearted feeling of obligation. It must be a proudness that originates from an impulse of deep love and sincerity for our Constitution, our way of life, our America the beautiful. A thrill must rise in every heart when Old Glory flies in these spacious skies. A pride must be sensed when voices swell to the chords of our national anthem. A proudness must be felt when you and I as American patriots pledge allegiance to our flag.

The Constitution is yours to defend, then, finally with determination, with confidence.

It must be a confidence that does not question the basic principles of our Government, that man can rule himself, or, in Lincoln's words, that "a nation of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish." In your mind and in your heart you will find the answer, the answer that must be told to your neighbor, to your enemy, to your children. Determined and confident must be your reply. There is no room for doubt that America is right according to the intentions of God.

This then is the responsibility of Americans for America.

Our Constitution has survived 178 years, years that have experienced civil war and world war; depression and inflation; corruption and misgiving. It has acted like a strong steady current guiding generations to right, to truth, and to greatness. And during these times it has depended on men, men who then did their best work and now naturally expect you to do your best. Our Constitution, foundation of freedom, needs your defense with courage, with pride, and with great determination.

And if the time ever comes that you or I are asked to do otherwise, with the famed theologian, Martin Luther, at the dawn of the Reformation, we may state and declare to friend and foe alike: "Here I stand. I cannot do otherwise, so help me God."

For government does depend on men rather then men on government.

Mr. Bookbinder's Speech to Washington Seminar for Lutheran Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, Aristotle once observed that men "remain together in order to enjoy the good life." For many people living in the United States, the richest country in the world, the good life is just a dream. For them, reality often approaches the nature of a nightmare.

Americans have moved mountains when the need presented itself. The need has now presented itself—poverty and its results are too real to be ignored. Our Federal Government, our State governments, and our local communities are now teaming up to eliminate the nightmare and make the dream real. The task is tremendous, but the results are also stupendous and soul stirring.

What is the extent of the problem? A few figures starkly stab us with the harsh reality of poverty. There are 40 million individuals in this country living in families with incomes of about $35 a week. Over one-fifth of our population is poor; desperately poor. They are cut off from the benefits that technological progress has brought most American citizens. One could say that they are living 18th century lives in the 20th century. In too many cases, they are even deprived of the most basic necessities of existence.

Poverty generates poverty. A poor father cannot provide the education and cultural benefits which are needed to provide his son or daughter with a good job. Chances are that a poor father's children will also be poor. This is to say

nothing of the psychological scars that his children will carry with them through life because of their deprived childhood. This is to say nothing of the crime that this poverty generates among our poor. We observe a vicious cyclic reaction setup. The poor generate more poor because they cannot provide their children with the tools to puncture the barrier of poverty. To puncture this barrier will require tremendous efforts on the part of the Federal Government, State governments, and the local communities.

Mr. Hyman Bookbinder, Assistant Director in the Office of Economic Opportunity, is noted as one of the most dedicated public officials in the very important fight against poverty. He has not only worked efficiently within the administration to get the program implemented, but he has also devoted much of his time in arousing the enthusiasm of groups which can help in this struggle.

On April 13, 1965, Mr. Bookbinder addressed the Washington seminar for Lutheran students at the National Press Club. The seminar is an annual convocation of Lutheran students from across the country who are interested in Government and public affairs. They are an outstanding example of the dedicated young people that John F. Kennedy addressed himself to when he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." Within this group were many who would give their very best to their country. There were many who would be tomorrow's Lutheran teachers, ministers, and social workers.

Mr. Bookbinder's message fell on receptive ears. He brilliantly pointed out the need for breaking the cycle of poverty and what can be done and is being done to break this cycle. As he pointed out, the battle against poverty requires the talents of huge numbers of our citizens—the kinds of talents these young Lutherans might possess.

Not only did his speech inform, but it also aroused the enthusiasm of the young people gathered at the National Press Club. When it was over, many were eager to volunteer their services to the good cause.

Mr. Bookbinder spoke off the cuff for almost 30 minutes on a topic obviously close to his heart. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it would be a great service to both my fellow colleagues and to all who might read the RECORD to have Mr. Bookbinders' message printed in the RECORD. The speech that I am submitting is practically identical to the one delivered off the cuff to the Lutheran students:

EDUCATION: MAIN FRONT IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Just days before an assassin's bullet changed American history, John F. Kennedy had directed a major Government effort to eradicate the causes of poverty in a generally affluent America. When a report on this effort was presented to his successor, Lyndon Johnson, the now famous war on poverty was declared—and has since become a major national commitment.

It is significant that the most important contributing factor to President Kennedy's concern about poverty was a report he had seen on Selective Service rejectees. When he asked why almost half of all young men examined for military service were not qualifying, he found that a principal cause was failure to pass simple mental tests, that hundreds of thousands of young people each year either drop out of school at an early age or attend such poor schools that they reach early manhood (and womanhood) practically illiterate—certainly functionally illiterate.

Further inquiry pointed to the link between poor educational attainment and poor economic and social and cultural attainment. Poverty, in a word, was generally both the cause and the result of educational deficiency. Not all poor people are poorly educated, of course, and not all poorly educated people are poor. The correlation, however, is so high that there can be no disagreement on the significance of the relationship.

Small wonder, then, that the war on poverty is laying so much stress on education. But the special problems of our poor requires special educational techniques. To develop these special programs requires understanding of the nature of poverty.

Who is poor in America? The 47 million American families today average more than $7,000 in annual income. Of these, however, almost 10 million have incomes below $3,000. In fact, the median income for these families (in which there are almost 40 million individuals, of whom about 15 million are under 18 years of age) is $1,800 a year—about $35 a week. Yes, $35 a week with which to feed, to house, to clothe, to educate, to provide health care for an average family of four.

The U.S. Government says that certainly these families—one-fifth of the Nation—by any reasonable, human standard must be considered poor in 1964. The figure of $3,000 is admittedly arbitrary but hardly overgenerous. At this level of income, the average family of four can budget about 70 cents a day for food for each member of the family—less than $3 for the family for all 12 meals required each day. But, please note, there are 40 million persons living below this standard.

Knowing that one-fifth of the American families are poor, by this standard, is important—but it is even more important to know the figures by major groups. Only then can we begin to understand the special problems of poverty, and therefore the special programs that are necessary. While 20 percent of all families are poor, poverty afflicts more than 50 percent of all Negro families; more than 50 percent of all families headed by a woman; more than 50 percent of all rural families; and more than 50 percent of all aged families.

The most important statistic of all is this: More than three of every five heads of poor families never went beyond grade school, and the children of these families provide the bulk of today's dropouts.

Herein lies the most important single characteristic of poverty—the cycle from generation to generation. Relatively few people become poor in the course of their lifetime; the great majority are born poor, and never find an exit from it. Some do manage to exit, of course, but the odds are just mercilessly stacked against the kid born into a "culture of poverty"—the current euphemism for homes without books and without talk, for disease-ridden slums, for deteriorating schools with the worst teachers, for angry and hopeless family life, for joblessness and despair.

The war on poverty has already scored its first gains. I refer to greater appreciation of the special needs of our poor in the field of education. For example, despite heroic and impressive work in preschool developments by experts like Martin Deutsch, it has taken the war on poverty to popularize the simple, but very basic, concept that a 5 year old entering school from a culturally deprived home can already be 2 or 3 years behind in schooling—and that the chances of ever catching up are close to zero, without special programs designed to make up for the deficiency.

This greater appreciation of the special role of education in the campaign to eliminate causes of poverty is quite evident in the $800 million Economic Opporunity Act. Throughout the various sections of this act the education component looms large and takes many forms. Its major educational programs are briefly discussed below.

YOUTH PROGRAM

While the educational needs of all age groups are recognized, the act gives special priority to the 16- to 21-age group. These are the young men and women who, without special help, are almost certain to be heads of new poor families in the next few years. For many, it may already be too late—but for many it is not.

The most significant—and probably most difficult—educational goal for these poor youth is the Job Corps. This is the program of full-time, residential centers where the enrollees will live together, learn together, work together. For these young people, after a careful screening and selection process, the Job Corps is planned to provide an alternative to the depressing and debilitating home environment from which they come. There will be two types of centers. The rural, or conservation, center will provide work experience on Federal lands plus basic academic skills. The urban, or training, center will provide some more advanced education and work training. The universities and research organizations of the country have been challenged to come up with new and imaginative ideas about the training of these young men and women.

Another youth program, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, will provide part-time or full-time jobs for about 200,000 youths who will continue to live at home. For some, it will means the ability to stay in school and become better equipped for regular jobs upon graduation. For those who have already dropped out, it will mean job experience and and accompanying training program, so that these too will be better equipped for regular jobs after these temporary jobs let out.

The third of the youth programs, the work-study system, will provide part-time jobs for 140,000 youths who manage to get through high school and wish to attend college. Added to the loan and scholarship programs already available, the new work program should result in more boys and girls from poor families getting a college education—and thus, for most of them, breaking the poverty and education cycle of these families.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

The Economic Opportunity Act does not provide general aid to education. But it does provide funds for the development of special remedial and other noncurricular educational assistance for the benefit of low-income individuals and families. The vehicle for this is community action. The Federal Government will provide 90 percent of the costs of special programs designed to meet the special needs of poor schoolchildren. Preschool programs, day centers, remedial reading classes, special tutoral services, counseling and psychological services—these and related programs are now possible. Alert communities are now developing imaginative programs designed to make up for past failures and to provide substitutes for unsatisfactory home orientation and motivation.

The effectiveness of community action programs lies in the fact that educational requirements of children from poverty areas cannot be separated from their health needs, their housing needs, their psychological needs.

Thus, while educational projects constitute the core of the dozen of community projects already funded, they are linked to work in the related fields. A hungry child is never a good student, even with the best teacher.

A sick child just cannot be expected to do as well as a healthy one.

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

It may be difficult to believe, but there are today in the United States more than 11 million persons, 18 years of age or older, who have never finished 6 years of schooling. In a labor market that constantly demands more and better education, these illiterate and semiliterate persons find it increasingly difficult to find or keep employment. They must become functionally literate if they are to manage. A special $25 million adult education program is authorized in the Economic Opportunity Act. Unlike the traditional adult literacy programs, designed for the recent immigrant, this new program will seek to make its enrollees better prepared for participation in the economy of the sixties.

There are other education programs too: special help for the children of migratory workers; special training for the smallest of small businessmen, so they can become self-sustaining; special counseling and training for the hard-core unemployed; the mothers and fathers of children receiving aid to dependent children.

This, then, is the essence of the first installment in the war against poverty.

It is important to observe that this is not just another welfare program. Welfare programs are necessary and appropriate. But the war on poverty is not designed to ameliorate poverty; it is designed to eliminate it. That is why there is such great stress on education; that is why we are determined to break the cycle of poverty. And the key to this is breaking the cycle of poor education.

The war on poverty, especially its emphasis on education, has special significance for our Negro citizens. They are still suffering the consequences of 100 years of inferior, segregated schooling—to say nothing of the years of slavery before then. Even when good schooling is available for the young child, the ignorance and hopelessness of his parents constitute terrible burdens. The antipoverty program seeks the maximum involvement of the poor themselves. This won't be easy, but the greater the involvement, the greater will be the chance for escape from poverty.

The war on poverty is a challenge to all America. It challenges the poor and uneducated to help themselves. It challenges the affluent and the educated to open up new opportunities for the less privileged.

The great Hebrew elder Hillel said it all more than 2,000 years ago:

"If I am not for myself, who will be for me?
But if I am only for myself, what am I?
And if not now, when?"

Foreign Assistance Commitments of Other Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, frequently the question is asked, "Why must the United States bear the whole burden of foreign assistance?" The answer is that the United States is not alone in its concern for the underdeveloped world. Through our examples, many of the industrialized countries maintain important foreign assistance programs which have helped to reduce our aid commitments.

The United States has strongly supported the principle of coordination of our assistance efforts with those of the free world for effectiveness and efficiency of the aid dollar. A great deal has been done in this regard by AID officials, particularly in recent years.

The Communist world supports a significantly large foreign assistance program, although its goals are at variance with our own. To intensify their efforts to influence the developing world, Communist aid commitments have sharply increased in the last few years.

I shall like to call attention to the following excerpt from the summary presentation to Congress on the proposed foreign aid program for fiscal year 1966, outlining the increased aid expenditures of other countries—both free world and Communist—and the U.S. efforts toward better bilateral and multilateral coordination:

OTHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

During 1963 bilateral commitments by other developed free world nations and international agencies for economic development increased, while U.S. commitments declined to less than half of the free world total. Communist commitments rose sharply over the previous 2 years to a new high.

FREE WORLD AID

The U.S. bilateral share of the aid burden declined from 56 percent in 1962 to 49 percent in 1963 (see table) and total U.S. bilateral commitments (including AID assistance, Export-Import Bank and Public Law 480) dropped from $4.7 to $4.0 billion.

When multilateral aid is added to bilateral aid, the U.S. share of total aid by developed free world nations rises above 50 percent. However, even this figure (59.9 percent) compares favorably with the U.S. share of the total free world gross national product.

The United States is persisting in its efforts: (1) to put more aid on a multilateral basis; (2) to improve coordination of bilateral aid; (3) to increase the share of the burden borne by other free world nations; and (4) to improve the terms on which aid is extended.

Aid received by developing countries—Commitments of grants and loans of over 5 years' maturity

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	1960		1961		1962		1963	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
United States	$3.9	60.0	$4.4	54.3	$4.7	55.8	$4.0	49.4
AID and predecessors	(2.2)		(1.78)		(2.20)		(2.12)	
Public Law 480	(1.1)		(1.49)		(1.76)		(1.43)	
Social Progress Trust Fund	(—)		(.12)		(.21)		(.05)	
Export-Import Bank	(.6)		(1.01)		(.38)		(.28)	
Peace Corps, and others	(—)		(.02)		(.12)		(.09)	
Other DAC	1.8	27.7	2.4	29.6	2.5	29.7	2.7	33.3
International agencies	.8	12.3	1.3	16.0	1.2	14.5	1.4	17.3
Total	6.5	100.0	8.1	100.0	8.4	100.0	8.1	100.0

More multilateral assistance

Since 1960, multilateral assistance has increased at a more rapid rate than bilateral assistance and has represented an expanding share of free world aid to developing countries. This trend is expected to continue. Total multilateral assistance commitments increased from $1.2 billion in 1962 to $1.4 billion in 1963. Commitments to developing countries from the World Bank and other international agencies[1] have risen from a total of $1 billion in 1962 to $1.2 billion in 1963. Gross disbursements rose from $544 to $721 million in the same period. Commitments through the U.N. technical assistance programs, comprising the Special Fund, EPTA, UNICEF, and other specialized agencies, have been well over $200 million annually.

The financial resources of these institutions are derived from subscriptions, contributions, earnings, and borrowings in private capital markets. The U.S. share of these resources ranges from 30 percent of World Bank subscriptions to 43 percent of the subscribed ordinary capital of the IDB. (The United States also contributes 68 percent of the subscribed resources of the IDB's Fund for Special Operations.) Other advanced nations' contributions range from 44 percent of World Bank subscriptions to 100 percent of the resources of the European Economic Community development institutions. The United States does not participate in the funding of the European Economic Community assistance programs nor do the other advanced nations subscribe to the IDB. However, Canada has agreed to provide $10 million on soft terms, to be administered by the IDB, for financing projects in Latin America, and several other European countries have also announced their intention to make financial contributions.

Recently, new measures have been instituted by the World Bank group to increase its flexibility such as lengthening loan maturities, grace periods in appropriate cases, and intensified support for agriculture, education, and industry. Replenishment of IDA resources by more than $750 million has been agreed to and will permit an increased level of lending. A recommendation to increase the resources of the IFC is currently under consideration. The authorized ordinary capital resources of the IDB were increased, and an expansion of the resources of the IDB's Fund for Special Operations is being approved by the member governments. As a result, the commitments of these multilateral financial institutions are expected to rise during the next several years and to constitute an increasing proportion of total free world aid.

Improved aid coordination

Consortia for aid to India and Pakistan meet under the sponsorship of the World Bank and include most of the Western European members of the DAC, plus Canada, Japan, and the United States. The India consortium has pledged $4,445 million of assistance for the first 4 years of India's third 5-year plan. The Pakistan consortium has made pledges totaling $1,819 million for the last 4 years of Pakistan's second 5-year plan. Improvements in the terms and conditions of pledges by other bilateral members have

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

recently been offered in these consortia. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) sponsors consortia to assist the development of Greece and Turkey. Members have pledged about $475 million for the first 2 years of Turkey's 5-year plan and $93 million in 1963, for Greece.

The World Bank sponsors less formal coordinating mechanisms—consultative groups—which examine the development plans and financial problems of Colombia, Nigeria, Sudan, and Tunisia. It also administers the Indus Basin Development Fund. The DAC promotes country coordination and has held meetings on Thailand, the Congo (Léopoldville), east Africa, and Somalia, and regional meetings on countries in Latin America, the Middle East, and west Africa.

Increased efforts of others

Bilateral aid commitments of the other DAC members increased by 50 percent from 1960 to 1963, rising from $1.8 to $2.7 billion. Their multilateral contributions, like ours, have fluctuated because of the various refinancing schedules of the international agencies. But their increasing support of multilateral programs is evidenced in their 52 percent sharing in the replenishment of IDA. There has also been a 26-percent increase (to $730 million) agreed to by the Common Market countries for the European Economic Community Development Fund.

Last year, Canada added a new $50 million a year loan program to its existing grant and loan efforts. The Netherlands recently announced a 20-percent increase in its aid budget. The United Kingdom has put increased priority on aid, elevating and centralizing the function in a new Cabinet Ministry of Overseas Development.

Terms of aid

The United States is concerned about the terms on which aid is extended and the effect these terms will have on the future debt burdens of recipient countries. The accumulated public foreign debt of these countries now totals about $30 billion. The repayment burden amounts to $5 billion per year, and has been growing at an annual rate of 15 percent. If annual servicing payments continue to grow at such a pace, the progress of development will be slowed, and gross foreign aid requirements will be increased.

There were some improvements in terms on loans committed in 1963. The new Canadian program will include lending on IDA-type terms which are significantly more liberal (50 years' maturity at three-fourths percent interest) than those provided by the United States.

British terms were also eased in 1963 for a number of countries, decreasing the average interest rate from 5.4 percent in 1962 to 4.8 percent and increasing the average maturity from 20.5 years in 1962 to 21.2 years in 1963. The new British policy of waiving interest during grace periods of as long as 7 years has reduced 6-percent interest rates on 25-year loans to an effective rate of 3.5 percent. West German loan maturities increased on the average from 15.2 to 18.5 years in 1963, while interest rates dropped slightly from 4.4 to 4.3 percent. In consortia, Germany has pledged some loans with 25-year maturities, including 7 years' grace, at 3-percent interest.

COMMUNIST AID TO LESS-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

In 1964, Communist economic aid to the less-developed countries increased sharply above the levels of the 2 previous years. New aid commitments by Communist countries in 1964 reached the highest total since the Communist aid programs began nearly 10 years ago.

As President Johnson noted in his foreign aid message to the Congress, "Russia and Red China have tripled their promises of aid in the past year. They are doing more than they have ever done before; the competition between them has led to increased efforts by each to influence the course of events in the developing nations."

The Soviet Union, the East European countries, and Communist China committed about $1.5 billion during this past year, mainly in the form of lines of credit for project construction, but including also commodity aid and hard currency grants. This figure compares with a level of about $350 million a year in 1962 and 1963 and exceeds the 1961 peak of $1.1 billion. Total economic aid credits and grants extended since 1954 by the Soviet bloc and Communist China are about $6.4 billion.[2] Expenditures to date are estimated at over $2 billion, or roughly one-third of the cumulative commitments.

Although new Communist aid commitments have fluctuated in recent years, aid expenditures have been rising steadily and without break for the past 5 years. This trend and the sharp rise in new commitments during 1964 both suggest that the Communist world has intensified, rather than diminished, its efforts to use aid as a lever in achieving its aims in the less-developed areas.

These aims include undermining the influence of the West, advancement of Communist influence and the exploitation of the political and economic instability in the emerging nations. The new aid commitments appear also to be strongly influenced by competition between the Soviet Union and Communist China.

The major share of new Communist credits in 1964 was provided to countries in the Near East and south Asia region; the United Arab Republic and India were the main recipients, together accounting for about half of the $1.3 billion total. Pakistan received a credit of about $60 million from Communist China, partly for project aid and partly for commodity imports. Several other countries in the region, including Afghanistan, Iran, and Ceylon received smaller new credits.

About $360 million, or nearly 30 percent of the total for the year, was provided to Africa, with several countries—Central African Republic, Congo (Brazzaville), Kenya, Senegal, Tanzania, and Uganda—accepting Communist economic aid for the first time. Algeria was a particularly heavy recipient, with credits of nearly $150 million.

As usual, the Soviet Union was the largest aid donor, accounting for some $800 million or roughly 60 percent of the 1964 total. The remainder was shared in nearly equal amounts by the East European countries and Communist China. The latter was especially active in Africa, partly perhaps as a result of competition with the Soviet Union, partly because of its desire to gain support in the continent for diplomatic recognition, and partly because of the opportunities it sees for taking advantage of current political and economic difficulties in the newly independent countries.

Included in the approximately $800 million of aid extended by the Soviet Union in 1964 were agreements to build three steel mills, including another large complex in India at Bokaro in Bihar state, and smaller plants in Algeria and the United Arab Republic. Most of the U.S.S.R.'s agreements contained their customary terms of 2½-percent interest and 12 years of repayment of principal after project completion. Repayment generally is to be made in the currency of the aid-recipient country.

Chinese aid consisted largely of credits and technicians to build light industries of immediate productive impact—textile mills, cigarette factories—and roads and state farms as well as commodity credits for the import of Chinese goods. The Chinese also agreed to provide some grants in pounds sterling and Swiss francs to a number of African countries. Most Chinese credits are interest free and carry generous grace periods and extended amortization schedules.

Although there have been some outright project grants and some instances of aid for general budget support, the bulk of Communist assistance has been in the form of nonconvertible credits. Receipts of such credits must buy the commodities, equipment, and technical help they need from the Communist country which made the aid commitment. For some Communist countries, particularly those of East Europe, economic aid is a means of selling goods and machinery which they could not otherwise dispose of in hard currency markets.

In addition to aid for project construction and commodity imports, the Communist countries are also providing substantial technical assistance. It is estimated that over 14,500 Communist technicians were working abroad in 1964 in some 30 less-developed countries, an increase of about 2,000 technicians over the number abroad in 1964.

The Communist countries are also carrying out a large-scale program of training within their own borders. Several thousand nationals from the less developed nations have gone to the Soviet Union, the East European countries and Communist China for technical training courses of all types. The Communists, moreover, have provided thousands of scholarships to bring students from Africa and Asia to Communist higher institutes of learning for academic study.

Most of the Communist credit commitments have been earmarked for industrial projects, including not only such heavy construction as steel mills but a variety of installations, large and small: cement plants, textile mills, sugar refineries, machine-tool factories, bicycle and tire plants and even small nuclear reactors. Another large segment of Communist credits has been allocated for reclamation, power and irrigation projects such as the Aswan Dam in the United Arab Republic, and smaller power plants. Substantial amounts have been provided for transportation and communications and minerals survey and exploitation.

Communist countries also continued to extend substantial military assistance during the past year. Cumulative Communist military aid since 1955 totals over $3.5 billion; most of this aid has already been drawn down in the form of deliveries of aircraft—primarily jet fighters, destroyers, patrol boats, artillery, tanks, tactical missiles and small arms.

---

[1] Includes the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) and its affiliates, the International Development Association (IDA) and the International Finance Corporation (IFC); the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB); the European Development Fund (EDF) and the European Investment Bank (EIB) of the European Economic Community (EEC).

[2] This figure excludes aid to Cuba.

Results of a Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, listed below are the results of the questionnaire mailed out to 100,000 people about 6 weeks ago. Results have

been most gratifying as we have had a return of over 15,000.

One of the most significant results is the answer to question No. 4, if you favor the medicare bill tied in with social security. A resounding "No" was given to this question as 86.6 percent of our replies voted "No" and only 7.7 percent in favor.

Question No. 2, which asked if you approve of the present $3.5 billion a year foreign aid program, was also included in my 1964 questionnaire. It is interesting to note that the percentages are approximately the same in both years. This year, 8.6 percent approved; 79.7 percent disapproved; and 12.5 percent were not sure. Last year, in answer to the same question, 8.6 percent approved; 81 percent disapproved; and 10.5 percent were not sure.

Nebraskans continue to want to solve their problems either through individual initiative or at the State or local level. Two-thirds do not approve of the Federal-aid-to-education bill recently passed by the Congress and 73 percent opposed doubling the appropriation to carry on the antipoverty program for the coming fiscal year.

It is interesting to note that 72.6 percent favor only 7.3 percent opposed my bill H.R. 333 which would amend the Sherman Anti-Trust Act and bring the labor unions under its provisions, and 20 percent were not sure.

One of the least conclusive replies is in regard to the agriculture programs as the percentage of "Not sure" votes was so large that it did not give a clear picture. No separate returns were compiled from nonfarmers so it is difficult to properly analyze the answers to questions No. 1.

The results of the questionnaire follow:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Not sure
1. In his inaugural message, President Johnson indicated that he would recommend extension of the present wheat and feed grains legislation.			
(a) Do you favor this type of program?	23.4	34.1	42.5
(b) Do you favor the same basic support price ($1.30 per bushel) for wheat plus an increased certificate payment?	18.4	34.6	47.0
(c) Do you favor an increase in the basic support price in both wheat and feed grains?	28.8	31.9	39.3
(d) Do you favor a land retirement program attached to soil conservation?	31.8	30.7	37.5
2. President Johnson has recommended $3,500,000,000 to carry on the foreign aid program next year. Do you approve?	8.4	79.1	12.5
3. Do you favor my bill, H.R. 333, which would amend the Sherman Anti-Trust Act and bring labor unions under its provisions?	72.6	7.3	20.1
4. Do you favor the King-Anderson medicare bill for people 65 years of age or over, which would be compulsory, tied in with social security, and paid for by increased social security taxes on both the employee and employer?	7.7	86.6	5.7
5. Do you favor an "eldercare" bill for senior citizens, administered by the States, on a matching basis, which would be voluntary and handled through private insurance companies?	70.3	16.3	13.4
6. The President has recommended doubling the expenditure in the coming fiscal year for the antipoverty program to approximately $2,000,000,000 per year. Do you approve?	14.5	73.7	11.8
7. Do you approve of the bill which I have introduced, H.R. 4502, to allow parents who have children in college or university an additional $1,000 tax exemption per year for each student?	76.6	15.5	7.9
8. Do you approve of the aid-to-education bill, currently before the Congress, which would give assistance to both public and private schools at the secondary and elementary school levels at an estimated cost of $1,200,000,000 for the 1st year?	19.9	65.5	14.6
9. In regard to the present war in Vietnam, in which the United States is currently engaged to the extent of approximately 25,000 American troops plus planes and equipment, do you—			
(a) Approve of the manner in which this is being handled?	12.7	51.7	35.6
(b) Favor withdrawing of American military aid from Vietnam?	20.9	40.3	38.8
(c) Favor increasing military aid and stepping up our involvement in this war?	34.6	23.1	42.3
10. Do you favor repeal of sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law which would nullify the right-to-work law now in effect in Nebraska and 18 other States?	10.0	65.6	24.4
11. Do you favor removal of excise taxes on cosmetics, luggage, handbags, furs, jewelry, etc., as the Republican House Members tried to get passed last year?	38.7	49.4	11.9
12. Do you favor amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act which would—			
(a) Increase minimum wage from the present $1.25 per hour?	26.2	60.5	13.3
(b) Provide for double time for over 40 hours per week?	17.8	68.7	13.5
(c) Reduce the workweek from 40 to 35 hours?	7.2	80.3	12.5
13. Do you favor a constitutional amendment which would increase the term for House Members from 2 to 4 years with one-half of the House membership up for election every 2 years?	54.4	27.1	18.5

A Tribute to the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, at a time when it seems all our efforts, all our sympathy, all our energy is directed toward helping everyone to some new version of paradise on earth regardless of what the individual does to help himself, I would like to pay tribuate to thousands of Americans who fight and overcome terrific odds in order to live normal lives. I refer to the handicapped who do not surrender because life has made their progress more difficult. There are thousands of men and women who have overcome physical handicaps to reach the highest pinnacle of success in the business and industrial world. Where lesser men have squealed and quit, many who live in constant pain are making valuable contributions to the world's work.

In addition, I would like to say a word for private industry whose genious has developed machinery and equipment to enable the lame, the halt and the blind to compete successfully in the labor market.

The following editorial from the Gadsden, Ala., Times of May 3, points out just one instance, the contribution of blind girls who have made good as switchboard operators, and the genious of the telephone industry which has enabled them to conquor their handicap:

BLIND GIRLS INSPIRE

The courage of the blind leave some lesser mortals wanting—particularly those who would rather shirk than work.

Specific reference is made to well-trained blind girls who serve industry, business and the general public as switchboard attendants at private branch exchanges.

For more than 5 years, the adult blind department training center in Talledega has had this program in operation.

Of the many persons who have contributed to this training, Southern Bell Design Engineer I. A. Vandergriff, of Atlanta, Ga., is the most outstanding. It was he who designed an electronic switchboard which blind girls could use effectively, enabling them to become efficient attendants.

More than technical training is involved. Before graduating to become good attendants at businesses, these girls must have a reputation of friendliness and courtesy. They must be able to meet their personal needs in daily living, travel, personal grooming, and possess an acceptable voice quality.

Since the switchboard operator of any business, industry, or organization is the first voice heard by the caller, it is imperative that the attendant introduces her company with a distinct, friendly and attractive verbal performance.

This the blind girls have achieved, and, in the process, maintaining their own dignity as human beings, sensing the enjoyment of accomplishment.

These PBX operators are a source of inspiration not only because of overcoming a great handicap, but because of the excellency of their work.

Peace—But How?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Harrisburg Patriot of April 29, 1965, published an editorial which says a number of things about President de Gaulle and the situation in Vietnam which need to be said.

I congratulate the Patriot on its awareness and understanding of our foreign policy problems, and commend the editorial to every Member of the House:

PEACE—BUT HOW?

Paris in the spring is lovely, but comments out of Paris this spring week have not been very helpful in bringing peace to southeast Asia.

French President de Gaulle, taking time out from his consultations with the visiting Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, appeared on television in a fireside chat to express, among other things, his "severe disapproval" of the spreading southeast Asia hostilities.

How anyone would dare continue fighting in the face of the French President's majestic disapproval may be puzzling, but that's humanity for you. Unfortunately, De Gaulle did not present any further positive proposals as to how the war can be ended other than to say what he has said before—that the area ought to be neutral and independent, "free of any encroachments."

In most of this the Johnson administration can agree, although it is not certain whether the French leader is as equally displeased with Communist encroachments in South Vietnam as he obviously is with the presence of American forces in the area.

An hour after De Gaulle spoke, President Johnson held a news conference in which he reasserted America's determination to arrive at a peaceful settlement and our hopes of preventing the war from getting any bigger. Mr. Johnson said he would talk "to any government, anywhere, any time, without any conditions." If the same kind of statements were coming from the Communist side, the hostilities could end forthwith.

But the United States does not propose to turn tail and run. If it be true that the Johnson administration now is overemphasizing the factor of outside aggression from Hanoi, after several years of American insistence that the struggle was primarily internal, it cannot be denied that outside aggression plays an important role. If North Vietnam—or, more likely, Red China—were willing to call a cease-fire, the bombing and bloodletting could come to a halt while the diplomats came to the conference table.

Ex-Senator Goldwater's comments in Paris were not helpful, either, and we can only hope that people elsewhere do not mistake the Arizonian's words for America policy. Mr. Goldwater said he rather prays that Red China will give the United States the provocation to attack Red China's military and atomic installations.

Nations in the past have gone to war over much less provocation than Red China already has given. But nations in the past did not possess the means to blow each other off the face of the earth. The war ought to be ended, not expanded. However, one may argue over strategy and timing, basic American policy now can hardly be other than Mr. Johnson summed it up in his press conference—"firmness with modernization, readiness for peace with refusal to retreat."

Baseball: A Study in Cupidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the past I have sought to direct the attention of my colleagues in the House to the sorry situation which exists today in organized professional baseball.

I have done so in an effort to spur action by Congress on legislation which would put baseball under Federal antitrust regulation. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 6, which has that purpose.

It is my belief that lucrative radio and television contracts have changed the essential nature of professional baseball. This belief was confirmed by a recent report in Broadcasting magazine which showed that the rights to broadcast games have netted the major leagues $25,310,000 for the 1965 season. Sponsors of these programs will pay the networks about $85 million this year.

These figures are ample proof that baseball today is big business and must be regulated in the public interest.

It has become evident that without such regulation the owners of the major league clubs are tempted to flaunt the best interests of the fans in their search for greater and greater profits.

Nowhere is the evidence of baseball greed more evident than in my own home city of Milwaukee. The Milwaukee Braves will go to Atlanta, Ga., next year—not because Atlanta is a better baseball town—but because of lucrative radio and television contracts.

Milwaukee proved that it is still the town that set the National League season attendance record on opening day. Through the efforts of a community organization called Teams, Inc., an attendance of 33,874 was achieved. This was one of the largest opening day crowds in either league.

Since then attendance has fallen off sharply and it is not strange that it has. Milwaukee is a city which has been hurt by big league baseball, and particularly by the Braves clubowners.

The Milwaukee baseball situation was the topic recently of two articles which appeared in the May 4 issue of the Milwaukee Journal. One was by Red Smith, the world famous sportswriter, and the other by the Journal's noted sports editor, Oliver E. Kuechle.

Their columns document the results of the cupidity of baseball's owners both in Milwaukee and elsewhere. Because of the pertinency of these facts to the effort to put organized professional baseball under antitrust regulation, I am inserting the two articles and commend the attention of my colleagues to them:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, May 4, 1965]

(By Red Smith)

BRAVES OWNERS OFFER A STUDY IN CUPIDITY

In Chicago, where the White Sox and Twins were fighting for first place, Sunday's doubleheader drew 42,367, Comiskey Park's biggest crowd since August 1963.

In Kansas City, where the Athletics lay a moldering in last place with a 6-game losing streak and only 2 victories for the season, 2 games with the Angeles drew 9,171.

Weather was good all over and nowhere was it better than in Milwaukee, where summer came rushing in after a frosty spring. Skies were clear and the thermometer reached a high of 86°. It was too fine to sit around drinking beer, and on a pleasant May Sunday there isn't much else to do in Milwaukee. Lake Michigan and Oconomowoc Lake are still too cold for swimming. The bass season isn't open yet. It's a bit too early to drive up to Door County to see the cherry blossoms.

GOOD OLD DAYS

It was, in other words, the sort of day when you either take the kids to the zoo or go to the ballgame. In his time there, Lou Perini could take a sellout of 40,000 for granted, especially with a live pennant contender like this year's Phillies in town.

So the Braves, who played to 19 million customers in 12 seasons since they settled in the American cheeselands, lost twice to the Phillies before 8,630 witnesses. This was the day's smallest crowd in the major leagues, but considering the way baseball people run their business, it was a triumph. Things will be worse before they are better for the Chicago owners of the Boston-Milwaukee-Atlanta carpetbaggers.

This is the story thus far for the lame ducks of County Stadium:

On opening day, a civic organization called Teams, Inc., bought out the park for $35,000 and resold 33,874 tickets for a profit of about $13,000.

For the second game, 3,362 seats were occupied in 40° weather. It was still chilly for the third game when 3,391 attended. Temperatures climbed into the 60° for the fourth game, but attendance dropped to 2,804. Then the St. Louis Cardinals, champions of the world, came to town.

They opened before 1,677, the smallest crowd ever to attend a big league game in Milwaukee. To be sure, the weather was bad again, so bad that only 862 tickets were sold at the gate. The other 815 had been sold in advance.

The next day a new record was set, 1,324. When 2,182 showed up for the Cards' third game there, it brought the total for the St. Louis series to 5,183. At about 28 cents a head, the Cardinals didn't clear expenses.

INCOME BELOW $700 A DAY

By then the Braves had played 7 times at home before total crowds of 48,614, slightly over the 1-game record. However, attendance for the 6 games after the high pressure opener added up to 14,740 for a daily average of 2,456.

Business like that means a gross daily income below $700 for the visiting team, which has to transport, house, feed, and pay the wages of a 40-man party.

Yet, baseball people have never discovered that they are business partners. They see a lodge brother losing his shirt in a bush league operation and don't realize that he's stripping them to the waist, too. The league president does not raise his voice to protest the despoilation of a city and a territory. The baseball commissioner does not lift a finger.

The other owners say, "It's his business," but it is their business too. The welfare of every club should be the president's direct concern, for what is bad for one is bad for all. "It's a league affair," the commissioner says, but when a fertile baseball territory is ravished, it should be baseball's affair.

VANISHING FANS

We have had many examples of what happens to baseball interest in a city which baseball abandons. In 1947 the Yankees, Giants, and Dodgers drew 5,387,256 customers in New York. The first year the Yankees had the field to themselves, New York attendance was 1,428,438. More than 4 million fans had vanished during the winter.

In 1948, the Braves and Red Sox played to 3,104,237 in Boston. In 1962, when Tom Yawkey had the only store in town, he sold 733,080 tickets. Two and a quarter million fans had got lost.

Next year, unless a court prevents it, the Braves will ship their carpetbags to Atlanta. Warren Giles will make a pious statement saluting once again the pioneering spirit of the National League, whose fearless missionaries are carrying the baseball gospel into the Deep South for the first time. He will be inspiringly eloquent.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, May 4, 1965]

TIME OUT FOR TALK—BRAVES BRING UP REAR IN ATTENDANCE

(By Oliver E. Kuechle, sports editor)

We now come to the merry month of May and the Braves fervently hope it will be merrier at the turnstiles than the last weeks of April which preceded it. Through this early stage of the season, Milwaukee, with its attendance of 62,653 on 10 dates, happens to be low town on the totem pole, low not only in the National League but in the American. It is a dubious distinction for a city which only a few years ago was the turnstile toast of all baseball.

Weather to blame? To a certain extent although other cities had cold, miserable April weather, too. A subtle but growing take-or-leave-it attitude toward baseball? Possibly, although under the stimulus of expansion and new stadia there are still areas of strong interest. An almost indifferent promotional approach by the Braves themselves? Very likely. They are practicing an unmistakable economy this last season here. and a deep community wound because of the Rover Boys' shift to Atlanta a year hence? No question.

This last, perhaps, explains better than anything else what is happening. The community wound is deep.

AVERAGE ATTENDANCE: 6,265

But let attendance statistics through May 1 speak their piece. In average attendance per game, the Braves stand at the bottom of the heap, although they have kissin' cousins in the Cubs and Reds in the National League and in the Twins and A's in the American.

National League

Team	Total	Dates	Average
Dodgers	395,550	13	30,426
Mets	132,324	5	26,464
Astros	288,065	11	26,187
Giants	131,057	7	18,722
Cards	125,972	8	15,746
Phils	79,613	6	13,268
Pirates	53,708	5	10,741
Reds	88,991	10	8,899
Cubs	47,524	6	7,920
Braves	62,653	10	6,265

American League

Team	Total	Dates	Average
Yanks	145,292	8	18,161
Sox	126,153	8	15,769
Angeles	77,280	6	12,880
Senators	71,201	6	11,866
Tigers	92,450	8	11,556
Indians	89,843	8	11,230
Orioles	65,959	6	10,993
Red Sox	41,810	4	10,452
A's	67,659	9	7,517
Twins	25,545	4	6,386

Into these figures, of course, enter various individual influences—some teams play doubleheaders, some don't; some play traditionally good draws, some don't; some play in new stadiums, some don't; one has the President in attendance on opening day, the others never have him; some have to start their Saturday games at 4:45 p.m. because of ABC's television commitments to the west coast, others don't. In the long run, it levels out fairly well but only in the long run.

STILL THE SAME

Curiously, opening day attendance, which is often achieved under forced draft as it was here or in Cleveland or in Cincinnati, does not markedly alter the overall April picture when considered separately—in a few instances a little, but not much. And the Braves, even with subtraction of opening day attendance down the line, remain at the bottom of the heap.

Here are the April attendances minus the first day's crowds:

National League

Team	Total	Dates	Average
Dodgers	358,949	12	29,912
Astros	245,413	10	24,541
Mets	94,325	4	23,581
Giants	93,058	6	15,545
Cards	101,608	7	14,515
Phils	47,690	5	9,338
Reds	60,524	9	6,725
Pirates	25,519	4	6,380
Cubs	27,773	5	5,554
Braves	28,779	9	3,198

American League

Team	Total	Dates	Average
Sox	107,870	7	15,410
Yanks	107,080	7	15,927
Angels	66,002	5	13,200
Tigers	59,792	7	8,542
Red Sox	23,792	3	7,931
Indians	45,508	7	6,501
A's	49,550	8	6,194
Senators	27,647	5	5,529
Orioles	26,504	5	5,301
Twins	10,157	3	3,386

Weather? Indifference? Lack of promotion? Community hurt? All of them probably enter into this, most of all community hurt. Milwaukee just refuses to forget. Maybe the good month of May with sunshine can heal some of it—if the team itself does a part.

The schedule the rest of the way is favorable. Milwaukee had only eight playing dates in April and will have 10 in May, 17 in June, 10 in July, 17 in August, and 11 in September—early September.

Remarks by Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus R. Vance, April 27, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some remarks by Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus R. Vance, Tuesday, April 27, 1965:

REMARKS BY DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE CYRUS R. VANCE BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ORDNANCE ASSOCIATION, SHERATON JEFFERSON HOTEL, ST. LOUIS, MO.

I deeply appreciate this opportunity to speak before a group so concerned as you are with the security of America, and so directly involved in the preservation of its strength and freedom.

Tonight, I want to speak of Vietnam.

On April 7, you heard the President address this subject at Johns Hopkins University. He explained, on that occasion, why we are in Vietnam.

We are there to honor a longstanding pledge to the independent people of that land.

We are there to strengthen world order and the faith of free people everywhere in our commitment to their stability, their security, and their independence.

We are there because we have learned that aggression, unmet anywhere, opens the gate to aggression everywhere.

And we are there—not just with soldiers, sailors, and airmen, but also with doctors, scientists, and teachers—to lend a hand as the brave Vietnamese people climb the hill to a broader vision of a peaceful, more abundant tomorrow.

The President made it unmistakably clear that we will remain in South Vietnam as long as we are needed:

"We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

At the same time, while maintaining our full commitments to Vietnamese independence, we remain ready for unconditional discussions. And we look forward to joining with all the nations of southeast Asia in a great, cooperative effort to develop that region for the welfare of all.

In the wake of the eloquent speech at Baltimore, it is clear that there is now far greater understanding of the conflict in Vietnam. But there are still some who will not heed the facts.

Here and in other lands, some still question the nature of the aggression we oppose, the identity of the aggressor, and the role we are playing. Let me set forth some of these questions, and let me answer them with truths which cannot be denied.

Some say that this is just a rebellion, inevitable, and probably justified, and they ask: "What evidence is there that the war in South Vietnam is a creature of the Communists, controlled and supported from the north?"

The evidence is overwhelming that this is not an indigenous rebellion but a war, directed, controlled, and supported from Hanoi.

We know, first of all, how the North Vietnamese have organized to control the war in the south. Within the Central Committee of the Lao Dong Party—the Communist Party led by Ho Chi Minh—there was once a committee for supervision of the south which has now become the so-called reunification department. This agency issues political policy directives to the central office for South Vietnam, located in Tay Ninh Province to the northeast of Saigon.

In the south, the National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam is the screen behind which the Communists operate. It is worth nothing that Hanoi demanded establishment of such a front 3 months before its formation was actually announced in December 1960. It is also worth noting that the front's representatives, when traveling abroad, do so with North Vietnamese passports and sponsorship.

Closely paralleling and coordinated with the political effort, the military affairs of the Vietcong are controlled by the North Vietnamese Ministry of Defense, through the military section of the Vietcong central office. Other agencies in Hanoi exist specifically to execute policy in the south, to control clandestine intelligence operations there, and to influence world opinion in favor of the so-called National Front for Liberation.

We know of this apparatus, and the constant policy and operational control which it exercises over the Vietcong:

By interrogation of prisoners.

By capture of many documents.

And by various intelligence sources.

We know, too, the historical pattern of Communist expansion—a basic ideology, centralized control, a direct relationship between Communist forces in every land, and a professed intention to impose the Communist system on all countries. We see direct reflection of this in documents such as the one found on the body of a Vietcong soldier in Ban Me Thuot as long ago as August 1961. To quote it:

"In implementation of the decision of the Third Congress of the Lao Dong Party [the North Vietnamese Communist Party], the NFLSV [the national front] was set up to unify the revolutionary struggle, to overthrow the United States-Diem regime, to establish a popular government of democratic union and bring about the peaceful reunification of the country. The revolution for the liberation of the south would never succeed if the party (i.e., the Lao Dong Party) were not directing it."

There is also evidence in the cells of activists which were left behind at the time of partition to prepare clandestinely for future operations, while others were taken north to be trained and then returned for insurgency.

We hear and read the constant propaganda broadcasts and leaflets from Communist China, Hanoi, and the Vietcong front in South Vietnam. Their matching tones, aims, and even words are much more than coincidence.

The Buddhists identified the source of their nation's problems in a communique, issued 2 weeks ago, which closed with the prayer that "the country and religion * * * be freed soon from the control and oppression of Communists."

There is evidence in the unanimous testimony of every South Vietnamese leader since partition—Buddhist, Catholic, military, civilian. No matter their differences, none has shown sympathy for the Vietcong. None has called this a civil war. All have agreed that the Vietcong movement in South Vietnam is the aggressive creation of Hanoi, and subject to its direct control.

Finally, as the most tangible evidence of direct Hanoi support, there are the men, weapons, and supplies infiltrated from the north to the south.

We know of the two Xuan Mai camps, near Hanoi, major training bases for the large infiltration groups which are set for guerrilla operations in both South Vietnam and Laos. We know of other camps and staging areas—at Vu Con, Dong Hoi, Vit Thu Lu, and many other places. We have identified at least one major element—the 70th Transportation Group—which exists solely to move infiltrators from north to south. We have identified another unit specially organized for sea infiltration.

But, people ask, aren't the infiltrators just a trickle, a tiny flow of symbolic sympathy for the rebels in the south?

We have calculated the number of infiltrators carefully, keeping our estimates intentionally conservative. No man is counted unless his presence has been established by at least two Vietcong prisoners, two Vietcong documents, or one of each. Still the figures are impressive, revealing a river rather than a trickle, a conscious, mounting effort to destroy South Vietnam with a flow of trained, indoctrinated, hard-core guerrilla fighters and terrorists—39,517 since 1959—and that total is unquestionably low.

Our best estimate is that the infiltrated manpower from North Vietnam—after allowances for casualties at the overall Vietcong rate of roughly 15 percent per year—represents a majority, and certainly the key leadership and technical skill, of the hard-core Vietcong.

Another point of significance is the marked rise we now see in the percentage of infiltrators who are inhabitants of North Vietnam, most of whom have never seen the south. In earlier days, most of the infiltrators were South Vietnamese, trained in the north by the Communists, and then returned south for subversion. But we now estimate that, in 1964, some 6,000 of the infiltrators—75 percent—were North Vietnamese, with no shred of a reason to move south except to wage war.

Other people, perhaps granting the evidence of infiltration, ask about the arms which the Vietcong use. Isn't it true, they ask, that most of the Vietcong weapons have simply been taken from government forces, clear evidence that there is no real will to resist this uprising in the south?

The answer is no; that is not true. The great bulk of the Vietcong weapons—certainly 60–70 percent, including nearly all of the heavier and more modern ones—come from external Communist sources.

It is true that the Vietcong use weapons cached in 1954. It is also true that the South Vietnamese, from 1961 until today, have lost 39,000 weapons, but in the same period the Vietcong lost 25,000, and so the Vietcong gains have netted them only some 14,000 arms. This is only 10 to 15 percent of their total requirements or, most favorably, only 30 percent of the requirements for their regular, main force units alone. The remainder—some 35,000 weapons for the regular, main force Vietcong troops, and between 50,000 and 100,000 for the Vietcong irregulars—must, and have, come from outside.

Related to this, it is heartening to observe the trend in weapons losses in 1965. For a long while, the ratio of losses was 3 to 1 in favor of the Vietcong. But this year the ratio is 1 to 1—a favorable sign.

Thousands of Communist-bloc weapons already have been captured this year, in every corps area in South Vietnam. As an example, in a recent major action in Chuong Thien Province, Government forces fought two units of Vietcong—the 96th Battalion, and a guard battalion of military region 9. In this encounter, 90 percent of the small arms, and 100 percent of the larger weapons captured by Government forces were of Communist-bloc manufacture. These included, for example, 20 Soviet 7.62-millimeter rifles; 52 Chinese Communist 7.62-millimeter carbines; 4 Chinese Communist RPD 7.62-millimeter machineguns; and a number of Czech arms.

The trend in capture of 7.62-millimeter weapons and ammunition is now becoming significant. This is materiel not used in Vietnam by either the South Vietnamese or by us. It is materiel which can only come from out-of-country sources, and that which we have found has all been manufactured in Communist-bloc countries. From many provinces comes increasing evidence that all main and local Vietcong forces are being equipped with 7.62-millimeter arms: One example is the action I have just mentioned in Chuong Thien. The large vessel sunk along the South Vietnamese coast in February contained 500,000 rounds of 7.62 ammunition along with 60 7.62-millimeter weapons. In the week of April 10–17 750,000 rounds of 7.62 ammunition were captured in Phu Yen. In Dinh Tuong, also in April, 174,000 more rounds of this ammunition were taken.

Prisoners have confirmed beyond doubt the arming of Vietcong units with this new materiel. As of now we believe that 6 battalions are so equipped—Battalion J–108 of the C–58 Regiment; the 801st Battalion; a North Vietnamese Army battalion which I shall mention in a moment; the 303d Battalion; the 96th Battalion; and the Guard Battalion at An Xuyen. In addition, 17 other battalions are thought to have 7.62 weapons already.

As if all this were not sufficient, proof has now come to us of one more clear link in the chain of aggression which extends from Hanoi to the home villages of the south. We can now confirm that a combat unit of the regular North Vietnamese Army—the 2d Battalion, 101st Regiment, of the 325th Division—has secretly entered South Vietnam and is located in northwest Kontum Province. There may also be other elements of this division in this area.

We have had previous indications of this from various intelligence sources. We were also alerted, in an encounter on March 29–30, between the Government's 21st Ranger Battalion and this force. At that time it was clear that the South Vietnamese forces had met a professional enemy unit—disciplined, skilled, aggressive, and more heavily armed than other Vietcong units. And we have confirmed this identification by extensive interrogation of a prisoner taken from this regular, North Vietnamese battalion.

So when people ask: "Is there proof of external control and support?" "If it exists, isn't it minor?" Or, "Isn't this a genuine civil uprising rather than aggression?" I point to all this evidence and, in turn, I ask these questions:

"Who are the leaders of this 'native rebellion,' if rebellion it is?" "Why—until the last few days—the total anonymity in this so-called revolution?" Why do northern Communist names come first to your mind—Ho Chi Minh and Vo Nguyen Giap?"

If 39,000 armed South Koreans were to penetrate North Korea and wage a war directed by Seoul, what would the Chinese Communists call this—a popular rebellion, or aggression?

If 39,000 armed West Germans were to penetrate East Germany and wage a war directed by Bonn, what would the Soviets call this—a poplar rebellion, or aggression?

If, still, it is maintained that this is a civil war, with the people rising up against an unpopular government, recall these facts:

At the time of partition, 900,000 Vietnamese refugees freely chose to leave the Communists north for South Vietnam.

In recent months, some 200,000 more have fled from their homes in Vietcong-controlled areas of South Vietnam to seek the protection of the Government.

At no time in the war, at its terrible worst, has any significant refugee group of this sort fled from government areas to Vietcong areas or to North Vietnam.

No single responsible leader, no major interest group or party in South Vietnam, has ever shown sympathy or support for the Vietcong.

No great, popular revolutionary figure has arisen from the faceless Vietcong. And no local Vietcong leader has been able to maintain control without the use of force, terror, and the constant threat of death for any opponent.

More than 50,000 soldiers of South Vietnam have been killed or wounded in battle for their country since 1960. Last year alone, the South Vietnamese Army suffered 25 percent more battle casualties, proportionately, than we incurred in the entire 3 years of the Korean war. And still they fight on. Is this a nation with no will to resist?

No, this is a nation which will resist—not only in its armed forces but also in its civilian populace where, despite the terror and the murder, there are always new leaders ready to take over in the villages for those who have been assassinated. This is a nation which is strongly resisting, not a popular uprising but a calculated, brutal, and bloody aggression from without. The South Vietnamese are not deluded about this. At every hand, they have evidence of what rule by the Hanoi-controlled Vietcong would mean. In the Vietnamese villages and countryside—where people ask no more than the freedom to live, work and bring up their children in peace—assassinations, bombings, kidnapings, armed assaults, and sabotage have become the tragic way of life.

In 1960, Communist terrorist assassinated or kidnaped over 3,000 South Vietnamese. Death came by knife; by pistol shots in homes in the middle of the night; by snipers' bullets in the fields; by bombs; by savage beatings; and by protracted, ruthless torture. And those who were kidnaped were seldom seen again.

Since 1962, more than 3,500 separate acts of terrorism, armed attack, and sabotage have occurred, affecting tens of thousands of individual South Vietnamese.

In 1964, 436 local officials were murdered; over 1,100 other officials were taken by kidnaping to an unknown fate; 1,359 other civilians were murdered; and another 8,400 were kidnaped by the Vietcong. Over 11,000 innocent humans in all—murdered or dragged away from their families and homes to captivity, forced labor, and much worse. In America, in proportionate terms, this would have meant 143,000 of our citizens slain or kidnapped in 1964 alone.

This bleeding and intimidation of the people and the local governmental structure in South Vietnam has gone on for 8 years. They go on today—against the women and children as well as the men—for what more effective way is there to dominate a populace than to kill its leaders and trained officials, to threaten the women with horror, and to kill the children of those who oppose the aggressors.

This is the nature of the aggression and of the aggressor in South Vietnam today. This is what the Vietnamese face and why they fight. And this is why we have pledged to help them.

Yet people ask—even Americans—how can we justify the use of our military power in South, and particularly North Vietnam?

We can justify it in South Vietnam because a sovereign and independent nation had asked our help in advising, supplying, and supporting its forces as they resist armed aggression and terror from without.

We can justify it in North Vietnam because, as all the evidence shows, and as President Johnson, has said, Hanoi's control and support of the Vietcong insurgency is "the heartbeat of the war." Once again here, South Vietnam has requested our assistance and we have responded. The South Vietnamese, and we, want Hanoi to know that its attack on its neighbor must cease.

It is important to understand the nature of our operations in North Vietnam, and to contrast them with those of the Communists against South Vietnam. There are too many who have recklessly applied the adjective "barbaric" in the wrong place.

Our aerial operations are carefully controlled as to area, target, and munitions. They are almost surgical, aiming to cut the lines of control and supply running from north to south, but carefully avoiding essentially civilian targets.

Which is "barbaric," the bombing of an infiltration bridge, or the beheading of a mayor? Which is "barbaric," the strafing of a military convoy heading south, or the systematic murder of innocent villagers?

The only action we could not justify would be failing to help South Vietnam. Of this, we will not be guilty. In operations in the north and in the south—and both are necessary—we will continue to stand with the valiant Vietnamese, giving them whatever kind and measure of help is needed and appropriate.

And so, in sum, I say to all who question what we do:

In the face of all the evidence, what other course can honor take? Indeed, what other course is there in our own self-interest? How else can we sustain the faith of all the free lands in America's will to resist aggression and bring an end to the day of the assassin? How else can we face our own national conscience?

Our aim is peace. Peace for all men, and freedom for them to build their own futures. We stand in Vietnam—and we will stay there—to give its people a chance at this greater destiny.

We will leave when the terror halts and the killings cease. We will leave when the aggressor leaves, and not before. And on that day, we would turn with all the peoples of southeast Asia; yes, with South and North Vietnamese alike—to the building of a free and more abundant future.

William J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address made by Mr. William J. Driver, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, on the occasion of the dedication of the new Washington, D.C., Veterans' Administration hospital. It is indeed encouraging to know that this is the 69th VA hospital dedicated since 1947, and that several thousand additional beds have already been authorized throughout the country and are in the process of being constructed.

The address follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY HON. WILLIAM J. DRIVER, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS, ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE WASHINGTON VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 28, 1965

Mr. Vice President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, today we join together in a ceremony that has become characteristic of the Veterans' Administration: the dedication of a new hospital, incorporating all the latest advances in medicine, engineering, and architecture.

This is the 69th VA hospital dedicated since 1947. Nineteen additional hospitals are now under construction or planned. These hospitals and expansions of others will bring over 19,000 new beds into the VA as older and outmoded hospitals such as Mount Alto are gradually retired.

This progress did not come about automatically; it is the result of the unceasing effort of those who have made excellence in veterans' medicine their personal concern. Many of these men are with us here today. All have contributed, but none more so than the man who it is my great honor to introduce to you.

There are in this land today many enduring monuments to the vigor, enlightenment, and courage of HUBERT HUMPHREY'S Senate career.

In my view, none is more important, none is more enduring, none is more expressive of the compassion that is central to his character, than his constant struggle to assure that there be no compromise with the quality of medicine for America's veterans.

In defending the integrity of the VA medical program, he has said: "One of the most important obligations of the Nation [is] providing the finest possible medical care for our wounded and ill ex-servicemen."

In alerting the Senate to the growing number of aging veterans, he said: "No single agency of the U.S. Government will be or is meeting the medical needs of a larger group of senior citizens than the Veterans' Administration. It is not simply the responsibility to meet the problem of diseases of the aged, but, rather more positively, to help our veterans enjoy the fullest of health."

In stressing the contribution made by VA research to the health of veterans and all our citizens, he said: "I feel that the research increases which the Congress has granted to VA in recent years are a fitting tribute to the important results achieved to date and are appropriate recognition of the significance of constantly seeking new answers to the medical needs of America's ex-servicemen, as well as the needs of our entire population."

He summed up his views on our national obligation to veterans and their dependents when he said: "The veterans of our Nation have made tremendous contributions to the welfare of our people, in time of peace as well as in time of war. Their patriotic devotion and loyal service merit the attention and gratitude of all Americans." And he assured his fellow countrymen that he would continue "efforts for adequate recognition by Congress of the needs and welfare of our veterans and their families."

He has more than fulfilled the promise of that assurance. He has more than kept faith with America's veterans, for he has been their advocate, their spokesman, and their champion against the forces of indifference.

Chicago Daily News Commends Sending of Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of April 30, 1965:

RESCUE IN THE CARIBBEAN

When American citizens are in danger, it is the duty of the American Government to do what it can to protect them. Clearly, Americans were in danger in the Dominican Republic, overrun by revolution, and President Johnson's decision was to land a detachment of marines to help bring our civilians out safely.

There is hardly room for dissent from the commonsense and justice of this action. The Dominican Government, or what was left of it, acknowledged it could not guarantee the safety of the Americans. Under such circumstances, international law allows for rescue missions.

Even so, the cries of "imperialism" and "intervention" arise, and it must be conceded that the history of U.S. operations in the Caribbean renders suspect any overt action involving marines. The Leathernecks have been used before to police the area and set up friendly governments.

The dispatch of the marines in this instance could serve no such purpose. Tough as they are, a few hundred marines could scarcely take over the country, and they had their hands full protecting stranded American tourists in a wholly justified rescue operation.

The subsequent dispatch of paratroopers is a different matter. The Johnson administration clearly is prepared to do whatever becomes necessary in light of the near-total breakdown of order in the Dominican Republic.

The exact situation in the strife-torn nation is difficult to fathom, but it would be surprising if Castroites failed to snatch whatever benefit they could from the disorder. It is very much in the U.S. interest to make certain that they do not seize control of the Government.

Direct intervention, if it comes to that, should be at the behest of the Organization of American States, which has been summoned to meet in Washington. Members of the OAS who were at first critical of U.S. moves involving the marines have begun to change their tune as the full scope of the Dominican breakdown becomes apparent.

We hope the presence of the marines and soldiers, bent on rescue, serves as a deterrent,

making any other overt action unnecessary. Certainly, the United States should not barge in alone to set up some puppet in Santo Domingo. But we could hardly stand aside if the Communists throttled the effort to establish democracy, and established a Red state instead by force of arms.

The United States allowed that to happen in Cuba. It must not hapepn in the Dominican Republic.

Bellmon Raps Reserve Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the leaders of our government in the State of Oklahoma have been greatly concerned about the Defense Department's proposal to abolish the U.S. Army Reserve and as a substitute for the security furnished us by this important element of our defense forces, to merge with the National Guard such of this trained reserve personnel as can be persuaded to join the Guard.

Governor Bellmon made an emphatic statement on this subject which was published in a recent issue of the Daily Oklahoman.

At the same time there appeared the story that the Army may pressure reluctant Reservists into taking a place in the National Guard.

The articles to which I have referred, follow:

[From the Daily Oklahoman, Mar. 17, 1965]

BELLMON RAPS RESERVE PLAN

Governor Bellmon said Tuesday he cannot agree with certain features of the Defense Department's revision of Army Reserve components and will urge the Oklahoma congressional delegation to continue efforts to bring changes.

He said he and the Oklahoma military affairs steering committee had completed a review of the new plan.

"While we consider some aspects of the plan to have merit," he said, "we are unable to concur with the following features: the elimination of the combat division structures and the inclusion in the National Guard troop list of units having solely administrative and training-type missions.

"It is our contention that the combat division headquarters structures should be retained to perform the management functions envisioned for the State headquarters augmentation, and to be available in case there should be future need for division level tactical headquarters.

"Concerning the units having only administrative and training-type functions (example: training division), since this type unit is not organized or equipped to perform a State militia mission, it would seem much more feasible that such units be administered under a separate reserve arrangement along with the proposed reserve replacement pools."

Governor Bellmon said he plans to bring his idea on the matter to the attention of Governors of the other States.

"However, in the event the Congress should approve the proposed merger, we find the troop structure of the State of Oklahoma to be acceptable."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, Mar. 17, 1965]

ARMY MAY PRESSURE RESERVISTS

WASHINGTON, March 17.—The Army finally has conceded that if it can't get reservists to transfer into the National Guard by persuasion, then it will use pressure.

The method: "attaching" reservists to Guard units, not only for the weeks' summer training, but also for weekly night drills.

Reservists attached to Guard units would get no pay for this duty unless they had been assigned to Reserve units previously.

And regardless of their prior status, they would not be eligible for promotion, nor would they be credited with time served, for retirement purposes, regardless of how long they remained attached to the Guard.

That merger is due to begin July 1, if Congress approves the plan, which is not at all certain.

Defense Secretary McNamara proposes consolidating the Guard and the Reserves, with authorized strengths of 400,000 and 300,000, respectively, into one 550,000 man Reserve component, under Guard control.

But reservists can't be ordered to join the Guard—they must enlist voluntarily.

Army Secretary Ailes acknowledges that if there aren't enough men available to make up the new consolidated 550,000-man Guard, then the "attachment" process will be used.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 last, more than 125 Members of Congress spoke movingly here of the gallant and untiring search for independence by Lithuania.

Because of official business elsewhere, I was unable to join them at that time.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert in the RECORD a splendid editorial from the Schenectady, N.Y., Gazette which bespeaks eloquently my own feeling:

LEST WE FORGET

Many new nations have been created in Africa and Asia in recent decades and have been universally recognized as independent states. But much of the world is overlooking some other nations that have lost their freedom.

Today is the 47th anniversary of Lithuania's previous independence (1918) of the Russian Empire. On this page today is a letter [not printed in RECORD] from Edward W. Baranauskas. It tells how the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia lost their independence. In spite of solemn treaties with the Soviet Union, those states lost their freedom through Soviet aggression and alternate scheming and competition between Stalin and Hitler.

Officially, such loss of freedom did not go entirely unnoticed in our country. In 1940, President Roosevelt told a delegation of Lithuanian-Americans, "The independence of Lithuania is not lost—only temporarily put aside. The time will come when Lithuania will be free again. This may happen sooner than you expect." Almost 25 years have passed since F.D.R. indulged in that optimism, yet Lithuania and her sister Baltic States are still not free, and what is especially saddening to Lithuanians on this anniversary each year is the fact that their native land is all but forgotten by many people while the spotlight is upon the rights and the opportunities of emerging nations in other parts of the world. It is something for Americans of whatever national origin or background to ponder.

Tax Justice for Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to allow more definitive and extensive tax deductions for educational expenses incurred by teachers.

This legislation is necessary, in my opinion, if we are to encourage qualified and experienced teachers to continue in the teaching profession as better trained teachers.

Under existing law and Internal Revenue Service rulings a teacher is only allowed to deduct expenses for education undertaken primarily to first, maintain or improve skills required by present teaching position; or second, meet expressed requirements to retain present salary, status, or position. Furthermore, a teacher must already meet minimum educational requirements of his present position to be eligible for such deductions.

Thus, a teacher with temporary certification generally cannot claim a deduction for expenses incurred to obtain permanent certification, for he has not met minimum requirements of his position. Similarly, those who prepare for college teaching by teaching part time while working toward an advanced degree may not deduct educational expenses under existing law. It is unlikely an instructor could deduct the expenses of additional college courses applicable to a master's degree which might qualify him for an advancement in salary or position. The Treasury Department would question that his goal was not primarily to maintain or improve skills, but to obtain a new position or degree.

These teachers with some teaching experience who might become fully qualified and established in the teaching profession find little encouragement to continue their education under existing tax regulations. Teachers who could apply the benefit of their experience to more specialized instruction or to positions of greater responsibility are discouraged from obtaining the education necessary for advancement. Teachers who take the initiative to become self-improved teachers are often actually penalized by the IRS rulings.

The IRS must follow the letter of the Internal Revenue Code and has tried to provide fair interpretations within these limits. However, there remains extensive confusion and controversy. Such confusion could be eliminated by amend-

ing the law to provide deductions for educational expenses of teachers be based on explicit provisions in the Internal Revenue Code. Furthermore, legislation should be enacted to allow more extensive tax deductions for teachers who are willing to make the necessary effort and investment to become better qualified teachers.

If the bill were enacted teachers would not have to depend upon IRS interpretations nor to contend with necessary delays often involved with IRS rulings to receive tax deductions for educational expenses. It would amend the code with precise language to provide that a teacher if teaching during the taxable year in an institution of higher education, secondary, or elementary school, may deduct expenses incurred for education in an accredited institution of higher education during the taxable year or in any of the 4 preceding years. If the bill were enacted, as long as a teacher continues to teach he would be eligible to deduct educational expenses. Such expenses would include: tuition and fees, expense of travel away from home, and books and educational materials required for a course or degree, and up to $100 per year for related materials and books.

All deductions now allowable for teachers' educational expenses would be continued. In addition, my bill would effect improvements by making additional and more equitable deductions available under the code.

Any teacher would be allowed to deduct educational expenses as long as he was continuing to teach. By way of example:

First. A teacher might return to college for advanced education. Upon resuming teaching, he could deduct up to 4 years of advanced educational expenses—sufficient to obtain an advanced degree.

Second. A teacher could deduct expenses for summer school courses as long as he continued to teach.

Third. Those teaching part time could deduct expenses paid to obtain additional education.

Fourth. The teacher temporarily hired would be allowed to deduct expenses for further education and thus be encouraged to remain in the teaching profession as fully qualified.

Fifth. Deductions allowable for travel would be extended to include travel necessary in connection with a course of study. This would help the teacher working on a thesis or dissertation which requires out-of-school experimentation and fieldwork.

Certainly, this legislation would serve first, to make deductions available to teachers for educational expenses explicit under the Internal Revenue Code—a teacher could go directly to the code to determine such deductions and would not have to contend with the confusion and necessary delay which often accompany IRS tax rulings; second, to provide more extensive and equitable tax deductions for teachers who desire to enrich their teaching experience through additional education; third, to give an added incentive to experienced and qualified teachers to improve their teaching capacity.

The qualified and experienced instructor should be encouraged to advance to more specialized teaching positions or positions of more responsibility.

It is my conviction our educational system can be strengthened substantially through measures which seek to encourage the individual teacher to improve his teaching and administrative capacities and to continue to contribute the benefits of his experience and education to the educational system.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the bill follows:

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the deduction of certain education expenses of teachers.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to trade or business expenses) is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g) and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) CERTAIN EDUCATION EXPENSES OF TEACHERS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If the taxpayer was a teacher during the taxable year, the deduction allowed by subsection (a) shall include any eligible education expense which was paid or incurred by the taxpayer in the taxable year or in any of the 4 preceding taxable years, and which was not deductible under this section in any previous taxable year.

"(2) ELIGIBLE EDUCATION EXPENSE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'eligible education expense' means only an expense paid or incurred after the taxpayer first became a teacher—

"(A) for his—

"(i) tuition and fees,

"(ii) travel away from home, and

"(iii) books and educational materials, required for a course for academic credit at an institution of higher education or for an academic degree at such an institution; or

"(B) for his books and educational materials, if they were related to the subject of any such course.

The amount deductible by reason of subparagraph (B) shall be limited to $100 for each taxable year during which expenses described by such subparagraph were incurred.

"(3) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) The term 'teacher' means an individual compensated for full-time or part-time professional services, related to an instructional program, at an institution of higher education, an elementary school, or a secondary school. Such term includes teachers, librarians, guidance counselors, supervisors, and administrators.

"(B) The term 'institution of higher education' has the same meaning as such term has in the first sentence of section 103(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

"(C) The terms 'elementary school' and 'secondary school' have the same meaning as such terms have in sections 103(g) and 103(h), respectively, of the National Defense Education Act of 1958."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to expenses paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

Representative F. Bradford Morse Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to inform the House that our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative F. BRADFORD MORSE, received the Public Service Award as Legislative Man of the Year from the Air Freight Forwarders Association in New York City on April 9. This award is presented annually to outstanding Members of Congress. The award was presented to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], by Louis P. Haffer, executive vice president of the Air Freight Forwarders Association.

Following the presentation of this award, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], addressed the convention. His remarks paid tribute to the contribution which the airfreight forwarding industry has made to the development of our national transportation system and to foreign trade. I am pleased to insert in the RECORD both Mr. Haffer's remarks and the address given by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman MORSE:

INTRODUCTION OF CONGRESSMAN MORSE BY LOUIS P. HAFFER

It has been truly said that one of the minor paradoxes of life is that only those deserve public recognition who do not really need it.

In the crisis world in which we live, most of our citizenry have awakened from an insular, purely domestic view, and have come to recognize that the rate and direction of economic and political spin, the rate at every corner of the earth, may affect their own balance, indeed their own survival. Among these alert citizenry, our guest and legislative speaker for the evening, the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE, Congressman from the Fifth District of Massachusetts, is very well known. For, now in his third term in the Congress, while not neglecting the local interests of his district, he has elected to make his special field of interest the foreign affairs and the foreign economic policy of our country. He has taken the larger view.

Congressman MORSE first came to Washington as counsel for the Senate Committee on Armed Services in 1953. From 1955 to 1958 he served as executive secretary and chief assistant to LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, then and now the senior Senator from Massachusetts. Thereafter, until he was elected to his first term, he was Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the United States.

Beginning with his very first term he was selected to serve on the important House Foreign Affairs Committee. Both as a member of this committee and as a representative of the whole House he has participated in a number of international conferences abroad. He has attended in an active and official capacity meetings of the Interparliamentary Union in various European countries and the Inter-American Parliamentary Union meetings in various Latin American countries. In each of these meetings he has served with

distinction that has brought him almost unprecedented praise from our national press. These involvements have served to give our guest a deep insight into the problems of other people, their interrelationships with us and ours with them, and the reality of the kinship of all of them with all of us. He has become an acknowledged congressional expert on matters of foreign trade and economic policy in their relation to our total foreign policy. He is widely recognized as one of the hardest working men on Capitol Hill.

In recognition of his eloquent advocacy of the development of international understanding through international trade, in appreciation of his vigorous devotion to a sound foreign economic policy and his championship of independent business, the Air Freight Forwarders Association has voted to pay tribute to Mr. MORSE and to bestow upon him its public service award as Legislative Man of the Year.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN F. BRADFORD MORSE, REPUBLICAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE AIR FREIGHT FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 9, 1965

It is a great honor for me to receive this award from you tonight. I am delighted to be the beneficiary of this recognition from your organization, which commands the respect of the various Government departments and the congressional committees before which it has appeared. I am particularly gratified because, as is my understanding, I am the first Member of Congress from my party to be so honored by your association. Believe it or not, there are still some of us on Capitol Hill, and you are to be congratulated—not on the award to me, but on your awareness of the continued existence of a vital two-party system in this Congress.

It would be pretentious for me to assume or imply that I am here tonight because of any profound knowledge of air transportation and its complex problems. I am not a professional in this field. But on the other hand, no man who serves in the Congress can afford ignorance on this subject in this age of rapid technological developments in air transportation. As far as my other legislative duties have permitted, I have tried to gain insights into this mode of communication which has already revolutionized so much of our national life, and made the concept of one world a reality.

My own part of the country, New England, and particularly the Boston metropolitan area, is an example of the dependence of a region's economy on air transportation. Our air transportation system is now facing many serious problems of attrition, including the potential loss of an important north-south service and a curtailment of the number of class A airports. We in New England cannot afford to, and do not propose to, see our region isolated in a transportation cul-de-sac removed from the mainstream of our Nation's air transportation system. It will take all of our knowledge, and a good deal of our energy, to assure that vital public service is not lost to us in the shuffle.

Speaking only of freight, with which you and your guests are especially concerned, I need not tell you professionals the extent to which the industrial complex of any region depends on an adequate air transportation system for getting its products to the markets of the country and the world—and for receiving in turn the industrial parts and raw materials to keep its factories and laboratories humming. This is particularly important for New England at this time, for we are now experiencing an exciting industrial renaissance. Newly established industries, capitalizing on our rich reserves of skilled manpower and highly trained technicians and scientists, have built new, modern plants, in many instances far outside the principal transportation centers. The products of these plants must be funneled into air transportation in order to be truly competitive with those of other regions.

Your industry serves an important function in making airfreight service available both to our older industries and to these newer ones. Many of you, I know, have offices in a number of principal New England cities, and through your know-how and facility in overcoming both roadblocks and airblocks, you have made yourselves indispensible to our factories and service establishments. And I am well aware of your efforts to render even more efficient service to these outlying industries, not only in New England but in the rest of the country as well, by seeking to broaden the areas of your authorized pickup and delivery operations under your control and geared to airfreight schedules. While recognizing the legal and regulatory problems involved, I would urge all of you to continue your efforts toward this worthwhile goal so that the advantages of expedited airfreight transportation may be extended to most, if not all, places in which the need exists.

I have every reason to feel confident that your relative role in airfreight transportation will grow even larger as the growth of airfreight transportation itself inevitably makes the problems of its use more complex for the shipper, and at the same time opens up new places and new ways for you to serve him.

Especially in the field of international trade and foreign economic policy, a field which occupies much of my legislative time, I have seen firsthand the present contribution of air transportation, and particularly airfreight transportation, to our national goals.

The growth of the Common Market has produced an accelerating increase in both surface and air freight transportation among those countries of Europe which have lifted their trade barriers and merged their economic futures. This economic unification of the Old World has served as a spur to our own American industry to make our products more attractive in price and quality, in order to compete in these markets. At the same time, it has stimulated our search for new sources of trade with countries beyond the Common Market, including those which lie behind the Iron Curtain. I feel that these developments are good, both for the healthy growth of our private enterprise system, and for the encouragement of underdeveloped countries to join us in the family of peaceful and stable nations. You in the air transportation business—forwarders and airlines alike—have been dedicated missionaries in exploring these new markets for our industry and in serving them effectively once they have begun to open up.

There are now pending in both House and Senate a number of bills seeking to lend encouragement to the expansion of our export trade. These will be given full consideration by the Congress, and I hope that we will be successful in enacting legislation to quicken the oversea promotion of American products, sales, and service, while improving our balance of payments. But we must not forget that international trade is a two-way street, and that our foreign economic policy must recognize the fact that foreign nations seek markets here as well. You airfreight forwarders, serving both American shippers in outbound movements and American and foreign shippers on inbound movements as well, can be a particularly appropriate agency in implementing both of these phases of our foreign trade goals.

I am aware that your industry has had many problems. But I also know that during your long maiden voyage, now in its 20th year, you have shaken down most of these difficulties and are now more than ready to take your place as a certified flagship in the fleet of the air transportation industry. You are here to stay. I want to assure you that I will lend every reasonable assistance to insure your continued participation as a valued force in our transportation system.

Again, let me thank you for the award bestowed on me tonight.

The GOP Can Spare Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 4 issue of the Chicago Daily News commenting on the meeting of the Congress of Conservatives in Chicago, sums up what should be done to minimize the effects that such groups may have on the future of our two-party system. I commend the editorial to my colleagues:

THE GOP CAN SPARE THEM

It is not surprising that the movement to form a far-right third party began to fizzle toward the end of last week's Congress of Conservatives in Chicago. The participants themselves, or a few of them at least, must have emerged from a week of nothing but extremist harangues with nagging doubts as to whether a political party could be founded on a platform of such inanities.

There was, of course, a consistent pattern to the inanities; there usually is. If you accept the premise (as Birch Society founder, Robert Welch put it) that "the whole country is one vast insane asylum," and that you and your eye-to-eye friends are the sane minority, then the most colossal misassumptions tend to become reasonable. The conservatives' meeting was strewn with such prodigious assumptions:

There is a Communist master plan calling for an independent Negro-Soviet republic to be carved out of the United States, and the Federal Government is abetting the scheme.

The U.S. Government is plotting to deliver South Vietnam into Communist hands without making it appear that we pushed it.

President Johnson has come closer to being a dictator than any other man in the history of the United States of America.

Civil rights are unconstitutional.

The income tax is a Communist tool.

Civil rights, the income tax, sex perversion, foreign aid, urban renewal, and relief are somehow all tied together in a many-tentacled Red plot, and such men as Chief Justice Warren, General Eisenhower, Henry Cabot Lodge, and, by inference, President Johnson, are fomenting it.

The principal question before the professors of this curious credo, in convention last week, was whether its cause could best be advanced within the Republican Party or outside it.

We wish they had seen fit to break clean with the party of Eisenhower, Lodge, and DIRKSEN, because they have done it too much harm as it is. They may yet elect to set up their own party, of course, having named a five-member committee to study the possibility.

But if they should fail to strike out on their own, the Republican Party should do everything it can to speed them along toward such an undertaking. For it is high time for the GOP to set them off in a corner where they can talk to themselves and each

other without seeming to be part of any serious effort to cope with the all-too-real problems that beset the Nation's course.

Poverty Is an Individual Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, poverty is not a mass condition nor is it possible to cure poverty through programs designed to deal with particular groups or mass numbers of people. Poverty concerns the individual. What would be a comfortable, and highly sought mode of living for one individual or family could be considered living in abject poverty by another. This is the fallacy of determining poverty by decree. Today we set the floor at $3,000 and consider that all those with an annual income of less than that as being poverty stricken. We then attempt to help individuals through programs created to solve a problem based on a false premise.

I am concerned in eliminating poverty wherever it exists, but I believe we should tackle the job in the only way it can be solved, on an individual basis. Basically, the only way society can truly help is to make possible an economic climate in a private enterprise system which will create more jobs and to provide education for those who are not now receiving an adequate education to meet the challenges of this age.

The following editorial, "Curing Poverty," which appeared in the Washington Daily News of May 5, points to the right direction:

CURING POVERTY

Poverty in the United States is not a matter of class, region, or even race. It is a matter of individual people and families, and should be treated as such.

And it cannot be cured by large-scale public works programs or by passing out money in the form of doles. It can be attacked successfully only at the roots, by helping each poor individual develop the skill and opportunity to become a productive citizen.

Those are key points in a report by a U.S. Chamber of Commerce task force which has been studying problems of the poor and methods of alleviating them. They are worthy of serious attention because, as the report points out, we are spending perhaps $50 billion a year combating poverty, much of it with little visible result.

The task force, which includes leading editors, professors, and economists, makes clear it does not oppose efforts to end poverty such as the "war" initiated by President Johnson. In fact, it says this should be a "prime social and national goal." The authors, however, do challenge much of present-day thinking about what poverty is and what to do about it.

One point of attack is the arbitrary defintion of a family with annual income below $3,000 as "poor." As the study indicates, a small family living on a farm and raising its own food might be very comfortable on $3,000, while a big family in New York City certainly would not. Such statistical definitions tend to cause many families to be considered "poor" when they really are not.

Also questioned is the concept that poverty can be eliminated merely by helping certain groups, such as farmers or Negroes. Such mass efforts, the writers contend, may "seal in" the poor and actually perpetuate poverty instead of curing it.

The study calls for much greater efforts by National, State, and local agencies to identify families which are poor in fact—not just in theory—and to learn the causes of their condition.

It would put more emphasis on "human resource development programs"—primarily education and training—and less on such palliatives as road construction, farm price supports, urban renewal, and public housing.

Most of all, it underlines the fact that the real answer to poverty is a creative job opportunity for all who are able and willing to do the work.

Uphold the Law: The Citizen's First Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Miss Jane Immler, of McKinley High School, in Canton, won second place in the Law Day, U.S.A., essay contest sponsored by the Stark County Bar Association last week. Her essay will serve as an inspiration to all who read it, and I am pleased to include it with my remarks as follows:

UPHOLD THE LAW: THE CITIZEN'S FIRST DUTY

(By Jane Immler)

The strongest houses are built of stone. The foundation must be solid, but it is the individual stones, firmly mortared together that make a house sturdy enough to endure the weather and the years.

The United States is a strong old house. It has an unshakable foundation of freedom, and the spirit and energy of its people have mixed to produce a lasting mortar. The elements of its construction responsible for its durability, however, are the stones—the Nation's laws.

No matter how noble the purposes for which a nation is founded, no matter how inspiring and capable its leaders, that nation will crumble without a workable system of laws to outline and direct its government. Even more important, no matter how just or how powerful a law, it can be effective only if the majority of citizens are willing to support that law.

Only through laws has America been able to preserve the cornerstone of our heritage, freedom. We are freemen and proud of it, but we cannot remain free unless the laws are maintained.

Laws are essential to freedom, because they protect the weak. Child labor laws, for example, helped abolish the many social evils afflicting helpless victims.

Laws are essential to freedom, because they protect property. Enforcement of the law makes possible the apprehension of thieves and trespassers.

Laws are essential to freedom, because they protect lives. What security would we have without laws against such crimes as murder and kidnaping?

Life, liberty, and ownership of property are but a few of the basic rights that owe their existence and continuance to laws. These rights are inscribed in glowing terms in the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Bill of Rights, but they are more than just words on paper. They are part of the law, and hence, they are realities. Laws do not restrict, but safeguard our freedom.

However, no man should enjoy the blessings of freedom that this democracy and the laws of the democracy afford him without assuming his share of the burden of maintaining those laws.

Here is where the primary duty of the citizen comes in. If he wants his democratic form of government to survive, if he wishes to retain his precious freedom—he must actively uphold the law. No public official is powerful enough to execute a law unless he has public backing. The responsibility traces back to the individual citizen himself. Each citizen must be held accountable for his own actions. The price of freedom is his to pay.

Freedom involves work. A balanced world depends on each and all of us living up to responsibilities, as well as enjoying rights of "putting in" as well as "taking out." A balanced democracy relies on the same principle.

A citizen "works" to uphold the law by respecting, obeying, defending, and preserving it. The law is the government that makes possible his freedom. He is part of that government—so the law must become part of him.

If, however, the law is disregarded, abused, or allowed to become lax, the citizen must beware the consequences; for he will have no one but himself to blame for them.

Perhaps the clearest way to see the importance of law is to envision a world without it.

Imagine a universe without the natural law which keeps the planets moving in an orderly fashion, each in its appointed path.

Imagine a city without laws to govern traffic, street lighting, and sanitation.

Imagine a nation without laws against murder, theft, and undue seizure of property.

Laws are essential to order. They are the means of establishing control and efficient operation of government. They are an insurance policy protecting the citizen's basic rights. In a democracy such as ours, they prevent the rise of dictatorships and tyrannical rule. They are also a source of the energy which keeps our democracy going.

The United States is a strong old house. It has to be, for it has over 190 million occupants; a number that increase every year. It is a varied combination of styles, from New English to Hawaiian. It has undergone countless renovations and frequent additions. New stones reinforce the old. They make up the walls of a house that survived the storms of two centuries, and promises many more years of service. It has not one, but many caretakers—all those citizens who conscientiously recognize and carry out their duties to keep the house in good repair.

Uphold the law—it is your individual share in the great joint effort to keep America free.

Poverty Program on Lower East Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Post urged in a recent editorial that the Nation's poverty program utilize the services and experience of community groups in its attack on deprivation.

Indeed, this was the intent of Congress in authorizing funds for the program; Congress stipulated that the program be developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served.

One of these groups is the lower East Side action project, which was created in 1962 by a 27-year-old psychologist, Laurence Cole, and his wife, Michelle. In 3 years this group has achieved remarkable results in working with members of a teenage gang. The story of the group's efforts is outlined in a statement by Mr. Cole, which I submit for inclusion in the RECORD. I also offer the Post editorial, titled "Of Poverty, Politics, and People," which mentions the LEAP project in my district as one of the independent agencies which should be recognized as the poverty program is organized.

The statement and editorial follow:

LEAP

The lower East Side action project was opened in the fall of 1962 among the remnants of an abandoned grocery store. It began as a recreational center for neighborhood youngsters when all other agencies were closed or had excluded them as unacceptable. The boys who came in 3 years ago were members of a teen gang of Puerto Rican and Negro boys. They had an extremely antisocial reputation.

They met LEAP and found a flexible yet consistent group of adults who said only that they were there and available. The kids tested and found that these people were indeed available.

The first year, LEAP's members accounted for 24 arrests, mostly for petty crime. Lawyer Arthur J. Gilligan, later to become the chairman of LEAP's board of directors, defended the boys. Usually they had been defended by court-appointed lawyers. Mr. Galligans labors, given without fee, helped to prove to the boys that their isolation was a thing of the past, and their alienation was somehow lessed. The third year of LEAP's existence showed two arrests compared to the 24 the first year for the same group of boys.

Dropouts are back in school. Boys who were experimenting with drugs are no longer doing so. Families who never had the opportunity to really get to know each other did so using LEAP as common ground.

LEAP provides recreational, legal, psychological, vocational, medical, and social services for the boys. It has done this with most professional services donated and with a constantly emptying treasury.

It exists as proof that an organization can emphasized smallness, individual growth, and adult flexibility and achieve the results the large, well-funded statistically-oriented programs only hope for. It exists as a model for many others that will certainly follow LEAP's lead.

LEAP fills a noticeably vacant space in delinquency prevention; the space left vacant by ignoring the expressed needs and aspirations of delinquent and predelinquent youth in favor of the imposition of doctrines from above that are proven in their irrelevance and impatience.

LEAP has proven also that unorthodoxy does not mean irresponsibility. Its active board of directors includes doctors, lawyers, legislators, and people prominent in the social services. It has been made a tax-exempt organization by the Internal Revenue Service and is chartered as a nonprofit corporation by the State of New York.

As a demonstration project LEAP would like to show that its unique approach could be implemented in other areas.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 18, 1965]

OF POVERTY, POLITICS AND PEOPLE

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL has never manifested any profound hostility to the uses of patronage and his crusade against the structure of New York City's antipoverty program will inevitably evoke cynical comment. But the issues raised at the hearings of his Subcommittee on Education and Labor should be not lightly dismissed. The danger that the antipoverty drive may become an aid program for well-fed bureaucrats is a real one; it is well to have the storm signals hoisted now.

Congress, in allocating funds for this national effort, stipulated that it be "developed, conducted and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served." There was valid reason for this provision; it was designed to protect the program from political exploitation and high bureaucratic living.

Obviously some centralized controls are needed. But authentic community representation and participation are essential—in every borough. Such independent agencies as the lower East Side action project and the East Harlem Tenants Council, which have deep local roots and sensitive awareness of neighborhood problems, should be given real recognition; they may have far more to offer than many conventional operations imposed from above.

To the extent that the Powell hearings have focused attention on such matters, they may have salutary results. We hope the spirit of these warnings will be felt in Powell's bailiwick as well as other areas.

Vietnam Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an editorial in the RECORD which appeared in the Denver Post on April 23, 1965. This article points out some things about this country's effort in Vietnam that have frequently been forgotten in recent weeks.

This editorial demonstrates the clear thinking that has long been characteristic of the Denver Post. I recommend it for the reading of all my colleagues:

HOW TO NEGOTIATE BY SHOUTING

One might think, from all the talk and protest meetings in this country, that the North Vietnamese had offered to negotiate an end to the Vietnamese conflict, and that the United States had refused. So perhaps this is a good time to straighten out the record.

First thing to recognize is that negotiations already have started, in a peculiar sort of way. The United States and North Vietnam have been shouting at each other over the roar of battle, as it were, for several weeks now.

What they're doing in this long-range shouting match is dickering over what to negotiate about, and probing for some hint of agreement on what terms they can aim for in negotiations.

So far, if we may use a recently fashionable term, there is not much sign of a consensus.

But it is only fair to say that President Johnson has gone much further in seeking one than have the North Vietnamese. He and he alone has offered "unconditional discussions" on any phase of the conflict, anywhere, at any time. And he alone has offered, in his billion-dollar Mekong Basin development proposal, any view of what a peaceful Vietnamese future might hold.

The North Vietnamese, for their part, have offered only to consider talks if their own four-point peace formula is used as the basis for the talks.

Since a key point of that formula calls for settling the internal affairs of South Vietnam "in accordance" with the program of the National Liberation Front—political arm of the Communist Vietcong—there is little chance of that formula being used.

Only sign, in fact, of any consensus is that both President Johnson and the North Vietnamese have suggested a return to the principles of the 1954 Geneva agreement as a basis for peace. The distance from a consensus may be judged by considering the first section of that agreement, which ended the French Indo-Chinese War.

That section called for temporary division of Vietnam along the 17th parallel, pending general elections in 1956 in both halves of the nation, intended to produce a unified government and country.

Now North Vietnam is insisting on eventual reunification, but President Johnson has come out firmly for an independent South Vietnam.

Also, there is the matter of elections. The Communists contend that the revolt in South Vietnam is due to the refusal of the old Diem regime, backed by the United States, to carry out those elections promised in 1956. This is true.

However, there also have never been any free elections in North Vietnam, nor any offers to hold them. If reports about popular feelings in North Vietnam are true, the Communists are unlikely to consider general elections a fit subject for negotiation.

So much for chances of reviving the Geneva agreement; it is possible, but seems a long way down the road.

In short, that shouting above the roar of battle seems likely to continue for awhile.

Observance of 50th Anniversary of Massacre of Armenians by the Turks

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the year 1965 marks the 50th anniversary of the saddest and most tragic event in the long and proud history of the Armenian people.

The Armenians, although the smallest of the Allied nations to participate in the struggle against Germany and Turkey in World War I, contributed more to the Allied cause in terms of casualties than any other single Allied state, large or small.

More than 1,500,000 Armenians perished during the Turkish genocide in the years 1915–18.

It is important that this event not be allowed to pass without the citizens of the United States of America pausing a moment in tribute to the memory of these martyrs.

It is important that we Americans know that these brave Armenians gave their lives so that the cause of virtuous democratic government, freedom, justice and human rights be served; and in advancing that cause, the Armenian victims advanced the cause of America and that of all freedom-loving countries in this world.

Such great sacrifices and devotion to the cause of freedom must not be forgotten in this year 1965, one-half century removed from the tragic events of 1915.

Unconditional Discussions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to a perceptive editorial on the subject of Vietnam which appeared in the New York Times of April 28, 1965 under the title "Unconditional Discussions."

This editorial makes clear, as I pointed out in the House yesterday commenting on the President's request for a supplemental appropriation, that it is the Communists, not ourselves, who have refused to accept the idea of negotiations on Vietnam without preconditions. The editorial also points out the usefulness of the proposed conference on Cambodia as one which might permit the exploration, at least "in the corridors," of the possibilities of a settlement in Vietnam.

The editorial follows:

UNCONDITIONAL DISCUSSIONS

President Johnson could not have been more emphatic yesterday in reaffirming his proposal of unconditional discussions to seek a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. He defined his proposal, which he said will remin open, as an offer to discuss "any subject and any point of view with any Government concerned * * * anywhere, any time, without any conditions." There is no doubt that the country supports such a policy.

The decisions that lie ahead, unfortunately, are likely to be more complicated. The first response to the President's April 7 offer arrived within 24 hours. It was the public Soviet proposal of a conference on Cambodia which might permit informal talks on Vietnam as well. It was almost 3 weeks later before Washington could decide there were no traps in this offer and could reach agreement with Saigon to accept.

Meanwhile, Peiping, which opposes negotiations, evidently went to work on the Cambodians. Within hours of his talk with Premier Chou En-lai in Jakarta, Prince Sihanouk in mid-April began raising obstacles to the conference he had sought persistently since 1962. The objections of Cambodia's ruler to the participation of Washington and Saigon obviously are designed either to prevent any meeting at all or to force admission of the Vietcong's National Liberation Front, with which neither Washington nor Saigon is willing to talk.

The next move is up to Moscow, which now has Britain's agreement as co-chairman to arrange a meeting of the nine participants to the Geneva parley of 1954. Soviet Minister Gromyko evidently told French leaders in Paris yesterday that Moscow was determined to press ahead with the idea of a Cambodian conference. But until the terms of the Soviet proposal are outlined, it will not be clear whether Moscow is resisting Peiping, yielding to it or seeking some middle course.

The Communists have laid down many conditions for Vietnam negotiations, so many that it is impossible to tell which ones they are serious about. President Johnson indicated yesterday that he is prepared to discuss these and any other subjects with Moscow, Hanoi, and Peiping—without commitment, of course.

If the Communists insist on conditions, they must expect to be confronted with conditions in return. A Cambodian conference would permit this whole problem—and it is a major one—to be explored in the corridors. It is difficult to see how any progress toward peace can be made if the channels to such exploration are kept closed.

Foreign Policy Gains Stature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of Members of the House of Representatives to the editorial of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, of April 24, 1965, entitled "Foreign Policy Gains Stature." This editorial goes far to delineate the administration's commitment of our Nation to freedom and the opportunity for self-determination for any nation in this world.

Our President has courageously led our Nation and the world in this time of stress, even in the face of great pressures that would have him do otherwise.

The editorial follows:

FOREIGN POLICY GAINS STATURE

The firm stand of President Johnson in the agonizing Vietnam crisis, while it has met with criticism in some world areas—as well as at home—has developed a new respect for American foreign policy in the community of nations.

In the face of repeated threats of reprisal from Peiping and Moscow, the President has remained steadfast in his commitment to halt Communist terrorism and aggression in southeast Asia. He has, at the same time, held the door open for negotiation.

The world should entertain no doubts as to America's course and intentions in its challenge to the Red expansionists.

In the past, the United States has been accused of not being tough enough, of condoning anti-American acts by nations and individuals when reprisal would have been justified, and of being a paper tiger in the jungles of aggression.

Mr. Johnson's firm policy has changed all this.

America's friends and enemies—and the neutralists—now can realize that this country's attitude has stiffened toward those who benefit by its aid but feel free to side with adversaries.

Mr. Johnson's canceling of a visit by Pakistan's President Ayub Khan is an example of the toughness that now infuses U.S. foreign policy.

Pakistan's increasing friendliness toward Red China is annoying to the administration. Ayub was not wanted as a guest. He was told so. In earlier days, Ayub would have been welcomed despite his admiration for enemies of the United States.

An unfortunate aspect of the snub to Ayub was India's coupling the cancellation with a U.S. request to Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri to postpone his visit to Washington until later this summer.

The administration purportedly did not want Shastri here while the foreign aid debate was in progress lest some remark made by him would jeopardize an aid allotment for India.

India resented Shastri being linked with Ayub and suspected the visit delay was a reprisal for Shastri's Vietnam views, which are critical of U.S. policy, especially the northern bomb raids.

It is to be hoped that the Indian misunderstanding can be cleared up. But India should get the hint that there is a hazard in trying to work both sides of the street.

Departure of the United States from its nice guy role in world affairs is a heartening development. It was not endearing the Nation to its friends or gaining the respect of its enemies.

Uphold the Law: A Citizen's First Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Miss Virginia Fohl, a student at Stark County's Perry High School, was author of the essay that won third prize in the Law Day, U.S.A., essay contest sponsored by the Stark County Bar Association. The essay has a message to all young Americans:

UPHOLD THE LAW: A CITIZEN'S FIRST DUTY

From the beginning of civilization, man has recognized the need for laws to maintain and develop his civilizations. From the 10 Commandments to the 12 Tables of Rome, through the Magna Carta, and down to our own Constitution of the United States, men have been governed by laws. Even in ancient eras, laws were unavoidably necessary to hold in check those who would have otherwise encroached upon the rights of others. They were necessary to insure safety, to prevent conflicts, to determine ownership, and to set up lines of succession. Man often chafed under rules, but the successful man learned to abide by them, and he expected his neighbors to obey them also.

Especially in today's world, in which the Common Market has expanded, the Communist satellite nations have begun to assert themselves, and in which the number of new nations in Africa keeps increasing, is upholding the law important, for all of them are looking to the United States for guidance. Because of our prominence as a world power, these nations are following our example.

The U.S. Constitution is one of the most important documents in the world; it guarantees every citizen the right to vote, to bear arms, and to pursue happiness. Foreign countries might be persuaded to incorporate some of its ideas into their own constitutions, if these nations felt our Constitution has produced results. If these observers see a nation where each citizen respects his fel-

lows, where men and women are safe from harm on the streets at any time night or day, where property rights are regarded as sacred and private; these countries will be more likely to provide these privileges for their own citizens. But, if these interested nations see a republic where robberies occur daily, where the inhabitants brag about evading taxes or escaping the police; they will form a much different opinion. We will have created in them a contempt and disrespect for the U.S. citizenry and its Government. Since the exchange students and businessmen who come here may well be future presidents and prime ministers; we, as citizens, want them to remember us as a country of exemplary citizens. The easiest and foremost way for residents to create a wholesome image is to support the laws enthusiastically.

The field of international relations is not the only one affected, however. Statewide we are hurt by lawbreakers too. Any picnicker who has stopped at one of Ohio's roadside parks has noticed that the tables have been chained to the ground so that they will not be carried off. What tourist has not seen the refuse of those irritating litter bugs who frequent our park systems or the vulgar sayings blatantly scribbled in red crayon on the walls of public monuments? The thoughtless folks who did these deeds have taken away much of the pleasure of visiting State memorials. If residents would comply with regulations these areas could be enjoyed by all and the money saved from repairs could be used to create new recreation spots. The citizen must learn to think first of respecting the law and second of his own momentary pleasure in destroying property.

The welfare of our own community is dependent upon our own attitudes toward the laws, too. If a member of the community does not support the law, he is not merely breaking an ordinance, but is injuring the liberty or rights of another individual. If one driver exceeds the speed limit on the expressway, he is endangering the lives of other motorists; if one storekeeper opens in a residentially zoned district, he is invading the privacy of the neighborhood; if one customer slips a bag of potato chips into her purse without paying, she makes the entire clientele suffer. Each of these events by itself may seem trifling to a few people, but each act in turn tempts someone to repeat or expand the violation. Each offense breaks down the fine system which insures the populace of its rights and privileges. In a material sense, each infraction results in higher prices, stiffer fines, and in increased taxes; in an ethical sense, it signifies a moral decay.

A citizen can combat this effectively by his determination to see that the regulations are carried out. First each individual should realize that the laws were made for his protection and that it is in his best interest to obey them. Secondly, he should strive to convince his associates to do the same, for a rule is ineffective if it is not followed by all. Thirdly, he should be willing to assist in any manner necessary those who are responsible for enforcing the law. If he does this, the citizen will find that his community will thrive, his children will have a safer place to grow up in, and he will be able to enjoy the prosperity and privileges he has earned.

It has been said that nations are not destroyed by invasions, but from decline within. A country which has a strong framework of laws will not easily be thrown over, and a country whose citizens uphold and defend those laws has erected a structure which will withstand any wind or blow without a waver. The law is our shield, but a shield is of no value if not used properly. Thus it is imperative that we uphold the law; if we do so our future will be protected, for a country which is strong will not soon perish; a country whose inhabitants respect the law will be respected; and a country whose citizens honor the law will be honored.

Hail to a Heroine: Tusha Helena Sobek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, a nation is only as strong as the individual citizens who comprise it. When individual morality weakens, so also does the fiber of the body politic. But when individuals take full responsibility for their own actions and for the well-being of others, in the same measure do they enrich the integrity and the stature of their country.

Recently, a conference was held at the University of Chicago Law School to discuss the problem of the "bad Samaritan," the individual who ignores the urgent plight of strangers in peril. At this conference, an international panel of scholars discussed the paradox that in the United States not only has there been a marked increase in the tendency of citizens to turn their backs on others, but also our legal structure puts obstacles in the path of those who would extend a helping hand.

Time and again good citizens have tried to be of assistance to their fellow man only to find that they have opened themselves to the possibility of lawsuits. In the opinion of the 11-man Chicago panel, proper changes in the law could reinforce and underwrite a moral feeling that people should be good samaritans if they can.

After seeing the grim evidence of man's indifference to others in the report of a conference such as this one, it is refreshing to learn of the heroic actions of a young school girl from Lees Summit, Mo., who through her presence of mind and personal courage averted a potential tragedy involving many schoolchildren.

Last November, Tusha Helena Sobek, a member of the schoolbus patrol, climbed on to a schoolbus taking her to the St. John la Lande Catholic School in Blue Springs, Mo. When the bus driver suddenly blacked out on a down hill grade on Colburn Road, Tusha realized the danger to the busload of children. She quickly took a position beside the driver, placed her foot over his on the brake pedal, and brought the bus to a timely halt. But for her quick thinking, Tusha and 12 classmates might have suffered serious injury.

Mr. Speaker, Tusha Sobek's heroism has not gone unnoticed. Through the efforts of Sister Mary Bernadette, principal of the St. John la Lande School, the American Automobile Association has awarded her the national school patrol Lifesaver Award. This morning I had the extreme pleasure and privilege to attend a ceremony in the White House at which President Johnson personally awarded Tusha and 12 other young American heroes gold medals for their courageous action in protecting others from danger. Thus Tusha has joined the honored roll of 113 individuals who have been awarded the school patrol Lifesaver Medal since 1949.

I wish to commend to my colleagues the example this young sixth-grader has set. Just as a single candle can cast away the darkness, so do the actions of this good Samaritan provide a model of personal responsibility and good citizenship for others to follow. Our country has a brighter future if we of the older generation can deliver it into hands such as these.

Under previous leave granted me, I include herewith an excellent article about Tusha, written by Miss Margaret Olwine, a member of the staff of the Kansas City Star:

DECISIONS COME EASY FOR HEROINE

(By Margaret Olwine)

"I was talking to this boy sitting next to me, but I kept watching the bus driver.

"He started coughing and coughing and he couldn't stop. His neck got real red. Then he sort of slumped over the wheel and the bus started swerving over toward a big ditch on the left side of the road, so I ran up and stepped on the brake."

DADDY'S TIP HELPED

"It wasn't hard. My daddy showed me where the brake is lots of times."

Thus Tusha Sobek yesterday described the quick-thinking act which likely saved the lives of herself and 12 classmates. All were students at St. John la Lande school in Blue Springs.

The incident occurred last November. This week it won the self-possessed 12-year-old a national gold Lifesaver Medal from the American Automobile Association and a trip to Washington.

The eastern Jackson County girl will be 1 of 13 children in the country who will receive the Lifesaver Award this year. And, according to AAA officials here, she is the first child in the Greater Kansas City area ever to be so honored in 33 years of participation.

MAY SEE PRESIDENT

Tusha will receive her award in Washington May 6—probably from President Lyndon B. Johnson. Two days later she will march in the 30,000-member national school safety patrol parade down Pennsylvania Avenue.

She has been a safety patrolman at St. John la Lande for 2 years.

The tall blond youngster has been enjoying the attention she has been receiving since the news of her selection was released Monday.

"I'll be a celebrity at Camp Fire Girls meeting tonight," she remarked mischievously.

Then, with a characteristic turn to seriousness, she said, "I wish Sister Mary Bernadette could go with me to Washington."

Sister Mary Bernadette is the principal of St. John la Lande. It was she who did not quite let die the memory of Tusha's brave act. She sent an account of the incident to the AAA in response to a standard letter about the safety award which was sent to 300 area schools.

HAD TO BE REPORTED

"It was so courageous and so brave for one so young, I thought it should surely be reported," the slender, brown-eyed nun said. "But after that, we had a nightmare trying to get substantiating evidence."

Tusha not only stopped the bus and aroused the busdriver, who then applied the emergency brake. She also hailed a pickup truck which had been following it, and asked

the driver to trail them, should the driver suffer a relapse.

Sister Mary Bernadette, Tusha's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Sobek, and other friends spent several days at AAA request, trying to locate the pickup truck driver in order to document this aspect of Tusha's actions.

"But the man was never found, and we didn't really think Tusha would be considered," Sister Mary Bernadette concluded. "We are so happy she won, and it's a great honor for our school."

As for Tusha's family, her mother summed it up.

"She's the eldest of six children, all born before she was 9. She's been changing diapers adn making decisions since she was 5; and frankly, she's more competent than I am."

Why America Fights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of Thursday, April 29, 1965:

WHY AMERICA FIGHTS

This newspaper has a deep and abiding horror of war. Throughout its more than 56 years, it has consistently urged the cause of peace, of conciliation, of negotiation, and of arbitration. It has strongly supported those international and national bodies sincerely dedicated to ending and outlawing warfare. It will continue to follow this course.

History has abundantly shown, however, that peace is not attained through submission before aggression. With aggression it is often wisest to take the course outlined by Shakespeare and "take arms against a sea of troubles, and by opposing end them." This is the course which Washington has followed in Vietnam.

Despite the difficulties of this war, despite a considerable measure of international opposition, despite the perils which surround this course, and despite the moral obligation to continually seek for ways to end the conflict honorably and fruitfully, we believe that the United States is justified in its armed support of South Vietnamese territorial and political integrity. This is why:

The United States cannot go back on its word to a nation which, as Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara said, is "suffering casualties at rates higher than we have ever experienced in our history."

Communism's appetite for territorial expansion in southeast Asia appears insatiable. It must be prevented from swallowing those upon whom its appetite rests.

To Communist China accommodation is weakness. As things are now to withdraw from Vietnam would be to encourage Chinese ambitions against her neighbors.

To withdraw from Vietnam would be to leave a neighboring nation such as Thailand—already being subjected to Communist infiltration—justifiably disillusioned with the worth of America's word and of the force of America's assurance of help.

To withdraw in the face of Communist aggression would be to face the probability of having to take a stand later under even less favorable conditions.

There is no other nation in the free world which has the physical capacity to stand against the tide of Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

Despite the considerable degree of international misunderstanding regarding America's role in Vietnam, we believe that the U.S. prestige—a prestige important in the defense of freedom and democracy—would suffer disastrously on every continent from a withdrawal under present circumstances.

This does not mean that we believe that, in every instance, American actions in Vietnam have been wise. We feel that opportunities have been missed to help the South Vietnamese create a national government with wide popular support. Washington has clearly done an inadequate job of explaining its position and purpose both to the world at large and to public opinion at home. We feel that Washington could have done more to encourage its friends—such as United Nations Secretary-General U Thant, British Prime Minister Harold Wilson, and Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson—to explore ways of getting peace talks under way.

But it does mean that we support the present course of resisting aggression and trust that it will be combined with a ceaseless quest for an early and stable peace.

Cushing Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein the text of a resolution congratulating the outstanding coeducational secondary school, Cushing Academy, which is located in the town of Ashburnham, Mass., now celebrating its centennial, upon its services, efforts, and contributions in the field of education.

I may state that Cushing Academy is one of the great preparatory schools of our country. It stands in the foremost rank of schools devoted to preparation of our youth for college and other institutions of higher learning.

This centennial celebration is indeed a very gratifying and proud one, since it marks an era in the history of Cushing and our Nation which has seen this great school make tremendous contributions to the education of our youth and to the welfare and well-being of our country.

I am proud indeed of this great school and happy to take this opportunity in the House to extend my heartiest congratulations to Headmaster Bradford Lamson and everyone associated with the great educational institution which is Cushing Academy, and to offer my commendations as well for the the gleaming record of accomplishment which Cushing has achieved throughout the years.

May I also express the fervent wish and prayer that Cushing's epochal work may continue in the future with unabated effectiveness and ever-widening scope.

There are many people to thank for Cushing's unexcelled contributions, and it is not possible for me to enumerate all of them in these remarks. Such great names as Wayland, Bullock, Lowe, Coolidge, Dunn, Booth, Pierce, Vose, Cowell, Quimby, and many others are associated with Cushing's magnificent history over the last 100 years.

In the modern era of Cushing so well exemplified by Headmaster Lamson and his colleagues, one would inevitably have to recall the outstanding, dedicated services of the distinguished former headmaster, Dr. Clarence P. Quimby, who had so much to do with shaping the modern educational patterns of the school, and Mrs. George R. Wallace of Fitchburg whose generosity has been truly magnificent. To be sure, there are other great educational leaders and faculty members, trustees, and a host of individuals who have by their ability, devotion, and generosity rendered invaluable contributions to Cushing.

It is noteworthy that Dr. Quimby during his regime secured national recognition for his superb leadership and his successful efforts in advancing the interests and the stature of the school in innumerable, commendable ways.

On this occasion, it is only fitting that we should express our deep gratitude to all these men and women of Cushing whose unselfish, dedicated, capable service and leadership have been helpful in reaching the very high goals of scholarship and standing that Cushing has achieved.

For their splendid contributions that have been made throughout the years by very many persons, including many generations of trustees, notably the present board, the present headmaster, and the faculty, and the headmaster and faculties throughout the years, whom we can never forget, it is surely most appropriate that we should tender our sentiments of esteem and gratitude on this centennial observance.

Let me reiterate that, in tendering my heartiest congratulations and best wishes to Cushing and all its sons and daughters upon its great anniversary, I am proud to hail and salute this magnificent secondary school which stands like a beacon light in the educational world.

Deeply moved with pride and appreciation, may I hope and pray today that Cushing Academy may endure until the end of time, spreading its wonderful influence, as it has done in the past, over countless generations of our youth, yet unborn, never widening and deepening its contributions to community, State and Nation, and ever strengthening the insoluable bonds of affection which link this great school so closely to its proud, distinguished alumni.

As Congressman of the Third Massachusetts District, where Cushing Academy is located, I join proudly and joyfully in this wonderful centennial observance of Cushing Academy and extend my warm greeting, regards, and best wishes to its alumni, its many friends and admirers throughout the Nation and the world. Long live Cushing Academy.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include a resloution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing and hailing Cushing Academy for its accomplishments in the field of education and public service, and extending best wishes in its future endeavors, and a resolution I have

introduced in the House of the same tenor:

RESOLUTIONS CONGRATULATING CUSHING ACADEMY ON ITS SERVICES, EFFORTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

Whereas Cushing Academy was founded with funds available from the estate of Thomas Parkman Cushing of Ashburnham and Boston "* * * for the promotion of so important an object as that of improving the education, and thus strengthening and enlarging the minds of the rising and future generations."; and

Whereas the academy was chartered by the great and General Court of Massachusetts on May 15, 1865, opening its doors to students approximately 10 years later on September 7, 1875, with first Principal Edwin Pierce (1875–78); first chairman of the board of trustees, the Reverend Francis Wayland (1865–67); fourth president of Brown University; and second chairman of the board of trustees, Gov. Alexander H. Bullock (1867–76), Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

Whereas administrators and faculty have been active in civic and church affairs in the town of Ashburnham and the Commonwealth. Principals Hervey S. Cowell and Clarence P. Quimby served as town moderators for significant periods of time. Cowell ran for Governor on the State Prohibition ticket; and

Whereas the academy served a dual role up to the mid-1950's by providing the secondary education needs of the town while serving as one of New England's leading independent schools and has attracted students to the Commonwealth from all over the world while, from year to year, more than half of the student population comes from Commonwealth communities; and

Whereas, in 1875, 122 students enrolled; in 1964, there are 252. The academy has grown from 1 major building to one with 12 major buildings on a 36-acre campus; and it continues to grow in excellence and greatness towards its continuing goal of maintaining the best in coeducational secondary education: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth hereby commends Cushing Academy for its accomplishments in the field of education and extends best wishes in all their future endeavors.

Adopted December 3, 1964.

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

H. RES. 373

Whereas the year 1965 marks the 100th anniversary of the granting of the charter of Cushing Academy of Ashburnham, Massachusetts, by the Great and General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

Whereas from the time of its founding, the trustees, faculty, and students of Cushing Academy have figured conspicuously in the growth, development, and defense of this great Nation; and

Whereas Cushing Academy is one of the Nation's oldest independent, coeducational, secondary boarding schools with more than 250 students from all parts of the world; and

Whereas the observance of Cushing Academy's Charter Year Centennial is being celebrated on Saturday, May 8, 1965, with impressive festivities and ceremonies with alumni, parents, college and secondary school educators, local, State, and National public officials, and friends of Cushing Academy in attendance; and

Whereas Cushing Academy is an outstanding educational institution, well known for its patriotic contributions, noted for its many famous sons and daughters who have distinguished themselves in many fields of endeavor and many facets of American life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the trustees, faculty, students, and friends of Cushing Academy on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the granting of its charter and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid educational services rendered to the Nation by Cushing Academy since its founding.

Let Us Proceed Cautiously: The Road Ahead Is Treacherous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious proposals facing this Congress is the attempt to circumscribe the appellate jurisdiction of the Federal court system.

The proposals now being considered are, to me, deficient both in merit and in method.

The Washington Evening Star, of April 16, 1965, carried an editorial cogently putting forth the dangers of the idea to limit appellate jurisdiction.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial and commend it to my colleagues:

PANDORA'S BOX

Article V of the Constitution provides two means of initiating constitutional amendments. In the one instance, Congress may propose amendments by a vote of two-thirds of both Houses. The other requires Congress, on petition by two-thirds of the States, to call a convention for the purpose of proposing amendments. And the use of this second device, in all the years since the Constitution was drafted in 1787, has never been more than a remote possibility—until now.

Within the last few months, the controversy over the Supreme Court ruling on reapportionment has enticed a steadily increasing number of State legislatures, nearly all of them rurally dominated, to approve resolutions petitioning Congress to call a constitutional convention. Their purpose is exactly the same as that of the Dirksen amendment in the Senate—to overturn the Court's requirements that both houses of State legislatures must be chosen on a basis of population.

The rollcall of States in this camp at the moment is hard to pin down precisely. For while most of the resolutions are identical, in a few instances they are not. And this has cast doubt over the effectiveness of those few exceptions. The number of valid petitions, however, appears to be between 20 and 25. And since only 34 are required under article V to compel Congress to call a convention, that goal is neither remote nor unattainable.

We do not believe there is merit in allowing one house of a bicameral State legislature to avoid equitable representation under any amendment procedure. But putting that argument aside for the moment, we are confident that the constitutional convention avenue is the wrong way to approach the problem.

Our Constitution has held up remarkably well over the past 178 years. And one reason for this is that the changes in it generally have been made in a responsible spirit.

What would happen, however, in the case of a constitutional convention? How would its delegates be chosen? Who would they be? What would they vote on? How far would their authority extend? Above all, could Congress limit the area of their deliberations? The Constitution is silent on all these questions. Presumably, as the convening agent, Congress would define specific purposes, powers and limitations. But more than one political scientist is bothered, for good reason, about what might actually occur.

Suppose, for example, there were a runaway convention. Suppose the delegates simply should choose not to abide by the rules set for them. It is not hard to imagine the desires, or the pressures, once this powerful body were in session, to make many changes in many things. And there assuredly would be no guarantee, if this should happen, that these pressures would be to the liking of the conservatives who are now pressing so hard for this device.

The substantial coalition of political forces which is attempting to maintain the status quo in at least one house of our State legislatures is banking its main stack of chips, of course, on the Dirksen amendment—which follows the traditional procedure for constitutional amendment. But if this should fail during the current session, the pressures are certain to mount along the second line of attack.

We hope, in such event, that a sufficient number of States will have the good sense to back off, and to refrain from opening this Pandora's box.

In Commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the Armenian Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to join with my colleagues in the House, and with thousands of fellow American citizens of Armenian descent, in commemorating the 50th anniversary of the tragic massacre and attempted extermination of the Armenian people by officials of the Ottoman Empire.

The great crime of 1915 resulted in the almost unbelievable torture and death of an estimated 1½ million Armenians and the deportation of some 1 million more from their ancestral homeland under conditions so incredibly inhuman as to shock the sensibilities of the entire world.

Never before in the recorded annals of history had a crime of such enormity and viciousness been so coldly conceived and deliberately executed by a government of supposedly civilized men.

The Armenian genocide was a crime against humanity that staggers the imagination when we try to realize the magnitude of the atrocities committed against this ancient and honored people.

It is a tribute to the unyielding determination, great strength of character, and deep spiritual faith of the Armenian

people that they have survived such a shocking and ghastly experience.

Indeed, though the members of the Armenian community are now scattered throughout the world, they have been able to preserve the essential values of their ancient heritage, while contributing outstanding leadership to the business, civic, political, and cultural life of their adopted homelands.

We, in the United States, are particularly fortunate in having some 400,000 Armenian-Americans in our midst, for they have added much to the ethnic and cultural diversity that has made America great.

Almost one-third of these American citizens of Armenian descent have settled in my home State of California, many in our own Los Angeles area, where they have achieved a proud and respected place in our communities.

With this in mind, I especially want to join with them today in honoring the memory of the hundreds of thousands of Armenian men, women, and children who lost their lives in the unspeakable tragedy of 50 years ago.

As a further mark of respect and esteem, I would like to include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD four recent newspaper articles commemorating this most sorrowful anniversary. The articles are: "Rites Will Memorialize Massacre of Armenians," Los Angeles Times, April 24, 1965; "Armenians Haunted by Massacre 50 Years Ago," Los Angeles Times, April 25, 1965; "Out Of Smoldering Ashes," the Armenian Mirror-Spectator, April 24, 1965; and "Armenia Remembers," New York Times, April 24, 1965:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Apr. 24, 1965]

RITES WILL MEMORIALIZE MASSACRE OF ARMENIANS—SERVICES SCHEDULED AT MANY SOUTHLAND CHURCHES TO MARK ANNIVERSARY OF TRAGEDY

The 50th anniversary of the massacre of many thousands of Armenian Christians by Turkish troops will be marked in the southland this weekend.

Clergymen of all faiths have been invited to a 1 p.m. ceremony today on the city hall steps.

A memorial Mass will be celebrated at 10:45 a.m., Sunday, at St. Vibiana Cathedral. Other services will be conducted at 1 p.m. at the St. Sophia Greek Orthodox Cathedral.

The Very Reverend Clement Morian, of the Armenian Catholic Church, will conduct the St. Vibiana services. The Very Reverend Sumbat Lapajian of the Armenian Apostolic Church, will lead the St. Sophia observance.

ST. PAUL'S SERVICE

At 1:30 p.m. there will be a memorial church service at St. Paul's Episcopal Cathedral, 615 South Figueroa Street, under auspices of the diocese of the Armenian Church of California, with Bishop Torkom Manoogian, primate, officiating and preaching.

Archbishop Vartan Kasparian will preside and the Reverend J. Ogden Hoffman, Jr., director of the department of Christian education for the Episcopal diocese, will represent the Right Reverend Francis Eric Bloy, bishop, and speak.

TV PROGRAM SET

Others will include the parish priests of four churches taking part: St. James' of Los Angeles; St. Peter's, Van Nuys; St. Sarkis', East Los Angeles, and St. Gregory's, Pasadena.

A program commemorating the event will begin at 7 p.m. Sunday at the Ambassador's embassy room. At 10 p.m. there will be a half-hour documentary on the anniversary televised over KCOP (13).

The event commemorated began April 24, 1915, and continued, according to one report, for 5 years, resulting in the destruction of much of the Armenian population in what was called Western Armenia.

Some sources put the figure of the slain at 1.5 million.

Vasken I, supreme patriarch of all Armenians, has called for this to be a year of national mourning and prayer, special observances to take place today and Sunday, that a lamp of perpetual light be placed before altars everywhere, and that other steps be taken to commemorate the tragedy.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Apr. 25, 1965]

ARMENIANS HAUNTED BY MASSACRE 50 YEARS AGO—HISTORICAL TRAGEDY IN WHICH AN ESTIMATED 1.2 MILLION DIED IS MARKED AROUND WORLD

(By David Lancashire)

BEIRUT, LEBANON.—"The soldiers came one morning and led my father and my two brothers outside the town and shot them. A few days later the police ordered my mother and me and my two sisters to leave our house.

"Everyone left in the town was marched out. We walked for weeks. My mother and my sister died on the way. My other sister was pretty and a policeman took her and I never saw her again. I was the only one who survived."

The speaker was a white-haired Armenian woman, her face a lacework of blue tattoos from the desert tribe that adopted her 50 years ago. What she survived was the massacre of Armenian Christians in Turkey, an historical tragedy being marked this weekend around the world.

MASSIVE SLAUGHTER

Hundreds of elderly Armenians in the Middle East recount the same haunting memories, for the slaughter was so massive it wiped out almost half the Armenian population of Turkey. Historical estimates say as many as 1.2 million Armenians died from bullets, bayonets, starvation, or exposure, and countless women vanished into harems.

U.S. Ambassador Henry Morgenthau protested in 1918 that the atrocities "surpass the most beastly and diabolical cruelties ever before perpetrated or imagined in the history of the world."

"The world remembers the Jews of Nazi Germany and the Arabs of Palestine, but we are the forgotten refugees," muses a gnarled priest in Beirut. "Our lands are gone, we have had no reparations, and Turkey has never even laid a wreath for the Armenians."

LONG TO RETURN

"The Armenians have settled down around the world and we are doing well," says a village chief. "Here, in fact, we are better off than in our old homes. But we long to return to our country."

Almost 4.5 million Armenians remain in the world today: 3 million in the Soviet Union, 350,000 in the United States, 150,000 in Europe, and about 480,000 in the Middle East. An estimated 85,000—of the original 2.7 million—remain in Turkey.

A brief list of prominent Armenians—usually identifiable by names ending in "yan" or "ian"—transcends the Iron Curtain: President Anastas I. Mikoyan of the Soviet Union; Paul Ignatius, U.S. Assistant Secretary of the Army; Gregory Peter Cardinal Agagianian of the Vatican, French singer Charles Aznavour, American writer William Saroyan, supermillionaire Nubar Gulbenkian, and playwright-director, Elia Kazan.

SPECIAL PRAYERS

To commemorate the 50th anniversary of the 1915 massacres, Armenians from the United States to the Soviet Union, from Australia to Egypt, will devote special prayers today.

In Lebanon, where 130,000 Armenians have settled, marriage feasts have been cancelled and the usually joyous Easter celebrations were toned down for a mourning period.

The Turkish Embassy here, whose Government regards the Armenian slayings as an affair of the old Ottoman Empire and not of modern Turkey, has quietly expressed fear that today's commemoration could lead to trouble or violence by the Armenians.

The story of Armenia is a story of trouble. Built 22 centuries ago around what is now the frontier between the Soviet Union and Turkey, Armenia was the world's first nation to adopt Christianity as a state religion, 300 years after Christ.

THREAT TO GOVERNMENT

When World War I erupted and Armenia was no longer a nation, the ruling Moslem "young Turks" claimed the Armenian Christians, with their revolutionary parties, were a threat to the Turkish Government.

Official British documents from 1918, however, argue that the Armenians were at first ardent supporters of the young Turks, and Armenians "were kindling the essential spark of life energy * * *" in the country, dominating Turkey's commerce, industry, finance, and intellectual life.

World War I, some historians contend, was not the cause of the massacres, but an opportunity for the Turkish rulers to wipe out Armenian demands for equality and reform.

On the night of April 24, 1915, 300 Armenian leaders were executed and deportations began.

FEW SURVIVED MARCHES

British documents and an account by historian Arnold Toynbee are filled with phrases such as "exterminated by the most cold-blooded and fiendish methods," or "death of unspeakable horror."

While the men were executed, entire villages of women and children were marched 500 miles or more on foot to the deserts of Syria or Iraq. Few survived. Many committed suicide. Criminals were released from prison to escort the convoys. Raiders attacked them from the hills.

Women were raped, sold or given away along the route. Children were murdered, babies were born and died by the track. The Italian consul general at Rebizond wrote of 8,000 Armenians being herded aboard ships and drowned in the Black Sea. Caravan routes were lined with corpses. A convoy which started with 18,000 from Malatya arrived at Aleppo with only 150 alive.

SOME CHILDREN SAVED

Many perished from disease and exhaustion once they reached the barren desert camps. Some children were saved by Arab tribes who adopted them.

Only in a few places, such as the villages of Musa Dagh, did the Armenians manage to fight back. Their fight became known to the world through Franz Werfel's historical novel "The 40 days of Musa Dagh."

"We received the order for deportation and we knew what that meant," recalls Serop Sherbetjian, a 72-year-old villager who was one of the Musa Dagh leaders. "We preferred to die and we thought we would. We planned to drown our women and children in the sea but instead our 600 armed men held off the Turkish army for 40 days.

"Then a French warship saw our signal—a Red Cross flag made from bed sheets and underwear—and French ships came and took us to Egypt. About 4,500 of us go out."

FAR FROM UNITED

Despite their background of common hardship, the Armenians are far from united. Sometimes violent divisions exist among three political parties, with much of the

argument focused on their attitude toward Soviet Armenia.

Even their Christianity is divided, with Roman Catholic, Orthodox and Protestant churches, and the Orthodox Church has been split for almost 500 years with two patriarchs. While many Armenians today accept Catholicos Vazken I of Soviet Armenia as their spiritual leader, others regard Catholicos Khoren I of Cilicia, who lives in Lebanon, as king of the Armenians.

During the massacres, about 180,000 Armenians crossed into Russia, and the Communist regime has preserved a part of the Armenian homeland. In 1947, the Soviet Union invited Armenians to emigrate there and from Lebanon and Syria alone, 40,000 answered the call. Many sent back coded letters saying they were disillusioned by life under the Communists, but none has been permitted to leave.

LOYAL CITIZENS

The last prime minister of the independent Armenia which had a brief existence after World War I, Simon Vratsian, a frail, 83-year-old school teacher in Beirut, says:

"The Armenians of the Soviet Union are loyal, obedient citizens, but they are not reconciled to the regime. Armenians in the United States are also good American citizens, but every Armenian remains an Armenian patriot. We still believe one day we will return to a truly independent Armenia. This is the spirit which keeps us alive."

[From the Armenian Mirror-Spectator, Apr. 24, 1965]

OUT OF SMOLDERING ASHES

The Armenian people in Turkish-occupied Armenia had existed in the numbness of a virtual state of slavery since 1375, when the last Armenian kingdom in Cilicia fell prey to the invading Memelouks. In the 19th century, after the influx of Western ideas of liberty and democracy into the country, the leaders of the Armenians awakened, and there was a general stir and cry for reform and for a limited amount of self-determination. The alternatives were eternal slavery or death.

The Turkish Government since Sultan Hamid had chosen to close the Armenian question by the alternative of death. After sporadic massacres in the 19th century in which many thousands of Armenians were killed by the Turks, the great crime began in 1915, 7 years after the young Turk Government had declared a new constitution promising "liberty, equality, and fraternity." Talaat Bey, Minister of the Interior, together with Enver and Jemal, headed the Government. They, with the consent and encouragement of many Turkish officials, started the deportations and atrocities. Talaat gave the orders.

April 24, 1915, is the day on which hundreds of Armenians leaders in Istanbul were taken into Government custody and killed. The marches in the interior provinces that soon engulfed all villages, towns, and cities, had already begun, and although there was Armenian defense in many areas, 1½ million Armenians succumbed to slaughter, after tortures and atrocities. The massacres continued after 1918, when the mask of World War I was gone, in Transcaucasia under the leadership of Kemal.

The Turkish Government had its way in the complete domination and usurpation of the western part of the Armenian historical homeland and part of eastern Armenia. Other Christian nations and people who had shown some sympathy to Armenians previously, ignored the Armenocide and did not interceded on behalf of Armenians, though they acknowledged with gratitude the help of many Armenian soldiers that fought for the Allies. There were notable exceptions, men who tried to stop the massacres or to aid the Armenian cause, men such as Dr. Lepsius, Lord Bryce, Gladstone, Morgenthau, Nansen, Woodrow Wilson, and others.

The Armenians in Armenia and those in the dispersion have not forgotten their friends; nor have they forgotten their Turkish enemies; nor shall they ever forget their martyrs. On this, the 50th anniversary of the great crime, they remember that lives, homeland, and $35 billion in savings and property were lost to the grace of the Turkish Government and mob. They remember that the world has not yet recognized the need for restitution, and that Turkey itself will never even admit its crime and its present distortions of history. These Armenians feel that the cause of justice is never outdated.

And they realize that out of the smoldering ashes and the bodily ruins of death and decay, a small Armenia was born and has made tremendous progress and contributions to the universal cause of education, scientific advancement, arts, and the Renaissance of its own cultural heritage. Turkey, by comparison, with much more land and many millions more population, has not made any significant contributions in these fields, even with its billions of dollars of foreign aid.

As an ancient people, Armenians have experienced the flow and ebb of many regimes and many wars, and they know that peace is the only answer.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 24, 1965]

ARMENIA REMEMBERS

The Armenian nation, everywhere in the world, is today commemorating the most tragic event in its long history. This was the massacre by the Turks that began on April 24, 1915. The former U.S. Ambassador to Turkey, the late Henry Morgenthau, called it "an episode which, so far as I know, is the most terrible day in history." This was, of course, pre-Hitler.

Armenians do in fact compare the event to the Hitlerite genocide of the Jews. The numbers massacred by the Turks will never be known, Armenian estimates running as high as 2 million. The English historian, H. A. L. Fisher, sets the figure at 1 million. It is terrible enough, although the comparison with Hitler's genocide is not quite accurate. Hitler exterminated Jews simply on racist grounds; in the Turkish extermination of the Armenians, whom they considered a threat to the Ottoman Empire, there was indeed an element of racism, but the primary factor was nationalism. And many Turks also lost their lives in the holocaust.

The Armenians are a very ancient race. Herodotus, writing in the fifth century B.C., refers to them in terms that show they were even then an old people. Cultured, intelligent, attractive, famous traders, they have spread over the world and enriched all countries in which they settled, including our own.

Turks and Armenians had lived side by side and as members of the Ottoman Empire for a very long time—and they live once again in friendliness today. While the Turks must certainly have a heavy burden on their conscience for the dreadful events of a half century ago, both people must now let the dead past bury the dead. Armenians, naturally, cannot forget, but perhaps they can forgive.

Uphold the Law—A Citizen's First Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to accompany the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio to Canton last week for the Law Day, U.S.A., program sponsored by the Stark County Bar Association and the Canton Rotary Club.

At that luncheon we met the winners of the Law Day essay contest sponsored by the bar association, and I wish to include with my remarks the excellent essay by William Rossiter, of McKinley High School, which won first prize in the contest:

UPHOLD THE LAW—A CITIZEN'S FIRST DUTY

(By William Rossiter)

A good citizen is one who is thoroughly concerned with the welfare of his fellow citizens and the society in which he lives. A good citizen is indispensable to society, because he, with other good citizens, forms a strong foundation on which the prosperity and security of the community depend. It is he who must support the Government by paying taxes and by defending the Nation during a time of crisis, but at all times his duty is extended beyond the basic requirements of citizenry. He has the great responsibility to maintain order within the society, so that the others may enjoy the privileges and benefits of an organized nation. In meeting this responsibility, he is obliged to conform to the legal standards created by his nation to promote social harmony and progress. To be maintained, harmony and progress depend on the maintenance of order. A citizen's first duty is to uphold the law, because obedience to law is necessary to maintain social order.

Ideally, goodness comes from within the individual; order need not be imposed. Society, if it is to exist, however, must have order regardless of the individual's willingness to conform. The citizen must agreeably comply with the law or he will necessarily be coerced into doing so, in order to preserve the personal security of each member of society. Provided, of course, that the law is founded on sound knowledge of the nature and relationship of man and society, one's primary duty as a good citizen is to support it wholeheartedly.

Laws which do not contribute to the security and welfare of the individual or to the Nation should be abolished—but only by the socially justified means. In the United States, every citizen has an opportunity to influence the making and the revision of law. The process is indirect but efficient. A letter written by a citizen to a Congressman, for example, is one of the many available, legal methods to influence legislation. Certainly, then, an individual living in the United States should not choose to disobey laws, because he is largely responsible for their existence.

In supporting the Nation, a citizen is supporting, to a great extent, his own well-being. While a citizen obeys the law, the Government can more readily work to see that the citizen is justly protected from crime, that is, the infringement upon his rights to peace and and security. A great deal of time and money is being spent by government in the United States to combat crime. Surely if everyone were to uphold the law, valuable time and efforts, expended now by anticrime organizations, could be used to help man and society progress more rapidly in such diverse and unrelated areas as medicine and engineering.

Perhaps because several misdemeanors carry only small penalties, there are those who believe that they are thus less obligated to obey minor regulations. The idea is an erroneous one. Misdemeanors, by definition, are not as offensive to society as are felonies, but they are detrimental to the foundation of society in a dangerously subversive way. In contrast with great crimes, which are immediately sought out and dealt with, misdemeanors can be widespread and are not nearly as apt to be corrected by a force outside the individual. It is thus the responsi-

bility of every person to be his own law enforcer, especially in the case of minor statutes, if the high ethical standards of a society are to be maintained.

A citizen today cannot afford to be indifferent to crime. Our ethical values are precious and should not be sacrificed, at the expense of all, because some choose to be lax in matters of citizenship. Indifference to government may cause its eventual weakening and fall. Edmund Burke has said, "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." Evil is active and aggressive, and indifference cannot defend goodness.

Let us all take heed: We must uphold and defend the laws of the United States, because we want to conquer those forces of evil which operate today in our society and which threaten to deteriorate our Nation from within. The downfall of a nation as a consequence of demoralization is the most dishonorable way a society can be ended. We have confidence, however, that we shall maintain the highest ethical standards and that we shall always be, as a nation, a champion of justice and equality to guarantee these great privileges to the citizen who upholds the law.

Joseph Baranowski: One of Nation's 12 Outstanding Physical Fitness Leaders of 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I salute Joseph Lewis Baranowski of Mishawaka, Ind., in my congressional district, on his selection as one of the Nation's 12 Outstanding Physical Fitness Leaders of 1964.

The 12 winners were honored this week in Washington, D.C., by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. They were selected from hundreds of candidates from 44 States.

The purpose of the national award, which was initiated at the suggestion of the President's Council on Physical Fitness, is to "honor individuals who contribute much but receive little of the publicity going to championship athletes and bigtime football coaches."

Twenty-five years ago Joe Baranowski organized the Indian Independent Athletic Association to give the youth of Mishawaka an opportunity to participate in sports. The activities of the IIAA include summer softball, winter basketball leagues, bowling, and golf.

Particularly noteworthy is the fact that Joe Baranowski's longtime efforts on behalf of the youth of his city were not performed as a part of his regular occupation but on a volunteer basis. Mr. Baranowski works as a plant guard at the Dodge Manufacturing Corp., Mishawaka.

The occasions are few in which we give recognition to our Nation's private citizens who devote their time, efforts and money on behalf of their fellow citizens. I am pleased that the Jaycees have seen fit to do so. It is also fitting that Joe Baranowski should receive the recognition and gratitude that he so well deserves.

Fair Packaging and Labeling Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I testified before the Senate Commerce Committee on behalf of the fair packaging and labeling legislation, which that committee is presently studying. I feel very strongly about the need for the enactment of this remedial legislation, and have long advocated its passage. For the benefit of those who are not familiar with this measure, I would like to incorporate my testimony in the RECORD for today:

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE SEYMOUR HALPERN, OF NEW YORK, SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE, FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING LEGISLATION, MAY 6, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this distinguished committee, to present my views on S. 985, Senator HART's fair packaging and labeling bill, and on my companion measure, H.R. 7493.

I respectfully urge this committee to accord favorable consideration to this legislation which, quite simply, is designed to provide the consumer with accurate and complete information on the foods and drugs he is buying.

The problems and abuses toward which this legislation addresses itself are well known to every shopper. For too long shoppers have had to contend with bogus cents-off sales; they have had to hunt diligently for statements of net weight only to find them expressed in fractions or unts of measure unintelligible to the ordinary consumer, and deliberately employed to defy rational comparison of similar products in varying sized packages. Consumers have been misled by attractive pictures appearing on packages and purporting to represent the product inside—pictures of cookies just chock full of chocolate chips, for example. It is not until the package is opened, that the truth is learned: the picture bears precious little resemblance to the product.

In addition to these abuses, we note such things as oversized packages and the use of meaningless catch phrases like "jumbo quart" and "giant half pint." Another interesting phenomenon may be witnesses in advertisements which boldly proclaim "four servings" or "six servings." These may be true if we are serving small children who have been nibbling all day long, but if the product is intended to be served to adults, then these ads are grossly misleading.

Mr. Chairman, it has proven impossible to rely on industry to rid itself of these unfair practices. In all candor though, I would like to acknowledge the fact that I understand some companies really made an effort to reform. But when the questionable practices of other competing firms meet with success, even the good firms feel constrained to follow suit.

This legislation would lay the ground rules, clearly and forcefully, for all to obey. In this way reputable firms would not be disadvantaged by the mischief of their less scrupulous competitors.

In substance, the bill makes it unlawful to distribute in interstate commerce any packaged or labeled consumer commodity if the label or package does not conform to regulations promulgated pursuant to the bill. These regulations will be drawn up by the Federal Trade Commission where products like soap, detergents, and paper are involved; and where food, drugs, and cosmetics are to be regulated, the responsible authority will be the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In some areas, the bill requires that regulations be promulgated; in other, more complex areas, the bill sets forth the kinds of regulations which may be promulgated, but leaves the final decisions to the administering authorities, to allow for sufficient flexibility.

Thus it will be mandatory to publish regulations—

1. Requiring the statement of net contents on the front panels of packages, and on labels affixed to the commodities;
2. Establishing standards of prominence for the net contents statements;
3. Prohibiting addition to net contents statements of qualifying words or phrases;
4. Specifying exceptions to the foregoing requirements;
5. Prohibiting "cents off" or other statements of price reduction or price advantage on packages or labels;
6. Prohibiting the placing on packages of illustrations which misrepresent the contents of the package.

In the discretionary area, the Federal Trade Commission and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are authorized to publish regulations—after public hearings and consultations with persons affected thereby—which would extend to—

1. Establishing reasonable weights or quantities in which a commodity shall be distributed for retail sale;
2. Preventing use of packages of sizes, shapes or dimensions which are likely to deceive consumers as to net quantity of contents;
3. Establishing standards other than net quantity of contents for designating quantity of contents;
4. Defining what constitutes a "serving";
5. Providing standards for alternative designations for quantity of contents which cannot meaningfully be designated in terms of weight, measure, or count; and
6. Requiring labels and packages to disclose sufficient information regarding product ingredients and composition as will establish or preserve fair competition between competing products by enabling consumers to make rational comparison with respect to price and other factors or to prevent consumer deception.

I am aware that there are some who would object to the passage of this bill, on the grounds that ample authority already exists to control these abuses, or that it would stifle the growth of industries or preclude product diversification. I believe these charges are unfounded.

As far as present authority is concerned, Mr. Dixon, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, put his finger on the problem when he explained that under the present law, the Federal Trade Commission must demonstrate consumer deception before it can act. As a result, it has not proved feasible to issue orders, on a case-by-case basis, requiring affirmative disclosures on packages, of net contents, or defining what constitutes a "serving," or requiring labels to disclose information concerning product ingredients or composition. Under this bill, the Federal Trade Commission would be empowered to issue regulations governing this area—and the regulations would have the force of law.

It is also said that the Federal Drug Administration has ample authority to curtail the abuses this bill seeks to correct. But Commissioner Larrick has explained that

the Federal Drug Administration is so caught up with handling problems of public health and sanitation, that it has had little opportunity to address itself to the pressing problem of "truth in packaging." Well, this bill seeks to see to it that the problem is attended to, by assigning authority to agencies better equipped to exercise it.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I submit that this bill will not stifle the growth of industries or preclude product diversification. Ample room is left for nonprice competition in the marketing of products. The only restriction is that packaging and labeling must be honest, must be fair. I am personally convinced that this will not be inordinately burdensome on the imagination and creativity of American business.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that Mrs. Peterson, the Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, and Mr. Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, have both appeared before this committee to speak on behalf of this legislation, and I am very glad indeed that the administration endorses this bill. When one considers that the average family spends some 30 percent of its income on consumer commodities of this sort, one realizes that the need for this legislation has been with us far too long, and now, surely, is the time for action. Mr. Chairman, I am confident that your committee will take this necessary action, and will favorably report this bill to the Senate.

Spanish War Veteran Young at 91

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in Chicago on Armed Forces Day and at the historic 100-year-old Germania Club a great soldier and patriot will be honored with a citation from the Veterans' Corps, 131st Infantry Regiment, 33d Division, Illinois National Guard, which is holding its annual reunion and dinner dance on that occasion.

I have known Col. Nicholas J. Budinger for many years. His is the caliber of old-fashioned Americanism, with complete love of and devotion to country. A veteran of the Spanish-American War, young at 91, he is an inspiration to veterans everywhere.

My good friend Joe Martin, who is the corps' able public information officer writes me:

This event marks the 91st anniversary of the organization of the Illinois National Guard which took place in Chicago in 1874, at that time designated as Chicago's Dandy First Infantry Regiment.

The principal speaker will be Col. Nicholas J. Budinger, a 91-year-old Spanish-American War veteran who has ben an officer of the Veterans Corps for 68 years. He will be presented with a citation for his long continuous service. Colonel Budinger is still spry and active. Recently, he offered his services to the Chicago Board of Education as a board member, a noncompensating position. In private life, he is an insurance broker and works at the job every day. Some old soldiers don't just fade away.

Colonel Budinger is proud of his service to the greatest country in the world and is ready and willing to continue serving whenever and wherever needed. He is a great American and his distinguished record proves it.

In addition to his volunteer Spanish War service, he sold bonds in World War I, served on the draft board during World War II, helped organize the Illinois Reserve Militia in 1940 and subsequently addressed many ladies' clubs, veterans' organizations and business gatherings on the subject of Americanism. There should be more Americans of his caliber.

Supplemental Appropriation for Military Functions of Department of Defense, Fiscal Year 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 447) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for military functions of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this appropriations bill. Our Armed Forces are engaged in battle in Vietnam and these funds are necessary to support that commitment. But, Mr. Chairman, I must say in all candor that I have serious reservations about that policy, and I do not intend that my vote be taken as approval to escalate our intervention.

I do not agree with those who insist that an affirmative vote for this bill represents an all-out endorsement of the President's policy in Vietnam. As the President's majority leader in another body said about the vote on this bill, according to this morning's press:

Language by one person does not make that language binding on the other person to whom it is addressed.

An appropriations bill is not the proper instrument for testing an important and complex foreign policy question such as Vietnam, particularly when only a minimum time of 1 hour was assigned for debate. If the policy is to be tested in the Congress, provision should be made for adequate consideration and debate.

Mr. Chairman, I have not taken open issue with our Vietnam policy because I believe it deserves an opportunity for hoped-for-results and negotiations for a peaceful settlement. I think Mr. Johnson is trying sincerely to extricate this Nation from a confused and difficult situation in which we found ourselves when he took office. It was an existing fact and he is trying to discover the best way out.

The President has said that he favors negotiations looking to a settlement of the controversy, "unconditional negotiations." He would talk any time, anywhere. Unfortunately, there has been no disposition on the part of the other side to negotiate. It is hoped that a way will be found shortly to bring the parties to the conference table to negotiate a fair settlement. And, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I do not believe that escalation of the conflict will serve to stimulate negotiations.

Mr. Chairman, I thought the debate took an unfortunate turn with the assertion of several gentlemen in the minority that dissent and disagreement should be curtailed. Free expression and debate are the glory of a democracy and a demand for conformity is the essence of a totalarian regime rather than a government such as ours. That is why I disagree with the gentlemen who took issue with the so-called "teach-ins." Americans, and this includes professors, have a right to express their views.

I would remind the gentlemen of the minority of the statements of two illustrious former members of their party in the other body. In a letter to a constituent dated January 5, 1950, the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg said:

Every foreign policy must be totally debated and the "loyal opposition" is under special obligation to see that this occurs.

On January 5, 1951, in a speech in the Senate, the late Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio said this:

During recent years a theory has developed that there shall be no criticism of the foreign policy of the administration, that any such criticism is an attack on the unity of the Nation, that it gives aid and comfort to the enemy, and that it sabotages any idea of a bipartisan foreign policy for the national benefit. I venture to state that this proposition is a fallacy and a very dangerous fallacy threatening the very existence of the Nation. As I see it, Members of Congress, and particularly Members of the Senate, have a constitutional obligation to reexamine constantly and discuss the foreign policy of the United States. If we permit appeals to unity to bring an end to that criticism, we endanger not only the constitutional liberties of the country, but even is future existence.

Mr. Chairman, the best safeguard against error in our foreign policy lies in continuous discussions to find the truth and to develop the best policy. So let us have an end to the criticism that those who take an opposite view from the majority are undermining the security of our Nation.

Sierra Leone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, Sargent Shriver recently sent me the March issue of a very interesting Peace Corps publication: Peace Corps Volunteer. In this particular issue, the work of volunteers in remote Sierra Leone, on the West Coast of Africa, is highlighted. I was delighted to find that a volunteer from the Second Congressional District of Michigan, Lon Dickerson, of Plymouth, was cited for his work in the Sierra Leone National Library.

Our late President Kennedy first publicly articulated the concept of the Peace Corps in an informal speech in the Sec-

ond District of Michigan, early on a campaign morning in October 1960. I strongly supported the idea then; as a Congressman, I support the volunteers, and their work, now. I recommend the article in the Volunteer to the Members. It follows:

SIERRA LEONE

(By Donovan McClure)

If you pick up a map of Africa, your left thumb will likely rest on, and cover up, Sierra Leone. It's that small, humid, very wet or very dry, thumb-shaped country on Africa's west coast. Sierra Leone was the 100th member of the United Nations, and one of the first dozen countries to receive Peace Corps volunteers.

The world has never really focused on Sierra Leone—that is, Newsweek and Time hardly ever write about it, and the Associated Press man in Nigeria who covers West Africa has been here only twice since 1963. The New York Times had a man here last summer, but he was selling advertising.

As a former newspaperman, I can understand the indifference of the news media. The noise and bombast are elsewhere. Independence came in 1961 and with it a smoothly functioning, democratic, two-party system of government. No coups, and no one went to jail for his politics. The country didn't even change its name. All this spells obscurity, for as every editor knows, good government makes poor headlines.

There is another factor in Sierra Leone's relative remoteness from the world: it is not easy to get here. At least, not as easy as it would appear. On the map, as the jet flies, it's a scant 5,000 miles from New York to Freetown. But while Freetown boasts the world's third-largest harbor, the airport is of lesser dimensions, and the big jet must land elsewhere. Blame the magnificent mountains that come down to meet the sea, the only place in West Africa where this occurs. Sierra Leone's international airport is located across the bay—a 2-hour bus and launch ride from Freetown. The Peace Corps volunteers who leave New York by jet arrive in Guinea, 80 miles from Freetown, in 8 to 10 hours. But the trip on from neighboring Guinea may take anywhere from 20 minutes (if all goes well) to 2 days (if all does not). Air Guinea, with its Russian and Eastern-bloc pilots, provides the charter. The Sierra Leone airport manager, a Britisher, on one occasion asked a Czech pilot how he felt about delivering American Peace Corpsmen: "It's a job," was the response.

No one planned it that way, but in 3 years, eight different colleges and universities—never the same one twice—have trained Sierra Leone-bound volunteers. Columbia University took first crack at it, in the fall of 1961, preparing 37 volunteers for assignments as secondary schoolteachers. Then came State University College of Education, New Paltz, N.Y. (teachers), Howard (nurses), Maine (rural development), Cornell (teachers), Yale (law), UCLA (rural development), and Indiana (teachers).

Not only has the training been diversified, but so have the programs.

Teaching, as elsewhere in Africa, has high priority, and while we've functioned so far only in the secondary schools and training colleges, next fall two dozen or so volunteers will teach in the primary schools.

A medical team of two volunteer doctors and eight nurses transformed a small upcountry hospital into a medical facility that attracted patients from all over Sierra Leone. Unfortunately, doctors could not be recruited for a new team and the program was terminated last July.

The first Peace Corps-CARE rural development volunteers arrived here in October 1962, and that program has come almost full circle—commencing as "pure" community development, evolving into self-help construction (bridges, market roads, jetties) and now, by degrees, returning to "semipure" community development at the village level. The first stage—"pure" community development—was frustrating to both the volunteers and Sierra Leoneans. The Latin America-style community development simply didn't work here. The villages were too small, the population too scattered, and the social structure too limited.

In a village of 60 people, a volunteer trying to build a bridge or school with voluntary labor soon wears out his welcome, and the self-help dries up before the project is completed. After much experimenting, the volunteers themselves arrived at a successful formula: each volunteer undertook projects in several villages simultaneous, spending a morning here, an afternoon there, the next day somewhere else, his visits timed to when his presence was required for either technical assistance or organizational help. Since this sort of schedule requires high mobility, the Sierra Leone Government donated seven land-rovers to the volunteers and provides fuel and maintenances for the vehicles. By the time the original rural development group completed their tours last spring, this system had been highly structured and functioned smoothly.

Too smoothly, in fact, for their group V replacements felt a lack of challenge. Also, their very mobility deprived them of close, meaningful relationships in the villages. To offset this, a few volunteers began probing into smaller, more personal projects in addition to the "high impact" ones. They are teaching villagers to make toys and furniture, promoting improved methods of agriculture, and delving into public health problems. Two volunteers, Mario DiSanto (Brooklyn) and Louis Rapoport (Beverly Hills, Calif.) have been assigned to single chiefdoms and are engaged full time in "semipure" community development.

WHAT THEY LIKE MORE

The impact made by rural development volunteers can be seen, and touched. Teachers sometimes fail to see results. If they could read the correspondence that comes across my desk from headmasters and ministry officials, they would not be troubled. Headmasters like the fact Peace Corps teachers are friendly and work hard and teach classes when they're supposed to; that they organize the libraries, coach the athletic teams, direct the choirs, tutor the dull students, monitor the evening study shalls, and spend their weekends and vacations painting, planting, plastering, and cementing. But what they like most of all, more than the go-go spirit and cheerful faces, even more than the projectors and tape recorders and wall maps and science kits that are the trappings of each volunteer teacher, what they like more than that is the number, the ever increasing number, of students taught by Peace Corps volunteers who pass the third- and fifth-form exams. This is where the payoff is, to students and headmasters alike. This is the battle they gear for, and the volunteers have done, and are doing, a good job preparing them for it.

Frustrations vary. Rain that won't stop and vehicles that won't start give the rural development guys their greatest headaches. When roads are impassable or the ferry is out or the Jeep is laid up, work stops and the rural development volunteer sits and chafes and wonders why he didn't stay in Pittsburgh.

The teachers have their own problems. The history major who had 2 years of French in high school finds himself the school French master. ("Ah cain't teach French," moaned one pretty volunteer from South Carolina, but she did, though her students speak with an accent that would not impress a Parisian.)

Volunteers improvise, and sometimes whole new programs develop. Al McIvor (Roselle, N.J.) a volunteer in group I, organized a band at Catholic Training College in Bo, the first in the school's history. The school liked the band so much that when Al's tour ended, they requested a "professional bandmaster" to take his place. And a pro they got. Jim Polite (New Orleans) a 47-year-old musician who had organized high school, college, and Army bands in the States, not only gave the big beat to that college but is working with bands and fledgling musicians at schools throughout the Bo area. To hundreds, he's "the music man." Jim has written a music syllabus for the secondary schools and several songs, including "Big Fat Joe" and "African Boogie." Now headmasters are flooding my office with requests for bandmasters "like Jim Polite."

Other efforts that began either as special projects or as extracurricular activities for volunteers have had similar payoffs. In addition to 114 secondary school teachers and 27 rural development volunteers, we have a museum curator—Janet Stone (Lambertville, N.J.); three professional librarians assigned to the Sierra Leone National Library—Ethel Hill (Seattle), Joan Loslo (Rantoul, Ill), and Lon Dickerson (Plymouth, Mich.); and a TV specialist who writes, produces, directs, and runs camera for Sierra Leone national television—John Gray (Grosse Pointe, Mich.). These specialists were requested after group I and II volunteer teachers with an interest in these areas made such positive part-time contributions that the ministries wanted full-time Peace Corps volunteers to replace them.

MANY STAY ON

Although it has been more than 3 years since the first Peace Corps volunteers arrived in Sierra Leone, there is still in the country at least one member from every Peace Corps group. Billie Day (Littleton, Colo.) who was in the original group of 37 secondary school teachers, is now a member of the staff in Freetown as administrative assistant. Patricia Preciado (Riverdale, N.J.) came in September 1962, with group II teachers, then stayed on for a third year to work in a hospital. Jeff Mareck (Novato, Calif.), a group III rural development volunteer, saw his colleagues off last July, but Jeff—a mechanical whiz who keeps Peace Corps vehicles running in addition to his rural development chores—has stayed on to give a sagging jeep fleet several thousand extra miles. Groups IV (51 secondary school teachers), V (27 rural development volunteers), and VI (69 secondary school teachers) are in the midst of tours.

Foreign Aid Gives New Hope to Thousands in Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent Los Angeles Times article should prove a point to critics of the foreign aid program who insist that U.S. assistance rarely reaches the people in need. A firsthand observation by Los Angeles Times staff writer, Francis B. Kent, tells the story of northeast Brazil—a story of the desperately poor who have found better ways of building things, better health facilities, employment, food, a helping hand in time

of disaster, and a future for their children because of aid from the American people.

And for those who insist upon expressions of gratitude in return for foreign aid, perhaps the prayers of these grateful townfolk will suffice.

Here is a story—a true story—proving that foreign aid deals with real people, real problems, and effective solutions:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Feb. 28, 1965]

RURAL BRAZIL GRATEFUL FOR U.S. AID—FOOD FOR PEACE GIVES THOUSANDS NEW LEASE ON LIFE

(By Francis B. Kent)

SALVADORE, BRAZIL.—In the drawing rooms of Brazil's big cities you hear scant mention of U.S. aid programs. The drawing room set would rather talk politics.

But in the interior, in the little towns just this side of starvation, U.S. assistance is a byword.

Listen to the Reverend Paulo Jose da Silva, Jr., pastor of a Baptist church in Ipiau, where floods routed hundreds of families last year and drove an already poverty-stricken people to the brink of despair:

"Every Wednesday we have a prayer meeting and invariably someone rises to thank the American people for their help."

Listen to Edison Moura Nery, acting mayor of Jaguaquara:

"Help from the United States has brought this town to life. Its results have been spectacular."

ALLIANCE PRAISED

On the wall behind Nery hung a poster, about 4 feet square, bearing the clasped-hands symbol of the Alliance for Progress. Others like it are in city halls throughout the northeast.

Both the pastor and the politician were talking about the food for peace program, which under the Alliance has given thousands of Brazilians a new lease on life.

And not only Brazilians. Food for peace distributes surplus U.S. farm products to needy people abroad, is helping people in more than 100 countries around the world.

Here in the Brazilian northeast, where lifetime hunger is the lot of millions, the effects of food for peace are particularly apparent. Food has become a kind of money and it has built scores of roads, dams, waterwells, and public buildings that would have been impossible without it.

It works like this: The chronically unemployed are put to work and paid partly in cash and partly in food. Local governments put up the money. Food for peace provides wheat, cornmeal, dried milk, and edible oils.

Ipiau and Jaguaquara are just two of the towns that food for peace is changing. They lie southwest of Salvador, capital of Bahia state, and just west of the sugarcane belt that runs along the Atlantic coast.

Beyond this fertile belt the land deteriorates rapidly. The soil is poor and the weather cycle irregular. More often than not there is drought and everything dries up, including the people. When it rains, frequently after dry spells of up to 3 years, the water comes down in torrents.

THOUSANDS FLEE FLOODS

Last year there were floods. Thousands of famililes were driven from their homes and had no place to turn for help. Food for peace stepped in with emergency relief.

When the immediate crisis was past it became apparent that a long-range program was needed, a program that would anticipate flood and drought and at the same time help meet the problems of chronic unemployment.

What grew out of it was the food for work program, which goes a long way toward meeting a prime goal for food for peace: Community development.

According to Leonard G. Wolf, a former Iowa Congressman who is the director of food for peace in Brazil, the distribution of surplus foods should be more than just a handout. It should be a tool, he says, to interest people in their problems and get them started toward solutions.

In some areas of the northeast it has worked dramatically. In others it has failed.

It has worked in Jaguaquara, where the townspeople have gone to work with vigor. A 6-mile burro trail to the main Salvador-Rio de Janeiro highway has been broadened and graded. Drainage ditches have been dug to carry away the heavy rains that used to isolate the town. At the road's junction with the highway a community market building is going up where farmers will be able to bring their bananas and mandioc for transport into Salvador.

Jaguaquara's main street is being paved, and as the paving progresses the face of the town is changing. No longer plagued by clouds of red dust raised by passing vehicles, the shopkeepers and dwellers are painting, planting flower gardens, and generally sprucing up their property.

SEVEN THOUSAND PARTICIPATING

Nery, the acting mayor, said in an interview that the 7,000 people of Jaguaquara now have an active interest in their town They take pride in it, knowing that they have contributed to its improvement

In Ipiau, a town of about 15,000, the story is much the same but on a broader scale Here, with the help of food for peace, more than 200 houses have been built for families flooded out of the lowlands along the river An agriculture school is being built, along with a sewerage system and the town's first public library

Ipiau's Baptist pastor, Mr. da Silva, operates a clinic in connection with his church. Since American food began arriving, he told a reporter, the number of townspeople seeking medical help has fallen off dramatically.

Food for peace will not last forever. In Brazil the program is scheduled to wind up in 1971. By then, Wolf said recently, it is hoped that Brazilians will be able to carry on by themselves.

One area that shows promise of carrying on independently is the school lunch program, under which about 3.5 million youngsters are now being provided with a daily hot meal. The fare is spartan: reconstituted milk, a sort of gruel prepared from wheat and perhaps some bread or macaroni.

But here again the purpose is community development, and Brazilians are taking a hand in local administration and food preparation.

In addition to community development, Wolf sees in the school lunch program a means of broadening education in a country where about half the population is illiterate.

BUILDING FUTURE

"The generation that should be in school today," he said, "will have to provide the national leaders of tomorrow."

But because of widespread poverty relatively few stay in school very long, particularly in the northeast. Where a hot lunch is served, attendance figures rise sharply and the number of children who go on to graduate increases.

For more than a decade Brazil has had a school lunch program of its own but, according to Wolf, until food for peace became available, it drifted along without much success.

Now the program has come alive. Representatives from throughout the country met here recently for a 2-week conference and their enthusiasm was high. They attended classes in nutrition and methods of food preparation and took home with them packets of vegetable seeds donated by the Ferry Morse Co., of Kentucky.

One reason for the heightened interest in the program, according to a number of delegates, is the unparalleled support shown by the revolutionary government that took power last April. The new government, which has slashed budgets everywhere, not only refused to cut back the lunch program, but quadrupled its funds.

At a closing ceremony in the University of Bahia auditorium, speaker after speaker mounted the rostrum to sing the praises of the alliance for progress and food for peace.

Unintentionally, perhaps they answered two questions often heard in the United States: are the people overseas aware of U.S. foreign aid? Do they appreciate it?

Here in the Brazilian northeast, it seems, they are. And they do.

Labor Develops Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is significant that among the forces in the United States encouraging the economic and social development of Latin America is the American labor movement.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the April 26, 1965, issue of the Michigan City, Ind., News Dispatch, concerning the role of the American labor movement in Latin America.

The editorial follows:

LABOR DEVELOPS LATIN AMERICA

The labor movement of the Americas is playing an increasingly active role in Latin-American economic and social development.

A major catalytic force in this effort is the American Institute for Free Labor Development, sponsored jointly by U.S. labor unions, private firms and the Government to foster development of free trade unions in Latin America.

AIFLD's social projects department assists Latin-American unions in preparing projects, arranging financing and construction and setting up administrative procedures for completed projects.

The social projects department, established in 1962, is currently working on 28 projects planned by Latin labor unions in 13 alliance nations. These projects, representing a combined investment of $94 million, are mainly in the housing field but also include such activities as credit unions, workers' banks, consumer and producer co-ops, medical clinics and rural development programs.

Three projects are essentially completed. Largest is the $10 million John F. Kennedy housing project in Mexico City sponsored by a union of graphic arts workers.

The institute also assisted in establishing ASINCOOP, a savings and loan association for workers' housing cooperatives, which opened in Lima last summer.

Another project nearing completion is a 185-unit housing development in Honduras, sponsored by the Tela Railroad Workers Union.

A $3 million extension is being planned for members of the North Coast Federation of Workers.

The Inter-American Development Bank is considering a $2 million loan application to help finance construction of the planned 1,400 homes.

Other examples of union projects, now being planned with assistance from AIFLD:

In Argentina, four unions are drafting plans for a 2,000-unit project to be con-

structed on 13 sites, mostly in the province of Buenos Aires. Financing will come from a $10 million loan from AFL–CIO-affiliated unions.

Members of 40 São Paulo, Brazil, trade unions will be eligible for homes in the proposed 5,000-unit Kennedy Memorial housing project, to be built on two sites. The AFL–CIO has earmarked $7 million for the project and AID has pledged more than $2.7 million in counterpart cruzeiros.

In Chile, 1,000 units are being planned for union members in six cities.

Colombia's Democratic Trade Union Alliance, formed to coordinate union housing efforts, plans more than 4,000 units in Bogotà and 14 other cities.

In Costa Rica, a proposed 215-unit project will be financed from a $1 million loan from the AFL–CIO welfare and pension fund.

In the Dominican Republic, site preparation work has begun for a 900-unit project for sugar mill workers in San Pedro de Macoris.

In Ecuador, a preliminary survey for a $2 million, AFL–CIO-financed project has been completed.

Peruvian unionists are making final revisions on a planned tricity housing project (Chimbote, Cuzco, and Trujillo) of about 830 units, to be financed by a $3 million AFL–CIO loan.

Uruguayan unions are planning construction of 800 units in three urban locations. Financing will come from a proposed $3 million AFL–CIO loan.

Craters of Moon Established as Monument 41 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the States bordering my State of Idaho are dotted with world-renowned national parks such as Glacier National Park in Montana; Yellowstone National Park in Montana and Wyoming, and a part of which is in Idaho; Grand Teton National Park in Wyoming; Bryce Canyon National Park in Utah; Crater Lake National Park in Oregon; and Mount Rainer National Park in Washington.

While the Yellowstone-Teton National Park combination is the only such area of this nature immediately adjacent to or partially within Idaho, yet Idaho does contain all, or parts of, 15 national forests—12 of which are entirely within the State. These national forests, together with other federally owned lands, comprise 67 percent of the land area of Idaho. These national forests—from Kaniksu on the Canadian border to Cache and Caribou in the southeastern corner of the State—contain some of the most rugged, the most beautiful, the most unusual scenic portions of the United States.

In Idaho is the world famous winter and summer playground—Sun Valley.

In Idaho is a river that disappears into the desert, only to reappear over a hundred miles away in the form of a "thousand springs" gushing from the walls of the Snake River Canyon.

In Idaho is probably the most weirdly beautiful and unique national monument in the United States—the Craters of the Moon National Monument—located just a few miles from where the Lost River sinks from sight. Created by a volcanic eruption—estimated by geologists to have occurred about 1,650 years ago—Craters of the Moon National Monument now attracts nearly 200,000 visitors yearly.

I include in the RECORD a story on this unique monument—a story which appeared in the Idaho Sunday Journal, published in Pocatello, Idaho, on May 2, 1965, the 41st anniversary of the designation of Craters of the Moon as a national monument:

CRATERS OF MOON ESTABLISHED AS MONUMENT 41 YEARS AGO

ARCO.—On May 2, 1924—41 years ago—President Calvin Coolidge proclaimed the establishment of Craters of the Moon National Monument.

The proclamation recognized "an area which contains a remarkable fissure eruption together with its associated volcanic cones, craters, rifts, lava flows, caves, natural bridges, and other phenomena characteristic of volcanic action which are of unusual scientific value and general interest * * *."

Today Craters of the Moon is visited by nearly 200,000 visitors per year, reports Superintendent Roger J. Contro. A modern visitor center, plus intepetive signs and tails, help visitors understand the fascinating story told here in lava rock. It is a unique study area for geologists, because in one small area it exhibits almost every primary feature of basaltic volcanism known the world over.

In 1962 a pristine grassland, surrounded by rough lava flows, and thus protected from domestic grazing, was added to the monument for scientific purposes. Such an island of vegetation, called a "Kipuka" by Hawaiians, provides a valuable comparison with native grasslands in this part of Idaho which have been subjected to various degrees of heavy livestock grazing. Scientists from the Soil Conservation Service and the University of Idaho are presently studying soil and range conditions of the Kipuka.

Craters of the Moon is presently Idaho's only member of the 200-unit national park system. It was the 11th of 77 national monuments which have been established.

Pennsylvania's Urban Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MESSAGE ON THE FUTURE OF PENNSYLVANIA'S URBAN COMMUNITIES, BY GOV. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, HARRISBURG, PA., APRIL 20, 1965

Mr. Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the general assembly, my fellow Pennsylvanians, we come here today in behalf of the 9 million Pennsylvanians who live in our big cities, our suburbs, our smaller cities, our growing towns.

We seek to design an effective local-State partnership to build better communities in a better Pennsylvania.

We shall talk of people; and of their homes and their schools, and of their fight against juvenile delinquency, and of their struggle for good communities, for public health and public safety.

And when we have finished, Pennsylvania will be on her way to another chapter of greatness.

For of all human creations none is more perverse than the urban community. It gives with one hand, and takes away with the other.

Cities exist, for example, to provide otherwise impossible opportunities for economic advancement. Yet, they also spawn the cruelest poverty.

Cities are for the common safety of their inhabitants. Yet, they simmer with crime, delinquency, and violence.

Cities are for health and happiness. Yet, there are places in Philadelphia where babies die at three times the normal rate.

Cities are for convenience. Yet, the suburban commuter is one of the most inconvenienced men in all America.

Cities exist so that man can savor and supplement his cultural birthright. Yet, even the basic education of the young becomes more difficult each year.

So, man creates urban communities to nurture and shape his civilization, but he must wage a perpetual struggle lest they succeed only in twisting and brutalizing it.

And the enemies of the urban community are legion.

Overcrowding. The sordid press of too many people into rundown, shoddy neighborhoods. The monotonous crush of stone, steel and brick, until God's green earth is blotted out and it almost seems as if man was made to serve the buildings.

The squalid ghettos of penned-in humanity, ill equipped by ignorance, prejudice, and disease to break the chains of poverty.

Overrapid growth. And, even in more prosperous communities, the failure to provide community facilities in sufficient quantity or quality to serve a burgeoning population.

Or lack of growth. And the growing cobwebs of decay it spins off.

One or more of these malfunctions of modern society has taken its toll through all the urban communities of Pennsylvania. The big cities, the suburbs, the smaller cities, the towns—none has completely escaped, and all are endangered in the future.

Juvenile delinquency in Pennsylvania's urban communities has increased as much as 30 percent since 1959.

Over 300 Pennsylvania communities still dump raw, untreated sewage into the streams and rivers of our State.

Though the average density of population in Pennsylvania is only 252 persons per square mile, there are neighborhoods in Philadelphia where nearly 63,000 human beings per square mile are squeezed in.

Each year, some 20,000 children in Pennsylvania's urban communities drop out without completing grade and high school.

There are sections of our larger cities where the unemployment rate surpasses 20 percent, and among young people in certain neighborhoods it rises to more than 60 percent.

And, in Pennsylvania, over 65 of every 100 single-family urban homes are older than 25 years—and that's 16 percentage points higher than the national average and higher than any of our neighboring States.

All this is clear testimony that Pennsylvania's urban communities have deep problems that must be solved.

And the government of this Commonwealth must be prepared to become a full partner with the local communities in the labor that lies ahead.

We have started.

But now there is much more to be done.

And that is why I come here today to propose a new era in the relationship of our State and our communities.

I propose a dynamic new partnership of State and local governments to make the urban areas of Pennsylvania the most livable, the most progressive in all the Nation.

Such an alliance requires that we adopt two broad and bold approaches.

The first of these is to assure that the local communities are strong enough to carry their end of the partnership.

And, second, the State government must embark on a series of new and expanded programs that hit as rifle shots at the most serious problems facing local communities today.

Consider the first of these two approaches:

Local communities are creatures of the State. In fact, the relationship historically has been almost that of parent and child. But a wise parent knows that when the child has reached maturity he must be given more of a voice in the conduct of his own affairs and those of the family.

For the communities of Pennsylvania that time has come. And to effect it I offer four specific proposals.

First, I ask the general assembly to create a new cabinet-level department of community affairs.

This will give the communities of Pennsylvania a fair voice and a long overdue voice in the highest councils of the State government.

At long last, 9 million persons who live in Pennsylvania's urban areas—whether big city, suburban area, smaller city or growing town—will have a major department of the government interested specifically in the experience and problems of urban living.

When finally assembled the new department will have under its jurisdiction all of those programs and areas of responsibility which are of paramount importance to the urban communities of Pennsylvania.

These will include not only the compilation and dissemination of statistical and professional information of importance to the communities, but also such programs as urban renewal, mass transportation and community planning.

In addition, the new department will have jurisdiction over the Commonwealth's efforts to encourage the development of housing for our citizens.

Summed up, the Department of Community Affairs will provide a clearing house for solving the common problems of Pennsylvania communities, an opportunity for those communities to be fully represented in the State government, and a one-stop agency to carry out the programs which are of vital importance to the urban areas of the Commonwealth.

The second great need, if our local communities are to develop the strength they ought to have, is for the general assembly to enact sweeping reforms in the election laws of the Commonwealth.

I will, therefore, put before you legislation to reform the conduct of elections in Pennsylvania.

It will call for a new method of selecting election district officials and will provide for their training. It will reform the existing absentee ballot law. And it will provide improved procedures to guarantee every citizen's right to vote without coercion and to have his ballot honestly counted.

The third need to strengthen our local communities is for more of them to voluntarily enter into regional planning and related activities with their neighbors.

The State planning board is currently conducting reconnaissance surveys of each region of the State. These, plus the other work of the planning board, will identify common regional problems which will only yield to regional solutions.

I am requesting the planning board, therefore, to make its studies and all other possible aid available to the local communities. And I urge our communities to undertake the widespread practice of voluntary, cooperative regional planning and related activities.

And, finally, the fourth proposal I am making to strengthen our local communities is this:

We need to strip away all of the old, outmoded restrictive State law which has piled up over the years. Nearly two centuries of legislative accumulation overcontrols our communities, stifles their initiative, and reduces their ability to produce viable local governments.

First and foremost, we must remove from the State constitution itself some of the old-fashioned and unnecessary restrictions and anachronism which it forces on local government.

A constitutional amendment to accomplish just that is already before the General Assembly as part of this administration's constitutional reform package. I urge you to pass it speedily.

Furthermore, we need to reexamine the whole body of local government restrictions enacted through the years by the General Assembly.

I am appointing, therefore, a high-level and bipartisan task force—including representatives of State and local governments, of the general assembly, of local government associations, and of other interested groups—to begin immediately the task of reviewing existing law.

When this task force completes its labor, the results will be presented to the general assembly, along with recommendations for change, repeal and modernization.

These four proposals then can make Pennsylvania's urban communities strong enough to carry their half of the dynamic local-State partnership I am proposing.

But to provide for strong communities is to meet only part of the challenge.

The government of the Commonwealth also must now take on an even more fierce determination to strike out at the common enemies of its communities and itself.

I propose, therefore, that we undertake new programs aimed at five great problems facing our communities, but which are beyond their ability to tackle alone.

These five great problems are: Education, housing, crime and delinquency, mass transportation, and health.

First, education.

In 1 week I will put before you the results of an exhaustive 2-year effort which untangles the present maze of State subsidies for the support of local schools.

I mention it today because the new system will be of great benefit to the schoolchildren of Pennsylvania's urban areas.

Besides the new subsidy formula, there are two more vital educational measures I urge you to enact. One will give youngsters from the slums a fair chance at an equal start. The second will replace wornout school buildings in our heaviest populated areas.

The first program is already before you. In my original budget requests I included, and I urge you now to act favorably on it, a request for $1 million to provide preschool training for children from the slums.

There are the children, who without special early help, will drop out of school before the eighth grade. Their deprived backgrounds guarantee that without this preschool training they will not be able to keep pace with more fortunate children. I believe they deserve our special help.

The second program—to replace wornout school buildings in our heavy populated centers—will be detailed in next week's education message.

In a nutshell, however, what I will suggest is that the State heavily invest, through its long-term borrowing capacity, in the modernization of Pennsylvania's most outmoded school buildings.

The second great need of Pennsylvania's urban communities is housing.

I am concerned about the general level of new home construction in Pennsylvania.

We know that the average age of housing in Pennsylvania is older than the national average and older than our neighboring States. And we know, too, that the number of new housing starts in the Commonwealth has been down in some recent years.

Obviously, the decades of economic plight in Pennsylvania, reflected in what until recently was an unemployment rate far higher than the national average, did have and might still be having an adverse effect on the housing industry.

But what no one knows is whether this completely explains the less than ideal construction level. We must find out.

I shall name, therefore, a cabinet-level group to work in close touch with the homebuilding industry to determine what the Commonwealth might do to stimulate the private construction of housing. If indeed there is need for governmental action, it shall be promptly made known to the general assembly.

Meanwhile, there is one vast segment of Pennsylvania's housing need that we can and should move immediately to meet.

We need nearly 30,000 middle-income homes and I propose an imaginative and unique program through which the Commonwealth will stimulate private enterprise to fill that need.

These homes would sell in the $10,000 to $17,500 price range and would be purchased by Pennsylvanians at the $3,600 to $8,000 annual earnings level.

The largest single obstacle now preventing these families from owning their own homes is the income requirements under presently available financing.

The detailed program I will shortly put before you will remove that obstacle by lowering the interest on mortgages and thus reducing the family income needed to meet monthly payments.

The money to finance this plan will come from bonds issued by the Pennsylvania Housing Agency. The mortgages it finances will be fully insured. The bonds will be repaid over the years as the mortgages are reduced by the families purchasing the homes.

In all, this proposal means more homeowning Pennsylvanians, stronger communities, and a shot in the arm to a vital segment of the State's economy.

The third great urban problem which I propose we tackle is crime and juvenile delinquency.

You will soon have before you a new plan to improve Pennsylvania's outdated system of corrections and rehabilitation for adult criminals. But today I want to concentrate on juvenile delinquency which is of particular concern to the urban communities.

I urge you to enact a $3 million proposal which, added to our existing effort, will provide Pennsylvania with a juvenile delinquency program second to none in the Nation in its ability to rehabilitate young delinquents and at the same time protect society from youthful lawlessness.

Here are the details:

1. We will provide within a matter of months, to fill what is an emergency need, institutional facilities for an additional 600 juveniles.

2. We will double the present State contribution toward local juvenile police units.

3. We will double the present State contribution toward juvenile court and probation services.

4. We will increase the professional staff working on the effective placement of offenders in institutions and other aspects of correction.

5. We will increase by 50 percent our efforts at juvenile gang control.

6. We will establish, perhaps at the Pennsylvania State University, a badly needed

training school for those who work in the field of delinquency and control.

The fourth great problem of our urban communities lies in the field of mass transportation.

Several weeks ago the administration presented to the general assembly what is Pennsylvania's first major program in this important area. I urge you to adopt it without delay.

When you do, you will have made it possible for us to help unclog the transportation arteries of our communities by helping to purchase needed transit equipment; by aiding in projects designed to ease the current inadequacies of commuter trains; by participating in programs to encourage public use of mass transit systems; and by establishing a State agency to specialize in mass transportation problems.

If you now provide for this program, which was developed after consultation and study across the State, you will have given Pennsylvania an immediate start on solving a grave problem that can only grow worse if ignored.

And, finally, the fifth great area of need for our communities which I ask you to meet lies in the field of public health.

I ask you specifically to do two things:

First, authorize local communities to establish district health offices so that through cooperation they can better meet the public health needs of Pennsylvania.

Second, to provide $2 million as the State's share in a program with local and Federal financing to make available $10 million in community centers for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded.

So, there you have it. An ambitious, but very practical plan to weld a dynamic new partnership between the State and local governments.

The formula is very much to the point: Provide strong local governments and then back them with the resources of the Commonwealth.

In behalf of the 9 million Pennsylvanians who live in Pennsylvania's urban communities, I ask you to adopt it.

If you do, we indeed shall have better communities in a better Pennsylvania.

In fact, as we have now begun to do so often, we can in this, too, lead the Nation.

An Interview With Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, the Honorable Jack Hood Vaughn, May 7, 1965, on the Situation in the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the transcript of a television interview I have just conducted with the distinguished Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, The Honorable Jack Hood Vaughn.

I think particularly significant among Mr. Vaughn's remarks is his call for the establishment of an inter-American peacekeeping force, a multilateral force composed of troops from the several states of the Organization of American States.

This force could be, in the words of Mr. Vaughn, "on call, ready and trained at all times to cope with such emergencies" as the present crisis in the Dominican Republic.

The transcript follows:

INTERVIEW BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN BRADEMAS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS, JACK HOOD VAUGHN

Representative BRADEMAS. Mr. Secretary, why are the U.S. Marines in the Dominican Republic?

Secretary VAUGHN. The U.S. Marines went into the Dominican Republic last Wednesday evening (April 28) after the only forces—the only elements in the Dominican Republic with whom we were in contact—after we had been advised by our Ambassador Bennett that the situation had deteriorated to the point where the lives and safety of our citizens there could no longer be guaranteed. That's why they're there.

Representative BRADEMAS. What about the danger of adverse Latin American reaction to our unilateral intervention down there?

Secretary VAUGHN. There has been a good deal as you know, JOHN, of adverse reaction and criticism already. Certainly this could have been expected and more to come. However, privately many of my Latin American friends have confessed that although this bothers them deeply and emotionally, they realize that we had no choice. The President felt at the time of taking action that he had no choice, that he was not prepared to abandon roughly 3,000 American citizens plus the hundreds of other citizens, non-Dominican citizens, who had requested and desperately needed our immediate help and protection.

Representative BRADEMAS. What about the involvement of the Organization of American States at this point?

Secretary VAUGHN. As you are aware, the Organization of American States has sent their Secretary General, Mr. Mora, and a special commission of five to investigate the situation to determine if a cease-fire can be established and made to work and if a more—not permanent but more—formal arrangement can be worked out whereby the peace will be safeguarded and the country will be able to move back toward constitutional government.

Representative BRADEMAS. Is there any prospect that a permanent peace-keeping force on a multilateral basis, composed of troops from OAS, could be developed for future crises?

Secretary VAUGHN. The first step will certainly be the effort to get a number of Latin countries to send contingents there to replace U.S. troops and assist U.S. troops in keeping the peace. I would hope, personally, John, that this would be the first step in the establishment of an inter-American peacekeeping force, a multilateral force that could be on call, ready and trained at all times to cope with such emergencies.

Representative BRADEMAS. I just have three other quick questions to shoot at you. What's the future of ex-President Juan Bosch?

Secretary VAUGHN. His future, in my opinion, depends on him and depends on the Dominican people. They have seen him as a successful campaigner and president. He left and much happened since he left. Whether he comes back and in what role I think should be determined by the Dominican people.

Representative BRADEMAS. Would you comment on the twin dangers of a Communist coup on the one hand and a rightwing military dictatorship on the other in the Dominican Republic?

Secretary VAUGHN. In the past the choice has been between democracy and the dictatorship of the right. More and more we have a new ingredient which is a dictatorship on the left. Neither form of dictatorship is acceptable to us and we would hope that there will be a government and a philosophy of government somewhere in the middle.

Representative BRADEMAS. I have just one final question which I ask you not only because we've had Peace Corps volunteers in the Dominican Republic but because you were once an administrator of the Peace Corps yourself. What about the role of American Peace Corps volunteers in that country?

Secretary VAUGHN. As has been the case always, I have derived great pride and satisfaction from the performance of the volunteers in this crisis. During the heavy fighting, during the disturbances in general, the Peace Corps volunteers stayed on the job. We have a contingent of nurses there who have worked around the clock in Dominican hospitals for the last 10 days. There are no complaints—they haven't been hurt—they're there to help the people.

Representative BRADEMAS. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Dr. Gilbert Klaperman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I listen with reverence to our opening prayer each day. Today I had the honor of hearing my own spiritual leader, Dr. Gilbert Klaperman, rabbi of Congregation Beth Sholom, Lawrence, Long Island, N.Y. Our guest chaplain today served during World War II as chaplain in the Canadian Army with the reserve rank of captain. Ordained by the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary in 1941, he received his B.A., and doctoral degree at Yeshiva University and his M.A. at the State University of Iowa.

Rabbi Klaperman is president of the National Jewish Book Council, vice president of the New York Board of Rabbis, assistant professor of sociology at Yeshiva University, vice president of the Hadoar, chaplain at the Nassau County Jail, and active in many Jewish and civic organizations.

Previously, Dr. Klaperman taught comparative religion, history, Bible, ethics and related courses at the State University of Iowa and Talmud at the Teachers Institute of Yeshiva University. He was the director of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation of Queens University in Kingston, Ontario; at the State University of Iowa and Iowa State College in Iowa; The Citadel at Charleston, S.C. and at Clemson College in Clemson, S.C.

Rabbi Klaperman served in pulpits at Charleston, S.C.; West New York and Kingston, Ontario, prior to coming to Lawrence.

He is listed in "Who's Who in Religion," "Who's Who in World Jewry," "Who's Who in the East," and "Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities," and is a past president of Yeshiva College Alumni Organization and past national secretary of the Rabbinical Council of America.

Rabbi Klaperman has contributed extensively to "Jewish Life," "Opinion, Horizon," "Jewish Spectator" and the "American Educator Encyclopedia," is the author of a definitive history of Yeshiva University and coauthor with his wife of a four-volume history of the Jewish people.

Rabbi Klaperman has traveled extensively and was a member of the five-man delegation of the Rabbinical Council of America that conducted a 7-week fact-finding mission in Russian and other countries behind the Iron Curtain in 1956.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted my colleagues to know about my spiritual leader, so they would better understand my pride and happiness today.

Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations, 1966

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7765) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, on April 27, 1965, I spent a few hours at St. Elizabeths Hospital, the only mental hospital operated by the Federal Government that admits all types of mental patients. Among the 7,500 patients to whom the hospital affords service are children as young as 10 years of age and oldsters up to 100. They are Negro and white, with a sprinkling of other races. They suffer from all known forms of mental illness, and not a few have other handicaps, as well. Some are blind, deaf, or physically crippled. They are veterans, residents of the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and American citizens who became ill while out of the country. Some are well off financially, and pay for their treatment, but most are afflicted by poverty. They have come as voluntary patients, by civil commitment, and some 750 as a result of criminal proceedings. Some have been in the hospital only a few days, while others have been there for 20 years or more. Some are treated only on their wards, but the majority are able to move about the 360-acre campus to various activities throughout the hospital. Many work a major part of the day in such places as the wards, laundry, warehouse, kitchens, and on the grounds. Some work in the city and sleep at the hospital, participating in treatment programs in the evening. Others live at home and return for treatment during the day. Some return every day, others only once every month or two. Treatment ranges from the administration of medications to individual and group psychotherapy, occupational and recreational therapy, and vocational training.

My visit was at once one of the most hopeful and rewarding, yet disheartening and annoying experiences I have had in recent years. The hopeful and rewarding aspects had to do with seeing some of the newer buildings and equipment provided in the last few years, and meeting with the able and dedicated staff members who treat patients in these and the older facilities. St. Elizabeths has, as far as I can tell as a layman, some of the finest resources available for the treatment of multiple-handicapped, mentally ill persons.

It has an extensive training program in psychiatry and some other medical specialties, psychology, undergraduate and graduate nursing, occupational therapy, ministry to the mentally ill, social work, and psychodrama. This training program could be expanded, with proper financial support, to increase its contribution to the critically short national pool of mental health personnel. Its efforts to develop new teaching methods for the training of these needed personnel could be further developed.

The hospital is also carrying out critically needed research, much of it in collaboration with the National Institute of Mental Health. With the research resources of the Institute and the patient resources of St. Elizabeths, both located in the Washington metropolitan area, we have the opportunity to strengthen greatly the training and research endeavors of the national mental health program. We also have an opportunity and an obligation to demonstrate, through joint endeavors of the hospital, the Institute, and the city of Washington, how services to the mentally ill can be provided in the most effective way possible, and how the size of large public mental hospitals can be materially reduced.

This brings me to the disheartening and annoying aspects of my visit. St. Elizabeths was established in 1855, and is still forced to use many buildings from 60 to 110 years old, that have long since been outmoded.

Many of these older buildings are frightfully overcrowded. Despite the best efforts of the staff, these buildings scream out of society's callous disregard for the dignity of our fellow human beings who are housed and treated in them. Those buildings must go. They must be replaced. To make matters worse, the Congress has already appropriated funds for the construction of one badly needed replacement building, and the working drawings and specifications were completed last June, almost a year ago. But the contract for construction has been delayed, apparently at the request of the District Government. Why this has occurred, I do not fully know, but I mean to find out.

This most affluent of all nations in the world, deeply engrossed as it is in the rights of its own citizens and the freedom of all men, simply cannot and must not continue to treat the mentally ill as second-class citizens. The Congress has launched a broad program to assist the States, local communities, universities, and other teaching and research institutions to improve the mental health of our people. Yet, the only federally operated general mental hospital, St. Elizabeths—located, here, in the Nation's Capitol—does not have the physical and staff resources necessary to carry out the assignment we have given it.

In a sense, St. Elizabeths now epitomizes the problem faced by most public mental hospitals in this country. It has some fine buildings and equipment, and a knowledgeable and dedicated staff. It is doing an excellent job within the resources available to it. Well over half of all patients now admitted are returned to the community within a few months of their admission. But it also has some obsolete, rundown, and wholly unacceptable facilities. Its staff is too small to give each patient his best possible chance for improvement.

I address the conscience of every Member of this Congress. We can ill afford to continue to neglect the patients in our own Federal mental hospital, while urging the States and localities to improve their services to the mentally ill. Let us demonstrate that the patients at St. Elizabeths are not second-class citizens, and develop our own resources as a model for the Nation.

Citizenship Award to Patrolman Crepeau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as our colleagues know, one of the most satisfying aspects of public life is the opportunity from time to time to participate in ceremonies honoring persons whose contributions to their communities have marked them as outstanding citizens.

Last Sunday, it was my privilege to join in a particularly impressive and worthwhile occasion of this kind. The honored citizen was Patrolman Frank J. Crepeau of Westfield, N.J., who received the Fifth Annual Citizenship and Civic Affairs Award of the Westfield-Mountainside Lodge of B'nai B'rith.

Patrolman Crepeau organized the Police Athletic League in Westfield 12 years ago and has worked tirelessly, selflessly, and effectively with the youth of the community ever since. He was a most deserving winner of this high honor, and I was proud to pay him my tribute and to express my appreciation to B'nai B'rith for making it possible.

Mr. Speaker, in the belief that our colleagues will also be interested in knowing of this example of good citizenship, I include as a part of my remarks the newspaper report of the award ceremony which was published in the May 3 issue of the Courier-News of Plainfield, N.J.

The article follows:

WESTFIELD POLICEMAN RECEIVES B'NAI B'RITH CITIZENSHIP AWARD

(By Herb Potter)

WESTFIELD.—Representative FLORENCE P. DWYER, Republican, of Union, paid tribute last night to Patrolman Frank Crepeau as a good citizen "giving of himself so that the community could be a better place in which to live."

Crepeau was the recipient of the fifth annual citizenship and civic affairs award of B'nai B'rith at a reception last night in Temple Emanu-El.

He was honored for his work in organizing the Police Athletic League here 12 years ago and working with it ever since. He has seen it grow from about 30 members to nearly 120 members. Two of the youths who participated in the early days are now members of the police department, helping him to help others.

Mrs. DWYER said today, "When our communities have become cogs in the giant megalopolis and when the fast pace and complexity of life tempts us to turn over our personal responsibilities to some supercaretaker, it's more important than ever that we recapture the meaning and restore the substance of citizenship to a place of honor."

EXTRAORDINARY CITIZEN

What is needed today, and what the B'nai B'rith citizenship award honors, the Congresswoman asserted, is the kind of citizen whose sense of public responsibility transcends the ordinary and overcomes the obstacles.

Patrolman Crepeau, she said, is one of these. Being a police officer, he is especially able to appreciate the importance of preventing delinquency before it becomes a police problem, he recognizes that young people need a chance to grow up as interested and contributing members of the community and he overcame obstacles and moments of discouragement to achieve his goal, Mrs. DWYER added.

"With community problems multiplying—and no evidence that the process will diminish—they must be dealt with, at least in part, here in our own local communities," Mrs. DWYER said. "Here is where the problems and the people live; here the needs are personal and manageable; and here there must be the Frank Crepeaus to handle them."

The award, presented by Mrs. Aldan Markson, cochairman of the committee, recognized Crepeau's outstanding contribution in community and civic affairs and said he is serving the community with honor and distinction.

TWELVE YEARS WITH PAL

In accepting the award, Crepeau said he was doing so with deep humility and that in his 12 years with the PAL he had a lot of help from different organizations, and the police department. He said his work with the PAL was a labor of love and a job he wanted to do and he hoped that the plaque he received will someday be displayed in a PAL building in Westfield.

Also paying tribute to Crepeau was Police Chief James Moran, who nominated him for the award. Moran said he worked with Crepeau in the early days of PAL and no one knows the amount of work he put into the organization and the many times he used his own money to help finance activities. The award, Moran said, is a glowing tribute to Crepeau's tenacity in sticking to this worthwhile activity.

Congratulatory telegrams were received from the Kiwanis Club and Crepeau's fellow members of the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association. Youngsters from the PAL formed a color guard for the pledge to the flag.

The Reverend John Flanagan, of Holy Trinity Church, pronounced the invocation and Rabbi Bernard M. Honan, of Temple Emanu-El gave the benediction. Herbert Ross, president of the men's lodge, and Mrs. Herbert Ross, president of the women's chapter, made brief remarks.

Conservation and the Poverty War: A Paradox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when major efforts are being made to alleviate poverty in our rural areas, the administration proposes to create new poverty by cutting budget requests for conservation programs. I can assure the experts in the Department of Agriculture that economic conditions on our family farms are already sufficiently low to provide adequate challenges for the poverty program. No further effort is necessary.

It is reported that the architects of the Great Society are having difficulties in communicating with rural leaders to implement the rural programs of the war on poverty. This communication's gap is neither startling nor new. What is surprising is that at a time when cooperation from farm leaders is desired, the effectiveness of one segment of farm economy, the conservation districts, is to be seriously impaired. This paradox has been recognized by the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts in its newsletter of April 27, 1965.

Because of the importance of conservation districts in promoting local coordinated action, I am including a part of the association's recent newsletter at this point in my remarks:

Encouraging rural people to organize to help themselves and advance vital national purposes is emerging as a major problem for administrators of several "Great Society" programs now underway.

Dissatisfaction with progress on one front came to light last week when critics charged that rural communities are being discriminated against in the fight against poverty. Officials responded by saying that urban areas are more successful in competing for attention and funds because they are better organized and have better communications.

Antipoverty Chief Sargent Shriver said it is "harder to get to the rural poor." Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman complained about the troubles of communicating with and stirring up leaders scattered about the countryside.

America's conservation district leaders know intimately just how difficult it is to activate public opinion about critical problems of national significance, and to start from scratch in building local organizations to deal with them. With patience and a sense of purpose, however, District leaders have done just that. And it didn't happen overnight.

Districts have been eminently successful in organizing people to help themselves—the very problem now engaging the directors of the economic opportunities program. Soil and water conservation districts have created a conservation corps of impressive proportions—composed of 15,000 community leaders and a working force of nearly 2 million individual cooperators ready to carry forward conservation activities.

Others share their dedication and enthusiasm. Among these are numbered the bankers, businessmen, housewives, suppliers, manufacturers, sportsmen, and municipal officials who have seen how district programs protect natural resources, build jobs, improve water supplies, and increase recreational opportunities.

The district movement—viewed solely as an organizational mechanism for enlisting local participation and fostering coordinated action—is an achievement of great consequence. It is in the mainstream of our democratic tradition, and every supervisor and friend of districts can be justly proud of the accomplishment.

But the question the Nation is now called upon to answer is—how much is this organization worth? How valuable is it to maintain this mechanism for advancing conservation; to continue the contributions of men and women dedicated to the principle of local self-government? How important is it to maintain the interest of 2 million landowners and operators in adopting conservation measures that benefit all the people?

There is a paradox in the spectacle of the Federal Government in its attempts, on the one hand, to advance the national purpose of ending poverty by struggling to build up local interest and an organizational framework for action; and, on the other hand, proposing budget cuts that would jeopardize the programs and dim the enthusiasm of district officials and their cooperators seeking to advance the equally important national purpose of conservation and resource development.

It should not be necessary at this stage of affairs to battle for recognition of the fundamental values of our proven approach to conservation objectives. Instead, this is a time for strengthening and fortifying district programs. It is a time for Congress to capitalize on the unique advantages that districts offer for mobilizing the capabilities of millions of participants in accomplishing the conservation jobs that must be done.

William M. Roark: "I Don't Want My Son To Fight a War I Should Have Fought"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, to most of us the war in Vietnam has seemed very distant and far removed from our personal lives. But the nearness of this problem was brought home to me rather shockingly recently when I was called off the floor of the House of Representatives to take a long distance telephone call informing me that the only son of one of my best friends was killed in action. This young man, whom I had known since childhood, was shot down in his Navy plane over North Vietnam.

In recent weeks we have witnessed a series of so-called peace demonstrations here in the Nation's Capital. Young men and women calling themselves students, and others, have demanded that

we pull out of Vietnam. These "pacifists" have conducted marches, sit-ins, and lie-ins in front of the White House, the home of the President of the United States. These "students"—supposedly cultured and educated young men and women—would ask the United States to stop hitting military targets in North Vietnam without requiring that the Vietcong stop its slaughter of civilians in South Vietnam. Most of the demonstrators, as well as the demonstrations, were a disgrace to this Nation, a nation founded on freedom, a nation dedicated to the task of preserving freedom for all of the world's peoples.

In contrast, there was Navy Lt. William M. Roark, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank F. Roark, of Omaha, Nebr. Bill was one of the finest examples of an all American boy. He loved life and liberty—he died defending that liberty when his plane was shot down over North Vietnam. He was willing to die in order that his children might know the meaning of freedom and liberty.

On March 3, a month before his death, Lieutenant Roark wrote to his wife Karen the following:

I don't want my sons to fight a war I should have fought. I wish more Americans felt that way.

I'm not a warmonger; it will be me who gets shot at. But it's foolish and blind not to have the courage of your convictions.

I will not live under a totalitarian society and I don't want you to, either. I believe in God and will resist any force that attempts to remove God from society, no matter what the name.

This is what we all must do if we believe in what our Founding Fathers stood for.

I hope my distinguished colleagues will take heart in these words from a young American who died for what he believed in. His words are a far cry from those uttered by the stringy-haired girls and bearded boys who paraded through Washington and whose main objective was to make a nuisance and a spectacle of themselves.

Mr. Speaker, there is more to the William Roark story, and I would call attention to the following article written by Robert Phipps for the Omaha World-Herald issue of April 9, 1965:

"I DON'T WANT MY SONS TO FIGHT A WAR I SHOULD HAVE FOUGHT"

(By Robert Phipps)

On March 3, Navy Lt. William M. Roark wrote to his wife in Omaha from the carrier *Coral Sea*

"I don't want my sons to fight a war I should have fought. I wish more Americans felt that way.

"I'm not a warmonger; it will be me who gets shot at. But it's foolish and blind not to have the courage of your convictions.

"I will not live under a totalitarian society and I don't want you to, either. I believe in God and will resist any force that attempts to remove God from society, no matter what the name.

"This is what we all must do if we believe in what the Founding Fathers stood for."

Karen Roark studied this letter Friday in her home at 3620 Ida Street, hugged her daughter, Lisa, 4, and son, John, 2, and talked bravely about the telegram from the Defense Department.

Lieutenant Roark was killed in action over North Vietnam, it was announced.

The telegram with supplementary information said he had ejected from his plane, had parachuted to the sea and was seen floating face downward, presumably dead from gunshot wounds. His body, said the Defense Department, is not recoverable.

Mrs. Roark, who is expecting a third child on about Easter Sunday, spoke of other things her husband had written to her.

"He believed we should stay in southeast Asia until we finished the job," she said. "He was proud of the Navy, proud to be a Navy flier.

"He felt we should not let the Communists drive us out, that it is better to finish the job as soon as possible. He wished more Americans were keeping up with the situation," she added.

Lieutenant Roark was a graduate of Central High School in 1956, was cadet colonel and commanding officer of the regiment, and was given the Kiwanis Club Medal in his senior year as the outstanding cadet.

His parents are Mr. and Mrs. Frank F. Roark, 1819 South 76th Street. Recalling the day he presented the Kiwanis medal to his son, Mr. Roark said: "From the age of 10, Bill knew he wanted to be a Navy officer.

"He had no idea then about the qualifications at the Naval Academy. He made himself qualify, physically and mentally, and graduated in 1960.

"I have talked to his commanding officer," Mr. Roark continued, "and he told me Bill was an outstanding officer and flier."

The lieutenant started his second cruise on the Coral Sea last December 7, after duty at Lemoore, Calif., since April 1962.

Arrangements for a church memorial service are pending. Survivors also include the officer's grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. W. W. Emerson, Sioux City, Iowa.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of attending and addressing a banquet in Baltimore last night by a Polish group representing the Polish Congress of America, in observance of their 174th anniversary.

I would like to insert that address at this point in the RECORD:

Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Tawes, Father Szelagowski, distinguished officials of our State and city government, other head table guests, officers and members of the Maryland Division of the Polish American Congress, ladies and gentlemen, once again we assemble to commemorate the 174th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. This is the most significant day in Poland's history, and is being commemorated by approximately 10 million Americans of Polish ancestry throughout our country today.

But May 3, 1791, is not just an anniversary, it stands as a memorial day for what was once a free Poland and it prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice even though Poland has once more been deprived of her independence and sovereignty by Soviet Russia. For "Truth crushed to the earth shall rise again," say the poets, and so it has with the Polish people who have time and again since this memorable date revolted from tyrannical domination and asserted their national identity.

This year's constitutional day observance also coincides with other significant dates in Polish history: the 25th anniversary of the discovery of the Katyn massacre; the 20th anniversary of the Yalta Agreement; and the 20th anniversary of the treacherous imprisonment by Russia of 16 members of free Poland's underground government.

Of these dates, the one that will long burn in the hearts of Polish patriots as one of the most brutal acts of genocide in World War II was perpetrated by the Russians who massacred 14,283 Polish officers and intellectual prisoners in the spring of 1940 at the Katyn Forest near Smolensk in the Soviet Union.

When accused of these murders, Moscow immediately denied them and countercharged the Nazi's with responsibility for this hideous crime. To establish the truth the Polish Government-in-exile in London appealed to the International Red Cross to conduct an impartial investigation of the incident. Since the Red Cross demanded representatives of each country involved in the charges to be present during the investigations, they refused to conduct them, for Soviet Russia would not agree to be represented. The Russians instead severed diplomatic relations with the Polish Government-in-exile, denouncing it as acting falsely in collaboration with Nazi Germany.

It wasn't until December 1952 that a select committee of the U.S. House of Representatives after a year and a half of detailed investigations of pertinent documents and testimony by hundreds of duly identified witnesses established beyond the shadow of a doubt that Russia stands accused of the Katyn massacre.

These facts of crime, deceit, falsehood, and treachery should bring about a new awareness to us of the Western World, of the true face of communism.

We must here today rededicate ourselves to deliverance of not only the Polish people but all peoples behind the Iron Curtain from the yoke of oppression.

Anniversary of Israel Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, the 6th of May 1965, presents me with the welcome opportunity to express my sincere congratulations to the courageous people of Israel on this, their 17th anniversary of independence.

For nearly two millenia after the destruction of their Second Temple by the armies of the Roman Empire, the Jews of the world were forced to look upon their ancient heritage as a purely spiritual matter. Never for a moment, however, was the dream of the return to Zion forgotten. The goal of once again establishing the independent State of Israel permeated the literature, the art and culture, the lives and, of course, the religion of the world's Jews.

In the latter part of the 19th century, due in large part to a new series of pogroms, a concerted drive to create a new homeland on the foundations of the old was begun. Called Zionism, after the hill in Jerusalem which bears that name, it soon attracted many notable adherents, as well as the support of a great number of Jews in countries the world over.

With the close of World War I, and the express support of the British Government as a result of the Balfour Declaration, immigration to Palestine by refugees from war-ravaged Europe increased markedly. Despite the desire of the Jewish community of Palestine for peaceful and fruitful cooperation with the Arab community, the irresponsible leadership of the Arabs encouraged violent opposition to Jewish property and activities.

In an effort to settle then early perennial problem of the future of Palestine, Great Britain asked the United Nations for assistance. And, in late 1947, a historic decision was reached: the partition of Palestine into a Jewish and an Arab State, joined together in an economic union. Once again, however, the intransigence of the Arabs proved that the final realization of this age-old dream was not to become an immediate reality. As soon as the mandate ended, and the newly independent State of Israel was proclaimed in May of 1948, the armies of the neighboring Arab States attacked and tried to thwart the peaceful implementation of the U.N. resolution.

The self-defense forces of the Israeli, and the courage and conviction of the citizenry of the new state were, however, more than a match for the invaders. Once the armistice agreements had been signed, this courageous country embarked upon programs to realize the dreams and ideals of centuries, even though there remained the constant threat of new attacks from its Arab neighbors.

What has, in fact, been achieved in the 17 short years which have passed is remarkable. In the field of agriculture, thousands of acres have been reclaimed; in the field of industry, thousands of new enterprises have been created; and new towns and cities, hospitals, schools, and universities have been founded to provide the necessary facilities for the expanding population. The rate of growth of the economy, as well of the per capita income, are among the very highest in the world.

Indeed, in the very short period since Israel has once again become an independent member of the family of nations, the progress which her people have achieved is nothing short of miraculous. It is, therefore, with great respect and deep conviction that I today salute this small state and its people on another of the many, many anniversaries I expect to see it celebrate.

The Selma, Ala., Situation

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in vigorously protesting the calumnious attack against participants in the Selma march by the Member from the State of Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] on the House floor.

The clergymen of all faiths, the nuns, and the other victims of this character assassination actually need no defense. The character of their lives and works is eloquent refutation of the charges leveled at them—charges leveled in the sanctity of the House of Representatives, immune from legal action. The vulgar diatribe of the Member from Alabama demeans only himself and those for whom he speaks.

Lurid stories cannot divert attention from the evils that caused the long and arduous march and that must not be allowed to continue. The dedicated citizens, religious and lay, who journeyed to Alabama at personal inconvenience and expense and endured hardship and hostility there will continue to practice the virtue of charity toward their detractors. They will continue to work wholeheartedly toward the goal of equal rights and equal treatment for all members of a democratic society.

It is saddening—and also frightening—to witness the extremes of which men are capable when they are consumed with racial and religious prejudice and hatred. This spirit of unreasoning hate and violence has found release in the bombings and murders of helpless people and scurrilous attacks upon citizens whose only crime is their commitment to the Judeo-Christian ethic and the democratic principles upon which our Nation was founded.

The vast majority of Americans join with the Selma marchers in rejecting the evil of hatred that poisons the wells of our democratic institutions. They will not be swayed from the great task of fulfilling the promise of America, of enabling all our people to enjoy the dignity, equality, and justice due them as children of God and citizens of the United States.

Israel's 17th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Israel is celebrating this week the 17th anniversary of its existence. The people of the United States take great pride in the fact that our country helped Israel attain its independence back in 1948. Since then the relations between our two countries have been most cordial and we are well aware that in Israel we have a stanch ally in that part of the world.

We also note with a great deal of pleasure that Israel has utilized our economic assistance to the best advantage of its people and the development of its resources, so that today it is one of the few countries which no longer needs our economic aid in the form of outright grants or even technical assistance. We still sell to Israel limited quantities of our surplus agricultural commodities and we also extend some loans to her for developmental purposes which are subsequently repaid with interest. All of this merely proves that Israel has made remarkable economic growth and has many notable achievements to its credit over these past years.

To be sure, Israel has its problems which are mainly of a political nature. To this day its Arab neighbors refuse to recognize her and to make peace with her. They refuse to recognize reality and are still dreaming of Israel's destruction and scheming against her. They fail to understand that a new conflagration in the Middle East would not only involve them too and bring home to their people the full tragedy and misery of modern warfare, but that it would also engulf many other nations throughout the world.

The adamant stand taken by some of the Arab leaders, especially that of President Nasser of Egypt, is most regrettable because in the long run it is a disservice to their own people. Some of the Arab leaders, I am glad to say, are beginning to regard this situation in more realistic terms and are calling for conciliation. President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia has recently taken the initiative in bringing the truth of the Arab-Israel situation in the Middle East to the attention of the Arab world and in warning that any aggression against Israel is bound to fail. He has shown himself to be a statesman of the first order and his efforts toward an Arab-Israel peace should be encouraged.

As the years go on, the cooperation between the United States and Israel is growing in many ways. The international trade between our two countries is constantly increasing. Cultural exchange is becoming an important factor. Politically, Israel has been a firm supporter of the United States and other free world nations in their efforts in the United Nations to maintain world peace and to uphold the cause of the free world. One of the most recent examples of United States-Israel cooperation is their agreement for joint research into the problem of water desalination. Should this research lead to the discovery of more economic methods for large-scale water desalination, as I am sure it will, this will constitute a great blessing for both the United States and Israel since both are in dire need of fresh water supplies.

It is clear then that both countries and the world at large have much to gain from peaceful relations. It is no wonder that the United States is extremely interested in maintaining peace in the Middle East and is ready at all times to help bring about true peace between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

On this occasion of Israel's 17th anniversary of its establishment as an independent state, we pay a well-deserved tribute to this little nation and to its leaders and people on their achievements. We send our greetings and our best wishes to them and to all of Israel's friends in the United States. It is my sincere hope that during this coming year we shall all witness another great achievement—peace, prosperity, and political stability in the Middle East.

Appendix

AFL–CIO Will Present Tribute to a Great American—Henry J. Kaiser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 7, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on May 20, 1965, Henry J. Kaiser will receive the AFL–CIO Murray-Green Award at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C. This is the only national citation given by the AFL–CIO, and for the first time in its 18-year history the recognition will come to a member of management.

The Murray-Green Award was established to express tribute to outstanding contributions made by individuals and organizations in this country and abroad that have improved the health, welfare, and recreation of people everywhere.

Mr. Kaiser was selected in recognition of his notable accomplishments in the field of voluntary medical care, housing, and labor-management relations.

It is my pleasure to know Henry J. Kaiser personally. West Virginians consider this industrialist and humanitarian a real friend. Ten years ago he broke ground for the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. at Ravenswood in Jackson County. Since then the population of that community has more than tripled and the county now has the second highest per capita income in the State, largely as a result of the plant's operation. The Ravenswood factory employs more than 3,100 men and women with an annual payroll in excess of $23 million. Kaiser interests have also been instrumental in improving the educational system and the hospital facilities.

Mr. President, I join with West Virginians and Americans in saluting and applauding Henry J. Kaiser—a truly great American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the official biography of Henry J. Kaiser be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. His achievements which have been so vital to our Nation should be available to the public.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF HENRY J. KAISER, 1965

Henry J. (John) Kaiser was born May 9, 1882, at Sprout Brook, N.Y., one of four children of Francis J. Kaiser, a shoemaker, and Mary (Yops) Kaiser, a practical nurse, both of whom were German immigrants.

He started his business career at 13 when he left school to take a $1.50 a week job as cash boy for a Utica, N.Y., drygoods store, and added to his income by taking photographs after regular working hours.

Later he traveled as a photographic supplies salesman in upstate New York, and at 22 became junior partner in the photographic firm of Brownell & Kaiser at Lake Placid, N.Y. Within a year he purchased the business, adding new photographic stores at Daytona and several other Florida cities and at Nassau, in the Bahamas.

Deciding to build a new career in the growing West, Mr. Kaiser went to Spokane, Wash., in 1906, and was hired by a hardware company, later becoming city sales manager. In 1912, he joined a construction company as salesman and manager of paving contracts in Washington and British Columbia, thus opening the way for his career in building.

He established his first company—the Henry J. Kaiser, Co., Ltd.—in 1914, at Vancouver, British Columbia, when he was 32. During the next dozen years, he concentrated on highway construction in the Pacific Northwest and California, in addition to constructing several sand and gravel plants of his own and two earthfill dams. Oakland, Calif., became Kaiser headquarters in 1921, and has remained the home office for his activities ever since.

The year 1927 brought what Mr. Kaiser considers the turning point in his career. It was a $20 million project—huge in those days—to build some 200 miles of highway and 500 bridges into the interior of Cuba. It meant organizing 6,000 workers and battling serious obstacles, but the pioneering job was finished long ahead of schedule. The principle of teamwork learned on this job guided future work. It led to partnerships and associations with other contractors for cooperative construction of gigantic projects, such as some of the world's largest dams.

This building era saw Mr. Kaiser become chairman of the executive committee of the famous Six Companies, Inc., which combined to build Hoover (Boulder) Dam. He went on to participate in the building of Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams on the Columbia River and such other heavy construction projects as the piers of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, levees on the Mississippi River, and pipelines in the Northwest, Southwest, and in Mexico. Up to the start of World War II, Kaiser and associated firms built about 1,000 projects totaling $383 million.

Mr. Kaiser's industrial era began in 1939, when he won the bid to supply 6 million barrels of cement and 11 million tons of aggregates for Shasta Dam in northern California.

Production in many fields moved ahead swiftly during World War II. Although new to shipbuilding, the Kaiser organization produced more vessels for the war effort than any other shipbuilder. At the peak, there were 58 shipways in 7 yards built and operated by Kaiser in California, Oregon, and Washington. These shipyards produced 1,490 vessels, including nearly one-third of the entire American production of merchant shipping and 50 small aircraft carriers. The Kaiser yards established a worldwide reputation for phenomenal speed in ship construction, averaging a ship a day.

Other World War II work included the founding at Fontana, Calif., of the Pacific coast's first—and still the only—completely integrated iron and steel plant; building and operating two magnesium plants for production of the ultralight metal and "goop," the magnesium war incendiary; supplying all the bulk cement used by the United States to construct Pacific fortifications; operating aircraft and aircraft parts manufacturing plants; and managing the largest artillery shell operations in the country.

The postwar growth of Kaiser-managed companies was rapid and diversified. By 1964—the 50th anniversary of the Kaiser organization—the industrial family identified with his name had total assets of more than $2 billion, and annual sales of $1.5 billion.

Today, at 82 (83 on May 9), Mr. Kaiser is chairman of the board of directors and active in the policy decisions of Kaiser Industries Corp., the parent company of more than 60 other active Kaiser-affiliated companies and subsidiaries.

A publicly held company, Kaiser Industries wholly owns six subsidiaries and divisions, including Kaiser Jeep Corp., Kaiser Hawaii Kai Development Co., Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp., Kaiser Broadcasting Corp., Kaiser Engineers Division, and Kaiser Sand & Gravel Division, and is partial owner of National Steel & Shipbuilding Co.

It also partially owns such major publicly held companies as Kaiser Steel Corp., Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., and Kaiser Cement & Gypsum Corp., of which Mr. Kaiser is founder-chairman of the board.

The affiliated Kaiser companies, now turning out some 300 different products and services, have 168 plants and projects located in 28 States and 40 foreign countries. They employ more than 80,000 persons and have 130,000 stockholders.

Mr. Kaiser has established an international reputation in a nonbusiness area—health and medical care. The Kaiser Foundation medical care program is the result of more than 20 years' pioneering to bring high-quality medical care within financial reach of the average man. The program includes the building of self-sustaining hospitals and medical centers where medical care is provided by independent partnerships of doctors under a prepayment health plan, with emphasis on preventive medicine.

More than 1 million persons in California, Oregon, Washington, and Hawaii are members of the Kaiser Foundation health plan, and hundreds of thousands of nonmembers are treated in foundation medical facilities. These include more than 50 outpatient medical offices and multimillion dollar "hospitals of the future," whose design and innovations have received world acclaim. The foundation also sponsors a rehabilitation center for those handicapped by various types of paralysis.

Kaiser Jeep, which succeeded Mr. Kaiser's first postwar automotive venture, Kaiser-Frazer Corp., has centered its automotive production around the world-famous Jeep commercial vehicle, and in 1962 expanded this product line to include the Wagoneer station wagon and the Gladiator truck. The war-born Jeep—an integral part of the U.S. armed services—has become America's most useful and versatile contribution to peacetime transportation.

The company, operating its principal manufacturing plants in Toledo, Ohio, and South Bend, Ind., is the world's largest manufacturer of 4-wheel drive commercial vehicles,

and the Nation's third largest exporter of commercial vehicles. It has interests in a worldwide group of manufacturing and assembly plants in 28 foreign countries, including fully integrated automotive industries in Argentina and Brazil, and plants in Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, India, Iran, Israel, Japan, South Africa, Taiwan, and Turkey. Sales exceed $450 million a year.

Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. produces one-fourth of the entire U.S. output of primary aluminum, in addition to fabricated aluminum products, chemicals and refractories, in 47 U.S. plants and facilities in 22 States. In 1964, Kaiser Aluminum sales exceeded $500 million, compared with $45 million sales in 1947, the first year of aluminum operations, and has become the largest of the affiliated Kaiser companies. The firm is now rapidly expanding its participation in international aluminum facilities and markets throughout the free world. By 1964, it had investments in 28 plants in 17 foreign countries.

Kaiser Steel Corp. has contributed materially to the rapid growth of the Western United States in the postwar years. Early in 1959, the company completed a $212 million expansion program—the largest single expansion of an industrial plant in west coast history—which doubled its capacity to 3 million ingot tons a year, also doubling finished product capacity and making Kaiser Steel the largest steel producer west of the Mississippi and the ninth largest in the Nation. Company-owned coal mines in Utah and New Mexico, and iron ore mines and limestone in southern California afford complete integration. Its nine major facilities in the West include the largest single area of coal land in the United States—more than a half million acres in New Mexico. Company sales approximate $280 million annually.

Kaiser Cement & Gypsum Corp. (formerly Permanente Cement Co.), with a diversified and integrated line of cement, gypsum, and insulating products, is the largest supplier of building materials in the West. The company has kept pace with the rapid growth of the west coast and Pacific area with annual sales of $90 million. It maintains its own shipping fleet to transport bulk cement along the west coast and to the Pacific islands.

Kaiser Cement's northern California plant—with an annual capacity of 8.5 million barrels—is the largest in the West. The company has plants in southern California, Washington, Montana, Hawaii, and Okinawa. Annual capacity is nearly 19 million barrels, equivalent to more than 75 million sacks of cement.

One of the largest gypsum deposits in the world, at San Marcos Island, in the Gulf of Mexico, supplies its gypsum board and plaster plants in California, Washington, New Mexico, and Florida, with a new plant under construction in New Jersey. Products from its Fir-Tex fiber insulating board plant at St. Helens, Oreg., are distributed nationally.

In Hawaii, Mr. Kaiser entered upon new fields of development, and in 1955 opened the first units of the 1,100-room Hawaiian Village hotels resort center on Waikiki Beach, later sold to Hilton Hotels Corp.

Mr. Kaiser also began the development, at Honolulu, of an entire new community, known as Hawaii Kai. Embracing 6,000 acres of Bishop Estates lands surrounding Koko Head scenic park areas, the $350 million project is expected, by 1970, to have a population of 50,000.

Construction and engineering continued to play a major role in the overall growth of the Kaiser organization. Kaiser Engineers is among the world's largest engineering firms, in 1965 having a work backlog of $800 million.

Supplemental Appropriation for Military Functions of Department of Defense Fiscal Year 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration House Joint Resolution 447 making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for military functions of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I had the opportunity of attending the White House meeting at which time the President made his request for the appropriation of $700 million now before us.

While I believe that a policy of firmness and decisive action is essential to our form of government, I also feel that all the ramifications of the legislative action before us cannot be adequately discussed in the short time of 1 hour given this body.

I realize that, even with the latest information made available to Members of Congress, it is hardly possible to reach complete agreement on an approach to a highly complex situation. I have always been reluctant to take hasty action on any measure of such far-reaching import, but have been convinced by the President's appeal that the urgency of this expenditure involves a show of national unity to shorten the war by making early negotiations possible.

I, therefore, find it most difficult to make an honest and personal evaluation of the tremendous significance of the resolution before us, and must rely on the President's statements of his desire for a peaceful solution of the Vietnamese conflict.

I am sure that Congress will fully support this measure. In some cases, because Members are in agreement with its implicit policy; in others, because of the possibility of being placed in the position of denying the funds necessary to supply our fighting men with the essential implements to lighten their burden and shorten the time before they can return to their loved ones at home.

The President stated in his message to Congress and the American people:

> I do not ask complete approval for every phase and action of your Government. I do ask for prompt support of our basic course: resistance to aggression, moderation in the use of power, and a constant search for peace.

In light of this it must be made clear that my vote should not be construed as an unqualified endorsement of our policy in Vietnam, nor as a blank approval of present and future action in this hemisphere or any place else in the world.

It is, however, in the interest of our constant search for peace that I cast my vote with the majority in the hope that a show of unity and determination on the part of the American people may open the way for a quick settlement of the conflict in southeast Asia, giving the Vietnamese people the right of self-determination without external interference, and the freedom of living in peace.

Elimination of Excise Tax on New Passenger Cars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 7, 1965

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Greater New York, Long Island, and Westchester Automobile Dealers Association, who "urgently request early elimination of the Federal excise tax of 10 percent on new passenger cars."

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE GREATER NEW YORK, LONG ISLAND & WESTCHESTER AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION

Whereas the Greater New York, Long Island & Westchester Automobile Dealers Association is comprised of more than 400 franchised new car dealers doing business in the 8 counties encompassed within its name; and

Whereas the volume of motor vehicles sold in the area, represented by this association, is of such magnitude as to constitute a major factor in the economy; and

Whereas the Federal excise tax on new cars, first levied as a temporary tax, has long since outlived its original purpose; and

Whereas few products, so essential to the community well-being, are as heavily taxed as motor vehicles; and

Whereas it is the reported desire of the present administration to reduce consumer taxes and thereby advance the economy of the country; and

Whereas the long-overdue elimination of the Federal excise tax of 10 percent on new motor vehicles would not only be in the consumer interest but would result in a substantial upsurge in the motor car business and affiliated industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the board of directors of the Greater New York, Long Island & Westchester Automobile Dealers Association in meeting today, April 26, 1965, urgently request early elimination of the Federal excise tax of 10 percent on new passenger cars; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the U.S. Senators for New York and to the Representatives in Congress from the eight counties served by the association.

RESOLUTION OF THE GREATER NEW YORK, LONG ISLAND & WESTCHESTER AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION

Whereas the Greater New York, Long Island & Westchester Automobile Dealers Association is comprised of more than 400 fran-

chised new car dealers doing business in the 8 counties encompassed within its name; and

Whereas the elimination of the 10 percent Federal excise tax on new passenger cars is the subject of many bills introduced in the present Congress; and

Whereas the possibility of the repeal of this tax has received considerable publicity in the various news media; and

Whereas the possible average saving of some $225 per car is a very substantial sum; and

Whereas prospective purchasers of new automobiles may tend to delay the immediate purchase of a new car until such time as legislative action is forthcoming: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the board of directors of the Greater New York, Long Island & Westchester Automobile Dealers Association in meeting today, April 26, 1965, urgently request that any legislation providing for repeal of such excise tax shall also provide for refund to the purchasers of new passenger cars of the amount of tax paid on units purchased prior to the effective date of repeal, or in lieu thereof, that the publicity to be given to action by Congress to contemplated repeal carry assurances that such repeal will be retroactive to the date of first public announcement of congressional consideration thereof; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress, from the eight counties served by the association.

We Will Defend Freedom

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 447) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for military functions of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, this resolution and this $700 million is an opportunity for Congress to help prevent another disastrous world war. This resolution is an opportunity for Congress to take positive action to solve the No. 1 issue facing the American people and the free peoples of the world—the constant threat of Communist domination of the world. At the moment, this Communist threat is manifested through infiltration and sabotage of free peoples by Communist agents. In recent years, we have seen the Communists gobble up nation after nation in Europe, in Asia, and even in this hemisphere. South Vietnam and Santo Domingo are only another step in the Communist plan to subvert and conquer the entire free world.

The President's decision to stand firm in South Vietnam and to forestall a Communist takeover in Santo Domingo is in the interest of freedom and the security of free peoples. The forthright action of the President is calculated to avert a general war and, therefore, is definitely in the interest of peace.

This resolution will eliminate the possibility of Communist miscalculation, which contributed to their open attack on the South Korean Republic in 1950, thus precipitating a general war. This resolution will prevent any dictator from misjudging the American will to resist.

Mr. Chairman, our own country could possibly have averted World War I and World War II had the dictators been put on notice by a resolution such as this one before the House today. The Communist world has been lead to believe, as Hitler was led to believe, that we do not have the will to resist aggression. The Communist propaganda mill has frequently referred to the United States as a paper tiger, lacking the will or ability to defend our allies.

This resolution today is the greatest single step this Congress can take for peace and to prevent a world conflict—a world war which would bring destruction to the cities of the world and to countless millions of innocent civilians.

The President has been the target of abuse, tirades, and ridicule from Moscow, Peiping, Hanoi, and Havana. I am shocked and distressed to see some in our own country lend comfort to those who have called the President an imperialist gangster and who seek to discredit our Commander in Chief before the peoples of the world. I believe the American people now realize and the Members here realize that speeches and articles attacking the President and his foreign policy are reproduced by the Communists and distributed as Communist propaganda in an effort to prove we are not a united nation.

This resolution is designed to let the Communists know in no uncertain terms that we will stand firm in South Vietnam and in Santo Domingo, in Berlin, and throughout the world. It will notify the Communists that we will fight in the defense of our friends and allies. This resolution will make it crystal clear to the aggressors that we will fight open aggression, we will oppose infiltration of free nations by foreign agents and that we will fight Communist subversion and sabotage.

This resolution is for peace and it will encourage the free peoples of the world to stand firm. I urge that this resolution be adopted by an overwhelming vote in order that the enemies of freedom will know now where we stand.

Tribute to Idaho's Lieutenant Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 7, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, upon nearing the age of retirement, most men cast about for hobbies with which to occupy the leisure time of their retirement years. Few men turn to a new and full career; and even fewer wish to burden themselves with tasks of dedicated public service, after a full life career as a railroad man.

But the Lieutenant Governor of my State, the Honorable William E. Drevlow, has done just that. Now in his 75th year, he has presided over three regular sessions and several special sessions of the Idaho State Legislature. He has served as Acting Governor longer than any of his predecessors. After his 70th birthday, he has battled disability in his legs, and has won.

Now he is considering a real retirement, which he richly deserves. In his 18 years in the Idaho political scene, he has won the respect and admiration of all of his fellow citizens, without regard to party affiliation. His gentle wisdom and his unchallenged title as the most fair of all political figures have brought accolades from all sections of the State.

One of those accolades came in a televised editorial by station KID, in Idaho Falls, and reprinted on May 1 in the Lewiston Morning Tribune.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THANK YOU, MR. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, OF IDAHO

All too often we pause and reflect, sometimes saying thank you in the process, after it is too late.

That's how we felt recently when we read a report out of Boise that the grand old man of Idaho's Democratic Party may have presided over his last session of the Idaho Senate.

We're referring to Lt. Gov. William Drevlow, who at 75 is beginning to feel the weight of those long days that traditionally are part of presiding over a legislative body as unpredictable as the Idaho Senate.

Politicians come in all shapes and sizes. Drevlow is a ranking politician—a politician who has that rare blend of maturity, patience, courage, and ability.

The courage which Drevlow has exhibited in his daily life could serve as a guidepost for each of us.

Twice in 4 years he has battled poor health that has taken him close to death. In 1961 his right leg was amputated near the knee. In 1963 artificial veins were strung through his left leg to save his life.

The just completed legislative session was the fourth in which Drevlow has presided over the senate. In 6 years as Lieutenant Governor, he has been Acting Governor for 295 days—more than any of his predecessors served as acting executive.

Drevlow has enjoyed being Acting Governor. He says his chores have been pleasant, that he's met many dedicated public servants, and that it's been enlightening to meet young people. All of these things, Drevlow says, would have been impossible unless he had been Acting Governor.

Once Drevlow thought about running for Governor. Well, really, it was more than a thought. He was a candidate for Governor for 3 weeks in 1962 before he decided he didn't want to run. Then he bowed out and was returned to the Lieutenant Governor's post although a Republican was elected Governor.

The man who was elected Governor in 1962 and is the State's chief executive now, Robert E. Smylie, is impressed with Drevlow. The Governor remarked recently in these words:

"You," meaning Drevlow, "have illustrated that quality of leadership and integrity which have endeared you to the people of Idaho."

Drevlow realizes his days of active politics are probably behind him. He questions if he'll run for Lieutenant Governor again.

"By the time I get through with this session," remarked Drevlow, "I will have more

than 18 years in politics. It would be restful at home."

Drevlow is a gentle and kind man whose efforts in the unglamorous job of Lieutenant Governor are often overlooked.

That's why we feel it appropriate to take this opportunity to say on behalf of the people of Idaho, "Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor. Thank you for a job well done."

The senate chambers will not be the same without Mr. Drevlow, but its members are much wiser and more mature because of his having been there.—KID-TV, Idaho Falls, in televised editorial.

New Gold Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have thought for some time that the United States should have a gold policy which does not protect speculators from loss. In addition, I believe that the entire international monetary system should be reviewed with a view toward establishing a new world monetary reserve unit. I should like, therefore, to call the attention of Members of the House to a proposal for such new policies advocated by Mr. Donald C. Cook, president of the American Electric Power Co. I include at this point in my remarks an excellent report on Mr. Cook's views as published in the American Banker, May 4, 1965:

NEW GOLD POLICY, WORLD RESERVE CURRENCY ADVOCATED BY COOK

(By Ben Weberman)

NEW YORK.—Donald C. Cook, president of American Electric Power Co., who is still among President Johnson's close advisers on domestic and foreign financial affairs, is one who advocates a new gold policy for this country and would like to see progress moving in the direction of a new international reserve currency.

These views were revealed in an interview with the progressive utility executive who was unable to accept the post of Secretary of the Treasury when it was offered by the President but who has remained a friend and confidant of Mr. Johnson.

For that reason, much weight must be given to his view that the United States could curb gold speculation by terminating the standing offer to buy gold at $35 an ounce (less a modest handling charge).

The United States would continue to redeem dollars for gold at $35 an ounce—that is the measure which fixes the value of the dollar—but is acting rather foolishly to stand ready under all circumstances to pay that price for all the metal offered to it, he declared.

The merit of accepting such a new policy is that gold speculation again would hold considerable risk. "The speculator would no longer have a 'put' on the United States enabling him to resell the yellow metal at any time at a price close to cost," Mr. Cook declared.

Up to now, the only cost of speculation is barely more than loss of income that could otherwise be earned on funds sterilized in gold. This is not nearly enough to dampen the demand of speculators who think they are playing for big profits for the hoped for devaluation of the pound or the dollar, he explained.

The realization that gold could drop to $30, $25 an ounce—or lower—would certainly tend to dampen speculative purchases of gold and could even bring quite a bit back to Government stockpiles from privately held supplies. It might also reduce the appetite of some countries for increased amounts of gold for reserve purposes.

At the same time, he urged moving ahead toward the adoption of a new international monetary reserve unit to be used in settlement of payments balances. The possibility of worldwide acceptance of this concept has been greatly enhanced as a result of the success of the American efforts to solve the country's balance-of-payments problem by restricting capital exports and the realization that an American surplus will produce deficits and possibly economic contraction abroad, Mr. Cook indicated.

This has highlighted the basic inadequacy of existing monetary mechanisms and placed in bold relief the need for reform, he added. He likened the potential system to the Federal Reserve assistance in settling interbank balances.

In Mr. Cook's opinion, the chief stumbling block to successful development of a reserve unit would be the difficulty in establishing one which has the stability and therefore would be readily accepted by all payments surplus countries.

A possible answer would be complete separation of the obligation of each country to the sponsoring international entity on the one hand and to everyone else on the other.

Stability then could be achieved by imposing a requirement that each country protect the value of its own subscription made in its own currency value against inflation or devaluation. Thus, if the relative price of a country's currency were reduced—through either devaluation or inflationary loss of purchasing power—more currency would have to be contributed to the entity to offset the difference.

This requirement, Mr. Cook added, would have the additional merit of bringing pressure on member countries to control their own economic affairs in such a way as to insure fiscal responsibility.

Some form of international reserve unit has been backed by virtually every country, which is a party to the International Monetary Fund. The French favor such a unit, too, though they have perverted the idea by trying to tie settlements to gold and "there just isn't enough gold in the world for such a purpose. To mark up the price of gold, to enable gold to stay in the picture as Mr. Rueff has proposed would be sheer lunacy for us, catastrophe for our friends, and a highly successful speculation for France, which could then sell back to us for $70 or $105, or whatever an ounce the gold it has so recently purchased for $35 an ounce from us.

Mr. Cook was only slightly concerned about the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. "The belief that this country has a terrible balance-of-payments problem and that it could wreck our economy is all wrong," he asserted.

He predicted that within 6 to 12 months, some of the European governments which have been calling most loudly for elimination of the U.S. deficit and for curtailment of U.S. investment in their industries would not only be letting up on the criticism but would be willing—indeed would desire—to see a continued deficit in the U.S. international payments. They would realize, he explained, that this country's deficit is not structural but results from exports of short-term and long-term capital which is necessary to their own economies.

An additional way of curbing speculation in gold, Mr. Cook said, could be done by raising the charges on official sales to say 1 percent, or 35 cents an ounce. This would immediately serve to deter some of those who now buy gold on very slim margins—often no more than 3 or 5 percent. Ultimate sale back to the United States—if this country were to continue to be a buyer—would be at $35 less 1 percent and the 2-percent charge for the round trip which would wipe out a good part of the cash investment.

Furthermore, if the United States were to say, in effect, that it will sell gold at $35 to the full extent of the $14.5 billion stockpile if necessary but isn't necessarily going to pay that price for the yellow metal, a considerable amount would come out of privately owned supply.

There is no reason why speculators should have a virtually cost-free perpetual "put" on the United States of gold at $35 an ounce, he declared. It would cost up to 10 percent to buy a 1-year option to "put" common stock where there is free-market risk, he explained.

The chief uncertainty which Mr. Cook feels about the U.S. effort to curb the balance-of-payments deficit is whether this country could be insulated from European recessions.

There is no question about the possibility that withdrawal of dollars from European money and capital markets will be tightening credit and curbing expansion in several countries. This is already evident in Italy and the United Kingdom, for example.

But the key question for U.S. policy is whether the spillover of recessionary tendencies would be felt here. It may be necessary to face up to this problem before it really develops, Mr. Cook declared.

Actually, he explained, any one of three things could happen.

"Such a hue and cry could be raised in Europe about the Johnson voluntary program that we will ease up. But this would require the European countries to admit that they have been wrong about the impact of the U.S. deficit. Some of them now admit it, but I don't think all of them will. Many Europeans who have been complaining the loudest are doing so on the basis of a deep-seated fear of competition from American corporations in their home markets.

"The second possibility," he said, "is that we will have the unfortunate experience of being pushed into correcting something (the payments deficit) when it is not computed properly." He explained that we charge ourselves with short-term capital outflows but do not credit ourselves with short-term inflows, thus greatly overstating the so-called deficit in our balance of payments.

The third choice, and the one apparently most favored by Mr. Cook, involves "broader recognition of the need for reform of the international monetary system."

"There is no reason why the dollar should have to carry worldwide responsibility for providing reserves and maintaining international liquidity," he declared. "This task can and should be shared by all major countries through an international organization that would issue an international monetary unit having protection of its stability."

The development and use of such a unit, too, would permit U.S. corporations, including banks, to resume the export of capital without being charged with creating a balance-of-payments deficit, endangering the economy and generally acting unpatriotically. He added that the United States is the only real capital market in the world and this would permit us to make U.S. capital freely available abroad to the great profit of both parties to the transaction.

Who Are Africa's Freedom Fighters?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, perspective is one of the most sorely needed com-

modities in international affairs. From Washington, D.C., the world is often seen as ever enlarging concentric circles but with the center always squarely fastened on our Nation's Capital. While American interests are those which must be served by the policies of this Government, an improved perspective can contribute a great deal toward enlightenment as to where our real interests lie.

The following article from the Economist of April 24, 1965, helps provide some of the sorely needed perspective on events and personalities in Africa. I commend it to the Members of this House:

WHO ARE AFRICA'S FREEDOM FIGHTERS?—IF THE WEST IS READY TO LOSE PATIENCE WITH AFRICA, LET IT REMEMBER THAT CHINA HAS ALL THE PATIENCE IN THE WORLD

In Africa, it can happen that all publicity is bad publicity. Nobody knows this better than President Kwame Nkrumah, of Ghana, unless it be President Julius Nyerere, of Tanzania. Dr. Nkrumah, the osagyefo, was unfortunate enough to become head of the first of the newly independent black African countries; so he is often the conductor for the world's lightning wrath. Yet, for all his political sins, Dr. Nkrumah has never yet deliberately executed political opponents, as some of his ex-French neighbors have done; nor, in terms of crushing opposition, has he exceeded the African norm. Dr. Nyerere, the mwalimu, has been unlucky enough to lead the African country that the Chinese chose as the major launching pad for their own style of continental revolution. Westerners therefore tend to view Tanzania's current history in terms of China's motives. It might be wiser, now that the Tanganyika-Zanzibar union is a year old, to look at the motives of Africa.

This last point is, roughly, what the mwalimu (it means teacher) has been expounding wherever he can find an audience. Fresh from a state visit to Mali, where everyone's suspicions of the osagyefo (it means redeemer) were discussed, Dr. Nyerere came to Britain for Easter and saw the Commonwealth Relations Secretary, Mr. Bottomley (as well as the Minister for Oversea Development, Mrs. Castle, who was just packing for her own trip to Tanzania). On Wednesday he began a state visit to Holland, in order to educate the Dutch about his views on aid, white-ruled southern Africa, the Congo, Germany, and President Johnson. No doubt the mwalimu was still putting on the nearest he can get to a grave face, while yet constantly cracking into the chair-slapping laugh that makes him so exhilarating to meet.

His audiences have, unfortunately, become less appreciative. In the good old days of Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Macmillan, and Mr. Macleod, the Mwalimu was the African you could trust. Now he is watched with that confusing squint that comes to trying to stare at China and Tanzania simultaneously. And the West has got more short tempered about Africa in general. But, for its own sake, the West ought to hear the teacher out. To say this is not to insist on reverting to the errors of the early 1960's, when overconfident liberals, in both London and Washington, too often argued that the best policy was to follow blindly wherever African nationalism led.

Now the pendulum looks like swinging dangerously far the other way. In Western capitals there is growing impatience with African tantrums, and a tendency to concentrate on whatever looks like being the cheapest way of keeping the Chinese out. This might prove to be the best way of letting the Chinese in. African nationalists believe that the southern part of their continent is still fighting for freedom. Many of them regard Mr. Tshombe as whiter than white—which is not, in that continent, a compliment. In their quest for aid, they sometimes find the Chinese more willing than the West (or Russia) to finance certain "glamour" projects dear to local politicians' pockets and hearts.

Some African policies can never be the West's. It is one thing to understand the arguments for one-party states, as President Nyerere asks the West to do; it is another to applaud them. It is prudent to be aware of the boiling passions of newly independent, oldly poor, young nationalists; it is another thing when the demands of the hotheaded jeunesse lead to arbitrary decisions to expel innocent foreigners, seize property or imprison political opponents in sometimes appalling conditions without trial or appeal.

But some policies, those in which the West itself believes, should have its support even if they are also supported by the Chinese Communists and voiced with thumping tactlesssness by African propagandists. These policies relate especially to the great drive for African majority governments in the south. If the ultimate political battle for true freedom in Africa (including freedom from African despots) is to be won, the West cannot afford to allow the Chinese to pose, by default, as the only friends of Africa's present admittedly divided, incompetent embryo independence movements.

Keeping all this in mind, it is worth looking at Dr. Nyerere's world through his eyes. On Communist countries, "we do not take orders from Peiping," he said in London this week. "We do not take orders from Russia." And, most serious face of all, "We do not take orders from East Germany." Tanzania has, in fact, demoted the East German Embassy in Zanzibar to a consulate general on the mainland; yet the suspension of West German aid to it will probably continue for some months, until a face-saving formula is devised. Meanwhile, Bonn seems to Tanzanians to look silly.

The 350 American Peace Corps workers in Tanzania outnumber the entire Chinese mission in that country. Its secondary schools are largely staffed by Americans, and Dr. Nyerere attributes to this the fact that some pupils have turned against his chosen one-party system. But the teachers have not been dismissed. "If my schools were staffed with Chinese and the pupils took an anti-Government line and we then did not dismiss the Chinese it would be said that this was because I took orders from Peiping."

On the Congo, President Nyerere said, "Our problem is, quite frankly, a person." Imagine, he said, a Jew who relied on Nazis to help him to power in Israel and imagine what the Jews would think of that; this, fairly or not, is what Tanzanians think of Mr. Tshombe's dependence on South African mercenaries in the Congo. "We cannot do business with Tshombe," said Dr. Nyerere in London. "Tshombe is a traitor." In the West, where Mr. Tshombe is seen by many policymakers as offering almost the only hope of stable government in the Congo, the best response might be: to work publicly for Congo unity, while making it clear everywhere in Africa that it is the unity, and not the person of Mr. Tshombe, that is being backed.

On Mozambique, "This country must become independent. We want it to happen peacefully. We do not want a war on our southern border," Dr. Nyerere said. He hoped America and Europe would put pressure on the Portuguese to understand this. But guerrilla fighters are being trained in Tanzania; and, failing a peaceful solution, Dr. Nyerere's threat is "We will then fight. We cannot use bows and arrows to prove we are good Africans. We must use arms. If we cannot get arms from the West we will have to take them from the Communist countries."

This is going to be the hardest African problem for the West to solve. It cannot hope to win the battle for freethinking in Africa if it does not do its utmost to help secure the placement of Africans in government in the "white" south that is, historically, the West's own creation. If it shrinks, as it rightly does, from violence as a means toward this end, then it ought at least to be seeking determinedly and, as far as possible, unitedly peaceful ways of setting about it. To President Nyerere, President Kennedy seemed like a man who understood these things. President Johnson's greatest initial act of foreign policy in this area might be to define, on behalf of the West he ought to be leading, what freedom is deemed to be in Africa; and to state, with all the fine determination applied elsewhere, just how far the West will go to help achieve it.

The Herald-Dispatch of Huntington, W. Va., Commends Firm Foreign Policy of President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 7, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the world in which we live is one of turbulence and constant change. Old ideas and ideals are constantly being reexamined. New concepts and approaches are being tested in almost every corner of the earth. It is heartening to note, therefore, that in the face of uncertainty and discord in international relations the United States stand firm in defense of individual liberty and national independence.

The Huntington, W. Va., Herald-Dispatch has praised editorially the forthright actions of President Johnson in moving to the aid of freedom-loving peoples in weaker nations. In its "Getting His Point Across" in the May 3, 1965, issue, this newspaper commends the President's attitude of resolve and purpose. It observes:

He may finally be getting across to the rest of the world the message that America is no paper tiger. Most Americans heartily approve.

Mr. President, the Herald-Dispatch of Huntington, W. Va., is a newspaper with traditions for straightforward reporting and incisive editorial policies. The contributions of this publication have been meaningful in the continued development of the city of Huntington as a progressive and prosperous community. It is appropriate to commend those who have dedicated their efforts to upholding these high standards of journalism: Mrs. William D. Birke, publisher; Raymond Brewster, editor; Boyd Jarrell, managing editor; and, H. R. Pinckard, editorial page editor.

I ask unanimous consent that the May 3, 1965, editorial "Getting His Point

Across," in the Herald-Dispatch of Huntington, W. Va., be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GETTING HIS POINT ACROSS

Six months ago it was still being said—as it had been said since Lyndon Johnson became President—that he was eminently qualified to deal with domestic problems, but that his grasp of international affairs and foreign policies was weak and unsure.

This theory must now be discarded. Mr. Johnson may or may not have felt uncertain about the international situation when he became President and he may or may not have hesitated at first to assume full charge of the ship of state on foreign policy waters. The point is that he has now demonstrated his willingness to take charge and his determination to run the ship.

In his excellent analysis of the administration's action in the crisis in the Dominican Republic, in Vietnam, in the Congo and in other trouble spots of the world, the Associated Press's John M. Hightower last Saturday wrote that President Johnson "may finally be getting his point across to the rest of the world."

The "point" is that the United States is getting fed up with attacks on its embassies, on its citizens and its interests—either by lawless mobs or hostile foreign governments.

"More significantly," said Hightower, "the Johnson administration also seems entirely ready now to run some long risks for major policy purposes—risks such as it has undertaken in trying to stop the Communist conquest of Vietnam and to nip at the outset a possible pro-Castro attempt to make the Dominican Republic a second Cuba."

This U.S. reaction is not projected as aggressive or pugnacious. It is more of a hardening attitude all along the line and a tendency to push back when pushed.

Last November, when the Congo was disintegrating into a state of chaos and anarchy, hundreds of Americans and Europeans were trapped in territory held by pro-Communist rebels.

The U.S. Air Force went in with planes carrying Belgian paratroopers for rescue operations that saved nearly 2,000 lives. Although the United States was widely denounced for assisting in operations that led to defeat of rebel forces in Stanleyville, Mr. Johnson did not apologize for the humanitarian endeavor.

More recently, this new strength of purpose has been evident even in the speeches of Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who will usually go to almost any length to smooth down the rough edges of a situation.

Secretary Rusk gave a sharp rejoinder last week to criticisms by some U.S. Senators for the beefing up of American forces in Vietnam and the continued bombing of North Vietnamese targets.

In Santo Domingo, Mr. Johnson has had to take rather more positive steps than, perhaps, he would have liked to. He has no ambition to recreate the image of "Yankee imperialism" which originated half a century ago when U.S. marines frequently intervened in "banana republic" revolutions.

But he is quite apparently running short of patience with troublemakers. He is tired of turning the other cheek. He has seen—most notably in Cuba—the disastrous results of temporizing and of leaning over backward to be fair to Communist stooges.

He may finally be getting across to the rest of the world the message that America is no paper tiger. Most Americans heartily approve.

Pittsburgh Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a major factor in the growth of any area is the quality of its higher education and academic research. My own city of Pittsburgh is blessed with a number of such institutions, distinguished faculty members, and exceptionally fine facilities. The Regional Industrial Development Corp. of Southwestern Pennsylvania, in its excellent publication, "Pittsburgh Research: Key to Tomorrow," has provided an informative report on higher education in Pittsburgh. I include it as part of my remarks:

PITTSBURGH RESEARCH: KEY TO TOMORROW

Pittsburgh has had a close association with colleges and universities almost from its inception. The first institution of higher education west of the Alleghenies was founded in Pittsburgh in 1787—only 23 years after Fort Pitt was built and 29 years before Pittsburgh was incorporated as a city.

This pioneering institution—the Pittsburgh Academy—became the Western University of Pennsylvania in 1819 and the University of Pittsburgh in 1908. Even before the last name change, it was offering a full science and engineering program. The first engineering degrees were granted as early as 1846.

The Nation's first nonprofit research institute—Mellon Institute—was an offshoot of the University of Pittsburgh. Started as a department of industrial research at Pitt in 1911, the institute began serving the basic and applied research needs of industry as a separate entity in 1913.

Another Pittsburgh institution, Carnegie Institute of Technology, is one of the oldest and finest technological institutions. Founded in 1900, it is known internationally for its strong scientific and technical instructional and research programs.

More than 20 colleges and universities are located in the 9-county Pittsburgh area. They enroll 40,000 students, and conduct millons of dollars of research each year.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

The University of Pittsburgh has a reputation for being a pioneer in educational circles. It has not hesitated to depart from tradition to experiment, to improve, and to provide academic, scientific, and civic leadership.

The university's many specialized academic programs, the 42-story Cathedral of Learning, the trimester calendar plan, and the proposed $250 million Panther Hollow research complex are testimonials to the institution's unique spirit.

Pitt is organized into three broad educational and research areas—the academic disciplines (humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences); the professions (business, education, engineering, mines, law, library, and public and international affairs); and the health professions (dentistry, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, and public health). It has about 7,000 full-time and 4,500 part-time students.

During the past year 1,200 professional staff members engaged in 1,400 research projects totaling more than $13 million. Although most of the studies were of a basic nature, many were interdisciplinary or had potential industrial implications. An engineering-medical study of the strength of scar tissue is typical of the increasing interaction within various scientific fields.

University scientists and engineers have been responsible for a long list of significant contributions over the years, including the first industrial applications of spectroscopy, the Salk polio vaccine, the synthesis of ACTH, advanced bomb release mechanisms, and the first manmade insulin.

CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Few institutions of higher education in the Nation offer the depth and breadth of scientific and technical education and research available at Carnegie Institute of Technology.

Founded at the turn of the century by philanthropist Andrew Carnegie, the institution's early emphasis was on engineering and architecture. In the years that followed, offerings were expanded to include extensive programs in the sciences, fine arts, industrial management, and other fields.

The institute has five major divisions—engineering and science, fine arts, humanities and social sciences, industrial administration, and Margaret Morrison Carnegie College for Women. Its highly rated Graduate School of Industrial Administration was the first of its kind. Carnegie Tech's enrollment averages 3,500 full-time and 2,500 part-time and summer students.

Creative research is carried on in each of the academic divisions. More than 500 professional staff members were involved in 150 research projects having a dollar volume of $5 million last year. Much of the research is being followed by such forward-looking firms as International Business Machines Corp., Philco Corp., and the Orlando division of the Martin Co.

Long recognized for its research in the coal, petroleum, and metals fields, Carnegie Tech is placing increasing emphasis on such advanced fields as computer technology, where it is developing new techniques for programing and decisionmaking.

Among the institution's outstanding facilities are the computation center and the nuclear research center.

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY

In 1878, a small group of Roman Catholic educators emigrated from Germany to Pittsburgh. They actually made their own bricks and handbuilt a college of arts and letters on a bluff overlooking the Monongahela River.

This institution, known for many years as the Pittsburgh Catholic College of the Holy Ghost, became Duquesne University in 1911.

The university has grown in curriculums, size, and stature over the years, but its educational objectives have remained basically the same as when the founding fathers welcomed the first students to their classrooms—excellence of instruction in a Christian atmosphere.

Duquesne University has eight academic units—liberal arts and sciences, business administration, education, law, music, nursing, pharmacy, and the graduate school. It enrolls about 4,000 full-time and 2,700 part-time students.

Like the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Institute of Technology, Duquesne offers undergraduate instruction in most of its programs. Unlike the other two universities, it does not have an engineering program.

Extensive research is performed by the faculty and graduate students, particularly in the natural and social sciences. Almost

all of the studies are fundamental investigations.

The school of pharmacy is nationally recognized for its teaching and research. Its chemistry and biology programs also are highly regarded.

MELLON INSTITUTE

The idea of a nonprofit research institute serving the research needs of industry was conceived by a young professor—Dr. Robert K. Duncan—and made a reality by two public-spirited Pittsburgh businessmen—Andrew W. Mellon and Richard B. Mellon.

Duncan's experiments with industrial fellowships at the University of Kansas caught the attention of the Mellon brothers, who used their influence and financial support to establish a department of industrial research headed by Duncan at the University of Pittsburgh in 1911.

The Pitt industrial research program was designed to assist industry—and mankind—through the coupling of science to technology. Some of the research studies were funded internally, while others were financed through industrial fellowships.

The idea worked so successfully that a separate institute was created in 1913 to continue the work under Duncan's guidance. The institute continued its activities as part of the university until 1927, when it was separately incorporated.

More than 650 novel processes and products have been developed by the institute's professional staff over the years. In a number of instances, the findings have resulted in new companies, divisions, or research laboratories.

The 246-man professional staff is active in the full range of physical and biological sciences. Approximately $6.5 million in research is carried on annually at two principal locations—the Oakland center and the suburban Bushy Run Laboratories.

Supplemental Appropriation for Military Functions of Department of Defense, Fiscal Year 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 447) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for military functions of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in support of the President's request.

It is an historical fact that the American people, when called upon to defend the principles of democracy and freedom, have always stood united in their determination to preserve these principles. Now, once again, the American people are being called upon by the President to prove to the world that we will not tolerate any situation that poses a threat to these very principles and to world peace.

The President is asking for a supplemental appropriation of $700 million to meet increasing military requirements in South Vietnam. These additional funds are necessary to continue our assistance to this unhappy land that has been fighting so desperately to keep from falling victim to Communist control.

I stand behind the President in his request, for the maintenance of world peace is a matter of universal concern. I know all Americans, too, will once again unite to defend the cause of freedom. Congress acts today to unite the Nation.

United Auto Workers Urges Antismog and Other Safety Devices for All Cars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, an increasing number of citizens are expressing their concern about the need for antismog and other safety features in new automobiles.

Air pollution and the terrible toll on our highways are very grave national problems. I am delighted, therefore, to see that the United Auto Workers, which represents production and maintenance employees of the auto industry, has proposed that automobile manufacturers couple any cut in the Federal excise tax on cars with the installation of antismog and other safety devices in new cars, plus cuts in price.

The UAW proposal was made in a letter from UAW President Walter Reuther to the presidents of the General Motors Corp., the Ford Motor Co., Chrysler Corp., and American Motors Corp. A press release including the full text of the letter follows:

UAW OFFERS TO AID AUTOMAKERS IN EXCISE CUT DRIVE—IF SAVINGS ARE GIVEN CONSUMERS THROUGH ANTISMOG, SAFETY DEVICES, PLUS PRICE SLASHES

The UAW has proposed a joint union-auto industry campaign to work for the elimination or reduction of excise taxes on cars provided the savings are passed on to consumers through a combination of antismog and other safety devices built into the vehicles plus direct price cuts.

The offer was made by UAW President Walter P. Reuther, on behalf of the union's international executive board, to the presidents of General Motors Corp., Ford Motor Co., Chrysler Corp., and American Motors Corp.

Text of Mr. Reuther's letter follows:

"Your corporation and the other automobile producers have repeatedly sought elimination of the excise tax on passenger cars. The industry has now launched a major campaign directed toward that end. Informal requests have been made to the UAW to support that campaign.

"Such requests are perfectly reasonable and we have given them careful consideration. While the relationship between your corporation and our union centers around collective bargaining, both of us have a common interest in the welfare of the industry as a whole. Elimination of the excise tax would undoubtedly advance the welfare of the industry in terms of expanded markets and increased production and employment—provided, of course, that the excise tax savings are passed on to consumers.

"Along with, and in fact, as part of, our common interest in the welfare of the industry, there goes a joint responsibility to the public that buys or is affected by the products manufactured in your plants by our members.

"Increasingly, that public is becoming concerned about the health and safety effects of automobiles.

"Legislation is now pending in Congress to require new cars to be equipped with devices to consume and render harmless those chemicals now present in exhaust fumes which help to blanket our cities with smog, increase the risks of cancer and poison the air with carbon monoxide. Such legislation is already on the books in California and will be made applicable, by regulation, to cars produced in the 1966 model year and thereafter.

"At the same time, responsible authorities have concluded, after careful study, that much can be done that is not now being done to reduce accident and fatality rates by modification of car designs and specifications. The General Services Administration has found it necessary to propose certain minimum standards for passenger safety devices (plus smog suppression devices) to be met by all cars purchased for use by the Federal Government.

"There is no question but that conformance to GSA standards would promote safety and minimize accidents and injury to motor car users and to the public. In view of the growing concern with car safety and the increased pollution of the air in our large urban centers, commonsense and public responsibility would suggest that smog control devices and the other GSA standards be applied not only to cars bought by the Government but also to cars sold to the general public.

"The industry is morally obligated to design its products, to the maximum extent feasible, so as to minimize both pollution of the atmosphere and hazards to life and limb. Voluntary leadership on the part of the automotive industry in meeting this obligation will serve the public and such voluntary action will give the industry a far stronger claim on public support for elimination of the excise tax. Voluntary action to minimize car-produced smog and to maximize safety would also avoid the necessity for Government intervention through legislation that the industry might find onerous.

"I am, therefore, writing you and the heads of the other passenger car-producing companies, at the direction of the UAW international executive board, to propose joint action by the industry and the UAW directed both toward advancing our common interest in elimination of the excise tax and toward meeting our joint responsibility to minimize adverse effects of cars upon health and safety. These dual objectives would be pursued jointly by the industry and the UAW on the basis of agreement on the following points:

"1. The UAW will cooperate with the industry to create a joint committee to petition Congress and to mobilize maximum public support for elimination, or at least substantial reduction, of the excise tax on passenger cars.

"2. The industry will commit itself to pass on to the general public and to consumers the full benefits of excise tax elimination or reduction through a combination of improved health and safety features to be built into the cars (in conformity with GSA standards), plus direct price reduction.

"3. The industry will agree that, if the tax should be reduced but not eliminated completely, or if total elimination is approached by stages through successive reductions of the tax; the priorities in the use of the tax savings will be as follows:

"(a) First, to incorporate in all new cars, starting with the 1966 models, smog-suppression devices of the kind required to meet the standards under the California law.

"(b) Second, to incorporate in all new cars, no later than the time sufficient excise tax savings become available to meet their costs, the remaining safety standards proposed by the General Services Administration for cars bought for Federal Government use.

"(c) All remaining excise tax savings will be passed on to car buyers in the form of price reductions.

"4. To assure fulfillment of its commitments, the industry will agree to support legislative provisions which would make excise tax reduction or elimination applicable only to those vehicles which incorporate the smog-suppression devices and the other GSA safety requirements (the latter at least to the extent that could be paid for by the amount of tax savings available at the time) and which fully reflect in their list prices any part of the excise tax reduction not offset by the cost of such devices and requirements.

"We believe that the possibilities of excise tax relief being enacted in this session of Congress would be greatly enhanced through joint industry-UAW action based upon agreement to the above points. Such agreement would enlist the widest possible public support for excise tax elimination for it would promise substantial benefits not only to car buyers but also to the general public. The public as a whole would enjoy the benefits of cleaner air and improved safety on the Nation's streets and highways. Car buyers would benefit from both safer cars and price reductions.

"There can no longer be any dispute over the need for smog-suppression devices on cars. The substantial contribution made by motor car exhaust fumes to air pollution is now widely recognized, and a program to end it is urgent and long overdue. Your company and the other major producers have already developed antismog devices capable of reducing the harmful effects of exhaust fumes and we understand that the overwhelming majority of 1966 model cars will be engineered to accept such devices. However, they are to be installed only on cars sold in California, where they will be required by State law and on cars sold to the U.S. Government, where they will be required under the ruling of the General Services Administration.

"While the Los Angeles area has a particularly bad smog problem, due in large measure to car exhaust fumes (and this led California to pass the first State law requiring an exhaust control device), similar problems exist in nearly all U.S. cities. Surgeon General Luther Terry reported to the Second National Conference on Air Pollution in 1962:

" 'Approximately 90 percent of the urban population live in localities with air-pollution problems—a total of about 6,000 communities.'

"In an interview published in U.S. News & World Report of September 16, 1963, the Surgeon General said that 'there is not a large city in the United States that does not have an air pollution problem,' and that, if motor vehicles could be stopped from emitting fumes that create smog, 'it would certainly solve a very significant part' of the smog problem.

"Vernon G. Mackenzie, Chief of the Division of Air Pollution in the Public Health Services, appearing before the Muskie Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, on June 24, 1964, to discuss the creation of photochemical smog by motor vehicles, quoted the 1963 Yearbook of Agriculture:

" 'Los Angeles no longer has, if it ever had, a monopoly on photochemical smog. The characteristic symptoms on plants have been found in almost every metropolitan area of the country * * * the entire coastal area from roughly Washington, D.C. to Boston has come to rival southern California for extent, severity, and economic loss to agriculture because of photochemical smog.'

"Mr. Mackenzie concluded:

" 'Mr. Chairman, I believe that this brief discussion clearly demonstrates that photochemical smog deriving from motor vehicles is not confined to the Los Angeles area, but must be considered an important aspect of the national air pollution problem.'

"Similarly, there can be no dispute on the need to make cars safer to operate. An estimated 48,000 Americans died and 1.6 million were injured in car accidents last year and for the third year in a row the rate of deaths per vehicle mile increased, confirming the reversal of a long-term downward trend.

"While we fully recognize that the condition of the vehicle is not the major cause of most accidents, there are safety devices which could undoubtedly help motorists to avoid accidents, and others which could cut down the risk of death or injury when accidents occur. Much research into such devices has been done. The GSA standards were developed on consultation with the automotive industry, technical societies, trade associations, the medical profession, and Government agencies. The GSA lists 17 such devices including an exhaust emission control system which meets the California State standard, which it proposes should be required, where applicable, as equipment on all cars purchased by the Federal Government. Many of them are already standard or optional equipment on some models. The list includes the following:

"Standard anchorages for seat belt assemblies, including shoulder belts, to insure that the seat belts function properly.

"Padded dash panel and sunvisors.

"Recessed instruments, control knobs, etc., on instrument panels.

"Impact-absorbing steering wheel and steering column to prevent impalement of the driver in head-on crashes.

"Safety door latches and hinges to prevent doors flying open in accidents.

"Safety anchorage of car seats.

"A control that permits all four turn signals to be flashed simultaneously as a hazard warning.

"Safety glass in all windows.

"Dual brake system which will insure that if one brake fails the others will continue to function.

"Standard bumper heights.

"Standardized gear shift for automatic transmissions.

"Multispeed, electrically operated windshield wiper with washer attachment.

"Design of instrument panel and windshield wiper surfaces to minimize glare in the driver's eyes.

"Safety tires and rims.

"Backup lights.

"Outside rearview mirror.

"The GSA safety standards are but a beginning and there is growing recognition of the need for the automotive industry to give greater consideration to the engineering and designing of the cars with respect to safety factors.

"The added cost of meeting the GSA standards on cars sold to the public would represent only a portion of the present excise tax on passenger cars. The tax averages approximately $225 per car, while the cost of meeting the GSA standards—including the smog-suppression devices—is estimated to be less than $100. Thus, there would be ample room, after meeting those standards, to make meaningful cuts in car prices.

"It would be necessary, of course, to insure that such price reductions would be made and that they would be continued in subsequent model years. Since auto industry representatives have publicly committed themselves to pass any excise tax saving on to carbuyers, I am sure there would be no difficulty in finding means to assure that this course would be followed.

"Such a step would add substantially to auto production and employment. It has been estimated that a 1-percent cut in retail car prices will stimulate a 1.2-percent increase in new car sales. On this basis, every reduction of 1 percent in average retail car prices resulting from reduction of the excise tax could boost domestic sales of U.S.-made cars by about 90,000 units, and create possibly 7,000 new production worker jobs in the auto industry, plus additional jobs in the industries supplying it and those engaged in selling and servicing cars. These newly employed workers would immediately become customers for all the other goods and services which workers and their families need.

"For those who would have bought a new car in any case, elimination or substantial reduction in the excise tax would free the amount of their tax saving for other purchases, thus helping to stimulate the general economy further.

"As you know, we have long favored the elimination of the excise tax on passenger cars because it is highly regressive. Cars are no longer luxuries. They have become necessities to most workers and their families. Elimination or reduction of the tax would enable many more families to afford a new car, resulting in increased demand and production and thereby creating thousands of additional jobs in the auto industry and in the firms which supply it. Needless to say, such expansion of the market would also be reflected in higher profits for your corporation and the others engaged in producing passenger cars.

"The excise tax on passenger cars is essentially a wartime tax. It was increased from 3½ to 7 percent in 1941, and further increased to 10 percent in 1951, during the Korean war, for the express purpose of discouraging purchases of new cars because they used up precious steel, rubber, and other strategic defense materials. Such restraints are necessary in wartime, but their continuation in peacetime for purely revenue purposes cannot be defended on either economic or social grounds. Similar taxes, imposed at a much lower level on motor vehicles and associated products during World War I, were repealed in 1926 and 1928.

"Repeated efforts made by the industry in recent years to obtain repeal of the excise have been unsuccessful. There is danger of a similar failure this year unless the campaign for repeal can enlist the wide public support that our proposal would assure.

"If the repeal effort should fail this year, there would remain, nevertheless, the probability that legislation will be adopted during this session of Congress to require the installation of antismog devices on all cars and a strong possibility that, within the very near future, safety standards similar to those proposed by GSA will be required by law on cars sold to the general public.

"In that case, the likelihood is that car prices will be raised rather than reduced with the consequence that markets will narrow, and production, employment, and profits will be decreased.

"In the light of these facts, we urge the representatives of the automotive industry to give favorable consideration to this constructive and responsible proposal that would serve the best interests of the public, the consumer, the industry, and the workers.

"Since hearings are already being held on legislation to require the installation of antismog devices, and since Congress will soon begin consideration of excise tax cuts, time is of the essence. A favorable decision by the automotive industry will enable the industry and the UAW to launch the joint campaign we propose with a minimum of delay and a maximum of effectiveness.

"We would, therefore, appreciate an early reply.

"Very truly yours,

"WALTER P. REUTHER,

"President, International Union, UAW."

Government Politics

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that the Federal Government is engaged in many and various enterprises, including the dissemination of what I would call pure propaganda.

Just 2 years ago, I called the attention of my colleagues here to the open and obvious efforts of the Secretary of Agriculture to influence the outcome of the wheat referendum vote through not only the authorization but the actual designation of Federal funds to be used in "selling" the Department's position in that referendum. But in spite of the Secretary's personal efforts and the various directives that went out to State and county ASCS offices, the wheat farmers of the Nation voted the other way. Since that time, the office manager of the McCone County, Mont., ASCS office, the office that exposed the fact that they were supposed to spend $900 in "advising" the farmers of that area how to vote, that office manager, Mr. Francis D. Kelly, has been fired. It was not, of course, Mr. Kelly but the elected county ASCS officials who advised me of what I still believe was a violation of Federal law in authorizing the expenditure of Federal funds in an effort to influence the outcome of the wheat referendum.

As a further illustration of just how far the Federal Government will go in its brainwashing campaign, and again this is the Department of Agriculture, I received a copy of an amazing document recently. This one is an official publication put out by the regional forester of the northern region of the U.S. Forest Service. Embellished on its cover with the official emblem of the Forest Service and labeled "U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Region, Missoula, Mont.," and titled "Reference Points," the brochure carries a signed letter from the regional forester addressed to division chiefs, forest supervisors, Director, EDC, and advises that its subject is "Training."

Attached to the cover and letter is a reprint of an article from Harper's magazine with a note stating it was reprinted by special permission from Harper's magazine.

Now this Harper's article, you might guess, would have something to do with forestry or agriculture or at least management or personnel matters in view of the subject of the cover letter under which it was mailed—at Government expense.

But guess again. The subject of the article was "The Paranoid Style in American Politics," and a prefacing paragraph explains:

> It had been around a long time before the radical right discovered it—and its targets have ranged from the international bankers to Masons, Jesuits, and munitions makers.

Now I have no more sympathy for the so-called radical right than I have for the so-called radical left. The terms are used so loosely and recklessly these days that I am not sure anyone, including the authors who so phrenetically condemn one or the other flank of the extremists, really know what they mean. They may know what they think these terms mean or possibly have their own prejudiced or colored focal points.

I do not intend to clutter up the RECORD or burden the taxpayer at $90 a page with the contents of the Harper's magazine article. It was in the November 1964, issue in case any of you want to know anything about paranoid politics you have not heard here.

But I would like to quote the opening sentence of the article and the regional forester's letter that conveyed the reprint in the Forest Service magazine—printed and mailed at taxpayers' expense:

> American politics has often been an arena for angry minds. In recent years we have seen angry minds at work mainly among extreme rightwingers, who have now demonstrated in the Goldwater movement how much political leverage can be got out of the animosities and passions of a small minority.

And here is the regional forester's letter which conveyed this reprint to his division chiefs, forest supervisors, and director, EDC, whoever that is:

> The attached article, "The Paranoid Style in American Politics," deals with one facet of political psychology. The author simply borrowed the clinical term "paranoid," for descriptive purposes.
>
> The term "politics" should be considered in its broadest aspect—group behavior. Today, understanding of group behavior and group dynamics is an important part of every forest officer's job. The word "style" has more to do with the way in which ideas or causes are believed or advocated than with the truth or falsity of their content. It has to do with the tactics and techniques used by some special interest groups to attract supporters and to influence political leaders. As the author points out, the paranoid style has a greater affinity for bad causes than good, but nothing prevents the use of this style for advocating a sound program.

The term "politics" he says should be considered in its broadest aspect—group behavior. So I presume this puts us all in the same boat because none of us profess to be other than politicians. But I had been under the impression that we represented congressional districts as individuals and acted, usually, as members of one party or the other rather than as a group and, by implication of the regional forester's letter, a paranoid group.

But this is beside the point. The point is this. Why is the understanding of group behavior and group dynamics as explained in an article such as "The Paranoid Style in American Politics," an important part of every Forest officer's job? This has no more to do with his job than would a reprint of the two very excellent volumes put out by the House Un-American Activities Committee, "Facts on Communism."

But the real point is that the regional forester nor any other Government official has any right to produce, reproduce, circulate or distribute such material under an official Government seal and frank. This, I believe, is actually a violation of the Hatch Act if that act any longer has meaning or can or will be enforced.

I would not object if the regional forester should send out material devoted to better methods of forestry; the need to plant trees and grow forests, insect control, fire protection, erosion control, and possibly even a hint that the alternate to politics is something he or few other Americans would tolerate.

Hero Medal for Ronald Sands, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon B. Johnson has presented one of the coveted American Automobile Association Gold Lifesaver Medals to Ronald Charles Sands, Jr. He is a 12-year-old student at Ontelaunee Elementary School in Leesport, in the Sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I am honored to represent. Ronald was one of the Nation's 13 school safety patrol youngsters to receive the award for having saved the lives of schoolmates in traffic incidents.

The ceremony was held on Thursday, May 6, at the White House. It is the fourth consecutive year that the Lifesaver Medal, the highest award in the safety patrol movement, has been presented by the President of the United States. Ronald was accompanied to the White House by his mother, Mrs. Jacqulyn Sands; Stanley A. Prey, supervising principal of Schuylkill Valley joint school system; Mrs. Prey; Frank B. Sylvester, director of school safety education for the Reading Automobile Club; Robert R. Gerhart, Jr., club public relations director; Mrs. Margie S. Rhodes, and Mrs. Kathryn S. Wolford.

The event preceded by 2 days the 29th national school safety patrol parade on Washington's Constitution Avenue, Saturday, May 8. More than 22,000 youngsters from 21 States and the District of Columbia marched in tribute to the Nation's 850,000 safety patrol members. Berks County high school bands from Reading, Woodrow Wilson, and Boyertown participated.

Later the same day, the 13 young heroes, 2 girls and 11 boys, visited the office of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to present to the veteran G-man a plaque naming him "an honorary member of the school safety patrols."

Today, when much is heard about juvenile delinquency, it is good to know that there are many brave young people of whom we can be proud. I would like

to take this opportunity to relate the heroic and self-sacrificing effort which earned Ronald the gold Lifesaver Medal.

As Ronald was waiting with a group of children, April 30, 1964, at a schoolbus stop on rural Route 61 near Leesport, Pa., a large truck passed the approaching bus on a curve and began to skid on the wet highway. The skid brought the truck onto the road shoulder with several mailboxes and the children in its path. Ronald, realizing the imminent danger, turned around and pushed his small sister, Susan, and several other children back toward the bus shelter. Ronald's prompt action prevented injury to the youngsters both from the broken mailboxes flying through the air and the skidding truck.

Authorizing Defense Procurement and Research and Development

SPEECH

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7657) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels; and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces; and for other purposes.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Armed Services Committee I, too, want to compliment and commend the able chairman for his exemplary work on H.R. 7657. I also want to express my appreciation to the senior Members on both sides of the aisle for the courtesy and understanding afforded to all the new members of the committee. To become at all knowledgeable in this extremely technical field would be most difficult without their patience, help, and consideration.

There is little to add to the remarks already made by the distinguished chairman and so it is with a great deal of pride that I join him and all other members of the Armed Services Committee in full support of this legislation which is so necessary to our national defense.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Address by Mr. Herrell DeGraff at the Congressional Dinner AMI Board Meeting, May 6, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening, May 6, the American Meat Institute held its now traditional dinner for certain Members of the House of Representatives. The highlight of the evening was a message delivered to us by Dr. Herrell DeGraff, president of the American Meat Institute and a distinguished agricultural economist.

The context of his speech was addressed to a very important legislative matter now pending in Congress, and I think it would be very helpful for all Members to have the benefit of his views. Therefore, I include the speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

COMMENTS AT THE CONGRESSIONAL DINNER AMI WASHINGTON BOARD MEETING, MAY 6, 1965

May I add my word of greeting to that which you have already had from our chairman, Mr. Haynie. We of the meat industry are indeed greatly honored that you would find time in your already overburdened schedules to meet here with us. This is the eighth consecutive year that these dinners have been held honoring two important committees of the House as well as individual Members of the House.

We believe that these informal and pleasant gatherings have been mutually beneficial. We have attempted in our visits with you to discuss in a friendly and unpressured atmosphere some of the problems of our industry. Equally, we have been interested to hear from you of some of the knotty problems which you, as representatives in the National Legislature, have to face.

We believe it is indeed in the public interest when responsible leaders of a great industry can have an opportunity such as this, to visit with you who are elected representatives of all the people. You carry great responsibility indeed in deliberating as to how the immense residual powers of the people of the United States shall be delegated, and to whom. The powers that you do delegate are then handled by public servants who have to enforce the myriad rules and regulations under which we all live.

We, on the other hand, representatives of a great industry, have responsibilities both for the present and for posterity to keep you fully aware of the climate in which the livestock and meat industry operates, and to discuss with you our ideas of how government can function most effectively in the public interest in its influence on the destiny of our industry.

As you know, in recent years, we have had these visits and pleasant times together when this industry has not been a petitioner for redress of grievance nor an advocate of any special congressional action.

Tonight, however, I would be remiss in my own responsibilities if I did not take this opportunity to express to you our deep concern and our disagreement with the announced policy of President Johnson in his budget message to Congress, in which he advocates that the cost of meat inspection that is now borne by the public treasury should be placed in its entirety on the packing industry.

Many of you are fully familiar with the history of the Meat Inspection Act, and most of you are familiar with the fact that the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture enjoys both domestically and internationally a reputation for effectiveness and public service second to none.

Many of you realize that the mandatory requirements of Federal inspection for meat products flowing in interstate commerce is one of the most rigorous and demanding laws enforced on any industry in the world.

It is not happenstance that the origins of the American Meat Institute over which I have the honor of presiding, date from the same year in which Congress passed the original Meat Inspection Act. The long and somewhat bitter debate that preceded the adoption of this basic consumer-protection law in the first decade of this century was instrumental in awakening this industry to its public responsibilities. The American Meat Institute was conceived in the travail of that debate.

We have come a long road since those days, both in the industry's recognition of public responsibility and in the growth and power of Federal regulation of the industry's operations. But certain basic facts that were firmly grasped by the Congress in 1906 are facts today. The increased costs of Federal meat inspection, the sustained growth of the meat industry, and the burdensome overall costs of government—all these do not change the fact that the meat inspection law was passed by Congress to protect the consumer by assuring that only wholesome meat could flow in interstate commerce.

When the 1906 legislation was being debated it was recognized that police power over an industry required agents of government responsible only to government, and that the cost of such a function should be borne by government on the principle that it would be unwise for those who are policed to be paying the policeman. The industry agrees with that posture—it did in 1906, it has throughout six decades, and it will resist any attempts to change such a proposition.

Further, it is well recognized that, to conform to the strict requirements of the Meat Inspection Service, a meatpacker must comply at high costs for approved types of buildings and equipment and other regulatory dictates. The cost of condemnations enforced by the Service for the protection of consumers is a substantial item. The labeling requirements of the Meat Inspection Division are the most detailed in the whole food industry and are a substantial cost of doing business. For all such reasons, we submit that a user charge for such a mandatory consumer-protection function is simply not valid.

We sympathize with President Johnson who is faced with financing the enormous and rising costs of the National Government. We are, in fact, more than sympathetic, because taxes generated from the meager profits of this industry help pay these costs. However, we fail to see the fairness of shifting costs for the protection of consumers, which is everyone, on to the backs of a few—a few who make up this industry and who, in turn, would be forced to transfer such a cost either backward to the producers of livestock or forward to the consumers of meat. Whether the costs would be pushed back to producers or forward to consumers would ordinarily depend on the supply of livestock. At present and in the foreseeable future it is almost certain that the real incidence of inspection costs assessed on packers would fall on farmers and ranchers at the very time when the President and the Secretary of Agriculture are concerned about shrinking farm income, and widening food-marketing margins.

I do not wish to belabor the point. Let me merely add livestock producer organizations, all segments of the meat industry, the labor unions whose members work in the industry, and various consumer organizations—all these have indicated to us their support of our contention that a user charge for meat inspection, assessed in the first instance on meat packers would be an unwise and unsound public policy.

The 80th Congress, faced with the problems of consolidating and refinancing the great costs of World War II and the postwar rehabilitation, did place the cost of meat inspection on the meat industry for 1 year—1948.

But the succeeding Congress, having had full and exhaustive debate of the issue, reiterated the previous policy that meat inspection is for the benefit of all the people and should be paid for by all the people. The wording then written into law is as follows: "The cost of inspection rendered on and after July 1, 1948, under the requirements of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat * * * shall be borne by the United States * * * (21 U.S.C. 98)." This is the policy of Congress. Congress will have to change this law before meat inspection costs can be reassessed.

In recent debate we have observed confusion in the public mind between meat inspection and meat grading. Meat inspection is a health protection measure, and is compulsory. Meat grading is a so-called marketing service, and is voluntary. The two are different things. The first is to assure wholesomeness directly to the consumer. The second is to designate value as a marketing tool for those who voluntarily choose to use it. Grading services furnished by the Government are now on a user-charge basis. This we hold to be right and proper. But meat inspection services are by no means a comparable matter.

It is with reluctance and yet with complete firmness that the American Meat Institute is impelled to oppose President Johnson on this issue. We hope if and when the matter is presented to you, that you will be able to support our position. We gladly hold ourselves available to discuss the subject with you at any time you desire.

Through the years our livestock and meat industry has developed in service to the consuming public to where it is the envy of the world. This development has come under wise and generally well-administered basic laws specifically designed to protect livestock producers, consumers, and the free market system. The Packers and Stockyards Act and the Meat Inspection Act are two such laws that have, with little change, withstood the test of time and the remarkable growth of our economy. Like most

laws they are not perfect, and there are some persons and groups who, for one reason or another, feel they are continuingly in need of revision. We who operate under these laws feel, in general, that wise and enlightened administration can keep pace with modern challenges, and that only after most careful and exhaustive analysis should these laws be tampered with. We believe there is generally ample power in the Federal agencies at present, adequately and successfully to protect the public interest without doing violence to the operations of responsible persons and companies in the livestock and meat industry.

In connection with proposals to open these acts to amendment we hope that you will call on us to share our views and concerns with you. Be assured that protection of the public interest is our concern also. There is no other basis on which we can be a successful industry.

Again, our appreciation to you for being with us, and for listening so graciously to our views.

Hawaiian Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the Saturday Review for May 8 includes a very interesting article on TV Station KHVH, of Honolulu, Hawaii. The article was written by Robert Lewis Shayon. In these days when TV programing has been referred to as a "vast wasteland," I thought it particularly fitting that this article, which indicates the popularity of science education shows and news reporting on Hawaiian TV, should be brought to the attention of those who see little hope of upgrading the quality of fare served on this most popular communications medium.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAIIAN HERESY—TV AND RADIO

HONOLULU.—Television stations here in Hawaii, like those on the mainland, adhere to the proposition that entertainment is the key to attracting audiences. But the case of KHVH-TV, the basic ABC affiliate on the island of Oahu, suggests that a station's leadership in a competitive market may be due to factors other than its network's lineup of entertainment shows. These other factors include the image of the station in the local consciousness, the news and public service programs offered by the station, and, perhaps most importantly, a licensee's understanding of his community's needs. On the mainland, generally, ABC ratings run behind those of both NBC and CBS, although the range of the competitive figures has narrowed considerably this season. But all through the Hawaiian islands KHVH-TV is outstandingly an ABC first. According to Robert Berger, new chief executive and majority stockholder of the station, last November's important American Research Bureau ratings showed that KHVH-TV had all of Hawaii's top 20 television shows. From "Bewitched" through "Peyton Place" to "Valentine's Day," it was all ABC. Neither NBC nor CBS nor the one independent station on the island had a single score in the top 20. And the degree of ABC leadership in some cases was extraordinary. "Bewitched," shown Thursdays at 8 p.m., had a 70-percent share of the audience, against its nearest competitor's 16 percent ("Password," a CBS show). "Captain Honolulu," an afternoon kiddie show on KHVH-TV, had 77 percent of the audience, against an NBC movie that had a 9-percent share. The station's 10 p.m. news, on one weeknight, showed a 64-percent share of audience, against NBC's "That Was the Week That Was," which had only 13 percent. Even more unusual is the fact that "Science in Action," a National Educational Television series on KHVH-TV, scored a 39-percent share of audience against "Mr. Novak" (28 percent) and "Highway Patrol" (23 percent).

Oahu is where most of the 50th State's population (750,000) resides. Its ethnic groupings (Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Portuguese, Hawaiian, and Caucasian) are unique, yet underneath the island's undeniable charm for tourists is a style of life, very much like that of the mainland's. Supermarkets and realestate developments abound, as do used car lots and traffic jams. Why should ABC-TV be third on the mainland and first in the islands—and what are the implications of the leap up the ladder? Though Bob Berger never even hinted it, I inferred from our conversation that it wasn't his network's entertainment lineup that was responsible for the lead; the station could probably turn the trick even if it were carrying a full NBC or CBS schedule of programs. To Hawaiian viewers, network identities are hazy, a station's call letters only somewhat less vague; it's the channel number that counts, and channel 4, KHVH-TV, stands for the "Kaiser" image, for the station was bought in 1958 by the Henry J. Kaiser interests.

The Kaiser Corp. determined to use the television station as a public relations lever. It hired Richard Block an enterprising young broadcaster, and backed him with significant program money. He did not hesitate to pay top prices for movies and run them in place of weak ABC shows. He brought public service programs to the station. He introduced television news to the islands. To this day, the NBC station (KONA-TV) does not carry the network's regular Huntley-Brinkley news show, and it has no regular late-evening news show of its own. KGMB, the CBS-TV affiliate, runs Walter Cronkite at midnight, because that's the earliest it can jet the CBS news show from the west coast. KHVH-TV also jets its ABC-TV network news show from the mainland, but uses clips from the network news in its own 10 p.m. news program.

With Kaiser backing, Richard Block took KHVH-TV from third place to first. The corporation paid $685,000 for the station in 1958 and sold it in 1964 to Berger's Western Telestations, Inc., for $4,250,000. The new owner hopes to substitute his own image for Kaiser's, but he, too, will continue to accent news and community needs. The islanders, he asserts, hunger for world news and take politics seriously, as their children do education. This, suggests Berger, accounts for the lead of "Science in Action" over entertainment. To the islanders, he believes, one network's entertainment package is just like another's. What attracts audiences is boldness, innovation, imagination, and willingness to take programing risks—on the local level. The doctrine may be heresy according to the canons of mainland broadcasters. But here in Hawaii, KHVA-TV has demonstrated its pragmatic value.

—ROBERT LEWIS SHAYON.

Supplemental Appropriation for Military Functions of Department of Defense, Fiscal Year 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 447) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for military functions of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, the 5th of May 1965, undoubtedly will be a day that I shall long remember for the mental and emotional experience I just endured. The President, concerned that the people of the United States did not support his policies in Vietnam, called upon the Congress in an extraordinary move to gain approval of his program by asking for $700 million to the end of June 30, 1965. The President by this request asked for a vote of confidence in his leadership. It was readily acknowledged that these funds were not needed for the furtherance of his policies in Vietnam, for he has the authority to use general funds of the Defense Department, but that he chose this means of asking for a vote of confidence in his leadership to carry this to his avowed ends of peace through negotiations without conditions.

I do not need to state my commitment to peace, and my belief that peace can come to Vietnam only through the conference table. And herein lies the conflict that I faced in this vote. While I do not agree with any policy of escalation of the war in Vietnam, it has consistently been denied by the President and all concerned that this is in fact the policy of the Government of the United States. Rather, the President has repeated several times in recent weeks that the policy of the United States is to seek an unconditional negotiation for the peace and stability of Vietnam, and further that the strategy now being pursued by this Government is to seek this just end to hostilities. With this statement I cannot but heartily agree. Our disagreement then, comes in not knowing what the peace is which we want to secure, nor how the conflict can be stabilized to the end that the right of self-determination can be assured, and finally in the matter of the strategy to accomplish these ends in the fastest, most expeditious manner. And it is here at this point that I find myself in utter confusion. Without the facts and the full explanation of the strategy involved, which for obvious reasons cannot be revealed if the strategy is to work, I cannot disagree with the President purely on the assumption that my analysis is susuperior to his judgment. Facing this dilemma, I am asked by the President to express my confidence that the ways in which he seeks to end this conflict by

negotiation can best be achieved by the methods and plans that he has laid.

Had the President never stated that he was pursuing a course which he personally believed would permit the earliest possible convening of negotiations, I would have no choice but to vote against his actions thus far. But in the context of his avowed purposes, I believed that he was entitled to pursue his course with the support of the people of the State of Hawaii, as cast by my vote as one of its representatives.

Further the President has stated to the Congress that without its overwhelming vote of confidence, his actions are subject to the interpretation by the Government of North Vietnam as not having the full support of the American people. He has explained that his hand would be weakened in his efforts to bring the parties to the conference table. His case is irrefutable. Any leader without the support of his people cannot display the resolution and conviction that this kind of crisis demands.

And so, though I am first and foremost committed to the cause of peace, I cast my vote in support of the President; that I do in fact believe his intent to seek a negotiated peace in Vietnam. As an elected representative of the people of Hawaii I could not let my feelings as an individual outweigh my responsibilities at this point, and so I had to say to the President that we of Hawaii do have confidence in his integrity and sincerity to achieve the ends of peace by means of negotiations.

The President said to the Congress in his May 4 message:

For, in the long run, there can be no military solution to the problems of Vietnam. We must find the path to peaceful settlement. Time and time again we have worked to open that path. We are still ready to talk, without conditions, to any government. We will go anywhere, discuss any subject, listen to any point of view in the interests of a peaceful solution.

This was the basis of my vote of confidence.

Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of Senators to a significant article recently published in the Minneapolis Tribune. Miss Sylvia Porter pointed up one of today's most important facts: that food, whether the most costly or the least expensive brand, is today far and away the greatest single bargain in America.

I commend Miss Porter's report to Senators as another verification of the benefits which American agriculture has brought to all of us. All Americans benefit when American agriculture is producing abundantly and efficiently.

Therefore, I request unanimous consent that Miss Porter's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Apr. 13, 1965]

FOOD FOR THOUGHT ON GROCERY PRICES

(By Sylvia Porter)

NEW YORK, N.Y.—How much money could you save on your food budget if you ignored quality and convenience and traded down instead of trading up? To answer this question, I went through a typical supermarket last week with one shopping list and two carts. Into the "bargain" cart I put the least expensive brand of each of 25 items, and into the "splurge" cart I put the most costly brands.

Price alone dictated my selections, but none of the items was an advertised special. When I checked out my two carts, I found my bargain basket cost $20.01 and my splurge basket came to $36.74—a difference of $16.73, or 84 percent.

Here's my grocery list, with the high and low prices:

Item	High	Low
Frankfurters (2 pounds)	$1.60	$1.15
Hamburger (3 pounds)	2.97	1.47
Liver (2 pounds)	1.98	.78
Bacon (2 pounds)	1.80	1.14
Steak (3 pounds)	4.47	2.07
Eggs (2 dozen)	.99	.74
Butter (2 pounds)	1.62	1.38
Milk (8 quarts)	2.16	[1] .63
Coffee (5 pounds)	2.79	2.13
White bread (2 loaves)	.66	.37
Frozen orange juice (4 6-ounce cans)	1.10	.79
Frozen peas (6 packages)	1.86	.95
Pears (2 large cans)	.98	.66
Mayonnaise (large jar)	.69	.43
Vegetable soup (4 cans)	.98	.27
Cat food (3 cans)	.70	.29
Tomatoes (2 large cans)	.70	.49
Salad oil (1 quart)	1.15	.59
Beer (6-pack)	2.70	.83
Cookies (1 box)	.49	.29
Onions (3 pounds)	.60	.25
Spaghetti (2 boxes)	.50	.43
Potatoes (10 pounds)	1.75	.94
Liquid detergent (1 quart)	.87	.49
Flour (5 pounds)	.63	.45

[1] Powdered.

Food prices have been rising from year to year but at a much slower pace than our personal incomes and our overall living costs. Personal incomes have soared 145 percent since 1949, but food prices have climbed only 15 percent—and today food takes an all-time low of 18.5 percent of our take-home pay.

Admittedly, most of us don't want to shop strictly for bargains. We want quality and convenience, we're willing to pay the price.

But, as my supermarket experiment and the national figures on food price trends underline, food is one of the greatest single bargains in the United States today—any way you count it.

Fifth District Voters Support President's Position in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, each year during the past 5 years I have conducted a poll of public opinion in the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut, which I have the honor to represent. I have just completed a tabulation of the returns on my most recent questionaire which covers 14 major issues confronting the Congress and the administration and never before has the questionnaire turned up a more significant registration of public opinion than the current one. It is particularly noteworthy because of the nature of the response to the questions concerning Vietnam.

I include in the RECORD the complete chart of the results of my questionnaire, but I want to call particular attention to some of the highlights. On the issue of Vietnam, 38.8 percent or a plurality of those answering favored intervention in strength by U.S. forces, 36.4 percent opposed such action, 24.8 percent expressed no opinion. The answers become more significant and I am sure that the President will take comfort in the knowledge that 68.6 percent flatly opposed withdrawal of U.S. support from South Vietnam and 62.6 percent favored expansion of our present support program for the people and army of South Vietnam.

While this study is the fifth which I have conducted, it is the first report of sentiment from the redistricted Fifth Congressional District, the boundaries of which became effective with the convening of the 89th Congress.

I am happy to tell you that my constituents are continuing to demonstrate a gratifying interest in the problems of government. In response to approximately 20,000 questionnaire cards distributed by me, at no cost to the Government, I received a total of 3,300 returns or 16.5 percent and these were mailed to me by my constituents at their own expense. In addition, I received hundreds of letter from constituents who commented at length on the issues listed, having found unduly restrictive the confinement to the "yes" or "no" of the printed questionnaire.

I am grateful to the people of my district who have assisted me by their participation in this survey. While I do not look upon these returns as an official mandate, they are helpful guides and indicators of public opinion trends. I shall, of course, continue to exercise my own judgment in voting on the issues.

I want to point out the heavy registration of support for revision and improvement of presidential and vice-presidential succession and inability laws and for a 60-day limit on presidential campaigns, which have been two of the subjects in which I have taken a very personal and particular interest. Among other subjects in which I have initiated legislative action and which have won strong support in the survey are an accelerated program of Federal assistance for local-State effort to curb water and air pollution; a constitutional amendment to permit the voluntary recitation of prayer in public schools; Federal legislation to guarantee the right of voting registration for every citizen; and an additional income tax exemption for persons paying expenses of college students. There are others, but these are the ones most favored.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the complete tabulation of the 14 sections and the several subsections covered in my 1965 questionnaire, showing the total scores both in figures and in percentages:

Results of questionnaire, April 1965, JOHN S. MONAGAN, 5th District of Connecticut

	Yes		No		Undecided	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Do you favor?						
1. (a) A program of hospital and nursing care under social security?	2,019	61.2	1,145	34.7	136	4.1
(b) Extension of present programs based on general tax revenue?	1,591	48.2	736	22.3	973	29.5
2. (c) Withdrawal of U.S. support from South Vietnam	610	18.5	2,263	68.6	427	12.9
(d) Expansion of our present support program for the people and Army of South Vietnam?	2,026	62.6	719	21.8	515	15.6
(e) Intervention in strength by U.S. forces?	1,281	38.8	1,201	36.4	818	24.8
3. Repeal of sec. 14-(b) of the National Labor Relations Act of 1947?	702	21.3	921	27.9	1,677	50.8
4. Revision of immigration and nationality laws by elimination of the national quota system?	1,690	51.2	1,187	36.0	423	12.8
5. Inclusion of private and parochial schools in benefits of Federal programs of aid to education	1,851	56.1	1,317	39.9	132	4.0
6. Abolition of House Un-American Activities Committee	745	22.6	2,052	62.2	503	15.2
7. A 60-day limit on presidential campaigns?	2,811	85.2	357	10.8	132	4.0
8. A constitutional amendment to permit the voluntary recitation of prayer in public schools?	2,683	81.3	436	13.2	181	5.5
9. (a) Appropriations for U.S. foreign aid program (military)?	1,726	52.3	1,141	34.6	433	13.1
(b) Appropriations for U.S. foreign aid program (economic)?	1,956	59.3	944	28.6	400	12.1
10. Additional income tax exemption for persons paying expenses of college students?	2,547	77.2	604	18.3	149	4.5
11. Accelerated program of Federal assistance for local-State effort to curb water and air pollution?	2,799	84.8	323	9.8	178	5.4
12. Revision and improvement of presidential and vice-presidential succession and inability laws?	3,010	91.2	101	3.1	189	5.7
13. Termination of selective service (draft)?	759	23.0	2,211	67.0	330	10.0
14. Federal legislation to guarantee the right of voting registration for every citizen?	2,908	88.1	250	7.6	142	4.3

Statement by Senator Smathers and Address by Vice President Humphrey at Annual Meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks entitled "Inspiration of the Handicapped" and those made by the Vice President of the United States, on April 30, at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

There being no objection, the statement and the speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSPIRATION OF THE HANDICAPPED—STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

It is an inspiration to us all when we see men rise above crippling handicaps and go on to render significant contributions to society.

Such men inspire not only those of us who are more fortunate but more importantly, those who have been disabled and who must make major readjustments to life.

Roger W. Irving, of St. Petersburg, Fla., is that kind of a man.

On April 29, Mr. Irving was honored as the Handicapped American of the Year and received from Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz a special plaque.

At 72, Roger W. Irving is continuing to lead an active and useful life despite multiple handicaps including the loss of an arm, the removal of his larynx because of cancer, and a recent sight impairment.

Despite this, Mr. Irving has rendered outstanding service to his fellow Americans—ranging from the Boy Scouts to laryngectomees like himself, to whom he has taught the technique of regaining speech.

I regret that other duties prevented me from being present at ceremonies honoring Mr. Irving on April 29.

Mr. Irving demonstrates so graphically that a physical handicap need not be the end of a career. He is a credit to the State of Florida and the entire Nation.

Vice President HUMPHREY has summed up, I think, some excellent thoughts on the contributions of men like Roger W. Irving and the role of the handicapped in society.

The Vice President's remarks were prepared to delivery April 30 at he annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED ANNUAL MEETING, APRIL 30, 1965

Four years ago, Emik Avakian won the President's trophy as Handicapped Man of the Year. Mr. Avakian is severely cerebral palsied, almost unable to sit in a wheelchair.

Years ago, he had to fight his way into college against the advice of counselors who thought he was too severely handicapped. Now an electrical engineer, he is also a brilliant scientist. He devised a lightning-fast reservation system whereby airlines can tell how many seats are available on all flights.

He couldn't hold a pencil, so he invented a typewriter that could be operated with his breath. He is at present working on use of a computer to control radiation beams that might perform bloodless surgery on that part of the brain which, if injured, can cause cerebral palsy.

This disabled American acts to overcome not only his own disability but to make possible new vistas for the able as well as for the disabled. Others are joined in this struggle. This administration is committed to it. And so are you.

This February, President Johnson wrote to the Nation's employers:

"Given encouragement and hope, our handicapped citizens can competitively earn a useful place in our great land of opportunity. They have the courage. All they need is a chance to prove themselves."

It is you who are providing that chance—you of Governors' committees and mayors' committees, you who are leaders of business, of labor, civic groups, veterans, and other voluntary organizations.

Your teamwork with the President's committees, the U.S. Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and State rehabilitation agencies has opened employment doors which for too long were barred to the handicapped. You opened those closed doors by first opening closed minds. Those minds had arbitrarily rejected the disabled as being allegedly "unemployable." But "open minds," "open hearts," friendly outstretched hands have changed that picture.

Thus, as an example, last year, 8,300 men and women who had been regarded as completely outside the labor force—because they were mentally retarded—were put to gainful work. They represent only a small portion of the 3 million retarded who are capable of doing a job. But this important beginning does show what can be done.

I honor those—in the National Association for Retarded Children—and in cooperating organizations who blazed this path of progress.

This October will mark the 20th anniversary of the first celebration of a special week to employ the handicapped.

Eighteen years ago it was my privilege, as mayor of Minneapolis, to issue one of the first municipal proclamations for observance of that week. At that time, the secretary of our mayor's committee was a young Purple Heart veteran named Orville Freeman. Today, as Secretary of Agriculture, he is leading the fight to aid America's rural disabled.

In this auditorium today are many pioneers of jobs-for-the-handicapped. You have proven that it is definitely good business to employ the handicapped.

And it is good government and good citizenship to get a disabled man off the welfare roll onto a payroll and a tax roll.

For years, the roll call of honor for the handicapped was headed by the predecessor of your great Harold Russell a fellow Minnesotan, the late Gen. Melvin Maas. Though blind, General Maas "saw" this need of the Nation and responded magnificently to it.

He led us closer to the time when all men and women in our society will have opportunity to develop their talents and skills.

The goal of this administration is—as it was General Maas' goal—opportunity for all Americans. We seek opportunity for all who would work to lift themselves.

The handicapped do want to work. The handicapped do not want pity. They do not want handouts. And they do not want "made work." They ask only that they be trained for meaningful jobs they can perform and that, whenever necessary, jobs be adapted so they can perform them.

That is not too much to ask.

But the job-seeking handicapped comprise a long waiting list. Three million Americans have disabilities which still keep them on the fringes of community and family life.

Year by year, the numbers of the rehabilitated are—fortunately—rising. In 5 years, we hope to reach the annual mark of rehabilitating 200,000 each year.

But the time gap implicit in these figures confirms how far we still have to go.

Meanwhile time hangs heavy on those waiting their chance for a job. Is there anyone among us who can calculate the anguish of the man or woman forced to wait or who vainly apply for employment—time after time—only to be rejected?

For these men and women we are determined to open up more jobs. Jobs are

needed, too, not just for the disabled—but for millions of the impoverished.

The poor and the disabled are frequently one and the same.

Some 40 percent of the disabled are poor.

It is no coincidence, too, that the poor are blighted far more frequently by mental retardation and mental illness than are more fortunate citizens.

One handicap tends to breed others. A vicious cycle goes on and on. Starting with disability or with poverty, it leads to other forms of deprivation—to psychological, cultural, social or other wants.

To remedy this tragic pattern—to provide for the deprived, to uplift the poor, the disabled—a peaceful war is being fought in this Nation.

The war against poverty is simultaneously a war against disability—to prevent disability before it strikes, to treat disability if it does strike, to cure disability, if possible, or to relieve it and to rehabilitate the victim.

Against single or multiple handicaps, your administration is mobilizing every sound weapon that the ingenuity of man's mind and the devotion of man's heart can devise.

History-making legislation—Federal aid to primary and secondary education, including special education—aid to evaluate the potential of the disabled and to expand sheltered workshops—aid for regional medical centers—is being passed.

It is being passed because of the broad support of American citizens—especially the citizens in this audience.

I urge you in this audience not just to receive—passively—the qualified handicapped who are sent to you, and not just to hire them.

I urge you to go out and see the handicapped—where they live, where they train. See them in sheltered workshops. See them, too, in companies which are successfully employing them. Listen to them.

Then participate in the new program of employment seminars which mayors throughout America are now organizing.

Examine the program of jobs-for-the-handicapped in your own State and community. Meet the targets you have set for job placements and then go on to achieve still higher targets.

What you are doing is not only economically right but morally right.

In the future, despite our progress, we face formidable problems.

Most of our efforts must now be directed against fortresses which thus far have resisted progress. I refer to such citadels as mental illness, mental retardation, and epilepsy.

Recent history proves that the walls of an enemy fortress—like poliomyelitis or tuberculosis—"will come tumbling down" if public and private forces combine to concentrate national attention upon it.

Long since, American genius broke the sound barrier. Now let us break the prejudice barrier—the poverty barrier—the disability barrier—the psychological barrier which denies any man his due.

Jobs for disabled Americans are a blessing for every American. Let us multiply that blessing.

"I Will Try"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to an interesting and important book written by a most unusual and outstanding individual. He is not a professional writer. Rather, he is a student who has been living in my district and the State of Washington since he walked out of Africa in 1958.

He is Mr. Legson Kayira, a native of Malawi, formerly Nyasaland. His book, "I Will Try," is the story of a difficult journey from the stone age to the space age.

Occasionally, a rare individual will demonstrate a capacity of the human spirit that shows us the truly enormous potential we all possess. Mr. Kayira has done this. He has demonstrated, for the world to see, a compelling tenacity and desire to learn that leaves us breathless with wonder.

Perhaps the great lesson he can teach us rests not so much in his incredible accomplishment, but, rather, upon its simple beginning. Legson Kayira started his journey with few belongings and one major resolution, "I will try."

The review of his book in Time magazine of April 30, 1965, tells his story well, and captures the spirit of this young man's adventure. Under unanimous consent, I insert this review in the RECORD:

GOOD WILL ODYSSEY

"Mr. Legson Kayira." As the loudspeaker boomed his name, the African village boy, awkward in his new shoes and suit, stopped short and stared wonderingly into the crowd at New York's International Airport. "Calling Mr. Legson Kayira," the disembodied voice repeated. The boy took a deep breath and, as other travelers gaped in astonishment, he bellowed at the top of his voice, "I am here."

How he got there is the subject of this ingenuous but significant autobiography, the story of an African Horatio Alger who made good his determination to go to college in America. It is the account of one man's odyssey from the stone age to the space age, and above all, it is an example of good will between black and white.

PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

Legson was born in the British colony of Nyasaland, now independent and known as Malawi. The first white man he ever saw was an elegant official marching behind a column of African tribesmen, commandeered to bear the white man's burden—notably the white man's wife, who was carried through Legson's impoverished village on a litter. He asssumed that the strangers were gods. Later, at a Scottish mission school, he discovered that they were often stupid and insensitive gods who beat black boys. He worked hard at algebra, read Booker T. Washington, pondered the life and works of Abraham Lincoln: "I saw the land of Lincoln as the place one went to get the freedom and independence one knew was due him."

Impossible to get there? The emblem on Legson's school uniform bore the words: "I will try." When Legson was about 16 or 20—nobody really knows when he was born—he decided to try. One October morning in 1958, carrying an ax, a little flour, a Bible, and a copy of Pilgrim's Progress, he set out barefoot for America. He struck due north through Tanganyika, Uganda, the Sudan. Some days he walked 50 miles, living mostly on bananas and peanuts. After 4 months his feet were a mass of blisters. "I am mad," he muttered. But his shirt said "I will try." For consolation he read Pilgrim's Progress.

Fifteen months after leaving home, Legson appeared at the U.S. Information Service Library in Kampala, Uganda. There he came across a directory of American junior colleges, opened it at random, put his finger on the first words he saw: "Skagit Valley Junior College, Mount Vernon, Washington." Then and there, he wrote a letter; 2 weeks later he had a scholarship; 9 months later, thanks to the people of Mount Vernon, he had a plane ticket.

IMMORAL FACE

The United States gave Legson quite a reception, but he seems to have accepted everything that came his way with a grave and innocent equanimity. In the Capital, he endured the standard tourist treatment, discovered the sweet relationship between waffles and sirup, stood in the Lincoln Memorial and timidly waved at the immortal face. Skagit Valley College received him with a banner and a banquet. The family that "adopted" him had redecorated the spare bedroom. Neighbors stopped in with cakes. Huntley-Brinkley televised him. Some will pin the word "naive" on Legson's wide-eyed good will and on America's cozy, corny reception of him. But there may be more basic human realism in this naivete than cynics either in the United States or in Africa would concede.

After studying speech, physics, English and volleyball (easier than physics) at Skagit, Legson went on to Washington University as a political science major. In wide demand as a speaker, he was welcomed in Little Rock, segregated in Dallas. After 4 years in the United States, he retains his love for the land of Lincoln—and for the land of his birth. After finishing his education, he intends to go home to Malawi and teach school and enter politics. "A salute to you, Malawi," he writes at the end of his book. "We have just begun to try."

Air Force Academy Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, May 6, the report to the Secretary and Chief of Staff of the Air Force by the Advisory Committee on the U.S. Air Force Academy was released to the public. Named after the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, former Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Gen. Thomas D. White, it brings to a close an unfortunate episode in the history of the Air Force Academy during which 109 cadets were dismissed for violating its honor code.

As I have mentioned previously, the Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene M. Zuckert, handled this affair which had the potential of seriously damaging the whole fabric of our military service institutions with commendable effectiveness, candor, and understanding. The frank revelation of the cheating incidents and the judicious corrective action taken by the Air Force kept this incident in its proper perspective and reaffirmed the high caliber and integrity of our officer and cadet corps.

Even before the conclusion of the investigation, Secretary Zuckert appointed a board composed of the following outstanding individuals to review and analyze the basic causes of the cheating episode in terms of an evaluation of the structure and working of the Academy:

Gen. Thomas D. White, chairman.

Prof. Hardy C. Dillard, dean of the Law School, University of Virginia.

Lt. Gen. Joseph J. Nazzaro, vice commander in chief, Strategic Air Command.

Dr. Robert L. Stearns, former president of the University of Colorado.

Charles B. Thornton, president of Litton Industries.

The report of this Committee is thorough, straightforward and consistent with the competency, forthrightness and professionalism that has marked the handling of this entire affair.

I was particularly impressed with the recommendations on the extension of the minimum tour of the Superintendent and the Commandant as well as the appointment of a permanent Advisory Board to keep the Secretary and Chief of Staff advised on all aspects of Academy policies and operation. The adoption of these recommendations will tend to develop at the Academy greater stability of management and a continuity of operations.

The Committee is to be commended on its remarks with respect to athletics. The report bears out what I have always felt—that athletics are vital to a well rounded Academy program. However, the point is well made that the primary purpose of the Academy—to produce career officers—is being achieved.

The report clarifies the role of the foundations which provide scholarship aid to young men who need additional scholastic training to qualify for admission to the Academy. In the past 3 years, the Falcon Foundation funds have supported 67 scholars of whom only 4 were known to have high potential for varsity level athletic participation. In the same period, the Gertrude Skelly Trust has aided 45 scholars, all of whom were sons of career military personnel; the trust does not take athletic ability into account.

In its consideration of the honor code itself, the Committee clearly pointed out that the code did indeed set a high standard, but one not out of line for a profession committed to public trust and mutual confidence. A military organization depends for its success upon a deep sense of personal responsibility by each member to the group at large. The high calling of the Air Force officer and the demands made by the profession of arms lends support to the choice of the high standards which the cadets have adopted.

The prohibition against toleration which rounds out the cadet honor code is its most exacting and difficult standard. Since honor is not an exclusive value, a very real conflict may develop between personal friendship and a higher loyalty to the cadet wing which the toleration clause embodies. Here too, however, the standard which cadets exact of themselves, though far more rigorous, is not without roots in society at large.

When we consider that these cadets will somebody be our military leaders and could be called upon to make decisions determining the life or death of our Nation, or perhaps civilization, we must expect that they will be trained to adhere to the strictest codes of honor and moral integrity.

The members of the Committee who unselfishly devoted their time and energy to prepare this authoritative report are to be congratulated for the great service they have rendered the Air Force and the Nation.

Old Numbers Game Gets Workout in Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of the old medicine show technique in the presentation of most of the legislation Lyndon Johnson is whipping through his rubberstamp Congress. "Now you see it, now you do not," confuses the arguments for such bills as medicare, Federal aid to education, and most of the appropriation bills. The taxpayers are told one thing, but the legislation never quite comes up to the promises made for it.

One of the best examples of the numbers game is in the President's voting rights bill where the administration blithely tosses off figures and percentages for one purpose only, to punish six Southern States for daring to challenge the right of the Federal Government to usurp the constitutional rights of the States.

How the numbers game is being used in connection with the voting rights bill is clearly stated in the following editorial from the Montgomery, Ala., Advertiser, for May 3, 1965:

OLD NUMBERS GAME

The old numbers game has been around in politics a long time, but it doesn't take long experience to recognize that the way it's used in the Johnson civil rights voting bill is about as unrealistic as a numbers game can be.

The numbers game is played with percentages, or dates, or figures, and what it really represents is an attempt to justify an act someone wishes to perform, or to single out a grouping by applying criteria that, upon examination, may actually be meaningless.

For example, the President's bill says that all States where less than 50 percent of the voting-age population voted in the November 1964 general election automatically come under the surveillance of the Federal Government and so Federal registrars will be sent down to investigate.

Admittedly, the Johnson bill was written to scatter-shot a few Southern States; some way had to be found to do it and so the numbers game netted Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and, to the surprise of many, Alaska. We'll have a bit more to say about Alaska farther on.

But we'll begin by wondering how the fact that a certain percentage of the population of voting age did not vote can be proof that they were prevented from voting.

In the South, for example, the voter is likely to turn out in larger numbers in a primary than in a general election, for that is when the officials of the county or the city or the State are most likely to be decided. But they do not always turn out in larger numbers in a primary; for example, a total of about 349,000 Virginians voted in the last Democratic gubernatorial primary race in this State. But in the Kennedy-Nixon election the year before, 501,965 Virginians voted. Under the implications of this bill—which is that, when 50 percent of the people of an age to vote do not do so, somebody is denying them their right—there must have been a lot of registrars and their strongarm henchmen around to keep more than 150,000 Virginians who voted in November 1960 from voting in July 1961.

The numbers game is nonsense on the face of it. One cannot prove that an apple is an orange merely by calling it one.

And one cannot prove that people are being denied a right to vote merely by choosing a percentage and saying that all on one side are the faithful and all on the other are infidels.

No one doubts that there are times and places when Negroes are denied the right to the ballot. No one here argues that the Negro does not have the same right to the ballot as the white man.

But the cure lies far better elsewhere than in a law that strains credulity and insults the intelligence.

If it were not such a dangerous procedure, the proposed system would be downright funny. Alaska, please remember, fell into the net cast to catch the Southern States. Alaska's explanation of why less than 50 percent of its voting-age population failed to vote last November was that "it gets cold up here in November."

The explanation ought to do much to disclose how irrational is the thinking behind this numbers game approach of the Johnson bill.

But in case it does not, then we would point to the Truman-Dewey election in 1948. That year, across the entire United States only 51.8 percent of the voting-age population voted. If such a law had been in effect prior to that election, there would have been a lot more States than six Southern ones with Federal registrars busy hunting down the vote deniers. And learning, in the end, that what really happened was that a lot of people hadn't voted because they didn't want to vote for either Truman or Dewey.

Randy Matson Makes Sports History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in a truly astonishing and historic display of athletic prowess Saturday, May 8, 1965, 20-year-old Randy Matson of Pampa, Tex., tossed the 16-pound shot 70 feet 7 inches.

It was the first time any shotputter had exceeded 70 feet, the mark that had stood as the shotputting equivalent to the 4-minute mile.

Randy seems to break a new record with every meet. On April 29, I was privileged to report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the new world shotput mark he set April 9 of 67 feet 11¼ inches. In a subsequent meet he surpassed that record—and then Saturday he exceeded it again.

Four of Randy's six tosses in Saturday's preliminaries to the Southwest Conference Track and Field Meet exceeded the previous pending record he had set.

To make Saturday a fully satisfying day, Randy tossed the discus 199 feet 7½ inches for a new national collegiate record.

The Olympic silver medal winner set the records Saturday despite a pulled ligament in his left knee. His plans for future assaults on the record books were outlined in an Associated Press article appearing this morning in the Washington Post.

This fine young man is thrilling sports fans all over the country with his remarkable achievements. And, of course, we of Pampa, Tex., who are his friends and neighbors have a special pride in Randy Matson.

Today's Associated Press article is as follows:

COLLEGE STATION, TEX., May 9.—Randy Matson, the strong man of the Texas Aggies, cracked the 70-foot barrier in the shot put Saturday despite an injured knee, then said he would take a rest after competing in two more meets.

It has been a long haul for the 20-year-old giant who started throwing the shot virtually the year round 2 years ago and finished second in the Olympic games.

"I'll compete in the Coliseum Relays next week, then in the NCAA at Berkeley, Calif., June 17 and 18, and call it a season," said the 256-pound Texas A. & M. sophomore, who hurled the shot 70 feet 7 inches for a world record and threw the discus 199 feet 7½ inches for a National Collegiate mark.

"I would compete in the AAU for a chance to get on the team that goes to Russia, but I can't because of the controversy between the AAU and the NCAA," Matson said. "I can't compete with the colleges and in the AAU, too. If they straightened this out so I could, I might go on."

But he said that he would lift weights to keep in shape. He lives at Pampa, where he was a weight sensation as a high school boy.

Matson has a pulled ligament in his left knee. While throwing the shot Saturday it caused him more pain that he had ever experienced before. This helped him to decide he needed a rest to correct the ailment.

He also said he needed to work on his speed.

"I need more speed across the ring," he explained. "I can't get it by adding weight. I would like to eventually get up to 270, but 300 never."

Heroes Are Born

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, at a time when many unfortunate and unrealistic impressions about Alabama have been spread across the country and across the world all persons with a sense of fairplay will want to know as much as possible about relations between the races in our State. With that in mind I request that attention be given to a recent incident in which a young white man distinguished himself in an act of heroism toward a Negro boy.

Vernon Anderson of Alabama is a hero because he acted not as a white man, not as a southerner, not as the partisan of any divisive group, but rather as a whole American in the spirit of American willingness to aid one's neighbor.

I include an article and editorial from the Thomasville, Ala., Times of May 5, 1965, here. We can all join in wishing Vernon Anderson a speedy recovery and a thank you for being a fine American:

LIFE SAVED BUT COSTS FOOT OF HERO RESCUER: FELLOW WORKER TELLS OF MISHAP IN JACKSON, ALA.

A Southern Railway trainman has been credited by fellow workmen with saving the life of a Negro boy at Jackson last Thursday afternoon when he jerked the boy from beneath a freight car, losing a portion of his own foot during the rescue.

Vernon Anderson of Orrville, who is well known here, was first treated at Jackson then transferred to Selma Baptist Hospital Thursday night after losing a portion of his right foot during the accident Thursday afternoon. He was reported in good condition this week.

N. L. Horne of Selma, conductor on the train on which Anderson was working, told the story of the daring rescue that snatched the 11-year-old Negro boy from almost certain death beneath the car's wheels.

Horne said that while the train was switching some cars in Jackson they saw a group of Negro youths picking blackberries and that the boys started to shout that one was trapped under a car. They investigated immediately. One of the boys, identified as Roland Jenkins of Jackson, had his toes pinched under the wheel of the train.

Horne said that, using the walkie-talkie radios with which the trainmen are equipped, the engineer was told to "slack back" so that the boy could remove his foot from beneath the wheels. When he slacked back, the boy slipped underneath the train, according to Horne.

Horne said that Anderson then grabbed the youth, who was lying across the rail, and jerked him from beneath the wheels, was brushed by the train himself and his foot slipped beneath the wheels and was severed.

The Negro boy was apparently unhurt.

The conductor said that but for Anderson's quick action, without any thought for his own personal safety, the youth most certainly would have been killed.

Troubles of the crew on the train, bound at the time from Selma to Mobile, didn't end there, however.

When Flagman Beatty Wynn Morgan picked Anderson up, rushing him to a truck nearby for an emergency trip to the hopsital, he suffered a slipped disc in his back, landing him in Selma Baptist Hospital, also. He was reported resting comfortably this week.

Both Anderson and Morgan are natives and lifelong residents of Sunny South, Morgan still living there. Anderson has resided in Selma and Orrville in recent years.

HEROES ARE BORN

There is nothing magical about heroes. Usually, they are just ordinary people to whom fate decrees the opportunity to perform unusual deeds. And, because they are so much like all the other people in the world, the things they do are often overlooked and forgotten.

We think that a heroic deed, performed in Jackson, Ala., last week, by a 31-year-old railroadman, should not be overlooked and forgotten.

He is Vernon Anderson, born and reared in sunny South, current address: Selma Baptist Hospital, Selma, Ala., married, the father of two young sons, and a fine upstanding young man who has been working as a crewmember on Southern Railway trains between Selma and Mobile.

The train on which he was working was engaged in switching operations in Jackson last week when a Negro boy, apparently unaware that the train was there, was caught under a car, unable to free himself, and was in imminent danger of being crushed to death.

Without regard for his own danger, this young man risked his life to get down and, literally, snatch the boy from the jaws of death. In so doing so, he suffered the loss of a portion of his own foot.

Such heroism, we think, should not go unrewarded. We feel that this young man should at least, receive the Carnegie Foundation hero medal (or whatever is the proper name of this award). We feel, moreover, that his company should be able to find another position for him, now that he will, most likely, be unable to continue as a trainman. He is intelligent and capable of filling other positions.

The accident which cost the young man his foot serves to demonstrate, once again, that the South is not the barbaric region so often pictured in national news media. It demonstrates that compassion and heroism knows no color line. It is a small example of the white race giving for the benefit of the Negro race, but it is not the sort of human interest story you are likely to see on the "Huntley-Brinkley Report" or read about in Life magazine.

Not that the young man stopped to question whether the boy was white or black. He could have stood and cursed the boy, watching him crushed to death. He could have saved his foot and not risked his life. But he didn't. The only thing that mattered was not that he was white or black, but that here was a human being in desperate need.

He answered that need.

A Salute to Mr. Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today is the 41st anniversary of the day a young lawyer named John Edgar Hoover was appointed Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Most Americans will agree it was an unusually fortunate appointment for the country, and most Americans will join enthusiastically in saluting the able official who continues to lead the FBI today.

Lyle C. Wilson has said it very well for all of us in today's issue of the Washington Daily News:

SKOAL

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

Now is the time for all good men to drink an anniversary toast to J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI.

Today is the 41st anniversary of Mr. Hoover's appointment as FBI Director. That lucky choice was made by the late Harlan Fiske Stone, Attorney General in the Coolidge Cabinet, later promoted to the Supreme Court.

The Justice Department and its investigative arm had been in disgrace before Mr. Stone and Mr. Hoover began in 1924 to figure in the headlines. William J. Burns was head G-man during the Harding administration. Harry M. Daugherty was Mr. Harding's Attorney General.

Mr. Daugherty was the chief of the so-called Ohio gang which accompanied Mr. Harding to power. Likewise, Mr. Daugh-

erty was a principal figure in the scandals which degraded the Harding administration. President Calvin Coolidge forced Mr. Daugherty out of the Cabinet in 1924 and named Mr. Stone to succeed him.

One of Mr. Stone's first acts was to make 29-year-old J. Edgar Hoover director of the newly created FBI. Mr. Stone and Mr. Hoover began accomplishing the almost impossible. Their task was to restore public confidence in the Department of Justice. Mr. Daugherty had left the Department under charges of corruption.

These charges developed out of an investigation said by the Encyclopedia of American History to have "revealed that the Attorney General, acting in concert with members of the Ohio gang, had received payments from violators of the prohibition laws (and) also disclosed that Mr. Daugherty had failed to prosecute graft in the Veterans' Bureau." Daugherty was acquitted in 1927 of a conspiracy charge.

The young J. Edgar Hoover established high standards for the FBI. He compelled his men and his organization to conform precisely to those standards just as he himself conformed. Soon Mr. Hoover became a legend in his own time. It became standard operating procedure for the Congress and for Presidents to call on Mr. Hoover and his men when the Nation was troubled by a law enforcement problem of such nature that citizens were uneasy in their beds at night.

That is the way it was after Charles A. Lindberg, Jr. was kidnaped and murdered. Congress enacted the Lindbergh kidnap law and stipulated that Mr. Hoover's FBI should enforce it. Not a moment too soon either. Prohibition soon ended in 1933, and the booze hoodlums turned to a new business—kidnaping. Others began knocking over national banks. They also were in FBI jurisdiction. One by one the Dillingers and Machinegun Kellys were disposed of.

Meantime, the Communists were crawling out of the woodwork in the United States. Mr. Hoover's FBI drew the assignment to ride herd on the commies. Then began the ceaseless effort of the commies, their friends and their dupes to get Mr. Hoover. Why? Because Mr. Hoover's FBI is the most effective existing bar against the objective of all Communists here and abroad, which is to bury the American way of life.

A great many citizens cheer Mr. Hoover for the enemies he has made. To J. Edgar Hoover: Skoal.

Cleveland's Capabilities Recognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is not always true that "a prophet is not without honor but in his own country." Proof of this comes in an editorial that appeared recently in the Daily Eagle of Claremont, N.H., in which the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] is given recognition for the excellent manner in which he has undertaken his new and important job as chairman of the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing.

The appointment, says the editorial, is "pleasing not only to the Congressman personally, but to all his constituents of the Second New Hampshire District." I would like to add that the appointment is also a source of gratification to all Republicans and an encouraging development for the cause of representative government.

The gentleman from New Hampshire is known for his hard work, dedication, and fearlessness. The people of his district have chosen wisely in sending him to Congress and should be congratulated. I am happy to offer the fine editorial from the Daily Eagle for the RECORD:

CLEVELAND'S CAPABILITIES RECOGNIZED

The recent appointment of Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire, as chairman of a new congressional committee is a gratifying recognition of his capabilities. It's pleasing not only to the Congressman personally, but to all his constituents of the Second New Hampshire District.

Representative CLEVELAND heads up the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing this term. It's a successor to the so-called Schwengel committee on minority staffing, in which he also served in his freshman session in Congress.

The Schwengel committee hired its own staff from funds provided independently. This year, however, the party has a different staff program and a new research director, with operating details still under study.

It was while Representative CLEVELAND was on the Schwengel committee, it might be noted, that he wrote a law review article in which he called attention to another type of staffing abuse engaged in by "Boss" Buckley of the Bronx. This article, picked up by Washington correspondents, drew nationwide attention and editorial comment.

It may well have been that the CLEVELAND exposé of the Buckley misuse of committee staff played some part in his appointment to the new chairmanship. Another contributory cause may have been his fight last January to bring before Congress for consideration the facts in the contested election of Representative RICHARD L. OTTINGER, Democrat, of New York.

"The minority staffing problem," Representative CLEVELAND writes us, "remains of high priority. I do not have the figures for this year, but in the last Congress, staff available to the Democrats outnumbered Republican staff resources by 10 to 1. It is substantially the same this year.

"The public generally and many Republicans particularly do not appreciate the fact of this imbalance. The time of Congressmen is spread too thin among our many obligations to permit them to do much of their own research. My own is pressed to keep up with me and, although I have my own research staffer, his hands are pretty full.

"Effective coordination among staffs is pretty well impossible. Few members or their staffers are specialists, and we have to rely heavily on the few minority specialists that we do have on the various committees where we have them (we have none on some committees).

"An effective two-party system, meaning responsible criticism and opposition by the minority, depends to a large degree on an adequate supply of staff, professionally trained and competent to analyze legislation and draft counterproposals when required.

"In January, Republicans sought a guaranteed 60 to 40 majority-minority staff ratio on the committee of the House, but this was rejected by the Democrats.

"There are many other suggestions for reforming congressional procedures to improve the effectiveness of the legislative branch. I hope our committee will winnow through them successfully and come up with sound proposals.

"The job is formidable, and some of the issues involved are controversial; but if we do no more than open them up for lively public debate, we will have made a contribution."

Cutback in SCS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months there has been a vast uprising in protest over the administration's proposal that landowners and operators pay a user charge for the technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service.

This proposal would destroy the effective Federal-State-local partnership that we have had for 30 years. Landowners already contribute far more than the Government to soil and water conservation work. The preservation and development of our resources benefit all Americans in a direct way. All Americans should, therefore, share in the cost.

On April 16 the Daily Journal published at Fergus Falls, Minn., carried an editorial devoted to this point of view. I include this editorial in the RECORD:

CUTBACK IN SCS

At the same time that Congress has committed billions of the taxpayers' money for new programs of aid to education, medicare, poverty legislation, and other programs, it is cutting back on what seems to us a most important program which has operated effectively for 30 years.

We refer to the conservation operations of the Soil Conservation Service. The President's budget calls for a cutback of $20 million on the SCS operations budget which was $104 million in fiscal 1965, and planned to be approximately the same for fiscal 1966.

To make up the $20 million, the budget proposes to ask farmers to pay for services previously provided free of charge by the SCS. If the money were not forthcoming from soil conservation districts and their farmer members, the service would be cut back to within the remaining portion of its budget. This cut would mean a reduction in force in Minnesota of about 50 men from the 300 currently employed, according to conservation officials.

What are these men doing? They are helping to plan and develop grass waterways, contour strip cropping, farm plans, soil surveys, livestock watering facilities, terracing, and many other practices which conserve the land and water so vital to our future.

(They are also planning drainage in areas—a debatable conservation practice. But if Congress would want to cut back drainage, they should do so, not cut back all the other services.)

Should farmers be expected to pay for this service? Yes, they should, and they do. SCS only provides free technical assistance. Farmers pay for the actual work which is done by contractors, and may apply to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) for approximately 50 percent cost sharing. But the SCS contribution has been free for 30 years, and why should farm-

ers be asked to pay a portion of it now—at a time when Congress is trying to find ways to improve farm income which they admit is too low?

By the way, the budget also calls for a near 50-percent cut in the agriculture conservation program of the ASCS, which would also affect this situation.

This cut in SCS funds, with its plan to shift the cost to hard-pressed farmers, seems foolish economy from a Congress which is allocating not millions, but billions, to a variety of domestic programs to aid other segments of the economy.

Above the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following article which appeared in Human Events, issue of May 15. The article was originally printed in the Chicago Tribune. It points out the danger in accepting the premise that agitators should be allowed to determine which laws they will disobey. If each of us is to determine for himself those laws by which he will abide and those which he will defy, what is going to happen to constitutional government and to law and order?

The article follows:

OBEY ONLY "JUST" LAWS—JUDGES OF THEIR OWN CAUSE

Action in the name of "civil rights" is producing some strange excrescences. Dissidents at the University of California at Berkeley again have put the campus in an uproar by bellowing imprecations against the university administration for disciplining four students. The offenders extended what was represented as a student free speech movement into a filthy speech exercise.

They shouted a four-letter obscenity, flaunted it on signs, and then proceeded to the public reading of "Lady Chatterley's Lover." All this was supposed to be the exercise of some civil right—perhaps the right to offend or shock others and to debase public morality.

When the administration summoned up enough gumption to dismiss one of the students and suspend three others for the remainder of the academic year, the free speech crowd, led by Mario Savio, a former student who dropped out of school to become a full-time agitator, went into disruptive protest session.

Savio offered the wholly ridiculous argument that the four students bounced by the university had been exposed to double jeopardy because they also are on trial in a city court for obscenity. There is no connection between a criminal offense and university disciplinary action.

The point here, however, is that the campus malcontents are not satisfied with simple troublemaking but must also assert that they are to be listened to respectfully as lawgivers. This is a delusion that afflicts a great many people—notably, as one handy example, the Reverend Martin Luther King, also a practitioner in the field of civil rights.

The Reverend Mr. King has established to his own satisfaction that there are two kinds of laws—just laws and unjust laws. The unjust laws are those not to his liking, especially when they cramp his style as grand marshal of marches and demonstrations. He has discovered a "moral responsibility" to disobey them.

It is the same with the California students, who were unwilling originally to accept university rules governing physical limitations for recruiting and soliciting in support of various political and social causes within the confines of the campus. This, in their view, was a denial of free speech, and so, by extension, was disapproval of the right to hurl dirty words at the heads of passers-by.

On the familiar principle that, if tolerated an inch, it is permissible to grab for a mile, the Reverend Mr. King keeps extending his area of operations. His marches have become longer and the federalized National Guard must be turned out for protection at his convenience. As no one has the courage to say him nay, he is getting still more ambitious.

At Boston recently he announced that the civil rights mission now commands opposition to the war in Vietnam, as, so he maintains, peace and human rights are inseparable. He might try these dialectics out on the Communists, who are spreading civil rights with machineguns and bombs.

He has scheduled 10 Northern cities, among them Chicago, for his double-barreled operation. Ho Chi Minh will be with him in spirit.

The Berkeley students also proceed on the strategy of grab an inch and reach for a mile. They must not only be allowed to propagandize, agitate and engage in scandalous behavior, but the university and its officers must defer to them until the point is reached where theirs is the only important voice in the conduct of one of the world's great universities.

The lesson, we think, is clear. When men are allowed to be judges in their own cause, the result is anarchy.

Operation Bootstrap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the orderly manner in which a military installation was recently closed in my district. Benicia Arsenal, located at Benicia, Calif., after over 100 years was ordered closed by the Department of Defense. This installation employed approximately 3,000 people in a relatively small community and was the base of the local economy. The closure notice seemed an insurmountable economic blow.

However, due to vigorous local civic leadership, the transition from public to private enterprise is certainly a model that others may wish to follow. On May 2, 1965, the city of Benicia held a commemorative ceremony marking the changeover from a military installation to an industrial park. During the ceremony, messages were read or heard from President Johnson, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, Gov. Edmund "Pat" Brown, Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, and myself. However, I feel one of the most significant messages was the address delivered by Commissioner Lewis M. Holland of the California Economic Development Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following text of Commissioner Holland's speech to be reproduced in the RECORD at this time.

REMARKS OF COMMISSIONER LEWIS M. HOLLAND OF THE CALIFORNIA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY AT BENICIA ARSENAL DEDICATION CEREMONIES, MAY 2, 1965

Chairman FitzGerald and members of the celebration committee, Mayor Johansen, and honored guests and friends, a completely new, different, and bright chapter in the economic life of the city of Benicia has just begun, and I am exceedingly pleased to represent the State of California in helping to dedicate a new usage and to call attention to a new and exciting course of direction for this historic arsenal property.

Governor Brown, who simply was not able to break away from a prior commitment to be here with you today, shares the pride all of us are feeling at this moment.

What at first seemed a killing economic blow to your community, which for over a hundred years had relied largely on this arsenal for its economic support, has now been turned into a golden industrial development opportunity. Nowhere else in the San Francisco Bay area—which, as most of us know, is the West's second largest market—is there a sizable industrial property remaining which has all the advantages of this one. Here you have approximately 2,000 acres on the main line of a transcontinental railroad, which will be at the junction of two freeways, and with a dock for ocean shipping. And as though these things weren't enough, there is even an airstrip for executive planes.

There is no question but that we are standing here today on one of the west coasts finest industrial sites with an unlimited potential. So unlimited, in fact, I doubt that its actual value to you and to the State can even be measured. Furthermore, where else can one find in the San Francisco Bay area over 5,000 acres of beautiful rolling hills for new home sites and shopping centers, now under development by Watchie & Associates, and which overlooks the bay below?

Four years ago, immediately following the announcement from Washington that this historic Benicia Arsenal was to be closed, the then commissioner of the Economic Development Agency in Sacramento, Mr. Carl Zachrisson, came here for a firsthand look at the situation. He met with Mr. FitzGerald, former Mayor Jimmy Lemos, and others to get the information he needed for a report to the Governor containing suggestions for possible assistance from the State.

Governor Brown followed the reading of that report with a personal trip here to learn even more about the matter, then directed the Economic Development Agency to work closely with the officials and leaders of your community, as well as with the many State and Federal agencies that were involved in the transfer, in the big job of converting the Arsenal from a military installation to an industrial property. As industrial manager of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce at that time, I served on the initial Benicia Arsenal committee.

Today the task has been accomplished. The transformation is complete, and the dedication in which we are participating this afternoon stands as a monument to cooperation and teamwork on the part of local, State, and Federal agencies as well as private investors. It shows, better than anything I know, what can happen when all these diverse elements work together in harmony. Above all, this stands as a monument to what can happen when local leaders with

vision and determination devote tireless effort to a task, and when those efforts are sparkplugged by someone like your able city attorney, John Bohn. Truly, all of us here today can be proud of Benicia's civil leaders and officials.

I just want to conclude by saying that in my 20 years of industrial development work in California and the bay area, I have come to know the attitudes of industry to this part of the State very well. In all that time, I can tell you today, I have never before seen the degree of interest being displayed by large out-of-State firms looking for industrial sites in the West as is being seen these days. And, more and more of these firms are interested in finding suitable locations for their operations in or near the bay area, which certainly means that Benicia will have to be considered by many of them in their deliberations. I know that Benicia Industries, Inc., will continue their good efforts to interest a fair percentage of these firms in locating right here.

Yes, there is every reason to predict a bright future for Benicia and for this rededicated arsenal property—the kind of future you have never before experienced.

Finally, I just want to urge all of you who have worked so hard to make this conversion become a reality to keep right on working together as you have these past 4 years. Keep right on telling the Benicia story to your out-of-town and out-of-State friends, and I am sure you will be amazed at what takes place here in the next 5 to 10 years.

Thank you.

Oklahoma Democrats Support President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the President's firm policy in Vietnam, and more recently in the Dominican Republic, has received strong support, but it also has brought vocal criticism—some of it from Members of Congress. Because some of the President's strongest foreign policy supporters have been Republicans, and because some of the criticism has come from within his own party, the press has commented repeatedly that President Johnson is supported more strongly by Republicans than by Democrats.

In this atmosphere, Mr. Speaker, a refreshing document arrived in my office this week. It is a resolution approved by the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Oklahoma commending President Johnson for his firm and decisive actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I include this resolution in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION BY THE DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF OKLAHOMA

Whereas the rise or fall of civilization rests upon wise and firm action to repel aggression in all parts of the world; and

Whereas the United States must fulfill its obligation to aid in protecting friendly nations from unwarranted aggression in all parts of the world; and

Whereas this is in keeping with the U.S. record of providing aid to Greece, Iran, and other nations under the Marshall plan, which saved Western Europe during the dark days following World War II; and

Whereas this policy is also in the tradition of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, the Berlin Airlift, and Korea, all of which prevented or halted aggressions which could have led to the tragedy of atomic warfare; and

Whereas the most dangerous world trouble spot today is Vietnam, where our obligation is clearly to help prevent further aggression against the South Vietnamese; and

Whereas the President of the United States has courageously ordered that we stand by our friends in South Vietnam and help them repell the aggressors, in order that all the world may learn again that the free world cannot be intimidated by force; and

Whereas such action on our part is essential to preserve lasting peace; and

Whereas this is the policy of both the Democratic Party and our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Oklahoma, do hereby commend the President of the United States, and our Oklahoma congressional delegation members supporting him and the Nation's South Vietnam and Dominican Republic policy; be it further

Resolved, That the Democratic Party of Oklahoma, at its next regular convention, be urged to adopt this resolution as party policy.

Chariton, Iowa, Newspaper Comments on the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the Dominican Republic have created a complex situation. Some concern has been voiced about American action on the island.

I am sure, however, that the people of the United States do not want to take any chances that could result in the esablishment of another Communist regime in the Western Hemisphere. Hopefully, this will not happen.

In matters of foreign policy, decisions are difficult. Complex situations do not admit of easy solutions, and one alternative must be weighed against another.

On this point, I commend to my fellow Members comments on the Dominican situation from the May 4, 1965, issue of the Chariton Leader of Chariton, Iowa. The editorial is brief, but it goes straight to the heart of the matter.

The decision to intervene, as the editorial points out, may not be universally popular. But a policy of nonintervention, as the newspaper also notes, might well have led to grave consequences for the security of both the United States and the Western Hemisphere.

So both alternatives must be considered. And if neither appears entirely satisfactory, we should remember that such is generally the case in foreign affairs.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the editorial from the Chariton Leader:

INTERVENTION

The U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic is an embarrassing necessity.

The U.S. position involves the saving of American lives, the establishing of a cease-fire, the making certain that Cuba-directed men do not take over the government, and the restoration of constitutional government.

The use of force to achieve these ends is distasteful to Americans, lots of things can go wrong, much world opinion is certain to equate it with the old gunboat diplomacy or with the Soviet Union's action in Hungary.

The OAS, with cooperation, can do much to determine the success or failure to achieve our objectives. One thing that Americans will applaud is the overwhelming force that has been used. There was none of the shoestring operation that characterized the Bay of Pigs. Marines and paratroopers have been poured into the tiny republic.

It is often good in assessing a policy to consider the alternative. If the United States had not acted and hundreds of our citizens living in the Dominican Republic as well as other foreign nationals had been killed, if anarchy had been permitted to continue with a Communist takeover, our heads would not have been very high.

If a cease-fire can be effective, if an interim government can be established and the dispute between Dominicans settled at the ballot box in an election supervised by the OAS, then the United States can consider it a humanitarian job, with democracy preserved. A prolonged occupation will be something else.

Prophetic Words: What Senator Ben Hill Said

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the attention of my colleagues is called to a fine editorial that appeared recently in the Thomasville Times-Enterprise of Thomasville, Ga.

Quoting a great Georgian, U.S. Senator Benjamin Harvey Hill, in 1878, the editorial points out that the Federal Government is "A corporation we may all dread." Many communities have felt the oppressive hand already. Will there be a reversal of this trend before it gets to you?

The editorial follows:

WHAT SENATOR BEN HILL SAID

Seldom do we now hear protesting voices from those who see imminent dangers confronting this country because of the encroachment of Federal power on the rights of the States and the individuals living therein. So great has become the cry of liberalism that it seems to have silenced the voices of those who in other years would have spoken vehemently against a system of government which has now become supreme in its authority and all encompassing in its scope.

These conditions remind us of the prophetic words of Georgia's immortal U.S. Senator Benjamin Harvey Hill, delivered March 27, 1878. He foresaw as did many other great leaders of that day the growth of the superstate and the dangers it would present in the guise of a beneficent guardian of the rights of the people.

Extracts from his address of that day are printed herewith as a reminder of what he then foresaw. It follows:

"I have said I did not dread industrial corporations as instruments of power to destroy this country, because there are a thousand agencies which can regulate, restrain and control them; but there is a corporation we may all well dread.

"That corporation is the Federal Government.

"From the aggressions of this corporation there can be no safety if it is allowed to go beyond the well-defined limits of its power.

"I dread nothing so much as the exercise of ungranted and doubtful powers by this Government. But it is, in my opinion, the danger of dangers to the future of this country.

"Let us be sure to keep it always within its limits. If this great ambitious, ever-growing corporation becomes aggressive, who shall check it? If it becomes wayward, who shall control it? If it becomes unjust, who shall trust it?

"As sentinels on this country's watch-tower, Senators, I beseech you, watch and guard with sleepless dread that corporation which can make all property, and rights, all States and people, and all liberty and hope, its plaything in an hour, and its victims forever."

Senator Hill, like other great patriots, including Benjamin Franklin, James Monroe, Thomas Jefferson, and others of Colonial days, all of whom had experienced the oppressive hand of King George of England, wanted government to serve the people not as their master. They wanted a free and independent people as the best means for assuring a continuation of the democratic processes which they had installed in our republican form of government. For their words of caution and advice we can be thankful. For our failure to keep faith with their ideal, we can be sorry.

Citation and Distinguished Service Award Presented to the Honorable Harley O. Staggers, of West Virginia, by the American War Mothers Yesterday at the 41st Annual Mother's Day Ceremonies in the Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, just yesterday, Sunday, May 9, the American War Mothers conducted their 41st annual Mother's Day ceremonies in the amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery.

During this ceremony the American War Mothers presented a special award honoring the officers and men of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam in appreciation of patriotic and dedicated service to country. This was presented to the members of our Armed Forces now serving in South Vietnam through Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, representing the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to share with you and the Members of the House the fact that the American War Mothers presented the following citation to the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, the distinguished dean of the West Virginia congressional delegation:

The Founding Fathers of the United States of America devised a system of government, unique to its time, under which its citizens could freely seek their chosen goals, and the Nation as a whole could prosper and progress. Providing for three separate and distinct areas of authority, the Constitution delegates to the Congress the solemn responsibility of legislative power. It has been, and is, for those men who have followed that Continental Congress to build the edifice of a great Nation upon this foundation of great principle.

Since 1948, the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS has served in that great body as a Member of the House of Representatives from West Virginia and now dean of the West Virginia congressional delegates. Appointed to important committee assignments on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and the Veterans' Affairs Committee, he has worked with a diligence recognized by the continued support of the people of West Virginia, and with regard at all times for the national interest and the welfare of all Americans.

The American War Mothers believes that skilled and dedicated leadership is essential to the continued security of this Nation and is privileged to commend the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS for distinguished and faithful service marked by excellence of achievement and honor in the Congress of the United States of America.

In addition, the American War Mothers presented its Distinguished Service Award, which was a plaque with the following words inscribed thereon:

The Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS for distinguished and faithful service, marked by excellence of achievement and honor in the Congress of the United States of America.

I take this opportunity to highly commend the American War Mothers for selecting our esteemed colleague, Congressman STAGGERS, to receive their annual Distinguished Service Award.

Czechs Chance Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been well known for some time that substantial changes have been taking place in certain European Communist countries. These changes have been both economic and political and have provided a basis for some hope for future relaxation of rigid political and economic communism.

The economic policies recently implemented by the Government of Czechoslovakia constitute a radical turn away from stale and barren classical Marxism. The Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in its recently published report, "Report of Special Study Mission to Europe, 1964"—House Report No. 15—set forth the basic Chech document outlining in detail the proposed changes.

A recent article in the Washington Post by David Nichol provides an interesting summary of these changes and comment on them and I include the article here because of its general interest:

CZECHS PLAN NEW ECONOMIC EXPERIMENT

(By David Nichol)

PRAGUE.—Czechoslovakia has embarked, with as little fanfare as possible, on a breathtaking experiment to discover whether the basic principles of the Communist system and the demands of modern industrialized societies can be reconciled satisfactorily.

Beginning next January 1, it is planned to introduce the most sweeping economic reforms ever to be applied within the general confines of Communist theory. They are described in bulk simply as the new system of management, a label that conceals much of their scope.

As now envisioned, the cumbersome, suffocating centralized planning is to be replaced by a much more flexible system in which the authorities in Prague will fix only the overall aims.

Within these limits, some of the recognized principles of supply and demand, of prices, and of individual incentive and responsibility are to be given much freer play.

By nature and disposition, the Czechoslovak authorities and people are among the least [illegible] to radical departures or experiment. But [illegible] choice was taken out of their hands by a [illegible] and previously unknown phenomenon among the [illegible]nist-led countries. The economy was not only stagnating in the early years of this decade; it actually began to run backward in 1963.

The trend now has been reversed, and the indexes are moving upward again. But when the final balances are drawn, Czechoslovakia's national income for 1964 will still be below that of 1962.

Western critics have been quick and gleeful to describe the proposed reforms as a return to capitalism. But there is some validity in the argument here that this is not the case.

There is no intention, for example, to restore industrial production to private ownership, or to break up the farm cooperatives, as the former collectives now are called.

It is argued instead that both Communist and capitalist societies are influenced by similar economic principles, and that Communist leaders have failed in the past to recognize this. The blame is essentially Josef Stalin's although this is not often said so explicitly.

Stalin applied his own interpretations of the theories of Marx and Lenin to a society that was primarily agricultural in the 1920's and 1930's. At terrible human cost, it permitted the accumulation of investment capital, and the construction of an industrial base.

Yugoslavia was the first to break out of this deadening pattern, in 1949 and 1950, and Poland made some tentative moves in the middle 1950's. But these countries were themselves still underdeveloped, in the modern meaning of the term.

Czechoslovakia was different. It already was one of the most advanced and balanced economies in Europe when the Stalin model was applied. For more than a decade the country's innate prosperity concealed the havoc this was working. This is no longer possible.

Youthful and unorthodox economists were beginning to recognize the problems nearly 10 years ago, but it required the visible and admitted disasters of the early 1960's to give them their opportunity.

So far no one really has been hurt. But once the economic forces are given their head, all kinds of special interests will be jeopardized.

In theory, it is recognized now, for example, that industrial branches that cannot sell their products for a profit in a competitive market should be allowed to wither away, and that their employees should be transferred to more efficient fields of endeavor.

But much of the country's basic industry falls within this pattern. What of the coal miners, if Czechoslovakia begins to rely to a greater extent on imported liquid fuels and nuclear energy, as it must to be efficient?

Perhaps most basic of all is the revolutionary acknowledgment that human beings cannot any longer be reduced to impersonal economic ciphers if a complex and modern society is to be achieved.

"It is not enough," Premier Jozef Lenart told the central committee, "to pay well for good and conscientious work. We must have a sense and understanding for the daily worries of people, and take note of their problems so that the details of day-to-day living do not grow into complex conflicts."

Communism at Home and Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, most Americans applauded the President's quick and decisive move to prevent a Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic. Indeed, the only opposition came from the extreme left and the liberals who seem to be always in the forefront of protecting Communist aggression.

I agree with the President that communism must be stopped in the Dominican Republic and other Latin American countries. I wish he were as concerned about Communist influences at home. I have repeatedly urged the President and the Congress to undertake an investigation of the extent of the Communist influence in the several groups carrying on civil rights demonstrations and acts of violence throughout the country. The administration is strangely reluctant to instigate any such investigation. I wonder what purpose can be served by establishing a double standard which accepts Communist agitation in the United States, but finds it evil in other countries?

The following editorial from the Greenboro, Ala., Watchman raises an interesting point:

TWO TYPES OF COMMUNISM: A STRANGE ANOMALY

While confessing our conservatism, we have never been one to scream "communism" every time some fuzzy-headed liberal took off in pursuit of the extreme left. We have admitted the right of these liberals to make fools of themselves without reprisal.

The current policy of our Federal Government, however, has us puzzled. On domestic matters, insofar as the Communist conspiracy is concerned, it stands at one pole; on foreign matters, it stands at the other.

No one is foolish enough to say that the Selma march was the handiwork of the Communists, and the Communists alone. Certainly, it involved large numbers of dedicated men and women—most of them foolish, perhaps, but still sincere and devoted. But it also contained a heavy infiltration of professional or semiprofessional Communists who have only one goal in mind, and that is the destruction of this civilization as we know it. The names and records of these people were announced publicly by responsible State officials, yet they were allowed to advance their plots and to fan the demonstrators to a feverish pitch. At the same time, our Federal Government not only failed to move against these conspirators, it actually took steps to help them, and to make their positions secure. In short, President Johnson used the power of the Government of the United States, including his Armed Forces, to protect the Communists in the Selma march.

The Selma affair was a strange spectacle. But even stranger has been the spectacle of the past few days in the West Indies, where the Federal position on foreign affairs has been an utter reversal of its position on domestic communism. When the Dominican revolt flared, President Johnson sent in U.S. Marines, for the purpose of protecting American nationals. They had hardly landed, however, before he began to suspect that the Dominican revolt, while containing some sincere and dedicated people, also had the odor of the Communists who had infiltrated the movement. He spoke out against the Communists, and he boldly announced that the power of the U.S. Government would be employed to prevent another takeover, such as occurred in Cuba.

Marshalltown, Iowa, School Superintendent Reports on Education in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Soviet Union sent its sputnik I into orbit, in October of 1957, there has been a tendency on the part of many Americans to look upon the Russian educational system with something akin to awe.

At the same time, education in the United States came under heavy fire from certain quarters. The Russians, it was said, were doing a better job than Americans in this vital area.

Of course, there still remains much room for improvement in our educational system. And criticism is an aid to progress, providing it is sound and constructive criticism.

Nevertheless, we should not lose a sense of perspective in these matters. The Russians, no less than we, have their problems, and in many cases their problems are greater than ours.

In this connection, I think my fellow Members will find of interest the observations of Mr. J. C. Hoglan, superintendent of schools at Marshalltown, Iowa, who recently took a firsthand look at elementary and secondary schools in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Hoglan, in an interview with Staff Writer Ed Deckert of the Marshalltown Times-Republican, concludes that the Soviet elementary and secondary system does not match the standards of its American counterpart.

My colleagues should find Mr. Hoglan's comments enlightening and, under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the interview from the May 6, 1965, issue of the Times-Republican:

HOGLAN FINDS SOVIET SCHOOLS INFERIOR

(By Ed Deckert)

Are Russian primary and secondary schools as good as ours?

No, says Superintendent J. C. Hoglan after traveling 20,000 miles and spending 33 days visiting schools in Eurote, the Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe.

Hogland formed this opinion as he evaluated the curriculum, organization, and teachers of schools in the U.S.S.R., as well as those in East and West Germany, Denmark, Finland, Austria, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

The Marshalltown superintendent and school administrators from more than 30 States left the United States March 25 on the tour sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators, a department of the National Education Association. Hoglan returned home last week.

While in the U.S.S.R., Hogland recalls, "we were in the hands of Intourist," the government agency in charge of Russian tourism. The head guide, a woman, was with the group during the entire 3 weeks in Russia.

Intourist arranged the itinerary, he says, to "only show the best. When we asked to see other schools, we were told they were not open." The guides often claimed the schools were closed for "sanitary day," the day used for school cleaning and maintenance work.

Even the "best schools" had evident faults. The Soviets have a shortage of buildings that forces them to run a double shift of classes of 30 to 35 pupils each day, 6 days a week, he reported.

This means that students go to school half-days and that although the Russian schools are open more than 200 days compared to our 190, the Soviets' children are in class fewer hours each year.

The buildings are not comparable to ours, Hoglan notes. They are old, poorly maintained and often converted czarist palaces. Supplies and equipment are scanty.

He recalled that a secondary level chemistry laboratory he saw had only a few test tubes.

Often things are different from what they say they are, he remembered. For example, a science course that was labeled "physics" at the primary level was in fact very similar to our general science courses.

The American educators thought that Soviet teachers were devoted and making the best of what they have. They found a teacher has a salary and status equal to that of an engineer or doctor.

Soviet teachers received salary increases up to $137 a month maximum after 5, 10 and 25 years of experience. Badges are awarded for merit, he added. Women teachers may retire at 55, men at 60.

Russian schools are organized so that compulsory education begins when children are 7. Resident nursery schools are available at a nominal fee to parents, Hoglan says.

The state operated nursery schools only allow parents to visit their children on Wednesday. The children, ages 1 to 5 or 6, only come home on Sundays and vacations.

Eight years of primary schooling, grades first through eighth, are compulsory. Secondary education includes grades 9 through 11.

Students are admitted to universities on the basis of examination scores. Hoglan thought that the Soviets are successful in

educating the top 25 percent in academic ability.

He pointed out that students are paid stipends to attend undergraduate schools and pay no tuition, room or board.

The 75 percent who are not admitted to universities enroll in vocational or technical schools or take correspondence courses. Some will apply again to the universities.

Hoglan believes that a young Russian who is not admitted to the university has a very small chance of getting a good job and advancing himself.

The Russian school system does not offer many opportunities to students in rural areas. Education seldom goes beyond the fourth grade there. Hoglan recalled that one Russian official dismissed this fact by saying: "If a student in the country really wants an education, we will send him to a boarding school."

The youth organizations of the Soviet Union impressed Hoglan. He emphasized that all extracurricular activities are sponsored by independently staffed and financed Government agencies. The youth groups are indoctrination agencies of the Government, he added.

Communist youth programs, he added, are much more extensive and intensive than ours because of more money and personnel. He pointed out that our full-time teachers must double as extracurricular advisers.

Children in the primaries join the Octobrists; those in secondary grades, the Young Pioneers. A selected number of pioneers join Komsomol, the stepping stone to the Communist Party and elite status, he said.

Secondary schools require each student to take four languages. Hoglan explained that the Soviet language program is stronger than ours partly because their need is greater.

He noted that a trip from Tibilisi, Georgia, to Kiev in the U.S.S.R.—a distance equal to that between Denver and Marshalltown—would take a Russian from an area speaking Georgian to Kiev, where Russian is the native tongue.

Voice of Modern History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Charlotte Shedd, one of my constituents, who conducts a regular program on radio station WDEL in Wilmington, Del., forcefully and eloquently set forth her personal views in a May 3 broadcast. Her remarks were based on her personal experience and knowledge of the ruthless forces of totalitarianism, and hers is, therefore, an authentic voice of modern history.

I take this opportunity to share her views with my colleagues, and I include the text of her broadcast remarks at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

VOICE OF MODERN HISTORY

Mine is but a voice in the wilderness, a small voice, lost in the hum of 190 million voices that fill this land from ocean to ocean, from border to border, from hills to plains, in the valleys, and on the mountaintops. And a woman's voice at that.

But nevertheless it is a voice of a citizen of the United States of America. A citizen not by birth but by choice. The choice decided by the system of government and the freedom of its institutions offered to one like myself—that very freedom indeed which at this moment permits me to express my views and my emotions freely through the medium of a free press and radio.

I am concerned about this freedom, I know what it is like to be without it. You do not. You have never sat in your livingroom and listened to your President announce in a voice filled with tears and breaking with emotion: "foreign troops are crossing our borders, to avoid unnecessary bloodshed I have ordered to cease all resistance; God save—well, in my case it was—Austria."

You have never sat there, stunned at the news, your throat choked with fear, your heart beating wildly, listening, listening for the sound of the conquerors' boots. And they came; the conqueror—with tanks and planes and guns and with truncheons, and chains and tortures and death.

And they had their lists of people who at one time or another had voiced opposition to dictatorship; who were known to be hostile to the conqueror. And the knocks began on the doors of the citizens at 4 o'clock in the morning, "open up—Gestapo." And the fathers and sons and brothers and daughters did not return from shopping trips because they had been picked up in the streets, denounced by their neighbors who thus gave vent to a personal grudge.

You don't know all of this, and I hope and pray you never will. But don't think, don't let yourself be lulled into thinking, it cannot happen here; it can and it will if we permit Communist infiltration of our neighbors to the south. One by one, the plan prescribes, one by one they are to be converted to Communist strongholds. Its all the same, remember how Hitler did it? One by one, the Saar, the Sudetenland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, the Polish Corridor. One by one, Cuba, Panama, the Dominican Republic, maybe Guatemala, Venezuela, until one day the whole of South America would explode—while from the north the Russian Bear would form a perfect pincers movement to obliterate our country as we know it.

That is why it was the imperative duty of the President to finally act, to say: enough, we have taken enough, we cannot sit by any longer and watch disaster overtake us, enough of the "nibble campaign," this means life or death for our future.

Naturally Castro screams; naturally, the Red press of Europe screams; naturally, our own fellow travelers scream and bemoan our actions—they were gleefully happy when our honor was soiled during the Hungarian crisis, they rubbed their hands when we didn't do in Cuba what we are now doing in the Dominican Republic. They are the Trojan horse, the fifth column, the quislings, or have you forgotten these terms in the past 20 peaceful years?

Don't forget. And be proud and grateful that you have at the helm of your country a man who has not forgotten, who knows the danger, who has the power and who uses it well, who above all is keenly conscious of the honor and responsibility of being, and remaining, a free American.

Paul Harvey: How Long Before the South Will Be Forgiven?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, ABC's Paul Harvey delivered a magnificient editorial in tribute to the South in his evening broadcast last week. In view of the unwarranted criticism often directed at my region, I found his remarks most gratifying.

Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert his editorial for the information of the Congress:

BROADCAST BY PAUL HARVEY—ABC—CHICAGO

How long before the South will be forgiven? Only a part of the abuse which is heaped on Dixie relates to race discrimination. Another large part relates to North-South discrimination.

Why is the race problem North and South, but the pressure is most on the South? How long before the South will be forgiven?

The South lost a war 100 years ago and is still paying for it.

We forgave Germany twice in half that time.

In the 20 years since Germany fought us the last time, we've forgiven them and sent them $4 billion.

In the 20 years since Japan lost its war with us, we have forgiven Japan and sent the Japanese $2½ billion.

It has been 100 years since Alabama and Georgia, and Mississippi lost their war and Washington is still forcing those States to pay to Washington six times as much as they receive in "aid."

The economic jealousy which was, in large part, responsible for the uncivil war is still apparent in the present North-South cold war.

Southern Negro slaves had security but fought for freedom. Today, they have freedom, seek security.

We have forgiven Germany and Japan and Spain and Mexico and everybody who ever waged war on us—except the Confederacy.

We have even promised North Vietnam reparations in advance—a billion dollars aid per year if southeast Asians will stop the war at the 17th parallel.

The Southern United States, entirely willing to accept a cease-fire at the Mason-Dixon line and peaceful coexistence wherever—is still occupied by "the enemy."

The Southern States have surrendered unconditionally. They are no threat to the security of their neighbors. They have no territorial ambition beyond their borders. Indeed, you never even hear of a retired southerner moving north. They mind their own business, contributing more than generously to the U.S. Treasury.

Washington would not think of meddling in the internal affairs of West Germany or Italy or Japan. It would be inexcusably bad manners. It would engender resentment.

It would likely set the stage for another military confrontation.

Yet, Washington approves and applauds the invasion of our own South by Yankee mobs and supports their continuing invasion with Federal troops.

Granted, the South made a mistake. It lost the war. But many others have lost many wars and Washington has generously helped the fallen to their feet, sponsored their reconstruction, reestablished their independence.

How long before the South will be forgiven?

Not one of Uncle Sam's former enemies has become a better friend. Not one has stuck with him through peace and war, feast and famine, as has this one.

Uncle Sam has no ally on whom he can count as surely as this splendid, energetic, dynamic segment of himself.

Isn't it time to stop the masochistic punishment?

Isn't three generations of spitting on Johnny Reb's grave enough?

How long before the South will be forgiven?

In Cooperation With OAS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer of Tuesday, May 4, 1965, in its lead editorial, commented on the situation and developments in the Dominican Republic.

The Inquirer supports the action taken by President Johnson in his decision to send U.S. troops in there immediately in order to save the lives of countless men, women, and children, many of them U.S. citizens.

In addition, the Inquirer states that "the peril in the Dominican Republic is precisely the kind of crisis in which the Organization of American States is solemnly pledged to respond."

The editorial follows:

IN COOPERATION WITH OAS

Joint action by nations of the Western Hemisphere, utilizing the administrative and diplomatic machinery of the Organization of American States, offers the best hope of resolving the crisis in the Dominican Republic. Proposals by the United States on Monday, enlisting the participation of other Latin American countries in emergency peacekeeping operations, under OAS auspices, point the way to proper and effective handling of an extremely grave situation.

There are several urgent elements in the Dominican turmoil and each of them requires decisive and immediate attention. In each instance the authority to act lies clearly with the OAS. President Johnson is moving in the right direction in calling upon the Organization to exercise its authority as expeditiously as possible.

Responsibilities for ending the bloodshed in the Dominican Republic, and safeguarding hemispheric interests there, should be assumed by the OAS swiftly so the United States may be relieved of its interim role of unilateral intervention that was undertaken to save thousands of persons from an imminent threat of mass slaughter by Communist-inspired terrorists.

As President Johnson said, in his televised report to the American people Sunday night, "We have acted to summon the resources of this entire hemisphere to this task.' He defended his decision to send U.S. troops to the Dominican Republic, without waiting for OAS action, on humanitarian grounds. "I knew there was no time to talk, to consult or to delay," the President emphasized. To have hesitated would have been to condemn countless men and women to "die in the streets."

Communist efforts to captialize on the Dominican upheaval for their own purposes are not surprising. It is the classic Communist strategy of turning chaos into opportunity. The OAS has placed itself on public record several times in opposition to Communist infiltration and aggression in the Western Hemisphere.

One such occasion was in January of 1962, at the OAS meeting in Uruguay, when several resolutions in condemnation of Communism were adopted. President Johnson made appropriate reference to one of these resolutions in his address Sunday night.

The peril in the Dominican Republic is precisely the kind of crisis in which the Organization of American States is solemnly pledged to respond. Such response should have solid support from the United States and other OAS members and should be sufficiently firm to assure both peace and freedom for the Dominican people—within a framework of self-government free of foreign dictation from anywhere.

Medical Association of Georgia Selects Georgian General Practitioner of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to advise the House that a high honor has been bestowed upon the father of one of our distinguished colleagues, ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

The House of Delegates of the Medical Association of Georgia just recently selected Dr. Robert G. Stephens, of Washington, Wilkes County, Ga., as the General Practitioner of the Year for the State of Georgia.

Dr. Stephens has been dedicated to the noble practice of medicine for 60 years, and I am proud to insert in the RECORD a splendid article about his selection as General Practitioner of the Year:

MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OF GEORGIA SELECTS GEORGIAN GENERAL PRACTITIONER OF THE YEAR

AUGUSTA, GA.—The House of Delegates of the Medical Association of Georgia at its annual session at the Augusta Town House on May 2–4 selected Dr. Robert G. Stephens, of Washington, Wilkes County, Ga., the "General Practitioner of the Year." Dr. Stephens, father of Congressman ROBERT G. STEPHENS, Jr., of the 10th District, was nominated by the Wilkes County Medical Society and endorsed by the Richmond County Medical Society. The award was made on May 4 to the honoree at the afternoon session. Congressman and Mrs. Stephens flew from Washington, D.C., for the ceremony and one daughter, Mrs. J. Mason Williams, Jr., came from Perry, Fla., while Dr. Stephens was accompanied by his daughter, Mrs. Lucian Wilson, who lives with him.

The Medical Society of Georgia, founded in 1849, through its committee chairman, Dr. Hubert Milford of Hartwell, cited Dr. Stephens for his 50 years of service with these words:

"Dr. Stephens has practiced medicine for 60 years. Sixty years of unselfish devotion to the practice of a profession that he considers a calling. He practices the type of medicine that is attempted by many but achieved by few. He keeps abreast of the best medical practice and shares his knowledge unselfishly for the benefit of the rich and poor alike. He has been an inspiration to those of us who have had the privilege of working with him since he started practice.

"Dr. Stephens was born in Crawfordville, Taliaferro County, Ga., on June 17, 1881, the youngest of four children born to John Alexander Stephens and his wife, Mary Emma Stephens. Of noble lineage, he was the nephew of Alexander H. Stephens, Vice President of the Confederacy, an outstanding Southern statesman. He received his primary education in Washington, Ga., and later in Atlanta. He is a graduate of the University of Georgia, and while there, was outstanding in its activities, having been associate editor of the Pandora and treasurer of the athletic association. He graduated from the university in 1902, with an A.B. degree. He then entered medical school at the Atlanta College of Physicians and Surgeons, from which he graduated April 3, 1905, with an M.D. degree. While there, he was instrumental in establishing the chapter of Chi Zeta Chi medical fraternity, and in 1910, at the national convention of this fraternity, he was elected to supreme historian of the national council and held this position for a number of years.

"It is of interest that Dr. Stephens was the first resident physician of Wesley Memorial Hospital, which at that time was on Courtland Street in Atlanta, where it remained until 1918, when it was relocated in a large and up-to-date new plant on the campus of Emory University, where its name was later changed to Emory University Hospital.

"When Dr. Stephens finished his residency, he started his practice as contract physician and surgeon for a lumber company in Silver Springs, Fla. He returned to Atlanta, January 1907, where he started in private practice in the general practice of medicine. Soon after his start in practice, he became adjunct professor of physiology at the Atlanta Medical College which was the forerunner of Emory Medical School and later acted also as chief of the outpatient department.

"While engaged in the teaching of physiology, Dr. Stephens revised and brought up-to-date 'Jones' Outline of Physiology' and this was published under the title of 'Outlines of Physiology' by Jones and Stephens. It was used as a textbook of physiology at numerous medical schools.

"In 1910, Dr. Stephens was elected to the position of medical director of the Atlanta public schools, which he held until 1915, at which time he refused reelection in order to return to the full-time practice of medicine. He did general practice in Atlanta, in Fulton County, Decatur, in DeKalb County, and in Old Campbell County and in portions of Cobb County. During this time he was on the staff at Crawford W. Long Hospital and had privileges in every hospital in Atlanta until the time of his removal to his old family home in Washington, Ga., in 1938, where he has served his community and followed the practice of his uncle, Dr. Robert A. Simpson, who died that year. His honors have been many. Besides the aforementioned honors and achievements he has served on the faculty of the Atlanta Medical College and on the staff of Grady Hospital. He was on the board of trustees at the Carnegie Library in Atlanta for 10 years, serving as its chairman for 6 years. He has served as president of the Washington, Ga., Kiwanis Club. He has twice served as president of the Wilkes County Medical Society and as chief of staff of the Washington General Hospital. He is a member of the board of trustees of the Mary Willis Library in Washington and chairman of the board for 16 years. Dr. Stephens is Presbyterian; while in Atlanta he was a ruling elder of the Druid Hills Presbyterian Church for 26 years. He is now a member of the Washington Presbyterian Church where he has served as a ruling elder for 25 years. During World War II, he was appointed by the Governor to serve on the Selective Service appeal board No. 3 and for 5 years was a member of that board.

"In 1907, Dr. Stephens married Miss Lucy Evans, of Atlanta, a daughter of Gen. Clement A. Evans and from this union was born four children. Three girls, Mrs. Dudley W. Reynolds, of Atlanta, Mrs. Lucian C. Wilson, of Washington, Ga., and Mrs. Mason Williams, Jr., of Perry, Fla. One son, ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR., of Athens, Ga., now serving as a Member of Congress from the 10th District of Georgia.

"As a final note let it be said that Dr. Stephens is still active in the practice of medicine, going day and night attending to

the needs of his many patients in Wilkes and surrounding counties. Because of Dr. Stephens' outstanding record in the past and because of the fact that he is still active and enjoying attending to a large clientele in general practice, we deem it a privilege to nominate him for General Practitioner of the Year in the State of Georgia."

Israel Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to join the commemoration of the independence of Israel. For the past 17 years Israel has been an example to all the nations of the world of what a determined people can do under a free, democratic government. Not only has Israel progressed notably at home, but she has also supported the United States and the United Nations and has undertaken a successful technical assistance program to emerging nations of Africa and Asia.

Israel was called "a land flowing with milk and honey" in the Bible—Deuteronomy 6: 3. Yet in 1948 much of Israel was an arid desert. Furthermore, the tiny nation was surrounded with enemies and was faced with a flood of refugees which, proportionately, was many times greater than the number of refugees that the United States admitted in the first two decades of this century. Industrial development lagged, and manufacturing techniques were not widely known.

Yet in 17 years Israel has gone a long way toward fulfilling the Biblical pronouncement. The new state has struggled against an unfavorable balance of trade and has scored notable achievements in this area. The gross national product has grown considerably and new industry is flourishing.

In the Israel Proclamation of Independence may be found the ideals of the Jewish people. I would like to quote two paragraphs which seem to me to be particularly important in the year 1965:

Despite every hardship, hindrance and peril, the remnant that survived the grim Nazi slaughter in Europe, together with Jews from other countries, pressed on with their exodus to the land of Israel and continued to assert their right to a life of dignity, freedom and honest toil in the homeland of their people.

We extend the hand of peace and good-neighborliness to all the states around us and to their peoples, and we call upon them to cooperate in mutual helpfulness with the independent Jewish nation in its land. The State of Israel is prepared to make its contribution in a concerted effort for the advancement of the entire Middle East.

These words need to be remembered today for they contain the foundation for the program that can be the salvation of the Middle East. Israel has lived up to the ideals that it put in writing back in 1948. May these ideals become realities in the very near future, and may Israel be free to develop in peace. Her past accomplishments give every reason to hope that the Israeli future will be a proud one.

Our Canyon Will Not Be Flooded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, many friends of conservation in this Congress have been receiving mail from persons expressing fear that the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River is about to be despoiled. Their fears stem from provisions of a bill introduced in duplicate by a majority of Members from both Arizona and California, following the recent settlement of longstanding differences between the two States over division of water from the Colorado.

The chief concern of our critics results from the plan to erect two new dams along the lower Colorado, to generate electric power that would help eventually to pay the cost of the central Arizona project. It is charged that the backup of water from these dams would destroy for all time the scenic splendor of the Grand Canyon, one of the great wonders of America.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I have been deeply disturbed by the criticism it aroused on this score. Thus I felt relieved last week upon reading a newspaper column by Jones Osborn, publisher of the daily Yuma, Ariz., Sun. Mr. Osborn, an Arizonan since childhood, is no newcomer to the great Southwest nor to the cause of conservation, which his newspaper stoutly defends. He has traversed much of the lower Colorado by boat and afoot. I can imagine no one whose blood would boil faster if the Grand Canyon were in fact facing destruction.

It should be noted that Yuma County, the area served by Mr. Osborn's newspaper, would not benefit directly from the central Arizona project, which aims to irrigate another section of the State. But this publisher's concern for facts prompted him to dissect what he thought to be a misleading account of the Grand Canyon's peril, as carried by the Christian Science Monitor.

Not as a final judgment, Mr. Speaker, but as information that may assist other Members in answering their mail on this subject, I offer for the RECORD the "Editor's Notebook" column by Jones Osborn, from the Yuma Sun for Friday, May 7.

OUR CANYON WILL NOT BE FLOODED

(By Jones Orborn)

"Danger: Tricky words ahead."

Some news reports and newspaper and magazine columns should carry that warning to readers. Because it does not take much to turn a straight and fair news report into a misleading article. Most publications try very hard to be fair and one of the best of these is the Christian Science Monitor.

But the Monitor slipped yesterday. It caught my eye because it was about Arizona.

On its front page, the Monitor said:

"Plans to dam up both ends of the Grand Canyon may yet detonate a major storm in the American West."

(Notice the use of four words: "dam up both ends." This creates an image of the Grand Canyon being plugged up at both ends and filled with water like a giant bathtub. This image will be reinforced in a later paragraph.)

More from the Monitor:

"The Federal Government wants to build two electric power dams on the Colorado River, which snakes through the canyon. They would belong to the central Arizona project, a $1.3 billion scheme to water Arizona's dry heartland."

(The tricky word is "scheme." It has the sound of something not quite honest, like a scheme to defraud the public.)

"The lower dam would form a new lake, backing up deep into the Grand Canyon itself."

(Thus, the final touch is added to the image of a grand canyon being plugged at both ends and then filled with water.)

What is the truth of the matter?

The truth, while similar, is substantially different.

It is true that the central Arizona project calls for two power dams on the Colorado River to earn money to help pay costs.

The lower dam, in Bridge Canyon, would indeed form a lake. This lake would be 93 miles long.

But the first 53 miles of this lake would be located in Lake Meade National Recreation Area.

The next 40 miles would be found in the Grand Canyon National Monument—but only 13 of these would actually be found in the Grand Canyon itself.

For the remaining 104 miles of the Grand Canyon (all the way to the upstream dam) the river would be unchanged. It would continue to be "white water," as the engineers say, rapid flow of the mainstream.

Incidentally, none of the newly formed lake would even be visible from any of the viewing points where millions of tourists now view the grandeurs of this great natural wonder.

Times Herald-Record of Middletown, N.Y., Wins Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to report that the Middletown Times Herald-Record in my congressional district—27, New York—has won first honorable mention among tabloid newspapers in the annual Ayer competition for excellence of typography, make-up and printing.

For the past 35 years the N. W. Ayer Award has been coveted by English-language daily newspapers published in this country, to whom the contest is open. This year's entries numbered 700.

As the top prize—the Ayer Cup—went to a regular-size newspaper, the award to the Middletown Times Herald-Record places it first among tabloids.

I wish to take this opportunity to publicly applaud its most talented management and staff for their very fine achievement.

The Larger Implications of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in two recent articles, the distinguished columnist of the New York Times, James Reston, has added several thoughtful and pertinent observations to the debate on Vietnam.

In suggesting that now may be a time to give private diplomacy a chance, Mr. Reston has pointed out that Washington's options are limited:

Regardless of the mistakes and miscalculations of the past, it is not engaged in a discussion of what might have been, but in how to avoid a defeat that would have the most serious consequences in Asia and the Middle East.

He has gone on to comment that:

The Communists have seen to it in Vietnam—and they will no doubt do so elsewhere—that we are confronted with highly ambiguous situations, where the arguments are not clear but vague, and any course of action or even inaction may be risky.

Mr. Speaker, neither of these articles presents a solution to a country and a world sorely troubled by war, but each makes a contribution to any meaningful and constructive debate:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 25, 1965]

WASHINGTON: THE LARGER IMPLICATIONS OF VIETNAM

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The war in Vietnam has shown once more that the United States still does not have a satisfactory answer to the problem of limited war.

Washington has an effective strategy for deterring nuclear war, which will probably not start, but not for limited wars, which never seem to cease. And the disturbing thing about Vietnam is that all the other border lands along the Chinese-Soviet periphery from Korea to Iran are vulnerable in one degree or another to the Communist techniques of subversion and indirect aggression.

Vietnam, therefore, is not only a present agony but a warning of future trouble in other areas. One does not have to believe in the domino theory—that if Vietnam falls many other states will follow—in order to recognize the dangers inherent in the triumph of what the Communists call—as in Vietnam—wars of national liberation.

THE UNCHANGED OBJECTIVES

The Communist objectives have not changed. They are determined to extend their influence and control as far as they can. What the Soviets attempted by political pressure on Western Europe, by threats of war over Berlin, by nuclear blackmail in Cuba and by their adventure in Korea, the Chinese Communists are now trying to achieve by subversion and guerrilla warfare in Vietnam.

The Soviet Government has come to realize the dangers of this process, at least in areas far from their frontiers, but the Chinese have not. There are serious indications that Moscow wants a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, whatever it says publicly, but Peiping has another idea. It thinks it can triumph by limited war in Vietnam, and if it does, the problem of countering limited wars from the Sea of Japan to the Persian Gulf will be even more serious than it is today.

AGGRESSION BY SUBVERSION

How, then, is this aggression by subversion to be stopped? This is the main point. There is no evidence that anything but power will deter the Communists from seeking their objectives. They are the arsenal of rebellion. Therefore, despite all the argument about diplomatic and military tactics in Vietnam, this larger question of how to wage limited wars against their advance remains.

Several theories have been advanced about this. The first is that it is impossible in politically unstable areas right up against China or the Soviet Union for the United States to do anything about it. A variation of this doctrine is that it may be possible to do something about this type of war but only at a cost the American people will not pay.

The second theory, popular during the Dulles-Radford ascendancy in the Eisenhower administration, is that this kind of frustrating war must be avoided by other means. The Secretary of the Air Force in those days of brave words and small budgets, Donald A. Quarles, explained this theory as follows:

"If it were obvious that limited aggressions would be met with the full force of atomic weapons, I do not believe such aggressions would occur."

However, when it came time to practice this doctrine, Eisenhower concluded that maybe it wasn't such a good idea.

A third theory is that America can engage in these wars effectively only if it retreats off the continent of Asia and draws the line against Communist aggression farther south where it has blue sky and blue water to exercise its superior air and naval power.

Finally, the fourth theory is what is being applied by the Johnson administration now. This is that it can hold the populous areas of South Vietnam with its own troops if necessary and meanwhile use its air and naval power to demonstrate that a continuation of the aggression in South Vietnam will cost the Communists in North Vietnam more than they will gain in the South.

THE PRESIDENT'S CRITICS

It is now popular among the administration's critics to say that this policy has failed, that the Communists are not impressed by the bombings, and this may or may not be right. What we do know is that in the last few days there have been private messages to the West indicating that Moscow, if not Peiping, feels that the conflict must now either go to the conference table with the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong or go forward into a much more serious war including Soviet and Chinese weapons and "volunteers."

This, therefore, may be a time to give private diplomacy a chance. The U.S. Government, whether right or wrong, is engaged in a delicate operation. Regardless of the mistakes and miscalculations of the past, it is not engaged in a discussion of what might have been, but in how to avoid a defeat that would have the most serious consequences in Asia and the Middle East.

Washington is not now free to adopt any policy advice. It is not free to avoid the consequences of its past commitments or even of its blunders. Its options are limited.

LIMITS ON ACTION

It is not morally free, for example, to carry the air war into the populous areas of North Vietnam where the really important strategic targets are located. Nor is it morally free to abandon the people who have committed themselves to the battle in South Vietnam and who will be at the mercy of the Vietcong if we pull out.

Even more important, it is not free to submit to the triumph of the Communist guerrilla techniques without making them pay dearly in the process, for if they succeed in Vietnam, nobody dare assume in Washington that the same techniques will not be applied in all the Communist rimlands from Korea to Iran.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 2, 1965]

ANN ARBOR: THE STRANGE BEDFELLOWS IN VIETNAM

(By James Reston)

ANN ARBOR, MICH.—Vietnam has produced some odd divisions of opinion in the country. President Johnson has strong support from Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, but not the same from Senators MANSFIELD and FULBRIGHT. Walter Lippmann, who usually supports the President, is now opposing him on Vietnam, and David Lawrence, who usually opposes him, is backing him up.

Meanwhile, liberal sentiment on the university campuses is critical of Mr. Johnson's Vietnam policy, while the conservative intellectuals, who not so long ago were condemning Mr. Johnson, are now either silent or mocking him for following the Vietnam policy of Barry Goldwater.

COMPLEX BATTLELINE

This has now reached the point, moreover, where the prominent spokesmen of both sides are now fighting with one another, with Dean Rusk, the Phi Beta Kappa and Rhodes scholar, condemning the opposition teachers and students; Joe Alsop calling Hans Morgenthau an appeaser, and Morgenthau describing Alsop's proadministration line a scandal.

It is impossible to deal with all the complex issues in the debate in a column, but it may be useful to say something about the debate itself—particularly the issue between the administration and its critics in the universities.

First, it is obvious that all the major problems in the field of foreign policy are now increasingly complex and subject to honest differences of opinion. Therefore, every course of action is open to debate, and any course of action can be condemned.

This is not only true of the bombings in Vietnam or the ending of the bombings, but it is true of the decision to land the Marines in Santo Domingo without prior consultation with the Organization of American States.

Second, since all courses of action are debatable, the need for discussion and debate is unarguable, especially since the administration's misjudgments of the political and military situation in Vietnam are conceded by responsible Government officials themselves.

Third, the principal obligation of responsible debate at the moment is how to deal with the problem now before the country. The opposition will properly debate in the next election how we got into the mess, but the problem for now and the foreseeable future is how to get out of it.

THE NATURE OF WAR

Here the problem of debating the war is changing, because the nature of modern war is changing. The old classical war of open invasions across marked frontiers in defiance of international agreements raised few problems of debate. After Pearl Harbor there was only one honorable course of action open to the Nation, but Vietnam is a much more complicated proposition, subject to many different interpretations and possible responses, and it is probably only the beginning of a long series of such tangles.

The Communists have seen to it in Vietnam—and they will no doubt do so elsewhere—that we are confronted with highly ambiguous situations, where the arguments are not clear but vague, and any course of action or even inaction may be risky.

CHOICE OF WARS

They are choosing limited objectives on terrain favorable to themselves, and hoping to confront us with a choice of unlimited war, which they know we will not choose except in self-preservation, or limited war, which they feel we do not have the patience or the will to endure.

It is a cunning strategy. It forces Washington to yield or fight on Communist terms in unnatural surroundings, with unstable and divided allies, and it confuses public opinion in this country. There is an odd paradox in the American character. On the one hand we have a strong aversion to war, but on the other, once it has started, we are violently pugnacious. We don't like bombing for anything but obvious self-preservation; but, on the other hand, we are reluctant either to fight it out on the ground with our own men or give up.

Dealing with this tangle of military, political and moral ambiguities requires the most careful analysis and balancing of judgments. Nothing is easier than to find fault with whatever is done, and nothing harder than to find precisely the delicate line between provocation and effective retaliation.

Obviously, everybody has the right to say anything he likes about all this, to demonstrate or petition of sit down on the White House lawn. Students who want to "stop the bombing" or "get out of Vietnam" may be right—this is a question not of fact but of judgment—but the consequences of each policy has to be weighed, and this will require more study and thought in the kind of war now being waged than ever before.

ON FINDING FAULT

Meanwhile, the perennial misunderstanding between the men of action and the men of thought will probably go on. "The men who write," said that intellectual, President Woodrow Wilson, "love proportion; the men who act must strike out practical lines of action and neglect proportion * * *. Here unquestionably we come upon the heart of the misunderstanding between the men who write and the men who act."

Nobody here is asking that discussion be stopped, not even Secretary Rusk. Nobody is suggesting that all this be left to the President, except maybe the President. The debate will have to go on, but it will not be effective unless it concentrates a little more, not on the past but on the hard dilemmas of the present.

Rumanian National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is the traditional national holiday of the Rumanian people. Here in the United States we are privileged to know the meaning of this annual event, and in like spirit, we commemorate the day of Rumanian independence.

Rumania proclaimed her independence on May 10, 1877. She severed the bonds which previously had linked her to the Ottoman Empire. Liberty was dearly fought for. In 1878, the Congress of Berlin recognized the independence of Rumania and accorded her official status.

In 1881, the land became a kingdom and thereafter, for many decades, the country was a model of stability and peaceful progress.

The tragic ramifications of World War II altered the complexion of affairs. The nation remains dominated by the Soviet Union, ruled by her, subjected to an outside and foreign ideology.

I hope that the 10th of May will serve to remind us that once the flame of liberty has been set afire, it can never completely be extinguished. The Rumanian people have suffered much throughout the Russian intereference. They are still oppressed by a ruthless foreign invader.

Let us hope, in commemorating Rumania's national holiday, that freedom will be restored to this brave people.

American Veterans Honor Congressman Zablocki

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the 20th National Convention of AMVETS honored a group of distinguished Americans for their important contribution to our Nation.

Included in this group was our very distinguished colleague, Congressman CLEMENT ZABLOCKI. He received the Silver Helmet Award for his leadership in foreign affairs and for his many activities in behalf of veterans.

The Silver Helmet Award, a replica of the World War II GI helmet, was voted to Congressman ZABLOCKI by the 1964 national convention of AMVETS in Philadelphia last August.

I believe that we in the House share a just pride in seeing our colleague honored for his tireless effort in leadership in foreign affairs.

I should like to include in the RECORD today the very moving citation which was presented to Congressman ZABLOCKI along with the Silver Helmet Award.

Our colleague is certainly, without question, a most worthy recipient of this highly coveted award.

Mr. Speaker, the AMVET citation follows:

AMVETS NATIONAL CITATION

The 20th National Convention of AMVETS assembled in Philadelphia, Pa., on August 30, 1964, did unanimously resolve that its congressional award be presented to the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Congressman from Wisconsin, ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in recognition of his numerous contributions to the public interest, his leadership in foreign affairs, his many activities in behalf of veterans, and his interest in AMVETS.

Congressman ZABLOCKI has a consistent record of supporting legislation in the interest of the average taxpayer, the farmer, the small businessman, and all veterans. He has supported, extended, and improved social security, and he was the original sponsor in 1953 of legislation to lower the retirement age for women and to authorize payment of benefits to disabled workers. Both proposals were approved by Congress and enacted into law.

The Congressman has also consistently supported a strong national defense, the mutual security program, the Hoover Commission's recommendations for streamlining Government operations, reductions in Federal spending, and tax reforms. He has worked hard for measures to strengthen the internal security of the Nation and to combat the Communist menace at home and abroad.

Congressman ZABLOCKI introduced the legislation to authorize construction of the new 1,250-bed Veterans' Administration Hospital at Wood, Wis. The project was approved and the hospital has been constructed. This hospital is an important Veterans' Administration medical center, serving veterans throughout the midwest.

The Congressman has been a champion of the VA center, working actively for its progress and well-being.

The VA hospital at Wood is only one example of the Congressman's interest and efforts in behalf of veterans. He has also pioneered in the establishment of nursing care and rehabilitation programs for veterans. Over the years, Congressman ZABLOCKI has given his full support to legislation providing equitable compensation and other benefits for servicemen and veterans. In addition, there has not been an AMVET problem in which Congressman ZABLOCKI has refused to take an interest.

For his numerous contributions to the public interest, for his leadership in foreign affairs, for his many activities in behalf of veterans, and for his interest in AMVETS, the Silver Helmet Congressional Award is presented to Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI.

Presented April 3, 1965.

LINCOLN S. TAMRAZ,
National Commander.

AHEPA Crusade for Freedom Week for Constantinople and Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a number of U.S. citizens have watched with growing concern the campaign directed against Greek nationals living in Istanbul. On April 19 the Government of Turkey announced its decision to expel the remaining 2,800 Greeks in Istanbul.

The Government also announced its intention to impose controls on the ecumenical patriarchate of the Greek Orthodox Church in Istanbul. This decision raises a grave question of religious freedom and could encourage the Soviet Union to attempt to exercise further influence over religious affairs.

Although the Department of State has not publicly expressed its concern over this matter, many people are alarmed. Gov. John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts, has declared the week of May 9–15 AHEPA Crusade for Freedom Week for Constantinople and Cyprus and expressed his support for action by our Government "to bring about the freedom of religion in the Republic of Turkey."

Under unanimous consent I include the Governor's proclamation and a recent article from the London Economist of April 24, which discusses the situation, in the RECORD:

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS

Whereas the Christians of Constantinople are being expelled and persecuted and their properties are being confiscated without compensation; and

Whereas the hierarchy and the clergy of the ancient and venerable Eastern Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Constantinople are being persecuted, deprived of the right to exercise their churchly and religious functions and some of the hierarchy are being exiled unjustly; and

Whereas the people of Cyprus are seeking the right to establish a democratic government where all the citizens will have equal suffrage, equal protection of the laws, religious freedom and equal educational, economic and social opportunities; and

Whereas the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, otherwise known as the Order of Ahepa, is seeking redress and a solution of these problems in accordance with the American principles and traditions originally enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and which, ever since, have become the cornerstone of the ideals, beliefs and traditions of the American people and government: Now, therefore,

I proclaim the week of May 9–15, 1965, as Massachusetts Ahepa Crusade for Freedom Week for Constantinople and Cyprus.

I endorse the basic principle of the U.S. foreign policy on self-determination for all peoples and earnestly urge our Government to fully implement and support this policy of self-determination for the people of Cyprus.

I further urge our Government to do all in its power to bring about freedom of religion in the Republic of Turkey.

I further urge our Government to do all in its power to stop the persecution and exiling of the Christian people of Constantinople.

I further urge on all our citizens of all creeds to participate in the Ahepa Crusade for Freedom Week for Constantinople and Cyprus, and to pray for a just solution of the problems and the establishment of a just and permanent peace in these ancient places where civilization was born and where all our great religions were first promulgated and established.

JOHN A. VOLPE,
Governor.

[From the London Economist, Apr. 24, 1965]

GREECE AND TURKEY: NOT THE WAY TO WIN FRIENDS

"It is impossible to proceed to any understanding with the Turkish Government under pressure or threat of violent action." This was the response of the Greek foreign minister, Mr. Costopoulos, to Ankara's latest attempt to press a sense of urgency about Cyprus on the Greek Government. Turkey's decision, announced on April 19 to expel the remaining Greek nationals from Istanbul and to impose controls on the affairs of the ecumenical patriarchate of the Greek church in Istanbul, is seen in Athens as a mark of Ankara's impatience to get the Cyprus problem out of the way. From the Turkish point of view, the resumption of Greek-Turkish friendship is dependent on finding a quick solution to the bitter unease in Cyprus. But, the Greeks ask, is this the way?

Ankara's action has come at a time when it had been hoped that the Greek and Turkish foreign ministers might have seized the opportunity of the spring session of the NATO Council of Ministers in London (to be held on May 9 to 11) for preliminary discussions on Cyprus. "We shall sit at the same table to discuss NATO affairs since we are allies," Mr. Costopoulos told your correspondent, "but we cannot carry on bilateral talks. It is a question of dignity."

The decision to expel the remaining 2,800 Greeks from Turkey (most of whom live in Istanbul) is an irritation rather than a serious worry to the Greek Government. Already several thousand once-prosperous Greeks have been repatriated from there, and the addition of more will cause only mounting annoyance. It is the question of the ecumenical patriarchate that is causing anxiety. The fear is the effect the Turkish action may have on the Soviet Union.

The Greeks claim to be alarmed in case it might encourage the Russians to do one of two things. They might now press for the removal of the ecumenical patriarchate from the See of Constantinople with a possible view to misappropriating the primacy of the Orthodox church to Moscow's own patriarchate. Or, on the contrary, they might intervene in support of the ecumenical patriarchate against Turkish pressures, and so enhance Russia's prestige throughout the Orthodox world.

The Turkish prime minister's statement on Tuesday that, if "inhuman and unbearable" actions continued in Cyprus, his Government would have to reconsider the Treaty of Lausanne has prompted the Greeks to remark that the treaty, which in 1923 established a delicate balance of power across the Aegean, did not merely grant Greece privileges for its own minority and church in Istanbul. It also, as a counterbalance for Turkey, gave rights to the 100,000-strong Moslem minority living in Greece's western Thrace. But so far they are only pointing this out; Greek officials say that they earnestly hope that the situation will not reach the point when Greece is forced to answer threat with counterthreat.

The Anatomy of Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, the voices of extremism are loud in the land as zealots of the right and left clamor for center stage before a public audience that is seeking to resolve in a responsible way the multitude of complex problems which we face at home and abroad.

And while the irresponsible antics and pronouncements of extremists—from the recent trial summation by a Klan lawyer in Haynesville, Ala., to the "conservative" convention in Chicago, to demonstrations and harangues hither and yon by so-called campus "peace" groups—garb headlines they do not reflect the true American mood.

Yet extremists of all hues—and they abound in our political spectrum as do the colors of a rainbow—present a clear and present danger to the body politic.

While our form of government dictates that we must tolerate some of their theatrics and most of their taunts, it also gives responsible citizens license to use truth as a weapon against their turbid and turbulent ideologies.

As the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times clearly points out, a vigilant, concerned public can accelerate the process of self-destruction inherent in extremist movements:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Apr. 11, 1965]

THE ANATOMY OF EXTREMISM

Periodically, in the history of this Republic, there have emerged during times of stress extremist cults and movements of various stripe. They often rally under patriotic banners. But they are dedicated nonetheless to assaulting by word and deed certain basic institutions and tenets of American society.

In the 1840's and 1850's the Nation suffered, and survived, the Know Nothings. In the 1930's, amidst the fear of the great depression, both Fascist and Communist organizations flourished. At other times, in less organized ways, we have endured other divisive, truly un-American movements, which preached hatred of class, or race, or religion, or democracy.

These have not been nor are they today welcome experiences. Living through them has sometimes left scars. In every case, however, the fundamental strengths of our political and social structure have readily absorbed the attacks of internal foes.

This is not to minimize or discount the inherent threat posed by organized extremist movements. These are ugly, intolerable manifestations whenever and wherever they occur.

Whether of right or left, extremists are a departure from both the ideal and practice of American national life. And when hate, which so easily is expressed through violence, is the chief mark of extremism, the aberration is even more alarming.

We live now, as we have for some decades past and as we no doubt will for some time to come, in an uneasy world. Fears, real and imagined, vague and precise, surround us. Within and without our borders, great and unusual transformations are taking place.

Old values are questioned and sometimes discarded without being replaced. What once were sureties making for stability—of belonging, of participation, of individual worth—now seem frequently in doubt.

In this changing climate a sense of frustration, a feeling by the individual that life is wasted or spoiled, can be easily nourished. Widespread frustration, with all its ambiguities, is the commonest breeding ground of extremism. It is from among the frustrated that the zealots, the "true believers," are recruited for extremist movements.

Regardless of the cause to which he dedicates himself, the extremist in every case seems motivated and compelled by an inner turmoil, for which he invents elaborate and high-sounding rationalizations. This is true whether he is a college youth eagerly enlisting in a far-left crusade, or a goon marching in a bedsheet, or a man in a business suit conspiring to take over a PTA—or a local police force.

The raw material for making extremists has always been with us and, given human nature, always will be. The existence of this fortunately limited element in our midst is not itself alarming. Extremism in any form, thanks to the basic commonsense of Americans, has never yet grown into a mass movement.

What is alarming is the chance that passivity, preoccupation, and apathy on the part of the overwhelming majority of decent Americans will permit one or more extremist movements to assume a strength far out of proportion to its size. Then it may prove too late to do anything about it.

This has happened in other countries.

Despite the phrases they mouth or the flags in which they wrap themselves, extremists can be readily identified. For what distinguishes them all is a basic hatred and contempt for American society as it exists today. That hatred, however disguised, gives ex-

tremists cohesion and motivation. It is their strength, but it is also their undoing. For such sick hatred ultimately is self-destroying.

Given a vigilant, concerned public, the process can be accelerated.

Questionnaire to 22d District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of each session of Congress, I send a legislative questionnaire to all households in my district, soliciting the views of my constituents on the important issues before us. This year's questionnaire was mailed to 152,000 households in the 22d Congressional District. At this time, I would like to make the results of my fifth annual questionnaire an official part of the RECORD:

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1. I have listed below a number of issues of vital public concern. Please check the three items you believe deserve priority in Congress (listed in order):

	Percent
(a) Reexamination of foreign aid	15.7
(b) Juvenile delinquency, narcotics, and crime	15.2
(c) Taxes and economic growth	10.4
(d) Diversification of the private economy to provide for less reliance on Government contracts	9.7
(e) Aid to education	9.5
(f) Reapportionment of State legislatures on a population basis	8.4
(g) Training and employment opportunities for youth	7.7
(h) Reexamination of national defense requirements	7.6
(i) Space research and exploration	5.5
(j) Needs of our senior citizens	5.3
(k) Reglation of mail-order purchase of firearms	5.0

2. Please indicate any or all of the following measures Congress should enact in the field of education:

	Percent		
	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
(a) Establishment of Federal scholarships to enable more high school graduates to attend college	50.2	43.8	6.0
(b) Extending work-study programs, which provide oncampus jobs, for college students from middle-income families	60.1	29.9	10.0
(c) Awarding of grants to help States buy books for elementary and high school libraries	40.4	49.1	10.5
(d) Aiding low-income school districts	61.0	31.6	7.4

3. If Federal money is used to assist public schools, should it also be made available to children in private and parochial schools? (Examples, providing textbooks or shared classroom space.) Yes, 51.5 percent; no, 43.4 percent; no opinion, 5.1 percent.

4. In order to promote more responsible and effective law enforcement, should the Federal Government establish institutes to assist in the training of police and correctional personnel? Yes, 50 percent; no, 39 percent; no opinion, 11 percent.

5. How do you rate Robert McNamara as Secretary of Defense? Doing good job, 42 percent; fair, 23.5 percent; poor, 20 percent; undecided, 14.5 percent.

6. Is it a proper function of Government to provide birth control information? Yes, 70 percent; no, 24 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

7. What do you think the United States should do in South Vietnam? (Check the course of action that seems most preferable to you.)

	Percent
(a) Expand the war into North Vietnam and go all out to win	47.2
(b) Work toward a negotiated settlement through the United Nations and withdraw our troops when a settlement has been reached	25.4
(c) Continue current policies of military support, without expanding or reducing our efforts appreciably	17.4
(d) Withdraw our military troops and advisers immediately and let the Vietnamese solve their own problems	10.0

8. Federal excise taxes are charged on many luxury items. (For example, a 10-percent tax is levied on the retail price of perfume.) If you agree with me that Congress should cut excise taxes, please indicate in what order they should be eliminated or modified.

	Percent
Telephone service	40.5
Automobiles	22.9
Appliances	20.4
Cosmetics	5.0
Theater admission	4.2
Cigarettes and tobacco	2.6
Liquor	2.2
Furs and jewelry	2.2

9. Do you favor or oppose medicare, that is, hospital care for persons over 65, financed through the social security system? Favor, 47.8 percent; oppose, 42 percent; undecided, 10.2 percent.

10. Our national objective is to land an American on the moon by 1970. Do you support this program? Yes, 68.7 percent; yes, but the program should be slowed down, 14 percent; no, 17.3 percent.

11. I have introduced legislation to create a National Commission on Economic Conversion and Diversification and to establish regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise. Do you favor this approach as a means of creating new markets and industry to widen the employment base in our valley? Yes, 66.3 percent; no, 18.4 percent; no opinion, 15.3 percent.

12. Do you favor continuance of this type of questionnaire? Yes, 95.3 percent; no, 1 percent; no opinion, 3.7 percent.

National Distinguished Service Award To Be Given Speaker McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the great honor to be tendered to you on Thursday of this week when you receive the National Distinguished Service Award of the National Association of State Directors of Veterans' Affairs.

Every Member of this House knows how well you deserve this high honor. Throughout your service in this body, you have given the interests and concerns of our Nation's veterans a high place in your thoughts and efforts.

I am pleased to add my congratulations and good wishes to those of other Members of the House on this occasion.

Addresses of Theodore McKeldin, Mayor of Baltimore, at High Schools Groundbreaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to report that my city of Baltimore, under the progressive leadership of its mayor and city council, is endeavoring to meet the city's needs for educational buildings. Last month ground was broken for two new high schools, on adjoining property. At that time the speaker was the mayor, Theodore R. McKeldin.

At the luncheon following the groundbreakings, he spoke briefly in tribute to the contractor in charge of these projects, Victor Frenkil, president of the Baltimore Contractors, one of the largest contractors in Baltimore, an outstanding citizen and philanthropist.

Mayor McKeldin's remarks follow:

ADDRESSES OF HON. THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, MAYOR OF BALTIMORE

(Addresses delivered in connection with groundbreaking ceremony and luncheon of Polytechnic Institute and Western High School)

GROUNDBREAKING

Here today we begin the process of proving that Baltimore is measuring up, not only to its municipal, but to its national responsibilities.

All experts agree that the problems facing the Nation today, although they are of many kinds, trace back, almost without exception, to the problem of education. Poverty, for example, on which the President invites us to make war, is to a very large extent a problem of the ignorant. It is a rare thing for a man with even a fair education not to be able to find a job that will enable him to keep his family from want; but among the illiterate it is getting to be more and more the usual thing.

Even in the matter of national defense, education counts for more and more. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force can make little use of a man who is illiterate, or nearly so. On the other hand, if a recruit has excellent high school training, the defense forces can not only use him, but can give him additional special schooling that will make his military service not a loss but a gain of time in the civilian world after his term of service.

However, many of our ablest thinkers have become alarmed lest in meeting the needs of the services we pay too exclusive attention to technical training, turning out large numbers of scientists, but forgetting that the country's first need is for intelligent citizens,

competent to discharge their civic obligations with wisdom and honor. So we are faced with a strong demand not to forget the humanities in our preoccupation with the sciences.

On this spot Baltimore City is preparing to link the two in an establishment that will be the city's honor and pride. Polytechnic, for the sciences, is balanced by Western High for the humanities; and both are located on a site where their noble buildings can be displayed in a way that will make them ornaments as well as utilities.

This is, as I see it, a much more important consideration than some people believe. The strictly utilitarian mind holds that a boy or a girl, given shelter from the weather and enough elbowroom, can be educated as well in one kind of structure as another, and it is wasteful to spend money on grace and dignity in school buildings.

These people overlook the fact that the first problem of education is to make the student desire to learn; and one of the most effective ways of making him desire to learn is to associate grace and dignity with learning in his mind. Put him in a hideous old barn, even though it is weathertight, roomy, and adequately heated, and you have to some extent poured contempt upon education, and to that extent blighted his desire to learn.

Therefore, I am delighted that the architects' drawings show a group of buildings graceful in their design and dignified in their proportions. We have not gone in for gaudy magnificence, but we have gone in for the beauty that is attained by a proper balance of line and mass. Those things contribute to the efficiency of the school just as surely as do sturdy construction and convenient arrangement. I do not believe that any student can come on the campus when the group is completed without gaining the impression, although he may not realize it at the time, that the city of Baltimore has a real respect for the educated man or women; which will stimulate the student's desire to become one.

I feel, too, that we have done well to place this group apart from the hurly-burly of the business section, yet within easy reach. I believe that open air, sunlight, and a wide-sweeping view also contribute to education. I do not doubt that the youth who spends some years in these surroundings will attain an increase of self-respect that will be of growing value as the years pass; and I can think of no greater contribution to good citizenship.

What we are actually building here is a gateway, a portal, through which generations of boys and girls will pass from the wilderness of the untrained mind into the ordered and beautiful world of the republic of letters. It is highly appropriate, then, that the gateway should be suggestive of the order and serenity that are the finest rewards of the cultivated mind.

Let us speed the work, then, for whatever formal name we may give it, the real meaning of this structure, both to the men and women who build and to the boys and girls who will occupy it, is in the one word, "Hope."

LUNCHEON

I have talked earlier of the meaning to Baltimore of the construction job we started today—I mean the masonry, steel and concrete structures. I propose now to talk about another kind of construction that goes along with it, but that does not use tangible, visible building materials. There are things going into this construction job that are not measured by a sliderule nor weighed on scale, but that are just as important as anything hauled in by trucks or poured from a concrete-mixer.

The tangible things we use to build an educational plant. The intangible, we use to build pride of achievement. The educational plant will be worth $13 million. What the achievement will be worth is beyond computation. Where the physical plant is built of masonry, steel and concrete, the achievement is built of skill, confidence and faith—skill to make the buildings strong and beautiful; confidence that the job will be carried through to a triumphant conclusion; faith that the finished work will be the door of hope for thousands of Baltimore boys and girls.

Now I want to pay tribute to the man who has contracted to supply us these things, Victor Frenkil, president of Baltimore Contractors. Of course if you look through the legal documents you will find none of these things mentioned; but they are in the contract, just the same, written there not by the lawyers, but by the life-work of Victor Frenkil.

The story should be familiar to us for it unfolded right here in Baltimore, and it follows the lines of the story that embodies the American dream, the story of the boy who, starting without wealth, or influence, or friends in high places, pulled himself up by a combination of intelligence and integrity, until he stands like one of the rulers of the great city of Tyre, "whose traffickers are the honorable of the earth."

Victor Frenkil came up the hard way. Helping around his father's store at 9, out of school and holding a full-time job at 17, he started in business for himself in 1931, half-way down the landslide of the great depression. A man who could merely survive in those days was good. A man who could build up a business then was more than good, he was a phenomenon.

But Vic Frenkil did it. Statistically, it wasn't much of a business. In that first year his contracts ranged from $15 to a top of $250. But that wasn't the point. The point was that it kept going and growing at a time when giant corporations were crashing all over the place. I am not at all sure that to get a $15 contract in 1931 didn't take more real ability than to get this $13 million contract in 1965, for a magnificent record of achievement is more help to a man than an unlimited credit line.

On his first sizable job by an error in his own estimate he lost $1,200, a more serious blow to him at that time than a loss of a hundred times as much would be today. But did he plead excuses, moan, and groan, and try to wriggle out? Not he. He took the jolt, paid the loss out of his own pocket, and finished the job for his client as agreed. And he lost only in the short run. The reputation for honesty given him by that deal in the long run was worth far more than $1,200.

Vic Frenkil, in fact, is a fine illustration of a saying that was a favorite with the senior Kennedy, Joseph P. Time and again he told his sons, "When the going gets tough, that's when the tough get going." In 1931 the going was tough, but that's when Vic Frenkil got going, and he has been going ever since.

He has gone so far that today he is in position, as general contractor, to deliver not only the physical building materials that will go into these schools, but also the spiritual values that we need even more than we need bricks and mortar—the skill that will build those buildings right; the confidence that they will be delivered exactly as agreed; and the faith that in constructing them we are adding immensely to the educational opportunities of Baltimore boys and girls.

For that is what we owe the rising generations. For youth today the going is, in many respects, actually tougher than it was in 1931 because more education is required to hold even the simplest jobs. I am not sure that even a boy as good as Vic Frenkil was, starting with the same handicaps, could go as fast and as far as he did.

But never mind that. Vic did it, and in that we rejoice. Do you remember the song written by the fellow who joined the Navy and served as an ordinary seaman, a plain gob, through the late war? The rest of it doesn't apply, but I am sure you will all agree that Vic Frenkil is entitled to sing the last lines, in which the gob asserted that there is no danger at all for "a nation with millions of men like Nimitz, and Halsey, and me."

A Letter Carrier Looks at the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about poor mail service in the United States. I have received legitimate complaints from postal patrons in nearly every community in the Nation. Reports of poor postal service are not confined to isolated instances or areas—they are nationwide.

Perhaps one of the best summaries of some of the postal service problems was contained in an interview with Jerome Keating, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, which appeared in the May 10 Republican Congressional Committee Newsletter, which follows:

MAIL SERVICE: "THE WORST I'VE EVER SEEN"

Once it took a whole day to deliver mail from Cobleskill, N.Y., to Hydnsville, N.Y., 5 miles away. Today, under the administrations new ZIP code program, the time has been cut to 2 days.

The complaint above is typical of those heard daily across the country and flooding into congressional offices from irate postal users. What's behind the deteriorating mail service? To try to find out, the Newsletter interviewed Jerome Keating, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, which represents the Nation's postmen. The interview follows:

Mr. Keating, just how bad is mail service these days?

"It's the worst I've ever seen and I've been associated with the Letter Carriers for 42 years. It gets worse every year."

Can you give some specifics?

Mr. KEATING. Yes. Service has been cut all along the line. The postal service has steadily consolidated post offices, reduced railway post office operations and cut money-order and postal savings facilities. Twice-daily deliveries now are reduced to one. Parcel post deliveries are down to 5 from 6 per week. I have here on my desk the wrapping from a package mailed from lower Manhattan to a point on Long Island on January 4. It did not arrive until the 14th. Ten days to travel just a few miles. Another package, mailed from Washington, D.C., last January 13, arrived at its destination in Des Moines on January 25. In Greenville, S.C., church bulletins mailed on a Monday did not arrive until the following Monday or Tuesday, thereby leaving members uninformed about the Sunday services. All were for local delivery. In Madisonville, Ky., beauty parlors' supplies, shipped parcel post by train from nearby Nashville, took nearly a week. In sheer exasperation, the owners switched to a commercial delivery service.

Speaking of parcel post, why are so many packages smashed in the mails?

Mr. KEATING. Largely because of electronic sorting equipment. At the main post office

in Washington, D.C., 14 employees are kept busy rewrapping broken packages. Recently, the St. Paul post office was smashing 25 hampers of packages daily. When this forced them to return to human labor, the rate dropped to one hamper per day.

What's behind all these shortcomings in the mail service these days?

Mr. KEATING. Lack of manpower, primarily. Reduced use of railroads is another reason. The Post Office now has taken the position that sorting of mail in transit, as done in the railway mail cars, is no longer necessary. All of this means not only poor service, but more and more overtime. Some postal workers now spend 80 hours a week on the job. That is a waste of money, because a man cannot work efficiently that long.

That brings up the question of postal employee morale. What's the picture there?

Mr. KEATING. It could hardly be worse. Postal employees are trying to do a job they cannot do because there are not enough of them. But, of course, they get the blame for poor service. Employees are being worked to their physical limits and are suffering in many ways. In the Atlanta region, there were 55,840 hours of work lost over seven pay periods. Many accidents were due to physical and mental exhaustion. Employees in the Denver post office have been requested to cancel annual leave. In Hays, Kans., all annual leave has been canceled. It is impossible to begin to tell of all instances where men are compelled to carry their own mail route and part of another one.

What's your answer to these problems?

Mr. KEATING. The postal service needs more manpower, particularly the appointment of full-time career employees to a greater extent. Equipment and management techniques were supposed to improve service, reduce manpower. But frankly, they looked better in the show window than they have worked inside the store. ABCD (same day business delivery) has delayed as much or more mail than it expedited. It has turned out to be a mere gimmick. Much more has been expected from the ZIP code than it can produce. The program depends upon a machine, the optical scanner, which has not even been completely invented—and when invented will have many shortcomings. The main trouble is that the Post Office Department has been laying off people in anticipation of automation before the automated machines have arrived.

Robert E. Kennedy Named Sun-Times Associate Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD today a most welcome announcement which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times disclosing that Robert E. Kennedy, chief editorial writer of that publication since 1950, has been named associate editor. In making the announcement Mr. Milburn P. Akers praised Mr. Kennedy for the objectivity with which he approaches every editorial problem.

It has been my privilege to know Robert E. Kennedy for more than a quarter of a century. During all of these years I have seen Mr. Kennedy exemplify the highest principles of American journalism. He has always been a credit to his profession, and I am sure that his many friends throughout the Nation will be happy to learn of his very well deserved promotion.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times announcement follows:

ROBERT E. KENNEDY NAMED SUN-TIMES ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Robert E. Kennedy was named associate editor of the Sun-Times Saturday. The appointment, effective immediately, was announced by Milburn P. Akers, editor of the Sun-Times.

In making the announcement, Akers said, "I have been associated with Robert Kennedy for more than a quarter of a century. He is a very able and widely experienced newspaperman, an excellent student of public affairs and, equally important, one possessed of an intelligent compassion for the underprivileged and the oppressed. The objectivity with which he approaches every editorial problem is unsurpassed."

Kennedy has been chief editorial writer of the Sun-Times since 1950. During this period he has traveled extensively in the United States and abroad to observe firsthand political and economic conditions in this country, Europe, and Latin America.

In 1947 he became a charter member of the National Conference of Editorial Writers and served as chairman for 1957–58. He was president of the Chicago Press Club in 1963.

In 1954 Kennedy won the TWA Aviation Award for editorials on travel. His editorials were included in those for which the Sun-Times won the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations Award in 1956 and the Education Writers Association Award in 1957.

Kennedy began his career as a reporter for the City News Bureau in 1929. During the early 1930's he covered prohibition era gang murders, board of education affairs, politics, and such famous court trials as those of Roger Touhy and the late Samuel Insull.

After a stint as assistant city editor of the City News Bureau, Kennedy joined the Chicago Times in 1935 as night city editor. In 1938 he was made political editor and wrote a daily column, "Mugwump." Four years later he became chief of the Times' Washington bureau where he wrote a daily political column.

In 1954 he was named chief editorial writer for the Times. Five years later he assumed the post of chief editorial writer for the Sun-Times, a post he has held up to now.

Free Elections, Not Anticommunism, Should Be Goal of U.S. Intervention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, we need some plain talk about the nature and morality of intervention because the action of the United States in the Dominican Republic these last 10 days has outstripped, or at least fails to correspond with the contemporary attitude about intervention.

Intervention in the internal affairs of other nations is strongly condemned. This principle is found in the U.N. Charter and it is even more explicity stated in the Charter of the OAS. Yet we intervene every day in the affairs of other nations. The total thrust and purpose of American foreign policy is aimed at influencing events in other nations ranging from our military strength designed to deter others from starting a war to economic assistance aimed at speeding development in the recipient nations.

These kinds of intervention have been acceptable and not thought to be inconsistent with the prohibitions contained in the various multilateral charters because they are peaceful in character. They do not employ force.

We are using force in South Vietnam. Intervention in South Vietnam has been justified on the ground that the insurgency war had external origins and continues to have outside support thereby constituting aggression within the meaning of the U.N. Charter. The charter permits us to intervene when there is aggression. We have not taken that claim before the U.N., however.

Today, we have taken another step. We are employing force in the Dominican Republic to quell a revolution which admittedly was of internal origin. We need to talk about these events and what they mean, because the quality of our leadership—its morality, if you will—is being called into serious question, both by our own citizens and abroad. We must reconcile our actions within the more fundamental values which are generally shared by mankind.

UNITED STATES AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

In 1963 President Bosch, elected 7 months earlier and strongly supported by the United States, was overthrown by a military coup. We protested and suspended aid but did not send in the Marines.

In the past 10 days the United States did intervene in the Dominican Republic when a new revolution sought to restore President Bosch to power. We did so because of our fear of a possible Communist takeover in that revolution. But the hard truth is that most revolutionary movements seeking to oust a military sponsored or nondemocratically based government will contain some Communists. They may lean toward Moscow, toward Peiping, or they may be indigenous types. If they were in charge, they surely would not reestablish democratic institutions in that country. But how can we know with accuracy the role they are playing? One can assume that the more resistance encountered by the revolution the more the Communists move toward control. Yet their influence cannot be easily identified nor can we assess their prospective control if the revolution is successful.

One is not reassured by the cries from some within the United States that our own civil rights movement is Communist inspired, nor by the tendency in Latin America to classify social reformers generally as Communists, just as General Wessin with whom we are cooperating calls former President Bosch Communist, which he is not.

Thus, if the United States continues to use this rationale of a possible Communist takeover for intervention, we are placed in a peculiar and untenable position. We do not intervene when demo-

cratic institutions are destroyed by a military takeover, but we do intervene when efforts are made to restore such institutions because of the inevitability of Communists attaching themselves to the cause.

This is a wholly unsatisfactory state of affairs. This type of assymetrical intervention can only lead to increasing isolation from our friends and increasing involvement in the civil wars of other countries.

The fundamental objections to forceful intervention come from the experience of mankind, particularly from the experience of those who have been the victims of intervention. Countries which have been under colonial control and countries which though emancipated have been subjected to the strong arm of the larger powers are particularly sensitive. We need only ask how we would feel if other powers were to intervene with force in our affairs.

NONINTERVENTION IS NOT AN ABSOLUTE PRINCIPLE

Yet it is perfectly plain that nonintervention is not an absolute principle paramount above all others. My clearest example is the genocide committed by the Nazis against the Jews. Who among us could ever again stand by and say this was no concern of ours? A contemporary example is the ruthless, uncivilized treatment which South Africa accords its non-European population. Nor can civilized people ignore the wholesale denial of political and personal rights by totalitarian governments on both the left and the right. In short, there are more compelling considerations to determine our conduct than that of nonintervention.

THE PROMOTION OF REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY

The promotion of representative democracy as a form of government is one principle to which the principle of nonintervention must often give way. American foreign policy is bottomed on the belief that a world of democratic nations provides the most favorable environment for our own security. Our faith in the democratic process has deep pragmatic roots. The genius of this process is its ability to effect change without revolution. Moreover, experience has shown that governments which have a mature political process permitting the free exercise of the ballot are least likely to engage in military adventures and are most likely to add stability to the international community.

OAS NATIONS ARE COMMITTED TO PROMOTING DEMOCRACY

In the Western Hemisphere, to establish and maintain representative democracy is an important goal of the Organization of American States. In the Charter of Bogotá which set up the OAS in 1948 as a "regional agency within the U.N.," there appears the following language:

> The solidarity of the American States and the high aims which are sought through it require the political organization of those States on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy.

A conference of Western hemispheric nations was called in 1962 on this question. It is interesting to note that this conference, called the "First Symposium on Representative Democracy," was held in Santo Domingo, capital of the Dominican Republic, from December 17 to 22, 1962. One of the activities of the conference was the observation of the December 20 election which brought that island its first representative government after 30 years of the Trujillo dictatorship.

It was the conclusion of that OAS symposium that "the other fundamental principles of the American regional system would become truly meaningful only insofar as all the member States adopted a vigorous constitutional policy favoring the establishment or consolidation of such a political system within their respective national territories."

So the principle is well established in our hemisphere to promote representative democracy.

INTERVENTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC MAY BE JUSTIFIED

The action of the United States in the Dominican Republic can be justified, in my opinion, if the basis for such intervention is explicitly stated as the need to preserve the right of the people to choose their own government. This statement needs to be followed by action consistent with this objective. If the United States promptly moves toward the holding of free elections and requests the OAS to take over in the interim, then I see the total effect of intervention resulting in the strengthening of democratic institutions on the island, the avoidance of bloodshed, and the will of the people being observed.

What must be avoided at all costs is the establishment of a client government dependent upon outside forces for support. This would utterly destroy any moral foundation for our action.

These steps in support of the right of the people to choose their own government would not be easy. The Dominican Republic lacks strong traditions of public service. It had barely the veneer of an effectively organized and functioning government.

Suppose that under OAS sponsorship an election is held and someone is elected President who finds himself unable to meet the demands of his people for adequate wages, employment, and economic progress. Then the country moves more closely toward another coup, revolution, or civil war? Then what is the role of the OAS or the United States?

There is no easy answer to this dilemma, and every course of action involves calculated risks. For my money, however, I would choose the right of self-government unrestricted except for a continuing guarantee to the people that their right to choose their own leader would be respected and enforced. This would mean that a military coup or any other revolution would automatically bring forward OAS forces designed to enforce these basic constitutional processes. This is the kind of intervention which in my judgment is highly moral and is sorely needed.

Had this type of guarantee been in effect in 1963 President Bosch could have called upon the OAS or the United States for help in defending his constitutional right to his office. Such a procedure would, of course, be giving free license to the people to vote into office good and bad presidents alike, some of whom might well damage the economy or welfare of the Nation. Unfortunate as this might be, there is no other acceptable solution which does not place our goals in serious jeopardy.

MULTILATERAL FORCE IS BEST

I have suggested that the OAS take on these new tasks, because multilateral intervention carries assurance that announced reasons for intervening are indeed genuine and unlikely to become subordinated to someone else's national interest. Confidence in the multilateral agency is thereby engendered. Moreover, the presence of multilateral forces favorably changes the psychology flowing from the use of force.

The prime example was the recruitment for use in the Congo of small nation forces which had no history of colonialism. Logistical support, on the other hand, was supplied by the larger nations. The same concepts applied in the Dominican Republic would be of enormous assistance.

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Although the OAS seems the logical agency to effect a transition to a popularly elected government, the United Nations may be the logical vehicle for a major economic program which must surely follow the reestablishment of a democratic government in this country which suffers from illiteracy and high unemployment. The U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America, the U.N. Special Fund and Expanded Technical Assistance programs or the World Bank might well be asked to accept substantial development responsibilities in the Dominican Republic in cooperation with the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress. This possibility should be explored because the United States should make perfectly clear to the world as well as to the Dominican Republic our willingness to employ multilateral agencies to carry out a program of economic assistance to which we will make substantial contributions rather than insist on a bilateral aid relationship.

The possibility of the United Nations becoming the multilateral agency to intervene in support of free elections needs further consideration. The OAS Charter provisions are explicit in rejecting such a role today—but they can be changed. The U.N. Charter provisions are not so explicit and in the case of the Congo the U.N. found a way to intervene. For the moment the political problems within the U.N. probably preclude such a role, leaving regional organizations such as the OAS and the OAU in the best position to act if they will. There is no inherent reason, however, why the U.N. should not act when requested to act by a freely chosen government which is threatened by forces within the country.

UNITED STATES MUST ANNOUNCE ITS OBJECTIVE OF FREE ELECTIONS

Some implications which follow from this examination of our intervention in the Dominican Republic are inescapable. We need to firmly fix in our minds and announce to the world that our objective

is the preservation of the right of people to choose their own government. It is in these terms that we must justify the use of force, and not on the grounds of anticommunism. Moreover, this requires a reexamination of our position on coups which are committed by the military forces in these countries.

It is my fervent hope that events in the Dominican Republic will cause this Nation to take a good, hard look at what it really seeks to do—and then to speak the truth. If a fundamental reexamination follows these events it may bring a new surge of enthusiasm and commitment to the enormous undertakings of this Nation across the globe.

WE ARE AT A CROSSROADS

It is my considered judgment that the United States stands at one of its most crucial crossroads since World War II. The energetic application of force by President Johnson has filled a vacuum, but like the genie in the bottle, we may have uncorked an ill spirit which can do more damage to the United States than any other single action taken since the end of World War II. People across this entire globe will be watching with close attention the steps now taken by our Government. If there was ever a time when the fundamental morality of our Nation had to be demonstrated, that time is now. This fundamental morality must be pursued vigorously to its logical conclusion despite the calculated risks which are involved.

The Organization of American States likewise stands at a crossroads. The doctrine of nonintervention uncritically accepted these past decades must now be reexamined with eyes which also comprehend the enormous moral implications of the events which are unfolding. If the OAS meets these challenges, it can literally transform this hemisphere with new relationships which recognize man's responsibility to man and our mutual interdependence in our common efforts to secure the blessings of freedom for posterity.

The Importance of Job Vacancy Data

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee have been urging the administration to do a statistical survey on job vacancies to serve as a critical tool of economic policymaking. Work on this project has now begun. At the same time, the National Industrial Conference Board has been conducting its own pilot studies in this area, the first results of which were announced in the Washington Post of May 10.

In a Rochester, N.Y., study, the NICB found 8,000 job vacancies for an estimated job vacancy rate of 3 percent of the work force. When the NICB eliminated those jobs that would be available at some date beyond the cutoff date of the study, the job vacancy rate was 1.9 percent. Comparing these figures to Rochester's 2.7 percent unemployment rate presents a convincing demonstration of how in at least one labor market area, the number of jobs going begging equals or even surpasses the number of people unemployed.

This information makes strikingly clear the dangers inherent in trying to pump up aggregate demand in order to reduce unemployment without knowledge of the number of job vacancies existing in the economy. It lends new urgency to the need for such data which has been expressed by Prof. Arthur Burns, Prof. Raymond Saulnier, and other distinguished economists.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post, to which I referred be included in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

JOB VACANCIES STUDY ADDS FUEL TO POLICY CONTROVERSY

(By Frank C. Porter, Washington Post staff writer)

New fuel for a continuing argument over national economic policy was supplied yesterday by the National Industrial Conference Board, which said a pilot study indicates the significance of job vacancy statistics.

The finding bolsters the case of some conservative economists, who contend that unemployment figures as a determinant of Government policy are misleading unless comparable statistics on unfilled job opening are also considered.

Other economists have argued that job vacancy figures are uncollectible in a form precise enough to be useful—largely because too many employers are unwilling to furnish the information.

But the NICB, a business-backed research organization, claimed yesterday that "a high rate of employer response can be obtained."

It released the first part of a pilot study in which it surveyed 401 employers in the Rochester, N.Y., area and found some 8,000 job vacancies as of February 12.

NICB reported 33 percent of the openings were for professional and managerial talent; 22 percent for semiskilled workers, 17 percent for skilled, 14 for clerical and sales, 7 percent for service, and 6 percent for unskilled workers.

Despite the demand for professional types, the survey found that in 58 percent of the vacancies, employers were willing to accept those with no related work experience. And in more than a third, no high school diploma was required.

As a result of the survey, Rochester's job vacancy rate was estimated at 3 percent of the work force. Eliminating those jobs available at some future date, the rate would be 1.9 percent. The area's unemployment rate was 2.7 percent at the time, NICB said.

The small spread between the job vacancy and unemployment rate goes to the nub of the argument set forth by Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Eisenhower. Writing recently in the Harvard Business Review, Burns took issue with the longstanding policy of basing stimulative Federal monetary and fiscal policies on the basis of a high unemployment rate alone without any reference to existing job vacancies.

The Burns theory can be put this way. Faced with an alarming 7-percent unemployment rate, a nation might resort to deficit financing and low interest rates to perk up the economy and take up the manpower slack.

But supposing the job vacancy rate was also 7 percent. This would indicate as many unfilled positions as idle workers. And it would suggest either or both of two conditions: (a) imperfections in the machinery of matching men or jobs, and (b) lack of qualifications among the unemployed to fit them for the vacant jobs.

Under these conditions, Burns argued, the Government's stimulative policy would have little impact on unemployment; rather would it aggravate a skilled manpower shortage through increasing demand and thus produce inflation.

Some liberal economists, in addition to being dubious about the usefulness of job vacancy figures, fear they might be used as a political tool to squelch or cut back economic stimuli and other policies to relieve unemployment.

But H. Bruce Palmer, NICB president, noted yesterday that "job vacancy information has been collected and published regularly in most of the developed countries.

"Our ultimate goal is the development of at least as good a measure of the demand for labor as we now have for the supply of labor," he said. "Although final judgment must await the completion of two additional surveys later this year, it seems apparent at this point that a meaningful count of job vacancies can be made."

Los Angeles City Council Opposes Dirksen Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the Los Angeles City Council, I am proud to report its unanimous opposition to proposals which would overturn the one-man one-vote rule. The action of the Los Angeles City Council and of many other representative governmental bodies and organizations throughout our Nation is encouraging evidence that the voice of the people will be heard and that attempts to write permission for unfair legislative apportionment into the Constitution will be defeated. The text of the council resolution follows:

Whereas the central right of all men who live in a self-governing society is the right to vote; and

Whereas the form of a self-governing society is nothing but a pretense and a deception to the extent that its structure actually operates to grant to its members an unequal voice in the conduct of their public business; and

Whereas citizens of the populace counties of California have an unjustifiably unequal voice in the conduct of their affairs because an amendment to the California constitution was adopted in 1926 for the purpose of perpetuating the political dominance over the affairs of this State which the northern counties of California enjoyed by reason of their population in the 19th century; and this was done through the device of diluting the strength of the votes of persons residing within the rapidly growing heavily populated counties of the south; and

Whereas the citizens of Los Angeles County, now totaling nearly 7 million in number, are entitled by reason of their population to more than 15 State senators, but have suf-

fered by reason of the dilution of their voting influence to the extent that now they have but one senator, and the vote of a citizen in the sparsely settled areas of the State is inflated to the extent that it may have as much as 450 times the influence in the State senate as does the vote of a citizen in Los Angeles County; and

Whereas despite court ruling that this injustice must end, an active and well-financed campaign to preserve the present system is being carried on by members of the California State senate and a member of California interests which seek to preserve the present system through which a minority of less than 11 percent of the people can effectively control the State senate; and

Whereas Members of Congress are being actively solicited to adopt measures making it possible for minority control to continue in California, and there is danger that this campaign of propaganda, if not forcefully contradicted, may persuade even Congressmen from those districts of California which are most severely discriminated against that the people of the heavily populated counties are content with the present intolerable situation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of Los Angeles advise California's Senators and all Members of Congress elected from the County of Los Angeles:

1. The Council of the City of Los Angeles without a dissenting vote has advised the State legislature that it favors the creation at an early date of Senate districts in this State based upon the judicially approved principle of substantially equal population.

2. The city of Los Angeles requests the Congress not to adopt any amendment to the U.S. Constitution which, by superseding the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, or otherwise, would make it possible for a State legislature, whether supported by a majority vote of the people or not, to be so organized that the equality of the weight and influence of one citizen's vote upon the State's legislative processes is substantially different from the weight or influence of another's merely because he lives in a different place, engages in a different means of livelihood, or belongs to any class or group whose existence has no relationship to his status as a citizen.

Chicago's Radio and Television Industry Honors Ralph Atlass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the Broadcast Pioneers Organization awarded its annual achievement award to Mr. Ralph Atlass, vice president of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., Inc., and founder of radio station WIND in Chicago.

Several hundred leading figures in the radio and tlevision industry joined in the tribute to Mr. Atlass, who has scored with several of the "firsts" in the development of the radio industry.

Mr. Howard Miller, one of Chicago's most distinguished radio and television personalities, served as master of ceremonies at this inspiring banquet.

I should like to include in the RECORD today, Mr. Miller's eloquent tribute to Mr. Ralph Atlass, and I should also like to include in the RECORD today, the names of those illustrious Chicagoans who sat at the main table in honoring Mr. Atlass.

Those joining in the tribute represented a cross section of Chicago's leading personalities in the radio and television industry.

The head table guest list included the following:

Bob Larsen, Chuck Bill, Daddy-O Daylie, Josh Brady, Merv Griffin, Gene Taylor, Capt. Bill Eddy, Virginia Gale, Bob Atcher, John Doremus, Norman Ross, Paul Gibson, John Harrington, John Moser, Dan Calibraro.

Sock Hettler, Don McNeill, Larry Wolters, Ed Wallis, Howard Miller, Ralph Atlass, Jim Beach, Jack Brickhouse, Irv Kupcinet, Ernie Shomo, Lee Phillip, Jack Bowen, Franklyn MacCormack, Eddie Hubbard, Fahey Flynn.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Miller's remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY HOWARD MILLER AT THE RALPH ATLASS TESTIMONIAL BANQUET, APRIL 23, 1965

Unlike Marc Anthony, who appeared in the Roman Senate to bury Caesar, not to praise him, we here admit that our privilege is to praise Ralph Atlass, not to bury him; because today, Ralph Atlass is as vital to our industry as he has been since 1924, when he brought a facility out of a basement in his home in Lincoln, Ill., a facility which was born a decade earlier in the mind of an 11-year-old boy, only to become radio station WBBM. Since then, for these intervening 41 years, he has continued to make substantial contributions to our thinking and to the art and science of radio communications. Perhaps it is not wise to list accomplishments of one so alive for fear a hearer might believe the contributions have ended—nothing could be further from the truth—but for the historians, let me recite just a few of the firsts achieved by Ralph Atlass:

First public service shows in conjunction with the AMA in 1924, first courtroom broadcasts in 1929, first schoolroom of the air, first exclusive baseball broadcasts, first broadcast of a baseball road game, first coincidental listening survey—the birth of our rating services.

There are just too many more to list here, but Ralph's biggest first was his introduction of a format or broadcast philosophy which is now practiced by over 95 percent of all the radio stations in the United States, the music and news format. It was in 1940, a quarter century ago, that Ralph Atlass decided radio could, and radio should do a better job for our citizenry; a quarter century ago that he determined radio, as we knew it then, was overdue for an overhaul. With emphasis on public service, he introduced music 24 hours a day with news every half hour.

Now these are the firsts which the documentarians can and will talk about. But so that we don't miss the real story, as an employee, associate; and I am proud to say, a friend, the real greatness of Ralph Atlass is born in the complete integrity he has for our industry; integrity for the business aspect, for the client and for the public. Long before an NAB existed to establish a code of broadcast standards, Ralph Atlass had limited commercial word count and had introduced a maximum spot content in the broadcast hour, in keeping with good taste he had banned certain types of objectionable advertising. Long before an FCC demanded a share of time devoted to public service, Ralph Atlass had initiated a wide spectrum of programing designed to serve the needs of our society. Long before our present-day rating services were created to benefit the advertiser in measuring circulation and to assist management in pleasing the public, Ralph Atlass conducted radio's first coincidental listener survey—this is integrity—not imposed by rules or regulations, but born in a mind and a heart.

Today, Ralph Atlass, as vice president of a great group of radio and television stations, continues to contribute, long he will. He will continue to teach all of us how radio stations should be properly operated to serve the needs of an audience. He will continue to teach us the value of integrity.

This is the Ralph Atlass we honor tonight.

L.B.J. Reemphasizes U.S. Desire To Negotiate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Sacramento Bee, in an editorial dated April 30, 1965, makes it abundantly clear to all that our President and our Nation is willing to enter unconditionally into discussions on the Vietnamese crisis.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the full text of this editorial:

L.B.J. REEMPHASIZES U.S. DESIRE TO NEGOTIATE

President Lyndon B. Johnson has provided new evidence America is eager to end hostilities in Vietnam. In a well mounted press conference he emphasized again the willingness of this Nation to enter unconditionally into discussions on the Vietnamese war, or any other subject with any government in order to advance the cause of peace.

He emphasized that this Nation will not relax its support of South Vietnam so long as it is under aggression from the Vietcong.

Many the world over are asking why the United States is in this messy fracas at all. The answer is obvious. It is there because twice it has been drawn into world wars which it did nothing to head off when they were building.

And America well may ask: Why are we in this alone? Do the nations of Europe have no recollections of Munich? Do they have no memory of the clearly hostile steps taken by the general staff of Germany before 1914?

This Nation has the logic of history on its side. A Communist bloc, which already has declared war on all capitalistic powers, is making a preliminary move in this war. America is standing alone in trying to check the expansion of a force which threatens all free governments.

Of course this Nation should have done more than it has done on the diplomatic level. It should have reminded the signatories to the treaty which ended the Indochina war in 1954 that they have as grave a responsibility as the United States has to see the treaty is observed. Probably the United States has done so. But has it done so in terms which the other nations cannot profitably ignore? Certainly the United States should demand a showdown with the treaty signatories, with the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and with the United Nations.

It is a reflection on this country's persuasive power and on the gratitude of the other free nations that America alone has to suffer the full cost of fighting the advance actions of the Red bloc, which if they are successful will embroil the whole world in annihilatory war.

L.B.J.'s Ceaseless Hunt for Talent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include at this point a copy of an article written by Marianne Means, which appeared in the New York Journal-American of April 25.

The column deals with the President's continuing search for individuals eminently well qualified to serve the Government and the country.

I believe President Johnson's efforts along these lines deserve our thanks, and should merit the attention of the Congress.

The article follows:

L.B.J.'S CEASELESS HUNT FOR TALENT

(By Marianne Means)

WASHINGTON.—Vietnam, civil rights, and the Great Society get the headlines, but President Johnson struggles constantly with another major problem that draws little attention—finding high-caliber talent to staff his administration.

Almost as fast as he fills jobs, it seems, others fall vacant—men leave to return to private life and the greater financial rewards of the business world. Although the President has made nearly a dozen new appointments in the last week, about 20 top posts remain to be filled.

Some critics have charged that the President is too pokey about filling jobs. Some claim he cancels scheduled appointments in disgruntlement if news of his choice leaks out before he can get around to announcing it himself. The latter charge is a myth, spread largely by newsmen who guessed wrong or accepted the word of a hopeful appointee who boasted before he actually had the job in the bag.

It is certainly true, however, that the President takes his own sweet time about filling jobs, and refuses to be pressured into hasty appointments. But this is not necessarily bad. He has devoted a great amount of thought and energy to picking his administration team. He has made a real effort to play politics with appointments little as possible short of angering some important political ally.

Part of the President's slowness in filling jobs is due to his insistence upon a thorough field check by the FBI—which takes a minimum of 30 days—before he makes his final decision. Under past Presidents a quicker but less complete type of FBI check was usually made on potential jobholders and some appointees were even announced before an FBI check had been made.

The wisdom of the President's caution in this regard has already been proven, for in several cases the FBI checks have turned up factors that forced the President to shelve the potential jobholder or at the least to ask for an even more penetrating FBI investigation.

Ambassadorial appointments take even longer, because they must be cleared with the countries involved before the President can name them.

President Johnson's insistence upon deep secrecy during this waiting period has given credence to the argument of those who say he tosses out job hopefuls who spill the beans before he is ready. In fact, however, the secrecy is necessary to give him an absolutely free hand. The President characteristically wants to remain flexible until the last minute when he has gathered in every last report and absorbed every last development—whether he is deciding upon the course of the war in Vietnam, whether to go to Texas for the weekend, or whom to name to his sub-Cabinet.

The record demonstrates that the President has named many men whose appointment or reappointments were first leaked in the press. They include Charles Ross, a member of the Federal Power Commission; Joseph Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury; and John Carver, Under Secretary of the Interior.

Celebrating Israel Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1948, according to the Julian calendar, and May 6, according to the Hebrew calendar, the British mandate over Palestine came to an end, and present day Israel was born. For the idea of a return to their original homeland had never been absent from Jewish hearts, nor indeed from Jewish thoughts or culture, from the very beginning of the dispersion.

That the Arabs immediately attacked Israel and were beaten back is known to all of us. That the United Nations had to be called in to establish and maintain a precarious peace is equally well known. From May 15, 1948, until today, Arab leadership has never recognized the permanence of Israel, and has never renounced its intention to drive the Israelis into the sea. When recently the enlightened leader of Tunis, Habib Bourguiba, suggested that it might be time to recognize Israel and get on with the business of development, he was denounced as a traitor by the Arab leaders.

However precarious her security, Israel has used the intervening years well. She has brought in the exiles, the survivors of Nazi persecution and Jews of North Africa and the Middle East who were often second-class citizens in lands in which they had lived for a thousand years. Rapid and continuing expansion of her economy has been a top priority Israel objective, an objective which gives every sign of being successfully met. The Israel gross national product has continued to rise, and by enormous national effort Israel export have also risen. So much land has been brought under cultivation through irrigation schemes that it is already proverbial throughout the world that Israel has made the desert bloom.

Politically Israel is a stable democracy, not only friendly with the West, but actually tied to the West by vital national interests. Her defense forces have already proved superior to those of the enemies that surround her. But Israel takes equal pride in her technical assistance programs, which while modest in scope, are pursued with vigor and enormous skill. Many an African country has already benefited substantially from such an Israel program.

Most of all, Israel can take pride in the spirit of her people, a people rescued from the jaws of extinction, with a fierce will to live, and a never-say-die outlook. Israelis are accustomed to living dangerously. Their bearing under stress contains a lesson for all of us, as we extend the hand of friendship, on this, their independence day.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the date of the 10th of May is celebrated by freedom-loving Rumanians and Americans of Rumanian descent as the anniversary of Rumania's independence. On that day in 1877, the Rumanians proclaimed their liberty from the Turks, under whose yoke they had suffered since late in the 15th century. For more than four centuries the Rumanian people had been seeking to free themselves from the Ottoman Empire whenever opportunity permitted, and in the last decades of the 19th century they finally met with success.

The independence of Rumania was soon afterward recognized by Russia, Italy, Great Britain, France, and Germany. A kingdom was proclaimed and Prince Charles was crowned King on May 22, 1881. Until the Second World War, Rumania flourished in its liberty. The war, however, resulted in the loss of that liberty. Rumania became one of the captive nations of the Soviet Union, its sovereignty curtailed by a satellite status which is deplored by those Rumanians who understand the importance of freedom as well as by all Americans who have migrated to this country from Rumania.

At the present time significant changes are taking place in Rumania. Although until recently Rumania was one of the most ardent Soviet allies, there has been a conspicuous amount of de-Russification and expanded cultural interchange with the West in the past few months. Russian is no longer a compulsory language in schools. The number of Soviet films has been reduced and the Soviet radio program has been dropped. In 1964 Soviet-Rumanian Friendship Week was given only perfunctory attention. More and more Western plays are being shown, and additional Western authors have been put on accepted reading lists.

There should be no illusion that the Communist system itself has been liberalized, or that the Government of Rumania has moved one iota away from Communist ideology. Rather, the Sino-Soviet ideological differences have given Rumania more opportunity for maneuver. Let us hope that in the process of

change the longing for freedom which is felt in the hearts of the Rumanian people can eventually result in the attainment of true independence once again. May our expressions commemorating Rumanian indepedence remind all people behind the Iron Curtain that they have not been forgotten by the free world.

Minnesota's Capable Congressman: Joseph E. Karth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to call the attention of the House to an article on the gentleman from Minnesota, JOSEPH E. KARTH, that recently appeared in that outstanding magazine Challenge published by the General Electric Co.

JOE KARTH has been an outstanding member of the Committee on Astronautics ever since he joined it in 1959. His dedication, unflagging energies and mature wisdom have been a tower of strength to me and to the other members of the committee in the many investigations we must take into the Nation's space and science programs.

JOE KARTH might be a little embarrassed by the many complimentary things that are said about him in this article. But he need not be, because I am sure that every one of his colleagues in the House and on the committee wholeheartedly agree with them.

I am very happy to place in the Appendix of the RECORD this very well written story entitled, "Minnesota's Capable Congressman":

MINNESOTA'S CAPABLE CONGRESSMAN: JOSEPH E. KARTH

(By William Haynes)

Ask any American mother if she wants her son to grow up to be President of the United States and she'll say yes. But ask her if she wants her son to grow up to be a politician and she'll be insulted.

Distrust of politicians and political life is a feeling that runs deep in American society—yet many of our Presidents have had long and honorable careers in politics before they assumed the Presidency. And countless dedicated men and women have served the Nation in less conspicuous but also vitally important political positions, in local communities, in the States, and at the national level.

The simple fact is this: You can't have good government in a free nation unless individual citizens of integrity are willing to give up their private careers and enter the political arena. For those that do, the risks are great and the rewards of public service are often long in coming. Why then, do they do it?

Ask a man like JOE KARTH of Minnesota, why he entered politics and he'll tell you how it happened: how a group of friends and associates prevailed on him to run for the State legislature to help better conditions in their county ("I had no more intention of running for office then—it was 1948—than the Nation had then of sending a rocket to the moon," he says); how he listened to their arguments and became a candidate ("I agreed with them that the legislator we had was not supporting needed programs for the State"); how he lost in his first campaign—and chastened, redoubled his efforts to win 2 years later and embark on a political career that would lead him eventually to Washington, D.C., and stewardship of a key subcommittee in Congress.

In a world he never made, or dreamed of, JOE KARTH has "made it." At age 41, he is chairman of the House Subcommittee on Space Sciences and Applications, and second ranking Democrat on the full committee on Science and Astronautics of the House. He is, perhaps, the youngest subcommittee chairman in Congress—using his full talents to represent his constituents in suburban Ramsey County back in Minnesota and guard the public interest in the Nation's scientific space programs.

A happy combination of capability, conscience, and coincidence brought him there.

CAPABILITY

For capability—take his career in Minnesota and the armed services. He was the international representative for the union of Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers, AFL-CIO. "I handled their arbitration and NLRB cases in a five-state area—as well as helping them negotiate with the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.," he states. "I did general troubleshooting for them also."

He attended the University of Nebraska School of Engineering. After completing 2 years of engineering studies, his education was interrupted by a call to combat duty. During service in Europe, he received a recommendation for a battlefield commission.

He served 8 years (four terms) in Minnesota's State Legislature from 1950 to 1958; was named chairman of the legislature's labor committee, and also served on the tax and game and fish committees. He was voted "outstanding legislator" during the 1958 session. Also in 1958, he was elected permanent chairman of the State Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party Convention, a position he had filled on previous occasions.

During his 6 years in Congress, he has set a standard of accomplishment in his work that is envied by many and matched by few. It's a formidable task simply to understand the complexities of NASA's unmanned and scientific space programs, but JOE KARTH has gone beyond this. Keeping his eyes firmly on the public interest, he has analyzed and studied both long- and short-range objectives of the NASA programs and played a major role by tailoring congressional appropriations for NASA to meet the Nation's needs.

CONSCIENCE

For conscience—take his devotion to good government and his belief that good government and good citizenship mean more than voting once or twice a year. Answering calls to duty has become second nature to JOE KARTH. He did it in the Second World War. He did it when he was called upon to run for the State legislature. And he did it once again when he was asked to solve a party crisis and run for the congressional seat he now holds.

But more than this, he has seen each call in terms of an all-out commitment to the job at hand—and hasn't been satisfied with less than total success. Defeated in his first political campaign, he took stock of the situation, decided he hadn't worked hard enough—and immediately began planning for his second and successful attempt.

As chairman of the Space Sciences and Applications Subcommittee, he has a difficult role. "Other congressional committees," he observes, "can get testimony from scores or even hundreds of witnesses who take positions either for or against the legislation being considered. On the other hand, we on the Space Committee receive only one side of the story. We get witnesses mainly from NASA and some of the contractors on NASA programs. All of the testimony we get is positive and uncritical. There are no witnesses who testify against the space program, for example. Although I am a strong supporter of the national space program, it would still be helpful to hear some dissenting views on some of the projects," KARTH adds.

"The fact that we don't get this kind of testimony," he continues, "means that it's more difficult for us to reach accurate judgments in our hearings on requests for funds. Remember, we get highly sophisticated, scientific testimony—and evaluation is often difficult. The only answer to this problem is that we must exercise independent judgment. To accomplish this, each member of the committee must do a great deal of homework in order to be thoroughly familiar with the space programs. We must maintain and protect our objectivity above all—so that we do not simply become 'yes men' for every request for money. We must never forget that the American public depends on us to make sure that each dollar spent is spent intelligently."

COINCIDENCE

For coincidence—take his nomination for Congress in 1958. EUGENE MCCARTHY, now a U.S. Senator from Minnesota, had decided to give up his seat as Congressman and run for the Senate. KARTH was chairman of the county Democratic Convention that met to choose a successor for MCCARTHY. Recalling the episode, KARTH says: "There was no thought on anybody's part to choose me. We had some good candidates for the job and it was assumed one of them would be chosen. However, a stalemate between two of them developed in the convention—and someone threw my name in without telling me. Then they came to me and asked if I would run. I said no. But they nominated me anyway; I was chosen on the first ballot. I agreed to run and I've never regretted my decision," he concluded.

After winning the election in November 1958, he went to Washington to begin his first term. Here again coincidence played a part in his career. As a freshman Congressman, he was asked what committees he wanted to serve on. His first preference was the Labor and Education Committee, because of his background in labor relations and his strong interest in education. However, another Democratic Congressman from Minnesota was already serving on that committee; to keep an equitable geographical representation, congressional leaders asked KARTH to select another committee. His choice of the Science and Astronautics Committee was a logical development from his interest in engineering studies in college.

RESPECTED BY ASSOCIATES

Today, KARTH stands in that select group of men—some in Government, some in industry—who, by their knowledge, dedication, and experience in their field, have proven themselves worthy of public trust and confidence. His strapping 6-foot, 2-inch frame is now well known on Capitol Hill.

A congressional colleague describes JOE KARTH as an "outspoken legislator whose energy and dedication are mammoth—with a sense of humor that is always welcome during long committee sessions."

Another comment: "Political leaders of both parties have to respect a man like JOE KARTH. In his highly important work he avoids partisanship and is solely an intelligent, informed, hard-working Congressman." He's direct and pulls no punches. His knack for summing up complex problems in simple terms has found an appropriate subject in the scientific space program. He can also use it to sum up his own feelings. How does he like his work? "What I like best about this work is the challenge it offers to do something good and do it properly—and the opportunity to participate in the decisionmaking process," he says.

"The most difficult thing about the whole job is finding adequate time to keep informed about what you should know and what people expect you to know." KARTH, of course, must keep abreast of all current public issues and legislation, not just those in his space specialty. Like most Congressmen, KARTH must maintain two households—one near Washington, D.C., and one in his home district in Minnesota, which includes the city of St. Paul. With his wife, Charlotte, and his three sons, Kevin, 12; Bradley, 6; and Brian, 2½, he lives in Temple Hills, Md., when in Washington. "It's tough to do the job that must be done here in Washington and have enough time to get back home often enough to keep in touch with the voters," he acknowledges. "But I wouldn't exchange this for any other life. I like it better than anything I've ever done."

Here are his observations on the state of the Nation's scientific space programs.

PURPOSE OF UNMANNED SPACE PROGRAMS

"The manned and unmanned space programs should supplement each other and in most cases I believe they do. Let me contrast the reasons for each category of programs. We have manned programs because we want to determine how well man can survive in the rigors of a space environment—and how much contribution he can make in terms of carrying out activities there. For example, our manned programs may involve national security. We may well have a need to develop the ability to inspect alien satellites and spacecraft while they are in flight, and manned programs may be necessary to do this. On the other hand, our unmanned and scientific programs have four major purposes:

1. To explore the far reaches of outer space where man can't at this time anyway, endure the environmental conditions.

2. To find out whether man can exist in these other parts of the solar system; to learn what could be called the variables of existence—what are the effects of the environment on mice, monkeys and other organisms; is there deterioration of cells, and if so, how much.

3. To do things that man can't do and that man is not needed to do, i.e., a communications or a weather satellite system—these missions can be accomplished effectively without man and therefore should be done that way.

4. To support the manned programs: the Ranger, Surveyor, and Lunar Orbiter programs are all intended to get information that will be useful in pointing to answers for design and other problems in the manned programs; to make sure that the manned programs have the best opportunity for success.

"The most practical and sensible way to proceed with space exploration is to find answers to questions about space with simple spacecraft and then use these simple vehicles as forerunners to heavier and more complex vehicles. For example, if the unmanned programs can prove it's feasible for man to survive on a planet such as Mars, we might then begin programs designed to put man on these planets."

INTERPLANETARY PROGRAMS

"I'm not satisfied with our progress in this area. We have a vital need for two things for future planetary exploration programs: more dollars and better planning. There should be carefully planned, long-range objectives in these programs—but there are not. In my opinion, NASA does not have adequately prepared plans for such missions. The plans they have made are redundant, calling most often for more of the same. A well planned program would show a logical progression, e.g., a planned Mariner 66 flight should be designed to gather substantially more information about Mars than the Mariner 64 flight. To make the best use of the launch opportunities over the next 5 to 10 years, the Nation must have well thought out, long lead-time programs.

"NASA is putting most of its eggs in the manned lunar basket. Large slices of the space budget pie go for this purpose because the manned lunar program is the only national priority program. I'm not suggesting we diminish the effort and money we are putting into this manned program—but I am suggesting that we should expand the unmanned programs. They are on a starvation diet now, dollarwise, and this should be corrected as soon as possible. In terms of dollars spent each year, we should increase the money spent for the unmanned space programs by at least 50 percent and perhaps as much as 100 percent to achieve the proper results. The current budget for the unmanned programs is about $750 million a year, while the budget for the manned programs is more than four times as much—over $3 billion. But better planning is necessary, too. Much more could be accomplished, even within current budgetary limitations if some real planning were done. However, NASA is a young agency with a highly technical, extremely complicated task and I'm sure as time goes on, more comprehensive unmanned programs will be offered.

"The need for more dollars is pressing. The unmanned programs are the heart and soul of scientific investigation of outer space and the funding level for them is inadequate."

APPLICATION SATELLITE PROGRAMS

"These are very practical programs that offer the promise of direct benefits to the Nation and to the world. For example, a weather satellite system could help us predict the weather accurately—a benefit worth billions of dollars to the Nation. I think a greater effort might be made in supporting some of these practical programs. Why? It might be because some scientists tend to like more abstract and less realistic projects. Also, in some instances, it may be easier for them to sell abstract ideas for programs rather than practical ones. We need more emphasis on these application satellite programs. They will bring direct benefits to the country long before many of the other programs have their technical payoff.

PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING

"I think we need to build greater public understanding of the scientific and unmanned space programs. However, it's going to be a very slow educational process. You can equate it to the amount of time (2 or 3 years) it took members of congressional space committees themselves to become familiar enough with the programs; and this, of course, was after close association with the programs. There is, naturally, much greater understanding of the manned space programs because they have received 30 to 40 times as much publicity.

"However, I am enthusiastic about public acceptance of the space programs because it is generally good. The public may not fully understand the programs, but they do support them. I anticipate this support will continue.

"I do think if people had their 'druthers' and they could, say, cut a billion dollars from the space program and increase Government spending for something like hospitals by a billion dollars, they would do it. But that's not the way Government appropriations work. These appropriations can't be transferred from one program to another. You can't help one program by cutting another one and I think people understand this now. In any case, cutting spending for space programs would hamper the Nation's economic progress and stifle the extremely useful technical advances the program is producing."

TRAINING OF PEOPLE

"I believe strongly that the Government has a responsibility to help train more highly qualified technical people. Both the military and civilian space programs need these people. In a very realistic sense, you can't keep taking apples from the barrel indefinitely without replacing them. Therefore, I have vigorously supported the NASA university program, which provides for the training of Ph. D.'s in certain key fields. Originally started to train 10 people in each of 10 universities, the program now includes training for more than 1,000 persons. In fact, NASA's goal is to provide 3,000 to 4,000 Ph. D.'s by 1970. Each year I support the NASA program. Another part of this program provides special technical facilities at the universities to give added depth to the training."

INDUSTRY-GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

"These are generally good. I do have one complaint though: too often the Government does research and development work itself—work that could be more effectively done in private industry and university laboratories. I oppose the Government building expensive facilities that duplicate private ones—or that preempt possible private ones.

"Industry applies its experience to getting the most commercial or consumer value out of research and develoment work, and this is what we need to take full advantage of the spinoffs that occur in all major R. & D. programs. The Government does not have the incentive to do this. Another problem with extensive Government research facilities is that much data tends to get stamped 'classified.' This stifles economic progress by preventing industry from making use of possible new techniques.

"I do agree with NASA and the Government, however, in building certain large test facilities. Those such as the Saturn test facility are appropriate for the Government to build because they are so large and so expensive that they cannot be duplicated. If a prime contractor were permitted to build such a facility, it would give that contractor an automatic monopoly on future business involving the need for the facility, and I believe this would be wrong. However, industry certainly ought to invest in test facilities where monopolies would not be created and here the facilities would be competitive and useful for various programs.

"Industry generally does a fine job on the various space programs, but I wish people in industry were more willing to speak up on particular issues. Sometimes it's difficult to get industry's honest opinion on a project or a program because the people involved are afraid to antagonize persons in other organizations, in NASA or perhaps even in Congress. As a Congressman, I want to get objective opinions from industry about various space programs and I have a hard time doing this. We need a little more courage on the part of everyone in the business, I believe."

COMPETITION WITH RUSSIA

"The international competition with the Soviet Union is an important fact of life. It is, and it should be, a vital consideration in the decisions we made about the space program. From the historical point of view, the countries we now consider underdeveloped are the ones who have not advanced scientifically or technologically. They have large numbers of uneducated and sick and hungry people. They have fallen behind in the competition because they have not advanced technically. History also shows that those countries or cultures that did advance technically gained world leadership—and when they rested, they fell from the pinnacle of leadership. From this standpoint alone, it's worthwhile for us to invest this money in space because it's keeping us in the lead in this crucial struggle for world leadership."

John A. Schnittker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of John A. Schnittker as Under Secretary of Agriculture has been warmly received in his home State of Kansas. My own State of Iowa has an interest in this recognition, too, because he received his doctor's degree from Iowa State University in Ames.

I had the personal privilege of association with Dr. Schnittker about 2 years ago in Geneva, Switzerland, where he was representing the U.S. Department of Agriculture at preliminary discussions covering the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

An interesting and informative editoral reviewing Dr. Schnittker's career as student, teacher, and Government official appeared in the April 28 edition of the Manhattan, Kans., Mercury.

The editorial follows:

JOHN A. SCHNITTKER

A young man who began his agricultural career on a Kansas farm near Nashville in Kingman County is now the No. 2 man in the huge U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The brilliant success of 40-year-old John A. Schnittker, newly appointed Under Secretary of Agriculture, comes as no surprise to professors and others who knew him both as a student and faculty member at Kansas State University.

"Everybody recognized John had real ability when he was an agriculture student at Kansas State in the late forties and early fifties," says Dr. Paul Kelley, a Kansas State agricultural economics professor who supervised Schnittker's undergraduate work on a research project.

"He was a topflight, hard-working fellow who, even as a student showed signs of getting ahead, " Kelley recalls.

Most Kansas State people who knew Schnittker as a student remember that he was a leader in college activities both in and out of the classroom. He was an officer in several campus organizations and was president of both his social fraternity and a technical argricultural organization.

Schnittker received a bachelor of science degree in agriculture in 1950 and a master of science in agricultural economics in 1954. Both degrees were awarded by Kansas State University. Later, he received a doctor's degree at Iowa State University, Ames.

Between earning his B.S. and M.S. degrees, friends recall, Schnittker served with the Armed Forces in Korea, farmed near Salina, and sold real estate. The future Uder Secretary joined the Kansas State Agricultural Economics Department in 1933.

During 1958–59 Schnittker was on leave from Kansas State to serve on the staff of the Council of Economic Advisers in Washington, D.C. This group reported directly to the President of the United States on economic policy.

Shortly after John F. Kennedy was elected President, he named Schnittker to head up a nine-man committee to formulate a national wheat program. Later Schnittker was called to Washington again as a consultant to the Secretary of Agriculture. He left Kansas State in 1961 to enter full-time Government service.

In June of last year Schnittker was named Director of Agricultural Economics in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, one of the Nation's top farm jobs. In that position he was key adviser to Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, and administered the Department's economic research and statistical programs. Prior to his appointment, Schnittker had represented the Department in the preliminary discussions at Geneva on the negotiations on general agreements on trade and tariffs.

It's no wonder Schnittker's former professors and colleagues at Kansas State University weren't surprised when he was picked for the No. 2 job in one of the world's largest agencies. John Schnittker had been getting read for it since he was a Kansas farm boy.

The Dangers of Negotiating With the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Zbigniew Stypulkowski, 1 of 16 members of Poland's wartime underground government who were taken from Warsaw to Moscow just before the end of World War II, supposedly for the purpose of negotiating a postwar peace agreement and then jailed by the Soviets on trumped up charges, is visiting Washington this spring. We are particularly fortunate to have him here in America at a time which marks the 20th anniversary of Soviet treachery committed against the Polish underground leaders, who were taken to Moscow, where upon their arrival they were immediately arrested and interned in the infamous Lubianka prison.

Mr. Stypulkowski refused to plead guilty or crack under the Soviet system of psychological brainwashing.

I should like to include at the conclusion of my own remarks a statement issued by Mr. Stypulkowski in observance of his 20th anniversary. I believe his statement is particularly significant and should be called to the attention of all of our Armed Forces since Mr. Stypulkowski is today undoubtedly one of the greatest living authorities on Communist brainwashing techniques. He personally was the victim of these techniques, and the fact that he survived this Communist ordeal is a tribute to his strength and his firm belief in the principles of human dignity.

Mr. Stypulkowski, author of the book, "Invitation to Moscow," presently is representative to the United States of the Polish Consul of Unity, which is stationed in London and continues its resistance to Communist domination of Poland.

On March 28, 1945, when it appeared the Soviet Army would occupy the whole of Poland, the 16 Polish underground leaders were invited by Marshal Zhukov, Supreme Commander of Soviet forces in Poland, to begin negotiations with the Soviets about future relations between the U.S.S.R. and Poland.

Mr. Stypulkowski was a member of the Polish underground movement in Warsaw at that time, and helped organize reisistance through sabotage of Nazi occupation forces.

Marshal Zhukov sent word that his efforts to negotiate with the 16 Polish leaders were authorized by Stalin.

Mr. Stypulkowski and his colleagues contacted by radio the Polish Government in Exile in London for instructions. The Polish Government in Exile in London in turn contacted the United States and British Governments and were told not to reject this "generous gesture by Stalin because it might be the last chance for survival of the Polish nation."

Under this pressure, the Polish underground government in Warsaw accepted Zhukov's invitation but not without their own suspicions. They agreed that to reject the Soviet's overtures would have given Stalin an excellent excuse for erasing Poland from the map and saying that the Poles did not want to negotiate after the war.

Part of the arrangement for negotiations with the Soviet Union was that Zhukov would provide the Polish underground government a Liberator airplane in which the Poles would be flown to London for more thorough consultation with the Polish Government in Exile. However, the agreement was that first the 16 members must come to dinner with Zhukov to demonstrate to the tense Polish population that there was cooperation between the Soviets and the Polish. In the closing days of the war, the Polish population was tremendously uneasy about the presence of Soviet troops within the Polish nation, and the Communists were most anxious to establish an image of friendly relations.

The 16 Polish leaders were advised on March 29 that Zhukov had to visit his headquarters at the advanced Soviet positions, and were requested to fly to his headquarters.

It was only after boarding the Soviet plane and taking off that the Polish leaders realized that they were heading for Moscow. They were told not to be concerned because Zhukov's plans were changed at the last moment and he was in Moscow. Even upon arrival at Moscow the delegation of 16 Polish underground leaders, including Stypulkowski, were received very warmly and with top honors at an airport ceremony. It was not until they arrived at the gates of Lubianka prison that they were told that they were under arrest, imprisoned, and charged with three crimes; First, obstructing Soviet efforts during the war; second, that they were German spies; third, that they were agents for the British and American intelligence.

They were then all exposed to unending cross-examination in Lubianka prison which Stypulkowski describes as Russia's "laboratory of psychological brainwashing."

In the book, "Invitation to Moscow," Stypulkowski has exposed this technique which continues to be used to this day as witnessed by the reports of U–2 pilot Francis Powers, and Prof. Frederick Barghoorn.

Stypulkowski is in the United States in an effort to call attention to the

meaning of these same techniques in relation to developments in the international arena.

Stypulkowski was released by the Soviets in August 1945, after surviving an ordeal of 141 intensive interrogations. His release came after parliaments throughout the world demanded to know what had happened to the 16 Polish underground leaders. The organizing session of the United Nations being held in San Francisco in 1945 was suddenly disrupted when representatives of the Polish Government in Exile demanded to know what had happened to Stypulkowski and his compatriots.

President Roosevelt personally intervened in behalf of the Polish leaders. It was only after this type of world indignation that the Soviets released Stypulkowski and some of his compatriots.

Stypulkowski believes that the free world must understand Soviet psychological warfare techniques in order to properly evaluate the attitudes of the Soviets and China in relationship to Vietnam and the entire Far East.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stypulkowski's statement follows:

STATEMENT ISSUED BY ZBIGNIEW STYPULKOWSKI

(Polish lawyer and one of the 16 members of Polish Underground Government who were kinapped in March 1945, by Soviet authorities and taken to Lubianka prison)

This observance of the 20th anniversary of my illegal arrest by Soviet authorities is not an observance of an anniversary of my personal experience.

It is an observance of a much greater and deeper disclosure to the Western World of the depth of international and political immorality to which the Soviets may reach to accomplish their purposes. Sixteen underground leaders of the Polish State, after having successfully led the nation on behalf of the Allies during World War II, were taken by force and the duplicity of a dishonored assurance of safe conduct by the Soviets, and sent to Moscow to stand trial.

Trial for what? Trial for crimes against the Soviet Union. What crimes? The crime of not surrendering their nation to Russia. This monstrous violation of the integrity of a nation's right to survive is what we witnessed 20 years ago. This knowledge has been ours now for this period of time. Let us not forget this lesson—so that the lesson may not be repeated at your expense next time.

We are observing also the pitiful fate of many of my colleagues who were taken with me to Moscow.

The Western World stood aghast at this obvious attempt to liquidate these 16 leaders by means of legal procedure.

In deference to world opinion, the Soviets magnanimously meted out sentences ranging from a few months to 10 years. The result? Some died in prison while others, when they returned to Poland, were inprisoned again—quietly this time—and the world hears of them no more.

Soviet mission accomplished? Yes. Western World conscience satisfied? Yes.

Is there something to be learned here by nations who still preserve their national integrity? I say yes.

At this time I wish to note that Lubianka prison, where I was incarcerated and subjected to 141 interrogations day and night without breaking down and confessing is the supreme laboratory of Soviet brainwashing techniques. Being the only one who did not confess makes me, I suppose, somewhat of an expert in this field. At least a kind of victim expert.

As a matter of fact, I have written a book upon these experiences hoping to make a small contribution to the world—deeper and broader awareness of Communist brainwashing techniques—techniques transferred from application to the individual to application to whole nations and people. While Lubianka is the laboratory, the world is the field of application for this ghastly science.

Whether it is Russian communism or Chinese communism is irrevelant. The technique is the same and its purpose is but one: "Weaken and destroy the will to resist."

We see this today in Vietnam. All moves have been learned in Lubianka. Exert pressure; make demands that are excessive; intimidate; cajole; extend the hand of friendship and cooperation; make the subject weary of this continual resistance; show him how he can end this struggle, reexert demands; induce in him a belief that continued resistance is impractical, too costly, and senseless. Give him to understand that there is no foreseeable end to the struggle; the future brings nothing but effort, and effort, and ceaseless effort; one has done all that one can; one now deserves that rest one has been promised if only one gives in. Does this sound familiar?

This is what I have personally experienced in Lubianka, and this is precisely what you are experiencing as a nation in Vietnam.

My standing here before you—alive and not broken down—is living proof that it is possible to resist Communist psychological brainwashing, and win. To successfully resist, an individual, like a nation, must have something within him which he loves very much and will not surrender. It may be his sense of personal honor and integrity. It may be his love of country. It may be his religious beliefs. But whatever it is, it must be a positive value without which to him life is nothing.

It must be stronger than the fanaticism and hatred possessed by the enemy. Once the enemy realizes this fact, he is the one who becomes weaker in his determination. Moral courage has shifted the balance in favor of the resister. Now the enemy, feeling this relative weakness of his own, begins to concentrate on ways to develop compromises with his intended victim.

It is good for our Western World to remind itself from time to time of these basic lessons learned from the experiences of these Polish leaders. This, I conceive, is the real and worthwhile purpose of this 20th anniversary observance.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C* — 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa* — 301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn* — 119 7th St. SE.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

No Single Resource Is More Important Than Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 8, 1965, was a very significant day in the history of southeast Texas. On that day, President Lyndon Johnson dedicated the Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir in Jasper, Tex. This 120-foot-high dam and the 114,000-acre reservoir make up the largest fresh water lake in the State of Texas. The thousands of people assembled at the site were welcomed by the senior Senator from Texas, the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH. Following this, President Johnson, speaking by telephone, told of the importance of maximum utilization of our water resources. He also pointed out how especially appropriate it was that the dam be dedicated to our late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn. Others pointed out that it was fitting that the President make the dedication since he has been long noted for his work in behalf of water development for Texas and the Nation and particularly since, as Senator, he had strongly supported this great project in southeast Texas from its inception.

The complete text of the President's remarks follows:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S REMARKS

Hello there, JACK BROOKS and Charlotte, Senator YARBOROUGH, General Free, Bill Weed, and my beloved friend Mrs. Bartlett, this is a very happy and proud occasion for me and for the people of southeast Texas and for the entire Nation.

Having worked with all of you from the earliest beginnings of this project which you are dedicating there today, I deeply regret that the official duties that I have here this weekend make it absolutely impossible for me to join with you this morning in your celebration which I had planned for so long to attend.

JACK and Charlotte have talked to me for several months about this occasion and Lady Bird and I had looked forward to being there and enjoying it with all of you. Perhaps you will give us a raincheck and we can come back another day.

This dam and reservoir fulfill the foresight and the vision of many citizens who saw many years ago the necessity and the opportunity of developing the basin of the Naches and Angeline Rivers. The list is long of private citizens to whom credit is due. Certainly particular credit goes to the energy and the enterprise of your own very able and effective Congressman and my longtime good friend, JACK BROOKS. Day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year, I was almost afraid to meet JACK in the corridors or on the street for fear that he had one more errand that he wanted me to run in connection with this authorization and appropriation. Without the patience, the perseverance, the will, and the determination of Congressman BROOKS, this important achievement might not yet be a reality. He had the support of the Texas delegation, including Mr. Rayburn, your own very able, senior Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH and all the rest of us in doing our little bit to help bring this about, but it is chiefly through his own efforts that it is a monument to him as well as to Mr. Rayburn.

I think it is especially appropriate that this dam should bear the name of that great American—Sam Rayburn.

As Speaker of the Texas House of Representatives, he was a friend of my father when I was born. Later, as Speaker of the House in Congress, Mr. Rayburn became my teacher and my counselor. My personal debt to him is great and I am so proud to be able to participate in perpetuating his memory so appropriately when his sister is able to be present.

Through his lifetime, Mr. Rayburn was a strong and tireless supporter of our Nation's efforts to conserve and to develop the bountifulness with which we are now endowed. This continuing effort, through many generations, has contributed greatly to the strength and success in the challenging years of the 20th century.

No single resource is more important to us than water. Our management of America's water resources is basic to the success in meeting the many obligations and many opportunities of our growing population.

Water has always been a first concern of the Western and Southwestern States. Today, no region of the Nation can afford to take water for granted because from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast, the urbanization and industrialization are creating a mighty and great thirst for water, and more water.

I don't think any of you really know how much you are contributing to the industrialization of your wonderful east Texas area by the attention that you are giving the water resources of that area. And no two men in the entire Congress are more active in water resource legislation than JACK BROOKS and RALPH YARBOROUGH, and I know all Texans are proud of that.

If this thirst is not satisfied by positive and constructive and timely action, we could experience very great trouble in fulfilling the promises and the potentials of American life.

I believe there are at least 10 objectives that we should set for ourselves and we should strive continuously to reach. If you will give me a moment, I would like to point them out:

We must control flooding on our rivers and our streams.

We must assure an ample supply of good water for domestic and industrial and agricultural use.

We must purge our rivers and harbors of pollution.

We must further develop our navigation systems.

We must develop more fully our Nation's great hydroelectric power potential.

We must provide increasingly for water-oriented outdoor recreation of all kinds.

We must be good stewards of our irreplaceable fish and our wildlife heritage.

We must conserve and enhance the grandeur of natural environments and make them more accessible to all of our families of this land.

We must preserve and create beauty throughout the land.

Finally, we cannot afford to approach any part of our overall water resources development program on a single-purpose, or a single-interest basis. If all the requirements that confront us are to be satisfied, none of us can afford to be selfish. We must all learn to share this limited resource to attain the greatest good of the greatest number of people.

"The greatest good for the greatest number" was the personal creed by which Sam Rayburn lived and by which JACK BROOKS and RALPH YARBOROUGH and the rest of us try to work and serve our Nation. That creed is an appropriate and fitting guide for us as we work together in unity to make life better throughout our land, and to make life safer and happier and most hopeful throughout the world.

We of our generation bear a high and a noble trust. The burdens are heavy. The demands are many. But we shall not fail. Where the word of America has been pledged, as we have demonstrated this last week, it will be honored. Where freedom is in danger, it will be defended. Always and forever wherever there is an opportunity to make peace, America will be represented.

So I take great personal pride now in dedicating to the service of the American people and to the strength of the American Nation the Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir.

Thank you my good friends of Texas. I am so sorry I am not there with you now.

Wages and Prices in the Steel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, an interesting and insightful editorial on the special study of wages and prices in the steel industry, as made by the Council of Economic Advisers, was published in the Wall Street Journal of May 7. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS THAT SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES

In unveiling the Council of Economic Advisers' special steel study this week, administration economists denied they were trying to influence the industry's wages and prices. Still, an official conceded, "the facts more or less speak for themselves."

Indeed they do, and not only in the way the official had in mind.

The facts show that the administration, in its effort to cope with inflation, is coming down ever harder on the steel industry. The

CEA even produced a special productivity figure for the industry, using a method it applies nowhere else.

Throwing out the sharp productivity swings associated with strikes and strike threats, the Council estimated that industry's productivity had risen at a 3-percent annual rate during the more "normal" parts of the 1957–64 period. It's a fair inference, a Federal official acknowledged, that Washington therefore thinks the steel industry can boost wages by 3 percent without raising prices.

If the industry does not follow this artificial "guidepost" (are strikes and strike threats in steel really abnormal?), administration officials foresee dire consequences. President Johnson declared that "the prosperity of the whole economy" lies in a wage settlement consistent with the guidepost and "continued overal stability of steel prices."

How did a single industry acquire, in governmental minds at least, such a dominant position? Certainly the steel industry is large and important, but so are automobiles, housing, chemicals and a number of others.

Well, when the administration first came up with its notions about guideposts for "noninflationary" wage and price levels several years ago, it did intend to apply them to everyone. Watching every nook and cranny of our complex economy, however, can be taxing even for a bureaucracy as well developed as Washington's. In any case a number of labor unions, like the United Auto Workers, quickly made it plain that the guideposts weren't going to guide them.

In the circumstances, it was easy for the Government to settle chiefly on policing steel, an industry everybody knew was important. Yet this approach, however convenient it may be, raises large questions of equity and commonsense.

Perhaps the steelworkers should not receive a wage increase larger than 3 percent. But is it equitable to expect them, almost in isolation, to forgo any effort to get more?

As for steel prices, maybe competition would roll back any major increases. But is it fair to expect steel firms, and steel firms almost alone, to forswear forever any effort to sustain the profits they need to generate jobs?

Even if considerations of equity are overridden, the administration's one-industry approach is no assurance of general price stability. Competition has kept steel prices stable since 1959, but that condition hasn't kept consumer prices from going up more than 7 percent.

The reason is that inflation's pressures are not built up by the policies of a single industry but by the policies of Government. And the fact is that, for more than 4 years, Washington has been inflating the supply of spendable funds more rapidly than industry has been able to add to the goods and services those funds can be used to buy.

Though competition up to now has at least limited price increases generally, the economy for some time has been showing signs of overheating. A number of industries already are operating at close to capacity, and shortages of many types of workers are showing up. The Government, however, still seems determined to go on using big budget deficits and artificially easy money to try to push the economy to ever dizzier peaks.

If the administration at the same time continues trying to make the steel industry the principal scapegoat for its own sins, the upshot could be an explosive price inflation in due course. Then, instead of the current kind of official meddling in market prices, dubious as it is, we could perhaps expect direct controls in a futile attempt to dampen inflation's effects.

As that gentleman in Washington said the other day, the facts pretty much speak for themselves.

Serviceable to the Human Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the recent installation ceremonies at Bucknell University marking the inauguration of Charles H. Watt II as the new president were most impressive. The colorful procession of the marshals, the hundreds of delegates from distinguished sister colleges and universities, inspired a thrill and pride in our academic institutions and their continuing progress.

The high moment of the day's ceremonies was the address of President Watts. His message provided assurance that under his guidance Bucknell will maintain the qualities and high standards that have market its development, and a challenge to the future growth and success of this fine university.

I want to share President Watts' excellent presentation with my colleages:

SERVICEABLE TO THE HUMAN RACE

(Inaugural address by President Charles H. Watts II, Bucknell University, May 1, 1965)

The real work of an academic community is neither achieved by ceremony nor conducted in public, and yet, almost alone among the social institutions of our culture, that community has retained the capacity to celebrate itself. It knows the uses of ritual, delights in the colorful symbolism of its several degrees, and is ready at proper moments to interrupt its real business for festive purposes.

This would seem to be such a moment in Bucknell's life, and our gratitude to our many friends who have come to celebrate with us is enormous. For our alumni it is a return to a place and to people greatly loved, and for our colleagues from other colleges and universities a witnesses to common academic purpose, as well as a chance to get off the campus amid the sometimes boisterous rites of spring.

All here assembled will pardon our pride in Bucknell, and indeed will surely share it, reminding us only that what we say here of our hopes for this institution must be measured later, and by others. Our celebration must be by ritual, for the worth of a university is not told in one man's accomplishment or a decade's time. No university catches more than the beginnings of what it does, either in the freshening lives of its students or in the wisdom of its scholars, for both go out from that community to affect the world's course.

We begin again, therefore, in every student and in every moment of scholarly insight, and it is this returning and continuing opportunity which we celebrate today. If we are never done, then our pride we may hope will be without boast, and our senses of satisfaction at the past balanced by our awareness of the effort required by tomorrow.

That I am now part of another beginning rouses great pride within me, and I do with firmness commit my energies to furthering the chartered purposes of this university. Those purposes are large, their achievement an honorable pursuit, and their fulfillment dependent upon a common determination among us all, trustees and faculty, administrators, students, and alumni.

Bucknell's purposes are old and treasured, not different in substance today from what they were more than a hundred years ago. We sought then to enable young men and women to liberate themselves from ignorance, and we seek the same end today. Ignorance of self, of the physical world, of governing law—any one of them limits severely the prospects for wise action. Untutored emotion still threatens sense, and rationally has always become sterile when detached from the ambitions of the spirit. The ambiguities of language, the capacity of words to attract multiple and changing meaning, remain as both delight and barrier in our efforts to speak to one another, even in a time when we are learning to quantify information in ever more subtle ways.

At root, amid changed circumstances, we still seek to lessen the gulf between man's possibilities and his accomplishments. Both seem to have grown, but we do not yet really know whether the gulf has been diminished.

One thing is sure. The amount of information we have about ourselves and our world has radically increased, and someday soon it should be possible to tell whether the possession of nearly total information about himself will really move man to use that information responsibly. There are certain comforts in ignorance, and they are rapidly being taken from us.

Education relieves ignorance, or has always sought to. I suggest that the context in which Bucknell and her sister institutions now seek this familiar end has changed. Release from ignorance in our time brings to the then-informed man greater power than it ever has before, and in that measure lessens his right to use it irresponsibly. If our colleges and universities are to remain useful agents of social change, as they have been in the past, this lesson must be taught above all.

Irresponsibility is a privilege only the powerless dare for long assume, and even then its effects are corrosive. Power tomorrow's children will have aplenty. Acceptance of the moral imperative that with knowledge comes the responsibility of right use of knowledge must characterize the years to come, and the education of the men and women who will direct that society.

If we do not accept this challenge, then we will make of education little more than an increasingly complex process of gulping down more and more information. If we do accept it, then we must study to find the proper ways in which a man's increase in knowledge is conjoined with his willingness to put it to good use.

We have long said that a liberating education is more than training, much more than the accumulation of data, and we have believed that education has a moral and ethical dimension. We must make that dimension real, to ourselves and to our students, at a time when encompassing even a portion of the new knowledge which floods upon us seems task enough.

I am not talking of moral platitudes. I am talking about the kind of moral judgments which are beaten out, not in the absence of the real world and its problems, but precisely in the midst of careful understanding of what those problems are.

There is for all of us great hope in the fact that numbers of our students readily accept this kind of responsibility. They do wish to have an effect upon the world, and their impatience before the fact that the world's problems are not susceptible to ready solution is not improper. Far worse would be cynical abstention from a world they believed not susceptible at all to moral judgment.

We will have failed if it proves tomorrow that we have turned out two kinds of students, neither understanding the other.

The one may be the informed manager of the great complexities of our corporate society, ready to cope with esoteric data and the involved machinery of a technological age. The other may be the passionate man who, with deep belief in the worth of the individual and great anger before social injustice, rough-handedly attempts to apply simplistic solutions to complex problems.

We will have succeeded if we can instill in the corporate manager a sense of broad social responsibility, and in the reformer a real acquaintance with the intricate facts and techniques whereby men and their environments may be bettered.

There surely has never been before a time when what may be done in a strong university has had more immediate relevance to more phases of our national life. A literate and moral citizenry is no luxury in our century, and that society which today hampers the development of new knowledge or prevents its rapid assimilation condemns itself to reflexive action tomorrow.

We are, as a people, increasingly willing to grant a central place in our society to our colleges and universities. We do not resist the new knowledge revealed there; we expect it and inquire into its usefulness, even if its application may disturb long-held assumptions and familiar modes of thought and action. If, as has been suggested, innovative change itself will be the prime characteristic of our world tomorrow, then it is my impression that—particularly among our young people—tomorrow has already been accepted.

They have a better notion of what their lives will require of them than many suspect. I find them neither frightened nor complacent, respectful of intellectual, moral, and verbal clarity, and not only responsive to new information but responsible in its use. They work extraordinarily hard as a rule, and regularly sustain tensions which were uncommon not long ago.

Furthermore, they seem to believe what we have said about the relevance of their collegiate experience. Often the protests they organize are mounted against ills we have not found ways to cure. They fight anonymity on one coast and restrictions upon academic freedom on the other. The central purposes and methods of our academic institutions themselves are coming under their interested gaze, and well they might, for higher education in America is in the midst of profound structural change.

The capacity of any organization to adapt itself to new demands, and to new knowledge, without losing its heritage, is a sign of its strength. While new collegiate and university structures are evident everywhere—from the elaboration of the community college idea to the birth of the multiversity—it is critical that those institutions bearing older and more traditional forms examine themselves carefully, lest in cherishing their past too closely they forfeit their future.

Bucknell cherishes its past, believes its old purposes still valid amid changed circumstance, and seeks confidently proper form for its future. The evolution through which we have gone in recent years provides, I believe, the right foundations for its development. The characteristics of that future form will draw from Bucknell's past achievement, and bring its present strength into greater usefulness.

Bucknell must protect its liberal heritage, be respectful of truth and aware that its edges are sharp, and stand ready to protect that freedom of inquiry from which the truth is most likely to evolve. Such freedom will be more difficult to maintain tomorrow than today, for our involvement with our society will be more complex, and our judgments upon it less distant.

It must meet soberly its task as a conservator of the past, seeking that historical perspective upon the present which is most revealing. Few tasks are more important in a mobile, changing society, and few are more difficult.

It must not only attend to new information and knowledge; its faculty and students must participate actively in their development. Only then will the student sense the real excitement of discovery, and only if he completes his course amid such discovery will he be prepared for the continuing explosion of knowledge in which he must live.

It must somehow cherish both the toughness and the fragility of each man's soul, nurturing to strength his capacity to make moral judgments and ethical distinctions. The informed man lacking conscience scarcely serves even himself, and the man who refuses to judge himself or his world because all the evidence is not yet in, harms both.

It must draw the years of the undergraduate and the life of the teaching scholar into useful partnership, in helping to inform the institution's future course. If the concept of a university as a community of scholars is a visionary one, it is still better than the fragmented alternative of time-serving students up against intermittently resident faculty, both besieging a sterile administration.

It must recognize that the process of education resists neat packaging into either courses or classrooms, that it is continuous and rarely orderly, occurring in the residence halls and at dusk quite as often as at high noon in the laboratory. Unless the values and attitudes of the seminar and library receive reinforcement in the life lived by the students, they will quite naturally fail to carry them beyond our cloisters, where the world is seldom so nicely structured.

These are the precepts, I should think, to which we might properly attend. If we hold to them strongly, they may make possible here the emergence of an unusual structure, one which—drawing upon the best of the university world, and sustaining the virtues of the collegiate—seeks its own, new ways.

President Spalding has rightly identified its outlines as those of a liberal university.

Whatever its name—liberal university, university-college, or liberal arts university—my belief is that it may serve our emerging society in ways as profound as the college structure has served less complex areas, for it seeks the same humane goal, that intimacy between student and scholar which makes for great teaching. It should effectively complement the vital activities of the great universities chiefly committed to research, for both its scholars and its students will themselves seek new knowledge. And it may well aid our enlarging and critical systems of State institutions, which must bear the desperate burden of educating the great majority of our young men and women, for its curricular innovations should develop more effective modes of pedagogy.

One of our great blessings is our freedom to shape Bucknell in ways which may appear best to us. Attendant to such freedom is our responsibility to plan for our future in ways which are not selfish, but reveal our effort to share in the solution of new problems brought to higher education by our changing world. No institution may with impunity isolate itself from its society, and Bucknell seeks, in its development, to be deeply involved in the affairs of its community and our Nation.

That desire, however, need not lead us to thoughtless emulation of others, nor should it force us to undertake tasks which others may better perform. We will hope to be ourselves.

If we choose to remain of moderate size, it is because we seek an internal coherence which mitigates the effects of necessary specialization.

We would avoid fragmenting either the faculty or the student body. Only the collective wisdom of the former, brought to bear upon university problems, can keep the institution whole, and only a sharing of disparate experience can make whole men and women of our students. The world has never more needed men and women capable of speaking the tongues of several disciplines, and perhaps the best chance for such dialog lies where numbers, but not variety, may be limited. The poet will never be physicist, nor the engineer an historian, but unless institutional ways are found for them to talk with one another about more than the generalities about which none of them knows anything, each will be less. Call it an attempt at institutional synthesis, if you will: it is what a university-college can do well.

If we choose to expand upward through graduate levels our areas of faculty competence and curricular planning, it is because we believe the old distinctions between graduate and undergraduate performance are lessening. They have, in any case, never been more than academic bookkeeping. Where should we mark the achievement of real literacy in our times? At the limits of each separate student's competence and motives, which may be far beyond the baccalaureate level. When should a great teacher cease being a student of his discipline? When he has in scholarly effort wrung himself dry, not at the awarding of some degree.

Amid expanding knowledge, each of us may be an explorer, faced with no curricular endstop. We will work here, as our resources permit, to provide scholarly challenge to the brightest applicant, and scholarly opportunity to the most creative member of our faculty: it is something a university-college can do.

If we seek in all who would work or study here more than measured brightness, the testimony of board scores or of up-piled monographs, it is because such proofs do not tell us all we wish to know. The very intimacy of our institution requires the seeking and flexible mind, as well as the accomplished one. The capacity for friendship itself we respect, if it is not sentimental, for it carries charity with it. High energy, toughmindedness, and a commitment to the delights of intellectual achievement, when shared by student and scholar alike, may cause us all to seek the outer limits of our ambitions: again, it can occur in a university-college.

We will work out together our course for tomorrow. We are excited by its possibilities and not awed by the fact that we must find new ways to sustain our old purposes.

Our gratitude and respect for the men and women who have preceded us is couched in pride. They have brought Bucknell to a threshold, one of great promise. We can never know the strains of their labors, but we can accept the responsibilities which their success brings to us. This is a quiet valley, but we mean to make sure that the sounds raised here are heard in the distance, certain they will tell, as Stephen Taylor hoped at our first commencement, that the people and thoughts of Bucknell are indeed serviceable to the human race.

The Role of the Individual in Upholding the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I call to the attention of the membership of the House

an essay written by one of my constituents, Tommy Christian, who is a student at Rossville High School, Rossville, Ga.

This essay won second place in the Law Day contest conducted by the Chattanooga Bar Association:

THE ROLE OF THE INDIVIDUAL IN UPHOLDING THE LAW

(By Tommy Christian, Rossville High School)

Today in our free civilized society each individual has certain undeniable rights and privileges guaranteed to him by the Constitution. Many wars were fought and many lives were given for the securing and continuation of these liberties.

Although these liberties are guaranteed to every citizen, they are not absolute, that is, no one can say or do anything anywhere or anytime that he wishes. As someone once said, "One's right to stretch ends where his neighbor's nose begins."

In all societies, to protect these freedoms and privileges, laws are necessary. Laws are, according to Webster's "all the rules of conduct established and enforced by the authority, legislation, or custom of a given community or other group." Laws then, are rules made by a society for the conduct and behavior of its members. These rules were established mainly for the protection of the citizen's rights and privileges.

What is the duty, the responsibility, of the individual citizen of a community in upholding and obeying the law? Before one can truly obey and uphold the law he must take certain things into account. First, he must agree that law is necessary. Secondly, he must agree that laws are made for the protection of all and not for just a few. Next, he must have a well-developed sense of responsibility. Finally, he must have respect for himself as well as for others.

Each individual should do his best to uphold and obey the laws and statutes of his community, State, and Nation; for when laws fail, justice fails, and when justice fails, freedom fails. The failure of freedom means the loss of one's rights and privileges, just as certain as night is night and day is day.

Knowing these things, why should anyone refuse to accept the role of upholding and obeying the law? The main reason, I believe, is expressed in this very common statement "I don't want to get involved." Get involved. Is the protection of one's life, his home, and his liberties, getting involved? There are many cases on record of citizens, who although fully aware that a law was being broken, refused to do anything about it. Their excuse was, "I don't want to get involved." If everyone felt this way, our entire system of life would collapse. If everyone believed in the old adage "every man for himself" then we would be no better off than the caveman of ages past. We would have no system of government, and no well-balanced society such as we know today. Anytime that a group of civilized people gather to form a society, some system of cooperation is needed. Without cooperation, no progress can be made, and without progress, a society can hardly be expected to endure.

Our great Nation was founded on the basis of cooperation for mutual benefit. Our ancestors worked together to build—to build homes, to build a government, to build a nation. This involved the observation of the laws and rules which they, themselves, had set down as the pattern for their lives.

In this modern age, our lives are ruled by the laws which we established for our own benefit. Without these laws our lives would compare to a car without a driver. We need laws to guide us as well as to protect us.

Every citizen should consider it his duty to respect, obey, and uphold the law. Failure to do so means the downfall of our organized system of society.

Preserving the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Citizens Committee To Preserve Taft-Hartley, a national organization headquartered in Washington, D.C., inserted a full-page advertisement in the Washington Post on May 4, 1965.

The purpose of the advertisement was to for public opinion to support retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. It was entitled "Keep the Taft-Hartley Act Intact and Protect Fundamental American Rights."

As I read the advertisement, Mr. Speaker, I was delighted by the high aims of this group of citizens. I read that the committee sought to "safeguard an employee's right to make a free choice regarding union membership." Further, I found that the committee was working to prevent serious weakening of "the fundamental right of every American to work in his chosen occupation."

What American could deny that these are desirable goals? Impressed by these statements, I read further. An interesting statement of the beliefs of the committee was presented:

> We believe that good labor-management relations depend upon the proper balancing of the rights of individual wage earners, labor organizations, and employers, so that the interests of all are served.
>
> We believe that the Taft-Hartley Act helps to achieve this balance by placing reasonable restraints on the powers of each group involved.

Finally, the committee stated that the President and the Congress should stand firm against pressures to reduce the effectiveness of the Taft-Hartley Act.

As I read the advertisement, I wondered who are these fine businessmen who are willing to stand up to be counted publicly on the side of the American workingman and to defend him against all sorts of unlawful abuses? What forward looking men they must be who pledged themselves to protect an important Federal law regardless of the consequences, and who felt that they had a duty to "protect fundamental American rights."

I must confess that I was shocked, Mr. Speaker, at the very first name heading the list of 34 active committeemen. It was none other than Mr. A. D. Davis, president of the Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., cochairman of the committee.

I recognized the name of this company, Mr. Speaker, because it was involved in a Federal court action in the city of Cincinnati in my district just 9 weeks ago. The court action involved the findings against the Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., made by the National Labor Relations Board that the company was guilty of unfair labor practices, and that it had violated the Labor Management Relations Act, otherwise known as the Taft-Hartley Act.

The National Labor Relations Board—143 NLRB No. 848—had found that the Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., was guilty of four charges of unfair labor practices. The company had:

First. Illegally refused to bargain with employees.

Second. Illegally demanded that employees should provide the company with statements given under protection of the law by the employees to investigators from the National Labor Relations Board.

Third. Illegally interrogated employees as to their desire for a union.

Fourth. Illegally threatened reprisals against employees, including the threat to close the store if the employees there voted for a union.

These are very serious findings, Mr. Speaker, which were made by the National Labor Relations Board, a Federal Government agency set up to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act and to prevent abuses to both employers and workingmen.

The Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., refused to abide by the finding of unfair labor practices by the NLRB, and would not respect its working people as bargainers for wages. It was necessary for Mr. Arnold Ordman, General Counsel for the NLRB to bring the Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., before the U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth District, Cincinnati, for trial. The case is known as the National Labor Relations Board against Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc. and Winn-Dixie Louisville, Inc., and was decided on February 27, 1965, just 9 weeks ago.

Were the Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc. guilty of unfair labor practices as charged? The U.S. court of appeals agreed with the NLRB and sustained the findings against the company.

First, did Winn-Dixie illegally refuse to bargain with employees? The court said:

> We find substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole to support the holding of the Board (concerning procedures requesting bargaining) and that respondents (Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc.) violated Section 8(a) (5) and (1) of the act (the Taft-Hartley Act) in refusing to bargain with the union.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, does this sound like an attempt to "keep Taft-Hartley Act intact and protect fundamenal American rights"?

Second, did Winn-Dixie illegally demand that employees should provide the company with statements given under protection of the law by employees to the NLRB?

The court said:

> We approve the following language of the Board's decision on this point.

The Board was concerned that if the employers "knew of the employees' statements to them, what they contained, or how the union was viewed, it would exert an inhibitory effect on the employee's willingness to give a statement at all or disclose all of the matters of which he has knowledge for fear of saying something that might incur the employer's displeasure and possible reprisal," and issued orders to Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., to cease its activities in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, does this charge bear out the advertisement's statement that the committee—of which Mr. Davis is cochairman—and the members of it desired to "safeguard an employee's right to make a free choice regarding union membership"?

Third, did Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., illegally interrogate employees as to their desire for a union? The U.S. court of appeals says it did, and that it should not have interfered in—

Matters of union membership (discussion of) the nature of extent of union activity, or (the dissuasion of) employees from joining or remaining members of a union or otherwise to interfere with the statutory right to self-organization.

Mr. Speaker, does this finding bear out the statement of the committee—of which Mr. Davis was cochairman—and its members that it is in favor of placing reasonable restraints on the powers of each group involved?

Fourth, and last, did Winn-Dixie illegally threaten reprisals against employees, including the threat to close the store if the employees there voted for a union? If Winn-Dixie did, then it is guilty of a dastardly action, threatening reprisals against a group which cannot defend itself, and which fears that its very means of livelihood might be taken away. The court said:

We find substantial evidence on the record supporting the Board's conclusion that respondents violated section 8(a)(1) (of the Taft-Hartley Act) by interrogation and threats of reprisal, including a threat to close the Owensboro store in event a majority of the employees authorized the union to become their bargaining representative.

Does this square with the assertion of Mr. Davis, as a member of the committee, that he desires to assure the fundamental right of every American to work in his chosen occupation?

Can it be said, Mr. Speaker, that it was only one store of a number of stores owned by the Winn-Dixie Co., Inc., which did these dastardly things, and that Mr. Davis, as president of the company cannot be connected with the action of one of its stores?

No, Mr. Speaker, as the U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth District, Cincinnati said:

The parent corporation, respondent Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., is liable together with its susidiary for the unfair labor practices found with respect to the Owensboro store.

It further said that:

The respondents have common officers, directors, and operators; that the common directors and operators formulate and administer a common labor policy for both respondents; that the same directors sit as the ultimate managerial authority for both the parent and subsidiary; and that the basic labor relations policy of the subsidiary emanates from the headquarters of the parent corporation in Jacksonville, Fla.

In order to realize the extent of the dangers inherent in the actions of the Taft-Hartly busting company known as Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., it must be realized that this is a giant corporation, for as the U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth District, Cincinnati, said:

Respondent Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., a Florida corporation, operates through subsidiaries or divisions some 600 retail food supermarkets in the southeastern part of the United States.

And so we have the whole sorry story, Mr. Speaker. It is a story of harsh, unprincipled, abusive breaking of the Taft-Hartley Act by a company whose president now serves as a cochairman of a "National Committee To Keep the Taft-Hartley Act Intact and Protect Fundamental American Rights."

It is a sad day indeed, Mr. Speaker, when a company which has broken a national law, and unlawfully abused its employees, piously preaches about preserving a law it has so flagrantly violated, and about protecting the rights and interests of the American workingman. This sorry incident may well serve as a warning to the Members of this House that not all those who proclaim their devotion to the rights of the individual workingman, and to his right to work, deserve either the respect or attention of the Nation.

Southeast Asia's Chance for Peace: A Thai View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of May 9, 1965, an interesting speech delivered by the Foreign Minister of Thailand, Thanat Khoman, at a recent meeting of the Council of Ministers of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization in London.

The speech, which I am sure will be of substantial value to all Members of Congress, follows:

SOUTHEAST ASIA'S CHANGE FOR PEACE: A THAI VIEW

(NOTE.—As assessment of the dangerous situation in southeast Asia and particularly the United States role there is contined in this speech by Thailand Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman. It was delivered last Monday to the Council of Ministers of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization in London.)

Ever since the Second World War came to an end, southeast Asia has enjoyed little if any peace. While legitimate nationalistic aspirations have led subjugated peoples to merge as free and independent nations, other aggressive and expansionist forces have relentlessly been at work attempting to exert their influence and to bring these new entities within their orbit of authority.

The main attacks were directed against the former colonial territories, hitherto known as Indochina, probably because their former rulers, failing to realize the deep yearnings of the subjected peoples to be masters of their own destiny, overstayed their welcome until they met with a military disaster in the battlefield of an unknown little spot in Vietnam, Dien Bien Phu, which since then has been glorified as a landmark of victory for liberty over the unenlightened form of western colonialism. The results of that famous battle made the position of the then colonial rulers untenable and the latter had to bow to the inevitable. The 1954 Geneva Conference was then called to arrange for their more or less honorable exit from the scene they dominated for so long.

SEEDS OF THE TROUBLE

As that international conference closed its doors, it was clear that while a few nations were in effect ushered into a new life of insecure independence, more substantial gains went to an ambitious and ruthless group who, from the very beginning, nurtured the design of supplanting the retiring colonial regime with their own new form of colonialism, the Communist colonialism, which is even more exacting and more destructive of liberty. Thus the triumph of freedom was less real than it was made to appear. In fact, as a result of the 1954 Geneva agreements, the frontiers of the Communist empire rolled further southward to the 17th parallel, while to the west, the unlawful Communist occupation of northern Laos continued and was later expanded despite provisions to the contrary of the same agreements.

Thus the seeds of present troubles in southeast Asia, particularly in South Vietnam and Laos, must be traced to the past neglect and colonial mismanagement as also to the Geneva agreement of 1954, which by legally sanctioning a Communist state in North Vietnam gave the Communist powers a convenient base for further expansion. To many who attended that fateful conference on Indochina, a clear realization dawned unmistakably that the Communists would not be content with their new acquisitions but were bent upon extending then further almost without limits. Hence the necessity of trying to stem the Communist expanionist tides and this was how our organization came into being.

From its inception, SEATO inherited a burdensome legacy of deep division, of instability and notably of boundless rapacity of nearby countries to gobble up their neighbors. Nevertheless, it bravely assigned to itself the momentous task of resisting further Communist aggression through collective means of defense. The first real challenge came some 6 years later when Communist aggressors, seeking a more convenient access for their infiltration into South Vietnam threatened to overrun Laos. SEATO, then, racked by incohesion and undermined from within, hesitated and faltered. Evidently the organization was not up to its task. The responsibility therefore had to be shifted to another Geneva conference in which Communist powers also took part. With proper perspective, the outcome of that conference which some naively thought to be the pattern of peace for southeast Asia and perhaps for the world, could be now more properly assessed. The Communist elements which, as a result of the Geneva agreements of 1962, secured a legal foothold in the coalition government of Laos, as could be expected, were not satisfied with the gains they had made there. Consequently, holding that Laos was only a secondary target which would be easily taken if the main target were to fail, they escalated their campaign of terrorism as well as their military activities in South Vietnam in the hope of delivering what they thought to be the "coup de grace" to South Vietnam which they have always held to be their primary objective of colonial expansion.

On this occasion, I should like to pay the respectful tribute of the Thai Government and people to the gallant men and women of South Vietnam and the United States who gave their lives to uphold the cause of peace and freedom in South Vietnam. May I add how heartening it is to us all the decision of the Government of Australia to send a contingent of Australian forces into South Vietnam.

Although South Vietnam is actually a protocol state placed under this Organization's protective umbrella at the insistence of its former colonial rulers, SEATO has shown little, if any, ability to deal with the

emergency. In fact, had it not been for the willingness of a member of this Organization, the United States, to assume responsibility and to accept sacrifices for the defense of South Vietnam, that nation may well have long been lost to the Communist aggressors.

As we meet here today, I hope none of us will fail to realize how crucial the struggle in Vietnam is and that the outcome will transcend the borders of that country and is bound to affect not only southeast Asia but the entire free world.

What, then, can this Organization do?

Obviously our duty is not, and cannot be, to borrow that famous expression, "to preside over the liquidation" of either South Vietnam, or, for that matter, of free southeast Asia, in favor of the Communists. Rather, we are committed, singly and collectively, to defend southeast Asia against Communist aggression and to help keep that region free.

RESISTING COMMUNISTS

For that purpose, what is needed is much less good advice or wise counsels, which have been flowing rather liberally and gratuitously during these past few years, as a firm determination to resist Communist encroachments and the willingness to take necessary risks and even to accept sacrifices. To some, the price may seem too high and they may prefer to retreat rather than to stand firm. But these are the people who have not learned and will probably never learn the lessons of history and today they may be the same as those who, 30 years ago, failed to take appropriate measures when a few ill-equipped Hitlerite divisions moved into the Rhineland. In so doing they made the Second World War become a certainty and paved the way for a terrible holocaust in which more than 20 million human beings were immolated. They should be responsible, if not before the law but in their conscience for this grievous and utterly purposeless loss. Across the Atlantic, these people are known as "doves" who claim to be the apostles of peace. In fact, by bowing to the aggressors and allowing the latter to fortify themselves with the flesh and blood of their victims, they are deserting and even betraying the cause of peace. If we allow them, these apostates who bear in their conscience the responsibility for the loss of so many human lives will again send even more millions of people to their doom.

APPEASEMENT WON'T WORK

Though we live far away from Europe, therefore less likely to profit from the wisdom of that continent, we profoundly realize that nowadays, as in the past, no peace can be bought by sacrificing a free nation, be it South Vietnam or southeast Asia or, for that matter, any other nation in the world. On the contrary, the chances for an enduring peace will become greater if we can see to it that aggressions against free nations, either in overt or convert form, will not be profitable. Rather we should make it clear beyond doubt that those who commit them will be made to pay dearly for their mischiefs. Only thus can southeast Asia, Europe, and indeed the whole world enjoy peace and tranquility.

THAILAND'S ROLE

In so saying, let it be well understood that there are no warmongers in my country. We are too close to the scene of battles not to know that should a large scale conflict break out in the area, Thailand, as other nearby nations, could hardly enjoy immunity from the effects of such a conflict. That is why, perhaps more than many other nations, the Thai Government and people have every reason to work for a peaceful solution to the existing problems, rather than allowing the present tense situation to drift toward an armed conflict. We indeed prefer, as President Johnson so generously suggested, to see the resources of our nations devoted to the improvement of human welfare and to the realization of man's age-old hope for a better future than to be expended for the killing of other men. For after all, what the Thai people desire most is not to have their names inscribed on a war memorial, but live their lives as free men and to be able to shape their own destiny. However such a desire for peace and constructive approach to international problems have not been reciprocated, and every gesture of conciliation and reasonable solution is taken as a sign of weakness and met with arrogant aggressiveness from the Communists. Thailand, in effect, has recently been openly threatened with guerrilla warfare within its territory.

MUST FACE CHALLENGE

Under these circumstances, there remain few if any other alternative but to face the challenge to our free and independent existence with determination.

At this grave hour, the Thai nation hopes that its friends and allies, as well as other free peoples, realize that Thailand's future as that of southeast Asia will also have a deep bearing on their own freedom and well-being. If we fail to close our ranks we will be encouraging the actual or potential aggressors to become bolder to the point of plunging the world into a hostility which none of us desires. By remaining firm and resolute, the risks we are taking are infinitely smaller than the ones we may face later, if through lack of conscious realization and indecision, we choose the temporary expedient of yielding to threats and retreat. Let the name of that south German town, Munich, be a constant reminder to us all that appeasement is still the surest way of losing peace.

Joint Congressional Committee Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the special Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress opened its hearings in the old Supreme Court chamber in the Capitol Building.

Members of Congress will be heard over the next two weeks if they so desire to appear before the joint committee.

As cochairman of this committee I am submitting the statement made by me at the opening hearings:

OPENING STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN, COCHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Congress acted wisely when it authorized this joint congressional committee to hold hearings and make recommendations on streamlining and modernizing the legislative procedures of both branches of the U.S. Congress.

On only one occasion in modern history of our Government has this legislative step been taken, and that was over 20 years ago when Congress passed the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The LaFollette-Monroney joint committee was primarily responsible for this act. We are, indeed, fortunate to have Senator MIKE MONRONEY as a cochairman of this joint congressional committee, since he was in 1946 a Member of the House and the cochairman, along with Senator LaFollette, of the earlier committee.

The LaFollette-Monroney committee made a remarkable contribution to the functions of Congress by reducing the permanent committees of the House from 48 to 18. It also made a number of other valuable recommendations that were adopted in both Houses. Some of the changes adopted through the recommendations of the LaFollette-Monroney committee have not been implemented and others have been outgrown by reason of population explosion and the numerous additional functions assumed by the Congress. Certainly some of the duties we have today never even occurred to the Members in 1946.

But at that time the Members did not nor could not realize that the next 20 years would bring about a fantastic scientific advancement of modern office inventions, computer systems and work-saving devices, most of which were totally undreamed of during the days of World War II.

For example, in 1965 our annual budget has risen to approximately $100 billion and our gross national product in 20 years has increased from $220 billion to approximately $660 billion. (Secretary Dillon predicted that figure would be reached by the end of 1965.)

After the long program of hearings which this committee is scheduling, additional recommendations on organizational and legislative procedures will, no doubt, be made which the House and the Senate will adopt in order to carry out the intentions for which this joint committee has been organized.

I predict this committee, in its report, will make recommendations to the various governmental departments, including the Bureau of the Budget, to forward systematically to the desk of each Congressman and Senator, a simple abbreviated breakdown of all appropriations properly bracketed as to "purpose for expenditures" so that each Congressman can understand the purposes for every dollar appropriated in our annual gigantic budget of around $100 billion.

The committee can also explore the advisability of saving time on lengthy and tedious rollcalls and quorum calls by the possible installation of modern electrical systems for that purpose. For example, a 5-hour congressional day and a 35-minute average for rollcalls or quorum calls will waste approximately 70 congressional days in a 12-month session of the Congress.

Possible recommendations, after testimony is taken, could be worked out for simplifying and reducing the cumbersome subcommittee system which has expanded beyond reason in some of the House and Senate committees.

The inexcusable and extravagant time which has been wasted on unnecessary filibusters, some of which extend to 2 or 3 months, can also be reviewed by this committee in order to save the time of both Houses and the expense to the taxpayers.

Also some recommendations seem appropriate to develop a system whereby committees can begin work immediately after the convening of a new session of Congress. By so doing, the House can proceed to act upon legislation within a few weeks after the convening of Congress.

The committee could explore the advisability of establishing a code of ethics, eliminating fabulous campaign expenses, conflict of interest of Members, and numerous other areas which could eventuate a great saving to the American taxpayer.

Our forefathers, in the colonial days, decided on a 2-year term for the Members of the House of Representatives. Since that time, practically all offices on city, county, and State level have been extended to 4-year terms. The committee could explore this angle progressively and if the Congress saw fit, it could, under its own authority and jurisdiction, adopt a recommendation for an amendment to the Constitution extending the term of Members of the House of Representatives to 4 years. When a Member is sworn into office in January, after his November election, he is then within 12 months of another campaign and a great deal of his time and money is spent on and wasted in

an almost round-the-clock campaign for reelection under the 2-year term provision.

Our workload here in Congress has increased because of the fantastic economic growth and expansion which has taken place within this great Nation of ours, and the tremendous responsibilities that have been placed upon our Nation by our position as leader of the free world. We have met our responsibilities here in Congress but only by increasing the workday and the length of our sessions. This has often meant neglecting some of our other duties with regard to office work and constituent requests, and most particularly it leaves little time to visit our congressional districts.

Thus, this bipartisan committee has the tremendous task of studying the organization and operation of the Congress. Its task is to make recommendations that will help to strengthen the Congress so that it may better meet its responsibilities as one of the three coequal branches of our Government. When one looks at the many timesaving devices that have been adopted by our large corporations and other institutions in the era since World War II, one cannot help but wonder if many of the new automatic and electronic office and auditing devices could not be adapted to our use. I would hope that this joint committee, after conducting thorough and exhaustive hearings, will be in a position to make recommendations to our respective Houses that will enable Congress to fulfill its responsibilities more efficiently and economically.

There have been a great many proposals made concerning the reform of Congress in the last few years both within and outside this body. In the proceedings commencing today we shall undoubtedly hear many of these repeated and even some new ones suggested. We, of this committee, have the duty to investigate all these possible avenues of reform in detail. After due deliberation we shall have the opportunity to make recommendations that will enable us to save the taxpayers millions of dollars and insure for the future that the Congress of the United States will remain the greatest legislative body in the world.

Remarks Made by President Lyndon B. Johnson to the Building Trades Council, Washington, D.C., May 3, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following remarks made by President Lyndon B. Johnson to the Building Trades Council on May 3 in Washington, D.C. The President's words constitute an inspiring message for all Americans.

Mr. Hagerty, members of the Building and Construction Trades Department, friends from the Building and Construction Trades Department, ladies and gentlemen, I knew you were meeting today and I wanted very much to come over and drop in and give you a word of welcome and say howdy and thank you. But when I looked at my schedule and saw the cables that were being brought to my desk I did not see how in the world I could make it. Then I got a telegram. It wasn't about repealing 14b, although I know that is important to you, and it is important to me. It wasn't about the various legislative proposals which you are interested in, important as they are. It was about the most vital issues in this country, and for that matter, in the whole world, which are peace and freedom.

So I have stolen these few minutes to come over here just to say thank you. Thank you for saying to the world that this Nation of ours, the United States of America, speaks in unity with one voice from one heart. Thanks to you for saying that we believe in freedom and we believe in peace. Thanks to you for saying that we will not buy peace at the price of losing freedom anywhere, anytime, in the world. Thanks to you for saying that American labor, the champions of freedom here at home, knows that freedom's frontiers are today in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, where both are under attack.

So thank you for putting first things first, for being leaders of the free America today, for being, even before that, the leaders of America herself, and before I overlook it, I want to thank you for what we did last November.

As citizens you must be proud of the fact that you are the builders of America. You know what it is to make something rise with toil and sweat and effort. The product of your labor is not just buildings, and not just homes, and not just monuments. The product of your labor is the face of America itself throughout all of the world.

We have seen that face change many times, you and I. We have worked through the darkness in distressing periods. We have worked through the depression, or at least wanted to work during the depression.

We have worked through the challenge of conflict through the prosperity of an uneasy peace.

We share in the legacy of great American leaders, from Franklin Delano Roosevelt to John Fitzgerald Kennedy. And I came here this afternoon to pledge to you that together we are going to build an America that Roosevelt began, that Harry Truman worked for, and that John Kennedy died for. We are going to build a Great Society where no man or woman is the victim of fear or poverty of hatred; where every man and woman has a chance for fulfillment, for prosperity, and for hope. That is the direction that you are going. That is the direction that we are going to continue. And I promise you here today that no one, no group here or in an land, is ever going to stand in our way as we march forward.

There is crisis and conflict in many lands at this hour, and we have very great and overpowering responsibilities in a very turbulent world, but we are going to fulfill those responsibilities. Let me make this clear. No world problem must be allowed to keep us from meeting the needs and the desires of our own people. Trouble abroad will never divert us from the task of building the Great Society at home.

There are some that would say turn the clock back, stop, look, and listen. We have problems in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic. Before you get back to the office we may have some in other lands in the world. And for that reason let's put off until another day the poverty program, the Appalachia program, the medical care program, the education program. Well, they are just talking through their hats. We are not going to put anything off.

I worked last night on some thoughts that I want to incorporate when I get the recommendations from your leaders, and from the leaders of the Government concerned with your welfare into a message that I will send to Congress in the next few weeks. By the way, while we are talking, I want to make an arrangement with you today, while you are here in person, to realize that we don't just send these messages up to Congress to be read. We send them up there to be acted upon and voted upon, up or down. And as Andy B. Miller plows through the dark corridors of the House Office Building calling "wolf" to the White House, I don't want you fellows to run under the bed and hide either.

There are talkers and there are doers. An old man told me the first year I was in Washington, which was 34 years ago, and I was inquiring about the processes of the Congress, and he said, "Son, there are two kinds of congressional horses, the workhorse and the show horse." Well, we want to be workhorses, and before this Congress, this 89th Congress, closes its first session, the workhorses are going to establish it as the most productive, the most enlightened, the most progressive Congress for all the people that ever sat in Washington.

That is why I came out here this afternoon. I came out here to ask your help. I came out here to call upon you to help me do what you have been doing so well for more than a half century—to help build America, in the cause of freedom, and the cause of prosperity, build it here and build it abroad.

We have much to be thankful for. We have much to remember. The figures for the first quarter, January, February, and March, are just out of the typewriter. They show that we have 71,300,000 people working today. That is exactly 1,500,000 more than were working this day last year, 1 year ago. The figures out of the typewriter show that wages and salaries amount to $347 billion. That is up more than $25 billion. I said up, now, not down. That is an increase in wages and salaries over last year of 8 percent.

The corporation profit figures for this quarter are just in, and they are running at the rate—for the end of the quarter—but they are running at the rate of $36 billion after taxes. That is up 13 percent.

So our employment is up, our wages are up, our business profits are up. You just don't know until you talk to the leaders of 114 other nations how much you have got to be grateful for; how much you have got to be proud of.

I have been your President for 17 months. I have met every week with the titans of industry and the great corporate leaders of this country. I have met every week with the religious and spiritual leaders of this country, ranging from Cardinal Spellman to Billy Graham. I have met every week with your leaders, Mr. Hagerty and Joe Keenan and Andy Biemiller, and that great statesman, George Meany. They have sat in the Cabinet room. They have met face to face with each other, and they have met privately in the little offices off the corridors. We have started some strikes and we have settled some, but I think I can say without peradventure of a doubt that never in the history of the Republic has there been more cooperation with any President, the 35 men that have preceded me, than the cooperation that I have received from labor, from business, from government.

The judicial branch, the legislative branch, the Congress, headed by that great leader, JOHN MCCORMACK, and MIKE MANSFIELD in the Senate, are workhorses. And the executive and the legislative and the judiciary have never gotten along better, just as the employer and the employee and their Government have never gotten along better.

I am happy that the corporations got $36 billion after taxes. I don't begrudge them a dime. I helped them make it. They had $72 billion before taxes, and I took half of it. And the more the incentive system and the free enterprise system makes, the more they have to pay decent wages, and the more they have to let their Government use for medical care, and for education, and for beautification.

I don't object to the payrolls running $347 billion, because we have some men scattered in district offices all over the land with their

scissors that cut out that little withholding from every dollar of that $347 billion. All I want them to do is to do better because the better they do the better the country does.

Last Saturday, a week ago, our Ambassador from the Dominican Republic was here in Washington. He had been called back here to report on very disturbing developments in that little nation of 3½ million off our shores in this hemisphere.

While he was talking to us, the government was overthrown. We rushed him back to his post of duty. Since that time certain undesirable elements have stepped in and tried to take control of that nation.

Today, there are between 1,000 and 1,500 dead people whose bodies are in the streets of Santo Domingo, threatening an extreme epidemic. There were 8,000 American and foreign nationals in that country whose lives were in danger.

At approximately 3:30, our Ambassador wired me—well, he was here Saturday, we rushed him back—on Tuesday we went before the OAS Peace Council and discussed that serious problem. On Wednesday, the Organization of American States met and they talked about the gravity of the situation, discussed it thoroughly, and adjourned.

On Wednesday afternoon we were meeting there with what I thought was the greatest problem that we had on our hands—Vietnam.

Mr. Rayburn used to say, when these Congressmen poured into his office every day, the fellow would say, "I have the most important problem in the world." He said, "That's what that fellow said that you met going out of here."

I thought this was the most important until I got a cable at 3:16 saying the chief of police, and the governmental authorities, telling us that American lives are in danger and we can no longer offer them any protection. We notified the appropriate people to stand in readiness and we went ahead to conclude our conference on Vietnam.

By 5:16 we had another cable that said, "You must land troops immediately or blood will run in the streets, American blood will run in the streets."

And that is the unanimous decision of every man on the American team. There are nine of them, one from the Army, one from the Air Force, one from the Navy, the Ambassador, one from the USIA, and so forth—what we call a country team, the board of directors in that specific country.

Well, I said I have a meeting on the balance of payments with a bunch of bankers and big businessmen in the next room. You get the troops on the way, and you ask the Congressmen, the leadership, to come to the White House and we'll meet at 7 o'clock. That was about 6 o'clock, a little before. I went on with my meeting without discussing it. When we met at 7, talking to the leaders, while I was talking to them, I was handed a note by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff which said the marines have landed. That's a great tribute to Bob McNamara and the Joint Chiefs of Staff for competence and efficiency, that within an hour they can put men ashore without the loss of a single life.

No President ever has a problem of doing what is right. I have never known one to occupy this office—and I have worked with five of them—that did not want to do what is right. The big problem is knowing what is right. But I knew this, this was no time for indecision, or procrastination, or vacillation. The American people hadn't elected their President to dodge and duck and refuse to face up to the unpleasant.

Since that time we have evacuated 2,500 Americans. The Michigan State University Jazz Band was down there. We got them home. The brewers, the brewery people—I guess they didn't know you were all meeting here in Washington, they were having their convention down there, and we got them home.

There hasn't been a drop of civilian blood shed although 5 of our marines have died because of sniper action, and 41 of our boys are wounded. We have 5,000 nationals from 30 other countries and American yet to be evacuated from Santo Domingo and all over the countryside. We will by tonight have 14,000 Americans there to get that job done.

I have had the papal nuncio send me a cable congratulating us and commending us for our assistance. The leaders and ambassadors from many countries have told us that the streets would have run red with human blood except for the presence of American troops. The representatives of 30 countries, 6 of whose embassies were torn to pieces, are expressing their gratitude, but we still have 5,000 to get out. We still have the job of feeding 350,000 people, both the rebels and the loyalists have to eat because we are humanitarians and we don't want to starve people to death. We have the hospitals and they are running out of their ears. So we have taken some of David Dubinsky's mobile hospital units and we are putting them in the Dominican Republic to take care of their health.

We are taking sanitary measures so that a serious epidemic won't break out. We have established an international peace zone and asked the Organization of American States of these Republics to go there and present us with some plan for setting up a stable government.

We covet no territory. We seek no domination over anyone. All we want to do is live in peace and be left alone if they will do it. But if they are going to put American lives in danger, where American citizens go that flag goes with them to protect them. You don't know how they appreciate it.

As a little boy I learned a declamation that I had to say in grade school. I don't recall all of it but a little of it is appropriate here this afternoon. It went something like this:

I have seen the glory of art and architecture. I have seen the sun rise on Mount Blanc. But the most beautiful vision that these eyes have ever held was the flag of my country in a foreign land.

Now I am the most denounced man in the world. All the Communist nations have a regular program on me that runs 24 hours a day. Some of the non-Communist nations just kind of practice on me. Occasionally I get touched up here at home in the Senate and House of Representatives. But that is not important. What is important is just two things in this hemisphere. No. 1, that we know, and that they know, and that everybody knows, that we don't propose to sit here in our rocking chair with our hands folded and let the Communists set up any government in the Western Hempshire.

We have said to the people of the Dominican Republic that we are hopeful that the other nations of this hemisphere will provide some troops to help us clean up this operation, to preserve law and order and peace. We'll provide our share of them and we'd like to bring our boys home as soon as we can evacuate our people.

We have two purposes: We want to evacuate our citizens and we want to preserve, to see that a plan is worked out where the people themselves can select their own government, free from any international conspiracy or any dictatorship of any kind.

We believe the Organization of American States will make such a recommendation. We are not intervenors in the Dominican Republic. The people that intervened in the Dominican Republic were the people who had been trained outside of the Dominican Republic in guerrilla warfare and came in there to help overthrow that Government and to have a Communist seizure of that country. We are there to protect those people and we propose to protect them.

It reminds me of a story I heard as a youngster when Huey Long was here and everybody in the Senate was denouncing him because he had taken a sound truck and went into Arkansas and helped to elect the first woman elected to the Senate—Mrs. Caraway. People weren't accustomed to electing women in the Senate in those days. The Senators in those days campaigned for somebody else and they were a little upset about it, and they were denouncing Long for forgetting States' rights and leaving his State and going into another State. He sat there all afternoon and let one Senator after another denounce him for importing his sound truck and telling other people what to do and dictating to them. He had this chocolate silk suit on—I'll never forget it—and he had brown and white shoes, and he was marching back and forth. And it come his time to answer, and he got up and said, "Mr. President, I have been denounced all afternoon." He looked over at Senator Robertson, who was the majority leader and the most powerful man in the Senate, a very robust man, a very rotund man, he had a great big stomach and had a cigar that he always smoked and kept in the corner of his mouth—he was the most powerful man in the Senate. He walked right over to Joe Robertson, and put his hand on his shoulder in a very affectionate and friendly way, and said, "I wasn't in Arkansas to dictate to any human being. All I went to Arkansas for was to pull these big, pot-bellied politicians off this poor, little woman's neck."

All we are in the Dominican Republic for is to preserve freedom and to save those people from conquest. The moment that the Organization of American States can present a plan that will bring peace on the island, and permit us to evacuate our people, and give us some hope of stability in government, we will be the first to come back home.

Now, in these times our enemies want to divide us. They want us to argue among ourselves. They want us to chew on each other.

I read the cables every day and up to the last 3 weeks they have really believed that in Vietnam the pressure would become so great on the American President that he would have to pull out. Well, I have had plenty of pressure but they don't know the American President. He is not pulling out until aggression ceases. But they have that hope.

So I warn you and I plead of you, if you have any suggestions or any views, or any differences, with your President—and all of you do at times; we don't see everything alike or we would all want the same wife—but communicate them to me through Uncle Sam, or Western Union, or directly, or through your friends. Don't send them through my intelligence bulletin via Peiping, or Hanoi, or Moscow.

A great man said, "United we stand; divided we fall." There never was a period in our national history when unity and understanding, perseverance, and patriotism would pay larger dividends than it would pay now.

I expect the leaders of the labor workers' movement in this country to come up, punch that timeclock, stay on that shift until we preserve democracy for ourselves and for free people all around the globe.

Thank you very much.

The Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 5, 1965:

THE FARM PROGRAM

The House of Representatives is holding hearings on President Johnson's omnibus farm bill. With several new twists, it continues the price support program, endeavoring to protect farm income at moderate levels. It also aims at curtailing production in a limited and voluntary way.

Of the big farm organizations the National Grange has given most support to the measure. The National Farmers Union, more concerned with the plight of the less affluent farmers, would have preferred that it go further toward raising farm income.

The largest and most conservative of the farm organizations, the American Farm Bureau Federation, opposes it on the ground that it would "ask consumers to pay higher food prices to perpetuate a program designed to keep producers dependent on Government handouts."

President after President has wrestled with the farm problem in the hope of finding some way to reduce the multibillion dollar support program. But none has found a way to achieve a significant reduction in supports—or to return to a relatively free market—without the prospect of bankrupting many of the Nation's farmers and causing problems more serious than those inherent in the present high cost program.

The administration's bill proposes long-term contracts for voluntary retirement of farmland. The Farm Bureau argues that this won't really help reduce surpluses as long as high price supports continue to encourage greater production.

Another way to reduce price supports and prevent the accumulation of surpluses would be to adopt production and marketing controls. There is every indication that farmers would resist the imposition of controls, even as they have in the past.

Some put their hope in programs designed to speed up the process of getting more farmers out of farming. Others believe that underconsumption rather than overproduction is the problem and that the answer lies in expanded markets. In either case the solution is difficult to accomplish without creating far more serious problems.

Farmers, realizing their waning political influence, are aware that they must find means other than Government support to obtain fair and adequate prices for their produce. With farm costs continuing to rise and net farm income dropping steadily in spite of Government price supports, all farm organizations are endeavoring to find ways to improve their bargaining power.

The National Farm Organization, a newer and smaller farm group, has sponsored programs to withhold produce from the market to force better prices. But many object to this collective bargaining technique, and it has not caught on.

Farmers are becoming more interested in uniting for contract or cooperative marketing and purchasing as a means of gaining bargaining power. This may turn out to be the ultimate solution and one which may eventually enable the Government gradually to withdraw from the farm subsidization and surplus storage business.

Should the farmers prove successful in wielding greater power in the market, it will mean somewhat higher consumer prices. Many would consider this preferable to the heavy burden which the Government support and storage programs place on the taxpayer.

If given the choice, we believe that most Americans would rather pay as consumer than as taxpayer. And what's more, we suspect that savings to the taxpayer would more than offset any increase in consumer prices. We welcome further exploration in this direction.

Greater New York YMCA Formulates Plan To Aid Disadvantaged Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the YMCA of Greater New York formulated an important proposal to aid disadvantaged youths in the city of New York. At a time when we are seeking imaginative programs on State and community levels designed to maximize the opportunities for becoming productive citizens afforded to young men of limited education, I am pleased to bring this plan to the attention of the Congress:

The 1965–66 proposal: YMCA Training Resources for Youth (TRY) is designed to train 1,000 young men, aged 17–20, who are out of school, out of work and in the lower one-third of the population in employability. The project will operate in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, from which most of the trainees will come. The project area has a population of 360,000 (1960 census), 82 percent Negro, 10 percent Puerto Rican. Racially, trainees will reflect the area's population. TRY has been designed so that it can be operational in the summer of 1965 with a first-year budget of about $7 million. Sources of funds: Economic Opportunity Act (1964), Vocational Education Act (1963), and Manpower Development and Training Act (1962), foundations, business and private contributors.

TRY is being developed by the YMCA of Greater New York, a nonprofit, tax-exempt membership corporation with 28 branches and 75 activity centers in the 5 boroughs. The year of preparation of TRY was underwritten by the YMCA at a cost of more than $40,000. It is being continued with the aid of a grant of $42,000 from the Antipoverty Operations Board of New York City.

TRY will offer a new life skills and basic education program which starts with the needs of the individual and helps him develop the personal resources to resolve those needs. The program will develop new counseling techniques, new tests, new curriculum and new professional roles. Relationships with universities and public school systems will be established for full exchange of information, resources and techniques. Occupational training will include six areas offering the greatest promise of employment: auto service, food services, vending machine service, heating and air conditioning service, small appliance repair and service, business machine repair and service. Trainees will receive counseling, work experience, leisure time education, placement and follow-through services.

The TRY project provides for housing of trainees at YMCA and other available facilities, making possible a 24-hour-a-day learning environment. Each student will be paid $20 to $30 a week, and each will progress at his own speed. Estimated time per trainee: 9 to 18 months.

TRY will have a racially integrated staff of more than 200 psychologists, counselors, classroom teachers, shop instructors, and youth advisers. It is intended that a substantial number of these will be recruited from the project area.

TRY has evolved from "Youth and Work." In September 1962 the Vocational Service Center Branch, YMCA of Greater New York, initiated at the Bedford YMCA a demonstration "Youth and Work" training program for 17- and 18-year-old male high school dropouts from the Bedford-Stuyvesant area, where the school dropout rate exceeds 50 percent. "Youth and Work" provides 16 weeks of job training in either auto mechanics or machine shop practices, work experience, remedial reading and math, group counseling and placement.

"Youth and Work" is now in its eighth 16-week cycle. The most recent analysis (seventh cycle) reveals that of the 42 teenage boys who started training, 81 percent completed the course; of these, 65 percent have been placed in jobs and 6 percent have returned to school. The national average for high school dropouts obtaining and holding jobs is estimated at less than 25 percent.

Each student is paid $20 a week to train, contingent on attendance. The cost per youth per cycle is $1,400. Funds for the "Youth and Work" program have been provided by foundations, the New York State Division for Youth through the New York City Youth Board, the YMCA, the Office of Manpower Automation and Training (U.S. Department of Labor), and the New York State Department of Vocational Education.

"Youth and Work" grew out of the YMCA's experience: The YMCA's Vocational Service Center was organized in 1944 as a continuation and expansion of previous services dating back to 1871. It is the branch of the YMCA responsible for providing professional counseling and testing, educational and career guidance and job placement services to young people in the New York area. VSC is approved by the American Board on Counseling Services and represents the YMCA in the war on poverty program. VSC has centers at the Bedford YMCA and at its headquarters at 11 East 36th Street, Manhattan.

Harbor Improvement at Port Orford, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call the attention of this House to the memorial passed by the 53d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon supporting the proposed harbor improvement at Port Orford, Oreg.

Last year and again this year, I introduced a bill to extend to Port Orford Federal help in harbor improvements so vital to the economic survival of this community. Not 1 cent of Federal money has been spent on this harbor, the people having developed it from their own resources. This project is not a great dramatic one in a national sense nor does it require a large amount of money, but it is critical to Port Oxford

and I hope it will have the support of the House.

The memorial follows:

ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 22

(Introduced by Representative Back, Senator Chapman, Representatives Bedingfield, Boe, Hanneman, Holmstrom, Kennedy, Leiken, Morgan, Turner, Whelan, Wilderman, Wilson)

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 53d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas there is need to improve the harbor at Port Orford in Curry County; and

Whereas such improvement has been recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, continued in Senate Document Numbered 62, 88th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact H.R. 2413, 89th Congress, 1st session, to appropriate $696,000 for the harbor improvements at Port Orford.

2. A copy of this memorial shall be transmitted to the President of the United States and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Small Business Needs To Study Modernization Needs of Machine Tool Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the tool and die industry is the heartbeat of our free enterprise system. At this time, however, it seems that the small business members of this industry are handicapped because of their inability to finance or otherwise bring about the high degree of modernization that is needed to enable them to compete against foreign manufacturers. Accordingly, the House Small Business Committee is going to study this problem and hold hearings in an effort to find some workable solution to this problem.

Recently representatives of the National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association met in Washington and on this occasion Mr. Richard L. Mitchell, General Counsel of the House Small Business Committee, delivered a speech to which I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Mitchell's comments in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY RICHARD L. MITCHELL, GENERAL COUNSEL, HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE BEFORE NATIONAL TOOL, DIE & PRECISION MACHINING ASSOCIATION

It is a pleasure for me to be here with you today, although it is unfortunate that Chairman EVINS cannot be here as was originally planned. It has developed since he initially accepted your invitation that the House Public Works Subcommittee, on which he is a ranking majority member, scheduled hearings for today on TVA appropriations. These hearings are now in prorgess. Chairman EVINS deeply regrets that he cannot be here and asks me to extend to you his apologies.

But I am honored to be here and appreciate the opportunity to appear before you even though I am a poor alternative for Chairman EVINS. You are very gracious to receive me.

You know, I feel that the Members of Congress and you gentlemen have something in common—at least in a philosophical way.

You make the tools and the dies and the jigs and the fixtures necessary for our economic system to produce at a high degree of productivity.

The Congress makes the laws that are necessary to help the Nation produce at top capacity and meet its potential for growth across all dimensions of national activity.

In our economic system basic productivity depends upon your industry.

In the broad area of national growth and development, the Nation's success in developing its fabulous productive potential hinges on the wisdom of President Johnson and the Congress in responding to needs and trends.

And, gentlemen, the potential of this Nation is almost too great to grasp. The rate of change has accelerated to the point that more is expected to happen, that is totally new, within the next 10 years than has happened in the past 25.

Within the past 25 years we have seen an incredible display of progress—television, guided missiles, space exploration, computers with automated numerical programing for industry, the atomic and hydrogen bombs, jet aircraft, and many more sophisticated innovations.

But the prediction by researchers is that within the next 10 years we will see more new things than we have seen in this remarkable era—the 25 years just passed.

The prediction is that the new factory of 1980 will be computerized, automated, air conditioned, landscaped, relocated, compressed, and miniaturized.

By the end of the next 15 years there will be 50 million more Americans that this free enterprise system must serve. We often hear of the remarkable progress of West Germany. But our population increase in the next 15 years will exceed the entire population of West Germany. And our increase in purchasing power will exceed all of West Germany's purchasing power today.

Fifteen years from now there will be 62 million American families—14 million more families than there are today.

There will be a fantastic growth and diversity of markets. There will be so many people that more and more industry and business will concentrate on market segments rather than a broad horizontal market.

You can see this diversity now.

For instance, there is a boom in the sale of Beattle and rock 'n roll records—and yet sales of classical records are at an alltime high. Sales of corn flakes is increasing—but the sales of exotic foods is mushrooming, too.

Television seems to be our king of attention—and yet there is a boom in the sale of paperback books.

There is a boom in camping and sales of camping equipment—and yet there is also a boom in battery-powered tooth brushes and electric-powered kitchen knives, and other luxury items.

The truth is that our 200 million people are all individuals and their tastes differ. More and more they have the discretionary income to buy what they want and this makes for this remarkable and healthy diversity of demand and interest.

We are living in an exciting, demanding age.

We are also living in history's most rapid and dramatic period of change—even more dramatic than the basic change 7,000 years ago when man began cultivating edible plants and domesticating animals to lay the groundwork for villages and towns and cities and finally, for our vast urban complexes of today.

There are 18 different revolutions swirling around us in every facet and dimension of business and industry—of our daily lives, of our cities, our population and trends of growth. There is even a revolution in innovation because change is so fast it has become a revolution in itself.

Knowledge is increasing at a great rate.

Our information is doubling every 8 years as we cross the threshold of a fantastic computer age.

Electronic data processing has developed so fast that these machines can now gage the relative merits of bulls. The prediction is that we will soon have machines that will add when we talk to them.

Some are predicting an age of robot retailing. Customers in a grocery store, for example, would not select their groceries physically and place them in a cart. The items would be displayed and marked. The customer would select a computer card indicating the product he wants. As he left, these cards would be fed into a computer which would set in motion the machinery that would select, bag, and transmit the groceries to the customer within 2 minutes of the time he handed his cards to the cash register.

Personally, I doubt that Americans will accept that. I believe there is a point beyond which Americans will refuse the surrender of their individualism to machines. But this is the possibility. This is another projection into the future.

I have labored this point of growth with you members of the National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association because it is this industry—your industry—that is going to help provide the machine tool complex that will power our economy—this diverse, high-powered economy.

And it must be high-powered to meet this incredible growth. The National Planning Association estimates that by 1980 our gross national product will have increased by over one-half trillion dollars to $1.2 trillion in order to serve our exploding population—not to mention the expanding world trade developing from accelerating populations in developed countries and new markets in emerging nations.

Our entire industrial capacity—small business and big business—must operate at maximum efficiency to achieve this goal—to serve a dynamic society and our exploding population.

That is why it is essential that the machine tool and die industry modernize as many of you have done and are doing.

That is why it is essential that you utilize the latest technology—including numerical programing with its automated operations if it appears feasible for your plant.

If you are efficient, our entire complex of production will be efficient.

If you are inefficient, then our base of production will be soft.

If you are inefficient, then we lose markets to Germany and Japan.

Many of you are modernizing with private financing.

Others are doing it through financial assistance programs of the Small Business Administration.

However you do it, it must be done to achieve the gigantic growth rate this Nation must have and to maintain our position in world markets.

President Johnson and the Congress have advocated an economic policy of sound expansion that should assist you in making your basic improvements.

You have the liberalized depreciation guidelines on new equipment.

You have the 7 percent investment credit.

You have the overall income tax reduction—ranging to 27 percent for small corporations.

You get a double dividend there. You get the immediate dividend from immediate reductions in your taxes and comparable increase in earnings. And you get the feedback from a strong rate of economic growth.

And you are getting that now.

The Department of Commerce predicts that capital expenditures will rise this year to a new peak of $50.2 billion—an increase of 12 percent over last year's record of $44 billion.

New domestic orders for cutting tools totaled more than $78 million in February which was 29 percent more than the total for February of last year.

And so the policies of the President and the Congress have strengthened the small business sector across the board.

President Johnson has taken a personal interest in small business programs.

He personally inaugurated a small loan program in 1964 that brought a quick response from smaller businessmen. The SBA under the direction of its very able Administrator, Gene Foley, set new records in loans made last year and will set new records this year.

Our current economic expansion has broken all peacetime records.

We are now in the 50th month of healthy and sustained growth.

And economists who a few months ago were predicting a slackening in 1965 are now predicting that this rate of growth will continue throughout this year.

President Johnson and the Congress are determined that this growth rate will be sustained and are prepared to introduce added stimulus when it is needed.

We know that your industry has done a tremendous job in tooling up the Nation—without which our country would not be great. We know you are dedicated energetic businessmen.

But we know you have some problems which are often beyond your control.

We know that many of you feel that equitable financing for new machinery is not available to you.

We know that many of you feel that the rates charged by some elements of the private sector are too high.

We know that some of you are utilizing Small Business Administration programs but that many of you hope for a specialized SBA program tailored to your industry.

I know that you are disappointed that an element of the private sector declined to go along with one carefully prepared proposal.

Some of you have found the answer in existing SBA programs. I wonder if all of you understand the opportunities and the details of these programs. I understand, however, that a small business forum to be conducted by SBA is on your agenda for tomorrow and I am sure you will receive a thorough and complete briefing on that agency's programs.

Certainly there are many instances wherein members of your industry have prospered and progressed with the assistance of the SBA.

Certainly there is presently Government assistance for your industry.

But it is still felt that a complete program is lacking.

Chairman EVINS and the committee think we need to determine what your industry needs and then find some way to fulfill those needs.

And so for that reason, Chairman EVINS is announcing today, and has authorized me to announce it first to you here now, that the House Small Business Committee is going to hold hearings on your problems during the 89th Congress and is going to come up with recommendations for their solution.

Chairman EVINS and the committee are concerned.

They are concerned when they hear that our exports of machine tools have declined steadily since 1957 with the exception of two categories—metalworking and power generating.

They are concerned when they hear that with two minor exceptions our share of the imports of machine tools has dropped in all regional world markets.

They are concerned when they hear that our share of the world production of machine tools has dropped from more than 24 percent to less than 20 percent.

They are concerned when they hear that our machine tools generally are older than those of some other nations.

They are concerned that machine tool and die manufacturers in other nations can undersell our industry by 30 percent.

They are concerned that we seem to be lagging in research and development of information in the machine tool and die industry.

We have got to get this modernization underway—and underway on a massive scale.

Chairman Evins in his speech prepared for delivery here stated—and I quote—"The tool and die industry is the heartbeat of our free enterprise system.

"It must move ahead with the times.

"We cannot fiddle while the competition from foreign toolmakers burns hotter and hotter."

And so the House Small Business Committee will conduct fact-finding studies to help you find the best possible course for modernization.

The committee will study all alternatives of financing.

It will document the need for modernization.

It will pinpoint problems and recommend steps to counter them.

Chairman EVINS and the committee are sympathetic to you and your problems.

The committee exists to serve small business.

It exists to explore the problems of small business and to help it down the paths to solutions.

That is what we intend to do in your case.

Thank you for allowing me to appear before you today. We shall look forward to seeing some of you at the hearings during this term of Congress.

Thank you.

Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arthur Hoppe, the columnist from San Francisco, has prepared two very good and amusing columns on affairs in Washington, the first one published on the 26th of April in the San Francisco Chronicle and the second one on the 29th.

I am sure that many of the readers of the RECORD will enjoy these two articles, which follow:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Apr. 26, 1965]

MR. JOAD GOES TO WASHINGTON

(By Arthur Hoppe)

"How'd it go, Jud?" Mrs. Jud Joad asked anxiously as her husband sank down on the bench in the little park across from Poverty Corps headquarters. "Was they glad to see you?"

"To tell the truth, Maude," said Mr. Joad, "I don't rightly know whether it was worth the long trek up here from Appalachia Corners. Oh, they was mighty glad to see me, I walks right in and tells this pert young lady who I am and what I want.

" 'I seen by the papers,' I says, 'that you are recruiting poverty fighters for the war on poverty,' I says. 'At $20,000 a year on up. I am an old man,' I says, 'but I am not too old to fight.' "

"Oh Jud, that took grit," said Mrs. Joad, squeezing his arm. "Well," said Mr. Joad, "pretty soon this smart-looking young fellow in shirtsleeves comes out. He looks at me and says, 'My Gawd.' Then pretty soon there's a whole passel of these young fellows standing around, staring. 'It's a genuine victim,' says one, kinda awed like. You could tell they never seen the likes before. I was mighty proud.

" 'Let's take him in to see Sarge,' says one. 'It might be worth a couple of columns in the dailies.' So's they take me in to see their sergeant, who's right nice. 'What can I do for you?' he says.

"Well, I tells him all about my fighting poverty from the Texas dust bowl to the piney woods of Georgia, man and boy for nigh on 70 years, 'So,' I says, 'figuring my country needed my vast experience, I come to fight for you. And I'll settle for half pay.'

" 'You are a patriotic American,' says he. 'But we got 12 different programs going at the moment. Now, drawing on your vast experience, which would you say was the best way to fight poverty?' I give this a couple seconds' thought and then I tell him. 'With money,' I says.

" 'By Gawd, says he, 'you and I think alike. That's just what I been telling them up on Capitol Hill. You got the right outlook to be a member of our team.'

" 'I ain't much at sports,' says I. 'No,' he says, 'I mean fighting poverty. Just you look over this here list of jobs and see which one suits you best.' So's I do, but none make much sense. Like 'community services planner' and 'public relations coordinator.' But finally I seen one: 'pilot program director—$22,500.' 'That one,' says I. 'Never been up in no aeroplane, but I ain't too old to larn.'

" 'Well,' says he, 'we'll give you the usual tests and interviews and see how you do.' So's they give me all these tests and * * *

"Jud,' said Mrs. Joad impatiently, "stop frittering and tell me, did you get the job fighting poverty or no?" Mr. Joad shook his head sadly. "Nope," he said. "I ain't qualified."

"Well, don't take it too hard, Jud," said Mrs. Joad, patting his shoulder. "I don't," he said. "The sergeant bucked me up. He says I should go home and fight at the community level. On a volunteer basis. And while he didn't exactly promise, I figure he may land me one of them jobs yet. Soon as I get a little more experience."

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Apr. 29, 1965]

LET'S NOT FORGET THE FORGOTTEN

(By Arthur Hoppe)

It is time for another chapter of "Where Are They Now?"—that nostalgic, heart-tugging series which tells of the unforgettable greats of yesteryear now tragically forgotten by a fickle public.

And who will e'er forget the fighting liberal, that crusader for the oppressed, that independent-minded Senator who wore no man's yoke—the unforgettable Hubert Horatio Whatshisname.

Oh, who can help but feel a warm inner glow on remembering this human dynamo in his heyday—battling the militarists and the trusts, standing up for the cause he believed in without fear or favor, making 50 to

60 speeches a day. Quite often when someone was listening. Then suddenly, at the peak of his career, he vanished.

Oh, how it will bring tears of joy to the eyes of his millions of oldtime fans to learn that he lives. Yes, today the once-famous Hubert Horatio Whatshisname lives quietly in the humble obscurity of the Vice Presidency.

And while we must respect his wish for privacy, we oldtime fans cannot help but envision how happy he must be humbly puttering about his humble new duties in his humble new role.

Scene: The breakfast nook of a humble cottage at the end of a one-way lane in the backwash district of Washington. It is dawn. Hubert bounces energetically up and down in his seat as his wife prepares his morning meal.

Mrs. H: "Now that you've retired from active life, dear, must we still rise so early? Look, the sun is just coming up."

Mr. H (solemnly): "Yes, precisely as our great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, pledged that it would."

Mrs. H (sighing): "I wish you wouldn't start working on your job before breakfast. Will you have some eggs?"

Mr. H: "Yes, please. I would dearly love two clear examples of the wise planning inherent in our great President's forthright program to increase the productivity of our fine American chicken ranchers. Scrambled."

Mrs. H: "Really, dear, while I love the simple anonymity of your new job, you must miss expressing your opinions."

Mr. H: "Nonsense. As our great President said to me, 'Hubert, there's room for a wide range of opinions in my administration. As long as they don't conflict with mine. And you don't get your name in the papers.'"

Mrs. H: "Thats nice, dear. Do you like your eggs?"

Mr. H (annoyed): "You know I can't call him up at this hour to ask a silly question like that. Hand me the paper."

Mrs. H (blanching): "Oh, dear, you promised not to read the papers any more. You know what it does to you."

Mr. H (stanchly): "I know, but if I wish to be a success in my new job, I must calmly overcome this foolish reaction. Here you take the Great Society section, while I coolly read the headlines, which say, 'President Sends More Troops to Vietn * * *'"

Aggghhh. Oooggh. Quick, open the door of the broom closet. I feel an attack coming on. (As he dashes into the broom closet.) Fellow Liberals, our outrageous policy in Vietn—"

Mrs. H (slamming the door behind him and locking it): "Phew. That was close. It sounds like a long one. I'll set the timer for 2 hours and then peek to see if he's done."

Teenagers Carry Fight to the Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, we frequently hear criticism of our teenagers. Newspaper articles reporting misdeeds of a small portion of our young people do much to create a bad image for all. Because teenagers seldom have an opportunity to rate headlines for their good deeds, I was pleased to see the article in the April 23 Washington Post by Alfred D. Stedman citing the generous efforts of Minnesota teenagers who assisted in controlling the recent flood. Mr. Speaker, I request this article be reprinted in the RECORD. I also request that a recent report from the Minnesota State civil defense office be reprinted:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1965]

A TARNISHED IMAGE IS WASHED AWAY BY FLOOD

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

ST. PAUL, MINN.—Came the Mississippi's worst floods in history, and up from the schools and colleges and universities sprang a student army to save the day.

Their generation had been headlined as "lost" and "troubled" and "wayward" and "fickle." But on the banks of the raging Mississippi and its rampant tributaries, they pitched in with the margin of nerve and muscle that did the job.

In fact, the performance of students whose antics have worried parents and puzzled professors from Yale to Berkeley may turn out to be the biggest bright spot in the whole murky story of the floods.

FLOCKED TO FLOOD SCENE

Adults managed and directed and did their share of sandbagging and diking. But it was the grit and energies of thousands of boys and girls from campuses and classrooms that, at the crisis, tipped the balance against the floods.

Some hailed the youthful feat as a transformation for the better from weird student doings and attitudes. Some guessed that perhaps education may be cultivating youthful values and capacities that aren't always visible. Others asserted the student generation has been all right all along, being merely exposed by a small minority to public misunderstanding and a bad press.

But as to the facts, there's complete unanimity. It was no bunch of hopeless beatniks or social rebels who flocked to the flood scene from nearby high schools and by busloads and carloads from fraternities and sororities and college dorms. It was instead an ablebodied volunteer force of determined young people, in quick grasp of the emergency and ready to take orders for action to meet it.

Up and down the Mississippi and its feeder rivers, the story was clear and undisputed. At Mankato, the teenagers fought the floods around the clock on both banks of the Minnesota River. "They were magnificent," said Mayor Rex Hill. "The stamina of the girls was especially amazing."

At Stillwater, they teamed with adults, including 50 State prison convicts, in erecting what was christened the "condike" to contain the St. Croix River overflow and save the city. Generally in the Upper Mississippi Valley, the role of the student flood fighters in reducing or averting destruction was judged "highly significant" by Col. Leslie P. Harding, U.S. Army District Engineer at St. Paul.

Sitdowns? Sex? Unwillingness to take orders? Vandalism? Disrespect of authority? Not a sign of any of such objects of complaints about campus conduct was observed day or night by Colonel Harding, his assistants or others in charge of flood work. Nothing of the kind, reported the Washington County sheriff, Reuben F. Granquist of Stillwater.

CONTRAST STUDIED

The contrast with the image of a rebellious student generation is not at all surprising once the basic motivations of students in the contrasting roles are understood, commented several who work closely with them.

"They want to be useful," said School Superintendent Thomas D. Campbell of Stillwater. "When they see an outlet for service, they leap for it."

Agreeing completely, the University of Minnesota's director of student activities, Donald R. Zander, expressed confidence that, in the same kind of emergency the student response would have been just as heartening on other campuses, including Berkeley. In a swiftly changing world, the students are insistent on freedom to explore ideas, but that motive, said Dr. Zander, is wholly consistent with their urge for useful service.

At least, in the light of the flood story, a fresh look at the character of the student generation can make worried parents feel much better than they did.

[From the Office of the Minnesota State Civil Defense]

Of the 6,000 unpaid, unsung volunteers that slogged in the mud at the dikes in Mankato, literally thousands had not yet seen their 20th birthdays; many not their 15th.

Those young people worked to the point of exhaustion in the muck and rain; catching a few hours sleep only to join the battle with renewed vigor that only comes with youth.

While the younger ones filled the sandbags with blistering hands, the older or more sturdy types struggled with the weight of them to the top of the dike—girls as well as boys.

This was not going on only in Mankato. A coastguardsman was quoted as saying that if it wasn't for the kids in Minnesota, there wouldn't have been a volunteer dike raised in the State. The teenagers in every affected city and town carried the fight to the rivers. It was seen in Rockford, in Henderson, in Wabasha, and East Grand Forks.

Our kids filled the breach left open by the lack of adequate control measures.

Dominican Responsibility Should Be Taken by OAS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our distinguished colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Sacramento Bee, on May 4, 1965, regarding the U.S. involvement in the Dominican Republic and the OAS.

The text of the editorial follows:

DOMINICAN RESPONSIBILITY SHOULD BE TAKEN BY OAS

President Lyndon B. Johnson acted swiftly and decisively to meet the threat of a possible Communist seizure of the long-troubled Dominican Republic.

The sending of American troops into that country has ended any immediate threat another Castro-type regime will be established in the hemisphere. But large-scale intervention also has imposed on the United States a great responsibility.

The government which eventually will take over power must be one representing the will of the people of the Dominican Republic and meeting the approval of the Organization of American States.

The President has enunciated a firm American policy to prevent the establishment of another Cuban-type regime in Latin America. It also should be American policy to prevent the return of an oppressive, reactionary regime such as existed under Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo, under the guise of anticommunism.

It would be tragic, and in the long run, disastrous, if American intervention proved to be the instrument of returning the destiny of the Dominican Republic to the hands of a military oligarchy opposed to social progress and democracy.

Juan Bosch was elected President by an overwhelming majority of the Dominican people in 1962 during the first really free election in the history of the nation. He has called on the rebels fighting for his return to power to lay down their arms and not to fight our soldiers.

This could open the door to a peaceful solution which would serve the interests of the Dominican people and at the same time eliminate the threat of a Communist-dominated government.

As rapidly as possible the United States should turn over to the Organization of American States control of the peacekeeping activities now being carried out by U.S. soldiers.

The OAS also should assume full responsibility for determining the proper, legitimate government of the Dominican Republic. The intervention of America, based on concern for a Communist seizure, must not be the prop to support a reactionary, repressive regime.

However, the intervention will have been in a good cause if U.S. troops assist the OAS in bringing peace and an honest government responsive to the needs of the people.

Excise Tax on Entertainment Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1965, I introduced H.R. 4471 to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the manufacturers excise tax on entertainment equipment to alleviate the economic burden on consumers.

I believe my colleagues would appreciate being informed of the reasoning for the introduction of this legislation:

TEN REASONS WHY CONGRESS SHOULD REPEAL THE 10-PERCENT FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON TELEVISION, RADIOS, PHONOGRAPHS

Most excise taxes were levied on the American people by Congress during World War II and the Korean conflict as fundraising measures for the Nation's defense effort. They were described as wartime and temporary taxes.

The following reasons explain why the 10-percent manufacturers excise tax imposed on radios, phonographs, television sets and their components should be repealed to remove the burden imposed on the consumer, encourage the growth of ultra high frequency (UHF) television broadcasting, promote the economic well being of the industry and stimulate the national economy.

1. Tax repeal is the logical second step after the all-channel TV law.

This industry became "double taxed" when Congress passed a law effective May 1, 1964, requiring a separate UHF tuner on all TV sets, raising the price as much as $30 per receiver even though 80 percent of purchasers cannot now, and many may never use this added equipment. Leaders of Congress and Government agencies concerned have advocated excise tax repeal to offset this added burden on the consumer.

2. Excise tax cuts will be passed along to the consumer.

The reduction in the average price of black-and-white television sets from $270 in 1950 to $140 in 1965 demonstrates the intensity of competition and efficiency in this industry.

Compared to the Department of Labor wholesale price index of 100 for the base years 1957–59, the December 1964 wholesale price index was 87.2 on radios, phonographs, and television, whereas all other commodities averaged 100.8. Portable radios, for example, had a price index of 60.1. In fact, radios, phonographs and television had one of the lowest price indexes of all consumer items in the Nation.

The administration, the Congress and the consumer can be assured by this industry's pledge and past performance that the benefits of excise tax repeal will be passed on to the consumer through lower prices, thereby bringing the hoped-for result—a boost in the national economy.

3. Excise taxes on radios, phonographs, and TV fall on those who are least able to pay.

The history of tax philosophy has been to alleviate the burden of the taxpayer least able to pay—the family—particularly the lower income family for which these media are often the sole means of entertainment and enlightenment. To these families a radio, phonograph or television purchase represents a much more substantial expenditure than it does for the higher income groups.

4. The householder pays a discriminatory tax on his radio, phonograph, or TV set.

In 1954 Congress reduced the manufacturers excise tax rate on practically all household items subject to the tax, but the 10 percent on radios, phonographs and TV sets remain. These products account for 43 percent of total sales. Yet they are the source of 59 percent of the revenue from all household items.

5. TV, radios, and phonographs are no longer luxuries, but necessities.

Radio and television as the major sources of information and entertainment today are essential to everyday life. Radios or phonographs are in 94 percent of U.S. homes and TV in 93 percent. Average TV families watch some 6½ hours daily; 70 percent of all men, 78 percent of all women and 99 percent of all children watch TV daily.

6. Radio and TV are "must" media in time of crisis.

They provide an unmatched communications system to the entire population in times of local or national emergency, for civil defense instruction, and for hurricane, tornado, and flood warnings. They were the first media to inform the people of such events of national importance as President Kennedy's assassination and the succeeding dramatic events; Presidential speeches on the Cuban and Vietnam crises, and vital messages to Congress and the Nation. More people are likely to hear of a major news event from radio than through any other medium of communication.

7. Radio and TV are optimum means for enlightenment, education, and cultural progress.

The most important key to national and international understanding is communication. Because of their intimacy and immediacy, radio and television stand supreme among all media of communications. Educational television (ETV) supplements and enhances classroom instruction and brings information and culture into the home. ETV, largely dependent on UHF broadcasting, is hampered by the higher cost of all-channel sets. Tax repeal would offset this deterrent to UHF development.

8. Radio and TV are major, mature media for news and special events.

A survey[1] reveals that TV is looked to for news more than any other medium, and that radio and TV are the most believable news sources. More than a third of the time spent by people viewing TV or listening to radio, even on the lowest educational level, was devoted to news and public affairs programs. Live coverage of the political conventions, the elections, the space launchings, the civil rights movement—all illustrate the vital role radio and TV play in keeping the American people informed.

A tax on television and radio is as contrary to wise public policy as a tax on newspapers and magazines would be.

9. Radio and TV are the most valued sources of entertainment.

Radios, phonographs and television are the principal means of entertainment for the entire family and particularly among the lower income families who are least able to pay the higher prices made necessary by the 10-percent excise tax. The American public, in a recent survey,[2] chose television ahead of radio, newspapers and magazines as the item they would least want to give up.

10. Revenue loss to the U.S. Treasury will be largely offset by business growth.

The combined radio and television manufacturing and broadcast industries employ over a million people. Increased sales brought about by excise tax repeal on radios, phonographs and television will increase employment and plant expanion in manufacturing and distribution and will open new areas of opportunity to broadcasting.

Color television is on the threshold of becoming a billion-dollar industry and the all-channel law is encouraging UHF broadcasting. The effect of excise tax repeal in these areas and in general on the electronics industry, the Nation's fifth largest, can have no other result than to stimulate the flow of the economy, thereby offsetting to a large extent any tax revenues lost to the Treasury.

[1] Elmo Roper & Associates Survey, 1964.

[2] Elmo Roper & Associates Survey, 1964.

Rutgers Degrees: 41,410 in 20 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, Rutgers University, one of the Nation's oldest educational institutions and one rich in tradition and accomplishments, is now marking the 20th anniversary of its designation as the State University of New Jersey. I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention the outstanding work this great university has been doing on behalf of the community, State, and Nation.

Rutgers, nearly 200 years old, has developed numerous leaders in government, business, agriculture, journalism, and many other fields. Rutgers graduates can be found at the head or in the top echelons of many business enterprises. They have served their State and their country well.

Since becoming our State university, Rutgers, through enthusiastic public support, has grown and prospered in order to serve many more of our young people. Much more work is to be done, but we have gone far at Rutgers.

The Newark Evening News pointed out this week that Rutgers, the State university, has awarded advanced and under-

graduate degrees to 41,410 persons in the past 20 years, more than it had granted in all the previous 180 years in its history.

So that many more observers can be made aware of the great forward strides Rutgers University has made, I would like to insert in the RECORD this article published by the Newark Evening News:

UNIVERSITY'S EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES HAVE MUSHROOMED SINCE 1945: 41,410 RUTGERS DEGREES IN 20 YEARS

NEW BRUNSWICK.—Since passage of the State university act 20 years ago, Rutgers University has granted undergraduate and advanced degrees to 41,410 persons—more than were granted in all the previous 180 years of its history.

The act, approved March 26, 1945, extended the designation of State university to all units of Rutgers. It started the university expanding in the areas of enrollment programs, faculty and physical facilities which included acquisition of urban campuses in Newark and Camden.

The tangible results of this expansion are a quintupling of college credit students, construction of millions of dollars worth of new buildings, and enlarged opportunities for graduate and professional study.

"But beyond all this," according to Dr. Richard Schlatter, acting university president, "I believe there has been a growing realization of what a State university means to the educational, cultural, social and economic life of a State; that the investment in a university pays off in a richer and more productive community."

Commenting on the enlargement of the State university's educational offerings, Dr. Schlatter said Rutgers has organized a major educational, research or service unit almost annually since 1945.

DEGREE-GRANTING SCHOOLS

The university has established degree-granting schools in library service, social work, nursing and medicine. It recently has authorized establishment of a new coeducational undergraduate college at the former site of Camp Kilmer in neighboring Piscataway Township.

Also organized during this period have been units in management and labor relations, microbiology, practical politics, radiation science, information processing, animal behavior, statistics, urban affairs, alcohol studies, conservation and environmental science and community affairs.

Dr. Schlatter said that Rutgers scholarship and research have kept pace with its expansion in education and service units. Rutgers investment in sponsored research rose from $763,000 in 1945 to $8,505,000 in 1963.

"All of this would have been impossible without an outstanding faculty, including some scientists and scholars of national and even international reputation," he remarked.

Rutgers physical plant has grown tremendously in the last two decades. The university today has about 585 buildings located on 4,500 acres in New Brunswick, Newark, and Camden besides its research locations.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

A substantial part of this is new construction. Since 1958, $118 million in new facilities have been built or planned throughout the State. A $16.5 million medical school building and a $16.3 million start for the new college in Piscataway are among projects on the drawing boards.

Dr. Schlatter said that two voter-endorsed bond issues for $29.8 million in 1959 and for $19 million last year plus $19 million in State appropriations has provided the bulk of the financing for new construction at Rutgers.

"But despite all this expansion, the number of applicants we had to turn away this year has been larger than ever before," Dr. Schlatter said.

The State University Act of 1945 resulted from the study of the New Jersey Commission on State Administrative Reorganization. It was a high point of a State-Rutgers relationship which started before the Revolutionary War when the royal governor of the province was an ex officio member of the university's board of trustees.

Another high point in that relationship occurred 9 years ago when legislation was adopted creating a board of governors at the university. The board consists of 11 regular members and 2 ex officio members.

Six of the voting members are named by the Governor with the advice and consent of the State senate. Five are named by the Rutgers board of trustees which retain fiduciary and advisory functions. The university president and State education commissioners are the ex officio members.

Supplemental Appropriation for Military Functions of Department of Defense, Fiscal Year 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 447) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for military functions of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, cloaked in the disguise of a military appropriation bill, this House was asked to approve, and did approve, this Government's policy of escalating the war in southeast Asia. Six of my colleagues and I dissented.

Since it is conceded by everyone, including the President, that the $700 million was not the issue at hand, then at a minimum, surely, in this body which the Speaker refers to as the greatest deliberative body in the world, there should be full discussion of what this resolution does mean while there is still time, hopefully, to resolve these tragic affairs before we bring down upon our heads the wrath of the world and shatter the frail edifice of world peace.

To my colleagues and my constituents I want to say that for many, many months now I have searched for every possible excuse to support my Government in the policies it is pursuing in Vietnam—and I have supported it. In spite of the shaky logic of the "domino" theory, I have done by very best to believe in it; in spite of the fact that the people of South Vietnam have been subjected to one unpopular and unstable dictatorship after another, I have done my best to believe we are defending their freedom; in spite of the fact that we have violated the Geneva accords, I have done my best to believe this was justified because the North Vietnamese did also, even though I know that two wrongs do not make a right; in spite of one humiliating military defeat after another, I have done by best to believe all the optimistic reports about our really winning the war over there; in spite of all the evidence of internal discord and revolt against the governments we maintain in power, I have done my best to believe this is what the Vietnamese people really want us to do—but, my fellow Americans, there is a point beyond which credibility simply will not stretch—and it is that somehow by waging a wider war we pursue a policy of peace.

This vote represented, in my opinion, a vote for that delusion. It could not have been a vote for $700 million, for the President himself said this was available in any case. It could not have been a vote to show our united determination to halt Communist aggression, for if more than a decade of effort, more than 400 American lives, more than $3 billion expended does not show this, then how can $700 million demonstrate it?

One of the things the vote could mean, though, is what in fact everyone knows it will be interpreted to mean, and that is Congressional approval for the continued bombings of North Vietnam and commitment of thousands and thousands of American troops to a war the justice and wisdom of which has been questioned inside and outside this Nation by citizens and friends of unimpeachable loyalty. I think it also clearly means the relinquishment by Congress of its constitutional authority to declare war, for if the President can direct bombing raids on North Vietnam by simple executive fiat, why can he not direct similar action against any other nation at any other time? Why bother to ask? Once the bomb is dropped, it can always be pointed out that rightly or wrongly—legally or illegally—we are in a war and that American lives are at stake and that it would be disloyal to not approve funds for the war.

I cannot in good conscience lend myself to that kind of usurpation of congressional power, and for the purpose of continuing a course of action which I believe will only reap at best, decades of hostility, enemity, and distrust of my countrymen by the peoples of Asia or, at worst, utter catastrophe for my Nation and the world.

Yet but an hour and a half debate was allotted for discussion of a measure which profoundly affects the future of our country and the world, and less than 15 minutes of that time was given to those who might have reservations, who might have questions, who might disagree. I find it impossible to understand why an admittedly unnecessary appropriation request need be mantled in a cloak of urgency and secret meaning, with full, free, and frank discussion of its merits denied.

The high point of these whole implausible proceedings was the speech of one of my colleagues who, in one breath, demanded withdrawal of Government funds to an educational project, because some of the participants criticized administration policy in Vietnam and then, in the next breath, he admiringly quotes Senator Vandenberg's statement that:

> Every foreign policy must be totally debated, and the loyal opposition is under special obligation to see that this occurs.

And this in the context of demanding for himself and others of the minority

party a voice in foreign policy decisions. His exact quote is:

These teach-ins are a protest against the national policy of our country. It seems to me that when we have individuals conducting these teach-ins and acting as leaders in these groups, that it is not in the best interests of the national security of our country for our Government to subsidize this kind of operation by financing projects in which these same people play a prominent role.

I can see we are all going to have an absorbing year if we follow the advice of the gentleman from Wisconsin, making certain we do not subsidize free inquiry, but only subsidize thought control.

And yet, I wonder if any policy, domestic or foreign, which its supporters here in this House are unwilling to risk to the judgment of free and inquiring minds can prove anything except on the part of its advocates, an abysmal lack of confidence in its strength. Surely a policy in which one believes deeply can stand examination and discussion.

Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, our national neighbor, Canada, is one of our best friends and our best customer, ranking first in purchases of U.S. goods. Yet, in general, we are too uninformed about our neighbor. As a nation, we should have more knowledge about Canada. Mark Ethridge, Jr., the distinguished son of a distinguished father, writing for the Detroit Free Press of which paper he is an associate editor, has in a series of four articles attempted to increase our knowledge. The first article follows:

RIVALRY HURTS AS CANADA SEEKS IDENTITY—HERITAGE AND U.S. WEALTH RULE A DIVIDED NATION

(NOTE.—Geographically and culturally divided, rich in resources yet economically dominated by her giant neighbor to the south, Canada is struggling for a national identity. Free Press associate editor Mark Ethridge Jr., in a four-part series beginning today, puts a new perspective on the personalities and problems, the advances and the setbacks, and the directions the struggle is likely to take.)

(By Mark Ethridge, Jr.)

One hundred years ago, Canadians began a search for independence that culminated in the British North America Act of 1867.

Today they are beginning a search for identity, and where it will lead no one yet can tell for sure. The only certainty is that even after 100 years of freedom from British control, Canadians still don't have it.

"Given a chance to adopt French culture, British government and American technology," a Toronto editor said recently, "Canadians settled for French government, American culture, and British technology."

Accurate or not, the three most dominant influences on the life of Canada are the two nations of its heritage and big daddy to the south—the United States. To each there are ties of blood and money as well as strains of resentment.

So strong are each of these that Canadians have not yet created a society, an economy or a culture which could be classified as native Canadian.

With the adoption of a flag this year as the most evident symbol this is precisely what Canadians are trying to do. Whether they will succeed is still to be determined.

By an odd paradox Canada's three greatest assets—land wealth, a high standard of living and indomitable courage—are also its three greatest handicaps.

Canada's land mass is the second largest in the world, only after Russia, and it covers more than 3½ million square miles. Considering that the population of Canada is less than 20 million, this gives it one of the highest land-to-population ratios in the world, a standard economic index of wealth and potential.

But the land is not divided right for the most efficient development along Canadian lines. Its mountains, as in the United States, run mostly north and south. Except for the St. Lawrence Seaway, which separates the United States and Canada from Duluth almost to Montreal—and then divides Canada itself—its river also run the wrong way. The ones that don't flow into Hudson Bay or the Arctic flow south into the United States.

Thus the natural geographic ties are not east and west, but north and south. The plains of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta have more in common with the Dakotas and Montana than they have with the maritime provinces.

The Maritimes, in turn, are linked closely with New England, and British Columbia, on the west, considers Washington and Oregon its natural allies.

Only the heartland, Ontario, is central enough and highly developed enough to concentrate on being Canadian. And industrialized Ontario is economically tied to the United States. We are Canada's best customer, just as Canada is our best customer.

This is paradox No. 2. Canada's high standard of living is a product of U.S. investment in Canada, but it also means that Canadian industry does not have an identity of its own. Canada is dependent on the United States, while at the same time competing with us.

This kind of relationship, said a highly respected editor of a Canadian financial newspaper, "is like the rich man playing poker with his chauffeur—after he's beggared the poor man he has to bail him out."

"The best we can hope for is that this match, too, will be fixed."

And the third paradox is Canadian courage, one not delineated by national origin. It is what enables a Canadian to tolerate the rigors of a northern winter or to stand up to the United States.

But the same quality that makes Canadians fearless also makes them stubborn. Like Americans of 100 years ago, most put the province ahead of the nation. Rather than cede a point to another section, they seem willing to risk the dissolution of their country into its five natural, geographic, and cultural entities—British Columbia, the prairies, Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritimes.

At the emotional center of this divisive quarrel is Quebec, where proud and provincial French Canadians never have forgotten that France lost her power in North America because of a British victory there in 1759.

Quebec does not really care to be Canadian. It wants to be French. If it is possible to be both French and Canadian, Quebecois are willing, though.

Since Quebec's 5 million people make up 28 percent of Canada's population, they constitute a minority which cannot be ignored. To keep them happy, the Federal Government has had to make concessions which intensify rather than temper the dividing process.

Prime Minister Lester Pearson, operating in Ottawa with a government made up of less than a majority, has been pressured to back down on centralization of government and to grant provincial premiers such independent authority over their affairs as would scare a U.S. governor witless.

While these provincial powers have permitted each part of the nation to strengthen itself in its own way, they have not served as a unifying force. Unlike the United States, Canada is not a melting pot. It is a collection of ethnic, economic, and religious islands separated by vast stretches of undeveloped land.

Because Canada is divided into five separate and distinct areas, and because each has more independence than any comparable U.S. area, the Canadian economy also is fractionated. In general, in terms of gross national product and the export market, it is booming. But it is uneven, more so than the assorted economies of the 50 United States.

Ontario and Quebec are enjoying the greatest prosperity in their history. Ontario, long the industrial leader of Canada, is seeing new plants spring up every day. Toronto, Canada's second largest city, is nearly the size of Detroit.

Montreal, the first city of Canada and the world's largest French city after Paris, is almost exploding with prosperity. In the center, across the street from the sprawling Queen Elizabeth Hotel, is the Place Ville de Marie, a remarkable underground International Villate where a visitor can find imports from almost everywhere and dine at restaurants recapturing a Paris bistro or a backyard barbecue in Albuquerque.

Dorval, Montreal's new airport is not so large as Kennedy International, but its architecture is more imaginative and the service is better than anything in the United States.

And its planes are on time.

Montreal currently is, engaged in great plans for Expo 67, an international exposition to mark the 100th birthday of Canadian independence.

Canada itself plans to spend $21 million on its national pavilion and exhibit, and total $167 million. More than 50 nations, including the United States and Russia, have promised to participate.

"We will move heaven and earth to insure that no visitor, participating nation or private exhibitor is gouged," says Robert F. Shaw, deputy commissioner of the exposition. "We want to build up enduring relations, both with the countries participating and with the guests who will visit us in 1967, and the way to do that is to make sure that they get good value for their money."

To the east and south of Quebec, the Maritime Provinces—Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland—are the Appalachia of Canada, cramped, economically depressed, losing population, hindered by lack of ready access to the outside world.

The prairie Provinces, like our Great Plains, still are tied to a farm economy with its resultant boom and bust cycles. Last year was a boom time, but next year—or any year—could be a disaster. The prairies are trying desperately and in competition with each other, to diversify by developing their ore deposits.

British Columbia has the same problem of economic development that plagues Washington and Oregon—the familiar footnote in the ad which says, "Slightly higher west of the Rockies." Transportation is expensive, especialy in a land whose population is spread out in a strip more than 3,000 miles long but only 200 miles deep. British Columbia is the end of the line.

Inflamed by the irritant of Quebec, inspired by dreams of new authority, provincial rivalry has become so intense that many Canadians would rather buy abroad than from another Province. According to U.S. News & World Report, economic studies show

that Canadians will spend up to 15 percent more to support local industries rather than "imports" from other Provinces.

The executive of a Canadian firm is quoted is saying, "We find it more difficult to sell our products today in some of the Provinces of our own country than in Algeria and Venezuela."

He might not be typical of the majority of Canadian industrialists, but there can be little question that the essence of his lament is real. Canadians, doing better than ever before, don't feel they need each other as they once did.

There can be even less question that the source of this feeling, the irritant which keeps Canada from finding a national identity 100 years after the search began, is Quebec.

The Role of the OAS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIGIO DE LA GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the strife, turmoil, and bloodshed in the Dominican Republic in the last few days points up once again the continuous Communist subversion dictated from Moscow and Peiping and implemented from Havana.

Every American should be proud of the swift action of President Johnson in taking those measures necessary to insure that communism shall not spread to another freedom-loving people in our own hemisphere.

The issues in the Dominican Republic crisis are clear. Shall a small band of foreign-trained subversives defy the will of the people, their constituted representatives and their national neighbors, or shall the combined moral and political forces of the republics of the Western Hemisphere be brought to bear?

The United States has a clear answer. President Johnson gave that answer in his address to the Nation when he said:

> The United States is ready to support with every resource at its command the inter-American system.

I am proud of the determination which the President displayed to the world. I am proud too of the strong support which the American press has given to our foreign policy decisions. The editors of our Nation have done an excellent service in clarifying the issues and printing informative explanations of the nature of the U.S. commitment to fight communism anywhere in the world. The May 5 editorial from the Washington Evening Star is a sample of that support.

This editorial follows:

THE ROLE OF THE OAS

When the crisis in the Dominican Republic reached the point at which the governing junta advised our officials that it could not guarantee the safety of U.S. citizens and those of other countries, President Johnson acted promptly and firmly. When information came through which persuaded him that the revolt against the junta was being taken under Communist control, he again acted promptly and firmly. Additional thousands of marines and paratroopers were rushed to the Caribbean country. And this was the right thing to do. As a result our nationals and the others have adequate protection, large quantities of much-needed food and medical supplies are getting through, and the fighting for practical purposes is over. All of this adds up to a good day's work for Lyndon Baines Johnson, and we applaud his willingness to act decisively when delay might have been fatal. Once a decision has been made to intervene in a situation like this, it is vital that the intervention be effective.

Still, the American people should not deceive themselves. There is much that remains to be done, and the doing of it may be more difficult than sending in the marines and the paratroopers. Those who worry about our image say that the United States has suffered because of this exercise in gunboat diplomacy. To the extent that this may be true, and we do not believe there is much truth in it, the fact remains that, under the circumstances, damage to our image was greatly to be preferred to the slaughter of American citizens or a Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic. On this point it is significant that the complainants, whether in the Senate, the United Nations, or Latin America, have failed to come up with a plan for a better course of action, or, in fact, with any proposal at all for an alternative. The truth is that the President had no alternative, except to do nothing and accept what promised to be frightful consequences.

The stage has now been reached, however, at which all parties should join in the search for a political solution. In this connection the best hope lies with the Organization of American States, which has had a peace-seeking commission in Santo Domingo for several days.

It seems to us the OAS will do well to concentrate its efforts on securing a cease-fire in Santo Domingo followed by establishment of an interim provisional government there. If it proves possible meanwhile to replace our troops with an inter-American force, so much the better. But there is less value in justifying the steps already taken to restore order in the island than there is in searching out a solution to the problem of the political future.

After negotiations with both factions in Santo Domingo, an OAS spokesman is reported as saying that a great deal of progress toward a solution of the crisis has been made. Since no details were forthcoming, this should be put down as a generality, but a hopeful one. On the other side of the ledger, U.S. authorities are reported to have said they are determined to make sure that all measures will be taken to eliminate any danger of a Communist takeover before American troops leave the island.

Again, what we have here is a generality, but one which is in line with the President's newly proclaimed doctrine that no new Communist regime will be tolerated in the Americas.

All of this, it seems to us, suggests that the role of the peacemakers will not be an easy one. Our troops may be in the Dominican Republic for quite a while. In the end, however, there must come an acceptable settlement, and it is most likely to be achieved through the good offices of the OAS.

Rumanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in commemorating Rumanian Independence Day.

Twenty years ago—a generation—Soviet military might thrust a crown of thorns on the brow of Rumania. Since that time the people of Rumania have suffered under the domination of a Communist totalitarian regime.

In recent years there have, happily, been signs that the oppression slowly is being lifted. No longer does the Soviet Union maintain its military garrisons on Rumanian soil.

Recently too, the Rumanian Government has demonstrated some independence from Moscow, and has expressed a desire for better relations with the West.

These efforts at breaking the grip of Soviet communism over a people are to be applauded. Let us hope that they presage even further advances toward restoring freedoms to the Rumanian people.

While no concession should be made any regime in Eastern Europe which would endanger our national security or solidify the position of Communist rulers, the United States should continue to work for the betterment of the Rumanian people.

In this effort, it may be possible to explore increased trade, cultural and trade relations between people of the United States and the people of Rumania. In this way it eventually may be possible to assist the reentry of Rumania into the family of European nations.

It is that glorious time we look toward today as we commemorate Rumanian Independence Day.

REA in Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no congressional district in the Nation can testify more directly and convincingly of benefits derived from the Rural Electrification Administration than the Sixth Congressional District of Minnesota. Since the beginning of the rural electrification program in 1935, REA has helped to light the homes and ease the labors of farm people in rural areas of the 19 counties in this district.

In this great agricultural area, REA has been a boon to farm and village residents and to the city dwellers who have cottages near our fine lakes or in our wooded sections. Today, there are 13 rural electric cooperatives which maintain their headquarters facilities within the Sixth Congressional District, and 6 others which serve sections of counties in the Sixth District. In addition, there are eight REA telephone borrowers which have headquarters within this congressional district.

The 13 rural electric borrowers are operating a total of 19,664 miles of electric powerlines and they serve 53,044 rural consumers. One of these borrow-

ers is the Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River, a generation and transmission cooperative, which is operating the first nuclear power facility built in our State.

The people of Minnesota know the value of the REA programs and are grateful for the opportunity to enjoy rural electric and telephone service at rates which would not be possible except for the favorable terms which the Congress has made available. In reviewing the history of the REA programs, we are impressed that the Government used its credit to help rural people gain the blessings of rural electrification and later to help rural areas get modern dial telephone service. There were risks, great ones, but farmers and other rural residents took much of the risk out of the programs by their enthusiastic reception of electric power and telephone service.

So it is with pride that I call attention to the great achievements made under the REA programs in Minnesota.

Despite criticism of REA, we in Minnesota have seen no evidence that the rural electrification program has turned away from its original purposes. In Minnesota, five out of every six farms today receive electric service from REA-financed rural power systems. The partnership of local people with their Federal Government was the means by which rural Minnesota was able to enter the wondrous electrical age. In 1935, when REA began, only 6.8 percent of Minnesota's farms had central station electric service. For the Nation, the percentage of farms so electrified in 1935 was 10.9 percent. Today, 99 percent of our Minnesota farms have central station electric service, against 98 percent for the entire Nation.

Today, the Minnesota rural electric borrowers are operating almost 85,000 miles of line, both distribution and transmission, to serve almost 250,000 farm and other rural consumers. About one-half of these rural consumers are farmers.

Because Minnesota farmers have found cooperatives an effective means of solving tough problems, 52 of the 54 Minnesota electric borrowers under the REA program are rural electric cooperatives. The other two are municipalities—Litchfield and New Prague—which used REA financing to serve rural needs. The loan to New Prague has been fully repaid.

The first REA loan in the State was approved in September 1935. Since then, REA has approved loans totaling $248 million. REA had advanced $191.8 million of this amount on December 31, 1964.

It must be recognized that the job of rural electrification in Minnesota has been made difficult by the built-in handicaps which are found in so many rural areas of this country. The Minnesota rural electric systems have had to contend with low consumer density per mile of line, 2.8 consumers for the Minnesota cooperatives, compared with 3.3 consumers per mile for all REA borrowers. As a result, the Minnesota borrowers, despite their great progress, have averaged annual revenues of only $480 per mile, whereas the class A and B commercial utilities in Minnesota averaged 38.7 consumers and $8,599 per mile.

The Minnesota rural electric cooperatives are also handicapped by a lack of diverse loads and large power consumers. And they operate as isolated systems, which adds to cost and difficulty of operation.

Their principal handicap at the outset was the high cost of wholesale power. Some of the early cooperatives were asked to pay more than 2 cents per kilowatt-hour at wholesale. Fortunately, the availability of power from Federal dams on the Missouri River helped to reduce somewhat the high power costs for Minnesota rural electric cooperatives. The availability of REA loans for generation and transmission facilities also is helping to bring this cost down.

In finding ways to surmount their handicaps, the Minnesota rural electric systems have fully justified the confidence of their organizers and members with outstanding performances in almost every phase of operation and service.

By January 1, 1965, REA borrowers in Minnesota had made a total of $140,988,227 in payments on their Government loans. The payments included $64,802,835 repaid on principal as due, $12,950,685 of principal paid ahead of schedule, and interest payments of $33,234,707. No borrower was overdue in its payments.

Consumers served by REA borrowers in the State are using increasing amounts of electricity on their farms and in their rural homes and businesses. In 1954, the average monthly consumption per consumer was 293 kilowatt-hours. By 1964, the average had risen to 560 kilowatt-hours. The continuing objective of REA borrowers in Minnesota is to provide the electric service required by their consumers under rates and conditions comparable to those available in urban communities.

The growth in power consumption points up one of the principal concerns of rural electric systems as they plan for the future—the assurance of an adequate supply of power at low cost. The power requirements of all REA-financed rural systems rose from 30 billion kilowatt-hours in 1960 to 41 billion in 1964. Looking to the future, REA estimates that its borrowers will need at least 65 billion kilowatt-hours by 1970, 87 billion kilowatt-hours in 1975, and 116 billion kilowatt-hours in 1980.

For Minnesota borrowers, power requirements will rise from the 1.7 billion kilowatt-hours of 1964 to 2.7 billion kilowatt-hours in 1970, 3.4 billion kilowatt-hours in 1975, and 4.3 billion kilowatt-hours in 1980. By 1985, incidentally, the Minnesota rural systems will require 5.3 billion kilowatt-hours, or more than three times the total for 1964.

These estimates underscore the fact that the task of rural electrification is far from finished. In the 30-year-old REA program, as with our highways, the job is not finished when the initial system is built.

As REA Administrator Norman M. Clapp has pointed out, along with their total power requirements, the capital requirements of REA-financed systems will increase in the years ahead. Mr. Clapp has said that REA borrower systems may need as much as $8.1 billion in new capital between 1965 and the end of 1980. In 1980, the REA borrowers may need as much as $675 million for investment in new facilities to serve their consumers.

I regret that time is not available for me to discuss the accomplishments and needs in Minnesota and the Nation adequately or fully. I do wish, however, to state that rural electrification progress has been facilitated in our State by the close cooperation of all types of power suppliers. The power cooperatives in Minnesota are working with the commercial utilities in the creation of power pools and the planning of future facilities for maximum economy.

Crime Rate a Growing Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the growing crime rate in America is becoming the tragedy of our age. Our country faces many crucial problems, probably more now than at any time in our history; but the wave of crime, in my opinion, supersedes almost any other in the terrible results it will have upon our Nation's future.

Nowhere is this fact more glaringly apparent than here in Washington. We must take immediate and the most determined steps to come to grips with America's crime problem.

I insert in the RECORD in this regard a recent column by David Lawrence which contains a brief but terribly tragic story for us all to consider:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SHOULD TAKE STERN MEASURES TO COMBAT GROWING CRIME WAVE IN THE COUNTRY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson is to be commended for sending marines into Santo Domingo to protect the lives of 1,200 or more Americans and European nationals—but there are those who say he hasn't gone far enough. They point to the tens of thousands of Americans living in Washington, D.C., who need similar protection, particularly at night. Even servicemen in military installations near large cities are being warned, because of at least two or three persons.

The situation in the District of Columbia is not far different from what it is in other parts of the United States. But it so happens that the President has complete authority to govern the National Capital and to use Federal troops as policemen to protect the lives of the residents. Many marines and soldiers in the Regular Army have no heavy duties at their military bases or barracks and could be employed to guard the lives of American citizens in this country, especially in the evening hours.

The tragedies are numerous. Here is an excerpt from a letter just received by this correspondent from a serviceman who has fought gallantly for his country:

"My wife and I both worked our way through college. We lived and worked in the District of Columbia, where she was graduated at the Southeastern University and also attended the Corcoran School of Art. She was a talented artist, accountant, and legal

secretary. In December 1962, she got off a bus in Southeast Washington, where we lived. A teenage colored boy ran up behind her and slugged her viciously with a brick or club, knocking her down on the walk, and almost broke her arm when he jerked the purse off her arm. She was covered with blood and hospitalized nearly a week.

"Last August 25, 1964, she went out of the apartment about midnight with a flashlight looking for her cat. She was 55 years old. A 20-year-old Negro grabbed her around the neck with an arm lock and attempted to drag her into the nearby woods to rape her. When she screamed for help, he stabbed her four times with some vicious, narrow daggers, almost like ice picks. She died 12 days later in the hospital. Although she was given many blood transfusions and operated upon by the best doctors in Washington. Servicemen in the Department of Defense gave 16 pints of blood to the hospital in her memory. There is no use my attempting to tell you how terribly I feel about this: I cry all the time about losing her, and just scream when I think of the attack by this vicious brute.

"The police did a good job catching him, but he hasn't been convicted yet and may beat the case, although they found her wristwatch in his pocket. He has been in jail 6 months waiting trial.

"There is nothing more to add. It is really a matter of the survival of our country, if the crime wave isn't stopped. In the meantime, merchants are being shot to death and policemen maimed right here in the shadow of the Capitol.

"Would use of the marines and troops be possible to stop the crime wave? Should all men be fingerprinted? Should criminals be deported? Surely there must be some solution to save our country. It is more dangerous to walk the streets of Washington, D.C., than anything I faced in World War II or the service during the Korean police action, and I have nine campaign ribbons and lived through it, only to find my wife murdered in front of our home in Washington, D.C."

It would cost the Government of the United States hardly any extra funds to allocate troops to the major cities of the United States for night patrol duty. They could travel in automobiles and make tours every few minutes in all sections of a city. Eventually, of course, the States would have to appropriate money for permanent patrols by policemen of their own. But it might require months and months, if not years, to organize such additional forces. There could, however, be some immediate relief through the use of Federal troops.

The administration is studying the whole question of how it can be of help in getting better police protection for the entire country. But the project has not been given priority over everything else, and, while studies and surveys are being made, many Americans are losing their lives.

If the President were to send to Congress a message demanding immediate appropriations for the benefit of the States so that an emergency project for increasing the police forces could be put into operation, it would unquestionably be approved by American public opinion. For the war on crime deserves the highest priority on the list of domestic projects before the administration today.

The 10th of May

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, each year on the 10th of May, the people of the free world commemorate a traditional Rumanian national holiday. This is the day which honors the achievement of Rumania's independence from Ottoman oppression and the founding of its kingdom. The observance by the free world is to signify to the Rumanian people behind the Iron Curtain that they have not been forgotten and will not be forgotten.

The American people share the hopes and aspirations of the Rumanian people for national liberty. On this commemoration of the 10th of May, we hope they will find new strength in their determination to celebrate the freedom and independence they rightfully earned nearly a century ago.

Three Hundredth Anniversary of Staten Island Reformed Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Staten Island Reformed Church celebrated its 300th anniversary this year and on May 2 at the 4 p.m. service a beautiful plaque was unveiled. The plaque reads:

In 1665 a small group of the first Dutch settlers to come to the shores of this Island banded together for the worship of Almighty God. Through three centuries, faithful men and women have continued this ministry to the community, the Nation, and the world.

John M. Braisted, Jr., district attorney for Richmond County, and a member of the Reformed Church, played the organ for this historic service.

A message from President Johnson to Rev. Jack Hascup, pastor, was delivered by me as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

Rev. JACK HASCUP,
The Reformed Church of Staten Island, Staten Island, N.Y.:

I have learned with much pleasure from Congressman MURPHY that the Reformed Church on Staten Island is observing the 300th anniversary of its founding.

On this joyous and memorable occasion you may recall with pride and satisfaction the many fruitful years of service rendered by your church to God and to your community.

I am happy to extend to you and to your members my heartiest greetings and warm congratulations. I hope that the years ahead will be replete with abundant blessings for you and for the members of your church.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The church services were edifying and enlightening to all who attended. In the front row of the church, seven little girls in Dutch costumes set the tone for the occasion and they were a reminder to all that although costumes and materials have changed, the principles and faith in our heritage and religion have not.

The former pastor of the church from 1948 to 1959, Rev. Cornelius Vander Naald, gave the principal address.

Vietnam: The Right War at the Right Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the most recent issue of Time magazine, now on the stands, carries in its weekly feature, "Time Essay," an excellent analysis of why the United States is in Vietnam, and why it should remain there.

The essay, entitled "Vietnam: The Right War at the Right Time," places in the most succinct and logical manner that I have seen to date the justification for President Johnson's bold determination to resist Communist aggression in Vietnam.

I believe Time magazine has rendered an imposing public service by raising the six most frequently asked questions about America's policy in Vietnam, and then methodically answering these questions with arguments that, in my judgment, leave little room, if any, for rebuttal.

It is particularly noteworthy that Time magazine recalls the arguments of those who have been most critical of President Johnson's policy, and then proceeds to show how wrong they had been in the past in their criticism of other instances in American foreign policy. Mr. Walter Lippmann, noted American columnist, who has been highly critical of President Johnson's Vietnam policy, is quite properly singled out by Time magazine as being the same Walter Lippmann, who during the Greek crisis of 1947–49, would have abandoned our gallant wartime ally, Greece.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that all Americans would have an opportunity to read this excellent Time magazine analysis in order to have a more thorough understanding why the United States must take the steps we are taking in Vietnam, and why President Johnson deserves our undivided support in his effort.

Mr. Speaker, the Time essay follows:

TIME ESSAY: VIETNAM—THE RIGHT WAR AT THE RIGHT TIME

The Caribbean is closer to U.S. shores than the South China Sea, but despite the nearby uproar in the Dominican Republic, the crucial test of American policy and will is still taking place in Vietnam.

By and large, U.S. public opinion seems strongly behind Lyndon Johnson's unyielding strategy of bombing the North and stepped-up ground action in the South. At the same time, an insistent—if by no means unanimous—chorus of criticism is heard, particularly on college campuses, from faculty as well as students. Teach-ins, petitions, and picketing get headlines. Most of the critics argue that the United States should stop the bombing and get out quickly, giving an odd combination of pragmatic and supposedly ethical reasons.

The pragmatic reasons add up to the notion that the United States either cannot win or need not win in order to safeguard its interests. The moral objections are often weakened by the fact that, while the critics condemn the use of force against North Vietnam, they either condone or ignore it in other

situations—such as Sukarno's guerrilla war against Malaysia, Red China's conquest of Tibet or, most important, the Vietcong's own terror against South Vietnamese peasants.

QUESTIONS OF REALITY

Herewith a discussion of the six principal arguments.

The struggle in Vietnam is a civil war and the United States has no right to interfere. Certainly, there are elements of a civil war present. Many Vietcong are not hard-line Communists but nationalistic and social revolutionaries whose aims include land reform and reunification. But as elsewhere, the local revolution has been captured by communism. The Vietcong have some autonomy, but they are trained, directed, and supplied by North Vietnam. In the Communist rebellions in Greece and Malaya, for example, almost identical arguments were heard; these were called civil wars in which the United States was supposedly backing reactionary regimes that lacked popular support and could not win. And yet in both cases, when outside Red help was shut off, the rebellions collapsed. Because the West has lately learned to live with Communist regimes that have been forced to cut back their export of revolution, it is sometimes forgotten that communism still remains an international aggressive movement, that infiltration and subversion remain realities, not words to frighten children. No struggle in which communism is involved is ever truly a civil war.

The South Vietnamese people don't care whether they live under communism or not, as long as they get peace. Obviously they desperately want peace, and they need more positive hopes than just anticommunism to keep them going. But after a decade, South Vietnam's army is still fighting, and sustaining casualties proportionately higher than U.S. casualties in two World Wars. This is an amazing fact, recently heightened by the decline in Government desertions, and in the increase in new recruitment.

The United States cannot fight for democracy by backing more or less undemocratic regimes in Saigon. A democratic regime is hardly possible in a war-torn country without much democratic tradition. What the critics fail to admit is that even a bad non-Communist regime is usually subject to change, but once a Communist regime is established, it is virtually irreversible. Taking up the argument that the integrity of U.S. democracy at home depends on an end to the war, Columnist Max Lerner, himself a professor, recently replied: "No, it depends on not flinching from the reality principle, on maintaining clear goals without hypocrisy, and in showing that democracy has what it takes for survival against ruthless forces both at home and abroad."

North Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh might turn into the Tito of Asian communism. This is possible, but only if Red China changes its nationalist-expansionist direction. Tito's Yugoslavia is separated by 200 miles of Carpathian wilderness from Russia, while North Vietnam has a common frontier with China. Moreover, the Chinese have traditionally pushed south. Ho, whose basic training and sympathies derive from the Soviet Union, is now 75; most of his rising lieutenants are pro-Peiping. A Vietnam united under Communist rule would, for the foreseeable future, remain a Peiping satellite. It is absurd to suggest that after winning all of Vietnam the Communists would then sit back and turn "mellow." Inevitably, they would seek domination of the whole area, and there is no sign that they would be resisted except in Thailand—and even here the Red pressure would be enormous.

U.S. escalation in Vietnam is pushing Red China and Russia together. Despite some parallel warlike noises from Moscow and Peiping, there is little to support this belief. China seeks to control the Communist movement throughout the world, hopes to win that control by showing that "wars of liberalization" pay off. Russia, on the other hand, is unwilling to give up the hard-won détente with the West, which permits Moscow greater concentration on internal development, in favor of the Chinese hard line. Should Mao prove his point by winning in South Vietnam, Russia might well be forced into greater militancy.

Asia is not of vital importance to the United States. After all, so runs this argument, the United States is not omnipotent. Walter Lippmann contends that Asia is legitimately the sphere of Chinese influence, just as the Western Hemisphere is America's.[1] That contention is questionable. Since the early 19th century, the United States has grown to a major Pacific maritime power; to surrender the Pacific to China now makes no more sense than surrendering it to Imperial Japan would have in 1941. With southeast Asia gone, the United States would rapidly approach a point where it might have no foothold in Asia from Okinawa to Australia. Beyond that, the argument cannot be sustained in the light of modern weaponry: geographic spheres of influence are simply not pertinent in an era of ICBM's. The Chinese themselves pay no attention to the theory, as is shown by their activities in Africa and Latin America.

DANGERS OF INACTION

The chief immediate demand of the critics is that the United States negotiate. But such an argument leaves out of account the fact that the Communists use negotiations only as a tactic to make further gains—unless they are forced by superior power or self-interest to stick to their bargains. They quickly broke the Geneva agreement of 1954 and the Laos agreement of 1962 by refusing to withdraw Communist guerrilla forces. Depite vague talk, no one has advanced even the outlines of an international arrangement that could keep South Vietnam secure from communism. Hanoi and Peiping show no sign of considering any international agreement except the kind of neutralization that would put the Vietcong in a position to capture power in Saigon.

Obviously, after overcoming his early hesitation, Lyndon Johnson will not allow the United States to be pushed out of Vietnam. For if that were to happen, Americans would only have to make another stand against Asian communism later, under worse conditions and in less tenable locations. As Demosthenes said about expansionist Macedonia in the fourth century B.C.: "You will be wise to defend yourselves now, but if you let the opportunity pass, you will not be able to act even if you want to." Despite all its excruciating difficulties, the Vietnamese struggle is absolutely inescapable for the United States in the mid-sixties—and in that sense, it is the right war in the right place at the right time.

[1] Irritated by the Lippmann argument, Pentagon officials made a study of his columns during the Greek crisis of 1947–49 and concluded: "My God, Walter would have given away Greece, too."

Jewish Labor Committee Asks Poland and Russia for Information on Nazi Crimes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the search for escaped Nazi war criminals continues and the German Government now has 4½ more years to locate these outcasts as a result of the extension of the German statute of limitations.

In a recent letter to the Procurator General of the Soviet Union and the Minister of Justice of Poland, the chairman and executive secretary of the Jewish Labor Committee requested those two officials to furnish to the German Government whatever documents which may be in their possession concerning Nazi war criminals.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement issued by the Jewish Labor Committee containing the text of the letter:

JEWISH LABOR COMMITTEE ASKS POLAND AND RUSSIA FOR INFORMATION ON NAZI CRIMES

NEW YORK.—The Jewish Labor Committee has called upon the Governments of Poland and Soviet Russia to make available to Germany documents naming Nazi criminals who have not yet been prosecuted.

In a letter to the Polish and Soviet Ministers of Justice signed by Adolph Held, chairman, and Benjamin Tabachinsky, executive secretary, the JLC stated that the 4½-year extension of the statute of limitations on Nazi crimes made it necessary that the German police authorities act with all deliberate speed if the criminals are to be brought to justice.

The JLC leaders pointed out that the German authorities have repeatedly stated that they would have had better results in their research for Nazi criminals if they had the information that was possessed by the Polish and Russian Governments. At the end of World War II, tons of German documents were captured by the invading armies from the East and removed to Warsaw and Moscow.

In their communication Messrs. Held and Tabachinsky stated to the Russian and Polish officials: "We feel sure that you too have the greatest interest in seeing to it that the criminals of the Nazi-Hitler period should be apprehended and brought before the bar of justice for their crimes."

The JLC letter concluded with the request that photostatic copies of the documents possessed by the Russians and Poles be promptly made available to the law enforcement authorities "thereby helping to eliminate all obstacles to the punishment of those Nazi criminals who have thus far escaped justice.

The following is the text of the JLC letter. The identical letter was sent to Roman A. Rudenko, Procurator General of the U.S.S.R., and Marian Rybicky, Minister of Justice of the People's Republic of Poland.

"DEAR MR. MINISTER: As you know, the German Parliament has voted to extend the statute of limitations for the prosecution of Nazi crimes for an additional period of about 4½ years. Our organization has always opposed and fought against any statute of limitations whatever on the crimes of the Nazis. However, as you know, our position was not accepted and the 4½-year compromise was adopted.

As a result of the decision of the German Parliament it is necessary for the German police and judicial authorities to move effectively and with all deliberate speed to round up and indict all Nazi criminals who were active in the extermination of European civilians, Jewish and non-Jewish.

During discussions with various German agencies about the statute of limitations, they repeatedly pointed out that they would have achieved better results and would have been able to punish more Nazi criminals if they had possessed the various documents in your possession. On our part, we feel sure that you too have the greatest interest in seeing to it that the criminals of the Nazi-Hitler period should be appre-

hended and brought before the bar of justice for their crimes.

We therefore appeal to you most urgently that you do all in your power to make these documents available to the West German Government. We request that you make photostatic copies of your documents available for examination by the German law enforcement agencies, thereby helping to eliminate all obstacles to the punishment of those Nazi criminals who have thus far escaped justice."

Yours very truly,

ADOLPH HELD, *Chairman.*
BENJAMIN TABACHINSKY,
Executive Secretary.

Address of the Vice President on Polish Constitution Day at Chicago, Ill., May 2, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 2, 1965, Chicago observed the commemoration of Polish Constitution Day with a rally held in Humboldt Park, which is located in my congressional district. We were honored by the presence of the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who delivered the principal speech to the 150,000 people gathered for the occasion.

It was a stirring speech, so with permission I include it in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT ON POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 2, 1965

Distinguished reverend clergy, his honor, the great mayor of the great city of Chicago, Richard Daley; members of the county and city government, State legislators, my good friends of the Congress, the Congressmen from the district in which this great gathering is being held—Congressman DAN ROSTENKOWSKI whom you all know well, Congressman ROMAN PUCINSKI. DANNY and ROMAN invited me several times to be here. They promised me that with your intercession and divine providence and the mayor of Chicago all working together, we'd have good weather, and we have it. Congressman KLUCZYNSKI, who I trust is with us here today, and Congressman ED DERWINSKI, my good friends are all here on this great day to commemorate the Polish Constitution Day, the 174th anniversary of a document of freedom—a document of liberalism—a document of humanitarianism—a document of parliamentary government—a document of majority rule—a constitution of liberty for a great people. What a beautiful day it is to celebrate that memorable event of May 3, 1791—Polish Constitution Day.

May I pause for a moment in behalf of our country, in behalf of freedom-loving people everywhere, to pay our respects to a great soldier, to a great patriot of his own land, and to a fighter of freedom second to none. Of course, I refer to the distinguished soldier and patriot that has addressed us here today, General Marczek, who has graced this platform by his presence and by his words. The world will never forget this great general was commander of the famed Polish 1st Armored Division which took part in many of the most important battles of World War II, and every battle was an honor to the general and his troops. And then, may I once again pay my respects to these distinguished statesmen who have come here representing the Assembly of the Captive European Nations. They're fine people, and Mr. Rozmarek, the citation and the medal you've received today is a high honor. I cherish in my office a plaque which I received a few years ago with the flags of the captive nations of Europe—a plaque which was an expression of appreciation on the part of those people for some work in the Congress of the United States which I was privileged to perform. So may I once again express my gratitude to these valiant, courageous lovers of freedom who have done so much for each and every one of us. And I want also to pay my respects today to the many fraternal organizations that are here—the Polish fraternal groups, the Polish veterans, and the many veterans organizations that are here on this memorable day; and above all, may I say a word of happiness and good cheer to the youth, to the young people, because, as Mrs. Humphrey and I had those few moments to witness a part of your parade, we were once again thrilled by the young people—their health, their vigor, their vitality.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to talk today a little bit about our citizenship as Americans. I want to talk to you a little bit about our responsibilities as a people and as a country, because this Nation of ours, as Mr. Rozmarek has indicated, has tremendous responsibilities today. Charles, I want you to know how grateful I am as Vice President of these United States to hear your words in support for the President, for the Congress, for the policy of the Government of the United States, as we defend freedom in southeast Asia and as we resist the most brutal form of terrorism and the most unbelievable and insidious form of subversion and aggression that this Nation has witnessed in all of its life, by the Communists in that area. And lest there be any doubt, let me remind you of the words of President Johnson in that memorable address at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore just a few weeks ago, when he told us that we will not be defeated, we will not withdraw, we will not tire, we will defend freedom and we will not sell out or sell away the liberties of others and call it peace. That lesson has been learned in this century. There is no peace for anyone, nor is there any freedom for anyone, if country after country—little countries—can be sold down the river into tyranny and into slavery. Freedom and peace are indivisible, and we have no intention my fellow Americans of withdrawing from the struggle, of seeking an easy truce or peace at the price of principle and freedom.

Yesterday, Mrs. Humphrey and I were at Williamsburg, Va., and at Jamestown. Jamestown, Va., represents the first English-speaking settlement in the United States—1707. There we were privileged to participate in the ceremony of new citizenship for about 200 immigrants that had come to our shores to become American citizens. And what a wonderful experience it was. What a glorious day. It was beautiful like today. And there they were, young people in the main, people of every race, creed, and nationality, people from Poland, people from Eastern Europe, people from the northern countries of Europe, from Asia, from Latin America, from Africa, from the Middle East. There they were taking that oath of allegiance to the United States of America. It was an exciting experience because I saw my country and our country strengthened. No one nation has a unique claim to America, but no people has a greater claim or can claim greater contributions to our country, to our beloved America, than those who came here from Poland. All one has to do is to look at that statue, to look at that memorial to a great patriot, General Kosciusko, one of the great fighters for freedom, one who helped America, and then we know that the people of Poland have made great contributions to our land.

From the earliest beginnings, America—our country—has benefited from the wisdom, the courage, the guidance, the leadership of the Polish people. We have benefited from the art and the literature and the beautiful music and the skill and the craftsmanship and the statesmanship and the love of liberty of the Polish people.

We share great heroes, as I've said, like Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko and General Pulaski, men who have been heroes in battle and fighters for human rights and human dignity, battlers every one of them against tyranny, battlers against tyranny of the mind and spirit, as well as tyranny of the body politic.

As Americans of Polish descent, therefore, you share the strengths of two great peoples. Many of the democratic American traditions have their parallels in Polish history of a thousand years. Think of it—a thousand years. Might I add, that great Constitution that we commemorate today, of May 3, 1791, came to the Polish people only 2 years after our own Constitution. This, above all, proves to me that a good idea is a powerful weapon. And the good idea of American freedom and independence penetrated every land within a very few years after the adoption of our Constitution. That Constitution of Poland, dedicated to parliamentary government, had much of its inspiration, my fellow Americans, from our Constitution—we the people of these United States.

For most of that period of a thousand years, Poland has been an independent Christian nation, though there are those that today within her boundaries would ignore, and indeed destroy, these traditions, we know that the spirit of the real Poland never dies, and we know that the spirit of the liberty-loving free Poland will flower once again.

Our late and beloved President Kennedy said these words: "Poland's claim to independence and liberty is not based on sentiment or politics. It is deeply rooted in history, in culture, and in law—and no matter what pressure the Soviets may exert, we do not intend to see that claim abandoned."

Ladies and gentlemen, those words of a departed President who loved Poland—those are the words of America today, just as truly now as then.

We are convinced that time is on the side of freedom—that is, if we put time to good use—if we put time to good use and do not abandon freedom.

We intend to put that time to good use, and we're doing it here today. We intend to build bridges to the Polish people—bridges which may now and then be obstructed at the other end, but which will be there to be cleared when the day of freedom dawns. We intend to build bridges that strengthen the bonds of friendship between America and the Polish people, and I say to Frances Dymek, as she read the resolutions here today, we intend to expand our programs of cultural exchange, of contact with the people of Poland, because, make no mistake about it my friends, Poland is not Communist—Poland is Polish, loving liberty. Poland is a friend of the United States, the likes of which I've never seen elsewhere and I've traveled in that country and know of what I speak. The people of Poland love our America, and the people of Poland love their nation, they love their history, and I wish my voice could go to the people of Poland—we love you too, and we stand with you, good people of Poland, for your days of freedom.

The fires of liberty are not dimmed in Polish hearts. The fires of their nationalism and their independence—they burn brightly. We must help sustain that fire.

As our own President Lyndon Johnson has said only recently: "We know the unswerving dedication of the Polish people to the goals of liberty, equality, and independence. That is why our policy is extended to help the Polish people, so that they may increasingly help themselves." These are the words of your President.

Last fall, as has been indicated here today among the introductions, I spoke here of one act of friendship and fellowship of the United States—one act that was intended to help cement our good relations with the people of Poland. It was an opportunity which we did not miss.

Under legislation sponsored by some of your own very distinguished Representatives, such as your own Congressman PUCINSKI, and with the help of your own friend, DANNY ROSTENKOWSKI, and others, the United States—and I should add CLEM ZABLOCKI who was a power in this from the great State of Wisconsin—the United States has contributed more than $10 million for the construction of a modern, beautiful children's hospital at the great university city, Krakow, in Poland. What a different symbol it is, my friends, to the Polish people than that of a statue of Stalin or someone else. My friends, that hospital will stand there as a living reminder to the people of Poland for generations yet to come that America believes in people and human dignity, that America believes in and stands up for freedom and human life, and the hospital will remind them of that.

I am proud to say that this hospital and research center which I had something to do with will be dedicated sometime this summer. The children of Poland will know that the United States has a real love for the children of God wherever they are, and that we are determined to wipe out sickness, crippling misery, and disease, wherever we can. We care not what be the nationality or what regime they may live under. Where there is a child that is in need, America wants to be of help, and that's what the hospital means.

Now quickly let me turn to another matter where we need your attention and your help. Four successive Presidents, President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and now President Johnson, have called attention to the need of revising our immigration laws, pointing out the serious defects in our existing immigration law.

Now before the Congress is a bill—a bill which was put before them some 3 years ago first by President Kennedy and now by President Johnson—which puts the principles of basic American immigration law in line with the ideals and the commitments of this Nation and its people. It's a bill that is humanitarian, a bill that is fair.

This legislation calls for the elimination of the national origins quota system, because that system is incompatible with our basic American tradition. This bill seeks to put into practice in the law the words that we think about freedom and human dignity.

After all, all of us are immigrants or sons of immigrants, and I think the main reason that America is so strong and so rich and so interesting and so vital is because there is in this land the bloodline of many people, many cultures, many faiths, many traditions—all of them like you with their identity, but all of them, may I say, with one common purpose—to serve the United States of America and what it stands for.

Throughout our history the newcomers to our shores have brought us new energy and new vitality—never new problems, never weakness. Do we still offer welcome to those who would come to America to build a better life? Under our present immigration law, we do not.

Our present immigration law is, to put it bluntly, a bad law. The national origins system has four major defects.

First, it is not humanitarian. It has kept families divided and broken. Elderly parents and relatives of many of you right here have had to wait years, sometimes wait until they were no longer alive—wait for admission under an outmoded, unfair national quota—often a very small national quota discriminating against the eastern and central and southern European people. And I submit to any fairminded man, that the people of eastern Europe and central Europe and southern Europe have contributed as much or more to America as any people in our rich land. Today a man can bring to Chicago a domestic servant from any of the several countries, but he can't bring his own mother or his own father or his own brother to live here and to enjoy in those last few years of their lives that have been filled with such pain and anguish—to enjoy a little of the happiness that the younger ones could provide. And my goodness, couldn't we make them happy if they could just join us here in America.

Secondly, our present immigration law deprives us of people that we need, people of great skill and professional ability. There's always room in America for people that know how to do things. There's always room in America for people that are ambitious, people that want to work, people that have pride and skill and self-confidence.

Thirdly, the present immigration law embarrasses us in our international relations. It seems to say in bold type that we regard a great majority of the people on this earth as inferior to others. And surely in a nation that believes in equality, that kind of law has no place on our statute books.

Finally, and most important, this present law goes against our basic commitments and ideals. It is a flaw, it is a blight, which we must remove, and we owe it to ourselves to correct.

So I ask you today to help us—in keeping with the very best traditions of our democracy—I ask you, Polish and American, to throw your wholehearted support behind President Johnson's new immigration bill, so that America can hold her head high. Let your voices be heard.

This immigration bill is just one more step toward achieving what you and I know we can achieve—a better America, the Great Society for all Americans. A great society is a just society. It's a kind society, and it is possible for America.

The Great Society is not just one of more goods and bigger bank accounts. It is a society in which every American, regardless of race, color, creed, religion, or national origin will have the opportunity to develop his potentiality and his ability to a maximum. And it's to that proposition that present-day America is dedicated. The key word, the theme of these days in your America is opportunity for all—equal opportunity for every American. I know that there may be some who will squander this opportunity. There may be some who will waste it, some who will let it slip away. But at least every person should have the opportunity to make freedom and dignity realities in his life.

This means better education for young and old alike. And we're going to give it. We're going to provide it. There will never be a time again in America when a person who wants to have an education will be denied it. We have resolved to permit every American to develop his mind to the maximum, and how rich America will be and how powerful it will be when that goal is achieved. And Mr. Mayor, Mayor Daley, following your leadership, we intend to help America make better cities, better places for our people to live, not only places where people can work, but cities that are worthy of the people within them, cities that are beautiful, cities where the laughter and the joy of children is evident and can be heard. A degree of kindness and security for the elderly and opportunity for everyone. This is the meaning of our new immigration which needs your support. This is the meaning of the Great Society. This is the meaning of a thousand years of Polish history, a thousand years dedicated to the great concept of freedom and justice.

My fellow Americans, as I leave you today, I remind you of the pledge that every one of you has taken a hundred times—at least your children have. When we look at our flag, and as our youngsters go to their schools, they are called upon time after time to repeat, as an affirmation of their faith and their loyalty to this Republic, what we call the Pledge of Allegiance. These young people, and most of us older people, repeat it almost, I'm afraid, without thinking through each word. We say, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands." And then these words, "One nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all." Not two nations, not North, not South, not East and West, not city and rural, but one nation, one people, under the majesty of divine providence. With a recognition that or rights and our liberties are God-given and God-ordained, and that it is man's duty through law and through custom and through tradition, to uphold those God-given rights and protect them. The rights of freedom of speech and freedom to assemble and freedom to petition, the rights indeed and responsibilities. Of social order and obedience to law, of respect for law and of responsibility for our actions. And finally, in those words "with liberty and justice for all."

Liberty—what a precious, precious gift. Remember freedom is never free and liberty only belongs to those who can defend it and love it. And justice for all means just that. If it is not justice for all, it is justice for none. And whether it be colored or white, Catholic, Protestant or Jew, whether it be big or little, rich or poor, justice means what it says—to do justice and to be kind and to walk humbly with thy Lord. Thank you.

Salute to the State of Israel

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have noted with great satisfaction the deepening warmth of the friendship of African nations for the State of Israel, which on May 6 celebrated her 17th birthday. From her limited resources, Israel has contributed much to the developing nations of Africa, and everywhere among Africans I have heard words of appreciation.

I do not hesitate to predict that the time is not far distant when the attitude of the Arab world toward Israel will change from hostility to acceptance of the facts of the present century and the truth that by working cooperatively together both the Arab States and Israel will benefit.

I have expressed this thought on at least two occasions when the newspapermen of Cairo graciously met with me at press conferences. While none of the

Egyptian journalists spoke in agreement of my thought, there was no apparent resentment because I was championing the cause of Israel on Arab soil. This would not have been the case, certainly not 10 years ago.

Nations working cooperatively together in development of natural and social resources for mutual benefit is the order of the new day into which we have been ushered by the epochmaking changes that have followed World War II.

Israel offers no menace to the Arab States and she can be of tremendous benefit to them, as many of the new African nations have found.

It was on this keynote of optimism, with the vision of approaching understanding and friendship on the part of Israel's former foes, that I joined with my colleagues in birthday greetings to the brave and noble State of Israel.

What the State of Israel has accomplished in 17 years is one of the miracles of history. And the blessings she has brought to herself and her own people she has shared with all her neighbors and the new nations that would accept.

Long, Difficult Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Tuesday morning, April 27, 1965:

LONG, DIFFICULT ROAD

Defense Secretary McNamara, at his televised news conference Monday, gave the American people a forthright appraisal of the enormities and the complexities of the problems in Vietnam.

He might have looked at the southeast Asian crisis through rose-colored glasses, but he didn't.

He might have chosen to tell the American people what they would like to hear. He elected, instead, to tell them what they ought to know.

It was an illuminating presentation of unpleasant facts as they are in Vietnam. The war there is ugly and brutal. North Vietnam not only is infiltrating South Vietnam with tens of thousands of guerrillas but also has recently dispatched at least one regular army combat unit of several hundred men.

Both sides are incurring heavy losses.

The picture isn't all bleak, however. Mr. McNamara noted that U.S. air attacks against North Vietnam, aimed primarily at transportation and communication facilities have succeeded in slowing down the flow of military supplies to Communist forces in South Vietnam. But the flow has not been stopped.

South Vietnamese troops, who have been accused in the past of showing a reluctance to fight in defense of their country, are demonstrating both the will and the ability to fight effectively, according to the Secretary. He pointed out that the South Vietnamese Army is suffering casualties at a higher rate, in proportion to total manpower, than we in America "have ever encountered in our history." This would seem to knock the props from the argument, heard in some quarters, that Americans ought to withdraw from South Vietnam because the people there are indifferent to the Communist threat.

Mr. McNamara wisely declined to engage in speculation about the future course of the war or the kinds of weapons that might be used in hypothetical situations. Nothing is to be gained by such talk and, besides, it is better to keep policy flexible and the enemy guessing.

Even as the Defense Secretary was speaking, there were continuing attempts to set up an international conference in Cambodia that conceivably could lead to negotiations on the Vietnam conflict. Secretary of State Rusk has formally announced U.S. readiness to participate in such a meeting. Although the outlook for a fruitful parley is dim, every effort should be made to encourage any discussions that might contribute to a fair settlement.

Secretary McNamara, when pressed for a prediction on the outcome of events in Vietnam, said the only certainty of what lies ahead is "a long, difficult road." That is, indeed, the prospect—whether on the battlefield or at the conference table.

California Can't Get Its Crops Picked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, California grows more than 25 percent of the table foods of the United States—but we cannot get them picked.

Millions of dollars of crops are rotting in the fields. Thousands of American workers will not enjoy their usual employment this year and in future years.

Small family farmers and large corporate farms are only one step away from bankruptcy.

Prices of fruit and vegetables to the consumer will unnecessarily increase.

Most significantly, valuable and nutritious food will be lost to many families.

To show that even big city editors are now confirming what I predicted months and years ago, I insert an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner of May 5, 1965:

THE SCANDAL OF ROTTING CROPS

California's next and imminent major political issue may be boiling up apace in the accumulating food crop spoilage in the State's spreading acreage of unharvested fields.

If Governor Brown and his administration, and the California congressional delegation, are not aware of this swiftly developing fact, they are less astute than we think.

The critical farm labor shortage has already made damaging inroads on the asparagus crop in the Stockton area and the strawberry crop at Salinas. Without adequate labor, the damage will increase progressively as harvest deadlines approach for other crops all over the State, with a peak in early autumn.

The abrupt ending of the bracero (Mexican labor) program touched off the crisis. The reasonable and mandatory solution was to establish an emergency foreign labor reserve to bridge the gap, as Governor Brown urged. But the politicians temporized.

The same U.S. Public Law 414 that permits foreign entertainers (Richard Burton and the Beatles) to work here should have been invoked to save California's ripening and now rotting crops. That was not done. Very little—certainly not enough—was done. So now we have the State's richest food crops going progressively and deplorably down the drain.

Politicians may be sure they are running into a storm over this situation. Farming is California's No. 1 industry. Most other industries are vitally linked to farming. All economic indexes reflect the good or bad health of agriculture.

The time left for effective political action is short. The Governor, the Congressmen, the whole body of responsible political leadership, should concentrate on two main channels of action. A prompt meeting of minds between the United States and Mexican Governments should be sought on at least a temporary renewal of farm labor contracts. The second point of concentration should be on breaking down the reluctance of Labor Secretary Wirtz to let enough Mexican workers into California in time to save the remaining food crops from dying unharvested in the fields.

H.R. 7765: HEW Appropriation Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7765) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Eductaion, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, for a number of years now there has been much tongue-clucking and quite a few thousand words written about the young people of this Nation who because of their lack of education, or their environment, or their attitude, have been lumped into the disadvantaged category.

In the past year a number of programs have been launched by the Federal Government whose laudable aim has been to bring help, and aid and counsel to these young people who, thorugh no fault of their own, are considered to be economic and social pariahs.

I believe that most of these programs are succeeding. But one of them, with which I am well acquainted because it operates within my own district, is threatened with extinction almost before it has drawn its first breath.

I refer to the youth opportunity center program which was launched early this year by the Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security. These centers are not just job referral agencies. Nor are they of the mission variety which offer a bowl of soup, a bed for the night, and a heartfelt prayer.

These youth opportunity centers are proving to be economic and social havens for the nearly one million young people

between 16 and 21 who nobody will hire because they have no education, no skills, and not much hope. The Department of Labor planned to have 105 of these centers in operation by June 30, and 139 early in fiscal 1966. But those plans may have gone aglimmering because the House Committee on Appropriations recently turned down a request by the Department of Labor that general funds from the Treasury be used to supplement certain trust funds. The committee explained its reasons for rejecting the Department's request, and it also noted that it was aware that its action "is going to mean severe curtailment of some activities of that Department."

However, I do not believe that the members of that committee were aware that its action could curtail the hopes of thousands of young Americans who might find the counsel and encouragement they need through the system of youth opportunity centers that are now in operation throughout our country. These centers are making a valuable contribution to solving the problems of disadvantaged youth. To close them now, to halt their development, seemingly would indicate that we are content to pay only lip service to the needs of our youth, but not to offer them the skilled counsel they must have if the are to achieve a productive role in our society.

It is my sincere hope that this mistake can be corrected and that the youth opportunity centers will continue to perform their important function.

H.R. 7765: HEW Appropriation Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7765) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, the new youth opportunity centers now being opened all over the country are quickly capturing public support, thus providing the need for this expanded service to youth. Emphasis is placed on youth employability at the centers, for many of today's youth are virtually unemployable. This is caused by a combination of circumstances. Employers must demand more highly qualified employees, automation and technological advances have made immense changes in the structure of the labor force, all but eliminating the need for unskilled workers, and added to this situation is the vastly increased youth population. Thus, when youth are undereducated or disadvantaged in other ways, as many are in this country today, their employment problems are usually acute.

The centers' community relations coordinators work actively with all agencies in the community, whether governmental, private, or voluntary, and enlists their cooperation. This support is essential, because it has become apparent that many youths are in need of extra services which obviously could not be offered in the centers, but which can be made available to them through effective local liaison arrangements. These needs may arise from educational deficiency, health, legal, psychiatric, rehabilitative, and other problems.

At the national level, the USES staff works with national officers of various organizations, and they in turn endorse the YOC program and recommend cooperation of State and local affiliates. In addition to assistance in providing needed youth services, these organizations have proved effective in working with the hard-to-reach youth. Most of our severely disadvantaged youth are frustrated and discouraged. They need motivation and encouragement to even seek help for themselves. A number of voluntary organizations have been actively concerned with youth employment programs in the last few years, and many local programs have tackled related areas, such as school dropouts. Now the youth opportunity centers are providing the focal point for these efforts.

Another YOC medium that is actively involving the community is the YOC advisory committee, whose members work individually and as a group in furthering the mission of the center. These committees include representatives of all elements in the community, including the disadvantaged themselves.

It is my firm conviction that these youth opportunity centers, providing they receive full congressional support, have the opportunity to become the prime coordinating factor in this Nation's efforts to end the economic frustrations of its young citizens. They should, in my opinion, receive our wholehearted endorsement and support.

H.R. 7765: HEW Appropriation Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL J. KREBS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7765) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, although total employment and national output rose to a recordbreaking high in 1964, the number of unemployed teenagers actually increased. Youth unemployment is a serious and growing problem. One out of every nine young people between the ages of 16 and 22 who are out of school and in the labor force today is jobless. The problem is serious and can be expected to become even more so, for growing numbers of untrained and inexperienced youth will be competing for jobs in the face of a steadily shrinking demand for unskilled workers both in industry and on the farm.

Among young members of disadvantaged minority group some of our most serious problems of chronic unemployment are to be found. The rate of unemployment among nonwhite is about twice as high as that of white youth. Even nonwhite youths who have high school diplomas find difficulty in getting jobs. Their unemployment rate is double that of their white counterparts.

Seeing little to inspire hope and ambition, some children of the slums may turn to unlawful acts. Delinquency rates are about three times higher in urban than in rural areas, and within the cities delinquency tends to be concentrated in slum sections.

Because many of the unemployed youth have deep-seated problems, because many may be alienated, hard to reach, and disillusioned because they have in the past been too frequently promised help and too frequently failed by those who purport to help them, the services of the youth opportunity centers have been planned to provide services to meet the needs of individuals. The procedures of the centers will emphasize continuity of service to youth. To the maximum extent possible, each youth will be assigned to a counselor who will work with him from the time he first has contact with the center, through training and remedial services, according to his needs, to satisfactory employment. Counseling will be focused on the goal of ultimate employment through a vocational plan. Each youth will be helped according to his needs and the help will not be terminated until it is no longer needed. Emphasis will be on development of the employability of each youth to the maximum of his potential, to furnish employers with useful, trained, capable employees.

A youth opportunity center has been approved for Newark, N.J., and is scheduled to open shortly. However, the future of these centers may be in doubt because of a recent action by the House Appropriations Committee. I am sure that the members of this committee did not intend that their vote to reject additional appropriations to the Department of Labor might seriously cripple the youth opportunity program. It is my deep conviction that this House and the Senate should act quickly to assure the continuation of these centers which are serving so well the disadvantaged youth of our Nation.

H.R. 7765: HEW Appropriations Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H.R. 7765) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, last week, the House Committee on Appropriations dealt what could be a serious blow to an important program that has been designed to render real and effective help to the more than a million young people of this Nation who find themselves at the very bottom of our economic totem pole.

The committee acted, I believe, reluctantly and took considerable pains to give its reasons for rejecting a request for an additional appropriation by the Department of Labor. I do not rise to dispute the committee's decision, nor its recommendation. I do rise to protest its effect.

By refusing the Department's request for an appropriation of $39,280,000 from general funds of the Treasury, the committee in its own words stated that "it is going to mean severe curtailment of activities that the department feels quite important."

One of these activities is the operation of the youth opportunity centers, the first of which was established earlier this year. These centers' financial base rests on the funds which the Department requested and which the committee refused.

None of these youth opportunity centers has been established in my district, so perhaps I can speak of their value with a certain objectivity. One hundred and five of them were scheduled to be in operation by June 30 of this year. Their primary purpose is to provide counsel for the disadvantaged young people who are between 16 and 21.

The problems that young people of this age and of this economic and social classification encounter are without number. They need the advice and counsel from persons who understand them emotionally and intellectually. they need to find such persons in an environment which holds its institutional atmosphere to a minimum. This has been, and is, the purpose of the youth opportunity centers which operate under the guidance of the Department of Labor's Bureau of Economic Security.

These youth opportunity centers have just begun their vital work of bringing help and hope to our young economic cripples. These centers have been launched with a minimum of fanfare. Indeed, their reputation has been spread by word of mouth among the young whom they have already served. I hate to think what will happen if our youth opportunity centers are forced to hang up an "out of business" sign on their doors.

I believe that these centers are a vital segment of our efforts to relieve the poverty among our young citizens. They should not be abandoned. We must find the means to preserve them.

Persecution of Soviet Jewry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning I testified before the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, on my resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 277, and similar resolutions, which express the sense of the Congress that persecution of the Jews in the Soviet Union be condemned and censured.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to set forth my testimony herewith:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF EUROPE OF THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, MAY 10, 1965

Madame Chairman, I am grateful for the opporunity to appear before this committee in support of my concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 277, which expresses the sense of Congress that persecution of Soviet Jewry be condemned and censured. I want first to commend the subcommittee for the service it is performing as a forum for national opinion on this critical issue. I appear before you today out of a profound sense of duty and personal commitment, and as the representative of thousands of my constituents to whom the subject before us today is of the deepest possible significance.

It is my belief that the crime against Jews in Russia is a form of cultural genocide, a crime against all humanity, and therefore is properly on the agenda of this Nation and all nations, subject to the judgment of all men.

Three million Jews currently living in the Soviet Union are now subject to the systematic strangulation of their historic identity and the erosion of their sacred traditions. This deliberate policy of premeditated persecution is evil. It offends the ethical dignity of all men. It denies the accumulated moral wisdom of centuries. It contradicts the principles which all members of the United Nations, including the Soviet Union itself, have declared to provide the basis of a world order dedicated to universal justice.

Only in the past several years has the full story of the persecution of Soviet Jewry become clear. Now we are able to see that the ends of this persecution are in no way different from those once pursued by Nazi Germany. Only the means have changed. Gone are the concentration camps and the cruel machinery of extermination. In their place is a strategy seeking the destruction of Jews by undermining all those special qualities which have assured the cohesion of a people throughout the most rapacious persecutions in history. In place of death by violent murder, there is a different death—one of subtle and persistent cultural starvation.

Thus, Jews in the Soviet Union are now being denied the sustaining food of their religion, their education, their culture, their vocations and, indeed, their humor and pleasure. No people can maintain its identity in the absence of all those forces which bind it together and make it one. It is this danger which we must recognize as the real threat to Soviet Jewry.

The systematic assault on an entire people escapes the imagination. Only when we began to comprehend the tragedy of individual Jews did we begin to make sense of the Nazi genocide. Perhaps it will be useful, therefore, to consider the case of one Russian Jew.

If this citizen is a young man, say in his middle thirties, he may still remember that 2,500,000 of his fellow Russian Jews were murdered during World War II. His memory, if it fails, may be reinforced by the circumstances of the life he shares with those Jews who escaped the Nazi terror. On his passport he carries the classification "Jew," as did his brothers in Europe during the Nazi domination of the Continent. He is branded at once as a member of a minority, a special unit of humanity to be distinguished from all others. He is to be known as a Jew because he and his fellows are subject to special rules, laws, and procedures in the operation of Soviet society.

Perhaps he has sought the education which Soviet Russia has declared to be the right of all its citizens. In so doing, however, he has encountered a ruthless quota system limiting the number of Jews who can participate in the benefits of a Russian education—a quota system, scholars tell us, more extensive and discriminatory than any which operated during the days of the czarist pogroms. Denied an education, the Soviet Jew finds himself with most doors to opportunity closed to him forever.

He may turn, then, to self-education, education in his own heritage and traditions perhaps. If, as is true with many Russian Jews, his language is Yiddish, he may seek books and journals and newspapers in this tongue. He will find none, for no publication of Yiddish books has been permitted since 1959, with the exception of six—only six—short works by authors long dead. Perhaps he may wish to go to his own theater, but the Soviet Yiddish theater, long one of the prides of Russian artistic achievement, has been banned. Today, only a few amateurs gather together informally and privately to try to continue a tradition of hundreds of years. But a culture deprived of public expression and celebration is a culture threatened with extinction—which is the policy in Russia toward the rich and persevering culture of its Jews.

If the cultural and intellectual roots of his identity are thus threatened, perhaps our citizen may seek ennoblement and purpose in his religion. In the Soviet Union, however, the Jewish house of worship—with few exceptions—is padlocked. The number of synagogues and rabbis which the Government allows to flourish has now been reduced to about 60 or 70 in the entire country, or 1 for each 16,000 Jewish believers. The training of young rabbis who seek to continue the religious vocation has been viciously curtailed so that of the 13 students in the one single rabbinical academy, in all Russia, only 2 are less than 40 years of age—2 young rabbinical students in the entire country.

Our citizen, then, has virtually no one to train and serve him in his religion. He has almost nowhere to worship. If he seeks to do so at home, once again, he is denied the material of his faith; for Judaism is permitted no publication facilities and no publications. No Hebrew Bible has been printed for 50 years. No religious book of any kind in Hebrew has appeared since 1920. Nor is this surprising, for the language itself is outlawed.

The ritual articles and symbolic foods of his faith are denied him; these too cannot be produced without ruthless prosecution. If our citizen is fortunate enough to live in an area where a synagogue has been allowed to exist, he still will find no opportunity to communicate with his brothers in other parts of the country; for the Soviet Government has outlawed any association of Jewish religious organizations. Nor can he communicate with Jews outside Russia.

Denied the language, the teachers, the practitioners, the facilities, the ritual articles, the books, and the community of his faith, the Russian Jew is dispossessed of his religion and sent, once again, to the exile of secrecy, with the threat of arrest and further persecution.

As a Jew, then, he is deprived of his culture and religion. As a Russian, he is deprived of first-class citizenship in employment and vocation. Since he has not had full opportunity in education, he is at serious disadvantage in the specialist society of Soviet Russia. Even if he is specially gifted, he will still be refused entrance into any vocation judged to be of significant national importance. Thus, he is excluded from any service in government, in diplomacy, in education, or in science. The few scientists and educators whose brilliance could not be matched are now older men and women who are being eased out as the elitist educational system produces non-Jewish talent and skill. In the work and business of his land, then the Russian Jew is an alien, not to be trusted—to be avoided and excluded systematically without regard to his worth and his gifts.

The Jew in Russia, then, is increasingly a stranger to his history and tradition. Who is the Jew to his fellow Russian citizens, to those who have never met him or his fellows? A review of current Soviet publications, journals, magazines, and newspapers reveals a systematic ridicule and virulent stereotyping of Jews and Judaism. The young citizen whose life we have discussed is described, to his fellow Russians, as a worshipper of money, a drunkard, an agent of subversion, a speculator in human lives, a pagan who not only exploits his fellow citizens, but turns, as a matter of habit, upon his own fellow Jews. This is the Russian Jew as he appears day after day in Soviet publications. He resembles, if one takes the time to remember, the exact same stereotype as was publicized throughout the years of Nazi domination in Europe. He looks the same, acts and talks the same; the brutal cartoons may just as well have been captured Nazi documents. Their message is the same: The Jew is to be avoided for he corrupts and demeans society and blemishes national integrity.

Can just men in this country tolerate this subtle attempt to destroy the character and unity of an entire people? Can any of us here fail to raise voices of protest and still remain true to the democratic traditions and principles of our own history? I myself cannot. And this is why I have introduced a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Soviet Government's persecution of Jews be condemned and that it allow the free exercise of religion and cultural pursuits by Russian Jewry. This is why I urge that the United States ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, as established by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948. This is why I urge the President and Secretary of State to communicate, again and again, this country's outrage over the cultural genocide now being pursued against Russian Jews.

There is no tradition or custom which forbids the citizenry of the world to make public its indignation at crimes against humanity. For such action, the nations of the world have sought to join together in common enterprise in the United Nations. Where an entire people is threatened with spiritual and cultural extinction, so the whole world is threatened with moral guilt if it fails to express its outrage in the strongest voice. I therefore urge the adoption of my resolution expressing the outrage of the U.S. Congress at the crime of cultural genocide against Soviet Jews.

Possession of Guns Is American "Right"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and much correspondence has taken place with my constituents in the Eighth Congressional District relative to legislation on the possession of guns.

There appeared an excellent editorial in the Jackson Sun of Sunday, April 25. I agree wholeheartedly with this editorial and I intend to support their position.

The Jackson Sun is the outstanding daily newspaper published at Jackson, Tenn.

The editorial follows:

POSSESSION OF GUNS IS AMERICAN "RIGHT"

Constant pressure has been exerted for years in the campaign to deprive Americans of their guns.

All manner of excuses have been used to make it seem "humane" or something for laws to permit only police or national agencies to possess hand guns.

Any accident in which a child was shot has served as an excuse to raise a hue and cry to banish guns from the home.

Accidents while hunting gave the antigun factions an excuse for including all kinds of guns in their campaign of destruction.

Then the do-away-with-guns advocates pounced upon the criminal use of guns as an excuse for mounting a drive to prohibit the sale or possession of guns except by police permit.

The matter has even been taken so far on occasion as to seek national action banning the purchase of a gun of any kind unless by permit issued by some Federal agency.

One of the most recent occasions sparking another antigun explosion was the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

The fact that investigators blamed a mail-order gun as the weapon seemed perfect for the campaigners. Here was the ideal scapegoat—and the excuse by which the sale of guns could be prohibited.

By stopping mail-order gun sales, the goal might be reached. For taxes and privilege licenses could be made so costly that local dealers would be driven out of the market.

That seems to be the method now being pursued.

Curtis Baker, in his April 16 "Wood and Water" column in the Sun, calls attention to Senate bill 1592, introduced March 22, by Senator DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, at the President's request.

The bill, as Baker points out, would prohibit all mail-order sales of any firearms to individuals. They would be allowed only between licensed importers, manufacturers, and dealers.

The bill would give the Secretary of the Treasury what appears to be unlimited power to regulate and restrict the honest and licensed dealers in firearms.

Such a power could easily and quickly kill off the sporting guns sales, as well as stopping the sale of handguns or other shooting implements.

Other provisions in the bill would end the private shooting club reloading of ammunition for skeet shooters; would prohibit a licensed gun dealer from selling to the resident of another State; would put a $100 license fee on the dealer in ammunition; would even prevent sending a gun to the factory for repairs unless allowed by the powers in Washington.

All of this and whatever else may be in the bill is offered the Senate in the name of preventing a repetition of a President's murder by means of a mail-order gun.

To put it bluntly, every decent, law-abiding American would be deprived of the implements of sports and self-protection because a Communist-trained assassin killed a President.

The bill must not be allowed to pass the Senate. And if it should, it must be stopped in the House.

For one reason, the second amendment to the Constitution guarantees:

"A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."

Any effort to prevent the people from keeping and bearing arms is an attack on the Constitution and must be resisted.

For another reason, criminals always have and always will be able to get their hands on guns and other instruments of destruction. Only the law-abiding citizen would be penalized.

For a third reason, the first move in setting up a dictatorship or tyranny is to deprive the people of their means of resistance. That is, their guns.

The United States must not become another Nazi Germany nor Communist Soviet Russia, nor anything like them.

The time to prevent such a move is before there is any appearance of legal authority. Tell your Senators and Congressmen your feelings—now.

Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom—which is worth all, life included.

Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the birthday of an agency of our Government which has meant more than can be told to the people of this country. An agency which attains the age of 30 years could be forgiven if it concentrated on the achievements of the past but I know that the Rural Electrification Administration is looking to the future.

I would therefore like to briefly review the history of this agency—one of those that has made life as we know it today possible.

The REA was created May 11, 1935, by Executive Order No. 7037 pursuant to authority granted in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. With that action President Roosevelt set into motion machinery of government that would have an untold impact on millions upon millions of our people. The authorizing legislation had been sponsored by Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, and Representative Sam Ray-

burn, of Texas, but this legislation was anything but regional. It was national in the broadest sense of that term.

When Executive Order No. 7037 was signed, only 10.9 percent of the farms in the country had access to electricity. Some men said it was and would always be impossible to electrify farms because of the distances and lack of uses for this source of power.

Others predicted that the REA would fail early and often and the entire concept would end in dismal failure. But, Mr. Speaker, I can remember that the success of the REA was immediate and often. I remember utility companies racing to put up lines to rural consumers after passage of the act so the REA's would have less territory to cover.

The record of the REA is a proud one. It has made loans to more than 1,100 borrowers with a total of more than $5.5 billion loaned. About 93 percent of these loans were to cooperatives organized under State laws by rural people seeking electric service. REA borrowers operate more than 1.5 million miles of line and serve over 5.4 million consumers in 46 States, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

The activities of the REA have been so successful that today, it is estimated that more than 98 percent of the farms in this country are electrified.

That uneconomic market for electricity of 30 years ago has become one of the largest single blocs of electrical consumers in the country and were the farms to be deprived of electrical power, costs of food would skyrocket. Slightly more than half of the electrified farms in this country are served by REA-financed systems and the demand for electricity in rural America is increasing.

As farms become larger, farmers turn to electrically powered equipment to do more of their work and this increased demand places ever greater burdens on rural electric systems. Burdens which must be met by expanding distribution and generating systems.

All of this work must be done under handicaps which are unique to systems which provide service to rural consumers. There is an average of 3.3 consumers on each mile of rural lines versus 33.2 consumers per mile of class A and B utilities.

In spite of this handicap, REA borrowers have one of the best payback records of any group in the country. These borrowers have paid more than $1.2 billion on the principal of their loans as due, $255 million of principal ahead of schedule, and $693 million in interest.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that this is a record of which the REA, the Congress, and the country can be very proud but much work remains. We can rest assured that the Rural Electrification Administration will devote the same heroic efforts to the work of the future that they have given in the past.

Remarkable Achievements of 10 Years of Operation by the Cortland County Extension Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, each year this House appropriates funds to set up or to continue a number of important programs relating to agriculture. We believe these programs are sound, and we of course hope that they will be properly administered.

But in the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, the administration and effectiveness of any program, either for agriculture or some other activity, depends on the men and women charged with that responsibility.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am especially proud of the great record in the operation of the agricultural extension service which has been built up in the past 10 years by the Cortland County Extension Service in my congressional district. These achievements have been made possible, of course, by the activities of all the members of the service, but especially by the dynamic and inspired leadership of the county's extension agent, Ira H. Blixt.

Just to underline the fine work which Mr. Blixt has been doing, I had the pleasure just a few weeks ago to welcome here to Washington a group of farm men and women from Cortland County, members of the extension service under the leadership of Mr. Blixt. Although the group numbered more than 80 persons, they visited the Department of Agriculture, visited the Capitol, visited the Goddard Space Center, and the Beltsville Agricultural Station. It was a very ambitious but also very successful tour, and bespeaks the fine leadership which Mr. Blixt has given to this fine service and to Cortland County.

Recently in the February 1965 issue of the Cortland County Farm and Home News there appeared an editorial summarizing the accomplishment of the Cortland County Extension Service. Under leave to extend my remarks I include this editorial:

THIS IS MY OPINION

A decade is a relatively short period of time, but the changes that have taken place in the past 10 years have been more significant and have had a greater impact on the total society than any previous 20-year period. It is safe to predict that there will be many greater changes developing at a more rapid pace in the future. It is interesting to take an inventory of just what has happened since 1955. This was the year that the Extension Service and Farm Bureau, after 42 years of "togetherness" mutually agreed to separate. The decision resulted in a definite strengthening of both organizations. It is significant to note that membership in the agricultural department was 918 10 years ago, and last year it reached an alltime-high of 1,247.

The farm numbers and sizes of these operations have changed. In 1955, the milk market administrator reported an average milk delivery of 549 pounds per dairy, per day for Cortland County. In 1963, it had increased to 944 pounds. The same report shows that Cortland County in 1955 ranked 10th among the New York counties supplying milk to the New York-New Jersey market, with a production of 232,572,718 pounds of milk valued at $9,112,302. In 1963, Cortland was the third highest producing county, with and output of 434,485,522 pounds, valued at $18,248,297. A decade ago there were more than 500 farms that kept a sizable number of chickens, and Extension Service specialists insisted that every layer should be provided a minimum of 3 square feet of floor space. Today there are 10 commercial poultrymen in the county who keep more chickens than the 500 poultrymen. How do they do it? The majority use housing that accommodates 22 birds in a 3 by 4-foot wire cage.

Crops, machinery, housing and methods have also changed. In 1955, dairymen had a choice of two alfalfa varieties—Naragansett and Ranger. Today, they have at least five outstanding varieties, not counting Ranger, which is no longer recommended. Farmers during this period have been exposed to more than a dozen new oat varieties and a list of corn hybrids that would be too long to publish in this News.

The first Hay Day, nearly 10 years ago, introduced a new Canadian hay tedder that took the county by storm. They were replaced by the hay conditioner, and on some farms the crimper and crusher has been exchanged for self-propelled windrowers. In 1955, there were no bulk tanks, but plenty of discussion for and against. As of January 1965, the Cortland County sealer of weights and measures, reports 145 tanks on farms in Cortland County.

Other significant changes have been farm organization mergers and reorganization; a new interstate highway; industrial growth and suburban development absorbing some of the good farmland. A recent event that will probably have more impact on rural counties such as Cortland, than any other legislation or program in past history, is the Supreme Court order of reapportionment.

What does the next 10 years hold forth? Certainly, more of the same can be assured, but the significance of it all, emphasizes the importance of (1) being alert to change through education and informational sources; (2) analyzing and planning for the best management procedures; and (3) developing the very best leadership abilities.

What is your opinion?

Authorizing Defense Procurement and Research and Development

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H.R. 7657) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces and for other purposes.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, as one of the newest members of the House Committee on the Armed Services, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sentiments about the excellent manner in which my chairman presented the $15 billion military procurement bill in the House.

It was another demonstration of the effective leadership he has exhibited since assuming the chair of the committee upon the retirement of the Honorable Carl Vinson, who served as chairman so long and well. We who are freshmen on the Armed Services Committee will look to L. MENDELL RIVERS for continued leadership of the same high caliber.

President's Order on the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, because of the numerous statements being issued daily on the President's order dispatching our military personnel to the Dominican Republic, I should like to insert in the RECORD a recent editorial from the Pittsburgh Press, April 29, 1965, on this subject.

As the Press has so ably stated, the President is working and acting in behalf of our citizens. Were he to ignore their plight, there is a possibility that not only the Americans in the Dominican Republic would suffer. Other Americans—within our own borders—could feel the effects of our Nation's disregard of rebellions, even small ones, so close to our shores.

The President's action was well taken, I believe—and future events will so prove it.

The editorial follows:

SENDING THE MARINES

President Johnson's timely action in sending U.S. Marines to protect U.S. citizens in a friendly neighboring country torn by armed strife is well taken—as is his urgent new plea for warring factions within the Dominican Republic to cease fire.

The President ordered the Marines into the island Republic only after new fighting had broken out and Dominican military authorities advised that U.S. military aid was needed to guarantee the safety of American citizens.

The political situation within the Dominican Republic remains unclear. The Dominican Ambassador to the Organization of American States contends efforts to overthrow the Government were the "finalization of Communist plans to make the Dominican Republic a second Cuba."

Our troops are officially in the Caribbean nation to guard U.S. citizens and foreign nationals who ask our protection. But high officials in Washington feel that we had another purpose in landing marines—to checkmate an attempt by Cuba's Communist dictator, Castro, to extend his sway.

If that is true, it is welcome evidence that the United States is willing to take a firmer stand than it has in the past in blocking subversive activity that threatens the peace and good order of friendly nations in Latin America.

Law Day in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of our very able jurists in Minnesota, the Honorable Donald Barbeau, judge of the district court of Hennepin County, was the principal speaker in Law Day ceremonies held in the city council chambers in the city of Minneapolis on April 29, 1965.

His message is brief but eloquent. Law Day is every day for the conscientious jurist who must exercise constant vigilance to see that the rights of all those who come before him are protected.

Because this message speaks so clearly of this continuing role of those administering justice, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

LAW DAY U.S.A.—EVERY DAY U.S.A.

(An address delivered by the Honorable Donald T. Barbeau, judge of the district court, at Law Day ceremonies in the city council chambers, at 9:30 a.m., Apr. 29, 1965)

While I greatly admire the setting aside of a particular day each year as Law Day to reaffirm the American belief in law and peace as opposed to the totalitarian belief in armed might, I must point out that those of us closely connected with the law must and do practice Law Day every day of the year.

The people who appear in our courts come from all levels of society, rich and poor, educated and uneducated, man, woman, and child, of all races and creeds, the poverty stricken and the affluent, the alcoholic, the mental misfit, all reaching out for an American way of justice administered in an equitable manner.

We jurists think of Law Day every day when we ascend the bench and see before us the poor and downtrodden and persons by the thousands burdened with almost insurmountable problems of existence.

We see Law Day every day when the American system of justice is able to extend itself and apprise each of these persons of his rights, protect his constitutional privileges and give each and every one an opportunity to express himself. Above all, we see it when the American system of justice is able to furnish help and succor to many of these citizens who are enmeshed in problems beyond their control.

We think of Law Day every day when we see the great legal advocate rise to defend these same impoverished people, regardless of how unpopular or impossible the cause may be, and when he carries such cause to the highest court in the land, not always with success, but always with sincerity.

What bulwark would freedom or the innocent unjustly accused of crime have if none had the courage to defend?

We think of Law Day every day when we consider the judge who, to quote Socrates, "hears courteously, answers wisely, considers soberly, and decides impartially." We think daily of the courts as being the guardians of liberty and the sentinels who watch for the capricious, the corrupt, the arbitrary, and the automatic. We see it every day in the conduct of the trial judge who feels it is his duty to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with his God.

The citizen, the advocate, and the judge, all working together daily, must convince the entire world that we have the finest form of justice. This can be done by the daily guarding of our precious heritage and a daily reaffirmation of our belief in the dignity of man because freedom itself demands constant vigilance. We must all daily dedicate ourselves to fighting for freedom for "the man next door." So to us who sit as judges "the rule of right, not might" is a living, vibrant thought that must be present day in and day out.

The American system of justice, though not perfect, is the marvel of the modern world. Under it we have grown and progressed and become the richest and most powerful Nation in the world.

But more important than that, today in our country the lowliest person under our flag enjoys a broader opportunity to possess happiness, more equal justice, more protection of life, liberty and property, and a greater personal freedom than has ever been provided for the common man by any other legal system in recorded history.

Under present world conditions, with all of us so concerned lest nations and peoples, forgetting law and morality, turn to mutual destruction, we need all the more every day, as well as Law Day, to work for a day when law may govern nations as it does men within nations.

Thoughtful persons do not need to be told that our Government cannot long exist once respect for the law is destroyed. Any apathy or indifference to the great rights of American justice may deprive us of many of them.

It is most proper, therefore, that on Law Day U.S.A. and every other day we rededicate ourselves to the idea of the preservation of a free society with equality and justice for all.

His Victory Our Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I heard last week of the official election as international vice president of the United Steelworkers of America of my dear friend, Joseph P. Molony of Buffalo. For while I and countless of my fellow citizens in Erie County are gratified and proud that our neighbor, Joe Molony, has been elevated by his brother steelworkers to the second highest post in the Nation's third largest trade union, we stand to lose a wonderful member of our civic community.

Much has been written in recent years about the development of the so-called "union bureaucrat," Mr. Speaker, and there have been those both within and without the house of labor who have spoken sharply about the leadership of the American trade union movement. Some have suggested that their former ideals and aspirations have been shelved in favor of personal gain and power.

There is no question but that this has been the case in many unions, but it is indeed refreshing to know that three decades in the labor movement, through both good and bad days, have not changed the principals and standards of Joe Molony, who has earned the respect and the admiration of leading industrialists, statesmen and civic leaders.

Our neighbor and friend, Joe Molony, has been saluted in the Wall Street Journal for his determination and resolution to seek the fruits of the American way of life for the some 1 million members of the United Steelworkers. He is indeed in the tradition of Phillip Murray, the beloved founder of his union, and of the other great figures of the American trade union movement.

Mr. Speaker, if there is no objection, I would like to insert the following editorial tribute which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News on May 4, 1965:

HIS VICTORY OUR LOSS

Now that the election of the Abel-Molony ticket of the United Steel Workers is official even though the result is not conceded by incumbent President David J. McDonald, we congratulate the winners. But especially so to "Joe" Molony, who is known in Buffalo not only as a forthright and courageous and intelligent labor man but as a civic leader. As such he has been enlisted on the side of good government in Buffalo and Erie County.

Ed Kelly, our respected labor reporter, advises that Mr. Molony's election as vice president of United Steel Workers doubtless means he will have to move himself and his headquarters to Pittsburgh, the center of activity for the million-member Steel Workers Union. This will be a gain for the steel workers, we believe, but it will be a serious loss in the political areas in which Mr. Molony has been active and has made his voice heard and judgment felt in this community. There are those who will be glad to see him go. We are not among them.

Laotian National Day, May 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 1947, Laos promulgated its first constitution. This constitution was to become a kind of modern statute for the kingdom, which received its independence from France 2 years later. In Laos, May 11 has been designated National Day and today is the 18th anniversary of that important and historic occasion.

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate His Majesty King Sri Savang Vatthana, His Royal Highness Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma, and His Royal Highness, the Laotian Ambassador to the United States, Prince Tiao Khampan.

It is an appropriate time to turn our attention to the Kingdom of Laos. There is a tendency for our eyes to focus on the developments in South Vietnam and to ignore what is happening in Laos. Yet Laos, as much as its neighbor to the south, is deeply engaged in a grim struggle for survival. Both countries are waging a war against Communist subversion and penetration.

The front pages of newspapers are filled with reports from South Vietnam—about the most recent air strike against a Vietcong stronghold or the arrival of a new contingent of marines. On rare occasions a column or two on Laos may appear in an inside page. In Laos there is none of the tempo or drama of the conflict in South Vietnam. Perhaps, for this reason, it is often called "the quiet war."

We should not forget, however, that the struggles in Laos and South Vietnam are indivisible. The leaders in Hanoi are masterminding both offensives and their goal in each case is the same. Their aim is clear and unmistakable—to bring the people of both countries under Communist domination.

A year ago the Communist Pathet Lao were rapidly gaining ground and the Royal Lao government, as represented by its neutralist and right wings, was falling apart. Indeed, it seemed that Laos was almost lost. The last 12 months, however, have seen some remarkable changes. Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma has consolidated his power and is for the moment confident and prepared to battle with the Communist guerrillas.

It would be unwise to exaggerate the importance of these gains. On the 18th anniversary of its "national day" the kingdom of Laos faces a difficult and dangerous future. In the year to come each day will be a test of the people's strength and will to survive. We in the United States honor these democratic and freedom-loving people. Their courage in these days of crisis assures them of the continued close support of the American people.

The President's Agonizing Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column by Max Lerner which was reprinted in the New York Herald Tribune of May 10, 1965 by the International Latex Corp.

Mr. Lerner has put his finger directly on one of the tremendous problems facing our President.

The article follows:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S AGONIZING CHOICE

(NOTE.—The following article from the pen of a renowned political liberal, a distinguished scholar and widely read columnist, sheds light where so much heat is now being generated. Reason and fact are used here to counter the confusions born of passion and noise.

(We are convinced that Mr. Max Lerner's article should be read by Americans and Latin Americans alike; and by those who find strange comfort in criticizing President Johnson for his courageous decisions in the Dominican Republic disaster.

(A. N. Spanel, founder chairman, International Latex Corp.)

A friend of mine, who knows Latin America better than I do, says it will be a long, hot summer in the Caribbean. Certainly what has happened in Santo Domingo, turning a lovely city into a charnel house, suggests that there are volcanic political passions in the area. The bloodshed wears the aspect not only of a rebellion but of a civil war, with longstanding hatreds coming into play and old accounts being settled.

In this jungle of passions, anti-American hatreds emerged very early in the rebellion. President Johnson had to act swiftly to get American civilians out. But most political decisions have plural, not single, motives. Having entered the Dominican Republic to save lives, the American troops have stayed to prevent anarchy, seal off the chances of a Communist takeover, and await the beginnings of a new frame of political order.

One's first impulse is to say that this was a monstrous blunder, awakening long muted memories of marine landings and gunboat diplomacy, and feeding the Castro image of American imperialism. Yet one cannot stop there, without raising a haunting question: What was the alternative for President Johnson? Was it to appeal to the OAS? There would be days and days before any practical action; and if the revolt did indeed contain, as a second-stage effect, the design for a Communist takeover, the OAS action would have come far too late. Or was the alternative simply to stay out, or to get out again immediately after the first evacuation of Americans, and let events take their course?

It isn't enough to point out in a holier-than-they way what must have been obvious enough to Johnson, Rusk, Bundy, and Tom Mann—that the decision was a dangerous one. But was there any alternative that would have been any less dangerous? Running a country isn't a question of making choices between the beautiful decisions and the damned ones. It is often an impossible choice between a blind alley and a somewhat less blind one, and a President is lucky, even as he enters a dark tunnel, that he can see a thin shaft of light at the far end.

The whole decision in the Dominican operation, as it transpired in the minds of the President and his advisers, was made in the shadow of Cuba. It is easy to say that the shadow shouldn't have been there—but it was. Too much blood has been spilt in Cuba, too many lives have been blasted there, too much heartbreak and frustration and remorse have been felt in Washington to leave the slate blank.

The pro-Bosch leaders now say that the Communist elements in the revolt are not many, and that the irresponsible ones got out of control. Maybe so. Certainly Bosch himself is a decent committed democrat with a small d, even if he is an ineffectual political leader. But after the Castro experience should one have expected President Johnson to take a course of action—or nonaction—that might well have led to a second Cuba off American shores? For him to have done so would not only have been out of character an out of philosophy; it would also have run counter to the kind of President most of the American people think he is, and the kind of belief they have in him.

Well, then, once the American troops came in, why has President Johnson piled up more and more thousands of them? Isn't each detachment he sends a further slap at the Latin American self-image? Here again one must go back to Cuban-American history, this time to the Bay of Pigs. The shadow of the Bay of Pigs fiasco hangs even more heavily over Washington than the shadow of Castro's persistence in power. If the Bay of Pigs invasion was a mistake then—as everyone now agrees—the failure to carry it through in full force compounded the mistake many times over. That was in Ken-

nedy's mind when he had to make a decision on the Russian missiles in Cuba. It will be in the mind of every President for some years to come. If history is lights and shadows, it is mostly shadows.

Of course there has been an outcry from the Latin neighbors and partners of the United States. If I were a Brazilian, a Mexican, a Chilean, I should probably be joining in the outcry. Yet if I asked myself what alternative there was, I should have no answer. I suspect strongly that, however great the outcry has been, it would have been dim and pale alongside the withering contempt of the Latin American leaders if the United States had done nothing, if its citizens had been killed, and if the revolt had led to another Castro regime—or a Castro-oriented one—in Santo Domingo.

The satisfying fact is that the OAS political presence has been enabled to establish itself alongside the U.S. military presence. There are dead to be buried, wounds to be bound up, food to be distributed, the routines of life to be restored. A new leadership will in time be found, and with heavy economic aid it will be able to make a new beginning of order. Whatever may be said against the Americans, they will not stay any longer than the minimal need for them. They will get out. That would not have been true of the Castroites, if they had been given a chance to turn the rebellion into a class dictatorship.

A Tribute to Congressman Frank Annunzio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week our colleague from Chicago, Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO, was honored by the Filippoo Mazzei Post No. 1, Illinois, of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, for his outstanding contribution in behalf of veterans legislation.

I should like to call my colleagues' attention to the fine tribute given Mr. ANNUNZIO and also to include his own remarks delivered in Chicago on Loyalty Day, May 1, 1965. We can all find great inspiration in Mr. ANNUNZIO's eloquent words regarding Loyalty Day.

Mr. Speaker, the two documents follow:

A TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN FRANK ANNUNZIO

(By Dr. James F. Greco, commander, Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.)

We are pleased to have with us this evening the distinguished Congressman from the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO. We welcome him as a friend; but his presence here tonight is of even greater significance—he is a champion of veterans everywhere.

From his earliest beginnings, Congressman ANNUNZIO's interest in civic affairs has prompted him to work for and with the people—recognizing their needs and their deeds—filling those needs and praising their deeds.

A look at the long, impressive list of his accomplishments makes one wonder how one man could have done so much. His driving vitality earned him a bachelor of arts degree and a master's degree from DePaul University. He entered the teaching profession and guided students in many of our Chicago schools.

As a fighter for human rights, he was in the trenches many years ago. After he was named director of labor in 1949, he issued a bulletin which drastically eliminated discrimination in employment services. He continually worked for the educational and legislative betterment of the labor community.

For his service to the Catholic Youth Organization, FRANK received the CYO Bishop Sheil Medal—Club of Champions. His fostering of good relations between Italy and the United States impelled the Italian Government to award him the Medal of Solidarity during the crucial period of World War II.

Even in private business FRANK found time to be part and parcel of a multitude of civic and charitable organizations. And just to prove this man is human, he is married and the father of three lovely girls. To his four grandsons, he is simply and affectionally "Grandpa."

FRANK typifies the expression, "Service before self," and he is not a man who is satisfied to go on past performance. His projected plans for the future include the procurement of a congressional charter for the national organization, the establishment of a national shrine for Italian-American War Veterans. He has been instrumental in securing a 40-bed hospital on the West Side of Chicago which will be built in 1966.

On March 12 of this year, we were honored to have FRANK represent the Filippo Mazzei Post at the ceremonies at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and at the wreath-laying ceremony at the Kennedy gravesite in Arlington Cemetery.

And so this evening we feel it particularly fitting that we present Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO with the flag of the country he is serving so well. May it long stand in his office in Washington as a reminder of the high esteem in which he is held by his friends of the Filippo Mazzei Post.

LOYALTY DAY

(By Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO)

I am very happy to be here with you tonight and very honored to be invited to share your observance of Loyalty Day. In March 1961 the late Senator Wiley, of Wisconsin, predicted that our country during the 1960's will face "threats to our security and survival greater than ever before in our history." In this spring of 1965, the truth of his words is becoming appallingly apparent. Never has our country had greater need of our loyalty, and never has there been a time, more urgent in its demand, for all Americans to step forward and give expression to their loyalty.

I did two things when I first began to think of speaking to you tonight. I looked up the dictionary's definition of loyalty, and I looked back over the history of Loyalty Day in order to review it briefly with you. From time to time, our office has been asked what is Loyalty Day, how it does differ from Law Day, and why are they both celebrated on the same day.

Loyalty, according to Mr. Webster, is the state, quality, or instance of being loyal, and one of the definitions of loyalty is "being faithful to the lawful government."

In 1961, the chairman of Loyalty Day of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Thomas B. Dean, published an article entitled "Loyalty Day—Americanism in Action." It appeared in the VFW magazine, and in it he reviewed the beginnings of Loyalty Day. He wrote:

"When the Communists in the United States flaunted their anti-American beliefs with the visual aid of annual May 1 parade in the heart of New York City, the VFW parried this strategy with the sponsorship of another parade—this one dedicated to the spirit of Americanism. Subsequently the May 1 parade by Communists in New York became a memory."

Loyalty Day then was the idea of a veteran's organization, whose members had fought on land and sea. It was the brainchild of men who knew the horrors of war and who were determined that all people of this country should understand the sacrifices of war and rededicate themselves to a love of country which these fighting men had demonstrated in the past.

The idea was enthusiastically received. The American Legion and numerous other groups joined in celebrating Loyalty Day in State after State, city after city. Then Governor after Governor in all the States joined the list of those proclaiming May 1 as Loyalty Day.

In 1955, Congress by a special proclamation designated May 1, 1955, as Loyalty Day, and 3 years later the Congress officially designated May 1 of each year as Loyalty Day.

The resolution was introduced in Congress by Mr. Van Zandt in the House, who said he did it at the request of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He offered an explanation of why May 1 was chosen, when he said:

"The idea of a patriotic celebration is an excellent means of countering communism. May Day demonstrations was conceived * * * about 30 years ago. It was agreed that emphasis should be placed on and attention focused on loyal Americans rather than subversive elements * * * (and that the day should be) dedicated to openly expressing loyalty to our Nation and its cherished ideals of liberty and freedom. In short, the virtues of true Americanism were given the public spotlight as a fitting and conclusive rebuttal to the vaunted claims of the Communists."

The joint resolution requested the President to order the flag to be displayed on Government buildings and to invite the people to observe Loyalty Day with appropriate ceremonies.

In the same year that Congress designated May 1 as Loyalty Day, President Eisenhower proclaimed May 1 as Law Day, and 3 years later Congress by joint resolution officially designated May 1 of each year as Law Day. The result is that we celebrate both Law Day and Loyalty Day on May 1, but no one has ever suggested that the two observances on the same day conflict in any manner.

If you recall with me the definition of loyal as "being faithful to the lawful government," you will see why no question was ever asked. However, the newspaper, The Stars and Stripes, on May 1, 1958, carried an editorial on "Law and Loyalty," which summarized the affinity of the 2 days as follows:

"Fortunately the ideas do not conflict. Dedication to the principles of government under law and loyalty to our country go hand in hand. Proper observance of the law brings of itself loyalty to the country and loyalty to the country must result in recognition of law which governs the people."

A good citizen obeys the law and is loyal to his country. A loyal man is faithful to the lawful government. America today is being challenged by a ruthless world and by countries without principles who are dedicated only to the will to conquer and to accomplish world domination. I thank you for this opportunity to join with you in this Loyalty Day observance to demonstrate to the world that we in America are free and friendly and dedicated to the proposition that all men should be free and friendly, and in addition, we are united as one people living loyally under law.

Reds Learn L.B.J.'s Tough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, all Americans can point with pride to the dynamic leadership of President Johnson in the field of foreign affairs.

We in America—and especially we Members of Congress—have long admired the President for his ingenious insight into the domestic problems that confront our people. We have seen him cope with these complex problems with an amazing ability and outstanding effectiveness.

But only in recent weeks has the world learned of the leadership greatness of Lyndon B. Johnson. This Nation's recent actions in Vietnam and in Central America have focused the world spotlight on our courageous Commander in Chief, who has charted his course of leadership in the free world community and proclaimed his position to the people of all nations.

There were skeptics, of course. There were those who doubted the wisdom of the President's policies. However, more and more leaders of liberty-loving nations everywhere are supporting these policies and joining with our President in standing firmly united against our common Communist foe.

Now, perhaps more than ever before in recent history, the free world stands strongly in unison against the aggressive acts of our enemy. This united front is due greatly to the determined action and firm know-how leadership of President Johnson.

Surely all Americans, and indeed the entire free world, owe President Lyndon B. Johnson a debt of gratitude.

Our Nation's editors, who have followed closely the turn of events in foreign affairs, appreciate and understand the international importance of President Johnson's courageous actions. In this connection, I would like at this time to insert in the RECORD an editorial by Mr. Robert G. Spivack as it appeared in the May 5, 1965, issue of the New York Journal-American.

This article clearly demonstrates that the American people are strongly in support of our great President:

[From the New York Journal-American, May 5, 1965]

WATCH ON THE POTOMAC: REDS LEARN L.B.J.'S TOUGH

(By Robert G. Spivak)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson is proving as much of a professional in his handling of international crises as in domestic affairs.

In every open confrontation with the Communists during his 17 months as President they have more than met their match. Where the Communists have tried to capitalize on ambiguity, chaos, and confusion, as in the Dominican Republic, the President has not been found wanting either.

It has taken the Communists, torn by dissension and under heavy Chinese pressure, a little time to realize what they were up against. The new President was, to them and to many Americans, an unknown quantity. But they may be catching on. The best measure of how badly they have been hurt is how loudly they have howled since the bombing of North Vietnamese military installations.

No one expects them to let up in their efforts to probe for L.B.J.'s weak spots, or give up taunting here and testing there, looking for whatever openings they can find. But, unlike some of L.B.J.'s fuzzy-minded critics at home, they are completely realistic.

If there is no advantage to be gained in Santo Domingo, they will retreat, since restoration of constitutional government under the liberal Juan Bosch was never their real objective. In Vietnam there are new indications that they would like a temporary cessation to hostilities, because of the punishment they have been taking and might yet take.

Has the President's policy succeded in North Vietnam? Perhaps it is too early to tell. But one European expert on Far Eastern affairs who briefed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in executive session forecast nearly a month ago that Red China would react cautiously to the American action.

Now, obscured by the headlines from the Dominican Republic, comes news that the Vietcong guerrillas say they do not want "volunteers" from China or the Soviet Union, that they want to win the war themselves. It's a good propaganda line, especially since their allies have not seemed overeager to have a military confrontation with the United States.

What of the President's intervention in the Dominican revolt? At this stage there are several mysteries about that unhappy affair, especially its timing. Perhaps Bosch will explain why at this particular moment an effort was made to overthrow the civilian junta. Bosch is no Castroite; he is a close friend of former Gov. Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico, who is a good friend of the United States.

But he is also something of a political innocent. The whole affair looks very amateurish, not simply because Castroites and other Communists could be expected to move in quickly and try to take control, but because the rebels did not understand how L.B.J. would respond.

The President is aware that the Dominican military are no friends of democracy, that many are ex-Trujilloites. But he could not risk a second front being opened against the United States while we were engaged in Vietnam. Better than others he knows the inside story of the halfway measures taken at the Bay of Pigs; he was determined there would be nothing like that again.

Johnson does not expect the presence of U.S. Marines to solve the Dominican problems. They were a temporary, but necessary, expedient. But to know when to take such measures and to act decisively is what distinguishes the pro from the amateur.

Rumanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago Soviet communism crushed the freedom and independence of many civilized European nations, among them the sovereign, constitutional, and socially progressive Kingdom of Rumania, established on the 10th of May 1881. Transformed into a so-called peoples republic, Rumania today is in fact a Soviet colony, ruled by the naked force and incredible terror of totalitarian tyranny. To stifle the national feeling of the people, even the celebration of the 10th of May—the traditional national holiday—has been forbidden. Today only the refugees scattered over the free world, many of them in our own country, are able to perpetuate the sacred tradition and in so doing, to draw our attention to the present tragedy and the just aspirations of their oppressed people.

As a nation conceived in freedom and committed to its defense everywhere, we Americans feel deeply saddened by the plight of the Rumanians and appreciate highly their valiant resistance to tyranny as a valuable contribution to the general struggle against the Communist menace. Let us therefore take advantage of the anniversary of the 10th of May to convey to Rumanians everywhere the sincere sympathy and the very best wishes of the American people. Let us assure them anew of our determination to pursue, with prudence of course, but with firmness, our national commitment as defenders of freedom. We consider the right of all peoples to freely choose their governments as sacred and inalienable and in the common interest of peace. Thus we cannot and will not acquiesce in their enslavement or accept the status quo as permanent. On the contrary, we are dutybound to support their strivings for freedom by all peaceful means, and express our conviction in the ultimate victory of our common efforts.

Recent developments in the Communist world add considerable substance to our hopes, especially concerning the Rumanians. A great deal has been written recently about a seemingly radical change of mind and policy by Rumania's Communist rulers, who are alleged to have become politically—but not militarily and economically—"almost independent" of Moscow, eager to put national interests above Communist allegiance and to intensify contacts with the West. Consequently the West, and our administration particularly, has decided to encourage by all means, mainly economic, the Bucharest regime in its new orientation.

We certainly welcome any change for the better in Rumania, provided it be genuine, and we wholeheartedly approve any American help, provided it improves the lot of the people more than it strengthens the Communist regime. Well knowing that it was the stubborn will for freedom of the Rumanians which compelled their rulers to make certain "concessions" to the national sentiment and national interests, we must make it clear that we do not intend to recognize the Communist regime as legitimate, or to bail it out from its self-created economic chaos simply for its own sake. Our intention is to alleviate the lot of the people and thus make them more able to assert more forcefully their will to freedom. Any confusion or misrepresentation concerning this fundamental position might tend to dishearten the

Rumanians, weaken their spirit, and make our generosity self-defeating.

We must not forget, wishful interpretation of current events notwithstanding and despite the welcome release of thousands of political prisoners, that Rumania's regime continues to enforce "Socialist discipline," that is, police terror, more ruthlessly than any other regime in the Soviet camp. Would it be too much to ask the Bucharest rulers to grant at home at least the degree of freedom and respect for human rights which has become common in Poland and even Hungary? How else can they find in the West the good will, and the dollars, they so desperately need and want?

Confident that our Government is well aware of the complexities of this situation and will move with wisdom, we wish to pay tribute to the unbending spirit of the Rumanian people, who have compelled their rulers to enter upon the path of national interest. This gives us renewed confidence that the ideals of freedom and independence so eloquently symbolized by the 10th of May will once more prevail.

H.R. 7765: HEW Appropriations Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7765) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for the other purposes.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Employment Service has been actively concerned with youth since its inception in 1918. In the past few years, however, the Employment Service has attempted to reappraise its services to youth in an effort to see what changes could perhaps be innovated to best meet the employment needs of youth today. In the process of this examination, it was decided that although much was being done for youth in the existing 1,900 local employment offices across the Nation, it was not enough. The outcome was the recommendation for establishing a network of youth opportunity centers with at least one center in every State.

These centers are to be an integral part of the USES system, but will be housed in separate facilities and only provide services to youth ages 16 to 22. They will serve as a focal point for all Government and community efforts to aid youth. The Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps will rely heavily on these centers to do the initial recruiting and screening of applicants for their respective programs as well as to provide supportive services for their projects once they are operational. In those communities having a community action program, the YOC will serve as an important resource for youth referral in their communitywide program.

As of May 1, 1965, some 29 separate centers opened their doors and became operational. Hopefully before the end of the 1965 fiscal year, there will be approximately 139 centers open in some 105 different major metropolitan areas of our country. From those reports which have been received, the general response to the few operating centers thus far has been more than just enthusiastic.

Unfortunately, these centers will not be enough. There are many other urban areas not provided with these highly specialized services to youth. Rural areas are also neglected by this present distribution of centers. In one case in a New England State, a youth traveled 50 miles on foot from a rural area to the nearest center for help. In the Appalachian area, a number of rural youth have traveled 30 miles or more to reach a center. Those centers which are proposed for this first year of operation are all in the more heavily populated sections of the States which gives little hope for the rural youth to benefit from the services of a designated place where he may receive personalized service relating to employment.

These centers are a vital, important segment of our attempt to relieve the economic frustration of our jobless youth. It is my earnest hope and firm belief that they should be encouraged and expanded.

The solution to the dilemma was offered by the Appropriations Committee itself, of which I am a member. When it stated its refusal to approve the Department's request for the additional appropriation, it noted that this "is going to mean a severe curtailment of some activities that the Department of Labor feels are quite important, if legislation is not enacted to increase the limitation."

It is my conviction, Mr. Chairman, that legislation to raise the limitation on trust funds that are available for grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration should be speedily introduced and quickly voted into law. Otherwise, a most worthwhile program of needed help for our disadvantaged young people is bound to suffer.

Project in Human Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very imaginative and thought-provoking proposal made by Prof. Wendel H. Stephenson, of the University of Oregon. Professor Stephenson has recognized the need for an educated dialog to help break down some of the sectional differences that mar the American scene.

He has advocated a student exchange program among cooperating universities in the North, South, and West for the purpose of bringing about better human understanding of the problems of American society. Such a program would help break down some of the prejudices that exist throughout the Nation—as the problem of human rights is neither sectional nor regional, but is nationwide and can only be solved by all Americans working together.

The student director of the north-south project at the University of Oregon is Richard Rapp, of Baker, Oreg., who has kindly furnished me with the following outline of Professor Stephenson's proposal: "A Project in Human Understanding":

PROPOSAL FOR A PROJECT IN HUMAN UNDERSTANDING THROUGH EXCHANGE OF STUDENTS BETWEEN SOUTHERN AND NORTHERN UNIVERSITIES

1. THE PROBLEM AND THE PURPOSE

The attainment of human rights by all Americans is a national problem that must be resolved before the Great Society can materialize. The problem is not sectional or regional; it is nationwide. Basically, it is a problem in human understanding, and it involves all Americans irrespective of color, creed, or economic and social status.

The concept is not new. Philosophers throughout the ages have given attention to it. To cite one of them, John Locke wrote effectively on the subject, in the closing years of the 17th century, in his two-volume "Essay Concerning Human Understanding," and in his subsequent treatise "Of the Conduct of Understanding," both merit study in the 20th century.

A reputable French historian, Marc Bloch, put in trenchant language the purpose of his guild. "When all is said and done," he wrote shortly before facing a German firing squad in 1944, "a single word, 'understanding,' is the beacon light of our studies. Let us not say that the historian is a stranger to emotion. He has that, at all events. 'Understanding,' in all honesty, is a word pregnant with difficulties, but also with hope. Moreover, it is a friendly word. Even in action, we are too prone to judge. It is so easy to denounce. We are never sufficiently understanding."

2. RESPONSIBLE OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITIES FOR ADVANCEMENT OF THE DESIDERATUM

Institutions of higher education must provide a substantial part of the leadership that will ultimately reduce passion and prejudice and substitute therefor thought and reason, comprehension, and understanding. Educated minds can contribute immeasurably to the better society of the future. They can improve the image of America at home, and this improvement can contribute to the effectiveness of the American image abroad.

A half-century ago a distinguished Columbia University teacher and scholar addressed a student convocation on the subject, "The University as a Rationalizer." He divided mankind into two categories, men of sentiment and men of reason, though action might derive from both emotion and rationality. Both contributed to the advancement of society. Feeling and emotion inspired noble ends, but reason should supply the means of attaining them. A university's function is to qualify students to apply rationality in defining and advancing "social and individual ends." Rational man is not barred from pursuing ideals predicated upon imagination and feeling, but he must "restrain and rescue hapless posessors of hair-trigger emotions and untempered zeal," even though he be "pilloried for the heinous crime of seeing two sides to a question, when

the myopic vision of his fellows asserts that there is but one."

3. THE PROGRAM'S CLIMATE OF OPINION

The atmosphere in which exchange and host university students labor should be one of congenial cordiality. The old cults that have dominated much northern and southern thinking during the past century are not conducive of a practical approach to mutual good will. Robert Penn Warren, novelist, poet, biographer, and historian, put it strikingly in his philosophic and interpretive essay, "The Legacy of the Civil War: Meditations on the Centennial." The southern "great alibi" that explains and condones everything from pellagra and hookworm to illiteracy, and the northern "treasury of virtue" that convinces the section that it is redeemed by history—are "equally unlovely."

The words of a Mississippi statesman and jurist, L. Q. C. Lamar, post-Civil War Member of House and Senate, Cabinet appointee of Grover Cleveland, and Supreme Court Justice, are as significant today as they were when he uttered them in 1874. In a speech eulogizing Charles Sumner of Massachusetts upon that stateman's death, he admonished, "My countrymen, know one another and you will love one another." In a less sentimental age, we may substitute the word "understanding" for the second verb without changing the import of his meaning. The sentence emphasizes the purpose of the proposed program.

4. THE EXCHANGE PLAN

The program visualizes an exchange of students between pairs of northern and southern universities. Approximately 10 students from university S would migrate for a year's study at university N, and 10 from university N for a year's study at university S. Similarly, 10 or 12 other pairs of schools would exchange students.

All students participating in the program would assemble at some central location for a week of orientation before the beginning of the fall term. In addition to general sessions addressed by well-selected government officials, university administrators and professors, and student body leaders, the students from paired schools would hold meetings to discuss topics mutually beneficial in making adjustments to a new environment.

At the host universities migrating students would study subjects normally a part of programs at their home schools. They would also enroll, along with the same number of students from the host university, in a colloquium devoted to the study of problems and issues that affect American society in its social, economic, and cultural aspects. First-class citizenship for Negroes is a significant facet, but students should not permit one aspect, now at attention's focus, to obscure the broader perspective of the whole human understanding panorama. The program is broadly conceived as an important step in the direction of the Great Society. Members of the colloquim from the host university should recommend to the administration and departments concerned the selection of the great teacher, or teachers, who will conduct the class, and all colloquium members should help to determine the nature and content of the course.

Local and visiting students may be called upon to engage in panel discussions of their studies, with an equal number from both groups. They may accept invitations from student organizations at other institutions in the area, if in their good judgment the cause of human understanding can be served.

Migrating students would assemble for a second time at the close of the school year, at some central location, to consider summary reports from the several groups. Much thought should be given to these reports as the year progresses so that they will not be hastily prepared reflections and conclusions at the 11th hour. They will be the joint product of all the students in the colloquium, and participants should endeavor to assess the thinking of the whole community of students and regional countrymen. The reports should exhibit the maturest judgment of which young adults are capable. At the second general assembly, students from paired schools would meet for the exchange of experiences and conclusions; and general sessions would consider recommendations for improvement of programs in future years.

5. PUBLICATION OF REPORTS

The program would have significance far beyond the value to participating students and host universities if the reports were published in book form with appropriate editing by the director of the project to eliminate needless repetition and to present an introductory summary of findings and conclusions. A book with some such title as "Human Understanding: A Basis for the Great Society," might command widespread attention; and if the suggested sponsorship materializes, it might be officially addressed to the President of the United States.

6. QUALIFICATIONS FOR STUDENT PARTICIPANTS

Much thought should be given to the qualifications of students for the great adventure. As a first consideration, students should have established good academic records at their home universities, for no student body would wish to be represented by members who have little talent for learning.

The success of the program would depend in large measure upon such qualities as openmindedness and objectivity. Students should not have already all the answers to the problems of American society. They should have capacity for calm reflection and judicious appraisal. Young adults can be men and women of large vision, of tactful demeanor, of serious purpose—dedicated to a twofold purpose: of advancing their own personal educational growth through study at a reputable university in a different environment; and of contributing constructively toward that understanding so vitally necessary in improving American society.

Provincialism in our vast country is still a roadblock to understandng. Jacques Barzun, French-born historian at Columbia University and now dean of graduate faculties there, spoke of this subject in discussing the uses of history, but what he said would apply equally to any discipline interested in understanding our heritage; the elimination of provincialism of self, the provincialism of time, the provincialism of place.

Herein lies a great challenge to today's college students.

7. SPONSORSHIP

While sponsorship of the program would be primarily the concern of student body organizations, with the approval of university administrations and faculties, some overarching promotion will be necessary. The nature and significance of the proposed program of student interchange would obviously suggest official and financial sponsorship by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A good case can be made for underwriting the project through the Government's Federal aid to education program, by budgeting funds to finance the preliminary and subsequent assemblies, for migrating student fellowships, and for publication of reports.

8. PILOT PROGRAM

The present emphasis on attainment of the Great Society would indicate that the time is propitious for initiation of the exchange student program in human understanding without delay. If the intervening months between now and next September are too few to initiate an elaborate program as the one suggested in this proposal, then we hope that a pilot program involving at least four or five pairs of universities might begin at that time. This number would give substantial standing to the first year's reports and to recommendations for improvement of a larger scale program. In either case, however, we should look forward to continuation for 3 or more years.

Submitted by Wendell H. Stephenson.

Students of Mynderse Academy Undertake "School-to-School" Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I bring to the attention of the House a project being undertaken by the students of Mynderse Academy in Seneca Falls, N.Y. in my congressional district.

The students of this school have organized a "school-to-school" program in cooperation with the Peace Corps. These young people are contributing their own time and money to help buy building materials for a school in Latin America.

I want to express my great admiration for these students. Their action is typical of the vast majority of our young people, who do understand and demonstrate their deep concern for the problems facing the peoples of distant parts of the world. Their realization of the responsibilities of citizens of the free world is an important step toward obtaining lasting peace and cooperation throughout the world in the years to come.

Two newspaper articles describing the project, one from the Syracuse Herald Journal of March 11, and the other from the Geneva Times of March 12, follow:

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Journal, Mar. 11, 1965]

STUDENTS TO SPONSOR PEACE CORPS SCHOOL

SENECA FALLS.—The student council of Mynderse Academy has organized a new student project which is a school-to-school program to help build a school through the Peace Corps.

Members of various committees are August Sinicropi, Bob Rosenkrans, Nancy Gillespie, Jimmy Marrapese, Harold Sanderson, Bertha Morgan, Sam Scibona, Steve Aronson, Andy Batty, Mark Fullerton, Jean Huntington, Charlie Marsh, Danny Tompkins and Nancy Capacci.

Each student is taking part in this "person to person" diplomacy by donating $1.50 of money he or she has earned. The contributions are expected to total $1,000. The money will be used for building materials for a school which will be built by the citizens of a village in Latin America under the supervision of a Peace Corps worker in the area.

By promoting education, each Mynderse student is doing a part to stamp out illiteracy which is the breeding ground of the infectious blight of communism. Not only is this a humanitarian program to aid others and show Mynderse Academy's spirit and concern for the betterment of our world, the press was told Wednesday, "but it is also generating a new interest in world affairs in the high school students." It is hoped that

this drive will inspire other groups in central New York to take a more active interest in world problems, Marr added.

[From the Seneca (N.Y.) General Times, Mar. 12, 1965]

USING PERSONAL FUNDS—PEACE CORPS SCHOOL PROJECT OF MYNDERSE STUDENT COUNCIL

SENECA FALLS.—The Student Council of Mynderse Academy, under the leadership of President Ed Marr, has organized a new student project, a school to school program to help establish a school through the Peace Corps.

Members of various committees are Augie Sinicropi, Bob Rosenkrans, Nancy Gillespie, Jim Marrapese, Harold Sanderson, Mark Fullerton, Bertha Morgan, Sam Scibona, Steve Aronson, Andy Batty, Jean Huntington, Charlie Marsh, Dan Tompkins and Nancy Capacci.

Each student is taking part in this person to person diplomacy by donating $1.50 of money he or she has earned. The contributions are expected to total $1,000. The money will be used for building materials for a school which will be built by the citizens of a village in Latin America under the supervision of a Peace Corps worker in the area.

By promoting education, each Mynderse student is doing a part to stamp out illiteracy which is the breeding ground of the infectious blight of communism, said Marr.

Not only is this a humaritarian program to aid others and show Mynderse Academy's spirit and concern for the betterment of the world, but it is also generating a new interest in world affairs in the high school students. The drive, it is hoped, will inspire other groups in Central New York to take a more active interest in world problems.

Statement of Representative Benjamin S. Rosenthal Before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to set forth at this point my testimony given this morning before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS, MAY 11, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. A systematic scrutiny of congressional procedures, rules, and mechanics, it seems to me, is a precondition for maintaining the health and vitality of the legislative branch.

Voices more experienced and knowledgeable than mine have urged a reexamination of the full spectrum of congressional operations. I will not presume to undertake anything of such scope. I appear today in hopes that my experiences can help this organizational introspection be fully representative of all congressional sentiment.

Even as the increased burden of work has, perhaps, complicated the procedures of Congress as a whole, so has it rendered more difficult the job of the individual Members of the legislative body. Since the commencement of my term of service, I have been particularly anxious to discover ways whereby my own personal service to constituent and Congress could be made more efficient.

In anticipation of these hearings, I have attempted to crystallize my own views and share them with several experts on management and office organization. Several weeks ago I asked representatives of the firm of Daniel J. Cantor & Co., a management consultant organization in Philadelphia, to meet with me in Washington, to examine the entire operation of my own office, including my work and that of my staff, and to discuss in some detail possible ways of increasing the efficiency of individual congressional offices. It was my feeling, Mr. Chairman, that their detached study of the means and methods by which I myself function as a legislator might provide the best possible perspective for offering useful testimony to this committee. In several frank discussions, certain proposals seemed to emerge which I believe could be helpful to our joint project of studying congressional organization.

It seems to me Congress might well profit from the establishment of an Office of Management Adviser to be available to any Member of the House or Senate who felt that professional management advice might increase the efficiency of his office operations. New methods, procedures, and equipment for facilitating business organization and operation are constantly being developed. Such innovations might well be of service to the individual Member in such diverse but important fields as the utilization of staff talent, the budgeting of office operations and personnel, the processing of research studies, the arrangement of office furniture, the organization of case and legislative files, and many other such functions.

Let me make it clear that I appreciate the extent to which any office and its procedures must be an extension of the peculiar needs, talents, interests, and temperaments of the individual Members. Might there not be, however, certain basic plans and procedures common to all offices in Congress—or to any efficient complex organization for that matter? And might there not be certain important innovations which informed and sensitive management consultants are in business to keep track of—to discover, devise, and develop—innovations which could help any one of us improve the service he renders his constituency and the Congress itself? I think these questions can be answered in the affirmative. My own experience convinces me that an Office of Management Adviser might provide a permanent agency for advice, whenever any Member sensed the need for consultation on how to improve his own operations.

Surely such an Office would be of invaluable aid to the new Member, unacquainted as he is with the practical complications of his new role. In my own particular case, at the beginning of my service, I was fortunate enough to secure the able services of an administrative assistant with great experience and knowledge of congressional operations. There are, as we all know, many new Members who are not that fortunate.

The Office of Management Adviser that I am projecting could be a repository of ideas on how to establish and develop an individual congressional office. It would be sensitive to the requirements of serving different types of constituencies, or different legislative functions. And, in all cases, it would be the faithful servant of the individual's Member's own requests, needs, and even whims.

Naturally such an office will not spring up overnight. Before becoming fully equipped to service the varied needs of diverse congressional offices, it would have to acquaint itself with all available services now present and offered, and it would have to study the full spectrum—and I am convinced this exists—of possible improvements and innovations.

I am equally emphatic, Mr. Chairman, in maintaining that there would be nothing compulsory about the services rendered by an Office of Management Adviser. Its sole purpose would lie in being constantly available upon request; we would call it, not have it call us. Members fully satisfied with their own operations would have no occasion to deal with such an office. But the availability of professional, expert, objective, and detached advice on ways to improve the means by which we do our job seems to me fully consistent with the goal of an effective and efficient Congress.

II

Another area that I believe warrants attention is that of congressional personnel hiring procedures. As of now, there is no central hiring office or personnel pool to service the staff needs of individual Members. An Office of Personnel might be a clearinghouse for trained and aspiring congressional employees. It could be equipped to offer Members names and background material on available staff. It could supervise an extensive intern program, something many Members seem to be making more use of. It might also provide greater career stability for our aids whose services are often unique and valuable. There might be developed a standing pool of employees to be called upon to assist particular offices on peak days, or under circumstances of illness, leaves, or vacations. As with the Office of Management Adviser, such a service would simply be available to Members on request, and would in no way constitute the sole sources of employment. But again, its availability and readiness to serve our unanticipated needs constitutes its potential contribution to congressional efficiency.

III

In reflecting upon means of increasing my own efficiency, I have also been concerned with the problem of finding specialized information and expert advice on legislative problems in a reasonably short period of time. Certain proposals have occurred to me as means to that end.

First, the Legislative Reference Service is, of course, an invaluable aid to all of us. I would hope, for that reason, that the joint committee would consider ways of expanding and increasing the Service's resources. Obviously, the workload of this session is unprecedented. The Legislative Reference Service is too important not to receive careful and sympathetic attention.

Second, there might also be ways to improve and enlarge the services of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think many Members would find a subject index in each daily RECORD of significant value. Rather than leafing through every page of every RECORD looking for a particular topic, we might save much time by being able to turn to an index in order to discover which issues were covered that day, and where such items might be found.

Third, let me also raise the possibility of developing some sort of daily press digest which could reproduce and capsulize important editorial, feature, or reportorial journalism from the national press. Not one of us has time to read as many newspapers as he would like. Such digest could serve us by reproducing those stories, reports, or expressions of opinion which are, for all practical purposes, unavailable to Members.

Fourth, and perhaps most important, we might also expand the present means of securing legislative expertise by authorizing office budget allowances specifically for expenditure for consultations with experts not in Government service. There may be times,

for example, when the views of a single expert are particularly pertinent to a legislative concern of a Member. At present that Member can only call upon the services of such an expert informally—usually without being able to offer remuneration. A small allowance might yield a large improvement in the quality of legislative work by providing a Member with resources for seeking out ideas and expertise not available from his own staff, committee staff, or established Government services.

In conclusion, I believe that there are services not presently available to Members of the Congress which, were they available, would be utilized and would improve the efficiency and quality of congressional operations. None of the recommendations I have made today need be instituted without full consideration of their impact and utility. We might be prepared to institute trial periods—an approach perhaps useful for an Office of Management Adviser.

Our duties, functions, and interests seem to be rising in geometric proportion to our resources. To acquit ourselves well under such conditions, we must be prepared to entertain new ideas and procedures, often developed outside Congress or outside Washington. Such a process seems to me practical, promising, and democratic.

Finally, lest my remarks emphasize the technical and dreary side of congressional organization, let me raise a strong plea for a guaranteed congressional vacation—each summer, at specified times—in order to allow us to be efficient family men as well as efficient Members of Congress. Unlike any other job I know of, there is no promise of a planned vacation for Senators and Representatives. Naturally, such plans would be made subordinate to the Nation's needs. Surely rest, relaxation, and the resultant renewal of energies lead to a more efficient, modern, and responsive 20th-century Congress.

Speaking of Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Associated Taxpayers of Idaho is an organization devoted to exposing government waste of taxpayers' money. It is an organization dedicated to good government, criticizing when it deems it necessary, and praising when praise is due.

Mr. Max Yost, executive manager of Associated Taxpayers of Idaho, has recently sent to me an evaluation of the weakness of controlled economy as it relates to medicare taxes, due to go into effect next January, and the cut in excise taxes proposed by the administration.

Controls beget controls, Mr. Speaker, until, ultimately, control is lost over controls. We, in the Congress, should heed the warning given in this thought-provoking article as we deliberate even more controls.

The article follows:

SPEAKING OF TAXES

Is there weakness in controlled economy? The difficulty of control itself is the weakness; control of taxes, control of expenditures, control of debt, control of inflation.

H.M.

When the Council of Economic Advisers last week presented to the Chief Executive and the Cabinet a rather glowing report of recent economic gains, they also cautioned against certain "challenges" which may lie ahead and against being "led into the mistake of assuming that continuing gains at the recent rate are assured—either for the second half of this year or for the second half of the decade." "In the months ahead," the Council stated, "solid economic advances will depend heavily" on the proposed excise tax reductions and liberalization of the social security benefits. There are, however, apparently some worries about both the excise cuts and the proposed increases in social security taxes to finance the increased benefits and the new medicare program.

In his January budget message, the President indicated he would propose reductions in excise tax liabilities totaling $1.75 billion. But it has been rather generally predicted that there will be strong pressures for larger excise reductions, and this is undoubtedly one reason why Secretary of the Treasury Fowler, in his recent maiden address, emphasized that such reductions must be held to a "prudent amount."

According to reports circulated in Washington, D.C., last week, some administration economists are also concerned—even before the program has been enacted—about the possible impact on the economy of the social security-medicare tax increase which would go into effect next January 1 under the bill (H.R. 6675) recently approved by the House.

The tax increases scheduled to take effect next January 1 include the new medicare tax, and no benefits under the program would be paid out until July 1966; so for the first 6 months of calendar 1966 this tax will be taking substantial amounts of money out of circulation. An unnamed official of the Council of Economic Advisers was quoted last week to the effect that "if the economic momentum slows, pulling that much money out of circulation the first half of next year could hurt."

This could pose something of a dilemma. One suggestion that has been mentioned is to put the medicare tax in effect more gradually, or even postpone it until mid-1966 when the benefit payments begin. This, however, would undoubtedly run into strong opposition from those insistent upon sound financing of the program, including some medicare proponents. On the other hand, the fear that the medicare tax would have an "economic drag" effect is very likely to be used as one argument for substantially higher excise reductions.

That is the way controlled economy works—the hoop gets bigger and bigger and bigger.

Mr. Peter C. Robertson, Executive Director, Missouri Commission on Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that one of my constituents has received the St. Louis Junior Chamber of Commerce Distinguished Service Award. The recipient of the award is Mr. Peter C. Robertson, executive director of the Missouri Commission on Human Rights. The award is made each year to the man of the St. Louis area between the ages of 21 and 35 who has made the most exceptional contribution to his community, State, and Nation. Mr. Robertson was the youngest director of any human rights commission in the entire United States. He has shown much determination, imagination, and maturity in handling his job. He has done all of this in the face of low salaries, small staffs, and low budgets.

He has been particularly interested in encouraging civil rights groups to use the legal process instead of resorting to agitation to redress their grievances. They have been shown that the legal process is a really meaningful instrument of equal justice.

Mr. Robertson feels that our free enterprise system which limits an individual in his desire to work not because of his capabilities but because of some arbitrary limit, is in serious trouble. Any system that allows decisions to be made on some ground other than the merits of the product sold or the service rendered is in danger of destroying itself. Our laws against discrimination provide a helpful framework to end inequalities; however, they must only be seen as a framework. This framework needs something solid to back it up. Despite the civil rights law, our society too often ignores the needs of the Negro. He is discriminated against in many phases of life. Everyone must work to fight this discrimination so that the laws against it are really meaningful. Until then, the Negro will be tempted to feel that our legal system is no way in which to redress his grievances; instead he will be tempted to resort to demonstrations.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the State of Missouri is privileged to have a young man of the caliber of Mr. Peter Robertson as the head of its commission on human rights. I would like to show my appreciation for the service he has rendered to his State and to the Nation by publishing in the RECORD the text of several salutes to him. I would also like the Congress to have the benefit of his thinking on the subject of human and civil rights. Under unanimous consent I place the chamber of commerce's announcement of his selection to the award, the editorials of praise, and his acceptance speech in the RECORD:

[From the St. Louis Argus, Mar. 26, 1965]

BETTER THAN WE DESERVE

Recently, the St. Louis Junior Chamber of Commerce selected Peter C. Robertson, executive director of the Missouri Commission on Human Rights, as its Man of the Year and gave him the Distinguished Service Award. That award is given each year to the man between the ages of 21 and 35, who has made the most exceptional contribution to his community, State and Nation. The chamber could not have selected a better recipient of its award.

Mr. Robertson was the youngest executive director of any human rights commission in the Nation when he assumed the post. Yet, he has shown mature sensitivity, judgment, and ability seldom reached by men twice his age.

The award noted that "he has taken the lead in encouraging civil rights groups to use the legal processes instead of the streets for redress of grievances." This is only half the story. Much more importantly—he has at-

tempted to make of the legal process a really meaningful instrument of equal justice for Negroes who have so long been denied equal protection before the law. Only to the extent that he is successful in this, will we provide the alternative that will keep people long frustrated by the law from seeking solutions outside the law.

His activities and dedication could set a pattern for the Nation. Yet, Missouri pays him the lowest salary paid the executive director of any of the other 25 State human rights commissions. He has declined offers at almost twice what he is now making so he could stay and finish the task. He cannot long be asked to do this. Missouri is getting better than it deserves. This situation should be corrected immediately.

[From the St. Louis Junior Chamber of Commerce Flash Bulletin, Mar. 15, 1965]

PETER C. ROBERTSON RECEIVES ST. LOUIS JAYCEE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD FOR 1965

One of the highlights of our junior chamber of commerce year is the presentation of our distinguished service award. This recognition is given to a St. Louis man between the ages of 21 and 35 who has accomplished outstanding achievements or has made the most important contribution to his community, State, and Nation. This year's winner has not only achieved outstanding accomplishments, but has also made substantial contributions to the social betterment of St. Louis and of Missouri.

Mr. Robertson is a 1957 graduate of Oberlin College and in 1960 received his LL.B. from Yale Law School. During his undergraduate years he became president of the College Young Democrats and since graduation from law school has become a member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of Missouri; of the U.S. District Court, District of Columbia; and of the U.S. Court of Appeals. Besides membership in local and Federal bar associations, he is a member of the Inter-American Bar Association and regional chairman of the board of directors of the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials. He is also a member of the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Missouri Association of Social Welfare.

In the fall of 1960, Mr. Robertson served as the assistant to the director of research for the Democratic National Committee and helped prepare the background materials used by Senator Kennedy for his television debates. After the election, he went to work for Congressman HENRY S. REUSS as legislative assistant. In May of 1963, Mr. Robertson was named executive director of the Missouri Commission on Human Rights, the position he now holds. Among the numerous duties of his office is the administration of the Fair Employment Practices Act which prohibits discrimination in employment. At the time Mr. Robertson received this appointment he was 28 years old and the youngest executive director ever appointed. In the year and a half since his selection, he has brought national recognition to the State of Missouri by handling a wide variety of difficult problems.

Through his position as executive director of the commission, he has taken the lead in encouraging civil rights groups to use the legal process instead of the streets for redress of grievances.

Private enterprise is based on the institution of private property and cannot thrive in a society which does not have strong regard for law and order. Mr. Robertson's work in preserving both property rights and human rights is well recognized by officials of business and government organizations and by the public. The distinguished service award is presented to Mr. Robertson tonight in recognition of his outstanding contributions to strengthening and maintaining the basis of our society in a practical and effective manner through the Missouri Commission on Human Rights.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 19, 1965]

NOW FOR A SECOND AWARD

Peter C. Robertson has won the distinguished service award of the junior chamber of commerce here. To those who never heard of Mr. Robertson, we would say that he is one of the most effective, and youngest, public servants in the State. A Yale Law School graduate with some experience in Washington, Mr. Robertson was only 28 when he became executive director of the Missouri Commission on Human Rights a year and a half ago. His is an understaffed, underpaid, and largely one-man operation to sustain the State's civil rights laws. Yet by his dedication and ability he has won generous respect, even among critics of those laws. The most fitting award for him, however, will be passage by the legislature of a budget suitable to the task imposed upon him.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

(By Peter C. Robertson, executive director of the Missouri Commission on Human Rights, delivered in St. Louis on Thursday, Mar. 11, 1965, on the occasion of his receiving from the St. Louis Junior Chamber of Commerce their Distinguished Service Award as Man of the Year)

Mr. James, President Halloran, distinguished guests, lady and gentlemen, I accept this award and your kind words on behalf of the Missouri Commission on Human Rights which I view, in the larger sense, as being the recipient of this award. I am particularly honored and grateful when an award comes from a group such as the St. Louis Junior Chamber of Commerce which has long taken meaningful community leadership in a wide variety of important civic causes for the benefit of our city, our State and our Nation.

Your creed which is outlined here on the banner behind me pledges you and your members to the "brotherhood of man", and it is well known in our community that this is not just a pledge but a report on the reality of so many of your actions.

Other sections of your creed outlined on the banner behind me proclaim that: "Economic justice can best be won by freemen through free enterprise" and "that government should be of laws rather than of men."

In this spirit particularly do I accept your award. One of the greatest problems confronting this Nation is the challenge of securing to all our minority citizens the "economic justice" so long denied them. To do this is basic to the success and survival of the free enterprise system which you support in your creed.

It is my view that the basis of that free enterprise, capitalistic, system is really the basis of the law which our agency administers—the Fair Employment Practices Act—which prohibits discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, religion, national origin or ancestry.

As I understand it, the free enterprise system is a system in which a society allocates its resources on the basis of "dollar votes" in the marketplace. It is based on the asumption that if all products and services are allowed to compete in that marketplace on their own the "dollar votes" will be cast for the most efficient product or service and thus only products and services will be produced and delivered which tend to maximize the use of resources in our society.

One has only to think of the recent ill-fated Edsel made by the Ford Motor Co. to understand how important this is. You will recall that when the election returns were in from the marketplace that Edsel did not receive the dollar votes of our consumers and that it lost the election. You will recall, further, that it did not take the Ford Motor Co. very long to bring to a screeching halt the allocation of any resources to the production of that Edsel.

To point out the main distinction between our system and the communistic system one has only to contemplate what would have happened if such an automotive monstrosity had been produced on the drawing boards of the Soviet Union. Whether the dollar votes were there or not, whether the consumer wanted the horrible thing or not, the mastermind planners of that nation would still be decreeing production of the Edsel.

When a man seeks employment in a free enterprise system any employer or labor union or employment agency which places arbitrary limits upon his ability to obtain work, which limits are not related to his qualifications for that work, is contributing to a destruction of the very basis of the free enterprise system. They are destroying the very mechanism by which that system achieves for our society the maximum use of our resources. In the long run any free enterprise system whose economic units are making decisions not based on the merits of the product sold or service delivered contains within it the seeds of its own destruction. The longrun preservation of such a system depends upon achieving a solution which can remove such inequities.

If the preservation of our economic system in the future depends on this, I suggest that the preservation of our entire Nation depends on close adherence to one of the other aspects of your creed: "Government should be of laws and not of men."

If there is anything that underlies the work of the agency for which I work it is a determination to achieve a solution to the racial problems of our society through legal proceedings. In fact, if you will permit me a personal observation, I took this job for that very reason.

As a human being and as an American, I was deeply concerned with the massive historic injustices that we have done and continue to do to our fellow Americans who happen to be Negro. As a lawyer, I was deeply concerned that many of the attempts to remove these injustices were being made through means which were either extralegal or even illegal.

However, I had to recognize—we must recognize—the underlying causes of these demonstrations. To understand them is not to support or even condone them. But we must understand them and their historic cause if we are to be able to take any kind of meaningful steps to achieve a society which is free of them.

The Negro American by demonstrating is showing that he has given up faith in the use of the legal proceedings. He has no faith in the ability of the legal institutions of this society to obtain justice for him. History offers him very little reason to have this faith. We promised that all men were "created equal" in our Declaration of Independence, and it meant nothing for the Negro. We attempted to deliver on that promise to Negroes with the passage of the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments after the Civil War; but then 'sold out' on their enforcement. Recently we have enacted more laws which we hopefully will enforce with more vigor.

We only have to remember the horrible scene on our television sets as recently as last Sunday—in which grown men—agents of the State—waded into a group of women and children who were standing—not marching—not picketing—not demonstrating—but standing—and started to hit them with sticks, beat them on the heads, and kicked them to the ground—breaking limbs and causing great pain and suffering—to know that in many parts of our Nation even today the officer of the law is not appointed because he can obtain equal justice and equal

treatment for all our citizens. He is hired because—among other things—he can keep "the Negro in his place."

We are very fortunate here. Missouri is not Alabama. In Missouri we do have laws on the books. We have a fair employment law and soon we will have a public accommodations law. These provide a framework for the solution of these very serious racial problems and injustices and we are determined, here in the Missouri Commission on Human Rights, to make it a meaningful framework. We are determined that all citizens in the State of Missouri can look with pride to their State government and without hesitation believe that it will stand ready to protect their rights without regard to race. And only if we can succeed in this can we in good faith expect to see an end to demonstrations. It is no longer possible to end these demonstrations without making meaningful changes in the basic discriminatory pattern against our Negro citizens.

In Missouri we have a law which provides a framework for solving the problem. Last year on the Federal level we enacted extensive new legislation to provide a framework for solving the problems there. It is obvious, however, that the framework which exists for achieving a meaningful end to discrimination in voting is not sufficient and is not being used for the benefit of the Negro, and for that reason he is taking to the streets again in the city of Selma. Just as the demonstrations in Birmingham a year and a half ago ended in the writing of Federal fair employment and public accommodations laws so it now appears obvious that the demonstrations in Selma will result in the writing of a new Federal voting law. Thus, another legal framework will be created.

Before I conclude I must make one last observation on the framework of law here in the State of Missouri. As of now it is just that, a framework. If it is to be meaningful, and it is to provide the Negro with a legal alternative to demonstrations, and the State of Missouri is determined to solve these problems through law then something solid must be put within the framework. For, just as our legal institutions in the past have not really made any meaningful attempt to obtain equal rights for Negroes, so here in the State of Missouri the legislature which passed the fair employment law did not really intend that it be used as a meaningful instrument of obtaining equal rights for our Negro citizens, for they financed it only to the extent of $24,000 a year. Twenty-four thousand dollars, and permitted the hiring of one man, to cover the entire State of Missouri. That is no alternative. However, we are optimistic that the legislature intends to rectify that shortcoming in this session. If they do not then Missouri will face these very serious problems with no meaningful alternative—with no way to honestly urge citizens to use the "courts and not the streets."

To this point, gentlemen, I have been discussing law and legal institutions. It is encouraging that as a Nation we are finally making meaningful attempts to use law as an instrument of justice to the American citizens who are Negroes. However, law is just a beginning. In the long run, in terms of making deep inroads into the massive discriminations that exist against our Negro citizens, law cannot solve the problem. It can just be a beginning and just serve to point us in the right direction.

The last section of your creed, outlined here behind me, states: "Service to humanity is the best work of life."

I suspect that each of us can best serve humanity in this society and in this Nation by looking deeply within every aspect of this society to seek out the massive discrimination that remains and by helping to remove all vestiges of that discrimination from the society and from the Nation. Now, I suspect that many of you are wondering right now what I mean when I continue to talk of "massive discrimination." I suspect that many of you are thinking that it is unreasonable for me to talk in this fashion, for you believe that we have made extensive progress in recent years and that the Negro has made great strides. Rather than outline to you in any detail my documentation for the claim that the Negro still suffers discrimination in almost every aspect of our society, I would prefer, in closing, to suggest a way of thinking about our society that might be helpful to all of us to use in analyzing these problems and many show what I mean.

The Negro comedian, Godfrey Cambridge, I think summed it up better than anything else which I could say. He spoke on television one evening of "flesh-colored band aids" and looking remorsefully at his black hands said "They didn't have me in mind." Well, quite frankly, I think that if we are really honest in analyzing every single aspect of our society we will find out that it is a "white" society, and a society which as it was designed, and as it is run, does not in fact have Godfrey Cambridge and 20 million Negroes "in mind." It is a society which has "flesh-colored bandaids" from one end to the other. Whether it is the help wanted "white only," want ads that still run in the St. Louis newspapers; whether it is the textbooks in our schools which show pictures only of whites and not of Negroes; or whatever it is—it is, sadly, still a society which does not have it Negro citizens "in mind." In closing, let me say that I believe that the best "service to humanity" in which we may engage is to become aware of the extent to which this is true, to make sure we do have our Negro citizens "in mind," and to remove from the fabric of our society every inglorious "flesh-colored bandaid" that is still stuck there proclaiming our self-centered assurance in our own superiority.

Gentlemen, again, I gratefully and humbly accept your award.

Chicago's Joseph Germano Top Votegetter Among Steelworkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Bliss, labor editor for the Chicago Tribune, has written an excellent article about one of my most distinguished constituents, Mr. Joseph Germano, director of district 31 in the United Steelworkers Union.

Mr. Bliss points out that Mr. Germano was the biggest votegetter in the union's international election of February 9, 1965. Those of us who know of Mr. Germano's tremendous dedication to the highest principles of trade unionism can well appreciate this huge vote of confidence given him by the Steelworkers.

Mr. Germano epitomizes the highest traditions of good Americanism and good trade unionism. He has conducted himself in a manner which brings credit to the entire American labor movement and I am certain his sincere respect for his fellow man has been felt by all of those who gave him such overwhelming support in the recent Steelworkers' election, a support Mr. Germano has rightfully earned.

I should like to include the article which appeared in the Chicago Tribune by Mr. Bliss in today's RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

STEEL UNION'S GERMANO TOP VOTEGETTER—POPULARITY PROVEN IN RECENT ELECTION

(By George Bliss)

Joseph Germano, district director of the United Steelworkers union, was the biggest vote getter in the union's international election February 9, the official tally sheets of the international union disclosed yesterday.

Germano turned down bids to run for an international office in seeking reelection as district director. It was the largest election in labor history.

ABEL DEFEATS M'DONALD

On April 30, the international tellers announced that I. W. Abel defeated incumbent David J. McDonald for the presidency of the million-member union. Germano was the campaign manager for Abel.

The tellers distributed the election results in a thick booklet covering each of the more than 3,000 locals in the union. The booklet also explained reasons why the tellers invalidated the ballots of 37 locals. McDonald is expected to challenge the election results on claims of irregularities in the conduct of the election in some of the locals.

Germano, in his relection for district director, received 43,920 votes, which was by the 28 other districts. In the election for far the highest received by the directors of delegates to the national conventions of the federation, Germano received 318,826 votes and led all other candidates.

TELL ABEL'S MARGIN

Abel defeated McDonald, 308,910 to 298,768. Walter J. Burke was elected international secretary-treasurer with 313,229 votes to 266,-381 votes for Al Whitehouse. Joseph P. Molony was elected international vice president with 300,414 votes compared with the 278,786 votes received by Howard R. Hague, the incumbent.

A study of the local union tally vote disclosed Germano's vote getting ability in district 31, the Chicago-Calumet-Gary area. It is the largest district in the union. In district 31 locals in which McDonald defeated Abel, the vote showed that in many instances Germano received up to twice the number of votes cast for Abel. Many of the union members who voted for McDonald switched to vote for Germano.

A Persuasive Argument for Extending the Proposed Voting Rights Bill to All Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following report adopted by the Committee on Civil Rights of the New York County Lawyers' Association dated April 27, 1965.

The report presents persuasive arguments for the inclusion of all elections under the provisions of the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The report follows:

NEW YORK COUNTY LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS ON CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF S. 1564, S. 1517, AND H.R. 4452

This report is addressed to voting rights legislation now pending before the Congress in only one aspect which is of particular concern to this committee. It is the opinion of this committee that there is an important omission from the proposals submitted to the Congress by the administration as S. 1564, and that the legislation finally enacted should correct this ommision in the manner now proposed by S. 1517 and H.R. 4452.

In view of the limited time available, this committee does not at this time comment upon other provisions of the pending bills.

RECOMMENDATION

It is the recommendation of this committee that any bill in the field of voting rights enacted by the Congress should contain language striking from the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 language now limited to Federal elections.

DISCUSSION

At the time the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was enacted, there were comments from many Members of Congress that limitation of the voting provisions of title I to the election of Federal officials did not appear to be based upon reasonable grounds. Similar conclusions were contained in a report of this committee on H.R. 7152 dated March 5, 1964—which became the Civil Rights Act of 1964—and a report dated April 3, 1962, addressed to legislation pending in the 87th Congress.

We remain deeply concerned with the limitation of the 1964 act to Federal elections, because we believe it to be an unnecessarily narrow distinction and one which can give rise to serious problems in its application and enforcement. Elections in our country are not held separately for Federal and for State and local officials, and voting registration normally covers both types of candidates—with two recent notable exceptions which demonstrate the need for the amendment proposed herein. These exceptions in existing and proposed registration procedures in Virginia and Texas, grew out of a distinction between Federal and State elections made in the 24th amendment barring poll taxes in the Federal elections only. As a result, steps have been taken in these States to separate the electoral process for Federal officials as to whom a poll tax may not apply and the election process for all other officials.

It should be noted that both the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts, in their provisions relating to voting rights, extend to all elections after specific consideration was given to the question of limiting portions thereof to Federal election only. In fact, the testimony on the 1960 act, of the then Attorney General William P. Rogers before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, specifically pointed out the serious problems and dangerous implications of legislating separately for Federal and State elections.

The present language of the 1964 act is open invitation to additional local officials and State legislators to establish separate elections with different standards, different enforcement procedures, and varying record-keeping requirements. In these elections State and local officials—Governors, State legislators, mayors, and sheriffs who most closely affect the day-by-day life of local citizens—could be elected under more discriminatory conditions and, perhaps, by a narrower and less representative electorate than are our Representatives in Congress, Senators, and presidential electors from the same area. For Negroes in the South today, the ability to exercise the franchise in local elections is in many ways more important than the right to vote for Federal officials. Many of the disabilities under which they suffer and the indignities which are imposed upon them are inflicted by locally elected officials acting under color of law. Recent events have particularly illustrated the powers of Governors and sheriffs in this respect.

There appears to be no logical distinction in constitutional law between applying prohibitions against discriminatory literacy tests and similar devices to elections for Federal officials and applying them to elections for State and local officials. In fact, the applicability of both the 14th and 15th amendments to all elections, not merely those for Federal elections, is too well established to deserve long discussion. The language of those amendments makes no such distinction, and the 15th amendment bars, on its face, State discrimination in elections generally. *United States* v. *Raines*, 362 U.S. 17 (1960). Also see, *Gray* v. *Sanders*, 372 U.S. 368 (1963); *Chapman* v. *King*, 154 F. 2d 460 (C.C.A. Ga. 1946), cert. denied, 327 U.S. 800.

The committee concludes that Congress clearly has constitutional power under the 14th and 15th amendments to enact legislation finding a specified voting requirement to be excessive, unreasonable, and discriminatory, and to bar equally the use of such requirement in elections for Federal, State, and local officers.

The objectionable discrimination has taken place without distinction as to State or Federal elections and the appropriate relief granted by Congress should be equally broad.

CONCLUSION

This committee strongly urges the incorporation in pending legislation of an amendment reading as follows:

"(a) Title 42, sections 1971 (a) (2) and (c), United States Code, are amended by striking out the word 'Federal' wherever it appears therein.

"(b) Title 42, section 1971(f), United States Code, is deleted and the following subsections shall be renumbered accordingly."

Idea for the Electronic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times recently carried an editorial which has brought great pride to myself and to members of the subcommittee which I head. This editorial enthusiastically endorses the concept of establishing a national scientific research information retrieval system in the United States.

I am most grateful to the Chicago Sun-Times and its associate editor, Mr. Robert Kennedy, for the depth of understanding which they have expressed in this editorial.

I am enclosing the Chicago Sun-Times editorial in the RECORD today and since the editorial refers to the speech which I had the honor of presenting at the University of Pennsylvania on this important subject, I am also enclosing the entire speech for the perusal of my colleagues.

My own remarks delivered at the University of Pennsylvania follow the Chicago Sun-Times editorial:

IDEA FOR THE ELECTRONIC AGE

The world is going through a knowledge explosion as well as a population explosion. Man is learning more about the physical sciences faster that at any time in history. He is learning so much so quickly that it is becoming impossible to keep track of and to store information except through one of science's most recent marvels, the electronic computer.

Ultimately it may be not only possible but necessary to put such information into a central computer available to all who need up-to-date information. U.S. Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois, has taken the lead in pushing such a project and is chairman of a House ad hoc subcommittee on a National Information System.

On Friday, PUCINSKI described his plan to scientists gathered for the Second Annual Colloquium on Information Retrieval at the University of Pennsylvania. There are hundreds of information centers throughout the United States and the world. PUCINSKI proposes that they be tied into a central computer which would act not only as a storage center but a switching center.

"Ultimately," says PUCINSKI, "I foresee each individual scientist will have available a pocket-size TV screen tied in with the National Information System, which in turn will be tied in with all the information centers throughout the world. In a matter of seconds, a scientist will be able to communicate and interrogate the world's storehouse of information and reproduce instantly any article he may need."

PUCINSKI's concept is certainly a space age one but it is not as fantastic as it might seem at first examination. Many businesses already centralize their records in a distant computer, linked with it by telephone wire. The American Bar Association is considering putting court decisions into computers to be made available on a national basis.

Not only would a system for storing and furnishing all types of knowledge—in all fields—be useful, it would help save waste through duplication of effort and it could save lives by making vital information quickly available. It would be an entirely new industry, PUCINSKI points out, and create jobs. It need not be a government monopoly but it could be operated within the concept of the private Communications Satellite Corporation created by Congress.

We may be many years away from the day when a scientist can scan the world's knowledge by pushing a button on a pocket-size TV set. But some start on containing the oceans of information and knowledge poured out every year must be made. Dr. Jerome Weisner, the late President Kennedy's science adviser, has said, "The balance of power between nations may well be resolved in favor of those countries which have the most effective information retrieval system."

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN ROMAN C. PUCINSKI BEFORE THE SECOND ANNUAL COLLOQUIUM ON INFORMATION RETRIEVAL, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, APRIL 23, 1965

I am delighted to have the opportunity to address this audience of outstanding scientists, in this distinguished institution of learning. Indeed, I feel humble standing here under the shadow of giants who built the world's first electronic computer.

There is a story circulating in the Soviet Union about the latest Russian breakthroughs in computer application to information retrieval. You can imagine how delighted the Russian scientists must have been when the computer, after being queried on ancient Russian history, replied that Adam and Eve were Russian. This reply prompted the Russian scientists to pursue the question further. "How do you know?" they asked the computer. And the computer

faithfully replied: "To begin with, Adam and Eve had nothing to wear; they had only one apple between them; and in spite of all this, they still believed they were in paradise. Therefore, they must have been Russian."

There is also a story about a cello player who sawed away continuously on a single note. His wife remarked to him that other cello players seemed to move their fingers up and down the strings, producing less monotonous sounds.

"Oh," replied the cellist, "they are still looking for the note. I have found it."

In a sense I, too, have found my note: it is the establishment of a National Information System, and it is the subject I wish to discuss with you today. More specifically, I will discuss some of the highlights from the hearings held on H.R. 664, which calls for the establishment of a National Information System and the role such a system will have in a great society.

During the past several years it has been a rich experience for me, as Chairman of the ad hoc subcommittee on a National Information System, to learn a great deal about some of the problems and solutions associated with DPIR. I had the privilege and honor to hear testimony on the subject of information handling from the most outstanding scientists representing universities and industry from all over the United States; I am happy to say that two of these scientists are from this beautiful city of brotherly love: Dr. Morris Rubinoff, Moore School of Electrical Engineering, and Dr. Eugene Garfield, Institute for Scientific Information.

I am sure this audience is well versed in the staggering statistics on the proliferation of scientific data, as well as the hopeless task our scientists are faced with in attempting to find pertinent information from the flowing torrents of scientific documents.

The loss of money, material, and manpower resources from waste and duplication is astonishing and overwhelming. But what is perhaps less known is that these losses do not extend merely into money and material. The lack of an effective National Information System has also caused the needless loss of many lives.

Let me give you one example: in 1916 Dr. Peyton Rous and Dr. F. S. Jones developed an important method for using tissue cells in studying virus.

In 1954, almost a half century later, the same method was rediscovered by Doctors Dulbecco and Vogt, which led to vaccine production and treatment of virus diseases. I am told that millions of lives could have been saved had the earlier method been readily available to our scientists.

Unless we provide this Nation with an effective National Information System for making readily available scientific and technical information; unless we assist and accelerate the discovery of cures for diseases; unless we prevent future thalidomide cases; we may well be charged with wanton murder.

This is but one of the many reasons I am so deeply concerned about the future direction of our national effort in the area of DPIR.

First of all, my responsibilities to my constituents make it imperative that the mounting Government costs in research are, in fact, spent for new and expanded research, and not for a duplicate effort contained in some document drowned in an ocean of inaccessible information.

Second, it is my firm belief that unless our scientists are given better, faster, and more accurate information wherever and whenever needed, their valuable training and creative energies will be substantially impaired.

Thirdly, the emergence and advancement of scientific and technological competition from many countries makes it crystal clear that this Nation, in order to insure its economic survival, no longer can afford to ignore the development of its most important national asset: scientific information.

I am well aware that we are faced with a tremendous job comparable in scope to the Manhattan project or even the moon shot. But now I am also aware that we have the brainpower and computer capability to break through the paper curtain and start on the road to a national information system.

Without exception, witnesses appearing before my committee agreed to the need for cooperation and coordination. For the heart of H.R. 664 is to cooperate and coordinate with all the various information centers throughout the country and the world. The proposed national information system will serve in the capacity of a switching network between all the independent sources of information, thus making it possible for all to reap and participate in the efforts of many.

Professor Fano of MIT gave testimony on Project MAC (multiple-access computer), which I am sure all of you are familiar with. Here is an excellent example of time sharing of computer facilities by users in remote areas. There are many similar projects springing up all over the Nation.

Mr. Norman Taylor, of Control Data Corp., discussed the possibility of man-machine interaction. This interesting concept of interrogating a computer by the question-answer method makes possible greater selectivity of information and holds promise of making a significant contribution to a national information system.

Many other individuals testified before my committee and provided important ideas and information on the concept of a national information system. I won't dwell any further on the testimony received by the committee, since the hearings are now in the process of publication and will shortly be available for distribution. To those of you who request copies and anyone else interested in a national information system, I would be grateful to receive your comments regarding the need for such a system and any other suggestions you may wish to make.

As for myself, the committee hearings bear out my hope that we can make an important beginning. Indeed I am most gratified to see the important progress being made by all the Government agencies in strengthening their information handling capabilities.

For example, in my speech delivered at Maryland University in 1963, I stated: "It is planned that there ultimately would be a single completely integrated index for the entire body of scientific and technical literature."

It is reassuring to note that, starting this month, a single index to unclassified governmental report literature will be issued monthly by the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

I am also tremendously impressed with the efforts of IEEE (Institute for Electrical and Electronic Engineers), under the able leadership of Dr. Rubinoff, in preparing a strong base which, it would be my hope, would be tied into the National Information System on a contractual basis.

As new advances in automatic documentation take place, the National Information System will provide a base for augmenting the evolutionary growth and capability for rendering information retrieval services to the scientific community.

It is readily apparent that modern science no longer recognizes the boundaries of various scientific disciplines. What happens in biology may be important to the theory of information, as indeed it is. What happens in physics may be important to a chemist, geologist, astronomer or biologist.

In short, the cross applications of various scientific disciplines provide a treasure house of important information. It is equally apparent that only a coordinating system in scope and function outlined here can hope to capitalize on and capture the cross-fertilization of scientific ideas and facts.

This will be possible through permanent communication links between the National Information System and various satellites of specialized information centers cooperating with the system.

The communication links will constantly provide the national information system with the latest scientific data processed in the various satellite centers. The system, in turn, will provide various services including: (1) retrospective searches on any specific subject, (2) current awareness profiles, (3) copies of references on request, and (4) with the help of our long established and highly developed abstracting societies, again on a contractual basis, classify and separate trash and trivia from the profound and penetrating. As the national system is developed, its services obviously would be expanded to include many other services.

I believe the hundreds of information centers throughout our land, isolated and disjointed and often uncoordinated, are doing an excellent job within their present limitations. However, when tied into a national information system, a switching network, these satellite centers would begin an integrated life of a living, coordinated organism with a much more profound direction and purpose and a more meaningful existence.

I want to emphasize that each of the many hundreds of specialized documentation centers has an important function and will be the major lifeline and source for the National Information System. In addition, many of the problems besetting each center will begin to diminish because of coordination and cooperation for a common purpose.

To paraphrase President Johnson, this is not a Defense Department problem, NASA problem, NIH problem or a Patent Office problem; this is a national problem.

Ultimately, I foresee each individual scientist will have available a pocket-sized TV screen tied in with the National Information System, which in turn will be tied in with all information sources throughout the world. In a matter of seconds, a scientist will be able to communicate and interrogate the world's storehouse of information and reproduce instantly any article or portion he may need. His own laboratory, through the full use of teletype equipment, closed circuit facsimile, and whatever new means the electronic industry develops—tied into the National Information System—will become in effect its own world storehouse of knowledge for use by himself and his staff, as the need for specific information arises.

Every doctor will receive instant warning bulletins, no matter where it may have originated. These and other realizations can be effectively achieved only through a National Information System. And I have no doubt that with the remarkable accomplishments of our scientists, we will achieve it.

Indeed, it is sometimes an overwhelming experience to observe the remarkable progress computers have made, including computer reproduction. For example, we now have computers which are being built from complete information furnished by another computer—a task virtually impossible for humans to achieve.

The full significance of the startling breakthrough becomes readily apparent when we recall that ony 130 years ago people were still counting on their fingers, over 20 years ago atomic energy was a speculation, 15 years ago computers as we know today were dreams—otherwise all of us would have bought IBM stock—and within the past few years the moon, the glorious lamp in heaven, has succumbed to space exploration and deprived the poet of its hidden mystery.

And to the skeptic prophets who harbor doom and doubt, let me read to you the

editorial of the New York Times about space exploration written in 1920, almost a half century ago:

"A SEVERE STRAIN ON THE CREDULITY

"As a method of sending a missile to the higher, and even to the highest parts of the earth's atmospheric envelope, Professor Goddard's rocket is a practicable and therefore promising device. * * * It is when one considers the multi-charge rocket as a traveler to the moon that one begins to doubt * * * for after the rocket quits our air and really starts on its longer journey, its flight would be neither accelerated nor maintained by the explosion of the charges it then might have left. Professor Goddard, with his "chair" in Clark College and the countenancing of the Smithsonian Institution, does not know the relation of action to re-action, and of the need to have something better than a vacuum against which to react—to say that would be absurd. Of course he only seems to lack the knowledge ladled out daily in high schools."

To build a great society we need men of vision and courage, not doom and doubt; dedication and understanding, not skepticism.

I submit that President Johnson's own credo can best be defined as a firm belief that when the awards of freedom and democracy bestow upon us abundance and plenty, let us not forget the plenty who have been abandoned.

We can give living meaning to the commandments of the Great Society by developing a National Information System, and with its growth an entirely new basic industry for the United States.

I have discussed up to now the benefits that a National Information System would afford the scientific research community.

But there is an equally broad application to this concept as it relates to the Nation's economy.

As a member of the Labor Committee studying the present problems of employment and unemployment, I have seen impressive evidence that our Nation must create 1,700,000 new job opportunities every 12 months to sustain our economy.

We must create 1 million new jobs for young people coming into the labor market every year. We must create an additional 700,000 new jobs for people being displaced by automation.

I have supported and will continue to support the manpower retraining program, the antipoverty bill, the aid to education legislation, and all the other devices proposed by this administration to help meet the challenge ahead.

But in each instance I find that those administering these programs tell us that the ultimate answer is to constantly devise new ways to create new job opportunities.

Gentlemen, I submit that an orderly development of a national information system with its attendant proliferation of job opportunities throughout the width and breadth of this Nation will create one of the most impressive vistas for new employment in the 20th century.

This is no sport for the weakminded. We are on the threshold of seeing a whole new industry being borne; an industry that can create, not destroy, millions of job opportunities for Americans of all educational levels.

I am impressed with a project now underway in New York City where a group of dedicated businessmen have taken 100 youngsters off the streets of Harlem and are training them as punchcard operators in data processing. These are youngsters who but yesterday belonged to the toughest street gangs of New York. Today they are young men walking the street with dignity, earning their own salary, and above all, recognizing the positive contribution that they can make to society.

This is but a capsule of the fantastic opportunities that lie ahead as we develop and encourage the data processing industry.

I have no doubt that within the next few years, DPIR will stand beside steel, transportation, auto production, and building construction as one of this Nation's basic industries—holding out great hope for employment not only among the young but also among the old. Certainly, we can agree that in some aspects of DPIR, the job requirements do not necessitate great physical strain, and it offers a completely new horizon of hope for middle-aged and older Americans, who today are being denied job opportunities for no other reason but age.

We are indeed going to give the unemployed of this Nation a chance to share in the fruits of our computer age, and build one of the most durable weapons in President Johnson's war on poverty.

My committee now has under consideration legislation to help improve the library systems of our Nation's institutions of higher learning. Already we have seen examples of medical libraries on the east coast tieing together their facilities through lease lines and the use of computers for a more effective dissemination and sharing of their information. It is my hope that the bill before my committee will make funds available to encourage this kind of cooperative effort between the universities, and it is my hope that in a relatively short time these regional systems devised between the universities will be able to be tied in to the national information system.

It would be my judgment that tieing together the information resources of these respective university libraries; giving them the funds to improve their own research and retrieval facilities; giving them the funds to install the necessary electronic equipment; giving them the funds to hire the technical help and nontechnical help that they need; and finally, giving them the funds to train the urgently needed information specialists in this field, would develop one of the most formidable elements of the national information system.

There can be no question that ultimately all the other professions will want to give careful consideration to establishing information retrieval systems within the basic structure of their respective profession.

Professor Horty from the University of Pittsburgh testified before my committee regarding a project of his university, where they are now putting the Federal Code on magnetic tape for speedy retrieval. The American Bar Association already is considering a system of retrieval for court decisions, which I am sure will be made available on a national basis.

Dr. F. Ellis Kelsey testified before the committee that the Public Health Service is now on the threshhold of developing a highly computerized retrieval system for making readily available information on the effects and countereffects of the thousands of chemicals and drugs being used throughout this country and the world.

Nor can we ignore the exciting work that is now being done by the medical library in Washington under the auspices of the National Institute of Health to create a retrieval system for the medical profession.

All over this country exciting and significant breakthroughs are being made in data processing and information retrieval.

Our hope, contained in H.R. 664, is to create a national system which would make funds available to these individual efforts and then, under their own auspices, management, and direction, tie them in to the national information system.

I sincerely believe we are on the threshhold of one of the most exciting and daring achievements in the history of civilization. When man has devised a system for quick exchange of the products of his ingenious mind, only then will we be able to solve the many problems which have plagued civilization since its beginning.

Finally, gentlemen, what we propose here today can indeed help pave the way for mankind to solve his most pressing problem—that of conflict between nations.

The United States has been seeking ways to capture the imagination of people throughout the world, and through our various programs to convince them that indeed their future promises greater hope by alining themselves with our concepts.

We have succeeded in some areas and failed in others.

A national information system can have a profound effect on this Nation's foreign policy and help chart the way toward better understanding among nations—particularly among the newly emerging nations of the world.

I need only recall for you the impassioned plea made by some 2,300 scientists and scholars from the newly emerging nations of the world who met in Geneva 2 years ago, and in a formal resolution called upon the free world to establish a system by which they could share in the exchange of scientific knowledge for their own countries.

Man has made nuclear war so costly that we have reason to hope it can be avoided.

Our battlelines now are in the field of ideas; in the field of knowledge; in the field of concepts and philosophy.

Imagine, if you can, what a fantastic weapon for peace and freedom the United States would acquire if it had a National Information System now which it could make readily available to the scientists of the whole world to use as they wish. Here, I submit, is the lasting road to peace and dignity among men. Dr. Jerome Weisner, President Kennedy's science adviser, quite properly observed that, "The balance of power between nations may well be resolved in favor of that country which has the most effective information retrieval system."

And so you see, gentlemen, the challenge before us is breathtaking. Through hard work and unselfish support, we can build a National Information System which will not only strengthen our own democracy, but will prove one of our most formidable weapons in the struggle for peace.

My plea to the cynics and the skeptics is, "Don't fail to see the forest for the trees." We are not talking about centralization. We are not talking about the Government taking over the whole operation. We are not talking about reducing or eliminating existing facilities.

Indeed, it would be my hope that we could devise a method by which a national information system could be operated within the concept of Comsat, a private corporation created by Congress with strong support from the Federal Government, and this may also come. But for now we need a start, and I submit that H.R. 664 is the vehicle by which we can give everything said here today living meaning.

You will recall President Kennedy so eloquently reminded us that even a journey of 1,000 miles requires a first step. President Johnson, in every single program which he has presented to Congress, has recognized that ancient Chinese proverb.

I urge you to join me in supporting this first step embodied in H.R. 664.

May I conclude by reminding you that the true meaning of democracy is that whatever sacrifice we must make for our freedom to endure, we shall endure it freely.

Assassinated Americans Won't Be Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, despite the many regrettable actions of Indonesia's President Sukarno during the last few years, we can take pride in the role that individual Americans played in helping that nation achieve its long-sought-after independence.

The Indonesian people themselves are grateful for the many contributions which Americans have made through the Peace Corps and various other people-to-people programs, and we can only hope that the leaders of Indonesia will reconsider their present reckless course of action which ignores both strong personal ties and a peaceful approach to international problems.

Both the contribution which Americans have made and the appreciation of the Indonesian people is quite nicely described in an article by Monroe Sweetland which appeared in the New Haven Register.

I include it for our colleagues attention:

[From the New Haven Register]

YALE PROFESSOR LOST LIFE AIDING INDONESIAN INDEPENDENCE

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION—"At a lonely stretch of the road near the village of Tomo a sedan overtook the jeep. Four men wearing uniforms without insignia forced Doyle and Kennedy at revolver's point to leave the jeep, led them into a wood a few hundred yards from the road. There they shot the two unarmed Americans at close range from behind. Then the men stripped the bodies and forced frightened peasants who had come to the scene to bury them."

—TIME, *May 8, 1950.*

(By Monroe Sweetland)

Dr. Raymond Kennedy, 43, was by 1950 the outstanding American scholar on the Indonesian people, a professor of anthropology at Yale, and an ardent champion of the new republic struggling to be born. Robert Doyle, at 31, had just authored extremely effective pictorial reports to his influential journals, Time and Life, reports which had warmed American sympathy and support for the Indonesian revolution ending 350 years of Dutch colonialism.

Indonesians were outraged and heartbroken at the assassination of their American friends. Furiously they charged enemies of their new nation with guilt, but long investigations failed to indentify the actual assassins or to pinpoint their principals. Dr. Mohammad Hatta. then Prime Minister, lauded the two Americans as martyrs and stanch supporters of Indonesian freedom.

"The Public Relations Office of the Ministry of Defense is of the opinion the killing is a political murder done on purpose," reported the Jakarta Daily Merdeka on May 2.

Kennedy had lived among the villagers of Borneo, Ceram, Sumatra, and Java. He could talk with them and speak their languages. He wrote detailed daily journals, later published by Yale and used to this day as the most authoritative sourcebook in English on the village and rural life of these vast island areas. He had published in 1941 "The Ageless Indies," a popular book which stimulated wide American interest in this almost unknown area and its "emerging" people.

Kennedy was a vigorous advocate of education for the Indonesians—education denied them under the Dutch regime. His writing stimulated American and European interest in the youth of Indonesia and at the same time it whetted the expectations of ambitious Indonesian students. In his book "The Colonial Crisis and the Future" their American patron wrote of his Indonesian friends:

"Western education has given many the ability to fill leading posts, which the Western-imposed colonial caste-like system then denied them. Here, too, those who stood nearest the Western culture often became the fiercest adversaries of the Western representatives in the East. Western education had the effect of dynamite upon the colonial status system."

Bob Doyle shared with Kennedy a love for the people of Java, where he had come from his regular China beat to report the final stages of the Indonesian Revolution.

"If you approach them with a smile they will be your friends," Time quoted young Doyle in its obituary story.

Next April 27 it will be 15 years since the tragic incident in the mountains of West Java. Each July 4 a few Indonesians who remember, sometimes with American friends, gather at Pandu Cemtery in Bandung where Raymond Kennedy and Robert Doyle lie side-by-side in an old Christian burial ground.

Just as Americans cherish the names of Pulaski, Lafayette, Von Steuben, and Kosciusko—foreigners who aided our Revolution against colonialism—there is a rich but neglected heritage from Americans who, like Kennedy and Doyle, have aided the new emerging nations of our century. The enemies of democracy would like to write the history of these new self-governing commonwealths as if the comfortable Americans are spectators only, indifferent and neutral, or are actually supporting the perpetuation of colonialism.

Some of those who attack Americans as lackeys of colonialism or even of that lead horse, imperialism, could do well to reread the sharp critique of colonial misrule in the East Indies as penned by Dr. Kennedy. There are numerous other Americans who, without having had to suffer violence, have made impressive contributions to Indonesian independence just as had other Americans in India, China, Burma, the Philippines, and new nations the world around.

On Kennedy's grave his colleagues from far-away Yale University placed a bronze tablet:

"In Memory of Raymond Kennedy 1906–50, American Scholar, Scientist, Humanist—Loyal Friend of the Indonesian People and Martyr to Their Independence. The Light of Truth and the Warmth of Understanding Inspired His Labors for the Fellowship of Man."

Americans, frequently put into a defensive posture on these issues, have tremendous untapped resources for goodwill, if we will marshal them, in the work and sacrifice of scholars, statesmen, newsmen, authors, missionaries, businessmen and even soldiers who have helped others achieve freedom, much as our Republic was helped by idealistic foreigners almost 200 years ago.

It was another New Englander named Kennedy who declared on Inaugural Day, 1961:

"We dare not forget today that we are heirs of that first Revolution * * * To those new states whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our word that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far more iron tyranny. * * * To those people in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right."

Law Enforcement as a Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, since the House of Representatives is considering the Law Enforcement Act of 1965 at this time, I thought my colleagues would be interested in the following article entitled, "Recognition of Local Law Enforcement as a Profession—The Time Has Surely Come." The article, written by Dr. John J. Mirich, chairman of the Department of Law Enforcement of Treasure Valley Community College in Ontario, Oreg., and Dr. Eugene F. Voris, president of Treasure Valley Community College, points out the great need for improving the education of our law enforcement officers:

RECOGNITION OF LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AS A PROFESSION: THE TIME HAS SURELY COME

(By John J. Mirich and Eugene F. Voris)

(NOTE.—About the authors: Doctor Mirich has had a varied background in police work and the study of delinquent behavior, having served as a city policeman in Green River, Wyo., and recreation director in Greeley, Colo. He has also been a probation officer for youthful felons with the district court in Weld County, Colo. In the academic world, Dr. Mirich has served as professor of child and adolescent psychology at Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.; professor of human growth and development at Idaho State University, Pocatello, Idaho; and currently is chairman of the Department of Law Enforcement at Treasure Valley Community College, Ontario, Oreg. He is well known as a lecturer and contributor to law enforcement journals, and has written works for the Idaho Police Officer's Journal, and Colorado Teacher's Journal, among others. His doctoral paper is entitled "Psychosocial Studies of Juvenile Delinquents."

(Dr. Voris is president of Treasure Valley Community College. His previous academic experience includes service as dean of student affairs, Adams State College, Alamosa, Colo., and superintendent of Jackson County High School, Walden, Colo. He received degrees from the following colleges and universities: University of Denver (Colorado), Northwestern University (Illinois), North Carolina State (Raleigh), Colorado State College (Greeley), and the University of Wyoming (Laramie). He has also held the position of municipal judge in Walden, Colo.)

Why is it true that professional gangsters violate city, county, and State ordinances and laws with impunity? Why is it true that weekly we read where "Banana Nose Cardoni," "Slim Jim Anistosi," "Alexander the Strangler Bucci," "Pulverizer Jake Taylor," "Killer Sammy Kolowski," etc., was taken from his home, his business, or even from a public street, and murdered? Sometimes they are ice picked to death, sometimes they are dynamited to death in their cars, sometimes they are gunned down in their homes or in public places, sometimes they are encased in cement and dropped into waters, but seldom if ever are their killers brought to justice. Murder, of this type, in most

cases is a violation of State and not of Federal laws.

Could it be true that these professional killers have a deeper respect for the apprehension abilities, and conviction records, of the highly trained, professional law officers in Federal enforcement (FBI, Treasury agents, Post Office inspectors, among others)? Is it not true that it has been known for years among the professional hoodlums that the G-men "always get their man"? Is there not a code in the professional underworld to the effect that the violator of Federal law for personal benefit is dealt with most harshly by the professional gangster community? Further, could it be true that professional crooks, of the above variety, are far better trained as a group in the rudiments of their illicit vocation than is local enforcement in the legal profession it represents? True, gangsters are able to hire the best criminal lawyers available when they do face the bar of justice, but those occasions are rare in that such men are rarely apprehended.

The Capones, Lucianos, Schultzs, and their variety, escaped answering for the many State laws they violated (murder, thievery, prostitution, gambling, etc.), and had it not been for the professional Federal officers of the Internal Bureau of Revenue and other Federal agencies, they might never have had to face the bar of justice. This is as true today as it was in the 1920's and 1930's when hoodlumism flowered in this Nation. Certainly local enforcement has improved in professional status since then; but not nearly enough, as a body, to be labeled a profession.

In addition to the professional gangster the local officers are not apprehending, there is another more important reason which demands that they must become professionally trained nationally as a group, and this training must come soon. Recent U.S. Supreme Court and various State supreme court rulings have turned loose confessed, proven guilty murderers, sex killers, etc., because of the violation of their individual rights (right to assistance of counsel, improper search, and seizure, etc.) before, or after arrest, by police officers. This indicates that even though local officers as a national group are ill paid, disregarded by a disinterested or poorly informed public, expected to perform professional duties while not being professionally trained, they are going to have to reach professional status if they are to serve as a deterrent to crime which, there is every reason to expect, will continue to rise sharply every year. Whether criminal behavior of the type we are now experiencing is the result of a moral decline nationally, (every other theory, even the Lombrosion, has had its day) matters very little after the crime is committed. The plain fact, as the uniform crime report has always indicated, is each year we have more and more crimes, and projected estimates on future crimes are truly frightening.

In the May-June, 1958 issue of the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, one of the authors (Mirich) presented a system of police certification with various levels of police specialty (police administrators, police specialists, and patrolman) for which he suggested respectively, 4, 4, and 2 years of police science education, coupled with experience in some area. Since then, he has much reason to believe that 4 years of police science education should be a prerequisite to enforce any city, county, State, or Federal law, in that, realistically speaking, if local law enforcement is to become a profession it must set high standards which encompass most of the knowledge in its discipline. The comparison microscope, spectrograph, fingerprinting and photography techniques, handwriting, ballistics, firearms, etc., etc., in the police science area are so technical it is almost impossible to learn them by police experience alone, or by sporadic in-service training, which is generally given in local law enforcement within individual police departments.

Although new innovations in police science demand specialized training to understand and benefit from them, a good understanding of psychology, sociology, and criminology is equally important. In addition, even a patrolman in our smallest community must have a thorough background in city, state, and Federal law if he is to enforce these laws on citizens, who in many cases, know more about the laws than do many local law officers. Hence one becomes aware of how much knowledge, and how many abilities are expected of policemen, which are impossible to obtain without formal training.

The time has certainly come when local law enforcement must seek ways and means to certify or license its membership. It should set academic and other standards and regulate the licensing of its members. This can be accomplished through the local and State police officer associations in coordination with a national association. Believing in local autonomy as we do in this democracy, we should guarantee that these associations have no authority to control or dominate local enforcement officers. Their duties should be standard setting, licensing, and public-police public relations only. The police officer owes his allegiance to the citizens of his jurisdiction, to his police agency, and to the Nation. His involvements in professional organizations are for professional betterment for local law enforcement, and these organizations should not have any authority over his loyalties, duties, or responsibilities.

Police science school can, and most certainly should, be established in every tax-supported junior college, college, and university in the Nation. The expense involved in setting up these schools would be repaid fourfold through better law enforcement. In addition, the State of California's police education in higher institutions should be a blueprint for all of the other 49 States.

This paper should not be construed to mean that all local officers in the Nation are ill-trained. Certainly the bulk of local officers in California are well-trained, well-paid, and highly respected. In addition, there are many competent officers nationally, but as a group, they need a higher level of education before they can be considered professional persons. Indeed it seems that the time is ripe, the reasons abundant, and no better time available than the present, for local law enforcement to seek the public's assistance in reaching professional status. Presently employed officers could receive blanket certification, under a realistic proposal, and might possibly be required to attain a certain amount of professional achievement through training while employed, but new recruits should be expected to be thoroughly trained and licensed before employment and their starting salaries should be commensurate with their training.

With high academic standards and other professional requirements (good moral character, adequate emotional and psychological abilities, and sound physical health) will come the long needed, much sought after, and certainly well-earned rewards; high pay, community respect, and professional standing for the local law enforcement officer. When this hoped for day arrives, the professional thug who sneers at local law officers today will then respect him as he now does the Federal enforcement officer, and the whole Nation will benefit as a result. In addition, the innocent will be better protected, the public services better done, crime will be more adequately controlled, crime prevention will become more scientific, and a profession called local law enforcement will have been born.

REFERENCES

Mirich, John J.: "Certification of Local Law Enforcement: A Must," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, vol. 49: 92–95, May–June 1958.

Mirich, John J.: "The Qualified Policeman: The Backbone of Society," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, vol. 50: 315–317, October 1959.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C* — 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa* — 301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn* — 119 7th St. SE.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

Death of One of Georgia's Leading Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Dr. Phinizy Calhoun, one of Georgia's leading citizens, died on Sunday, in Atlanta. He will be sorely missed by all his friends and associates, who loved him and benefited from his good works.

Mrs. Talmadge and I wish to express our deepest, heartfelt sympathy on the passing of Dr. Calhoun, who did so much for medicine and education in Atlanta and Georgia.

On Monday, May 10, the Atlanta Journal editorially eulogized Dr. Calhoun; and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial and his obituary be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and the obituary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Journal, May 10, 1965]

DR. PHINIZY CALHOUN

In the death of Dr. Ferdinand Phinizy Calhoun, Atlanta and Georgia lost a leading citizen, one who had contributed a great deal in several fields.

Dr. Calhoun was an ophthalmologist, and succeeded his father, Dr. Abner Wellborn Calhoun, as a teacher of this subject at what is now the School of Medicine of Emory University.

But his interest in the education of young people of his State was broader than this. He received the first alumni award given by the Alumni Society of the University of Georgia and was a chairman and one of the founding trustees of the alumni foundation. He also endowed a lectureship at the university in memory of his grandfather, Ferdinand Phinizy, of Athens. He was a member of the executive committee of the trustees of Emory, and with other members of his family, had endowed the medical library there as a memorial to his father.

He was a gentle man and a wise and witty one. The Journal joins his family and many friends in mourning his death.

DR. CALHOUN'S RITES SET FOR TUESDAY

Funeral for Dr. Ferdinand Phinizy Calhoun, distinguished Atlanta ophthalmologist and educator, who died Sunday morning at Emory University, will be Tuesday at 3 p.m. at Spring Hill. Officiating will be Dr. Harry Fifield and Dr. W. I. Howell, of the First Presbyterian Church and Bishop Costen J. Harrell, of the Methodist Church. Burial will be in Westview Cemetery.

Dr. Calhoun would have been 86 years old September 20. He was born in Atlanta, son of Dr. Abner Wellborn Calhoun, himself a leading ophthalmologist of his day, and Mary Louise Phinizy Calhoun, both members of pioneer Georgia families.

He was educated in the public schools of Atlanta and graduated from the University of Georgia in the class of 1900. He attended Harvard for 1 year and then entered the School of Medicine of Emory University (at that time the Atlanta College of Physicians and Surgeons), graduating in 1904. He interned at Grady Hospital and trained in ophthalmology at the New York Eye and Ear Infirmary and did postgraduate work in Vienna.

On his return to Atlanta he was associated with his father in the practice of ophthalmology. On his father's death in 1910 he succeeded him as head of the department of ophthalmology at the medical school and as visiting ophthalmologist at Grady Hospital. At various times he was also a member of the staff of Wesley Memorial (now Emory University Hospital) and St. Joseph's Infirmary.

He was a former president of the Alumni Society of the University of Georgia and in 1937 received from the society its first alumni award. He had been chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Georgia Foundation, and a president of the Alumni Society of the New York Eye and Ear Infirmary. He was a member of the executive committee of the board of trustees of Emory University, a trustee of the Joseph Brown Whitehead Foundation, a member of the Atlanta Advisory Board of the Citizens & Southern National Bank, and a deacon emeritus of the First Presbyterian Church.

He was a member of the Piedmont Driving Club, the Chi Phi fraternity, the Phi Chi medical fraternity, and the honorary societies Phi Beta Kappa, Alpha Omega Alpha, and Omicron Delta Kappa.

In 1954 he was granted the honorary degree of doctor of laws by Emory University.

He was a member of the Fulton County Medical Society, the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otology, and had been a member of the Medical Association of Georgia for 50 years.

He was president of the American Ophthalmological Society in 1941, and was a fellow of the American College of Surgeons, serving as second vice president in 1941. During World War I he served in the Medical Corps with the rank of major.

Dr. Calhoun established a lectureship at the University of Georgia in honor of Ferdinand Phinizy, his grandfather. With other members of his family he established and endowed the medical library at the School of Medicine at Emory University as a memorial to his father, Dr. A. W. Calhoun.

The Ferdinand Phinizy Calhoun Chair of Ophthalmology was established in his honor in 1960 at Emory.

In 1909 Dr. Calhoun married Miss Marion Peel, who survives. She was the daughter of Col. and Mrs. William Lawson Peel, leaders of the State and city of their day.

Other survivors are two sons, Dr. F. Phinizy Calhoun, Jr., Lawson Peel Calhoun, and a daughter, Mrs. B. W. Cardwell, nine grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

He lived at 2649 Rivers Road NW.

Amendment of Social Security Act To Permit Remarriage Without Loss of Benefits for Elderly Social Security Survivors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that an individual shall not be deprived of a monthly social security benefit solely because of marriage or remarriage after the age of 62. The existing law is unjustified which penalizes widows and other survivors by cutting off their social security survivors' benefits if they marry or remarry.

The rationale of the present law is that the widow's benefit is canceled upon remarriage, since she will become entitled to a wife's benefit. This, however, is not always the case today. Because the coverage of the social security system was limited during its early years, many men were actually excluded from coverage during their working life. Self-employed farmers are included in this category.

There would be extreme hardship in the case of a widow who wanted to marry such a retired farmer. She would have to sacrifice the benefits earned by her first husband, and she would receive no wife's or widow's benefits.

Even if the new husband were entitled to benefits, the widow's stipend would be reduced. Instead of receiving 82.5 percent of her deceased husband's benefit, she would receive 50 percent of her new husband's benefit—which usually means a reduction of at least $20 a month in the amount she receives. It is clear that this reduction in income would be a deterrent to marriage when one realizes that the average retirement benefit for workers is now around $80, yielding a wife's benefit of $40—a total family income of only $120 a month.

This bill, which would result in only minor costs to the social security system, merits the attention of my colleagues in the Congress. It would enable many of our elder citizens to avoid living alone. Married couples who can take care of each other are more likely to retain their health and spirit as active members of the community. I strongly urge the passage of this bill by the Congress.

Communists Had Voting Program Like Johnson's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a number of persons in South Carolina and in other parts of the country have called my attention to an excellent article entitled "Communists Had Voting Program Like Johnson's." This article, written by Henry J. Taylor, has been published in a number of daily newspapers across the country, including the Birmingham Post-Herald of April 16, 1965.

This article written by a most responsible newspaperman, certainly merits the attention of all Members of Congress during this time, when consideration is being given to the so-called voting-rights bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham Post-Herald, Apr. 16, 1965]

COMMUNISTS HAD VOTING PROGRAM LIKE JOHNSON'S

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The Communist Party, U.S.A., in 1956 planned a voting rights program similar to the one the Johnson administration is sponsoring today.

This is not to argue the merits and demerits of the administration's bill. That's a different topic. Federal intervention may be needed.

But the veil should be lifted on a fact of history, certainly unknown to our public and probably unknown even to most Congressmen and Senators who will vote "yea."

Soviet attention to our legislation has always been much more constant and effective than we suppose. The pen of Lee Pressman, who later confessed to having been a Communist, trails all throughout initial agricultural act and the labor legislation sponsored by the original Congress of Industrial Organizations, of which Pressman was an official.

Well, the Red shadows still breathe and glow.

Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko is the Kremlin's top specialist on American affairs. He knows our country like Mickey Mantle knows the Yankee Stadium. Nobody in the Soviet hierarchy even approaches his staying power, for he has survived every purge on his knowledge of the United States.

I encountered Gromyko's expertness again and again during Geneva conferences. In fact, I came to know this Red leader when his concentration on our country began a full 21 years ago. This was during the 1944 Dumbarton Oaks conference called to design the United Nations.

He's acquainted with a surprising quantity of American political, trade union, and industrial leaders on an after-hours conversation basis.

Some, like Mr. Bernard Baruch, whom he respects, always have had his number, but nothing chills this already cold man in his search for leverages against our internal stability and especialy our legislation.

Gromyko's bland, Sphinx-like personality reminds you of a magician who comes on stage without tables or props—just a handkerchief hidden in his hand. Then for 20 minutes he pulls unexpected things out of it.

For example, in an airplane flying the Atlantic, Gromyko once suddenly recited to me the foreign-born percentages in our chief trade unions and in our 12 largest cities, and he mentioned in passing that more Czechs live in Chicago than in any city except Prague.

Or listen to Gromyko on another occasion. "Mr. Taylor," he said, "what you Americans call law is really a form of politics". He didn't just say that. He thinks that. Such are the notes he plays when he calls the tune for Kremlin policy inside our country.

This means Gromyko calls the tune for the Communist Party, U.S.A.

In December 1956, that party began a program which it named the "Lincoln project." Its target date for fulfillment should interest us today—1965.

At its inception in 1956 the plan was published in Philadelphia by the respected American Flag Committee and read

"To implement the Lincoln project, the Communist Party's Central Committee will begin to dispatch agents to 11 Southern States next month (January 1957) to work with local party leaders in surveying 20 counties, any one of which might be ideally suited as a target for disorder early in 1965.

"This survey will continue through 1957, the central committee making the choice of 20 counties * * * with the final selection to be made on the estimated most favorable conditions prevailing in 1965.

"The legislation which the party will seek from Congress in 1965 has already been prepared by its legal staff.

"It provides for elimination of all educational requirements, including minimum literacy tests, as qualifications for voting in Federal, State, and local elections; voids residence with respect to counties, municipalities, and other political subdivisions within a State, and establishes a system of direct Federal supervision and control of the local, county, State, and Federal elective process."

Evidently the House and Senate will pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965 after debate and amendment. To repeat, its merits and demerits are another matter. Nevertheless, penetrating—and exposing—the Soviet's secret interest in any legislation is important to our lawmakers and our public alike.

The Lincoln project is a revelation of the ghostly Reds' eternal presence.

Rumanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, World War II and the years since the termination of this conflict have been tragic for some 17 million Rumanians in their homeland.

The 10th of May is the traditional day of independence of the Rumanian people, but in Rumania there is no joy on this day, no celebration of that glorious day of May 10, 1877, when Rumania proclaimed her independence. Today, these brave Rumanians are under the yoke of Communist subjugation and oppression and this day of rejoicing has been taken away as a right of the Rumanian people.

In 1877 Rumania proclaimed independence from Turkey, and was recognized by the European powers as an independent state in the Treaty of Berlin, and as a kingdom in 1881 under Carol I. In 1886 Rumania became a constitutional monarchy with a bicameral legislature.

The life of the Rumanian people was always one of uncertainty because of its geographic position. Rumania's location on the border of warring nations made it a frequent victim of strife. It helped Russia against Turkey during the years 1877 and 1878. It was defeated by Germany and Austria-Hungary in World War I. In World War II, Rumania was forced to join Germany against the U.S.S.R. by Marshal Ion Antonescu, a leader of the militarist movement in Rumania. In 1944, Antonescu was overthrown by King Michael with the help of the Soviets and Rumania joined the allies.

With occupation by Soviet troops the National Democratic Front, headed by the Communist Party, displaced the National Peasant Party. As a result of this change, a People's Republic was proclaimed on December 30, 1947. Under this rule, land owners were dispossessed, industrial and transportation units were nationalized and banks were taken over by the new regime. On September 24, 1952, a Soviet type constitution was adopted and Rumania, as an independent and free state was lost.

Even though Rumania is behind the Iron Curtain for a number of years now, her spirit and her wish to once again be free and independent remains undaunted.

I know that all Americans are united in the hope that Rumania and all those who have been crushed under the heel of the Soviets will some day be free again.

The question arises, since Rumania cannot clebrate her own day of independence, and is a country so far removed from the every day life of the average American—why do we, in the House of Representatives celebrate and commemorate this day?

We do this because we understand the plight of the captive nations and have many times pledged ourselves to bring back freedom to these subjugated nations. We take this time to again renew our determination that these nations will be enabled to obtain self-government, freedom and liberty, to which they have an inherent right.

We cannot forget the ordeal of Rumania and all the other captive nations under the rule of the Soviet. We should not turn our eyes away from the encroachment of Soviet domination into the Western Hemisphere. There already has been evidence of this domination in the instance of Cuba, which lies only 90 miles away from our borders. Now, the uprisings in the Dominican Republic should further alert us to these dangers.

Let us make no mistake about the intentions of the Russians. They are de-

termined to win a total victory in the skirmishes they have launched against the United States and other free nations. There is no desire on their part to negotiate, they believe in a winner-take-all policy and are determined that they be the winner. We are forced into this game, because there is much at stake for the Western and free nations and we cannot let this game go to the Russians by default.

So, on this 87th anniversary of Rumanian independence we should again revaluate the world situation. We should again give hope and encouragement to the Soviet dominated nations and our pledge to those free nations that are subject to pressure from the Soviets that we shall continue our efforts to make this world one of free and independent nations, each with its own choice of government and leadership.

Young Democrats Support Supreme Court Reapportionment Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, for the past 3 months the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee has been holding hearings on proposed amendments to the Constitution which would allow one house of a bicameral State legislature to be apportioned on the basis of factors other than population. The country is gradually becoming aware that such an amendment could have unfortunate results.

On April 10, at their national committee meeting in Kansas City, the Young Democratic Clubs of America recognized such possible unfortunate results, and adopted a resolution in support of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling. The resolution was submitted by the national committeeman of the Young Democratic Club of Maryland, Walter S. Orlinsky, and the president of the Maryland club, Steny H. Hoyer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution adopted by the Young Democratic Clubs of America.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY STENY HOYER AND WALTER ORLINSKY OF MARYLAND

Whereas there are pending in the Congress of the United States numerous proposed constitutional amendments designed to negate the effect of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling; and

Whereas the concept of an equally weighted vote is fundamental to a progressive and enlightened democratic society; and

Whereas the passage of such amendment would perpetuate the disproportionate voice given minority interests in many of our State legislatures; and

Whereas historically this Nation in its wisdom has not reflexively reacted to tamper with and obviate decisions of the Supreme Court: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Young Democratic Clubs of America call upon the Congress of the United States to reject all pending efforts to overturn the meaningfulness and content of the Superme Court's one-man, one-vote decision.

Prosperity Causes Economy as a Percentage of Gross National Product—GNP—To Decline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned over the costs of government, the Federal debt, the budgetary deficit and related fiscal matters.

In this connection, a most astute editorial was carried by the Nashville Tennessean on Thursday, April 29, 1965, putting this whole picture in perspective.

I request unanimous consent that this editorial be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

FINE ECONOMY, COST CUTS ARE TRIMMING 1965 DEFICIT

In his news conference Tuesday, President Johnson disclosed that the Government's budget deficit in the fiscal year ending June 30 is expected to be a billion dollars less than was estimated in January. The deficit is expected to be about $5.3 billion, and is indicative of several things.

One is the galloping economy, which had a first quarter output rate of $649 billion and is still climbing. Thus tax receipts are running well ahead of expectations. Specifically, revenue is some $500 million above the $91.2 billion forecast.

At the same time, Government spending is falling about $500 million short of the projected $97.5 billion, according to the President, who may be a little low in his estimates. Defense Department spending may well run $1 billion under the January estimates, largely because Secretary of Defense McNamara's cost reduction program is paying off better than most anticipated.

In fiscal 1964, the Defense Department estimated it would save $1.5 billion. It ended up saving $2.8 billion.

When the final figures are totaled up, the deficit may be $5 billion, which would be the smallest since 1961.

There are those to whom even a $5 billion deficit is regarded as something terrible. But most of the noise about deficits is caused by the peculiar way the United States keeps its books. If General Motors or A.T. & T. kept books the way the United States does, they would have big deficits, too. And for that matter, so would most of the foreign countries who sometimes propose to lecture us on fiscal integrity.

These have a forum of capital budgeting. The United States lumps its expenditures, although they may involve investments, acquisitions, recoverable loans and the like. Expenditures for a Federal dam are quite different from expenditures for jet fighters, yet they are added up the same way.

Even with all this lumping together of things that may not represent an outright expenditure, the budget as a percentage of gross national product has continued to decline. During World War II, this Nation was spending nearly 50 percent of its total output of goods and services. Today it is spending less than 15 percent of its total output—and that output is continuing to climb.

Federal debt shows much the same trend. Nearly 80 percent of public debt was incurred in wartime. During the war years, public debt as a percentage of gross national product went through the skylight. By 1950, it was still 98 percent of the GNP. By 1960, it was only 58 percent, and the 1966 estimate is 48.

All of this is to demonstrate that deficits are relative in a big nation growing bigger; that if the United States had a better system of bookkeeping, it would end up with fat surpluses instead of red ink. But since the only measure available is the present system, the goal is to reduce deficits.

The economy, which has been accelerated by tax cuts, has pumped in more revenue instead of less. And the Johnson administration's emphasis on cost reduction in Government is paying off. Short of a major war, the country may see a balanced budget sooner than any one anticipated.

The Attempt To Punish the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on May 7, 1965, Harry C. Weaver, president and general manager of radio station WOKE, in Charleston, S.C., broadcast an outstanding editorial in which he quoted from a recent broadcast commentary by the distinguished news analyst, Paul Harvey, of the ABC radio network. In view of the fact that there is now pending before the Senate another piece of anti-South legislation, I ask unanimous consent that this broadcast editorial, which is concerned with the practice of continuing to try to punish the South, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIAL BY HARRY C. WEAVER, PRESIDENT AND GENERAL MANAGER, WEAVER BROADCASTING CORP., CHARLESTON, S.C.

America's best-known newscaster and one of the few men on national radio today who defends his America, like a gallant knight in bright shining armor riding forth to do battle with his adversary, is Mr. Paul Harvey.

Heard three times daily at 8:55 in the morning, 1 o'clock in the afternoon, and 6:10 in the evening, and once on Saturday afternoon at 1 over the ABC radio network through the facilities of our radio station, Paul Harvey has a deep and transcendent love for our American Republic, a burning desire to see it well, strong, vital, and united. This great American newsman has a tremendous radio following as South Carolinians listen daily to hear what Paul Harvey has to say. He has not only captured the hearts and minds of our people through the power of the spoken word on radio but has endeared himself to the "low country" by his several personal appearances during the past decade. His love for America has been

projected into his daily messages with his magical words of sincerity and believability cultivating, magnifying, and transmitting the American way of life throughout our great country.

This past Wednesday evening, Mr. Paul Harvey wrote and aired one of the finest commentaries in his long and distinguished career as a newsman and broadcaster. Through public demand, we are attempting to re-create his stirring message to Washington over the split Union that has existed for over a hundred years in our America:

"How long before the South will be forgiven? Only a part of the abuse which is heaped on Dixie relates to race discrimination—another large part relates to North-South discrimination.

"Americans, why is the race problem—North and South—but the pressure most of all on the South? How long before the South will be forgiven? The South lost a war 100 years ago and it is still paying for it. We forgave Germany twice in half that time. In the 20 years since Germany fought us the last time, we've forgiven them and sent them $4 billion. In the 20 years since Japan lost its war with us, we've forgiven Japan and sent the Japanese $2½ billion. It's been 100 years since Alabama and Georgia and Mississippi lost their war and Washington is still forcing those States to pay to Washington six times as much as they receive in aid. The economic jealousy which was in large part responsible for the uncivil war is still apparent in the present North-South cold war. Southern Negro slaves had security—but fought for freedom. Today, they have freedom—seek security. We have forgiven Germany and Japan and Spain and Mexico and everybody who ever waged war on us, except the Confederacy. We've even promised North Vietnam reparations in advance—a billion dollars' aid per year—if southeast Asians will stop the war at the 17th parallel.

"The Southern United States is entirely willing to accept a cease-fire at the Mason-Dixon line and peaceful coexistence wherever it is still occupied by the enemy. The Southern States have surrendered unconditionally—they're no threat to the security of their neighbors. They have no territorial ambitions beyond their borders; indeed, you never, ever hear of a retired southerner moving North—they mind their own business, contributing more than generously to the U.S. Treasury. Now, Washington would not think—would not think—of meddling in the internal affairs of West Germany or Italy or Japan, it would be inexcusably bad manners, it would engender resentment, it would likely set the stage for another military confrontation. And yet, Washington approves and applauds the invasion of our own South by Yankee mobs, and supports their continuing invasion with Federal troops. Now, granted, the South made a mistake—it lost the war—but many others have lost many wars and Washington has generously helped the fallen to their feet, sponsored their reconstruction, reestablished their independence. How long before the South will be forgiven? Not one of Uncle Sam's former enemies has become a better friend, not one has stuck with him through peace and war, feast and famine, as has this one. Uncle Sam has no ally on whom he can count as surely as on this splendid, energetic, dynamic segment of himself. Isn't it time to stop this masochistic punishment? Isn't three generations of spitting on Johnny Reb's grave enough? How long before the South will be forgiven?"

For many long years a great admirer of this outstanding American and newsman of integrity and morality, we of WOKE respect and appreciate the untiring efforts of this uncommon man, Paul Harvey, as he travels and broadcasts from every section of our American Republic, writing and telling the wonderful story of the American way of life. Our only regret—in these times of trouble and strife in the Union—is that there are not more Paul Harveys to project the glories and blessings of Americanism throughout the length and breadth of the greatest Nation in the world—the United States of America.

A Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to submit for the RECORD a speech made by Mr. Ned Curran, 608 Birch Street SW., Vienna, Va., before the town council on April 19, 1965, in which he brings forward an unusual solution to a serious problem affecting the community. It is through such active participation of our citizens that government at all levels can be improved and enabled to serve the people effectively. It is indeed a pleasure to present this fine example of individual talent given in public service.

The speech follows:

A PROPOSAL

Mr. Mayor, members of the town council, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you. Let me stress in the beginning that I appear as a private citizen of Vienna and not as a reporter for the Vienna Virginian. My appearance therefore is not to be construed as any representation of Virginian policy, pro or con.

As one who has sat through several lifetimes of speeches, presentations, discussions, and debates of public issues on all levels, I can best appreciate the blessings of brevity. I shall be brief.

I think by now we are all well aware that Vienna faces what very closely approaches a transportation crisis. Its only railroad line, the Washington & Old Dominion, literally teeters on the brink of extinction. It is said to be unprofitable in its freight-only operation and may soon be sold to the Virginia State Highway Department. The fact that the State reportedly plans to use the rail bed for Highway 66 right-of-way in Arlington County seems of obscure benefit to Vienna.

The situation has all the elements of crisis. First of all, loss of the line would deprive business and industry along its 40 miles from Herndon to Alexandria of rail ingress and egress. Location on the railroad is obvious testimony of the integral part it plays in the operation of this business and industry. Several establishments in Vienna particularly have gone so far as to make substantial investments in the expectation of the railroad's continued existence.

Secondly, withdrawal of rail service would almost immediately necessitate the introduction of heavier truck traffic into the area. This carries the twofold disadvantage of being more expensive to individual businesses and of being physically and financially burdensome on the local road system, its users, and the jurisdictions which maintain it.

Not the least dimension of the crisis is time. The railroad is even now seeking permission on the State and Federal level to discontinue operation. Besides the imminence of the problem to commercial freight users, there is the necessity of saving the railroad now or it will be lost forever for whatever future purpose it might serve.

There can be little doubt, then, that there is a crisis or that it is acute.

In an attempt not only to solve the immediate problem but also to convert the railroad into an asset for much of northern Virginia, I offer the following proposal.

I suggest that all the jurisdictions along the railroad, Loudon County, Herndon, Fairfax County, Vienna, Falls Church, Arlington, etc., form a Northern Virginia Railroad Authority for the purpose of buying and operating the Washington & Old Dominion.

The authority would be a separate and distinct physical and fiscal entity with jurisdictions represented on the basis of population or track mileage, or some such formula.

The authority would raise revenue through the medium of a taxing district, or by issuing bonds. The bonds could be self-liquidating, or in the nature of a public debt, incurred by a vote of the people.

The purchase of the line by this means would serve first to save the railroad for its immediate freight function. But perhaps even more significantly, the line could then also introduce commuter service.

This latter conception, admittedly a long range proposition, could some day link this area to the proposed Washington metropolitan rapid transit system, at least one leg of which is planned to extend to Rosslyn.

The benefits of a northern Virginia commuter line seem to me to be both many and obvious. It would give this area that much better access to the District of Columbia as well as to points in between. It would help preserve the rural-residential character of the area by operating on the existing roadbed and obviating the need for more and more terrain-destroying super highways.

The line would be of even greater benefit, I would think, to the more remote areas of Herndon, Dulles Airport and Reston, which are destined to become bigger population clusters while losing none of their insularity.

I do not envision that such a commuter line would seriously affect current or future bus service or highway complexes. The point in the whole issue is that all of these and more are needed and will continue to be needed into the foreseeable future. Intra-area transportation as well as Virginia-Washington travel are unquestionably essential to our community and those surrounding us.

It is quite possible there are not now enough prospective rail commuters in this area to enable the line to operate in the black immediately. Besides the difficulty of changing traveling habits, there is probably the fact that there just aren't enough people here to sustain reasonably worthwhile service. The possibility is quite distinct that the commuter service would have to be subsidized during its initial years.

But the authority could devote some energy to a public relations selling job to win customers. It might also consider such sidelights as tourist trips, or historical tours, tapping the growing Washington influx, or possibly school excursions.

It is without any hesitation that I add that the line might possibly qualify either in the beginning or soon after for Federal aid of some sort, either as part of a greater transit system or as a suburban commuter line. I see no harm in looking to the Government for help in an undertaking so vital as this one.

I cannot stress too strongly, nor argue too repetitively that in our part of the world, in Vienna, in northern Virginia, in 1965, public transportation is seriously inadequate and constitutes a major area flaw that bids to become worse. Any public opinion poll taken in Vienna in recent years will testify to that.

Anyone, I think, from a person you stop at random on Maple Avenue to the most knowledgeable modern transportation experts will tell you that more highways for

more cars is not the answer. Almost all official thinking (and planning) on the subject has shifted very markedly from highways to public surface transportation in grappling with today's and tomorrow's mass movement problems.

We should be unwilling, financially and esthetically, to permit Vienna's inundation by highway traffic. If we mean to do more than repeatedly recite our chronic litany—preserve Vienna's scenic and sociological character and cater to aging toddler population—then I insist we must at least consider a way to make it easier, safer and more attractive to get from one place to another. Transportation is almost as necessary as food and I submit that the time has come for us to regard it as such.

I mean to pursue this proposal as far as I can. I present it to the council for your serious deliberation and to give it as broad a currency as possible. I would like to see it an issue in the coming council election campaign. I would like to hear it debated extensively. I may be wrong about the tactic, I'm convinced I am not about the strategy. And I need your help—we all do.

Forgive my ineloquence and thank you for your time and attention.

L. J. Hortin, Director of the School of Journalism, Ohio University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, over 30 years ago I had the privilege and honor of being in a journalism class at Murray State College where the instructor was Hon. L. J. Hortin.

He was an outstanding instructor at that time and all of his former students are honoring him at Murray State College at Murray, Ky., on the night of May 29.

His record speaks for itself.

There was an outstanding article written by Bill Powell, one of the best writers in the Nation, that appeared in the Wednesday, March 10 issue of the Paducah Sun-Democrat, an outstanding newspaper, which portrays the greatness of the Honorable L. J. Hortin. The article follows:

BILL POWELL'S NOTEBOOK: L. J. HORTIN HAS MANY STUDENTS IN NEWSROOMS

I don't remember many of my college teachers; I saw most of them only at classtime and I saw few of them any other time.

I remember E. B. Howton; he was my kindhearted agriculture teacher who somehow knew from the first that I didn't have my heart in agriculture.

I remember Professor Mellen, the brilliant English teacher who sensed that first day in class that I had more affection for the newspaper business than I did for English.

I remember Dr. Forrest Pogue. Actually I didn't have any classes under Pogue, the remarkable teacher who has gone on to be a great World War II historian and biographer (George Catlett Marshall), but he would talk to me and others at length at the Hut or on the library steps most any time we drew him into a conversation.

And I remember Prof. L. J. Hortin.

How I remember Hortin, the slim and nervous journalism teacher. He has meant more to me and to many others who knew him at Murray than anyone else.

Hortin, now director of the School of Journalism at Ohio University, Athens, was a genuine newspaperman who took his sharp professional training right into the classroom and never, never let it get mossed over with the unreality of a secluded college campus.

Hortin brought with him the actuality of reporting, and of the city room, and even the presses. He introduced us, with all the realism in the world, to the editor's desk and the characters which paraded through his newsroom, and who, like lingering ghosts, parade through ours now.

As I said, Hortin was nervous. But his nervousness was energy; his inability to stand still was enthusiasm.

Many young men and women who went through his classes gained and kept unusual interest in the news business.

Among them were Ed Freeman, now managing editor of the Nashville Tennessean; Gene Graham, a Pulitzer Prize winner for reporting; John Mack Carter, editor, Ladies' Home Journal; Burgess Scott, Ford Times roving editor; Jack Anderson, telegraph editor of the Mayfield Messenger; Ray Mofield, head of a new communications department at Murray College; Herbert Lee Williams, head of the journalism department at Memphis State, and many others who have been successful in the newspaper business and in other fields. Pogue was one of Hortin's boys. So were Lt. Gov. Harry Lee Waterfield and U.S. Representative ROBERT A. EVERETT, of Tennessee. So were Wayne Freeman and Wayland Rayburn, and Frank Ellis and Henry Whitlow, and Joe Freeland.

The remarkable thing is that Hortin can reel off a list of 50 or 60 such people without consulting a note and without stopping very long to think.

"I'm reluctant to start naming my boys and girls of yesteryear, however," he told me. "I'm sure I would leave off someone, and I don't want to do that."

He said he was a typical absentminded professor, but I know better than that, of course.

The reason for his statement was that I had written to Hortin and asked him to list for me, if he could, the standout boys and girls he had in his classes.

Back came a letter and a long list, but Hortin asked that he be given time to write to Murray State and obtain a correct list.

That is like him; he taught us very early not to guess, but to strike quickly at the best source.

But those he remembered make an impressive list; I don't believe any teacher in Murray State's history drew around him so many people who really were on their way to success.

"Please don't say much about me," Hortin said in his letter. "It is the students of mine who deserve the notice."

You don't have to say much about Hortin—just that he is one of the rarities of the journalism colleges. He is a professional who could do well in any newsroom at any time because, in the long years and the buzz of amateurs around his thronelike desk, he has not lost touch with good reporting and editing and the other realities of newspapering.

Wherever Murray Staters gather—especially those who have wound up in the newsroom, as I have and as Jack Anderson and Ed Freeman and many others have—the name of Mr. Hortin soon comes up.

We speak of him with awe. Graying men and women who are old hands in their own right do this.

The slight, quick-speaking professor has stayed with us. We never seem to alter our perspective—with Hortin being in the head chair and us listening and looking on as he talked like a Gatlin gun and nervously toyed with a blank sheet of paper on his desk.

Actually, not one of us was Hortin's favorite student. His favorite was Miss Mellie Scott of Heath. She still is. Mellie is Mrs. Hortin.

I wish we could have a reunion with Hortin sometime this summer at Kentucky Lake.

I believe we could have a big thing and that it would do all of us good to be together again.

If you're interested in a reunion, please let me know.

The Indians of Idaho—Poems by Phillip William George

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the history of our Nation and of my State of Idaho is bound up in the proud history and traditions of the American Indian.

Phillip William George, a member of the great Nez Perce Nation, of Lapwai, Idaho, has captured in magnificent poetry, the lonely and lost splendor in which his people lived and the love they held for their lands.

Mr. George is presently attending the Institute of American Indian Arts, in Santa Fe, N. Mex. He plans to major in anthropology, with an eventual teaching career in Indian history.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two of Phillip George's outstanding poetic works, entitled "Battle Won Is Lost" and "Proviso." Both of them were published in a special book which was presented to the Secretary of the Interior, in conjunction of the American Indian Festival Pageant.

There being no objection, the poems were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE WON IS LOST

They said, "You are no longer a lad."
I nodded.
They said, "Enter the council lodge."
I sat.
They said, "Our lands are at stake."
I scowled.
They said, "We are at war."
I hated.
They said, "Prepare red war symbols."
I painted.
They said, "Count coups."
I scalped.
They said, "You'll see friends die."
I cringed.
They said, "Desperate warriors fight best."
I charged.
They said, "Some will be wounded."
I bled.
They said, "To die is glorious."
They lied.

PROVISO

After my wake, oh people of my lodge,
Place a drum upon my chest
And lay me on a travois—
An ancient, gentle travois.
In the dawn, not eventide, I beg,
Take me far away.
I'll drum.
I'll sing.

Carry me in regalia of bygone days
Plumed by the morning breath of Appaloosas,
Across the meadow of the camas,
Through satin dew upon Wallowa's shadow,
There leave me far away.
I'll drum.
I'll sing.

Hold me without bruising, as in embrace,
Carpeted on the palms of loving hands.
Move through the camps from west to east,
For my sun rises, does not set,
And lifts me far away.
I'll drum.
I'll sing.

Mail Service Getting Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD the statement of Jerome Keating, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, in which he points out that the mail service is the worst he has seen in 15 years and is getting worse. He also indicated that one reason is "reduced railway post office operations."

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, the Postal Department is planning to remove the mail car from trains Nos. 42 and 43 of the Burlington Railroad between Alliance, Nebr., and Billings, Mont. If this is permitted it will mean the mail service in the four Western States will get even worse, even though making the mail service worse is almost unbelievable:

Question. Mr. Keating, just how bad is mail service these days?

Answer. It's the worst I've ever seen and I've been associated with the letter carriers for 42 years. It gets worse every year.

Question. Can you give some specifics?

Answer. Yes. Service has been cut all along the line. The postal service has steadily consolidated post offices, reduced railway post office operations, and cut money order and postal savings facilities. Twice-daily deliveries now are reduced to one. Parcel post deliveries are down to five from six per week. I have here on my desk the wrapping from a package mailed from Lower Manhattan to a point on Long Island on January 4. It did not arrive until the 14th. Ten days to travel just a few miles. Another package, mailed from Washington, D.C., last January 13, arrived at its destination in Des Moines on January 25. In Greenville, S.C., church bulletins mailed on a Monday did not arrive until the following Monday or Tuesday, thereby leaving members uninformed about the Sunday services. All were for local delivery. In Madisonville, Ky., beauty parlors' supplies, shipped parcel post by train from nearby Nashville, took nearly a week. In sheer exasperation, the owners switched to a commercial delivery service.

Question. Speaking of parcel post, why are so many packages smashed in the mails?

Answer. Largely because of electronic sorting equipment. At the main post office in Washington, D.C., 14 employees are kept busy rewrapping broken packages. Recently, the St. Paul Post Office was smashing 25 hampers of packages daily. When this forced them to return to human labor, the rate dropped to one hamper per day.

Question. What's behind all these shortcomings in the mail service these days?

Answer. Lack of manpower, primarily. Reduced use of railroads is another reason. The post office now has taken the position that sorting of mail in transit, as done in the railway mail cars, is no longer necessary. All of this means not only poor service, but more and more overtime. Some postal workers now spend 80 hours a week on the job. That is a waste of money, because a man cannot work efficiently that long.

Question. That brings up the question of postal employee morale. What's the picture there?

Answer. It could hardly be worse. Postal employees are trying to do a job they cannot do because there are not enough of them. But, of course, they get the blame for poor service. Employees are being worked to their physical limits and are suffering in many ways. In the Atlanta region, there were 55,840 hours of work lost over seven pay periods. Many accidents were due to physical and mental exhaustion. Employees in the Denver post office have been requested to cancel annual leave. In Hays, Kans., all annual leave has been canceled. It is impossible to begin to tell of all instances where men are compelled to carry their own mail route and part of another one.

Question. What's your answer to these problems?

Answer. The postal service needs more manpower, particularly the appointment of full-time career employees to a greater extent. Equipment and management techniques were supposed to improve service, reduce manpower. But frankly, they looked better in the show window than they have worked inside the store. ABCD (same day business delivery) has delayed as much or more mail than it expedited. It has turned out to be a mere gimmick. Much more has been expected from the ZIP code than it can produce. The program depends upon a machine, the "optical scanner," which has not even been completely invented—and when invented will have many shortcomings. The main trouble is that the Post Office Department has been laying off people in anticipation of automation before the automated machines have arrived.

What Is Conservatism? Who Is a Conservative?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit today a treatise in semantics. I know not the author, but in this day when the leftist liberals claim to be moderates, and the moderates to be conservatives with complete outlawing of true conservatives, by root derivation and definition, it would do all of our colleagues well to reread this definition as set forth:

WHAT IS CONSERVATISM? WHO IS A CONSERVATIVE?

Conservatism—derived from the root word "conserve," meaning to save, protect, guard, and maintain and insure for the future.

Hence, "conservationists" of nature and natural resources are accepted as vigilant guardians of forest preserves, animal life, water, and soil and are respected for their stand.

A conservative is concerned with the conservation of spiritual and legal resources found in our Declaration of Independence and established in the constitutional system of the United States of America. He believes principles are eternal and hence do not all necessarily need changing.

Thus a conservative is one who:

Recognizes and asknowledges the power, authority, and providence of Almighty God the bestower of human liberty.

Practices personal responsibility as a counterpart of his personal liberty, and understands that this provides the ultimate support for our system of government.

Dedicates himself to the conservation of the Constitution of the United States, in order to insure limited constitutional government and national independence.

Defends and encourages personal privacy and the right to own and operate private property, which he fully knows to be the only source of all public revenue for the operation of Government.

These are the basic tenets and principles which unite all conservatives, in spirit and moral law, regardless of creed, color, race, sex, or political party affiliation.

Dominican Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following excellent editorial appearing in the May 5, 1965, issue of the Peoria Journal Star written by Charles L. Dancey:

DOMINICAN ECONOMY THREAD THIN

(By C. L. Dancey)

A few months ago, when I was just checked into El Emajador Hotel at Santo Domingo, I went up to my room in the evening and found the washbowl filled with water, the glass on the little shelf filled with water, and the bathtub filled with water.

I said to myself, "Somebody is trying to tell me something."

What it meant, of course, was that the water supply of the finest modern facility in the country was not reliable, and it was a standing custom to "be prepared."

This is a hint of how that little country has been hanging by a thread, and how the snapping of that thread is more than political, more than economic, and threatens the very life of the population in basic terms of having water to drink, food to eat, and a minimum level of protection from epidemics.

President Johnson wasn't exaggerating a bit when he indicated the need for sizable forces and great deal of effort to provide the simple basic services of modern civilization if we are to keep the population alive under conditions that have disrupted such services.

These conditions have also been a clue to how vulnerable that place has been to ruthless Communist efforts at destruction. They did not need the strength to take over anything. All that was needed was the opportunity and the training to disrupt a level of development that was hanging on the edge of the cliff at best.

The consequences would automatically be massive disaster for tens of thousands, and the kind of shattering health and survival conditions that strip a people naked and defenseless before any hard-core authority trained and prepared to emerge.

The political situation was similar. Thirty years of the iron dictatorship of Trujillo, who wouldn't tolerate the existence of

competent or independent men, stripped the country of any political development or of the development of potential political leaders, or of any truly political experience.

When Juan Bosch was elected in their first free elections, he tried to play both ends against the middle to some extent. He launched a program for "social justice" and was hailed in this country as a fine, liberal, democratic leader.

But he was blind to the nature, character, and menace of Castroite communism, it seemed.

He had not learned politics either stripped of the dictatorial experience, and he was rapidly forging a one-party liberal regime that increasingly employed the methods of oppression to build its power and permanence.

He seemed to be using union mobs to take vengeance and assist in the repression of any who disagreed with him and his program, and he made appeals of the nature that could be used with equal effect by the Communists.

As we pointed out some years ago, the military chiefs of all Latin American countries now realize that they are the first to be executed when the Communists take over, and Castro's ruthlessness in Cuba even against those military leaders who were on his side has impressed all such in Latin America and makes them sensitive and alert to developments that may lead to their own execution.

Bosch's increasingly erratic conduct. His promises and appeals. His centralization of power. All these things caused increasing fear among the military chiefs and many others involved in trying to make the primitive economy function and develop that he was intentionally or blindly setting the stage for a Castro takeover.

They finally kicked him out in desperation.

A military junta took over, but they were chiefly concerned with having a functioning state, and did not desire to run its civil life. They summoned Donald Reid Cabral, a slightly built youngish man, an auto dealer, and a man who had been on an economic mission for Bosch overseas at the time of the coup. They asked him to head up a civil government and try to put the country on its feet.

This unassuming young man apparently had nothing to do with the revolution itself and his talents were simply called upon because of the urgent need of some administrative talent.

He restored a press freedom that didn't exist under liberal, democratic Juan Bosch with the blessing of the military chiefs (although they were the chief targets of free press criticism).

They were trying to make Dominica a livable, organized part of society, after it had been under an iron heel in abject poverty for a generation, and this was a staggering task in a poor country.

Because there had been a military putsch against the democratic president, our own country dragged its feet on the normal economic aid which Dominican Republic needed more desperately than almost anybody else as a simple matter of human necessity.

This didn't help matters.

Just when we were beginning to move to give real assistance and perhaps because of that—because of the threat that it might succeed and it was now or never—Bosch's folks launched their revolution.

As the military chiefs had originally feared, Bosch's forces, his followers, and his program was so infiltrated by Communists that when Bosch, himself, tried to bring about a cease-fire, it became clear that he wasn't running the revolution any longer.

It was, indeed, in the hands of the Communists.

Their allies are ignorance, poverty, disorganization, disease, and fear. And these will be our most stubborn foes.

The Reds were obviously, and are now, perfectly willing to snap the thread of life for Dominica, to permit those island people to go down to death and desolation by starvation, thirst, epidemic disease, and then take over the shattered remnants by traditional terror tactics.

It is this that we have moved to prevent.

The biggest problem is not a military confrontation with these specialists in disorder and destruction. The biggest problem is putting together enough of the functional fabric of a society to permit people to live, to eat, and to escape mass death by epidemic disease.

That is a big job.

And it must be done—or we hand Fidel Castro, free of charge, a weapon he can use over and over again throughout the Americas.

Drug Control Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, the House passed and sent to the other body a drug control bill for 1965. This is much needed legislation and it is the hope of many of us on the House side that the other body will take this matter up at the earliest moment and come forth with some legislation. If there is a difference between the House and Senate legislation, I am sure we can go to conference and can come up with a workable bill in the public interest. Much is being written about narcotics and drugs throughout the country. I append herewith an article condensed from "Today's Health Guide" which will be published in June of this year. Contained within this article are many reasons why this legislation should be enacted by Congress to assist in resolving this situation:

NARCOTICS: THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION'S REPORT[1] ON A GROWING PROBLEM

Thousands of Americans awakened this morning with one driving need—to obtain enough illegal drugs to see them through the day. They are victims of a habit so powerful and so expensive that many will commit crimes before the day is done in order to pay for their drugs.

Addiction is a serious illness, with frequently tragic consequences. It is also linked in the public mind with the underworld, which today in the United States is the source of narcotics. As a result most people are concerned with addiction as a crime rather than with addiction as a disease.

In numerical terms, the problem seems small and insignificant when compared with alcoholism or with the venereal disease problem. The truth is that no one can say, with complete certainty, how many people are addicted to drugs. Addicts are hardly eager to be counted in a census, knowing that their behavior is illegal and considered immoral.

The typical narcotics addict requires $10 to $30 daily for drugs. Male addicts usually turn to stealing in one form or another to obtain the necessary money. Since stolen merchandise brings the thief only a small proportion of its original cost, addicts must steal items worth far more than the cash they need for drugs. It can be safely said that the typical male addict may steal in a year's time merchandise valued at from $30,000 to $90,000. The figure of $350 million has been suggested by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics as the amount spent annually for illegal drugs.

The typical female addict usually resorts to prostitution to obtain the money she needs. It is likely that more than half the women in the prisons of our large cities are both prostitutes and narcotics addicts.

It is clear that society is paying an exorbitant price, in a variety of ways, for continuing to let this problem go unsolved.

THREE PHASES OF ADDICTION

True addiction occurs only with sedative drugs and is associated with the continued use of barbiturates and opiates. Addiction has three separate but related phases: tolerance, habituation, and physical dependence. Tolerance is the diminishing effect of the same dose of a drug, or the need to increase the size of the dose in order to get an effect similar to the earlier ones. Habituation is the emotional or psychological need which is met by the drug. Dependence is the body's need to get the drug.

Opiates that have been used by addicts in the United States are opium, morphine, heroin, and the synthetic drugs that are man-made but have an effect similar to that of an opium derivative. In the early 1930's, opium ceased to be the drug of choice among American addicts, giving way to morphine. A few years later heroin, a morphine derivative, became their preferred drug. Heroin is nearly twice as powerful as morphine and is used by most of today's opiate addicts. Heroin is illegal in the United States, and anyone possessing it is violating the law, for either the heroin itself, or the opium from which it is made, must have been smuggled into the country.

THE SPEED BALL KICK

Although not an addicting drug, cocaine is habituating and is used by some opiate addicts. It gives an almost instantaneous "charge" which is very concentrated and intense but of short duration. It stimulates, whereas opiates depress. Addicts seldom use cocaine by itself consistently because it is extremely high priced on the illegal market and because its effects are so short lived. Some experienced addicts like to mix heroin and cocaine into a "speed ball" which combines the immediate "kick" of cocaine with the extended afterglow of heroin. Addicts also call this mixture a love affair, because heroin is often referred to as "boy" and cocaine as "girl."

Other drugs which are under Federal regulation, even though they are not opiates and not addicting, are marihuana and peyote. They, too, are stimulants—not depressants.

The barbiturates, or sleeping pills, are regarded as genuinely addicting drugs when used to excess. Evidence gathered in the past few years strongly suggests that overuse of barbiturates may lead to an addiction as serious, if not more so, than the opiates. Some nacotic users, take barbiturates if their regular drug is not available, and some take both opiates and barbiturates.

Many people still believe that an addict can be identified by his appearance. He cannot. As a matter of fact, members of an addict's immediate family may not observe any changes in his appearance due to his use of drugs. It is true, however, that heroin

---

[1] Condensed from the forthcoming book, "Today's Health Guide." Copyright 1965 by the American Medical Association. To be published in June 1965.

users may have scars or sores on their arms resulting from repeated injections of the drug into the veins.

It is extremely difficult to recognize an opiate user who is receiving a regular supply of his drug. If the drug is withdrawn for 1 or 2 days, however, the addict is easily identified by a series of definite involuntary reactions called the withdrawal or abstinence syndrome. The severity of the addiction can be measured by the severity of this reaction pattern. A mild abstinence syndrome involves sneezing, yawning, perspiring, watering of the eyes, and a running nose. A moderate response includes tremors of the body, goose flesh, loss of appetite, and dilation of the pupils.

A severe syndrome often involves fever, increased blood pressure, rapid breathing, insomnia, and acute restlessness. In its most intense form, the response takes the form of vomiting, diarrhea, weight loss, and spasms of the limbs. The reaction pattern begins when the effect of the last shot starts to wear off. For the typical heroin addict, this period is nearly 6 hours; for the morphine addict, it is likely to be 12 hours; for the opium addict, 24 hours.

The sociologist sees addiction as a problem that develops in certain geographical areas, in specific environments. He equates addiction with economic depression, cultural deprivation, and a high rate of juvenile delinquency. The phychologist, on the other hand, interprets addiction among minority groups as an expression of frustration and hostility. The psychoanalyst sees the addict developing in and responding to a specific kind of family situation.

Many people hold fast to the idea of addiction being strictly a problem of law enforcement. They feel that if the smuggling rings are smashed and the pushers thrown in jail, addiction will disappear because no illegal drugs will be available.

Another group holds the opposite view. They insist that addiction is an illness and that law enforcement cannot cure an illness. They point out that prohibition did not eliminate alcoholism. Drug use, they point out, is a symptom of other serious problems, and any treatment for addiction must take these problems into consideration.

This group also argues that making addiction a crime may actually increase the number of addicts. Because drugs are illegal, they are expensive; because much money can be made from their sale, the underworld and the "pushers" try to make as many addicts as possible. This group points to the low number of addicts in Great Britain. There addicts may register with the police, without penalty, and receive drugs at low cost while undergoing medical treatment.

A NEW INTEREST

Formidable barriers stand in the way of progress in the narcotics addiction field, but the situation is far from hopeless. As this is written, there is a new stirring of interest in the drug problem; there is encouraging action on a number of fronts, there are many hopeful signs.

Several State probation and parole departments have been testing the usefulness of intensive casework by parole officers to help the addict make a satisfactory adjustment.

A number of church-sponsored groups have pioneered in providing services to support addicts trying to break their drug habit. A few voluntary agencies are developing experimental casework services tailored to the needs of the addict struggling with the problem of readjustment.

The mass media have been focusing the public's attention on the narcotics problem.

Narcotics Anonymous, patterned after Alcoholics Anonymous, was founded in 1949 by Daniel Carlson, a former addict. It now has branches in a number of cities and is gaining experience in providing effective resources for addicts. NA accepts only members who are off drugs and offers the ex-addict the chance to discuss his problems with others facing similar difficulties.

While addiction can be treated successfully in some instances, it is a long and hard fight, and relapses are common. It cannot be emphasized too often or too earnestly that the only way to be safe against drug addiction is to avoid any practice that might lead to it. Trying marijuana just for kicks often leads to heroin addiction. Glue sniffing by adolescents, using airplane model glue, can lead to serious physical results, and the effects it produces may cause a desire for bigger and stronger "kicks." Other dangerous drugs include peyote (mescaline), Mexican mushroom, jimson weed, and LSD-25. These drugs are known as hallucinogens; they create a temporary illusion of well-being, but their ultimate effect is trouble.

WARN YOUNG PEOPLE

Another form of drug use which leads to habituation rather than addiction is the use of stimulants or pep pills, such as amphetamine, often used by students and others who wish to keep awake under difficult conditions. Often sleeping pills are alternated with stimulants, creating first artificial sedation and then stimulation, an undesirable substitute for normal rest and sleep.

While drug addiction has been decreasing in the United States, it remains a serious problem in areas where minority groups are numerous, and where social and economic conditions are unfavorable. Young people should be warned in a factual, unemotional, but emphatic manner of the dangers involved in trying a drug "kick" just once.

The only safe way to use any kind of drugs, except possibly a few common household remedies, is under medical supervision.

Thirtieth Anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, for many farm families across the Nation, including those in my home State of Iowa, this week marks an anniversary of very special importance.

Thirty years ago this week, on May 11, 1935, President Franklin Roosevelt signed the Executive order establishing the Rural Electrification Administration. A year later, with the passage of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the Congress gave its support to this constructive venture.

Today, the REA is a permanent agency of the Federal Government. It has done much, over the 30 years of its existence, to bring the benefits of electric power to farm houses throughout America.

In Iowa, for example, only 14.4 percent of the farms were receiving electric service when the REA was created in 1935. As of June 30, 1964, 98.7 percent of Iowa's farms were served by electric power.

The REA, and those who have supported it, can justly claim the credit for much of this increase in rural electric service—an increase which, in the long run, benefits both urban and rural areas of our society.

Much remains to be done in developing the resources of rural America. There are new problems to be solved, and new programs must be devised to do so. But the REA, with 30 years of success behind it, is an example that provides us with confidence.

Potential for a National Park: The Guadalupe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a very fine piece of writing which appeared in the January 1965 issue of American Motorist. This article very aptly points out the need and reasons for establishment of Guadalupe Mountains National Park in west Texas:

POTENTIAL FOR A NATIONAL PARK—THE GUADALUPE

(By Glenn T. Lashley, editor, American Motorist)

The land west of the Pecos is a country that seems desolate, yet abounds in incredible beauty and soul-satisfying tranquility. The land, in west Texas and eastern New Mexico, is literally a paradise for the man and his family who must live in the city for economic reasons, but feel compelled to turn to the outdoors for its spiritual lift.

There is a tremendous need for the preservation of such areas. Congress established the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to survey the outdoor recreation needs of the American people, and to recommend actions to meet them. The Commission has reported that the gap between the demand and an adequate supply of outdoor facilities will widen over the coming years, if effective action is not taken, and promptly.

Commission research reveals that by the turn of this century our population, which is going to double, will have triple the present outdoor recreation needs. Not only will there be more people, but they will have more free time, more money, and a greater mobility, than ever before.

Congressman JOE POOL, of Texas, is very much concerned about this trend, and plans to reintroduce a bill in the House of Representatives this session which would establish the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in west Texas. He submitted the bill during the last session of Congress, but it was never brought out to the floor for action. Before submitting, Congressman POOL had called for an investigation of the area by the Interior Department to determine its value as a national park.

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall ordered such a study and, when the results were in, enthusiastically urged Congress to enact the legislation. He said:

"The area set aside for the park contains a combination of scenic and scientific attributes that qualify it as an outstanding addition to the national park system. It contains the most diversified and beautiful scenery in Texas, some of the most beautiful landscape in the entire southwestern part of the United States, and its Permian marine limestone mountains contain the most extensive and significant fossil reefs in the world."

The southern extremity of the Guadalupe Range is a wedge-shaped mountain group in a limestone upland extending northward from Texas into New Mexico. The point of the wedge, in Texas, is sheer-faced El Capitan, an 8,200-foot-high landmark visible for over 50 miles.

Directly north of El Capitan is Guadalupe peak, towering to 8,751 feet above sea level, the highest point in the Lone Star State. The beauty of Guadalupe peak, says Congressman POOL, is the greater for its shock value—nobody expects to find an 8,700-foot mountain in Texas.

Between the eastern and western slopes of the wedge is a pine-covered, rolling highland slashed by deep canyons. One of these is McKittrick Canyon, with an area of some 6,000 acres.

The Pool bill would preserve 71,790 acres of this land, nearly all of which now belongs to J. C. Hunter, Jr., owner of Guadalupe Mountain Ranch, and an Abilene businessman with a lifelong interest in conservation. Hunter told the writer that he has had some fabulous offers for the land from developers who would subdivide the property for various commercial interests, but that such thoughts just make him sick.

Mr. Hunter strongly advocates that areas of great natural beauty like this should be preserved in their primitive stage for the American people. He says, it belongs to them, even though he holds title to the land. "How can anyone consider himself owner of this magnificent land, when these mountains have been here for several million years, and I'll be lucky to be around 70?"

Mr. Hunter's concern about the future use of the area in and adjacent to his holding, is illustrated by the instructions given to all guests at Guadalupe Mountain Ranch. A printed card reads: "In order to preserve the canyon in its native state, please observe the following suggestions: If you smoke, completely extinguish your cigarette, matches, etc. Build fires only in the places provided at the lodge. Do not molest any plant or animal life. Please stay on the road and do not bother any plant or animal life on adjoining properties."

Because of this kind of selfless care, the wonderful plant and animal life of the canyon has been able to thrive.

Geologically, the Guadalupe Mountains present a spectacular exposure of the famous Capitan barrier reef, built up over millions of years when the whole of central North America was a shallow ocean. This is why Secretary Udall and Dr. Norman Newell, of the American Museum of Natural History, both point out that the Capitan is the most ineresting and most extensive fossil organic reef known.

In boh plant and animal life, the proposed park's McKittrick Canyon offers a rich, living museum. Among the trees, ranging from scrub juniper and cacti to magnificent Douglas-fir, the ponderosa and limber pine winds Texas' only trout stream, sparkling along for 4 miles through the cut before vanishing underground. Guadalupe Mountain Ranch protects Texas' only herd of wild elk, and a flock of wild turkeys, to boot.

Probably less is known of the archeology of the Guadalupe Mountains than of any other area in the Southwest. Information from preliminary studies which have been made indicates long-term Indian occupancy, beginning at least 6,000 years ago. At one site, indeed, carbon-14 dating of over 12,000 years has been obtained. Pottery fragments 600 years old have also been excavated.

The Mescalero Apaches lived in this area at the time of the coming of the white man. Spanish conquistadores, riding up from Mexico in search of the fabled Seven Cities of Gold, first referred to the area in their accounts. They didn't find the golden cities, however, and the area remained unexplored by other than Indians until 1849, when the U.S. Army sent out an exploratory expedition. Both the Indian inhabitants and the white intruders used El Capitan as a signal peak.

The famous Butterfield overland stage route was pushed through the area in 1858, crossing the range at McKittrick Canyon, where the stage line established a holding area for its horses. Ruins of one Butterfield station are still to be seen at the mouth of Pine Springs Canyon.

The legends that led the Spaniards up from Mexico are still retold today, and have played their part in area history. While Gen. Lew Wallace, the author of "Ben Hur" and an acquaintance of Billy the Kid, was Governor of New Mexico Territory, he reported finding a document in Santa Fe, describing how a converted Indian led a party of Spaniards to a "wonderfully rich gold deposit on the eastern spurs of the Guadalupe Mountains."

Geronimo, last strong and independent leader of the Apaches used to say, too, that the richest gold mines in the world lay hidden in the Guadalupe. Ben Watson, a present-day prospector who, until recently, lived on Guadalupe and estimates his age at 100, says he knows where the mine is, but won't tell because "the world isn't ready for that time yet."

In 1959, Wallace E. Pratt donated 6,000 acres of McKittrick Canyon to the National Park Service, commenting that if the public was ever to enjoy the scenic and educational values of McKittrick and the surrounding Guadalupe, "the limits of the new national park must be extended to include these privately owned lands."

Mr. Pratt first suggested a superb mountain highway, rivaling the spectacular Skyline Drive in Shenandoah National Park. He said it "could be built along the crest of the Guadalupes, starting at the present terminus of the mountain highway at Carlsbad Caverns in New Mexico, continuing to the southwest to the ridges above McKittrick on Guadalupe Peak, then descending 4,000 feet to El Paso Gap. From there the highway could swing back across the floor of the Salt Flats to rejoin the main transcontinental highway at Salt Flat Post Office east of El Paso."

(Appropriate to Mr. Pratt's suggestion, the Federal Government, in cooperation with State highways departments and other agencies, is now engaged in a major study of scenic highway development, to provide access to America's treasure trove of outdoor recreational resources. This Federal action is being led by the Recreation Advisory Council, consisting of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Interior, Health, Education and Welfare, and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Target date for their final report is June of this year.)

Grandeur and scenic wonders are almost commonplace in our country, and nowhere more so than in the Southwest. If created a National Park, the Guadalupe will be central in a chain of three great parks including Carlsbad Cavern National Park, centering about a world-famous limestone cavern a few miles to the north in New Mexico, and Big Bend National Park, a large and rugged natural area bordered by a big bend in the international boundary, the Rio Grande, a little over 200 miles to the south.

There has been widespread support for the Guadalupe Mountains National Park idea. It has been endorsed by the National Parks Advisory Board, and many newspapers have printed editorials expressing strong hope that the area will be brought into the national park system. Gov. John Connally, of Texas, a strong proponent of the cultivation of tourism in Texas, has expressed a great interest in the Pool bill and the potential parkland, as has Gov. Jack M. Campbell, of New Mexico. It has been estimated that a new national park in the Guadalupe area would, potentially, attract 900,000 visitors a year. What with the 20th century advantages of more time, more money, good automobiles and good highways, it is no wonder that tourism, especially that attracted by parks and outdoor recreation facilities, has become the fastest growing industry in America.

The need for preservation of such unspoiled, natural areas as Guadalupe was perhaps best summed up by President Johnson recently in a speech at the University of Michigan: "Once our natural splendor is destroyed, it can never be recaptured. And once man can no longer walk with beauty or wonder at nature, his spirit will wither and his sustenance be wasted."

A Tribute to Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at the conference recently held in Washington, sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and attended by hundreds of wonderful and dedicated persons from all parts of the United States and a number from other countries, Mr. Roger Warren Irving was chosen as the Handicapped American of the Year. The presentation of the award, "A Tribute to Courage," was made by Mrs. Nancy Dickerson.

The remarks of Mrs. Dickerson, which I am pleased to enclose herein, are an especially fitting tribute to a gentleman of determination and courage, Mr. Roger Warren Irving who, physically handicapped himself, has dedicated his life in the cause of the sick, the ill, and the afflicted, and who by his example and deeds has done so much to overcome multiple handicaps complicated by financial difficulties.

And it is a person like Mr. Irving, and there are many others, probably unknown to the world at large, but known to what might be termed "The world of the handicapped" who are keeping in the minds of countless of thousands of persons faith and hope, and the determination to lead an active and contributing life.

And it is the duty and responsibility of all of us, particularly in Government, through the enactment of appropriate legislation and the making of adequate appropriations, to cooperate to the fullest extent possible.

The remarks follow:

A TRIBUTE TO COURAGE

A friend of mine from California has devoted her life to helping the blind and raising money for the guide dogs—the dogs that become the eyes for the blind. My friend, Norah Hamilton, of Santa Barbara, told me of being with the famous blind pianist, George Shearing. Just as Mr. Shearing approached the stage to perform, an incredible thing happened: a reporter dashed up and demanded, "Mr. Shearing, have you been blind all your life?" Quick as anything, Mr. Shearing answered, "Not yet."

Those two words—"not yet"—show an indomitable spirit. The spirit in which they were said epitomize the life of the man chosen as the Handicapped American of this year, Roger Warren Irving.

Whenever we try to honor another man's courage, it is difficult to find the right words. When the other man has courage plus severe physical disadvantages, the comments are even more difficult to find.

According to Webster, the word "handicap" means a disadvantage that renders success more difficult. And there is no doubt that life has been more difficult for many of you. But you are also among the most fortunate people in the world: you have hope; you have measured up to your adversity; you have overcome; and you've become highly successful supermen.

The truly handicapped are the young, the old, the strong physically, who ride at night wearing the white hoods of the Klan. They are the cripples of our society. So, too, are those who increase the terror on the streets at night. They have perfect muscles to behold, but lack any muscle at all in the place where it counts—in their hearts.

I don't know what the doctor's report is on Mr. Irving's heart, but I do know that if they looked carefully, they would find a very special kind of muscle—the kind that comes from overcoming a lifetime of troubles.

At 16 he didn't have any money—had to drop out of school—only to work in a factory and lose his right arm in the jaws of a diepress.

Before he lost his arm, Roger Irving had been a fine tennis player. Less than 2 years after his right arm was amputated, he won the singles championship of the Birmingham public schools; he played with his left hand.

His misfortunes have become blessings for others. Almost as soon as he mastered one-armed living, he was out teaching his techniques to other amputees. After World War II he taught legless and armless veterans how to live as amputees. He gave them the two things they needed most: self sufficiency and hope.

Through the years Roger Irving had other work, but his great love was singing. He became a professional religious singer whose services were in great demand. Then, about 20 years ago, he got throat cancer. His larynx was removed. He was voiceless.

Somehow, I think most people would have given up then. Not Mr. Irving. He enrolled in an esophageal speech clinic and learned to speak again. Then he spent all his spare time teaching other speechless persons to talk.

After years of study and research, he is a world authority on the art of esophageal speech. He is a consultant to the Veterans' Administration and to the Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Because this remarkable man simply refused to give up, maimed men have learned to walk—and silent men to talk.

So today we pay tribute to a man of true courage—Roger Warren Irving, Handicapped American of the Year.

Economy More Robust Than Ever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to draw the attention of the House to an editorial which recently appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer entitled "Economy More Robust Than Ever."

So often amid the daily crises we are prone to over look the accomplishments and gains of this administration in maintaining the economic vitality of the Nation. Present economic conditions, coupled with President Johnson's efforts to control Federal spending have resulted in substantial deductions in governmental spending. I am pleased to add my approval of the administration's program and note its acceptance throughout the Nation.

The editorial I refer to is as follows:

ECONOMY MORE ROBUST THAN EVER

The most important development coming out of President Johnson's news conference was his revelation of the booming health of the Nation's economy.

A combination of higher Federal revenues and a reduction in spending below the anticipated level will reduce the budget deficit at least $1 billion below the $6.3 billion forecast in January, the President said.

A gain of $500 million in revenues is anticipated, with a corresponding decrease from estimated expenditures. Spending had been forecast at $97.5 billion and income at $91.2.

The increased revenue reflects, of course, the rising level of business in general, far above the rosiest predictions of 4 months ago.

Equally as important is the administration's pressure for economical operation of the Government, resulting in the expenditures cut of half a billion.

Both business and Government share the credit for the good news, business for the stimulation of national buying habits and government for thrifty housekeeping.

A slice of $1 billion knocked off the budget deficit is good news but we must remember the deficit is still $5.3 billion—and that ain't hay.

Rumanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on this, the anniversary of the declaration of Rumanian independence on May 10, 1877, it is a pleasure to send greetings to the Rumanian people, many of them still living behind the Iron Curtain, many of them scattered throughout the world. For many centuries, the Rumanians lived under the yoke of the Ottoman Turks. But in the 18th and 19th centuries, the forces of nationalism began to awaken in eastern Europe, and the Turkish administration began to weaken. Following a number of uprisings, the Rumanian people were able to achieve independence in 1877. But that independence was precarious. For to the north and to the east, lay a giant neighbor, whose aims of dominion in eastern Europe has already become too apparent. Thus the Russian empire seized southern Bessarabia in 1877 and held this territory until the end of World War I. And in 1939, following the Soviet-Nazi pact, the Soviet Union seized Bessarabia and northern Bukovina. Today, these territories remain lost to Rumania and stand as symbols of the tyranny practiced by a far from benevolent neighbor.

The Rumanian people, however, have never lost sight of the independence that they won in 1877. While still remaining in the grips of the harsh system imposed by the Soviet Union in 1945, they have steadily worked to free themselves of external domination. Today, Rumania is increasing her trade and contacts with the West. The country is resisting Soviet economic plans to maintain her in the subservient position of a primarily agricultural nation and is rapidly building her own industry over Soviet opposition. However long the road to true independence and freedom may prove to be, the first steps have been taken. The Rumanian people are imbued with the cultural traditions of the West. I am confident that these ties to the West can never be broken. I am confident that one day the Rumanian people will regain the liberty for which they fought so hard in the 19th century.

Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. S. Wamsley has written an editorial in April's issue of the Commonwealth, the magazine of Virginia, which I commend to my colleagues for the wisdom contained therein.

The editorial follows:

RIGHT TO WORK

(By J. S. Wamsley)

The right-to-work controversy is one of those rare issues of national concern which are essentially simple. Usually, the great disputes are complex, delicately shaded: reasonable men can offer reasonable arguments for both sides.

Not so the right-to-work dispute. It is, in our view, an unusual case where one side is heavily loaded with the right, and the other with the wrong.

The right to work is a simple principle of freedom, a classic example of personal liberty that affects the sanctity of a worker's pursuit of his living.

It means that an employee cannot be forced to join, or contribute to, a labor union (or any private organization) in order to get or hold a job. There is only one issue involved: compulsory unionism.

Right to work does not interfere with legitimate union activity in any way. Most assuredly, it does not limit the right of employees to organize and to bargain collectively with their employers.

Today, the principle of right to work is guaranteed by law in 19 States. Virginia is one of them.

These individual States can legally enjoy their right-to-work laws because there is a 44-word paragraph in the Taft-Hartley Act called section 14(b).

Now, the 1964 Democratic platform made no bones about 14(b). It called for its repeal. Right-to-work laws, the platform said, must be scrapped in order "to strengthen the security of American trade unions." In his state of the Union message last January, President Johnson served notice that the

Democratic platform goal was far from empty persiflage. Section 14(b) should be changed, he said, "to reduce conflicts that for several years have divided Americans in various States."

How quaint it was that this suggestion followed by only moments his statement that America is "dedicated to freedom from arbitrary power."

The President is (although it is futile to point it out) far from consistent in his attitude toward 14(b). In Congress in 1947, he voted for the original Taft-Hartley Act. Later, as a Senator, he voted against repealing 14(b). Still later he supported Texas' right-to-work law.

One need not be a skilled political observer to conclude that, since organized labor delivered a massive Democratic vote last November, President Johnson's new antipathy for right to work must be related to that support. It is the only possible conclusion. Because the President, respecter of the consensus that he is, supports a minority cause when he supports compulsory unionism.

The most recent nationwide survey reveals that 67 percent of the American public favors right to work. Only compelling political reasons could cause Mr. Johnson to fly in the face of such a consensus.

Soon, congressional hearings will be held on legislation which would repeal 14(b). What are the prospects?

As of the end of March, it was touch and go. In the House there were 185 Congressmen for repealing 14(b), 187 against repeal, and 63 doubtful. In the Senate there were 40 counted for repeal, 41 against, and 19 doubtful. Thus the champions of right to work appeared to hold a slight edge, although the high number of doubtfuls made any valid prediction impossible.

One conclusion, though, is inescapable.

The politicians who cry for compulsory unionism (to the cheers of a noisy claque of labor leaders) are the very ones who cover themselves with piety when, in other matters, they lead the charge for so-called human rights.

It seems to us that any human should have the right not to join a union.

Poles Won't Forget Once-Had Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of all Members to a letter by a constituent of mine, Edward S. Warlikowski, president of the Polish American Congress, which appeared in the April 27 edition of the Jersey Journal, a leading newspaper in my district.

No people in history who have loved freedom as much as the Poles have had less of it. Their lot in history has been a tragic one as they have been repeatedly subjugated by their powerful neighbors to the east and the west.

Conquered though they may have been, no captor has ever been able to conquer the Polish soul. Their love of liberty has never been extinguished, and all Americans, whether of Polish extraction or not pray that we will soon see Poland free and independent.

Mr. Warlikowswi's letter is proof of why Americans of Polish extraction are such loyal citizens of the United States and why they have been such champions of American ideals.

Mr. Warlikowski's letter follows:

POLES WON'T FORGET ONCE-HAD FREEDOM

DEAR EDITOR: To the Poles living in the free world, May 3 is a day of national importance; for on this day, 174 years ago, there was promulgated by the Polish Government a constitution. Although regarded as outdated in our modern age, this constitution has become a symbol of national heritage, of freedom and democracy for the Polish people.

On that fateful day in May in 1791, the King and the Polish Parliament, the Diet, jointly declared in this historic document an end to feudalism and the beginning of democratic processes. Contained in the articles were rights which would permit the peasants to own lands, would permit the common people the right to appeal to the central government instead of bowing to the will of the land barons, would give to the Polish people representation in a central government.

The major purpose of the Polish leaders in promulgating this constitution was to unite all Poland against further Russian encroachments. Unfortunately, time proved insufficient.

The Empress Catherine, Czrarina of Russia, sent her armies across the borders to stop this revolutionary idea before it reached the Russian frontiers. A valiant defense by the Polish armies, led by Kosciusko, a name so familiar to and revered by the American people, proved incapable of turning back the invading forces. The Polish King, Stanisla Augustus, was compelled to abrogate the newly adopted constitution and accept Russian suzerainty. Two years later, in 1795, Poland ceased to exist as a nation, its territories divided among the rapacious empires on its flanks.

Although Poland emerged as a sovereign nation once more at the conclusion of World War I, its independence was short lived. Again Russian and German troops, during World War II, reconquered the state and subjected the Polish people to horrendous treatment.

Poland does exist as a nation today, but in name only. Governed by a Communist regime which carries out the dictates emanating from Moscow, the Poles live in a state of drabness, destitution, and despair. The spark of freedom, however, continues to reside in the hearts of all Poles.

Let us, therefore, honor the memory of their historic constitution, since they in the Polish homeland are forbidden to make any reference to this national document. By also extending to them on this day the hope that they soon may enjoy democracy and the God-given rights from which they are deprived, we in the United States are thus helping to keep alive the spirit of liberty which is symbolized so uniquely by the Polish Constitution of 1791.

EDWARD S. WARLIKOWSKI,
President, Polish American Congress.

Iowa Rural Electric Co-Ops Congratulated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as one who remembers vividly the time consumed filling kerosene lamps, hand pumping water, and cleaning outhouses, the 30th anniversary of the creation of the Rural Electrification Act, observed on May 11, is of special significance.

Ever since President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Executive order creating the rural electrification program in 1935, American rural life has experienced significant improvement. The vital role played by the lending agency and its loan program is illustrated vividly by the over 5,300,000 consumers presently provided electric service by borrowers from the REA, and by the almost 2 million telephone subscribers. To date, rural electric cooperatives have over 1½ million miles of powerlines.

Another example of the contribution of our rural electric cooperative program is the contrast between the 7 percent of our farm population in the counties presently served by co-ops who were receiving service when the program began, and the 98 percent who are presently being serviced. In my own State of Iowa, a similar increase in families served has resulted from this great movement.

It is a great pleasure to salute our rural electrification cooperatives on this memorable 30th anniversary of this outstanding program.

Iowa's Teacher of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, few professions are of more value to society than teaching, and whenever the opportunity presents itself, it is helpful to remember this by giving recognition to individual members of the profession.

And so I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members the selection of Mr. David Fagle, of Marshalltown, Iowa, as Iowa's teacher of the year.

Mr. Fagle describes his teaching philosophy in an article from the May 1965 issue of Midland Schools, the monthly publication of the Iowa State Education Association. I think my colleagues will find the article of interest.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the article, written by Mr. James Crook of the Marshalltown school system:

IOWA'S TEACHER OF THE YEAR

(By James Crook, journalism instructor, Marshalltown Community College and senior high school)

An ideal classroom for Iowa's "Teacher of the Year," David Fagle, of Marshalltown Community College, is a creek bed south of the city where his biology students frequently gather speciments for class investigations. It is a familiar sight for Marshalltown teachers to see David's students returning to school at 8 a.m. with hip-waders, butterfly nets, and various other paraphernalia after 2-hour field trips.

There is no substitute for an on-the-spot discovery in the learning process, David maintains. As a staff member in a National Science Foundation summer program for high school biology teachers, he takes his classes to Itasca State Park in Minnesota. There he guides field trips to floating bogs and "although I know they will get wet to the ears, the discoveries made concerning insectivorous plants are worth the unusual conditions," he laughed.

One of the most profitable assignments that these teachers complete, he said, is to sit in total silence for a half hour and record the sounds they hear. This type of assignment uncovers a multitude of previously unobserved sounds.

INFLUENCED TEACHERS

David was, as he describes it, born into a family of teachers and was influenced greatly by three high school teachers. These teachers, two biologists and a social studies teacher, convinced him that teaching should be his career by their dedication and enthusiasm.

When sitting in his laboratory, it is easily understood what he means by favoring a "living classroom." The lab-greenhouse area in which he conducts his classes is a veritable Pandora's box for the student biologist to learn from and to use in experiments. It contains a range of animal life from snakes to fish to guinea pigs and plant life from Venus fly traps to lemon trees to pineapple plants.

The Marshalltown community recognizes David as an expert in his field and frequently calls upon him for advice and to give him specimens. In this aspect of his teaching, which obviously gives him a great deal of pleasure, he answers questions about "the mushrooms in my backyard," and receives offers of donation of "a snowy owl shot by accident on a farm." On one occasion a medical examiner called him for an opinion on flesh flies' maturation, in setting the time of death in a murder case. "I call upon the community in return," he related, "for answers to questions that come up in classes."

EMPHASIZES INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION

David calls himself a generalist in education. "I was as excited about substituting in a junior high science class yesterday as in teaching my first college biology class," he said. Individualized instruction is the key to education in his field, he believes. "I'm not interested in the lecture method with large groups," he added, "it's the setting up of a problem and allowing the student to inquire into it that is most effective in biology."

It takes students who are willing to work, and this does not always mean high ability students, he feels, to succeed in biology. Four of David's students won the top honors in Hawkeye science fairs. These students had the scientific spirit and the investigative enthusiasm needed for success, he said.

A low-ability student's eye-popping discovery of a bacterial design on a refrigerated culture was as rewarding for David as some of the discoveries achieved by many of his brighter students.

ACTIVE ON MANY LEVELS

David Fagle is a well-known biologist in Marshall County, the State, and the Nation, mainly because he works at it. Though he is not one known to live his subject to the exclusion of all else, he is active on many levels of biology training.

He is the instructor of the county workshop, for new science-teaching methods for elementary science teachers, presented annually by Marshalltown Community College. He has served on national science committees, as a State editor for the American Biology Teacher, and he takes time to attend national science conventions annually. He is eager to visit other biologists in the State to discover new methods of presenting materials.

COAUTHORS TEXTBOOK

Not the least of his accomplishments has been the publication of a textbook for advance biology classes entitled "Design for Life" which he coauthored with Richard Trump, head of the science department at Ames High School. In the preface the authors suggest the student should employ the thinking-through process and that he need not merely repeat what he has been told. This is David's classroom philosophy.

In stating his philosophy of education, he wrote, a teacher must consider that each student has individual worth, a unique design, and a vital life role to play. "An education should enable a student to live a full life." It is toward this end that Iowa's Teacher of the Year devotes his instruction.

Address of William G. Downey at the Dedication of the Richard Byrd Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, March 21 was a very important day in Springfield, Va., in my congressional district, for that community dedicated the Richard Byrd Library, bringing easy access to new avenues of learning to thousands of young people and their parents in the community.

The library was named, most appropriately I believe, for one of Virginia's real national heroes, Adm. Richard Byrd, and at the dedication an address was delivered by a Springfield attorney, Mr. William G. Downey, which I believe will be an inspiration to all who note it in this RECORD. I am pleased, therefore, to insert Mr. Downey's address and commend it to you for your attention.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM G. DOWNEY FOR THE SPRINGFIELD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AT THE DEDICATION OF THE RICHARD BYRD LIBRARY, MARCH 21, 1965

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen of Springfield, and friends, we, who have come together from all corners of the Union to form one of Virginia's youngest communities, are here assembled to assist at the opening of this library, dedicated to the memory of a member of one of Virginia's oldest families.

As Virginians all, we share our pride in Richard Evelyn Byrd with Americans everywhere. This son of the Old Dominion, who was born in Winchester some 77 years ago, filled our lives for 40 years with the sagas of his extraordinary achievements in the fields of aviation and polar exploration. For, like his forefather before him, William Byrd of Westover, Richard Evelyn Byrd was a pioneer and a mapmaker, until his untimely death, 8 years ago.

In 1912, when he was graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, the unexplored heights of the air and the unmapped polar regions of this globe were the challenges that beckoned young Dick Byrd, as he received his commission as an ensign in the pre-World War I U.S. Navy.

After service at sea and in the air during the First World War, Richard Evelyn Bird was retired from the Navy, but his career was not ended. It had only just begun.

With Floyd Bennett, Commander Byrd made the first flight over the North Pole in 1926. In 1927, less than a month after Lindbergh's lone-eagle flight across the Atlantic, Commander Byrd and his companions flew from New York to France, carrying the first transatlantic airmail. In December 1928, Commander Byrd established his first base in Antarctica, which he called Little America, and in the following November he made the first of his three flights over the South Pole.

Admiral Byrd's long romance with Antarctica continued for more than 29 years and only ended with his unexpected death in 1957, as he was preparing his fifth expedition to the South Polar regions.

The younger brother of our senior Senator, HARRY F. BYRD, the competent author of four books which are in this library, the proud wearer of the Congressional Medal of Honor, Richard Evelyn Byrd was one of the few persons ever promoted by the Congress to the rank of rear admiral of the U.S. Navy retired list, for his work in polar exploration.

In dedicating this library to Richard Evelyn Byrd, we, the people of Springfield, are opening the door to the future as well as to the past. For a library is essentially a collection of books or other literary materials concerned with the achievements of men, preserved and arranged for reference and study by other men.

Here, the children, and people of Springfield, can search the records of the past in order to plan the direction and development of their future.

But let us consider, as Emerson did, what we have in even the smallest library. "A company of the wisest and wittiest men that could be picked out of all civil countries in a thousand years have set in best order the results of their learning and wisdom. These men themselves were hidden and inaccessible, solitary, impatient of interuption, and fenced in by etiquette; but the thought which they did not uncover to their bosom friend is here written out in transparent words to us, the strangers of another age."

In this Springfield of 1965, as we dedicate this newest library to the 20th century's Richard Evelyn Byrd, let us also remember that the earliest library in North America was established in Virginia in the 17th century; and that the same William Byrd of Westover is reported to have collected the best library in the Colonies during the 18th century.

In this Springfield of 1965, in our days of public libraries, it is difficult to understand or to realize the power which was generated by the few books in the few private libraries which were available in this land of ours some 200 years ago.

In those days, on the banks of the Rivanna, young Tom Jefferson, through a book borrowed from a friend, was introduced to the age of Homer, and dreamed of ancient navigators sailing the wine-colored seas.

In this Springfield of 1965, the young people of this community, from books borrowed from this library, will be introduced to young Tom Jefferson and will dream, as he did, not only of navigators sailing the wine-colored seas, but also of astronauts cruising the long blackness of space. And we hope that they will ponder, too, in their changing times, the unchanging principles of American Government set forth so eloquently by that same young Tom Jefferson.

And so, on this second day of spring 1965, on this space age day when one of our satellites has taken off for the moon, on this day of the beginning of nature's perennial renewal, on this day of the dedication of this library to the memory of a great Virginian, Adm. Richard Evelyn Byrd, let us, the strangers of another age, renew our pledge to the fulfillment of the promise of the immortal words of that other Virginian:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain un-

alienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The Atlantic Ideal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the great partnership between the United States and Western Europe has been a shining light in the annals of contemporary history.

Never have so many worked for so much—and achieved so much success. The economic resurgence of Western Europe is a tribute to its people and to the confidence of the American people in the basic good will of all Western European peoples.

Lately there have been voices raised that would tear the fabric of this relationship. If they reap the harvest they seek, it will bear bitter fruit. But the indications are that this dissidence will—as all things—pass.

A perceptive editorial on President Johnson's eloquent address summarizing our traditional relationship with our neighbors in Western Europe was published in the New York Times, May 8, 1965.

I request unanimous consent that this editorial entitled, "The Atlantic Ideal," be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

THE ATLANTIC IDEAL

President Johnson was at his best in reaffirming the ideal of a united, prosperous, and responsible Atlantic Community in his talk marking the 20th anniversary of V-E Day.

He spoke, of course, in a field of foreign affairs where American policy has been most fully and richly developed by both parties and four administrations over the past two decades. But if he said nothing new, he stated the familiar uncommonly well.

In the light of General de Gaulle's increasingly blunt challenge to the United States, President Johnson's reiteration of what unites the Atlantic Alliance was necessary and timely. General de Gaulle, having excluded Britain from the Common Market, now hints he wants to exclude the United States from Europe. Such an attempt can only fail.

A Europe without American nuclear support and political backing is a Europe much diminished and endangered. Since none of France's neighbors shows any serious signs of wanting to follow this self-defeating course, President Johnson was wise to respond to General de Gaulle calmly and without rancor.

It is useful to be reminded of the success, abundance, and enhanced security that both the United States and Western Europe enjoy in large part because of their cooperation. Through that same cooperation the Atlantic nations can achieve the goals Mr. Johnson sets forth. The most important of these is the gradual reconstitution of Europe "within its wide historic boundaries" by the breaking down of the barriers that divide the West from Russia and its now restless satellites.

There are no insuperable obstacles that prevent the Atlantic nations from meeting their moral responsibility to the economically underdeveloped world or solving such internal problems of their own as a better sharing of the defense burden or a modernizing of the international monetary system. These responsibilities and problems are manageable once all of the Western nations recognize that the United States is as indissolubly a member of the Atlantic Community as Britain or Luxembourg—or even France.

Democracy in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the great ladies of Arkansas is Mrs. Marie Morris Rushing, of Route 5, Fayetteville, Ark. She is a noted poet and writer and is a member of the National League of American Penwomen—one of their distinguished members.

Recently an article written by Mrs. Rushing was printed in the Tulsa World, Tulsa, Okla. It is a great tribute to our country and our system of government. Under unanimous consent, I insert her article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks:

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

(By Marie Morris Rushing)

I was preparing to go to a Washington County Home Demonstration Club Council meeting, when the Penwoman magazine arrived. It was a whole month late. I knew it was to list some important biennial contests of the National League of American Penwomen, so I thumbed through it hurriedly. One contest title intrigued me: "How Can We Aid in Defeating Communism and Preserving our American Heritage?"

As a housewife, mother, clubwoman, and freelance writer, I was especially interested in this subject, but I remembered with irritation, a worthwhile article would necessitate much research. Research would require time, and where was I to find time? Here I was wasting a day on a county council meeting, a day when I could be doing research.

The telephone rang and my neighbor reminded me they were waiting for transportation to the Washington County council meeting.

More grumpy than usual, I picked up three of my fellow home demonstration club members, begrudgingly, and drove to the Woman's Building at the county fairgrounds, where the council meets.

"How are county council meetings going to help us?" I growled to no one in particular.

"They are very important and they only meet quarterly," Nell Hughes, my patient neighbor began. "They are very important because the council coordinates the work of all the home demonstration clubs in the county."

"It's such a nice place to get to see all of your acquaintances," Mrs. Lawson injected. "The fellowship and the demonstrations are worth the sacrifice we make in attending. I've never attended one that I didn't learn something."

"The food and speakers interest me most," Miss Harris, one new home demonstration club president, added. "Honestly, the way those timid women participate, even make speeches, amazes me."

The program subject for the day was, "Heritage." I observed, a bit intrigued. "God Bless America," was being sung with enthusiasm as we found seats. The council president asked us to remain standing for the American's creed to be read in unison. I fished the leaflet out of my bag and followed the other readers.

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, for the people: whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union; one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes. I, therefore, believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution, to obey its laws; to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies." Signed William Tyler Page.

For a moment I had the feeling the little brown hen (who starved to death searching for a grain of wheat, in the fable) must have had, when she suddenly realized she was sitting by a bushel of wheat. This creed, I told myself, is part of our heritage, and I have repeated it many times without accepting its deeper implications and meaning.

I turned to the home demonstration club creed, my heart beating faster, while "My Country 'Tis of Thee," was being sung.

"I believe in the home demonstration club's program and accept the responsibility it offers to be helpful to others and to provide continuous improvement in all levels of living. I believe that through working together in a group we can enlarge the opportunities, enrich the lives of our people, and create a more contented family and community life. I believe in my own work as a homemaker. I believe that the greatest force that molds character comes from the home and I pledge myself to create a home which is morally wholesome, spiritually satisfying and physically healthful and convenient."

The program had been so successful and the rural youth learned so much that the mothers of 4-H Clubbers had appealed to the county agents for a program in which they too, could be better trained.

Miss Harriett B. King, who had been active in keeping 4-H Club work on an even keel, when I was a child, was the first director or county agent in Washington County, Ark. At present, there are 50 clubs in 1 county alone. These clubs have an average membership of 25 to 30 homemakers. The county council coordinates the work of the clubs. It meets quarterly. It alert the HD Club members to health and safety, community improvement, legislation, 4-H Club work, education and family life, citizenship and civil defense, and international relations. What other organization does as much, I mused?

I was brought back to the present by the HD clubwoman who addressed the group next, and I was faced with the enormity of my ingratitude; I had not thought of my American heritage for some time, but had taken the right to worship, assembly, and vote, for granted.

Later, the student to whom the council had presented a scholarship (to the State university) the past year, spoke.

The county council delegates gave reports next. They had just returned from a National HD Council meeting at Little Rock, where 5,000 delegates from Home Demonstration Clubs all over the Nation had met in their annual meeting. Their voices, I learned from this report, were voices to be reckoned with. Voices from the makers and keepers of homes. "I believe the greatest force that

molds character comes from the home." HD Club creed.

The midday luncheon was the cooperative effort of clubwomen and boasted all varieties of culinary art. Many of the recipes were first demonstrated by club members, with health charts, vitamin and calorie content carefully considered.

The blessing prayer was sung in unison: "Be present at our table Lord. Be here and everywhere adored. These mercies bless and grant that we may feast in paradise with Thee."

In the afternoon reports of projects, workshops and demonstrations by the individual clubs, were reported. I was astonished to find such things as wiring, willmaking, library, building, interior decorating, dieting, foundation garments (selections), were in the reports, as well as clever ways to make a number of Christmas decorations with clothes hangers and tin can lids. I realized these things had been going on before, but I was analyzing the HD program for the first time.

Home Demonstration Clubs all over the land were symbols of democracy in action. They were carrying on our American heritage as no other groups in our land. What better way was there to fight communism?

The Anatomy of Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, Otis Chandler of the Los Angeles Times, is rapidly gaining a position of prominence in the newspaper world. In the short period he has directed the publishing of the Times, he has established a reputation for objectivity and highest quality news coverage. He has set a fine example for newspapers throughout the country.

The honest and incisive approach he has maintained is evidenced in the following editorial which I bring to the attention of the House membership. It points to a critical and timely problem that today threatens the dynamism of our democratic process. Expressing the need for a concerned and motivated public in our system, the article brings great encouragement to me and indicates that there are vigilant people who will bring public heed to sometimes subtle erosions of the basic tenets of our democracy:

THE ANATOMY OF EXTREMISM

Periodically, in the history of this Republic, there have emerged during times of stress extremist cults and movements of various stripe. They often rally under patriotic banners. But they are dedicated nonetheless to assaulting by word and deed certain basic institutions and tenets of American society.

In the 1840's and 1850's the Nation suffered, and survived, the Know-Nothings. In the 1930's, amidst the fear of the great depression, both Fascist and Communist organizations flourished. At other times, in less organized ways, we have endured other divisive, truly un-American movements, which preached hatred of class or race or religion or democracy.

These have not been nor are they today welcome experiences. Living through them has sometimes left scars. In every case, however, the fundamental strengths of our political and social structure have readily absorbed the attacks of internal foes.

This is not to minimize or discount the inherent threat posed by organized extremist movements. These are ugly, intolerable manifestations whenever and wherever they occur.

Whether of right or left, extremists are a departure from both the ideal and practice of American national life. And when hate, which so easily is expressed through violence, is the chief mark of extremism, the aberration is even more alarming.

We live now, as we have for some decades past and as we no doubt will for some time to come, in an uneasy world. Fears, real and imagined, vague and precise, surround us. Within and without our borders, great and unusual transformations are taking place.

Old values are questioned and sometimes discarded without being replaced. What once were sureties making for stability—of belonging, of participation, of individual worth—now seem frequently in doubt.

In this changing climate a sense of frustration, a feeling by the individual that life is wasted or spoiled, can be easily nourished. Widespread frustration, with all its ambiguities, is the commonest breeding ground of extremism. It is from among the frustrated that the zealots, the true believers, are recruited for extremist movements.

Regardless of the cause to which he dedicates himself, the extremist in every case seems motivated and compelled by an inner turmoil, for which he invents elaborate and high-sounding rationalizations. This is true whether he is a college youth eagerly enlisting in a far-left crusade, or a goon marching in a bedsheet, or a man in a business suit conspiring to take over a PTA—or a local police force.

The raw material for making extremists has always been with us and, given human nature, always will be. The existence of this fortunately limited element in our midst is not itself alarming. Extremism in any form, thanks to the basic common sense of Americans, has never yet grown into a mass movement.

What is alarming is the chance that passivity, preoccupation and apathy on the part of the overwhelming majority of decent Americans will permit one or more extremist movements to assume a strength far out of proportion to its size. Then it may prove too late to do anything about it.

This has happened in other countries.

Despite the phrases they mouth or the flags in which they wrap themselves, extremists can be readily identified. For what distinguishes them all is a basic hatred and contempt for American society as it exists today. That hatred, however disguised, gives extremists cohesion and motivation. It is their strength, but it is also their undoing. For such sick hatred ultimately is self-destroying.

Given a vigilant, concerned public, the process can be accelerated.

Facts, Fallacies, and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Senator from Washington, HENRY M. JACKSON, is currently delivering a series of major addresses concerning foreign policy, concentrating on the campuses of the country where our leaders of tomorrow are gathered.

The Senator has spoken in my own district, on the campus of Pacific Lutheran University at Tacoma, Wash. He has spoken at major schools in many areas, and recently summed up many of his views in the Maurice Tobin International Affairs Lecture at Boston College under the title "Facts, Fallacies, and Foreign Policy."

These views are not to be taken lightly, for Senator JACKSON enjoys an ever deepening respect in the field of foreign relations as well as in other fields. He understands international affairs, he understands America's role in the world today, and he expresses this understanding clearly.

I am pleased to bring Senator JACKSON's remarks at Boston to the attention of my colleagues:

FACTS, FALLACIES, AND FOREIGN POLICY

(By Senator HENRY M. JACKSON)

I am pleased and honored by your invitation to appear here today.

In recent months, the college campus has become a forum—and in the case of some groups a target—for the advocacy of ill-conceived and false notions of foreign and defense policy. In many cases demonstrations—some of them disorderly—have been a substitute for what should be an informed and orderly debate.

Students who are being exposed to such bombardment may begin to feel like the inebriate who stopped a man on the street to ask the time. The man looked at his watch and gave him the time. The drunk scratched his head and said, "All day long, different answers."

Today, I have no intention of setting forth another program to meet the world crisis. My aim is a modest one. I want to examine with you some of the serious misconceptions that turn up in the national debate.

Debate is our social locomotive—the force that shapes our approach to problems, from Appalachia to Zambia. Public opinion is its byproduct, the fruit of the discourse that begins at the breakfast table, continues at work, in the lunchroom or around the conference table, and is the stuff of which editorial pages and letters to the editor are built, not to mention the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We live in a dangerous world, where a fresh crisis arrives as regularly as the morning paper. We confront complex issues, and understandably many of us hope for simple answers. So it is not surprising that convenient but false assumptions creep into some people's thinking about public issues.

If the American people are to come to grips with the real problems and the real dangers, roadblocks to clear thinking need to be removed. As Josh Billings has said: "It isn't ignorance that causes so much trouble; it's what people know that isn't so."

Let me discuss with you certain mistaken assumptions about international affairs that crop up repeatedly.

1. One false notion is that communism is a unified force—a really monolithic international movement.

There was a time, in the years following World War II and ending roughly with the death of Stalin in 1953, when communism appeared to be a unified force, centrally directed from the Kremlin. But this view was always exaggerated. Nationalist yearnings were weak but they were not dead. Even before Stalin's death, Tito had introduced the virus of national communism into the movement, and the rumblings in Yugoslavia had their echoes elsewhere, increasingly in Eastern Europe and most vividly, of course,

in Red China. It would distort the meaning of words to call Red China a satellite of the Soviet Union today.

What this proves is that ancient traditions and cultures and historic conflicts of interest are deeper than attachment to the religion called Marxism-Leninism.

Today the contest for leadership of world communism is as bitter as only family quarrels can be. But the family, however deeply split, is still a family. Were Peiping's hold on power to be seriously threatened from within or without, Moscow might and probably would come to Peiping's aid. And vice versa—even though that may be difficult to imagine today.

In short, the real world is gray, not black and white. Communism is not a monolithic force: even a junior grade satellite like Cuba does not dance always to the Soviet tune. But neither does the split go so deep that the family could not patch up its quarrels long enough to aid a member whose survival was in jeopardy.

The situation therefore opens up some possibilities, but they must be exploited with care. We cannot expect to inflict a humiliating defeat on a member of the Communist camp without provoking a response by other members. This imposes on the American public a demand for something much subtler and much more difficult to accept than the familiar cry for absolute victory and the unconditional surrender of an enemy. In the atomic era no one can afford a total war, with a total victory for one side and a total defeat for the other. We can push, but we must not push too hard. We must learn to accept the idea of limited conflict with limited objectives, and that means we must learn to accept outcomes that are somewhat ambiguous and that will not satisfy the demands of those who want clear-cut, absolute solutions.

Unfortunately, it is more palatable to say, as General MacArthur did, that in war there is no substitute for victory, than to say gains must be weighed against costs—in lives, in treasure, and in the interruption of forward national programs on other fronts. For to hold the second view means that one must think—and that is always hard.

2. A more and more common fallacy, as a generation comes to maturity that did not experience the thirties and forties first-hand, is that preparedness is the road to war and disarmament is the road to peace.

Once again the so-called peace movement is gaining adherents on many campuses. In addition to writing letters to the editors, you aren't really with it these days unless you have advised the President by carrying a placard up and down in front of the White House.

In one midwestern college, a few students gained brief national attention by staging a 2-day fast for peace. In the same school, another group was formed to eat for escalation. College food being what it is, it is not clear which group made the greater sacrifice.

At one college, I heard about a group of students who were planning a demonstration. A delegation went to see the college president in his office. "Everybody tells us we should conduct a sit-in," they said. "Can you suggest a good issue we could use?"

I wonder sometimes whether the so-called peace movement may not be related to our American tendency to neglect the study of history. I wish every student could be exposed to a thorough study of that fascinating but shameful decade when Hitler was building the German war machine while the democracies were preaching disarmament and neglecting their military preparedness.

Hitler's strength was our weakness, and World War II was not the product of an arms race but of the failure of the West to use its superiority to call a halt before Hitler could do what he said he was going to do.

It is not a pleasant fact to recall but the truth is that the peace movement of the thirties helped to bring on World War II, not to prevent it. And it is a fact that the well-intentioned advocates of immediate withdrawal of our Armed Forces from Vietnam should ponder. As Reinhold Niebuhr has said: "If the democratic nations fail, their failure must be partly attributed to the faulty strategy of idealists who have too many illusions when they face realists who have too little conscience."

The true champions of peace today, as in the thirties, are those who understand that power must be used, with restraint but also with assurance, to keep the peace, or to restore it.

It did not seem possible 15 years ago that it would once again become necessary to expose the fallacies of appeasement. But time passes, and another generation is tempted to hope that perhaps the aggressor's appetite is limited. History suggests that success but whetted Hitler's appetite, and, if possible, Communist ambitions are even more grandiose than Hitler's.

3. Another mistaken idea is that the United Nations is the keystone of American foreign policy.

You have all heard, as I have, that the United Nations is the world's best hope for peace. The truth is that the maintenance of peace depends not on the United Nations but upon the power and will of the free nations to defend the peace.

We want a world that conforms to the Charter of the United Nations, and this is a noble aspiration. But if this world is to be created, we and like-minded peoples will have to do the building. It is not a job we can transfer to the U.N. or otherwise leave to others.

The notion that the United Nations is the keystone of American foreign policy would be closer to the truth if subject and predicate were reversed. The correct statement, indeed, is that the United States itself is the keystone of American foreign policy: our strength, our will, our sense of purpose, the appeal of our conception of peace as a condition in which free and independent peoples may survive and flourish.

The United Nations is not, and was never intended to be, a substitute for our own leaders as makers and movers of American policy. We cannot subcontract away to the U.N. the responsibility for national decision-making.

Today, the crisis of the United Nations is evident. That organization could be one useful avenue of American foreign policy. But this requires that we really understand what the United Nations is—and what it is not—what it can do and what it cannot do.

In the words of W. H. Roberts—distinguished professor of international law and relations at the Catholic University of America: "The United Nations can and will serve a worthwhile purpose only if its limitations are clearly recognized and if its potentialities are not exaggerated."

By misusing the organization, by loading on it a heavier burden of problems than it is able to handle, its ability to act constructively in other situations is impaired. In the name of "building up the United Nations" some of its so-called friends have contributed to the current predicament. And the way to finally destroy the United Nations is to give it assignments that it cannot carry out.

This is not, of course, a popular view in many quarters. To utter it is to expose oneself to the charge of "downgrading" the United Nations.

But the view I am presenting is not a criticism of the United Nations; it is rather a criticism of the approach to the organization taken by so many government officials and pressure groups. If they would approach the United Nations with a more realistic appreciation of its limitations, more modest hopes for its accomplishments, and a mature recognition of the burdens of responsible American leadership, the organization could still be a useful avenue of American foreign policy.

(4) Another frequent error is that "America can do anything" and that American power can always succeed if we will only use it.

The "can do" philosophy grows out of America's successful experience in taming a continent, building a free society, and developing the most productive economy the world has ever seen. But even the United States cannot do everything.

For power is relative. It cannot be measured except in relation to another's power. Strictly speaking, it makes no sense to say, as we often do, that the United States is strong. We should use the comparative—the United States is stronger—or weaker—in this or that respect than some other state.

Power is the ability to produce intended effects. Power is, in other words, the ability to bend others to one's will. Even military force is, in the final analysis, a tool of persuasion. In Korea we sought to persuade the Chinese to accept the unification of Korea on our terms. They were not persuaded. In turn, they sought to persuade us to accept unification on their terms. We were not persuaded. In the final outcome, each side was persuaded to accept roughly the status quo ante because the price of accomplishing unification on its terms proved to be too high.

Thus, power is relative in a second sense: It is not only relative to the power of adversaries but it is relative to the goals sought. The more limited one's objectives the more limited is the power that has to be brought to bear in achieving them. This point has relevance today in Vietnam.

President Johnson has repeatedly made clear that we are determined to preserve the independence of South Vietnam but that we have no designs on North Vietnam. Our goals are limited and, because they are, I believe that we will be able to achieve them with a limited use of American power. But we must make our determination entirely clear to the adversary—and our ability to make him pay a higher price to achieve his goals than he is prepared to pay.

"The difficult we do today, the impossible tomorrow" is a marvelous wartime slogan. But it is not a good premise for the conduct of foreign policy, for it ignores the relativity of power, and that is something responsible statesmen can never afford to ignore.

5. Another misleading view, voiced by some who weary of our involvement in Vietnam, is that neutralism is the way of the problems of southeast Asia.

First, let us understand what we mean by "neutral." Many sins have been committed in that name.

A nation is not neutral by free world standards if it is subservient to Communist aims or a setup for imminent takeover by local Communist stooges. That is the status of the soft neutral which Peiping and Moscow advocate. We see a place in the world, however, for the hard neutral, which recognizes the full dangers of Communist tactics, and which, while telling us it does not intend to be pushed around or become our ally, says the same thing to Peiping and Moscow, and can make it stick.

In short, independence, and the means to maintain independence, are preconditions of hard neutrality—a neutralism that is genuine and not merely a cloak for a Communist takeover.

President Johnson has stated our objective in Vietnam in these words: "An independent South Vietnam securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others—free from outside interference, tied to no alliance—a military base for no other country."

The problem is precisely how to achieve and assure such independence for the nations of southeast Asia.

Some people may be honestly confused about this issue. I fear, however, that some of the advocates of neutralism are being disingenuous, that in fact they believe we should now cut and run from Vietnam, that Red China is foreordained by history to dominate Asia. One could at least deal with someone who frankly took this position. It is more difficult to deal with persons who persistently confuse their hopes with reality.

6. Another familiar illusion, often harbored by people of good will, is that negotiation around a conference table is an alternative to the risks and burdens of the cold war.

Like many fallacies, this one is comforting, for it suggests that the risks and burdens are unnecessary; convenient, for it seems to offer a plausible alternative; and false, for it rests on a mistaken notion of the nature of negotiation.

When American and South Korean Forces threw back the third Chinese Communist offensive in the spring of 1951, with staggering Chinese losses, the Communists indicated their willingness to negotiate. At that moment, instead of keeping up the military pressure, our forces were ordered to halt their drive and we agreed to sit down with the Communists at the conference table. Officials thought that the war phase had ended and that the negotiating phase had begun. Optimists thought it might take 3 weeks to work out the details of an armistice; pessimists though it might take 6 weeks. No one imagined that it would take more than 100 weeks.

But once this country let up our military pressure, the Communists took advantage of the lull in the fighting to build a strong defensive line, 14 miles deep, and, once they had it built, they knew we could renew hostilities only at the cost of heavy casualties. With their defenses secure, they proceeded to drag out the negotiations, trying to win at the negotiating table far more than they had been able to win on the field of battle.

Negotiation is not a substitute for pressure. Pressure is a part of the negotiating process. It is an old rule that a diplomat cannot be expected to win more at the bargaining table than his comrade-in-arms has won—or is clearly in a position to win—on the field of battle. I see no reason to doubt the relevance of this principle to Vietnam.

A good many Americans still have to learn the lesson. Negotiation is not talk apart from action—negotiation is talk and action. Indeed, the outcome of discussions inside the conference room is likely to be decided by the whole series of pressures outside the conference room. All these pressures, including military moves, determine whether an international discussion can be brought to a satisfactory end.

To sum up the matter: Whether Americans understand it or not, the Communists know that the war in Vietnam is part of a negotiation that has been going on for 20 years and will continue as far ahead as anyone can see.

Finally, let me say this:

History does not award its prizes in terms of the merits of one's cause—but in terms of the efficacy of one's efforts on behalf of his cause.

Winston Churchill once said he had only one question about the future: Are the American people ready to stay the course?

Communism thrives on crises and strives to produce them. One of their goals is to break our will. They believe, as Hitler did before them, that we do not have the staying power, and that, out of sheer frustration, we may make the fatal errors that will fulfill their prophecy of a funeral for the West.

But they have forgotten something. As someone put it, "The first essential of a quiet funeral is a willing corpse," and we and our allies are certainly not that.

Maybe Moscow and Peiping do not realize this, but, putting this challenge to us as they are, they give us the historic chance to prove the determination, strength, and good sense of freedom.

A Modern America's Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, without much debate, the United States of America has the greatest war machine in the history of the world either for a time of peace or war. With that power goes tremendous responsibility lest a balance of power to assure peace in our time actually confound it. I cited the administration's policy in Vietnam last week in a positive way.

Right in southeast Asia does not necessarily mean right in Latin America. Our action in the Dominican Republic to date can be perhaps justified as a lifesaving mission. As action to stem a Communist threat, I think we are on tenuous ground. I personally don't believe that communism is here the issue. To project the Domino theory to the Americas today is unrealistic. While the United States should adopt a modern-day Monroe Doctrine of protecting the Americas from forceful intrusion of communism by a minority, I do not believe we should intrude where a majority of a people express themselves in any direction by a rebellion, election, or otherwise. James Nelson Goodsell, Latin American correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, observes the following:

DOMINICAN REVOLUTION AS SEEN FROM REBEL SIDE

(By James Nelson Goodsell, with the rebels in Santo Domingo)

A tour of the rebel section of this embattled city shows the extent to which antigovernment forces have dug in.

I spent 5 hours wandering through the 10-square-mile section of the city which includes the National Palace, Fort Ozama, and the commercial, and business heart of the city.

My conclusions are these:

Virtually to a man the rebel elements feel they have a cause which is important to preserve, that of fighting for constitutionalism and returning the deposed President Juan Domingo Bosch to office.

While there are Communists in their midst, the top rebel command is in the hands of non-Communist elements who fiercely proclaim their opposition to communism.

There remains a significant balance of good will toward the United States despite the marine and airborne occupation of other parts of the city—even the understanding that the marines had to come to rescue American lives.

But the rebels are questioning the continued presence of U.S. forces and seem determined to resist any further encroachments on rebel territory by U.S. forces.

It may be possible to dislodge the rebel force with superior arms, but the rebels would probably put up a real struggle, for they possess large stores of weapons and ammunition.

FRIENDLINESS SHOWN

Friendliness greeted me as I walked alone through the rebel territory. People seemed pleased to talk with a newsman, if nothing more than to get their points of view across.

"Tell the world we are not Communists," was a repeated refrain. Spoken in a variety of ways, this view was virtually unanimous.

Col. Francisco Caamaño Deno, military leader of the rebel forces and apparently the top man in the whole effort, said, "We just do not have a Communist problem."

But the colonel, who is looked to with respect by thousands of Dominicans in the rebel area, admitted there are Communists in the midst of the rebel movement.

Another rebel chieftain added, "After all, we will take any support we can get."

Still another said, "But do not forget that we have control of the situation, and this is not a Communist revolution. It is a constitutional movement to restore constitutionalism."

This seems the driving force of the rebel movement. A number of Mr. Bosch's longtime associates and members of his political party are in key command positions in the rebel hierarchy.

LOOKING FOR REDS

However, some American spokesmen here cite the names of 53 known Communists who occupy positions of authority in the rebel command. On the other hand, not all U.S. officials in Santo Domingo agree with this assessment.

I tried to locate several of those whose names are on the list. I was not successful.

In the rebel headquarters in downtown Santo Domingo, as I went from office to office, I could find no evidence that they were anywhere in these key command positions. (This is not to suggest they do not operate with rebel forces, but merely to indicate they are not visibly in evidence as the U.S. spokesmen had affirmed they would be.)

A large supply of weapons and ammunition—including some tanks and some large weapons—are in rebel hands. They are stored at a variety of spots throughout the rebel territory.

U.S. presence in the Dominican Republic, to the extent of 15,000 troops, is viewed with growing alarm by the rebels. There is clear good will and even an understanding of President Johnson's decision to safeguard American lives.

U.S. INVOLVEMENT

"But we understand you've removed these Americans," said a rebel major who added: "Isn't it time for you to get out and allow us the opportunity to win the struggle against the forces of those opposed to constitutionalism?"

The major was speaking of the military under the command of last week's hastily formed military junta, headquartered at San Isidro Air Force Base east of Santo Domingo.

The U.S. forces began landing in the Dominican Republic at a time when the heart appeared to have been going out of junta cause—and rebels were on the point of gaining the advantage—despite some reports inspired by the junta to the contrary.

There are many questions in the rebel territory about the next U.S. action in Santo Domingo.

"We will fight against Americans as we have fought against fellow Dominicans. We believe our cause is just, and we are willing to die for it," said one rebel.

His view is general, although of course expressed differently by others.

While I spent only 5 hours in the rebel area, my observations are in general corroborated by neutral observers who have been in the same territory in the past several days.

UNITED STATES CUTS OFF DOMINICAN REBELS

U.S. forces here have effectively isolated Dominican rebels in downtown Santo Domingo.

The move came as U.S. spokesmen here announced that it is Washington's official policy to "help the Dominicans to find a democratic solution to their problems."

The statement was accompanied by clear indications that Washington expects to maintain its troops in the Dominican Republic for an indefinite time. There was no explanation, however, of what was meant by "a democratic solution."

Rebel forces, now holed up in a 10-square-mile area embracing the major business and commercial area of the capital city, assert that there is only one democratic solution for the nation: return of constitutionalism through the return of ousted President Juan Domingo Bosch.

COMMUNIST THREAT?

But Washington has held all along that a Castro Communist takeover was a likely result of the rebellion which began with a call for Mr. Bosch's return from Puerto Rican exile where he has been for the past 19 months since his ouster.

(In San Juan, P.R., Mr. Bosch told an interviewer the United States is suffering from "communism psychosis" and that its troop landings had helped rather than hindered the Communist cause in Latin America, the Associated Press reported.

(Col. Francisco Caamaño Deno, a coup leader, was declared provisional president Tuesday and acknowledged as such by Mr. Bosch in San Juan.

(A peace mission from the Organization of American States (OAS) was in Santo Domingo continuing efforts to mediate and bring about full observance of the cease-fire agreement reached between the various factions.

(The mission also backed a Washington recommendation that an OAS peacekeeping force be sent to the island nation.)

The effective isolation of the rebel-held territory, accomplished by the linkup early Monday of U.S. marines and airborne troops, is part and parcel of Washington's policy here. But there is a puzzlement here over the U.S. position.

In the first place, while Washington insists there is a Communist problem, U.S. officials here are playing down the role of Communists in the rebel movement to explain why U.S. soldiers were landed here.

As the buildup of U.S. forces continues, now totaling at least 12,000 rebels are being viewed as including some Communists but not being dominated by them.

AMBIGUOUS STATEMENTS

Moreover, ambiguity of official statements, made on and off the record here, is lending a degree of uncertainty and confusion to the whole U.S. operation. Embassy sources privately express concern over the confusion. Many officials in the embassy lament the whole U.S. role in the Dominican Republic.

With the isolation of rebel-held territory, it now is possible to travel through Santo Domingo from east to west along one street corridor patrolled and held in tight security by some four thousand U.S. marines and 82d Airborne Division troopers.

This correspondent was one of the first people to pass through the corridor early Monday. U.S. tanks, armored cars, and other armor-plated vehicles were located at every intersection. He was stopped on an average of at least 2 times every block in the 28-block corridor.

During the course of the walk, roughly 3 miles in length, he talked with U.S. troops and private Dominican citizens living along the street who have opened their houses to U.S. use.

TROOPS ON ALERT

There was a mood of relaxed, easygoing banter between U.S. troops speaking pidgin Spanish and Dominican citizens. But troops were on the alert and kept so by steady patrolling of offices along the street.

Later in the morning, returning via the same route, this reporter was caught in the rain of gunfire as snipers opened up on elements of the 82d Airborne Division.

U.S. troops returned the fire and eventually flushed snipers out of buildings—but there were other incidents later in the day which suggested U.S. forces still had their work cut out to maintain the corridor.

As this work went on, there remained a question of what would be the next U.S. move. Here now were answers, but there was a variety of guesses: anything from moving block by block into rebel-held territory to trying to force rebels into surrender through cutting off supply routes.

Whatever course eventually is followed, the likelihood of a long U.S. stay here grows.

DOMINICAN REVOLT: HOW RED?

(By James Nelson Goodsell, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic)

The mounting U.S. occupation here is based on the view that the rebel government "is Communist controlled."

This evaluation of the situation, given repeatedly by U.S. spokesmen here, holds that Col. Francisco Caamaño Deño, rebel chieftain, "seems to be moving closer and closer to the Communists around him."

This disclosure came as officials in Washington released their own evaluation—based on similar information—that Communists had gained control of the rebel movement here.

These evaluations are being used to justify continued U.S. occupation of Santo Domingo.

This occupation includes a full airborne division, large Marine elements, sizable Navy units offshore, and scattered Air Force and Seabee elements on the ground.

VALIDITY QUESTIONED

There are numerous longtime observers of the Dominican scene who question the validity of U.S. allegations.

Moreover, some U.S. Embassy officials think, as one expressed it, "we have made a mistake and now must justify it."

The difficulty in all this is the clear possibility that the deviousness of Communist methods might well be turning a legitimate social revolution into a Castroite movement.

U.S. officials here, in briefing the press, have been slow to come up with any facts and figures on Communist strength in the rebel cause. They only released information here in a haphazard fashion after Washington had already released the information.

PICTURE OF FIST

But U.S. sources here did announce information here of a May 4 meeting between Colonel Caamaño and nine persons who are variously described by these sources as leftists, Castroites, or Communists.

In addition, one U.S. source here alluded to a picture of Colonel Caamaño with a clenched fist, which appeared in the San Juan Star, as evidence of Communist tendencies.

Newsmen found a picture of President Johnson with a clenched fist in the same edition of the paper.

The question repeatedly being asked here in the light of these allegations is this:

Just how strong are the Communists and just how close to rebel leadership are they?

It ought to be recognized at the outset, say observers of the Dominican scene, that Colonel Caamaño himself is not a Communist. He has emerged as the legitimate leader of the rebels following nearly 2 weeks of rebel activity here.

ADVISERS LISTED

Colonel Caamaño is the son of a general who served under dictator Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina. He is regarded as a bright military officer who has long chafed at domination of the military by traditionalists and those opposed to the nation's economic and social reform.

Moreover, many of his advisers are leftists to be sure, say observers, but they represent the anti-Communist democratic left. It is this group that has effected valid social, economic, and political reform in the hemisphere.

These Caamaño advisers include a fellow military officer, Col. Manuel Montes Arache, and two civilian advisers, Manuel Bordas and Hector Aristy.

No observer here, nor any U.S. official, will say that Colonel Montes Arache or Messrs. Bordas and Aristy are Communists.

Indeed, they view these three and Colonel Caamaño as non-Communists.

But, say U.S. observers, it is the second level of advisers who are Communists. For instance, Manuel González González, an experienced Spanish Communist, who has been working with the Dominican Communist Party for 2 years, is said to be the leader of a certain bloc of Communists advising Colonel Caamaño.

TRUJILLISTA NAMED

Exactly what responsibility does Mr. González have is the rebel government? This question is not being answered by U.S. officials here. He is simply said to be an adviser to Colonel Caamaño.

Other names are given by U.S. sources:

Fidelio Despradel Roque, regarded by these sources as "a prominent Dominican Communist";

Buenaventure Johnson, a man active in the Soviet line Partido Socialista Popular Dominicana (PSPD);

And Luis Lújara González, a onetime Trujillista who, following the fall of the dictatorship, changed stripes and became a Communist.

These names are among the 53 names of leftists variously described to newsmen here as being leaders of the revolt, advisers of Caamaño, or known Communists active in the Dominican rebel elements.

FIFTY-THREE NAMES ON LIST

When pressed for specifics, U.S. spokesmen are not able to give many details. They assure newsmen that the list is authentic and ask from newsmen an attitude of trust us.

The difficulty in all this is the U.S. Embassy uncertainty about the list. Members of the Embassy staff who think the whole U.S. operation here has been a mistake cite the list as an example.

"Sure, we have a list, but this doesn't prove anything," said one Embassy source. One well informed Dominican observer, long a student of Communist activities here, said the list of 53 names was an obvious one that "anyone of us with a little knowledge could have put together. But are these Communists in key roles in the rebel movement? I doubt it."

The 17th Anniversary of the Creation of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, 17 years ago this week occurred an event which

is of great importance to all who love liberty and support the right of self-determination for all people.

On May 14, 1948, Sir Alan Gordon Cunningham, the last British High Commissioner for Palestine supervised the hauling down of the Union Jack symbolizing the end of British rule in Palestine.

On the same day, the General Zionist Council and the Jewish National Council declared the establishment of the State of Israel. A new nation was born, a nation which has been a democratic model of stability in a perennially troubled corner of the world.

From the year 70 A.D. when Roman legions commanded by the Emperor Titus destroyed the Temple in Jerusalem there had been no national Jewish homeland. These were the years of the Disapora, or dispersion, when Jews were scattered unto the four corners of the earth.

In all of these years, whenever Jews gathered for the Seder—the family meal held as part of the Passover services—the Hebrew words La Shan ah Haba'ah Bi-yeru Shalayim—next year in Jerusalem—were always chanted demonstrating the desire of Jews everywhere for a national state.

In 1948, the dream of almost 1,900 years became a reality as the blue and white flag with the Star of David flew in its rightful place over the newly declared nation of Israel.

Since 1948 every effort by hostile neighbors to drive the Jews out of Israel has failed and the little nation has grown strong and increasingly self-reliant.

I join with my colleagues to say mazeltov to the people of the gallant little nation of Israel.

Appointment of James Doyle to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said about the vacancy in the District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin. When the President's nomination of Attorney James Doyle was announced, it was greeted by both feelings of relief that the vacancy was now filled and satisfaction that it was filled so well.

For those of us who have known Jim Doyle over the years, his appointment was a most appropriate recognition of the judicious way in which he has conducted himself during many years of involvement in some of the most controversial and important political matters. All of this is summed up most effectively by Mr. Bob Heiss of WTMJ, WTMJ-TV, the Milwaukee Journal stations in Milwaukee, Wis. Accordingly, I place Mr. Heiss' editorial of Friday, April 30, at this point in the RECORD:

President Johnson, in nominating Attorney James Doyle to the vacant western Wisconsin Federal court bench, selected one of the most respected Democrats in the State. The announcement ends an unfortunate situation which saw the original appointee unacceptable to the Senate and which resulted in a court vacancy for a year and a half, and a big backlog of cases. The blame for this perhaps will never be placed on any one person's shoulders but the overriding cause plainly was politics within the party. Certainly it was no easy task to make the appointment when the State's two Democratic Senators could not reach early agreement on their choices. Apparently the compromise that was reached will give former Governor John Reynolds the first opening either in the eastern district or on the appeals court in Chicago.

A native of Oshkosh, James Doyle is a distinguished Madison attorney. He was one of a small group of young Democrats who in 1948 started working hard to reestablish the party as a political force in Wisconsin. Known as the party's "philosopher" he has often tangled with others on policy. And in later years, with Reynolds and John Gronouski over the sales tax issue. One can assume that this was one of the reasons why Doyle failed to obtain labor's support for the judicial post. Doyle, however, is a political realist. In this connection, it's interesting to note that although he fought unsuccessfully for Adlai Stevenson's nomination for President, even at the 1960 convention, Doyle was on record previously in defense of Lyndon Johnson. At a time when Johnson was being attacked by Wisconsin Democrats for his majority leadership in the Senate, Doyle said such criticism "had the appearance of fearlessness but not of reality." Speaking to North Shore Democrats, Doyle added: "A national party is a combination of persons with divergent points of view, and a leader has to be one with views somewhere near the party average and who understands the varied problems of his colleagues. Johnson is such a man."

Little did Doyle know in 1958 when he made that speech that fate would move Johnson into the White House. Little did he suspect that one of the candidates he opposed at the 1960 convention would some day appoint him to a high judicial position.

The Teacher and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, few men in American history are so well-qualified as William Benton, former U.S. Senator and now Ambassador to UNESCO, to observe the implications of education both here in the United States and abroad.

During 1964, Mr. Benton visited the Soviet Union for the fifth time since 1955. He has written an outstanding assessment of Soviet education and its directors, who aim at victory in the "cold war of the classrooms."

This assessment is one of the most thought-provoking studies of U.S.S.R. education that I have ever seen, and, with permission, I would like to see it appear in the RECORD.

Due to the length of the articles, they have been broken into chapters and I am asking permission for one chapter to appear each day that the RECORD is printed until the full extent of Mr. Benton's analysis has been printed.

The article follows:

A PERSONAL REPORT: THE TEACHERS AND THE TAUGHT IN THE U.S.S.R.

(By William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Senator; presently U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its executive board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica)

"WELCOME TO MOSCOW!"

Precede

From the moment of my arrival at Moscow Airport in late May of 1964, I was struck by an air of excitement. I was greeted by a delegation from the Institute of Soviet-American Relations, the organization which then served as my host. The group was headed by Academician Nikolai Blokhin, head of the Soviet Academy of Medical Science and president of the institute; it included Henrikh Chvedov, secretary-general of the Soviet National Commission for the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); Gennadi Fedesov, the amiable and well-informed young man who, on my previous visit in 1962, had served ably as my interpreter; and the chic and vivacious Tamara Mamedova, the director of the institute who was to be my principal consultant for appointments with Soviet officials.

"Welcome to Moscow!" they exclaimed. Mme. Mamedova added, "This is a very good time for you to be in Moscow."

Was it an especially good time for an American to be in Moscow? Much of what I have set forth here, as an account of my observations and impressions, was written in the summer of 1964, before the downfall of Chairman Khrushchev on October 15 and before the ouster of some of his key associates whom I had interviewed. The news of his fall reached me in Paris, where I was representing the United States as its Ambassador at the October meeting of the executive board of UNESCO. The news startled me as much as it did my colleagues from the other 29 nations represented on the board.

The visit was my fifth to the U.S.S.R. in 9 years. This return was at the suggestion of Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and of W. Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs. They asked me to take time off from my official duties at the spring meeting of UNESCO for 10 days in Moscow. The three of us had agreed that changes had been taking place in the Soviet Union—perhaps symbolized by the nuclear test ban treaty, and marked most notably by a seeming general relaxtion of tensions. What did the so-called détente signify? Which aspects of it were short range and tactical? Was it merely a temporary appeasement of the United States, a pause before a new offensive? Could I contribute to an understanding on such questions?

I talked with 20 or 30 top Soviet officials, an average of 2 or 3 a day. Some of our talks were on political problems—for example, on Germany, disarmament, "nonintervention" in the affairs of other countries and international trade. These were the political themes of greatest interest to me and to Khrushchev and other top political leaders. But the main theme of many of the dialogs was education. Political and economic trends in the U.S.S.R., never easy to appraise, became murkier as the year drew to a close, in part because of the overthrow of Khrushchev. The dialog on education, however, remains reasonably clear.

Thus, putting politics largely aside, the major theme in this article is education in

the U.S.S.R. and what we may learn from it that can be applied to the United States. To a lesser extent, it is communication and propaganda in the Soviet system and the outlook for cultural and informational exchanges between the U.S.S.R. and the United States. The outlook for such exchanges may again be clouded. But there is nothing murky or clouded about the goals, the direction, and the achievement of Soviet education and science. These have been developing steadily for at least 35 years. There is no reason to expect that any new regime will change the direction or alter the emphasis. The logic is clear and inescapable for any regime: education and science are now the most powerful instruments, and the only "safe and sure" instruments toward the Soviet hope of world dominion.

Mme. Mamedova's remark about "a good time" implied that there have been in the past—and may be again—times not so good for an American observer to visit her city. But on this visit she proved to be right. I found the highest Soviet officials eager to talk. They had been hospitable on my four previous visits. Now they were eager. Yes, an air of eagerness prevailed among officials of the institute in their efforts to make certain I had appointments with as many key Soviet leaders as possible. The culmination of this effort was my interview with Chairman Khrushchev—and then a harrowing, last-minute ride to the airport in his official car to make my return flight to Paris.

The Institute of Soviet-American Relations is the United States section of an organization with a lengthy title: Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. The union seeks to present itself as being "private" and free from state control. This, of course, it is not. It is headed by a most impressive woman, Mme. Nina Popova, who is a member of the Supreme Soviet and the all-important Party Central Committee. Mme. Mamedova reports to her.

Tamara Mamedova, who had been my hostess on my 1962 visit also, is the wife of Enver Mamedov, who was chief deputy to Mikhail Kharlamov, then chairman of the State Committee on Radio and Television (Kharlamov was deposed with Khrushchev in October). She spent 5 years in Washington as cultural attaché with the Soviet Embassy when her husband was editor of "USSR," the Soviet propaganda magazine published in English in the United States. In addition to other major responsibilities, at the time of my visit in May, her husband was in charge of all Soviet overseas broadcasts, and the total volume of these is enormous. In their middle forties, he and his wife are as attractive a couple as one is likely to meet anywhere and, of course, both speak excellent English.

With Mme. Mamedova acting as my interpreter, I called upon Mme. Popova on the morning after my arrival. She occupies an office as large as President Johnson's in a turn-of-the-century palace built by a merchant prince who collected French Impressionist paintings. Her expressive blue-gray eyes are penetrating. Married, with a daughter and grandchild, she is direct, practical, efficient—but altogether feminine. She symbolizes the high status given to women in the Soviet Union.

During our talk she returned repeatedly to her favorite theme—"how much the United States and the U.S.S.R. have in common." That is her job: "friendship." She talked about the need for me and for her to be "independent of the critics of the right and of the left."

To most Americans this must seem a most unusual Communist "line," and so it once seemed to me. However, I shall be surprised if she doesn't stress it in 1965 as she did in 1964. This line is integral to Communist propaganda throughout the world. Regardless of the belligerence of Communist actions, the talk must be—and is—of friendship and peace. Thus this powerfully placed and attractive woman, with whom I have had many visits, still admonishes me on what I consider to be an essential of democracy. (As a professional protagonist of "friendship," she minimizes or neglects the many deep and serious issues that divide the United States and the U.S.S.R. This is both conscious and subconscious. She genuinely hopes, I am sure, that many are in the process of being resolved.)

Most of our first visit centered on my schedule. Whom should I see? Chairman Khrushchev was in Egypt, but she hoped he would be back before I left. Was I still interested in education—as well as politics? I assured her that I was. All right. She would see that I was reexposed to what was going on and what was new in Soviet education.

"The Voice of the Kremlin," which I wrote for the 1956 Britannica "Book of the Year," pointed out that Soviet progress in education challenges the "American Dream"—at least that part of the dream which envisions equal opportunity for every boy and girl to achieve the highest level of education of which he or she is capable.

In some areas of technical training the Soviets are already ahead of us—for example, by nearly 3 to 1 in the quantity of output of engineers. But the issue runs far deeper than this.

Today Soviet leaders are using, and have detailed plans to expand, every new teaching technique, including programed learning, films, radio, and television, to help achieve the maximum development of their manpower, which they understand means primarily brainpower. As I wrote in 1956, on my return from my first visit, we are indeed facing "a cold war of the classrooms." I shall revert to this theme occasionally in the essay which follows.

One of my visits was with Alexei Adzhubei, Chairman Khrushchev's son-in-law and then editor of Izvestia. In or out of office, Adzhubei is a representative Soviet intellectual. In a current article written for another Britannica publication, "The Great Ideas Today," 1964, the annual yearbook for the purchasers of Britannica's "Great Books of the Western World," Adzhubei blandly states, "In one item we want to give you battle. It could be referred to as 'the consumption of cultural values.' In this area it is clear that we left you behind a long time ago."

So says Mr. Adzhubei. Thus he promotes the war of the classrooms to the whole cultural field. He would concede, I am sure, that it is virtually impossible to separate "cultural values" in the Soviet Union from its one-party, one-ideology political and economic system. I shall touch only glancingly on this in the following report. Suffice it to say here that the cold war of the classrooms and of so-called cultural values can be the war upon which America's survival depends.

My role in the following pages may seem to many to be more that of a journalist than that of an analyst. Sometimes, in reporting the words of Soviet officials—who almost always speak from an ideological basis—it seemed necessary to make my own position clear. However, I did not often attempt to interrupt in the midst of an official discourse merely because the views expressed were at variance with the facts—or with the interpretation of the facts as they are known in the United States. There were, of course, times when I could not remain silent, and did not. In general, however, my purpose was to hear their arguments rather than to offer mine.

The reader will keep in mind, I hope, my role as a journalist and will answer silently for himself, or improve on what may seem to him to be inadequate rejoinders from me.

Red Merchant Fleet Will Surpass American Fleet in 1 Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House two news items which appeared side by side in the May issue of District 2 Marine Engineer.

Their headlines tell an ironical story "President Proclaims May 22 Maritime Day," and in the next column, "Soviet Merchant Fleet Will Outclass Ours Within a Year."

President Johnson's proclamation states, on the one hand:

> We must be ever mindful of the state of our merchant fleet. A balanced, economical and efficient merchant fleet, manned by well-trained and skilled seamen, is a vital national resource.

The other story tells of a report just released by the Shipbuilders Council of America, which warns that by the middle of next year the Soviet Union's merchant fleet will outclass ours in both the number of vessels and total carrying capacity.

Mr. Speaker, I await with interest and concern the maritime program the President implied would be forthcoming in his state of the Union message. Russia's threatened dominance in the merchant marine is paralleled by her massive, far-ranging fishing fleets and by a priority program in submarine production. This is not simply a matter of national prestige, it is a question of national security and a serious challenge to our economic supremacy.

There are a number of legislative proposals before Congress designed to help the merchant marine and the American commercial fishing industry. One in particular comes to mind because it is a bill that I filed only last week, H.R. 7956, which is companion to Senator BARTLETT'S S. 1858.

This legislation would extend to the nonsubsidized portion of the merchant fleet—tramp and bulk carriers, coastwise and intercoastal domestic carriers, Great Lakes shipping and liners not aided by operating subsidies—and the fishing industry, the same tax privileges now enjoyed by subisidzed operators. That is, to allow them to establish tax-deferred capital reserve funds for rebuilding old vessels or building badly needed new ones.

Our merchant and fishing fleets are falling behind those of other nations on both sides of the Iron Curtain. It is in the national interest to initiate a rebuilding program, and this bill, H.R. 7956, is a step in the right direction.

For the RECORD, I would like to include at this point the two news articles previously mentioned:

SOVIET MERCHANT FLEET WILL OUTCLASS OURS WITHIN A YEAR

WASHINGTON.—The merchant fleet of the Soviet Union will surpass the American fleet

by the middle of next year, according to the Shipbuilders Council of America, in both the number of vessels and carrying capacity.

The council's report on the comparison between the two nations was carried in its annual report released during mid-April, and predicted that Russia's booming ship building campaign will put her way ahead of the United States by this time next year.

TWENTY-FIVE-YEAR-OLD SHIPS

"More importantly," the report indicated, "the Soviet fleet will be composed predominantly of new, efficient vessels, while the U.S. merchant marine will be composed overwhelmingly of obsolete ships in the 25-year-old bracket."

According to statistics obtained from various reliable sources, and included in the council's report, the Russian merchant fleet, since 1951, has increased from 432 ships of 1.8 million deadweight tons to 1,200 ships amounting to 8 million tons. During the same period, the U.S. fleet has dwindled from 1,955 ships of 22.4 million tons to a total of 900 ships amounting to only 13.5 million tons.

As of November 1, 1964, the Russians had 673 ships of almost 6.5 million tons under construction or on order, compared with only 43 American ocean-going vessels being built, or for which orders had been placed.

The council's report pointed out that because of the Soviet crash program, Russian shipyards cannot handle the naval and merchant orders and have had to farm almost 4 million tons of modern ships to yards outside the U.S.S.R. proper.

Even as the Soviets continue to build modern merchant vessels at an alarming rate, 18 shipyards in the United States have been forced to close since 1955 because of the lack of work for the U.S.-flag fleet rejuvenation. As a result, the fast, new Russian ships contrast sharply with the older, U.S. tramp fleet, which is composed almost entirely of small, slow Liberty and Victory-class vessels.

District 2 MEBA and other member unions of the AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department have been urging the Government of the United States to reevaluate its shipbuilding program and system of subsidies in order to get the American merchant fleet back on its feet. To date, the call from maritime labor unions has gone unheeded and the U.S.-flag merchant fleet continues its slide downward.

PRESIDENT PROCLAIMS MAY 22 MARITIME DAY

WASHINGTON.—May 22 has been designated National Maritime Day and President Lyndon B. Johnson has called upon the Nation to honor the American merchant marine on that day in recognition of the vital role played by merchant seamen and the maritime industry in the Nation's economy.

"International commerce and the ships which make it possible have contributed immeasurably to America's greatness," Johnson noted. "The sea and ships are an integral part of this country's past, present, and future.

"In war and peace merchant seamen have served us well * * * to carry people and goods between nations in peaceful commerce or, if need be, to carry the men and equipment needed to protect our interest and our friends overseas."

Noting the vital role played by maritime in the well-being of the entire Nation, the President made several observations which might well be heeded by more than one agency of the U.S. Government—particularly the Agriculture Department, and the Maritime Administration. The President noted:

"We must be ever mindful of the state of our merchant fleet. A balanced, economical, and efficient merchant fleet, manned by well-trained and skilled seamen, is a vital national resource * * *. Our fleet must ultimately be supported by Americans who ship their cargo on American ships."

Statement of Weyerhaeuser Co. With Respect to Proposed Bonneville Power Administration Rate Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Weyerhaeuser Co. recently sent to me a statement with respect to proposed Bonneville Power Administration rate changes. It discusses in detail the reasons why a proposed rate increase would injure the economy of the Northwest.

I am placing this statement in the RECORD so that the Members of this House will be fully aware of the implications of the rate increase proposed for users of electricity in the Northwest:

STATEMENT OF WEYERHAEUSER CO. WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSED BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION RATE CHANGES

In late 1964 the Bonneville Power Administration proposed an increase in power rates and a change in its rate schedules. In response to widespread protests that the BPA had failed to demonstrate either the need for an increase or the fairness of the structural changes in its rate schedules, action on such matters was postponed for 1 year. In February of this year BPA proposed a new set of rate schedules designed, according to BPA, to increase its aggregate revenues by approximately 4 percent per year. In addition, they made various structural changes in the overall rate schedules. We wish to address ourselves to three points.

1. THE NEED FOR A RATE INCREASE

BPA has prepared and distributed a "50-year payout schedule" which purports to be the justification for the increase. This schedule projects a tremendous stepup in its expenditure program, commencing in fiscal year 1968 and continuing through 1975. During this 8-year period, BPA anticipates aggregate expenditures of about $2½ billion—or almost one and one-half times its total expenditures during its entire history to date! The schedule further shows that with expenditures of this magnitude incurred during this period, a deficit will develop in the year 2022 if the present power rates are continued in effect. In short, the BPA is proposing that rates be increased in 1965 so that expenditures to be made in 1975 can be amortized by 2025.

Obviously, many developments would eliminate the deficit. Moving the program back for 1 year, with the consequent reduction in interest charges, would do so. Any significant breakthrough in atomic power generation during the next 10 years would reduce projected costs and thus produce a substantial surplus instead of a deficit in 2022.

However, even if we assume that none of these contingencies will materialize, we still have a basic question—why should power users in 1966 be asked to pay increased rates so that facilities that will not be built until the middle 1970's can be paid for in 50 years? We submit that the facilities built in 1975 to meet the needs that then exist should be paid for by those who benefit from them.

2. THE NEW RATE SCHEDULES PENALIZE INDUSTRIES WHO PURCHASE INDIRECTLY RATHER THAN DIRECTLY FROM BPA

Turning to the problem of the rate structure, we believe that those industrial customers who purchase power indirectly through utilities are being treated inequitably. Our power experts, after consulting with our suppliers, have calculated that our power costs will increase by about 6 percent—or 1½ times the average increase.

3. SCHEDULE S-1 SHOULD HAVE A "PASS THROUGH" PROVISION

The new S-1 rate schedule is predicated on a meritorious principle; namely, that it is desirable to offer an attractive rate to encourage the use of BPA energy as an alternative to generating energy with steam facilities. This not only maximizes BPA revenues, but conserves the Nation's fuel resources. However, this S-1 schedule appears to create a serious inequity because it fails to extend such rate to those utilities who rely on the steam generating capacity of their customers' plants rather than their own plants. Such utilities must buy their interruptible power under schedule 4-H, which is 25 percent higher than the new S-1 rate. We most strongly urge that schedule S-1 be clarified so that the benefits of it are extended to those utilities having contractual commitments from customers with steam generating capacity. This is consistent with the basic objective intended to be recognized by the new S-1 schedule. Of equal importance, it will avoid discrimination among industrial customers purchasing the same class of power from different utilities.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we submit that BPA has not demonstrated either the need for a rate increase at this time or the fairness of the changes in its rate structure.

A State Primary for Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Long Island Star-Journal of May 10, which refers to New York State's method of nominating for statewide elective offices by convention.

The editorial calls attention to the fact that only in New York and in Indiana is this method followed—despite the fact that New York has a well-earned reputation for liberal and progressive ideas.

It is time we gave some thought to changing this practice, and I hope that the recent study by the Honorable Frank D. O'Connor, district attorney for Queens County, will receive the attention and action it deserves.

The article follows:

A STATE PRIMARY FOR GOVERNOR

In terms of progressive legislation in general * * * with antidiscrimination laws, labor laws and welfare laws as particular examples * * * New York is high among the States which lead the Nation. This fact seems to make our conservatism and our State election methods all the more curious.

By and large, New York State voters give their majorities on election day to candidates pledged to progressive ideas. But in nominating all candidates for statewide office, New York clings to an antiquated method never used or abandoned by virtually every other State in the Union.

In 43 States today nominees for Governor and other statewide elective offices must be chosen by direct primary alone or by a combination of party convention and direct primary. In five States in the South each party has a choice between nomination by convention or by primary. But only in Indiana and New York must the parties still nominate by convention alone.

But even in Indiana every delegate casts his own vote in person and by secret ballot, whereas in a typical New York convention each county chairman blandly announces the vote of his entire delegation.

This obviously means that New York State's party leaders, even the obvious mossbacks among them, still have a measure of direct power which has been denied to party bosses in other States.

District Attorney Frank O'Connor of Queens, who has fathered a detailed study of nominating practices throughout the Nation, has earned the thanks of New Yorkers of all parties. A preliminary report on the study, as made public today in booklet form, is an illuminating performance.

Hotel Muehlebach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, next Monday, May 17, one of the proudest institutions in Kansas City will celebrate 50 years of service to the community and, in an unique way, to the people of America and the world.

Anyone who has ever heard of Kansas City has heard of the Hotel Muehlebach. And with good reason.

It was here that a Missouri Senator sat in November 1944, with his wife and daughter to receive word that he had been elected Vice President of the United States.

Just 2½ years later President Harry S. Truman sat in the presidential suite of the Hotel Muehlebach and signed into law a bill to provide aid for Greece and Turkey. With a few strokes of the pen Mr. Truman introduced a whole new concept of international understanding. Out of that quiet ceremony grew the whole Truman doctrine. We know what that has done to keep a large part of this world free.

An entire nation listened and cheered when the man who could not possibly win did just that in the presidential election of 1948. And when the world heard the man from Missouri after his reelection, his voice came to them from the penthouse of the Hotel Muehlebach.

In the years of Mr. Truman's Presidency, the Hotel Muehlebach was the temporary White House when he came home to Missouri.

Is there a hotel suite in the world better known than the presidential suite at the Hotel Muehlebach? I do not think so.

Mr. Speaker, this hotel has indeed found its place in the history of this country and the world. I salute it on its golden anniversary.

On Being Educated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Special Subcommittee on Education, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], is considering President Johnson's proposal for assistance to higher education.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial concerning higher education published in the Washington Evening Star of May 10, 1965.

This editorial points to the need for the enactment of H.R. 3220, a bill that would strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and provide financial assistance for students.

The editorial follows:

ON BEING EDUCATED

President Johnson's proposed legislation for aid to higher education seems conservative in its provisions when measured against the dimensions and complexities of the problems confronting our colleges and universities. These problems, which are without precedent in history, stem primarily from the explosion of knowledge and population that has been rocking mankind ever since the start of the Second World War.

At its annual conference recently the Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers made clear that the situation—in its potentials at least—is serious in the extreme. James Hitt, the organization's president, has summed up the matter in these words: "I foresee far more students entering the higher education process in the years to come than any of us have ever predicted. * * * The expansion to higher education will necessitate increasing the size of every existing institution to its maximum, and the creation of additional educational facilities. * * *"

Actually, of course, this should come as a surprise to nobody who has read the newspapers with any care over the course of years. As far back as 1957, for example, a Presidential committee reported, after an exhaustive study, that the number of young men and women seeking a college education would more than double between that year and 1970 to a total of 6 million. And now Mr. Hitt and his colleagues anticipate that the figure will rise to roughly 8 million in 1972, which is a mere 7 years away. How will these youngsters find places in our higher education system?

The answer is that great numbers of them will not be able to get into the so-called prestige institutions, but they should have a good chance—given the scholastic qualifications—to be accepted by relatively obscure but sound institutions. After all, when it comes to learning, the principal thing is the quality of the student and his teacher. As has been observed, a school is excellent if it amounts to nothing but a log, with Mark Hopkins on one end and an earnestly inquisitive young mind on the other.

But life and the processes of education are no longer nearly so simple as they were when Mark Hopkins held forth at Williams College. If he were still with us, he might raise some objections to Federal meddling in the field, but he probably would bow to this fact, no matter how reluctantly: Help from Washington is needed to build up our academic world to meet the great challenges before it. Some years ago, Alfred North Whitehead warned as follows:

"In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute: The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of Fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated."

These words add up to a good text for all of us in a troubled time.

Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a soil for every purpose in America—more than 75,000 kinds to choose from in planning land use. If we choose wisely, all land will be put to its best possible use.

Some soils are best for growing certain crops, some for growing grasses. Some are suitable for building sites, some are not.

Unfortunately, soils frequently are not considered when a decision is made concerning the use of land. Sometimes the results are calamitous—effluent from septic tanks pollutes ground water supplying wells and contaminates the ground surface; walls crack, buildings settle and even collapse. Such things happen not as infrequently as we would like to believe.

To prevent bad land use and to promote good land use, the Federal Government provides help, in cooperation with State colleges and experiment stations, through the National Cooperative Soil Survey. The survey is directed by the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In Nebraska, soil surveys have been completed on about 30 million acres, or about 61 percent of the State's land area.

The purpose of the survey is to map all the agricultural land in the United States. Its functions are gradually being extended to urban areas as American cities expand into the countryside. Cooperation is increasing at the county level of government to bring the benefits of the soil survey to all land under development.

For agricultural purposes, soils are grouped into eight capability classes. As each survey is completed, a descriptive report is published by the Department of Agriculture. The uses of these surveys are many. Besides the farmer, county, and community planning officials, investors, bankers, insurance companies, and loan companies find soil surveys useful. Land appraisers use them as a source of information on which to base land values. Soil maps help community of-

ficials locate the most suitable land for housing, schools, shopping centers, parking lots, and industry.

Our Unfair Draft System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very profund and informative commentary on the military draft system which appeared in this morning's New York Times.

Mr. James Reston makes some important points relative to this question.

The President's Defense Department Committee, charged with studying America's military manpower requirements, will report to the President at the end of May or early June. I look forward to examining this report once it is made public.

The Selective Service System must be made more equitable and efficient, if the consensus is that the United States, in properly fulfilling its global responsibilities, cannot maintain adequate manpower strength without the draft. The Congress has its responsibility in this regard.

For the information of Members, I include Mr. Reston's article at this point in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON: VIETNAM, THE CARIBBEAN, AND THE DRAFT

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 11.—The increasing military commitments in southeast Asia and the Caribbean are dramatizing once more the shortcomings and inequities of the Pentagon's current manpower policies.

There is no shortage of men, but there is apparently a shortage of specialists for the new kinds of limited warfare now facing the country.

Thus Secretary of the Navy Paul H. Nitze called this week for each naval officer and enlisted man whose term of service is soon to expire to volunteer for additional duty "in a combat environment." A combat environment is a place where you are liable to get shot.

THE PROBLEM

This is no doubt necessary, but it illustrates the problem. The burden of military service is not being fairly shared either among the allied nations or among the youth of the United States. Many of the latter are not serving at all, many more are not trained in counterguerrilla warfare, while those who are trained—many of them volunteers—are being asked to do double duty.

The problem is not as serious as in the Korean war when 600,000 World War II veterans were called up while about 1.6 million young men of draft age who had never served before were not called.

Fortunately, Secretary of Defense McNamara called for a review of the whole military manpower problem about a year ago, and voluminous studies are now being sent to him. In these last 12 months, however, the Pentagon's problem has increased, partly because of the new demands of new kinds of warfare, and partly because there was a lot of electioneering talk in 1964 about "ending the draft," which reduced the volume of volunteers.

OBVIOUS INEQUITIES

The inequities in the present system are obvious enough. Though it is clearly in the national interest to defer college students in good standing, this often means that those who can afford the increasingly high tuition fees have a distinct advantage over those who cannot. Also, in some cases the pursuit of advanced college degrees, according to many college officials, is explained not so much by a love of learning as by hatred of the draft.

Sectional differences also produce criticism of the present system. Since each draft board has some independence of choice, a young man may be drafted in one area while another of the same standing may be deferred in another. Cassius Clay is strong enough to be heavyweight champion of the world, but is deferred from military service for physical reasons, maybe because he can't stop talking.

To deal with the inequality of the present draft, some observers here would like to revive the old idea of a comprehensive form of national service in which more men could meet their obligation to the Nation in the armed services or in useful civil occupations.

Thus, a young man might not be able to meet the physical standards for military combat, but might meet his obligation in the Job Training Corps, the Peace Corps, in social work in the city or rural slums, or even as auxiliary policemen in some of the urban jungles.

One college president puts the point this way:

"Unskilled youth accounts for the major portion of our current unemployment, and a year or two of national service, properly organized and directed, could do much to correct this.

"It could also, perhaps, provide some measure of discipline and, hopefully, some sense of direction for groups such as the high school dropouts, many of whom have neither discipline nor direction. Finally, if options were afforded, it would help to give direction to a good deal of deep-rooted but unchanneled idealism, which too often answers its own frustrations by more or less blind revolt against all authority."

A MANPOWER POLICY

This goes against the American opposition to widespread conscription, but at least it is worth considering at a time when new military, industrial, scientific, and social problems are forcing a review of the Nation's manpower.

There were 2,644,000 men and women in the armed services last month, 1 million of them overseas. There are now 42,000 in Vietnam, 23,000 in and around the Dominican Republic, and the prospect is that more of them will be used in similar assignments as time goes on.

The immediate issue is military, but the effective training and utilization of American manpower is much wider and more important and will have to be studied not by the Pentagon alone but by the whole Government, and by thoughtful and creative minds outside the Government as well.

Postal Rates Up—Service Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have had numerous complaints from constituents about the decline in postal service in a period in which postal rates have been increased.

A Springfield, Ill., constituent puts the problem in these words:

MARCH 15, 1965.

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: But, there is another thing that is bothering me quite a bit. That is the announced intention, according to the press, of the post office people prosecuting anyone who does not include that foolish ZIP code number both on the mail he sends out, and on his letterhead. This now has reached the height of absurdity—and if that Postmaster General really means it, he should be removed and impeached if possible. Isn't there any end to the Government control of individuals?

The threat is particularly obnoxious because the delivery of mail has slowed up to the point of exasperation. First-class mail we address to our Chicago office, 200 miles away, takes 2 days to be delivered, and in some cases, 3. A recent mailing, first class, to various cities around Illinois, was not delivered in some cities for 6 to 8 days, yet in others it was delivered the day after the mailing. We've had first-class mail sent to Decatur from here take 2 days to get 40 miles.

From talking to many others who do considerable first-class mailing, I know this situation is not peculiar to the Springfield post office. It seems to be widespread. Protests to local post offices always get the response that it was handled promptly locally and the fault must be at the other end.

A friend of mine in another State who does a very large amount of first-class mailing was telling me of his troubles, and mentioned that he had complained to his Congressman and his two U.S. Senators. Things happened all right. He was investigated and harassed by his local post office, his mail held up, both outgoing and incoming, and an inspector who said he was from Washington called on him and cross-examined him, and even dropped hints that if there were any more complaints, there would be even worse action.

So, I don't want you to use my name or the name of this organization, because the mail service is bad enough now, and we don't want it to get any worse. Furthermore, I have no wish to have some bureaucrat come in to my office, and cross-examine and threaten me. There would be a chance of physical trouble.

However, any foolishness about the ZIP code in the light of the very poor mail service is ridiculous, and I hope you will use every effort to put these bureaucrats in their place.

The Misdirected Demonstrators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently television station WBBM-TV—channel 2—in Chicago carried an excellent editorial on the whole question of mass demonstrations. I am enclosing this editorial in the RECORD today as an excellent example of the responsible leadership our radio and television stations are demonstrating by helping put the many social problems facing the American people in their proper perspective.

I believe Mr. Edward R. Kenefick, general manager of WBBM, and vice president of CBS television stations, along with his editorial director of WBBM-TV, Mr. Carter Davidson, deserve the highest commmendation for this forthright editorial.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

THE MISDIRECTED DEMONSTRATORS

(Presented by Carter Davidson, editorial director of WBBM-TV)

Student demonstrations have been known to change the course of events. In many countries, governments have fallen because student demonstrators—in some cases, rioters—have come charging off their campuses to state their demands.

It's been going on for years in other parts of the world. It's been going on in this country for some time in the area of civil rights demonstrations.

Only recently, however, have student demonstrations attempted to change the course of U.S. foreign policy. The effort seems as witless as it is fruitless.

Until recent times, such students as elected to leave their studies usually contented themselves with prankish pantie raids or scurrying southward on spring vacations for beer brawls on Florida beaches.

Now we are seeing Chicago area students, in ones and twos and groups, joining marches on Washington to protest U.S. policies in Vietnam.

We had, the other day, a relatively large group of adults, students, and children parading through Chicago's Loop in a demonstration against war in general and the war in Vietnam in particular.

Students from all parts of the country have been converging upon Washington to picket in front of the White House. Some Chicagoans were in their midst. When they were asked to move along and refused, they had to be carted away from the premises in paddy wagons.

All in all, it was a pretty sorry spectacle, accomplishing, perhaps, only the end of persuading enemies of our Government that they have an ally in the American people.

Fortunately, such is not the case.

There is, and there should be, division of opinion in this country about the course of our diplomacy. But there is not, nor is there permissible, any suggestion that the American people want their Government to surrender its principles.

South Vietnam, admittedly, is not a place where every prospect pleases.

The fiendish difficulties involved in trying to establish political stability while fighting a determined military foe tend to create a feeling of frustration and sometimes haunting fears.

The President of the United States, however, has made plain our policy. That policy simply is to seek peace in southeast Asia by any means short of caving in or being defeated.

We believe the majority of the American people support this policy.

We do not believe the interests of that majority is served, nor is that policy strengthened, by wretched forays of picketeers at the White House nor by the distribution of antiwar leaflets in downtown Chicago.

We suggest the students lay down their banners.

We would not venture so far as to suggest they return to the pantie raids and beer brawls on the beaches. But it might not be too revolutionary a notion to return to studies and to an understanding of what's involved.

To those students who would reply they fear the world may not survive until their generation matures, we can only say—it probably will. It survived the generation which preceded you.

Miss Mabel James: Pioneer in the Fight To Preserve Our Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, for as many years as I can remember, I have enjoyed the delights of hiking through the many well-preserved nature trails and wildlife refuges in the Niagara Frontier. The beauty and solitude of these areas has been a source of delight and appreciation to many thousands of outdoor enthusiasts and nature lovers. Recently, Miss Mabel James of Holland, N.Y., was honored for her many years of service to the cause of conservation in western New York. I believe it is fitting and proper that Miss James is given recognition for the countless time and expense in this battle to preserve our magnificent natural resources. I join with her many friends and generations yet to come in thanking her for her foresight, determination, and dedication in the service of others and in the cause of conservation. Without objection, I ask permission to include in my remarks a copy of an article which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News.

The article follows:

HOLLAND WOMAN HONORED FOR CONSERVATION WORK—MISS MABEL JAMES IS PRESENTED UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

Miss Mabel James of Holland, a conservationist noted for her efforts to preserve area natural resources, today was awarded the 1965 achievement award of Buffalo Branch, American Association of University Women.

Mrs. Charles W. Whittemore, branch president, presented the award, a silver dish, at the annual luncheon at 595 Delaware Avenue.

Officers were elected from a single slate previously announced and Mrs. Michael J. Sabia, St. Catharines, Ontario, president of the Canadian Federation of University Women, spoke on "Whither Women-Finance and Trade."

DEDICATED SERVICE

Referring to Miss James as the "Carrie Nation of conservation," Mrs. Whittemore cited her for her efforts to preserve the Montezuma Wildlife Refuge, Buckhorn Island State Park and sections of Emery Park from encroaching highway construction.

"We in western New York have much reason to be grateful to her for her long years of dedicated service to the cause of conservation," Mrs. Whittemore said.

"Not only has she halted bulldozers to preserve our natural resources, she has taught many of us to appreciate the beauties of nature."

A native of New England and a graduate of Mt. Holyoke College, Miss James began her career in nature study and conservation in the 1930's when she became naturalist of the Garden Center Institute of Buffalo and research associate in conservation for the Buffalo Society of Natural Sciences.

HAS HONORARY DEGREE

As founder of the Conservation Forum, Miss James has been associated with the establishment of wildlife sanctuaries, the marking of nature trails and the development of conservation trails.

In addition to lecturing and writing, she has conducted hikes and organized the Conservation Caravan for outdoor education.

The award recipient is an honorary life member of the American Nature Study Society and has been awarded an honorary doctorate of pedagogy in natural science by Houghton College.

Dredging of the Thames River, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the text of a statement I presented this morning before the House Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations in regard to two budget items on dredging and navigational improvements of the Thames River in eastern Connecticut, in my congressional district.

My statement was as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, OF CONNECTICUT, PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, MAY 12, 1965

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate having this opportunity to present to you some brief views regarding two items in the budget which are now under consideration by your committee. These two items are of tremendous importance to my district.

One, is a request to appropriate the sum of $18,000 for a study to consider the feasibility of modifying and deepening the existing channel of the Thames River from New London to Norwich. Specifically, it will be the purpose of this study to determine whether a 33-foot channel shall be dredged from the mouth of the river to Norwich, a distance approximately 18 miles long.

The other, is a request for an appropriation of $350,000 for dredging the Thames River and restoring the channel to the authorized depth of 25 feet from the U.S. submarine base at New London to Allyns Point in Gales Ferry, a distance approximately halfway up to Norwich. The Dow Chemical Co.'s plant is located at this point.

The people of southeastern Connecticut, which is an important part of my congressional district, are vitally interested in the navigational improvements of the Thames River. This area has not been making the economic progress that it is capable of making. It has not kept up with the economic growth and development of the rest of the State of Connecticut. It has the people, the land, the waterways, the natural resources, the capabilities—but it is stymied by the lack of new industries and by difficult transportation problems.

Dredging the Thames River all the way up to Norwich and making it navigational for medium- and large-size vessels would serve as a major factor in the economic revitalization of this area. The city of Norwich, for example, which has been severely hit by the lack of new industries in the past few years, has recently completed a redevelopment program which includes a municipal wharf at the head of its harbor. Dredging the river and the Norwich Harbor would open up great possibilities for commercial shipping which would unquestionably have a favorable im-

pact on the economic growth of Norwich and its immediate vicinity—a region which desperately needs industrial development.

Thus, dredging the Thames River and making it navigational for commercial shipping is truly a must upon which the future growth and prosperity of this region depend. The river is the gateway to economic progress of southeastern Connecticut. During the past 2 years I have received many letters from town officials and town councils in the various communities located along the Thames River, from commissions and committees, from business groups and associations, as well as from individual citizens, stressing the need for dredging the river in sufficient depth to Norwich, widening the existing channels, and instituting other improvements.

In the past two decades eastern Connecticut has experienced a substantial increase in population, although its industrial development has not been nearly as extensive as in the rest of the State. I have been informed by some of the towns along both sides of the river, and Norwich in particular, that on several recent occasions they have lost out in having industrial establishments locate in the area simply because of the poor navigational condition of the river. We have been assured, for example, that with proper dredging of the river, the Dow Chemical firm would undertake a substantial expansion of its facilities. Similarly, other industries would be encouraged to locate their plants, factories and other facilities in the region.

The importance of all this is that it would help to create a diversification of industry in eastern Connecticut which would have a beneficial impact on the economy of the area. It would also help to alleviate the crushing tax burden on many of the communities who are struggling to maintain their local school system and the various other services provided by these towns to their citizens.

Most important of all, however, it would help convert eastern Connecticut into an area of diversified industry, instead of having to be dependent primarily on Electric Boat Co. at Groton, Conn., whose employment level is, in turn, dependent on the military needs and contracts of the U.S. Government. Under the best circumstances, the economy of an area which is dependent on such needs is not based on a very solid foundation. It should, therefore, not come as a surprise when many of us in that part of the State are deeply concerned over this situation.

Furthermore, the fact should not be overlooked that the Thames River is strategically located from a geographic standpoint. Several very important Government installations are located on the Thames estuary, such as the U.S. Naval Submarine Base, the Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory, the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, the Coast Guard Mooring Station, and others.

Finally, it should also be noted that dredging of the Thames River and providing other improvements would encourage more boating, fishing, and other recreational activities, as well as more commercial traffic. It would contribute vastly both to the future growth of the area and to its economic stability. I am convinced that this waterway, so neglected in recent years, could become an important artery for shipping and commerce, which would benefit the whole area.

I urge this committee to consider very seriously the facts presented here today and to approve the two items requested in the budget; namely, the $18,000 for a feasibility study of deepening the Thames River to Norwich and $350,000 for dredging the river to Allyn's Point. It is not exaggerated to say that these are life-and-death matters for southeastern Connecticut. Your favorable action will be most appreciated.

The Anatomy of Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself."

These words, spoken by President Roosevelt more than 20 years ago, became the bywords of a nation which was unified against a common enemy. I think it is time that these same words were restored to the position they once held and became everyday thoughts in the minds of all Americans.

Over the past several years, we have seen the growth of extremist groups. We have seen these groups become more and more vocal entirely out of proportion to their size. I know that much of the mail which comes to my office reflects these groups and the philosophy they preach—trust no one, condemn America as a fallen idol, return to ideas of the past which did not even exist as these groups interpret them, twist events and statements of today to find corruption in every public official and treachery in every school text book.

"We have nothing to fear but fear itself." Today these words could mean the end of apathy and the beginning of realization that extremists of any breed can gain strength far out of proportion to their size if Americans do not begin to be watchful of the credo, the common enemy, of fear.

The Los Angeles Times recently printed an editorial on this subject, and, with permission, I would like to have this editorial reprinted in the RECORD at this point:

THE ANATOMY OF EXTREMISM

Periodically, in the history of this Republic, there have emerged during times of stress extremist cults and movements of various stripe. They often rally under patriotic banners. But they are dedicated nonetheless to assaulting by word and deed certain basic institutions and tenets of American society.

In the 1840's and 1850's the Nation suffered, and survived, the Know-Nothings. In the 1930's, amidst the fear of the great depression, both Fascist and Communist organizations flourished. At other times, in less organized ways, we have endured other divisive, truly un-American movements, which preached hatred of class or race or religion or democracy.

These have not been nor are they today welcome experiences. Living through them has sometimes left scars. In every case, however, the fundamental strengths of our political and social structure have readily absorbed the attacks of internal foes.

This is not to minimize or discount the inherent threat posed by organized extremist movements. These are ugly, intolerable manifestations whenever and wherever they occur.

Whether of right or left, extremists are a departure from both the ideal and practice of American national life. And when hate, which so easily is expressed through violence, is the chief mark of extremism, the aberration is even more alarming.

We live now, as we have for some decades past and as we no doubt will for some time to come, in an uneasy world. Fears, real and imagined, vague and precise, surround us. Within and without our borders, great and unusual transformations are taking place.

Old values are questioned and sometimes discarded without being replaced. What once were sureties making for stability—of belonging, of participation, or individual worth—now seem frequently in doubt.

In this changing climate a sense of frustration, a feeling by the individual that life is wasted or spoiled, can be easily nourished. Widespread frustration, with all its ambiguities, is the commonest breeding ground of extremism. It is from among the frustrated that the zealots, the "true believers," are recruited for extremist movements.

Regardless of the cause to which he dedicates himself, the extremist in every case seems motivated and compelled by an inner turmoil, for which he invents elaborate and high-sounding rationalizations. This is true whether he is a college youth eagerly enlisting in a far-left crusade, or a goon marching in a bedsheet, or a man in a business suit conspiring to take over a PTA—or a local police force.

The raw material for making extremists has always been with us and, given human nature, always will be. The existence of this fortunately limited element in our midst is not itself alarming. Extremism in any form, thanks to the basic common sense of Americans, has never yet grown into a mass movement.

What is alarming is the chance that passivity, pre-occupation and apathy on the part of the overwhelming majority of decent Americans will permit one or more extremist movements to assume a strength far out of proportion to its size. Then it may prove too late to do anything about it.

This has happened in other countries.

Despite the phrases they mouth or the flags in which they wrap themselves, extremists can be readily identified. For what distinguishes them all is a basic hatred and contempt for American society as it exists today. That hatred, however disguised, gives extremists cohesion and motivation. It is their strength, but it is also their undoing. For such sick hatred ultimately is self-destroying.

Given a vigilant, concerned public, the process can be accelerated.

Nebraska Legislature Endorses Obscene Mail Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last week the distinguished members of the 75th Legislature of the State of Nebraska passed a resolution overwhelmingly endorsing H.R. 980, the bill I sponsored to stop the flow of unsolicited obscenity through the mails. This bill has already passed the House of Representatives and is awaiting action in the Senate.

This resolution by the Nebraska Legislature is much appreciated by me and, I am sure, by my distinguished colleagues who voted in favor of my bill. It is encouraging to have such wholehearted support from our distinguished State senators from Nebraska.

I would call attention to Nebraska Legislative Resolution 40 which urges that all necessary action be taken to pass this legislation and that it be signed into law by the President:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 40 BY LEGISLATURE OF NEBRASKA

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States, House bill 980, which if enacted will give an effective means of stopping the flow of unsolicited obscenity through the mails; and

Whereas the enactment of this legislation is necessary to close a gap in postal and penal statutes through which a tremendous volume of indecent mail is pouring into American homes and particularly into the hands of American children; and

Whereas this legislation will be an effective remedy against the cheap filth peddlers who are invading the privacy of the individual; and

Whereas, House bill 980, was passed by an overwhelming vote by the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 75th session assembled:

1. That the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby urged and requested to take all necessary action to the passage of House bill 980.

2. That printed copies of this resolution be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Members of Congress from Nebraska.

PHILIP C. SORENSEN,
President of the Legislature.

Attest: HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

Land Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that land is the main resource of this country. We also know that it is becoming increasingly scarce. Right now there is plenty of room for every man, woman, and child but what of the future?

Soil and water conservation practices in my own State of Nebraska are helping us prepare for the future growth of the Nation. Multiple land use is a development of growing importance in the conservation picture and it will be even more important in the years ahead as demands upon the land continue to increase. These demands are recreation, urban expansion, transportation, water supply reservoirs, wildlife refuges and others. We cannot afford to overlook the increasing demands of a well fed, growing population for agricultural products and the land that will be needed to produce this food—not to speak of the needs of those in other nations.

In Nebraska, as elsewhere in the Nation, we are already well on the way in multiple land use planning. Land owners and operators are providing outdoor recreation opportunities on their farms, ranches and other rural lands. In Nebraska, 65 soil conservation district cooperators have established income-producing recreation enterprises since the U.S. Department of Agriculture began stressing these developments in 1962.

Other promising projects on private land in many small watersheds include providing areas for wildlife refuges, building ponds for fish conservation and lakes to serve agricultural, municipal, and industrial needs, and reserving space for forestland.

Town and country are meeting across the broad acres of rural America. Wise use of the land will permit Nebraska and the rest of the Nation to contribute to and benefit from this dramatic transition caused by rapid national growth.

Don't Vote "No" on Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, Nebraskans were prominent at the 12th National Watershed Congress held recently at Sioux City, Iowa.

In fact, Nebraska's Governor, Frank Morrison, gave the keynote address. He illustrated the importance of conserving natural resources by drawing a parable between the countries today faced with food shortages and the fact they have also lost their precious top soil and other natural resources.

Nebraska's role in this annual conservation event was reported fully in a recent issue of the Lincoln Journal in a byline account by Glenn Kreuscher. He reported that spokesmen from both political parties consider the Federal-State-local partnership for conservation in jeopardy today, endangered by proposals to cut conservation funds. He commented that:

Never in three decades have the demands been so great, floods and dust storms are still both prevalent, improving water supplies demands urgent action and recreational facilities have taken on a major importance.

I wouldn't want to be the Congressman who voted "no" on conservation and wants to still call Washington to reach his office.

Under unanimous consent I place Mr. Kreuscher's full article in the RECORD:

[From the Lincoln Journal, May 1, 1965]

CROPLAND AND CORRAL: NEBRASKANS PROMINENT AT WATERSHED CONGRESS

(By Glenn Kreuscher)

While the 12th National Watershed Congress was held at Sioux City it had all the appearance of a Nebraska event when it came to key spots on the program.

Gov. Frank Morrison received an excellent response from his keynote address when he illustrated the importance of conserving natural resources by drawing a parallel between the countries today faced with food shortages and the fact they have also lost their precious topsoil and other natural resources.

FRICKE HONORED

Milton H. Fricke of Papillion, recognized throughout Nebraska for his watershed leadership, was selected as the Watershed of the Year Award winner.

Fricke headed the important national water resources committee and moderated a nationwide review of land treatment phases for watershed development.

Warren Fairchild, executive secretary of the Nebraska Soil and Water Commission, headed the national planning and financing committee for State watershed development.

Fairchild illustrated the importance of State financial participation in conservation by correlating the watershed progress in the 10 States that have led in State appropriated funds.

NEBRASKA IS ONE

Nebraska is in this group, and where States have participated with funds approximately 50 percent of the Federal funds have been spent aiding the conservation programs.

The 10 leading States have 77 percent of the Nation's floodwater retarding structures, 50 percent of the channel improvement, and 47 percent of the total acres in watersheds authorized for operation.

While Governor Morrison proudly recognized Nebraska's status as a leader, he said, "We only have an estimated 10 percent of our resource conservation work completed in Nebraska. Where does that leave the part of the country not among the top 10 States?"

For Don Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, it was a touching moment when he took the speaker's stand Tuesday.

About the exact time he started speaking SCS was observing it's 30th anniversary.

THIRTY-YEAR PARTNERS

For 30 years the Federal Government has been in a partnership where the energies of the American people have been dedicated to the task of preserving natural resources.

Spokesmen from both political parties consider that partnership in jeopardy today, endangered by proposals to cut conservation funds.

Never in three decades have the demands been so great, floods and dust storms are still both prevalent, improving water supplies demands urgent action and recreational facilities have taken on a major importance.

I wouldn't want to be the Congressman who voted "no" on conservation and wants to still call Washington to reach his office.

When We Have Overcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues a poem sent to me by a long-time friend, who has a personal knowledge if the subject he treats so eloquently. Mr. Benjamin F. Peery is an outstanding Negro civic leader in the Los Angeles area. His poem follows:

WHEN WE HAVE OVERCOME

(By Ben Peery)

When the demonstrations are ended,
And the last law is writ for the clan,
We will still have to face,
Not the challenge of race,
But the acts of each single man,
Go back to your hovels and cabins,
Apartments and rats that you share,
Make yourselves worthy of better things,
And they will be waiting there.

Why weep o'er your fate to your neighbor,
Let dignity dry your eyes,
America's hope is denied those who grope,
But to no one who earnestly tries,
Victory comes through struggle,
Peace at the ending of strife,
The spoil goes to those who are fearless,
But never to beggars of life.

When you have finished with marching,
To the cadence of sorrowing drum,
And through with the chanting,
The histrionic ranting,
Of how you will overcome,
You will find an America builded,
That each man may have a place,
That he may claim as a person,
But never can find as a race.

The Population Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, in accord with my interest in this subject, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the seriousness of the rapid growth of the population of the world. To this end I submit the following editorial from the Enquirer and News of Battle Creek, Mich., of Sunday, April 18, 1965:

POPULATION CONTROL NOW OF WORLDWIDE CONCERN

One of the great problems of modern man—the population explosion and how to control it—has come out into open discussion as individual, church, and state search earnestly for a solution.

It is a problem in Calhoun County as elsewhere.

At present rates, the world's population will double in the next 35 years. Unless the rate of increase changes, in 600 years there will be only an impossible one square yard of the earth's surface for each person.

Because statistics like these have such vast implications for the family of man—moral, social, political, military and pertaining to life itself—men, women, and nations are almost frantically looking for a way out of the looming dilemma.

Population control means birth control—or it means famine, war, or poverty-stricken degradation. All over the world, the more advanced nations are turning to birth control as the better alternative.

Argument still runs high, however, over the means, which medical science has made available.

So urgent is the population problem, the Associated Press has prepared an exhaustive special report on the subject, scheduled for release today. Believing the report to have public value, with Calhoun County implications, we present the following highlights and what we believe to be pertinent comments:

Babies are being born faster than a person could name them; 192,000 births a day, more than 60 million a year.

United Nations projections show today's 3.3 billion world population doubled by the year 2000; Mexico's 40 million doubled in half that time. It took all of history for world population to reach 1 billion in the 1840's.

Reason for the swift rise in population is twofold: high birth rates, especially in underdeveloped nations, and a decline in the death rate, accelerated since World War II, through scientific developments.

Half of the world's people suffer from hunger and malnutrition.

"If present trends continue," says Raymond Ewell, research vice president of the State University of New York, "it seems likely that famine will reach serious proportions in India, Pakistan, and China in the early 1970's, followed by Indonesia, Turkey, Iran, and Egypt and several other countries within a few years * * * and Africa and Latin America by 1980."

"Food, not Berlin or its equivalent, could be the cause of world war III," says a U.N. official. Theoretically, the world could produce enough food for 25 times its present population, some experts say. The technology is there, but are the money, the international cooperation, the technicians, the necessary changes in ways of life?

The Population Reference Bureau estimates that if all the huge U.S. food surplus were distributed to the world's hungry, it would provide each person the equivalent of only two cups of rice every 17 days.

Philip Hauser, University of Chicago sociologist, notes that even if all the world's present wealth were equally distributed, per capita income would amount to only $223.

Nations are working on fertility control. The United States already is giving advice in foreign nations, on request. Egypt has begun distributing birth control pills. India is spending $56 million in a 5-year family planning program.

Japan, with birth control a national policy since 1949, has had 20 million legal abortions since then and cut its birth rate in half—to 16.5 per 1,000 population, lower than the United States' 19.5. Communist China has imposed rationing restrictions on parents having more than three children. The Soviet Union legalizes birth control programs.

Within the United States, whose population increase is running little more than half of the world's average 2 percent a year, Federal aid has started for a few birth control clinics—it is less expensive to give birth control services, the argument runs, than to spend money to support impoverished families.

Through research, many feel, some way will be found to the perfect birth control device, one that is cheap, easily used, long lasting and could meet Roman Catholic Church objections to interference with natural conception. The church permits the rhythm method of continence during the month fertile period of ovulation. A new pill is being tested now which controls that fertile period to a known 1 week in 4.

Italy, almost universally Catholic and where contraceptives are illegal, has one of the lowest birth rates in the world. Why? "There are two things Italians do not regard as sinful," said a non-Italian priest, "missing Sunday Mass and using contraceptives." In heavily Catholic Chile, a doctor estimates between 35 and 49 percent of pregnancies end in abortion.

Surveys show parents even in backward areas want fewer children. But so far no contraceptive program has been fully effective there, partly because of ignorance and partly for lack of enough motivation to use the methods regularly.

"Population growth will most likely stop by the free choice of people, as it did during the depression years," according to one clergyman.

So much for the overall picture of the situation. Closer home there are refinements of the problem, even though the gain in births over deaths in the United States, Michigan, and Calhoun County is only 1.1 to 1.25 percent a year—a third the rate in the backward countries.

Michigan's Legislature is even now hotly debating a proposal to take the teeth out of a new social welfare commission policy that would let welfare departments give birth control information and materials to poor families who want no more children.

Many of our own poor and uneducated, even as in other parts of the world, don't know how or can't be bothered to use the controls that are available—and unwanted children are born in a continuing cycle of poverty and increasing public support.

Another part of the problem: who should get the information and materials? Calhoun County last year reported 3,046 births—1,651 more than the county's 1,395 deaths.

And of these 3,046 births, at least one in 15 was illegitimate, mostly to young, unmarried girls.

The rate is probably no better in other counties, States or nations. Thus yet another moral and ethical problem arises in any program aimed at effective birth control.

In the final analysis, however, public action and debate assure that the problem of unwanted overpopulation is being attacked.

And once the principle of conscious effort is applied to avoiding unwanted pregnancy—whether by the rhythm method, drugs, devices, or surgery—the rest is largely a matter of rationalization and a resulting program of action.

Birth controls will come because they must—because the alternatives are an affront to human intelligence. The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse must not ride again.

Senior Citizens Month

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 10 President Johnson proclaimed May 1965 as senior citizens month. In his proclamation, the President stated:

It is a time dedicated to community action on behalf of older Americans. Their hopes and their problems are shared by us all. It is up to us to help them solve them.

Our older Americans have made significant contributions to the progress and development of our country; yet, many of us tend to forget or ignore their problems and their aspirations.

One organization that never forgets our older Americans and that is continually striving to assist them is the Westchester County Council of Senior Citizens, headed by Mr. Paul Leith. This group, particularly, has made significant efforts to promote senior citizens month and I should like to take this opportunity to present some of the material it has distributed in preparation for this event.

The first item is a statement adopted by the council last February on senior citizens month:

SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH, MAY 1965

(A statement adopted by the Westchester Council of Senior Citizens at White Plains on Feb. 18, 1965)

The month of May was proclaimed as senior citizens month by New York State Governors since 1954, and for several years by U.S. Presidents. In his proclamation of March 26, 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson stated:

"I urge all public and private organizations and all citizens to have the theme of this special month, Opportunities for Older

Americans, become a living reality. Let us repay our older Americans for their sustained creative participation in our national and community life by providing them wth a wide range of meaningful opportunities. Let us take all necessary steps to see that they have a real chance to enjoy health and a life of dignity. Let us find ways to employ the skill and wisdom that so many of our older Americans possess and long to share. Let us make this month outstanding in our continuing effort to keep in the mainstream of our national life all those who have lived so long and contributed so generously."

President Johnson has already indicated the theme for this year: "Community action for senior citizens."

Proclaiming May 1964 senior citizens month in the State of New York, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller declared on March 24, 1964:

"We observe this month, in recognition of the contributions made by countless citizens of this State, fully realizing that it is but a small token for those to whom we owe so much. The task before us requires our dedication every day of the year."

These noble sentiments indicate the need for a varied, comprehensive program of activities and events during the entire month of May. Observance of senior citizens month should not be limited to a 1 day celebration. It should involve all appropriate Federal, State, county, town and village boards and departments, as well as civic and fraternal organizations. The needs of senior citizens should be discussed in town meetings and in meetings of organizations; e.g., medicare, housing, tax relief, low-cost drugs, etc.

Last year, Westchester County and the Town of Cortlandt celebrated senior citizens day. In most of the cities, towns and villages, senior citizens month went by unnoticed. Let us resolve that this shall not happen this year. Let the public authorities in every city, town and village proclaim May 1965, as Senior Citizens Month and make extensive plans for its celebration.

The Westchester Council of Senior Citizens requests the county board of supervisors to bring the message of senior citizens month to the people of the county through their various departments. We request all senior citizens clubs in Westchester County to adopt as their own the Senior Citizens Charter passed by the 1961 White House Conference on Aging. We request all newspapers in the county to print this charter and comment editorially on it; we request churches, and civic and fraternal organizations to print the charter in their bulletins.

The Westchester Council of Senior Citizens particularly requests the Mayor's Advisory Committee on Aging in the city of Yonkers, the Citizens Advisory Committee on the Aging in New Rochelle, and the Senior Citizens Advisory Board in Mt. Vernon to set an example to the other cities, towns and villages in the county, by drawing up a comprehensive program of activities by the entire community during the whole month of May. We hope that by May 31, there will not be a city, town or village in the county without a local committee on aging, appointed by the responsible public authority. We hope, too, that by May 31, there will not be a village in the county without a senior citizens club.

We request all newspapers and radio stations to further the aims of Senior Citizens Month. Special radio programs interviewing senior citizens and public officials could be arranged.

We request school authorities to arrange for senior citizens club members to speak before school classes as "living pages of American history." Senior citizens club members could be invited to school entertainments. School children should also be encouraged to devise special projects to honor their grandparents and other senior citizens during the month of May.

We request all adult organizations and clubs to honor their members who are 65 years and over, and to consider what they can do for all senior citizens in their community.

We request all senior citizens clubs to reexamine what their club and individual members can do to help their community. This is an obligation of senior citizens. We request all senior citizens clubs to bring senior citizens month to the attention of their community authorities and organizations, recommending plans to their city, town and village boards. Let us all work together, so that our celebration of May 1965 as senior citizens month may be a shining example for the Nation of what the people of Westchester County can do.

PAUL LEITH, *President*.

CROMPOND, N.Y.

The following is a letter which was sent to 46 mayors and supervisors in Westchester County. Accompanying this letter was a copy of the Senior Citizens Charter.

WESTCHESTER COUNCIL OF SENIOR CITIZENS,
Crompond, N.Y., March 3, 1965.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a statement on "Senior Citizens Month—May 1965" adopted by the Westchester Council of Senior Citizens. It calls for the widest participation by local government and private agencies and of the people generally in observance of senior citizens month, annually proclaimed by President Johnson and Governor Rockefeller.

We hoped that your city (town or village) will participate fully in this celebration. May I make the following suggestions:

1. A discussion on senior citizens month by your council (or board) (a) on the significance of the celebration, on the situation of the elderly in your area, and whether improvements can be made by government or private action to make the lot of the senior citizens a happier one. For example, health care, housing, etc.; (b) on whether or not the existing senior citizens clubs are adequate to meet the need: (i) the number of clubs; (ii) their capacity; (iii) the nature of their programs; (iv) transportation problem.

2. Selection of a local committee on aging as proposed by the 1961 White House Conference on Aging. There are only three in all of Westchester County.

3. A proclamation on senior citizens month.

4. A "town meeting" to honor senior citizens, a certificate of award to "the senior citizen of the year", etc. A reception at city (town, village) hall. Awards to active senior citizens in professional, artistic and business circles.

5. The schools, in particular, should be involved.

Would you be kind enough to let me know what action you plan on this?

Sincerely yours,

PAUL LEITH,
President.

SENIOR CITIZENS CHARTER

(Adopted by the 1961 White House Conference on Aging)

RIGHTS

Each of our senior citizens, regardless of race, color or creed, is entitled to:

1. The right to be useful.

2. The right to obtain employment based on merit.

3. The right to freedom from want in old age.

4. The right to a fair share of the community's recreational, educational, and medical resources.

5. The right to obtain decent housing suited to needs of later years.

6. The right to the moral and financial support of one's family so far as is consistent with the best interest of the family.

7. The right to live independently, as one chooses.

8. The right to live and die with dignity.

9. The right of access to all knowledge as available on how to improve the later years of life.

OBLIGATIONS

The aging, by availing themselves of educational opportunities, should endeavor to assume the following obligations to the best of their ability:

1. The obligation of each citizen to prepare himself to become and resolve to remain active, alert, capable, self-supporting, and useful so long as health and circumstances permit and to plan for ultimate retirement.

2. The obligation to learn and apply sound principles of physical and mental health.

3. The obligation to seek and develop potential avenues of service in the years after retirement.

4. The obligation to make available the benefits of his experience and knowledge.

5. The obligation to endeavor to make himself adaptable to the changes added years will bring.

6. The obligation to attempt to maintain such relationships with family, neighbors, and friends as will make him a respected and valued counselor throughout his later years.

The council also sent special letters to the 47 school superintendents and district principals in Westchester County; to the 47 senior citizens clubs in the county; and, to the 29 newspaper editors which serve the county.

I am privileged to present some of this material as it is a fine example of community service in action. I feel all Americans should know of the splendid work which the Westchester Council of Senior Citizens has done, not only in preparing for Senior Citizens Month itself, but for the service it has done by making the community aware of our older Americans.

The Congressional Directory: A Veritable Treasure Trove of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, all of us are prone to take familiar things for granted without considering the work and effort necessary to produce it. The Congressional Directory is an excellent example.

The new directory—larger and containing more information than ever before—is a veritable treasure trove of valuable and useful data to every Member of Congress, the executive branch, and others. The table of contents reflects the extent of every branch of our Government. This directory, prepared annually by the Joint Committee on Printing, contains a wealth of information and we must acknowledge that without the Congressional Directory we would

not have at our fingertips a handy reference of our Government and its officials.

I want to take this means of expressing my sincere appreciation to the members of the Joint Committee on Printing, Senators HAYDEN, JORDAN, and SCOTT and Representatives BURLESON, HAYS, and LIPSCOMB for furnishing the Congress with such a highly successful medium of information.

Return to Midway Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD today a most important editorial which was broadcast over radio station WIND in Chicago regarding the return of commercial traffic to Midway Airport in Chicago.

It is sincerely hoped that the responsible officers at the Federal Aviation Administration will make every effort to assist in the reactivation of Midway Airport.

One way that this can be done without further delay is to permit short-runway jets from selected areas, such as Midway in Chicago operating into Washington National Airport.

I understand that the FAA is now conducting an elaborate survey on this subject, but I am of the opinion that the FAA could let short-runway jets into National now from carefully selected areas, such as La Guardia, Chicago's Midway, and perhaps from Dallas or Houston as well as from one of the major Southeast aviation hubs.

Mr. Speaker, the WIND editorial read by Mr. Edward Wallis, general manager of WIND, follows:

RETURN TO MIDWAY IMPORTANT

Chicago may rightfully take pride in its fine international airport—O'Hare Field—the busiest air terminal in the world. As the hub of the Nation's air travel, the city does have one of the finest airports anywhere. But we submit there are some shortcomings which need remedy at the earliest possible moment. These shortcomings are the direct result of O'Hare being the world's busiest airport. As fine as it is, as vast as it is, at times O'Hare is overburdened with air traffic.

We cite last Sunday evening as an example. Gusty winds, rain and low ceilings prevailing at an hour when dozens of aircraft were scheduled to land or take off brought about a "stacking" of planes waiting for the one runway which was deemed usable under weather conditions. One plane from Atlanta, for example, spent more time in the waiting pattern over Chicago than the elapsed time from Atlanta to Chicago. Another carrier from the East was in the holding pattern for nearly 2 hours.

Never were any lives in danger—but there was extreme inconvenience for passengers, many of whom missed connecting flights at O'Hare because of the delays caused by "stacking."

We maintain there is a way to eliminate most such inconveniences and improve air service in and out of Chicago. That is the immediate full and complete reactivation of Midway Airport which can handle all piston-engined airplanes and the smaller jet craft. At present, only one scheduled airline is using the facilities of Midway. In the interest of serving their passengers more efficiently, others, we believe, should follow suit. If Midway had been in use last Sunday night, many of the delays could have been shortened considerably, if not eliminated altogether.

We urge the city to continue its efforts to reactivate Midway and to make its use attractive financially to the airlines, all of which now using O'Hare have substantial financial investment in the O'Hare facility. Chicago must now join with the airlines in solving a success problem so that the vital air transport industry may continue to grow, prosper and serve.

Rural Electrification's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week we observe the 30th anniversary of the real beginning of rural electrification in America. In this observance, it is fitting that we bring special attention to the role which the Rural Electrification Administration—REA—and electric power play in the changing pattern of American agriculture.

This is an occasion to look back across the years.

When I entered the Congress a little more than three decades ago, I immediately joined in a movement, then in its infancy, to turn on the lights in rural America. As a young Member of the House, I associated myself with the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas, then chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and later to become the great and revered Speaker of the House. "Mr. Sam" stepped into the forefront of a drive in the Congress to carry electricity down our country roads to the people who produce our food and fiber. I have no greater pride of service in the Congress than my work with "Mr. Sam" to create the REA, and my subsequent efforts in behalf of the rural electrification movement.

Mr. Speaker, the industrial revolution of the 19th century transformed life in the cities but scarcely touched the farm.

At the turn of the century, the American farmer was earning his living in a way that had changed but little since the days when the first colonies were established in the New World. The tools he used were simple and ancient—the wheel, the lever, the block and tackle, the plow. For most tasks, he had to depend on the strength that he and his family could supply and upon his horses and other animals. His children studied by the dim light of a kerosene lamp, and his wife was slave to the wood range and the washboard.

Thirty years ago electricity for light and power and heat was available to people in the cities and towns, providing comforts and creating wealth through industrial production and commerce. On a few farms electricity was a luxury in the first three decades of this century. For a number of farm chores the tractor and the stationary gasoline engine had replaced animal power and human labor, but in most respects there was little evidence of the progress which characterized the cities.

Rural electrification was neglected because it appeared unprofitable. In 1929, only 9.5 percent of the farms in the United States had electric service, and the economic depression of the early 1930's further limited the electric companies' progress into farming areas. In 1935, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt created the Rural Electrification Administration as an emergency relief program, the figure for farms with central station electric service had crept to 10.9 percent.

Today, Mr. Speaker, after 30 years of REA loans and technical assistance in rural electrification, more than 98 percent of our farms are electrified. The lights have been turned on in rural America.

When the rural electric cooperatives in my home State of North Carolina and elsewhere were building their first lines, some cooperative leaders and even REA doubted that the average consumer would use as much as 40 kilowatt-hours per month. In 1964, not yet 30 years after those first lines were built, the average consumer on the lines of REA borrowers used 451 kilowatt-hours per month. This is more than 10 times the early estimates.

To grasp some idea of the impact which rural electrification has had on agriculture, we may look at farm production. The average farmer in 1935 produced enough for himself and 10 other persons; today that same average farmer—or more likely his son—produces at least enough for himself and 32 other persons. It is no coincidence that in the same years while the rural consumption of electric power showed such a remarkable increase, the individual farmers' production of farm goods also showed a remarkable increase—300 percent.

Certainly no one credits all the increase to rural electrification. We know that soil conservation practices, increased use of fertilizers, insecticides, the tractor, improved breeding methods, new and better roads, better selection of seeds, and a considerable list of other developments in the science and practice of farming all share credit for improvement in yield and quality of farm production. But we also must recognize that electric power was a significant factor, and on this 30th anniversary of REA we should acknowledge the accomplishments of REA under the Rural Electrification Act which Congress passed in 1936, and of the rural electric cooperatives and other borrowers of REA funds for building the lines that carry power to this Nation's farms.

Farmers have found more than 400 uses for electricity in their homes and on the farm. Farmers soon learned that a 1-horsepower motor can do as much work in an hour as a man can do in a

day. Usually the more repetitious the task and the more drudgery connected with it, the more easily an electric motor can be harnessed to take it over.

Mr. Speaker, many aspects of modern farming would be unthinkable without electrification. Take dairying as just one example. Three decades ago, dairying was confined largely to Northern States. There were many reasons for this regionalization of dairy herds. Warm temperatures in rural areas where there was no electric power for cooling was just one aspect of the problem.

Today, many of the Southern States stand high in the production of milk and milk products. The modern sanitary dairy depends on electric power for its very existence. Electricity mixes the feed, loads hay and silage, powers the milking machines, provides the hot water for sterilizing equipment, furnishes refrigeration, and even ventilates and cleans the barn.

The same advantages apply to many other aspects of farming.

Rural electrification helped make the revolution in agriculture possible. It also offers the solutions for many of the problems arising from the great changes in agriculture that we are witnessing. For about half the farms in the United States, the farm families themselves own the electric systems that have become such important farm tools.

Mr. Speaker, inequality still contrasts the cost of electricity in the cities with what rural people have to pay. Even with all the progress which has been made, farm families and other consumers on the lines of REA borrowers pay on the average 24 percent more than urban consumers for 250 kilowatt-hours of electric power. For 500 kilowatt-hours, the difference averages 19 percent.

The reasons for this disparity are easy to understand. REA borrowers, serving thinly populated territory, average 3.3 consumers per mile of line. By contrast, the urban based companies average 33.2 per mile of line.

But, Mr. Speaker, we can be thankful on this 30th anniversary of REA that the hard fight is being won, day by day, to pull down the cost of electricity for rural America. On this occasion, I salute the rural electrification movement and all the farm families and others who have brought the blessings of electricity to rural America.

See the U.S.A., Says Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has given an excellent review of the work of the Johnson-Humphrey administration to encourage tourist travel within the United States. Vice President HUMPHREY, as chairman of the Cabinet task force on travel, spoke before the meeting of the National Association of Travel Organizations here in Washington and urged private travel groups to cooperate in a See the U.S.A. program.

President Johnson has just appointed Mr. Robert Short of Minneapolis as national chairman for "See the U.S.A." Mr. Short is president and owner of Admiral/Merchant Motor Freight, Inc., the Los Angeles Lakers and a number of other businesses. His leadership of this program brings promise of a vigorous, effective campaign of expansion of our domestic tourist industry. All who are interested in seeing an increase in tourist business here at home will find the Vice President's speech encouraging.

The speech follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TRAVEL ORGANIZATIONS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 12, 1965

I am highly pleased to meet today with my friends of the travel industry.

As you know, I am chairman of the President's special Cabinet task force on travel. That task force was formed 3 months ago by the President as a means of meeting some of our balance-of-payments difficulties. Other members of the task force include Secretary Conner; Secretary Fowler; Secretary Udall; Gov. Buford Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning; and Sargent Shriver of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

All of us have been giving our attention to this important program.

There is no question that our so-called travel gap contributes to our balance-of-payments deficit. Last year Americans traveling overseas spent $1.1 billion more overseas than foreign visitors spent here. If we add the money spent by Americans on foreign-flag airlines and steamship tickets, our travel gap stood at $1.6 billion—almost half of our 1964 payments deficit.

I remind you of these facts because travel is one of the places where we can meet our payments problem.

President Johnson, in establishing our travel task force, made it clear that the need was for a positive program which would encourage more foreign visitors to come to the United States and which would stimulate greater travel here by our own citizens.

(And may I say to our friends here representing Canada and Mexico: you, too, can gain from the increased number of tourists we hope to draw to this continent.)

I wish to emphasize again today that this administration is not adopting a restrictive policy on travel. We have stood too long for liberalized travel, for removal of travel barriers, and for lowering of travel costs to change our minds now.

How then do we reduce the travel gap?

First of all, we must do more to encourage increased travel to the United States by people from overseas. I was cosponsor of legislation 4 years ago which authorized establishment of the U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce. (And I note that Congressman AL ULLMAN, another sponsor of that legislation, is here today.)

The Travel Service has done an excellent job within the limits of its small staff and small budget, just as NATO has done on an even smaller scale at home.

The Travel Service has requested from Congress a budget increase of $500,000 this year. This request deserves your wholehearted support. But even with the increase, the total Travel Service budget will be only $3.5 million—and that is not enough to do the job overseas.

We have chosen a second way to reduce the travel gap. Legislation has been proposed to reduce from $100 to $50 the duty-free allowance to returning travelers. I want to emphasize that this proposal is not meant to keep Americans at home. It is meant to discourage unnecessary spending overseas.

The third and final part of our program is an ambitious and positive See the U.S.A. program here in the United States. I am highly encouraged by what many private companies and industry associations have already undertaken to promote the See the U.S.A. theme during this travel season. I commend those of you here today who have done this.

Some of you have not chosen to include the See the U.S.A. theme in your promotion this spring and summer. That of course is your choice.

I would point out, however, that there has never been a better time to use this theme.

President Johnson and this administration have thrown their full support behind development of our domestic travel industry. The members of our Cabinet task force are actively doing things to aid the program. All of us are publicizing the effort. These last 2 days, for instance, Secretary Udall has accompanied Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Humphrey, and wives of several Cabinet members on a tour through the State of Virginia to focus attention on tourist attractions there. I have appeared several times on national radio and television on before of the See the U.S.A. program, and so have other members of our task force.

The program, in addition, ties in closely with the President's highway and beautification programs. It also ties in with the New York World's Fair and other major tourist events throughout the country.

We in Government are doing our best to create the best possible climate for development of tourism.

We ask you to capitalize on that climate. All of us stand to gain.

I would like now to take a few moments to tell you what our Cabinet task force has been doing.

Secretary Udall and the Department of the Interior have played a most active role. The National Park Service has made this spring a thorough inventory of all its facilities and the tourist facilities of our States. We know now just where more and better facilities are needed, and where present excellent facilities are not being properly publicized or used. And we are taking steps to do better.

In addition, the Interior Department has established a special task force on Washington, D.C. The objective of this group is to make Washington, D.C., a pilot project for tourism.

This Interior Department task force has set for itself an October deadline to give us a full proposal on long-range development of tourism in Washington, D.C. But in the meantime, the Interior Department task force is doing things to make Washington a better place to visit in 1965.

Before this task force has completed its work, we expect to see a National Visitors Center in Washington—perhaps at Union Station. At this center, newcomers to Washington could arrange their entire visit to the city, from guided tours to hotel accommodations.

They could also receive information on tourist attractions in Washington and be given orientation on U.S. history and Government.

The center could also provide restaurants and parking space and serve as a terminal for a visitor transport system to reduce automobile and bus congestion downtown.

We also expect to see youth hostels in Washington where students can get inexpensive lodging. We expect to see expanded parking facilities for tourists.

We expect to see new tourist literature in a number of foreign languages. We expect to see better housekeeping throughout the city and an effective cleanup drive. Through the efforts of the Interior Department, working with private interests and other Government agencies in Washington, we plan to fully realize Washington's potential as a tourist attraction.

The Office of Economic Opportunity plays a role in our Cabinet task force because travel is an industry which benefits underdeveloped areas of our country and which employs low-skill people. Sargent Shriver is working now with public and private agencies to increase employment opportunity through tourism.

The Treasury Department plays an important part in our task force because it follows, of course, the balance-of-payments situation. But in additon, the Treasury Department is acting through the U.S. Customs Service to extend the best possible welcome to all foreign visitors to this country. The welcome these visitors receive often determines how long they will stay and whether they will ever be back again.

The Department of Commerce is represented on our task force because the U.S. Travel Service is housed there. Beyond this, the Commerce Department has done an excellent job of soliciting cooperation of private industry in closing our balance-of-payments gap—including the travel gap.

Governor Ellington, who works with all the Nation's Governors, has been active in alerting our States and State tourist departments to the unrealized benefits which tourism can bring to their States. I think all our States today are far more aware than they were a few weeks ago of the dollars and cents that can come into their States through tourism. And they are undertaking new programs of cooperation among themselves, with Federal agencies, and with local private industry.

I have also been assigned by the President the task of liaison with the Nation's mayors, city managers, and county officials. I have called their attention, too, to the benefits tourism can bring to their areas.

But despite our efforts within Government, the greatest role in the See the U.S.A. program must be played by the private sector.

The most valuable thing we in Government can do in this task is to extend our full cooperation to initiatives by private industry. We are ready to help you where you need help.

The President last week appointed my good friend, Robert Short, of Minneapolis, as national chairman of a private industry See the U.S.A. program. I have known Bob for many years. He is energetic and has great imagination. If there's a man in this country to make See the U.S.A. a success, it is Bob Short.

I know that Bob has met in the past few days with representatives of the travel industry—in fact, with a number of you in this room. He is forming a private industry committee and is soliciting funds and staff to do a job.

There is hardly an industry in this country which does not benefit directly or indirectly from tourism. But let's be quite frank. In the past, many of you have not been together in fully developing that benefit.

In Bob's hands is the task of encouraging and developing a common effort, cutting across company and industry lines. The President hopes, and I hope, that you will extend your full cooperation to Bob as his private industry program gets underway.

The success of that program will depend upon Bob Short's initiative and the initiative of those working with him.

I think there is no question that all of you who benefit from tourism know that your own self-interest and profits can be served by such cooperation.

There is research to be done. There is promotion to be done. There is a greater need for travel packages. There is the need to look at your costs.

The travel industry has hardly touched the surface of its potential. You know the travel statistics. Those of you in the hotel business are painfully aware of the 65-percent national average occupancy rate—while only 40 percent of our people have ever spent a night in a hotel or motel.

You in the airlines know that 80 percent of our citizens have never been in a plane.

You in the State tourist departments know that more than 80 million Americans took no trip anywhere last year.

All of us are well aware that more than half of our people have never been more than 200 miles away from home.

This is the year, and this is the season when we intend to do something about this. I call on all of you here today:

Devote yourself to this effort through your own companies.

Work through your trade associations.

Join wholeheartedly in the efforts of Bob Short and his private industry committee.

And in your efforts, be fully assured that we in Government are fully behind you.

When these things have been done, I am confident that our domestic tourist industry can be fully developed. When it is, this country can be a magnet for tourists—tourists from within our country and from other countries. An underdeveloped industry can be fully developed. Our travel gap can be a travel surplus.

Coast Guard Lives Up to Motto of Vigilance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we all too often overlook the magnificent job performed for America by the U.S. Coast Guard. The fact that they are always ready, willing, and able to step in on a moment's notice wherever needed is a true credit to them and deserves our full commendation.

The enclosed editorial entitled "Coast Guard Lives Up to Motto of Vigilance," recently appeared in the San Diego Union and I am moved to take this opportunity to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

COAST GUARD LIVES UP TO MOTTO OF VIGILANCE

The news that the U.S. Coast Guard would assign 17 cutters to the unfolding crisis in southeast Asia received modest and passing mention in the flow of daily news.

In a sense, that modest news mention was in itself typical of the way the Coast Guard operates.

Tireless dedication and the striving for perfection come first. Public recognition almost seems incidental.

The full measure of the Coast Guard's selfless service and dedication, however, is in the proud tradition of its history and in its motto: Semper Paratus—Always Vigilant.

Vigilant it has been since the first 10 "Revenue Marine" boats were launched nearly 175 years ago to guard the coast against smugglers. For 8 years the Coast Guard was the United States only naval force. Its protection played a large role in getting the foundling Republic off on a sound economic footing.

Since then, in peace and in war, the Coast Guard has been an indispensable arm of the Government. In peace, the Guard as an everyday routine saves lives, protects property, enforces laws, mans lighthouses, and forms a link of boats across the oceans for defense and to collect weather data.

In wars it has distinguished itself time and again. It was in the thick of the War of 1812 and 1898. In World War I the Coast Guard lost more lives in proportion to its strength than any other service.

Coast Guardsmen were manning many of the landing craft that landed troops on the bloody islands of the Pacific during World War II. They were at Korea also.

It is not all at surprising to learn that the Coast Guard will play a role in the battle for freedom in Vietnam. In fact, it would be surprising if it did not. The Coast Guard is especially experienced in coastal patrols and control of smuggling of the type carried on by Vietcong guerrillas and junks.

When the Coast Guard was formed in 1790, Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, said he wanted a service to "'attach men to their duty by a sense of honor."

The service has quietly lived up to the fullest measure of the goal.

Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting fact that the average Canadian lives about 50 miles from the United States-Canadian border. Three-quarters of all Canadians live within 200 miles of the border. We can assume from this estimation that every citizen of Canada at one time in his life will enter the United States. Therefore, as Americans, we need to be more informed about our neighbors. Mark Ethridge, Jr., associate editor of the Detroit Free Press, has written a series of articles on the problems and prospects of Canada. The second article follows:

SPLIT INEVITABLE? CONCESSIONS FAIL TO QUIET REBEL QUEBEC

(NOTE.—In the second of a four-part series on the problems and prospects facing Canada, Free Press Associate Editor Mark Ethridge, Jr., examines the split between French and English-speaking Canada.)

(By Mark Ethridge, Jr.)

If the political leaders of Quebec could get together on what they want from Ottawa, they might get it.

But like the leaders of the civil rights movement in the United States, the Quebecois are themselves divided, bitter, quarrelsome, competing for leadership.

Some, most notably the able and articulate provincial Premier Jean Lesage, talk like a Martin Luther King, demanding equality with English-speaking Canada, but abjuring violence of separatism.

Others—the young, generally well-educated inhabitants of the beatnik coffee houses of Montreal—talk about a Quebec nation, going it alone allied to France. The coffee-housers,

like the Muslims in the United States, are a tiny minority, but they make an awful din.

Two years ago in Montreal, the FLQ terrorist youths panicked the suburban area of Westmount by blowing up mail boxes as symbols of royal authority.

More often, though, when they speak of the legalisms of "going it alone," the leaders of Quebec conjure up images of John C. Calhoun, the 19th century politician who developed the doctrine of interposition and resigned from the Vice Presidency to defend the State's right of his native South Carolina.

The British North America Act of 1867, said a Montreal professor quoting Canada's founding fathers, recently set up a system of two races, two languages, two religious beliefs, two sets of laws—two systems of everything.

Quebec adopted British criminal law, but was allowed to keep French civil law. The schools in Quebec are run by the churches, with separate but equal facilities for Catholics and Protestants.

Now, they say, French culture and French traditions are threatened. Encroaching federal bureaucracy is destroying the provincial independence of Quebec. The trend must be reversed.

Historically, their lament is parallel in time and circumstance either to the Old Confederacy of John Calhoun or the new nationalism of Africa and Asia. In either case, the talk is tough, the determination seems real. They want it their way or else.

A more moderate view of French Canadian demands, though, was taken in the same conversation by a Montreal newspaper editor, who likened the problem to a man sitting on your hat.

"He is so large, and the hat is so small," the editor said, "that he does not know it. And when you ask him please to get off your hat, he asks, 'What hat?' What we want is Canadian recognition of the Quebecois as equal citizens."

Specifically, he said, French Canadians want the right to communicate with their Government—which means that all Government functionaries in areas where French-speaking Canadians live must speak French as well as English. They want to be able to continue French education for the children outside Quebec. About a million French Canadians live in the nine other provinces. And they want the right to earn a living knowing only French.

This, economically, is a sore point across the width and breadth of Quebec. Just coming into its own industrially, Quebecois see Canadian companies building plants in Quebec, appointing English-speaking managers, and then finding themselves denied jobs because they know only French.

One of the great recent triumphs for Quebecois, in fact, was when the blueprints for a new hydroelectric plant on the Manicouagan River in Quebec were prepared last month in both French and English.

The problem is not one simply of pride. It is serious to the point that Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson last year appointed a Commission of Biculturalism and Bilingualism.

In its first interim report recently, the B and B Commission, as it is called, said that Canada, "without being fully conscious of the fact, is passing through the greatest crisis in its history. The source of the crisis lies in the Province of Quebec; that fact could be established without an extensive inquiry. If it should persist and gather momentum, it could destroy Canada."

It could, says Premier Lesage both threateningly and appealing, but he hopes it won't. To avoid the crisis, Canadians must adapt themselves to what he calls "the French fact."

"I must state it very clearly," he said in St. Catherines, Ont., last month, "Canadians must either adapt themselves to this new fact or else accept that Canada will evolve in a world entirely of its own making.

"Alas, there is no other choice."

Lesage, one of the leaders of Quebec's quiet revolution, is a persuasive speaker. Equally fluent in French and English (to a recent joint meeting of Canadian and American newspaper editors he spoke in both without translating for either), he spends much of his time pressing on the Ottawa government his own demands, while at the same time insisting that they are the minimums which French Canadians will accept.

Though Quebecois argue, as in the story about the hat, that the rest of Canada does not hear them, the evidence is that the Federal Government in Ottawa does—and it rankles the non-French.

In less than 2 years in office, and working with a coalition of parties to form a majority (of 265 seats he holds only 129, including 47 from Quebec), Lester Pearson has:

1. Hauled down the Red Ensign, symbolic of ties to Britain, and replaced it with the inoffensive Maple Leaf Flag;

2. Provided a job preference in the civil service to redress the imbalance between French and English;

3. Changed the name of Trans-Canada Airlines to Air Canada, in keeping with the French style of Air France;

4. Agreed that Quebec could "opt out" of joint Federal-provincial programs such as old-age assistance without loss of income. Already Quebec has withdrawn from 29 of of 46 such programs;

5. Watched without public irritation as Charles de Gaulle, doing his best to inflame the wound, and the Province of Quebec signed a $2 million educational exchange treaty under which France is seeking to instill even more French culture to Quebec. The province already has a trade and tourist mission in Paris, serving all the business and promotional functions of a consulate.

6. Launched a campaign with Lesage to "repatriate the Constitution." Under the British North American Act, which includes Canada's Constitution, any amendments to the Constitution must go to England for approval. The gesture is automatic, but it's somewhat embarrassing for an independent nation.

Originally, Quebec was opposed to the plan. They have looked upon London as a safeguard, because the tensions of Ottawa don't extend to the British Isles. But now Lesage supports the plan on the grounds that the revised Constitution would break the last legislative links with London and would open the way for a "special status" for Quebec.

This in turn antagonizes the French extremists, who say the change would put Quebec at the mercy of the other nine provinces. And it also antagonizes Pearson, who denies that Quebec will get any special status.

John Diefenbaker, the former Prime Minister and leader of the conservative opposition in Ottawa, chooses publicly to agree with Lesage's interpretation, and denounces the proposal as a giveaway of federal rights.

Meanwhile, the separatists also put pressure on Lesage inside Quebec, saying that Pearson's concessions don't go far enough, and that Lesage's goals of equality are dream stuff.

It would be foolish, says Rene Levesque, Natural Resources Minister in Quebec, to devote the best of our energies to propagating the doubtful advantages of biculturalism. If French culture is to spread, if the French language is to be respected, that will depend on the vigor, on the economic and political importance of Quebec.

Or, as a French Canadian farmer told the B and B Commission, "Either we get to be understood when we speak French anywhere in Canada, or we get out."

Will they? Hopefully, Lesage says no. So does Saskatchewan's Premier Ross Thatcher, who is ready to take up arms in defense of unity.

But lending truth to the words of the B and B interim report that English Canadians don't understand the situation, Pearson's Agriculture Minister Harry Hays, a cattle baron from Alberta, says, "This is a crisis? Why man, in Canada we have a crisis a day, often every hour on the hour, and this will blow over same as the rest."

In the coffee houses of Montreal, in the Parliament of Quebec, and the fishing villages along the St. Lawrence, they don't think so.

The Nile Dictator Reaches Out Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article details the latest aggressive designs of the Egyptian dictator on one of his neighbors—this time Libya.

The article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 9, 1965, and follows:

NASSER LOOKS COVETOUSLY AT LIBYA, FRIEND OF UNITED STATES

(By Seymour Freidin)

LONDON.—A duel in the desert sun, definitely detrimental to American politicoeconomic interests, is building up swiftly to the straining point without much outside attention.

An impending showdown between a three-way alliance, led by pro-Nasser agents and political forces, and the rather flimsy regime of King Idris, of Libya, looms as the next big test for U.S. policy in the Middle East.

One portent of developments will be the results of yesterday's general elections, the second in less than a year.

On the perimeter of north Africa, smack between long frontiers with Algeria and Egypt and a wedge of Tunisia to the northwest, Libya is a sort of sitting duck for subversion. Its population, sparse and mostly nomadic (total: 1,559,399 for so vast a stretch of barren real estate), is an easy target for takeover tactics made in Cairo.

Bogged down in his armed expeditionary quest to grab the Yemen, President Nasser of Egypt casts covetous eyes at Libya as an alternative to a qiuck victory—and cash revenue. He looked longingly last year in the same direction for the same reason.

But immediate persuasion from the West kept aged, frail, and myopic King Idris on a throne he was ready to yield. At stake are not simply U.S.-operated Wheelus Field in western Libya and British RAF enclaves in the east, but dividend-paying oil fields and a great pipeline bringing "black gold" to coastal ports.

Broke, with bad credit, President Nasser recently sharpened his sights on Libya. To avoid some political mistakes made last time, including rather surprising local independent reaction, President Nasser's troubleshooters appear to have contrived a working alliance.

They have made common cause with the Communists in Libya, a small and outlawed organization but highly disciplined and with good connections with the Italian party. Interestingly, they made their original contacts with Italian Communists while Mussolini tried to create his fool's paradise of empire in Libya.

BAATH, TOO

The second group with whom the Nasserites have hammered out working agreement are the Baath Socialists, who only appeared in effective force in Libya the last couple of years. As recently as last October, these

three political forces were undercutting each other, even informing on one another.

A serious reappraisal by President Nasser, after his war in the Yemen did not come to a successful conclusion, led to the three-way deal. He got on friendly terms with the Syrian Baath Party, which calls itself the real Arab Socialist force. Through its leaders, his agents were able to contact colleagues in Libya.

The Communists were wooed by Baath in Syria and simultaneously in Egypt by President Nasser. His high-level sessions with the rising star of the Soviet Presidium, Alexander Shelepin, also paved the way for relaxing official Egyptian suspicions against Communists. President Nasser in turn got some quick credit, but he will be picking cotton to pay off the Russians for years to come.

Since President Nasser's nonalinement had been placed firmly along side Soviet policies, Baath in Syria regarded its Communists with a kindlier eye. Even Khaled Biqdash, veteran international Communist apparatus operative, has had talks with Syrian Government people and Baath leaders, whom he is sworn to liquidate one day.

Preliminaries over, it required just under 4 months to make these three forces in Libya a working alliance. President Nasser showed no interest in the fact that the Libyan Communists are illegal. His people, including hundreds of teachers, stopped being opposed and went into political business with Communist cadres.

They shared their information and plans with the Baath, which was the last to volunteer to cooperate. Slogans are held high for Arab socialism (which nobody has really been able to define) against foreign bases, meaning American and British, and, finally, republicanism and no monarchy.

Except on the highest government-to-government levels, little mention ever is made of all that oil so recently developed in Libya. Fierce criticism is spread about lack of distribution among Libyans of the oil income. President Nasser's propagandists and political troubleshooters carefully shun discussion of how he hurts for that money.

In the last few years, because of mammoth cash outlays for rocketry designed by ex-Nazi scientists for use against Israel, vast spending programs for propaganda and the burden of war in the Yemen, Egypt's low standard of living has dropped.

Simultaneously, the population has shot up, from about 21 million in 1950 to 26 million this year. If the United States, for example, canceled its grain assistance, President Nasser would have to buy it or pull out of the war in the Yemen.

Rather than renege on his own war, President Nasser sees pay dirt just around the corner in Libya. This time, to guarantee better returns, he formed a three-way operation. But he remains senior partner. When he decides to move, expected pretty soon, only the United States is in a position to oppose him. It can, if it so chooses. Otherwise, President Nasser is recapitalized.

Charles Burchfield, Artist Laureate of the Niagara Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, once in each age of man's experience comes an artist who combines the botanist's knowledge, the lover's ecstasy, the dreamer's fantasy and has the cohesive mind to compress all of these into a unique unity.

Such a man is Charles Burchfield, a lifetime artist in my district, but in essence a citizen of every man's domain. Upon his 50th anniversary as a professional artist and upon his selection by the President's Commission of Fine Arts as the only living artist to have two paintings hung as a part of the White House collection, I would like to place in the RECORD the following two articles, first from the Buffalo Courier Express and secondly from the Buffalo Evening News. I would also like to place in the RECORD some tributes Mr. Burchfield has received on his outstanding exhibition of paintings at the State University College in Buffalo.

The aforementioned material follows:

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express, Apr. 30, 1965]

WYETH, BURCHFIELD ART HUNG IN WHITE HOUSE

Paintings by a West Seneca man and a widely known realist-artist with western New York ties are included in a selection of works representing American scenes hung in the White House in Washington, D.C.

Charles E. Burchfield of 3574 Clinton Street, Gardenville, who studied at the Cleveland School of Art, is the only artist with two paintings in the collection.

A retrospective exhibition marking Burchfield's 50th anniversary as a professional artist opened Wednesday at State University College here.

Andrew Wyeth, described as America's "super realist," is represented in the White House collection by his large watercolor, "V.F.W. (Veterans of Foreign Wars)," in Pennsylvania landscape.

Wyeth's works were gathered from 18 museums and exhibited in the Albright-Knox Art Gallery here in the fall of 1962. His wife, the former Betty James, is from East Aurora. Her father, Merle James, also an artist, was for 20 years editor of the Courier-Express Sunday magazine.

[From the Buffalo Evening News]

EXHIBIT OF BURCHFIELD DRAWINGS BEAUTIFULLY INSTALLED AT COLLEGE

(By Jean Reeves)

If you see no other art exhibition this season, let it be the enchanting and enchanted Burchfield drawing shown in the State University College at Buffalo.

The college is honoring Mr. Burchfield, as we all should, on his 50th anniversary as a professional artist.

And in what better way could this be done than to gather some of his most memorable drawings—the thinking medium of all artists—and present them to us as a perfect gift?

Charles Burchfield is 72. He long has been the artist laureate of the Niagara Frontier—he still lives in the comfortable old frame house in Gardenville that he and his wife, Bertha, and five children moved into in 1925—but his romantic art has sped his fame, too, across oceans.

HOLD WORLD OF WONDER

There is a world of wonder in these 98 drawings, installed so exquisitely in the college's beautiful little Upton Gallery—the wonder of all God has created.

Mr. Burchfield tells us of it, may sings of it, for every Burchfield picture is a symphony of sounds and sights.

Mr. Burchfield paints nature with ecstatic vision. It is to him always the first morning of creation. And he invites us to revel with him in the mysteries of summer nights, rain-drenched landscapes, new moons and the thrust of tender blooms toward sun and sky

Burchfield drawings are more intimate, more immediate, than Burchfield painting, for drawings are always the handwriting, so to speak, of the artist.

But they are no less dynamic, no less mystical than his large, light-filled paintings.

A CHOICE IS DIFFICULT

How difficult it is to single out individual drawings for mention from such a company. As one walks from work to work, each seems more magical than the last.

How wonderfully droll and gay are the "Trees Dancing in the Wind" (1952). How lyric the little "Village Church in August," enfolded in a pink and golden sky, lush foliage and the warm vapors of a summer afternoon.

Not all Burchfield drawings are black and white. Color is very dear to him, and he cannot resist using it in many of his drawings.

It is employed sparsely—just lemon yellow and steely blue—to produce cold sunlight in "March Sun and Crow Call," a work dated this year.

"GOLDEN ROD SPRAY"

It is muted in "Golden Rod Spray" (1954–65), a work almost unlike Burchfield. He has used a montage device, the golden rods occupying the center space, superimposed on a background of buildings sketched in red conte crayon.

But the colors burst forth gloriously in such works as "Old House and Spring Dawn" (1965).

One of the black and white works that particularly took our fancy was "Late Summer Sun" (1953). How more eloquently lines can speak than words:

Black clouds spike the sky (Burchfield clouds are seldom puffy) and the trees below, sensing nature's mood, flatten themselves like doily-covered plates to catch the last rays of warmth.

Mr. and Mrs. Burchfield and their daughter, Mrs. Henry Richter, of Ebenezer, herself an artist of some skill, were guests at a dinner given by Dr. Paul G. Bulger, president of the college, and Mrs. Bulger, Wednesday evening.

BAUR SUMS UP SPIRIT

The artist and his family then greeted guests at the preview of the exhibition and attended a concert given by the members of the music faculty.

Mr. Burchfield said the exhibition is a wonderful thing for the college to have done and they have done it so well.

Accompanying the Burchfield exhibition is a small catalog which includes tributes to the artist from Governor Rockefeller, museum directors, collectors, and fellow artists.

Perhaps the words of John J. H. Baur, associate director of the Whitney Museum, sum up best the spirit of these little notes of praise:

"More than any American artist, he has opened the secrets of one's own heart in its private dialog with the natural world."

The Burchfield exhibition was assembled by Dr. Edna M. Lindemann and Dr. D. Kenneth Winebrenner with the aid of Gordon M. Smith, director of the Albright-Knox Art Gallery. The installation was designed by Frank C. Eckmair.

Hurry. You have only 17 more "looking" days. The show comes down after May 16.

TRIBUTES

Mr. CHARLES BURCHFIELD,
Upton Hall Gallery,
State University College at Buffalo,
Buffalo, N.Y.

DEAR MR. BURCHFIELD: I am delighted to know that an exhibition of your drawings is being held at the Upton Hall Gallery. It affords me great pleasure to congratulate you upon celebrating your 50th anniversary as one of the outstanding artists of our time.

We in the Empire State have a particular pride in you as a fellow New Yorker. My very best wishes that your exhibition may have the success it so thoroughly merits.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor, State of New York.

ALBANY, N.Y.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to congratulate Charles Burchfield on the occasion of his 50th anniversary as an artist. When the history of 20th century art is written. I am certain that he will be named as one of the most creative interpreters of nature—its beauties, mysteries, and changing moods.

Because his work is readily understood by the layman, he has made an additional contribution to the arts in expanding the audience for contemporary works. Residents of the Niagara Frontier are particularly proud that this distinguished American artist is a neighbor and friend.

GORDON M. SMITH,
Director, Albright-Knox Art Gallery.

BUFFALO, N.Y.

"If you will call me 'Charlie,' I'll call you Paul." This was said to me by the noted artist and humanist, Charles E. Burchfield. The warmth and depth of this artist have generated within me an affection that is very real.

I knew his paintings; I now know the man. How fortunate we are to have the high expressions of his artistry and humanity at our college for this major exhibition. How thankful we are to have these drawings from the heart, mind, and soul of Charlie Burchfield. It is a distinct privilege to have this man as consulting artist for the college.

PAUL G. BULGER,
President, State University College at Buffalo.

Charles E. Burchfield's nature painting is what I enjoy most. Perhaps it can and will be said that he is the Audubon of our time. And important, too, is the fantasy art of his early period and the industrial scene depicted in his middle period.

It was with three of Mr. Burchfield's drawings that I began collecting his works. Now in the collection of his watercolors, drawings, prints, and oil, I can see over a 50-year period from 1915 to the present what a versatile artist he is and the magnitude of himself as a person. His art has withstood the test of time and has earned for him the reputation of one of America's great masters. It has been my good fortune to know him as artist and friend.

CHARLES R. PENNEY,
Attorney, Olcott, N.Y.

Charles Burchfield is a far cry from the streotypical image of a landscape painter, and this very circumstance is sparkingly reflected in his works. He is not only a great artist but an attuned naturalist as well. This inestimable asset together with an innate poetic sense has produced a world which is definitely Burchfield's own, but which he has been amazingly able to convey to others by means of a revealing brush.

His watercolors and drawings excite an unmistakable feeling of delightful completeness which is scarcely characteristic of the oeuvres of any other comparable landscape artist, for in Burchfield's productions there is not only an appeal to the eyes but to other sense organs no less directly.

These, then, are, in my opinion, at least some of the more obvious factors which have contributed to the perennial appeal of Burchfield's pictures and which have turned them into visualized poetry of imperishable splendor. His presiding genius did the rest.

THEODOR BRAASCH,
Professor of German, Emeritus, Western Reserve University, Newark, N.J.

The drawings of the last 20 years are of Burchfield's full maturity. While renouncing the realism of his middle period, he has remained faithful to the romanticism of his youth. They have ripened into a most profound, intensely personal interpretation of nature in its changing moods. Through his rich yield of work, he has brought a new dignity to 20th-century American drawing.

LEONA E. PRASSE,
Associate Curator, Prints and Drawings, Cleveland Museum of Art.

On my visits to view the work of Charles Burchfield, I am always filled with wonderment and excitement to see with what magic he is able to extract the mysteries that lie hidden in nature, be it a storm or a hot day in summer. It has been a privilege to know him as artist and friend for 35 years.

JOHN CLANCY,
Director, Rehn Gallery.

During the years 1926–28, when I had a studio in Buffalo, I had the pleasure of spending a lot of time in the company of Charles Burchfield. I shall always be grateful to this great artist for his encouragement, and for the sterling example he set as a man of integrity.

Charles Burchfield has made a very important contribution to American art, and it has always been a source of personal pride, that having met him at the outset of his distinguished career, I knew instinctively—almost 40 years ago—that he was marked for greatness. Please convey my sincere congratulations to him on his notable career.

NORMAN KENT,
Editor, American Artist Magazine, New York City.

Many American artists, from the Hudson River schools to the present, have turned to nature for their subjects—sometimes because it is a traditional area hallowed by usage, sometimes because it offers a storehouse of purely pictorial motifs, form and color—more rarely because of a genuine pantheism, a sense of order and purpose transcending the accidents and variety which are nature's outer guise. Charles Burchfield is of the last, but he stands apart from earlier men like Asher B. Durand, or later men like John Marin, in the intensity of his response and its peculiarly intimate quality.

Perhaps he is closest to Thoreau, for he sees both the minutiae and larger forces of nature simultaneously, and he sees them with an inner eye which gives them personal meaning. Yet the parallel is not exact, for Burchfield's spirit is more romantic than Thoreau's. Filtered through that spirit, nature becomes a vision embodying pure emotion—be it fear, tenderness, exultation or delight.

Burchfield has made these visions compellingly real by inventing a pictorial language of his own, a language that translates what is basically fantastic and imaginative into a poetry, a legend, a saga, with its recurring symbols, its own inner logic. More than any American artist, he has opened the secrets of one's own heart in its private dialog with the natural world.

JOHN I. H. BAUR,
Associate Director, Whitney Museum of American Art

Whatever their function, as a complete statement or as a soliloquy, Burchfield's handwriting is unmistakable in his drawings. In their intimacy and immediacy, these are closer to his philosophy than any painting. Here, ideas as image are weighed and measured before being clothed in public finery. His drawings are a chamber performance, at which I feel a privileged guest.

JAMES N. GOODMAN,
Director, James Goodman Gallery.

Hon. Earl Rudder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Bryan and College Station, Tex., paid tribute to my good friend and former classmate, the Honorable Earl Rudder, president of Texas A. & M. University on Friday, April 23, 1965, and the occasion was marked by the receipt of many telegrams from leading figures throughout the country. Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the article which appeared in the Bryan Daily Eagle for April 25, which says more than I can say concerning Earl Rudder and his distinguished career:

L.B.J., BRYAN, AND COLLEGE STATION PRAISE A. & M.'S EARL RUDDER

(By Robert Stewart, Jr.)

Top officials of the United States and Texas joined Bryan-College Station citizens Friday night in paying tribute to Earl Rudder, president of Texas A. & M. University.

In a short 30-minute program, Rudder was praised by three speakers as a soldier, educator, and distinguished American.

The appreciation banquet sponsored by the citizens of Bryan-College Station was staged in the Ramada Inn and attracted almost 700 persons.

Ford D. Albritton, Jr., a local businessman representing the twin communities, presented the war hero with a large scroll which described Rudder as "a man of action and accomplishment."

"Through his initiative, outstanding scholars have been attracted to the A. & M. campus, and the presence of such men has greatly enhanced the academic standing of the university, and has led to the development of a student body of superior caliber," the scroll reads.

"As president of the university, he has been instrumental in developing many modern facilities for instruction, research, and extension activities, thereby stimulating the continued improvement of these university functions," it continues.

The scroll, which was read by Albritton, also pointed out Rudder's activities in wartime, as a State officer in the general land office and as educator participating in the Governor's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.

President and Mrs. Rudder also received a silver coffee urn, bearing the seal of Texas A. & M. University, for their new campus home which is now under construction.

Before Albritton introduced guest speakers Sterling C. Evans, president of the board of directors of the Texas A. & M. University System, and John F. Younger, president of the Association of Former Students, he read a number of telegrams received for the dinner.

President Lyndon B. Johnson called Rudder my cherished friend, under whose leadership "Texas A. & M. has reached a new pinnacle of achievement and can look forward to the attainment of still higher goals in the future."

The President continued in his telegram by calling the local university "one of the creative educational institutions of our time."

"Earl Rudder has made a lasting contribution to the State of Texas and to our Nation," President Johnson said.

Evans cited Rudder for development of Texas A. & M. University as a place for great learning and great research. He called Rudder a man of "experience with leadership."

The president of the board continued his remarks by predicting future expansion for the university.

Evans called the university president of 6 years "a man who comes from the soil * * * a leader * * * a great soldier."

Speaking of the university's 100th anniversary 7 years from now, Evans predicted the university will continue on "the greatest voyage of all history, with Rudder at the helm."

Younger noted that Rudder was the type of man the founding fathers of the school had in mind. He called Rudder a leader in war and a man dedicated to service to his fellow man in peacetime.

"We are proud to claim him as one of our own," he concluded.

Albritton praised Rudder for "prudent judgment * * * a man of convictions," during closing remarks. He called the university president a man who wears many hats, "educator, general, president, family man."

"He is indeed a leader," Albritton said.

In a brief statement Rudder thanked citizens of Bryan-College Station for support of the university.

"A. & M. would not be what it is today without your loyal part," he said.

Rudder added that "to honor Earl Rudder is to honor all the people who had a hand in bringing me to this point." He singled out his family for special consideration.

The educator also lavished praise on "the splendid efforts of the faculty, staff, students, former students, the board of directors and the chancellor."

"My most heartfelt thanks and special thanks to Chancellor M. T. (Tom) Harrington for approval and friendship and guiddance," he said.

Rudder cited State Senator W. T. (Bill) Moore, Representative David Haines and former Representative B. H. Dewey, Jr., for legislative work in connection with the university.

TELEGRAMS ALL CONTAIN SAME NOTE

The telegrams came from President Lyndon B. Johnson, Gov. John Connally, Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE, of College Station, Lt. Gov. Preston Smith, U.S. Army Gen. Omar Bradley, Secretary of the Army Stephen Ailes, and from dozens of other persons, both well known and little known.

They were read at a banquet here Friday night and they all had one message in common: They all praised President Earl Rudder, of Texas A. & M. University.

Here is the text of Preident Johnson's telegram which was read at the appreciation banquet of General Rudder:

"I am pleased to extend warm greetings to my cherished friend, Earl Rudder, as he is honored by friends and associates for his splended contribution to education.

"Under his leadership Texas A. & M. has reached a new pinnacle of achievent and can look forward to the attainment of still higher goals in the future through its farsighted program, through its greatly increased graduate enrollment, and through its uncreasing involvement in the unfolding wonders of the space age.

"Through all of these and many other areas Texas A. & M. has become one of the creative educational instititions of our time. Earl Rudder has made a lasting contribution to the State of Texas and to our Nation. I extend to him my best wishes for the continued success of all of his worthy endeavors."

Governor Connally's telegram carried out the theme of educator, soldier, and leader in peace and war.

"As a soldier, as a public officer, and as an educator he has always shown great ability, courage imagination and vision," Governor Connally said in a telegram. "Texas A. & M. University has a bright future in service to the people of Texas."

"I am confident that Earl Rudder's strong attributes of leadership will magnify the greatness of A. & M. and assure its continued success," Governor Connally said of Rudder's ability as an educator.

Some of the telegrams recalled the difficult task in June 1943 when, as a war leader, Rudder, then 34, directed the bloody assault of Pointe du Hoe on the D-Day invasion of Normandy. Before the day ended Rudder had been wounded twice and 50 percent of his men were casualties.

"No soldier in my command has ever been wished a more difficult task than that which befell the 34-year-old commander (Rudder) of this Ranger force," Gen. Omar Bradley, then commander of the U.S. forces in Europe, later said of the gallant effort of Rudder and his men.

Despite his injuries Rudder remained in command of his unit that day. Six months later, at a new task, he directed the 109th Infantry Regiment in a major role in repulsing the Germans' last major counteroffensive of the war in the famed Battle of the Bulge.

One of the telegrams recalled the earlier days of Rudder's youth as he struggled to pay for his education at Texas A. & M. by working as a cafeteria employee.

"Little did I think in the year of 1932, when you were a white-collar worker waiting on tables as a student at Texas A. & M., and I was a common laborer, doing I won't say what, in the animal husbandry department, that I would be wiring you as president of Texas A. & M. University," Congressman OLIN E. (TIGER) TEAGUE wired. "I congratulate you on being a great citizen, a great Texan, and an American we are all proud of." TEAGUE said a presidential mission kept him from attending the dinner.

Upon his graduation with a degree in industrial education and a commission as second lieutenant of infantry in the Army Reserve, Rudder accepted a position as football coach and teacher at Brady High School.

There he met and married his wife, the former Miss Margaret Williamson, of Menard. Rudder than went to John Tarleton Agricultural College as football coach and teacher. He remained there until war service in 1941.

And a telegram from his brother, John Rudder, now mayor of Brady, recalled the time Rudder returned from the battles of World War II to become a businessman and eventually mayor of the city from 1946 to 1952.

In 1955, Rudder was appointed commissioner of the general land office of Texas. Under his leadership, the office, which formerly was riddled with scandal, once again regained public confidence. While in the office, Rudder promoted the interest of the permanent school fund and the permanent university fund.

In 1958, as pointed out by the speakers of the evening, Rudder accepted a post as vice president of Texas A. & M. University. A year later, he was named president of the university.

The telegrams were numerous at the meeting; they came from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the U.S. Army Reserve (of which Rudder is a major general) and the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. A number of U.S. Congressmen also joined TEAGUE in offering congratulations.

What America Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay written by Miss Cathy Curran, the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Sidney Curran, 15 Lakeview Avenue, Lakewood, N.Y.

Miss Curran is the New York State winner in the Independence Hall essay contest sponsored by the New York State Junior Chamber of Commerce. I am especially honored that the New York State winner is from my congressional district.

Cathy's superb essay merits the attention of the entire membership of this House of Representatives.

The text of her essay follows:

To me, my country is not just a name, a place in which to live, a spot on the globe of which I can say I am a small part. It is these things and many more.

My country. It is like a religion to me. Many tangible and intangible elements, thoughts, and characteristics endear it to me. Among these are: its music, which the people make to suit their moods; the vibrant excitement of its cities; the majestic peacefulness of its woodlands, lakes, streams, mountains and valleys; the freedom, limitless in value, yet so often taken for granted; and my insignificant home, beautiful to me as a place where I will always be welcome no matter if I have done wrong.

Still, it is the people who fascinate me. A nation can only be what its citizens make it. Through the short history of our homeland, great men and women have handed us a great heritage of high ideals and unheard of freedoms. Our ancestors lived and died for those certain inalienable rights spoken of in the Declaration of Independence, so that their children might have a better world in which to live. We are those children. More than anything else, to me, my country means that I have a purpose for being alive. I have an obligation to my forefathers. In some small way I must try to make my country a healthier, wealthier, and better educated land than the one my father gave to me. America means I have that opportunity to do better and give more of myself than did the generation before me. This is the most important aspect of our country, the freedom to "do better."

America also means we have the right to "be different." That means I have the right to tell the world what I think. I can voice my opinion. If I decide that the whole country (or world for that matter) is wrong, I can stand up on my soapbox and talk all day and all night if I want to. That doesn't mean that anybody is going to listen, but they can if they want to. If my talents are literary, I can write a book telling everyone how terribly wrong they are. I may have to pubish it myself for the lack of eager buyers, but I do have the right to do so if I care to.

One of the most important meanings of America to me is the fact that I can be almost anything I want to be. I am guaranteed of a grade school and high school education. If I want to go to college, there are hundreds of scholarships open to me if I

want to work hard. No one will tell me what I have to be. Free education is a foremost reason why America means much to the world.

There is a catch. For all of these freedoms, I have an obligation. In freedom of the speech and of the press, I have the rights described above—but as soon as I hurt another human being by what I say or write, this freedom is taken away from me. This is just one more example of the value of human life here in America.

I am not so naive as to believe that our country or any country is perfect. Yes, we have high ideals such as: equal rights for all of mankind (citizens) regardless of color, race, or creed, right to vote for all citizens of the United States, and the right to a fair trial by jury. Do we really give all citizens equal rights? Do we let all citizens vote? Does every wrongdoer get an unprejudiced trial? The answer has to be "No." These very facts give me another meaning for my country. My country is not anywhere near perfect. Because we are human, we make mistakes. Because we make mistakes, there is room for improvement; and because there is room for improvement, there is room for me and my generation in the land of my birth. Of course, I am prejudiced, but I think America is the greatest country in the world. It is fairly safe to say that we have a person from every nationality in the world living in the United States. I like to think that we have taken the good things from the customs and ideas of these countries and discarded the bad. Within our boundaries we probably have almost every climate experienced in the world with the possible exception of a rain forest. I am pround to live in this mongrel Nation and glad that I can be reasonably sure of the bright future if I remember to pay my income taxes every year to Uncle Sam.

Yes, America means much to me. Its customs, people, religions, freedoms, ideals, and extensive splendor will always make it different from the rest of the world. It has its bad points along with the good, but that only gives my generation something to work for. I know how lucky I am to have been born in such a land of opportunity.

For, "They call it America, but I call it home."

February Imports Peak for Manmade Fabrics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the importation of manmade fiber fabrics reached a new high in February of this year with 12 million yards of the material being imported to the United States. The value of manmade fibers imported also set a new mark of $3.8 million, compared with the previous high of $3.5 million recorded in July 1964.

This tremendous increase in the importation of manmade fiber fabrics is of great concern to our domestic textile industry. I represent one of the largest textile manufacturing districts in the United States. My constituents are alarmed over the increase in the importation of manmade fibers. I share their hope that our Government will reexamine our policy concerning the importation of the material with a view to insuring adequate protection for our domestic textile industry.

The April 16, 1965, edition of "Daily News Record" gives some factual information on the importation of manmade fiber fabrics, which I believe will be of great interest to every Member of the House. I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FEBRUARY IMPORTS PEAK FOR MANMADE FABRICS

NEW YORK.—U.S. imports of manmade fiber fabrics set a record in February with 12 million yards, topping the previous high of 9.5 million yards recorded in December 1964. Value of imports also set a new mark of $3.8 million, compared with the previous high of $3.5 million recorded in July 1964.

This sharp upturn followed a halt in deliveries here during the east coast and gulf port dock strike from January 11 to February 15. During January, imports had fallen to 4.6 million yards worth $1.8 million.

For the first 2 months of this year, imports totaled 16.6 million yards, a jump of 38 percent from the 12 million yards recorded in the same period last year. Value increased 33 percent to $5.6 million from $4.2 million in January–February 1964. Two years ago, the figures were 11.7 million yards worth $3.2 million.

Imports from Japan jumped to 10.7 million yards in February, compared with the previous record of 8.6 million yards last December. This brought the 2-month total to 14.7 million yards from Japan, a rise of 48 percent from the 9.9 million yards recorded a year ago. Two years ago, the figure was 10.5 million yards.

Nylon fabric imports jumped to 3.5 million yards in February from 318,000 yards a year ago, bringing the 2-month total to 6.6 million yards, compared with 1.8 million yards. In polyester fiber fabrics, the latest month had 1.6 million yards, up from 842,000 yards, resulting in a 2-month total of 3 million yards, compared with 1.9 million yards.

Rayon fabrics hit 5.2 million yards in February, compared with 2.6 million yards a year ago, making a 2-month total of 9 million yards against 6.1 million. In acetate fabrics, 743,000 yards arrived in February, up from 90,000 a year ago, bringing the total this year to 1.4 million yards, compared with 222,000 yards.

Other import categories in February included manmade fiber fabrics containing wool, 116,000 yards, compared with 99,000 yards a year before, and pile fabrics, 76,000 yards, compared with 33,000 yards.

MANMADE FIBER GRAY GOODS, APR. 15, 1965

Filament Fabrics Acetate crepe	
48 135x64 100/100	42
Acetate taffeta	
45½ 180x54	26¾s
45½ 92x42	20⅔–21s
Figment taffeta	
45½ 92x56 100/150	22s
Acetate satin sweetheart type	
46 200x56 75/150	28s
Rayon taffeta	
42½ 120x76 100/100	32¼
42 91x64 100/150	27¼
Lining twill (No fancies)	
45½ 92x62	29½
42 108x62	29¾
42½ 114x64	31½
42½ 120x66	33
Polyester marquisette to finish 45 in. 50x32, 20. Spun fabrics (to finish 45 in.) linen effect rayons:	
2.30	28½c-29s
2.60	22½c-22¾s
2.85	21½c-22½s
3.80	21½
Luana types:	
108x42 15/1	30
108x38 10/	32½
Rayon Challis:	
3.20	23½
Flannel (rayon & acetate):	
1.86	37
Polyester-cotton blends:	
47 in. 88x64 batiste	38½c-41s
47 in. 96x64 batiste	39c-41s
47 in. 96x72 batiste	39½c-41½s
47 in. 116x72 broadcloth	44-44½s
47 in. 128x72 broadcloth	44½c-46½s
47 in. 101x54 poplin	46½c-47s
Dacron polyester fiber:	
Batiste 49 R 100x62 40 den. 30/1	45s
Triacetate-cotton: 6x6 check	36–36½
Cotton cupioni: 40s natural filling	39½
Nylon gray goods:	
40 denier tricot	2.15-2.11
49½ 96x86 den. taf	41s
49½ 96x68 70 den. taf	35¼s
48½ 96x66 50 den. taf	29½s
51 96x82 nylon sheer	28s
Nylon warp-poly./cotton filled:	
65 in. 118x96 (60s)	56c
49½ 118x96 (60s)	43½c–45s
Nylon tricot finished, to cutters: 40 den. 6.00	43–44
Acetate tricot: 55 den. 6.00	25
Triacetate tricot: 55 den. prep. for printing	55½

c—Future delivery.
s—Spot delivery.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C* — 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa* — 301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn* — 119 7th St. SE.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

Additional Authorization for Certain River Basin Plans To Cover Fiscal Year 1966

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6755) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that is noncontroversial which was unanimously reported out of the committee. It is needed and needed now. It is not an authorization for new projects but increases authorizations for existing projects, and I would suggest it deserves the support of the House. I ask the gentleman from Alabama if my statement is not substantially correct relating to the bill?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes, the bill was reported out unanimously by the subcommittee and the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably absent when hearings were held on this legislation. Detailed hearings were held, thanks to the efforts of my colleagues. I would particularly like to thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] who so ably chaired the hearing in my absence. He, along with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] and the associate members of the committee rendered invaluable assistance in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 6755, provides for the increased authorizations for the prosecution of river basin plans for flood control and related basins under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

At the present time there are 21 basin development plans, or major project plans, subject to basin monetary authorization limitations. Authorizations provided to date, including the most recent provided by legislation in December 1963, are generally adequate for work to be performed through the end of the current fiscal year, June 30, 1965. However, the 10 basins listed in H.R. 6755 will run out of authorization in fiscal year 1966, unless additional authorization is provided.

The 10 basins as listed in the bill are: Arkansas River, Brazos River, Central and Southern Florida, Columbia River, Los Angeles-San Gabriel, Missouri River, Ohio River, Ouachita River, Upper Mississippi River, and West Branch Susquehanna River.

When this same condition arose in 1963 it was necessary for the Corps of Engineers to curtail expenditures for design, construction, real estate acquisition, and other necessary work, and to advise contractors of the lack of authority to obligate or expend appropriated funds.

Of course, that is the aim of this bill.

This bill provides for increased authorizations totaling $263 million for the 10 river basin plans. These increased authorizations are needed to cover funds already appropriated or funds that are included in fiscal year 1966 appropriations. Furthermore, these increased authorizations are required at this time so that the construction programs for these basins can be maintained without delay.

The normal construction programs for these basins could continue through fiscal year 1965 under the existing authorizations if an increase in basin authorizations is assured by June 30, 1965. However, the important point is that decisions must be made and continue to be made for the next 2 months on the deferral of contracts scheduled as a part of the approved fiscal year 1965 program for which appropriations have been made. In fact, decisions have already been made in some instances resulting in 14 contracts, in 4 river basins, having a total value of $18,408,000, being deferred. I will cover these in more detail later.

According to testimony of the Corps of Engineers, in hearings before the Subcommittee on Flood Control, decisions on deferring contracts are made on a day-to-day or week-to-week basis. These deferrals are necessary because without assurance of sufficient authorization at this time the award of new contracts would use the remaining available authorization required for existing contracts and real estate acquisition where landowners are depending on announced dates for taking their land.

Now I will very briefly discuss the 10 basins listed in the bill and I will take them in the order in which they are listed in the bill.

In the Arkansas River Basin there are 12 projects on which the requested authorization is planned to be used. Although no contracts which are scheduled for award in May or June of this year have been deferred, if H.R. 6755 is not enacted into law as soon as possible, it will be necessary to defer 18 contracts having a total value of $46,162,000 in the States of Arkansas, Kansas, and Oklahoma.

In the Brazos River Basin there are three projects on which the requested authorization is planned to be used. The assurance of the increased authorization must be had now so that construction programing through fiscal year 1966 can be more effectively developed.

The central and southern Florida basin is essentially one project. Four contracts having a total value of $7,837,000 have already been deferred in this basin. There are two additional contracts with a scheduled May 1965 award date which have not yet been deferred.

In the Columbia River Basin there are 13 projects on which the requested authorization is planned to be used. Although no contracts that are scheduled for award in May or June of this year have been deferred, as in the case with the Arkansas River Basin, if H.R. 6755 is not enacted into law as soon as possible it will be necessary to defer 16 contracts having a total value of $21,851,000 in the States of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

The Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin consists primarily of one project, the Los Angeles County drainage area. Three contracts having a total value of $6,722,000 were not awarded in April as scheduled.

In the Missouri River Basin there are 21 projects on which the requested authorization is planned to be used. Here, as with the Brazos River Basin, the assurance of the increased authorization must be had now so that construction programing through fiscal year 1966 can be more effectively developed.

There are 35 projects in the Ohio River Basin on which the requested authorization is planned to be used. Here, again, assurance of the increased authorization must be had now.

There is one active project in the Ouachita River Basin on which the requested authorization is planned to be used. This basin falls in the same category as the Brazos, Missouri, and Ohio River Basins.

In the Upper Mississippi River Basin there are four projects on which the requested authorization is planned to be used. Five contracts in the State of Iowa, having a total value of $1,839,000 have been deferred.

In the West Branch Susquehanna River Basin there are two projects on which the requested authorization is planned to be used. Two contracts in the State of Pennsylvania, having a total value of $2,010,000, have been deferred.

So in 4 of the 10 basins, 14 contracts having a total value of $18,408,000 in the States of California, Florida, Iowa, and Pennsylvania have already been deferred because of the lack of assurance at this time that additional monetary authorization will be available.

Furthermore, it will be necessary to defer 36 contracts having a value of $68,-

562,000 in the States of Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Kansas, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Washington, which are scheduled for award in May and June 1965, if H.R. 6755 is not enacted into law as soon as possible.

In view of the fact that on four basins contracts have already been deferred, and of the impending deferral of additional contracts in two other basins, on work scheduled for award in May and June, I am sure that you will agree that the situation is urgent and I therefore urge approval of H.R. 6755.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to say that all of us are very happy and pleased to see the distinguished gentleman from Alabama at his usual post working very diligently and very hard. We are all happy to see him looking so well.

I wish to express my appreciation to him and the members of the subcommittee for acting with dispatch on a matter which is so urgent. They have acted in the national interest and certainly in an economical sense to see to it that the necessary authorization is provided for these basins so that the contracts will not have to be canceled and work can proceed as scheduled.

Mr. Chairman, as the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Florida, one of the areas which may be affected by the lack of sufficient monetary authorization, I strongly support the bill before us today, H.R. 6755. Along with several other colleagues, I cosponsored this legislation when it became apparent that 10 basin development programs would run out of authorization in fiscal year 1966.

The central and southern Florida flood control project encompasses an 18 county area, comprising more than 2.4 million residents, or 40 percent of the total population of the State. Since World War II, southeastern Florida has doubled in population during each of the two decades; since 1950, it has more than tripled in economic developments.

In Dade County, Fla., we have experienced devastating floods over the years due to hurricanes. Need for the flood control works to prevent further serious flood damage and loss of life by the periodic floods that ravage the area is accentuated by the phenomenal growth in the region.

The committee supports my contention that central and southern Florida is one of the basins in most critical need of authorization for fiscal year 1966. Unless Congress acts immediately, four contracts totaling $7,837,000 scheduled to be awarded in May must be deferred.

I join the committee in urging our colleagues to support this sorely needed legislation. Further delay will mean the deferring of scheduled contracts and additional construction and administrative costs to the U.S. Government.

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I announce to the House that it is the intention of the Committee on Public Works to begin hearings very shortly on the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. The presentation of this bill today should not lend itself to any misunderstanding that we will not consider a rivers and harbors and flood control bill this year. We expect to present such a bill. We invite the Members to communicate with the committee if they have projects they think should be included in the omnibus bill this year.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I join the gentleman from Florida in saying it is a source of keen pleasure to all the members of the committee that the gentleman from Alabama is able to be back at his post and in charge of this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] it is rather rewarding to be away and find that the work assigned to me has been done much better than I could have done it myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is urgently needed to assure orderly progress in construction on 10 of our river basins.

The evidence heard by our committee firmly establishes the need for expeditious approval of the measure, in order to avert wasteful delays in construction contract awards.

Those delays are already being experienced on four river basin projects: the Los Angeles-San Gabriel, the central and southern Florida, the upper Mississippi and the West Branch Susquehanna. They are costing us money in all four instances.

I hope and trust the bill will be approved by an overwhelming vote in this body, and expeditiously advanced by the other body.

There is certainly no reason why the passage of this 1-year authorization should interfere in any way with plans for an omnibus public works authorization bill a little later in the session. It will serve to meet the emergency now confronting us, and will make possible the careful and orderly consideration of an omnibus bill by the House Committee on Public Works.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee of which the distinguished gentleman from Alabama is chairman, I am glad to see my captain back at the helm looking so well. I certainly want to commend him for the fine work that he has done not only on this piece of legislation but all of those passed by this House. I know, coming from the Mississippi River area, that these river basin authorizations are a must if we are to continue the orderly development of our resources and alleviate the flood conditions up and down the great river valleys.

Again I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Alabama and tell him how delighted we are to see him carrying this legislation through the House today.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I do not know of any experience that could possibly be so satisfying and make me so happy as to return to this splendid forum.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to join my colleagues in expressing delight that the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of this important subcommittee, is well again and back in the position of leadership that he has filled with such credit to the Congress for so long. Florida, particularly south Florida, is especially grateful to him and to his committee for the provision that has been made for a continuation of a meaningful program for central and southern Florida flood control projects.

We, in south Florida particularly, are very much concerned about the Federal Government discharging what we feel to be its responsibility in respect to contributing to projects to arrest saline encroachment into our waterways. We feel that legislative authority already exists for the Government to perform such work and we are going to pursue the matter so that a satisfactory clarification of the authority of the engineers may be provided.

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his kind remarks, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Hon. Minter L. Wilson, Eminent West Virginia Jurist, Commends Action of President Johnson in Upholding Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Honorable Minter L. Wilson of Morgan-

town, W. Va., has long been among the most respected members of the legal profession in the Mountain State. As a lawyer of experience and ability, and an author of several books, and as former judge of the 17th Judicial Circuit of West Virginia, he has built a reputation for impartiality, clear thinking and a forthright manner. It has been my privilege to number Judge Minter Wilson among my cherished friends for many years and on frequent occasions I have been helped by his mature counsel.

Recently, Judge Wilson has written a thought-provoking monograph on the Monroe Doctrine, with particular emphasis on its application in the present day. At this time of international tension I believe it valuable to encourage the widest possible discussion of issues which will affect the lives of all of us. For this reason I request unanimous consent that the article "The Monroe Doctrine Must Be Enforced" by Hon. Minter L. Wilson, of Morgantown, W. Va., be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MONROE DOCTRINE MUST BE ENFORCED

(By Hon. Minter L. Wilson, Morgantown, W. Va.)

The Monroe Doctrine was promulgated December 2, 1823, in a message to Congress by James Monroe, who was then President of the United States. It is not necessary to quote all of his message to Congress on that occasion. The following statements, which he made at that time, are the basis for the Monroe Doctrine: "The American Continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power.

"With the movements in this hemisphere we are, of necessity, more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interferred, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principle, acknowledged, we cannot view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

On June 17, 1940, the Government of the United States sent a note to Germany and Italy referring to the Monroe Doctrine as it related to the Western Hemisphere. The note was as follows:

"The Government of the United States is informed that the Government of France has requested of the German Government the terms of an armistice.

"The Government of the United States feels it desirable in order to avoid any misunderstanding, to inform Your Excellency that in accordance with its traditional policy relating to the Western Hemisphere the United States would not recognize any transfer and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer any geographic region of the Western Hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power."

It should be noted that the State Department in the message just referred to, uses the expression, "geographic region of the Western Hemisphere." That expression means more than "these continents." It means more than just "this hemisphere." It has interpreted the Monroe Doctrine to mean not only the Western Hemisphere, but to include all the islands in the geographic region of the Western Hemisphere. It clearly includes all islands near the mainlands of the Western Hemisphere.

The substance of the Monroe Doctrine is that the Western Hemisphere, including any island in its geographic region, is not to be subject to future colonization by European nations; that the independence of all nations in the Western Hemisphere, including all nations on any islands in its geographic region, have been recognized by the United States; that if any European nation intervenes in the affairs of any one of these nations, with the aim of extending its political system to that nation, or of oppressing it, or of controlling its destiny, in any way, then the United States will view any of such actions as the manifestation of sentiments unfriendly to the United States.

The Monroe Doctrine is a national policy. Its purpose is to promote the prosperity, the independence, and the happiness of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere and the islands in its geographic region; preserve the peace and safety of the United States; and make this hemisphere and the islands in its geographic region places of freedom, and not places of despotism.

The authority of the Monroe Doctrine came from its long observance from the time of its promulgation until the time the Communists took over the control of the destiny of Cuba. The fact the Monroe Doctrine had been in existence and observed and acquiesced in by European nations for so long was a national asset. It was one phase of our foreign policy that was definite. No foreign nation could misunderstand it. It had been our most important foreign policy for 137 years at the time it was violated in 1959 by the Soviet Union with impunity.

The United States rescued Cuba from the despotism of Spain in 1898 and administered the affairs of Cuba until 1906, at which time we gave Cuba her independence.

The Soviet Union has clearly and definitely violated the Monroe Doctrine. When the Soviet Union intervened in the affairs of the Cuban nation and extended its political system to the Cuban nation it did what the Monroe Doctrine said no European nation could do. The Soviet Union is controlling the destiny of Cuba today. For 142 years the Monroe Doctrine has proclaimed that no European nation can do this.

Why have we allowed the Soviet Union to control the destiny of a nation 90 miles from the mainland of the United States? Why does the United States allow an act which we have notified the world since 1823 we would consider unfriendly. Why did we enforce the Monroe Doctrine for 137 years and fail to enforce it in 1959. Our failure to act here is a mystery. We promulgated this doctrine when we were a weak nation. We proclaimed it when there was a Holy Alliance in Europe which consisted of Russia, Austria, Prussia, and France. We proclaimed this doctrine when both Russia and England made claims to that part of America which would have precluded the United States from the Pacific coast. We proclaimed it at a time when the Holy Alliance was declaring that it would engage in the most solemn manner to employ all of its means and unite all its efforts to put an end to the system of representative government. This Nation was courageous 142 years ago. It had been courageous down through the years until 1959 and that courage paid off.

The Monroe Doctrine has been one of our greatest assets. Now we sit with our arms folded and look the other way when it is violated. We are taking the stance of an indifferent giant.

NOTE.—Just as I finished writing what you have read above, the news came flashing over the television that President Johnson was sending marines to the Dominican Republic, which I believed then meant he intended to enforce the Monroe Doctrine. What has happened during the last few days has confirmed that belief. Three cheers for him. We are in a fight with communism to the death. Our leaders have dillydallied too long. We must stop communism now. We cannot do it at some future time.

Our leaders during the last few years have feared world opinion. We have no choice except to disregard world opinion when it interferes with our national interests. Besides, what our leaders during the recent past thought was world opinion, was nothing more than Communist propaganda. Our leaders have feared world opinion when they should have realized that when they act courageously and justly and for the benefit of the United States and weak nations they will mold world opinion to our side.

President Johnson, the great Texan, gave us a glimpse of the spirit of James Monroe, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman when he said: "We are resisting aggression and we will stay there and resist, whether we make friends or lose friends." When he said: "We don't propose to sit here with our arms folded and let the Communists set up a government anywhere in this hemisphere." And when he said: "We don't want to bury anyone, as I have said so many times before. But we do not intend to be buried." This is not only sound principle, but good commonsense.

As one American, I was heartsick when our leaders sat with their arms folded and allowed the Communists to take control of Cuba in 1959 in violation of the Monroe Doctrine. I am now thrilled, and I thank God, that we now have a leader who not only understands what must be done to preserve and safeguard this Nation and the Western Hemisphere, including any islands in its geographic region; but also has the courage to do it.

Joint Conference of Postal Employees Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 2, 1965, the Joint Conference of Brooklyn Postal Employees held a legislative and grievance rally in Brooklyn, N.Y. As a firm supporter of legislation beneficial to our loyal, hard-working postal employees, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a resolution adopted at said rally.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the resolution:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT LEGISLATIVE RALLY MAY 2, 1965

Whereas Postal Employees for many years have been treated as second-class citizens with regards to salary, fringe benefits and working conditions,

Whereas we constantly hear of the need for comparability of postal workers with outside industry,

Whereas the constant delay in improvements has resulted in lowered morale and considerable personnel turnover: Be it

Resolved, That the legislative and grievance rally of the Joint Conference of Brooklyn Postal Employees, assembled at the

Brooklyn Academy of Music on Sunday, May 2, 1965, endorse the following:

1. At least a 7-percent salary increase.
2. Overtime pay for weekend and holiday service.
3. Overtime for all substitute employees after 8 hours work or 40 hours per week.
4. Liberalized retirement legislation.
5. Improved fringe benefits including:
(a) Increased Government contributions to health insurance.
(b) Increased Government group health insurance.
6. Elimination of work measurement system.
7. Elimination of summer racking.
8. Freedom of peaceful demonstration.

Dope Peddling in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, instead of being labeled one of the crime centers of our country, Washington should be a city of exemplary character—a model if you will, for the world to admire. Especially during this season of the year when so many tourists visit this beautiful city, when young people from all over the country come here for education, culture, and general vacation sightseeing, we should set an example of decorum.

Instead our newspapers daily tell a sordid story. I enclose for the RECORD an editorial from the Southwest Virginia Enterprise of Tuesday, May 11. I call for action in reducing our incidence of crime in Washington as well as all over America:

DOPE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—A NATIONAL DISGRACE

Washington, D.C., is one of the crime centers of our country.

The state of affairs is reflected in the latest annual crime report, which showed that when dope peddling was suppressed, daylight housebreakings increased.

When asked by a reporter to clarify this relationship, a Washington official explained:

Early in 1964 the force decided to declare all-out war on the city's narcotic traffic. Scores of dope peddlers were jailed. Peddlers not jailed found they had a corner on the market, skyrocketed prices.

Consequently, hundreds of Washington addicts, unable to afford the increased cost, resorted to impulsive daytime housebreaking in search of extra money. Not until the jailed peddlers were released on bond and the market brought back to normal did the rash of daylight stealing subside.

This is a national disgrace. To think the Nation's Capital has become a nest of dope addicts, along with every conceivable crime. This latest phase of the crime-infested U.S. Capital produces the question we have asked before—who is responsible for the breakdown of law in Washington, D.C.—what are the reasons that sowed seeds that have produced such a horrible nightmare of crime? Something, someone, some reason has to be responsible. All Americans should be concerned—it is past the hour when the moral and spiritual decay be remedied. We contend the dope peddling, the crime—the actual danger that exists has caused hundreds of citizens to refrain from visiting their Nation's Capital. Uncle Sammie is very quick to see the trouble in other places—doubly true of below the Mason-Dixon line—but is almost blind in both eyes to what is happening in his own backyard.

Remarks by President Lyndon B. Johnson Before the National Homebuilders Association, May 11, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues President Johnson's remarks on May 11 before the National Homebuilders Association. His remarks follow:

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON BEFORE THE NATIONAL HOMEBUILDERS ASSOCIATION, MAY 11, 1965

Mr. Willett, ladies, and gentlemen, I thank you very much for your courtesy and your very nice reception. I appreciate Bernie Wooten's invitation to come over here and see the men that he had rather work with than me. Back in November, Bernie was in my office almost every day always telling me about these poor little fellows who need him so badly, to help them out. Well, judging by appearances here tonight, Bernie must have done you a lot of good. And I saw Bernie at the elevator and you have not done so badly by Bernie, either.

I wanted to come by for a brief visit tonight, live, and in person, for at least two reasons. First, I did not want anybody to complain that I had interrupted the Red Skelton hour on television, so we won't miss a single commercial. And, secondly, and far more importantly, I wanted to say a very few words about you and your great industry and this country that you have helped to build.

You have come to your Capitol in a very important month. This month of May 1965, is the 50th month of uninterrupted economic expansion in our country. That is the longest, and that is the strongest peacetime prosperity in American history. That is a very proud record, and each of you can be proud of your share in establishing it.

In these first 4 years of our expansion, you built about 6 million new housing units. You, and others in the construction industry, helped to create more than a half million new jobs. And you and your associates have helped to hold down business costs and building costs.

Today disposable incomes are rising for all of our families, and they are putting more into the homes they buy. In February 1961, the typical new home had a value of $16,000. Now that sales price is up to $20,400. But building costs over the past year have gone up only 2½ percent.

This expansion, which is benefitting all sections and all segments, must continue, and it will continue if all elements show restraint and show responsibility, as your organization does.

Yes, tonight we can say that these are good times in America but, far more, these are very exciting times. All throughout this land, Americans young and old are taking a new pride in doing what has too long gone undone, in our classrooms and in our cities across our countryside.

My wife left a little after daybreak this morning in two big Trailways buses with 100 people, touring the State of Virginia pointing out the beautiful places. We are going to expect each of you to go back to your homes and your States and carry a message that we not only want a peaceful America, we not only want a prosperous America, we want a beautiful America.

I don't believe that the abundance that we are enjoying is softening America either. We are sharpening our attack upon our problems. We are raising our standards and our sights. We are moving ahead to meet the promise and to fulfill the potential of our age.

Like the old biblical parable, we are, I believe, making wise use of the talents given to us, and I have faith that this will bring blessings upon our children, and old children's children, for generations to come.

We hope that in the very next few days we can have one of the best housing bills to ever come out of the Committee that we reported to the House for action.

On the broad front we are strong and we are stable, and we are successful and, above all, we are steady on our course. But for us, as for all who have gone before us in this century, our real test lies in how we meet our responsibilities in this big world in which we live.

Be they friend or be they foe, let none anywhere entertain the needless fear or the futile hope that this Nation will ever falter in meeting all of its responsibilities.

Yes, we have responsibilities to freedom and we shall meet them. We have responsibilities to peace and we shall honor them. We seek accord among all nations and understanding among all peoples.

Our first purpose—America's only purpose—is to work with others for the good of all mankind, but let this be clear: If choice must be made, we would rather than men quarrel with our actions to preserve peace than to course us through eternity for inaction that might lose both our peace and our freedom.

Thank you and good night.

Loyalty Day Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 1, 1965, the Brooklyn Council, Kings County Veterans of Foreign Wars, held a Loyalty Day celebration and parade in Brooklyn, N.Y. Leon J. Elterman, past county commander, VFW, was the master of ceremonies and addresses were given by Stanley Zielinski, senior vice county commander; Borough President Abe Stark; Vincent J. DiMattina, senior vice commander, VFW Department of New York; Hon. James V. Mangano, administrative director of the supreme court, Kings County; Representative HUGH L. CAREY; and myself.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address:

Today, while we pause briefly to rededicate ourselves to loyalty, more than 25,000 American servicemen are proving theirs in the steaming, guerrilla-infested jungles of South Vietnam, lonely guardians of our most remote

outpost in the long struggle to contain Communist imperialism.

As of last week, 348 of them had been killed in action; 126 had died in accidents involved with their duties, and 2,049 had been wounded in action. This cost in lives and blood undoubtedly will rise—how much so, nobody knows.

Our involvement in South Vietnam is, as you know, a bitterly controversial issue, in public forums, on college campuses, and in the editorial columns of the newspapers. I feel, personally, that the vast majority of thinking Americans support President Johnson's resolute determination to keep South Vietnam free. I can tell you that I do.

But those who oppose President Johnson's policy of firmness, and would have us get out of South Vietnam at whatever cost in prestige and strategic advantage, seem to have an impact far out of proportion to their numbers. They have a perfect right to express their opinion, certainly, and they do express it, loudly if not always clearly.

Those of us who support President Johnson's commitment to prevent a Communist takeover of South Vietnam also have a right to express our opinion. But how many of us do it? We hear and read the arguments of those who want this country to abandon all southeast Asia to whatever fate might befall it, and maybe we angrily disagree—but do we disagree with anybody, in conversation or in writing? Not often.

True, we're busy—we can't be continually writing to the newspapers and getting into arguments, but we can and should make our views known. How? There are several ways. If a public figure takes a stand that you disagree with, write him a courteous, reasoned rebuttal of his argument. He'll read it. Not everybody agrees with me and those who don't aren't always courteous or reasonable, but I read their letters.

But there is an even better way. Think for a moment of those 25,000 servicemen out there in South Vietnam, killing and being killed in a conflict without banners and glory. We read of their sacrifices and their gallantry and pass on to the sports pages or whatever else happens to gain our attention at the moment.

Now in our circle of friends it is possible that a friend, or a relative or a friend of a friend, is among those 25,000 who are today proving their loyalty in South Vietnam. If such is the case, why not demonstrate our loyalty to them?

Why not sit down tonight and write the 1 man in that 25,000 that you might know, or know of? It doesn't have to be a long letter; just tell him he is out there in a good cause, that he is not forgotten, and that you are with him 100 percent. In doing so, you will lighten his burden—and your own. Thank you.

Customs Bureau Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune and also the Evansville, Ind., Press in their recent editions contain the following editorials commending the Bureau of Customs for its economic policy in eliminating patronage jobs. These two newspapers are to be commended for calling the public's attention to the economic policy of the Johnson administration.

Great prominence is generally given by some newspapers to expenditures but they fail to call the public's attention to the great number of economic programs which the Congress and the administration, from time to time, have inaugurated.

The editorials follow:

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, Mar. 23, 1965]

EXPENSIVE CUSTOMS

George Washington apparently did a commendable job of setting up an administrative system to run the Customs Bureau, but President Johnson thinks it's time for some changes. He should find little opposition.

He has announced a major reorganization of the Customs Bureau which may ultimately save the taxpayers $9 million a year. About $1 million of this saving will result from the abolishing of 45 top political patronage jobs. Some of these 45 collectors who will be dropped retain their private jobs while drawing up to $22,000 a year from the Government. About half a dozen other patronage jobs also are slated to be erased.

Major changes in the archaic customs collection system will include establishment of 6 new regional offices, with about 25 subordinate offices to replace the present 133 now operating.

Either House of Congress can veto the plan within 60 days and block it, but there is no indication this will happen and it should not. Expensive duplication and needless patronage are luxurious customs that even the Customs Bureau should not enjoy.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Press, Mar. 31, 1965]

CUSTOMS-ARY BELLOWS

Inevitably, we suppose, there will be the usual bellows of rage on Capitol Hill after members study President Johnson's plan to modernize the Bureau of Customs.

This has long been a prime source of patronage appointments with which Senators and Representatives rewarded their friends. It now is to be consolidated and many of its jobs put under Civil Service, meaning employees will be chosen on merit rather than political pull.

The bellowers, of course, will advance all sorts of fine reasons for leaving the Customs Bureau alone. Even though their real motive is to preserve their choice plums.

But if your Congressman is one who squawks, ask him how he feels about this feature of the President's plan—that it will save taxpayers an estimated $9 million a year.

Basic English From Derwinski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read the following editorial which appeared this week in the Chicago's American commending the forthright performance of our distinguished and straight-thinking colleague, Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois, at the recent Dublin meeting of the Interparliamentary Union. This positive response by a representative of the United States to the efforts of the Communists to divert attention from violations of international agreements and their imposition of totalitarian regimes on once-free nations certainly represents a valuable contribution by an unusually able Member of Congress:

BASIC ENGLISH FROM DERWINSKI

Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois, who plainly favors calling things by their right name, got under the hides of the Communists at a recent meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Dublin. He also helped prevent the Russians from turning the meeting into an international denunciation of the United States for its policies in Vietnam.

The Interparliamentary Union is 72 years old and it meets twice a year. DERWINSKI was appointed first to attend the 1959 meeting in Warsaw, because he is fluent in Polish. At the meeting last month he was discussing the nations of Eastern Europe, and used the term "Russian satellites." A spokesman for the Communist bloc protested that DERWINSKI had insulted "the free and democratic nations" of Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland. Said DERWINSKI: "OK, I'll call them puppets instead."

This was not satisfactory to the Communist protester either. So DERWINSKI went on calling them satellites.

DERWINSKI did some more blunt speaking which will not endear him to Senators J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas; ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alabama; FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho; JOSEPH B. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; and WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon. I. Spiridonov, chief of the Soviet group, was denouncing President Johnson as a maker of wars; he quoted speeches by the Democratic Senators as proving that Johnson's course was not approved by the leaders in his own party. When he had finished DERWINSKI said:

"These men do not speak for the American Government—or for the American people."

They do not. They seem to be speaking for a policy the Communists would find ideal: That when the Communists start a war of liberation, the West should accept their right to wage it and let them win it.

Streamlining Bureau of Customs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, in the near future, the House will be called upon to consider Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965, the purpose of which is to modernize the Bureau of Customs in the Department of the Treasury.

An editorial in one of the most widely read newspapers in the San Joaquin Valley of California, the Stockton Record, recently made reference in its editorial columns to the need for reorganization of the Customs Bureau. At this time I wish to bring to the attention of the House the editorial which appeared in the March 25 edition of the Stockton Record. The article follows:

STREAMLINING BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

The administration's proposed streamlining of the Bureau of Customs, one of the oldest Federal agencies, appears to be the

sort of reform that is needed in our Government. It would have the effect of making Customs a more efficient, tightly knit agency, and in the process would bring worthwhile savings.

The reorganization would establish six regional offices—in Boston, New York, Miami, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Chicago—that would oversee the operation of some 25 subordinate districts. This setup would replace the present system under which there are 116 independent field offices that report directly to Washington and have no regional supervision.

It is anticipated that this change will bring annual savings of about $9 million, partly through elimination of numerous jobs. And there, politically speaking, is the rub. Congress will not be eager to eliminate the jobs of collectors of customs and others which have for a long time been succulent patronage items. The reorganization plan may encounter some trouble in Congress on this score.

The plan makes such good sense, however, that the chances of its being killed—as could be done by either House of Congress—are not great. It provides, among other things, that all jobs would henceforth be under civil service. This, coupled with the proposed modernization of procedures now in part outmoded, promises to lead to smoother and more economical functioning of an important agency.

Rural Electrification's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, on the 30th anniversary of the beginning of rural electrification in the United States it gives me pleasure to call attention to the changing pattern in life in rural America made possible by electric power brought to the areas by the programs of Rural Electrification Administration. Today after 30 years of REA loans and technical assistance in rural electrification more than 98 percent of our farms are electrified. Thirty years ago electricity for light and power was available to people living in cities and towns but at the turn of the century the American farmer's way of life had changed little since the first colonies were formed.

In 1935 when President Franklin D. Roosevelt created the Rural Electrification Administration as an emergency relief program 10.9 percent of our farms had central station electric service, but now the lights have been turned on in rural America. In 1964 the average consumer on the lines of REA borrowers used 451 kilowatt hours per month. This is 10 times the early estimates made by REA and cooperative leaders. In the years while the rural consumption of electric power showed such a remarkable increase, the individual farmers' production of farm goods also showed a remarkable increase—300 percent. Soil conservation practices, increased use of fertilizers, insecticides, the tractor, improved breeding methods, new and better roads, and a considerable list of other developments in the practice of farming all share credit for improvement in yield and quality of farm production, but electric power was a significant factor and on this 30th anniversary of REA we acknowledge the accomplishments of the REA, under the Rural Electrification Act passed in 1936, and of the rural electric cooperatives and other borrowers of REA funds for building the lines that carry power to this Nation's farms. Many aspects of farming would be unthinkable without electrification. Three decades ago dairying was confined largely to northern States. Warm temperatures with no cooling process available was just one aspect of the problem. Today many southern States stand high in the production of milk and milk products. The modern, sanitary dairy depends on electric power today and the same advantages of electric power apply to other phases of farming. The industrial revolution of the 19th century transformed life in the cities and rural electrification helped make a revolution in agriculture possible. The fight is being won, day by day, to bring electricity to rural America and bring down the cost of electricity, and on this 30th anniversary of the REA I salute the rural electrification movement and all the farm families and the others, who have brought the blessings of electricity to rural America.

Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, many of us may be unaware that members of the Peace Corps are constantly receiving praise from the citizens and officials of the countries to which they are assigned.

While the work of the Peace Corps men is not always under the most favorable conditions, the recipients of their labors often are observant and appreciative. The following editorial from the April 2, 1965, issue of the Montego—Jamaica—Bay Beacon is only one example that such is the case:

PEACE CORPS

Now that the American Peace Corps has established a branch office in Montego Bay, we take this opportunity of welcoming the organization to Montego Bay, although they have been working in the area ever since the late President Kennedy founded the volunteers over 3 years ago.

The organization is publicity shy, maintaining that no purpose is served by shouting about what they are doing. Because of this, their work is not as widely known about or appreciated as it might be.

The movement is definitely the finest concept of foreign aid which has ever been evolved. The volunteers are drawn from young people of good education who spend 2 years of living and teaching in an underdeveloped country. They are all people well-qualified to teach in their chosen field and most have university degrees.

They receive no pay for the work they do during their 2 years, but they receive living allowance from the U.S. Government.

The volunteers have virtually no funds at their disposal so that they can give nothing but themselves and their knowledge. They live with families wherever they go and apart from the actual teaching they may do in schools, community centers or hospitals, they take a very active part in the community life, bringing fresh ideas where they can.

In all this, however, they do not regard themselves as missionaries. They feel that the teaching is a two-way traffic and that they learn at least as much as they teach by absorbing a different culture, a different outlook and a different way of life.

The National Origin Quota System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it has been amply demonstrated that national origin has very little to do with loyalty to this Nation and its institutions. Americans whose ancestors have come from every nation under the sun have rallied to the colors in all our wars. No group has a monopoly on either virtue or rascality and the concept that certain national origin groups make better citizens than others has been exploded time and time again.

At present, the Judiciary Committee is holding hearings on proposals to eliminate the discriminatory national origin quota system in our immigration law.

Recently, the mayor of Hoboken, N.J., Hon. John J. Grogan, and the city council of that city, have approved a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to eliminate the discriminatory clause in the national origin quota system.

The city fathers in the city of Hoboken have struck an important blow against the concept that some immigrants make better citizens than others. I am proud to include at this point in the RECORD this forward-looking resolution.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION CURRENTLY BEFORE THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEES OF BOTH NATIONAL CHAMBERS WHICH WOULD ABOLISH THE DISCRIMINATORY CLAUSE OF THE NATIONAL ORIGIN QUOTA SYSTEM

Whereas the Walter-McCarran Act of 1952 terminated racial bars on immigration, but continued the quota system based on national origin; and

Whereas such provisions thereby continue ethnic discrimination which should have no place in American life; and

Whereas as a result of arbitrary national quotas, many persons seeking a home here are denied while other national quotas go unfilled: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the mayor and Council of the City of Hoboken, That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation currently before the Judiciary Committees of both National Chambers which would abolish the discriminatory clause of the national quota system; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to members of the

Judiciary Committees of both National Chambers, to members of the Hoboken congressional delegation and to our two U.S. Senators.

The Effect of Foreign Aid on the U.S. Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, no man can deny the fact that the foreign aid program of the United States has been our most effective insurance against the third worldwide conflict. In my opinion, had it not been for our foreign aid program, I seriously doubt that we would be meeting here in the Congress today. Had it not been for the Marshall plan, which my late father, Hon. John Kee, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee so vigorously supported, the chances are that we would have been defending our own shores from invasion by foreign troops long before this date.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully endorse the following statement concerning the effect of foreign aid on the U.S. economy:

THE EFFECT OF FOREIGN AID ON THE U.S. ECONOMY

Much has been said, pro and con, concerning the effect of foreign assistance upon the U.S. economy. When one examines the facts the impact of the aid program has been very favorable to American industry and export markets.

The following excerpt from the Agency for International Development's Summary Presentation to Congress on the proposed foreign assistance program for fiscal year 1966 discusses AID's policies and their effect upon the U.S. economic system:

AID IN PERSPECTIVE: AID AND THE U.S. ECONOMY

The mutual defense and development programs proposed for fiscal year 1966 represent the smallest burden the American economy has been asked to bear since the beginning of the Marshall plan. It is a burden the American economy can easily support. It represents one-half of 1 percent of our GNP. In per capita terms, it represents a drop from $30.52 for every American in 1949, during the Marshall plan, to a cost of $17.51 per person for fiscal year 1966. (Per capita GNP in the United States has nearly doubled in this time, rising from $1,760 in 1949 to an estimated $3,320 today.)

The U.S. procurement policies followed over the past 4 years have minimized the drain of our assistance programs on our balance of payments. Over 85 percent of all aid dollars is now committed directly for purchase of U.S. goods and services.

Another result of AID's procurement policy is a substantial export business for American private enterprise. AID economic programs alone financed the export of nearly a billion dollars in American products during fiscal year 1964, and American shipping lines were paid more than $80 million to carry these products to their destinations in the less-developed countries.

In effect, the AID program helps to introduce American products and American industrial know-how to new markets. American farm surpluses provided as aid to Japan after World War II changed the Japanese diet, and Japan is now the biggest single cash customer for U.S. farm exports—some $500 million per year. The American Coal Exporters Association traces more than $250 million in current annual coal export business directly to new markets opened by aid shipments of U.S. coal to postwar Europe and Japan.

The most important long-term benefits of the mutual development program, however, are those that stem from the expanding export markets that are the product of successful development.

Since the Marshall plan and the recovery of Western Europe, our exports to European markets have more than doubled. They have quadrupled to Japan during the same period.

Today, with the success of their effort and our assistance, the first of the developing countries are emerging as self-supporting cash customers. As Israel approaches self-support, American commercial exports to that country increase steadily. U.S. commercial exports to Israel (those not AID-financed) have nearly tripled—from $85 million since 1958 to $235 million in 1963—and they continue to increase at a rate of 15 to 20 percent a year. U.S. commercial exports to the Republic of China on Taiwan, where economic aid ends this year, rose from $49 million in 1962 to an estimated $80 to $85 million in 1964. They are sure to rise further as the Taiwanese standard of living continues to improve.

The expended trade opportunities already opened by the process of development make it clear that the economic progress of other free countries is in the direct, long-term interest of our own economy.

Jews Support Aid to Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, when the first supplemental appropriation money bill came before this session of the Congress on January 26, 1965, in the amount of $1,600 million to take care of the net realized losses of our agriculture surplus sales abroad, and restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I offered a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to cut off any further shipments and sales of surplus commodities to Dictator Nasser of Egypt. Members will recall that 76 Democrats joined our solid phalanx of 128 Republicans in support of my motion which carried 204 to 177.

After the measure went over to the other body, it came back to the House in a watered-down form that, for all practical purposes, nullified my amendment. I asked for another vote in the House on a motion to instruct the conferees to stand by the House position and to my dismay 41 Democrats, including several of the Jewish faith, of whom I would least have expected it, succumbed to White House pressure and reversed their vote of a week before.

Of course, ever since offering my amendment I have received volumes of correspondence, practically all in support of my motion, and we are continually getting comments of one kind or another. Just the other day a rather interesting article came across my desk from the North Woodmere Jewish Center, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the article signed by Theodore Jungreis, rabbi, and Jerald C. Newman, congregation president, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From KOL HO-AM, March 1965]

JEWS SUPPORT AID TO NASSER

The State of Israel has been the bastion of democracy in the Middle East and has been constantly under military or economic attack by the Arab nations. This steadily mounting pressure has been maintained and directed by Dictator Nasser, of Egypt.

Let us examine the facts. The State of Israel has steadily supported the free countries of the world in the United Nations. Israel has been steadfast in its support of the United States. Israel has made no "deals" with Communist nations. Israel has attempted through peaceful means to build anew, to reclaim the desert, and to be a homeland to millions of homeless Jews. Israel has opened its doors to displaced persons of many nations.

Israel has offered, in fact has demanded in the forum of the United Nations that the Arabs sit down at a peace conference; unfortunately to no avail. On the other hand Egypt has refused to permit Americans citizens of Jewish birth to tour its country. Egypt has mortgaged its economy, building rockets, hiring "Nazi" technicians, has made economic, political, and military deals with Communist nations, honored Communist leaders and purchased modern Soviet tanks and jet bombers.

Recently, Nasser permitted the John F. Kennedy Library in Cairo to be burned to the ground and an unarmed American civilian plane to be shot down. Nasser brags about his arms shipments to pro-Communist Congolese rebels, in direct violation of U.N. policies, which arms are being used to massacre the innocents of many heritages, religions, and nations. Nasser has used American financial aid to further other anti-American activities including tacit support of North Vietnam, North Korea, and Cuba. Nasser has told America "to go to ——."

As April 15 approaches we as taxpayers who support this dictator can well ask "Why?" The absurdity of this situation has now reached new heights; heights which we as Americans with sincere belief in our Jewish heritage cannot accept. Within the last month the following occurred in the Congress of the United States:

In the House of Representatives a bill was proposed to permit President Johnson to grant up to $400 million in additional aid to Dictator Nasser. The House, including Nassau County's three Congressmen and Suffolk County's two Congressmen, voted against this proposal, and assisted in its defeat. The U.S. Senators from New York were divided in their opinion, Senator JAVITS voting against and Senator KENNEDY voting in favor of the proposal. It was then resubmitted to the House and a shocking change took place. Of the five Congressmen representing Long Island three continued to vote "no." They were Congressman PIKE, Suffolk Democrat and Republican Congressman GROVER, Nassau-Suffolk, and WYDLER, Nassau. And then shame of shames our two Nassau Congressmen of Jewish decent saw fit to vote in favor of granting more aid to Nasser.

Congressman HERBERT TENZER (who represents us) and Congressman LESTER WOLFF recently were elected to their high office and yet notwithstanding their own previous statements that they were unalterably opposed to giving aid to Nasser, they reversed themselves forsaking their own heritage and voted in favor of granting the President to give this additional blood money to Egypt.

Write to Congressman HERBERT TENZER, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D.C,. and let him know that we will not sit by while votes, that morally and ethically have no basis in fact, are cast.

Tribute to George Caffrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, the many friends and associates of George T. Caffrey were shocked and sorrowed beyond words by the news of his sudden death last Saturday. As the House Member whose office benefited most from his wise and knowledgeable assistance, I feel the loss more deeply than others. I have lost a trusted and valued associate and a true friend.

But more than that, George Caffrey's skill in the congressional field was a tribute to all the House and Senate aids without whose help no congressional office could function as it should. All of us received great credit in the press and in public favor for a wide range of results that we know full well stemmed from the unstinting work of our staff aids—people like George Caffrey. They are the unsung heroes of Capitol Hill.

When a Congressman passes on, considerable attention is paid to the event. But attention is also deserved by the men who stand behind the Congressmen, the men without whom Congress would be a snarl of tangled confusion.

It is the George Caffreys who make Congress work and who strengthen the ties between Representative and constituent. My predecessors from northern New York in the House of Representatives and I have been more fortunate than most in that we enjoyed and benefited from the services of George Caqrey. So also, did the people we serve.

His service to the public—for his work in Congress was just that—will stand as a constant reminder of his selflessness and as a model for all congressional aids, present and future. There will never be another like him.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to place in the Appendix of the RECORD articles and editorials on the passing of Mr. Caffrey:

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, May 10, 1965]

GEORGE T. CAFFREY

George T. Caffrey, who died unexpectedly of a heart attack on Saturday night, was actively identified with the Washington political scene for more than 26 years. He went to Washington in 1940 as secretary to the late Congressman Wallace E. Pierce after abandoning a successful newspaper career for politics. Then he served in a similar capacity during the time that Congressman Clarence E. Kilburn held office. When ROBERT C. McEWEN took over the congressional duties the first of the year as successor to Mr. Kilburn, Mr. Caffrey was retained as administrative assistant.

There is little question that Mr. Caffrey, of Arlington, Va., formerly of Plattsburgh, was one of the most able congressional aids in the Nation's Capital. He knew Washington thoroughly. He enjoyed a close association with the congressional leaders, heads of the various departments and their associates, which proved to be of great value in performing the duties demanded by his position. He was widely respected for his ability, of his desire to be of assistance in any problem, big or small. Many hours of work meant nothing to him.

Mr. Caffrey was a friendly man, quiet and unassuming. He had a wide circle of acquaintances both in northern New York and in Washington. When Congressman Pierce named Mr. Caffrey as his secretary in 1939 he made a wise choice. He had selected a man who was later to prove so valuable to Mr. Pierce, Mr. Kilburn, and later Mr. McEWEN. A Congressman depends considerably upon his secretary to take care of problems that may arise in a district. The demands on such a position are enormous and an efficient, qualified and able secretary like Mr. Caffrey does much to build up the political strength of a Congressman.

The loss of Mr. Caffrey will be keenly felt by Congressman McEWEN. It will be difficult to find a successor who will measure up to the stature of Mr. Caffrey. In recent years he had not been in the best of health but his death at the age of 60 came unexpectedly and shock to his many friends in northern New York and Washington.

[From the Oswego (N.Y.) Palladium-Times, May 11, 1965]

GEORGE T. CAFFREY

We don't suppose 1 person in 100 in the vast area of this congressional district knew George Caffrey personally but for more than a quarter century he has looked after their interests in Washington, solved their problems and fulfilled their requests wherever possible. George, who died unexpectedly Saturday night at the age of 60, was one of those knowledgeable, vastly experienced and shrewdly resourceful pros who—always discreetly in the shadow of their employers, Members of the House and Senate—get the day-to-day business of Congress done.

In the maze of bureaucratic Washington a person with some business to transact with some arm of Government might be bounced from office to office for days before arriving at last at the desk of the man who could help him. George Caffrey knew who to call, what to say and how to present his cases to achieve maximum results. He had, over the years, developed scores of contacts throughout the Capital that have proved invaluable to the people of this area. Notable among his efforts was the work he did under the direction of Representative Clarence E. Kilburn in securing the approvals necessary preliminary to congressional action on Oswego harbor projects. And there was no request too trivial for him to handle—an immigration problem, an obscure Government publication, a tour of the FBI or even tickets to the Army-Navy game. He dealt with them all with equal effectiveness.

A quiet, well-informed and pleasant man to be with, George Caffrey was an extraordinarily able public servant, one of those career men who over the years get about as close to indispensability as one can be. He may not have been widely known in the district but he knew the district and its problems intimately, and the people of this section have in his death lost a good friend in Washington.

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, May 10, 1965]

GEORGE CAFFREY DIES AT 60; WAS AID TO THREE CONGRESSMEN

WASHINGTON, May 10.—George T. Caffrey, 60, Arlington, Va., administrative assistant to Representative ROBERT C. McEWEN, Republican, of Ogdensburg, N.Y., died of a heart attack at 8:30 Saturday night, while visiting his daughter, Mrs. John Patrick (Gail) Gardes, in Poughkeepsie, N.Y. His wife was with him at the time.

Mr. Caffrey, who had served as secretary to Clarence E. Kilburn, Republican, Malone, N.Y., and his predecessor, the late Representative Wallace E. Pierce, Republican, of Plattsburgh, N.Y., had not been ill and his sudden death was unexpected.

The funeral will be held at Our Lady of Lourdes Church, Arlington, Wednesday.

Burial will be in National Memorial Park Cemetery, Falls Church, Va.

Congressman McEWEN paid tribute to Mr. Caffrey today as a friend, as well as his chief of staff.

"Words fail to express my shock, profound sorrow, and deep feeling of personal loss on the passing of George T. Caffrey," Mr. McEWEN said.

"More than the able congressional assistant that he was he was a trusted aid, wise counselor, and warm personal friend."

The former Plattsburgh newspaperman, who had served three Representatives in a vital role for 26½ years, was said to be one of the most able congressional aids in the National Capital. He was thoroughly conversant with the problems of the northern New York congressional district and became widely known for his efforts in behalf of district residents.

Mr. Caffrey came to Washington in 1939 after managing the successful election campaign for the late Representative Pierce. Following Mr. Pierce's death, he became associated in a similar role with Representative Kilburn and remained with the Malone Congressman during his long tenure in office as Representative of the 31st District.

Following Mr. Kilburn's retirement from the national political scene, Mr. Caffrey remained as administrative assistant to Mr. Kilburn's successor, Representative McEWEN.

With Mr. Caffrey when he died was his wife, Marian. He is survived by his widow and two children, a son, Anthony, and a daughter, Mrs. Gardes. Four grandchildren also survive.

Also surviving is a sister, Mrs. Harry (Mary) Twilliger, Plattsburgh. A brother, Arthur, is dead.

Born in Plattsburgh, Mr. Caffrey attended schools, in that city. He started a newspaper career, working successively on the old Plattsburgh Press, the onetime Daily News and finally as a member of the editorial staff of the Plattsburgh Republican. Since then, the Press and Republican merged.

Mr. Caffrey was a Plattsburgh newspaperman in the days of fierce news competition during an era when three daily newspapers were in the field. It was a time of violence during prohibition when firing at bootleg liquor caravans out of Canada was commonplace.

Mr. Caffrey's aggressive reporting soon earned him the nickname of "Scoops," a name he liked and lived up to.

He was active in the newspaper business during a time when reporters were on call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. His close association with the border patrol and customs during the hectic, fast-paced era of whisky-smuggling earned him the respect of his associates in the business and his news beats were frequent.

One of his best news beats came when nearly a dozen Federal agents were arrested and indicted for accepting bribes from bootleggers. Most of the officers served time in the Federal penitentiary at Atlanta.

Following the violence of prohibition, Mr. Caffrey gradually became intensely interested in the political affairs of the then big 33d (now the 31st) Congressional District. He followed candidates closely and made friends with them. Finally, he decided to make the jump from newspaper work to politics and plunged into the campaign of the late Representative Pierce, a Clinton County

candidate not given too much chance of election.

Mr. Pierce won handily, however, and offered Mr. Caffrey the job as congressional secretary. Mr. Caffrey accepted and moved to the Washington area where he had since remained helping direct the careers of Mr. Pierce, Mr. Kilburn, and Representative McEwen.

Mr. Caffrey married the former Marian Benning, of Clyde, N.Y.

Mr. Caffrey's success on behalf of the Representatives he worked for likely was his quick response to constituents with problems. His tenacity and ability to follow through on appeals for congressional help also helped him attain the respect of his employers and the constituency as well.

Nominally, Mr. Caffrey was quiet and retiring. He worked hard and long hours. In 1962 he was seriously ill with pneumonia and was hospitalized for some time. He recovered slowly from the illness.

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Times, May 11, 1965]

GEORGE CAFFREY RITES PLANNED—FUNERAL FOR CONGRESSIONAL AID TO BE WEDNESDAY IN ARLINGTON, VA.

Mr. Caffrey, whose career spanned the White House tenure of four Presidents, served as chief aid to Representatives Wallace E. Pierce, Clarence E. Kilburn, and Robert C. McEwen, all of whom represented northern New York communities. His 25 years of Capitol Hill service made him about the dean of legislative assistants and he was extremely popular with congressional offices regardless of political affiliation.

His great familiarity with committee staff and key officials of the executive agencies enabled him to keep several steps ahead of announced decisions and breaking events.

Frequently when it was impossible to get something done, arrange an appointment or get a visitor into a special tour, Mr. Caffrey found his longstanding connections around Washington invaluable and the impossible became the possible.

A dour-faced man who rarely smiled, Mr. Caffrey nevertheless had a good sense of humor and prized friendships, of which he had many. His assessments of individuals and events were frank, measured and based on a wealth of experience.

His loyalty to the men he served in Congress was unwavering, and their welfare was paramount with him. In addition to serving as chief of staff, Mr. Caffrey used his newspaper experience as a solid background for handling his Congressman's press relations.

He regularly referred to the man he served as "the boss."

One embellishment he brought to his office was a large, overgrown brandy snifter-type glass bowl, which he kept filled with small candies, and visitors regularly dropped in while "passing by" to help themselves.

Mr. Caffrey rarely allowed himself to be roused to sharp anger. His advice to those whose blood pressure started to rise at some setback was always keep sweet.

He delighted in attending occasional Republican Party functions in New York City, and he was active in the Republican congressional secretaries' organization known as the Bull Elephants.

One of his hobbies was the collection of models of airplanes and rockets and missiles that brightened the Capitol Hill office. For many years he attended the opening-day baseball games in Washington, but skipped recent ones because of the raw weather.

His death prevented Mr. Caffrey from participating in a forthcoming Washington "first"—a reception President and Mrs. Johnson are planning for top congressional aids.

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Times May 11, 1965]

KILBURN PAYS TRIBUTE TO LATE GEORGE CAFFREY

MALON, May 11.—Former Congressman Clarence E. Kilburn, Malone, today termed the passing of George T. Caffrey, 60, Arlington, Va., as a terrible blow to the entire Kilburn family."

Mr. Caffrey, who served for 25 years as administrative assistant to the Malone Republican in Washington, died of a heart attack while visiting his sister, Mrs. John Patrick (Gail) Gardes, in Poughkeepsie Saturday.

Mr. Kilburn said that Mr. Caffrey was a "very close friend * * * and the best assistant on Capitol Hill." He said the congressional aid was "an honest and forthright man who worked hard for the north country."

Mr. Kilburn continued: "I don't know, in the 25 years I was there (Washington), how I could have gotten along without him. Mr. Caffrey's death was a terrible blow to the entire Kilburn family."

Mr. Caffrey served as administrative assistant to Representative Robert C. McEwen, Republican, of Ogdensburg, up to the time of his death. Before serving as Mr. Kilburn's chief of staff, Mr. Caffrey was the top aid to Representative Wallace E. Pierce, Republican, of Plattsburgh, for 1 year.

[From the Ogdensburg Journal, May 10, 1965]

GEORGE T. CAFFREY, VETERAN AID TO THREE CONGRESSMEN, DIED SATURDAY

Congressman McEwen said today:

"Words fail to express my shock, my profound sorrow and deep feeling of personal loss on the passing of George T. Caffrey. More than the able congressional assistant that he was, he was a trusted aid, a wise counselor, and a warm personal friend."

Mrs. Esther VanWagoner Tufty, Washington correspondent for the Ogdensburg Journal, said:

"With George Caffrey as administrative assistant to Congressmen from the 31st District for more than 25 years, the district has really had two Congressmen in the House of Representatives. And yet, George would not like me to say that, for fear he would be taking something away from the three men whom he served.

"George T. Caffrey was a newspaper reporter's kind of administrative assistant. He knew news—sometimes even before it happened. And he kept his news sources informed. He would evaluate the importance of national and world events to the local congressional district. Add to that his steady friendship and willingness to assist a reporter. Yet he always kept his loyalty to the Congressmen intact.

"George Caffrey was an administrative assistant extraordinary."

Israel's 17th Anniversary

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, May 14 marks the 17th anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel, and it gives me pleasure to congratulate her and her people on this momentous occasion.

The State of Israel was born with great struggle as was our own United States. The founders of Israel and its people have much of the pioneering spirit that our forefathers had—we built a nation from the wilderness, Israel has built a nation from the desert. It is this spirit and determination which is responsible for the almost unbelievable strides she has made in the short period of 17 years.

We were the first country to recognize Israel as a nation and we want to be in the forefront of those congratulating her on her success and reassure her of our continued support and best wishes for continued growth and prosperity.

Reinstatement of the Bracero Program Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said lately about the bracero program—proponents of its abolishment have advanced beautiful arguments that we have a plentiful domestic labor force to do the work of the bracero; that the fresh fruit and vegetable growers would be well served; that the Nation's welfare would be enhanced by the utilization of this domestic labor.

We are now confronted with not the fine-sounding logic—but with the grim reality. I hope every Member of Congress will read the following communications, describing in real terms the already devastating effects of the ill-advised action to abolish the bracero program. I think it is incumbent upon all Members of Congress to seriously consider the reinstatement of the bracero program—vital not only to the grower, the canner, and the trucker, but to the economy of our entire Nation.

The communications follow:

MENDOCINO COUNTY POMONA GRANGE, NO. 10,
Willits, Calif., May 5, 1965.

Hon. DON CLAUSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CLAUSEN: At their regular meeting on April 25, 1965, members of Mendocino County Pomona Grange No. 10 heard the reading of the following, which is based on a report originally presented at a meeting of Little Lake Grange No. 670, Willits, Calif., by a member of its committee on agriculture. The members voted to send the report to several persons, and this copy is for you.

"Pertaining to agriculture in the State of California, it appears that we have a major problem, the seriousness of which a good proportion of our population does not fully realize. This problem exists because of the abolishment of Public Law 78, preventing Mexican nationals from coming into California to work at harvesting our farm products, as most Americans are unwilling to go to the fields and work under the scorching sun for $1.25 an hour.

"According to the Santa Rosa Press Democrat for March 28, our honorable Secretary

of Labor, Mr. W. Willard Wirtz, after a 4-day tour of California farm areas, said: 'There will be no reactivation of Public Law 78 under which Mexican nationals were imported to the United States to work in the fields.' Mr. Wirtz also said that increased labor costs would have to be assumed by the consumers.

"Also, Mr. Wirtz says that since we have 500,000 unemployed workers in California we should not import any foreign labor. That sounds logical, but I believe that he overlooked the fact that few Americans will work for $1.25 an hour, which for forty hours would amount to $50 per week, from which there would be payroll deductions, namely Federal withholdings, social security, California unemployment insurance, and accident insurance. Also, a worker may live from 5 to 50 miles from the farm and need gas and oil to commute, so he may not clear more than $40 per week. However, if he goes once a week to the unemployment office he may collect a $55 check, with no deductions, and go home and do no work.

"We note that Mr. Albert Tieburg, director of California Agricultural Employment, recently said that we needed 8,700 workers immediately in the Stockton, Salinas, and Coachella Valley areas. At the February meeting of Mendocino Pomona Grange it was reported that at Oxnard they had rounded up 500 fellows to pick lemons starting on a Monday, and by Saturday they had only 17 or 18 left, and these were too old to go up ladders to pick lemons, so the lemons will be rotting on the ground, and the prices will go up. We recently heard on the radio that in Stockton area they rounded up over 800 workers to pick asparagus, and by the third day they had about 80 left.

"We know that the planting and harvesting of vegetables must be done at the right time of the year; also the fruit from orchards must be picked at the right time or it will spoil, and therefore it will not wait for our Congress and the rest of the Government to be just talking about Public Law 78 that has been abolished, or the 'green card' to braceros, and the rest of the theories and technicalities.

"We have heard that, because of the uncertainty of harvesting, a few of our canneries have already moved to Mexico, and more will be moving, because they are sure of abundant products and labor there, so in another 2 or 3 years the million and a half of cannery and processing workers will be out of jobs, and California will have two or three times more unemployed collecting $55 per week, and our 15 billion agricultural industry will have gone to the dogs, and Uncle Sam will have lost the cannery and processing companies' income tax, and the workers' income tax, while Mexico will be gaining these taxes. Also, the farmers won't have to pay the State the $84 million that they paid last year to the State, for unemployment benefits, but still the State will have many more unemployed people to support.

"Having been for many years in our merchant marine service, I remember that as far back as 1918 our California dried fruits, such as raisins, prunes, apricots, pears and peaches, and walnuts and almonds were being exported to North European countries by many thousands of tons, and if we are now not to have anybody to do the harvesting of such crops the loss of this export business will be a serious blow to our entire agricultural economy. Also, we should be considering our canning industry, which is very large at present in our State, and the frozen fruit and vegetable industry.

"We do not know of any machine that can pick up asparagus, celery, Swiss chard, peas, ripe tomatoes, strawberries, cherries, plums, apricots, peaches, pears, and many more fruits and vegetables. They must be handled by loving hands, since a machine does not know if a pea pod has anything inside, or if strawberries are red or green.

"Under such conditions of having no manual workers to do our planting and harvesting of agricultural products, the farmers will have no choice but to go into other fields, such as raising cows or sheep or cotton. Then the fruit and vegetable stands and canned goods shelves will have a very sickly appearance, and prices will be two or three times higher, and our incomes or social security checks won't be any bigger. In a couple of months or less the strawberries will be nice and ripe, and with no one to pick them and bring them to our stores strawberry shortcake will be past history.

"We know that Mexico permits big American capital and many, many thousands of Americans to work and do big business in Mexico, especially in the line of gas and oil for our cars, so if Mexico permits Americans to do busines and work there why cannot America permit temporary Mexican workers to come over and harvest our products (which we won't do for ourselves), in order to keep our bay windows up in good shape? Suppose the Mexican Government retaliated by saying: 'If you don't want us in your country, we don't want you in ours; pack up and go home.' Mexico is not going to say 'Pack up and go home.' On the contrary, at present as in the past, Mexico encourages with open arms foreign industries to come in, and they accord any privileges and facilities possible, as we already know quite well. We have read that in 1963 we imported 242 million pounds of tomatoes from Mexico, and this year our farmers are having difficulty borrowing any money from banks for tomato planting, because of the uncertainty of harvesting.

"It is interesting to notice that our Secretary of Agriculture does not seem to have made a peep concerning the situation. Does he not have jurisdiction?

"We should all write to our Representatives in Washington and the Secretaries of Labor and Agriculture."

We earnestly urge that you do all possible to help California avoid the disaster which may result from failure to plant and harvest the crops which her people, and indeed the peoples of the Nation and of the world, have come to expect.

Respectfully yours,

PHYLLIS S. JIMENES,
Mrs. F. A. JIMENES,
Secretary.

SALINAS, CALIF.,
May 11, 1965.

Hon. DON CLAUSEN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Today, more than 20,000 crates of strawberries will be added to those already rotting on the plants in our fields. Continual daily losses building to 40,000 crates per day this time next week are anticipated if we are unable to pick. Translated to market value using combination fresh and freezer prices on last year's market prices at least $50,000 per day loss. It is clearly and abundantly evident insufficient numbers of domestic workers available for strawberry harvest and cultural practices. Today, our needs are for an additional 2,000 workers and by the middle of next week an additional 1,500 required. This company has met all items of criteria for becoming eligible for supplemental foreign labor and certified for workers, however no help other than 200 plus Japanese and Filipino nationals yet. Further documentation of losses to be developed by Agricultural Extension Service, University of California and forwarded separate cover. Any assistance you are able to provide greatly appreciated.

SALINAS STRAWBERRIES,
TOM MCNAMARA.

Shadow of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding editorial on American action in the Dominican Republic by the renowned writer, Max Lerner. This article appeared in the New York Post of May 3, 1965. I concur completely in Mr. Lerner's remarks and hope that other editorialists speak out as forthrightly as he has.

[From the New York Post, May 3, 1965]

SHADOW OF CUBA

(By Max Lehner)

A friend of mine, who knows Latin America better than I do, says it will be a long, hot summer in the Caribbean. Certainly what has happened in Santo Domingo, turning a lovely city into a charnel house, suggests that there are volcanic political passions in the area. The bloodshed wears the aspect not only of a rebellion but of a civil war, with longstanding hatreds coming into play and old accounts being settled.

In this jungle of passions, anti-American hatreds emerged very early in the rebellion. President Johnson had to act swiftly to get American civilians out. But most political decisions have plural, not single, motives. Having entered the Dominican Republic to save lives, the American troops have stayed to prevent anarchy, seal off the chances of a Communist takeover, and await the beginnings of a new frame of political order.

One's first impulse is to say that this was a monstrous blunder, awakening long muted memories of marine landings and gunboat diplomacy, and feeding the Castro image of American imperialism. Yet one cannot stop there, without raising a haunting question: What was the alternative for President Johnson? Was it to appeal to the OAS? There would be days and days before any practical action; and if the revolt did indeed contain, as a second-stage effect, the design for a Communist takeover, the OAS action would have come far too late. Or was the alternative simply to stay out, or to get out again immediately after the first evacuation of Americans, and let events take their course?

It isn't enough to point out in a holier-than-they way what must have been obvious enough to Johnson, Rusk, Bundy and Tom Mann—that the decision was a dangerous one. But was there any alternative that would have been any less dangerous? Running a country isn't a question of making choices between the beautiful decisions and the damned ones. It is often an impossible choice between a blind alley and a somewhat less blind one, and a President is lucky, even as he enters a dark tunnel, that he can see a thin shaft of light at the far end.

The whole decision in the Dominican operation, as it transpired in the minds of the President and his advisers, was made in the shadow of Cuba. It is easy to say that the shadow shouldn't have been there—but it was. Too much blood has been spilt in Cuba, too many lives have been blasted there, too much heartbreak and frustration and remorse have been felt in Washington to leave the slate blank.

The pro-Bosch leaders now say that the Communist elements in the revolt are not many, and that the irresponsible ones got

out of control. Maybe so. Certainly Bosch himself is a decent committed democrat with a small d, even if he is an ineffectual political leader. But after the Castro experience should one have expected President Johnson to take a course of action—or nonaction—that might well have led to a second Cuba off American shores? For him to have done so would not only have been out of character and out of philosophy: it would also have run counter to the kind of President most of the American people think he is, and the kind of belief they have in him.

Well then, once the American troops came in, why has President Johnson piled up more and more thousands of them? Isn't each detachment he sends a further slap at the Latin American self-image? Here again one must go back to Cuban-American history, this time to the Bay of Pigs. The shadow of the Bay of Pigs fiasco hangs even more heavily over Washington than the shadow of Castro's persistence in power. If the Bay of Pigs invasion was a mistake then—as everyone now agrees—the failure to carry it through in full force compounded the mistake many times over. That was in Kennedy's mind when he had to make a decision on the Russian missiles in Cuba. It will be in the mind of every President for some years to come. If history is lights and shadows, it is mostly shadows.

Of course, there has been an outcry from the Latin neighbors and partners of the United States. If I were a Brazilian, a Mexican, a Chilean, I should probably be joining in the outcry. Yet if I asked myself what alternative there was, I should have no answer. I suspect strongly that, however great the outcry has been, it would have been dim and pale alongside the withering contempt of the Latin American leaders if the United States had done nothing, if its citizens had been killed, and if the revolt had led to another Castro regime—or a Castro-oriented one—in Santo Domingo.

The satisfying fact is that the OAS political presence has been enabled to establish itself alongside the U.S. military presence. There are dead to be buried, wounds to be bound up, food to be distributed, the routines of life to be restored. A new leadership will in time be found, and with heavy economic aid it will be able to make a new beginning of order. Whatever may be said against the Americans, they will not stay any longer than the minimal need for them. They will get out. That would not have been true of the Castroites, if they had been given a chance to turn the rebellion into a class dictatorship.

Israel Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it was 17 years ago that the Union Jack was lowered over Palestine, marking the end of British rule over that area.

May 14, 1948, saw the emergence of a new nation, the State of Israel. This is a nation which has created an example of what a people can do when given the right of self-determination; she is a model of democracy in action.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, 17 years ago this dream of almost 1,900 years became a reality as the blue and white flag with the Star of David took its rightful place among the banners of the free world.

It has not been easy for the people of Israel these last 17 years, as it has not been for the last 1,900 years, because hostile neighbors have attempted to drive the Jewish people out of Israel. But this gallant nation has stood steadfast and grown strong and self-reliant.

I join with my colleagues and say mazeltov to the people of Israel.

Chicago Sun-Times Editor Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay particular honor and recognition today to a distinguished and truly outstanding Chicago newspaperman, Mr. Milburn P. Akers, who is retiring after a quarter century of service with the Chicago Sun-Times. Throughout his career, Mr. Akers has made extraordinary contributions to his community, State, and the Nation.

Readers of his columns and editorials will long remember his discerning reporting on national and world affairs, as well as his public spirit and dedication to the causes of good government and education. A Chicago Sun-Times article, which follows, highlights Mr. Akers' career and pays due respect to his leadership:

AKERS TO RETIRE AS SUN-TIMES EDITOR

(By Donald M. Schwartz)

Milburn P. Akers announced his retirement Saturday as editor of the Chicago Sun-Times after a quarter of century of service with this newspaper.

Akers, who reached the retirement age of 65 earlier this month, will step down as editor on Monday, June 7.

In accepting Akers' resignation, Marshall Field, publisher of the Sun-Times, praised Akers' many contributions to the paper.

"All the years of my working newspaper life have been spent in close and pleasant association with Pete Akers," Field said. "His vigor, professional knowledge, and journalistic integrity have been invaluable to me.

"Much of what the Sun-Times has become is a reflection of his leadership." And, as Akers discussed his retirement with a reporter, it was typical that he was at his typewriter composing one of his columns on current affairs.

(The column will continue to appear once a week in the Sunday Sun-Times even after Akers' retirement.)

LIKE A MUSICIAN

Now and again he would dash off a few sentences or perhaps only a few words, then pause and ponder, taking a drag on a cigarette hardly noticing it in his fingers or at his lips.

Then he would start up again at the machine with only a few of his fingers doing the work—they skipped about easily in a bouncy, jaunty fashion that may oldtime newspapermen use. It was more like a musician playing an instrument than a skilled typist operating a machine.

"Best one-fingered typist in the country," Akers threw out in an aside that disturbed his attention to the growing column as little as the drag on the cigarette.

Pete Akers had been doing that for a long time—42 years—in a career that began as a cub reporter on the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in 1923. From there he went to the Illinois State Register in Sprinfield; the Associated Press, for which he worked in Springfield, Chicago, and Washington, and finally to the old Sun and the Sun-Times, where he became successively managing editor, executive editor, and editor.

Pete Akers had pounded on typewriters in countless newspaper offices and Western Union offices, in the Senate Press Gallery in Washington, in the statehouse in Springfield, in small towns in southern Illinois, during the bloody days there when he worked for the P-D. He had roamed the broad circuit of a big-time newspaperman and written of what he saw just as his great-grandfather, Peter Akers, a Virginia planter's son who became a Methodist minister, roamed the country from his birthplace to Kentucky, to Illinois, to Minnesota, telling of what he saw and how it could be improved.

That was in the back of Pete Akers' mind too—how things could be improved—and it came out especially when he moved into positions of command in the newspaper business.

It also is a major theme of the work he has done in government, education, and religion, much of it closely related to his newspaper career.

Asked why he went to work for Illinois Gov. Henry Horner as his publicity man in 1936 (a job he held 3 years), Akers replied: "I just thought he was a high-grade, first-class Governor who shouldn't be displaced." The Chicago Democratic machine had turned against the Democratic Governor and he faced a tough primary contest.

A TOTAL COMMITMENT

Perhaps Akers' commitment to improving things can be shown, as well as anywhere, in the job he did on the Sun-Times. Although he himself balks at comparisons between his ministerial forebears and the moral, crusading tone of his newspaper career, a colleague on the Sun-Times notes that as boss of the paper he "operated almost as though it were a total commitment"—like a dedicated preacher answering a call to a pulpit.

Akers became managing editor of the Sun-Times and started converting it as fast as he could into a paper of stature, seriousness, and substance. "That was Mr. Field's desire," he observed.

The new managing editor faced serious practical problems, some of which stemmed from the fact that he was trying to meld into a single paper, with its own identity, two vastly different papers—the serious-minded Sun and the tabloid Times, which had been merged shortly before he took over.

"If you went either way," he recalled, "if you went to the old Sun or the old Times, you had the problem of losing part of your audience. So you had the problem of making the change very slowly so you didn't lose your audience."

As it was, Akers later had the nerve-wracking experience of losing large parts of his audience when the Sun-Times, a 24-hour-a-day paper up to the mid-1950's started lopping off afternoon editions to become solely a morning paper.

"That was the toughest thing I ever had," he said. "I'd come down to work and find I'd lost 50,000 circulation and I was supposed to make it up the next day."

The changes came slowly and were many. In January 1950, the headline type was changed from Karnak to Vogue, a purely technical point it may seem, but it was movement from blocky, jarring, rather crude looking headlines, to a more modern and streamlined typeface. Moreover, said Akers

in a memo to the staff: "With the larger unit count in the heads, it is hoped that the use of such abbreviations as 'exec,' 'ma,' 'dad,' 'cop,' 'hood,' 'con,' * * * can be greatly reduced, if not eliminated entirely."

Classic earmarks of tabloidism were being dropped over the side even while the paper, in size, remained in the tabloid format.

Akers also introduced longer stories on serious subjects, including education and religion, and permitted more interpretive reporting in the paper, a technique which newspaper editors often praise but frequently have been reluctant to use, and this was especially true 15 years ago.

A LINK TO HIS OWN CAREER

The turn toward interpretive reporting was linked up with Akers' own career and his own style as a writer and reporter. As a reporter for the Associated Press, during a time when it stressed a mechanical, almost inhuman objectivity, he had suffered under such restraints, which he later described in a speech as "a rather sterile formula known as objective reporting." At the Sun-Times he sought out intelligent reporters and gave them a little more elbowroom to tell what was going on instead of merely serving as conveyor belts for disparate facts.

Even the stylebook issued during Akers' tenure as executive editor speaks of the changes he was bringing about.

Many newspaper stylebooks are dry, mechanical things which deal mainly with contractions of State names and what words to capitalize. But the Akers stylebook, issued in 1955, had a style of its own—a philosophy of writing—and a carefully articulated outlook on such matters as good taste and fairness.

Simultaneous rebuttal, for example, was one of the earmarks of the book and became so in the newspaper.

It was the time of McCarthyism and the executive editor, as he had then become, insisted that those who were attacked, perhaps unfairly and inaccurately, should have a chance to reply, simultaneously, in the same story.

IMPROVEMENT ON COMMUNITY LEVEL

There were many other changes large and small, such as a special Sunday section to deal comprehensively with important topics, and in time these added up to a new reputation for the tabloid that acted like a quality paper, a reputation that spread beyond Chicago and caused a Saturday Review writer to declare it the best paper in town.

But while Akers was improving the paper inside he was also pursuing improvement outside, in the community.

A close colleague on the paper in those days describes him as a "crusading, investigative newspaperman." Gordon E. Michalson, president of MacMurray College, Jacksonville, Ill., with whom Akers has had much association, said, "His whole journalistic career has been tinged with social justice."

Akers at the Sun-Times instituted and presided over many crusades, many investigations—the disclosure that an alderman was sharing in legal fees paid on zoning variations obtained through the city council, stories that forced a Democratic gubernatorial candidate to withdraw from the race, revelations about the high costs of hauling surplus foods to schools in the State.

Not all the stories were major crusades or investigations. There was also the time, in 1950, when Akers sent a reporter up to Wisconsin to get the background on the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin, who was just beginning his rise as a Communist hunter.

Akers, the editor, from having known McCarthy when he was Akers, the reporter, thought the Senator was far from being the admirable figure that some thought him to be and he instructed a reporter to get the rest of the story, which he printed in a series of articles.

MASSIVE KNOWLEDGE

The reporter recalls that, in addition to the importance of the subject matter and how much it preceded most assessments of McCarthy, the assignment also illustrated two facets of Akers as a newsman.

First, he had encountered McCarthy on one of his many political reporting journeys and had formed a firsthand impression, something indispensable to a good journalist. The reporter noted that this was part of Akers' "massive knowledge of things"—from books, experience, from having been around a long time in a lot of places and having his eyes open—a characteristic emphasized by many who have known him. A writer who has sat in on editorial conferences with him has spoken of Akers' far-ranging mind.

The second point about the McCarthy assignment, said the reporter, was that Akers did it without fooling around, without worrying about the paper's image.

One of the most revealing of the Akers stories, for what it shows about the man, was the Moretti case.

MORETTI CASE RECALLED

Michael Moretti was a 33-year-old policeman assigned to the State's attorney's office who shot two youths to death and wounded a third, but was not indicted when his case was first brought before the county grand jury. He pleaded self-defense, but the wounded man claimed that he killed in an unprovoked rage.

Akers exploded and the Sun-Times demanded a reopening of the case, claiming a whitewash by the States' attorney's office to protect one of its own. Moretti was subsequently indicted and convicted of murder.

Why was Akers so outraged by the case, into which he threw all his energy and expertise, all available resources on the paper and the paper's name itself? When he was asked that he said:

"That murder could be covered up; that murder could be whitewashed.

"Here were a couple of human beings with no status in our society.

"That they could be shot, killed, murdered, and whitewashed by the people who did it."

That was his answer, but under questioning he took it further.

"I have said to young people in speeches many times that I believe in the American capitalistic system and the American democratic sysem, and I am utterly opposed to corruption of either.

"The only way we can retain these systems is to be continually on the alert to eradicate the abuses of either, and there are abuses.

"So when something like the Moretti case came along—and the democratic system which is supposed to dispense equal justice wasn't doing so—this violated a basic belief of mine. If I didn't believe so much in the systems, I wouldn't get so violent about the abuses."

A colleague who worked closely with Akers on the Moretti story suggesed another, simpler element—"the fact that young men were involved." One of the slain was only 15.

"Pete is soft about kids," the colleague remarked, and the point linked up with something Akers himself said about another, current story that has moved him—South Vietnam.

In 1963 he visited that war-brutalized country and since his return he has written about it often in his Sun-Times column.

Sometimes the column, on Vietnam, has not been cool and analytical but outraged, as when he wrote on February 22 that the Vietnamese people were being "ground to pieces" while the United States held back from negotiations.

DESCRIBES VIETNAM INCIDENTS

Akers described the other day what lay behind those feelings.

"I was down in the delta country in South Vietnam. Somewhere they'd killed a nest of Vietcong the night before.

"Here was a bunch of little people heaped on the ground, in the position they had fallen, and died in. You turned them over and looked at them and most of them were little kids 16 or 17."

Akers, of course, has not always been struggling with such heartrending subjects as youths foully murdered in Chicago or youths heaped up dead in South Vietnam.

A familiar scene in his office at the Sun-Times was to find him chatting with staff members—really passing the time of day in smalltown style while editors drifted in and out to consult with him.

Akers, although he happened to have been born in Cook County, was really from Jacksonville, where his father was a Methodist minister, the third in a line of Methodist ministers.

He grew up amid a rural Illinois where his family had been for three generations before him; where he absorbed the atmosphere of the Lincoln country, the habit of thinking for himself, and a prejudice against being high flown. He also started an unending study of the State, in books and in person, and is known in his profession for an encyclopedic knowledge of Illinois, down to little bits and pieces, obscure rivers and out of the way highway routes.

He is not a slick, modern man. He is a bulky figure, often in rumpled clothes, with a massive head and small, pudgy hands. He looks like a man who might have been found in a small county courthouse a generation or two ago. But he is deceptive; he can be very much up to date as he proved in transforming the Sun-Times.

He is a reader—not just one who reads books, occasionally or often, but one who is at home with books, relishes the books, relaxes with books. Reading is his hobby—chiefly biography, history, politics. His mother and father, he says, were readers, his mother—Massachusetts born—having been among the first women graduates of Syracuse University and later a schoolteacher.

EDUCATION A MAJOR INTEREST

His interests outside newspapering have run to education, and he is credited by one qualified source with having saved his alma mater, McKendree College, from extinction. Some Methodist Church officials thought it too costly to continue supporting. But Akers waged a successful battle to preserve it, and one small college official observed that now, what with the great upturn in enrollments, a college like McKendree, only 20 miles from populous St. Louis, can't fail.

Michalson, president of MacMurray, said that Akers, at a trustee and chairman of the school's development committee, has played a commanding role in MacMurray's recent expansion.

He is chiefly responsible, for one thing, for the founding of a men's college at the MacMurray campus where there was previously only a girl's school.

At both places, MacMurray and McKendree, he was tending the deep roots put down in Illinois by his great-grandfather. Peter Akers was the principal founder of MacMurray and the first president of McKendree.

SCHOLARSHIPS SET UP

After his retirement Akers will continue as the head of a statewide committee attempting to make the job of State superintendent of public instruction an appointive office—an effort to take the important position out of politics.

The Sun-Times recognized this deep involvement with education in an announcement last week by Executive Editor Emmett Dedmon that three annual Chicago Sun-Times college scholarships in honor of Milburn P. Akers had been established.

One is for $4,000, one for $2,000 and one for $1,000, each payable over 4 years. They will go to winners picked yearly by an independent academic committee. One criterion for the selection will be a demonstrated interest in Illinois history and politics.

"We believe that this is the kind of honor that Milburn P. Akers would want us to pay him," Dedmon said. "These scholarships recognize the great contribution which Mr. Akers made to education in Illinois, both as editor and as public-spirited citizen."

Thus the minister's son from Jacksonville completes 42 years of newspapering June 7, having tried to make things better where and when he could.

In 1953 he made a speech to a journalism graduating class.

After describing in detail the investigative, crusading exertions of this paper, he said:

"You may ask: What does all this do for a newspaper? Many papers content themselves with printing routine news and seem to be making a success of it. * * * But I think a newspaper has responsibilities as well as rights; that is greatest responsibility is to render not merely routine public service but what some newspapers might consider public service above and beyond the call of duty."

Only slightly reworded that could be a description of the main responsibility Pete Akers has accepted for himself.

Jet Noise—Opens the Floodgates of Litigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1965, I sounded an alarm in the House on the problem of aircraft noise abatement. While this is a multifacited problem, I would like today to discuss one aspect of the problem; namely, that of the incresaing number of lawsuits brought against municipalities and airport operators and owners in recent years, and to document for my colleagues the statement made on the floor on May 6 by furnishing data on pending lawsuits.

As a resident of Lawrence, Long Island, in the five towns on the perimeter of Kennedy Airport, I have personally experienced the annoyance of aircraft noise, but more important, as a member of the bar for 36 years and as a director of the New York County Lawyers Association, I foresee a surge of unwarranted and unnecessary lawsuits arising from the inevitable growth and expansion of the use of jet aircraft. There is a legitimate and grave concern over the huge financial burden which will be placed upon municipalities, counties, and State agencies from litigation in this field, which will result in an increased tax burden on property owners and tenants.

At this date lawsuits are pending in 18 States represented in this Chamber by 269 Members of Congress. In Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin claims are made and damages sought aggregating more than $21 million against cities, airport operators, and airlines.

The National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council has published a summary of pending aircraft noise litigation at commercial airports in the United States as of June 15, 1964, which tells the story in a clear and convincing manner. I urge my colleagues to read my statement on jet noise and read the chart which follows and then consider that as more airports service jet planes, the number of cases and the amount of damages sought will increase. No State, county, or municipality which operates an airport can afford to ignore the problem, and no private airport operator or airline should fail to give it recognition because none will be immune from the cost and expense of litigation.

Summary of pending aircraft noise litigation at U.S. commercial airports as of June 15, 1964

City	Total dollar amount claimed	Number of suits
Atlanta	$2,000,000+	53
Dison etc. v. City of Atlanta (49 identical suits). *Donald et ux. v. City and Airlines. C. Waddell, Maj., E. H. Waddell v. City, Airlines, and others* (3 separate suits).		
Chicago (Midway)	(1)	1
Southwest Council of Civic Organizations et al. v. City of Chicago and Airlines.		
Cleveland	20,000	1
Da Luge v. City of Cleveland.		
Columbus	(1)	1
Royal et al. v. City of Columbus.		
Dallas	270,000	20
All suits are against city of Dallas and 3 airlines.		
Denver	353,550	3
Rehmer et ux. v. City of Denver. Johnson et al. v. City of Denver. Schwayder v. Airlines.		
Elmira (N.Y.)	150,000	1
Welles et ux. v. County of Chemung.		
Houston	38,000	3
Shaw et ux. v. City of Houston. McFadden et ux. v. City of Houston. Langner et ux. v. City of Houston.		
Indianapolis	(1)	3
Skinner et ux. v. Indianapolis Airport Authority. Bush et ux. v. Indianapolis Airport Authority. Harris et ux. v. Indianapolis Airport Authority.		
Jacksonville	3,000,000+	5
Corbett et al. v. City of Jacksonville. Corbett et al. v. Three Airlines. Corbett et al. v. City of Jacksonville. Brian et al. v. City of Jacksonville. Schumann et al. v. City of Jacksonville.		
Los Angeles	8,465,000+	9
Arnold et al., Lewis et al., Greene et al. v. City of Los Angeles and Several Airlines (3 substantially identical suits). *Skaggs, S&T Construction Co., Bozenich v. City of Los Angeles and 8 Airlines* (3 substantially identical suits). *Laughlin et ux. v. City and County of Los Angeles. Lennox Citizens Council, Inc. v. Several Airlines. Aaron et al. v. City of Los Angeles* (and possibly some airlines to be served in the future).		

Footnotes at end of speech.

Summary of pending aircraft noise litigation at U.S. commercial airports as of June 15, 1964—Continued

City	Total dollar amount claimed	Number of suits
Louisville	$92,000+	6
Murphy et ux., Dickey et ux., Ray et ux., Davidson et ux., Schurch et ux., Porter et ux., all against Louisville and Jefferson County Air Board (6 substantially identical suits). (Judgment for plaintiff in Porter case under appeal.).		
Lubbock	820,000+	1
Ford v. Lubbock Joint Airport Zoning Board et al.		
Memphis	300,000	15
Anderson, Bumpas, Cayson, Chambers, Hall, Harrell, Harod, Hooper, Hoover, Nolan, Shute, Vickery, Williams all against city of Memphis (substantially identical suits). *Pleaseant Acres Corporation and Wilson both v. City of Memphis.*		
Milwaukee	600,000	6
All substantially identical suits against city of Milwaukee.		
Minneapolis-St. Paul	30,000	1
Meyer et al. v. Metropolitan Airports Commission.		
Nashville, Tenn	200,000	1
Read v. City of Nashville.		
New York	(1)	3
Trippe et al. v. Port of New York Authority and 39 Airlines. DeSpirito et al. v. Port of New York Authority and 39 Airlines (withdrawn as against PNYA). *Nine Airlines, Air Line Pilots Association, et al. and Port of New York Authority v. Town of Hempstead et al.* (3 separate suits consolidated; FAA has intervened on side of plaintiffs.)		
Oklahoma City	60,000	1
Henthorn v. Oklahoma City. (Another, separate suit, *Henthorn v. Oklahoma City*, involving a different plaintiff, resulted in a jury verdict for defendant, June 1964. Plaintiff had asked damages of $560,000.)		
Phoenix, Ariz	400,000	2
Stewart et al. v. City of Phoenix and 6 Airlines. Horton v. City of Phoenix and 6 Airlines.		
Pittsburgh	(1)	3
Griggs v. County of Allegheny. Gardner et al. v. County of Allegheny.		
Reno	15,000	3
Phillips et ux., Blochowiak et ux., O'Day et ux. all against city of Reno (3 identical complaints).		
Rochester	50,000	2
Cunliffe et ux. and DeWind et ux. both against Monroe County (2 identical complaints).		
San Antonio	90,000	3
Deike et ux., Fant et ux. v. City of San Antonio (2 substantially identical complaints). *Hudson et ux. v. City of San Antonio.*		
San Diego		1
Loma Portal Civic Club et al. v. 7 Airlines and others. (Intermediate appellate court's reversal of lower court's summary judgment for defendants has been appealed to California Supreme Court.)		
San Francisco	2,047,500 (App.)	2
Field et al v. City and County of San Francisco (and leaving room for possible inclusion of airline defendants). *Andrako et al. v. City and County of San Francisco* (also leaving room for airline defendants): complaint identical to Field.		

Summary of pending aircraft noise litigation at U.S. commercial airports as of June 15, 1964—Continued

City	Total dollar amount claimed	Number of suits
Seattle	$1,200,000	12
Martin et al v. *Port of Seattle, Aarhus et. al.* v. *Port of Seattle.* (Petition for rehearing filed in Washington Supreme Court by port of Seattle from decision finding that plaintiffs have stated a claim upon which relief can be granted. Question of damages reserved for later trial). (See report of case page 2, addendum No. 1, NANAC Compendium.) Silverling, Clap, Evans, et al., Hermanson et al., Rose, Morey, Albright et al, Anderson et al., Ayers et al., Jovanovich et al. (10 cases) all against port of Seattle (substantially identical allegations).		
Spokane	138,500	8
Substantially identical suits; no activity since 1960.		
Syracuse	(1)	1
Scott et ux. v. *City of Syracuse et al.*		
Tampa	219,000	9
Riley et ux., Rodriguez et ux., Ubeda et ux., Markey et ux., Diamond et ux., Friscioni et ux., Singerle et ux., Macias et ux., all against Hillsborough County Aviation Authority (8 separate suits, identical complaints). *Benitez et al.* v. *Hillsborough County Aviation Authority.*		
Total	20,558,550	180

[1] Indeterminate.

J. Wayne Stark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently a very good friend of mine was recognized by the Senate of the Texas State Legislature for the work he has done, is doing, and I know will continue to do for and in behalf of the students of Texas A. & M. University. His work with this student body has indirectly affected the lives of many university students, as he has provided the guiding hand for functions which have involved the students of colleges and universities throughout the country.

I was not able to participate in his recognition by the Senate of Texas, but I believe I can recognize him in this small way through the medium of the RECORD and say that I personally appreciate the work that he has done with these young people.

An article follows:

[From the College Station (Tex.) Battalion, Apr. 30, 1965]

TEXAS SENATORS HONOR STARK FOR MSC WORK

(By Glenn Dromgoole)

J. Wayne Stark, director of the Memorial Student Center for 15 years, received special recognition from the Texas Senate, Thursday.

Senate Resolution 439 praising Stark for his direction of MSC activities was read at the annual awards banquet of the MSC Council and Directorate Thursday night.

Council President Terry Oddson presented Stark with the senate document to highlight the final session of the 15th MSC Council and Directorate.

The resolution recognized Stark's contribution to Texas A. & M., including:

1. Directing such programs as the student conference on national affairs, leadership conference, space fiesta, the intercollegiate talent show.

2. Counseling, advising, and guiding many Aggies to continue in a role of public service after graduation.

3. Serving as president of the National Association of College Unions.

A page in Thursday's Senate Journal was devoted to the expression of senate admiration.

The Worst Is Yet To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Eric Brazil, a competent, careful reporter for the Salinas Californian newspaper, has written on May 6, 1965, a report which should be read by the President, the Secretary of Labor, and each Member of Congress.

The present chaos will not abate; the intensity is accelerating. The problem will not solve itself; if the Secretary of Labor will not discharge his duty, the President must assume the responsibility; if the President refuses to act promptly, the Congress must not permit such a disaster to continue.

The farmer, farmworker, allied workers, employers, and vegetable consumers should not be forced to watch helplessly while their food crops spoil in the fields.

The report follows:

WORST YET TO COME—VALLEY HAS ONLY BEGUN TO FEEL AG LABOR PINCH

(By Eric Brazil)

Simple arithmetic shows that even though a crisis already has erupted in the strawberry fields, the Salinas Valley has only just begun to feel the farm labor pinch this year.

A University of California research team forecast trouble ahead last fall in a report, "California Agriculture Labor Requirements and Adjustments." It wrote that "termination of the bracero program will mean that Monterey County will have to replace 40 percent of its (farm) labor force."

Salinas Valley growers went further out on the limb with braceros than growers of any other area in the State. And, of course, the limb was sawed off on December 31, 1964.

THE CATBIRD SEAT

This seems to be the year that the domestic farmworker will be sitting in the catbird seat. The demand for him is high now and, unless the valley's cropping pattern changes radically overnight, it's going to step up.

Based on the experience of its user-members in past years, Growers Farm Labor Association of Salinas recently estimated a local need of 8,340 to 9,900 foreign supplemental workers during the period May 1–31. On the same basis, it estimated that the peak need for supplemental workers, 11,841 would fall between September 1 and 15.

There are only about 270 foreign workers—Japanese and Filipino nationals—in the Salinas Valley today. Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz has certified the local use of 1,063 Mexican braceros, but they're still south of the Rio Grande.

The State department of employment reported this week that, as of May 1, there were an estimated 5,750 "seasonal domestic" workers in the valley. That's 1,900 more than were employed here at a comparable time in 1964. But at that same time last year, growers were also using 4,700 foreign contract workers—mostly braceros—and the total seasonal farm labor force was 7,550.

WORKER DEFICIT

Therefore, the current "deficit" is right around 2,000 workers. It is being felt right now in strawberries. The State department of employment reported that the estimated total seasonal work force in strawberries on May 1 was 800, including 140 Japanese and Filipino nationals and 660 domestics.

For the week ending May 9, 1964, the Salinas Valley strawberry industry employed 3,000 foreign contract workers and an estimated 450 domestics.

The strawberry harvest hasn't reached its peak yet, and it won't until about the end of this month. For the week ending May 23, 1964, Salinas Valley strawberry growers employed 4,380 foreign contract workers and 170 domestics.

If the strawberry growers were trying to plug their labor gap under laboratory conditions—that is, without competition from growers of other crops, both in the Salinas Valley and in other areas of the State—they'd have a hard row to hoe. But there is going to be a lot of competition for workers from growers of row crops, tree fruit, grapes, etc.

SQUEEZE ON LETTUCE

Take lettuce for example. Local growers seem to have enough labor now, but the situation is getting tighter as the 1965 deal accelerates.

"We're walking a tightrope now," one lettuce shipper told the Californian Wednesday afternoon.

"The shoe is getting a little bit tight," another said.

The Salinas-Watsonville-King City district is shipping out about 150 carlot equivalents of lettuce a day at this time. In another week or so shipments should be over 200 cars a day. The deal has a potential of about 400 cars a day at its peak. And it takes more field laborers to cut 200 or 400 cars of lettuce than it does to cut 150 cars of lettuce.

The State department of employment estimates that on May 1, 2,300 seasonal domestic workers were employed in the lettuce harvest.

Last year, for the week ending May 23—right when the strawberry harvest was peaking—there were 4,300 foreign contract workers and 600 seasonal domestics at work in the lettuce harvest.

Between them, the lettuce and strawberry harvests provided work for 9,450 seasonal workers—foreign and domestic—during the week ending May 23, 1964.

Seasonal employment in lettuce and strawberries now is right around 3,230. Add in the 1,063 braceros certified for Salinas Valley growers, and you get a work force of some 4,293.

What in the world is going to happen in 2 weeks?

OTHER CROPS

The valley's 450 lettuce growers and 49 strawberry growers don't just have each other to compete against for farm labor. Not by a long shot. Several other crops with high labor needs—broccoli, cauliflower, onions, etc.—are being harvested. Then in June along come the celery and carrot har-

vests. Later on in the summer, tomatoes start.

In mid-September, when the kids who can do field work are back in school, just about everything the Salinas Valley grows is being harvested.

Unquestionably, life was a lot simpler for the farm employer a year ago than it is today.

Where Will Subsidies End?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, how far are we willing to go in subsidizing living costs for the American people? How long can we maintain a free society if we accept the premise that the Federal Government should legitimately feed, clothe, house, provide jobs, and all basic necessities for all the people? Where will subsidies end in a private enterprise system and socialism take over?

These are questions we should ask ourselves before we vote for the administration proposal to pay part of the rent for low- and middle-income families.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 13 should give us food for thought:

PROTESTING TOO LITTLE

Peoples have been tolerating Federal subsidies in one form or another for so long that the administration's new rent subsidy proposal has stirred scarcely a ripple of protest.

The subsidy scheme—which officials call a rent supplement to make it sound more palatable—envisions church or other nonprofit organizations building housing into which eligible families of low and moderate income would move, paying about 20 percent of their annual income as rent. The Federal subsidy would give the owners the difference between that amount and whatever an economic rent would be.

When the plan came to its first legislative hurdle in a House Banking Subcommittee the other day, the discussion did not center on whether the whole rent subsidy theory is unsound and ought to be thrown out of the proposed housing legislation. The question, rather, was whether the administration's formula was perhaps a bit too generous.

In some high-rent cities, as the administration wanted it, families with an annual income as high as $8,550 could have part of their rent paid by the Government. The subcommittee members evidently concluded that was a little on the high side, for they reduced the ceiling to $6,850, and they dropped proportionately the ceiling for cities where rents are lower.

However, this and other less consequential revisions do not face up squarely to the issue: Should the Government, already deep in the housing business and making a botch of it, go even deeper by handing out rent subsidies, no matter what income limitations arbitrarily are decided on? Surely our social and moral fabric is badly torn when hardly anybody sees anything wrong with a citizen being beholden to the Government for part of his rent for as long as 40 years, which is what the bill provides.

Yet the absence of any widespread outcry is not hard to explain. A sweating farmer on a tractor in Iowa, say, may mutter about the Government making him help to pay the rent for some city people in Pittsburgh or New York. But he isn't going to mutter much when, at the same time, the Government is making those city people help to pay subsidies for his farm. And that is the sorry state to which Government's extension of subsidies has come; who is there left to be free to cast the first stone?

Remarks of Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey at the University of Pittsburgh, May 13, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the city of Pittsburgh is honored today by the presence of Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. This evening he will speak at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at the Penn Sheraton Hotel. This afternoon the Vice President addresses a special convocation of some 600 students from western Pennsylvania on the campus of the University of Pittsburgh.

I include at this point in my remarks the excellent address Vice President HUMPHREY is making this afternoon at the University of Pittsburgh:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, MAY 13, 1965

My fellow students, my theme today is this: What can we Americans ask of each other in 1965?

Where are we bound in life? What is our place in the world?

It was only 30 years ago that millions of Americans asked of each other: "Brother, can you spare a dime?"

We worried in those days about shelter, clothing, and holding onto work and life.

Thank God those times are past.

But to my generation they will always be fresh and real. And a reminder that our precious democratic society once tottered on the edge.

This Nation 30 years ago was divided, deeply divided: have and have-not, business and labor, North and South, black and white, farm and city, left and right. But in face of disaster and revolution we united—united, I might add, under brilliant leadership—to face our common foes. First, economic crisis at home. Then, totalitarianism and barbarism abroad.

We did not have to be asked what we could do for each other and for our country. We had to fight for survival.

Most of you here today were born after those crises had passed. You have lived in time of prosperity.

But your young generation has not turned inward on itself or satisfied itself with material pleasures.

You have responded to the needs of these times and you have done it in magnificent fashion. You are the volunteer generation.

There are now 10,000 volunteers serving in the Peace Corps with more than 3,000 already returned and another 100,000 waiting for their chance to participate.

When VISTA—the Volunteers in Service to America—was launched, there were 3,000 inquiries on its first day of business.

And I know that in most of the minds here today there is the question: What can I do to serve my country and my fellowman?

President Lyndon Johnson held his first Presidential appointment at 27 and his first political office at 29. As he has said:

"No one knows more than I the fires the burn in the hearts of young men who yearn for the chance to do better what they see their elders not doing well or not doing at all."

Old men dream dreams, but young men see visions. Today in our country there is a vision of a Great Society.

The nature of this vision has much to do with my question here today: What can we Americans ask of each other in 1965?

In this time of prosperity, is the Great Society to be a welfare state? Some may think so. But that is not the vision of President Johnson. Neither is it my vision.

We see the Great Society as a state of opportunity.

No government owes every man a living. But a just government of, by, and for the people does owe every man an opportunity to enjoy the blessings of life.

The Great Society is based on the proposition that every man shall have that opportunity.

If you examine the legislative program in this Congress, if you listen to the words of our President, if you look into your own heart you cannot escape the conclusion that we are succeeding, we are breaking through in ur efforts to provide all American men and women with that precious opportunity.

Some, once receiving it, may squander it. But all Americans must have the chance—a chance now denied to many—to make something better of their lives and the lives of their children.

Last month this Congress passed a great bill which is a basic investment toward achieving that equality of opportunity: the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Thomas Jefferson was right. We cannot be both ignorant and free.

This act in itself is accomplishment enough to satisfy an ordinary Congress. But it will be followed soon by passage of the higher education bill.

These bills together will help build classrooms. They will provide funds for libraries and textbooks and teaching materials. They will provide funds for research in teaching techniques and development of community education centers.

They will above all, I hope give new inspiration to teacher and student alike in the exhilirating experience of gaining and using knowledge. (And may I digress for a moment to say that true education depends more than anything else on the quality of teaching. I may be venturing here into dangerous ground, but I must say that there must thus be an appropriate balance between research and teaching.)

The education bills passed by this Congress will contribute to the long-term, lasting health of this Nation. So will a dozen other bills which will come from this Congress, acting out the will of the American people.

For the American people, in unprecedented peacetime consensus and unity, have made known their purposes.

We today stand united as Americans in agreement:

That all Americans shall have truly equal education.

That all Americans shall have truly equal voting rights.

That we shall provide adequate medical care to our elder generation.

That we shall make our cities better places in which to live and work in safety and health.

That we shall preserve this Nation's beauty, history, and natural resources.

That we shall open our doors again to immigrants who can enrich and lend new vitality to our national life.

That we shall help our urban and rural Americans alike adjust to technological revolution and social change.

That we shall not drop the torch of international leadership.

Let us not be mistaken. The forces of totalitarianism do not plan to blow the world to pieces. They plan to pick it up piece by piece as we progressively tire and withdraw.

But, as President Johnson declared in his historic speech at Johns Hopkins University:

"We will not be defeated.

"We will not grow tired.

"We will not withdraw."

Aggression need not come in the form of all-out atomic war. It can come through propaganda, through terrorism, through subversion, through diplomatic blackmail, through economic pressure. We recognize aggression in its subtler and more refined forms.

And we resist it as we would direct, large-scale military attack.

But at the same time, with equal determination, we will pursue each possibility of lasting and just peace. The pursuit of peace resembles the building of a great cathedral. It is the work of generations. In concept it requires a master architect; in execution, the labors of many. It requires great patience.

Yes, we Americans as people, and we Americans as a force in the world must pursue peace. But what sort of peace shall it be?

Is it to be the peace of domination?

This peace is easy indeed to achieve, for it is based on control of the weak by the strong. It need not be based on any principle higher than that of "might makes right."

Is it to be the peace of permissiveness?

This peace too can be bought most cheaply. For it leaves the outside world to its own devices. It justifies sacrifice of the small and weak. It justifies aggrandizement of the powerful and greedy. It justifies international irresponsibility—all on the premise that affairs not within our own borders are not our affairs.

Is it to be the peace of balance of power?

This peace has existed before. It depends on perpetuation of a delicate power relationship. It depends on the status quo. It has often also meant in the past "dividing up the world" at pleasure of those at each end of the balance.

All of these peaces can and have been achieved, at least temporarily, throughout history. But they have never lasted.

For they have not been based on justice or humanity. They have not responded to the needs of men and women seeking fulfillment for themselves and their children. They have not taken into account the spark that burns in all men and says: "Be free."

Thus I call on you as the generation coming to leadership to be strong and persevering: strong in defense of justice and in opposition to tyranny * * * persevering in seeking a goal of peace for all men.

I am essentially a religious person. I am not ashamed of it. I believe that God created man in His own image. I believe that there is a spark of the divine in every person. And I believe in the meaning of human dignity.

My fellow students, the big struggle in the world—and at home—today is not over the forms of production. The struggle is about man's relationship to man * * * and man's relationship to a higher and nobler force.

I say that what we can ask of each other is this:

To fight poverty because poverty destroys the human spirit and human dignity.

To fight discrimination because it violates the precepts of our democratic society and Judeo-Christian ethic.

To pursue justice because it is basic to our religious and ethical heritage.

To pursue an honorable peace because it is the greatest gift we can give our children.

We can achieve the Great Society. It is within our grasp—perhaps for the first time in history.

Yes, the first step toward these things is the longest journey. And we have made that step. And the second step. And now we take a third.

We are privileged each year, each decade, each generation in our time to take a new step.

How fortunate we are to live in this dramatic and creative period of change, of challenge, of opportunity. How great is our responsibility to achieve excellence of mind and spirit to do the tasks that must be done.

I appeal, therefore, to you the generation of 1965:

Make no little plans. Have no little dreams. Do not set your standards and goals by those of this time.

Challenge the impossible. Do what cannot be done.

Thirty years ago it was "Brother, can you spare a dime?" Today we reach the stars.

I ask of you: Believe in the perfectability of man, make a better life for our people, save the peace, build a Great Society to last for generations beyond us.

Role of the Merchant Marine in Amphibious Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, last fall the U.S. Navy, the Marine Corps, and the American merchant marine held a tremendously significant amphibious training exercise off the coast of Spain. Called Operation Steel Pike I, it was the largest peacetime amphibious exercise ever conducted on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean. It was the largest military landing operation conducted by our forces since the Korean war. It provided a major testing ground for the American merchant marine, which contributed 10 large merchant ships to the Naval Fleet Forces that provided the combatant support, and special services ships that made the operation a success.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, with its responsibility for the development, maintenance, and welfare of the American merchant marine, wanted to get a firsthand report on the Operation Steel Pike I. We wanted to hear the views of the top military officers who directed the exercise as they concerned the quality and effectiveness of the role played by the ships and men of the merchant marine. Accordingly, on March 16 and 17 of this year, we held hearings before the full committee to receive a briefing by the military officers in charge of the exercise. Appearing before us were Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., commander, Amphibious Forces, Altantic; Lt. Gen. J. P. Berkeley, commanding general, Fleet Marine Forces, Atlantic; and Vice Adm. Glynn R. Donaho, commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, and other supporting officer witnesses.

The hearings were most interesting, and the military testimony was unstinting in its praise of the performance of the 10 privately owned merchant ships and their crews in Steel Pike I, underscoring the importance of our merchant marine to our national defense posture.

Thus, it was a great disappointment and, I might add something of a shock to read later that the testimony of Vice Adm. Lot Ensey, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations—Logistics—in executive session before the House Subcommittee on the Department of Defense Appropriations on February 19, 1965, was apparently in direct conflict with the testimony presented before our committee at our Steel Pike I hearings, and further seemed to downgrade the value of the American merchant marine as a military or naval auxiliary. A reading of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee hearings seem to confirm earlier press reports.

Accordingly, I felt it necessary to write Admiral Ensey, call his attention to our hearings and ask for a reply with his comments. I sent copies of my letter, dated April 30, 1965, to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of Commerce, the Chief of Naval Operations and the commander, Amphibious Forces Atlantic.

Admiral Ensey replied to my letter by telegram dated May 6, 1965. On May 7, Adm. David L. McDonald, Chief of Naval Operations, wrote in connection with my letter to Admiral Ensey. Their statements go far to eliminate what could otherwise have been a very serious misunderstanding.

Under leave previously granted, at this point I insert in the RECORD the text of my letter of April 30 to Admiral Ensey, Admiral Ensey's reply, Admiral McDonald's letter of May 7, and acknowledgements from the Secretary of Commerce and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. I believe the correspondence is self-explanatory:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE
AND FISHERIES,
Washington, D.C., April 30, 1965.

VICE ADM. L. ENSEY, U.S. NAVY,
Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics),
Pentagon Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ADMIRAL ENSEY: Press reports have come to my attention concerning your testimony before an executive session of the House Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations on February 19, 1965. I was greatly surprised at your reported position with respect to the value of our merchant marine to our defense posture and, more particularly, with respect to the quality of, and contribution made by 10 privately owned merchant ships which participated in Operation Steel Pike I. Surely, I thought, the press reports must be in error. Yet, when I checked the primary source—the printed hearings before the subcommittee—I was deeply shocked to find the press reports to be completely accurate.

Less than 1 month following your appearance before the subcommittee, Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., U.S. Navy, and Lt. Gen. J. P. Berkeley, U.S. Marine Corps, appeared before the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to report on the merchant marine—its ships and its men—and its role in combined operations under emergency conditions and, specifically, about the role of the merchant marine in Steel Pike I. Both Admiral McCain and General Berkeley, who, as you know, are highly respected professional

men, spoke in the most glowing terms about the performance of the 10 privately owned merchant ships and their crews in Steel Pike I, underscoring the importance of our merchant marine to our Nation's defense posture. I particularly invite your attention to the following statement made by Admiral McCain in the beginning of his testimony:

"I would like to observe that as commander of the amphibious force of the Atlantic that I cannot execute a major amphibious assault without the merchant marine to augment the gap that would have to be filled in the event of such an emergency."

A copy of our committee's hearings on Steel Pike I is enclosed. Pertinent sections of the testimony have been marked for your ready reference. I would like you to take particular note of the following facts elicited during the course of the hearings:

That, while you testified that the merchantmen in Steel Pike I were World War II ships, 8 of the 10 privately owned merchantmen were of the most recent construction, having been delivered within the past 4 years and are the most modern types in the world;

That General Berkeley testified to his surprise at the speed at which these new merchantmen could unload in the objective area and that unloading went a great deal faster than planned;

That if there had been any limiting factor in the convoy speed, it would have been owing to naval vessels, not the merchantmen; and

That, while better communication is always desired, there was no problem communicating with the merchant ships.

All of the foregoing, of course, is in complete contradiction to your earlier testimony before the subcommittee. These positions are wholly irreconcilable and I would appreciate your comments on the matter.

I am sure that you can appreciate that I, and my colleagues on the committee, are vitally concerned with the well-being of our merchant marine and its historically proven role in times of military emergency. We have had experts testify before us that passenger sealift capacity is not necessary in this air age. Only months later these same experts were scrambling to secure American-flag passenger ships to prepare for the Cuban crisis. Others have opposed our attempts to upgrade the fleet of the Coast Guard, which service is within the committee's jurisdiction. Yet, only yesterday, 17 Coast Guard vessels were ordered to patrol duty in Vietnam for service with the Navy. Our history is replete with the folly of unpreparedness. In all these matters, the committee has a continual and endless battle to gain support for our programs. For these reasons I am greatly alarmed when men of responsible position, such as yourself, take such a misleading and damaging position and, particularly, before such an important congressional committee.

Your early reply to this letter will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Your letter of April 30, 1965, concerning my testimony before the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations has reached me. I appreciate the opportunity to clarify my statement in the light of its unfavorable impact.

The points you have made concerning my testimony in relation to that of Vice Admiral McCain, Lieutenant General Berkeley, and others before your committee are all well taken. However, our testimonies are not inconsistent as further explained. Certainly their appraisal of the steel spike I exercise, as on-scene participants, represents, as it should, a more precise and technically comprehensive assessment of the operation, and the role of the merchant marine therein than does my comment before the Appropriations Subcommittee.

As I have advised Mr. MAHON, the overall objective of my testimony in this matter was to make it quite clear that there is no merchant marine capability, old or new, which can be substituted for naval amphibious units, integral to the fleet and especially designed and constructed to meet the particular needs of our Navy-Marine team for the actual landing in the initial combat amphibious assault, repeat, the combat amphibious assault echelon. It is fortunate that I did not first stress the vital and specific role that the merchant marine played in the exercise. A thorough study of the operation plus the testimony before your committee does indeed substantiate that our modern merchant ships contributed in great measure to the success of the exercise.

I do certainly appreciate the concern and responsibility you and your committee share as to the well-being of our merchant marine. In this respect, it would be clearly inappropriate for one in my position to be any less concerned about the welfare of this critical element of our economic and defense posture. It was never my intent to portray the merchant marine in any other right.

I do believe it is fair to suggest that there are differing but complementary roles for Navy-built ships on the one hand, and merchant marine ships on the other, in the complex total amphibious operation. Modern, high-speed cargo ships are quite essential to meet the heavy demands for material supply and resupply of our troops ashore. Furthermore, our plans call for development of a 20-knot amphibious capability in the years ahead just as the merchant marine is gradually increasin gits ship's speeds. It was in this context that I endeavored to draw a distinction between those Navy ships which must be designed and constructed for our specific combat assault requirements in the initial assault landings ashore and those merchant ships needed, on the other hand, to augment our Navy capability and to sustain us through successive phases of the overall amphibious operation.

I hope that this clarification of my views will serve to relieve your concern. It has been my intent to do so, and you can be assured of my full support in our mutual efforts toward a healthy U.S. merchant marine.

This telegram also being sent to Congressman MAHON, Congressman MAILLIARD, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of Commerce, Admiral McDonald, and Vice Admiral McCain.

Sincerely,

LOT ENSEY,
Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
May 7, 1965.

Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

My DEAR MR. BONNER: By your letter of April 30, 1965, you expressed concern over Vice Admiral Ensey's testimony before the House Subcommittee on Department of Defense appropriations as it pertains to the contribution of the U.S. merchant marine in the recent amphibious exercise, Steel Pike I. In particular, you mentioned an apparent conflict in the record of hearings regarding Admiral McCain and General Berkeley's statements on Steel Pike I as compared to Admiral Ensey's testimony.

After reviewing this matter, I conclude that Vice Admiral Ensey in his testimony desired to make a point for continued construction of specially designed naval amphibious ships. These ships are operated as part of the fleet amphibious force and are used in the over-the-beach combat assault phase of amphibious landings. It was not the intent of Admiral Ensey to downgrade the role of the U.S. merchant marine in Steel Pike I. The 10 U.S. merchant ships in the exercise were an integral and important element which contributed greatly to the overall success of the operation.

I appreciate the fine work being done by you and your colleagues on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in support of the U.S. merchant marine. The Navy has long relied on American merchant shipping as an auxiliary arm necessary to support military operations. You can be assured of my continued support for the merchant marine in order that it can fulfill its vital role in national emergencies.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID L. MCDONALD.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1965.

Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate your thoughtfulness in calling my attention to the testimony of Vice Admiral Ensey before the House Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, concerning the value of merchant ships in Operation Steel Pike I.

Needless to say, I am earnestly interested in the performance of the merchant marine and its contribution to our national defense. I have, therefore, referred your letter of April 30 to Mr. Nicholas Johnson, our Maritime Administrator.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1965.

Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Secretary McNamara has asked me to reply to your letter of April 30, 1965, concerning Navy testimony on merchant ships. We appreciate your taking the time to write on this important matter and have forwarded your letter to the Secretary of the Navy so that he will also be informed.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. MCGIFFERT,
Assistant to the Secretary (Legislative Affairs).

Fairfield University's "Dante Festival"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I note with particular pride that Fairfield University will be holding its Dante Festival this Saturday, one of the few campus programs honoring the author of "The Divine Comedy" on the 700th anniversary of birth.

The celebration of the 700th birthday of Dante Alighieri is an occasion of which Americans of Italian descent can truly be proud. It is also an occasion that has a great deal of meaning for our

ages. For Dante in his "Divine Comedy" saw a total vision of mankind.

The poet John Ciardi, in a recent lecture, compared the figures in Dante's 13th century allegory to the "populations of our own nervous system," adding that the current contest for men's minds is probably the reason Dante has such relevance to us.

Of the three sections of the "Divine Comedy," it is the "Inferno" that "overwhelms 20th centry readers," Ciardi noted.

He said:

It is hard for a man of our age to identify with a condition of static bliss such as the "Paradiso." A meditative man can grasp the "Purgatorio" as a highly conceived consideration of becoming * * *. But there is something the darkeness of our age's own mood that responds at great depth to the darkness of hell.

If the "Divine Comedy" ever ceases to be relevant to man's idea of himself, humanity's values will have become meaningless.

And this, to me, is something we should not lose sight of as we celebrate the 700th birthday of Dante—an outstanding figure of any age whose writings seem almost immune to time.

The 17th Anniversary of Israel Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure to join my colleagues in extending best wishes to Israel on the 17th anniversary of her independence.

It is a friendship that springs naturally from the many ties that link Israel and the United States.

It is a friendship filled with genuine admiration for what has been accomplished in so short a time. She is the most democratic and stable nation in the Middle East, an area noted for shaky governments and sporadic upheavals. She has made great strides in economic development. In a land that was once characterized by barren fields and deserts have risen modern cities and cultivated fields. It has become a center of learning and culture. Thousands of students from other lands pour in to attend its great colleges and universities. And only this week Israel opened its first national museum in Jerusalem.

Israel's achievements are more remarkable when we consider the handicaps she labored under. Israel had to absorb large numbers of immigrants from Europe as well as other parts of the globe. Israel was born in battle and had to fight hard to preserve her freedom.

Her achievements can also serve as an inspiration to many of us. Many newer nations in Africa and Asia, with whom Israel has maintained friendly relations, can find a practical example of what great economic strides can be taken in so short a time. And we in the United States can learn from Israel—as young as she is. The way her courageous people have repeatedly demonstrated their willingness to give their lives, if necessary, in defense of freedom and democracy, can serve as a powerful reminder of the value of what we are inclined to take for granted. It is therefore a warm pleasure to salute Israel, our democratic partner in the Middle East.

Publisher Carl Estes Donates $10,000 to the Texas Publishers Association Building Fund During North East Texas Publishers Association Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most public spirited men and one of the most outstanding men in Texas is Publisher Carl Estes of the Longview Daily News. Publisher Estes is known throughout our Nation as an accomplished newspaperman and a truly great Texas leader. Under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an item which appeared in the Longview Daily News on April 21, 1965:

(Originally printed in the April issue of the Texas Press Messenger, in honor of Carl Estes in recognition of his leadership in the field of journalism in Texas and the Southwest, and in appreciation of his support of the Texas Press Association and its building fund. Signed by Aubrey McAlister, president; Staley McBrayer, chairman, building committee; Vern Sanford, general manager, Texas Press Association.)

ESTES GIFT SETS PACE FOR TPA BUILDING PLANS

Tap of the gavel closing the North and East Texas Press Association's meeting in Longview on March 20 was the opening sound for TPA's vast, current project.

Host Publisher Carl Estes of the Longview News & Journal gave $10,000 as the first contribution toward TPA's building fund for the proposed headquarters of all Texas newspapermen in Austin.

When Estes tendered the gift to TPA President Aubrey McAlister, publisher of the Bonham Daily Favorite, lifetime member Arthur Lefevre led a standing ovation to the Longview publisher.

Said Lefevre: "This is typical of Carl Estes, and all of us should be grateful for the tremendous boost he has given this undertaking. I have known Carl Estes a long time, a great many years, and I never have gone to him for assistance for the Texas Press Association or anyhing else without his giving it full support."

In paying tribute to Estes and thanking him for the first donation to TPA's proposed headquarters in Austin, President McAlister commented: "This building will be a landmark to the contributions journalism has made to the growth of the great State of Texas across the years.

"Wherever you go in Texas, it is common knowledge that the Longview newspaperman not only has built two great newspapers, but also has used the newspapers and his own energies to build his community. No one anywhere has done a finer job than Carl Estes." McAlister added that Estes was a man of dreams, with the ability to make those dreams come true.

Included in the plans for TPA's new building is a hall of honor in which will hang special, handsomely engraved plaques of each individual who donates $1,000 or more to the building fund.

Glyndon Hague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the news article concerning the citation of a very good friend of mine, Mr. Glyndon Hague, manager of the Veterans' Administration regional office in Waco, Tex.

The article follows and it will be noted that Mr. Hague was cited by the Governor of Texas and the Texas Veteran Affairs Commission for his work in behalf of veterans in the State of Texas and his cooperation with the State agency, the veteran affairs commission:

GLYNDON HAGUE CITED BY GOVERNOR, VA GROUP

Glyndon M. Hague, Cleburne native and former district attorney here, received commendation and congratulations from Gov. John Connally and the State veterans affairs commission Tuesday in Austin. Hague is now manager of the Waco regional office of the veterans affairs commission.

John McKelvey, chairman of the commission, presented a framed resolution of commendation to Hague at ceremonies in the Governor's reception room.

"We would like to especially commend Glyndon for his work in consolidating the Dallas office," McKelvey said. "Not a day was lost."

Governor Connally, in his greeting to Hague, remarked: "It is a delight to see you and have this opportunity to add my personal congratulations for the fine work you have done." He added further that it is particularly significant to recognize the consolidation effort brought about by Hague "now when often it is difficult to mesh Federal and State activities."

The resolution follows:

"Whereas Glyndon M. Hague, manager of the Veterans Administration Regional Office, Waco, Tex., has demonstrated his ability to coordinate services and bring about better understanding and working relations between the Veterans' Administration and veterans affairs commission, and without such assistance and cooperation it would be difficult for this commission to perform the services for which it was created; and

"Whereas Mr. Hague has gained the confidence of veterans and their dependents, as well as veterans' representatives, through personal interest in their problems and through his competent planning, untiring efforts, and his ability to promote the development of the veterans program in Texas; and

"Whereas he has filled his post with intelligence and distinction, with a mind for business and a heart for humanity. His

pleasing personality, his sincerity, tact and friendliness, has endeared him to his associates: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Texas Veterans Affairs Commission does hereby go on record to commend Glyndon M. Hague for the significant contribution he has made toward our mutual goal of rendering a real and tangible service to Texas veterans and their dependents; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the members of the veterans affairs commission acknowledge with profound appreciation the cooperation and assistance that Mr. Hague has extended to this commission, and by this resolution, recognizes and pays tribute to Glyndon M. Hague for his active interest and understanding of veterans' problems and welfare, and direct that a copy of this resolution be presented to him.

"In official recognition whereof, we hereby affix our signatures this 4th day of May 1965.

"JOHN E. MCKELVEY,
"*Chairman.*
"CHARLES L. MORRIS,
"*Executive Director.*"

Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, with permission I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 2, 1965, concerning the situation in the Dominican Republic:

INTERVENING FOR FREEDOM

In announcing the Soviet call for a Security Council meeting on the U.S. Dominican intervention, Tass yesterday echoed the cries of the anti-Yanqui, of the automatic anti-interventionist, of Castro and his acolytes, and also of many an American who, nose buried in the history of an earlier era, was quick last week to shout "gunboat diplomacy."

According to Tass, the marine landing was "yet another attempt to keep in power a reactionary, an antipopular dictatorship regime, which suits the United States of America, and to suppress the strivings of the people for freedom and independence. * * * There can be no justification for the invasion of the territory of a sovereign state by the American Armed Forces."

The charge of "gunboat diplomacy" is, in the common pejorative sense of the phrase, as unjustified in this instance as the gunboats of old are obsolete and as the Tass charge is false. True, American Armed Forces landed on a neighbor nation's shores. True, the protection of U.S. and other foreign lives seems to have been more an excuse than a reason, a device designed to give juridical legitimacy to a move made for reasons of high policy. But what matters most in this case is the purpose and the context.

The purpose was not to grab territory, to extend U.S. influence or to install a Latin-American dictator of our choosing. We have no right and no reason to intervene or to take sides in a clash between those who favor the restoration of President Bosch and those headed by Gen. Wessin y Wessin, who oppose it. The record proves that we supported Dr. Bosch during the time he was in office and that we demonstrated our strong disapproval of those, including General Wessin y Wessin, who overthrew him.

We do, however, have a duty to ourselves, to other American Republics, and even to the Dominican people to take precautionary measures which might prevent a group of Communists from exploiting chaos to repeat what happened in Cuba. If that was undertaken unilaterally by the United States, it was not by choice but by necessity. It was due to the failure of the Organization of American States, following the Castro betrayal, to create an inter-American force which might act swiftly to deal with such an emergency as arose in the Dominican Republic.

Latin-American governments instinctively rush to the nonintervention article 17 of the OAS Charter whenever they fear the "colossus of the North" is overstepping itself in hemisphere affairs. But this time, while citing the article, they have been strikingly moderate and reserved in their reaction.

The reason must be that many, at least, understand and sympathize with the purpose of President Johnson's action, and recognize that Castro has introduced a new element that requires new responses. Through his betrayal of his own revolution, followed by his persistent campaign to organize—and subvert—revolutions in other countries, Castro has made revolution in Latin America an international exercise. Whatever its trappings, a Castro-inspired revolt is not a domestic product. To be effective as an organization for the common defense, the OAS has to devise means to prevent the new-style Havana-directed burrowing under national boundaries, as well as the old-style crossing over them.

President Johnson has sought diligently to prod the OAS into converting the unilateral American intervention into a multilateral OAS intervention. This, if successful, could be the first step toward creation of a permanent force that would make future unilateral action unnecessary. It should be.

Meanwhile, conditions have to be established in the Dominican Republic which will enable its sorely tried people to walk the streets in safety, and to choose their own government—without fear that they are being delivered into the hands of a secretly plotted tyranny, a tyranny which the Soviets, who so piously protested to the U.N., would dearly like to see imposed.

Fabulous Fourth Questionnaire

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year I mailed my second annual questionnaire to over 100,000 constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of New York.

My first questionnaire last year elicited an enthusiastic response and requests for more, and I promised to make this procedure an annual one. Through it I learn the thinking of those who live in the "Fabulous Fourth" Congressional District and I keep abreast of public opinion. Although its printing is expensive, it is well worth the cost to me.

Returns are still coming in at a rate which indicates we will surpass the unusually high number of 14,000 replies received last year.

There is no politics in this questionnaire. It is sent to all registered voters regardless of party.

The results were independently compiled by Date Management, Inc. of Washington, D.C.

Of the 11 questions asked only one received a "no" vote and that was on admitting Red China to the U.N. There was an overwhelming 73.7 percent against this.

All the other questions received "yes" votes, the most emphatic being in favor of withholding voting rights from U.N. members who do not pay dues—89.7 percent—and the next in favor of prayer in public schools—81.1 percent.

The largest uncertain vote concerned American policy in Vietnam—14.6 percent—and the smallest on prayer in schools—3.1 percent.

However, 54.9 percent of those answering favored continued participation in the war in South Vietnam using present methods.

The deepest splits developed on the issues of medicare—46.5 to 44 percent—and Federal aid to private and parochial schools—44.6 to 49.6 percent.

Support for my bill, H.R. 2488, to give tax credits to parents paying tuition—70.2 percent in favor this year as compared to 72.3 percent last year.

The most interesting and unique result was on the personal choice of a political philosophy. Most persons described themselves as politically moderate—43.7 percent. Conservative was selected by 28.8 percent and liberal by 20.1 percent. The balance indicated no preference.

The growing response and fact that more than half of the questionnaires returned contained individual comments shows that the people of the "Fabulous Fourth" Congressional District do care about their government.

On May 13 of last year, I gave the benefit of this combined thinking of our district to my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

As promised, I now do this again this year—and on the same day—May 13—and I will mail these results to all who live in the Fourth Congressional District.

My thanks and congratulations to those who participated and made this questionnaire a success. You have assured its continuation next year.

The questionnaire follows:

FABULOUS FOURTH QUESTIONNAIRE

FOREIGN POLICY

1. Do you favor participation of Red China in the U.N.? Yes, 17.5; no, 73.7; undecided, 8.8.

2. Do you favor continued participation in the war in South Vietnam using present methods? Yes, 54.9; no, 30.5; undecided, 14.6.

3. Do you favor withholding voting rights from U.N. members who do not pay their dues? Yes, 89.7; no, 4.8; undecided, 5.5.

HOMEFRONT POLICY

4. Do you favor further Federal legislation to enforce the right to vote? Yes, 66.1; no, 26.4; undecided, 7.5.

5. Do you favor the 35-hour week? Yes, 46.3; no, 42.0; undecided, 11.7.

EDUCATION

6. Do you favor allowing a voluntary nondenominaitonal prayer to be recited in pub-

lic schools? Yes, 81.1; no, 15.8; undecided, 3.1.

7. Do you favor inclusion of private and parochial schools in Federal aid-to-education programs? Yes, 44.6; no, 49.6; undecided, 5.8.

8. Do you favor tax credits for parents who pay tuition for their children attending school? Yes, 70.2; no, 24.3; undecided, 5.5.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND TAXES

9. Do you favor hospital care for those over 65, paid for by an increased social security tax? Yes, 46.5; no, 44.0; undecided, 9.5.

10. Do you favor a reduction in spending to produce a balanced Federal budget? Yes, 72.2; no, 16.8; undecided, 11.9.

GENERAL PHILOSOPHY

(This question is optional. An answer is not required.)

11. Do you favor a philosophy of government that is: conservative? 28.8; moderate? 43.7; liberal? 20.1.

A Personal Report: The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I inserted in the RECORD the first portion of an outstanding analysis of education in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics written by William Benton, former Senator from the State of Connecticut, former Assistant Secretary of State and now serving as Ambassador to UNESCO.

Today, with permission, I would like to continue this series, which was first published in the Encyclopedia Britannica's Yearbook for 1965.

A PERSONAL REPORT: THE TEACHERS AND THE TAUGHT IN THE U.S.S.R.

(By William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Senator; presently U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its executive board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica)

CHAPTER I—A QUICK OVERVIEW OF THE CHALLENGE OF SOVIET EDUCATION

Education is at the very core of the Communist system.

To the question, "Is Soviet education any good?" I must reply, "Yes, it is good—it is very good indeed, and it is getting better—for the purposes of communism." Education in the Soviet Union is the major instrument of national policy. It commands the vigorous support of all Soviet leaders—Leninist, Stalinist, Khrushchevist, and post-Khrushchevist.

"A point of honor and a patriotic duty with Soviet scientists," said Nikita Khrushchev at the 22d meeting of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1962 (and his successors are pledged to the resolutions of that meeting), "is to establish Soviet science in a preeminent position in the most important branches of knowledge and to occupy the foremost position in the world in all fields of science." Toward this goal, scientific education in the Soviet Union is making rapid and effective strides.

I have reported this before. So have others. After my first trip to the U.S.S.R., in 1955, I wrote and spoke at length about it. As early as May 1956, I said in an address before the National Association of State Universities in New York:

"I fear the Communists may have found a formula for combining on the one hand high quality in scientific and technological training and research—including production of original and creative work in the natural sciences—and on the other hand acceptance and obedience in political, economic, philosophical, and moral matters. Whether this formula will hold up over the decades may turn out to be the crucial question of our historic epoch. Allen Dulles, head of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, expresses 'cautious hope' that it won't. I want to share this hope; but I must honestly report that I have found no concrete evidence to sustain it."

When the Soviet Union launched the first sputnik, on October 4, 1957, most people in the United States were startled. They hadn't remotely suspected that the Soviet Union had developed scientists knowledgeable enough, and in command of enough skills and resources, to accomplish such a spectacular breakthrough. The sputnik impelled me to write a book enlarging on my observations of 1955. Published in 1958, "This Is the Challenge" dealt with the gauntlet the Soviets had hurled at American education. My views have subsequently been corroborated many times. Lawrence G. Derthick, U.S. Commissioner of Education, in 1958 headed a delegation of 10 leading U.S. educators to inspect Soviet education. He told the National Press Club in Washington, D.C.:

"What we have seen has amazed us in one outstanding particular; we were simply not prepared for the degree to which the U.S.S.R., as a nation; is committed to education as a means of national advancement. Everywhere we went we saw indication after indication of what we could only conclude amounted to total commitment to education. Our major reaction therefore is one of astonishment—and I choose the word carefully—at the extent to which this seems to have been accomplished. For what it is worth, 10 American educators came away sobered by what they saw."

The reappraisal of science education within the United States following the sputnik largely contributed to the passage by Congress of the National Defense Education Act of 1958—and to its amendment and extension in 1964 for another 3 years.

The sputnik detonated a barrage of criticism and condemnation of educators and educational practices in the United States. Some of this criticism was constructive. Much of it was aimed at the wrong targets. However, it seems ironic that a Soviet scientific and technical success was required to galvanize public interest in our American schools.

The sputnik may help illustrate how ignorance of Communist purposes, and of Communist abilities and successes, can help blind us to the task of improving American education. We should not wait for such external stimuli as the sputnik.. I fear that unless American education is infused with new fervor from within our own society, unless it is stimulated by our own extensive research and by experimentation in new methods, unless it is reinforced through a renewed love of both teaching and learning, and buttressed by a larger proportion of the national income—we may wake up to find ourselves outwitted and outdistanced by the U.S.S.R. around the globe.

This does not mean that at its best, and for a limited number of students, the present quality of education in the United States is surpassed in any country; and quantitatively—in the numbers of people to whom educational opportunity is afforded—our statistics rank among the highest in the world. But it is precisely this record that the Soviet Union is now challenging with sensational success. The challenge, although we didn't recognize it, was launched as far back as the late 1920's when Soviet education began to be honored and promoted as the key to Communist progress and ultimate victory.

M. M. Deineko's "Forty Years of Public Education in the U.S.S.R." (Moscow, 1957) records that: "The right of citizens to education is guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution (art. 121) and is ensured by various state measures: universal, compulsory 7-year education for children of school age in their native language, extensive development of secondary education, free tuition in all types of educational establishments, payment of state stipends to students, and provision of free technical and agronomic training in factories, on state and collective farms and at machine and tractor stations."

In August 1964 a report on "Recent Trends in Soviet Scientific and Technical Education" was released by the Committee on Education and Labor of the U.S. House of Representatives. It was presented by Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, who in his letter of transmittal summed up its highlights as follows:

"1. Top Soviet leaders, including Chairman Khrushchev, have made strong pronouncements during the last couple of years that they intend [the U.S.S.R.] to be the world leader in science.

"2. The Soviets have doubled their graduate enrollments during the last 4 years, with heavy emphasis on science and engineering.

"3. They have doubled their scientific research budget during the last 4 years.

"4. They are continuing to graduate three times as many engineers as we are. For each engineer they plan to train 3 or 4 technicians.

"5. Their present 20-year plan, extending to 1980, envisions tremendous expansion in science, technology, and education, with manyfold increase in productivity in certain branches of the national economy.

"6. A number of American leaders who are qualified to speak on the subject rate certain aspects of Soviet higher education and their science and technology very highly."

Thus Soviet leaders continue to drive toward their educational goals within the limitations of their social order and human fallibility. To be sure, to them the word education has a meaning that is different from the generally accepted meaning of the word in the United States. Education in the Soviet Union is always in part admonition to serve the Communist cause; often it involves what to us is a distortion of history. Never does it stress the benefits to the individual, as we do, but always the benefits to the State. But rarely, if ever, is it a distortion of science. With occasional exceptions in one or two fields, Soviet scientific researchers are as precise, as probing and as curious as any in the world. For example, mathematics and all the physical sciences remain free of political bias. The theories of the biologist Lysenko, supported by Stalin and other political leaders but laughed at by Western scientists, have recently been discredited and withdrawn.

In substance, however, the Communist Party is itself the most effective educational force in the Nation. To us, this is impossible to imagine. We cannot conceive a political party in the United States playing a similar role even if one party were in permanent control of all branches of our Government. In the U.S.S.R., the Communist Party is the central source of power; it is itself the all-powerful government; it is above all an integrated political, economic, and social system, all in one package. Further, it demands complete and unswerving devotion from Soviet citizen. Thus, inevitably, it is an educational system as well. As education has become the lifeblood of communism, the Communist Party's support of its type of education must be total.

Quite a different goal for education always has been an integral part of the American dream. America has dreamed of producing supreme individuals, not the su-

preme state. The proposition of education for all children is nothing new for us; as a national ideal it is about as old as the United States. As a philosophical ideal it is much older, rooted in the accumulated wisdom of mankind. An educated, "enlightened" electorate is deemed by many Americans to be essential for a government of, by, and for the people.

Many advances and improvements have been made in American education in recent years. But they fall far short of the challenge—not merely the challenge of the Soviet Union for world leadership, but the challenge of our own life in this exciting, demanding, and rewarding century. Thus I submit that to sustain what we call a free society, in its best and full sense, we shall have to work at it a good deal harder and devote more—and ever more—of our attention and resources to education.

One of the eye-opening passages in the recent House of Representatives committee report on education in the Soviet Union appears in the preface signed by Congressman BRADEMAS. He says:

"Today, education represents a national expenditure of about $30 billion, which (in the United States) is only about 5 percent of our gross national product. According to the October 1963 issue of the magazine U.S.S.R., the Soviet Union regards education so highly that in 1963 it spent 13.8 billion rubles on education, or about 16 percent of all budgetary expenditures. It would, of course, be misleading to compare a percent of the U.S. gross national product with a percent of the total Soviet budgetary expenditures. What is significant is that the Soviet Union in 1963 spent approximately the same amount on education as on defense (13.888 billion rubles)."

It is, of course, not correct to compare a percentage of gross national product with a percentage of the national budget, as Congressman BRADEMAS himself states. Further, the education budget in the U.S.S.R. most likely includes items not included in U.S. figures (press and other information media, for example). Even so, the Soviet figure is very high. It reflects a stage in their educational development in which they are desperately trying to catch up with—and to surpass—the United States.

Soviet plans for the future are ambitious, thorough, and expensive. They involve no less than centrally directed and controlled use of the mass media—television, radio, films, and press—as well as enormous expansion of both conventional and experimental teaching techniques—programed learning, recordings, films, and every form of visual aid.

On Moscow subways and buses every second or third passenger may be reading a book. Soviet books may become even cheaper, since prices can be fixed regardless of profit. Libraries are used intensively. They may become palaces, and the lowliest worker will be encouraged to use them.

Early learning, especially during those most malleable years of a child's life from 2 to 7, will be stressed. So also with schemes to speed up and condense the process of acquiring the basic tools of reading and figuring. The Soviet objective is to bring intellectual workers to the frontiers of knowledge at a much younger age. Soviet educators hope to add at least 5 years to the life of a scholar-scientist—at the beginning of his educable life, beginning virtually at his first breath. This is a legitimate goal. This I predict will also become our American goal, although we do not now see this clearly.

Thus the present phase of education in the Soviet Union is a clear challenge to our U.S. system. In the future this will be even more manifestly true. Senator FULBRIGHT predicted succinctly the implications of the educational competition in his remarks on the Senate floor on December 10, 1963:

"I was interested in hearing this morning that our competitors and antagonists, the Russians, are spending almost twice as much of their gross national product on education as this country is. I predict that history will show that it is in this area that the real struggle will be determined."

Here is current confirmation by one of our most experienced political observers of my 1956 report on "the cold war of the classrooms."

Does this mean we should emulate Soviet educational attitudes? Of course not. We could not if we tried. Nor should we—nor need we—try. I favor nothing of the kind. But we should not be blind to what we can learn from Soviet techniques and methods.

As I have pointed out, the welfare of the state is the end objective of the Soviet system; the individual's welfare is the end of the American system. In the Soviet Union, power and decisionmaking are concentrated; in the United States, they are diffused. The Soviet state speaks with one voice; we speak with many voices. The Soviet goal is the communization of the world. American society has no single goal unless it is peace and freedom for human beings to pursue many goals. The U.S.S.R. conceives a perfect Soviet man. The United States holds up no such ideological goal.

But at the technological and technical level in the field of education, can the two countries learn from each other? Manifestly they can. Can such an interchange go beyond this? Edward Crankshaw, writing in 1964 for the London Observer, and for the New York Times, sees the logic of events leading to an eventual Soviet-American rapprochement. This may have implications applied to both educational systems. I am not now endorsing his point of view, although I am glad to espouse it as a theme for public discussion. He sees emerging from the confusion of overall Soviet political policy a trend toward an undeclared alliance between the two great powers, who will act as "joint nuclear policemen on a worldwide scale." But, as Crankshaw points out, logic is one thing; human aspiration, with its "incorrigible determination to eat its cake and have it, quite another." I am not sanguine about the prospect of any foreseeable basic changes in the nature of communism, although I feel that at this juncture in history it is essential for the people of the United States to know and understand the people of the Soviet Union much better than they have in the past—and for them to understand us. And why not? Isn't this the best chance? And through such understanding, may not a still better chance develop? This is perhaps the world's greatest hope. We must be on guard, but we must pursue the hope. Similarly, we must ever strive for better understanding, and ultimately for more agreement on goals of education in our two countries. Is it possible that our joint devotion to education may help foster even such a seemingly remote possibility as Crankshaw's undeclared alliance?

Austrian Federal Chancellor Dr. Klaus Urges a Broad and Inclusive Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a notable address to the General Assembly of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg on January 26, 1965, Austrian Federal Chancellor Dr. Josef Klaus urged a unification of Europe that is broad and inclusive.

While seeking to diminish differences between East and West, Europe should keep a door open for the countries of Eastern Europe, he said.

Strive for a European formula that provides room for all the nations of Europe—

Dr. Klaus said.

I include pertinent excerpts from Dr. Klaus' excellent speech:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, "Civis Europaeus Sum"—I am a citizen of Europe: inspired by an old Roman custom those are to be the first words of homage and introduction addressed by the Austrian Federal Chancellor to you, ladies and gentlemen, the representatives from 17 nations, of European thought, European ethics, and the European way of life. In greeting you as the envoys of so many countries with different languages, I salute the diversity of this Continent, a diversity decreed by history. But in greeting you as members of this august Assembly, which is a European body of incomparable value, I also salute the unity in diversity for which we strive, our common European way of thinking, the "European idea" that unites us.

Among the achievements of our time is the awareness that the world is becoming smaller, that nations are getting into closer touch, that the continents are losing their old dimensions. The nations of Europe have become more and more conscious of the fact that the cruel feuds and wars which have divided the peoples of Europe until well into our century must end, if Europe is to survive in the world of tomorrow. That the people of this Continent are striving for unity, that they are willing to overcome the selfishness inherent in nationalism must be considered a great step forward in the progress of civilization.

Where does Europe stand today? Who is entitled to speak on behalf of all?

We only have to open a political reference book and look up the European associations and organizations, to see that the difficulty of creating a union of European nations does not only result from the diversity and number of peoples, but also from the diversity and number of institutions and associations created by the nations of Europe. The enumeration of only a few of these organizations—EEC, Euratom, ECSC, EFTA, and many others—suffices to show the richness of the European spectrum.

But when one resorts to "catchwords," further differentiations become possible.

There are the advocates of a "greater Europe" and those who want a so-called little Europe.

There are conceptions which the political commentators register under the heading of "l'Europe des patries," Europe as a community of sovereign nations; and there is the opposite ideal: Europe as a "Vaterland" replacing the national states.

Among the Europeans there are "Federalists" and "Confederalists"; there are those who want to preserve a "national" structure for the unified Continent, and those who want to give it a "supranational" one. Some want Europe to be an independent "third power," others want to see the Continent embedded in a great "Atlantic partnership." Finally, there are Europeans who can only imagine a "fully integrated" Europe as far as military, economic, cultural and political matters are concerned, and there are Europeans who regard this very tendency as a great danger.

It is not because I wanted to produce the impression that the pursuit of Europe appears hopeless in view of the numerous different attitudes, opinions, and philosophies

that I have taken the liberty of reviewing briefly the great mosaic of existing conceptions of the unification of Europe; I have done so because such a survey of the different points of view enables me to highlight the problems that arise in connection with Austria's orientation toward Europe. And about this difficulty, about these Austrian problems, let me now say a few words.

Left over after the dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy the small country of Austria at first found it difficult to fit herself into the European political system established by the peace treaties of 1919, a system which, as we all know, did not prove long lived. What had been handed over to the 7 million Austrians, the residue of the dismembered great empire, was regarded by many of my compatriots as well as by numerous foreign observers as a very poor basis for a new beginning, as a very small dowry for the establishment of a new state. Inevitably at that time many an Austrian patriot considered union with a larger economic and political body the only possible way out of that very discouraging situation. It was only when Austria had in fact vanished from the map in 1938 that many became aware of the historic significance and the tragic consequences of that event for the other European nations.

The Austrians did not only have to go through the "sea of blood and tears," to quote Sir Winston Churchill's unforgettable moving phrase, like all the other European nations, before they were able to rejoin the community of the peoples of Europe as a completely free and independent member. Even after the end of the war they had to wait for a rather long time. It was only 10 years later that their hour came: May 15, 1955, when the "State Treaty for the Reestablishment of an Independent and Democratic Austria" was signed. On October 26 of the same year Austria's Parliament passed the constitutional law laying down the country's permanent neutrality. This act was passed "for the permanent maintenance of Austria's external independence and the preservation of the integrity of her territory." It may seem strange for the head of government of a European state to lay so much emphasis on the desire of his country to retain its independence in addressing this Assembly which you, ladies and gentlemen, have formed for the express purpose of discussing ever new and ever better ways and possibilities for the pursuit of European unity.

Karl Jaspers rightly observes: "The ethos of neutrality proper—which in smaller states reaches into the very way of life as well as into the consciousness of existence of the individual citizen—could serve as guidepost to world order. The essence of the neutrality of small powers, self-restraint, would become universal."

Neutrality and independence are now the basis of our political existence, the indispensable precondition for continued friendly relations with the great powers, the solid basis of our good relations with our neighbors, the "sine qua non" of an avoidance of tension in the Danubian area of central Europe.

We Austrians know what the great unity of Europe means for everybody, including ourselves. Therefore, what Austria's representative requests of this distinguished Assembly and of all who think and feel as Europeans and who desire a unified Europe is this: Please search for a European formula which is not too narrow and too restricted; find a European formula in which there is no "exclusivism"; strive for a European formula that provides room for all the nations of Europe. The neutral countries, too, are part of Europe, and they do not wish to be forced into the role of expatriates on their own Continent. "Isolation of the neutrals" must not be the motto when the other Europeans think of creating the Europe of tomorrow. We were among the nations who warmly welcomed the resolution passed by the Committee of Ministers in the course of its 32d session, because this represents an important step forward on the way to the unification of Europe.

After the liberation of Austria had been achieved, Julius Raab gave the following description of the new hopeful attitude of my compatriots: "The most important symptom of the change the attitude of the Austrians has undergone is that they now believe in the political and economic viability of their country. Therefore the overwhelming majority of the Austrian people wants Austria to remain an independent state and rejects any policy that tends to jeopardize that independence."

I fully concur with that statement of my predecessor. But now I have to give you a short description of my country's economic situation so that you will understand why, in the future, Austria, while fulfilling all her international obligations and strictly maintaining her neutrality, must continue to move with the great economic currents of Europe and avoid being pushed into a picturesque but sterile backwater.

The Austrian economy has shown a favorable development during the last decade, a trend which has been facilitated by the favorable level of international economic activities. But the various measures adopted under Austria's economic policy also contributed materially toward this development. Their main emphasis was on a well-designed growth policy; on the prevention of any major inflationary tendencies and on increasing mass incomes and raising the population's standard of living. Between 1950 and 1959, there were, among the OECD countries, only the Federal Republic of Germany and Greece which recorded higher growth rates than Austria. This growth, it is true, slackened somewhat after 1960, but in 1963 and 1964 Austria was again among the leading European countries. This fast progress has primarily been due to the high level of investment; the changes in the economic pattern in favor of more productive branches; the shifting of manpower from agriculture to industry—a "sacrificium sociale" imposed on Austrian farmers for the benefit of the Austrian people as a whole—and, last not least, due to the prevailing industrial peace and to the prevention of any serious internal crises. There exists hardly any other country throughout Europe where the internal stability has been warranted by the fact that the political responsibility has uninterruptedly for 20 years, been vested in a government whose pattern did not change. In this government the Federal Chancellor has been appointed by the Austrian People's Party, while the Vice Chancellor has been delegated by the Socialist Party which is second in importance in our country.

As the social product has grown, mass incomes, too, have gone up. From 1950 to 1962, average per capita incomes of Austrian dependent workers rose, in real terms, by 40 to 50 percent. This increase of mass incomes resulted quite naturally in a corresponding increase of the living standard, a fact which was reflected by the growing share of incomes spent for the purchase of durable consumer goods.

From the description I have given of my country's economic situation—which justifies a reasonable optimism—you will readily understand that the Austrian people, with their sad experience from the interwar period, are greatly interested not to miss the connection with the large international economic areas which are in the making in Europe. Therefore, since the initiation of the Marshall plan, we have cooperated in all economic schemes in Europe with a view to insure prosperity to our economy by securing our markets with our traditional trading partners. This was the reason why we cooperated in the attempts to create a large European free trade area, which then formed the objective of the intense work of a committee of OEEC. When late in 1958 it became obvious that this way was impracticable because it did not meet with the approval of all member countries, we joined the European Free Trade Association. We have benefited from our cooperation in that organization in that we have been able to intensify our trade with EFTA countries. However, our economy is so highly dependent on exports that economically we must keep pace with the European Economic Community and cannot dispense with a continued development of favorable trade relations with it. We certainly do hope that satisfactory solutions can be found for all countries which are interested in European trade and which have to face problems similar to ours. However, the problem as to whether each of these countries can wait equally long for an overall European solution will depend on the individual country's economic structure, its economic resources or, so to speak, on the length of its "economic breath." We people of Austria believe that, in the interest of this country's industry, trades, and agriculture, there should be no further unnecessary delay in the conclusion of a special kind of arrangement with the European Economic Community. Ever since December 1961 we have been making efforts to enter into such negotiations, and we hope that the EEC Council of Ministers will at the soonest possible date issue a mandate to the Commission to take up negotiations. We Austrians realize fully that the participation of our country—its integration—in the economic dynamism of Europe is an indispensable condition for maintaining Austria free and independent. Such an arrangement, it is true, will have to take account of the particularities and reserves resulting from our firm will to abide strictly by our international obligations and to maintain, in accordance with our undertakings, "permanent" neutrality, which, besides, has been time and again appreciated by both the East and the West in view of its high stabilizing effect.

In a recent address before the council of Europe, Dr. Bruno Kreisky, Austria's Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs, drew the attention of the Assembly to our country's geographical position and in particular emphasized the fact that our country is nearer to the capitals of the countries in Eastern Europe than all other metropolises of Europe and that in our country there live many people whose forefathers came from countries in Central, Eastern, and Southern Europe. Dr. Kreisky warned against any overestimation of Austria's possibilities, but rightly pointed out that the relations to Eastern Europe "create affinities and constitute imponderables" which are of significance.

And that is a fact which must not be neglected by the political architects of the future Europe; namely, the fact that Eastern Europe is also part of Europe. Europe does not end at the eastern borders of my country. The city of Vienna should not be regarded as "the terminus of the West" as Dr. Drimmel, vice mayor of Vienna, rightly put it. The future house of Europe would have to be viewed by us Austrians as an unfinished and incomplete structure if it consisted of a central front and a western wing while the eastern wing would remain unfinished. Austria adheres to the liberal-democratic way of life. We hold fast to Western thinking, to Western traditions and habits. We know that the countries of Eastern Europe have a social system which has nothing in common with our own. But we welcome that evolution in the countries of Eastern Europe which makes us hope that these peoples will come closer to greater Europe. In our view it is to be welcomed when they open their doors ever more widely inscribing them ever more clearly and invitingly with the words: "Introite! nam et hic Europa est." And we welcome their people when they come to our

countries in ever-growing numbers as visitors and tourists, as economic and political negotiators, and as artists and scientists.

The Council of Europe has initiated a great number of agreements and has sponsored many European conferences which were not dedicated to the so-called major unsolved problems of policy but to very important and useful arrangements which produce beneficial effects in many spheres of social life. I refer in this connection—to give most recent examples—to the important European Conference on Air Pollution, which was held at Strasbourg last year and I refer to the Parliamentary and Scientific Conference which was convened in Vienna last May. I know your efforts for arriving at a Europe-wide cooperation, for instance, in the fields of metetorology and river conservancy. As the representatives of a country of recreation and tourism we are highly interested in these activities. To me, it would appear reasonable to consider seriously an invitation to the countries of Eastern Europe in order to arouse at first their interest in European cooperation in all of those spheres where a new climate of cooperation between the West and the East could be created irrspective of political resentments and divergencies. I fully endorse the ideas expressed in your recommendation No. 389 last May which stated that it was a "duty of the Council of Europe to contribute both toward uniting free and democratic Europe and reducing tensions between East and West."

In the 15 years of its existence, the Council of Europe has displayed an activity which has been extremely beneficial to the people of Europe. The agreements, recommendations, debates, and discussions have been to the advantage of all member countries. The flexibility of your statute, the wise limitation of your scope of activities to fields where any competition with other European organizations is avoided make Strasbourg and the Council of Europe an ideal place of meeting for all Europeans. This is your great asset, because it is precisely for this reason that Strasbourg has become a signpost showing the way to greater Europe, to that Europe of which at all times the best Europeans have dreamt. It should become possible, even in critical moments, when the European family will be at variance, that the common philosophy to which we adhere should prove its worth and prevail over national interests.

We have a regrettable dispute on the issue of South Tyrol with Italy, our neighbor with whom we desire to entertain good and friendly relations. We are conducting very intensive negotiations on that problem with the Italian Government. I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to thank the Council of Europe for actively assisting in the elimination of the existing difficulties between Italy and Austria by setting up a subcommittee.

In conclusion I should like to say this: Austria's main contribution toward reducing tensions between East and West is her foreign policy which provides the basis for peaceful relations in the geographical area around our own territory. Since 1955, Austria has been a stabilizing factor in Europe, and since then it has been one of the basic principles of our foreign policy to maintain undisturbed and untroubled relations with the main signatories of the State Treaty. For some time, we have had very good and friendly relations with Yugoslavia and in recent months we have arrived at a remarkable improvement of our relations with Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Poland; furthermore, we wish that the settlement of pending property issues with Czechoslovakia should result in a further improvement of our relations with that neighbor of ours. Similarly, we do hope for an early settlement of unsolved property problems with Poland. The people of Austria have one great wish; to create such conditions along the borders with our neighbors as will constitute a very clear and manifest proof of the elimination of tension in this part of Europe. All of our efforts in the international sphere are aimed at maintaining and insuring Austria's present position in international relations. We believe that in pursuing this policy, we act not only in our own interest but also in the interest of all nations of Europe.

The starting point of the activity of the Council of Europe was the profession of faith in man, in human freedom, and human dignity. Allow me to add a personal remark: I know that the living together of people different in origin, different in their way of thinking, and different in their philosophy presupposes a great deal of tolerance on all sides. We live in a pluralistic society which cannot regard as its exclusive objective the realization of the so-called Christian Occident. As a Christian, as an Austrian, and as a European, I take this profession of faith in man for a reliable proof of the fact that in Europe today there are men of different philosophies and of different ideologies making efforts to seek and establish a European system of human relationships whose basic principles are rooted in European (occidental) thinking. I wish that the Council of Europe continue to be a Europe-wide forum providing an opportunity for all Europeans to participate in your discussions. In taking the floor I introduced myself to your Assembly by saying "Civis Europaeus Sum."

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, I request you to recognize Austria's position in Europe, as I have explained it. Not only today but also in future decades, in the "Europe of tomorrow," we Austrian people wish to be able to come to this Assembly and to greet you with the same saluation: "We are citizens of Europe."

League of Women Voters Again Supports Home Rule for District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters is an organization which consistently serves the Nation by drawing together the important facts about the important issues and presenting them to its members and to the Nation.

The league has served us well again in its March issue of "Facts and Issues." An article on home rule for the District of Columbia asks the most frequent questions raised about home rule and gives the relevant answers. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent that the text of the league's article be included at this point in the RECORD for the consideration of the Members of the House.

The article follows:

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA?

Washington is a lovely city. Crowds of sightseers take home and cherish memory of the Capitol, the White House, the Lincoln Memorial, the Washington Monument, the Supreme Court, the National Art Gallery, and the glory of flowers in spring. But they do not see Washington, which is the District of Columbia, as a city with citizens, schools, houses, like other cities. Its schools, like others, are overcrowded; it, too, has dilapidated teeming slums and it is concerned about high rates of crime, infant mortality, and dependency. Many District citizens, including the Commissioners who administer District affairs, work as citizens elsewhere do—for better schools, more health services, less racial discrimination in housing and hiring.

But what District citizens think and say has had little impact on improving these conditions. They have no vote for their city government and their city officers have no ultimate power. American citizens who are represented in Congress should know about this anomalous situation in the Nation's Capital City.

Home rule, or more appropriately local self-government, would restore to citizens of Washington the privilege of voting for officials who would have the authority to enact and enforce laws relating to purely local affairs, the power to tax and to determine how local tax money should be allocated.

Home rule is a solution which has the overwhelming support of the majority of voters in Washington, and many local and national organizations.

WASHINGTON HAD SELF GOVERNMENT BEFORE RECONSTRUCTION ERA

Local self-government is not a new idea. For almost three-quarters of a century after the city was granted a charter in 1802, Washington's citizens practiced local self-government as anticipated by the Founding Fathers. They elected mayors and city councils of various types until the Reconstruction Era. In 1871 there were three separate jurisdictions within the District of Columbia; the city of Washington, the city of Georgetown, and the county of Washington. That year, Congress abolished these three separate governments. A single jurisdiction, the District of Columbia, was established in order that improvements in sanitation and other public works might be accomplished.

The new government, consisting of an appointed governor and a legislative assembly of two chambers, one appointed and one elected by popular franchise, was charged with the responsibility of providing the city with the public works it so desperately needed. In its haste to fulfill this charge and with insufficient fiscal guidance and financial assistance from the Federal Government, it brought the city to the edge of bankruptcy.

Washington in this period was emerging from the havoc of the Civil War and was developing into the major city it is today. Among its problems, then as now, was the question of how financial responsibility for the development of the National Capital should be shared between the local and Federal Governments. There had been a good deal of bickering between Congress and the city governments as to responsibility for bearing the financial burden of educating the newly freed slaves who had come to Washington in great numbers in the preceding decade and there was some fear among the city's white population about the way Washington's newly enfranchised Negroes might use their vote.

COMMISSION GOVERNMENT INTENDED AS TEMPORARY MEASURE

In 1874 Congress decided to take over administration of the city. It withdrew the local franchise and established the commission form of government as a temporary measure until the city could get back on its feet financially. This measure was made permanent by passage of the Organic Act of 1878, and essentially the same form of government operates in the District to this day.

PRESENT STRUCTURE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

At present, both legislative and fiscal responsibility for the District of Columbia rests with Congress. There are four congressional committees who spend all or part of their time on District affairs—the Committees on the District of Columbia in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, which consider all measures relating to District municipal affairs other than appropriations, and the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, which consider appropriations.

Congress has delegated limited authority to a board of three commissioners (one of whom is detailed from the Army Corps of Engineers), who are appointed by the President, and to many agencies whose members are variously appointed by the President, the Commissioners, or judges of the district court. The most important of these agencies are:

The National Capital Planning Commission, which is the central planning agency for the Federal and District governments within the National Capital region.

Redevelopment Land Agency, which administers urban renewal in the District.

National Capital Housing Authority, the District's public housing agency.

National Capital Transportation Agency, which was established in 1960 to prepare a transit development program for the National Capital region.

The Chief of the Army Engineers, Department of the Army, who is responsible for the District's water supply.

National Park Service, which has exclusive charge and control of the park system.

Architect of the Capitol, who is an agent of Congress and has jurisdiction and control over the U.S. Capitol Grounds.

Zoning Commission

Board of Zoning Adjustment, which can make exceptions to zoning regulations.

Public Service Commission

Boards of Education, Elections, Library Trustees, and Recreation.

The District Commissioners are responsible for the agencies of the District government as follows:

Commissioner of Public Works (Engineer Commissioner)—Departments of Sanitary Engineering, Highways and Traffic, Buildings and Grounds, Motor Vehicles, Licenses and Inspections, and Veterans' Affairs; Office of the Surveyor; Office of Urban Renewal; Office of the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency.

Commissioner of Public Safety (usually the president of the Board of Commissioners, who also has many ceremonial duties)—Metropolitan Police Department, Fire Department, Office of Civil Defense, Office of Recorder of Deeds.

Commissioner of Public Health and Welfare—Departments of Public Health, Public Welfare, Corrections, Insurance, and Vocational Rehabilitation; Board of Parole; Alcoholic Beverage Control Board; Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board; Office of Coroner.

Neither the Congressmen, the Commissioners, nor administrators of any of the agencies listed above, even those whose functions relate exclusively to the local community, are answerable to the citizens of Washington.

Home rule would transfer to a locally elected government the powers presently held by the Commissioners and the responsibility for purely local functions performed by such special agencies as the Boards of Education and Elections. To protect the Federal interest and to insure that Washington is a capital worthy of the Nation, the other agencies would continue as Federal organizations. Members of the locally elected government, representing the District interest, would have the positions in these agencies now set aside for the Commissioners.

CONGRESS LEGISLATES, COMMISSIONERS ADMINISTER

Congress legislates for the District on all matters that have not been delegated to the District Board of Commissioners. The Commissioners administer the laws and supervise most of the administrative agencies of the District government. In the critical matter of finance, however, they may only set the rate of taxation on real estate; all other taxing and bonding authority is retained by the Congress.

The Commissioners are responsible for drawing up the annual budget for the city. It is prepared in a manner similar to that followed by departments of the Federal Government. The District's budget is tied to the Federal budgetary cycle and suffers frustrating delays because of this fact. (For example, the budget for fiscal year 1964 which began on July 1, 1963, was not adopted by Congress until December 1963; the budget for fiscal year 1965 which began on July 1, 1964, was adopted in August 1964.) The Federal Bureau of the Budget presents the District budget to the President after the Commissioners and their agency heads, together with the budget officer in the District of Columbia Department of General Administration, have scrutinized and weighed budget estimates along with projected total revenue. After the President submits the budget to Congress, the Commissioners and their staff appear before the District of Columbia Subcommittees of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to justify the budget.

DOES CONGRESS "FOOT THE BILL" FOR WASHINGTON?

Since Congress plays such a central and crucial role in these budgetary procedures, many persons erroneously believe that Congress foots the bill for the city of Washington. The fact is that nearly 90 percent of the District's general fund expenditures come from money raised by local taxes. The general fund finances the city's basic services (schools, libraries, police and fire protection, courts, corrections, welfare, sanitation, recreation, and the construction of public buildings for any of these purposes). However, Washingtonians have no official voice either in the levying of these taxes or in deciding how these revenues should be spent.

A part of the District's operating and maintenance budget is financed by Federal money. The Federal payment is compensation to the city for the fact that the Federal Government and tax-exempt institutions, such as embassies and national headquarters for many organizations, occupy more than 50 percent of the city's land but pay no taxes to the city. During the last decade, the Federal payment has been small, hovering around 12 percent. From 1879 through 1920, 50 percent of the general fund appropriation was paid by Congress and 50 percent from District taxes. Since 1921, however, the Federal payment has fluctuated from a high of 39.5 percent in 1924 to a low of 8.5 percent in 1954.

WILL HOME RULE MEAN LOSS OF FEDERAL PAYMENT AND INCREASE IN LOCAL TAXES?

There is concern in some quarters that if Congress were to transfer revenue and budget functions to a locally elected council it would be disinclined to appropriate reasonable annual Federal payments to the District and the tax burden on Washington's residents and businesses would necessarily increase. Supporters of self-government argue that the Federal Government's financial obligation to the District derives not from Congress legislative responsibility for the District but rather from the role which the city plays as Capital of the Nation. Compounded with the fact that more than 50 percent of the city's land is tax exempt is the fact that the city incurs extra expenses and its ordinary city functions cost more because it is the Federal City: It must pave wider streets, plant and care for more trees, help to keep more parks than most cities; plan for and clean up after parades for visiting dignitaries and on special occasions; it has thousands of tourists every year; it even finances the operation of the National Zoo.

As for the often-used argument that taxes will go up in the wake of self-government, it is noted that taxes have increased in Washington in the absence of home rule and that tax increases are common in cities throughout the country. Tax increase is not a problem that is unique to Washington, but taxation without representation is. Some forces are responsive to the "taxation without representation" complaint and propose as a remedy representation in Congress. Full representation in Congress can be granted, however, only by adoption of an amendment to the Constitution which requires action by Congress and ratification by the States. Local self-government, including a provision for a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives, can be achieved simply by an act of Congress.

HOME RULE IS CONSTITUTIONAL

Questions have been raised as to the legality of home rule for the District of Columbia. This matter was settled in 1953 when the Supreme Court unanimously upheld the constitutionality of home rule. Its decision in the Thompson Restaurant case confirmed the fact that Congress can properly delegate to a city council or legislative assembly the authority to pass laws for the District.

PROTECTION OF THE FEDERAL INTEREST IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The status of Washington as the Capital of the Nation and the concentration of so many Federal agencies here are factors in the home rule problem. Some opponents of home rule maintain that the Federal interest might be overshadowed by the parochial interests of local residents and their elected representatives. On the contrary, the Federal interest will be protected under any proposed form of home rule because ultimate legislative authority for the District will still rest with the Congress, as set forth in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States.[1] Congress would still have the authority to initiate legislation for the District if it chose to do so or to veto any locally adopted legislation that threatens the Federal interest. Recent bills have provided that the President have the right to veto any acts of a local government which might be contrary to the Federal interest. Further limitations have been written into home rule proposals to the extent that the local government would have no authority with respect to Federal agencies beyond that which the Commissioners have at present.

HOME RULE COULD MEAN BETTER GOVERNMENT

Would the Federal interest and the interests of good government be served better if Congress relieved itself of the duties pertaining to the formulating of laws for the ninth largest city of the United States? Local needs of a large city require local attention and study to provide effective local government. Most Members of Congress cannot devote themselves to the District and its problems—they simply do not have the time to give Washington the attention it needs because of the volume and complexity of legislation affecting their own districts, States, the Nation, and the world. Since city coun-

[1] Art. I, sec. 8, contains this provision: "The Congress shall have power * * * to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the government of the United States * * *."

cilmen would not have these other weighty responsibilities, it could be expected that their time and energies would be devoted to the problems of the city and its residents.

SUPPORT FOR HOME RULE

The Senate of the United States has passed bills to give the District of Columbia home rule five times since 1948. The Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations have all endorsed home rule for the District, as have the two major national political parties. Although the House District Committee has never given the House of Representatives the opportunity to vote on these bills, repeated surveys of House Members indicate there seems to be sufficient sentiment in favor of home rule to permit the passage of a bill if one were permitted to come before them.

American citizens take for granted their right to vote in local elections. Residents of our Nation's Capital want this right, too. In the 1964 District primary elections, Washingtonians had their first opportunity to vote for President and Vice Presidnt under the 23d amendment to the Constitution. Both Democratic and Republican ballots contained questions asking voters to indicate whether they wanted local self-government. Democrats voted 64,580 to 4,368 in favor; Republicans 8,094 to 7,733. Overall response in favor of home rule was 6 to 1.

Home rule for the District of Columbia has the support of many national organizations. The League of Women Voters of the United States has supported self-government for the District since 1938. Others include the AFL-CIO, American Association of University Women, American Civil Liberities Union, American Jewish Congress, American Veterans Committee, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Association of College Women, National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, National Community Relations Advisory Committee, National Council of Jewish Women, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, United Auto Workers of America, and Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

IS OPPOSITION JUSTIFIED?

The civil rights aspects of home rule were recognized by the inclusion of a demand for full enfranchisement of all citizens in the Nation's Capital in the historic march on Washington for jobs and freedom, August 28, 1963. Negroes are a majority in Washington—53.9 percent according to the 1960 census—and this fact is said to be a significant factor in congressional and other opposition to home rule. Undoubtedly, some of the present opposition has its roots in attitudes that grew out of the Reconstruction era and the poor fiscal administration by the territorial government.

But present-day Washington's electorate is well-qualified to choose its own officials. The average number of school years completed by Washington residents aged 25 years and over is 11.7. Only nine States surpass this level of educational attainment. Washingtonians, both white and Negro, have repeatedly demonstrated their civic maturity and pride in the capital city by their vigorous participation in civic organizations and many, both white and Negro, serve with distinction in responsible positions in the present District government.

The Bureau of the Budget has carefully scrutinized the fiscal provisions in home rule legislation and has endorsed them as sound. There is no reason to believe that home rule would mean financial irresponsibility. Among the fiscal safeguards written into the bills are: limitations on the amount of bonds which may be outstanding at any time; a limitation on the amount of borrowing which may be undertaken without the assent of the voters; and an independent audit of the local government's books by the General Accounting Office.

HOME RULE IN THE 88TH CONGRESS

For the first time in nearly 5 years, the House District of Columbia Committee heard testimony on proposals for home rule in November 1963. A bipartisan statement supporting home rule, signed by more than 50 Congressmen, was filed with the committee and strong testimony favoring the mayor-council bill was presented by the president of the Board of Commissioners, the Attorney General of the United States, the Deputy Director of the U.S. Budget Bureau, and a few of the many representatives of civic groups who were waiting to testify. In spite of the strong statements presented by these witnesses, committee members expressed much interest in a bill which would retrocede most of the District to Maryland, claiming this would provide fullest enfranchisement for Washingtonians. However, the device of retrocession is of questionable constitutionality.

The hearings were recessed abruptly, to be resumed at the call of the chairman. Further hearings were not held. In May 1964 the League of Women Voters of the District of Columbia and the League of Women Voters of the United States, along with the Washington Home Rule Committee and many civic organizations, filed statements in support of home rule and joined in an effort to urge the chairman to close the hearings and report a bill. There was no response.

HOME RULE IN THE 89TH CONGRESS?

In his message of February 2, 1965, President Johnson urged the 89th Congress to enact legislation at "the earliest possible date" granting the right of self-government to the District of Columbia. The following excerpts are from that message:

"Our Federal, State, and local governments rest on the principle of democratic representation—the people elect those who govern them. We cherish the credo declared by our forefathers: no taxation without representation. We know full well that men and women give the most of themselves when they are permitted to attack problems which directly affect them.

"Yet the citizens of the District of Columbia * * * have no vote in the government of their city. They are taxed without representation. They are asked to assume the responsibilities of citizenship while denied one of its basic rights. * * *

"Self-government for the District would not be an innovation. It is a return to the views of the Founding Fathers and to the practice of the early days of the Nation.* * *

"There is a fundamental Federal interest in the National Capital. The Constitution wisely delegates to the Congress supreme legislative power over 'the seat of the Government of the United States.' The Congress can, however, delegate to a municipal legislature all the powers necessary for local self-government, and at the same time preserve fully its ultimate power and the interests of the Federal Government."

Several bills have been introduced in the 89th Congress to provide local self-government for the District of Columbia. On March 9 and 10 the Senate District of Columbia Committee held hearings at which a representative of the President, the District Commissioners, and spokesmen for national and local organizations expressed support. The Senate seems to be moving toward passage, for the sixth time, of a home rule bill.

Action in the House of Representatives depends to a large degree on whether citizens in other parts of the country let their Representatives know how they feel about the local government situation in the Nation's Capital City.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses received President's message on reorganization of Weather Bureau and Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Senate cleared coffee bill for White House and worked on voting rights bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 10039–10078

Bills Introduced: 13 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1959–1971; and S.J. Res. 81.

Page 10041

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S.J. Res. 81, to authorize Secretary of Commerce to apportion the sum authorized for fiscal year 1966 for National System of Interstate and Defense Highways (S. Rept. 187); and

H.R. 7717, fiscal 1966 authorizations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, with amendments (S. Rept. 188). Page 10041

Bill Referred: H.R. 6755, authorizing additional appropriations for river basin plans for flood control and navigation, was referred to Committee on Public Works.

Page 10039

Reorganization Plan No. 2—Department of Commerce: President transmitted message outlining his proposal for the reorganization of the Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, of the Department of Commerce—referred to Committee on Government Operations. Pages 10039–10041

Interparliamentary Group: Senator McNamara was appointed by Vice President in lieu of Senator Young of Ohio to the Eighth Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group, to meet in Ottawa May 20–24. Page 10041

Coffee Agreement: By 19 yeas to 61 nays, Senate concurred in House amendment to S. 701, to carry out U.S. obligations under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962. This action cleared bill for the President's signature. Pages 10083–10084

Voting Rights: Senate worked on S. 1564, to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the U.S. (right to vote), rejecting two amendments, as follows (to Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in nature of a substitute for the amended committee substitute for the bill):

By 19 yeas to 66 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Sparkman amendments en bloc to provide that list of eligible voters shall be made up of those persons the examiner finds to have the qualifications prescribed by State law rather than those having such qualifications not inconsistent with the Constitution of the U.S.; and by 34 yeas to 44 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Prouty amendment to assure that State and local poll taxes are not used to prevent voting on account of race or color.

Pending at adjournment was Ervin amendment to provide that nothing in the proposed law shall be construed to invalidate or suspend any State law applying equally to citizens of all races that would merely require before registration or voting the ability to read or write in English any section of the State or Federal Constitution.

By unanimous consent, it was agreed to vote on the Ervin amendment by 2:30 p.m. on Friday, May 14, with debate thereon to be limited to 2 hours, equally divided, to start not later than 12:30 p.m. at conclusion of routine morning business. Pages 10078–10094

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today.

Pages 10083, 10084, 10094

Program for Friday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 5:26 p.m. until noon Friday, May 14, when it will continue on S. 1564, voting rights, with vote on pending Ervin amendment to be taken by 2:30 p.m.

Pages 10094, 10098

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on fiscal 1966 budget estimates for the Bureau of Reclamation and power marketing agencies, having as its witnesses Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power; and Charles F. Luce, Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

Appendix

"The Creative Role of U.S. Private Investment Abroad"—Address by Michael L. Haider

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14, 1965

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on April 28, a very distinguished American industrialist addressed the Harvard Business School Club of Washington on the subject "The Creative Role of U.S. Private Investment Abroad."

Michael L. Haider, chairman of the board of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, told the gathering of important contributions being made by U.S. investors in developing countries abroad. He also discussed with great clarity the many problems faced by U.S. investors in the newly developing countries and in the more developed nations.

As the chairman of a firm with vast investments overseas, Mr. Haider speaks with a deep knowledge of his subject. He has worked and traveled abroad many times in his more than 30 years with this great oil firm. I believe his comment will be of much interest to all Senators. Therefore, I ask that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CREATIVE ROLE OF U.S. PRIVATE INVESTMENT ABROAD

(Remarks by M. L. Haider, chairman, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, to the Harvard Business School Club of Washington, Washington, D.C., Apr. 28, 1965)

I appreciate very much this opportunity to talk to you tonight and I hope that in deciding to discuss the role of U.S. private investments abroad I have selected a subject of mutual interest. It is a subject important to my company because of our extensive foreign investments and because about two-thirds of our profit comes from abroad. I assume that all of you as students of world affairs have an interest in the subject and that some of you also are concerned with shaping Government policies relating to foreign investments.

Before talking directly to this subject I should like to digress a bit to touch on one aspect which has great current—but I hope temporary—interest: namely, the participation of U.S. investing companies in the President's voluntary cooperation program to improve the U.S. balance of payments.

I have assured Secretary of Commerce Connor that the Jersey company will cooperate fully in the program. We are taking special measures which we expect will result in an appreciable increase in our company's net payments contribution in 1965 over the 1964 figure, which was about a third of a billion dollars.

To accomplish this increase will not be easy. Ironically, the task is made harder in our company's case by the fact that we jumped on the temperance wagon several years too soon. Before the voluntary program began we had already taken steps, in deference to the Nation's balance-of-payments problem, to make sure that we held abroad no liquid funds in excess of the minimum working requirements of our foreign affiliates. We had refrained from the short-term investment of such funds abroad where the yields are higher. Consequently, we cannot now improve our apparent balance simply by repatriating such funds.

Also, we have been following a policy of borrowing abroad. At the end of last year our foreign debt stood at over $1 billion. In view of this fact, it is not feasible to finance all of our foreign investments simply by further borrowing abroad when one considers the magnitude of the annual expenditures required to keep our plants and equipment modern and efficient and to keep pace with the growing demand for petroleum products.

In spite of these handicaps we intend to do our utmost to achieve a substantial improvement because we concur strongly with the conclusion of President Johnson and Secretary Connor that the most suitable way to get U.S. business to increase its payments contribution is a voluntary program. It provides flexibility and yet puts the responsibility on those who can make the program work.

The two main steps we are taking under the voluntary program are to defer investments and, to the extent possible, to borrow more abroad. These steps will mean definite direct costs to the company. We accept these costs in the belief that they will be more than offset by advantages which our company will share. Essentially, the advantages are two: stability for the dollar, and avoidance of the disruption and chaos which would accompany any attempt to introduce direct exchange controls into the U.S. economy.

I am confident the voluntary program will work, and that there will be—and probably already has been—a clear-cut increase in the payments contribution of U.S. investors abroad. Businessmen are doing their part in meeting what the Government concluded was an urgent problem requiring immediate and extraordinary measures.

Yet at the same time I should like to stress that I do not consider the program of voluntary restraint to be a solution to our balance-of-payments problem. It only provides a breathing spell during which we can make sure that our fiscal and monetary policies are adequate to protect the value of the dollar on a long-term basis.

Among other reasons, prompt removal of the present restraints is important for the sake of the balance of payments itself. We need to act just as soon as possible to protect the future payments position of the United States—and I am talking about the short-term future, not a decade or more ahead.

With those brief comments on the balance-of-payments problem we might now leave that subject and go on to discuss the main theme—the creative role of U.S. private investment abroad.

It might be well to begin with this question: Just what is private investment? I know this is very elementary, but frequently elementary concepts are obscured by the complex mechanisms which grow from them, so that we sometimes forget the basic concepts themselves.

I think this is particularly true abroad where people encounter only the larger U.S. corporations, and because they are large, many people conclude that they make unreasonable profits. These critics do not relate the profits to investments, nor do they recognize that in their own country they too have both large and small private enterprises.

The fact is that private investment, or the free enterprise system, on the international scene just as in this country, does not consist solely of large international oil companies, IBM, General Motors, General Electric and General Foods, and all the other "generals." It includes countless colonels, captains, lieutenants, and privates as well.

All elements of the private enterprise system, large and small, have one thing in common—they all invest money with the hope of making a profit. Whether the investment is made in a simple machine to make mousetraps or in an industrial complex to make automobiles; whether it is the corner grocery store or the big supermarket, the common incentive is profit. The prospect of making a profit, then, is the main driving force which causes people to risk their money in investments whether in a big firm or a little one.

Merely making an investment, of course, does not insure a return on the investment. Some useful service or product must result which is wanted by the purchaser and it must be better or cheaper than that supplied by a competitor. Competition, then, is the second driving force which motivates investors. And when allowed free play it is also the force which limits profitability of an investment and prevents an investor from making an inordinate profit.

These two forces, the profit incentive and competition, are responsible for the inventiveness, the ingenuity and the resourcefulness of the businessman, and for the production of more and better services and products at lower prices for the consumer.

While this system of free enterprise operates in many countries of the world, I think it has been most highly developed and has been most beneficial in the United States. It has given this country the highest standard of living of any country in the world, as well as great national economic strength. In the process it has developed new technology as a result of large expenditures for research; new techniques of distribution; new concepts of mass production, and new management skills.

The U.S. private investor is continually seeking opportunities to put his limited capital resources to the most productive use. With his technology and management skills he often finds opportunities to apply these resources in foreign countries. In investing abroad he does several things, if he is successful. First, he makes a profit. Second, he makes a contribution to the country in which he invests by creating employment, by paying taxes, and by bringing to the public new or better or cheaper services and products, thus improving the economy. Finally, he benefits the U.S. economy by the return of profits and by stimulating exports. In addition to the services and goods required for his own in-

vestment, he also broadens the general acceptance of U.S. manufactured goods, thus increasing exports of products other than his own.

These facts simply illustrate the principle that good business trade or a good business investment is one in which all the parties directly involved share the benefits—though there may sometimes be less joy in the thoughts of a competitor standing by with a more costly product or less efficient investment.

These thoughts have been brought to mind by reading some of the recent newspaper accounts of comments by Government officials on both sides of the Atlantic and by some company officers in Europe on the "disturbing" effect of the U.S. private investment in Europe. I can't help feeling that these have been rather heavily weighted by the viewpoint of the producer who finds himself facing new competition in service to the consumer.

Some of you may remember the story of Robert Benchley's dilemma when he came to class at Harvard one day totally unprepared for a surprise test question which required him to write about the negotiations for a North Atlantic fisheries convention from the point of view of either the British or the United States Government. Benchley met that crisis by writing about the convention from the point of view of the fish.

What I'm trying to suggest is that we need an unconventional reporter these days to stand up for the "fish" and write about U.S. investment abroad from the point of view of the foreign consumer. From the consumer's point of view the "disturbance" caused by new investors is welcome, for if new investors did not offer something better to the consumers there would be no "disturbance." The benefits of the "disturbance" can take many forms. There is for one thing, a good deal of evidence that U.S. competition has had something to do with improvements in the quality and variety of goods for sale in European shops in recent years. For example, British firms are now offering readymade shirts with varying sleeve lengths instead of the old one-length-for-all model. This change may also have disturbed some manufacturers of arm garters but it seems clear that the consumer benefited. I suspect also that the competition of U.S. firms has had a lot to do with the fact that so many European firms are now studying larger economic units which will operate beyond narrow national boundaries and thus be able to produce better and lower priced goods for the consumer. In fact, one test of the role of any investment is its contribution to the welfare of the consumer. I am sure that U.S. investors in Europe are passing that test with high marks. But I do not wish to suggest that the movement of knowledge and ideas and investment has been only one way across the Atlantic; the U.S. consumer has long benefited from foreign investments here.

The same test of benefit to the consumer is applicable also to investments in the developing nations. The same necessity exists there to avoid being swayed over much by the outcries of a producer—whether he controls a private or a governmental facility—when competition puts the pressure on him to improve his service to the consumer. Protectionism can lead to retarded living standards whether it is applied against foreign products or foreign productive investments.

Our national policy has, of course, in recent years taken a special interest in speeding up the economic development of the so-called developing nations. It is for this reason as well that we must work our way out of the voluntary balance-of-payments program. Despite an attempt at special provisions for the developing nations both in the voluntary balance-of-payments program and in the interest equalization tax, I have seen evidence that the voluntary restraints are retarding the flow of funds to these areas also. Yet it is in these areas that private investment, when allowed the opportunity, can probably make its most dramatic contributions to economic growth—often in soil which had been nearly barren.

I do not contend that Government enterprises have never made productive economic innovations or carried out efficient commercial operations. But I do contend that such enterprises are the exception.

By contrast, the private companies have invested their own funds, pioneered entirely new fields of production, introduced new standards of efficiency and professional management—and paid their taxes.

My company alone paid $4 billion in taxes and other payments to governments last year, a large part in the developing nations. Such payments by many companies provide the bulk of the funds needed to finance essential Government services such as schools, roads, and hospitals in the developing nations, just as they have done in this country. The funds so provided will be more commensurate with the task if governments in the developing areas see the wisdom of concentrating their talents and resources on their essential functions without trying to preempt those areas which private businessmen are willing and able to pursue more productively.

The greatest obstacle to private investment in the developing nations today is not the threat of expropriation and breach of contract, serious though these threats may be in some areas. The greatest obstacle lies in the actions which governments have taken to carve out large areas of economic endeavor in which private investors are simply not permitted to operate.

This is the policy of the closed door. No other policy is doing more to slow down the development of nations. This fact, of course, poses an acute problem for our AID authorities who do not wish their assistance funds to substitute for more productive private funds. Our AID officials must be especially concerned that their grants and low-interest loans do not encourage governments to bring even larger areas of their economies under State management in order to present additional projects as justification for such apparently attractive finance.

To combat the policy of the closed door, U.S. private investors have acted flexibly to try to gain broader recognition of their potential contribution to the developing areas. In many areas they have joined together to carry out cooperative community action programs. You may also have heard of the work of some of our Jersey affiliates in such countries as Venezuela, Colombia, and Jamaica, where we are attempting to encourage a strong private local economy through participation on a minority equity basis in various small promising business ventures. The lesser part of our contribution is capital; the more important part is technical and managerial knowhow.

Undoubtedly you have also heard of the formation of the Adela Investment Co., in which more than 120 major firms in Japan, Europe and North America have joined together to provide capital to the private sector of those Latin American countries which offer reasonable security for the investor.

And yet valuable as these special efforts may be, they are not the core of the contribution of the U.S. private investor in the developing country. He makes his main contribution by investing in his own business, operating that business efficiently and productively, and creating new products, new employment, new skills, new taxes and new income. In many of these ventures the necessities of international trade and competition will make joint ventures inappropriate whether they be with local private investors or governmental investors.

In any event I think we should recognize that wholesale adoption of the joint venture form of business would not put an end to the fears concerning foreign investment, nor the frequent opposition to it, in many developing nations. The only lasting answer is twofold: first, we and other U.S. investors must do a good job in conducting our own business abroad; and, second, we must provide the facts which will dispel the fears and present the advantages of the investment to the developing nations so clearly that private investments will be permitted to flourish.

First, naturally, we must study the fears. One, for example, which is frequently expressed is the fear that the foreign private investor will impoverish the developing nation by depriving it both of its natural resources and of its limited supply of foreign exchange.

Perhaps I can best indicate the answer to this concern by referring to the operations of my company. The primary international business of Jersey Standard is not importing into or exporting from the United States. It is producing and refining oil in some areas of the world abroad, transporting the oil, and distributing it in many other areas abroad. By happenstance crude oil is found in large volumes in developing countries—whereas it is the developed countries with their great energy requirements that provide the largest outlets. For greatest efficiency such a business must be conducted on an integrated basis, so that investments in each area abroad contribute to the whole worldwide operation.

In this business we do indeed take oil from the ground in Venezuela, in Libya, and other oil-producing countries. But such oil would be of no value to the producing country if it were left in the ground and it would have little value if we had not made the investments which provide the transportation, the refineries to convert the crude oil into useful products and the distribution system to bring the products to the markets. Such investments and operations do not take value away from the oil-producing countries; they give value to the resources of these countries. We expect to receive some reward for our money and our efforts invested in the process, but the great bulk of the value created is paid to the governments, the workers, and the suppliers in the developing countries. And the story is similar with foreign exchange. We do not remit foreign exchange from the developing countries; rather we generate foreign exchange through sales in the markets of the developed countries and we remit the bulk of this exchange into the developing countries.

In this connection I cannot refrain from adding that it was the private oil companies, both United States and foreign, that first recognized the potential of petroleum and created an international industry which could provide the enormous volumes of low-cost energy that are so vital to the economic development of both producing and consuming nations.

In the petroleum business, as in other businesses, the main contribution of the private investor to the development of nations is the imaginative conduct of his own business. But if he is to make that contribution he must be allowed to open his store in the first place. If private investment is to have its deserved future in the community of nations, an appreciation of this fact must come to permeate business, academic and official thinking on the subject.

I realize that a long-range task of education lies ahead and that many channels must be used. Among these I attach great importance to the programs of the business school in training foreign students, both in Cambridge and through the new overseas program. I also place great stress on the views of those Americans who help to shape

U.S. foreign economic policies and who deal with foreign officials on a government-to-government basis. And, let me add, I consider it most important that the business community should give constant attention to the manner in which American businessmen conduct themselves abroad. Let us hope that, through the combination of all such efforts, the great potential of American private investment will be put to work more and more in the service of the development of nations.

Now, in view of the interest and experience that many of you have in this subject, I would be glad to pursue the subject further on an informal basis with any of you who may be so inclined.

Thank you.

Comprehensive County Planning and Investment in Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14, 1965

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during the recent "Public Land Management Congress" of the National Association of Counties, in Reno, Nev., one of the outstanding papers was delivered by Mr. Neil Pfulb, director of the San Bernardino County Planning Commission, County of San Bernardino, Calif.

In view of the importance of Mr. Pfulb's address to all levels of government, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Pfulb's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPREHENSIVE COUNTY PLANNING AND INVESTMENT IN TOMORROW

(By Neil B. Pfulb, director, County Planning Commission, San Bernardino County, San Bernardino, Calif.)

As I have listened to the various speakers on the program today, it occurs to me that quite properly there is an underlying theme which is consistent throughout all of the talks and that the speakers are conveying this theme to you in many different ways. This reminds me of the story about the little boy that went to Sunday school and upon returning, he was asked by his mother, "Well, what did you learn in Sunday school today?" Little Johnny said, "Well, our teacher told us about when God sent Moses behind the enemy lines to rescue the Israelites from the Egyptians, and when they came to the Red Sea, Moses called for engineers to build a pontoon bridge. After they had all crossed, they looked back and saw the Egyptian tanks coming. Quick as a flash, Moses radioed headquarters on his walkie-talkie to send bombers to blow up the bridge and save the Israelites." Johnny's mother exclaimed, "Are you sure this is what your teacher told you?" "Well," Johnny said, "Not exactly, but if I told it her way, you'd never believe it." So, there are many ways to tell a story and the particular assignment given to me is to talk about planning as an investment in tomorrow.

BASIC NATURE OF INVESTMENTS

We are told that today, more Americans own a larger portion of American industry than ever before. Investment is no longer practiced only by the wealthy. The basic nature of investment, however, has not changed. There must be first an expenditure before there can be dividends. Such is the nature of planning as an investment. The expenditure may not necessarily always be money; it may only be an effort or time. The profit, also, is not always expressed in dollars. It may be in the nature of improved environment.

Many investment counselors advise a three-point system: One, select carefully; two, budget a reasonable amount in relation to income; and three, make regular purchases.

Let's apply this advice to the planning program in your area or in any county. The first point—"select carefully." In choosig the goals for a planning program, in most western counties, the variety of needs and the pressures for planning services are so intense that there is danger that the major investment will not be in planning at all, but in short-term problem solving. The major expenditure can be spent in jumping from one hotspot to the other, while the opportunities for good planning investment are ignored.

ESTABLISH PRIORITIES

There are usually more planning projects than there is staff to conduct them. A conscious effort should, therefore, be made to select and establish priorities on those planning functions which will produce the greatest profit or dividends for your county.

In the investment field, the competition for the wage earners' investment dollar is very intense. Many exciting opportunities are presented. Yet it is basic to our system that the individual investor will choose where to put his dollar.

Today, the counties are in the position of being urged and even pressured into planning projects of many different kinds. Planning and planners have never been in greater demand. But, just as the individual should choose his own investment, so should the counties clearly state their intention and their right to choose what they consider to be the most pressing and promising area in which their planning investment is to be spent.

BUDGET REASONABLE AMOUNT—INVEST REGULARLY

Returning to the advice of the investment counselor, "Budget a reasonable amount in relation to income and invest regularly." The trend in expenditure for planning continues to rise for cities, counties and combined agencies.

A recent survey showed that cities are up 2.6 percent, counties are up 10.7 percent and combined agencies' expenditures are up 14.3 percent. The median expenditure in 1964, in all counties surveyed, was about 33 cents per capita, or in other words, just a little over $1 per family.

This appears to be a favorable picture, nationwide, so far as investment in planning is concerned, but I submit that you cannot always measure the effort in planning in terms of dollars. It can also be measured in the time spent by your boards, your planing commissions and the effort that they make in truly comprehensive planning programs. It can also be measured in the frequency with which planning matters are presented at civic and social organizations and it can be measured by the frequency with which planning projects are constructively presented in the local newspapers.

These are simply indicators. They dramatize that planning is a process involving many people. They illustrate that planning means going through a number of steps to reach a goal. The results, of course, are that if planning investment exists, it pays dividends, or in other words, it achieves goals. Some of these goals will result, as I have mentioned, in dollars saved, and others cannot be measured in dollars.

A FEW EXAMPLES

A few examples, I believe, are appropriate. A particular county long noted for its beautiful scenery, but now undergoing extensive urbanization has been successful in acquiring extensive scenic easements which will preserve some of the most beautiful views in that area. This was a direct result of a planning effort. This effort had brought community support and it will continue now to pay dividends to many generations in that county.

Another county recognized a particularly fine agricultural area and some 10 years ago or more, took steps to protect it by exclusive agricultural zoning. By refusing to permit encroachment into this area, by steadfastly resisting the pressures to rezone, that county has now preserved an area which is being developed by dairies and other agricultural activities which produce a tremendous economic benefit to the county without demanding high-cost Government services. In addition, they have saved an open space which has value in that it separates urban areas and helps give community identity. This value, of course, cannot be measured in dollars.

In another case, a county had a particularly fine freeway planning program and through their advance planning, they have been successful in gaining the support of communities affected by these routes. Their planning program attempted to select routes which would have the least detrimental effect on the local communities. They have now been successful and the State has selected the routes which were recommended primarily through a local planning program. In this way, local communities have expressed themselves in the most forceful way concerning the route of freeways through their areas.

In another case, a county through adequate advance planning encouraged the consolidation of separate sanitation districts, thus eliminating the need for numerous separate sewer plants, permitting a more efficient and economical single plant to serve the area. An advance planning program for schools in one county was carried out with the close cooperation of the planning department and the school districts. The fact that a well thought out plan was adopted and published in attractive brochure form resulted in a savings to many school districts in the cost of purchasing the sites. But probably more important, the location of the sites were better related to the population they served. Thus, the added benefits of convenience were a dividend of planning.

HIGHWAY AND PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING

Probably the most widely publicized and practiced advance planning is in connection with highways. All levels of government are involved in this type of advance planning. Most everyone is familiar with it, so I will not give examples. I would like to say, however, that in many jurisdictions, the value of the rights-of-way which have been received from subdividers and developers as a result of having a formal comprehensive highway plan would probably pay for the entire budget of the planning department.

Public works planning has been emphasized in some jurisdictions where all requests for capital projects must be submitted for review and recommendation. Where sufficient time and study has been given to a capital improvement program, this type of review helps keep public improvements on a priority basis, related to need, and coordinated with other elements of the public improvement program.

Such a clearinghouse procedure can help eliminate conflicting and overlapping improvements. In addition, if this review is related to a well-developed general comprehensive plan in the county, such projects can be properly related to population growth and changes in land use.

SPECIAL DIVIDEND FROM GOOD COUNTY PLANNING

Finally, I would like to mention a dividend of planning which is of particular relevance to this conference. An active planning program is necessary to retain at each level of government that decisionmaking authority which is most appropriate to solve the problems facing that particular level.

Today, we frequently see and hear about the encroachment of high levels of government into the decisionmaking powers of lower levels. I believe, however, it is necessary that we recognize the interdependence of the different levels of government, and that the legitimate functions of each level cannot properly be carried out unless there is mutual reliance upon one another.

Thus, if any level fails to perform, a vacuum is created, and just as nature abhors a vacuum, so does government. Believe me, if there is a vacuum, it will be filled, and probably by the next higher level of government.

Let's take a specific example. San Bernardino County recently participated in a transportation planning study. The study area covered portions of 5 counties and over 100 cities. We know that the future transportation needs in this area will be dependent upon future distribution of people and how they use the land.

The whole basis of the study was dependent upon reliable land use information. Each jurisdiction, therefore, was asked to furnish information on existing and future land use and population. Now, those jurisdictions who had done their homework, those who had prepared plans, were able to submit information which represented decisions made at the local level.

In cases where a jurisdiction had no plan, it was necessary that the higher level of government produce the information and make certain decisions.

The important thing here is that where local governments were able to perform, and where they did perform, their decisions were accepted. But where there was no performance, decisions had to be made by the next higher level of government.

A HEALTHY SIGN

In some cases, the fact that the Federal Government is concerning itself with local decisions is actually a healthy sign. Too often in the past, State and Federal programs and policies were designed, disregarding their effect on local problems.

The purpose of this Conference and the participation shown here between Federal and local government is a significant contribution to understanding needed between all Federal agencies and local government.

NEW FEDERAL REGULATIONS

To illustrate what I mean, I refer to a document just received in my office within the past several weeks. This document sets out the proposed new Federal regulations to establish basic policy in the Department of Interior for the disposition and management for multiple-use lands, and other regulations pertaining to the sale and disposal of lands which are required for the orderly growth and development of a community. I would like to quote certain sections from this proposed regulation:

"1725.2 Disposal policy: Public lands will be transferred out of Federal ownership in the most efficient manner possible. This will be accomplished by the following procedures:

"(a) Encouragement and assistance will be extended to State, county, and other local governments in master planning and zoning.

"(b) Participation of the public and consultation with local government will be invited in the formulation of plans for transfers of public lands. Retention and management classification under this act will expire on June 30, 1969, except as otherwise provided.

"2410.1-3 Disposal classification criteria: (a) (3) After it is found that the lands are needed for the orderly growth and development of a community, or are chiefly valuable for residential, commercial, agricultural, industrial, or public uses or development, consideration will be given to the criteria which follow to determine under what law or laws the lands will be classified and disposed of. An important consideration for this purpose will be whether local zoning officials have sufficient authority to prescribe the terms and conditions for all uses of private lands in the area and to enforce those terms and conditions, irrespective of whether or not the zoning officials actually have exercised their authority.

"(b) Additional criteria for classification of lands required for the orderly growth and development of a community.

"1. To be required for the orderly growth and development of a community, it must be anticipated that the community will expand to embrace the lands within 15 years.

"2. Lands determined to be required for the orderly growth and development of a community may be classified for sale pursuant to the Public Land Sale Act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 988; 43 U.S.C. 1421–1427), if (i) zoning regulations are in effect and (ii) local governmental master plans have been adopted.

"3. Lands determined to be required for the orderly growth and development of a community may be classified for disposal under any appropriate law other than the Public Land Sale Act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 988; 43 U.S.C. 1421–1427), if the disposal under such other authority would be consistent with local master plans, or in the absence of such plans, with the views of local government authorities."

A WILLING AWARENESS

These quotations are just samples from the proposed regulations. Similar paragraphs are to be found in other portions of the regulations. These paragraphs and many others reveal an awareness on the part of the Department of Interior and the Bureau of Land Management that their management policies affect local government, and that they are willing to be guided by the opinions of local government.

AN INVITATION FOR COUNTY LEADERSHIP

These regulations are an invitation to us to exercise our authority for planning. If we choose not to do so, I do not believe that we at the county level can criticize the Department of Interior or the Bureau of Land Management if they devise their own methods to fill the vacuum.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, let me paraphrase an often-heard quotation. "Politics is the art of accomplishing the possible." Most of you here are very familiar with this political process. Paraphrasing this in terms of planning, I would say that, "planning is the art of expressing the accomplishable." This may not be a grammatic statement, but it does express two thoughts which I sincerely believe should be basic to county planning or any form of planning.

One, it accepts planning as an art, not an exact science. This does not mean that planning should not be based on research. I acknowledge the necessity for research, for data gathering of factual information. I admit to the usefulness of the new complicated computer methods and mathematical models now being produced. But just as I personally don't like to play blackjack with one of these mechanical blackjack machines they now have in the casinos here in Reno, I personally believe that planning decisions affecting the life and character of a community should be left finally to human judgment.

Second, the phrase, "expressing the accomplishable," conveys the thought that our planning should express goals which are within the realm of feasibility. Again, this does not mean that our plans should be devoid of idealism. It does, however, mean that if planning is worthwhile at all, it must produce and attain goals.

Planning is like any investment, so, "select carefully, budget a reasonable amount, and invest it regularly."

Thank you.

International Executive Service Corps Underway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, another significant step has been taken by American private enterprise with the help of the foreign aid program to promote economic development abroad. This month the newly formed International Executive Service Corps (IESC) signed its first country agreement to undertake projects to improve business and managerial techniques with Panama. President Marco A. Robles signed on behalf of Panama at the ceremony in the Presidential Palace, Panama City, and representing the IESC were David Rockefeller, chairman of the board, and Omer C. Lunsford, IESC representative in Panama.

The corps is a nonprofit, private corporation formed by leading American businessmen whose purpose is to recruit American business executives to work on a short-term basis with the private sector of the less-developed countries. The IESC hopes to relieve the shortage of skilled executives and management leadership which presently limits the growth of industrial enterprises in the developing countries.

The Agency for International Development encouraged the formation of the IESC and provided the initial planning and financial support to get it underway, although the direction and control comes wholly from the private sector.

The IESC has now initiated preliminary surveys or active projects in eight countries: Panama, Costa Rica, Peru, Colombia, Brazil, Taiwan, Iran, and Pakistan. In Panama, executives are at work on three projects, including assistance to a general engineering and aluminum manufacturing firm, and three more are under consideration. In Peru, where there is a meat shortage, an IESC executive is studying possibilities of marketing whale meat. In Colombia, another execuitve is working with a general construction company, and in Brazil IESC is preparing to cooperate in a program sponsored by the National Federation of Industries to increase the productivity of small businesses.

The great acceptance of the corps both at home and abroad is a credit to private American initiative in the economic development of less fortunate countries. It is also an important indication of the

wider private involvement in the economic growth of aid recipient nations which is being strongly encouraged by our Government.

Gullible "Peace" Professors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., has published an excellent editorial on the pacifist professors who are demonstrating and advertising for a sellout in Vietnam. The editorial is entitled "Gullible 'Peace' Professors," and it was published in the May 12, 1965, issue. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, May 12, 1965]

GULLIBLE "PEACE" PROFESSORS

Most college freshmen are taught something of argument and logic. If they are well taught they learn to distinguish argument (an attempt to influence belief or action) from exposition (an attempt to clarify). They also should learn something about evaluating argument, including the acquisition of the ability to detect sweeping generalizations, forced analogies, forced casual relationships, and the utilization of nonrepresentive facts.

If the freshman is well taught, he learns.

In his address of April 23 before the American Society of International Law, Secretary of State Rusk referred to some professional critics of the administration's Vietnamese policy for talking "nonsense about the nature of the struggle." He said, "I sometimes wonder at the gullibility of educated men and the stubborn disregard of plain facts by men who are supposed to be helping our young to learn—especially to learn how to think."

The Secretary's criticism was well taken then—and now.

Answering Rusk, a portion of the academic community in the Boston area purchased a $6,500 advertisement to defend themselves. And in their defense, they reinforced the public evidence of their "gullibility" as "educated men." As educators charged with the responsibility of teaching the young how to think, they disregarded plain facts—anew.

Astonishingly, they distort the facts of the Geneva agreement, its postlude, and prelude, to make the United States and Saigon guilty parties. How in the name of all that is holy in honest intellectual inquiry they could diregard the violations of the Geneva agreement by the signatory Hanoi regime, we cannot understand. Hanoi has not now, and had not then, any legal basis for its aggressive actions in South Vietnam, where the Vietcong are its agents.

How these campus intellectuals can umbrella the truth and accuse our own Nation of intervention without even the smallest acknowledgment of the post-Geneva developments, including the invitation of the South Vietnamese, we cannot known.

How in the name of intellecetual honesty the professors can blithely refer to a "macerated Indochina" without careful condemnation of the calculated campaign of Communist subversion against established governments, we cannot fathom.

And how, after the patient and deliberate discussions of months and years, the professors can still refer to "the rebel forces in the civil war" is beyond our comprehension. For years now, under Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, spokesmen for the Department of State have been reiterating the truth about "the nature of the struggle" in Vietnam.

Example: 3 years ago, on April 30, Under Secretary of State George Ball said in Detroit: "Let us at this point dispel a few myths. The struggle in South Vietnam today is not a local civil war. It is a carefully planned and mounted campaign of subversion and insurgency—equipped and directed from Hanoi. Consider, for example, what the Vietcong is attempting to destroy. Its targets are the very symbols of economic progress—schools, hospitals, first aid stations, malaria eradication teams, and the transport system."

Still, the professors cling to the myth of a "civil war."

Secretary Rusk is quite right. These professors are gullible; they stubbornly disregard plain facts. No one questions their loyalty, despite their fantasies, but one can question—along with the Secretary—how they are teaching the freshman to think.

Our Ambassador of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the good work which our young citizens accomplish is frequently overlooked in the stress and strain of our days. I am calling to the attention of my colleagues and the people of our 50 States the splendid good-neighbor policy carried on by one of my young citizens with the cooperation of Mrs. Sharlene Garfield, a third-grade teacher in the Thorp School which is the Second District, which I have the honor to represent.

Miss Elea Kay Radley is the sister of a member of the Peace Corps who lost his life in a plane crash in Colombia. Elena followed her brother into the Peace Corps and as her letter, which was published in the Daily Calumet, indicates, she is an ambassador of good will serving in Colombia, teaching and bringing the message of our country to the children of Colombia and to the adults who might otherwise regard themselves as outcasts.

The article follows:

WRITE VOLUNTEER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Elena Kay Radley will finish her 2 years in the Peace Corps this summer. She graduated from Bryn Mawr grammar school and South Shore High School. She majored in American studies at the University of Michigan, graduating in 1960.

(That year she entered the Peace Corps and was assigned to Colombia, South America, where she works on an educational television project with the Colombian Ministry of Education. "In her spare time" she began a project of her own, teaching prisoners in the Colombian jails how to read and write. As a result of her work, there have been many reforms made in the Colombian jail system and she has received wide acclaim for her work.)

The third-grade students of room 203 of the J. N. Thorp Grammar School have a Peace Corps pen pal in Colombia—Elena Kay Radley.

Mrs. Sharlene Garfield, third-grade teacher, encourages the children to correspond with Miss Radley.

Mrs. Marion Skoronski, principal of Thorp, decided to share this letter from Miss Radley with readers of the Chicago Daily Calumet.

DEAR THIRD-GRADERS: I was very happy to receive your letters. You all write very well and your spelling is also excellent. It was nice to know that the schoolchildren back in Chicago are interested in knowing about life in Colombia. The schoolchildren here are not as fortunate as you are. They do not have readers or spellers or any kind of workbook.

They also do not have crayons or paints or any of the things you use in art class—like paste, scissors, glue. The only things these children have are a pencil and a small notebook. Because there are no textbooks, the teacher has to read all the lessons to the children while they copy them in their notebooks. They do not have gym teachers or music teachers. Their classrooms are crowded and dark, and many of the children sit on the floor. They go to school from 8 to 11 a.m. and 2 to 5 p.m.

They have 3 hours at lunchtime so that everyone can take a nap. In Colombia, all the fathers come home to eat lunch with the family, and then everyone takes a nap before they go back to work in the afternoon.

The people of the United States were very worried about the children of Colombia, because we knew that they did not have the opportunity to go to a nice school as you do and learn all the interesting things Mrs. Garfield teaches you. So the Government of the United States sent some Peace Corps volunteers here to help the Colombian people improve the grammar school educational system. They also sent 1,500 TV sets to put in the schools. Now the children can learn reading, writing, geography, and arithmetic while they watch television. The Colombian children are very happy now, and they are learning many new things.

These children have never seen a television set before, so they are very proud to have one in their school, and they are careful to see that it never gets broken. They are also happy to know that the people of the United States care about them and have sent so many people to help them. They see that we are not selfish. They see that we want to share our knowledge and our money with them. They see that we are worried about our brothers in South America.

It is very important that all the schoolchildren in the United States remember the schoolchildren in South America. Many of these children do not have any shoes, and they never have any milk to drink. But they are just like you. They like to sing and play games. They have puppies and cats that they take care of. They love their parents, their brothers and sisters, their teachers, and their country. They appreciate the help of other people.

They are interested in hearing about the children in the United States. We should all be very proud of our country. The United States is trying to help people all over the world.

We are trying to make this a better world for everyone, not just for ourselves. We must be thankful for all the nice things we have. But we must never forget the children in other countries who do not have the nice things. And we must help them to help themselves.

I hope that Mrs. Garfield will continue to teach you all about the people in South America. You are lucky to have such a nice

teacher who can tell you all about lots of different countries and peoples.

I hope that you will all be very good and do all your work well. Maybe someday you, too, can go to another country and help teach children just like yourselves.

Best regards.

MISS RADLEY.

Invasions of Privacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14, 1965

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two very interesting, current articles on invasions of privacy. Both of the articles are very enlightening. One was written by Holmes Alexander; the other was written by Dr. Thomas J. Fleming.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LOW-LEVEL POLICE STATE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Old-fashioned politicians, like Senator EDWARD V. LONG, of Missouri, who won his first elective office in 1937, are often equipped with hearts which don't bleed in public but which maintain a steady beat for the rights of man.

When he was a young lawyer back home, ED LONG took a lot of no-fee cases for elderly citizens who needed help in proving their eligibility under the old age assistance statutes. When he came to Washington by appointment in 1960, after serving as State senator and Lieutenant Governor, LONG discovered a lot of other unimportant persons who were eligible for protection and not getting it.

The Constitution promises that the American people shall be "secure in their persons, homes, papers, and effects." Long found that about 1,000 individual or businesses a year were being subjected to having their mail intercepted by the Post Office Department in collaboration with the Internal Revenue Service.

It took LONG a couple of years to get an inquiry launched. The Postmaster General didn't answer the Senator's letters. A Cabinet member sat in LONG's office and vowed that no such snoping went on in his department—until LONG proved him to be wrong. By the fourth year, the Senator knew he had a bigger subject than at first appeared.

"I'm convinced," he told me, "that this Cabinet officer really didn't know what was going on. I'm sure that Presidents Kennedy and Johnson had no idea, either. But here we have the beginnings of a police state, building at the lower levels."

Not only were Federal underlings opening and reading people's mail, but they were tapping telephones and bugging rooms. LONG has his Judiciary subcommittee taking testimony and hearing excuses of the Federal snoopers. The hearings don't yet indicate the spread of the low-level espionage carried on against the people by what's supposed to be their own Government. This reporter made a dip into data at the Civil Service Commission to find out about the dimensions of the spying network.

There hasn't been a rundown on the subject since October 1961. At that time the Federal Government had 2,374,157 employees (now it has 2,478,515) of whom 31,946 were paid, civilian inspectors in 24 different fields of investigation, including one field listed as miscellaneous.

The Treasury Department has more investigators (10,307) than Justice (9,374). Agriculture (4,739) has more than the Atomic Energy Commission (119). The miscellaneous category of investigators is large (1,467), whereas the Commerce Department is small (25). The fields of inspection cover something called general investigation as well as specific criminal investigation. They include readily understandable classifications like Customs and Air Safety, but also a classification listed as admeasurement—which the civil service spokesman I interviewed wasn't able to define.

It stands to reason that a Government which supervises food and drugs, wages and hours, public housing and farm warehouses, and much else, require a civilian army of watchers to see that the little brothers of the welfare state don't cheat or get cheated. But there's the well-known Bible story about taking a mess of pottage in trade for a birthright, and there are still some of us who wonder if the gain of material benefits is worth the loss of personal liberties.

Anyhow, Senator LONG has spotted a new wrinkle here. Most police states are ruled at the top by men of strength. We are developing one that can be ruled from the bottom by small men who snoop in the fog of investigation on little cats' feet of anonymity.

[From This Week magazine, the Milwaukee Journal, Apr. 25, 1965]

NO SECRETS ANY MORE

(By Thomas J. Fleming)

"We are rapidly reaching the point where the company that hires a man knows too much about him," says E. A. Butler, one of America's foremost management consultants.

"The proliferation of snooping paraphernalia is increasingly placing the constitutional right of privacy of the individual citizen in peril," says Senator EDWARD V. LONG, of Missouri.

"The use of personality tests on job-seekers," says Thomas M. Garrett, S.J., of Scranton University, "poses a growing danger. Employers have no right to ask a man not merely to sell his labor, but the inner secrets of his being."

These three men are all worried about one thing: the terrifying loss of privacy in American life.

Sitting at home in your apartment or in your house, you may scoff: no one is invading my privacy. But as you loll in your assumed security, the neighbor next door may have, just for kicks, attached a small listening device to his side of your living room wall. Or if you are enjoying your suburban patio, another neighbor may be aiming a gadget called the "Big Ear" at you—picking up every word you say from 500 feet away.

Either of these electronic snoopers can be obtained through the mail by any private citizen, for less than $25. But let us assume your neighbors are not interested in you. Suppose, instead, you have applied for a job with a company that is security-conscious or believes devoutly in psychological testing, or both. There are three distinct threats to your privacy:

1. Private detectives may prowl your neighborhood, asking friends if they have ever seen you drunk, checking on your spending habits, asking the milkman and hairdresser if your wife is faithful, snapping telescopic-lens pictures of your whole family.

2. You will be invited to take a lie-detector test, in which you will have to dredge up and confess every petty dishonesty you ever committed.

3. Next may come a series of psychological tests which first assess your aptitudes, and then probe deeper, in search of personality problems. Depending on the vagaries and prejudices of the psychologist, you may be judged to have homosexual tendencies, be labeled an introvert, a masochist, any of a hundred reputation-wrecking terms—without a chance to defend yourself.

These tests are not reserved for executives. Would-be milkmen and clerks are taking them. Some 60 percent of all American companies use them regularly. For the executive, of course, the prying is more intense. He must often submit to a face-to-face interview with the company psychologist, in which his sex life, his feelings about his wife, his political opinions are explored in detail. Meanwhile, more snoopers are asking former employers about him and interrogating his college and high-school teachers.

WIRED WASHROOMS

Once all these hurdles are cleared, can you relax and feel Big Brother is no longer watching? By no means. In company after company, and in almost every department of the Government, electronic snooping is a favorite device of the insecure boss, who wants to find out who is loyal. Offices are bugged, phones are tapped, even washrooms are wired for sound.

The bill for all this is an estimated $1 billion a year.

The recent Senate investigation headed by Senator LONG revealed that the Federal Government was the largest single customer for electronic listening devices—and this did not include any equipment purchased by the CIA and FBI.

LONG is especially perturbed by the growing sophistication of the bugging devices. Miniaturization has reached the point where microphones can be concealed by a tie clasp, cuff links, a fountain pen. One tiny electronic ear snuggles into the base of a standard office stapling machine. Even more alarming are gadgets that can be hidden in or near your phone.

A BUGGED HEARING ROOM

On the first day of his hearings, Senator LONG dramatized the situation by hiring two private eyes, who bugged the hearing room. After a half hour of testimony, the witness opened his innocent-looking attaché case, pressed a button, and a concealed tape recorder played back everything that had been said.

Senator LONG is worried about the possibility that our electronic ingenuity is moving us closer and closer to a 1984 police state. As a moral philosopher and author of "Ethics in Business," Father Garrett is concerned about the spiritual implications of privacy invasion. "We have tended to talk about privacy as a political right," Father Garrett says. "But it is also a natural right, something that flows from the nature of man. Take it away and you have violated a man's integrity."

ONE SLIP AND YOU'RE THROUGH

Management consultant Butler is aroused in a more practical way. He is convinced that our mania for personal prying has reached a point of no return. "I have rarely met a creative executive, particularly in the sales end, who was not unconventional in some way.

"Today, if the company president finds out something a little out of the ordinary about a man during the prehiring investigation he won't hire him. Even if he's broadminded enough to give him a chance, knowing some secret of his new employee's private life makes the boss nervous and suspicious. If the man's job performance slips, for whatever reason, he is fired. I've seen more companies lose more men this way—good men they needed and really wanted to keep."

Another problem seldom considered by the higher-ups who read the reports is the re-

liability, not of the electronic devices, but of the human reporters.

Too many snoopers' reports are full of half-baked information. And under the present system, a vindictive neighbor or former business associate can drop a noose of vicious lies around your neck and you can only hope that the man reading the report will detect the odor of malice. In one study of such reports, one out of every four was derogatory in regard to a man's performance on a previous job—a grim indication of how often envy is substituted for truth.

All of these investigations—by private detective, electronic snooper, and psychological tests—have one thing in common, and that is invasion of our privacy. Yet, there is an even greater danger to our civilization, aside from that posed to our civil liberties, the danger of the reduction of everyone and everything to mediocrity. Constant surveillance and psychological testing will inevitably tend to make people keep daring thoughts and ideas to themselves and stay in the safe, dull, middle of the road.

DOWN WITH DARING

If this should happen, we would be turning our backs on some of our greatest industrial, technical, and scientific geniuses, many of whom have been men with unorthodox opinions and ideas. No one really knows what makes a great executive, inventor, or scientist, and the idea that investigation and invasion of privacy will find them certainly seems open to doubt. It's the imaginative individuals who can create new products, processes, and technology.

The solution to the snooping plague must come from two directions. First, the Federal Government must pass laws limiting the sale and use of electronic bugs, lie detectors, and similar privacy invaders to law-enforcement agencies. Even here, the courts must keep a watchful eye.

Second, businessmen must quit prying into the minds and pasts of their employees. They must realize the ultimate futility of this mania—and stop it voluntarily before damage to our national spirit becomes irreparable.

Prince Georges County Boy Receives Lifesaver Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, on May 6 at the White House, President Lyndon B. Johnson presented one of American Automobile Association's gold lifesaver medals to James Raymond Hendricks. Buddy, as he is known to his friends and family, was honored for saving the life of a 1st grade student who ran in front of an auto after she accidentally knocked him down. He jumped to his feet and grabbed the girl as the auto narrowly missed both of them.

The American Automobile Association has been presenting these medals since 1949 to members of the school safety patrol whose acts have saved the lives of persons in imminent vehicular traffic danger. We have seen some startling statistics concerning the reduction in the traffic death rate for children 5 to 14 years of age. Since 1922 the traffic death rate for this group has decreased to nearly one-half while the death rate of other age groups has practically doubled. I am certain that a large amount of the credit for this achievement can go to youngsters like Buddy Hendricks who conscientiously and bravely perform their duties as safety patrol members.

"The Public Lands—A Challenge for the West"—Address by James G. Stearns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MURPHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14, 1965

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, during the Public Land Management Congress of the National Association of Counties, Western Region District, which was held in Reno, Nev., from March 30 through April 1, James G. Stearns, president of the County Supervisors Association of California, delivered the keynote address.

His address was entitled, "The Public Lands—A Challenge for the West." Because of its importance, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC LANDS—A CHALLENGE FOR THE WEST

(By James G. Stearns, president, County Supervisors Association of California, Modoc County supervisor, Tulelake, Calif.)

My pleasant duty this morning is to set the stage for this very significant meeting and to preview what it is designed to accomplish. To be allowed the first lick in any hassle is a distinct advantage, and I intend to fully exploit the opportunity it affords. Nor did anyone exact any promise from me that requires me to keep quiet for the balance of the meeting, either. I find myself in a very favorable tactical position and will now proceed to get in that first lick.

We have gathered together here from all over the United States to discuss the public land problems in general, but with special close attention to the public domain, for there the winds of change are blowing our way for the first time. More to the point still, we will discuss the problems and opportunities presented by the first tentative offer of a partnership to the counties of the West ever tendered by the Federal Government in planning the future use of one of its major resources. Your presence here proves your willingness and eagerness to explore the exciting possibilities that this present circumstance affords.

The public domain, as it exists today, has arrived at this point in time through a long and very interesting series of events too long to begin to document here. But our system of awarding land to our citizens as a reward for developing it, inherent in our Constitution and carefully implemented by our Congress over the years, is unique in the history of the world. Under this system, the Homestead Acts, the railroad grants, the grants to Sates, and many others, modified beginnings in the late 19th century to provide for reservations of lands for public purposes, such as national parks and national forests, the United States has become the strongest and most prosperous Nation of all time. History will record the westward expansion of the Original Thirteen Colonies as one of mankind's great achievements.

But in that same period of time, we have seen the original policy of wholesale disposition, first slowed, and then brought to a halt, with the pendulum now swinging back toward reacquisition of much of this same land by the Federal Government, for parks and refuges and such.

CHARTING THE FUTURE

Standing somewhat apart from these events is the land still not permanently dedicated to any of these purposes that we call the public domain. Under the stewardship of the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, it still amounts to almost a tenth of the land area of the United States. The offer to county government to join in charting the course to the future for this land is the central subject of this conference.

Over the years of the last century, Congress has passed over 4,000 laws dealing with the public domain. Each dealt with a particular problem of the day, and each served its purpose. Looking back, it can't honestly be said that a much different course could have been followed, even realizing that the end result of such a course had to lead to some sort of final battleground. For none of these laws has granted any sort of permanent status to any of the existing public domain—no tenure to its users and no justification for major investment for development by its owner, the United States.

Therefore, it became the obvious duty of the Congress to provide some sort of common ground where all the varied interests could reconcile their differences. Last year, under the able and persistent leadership of Congressman ASPINALL, they did just that, when they set up the Public Land Law Review Commission. They also passed several interim bills to ease some immediate pressures and to provide the Commission with some additional experience in several areas not heretofore thoroughly explored, notably from our point of view, intensive land use planning.

BLM LEADERSHIP

The BLM, in the futherance of this common goal, has taken the leadership in going one step further, and has initiated a pilot program in several western counties of joint land use planning on a full local-Federal partnership basis.

Other speakers at this conference are assigned the chore of explaining and debating the present status of this series of events, but let me point out two rather alarming facts. With the clock running, the Public Land Law Review Commission is not yet organized and operating, and the Department of the Interior has not yet implemented its very laudable study proposals with the additional men and money it will take to complete the job in time to be of value. The economic stability of nearly every community and natural resource industry in the West is at stake, as well as a very substantial national interest, and wise, well-considered answers must be provided to some very knotty problems, and soon.

It will be sad, indeed, if the molasses that is the lubricant of bureaucracy is allowed to sabotage this fine machinery, so honestly conceived, so meticulously designed, and so painstakingly constructed. The penalties for procrastination are extreme, and they are irrevocable.

To illustrate just one important facet of this situation, let me draw this picture for you: The BLM is, and always has been, one of the easiest Federal agencies for the citizens of this country to deal with. In their present offer of partnership planning to the counties, they have gone further than any other similar group before them, in heeding and hearing the people whose property they

manage. But because it is that way today is no guarantee that it will remain that way. To prove it, let us look for a moment at another agency of the Department of the Interior, the National Park Service.

Founded by Congress to manage and preserve our national parks and monuments, the NPS did its job admirably and well for many years. It became in fact just what the Congress intended, the curator of our outdoor museums and the protector of those features of such historical, geological, and vegetative significance that required the most rigid policy of preservation and display to guarantee their existence for our people for as long as our Nation lasts. It was, as it should have been, above politics, and its very function placed it in a position that was morally unassailable. The natural additions to its system and parks for many years satisfied the minimum demands of Parkinson's law still within its very narrow design function, and because it held to its original purpose and performed its job far better than anyone then expected, accumulated over the years a mountain of public respect and prestige that has no parallel in our Government.

But in the last two decades, from its fortress of God and motherhood on this mountain of prestige, the NPS has been sending out patrols on different missions that was not part of its job in the beginning. It is in the highway business, with its system of national parkways. It made a very nearly successful raid on the whole wilderness system in the national forests. It is firmly in the outdoor recreation business with its system of national seashores and recreation areas, and is expanding it rapidly with allies and methods wholly out of keeping with its shining public image.

PROPOSED NATIONAL REDWOODS PARK

A current case in point is the proposal to establish a national redwoods park in northern California. Using the excuse of a supposedly threatened resource, the NPS has delivered a monumental insult to the States of Oregon and California, to several coast counties in both States, to the redwood timber industry, and finally to the private landowners on a long stretch of coastline in Humboldt and Del Norte Counties, Calif. Although more State and county parks already exist in this area than have ever been aimed at preserving any other resources anyplace, although the timber industry has voluntarily left uncut thousands of acres of the finest virgin trees and replanted many thousands of acres more of cutover land, meanwhile paying taxes on the whole works, and although much of the private land it covets is miles from any redwood, all these people must be thoroughly discredited and held up to public view as a threat to a great resource to accomplish the NPS purpose. And strangest of all, to the people who live there and love and know their home country better than anybody, the main allies of the Park Service are people in the East whose principal qualification is ignorance of the true facts.

All of the planning and preparation for establishment of the park was done without official notice to the counties or the people whose land was to be acquired—they saw the map for the first time in the newspaper, and then, but not until then, their "comments were invited." It did not need to be done that way, but it was.

To the minds of the local people, and to mine, it further occurs that these same easterners are the descendents of a generation that destroyed its hardwood forests, shot the passenger pigeon into extinction, allowed market hunters to very nearly destroy the migratory waterfowl on the Atlantic flyway, and turned every river on the eastern seaboard into a sewer.

So hear me when I say that today's cuddly kitten can very easily turn into tomorrow's nasty tomcat. In accepting the share of the responsibility for future important determinations on the public domain lands now being offered us, we take out the only real insurance there that the errors of omission of today would not become the scouts for tomorrow's bureaucratic domain.

TIME FOR COUNTY ACTION

We in the West have always sought and pleaded for this very opportunity—this approach has always been the backbone of our whole legislative program. Now we have it, and the time has come for we westerners to put up or shut up and to put our money where our mouth is.

Success in this venture requires investment and hard work, and if we fail to supply our part of both, we will have no one to blame but ourselves. How easy it would be to break up into squabbles among ourselves, and like a bunch of coyotes fighting over a dead horse, look around and see that the buzzards have already picked the bones clean.

The decision is now before us—the stakes are very high—so let us proceed to act, and to act wisely, and to act at once, for we will not pass this way again.

A Deserved Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the citizenry of Oakland, Calif., are extremely proud of the Oakland police force and its efficient and respected chief.

I cite below an editorial from the Oakland Tribune that appeared in the Monday, May 10, edition, pertaining to Chief Edward M. Toothman and an honor that was recently bestowed on him for the fine work that he has done:

A DESERVED HONOR

The citation given to Oakland Police Chief Edward M. Toothman the other day is a tribute to every man on the force. The Alameda County Bar Association and the Oakland Lions Club presented the chief its Liberty Bell Award for outstanding community service.

The presentation ceremony was part of the observance of Law Day-U.S.A., which this year stressed the theme, "Uphold the Law—A Citizen's First Duty."

As Edgar B. Stewart, former bar association president at last year's dinner, observed: "Oakland has had its share of the demonstrations that are sweeping the Nation. Toothman has taken his position seriously and filled it with dignity. He has enforced the law firmly, fairly and without favoritism, and he has kept the peace."

Those words sum up what every citizen expects from the police department in his community. And the Oakland Police Department has lived up to these high standards. We know Chief Toothman would be the first to acknowledge that the devotion to duty and justice exhibited by his men is the major contributor to this fine record.

The award also cited Toothman's civic achievements, including his work with boys clubs, as a member of the Boy Scout Council and as chairman of the cancer fund drive.

It is an honor that is justly deserved and one which reflects great credit upon the chief and the men in his department. Our congratulations.

The Structure of Lower Schools—Chapter II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, few men have the knowledge and insight necessary to fully understand any aspect of Soviet society today. One of these few men is Mr. William Benton, the U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO.

Mr. Benton has traveled to the Soviet Union nine times since 1955, his last trip coming during 1964. In the Encyclopedia Britannica Yearbook for 1965, he has a series of articles concerning education in the U.S.S.R.

It is my pleasure to include the next article of this series in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE STRUCTURE OF THE LOWER SCHOOLS—CHAPTER II

For Soviet boys and girls—as for their counterparts in America—schooling is universal and it is compulsory; to a far, far greater degree than in the United States, Soviet primary and secondary education is uniform. Illiteracy, which 50 years ago afflicted more than half the population of Russia, has virtually disappeared except among the old. A population is being produced possessed of the mental tools for rapid intellectual growth.

The Soviet system is based on the 10-year school, for ages 7 to 17. The first 4 years are described as the primary grades, the next 3 as incompleted secondary, and the last 3 as completed secondary. The first 4 years were made obligatory in 1930. The next 3 were made obligatory for urban children in 1949. Now it is Soviet policy to work toward making the 10-year system compulsory for all.

So intensive are the pace and pressure of the Soviet schools that graduation from the 10-year system represents a mastery of subject matter—and often of very difficult subject matter—at least equivalent to, and probably much greater than, the level of the better American 12-year elementary-high schools.

However, Soviet primary and secondary education is today in a state of flux. In 1958 an 11th year was planned to be tacked onto the schools (to be made universal in 1965) in order to give students more work experience. Students in the last 2 years of secondary school were to spend 2 days a week in productive work. The time devoted to polytechnical subjects at all levels in school was increased.

The Ministry of Education changed its mind after a mere 4 or 5 years of experimentation. It is willing to confess its mistakes. It announced in August 1964 a reduction of the 11-year system back to 10 years.

The problem has been how to reconcile the importance of manual work with the educational goals. Manual work as an integral part of education has always been stressed in Communist ideology.[1] In 1958

[1] Marx in "Das Kapital," ch. xv, sec. 9, refers to the education of the future as an "education that will, in the case of every child over a given age, combine productive labor with instruction and gymnastics, not only as one of the methods of adding to the efficiency of production, but as the only method of producing fully developed human beings."

Chairman Khrushchev proclaimed that the schools had departed from the principles of Marxism-Leninism, that work was an essential condition of Communist society, and that it was his scientific opinion that students should have more labor experience. Textbooks were rewritten to show the industrial and agricultural applications of various courses; laboratory experiments were redesigned; the glory of physical labor was featured in anthologies of Russian literature as it has always been glorified in the billboards which portrayed glamorous and muscular figures of men and women manual workers.

Now, according to the 1964 decree, a change in the school system must be made again. The transition back to the 10-year school with the more orthodox academic system is to be completed by the end of the 1965–66 school year.

The primary argument against the 1958 reform seems to have been that good students lost 1 academic year which they needed on the road to higher education. Soviet educators, like the most advanced of our own, are increasingly concerned with speeding up the learning process. They are searching for new and better ways to pack more knowledge into youngsters in less time. This is a remark of Mikhail Kharlamov, the former chairman of the State Committee on Radio and Television. Kharlamov suggested to me that history might be one of the subjects children could study at home in order to have more time for other subjects in the crowded school curriculum.)

The decision to abandon the 1958 plan followed several months of debate in the Soviet press. Scholastic standards had dropped as a result of the stepped-up work program, the critics said. The press carried charges that the vocational training was badly organized and that students frequently stood around idly watching factory workers. Such criticism, openly expressed, is relatively new in Communist society. Today some of it sounds not unlike the continuing criticism of education in the United States.

Pravda, on July 20, 1964, published the following editorial:

"Only the leaders in their classes are now passing the entrance examinations to universities. According to the textbooks and curriculum plans available in secondary schools, all students should pass the exams if they are graduated.

"But one-half of them flunk mathematics and physics on entrance exams even though they have passed in the secondary school subjects. They do even worse in chemistry. The preparation of the secondary school graduates in Russian language and literature and history leaves much to be desired.

"The fact is that textbooks are so jammed with unnecessary information and the curriculum is inflated with so many subjects that even outstanding students, who study 10 to 12 hours a day, cannot learn any subject well.

"Of course, a well-trained teacher in any subject can overcome these handicaps in textbooks and study programs and guide the students to master the subject. The student will be as good as the teacher.

"But in general, the time has come to admit that teachers, especially the young ones, have not mastered the subjects they are teaching. They are as bogged down as their students.

"This is the root of the evil in our secondary schools at the present time. And it has come about because fewer and fewer teachers are graduates of universities, where subjects are taught. Instead they are graduates of teachers colleges, where they are supposed to be taught how to teach. Even this questionable goal is sought with outmoded textbooks and theories."

On June 30, 1964, in a letter to the editor of Sovietskaia Rossiia, a professor of higher education complained:

"The elementary and second school study plans are so crammed that the whole idea of perfection in anything has been lost.

"The Ministry of Education is not taking this problem seriously enough.

"Workers of the Ministry say, "Of course with present study plans, many subjects are taught and learned in some darkness. But this is not a disgrace."

"Well it is. The teaching of many subjects is a disgrace. And so are the students."

Our own high school teachers will recognize this university professor's lament. Yes, a little more of this, and American schoolteachers will feel at home with the critics in the Soviet Union.

The Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, for sound reasons, has views other than those of the Pravda editorial. The academy agrees that there is no doubt that one of the reasons for Soviet youth failing to show well in examinations is that the teaching has been advancing too rapidly at too theoretical a level. Historically, in Western Europe, as in the United States and Russia, only 5 to 10 percent of an age group has been able to advance early to abstract learning. The Soviets seek to step up this percentage. In this they perhaps will prove successful.

While instructional quality varies somewhat in different sections of the vast country, the Soviet primary and secondary school curricula are rigorous. During the 3 weeks of instruction per year (6 days per week) during the first three grades, the pupil studies Russian language and literature 13 hours a week. This includes reading, calligraphy, and writing, and so-called moral tests. He has 1 hour of arithmetic daily. Two hours a week are spent in physical culture and gymnatsics, 1 hour in singing and music, 1 hour in freehand drawing, and 1 hour in pursuits of the kind known as arts and crafts in our early grades.

In the last of the 4 primary years the curriculum begins to diversify; language and literature drop to 9 hours a week, and the 4 hours saved in the reading-writing course are replaced by 6 hours—2 in history, 2 in geography, and 2 in biology. During the 4 primary years, then, the Soviet pupil has 3,234 prescribed hours of instruction: 1,584 hours in language and literature (either Russian or his native regional language), 792 hours in arithmetic, 264 hours in physical education, 132 hours in each of the cultural subjects of singing, drawing, arts and crafts, and 66 hours in history, geography, and biology.

Reading is, of course, the key to other intellectual skills. In his first reader, the Soviet child is introduced to easy-to-read but sturdy selections from the Russian masterpieces of literature by such writers as Tolstoy, Pushkin, and Gogol. When he finishes fourth grade, he is expetced to understand 10,000 words. These are standards for higher than the normal ones in American schools.

When the Soviet pupil enters the middle, or incomplete secondary, school (the next three grades) in the fifth year, he embarks on the study of a broad range of subjects at a surprisingly mature level. At this point the pupil is allowed to make one of his very few choices—the foreign language he will study for the remainder of his school career. English is the most popular choice, then French and German. (John Gunther reports that there are 41,000 teachers of English in the U.S.S.R.) Even at this early age, Soviet schools in some areas begin the teaching of certain strategic languages, such as Chinese and Arabic.

Weekly class loads rise from 24 to 26 hours and the number of annual weeks of instruction increases. The prescribed weekly course load, while it varies in some details with locality and is subject to change, is shown in table I:

TABLE I—*Weekly course load, 5th through 10th grades, U.S.S.R.*

Subject	Grades					
	5	6	7	8	9	10
Russian—language and literature	9	8	6	5	4	4
Foreign language	4/5	4	3	3	3	3
History	2	2	2	4/3	3/4	4
Geography	2	2	2	2/3	3	------
Physical education	2	2	2	2	2	2
Singing	1	1	1	------	------	------
Mechanical drawing	1	1	1	1	1	1
Shop courses—work	2	2	2	2	2	2
Arithmetic	6	4/0	------	------	------	------
Algebra	------	0/4	4	4	4/3	2
Geometry	------	2	2	2	2/3	2
Trigonometry	------	------	------	------	------	2
Biology	2	2	2	2	1	------
Physics	------	2	3	3	4/3	4
Chemistry	------	------	2	2	3	4
Astronomy	------	------	------	------	------	1
Psychology	------	------	------	------	------	1

At least 80 percent of all Soviet children finish the incomplete secondary school, roughly comparable to the best of our elementary schools, which concludes at the end of the seventh year. (In urban areas, the percentage is higher.) Thus, according to table I, supplied by the Soviet education ministry, at least four of every five Soviet children will have studied physics, algebra, and geometry for 2 years, biology and a foreign language for 3 years, and chemistry for 1 year—by the time they are 14 years old. (The school year must be interpreted as two to six periods per week, as shown in table I.)

I have said that in the fourth and fifth years the curriculum begins to diversify. This does not mean that the student has a choice among an increasing range of electives, as in a typical American comprehensive high school. Except for the choice of a foreign language he has virtually no options.

Following my own visit to Moscow in May, three executives of Encyclopædia Britannica films called on top Soviet educators in September to discuss the possible exchange of teaching films. The three were Charles Benton, president of EBF; Milan Herzog, vice president for production; and Ralph Buchsbaum, an eminent scientist who is responsible for EBF's biology film series. When they visited with Yevgeni Afanasenko, minister of education for the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, the minister disagreed emphatically with the American elective system, and with the decentralized American system which gives States and communities control of the curriculum. He doesn't believe students in primary or even in secondary grades have the knowledge or judgment to decide wisely for themselves. As for State and local control, he asked what would happen if Alabama decided that physics is not important, or if Arkansas decided that biology should be optional. His motto is, "one educational sytsem for the entire country."

Although it is Soviet policy that the completed 10-year school shall become universal, Nicholas DeWitt, of the Russian Research Center, Harvard University, estimates that only about 55 percent of all Soviet children are now actually and presently enrolled in the upper secondary schools (grades 8 to 10), and that only about 30 percent of all children graduate. The 30 percent will have completed a course of study which embraces a total of 10 years of Russian language and literature; 7 years of history (with special Soviet interpretations on every page); 6 years of geography; 4½ years of algebra, 5 years of geometry, both plane and solid, and 1 year of trigonometry; 4 years of chemistry;

5 years of physics; 6 years of biology; 1 year of astronomy; and 1 year of psychology.

Secondary school education in the United States is more nearly universal than is the Soviet 10-year school. Roughly twice as many American youngsters graduate—85 percent enter high school and 57 percent graduate. Since high schools in the United States offer different curricula to meet allegedly varying needs—in academic, vocational, and commercial courses—the average, or typical, curriculum of the American high school graduate is hard to define. However, a comparison of the percentages in table II with table I indicates that the average Soviet 10-year-school graduate will have had much more instruction in chemistry, physics, biology, and mathematics than most American high school graduates—and that even the graduate of the Soviet 7-year school will have had more straight academic instruction than a very high percentage of American high school graduates. This contrast offers a very sharp challenge to American procedures and standards.

TABLE II.—*High school enrollments in science and mathematics, United States*

Courses	Grade level	Percent of students enrolled of total in grade
General science	9	67.0
Biology	10	75.5
Chemistry	11	34.6
Physics	12	24.3
Elementary algebra	9	67.0
Plane geometry	10	41.6
Intermediate algebra	11	32.2
Trigonometry	12	9.2
Solid geometry	12	7.6

Source: "The Development of Human Resources," pt. iv of "Dimensions of Soviet Economic Power," prepared for the Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, 87th Cong., 2d sess., 1962.

The Soviet student who completes the 10-year school in the top 20 percent of his class is eligible to take university entrance examinations. If his work is below that of the top fifth, he may still take the entrance examinations, perhaps after an extra period of study, but he is more likely to choose to enter the work force at once or to try for a place in one of the 2-year technicums. These latter are run by the various ministries—mining, railroads, etc. The technicums are vocational, industrial, and agricultural schools designed to produce skilled workmen who can rise to middle-, foreman-type supervisory positions in the Soviet economy.

The pressure on a student as he takes the university entrance examinations is heavy. His way of life, his aspirations to party membership, his entire future depend upon the outcome. This is a game for keeps. Only by continued application will he achieve a second or a third chance. Applicants for places in universities outnumber the openings probably by as much as 8 or 9 to 1. But an ambitious and persevering student can keep trying indefinitely.

Those students scoring 5's (the top score) on all the university examinations are taken first, while those who make grade 2 (poor) in any subject are eliminated. After the straight 5's come the 5–4 students, and from these two groups all the stipend positions are filled. If a student has better than average marks but is not within the two top groups, he may be entitled to enter the university, but he must complete his studies at his own expense. Few students—except sons of Cabinet Ministers or college professors, of opera singers or novelists, or others of the top elite—have sufficient funds to do so.

It is easy to see why the individual's motivation for learning in the Soviet Union is so strong. The achievement of education is indeed a life-and-death struggle; there is no boss' daughter to marry; no father's business to enter; no easy way up the ladder; no road to success except the hard, tough, competitive road of excelling in one's chosen field. Thus, only through education can most young Soviet citizens hope to attain status and material rewards. This drive is methodically reinforced by the Government, through so-called techniques of persuasion.

Many more of our American youth would strive for—and achieve—academic excellence if they were as strongly motivated. Rewards and choices for youth in the United States are, of course, much more varied—and many of them much less intellectually demanding—than in the Soviet Union. We are fortunate and indeed blessed in this. However, one result is that there is much less pressure on our educational system for excellence and much less pressure on our young people to achieve an educational foundation for life that will enable them to live up to their maximum potential. This is indeed a challenge. It will continue to be one.

The Befuddled Mr. Bosch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, The Washington Star, in an excellent editorial published in its May 13 issue, has questioned the thinking and judgment of Juan Bosch, former Dominican President, in connection with recent developments in the Dominican Republic. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 13, 1965]

THE BEFUDDLED MR. BOSCH

When the 1963 coup swept him away as President of the Dominican Republic, the foes of Juan Bosch, besides belittling him as a poet, charged him with being a naive politician and an incompetent administrator. His softness of head and heart, they said, could only pave the way for a Communist takeover.

This may have been an oversimplified judgment of the man. But in recent days, at his comfortable place of exile in Puerto Rico, Mr. Bosch has said things that do cast doubt on the soundness of his thinking and his awareness of what is really going on in the Caribbean.

Referring to the landing of American troops, he had this to say: "Instead of stopping another Cuba, they will make another Cuba. They say there are 53 known Communists. There are going to be 53,000 Communists in the Dominican Republic because of the Marine intervention, and they will be U.S.-made Communists."

Mr. Bosch's complacency about the real Communist threat in Santo Domingo is in strange contradiction to the judgment of the Organization of American States, which now confirms President Johnson's assessment of the situation. The Star's Haynes Johnson reports the view of foreign diplomats on the scene that the Communists would have taken over if the President had delayed intervention by only a few hours.

Juan Bosch is entitled to have his say. But the more he talks, the less convincing he is. Small wonder that he seems to have no chance of ever again becoming President of the Dominican Republic.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Proposed Skip-Row Rule Change Threatens Ruin for Thousands of American Cottongrowers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thousands of American cotton farmers will suffer a severe, and in some cases disastrous, economic blow if the Department of Agriculture places in effect its proposed rule change affecting cotton planted in skip-row patterns. The rule not only would result in reduced net income to cotton farmers but would bring the end to proven, sound conservation practices followed by a generation of Texas Panhandle and South Plains cotton farmers, as well as growers in many other areas of the Nation.

In addition, the new rule would disrupt current farming practices followed by grain sorghum producers in our Panhandle-Plains region, would serve to offset Government efforts to keep grain stocks in check, and would destroy the faith our farmers have in the wisdom of current farm policy objectives.

We are told that one of the objectives of current Agriculture Department policy is to provide opportunity for efficient family farmers to earn parity of income, that the Department seeks parity of income for all rural people, including new opportunity for small farmers. I find it impossible to reconcile these announced goals with the Department's proposed rule change affecting cotton when planted in skip-row patterns.

We are told that USDA officials feel that increased yields due to skip-row plantings have, in the words of a Department press release, "contributed substantially to the increase in cotton production." The Department does not state the obvious truth that other modern-day farming practices—including irrigation, improved fertilizers, and insecticides—also contribute to the increased productivity of the American cottongrower. But only skip-row planting practices are the target of the rulemaking authority the Department of Agriculture seeks to exercise.

What is proposed in the rule is a fundamental change in farming practices followed by thousands of farmers. For more than 30 years, since long before the Government first established a cotton program, planting cotton by skipping rows has been an established practice in the Texas Panhandle and South Plains, as well as other areas.

Skip-row planting has been a good and common practice in our part of the country because it is a practice that makes the best use of available moisture. The roots of the cotton plants are able to reach out to benefit from the moisture in adjacent skipped rows.

It is a good and common farming practice because it permits sunlight to reach the sides of the plants, cutting down on boll rot and improving the quality of the fiber.

It is a good and common practice because it enables our farmers to prevent damaging wind erosion, which threatens in late winter and early spring. Farmers are able to plant rows of grain sorghum in the skipped rows and thus check the wind by rows of standing sorghum stalks. This is a practice strongly endorsed by the Soil Conservation Service.

It is a good and common practice because it permits so-called interplanting, by which a farmer on irrigated land may plant alternate four-row strips of cotton and grain sorghum to the benefit of the quality of both crops. Estimates are that this practice adds from $6 to $12 per bale in the quality of cotton lint and seed. The sorghum strips, by holding the heat, permit the cotton to mature earlier at higher grade.

It has also been tied closely to the Government grain sorghum program, enabling the farmer to count as diverted acres under the grain sorghum program the fallow four-row strips between four cotton rows. The effect of the proposed new rule, with its system of measurement, would force present four-four skip-row patterns into an impossible pattern of four rows of cotton and five of fallow—in order for the fallow to count as diverted grain sorghum land. Present four- and eight-row farm equipment is obviously not built to accommodate such a scheme. Grain people are convinced that the effect of the skip-row proposal would be to encourage increased production of grain sorghum by farmers who now work that crop in conjunction with cotton.

The Department must give extremely careful consideration to this potential consequence.

The skip-row rule constitutes another damaging blow to an already depressed segment of American agriculture. Cotton supports have declined in 3 years to bring a reduction, in effect, of 30 to 40 percent of cotton farmers' net income after production expenses. The so-called cost-price squeeze has a very real meaning for the American cotton farmer, who now must face one more threat to his survival. The new rules are also causing considerable consternation, as they should, in local communities whose economies are dependent upon the fate of cotton farmers. The Commissioners Court of Childress County, Tex., for example, estimates that the imposition of the proposed rules would result in a $1 million drop in income within the county.

By proposing rules such as this one, the Agriculture Department is seeking to attain the goal of a workable balance between supply and demand at the expense of thousands upon thousands of bankrupt cotton farmers and depressed economies in the communities which have served them. The full impact of trying to attain this balance is being visited upon that segment least able to absorb it.

In formulating the new rules, the Department of Agriculture is following a practice I find altogether too common in the departments and agencies of our Government. Instead of seeking a correction of what are viewed as problems by coming to the Congress to ask for new legislation, the departments seek first—in too many instances—to exercise their authority to make rules and regulations. They, in effect, are legislating, and by doing so are invading the ground granted to Congress by the Constitution. When rules are imposed, citizens by the millions are affected by regulations which their duly elected representatives had absolutely no part in formulating. In our system of Government, rulemaking authority should not be used to circumvent the expressed will of the Congress or to avoid the more time-consuming process of enacting legislation. When rulemaking authority is abused, the people can justifiably complain of rule by fiat, of power improperly exercised by unfeeling bureaucratic administrators. But action by the Congress, through legislation enacted into law, has the great strength of having been supported by majorities of representatives elected by the people.

In seeking the objective claimed for the proposed skip-row rule change, the Department has the alternative of coming to Congress for new cotton program legislation. The Department has as yet offered no proposals to the Congress affecting cotton, but when it does so it could very well incorporate into its request provisions that would make unnecessary any change in the skip-row planting rules.

The Department could, for example, make a strong case before the Congress for increasing the per-pound support payment on the domestic allotment for each farm, now placed at 4.35 cents per pound, to further encourage the voluntary cutback of cotton production. I am convinced that an increase of a cent a pound or more in this phase of the cotton program would result in a substantially higher degree of grower participation. This would have the effect of

lowering Government cotton stocks, thereby cutting the cost of the cotton program.

I am convinced also that progress can be made, under renewed and more aggressive effort by the Department, to improve the cotton export picture.

All aspects of the matter deserve thorough and careful review, not only in the Department but also in the Congress. In this connection, I have joined with the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, to ask that the House Committee on Agriculture hold a public hearing to permit cotton growers to appear and protest the proposed action of the Department of Agriculture. With Congressman MAHON, I would join growers in appearing before the committee.

If the Department should follow through with the skip-row proposal and place the rule in effect, Congress must act to correct the situation. The proposed rule in punitive, defies sound agricultural practices, would destroy morale and confidence among farmers and rural people generally, and would threaten economic ruin for thousands and thousands of our farm families.

The Profile of a Nonconformist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, our distinguished Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, is rendering an important and much needed service to our Nation through the column he writes, which is published in the Sunday Star of Washington, D.C., and in various other newspapers around the country. I have been particularly impressed with several recent articles by Dr. Harris in which he has stressed the importance of individualism to our Nation, and has warned against the cult of conformity which appears to be engulfing America in so many aspects of life. In his article which was published in the Sunday Star of May 16, 1965, Dr. Harris has done an outstanding job of challenging Americans to be individualists and to dare to stand by their convictions, regardless of the pressures to conform. The article is entitled "The Profile of a Nonconformist." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[May 16, 1965]

THE PROFILE OF A NONCONFORMIST

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

The miracle of television has been etching for a vast audience the profiles of brave men who in public life could not be counted upon to conform. They refused to jump through the partisan hoop even at the mandate of the majority. Such biographies are the inspiring tales of those who disregarded their political future by voting "no" instead of the demanded "yes", or vice versa. The narration of such deeds of untarnished honor is a legacy left by the martyred young President who, as he lay in the gloom of wartime wounds, heard nightingales singing in the dark.

In this age of mass production one is quite accustomed to gaze at the contented profiles of lock-step pedestrians who would never think of stepping out of the prescribed line. Theirs not to reason why—theirs but to stolidly acquiesce in being stamped with the accepted and expected brand of fashion, thought, usage, and custom. It cannot be denied that the vast majority just keep slavish step to the drumbeat of conformity. They seldom, if ever, explore the reason for the routine of their changeless ways. If questioned regarding their attitude the only explanation would be suggested by the phrase "Everybody's doing it."

In every pod of peas there is usually a string of duplicates, hence the expression, when measuring the characteristics of separate entities, strikingly similar, often is—"they are as alike as two peas in a pod." A pod of identical peas might well be included in any appropriate coat of arms for the second half of the 20th century.

If individualism was the prevailing feature of American life in the days gone by, standardization is certainly the dominant vogue now. Somebody thinks of setting an ad to a lively tune and immediately commercial houses, selling anything from food or filters to flights by planes, tune up to do the same thing.

And so from the radio comes each day a long line of giggly melodies. In more or less dulcet tones we are exhorted to wear the same kind of clothes, eat the same food, read the same kind of books, see the same type of movies, listen to the same kind of radio and TV programs, and alas the peas in a pod design extends also to what we say and what we think.

Robert Louis Stevenson once made a remark which suggests that he would think of this conforming day. He declared, "To do anything because others do it, and not because the thing is good, or kind, or honest in its own right, is to resign all moral control and the determination to be captain of yourself and go posthaste to the devil with the greatest number." Multitudes have gone to the devil, and with the devil, by simply taking the line of least resistance. A keen observer of our national habits and customs recently remarked, "In America speech and thought are so conditioned as to be for millions practically automatic, individuality of expression and independence of judgment are in danger of becoming lost arts. We have to reckon with the mass mind whose opinions are molded by the press, the films, the radio, the book clubs, and whose taste, standards, ambitions, and responses tend to be stereotyped."

Yet, in the face of all, it needs to be said that there can be no question that the great benefactors of the race have been nonconformists who refused to be just peas in a pod. They were men who stood alone, while the men they agonized for threw the contumelious stone. The men upon whose brow a nation now puts a crown of gratitude as the Republic's Founding Fathers are first rebels. A rebel is one who steps out of a regimented line and refuses to conform. Pasteur, whose very name safeguards the daily bottles of milk at our doors, is an inspiring profile of a nonconformist. He refused to fit into the medical pea pod of his day. In America's history there have been men in the field of public office whose courageous vote in legislative halls, as they defied the majority, sent them to political oblivion but with their integrity unsullied. Always the world's chosen heroes have been willing to pay the price of nonconformity by accepting criticism, ridicule, ostracism, and poverty, rather than to utter a spineless "Yes." What discipline of the will was suggested by the old hymn which was a tonic to youth in the yesterdays and whose lines were loaded with spiritual vitamins:

"Dare to be a Daniel,
Dare to have a purpose true
Dare to stand alone,
And dare to make it known!"

Why have the names of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego lived in shining honor across so many centuries? It is because in spite of the decrees of a dictator when everybody else was bowing down to the golden image set up on the plain, these three immortal Hebrews stood up and, refusing to bow or bend, defied the tyrant by declaring—"We will not bow down."

St. Paul, in drawing the profile of a nonconformist, put it once for all when he wrote, "Be not conformed to this world but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind."

Resolution Supporting the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a resolution passed by the American Legion Irvington Post No. 38 in Indianapolis in support of President Johnson and his conduct of the crisis in Vietnam.

This resolution also was passed by the 11th District of the American Legion at its regular meeting May 6, 1965:

"RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES

"Whereas the free world is in constant hot and cold wars with communism for perpetual freedom; and

"Whereas the loss of freedom anywhere in the world is a loss of freedom everywhere; and

"Whereas freedom is in dire danger in South Vietnam in Asia; and

"Whereas the President of the United States is taking proper action necessary in that country to uphold and defend that freedom; and

"Whereas subversives, Communists, unwitting and appeasement-minded individuals in the United States and other non-Communist countries believe that aggressive Communists can be appeased; and

"Whereas these people are materially and psychologically helping the Communists by attempting to force the President of the United States into some form of negotiations, which course will add up to a disastrous defeat for the free world or force it into a nuclear war for survival; and

"Whereas in reality Communists are unreasonable, unworthy men, in deeds, words, broken treaties and never to be trusted in sincere negotiations; and

"Whereas President Johnson deserves, and should have, the full support of freemen everywhere: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Irvington Post No. 38, Department of Indiana, the American Legion, this 23d day of April 1965, in regular meeting assembled does hereby go on record as

strongly supporting the President of the United States in his forceful policy in South Vietnam, thus disregarding the opinions of the above mentioned groups, but at the same time pursue such a firm policy as will negate the purposes of the Communists in obtaining their objectives by a premature cease-fire in South Vietnam, or by prolonged deliberations which practiced in Korea ended in great disadvantages for the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the next regular meeting of the 11th District, Department of Indiana, of the American Legion for further favorable action, that copies be forwarded to the next Department executive meeting, the President of the United States, the 11th District congressional Representative in Congress, the two Senators from Indiana and the local press.

"This resolution unanimously passed as attested by

"JULIUS MEININGER,
"Commander.
"DON M. OWEN,
"Adjutant."

This resolution was passed by the 11th District of the American Legion at its regular meeting May 6, 1965.

DWIGHT MCCAGUE,
Commander.
LOWELL B. STORY,
Adjutant.

Address by John M. Hosford on Presentation of 23d Annual Bellamy Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an address delivered at the 23d annual Bellamy Award presentation, last year, by John Michael Hosford, the president of the Annapolis High School Student Council.

The Bellamy Award is in honor of Francis Bellamy, the author of the "Pledge of Allegiance," and is given each year to an outstanding high school.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MIKE HOSFORD, ANNAPOLIS HIGH SCHOOL, ANNAPOLIS, MD.

I feel that the endeavors of the students in school and in community lives are best expressed by the inscription above the Annapolis High School entrance: "The measure of a man is the depth of his convictions, the breadth of his interests, and the height of his ideals."

Annapolis, capital city, has played an important part in our Nation's history. In its State House, the oldest in the United States still in legislative use, George Washington resigned his commission as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army. Annapolis is the home of the distinguished U.S. Naval Academy and of St. John's College where the author of our national anthem, Francis Scott Key, received his education.

Annapolis High School was founded in 1897. It consists of grades 10–12, and has an enrollment of 2,000. Its motto is "Knowledge is Power," and the panther is its emblem.

Our school supports an extensive athletic program. Our 1963 football team was first place in the county, as were the girl's hockey team and boy's soccer team, both undefeated. In lacrosse, an Indian game to which many of you probably have never been introduced, Annapolis High School is undefeated in 34 games over 4 years. We are rated first in the State, and as one of the finest teams in the country.

Our student council promotes and supports a large number of clubs, among them: the Booster Club, which maintains spirit and morale; the Junior Civitan Club, which is for young leaders in the community; and the American Field Service chapter, which sponsors our foreign exchange student, this year from Thailand.

Our school newspaper, Tally-Ho, was the first high school paper to take part in an exchange program with a foreign country, under a program sponsored by the U.S. Information Agency.

From Annapolis, I extend to you sincere congratulations, and I present a set of historical prints of our capital city, as a memento of your Bellamy award sister city.

California's Manmade Agricultural Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, over a month ago, on April 7, the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram editorially assessed the administration's refusal to permit Mexican labor to harvest California crops as unrealistic and a threat to the economic well-being of millions of citizens. As the weeks have passed since then the crisis has mounted to disaster proportions, all as predicted in the editorial, which read as follows:

BRING BACK THE BRACERO

Because Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz refuses to admit the realities of the farm labor problem in California, this State faces an agricultural crisis which can affect the economic well-being of millions of citizens.

The crisis stems from the expiration, last December, of the program under which Mexican farmworkers came to California to help harvest crops of fruits and vegetables.

It was and is the contention of Secretary Wirtz that domestic American labor is sufficient to do this work. Unfortunately, the need for farmworkers is not being met by domestic labor, with the result that agricultural production suffers.

Despite the end of the so-called bracero program, Secretary Wirtz has the power under Public Law 414, an immigration act, to let foreign workers enter this country temporarily. He has refused to exercise this power.

When the bracero program ended, he immediately slammed the door against further imports of farm labor. Growers couldn't get enough American workers to pick crops. In desperation, State employment director, Albert Tieburg asked Wirtz to authorize the use of 5,100 Mexican nationals in the vegetable fields. Governor Brown, himself, echoed the request. Wirtz merely answered that he was not satisfied that growers had cooperated fully in recruiting farm help from the State's unemployed. About 10 days ago, after a tour of California farm areas, he criticized living quarters offered by some growers and declared that the farmers must just learn to live without the importation of Mexican nationals.

Meanwhile, fruit and vegetables rotted on the ground. Farmers began to curtail plantings because of the uncertainty of getting labor to do the harvest. Some canners were reported thinking about moving their operations to Mexico. The Bank of America announced it would not lend money to farmers to plant crops requiring stoop labor if there was no reasonable expectation of adequate labor to harvest crops.

Right now is the period of smallest need for harvest workers, and yet the farmers are having trouble. There has been a reported drop of approximately 40 percent in tomato plantings this year from last. If difficulties are encountered now, what will the problem be next September at the peak of operations?

Senator GEORGE MURPHY, who is leading the campaign to permit the importation of Mexican farmworkers, contends that the stubborn attitude of Secretary Wirtz is hurting small growers very seriously, driving agriculture to Mexico, and creating unemployment. Teamsters and longshoremen are suffering loss of work. Cutbacks in production of vegetables can eliminate the jobs of cannery workers and raise the prices which housewives must pay at the grocery store.

At the heart of Secretary Wirtz' opposition to the bracero program is the contention that it was a slave-labor program which exploited Mexican workers while denying jobs to California's unemployed. But columnist Caspar Weinberger recently pointed out:

"The Mexican workers signed up years in advance, hoping their names would be drawn so they could some to California to work. Their working, living, and traveling conditions were carefully regulated and improved by governmental and private agreements. And, most important of all, there never were anywhere near enough domestic workers willing to harvest the row crops that make up the staple of California agriculture."

The Department of Labor tried to recruit American workers but fell flat on its face. Willing domestic workers were found to be insufficient in quantity and quality; and when they did appear for work, they could not be depended upon to stay on the job. It was more rewarding to go on relief.

A point which Secretary Wirtz evades is that the law requires domestic labor to be hired before foreign workers are authorized. The bracero can be hired only in the absence of the domestic. Thus, it's not actually a question of putting willing American workers out of jobs.

During the bracero program, California growers used about 90,000 Mexicans and about 40,000 domestic workers. This offers some idea of the vacuum of labor which has been created.

Why did Mexicans clamor for the slave jobs on California farms? The answer is that in terms of the cost of living in Mexico, they were well paid. The bracero program was a happy situation for them, for Mexico, for the California growers, for the California economy, and for just about everybody—except Secretary Wirtz.

The experiment since last December has proven that domestics cannot or will not fill the needs of California growers; it has produced economic hardships; it promises further, more serious hardships. Therefore, the time has come for Secretary Wirtz to admit that the bracero is needed and to proceed with the negotiations necessary to assure his services for California growers. Further delay will cause irreparable damage.

Soviet Strength—Editorial by William J. Coughlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the May 17 issue of Missiles and Rockets contains an editorial which discusses the Soviet military displays in the last few days and the meanings of the displays, in terms of U.S. military security. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Soviet Strength," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET STRENGTH

(By William J. Coughlin)

The Soviet Union, with its May 9 display of missile and space might, has dealt a major blow to the complacency of those persons in the United States who consistently have underestimated the competence of the Russians in these fields.

The appearance of Soviet solid-fuel missiles of a type similar to the U.S. Minuteman ICBM indicates that the Soviets finally have overcome the chemical roadblock which until now has made possible the U.S. lead in solids. We predicted just such a development on this page last January (M/R, Jan. 11, p. 46).

The credit rests with former Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev. He did not fail to grasp the fact that the early unwieldy liquid-fueled Russian ICBM's were militarily and geopolitically unsatisfactory. The intensive Russian effort to grasp the technology of solids now has paid off.

In a film which the Moscow correspondent of the New York Times estimated to be at least 3 years old, the Soviets also displayed launchings from an underground silo. The combination of these events suggests the Soviets now are in a position to rapidly close the missile gap with the United States to the point where it is of no consequence in military calculations. The gap was a deliberate gamble on the part of the Soviet Union during development of the solid ICBM.

This is not entirely a gloomy turn of events for the United States. Solid-fuel missiles and underground silos make it possible for the Soviets now to assume a second-strike posture in military confrontations with the West.

The administration's display of confidence in recent months in the less intransigent attitude of the Soviet Union on the world scene, may, in fact, stem from early knowledge of these developments. Construction of underground silos would be difficult to hide from the high-resolution cameras of U.S. reconnaissance satellites.

We should not forget, however, that an ominous interpretation also can be put on such activities. Underground silos make it possible to conceal first-strike preparation, something that was not possible with liquid-fueled aboveground missiles. The damage-limiting nature of silos also removes from a first-strike position the necessity of getting all missiles off in salvo.

The Soviets also displayed an intermediate-range missile unmatched in the Western arsenal. Mounted on a tracked carrier, this very mobile weapon was described as having a range of 1,100 miles. It, too, was solid-fueled.

The nearest comparable U.S. missile is the Pershing, with only half the range. It appears that while the United States has been discussing the Mobile Medium-Range Ballistic Missile (MMRBM), the Soviet Union has been building it.

In the film release, the Russians for the first time showed their antimissile missile in action. One sequence was of intercept of an ICBM.

Again, it must be remembered that the film probably was 3 years old. The Russian Defense Minister announced in October 1962 that the Soviets had solved the anti-ICBM problem and the Russian lead in the field was officially acknowledged in the United States about the same time.

Undoubtedly, the effort on anti-ICBM's is much further along at this time. There is a significant side effect to this work also. The chances are exceedingly good that Soviet ICBM's are quite sophisticated as to penetration aids. Most certainly, knowledge from the antimissile program would have been used in this fashion, just as the United States has made similar use of information from the Nike-X program.

Therefore, the requirement imposed on Nike-X becomes even more severe and must be taken into account in the decision as to whether and when it should go into production.

The Soviets also displayed a new radio-guided antitank missile which is of interest in view of United States difficulties in developing an entirely satisfactory missile in this field.

Films of submarine launchings of Polaris-type missiles also were shown, a clear warning that the Navy's ASW burden can be expected to increase.

There are two comments which might be made on the display of Soviet missile might. First, it indicates a growing confidence in the capability of their weapons—since they are unlikely to display weapons of dubious quality. Second, going along with the new second-strike posture, it indicates an increased Russian belief in the value of deterrence. As U.S. Secretary of Defense McNamara has pointed out, a deterrent is of no value unless it is credible to the enemy. Therefore, it must be displayed. Despite some interpretations of the Russian show as warlike, this position on deterrence surely is to be welcomed, since deterrence is a defensive attitude.

The increasing Soviet confidence also is indicated in the space field. The Soviets let it be known more than a month in advance that their next space spectacular could be expected on May 9 (M/R, Apr. 5, p. 7). The launch of Lunik V obviously was right on schedule. The acknowledgment after launch but in advance of impact that its goal was a lunar soft landing also is a more realistic approach to space developments than previously shown.

This shift toward a franker attitude is supported by the open admission of the Zond II Mars probe failure by Soviet scientists attending the Space Exploration Symposium in Chicago on May 4.

At the same time, the Russians released more information on the Soviet space program at the Chicago meeting than heretofore.

All of this points toward greater maturity in both Soviet missile programs and Soviet space programs. The competition, therefore, is far keener than many persons in the United States have been willing to admit.

The conclusion is clear. The United States cannot afford to let down or it will be far outdistanced in areas which will continue to be vital to its national security and well-being for many, many years.

Tribute to the People of Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLLAND REDLIN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, today, May 17, is an appropriate time to pay tribute to the people of Norway, for 151 years ago on this date the Norwegian Constitution was signed, creating a new nation oriented toward liberty and democracy.

In many parts of the United States—and particularly in my State of North Dakota—Americans of Norwegian extraction will commemorate this anniversary. They have reason to be proud, because the Norwegian Constitution was rooted in traditions of liberty and rule by law dating back eight centuries.

Independence for Norway came after a series of unions with Denmark and Sweden in which either one or the other of these nations held the upper hand. In the early part of the 19th century, the Norwegians reluctantly entered the Napoleonic wars on the side of Denmark, with Sweden on the opposite side. As hostilities came to an end, Denmark was forced to sign the Treaty of Kiel on January 14, 1814, ceding Norway to Sweden.

Not only were the Norwegian people unhappy about being used as a pawn in international politics, but so was Prince Christian Frederik, Danish Governor General in Norway, who felt that his hereditary rights to Norway had been signed away.

Upon the call of Prince Christian Frederik, a constituent assembly convened at Eidsvoll near Oslo on April 10, 1814, to draft a Constitution. Fifty-nine government officials, 37 farmers and 16 businessmen drafted the Constitution in 6 weeks, and it was approved and signed on May 17.

Unfortunately, Norway's sovereignty was short lived. When the assembly elected Prince Christian Frederik to be King of Norway, Sweden launched a military attack. After brief hostilities, the Convention of Moss was negotiated, establishing Norway and Sweden as separate kingdoms under one monarch, King Carl Johan, of Sweden. Not until 1905 did Norway become a completely independent nation.

Nevertheless, King Carl Johan recognized Norway's Constitution and it remained in force during the entire period. Today, although two-thirds of the articles have been amended, the chief features of the Constitution remain intact as the fundamental law of Norway.

Mr. Speaker, the development of democratic thought in Norway, although rooted in ancient national traditions, was also influenced by the U.S. Constitution and by thousands of letters from the steady stream of Norwegian emigrants to the United States.

I am proud that thousands of these emigrants came to my State of North Dakota. Census reports show there are more than 50,000 persons of Norwegian extraction in my State.

Norway and the United States have many common ideals, based on a belief in the dignity of the individual. It is a pleasure to take note of Norwegian Constitution Day.

The Balance of Power and the Balance of Payments—Statement by Walter B. Wriston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, last week our Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations held the first hearing in its study on the conduct of national-security policy. As the first witness, we asked the eminent banker, Walter B. Wriston, executive vice president of the First National City Bank of New York City, in charge of the bank's oversea division, to testify on the relationship of national economic policy and operations to strong and effective action in international affairs—with particular emphasis on the balance-of-payments problem.

It was a great privilege to have Mr. Wriston before the subcommittee. His opening statement, on "The Balance of Power and the Balance of Payments," deserves careful reading by Members of Congress and by the public. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the perceptive statement submitted by Mr. Wriston before the subcommittee, on May 13, 1965, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BALANCE OF POWER AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

(Statement by Walter B. Wriston before the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations, May 13, 1965)

Long before the phrase, "balance of payments," was widely known in our country many people were familiar with the concept in international relations of balance of power. The whole phrase, "balance of power," seems to suggest a seesaw with a great power sitting at each end and some of the smaller powers throwing their weight first one way and then the other as circumstances changed. The balance of power, however, might better be likened to a large disk supported in the center by a pivot with its circumference ringed with all the elements which go into maintaining a nation's position. The chips that a nation places on the edge of this disk to tip it one way or the other have been the subject of study by this committee. They include, among others, moral force, military power and the geographic location of these forces in relation to other forces. What I am suggesting today is that the deficit in the American international balance of payments is now a weight on this disk which is influencing our relationships with the rest of the world.

In relating the soundness of the dollar to American power, I want to make it clear at the outset that history teaches that no war has ever been lost solely because the defeated power ran out of money or mismanaged its internal finances. If a sound currency were a prerequisite for victory, the American Revolution would never have been won and Nazi Germany would have been defeated much sooner. It is interesting that I can find no reference in the Federalist papers to the importance of a sound currency in the national scheme of things, and if you review one of the oldest diplomatic handbooks of skulduggery, "The Prince," by Machiavelli, you will fail to find any strong statements about the importance of maintaining a solid currency. Indeed, it was not until 1863 in our own country that the National Bank Act and subsequent legislation forced out of circulation all notes excepting those issued by national banks. The point to remember, therefore, is that a country living in isolation can often survive with a bad currency, but a world power, like the United States, whose internal money is the reserve currency of the world, must inevitably be subject to different pressures and limitations. A bad currency, which is often the mirror image of a balance-of-payments deficit, is capable over a period of time of reducing a great power to a nation without influence in the world. The Spanish historian, Salvador de Madariaga, traced the decline of Spain as one of the world's most important powers to the importation of Peruvian gold which started a cycle of inflation which eventually broke up the greatest colonial power in the world. There are few instances in history where cause and effect can be sharply delineated with certainty, but there is no doubt that runaway inflation has been a major factor in many cases of declining political power.

John Stuart Mill wrote about money that: "It is a machine for doing quickly and commodiously, what would be done, though less quickly and commodiously, without it: and like many other kinds of machinery, it only exerts a distinct and independent influence of its own when it gets out of order." "Perfectly true," says Prof. Milton Friedman. "Yet also somewhat misleading, unless we recognize that there is hardly a contrivance man possesses which can do more damage to a society when it goes amiss." If the U.S. dollar were permitted to deteriorate through extraordonarily large doses of credit expansion and thus assure a growing and continuous deficit in our balance of payments, this would have at least two major effects on the world balance of power:

1. It could in the end destroy the savings flow that builds our industrial plant and with it the main power base of our foreign policy.

2. Concurrently with our internal deterioration, the present gold exchange standard, which is anchored to a sound dollar, would be in danger of breaking down. Should this breakdown occur, the cohesive character of world economics made possible by the enormous growth in international trade and investment would be seriously undermined.

A look at the international record is instructive. In July 1944 the allied nations sat down at Bretton Woods and put together the framework for a world payments mechanism built around the International Monetary Fund. It worked and worked so well that since 1949 it has financed an increase of more than $100 billion in free world exports. In the process we largely freed ourselves from the shackles of economic nationalism that arose out of the debris of worldwide economic collapse in the early 1930's.

The wealth of the world has grown enormously. A number of countries once again can afford to hold vast amounts of gold. The system of international payments based as it is to a great extent on dollars and sterling is under sharp attack and there are uneasy rumblings of wanting to return to the exchange controls of the thirties.

While recurring crises in sterling, and particularly the one last November, are major factors contributing to the rather pessimistic view some hold for the future of the present payments arrangements, we will center our remarks largely on the difficulties of the dollar.

The arithmetic of our balance-of-payments deficit is becoming familiar to many people who never gave it a thought until recently. Since 1949 the United States has incurred a deficit in its balance of payments every year but one. That was 1957. A statistical snapshot of that period shows that the cumulative deficit through last year totaled about $34 billion. It was financed largely by $9 billion of gold sales and an increase of $22 billion of liquid dollar liabilities to foreigners both private and official.

Gold losses from the United States accelerated after 1959 and in the past 6 years our deficit on the so-called regular basis has ranged between $3 and $4 billion a year. The changes in accounting recommended by the Bernstein Committee would reduce last year's figures by about one-half. The deficit on any basis was serious enough so that various ad hoc measures have been undertaken to bring about equilibrium.

For years our balance-of-payments deficit was largely the concern of economists who regarded it as something of a technical problem. Traditionally, we regarded balance-of-payments problems as something that happened to other countries and had no real meaning for us except as an academic exercise. More recently, our deficit has moved from a classroom discussion to a position of some importance as a limiting factor upon the power of the United States to pursue its worldwide objective and meet its responsibilities. Growing awareness of this new limitation has helped inspire a greater sense of urgency in finding a lasting solution. The global side effects of our balance-of-payments deficit are many and are increasing.

1. The specter of a breakdown in our international payments mechanism has tended to feed this world neurosis which could influence important economic decisionmaking.

2. As a great power in a divided world we must assume political postures in our national interest which inevitably displease some of our allies. The France of De Gaulle has been outspoken in this regard. Our failure to bring our balance of payments into equilibrium has not been overlooked by that country as one means of giving weight to its differences with the United States—a kind of gold-rattling diplomacy.

3. Should the deficit in our international payments continue unabated and at an accelerated rate, leading ultimately to devaluation of the dollar and collapse of the present payments mechanism, the political unity of the free world in facing up to the Communist challenge could be seriously imperiled.

4. The difference between having a surplus or trying to finance a deficit must find reflection in our national posture. In the last few years we have had to ask our friends not to convert their dollars to gold and, additionally, to set up short-term credits to ward off gold losses. To be in this position cannot be said to improve our political-bargaining position in the world.

5. The less developed countries are asking with increasing frequency: Will your aid continue? Can you afford the Alliance for Progress?

The international political impact of our balance-of-payments problem has increased

significantly over the past year so that it can no longer be regarded merely as a bookkeeping problem. In early January, when one of the most serious sterling crises of the postwar period was scarcely 5 weeks old, the French announced intentions to step up their conversion of dollars into gold. They did and in the first quarter of this year French gold purchase from the United States totaled about $450 million.

Many Americans are prone to scold General de Gaulle for what seems to be his bad manners in attacking a financial weak spot in the very country that had so much to do with helping his own achieve financial recovery and strength. I have no such inclination. We should learn a lesson from this experience. The difficulties we are now passing through with France are not by any means peculiar to that country or these times: they are evident elsewhere and could emerge to the French proportions.

The general is clear on the significance linking national financial power to political power. France's differences with the leadership of the United States have many roots. Whatever the causes may be, the point is that the French have added their excess dollar holdings to their arsenal of arguments. Failure to give sufficient weight to the possible effects of our balance-of-payments deficit on political postures was a serious omission in our international financial policies durng the past 4 years. What I have in mind particularly is the reliance on cooperative arrangements between central banks, foreign currency swaps, informal cooperation between the United States and foreign central banks in providing stability to the London gold market and the sale of special U.S. Treasury issues to foreign governments. There is no doubt that the spirit of cooperation embodied in these arranegments made possible the $3 billion rescue package for sterling last November. But even then, France, one of the major players in this teamwork went into the game half-heartedly.

The pressures of dollar and sterling difficulties are giving rise to a growing chorus of demands that urgent steps be undertaken to make changes in our international payments mechanism. The Group of Ten has been studying possible steps during the past 2 years. Whatever changes may be made in world payments arrangements, we must not overlook the lesson that the payments machinery must be insulated as much as possible from the political power plays in the community of nations. Long before we reach international agreement on changes in our international machinery, we must recognize the extent to which a weak dollar would fail to carry its weight on our balance-of-power disk.

As a nation we are concerned about the image created abroad by our open efforts to Negro citizens. It is also important that we achieve social equilibrium between white and Negro citizens. It is also important that we recognize the extent to which our image as an effective free world leader is influenced by our success or failure to achieve balance-of-payments equilibrium.

The dollar, hungrily sought by nations of the world in the aftermath of World War II and long regarded as better than gold, has recently picked up some of the stigma of controls that has long been identified with other currencies of the world.

Two years ago we imposed a tax on borrowings by foreigners in the traditionally free U.S. capital market. More recently this tax was extended to bank loans and the President has asked Congress to extend it for 2 years beyond its expiration date of December 31, 1965. Furthermore, this year, in response to a sudden deepening of our deficit in the final quarter of last year, the administration asked businessmen voluntarily to restrict their investing and lending abroad. In part this move was a response to the growing complaints in a few foreign countries that Americans were too competitive, too aggressive, in acquiring business interests there. The voluntary program, in its initial stages, seems to be working and working well. Dollars are draining out of markets abroad and while this may satisfy some countries abroad, notably France and Germany, others are becoming unhappy about the relatively sudden difficulties in getting all the dollars they need. Among these are Australia, Japan, and some of the Scandinavian countries. Here too the balance-of-payments problem moves quickly from the Treasury Department to the State Department. The political overtones make a solution to the deficit more imperative than ever.

For many years we offered advice, first to Europe, then to our neighbors to the south, on how to stop the currency printing presses and so curb their balance-of-payments deficit. We have sought to enunciate the simple accounting principle in the balance sheet of central banks that when domestic assets in the form of Government securities or loans to commercial banks go up, this increase is often offset by a reduction of gold and foreign currency holdings or, in other words, a deficit in the balance of payments. This is not an economic theory—it is arithmetic. Each nation, including our own, starts out on the premise that its deficit in the balance of payments is unique. It is due to low coffee prices, unfavorable terms of trade, capital flight, too much tourist expenditure, or too much foreign aid. Only after a protracted period do we ever get down to a concerted attack on the basic source of the deficit.

Before attacking the root cause, nations sometimes go down the dark road of exchange control despite the fact that exchange control has a perfect record of failure in curing balance-of-payments deficits anywhere in the world. The secondary political consequences of exchange control are even more important than their primary economic impact. Like our experiment with prohibition, exchange controls are not effective and encourage the worst criminal elements to circumvent them and erode our moral base. The British, for example, by limiting money made available to their citizens for foreign travel to a few dollars a day, effectively stopped an entire generation from seeing and thus learning about the world. Never in history has the penalty been so great for failure to understand the aspirations of the people of the world; yet the United States, where the need is critical, seriously considered a tax on foreign travel which would have hindered the teachers of your children and mine from the kind of learning that only travel can bring. Controls breed more controls because it is impossible to write down the permutations and combinations of a free economy. Controls breed centralization of power which erodes freedom. For all of these reasons and many more—not the least of which is that they don't work—controls are the wrong way to solve our problem. They would vitiate our position of leadership by gumming up the wheels of the most efficient economic machine ever constructed.

The magnitude of our problem is great, but it is well within our capacity to solve through the intelligent application of the resources at our command, including the use of classical monetary and fiscal policies. This Nation pays about $50 billion a year in sterile manufacture of military might as the necessary price of freedom. It is not unreasonable to believe that we would pay a far smaller price to maintain the integrity of our money lest we dissipate through this medium the leverage we need in the world to maintain our freedom.

The essence of successful policy is a highly developed sense of perspective. Those among us who would dismiss a deficit in our balance of payments as an inconsequential amount when measured against our overall economy would be as wrong as those who overstate the danger to the point of talking about the collapse of the American power base. If the ancient axiom that we should negotiate from strength has any validity, it is clear that in the year 1965 one important element in that power base is a strong U.S. dollar. The relative importance of maintaining a sound dollar has grown enormously as America changed its posture from that of isolation to involvement in the world. The stakes are no longer only the stability of the American economy, but must include the enormous interest we have in preventing the breakdown of the whole free world's monetary structure.

Crime and Violence a National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, to those of my colleagues who worry unceasingly about our problems in Alabama, I would like to call attention to the feature article in the Sunday Star detailing crime in New York.

The article, written by Bernard Gavzer and called "Crime in New York: A Crisis Atmosphere," should give us ample reason to stop and think what is happening in America. In every major city, especially in the North, the streets are unsafe even in daylight hours, and homes are no longer a place of safety and refuge. Criminals roam in animal-like packs, pillaging, murdering and raping. While the South has the lowest crime rate in the Nation, crime in Washington, New York, and other metropolitan areas is of national concern and all Americans must demand laws and the enforcement of laws which will bring a halt to this madness. The time is fast approaching when society can no longer permit sociologists and tender-hearted courts to let loose in our communities vicious criminals. The right of the individual against persecution must always be protected, but the right of all the people to life and freedom from fear of assault is also a guarantee under the Constitution. It is past time we begin to administer justice in behalf of the victim rather than the criminal.

The article from the Washington Sunday Star follows:

CRIME IN NEW YORK: A CRISIS ATMOSPHERE

(By Bernard Gavzer)

NEW YORK.—It is 8 p.m.

Patrolman Harry Habart, 63d precinct, boards the IRT subway at Flatbush and Nostrand Avenue in Brooklyn, set to ride the noisy trains until 4 a.m., like a shotgun guard in the Old West.

Rabbi Seymour Schrage, of Crown Heights, in Brooklyn, enters a sedan and begins night patrol of the streets, like a vigilante on the prowl for highwaymen.

Florence Ward, a part-time bar waitress of 56, puts a $2.98 pen-type tear gas gun in her pocketbook and walks to a Queens bus stop, determined to protect herself even if it means violating the law (the pen-gun is considered a dangerous, concealed weapon).

Their paths do not cross, but the policeman, the rabbi, and the waitress play roles in the night-after-night drama in which this great and exciting city becomes a place of fear for many.

In a city which has so much to please them, they become prisoners in their homes. They feel they cannot enjoy their parks, their streets, even their neighborhood shops.

IN OTHER CITIES

City officials draw another picture. They argue—and show statistics to prove their point—that New York has no runaway crime, any more than any large city. FBI statistics for 1963, the most recent year for which they are complete, show the New York metropolitan area crime rate as 1,688.6 crimes per 100,000 population. Rates in other large cities, 2,935.4 Los Angeles-Long Beach; 2,195.1 Chicago; 1,781.3 Atlanta; 1,621.2 Washington.

New York still throbs with activity. It is a work place and play place for millions. It is the capital of finance, theater, arts, science, the place where far-reaching decisions are made. People still earn their living, shop, go to the theater, art galleries, department stores, hotels, night school, sports events, raise families, educate their children, and spend their lives with security and without unpleasant incidents.

Still—despite the statistics, despite the obvious vitality of the city—many New Yorkers are uneasy. While their fear may not necessarily be related to fact it is a real state of mind.

And it is one which says—no matter what contrary evidence is presented—that New York is in a crisis of violence.

If not, why must police ride the subways and patrol the station platforms?

Why must private citizens form vigilante groups?

STEPS BY THE MAYOR

Why must women buy weapons, which are enjoying a brisk sale, to protect yourself against mashers, thieves, and hoodlums."

When extraordinary steps to combat crime were taken by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, they may have been designed to calm public fear, but at the same time they had the effect of confirming suspicions that crime was reaching a critical stage.

The mayor early in April issued the order that put hundreds of uniformed police on subway trains and platforms during the high incidence crime hours of 8 p.m. to 4 a.m. Fifteen days later, the mayor said 500 patrolmen were immediately being put on street duty during the night and that by July 1, the Nation's biggest police force would be brought to a strength of 28,228—nearly twice that of a U.S. Army Infantry division.

"The days ahead will be days of open war—we against the criminals," the mayor said. "We are going to win. They are going to lose."

Such assurance may filter down to the people, but at this point there is anxiety, and it manifests itself in many ways:

Central Park, an 840-acre island of greenery and lagoons in the midst of the concrete city, becomes a no man's land. People do not stroll through it at night. They fear assault from toughs or dope addicts moving in from Harlem at the north edge of the park, or Puerto Ricans from the tenements sprinkled among luxury apartment buildings on Central Park west and Riverside Drive.

LIFE IN TIMES SQUARE

Times Square, the garish symbol of New York night life, has its particular breed of creeps who come out of the woodwork at 2 a.m.—hustlers of all sorts, homosexuals, panders, whatnots.

Women who work at night—telephone operators, for example—get free taxi service home, paid for by the company. Women who clean offices in the skyscrapers band together for subway rides home, or also get taxi service.

Along some business streets—Fulton in Brooklyn, is typical—businessmen close their shops at 7 p.m., instead of 9 or 10, as they did for years.

Subway trains and stations are considered dangerous places. Serious crimes in the subways increased 41.4 percent in the first 3 months of 1965, compared with the like period in 1964—a total increase of 123.2 percent since 1963.

Tai drivers keep doors locked at night, refuse to take passengers into certain areas, and campaign for the right to carry weapons. They also want protective shields between driver and passenger, and electronic alarms.

In many buildings, public housing as well as private, tenants are afraid to use the automatic elevators alone. In a typical middle income building off Broadway tenants have metal coverings on their doors, and at least two locks on each door. New buildings have TV equipment so tenants can see who is calling, or so custodians can monitor corridors from a central control point.

As for subways, there are 4.6 million fares each work day. In 1964, there was an average of 30 reported crimes each day. Offenses ranged from stealing light bulbs to murder.

"Does this mean that the subways are really unsafe?" asks a transit authority administrator.

On the basis of statistics, no. But "how can you rely on statistics," asks Rabbi Schrage, who organized the Maccabees, a citizens patrol in Brooklyn. "Consider rape. How many mothers will go to the police and say a daughter has been accosted? They do not want to mark a daughter with a public stain. Who would want to marry the girl? But to me, as a rabbi, and to others, they come to discuss such troubles."

According to Gilbert Geis, sociology professor at California State College:

"Possibly 1 out of 10 crimes committed becomes known to the police; maybe 1 out of 20; perhaps 1 out of 100; or, if you would care to, you could easily defend the view that, for each 100,000 criminal acts committed, only 1 becomes known to the police."

THE NEGRO ANGLE

Negroes have been blamed for crime. Statistically, they are involved in a disproportionate share of known crimes. Sociologists and criminologists say this is because Negroes have been subjected to discrimination and disadvantage in jobs, housing, and education.

But many people feel a new element has been added—wanton crime against whites for racial reasons.

A Westchester executive waiting for a subway in mid-Manhattan was accosted by two Negroes and offered no resistance. But the men beat him before taking his wallet, saying in effect that he was a white so-and-so. Other whites have been beaten and injured by Negroes in unprovoked attacks.

"There possibly is the element of frustration on the part of some northern Negroes," says a Negro writer, "in the sense that they have not had the real opportunity to put themselves to the test in civil rights action, as some southern Negroes have."

"Most robbers want to get the money and get away," says a detective. "Every second these guys spend beating somebody raises the risk of getting caught."

The detective's conclusion is that there was more than robbery at work in some recent cases: that racial frustration had entered the picture.

FEARS FOR CHILDREN

A young mother living in Greenwich Village tells of a change that has bewildered her.

"I used to wheel my daughter, who is now 8, in Washington Square Park, when she was a baby. Even then, there were odd people around but you'd very seldom experience anything nasty. Now, I won't take my little boy there. The men are drunk and coarse, and there is something very abnormal about it.

"Some of the things the men say to you are not being said to you as a woman, but as a white woman. I'm very depressed by this because I fight for civil rights. These people are the ones I want to help, but I can't honestly put down the feeling that they have something against me because I'm white."

On racially inspired viciousness in crime, a spokesman for the New York City Police Department says: "There is no way in which this could be determined with any precision or accuracy, but we doubt it very much. Criminals do vicious things."

Certain crimes may occur infrequently, but when they do they get dramatic treatment. The stabbing of Jill Neitert, 24, in a 75-cent robbery, for example, produced a photograph of the girl sitting in an automobile with the mother-of-pearl handle of a switch-blade knife protruding from her back. On several occasions, gangs of young Negroes systematically harrassed, beat and robbed passengers on subway trains. These incidents remain imbedded in the public mind.

"The fact is that Negro versus white crime is exaggerated," says an executive of a national Negro organization. "There is no disputing the fact the 9 out of 10 crimes committed by Negroes are against other Negroes, especially in murder, robbery, and rape.

"In the white press, Negroes are frequently victimized by misrepresentation, such as the case in which a married woman was beaten by her boy friend, and reported that it was done by a Negro in order to conceal that she'd been cheating on her husband."

WORK WITH TEENAGERS

As for the element of a Negro compulsion to strike out against whites, he says:

"Of course, you get pushed around for generations, and the time comes for pushing back. If you're antisocial or a sociopath, then the race part will enter into it."

A Negro who does volunteer work with Negro teenagers says:

"I notice there is some of that feeling among the gang kids. It's not just that they're interested in bopping (fighting) with Italians or Puerto Ricans, but that now it also means getting back at whitey. The soul brothers (Negroes) have the sort of feeling that now is the time to act against whitey and you have to do it every which way."

This coincides with the notion that some northern Negroes are striking out because the brunt of the civil rights action is being carried by Negroes in the South.

"You get some people who think that because they mug some white person or steal something from a white person that they are being part of this big revolution," says one Negro. "They are not, but in a crazy way it gives them a way to rationalize mugging and robbing."

The immediate reaction to posting of police in potential problem areas was enthusiastic. Subway passengers remarked that they felt a lot better.

"I feel I can close my eyes and grab some sleep for the first time in years," says one man.

"Having more people together is better," says a woman. "This way you don't feel so much that you can go rattling around by yourself in some end of the train." (At night, fewer cars in each train are open to passengers.)

"To tell the truth, the police on the subway is a very good thing," says a 65-year-old Washington Heights woman, "but for how long will it be? If you have a situation somewhere else in the city, a riot of some

kind of other troubles, they will take these police.

"But anyway, these little bums do not worry so much about the police. For them, it is a game. The policeman only makes it a harder game. But wait and see, they'll do some mugging again, believe me, even with the police."

It is with this cynicism and foreboding that the city moves toward summer. Already, there is the atmosphere of perhaps trouble worse than last summer's riots in Harlem, or subway harassment. One clue is in the growing talk about vigilante groups.

"I have been approached by influential persons about forming a citywide citizens patrol patterned on the Maccabees," says Rabbi Schrage, who started the Maccabees a year ago. Its original members were ultra-orthodox Jews, but it now is interreligious and interracial. It is credited with a substantial reduction in crime in Brooklyn's Crown Heights area.

"Who can say what it will be," says the rabbi, "but we must never stop, or it will get out of hand again."

President Johnson Understands the Stakes in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, television station WTOP in Washington recently dispatched Jack Jurey to Vietnam to report on the situation there. His editorials are truly fine illustrations of outstanding journalism.

These editorials point out that it is not a pleasant task the United States undertakes in southeast Asia. However, it is a necessary task.

President Johnson understands the stakes in southeast Asia. He knows that if communism is to be halted, we must draw the line somewhere. In defending freedom in Vietnam, President Johnson is defending our national honor and the honor of the entire free world.

So at this time, I salute the resolute determination of our great President as well as the fine editorial work of WTOP.

The text of three of Mr. Jurey's editorials follow:

[Editorial broadcast on May 11 and 12, 1965, over WTOP radio and television]

This is a WTOP editorial from Saigon.

During the next several days, WTOP will discuss the American involvement in Vietnam from this vantage point. The conclusions are based on first-hand observations of the U.S. military effort both in the north, at Danang, and in the Mekong Delta to the south, plus numerous off-the-record and background interviews with American and Vietnamese officials, including Prime Minister Quat.

What appears to us to be clearcut here in Saigon is that the U.S. position in South Vietnam is justified by hard fact. It is possible to argue by abstraction—as some do—that our country should not have allowed itself to become deeply enmeshed in this war in southeast Asia. Yet our commitment here is not the product of any one President, any one administration, or any one incident or episode. It has been forced upon us by two basic factors. One is the imperative need to make a stand somewhere, somehow against the political and military ambitions of North Vietnam and Communist China. The second is the obligation to protect those South Vietnamese who have actively and openly supported us. To quit now, to give the Vietcong control of South Vietnam, would be to throw these men and women to the wolves.

These circumstances compel the United States to remain on its present course. South Vietnam may not be the best place to draw the line in southeast Asia, but there are worse places. The threat of further escalation continues, but that threat appears no more dangerous than the consequences of craven conciliation.

This station previously has supported the thrust of U.S. policy in Vietnam. We have now viewed the situation at firsthand. Our belief is reinforced that there is no acceptable alternative to present action. We cannot see how any retreat from the present policy could possibly do anything but work against American national interests.

This was a WTOP editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP from Saigon.

[Editorial broadcast on May 12 and 13, 1965, over WTOP radio and television]

This is a WTOP editorial from Saigon.

Discussing the ugly, uncertain war in South Vietnam, there seems to us to be both an official and unofficial failure to emphasize one aspect clearly enough. That is the extreme likelihood that, having entered into this struggle, the United States will be unable to withdraw from it for a considerable number of years.

If there are no negotiations, if the Vietcong continues its harassment of South Vietnam at about the present level, our country will have to maintain a military and political effort of very substantial magnitude involving the assignment of troops and the spending of large sums of money.

If on the other hand there is a Communist willingness to negotiate an end to the fighting, even then we are not home free. Because even if the shooting stops, the South Vietnamese will need a great deal of help to combat political subversion—help which will include massive economic development and the creation of a central government able to exercise effective control over a nation many of whose people are so isolated in various villages and hamlets that they don't know what's happening over the next hill.

Provided the military situation remains about as it is, with Vietcong units roaming a good deal of the countryside, nobody knows how long victory will take. We've heard estimates here ranging from 2 years to 10 years or more. Even when peace comes, a good many years will be required before the United States could withdraw totally.

Since Americans tend to want to deal with their troubles in haste, the prospect of a prolonged involvement in South Vietnam might be used by the opponents of that involvement. But now that we're in, we cannot get out quickly. And we should not want to get out until South Vietnam is a free, viable nation able to take advantage of its vast potential. Fate seems to have selected South Vietnam as the place in Southeast Asia where the United States has been forced to make one of its most difficult commitments. That commitment is going to be with us for a long time.

This was a WTOP editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP from Saigon.

[Editorial broadcast on May 13 and 14, 1965, over WTOP radio and television]

This is a WTOP editorial from Saigon.

In this city, each American has a vague but constant apprehension about the possibility of Communist terrorism. To the north, around the base at Danang, Marine patrols expanding the perimeter come under sniper fire daily, with daily casualties. To the south, in the rich and crucial Mekong River Delta, Vietcong snipers are still active. Throughout South Vietnam, in all areas, Americans—including more than 100 women here in Saigon—are enduring danger and discomfort. Our military men, trained for a Western war, find themselves engaged in a guerrilla conflict in which the enemy is skilled and elusive, where there are no fixed battlelines and where the opponent is frequently a farmer by day and a fighter by night. The American advisers to the Vietnamese work patiently, often in isolated areas, to teach a variety of skills. What is underway in South Vietnam is an American effort in which military, political, and economic aspects are bewilderingly intertwined. There's been nothing quite like it in all our history.

But the Americans on duty here—about 37,000 at the last count—are conducting themselves admirably in the most difficult circumstances. Even the most fleeting visitor cannot avoid being deeply impressed with their dedication and with their willingness to try to cope with circumstances far outside their experience. It is a fact that among the American advisers, for example, a genuine affection is being created for the often hapless Vietnamese. Among American officers attached to Vietnamese units, there is a real feeling that the South Vietnam soldier can become an excellent fighting man if only he is given the proper training and leadership.

This is no small thing, this effort by Americans in South Vietnam to adjust themselves to strange and dangerous circumstances with good grace and good will. Because in the end, the war here will not be won by Americans, it will be won by the South Vietnamese themselves. And no matter how long and difficult this ugly struggle may be, the American presence here is remarkable for its quality.

This was a WTOP editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP from Saigon.

Results of Questionnaire, 12th Congressional District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, recently I circulated a public opinion questionnaire to more than 127,000 households in the 12th District of Illinois—comprising Lake, McHenry, and Boone Counties. It is gratifying to report that over 17,000 questionnaires were returned, many with additional comments and suggestions.

It has been most helpful to me in my work to review these questionnaires and to read the numerous individual opinions expressed by the well-informed and vitally interested citizens of our 12th Congressional District. I am pleased to include the compiled results of this poll in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

THE 1965 QUESTIONNAIRE—FINAL RESULTS

1. Because the Nation's growing need for coins cannot be met by the two existing U.S. mints at Philadelphia and Denver, I introduced H.R. 39 to construct a third U.S. mint

in our area to serve the Midwest. Do you favor passage of this measure?

	Percent
Yes	83.6
No	16.4

2. Congress will review our immigration law this year. What factors do you consider basic in allowing an individual from another nation to immigrate to the United States?

	Percent
(a) Having a skill needed in the United States	34.3
(b) Being born in a certain country	2.4
(c) Closely related to U.S. resident	18.7
(d) Having educational attainments	22.5
(e) Being of a certain race	1.6
(f) Persecuted by another country	15.5

3. Do you favor repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley labor law (the section which now allows a State to outlaw the union shop clause in labor contracts)?

	Percent
Yes	28.3
No	71.7

4. In solving the persistent problem of agricultural overproduction and mounting surpluses, which approach do you prefer?

	Percent
(a) Continuing the present farm program with price supports and production controls	12.0
(b) Making a gradual transition toward a free agricultural market	88.0

5. The metric system applies to most scientific work (centimeters, kilograms, etc.). However, our use of feet and inches as units of linear measure, and ounces and pounds as units of weight (avoirdupois system), are examples which are out of step with the metric system. I have introduced H.R. 38 to study official adoption by the United States of the metric system. Are you in favor of this action?

	Percent
Yes	67.2
No	32.8

6. It appears that some Medicare legislation will be passed at this session to provide hospital care for the aged. Which method do you prefer:

	Percent
(a) Hospitalization administered by Federal Government financed by increased social security taxes	16.3
(b) Expansion of Kerr-Mills program to provide medical care for the needy aged only	37.8
(c) Giving tax credit or premium payment credit for individuals who purchase private health insurance	45.9

7. The President has expressed interest in more American trade with the Soviet Union and Communist bloc countries. What is your opinion?

	Percent
(a) No trade whatsoever	35.8
(b) More trade but not strategic materials	57.7
(c) Trade with no restrictions	6.6

8. Do you think congressional action is needed to protect the housewife and other consumers from certain marketing practices by granting the Federal Food and Drug Administration authority as follows:

	Percent
(a) Limit food packages only to permissible weights and sizes	26.6
(b) Require food manufacturers to obtain permission before changing the recipe for a standard food	23.3
(c) Restrict the use of advertising and sales messages on food packages	23.6
(d) No action needed	26.5

Key Man of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Leonard Warren, of Key West, Fla., is an outstanding example of a man of courage. Though blind, he has not let his handicap stand in the way of a life of fullness and service to his community. For the last 25 years he has been an integral part of Key West life. He is highly respected in the community and all of his many friends hold him in high regard.

Among Mr. Warren's many and diverse activities are his chairmanship of the Monroe County Antimosquito District Commission, the Lions Club, and his ham radio station W4ZUT.

I would like to call the attention of the House to the following article from the Florida Keys Times of April 15, 1965:

KEYMAN OF THE WEEK

Leonard "Mike" Warren is the sort of fellow who hasn't allowed personal misfortune to prevent him from leading a rich and productive life—and from rendering a full measure of service to his community. A native Conch, the 47-year-old Warren was blinded at the age of 11 years when a wildly-thrown baseball caused detached retinas in both eyes. But Warren lives in anything but a life of darkness. Since 1943, he has operated the cigar and news stand in the lobby of the post office and one has to spend just a few minutes there to learn that much of the richness of his life stems from the multitude of friends who stop by to chat, gossip, and josh with him. "I'm a fortunate man to have so many friends." Warren says simply. He's also a fellow who has more than made his way in life despite what generally is considered a handicap. Rather, Warren has made a distinct contribution to the betterment of his community as chairman of the Monroe County Antimosquito District Commission, a post to which he was appointed 6 years ago by then Gov. LeRoy Collins. Warren polled more than 5,500 votes in last November's general election to lead his ticket. His colleagues consider him a man with an incisive mind that quickly grasps the essence of a problem; a leader, and a man not afraid to fight for his convictions. He modestly sums up his role in the job by saying: "I hope that we can continue last year's progress in mosquito control and, perhaps, contribute to the growth of Key West and the Keys." Warren's other activities include membership in the Key West Lions Club, lifetime membership in the Junior Chamber of Commerce, and the Key West Amateur Radio Club. As a ham radio operator, Mike has contacted other fans in such far away places as Melbourne, Australia, and Bonn, Germany. And, despite the fact he was blinded playing the game. Warren has never lost his love for baseball. He's a Yankee fan—and Mike seldom misses a Key West High School game. His prediction: "It's the Yanks again this year in the American League—and they'll win the world's series." He also rates his beloved Conchs as "a championship team that just hasn't had the breaks" Mike also finds time to read voraciously through the Library of Congress "talking book" program. His taste runs to history, fiction, and current events. Mike lives with his mother at 612 Fleming Street.

Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Mark Ethridge, Jr., associate editor of the Detroit Free Press, has written a series of articles on Canada.

The third article follows:

U.S. INROADS GIVE CHILL TO CANADIANS

(NOTE.—In the third of a four-part series on the problems and prospects facing Canada, Free Press Associate Editor Mark Ethridge, Jr., discusses the pressures that arise from Canada's dependence on U.S. dollars.)

(By Mark Ethridge, Jr.)

QUEBEC.—Quebec is to Canada as Canada is to the United States. We are "Big Daddy," extending our protective arm north, but also leaving our stamp of influence on everything Canadian.

As Robert Thompson, leader of the Social Credit Party, said a couple of years ago in a heated debate in Ottawa, "The Americans are our best friends, whether we like it or not."

"Travel where you will in Canada," a Toronto editor told a joint meeting of American and Canadian newspaper editors here recently, "and you will find some evidence of your influence in our society. If it is not a military base, it is American-made military equipment used by Canadian forces.

"If it is not an American owned factory, it is a theater showing an American movie. If it is not a store with its shelves lined with products of your Canadian subsidaries, it will be an American flag flown by some misguided motel owner in the hope of luring your tourist dollars."

American influence does have a way of spreading, and while it usually leaves dollars in its wake, it does nothing to help Canada in its unique search for identity.

"We like the feeling of security and well-being that comes from living next door to the United States," another prominent Canadian said at the same meeting. "But while we like you, we are also worried about you.

"American cultural, economic and political influence so pervade our way of life that we have begun to wonder if one relatively small nation can retain its independence in the face of the strong pressures generated by our giant neighbor to the south."

The worry is real—as far as it goes. Americans now control 60 percent of Canada's petroleum industry, 52 percent of her mining and smelting, 35 percent of pulp and paper production, 45 percent of Canadian manufacturing, 50 percent of her chemical, electrical, and farm machinery industries and almost 100 percent of her auto and rubber industries.

Canada itself promoted this giant U.S. investment. In the period from 1950 to 1962 Canada established a floating rate for its dollar, which ran an average of 3 cents above the U.S. dollar—"with no good reason," a Canadian financial expert insisted.

"It put us on a mad merry-go-round," what he called a folie de grandeur.

While the folie promoted prosperity at the time, it also meant that by 1963, when the plants were paid for, Canada was shipping out nearly $1 billion a year in dividends to foreign investors of whom three-fourths were Americans.

To get an estimate of what that means to Canada, see what it would mean to the United States.

The total foreign investment in Canada is $25 billion. In proportion to Canada's gross national product last year of $44 billion—one-fifteenth that of the United States—this would mean a foreign investment of $375 billion in the United States, or more than the combined assets of the 500 largest U.S. corporations.

No Canadian seriously objected to the inflow of capital for Canadian industries, or would have had it any other way at the time.

It promoted development of vast untouched resources. It offered jobs to millions of Canadian youths, and provided Canadians with a standard of living second only to the United States.

But now, in the words of one chauvinistic Canadian newsman, it means that Canadians have a hard time "being the masters in their own house."

"Our fear that foreign control of our industries will lead to foreign control of our politics is something that we feel with our hearts rather than we can prove with our heads," he went on.

Here, too, the complaint is real, just as the Quebecois complaint against English Canada is real. And just like English Canadians, the United States is inclined to dismiss the problem as a figment of Maple Leaf imagination.

Canadian foreign policy, the newsman pointed out, permits trading with Cuba and Communist China. But American foreign policy prohibits it, and the U.S. Trading With the Enemy Act punishes American companies whose foreign subsidiaries take part in such trade.

"What happens," he asked, "when China wants to buy something from Canada, and the major producer is a Canadian subsidiary of an American firm?"

The subsidiary has to say no, and Canada is thus deprived of the ability to earn dollars or gold from China.

"Foreign investors are entitled to a good return on their capital. Canada provides this in return. I think we have the right to expect foreign firms to conduct themselves as good Canadian citizens."

Further, he said since both the United States and Canada have a balance-of-payments deficit, and both need to expand foreign trade to stop the outflow of dollars, the two nations are competing hard in the European, Latin American, and Japanese markets.

"But when President Johnson asks U.S. companies to expand their trade with Europe," he asked, "who gets the business: the U.S. parent company or its Canadian subsidiary?"

The question was rhetorical and the answer was expected. Canadian firms, he said, suffer from a "branch-plant mentality." But Canada is a separate—and different—country.

Complicating the whole economic structure of United States-Canadian relations is trade between the two. Each is the other's best customer, and each is inclined to be the other's greatest frustration.

Exports make up about a sixth of Canada's gross national product, and most of this goes to the United States. Canada last year sent us nearly $3.9 billion worth of goods, and most of that raw materials.

We got newsprint and paper, lumber, and timber, woodpulp, aluminum, nickel, copper, and iron ore mostly. And we got some finished products, a small proportion of the total.

In the same year, we sent to Canada slightly more than $4.4 billion in U.S. goods, most of this finished goods such as automobile parts, petroleum, and electrical equipment.

Thus Canada, which can afford it even less than we can, ran a balance-of-trade deficit with the United States. With the rest of the world it ran ahead, but that included $500 million from a one-shot sale to Russia of 239 million bushels of wheat and flour. Canada's overall balance sheet shows a deficit.

What grates on Canadian wallets is that their deficit to us, including what they send Americans in dividends, seems built in, and we seem determined to keep it that way.

Canada grows and mines, while we process and manufacture. And a study made by a tariff commission a few years ago made it evident that the growers and miners are losing out all over the world.

Yet when Canada tries to expand her manufactures, the old bugaboo pops up—a lack of capital. The best sources is Wall Street once more, and the cycle goes on.

It is, as a Montreal financial expert put it, "like the rich man playing poker with his chauffeur—after he's beggared the poor man he has to bail him out.

"The best that we can hope is that this match, too, will be fixed."

One way of fixing it is with such agreements as the recent auto trade pact, signed on the L.B.J. Ranch earlier this year but not yet approved by Congress.

Despite much trumpeting, it is not a "free-trade" agreement, or even anything approaching such an arrangement.

What happened was fairly simple. Auto trade between Detroit and Canada cost Canada a net $500 million a year. Canadian manufacturers, being smaller, couldn't compete.

So rather than go on borrowing the half billion each year, Ottawa set out to reduce the loss.

It had two ways to go about it. One was to apply prohibitive duties on American cars going in to Canada. The other was to attempt to juggle the industry so that Canada would get its fair share of production and both nations would get the advantage of specialization. Ottawa chose the latter.

The heart of the plan is a promise by American manufacturers that they will increase their Canadian investment substantially in the next 3 years and reduce, at least by half, the number of American parts in Canadian cars.

As editorials have argued, the plan flies in the face of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, but it seems to have been the best solution possible.

It sets no pattern, simply because no other industry is so controlled as Canada's automobile industry. And it doesn't come close to being the beginning of a United States-Canadian common market.

But, as one expert said, "it is fatal to confuse the practical with the ideal."

The United States likes to think in ideals. Canada, apparently, is beginning to think in terms of the practical.

Dillsboro's Boy Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the story of a remarkable young man from Dillsboro, one of the fine Hoosier towns in the Ninth District.

The following article appeared in the Sunday Pictorial Enquirer, Sunday magazine of the Cincinnati Enquirer, an excellent newspaper widely read in southeastern Indiana.

Paul Brown is shy, dislikes girls, worships basketball, and at 13, may be the Nation's youngest weekly newspaper editor.

Paul, who started publishing the Dillsboro Press when he was 11, finds little time for the pursuits of other boys his age, however. His week is made up of attending the eighth grade at Dillsboro High School, selling advertisements, laying out pages, collecting and writing news and features, and printing the newspaper. He has three delivery boys—Terry Brown, 14; Randy Eaglin, 12; and Harold Seamon, 12—helping him distribute the paper. They get 2 cents of the nickel per copy price.

Dillsboro, a southeastern Indiana town of 800 population, had no newspaper prior to Paul's endeavor. He conceived the idea 2 years ago and won the support of his father, who teaches commercial subjects at the high school, and Dillsboro merchants. But it wasn't easy. Some weeks during peak-loads there isn't time to do everything, but somehow, by spending late hours, he gets the product out.

Paul set up his own advertising rate at $1 a page or 50 cents a half page. He has several full-page ads in every issue of the paper, which averages 7 or 8 pages per issue. "We make mistakes," he admits, "lots of them—but that's the way we tell if people are reading our paper." He plans to attend a journalism workshop at Ohio State University next summer to further improve his enterprise.

The Enemy Is Apathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, commerce has been the lifeblood of every empire built throughout history.

But, the backbone of commerce is ships, and our once bustling merchant fleet is on the wane.

This is a field to which we in the Congress must devote more attention. I consider it absolutely essential for America to expand our maritime industry—both for commercial and military purposes. Make no mistake, seapower—both in shipping and military vessels—is vital to our survival against those who would destroy our freedom.

To revive our dying merchant fleet, we must develop a practical, viable power source. To me, the best bet is nuclear power—a field which we have failed to develop to our fullest advantage.

Perhaps this is due in some measure to the initial high cost of building nuclear ships; yet, I might point out that once this initial cost has been surmounted, the cost of operating diminishes over a period of time. I am sure this factor has not been emphasized enough.

Apathy to the plight of our merchant marine must be thwarted. We must move forward in the field of nuclear power for our merchant vessels. In this connection, Adm. John M. Will, U.S. Navy, retired, in a speech at Chicago, delivered a very informative address on the urgency of constructing more nuclear-powered merchant vessels for commer-

cial shipping. His remarks are of such importance to America's seapower that under unanimous consent, I insert them in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of the Congress:

THE ENEMY IS APATHY

(By Adm. John M. Will, chairman of the board, American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, Inc., at the Maritime Week Luncheon of the Ocean Freight Agents Association of Chicago)

Since those splendid days when proud Yankee clipper ships dominated the seas and gained for themselves a near monopoly of the world's ocean cargoes, the American Merchant Marine has been shipping water badly. Except for the frenetic activities of wartime, U.S. merchant ships have been sailing on an ever-ebbing tide.

Today, far from the lion of yesterday, the mouse of American scheduled freighter services carries only about one-quarter of the foreign trade tonnage entering or leaving U.S. ports. In nonliner bulk commercial commerce, the appalling figure is less than 5 percent.

The picture grows more dismal each year, yet the means are at hand right now to reverse this ebbing tide and to catapult the American Merchant Marine back onto the cresting tide of world commerce.

The means for this dramatic reversal lie in high speed ships powered by nuclear energy. This is neither a fuzzy concept nor a "maybe someday" proposition. The NS *Savannah* has proved beyond all doubt that the power of the atom is a practical, viable power source for the merchant marine.

Yet, despite our preeminence in the field of nuclear propulsion—despite the incontestable fact that nuclear power offers the only immediately available opportunity for a major breakthrough in marine engineering—we have thus far failed to exploit this chance which is so singularly ours.

We have failed to move forward because we are heeding the cost-conscious cautioners who say nuclear power is not economically feasible. This form of pennywise, pound-foolish reasoning may be of some comfort to comptrollers and accountants, but it is hardly in the American tradition of "can do" and "will do."

At the time of their inception, neither the locomotive nor the automobile nor the airplane were "economically feasible." The first locomotive tore along at 10 miles an hour, the first automobile coughed and sputtered to achieve 4 miles an hour, and Orville Wright's first biplane hung precariously off the ground for 12 seconds to make good a forward speed of about 7 miles an hour. By what rules of economics were these prototypes feasible?

Yet, contrast the progress of these vehicles, none of them suitable for massive over-ocean commerce, with the progress of the steamship. Today's most efficient freighter moves fully loaded at a maximum of 21 knots, a scant four times faster than Mr. Fulton's *Clermont*.

The NS *Savannah* is capable of 23 knots and the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier USS *Enterprise* is rated at more than 30 knots. We can apply the same propulsion principles which have been proven in those two ships to a fleet of 30-knot freighters which would place us immediately in a strongly competitive position for world trade. Still, we, as a nation, sit back and say, "It is not economically feasible."

If we wait for further developments from the drawing boards, or if we defer our nuclear building program while we "prove out" on shorebased prototypes an already proven propulsion system, we may as well file and forget our hopes for a nuclear merchant fleet.

Then, perhaps, we can send our engineers and technicians to West Germany where they can observe and report while the Germans install an American-built reactor directly into a new hull. Then, perhaps, we can wait yet another year or so until the Japanese are ready to demonstrate this same technique.

In the meanwhile, we can conveniently ignore the 68 marine reactors now in actual operation in naval vessels at sea—we can brush aside the fact that 54 more are being readied for seagoing operations—and we can assure the Bureau of the Budget that it is not important that only one of these reactors, the one already in the *Savannah*, is available for use in the American merchant marine.

Even further, perhaps we should hold to the narcotic notion that maritime reactors are, indeed, not economically feasible and surrender by default our chance to reestablish the American Merchant Marine as an integral and important part of our national economy.

If this is the answer, then we must also be prepared to retire the American eagle in favor of the ostrich and wait, with our heads complacently in the sands, until we can safely and "feasibly" buy nuclear-propelled merchant ships from the Germans or the Japanese—or the Russians.

Anniversary Celebrations at St. Paul's Church, Eastchester, N.Y., a National Historic Site

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, a considerable amount of hard work recently has been accomplished, primarily by a group of high school students, in preparing St. Paul's Church in Eastchester, N.Y., for its anniversary celebration.

Actually, there will be a double celebration this year as the church has reached both 200-year and 300-year milestones.

Three hundred years ago, in 1665, the original parish was founded. One hundred years later, 1765, this church was rebuilt on its present site in Eastchester after the original edifice had been destroyed. The church is believed to be the oldest Episcopal church in the entire New York metropolitan area.

In 1943, Congress designated the church as the national site of the Bill of Rights. It has the distinction of being Westchester County's only national historic site.

Although its congregation has been dwindling, it has not been forgotten by the local citizenry who have been taking an active part in the preparations for the celebration. The Eastchester Historical Society has placed on exhibit at the church a display of letters of Aaron Burr, who once tried cases there, as well as items of John Peter Zenger whose famous freedom-of-the-press trial emanated from his writings about elections at the site of St. Paul's.

This old and distinguished church has made significant contributions to our Nation's heritage. It is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to join with my fellow citizens of Westchester County in honoring St. Paul's Church.

Firm Foreign Policy Emerges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of this body an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Sunday, May 9, 1965, entitled, "Firm Foreign Policy Emerges." This editorial clearly delineates the courageous stand our President has taken in his development of American foreign policy in this and in the Eastern Hemisphere. His objective of keeping the Americas free of Communist domination is to be applauded. His concurrent desire to see the development of a sound economic and social atmosphere in all of Latin America should not be forgotten or overlooked. The potential development of our neighbors to the south is unparalleled by any region in the world.

The concurrence by the Organization of American States by 2 to 1 to support the American policy stand substantiates the desire of our President and the Nation to allow the free development of the economies of each of the nations in this hemisphere. Now it is imperative that each country in this hemisphere assume the responsibility of assuring that each nation attains its potential goal of national and individual betterment.

The editorial follows:

When 42,676,220 Americans cast their ballots for Lyndon Johnson last November they gave little thought to the possibility that they were also writing a new foreign policy for the United States.

But it has been on the leverage of this expression of massive support that the President has moved swiftly and confidently to assert the great power of this Nation in matters of world import.

The historic policy changes have produced the Johnson doctrine for the Americas and the switch from an advisory role in the Vietnam war to a combat footing.

Yet the show of bristling power has not overshadowed the traditional American dedication to a peaceful world.

The offer to confer with anyone, including Red China, on Vietnam still stands.

The urging of the President for the Organization of American States to resolve the Dominican Republic dispute has been strong and sustained.

But the open door to negotiation can no longer be misinterpreted as a sign of weakness or indecision.

So also, bluntness has replaced polite subterfuge in conveying American displeasure with nations trying to play both sides of the international street.

The President's control of foreign aid gives him a powerful weapon in dealing with gov-

ernments wanting American help but currying Communist favor.

Elements viewing American mistakes in the Fidel Castro rise to power as a policy are experiencing a jarring surprise.

The Johnson doctrine holds that any country has a right to revolution, but if the aim is a Communist dictatorship and the country is one of the Americas, then United States action is immediately called for.

One year ago, Washington was showing timidity about use of American troops in South Vietnam lest the United States again be accused of "gunboat diplomacy."

Now, American troops are committed to holding the sagging line against Communist infiltration in central Vietnam.

The token phase of the war has ended.

A strong leader of a strong power is now dealing from a position of strength.

America has a new foreign policy—a Johnson policy of strength and power reminiscent of the foreign policies of Presidents Roosevelt and Harry Truman.

Pressure Mounts To Free District Home Rule Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the prospect for home rule in the District of Columbia was discussed in a recent Washington Post article. It is my hope that the Home Rule District Committee will soon begin hearings on the various bills that have been introduced. Because of the national interest in this subject, I insert this article in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 18, 1965]

PRESSURE MOUNTS TO FREE DISTRICT HOME RULE BILL

(By Paul A. Schuette)

House District Committee Chairman JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina, is under mounting pressure to loosen his stranglehold on Washington home rule legislation.

MCMILLAN received two letters last week—one from seven members of his committee, another signed by 116 other House Members—urging him to hold hearings and report a bill to the floor this year.

A special steering committee set up by the liberal House Democratic Study Group also during the week to organize its push for enactment of home rule.

Those moves in themselves were not calculated to bowl over committee opponents of self-government for Washington. Nevertheless, there was a cautious optimism that a home rule bill can be brought to the floor this year without resorting to a discharge petition.

Representative CARLTON R. SICKLES, Democrat, of Maryland, chairman of the Study Group steering committee, seems to share that feeling although he refrains from any predictions. He is well aware of the obstacles to be overcome.

As the letters to MCMILLAN pointed out, the Senate has passed home rule legislation repeatedly in the last 17 years but the House District Committee has steadfastly refused to let a bill get to a floor vote.

The Senate is expected to deliver again this year, once more testing the resistance of the House committee.

The steering committee's role, SICKLES explained, will be primarily that of a coordinator.

The committee, which now has about 25 members, will be trying to make House Members, particularly this year's large freshman class, aware of the home rule issue.

The committee also intends to work with Republicans supporting municipal self-government, with the White House and with local organizations pushing for home rule.

SICKLES is sure that the continuing active support of President Johnson, who gave the home rule campaign a powerful send-off this year, will be necessary to bring a bill to the House floor.

SICKLES is equally certain that there will be no home rule bill enacted without bipartisan support. Representative CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., Republican, of Maryland, agrees. The makeup of the District Committee bears them out.

The letter to MCMILLAN was signed by one Republican, MATHIAS, and six Democrats, Representatives ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., of Michigan, DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota, J. OLIVA HUOT, of New Hampshire, GEORGE W. GRIDER, of Tennessee, and SICKLES.

Six other members will be needed to form a home rule majority on the 25-member committee.

Among the Democrats, Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, probably would have signed the letter had he been available, and Representative B. F. SISK, of California, also is counted on for support.

On the Republican side, Representative FRANK J. HORTON, of New York, has sponsored a home rule bill and Representative ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota, ranking minority member, and Representative ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin, are regarded as sympathetic.

If the guessing is right, that would leave home rule advocates only one vote short of a majority with at least two uncommitted members to work on.

The Trouble With Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Congress has become the whipping boy for many difficulties that have resulted from actions of the executive or judiciary branches. Many of the frustrations experienced by the public are diverted by labeling the Congress as the culprit. Therefore trouble with the Congress is a national point of discussion.

An editorial on Saturday, May 15, by Chicago's American covering the subject is especially timely, and I am pleased to direct it to the attention of the Members:

THE TROUBLE WITH CONGRESS

Congress has started a month of hearings to find out what's wrong with it—why it is losing power to the judicial and administrative departments, with which it is supposed to be equal. Several of the early witnesses told it what was wrong, and the next day the House Ways and Means Committee gave a demonstration of subserviency to the executive department that illustrated perfectly what the witnesses were talking about.

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, testified on the first day of the hearings that the one thing Congress can do to win back its power and self-respect is to have the will, the determination, and the ability "to protect, preserve, and exercise the legislative powers vested in Congress by the Constitution."

Another witness, Representative DURWARD G. HALL, Republican, of Missouri, testified that both the executive and judicial departments have gained more of a voice in Government than Congress has. They could not have done this under the Constitution unless Congress permitted it. Congress has a sole constitutional right to make national laws.

Congress complains that the Supreme Court is legislating, but does nothing further about it. As for permitting the executive branch to direct the course of lawmaking, the present Congress has reached a new low. It hastens to obey whenever President Johnson gives orders.

On Tuesday, the House Ways and Means Committee had decided not to recommend enactment of all the restrictions President Johnson wanted to impose on American travelers abroad, to save some of America's vanishing gold supply. (Foreign nationals can demand gold for each American dollar that comes into their possession.)

Johnson had asked that American travelers be permitted to bring home with them, duty free, only $50, retail value, instead of $100 wholesale value, as it is now. Word came from the White House that the decision was "unacceptable." If Congress had wanted to preserve its rights, the committee would have sent work back to the executive department that it would have to accept the limit imposed by the committee if the House of Representatives enacted it. Instead it quickly scrapped its own judgment and accepted Johnson's demand that the limit be $50, retail value. It will recommend a law imposing Johnson's limit.

Congress does not need a month of hearings to find out what is wrong with it. It knows now, and it can take back its constitutional powers any time it gets the courage.

Guduras Lauds FBI Training Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in every field of endeavor, it is becoming increasingly important to keep up with rapid changes in technology. This is nowhere more true than in the field of law enforcement. Fortunately, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has developed a comprehensive program for police officials to enable them to keep up with their profession, acquire new skills, and bring to their own police forces at home a new dimension of skill and technology.

One of the participants in the current National Academy course here in Washington is Police Chief Peter G. Guduras, of Lowell, Mass. In an interview with Lowell Sun Washington Bureau Chief Peter Barnes, Chief Guduras outlines the program in some detail, and I, under unanimous consent, insert this article from the Lowell Sun of May 11 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STRENUOUS COURSE: GUDURAS LAUDS FBI TRAINING PLAN

(By Peter Barnes, Sun Washington Bureau)

WASHINGTON.—It takes training to use a .45-caliber Thompson submachinegun (commonly known as a "Tommygun") or a 357 Magnum revolver or even a regular .38 police pistol.

And training is just what Lowell Police Chief Peter G. Guduras has been getting at the FBI's National Academy here in Washington. Tarining is also what Guduras wants more officers on the Lowell police force to get more of.

"My coming down here is the first time that anyone in Lowell has taken advantage of the best police training program this country has to offer," Guduras said. "There are cities and towns, some of them much smaller than Lowell, who send officers down here every year. I have no doubt in my mind that we in Lowell could profit tremendously by having more officers attend the National Academy in the future."

For 10 weeks, Guduras has been busily absorbing expertise from the Nation's top law enforcement technicians. During the 8-hour school day at FBI headquarters, classes have dealt with every aspect of police operations: criminal investigation, fingerprint identification, laboratory aids, constitutional law, traffic control, records systems, personnel administration, public relations, and control of juvenile delinquency.

In addition, there was a 2-week course in firearms use and target practice at the U.S. Marine Corps base in Quantico, Va., and some gruesomely vivid exercises in examining dead bodies for clues, in which actual corpses were used.

"My idea is to bring back what I've learned and to put it to work in Lowell," Guduras said. "This will help the department in many ways. It will speed up our solution of criminal cases, and help us fight crime before it breaks out."

Guduras pointed out that Lowell is already below the national average in its per capita crime rate, and slightly higher than average in its rate of crime solutions. But he thinks that there were a number of major cases in Lowell in the past few years that could have been solved, or solved faster, by the use of some of the FBI techniques he has acquired here.

To assist him in applying the most modern police methods in Lowell, Guduras will bring back with him a fact-packed set of six looseleaf notebooks. These notebooks contain the FBI documents on all subjects in the curriculum that the chief amassed during the course, plus many dozens of pages of his own typed notes of classroom and laboratory discussions.

The Lowell police chief was awarded a singular personal honor by his colleagues at the academy, when he was nominated for president of the class. In the final election, Guduras came in third, and considers this a real tribute, since at 50 he is the oldest member of the 113-man class. The winner was a young police lieutenant who campaigned among the younger officers almost from the beginning of the course.

The 12-week training program, which ends up with a full dress graduation ceremony on May 26 at which FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and possibly President Johnson will be present, has been no vacation for the hard-working Lowell law enforcer.

To keep expenses down, he has been living in a modest guesthouse in the racially-mixed Capitol Hill section of Washington.

His class schedule has been continuous from 9 in the morning till 5 in the afternoon, Mondays through Fridays. Evenings have been spent typing up the day's notes, or reading in preparation for the next day's lessons. "The only tourist attraction I've had time to visit is the Smithsonian Institution," Guduras lamented.

The physical conditioning program has also been a tough and taxing one, and Guduras observed that "I'm not as young as I was 20 years ago." An idea of what was expected of the officers can be obtained from this excerpt from one of the FBI curriculum sheets: "The student is expected to approach his physical training with grim seriousness and with knowledge of the fact that it may become a last resort in a life-or-death struggle."

The FBI National Academy, the "West Point" of law-enforcement officers, was founded 30 years ago and has trained more than 4,500 police officials in the best techniques of fighting crime effectively.

Guduras' graduating class is the 75th since the Academy began, and it is a source of extra pride to the chief to be part of the "diamond anniversary class." It may also be one of the last classes to graduate under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI's founder, who is now over 70 years old though still as tough as ever.

Guduras' classmates include Chief Harold E. Knowlton, Jr., of the Laconia, N.H., Police Department; Chief Robert E. Wagner, Jr., of Bath, Maine; and two lower officers from Connecticut. Guduras is the only member from Massachusetts.

In addition there are police chiefs from Thailand, Pakistan, New Zealand, and eight other foreign nations.

Florida Legislature Passes Memorial on Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have reprinted herewith a copy of Memorial No. 751 of the Florida House of Representatives regarding continuance of technical assistance to soil and water conservation districts in Florida.

I am in accord with the thinking of this resolution and commend it to the Members of the Congress for their reading and reflection, for it certainly deals with a very critical problem.

As I have stated many times, I am personally opposed to the reduction in our soil conservation service program.

The memorial follows:

HOUSE MEMORIAL 751

Memorial to the Congress of the United States to continue to provide technical assistance to soil and water conservation districts and their cooperating landowners and operators without cost in accordance with a long-established policy, and to increase technical assistance requested by the soil and water conservation districts in Florida and throughout the Nation needed by landowners and operators to accelerate the planning and application of conservation measures on their privately owned land

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget has proposed that the Soil Conservation Service appropriation for assisting locally managed soil and water conservation districts be reduced by $20 million and that soil and water conservation districts and cooperating farmers, ranchers, and other landowners shall pay the Federal Government up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished in the design, layout, and installation of planned soil and water conservation practices on their lands; and

Whereas the Federal Government has, for some 30 years, provided technical assistance to owners and operators of privately owned lands believing that it is in the total public interest, and one of the most urgent national needs to protect and improve the soil and water resources of this Nation; and

Whereas over 90 percent of Florida's privately owned land is included in its 59 soil conservation districts, and nearly one-third of Florida's farmers and ranchers are annually using the technical assistance in the design, layout, and installation of planned soil and water conservation measures on their lands; and

Whereas the supervisors of such districts have continuously requested additional technical assistance to meet the needs of farmers and ranchers to accelerate the application of conservation practices; and

Whereas statewide storms and floods of disastrous proportions have resulted in heavy erosion and loss of valuable topsoil, in heavy sediment deposits in our lakes, streams, and rivers which also have spread over valuable bottom lands and other flood damage to both public and private property together with destruction or severe damage to thousands of water control and use structures, requiring greater rather than reduced efforts in the application of soil and water conservation practices; and

Whereas if this proposal is adopted it would break faith with the Legislature of Florida which has been providing State funds for soil and water conservation with the understanding that the local-State-Federal team effort would be maintained as a team effort for the universal good of the Nation and all its people; and

Whereas such assessments of payments to the Federal Government will discourage and seriously curtail the application of soil and water conservation measures on lands so vital to the strength and welfare of the State of Florida and the Nation and will seriously affect the harvest on family farms and the holdings of small operators; and

Whereas this proposed additional burden added to the costs of farmers and ranchers already in a depressed economic condition would limit the ability of these people to participate in the existing soil and water conservation district programs and similar programs which have in the past contributed substantially to conservation development, and prudent use of these soil and water resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Legislature of the State of Florida respectfully makes application to the Congress of the United States to continue the long-established policy of providing technical assistance to soil and water conservation districts and their cooperating landowners and operators without requiring them to pay the Federal Government any portion of cost of such technical assistance; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress provide the increases in technical assistance requested by the soil and water conservation districts in Florida and throughout the Nation to meet the needs of landowners and operators to accelerate the planning and application of conservation measures on their privately owned lands; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.

Approved by the Governor, May 10, 1955.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state, May 11, 1965.

A Newspaper's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Keene Evening Sentinel has offered a newspaper's prayer which I commend to my colleagues and, especially to those of the press who may peruse these columns. It is excellent and I congratulate the Sentinel for it:

A NEWSPAPER'S PRAYER

A generation or so ago, the walls of most middle-class, New England parlors were adorned with embroidered, framed mottos which asked, "What Is Home Without a Father?" and "What Is Home Without a Mother?"

There are few of these seen in modern homes but reverence is not, by any means, completely missing from the walls of today's dens and offices. In place of questions that emphasize the significance of family ties, we now find individual prayers and creeds: "A Doctor's Prayer," "A Nurse's Creed," "The Prayer of the Milkman," "An Ode to the Sunday Fisherman."

So far as we know, no one seems to have bothered writing "A Newspaper's Prayer" and, egotistical souls that we are, we don't want to be left out of this new field. So we've decided to write one ourselves.

Here it is:

Dear Lord, give us the strength of mind, body, and spirit to make an enthusiastic entrance into another day, knowing that before the sun sets on it, we will have witnessed violence and destruction.

But remind us, O Lord, that if we are alert to it, we also will have witnessed kindness, love, and compassion; and if we are blessed with the heart for it, we may have dispensed a little of each.

Bless us with the patience to explain to Mrs. Smith why her grandmother's anniversary didn't make page 1; but never let us doubt that it should indeed appear somewhere in the paper.

Make us charitable when we tell an advertiser that only our services, not our opinions, are for sale; but grant us the energy and desire to constantly improve those services.

Endow us with a stern voice when we explain to a subscriber why he must pay his carrier boy, but prepare us to be sympathetic when he tells us the boy will have to wait another week.

Shelter us, dear Lord, from the evils of profanity when a typesetting machine breaks down; but let us not forget for a moment that without it we can't put out a newspaper.

Lead us down the paths of righteousness when we should be righteous, but cause our ears to burn if we're self-righteous when we should be humble.

Arm us with indignation when we witness violation of human dignity, but keep our minds clear enough to know that we might also be violators.

Bestow upon us the sharpness of wit to know that a committee is comprised of the disinterested, assigned by the absent to perform the useless; but grant us the fairness to acknowledge its accomplishments when there are some.

Deprive us of anger when someone calls us names, but remind us continually of his right to disagree, and help us to understand his anger.

Make us honest and forthright, that we may enjoy the respect of our readers; but give us the good sense to remember that the arrangement must be mutual.

When we are right, let humility prevent us from screaming it on page 1; when we are wrong, grant us the courage to admit it.

Dear Lord, permit us not to swerve even momentarily from the course of the truth; but give our conscience no rest if we hesitate even momentarily to tell all of it. Amen.

Israel Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to add my congratulatory message to those of other Members on this 17th anniversary of the recreation of the State of Israel. The struggle of a people for nearly two milennia to reestablish their country on the site where their forefathers generations ago lived and worshipped is a stirring story of determination and courage. Even today, as the archeologists of the modern State of Israel undertake their excavations of such fortresses as Massada, the evidence accumulates to testify to the brave tenacity of the Israelites of old in defending their homeland against the occupation and destruction of their temple by the troops of Imperial Rome.

For many centuries the story remained the same. As Judea and Canaan changed hands innumerable times—from Roman to Arab to Turkish to British domination—most of the former residents of ancient Israel were driven into the Diaspora, the Dispersion. Within the literature, the oral and written tradition, as well as the culture and religion of the world's Jews, however, the goal of once again returning to their ancient land remained an important element.

The endemic anti-Semitism which has long existed in Eastern Europe and Russia, as well as new pogroms during the 19th century, occasioned a rebirth of national consciousness. Under the intellectual leadership of Theodor Herzl, an international organization was created which had as its goal the regaining of a national homeland. The movement called itself Zionism, after one of the small hills in Jerusalem which has become synonymous with the city itself, as well as the ancient land of Israel.

It was not until the First World War had come to a close, however, that the work of reconstructing and rebuilding could begin. As a result of the Balfour Declaration, according to the terms of which the British Government committed itself to the "establishment of a national home for the Jews" in Palestine, Jewish refugees from the war in Europe, as well as other countries of the world, were permitted to settle there. They established thriving farms, new industries, and generally began to build their life anew.

Additional hundreds of thousands of refugees strove to enter the "promised land" as a result of the Nazi holocaust in Europe and the Second World War. Nevertheless, the struggle for independence was still not over: irresponsible Arab leadership as well as the opposition of the British authorities to increased immigration still had to be contended with.

The historic resolution of the United Nations in 1947 which provided for an economically unified Palestine, divided into a Jewish and an Arab state, was the next to last step in the long process of once again achieving independence. When the Arab States refused to acknowledge the existence of the newly proclaimed State of Israel in May, 1948, the modern Israelites once again had to defend their homeland. This time they were successful, and they have gone on from there to build one of the most progressive and successful of the new states.

I take this occasion to congratulate them on the nearly incredible achievements of these past 17 years—a modern economy, a thriving agriculture, and the successful assimilation of hundreds of thousands of refugees from a tremendous variety of backgrounds. The Israelis deserve our compliments, and our best wishes for the future.

Tabulation of a Public Opinion Poll, Second District of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the final tabulations have recently been completed on the questionnaire which I sent to nearly 90,000 residents of my district in South Dakota. This year, because of the additional area of 20 counties being added to the Second Congressional District, I sent two types of questionnaires, the one on a postcard to all boxholders living in the former district, and the other on a letter-type sheet which was sent to all persons listed in telephone directories in the 20 counties east of the Missouri River.

The response to the questionnaire was large, and the results are most interesting. In the following report, which was mailed to the same people who received the questionnaire, the results were published giving both the results from the former district and the new area.

Under leave granted I include the report in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REPORT FROM HON. E. Y. BERRY, SECOND DISTRICT, SOUTH DAKOTA

APRIL 1965.

DEAR FRIEND: Let me again express my appreciation to you for taking the time to complete and return my 1965 questionnaire. This year, because of the additional interriver area being added to the Second Con-

gressional District, I sent two types of questionnaires, the one on a postcard to all boxholders living west of the Missouri River, the other on a letter-type sheet which was sent to all persons listed in telephone directories in the 20 counties east of the Missouri River.

The response to the questionnaire was large, and the results are most interesting. In this report, I shall refer to the tabulation from the west Missouri River returns and the tabulation from the east Missouri River returns separately. While there is some variation, the results are, however, surprisingly similar.

Medical care for the aged: The first question dealt with medical care for the aged and was divided in two parts, the first part asking, "Do you favor medical care for the aged through medicare, hospital and nursing care under social security?" The second part of the question was, "Do you favor medical care through eldercare, State-administered health insurance program with aid to needy?" The results of the returns from west of the Missouri River were 83 percent against medicare and 84 percent for eldercare. In the east-river counties, 74 percent opposed medicare and 75 percent favored eldercare.

Interestingly enough, medicare came to the House floor for action about the time most of the returns from the questionnaire were in. It came under what is termed a "closed rule," meaning that no amendments could be offered to the bill. The only opportunity to express your will was through a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to report it back with the medicare provisions stricken.

It was a complicated 300-page bill. The medicare section is compulsory for all employers, employees and self-employed requiring increased payroll taxes for hospital benefits available at 65. The social security base is increased from the present $4,800 to $5,600 next January and will go to $6,600 in 1971. An employee earning the full amount of the covered wage will have his tax increased from $198 to $243.60 in 1966, and to $353.10 by 1973. The farmer, the small businessman, and all self-employed will have the present tax of $297.60 per year increased to $355.60 in 1966, and to $498.30 in 1973. A 21-year-old self-employed person can expect to contribute about $19,000 during his productive years, which payments, if banked at 3½-percent interest, would net him $45,000 at retirement time. It completely ignores need and ability to pay; everyone must pay who earns $1 or more. The Associated Press reported on April 22 that administration economists are becoming jittery about the possible depressive impact on the economy next year of this heavy tax which will take about $5 billion out of circulation. Last year they hailed the $11 billion tax cut as an economic "shot in the arm." Little wonder they now worry about a new $5 or $6 billion regressive tax which bludgeons every low-income citizen.

The second part of the bill is a revision of eldercare. It is voluntary for all persons over 65. It provides for a $3 deduction from the monthly social security payment to be matched by a like amount from the Federal Government. This payment is used to purchase insurance which would cover 80 percent of the cost of physicians' services, home health services, drugs, and other medical needs exceeding $50 per year, which benefits are not covered by the compulsory medicare section.

The third part is direct aid. It is designed to help the elderly poor who are self-supporting and who would be made charity cases by any major health problem. This part of the bill is a liberalization of the Kerr-Mills program which operates in our State. Under it, the Federal Government matches State funds to aid this class of patients.

Because you in both the old and new portions of the Second Congressional District very emphatically told me you wanted me to vote for eldercare and against medicare, I first voted to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions to bring it back forthwith without the compulsory social security medicare provisions. Failing to eliminate medicare, I cast your vote as 83 percent of you west of the river and 74 percent of you east of the river directed and that was against social security financed medicare.

Education: The second question was on Federal aid to education. West of the river 67 percent opposed, and east of the river 54 percent opposed. Here again, I cast your vote as you directed. The bill recently enacted and signed into law by the President in a one-room school in Texas, authorizes $1.3 billion in education benefits beginning July 1, and is directed primarily toward pupils from low-income families. More than $1 billion will be used in a 3-year program of Federal grants to States. It provides 5-year programs of grants for the purchase of books and library materials, establishment of federally financed supplementary education centers, and research. It extended for 2 years the federally impacted area laws.

This measure is the opening wedge for Federal aid and subsequent control of grade and high school education systems which have traditionally been operated locally and responsible to local needs. Significant strides have been made under local school boards to improve educational standards, as evidenced by the fact that classroom construction has substantially exceeded increases in pupil enrollment and the number of students per classroom has decreased in the past decade.

General: In the west river area 67 percent favored providing parents of college students with a tax credit for part of the student's expense. In the east river counties 72 percent favored it. With regard to the removal of $3 billion worth of excise taxes on furs, luggage, etc., 61 percent in both areas were opposed. On the question of relaxing restrictions on immigration by gradually abolishing the quota system based on national origin, in the west river 79 percent said no, in the east river 72 percent said no.

On the question of prohibiting states from having right-to-work laws, west river 82 percent said States should not be prohibited, east river 74 percent voted to permit States to have right-to-work laws. To the question, "Do you favor creation of a Cabinet level post of Department of Housing and Urban Affairs," west river 78 percent said no, east river 72 percent said no. In the east river questionnaire, as a subhead to this question we asked whether or not they favored rent subsidies for moderate income families as recommended by the administration and 73 percent said no. The question of authorizing reapportionment of the State Senate on other than population basis brought an interesting answer. In the west river 38 percent said yes while 53 percent said no. In the east river 42 percent said no, while 45 percent said yes.

Under agriculture the question was, "Do you favor the President's proposal to purchase 50 million cropland acres and encourage farmers to divert their land to nonagricultural uses?" West of the river 84 percent said no. East of the river 74 percent said no. On the question, "Do you favor stopping funds to nations friendly to Communists," West of the river 80 percent said yes. East of the river 84 percent said yes. On the subject of war on poverty, the question was, "Do you favor doubling funds to approximately $2 billion annually?" West of the river 68 percent said no. East of the river 63 percent said no.

The answers on social security were interesting. The question was, "Do you favor increasing benefits by 7 percent with accompanying tax increase?" West of the river 64 percent said "No." East of the river 62 percent said "No." This, of course, was influenced in the medicare bill as it passed the House. The answers on spending were almost a deadheat on each side of the Missouri River. The question was, "Do you favor increasing spending authority by $6 billion as the President requested?" West of the river 84 percent said "No." East of the river 82 percent said "No."

Because a group of 10 Senators have asked the President to eliminate the export provision requiring that 50 percent of all grains sold to Iron Curtain countries must be shipped on American-flag vessels, the question of trading with Iron Curtain countries was especially interesting. West of the river 70 percent voted against trade with Iron Curtain countries, while east of the river 59 percent opposed trading with the enemy. Then on the last question, "Do you favor Federal aid to meet transportation problems in cities," the west river voted 81 percent in opposition while the east river voted 74 percent against.

I want again to express my appreciation to you for giving me the benefit of your thinking on these many troublesome problems that face us as a nation, that face you as a taxpayer and citizen, and face me as a legislator casting your vote for you.

Agriculture: Received an interesting letter over the signature of the Secretary of Agriculture telling of the wonderful work the Soil Conservation Service was doing in South Dakota and specifying several districts that had done especially outstanding jobs. I wrote back to thank him and asked why, if he is so pleased with this work, was he demanding the emasculation of the program by a 50-percent cut in the SCS budget. The House Agriculture Committee has indicated they will hear testimony in support of my wheat bill which would retain export certificates at the present level but support domestically consumed wheat at $3 per bushel. This would give the producer 90 percent of parity on all wheat produced. It will do two things, first, it will return wheat to a price from which it should never have been reduced last year, and secondly, it will point up the fact that it is actually the consumer who is being subsidized by cheap food prices—the farmer simply collects the check. The wool program which I cosponsored some 11 years ago will be extended for another 2 years. No effective changes can be expected in the Sugar Act. Today 65 percent of all domestically consumed sugar is imported while American farmers are begging for an opportunity to raise sugarbeets or cane on their land idled by imports.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

E. Y. BERRY.

What Will You Tell Your Children?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, for those who encourage us to be soft on communism and weaken our country's determination to resist the Communist conspiracy, I call attention to the editorial from the Cherokee County Herald, a fine newspaper published in the Seventh District of Alabama, which I have the honor to represent in the House. The article, written by Tom Burke, dares to challenge our apathy toward the Com-

munist design to destroy America and its hope of freedom for all men, by asking, "What Will You Tell Your Children?" if we allow this to happen:

WHAT WILL YOU TELL YOUR CHILDREN?

(By Tom Burke)

Oftentimes, for the sake of argument, one must stipulate to certain points of facts. Let's hope that our friends who see no danger in the Communist program will agree, for the time being, that there is such a danger and that the danger may suddenly overcome America, just as it did Poland. What will you tell your children?

Let's say, for the sake of argument, that the Reds assume control. They are in control of communications and public utilities; they have slaughtered or imprisoned the police; they have clobbered resistance; and America lies prone, awaiting the blood purges that must certainly follow, enduring the terrifying vacuum before the godless Communist tyranny comes smashing down.

What will you tell those youngsters clustered at your knee? How will you tell them that their Nation, strong, dynamic, compassionate a few years ago, is now gone? How will you tell them that you cannot go to the store and buy food for them because the store is locked against its owners and that your money is no longer any good? How will you tell them that the policeman on the corner is no longer a friend—he has been replaced by a tyrant from the steppes of Asia or the jungles of Africa? How will you tell them that the America your fathers gave to you has been lost?

What will you say when your little son, who feels you are a Cheyenne Bodie, or a Marshall Dillon, asks you why you don't take a gun and go out to set things straight? What will you say when your teenager asks you what you have done to prevent this takeover? Will you tell him you played golf or went fishing or learned to water ski or worked in the garden or hiked in the hills or a million other things, while your Nation went down the drain? What will you say when these children, whose lives have already been blueprinted for them, ask what they should do? How will you advise them when they ask if they should resist? What will you say if they ask you if they should continue to adore God, despite the ultimatum of the new order? What will you do when the order comes to gather your children and ship them into state camps where they can become robots of the state?

Communist writings openly predict that they will seize control centers, and that the great mass of population will lie prostrate. Records show that the lawless of a nation will take this opportunity to swoop down on the helpless, motivated in part by the same drive that causes looting after floods have driven people from their homes. Can you be sure that this will not happen, especially after you have read of the riots in Rochester, N.Y., Chicago, St. Augustine, and other places? There certainly was no motivation to justify attacks upon citizens and police, and the destruction of private property. How would these same people react if all law were suddenly eliminated?

Or, suppose you lived through the blood baths, and 15 years from now, your youngsters ask about the America that was. Will you tell them of the freedoms you had, the freedom to go where you wished, to do what you wished, to say what you wished? Will you tell them of the fun you had and the happiness you had? What will you say when they ask how these things happened to slip away?

Will you admit that you dismissed all efforts to halt the drift toward communism as McCarthyism, that you helped smear everyone who tried to point out the danger?

It may seem a flight of fancy to ponder what could happen to America, but remember, the Pentagon, charged with protecting you and yours from all dangers, foreign and domestic, has already made a study as to the best time to surrender. Ponder that.

If you are a father or mother look at your children. If they are asleep, walk in and look at them, peaceful, contented and trusting. Are you doing anything to prevent just such a terrifying picture as we have painted? Do you bother to inform yourself on the drift toward tyranny? Or do you plan to collaborate with the enemy, to "make friends" with the new order?

If America is to be spared this terror, it must be because her people have forbidden it. If the people will not stem the tide, then each American must face the terror that has already been visited upon Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Rumania, Estonia, Manchuria, Tibet, and many, many other lands. It can, and will happen here, unless we stop what is going on in Washington today.

And, Mister, what will you tell your children?

Maine Maritime Academy's Participation in Merchant Marine Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my esteemed colleague from Maine, Representative HATHAWAY, I draw to the attention of the House the forthcoming observance, May 17–24, 1965, in Washington, D.C., of Merchant Marine Week, World Trade Week, National Maritime Day, and the 15th anniversary of the U.S. Maritime Administration.

We take special pride because a feature role in this program will be taken by the Maine Maritime Academy, one of the Nation's finest institutions of Merchant Marine officer training. The Academy's training vessel, the *State of Maine*, largest ship ever to navigate the Potomac, will be in Washington throughout the week.

Also on board the *Maine* will be cadets from the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, New York State Maritime College, Massachusetts Maritime Academy, and the Texas Maritime Academy. In addition, alumni from these five academies have joined together in arranging a splendid program of social and educational activities while the Maine's 300 cadets are in Washington. It is a heartwarming display of interacademy cooperation which bodes well for the future in our expanded efforts to foster a resurgence of the American Merchant Marine.

The *State of Maine* will be open to public inspection at the U.S. naval gun factory each afternoon, Monday through Saturday, from 1:15 to 4:30 p.m. and members are urged to take this opportunity for a firsthand look at our merchant marine officer training program.

While you are aboard the *Maine*, it is suggested that you also inspect the Maine Products Show Afloat, an industrial-agricultural exhibit containing goods from Down East forests, farms, and factories. Overall sponsor of the Maine Products Show is the Maine World Trade Council, a private organization, with assistance of the Maine Department of Agriculture, the Maine Department of Economic Development, the Maine Martime Academy, and scores of our fine Maine business firms.

The Maine Products Show, though new to Washington, has been a feature on the training vessel for several years. It began when the Maine Maritime Academy trustees sensed that the annual winter cruise to foreign ports had become valuable to the State's promotional program. Trips to South America, Caribbean, the Mediterranean and Europe have produced significant results in the export field.

Gov. John R. Reed, of Maine, has said:

> Maine is proud that the U.S. Maritime Administration has invited our maritime academy training ship to Washington to highlight this State's progress and its economic goals.

Merchant Marine Week will officially open Tuesday morning when Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson dedicates a new merchant marine exhibit in the General Accounting Office Building. The same morning Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY will present a $500 award to the winner of a national high school poster contest commemorating National Maritime Week—the poster now appearing on mail trucks throughout the country. Our fine Maine Maritime Academy Band will play at this ceremony.

On Wednesday the *Maine* Band and the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy Glee Club will perform on the steps of the Senate; that afternoon our *Maine* group will appear at the Annual Maritime Recreational Association picnic at Rock Creek Park. Thursday evening our *Maine* musicians will play at the Sheraton Park Hotel at which time Mr. Nicholas Johnson, Maritime Administrator, will address the Propeller Club of the United States.

Saturday, Maritime Day, will mark another "first" in Washington, as crews from all five maritime academies compete in an old-fashioned lifeboat rowing race on the Potomac River, off Hains Point. The race is scheduled for 2 p.m. There will be excellent facilities for spectators.

Evenings during the week, the *State of Maine* will be the scene of a series of social events, culminating with a gala dancing party for cadets on Saturday evening.

This unprecedented salute to the merchant marine came about through efforts of Maritime Administrator Johnson, the U.S. Department of Commerce, and reflects the administration's concern with the problems of the maritime industry.

We from Maine are most pleased that our Maritime Academy was able to solve the many problems involved in bringing the training vessel to Washington. We are ever mindful of our historic kinship with the sea, and are proud to be members of a growing team whose objective is a merchant marine second to none.

Virginia Military Institute Honors Hon. Harry F. Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 15, in impressive ceremonies at Lexington, Va., marking the 101st anniversary of the Battle of New Market, in which the Cadet Corps of VMI was moved into the battleline and distinguished itself with uncommon gallantry, Virginia's senior Senator, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD was awarded the third annual New Market Medal.

Although not a graduate, Senator BYRD has numerous family ties to the institute, and the award was made as a testimonial to his four decades of selfless public service in the spirit of the institute.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, a message delivered by Senator BYRD in accepting the award, together with two accounts of the ceremonies—one by a correspondent of the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch and the other a dispatch of the Associated Press as it appeared in the News of Lynchburg, Va.:

SPEECH PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, ACCEPTING THE NEW MARKET AWARD BY VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE, LEXINGTON, VA.

The first time I was invited to speak at Virginia Military Institute I asked my brother Dick (the late Admiral Byrd) what kind of a speech I should make. He gave me a one word answer. The word was "Short."

I'll try to follow that advice again today. I have been told that a good speech is one with a short beginning, and a short ending—close together.

But, if I manage brevity in these remarks, I want you to know how deeply pleased I am to be here, and how profoundly grateful I am for the honor you have bestowed upon me.

I am always pleased to come to VMI. There are many reasons for the satisfaction I find in coming back here. Family associations are among these reasons.

My grandfather was in the VMI class of 1849. My great-uncle was a New Market cadet. My father-in-law was in the class of 1879. My brother-in-law was in the class of 1907. My brother Dick was in the class of 1908. My eldest son was in the class of 1935.

While I was Governor of Virginia, I took pride in my responsibilities as commander in chief of the Virginia Militia—which includes the corps and officers of VMI.

As Governor, I signed the diplomas for the graduates of VMI. And, believe it or not, I enjoyed the job. VMI diplomas were the only ones signed by the Governor at that time.

Some of you here may recall also that, while I was Governor, a commission appointed by the general assembly recommended that VMI be made coed. My brother Dick heard about it in the Pacific, and cabled that he would never speak to me again if I approved that recommendation. I rejected it.

Your contributions to our State and Nation are unique. And the tradition of VMI—and the events, and the lives of men who have shaped it—is inspiring.

General Shell has paid eloquent, and richly deserved, tribute to Gen. Francis Smith and his monumental achievements at VMI. I am proud to be among those who revere him at this dedication today.

And President Walter Taylor Revely, of Hampden-Sidney—by reminding us of General Smith's work in that fine neighboring college—has underscored the enduring products of his talent.

The thrill of the Virginia Military Institute's corps of cadets on parade quickens the patriotic pulse of us all. It is a magnificent body of men. It always impresses me as young American manhood at its best.

And this, I think, has been the impression it has made since its baptism of fire at New Market where, 101 years ago today, it fought as a corps and acquitted itself in immortal glory.

You honored me with an invitation to be here last year on the centennial of the Battle of New Market, when, as today, we called the honor roll of cadets who gave their lives in the cause for which they fought.

We pay homage each year to the men of New Market by calling the names on this roll of valor and cadets who follow in their tradition respond: "Died on the field of honor, sir."

We hold this solemn report to be the greatest tribute we can pay those young men who died in defense of principles in which so many great men believed. But no tribute can exceed the merit of those young men.

Men of Virginia Military Institute have distinguished themselves as military leaders in every armed conflict of this country since the Mexican War. As a military college it has earned world renown.

But in its grand tradition, from the beginning, and to the great credit of General Smith, VMI has trained men to be leaders in peace as well as war.

General of the Army George C. Marshall is a more recent example of the VMI men who achieved greatness in both war and peace, and last year he was awarded the second New Market medal.

I was privileged to be present when Mrs. Marshall accepted the medal in behalf of her late, illustrious husband—at the time when your research library was dedicated in his memory.

Before General Marshall, the New Market Medal had been awarded only to Gen. Charles E. Kilbourne, my highly respected and esteemed friend—the sixth superintendent of VMI.

It did not occur to me a year ago that today I should find mysif at Virginia Military Institute in company with General Marshall and General Kilbourne who previously have been honored as I am now.

I know that your board of visitors authorized this medal to be awarded only to Americans deemed to reflect in their own lives the qualities displayed by the cadets at New Market.

Words at my command are inadequate for this occasion. But, as I look at the words engraved on the New Market Medal, I know why I am stirred by what I regard as the spirit of VMI.

I know you have a rousing song by that name. I, too, have been excited by it. But the spirit of VMI which affects me most deeply is etched in the words on the medal: Duty, honor, devotion, leadership.

There are no finer words in the English language. In his farewell to West Point, Gen. Douglas MacArthur said such words as these were hallowed.

Duty is the requirement to be useful according to our powers. It is our principle of action. It is the basis for our dignity. It upholds civilization. Robert E. Lee said it was the sublimest word of all.

Honor establishes the right to respect. It is the product of man's conscience and integrity, his virtue and reliability, and his justness and straightforwardness. It is the nobility of man.

Devotion is the inspired inclination which binds men together without selfish motive. Here at VMI, we see it as the combination of loyalty, allegiance, fervor, and zeal—in dedication to a common cause.

Leadership at its best inspires man's finest efforts—at personal sacrifice if necessary. It arises in men of honor, devotion, and fidelity—in men of dignity who are masters of themselves.

Duty, honor, devotion, leadership in my interpretation, are the exalting qualities of the spirit of VMI. Intangible as they may be, they are the substance of superb character.

They are, of course, qualities basic to military eminence. They are equally essential to transcendent civilian distinction. Both civilian and military excellence are the objectives of training at VMI.

How well VMI's dedication to this dual purpose succeeded a century ago is documented by the record of the cadets at New Market and their civilian achievements after the war.

Even Union commanders praised their precision and gallantry in victorious combat. In the economic and political confusion after the war their civilian contributions were beyond measure.

In all the years since, the military service of the men of VMI has been peerless, and their reputation for sound attainment in civil pursuits attests their training for responsible citizenship.

As of today we have troops stationed around the world. Our naval units patrol all of the major seas. There is actual fighting in both the Atlantic and the Pacific. There is a Communist base in Cuba.

At home the Federal Government has worked itself into fiscal and monetary difficulties which are exceedingly serious. Dangerous centralization in our Government has never been greater, and it is increasing.

Jefferson counseled us to "make the States one as to everything connected with foreign relations; but to keep them the several States as to everything purely domestic."

The rights of States principle for which the cadets fought at New Market has been virtually destroyed by the Federal Government. I come here today to rededicate myself to the cause for which they fought.

As we look at the state of our Government at home, and the conditions around the world where our responsibilities are tremendous, I think the need for men trained to the standards of VMI seldom has been greater.

We are in a new era of atomic energy, rockets, and space. We have the capacity and know-how for development. We are a God-fearing people who have demonstrated our courage and capabilities.

With responsible citizenship, responsible government, fiscal soundness, and adherence to the principles of our system, there should be no fear for the future.

Without these, there will be neither solid progress nor security with military preparedness. I want the life of this Nation to be the longest and best in history.

The mission of Virginia Military Institute is clear. You have never failed to meet the requirements made of you. You will not fail now. I am forever grateful to you.

Godspeed.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News, May 16, 1965]

SENATOR HONORED AT VMI

LEXINGTON.—Virginia's Senator HARRY F. BYRD called Saturday for a revival of the spirit which guided the cadets who fought and died at the Battle of New Market 101 years ago.

"The rights of States principle for which the cadets fought at New Market has been virtually destroyed by the Federal Government," BYRD said at the Virginia Military Institute after receiving its third annual New Market Medal.

"I come here today to rededicate myself to the cause for which they fought."

Each year since 10 VMI cadets died in the Civil War battle May 15, 1864, the institute has set the day aside for commemoration. BYRD is the third recipient of the medal given by VMI in recognition of the qualities of duty, honor, and devotion exemplified by the fallen cadets.

BYRD received the medal from Elmon T. Gray of Waverly, president of the VMI board of visitors. Afterwards, he spoke at ceremonies dedicating the institute's new administration building, Francis H. Smith Hall.

The building is named for the first superintendent of VMI, Gen. Francis H. Smith, who left Hampden-Sydney College in 1839 to command the institute for 50 years.

In accepting the medal, BYRD said the "exalting qualities of the spirit of VMI" are duty, honor, devotion, and leadership—qualities called "hallowed" by the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

"As we look at the state of our Government at home, and the conditions around the world where our responsibilities are tremendous, I think the need for men trained to the standards of VMI seldom has been greater," BYRD said.

"At home the Federal Government has worked itself into fiscal and monetary difficulties which are exceedingly serious. Dangerous centralization in our Government has never been greater, and it is increasing. * * *

"With responsible citizenship, responsible government, fiscal soundness, and adherence to the principles of our system, there should be no fear for the future."

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, May 16, 1965]

VMI HONORS BYRD, SMITH, 1864 CADETS

(By Dallas Kersey, Times-Dispatch News Bureau)

LEXINGTON, May 15.—Virginia Military Institute, markings its 125th year, paid tribute Saturday to a triumvirate who played key parts in the development and maturity of Virginia and the institute.

Center of attention during the hot day before some 2,000 persons was Senator HARRY F. BYRD, who was awarded the New Market Medal. The gold disk is given each year on May 15 in honor of the VMI cadets who fought and died at the Battle of New Market in 1864.

The medal, presented by Elmon T. Gray, of Waverly, president of the VMI board of visitors, was given to Senator BYRD for his "outstanding leadership in Virginia for nearly 40 years and whose very name has come to be synonymous with fiscal responsibility and conservation in governmental affairs * * *."

Also honored Saturday were Gen. Francis H. Smith, the institute's first superintendent, who died in 1890, and the VMI students who fought in the Civil War. VMI's new administration building, which has been in use since last June, is named for General Smith.

Several of General Smith's descendants were in the audience.

On the 101st anniversary of the Battle of New Market, the cadet corps gave a full-scale parade and passed in review by the famed statue, Virginia Mourning Her Dead, to honor 247 of their comrades who fought for the South in the Civil War battle several miles north of here in the Shenandoah Valley. Ten cadets were killed and 47 wounded in the battle.

GREATEST HONOR

At the Smith Building dedication, Senator BYRD remarked to the persons gathered, "I've been in public service 50 years in Virginia in various capacities, and this is the greatest honor to come to me.

"I would rather have this medal given to me than any other thing," BYRD said. In the audience was his son, State Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr.

This is the third presentation of the medal. It was given in 1962 to Lt. Gen. Charles E. Kilbourne, superintendent emeritus of VMI at the time, and last year was awarded posthumously to General of the Army George C. Marshall. His widow accepted the medal then.

After the dedication program, an open house was held in Smith Hall followed by a luncheon for cadets and invited guests.

REDEDICATE MYSELF

In his remarks, Senator BYRD recalled that his grandfather was in the VMI class of 1849, his great uncle was a New Market cadet, his father-in-law was in the class of 1879, his brother-in-law in the class of 1907, his brother Richard was a 1908 graduate, and his eldest son, Harry, Jr., in the 1935 class.

What has come to be known as the "spirit of VMI" grew out of the cadets' participation in the Battle of New Market. Senator BYRD said he also regards as the spirit of VMI, "which affects me most deeply," four words etched on the back of the medal: Duty, honor, devotion, leadership. "Intangible as they may be, they are the substance of superb character," he said.

"The rights of States' principle for which the cadets fought at New Market has been virtually destroyed by the Federal Government," Senator BYRD said. "I come here today to rededicate myself to the cause for which they fought."

MATHEMATICS PROFESSOR

Smith Hall stands at the opposite end of the parade field from the VMI barracks. It is the second building at VMI to honor Smith's memory. An academic building, which was built in 1899, was the first to bear his name. This building later gave way to an addition to the barracks.

General Smith was a mathematics professor at Hampden-Sydney College when he was asked to assume leadership of the fledgling military school at Lexington. He was one of two faculty members when VMI opened in 1839, and he continued to guide and lead the institute for 50 years.

It was only the persistent efforts of General Smith, a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, that brought about the reopening of VMI after Gen. David Hunter's raid virtually destroyed the institute in June 1864.

General Smith, whose first title had been principal, continued to lead the institute until he relinquished the post in December 1889. He died just 3 months later.

Hon. Charles S. Murphy

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, many fine tributes have been accorded our friend the Under Secretary of Agriculture Charles S. Murphy today upon his forthcoming resignation from the Department of Agriculture, and it gives me great pleasure to add my remarks to this richly deserved accolade.

I regretted very much to learn that Mr. Murphy was leaving his post in the Department. His record as Under Secretary has been outstanding and impressive and his experience, seasoned judgment, and wise counsel will be sorely missed. As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I have been privileged to work with him on many occasions and can certainly attest to his great ability and leadership. He is held in high esteem by all who know him, and I shall personally miss my association with him.

As Mr. Murphy leaves his position, which has been more distinguished by his service, I wish him much happiness and success in his future endeavors.

Address by Hon. John V. Tunney at Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner in Indianapolis, May 1, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, because of my deep admiration for Congressman JOHN V. TUNNEY, of California, his idealism and his dedication, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks he made at the May 1, 1965, Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Indianapolis. The nearly 4,000 people in attendance at the dinner were delighted with Congressman TUNNEY's charm and dignity and all Hoosiers look forward to his next visit to Indiana:

TUNNEY SPEECH, INDIANA JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY

We are assembled tonight to honor the proud history of our party and also to reaffirm our pledge to make Indiana, California, and America a better place in which to live, work, study, and create. Woodrow Wilson once said "What use is a political party unless it is being served and used by the Nation for some great purpose?" The Democratic Party has existed longer than any other party in the world. The reason for this is what it has identified itself with the problems of the future from the time of its creation in 1824. It has developed programs and policies to serve the best interests and welfare of the American people. It has not been satisfied with finding excuses as to why government should not act to destroy poverty, ignorance, disease, and frustration. It has followed the admonition of Thomas Jefferson when he said:

"Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppression of body and mind will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day."

Our party will not accept slogans in place of deeds. It knows that the spinner of apologies for inaction is a faint-hearted rationalizer who merely tries to explain away his own inadequacies.

Looking back in history, we find that the leaders of the Democratic Party were doers—men of compassion who were interested in improving the human condition.

Thomas Jefferson proclaimed the dignity of man and his inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. He was the statesman-philosopher who provided the moral and ethical justification for the American Revolution.

Andrew Jackson came from the frontier lands of Tennessee. He fought Indians and

spent much of his life in the wilderness. He possessed a toughness of spirit and resiliancy of character which was best demonstrated by his championing of the cause of the common man. He gave men from all walks of life a chance to participate in politics and in government. His credo was equal opportunity for all.

The heritage of Jefferson and Jackson has extended down to the present, and the result has been that what was considered new and controversial and dangerous in the administrations of Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman, is today almost taken for granted.

The history of progress in our country is a revolutionary history—not just a revolution of arms and an overthrow of oppressive British rule, but a revolution of ideas, discoveries, and laws. As our Nation has progressed and the dignity of man has been constantly reaffirmed, the Democratic Party has served a great purpose. I think that we might ask ourselves what are we doing now to meet the problems of today and tomorrow.

Our country is undergoing dynamic and rapid changes. Changes wrought by a developing technology, rapid communications, vast population migrations, and spiritual unrest.

We accept man's freedom of will and corporeal independence and yet are confronted by his singular inability to secure his job and his family income against downward trends in the national economy over which he has no control.

We have as a Nation created a fiscal paradox whereby we spend only $450 a year per child in our public schools, but spend $1,800 a year to keep a wayward child in a detention home; $2,500 a year for a family on relief and $3,500 a year for a criminal in a State penitentiary.

In the past 4 years, under the leadership of two great Democratic Presidents, a Democratic controlled Congress has come to grips with the realities of life for modern man living in an era of social, economic, and political transition. Hard-hitting programs have been enacted to meet the national needs of education, unemployment, civil rights, and air and water pollution.

Just this past month, Congress passed an education bill which is a major step forward in guaranteeing equality of educational opportunity for all children in our land. It authorizes $1.3 billion in the first year for grants to States for allocation to school districts with large numbers of children from low-income families. Its purpose is to strengthen primary and secondary school education. It is a bill that is needed because over 1 million children drop out of school every year without a high school diploma and because in most poor communities, children are destined to receive a poorer education resulting from a lack of textbooks, school facilities, and insufficiently trained teachers.

This bill was passed by a Congress and signed by a President who knew that unemployment of young people with an eighth-grade education is four times that of the national average; that the lifetime income of a person who graduates from high school is $60,000 higher than one who does not go to high school, and that the lifetime income of a college graduate is $135,000 more than for one who has only a high school diploma.

This spring was a busy spring for the House of Representatives. We not only passed an education bill of historic scope, but we also voted overwhelmingly in favor of medicare. It seems strange that there are still so many people in our country who argue with self-righteous fervor that every man ought to be totally responsible for his own old age medical needs. The great majority of people, old or young, do not want to be charity cases. They want to be independent, yet secure in their needs. In our Nation today, we have 18 million people over 65 with the average couple over 65 having an annual income of approximately $1,700. The cost of 1 day of hospitalization is over $40 a day. Over 50 percent of our senior citizens do not have medical insurance because they cannot afford it. Many do not go to doctors as the symptoms of disease appear because they are afraid of having their meager savings wiped out. By the time they do see a doctor and are hospitalized, many have passed the point where medical science can benefit them.

The only answer to this dilemma of inadequate medical treatment of our aged is to enable each person during his productive years to put aside a small amount of money so that when he gets to be 65 he will be able to have hospital care without impoverishment or charity. It is important in addition, that an option be given our elderly citizens to allow them to make small monthly premium payments with matching Federal payments so that private insurance may be acquired to pay doctors' fees. This is what the medicare bill provides. This is why it is good legislation and this is why it will become the law of the land.

We are currently engaged in a bitter and acrimonious war in Vietnam. There are some who are fainthearted and say the United States should pull out. There are others who are overly bold and claim that the United States should begin bombing civilian population centers. In my opinion, the slow and studied escalation of our military activities as directed by President Johnson is the only course of action open to us.

What is the real issue in Vietnam? We certainly are not fighting for the small piece of real estate with wet and fetid jungles. We are fighting for a principle. That principle is that the United States lives up to its international agreements, that we will not give up our military commitments in far-flung areas around the world where the Communists practice naked aggression—that our treaty commitments to fight to defend Western Europe and Berlin are credible. I am reminded of the words of Abraham Lincoln in his second inaugural address: "With malice for none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to know the right." President Johnson and the American people are not interested in a war of aggression in Vietnam. The President has offered to meet the Communist leaders to discuss methods and means of peacefully settling the hostilities. The Vietcong Communists are not interested. They believe they can win the war by force of arms. We have no malice toward the Communists but we are firm in our commitments to South Vietnam because we are right. Our President symbolizes the spirit in America to resist armed conquest by those who have an insatiable thirst for power and that is why all of us in this room tonight along with 180 million other Americans support his courageous stand.

The Congress and President Johnson have not just been concerned with education, medicare, and Vietnam. They have recognized that the only way we can maintain the vitality and strength of our economy is to have jobs available for all who must work to live. We have to develop and continue programs to train young men for employment in this age of complex technology and to retrain those whose skills have become antiquated. Under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, we have seen new approaches applied to solving old manpower problems. Vocational training programs have been initiated to help those who want to help themselves. Regional recovery programs such as the Area Redevelopment Act and more recently the Appalachia Act, have been inacted to invigorate areas of great poverty and joblessness. An antipoverty program has been created to give employment, training, and hope to thousands of youth out of school, out of work, and disillusioned by an apparent gray destiny of economic dependency.

Much has been done but much more is required. This year the number of 18- and 19-year-old workers, is expected to increase by 500,000—twice the increase of last year. The labor force is expected to grow by 7½ million workers in the next 5 years—50 percent greater than the last 5 years.

Certain groups face greater challenges than others. Negroes presently constitute 10 percent of our population, yet will account for 18 percent of the coming manpower increase. The level of Negro unemployment is twice that of whites in our society. We can never be satisfied until all races, colors, and creeds, have equal opportunity in all spheres of life.

The prospective and vast increase in our labor force over the next 20 years comes at a time that machines are replacing men at an increasingly faster pace. Automation is desirable in that it relieves man of the drudgery of having to spend all his time scratching out a living from the soil, the mine, or the factory. It gives him time for recreation, leisure, and cultural pursuits. It provides opportunities for man to notice himself and his relationship to his Creator.

Automation does, however, present thorny obstacles and grave dangers to our people. Year after year, throughout our land, productivity per man-hour of work has risen. Fifty years ago, it was considered good if a man could mine one-half a ton of coal in a 10-hour day. In 1965, a miner using the latest equipment can produce 60 tons in an 8-hour day. Over 500,000 jobs a year are lost out of our economy as a result of machines replacing men and the era of a strong willing back being a passport to success has passed forever. It is true that automation fashions new jobs for our people, but the new jobs require new skills and all too often the number of new jobs fashioned does not equal old jobs lost.

What is needed is a strengthening and broadening of college education and vocational education so that the skills of our work force will always match the jobs available in our economy. Counseling and job replacement services must be expanded so that the right man will be able to find the right job. Job development activities must be increased in order to create new service employment opportunities in fields where they have not existed in the past because of an inadequately trained work force. The people of our country want improved home and equipment maintenance, they want greater recreational opportunities for their children and stricter supervision in playgrounds. There is no reason why these services cannot be provided as automation steadily frees more men from work on the farm and in the factory.

What is needed in addition, is a reaffirmation of our cultural and spiritual heritage. It is written in the Bible: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every work that proceeds out of the mouth of God."

These words have great meaning to a society such as ours. We are a rich nation and our people on the average work but 5 days a week. We have time to reflect on our beginnings and on our destiny. We have time to read, to play, to watch television, to listen to music. Yet with all the free time we have to relax and understand ourselves, we are a country with 10 percent of the people suffering from mental disease requiring treatment and countless more from jangled nerves requiring tranquilization. In a sense, mere life itself within the community of man has become one of our greatest challenges. In future years of automated free time, our churches, colleges, and cultural centers will have a heavy burden to lift from many men the yoke of uninspired existence and restore to them the joy of living.

No nation offers its citizens more of an opportunity to advance on economic, political, social, and cultural levels than does ours. Every American within and without this Chamber has a duty to strengthen and improve our institutions and to protect the freedom of body and mind that gave birth to them.

One hundred years ago Walt Whitman wrote: "The United States themselves are essentially the greatest poem. Here at last is something in the doings of man that corresponds to the broadest doings of the day and night."

Let us look forward to tomorrow with hope, clarity of purpose and new dedication. The years ahead are fraught with danger. We not only have the menace of Communist arms and subversion; but domestic unemployment, poverty, disease, and inequality of opportunity. But I, like you, believe that the United States themselves are essentially the greatest poem. I believe we can overcome the obstacles in our path. I believe our Government is consecrated to serve the will of the people. We must act with courage—not sit transfixed by fear. We must regard the past without regret; we must contemplate the future without alarm. America is on the move, and all of us as citizens, as Democrats, are obliged to serve her well.

Our Stand in the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the editors of our Nation's newspapers have been almost unanimous in backing the policies of President Johnson in his stand against communism in the Western Hemisphere.

As so many papers have noted, we cannot tolerate another Castro in our own backyard.

President Johnson's bold and decisive leadership to the Dominican Republic crisis merits the praise of all Americans. As the May 5 editorial in the Rochester Times-Union pointed out, "Uncle Sam is standing straighter," because of the President's actions.

The Omaha World-Herald, another of the Nation's outstanding newspapers, repeated the President's announced reasons for sending troops to the Dominican island. The United States is there to protect lives and to stop the spread of Communist aggression.

In the long run, peace and freedom owe a debt of gratitude to President Johnson for his timely action.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask consent to include in the RECORD the editorials from the Omaha World-Herald and the Rochester Times-Union.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald May 4, 1965]

ON WITH THE JOB

President Johnson summed up the reason for the presence of U.S. troops in the Dominican Republic in one sentence Sunday night:

"Our goal is to help prevent another Communist state in this hemisphere, and we would like to do this without extensive bloodshed."

The address was an impressive account of the President's reasons for the actions he has taken since the Dominican crisis began, and an equally impressive declaration of our country's intentions.

The decision to intervene in the Dominican fighting came because of the immediate threat to the lives of Americans and other foreigners in Santo Domingo. As the revolution disintegrated into apparent anarchy, the original rebels were "superseded by evil forces." The Communists saw a chance to create more disorder and seize control, the President said, and he added:

"The American nations cannot, must not and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere."

Mr. Johnson chose to act first and then to invoke the official machinery of the Organization of American States to ratify his decision.

There is good reason to hope that his forthrightness in facing up to what he termed "violence and terror and international conspiracy" will serve to rally support in Latin America.

But if events should prove otherwise, if our Central and South American allies should fail to cooperate in the effort to prevent the establishment of another Communist regime in the Americas, President Johnson indicated that he is fully determined to go it alone.

That determination was apparent in the concluding paragraph of his report when he said that, come what may, the American people will not be "buried" by their Communist enemy.

If the Communist bosses were looking for a sign of weakness, they did not find it in the President's words.

This time the United States has met a Communist-precipitated crisis head on, without hesitation that might be mistaken for timidity, and without any hint of appeasement.

The President underscored his strong words by ordering more troops into the city of Santo Domingo, not only to evacuate American civilians and others, but to distribute food and medicine, and to bury the dead.

"We must get on with the job immediately," said the President.

Clearly this "job" is no mere rescue operation for American citizens in danger.

It is an operation to rescue another American nation from communism, to prevent another Castro-type takeover. The President's prompt action and his unequivocal words give every promise that the "job" will be done.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, May 5, 1965]

PROTOCOL WON'T DEFEND FREEDOM

Uncle Sam is standing straighter.

Through President Johnson's bold action in Asia and in the Caribbean, America has stopped being a musclebound giant, everlastingly frustrated in checking communism's nibbling at the free world.

Direct action in Vietnam to give the Communists second thoughts about aggression and in the Dominican Republic to nip a Castroite plot in the bud—this admittedly is not polite, striped-pants diplomacy.

Some call it "unwarranted unilateral interference in the internal affairs of other countries." Others call it "brinkmanship."

They miss the main point.

President Johnson said last week of Vietnam: "Defeat * * * would deliver a friendly nation to terror and repression. It would encourage and spur on those who seek to conquer all free nations * * * within their reach."

And he said this week of the Dominican Republic: "We don't propose to sit * * * with our hands folded and let the Communists set up any government in the Western Hemisphere."

This has been the theme of U.S. policy for nearly two decades. Unfortunately, it has been applied only in fits and starts. Freedom has suffered many a loss while diplomats haggled and U.S. leaders did too little too late.

Emerging now is a new determination to resist aggression and subversion as the occasion warrants.

America's tactics sometimes may appear distressingly similar to those of the Communists. But the purposes of the opposing forces are as different as the bright sunshine of freedom and the black darkness of tyranny.

America wants not to dictate a form of government but to permit free choice. It seeks not to conquer new territory for itself but to prevent others from expanding their dominion. It wants not to destroy international peacekeeping organizations but only to act when their complex machinery breaks down.

Those who protest that the conflict in Vietnam is just a civil war ignore the plain evidence of Red aggression from the north. Those who argue that the Dominican rebellion would not play into Communist hands forget the duplicity of Fidel Castro.

And to those who cringe at the new fighting, the President replies:

"From Munich until today, we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and * * * even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of a lasting peace."

Importance of Rural Life in Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and privilege of representing the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee. A few days ago the Future Farmers of America in their annual State convention meeting in Memphis, Tenn., heard outstanding members of their organization, participate in a speech contest.

Ernest Pounds of Bradford, Tenn., which I have the honor of representing, won the statewide speaking contest. His speech is so outstanding and timely that I felt it should be brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

This speech follows:

IMPORTANCE OF RURAL LIFE IN CIVILIZATION

(By Ernest Pounds)

Honorable judges, Future Farmers, friends, I am concerned about the future of our Nation, not today, not tomorrow, not a decade from now, but a more distant future. Although one of the youngest nations of the world, we are excelled by none. Our national resources seem almost unlimited. We possess more copper, zinc, aluminum, cement, pig iron, steel, and petroleum than any other nation. We lead the world in the production of corn, cotton, total small grain, meat, and milk, making America the leading agricultural nation of the world. With one of the greatest merchant fleets we lead all other nations in both imports and exports. We boast of having the tallest and finest buildings and the greatest network of highways, and of being the wealthiest nation in the world. This Nation has almost as many telephones, radios, television sets, and motor

vehicles, and uses almost as much electricity as all the rest of the world combined. Our educational system leads all others. We are making more progress in the education of all classes of people, while our colleges and universities are conferring more degrees than any other nation. Average American citizens today enjoy more privileges, greater opportunities, and luxuries, not only than the residents of any other nation but more than the "uppercrust" of our own Nation enjoyed a half century ago. We are living on the top of prosperity and glory.

How did such a nation come into existence? This Nation was built by sturdy farmers who owned their own land and cultivated it themselves. They were God-fearing and God-loving people, who felt their responsibility for the generations who were to follow. The pride of self-ownership, living on their own soil and neighboring with those who dwelt about them, created the desire for better communication, recreation, transportation, marketing, learning, worship, and protection. All these brought about better living. The solving of their problems together, with the consequent love for each other, developed a society which was willing to protect its welfare at any cost. In 1917, we did not wait for Germany to tread on American soil before we arose to defend it; we repeated the same in 1941 and a decade later when North Korea began her threat toward us. We staved off the Communist threat of the Cuban crisis and the uprising in the Panama Canal Zone. It is true that our military and political difficulties of South Vietnam are matters of concern among our national leaders, yet no one doubts our ability to solve the complex problems of the area. Our faith in the ability of our people to withstand any nuclear attack, which may be thrust upon us, is unshaken. What have we to fear?

Just what have we to fear? Is this the only great civilization that ever existed? I remind you of "the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome." What has become of the Egyptian art of mummyfying bodies or their ability to build the mighty pyramids? What have we that is more magnificent than the early temples? What is more beautiful than the art and poetry of ancient Greece? Where is there more wonderful literature than that written in the Holy Bible? Where can we find men who disclose greater wisdom than that which flowed from the lips of Solomon or Socrates? We need only to glance over the periods of history to know that there existed periods of great civilization throughout the ages. We know that these great periods have, in every instance prior to ours, faded from existence. We wonder how they came into being and how they vanished away.

The ancient powers of Egypt, Rome, Greece, and all others were also built by sturdy farmers who owned their own lands and cultivated it themselves. The pride of ownership in their homes and farms elevated rural society and created the desire to enrich their soil. They supplied their people with bounties of food and fiber. Their city people not only enjoyed better living but were better able to defend their government. These great periods of progress, too, were founded on noble principles. Civilization began with those powers slowly but increased in acceleration until they thought that they owned the whole world. Does that not resemble American prosperity? The downfall of those powers was brought about when their attention was turned from that which made them great to the luxuries that could be had only by the power of their greatness. After rural Egypt built a mighty nation, Pharoah took command and enslaved the owners. The wealth of Rome took charge of the farm homes in which it then ceased to live. In every instance, the farms were gathered into large bodies in the hands of great absentee landlords. The soil was cultivated by tenants, sharecroppers, and in many instances slaves. The increasing selfishness of these absentee landlords disregarded the welfare of the men of the soil; the pride of caring for prosperous homes and communities faded, and soon barren gullied land was returned to nature. The landlords had yielded to their weakness for luxurious living, strong drink, and adultery, and a powerful nation sank into starvation only to fall prey to barbarous force.

Can it be that this great state of civilization, which our forefathers have built and protected with their lives and of which we are justly proud, will someday meet the same disaster? It was in the early thirties that we suffered a serious threat. Values had shrunk to fantastic levels; government of all kinds was faced with serious curtailment of income; the means of exchange were frozen in the currents of trade; the withered leaves of the industrial enterprise lay on every side; farmers could find no market for their produce; the savings of many years in thousands of families were gone. We should feel thankful that there was no "barbarous force" prepared to leap upon our weakened back. We should thank our leaders for their guidance back into the road of prosperity. Our recovery was miraculous and it is upon that vehicle that we are riding in an excelerated motion. Our heads are in the air with our eyes visualizing a golden future of which we have no definite promise.

Is not the demon of the early powers riding invisibly in our carriage of prosperity seeking to devour the foundation of our great civilization? The dividing lines between our farms are being erased, giving rise to large farms under the dominance of great absentee landlords. Many farmers are forced from the land of their heritage to seek employment elsewhere. The cost of operating a farm has grown out of reach of the small farmer. The friendly chats of rural America are being silenced. The rural community center is fast disappearing. The unprecedented sale of alcoholic beverages, the sharp increase in the number of illegitimate children born every year and the popularity of divorce are definite proof that the mind of our society is turning from that which made America great to luxurious living, strong drink and adultry.

If America is to live on with all her splendor she must never forget that her feed roots are anchored in the rural community. When the standards of rural society are lifted civilization will flourish. When the standards of rural society are lowered the leaves of the tree of prosperity will wither. When the weather is beautiful and calm we are inclined to forget the hazards of a stormy day. It would be impossible for our Nation to enjoy the promised Great Society, when the sources from which it comes is forgotten. Shall we stand idly by and let history repeat itself to the destruction of this, our great civilization? America must realize that the freedom and rights of its rural people is the key to the freedom of all its people. Future Farmers: It is our opportunity and responsibility to formulate a plan where by the future society of America will be constantly aware of this impending danger. I believe that rural America can and will hold true to the best traditions in our national life and that we can exert an influence in our homes and communities which will stand solid for our part in that inspiring task.

Remarks by Hon. Kenneth E. BeLieu at Launching of SS "Genevieve Lykes"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to offer to my fellow colleagues in the Congress this fine speech by the distinguished Under Secretary of the Navy, Kenneth E. BeLieu, delivered in my home city of New Orleans, La., on the occasion of the launching of *Genevieve Lykes*, on May 1, 1965. It is appropriate that we take note of this speech and of what Mr. BeLieu says here, particularly in view of the fact that this month—May—is Maritime Month for the U.S. merchant marine.

The Under Secretary points out the dire need to continue at a more rapid rate the refurbishing and replacement of our merchant fleet, which is so vital an arm to our Nation's economy and progress. Mr. BeLieu cites the cooperation which is now in progress between the steamship companies, the labor unions, the shipyards, and our National Government, to replenish our merchant marine so that we can meet the competition and the challenges in trade from so many nations around the earth.

The *Genevieve Lykes*, a modern cargo vessel to augment the growing fleet of one of our country's great steamship line, Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., was built at the Avondale Shipyards near New Orleans. Avondale continues to prove that it is the finest shipyard in our Nation, with the caliber of ships which the yard builds for many of America's steamship lines.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD Under Secretary Kenneth BeLieu's fine speech of May 1, delivered at Avondale Shipyards:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE KENNETH. E. BELIEU, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, LAUNCHING SS "GENEVIEVE LYKES," NEW ORLEANS, LA., MAY 1, 1965

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to be with you today and to participate in this stirring ceremony. It has been some time since I was here in the Queen City of the South—beautiful New Orleans. Each visit has proven over and over again that your southern hospitality is unequaled anywhere.

I would like to pay tribute to Senators LONG and ELLENDER, Congressmen BOGGS and HÉBERT and Mayor Schiro for their interest in the well being of this Nation's maritime fleet and shipyards, for it is such leaders who serve to inspire the best from all of us. While I have attended many launchings, each one provides a new thrill for me.

Being present at the birth of a ship is and will always be an honor for me. To imagine the combination of steel, wiring, pipes, all put together to eventually form a ship with as fine lines as this one is a double honor.

The launching of a ship has been, down through the ages, attended with a great deal

of ceremony, steeped in tradition and vested with a somewhat mystical symbolism.

This is as it should be. Few other occasions bring together so clearly the net results of so many. The *Genevieve Lykes*, like her predecessors represents the combined work and efforts of the designers, the ship owners, the Government, but perhaps most of all—you—the shipyard workers.

I am sure no one more than you feels the pride in this symbol of your accomplishment which brings to mind a poem written for a launching ages ago and still appropriate today.

"When a land forgets its legends,
Sees but falsehoods in the past
When a nation views its sires
In the light of fools and liars—
'Tis a sign of its decline
And its glories cannot last
Branches that but blight our roots
Yield no sap for lasting fruits."

We have not forgotten our legends and have held dearly our traditions, no more so than the American ships, built by American hands, sailed by American sailors and owned by Americans.

This launching opens Maritime Month for the U.S. merchant marine. Throughout the Nation our past maritime exploits will be extolled over and over again, but it is not enough to talk of our past, it is to the future we must look.

It is easy to forget what our merchant marine has done for us; we forgot after World War I and we paid heavy penalties in lives and dollars to buy the time necessary to build World War II vessels. The continuing decline today of the American merchant fleet is alarming and in a sense the responsibility for this decline lies with all of us, for it is our individual responsibility to recognize the importance of this Nation's maritime fleet and to insure our support to those in Government and industry who strive to prevent this decline.

We certainly possess the know-how. This fine ship is an example of that. I am sure we also have the desire. But all the speeches and words will do little to achieve our goals without the willingness to channel our combined efforts in the proper direction. It is necessary, indeed of paramount importance, that the confusion now existing as to the size, type, and scope of the merchant fleet be cleared up so that we can proceed ahead to revitalize this fleet.

I am encouraged by the efforts of the American steamship operators to present completely new ideas in ship designs and ship propulsion—ideas that may soon bear fruit with new modern vessels which will be consistent with the age we live in, not ideas that date back to the sailing ship days. Certainly this automated vessel which is to be launched here within a few moments represents just such thinking.

I am further encouraged by the union officials and Government maritime leaders, all of whom are attempting to put together a maritime policy that will encourage the building of new vessels and the expansion of our trade.

I believe that this Nation can achieve a well balanced merchant fleet, that not only will be an economical one, but a merchant fleet that will be ready at all times as a right arm of defense.

We are all aware of the aging obsolescence of the maritime reserve fleet, and we all realize the need to replace it. The ultimate goal, however, is to have the vessels sailing the seas, not tied up in some lonely backwater.

The ships that sail bring economy and jobs to all of us, whereas vessels rusting in the reserve fleet are costly to maintain and bring little or nothing other than a paper reserve for defense needs. Most of these reserve vessels are over 20 years old and slow of speed. Each year brings their further decline and added maintenance costs. The President has consistently pointed out his interest in this Nation's merchant marine and has taken active steps to insure that the best minds of industry and Government work diligently toward achieving goals that would insure a modern up-to-date merchant fleet.

We must support his effort and the efforts of all others who lead the way to the rebirth of our maritime achievements.

The Defense Department has a vital interest in this rebirth and Secretary McNamara has actively participated with all programs addressed to this subject.

To achieve our goals, we must keep in mind the twin goals of economy and efficiency. For this reason, our planning for the future cannot proceed in a helter skelter pattern, but must be done in an orderly manner and in a way that will produce efficient cargo vessels operating economically.

To all of you who participated in the planning and building of this fine ship, I compliment you for a job well done, the fruit of your labors stands as a living monument to your great contributions, and I wish the *Genevieve Lykes* a long and successful life.

Builder Supports Housing Expansion, Extension of GI Loan Eligibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lawrence Weinberg, president of Larwin Group Cos., Beverly Hills, Calif., heads one of the Nation's largest homebuilding firms. He entered the building business upon his discharge from the Army in 1945, when he could not find a suitable home for his wife and expected first child. Realizing other married veterans were in the same predicament, Weinberg and his brother, William, bought four lots, built small homes, doing much of the construction work themselves, and wound up with a total profit of $280. The Weinbergs are still at it, and now have accounted for more than 13,000 homes—31 new communities.

In Washington this week for a meeting of the Board of Directors of the National Association of Home Builders, Mr. Weinberg, in expressing his support for the housing bill now before Congress, made the following statement:

The housing legislation of the 1930's, particularly the establishment of FHA, was a major factor in preserving the free enterprise system and spreading its benefits to millions of Americans.

Instead of clinging to the moth-eaten ideas of the 19th century, we should recognize and welcome the fact that we are living in a new era of government-business cooperation. The job that needs to be done in providing good housing for our expanding population is so big it will take the best efforts of private enterprise in cooperation with both Federal and local governments.

The proper role for Government in this partnership is to put its huge credit resources to work in the interests of quality housing provided by private companies at prices people can afford. We in the private sector will take the initiative in planning housing developments where Americans can enjoy a quality of homeownership consistent with our affluent society.

Weinberg, a veteran of infantry service in France during 1944, also expressed his support for legislation to extend eligibility for veterans' home loan guarantees:

We have men in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic today who are exposed to the hazards of hot war, and any serviceman is likely to face bullets in some brush-fire crisis. It seems only fair to give them an opportunity to won a new home after they are discharged, without expecting them to have accumulated a downpayment from their GI pay.

Australia's Decision Recalls Ford's Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it was gratifying indeed to learn recently that Australia will be sending an infantry battalion into service in South Vietnam. It is certainly to be hoped that other countries who have a stake in resisting Communist aggression in southeast Asia will also come forward with tangible help.

In this connection, I was much impressed with an editorial in the Lansing, Mich., State Journal of May 3 calling attention to remarks made by Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., House minority leader, earlier this year suggesting that other nations join us in the defense of South Vietnam.

In order that this editorial may be shared by my colleagues, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

AUSTRALIA'S DECISION RECALLS FORD'S PLAN

Announcement last week that Australia would provide an infantry battalion for service in South Vietnam is a gratifying indication of growing recognition that the United States should not be expected to carry the main burden of resisting Communist aggression in southeast Asia without additional help.

Prime Minister Sir Robert Menzies said the decision to send an Australian force numbering up to 800 men had been made on request of the South Vietnamese Government for further military assistance.

The dispatching of the infantry battalion would not represent Australia's first involvement in the effort to preserve the independence of South Vietnam and keep the gateway closed to Communist conquest of southeast Asia. Already in South Vietnam are about 100 Australian jungle combat advisers and a Royal Australian Air Force transport unit. The jungle advisers are not classified as combat troops but have been in combat areas for months and have suffered casualties in action, including one killed.

The Australian contingent of 800 men would be the second largest unit from any of America's allies in South Vietnam. South Korea is represented by 2,000 troops, serving primarily as a work force to build and repair roads, bridges, and railways.

In a letter to Menzies, President Johnson expressed delight at the Australian announcement and said:

"I am confident that our two nations working together can continue to make great

contributions to checking the spread of aggression and to bring about the peace that South Vietnam and southeast Asia deserve."

Australian Government sources said the decision to send combat forces did not result from the visit to Canberra recently by U.S. Presidential Envoy Henry Cabot Lodge, who is touring friendly Far Eastern and Pacific nations to win support for U.S. policy in Vietnam. The sources said the Australian Cabinet had considered the idea of a more positive involvement for some time before Lodge's visit.

Last week's decision recalled a plan put forward late in February by U.S. Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., of Grand Rapids, for winning the war in Vietnam without a major buildup of American troops.

The House Republican leader proposed that fighting men from several Asiatic nations be assigned to the defense of South Vietnam against the Communist Vietcong.

FORD had listed South Korea, Formosa, the Philippines, and Australia as countries he felt could contribute substantial numbers of troops to a joint force to defend freedom in South Vietnam.

"Those countries have just as big an interest as we do in keeping southeast Asia free," he said. "Maybe more so, since they are geographically closer to the war."

We observed at the time FORD made his proposal that the big question was whether other Asian countries would cooperate. We also noted that the answer couldn't be obtained unless the question were asked.

The fact that Australia announced its decision to send additional combat troops following and not before Lodge's visit to that country is significant. The timing suggests the possibility that representatives of the U.S. administration are now pressing the question raised by FORD's proposal more than 2 months ago.

A Personal Report: The Teacher and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the article written by Mr. William Benton for the Encyclopedia Britannica 1965 Yearbook should do more than awaken the American people to the importance of education in the cold war.

It should make them realize that in order to form a better society and in order to maintain the growth and position of the United States as leader of the world, education is the essential in all endeavors.

To produce thinking men and women is not a process of stagnation, it is a process of constant stimulation, of constant exposure to new ideas.

Mr. Benton ably demonstrates this and the importance which another nation, the U.S.S.R., is attaching to the teaching of their youths.

The third chapter of the article follows:

A PERSONAL REPORT: THE TEACHERS AND THE TAUGHT IN THE U.S.S.R.

(By William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Senator; presently U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its executive board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica)

CHAPTER III. THE THRUST OF SOVIET HIGHER EDUCATION

The Soviet universities train teachers. They also train research scientists "at the theoretical level." There were 33 Soviet universities when I first visited the U.S.S.R. in 1955. Now there are 40. This is almost one new university a year.

Engineers, physicians, agricultural experts, and other professionals are trained in specialized institutes. There are over 700 of these. They also train scholars in basic research. Only about 10 percent of Soviet students in advanced education attend the universities. The rest attend the institutes.

In December 1963 Vyacheslav Yelutin, minister of higher and secondary special education in the U.S.S.R., reported:

"At the present time there are more than 3 million students in higher educational institutions. The schools of higher learning will develop further in keeping with progress in science and technology. By 1970 the number of students will reach 4.7 million—that is, 1.4 times as many students in comparison with 1963. By 1980 there will be 2.5 times as many students in higher schools. This means the rate of training of high level specialists in the Soviet Union will exceed that of the United States even more than it does at present."

The 3,258,000 students enrolled in Soviet higher educational institutions in 1963 compared with 4,494,626 degree-credit students in the United States. (Yelutin questions this comparison; he told me he doubts that the first 2 years of undergraduate education in the United States should be classified as "higher education.") Of these enrollments, about 60 percent in the United States were full-time students, whereas only 40 percent were full time in the U.S.S.R. The Soviet plan for 1965, as delineated in a May 1963 order of Yelutin, called for an enrollment of 3,860,000. This projected an increase of 602,000 in only 2 years. However, only 1.6 million, or 41 percent, were expected to be full-time day students.

These increasing enrollments will require greater numbers of institutes and universities. During the years 1963–70, 23, new higher educational institutions are planned. Nineteen of these will be devoted to science and technology. Four will deal primarily with agriculture.

Because of the differences in structure between institutions of higher education in the U.S.S.R. and in the United States, it is impossible to compare precisely the number to whom degrees are granted.

Yelutin gave me the following breakdown of student enrollment by specialization:

Forty-two percent in "the humanities." Most of these are preparing to teach—including the teaching of science—in secondary schools.

Forty percent are preparing to become engineers and technical experts.

Ten percent specialize in agriculture.

Eight percent are in medicine. ("More than 80 percent of these are women.")

Yelutin conceded, "You are still ahead at the higher level in many areas. You are ahead in physics, chemistry, biology, and mathematics. Yes, you have more students in these areas. We are trying to catch up with you. But we are definitely ahead in engineers. We are now seeking to increase the number of students in the natural sciences, but we have solved the problem of engineers."

In the Soviet Union, higher education has generally consisted of 5 or more years of full-time study, culminating in a "diploma" (diplom) degree. However, in the current year curricula have been shortened in a number of fields, including teacher education. In 1963 a total of 332,500 diplomas were granted by Soviet higher institutions, compared with 316,000 in 1962. American first-level (bachelor's and first professional) degrees, of which 417,846 were awarded in 1962, are generally based upon 4 years of undergraduate education. In the United States a master's or other second-level degree is generally obtainable with 1 or 2 years of additional study. This degree is intermediate between the bachelor's and doctor's degree. The Soviet system has no similar intermediate degree.

In 1963–64 there were 196,700 professional and teaching staff members in Soviet higher educational institutions, including about 500 academicians (the highest academic rank) in various special fields, 6,700 holders of doctor's (doktor nauk) degrees, and 59,000 holders of candidates of science (kandidat nauk) degrees. These groups include about 34 percent of the total number of scientific research personnel in the country.

In the United States, Government service and college teaching are lowly paid professions in a relative sense, but this is not the case in the Soviet Union. The Supreme Soviet recently adopted a law, according to Izvestia, increasing salaries of elementary and secondary schoolteachers an average of 25 percent in 1964 and 1965. But teachers in the field of higher education in the Soviet Union have been extraordinarily well paid, again in a relative sense, for many years. These high rewards, plus the prized reward of relatively greater freedom of action than most officials and plant managers enjoy, help explain the tremendous motivation of Soviet students to achieve success in the world of Soviet scholarship.

There are three grades of teachers in the higher Soviet institutes and universities: assistants, a rank approximately equivalent to an American instructorship; the docents, who are roughly comparable to our assistant and associate professors; and professors, who normally hold the doctor's degree. (The Soviet doctorate is far more difficult to achieve than in the United States and thus is nowhere near as common; most achieve it only in middle age, with exceptions for the fields where scholarship flowers early, such as mathematics and physics.)

The highest academic honor in the Soviet Union is membership in one of the academies, and academy members are known and addressed as "Academicians." Fourteen of the republics have their own academies. There are special all-Soviet academies in medical science, pedagogy, agriculture, architecture, and other fields. Each academy elects its own membership. The most prestigious of them all is the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. Membership in the Academy of Sciences is the highest scientific honor that the Soviet Union can bestow, and it carries with a substantial stipend. Most academy members receive a professor's salary as well. They are the highest paid, most honored, and most independent professional men in the U.S.S.R. They conduct or supervise basic research in all areas of science, and they are currently credited with the extraordinary success of the Soviet Union in rocketry, space exploration, and related fields.

The Academy of Sciences runs the great research institutes. In these are concentrated most of the fundamental or theoretical research which in the United States is largely centered in our universities. The prestige of the 162 full members of the Soviet Academy of Sciences is at least comparable to that we bestow upon the president of Harvard or a Nobel Prize winner.

Our knowledge of how Soviet theoretical and applied scientific research are carried forward is not complete. But I think we can safely say that three bureaucracies carry on most research:

1. The Soviet Academy of Science and its reasearch institutes.

2. Universities and teaching institutes, with their research staffs.

3. Agencies of the various universities and ministries (e.g., for health, or the heavy industries), as well as institutes for various regions, with the laboratories and teaching institutes attached to them.

These three engage in some competition for personnel. However, in the monolithic society of the U.S.S.R. there is said to be even more competition for prestige. The lines of difference between basic or theoretical research, in which our universities specialize, and the applied research with which we identify the great laboratories of Bell Telephone and General Electric, for example—these lines are much more blurred and confused in the U.S.S.R. than in the United States.

Testimony in Support of the Freedom Commission Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following testimony given before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on May 14, 1965, by the Honorable William C. Doherty, former Ambassador to Jamaica. Experienced in both labor and foreign affairs, Mr. Doherty is well qualified to evaluate the need of our Nation for the Freedom Academy.

His testimony follows:

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM C. DOHERTY BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES ON H.R. 2379, MAY 14, 1965

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is William C. Doherty. I am appearing today as a private citizen to testify in support of the Freedom Commission Act. My background and experiences have led me to take a particular interest in the subject matter of this bill. For 21 years I was president of the National Association of Letter Carriers and I was active in both the AFL and later the AFL–CIO. I am at present a vice president emeritus of the latter organization. In addition I served from 1962 to 1964 as U.S. Ambassador to Jamaica. It was my honor to be the first American Ambassador to that nation after it received its independence from Britain. With this background in both labor and foreign affairs, I have had occasion to observe the methods employed by Communists both in this country and abroad in their attempts to undermine free institutions and turn legitimate movements and innocent individuals into instruments for furthering their totalitarian purposes.

As is well-known to the members of this committee, the Communists have over a period of 40 years developed and refined a number of political warfare techniques to a high level of effectiveness. These techniques are taught to Communists from all over the world in a very extensive network of political schools within the Communist countries. The graduates of these schools then return to their own countries to staff Communist Party organizations and Communist front groups. They know how to write propaganda and how to reproduce and distribute it. They know how to couch their propaganda so as to appeal to various interests and attitudes among the target population. They know how to utilize groups which have goals only partially compatible with communism in campaigns which actually further the overall Communist program. For example, Communists often succeed in enlisting pacifists and democratic social reformers in movements which are actually aimed more at discrediting free governments and promoting Communist totalitarianism than at the limited and laudable goals to which they superficially appear to be directed. Graduates of Communist political schools know how to organize groups, how to arrange demonstrations, and how to transmute a peaceful demonstration into forceful "mass action." They know how to use limited slogans to enlist peasants in guerilla operations actually under Communist control.

Given favorable social and political conditions, such trained political experts can be effective out of all proportion to their numbers. In stable societies, such conditions are absent, and Communist movements degenerate into pitiable cliques of cranks and misfits, as we have seen in the United States and several countries of Western Europe. In the developing nations, however, which are going through the wrenching revolutions set off by the Western impact and the resulting drive for modernization, institutions are not stable, large groups feel that their interests are unrepresented, masses of people are confused and despairing, and here the conditions for effective political action by Communists trained in the appropriate techniques are all too frequently present.

In the years since World War II, and particularly in recent months and weeks, we have seen how dangerous Communist political efforts can be to the cause of democracy and pluralistic development in general and to the national interests of the United States in particular. Communist guerrilla and political action brought Mao Tse-tung to power in China. Adroit and energetic political action allowed the Communists to seize control of the democratic revolution which overthrew Batista in Cuba. A few months ago a rather small number of Communists trained in Cuba and elsewhere came very close to maneuvering Zanzibar into the Communist bloc, and the danger is by no means eliminated today. Most recently, a fairly small number of Communist agents, taking advantage of a people deprived of political experience by 40 years of reactionary dictatorship, captured at least partial control of an initially democratic revolution in the Dominican Republic, making necessary the intervention of American troops to prevent the installation of a dictatorship of the left. I want to say at this point that I commend President Johnson for his forthright action in stabilizing the chaotic situation in the Dominican Republic. His administration is taking a strong stand against communism in the Caribbean, just as he is in Vietnam, where the slightest sign of irresolution on the part of the United States could endanger the whole of southeast Asia.

However, one cannot help but speculate as to what might have been done earlier to prevent situations such as those in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic from degenerating to the point that military action was required to stave off Communist threats. Had free men dedicated to the cause of democratic reform and development been as well organized, as energetic, and as well trained in basic political techniques as were the Communists, it would have been democratic groups which organized the peasantry in Vietnam, and it would have been democratic forces which emerged as the focal point of action from the confused situation in the Dominican Republic.

Clearly, the free world must take steps to give those devoted to democratic action the training needed to overcome the threat of Communist activity. Democrats must learn how to organize student groups, labor unions, womens' clubs, political parties, and all the other organizations basic to effective political action. They must also learn the operating techniques of the Communists, so that free men can anticipate what the Communists will do, and use democratic action to defeat the Communists when they do begin to move.

The Freedom Academy offers one promising approach to this problem of training cadres for democratic political action. It would give a full-time staff the support needed to carry out research on Communist political techniques, on the curriculums of Communist political schools, and on the use made by local Communist parties of graduates of these schools. It would also allow the development of ideas and procedures for combating Communist subversion and building up the many free organizations required for a pluralistic democracy capable of carrying through true social reforms. The Freedom Academy could also instruct our diplomats, information experts, and aid advisers on Communist tactics in developing areas and on techniques which could be suggested to aid-receiving groups as probably effective in countering Communist challenges. Finally, the Academy could train members of democratic groups in other countries, be they farm groups, labor unions, political parties, government bureaucracies, or other organizations, in the political skills needed to effectively achieve democratic social goals and remain impervious to Communist infiltration.

We in the American labor movement have considerable experience in these problems. The International Department of the AFL–CIO constantly works in many ways to strengthen free, democratic labor unions throughout the world. Since 1962, the American Institute for Free Labor Development has been working in Latin America to strengthen free unions and to bring social progress directly to their members. This year the Afro-American Labor Center opened in New York to undertake a related program in the countries of Africa. I am convinced that our experience in the labor field shows that the type of research and training to be carried out by the proposed Freedom Academy will be very effective in building democratic institutions and opposing communism. Whereas our work is concerned with one specific type of institution, the Freedom Academy could operate on a broader basis and bring the benefits of democratic political training to a wider spectrum of organizations.

To look more closely at the relevant experience of the AIFLD, I should like to first describe its training program. Through local seminars in Latin America, through 3-month courses in resident centers in most capital cities, and through an additional course given at our school in Washington, D.C., young Latin American trade unionists are taught how to administer their unions, how to collect dues, how to prepare for responsible collective bargainging, how to detect Communist attempts at infiltration, and how to foil them should they occur. To date over 20,000 young unionists have passed through

one or another phase of this training. Throughout Latin America, these trainees are now moving into positions of increasing authority within their unions, often displacing previous Communist leadership in the process.

In addition to giving the trade union leaders a thorough grounding in democratic philosophy and skills, the AIFLD gives them a concrete social program designed to bring the Alliance for Progress directly to the workers so that their tangible needs can be filled. The AFL–CIO's member unions have earmarked $67 million for lending to union housing projects in Latin America. Representatives of AIFLD's social projects department assist Latin American unions in setting up credit unions, housing cooperatives, workers' banks, and smaller self-help projects of community development. In rural areas, AIFLD experts help agrarian unions to bring knowledge of better farming techniques to their members, and to organize marketing and production co-ops to increase rural productivity and provide a better life for the peasant. When programs such as these begin operating, they provide benefits now that Communist agitators can only promise vaguely for the future, after a bloody and costly revolution. Taken together, we believe AIFLD's training and social programs offer an effective approach to building free labor institutions and in the process defeating Communist attempts at subversion.

I gather that many of these same approaches would be taught in the courses of the Freedom Academy, and on the basis of our experience in the international field of free trade unionism, we feel such instruction will be of great benefit to the cause of freedom. It is for this reason that I support the bill now under consideration.

I would like at this point to conclude by citing a few specific lessons which we have learned from our oversea labor work, and which I am sure will be beneficial to the successful operation of the Freedom Academy.

First, the Academy must broadly represent all the main strands within the American political consensus. It can succeed only if it has the full support of most major interest groups, most philosophical viewpoints, and both major parties. If it becomes the exclusive preserve of one clique, or one viewpoint, it will never get the support needed to survive. In the case of the AIFLD, its great strength is that it is supported not only by labor, but also by business; not only by liberals, but by virtually the whole sweep of U.S. political opinion, and by both Republicans and Democrats. The same must be true of the Freedom Academy. Without the full confidence of the public as a whole, the effort would be bound to fail. I hope that in drafting the bill, machinery will be provided which will be sure to reflect the views of all major groups within the American consensus.

Second, in training foreigners, the Academy should work through existing democratic organizations in developing areas. To oppose communism, people must have an alternative program to which they are committed as strongly as Communists are to Marxism. The foreign students selected should not be isolated individuals, or professional anti-Communists, but should be active members of democratic political parties, labor unions, youth groups, and other civic organizations. It is only by working through the existing democratic union movement in Latin America, which is committed to a program of social progress, that the AIFLD and the AFL–CIO has had any real effectiveness. I feel sure the same principle would apply to the Freedom Academy.

Third, the Academy should work to engage the U.S. private sector as much as possible in its efforts. This is because private efforts are less suspect abroad than the work of a government agency. Such official agencies obviously are supposed to serve the immediate foreign-policy interests of the state, whereas private groups can be presumed to have wider latitude. The Academy should train American private citizens in how to set up union-to-union, farmer-to-farmer, university-to-university and similar private relationships. The knowledge of Communist techniques and democratic political skills could best be transmitted from the Academy, to private U.S. groups, to their counterparts abroad, rather than directly from our Government to foreign nationals. This private, institution-to-institution approach has proved its merit in the experiences of the AIFLD, AFL–CIO, Credit Union International, 4–H, and other private groups.

Finally, the graduates of the Academy must promote a philosophy of social reform and economic progress in keeping with our democratic ideals. The groups chosen must be forces for progress, with programs directly attacking real social ills. While political skills and techniques are important, it is issues and program and philosophy which win political campaigns, whether in a U.S. election or in a confused cold-war situation abroad. Political gimmicks will not win the cold war. If the policy content of a group's program is not appealing, all the finely honed techniques and strategems in the world cannot help it to match the social appeals of the Communists to a desperate population. The real reason why American labor's efforts abroad have been successful is that we stand for a better deal for the worker. The political skills taught in our schools, and which will be taught in the Freedom Academy, are of value only as mechanisms to put across our social message. It is the content, not the form of politics, that counts.

I am confident that if these maxims are followed, the proposed Freedom Academy will make a great contribution to the cause of democracy throughout the world. It is this potential that led me to come here today to support the bill, and I want to thank the committee very sincerely for having given me the opportunity to come here and express my views before such a distinguished and influential forum.

Federal Support for Medical Schools, Medical Complexes, and Medical Libraries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to insert in the RECORD a recent letter I received from Dr. Robert B. Howard, dean of the College of Medical Sciences of the University of Minnesota. The Medical School of the University of Minnesota is one of the finest institutions of its kind in the United States and has developed many of the outstanding medical techniques used in the world today.

The administrative committee of the college recently discussed three bills now pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. They are: H.R. 3141, relating to direct support of medical schools; H.R. 3140, relating to the establishment of regional medical complexes; and H.R. 3142, relating to support for medical libraries.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the views of this committee of the medical school should be seriously considered by the Members of the House. Therefore, I am pleased to include Dr. Howard's letter in the RECORD:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
COLLEGE OF MEDICAL SCIENCES,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 1, 1965.

Hon. CLARK MACGREGOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MACGREGOR: The administrative committee of the College of Medical Sciences of the University of Minnesota has carefully reviewed three proposed bills which would vitally affect medical education. H.R. 3141 would provide direct support of medical schools. H.R. 3140 proposes the establishment of regional medical complexes for research, training, and demonstration of patient care in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases. H.R. 3142 would provide support for medical libraries.

We enthusiastically endorse and urge your active support of H.R. 3141 and H.R. 3142. H.R. 3141 is particularly urgent in view of the well-known needs of the Nation's medical schools including the University of Minnesota. This urgency is increased manyfold by the likelihood of passage of some form of H.R. 3140, which would produce unparalleled demands for medical manpower. If any sort of regional medical complexes are to be established as envisioned in H.R. 3140, passage of H.R. 3141 is an absolute essential for attempting to meet the consequent manpower needs. We can only wish, in retrospect, that a bill like H.R. 3141 had been adopted several years ago in order that a lag phase of serious proportions with respect to medical manpower could have been averted.

Our administrative committee gave close attention to the details of H.R. 3140. The committee recognizes that such a proposed bill would have a profound impact on medical education and the entire practice of medicine. The expansion of research and of medical education made possible under this proposal would increase medical knowledge and facilitate the utilization of medical knowledge already at hand to reduce suffering and death from cancer, heart disease, stroke, and other major diseases. Naturally, we support the objectives of this bill, but we do have a number of areas of concern with respect to the proposal as it stands. We believe that it can be strengthened and made more workable by appropriate changes, and we are making certain observations and recommendations for your thoughtful consideration.

The University of Minnesota Medical School has been operating as a part of a "regional medical complex" for many years. It has had an effective program of continuing or post-graduate education directed at physicians especially in the area including Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, eastern Montana, northern Iowa, and western Wisconsin. The Mayo Graduate School of Medicine in Rochester (formerly the Mayo Foundation) has served as an integral part of this complex.

The program established by the Minnesota Department of Health in 1956 of a Minnesota State plan for hospitals, public health centers, and related medical facilities has defined and facilitated the participation of the University of Minnesota Medical Center in an organized regional program of referral, consultation, and provision of medical services, in order words, in a "regional medical complex." According to the plan, the university medical center constitutes the base hospital for the State. The plan further

provides the basis for a professional relationships for consultation and referral of patients between community and regional hospitals and between regional hospitals and the medical center. On the basis of our experience, we believe that a similar arrangement could be made to establish a regional medical complex for treatment of heart disease, cancer, stroke and other diseases in the broader interstate area served by the university medical school.

Inherent in the proposal to establish regional medical complexes in such a way that they must include a medical school or schools is the recognition of the fact that medical scientists and the most advanced medical facilities in the United States are located mainly at medical schools. Although more facilities might be built in a relatively few years, a significant increase in the supply of medical educators and medical scientists would require a much longer period of time. The building of new research facilities and the institution of intensive new programs which would remove an appreciable number of medical scientists from the faculties of the established medical schools would disrupt the entire program of medical education and research which we now have and thereby would defeat the purposes of the proposed legislation. Therefore, optimal utilization of our manpower in medical education and research in order to achieve the desired goals depends, in part, on the organization of the proposed new program.

The administrative committee of the College of Medical Sciences of the University of Minnesota makes the following recommendations regarding a program which would make the most effective use of manpower and facilities:

1. Medical schools have been the foundation for the advances of medical sciences and for the preparation of physicians to practice all phases of medical care. Research in medical schools has been broadly based, not sharply categorized. The interplay of ideas between the various fields of interest, both basic and clinical, has contributed significantly to these advances. Relationships between fields or specialists which may produce the most significant new discoveries are not predictable. Therefore the continuing association of scientific minds from across the broad range of medical sciences to allow free exchange of ideas constitutes the optimal environment for progress in medical research.

If the regional medical complexes are to foster and assure the greatest possible advances, they should provide support for research on a broad basis, not on a narrow categorical basis. Each medical center (or combination of centers) receiving a grant as the basic unit of a regional medical complex should have support for research, medical education, and exemplary medical care for heart disease, cancer, stroke and the other major diseases supported under this title, not just one such area.

2. Medical education to undergraduate physicians, graduate physicians, physicians in practice returning for continuing medical education and paramedical personnel should be conducted primarily at the University medical center in order to provide for the most efficient utilization of the medical faculty. The critical shortage in medical personnel is in the number of medical scientists available for teaching and research. Efficient utilization of faculty time is a paramount consideration if the greatest possible effects are to be obtained from this program. To the extent that the proposed legislation envisions our faculty members traveling about the region to various hospitals and stations we are concerned that it would make for inefficient utilization of manpower already seriously limited. Extension of knowledge into the community should rather, come about through he professional services rendered by medical students and other health personnel graduating from such an educational program and physicians returning for continuation education.

3. Continuation education of the physician in practice should become a major aspect of the proposed educational program. The legislation should support expansion of the Department of Continuation medical education into a program of clinical education for the physician returning to the medical center for short periods of intensive training as well as through the short courses which it has conducted for many years. This should include a system of stipends for physicians returning to the medical center for study.

4. It is imperative that the program so envisioned "accomplish the desired ends without interfering with the patterns or methods of financing of patient care or professional practice (sec. 900C)." Medical care must remain primarily under the direction of the local physician who will be assisted in maintaining his competence through this program of continuing education. The legislation should provide ample opportunities for and, indeed, require consultation between those responsible for administration of the regional medical complexes and the physicians practicing in the region.

5. The legislation should include provision of support for the medical and hospital care of patients needed for clinical research programs or organized teaching programs. This would make both the research and the teaching more productive.

The passage of H.R. 3140, with suitable modifications, is supported by the administrative committee of the University of Minnesota College of Medical Sciences as a means not only of extending existing programs but also as a means of developing a more adequate system for medical research and training and for more rapid application of new methods of diagnosis and therapy in medical practice.

We invite your careful consideration of these recommendations. We are continuing our intensive study of this proposed legislation, and we shall subsequently present to you further and more specific suggestions.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT B. HOWARD, M.D.,
Dean.

Operation Deathtrap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a public service program which has gained wide attention, and praise, in the 27th District of California.

It is called Operation Deathtrap and it was born nearly 15 years ago as a result of appalling and recurring press reports concerning numerous deaths by suffocation of small youngsters who found themselves trapped while playing inside carelessly abandoned refrigerators or iceboxes.

Operation Deathtrap is a voluntary round-up of such carelessly stored chests-of-death performed free of charge by a civic-minded trade league, the San Fernando Valley Refuse Removal Association. The program has now become an around-the-clock, around-the-calendar collection of these lethal boxes performed at the expense of the refuse collectors themselves as their contribution to the health, welfare and safety of their community.

Since the program was started, hundreds of thousands of persons have moved to the San Fernando Valley. Current population figures have topped the million mark, and if the Valley had status as a city, it would be the seventh largest in our Nation. Despite this great population growth, not one valley child has lost his life in this way during the lifetime of Operation Deathtrap. It is my sincere prayer and trust that no valley child will lose his life in such a manner. If we are granted this good fortune, it will be in large measure due to the unselfish and civic-minded effort on the part of these fine men who are members of the association.

Operation Deathtrap was conceived by Will Chappel, San Fernando Valley civic leader and a public relations counsel, supported by Chief of Police William H. Parker and his valley command, and activated by the refuse removal operators. Working as a team, they have effected the removal of close to 1,000 of these derelict contraptions from garages, backyards, vacant lots, and other unguarded areas used by small children as playgrounds.

Their combined efforts have brought much favorable publicity to the city of Los Angeles and particularly to the San Fernando Valley. But, more important, I commend these citizens to you because of the safety legislation their efforts have inspired on the Federal, State, and city levels regulating and enforcing installations of safety devices in the manufacture of refrigerators, such as snap locks which can be opened from the inside of such appliances.

Mr. Speaker, I feel deeply and conscientiously that such a dedicated effort in my congressional district cannot go unacclaimed for long, and I respectfully submit it to you and my colleagues in this House for the recognition it so richly deserves.

Basic Combat Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on April 8 I included in the RECORD a report on the conditions of Army basic combat training. This is a relevant issue when we speak of the need for reforming our military draft system, to make it more equitable and also more worthwhile from a military point of view.

I asked the Department of the Army for its comments on this report. I am pleased to learn that basic combat training, according to Lt. Gen. J. L. Richardson, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, has undergone some fundamental im-

provement. For the information of Members, I include General Richardson's letter to me, dated May 14, 1965, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1965.

Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALPERN: This is in reply to your April 9, 1965, letter concerning basic combat training conducted by the Department of the Army.

In September 1963, the Secretary of the Army directed the then Under Secretary, Mr. Stephen Ailes, to undertake a broad survey of basic combat training to ascertain what the Army basic combat training currently contained, what changes were in progress or being planned, and what remained to be done to improve our overall basic combat training. As a result of this survey, it was determined the principal criticism of the program stemmed from the fact that it had too low a priority. It was felt the Army could only gain if more effort was devoted to recruit training, to staffing Army training centers with the right number and kind of trainers, and to give the participants in the program the recognition they deserved.

All of the recommendations have been or are in the process of being implemented. The majority of the deficiencies concerning basic combat training noted by the author of the report were likewise noted by Mr. Ailes and have been subsequently or are in the process of being corrected.

Department of the Army has completed a comprehensive revision of the individual training program. It not only revised the curriculum, but also a clear statement of objectives and goals for each aspect of the program was established. The revised program reduced lecture time, and substantially increased the time devoted to drills and ceremonies, physical training, marches and bivouacs. The training program has been restricted to the fundamental instruction considered necessary. It is not considered desirable or necessary to lengthen basic combat training but it is pointed out that normally Army recruits do go on to advanced individual training or to school before they are assigned to units. Basic combat training accounts for about half of the entire recruit training time. Nonessential training and activities have been eliminated from the training program.

Initial processing reduces the requirement for interruptions during the training period. Medical checks, personal processing, security applications, and other administrative checks are made at the U.S. Army reception stations. This reduces the interruptions that develop during the training cycle. Department of the Army has authorized accelerated advancement to the grade of private, E-2, of up to 20 percent of the personnel who successfully complete basic combat training with a new individual proficiency test being used as a guide in selecting the deserving graduates.

The Army has also taken action to improve the quantity as well as the quality of cadre personnel assigned to U.S. Army training centers. Highly qualified noncommissioned officers drawing proficiency pay (superior performance) are being selected for assignment to train new recruits. The objective is to establish an elite group of trainers as Army drill sergeants. These sergeants attend a 5-week formal drill sergeant school which prepares them for their training duties.

A new standard organization has been developed for the basic combat training activities. This organization authorizes 3 noncommissioned officer trainers with each training platoon of approximately 50 trainees. This gives a ratio of 17 trainees to 1 drill sergeant. This increase in cadre personnel has improved the overall training and places more experienced trainers with the recruits. All facets of the organization have been analyzed to insure that the best possible structure was developed to handle the mission.

I believe that the Army's basic combat training activities have been enhanced by recent changes, and that they are such that we can be proud of the program. Your interest in this matter is greatly appreciated. Please let me know any time I can be of assistance.

Sincerely yours,
J. L. RICHARDSON,
Lieutenant General, GS,
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel.

Compassion Versus Hardness of Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Right Reverend William F. Creighton:

COMPASSION VERSUS HARDNESS OF HEART

(Address given by the Right Reverend William F. Creighton, D.D., Episcopal bishop of the diocese of Washington, at the annual American Jewish Committee luncheon, May 17, 1965)

I'm going to speak this noon about compassion versus hardness of heart.

Through all the struggle for civil rights and for human freedom a great variety of principles have been considered. There has been the consideration of what is sometimes called simple justice, but which always proves to be not very simple at all. It involves us in the weighing of law against lawlessness, but also in the weighing of higher laws against lower laws, and in decisions that must ultimately be the decisions of conscience.

There are always moral considerations, the conflict between good and evil. There are deeply felt religious convictions. There are the considerations of patriotism, of our national purpose, of the directions in which we as a nation should go. Always, of course, there have been political considerations, and economic considerations. What will the ultimate conclusion be, or what will it cost, if I take this position or that.

But beneath them all and controlling them all there is the conflict between compassion and hardness of heart.

It's a commentary upon the sickness of our times that a compassionate man is so often held up as an object of scorn. Acts of compassion, compassion for neglected people who have been deprived of their rights, have sometimes been ridiculed and sometimes have been given evil names. One very prominent American not many months ago described men of compassion as bleeding hearts, a phrase obviously intended as an expression of obliquity and insult. Apart from being, from a Christian point of view, somewhat blasphemous, this description, which was all the more expressive because it came out spontaneously in an interview, is all too typical. Anyone whose heart bleeds for those less fortunate than himself is to be scorned as soft, or unsound, or dangerous.

I would wish rather to go on record as saying that the only chance we have of providing equal justice for all of our citizens, of solving our social problems or our racial problems, problems of poverty, or unequal opportunity in employment and housing and education, lies with those whose hearts do bleed for every human suffering, at every human need, at every injustice suffered by a human person. We're not going to be the Nation or the people we are capable of being until the men whose hearts bleed outnumber those whose hearts are hard.

Senator BYRD, whose position has such influence over our destinies in this city, was quoted recently as saying something that appeared to equate poverty with crime. According to the newspapers he said that poor people dislike being investigated just as criminals do. If this is really what he said this defines the issue with regard to the problems of poverty and crime, and of all human suffering and need. It is the issue between compassion and hardness of heart. It's a crime to be poor, and poverty and crime and all human need and lostness and incapacity are not to be dealt with out of sympathy for the persons involved. They are to be dealt with always objectively, to be investigated and dealt with only if there is no possible way to avoid it. This is as cruel and as lacking in compassion as it would be to tell a man suffering from arthritis that all he has to do to be completely well is to go out in the garden and turn cart wheels. If Senator BYRD's heart, or the hearts of men of whom he is typical, ever bleed even a little bit for children who are neglected and hungry and educationally and culturally disadvantaged, or for mothers who cannot find the counsel they seek in a fat, selfish and hard-hearted society, or for fathers who leave their families rather than deprive them by their presence, then we should begin to have a decent city.

All sorts of angry motives have been ascribed to those of us who went to Selma to help out our Negro brothers who have been unable to vote or to live full lives of creative work or of social cultural opportunity. This is not a matter of pride or of self-satisfaction. It's no pleasure to have a bleeding heart, it hurts a great deal more than it does to have a hard heart. To be in a place like Selma, in our Nation, in the 20th century, and to see kind, good, warmhearted Negro families constricted in a ghetto, an area in which the paved streets end, surrounded by troopers with cars parked bumper-to-bumper, with clubs and tear gas, allowing no more than three people out at a time, to see all this just because men like us wish to be free, makes one's heart bleed, bleed until one can feel the blood running down inside. What kind of a man is it, who after having merely looked at the television pictures of a bridge at Selma would not feel his heart bleed?

There are considerations of human justice. The ultimate issues, many of them will be settled in the courts. Let's remember again, however, that justice is determined and interpreted and enforced by human persons with regard to human persons. And let's remember that there are varieties of laws. The fighters for freedom this last year have stood clearly on the principle of nonviolence against endless provocation. And over and over again in bombings, in beating, in murders, in incitements the hard of heart have relied on violence. And all too often in doing this they have claimed the support of law. Most recently we have seen the ugly spectacle of incitement and vicious racism expressed by a judge and a lawyer in a courtroom in Alabama in the case of the Klan member on trial for the murder of Mrs. Liuzzo.

There are all kinds of laws and there are degrees of justice. There always remain the difficult questions of conscience with regard to civil disobedience. And this is an area in

which I personally should be fearful to have any but a man of compassion trespass. It is no area into which a hardhearted man or a man of violence is safe.

What do you do if you are driving along a highway and come to a lake and hear from the lake screams for help and see a child drifting away from a capsized boat? You rush to the lake, throwing off your coat, and prepare to dive in and swim out to rescue the child. But then you see a sign at the edge of the water signed by the sheriff, and the sign says, "Swimming in this lake is prohibited."

Do you put on your coat and go back to the car? Or do you see above the sheriff's sign a much, much larger sign that says, "Thou shalt love they neighbor as thyself" or "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me"?

Yes, there are all sorts of laws and all sorts of ways to interpret them, and God grant that the day may come when all the signs will be put, and all the interpretation of the signs, will be done by men of compassion, by men whose hearts bleed those whose need is great. Only then will the very difficult problem of civil disobedience be concluded. So long as hardness of heart and compassion remain in conflict the problems of conscience are going to continue.

We people who have been involved in the struggle for human freedom and or civil rights can take no pride in it, and certainly no one who went to Selma is a hero. The real heroes are the Negroes who at such cost have in city after city sought to become full responsible members of a free society.

There is the question of justice, of the conflict between higher law and lesser law. There is even more deeply the moral conflict between good and evil. Who dares to say, and on what principles of morality, that it is a good or a righteous thing to say to a man that because of his skin color he cannot vote, or that he cannot live in a decent house, or that he cannot travel through our land, eating and sleeping decently in the accommodations that are provided for travelers, that he cannot have a good education or the advantages that other enjoy. Who dares to say that this is morally good?

It is an evil thing from the point of view of every moral consideration, and most certainly from the point of view of our whole religious tradition. The moral issues are quite clear cut, and on one side stand men of compassion and on the other stands hardness of heart. If this sounds smug or proud, I certainly don't mean it that way. Could anyone see American citizens seeking day after day the right to register to vote, and being turned away by dishonest means, calling names so that they could not be heard, requiring tests that college professors might fail, and say that this is morally good? Or can any decent person fail to feel his heart bleed because of this? Could anyone have seen the Negro people of Selma jammed by the troopers into a concentrated area, gathering in the Brown's Chapel Church, singing freedom songs and hymns, praying in memory of Jim Reeb who was beaten to death only because he cared, and then say that there is no moral issue here?

Let's not be proud because we affirm the good against the evil, because we are on the side of moral decency. We had better admit, all of us, that we have not been very strongly on the side of morality. In the civil rights issue most of us are Johnny-come-latelies, who have only recently waked up, and we haven't done much. Making a trip to Selma, or marching in a parade may be a good gesture, but it doesn't prove much.

We had better be satisfied to say that no matter where we stand we do know that until the moral conscience of our people develops a great deal more and becomes overwhelming, and until many more hearts bleed than are bleeding today, the forces of evil are going to continue free to bomb churches, to send out murder squads to shoot women, to refuse the right to vote, the right to equal employment, to equal housing, to equal education, to a full life. This is a moral issue, and none of us has been very moral about it. We've been all too willing to condone and excuse evil.

And then it is a deeply religious and a theological issue. For us it is not possible to say that the question of human freedom is essentially a political question, or an economic one, or a legal one; and that politics and economics and law are not the concerns of religion. It's impossible to say this, because if religion has any meaning at all it has meaning in the lives of people, all people and in every aspect of their lives. We believe very sincerely in the separation of church and state, but we don't believe at all in the separation of religion and life. And in the civil rights struggle lives are at stake, the lives of persons whom God loves, and whom He has commanded us to love. It is out of our sense of the judgment of God and the love of God that our compassion grows. Our hearts might bleed as pure humanitarians or as decent people, but because we are religious people our concern is greater than that of others, and no one should be surprised that religious people, religious groups, and religious leaders have taken a position of leadership in the fight for freedom.

Finally I would come back home. I've had my share of hate letters this winter, stacks of them, many of them anonymous and some too vicious and profane to be answered. Many others have been from sincerely troubled people who have wondered why all this can't just go away so that no one need be disturbed and no hearts need bleed. To be faced with a choice between compassion and hardness of heart is terribly difficult for many of our fellows who have never really chosen before or taken a stand, and who are embarrassed that others have. Those letters I've tried to answer courteously and with sympathy and in return I've often had courteous and understanding replies.

A very common refrain in the letters is the question, "Why don't you do something about Washington where poverty is a national disgrace and where crime abounds? Why should people like you go off to Selma when your own city is a mess?"

And I've answered in two ways. First by saying that it has been the very people who have been most concerned here and who are working hardest to make our city a better place who have been concerned in the fight for social justice everywhere. It's the very people I have known here who have been fighting for a decent welfare program, for better education and better schools, for job opportunities and housing opportunities for Negroes and for all disadvantaged people, who went to Selma and who have felt their hearts bleeding for the poor and the hurt and the needy everywhere. These are the concerned people we find engaged in every sort of effort for human betterment.

And then I have said that far from resenting people elsewhere being concerned about our needs here, that I would do everything in the world to encourage such concern, honest concern that does not exaggerate our social problems, but which does care for the capital city of our Nation. We're dependent upon Congress and upon congressional committees and what happens here depends upon how much Senators and Representatives from all of our States care what happens here. If people such as some of those who have written me, unhappy because my heart bleeds for Alabama, would only bleed a little bit for our people here who still live in slums, who go to school in basements, who go hungry in the streets and fall so easily into crime because they do, then the light would begin to grow. If they would bring pressure on their Representatives in Washington, not to investigate poverty but to seek to end it, not to build aquariums and plant flowers while children go hungry, or not until they are fed, than we would be grateful indeed.

In the meantime I agree completely that we cannot go off to Selma or somewhere else to witness to our conscientious concerns, and do nothing about our needs here. It's all too easy to leave our comparative comfort here and go to Selma, through the police lines into the ghetto, to march thankfully to Dallas County courthouse and place a wreath in memory of James Reebs, and then fly back here to watch it all on TV. It's also too easy to live here in a comfortable neighborhood.

Even this, however, is a step in the right direction. It's a step in the right direction when we begin to know compassion, when we find that we can no longer put this out of our mind, when our consciences will not let us rest, when we discover that we can no longer be comfortable while others are in distress, when we begin to see poverty not as a crime committed by anyone other than ourselves who have permitted the social situations that breed it; when we can see that the school dropouts have dropped out because they know we'll never give them a break, so what's the use; when we see a mother wandering the streets seeking help for her children and dying in the process of rejection, as a woman rejected by us. When we begin to feel this and feel our hearts bleeding because of all of this, then our very discomfort may be the first step toward healing.

One can only wish that people like the mayor of Selma when they come to the capital of our Nation, instead of seeking whatever they seek in the early hour of the morning, would find compassion in their hearts. One can only wish and pray that men in positions of responsibility instead of making fun of bleeding hearts, could find their own hearts bleeding just a little bit; one can only hope and pray that people everywhere may join in the battle with hardness of heart until we become a decent people who may not even see the sign that says no swimming, if they see someone struggling for life who cries for their help.

At the very end I'll add a note of really heartfelt optimism. The forces of compassion are growing and higher laws are winning over lower laws, goodness is winning over evil, morality is stronger than immorality. We can be thankful, very thankful, that we have a President who is a sincerely compassionate man, who does care, and who is also courageous and wise. We can be thankful that a voting rights bill is surely going to pass, that forces of decency are emerging all over, in the business community of Alabama, in a coalition of conscience here in Washington, in a strong stand by decent men in Congress, in the leadership of our religious communities. Much good has come of Selma, much good. Even Governor Wallace is reported to have said recently in Selma that the day will come when Negroes will be free and will have a part in government. Of course they will, and this is no surprise to anyone but to Governor Wallace and his kind. A better day is coming; but it is coming only because compassion is stronger than hardness of heart.

More people will be beaten, surely, more churches will be bombed, more children will grow up without a fair chance in life, and people like us will get thousands more letters filled with hatred, before the struggle is over. But it will be over, in the Grace of God, and we should not be at all proud to have some part in it. We should be thankful that we've had an opportunity to add our lives to those of others who care deeply, and who know what it is to feel their hearts bleeding within them.

The Poor Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, there appeared recently in the Columbia University Forum an article by Joseph Froomkin entitled "The Poor Program." I am asking permission to have it included in the RECORD because of its general interest. The article follows:

THE POOR PROGRAM

(By Joseph Froomkin)

The United States has declared war against poverty. Unfortunately, the weapons chosen may not be suited to the task; what is more, it is not at all clear just who or what the enemy is. In "Le Diable et le Bon Dieu," Jean-Paul Sartre wrote flippantly that there are two kinds of poor: those that are poor together, who accept their poverty, and those that are poor alone, who are frustrated because they are not rich. The war on poverty mirrors this confusion: some of its programs may help the poor to stick together; others seem designed to create frustrated rich people.

Most of us feel instinctively that poverty in the midst of abundance is wrong; yet we are not agreed on what to do about poverty. President Johnson has called for its elimination. Other voices have been raised in support of a more modest aim: to enable the poor—especially the children of the poor—to benefit more fully from the opportunities of American society.

The rhetoric of poverty is complicated in the first place by the difficulty of defining the poor. When Franklin Delano Roosevelt saw two-fifths of the Nation badly housed, badly clothed, and badly fed, he excluded as too well off many families that would be considered poor today.

Currently, an annual income of about $3,000 is commonly accepted as the dividing line that defines roughly 9 million out of 45 million American families as poor. Finer distinctions—between the really poor and those living in the twilight of deprivation—are rarely made. Yet there are 2 million families with incomes under $1,000, most of which are or should be on welfare; nearly 3 million families with incomes between $1,000 and $2,000 that suffer only slightly less deprivation; and 4 million families with incomes between $2,000 and $3,000 that hover on the borderline.

Two other ways of defining poverty may give a truer picture of who the poor are. The majority of poor families fall into one or more of three following categories: They are elderly, they are members of broken families, or they are unemployed. One-third of the heads of poor families are 65 years of age or older; one-third are headed by a female because the father is absent; one-fourth have no wage earners, and roughly one-half are unemployed.

Poverty is more prevalent in rural areas than it is in cities. One-fourth of all families in nonurban areas have incomes of less than $3,000 per year. The poor range from 13 percent of the total population in cities of over 1 million inhabitants to nearly 20 percent in our small towns. One out of five poor families is Negro. Since Negroes have more children than the average, roughly 25 percent of young children today grow up in poor homes.

As Michael Harrington has described it in "The Other America," American poverty is not the condition of starvation, but a state of deprivation or anomy. For the majority of the poor there is no relief in sight from a tedious life that denies them a taste of the fabled American standard of living. Furthermore, the condition of poverty itself dulls the ambition to rise above it, and robs the children of the poor of avenues of escape. The poor voices that frustration by behavior that is antisocial by middle-class standards. The beer can thrown from the window, and the garbage bag emptied into the tenement courtyard, represent the voiceless protest of the dispossessed, according to Charles Silberman.

By far the most radical goal of a war on poverty is the one most often professed. But eliminating poverty would require an enormous change in American social structure: the dramatic reduction of inequality between the poor and the very rich. It is foolhardy to hope that this can happen merely by talking about it, as this administration has done. The pattern of income distribution in this country has not changed much in the past 20 years. And although the United States, with Sweden and the United Kingdom, has one of the most egalitarian income-distribution patterns in the world today, disparities between income groups are nevertheless quite wide. The bottom fifth of our population receives 5 percent of the income; the top fifth roughly 42 percent; in other words, the average person at the top of the social ladder receives eight times as much income as the average person at the bottom. It is this inequality that produces two Americas.

The more obvious egalitarian policies have had little appeal. The elimination of income taxes for the poor (some persons with incomes of less than $3,000 a year must still pay income tax), higher taxes for the rich, ceilings on professional wages, prohibitions of stock options, and heavy taxes on profits traditionally encounter strong opposition. High rewards for success are very much a part of the American dream. Still, if we wanted to, we could probably pass legislation that would tend to reduce inequality in other ways. An increase in social security payments, for instance, would go a long way toward raising the incomes of families headed by persons over 65 years of age—one-third of the total. Or we might alter existing farm support programs to favor the rural poor. The farm program now in effect costs nearly $4 billion a year, roughly five times the sum allocated for the war against poverty. Yet it has been estimated that 80 percent of this sum is pocketed by the 20 percent of farmers who earn over $10,000 a year.

If our aim is to abolish poverty, we must design programs that go to the heart of American social problems, that encompass not just the poor, but also the rich; if the rich get to be poorer, possibly the poor will feel richer. By contrast, programs designed merely to relieve the poor must be measured with a different yardstick: how much they help the poor to help themselves. Legislation to help the poor is much more likely to address itself to this latter problem.

Alas, the Poverty Act—the popular name for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—does poorly by any standard of evaluation. Despite the brave new words, it breaks no new ground, leaning heavily upon old palliatives which have done little to alleviate poverty in the past. Although the act is designed to "make taxpayers out of relief recipients," its major program—work-training and work-study—supplement existing welfare approaches that have failed to solve basic problems. Only the community-action program, if properly directed, could conceivably open new avenues of progress to the poor.

Indeed many of the measures are not as good as existing programs. For instance, the Job Corps residential camps, which derive their inspiration from the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's, are similar to facilities provided for dropouts from slum schools under the Vocational Education Act. The major difference is that in most cases the Job Corps proposes to take slum residents to wide-open spaces and put them to work building play areas for people who can afford vacations. After a hard day's work, the youths will be given remedial courses. The program is supposed to impart to the trainees good work habits, vocational training, and basic education. No one can quarrel with these noble objectives. Yet it seems hardly likely that they will be realized. Work conditions in the wilderness are different from those in urban areas, where the occupations that promise employment for the undereducated are mostly in the service trades. Currently, only one urban Job Corps camp in Kilmer, N.J., has been started to train repairmen, mechanics, and kitchen and stockroom helpers. The skills required in such jobs are minimal, but the employees must be punctual, reliable, and able to work with a minimum of supervision. The work-team approach of the Job Corps is unlikely to foster these habits.

In the congressional hearings on the act, considerable stress was placed on the opportunity of trainees to acquire such skills as carpentry and plumbing in the course of building tourist cabins. Even if the camp jobs are carefully rotated, at the expense of efficiency, most graduates of the Job Corps will have difficulty finding work in their newly acquired specialties unless their training is integrated with the apprenticeship programs of craft unions. The low rate of trainee pay and the probable predominance of Negroes in this program are not likely to gain the support of union locals. Unions in Massachusetts have already protested against Opportunity Act programs on these grounds.

It would be cruel indeed to use the poor to do work for which we do not want to pay a going wage. Yet there is real danger that the work-training program may support precisely this thrifty Victorian attitude. For instance, the Park Association of New York recently urged that poverty funds be allocated to rehabilitate city parks. "Several thousand youths who are unemployed and out of school would be given work. Not only would they be gainfully employed, but they would also be kept off the streets and out of trouble," said Whitney Seymour, Jr., president of the Park Association. Such a proposal might improve parks, but not the lot of the youths, who would still be at loose ends after it ended and no better prepared for the job market than before they started.

Much of the work-study portion of the act is designed to help the deserving poor, to use Shaw's idiom—untroubled, churchgoing youths who may be prevented from continuing their education by a lack of funds. Again the objective is as laudable as the legislative provisions to accomplish it are unimaginative and heavyhanded. High school students will be given the opportunity to work for nonprofit organizations, so that they may contribute to their families finances. (The cost of this program to the taxpayer is zero in the case of high school students whose families are on relief: their earnings will be deducted from the relief check.) College students will be given the opportunity to supplement their budgets by working 15 hours a week at annual salaries of $500 for undergraduates and $1,000 for graduate students. This will help college students who do not come from hard core poor families, but for the ambitious sons of the truly poor $500 to $1,000 is not enough. Perhaps a special fund is needed to subsidize the talented members of deprived families who cannot qualify for a scholarship, to give

them the $2,500 to $3,000 it takes to attend college without working and in this way overcome the handicaps of the inadequate preparation they received in slum schools.

With some luck, the poor can be helped by the community-action programs, but only if these programs are properly run—that is, for the benefit of the poor. Unfortunately, there is mounting evidence that the administrators of the poverty program do not understand the mentality or the problems of the poor well enough. Saul Alinsky, a community organizer in Chicago best known for his work in the neighborhood around the stockyards, believes that the poor can be brought out of their somnolence only by alerting them to specific grievances: shortweights in stores, overcharging, the wrongdoings of slum landlords. Mr. Alinsky's tactics are direct and do not allow time for the slow processes of courtroom justice, political pressure, and similar socially acceptable methods prescribed by social workers. Even though direct action has proved effective, Mr. Alinsky's tactics are strongly resented by the establishment.

When Mobilization for Youth encouraged such activity in an attempt to bring a community in New York's lower East Side into the mainstream of American life, it ran into trouble with its government sponsors. A committee of mothers who demanded that a public school supply their children with textbooks in good condition was said to be harassing the city administration. Rent strikes aimed at forcing landlords to remove violations from buildings were dubbed rabble-rousing. Selective boycotts of neighborhood businesses to compel the hiring of neighborhood residents prompted complaints about unfair pressure. The agency was further undermined by charges that some of its personnel had radical backgrounds. Yet if a lethargic community is to be organized, former union organizers and radicals would seem best qualified for the job.

Since the Administrator of the Opportunity Act can only provide support for programs orginated locally, the success of community-action programs will depend upon the willingness of State and city governments to request funds for organizers who could help the poor demand their share of local services. In New York City this could mean more sanitation service to the poorer neighborhoods and consequently less garbage removal from richer ones. In California, support of rural farm laborers may reduce State aid to urban schools. In Chicago, property tax rates may have to increased to make sure that Negro schools are brought to the level of white schools. It is not very likely that a municipal or State government will demand Federal funds to finance what it sees as rebellion by its constituents. Hence effective community-action programs will probably not get off the ground.

It is heartless to disparage a program designed to help the poor unless better alternatives are available. In its present form, the bold, the new, and the different are not encouraged by the Opportunity Act. Yet the act could be reoriented to include more fruitful programs to combat poverty and alleviate the conditions of the poor. We should not spend money indiscriminately, and probably not along traditional lines. It seems to me that investment of poverty funds would be particularly promising in three areas: research, counseling, and education.

Under the work-training program, for example, funds could be redirected to research that would modernize the methods of matching applicants and jobs in public employment offices. Experiments in California have indicated that computers and the use of advanced information-retrieval techniques can both improve and speed up this process. Another experimental project in New Jersey has shown that intensive counseling of discouraged and undereducated workers can result in job placement at least as effectively as retraining them in skills for jobs that may never materialize.

More money should be spent to investigate ways of modernizing administrative practices. As things stand, social work is too often supplanted by paperwork. It should be possible, if the funds were made available, to mechanize a great deal of the administration of welfare, and by reducing the time spent filling out the various forms required by Federal, State, and city welfare legislation, give social workers a chance to do what they were trained for—that is, counseling the poor. (Instead, first reports of grants administered under the Opportunity Act tell of increased paperwork.)

Additional counseling would be more beneficial than the work-study program, for lack of motivation is probably a greater deterrent to continued education than lack of funds. Many youngsters from poor families and minority groups have the ability—if not the desire—to keep up with their studies, and they might well be prevented from dropping out of school or college by more vocational and psychological guidance.

In the long run, it is likely that only education can prevent the war against poverty from degenerating into another crutch of philanthropy. We should seriously consider beginning now a patient, long-range educational program to combat hereditary poverty, to remove the burden of underachievement the poor carry from infancy. The best psychological and sociological thought of our time indicates that the personalities of most adults are determined by their experiences in the first 3 or 4 years of life. Hence, a campaign to eliminate chronic underachievement must start very early, with the preschool children of those who are poor today.

If we can be patient enough to realize that only a small fraction of today's high school dropouts can be influenced by current programs, we may place more emphasis upon preschool education, which is being undertaken on an experimental basis in several cities. The Opportunity Act could extend similar program to more slum children and include even younger children than the 4-year-olds now reached. Perhaps the community-action program could establish neighborhood nurseries, one on each crowded slum block, that would begin to influence the environment of children aged 1 through 4.

For slightly older children, unorthodox teaching methods might help them reach high school less embittered and better prepared. The Economic Opportunity Act specifically forbids grants to boards of education, but this may be a blessings in disguise. By side-stepping conventional educators, it should be possible to establish tutorial programs outside the school system that use advanced automated techniques. In particular, the experiments of Rutgers Prof. O. K. Moore with teaching machines should receive serious attention. The teaching machine, with its infinite patience, seems ideally suited to removing the tension that so often exists between the slum child and the middle-class teacher.

Three-quarters of a billion dollars was appropriated to combat poverty in 1964; the 1965 budget set aside double that amount. It would be more than wasteful if this money were improperly channeled. However, we are not likely to reallocate funds to worth while purposes unless we can see through the myths surrounding the battle against poverty. The Opportunity Act cannot eliminate poverty. Nor, in the present political climate, will it actively help the poor to help themselves by collective action. But if we are realistic, the program can be redirected to enable the poor—a few now, more eventually—to participate more fully in the advantages of American life.

James Kay of Fullerton, Calif., Is Winner of the American Legion's National High School Oratorical Contest, Americanism Division, for 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, James Kay of Fullerton, Calif., is a very talented and dedicated young American citizen. He proved himself worthy of this high evaluation recently when he won the American Legion's National High School Oratorical Contest for 1965 in the Americanism division. His moving speech is, I believe, worthy of our attention, and I therefore include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

OUR NATIONAL POEM

(By James Kay, 2120 Domingo Road, Fullerton, Calif.)

"April is the cruelest month, breeding lilacs
out of the dead land,
Mixing memory and desire,
Stirring dull roots with spring rain.
Winter kept us warm,
Covering earth in forgetful snow, feeding
a little life
With dried tubers."

These words are to be found in T. S. Eliot's poem "Wasteland." Literary critic Babette Deutsch has claimed that in this poem, Eliot registers "a disgust for the spiritual pauperization of a society in which love tends to be as thoroughly mechanized as war. Eliot presents as the most appalling aspect of the modern world the existence of the millions who merely exist * * *."

However, another critic, Louis Untermeyer, has seen a completely different importance and significance in Eliot's poem. He states that anyone who is acquainted with certain works (which he names) will immediately recognize in the poem certain references to vegetation ceremonies.

So here we see that two intelligent critics, reading the same poem, draw varying conclusions based upon their varying interpretations. These critics do not necessarily contradict one another nor diametrically oppose each other. They merely draw different interpretations, and are impressed by various aspects of the "Wasteland."

You know, the Constitution of the United States is in many ways like a poem. Oh, we may have never though of it as poetry. It was just some words to be memorized from the appendix of our history books. But remember those familiar lines. "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." I suppose that as long as there are courts and cartoonists, politicans and historians, liberals and conservatives, such phrases as to "insure domestic Tranquillity" or to "promote the general Welfare" will be argued over, debated about, and interpreted and reinterpreted with the passing of men and years. And because many of the words in our Constitution embody broad concepts and principles, they are subject to many interpretations, as are all great pieces of literature. Here then is a document that is

a giant metaphor of man's attempt at self-government—the highest form of poetic expression—and demanding the highest form of human interpretation.

Thomas Jefferson was perhaps one of the greatest thinkers ever to occupy the White House. For years he had been teaching—nay, preaching—hat the Constitution was subject only to the narrowest, strictest, most literal interpretations. Unexpectedly, however, the French Emperor Napoleon offered to sell the Louisiana Territory to the United States for a few million dollars. Now, the Constitution did not specifically state that the Federal Government had any right to purchase territory from another nation. Should Thomas Jefferson risk his popularity and the next election to purchase land yet unexplored whose boundaries were uncharted? Should Thomas Jefferson go back on his statements and beliefs of the past regarding strict constitutional interpretations, just to buy Louisiana? Should he? Could he? Dare he?

Knowing that Napoleon might change his mind, knowing that time was short, knowing that the future of his Nation hung in the balance, Jefferson abandoned his ideas of strict interpretation and adopted the great concept of implied powers. Jefferson reasoned that the Constitution empowered the Federal Government to make war and treaties—therefore, it implies the power to acquire territory, because often that is a result of wars and treaties. By adopting a new interpretation, Jefferson more than doubled the size of America.

The eminent historian Charles A. Beard has given an economic interpretation to the Constitution. He claims that, "The Constitution was essentially an economic document based upon the concept that the fundamental private rights of property are * * * morally beyond the reach of popular majorities."

Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black, in interpreting the first amendment, has said of the clause barring the establishment of a state religion, "Its first and most immediate purpose rested on a belief that a union of government and religion tends to destroy government and degrade religion."

Here are but three interpretations of our national poem: The Constitution as seen by Jefferson, Historian Beard, and Justice Black. Why interpretations? Because as someone has said, a word is not a crystal, transparent and unchanged. It is a skin of a living thought, and may vary greatly in color and content according to the circumstances and time in which it is used. If we said that the Constitution was not subject to change, not subject to discussion, and not subject to interpretation, our society would crumble like dry spice cake, because examination of ideas and the interpretation of those ideas are necessary for a vigorous society. When we say that the Constitution is so sacrosanct—so sacred—it needs no reevaluating. When we say that there is only one interpretation to the Constitution and all others are null and void; we are destroying the very things upon which this society was founded: free discussion, free minds, and free men.

If the Founding Fathers had taken the attitude that the Constitution was perfect and needed no reevaluation and interpretation as years wore on, there would have been no Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments—no outlawing of slavery, and men and women of all races would not have the right to vote, much less be free. Only 100 years ago was citizenship even defined in the Constitution. Only 45 years ago could women universally cast ballots. And only last November were residents in the District of Columbia allowed to vote for President. The Constitution is never perfect.

"We are the hollow men—We are the stuffed men
Leaning together headpiece filled with straw. Alas!
Our dried voices, when we whisper together,
Are quiet and meaningless as wind in dry grass
Or rats' feet over broken glass in our dry cellar.
Shape without form, shade without color,
Paralyzed force, gesture without motion."

I don't know how you interpret those words of T. S. Eliot, or how you interpret the Constitution, but I do know that tonight I could have talked to you on many things about the Constitution we all know to be true. But when we pacify we rarely provoke. And sometimes, when we whisper together, our voices are meaningless and we are hollow.

Only when you and I question, examine, and interpret the Constitution for ourselves and to our times, as the Founding Fathers intended, do we become not hollow men, empty of intellectual vigor, but men and women worthy of our national poem, the U.S. Constitution.

May we always interpret it, various as those interpretations may be, so that our Constitution will not become hollow, empty, and meaningless; and greater still, so that we will not become hollow men, headpiece filled with straw. Let us be honest men, seeking an honest approach to a constitutional interpretation for the problems of our day.

Viet "War Against War"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. The past weekend academic critics of the President's strong stand in the face of Communist aggression in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic had a field day in the denunciation of U.S. actions.

Therefore it is necessary for us to reemphasize that the vast majority of the American public support the President in his present position.

An especially effective editorial appeared in Chicago's American, Friday, May 14, which I place in the RECORD at this point.

VIET "WAR AGAINST WAR"

President Johnson's televised address on foreign policy yesterday contained little that was new, but it restated a fact that will probably need restating many times: That the Communist aggression in Vietnam is just not going to succeed, however long it continues, and the sooner its leaders give it up the sooner they can start rebuilding their country toward a wholly reasonable goal or prosperity.

This appears to be the basis of American policy in southeast Asia, and we believe it's the strongest one possible. The United States is not trying to win a war by ordinary standards of annexing territory or imposing its will on a beaten government. Such a victory would be meaningless. Our goal is to provide a point that is very likely the most important in the world today: That war itself no longer works. Our battle in Vietnam is meant to establish that fact beyond doubt; to discredit war permanently as an instrument of policy.

This is what makes the cries of the surrender-now brigade so incomprehensible. In effect, the "peace" demonstrators are demanding that we prove before the world that war does work—that Communist powers can start new wars with fair confidence that we'll eventually let them win. It's no wonder the Chinese Reds quote them so approvingly; they've been saying the same thing.

Johnson also enlarged on his April proposal for a cooperative economic aid program for southeast Asia. He said the United States was "prepared to participate in and support an Asian development bank to help finance economic progress," and invited other industrialized nations—specifically including the Soviet Union—to take part.

This idea plainly is designed to do several things besides making peace look more attractive to North Vietnam. It offers Russia a way to increase its influence in southeast Asia at China's expense; it offers the Hanoi Government increased independence from the Chinese; and it would help spread our burden of responsibility for southeast Asia.

It would also, no doubt, cost huge amounts of money. But we doubt that there's any solution that wouldn't do that.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, we all know that a spirit of freedom is possessed by many men who live under tyranny. The flame never ceases to burn although its light may be dimmed to protect those who gather hope from the smallest ray of light.

This may somewhat describe the plight of freedom loving people in Poland. The spirit of freedom lives on though it may of necessity be dimmed. It is, nonetheless, a source of encouragement to those who continue to be hopeful that one day this land may once again be free.

On May 3, the people of Poland and Americans whose ancestors or who themselves may have come from that great land celebrate Constitution Day, on this date in 1791 the Polish Diet, or Parliament, ratified a new constitution which established constitutional democracy under cabinet government in Poland.

I was privileged to be in attendance at a ceremony sponsored by the Polish American Citizens Club in Bayonne, commemorating Polish Constitution Day. Speakers recalled from history the names of Poles who fought for freedom not only in their native land but on the side of freedom with the American colonists in 1776. All Americans continue to be inspired by the spirit and deeds of the legendary heroes of the American revolution which included Generals Pulaski and Kosciusko.

As we spoke of these great men, I was mindful that in our city were two Amer-

icans of Polish ancestry who were recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded for valor in combat in World War II—Stephen Gregg and Nicholas Oresko. The people of Bayonne are proud of these modern day heroes who yourselves are part of the great nation of American and grateful for the service they rendered our country.

We should be ever mindful that many thousands of Polish-Americans fought in World War II, in Korea and are now serving in our Armed Forces. They too follow the pathway of freedom blazed by Pulaski and Kosciusko.

We are mindful that thousands of free Poles fought with the allied forces in Europe.

We acknowledge the great contributions made by Poles in every profession to the building of America. We are aware of the role of the Polish American community to the civic, culture, business, and political activities of this country. We are inspired and encouraged by their great accomplishments.

Polish Constitution Day is their day to recall the sacrifices that have been made for freedom in Poland and to rededicate themselves to the proposition that one day all men will be free.

Norwegian Constitution Day for 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a century and one-half ago, on May 17, 1814, the Norwegian Constitution was signed at Eidsvold Mansion, north of Oslo. The Constitution was the work of a small group of patriots who were concerned lest Norway become the victim of great power intrigues toward the end of the Napoleonic wars. Ever since the end of the 14th century, Norway had been united with Denmark under one sovereign and ruled by Danish officials. In the Kiel Treaty of January 14, 1814, Denmark was forced to cede Norway to Sweden without Norway's consent. Norwegians immediately protested what they regarded as an infringement of their right to decide their own future. Even the Danish Royal Governor in Norway, Prince Christian Frederik, was incensed by the transaction.

Hoping to proclaim Norway an independent kingdom with himself as king, Prince Christian Frederik called a constitutional assembly to draw up a constitution for an independent Norway. In a little over a month, the work of the assembly was completed. The constitution that was proclaimed on May 17, 1814, was one of the most liberal of the time. It reflected the influence of British political traditions, as well as the principles embodied in the U.S. Declaration of Independence and the ideas of the French Revolution. Although Norway was subsequently forced to accept union with Sweden as a separate kingdom under the Swedish crown, the constitution was allowed to stand. Today, that constitution, with its guarantees for the rights and liberties of citizens, still provides the framework for the Government of Norway.

Norwegians are justly proud of the achievements of the men of Eidsvold, and of the content and longevity of their constitution. The 17th of May is a national holiday in Norway. It is celebrated not with displays of armed might as is customary in so many other nations on the occasion of national holidays. It is celebrated with parades composed largely of children dressed in colorful costumes. For Norwegians are a peace-loving people. They place their hopes for the future in their children. They believe that their children should learn to cherish principles and ideals embodied in the Norwegian Constitution.

Norwegian-Americans, descendants of almost a million Norwegians who have come to this country in the past century, also celebrate the 17th of May. And rightly so. For they well see that the principles enshrined in the Norwegian Constitution provide a strong link between their land of origin and their adopted country. A solid respect for fundamental human rights, a continuing concern for the well-being of fellow citizens, and a profound attachment to responsible government, are shared by Norwegians and Americans. It seems only natural that Norwegians and Americans should stand together in many international settings to further mutual goals of peace and progress throughout the world.

Today therefore, I would like not only to salute our Norwegian friends and my fellow citizens of Norwegian descent on a day that they both hold dear. I would also like to pay homage to the principles that are enshrined in both the Norwegian Constitution and the Constitution of the United States of America. I would like to celebrate the friendly relations of more than a century and one-half between Norway and the United States.

Performance: The Best Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, a number of bills have been introduced in this session of Congress which have as their intent the substantial reorganization of our present system for regulating the banking industry. While recognizing that the present system does have its limitations, as do all human institutions, and while recognizing the well meaning intent behind those proposals, I think that it would be well to step back, reflect a bit, and ask some hard questions about the need for such changes. I believe that we can all agree that few things are more important to the growth and overall health of our economy than a well-run banking industry regulated in the public interest. Moreover, the relationship of these factors to each other is all important. To illustrate that relationship, let us for a moment compare the economy to a modern internal combustion engine. Using such a metaphor, we can easily visualize finance as the fuel which that engine needs to keep running, the banking industry as the system which brings the fuel to the engine and regulation as the carburetor which controls the flow of the financial fuel to the engine. If the engine is to function smoothly, the carburetor must be carefully and finely adjusted to be in tune with the engine and to allow just the right amount of fuel to flow into the cylinders.

Now like the best engineered carburetors, the regulatory mechanism is a human creation; it is therefore not perfect and may require some readjustment from time to time when and if the engine starts to run a little rough. But such an adjustment must be undertaken only with the greatest of care. Too radical a turn of the screw in one direction, even by a hand with the best of motives guiding it, will result in flooding the engine. Conversely, a violent twist in the opposite direction will choke off the entire fuel supply. The result in both cases is the same: the engine dies. Now, the better the engine is running, the finer and less radical the adjustment need be. Right now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the engine of our economy is performing in a superior fashion. To me that indicates that our regulatory mechanism is in excellent shape and is well tuned to the economy. While conceding the possibility of a need for a very minor adjustment or two, in no case do I now see the need for a major overhaul of a perfectly good carburetor.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, those who suggest completely replacing the present carburetor with a new one are going to have to show us that the engine will run better than it now does because of it. That is the criterion. Yes, a new carburetor may of and in itself be more streamlined; it might be more efficient; it might even be atomic powered. But is that what we need for our particular engine at this particular time? Will the new carburetor be better tuned to the engine than the present one now is? Will the engine run better? Again, Mr. Speaker, considering how well the engine is now performing, unless these mechanical engineering experts have some very convincing laboratory test arguments, we can ill afford to give them a road test at this time.

Along these lines, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce into the RECORD, and urge every Member of Congress to read, an editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the American Banker and which is based on the remarks of the Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. James J. Saxon, made before the Banking and Currency Committee on which I have the privilege of serving. The editorial asks some hard questions of those who would

alter or replace our current regulatory mechanism; these questions, Mr. Speaker, should not go unanswered:

PERFORMANCE: THE BEST TEST

The bureau of proof lies heavy on those who propose changes in the system which regulates banking. It is up to the advocates of change to show that their proposals will make banking do a better job than it does now.

Yet this burden is rarely assumed by the innovationists. Their focus seems to be primarily on the improvement of the machinery, rather than on improvement of the product. They point to the clashing of gears, conflicts, and inefficiencies in the way the present system works. They avoid the question of whether that system, awkward as it appears to be, is doing a good job of serving the financial needs of the free-enterprise economy.

Certainly they can make a good case that inefficiencies and conflicts exist in the present system.

But that is not the main point.

It is the results that count—and the results are very good indeed.

Perhaps there is some tactical logic on the part of those who seek change in choosing not to come to grips with this point.

By the same token it is good tactics on the part of those who believe in the value changes in the banking regulatory structure to stress this point. It is more than good tactics—it is the exercise of responsibility on the part of those who believe in the value of the commercial banking system in its present form.

This point was made well by James J. Saxon, Comptroller of the Currency—no stranger to controversy himself—in his testimony last week before the House Banking and Currency Subcommittee which is looking into the desirability of changes in the present regulatory structure.

"The best test of the effectiveness of bank regulation is the performance of the banking industry itself," Mr. Saxon declared.

"This performance is now at record levels throughout the country," he said. "Deposits, loans, and investments, and profits, have reached new heights—and they continue to grow.

"Added banking facilities are being brought to areas which long had suffered deficiencies. The services offered to bank customers are being progressively broadened. The banking system is alive and teeming with energy," he said.

The industry is doing the job it is supposed to be doing, and doing it well, Mr. Saxon concluded. For, he asserted, "the consuming public is the ultimate beneficiary of all this activity."

And how does the industry generate all this activity? To a large degree it does so through the very dispersion which many of the would-be changemakers seek to reduce, the Comptroller explained. "The present bank regulatory structure by dispersing the centers of public power, has preserved a variety of sources from which initiative may appear in fashioning bank regulation according to public needs," he said.

"This diffusion of public authority offers the best safeguard against stagnation in bank regulation, and the best hope that the banking industry will be allowed the freedom to make its maximum contribution to the Nation's economic growth and development."

The present discussions take on the form of the classic debate between those who would make changes in the name of efficiency, and those who would preserve basic vitality by retaining checks and balances.

Mr. Saxon has clarified the issues by challenging the advocates of change to demonstrate that their suggestions will result in improvement of the service which is now being performed—which is pretty good already—without running the risk of reducing the vitality of the system so that it might not work as well.

Remarks by Hon. Frank B. Morrison, Governor of Nebraska, Before the Soil and Water Conservation Workshop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great voices for conservation in this country spoke not long ago on this subject which is so necessary and vital to us all.

His interest in the improvement of our rural and urban areas through conservation has been unflagging for many years and his expertise unmatched. It is therefore appropriate that his words be brought to the attention of all Americans.

It is with much pleasure that I include in the RECORD at this point, remarks by the Hon. Frank B. Morrison, Governor of Nebraska, before the Soil and Water Conservation Workshop held in Lincoln, Nebr., February 16, 1965.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS BY GOV. FRANK S. MORRISON, BEFORE THE SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS AND WATERSHED DIRECTORS WORKSHOP, FEBRUARY 16, 1965

I have been appalled recently in reviewing the President's recommended budget to this session of the U.S. Congress of a proposed cut in Federal appropriations in the field of soil and water conservation. These budget cuts relate to the ACP cost-sharing program as administered through the ASCS and the SCS technical assistance to the soil and water conservation districts of America.

Specifically, the administration's budget calls for a $100 million decrease in appropriations for ACP. This decrease is approximately 40 percent across the board. This cut comes at a time when we are already short of ACP funds in applying permanent-type conservation in Nebraska. It is my understanding that most of the counties in the State of Nebraska have already used a considerable portion of their 1965 ACP allocation. These funds were used by farmers in Nebraska in applying conservation practices to their farms in 1964. I would ask you, "What would a 40-percent decrease in ACP funds mean to the conservation accomplishments in your area?"

Another damaging blow in the field of soil and water conservation is the proposed revolving fund whereby farmers and ranchers throughout the United States will share in the costs of technical assistance. In the past it has been the policy of the Federal Government for sufficient funds to be appropriated to the Soil Conservation Service so that their assistance to the local soil and water conservation district will be without charge. How a new program is being advocated hereby the Soil and Conservation Districts of America will charge for these technical services of the Soil Conservation Service. The authority for these charges will be embodied in proposed legislation authorizing the establishment of a revolving fund. The Bureau of the Budget through the President's budget message has recommended that $20,000,000 be placed in this revolving fund. On the average this amounts to approximately $7,000 for each soil and water conservation district in America. It is proposed that the soil and water conservation districts will collect a fee from landowners for the technical services of the Soil Conservation Service. These fees will then be turned over to the Soil Conservation Service on a matching basis with other Federal funds. It would work approximately like this. A charge would be made for all layout of conservation practices. Based on the 1964 conservation program, districts in Nebraska would be required to collect $482,918. This amounts to approximately $6,000 per district. If the average district collected $6,000 then an additional $6,000 would be made available on a cost-sharing basis from the Federal Government. In this way the average district would be able to maintain their present level of technical service; however, if this average district was unable to collect these fees, then the Federal Government costsharing fund would be unavailable to this district. As a result there wouldn't be any Federal technical assistance in that particular district in Nebraska for the "laying out" of the conservation practices.

Now again I ask you, what effect would this legislation have on your conservation program? Where would your district receive this $6,000 for cost-sharing with other available Federal funds? It would be possible to obtain these funds from your district treasury, the county board, the State government or "these" user fees. I am not very optimistic that the average district in Nebraska would be able to obtain sufficient matching funds. To me, this proposed legislation and the revolving fund marks a serious retreat in our soil and water programs throughout the Nation.

I can assure you that I will do all within my power as Governor of the great State of Nebraska to see that this action does not come to pass. I will advise President Johnson of my position. I also plan to contact all the Governors in our Midwest Governors' Conference and encourage them to do likewise. I will encourage our congressional delegation in Washington, D.C., to oppose this legislation. Reduction in the conservation program at this time would be "foolhardy." As I have said many times, appropriations for resource development is an investment and should be considered as an investment. Now, is not the time to consider a cutback in appropriations in the field of resource development, the economy of our State and Nation is closely tied to our soil and water resources. Eventually, maximum production will be required from these resources, if we are to maintain and to increase our standard of living. As you are well aware my budget message before the 1965 session of the Nebraska Legislature called for a substantial increase to the Nebraska Soil and Water Conservation Commission. I am firmly dedicated to the cause of resource development. I shall continue to support your program at all levels of government, local, State, and Federal.

L. J. Cappleman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 18, 1965, the Secretary

of Agriculture will present Mr. L. J. Cappleman with the Department's Superior Service Award. "Cap" as he is known to his friends is the State director of the Farmers Home Administration in Texas.

I do not know of another agency of our Federal Government who comes nearer to working with our citizens than does this Agency, and much of the desire to help people which is demonstrated by the agents of the FHA in Texas has been instilled by "Cap." The rural people of Texas owe him a vote of thanks, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to publicly thank "Cap" and to include the article which appeared in the Dallas Morning News concerning his award:

L. J. CAPPLEMAN: USDA CITES TEXAS LOAN AGENCY HEAD

The director of Texas operations of the Department of Agriculture's Farmers Home Administration, L. J. Cappleman, Tuesday will receive the USDA superior service award in ceremonies scheduled to be held in Washington, D.C.

Cappleman has been State director for 12 years and a USDA employee for 30 years. He will be cited "for exceptional effectiveness in program administration, agricultural leadership and institution of a farm management program to improve the living standards of Texas farm families."

Cappleman directs the loan agency operation at Temple which last year served about 127,000 farmers and other rural residents. The agency, during fiscal 1964, extended supervised credit totaling nearly $74.5 million.

The USDA and its Secretary, Orville L. Freeman, honored seven employees with the department's highest citation, the distinguished service award, and presented the second highest award, the superior service award, to 72 employees.

Memorial Day Is Approaching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Littleton Independent on Friday, May 14, 1965. Memorial Day is fast approaching, and I think it highly appropriate that the Independent anticipate the occasion with this fine editorial. I applaud this paper's thoughts, and I encourage my colleagues to read it.

The article follows:

[From the Littleton (Colo.) Independent, May 14, 1965]

MEMORIAL DAY SERMON

Memorial Day is approaching.

Veterans' groups and townspeople who made a personal sacrifice will remember on May 30.

One of those who died for his country was George Nyborg, brother of Mrs. Ralph (Gladys) MacKenzie and Mrs. Dale E. Thomas.

He was killed in 1944 and lies buried with other Americans near Liege, Belgium. The Noel family at Liege serve as the godparents to his grave. They go to the cemetery and place flowers.

George Thomas, the son of Lt. Col. and Mrs. Dale Thomas, is taking a semester off from Hastings College where he is studying political science.

The young student is improving his German while in Europe and also studying governments in the free countries. While in Belgium, he made a pilgrimage to Liege. He didn't know his Uncle George but he was inspired by his sacrifice.

This is what George Thomas wrote his Littleton parents:

"Today we went to the cemetery and visited George's grave.

"I don't know how to say it, but I think my generation has little contact with the war. When I saw the 7,000 graves of the American servicemen, I was deeply moved.

"I realize that those men were, at that time my age. And even though they may not have wanted to, they went to fight and give their lives that America and what she stands for might exist. One never realizes how selfish he is until he sees how much others have sacrificed.

"I know that most of those men weren't great statesmen and that they didn't have divine guidance. They were ordinary men. But to appreciate what they did is a very awe-inspiring thing. I think that you, Dad, will understand what I feel for those men."

Dozens of Littleton men gave their lives in World War II, along with George Nyborg.

The Littleton community will be aware of this as Decoration Day approaches. Citizens will rededicate themselves to the American ideal of freedom under the law.

Young George Dale Thomas will do his part to create a harmonious world. For that is what his major, political science, is all about.

Baltic Peoples Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, World War II brought misery and misfortune to all peoples in Europe, but to the three Baltic republics it was disastrous and tragic. The intrepid peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, who had regained their freedom at the end of the First World War, were robbed of their national independence at the beginning of the last war. They were deported by the hundreds of thousands to distant regions of the Soviet Union by Soviet authorities, and their homelands made part of the Soviet empire. That was the legacy of the war to these unfortunate peoples.

Toward the end of the war the Baltic peoples hoped that after all the sacrifices and suffering they had endured, they would be allowed to live in peace and to undertake the reconstruction of their devastated homelands. But they were sadly disappointed in their expectations when, instead of regaining their freedom, the Soviet Union imposed upon them Communist totalitarian regimes. To this day they are held down by these alien rulers in their native land. On this 25th year of their enslavement by Soviet tyrants, we hope and pray for their freedom and independence.

The Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs is presently holding hearings on the persecution of the peoples within the Baltic countries. It is significant that a continuation of these hearings opened on this day, May 17. I have learned that the colonization and Russiafication of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania is increasing through deportations, denial of cultural freedoms, and Russian control of the political life and government. I see great need for the United States and the members of the free world to rekindle their determination that these countries will again be free. I trust that the free world will unite in instigating resolutions in the United Nations to demand the withdrawal of Russia not only from the Baltic States but from the Balkan States. This they guaranteed to the nations of the free world, an agreement on which they reneged after World War II.

Hallelujah, I'm a Bum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in the days preceding the First World War, when the infamous IWW was making headlines in fomenting labor strife and calling for a new form of society in America, one of the famous Wobblie songs was called "Hallelujah, I'm a Bum." The Wobblies did not last and their doctrine was disowned by the great overwhelming majority of Americans, then. But what about now?

Under 30 some years of assault upon our national character by the giveaway programs of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the New Frontier, and the Great Society, many of the discredited theories of the past are being accepted as the proper way of life in America. Thrift is no longer a virtue. Initiative is for squares. A man need accept no responsibility for caring for his family nor need he work to eat and to enjoy the good things of life. Lyndon Johnson and his architects of the Great Society promise all the good things of life for everybody and no strings attached.

Of course, there is one little flaw in their thinking—who is going to pay the bill? How long are the industrious citizens going to be willing to struggle to raise their families, meet their civic obligations, and pay taxes to support the slothful, the lazy, those who refuse to work?

Americans will always be willing to share with those in genuine need, but the day of reckoning is fast approaching when they will not sacrifice for the sake of maintaining a high standard of living for those who refuse to accept their share of carrying the burden.

The well-known writer, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, points out some very pertinent facts in "The Wrong Road to Utopia"

which appeared in the Washington Evening Star for May 15, 1965. I include it here as a part of these remarks:

THE WRONG ROAD TO UTOPIA

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Yes, Virginia, there are such things as bums.

Not deprived persons. Not socially wounded. Not members of a subculture. Not underprivileged or disadvantaged. Just bums.

You can pick them up, but they'll fall flat again the moment you let them go. They work only under the compulsion of hunger. Opportunities don't interest them. Self improvement is for the birds.

We are beginning to get into deep water because both politicians and our academic sociologists stubbornly refuse to recognize the bum factor. Under the new-think it is heresy to suggest that bums might exist. For such an admission complicates the clear and simple orthodoxy of the moment, namely that all people who are not supporting themselves and their children are victims of a cruel and unfeeling social system.

This orthodoxy appeals to the political mind, for it provides the rationale for vastly enlarged government in the name of humanity. And it appeals for a variety of reasons to that segment of the academic world that carries the gonfalon of social science.

Many sociologists are bleeders for the poor in the abstract, although most of them wouldn't be caught dead spending the evening with a Puerto Rican family in a cold-water flat. And many resent a free market system in which bubblegum manufacturers and comic strip cartoonists usually make more than Ph. D.'s. They are always alert for ways to tax-up the underendowed, and tax down the overrewarded in the interest of social justice.

So the dogma, at least until recently, has gone like this: poverty is the result of society's coldness to individuals or groups of individuals. If society will only loosen up with more relief money, more low-cost housing, more special schools, more medical services, more job opportunities, etc., the poor will cease to be poor. They will, in fact, all become self-supporting taxpayers, to the profit of everyone.

You can see that if you hold to this dogma the admission that bums exist becomes a distressing qualification of the dogma itself. And no dogma can tolerate "ifs" or "buts."

But in spite of record empolyment, and the highest gross national product in history, relief costs keep soaring. In the past 10 years, with U.S. population up 18 percent, the number of persons on relief has risen 42 percent. Many of these are illegitimate children fathered by men who wander from woman to woman, unworried about who will care for their offspring because they know that aid to dependent children payments will.

The new think explains that these fathers are confused men, many of them automated out of their old jobs, who have been driven into delinquency by the agony of being unwanted. This is a comfortable theory, and suggests even more spending.

But when an effort was made to recruit Los Angeles reliefers to help get in the California truck-garden crop this winter, there were few takers. And one Florida grower, who brought jobless New Yorkers down to his farms at his own expense, found to his dismay that most of them took off for the beaches.

So the dogma is being revised a little. The new theory holds that no one should worry if some people never work at all, for the idea that all should labor is old fashioned. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, recently hit at overworking and oversaving. "I say that what the individual can offer no longer can or should determine the measure of his reward," said Patton. "His reward should and must be measured by his need."

And Prof. Martin Rein, of Bryn Mawr College, has come out in favor of income guarantees unrelated to previous wages earned so that the retired can maintain a standard of living much higher than known during their working years. And he advocates higher family allowances, even above the guaranteed income level (or the prevailing wage scale) for poor parents with very large families.

Patton must surely remember that it was Lenin who promised "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need." The Communists quickly found this theory so crazy that they inaugurated the cruelest of piecework systems and sent the drones to the new lands in Siberia.

Professor Rein's plan holds little allure for working hard if, upon retirement, you'll get a guaranteed income unrelated to your earnings. But it might put a stop to unclaimed illegitimate children, for every tavern derelict will claim as many as he can to qualify for higher family allowances.

If there were no such thing as bums, if everyone were fired by ambition to do his level best, such schemes might be manageable.

But, alas Virginia, there are bums, indeed. Just plain loafing, child-deserting, rent-money-drinking bums. And until we learn to distinguish between them and the upliftable unfortunate, we'll simply decrease the motivation of the weakly motivated. That's not the road to utopia.

Mexico Should Be Exempt From Tourist Buying Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague who represents 350 miles of the Texas border along the Rio Grande, KIKA DE LA GARZA, has recommended that our contiguous neighbors be exempted from proposals to reduce to $50 the duty-free goods a returning tourist can bring home with him. He emphasized the effect such a reduction would have on our relations with Mexico where no balance-of-payments problem exists.

The Corpus Christi, Tex., Caller Times on May 6, 1965, supported this position editorially stressing that extension of this proposal to Mexico would do more harm than good.

Feeling that the membership of the House might be interested in this point of view, I call their attention to the Caller Times editorial:

MEXICO SHOULD BE EXEMPT FROM TOURIST BUYING BILL

Valley Congressman ELIGIO DE LA GARZA is right in urging that Canada and Mexico be exempt from the Johnson administration's antigold drain bill on tourist purchasing. The bill would reduce from $100 to $50 the duty-free goods that American tourists may bring back from foreign lands.

Mr. DE LA GARZA—and our—interest, of course, relates to the Mexican part of the North American exemption he urges the House Ways and Means Committee to write into the bill. Our national economy—and particularly that of Texas—would be hurt more than it would be helped by discouraging United States tourist purchasing in Mexico.

The United States tourist trade spells the difference between deficit and surplus in Mexico's international balance of payments. And if we hurt the Mexican economy, we are likely to find ourselves sending out more dollars in aid than we save in trade.

Furthermore, Mexico spends most of its dollar earnings in the United States. What our tourists spend in Mexico largely comes back to the United States to buy things Mexico needs for its economic development and social progress. Mexico is one of the United States top foreign-trade customers; so it would not help our dollar strength to curtail Mexico's purchasing power.

In Texas, especially in the long, thriving border area, the United States and Mexican economies are closely interrelated and interdependent. The extensive transborder retail trade is mutually beneficial. It should be encouraged, not discouraged.

Finally, we should avoid any action that would move Mexico to restrict its nationals' spending in the United States—about $250 million a year, including some $180 million in border area retail trade. If we penalize Mexico's tourist trade, we should not be surprised if Mexico should retaliate in kind—to our mutual detriment. The Mexico and Canada exemptions urged by Mr. DE LA GARZA consequently are, in our opinion, fully justified.

The American Dental Association Looks at Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, although I voted for the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (H.R. 6675), on final passage in the House, I did so with certain reservations some of which were expressed at that time.

This measure is now pending, as we all know, in the other body and the statement recently presented by Dr. I. Lawrence Kerr, a constituent of mine from Endicott, N.Y., in behalf of the American Dental Association before the Senate Committee on Finance is most worthy of the consideration of all of us.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the testimony of Dr. Kerr follows:

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION CONCERNING H.R. 6675 BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, U.S. SENATE, MAY 6, 1965

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Dr. I. Lawrence Kerr, of Endicott, N.Y. In addition to maintaining a private practice in that city, I am a member of the Council on Legislation of the American Dental Association. With me here today is Mr. Bernard J. Conway, chief legal officer of the association. We are pleased to have this opportunity to appear before this committee to discuss the important questions raised by H.R. 6675. Most of our comments concern title I of the bill.

PART 1

The American Dental Association is well aware of the fact that there is a serious prob-

lem regarding the health care of the aged, that the problem has not yet been entirely solved, and that the Federal Government has a proper role to play in such a solution. The solution envisioned by part 1, title I, of H.R. 6675, however, is one that the association considers to be unnecessary and imprudent and we consequently oppose passage of H.R. 6675 in its present form.

Our opposition is twofold: we first of all believe that many of the principles underlying the hospital and medical care plans are mistaken ones, especially the principle of extending care without any regard for need. And then, second, we believe that the plan as drawn is, from a professional point of view, incomplete. This latter objection we will deal with in the second section of this statement. At this time, I should like to briefly discuss the mistaken premises upon which these plans are based.

As prolog to our comment, I should like to make it absolutely clear that our opposition is not based on mere obstructionism or on an unduly negative attitude toward the Government's role in the health field. The dental profession has long recognized that the Federal Government has a legitimate and essential role in improving health standards for our people and over the years the association has supported many legislative proposals involving the participation of the Federal Government. The Federal Government, for example, has traditionally and properly assisted in such health activities as hospital construction, expansion of community health services and facilities, general health and specific disease research, aid to professional education and general public health programs. These are activities that benefit not just a few of our citizens, but all of them.

When President Johnson sent his health message to Congress this past January, Dr. Fritz A. Pierson, serving this year as president of the American Dental Association, issued a statement praising many aspects of the Presidential message for offering "a prudent and realistic approach" to meeting our Nation's health needs.

Our opposition to the hospital and medical care plans in H.R. 6675, then, doesn't spring from an unreasoning bias against governmental action. Indeed, we are deeply concerned that if Federal resources are concentrated on a new and massive treatment program, this would inevitably deter Congress from continuing to support adequately these other essential activities.

Such a consequence could well be one effect of the hospital and medical care plans of H.R. 6675.

Dentistry, we are aware, is involved only to an incidental degree in the pending proposals. It is only realistic to expect, however, that were these parts enacted it would mark the first step in an inevitable broadening both with respect to benefits and coverage. The pattern for such extension can be seen in the history of the present OASDI law.

Our major objection, as we have said, is that both plans extend care without regard to need. Now, any person in need of health care is entitled to receive it, irrespective of his ability to pay. But there is nothing unreasonable, in our judgment, in the proposition that those who have the resources to be self-sufficient should be expected to be self-sufficient. Whatever programs are enacted to provide health care should be designed to include a method of determining who is in need and who is not. Such a determination should not, and need not, be made in a way that demeans or humiliates anyone.

Strictly from the standpoint of logic, if it is proper for the Government to provide health services for one segment of the general population without regard to need, then it would be proper to provide such services to any or all other segments. Certainly, there are persons in all age groups within our society who for one reason or another do not receive adequate health care.

For example, the dental profession has long concentrated much of its attention on the dental health of children. This is because it is with children that the dentist can most effectively establish sound oral health and thus prevent much serious disease from occurring during adulthood and old age. From direct experience, we know that there are children who do not receive adequate dental care because their families cannot afford it.

Certainly, such children are entitled to assistance. We agree here with President Johnson, who called for such assistance in his health message, and we regret that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has seen fit to ignore the President.

Nonetheless, it does not follow that a massive Federal health benefits program should be established which would also include the many millions of children whose families are self-sufficient.

Relative to the importance of children's needs, it is worth noting that since Britain began its national health program, there has been a concentration on restorative care for adults and a consequent neglect of preventive care for children.

This objection, of course, relates to both the hospital and the medical plans in the bill. A second drawback with respect to the medical plan is that it is so designed that those in greatest need of it may well be the very ones least likely to join it.

Conversely, those in the best position to provide their own health care of the type covered will undoubtedly and understandably hasten to take advantage of this bargain package. It should also be noted that this medical care plan was not subject to full and open hearings before being incorporated into the bill. This is true, as well, of part 2, of title I. This we believe is most unfortunate.

Another questionable assumption underlying both plans is the apparent belief that this problem is a permanent one rather than being transitional.

A man who is 65 this year probably began his working career about 1920. This was a very different country then. There was no social security system; there was little in the way of pensions, retirement plans, or private annuity programs; health insurance was virtually unknown. Furthermore, today's elderly citizens lived out part of their middle years in the midst of a worldwide depression that undoubtedly limited their ability to provide for their retirement.

Today, obviously, all this has changed. We now have social security; we have widespread pension and retirement plans and rapidly growing voluntary health insurance that can be carried into the retirement years. In fact, a great many of today's middle aged, not to speak of future generations, could, under prevailing conditions, enter their retirement years with considerable protection in terms of income and health insurance. In passing, it might also be noted that we are witnessing for the first time a soundly established and swiftly growing system of prepaid dental insurance both on a nonprofit and commercial basis.

These plans, then, propose a permanent solution for a problem that very probably is temporary. They ask the Nation to transform the health care system that has served it so well at the very moment when it is demonstrating its ability to cope with this problem.

We finally believe that the proponents of these plans fail to recognize the impact the Kerr-Mills program has had and could continue to have. Admittedly, the Kerr-Mills program is not free from defects. It needs perfecting amendments by Congress and fuller and more imaginative implementation by the states. But it has demonstrated its soundness; it has shown its basic capability for doing the job without at the same time embarking our Nation on an unwarranted and irreversible course.

Another advantage of Kerr-Mills is that it retains the community and the State as active partners with the Federal Government in providing the care necessary. This is important since it is these political bodies that can best judge the needs that exist in their localities and most efficiently tailor a program that will meet fully those needs.

The hospital and medical care plans of H.R. 6675, then, are ill conceived. They unnecessarily single out a segment of the population even though many persons within that segment have no need for assistance. They propose a permanent solution to a transitional problem. They ignore the progress that has been made by the private sector and by such public programs as Kerr-Mills. Because they go beyond the provision of assistance to those who truly need it, these plans will prove a drain on those resources of the Federal Government that can prudently be allocated to the health field. We have, Mr. Chairman, the utmost respect for the sincerity and competence of those supporting these plans. The objections, nonetheless, are overwhelming and we believe both plans should be eliminated from the bill.

PART II

In addition to the conceptual objections just discussed, the association believes it has the obligation to point out a number of defects in H.R. 6675 which relate solely to its soundness from the professional viewpoint.

Perhaps its foremost defect from the standpoint of total health is the failure of the draftsmen of the bill to carry out the recommendation made by President Johnson in his January 7 health message to Congress with respect to dental care. The President noted the need for dental care for poor children and recommended a program to: "Broaden the public assistance program to permit specific Federal participation in paying costs of medical and dental care for children in medically needy families, similar to the Kerr-Mills program for the aged."

However, part 2, of title I of the bill, dealing with grants to States for medical assistance, virtually ignores the President's request insofar as dental care for needy children is concerned. It ignores the fact that 60 percent of the children between the ages of 5 and 14 who are members of families whose income is below $2,000 have never received dental care. It ignores the fact that in this same age bracket, irrespective of economic considerations, 24 percent of urban children and 42 percent of rural farm children have never received dental care. It ignores President Johnson's statement in his health message that at age 15, the average child has 10 decayed teeth.

We believe the President's recommendation in this respect should be honored and that the bill should be amended to include dental care as one of the required benefits for dependent children under the expanded medical assistance program proposed in the bill. Oddly enough, one of the required benefits in this section of the bill is skilled nursing home care. We have been told that in a recent Children's Bureau study of 11,000 nursing home patients, it was found that only 8 of these patients were under the age of 15. We don't know why these eight children were placed in old folk's homes but we believe the example illustrates the folly of requiring nursing home benefits that would be virtually unused while not requiring dental care benefits that would be of great help to most, if not all, needy children. A simple amendment would remedy this defect in the bill.

The association also has serious professional objections to provisions of part B of title I, supplementary health benefits for the

aged, which discriminate unfairly among practitioners of the healing arts.

In this country, there are hundreds of dental practitioners who admit patients to hospitals for oral surgical procedures. About 40 percent of our hospitals have formalized dental services. Many dentists who have completed internships and residency programs in oral surgery regularly perform such procedures as excision of oral tumors and cysts, removal of stones from salivary ducts, reduction of fractures of the jaw or facial bones and other operations that certainly are intended to be covered under part B of title I of the bill. Yet, as presently written, a beneficiary who selected a dentist rather than a physician (M.D. or D.O.) to perform such procedures would arbitrarily be denied a covered benefit.

The drafters of the bill ignored the fact that no sound comprehensive health benefits plan can be written without the inclusion of some benefits that are within the scope of dental practice. They also ignored the fact that today practically all health insurance plans in the private sector recognize the right of dentists to perform oral surgical procedures and include a dentist within the definition of "doctor" or "physician" under such plans. All contracts under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act which is administered by the U.S. Civil Service Commission contain provisions permitting beneficiaries to select dentsts to perform covered oral surgical services.

Virtually all hospitals permit dentists to admit patients for oral surgical services and standards regarding dentistry in hospitals have been adopted by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals.

There would appear to be no valid reason why, in the supplementary benefits portion of H.R. 6675, the Government should depart from a pattern that is so well recognized and so firmly established in the private insurance field. To do so is unsound from the health standpoint and discriminatory against program beneficiaries and dental practitioners.

This defect in the bill should be corrected by appropriate amendments. It should be clear, Mr. Chairman, that such amendments would in no way increase or expand the present scope of benefits in the bill. The amendments would merely permit a patient to select a qualified doctor of dentistry as well as a doctor of medicine or osteopathy to perform covered oral surgical procedures.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the association wishes to record its objection to the reimposition of the 3-percent limitation on the deductibility of medical and dental expenses by taxpayers 65 years of age and older as proposed in section 106 of the bill. The rationalization given for this by the House Ways and Means Committee is that with the basic and supplementary benefit plan provided in the bill, older persons will not have a need for this tax incentive. This argument may have some validity with respect to medical care but it has none with respect to dental expenses since dental care is not included as a benefit in title I of the bill. Many aged people require dental treatment, much of it involving replacement of natural teeth with dentures. In many cases it is absolutely essential for nutritional reasons and for the maintenance of good general health in aged persons. Such people should continue to be encouraged to provide for their dental health needs. Rather than encouraging them, enactment of this section of H.R. 6675 would, in effect, penalize them for taking steps to protect and maintain their good health.

Oxford Debaters Revive War Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when much of our attention is focused on teach-ins on our Vietnam policy, I believe the following article, which appeared in today's New York Times, may be of value to my colleagues and to much of the Nation:

OXFORD DEBATERS REVIVE WAR ISSUE—PLAN TO DISCUSS 1933 PACIFIST MOTION STIRS CONTROVERSY

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, May 16.—In his history of World War II, Sir Winston Churchill wrote bitterly of a resolution by the Oxford Union in 1933.

"This house refuses to fight for King and country," the motion said. It carried by 275 votes to 153. Sir Winston, describing that result as "evershameful," wrote:

"It was easy to laugh off such an episode in England, but in Germany, in Russia, in Italy, in Japan, the idea of a decadent, degenerate Britain took deep root and swayed many calculations."

On Thursday the Oxford Union will debate the same motion, rephrased only slightly to say: "That this house would not fight for Queen and country."

Controversy has boiled since the union decided to rerun the famous—or infamous—debate. Two of the four union trustees have resigned. Efforts have been made to call it all off, but the students are going ahead.

The Oxford Union serves as both a club and a debating society. Its weekly debates have been a training ground for many eminent British politicians. The debates follow parliamentary procedure and are conducted in the union's own building.

The man repsonsible for the revival is the present president of the union, a 21-year-old Pakistani, Tariq Ali. He has been accused of a stunt or worse, and he has received anonymous threats, but he shows no signs of desisting.

ECONOMIST RESIGNS

Sir Roy Harrod, a well-known economist, was one trustee who resigned.

"The motion—in 1933—did make a recognized contribution." Sir Roy wrote to Mr. Ali, "in building up the idea around the world—which was present even in the mind of the father of the late President Kennedy, who was U.S. Ambassador here—that the British were played out and could not be depended upon."

In reply Mr. Ali said "war should be constantly reviewed as an institution lest we become complacent and fatalistic." He denied that the debate could have any international repercussions.

Last month Mr. Ali was arrested during a protest demonstration outside the U.S. Embassy here against the American bombing of North Vietnam.

HISTORIAN BACKS MOVE

One distinguished figure who has supported Mr. Ali's idea is Christopher Hill, a historian who was recently elected Master of Balliol College, Oxford. That election itself raised some eyebrows, as Mr. Hill is a former Communist Party member.

"I learned more from the 1933 debate," Mr. Hill wrote in a congratulatory letter to Mr. Ali, "and the controversy around it, than from any other single incident in my undergraduate career.

"I hope the union today will show equal independence of mind. Especially impressive to me then was the union's resolute refusal to be told by its elders what it ought to think and discuss."

A rebuttal came from the other trustee who resigned, Arthur L. Goodhart, retired Master of University College, Oxford. He sent a blunt message in which he said: "Do not think Oxford Union should make same mistake twice."

GOODHART EXPLAINS VIEWS

(By M. S. Handler)

Dr. Goodhart, an American and a professor of jurisprudence at Oxford University for many years, contends that the proposed Oxford Union debate would hurt Britain's national interest and would therefore be highly improper at this stage in international affairs.

Dr. Goodhart, who is in the United States, where he has been lecturing at the Universities of Virginia and Georgia, and at Washington and Lee University, is due to return to Oxford in several weeks.

He said in an interview here Friday that he felt the Oxford resolution might be carried because a considerable number of Asian and African students were members of the Oxford Union and in voting whether to fight for "Queen and country" they would be voting on an issue in which they had no direct involvement.

Not being involved, Dr. Goodhart said, foreign students have no right to discuss so critical a question of public interest.

Dr. Goodhart also said: "I dislike seeing undergraduate students being misused for propaganda purposes. It is a sad thing. They might come to resemble the turbulent continental European students. We don't want our students to start throwing things at foreign embassies."

Dr. Goodhart also contended that the resolution, by giving a false image of British opinion, might have serious consequences for British policy in the Far East and might weaken Prime Minister Wilson's determination to support President Johnson.

Discussing Britain's policies in the Far East, and in particular the commitment to Malaysia, which Indonesia has vowed to crush, Dr. Goodhart said the debate might spread the impression in Asia that the British people opposed their Government's policies in Asia. This could have the same consequences as the 1933 debate, which, he said, apparently convinced Hitler and Mussolini that the British people would never fight.

Traffic Safety Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a recent proclamation issued by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia which established May 23 to May 31, 1965, as

Traffic Safety Week. A respected District of Columbia newspaper editor, Mr. Calvin W. Rolark, has been named co-chairman of the Safety Week steering committee, along with Mrs. Sara Honesty, also of the District.

The Safety Week committee has named their activities operation survival, and members hope to involve area churches, the District of Columbia government, schools and business associations, citizens associations, public transportation groups, and communications media in their activities to dramatize the District's safety needs.

When the proclamation was issued, Chairman Walter N. Tobriner pointed out that traffic accidents on the District of Columbia streets last year saw 115 persons killed and nearly 11,000 persons injured.

The efforts of the operation survival group during Traffic Safety Week should have the full support and cooperation of all of us who live or work in the District. I hope that we can all participate in the effort, as Chairman Tobriner so graphically put it, "to do what we can personally to make the District's streets and highways arteries of life, rather than avenues to death and destruction."

Israel's Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, since the end of the war many new nations have come into existence, and many new states have been formed. Among these new nations the Israeli nation is in a class by itself, and the State of Israel testifies to that fact. The birth, growth, and gradual strengthening of Israel as a free and independent state may be regarded as the miracle of the century, and as the realization of 2,000-year-old dream, as something almost unique in human history.

Unhappy Jews were deprived of their homeland centuries before the discovery of America, and were scattered to all parts of the world. But these sons of ancient Israel were never reconciled with forced dispersion, and they dreamed of the day when they would return and recreate their old kingdom in their own image. This is what they eventually did, and their superhuman efforts culminated in the birth and rise of today's Israel on May 14, 1948.

Since that memorable day Israel citizens have done wonders in making their new state the model democracy in the entire Middle East. They have also made it a prosperous and progressive haven for its 2 million hard working, inventive, and confident inhabitants. On its 17th birthday the State of Israel is a powerful factor for peace and stability in the Middle East, and I wish its sturdy citizens more power in their struggle for peace and prosperity.

Hudson, Mass., Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein part of the remarks I recently made at the precentennial banquet for the town of Hudson, Mass., attended by a very large gathering of leaders and prominent citizens of that wonderful community.

I am anxious to compliment the committee in charge of this most impressive and memorable event which was so greatly appreciated by everyone in attendance and was indeed a very splendid beginning of the centennial observance to follow.

Hudson's centennial celebration will most assuredly be one of the very best.

Under the leadership of my good and esteemed friend, Mr. Anthony O'Malley, and his fine committee, its great success is already forecast.

The above mentioned follows:

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN, PRECENTENNIAL BANQUET, HUDSON, MASS., MAY 1, 1965

Speaking at the precentennial banquet in Hudson last night, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, called for calmness, firmness, unity, and reasoned judgments in the current international crisis and declared that the American people must stand behind the President and our national policy of defending helpless peoples from Communist tyranny and safeguarding our own security.

If this Nation shows weakness in facing up now with resolution and strength, to Communist aggression, the day may well come when we may have to face these dangers in San Francisco Bay or Boston Harbor rather than in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

This is not an imperialist nation, he said. We seek no territory or domination of others. We do not wish to control the affairs of other nations. But we cannot stand by idly while the Communist conspiracy perpetrates one attack after another upon poor, helpless, defenseless peoples, and moves with evil design and aggression to spread its powerful tentacles all over the earth, and we do not propose to do so.

At the same time, we actively seek peace with all nations, and we seek to establish permanent peace in the world, and we are ready and willing to negotiate for peace at any time that the Communists are willing to negotiate in honesty and good faith.

The peace we seek must be based on justice for all, and not on surrender to the selfish, territorial designs, threats and aggressive acts toward world domination of the Communist conspiracy.

The President of the United States is doing everything he can to propose and secure the peace, and at the same time, above all, to protect the freedom and security of this country, this hemisphere, and keep our commitments to freedom and security in the world so vital to our own.

It is a time for loyal Americans to stand behind him and strengthen his policy and his purpose, and it can be said to the great credit of this Nation that almost everyone in the Congress on a nonpartisan basis is following that course.

Let us hope and pray that through wise statesmanship, through our great strength and power, through our military might and economic resources, greater than any in history, or the world, and through the loyalty and devotion and spiritual courage of the American people, we will soon find a way to bring peace to the Nation and the world.

I heartily congratulate the people of Hudson and their able, dedicated leaders upon this occasion, and this banquet meeting, which has been so delightful for all of us.

I am sure that it marks the start, a good and worthy start, of your centennial celebration. It also marks the beginning of a great deal of hard work on the part of those who are undertaking the preparations for this noteworthy event in the history of this wonderful community. But there are good heads, willing hands and open hearts to lighten your tasks.

Hudson is a town rich in all the best, most constructive virtues of America. It has an illustrious history. It has been distinguished time and time again, in peace and in war, in turmoil and in strife, and at every time in history for the lofty patriotism of its people, their unexcelled citizenship, their allegiance to the best values of America, the fervor of their spiritual beliefs and their unceasing labor for the fulfillment of the American dream.

Much more can be and will be said on that subject during the days of your celebration, but I want it to be noted tonight that there is no place in this country where there is greater loyalty, a finer spirit of civic responsibility or a more God-fearing, freedom-loving people devoted to American ideals and principles than in this beautiful Massachusetts town of Hudson.

I want you all to know how very proud I am of you, and this splendid American community of yours which in every sense has done so much to build up our beloved State and to make our country a better, healthier, more progressive, more prosperous, free and happy place in which to live, and how very grateful I am for your kindness, cooperation, and warm friendship and support which has done so much to help and encourage me in my difficult work.

I am sure that your anniversary observance, under the vigorous leadership you have here, will be most successful and inspiring, and I want you all to know that I am looking forward to cooperating with you in every way I can, to make it the most memorable occasion of its kind in the long, illustrious history of this great town.

Thank you, Mr. Toastmaster, and all of you, for giving me the high and happy privilege of being with you tonight.

Great Plains Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, conservation has meant much to Nebraska. The dust does not blow on Nebraska's plains as it once did. Farmers and ranchers have turned in increasing numbers to the Great Plains conservation program, established in 1956. The program is administered by the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This program supplements, in designated counties, the good work that

has been going on for years in soil conservation districts.

In Nebraska, the Great Plains conservation program operates the same way as elsewhere in the vast region where it applies. The program is based on individual long-term contracts between the farmer or rancher and the Federal Government, but it is also a regional program that embraces the 10 Great Plains States which contain 37 percent of the Nation's land area and 40 percent of the cropland. The region, with 17 million people, normally produces 60 percent of the country's wheat and 35 percent of its cattle. The overall importance of the program lies in its broad regional benefits derived from the participation of more than 17,000 farmers and ranchers.

Voluntary participants receive technical assistance in developing soil and water conservation plans for their entire farm or ranch. Federal help ends when the plan is completed and the farmer or rancher is better able to cope with the drought and other climatic conditions.

More than 2,300 Nebraska farms and ranches are operated under Great Plains conservation program contracts. These farms and ranches embrace about 3 million acres.

Some 140,000 acres of cropland will be converted to grass, an estimated 90 percent of which is being planted to native grasses and is not likely to be plowed in the future. All this means that some of our richest topsoil will be preserved for the function it best serves and will be available for generations to come and not be blown away.

Representative George H. Fallon Has Busy Time as Committee Chairman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep satisfaction that I call attention to an article in the current issue of Congressional Quarterly about our colleague, Representative GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman of the House Public Works Committee.

This is a prestige publication of admirable and unusual objective, unbiased reporting. There must be demonstrable achievement and merit to warrant its praise and applause. Too often, the good a Member of Congress does is buried with his bones. This article about our colleague, Mr. FALLON, the dean of the Maryland delegation, should afford us some assurance that criticism is not always the lot of a Congressman. In order to share this fine tribute to a deserving congressional leader, I include this fine article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FALLON HAS BUSY TIME AS COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Representative GEORGE H. FALLON, Democrat, of Maryland, has been chairman of the House Public Works Committee only since January 18, but already has presided over three major pieces of legislation in the 89th Congress.

The committee currently is holding hearings on the administration's area redevelopment bill (H.R. 6991), which FALLON introduced March 31. The other measures were the Appalachian development program (S. 3), cleared by Congress March 3, and the water pollution control bill (S. 4), reported by the committee March 31 and passed by the House April 28 (Weekly Report, pp. 327, 823).

Other bills expected to be considered by the committee include H.R. 6755 to authorize $263 million in additional appropriations for flood control, navigation, and other purposes in 10 river basins; H.R. 7303, to provide assistance to California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho, for the reconstruction of areas damaged by floods and high waters in 1964 and 1965; and H.R. 2170 to provide $2 billion a year in grants of up to 75 percent for construction of local public works projects.

FALLON succeeded Charles A. Buckley, Democrat, of New York, 1935–65, as committee chairman. Buckley, 74, was defeated in the June 2, 1964, primary. He had been chairman for 12 of the past 14 years. FALLON, 62, became Buckley's heir apparent in 1955, when he became the committee's second ranking Democrat.

The Public Works Committee handles all legislation dealing with public buildings and roads, flood control, improvement of rivers and harbors, water power, and stream pollution. It is considered one of the most powerful "pork barrel" committees in the House. Since the committee's determinations of Federal construction projects affect every congressional district in the Nation, the committee chairman can be a man of power.

FALLON has become known as the leading House supporter of the Interstate Highway System. Highways have been called his favorite subject, and he has fought for increased road construction and the maintenance of a strong highway trust fund.

FALLON, a moderately liberal Democrat, is expected in general to support major legislation introduced with administration backing.

PERSONAL HISTORY

GEORGE HYDE FALLON was born July 24, 1902, in Baltimore, Md., the son of Lawrence Fallon, Sr., and Mary Dempsey Fallon. He was educated in the public schools of Baltimore and Calvert Business College. He also attended Johns Hopkins University.

Prior to his election to Congress, FALLON operated an advertising sign business, Lawrence Fallon Co., with his brother. The business was founded in 1904 by his father.

FALLON, a Roman Catholic, was married to Willa Virginia Thomas in 1929. They have one daughter, Mary Joyce, and three grandsons. FALLON's favorite sports are fishing and golf.

FALLON's rise in Maryland politics began in 1938 when he was elected to the Democratic State Central Committee of Baltimore. He became chairman of the committee in 1942. He was elected to the Baltimore City Council in 1939 and reelected in 1943.

FALLON was first elected to Congress in 1944, defeating incumbent Representative Daniel Ellison, Republican, by a 14,672-vote margin (59.2 percent). FALLON since has easily been elected over all primary and general election opponents.

HOUSE CAREER

FALLON was a member of the old House Roads Committee and the old Public Works Committee. After the Roads Committee became a Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee in 1949, FALLON became chairman of that subcommittee. As chairman, he became a leading House supporter of Federal aid to highway construction. He was the author of the Federal Interstate highway program passed in 1956, and was largely responsible for the securing of Federal funds for construction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway.

FALLON was one of the leading opponents of the St. Lawrence Seaway. If it were constructed, he said in 1954, foreign shipping would take over large parts of American trade. "Should we, the Congress, sanction construction of the Seaway, we surely will be guilty of jeopardizing our American shipping and our American railroads as well," he said.

FALLON was one of the five Congressmen wounded when a group of Puerto Rican fanatics fired guns in the House in 1954. He is a mild-mannered man, and does not seek publicity. He rarely makes speeches on the House floor dealing with subjects other than roads.

He is the dean of Maryland congressional delegation and the first Maryland Representative to chair a committee of the House since 1940, when the late Representative Ambrose J. Kennedy, Democrat, was chairman of the old Claims Committee.

VOTING RECORD

FALLON supported the 1961 Housing Act, the 1962 Trade Expansion Act, the 1963 Rules Committee enlargement, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1964 antipoverty bill, the 1964 income tax cut, the 1965 medical care bill, and the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Congressional Quarterly voting studies showed that FALLON in 1964 voted in support of President Johnson's position 88 percent of the time. During the 88th Congress, FALLON voted in agreement with the majority of the Democratic Party 78 percent of the time and voted in support of a larger Federal role on 83 percent of the selected rollcalls used by Congressional Quarterly. FALLON voted on 84 percent of the rollcall votes during the 88th Congress.

FALLON in 1959 supported the Landrum-Griffin Labor Reform Act. This led organized labor in 1960 to support FALLON's Democratic primary opponent, Francis X. Dippel. Dippel said he had received labor's support because of FALLON's "consistent votes against the interests of the working men and women of the district." In 1964, however, the AFL–CIO gave FALLON a 100-percent score in voting in support of labor on 11 selected issues in the 88th Congress.

VIEWS ON PUBLIC WORKS

Here are Representative FALLON's views on public works taken from various speeches:

Roads: "The greatest single combination of economic activities in world's history is the building of roads.

"My feeling about the highway program is that it constitutes an important and enormous capital investment in the welfare and the future of the Nation. The money that highway users contribute to the provision of safe, efficient highways is not in my opinion an expenditure, as we ordinarily think of it, but rather it is a sound capital investment in the Nation's future."

Underdeveloped areas: "In order to attract new industry to (underdeveloped) areas, there must be adequate public works and economic development facilities."

Stream pollution: "One of the most important problems facing the country today is the future need for fresh water."

DISTRICT PROFILE

The Third District (1960 population 434,977) includes low-to-middle-income areas in eastern Baltimore. Negroes probably make up 40 percent or more of the population and are increasing in numbers.

The Maryland General Assembly March 29, 1965, enacted a new districting law, putting FALLON and Representative EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Democrat, into the same district. The 1964 vote within the confines of the

new district indicates a tight 1966 primary contest if both decide to seek reelection. FALLON received 32,941 votes and GARMATZ 32,277. An additional 34,074 Democratic votes were cast in 1964 in two wards represented by Representative SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Democrat, that have been added to the new Third District. Both FALLON and GARMATZ have promised a drive to petition the redistricting plan to referendum. The new Third District is considered to be safely Democratic. (For report on the redistricting plan, see Weekly Report, p. 868.)

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Senator Mundt's Efforts To Protect and Preserve Rare and Endangered Species of Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, in the April issue of Modern Game Breeding, there is an article on the efforts of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to obtain funds for the preservation of rare and endangered species of wildlife. An amendment, which he sponsored, to provide $350,000 for the program has been adopted by the Interior Department Appropriations Subcommittee; and the bill now awaits Senate floor action.

In order that information contained in the Modern Game Breeding article will be made available to all Members of Congress and other readers of the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTENTION, ATTENTION: PLEASE READ AND THEN ACT

Ivory-billed woodpecker, whooping crane, everglades kite, tule goose, masked bobwhite quail, New Mexican duck, Aleutian goose, Canada.

The above species of wildlife and others need your help in order to survive. Now is the time for you to do your part.

A great many of the Nation's outstanding aviculturists have been advocating, for quite a few years, a program of research, and controlled captive breeding for endangered species as a means of preserving them. A great deal of time, effort, and money has been expended by these men in order to bring about such a program backed by the full power of the Federal Government. Surely a program of the scope required can only be adequately administered and conducted at the national level. These rare creatures are a heritage belonging, in trust, to all our people so it is natural that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should be entrusted with this task.

The accompanying news release from the office of U.S. Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, outlines the procedures to be followed, and gives some of the background information which led up to this extremely important decision. We are most fortunate that a Senator of Mr. MUNDT's stature is proposing this amendment which will provide the funds necessary to get this program for rare and endangered species underway at once. We know that Senator MUNDT will use all means to insure the successful passage of this amendment. But he needs our help. It means that he needs every one of us if this vital legislation is to be passed.

Today each of us must write a letter to Senator MUNDT stating: "I wholeheartedly support the committee amendment you propose to present to Congress, which will provide $350,000 for headquartering in southern Maryland a wildlife research project to save from extinction rare and endangered American wildlife species." Then we must write a similar letter to our own U.S. Senators and Representatives urging them to support Senator MUNDT's amendment.

Mail these letters now—tomorrow may be too late. This is not a project for just those who are aviculturally or zoologically oriented. This is a project that is vital to every American citizen. So we beg that everyone reading this plea send a letter to the gentlemen mentioned. It is your duty to do this if you take pride in our national heritage.

Modern Game Breeding would be interested in receiving copies of the letters you send to these Senators and Congressmen. It is possible that a few may be reprinted. So let's get those letters on their way to Washington.

Senator MUNDT's address is: U.S. Senator KARL E. MUNDT, 4121 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, today said he will propose an amendment to provide $350,000 for headquartering in southern Maryland a wildlife research project "to save from extinction rare and endangered American wildlife species."

The South Dakota Senator said he will recommend the funds as a committee amendment to the 1966 fiscal year budget request for the Department of Interior, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

MUNDT said testimony received in hearings by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies "demonstrates a real and immediate need for expanding our research effort if we are to save such species as the whooping crane, the tule white-fronted goose, the ivory-billed woodpecker, the everglades kite, the masked quail, and other rare birds and mammals."

MUNDT, ranking minority member of the subcommittee, said the $350,000, according to wildlife officials, would be sufficient to get the program underway on a tract of land at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center about midway between Washington and Baltimore.

In response to questions by MUNDT, John S. Gottschalk, Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, said "the immediate need" to insure success of the propagation of endangered species program "is to move our present activities from the Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge in southern Colorado to a location where this work can be carried out under more favorable conditions."

Sandhill and whooping crane studies are currently underway at Monte Vista.

"Monte Vista is too isolated and the winter climate too severe for this critical work," Mr. Gottschalk told the subcommittee.

MUNDT said the research at Patuxent would consist of three main parts.

Included, as outlined by Mr. Gottschalk, MUNDT said, were (1) a propagation phase in which techniques will be perfected and endangered forms will be produced in quantity to restore wild populations; (2) a laboratory phase in which specialists in physiology, nutrition, pathology, and other disciplines will be engaged in supporting studies of endangered forms; and (3) a field study phase in which wildlife research biologists will study endangered species in the wild to ascertain their requirements, assist in obtaining breeding stock for propagation, and to find the best prospective sites for the release of captive-reared stock to the wild.

Approximately half of the $350,000 would cover costs of moving the present stock from Colorado, construction of an incubation-brooder building, storage and other utility buildings, a well and water distribution system, and provide for two maintenance-man-patrolman positions, MUNDT said.

He said $50,000 would be for salaries and expenses of a supervisory biologist and secretary and for development of plans for a laboratory building at the location finally selected for the center.

Remaining funds would cover salaries and expenses for four field biologists to commence studies on endangered forms of wildlife in addition to the whooping crane.

Mr. Gottschalk told the committee: "We need to locate the remnant populations" of various endangered species "and study the factors affecting their survival as the starting point for restoration measures."

Following is transcript of testimony of John S. Gottschalk, Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, before Senate subcommittee on the Department of Interior and related agencies appropriations for fiscal year 1966, March 2, 1965.

Senator MUNDT. Last year at these hearings, in response to my question about what you were doing with the funds we had made available for whooping cranes, you stated you had begun some practice propagating with sandhill cranes. How is that program coming along?

Mr. GOTTSCHALK. Senator MUNDT, as a result of your early and continuing interest in rare and endangered wildlife, and the action of this committee in assigning funds for this important work, we have been able to make meaningful progress. We now have three groups of lesser and greater sandhills in captivity, the oldest of which may begin to breed and lay eggs this year. Also, we are working closely with the officials of the New Orleans Zoo to insure the maximum production from the whooping cranes in confinement there. As a result of pairing our bird Rosie, which we moved over from the San Antonio Zoo, with one of the offspring of Crip and Josephine, we may have a second pair in production this year. Also, as you perhaps know from the newspapers, we have an additional whooper in captivity. This is the injured young bird which the Canadian Wildlife Service picked up on the breeding grounds last summer.

Senator MUNDT. Now that you are getting further along with this program and your stock of birds is increasing, do you foresee needs which are not being met to insure the success of this program?

Mr. GOTTSCHALK. Yes. The immediate need is to move our present propagation activities from the Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge in southern Colorado to a location where this work can be carried out under more favorable conditions. Monte Vista is too isolated and the winter climate too severe for this critical work.

Senator MUNDT. Do you have a location in mind?

Mr. GOTTSCHALK. Yes. A tract of land at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, about midway between Washington, D.C., and Balti-

more, Md., is well suited and would suffice for the immediate needs of this program.

Senator MUNDT. Briefly, what sort of program do you expect to carry out at this location?

Mr. GOTTSCHALK. The initial research effort on rare and endangered American wildlife species would be headquartered at this facility. In addition to the cranes which we discussed earlier, we also have several other threatened species in captivity—Aleutian and tule geese, and we hope to add others as opportunity permits. This program will consist of three main parts; namely, a propagation phase, in which techniques will be perfected and endangered forms will be produced in quantity to restore wild populations; a laboratory phase, in which specialists in physiology, nutrition, pathology, and other disciplines will be engaged in supporting studies of endangered forms; a field study phase, in which wildlife research biologists will study endangered species in the wild to ascertain their requirements, assist in obtaining breeding stock for propagation, and to find the best prospective sites for the release of captive-reared stock to the wild.

Senator MUNDT. Despite your indicated needs, I can find no item in the 1966 budget for expanding this important work. I believe that this program should advance—the disappearance of these species will not be delayed if we fail to set aside the necessary funds for this program. I should like to ask you, therefore, would an item of $350,000 be sufficient to move and to establish your birds and equipment at a more favorable location, and how might this money best be spent?

Mr. GOTTSCHALK. About half of such an amount, or $170,000, would cover the costs of moving the present stock, constructing an incubation-brooder building, storage and other utility buildings, a well and water distribution system, and provide for two maintenanceman-patrolman positions. About $50,000 would be required for salaries and expenses of a supervisory biologist and secretary and for development of plans for a laboratory building at the location finally selected for the Center. The remainder, or about $130,000, would cover salaries and expenses for four field biologists to commence studies on such endangered forms as the tule white-fronted goose, ivory-billed woodpecker, everglades kite, masked quail, and other birds, and even some mammals. We need to locate the remnant populations and study the factors affecting their survival as the starting point for restoration measures.

Senator MUNDT. Will your present ceilings permit employing the additional staff necessary for this program?

Mr. GOTTSCHALK. No. Provision would have to be made to cover the hiring of eight additional employees.

Senator MUNDT. So far, we have mentioned only rare and endangered wildlife. Cold-blooded animals—fish, amphibians, and even certain reptiles—are also on your list of species needing attention. Will not the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium sponsored by Congressman KIRWAN play a part in the program of studying and restoring these forms in the wild?

Mr. GOTTSCHALK. It is our intention that no more native wildlife species will be allowed to become extinct if we can prevent it. The contemplated research program of the National Fisheries Center is expected to include studies of the needs of aquatic vertebrates. The display of living examples of these forms would serve to bring to public attention their problems and measures needed to protect and preserve them. Such studies might also point the way toward preventing endangerment of other ones not yet in jeopardy.

Small Firms Show the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the magazine, Nation's Business, carries an interesting article in its May 1965 issue explaining certain advantages that small firms have over larger firms.

As a matter of fact, the article advises big businessmen to learn from the practices of smaller businessmen. At a time when the press and the television screen and radio sets are extolling the accomplishments of big business, this would seem to indicate that there are inherent advantages in the smaller operation.

Under unanimous consent I place this article by Mr. Auren Uris of Research Institute of America in the RECORD.

The article follows:

THINK SMALL: EVEN HUGE ORGANIZATIONS CAN TAKE LESSONS FROM THE WAY CERTAIN LITTLE FIRMS OPERATE

America's biggest companies traditionally have been the developers of management know-how. General Electric Co., International Business Machines, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and dozens more of our largest corporations have come up with concepts and procedures used both in operations and executive training that lead to better management—and higher profits.

However, there is another wellspring of effective management. It may often lack the aura of academic or scientific recognition or the large budgets of big-company research efforts. But the approaches it produces have an outstanding recommendation: They work, proving themselves in the tough arena of the marketplace.

This source is none other than the smaller company, whose ideas and methods are forged under result-demanding pressures. Operating closer to the break-even point, the small firm has less room for laxity, error or failure.

Many a larger corporation has developed a healthy respect for the capabilities of its smaller competitors, a respect based on experience. A small competitor beats out one of the bigs on a choice contract; a small company scores a breakthrough in a research area being less successfully explored by a larger firm; occasionally desirable executive talent is lured away from the big company by a small one offering more challenge and greater freedom.

Granted, there's little need for big firms to worry about being done in by the smalls. Nevertheless, larger firms can learn important lessons from small competitors, lessons that can help the larger firm—and the one whose growth is getting out of hand—to achieve and maintain efficiency. And the small firm can learn its own lessons better.

THE REAL DIFFERENCES

It is sometimes assumed that a large firm is like a small one, only bigger. Nothing could be further from the truth. In addition to size, there are qualitative differences between big and small companies. Some of these differences explain the relative handicaps under which the larger firms operate:

Organization: A larger company will necessarily have a more elaborate organizational structure. But organizational differences go beyond mere size. Larger firms develop many more staff and service elements, which add to overhead, and tend toward multiple levels of organization. This often causes many of their organizational problems, including blocked communications, blurred lines of authority, multiple decisionmaking.

Employee morale: There is something about large size that seems to undermine the individual employee's devotion to duty.

This is shown by findings like these: A study of absenteeism in an airline showed that at four small locations having fewer than 300 employees, the rate was 5.9 days of absence per employee per year. At the two largest locations—over 3,000 employees—the rate was 9.4 days.

Job satisfaction of executives: Believing that the small company offers greater emotional satisfactions to its executives, a group of Harvard students has created an organization to improve liaison between graduates and smaller companies. As the Harvard group sees it:

"The firm with a smaller management group offers a greater challenge, an earlier opportunity for contribution, and a correspondingly greater personal opportunity than do some large corporations. The interest in the smaller business is a realization that significant participation and resulting contribution are more readily available to the new employee within a firm having a small, flexible management group."

Unlike their small-firm opposite numbers, who see their future in terms of ownership and costs, many big business executives are more likely to think in terms of promotion and security.

Methods of operation: Here is where the big company is often at greatest disadvantage. Procedures often seem so spread out that performance may not follow policy. Decisionmaking, a key to organizational effectiveness, may be a frequent victim in the large firm.

Says Paul H. Kiernan, of Kiernan & Co., executive recruiters: "There is a major difference between a large and small company in the way decisions are made. In the small company, the decisionmaker usually arrives at his decision on the basis of personal knowledge. In the large company, the decisionmaker typically makes his decision on the basis of facts, figures—and sometimes the recommendation—supplied to him by others."

Job control: The small-company manager tends to have a greater control of his job. Says Dr. Louis Hackemann, president of Hackemann & Associates, San Francisco and New York management counselors:

"In the small company, the individual executive can make things happen. Results are what count. Authority with a small company may be greater, and there is opportunity to be in closer contact with the board of directors, the owners or the president. The small-company executive's personal goals also lend themselves to creating, inventing, considering new ideas."

There are many benefits of size that larger companies would by no means want to sacrifice and which small companies wish they had—everything from volume buying to the ability to pay six-figure salaries to outstanding executives.

But here are points on which the growing firm might concentrate to avoid some of the handicaps size can impose:

1. Don't develop an elephant complex. The way a company sees itself can be beneficial or devastating. The firm that views itself as large, extensive and sprawling over the business landscape may not suffer from its self-image. But if executives see their organization as being ponderous and

slow moving, then the small business mouse nibbling at its feet can be frightening.

What's needed here as an antidote is for executives in the top echelons to think of the organization as compact, muscular, and alert.

2. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of small rivals. Companies often oversimplify the capabilities of an opponent. Stunned by the speed with which a small competitor was able to service an account, a steel supplier spent considerable time hashing over possible countermeasures. It wasn't until the marketing director pointed out that the rival's capabilities were limited to just a few items that the problem was seen in perspective.

The big company must learn to avoid getting involved in exhausting guerrilla warfare in the competitor's areas of strength. Technology, the traditional big gun of the large firm, should be used wisely in this connection.

The small firm is likely to remain strong in operations not subject to the computer revolution—unique products, custom production, personal and special services that machines can't handle. The larger firm can afford to be selective; in some cases, deciding not to become active in a given area may be the height of wisdom.

3. Adopt the small company's sense of time. An employee of a large food company recently set about looking for a new job, complaining: "Frankly, I'm frightened. I find myself taking 4 hours to do something I know I can do in an hour and a half. This is no way to work. I want a job that stimulates me, not one that puts me to sleep." The point is, the company expects the assignment to take 4 hours.

Despite widespread acceptance of Parkinson's law, that work expands to fit the time available to do it, many larger companies often operate under lax work schedules. This doesn't mean you should put on the screws. But workload and work pace should be in keeping with individual capacity.

The benefits to be gained are not only increased efficiency, but also heightened satisfaction and the self-esteem of the individual who feels he's carrying a man's load.

The larger company that thinks a surefire method of acquiring a small-company sense of time is to hire it must be cautious. "An executive moving from a small company to a large one often faces difficulties," comments recruiting consultant Kiernan, who has seen numerous examples of such transfers. "Many a fine performer in the small firm flounders and can't seem to mesh in a big organization. On the other hand, many men who grow up in small companies may reach a point where their experience, maturity and desire to grow give them the basis for success in a larger company. It depends on the individual, his personality and adaptability."

4. Decentralize selectively. Practitioners of organizational planning often admit confusion when faced with the time-honored dilemma of the centralize-decentralize seesaw. Without the recentralization that results from automation and the use of computers, the idea of decentralizing may seem impractical. Nevertheless, large organizations have discovered some functions may remain centralized while others are decentralized.

When line functions can be put in the latter category, the shortening of communications lines, the increased flexibility of action can put the big company, at least in selected areas, more on a par with the smaller firm.

5. Centralize selectively. The small company generally benefits from short and uncomplicated communications lines. In addition, the fewer waystations there are in a communications link, the easier it becomes for informal communications to operate.

While informal communications are less practical for the larger firm, new technological advances make instant communication possible. For example, computers for loading rail and air passenger carriers, hotel bookings and so on now make it possible to centralize scheduling, warehousing, filing systems and the like, regardless of how extensive they may be.

Entire functions, such as purchasing, payroll, inventory control, also may be centralized for larger firms, using computerized equipment and advanced information retrieval systems.

6. Emphasize small group loyalty and identification. A sufficient number of studies, as well as common experience, have established the fact that the individual can develop great emotional ties to a business.

Members' loyalties and emotional involvement tend to be stronger in relation to subordinate groups than to the bigger organization. The college alumnus tends to have stronger ties to the class of '45 than to the university as a whole. Similarly, the employee has greater feeling for the department in which he operates than for the company as a whole.

The organization that makes it possible for the individual to develop a sense of identity with his department or immediate work group by treating it as a unit can expect more in the way of loyalty and interest in job objectives.

But here's where many companies lull themselves into dangerous complacency by so-called "enlightened policies"—such as that of the "open door"—designed to give employees a feeling of closeness to executives and the company.

Says Hermon H. Scott, president of H. H. Scott, of Maynard, Mass., hi-fi equipment manufacturer: "In a small company, the top executives are generally available to anybody at any time within reason. In the big company, even though the top man may be in the same building, it is difficult for anyone to see him without an appointment, open door policy or not."

Or, as one disgruntled employee put it: "Sure, my boss' door is open—so he can kick people out."

7. Check for organizational blockage. Removal of organizational obstacles can put big company reflexes more on a par with the smaller firm. Managers are familiar with bottlenecks in production. Somewhat the same thing may take place with management procedures. A decision may get hung up somewhere along a chain of command; a communication may fail to penetrate a middle echelon. A number of specific questions can help pinpoint the bottlenecks:

If there is insufficient flow of ideas upward, where is the transmission failure?

If decisionmaking and implementation are unsatisfactory, where does the hesitation, buckpassing or failure to act take place?

What department tends to get out of step in carrying out company policy? Studies have indicated that everything from pilferage to higher absence rates results from communication blockages typical of some large firms.

Equally important is the need to distinguish between quantity and quality of communication. A weekly house organ may seem a worthwhile medium but is useless if nobody reads it. Failure to distinguish between going through the motions and actually producing results is often at the root of poor communications in the larger firm.

As for decision-making, often a major big-company problem, specific procedures tend to point up action-blockage:

Over-use of committees: In some companies, there is a tendency toward proliferation of committees for anything and everything—planning, problem-solving, development of ideas.

In other instances, procedures normally given over to one executive are made the responsibility of many. A typical example is the hiring committee. An executive job opening is filled when a committee finally selects the best candidate. The trouble is that under this practice the man who usually gets the job may not be the best man at all, but merely the one to whom no one on the committee objects.

Foggy lines of authority: In some cases, necessary decisions are delayed because of the question of who has the authority to decide. Traditionally, this problem has involved line and staff executives in controversy. In many cases, the personalities of the respective executives cause the confusion. The problem may assume a variety of shapes:

A power-minded top executive may insist on making decisions handled by a subordinate.

An indecisive executive may try to pass a critical decision either up or down the line. The small-firm executive usually lacks this alternative, and therefore tends to make the decisions required anywhere in his area of responsibility.

The big company can force the same degree of decisiveness on its managers by clarifying its policies and procedures of decision-making, pinning down who is responsible for what, seeing that necessary decisions are not delayed. An occasional decision review to see how executives have been scoring with their decisions can clear the lines and stimulate the process.

Larger firms must also be careful to reward individual enterprise.

Big companies sometimes tend to build an atmosphere of apathy and an attitude of let's play it safe. This can only be dissipated by positive policies and action by the company. When an organization, by its rewards—promotion, salary increases, and so on—shows that it appreciates original thinking and responsible, tradition-breaking action, it fosters the creativity and drive it must have at all levels to keep moving ahead.

Incidentally, the assumption that big companies pay higher salaries than small ones is not generally substantiated: "There's not much difference in starting salaries between large and small firms," observes Hermon Scott. "Obviously, top salaries in the largest corporations are higher than any small company can pay. But actually, there are few such jobs. I would even go so far as to say that after the first couple of years, the average income for small-company executives tends to be higher than for larger companies."

Accordingly, discovering just how your salary levels compare with others in your industry and area may explain some mysteries of executive discontent and quitting.

The nature of our economy is such that there is a need for both large and small business. Certain services and products fall naturally within the sphere of each. Few small firms could produce an automobile, a computer, or an airplane. Few large firms can tie up large pieces of equipment with custom orders or highly specialized small runs. In between are areas in which big and small compete for customers. When this competition is carried on at high levels of efficiency, everyone benefits.

AUREN URIS,
Research Institute of America.

U.S. Policy in Defending Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the recent actions by the United States in Viet-

nam and in the Dominican Republic have brought a new determination and firmness to our policy of defending freedom in various sections of the globe where America has vital interests.

Basically, our military actions have served notice that we do not intend to follow a policy of appeasement wherever the Communists determine to test our will.

The essential meaning of this policy is recognized in several recent editorials published in the New York Journal-American and the New York World-Telegram. I ask unanimous consent to have three of these editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Apr. 28, 1965]

L.B.J. STANDS FIRM

In recent weeks, even days, the war in Vietnam has escalated to its most dangerous level. U.S. marines have fought with Vietcong guerrillas, and the presence of regular North Vietnamese Army formations in South Vietnam has been reported by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

Hence, it was widely speculated that President Johnson's news conference would provide news of major importance. But it is simply a measure of the consistency of American policy in the Far East that it did not.

President Johnson, looking solemn but confident, merely reaffirmed that the United States would not yield to aggression in that area and repeated his offer to talk peace "with any government, anywhere, anytime, without any conditions."

Thus there were no surprises, nor should there have been.

The President declined to speculate about the possible future outright commitment of American ground forces in Vietnam and gently chided those who queried him on whether nuclear weapons might be used in Vietnam. No one in the Government has ever brought the issue up, he told his listeners.

But in view of the fact that there are many in this country who still do not appear to have grasped the meaning of the American action in Vietnam, President Johnson appropriately reminded them that we have merely learned the lesson taught at Munich—that appeasement leads to war.

[From the New York (N.Y.) World-Telegram, May 4, 1965]

OUR PIEBALD IMAGE

Because of our involvement in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic, the United States is being treated to an overdose of world attention—much of it critical, and a lot of it, of course, not very well founded.

This is what we can expect for trying to be helpful all around, and for trying to look out for our own interests.

We have some hip-shooters in the British Parliament charging us with "monstrous aggression" for sending troops to the Dominican Republic. Newspaper editors in Europe and elsewhere are busy experting the confused situation in Santo Domingo—and some who denounce the United States for intervening also say we should use our force to put former President Juan Bosch back in power.

Bosch seems to think so, too.

It would be nice to have everybody thinking we are wise, generous, and altogether pure. We have spent and given away billions of dollars to help others and thus, hopefully, to make ourselves better understood.

But we can't combat communism, repel armed aggression, rescue innocent souls trapped in mob scenes, or look after our own best interests and the general safety of free allies—and worry too much about our image all over the globe.

Our Government has to make decisions and sometimes they have to be made fast. We can't base decisions by guessing how everybody is going to react. The Communist governments are predictable, but everybody in friendly countries is not.

As the President said, we like friends, but when we have a job to do, we will go ahead and do it, "whether we make friends or lose them."

In the long run, the current squawks notwithstanding, we will make more friends by being honest with our own well-known principles, and acting on them.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, May 4, 1965]

WE KNOW THE FACE

The enemy is the same. The reason for the presence of American troops is the same. The only real difference between the U.S. military actions in the Dominican Republic and Vietnam—apart from their extent—is that they are taking place on different sides of the world.

In Vietnam, we are witnessing one phase of a long-term Communist plan to seize and subjugate a densely populated, rice rich region of southeast Asia. In the Dominican Republic it is a case of swift, skilled Communist exploitation of a tragic social eruption—with the identical aim of seizure and subjugation—this time in the strategic Caribbean.

There, in 1958, a submerged Communist element rode the crest of a wave of popular discontent, surfacing only when victory was achieved. Thus a bridgehead hostile to the United States was established in Cuba. It is simply the matter of U.S. national self-interest that this strategy of the overt or covered coup, by an armed, organized minority not be permitted to repeat itself, certainly not this close to home.

CAN'T TOLERATE RED MENACE

Lest anyone take undue note of Soviet and other Communist rantings in the United Nations or elsewhere, let us recall Hungary. There in 1956 thousands of death-dealing Soviet tanks rolled into Budapest—because the Soviet Union was not prepared to permit a free, democratic state to establish itself near Russia's borders in Eastern Europe.

For the Soviet Union, freedom behind the Iron Curtain—as in West Berlin—is a menace. For the United States, communism in the Western Hemisphere—as in Cuba—is a menace.

Let the faint hearts and those who entertain qualms about our action in the Dominican Republic dwell upon this. Moreover it must be noted that the Charter of the U.N. itself expressly recognizes the right of nations to act when their fundamental national self-interests are threatened.

Finally, we are impressed by the decisiveness of President Johnson's dispatch of troops to the embattled Republic. In addition, we are dazzled by the display of logistics which brought so much to bear within so short a time. Let students of American muscle, whether friend or foe, ponder this and draw from it the appropriate lesson.

Sherman's March Through the Carolinas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on May 11 I had the privilege of attending a dinner given by the Civil War Round Table of the District of Columbia at the Army-Navy Club. Dr. John G. Barrett, professor of history at the Virginia Military Institute, was the speaker for the occasion, delivering a speech describing Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman's march through the Carolinas. He is the author of a book bearing that title.

Dr. Barrett's speech was most interesting and enlightening, bringing out many important facts and features about both the march and the man who led it. I consider the address of keen historic significance and worthy of being printed and preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Under leave previously granted me to extend my remarks, I include the same, which is as follows:

SHERMAN'S MARCH THROUGH THE CAROLINAS

Although William Tecumseh Sherman could not recall saying "War is hell," he did state: "You cannot qualify war in harsher terms than I will. War is cruelty and you cannot refine it." It was in the fall of 1862 that he developed his philosophy of total war which he though would make conflict "so terrible" that the South would exhaust all peaceful remedies before commencing another struggle. Considering all the people of the South as enemies of the Union, Sherman planned to use his military forces against the civilian population as well as the armies of the enemy. He believed this plan of action would not only demoralize the noncombatants but also the men under arms.

The southern armies in the field, he felt certain, could be disheartened by attacks on the civilian population, as easily as by defeats on the battlefield. Sherman's program of total war also called for the destruction of the enemy's economic resources. By paralyzing the Confederate economy he hoped to destroy the South's ability to supply its fighting forces with war materials. Thus in bringing war to the homefront he hoped to destroy both the South's capacity to wage war and its will to fight.

"Collective responsibility," the theory upon which total war rests, made possible a new mode of warfare in which the accepted rules of the time were transgressed. The effect was a certain disregard for human rights and dignity. But with Sherman "war * * * [was] war and not popularity seeking." He thought the South, for its part in bringing on the conflict, deserved "all the curses and maledictions a people can pour out." Nevertheless, he held out to his enemies the sincere promise of helping hand if they would lay down their arms and rejoin the Union. It was not a sense of cruelty and barbarism that prompted Sherman to formulate his theory of total war. This conception was the outgrowth of a search for the quickest, surest, and most efficient means to win a struggle. Victory, he determined, could be won more easily by moving troops than by

fighting. Strategy had become to him the master of tactics. The purpose of his strategy was to minimize fighting by striking at the supply lines and morale of the enemy.

The full application of this new philosophy of war was to be applied by Sherman in campaigns through Mississippi, Georgia, and the Carolinas. In Mississippi, the Federal Army destroyed the State's resources and lines of communication and demonstrated to the inhabitants how cruel a matter war could be. In Georgia, Sherman was to repeat the Mississippi performance but on a much larger scale.

When the Georgia operations ended at Savannah on December 21, 1864, all the accepted rules of strategy called for the immediate transfer of Sherman's 60,000 veterans from the Georgia coast to Richmond where Grant had Lee bottled up behind fortifications. General Grant was desirous of this move, but much to his dismay Sherman voiced strong objections to such a plan. He hoped to march on to Richmond by way of Columbia and Raleigh in the Carolinas. Every step northward from Savannah, Sherman felt, was as much a direct attack on Lee as though he were operating within sound of the artillery of the Army of Northern Virginia. He was firmly convinced that an application of total war in the Carolinas would have a direct bearing on the outcome of Grant's struggle around Richmond.

The combination of Sherman's persistence and the news of Thomas' devastating victory over Hood at Nashville persuaded the reluctant commanding general to grant permission for the move through the Carolinas.

Sherman's plan of campaign called for feints on both Augusta and Charleston and a march directly on Columbia and thence to Goldsboro, N.C., by way of Fayetteville on the Cape Fear. Goldsboro was chosen as the destination because that city was connected to the North Carolina coast by two rail lines running respectively from Morehead City (via New Bern) and Wilmington. By this circuit the Federal force could destroy the chief railroads of the Carolinas and devastate the heart of the two States.

Sherman planned to cut himself off completely from his base in Savannah; hence he could expect no Government supplies until he reached the Cape Fear River in North Carolina. His wagons could carry only limited provisions; thus the army would have to "forage liberally on the country during the march." To regulate the foraging parties, very strict orders were issued.

These instructions were in complete compliance with the accepted rules of warfare. Yet there was wide discrepancy between the orders and the actions of some of the men. In Georgia many of the foraging parties had degenerated into marauding bands of mounted robbers which operated not under the supervision of an officer but on their own. These groups committed every sort of outrage. Most of the pillage and wanton destruction of private property in the two Carolinas was the work of the "bummers," "smokehouse rangers," or "doboys," as this peripheral minority of self-constituted foragers was called. But the majority of officers and men in Sherman's army neither engaged in indiscriminate looting nor condoned the actions of those who did.

South Carolina awaited with despair and trepidation the appearance of Federal soldiers on her soil. Sherman's intemperate language in Savannah and the conduct of his troops in Georgia certainly warranted this apprehension. The Confederate general, Lafayette McLaws, wrote his wife from Pocotaligo: "There is a great alarm all through the country and a strong disposition to give up, among the old residents even, and with the females especially." Time and again Gov. A. B. Magrath called with little avail on the people of South Carolina to rally to the colors. Magrath's continuous appeals led one Confederate officer to remark that he had two brigades and five proclamations with which to oppose the Federals.

When Sherman commenced his march through the Carolinas the latter part of January 1865, the meager Confederate forces that could possibly be brought to oppose him were scattered from Virginia to Mississippi. So by February 7 the major part of the Federal Army had penetrated, without diffculty, well into South Carolina and was encamped along the Charleston-Augusta Railroad. Five days later Orangeburg, to the north, was in Sherman's hands.

As the army had pushed deeper into South Carolina, foraging had become more of a vital necessity to the success of the campaign. Although Sherman had ordered that officers command all foraging parties, scores of foragers roamed about under no supervision, intent only on plunder. Due largely to the activities of this group much of the lower part of the State lay in smouldering ruins by the second week in February.

From Orangeburg the army moved out in the direction of Columbia, destroying the railroad as it went. This capital city, crowded almost to suffocation with refugees, was the scene of confusion and turmoil when the booming of cannon gave strength to the rumors of Sherman's proximity. Early in the morning of the 17th Columbia fell to the Federal forces, and sometime before noon Sherman, with a few members of his staff, rode into the city. His reception by the crowds in the streets was tumultous, but the temperate O. O. Howard, riding with the general at the time, correctly observed that the enthusiasm for the conquering hero was largely due to the inebriated condition of those present.

Columbia at this time was virtually one vast warehouse filled with spiritous liquors. In the confusion of the days preceding the city's fall the Negroes had gotten their hands on large quantities of these various beverages. They in turn passed out much of this alcohol to the men in blue as they approached the capital from the north and the west.

On a ride about the city Sherman had the unusual experience of observing large quantities of loose cotton, from bales lining the streets, being scattered about by a high prevailing wind and at the market square he had to ride his horse on the sidewalk to avoid a long pile of burning cotton bales. There is conclusive evidence that at least some cotton was fired before Sherman entered the city but the origin of these early fires is still a matter of dispute. In the final analysis, however, the source of these blazes is of little significance because they had all been completely extinguished by midafternoon.

Consequently it cannot be said that burning cotton was the cause of the terrible conflagration of February 17 that practically leveled the capital city of South Carolina. It was the drunken solider who was primarily responsible for this holocaust. Still he was not acting under instructions from his commanding general. Sherman's orders for the campaign of the Carolinas contain no instructions for the molestation of private property in Columbia.

In the long run the general felt that the burning of private homes, though not designed by him, was a trifling matter when compared with the manifold results which soon followed. "Though I never ordered it and never wished it, I have never shed any tears over the event, because I believe that it hastened what we all fought for, the end of the war." This laconic statement pretty well sums of Sherman's sentiments on the burning of Columbia.

The Army remained in the city for 2 days destroying, under orders, public and railroad property. On February 20, to the accompaniment of hisses and boos from the people along the streets, the troops resumed their march toward Winnsboro.

This historic old town, as well as Camden to the south and Cheraw to the east, suffered much at the hands of the Federal troops. At Cheraw, the Army's last stop in South Carolina, Sherman learned that his former opponent, Joseph E. Johnston, had replaced Beauregard as commander of the Confederate forces in North and South Carolina. He now concluded that Johnston would unite his widely scattered forces and at a place of his own choosing strike one of the Federal columns on the move. Fully aware that the battle he wished to avoid now seemed unavoidable, Sherman put his army in motion for Fayetteville, N.C., some 70 miles northeast.

South Carolina was now free of this army, which had applied total war in its severest terms within her borders. Lt. Charles S. Brown of the 21st Michigan never spoke truer words when than he said: "South Carolina may have been the cause of the whole thing, but she has had an awful punishment."

As early as January 1865 the North Carolina newspapers had begun to prepare the people of the State for invasion. But with the fall of Fort Fisher on January 15 and the occupation of Wilmington a week later, the people of North Carolina almost surrendered themselves to a wave of despondency. Late in February General Lee declared that the despair of the North Carolinians was destroying his army. He wrote to Gov. Zebulon B. Vance: "Desertings are becoming very frequent and there is reason to believe that they are occasioned to considerable extent by letters written to the soldiers by their friends at home."

General Sherman entered North Carolina with the confident expectation of receiving a welcome from its supposedly large number of pro-Union citizens. Thus he had his officers issue orders for the gentler treatment of the inhabitants and, when the State line was crossed, circulate new instructions regulating foraging activities. But no orders were drafted prohibiting the burning of the great pine forests within the State. North Carolina's turpentine woods blazed in fantastic "splendor as 'bummers' touched matches to congealed sap in notches on tree trunks." Seldom did the soldiers pass up an opportunity to fire these pine forests for burning rosin and tar created a spectacle of flame and smoke that surpassed in grandeur anything they had ever seen before. One Federal soldier wrote: "Among the curiosities of our march the burning of these factories was the most curious. Another remarked that oftentimes the smoke could hardly escape through the green canopy above and being like a pall, it created a feeling of awe as though one were within the precincts of a grand old cathedral."

On March 8 North Carolina for the first time felt the full weight of the Federal Army, the right wing having crossed the State line on this date. General Sherman, traveling with the 15th Corps, made his headquarters near Laurel Hill Presbyterian Church, a region his soldiers thought looked "real Northernlike. Small farms and nice white, tidy dwellings." However, the torrential rains which set in on that date soon turned the roads into a sea of mud and water, making them almost impassable for troops and trains. The most formidable obstacle in the path of the army lay in the dark, swirling waters of the Lumber River and its adjacent swamps. This region brought from Sherman the remark: "It was the damnest marching I ever saw." The wagons and artillery could only be dragged along by the mules with the assistance of soldiers who either tugged at ropes out ahead of the teams or put their hands to the wheels. The teamsters, reins in one hand, constantly punctuated the air with a dexterous whip lash to

remind the poor mules of their "black military heart and endless faults. Every sentence was ordained with an oath." "Such a wild scene of splashing and yelling and swearing and braying has rarely greeted mortal eyes and ears" wrote one Ohioan of Sherman's army. After darkness the work was carried on in the eerie light of thousands of torches and blazing pine trees.

The Federal cavalry under Gen. Judson Kilpatrick crossed the Lumber River on March 8. Here Kilpatrick learned that the Confederate cavalry under Wade Hampton was only a few miles in the rear and moving rapidly on Fayetteville. Hoping to intercept the enemy, he set a trap for them only to have his own camp surprised and put to flight on the morning of March 10 by the Confederate horsemen. To make his escape Kilpatrick, clad only in his underclothes, had to spring from the warm bed of a lady companion, mount the nearest saddleless horse, and disappear into a neighboring swamp.

Kilpatrick's escape on the morning of the surprise attack is as controversial a subject as the number of casualties suffered on each side. General Kilpatrick told an acquaintance after the war that on this particular morning he walked out of his headquarters in his slippers about daylight, as was his usual custom, to see that his horses were fed. Such a habit was certainly the exception rather than the rule for most high-ranking officers. A Confederate soldier in on this surprise attack presumed Kilpatrick to be the only example from Joshua to the 19th century of a major general who would walk out of a farm room in cold weather only partially dressed to see horses fed 100 yards away.

Since the Federal cavalrymen eventually drove the Confederates out of their camp there is still disagreement over who actually got the better of the fighting at Monroe's Crossroads, contemptuously tagged by the Federal infantry as "Kilpatrick's Shirttail Skedaddle." Yet the fact stands that by engaging Kilpatrick in battle, Hampton was able to open the road to Fayetteville which the Federal camp blocked. The Confederate cavalry joined Gen. W. J. Hardee near Fayetteville that night. Hardee's small force after evacuating Charleston on February 18, had been moving north just ahead of Sherman's army.

The Confederate forces withdrew across the Cape Fear on March 11, burning the bridge behind them. At the same time the Federal advance entered the city from the south. Sherman especially wanted to reach this river port in order that he could retake the arsenal located there. At the outbreak of war the Confederates had taken over the U.S. arsenal in the city and for 4 years this valuable Government property had served the South.

Fayettesville suffered a great deal as a result of the Federal occupancy. Besides the destruction of numerous public buildings, including the arsenal, there was considerable pillaging by the "bummers," but this plundering of private property was done, for the most part, before Gen. Absolom Baird took command of the city and garrisoned it with three brigades.

While at Fayetteville, Sherman took the opportunity to replace all rejected animals of his trains with those taken from the local citizens and to clear his columns of the vast crowd of white refugees and Negroes that followed the Federal Army. He called these followers "20,000 to 30,000 useless mouths." To Gen. A. H. Terry at Wilmington he wrote: "They are dead weight to me and consume our supplies." At the same time he complained to Grant that he could leave Fayetteville the next day were it not for the large crowd of refugees that encumbered his army.

By the middle of March, Sherman had his entire force across the Cape Fear, and the move on Goldsboro had begun. The general was in a happy frame of mind as he watched his troops march by. The campaign was running like clockwork. Goldsboro, he felt sure, would be his in a few days.

From Savannah to Fayetteville, Sherman had moved his army in flawless fashion, but from this latter place to Goldsboro his operations were definitely characterized by carelessness in the management of a large army. He placed little importance on General Hardee's delaying action at Averasboro on March 16. Also, he allowed his columns to become strung out to such extent that Johnston came close to crushing one of the Federal corps at Bentonville. At this small town west of Goldsboro, the Confederate general had skillfully managed, on March 19, to concentrate his scattered forces. Completely ignorant of this move, Sherman allowed his Fourteenth Corps to be surprised by the enemy. For a while it looked as though Johnston would carry the day, but Federal reinforcements late in the afternoon blunted the Confederate offensive.

More Union troops reached the field during the day of March 20, and by the next day Sherman had his entire army in the vicinity of Bentonville. That night Johnston withdrew his forces to Smithfield.

General Sherman claimed victory at Bentonville, the largest battle of the war in North Carolina, on the grounds that he was in possession of the battlefield when the fighting closed, and that Johnston had failed in his attempt to crush the Federal left wing. Still the general had little of which to boast. His force was more than twice the size of his opponent's. Yet on March 19, the Federals tottered on the brink of a resounding defeat. Sherman's conduct at Bentonville bears out the truth of one of his subordinate's statements: "Strategy was his strongest point. Take him in battle and he did not seem to be the equal of Thomas or Grant."

Furthermore, Sherman failed to follow up his success by pursuing the enemy. Instead he moved his army into Goldsboro. Awaiting him there were the forces of Generals Terry and Jacob D. Cox of John M. Schofield's command which had marched up from Wilmington and New Bern.

The general's explanation to Grant as to why he pushed on to Goldsboro rather than after Johnston leaves something to be desired. In this communication he does not claim that his men were short of food or ammunition, "the only adequate excuse: for halting." He seemed to consider shoes, which were noticeably absent among the men, his most essential need. But the scarcity of footwear did not warrant a delay at this time. The Confederate soldiers were also without shoes.

At Goldsboro, Sherman was disturbed to find neither of the two railroads from the coast fully repaired and no supplies awaiting him. Nevertheless, he decided to change the foraging system. All foragers were ordered dismounted and placed in the ranks. Their horses and mules were turned over to the Quartermaster Corps, which meant quite a few animals. "About half of this army are mounted," wrote a Federal soldier before this order went into effect. "It rather don't care to do much more walking. Nearly everyone has his own coach, cab, buggy, cart or wagon, drawn by horses or mules—blind or lame—colts or old worn out horses or mules * * * General Sherman could now advertise a livery stable extensive enough to supply the whole country, provided they were not choice as to rigs."

Still, the corn-crib and fodder-stack commandoes could look back upon a plentiful harvest between Fayetteville and Goldsboro. The countryside had supplied them with more forage, in some instances, than they could carry away. Meat and meal had been found in abundance. So skillfully had the bummers covered this region that the rooster no longer crowed in the morning because he no longer existed. Had the rooster escaped with his life there would have been no fence rail for him to perch on. At least such was the opinion of one newspaper correspondent.

As vital as the forager had been to the success of the campaign, Gen. James D. Morgan, of the Federal XIV Corps, regretted that he had to exclude him from praise and credit. He wrote: "I have some men in my command * * * who have mistaken the name and meaning of the term foragers, and have become under that name highwaymen with all of their cruelty and ferocity and none of their courage."

Sherman's arrival in Goldsboro had been announced by the columns of smoke which rose from buring farmhouses on the south side of the Neuse, but within the town itself the "bummers" had little chance to pillage and destroy because Schofield had occupied the place 2 days before they arrived and had stationed guards to prevent outrages.

Goldsboro was entirely too small to hold much interest for the Federal soldiers. A trooper of the 103d Illinois wrote in his diary that the "Town don't amount to anything" while a Michigan lieutenant referred to it as "a little 7 by 9 sort of a hole about as large as Bentonville was once." Despite what they said, these men along with the great majority of Sherman's soldiers enjoyed, as one of them put it, "luxuriating in the delicious spring weather."

By March 25, repairs on the railroad from New Bern were finished, and the first train from the coast arrived in Goldsboro. This completed the task Sherman had set out to do upon leaving Savannah. His army was now united with the armies of Schofield and Terry. Large supply bases on the North Carolina coast were available by rail, and the countryside from Savannah to Goldsboro, for an average breadth of 40 miles, had been laid waste.

The general now decided it was time to discuss with Grant the plans for a junction of their armies around Richmond. He hoped to share with the Army of the Potomac the glory of capturing the Confederate capital. Late in the afternoon of March 25, Sherman boarded a train for City Point, Va., Grant's headquarters. The visit proved futile as the commanding general was not disposed to delay his own push against Lee until the troops at Goldsboro could join him. So in 5 days Sherman was back in eastern North Carolina, busily addressing himself to the task of the reorganization of his army and the replenishment of stores.

On April 10 he broke camp and started his march on Raleigh. When Sherman's move was reported to Johnston at Smithfield, he also put his small Confederate force in motion for the North Carolina capital.

During the night of April 11, Sherman learned of Lee's surrender at Appomattox. The announcement of this momentous news the next day put the Federal soldiers in a hilarious mood, even as the march went forward. Toward this capering army was coming a Confederate locomotive. Inside the car were peace commissioners out of Raleigh. That night at Sherman's headquarters these emissaries unsuccessfully conferred with the general about a suspension of hostilities. They did get from him, however, a promise of protection for both the State and municipal officials in the capital city.

In the meantime the Confederate forces, along with Governor Vance, had evacuated Raleigh and Johnston had reported to President Jefferson Davis at Greensboro. While there, Johnston learned of Lee's capitulation. The news of this disaster fully convinced the general that the Confederacy was doomed. He realized that his small army, its ranks growing thinner by the day, was no match for Sherman.

In Johnston's opinion, President Davis now had only one governmental power left,

that of terminating the war, and he thought this power should be exercised immediately. In a conference with the President, he was able to get the Chief Executive, after much discussion, to authorize him to send Sherman, who was at Raleigh, a communication asking for a suspension of hostilities.

That Sherman would arrive in Raleigh in the course of his march had been anticipated since the day he entered the State. The local papers had kept the citizens posted on the progress of his march. This fact plus wild stories of Federal atrocities circulated by Gen. Joe Wheeler's men were not very comforting thoughts for the local inhabitants. Following the general practice of those Carolinians caught in Sherman's path, the citizens of Raleigh hid their possessions in an effort to save them. Former Gov. Charles Manly placed a portion of his possessions in a heavy wooden box and buried it 3 miles from the city. "It was a terrible job," he declared. "I laid on the ground perfectly exhausted before I could gain strength to mount my horse." Soon after the Federal occupation of Fayetteville, Governor Vance began the transfer of State records and huge military stores he had accumulated. To Graham, Greensboro, and Salisbury were transferred 40,000 blankets, overcoats, and clothes; English cloth for about 100,000 uniforms; shoes, and leather for 10,000 other pairs; 150,000 pounds of bacon; 40,000 bushels of corn, 6,000 blades; and large quantities of cotton cloth, yarns, cotton cards, and imported medical stores. The last train out of Raleigh with supplies, records, and State officials aboard left the depot shortly before 9 p.m. on April 12.

Sherman arrived in Raleigh early the next morning and immediately set up headquarters in the Governor's mansion which a member of his staff called "a musty old brick building * * * in derision called the 'palace.'"

Johnston's message asking for a suspension of hostilities reached the general on April 14. His immediate reply led to a meeting with Johnston at Daniel Bennett's farmhouse a few miles west of Durham. There on April 17 and 18 Sherman granted terms to his adversary that restored to the South a large measure of its "status quo" ante bellum condition. This generous agreement clearly shows that with Sherman, total war was a strategic not a vindictive matter.

While these negotiations with Johnston were in progress, Sherman had the unpleasant task of announcing to his army the news of President Lincoln's death. In order to prevent any serious disorders, he delayed releasing the announcement until precautionary measures could be taken to insure the safety of the city. This move in all probability spared Raleigh a fate similar to that of Atlanta or Columbia.

The general assumed that his peace terms would be acceptable to the administration in Washintgon and for several days all went well for him. Raleigh, unmarred by the ravages of war, made an impression on both Sherman and his soldiers. The men, with but few exceptions, acclaimed the city's lovely trees, stately public buildings, fine residences, wide streets, and well-kept lawns. To the members of the 86th Illinois, "Raleigh was the handsomest city in Famous Dixie, it being neat and clean and its situation grand."

The rural population of Wake and adjoining counties where Federal troops encamped did not fare as well as the citizens of the capital. George W. Mordecai wrote David L. Swain that farms in Wake, Orange, and Granville Counties were "completely dispoiled of everything in the shape of provisions and forage." In addition many houses were either burned or torn down. At Charles Manly's plantation 3 miles from Raleigh, the devastation was "thorough and unsparing." Manly listed as lost all weatherboarding, flooring, windows, and furniture in his dwelling houses. Barns, sheds, and cotton houses were stripped of siding; fences were burned; gear was broken up. All hogs and poultry were either driven off or killed. Medicine, excellent brandy, whisky, wine, and 200 gallons of vinegar were taken. Federal wagon trains came out every day until 150 bushels of corn, 15,000 pounds of fodder, 12,000 pounds of hay, and a few bushels of peas and wheat were hauled off.

Approximately 30 miles west of Raleigh at the small university town of Chapel Hill, a division of Kilpatrick's cavalry was encamped. These cavalrymen, however, resorted to very little pillaging and whiled away their time in much the same manner as the troops in Raleigh. Their commanding officer, Gen. Smith D. Atkins, certainly was not interested in robbing the countryside. He was too busy courting President Swain's daughter, Ellie.

While the troops were encamped in Chapel Hill, one could only speculate as to the outcome of this romance. Eleanor's parents certainly did not know, having refrained from questioning her on the subject. It was not until after Atkins' departure on May 3 that the long awaited announcement came. In a short note addressed to her parents, "Miss Ellie" stated that she intended to marry General Atkins. She reminded her parents that she was 21 years old and capable of judging for herself. In the face of the furor caused by her decision, the strong-willed Eleanor wrote a friend that "but one voice can prevent this affair, and that is higher than man." The Almighty did not see fit to intervene and the couple was married August 23, 1865. It was victory for "true love," wrote Cornelia Spencer, a friend.

Surely General Atkins, as he led his troops out of Chapel Hill in early May, felt that war was not altogether hell.

Sherman's confidence that the war was over received a rude jolt on the morning of April 24 when Grant arrived at his headquarters with the news that the surrender terms were not acceptable in Washington. So once again Sherman met with Johnston. This time he offered, and the Confederate general accepted per force, the terms Lee had received at Appomattox.

Rebuffed in his efforts to befriend the South politically, Sherman did what he could to alleviate the economic distresses in the region around Raleigh. Army commanders were ordered to "loan" the inhabitants at once all the captured horses, mules, wagons, and vehicles that could be spared from immediate use. Generals were encouraged to issue provisions, animals, and any public supplies that could be spared to relieve present wants and to encourage the inhabitants to renew their peaceful pursuits and to restore relations of friendship among our fellow citizens and countrymen. Foraging was to cease and all provisions acquired were to be paid for on the spot.

To Johnston, Sherman expressed the hope that the animals "loaned" the farmers would be enough to insure a crop. In closing, he repeated the familiar promise: "Now that the war is over. I am willing to risk my person and reputation as heretofore to heal the wounds made by the past war." He went on to say that he thought his feeling was shared by his army and that of Johnston also. In his reply the Confederate general informed Sherman that in all of their interviews he had been impressed by his sincere desire "to heal the wounds made by the (past) war." The most amazing line in this letter was the usually impassive Johnston's confession that the misfortune of his life was that of having had to encounter Sherman in the field.

Sherman's plan for departure were temporarily interrupted with the arrival in Raleigh of the New York newspapers of April 24. These papers carried over Secretary Edwin M. Stanton's signature a War Department bulletin implying that Sherman had deliberately disobeyed Lincoln's orders concerning surrender negotiations and that for "bankers gold" he might allow Jefferson Davis, who was fleeing south at the time, to escape.

The publication of this bulletin made Sherman extremely angry. Reacting as if he were a caged lion, the general, before members of his staff, lashed out at Stanton as a "mean, scheming, vindictive politician who made it his business to rob military men of their credit earned by exposing their lives in the service of their country. He berated the people who blamed him for what he had done as a mass of fools, not worth fighting for, who did not know when a thing was well done. He railed at the press * * * which had become the engine of villification."

Bitter at northern politicians and the press, Sherman now considered as his best friends the defeated Confederates and the soldiers of his own army. In a letter to Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase, Sherman voiced a strong feeling for the people of the South. He told the judge that in case of war against a foreign foe he "would not hesitate" to mingle with the southerners and lead them in battle. In the same temper he wrote his wife, Ellen: "The mass of people south will never trouble us again. They have suffered terribly, and I now feel disposed to befriend them—of course not the leaders and lawyers, but the armies who have fought and manifested their sincerity though misled by risking their persons."

On April 28 Sherman summoned to his headquarters in the Governor's mansion all corps and army commanders. He explained to them their duties after his departure. The necessary orders were completed and on April 29, Sherman departed by rail for Wilmington. He could leave Raleigh knowing he had honestly endeavored to shorten the road to reunion. If the terms first offered Johnston had been accepted, the southern people would have resumed the place they held in the Union in 1860, and the evils of congressional reconstruction might have been forestalled.

In retrospect, Sherman considered the march north from Savannah "by far the most important in conception and execution of any act of * * * [his] life." He placed particular importance on his operations in the Carolinas because, he he states it: "I honestly believe that the grand march of the western army * * * from Savannah to Raleigh was an important factor in the final result, the overwhelming victory at Appomattox, and the glorious triumph of the Union cause." This statement by Sherman raises the question as to whether the devastation wrought in the Carolinas by his army had a direct and immediate bearing on the end of the war.

Sherman's movements through South and North Carolina were bold, imaginative strokes, masterfully executed. One historian has rightly characterized the Carolinas campaign as "a triumph of physical endurance and mechanical skill on the part of the army and of inflexible resolution in the general." Sherman was absolutely sincere in his conviction that total war was the most effective means at hand to shorten the conflict; yet, this method of warfare as applied in the Carolinas had little direct bearing on Lee's decision to surrender when and where he did. It was the practical annihilation of Hood's army in Tennessee that paved the way for Appomattox.

Sherman disrupted much of the rail communications in two Carolinas, as well as destroying large quantities of the South's dwindling supplies, but Lee's army was not short of rations because of Sherman's march. The Confederate plight at Richmond was due largely to a breakdown in the transportation system in Virginia. Cavalry raids to Lee's rear in late 1864 and early 1865 had de-

stroyed much in the way of railroad installations. Up to the day of Lee's capitulation special depots, in Virginia and North Carolina, were filled with ample provisions earmarked for the Army of Northern Virginia. Had transportation been available during the latter months of the war, Lee's men would not have had to subsist on meager provisions. The chief of the Confederate commissary reported in February 1955 that it was even possible to draw a surplus for the Richmond and Petersburg depots "whenever transportation could be procured."

The Federal march north from Savannah, nevertheless, brought home to the people of the Carolinas the stern realities of war. The use of a military force against the civilian population and economic resources unquestionably helped to undermine the morale of the South, producing a "defeatist psychology" both on the home front and on the battlefield. As noted earlier, Lee's ranks were thinned daily by the desertions of soldiers going home to protect their families in the line of Sherman's march. In this respect the Carolinas campaign had an indirect effect on Grant's operations in Virginia.

General Sherman's military stature rests not upon the effect his campaign in the Carolinas had upon Lee's defeat but upon his refusal to be bound by orthodox strategy and stubborn military tradition which called for him to defeat or destroy the enemy's main army before striking at the "state sheltered behind it." To have seen and grasped the importance of such a move has given Sherman a ranking position among the country's great military leaders. As a strategist he was far ahead of his time. Some present-day writers see in the flexibility of Sherman's operations a similarity to modern panzer tactics and in his destruction of the South's economic resources a picture of strategic bombings.

Though pitiless in campaign and intemperate in language, Sherman was not a cruel individual with the instincts of a barbarian. He conceived of total war as a strategic necessity demanded by the very nature of war itself. To him war was cruelty and you could not refine it.

Padre Island National Seashore is Major Attraction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with the warmer weather coming on, the wisdom of Congress in making Padre Island a national seashore will soon be proven by the largest crowd of tourists in the island's history.

Although the final developments for this project are still being undertaken, this island is already becoming a haven for tourists, with its long expanses of while sand, as it is the last remaining while-sand beach in America, with its beautiful solitude along its beaches, and its warm gulf waters.

To illustrate the beauty and benefits of this national seashore, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Padre Island National Seashore Project Launched," written by L. A. Wilke, and published on April 25, 1965, in the Wichita Falls Times be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times, April 25, 1965]

PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE PROJECT LAUNCHED

(By L. A. Wilke)

The current budget request of President Johnson for approximately a million dollars for first construction work on the Padre Island National Seashore project will begin a new era in the history of this romantic stretch of sand and shell along the South Texas coastline.

The money will go into construction of an office building, headquarters, and immediate tourist facilities for the island, according to William L. Bowen, National Park Superintendent in charge. Currently the park project officials are using temporary headquarters to carry on their surveys and negotiations for land acquisition.

For those who want to remember Padre Island somewhat as it was, this will be the biggest year in the tourist history of the island, officials predict. The year 1964 brought more tourists to the island, and it received more publicity than for any other half-dozen years since its beaches have been accessible to the general public. The island can be reached now over two county-owned causeways. At the north end of the island, there is a causeway from Corpus Christi.

CAUSEWAY BUILT

At the south end, Cameron County has built a causeway from Port Isabel to South Padre Beach.

Projected is another causeway from Port Mansfield, east to Raymondville, to the midsection of the island. This causeway will run parallel to the U.S. Government shipping channel which splits the island at this point. This channel provides access directly to the Gulf of Mexico from Port Mansfield, where Willacy County has installed a massive, highly efficient boat basin.

Padre Island has had an immense amount of publicity during the past year. More than a score of travel writers, under the sponsorship of the Texas Tourist Development Agency, last spring played on the island. Their writing still is appearing in magazines of national circulation.

Later some 200 members of the Outdoor Writers Association of America, spent a day there, fishing, beachcombing and shell hunting. There hardly has been a week since then when an item hasn't appeared in some outdoors column about the wonders of the South Padre Beach.

This area boasts a post office, South Padre Island, Tex., and a chamber of commerce. The latter organization has prepared beautiful descriptive literature on the area. They describe fully the modern motels, marinas, and other facilities provided for either tourists or those who want to become residents.

ADDITIONAL FACILITIES

Another push was given South Padre promotion recently when a corps of Braniff Airlines hostesses and photographers went to the island to make pictures and gather information for the benefit of Braniff customers traveling to the south.

To meet the demands of those who visit Padre Island, additional facilities are now being provided. These will include several chain motor hotels, supermarkets, and perhaps an apartment complex.

However, main development foreseen for the year will be the projection of the new causeway, and the possibility of building a road some 20 miles up the center of the island between Port Isabel and the Port Mansfield ship channel.

Currently, the area just south of the Port Mansfield Channel not involved in the national seashore program, is being developed for subdivision by the South Padre Investment Corp., of Austin and Brownsville. George Sandlin, of Austin, is president of this company which has extensive plans for the area development.

Padre Island provides excellent playgrounds for both summer and winter vacationists. During the winter hundreds of families from the Middle West have spent the cold months in the warm sunshine of the island, fishing, playing in the sand, and enjoying other activities. Reservations already made at the deluxe island motels now indicate it will be the heaviest summer influx ever experienced.

Most of the land on Padre Island became a national seashore 2 years ago through congressional action. It is the last remaining, white sand beach in America and its development now is underway.

Former Cincinnati Mayor, Charles P. Taft, Opposes Coordinator for Urban Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there are many experienced city, county, and State officials in the Republican Party whose voices are heard all too seldom in discussing the proposals made in Washington favoring an ever more powerful Federal Government. The son of former President William Howard Taft and brother of the late beloved Robert A. Taft, has had years of experience as mayor of Cincinnati and as city councilman. In the magazine Christianity and Crisis, April 19, 1965, he wrote a letter taking exception with the proposal for a Cabinet officer of urban affairs. His remarks deserve careful study among the Members of Congress, and members and local officials, some of whom may too easily accept this project without thinking.

The article follows:

COORDINATOR FOR URBAN PROBLEMS

To the Editors:

I have just read the editorial by Richard T. Baker on "Governing Our Cities" in your March 22 issue. He includes this sentence, "The proposal for a Cabinet officer of urban affairs is a sound one."

I must take vigorous exception to this statement. In the first place Mr. Johnson did not propose it; he proposed that the Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA) be made a Cabinet post. The President has learned what John F. Kennedy did not: that the problem in the cities, in dealing with the Federal Government, is to get coordination between the Federal Housing Administration, the Urban Renewal Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads (in Commerce) and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This is not accomplished by a cabinet office of urban affairs, because the holder of that office will be fighting with the other cabinet officers.

Even if the HHFA is made a Cabinet office, for which there may be some reason, it will not help the cities at all.

What is needed is what Mr. Kennedy did for the District of Columbia, to appoint Mr. Horsky as a Special Assistant in the White House to coordinate the impact of the three departments on the District. His post should be enlarged to become the Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs. In that post a strong person could require coordination between the Cabinet officers and the head of HHFA.

CHARLES P. TAFT,
City Councilman, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A New Voice Is Heard in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, I was among a group of Members of this House, of both parties, on a short trip to Selma, Ala., where a number of persons were attempting to register to vote.

They encountered storm trooper tactics employed by the forces of reaction. As a result of the outrageous murders and other violence, this Congress is well along its way to enacting a tight but reasonable law to guarantee that no American citizen shall be denied his most basic civil right.

After its flirtation with the tactics of Nazi Germany, there seems a slight change of attitude in Alabama. The change may be due in part to the emergence of an enlightened self-interest on the part of the business and industrial comunity of the State.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an excellent news analysis from the Washington Post of April 18, 1965:

A NEW VOICE IS HEARD IN ALABAMA—THE "BIG MULES" CALL FOR MODERATION

(By Robert E. Baker)

The "big mules" of Alabama have gathered for a massive effort to push segregationist Gov. George C. Wallace toward racial moderation.

The question is, Did the big mules—the top civic and business leaders of the State—wait too long?

The call for moderation in Alabama follows a pattern that has been familiar during the last decade in Southern States and communities in racial crises. These places turn the corner toward moderation only when the big mules start kicking.

And the big mules start kicking only when their pocketbooks are pinched.

Industrialists and businessmen generally have stood aloof from involvement in racial matters in Southern States. But they eventually have entered the field when a racial crisis threatens to hurt them economically.

Virginia's top industrial leaders played a role in defeating massive resistance to school desegregation, when schools were closed and the economic future clouded. They did it in a Virginia manner, however, not flamboyantly, but by laying down the law to then Gov. J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., at a dinner meeting in Richmond's Commonwealth Club.

Threatened school closings in Georgia also spurred the reluctant mules into action. In Little Rock, the city had to undergo a serious financial setback before the top business and industrial men took action against the defiance of Gov. Orval E. Faubus. The businessmen of Birmingham and Atlanta were instrumental in settling racial impasses and strife.

In pre-World War II years, the moneyed and business interests in the South supported the demagog, giving him free run of the race issue in return for economic concessions and policies of opposition to organized labor.

But the South's economic base began shifting after World War II away from a preponderance of textile mills and agriculture with reliance on cheap, unskilled labor. In the new industrial South, it is no longer to the advantage of business to have a demagog running politics because bad race relations today means bad business.

A few years ago, the business community of New Orleans went along with Gov. James H. Davis and his defiant segregationist manner in return for favorable taxes and other concessions. But they awakened to find the Governor leading Louisiana into a school desegregation crisis that was hurting them economically—and they banded together to push moderation.

SOME ACTED BEFORE CRISIS

In some areas, the industrialists and businessmen have acted before the crisis. Such was the case in Charlotte, N.C., where the city leaders and top businessmen each took a Negro to lunch downtown to show everybody that the public accommodations requirement of the Civil Rights Act was to be obeyed.

In hard-core Mississippi, the businessmen, bankers, and industrialists finally came forth to call for racial moderation and only then did the State begin to move, slowly, away from utter defiance. It is significant that, in Alabama's recent crisis in Selma, neither Gov. Paul B. Johnson, of Mississippi nor Gov. John J. McKeithen, of Louisiana, has lent any support to Wallace.

Last week, the big mules of Alabama started kicking. In full-page advertisements in 22 State newspapers and in influential newspapers in the North, they called for obedience to the Civil Rights Act and asked business leaders of the State to provide leadership in obeying the fair employment provisions that go into effect in July.

LAW-AND-ORDER STATEMENT

They said the vast majority of Alabamans believe in law and order, fair treatment, and in the basic human dignity of all people to all men. They obliquely suggested the formation of a statewide biracial committee. They condemned public demonstrations which violate the law and hoodlums who take the law into their own hands. And anybody should be able to vote, they said, if he can pass fairly administered tests.

The big mules did not come out in public by name. Instead, the advertisement was signed by the chambers of commerce in 17 cities from Birmingham to Sylacauga, and by the State chamber of commerce, the Associated Industries of Alabama, the Alabama Bankers Association, and the Alabama Textile Manufacturers Association.

The Selma-Dallas County Chamber of Commerce was not among the original sponsors of the ad. But Friday the Selma City Council voted 8 to 0 to endorse it and both the city council and the local chamber took out ads in today's edition of the Selma Times-Journal to support the original statements.

LOSS OF U.S. CONTRACTS FEARED

The impetus for the businessmen's move was not the boycott of Alabama products and industry called by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. This was simply an added factor.

The basic impetus was the fear that Alabama might start losing out on Federal Government contracts upon which the State's economy depends heavily. Instrumental in getting support for the statement were the industries and businesses around the space center of Huntsville, for example.

Behind it, too, were big businessmen like Winton Blount, who is president of the State chamber of commerce and a financial backer of Alabama Republicans but, more importantly, a contractor who depends on huge Federal installations.

These men felt that Governor Wallace's defiance on racial matters was isolating Alabama and they feared that the Federal Government in the future might throw contracts and projects elsewhere.

Also striking deep concern into the Alabama industrialists and bankers was a story about the troubles of the Hammermill Paper Co. that appeared in the April 9 issue of the Wall Street Journal.

Hammermill's perfectly proper decision in May 1964, to build a $30 million pulp plant in Selma eventually got the company involved in Selma's racial problems this year. The lesson for industry, said the newspaper, is to consider racial harmony along with economic factors before locating in the South.

It is significant, therefore, that the newspaper advertisement of the Alabama business groups was taken in the Wall Street Journal, among others, last week.

The stand for moderation by Alabama's businessmen comes tardily. In the past, the successful candidate for the Senate or governorship in Alabama depended, of course, upon getting more than 50 percent of the mass voters—plus a sufficient portion of the business interests to put up the necessary money.

TWO YEARS OF SILENCE

But Alabama's business interests, many of which supported Wallace for Governor, lapsed into silence for the past 2 years. They abdicated their traditional position of influence as Wallace set about building a mass white following which today, expert observers say, could still rack up to 70 to 80 percent of the votes in a statewide election.

And thus the industrialists of Alabama, in taking their stand and placing their advertisement, are attempting to reassert their influence.

They got favorable reaction from Wall Street and many Negro leaders. But the big question mark is still its effect upon Wallace. The politically shrewd Governor must weigh his future—prospects of a Democratic primary race for the Senate next year against incumbent Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, who praised the businessmen's stand—in the light of such factors as massive white voter support, a prospect of greatly increased Negro voter registration, and the businessmen's push for moderation.

WALLACE BENDS SLIGHTLY

Wallace has shown a wee indication of moderation. After the recent Selma-Montgomery march was over, the Governor did meet with a Negro delegation that presented grievances. Last week, he chatted with Negro educators of the State. And there have been reports that he might appoint, not a biracial State commission, but a Negro advisory committee.

The Governor will sit back and determine his next best move from a political standpoint. He will consider the stand of the "big mules," but not with the consideration they would have had if they had not been silent through the racial turmoil of the past 2 years.

Presidential Pay Boost for Military Is Piddling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it costs $7,000 just to put a recruit in uniform, through 3 months of basic training, and get him to a ship or military unit. It costs many thousands more to train him in the technical skills America now requires in her fighting men. Every member of the military forces who does not reenlist after this investment is made in him must be replaced and this chain of expenditure is restarted. While Secretary McNamara has applied his cost-effectiveness formulas to military hardware, he seems to have overlooked the fact that effective fighting forces are a combination of both people and hardware and that cost effectiveness can be applied on the people side of the equation as well.

Military pay scales which provide incentive to reenlistments undoubtedly will prove in the end more effective and less costly than the present drastically low pay scales. Recognizing this as just plain commonsense, Chairman MENDEL RIVERS of the House Committee on Armed Services has wisely introduced legislation to establish such pay scales. He is supported almost unanimously by the membership of his committee.

Now the President comes along with a demand for military pay raises of much smaller amounts. They are likely too small to accomplish the desired purpose of raising the reenlistment rates, thus they will result merely in raising defense costs without encouraging reenlistments. The net effect will be a dead loss to the people of the United States. One wonders whether such policies are deliberately aimed at making our Defense Establishment so costly to support that we will be forced into risky disarmament steps.

On May 14 the Los Angeles Times editorial commented on the pay raise issue as follows:

SOLID MILITARY PAY RAISE DUE

In a day when the balance of power has already shifted heavily to the executive branch, it is hard to see why Congress should go along with President Johnson's proposal to trim its prerogatives still further.

The President this week asked authority to set pay scales for both military and civilian personnel on the Federal payroll—subject only to Congress right to veto within 60 days.

This would drastically alter the traditional procedure in which Congress writes legislation, after due consideration of White House opinion, which the President can veto if he wishes. The idea should be rejected.

Mr. Johnson's proposal was part of a larger Federal pay plan which, in other respects, has much to commend it.

Creation of a permanent salary review commission, as he suggested, could bring a continuing body of expertise to bear on Federal pay problems.

The President proposed that civil servants get a 3-percent pay increase, effective January 1. Draftees and recruits in the military services would get a hike of 2.7 percent. But, in a move to encourage reenlistments, the proposal provides for boosts of 4.8 percent to men with over 2 years' service.

Total annual tab would be $853 million.

Actually Congress should seriously consider military pay hikes greater than the President requested.

Compensation for military men has lagged behind that for civil employees in recent years. The last boost for servicemen came 2 years ago, and it was not overly generous.

The Air Force alone figures that 71,000 of its men hold off-duty jobs to make ends meet. Some service families are on relief. Bad housing frequently is another contributor to poor morale and low reenlistment rates.

If more money can reduce the turnover of expensively trained military technicians, it will pay for itself.

The 10.7-percent boost supported by key members of the Senate Armed Services Committee may or may not be too high. But a substantial increase definitely is due, and comments from key men in both parties indicate that one will be forthcoming.

Taxpayers must keep a wary eye on the lawmakers, however, lest they get carried away and vote themselves another raise.

What Next for the American Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents recently said:

We live in an economy that draws the farmer away from the soil; that beckons to youth to seek vocations and employment where the risks are fewer and the tangible rewards more quickly realized; that offers job opportunities for husband and wife * * * it is here that the rural citizenship faces its most serious, and at the same time, most complex challenge.

It is against this backdrop of happenings in my State that I offer a recent editorial from the Dakota Farmer published at Aberdeen, S. Dak., on April 17, 1965, and include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RECENT STATEMENTS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE FREEMAN INVITE FURTHER SPECULATION ON THE DIRECTION OF FARM POLICY

Farm planners apparently intend to separate the problems of commercial agriculture from problems of what is considered noncommercial agriculture, or rural society, or something.

Last month the Secretary of Agriculture stated: "The U.S. Department of Agriculture is broadening its concern from agriculture as an industry and the well-being of farm people to all of rural America."

He stressed that the Department's concern is for all rural people, farmers, and nonfarmers alike. Freeman said this does not mean efforts for the farmers have been downgraded, but it recognizes "that programs for agriculture as an industry are not enough by themselves to serve adequately the needs of the nonfarm rural community."

Freeman hinted the USDA is due for a name change. Said he: "Regardless of the name which eventually will adorn the Department, rural affairs has become a part of the working title."

This fits the emerging pattern of policy statements from Washington. This dual approach to rural areas was first put on official record by the President in his farm message to Congress. Some farmers now farming are considered unable to rise to the level of an efficient family farm operation. They are an excess human resource problem for commercial agriculture. Such a premise leads to a setup in programs that will redirect these human resources (people, in other words) into other lines of work.

At the same time, the administration gives every indication it does not favor the depopulation of rural areas. Hence, nonfarm businesses must spring up in rural areas to absorb the people agricultural technology is displacing or allowed to displace.

It could mean that fully as much public money, or more, will be spent in rural areas, but not specifically on commercial agriculture. Price support and voluntary control programs don't look to be abandoned for awhile, but their theraputic ability is being discounted. The fact that they have tended to benefit the prosperous farmers more than others has been a telling blow.

We haven't heard that the administration favors the alternate approach of direct income payments to farmers based on a cutoff according to their relative prosperity. This approach would continue to center on commercial agriculture. Farmers themselves would be the object of most of the economic pump priming, to the purpose of retaining human resources in commercial agriculture and thereby vitalize associated businesses and communities in rural areas.

But current administration thinking, as we see it, is for less involvement in commercial agriculture (or at least no more involvement). To balance this, it would spend more money in rural areas for things like education for other lines of work and industrial development, which may or may not be related to agriculture. Not quite the same pump would be primed as in a program committed to keeping the current number of farm families on farms at satisfactory levels of living.

The proposed Federal budget cuts for conservation practices fits the thinking that some rural economic and social problems go beyond those of commercial agriculture, hence should be dealt with separately. The Budget Bureau recommends that ACP cost share funds be reduced $100 million, or by 40 percent for fiscal 1966. In addition, Federal appropriations for SCS technical assistance would be cut about $20 million. Farmers and soil conservation districts would be asked to make up this difference by paying for technical assistance in establishing soil conservation practices. (Technical assistance has been offered without charge since 1937.) However, soil conservation leaders (primarily farmers) warn this would cut applications for conservation practices on privately owned land by 50 percent.

We're not in favor of the cuts either, but you can see the Budget Bureau's thinking behind them. The efficient farmer is assumed able to share more of the costs. Most farmers without the capacity will be encouraged to seek other lines of work. The idea is to get the same amount of conservation work done on $120 million less, which then can be used for other projects.

However, we question the soundness of adding yet another production cost to farmers whose production costs have increased while prices received have decreased. They might not be too receptive to installing those conservation practices which might be important for preserving a resource for future generations but not capable of yielding a very high immediate return. For those of us who extoll the benefits of soil conservation as an investment for both immediate and

long-term returns, the Budget Bureau's proposal would at least give farmers the chance to put more of their money where our collective mouth is.

If the administration commits itself to revitalizing economies in rural areas, while letting commercial agriculture run more of a free course (relatively speaking), you can expect more activity in such programs as rural area development (RAD), rural education, FHA housing loans, and the like.

We think things like the RAD program are fine and know many Dakota private citizens are working hard in their local committees.

But we would think such programs would be hard pressed for results in the Dakotas under a master plan which intends a heavy redirection of funds from agriculture to other works designed to make better use of excess human resources now in agriculture. The Dakotas are primarily rural. Most services and industries now depend not only on a healthy commercial agriculture but a fairly well populated one as well.

There are opportunities in the Dakotas for nonfarm industrial and business development, but are there that many?

Anyway, we get the impression that rural renaissance is to be weighted toward nonfarm industry and business. But farming and ranching are what the Dakotas know best, and the area has distinct disadvantages for nonfarm industry. We have the feeling there might be a lot of brave but unfulfilled talk about nonfarm industry. At the same time we know there are a lot of Dakota farmers who, if faced with a choice, would rather see less population and business activity than tie in with complicated and restrictive Government farm programs that bring with them the specter of creeping socialism.

Confusion in Unmerging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Knoxville Journal carried a very informative editorial in its issue of May 8, 1965, which I believe will be of great interest to all.

In recent weeks, much has been said about "unmerging" bank mergers. How do you cut in two a banking institution which has been in being for some time?

This editorial, written by Guy L. Smith, editor, makes some very salient points which I would like to make available to readers of the RECORD. He points out the need for an amendment to the law or to pass a new one that would measurably meet the requirements of both justice and commonsense. This should be done.

The editorial follows:

CONFUSION IN UNMERGING

In Lexington, Ky., the biggest bank in the area, the First National Bank & Trust Co., is under court order to break itself up into the two institutions the merger of which in 1961 formed the banking institution under the title named.

It is understandable that neither the Justice Department, which brought the suit to "unmerge" the two Lexington banks, under provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act, nor the Federal Court which ruled in its favor has advanced any clear pattern for the dismemberment of the two institutions.

How do you cut in two a banking institution which has been in being for almost 5 years? How do you equitably divide the deposits which represented new business after the merger? How are shareholders, who bought stock subsequent to the merger, to be compensated? How are loans now outstanding from the merged bank to be divided between the two separated institutions?

While some kind of answer is being sought to such questions as this, the Federal Court has ordered that "all capital stock in the merged bank is to be issued in the name of a corporate trustee to be held by it until directed by order of this court to be distributed to the proper shareholders."

In a subsequent order, the court directed that present shareholders of the merged institution shall become shareholders in the separated banks in proportion to their present holdings in the merged bank. While the court in its wisdom has ordered the two banks to be restored to their status prior to the merger, the ownership of the stock of the two banks is to be identical. In other words, the same shareholders are to own both new banks but are to be put to the additional expense of operating two banking houses which would be presumably competing.

Nor is the Lexington case unique. The Justice Department has already obtained an order from Federal court to similarly force the dismemberment of the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. of New York, the country's fourth largest bank. Suits are pending against the Continental Illinois Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, the seventh largest U.S. bank, and Crocker-Citizens National Bank of San Francisco. In the past 3 years, there have been 465 U.S. bank mergers approved by either the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Presumably any or all of these mergers could now become targets of the Justice Department in the name of preserving a climate of competition in the communities where the banks are located.

The Nation's business community, we think, will almost unanimously regard these court successes on the part of the Department of Justice as a form of idiocy which will cause substantial injury to shareholders in the present institutions and will result actually in no expansion in the area of competitive banking. When one considers the state of monopoly which exists, for example, in radio and television in Austin, Tex., or in the operations of national labor unions, the unjustifiable intrusion of the Federal Government into the banking business as outlined above appears not only silly but criminal. What the court's decision amounts to, in effect, is deprival of the property of shareholders without due process of law.

If the rulings of the various Federal courts on these bank mergers actually conform to the provisions of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, then this would be the time for Congress to amend the law or pass a new one that would measurably meet the requirements of both justice and commonsense.

Robert Anderson Nailling, Teenager of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I participated in the wedding of Mr. and Mrs. Sam Cary Nailling, now living at 515 East Main Street, Union City, Tenn. She was then Miss Virginia Anderson.

They have an outstanding family and only recently one of their sons, Robert Anderson Nailling, was selected as Teenager of the Week.

Robert Anderson Nailling has such an outstanding record that I thought it should be brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

The Memphis Press-Scimitar, an outstanding newspaper in the mid-South and the Nation as well has an excellent section devoted to all of the teenagers of the South.

The writeup by James Reid follows:

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar, Apr. 16, 1965]

TEENAGER OF THE WEEK—FROM UNION CITY, TENN.—HE PLANS TO BE A SURGEON

(By James Reid, of the Press-Scimitar staff)

Robert Anderson Nailling, 18-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Cary Nailling, 515 East Main Street, of Union City, Tenn., has a long list of impressive achievements.

"Bobby has a dynamic personality in that he accepts each honor as a stepping stone to a greater challenge," said Mrs. John C. Green, of Union City in nominating Bob. "Some of his most outstanding qualities are capability, dependability, and a fervent desire to do his best with each opportunity. Bobby never sells himself short; he has the determination to continue a task until he finds success."

Bob, a Union City High School senior, is 1965 class valedictorian with a 97.89 average. He has been a member of the National Honor Society 3 years. He was first place winner of the Mid-South Latin Tournament at Memphis in 1962 with first year Latin, returned in 1963 with second year Latin and repeated the honor.

Bob won first place in the regional math contest in 1962 and in 1964, placing in the top 10 math students of West Tennessee in 1963 and in 1964.

He was winner of the American Legion Obion County essay award last year.

School principal Guy E. Phipps says of Bob: "This year we honored two students from each subject taught in our school. Any one student could be honored only in one subject. Bob was nominated for an award by his teachers in all six of his subject fields. He is blessed with a wonderful sense of humor, a warm disposition and a fine personality."

In addition to his high scholastic rating, Bob by no means neglected participation in extra curricular activities. He played the leading role in last year's band musical and was emcee of the junior-senior banquet.

Bob played basketball in 1962 and 1963 and served as varsity basketball manager the same years.

As a member of the First Christian Church in Union City, Bob is a choir member and was associate president of Tennessee Christian Youth Fellowship in 1963–64 and serves now as its president.

Yet, Bob Nailling finds time to work on Saturdays and during holidays at Kirkland's clothing store to earn his own money.

Bob plans a career as a doctor, hoping to attend Vanderbilt for his studies, later to specialize as a surgeon. He has an older brother, a younger brother, and one younger sister. His father is a Union City attorney.

"I don't seem to have much time for a hobby," said Bob, "but I find great relaxation and satisfaction in my music." He plays the trombone.

Edward Welch, chairman of Boys State Committee with the American Legion, said of Bob, "He is the type of young man that I am proud to have my son associate with."

Congress Does Have a Role: To Study and Analyze, New York Times States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, all too often demands are made on editorial pages for Congress to act without thinking or without study. I have often deplored this and have urged more thorough committee work, committee reports, adequate staffing, including for the minority, and genuine debate and amendment on the floor. It is interesting that in connection with certain foreign policy situations some newspapers are now beginning to demand that Congress through its appropriate committees really study the situation, hold hearings and that the Democratic Party, which has overwhelming working majorities in both Houses, begin to start to exercise some of the responsibility it has.

On May 9, 1965, the New York Times published an editorial entitled: "Government by Crisis," which toward the end of it begins to discuss the subject. I hope that the editors of the New York Times will continue to recognize that scholarship in Congress is much needed and should be encouraged.

The editorial follows:

GOVERNMENT BY CRISIS

The Dominican and Vietnam troubles disclose a serious weakness in this country's management of its foreign affairs. This weakness has been a long time developing and it will not easily be set right, but its many-sided nature and its implications deserve exploration.

The weakness is simply stated. Congress control of the warmaking power has been eroded almost to the point of invisibility. This development is readily understandable insofar as the waging of thermonuclear war is concerned. If the President learns that hostile atomic missiles have been launched against the United States, he has no time and no choice except to act in his unique capacity as Commander in Chief.

But it is guerrilla wars, undeclared wars, civil wars, and wars by subversion that now plague the world and are likely to continue as the chief difficulties in the years ahead. It is in this area of policymaking that the people's elected representatives in Congress have largely abdicated their constitutional responsibilities.

Speed is not the overriding consideration in making policy in these diverse difficulties. The war in Vietnam, for example, has been dragging on for several years and U.S. activity there has been intensifying for 9 months. Yet Congress has not conducted a full, serious debate on American participation.

It is true, of course, that Congress has gone on record not once but twice. President Johnson has seen to that. Last August, after a now almost forgotten retaliatory air strike in the Gulf of Tonkin, and again last week, Congress dutifully countersigned what came close to being a blank check. In the case of the August resolution and of last week's $700 million appropriation bill, there was a suddenly announced television speech by the President. Then came the submission of a hastily drafted proposal which the relevant committees of Congress approved with the flimsiest of hearings and which both Houses approved with no real deliberation.

From initiation to Presidential signature, each of these maneuvers took only 3 days. That is not constitutional procedure; it is a caricature of such procedure.

The Dominican trouble exemplifies congressional default in a different form. In October 1963, after a military junta overthrew President Juan Bosch in the Dominican Republic, Senators JACOB JAVITS of New York and WAYNE MORSE of Oregon introduced a resolution intended to set forth the sense of Congress on Latin American dictatorships.

No action was ever taken on this resolution. Nor did the relevant House and Senate committees develop any congressional judgment on American policy in the event of future revolutions and coups in Latin America. When civil war erupted in the Dominican Republic, President Johnson acted in a vacuum, one partly of Congress own making.

The problem long predates Mr. Johnson's Presidency. It first became evident in the failure of Congress to clarify its own responsibility for the waging of war in Korea, where war was never actually declared.

There are many present contributing influences to the diminution of congressional authority in policymaking quite apart from Mr. Johnson's forceful assertion of leadership. One is Senator DIRKSEN's extension of responsible bipartisanship into something that often approaches coalition government. Another is the reluctance of Senator FULBRIGHT to follow his independent ideas by asserting his full authority as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

But beyond these transient personal factors, there has been an institutional failure on the part of Congress to develop the new procedures and tradition necessary to protect its role in the making of foreign policy in a new age of international political warfare.

The nature of the cold war, the speed with which minor engagements can escalate, the extent to which secret information must help shape vital decisions—all these and many other factors have made the development of new procedures and practices difficult. But they have also made them essential if there is not to be a total erosion of Congress authority in this field and an atrophy of democratic debate.

Celebration of Michigan Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 16, the people of the great State of Michigan began the celebration of our annual Michigan Week observance—an event through which we Michiganites each year proclaim our pride in our wonderful State.

We who claim Michigan as our home feel that we have ample reason to be proud. The story of Michigan is an unsurpassed tale of success, growth, and prosperity.

When it became a State on January 26, 1837, Michigan was an agricultural paradise. Within a few decades, however, Michigan began to emerge as one of the most important industrial centers of the Nation. Timber, coal, copper, iron, and other natural resources contributed to an era of spectacular growth.

Today, Michigan factories turn out a wide variety of goods, ranging from automobiles to stoves, machinery, steel, boats, paper and paper products, chemicals, drugs, building materials, furniture, refrigerators, canned goods, cereals, paints, varnishes, and clothing.

Meanwhile, Michigan has been developing on many other levels, as well as economic. One of the first functions of the State Legislature in 1837 was to authorize the creation of a State university. From that day on, Michigan has stood in the forefront of the drive toward better education.

One of the first labor organizations in the United States was the Detroit Mechanics' Society, formed in 1818 and incorporated in 1820.

One of the Nation's most powerful agencies in behalf of the preservation of natural resources was the Michigan State Conservation Commission, established in 1929.

Of the many ethnic groups which comprise the American population, Michigan has a large share of each, and the State's history is one of tolerance, friendship, and democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to declare that my State has lived up to the theme of this week's observance; "Michigan, dynamic in world progress." This slogan is symbolic of the entire State.

Michigan week is a proud occasion for all Michiganites. Our pride grows each year, for ours is a State in which progress is a byword and success is an unquestioned goal in the eyes of every resident.

L.B.J. Makes His Case Eloquently

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Albuquerque Tribune has very forcefully expressed support of the President's enunciations of our purpose in Vietnam. Particularly, I was glad to see attention called to nonmilitary accomplishments in South Vietnam and the emphasis given to the President's willingness to "sit down and talk it out" despite the hue and cry of the hecklers and critics.

The article follows:

[From the Albuquerque Tribune, May 14, 1965]

L.B.J. MAKES HIS CASE—ELOQUENTLY

President Johnson never has done a more persuasive job on an issue than he did Thursday morning in his TV appearance to detail again the whys and hows of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Some seem to think the President is making these repeated enunciations of our purpose in Vietnam because of few vociferous professors and others keep ragging him on the subject. L.B.J. isn't going to reverse this particular brand of nonthinking—but

addresses such as Thursday can do a lot to solidify national understanding.

Moreover, this puts is up to the Communists once more. They show no more sign of relenting than the college hecklers. But there are other people in the world who do have open minds.

Our policy, the way Mr. Johnson stated it Thursday, is positive, not merely defensive.

Our preferred priority is on helping the South Vietnamese (and other in southeast Asia) to improve their lot. Since 1954, for instance, rice production has been doubled, new crops introduced, industrial production developed. This all would be much more meaningful, and farther along, except for the Communists who murder and pillage and force the Vietnamese and the United States to concentrate on military defense.

Americans would much rather devote some of their resources to helping others with their economy and their standard of living. Our heavy expenditures on weapons are not by choice, but through necessity.

All the same, the President is still willing to sit down and talk it out.

The North Vietnamese obviously are hard to convince. Probably because for so many of the years this war has been going on they have been getting off easy, giving them the idea the United States was merely a "paper tiger" and that eventually they could overwhelm the South Vietnamese.

The President's purpose is to disabuse them of both notions—meanwhile being ready to negotiate and even readier to get on with peaceful ways to better life in southeast Asia, a program which would be far more useful to us and to the Asians than fighting.

There is nothing new or strange in this double-edged policy. This is what we did during and after World War II. We went all out to win and when the military job was finished we turned an enormous share of our effort and resources toward peaceful development around the world.

Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, in a series of four articles, Detroit Free Press associate editor, Mark Ethridge, Jr., has provided interesting insight into the Canada of today. The last article of this series follows:

CANADIANS UNITE IN FACE OF CRISIS DESPITE DIVERSITY

(By Mark Ethridge, Jr., Free Press associate editor)

(In the last of a series, Free Press Associate Editor Mark Ethridge, Jr., sums up Canada's problems and prospects.)

QUEBEC.—"Canadian politics," said a journalist long experienced in covering the Parliament in Ottawa, "has always been the art of making the necessary possible."

The fact that artistry is necessary is a weakness in geographically and culturally divided Canada, but the continual success of achieving the possible is a strength which confounds the prophets of down-the-drainism.

If Canadians could stand this World War II compromise made by MacKenzie King, they can stand anything. King, under pressure from the drys for national prohibition and from the wets against it, compromised by ruling that whisky would be diluted by one-third.

Canadians are adept at working out solutions that will preserve the political whole even though it is an economic and cultural artifice.

Canada, as one of the Canadian experts said here, has always had "the knack of prospering as a nation while maintaining the two cultural strains to which we owe our existence."

The answer to most Canadian problems, it seems clear, is economics.

For all the talk of retaining cultural ties to the old country, Quebec seems more interested in economic equality with the rest of Canada. The demand for bilingualism in Ottawa is perpetuated so Quebecois can plead their economic case. The same is true for French being compulsory in Canadian schools outside Quebec.

Now they know they have English Canada on the defensive and, as other suddenly recognized minority groups before them, they are using their Frenchness as a lever.

For the rest of Canada, the key is also economic. The airplane is opening up frontiers which were inaccessible before.

The Canadian shield, that massive central upland which is the heart of Canada, is one of the richest ore bearing areas in the world. There are unknown reserves of iron, nickel, lead, copper, zinc, asbestos and potash.

The Beaverledge area of upper Saskatchewan has been opened to uranium exploration by the airplane, and Air Canada now ties the commercial cities of the southern tier together with easy hops.

But the great future of Canada, as for many other nations, lies in changing its economy from production of raw materials to turning out the finished goods. That's where the money is, and that, according to world trade experts, is where more and more of the money is going to be.

Today's Canadian orthodoxy echoes this belief. Canada's newly established economic council reports that the country's only hope of maintaining full employment and prosperity in the future is to develop its own sophisticated, competitive manufacturing industries.

This revolution in Canadian thinking has come about because Canada is under the gun, even more so than the United States.

Canada's labor force, in relation to its population, is growing faster than any other country in the Western World. Canada must find as many jobs in the next 5 years as it found in the last 14.

Canadians aren't thinking in terms of giant corporate structures like General Motors or Du Pont. They don't have the people of the capital to support them. But they are thinking in terms of smaller highly efficient industries, supplier plants for the giants.

Though highly developed in the conventional sense of "underdeveloped nations," Canada is still in its economic puberty. It will be years before it can compete with giants like the United States and the European Common Market.

But because the United States and Europe have been talking about special trade concessions to the underdeveloped nations, Canadians can at least hope for half a loaf of similar consideration.

Though little has been done so far, Ottawa is also considering what it can do to bring about the transformation. Happy to be on the merry-go-round of prosperity, Ottawa has taken no steps to impose controls over foreign investments. Now Parliament is thinking about it.

Present investments, naturally enough, go where the quick money is. In the future, many Canadians think, Ottawa will see to it that the money goes to develop new industries and new commodities to serve the long-range interests of Canada.

It could even pass new legislation designed to drain some present foreign investment into new and undug channels.

In the long run, there can be no question about Canada's success. The country has too much going for it.

As the world population continues to explode, Canada's vastness becomes even more of an asset. Few people live in the northern parts of the lower provinces, and the population of the two great Territories, the Northwest and the Yukon, totals only 37,000.

Sooner or later man's ingenuity and modern technology will make the area habitable and self-sufficient.

Like Michigan, Canada is also blessed with an almost unlimited supply of fresh water. Few beginnings have been made either to use it or harness it, but they are not far off.

British Columbia and the United States are jointly tapping the potential of the long Columbia River, and the tributaries of the St. Lawrence system are being dammed for power.

Just as important as raw materials, Canada has a wealth of people with ability, intelligence, and charm.

With the possible exception of England, there could be no more polite or gracious people on earth than the Canadians.

Tip a bellboy 50 cents and the thanks is overpowering. Say a kind word to a waiter about the meat, and the chef is all but upon you, scattering rose petals in your path.

Get a mixup in a plane reservation, and a kind and competent young lady makes you her personal responsibility until everything is straightened out and you are airborne.

Nor is there a shortage of imagination. Montreal's Place Ville de Marie is one of the most exciting and creative shopping areas in the Western Hemisphere.

Built entirely underground, well heated and lighted, it boasts specialty stores carrying the world's merchandise.

In the center of the vast complex are four restaurants ringing an outdoor cafe complete with all the atmosphere of the Champs Elysee at dusk. It is all underground, but connected to the office buildings, the hotels, and the subway around it.

French, English, or potpourri, Canada is also developing a culture. Nowhere except on the left bank of Paris are there more bookstores than in Canadian cities. The airports don't have corners for buying pocket books, as Metro does; they have real bookstores, selling real books.

Canadians don't write too many of them, but they obviously read. Canada has few major magazines of its own—part of the lament about the pervasive influence of America—but the ones that do exist are good.

Not the best in the world, perhaps, but art museums and exhibits are springing up.

This, too, is part of the package of Canada's youth. The nation is just now discovering culture, and if French and English, with an overlay of American, grow up side by side, no one minds.

What Canada is going through, it seems from here, are the typical problems of adolescence—the rebellious nature, the search for identity, the growth of economic, cultural, and political maturity.

The ingredients for greatness are present. All that Canada really has to do now, as a savvy Canadian put it, is to recognize the genesis of Canadian nationhood: That it is, and will always remain, greater than the sum of its parts.

James A. Farley: Optimist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include an interview in the Kansas City Times, in Kansas City, May 8, 1965, with the distinguished citizen, James A. Farley, in which he made the following perceptive comments on the Great Society and America's role in the world today:

JAMES A. FARLEY'S OPTIMISM HIGH: FORMER DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CHAIRMAN APPLAUDS L.B.J. POLICIES AND U.S. ROLE IN WORLD

(By Bill Ellingsworth, a member of the Star's staff)

President Johnson's swift action in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic was firmly upheld yesterday by James A. Farley, former Democratic National Committee chairman and Postmaster General under Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"Johnson has shown the Communist world he isn't going to sit around—he is going to do what he thinks is best for America and the preservation of world peace," said Farley who is here to participate in the birthday celebration for former President Harry S. Truman.

KNOW UNITED STATES MEANS BUSINESS

"And, despite the statements issued by Red China and Russia they are doing nothing, which at last proves to me that they too are convinced that President Johnson and this country mean business."

Farley also upheld the President in his other programs and expressed optimism in his quest for a Great Society.

"President Johnson is doing very well so far," Farely said.. "He has a way of getting things done the way he wants them done, and he has been highly successful in obtaining the legislation he wants.

"Johnson has the know-how—after all, he was one of them once and he knows the mechanics of the business."

Farley said President Johnson was making an effort to restore favorable economic conditions in areas where economy is at a low level.

"The President is making an effort to educate the people in these areas," Farley said, "which is good because an educated individual is more likely to assume responsibility."

A LOT TO BE DONE AT HOME

Farley said there were many areas in both the North and South where much work needs to be done, and he added that it would not be accomplished without controversy.

"There is bound to be waste," he said, "just as there is waste in war. But you have to have this waste because you are out to win the war—not just fight it."

He said the program, in his estimation, would succeed because the American people want a strong society and a healthy economy.

"I am an optimistic fellow," Farley said, "with faith in my country and the people of the country—we will come out all right."

Farley also said that the job picture was bright in this country, adding that in the last 20 years new industries had cropped up to provide employment for millions.

"I am sure that 20 years from now many more new industries like those in the field of plastics, science and electronics, will spring up to provide work for many more millions."

The topic quickly changed from economy to the Nation's position in the world.

"Will we get ourselves into a war? I don't think there is any danger," he said. "I am not at all disturbed or worried—I think we are basically in the same position as Great Britain in the mid-1800's. She had the ships and ruled the seas. She was strong. We have ships as well as nuclear weapons and we are tremendously strong."

Farley added that while it was true that Russia, Red China and others also had nuclear weapons, it was almost unbelievable that any country would risk total destruction, which is what he said another world war would invariably lead to.

"And," Farley went on. "I feel we are doing the right thing in Vietnam. If we stepped out now the Communists would overrun everything. There is no doubt that the situation there is Communist-backed.

"And another thing: Many people have complained that President Johnson did not confer before acting in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic—well he didn't have time to confer and I feel sure that in the near future the moves will be justified and it will be proved that he acted wisely."

In a lighter vein, Farley said he still maintained his rapid pace and keeps very busy in his New York office. His daily schedule is no different from his younger years—that is, he is up at 7 o'clock and in bed about 11:30—after he has said his prayers.

"I have been having a little difficulty getting to bed on time with television around," he said.

Farley has offices on the 18th floor of a Madison Avenue building, just 3 blocks from his downtown apartment. He is board chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

Farley said that for the last 2 years he had been invited to the former President's birthday celebration and for various reasons had not been able to attend.

"This year I made up my mind that, God willing, I would get to Kansas City for my cherished friend's birthday. I have not only admiration for Mr. Truman, but a great affection—he has to rank as one of the top five Presidents in the history of our country."

Dual Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, during the past several years the House Small Business Committee, from time to time, has reported to the Members upon the impact which dual distribution is exerting upon small business.

Almost daily communications are received by the committee announcing new companies that have decided to market their products through their own company-owned outlets in competition with their retailer customers—the locally owned, hometown, independent small business merchant.

Mr. E. B. Weiss, vice president, Doyle Dane Berbach Inc., has written a comprehensive report dealing with this subject entitled, "Vertical Integration: The Coming Era of Scrambled Marketing." In a concluding paragraph Mr. Weiss observes:

So you see—marketing is indeed becoming scrambled. It will be less and less easy to determine who is a manufacturer, who is a wholesaler, who is a retailer.

All three will be all three.

A recent issue of the Iron Age magazine also included an article dealing with dual distribution which, I believe, will be found of interest to all Members. Therefore, with unanimous consent I place it in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Iron Age magazine, Apr. 22, 1965]

THE BATTLE OVER DUAL DISTRIBUTION

(By R. W. Crosby)

The integrated and independent companies in the United States are locked in a competitive struggle. The outcome may alter distribution patterns of manufacturing, wholesaling, and retailing.

This industrial civil war is being fought, in many cases, by businessmen who hardly realize it exists. But conscious or unconscious, the battle grows over the right to operate and compete on the many different levels of industrial production and marketing.

Sideline observers of the struggle—Government officials and private economists—say that in the next decade "the interplay between the integrated and independent companies will increase and become more volatile."

BY DEFINITION

This industrial in-fighting centers around dual distribution. Basically, dual distribution occurs when a company's supplier is also its competitor. A more detailed definition is given by Government economic officials:

"Dual distribution exists when a vertically integrated firm operates in two successive stages of production and/or distribution of goods but also sells some of its output from the first stage to independent firms who then sell in competition with the supplying firm's second stage operations. Thus the independent is in competition with his supplier."

The growth of vertical integration—expansion in the same line of commerce—is the basic reason for predictions of a growing battle between the two segments of industry.

REASONS WHY

There are other reasons which have come to the fore in recent months. They include: Concern over the growing business of franchising; new direct distribution plans such as seen in the grinding wheels industry; and the first attempts at industrywide guidelines for marketing and pricing by antitrust agencies.

There are two other reasons for the foment over dual distribution:

One is Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California. He is the Congressman whose hearings on "Dual Distribution and Vertical Integration" brought the battle into the open.

The other is Lawrence Schacht, president of Schacht Steel Construction Co., of New York. His battles with integrated steel companies have spurred independent companies to unit to force changes in dual distribution practices.

"PRICE SQUEEZE"

Mr. Schacht estimates there are 40,000 U.S. companies—ranging from steel to men's clothing—which suffer from dual distribution practices.

An alleged characteristic of dual distribution is the "price squeeze." It can affect many intermediate steps of manufacturing or distributing. These include fabricating, warehousing, jobbing, or wholesaling.

In this situation, the supplier-competitor, in his role of supplier, charges a relatively high price. But when acting as a seller-competitor, he offers his goods at a relatively low price. The independent then is caught between the pincers of a price squeeze.

In the Roosevelt subcommittee hearings, Mr. Schacht complained he had been squeezed by major integrated steel fabricators.

THE LEADER

The integrated companies rebutted Mr. Schacht's arguments. But the independent steel man's appearance before the committee launched him into the leadership of what became known as the Conference on Dual Distribution.

The Conference has a hundred members now. It expects thousands to come in via trade associations. And it has become the independent companies' spokesman.

Mr. Schacht recently told Iron Age that through the Conference "We have alerted many people to the fact that something can be done about dual distribution."

Mr. Schacht agrees that the battle between integrated and independent companies is growing. He also believes the independents will suffer without help from the Government.

NEW RULES

"The whole competitive relationship today is more diverse than it used to be," he says. "New relationships need new rules. Legislation is the answer.

"The legislation should aid open competition and insure that the purpose of competition is to make money, not to put people out of business. The legislation should insure that the integrated companies can't use a low price as a pressure on the independent," he says.

"If the integrated company can produce the product cheaper, it is entitled to the job. But it shouldn't use a special pricing system for one year to put somebody out of business and then, the next year, raise the prices."

LEGISLATION

Conference-backed legislation is being introduced in Congress by Representative ROOSEVELT and by Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, the majority whip. Senator LONG is the independents' Senate supporter.

Three bills will make up the major legislative program on dual distribution:

1. A reporting bill would require integrated companies engaged in dual distribution to disclose separate annual operating data on each of their establishments which compete with the integrated companies' independent customers.

2. A price bill would require the integrated companies to supply the independents with the same price supplied to company divisions competing with the independents.

3. A third bill would ban discrimination in price, services, or facilities in the transfer and sale of a product by integrated companies.

SILENT TREATMENT

Supporters of this legislation admit it is not perfect. Representative ROOSEVELT, himself, feels it will be revised and delayed. He thinks passage is 2 or 3 years away. Others predict it will take 5 years. But Representative ROOSEVELT and his supporters are confident of its eventual passage.

The report of ROOSEVELT's House Small Business Subcommittee, written after the public hearings, gave such legislation a boost. As with other recommendations in the report, integrated companies withheld reaction.

Integrated companies disagree totally with the charges leveled at them in the name of dual distribution. While they rebutted these charges in the past, they now are giving the subject the silent treatment in public.

NO PASSING FANCY

However, Washington experts say the integrated companies show increasing concern over the battle.

"There is a lot of pressure on integrated companies from their customers," says one distribution subcommittee staff man. He admits, too, that in some cases the distribution practices being questioned are beyond the control of these companies.

Mr. Schacht says the integrated companies are concerned by action of their independent competitors. "Company officials have shown me their concern," he says. "They call me 'Mr. Dual Distribution' with a smile, but it hurts them."

The integrated companies base their argument against dual distribution legislation on "competition." As one integrated steel corporation executive put it, the independents "seem to be seeking Government restraint on the severity of free competition to assure a higher profit margin for their companies.

"For these competitors to seek such a goal would be clearly illegal; for the Government to regulate free enterprise to achieve it is scarcely in the public interest."

REVERSE EFFECT

The suggestions that legislation force integrated companies to offer price differentials has drawn a sharp rebuttal from the leading integrated steel producer, United States Steel Corp.

The corporation says legislative efforts in the name of price discrimination could create reverse price discrimination with the integrated companies being the victims.

United States Steel Corp. gives this example:

"Under such a law, a nonintegrated company could drive the price for its product as low as necessary to get all the business it desired—even so low as to be below the total cost of the product to the integrated supplier-competitor—without concern for its own profitability, since that would be completely protected by the obligation of the integrated company to maintain an adequate price differential."

The corporation also has stated its position on charges that integrated companies attempt to put independents out of business:

CUSTOMERS ARE NEEDED

"United States Steel must necessarily look to a strong and healthy nonintegrated steel manufacturing industry as a market for its production of (basic steel) products, and its own best interests dictate policies which also serve the interests of its nonintegrated customers."

This same position is stated by integrated companies in such diverse industries in which dual distribution exists as aluminum, appliances, automobile sales, auto parts, copper, office machines and 40 others.

FREE ENTERPRISE

Another argument is raised by integrated companies in these industries: The mere fact that dual distribution activities are undertaken by one company "should not provide the basis for any new legislative prohibitions unless there is to be a revolutionary shift in the foundation of the free enterprise system in America."

The independents and their supporters feel such a shift is occurring in the form of vertical integration.

Vertical integration can be achieved in two ways—by internal expansion or by merger or acquisition. Present laws place no real limits on internal expansion. The Supreme Court has established that the antitrust laws do restrict vertical integration by acquisition.

MERGER ROUTE

Horizontal mergers are under increasing restrictions. Thus, industry is growing in a vertical direction, particularly via internal expansion.

Companies integrate "forward." Basic producers now also manufacture intermediate products. These are then further processed or incorporated in consumer products.

Or they integrate "backward." Here a retailer buys a wholesaler, buys a manufacturing plant, buys a materials supplier, and on back through the chain.

The distribution subcommittee notes that one byproduct of vertical integration is dual distribution.

"An integrated company has a number of levels of operation at which it may make a profit. At times one level may be subsidized by other activities of the integrated company. The volume of a manufacturing plant may be kept high with profits largely achieved through selling to captive retail outlets, in volume, with little or no profit, or perhaps even loss. The unintegrated, independent firm has but one level at which to make a profit."

NOT BAD, PER SE

However, contrary to what some independents charge, the subcommittee found that: "While dual distribution, when practices by a firm with substantial market power, can be harmful to small business, there should be no general or per se rule against dual distribution."

Representatives of the National Small Business Association put the problem in a different perspective than many independent companies.

Dr. Leonard W. Prestwich, assistant professor of business administration at George Washington University, spoke for the association. He characterized dual distribution as a "natural outgrowth of the competitive struggle among business firms to attract and maintain consumer patronage."

A STRUGGLE

Whether the struggle is natural or forced by competing segments of industry, it is, nonetheless, a struggle.

Entry into processing, fabrication or the various levels of distribution by manufacturers, or the integration into manufacturing by retail or wholesale companies will continue to produce a higher incidence of dual distribution activities.

The only other possibility is the adoption by companies of a policy of exclusive distribution in which they distribute all of the goods that they manufacture.

ALTERNATIVE PATHS

Independent companies won't sit by while integrated companies further their integration or adopt new policies. Says Mr. Schacht, "They should make up their minds whether we are their customers or their competitors. If they squeeze us, we have alternatives."

Besides the alternative of battling through the efforts of the Conference on Dual Distribution, Mr. Schacht, as a steel man, lists these alternatives:

1. Buying foreign steel.

2. The independents going into the steelmaking business.

3. Buying only from a company which makes steel but doesn't fabricate the steel it produces.

Title VI of Civil Rights Act Means What It Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the best portions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was inclusion of title VI, which allows withholding of Federal funds at the source when discrimination on account of race is used as an instrument of State or local governmental policy.

Within the next few weeks, we shall be hearing more of the application of the provisions of title VI. We shall be hearing more of it because there will be anguished cries from the people who pay the State, county, and local taxes—taxes which will have to be increased to pay for governmental services.

I should imagine that even the business and industrial community will take the lead in the desegregation issue.

Probably the issue will finally be resolved not on a basis of what is right or

just or proper; it is likely that the real answer lies in each citizen's pocketbook and in each company's relations with its stockholders. In other words, the South may decide to desegregate as much as necessary to comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 because it is financially the better course.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include three articles from the Washington Evening Star: "Federal School Funds Missing, Virginia Counties Find," April 17, 1965; "Integration Lag Stalls Virginia School Funds," April 18, 1965; and "Letters to Make One Wonder," Ralph McGill's column of April 16, 1965:

RIGHTS ACT WARNING BECOMES REALITY: FEDERAL SCHOOL FUNDS MISSING, VIRGINIA COUNTIES FIND

(By Harriet Griffiths)

In Prince William County, Va., county board officer N. C. Sharp noted a decrease in revenues and checked to see why Federal funds had not been received.

And in Prince George County, Va., officials said today the county schools might be shut down if Federal funds don't arrive. "It's as simple as that," said a spokesman. Officials declined to speculate on just why the money hasn't arrived.

It was a scene that can be expected to multiply in school districts over the country as the Federal Government enforces compliance with the Civil Rights Act before releasing new money grants to States and localities.

States and school districts must give assurance they are not practicing discrimination, that they are carrying out an acceptable voluntary plan of desegregation, or that they are proceeding to desegregate under a court order.

Otherwise, under title VI of the act, no Federal money may be granted them. The provision is designed to impose a uniform requirement of nondiscrimination in all programs financed by the National Government.

In the case of education, Federal funds form a growingly healthy proportion of the budgets. In Prince William, for example, the already delayed money amounts to $1,170,000 in so-called impact aid granted school districts swollen by children of Federal or military employes.

The school system there intends to comply, and is preparing a plan to be presented to the office of Allen Lesser, Director of Federally Assisted Programs Staff.

If the county had to make up the funds itself, it would mean an estimated extra dollar added to the real estate and personal property tax rate.

In Prince George, $303,000 is involved.

The county has signed a form pledging compliance with the civil rights law. Prince George receives Federal impact funds to help meet the costs of educating some 2,329 children of families connected with the Federal Government—most of them service personnel at Fort Lee.

A potential sleeper lies in the fact that some local agencies may not realize that some of the funds channeled to them through the State are not State but Federal program money.

Nearly 500 desegregation plans have been submitted from all over the South, none of them as yet accepted, and, by and large, quite inadequate, according to David Seeley, acting director of the equal educational opportunities program.

Actually, he said, 1,700 districts haven't even started to desegregate, and a large number that have begun have just scratched the surface.

"The matter is a serious one," Seeley said. "We have a very wide range of noncompliance in school desegregation that has got to be cleared up." Otherwise, funds will be withheld.

School programs under the Office of Education for the year beginning next July 1 total about $2.1 billion.

In the Washington area, Falls Church has not yet received its current installment of impact aid, some $80,000, although school officers said this sometimes does not arrive until June 1.

Falls Church, like Fairfax County, Alexandria, Arlington, Prince Georges, and Montgomery Counties, has nondiscrimination assurances or plans pending at the Office of Education. So far, none of the other districts is aware of any fund delays. The District's assurance is already accepted.

Altogether, 21,601 of the approximately 27,000 school districts have submitted assurances, most of them still under review. Some 77 court orders have been filed. Each State also must comply, and so far, only 15 State plans have been accepted. The States, in turn, must have assurance of compliance from the local school districts to release the Federal funds they channel to the localities.

Maryland's plan is under review, and the Office of Education has been working with Virginia, with reported good prospects of acceptance. For fiscal 1966, some $10.8 million of Federal funds are expected in the District, $34 million in Maryland, and $51 million in Virginia.

Federal officials have just returned from Atlanta, after conferring with school officials of Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Georgia, where about $168 million of Federal aid is at stake in grants to colleges and universities, library, vocational, and National Defense Education Act funds and impact aid. Lesser said the exchange of views was helpful on both sides.

Besides States and school districts, colleges and universities are required to file assurances if they receive Federal aid. About 1,800 of the approximately 2,100 institutions have compiled, including District universities and the Universities of Maryland and Virginia.

Lesser said it is impossible to predict now what the ultimate denial of funds will be, but that it is hoped local officials will realize the Office of Education must have the compliances. All assurances are being reviewed, particularly those from the 17 Southern and border States.

He said the big push is expected between now and May 15.

Lesser stressed that funds are not being held in escrow while localities get around to complying—they simply will not be assigned to noncomplying school districts.

"It is important that the school districts realize they must, in fact, desegregate, and do it at the earliest possible date," he said. "Token desegregation will not be sufficient."

He said it was encouraging that every State has at least initiated action to comply.

"It is a very big job, but I think we are being helped by the fact that many people in the South are making honest efforts to comply," he observed. "They really are trying."

INTEGRATION LAG STALLS VIRGINIA SCHOOL FUNDS

RICHMOND.—A Government official said yesterday that between $18 and $20 million in Federal aid to Virginia school districts is being withheld because of delays in meeting terms of the Civil Rights Act.

Worth Peters, regional representative of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Charlottesville, said the funds included those granted to school districts near major Federal and military installations.

Such assistance, known as aid to federally impacted areas, is in addition to about $30 million paid annually to Virginia for other educational purposes.

The impacted area funds, paid directly to eligible school districts, are handed out in two installments—three-fourths in the spring and the remainder in the fall. Peters said the $18 to $20 million figure represented the spring payment.

The delay has prompted the Prince George County school board, which had expected $303,000 by the end of February, to warn that it might have to shut down public schools for lack of funds. Fort Lee is located in the county.

Most of the aid to Virginia's federally impacted areas goes to schools in the northern Virginia and Tidewater areas.

To be considered eligible for new Federal funds since January 3, school districts have been required to submit evidence of full desegregation or plans aimed at reaching goal.

Dr. A. R. Lilywhite of Washington, Assistand Commissioner of Education and Director of the Division of School Assistance, said that some of the delay results from a heavy workload in his Division.

He said many school districts have not submitted proper information needed by HEW to evaluate their desegregation conditions.

Lilywhite said Prince George officials have not made their problems known to Washington, although he learned of the situation this week in a discussion with spokesmen for Fort Lee.

He said he would contact Prince George Supt. C. W. Smith Monday to learn more details of the county's plight.

LETTERS TO MAKE ONE WONDER

(By Ralph McGill)

There is an aroma of lavender and old lace about some of the mail. One thinks of flowers pressed in albums, of old musty parlors with stereopticon views on the table, of juleps stirred with a silver spoon and a pastoral peacefulness.

This is what makes such letters go so straight to the heart. This mail of which I write is not the vulgar "go to hell" sort. It is that which comes mostly from old persons, shaken by the events of the present, unused to the consequences of ideas and events.

Like these, for example, directly from letters:

"I want to speak up for Selma. I have lived here for 40 years. I have never seen a Negro go hungry here. Anybody that's hungry can go to the back door of any good home and be fed. * * *"

"I am 80 years old and have lived in the South all my life. I remember my father telling me how well cared for the slaves were and how happy they were. * * * We wish to treat these people well * * * the abolitionists upset things before * * * today the agitators do it. * * *"

Such comments are, of course, utterly irrelevant. Yet, there are an astonishing number which express the same thought.

In thinking of these old persons who write such letters, one earnestly hopes life somehow will continue to pass them gently by and that they may suffer nothing more than wistful wishes that everyone would be nice and treat other persons well.

Another letter over which one can do nothing more than shake a wondering head reads in part:

"If newspapers and television and people would quit writing and talking about this thing (the school problem), it would all die out. The Negro people are happy just the way things are. I have talked with my cook, who has been with me 25 years, and she tells me she and her friends wish it would all quiet down."

This letter from a middle-aged man expressed a belief incredibly held by an incredible number of persons who should know bet-

ter. Doctors, businessmen, and others of mature age and experience write they have talked with their chauffeurs, yardmen, or with the maid who comes to clean the house and find this is all the creation of "radicals, or Dr. King, or the NAACP." It is obvious from many of the letters that they do not know what the NAACP is. But they have heard "it" is "responsible."

These letters also produce a feeling of sympathetic frustration. They are not always from mean or vicious persons. They are written by troubled men and women who have lived so far out of the mainstream of life that they are unacquainted with the facts of it. They reflect that universal yearning to which all flesh is heir, to live a life undisturbed.

One troubled lady wrote, "I am almost 90 years old. I remember as a girl in South Carolina the Red Shirts handled trouble like this. Why can't we do something like that now? My uncle died for these rights. Why do we have to surrender them?"

She did not understand her uncle's cause lost its war. And that what she took to be "rights" were class privileges.

Still another: "This trouble grows out of the foolish decision to educate the Negro. The happiest Negroes I know are those who are skilled workmen. I am for them having their rights, but we have gone too far with education."

These samples, taken literally from one classification of mail, illustrate how unaware many persons are of what goes on in the world today, and of how this country is caught up in it.

All of them, the haters, the uninformed, the unaware, the dissenters, seem not to understand that the Constitution of the United States applies to all citizens alike.

And reading the mail one wonders wherein our educational system has failed to make this elemental fact plain to all.

A Call for Rededication by Representative James Kee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, in this time of unrest abroad, when the defense of traditional American principles requires us to maintain armed forces throughout the world, there are far too many among us who take the short view of our obligations to civilization. But there are others who remind us from time to time that these United States were created by the courage and strength of many people from many lands, all of whom contributed from their heritage to form our national concept of life in a land of freemen, protected by constitutional law.

Prominent among this latter group is my colleague from West Virginia, Representative JAMES KEE, who has been associated with veterans groups for many years in their continuing efforts to keep alive the fires of patriotism and national loyalty. On Sunday, last, in West Potomac Park, Representative KEE was the featured speaker on a program marking the 30th annual observance of the District of Columbia World War Memorial, and under leave to extend my remarks I take this occasion to call to your attention his timely and inspiring address at that ceremony.

A CALL FOR REDEDICATION

(Address of the Honorable JAMES KEE, of West Virginia, at the 13th annual observance of the District of Columbia World War Memorial and May Day Corp. and participating patriotic organizations, in honor of our war dead, on Sunday, May 16, 1965, at the District of Columbia World War Memorial in West Potomac Park)

Thank you, Mr. National Executive Committeeman of the Department of the District of Columbia of the American Legion.

Chairman Murphy, reverend clergy, members of the District of Columbia World War Memorial and May Day Corp., members of participating organizations, and distinguished guests, all, it is with a deep feeling of humility that I join with you today, as we attempt in our small way, to pay respectful tribute to those men and women who made the supreme sacrifice in times of wars.

These American men and women that we honor today, regardless of military rank, race, creed, or color, successfully fought for the survival of our form of government—the principles of freedom, justice, and democracy.

As we pause in this historic memorial structure in West Potomac Park, which was dedicated in 1931 by President Hoover, it is appropriate that we also remember Mr. Frank B. Noyes—"founder" and chairman of the 1931 Memorial Commission.

History has recorded in indelible flames the courage, the bravery, the sacrifices, of those we honor today.

Yes, from the War of Independence in 1775, the birth of our Nation, through the battles being fought in the distant jungles and swamps of South Vietnam at this very moment, and the loss of life yet to come, these sacrifices will never be forgotten.

These sacrifices have placed a grave responsibility upon each of us—the duty to justify the obligations placed in our trust.

History will record the degree of success and the degree of failure which will be ours.

The finest tribute that we can pay to those who died for their country is to be worthy of their trust, of the heritage that is ours.

This difficult and uncertain period in the history of the world demands the very best of America. We must, as parents, as educators, as citizens, prepare the younger generations for the grave responsibilities that one day will be theirs.

We must give them every opportunity to carry on. We must guide and teach them.

We must tell them over and over again the inspiring story of our glorious American heritage.

But above all we must tell the young men and women of the new generations that they have a supreme duty not only to honor this great American heritage but, if necessary, to fight and die for its preservation.

To the new generations we must say this:

"On this hallowed monument you see inscribed the names of 435 soldiers and sailors who died for you during World War I.

"On this hallowed monument you see inscribed the names of more than 1,000 other heroes who died for you during World War II and in Korea.

"These men and women paid the supreme sacrifice to preserve your liberties. What they did, you must be prepared to do, if our country is in need of such sacrifice."

I have an abiding faith that the new generations of Americans will keep the faith if we show them where the path of duty lies. I have an abiding faith that the new generations of Americans will not flinch or falter, that our young men and women when danger threatens will have the valor and the fortitude to preserve our country free from harm.

It is our task to inform the younger generations about the duties and responsibilities of patriotism. It is our duty, also, to inspire and edify them by telling them the wonderful story of what the United States has done to promote world peace and to help the cause of human betterment since World War II.

Let me refresh your memory also to this story of grandeur, to the story of human generosity on the part of our country, unmatched in the recorded history of ations.

When the guns fell silent after World War II, we found ourselves on the side of victory.

We did not demand the conqueror's spoils; we did not indemnify our losses by demanding territory or tribute from the losers.

On the contrary, we proceeded to "bind up the wounds of war—"; for the first time in history, a victorious nation actually made large financial contributions to the rehabilitation of its former foes.

During World War II the most destructive weapon in military history was developed, and the United States and its allies developed the secret of its fabrication. The secret of nuclear weapons was ours.

But, in the interest of peace, the United States and its allies offered to give up this weapon, in return for an iron bound pledge from the other nations that this horrible weapon would never be used against us.

There was no precedent for this act of self-sacrifice in recorded history. In the words of that great statesman, the late Winston Churchill, "It was one of the noblest gestures in the unhappy annals of mankind."

The opposition of Soviet Russia blocked the outlawry of atomic weapons, but that dark deed does not detract from the grandeur and nobility of what our country tried to do.

After the defeat of Hitler, it was soon evident that a new tide of despotism and tyranny was preparing to sweep across the war-torn nations of Europe.

Aggressive communism was prepared to fasten its loathesome grip on the heart of Europe; on Germany, France, and Italy, as well as Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Once again, the United States came to the rescue; just as American arms stopped Hitler, American dollars were employed to stop the onward rush of communism.

THE EFFECTIVE MARSHALL PLAN SAVED EUROPE FROM GODLESS COMMUNISM

In 1950 the military strength of the United States preserved the United Nations from utter collapse when the Communist aggressors tried to overrun the whole Korean Peninsula. And now, today, we have the job to do all over again in Vietnam, where once again only the valor of America is blocking the road to another frightening victory for the communism of China.

This is the proud record of the United States for the past two decades. This is the record of grandeur I wish to refresh in your memory. This is the story of American generosity and self-sacrifice which we must impress upon the minds of our children again and again and again.

The shield of America has been carried proudly by this generation. It was your sacrifice, your tax money, which made possible this magnificent record.

The United States has done everything within its power to preserve the peace of the world, but it will never yield to the threats and the bullying of Communist aggression.

The preservation of liberty is just as sacred to this generation as it was to our forefathers in 1776.

This splendid memorial on this site is a symbol—a symbol of 10,000 similar shrines dotting this land of ours from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

This monument on this beautiful site is a pledge that the memory of the men and women who died for our freedom will never be forgotten.

We came here today, each of us, to honor these noble dead.

We came here also to rekindle once again the sacred flames of our own patriotism.

If we keep green the memory of America's past, we need have no fear for its future.

Let us depart rededicated to the future of the land we love.

Runnymede

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the tribute paid to our late President, John F. Kennedy, by the British people when they set aside an acre of land in historic Runnymede Meadow, is the highest they can bestow.

Runnymede, where the Magna Carta was signed in 1215, was the site of the formal beginning of government by law. And the Magna Carta has influenced the world in every century succeeding.

I wish to add my thanks to those already expressed by others for this gift from the English peoples.

One of the finest expressions of our appreciation on this side of the Atlantic was the speech by Secretary of State Dean Rusk in accepting this acre of land.

With permission, I would like his speech to be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

SECRETARY RUSK'S STATEMENT AT RUNNYMEDE, MAY 14, 1965

Your presence here, Your Majesty, Your Royal Highness, this nation, Mr. Prime Minister, which has nurtured freedom for so many in so many parts of the world, the British people, Mr. Macmillan, Lord Harlech, who have generously joined their affection and their resources to give life to the Kennedy Memorial Trust.

This quiet and lovely Runnymede, the field of the Great Charter which began to lay the hand of "the law of the land" upon the exercise of power.

The extraordinary, incandescent man, Mrs. Kennedy, whom we honor here today, all these make this an unforgettable moment for us and for those we represent.

President Johnson has asked me to exercise personally, on his and our Nation's behalf, my statutory privilege of accepting this acre of land. I do so with the joy, and the sadness, which shall forever mark those of us who served with John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

When the American people learned about this tribute to our beloved late President, we were deeply moved—not only because you decided to share with us this Runnymede which is a common and precious symbol, but also because what you have done reflects so sensitive an understanding of John F. Kennedy himself.

No one of us more than he searched out the best of our past as a guide to present commitment and to future action. He would have been the first to recall:

That his own Massachusetts, in 1641, adopted a "Body of Liberties" in response to a need for what John Winthrop called a fundamental law "in resemblance to a Magna Carta."

That the lineage of our common liberties runs through the Petition of Rights, the Habeas Corpus Act, your Bill of Rights of 1689, and our own Bill of Rights in the Federal Constitution.

And that there is unfinished business in the endless struggle for human dignity and freedom, at home and abroad.

No one of us more than he was concerned for the future. You have generously provided fellowship opportunities for young men and women to enlarge their capacity to build that decent future which was his passionate concern.

The words you have inscribed on this tablet express not only the deepest resolve of John F. Kennedy but the abiding commitment of the American people: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend or oppose any foe in order to assure the survival and success of liberty."

We know, because you have proved it on many crucial occasions, that this is also the abiding commitment of the British people.

On behalf of President Johnson and the American people, I thank Your Majesty, your Government, and your people. We shall cherish this memorial to a President who shall be forever young. "At the going down of the sun and in the morning" we shall remember him. And we draw strength and confidence from the knowledge that all who pass this way shall be reminded of the common dedication of the British and American peoples to the cause of human liberty—a reminder which has its roots here in seven and a half centuries and its promise through all time to come.

Thank you, Your Majesty, Mrs. Kennedy.

Crash Program To Close Dollar Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a recent article from the business section of the celebrated Boston Herald quoting William McC. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, on the dollar gap.

Since I have been saying virtually the same thing in my House remarks over a long period of time now, I regard Mr. Martin's statement to be particularly timely as a grave warning to the executive department of this Government, and to the Members of this Congress.

Mr. Martin unequivocably states regarding the dollar gap as follows:

The massive overhang of liabilities to foreigners is more serious than Vietnam, the Congo, or the United Nations, if it gets away from us—

Mr. Martin said before the Society of American Business Writers.

Mr. Martin might have added that the 1965 gold loss to date of over $1 billion is an ominous sign that the dollar gap problem is indeed getting away from us.

This Government can no longer afford to temporize with this grave issue.

We must stop making mud pies. We must stop playing around with petty, picayune ineffective remedies that do not attack the heart of this problem.

As I have stated many times before, and as many economists and monetary experts well know, we need a massive attack on this dollar gap problem, and we need it now.

It must involve a reevaluation of our foreign aid program, and our foreign trade program, and the network of complex financial interrelationships we have with many nations of the world.

To delay further in taking strong, affirmative action to solve this grave question by applying effective remedies directed to the roots of the problem could be a fateful and disastrous thing for this Nation and for the world.

I again express the hope that our government at every level will give this important matter urgent attention designed to develop a crash program for grappling with and closing the dollar gap so that it will not be hanging over the heads of the American people like the Sword of Damocles.

[From the Boston Herald, May 14, 1965]

PAYMENTS DEFICIT OUR NO. 1 PROBLEM, MARTIN SAYS

(By William F. Homer, Jr., financial editor.)

NEW YORK.—The Nation's deficit balance of international payments is its No. 1 problem today, greater than political complications, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board said here Thursday.

"The massive overhang of liabilities to foreigners is more serious than Vietnam, the Congo, or the United Nations, if it gets away from us," William McC. Martin told the Society of American Business Writers.

SIXTY-MILLION-DOLLAR GOLD LOSS

His remarks followed revelations by the New York Federal Reserve Bank of a loss of $60 million in the Treasury's gold stock, bringing the 1965 gold loss to date to $1,035 million compared to $125 million for all of 1964.

"The dollar is not depreciating at the moment," the Chairman said, defending the Fed's checks and balances monetary policy of the last few years.

"But if we wait until prices have already risen, I don't want to see monetary policy move at all, because it will be too late."

Martin warned, too, of the steady rise of private debt in relation to personal income in the past 2 years.

"Credit is there to be used, but like a rubber band it can be stretched too far," he summarized.

Martin vindicated the Fed's stand against perpetual deficit financing and easy money, citing two changes in the rediscount rate in the last few years.

"Monetary policy has shifted from free reserves well above zero line to well below the zero line, with no disruption of the money market," he pointed out.

Earlier, two top newspaper executives, Thomas V. H. Vail, publisher of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, and Michael J. Ogden, managing editor of the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, capsuled their ideas of financial news pages of the future.

They allowed for differences in newspaper size.

They agreed that financial writers need to develop a special confidence between themselves and the business community. They concurred that successful financial sections would strike a balance of local, national, and human interest with attractive window dressing of cuts and layouts.

Suggestion of more space and higher pay were hailed with cheers.

Excess reserves move up—Stock of gold declines

WEEKLY AVERAGE OF DAILY FIGURES

[In millions of dollars]

	May 12 week	May 5 week	Year ago
U.S. Government securities:			
Bought outright, system account	37,565	+64	+3,661
Held under repurchase agreement	625	+232	+542
Acceptances bought outright	53	−1	+2
Discounts and advances:			
Member bank borrowings	498	+20	+184
Other	16	-------	+16
Float	1,557	−84	−83
Total, Reserve bank credit	40,332	+195	+4,312
Gold stock	14,395	−16	−1,068
Treasury currency outstanding	5,399	−12	−172
Currency in circulation	39,071	+252	+1,921
Treasury cash holdings	744	−10	+327
Treasury deposits with Federal Reserve banks	1,010	+173	+20
Foreign deposits with Federal Reserve banks	134	−30	−26
Other deposits with Federal Reserve banks	191	+14	+12
Other Federal Reserve accounts (net)	821	−6	−118
Member bank reserves:			
With Federal Reserve banks	18,154	−199	+936
Currency and coin (estimated)	3,318	−76	+231
Total reserves held (estimated)	21,472	−275	+1,167
Required reserves (estimated)	21,094	−319	+1,202
Excess reserves (estimated)	378	+44	−35

NOTE.—On May 12, U.S. Government securities held in custody by the Federal Reserve banks for foreign account totaled $7,614,000,000, a decrease of $59,000,000 for the week and a decrease of $303,000,000 from the comparable date a year ago.

The Three Faces of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's speech last Thursday to the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists is a moving account of what the United States is attempting through our foreign aid program.

The war in Vietnam, the President said, has three faces—armed conflict, the quest for a political solution, and human need. With the compassion which has marked his career, the President described this third face, "the untended sick, the hungry family, and the illiterate child. It is men and women, many without shelter, with rags for clothing, struggling for survival in a very rich and a very fertile land."

This he said is the most important battle in which we are engaged.

Our help to these people is the most crucial because, in his words:

> A nation cannot be built by armed power or by political agreement. It will rest upon the expectation by individual men and women that their future will be better than the past.

I commend the President's sensitive remarks to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN EDITORIAL CARTOONISTS IN THE EAST ROOM

Good morning ladies and gentlemen, and my friends of the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists. I am very happy that you requested through the press office this opportunity for us to meet together, because after looking at some of the cartoons you have drawn, I thought I'd invite you over to see me in person. After all, I had nothing to lose.

I know that I am talking to the most influential journalists in America. Reporters may write and politicians may talk but what you draw remains in the public memory long after these other words are forgotten. That is why, after I learned that you would be here and we would meet together that I put together some notes to discuss with you while you were in Washington, a very little-known side of our activity in one of the most vital places in the world—South Vietnam.

The war in Vietnam has many faces.

There is the face of armed conflict—of terror and gunfire—of bomb-heavy planes and campaign-weary soldiers. In this conflict our only object is to prove that force will meet force—that armed conquest is futile, and that aggression is not only wrong, but it just will not work.

And the Communists in Vietnam are slowly beginning to realize what they once scorned to believe: that we combine unlimited patience with unlimited resources in pursuit of an unwavering purpose.

We will not abandon our commitment to South Vietnam.

The second face of war in Vietnam is the quest for a political solution—the face of diplomacy and politics—of the ambitions and the interests of other nations. We know, as our adversaries should also know, that there is no purely military solution in sight for either side. We are ready for unconditional discussions. Most of the non-Communist nations of the world favor such unconditional discussions. And it would clearly be in the interest of North Vietnam to now come to the conference table. For them the continuation of war, without talks, means only damage without conquest. Communist China apparently desires the war to continue whatever the cost to their allies. Their target is not merely South Vietnam, it is Asia. Their objective is not the fulfillment of Vietnamese nationalism. It is to erode and to discredit America's ability to help prevent Chinese domination over all of Asia.

In this domination they shall never succeed.

And I am continuing and I am increasing the search for every possible path to peace.

The third face of war in Vietnam is, at once, the most tragic and most hopeful. It is the face of human need. It is the untended sick, the hungry family and the illiterate child. It is men and women, many without shelter, with rags for clothing, struggling for survival in a very rich and a very fertile land.

It is the most important battle of all in which we are engaged.

For a nation cannot be built by armed power or by political agreement. It will rest on the expectation by individual men and women that their future will be better than their past.

It is not enough to just fight against something. People must fight for something, and the people of South Vietnam must know that after the long, brutal journey through the dark tunnel of conflict there breaks the light of a happier day. And only if this is so, can they be expected to sustain the enduring will for continued strife. Only in this way can longrun stability and peace come to their land.

And there is another, more profound reason. In Vietnam communism seeks to really impose its will by force of arms. But we would be deeply mistaken to think that this was the only weapon. Here, as other places in the world, they speak to restless people—people rising to shatter the old ways which have imprisoned hope—people fiercely and justly reaching for the material fruits from the tree of modern knowledge.

It is this desire, and not simply lust for conquest, which moves many of the individual fighting men that we must now, sadly, call the enemy.

It is, therefore, our task to show that freedom from the control of other nations offers the surest road to progress, that history and experience testify to this truth. But it is not enough to call upon reason or point to examples. We must show it through action and we must show it through accomplishment, and even were there no war—either hot or cold—we would always be active in humanity's search for progress. This task is commanded to us by the moral values of our civilization, and it rests on the inescapable nature of the world that we have now entered. For in that world, as long as we can foresee, every threat to man's welfare will be a threat to the welfare of our own people. Those who live in the emerging community of nations will ignore the perils of their neighbors at the risk of their own prospects.

This is true not only for Vietnam but for every part of the developing world. This is why, on your behalf, I recently proposed a massive, cooperative development effort for all of southeast Asia. I named the respected leader, Eugene Black, as my personal representative to inaugurate our participation in these programs.

Since that time rapid progress has been made, I am glad to report. Mr. Black has met with the top officials of the United Nations on several occasions. He has talked to other interested parties. He has found increasing enthusiasm. The United Nations is already setting up new mechanisms to help carry forward the work of development.

In addition, the United States is now prepared to participate in, and to support, an Asian Development Bank, to carry out and help finance the economic progress in that area of the world, and the development that we desire to see in that area of the world.

So this morning I call on every other industrialized nation, including the Soviet Union, to help create a better life for all of the people of southeast Asia.

Surely, surely, the works of peace can bring men together in a common effort to abandon forever the works of war.

But, as South Vietnam is the central place of conflict, it is also a principal focus of our work to increase the well-being of people.

It is in that effort in South Vietnam which I think we are too little informed and which I want to relate to you this morning.

We began in 1954 when Vietnam became independent, before the war between the North and the South. Since that time we have spent more than $2 billion in economic help for the 16 million people of South Vietnam. And despite the ravages of war we have made steady continuing gains. We have concentrated on food, and health, and education, and housing, and industry.

Like most developing countries, South Vietnam's economy rests on agriculture. Unlike many, it has large uncrowded areas of very rich, and very fertile land. Because of this, it is one of the great rice bowls of the entire world. With our help, since 1954, South Vietnam has already doubled its rice production, providing food for the people, as well as providing a vital export for that nation.

We have put our American farm know-how to work on other crops. This year, for instance, several hundred million cuttings of a new variety of sweet potato, that promises a sixfold increase in yield, will be distributed to these Vietnamese farmers. Corn

output should rise from 25,000 tons in 1962 to 100,000 tons by 1966. Pig production has more than doubled since 1955. Many animal diseases have been eliminated entirely.

Disease and epidemic brood over every Vietnamese village. In a country of more than 16 million people with a life expectancy of only 35 years, there are only 200 civilian doctors. If the Vietnamese had doctors in the same ratio as the United States has doctors, they would have not the 200 that they do have but they would have more than 5,000 doctors.

We have helped vaccinate, already, over 7 million people against cholera, and millions more against other diseases. Hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese can now receive treatment in the more than 12,000 hamlet health stations that America has built and has stocked. New clinics and surgical suites are scattered throughout that entire country; and the medical school that we are now helping to build will graduate as many doctors in a single year as now serve the entire population of South Vietnam.

Education is the keystone of future development in Vietnam. It takes a trained people to man the factories, to conduct the administration, and to form the human foundation for an advancing nation. More than a quarter million young Vietnamese can now learn in more than 4,000 classrooms that America has helped to build in the last 2 years; and 2,000 more schools are going to be built by us in the next 12 months. The number of students in vocational schools has gone up four times. Enrollment was 300,000 in 1955, when we first entered there and started helping with our program. Today it is more than 1,500,000. The 8 million textbooks that we have supplied to Vietnamese children will rise to more than 15 million by 1967.

Agriculture is the foundation. Health, education and housing are the urgent human needs. But industrial development is the great pathway to their future.

When Vietnam was divided, most of the industry was in the north. The south was barren of manufacturing and the foundations for industry. Today, more than 700 new or rehabilitated factories—textile mills and cement plants, electronics and plastics—are changing the entire face of that nation. New roads and communications, railroad equipment and electric generators, are a spreading base on which this new industry can, and is, growing.

All this progress goes on, and it is going to continue to go on, under circumstances of staggering adversity.

Communist terrorists have made aid programs that we administer a very special target of their attack. They fear them. They know they must fear them because agricultural stations are being destroyed and medical centers are being burned. More than 100 Vietnamese malaria fighters are dead. Our own AID officials have been wounded and kidnapped. These are not just the accidents of war. They are a part of a deliberate campaign, in the words of the Communists, "to cut the fingers off the hands of the Government."

We intend to continue, and we intend to increase our help to Vietnam.

Nor can anyone doubt the determination of the South Vietnamese themselves. They have lost more than 12,000 of their men since I became your President a little over a year ago.

But progress does not come from investment alone, or plans on a desk, or even the directives and the orders that we approve here in Washington. It takes men. Men must take the seed to the farmer. Men must teach the use of fertilizer. Men must help in harvest. Men must build the schools, and men must instruct the students. Men must carry medicine into the jungle and treat the sick, and shelter the homeless. And men—brave, tireless, filled with love for their fellows—are doing this today. They are doing it through the long, hot, danger-filled Vietnamese days and the sultry nights.

The fullest glory must go, also, to those South Vietnamese that are laboring and dying for their own people and their own nation. In hospitals and schools, along the rice fields and the roads, they continue to labor, never knowing when death or terror may strike.

How incredible it is that there are a few who still say that the South Vietnamese do not want to continue the struggle. They are sacrificing and they are dying by the thousands. Their patient valor in the heavy presence of personal, physical danger should be a helpful lesson to those of us who, here in America, only have to read about it, or hear about it on the television or radio.

We have our own heroes who labor at the works of peace in the midst of war. They toil unarmed and out of uniform. They know the humanity of their concern does not exempt them from the horrors of conflict, yet they go on from day to da. They bring food to the hungry over there. They supply the sick with necessary medicine. They help the farmer with his crops, families to find clean water, villages to receive the healing miracles of electricity. These are Americans who have joined our AID program, and we welcome others to their ranks.

For most Americans this is an easy war. Men fight and men suffer and men die, as they always do in war. But the lives of most of us, at least those of us in this room and those listening to me this morning, are untroubled. Prosperity rises, abundance increases, the nation flourishes.

I will report to the Cabinet when I leave this room that we are in the 51st month of continued prosperity, the longest peacetime prosperity for America since our country was founded. Yet our entire future is at stake.

What a difference it would make if we could only call upon a small fraction of our unmatched private resources—businesses and unions, agricultural groups and builders—if we could call them to the task of peaceful progress in Vietnam. With such a spirit of patriotic sacrifice we might well strike an irresistible blow for freedom there and for freedom throughout the world.

I, therefore, hope that every person within the sound of my voice in this country this morning will look for ways—and those citizens of other nations who believe in humanity as we do, I hope that they will find ways to help progress in South Vietnam.

This, then, is the third face of our struggle in Vietnam. It was there—the illiterate, the hungry, the sick—before this war began. It will be there when peace comes to us—and so will we. Not with soldiers and planes, not with bombs and bullets, but with all the wondrous weapons of peace in the 20th century.

And then, perhaps, together, all of the people of the world can share that gracious task with all the people of Vietnam, north and south alike.

Thank you for coming this morning. Good morning.

A Chance To Help Through VISTA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a fine editorial on VISTA, the domestic peace corps, which appeared in the Denver Post on Tuesday, May 4, 1965. This editorial gives due acknowledgment to the fact that an increasing number of Americans are realizing that the Great Society will be attained only through man's humanity to his fellow man. I encourage all my colleagues to read this article:

[From the Denver Post, May 4, 1965]

A CHANCE TO HELP THROUGH VISTA

The same idealism that led thousands of Americans to enlist in the Peace Corps to help people overseas is now leading thousands of others to enlist in VISTA to help people who need help in our own country.

VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) has been called the domestic peace corps because its members have to have some of the same attributes as the Peace Corpsmen: the ability to bring simple knowledge, skill, and encouragement to people handicapped by ignorance; the willingness to live among the people being helped and share their poverty and hardship; the desire to work for the satisfaction of doing good and not for monetary reward.

Throughout the Nation, VISTA are beginning to move into poverty neighborhoods in city slums, in troubled mine and mill towns, in run-down farm areas, in migrant workers camps, and on Indian reservations.

They will not only teach the poor such fundamental things as homemaking, how to look for a job or how to make use of available public services, but they will work with them to organize and repair their neighborhoods and their lives and to help them escape from the grip of poverty.

The Government pays the volunteers basic living expenses and $50 a month.

VISTA is now conducting recruiting drives at the University of Colorado and the University of Denver to interest young people 18 or over in investing a year of their lives in this useful and unselfish undertaking.

If 18 is the minimum age, there is no maximum. Some persons in their 70's are already among the VISTA volunteers. Information and application blanks are obtainable not only at the campuses but at the offices of Denver's war on poverty at 810 14th Street, and, by mail from the offices of VISTA, Washington, D.C.

This is a challenging and useful program, with a large potential for good. There ought to be at least as much satisfaction in helping people who need help in our own country as there is in helping people who need help abroad.

VISTA deserves a large response from Americans of every age, and we have no doubt it will receive it.

National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, the passage of H.R. 7031, known as the National Technological Institute for the Deaf Act, is being hailed by those of us who are deaf as being almost as significant as the invention of the hearing aid. I want to take this opportunity to offer my gratitude to Representative CAREY,

who introduced the act, and to the House Committee on Education and Labor for reporting it favorably and managing it on the floor.

The committee report cites the approximately 3,000 deaf students between 16 and 20 years old who leave or graduate State and local schools for the deaf every year. This is where a major discrepancy occurs because, although some of them may want desperately to further their education or training, they are unable to for a number of reasons. It is my sincere hope and that of the thousands of us who, although deaf, are able to participate actively in all walks of life, that this gap will be filled through this legislation.

National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it has been estimated that there are 37,000 seriously hearing-impaired children in the country, of whom some 6,000 are receiving little or no special education help. Legislative activities in recent years that include stimulation for the training of teachers and other professional personnel, research, and demonstration, captioned films and other acts are beginning to improve the educational opportunities for these children.

There is a continual flow of some 3,000 students who finish or leave school each year. Very little to date has been done to improve the opportunities for education and training of this group that lead to adequate employment.

These capable young adults, with a valuable potential for contributing to society, are given little or no opportunity to develop this potential. In our modern society the demands for much more technical training is increasing. Provisions must be made to allow the special talents of this group to emerge. If they are trained in technical skills, they will be able to increase their self-esteem and their worth to society.

A National Technical Institute for the Deaf will give these deserving young adults the opportunity they need to increase their worth in their own eyes and in the eyes of their fellow man.

I might point out that their problems are particularly acute and particularly pathetic.

We held comprehensive hearings in the subcommitte on this subject. The bill was reported unanimously by both the subcommittee and the full committee. It is something which is really an absolute essential.

I believe that the Members of this body will be proud to learn that, of all the nations in the world, ours is the only nation where a higher education is available for deaf youngsters, in Gallaudet College.

It is the only institution of its type in the world. Its facilities are overcrowded. It has the type of curriculum and method of operation which will not take care of many thousands of young adult deaf persons whose talents lie in another direction; namely, that of the vocational type of education. Gallaudet College is a liberal arts institution as distinguished from the orientation that the deaf person would get from this new proposed institution.

Our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY], has done a magnificent job, as usual, in handling this legislation, and he will address himself to it later on.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I understand this bill provides for a commission or a national advisory board or something of that nature.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It does.

Mr. GROSS. For the establishment of the institution.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. A 12-member National Advisory Board.

Mr. GROSS. Do they report back to Congress, or to whom do they report?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. They report to the Secretary.

Mr. GROSS. To the Secretary of HEW?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes. And when their job is done, that is, the study with relation to the establishment of the institution, they will cease to exist.

Mr. GROSS. They make a recommendation and the recommendation goes to the Secretary of the HEW and not to Congress?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is correct. Technically, yes.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, will we have no opportunity, as Members of Congress, to pass upon the location of this institution?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No, we will not, except, of course, in the appropriations process.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield at that point?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. This is exactly how Gallaudet College, which has been in existence for 101 years, is operating now. Their appropriation comes up every year and is reviewed by the distinguished Committee on Appropriations. A budget is submitted and the funds are voted up or down depending on the needs described. In this particular bill, as the gentleman from Iowa probably knows, we provide there will be public members on the board of the institution once this board is constituted, just as we do on the Gallaudet College Board.

It is indicated there would be Members of Congress serving on that board. So the conduct and the administration of the institution would be under constant surveillance by Members of this body.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield to me in order that I might ask the gentleman from New York a question?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it the idea of the gentleman, who is the sponsor of this bill, that Gallaudet College should be merged with a new institution or that it should be continued in the work it is doing?

Mr. CAREY. I am pleased to answer my colleague from Iowa. The experts testified in depth before our subcommittee indicating that a merger with Gallaudet would neither be logical nor ideal. They are already up to the saturation point in terms of their present facility. It is not ideally situated in the District as an academic institution, but it would certainly not be practical to suggest a movement at this time of Gallaudet.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman that Gallaudet is not ideally situated. I would hope in the establishment of such a new institution it would not be an expansion, with all due respect to the fine work they are doing in Gallaudet College. It should not be an expansion of that institution in its present location.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. As a matter of fact, I can say to my colleague, the president of Gallaudet College and the dean testified in favor of this legislation and said specifically that Gallaudet is a liberal arts institution primarily and it would not do for this purpose at all. The criteria for the new institution are set forth in the report accompanying the bill. It is clear that Gallaudet does not meet these specifications:

H.R. 7031

A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of providing a residential facility for post secondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for successful employment, there are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary for the establishment and operation, including construction and equipment, of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf, including sums necessary for the acquisition of property, both real and personal, and for the construction of buildings and other facilities for such Institute.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State or in the District of Columbia which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State (or in the District of Columbia) to pro-

vide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, (4) includes one or more professional or graduate schools, (5) is a public or nonprofit private institution, and (6) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association. For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner of Education shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

(c) The term "construction" includes construction and initial equipment of new buildings, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings and equipment thereof, and acquisition of land; including architect's services, but excluding off-site improvements.

PROPOSALS

SEC. 4. Any institution of highed education which desires to enter into an agreement with the Secretary to establish and operate a National Technical Institute for the Deaf shall submit a proposal therefor at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

AGREEMENT TO ESTABLISH INSTITUTE

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary, after consultation with the National Advisory Board created by section 6, is authorized to enter into an agreement with an institution of higher education for the establishment and operation, including construction and equipment, of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf. The Secretary, in considering proposals from institutions of higher education to enter into an agreement under this Act, shall give preference to institutions which are located in metropolitan industrial areas.

(b) The agreement shall—

(1) provide that Federal funds appropriated for the benefit of the Institute will be used only for the purposes for which paid and in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Act and the agreement made pursuant thereto;

(2) provide that the Board of Trustees or other governing body of the institution, subject to the approval of the Secretary, will appoint an advisory group to advise the Director of the Institute in formulating and carrying out the basic policies governing its establishment and operation, which group shall include persons who are professionally concerned with education and technical training at the postsecondary school level, persons who are professionally concerned with activities relating to education and training of the deaf, and members of the public familiar with the need for services provided by the Institute;

(3) provide that the Board of Trustees or other governing body of the institution will make an annual report to the Secretary. The Secretary shall transmit the report of the institution to the Congress with such comments and recommendations as he may deem appropriate;

(4) include such other conditions as the Secretary, after consultation with the National Advisory Board, deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act; and

(5) provide that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on any construction aided by Federal funds appropriated for the benefit of the Institute will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5); and the Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

(c) If within twenty years after the completion of any construction (except minor remodeling or alteration) for which such funds have been paid—

(A) the facility ceases to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed or the agreement is terminated, unless the Secretary determines that there is good cause for releasing the institution from its obligation, or

(B) the institution ceases to be the owner of the facility,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility an amount which bears to the then value of the facility the same ratio as the amount of such Federal funds bore to the cost of the facility financed with the aid of such funds. Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which the facility is situated.

NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD ON ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby established a National Advisory Board on Establishment of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, which shall consist of twelve persons, not regular full-time employees of the United States, appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. The Secretary shall appoint one of the members to serve as Chairman. The appointed members shall be selected from among leaders in fields related to education and training of the deaf and other fields of education, and from members of the public familiar with the need for services provided by the Institute. The Commissioner of Education and the Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation shall be ex officio members of the Board.

(b) Members of the Board, while serving on business of the Board, shall be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including traveltime, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittedly.

(c) It shall be the function of the Board (1) to review proposals from institutions of higher education which offer to enter into an agreement with the Secretary for the construction and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf, (2) to make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to such proposals, and (3) to make such other recommendations to the Secretary concerning the establishment and operation of the National Technical Institute as may be appropriate.

(d) After the Secretary enters into an agreement under this Act, the Board shall cease to exist.

REPORT OF NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF ACT

The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 7031) to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 8, before the comma, insert "in order to prepare them for successful employment".

Page 3, line 22, strike out "provide that".

Page 3, line 23, insert "provide that" after "(1)".

Page 4, line 3, strike out "the Board of Trustees" and insert "provide that the Board of Trustees or other governing body".

Page 4, line 14, insert "provide that" after "(3)", and after the word "Trustees" insert "or other governing body".

Page 4, line 19, insert "include" after "(4)".

Page 4, line 22, insert "provide that" after "(5)".

Page 6, lines 18 and 19, strike out "Council" wherever it appears and insert in lieu thereof "Board".

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to enter into an agreement with an institution of higher education for the establishment, construction, equipping, and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf for the purpose of providing a residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf. A 12-member National Advisory Board on the Establishment of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf would be appointed by the Secretary to review proposals from institutions of higher education which desire such an institute and to make recommendations to the Secretary on entering into a contract for the establishment and operation of such an institute. The Commissioners of Education and of Vocational Rehabilitation would be ex officio members of the Board.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

There are approximately 3,000 deaf students between the ages of 16 and 20 who leave or graduate from State and local schools and classes for the deaf each year. A large number have indicated their intense interest and desire for further educational opportunities. Dr. Leonard M. Elstad, president of Gallaudet College, the only institution for higher education for the deaf in the world, in his testimony reported that over 600 student applications were received and reviewed this year. He reported that 275 of these students will be admitted in September 1965.

The other 325 students who could not meet the entrance requirements of the college, by the very act of submitted an application expressed their desire for further education. This number coupled with some 75 to 100 annual withdrawals from the college at various levels from freshmen to seniors, in addition to numerous other deaf persons among the unemployed or underemployed who desire further training, indicates that well over 400 students each year would be eligible for a program that could be offered in a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

The recent report on the "Education of the Deaf" prepared by the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf in 1964, appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, stated that "five-sixths of our deaf adults work in manual jobs as contrasted to only one-half of our hearing population." If the door to further educational opportunity is not opened for the group who could not be admitted to Gallaudet College, including other qualified students, they have almost no other alternative than to join the ranks of the nonskilled labor force.

Population and enrollment

The Office of Education estimates that there are 37,000 school-age seriously hearing impaired children in our country. According to the American Annals of the Deaf (January issue, 1965), 83 public and private residential schools are attended by approximately 18,800 deaf students. About 13,200 attend 355 public and private special day schools and classes for the deaf. It is estimated that 5,000 additional students not accounted for by the American Annals of the Deaf are either in public school classes that do not provide necessary special education services for these children or they are not in school at all.

Special problems in education of the deaf

Dr. S. Richard Silverman, director of the Central Institute for the Deaf and professor of audiology at Washington University Medical School in St. Louis, in his testimony described the educational problems brought about by severe hearing impairment. A portion of his statement was as follows:

"For the persons we are here concerned with, the essential and primary channel for receiving the acoustic symbols we call speech is either absent or severely restricted. All the skills of communication that depend on learning over this channel are adversely affected. From infancy to early school age, the chief mode of communication for the normal hearing child is auditory. The child hears and learns to talk from what he hears. Furthermore, he not only learns how to communicate; he also learns what to communicate.

"For a child who does not have the daily experience of listening to language, its acquisition is indeed difficult, if not impossible for some, even with instruction. * * * the teacher is confronted with the task of communicating language to a child in the absence of the sensory system considered to be essential for its acquisition.

"The educator, therefore, must seek ways to manipulate information so that it can be transmitted over whatever sensory system or combination of systems—vision, touch, residual hearing. At the same time, we are concerned about the content of what we communicate—language and subject matter, as it is influenced by the demands of society and the child himself."

A young child who has a substantial or total hearing loss, acquired at birth or before the normal age for learning language through hearing, has a serious educational handicap. Our schools and special classes for deaf children have done an unquestionably outstanding job over the past 150 years in providing these children with a basic elementary school education. These schools have been performing their task under extremely difficult conditions which include lack of funds, weak or token public support, poor facilities, and a lack of adequately trained professional personnel.

Every attempt has been made by educators of the deaf to accelerate the acquisition of reading, language, and communication skills by deaf children. For the most part, the objective has been to teach the tool skills well enough at the elementary level so that these children could go on with their education or further vocational training in our colleges, universities, and vocational training facilities for normal hearing students.

Philosophically, this goal would appear to be a reasonable one. Many educators have been convinced that this kind of preparation is the best way for the deaf child to become a full participant socially and economically in a hearing world. Numerous individual success stories can be and have been produced to support this theory. However, the facts reveal that for the general deaf population this has not been achieved.

Full use of the intellectual potential of the deaf child is seriously hampered by deafness. Only through the use of every visual educational device and technique together with all we have to offer by way of modern electronic acoustic technology can this potential be utilized more fully.

Most residential schools for the deaf offer programs that provide for the equivalent of an eighth grade education. Very few of the specialized day school programs go beyond this level. Students desiring more than this are expected to enroll in regular high school and other vocational schools for the hearing. This is a commendable objective and its practice should be encouraged wherever and whenever possible. However, because of the serious communication problem involved little more than 1 percent of these children can really communicate well enough to do this.

Considerable pressure is being brought upon Gallaudet College in Washington to accommodate a greater number of students than ever before in its history. Those who apply for admission indicate by this effort, their desire for further knowledge and training beyond what they have been able to secure in their own community or State. Since Gallaudet College is the only facility available that can provide such an opportunity (and this opportunity is restricted to a liberal arts program), a rejection for admission virtually closes the door to any possible further education for them unless they are in the small minority who can successfully attend a technical-vocational school or an institution of higher education for the hearing.

Because the occupational outlook of society is changing, there exists the danger that a substantial portion of these deaf individuals will no longer be needed in the labor market. Vocational education programs for the deaf in our residential schools in the past have trained the deaf for positions at mechanical and operative levels. Present and future modern technology is now and will be requiring far more sophisticated occupational training and education for those seeking employment. Now more than ever before, the deaf should have equal access to the full range of postsecondary education and training opportunities that are presently available to the general population.

A NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

The establishment of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf would, by providing a broad flexible curriculum, be able to meet the many and varied special needs of able young deaf adults who seek the opportunity for further education and training. Adequately trained staff members who are resourceful, flexible, and imaginative would be required for the successful operation of a residential, educational, and technical training program.

Size of the Institute

Since the estimates that have been made regarding the number of students who would be able to profit from a specialized program indicate that at least 400 students each year could qualify for enrollment, provision should be made initially to enroll at least 200 students each year. The special needs of individual students for program planning purposes would be determined following complete physical, psychological, audiological evaluations, and a program of orientation and guidance counseling. The goals established for some students could be accomplished in 1 year. The objectives for others might require 2, 3, or even 4 years to complete. A facility built to accommodate at least 600 students and adults above the age of 17 properly equipped and staffed should be able to completely process, counsel, educate, train, and place at least 200 students each year. Each student would complete his or her own special program or course of study at the end of 1 or more years depending upon individual needs and the training undertaken.

Program objectives

The principal objectives of the educational program should be employment upon completion of a prescribed training program. The environment of the school, the curriculum, and general living conditions, along with health and recreational services, should be designed to help the student achieve a high degree of personal development and a sense of social responsibility. The educational and training program should be supplemented by varied civic and social group activities to provide the proper environment for developing concepts of responsible citizenship and social competence.

The focus of effort of the entire faculty on behalf of the students attending the Institute should be directed toward the goals of successful employment and preparation for full participation in community living.

Location

The National Technical Institute for the Deaf should be located in a large metropolitan industrial area so that it could be designed to serve the special needs of deaf youth from any community in the Nation. The Institute should be affiliated with a major university for the administration of its program. This would facilitate securing the medical, audiological, psychological, and psychiatric services needed to supplement appropriate guidance and counseling services provided by the staff of the Institute.

The community where the Institute is located should be able to offer a variety of opportunities for training and experience in a wide range of modern industrial settings. The community should be one that would generally be receptive to a program of this nature and be sympathetic with training needs of the handicapped.

The Institute should be located in a community that has a wide variety of nationally representative types of industrial activities in order to make it possible for the student to return to his home for eventual employment.

Curriculum

The curriculum of the Institute should be very flexible so as to permit a variety of adaptations to meet the needs of individual students without the absolute necessity to conform to traditional accreditation standards, such as course credits, fixed period scheduling, and other curriculum, restrictions. A special course of study should be tailor made to meet the very specific needs of each student attending the Institute. Upon successful completion of a prescribed curriculum, each student should receive a certificate or other formal recognition that would attest to what has been accomplished. The standards and quality of training offered in all areas would have to be high enough to meet the usual requirements as recommended by labor, industry, and professional associations, including certifying and licensing agencies.

The program offered should be broad enough to include a basic or preparatory curriculum of a remedial nature in such subjects as English, reading, science, and mathematics. The basic program should be designed specifically to prepare students for the academic courses of study that would be offered to support the postsecondary technical training. A supplementary curriculum including such courses as humanities, government, history, and economics should be offered to properly prepare students for living in a modern urban society. A comprehensive supporting curriculum in such subject areas as physics, chemistry, biology, and higher mathematics, should be offered where required as prerequisites for training in technical areas.

The course work offered in preparatory, support, and supplemental curriculums should follow a logical sequence in preparing students for training and experience in a wide variety of technologies. The following suggested technological programs are illustrative of some of the kinds of training opportunities that should be made available to deaf students:

Automotive technology: mechanics and body repair, shop service operations, automotive refrigeration, internal combustion engines, and diesel engine technology.

Aviation technology: mechanics and engine repair, unit assembly work, and drafting.

Building and construction: carpentry, plumbing, equipment repair, and architectural drawing.

Paramedical and chemical technology: chemistry, microbiology, anatomy and physiology, quantitative analysis, dental prosthetics, optical instruments, and embalming.

Engineering technology: engineering graphics, technical math, physics, chemistry, general metals, technical drafting, engineering fundamentals, surveying, water-sanitary technology, and technical report writing.

Business: accounting, business machines, typing, office management, data processing, computer operation, and programing.

Commercial art: basic design, basic drawing, advertising, and dress design.

Electronic engineering technology: electronics fundamentals, technical math and physics, radio and television repair, industrial electronics, and technical drafting.

Technical graphic arts: lithography, engineering graphics, technical drafting, offset, and equipment maintenance and repair.

Mechanical and metals technology: machine shop, welding, air conditioning, sheet metalwork, refrigeration, tool and die, and ornamental metalwork.

An enrichment curriculum should be made available to those students who have the ability and desire to pursue further professional training in other institutions of higher learning. Such courses as literature, history, psychology, sociology, foreign language philosophy, and political sciences could be offered in the Institute itself or arrangements for study in these areas could be made for the students in other regular university programs.

Essential to the overall program would be the opportunity for continued instruction in communication skills. These would include work toward improving speech and speech reading skills in addition to a continuing support program of auditory training.

Administration

The Institute should be directed by a person who has had professional training and experience as an educator of the deaf. He should be qualified to organize a competent staff that would be able to pull together all the resources of a community and other institutions of higher education in order that the needs of students to be enrolled could be served. All staff members, including counseling, placement, psychological, and instruction specialists, should be adequately trained to deal with deaf students from all types of schools and educational backgrounds. These personnel should know and understand deaf students thoroughly, including their special eduaction and social problems.

Under the provisions of the bill, the governing body of the institution of higher education, subject to the approval of the Secretaary, would appoint an advisory group to advise the Director of the Institute in formulating and carrying out the basic policies governing its establishment and operation. Because of the Federal support for the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, it would be anticipated that congressional representation would be included in the membership of the advisory group among those who are designated as members of the public familiar with the needs of educational services for the deaf.

Placement officers on the staff of the Institute should provide for initial placement and followup services through appropriate liaison with community vocational rehabilitation agencies throughout the Nation.

As a byproduct, in providing this kind of expert service, the Institute could serve as a practice teaching center for the training of special guidance and rehabilitation counselors for the deaf.

One of the responsibilities of the placement guidance and counseling staff should be to maintain continuous liaison with personnel in all schools and classes for the deaf, vocational rehabilitation agencies, and industry in order to keep these individuals informed and up to date on all pertinent activities of the Institute.

Standards for admission

Students should be considered for enrollment in the Institute without having to take formal entrance or qualifying examinations. Admission to the program should be based on a complete comprehensive evaluation of each student's potential for successfully completing a course of study which would provide him with an employable skill. The information needed for this purpose as a part of the application process should include a review of medical, psychological, and audiological records; acadamic achievement and school progress reports; and recommendations from teachers, school principal, and others who are acquainted with the student. Wherever possible, personal interviews with potential students at the Institute, at home, or in school should be made by the appropriate staff members of the Institute.

A period of orientation, evaluation, and counseling at the Institute in order to properly prepare the new student for full participation in the program, should be available to those who need it.

Research

In addition to serving as a practice teaching center for the training of teachers, instructors, and rehabilitation counselors the Institute should serve as a research facility for the study of educational problems of the deaf. The Institute would be an excellent proving ground for the development of new and better educational teaching techniques. Such information would be useful to all programs where deaf children are taught.

Physical facilities

The Institute should have a sufficient number of flexible classroom accommodations to handle at least 50 groups or classes simultaneously; dormitories for 600 residential students equipped with recreation room, social center, reading and study areas; laboratory and shop facilities for all technological and occupational programs; a special library and instructional media center; group auditory training equipment available in all classroom and other meeting or assembly areas; a recreation and general student social center designed purely for recreation and physical fitness programs; an auditorium with a seating capacity for about 800 to accommodate the entire student body and staff at one seating; a completely equipped guidance and counseling and a psychological services center; and a cafeteria.

Comprehensive study of the education for the deaf

One of the important factors leading to the proposal for a program of technical education of the deaf, has been the report on the "Education of the Deaf," which was undertaken by authorization of the 1965 appropriation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It would be most appropriate that no later than 1970 a comprehensive study of the education of the deaf be undertaken to evaluate the progress made under the program authorized in this legislation, as well as education effort for the deaf developed on the elementary and secondary level through Federal assistance under the Vocational Education Amendment of 1963, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as well as other Federal legislation.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF ACT (H.R. 7031)

Section 1: This section provides that the legislation may be cited as the "National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act."

Section 2: This section authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for the establishment and operation, including construction and equipment, of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf as a residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for employment.

Section 3: This section defines, for purposes of the legislation, the term "Secretary" to mean the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The term "institution of higher education" is defined to mean an educational institution in any State or the District of Columbia which admits as regular students only graduates of secondary schools or the equivalent, is legally authorized to provide postsecondary education, provides an educational program leading to a bachelor's degree, includes one or more professional or graduate schools, is a public or nonprofit private institution, and is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner of Education. The term "construction" includes construction and initial equipment of new buildings, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings and equipment thereof, and acquisition of land, and includes architect's fees but not off-site improvements.

Section 4: This section provides that any institution of higher education may submit a proposal for an agreement to establish and operate a National Technical Institute for the Deaf in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary.

Section 5: Subsection (a) of this section authorizes the Secretary, after consulting the National Advisory Board on Establishment of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf created by section 6 of the legislation, to enter into an agreement with an institution of higher education for the establishment and operation of such National Technical Institute for the Deaf, giving preference to institutions in metropolitan industrial areas. Subsection (b) requires that the agreement contain certain provisions, including prevailing wage assurances and that the Board of Trustees or other governing body of the institution, subject to the approval of the Secretary, appoint an advisory group to advise the Director of the Institute with respect to basic policies for its establishment and operation. The subsection also provides that the governing body of the institution of higher education shall make an annual report to the Secretary. The committee would expect that under the terms of the agreement the report should contain such information as may be requested by the Secretary. Subsection (c) provides for recapture of Federal payments if any facility aided by Federal funds under this legislation ceases to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed within 20 years after it is completed.

Section 6: This section provides for the establishment of a National Advisory Board on Establishment of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, to consist of 12 persons selected by the Secretary from among leaders in fields related to education and training of the deaf and other fields of education and from members of the public familiar with the need for services provided by the Institute. The Commissioner of Education and the Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation would be ex officio members of the Board. The Board would review and make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to proposals from institutions of higher education which offer to enter into an agreement for the construction and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf, and make such other recommendations to the Secretary concerning the establishment and operation of the Institute as may be appropriate. The Board would cease to exist after the Secretary enters into the agreement.

Flight of Dr. Jeannette Piccard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement issued by the City of Dearborn Heritage Day Committee celebrating the memorable flight of Dr. Jeannette Piccard in a balloon in 1934 to establish the still current world altitude record for a balloon.

This momentous event is being appropriately celebrated by the people of Dearborn in the 16th Congressional District of Michigan by a ceremony and the placing of a marker at William B. Stout Junior High School at Oakwood and Rotunda, near the site from which Dr. Piccard took off for her historymaking flight in a balloon.

The statement follows:

MICHIGAN WEEK

A highlight of Michigan Week will be a program honoring Dr. Jeannette Piccard, a member of the world-famous scientific family. She was the first woman in the world to enter the stratosphere when she made a flight in a hydrogen-filled balloon from Ford Airport, Dearborn, Mich., on October 23, 1934.

Until the Russian Cosmonaut Valentina Tereshkova was boosted into space in the spacecraft Vostok VI, Dr. Piccard held the altitude record for women, and still holds it for a balloon category.

Her balloon flight was the space venture of another era, and it provided her famous husband, Dr. Jean Piccard, an observation post for the study of cosmic rays in the upper atmosphere that helped pave the way for the space flights of today. Her balloon had a 600,000 cubic-foot volume, and it floated to an altitude of 57,559 feet. The flight took her from Dearborn, Mich., to Cadiz, Ohio.

The text of the marker to be unveiled May 20, 1964, reads as follows:

"Near this location and not far from the Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village was located the Ford Airport. Here aviation history was made on October 23, 1934, when Dr. Jeannette Piccard made an ascent in a hydrogen-filled balloon. Accompanying her was her husband, Dr. Jean Piccard, scientific director and observer, who made a study of the cosmic rays."

Jeannette Piccard was the first woman in the world to pilot a balloon into the stratosphere. Her 175-foot-tall balloon attained an altitude of 57,559 feet.

Because the location of the marker is a spot famous in aviation history, the reverse side of the marker will contain a message describing the launch area, now the location of the William B. Stout school, named after a famous American aviation pioneer and inventor. Its text reads:

"This school was named after William B. Stout, a famous inventor, who contributed to the fame of Ford Airport. Airplane manufacture, airline operations, air races, Gordon Bennett balloon races, and mooring of dirigibles took place at the field, a portion of which is now Stout school premises."

A Michigan aviatrix, famed for her own aviation contributions, "Janey" Hart, wife of Michigan's Senator PHILIP A. HART, will be guest speaker at a program recognizing the contribution of women to aviation, and in particular honoring Dr. Jeannette Piccard. Many of Michigan's aviation and civic leaders are expected at the Heritage Day dinner at Dearborn's Henry Ford Museum, under the sponsorship of Michigan Aviation and Space Association. Besides Mrs. Philip A. Hart, who is one of the few women pilots with a rotocraft rating, Mrs. Robert Steadman, of Flint, chairman of the Michigan Week Aviation Committee, Michigan's only woman pilot with an airline transport rating; and James D. Ramsey, director of Michigan's Department of Aeronautics will be among the honored guests.

Dr. Jeannette Piccard has lived to see the results of her scientific achievements, and is even today active in a role of consultant to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, carrying on her good work at the age of 70.

Miles Stanley of West Virginia Leads AFL–CIO Effort To Spur Antipoverty Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is a privilege to invite attention to an article in the May 11, 1965, issue of the New York Times with the news that Miles C. Stanley, of West Virginia, has joined the national staff of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The Times notes that Mr. Stanley has been named an assistant to George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, with his first mission being to coordinate labor participation in the administration's antipoverty program.

Knowing as I do Mr. Stanley and his superb record as president of the West Virginia AFL–CIO, and of his popularity both within and outside of labor leadership in our State, I subscribe to the Times writer's observation that the AFL–CIO "has put one of its most respected State federation presidents on the headquarters staff."

Whatever his assignment—whatever his mission—Miles Stanley will perform admirably, efficiently, and with distinction.

But in the tasks for which he has been brought to the National Capital City especially at this time, he will achieve commendable results because he has a deep personal and official commitment to administration programs. These include the Economic Opportunity Act, the Appalachian Regional Development Act, and that which I hope soon will be added, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Miles Stanley is a man of compassion and understanding. The labor movement is fortunate in having his talents and his services available, and the leadership he will provide will enhance the success of the programs and program coordination for which he is responsible in his new national assignment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the New York Times article by John D. Pomfret, to which I have made reference.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY ROLE PRESSED BY LABOR: AFL–CIO NAMES AID TO SPUR ANTIPOVERTY DRIVE

(By John D. Pomfret)

WASHINGTON, May 10.—The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, in an attempt to get its State and local central units to participate more energetically in community affairs, has put one of its most respected State federation presidents on the headquarters staff.

He is Miles C. Stanley, president of the West Virginia AFL–CIO. Mr. Stanley has been named an assistant to George Meany, president of the national federation.

Mr. Stanley's first job will be to coordinate labor participation in the administration's antipoverty program. Part of the job will be to encourage State and local central bodies that have not done so to help their communities initiate or carry out community-action programs designed to combat poverty.

In some fields, federation officials are pleased with the efforts of most of the 50 State and nearly 800 local AFL–CIO central bodies. They cite politics, community chest programs and, to a growing degree, civil rights as areas in which the subordinate units are actively involved.

PARTICIPATION IS URGED

However, the general lack of participation in the antipoverty program is considered symptomatic of the failure of many central bodies to become as deeply involved with their communities as federation officials think they should.

In too many communities, these officials believe, unions are regarded as narrow special-interest groups and not consulted or asked to participate in programs of general community interest.

Mr. Stanley, who is 41 years old, has been a union official in one capacity or another since the age of 17. He has been president of the West Virginia AFL–CIO since 1957. Before that he was executive secretary of the State CIO. He has been president of the local CIO council in Charleston, W. Va., and served for 9 years as president of a steelworkers' local.

WIDE EXPERIENCE NOTED

Mr. Stanley has a long record of participation in community activities. He is chairman of the West Virginia Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and a member of the national advisory units of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Area Redevelopment Administration. He has served as USO chairman in West Virginia, directed a State mental health survey and has participated in the work of a number of other State advisory groups.

Mr. Stanley thinks that organized labor helped create the political and legislative climate favoring enactment of the administration's antipoverty program, but that the program will not work unless there is active community participation.

He has been explaining its concept to officials of State and local federation units in a series of speeches around the country. He is preparing an operations manual on how they should go about getting involved.

Mr. Stanley will also act as the labor contact man for Government officials administering the antipoverty program. Part of this duty will be to try to make certain that the antipoverty effort does not adversely affect union-negotiated wage-and-fringe-benefits standards.

Lufkin's Plea for Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an excellent statement by my friend and distinguished business, civic, and veteran leader, Robert S. Lufkin, Fitchburg, Mass., on the closing of veterans' hospitals.

The views which Mr. Lufkin has so forcefully expressed in this matter indicate the urgent need for keeping veterans' hospitals open, as well as the strong determination of our veterans' leaders, veterans and the American people to see to it that these hospital facilities are kept open.

It is extremely illogical to talk about closing Government hospitals on the ground that we are going to have new, modernized hospitals when the modernized ones are not even in the advanced planning stage as yet.

Obviously, until we have new, modern, veterans' hospitals, and we want them, and need them, we must use the facilities we now have.

So far as Rutland Heights VA hospital is concerned, this facility is in suitable condition, and could be used for sometime to come to hospitalize, treat, and care for many veterans of New England.

The hospital is well located, accessible, well-staffed and served by very capable, faithful employees, and there is no justification for closing it at this time.

It should be and must be kept open, in order to serve the veterans of Massachusetts and New England, and to spare our hospitalized disabled veterans from being shuttled around all over the country to get medical care and treatment that is available within a short distance from their homes and their dear ones.

Let me congratulate and thank my good and distinguished friend, Mr. Lufkin, upon his fine statement and commendable work to keep the veterans hospitals open, since this is, indeed, a sacred task of veterans' organizations, as well as Members of Congress, and all thoughtful patriotic citizens, who recognize the great contributions that the veterans have made in saving the country. Let us not forget them now. They are entitled to the best and they must have it.

FITCHBURG, MASS.

As commander of the 71st Regiment C.A.C. Veterans Association, with men from 47 States, Washington, D.C., Canada, and Italy. I protest to the closing of Veterans' Administration facilities across the Nation.

The American citizens who so overwhelmingly elected this administration, which promised us the Great Society of abundance for everyone, did not want this to come about, by imposing additional hardships and heartaches upon sick and helpless war veterans.

Masterminded Budget Bureau-computerized decisions will never take the place of good human relations toward our war veterans in strengthening the defense of our country. What has happened to our Government's good faith and promises to its veterans?

The United States has provided at least $105 billion in foreign aid, economic and military since World War II. This administration claims it can save $20 million by closing up veterans hospitals. Yet this saving has now been disproven.

The current attack on veterans is apparently designed to carry out executive department edict which aims to remove the Veterans' Administration as a Federal agency serving veterans and parcel out its responsibilities to other agencies under a social-welfare scheme which Congress rejected. This scheme is to do away with the special status and recognition, historically accorded American veterans, who will become identified only as a number on a national welfare roll.

Most of our hospitals and domiciliary homes have never been without a long waiting list, while hundreds of thousands of our buddies who are in desperate need of nursing care will die because of lack of proper care and attention. Why close a lot of these facilities and move seriously sick veterans 550 or more miles away so that they will lose contact with their family and friends? The decision to close these hospitals was made by someone sitting in Washington, who has no doubt never seen even seen the hospitals, or may be they know that there will be a saving of money because these confused sick old veterans, many of whom are in their late seventies will miss visits from their loved ones and will soon die off.

Non-service-connected disability veterans will have an even more difficult job of getting hospital care from the Federal Government.

Instead of closing veterans hospitals, nursing and rest homes, our great Government, charitable to so many foreign countries, should spend some of this gold at home and build more facilities to serve better its old veterans of World War I who deserve better treatment. Even the Civil War and Spanish-American War veterans received pensions, but World War I veterans receive no pension unless they can prove that they are too sick to work and destitute, and this is a very meager amount, not enough to prevent him from sinking into poverty and wretchedness of old age.

What little these old veterans have received, they had to fight for and that was given them by a begrudging Government. World War II veterans can thank these older veterans in the American Legion, Congressmen, and others for the fight they put up in their behalf so that they are receiving a much better deal.

I personally know of many soldiers in France during World War I who were taken sick or had an accident, but did not report on sick call as they did not think it was serious enough. These soldiers had the guts, courage, and determination to carry on but are now paying for it, as many of them now in their older years are feeling the ill effects of their wartime sickness or accident, but our Government does not recognize them as wartime disability cases because the company clerk did not have it on their record.

Many veterans who are pathetic cases now in hospitals with nonservice disability records will be sent home to their families to be taken care of. These veterans would not have been in the hospital in the first place if their families could have financially or physically taken care of them. These men who are proud to have served their country in time of danger at the risk of their own lives, now must go on local relief. They should not be submerged into the masses and should not lose their identity. How are millions of veterans' families, relatives and friends going to feel toward an administration that has become ungrateful to its old soldiers, many of whom never could adjust themselves after what they went through. What of the men at present in our Armed Forces? What can they expect to look forward to when they become old, sick soldiers?

How about the many small communities that are keyed to serve the local veterans hospital which will become bankrupt and the many workers who will lose their jobs and become unemployed? What will these people think of President Johnson's "anti-poverty campaign"?

I say to this administration—don't close up veterans facilities and hospitals but improve our present plans if needed, and build a lot more all over our country, and get ready now for the peak load of World War II veterans who will need hospital care within 15 years. This will save our taxpayers many more millions of dollars by not being forced to have a crash program to build a lot of new expensive hospitals.

Give the veterans that had the guts, courage, and determination to carry on a better deal. Let our sick veterans be hospitalized near their homes so that their families can afford to visit them.

This will show that the "Great Society" is not just political propaganda from Washington.

ROBERT S. LUFKIN, O.S.J.,
Commander.

Citizen of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents will receive a much-deserved award on Thursday, May 20, when the annual Belvedere Citizen of the Year honor will be bestowed on Alberto C. "Al" Diaz.

"Al" Diaz typifies the fine spirit displayed by so many of our Los Angeles citizens of Mexican ancestry who have inherited the fierce independence and yet the modest sophistication so admired in our Latin neighbors.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent news article describing the festivities that will surround the awarding of this honor to Mr. Diaz. The civic organizations and other groups and individuals responsible for choosing him as Belvedere Citizen of the Year are to be congratulated on making an excellent choice.

CITIZEN OF YEAR BANQUET HONORS ALBERTO C. "AL" DIAZ

Plans were finalized this week for the annual Belvedere Citizen of the Year banquet honoring newspaperman Alberto C. "Al" Diaz, Thursday, May 20, at Sir Michael's Restaurant in East Los Angeles, announced Judge Myer B. Marion, dinner chairman.

"Al Diaz will be honored for his more than 20 years of service to the community through the newspaper field and his contributions in welfare and special projects benefiting Belvedere-East Los Angeles," said Judge Marion.

Keynote speaker at the testimonial dinner will be Judge Carlos M. Teran, who will present the Citizen of the Year Award to Diaz. Judge Teran is a lifelong friend of the honoree.

"Many city, county, and State officials as well as leaders of community groups and friends in East Los Angeles-Belvedere will gather to honor Alberto for his many contri-

butions to the area," said Claude F. Elliott, banquet cochairman.

Diaz was chosen the Eastside community's No. 1 citizen by a committee made up of members of the Belvedere Rotary Club, Belvedere Chamber of Commerce, and the Belvedere Business & Professional Men's Association, plus representatives of other groups and organizations as well as associates and friends in Belvedere-East Los Angeles.

The Citizen of the Year was recently named publisher and editor of the Belvedere Citizen and Eastside Journal by Oran Asa, head of the Northeast Newspapers and owner of both newspapers. Diaz has been associated with the newspapers for the past 20 years.

Diaz will be honored for his many contributions in countless projects for the benefit of the area. He will also receive recognition for his service on State commissions, public welfare groups, and youth organizations.

Joining in ceremonies honoring Diaz will be Manuel Veiga, Jr., leading the Pledge of Allegiance; Rev. Father John Languille, invocation; Dr. Max Offenberg, gifts and awards; Morris Spievak, president of the Belvedere Rotary Club, will welcome guests; Edward Gilbert, reciting an "Ode to a Special Citizen"; and Rev. Antonio Hernandez, benediction.

Judge Marion, banquet chairman, will serve as master of ceremonies for the evening.

A Downey resident, Diaz is presently a member of the State athletic commission and has served on the State recreation commission, and the State consumer counsel advisory committee.

Diaz, for many years recognized as a leading citizen of the community, has resided on the east side and worked among his fellow citizens for the betterment of the community in numerous projects.

"El Beachcomber," as "Al" is many times called, was born in Golconda, Ariz., but was raised and attended schools in East Los Angeles-Belvedere areas. He attended Belvedere Junior High School and was graduated from Garfield High School and Los Angeles City College where he majored in journalism and public relations.

He saw service in the U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II with overseas duty in the European theater. He was discharged from the service in November 1945, with the rank of staff sergeant.

While in the service he was a contributor to the Stars and Stripes, and Yank magazine, Armed Forces publications; and attended service schools at English Universities (Oxford and Cambridge).

After discharge he became associated with the Belvedere Citizen and since that time has been an active participant in civic and community welfare projects and activities in the Belvedere-East Los Angeles community. He is a member and has been an elected officer of the Eastside Boys Club board of directors; Belvedere Rotary Club past president; has or is serving as a member of the American Cancer Society, board of directors; Welfare Information Service (a United Way agency) board of directors.

The Citizen of the Year is credited with instituting the Annual Belvedere Children's Christmas Fiesta. The Yule party, first held in 1945 with an attendance of 195 children, has grown to be the State's largest Christmas event with a record 6,250 attending in 1964.

Alberto holds membership in the Belvedere Business & Professional Men's Association, California Newspaper Advertising Managers Association, and is an elected member of the Los Angeles County Democratic Central Committee, 51st Assembely District.

He is a member of Gamma Delta Upsilon, national honorary journalism society, and was recently inducted into Sigma Delta Chi, national professional journalism society.

Diaz served a term on the State consumer council advisory committee and as a member of the State recreation commission, a post in which he was highly commended for distinguished service.

In March 1964, Governor Brown announced his appointment as a member of the State athletic commission, the first Mexican-American ever named to this position. Diaz was reappointed to a 4-year term on the athletic commission in January 1965.

In 1961 students, parents, and faculty of Belvedere Junior High School honored Alberto C. Diaz as the community's Citizen of the Year. He is ably known as the "Honorary Mayor of Belvedere" and familiar to residents and businessmen of the community because of his column, "The Beachcomber," which he has written in the Belvedere Citizen for nearly 20 years.

He is married to the former Frances Saldivar and has three children—all boys—Albert, Robert, and Billy. The family home is in the city of Downey.

A community newspaper man for 20 years, he has served as managing editor of the two leading weekly newspapers in East Los Angeles—the Belvedere Citizen and Eastside Journal. Recently, he was named editor and publisher of these newspapers.

Sylvanus Thayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief biography of Sylvanus Thayer entitled "Thayer of Braintree" by R. Ernest Dupuy. This article touches on the highlights of the great contributions that Sylvanus Thayer made, not only to the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Army, and the engineering profession, but to the development of the United States at the most critical period of its growth.

Critical to the development of the young United States of America were the years 1817–33 when Sylvanus Thayer served as Superintendent of the U.S. Miliary Academy at West Point. Out of that era sprang a host of men whose influence reached into every facet of American life, all proteges of Thayer and his extraordinary system for the education of young men.

Beginning with Thayer, West Point became America's primary, and for many years, its only source of engineers; from his personally assembled European texts grew the Academy's engineering library, the first at any American college.

Although widely recognized for the military leaders it was producing, of equal or perhaps greater importance was the technical knowledge West Point was introducing to the national scene. From this one institution whose curriculum, teaching methods, and standards were the brainchildren of Thayer alone, came the men who were to stamp "growth" on the face of America. Among their numbers were engineers, scientists, explorers, clergymen, empire builders. Nor was it any accident that these same men, having won the recognition and acclaim of the civilian community, were prevailed upon to bring their talents to the country's campuses. Starting there as professors in the technical and scientific disciplines many went on to become heads of their institutions and internationally famous scientists and scholars.

Through these educators, as first generation disciples, the training that originated with Sylvanus Thayer filtered into the American cultural stream.

Without the impetus provided by this farseeing father of the Military Academy the flame that lit early 19th century America and fired its progress might not have been ignited until decades later.

The biography follows:

THAYER OF BRAINTREE

(By R. Ernest Dupuy)

On April 24, 1815, Sylvanus Thayer of Braintree was a happy man. For Brevet Major Thayer, U.S. Corps of Engineers, the ink hardly dry on his new promotion, was bound for Europe to improve his military knowledge—not, as he had requested, on furlough—but on a duty status, with the specific blessing of President James Madison. It was indeed a dream come true.

But what Thayer wouldn't realize until later was that the Secretary of War's letter of instruction, dated April 20, launching him on his trip, had ineluctably transformed him into an instrument of destiny for the betterment of these United States.

"You will," the letter read in part, "proceed to the Continent and prosecute inquiries and examination calculated for your improvement in the military art. The military schools and workshops, and arsenals, the canals and harbors, the fortifications * * * will claim your particular attention. You will (collect) such books, maps, and instruments for the Military Academy, as may hereafter be directed by the War Department, or the Commander of the Corps of Engineers."

It was June 10, 1815, when Thayer actually got away. It would be May 14, 1817, when he returned, his personal mission accomplished. More than a year of his time abroad had been spent in the environment of France's Ecole Polytechnique and its galaxy of scientists. There, Thayer found out, military and engineering education went hand in hand. He absorbed Polytechnique's methodology, its precision, the wide scientific scope of its curriculum; hobnobbed with the best brains in France, and amassed for West Point a round thousand volumes on military art, engineering, and mathematics.

Now began Thayer's official mission; his destiny. For he was at once ordered to West Point, as Superintendent of the little, struggling National Military Academy founded in 1802. There he met headlong and solved the double problem of reorganizing a military institution staggering along haphazardly, and of filling a rising national demand for technologists and technological education.

For the Industrial Revolution's tidal wave was already swirling about the foundations of an American educational system as yet ungeared to economic and technical development. Thayer, product of a liberal arts college, Dartmouth, plus the smattering of a year at West Point, well knew the limitations of American collegiate education of the day—a luxury rather than a utility. The average curriculum, with its vestigial background of denominational theology, was framed to produce a top dressing to the student's mind, designed neither for immediate practical use nor for vocational advancement.[1]

Thayer met the challenge. Within less than a year a transformed West Point blos-

---

[1] See Wills, Elbert V., "The Growth of American Higher Education," Dorrance, Philadelphia, 1936; and Hofstadter, Richard, and C. DeWitt Hardy, "The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States," Columbia University Press, N.Y., 1952; both passim.

somed, with a comprehensive 4-year curriculum tailored to meet the demands of the pioneering thirties, the roaring forties, the bewhiskered fifties. Exploration and exploitation of the resources of a vast continent, with accompanying expansion in communications and education, were the basic urges for that "great system of internal improvements within the constitutional power of the Union," which Thayer's fellow townsman President John Quincy Adams would proclaim in his inaugural address in 1825.

It was natural, in a nation where civil engineering as a profession was still unknown, that, as Adams later declared, the men of West Point must furnish the means "of multiplying the undertakings of public improvements to which their acquirements at that institution are peculiarly adapted."

So to West Point the nation reached, for the men who would explore our expanding boundaries, build our railroads, develop our rivers and harbors, and furnish the nucleus of scientists and scholars who would found our present-day tremendous technological educational system.

What the sons of Sylvanus accomplished in nation-building is a matter of record; so too with their accomplishments in their military missions. But we linger a moment on Thayer's scholarly prowess making these accomplishments possible.

This Thayer system was triangular in plan, with equilaterals of education and discipline rising from a solid base of integrity. It was, in effect, a military novitiate. Thayer's wisdom in establishing an academic board, as well as an annual board of visitors, Presidentially appointed, insured supervision and adjustments, if necessary. His methodology—rigid entrance examinations to weed out the manifestly unfit; division of classes into small sections, with daily recitations and weekly grading; advancement by merit from a minimum standard below which no cadet could remain; the applicational approach in instruction—was entirely new to the American educational world. So, too, was the technological approach with its harness of practical mathematics. Like the pebble in the pond, this dynamic system, culled in the main from polytechnique, sent ripples across the entire surface of American education.

Thayer the pedagog became a figure in scholastic circles. In 1821 George Ticknor sought and received his advice on a proposed reorganization of Harvard's curriculum and the management of its student body. In 1826 and again in 1828, ex-President James Monroe, then a regent of the University of Virginia, asked guidance from him on the reorganization of that institution.

Farsighted civilian college administrators, sensing the trend of future education, began luring West Point graduates into pedagogical fields. The report of the Board of Visitors in 1832 noted plaintively that "as soon as an officer * * * renders himself useful and respectable (at West Point) he is taken away by a higher inducement offered by some literary institution." By 1860, when 203 collegiate institutions dotted the land, 78 West Pointers were included in their respective faculties—40 of them as professors of mathematics, 16 in chairs of civil engineering.

Civil engineering by now had become a profession. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, founded in 1824, had graduated its first class of civil engineers—four of them—in 1835. Harvard in 1846, Yale in 1847 and the University of Michigan in 1852, in turn established schools of engineering, each with a West Point graduate at its head. Then the dam really burst. By 1860, in addition to West Point, nine technological colleges existed. Eight of them had West Pointers on their faculties, and all of them used West Point engineering and mathematical texts authored by West Point professors.

Thanks to Sylvanus Thayer, technological education had come to stay. West Point marched on. Thayer himself, resigning from the Superintendency of the Military Academy in 1833 because of President Andrew Jackson's meddling with his rigid concept of cadet integrity, spent the remainder of his active service as a dominant figure in the Corps of Engineers; the harbor defenses and seawalls of Boston are major monuments to this phase of his career. Revisiting Europe in 1844–46, he renewed old friendships and investigated, for the Army and for West Point, the latest developments in ordnance and in public works.

But Thayer's interest in education never waned. On retirement from active duty June 1, 1863, at the age of 78, he returned to his native Braintree, occupying himself with the establishment of the Thayer Public Library, then, in 1867, with the endowment of the Thayer School of Engineering at his original alma mater, Dartmouth. His interest in its curriculum, which he modeled so far as was possible, upon polytechnic lines, was intense. Then came his last project, Thayer Academy, which did not come into being until after his death in 1872.

Typical of the lifelong aims and objectives of the man are his words endowing Thayer Academy as "an educational institution in which civil engineering and kindred branches shall be specialties, while the whole shall be of high character (offering local youth) the opportunity to rise, through the pursuit of duty, industry, and honor, from small beginnings to honorable achievement."

Not Braintree alone, but the entire Nation owes much to Sylvanus Thayer, Father of Technology in these United States. All honor to him on this 150th anniversary of that April day which saw him launched on his career.

Mr. Speaker, the Hall of Fame for Great Americans College of Electors for 1964 failed to elect Sylvanus Thayer by the slightest margin. It is my hope and that of many American educators that the College of Electors of 1965 will act favorably on his candidacy.

Can Press Be Free Part of Time?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in one of the leading newspapers in my State discussed one of the critical issues of our time. It's views are so basic to our free country that this material deserves the widest possible audience.

I recommend this article to all thinking Americans:

CAN PRESS BE FREE PART OF TIME?

Concern about free press and fair trial increased after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the arrest and shooting of Lee Oswald, and subsequent detention of Jack Ruby.

A bill has been introduced in Congress making it a contempt of court for police, prosecution or defense to give its new media information which might affect the outcome of a pending criminal case.

Two basic freedoms are involved. Article I says Congress shall make no law abridging freedom off speech or of the press. Article VI says that in criminal prosecutions the accused has the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury.

Gene Robb, former Nebraskan who is being honored by the University of Nebraska this month, told the American Newspaper Publishers Association in April, "The public interest is paramount in considering the relationship of free press and fair trial. They are not necessarily in conflict. Whatever problems there are in this area should be resolved without the loss of any of our liberties.

"The dangers of withholding such news include the ever-present possibilities of special favors, secret deals, coverups, star chamber proceedings and the rest of the hocus-pocus often attempted to hide the news from the people."

Members of bar associations, attorney generals, and judges have had their pieces to speak. A magazine published for lawyers by the American Trial Lawyers Association carried an article entitled: "Head-on Collision Course: The Law Versus the Press."

An unfortunate facet of the differences of opinion is the codes of bar associations often have far-reaching effect, even to the handling of courts, though they are not law and are made without popular representation.

In December, the Philadelphia Bar Association, drew up guidelines which would: Forbid lawyers from making statements, granting interviews, or issuing releases on pending criminal cases; forbid police and prosecutors from making statements as to guilt, from releasing any evidence admissible at trial time; deny the press access to police reports or photographs of suspects and to intimate and sordid details in sensational crimes.

Such broad restrictions miss the mark of fairness in the name of which reform is supposedly necessary.

Probably the most interesting comments on efforts to control news were made by a prison editor. He asked how are arrested persons to be protected from abuses which could come out of the silent treatment. He said he fears that somewhere along the line an over-zealous police official is going to take advantage of the opportunity to "stack the deck" if he feels the press won't be watching.

The man who said he had been the victim of news coverage several times said he does not understand how a recent plan of the U.S. Attorney General could work. It lists information which is not to be released to news media except in certain cases. Asks the prisoner: Who or what decides what exceptions?

The conclusion reached by this prison writer is that the problem is not complex: Either the press is free—with no exceptions—or it is controlled. It can't be both ways.

The Arab Boycott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune recently carried a series of very constructive articles on the Arab boycott.

This was particularly appropriate because our House Subcommittee on International Trade, of which I am privileged

to be a member, is currently holding hearings on an amendment to the Export Control Act which would, in effect, provide protection to American firms against the implementation of this menacing and arbitrary trade practice.

On Monday, May 17, the Herald Tribune published an editorial on the subject and I very much hope that our entire House membership will take a little time to digest the Tribune's forthright analysis. I ask that the editorial be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

THE ARAB BOYCOTT: UNNEUTRAL NEUTRALITY

The Arab countries, declaring themselves to be in a state of war, have the right to conduct economic warfare against Israel, and the latter, if it chooses, may reply in kind. The United States, which seeks to maintain friendly relations with both, has the right to remain neutral. The Washington administration professes to be doing so. But it isn't. It is permitting the Arab States to conduct their economic warfare on American soil by allowing their diplomatic, consular, and business agents in this country to engage in their boycott and blacklist activities.

There is nothing, of course, to stop them from such activities on their own soil, or on that of their Communist friends, or of others who may be motivated purely by profit. But that is no reason why Washington should make their task easier and, by doing so, become their unwitting accomplice. Its failure to uphold strict rules of neutrality has exposed American chambers of commerce and other trade associations to pressure by Arab States to handle their blacklisting papers and questionnaires for them.

To the extent that they are doing so, this raises the startling question whether such chambers and associations should be required to register as agents for foreign countries—and not just any countries but ones which are in a state of war. And the question is even more startling if applied to the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The Herald Tribune series on this issue has pointed out that the Department allowed its journal to advertise the discriminatory trade offer of an Arab state.

The proposal by a group of Congressmen to legislate against the conduct of Arab economic warfare on American soil makes sense. It would not end the warfare. That will take years and will come only after the Arabs themselves recognize that their best interests will be served by coming to terms with Israel. But it might help reduce it, and correct our presently unneutral position.

A Personal Report: The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are living in a world torn between the race for world supremacy. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the classrooms, especially here in the United States and in the Soviet Union, for education is the basis for all superiority in any field which can be named—medicine, the arts, physics, the conquest of space, the liberal arts and humanities.

Mr. William Benton, publisher of the Encyclopedia, Britannica, traveled to the Soviet Union during 1964, his ninth trip since 1955. After this visit he wrote a series of articles which appeared in the Encyclopedia's 1965 yearbook, entitled "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R." This is an outstanding commentary on Soviet education.

It is my pleasure to have this series inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The fourth chapter follows:

A PERSONAL REPORT: THE TEACHERS AND THE TAUGHT IN U.S.S.R.

(By William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Senator from Connecticut; presently U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its executive board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopaedia Britannica)

CHAPTER IV. VISITS WITH TWO TOP SOVIET EDUCATORS

Vyacheslav Yelutin

The Minister of Higher and of Specialized Secondary Education, Vyacheslav Yelutin, whom I have refered to frequently in the last chapter and with whom I had twice before visited in Moscow, began our interview last May by relating an espisode of his stay in a New York City hotel. He feels he knows something about the United States. He told me of staying up late at his hotel one night to watch a television show—a gangster picture in which the line, "I'll kill you," was used many times. When it ended, he called room service and asked, "Will you please kill me at 7 o'clock?"

The girl at the switchboard replied that she couldn't do that.

"But I want to be killed a 7 o'clock," Yelutin persisted. "You must do it as a service to me. I am a member of Chairman Khrushchev's delegation."

The girl again said she wasn't going to do any such thing. But after a discussion she and Yelutin agreed that he had used the word "kill" when he meant "call."

Yelutin tells this with a twinkle in his eyes. Less amusing mistranslations inevitably occur when ideas—particularly political ideas—expressed in one language are translated into another. Such mistranslations often occur in translating Russian into English—or vice versa.

Witty, urbane, often eloquent, Minister Yelutin greeted me as a familiar friend, and immediately spoke of my first visit with him in 1955. Here he was, 9 years later, in the same position, still giving an impression of vitality, of a willingness to make tough decisions. He seems to me a symbol of the best of the "new Soviet men"—although I do not like that term from the Stalin era, and of course there is no "new man."

He reminded me that in 1955 I had asked if I could quote him. He said he was not accustomed to such an inquiry. "I am accustomed to being misquoted," he said. "People come in to see me and quote me as saying many things I surely never said." Then he congratulated me for quoting him accurately in the book written on my return.

I commented that Thomas Jefferson was generally credited with the proposition that every human being should have the opportunity to get the best education he was able to absorb. Now the U.S.S.R., with a similar dream, was challenging the United States to live up to its American dream, to make it a reality—and thus to improve upon it.

"Yes," Yelutin agreed, "the dream of universal and progressively better education is the dream of any man who loves his country—regardless of his political orientation." Continuing, and referring to the relations between our two countries, he said, "I favor the education race instead of the armament race."

The power concentrated in Minister Yelutin's hands is—by American standards—awesome. Although he insisted that there are not actually "too many points of high centralization" in Soviet education, he noted "the biggest point is the planning." For example, he has the power to establish the number of students who may enter each course of study. When his Ministry has reached its decision, no one can change the figures. He hastily added that there was no rule that forced young people into any particular field, but admitted that "techniques of persuasion" are employed to guide them into fields of greatest interest to the state. These techniques, the propaganda and the financial incentives, help persuade a young man that aeronautical engineering, for example, is a more rewarding field than economics or English literature.

Higher education in the Soviet Union, he explained, has some of the same troubles it has in the United States. Both countries lack enough good professors. But he had an advantage over the United States, he said, because he controls the state budget. He continued, "We start with a state plan which guides us in deciding the number of students we can take, and we give the Minister of Finance our judgment of what the total enrollment should be. Sometimes we argue with him about this. It can indeed be a problem. But, after we agree, there is no argument thereafter about money. Thus, the only argument between us and the National Finance Minister is how many students to admit. After we settle this, the rest is automatic."

After planning the number of students to be admitted in each field, which is the first and basic decision, the second most important function of his Ministry, in his judgment, is "the academic standard." For example, only he has the authority to designate which books shall be official textbooks. Further, he appoints the professors.

I asked him how he decided whether to approve the appointment of a professor. He explained that the faculty of a particular university first makes a recommendation to him. He can then call on leading figures from other universities or elsewhere, in the particular field of specialization, to advise him. If the advisers are uncertain about the recommendation, they study the works of the candidate. If they are still in doubt, the matter goes to an "attestation committee." This committee then has a secret ballot. Yelutin said that he has "one voice only—but I am the chairman." He has the right to try to persuade the committee. He said he was not always successful; he insisted that the committee could act independently, disregarding his views—"and then it is adjudged that Mr. Yelutin has erred."

Yelutin's authority may be less than it used to be. The rights of the "learned councils" of the universities have recently been broadened. The deans now are elected by the faculties, the universities can now change their curriculums, and the faculties have more authority in the granting of degrees. This seems to be in line with the general relaxation of controls which is seeping through Soviet society.

Yelutin believes that it is essential to bring higher education "closer to practical work." He said, "This is a concern not only of practical importance but of great social importance." He explained that the philosophy of Marxism and Leninism envisions the eventual merging of the intellectual class and the manual workers.

When we visited, I did not know of the reversal of the so-called 1958 reform which had enlarged the 10-year schools to 11 to inject a year of "practical work." Thus I did not ask him about this, and I assume that he was speaking of higher education.

He explained that the nature of the practical work varied greatly. In the theoretical sciences, he said, much of a university student's fourth year of the five may be spent at practical work at a research institute.

The student in mathematics will spend time at a computer, the chemistry student in a laboratory; then, in the fifth year, he will return to the university for a final year of theory.

Yelutin stressed that this system gives the student "respect for physical labor," and that this is of basic importance. "Everything in life goes back to physical labor." This is good, sound Marxist doctrine.

Minister Yelutin was originally trained as a metallurgist. Education for engineering students is thus of particular interest to him. He talked about it a great deal. "Your training of engineers and ours has much in common," he said. "We reject the classic method of solely classroom instruction. We believe that actual practice must be a part of engineering training." He spoke of "plant students" and "plant institutes." This is the Soviet system of having engineering students spend half their time in the universities or the research institutes, and the other half working in the manufacturing plants. During the period the student works in the plant he receives regular wages. While he is in school, he receives a stipend.

The minister told me, "We must make education as intensive as possible. That is why we are stepping up our development of visual aids, our use of television and other new techniques. I am urging our scholars in pedagogy to break down the old methods, and to develop new and more effective ones."

The minister is greatly interested in programed learning, which enables the student to teach himself, but he spoke rather contemptuously of the "teaching machine" as such. "Why is there any need for a machine?" he asked "A programed book is perfectly adequate." (Encyclopaedia Britannica Press had reached the same conclusion in its Temac programed learning courses in mathematics and other subjects, which are now in use in some 2,000 U.S. school systems.) And he remarked further that teachers in the Soviet Union, like some in the United States, are apprehensive that machines or other forms of programed learning might take over their jobs.

"Conservatism among teachers is an international phenomenon," he said. "I have the same difficulty that you have—even in the use of classroom films. I don't have part of the problem you have—I don't have to charge money for my films. I say to teachers, 'Why don't you use my films?' And I offer films to them for nothing. But the teachers say, 'Your films break the continuity of my lectures—how can I change my lectures? I've been giving these lectures exactly the same way for 30 years. It's hard for me to change.'

"Once I had a long argument with the rector of the University of Leningrad," Yelutin continued. "I told him it was my impression that high school teaching had not changed since the days of Ivan the Terrible. He didn't agree. He argued that high school teaching had not changed since the Cheops Pyramid was built."

His implication was that schools would have to change, and would have to change rapidly, in order to meet the emerging needs of education. Manifestly, youngsters cannot change themselves in order to fit the schools. How rapidly will the schools learn to adapt their methods as the years ahead unfold? This is a key question in the U.S.S.R. as well as in the United States. "The future," said the minister, "is subjective, and that is probably why I like it best. It calls for imagination."

Alexei Ivanovich Markushevich

Alexei Ivanovich Markushevich, vice president of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and former deputy of public education of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, the largest of the 15 Soviet republics, is the prototype of the Soviet intellectual. His interest in education leaves off at the point where Yelutin's begins—as the student enters into higher education. He is a graduate of Central Asian University, Tashkent, Uzbek S.S.R. He is a collector of old and rare books. During our interview he was as relaxed as if his future stretched before him endlessly without a single obligation.

Markushevich opened our conversation by describing his duties and interests. "I am a professor at the University of Moscow," he said. "I am interested in theoretical mathematics—as far from applied mathematics as you can possibly imagine. I am also active in the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. My second field of interest is thus education, and I am editor of the Soviet Children's Encyclopaedia in 10 volumes." (This is the Soviet counterpart to Britannica Junior, Britannica's elementary encyclopedia in 15 volumes.)

He said he felt that the Soviet Union was lagging behind in the development of programed learning and teaching machines. Only the day before our visit, and I am here reporting on a visit in 1962, he had submitted his report on the subject to the third Conference on Technical Aids in Teaching. Several Soviet-made teaching machines had been shown at the conference—one, he said, that "teaches grammar." "The principles of our work and yours in the United States in this field are more or less the same," he ventured.

Markushevich mentioned another pedagogical conference which dealt with special aids in Russian language and history.

"The decision of the ministry is to continue this research," he said, "and to develop identical techniques in mathematics. I cannot find any field which is isolated from the rest—though many ideas are concealed in remote corners.

"By 1970 the Soviet Union is determined to lift the present 7-year minimum compulsory education and make it 10 years for everyone. This is a most difficult objective but I am optimistic that we shall achieve it."

I told him that this goal was indeed a high one, and that Soviet secondary schools faced a great responsibility in attempting to prepare enough students for the universities and higher institutes to meet the goals described to me by Minister Yelutin, by Rector Ivan Petrovsky of the University of Moscow, and others—more than 8 million students in the higher institutions by 1980.

Markushevich remarked that another major aim was to improve the quality of the teachers. "The tempo of growth of the students is faster than the tempo of growth of the teachers," he said. "It takes at least 5 years to train a teacher. We must cut down on the time now required to develop the skills of teachers; we must study and adopt the new techniques of teaching—and we must step up the number of students who are being trained as teachers."

He intimated he was not prepared to claim that the Soviet high schools have any advantage in curriculum content over the U.S. schools—if the U.S. pupil works hard and is willing to follow his teachers' advice. "Your big problem," he said, "is that the United States allows more electives in the ninth year. Johnny thus drops mathematics—it's hard. He turns his back on physics and biology. They are too difficult. He abandons a foreign language. Why learn it? Thus Johnny will fall behind Ivan, who must take required courses in mathematics, chemistry, biology, and foreign languages—all compulsory."

Markushevich had visited a number of American schools. He gladly conceded that he had met some very capable young people in the United States—the kind who would have no difficulty with any subject that Soviet students handle if they had comparable exposure and instruction and hours of work. "In my opinion," he said, "if the demands on your students were higher, they could cope with them.

"The difference between your students and ours," he continued, "is the difference between a film moving at slow speed and a film moving at regular speed. Soviet students work much harder." With a mixture of wit and wonder he told the story of a high school senior he had talked to in Detroit. This boy was in a large high school and was recommended as one of its most promising seniors. He liked the boy. He asked him, "What do you know about mathematics?"

The American high school senior replied, "I intend to choose law, and I have no use for mathematics."

Markushevich was bothered, and he said, "You are a bright young student and you must be a reader. Can you give me the names of some Russian writers?"

The boy couldn't name a single Russian writer.

Markushevich shifted his course and said, "What do you think of the French writers of the 19th century? Won't you name a few for me?"

The boy blushed. Finally, with the help of Markushevich's young girl interpreter, he remembered the name of Victor Hugo. The boy then became a bit angry. He said, "Such questions should be addressed to my sister. She is studying in Paris."

Markushevick claimed that when he gave young Americans a problem of reasonable difficulty in mathematics, in Boston, Chicago, and San Francisco, they could not solve it. "American teachers," he suggested tentatively, use more standard methods of solving problems. Their students may be able to solve a problem as presented in the textbook, but if the problems deviated from the textbook, my young American friends were at a loss."

In saying this, he may have ben giving me current and conventional criticism of U.S.S.R. education, which he felt applied to an even greater degree to the U.S. Both textbooks and teaching methods are, on the whole, highly standardized in the Soviet Union. As the quotations from Pravda in the previous chapter demonstrate, the letters to the editor and other criticism of education in the press often deal with overstandardization and inflexibility.

"As a mathematician, I have another comment," Markushevich said: "The English system of measurment is a great burden for your children when they study mathematics, physics, and chemistry. The metric system is far, far better. In the prerevolutionary days in Russia, we used both systems—plus an extra and complicated one which was strictly Russian—but now we use the metric system exclusively."

Thus he scored one more important point for Soviet education. The use of the metric system of measurement exclusively would greatly simplify many problems for American students, who now spend a great deal of time, and suffer much confusion and error, converting the elements of problems from one system to another. Nearly every teacher of mathematics or physics in the United States knows the metric system would be better, but no one does anything about it. There is no "central authority" in educational matters in this country, and no governmental agency is likely to institute such a change unless there is a strong and definite demand for it. Perhaps the leading scientists in the U.S. should sign a petition requesting the use of the metric system—and publicize it. I wish our National Academy of Sciences would take the leadership. We cannot afford to be oblivious to such challenges.

Does this illustration indicate that there is something to be said for centralized control of education? We Americans know well all the arguments against it. We never hear

a good word for it. Even at the State level, we have only reasonable centralization in two States, New York and California. The French and most other European countries exercise a tight centralized control of public education through their national governments. They do so with no seeming danger or threat to the democratic processes of their societies. I feel that we in the United States should seek to move rapidly toward more effective leadership at both the State and Federal levels.

U.S. Agriculture Is One of the Great Strengths of the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the so-called American farm problem has been the subject of a great deal of controversy over the years, the clear fact emerges that American agriculture today is second to none in the world. Our abundance and productive capacity have rendered malnutrition and starvation virtually extinct in this country. We may indeed have a hard core of poverty, but I think it is safe to say that starvation is not the terrible certainty for our poor that it once may have been.

Our farm situation has been the object of much concern and a great deal of attention from the Government. That we have reached the stage of productivity and plenty which we enjoy today is a tribute to the energy and determination, high mindedness and imagination of those in government who have had to grapple personally with these problems.

It is also to the credit of these dedicated public servants that our Agriculture Department has been able to flex and adapt itself to the changing nature of the problems not only on the farms but on all the land—in wilderness areas and in suburban areas. Certainly one of the most striking examples of this versatility has been the Department's efforts in the area of soil and water conservation which has brought help and relief not only to farms but to our biggest metropolitan regions which have tottered from time to time on the brink of disastrous droughts and water shortages.

In special ceremonies this morning, the Department of Agriculture paid tribute to some of the more outstanding of its employees during its 19th annual honor awards ceremony. I was pleased to attend the ceremony and to hear a particularly fine address by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma. Over the years I have come to know Senator MONRONEY very well. I have long prized his friendship and wise counsel on those occasions when we have met over the conference table on the annual Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill when the Senate and House versions have differed.

In these and other deliberations I have found him to be completely fair and objective in his judgments, fully informed on all details and aspects of the issues at hand, and completely sincere in his respect for the public welfare.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the fine remarks made by Senator MONRONEY this morning. I am sure they will evoke the same pride and inspiration for you as they did for me:

REMARKS BY SENATOR A. S. MIKE MONRONEY AT THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE HONOR AWARDS CEREMONY, MAY 18, 1965

Mr. Secretary, Mr. Staats, Bishop Moore, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Robertson, honored members of the Federal service, and other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, this is one of those shining moments of truth when we can all stand a little taller, as proud fellow workers for the Government of this great Nation. The Sylvan Theater, it seems to me, is a most appropriate site for this 19th annual awards ceremony. In this green and beautiful amphitheater with that mammoth obelisk that honors the Father of our Country as a backdrop, we sense the majesty and magnitude of our Government and the greatness of those people in the civil service who furnish the day-to-day dynamics of Government.

We assemble here to honor a group of men and women who have excelled in an impressive variety of endeavors affecting many, many millions of Americans. In fact, the whole world is a better place because of the dedicated and inspired service of the USDA group we honor here today.

USDA programs do not concern farmers alone. They involve industry, because much of industry depends on our farms, fields, forests, and food for raw material. They concern all citizens, all consumers, because these programs affect the diets, the health, the standard of living of every man, woman, and child in the United States—and, more and more, they are affecting men, women, and children worldwide.

I know of no public agency, anywhere, which over the years has contributed more to the basic welfare of this great Nation than has the U.S. Department of Agriculture. U.S. agriculture stands today as one of the great strengths of the free world, thanks to more than a century of dedicated and unremitting service by you—the employees of the Department.

Unfortunately, that service has not always brought the rewards and recognition it deserved. Criticism of "surplus" and "subsidy" has at times confused the facts of agriculture's contribution—and the Department's contribution—to the national well-being. This has not always enhanced the prestige of those who service agriculture.

This is why I feel that awards ceremonies like this are of great value. They are one way of showing our appreciation for outstanding service. They are also a way of letting all citizens know that we in Government are proud of our people. When you in USDA earn an award for constructive suggestions, outstanding performance, or long years of effective service, you have clearly merited the distinction. We can all feel proud of your accomplishments.

But, I have heard criticism of the Federal Awards program which I think should be mentioned at an occasion like this; namely, that the civil servant is paid a good salary to do an efficient job, so why give him special awards for doing that job well. What the critics do not understand is that the awards being presented here today are for performance beyond mere efficiency.

As a public servant myself since 1939, I would be the first to say that all of us must be efficient and carry out our designated responsibilities. But there is an attitude toward a job—and toward life itself, if you will—which separates and distinguishes a man.

There is a theory—I can't find the originator of it—which says that all progress is made by the dissatisfied. Those who are content with the world are not apt to change it. Only those who are rankled by the status quo will strive to upset it—therefore, change comes about because someone is unhappy about the world in which he finds himself.

Maeterlinck said that "The future is a world limited by ourselves, in which we discover only what concerns us." What a primitive world we would have if each man accepted all the old patterns of life; the safe, the routine ways. What an imperfect government this would be but for the dedication of our civil servants to higher and higher standards of service.

Yes, we have the greatest government ever known to man because of the quality of service it renders our people. Our society has been elevated to its present preeminence because our public officials have placed service above self, have demonstrated consistent and unquestionable morality, diligence, and good purpose.

The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., often speaks of this quality of service which has been his greatest objective. Mr. Macy has said the public official "can drift with society's ebb and flow, or he can set his own course, and in that way help to change the standards in his time and in the future."

One aspect of this ceremony which particularly impresses me is that the awardees represent a broad spectrum of Government service—old and young, men and women, Washington and field offices, individual effort and group action, scientific and managerial, high rank and low, secretary and administrator.

So it seems clear that the opportunity to innovate and do an outstanding job is present at all levels of government service.

The regulations don't indicate that a typist must smile when someone asks her a question.

The Government clerk may have no instructions to say "please," and "thank you" when talking to the public.

The fieldman is not forced to be patient when a farmer does not understand the regulations quickly.

The job description of branch chief will not necessarily indicate that he must reach out for new and better ways to get the job done.

But the smile, the "thank you," the patience, and the "reaching out" must be part of every Government employee's personality.

I know that Government—and big business as well—does not always reward initiative, or recognize the innovator. This is one price we pay for living in a complicated world—many of us do not enjoy the satisfaction of close personal relationships on the job that were possible in other years. We sometimes feel like small wheels in very big machines.

And, I repeat, this feeling is not limited to Government. Every large organization—public or private—must find ways to seek out those employees who want to achieve, who want to question, who want to improve things.

Time does not permit me to do what I would like to do and congratulate each of you individually. My desire to do this stems from the fact that I am greatly impressed with the tremendous record each winner has made. My personal knowledge of what one of you, my fellow Oklahoman Mr. Edd Lemmons, has done speaks most highly for all of you who receive the superior service awards with him today.

The Federal merit system, which puts a premium on excellence and high standards, has evolved over a long, long period of time,

going back 82 years to the passage of the first Civil Service Act in 1883. At no time in the history of this country has the Government worker stood in higher repute than he stands today. And the worker himself deserves the most credit for this.

In the 14 years that I have served as a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have seen many refinements and improvements in the civil service system. Many of these improvements can be credited to the genius of the late Senator Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina, whose recent passing came as a severe loss to civil servants everywhere. Those of us who have been assigned to carry on in this worthy endeavor have our work cut out for us.

As it is impossible to enumerate the many factors which have brought the Federal service to its present position of eminence, so is it difficult to foresee each step which we must take in the future if our trend toward greater excellence is to prevail. But there are some clear and very evident opportunities for further advancement toward improved productivity within the Federal service, toward better conduct of the Nation's business.

If there is a key word today it is that word "excellence." The President, in his message last week calling for new salary legislation, used the term in describing the obligation of the Federal Government to be a good employer. He said, "I define a good employer as one who demands excellence and rewards it."

Those of you we honor here today have responded to your Government's demand for excellence. I was curious in scanning your individual records of accomplishment to find a common ingredient of your success.

I believe I have discovered one of the magic traits. I note that many of you have strained and perspired through night courses, through career development programs of one kind or another, and that all of you have been persistent and diligent in the elaboration of your expertise long after you have completed your formal education.

I hope that in the years ahead we can encourage more and more Government workers to devote part of their leisure time to continuing education. Our schools, colleges, and universities stand ready to offer courses which can improve the skills of Government employees. I note that some departments and agencies of Government are putting far more emphasis on career development and continuing education, with incentives, than others.

Most Government workers, in my opinion, like most people employed in private industry, are motivated by desires for self-improvement that cannot be satisfied by the paycheck alone. But, while monetary remuneration seems of secondary importance to an increasing number in the work force, we must see that the pay of civil servants is fair and just.

In recent years, considerable advancement has been made toward this goal. Only last year, the Congress reaffirmed its support of a policy that provides Federal pay systems on the basis of comparability with salary patterns in private industry.

To such a deserving group of Federal employees I cannot resist this prediction—that Congress will again this year reaffirm the comparability doctrine.

I am convinced that Congress must continue to face up to this pay problem over the years ahead, yielding to no other entity the duty of preserving the doctrine of comparability. For there is also the need of accountability this being the task of seeing that Government and Government employees perform in a manner that merits positive action by the Congress to support fair and just pay rates.

Within the executive branch itself much has been done and is being done to encourage higher performance, higher work standards. We take heart in the very dramatic promotions recently of several career servants to high administrative posts. The President has thus recognized excellence in the terms that are most meaningful to those who strive for it.

In making these promotions from within the service, the President has emphasized the importance of creativity, and he has also emphasized once again that he is not afraid of new ideas, of new approaches to problems whether the problems themselves be fresh or stale.

This is the age of jet airplanes, satellites, and probes to Mars. But, perhaps of equal importance is what I call the quiet revolution in agriculture, which has changed the course of history without many of us even realizing it. While Russia can be proud—and justly so—of a Russian walking in space, America has reached a point in technological excellence which puts within our grasp the ability to forever banish hunger from the world. And, our American heritage has given us the conscience to want to share this knowledge—and the food it produces—with all the world's people.

Think of it: For the first time in recorded history, we possess the knowledge to grow all the food we need. For the first time in recorded history, we, as a Nation, are providing billions of dollars in food aid to our hungry neighbors abroad. Never before has such an organized effort been undertaken on such a vast scale.

Our challenge today is to use the productive genius of American know-how to serve the needs of all our people—and people throughout the world. We must make use of our agricultural abundance, a powerful weapon in the world struggle for peace. And we must make use of our agricultural productivity as a force for democracy in a world where the majority of its people live in newly developing nations.

We who devote our lives to public service have an especially challenging opportunity to pioneer in the struggle to free man from want. We must have the imagination not only to mechanically carry out the wishes of the Congress, but to inspire our fellow citizens, to pioneer new ways to get the job done faster, better, and cheaper. Our work must not only be efficient, it must be the best in the Nation, because 100 million citizens are our boss, our customers, and our stockholders.

In honoring these outstanding USDA employees today, we honor also the thousands of workers who serve with them in the Department of Agriculture, the men and women who do not get awards, but who also serve faithfully, with pride and honor.

We here today have the chance to get from our jobs what most men never realize—knowledge that we are serving our fellow men; that we can make a real contribution to the progress of the human race.

In the golden age of mid-20th century, we owe it to ourselves, our families, and our Nation to follow in the footsteps of these we honor today.

Food Marketing Commission's "Sweeping Study of the Food Industry"—Article From Business Week Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased this morning to see in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Daily Digest that the President, on Saturday, signed into law as Public Law 89–20, the bill H.R. 5702 to extend until July 1, 1966, the date by which the National Commission on Food Marketing must make its final report to the President and to Congress. This was the bill we considered on the House floor on April 5, and which the Senate agreed to on May 3. I want to thank the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, for the prompt and effective manner in which he guided this bill through committee consideration and House passage.

As the senior House Member on the Commission—which is composed of five Representative, five Senators, and five public members appointed by the President—I think I can speak for my colleagues when I say we share a determination to make this broad-based inquiry into the huge food marketing industry as thorough and comprehensive as possible. Members of the Commission include Senators MAGNUSON, MCGEE, HART, MORTON, and HRUSKA; Representatives SULLIVAN, PURCELL, ROSENTHAL, CUNNINGHAM, and MAY; and, as public members, former Representative Fred J. Marshall, of Minnesota; Republican National Committeeman Albert K. Mitchell, of New Mexico; J. C. Penney Co. Chairman William M. Batten, of New York; Dean Elmer R. Kiehl, of the University of Missouri; and the chairman, retired California Supreme Court Chief Justice Phil S. Gibson.

"WHY FARMER'S SHARE IS SHRINKING"

On the same day that the President signed Public Law 89–20 dealing with the Commission, Mr. Speaker, the authoritative magazine Business Week appeared with an excellent and objective report on the reason for the Commission's establishment and the methods we are following in the development of our study. I am always impressed when I read this magazine by the straightforward presentation it makes of business news with which I feel familiar. Once before, on June 8, 1964, I presented to the House through the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from Business Week on a subject with which I felt well acquainted—it was an article on our colleague, Congresswoman MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan, following her unprecedented achievement as a woman Member of the House in winning election to the Committee on Ways and Means. I felt that the Business Week article captured the important aspects of that story, just as I feel the article from the May 15 issue on the Food Marketing Commission summarizes our approach very well.

Under unanimous consent, therefore, I submit the article referred to from the May 15, 1965, issue of Business Week magazine, as follows:

[From the Business Week magazine, May 15, 1965]

MARKETING: WHY FARMER'S SHARE IS SHRINKING—FOOD MARKETING COMMISSION HAS STARTED A SWEEPING STUDY OF THE FOOD INDUSTRY—ITS GOAL: TO FIND OUT WHY COSTS TO CONSUMERS GO UP, RETURN TO FARMERS GOES DOWN

The National Commission on Food Marketing is finally plowing into its vast study of the Nation's biggest industry. Hearings have

gone on for 2 weeks in a row, and staff studies have begun.

The Commission's report, due July 1, 1966, will provide a comprehensive picture of how $69 billion worth of food moves from the farm, through the hands of processors, on to wholesalers, and at last to grocery shelves. Around Washington, it is being called the most sweeping study of any industry since the temporary National Economic Commission, in the 1930's.

The report may call for changes in Federal laws and practices, ranging from antitrust ground rules to the grading of beef by the Agriculture Department. And it will try to answer once and for all the question that underlies the bitterness and suspicion within the industry: Why are farmers getting a shrinking share of the money spent on food?

TREND ADMITTED

In 1947, the farmer got 51 percent of the retail price of the Agriculture Department's theoretical "market basket"; last year he got only 37 percent. Chain store spokesmen concede the trend, though they say the figures exaggerate the spread.

One Commission member, Senator GALE W. MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming—whose protests about falling prices of cattle were instrumental in establishment of the group last year—thinks retailers and processors may be "passing the buck" of increased costs back to the farmer, and that they have the concentrated market power to make him go along.

Another Commission member, Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky, takes a different slant. MORTON says it is obvious that food processors are simply doing more work for the housewife. "I'm not much for these frozen TV dinners," MORTON told the hearing in Washington last week, "but somebody has done an awful lot of work on them somewhere that used to be done at home."

THE TARGETS

Congress created the 15-member Commission last summer, at the urging of President Johnson. Five members are drawn from the Senate, five from the House, and five are expert "public" members. Its mission:

To determine the changes in the food marketing structure over the past 20 years.

To predict the shape of the industry, if present trends continue.

To suggest the form the industry should take to provide efficiency and fair competition at all levels.

To decide what changes may be necessary in either Government policies or private actions.

The Commission got off to a slow start, at least partly because members didn't want to tackle such volatile issues in the middle of a Presidential campaign. There were other delaying factors.

Johnson's first choice as chairman, Judge Marvin Jones of the U.S. Court of Claims, had to step aside because of illness. Not until September 17, did the President name former California Chief Justice Phil S. Gibson to succeed Jones. And it wasn't until November 16 that the Commission chose as its Executive Director—the top staff man—George E. Brandow, professor of agricultural economics at Pennsylvania State University, former president of the American Farm Economic Association, and a member of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission in 1963–64.

The first formal meeting was held in January, and the last of the five key second-echelon project leaders didn't join the staff until March.

VAST FIELD

The area for the Commission to cover is immense. In recent years the industry has see phenomenal changes, and the most important of these have been measured only skimpily.

Corporate chains—supermarket groups with 11 or more stores—have increased their share of total grocery sales from 34.5 percent in 1947, to 41 percent last year. Independent stores with affiliations providing joint wholesaling, promotion, and management consulting have increased their share from 29 to 50 percent.

In a number of commodities, such as fresh milk and frozen vegetables, chains have moved into processing. Such vertical integration is blamed by the National Farmers Union as a chief cause of the farmers' poor bargaining position. But the extent of this integration has not been measured since 1958, when the Federal Trade Commission found that 52 chains had integrated to some degree the sales of nearly $1.3 billion worth of food.

More difficult still to gage—and a prime question for the Commission—is the growth of the influence of the chains and affiliated groups on food processors, even without formal corporate ties. Processors now deal with fewer customers, who place larger orders. And the growth of private or controlled brands has in effect meant the retailers have taken control of some foods earlier in the marketing chain than they once did.

LIVESTOCK

The Commission began its hearing on livestock prices last month, in MCGEE's home territory of Cheyenne, and in Fort Worth, in the cattle ranching area of another Commission member, Representative GRAHAM PURCELL, Democrat, of Texas.

It heard charges that chainstores that operate meatpacking plants and feedlots had depressed the market by staying out when prices were firm and buying only when prices fell to distress levels.

"The major chainstores * * * have now reached such a dominant position in the meat trade that they set the retail price to the consumers and the price paid for livestock," said Rancher Courtenay Davis, of Horse Creek, Wyo.

CHAINS' REPLY

Chain spokesmen, in their turn, denied manipulating prices, blamed cattle overproduction, and added that by featuring frequent beef specials at cutrate prices they had in fact helped the ranchers by moving a huge oversupply of red meat.

At Fort Worth, they got some support. A meatpacker, Herman Waldman of Dallas City Packing Co., said, "instead of blaming chainstores we should commend them for moving such a big volume of meat."

This week Johnson released a report from Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman saying that beef producers should find this year "much more to their liking than 1964." Prices are averaging $25.50 a hundredweight, instead of last year's level of below $21, Freeman said. The chief reason, he said, was that beef production was up only 2 percent this year—in line with population and spending growth—compared with a 1964 surge of more than 12 percent.

MARGINS

At last week's Washington hearing, the Commission turned to the instore operations of supermarkets ranging from such giant chains as the 4,585-store A. & P. to very small independents.

Figures varied, but no one disputed that there has been an increase in the supermarkets' gross margins—the markup between wholesale cost and retail price. A study by Harvard and Cornell Universities for the National Association of Food Chains showed an increase in margins from 18.12 percent of sales in 1955 to 22.23 percent in 1963.

Explanations differed, too. NAFC said the biggest cost increase was for advertising and promotion, with real estate and labor costs just behind. Safeway Stores, Inc., said rising salaries, wages, and fringes were the biggest factor. V. C. "Rusty" Springer, owner of three stores in Lawrence, Kans., said the chief reason was the need for more space and new equipment to stock an ever-widening variety of products.

NET STANDS STILL

Retailers were agreed that net profits have increased little if at all. Super Market Institute said "typical figures" for its 200-company study showed net operating profits at 2.56 percent of sales in 1955, dropping to 1.16 percent in 1962 and recovering to 1.80 percent in 1963. NAFC said the Harvard-Cornell study showed net operating profits of 1.35 percent in 1955 sliding to 1.12 percent in 1963–64.

The Commission also asked the retailers whether increased costs might be due to "overstoring"—building more supermarkets than an area can support profitably. In answering, A. & P. Vice President and Treasurer Harold D. Hoag planted a suggestion that the retail food business is, if anything, too easy to get into.

"Food retailing, to be successful, requires considerable talent and an even greater amount of perspiration * * * it does not require excessive monetary investment. It would not be difficult, in most communities, for an enterprising person to set up a $20,000-a-week supermarket for an outlay of, say, $150,000, most of which could be financed locally," Hoag said.

BROILERS AND EGGS

In Atlanta, this week, the Commission was looking into the structure of the broiler and egg industry. Broiler production is considered the most completely integrated sector of all, with feed companies providing the initiative. They sign production contracts with farmers and supply them with chicks, feed, medicines, and even directions on how to operate.

Four more hearings have been announced for June and July. Others, including one on relationships between retailers and processors, probably will be held during the summer.

The bulk of the Commission's fact-gathering, however, is going on more quietly. Statistical work has been farmed out to private organizations and to such Government agencies as the Agriculture Department and the Census Bureau. The Federal Trade Commission is preparing a report due in September on vertical integration, and another due in March on food manufacturing.

GROUNDWORK

Food Commission staff members so far have spent most of their time preparing the hearings. Now they are beginning a series of confidential talks with businessmen, away from the courtroom atmosphere to public sessions, to try to learn the intricate operations and the specific problems of individual companies.

They have received all the cooperation they could ask. Each sector of the often bitterly divided industry apparently believes that its own position will be justified.

Herbert M. Cleaves, senior vice president of General Foods Corp., and chairman of the task force of the Grocery Manufacturers Association set up to aid the Commission, says the study gives the industry a "big opportunity to clearly tell its story."

SPREADING THE WORD

C. W. Cook, president of General Foods, said in a Chicago speech to the Super Market Institute this week: "I see in this Commission an excellent opportunity for the food industry to spread wider understanding of the efficient way our country's unprecedented food supply system works for the benefit of the consumer. The question * * * in people's minds can be answered factually and forthrightly—and with substantial credit to our industry."

In similar vein, Clarence G. Adamy, executive vice president of NAFC, says the association is "elated that a serious study, an objective study, will analyze the change in the industry and where the change is going. It is necessary to eliminate the fear that is the enemy of progress."

The militant National Farmers Union, which has been loudest in charging the processors and retailers with monopolistic practices, says its only complaint is that the Commission "started as slowly as it did."

The larger American Farm Bureau Federation backs the Commission, but feels that farmers will have more to gain from cooperative marketing efforts—which the Farm Bureau is sponsoring—than from the Commission's report.

EXPERTISE

Commission members give the panel the varied expertise it will need to evaluate the information it is gathering, as well as a bipartisan cast.

Congressional members, six Democrats and four Republicans, include Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee Chairman PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, and Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska.

The public members include a cattle rancher who also is a Republican national committeeman, Albert K. Mitchell, of Albert, N. Mex.; a self-described family farmer who served 14 years in Congress, former Representative Fred J. Marshall, Democrat, of Minnesota; a chainstore businessman, William M. Batten, chairman and chief executive officer of J. C. Penney Co., and Dean Elmer R. Kiehl of the University of Missouri College of Agriculture.

MORE FUNDS

The Commission originally was due to report this July 1, and was provided $1.5 million for its study. Congress last week completed action on a 1-year extension of the deadline, and authorized another $1 million.

It is too early to predict any of the findings, Commission sources say. But many of the questions to be answered are clear already:

Food retailers have increased their relative bargaining power through chain organizations and wholesaler affiliations, and such groups now account for 91 percent of grocery store sales. What effect has this had on food processors and on farmers?

How widespread is vertical integration that spreads direct retailer control back through the marketing chain? Is this a threat to free competition?

If a particular product is used frequently as a loss leader, does this tend to depress the price a farmer can get for it?

Have promotional programs such as trading stamps and giveaways increased food prices to the consumer, or built up a more efficient volume of business? This question seems to have special importance for consumer-oriented members of the Commission such as Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, and Representative CATHERINE MAY, Republican, of Washington.

Has the changing market structure outdated regulatory laws such as the Packers & Stockyards Act of 1921, passed at a time when virtually all food livestock was sold through central markets? Should present antitrust laws and policies be changed?

How effective are such Agriculture Department services as market news reports, and the inspection and grading of meat and other agricultural products?

Most important, as stated by Commission Chairman Gibson: "The thing we have to get to is how to get a better price to the producer."

Report From Washington by Congressman George Hansen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, a very small but extremely loud minority in this country is raising a furor over U.S. policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic—particularly over our policy in Vietnam.

Some of the so-called "teach-ins," and certain disgraceful actions such as sit-ins, picketing, and students burning draft cards throw little light on the matter, and succeed only in gaining publicity for those engaging in them.

Too often the protestors want to talk, but refuse to listen. They do not want to be confused with facts, their minds are made up. Neither the wisdom of a Solomon nor the silver tongue of a Borah could sway them from their actions which deceive and divide world opinion and discredit the United States.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I have made my position known endorsing a hard, consistent policy in dealing with Communist aggression. But, so that there can be no possible confusion as to what that stand is, I include in the RECORD my "Report from Washington," due to be published in Idaho newspapers on Thursday, May 20.

The report follows:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

(By Congressman GEORGE HANSEN)

President Johnson's policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic have been criticised severely by certain individuals in and out of Government. However, I am thoroughly convinced that a vast majority of Americans agree with him.

As a most notable example of the almost complete unanimity of opinion backing our President, consider the recent vote on the administration request for an additional appropriation of $700 million to be used, if necessary, in the Vietnam effort. The appropriation passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 408 to 7. It passed the Senate by a vote of 88 to 3. It was supported by all members of the Idaho delegation. It is interesting to note that all of the votes against the proposal were cast by members of the President's own party—not one single Republican voted against it. So surely, this has to be one of the most bipartisan, or nonpartisan votes ever cast in the Congress of the United States.

Why are we in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic? Are we there legally? And what should we do now?

Bluntly, simply, we are in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic to stop Communist conquest. President Johnson said last Thursday that Red China is the big obstacle in the way of a political solution of the war in Vietnam. He said the leaders in Peiping want the war to continue. In his own words:

"Their target is not merely South Vietnam, it is Asia. Their objective is not the fulfillment of Vietnamese nationalism, it is to erode and discredit America's ability to help prevent Chinese domination over all of Asia."

If we abandon Vietnam, to where do we retreat? Pearl Harbor?

Now, are we there legally? We were invited into South Vietnam, and we have never been asked to leave—at least not by the South Vietnamese. The 1954 Geneva Convention, signed by both North Vietnam and Red China, guaranteed the independence of South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese, aided by Red China, have invaded South Vietnam in violation of that treaty. While not signatory to the 1954 pact, every U.S. President since has offered support to the people of South Vietnam. We are, therefore, doing no more than abiding by our frequently given pledges, pledges which have been gratefully accepted by each existing government of South Vietnam.

It is charged that South Vietnam has also violated the pact by not holding free elections as it promised to do. However, this has not been possible because Communists within the country and covert acts by the North Vietnamese have kept the nation in such a state of turmoil that the stability necessary to hold such elections has not existed. I am sure that a vast majority of the people of the United States are in accord with the provision of the pact that free elections should be held in South Vietnam. I am also sure that they would not favor such elections while Hanoi and Peiping are interfering with the sovereignty of South Vietnam.

So what do we do now? Some say we should stop bombing North Vietnam and negotiate. Negotiate? With whom? There has been no indication that Peiping is ready to flick a switch and turn off the revolutionary current flowing through Hanoi to the Vietcong. There is no one with whom to negotiate.

To stop bombing North Veitnam would return matters in South Vietnam to where they were at the beginning of February, which was about two-thirds of the way to a Vietcong victory. The North Vietnamese have said that the bombing is not hurting them enough to make them stop aiding the Vietcong, but it is certainly hurting them enough so that they do not want it to go on indefinitely. A continuation of bombing can hurt North Vietnam—mortally. It can cut flow of aid to the Vietcong to the extent that recruitment in South Vietnam will become increasingly difficult and, with no supplies coming from the north, the Vietcong effort will be cut to its proper size as a civil insurrection. The way would then be open to a political settlement that would not merely be a case of the Communist north swallowing the south.

It has been said that there has been a lack of public discussion on the administration policy in the Dominican Republic. What should we do? Discuss this at length, and wait for another Cuba?

I believe history will record that President Johnson's prompt and decisive action in Dominica will mark the turning point in the march of communism in the Western Hemisphere. Without it Dominica would certainly have become another Cuba. And, if this positive position is not maintained, it may yet.

The President's critics condemn him for taking unilateral action. Such criticism is unrealistic and unfair. This criticism is unfair because the U.N. Charter specifically recognizes the right of any sovereign nation to act individually in defense of its own legitimate interests, and this criticism is unrealistic because such procedure would have imperiled American citizens lawfully present in the Dominican Republic.

There is just one effective way to deal with communism, and that is through strength.

Potential aggressors throughout the world must be made to realize that we will use whatever force is necessary, and whenever necessary, to halt Communist aggression. Such a policy will reassure our friends and prevent miscalculation on the part of our enemies.

Again, using President Johnson's words of last Thursday:

"And the Communists in Vietnam are slowly beginning to realize what they once scorned to believe: that we combine unlimited patience with unlimited resources in pursuit of our unwavering purpose."

Tributes to Johnny Moore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, recently a master craftsman, who was a printer proud of his work, retired after 54 years of service with the Grafton Sentinel, a daily newspaper in Taylor County, W. Va. His name is Johnny Moore. Recently, the Sentinel, edited by Thomas W. Russell, devoted its front page almost entirely to Mr. Moore's retirement. Although he is no relation of mine, I am proud we have the same last name. I think you would be, too, after reading these tributes on the front page of the Sentinel:

TRIBUTES TO JOHNNY MOORE

A friend, a man of outstanding character, an employee of exceptional devotion and loyalty, all these have been demonstrated by Mr. John Moore in his over half century with the Sentinel.

It is with sincere regret that the Sentinel will lose so fine a person, coupled with the sincere hope that the days of retirement so well deserved, will bring the fullest enjoyment, that we regard Mr. Moore's decision to retire.

Mr. and Mrs. MONTE F. BOURJAILY,
Owners and Publishers, the Sentinel.

John N. Moore typifies one of Grafton's finest assets, a half century of application to his work, a devotion to doing the finest possible job, loyalty to his employers.

It is the records and daily lives of such men as John N. Moore, that makes Grafton the finest place in the Nation to live and to work.

RONALD L. KNOTTS,
Mayor of Grafton.

John N. Moore over the past half century has compiled the type of an employment record as well as a personal life, that is the finest possible asset to Taylor County in attempting to persuade new industries to locate here.

We can point with pride to such an accomplishment, we can rightfully tell potential industry, that John N. Moore is a living example of Taylor County's pride in workmanship and loyalty.

I personally wish Johnny every happiness in the years ahead.

SAM MORASCO,
President, Grafton Area Development Council.

Johnny Moore is as much a part of life at the Sentinel as breathing.

Busy for the full working day, never taking any time off for himself, but always willing to lend a hand to another.

A mine of information about Grafton and its past, but never recounting past experiences unless specifically asked.

A man, who has won the respect of every fellow employee by his unfailing good nature over the years.

The envy of other printers because he is one of the finest craftsmen in the field, even today when failing eyesight has made the work extremely difficult.

We in the composing room of the Sentinel, have been fortunate in having the daily association with Johnny Moore. We wish him every enjoyment of a hard-earned retirement, but at the same time hope he drops in frequently because life won't be the same without Johnny.

The Sentinel composing room staff:

Joe Chis, Bud Robinson, Doc Robinson, Frances Ellington, Peggy Brown, Paul Frye, Blaine Haddix, Howard Taylor, Don Moore, Tom Dotson.

Usually the editorial rooms of a newspaper are pretty much of a closed unit, but on the Sentinel, we of the editorial department only wish the rest of the human race had the qualities of Johnny Moore.

Although our daily association is limited, Mr. Moore, especially to those of us without too much time in the newspaper business, is a model. To each and every one of us, regardless of length of experience, Mr. Moore is a friend.

We sincerely hope that he will enjoy his hard-earned retirement, that all the dreams of things to do after the end of the working days, come true.

We join with all other departments of the Sentinel in saying, "you'll be missed every day, please come by and see us frequently."

The Sentinel editorial staff,

Mrs. KAY THORN.
Miss PATRICIA GROVES.
Miss SHELVA JEAN PARSONS.
JOHN FORD.
RICHARD WRIGHT.

Advertising today is an art requiring craftsmanship, business a field requiring clear thinking and foresight, therefore, we have in our opinion, an even higher appreciation of the daily work of John N. Moore, as foreman of the Sentinel print job.

In addition, we have known Johnny as a friend, as a man always willing to lend a hand, to make suggestions that are helpful and by his daily actions to set an outstanding example.

We join with the other departments of the Sentinel at this time of retirement from active work by Johnny Moore, in wishing him the best of everything. We also join in the expressed wishes of all Sentinel employees that Johnny will find time to visit us frequently, because every day of his absence he will be missed."

Circulation, advertising and business staffs,

MILFORD GRIFFITH, CARLOS B. GOWER, MARY GRIFFITH, CHARLES WOLFE, FRED KIGER, SHIRLEY PATTERSON, BETTY RINGLER.

Years ago there was another John Moore, a Gen. Sir John Moore, commander of the English forces, killed at the battle of Corunna, Spain, January 16, 1809. As a school boy, I remember reading a poem, the burial of Sir John Moore, by Rev. Charles Wolfe. To those who haven't read this poem I strongly recommend they do so. It's worth your time. Now we have another John Moore, a general of the printshop of the Grafton Sentinel.

This is not an epitaph, but a eulogy to Johnny as he is known among his host of friends. Johnny is retiring after many years of faithful service in a job at which he was an expert craftsman.

John N. Moore has been a member of Taylor County Post 12, the American Legion, for many years. When dues time came around John was "Johnny on the spot." He is also a charter member of Grafton Barracks 1949, Veterans of World War I.

The writer, a member of both organizations, feels he is expressing the sentiment of the membership in congratulating John on a job well done and wishing him many years of happiness in his retirement.

J. L. HALDEMAN,
Past State Department Commander, Veterans of World War I.

I have known John Moore for several years. He is a member of the American Legion, No. 12, and has belonged to the post for 40 years and is a faithful worker. He is a member of the World War I Post 1949 and is a man anyone would be proud to call a friend.

His friend,

JOHN A. ROE,
Commander Barrack 1949, World War I, U.S.A.

A New Low

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress recognize the fact that it is the administration's policy to whitewash the Bobby Baker case. Obviously the Johnson administration has suppressed the discussion and further investigation of the Baker case since it would be politically damaging to Members of the Johnson hierarchy.

Furthermore, in its report the Senate Rules Committee saw fit to unjustifiably criticize the distinguished Senator from Delaware, Senator WILLIAMS.

This morning's Chicago Tribune contains a most forceful editorial on this development which I place in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 18, 1965]

A NEW LOW

Democrats on the Senate Rules Committee apparently have stooped to a new low in their protracted efforts to cover up the Bobby Baker scandal. Reporters have learned that the Committee's forthcoming report on the latest stage of its so-called investigations includes an ill-concealed and outrageous attack on the integrity of a fellow Senator, JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware.

Senator WILLIAMS is the Republican whose initial evidence led to Baker's resignation as secretary to the Senate majority on October 8, 1963, after piling up a $2 million fortune on a Government salary which never exceeded $19,600. And it is Senator WILLIAMS who has kept the investigation alive with one revelation after another.

The ripples of scandal reached the White House and the Democratic National Committee as well as any number of lesser individuals and agencies. In one previous committee report and in a series of statements and even more eloquent silences, Senate Democrats and the administration have tried to shake off the embarrassing evidence by evasion, by alibis, by diversionary tactics, by impugning the testimony of witnesses, by releasing derogatory material about them from supposedly secret files, and by crying "politics."

None of this has allayed the public suspicion or stemmed the flow of incriminating evidence, gathered almost singlehandedly by Senator WILLIAMS. So the Committee has

now stooped to implying that Mr. WILLIAMS is a meddlesome liar who shouldn't concern himself with matters under the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee. According to one reporter, the document reads as if it were a brief in a libel suit against Mr. WILLIAMS instead of an examination of serious charges brought by him.

These are vengeful gutter tactics which merely demonstrate the Committee's moral bankruptcy. It has exhausted its paltry supply of ammunition and has turned to name calling. If it persists in adopting this report, it will bring discredit on the whole Senate.

The College on the Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, among the granite hills of New Hampshire stands one of the Nation's oldest and greatest institutions of higher learning—Dartmouth College. Once, as the Dartmouth motto proclaims, she was "A voice crying in the wilderness." That was nearly 200 years ago but, although the wilderness is gone, the voice remains as a powerful influence in American education and culture. Men of Dartmouth have gone forth to become leaders in nearly every field of endeavor. Eight Dartmouth men presently serve in the House of Representatives.

The Wall Street Journal recently published a fine review of a new book on Dartmouth and I am happy to offer a copy of this review at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 7, 1965]

SALUTE TO DARTMOUTH

(By Edmund Fuller)

"We have an austere climate. We are of a hyperborean race; vigorous, patient, and happy. Our granite State, and her marble sister on the other side of the river, are the cradle of a hardy and beneficent enterprise. Our institutions are nurses of a caledonian independence. We are content with our position; proud of the northern hive."

Thus the voice of Dartmouth, expressed in the paper bearing the college name in November, 1839.

The college was founded in 1769 by Eleazar Wheelock "for the education and instruction of youth of the Indian tribes in this land in reading, writing and all parts of learning which shall appear necessary and expedient for civilizing and christianizing children of pagans * * * and also of English youth and any others."

There are virtually no Indians left but there are plenty of children of pagans, the endless civilizing and christianizing of whom is still a necessary, expedient, but bone-wearying work.

All this comes up in "The College on the Hill; A Dartmouth Chronicle," edited and in part written by Ralph Nading Hill, of Burlington in "the marble sister on the other side of the river." He is author of "The Winooski," in the rivers of America series, and other excellent historical narratives, and a loyal Dartmouth alumnus.

This is more than the puff book that any college might put out for its alumni, though it has some minor functions of that sort and a reasonable measure of old-tie enthusiasm.

The book can claim a larger audience, for Dartmouth has a substantial place in American history. It bloomed as a pure flower of colonial Calvinism, nurturing a doomed dream about the Indians. It played a role in the complicated struggle over the New Hampshire grants, the ambition of New York to take over part of the territory, and the emergence of Vermont as an entity. The college party tried to secede Hanover from New Hampshire and affiliate it with Vermont.

After the War for Independence a grudge-bearing legislature attempted to impose a reincorporation as Dartmouth University upon this independent institution. This precipitated the Dartmouth College case, an early test in constitutional law before the Supreme Court. Chief Justice John Marshall presided; alumnus (1801) Daniel Webster's eloquent pleading won for the college and enhanced the 36-year-old lawyer's career that was leading to fame and folklore. Because of that victory, independent institutions in our land remain free from political interference.

Dartmouth President John Sloan Dickey contributes a foreword on the theme of purpose. Mr. Hill writes a concise history of the college and traces its generation of students. Stearns Mores writes of the physical place and of the succession of its faculty. Athletic history and traditions are examined by F. William Andres and Ernest Roberts.

The early college deserved that part of its motto proclaiming it "A voice crying in the wilderness." A hardy student from Litchfield, Conn., earning his keep at a sawmill, recorded that the "howling of wild beasts and the plaintive notes of the owl greatly added to the gloominess of the night season."

Since stanch Eleazer Wheelock the college has enjoyed a number of colorful presidents. Nathan Lord wore green glasses. In chapel, "While appearing to read from the Bible he was actually reciting from memory, his eyes all the while wandering from aisle to aisle to detect improprieties among the students."

Samuel Colcord Bartlett was sharp-tongued. Seniors led a donkey to the platform in chapel, as rhetorical exercises were to begin. "Upon his arrival Dr. Bartlett regarded the donkey amicably, then taking up the list of speakers announced: 'As I call the names you may come up and stand beside your brother and declaim.'" Again, "when the students placed an outhouse at the chapel entrance, Dr. Barlett reproved them for having moved their 'own ancestral halls' to college property."

William Jewett Tucker, elected in 1893, broke the narrow molds of regionalism and Calvinism, honorable though they were, and led the college into a broader world and the beginning of its major intellectual growth.

Dartmouth was the ninth colonial college, the last to have a charter from the crown, and the only one to graduate a class, uninterrupted by war, every year since 1771. It takes pride in the name of a college though it could claim the label university.

"The College on the Hill," well written and lavishly illustrated, obviously anticipates the imminent 200th anniversary. In his peroration in the Dartmouth College case, Webster declared to the Chief Justice: "It is, sir, as I have said, a small college. And yet, there are those who love it." This book shows why.

("The College on the Hill: A Dartmouth Chronicle." Edited by Ralph Nading Hill. Dartmouth Publications. 357 pages.)

Tribute to Seabury Stanton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, recently the press reported the retirement of Mr. Seabury Stanton as president of Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., one of the country's leading textile manufacturing companies, a firm with which he had been associated for 50 years.

Mr. Stanton is one of the Nation's foremost authorities on textile manufacturing, and he has served on virtually dozens of Federal and State-level textile study and advisory committees. In addition, he has served as chairman of the Northern Textile Association, has been a director of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, the National Association of Cotton Manufactures, the New England Council, and is a past president of Associated Industries of Massachusetts.

It has been my privilege to have worked with Seabury Stanton on many occasions in behalf of the textile industry and in behalf of the city of New Bedford, a cause to which he has devoted generously of his time and energies.

I am glad to be able to report to his many friends, and to friends of the American textile industry, that his retirement from Berkshire Hathaway does not mean that he shall lose his interest in the welfare of this important industry, and that he has informed me that he will continue to work closely with his friends in Washington and with the textile associations.

The Standard-Times of New Bedford published on May 11 an editorial tribute to Mr. Stanton for the half century he has spent as a leader of industry and for the indomitable faith he has had in New Englanders and the future of New England.

I commend this well-deserved tribute to the attention of my colleagues in Congress:

END OF A CHAPTER

The withdrawal of Seabury Stanton from a position of active leadership in the Nation's textile industry keynotes the end of his family's association with this business in New Bedford for three generations.

Mr. Stanton's half-century in textiles embraced an era incomparable in terms of the problems it produced, the challenges it offered, and the administrative fortitude it demanded.

To this dynamic period of change, he brought dedication, a dominant and persuasive personality, plus the contagious conviction that there was a way around virtually every stumbling block.

In a New England that lost 14 million cotton spindles in a 25-year period, in which 150 plants providing 100,000 jobs were liquidated, the name Stanton came to signify to a business world watching with curiosity and admiration, the symbol of refusal to surrender to economic adversity.

A financial writer surveying New England's future in 1949 commented, "You talk to Seabury Stanton at Hathaway. What you hear adds to your faith in New England and New Englanders. He believes you need only use modern methods and modern machinery to prosper, provided your employees are willing to do 'the exceptionally capable job that only New England workers can do.'"

Mr. Stanton, year after year, addressed himself to the uneven contrast to capture markets under the handicap of geographical cost differentials. At local, State and national levels, he spent thousands of hours assisting in the negotiation of workable agreements among manufacturers, management and labor, and even nations competing for the textile markets.

For his faith in the industry and its people, for his great effort in behalf of both, there are many who owe Seabury Stanton much.

Address of Speaker McCormack at Morris Cafritz Memorial Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 16, it was my pleasure to attend a cornerstone-laying for the construction of a great new hospital, the building of which exemplifies the best in American tradition. The hospital, named the Morris Cafritz Memorial Hospital after the late prominent Washington builder, is located at the District line next to my home, Prince Georges County, Md.

The Morris Cafritz Memorial Hospital is the culmination of more than a decade of dedicated volunteer work by a group of interested citizens under the leadership of Raymond J. McDonough, who is also an attorney and a delegate to the Maryland General Assembly. It was my pleasure when, as a delegate to the general assembly, Mr. McDonough and I and a majority of other legislators approved a $650,000 authorization to be contributed by the Prince Georges County commissioners toward construction of the new hospital, which is expected to serve a large number of Maryland residents.

The significance of Sunday's ceremony is illustrated by the fact that one of the great friends of American hospitals, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, gave the major address. I might add at this point that the hospital's board of trustees under Mr. McDonough have announced that they will dedicate their suite of operating rooms to Speaker and Mrs. McCormack, an honor justly accorded them.

I would like to reiterate that the new Morris Cafritz Memorial Hospital represents the efforts of a group of dedicated citizens, those of a leading political figure whose lifelong interest in hospitals has paved the way for construction of many with Federal aid, and the community interest exhibited by a prominent builder. We shall long appreciate everyone's efforts in the building of this new community service, which will be dedicated in March 1966. Therefore, I insert the following address of Speaker MCCORMACK at the Morris Cafritz Memorial Hospital, Sunday, May 16, 1965:

ADDRESS BY SPEAKER MCCORMACK

President Raymond McDonough, reverend clergy, Gov. John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts, my dear and valued friend and colleague Congressman MACHEN, Attorney General Finan, of Maryland, Commissioner Spellman, Commissioner Duncan, Mrs. Cafritz, and ladies and gentlemen, it has long been the conviction of many of us who follow the course of history, and sometimes help to make it, that you can judge the civilization of a people by its hospitals. Hospital really means caring for the sick and the injured, the maimed, and the helpless. It is without a doubt the noblest manifestation of the highest aspiration of the human soul. When, as in this case, we express it in terms of Government effort and contribution, along with cooperation from private and local agencies, we are putting into the actual, the realistic and the concrete, some of the best qualities in human character.

It is a pleasure for me to stand here and participate in the laying of the cornerstone for this phase of the Greater Southeast Community Hospital here in Washington, D.C.

We are all of us familiar with the dream, the hope, the determination of countless of persons to build this hospital, and to make it one of the most distinguished and serviceable institutions of its kind. What is most impressive is the motivation of service and helpfulness that characterizes the endeavor on the part of all concerned.

I congratulate all who made the dream of a hospital an actuality. I congratulate the Prince Georges County commissioners. I especially congratulate the Southeast Hospital Foundation. I congratulate the Citizen's Bank of Maryland, and, of course, I congratulate the Federal Government for, at base, making all this possible. The legislation that helped to bring all this to fruition got something of a congressional boost when the 87th Congress, second session, back in 1962, passed a bill providing for an increase in the authorization funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia. It had the support also of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and met with no opposition from the General Services Administration, or the Bureau of the Budget. There was of course a great deal of helpful push and enthusiasm from local groups, official and private, and this is all to the good. It was a sound move to put the hospital inside the District line.

The Nation's health is as much a Federal or national as it is a local problem. Of all the common endeavors in which all can and should join I know of none more intimately concerned with the universal problem of health—the public health, the individual health—as the hospital. What it portends in the way of a nation's concern with its citizens is of course obvious. It is more than a duty, which is clear enough, a duty that belongs to all of us to perform. It is in keeping also with the profoundest teaching of the Judeo-Christian faith. We can hardly attend church and then turn our backs on a project like the Southeast Community Hospital. On the contrary, it is in the nature of the American spirit not only to make this edifice of human decency a symbol of man's humanity to man, but a symbol as well of sound legislation and common and total involvement of all concerned—not just Federal Government.

And now that congratulations are in order I would like to interpolate a personal note about a remarkably competent and patriotic American who did so much, out of the goodness of his heart, to bring this great and compassionate achievement into being. You have already demonstrated your appreciation by giving this hospital its name: The Morris Cafritz Memorial Hospital.

I am especially delighted to say these things that I believe so deeply about Morris Cafritz because here with us today is Mrs. Cafritz. The late Morris Cafritz left behind him a remarkable legacy just by the life he lived, by the works he accomplished, and by the services he contributed to his fellowman. And very much like her husband, Mrs. Cafritz, by her noble outlook on life has contributed greatly to the whole population of our community by such works as this one we celebrate today. This couple over the years have shown there love of God by the many good deeds they did showing their love of neighbors.

Mr. Cafritz before his tragic passing was a member of the board of trustees of the Greater Southeast Community Hospital Foundation, Inc. He was—outstandingly—the chairman of the special gifts committee. Through his dynamic enterprise in the field of philanthropy, as in all his enterprises, he helped in the raising of about $500,000. He himself contributed a large sum. And the Cafritz Foundation has contributed another quarter of a million dollars to the hospital—an action he certainly would have endorsed with all his heart. What he gave to this proud institution here on Southern Avenue in the form of personal energy, intense attention and devotion, can hardly be computed in dollars and cents.

Thus I congratulate you once more for the wholly deserving decision to name this great institution the Morris Cafritz Memorial Hospital.

We are living in an age when this profound attitude of being indeed our brother's keeper has become a vital and living and an electric part of our Federal, local, and legislative history. It is a spirit which has had an all-powerful and overwhelming impetus from President Lyndon B. Johnson. It is—this spirit—that rests behind the all-out war to wipe out the remaining pockets of poverty in our country. It is the spirit that seeks to alleviate the condition of the elderly through medicare. It is—under President Johnson—a part of the massive program to make the United States not only ideologically the last great hope of mankind, but to make it also and right now, today this very hour, the country with the happiest, the most prosperous, the healthiest people any country has ever known since the dawn of time.

Norwegian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 17, was the 151st anniversary of the signing of the Norwegian Constitution. It was Norway's Independence Day. I am pleased to join with other House colleagues in honoring Norway on this landmark day in the life of this brave and goodhearted nation.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, very many of us in Minnesota are the sons and daughters, grandsons or granddaughters of the wonderfully independent, self-reliant people of Scandinavia.

These immigrants from Norway and the other countries of the far north

brought with them to our shores attributes of character which have been a rich and welcome heritage to America. They brought such priceless gifts as a hardy independent spirit, great industriousness, lofty courage, warm compassion, and a sense of high purpose. It is virtues like these which have made the building of our country possible—which have made America great.

And so, I want to express my best wishes to our stanch friend and NATO ally, the Kingdom of Norway, and to all her descendants in this Nation. It is our hope that the sound qualities of the valiant Norwegians, their great dedication to the principles of democracy, individual liberty, equal justice under the law, and their rugged personal integrity, will long continue to set a high example to the people of the world.

Chicago Area Eyed as Site for Giant Atom Smasher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to submit the enclosed article by Richard Lewis which appeared in the May 16, 1965, edition of the Chicago Sun-Times. I am delighted to note that the Chicagoland area is one of those under consideration by the National Academy of Sciences to build what will be the world's largest atom smasher. Certainly this is a part of the country which has a great deal to offer the Nation in atomic and space efforts.

The article follows:

CHICAGO AREA EYED AS SITE FOR GIANT ATOM SMASHER

(By Richard Lewis)

The National Academy of Sciences has launched a nationwide search for a place to build the world's largest atom smasher and some experts are casting an appraising eye on the Chicago area.

The great machine, which would cover 1 square mile and use as much electricity as the Northwest Side of Chicago, is to be situated on 3,000 acres of land near a large city with a major airport and good highway network.

Cost of the proposed installation is $280 million, according to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, which will supervise construction.

It would employ more than 2,000 scientists and technicians, consume a power load of about 400 million megawatts and require 2,000 gallons a minute of clear water for cooling.

HUGE VOLTAGE PLANNED

Preliminary designs for the atom smasher, drawn at the University of California at Berkeley, show a 200- to 300-billion electron-volt proton accelerator, circular in shape like a doughnut.

The machine would be 7 to 10 times as powerful as the alternating gradient synchrotron at the AEC's Brookhaven National Laboratory at Upton, Long Island, the largest in the United States, and the CERN atom smasher at Geneva, Switzerland, the largest in Europe.

It would be some 20 times as powerful as the zero gradient synchrotron (12.5 billion electron volts) at Argonne National Laboratory, 27 miles southwest of Chicago near the village of Lemont.

ULTIMATE PROBE SEEN

The 200- to 300-billion-electron-volt accelerator has been declared to be the next step in equipment for the investigation of the ultimate structure of matter since 1963. It was not authorized, however, until February, when President Johnson approved an AEC recommendation that the machine be built and forwarded it to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atom Energy.

The AEC's long-range program in nuclear physics research provides that the 200- to 300-billion-electron-volt machine is the start of a new generation of super atom smashers. They will increase in power up to 1,000 billion electron volts in the next 10 to 15 years.

CALIFORNIA OUT

Even though the AEC has tentatively accepted the Berkeley design, the agency has indicated this does not mean the machine is to be built in California. In fact, it is understood by nuclear physicists here, that California is out as a site.

One reason may be criticism from other areas that California has been getting the lion's share of the Government's outlays for big science. Another is that much of California is affected by the Pacific coast earthquake belt and that many otherwise desirable sites there are potentially unstable.

On the other hand, an expert here pointed out, the Middle West, which is part of an enormous plain extending from the Arctic Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico, is among the most stable regions on earth.

ACADEMY TO PICK SITE

In order to avoid charges of favoritism, the AEC commissioned the National Academy of Sciences, one of the Nation's most distinguished scientific bodies, to recommend a site. The selection must be made this year because funding the huge project is scheduled to start next year, the AEC said.

California and the entire Pacific coast may be ruled out by the proviso that "sites with serious seismic (earthquake) activity, faults, or loose joints in bedrock are to be avoided."

The AEC has specified these site qualifications:

1. So far as the land is concerned, it must be level to minimize excavating and filling and there must be enough of it to allow expansion. A minimum area of 3,000 acres is required.

2. It should be owned by or be reasonably available to the Federal Government.

3. The terrain and underlying rock should have high-load-bearing capacity to insure a stable foundation for both the accelerator and other structures in the research complex.

4. The site should be near readily available electric power and an adequate supply of cool, clean water. Cost of power and water will be a factor influencing site decision.

5. The site should be reasonably close to a major airport having frequent service to major American cities, to allow university users and other research people ready access.

6. It should be reasonably close to a commercial and industrial center, which provides special facilities in electronics, electrical and precision mechanical equipment. It ought to be in an area where there is an adequate supply of skilled technicians.

7. Good housing and community facilities should be available and a cultural center including a large university to provide intellectual and cultural opportunities ought to be within driving distance.

CHICAGO FILLS THE BILL

Nuclear scientists here said the Chicago area fulfills every one of these requirements. Moreover, they pointed out, it is served by an international airport and it has all the power, water, skilled technical force, cultural environment and industrial support any advanced scientific facility would need.

"If we can come up with 3,000 acres or so near O'Hare Airport and say to the Academy and the AEC—here you are—we're in," said a spokesman for nuclear scientists in Chicago.

Once a site is picked, construction of the machine will take 6 to 8 years, the AEC said. Within 10 years, it would probably be the Nation's second largest science facility.

FLORIDA CENTER LARGEST

The largest is the John F. Kennedy Space Center on Merritt Island, Fla., where the first spaceport for launching manned rockets to the moon is nearing completion.

By building ever more powerful atom smashers, scientists hope to be able to clarify today's ambiquous picture of the structure of the atomic nucleus by finding new particles which cannot be produced by present atom smashers.

While enough land is available near Argonne National Laboratory, officials there believe the AEC will not agree to complicate its existing laboratories by adding to any one of them such a gigantic facility.

AEC REJECTION SEEN

For this reason, it is expected that the AEC will turn down bids for the super accelerator from Brookhaven and Oak Ridge National Laboratories.

So far, the AEC has received proposals from Hanford, Wash., site of the Government's plutonium works; Boulder, Colo., site of important National Bureau of Standards laboratories and the University of Colorado; Atlanta; Houston, site of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Manned Spacecraft Center; Los Angeles and the Madison-Stoughton area of Wisconsin, site of the University of Wisconsin and the Midwest Universities Research Association.

Henry Harris—In Memoriam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein some very touching articles from a recent edition of the Boston Globe by the gifted writer, Victor O. Jones, and a staff writer eulogizing the outstanding editorial writer and newspaper commentator, my friend, the late, beloved Henry Harris.

This great, talented writer was my college classmate, and a very dear friend of mine. I always knew him as "Puffer" and that is the way he was known to his intimates, and I imagine most of the people who worked with him on the Globe, where for so many years he won high and well-deserved repute for being one of the best newspaper writers and commentators in the country.

Henry Harris combined with a very well-stocked, discerning mind, outstanding reportial and writing skills and extremely lovable personal qualities that endeared him to everyone who knew him.

An avid, penetrating scholar, not in any stilted sense, Henry Harris' interest and horizons were indeed wide and encompassing.

He was a warm, humane personality, and he was endowed with a warm and

humane philosophy of life, politics, economics, art and human companionship, and many other interests. He was concerned with people and moving events in the active, dynamic things of life.

Somewhat shy and retiring, his diffidence invariably blossomed into a warm and friendly glow as time brought deeper understanding into his friendships.

He relentlessly pursued a wide range of interests and drew from the reservoir of his fertile mind to document the smooth-flowing phrases of his agile pen.

Puffer was a man of breadth, stature, and impregnable integrity. He did things in his own way, but he did them well. He met his deadlines, notwithstanding the pressures of the moment.

He was a man of keen awareness and deep involvements in what was going on in government and political affairs. This led him to several sorties into active politics, and in this connection I was very closely associated with him when he participated in several of the late, beloved Senator David I. Walsh's election campaigns in which he contributed research and brochures, campaign documentation, news items, and speech materials.

Naturally, at these tasks, he was simply unbeatable. He turned out some marvelously effective tracts and pieces on burning political issues. He had a flair for producing and pinpointing issues dealing with progressive, social, and labor legislation, although everything he did was solid, significant, and very well written.

He wrote with a firm, sweeping command of the wide range of political questions that his writings touched upon, and he was never at a loss for ideas or the ability to address them in an appealing style. He drove home his points with verve and telling effect.

To say that "Puffer" was informal might be somewhat of an understatement, because he never allowed formalities to burden him in any way, and in that regard, he might remind one of the Bard of Lake Walden, the great Thoreau.

Knowing "Puffer" as I did, I was much interested when I read Vic Jones' story about the casual manner in which he worked, lived, handled money, and approached sumptuary and clothing problems. He was ever thus, and I think it may well be said of him without indulging in cliches, that there could never be another like him.

Like Shakespeare, Henry Harris was many sided; like Benchley, he had a fluid sense of humor that ran freely almost any place or time, a man of many parts, functions, facilities, and ideas. To visit his college room in Beck Hall, Cambridge, was an experience never to be forgotten.

"Puffer" might be said to have been an impressionist. Some might call him a brilliant conceiver of new ideas, because they flowed from his alert, active mind as from some gushing fountain. I always thought his problem was to catalog them, but this never seemed to be much of a problem for the learned, versatile Henry Harris, since he put a great many of his ideas down in black and white, in the columns and in the editorial pages of the Boston Globe. And they were good ideas, admirably expressed.

If some gifted soul wants to write a biography that would be a bestseller from the start, he would be well advised to write one on the incredible Henry Harris; his life, his years, his beliefs, his ideas, his techniques, modes, and, perhaps, his likes and dislikes. Such a work would make great reading and "Puffer's" life, to those who knew it, and his friendship, to those who shared it, always will make happy, grateful memories.

I am sorry that I did not know "Puffer" had been indisposed, or that he had passed away. I would have liked to have visited him, above all, to have attended his funeral as a final mark of the great respect and very deep affection I felt for this genial, dear friend, whose labors and contributions will long be remembered in the newspaper craft by those who appreciated his brilliant writing, high public spirit, and outstanding dedication.

I am profoundly saddened by the passing of this dear friend, and it is with a very heavy heart indeed that I tender my most heartfelt sympathy to his dear ones, and all those he left behind him, especially his distinguished brother, Morgan, and his beloved aunt and uncle, Mrs. Edwin S. Webster and Mr. Chandler Hovey.

Henry Harris was in the best traditions of his craft, his college, and our great American scene. He will leave a legacy of gifted, dedicated service, warm, vibrant friendship, and true Americanism.

I hope and pray he may find rest and peace in his eternal home. His memory will long remain green with those of us who knew and loved him; his work and exploits will always be recalled with admiring, grateful appreciation. His loss is a truly great one.

The article follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, May 5, 1965]

NEWSMAN'S EULOGY: GLOBE'S HENRY HARRIS "LIVED, WROTE BRAVELY"

Services for Henry W. Harris Jr., 66, editorial writer, author, and reporter for the Boston Globe were held Tuesday at Story Chapel in Mount Auburn Cemetery, Cambridge.

Rev. Zoltan Nagy, pastor of First Church in Chestnut Hill officiated and delivered the eulogy.

He said, "to choose a life is a lifetime adventure. To die a little later or a little sooner does not matter. But to live bravely is to become sensitive to the truth, to beauty, to the dignity of life.

"To live bravely is to enjoy work which produces such things as excellence in one's own endeavors, sympathy where others are concerned.

"To live bravely is to embrace an unpopular cause which serves progress not yet seen, an ideal not yet accepted.

"To live bravely is to speak and write clearly in an age of darkness, 'to wage peace' in a world of wars.

"To live bravely in today's world is to include one's own life others who are not of our tribe.

"Henry Harris tried to live such a life, which now we celebrate.

"There is little left to say or do here.

"The pains of parting are hard, but the responsibilities of living lure us on. Life must be served. It is served between birth and death, and all that lies between.

"Here in the presence of death, we must continue to sing the song of life. We must raise our eyes from the valley of the shadow to the sunlit heights.

"We must go from here strengthened for the ascent, better able to bear our burdens and lighten the load of others."

William Davis Taylor, publisher, headed a large delegation from the Globe. Others attending including Wilton Vaugh, director of State division of motorboats; John Barry, vice president of National Shawmut Bank; Edward A. Counihan, former State banking commissioner; J. Edward Allen, international representative, American Newspaper Guild, and Sylvia W. Glynn, administrative secretary of Newspaper Guild of Greater Boston.

Mr. Harris, of 1558 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, died Sunday.

He leaves a brother, Morgan H. Harris of Tequesta, Fla., a retired Navy captain; an aunt, Mrs. Edwin S. Webster, and an uncle, Chandler Hovey, both of Chestnut Hill.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, May 5, 1965]

HENRY HARRIS: AN INDIVIDUALIST AT HOME WITH ALL

(By Victor O. Jones)

"I'm sorry," said the cabdriver, "to read that Henry Harris died. He was Uncle Dudley, wasn't he?"

Well, of course Uncle Dudley down through the years, has been a lot of people, always more than one editorial writer. But the cabbie was right in that.

"Puffer" Harris represented everything that was best about the Globe's mythical top editorial.

He was always for the little guy against the big guy, he was for human beings as against machines, he liked to present both views of all questions, though he himself took very positive position personally. He was entirely without any "side." Status except in his professional standards, didn't interest him in the slightest.

He was, of course, a unionman even before the days of the New Deal, during which he had a good deal to do with organizing the Newspaper Guild. He always maintained that Sacco and Vanzetti didn't get anything like a fair trial. And though he had served as a marine in World War I, he had no use for wars as a means of settling the arguments among nations. He was something of an expert on the United Nations, and though he certainly never argued that the U.N. was the solution of man's unhumanity toward man, he believed in it as the best available deterrent.

There were all sorts of legends about Henry, even in his lifetime. One of them was that he was fabulously wealthy.

He was indeed distantly related to the House of Morgan, but if he had a lot of money he didn't act, look, think, or dress that way.

The informality of his attire was notable long before the days of the beatnik. There was one period when ill-fitting shoes had rendered his feet sensitive and he thought nothing of paddling around his office in his barefeet.

Oldtimers on the Globe recall one very hot summer Sunday back maybe 15 years ago when late in the afternoon Henry came puffing into the Globe city room attired in nothing except a tee shirt, a pair of underdrawers (underdrawers—not shorts), and a pair of sneakers. It had been in the 90's outside, and Henry was covered with sweat and dust, but in no-wise embarrassed by his appearance.

"I'm sorry to bother you," said he with his unfailing courtesy, "but I wonder whether you could lend me enough to take a cab out to Newton?"

(Lending money to Henry was never any risk. In his earlier days it was almost a weekly occurrence for him to make the rounds of his friends on payday or on his quarterly dividend days and say: "I know that I have been borrowing some money recently. I have an impression that I borrowed from you. Did I?")

Even for Henry, his attire this hot Sunday afternoon was unusually informal. So, cabfare having been advanced the lender couldn't refrain from asking how come Henry was around downtown Boston in his underwear.

"Well," said Henry, deadly serious, "I have been worried about my weight, and read that Dr. Paul Dudley White believed in bicycle riding as a form of exercise. So I rented a bike and pedaled down toward Providence. I could have made it OK to Providence, but I was worried about getting back, and so decided to turn around at Brockton. When I got to Brockton this unusual exercise and the heat suddenly caught up with me, and I thought it would be silly to try to make it back. So I went to the railroad station to buy a ticket back to Boston and realized suddenly that there were no pockets in these underdrawers and that I had absolutely no money. The ticket man was kind enough to give me a ticket, but he made me leave my bike as security. So that's why I need cabfare back to Newton."

A man full of surprises. Henry never surprised anyone who didn't know him more when he came up with one of the greatest yachting exclusives in local sports history.

This was back in the 1930's when America's Cup racing was even more of a millionaire's sport than it now is, and when America's Cup people didn't give a hoot about public relations or sportswriters.

A Marblehead group headed by Charles Francis Adams had a contender for the honor of defending the cup, "Yankee," I believe against the likes of Harold Vanderbilt. Every sports and feature editor was trying to get a reporter aboard *Yankee* to describe for the man in the street what it was like to sail on one of these big, beautiful babies. No soap. Neither of the Fowles, pere et fils, could get aboard, not to mention Admiral Robbins of the New York Times.

But one fine day, covering a whole page in the Sunday Globe, there was an account of a day's sail aboard a cup defender. Those who saw the byline, "By Henry W. Harris"—did a double take.

How had the highly unnautical, ill-pressed friend of the workingman gotten aboard?

Henry took the congratulations with his usual innocence. "Why shouldn't they take me out for a spin? My brother Morgan Harris is the purser, and I was his guest."

That was Henry: a pacifist and no spit-and-polish guy who served in the marines; the workingman's friend who felt at home aboard a millionaire's yacht; a very smart guy (Harvard, cum laude) whose heart was in the right place.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

McEliece, James H., Jr.
McGurk, John R.
McKemey, William J., Jr.
McMillan, Jerry R.
McMillan, John E.
Meier, Frank L.
Menninger, George E.
Merges, George J.
Merriam, Nicholas H.
Metzner, Ladd H.
Mickells, Henry G., Jr.
Mims, James E.
Mirando, James A.
Mitchell, William B.
Miyashiro, James T.
Mogan, Bernard J., Jr.
Mohlere, Richard D.
Molepske, Robert J.
Momcilovich, Michael, Jr.
Moore, Harley L., III
Moorefield, Kenneth P.
Morrissey, Stephen R.
Moseley, Charles H., Jr.
Motal, Beverly W.
Motes, Preston M., Jr.
Mullen, Orlin L.
Munson, Merton E., Jr.
Mushovic, Thomas J.
Myers, Chester A., Jr.
Neal, Larry T.
Needels, Christopher J.
Nelson, Walter E., Jr.
Nenninger, Glennon E., Jr.
Nichols, Charles S.
Nowland, Donald E.
O'Brien, Francis W., Jr.
O'Connor, Joseph P., III
O'Donnell, Charles F., III
O'Grady, Michael J.
O'Hara, Timothy S.
O'Leary, Gerald D.
O'Neill, Eugene D.
O'Toole, George P., Jr.
Olivo, James A.
Olmstead, Kim H.
Olmsted, Philip R.
Olson, John V.
Olson, Stephen A.
Ono, Tadahiko
Paek, Stephen J., Jr.
Paley, James M.
Parcels, Donald C.
Parker, Eugene J., Jr.
Parrish, Donald J., Jr.
Paske, Raymond J.
Peters, James M.
Peterson, Carl A., Jr.
Pfeifer, Charles F., Jr.
Phillpotts, Donald A.
Philo, Steven E.
Pickler, John M.
Pickup, Bedford M.
Pollard, Raymond G., III
Powers, Thomas P., Jr.
Principe, Nicholas J., Jr.
Probst, Francis J., Jr.
Pylant, Julian E., Jr.
Radcliffe, Robert F.
Rau, Paul D.
Ray, Lloyd C., Jr.
Raybeck, Bruce A.
Reed, Howard H.
Reisner, William E.
Reller, Frank X., III
Renschen, Paul S.
Resick, Martin J.
Richardson, Douglas J.
Ridenour, Thomas A.
Riley, Francis G.
Riley, Ronald J.
Ritch, John B., III
Ritch, William N., Jr.
Roebuck, Zigmund J.
Rood, Omar E., Jr.
Rood, Robert D.
Rose, Leo P.
Roseberg, John B.
Roth, Arthur, Jr.
Rountree, Rance H.
Rowe, Donald S.
Ruggles, George W.
Ryan, Terrance C.
Salomone, John L.
Samnarco, Valentino T.
Sanchez, Jose L.
Satorie, Thomas R.
Savatiel, Karl R.
Saxon, Walter L.
Schaltenbrand, Raymond J., Jr.
Scheiner, James I.
Scholl, Wayne J.
Schultz, Paul F., Jr.
Schwartz, Marshall W.
Scobie, Jon D.
Scruggs, Hugh F.
Scully, Robert E.
Seaburn, James T.
Seaworth, George H.
Selkis, Robert F.
Seymour, John B.
Shapiro, Fred J.
Sharkness, Edward J.
Shaver, Michael P.
Shaw, Ralph T.
Sheridan, Mark E.
Sherrell, William W., Jr.
Shinseki, Eric K.
Shuford, John H.
Sikorski, Douglas J.
Simmons, Timothy J.
Simpson, Edward, Jr.
Singelyn, Paul J.
Sinnreich, Richard H.
Skidmore, Francis R.
Slutzky, Kenneth B.
Smith, Frederick J.
Smith, Herbert J., III
Smith, James L.
Smoak, John R., Jr.
Speilman, Daniel E., Jr.
Sperry, Steven M.
Spire, Christopher L.
Spoerry, Stephen J.
Stanko, Michael R.
Steinwald, Daniel F., Jr.
Stephenson, James P.
Sterba, Robert H.
Sterbenz, Henry W., Jr.
Stevison, Jay F.
Stewart, James V., III
Stewart, Lance R.
Stichweh, Carl R.
Stowell, Robert D.
Strassner, Lawrence M.
Sullivan, Richard A.
Swensson, John K.
Talbot, James W.
Taylor, Wesley B., Jr.
Teeters, Michael B.
Terry, John K.
Thames, John W., Jr.
Thomasson, John T.
Thompson, John C.
Thompson, Jon K.
Thompson, Michael H.
Thompson, Robert D.
Throckmorton, Terril M.
Tillman, James L.
Timbrook, Robert D.
Timmerman, Frederick W., Jr.
Tomaswick, James R.
Toomey, Kevin P.
Tragemann, Richard W., Jr.
Tredennick, William H.
Triick, William A.
Turner, Jack C.
Tutchings, Terrance R.
Tyner, Saint E. P., II
Van Dyk, Thomas W.
Vann, David B.
Vann, John M.
Vaughn, Jay E.
Viani, Michael L.
Walsh, Mark R.
Walter, Ronald L.
Watson, James M.
Wattendorf, John M.
Weatherall, Joe A., Jr.
Wells, Ronald M.
Wells, Walter J., Jr.
West, Lowry A.
Westpheling, Ernest D.
Wetherill, Roderick, Jr.
Wheeler, Louis L.
White, Robert C.
White, Thomas R.
Whitehouse, Benjamin, Jr.
Whitten, Jesse M.
Wiest, Lawrence P.
Wiley, Earl T.
Williams, Richard C.
Williams, Ronald N.
Winstead, Edward D.
Wolf, Roger W.
Wolff, Robert D.
Wollen, A. Ross
Wood, James H.
Woodard, James A., Jr.
Woodruff, Ray G.
Wuertenberger, Charles E.
Yoshitani, Ken
Zais, Barrie E.
Ziegler, Bernard L.
Zonne, Robert J., Jr.
Zurlo, Joseph A., II

The following-named midshipmen, graduating class of 1965, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3284, and 3287:

Fischer, Stephen J.
Frazar, Joe N., III.
Sanders, Raymond A.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 19, 1965:

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

Walter J. McCarter, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Stanley A. Cain, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Carl E. Bagge, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1967.

Appendix

Dr. Michael DeBakey, One of America's Great Heart Surgeons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality has been holding hearings for many years on the present immigration law. During the course of these hearings, much has been said about the loss of brainpower to the United States because of the archaic national origins quota system.

From time to time I have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD evidence of this loss of brainpower to the people of America. Once again, I call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives another vivid example of a great son of immigrant parents who is making a tremendous contribution to the general well-being, not only of Americans, but of all mankind.

In his article in the Parade section of the Chicago Sun-Times of May 16, 1965, Lloyd Shearer points out the accomplishments of a great American, Dr. Michael DeBakey, who is turning the dream of artificial arteries and artificial hearts into reality. Dr. Michael DeBakey was born in the Cajun country of Lake Charles, La., where his father, Shaker DeBakey, an immigrant from Lebanon, settled at the turn of the century. Shaker DeBakey fathered five children and among them are two surgeons, Michael and Ernest, and a medical writer, Selma. Dr. Michael DeBakey, son of an immigrant, at 56 years of age is one of the world's great heart surgeons.

I share with many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the hope that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality will soon report a more liberal bill in line with the declarations of the Democratic Party at its convention in 1964. Four Presidents—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and now President Johnson—have urged the Congress to repeal the archaic national origins quota system. President Johnson, in the campaign of 1964, pledged his all-out support for the revision of this law. He has worked consistently since the election for the repeal of this section of the law.

I feel certain that the Congress will support President Johnson in his pledge to the American people so that in 1965 we shall have a major revision of the law and thereby make it possible for our country and our people to benefit from the contributions of many more great men like Dr. DeBakey. It is my pleasure to insert the article about Dr. DeBakey, which follows:

DR. MICHAEL DEBAKEY, ONE OF AMERICA'S GREAT HEART SURGEONS

HOUSTON, TEX.—Several weeks ago a small, wafer-thin, French housewife, 42, Madame Claire Lestienne, appeared on a Paris television program.

Weak and worn, hollow-cheeked and anemic, around her eyes the jaundiced rings of impending death, she declared in a voice, tired and anguished: "I am doomed to die unless someone watching this program will help me."

Pitifully and simply, Claire Lestienne explained that she was in desperate need of a delicate, complicated heart operation.

"There is only one surgeon in the world," she cried out suddenly and incorrectly, "who can perform that operation and save my life. His name is Dr. Michael DeBakey, and he lives in Houston, Tex. I need $3,500 for my journey and hospital treatment. I have been able to raise only half. If I cannot find the rest of the money I will die in a matter of weeks."

Before the program was finished, a woman-viewer phoned, offering to pay Madame Lestienne's way to and from Houston. "All I ask," she implored, "is that my name be kept secret. I want absolutely no publicity."

The caller, it leaked out, was Sophia Loren.

Thanks to the screen star, Claire Lestienne flew to Houston and checked into the Methodist Hospital. There, Michael Ellis DeBakey, 56, one of the world's great heart surgeons, a no-nonsense taskmaster with much of his staff—he's known as the Texas Tornado. "Watch out men, here he comes, hell on wheels"—but surprisingly gentle with all his patients, took the small, gnarled right hand of housewife Lestienne and rested it in his. In warm tones of French he reassured her that with a little luck and a little surgery, she would enjoy a new lease on life. For the first time in weeks, Claire Lestienne smiled.

Several days later DeBakey ordered her into surgery. From her heart he removed a leaky, defective valve, replaced it with a new artificial one.

Today Claire Lestienne has returned to France, happy, healthier than she's been in decades, adding weight, her morale restored, living evidence of the amazing progress made by adventurous surgery in its all-out attack on diseases of the heart and blood vessels.

ROOTS IN LOUISIANA

No man has launched this attack with more sustained dedication, with more fanatical obsessiveness than Michael DeBakey, lean, driving, dour, hawknosed son of an immigrant Lebanese merchant, Shaker DeBakey. At this century's turn Shaker DeBakey settled in the Cajun country of Lake Charles, La., fathered five children, among them two surgeons, Michael and Ernest, and a medical writer, Selma.

As a surgeon and a human being, Michael DeBakey's history and way of life are both well-nigh incredible. Since 1948 when he first came to Baylor University as chairman of its surgery department, DeBakey has performed 10,500 operations, invented 55 new surgical instruments, written approximately 500 papers, taught thousands of students and physicians, devised new techniques for the repair of blood vessels, saved thousands of lives.

One of his most important contributions to vascular surgery was his introduction of synthetic vessels made of crimpled dacron to replace worn and blocked blood vessels.

When the Duke of Windsor some months ago arrived in Houston with a ballooned artery (the medical terms is "aneurysm") DeBakey cut out the damaged section, deftly substituted a 6-inch tube of dacron which cost 11 cents.

"A few years ago," the physician told me, "when I first got the idea of using dacron for a graft, I stitched it together in the form of a tube on my wife's sewing machine."

Before DeBakey dreamed up the dacron replacement for defective blood vessels, an estimated 90 percent of aneurysm sufferers died, because generally the aneurysm occurs in the aorta, the large artery originating in the left ventricle of the heart with branches carrying blood to all parts of the body. The mortality rate for such patients is now down to 5 percent.

If DeBakey had done nothing else in his life, that contribution would prove accomplishment enough. But he has contributed much more. In the 1930's he developed a roller pump which became a key part of the heart-lung machines so crucial in open-heart surgery. He was on of the pioneers in recognizing the importance of blood banks and transfusions and one of the first to prevent paralytic strokes and death by reaming out the clogged arteries leading to the brain. In one series of 800 operations he and his colleagues relieved the stroke symptoms in 95 percent of the patients they treated early. In the fall of 1963 DeBakey and his team, working in the field of open-heart surgery, installed a mechanism inside a patient's chest to help pump blood.

Most recently he and a team of surgeons at Baylor and a team of engineers at Rice University under Dr. W. W. Akers, have launched a program to develop an implantable artificial heart, an undertaking of tremendous complexity involving surgeons, scientists, physicists, engineers, biologists.

"I think,'" DeBakey says, "that with the right backing we can do it in 5 years."

ENDLESS ENERGY

When DeBakey offers such a time estimate, it is possibly unrealistic because he is talking in terms of himself. He is a dynamo who defies time. His pace is inhuman. He wakes at 4, works 2 or 3 hours on his medical papers, finds himself in surgery by 6:30 a.m. or 7. He operates hour after hour—installing an artificial heart valve, reaming out the carotid artery in the neck, sectioning out an aneurysm of the aorta, repairing a damaged heart. Between operations he dashes down to the closet he calls his office, dictates memos, answers mail, takes a long distance call from Paris or the White House.

At around 3 he leaves surgery to confer with his teams of residents, cardiologists and researchers. Together they pore over X-rays, arteriograms, medical charts, decide on the next day's operations. Some of these men, like Drs. George Morris, Jr., Denton Cooley, Stanley Crawford and Arthur Beall, Jr., are ace surgeons in their own right, men DeBakey describes as "the finest, finest men in the country." Some, like Drs. Bill Hall and Bill Akers, are directors of the artificial heart project.

Always there are visiting firemen of various stripe, professors, physicians, patients, politicians. DeBakey is chairman of President Johnson's commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke. A passionate believer in research, he serves on more community, medical, government and teaching societies than there is room enough to list. Married 28 years, he has a wife (a former nurse, Diana Cooper), four sons and an Alfa-Romeo coupe, gift from a grateful cardiac patient. He drives the Alfa-Romeo to and from the hospital each day and therefore sees it. But when and for how long he sees his wife and children, no one would care to guess.

On the evening we were scheduled to dine together, I wound up watching him and his team perform an emergency operation on a patient whose swollen aorta was about to burst like a blown-out tire tube. The surgery was over at midnight. Later, standing with him in front of a small restaurant bar, eating oysters, I noticed how refreshed DeBakey looked. He is amazingly tireless. Surgery somehow holds for him the rites of exorcism.

What drives this owlish-looking bespectacled man—5 feet 9, 155 pounds, black hair, brown eyes—to work a 20-hour day? By nature he is restless, kinetic, ambitious, curious, an intellectual with an insatiable hunger for knowledge. A colleague who served with him in World War II, when both were assigned to the Office of the Surgeon General, says, "I suspect that as a child Mike was not a member of the ingroup in Lake Charles. I know he played the saxophone in the high school band, but the South is no section to take an immigrant's son close to its social bosom. A good thing for the rest of the world, because Mike was driven by this insecurity to prove his worth, to accomplish, achieve, to show the world he would leave his mark on it. Certainly he's the best thing Lake Charles ever produced. But he's a driven man, a possessed man—a welcome case in my opinion of psychological overcompensation."

"Sure, Mike DeBakey is a driven man," says another colleague. "But you know what drives him? The sight of the promised land. He sees how far we've come. He sees what surgery has done in the fight against heart disease. He knows that cardiovascular disease is the Nation's No. 1 killer. It takes one American life every minute of every hour of every day. He looks toward the day when faulty or dying human hearts can be replaced by artificial ones, and he wants to see that day, bring that day, enjoy that day, be part of that day—make it a day in his lifetime. No wonder he drives himself. Does any man have a better cause for speed?"

In manner, however, unless triggered by the incompetency or disobedience of subordinates—and this is frequent because he is an absolute perfectionist—DeBakey is soft-spoken, personally charming and capable of patient pedagogy with inquiring reporters. Generally he refuses to discuss himself, prefers to talk about the accomplishments of vascular surgery, the prime role of research in medicine, the various team projects he has on the boards.

Ask him about the causes of coronary heart disease and hardening of the arteries, and he says frankly: "I am not a cardiologist. I am a cardiovascular surgeon. But I think it's safe to say that we don't know the causes. We suspect on a statistical basis that overweight, heredity, lack of exercise, too much cholesterol, and some other factors all have some role to play. But we don't know specifically. What we surgeons have been able to do, however, is to provide some effective therapy for the ravages of the disease.

"The man who suffers from heart block—Adams-Stokes disease—can have a little electric pacemaker implanted under his chest so that it regularly stimulates the heart to beat.

"People who suffer from a generalized disease like atherosclerosis (hardening of the arteries), we've discovered that the disease does not spread evenly through all their arteries. Frequently it focuses its attack on certain localized areas like the aorta, which now we're able to repair with a substitute. We're able to ream out arteries, to enlarge them slightly, and prevent further clotting. We've got the means and technique to cure little strokes before they become big ones. We've come a long way."

Ask him about the challenge of the artificial heart, and he says: "I feel confident that we can develop one for humans in 5 years, at the outside 10 years, but there are certain problems to surmount. First, we have to design a pumping mechanism that will not only stimulate the heart function but will not traumatize or destroy the blood. (Once the biologic heart is bypassed or removed, and a pumping mechanism assumes its function, it can only pump blood 5 or 6 hours before the blood deteriorates.) Second, our artificial heart must have built into it a control mechanism that permits the proper controls of the simulated function of both chambers of the heart. In the normal heart the controls are so delicate that they provide a coordinating function; the output of one chamber is comparable to the output of the other. They never get out of balance.

"In addition to this," DeBakey continues, "we must develop materials which will last. And another problem we'll have to solve is related to a power source to drive the artificial heart. And, of course, the whole package must be small enough to be implanted within the human body.

"WE'RE MAKING PROGRESS"

"These are all major problems," he concedes, "but we're making steady progress, and I know we can beat them. The answer lies in constant support and constant research."

Last month a team of Baylor University physicians and Rice University engineers tested their latest artificial heart on a female mongrel. They implanted a two-ventricle mechanism about the size of two packages of cigarettes. The dog lived with it for more than 3 hours, and according to Dr. William Hall, "We could have kept her alive quite a while longer."

Research centers in Cleveland and elsewhere have previously implanted artificial hearts in dogs and calves and kept them alive for as long as 27 hours, using, of course, periodic transfusions of fresh blood. But the accomplishment of the Baylor-Rice artificial heart is that it succeeded in duplicating the delicate, complicated action of the human heart, allowing each chamber of the heart to pump blood at its needed rate.

Made of silastic, an inert plastic, the two chambers of the Baylor-Rice heart were lashed together with a band of nylon, and for reinforcement, the two chambers were lined with stainless steel screen wire. In the experiment the first band broke and had to be replaced with a second.

The artificial heart was designed and built at Rice by the Biomedical Engineering Lab where researchers emphasize that it will not be the model eventually used in humans but may be something like it.

Before the year is out, artificial heart experiments will probably be conducted on human beings, undoubtedly on terminal heart patients. All over the country—at Thermo Electron Engineering in Waltham, Mass., Autonetics in Anaheim, Calif.—engineers are working on small pumps capable of circulating blood through the body and developing power sources from air, heat, nuclear energy, and body metabolism.

In a matter of years plastic hearts will be substituted for damaged ones. They will serve either temporarily until the damage is healed, or they will permanently take over the heart's function.

When that memorable day arrives, what will it mean to you? What will it mean to your children, your grandchildren? Inevitably many of us will live longer and longer, and the earth will fill up with more and more old people. Suppose future generations live to age 100 or 125 which is a distinct possibility. Will there be enough food to feed them, enough room to shelter them, enough work to employ them?

When I asked Dr. DeBakey those same questions, a small sonata of a smile played itself on his lips. He raised both his superb, life-restoring surgeon's hands with palms outstretched. He shook his head from side to side, quickly and good-naturedly confessed: "For those questions, I'm afraid, I have no answers. I'm only a surgeon—not a god. And I'm sure the Lord will agree that I've got enough problems on my hands without taking over some of His."

Recent Soviet Displays of Strategic Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the popular press has taken little note of the facts, and even less note of the meaning, of the recent Soviet displays of developed strategic weapons. The technical press have, however, both noted and called attention to the potential dangers evidenced by recent Soviet developments. One of the best discussions which has appeared is in an editorial published in the May 17 issue of Aviation Week and Space Technology. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "The Tocsin Sounds," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Aviation Week and Space Technology, May 17, 1965]

THE TOCSIN SOUNDS

The rumble of Russian solid-fueled ICBM carriers through Red Square and the growing crescendo of the shooting war in Vietnam are beginning to shake the facade of rosy optimism that Defense Secretary Robert Strange McNamara has erected around his defense policies during the past 4 years. Although Mr. McNamara repeatedly assured the American people and their Congress that his defense budget was adequate to cover any contingencies, including the war in Vietnam, President Lyndon Johnson has made it clear that it wasn't.

President Johnson's request for a $700 million emergency appropriation to finance the war in Vietnam, coming only a few months after Mr. McNamara submitted his fiscal 1966 defense budget, clearly indicates a major miscalculation in that budget. Another indication of how far Mr. McNamara's public pronouncements are straying from the facts is his continual denial that additional aircraft and helicopter procurement would be needed to replace Vietnam losses.

Those public denials continued until a few days before President Johnson's emergency request, which included $180 million for additional helicopters and tactical fighters. President Johnson indicated in making his request that it probably would be the first in a series of defense supplemental appropriations required to support the escalating war in Vietnam. We think his estimate of this requirement will prove to be more accurate than the self-justifying statements of his defense secretary.

President Johnson's steady flow of U.S. Marines and airborne troops to Vietnam in recent months also contrasts strongly with Mr. McNamara's repeated statements that the United States could safely reduce its forces in Vietnam and clean up the war by the end of this year. Estimates by top military officials in Vietnam of the possible duration of that conflict now stretch as long as 10 years. Congress, shaken by the $700 million supplemental appropriation coming so soon after the formal budget submission, is beginning to get inklings of how badly other U.S. combat units are being stripped of weapons and ammunition to support the current Vietnam effort. Congress also is beginning to suspect that any further escalation will reveal serious shortages in areas where Mr. McNamara had assured it that all was well.

But more serious than Mr. McNamara's poor forecasting of the tide of war in Vietnam are some disturbing signs that he has been even wider of the mark in estimating the military development of the Soviet Union. For several years the United States has been reassured that our possession of the solid-fueled Minuteman and Polaris ICBM's enabled us to maintain a posture of effective strategic deterrence toward the U.S.S.R. which possessed only awkward, vulnerable liquid-fueled ICBM's in negligible strategic quantities. During the past 6 months the Soviets have displayed publicly four types of solid-fueled ICBM's, two of which are launched underwater from nuclear-powered submarines. The other two ICBM's closely resemble the USAF Minuteman configuration of a solid missile which is capable of silo firing from hardened, dispersed and concealed sites. Also significant was the appearance in Red Square on May 9 of a new solid-fueled MRBM in a mobile self-contained launching rig. This missile, nicknamed "Iron Maiden," is a great state-of-the-art advance over the ponderous liquid-fueled Sandal missiles that were deployed in Cuba. The mobility and solid-fuel quick-launch capability of the "Iron Maiden" make it a far more difficult target than the earlier-generation liquid-fueled Shysters and Sandals. It is also much less vulnerable to reconnaissance.

There was a school of military-scientific thought, more prevalent in the Kennedy administration than currently, that the Soviets were developing offensive weapons only because they were spurred by our own progress. This school, which was weighted heavily with scientists turned politicians, maintained that if the United States stopped developing new generations of strategic weapons the Soviets also would do so voluntarily, and the arms race would have a happy ending. The recent displays in Red Square have proved how fallacious were those hopes. For the Soviets are plodding relentlessly toward their goal of surpassing the United States in strategic weapons of the future—a goal that they narrowly missed in the first generation of liquid-fueled ICBM's.

There are also indications that the Soviets are still working hard on developing supersonic bombers and large military transports to give long-range mobility to their ground forces in support of Communist-sponsored revolutions in Africa and Asia. The Blinder supersonic twin-engine bomber, first revealed to the West at the Tushino air show in 1961, was deprecated by Mr. McNamara at that time because of the relatively small turbojets powering the prototypes. The Blinder is now in full-scale production in Russia, and it is fitted with a pair of the 40,000-pound thrust turbojets that were being test-flown in the Bounder in 1961.

With each passing year it becomes more and more apparent that the Soviets agreed to the partial nuclear test ban treaty at a time most advantageous to them and most disadvantageous to us. The Soviets already had tested their nuclear warheads over the entire spectrum—from underwater devices to 50-megaton air bursts including live ICBM warheads. The United States has not tested any of its nuclear warheads in strategic systems and can only theorize about the effects that high-altitude nuclear blasts in the 50-megaton-and-up range will have on communications and control networks of silo-based ICBM's and other strategic systems.

Mr. McNamara has based his defense policy on the belief that he will be able to detect any new Soviet weapons development in time to develop a U.S. countermeasure before the Russians can become operational with their new force. Since several of the new Soviet ICBM's and an anti-ICBM shown in recent Red Square parades came as a complete surprise to the Western intelligence community, it would appear that this assumption by Mr. McNamara is open to serious challenge. History may prove that Mr. McNamara's view of the timespan available for the United States to counterdevelop weapons to thwart a Soviet challenge is as wrong as his forecasts of the war in Vietnam.

Unless corrected quickly, this aspect of Mr. McNamara's military myopia may be even more dangerous. This is because his research and development policies are not pushing the key new technologies hard enough to move into those areas that the Soviets already perceive.

ROBERT HOTZ.

Brief Summary of Quality Stabilization Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19,1965

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act in the following ways:

First. Gives recognition to the legitimate interest of the owner of a brand name or trademark, in stimulating public demand for his goods through effective distribution. It recognizes and confirms the property rights of any brand name or trademark, and in the trade and public goodwill it symbolizes. These property rights in the brand name or trademark will not be diminished or extinguished by any sale or transfer of goods to which the brand name or trademark relates.

Second. Grants the owner of a brand name or trademark the right to revoke for a period of not more than 1 year for the first violation the use of his brand name or trademark in reselling the goods identified by that brand name or trademark if:

(a) The person reselling such goods has used them as "bait merchandise," or

(b) The person reselling such goods, after written notice of the resale price established by the owner of the brand name or trademark, offered for sale or actually sold the goods at a price other than the one suggested, or

(c) The reseller intends to deceive purchasers by publishing a misrepresentation within 90 days before the written notice of revocation.

For the revocation to be effective the reseller must have received written notice of the trademark or brand name owner's currently established resale price, and acquired the goods after being given such a notice. But before a trademark owner may utilize the provisions of this legislation his goods must be in free and open competition with other goods that can be used for the same general purpose that are available to the public from other sources.

It should be noted, however, that the provisions of this legislation would not be applicable to the conduct of anyone who resells a brand name or trademark good after removing the insignia from the commodity and does not, therefore, employ in any way the goodwill of the brand name or trademark.

Third. Gives protection to the rights of the reseller of the merchandise on hand after his right to employ the brand name or trademark has been revoked by allowing two courses of action—

(a) Sell the goods in the regular course of business so long as he does not use it as bait merchandise, misrepresent or change the suggested retail price,

(b) Return to the brand name or trademark owner the inventory of the item for full refund of price plus transportation costs,

Fourth. Protects the reseller against discriminatory conduct by the owner of the trademark or brand name.

Fifth. Preserves the rights of the owner of a brand name or trademark in instances not covered in this legislation but already protected in law. This legislation is not repealing any of the present laws relating to the protection of trademarks.

Sixth. This legislation would apply to all commercial action which Congress may lawfully regulate, using the full sweep of its power over interstate commerce. But the people of each State would be free to accept or reject coverage under this legislation. If a State did not accept it there are safeguards provided for protecting States that do against such activities as mail-order businesses that would thwart the purpose of this legislation.

Seventh. Contains the requirement that each currently established resale price or resale price range should be uniform at each level of distribution except for reasonable marketing costs.

Eighth. Exempts:

(a) Sales of bulk commodities sold without wrappers or containers,

(b) Sales by any officer acting under orders or authority of a court,

(c) Sales of damaged, deteriorated, defaced, or secondhand goods,

(d) Sales of drugs, medicines, and devices for which State laws require a prescription,

(e) Sales to or by the Federal, State or municipal governments,

(f) Sales to charitable, educational, medical, and religious organizations for their own use and not for resale.

But Do They Really Help the Poor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, in an appraisal of some of the current Great Society programs, television station WJBK-TV and radio station WJBK, both in Detroit, editorially aired their views in recent broadcasts.

The text of the editorial follows:

BUT DO THEY REALLY "HELP THE POOR"?

Millions upon millions of dollars are being poured into urban renewal, war on poverty, youth employment, and other projects which use public money to try to improve the lives of poor people in the great cities of America.

Detroit is one of the most-talked-of examples, where enormous sums of Government money have been spent, and vast new projects are discussed. But in Deroit there is a rising chorus of voices which say: "Are these programs really helping the poor, or transforming the city as promised?" Urban renewal, for example, has been bulldozing houses and shops in Detroit for 15 years, and those families which have not fled from the path of the bulldozer and disappeared from the records have been helped to find housing elsewhere.

But the findings of a year-long study by Wayne State University sociologists, just released, show that the effect is actually only to push slums from one place to another.

People uprooted from one place do not change their nature just because they are forced to move to another area and their economic status remains the same. There is just as much unemployment, delinquency, illegitimacy, and illiteracy as before only in another neighborhood. And the new housing found for the uprooted people may be quite beyond their means thus leading to still more reliance on public aid and welfare.

Meanwhile, bitter criticism is also heard of the meager results of the war on poverty throughout Detroit. Very few concrete gains can be found at the poverty level, although well-paid staffs are busily engaged in "counseling" and other advisory services.

WJBK called attention to the weaknesses of both urban renewal and the war on poverty months ago. We noted that urban renewal was long on bulldozing vast empty spaces in Detroit, but short on anything but paper dreams from that point on.

We noted that the highly publicized war on poverty duplicated services already performed by more than a hundred agencies in Detroit and that a far better job-finding agency already existed in the Michigan Employment Security Commission.

That was months ago. There has been no change. The poor are as bad off as ever * * * maybe more so * * * and the citizens of Detroit are beginning to wonder * * *.

We recommend to the common council that it ask the city housing commission for a point-by-point answer to the charges in the Wayne State study * * * without gingerbread or frosting. And we urge the council to look upon the war on poverty * * * to see just how many permanent jobs have been found for the poor.

Let's talk facts for a change * * * instead of rosy dreams.

An Indigestible Remedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19,1965

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, there appeared an interesting editorial in the May 17 edition of the Wall Street Journal which I am sure will be of interest:

AN INDIGESTIBLE REMEDY

It is to the credit of the Ways and Means Committee that it found another cut in the tourists' customs allowance rather hard to swallow. But swallow it the committee did, if only after some force-feeding by the administration.

Under the new bill, which is supposed to help remedy the balance-of-payments deficit, American tourists would be allowed to bring home, duty-free, no more than $50 worth of foreign trinkets, compared with the present limit of $100. Before Congress first cracked down on tourists in 1961, the figure was $500.

There were plenty of reasons why the committee should have found the customs crackdown unpalatable. As politicians they must have been a bit queasy about resting the heaviest part of the burden on the many thousands of schoolteachers and other Americans who may go overseas once in a lifetime. The reductions in the allowance plainly are much less troublesome to the smaller number of more prosperous and heavier spending travelers.

Moreover, the legislators surely were aware that the 1961 cut in the allowance brought no reduction either in the number of Americans traveling abroad or the amounts they spent; to the contrary, both figures have risen sharply. Perhaps tourists spent more in Parisian night clubs and less on souvenirs, but the result was no more helpful to the balance of payments. And if a $400 cut accomplished nothing in 1961, is there any good reason to hope that a $50 slash will do more in 1965?

Yet such doubts seemingly were swept away by forceful sales talks from officials of the administration. All we need to do, the officials' argument runs, is to clamp down on tourists and, of course, continue those "voluntary" restrictions on private lending and investment overseas; foreign bankers will be impressed with our determination and the payments deficit will forever vanish.

However persuasive this argument may have seemed to the Congressmen, there's evidence many foreign bankers can't digest it. A number of them insist the dollar's standing will continue to sink so long as our Government keeps running it down with high spending, big budget deficits, and artificially easy money. They may sound old fashioned to people in Washington, but they have a lot of unhappy history to back them up.

Perhaps, as an administration spokesman piously avers, another cut in the customs allowance will influence some tourists not to splurge abroad. Unquestionably the proposal stands as further evidence of the Government's fetish for controlling the citizens while refusing to curb its own appetite for luxurious living.

Trade With the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it be foolish if a man threatened to kill you and you handed him the weapon to help him make good his threat? No sensible person would do such a foolhardy thing. Yet, that is exactly what the administration is now proposing in calling for relaxing trade restrictions with Soviet Russia and her Communist satellite nations.

Trade is a weapon the Communists use in the worldwide conspiracy to take over free governments. Communist Russia does not honor trade agreements, international patent rights, nor any of the international laws which inspire workable trade relations among the community of nations.

In spite of the Russian history of broken agreements, aggression, and default of legitimate debts, the administration, and I am sorry to say, some of our business leaders now urge that we help shore up a weakening Communist economy. Let's not forget the Communist goal has not changed. It was first stated by Lenin and has been repeated by every Communist leader since that time, including the present leaders in the Kremlin. The Communists intend to rule the world and in order to do so they will destroy the United States.

If you believe they have relaxed their efforts in achieving this goal then you are not paying much attention to the daily headlines about Communist aggression in Vietnam supported by Communist Russia; Communist infiltration in the Dominican Republic, with the full support of the Soviet Union and her Red satellite Cuba which we permitted her to establish in the Western Hemisphere.

The Communist economy is in a bad way. They cannot produce the consumer goods they need for their people and at the same time devote huge sums to building up their war machine. So the administration intends to help them by relieving them of the need to invest in the development of consumer goods production. They will then be in a position to maintain and enlarge their arsenal of weapons and continue to encourage aggression in all parts of the world.

A warning against trade with Soviet Russia was issued a year ago by R. G. Follis, chairman of the Board of the Standard Oil Co., of California in the April 1964 issue of the Bulletin issued by his company. To remind you how dangerous a game we are playing, I include the article by Mr. Follis as a part of these remarks:

TRADE WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

The U.S.S.R. wants to trade the West for prototypes of advanced industrial plants that will let them bypass five decades of research and experience, keep their technical resources at work on military projects and give them a big competitive edge in world markets.

From all the economic barometers, from reports from within Russia herself, the Soviet economy is sagging, and badly. Growth of heavy industry has slowed to a crawl; in other sectors, such as agriculture, the slowdown amounts to stagnation.

At the same time, there is an apparent relaxation of tensions in the Soviet cold war with the West. Whether or not these two things are related cannot be known for sure. One facet of the present "thaw" is a Soviet invitation for more trade with the West. Even now, to help ease their food crisis, America is selling grain to the U.S.S.R. Meanwhile, Russia continues to dump oil on world markets wherever it can be used to open free world countries to infiltration, and at the same time secure more foreign credits, at whatever price. It is not clear that the U.S.S.R. and the free world have the same understanding of the word "trade."

What do the Russians really want? They have already indicated what it is. Despite their aggressiveness and the advanced technology displayed in their military and related activities, the Russian plant for supplying consumer goods for peacetime use is inefficient and obsolete in many areas. To bring the Russian plant into shape would require years and years of devoting to the task huge amounts of capital and, most important of all, technical manpower which in our unbelievably complex technical era puts a firm limit on what can be done in any society.

What they are asking for, in their trade deals, is industrial machinery. Not to equip their whole industrial complex, but just one or two ultramodern plants in each category: chemicals, steel, petroleum, rubber, and a long list of other vital elements. These are obviously needed for just one purpose—model prototypes. At one stroke, by simply copying (Russia does not believe in patents) they will have bypassed 50 or more years of trial and error, of research, inspiration, and invention. And their plants, unlike those of the West, will all be of the most modern, advanced type, able to pour manufactured goods into the marketplace in quantity and price almost impossible to match. In other words, they want to repeat the massive transfer to them of Western technology which took place in the thirties and early forties. Then similar plants in a wide spectrum were made available to them—thus relieving their technological manpower so that their energies could be directed to military and other activities.

And what will the Russians use for trade goods to obtain these plants? The most accessible resource the Soviets have to offer the free world for exchange is their oil—they have already opened and disrupted several markets in the West with it. Further evidence that petroleum is their prime "trading" weapon is its top priority on the list of modern prototype plants wanted. Russia, before any other plants, wants samples of advanced major refineries and petrochemical plants. Once these plants are duplicated and reduplicated and in operation, they may well pay for the prototypes of all the rest.

What is Russia's eventual aim? On this, we have direct evidence. It is in their own statements. One such statement is contained in a speech made by Premier Khrushchev only last December at the Soviet Communist Party meeting in Moscow. It said, in effect, that when the U.S.S.R. had succeeded in obtaining from the West the equipment it needed to avert disaster, it would be able to then "inflict a crushing blow on the Old World and establish with incontestable conclusiveness the superiority of socialism over capitalism."

This is not a simple challenge of "competition"—and not just a matter of the oil industry alone. Petroleum happens to be the vehicle selected to force the door; if the Soviets can obtain the technical prototype machinery in this field, the new plants they will then build can, and will, secure the foreign exchange power needed by Russia to repeat the performance with every other industry.

It can be hoped that our own Government will be foresighted enough—in this one field of technical industry or in any other—not to create such "competition" for its own economy by permitting the sale to Russia of prototype equipment. To do so would be to abet a Russian purpose which is neither constructive nor beneficial. It is, in short, the complete destruction of our economy (including our oil and all other industry) and eventually our entire way of life. Perhaps we could convince some of our allies of this fact, too.

R. G. FOLLIS,
Chairman of the Board.

The 30th Anniversary of the REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GALE SCHISLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the month of May pass without taking note of the anniversary of a program which has helped to improve the living standards for all of rural America. The program was initiated by the Executive order of President Franklin Roosevelt in 1935 for the purpose of providing more jobs for our rural population. A year later the Congress created it as a lending agency only, for the purpose of financing electrical systems in rural areas. By 1949 it was given the job of extending and improving telephone service in rural areas through loans. I am speaking, of course, of the Rural Electrification Administration.

It is well to pause for a moment, in this day when we live within easy access to electricity and modern communications systems, and look at the beginnings of the REA program, which now serves more than half the geographical area of the Nation. As one who was born and raised on an Illinois farm, I believe I know the basis for the devotion that rests with the REA program.

When the Rural Electrification Act was passed in 1936, only 1 farm in 10 had central station electric service. When Congress enacted the REA telephone program in 1949, only 38 percent of the Nation's farms had telephone service of any kind, most of which was totally inadequate and of very limited use. The history of the REA is rooted in the deep frustration that surrounded rural families in the early 1930's after years of attempting to get the nearest power supplier to stretch his lines a half mile or even further so that they might have the comfort of electric lights in the house.

In 1935, at the end of its first half century, the electrical industry in the United States was generating about 95 billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually, in a plant costing $13 billion. To many in the industry, the advent of Government-financed rural electrification and the creation of TVA were the thrusts of a nationalized power industry.

But the record shows that these critics are wrong. REA did not harm the private segment of the electric power industry. Instead, its example of widespread electric service at lowest possible rates caused the commercial power industry to become more active in serving the needs of the Nation.

Our own State of Illinois has been a leader in the cooperative movement. The total loans approved to rural electric systems in our State since 1935 has amounted to $151,449,918. These loans have benefited 156,919 rural people in Illinois through central stations of electrical service.

In 1935, 12 percent of all farms in Illinois had electrical service. Today more than 98 percent of our farms are serviced with electricity. The efforts of REA borrowers have greatly stimulated extension of electric service by other suppliers to our farm families.

People on the lines of REA-financed systems in Illinois used an average of 596 kilowatt-hours of electricity per month in 1964. This was more than double the monthly usage of 10 years ago. And the demand continues to rise.

In my own district, the Farmers Mutual Electric Co. of Geneseo has been loaned a total of $702,000 since 1935. Seven hundred and fifteen consumers in the area are being serviced and 264 miles of line has been built. The Spoon River Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Canton, has been loaned a total of $3,882,956; 3,701 citizens are being serviced, and 1,181 miles of line are being used.

There are two additional electric cooperatives which service the people of my district: The Illinois Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., services Henry and Knox Counties; the McDonough Power Cooperative services Fulton, Henderson, Knox, and Warren Counties. Illinois Valley Electric has been loaned $3,261,381; 3,858 consumers are being serviced and 1,401 miles of line are being used. The McDonough Power Co. services 3,627 people with 1,321 miles of line, and has been loaned a total of $3,089,000.

The telephone loan program through the REA was authorized by Congress in October of 1949 and has made a great impact in the State of Illinois.

To date $39,675,143 has been approved in telephone loans to 29 telephone systems. Of these 29 systems 22 are commercial and 7 are cooperatives. Ninety-one percent of all farms in the State now have telephone service; 177 automatic dial exchanges are in operation to serve the people of Illinois.

The 19th district has three REA-financed telephone systems. The Port Byron Telephone Co., Inc., located at Port Byron has been loaned $1,235,000 to serve 3,258 subscribers. It services Henry and Rock Island Counties. The Mid-Century Telephone Cooperative, of Canton, has been loaned $2,295,000 to serve 4,215 subscribers. It serves the counties of Fulton, Henry, and Knox.

The newest borrowers in the State of Illinois is the Mercer-Rock Island Telephone Co. On April 29, 1965, this company was loaned $500,000 in order to implement service for 454 subscribers in 2

counties; 167 miles of line are being built to replace the outmoded exchange at Eliza with new and larger dial exchanges. The new service will be entirely private lines.

Recognition should be made of the outstanding manner in which locally owned cooperatives are meeting their loan obligations to the Government. Every cooperative in the State of Illinois is either currently meeting its loans payments or is paying the loan off ahead of schedule. This accentuates the fact that this is a program of tremendous cooperation—cooperation between town and country and cooperation between the people and their Government.

Electric power and modern telecommunications like highways are essential to the economic progress of any area. The cooperatives in Illinois have brought this vital service into rural areas of the State and are thereby making a constructive contribution to the economic progress and well-being of the people they serve.

Stingy Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, on March 22 of this year I introduced a bill which would increase the pay by about 50 percent for persons entering our military service and those with less than 2 years of service.

This bill, H.R. 6553, was referred to the Armed Services Committee.

The President has now announced his recommended proposals for pay increases for civilian and military employees of the Federal Government.

Again, Mr. Speaker, our uniformed personnel with 2 years or less of service have been neglected through the omission of special recommendation.

I can think of no better way to dramatize how this glaring injustice has been received by responsible people in this Nation, than to cite an editorial entitled "Stingy Raise," which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel on Monday of this week.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the Sentinel continually espouses a partisan Republican point of view in its editorial columns, and was one of the very few Wisconsin newspapers which endorsed the Republican candidate for President in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the Sentinel editorial in the RECORD at this point, but I wish to emphasize the opinion of that conservative newspaper on this subject by quoting:

There is no question, however, that the present pay scale for enlisted personnel is woefully inadequate and when compared with what troops in the war on poverty are getting, grossly inequitable.

STINGY RAISE

Paltry is the word for the pay raise President Johnson has asked Congress to give to enlisted men and women with less than 2 years of service in the Armed Forces.

The President has proposed average increases of 3 percent in Federal civilian salaries and 4.8 percent in compensation for all uniformed personnel with more than 2 years of service. Those are hardly munificent. But they are generous compared with the 2.7-percent increase in base pay proposed for enlisted men and women with less than 2 years of service.

A military recruit now starts at $78 per month. If the proposed pay increase is adopted it would mean a salary boost of a little over $2 a month, $25 for a year.

YOUTH CORPS BETTER PAID

When it comes to paying its own, the Government follows a niggardly wage guideline for draftees or enlistees. For others, the Government is not quite so parsimonious. It pays a volunteer who enters a youth corps camp to escape poverty $105 a month, $25 more a month than the recruit would get. In some cases, a youth corpsman will work a 32-hour week at $1.25 an hour, making $172 a month. And, unlike the recruit, he doesn't face the risk of getting shot.

The Defense Department is concluding a yearlong study of military conscription with a finding that the draft must be continued when the current law expires in 1967.

It is no wonder that the Government has to resort to the force of the draft to replenish the military ranks, considering the miserly wages it pays its servicemen.

Whether better pay would attract voluntary enlistments to an extent sufficient to make the draft unnecessary is debatable.

There is no question, however, that the present pay scale for enlisted personnel is woefully inadequate and, when compared with what troops in the war on poverty are getting, grossly inequitable.

It is bad enough that the draft has come to be a peacetime fixture in the American way of life. The Govermnent compounds the ill by paying inductees and enlistees an inadequate wage.

As Kenneth Galbraith points out, the draft is "a device by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay."

Winning Essays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I had the great pleasure of entertaining for luncheon 16 pupils from the Mount Pleasant Elementary School of Easton, Md.

This group had the privilege of visiting our Nation's Capital as a result of winning the school's essay contest on Americanism.

The essays are very well written and all of us can learn a valued lesson from the thoughts and ideas expressed by these young people.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the winning essays from the sixth grade class:

ESSAY BY BECKY SARVEY; AGE 11

A good American citizen is a person who stands up for the ideas he believes are reasonable. He votes for well-qualified candidates who he thinks are fitted for the job. He finds out the country's problems and does his best to solve them. He has an active interest in the kind of government his country has. A good American citizen is also loyal to his government and country.

ESSAY BY BEVERLY SARD; AGE 12

In being a good American citizen you have many responsibilities. The most important one is upholding the law. You should also respect authority. But in being a truly good citizen you should know and really love your country. Then you would naturally do what is best for her.

Treat All the States Alike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Knoxville Journal of Knoxville, Tenn., carried its third editorial on voting rights in its issue of May 17, 1965, entitled "Treat All the States Alike."

The editorial was written by Guy L. Smith, editor, who also authored the other editorials. I inserted the other two in the RECORD, and I feel that this is part of the story.

Certainly, all of the States should be treated alike.

TREAT ALL THE STATES ALIKE

There is considerable lack of understanding about what the current text of the voting rights bill of 1965 is because the Senate leadership comes up with a new text every little bit. The latest version before the Senate, introduced on April 30, became the target last week of a rebellion of Senate liberals sparked by the Kennedys against the leaderships of both political parties. The rebel Democrat forces, including both Senators GORE and BASS, of Tennessee, insisted upon keeping in the bill a provision which would out of hand ban all poll tax requirements as related to voting.

The latest text of the voting rights bill is applicable to four States, and it appears that Senators MANSFIELD and DIRKSEN, backed by U.S. Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, were in some doubt as to the constitutionality of such a ban. Therefore, in the April 30 version, poll tax requirements are not outlawed by the bill itself but a provision of it directs the Attorney General to bring suit immediately to a Federal court to determine whether poll tax requirements should be struck down. The Senate leaderships mustered a small majority for the new version, which actually has the same effect as the ban originally included in the bill. In the meantime, the House Judiciary Committee has voted out a bill including the original ban, so in the long run nobody can predict which version will finally become law.

Actually, what is of most interest in this recent dispute is that Senators MANSFIELD and DIRKSEN, or even Mr. Katzenbach, should feel any squeamishness about this or any other question of constitutionality where their bill is concerned. When they have agreed upon a bill which sets up a formula (for having Federal registrars appointed to

take over elections) based upon census figures and percentages of persons voting in the election last year, striking down all voting eligibility requirements in 8 or 10 States and at the same time leaving similar ones standing in 14 States outside the South, then who gives a whoop about constitutionality, anyway?

The Knoxville Journal has urged, with no hope of its views being adopted, that since constitutionality has been tossed out the window already, then Congress is under a responsibility to make the bill being debated unconstitutional where all States are concerned, not in those only which are the present targets of this legislation. The Senate has overwhelmingly defeated an amendment which would have established the ability to read and write as a prerequisite for voting in the target States, and yet leaves much more difficult eligibility tests on the books in 14 States outside the South. This is the very kind of discrimination against whole States that has undeniably been practiced against Negroes in some of them—not all.

Congress should not be guilty of the same kind of discrimination it claims to be eradicating. A fair bill would adopt uniform eligibility requirements for voting in all States, making it possible for Federal examiners or registrars to move into such States as Illinois or New York to protect voter rights just as they are authorized to do in the black belt of the South.

If we are going to have an unconstitutional bill, then let us have one equally unconstitutional where every State in the Union is concerned.

Juggled Figures Confuse Employment Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 18, "Poor Statistics and Worse Economics."

I am afraid, in its desire to force enactment of huge welfare and spending programs the administration is resorting to a little sleight of hand in juggling statistics. The least we should expect, if we are to legislate intelligently, is a presentation of honest figures from the various departments in the executive branch.

The editorial follows:

POOR STATISTICS AND WORSE ECONOMICS

As a voice in the statistical wilderness that has long questioned the validity of the Federal unemployment estimates, we naturally welcome Samuel Lubell's call for a new and sharper definition of the jobless.

Mr. Lubell, the diligent and perceptive political pollster, has spent many recent weeks interviewing hundreds of people out of work in 21 cities around the Nation. His overriding conclusion is that the national unemployment rate as proclaimed by Washington is in several ways misleading and in need of considerable revision.

It is not only that the figures distorts the actual condition. What is worse is that it has come to be regarded as the single most important barometer of the Nation's economic climate. It can be, and is, used as the basis for vast new public spending programs, however irrelevant or wasteful they may be. Another way of putting it, in our somewhat jaundiced view, is that it has become a convenient tool for politicians eager to tap the Treasury.

Yet this sacrosanct statistic, as Mr. Lubell observes, does not provide an accurate estimate of how serious is the need for more jobs. For one thing, the Government does not even attempt to measure the job vacancies that exist along with unemployment. Nor does the announced national rate yield, in the interviewer's words, "a sensitive picture of the shifts taking place in the quality of the unemployed and of the changing nature of their problems."

Moreover, the figure does not tell how much, or how little, hardship there is among the jobless. To us this is a particularly important point. Surely a humanitarian nation should be more concerned with the actual cases of hardship than with statistical veneration. Beyond that, we reject the proletarian doctrine, implicit in governmental attitudes, that everyone should work regardless of need. If some people can make a decent life without working, we would say that is their privilege and pleasure.

Part of the trouble with the official unemployment rate stems from the sampling methods used, a survey of 35,000 households in which the main question is, "Have you been looking for work?"; if the answer is yes, the individual is counted as unemployed. As sampling techniques go, 35,000 households might be considered adequate, though obviously capable of producing only a broad national guess. The loose questioning is another matter.

One of its results, Mr. Lubell writes, is that "the identical label 'unemployed' is applied to such an astonishing variety of situations that it has been robbed of much of its real meaning. A coal miner who has lost his job for good is given the same statistical weight as an autoworker who is guaranteed 70 percent of his pay even when laid off for model changes."

The sweeping definition of "unemployed" also leads to abundant abuse: People who are on jobless relief but won't look for work, people who won't take jobs at pay lower than they had been making, people who don't need to work at all but receive compensation. One young man interviewed at an extension university admitted that he was a full-time student and shouldn't be getting unemployment checks.

To give the Labor Department its due, it does put out certain breakdowns of unemployment by groups. Unfortunately the more significant of these figures are usually granted scant attention by the public, the politicians and apparently Labor Department officials themselves, since they are among those who constantly contend that the aggregate level of unemployment is intolerable.

Almost certainly, it seems to us, the most revealing estimate, in terms both of degree of hardship and of economic significance, is not the national rate, currently given as 4.9 percent of the labor force, but the jobless rate for married men. These, after all, are generally speaking the people who do need to work and who comprise the bulk of the labor force. By any standard they are far more deserving of concern than the jobless teenagers about whom there is so much weeping.

That rate for married men is presently put at 2.5 percent. If it is anywhere near a correct approximation, it represents not a state of intolerable unemployment but for all practical purposes full employment. In a huge, complex and mobile economy, with a considerable amount of seasonal employment, it would be difficult if not impossible to attain a much lower rate of unemployment.

The deficiencies of the jobless tabulations suggest their own remedies. One private group, the National Industrial Conference Board, has just shown, in a local survey, the way to correcting part of the problem—the compilation of job-vacancy figures. It is by no means unlikely that a national survey would indicate more job opportunities than qualified job-seekers.

But what is needed most of all is public realization that the lot of the genuinely unemployed is being employed for questionable political purposes. In such a climate, it is at least encouraging when attempts are made to expose an arrangement which builds, on a foundation of faulty evaluation, a pyramid of bad economic policy.

The 1965 College Chemistry Teacher Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of the House the names of three outstanding college professors selected by the chemical industry to receive 1965 college chemistry teacher awards. The awards, which will be presented by the Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., on June 3, consist of a medal and a citation, accompanied by a check for $1,000. MCA, the oldest chemical industry trade association in the United States, has conducted the college chemistry awards program for the past 9 years with the aims of directing public attention to the importance of good science teaching at the undergraduate level; honoring the men and women engaged in college science teaching; and inspiring qualified students to choose careers in science. To date, 45 professors have been honored by the chemical industry as outstanding college chemistry professors.

Those selected to receive the award this year are:

Dr. Ernest L. Eliel, professor and head of the department of chemistry, University of Notre Dame.

Dr. William Franklin Kieffer, professor of chemistry, the College of Wooster.

Dr. Albin Iver Johnson, professor of chemical engineering and chairman of the department, McMaster University.

Dr. Eliel has been teaching in the University of Notre Dame chemistry department since receiving his Ph. D. from the University of Illinois in 1948. I am proud to have known him as a good friend and constituent for many years. For a number of years he has singled out the more capable sophomores in chemistry and given them the opportunity to collaborate with graduate students on original research. About 80 percent of the chemistry majors from the University of Notre Dame go on to graduate study.

Dr. Eliel's advanced textbook, "Stereochemistry of Carbon Compounds," has been described as a classic in its field and has been adopted as a text in many other

colleges and universities. Much of Dr. Eliel's impact as a teacher derives from his universal interests as a chemist, and in research he has been associated with many undergraduates as well as graduate students and postdoctorals.

Dr. Kieffer has been a professor of chemistry at the College of Wooster for the past 21 years. He received his Ph. D. from Brown University, his master's from Ohio State, and his B.A. from Wooster. In all his lecture work he attempts to develop basic points and applications and sends undergraduate majors to the original literature in solving problems and writing papers. Dr. Kieffer constantly demands a high standard of student preparation and rejects routine and superficial parroting of text or lecture material. He has been editor of the Journal of Chemical Education for 10 years and served as chairman of the American Chemical Society Advisory Committee for Continental Classroom. Dr. Kieffer also was on the committee that planned the Ford Foundation-sponsored project of putting a complete high school chemistry course on film.

Dr. Johnson was associate or assistant professor at the University of Toronto and Johns Hopkins University prior to joining the faculty at McMaster University in 1963. He has been in the forefront of the application of simulation and optimization procedure in chemical engineering. His basic objectives in presenting chemical engineering are to stimulate students in expressing a physical problem in mathematical terms; to exploit modern teaching and computational aids in increasing classroom efficiency; and to relate laboratory experiments to modern chemical engineering theory.

Today quality teachers are in short supply. Their number will never be adequate. These three science teachers honored by the chemical industry have dedicated their lives to the instruction of our youth. They deserve our recognition and profound gratitude.

Telegram Sent to the President by Members of Stanford University Faculty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, during the past weekend, there were many teach-ins held on many college campuses of the country. The general purpose of these meetings seemed to be to establish in the minds of our citizens that there is a vast number in this country who oppose the opposition which our country is providing against communism in both Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

It is refreshing to note that the following ad, signed by 137 professors, appeared in the May 17 issue of the Stanford Daily:

TO THE STANFORD COMMUNITY

(The following telegram, signed by the members of the Stanford faculty listed below, has been sent to President Johnson.)

To LYNDON B. JOHNSON, *President of the United States*

MR. PRESIDENT: This telegram, signed by 137 members of the faculty of Stanford University, is to record our basic agreement with U.S. policy in Vietnam, as expounded in your recent Baltimore speech. Although some of us may have doubts or reservations with regard to specific aspects of our Vietnam policy, we all believe that a U.S. withdrawal before we have achieved a viable agreement guaranteeing the freedom of the people of Vietnam would encourage the aggressiveness of the most militant branch of communism throughout the world.

Andreas Acrivos, Bo Anderson, James B. Angell, Max Anliker, Thomas A. Bailey, Charles A. Beye, Helene Blattner, Karl, Brandt, Leland H. Brown, Donald E. Buck, Philip W. Buck, Chilton R. Bush, Rita R. Campbell, W. Glenn Campbell, Robert H. Cannon, Jr., and Robert L. Carlson.

Shau Wing Chan, A. Kent Christensen, Clarence C. Clendenen, Donald I. Cone, Gordon A. Craig, Norman H. Crawford, Edward Crothers, Lucille Daniels, Daniel B. DeBra, Dennis J. Doolin, Edwin J. Doyle, Milorad M. Drachkovitch, Theodore Draper, Peter J. Duignan, Holmes Easley, Richard H. Eastman, Rolf Eliassen, and Don E. Fehrenbacher.

Paul J. Flory, John W. Fondahl, Roger A. Freeman, Lewis H. Gann, Owen K. Garriott, Frank Otto Gatell, James M. Gere, Ben C. Gerwick, Robert C. Goodlin, Grant P. Gordon, Boynton M. Green, Elmer M. Grieder, Moffatt Hancock, John W. Harbaugh, Christina P. Harris, David Harris, Edward Havard, and Robert H. Hayes.

Miklos Hetenyi, Ole R. Holsti, Robert A. Horn, Arthur D. Howard, John B. Hurlbut, Eric Hutchinson, Evan Just, Robert L. Katz, Marion R. Kirkwood, Paul H. Kocher, Walter H. Kohl, Ladis K. D. Kristoff, I. Robert Lehmann, Marian B. Lidster, H. C. Ling, and Edgar Lohner.

Hubert S. Loring, J. Murray Luck, David G. Luenberger, Victor C. Macres, Jean Mayers, Fr. Charles McCoy, Henry B. McDaniel, Quinn McNemar, Frank G. Miller, Roy E. Murphy, William Nachbar, Hayes A. Newby, David S. Nivison, William D. Nix, Carl R. Noller, and Clarkson H. Oglesby.

Henry W. Parker, George S. Parks, Nicholas Pashin, Howard H. Pattee, Gerald L. Pearson, Otis A. Pease, Stefan T. Passony, David M. Potter, William R. Rambo, Antony E. Raubitschek, Elliott G. Reid, George S. Rentz, Cedric W. Richards, Rutherford D. Rogers, Robert M. Rosenzweig, Edward G. Seidensticker, Howard S. Seifert, and Oscar E. Sette.

O. Cutler Shepard, Oleg D. Sherby, John C. Shyne, Joseph T. Sneed, Anthony E. Sokol, William E. Spicer, George D. Spindler, Louise Spindler, Lewis W. Spitz, David A. Stevenson, F. W. Strothmann, Graham H. Stuart, Witold S. Sworakowski, Alan S. Tetelman, Earl A. Thompson, and Frederick G. Tickell.

William A. Tiller, Jan F. Triska, John P. Troxell, Victor C. Twitty, Pierre Van Rysselberghe, C. H. Van Schooneveld, John K. Vennard, Louis J. Vignoli, Robert A. Walker, James T. Watkins IV, Clifford F. Weigle, Robert L. White, Bernard Widrow, Peter R. Winters, Yvor Winters, Lauress L. Wise, Richard Wraga, Y. L. Wu, and Richard D. Young.

Federal Government and New Jersey: Partners in Crime and Vice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to bring to the attention of this House facts which show that the Federal Government and the State of New Jersey are full and equal partners in organized crime and vice.

New Jersey is called the Garden State but actually it should be called the garden of gambling. Several northern New Jersey counties were long known as hood hangouts. The gangs bought protection for these nerve centers minutes from downtown New York City with their easily won gambling dollars—which dollars were a tribute to shortsighted policies which kept gambling illegal and thus lucrative for the gangs.

Anyone who has looked into the financial roots of organized crime has pinpointed gambling moneys as the root from which most evil flows. Gambling debts or profits are behind everything from heroin wholesalers to housewife prostitution rings.

New Jersey is no exception. Far from it. Last year's parimutual turnover in New Jersey was $316 million. This is the part of New Jersey's total gambling which roughly corresponds to the part of the iceberg that is out of the water, a very small part. Gambling is big business in gang-garden New Jersey. The McClellan committee recently heard that yearly off-track betting in this country is $50 billion, and that this type of betting represents about 42 percent of total illegal gambling. Nationwide illegal gambling would thus reach a yearly total of some $120 billion, which sounds incredible until you remember a Massachusetts Crime Commission report saying that people of that State spend more money gambling than on groceries. On a population basis, New Jersey would account for some $4.2 billion of that $120 billion, so it is not hard to see why the mob must think New Jersey is truly a garden State.

The mob keeps 10 percent of this gambling turnover, or some $400 million. No wonder they can afford to bankroll a lot of vice and narcotics. No wonder they have more than enough profits to keep New Jersey safe for illegal gambling and all that flows from it. A cynic might say no wonder New Jersey has no government-controlled gambling that would drive out the syndicates waxing fat in the present vacuum. All I can say is that the people of New Jersey ought to take a long, hard look at the alliance of ignorance that has made the New Jersey and Federal Governments, by their refusal to recognize and regulate gambling, partners in crime, partners with the mob behind every housewife prostitution ring, every narcotics ring, and many other vice rackets. The very governments who

piously talk of vice control are up to their necks in negligent contributions to that which they supposedly seek to exterminate. This seamy government partnership in crime has made the Garden State a rich pastureland of vice.

Lessons of Youngstown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal's Review and Outlook section entitled "Lessons of Youngstown" is must reading for those of us who plan economic opportunity, rehabilitation, economic development, and vocational or technical job training. An industrial community, which has risen from unemployment at the end of 1960 of 12 percent, to a jobless rate of only 3.3 percent, is remarkable in its own right. However, to have had the cooperation of understanding labor union officials that the whole of Ohio's larger communities prevailing wages must not apply, plus the do-it-yourself attitude of the citizens for the past 25 years, plus sweat, incentive, risk, and labor rather than legerdemain, is noteworthy.

Republicans have always fostered vocational retraining, and indeed my colleague from Missouri's book entitled "Eighty-seven Million Jobs," is a large part of the answer to the alleged fear of automation among workers in this country. However, the job performed by Youngstown, Ohio, and the editorial, specifically point out, not only the question of retraining, but the all-important question of relocation. Our colleagues' specific attention is invited to the pertinent editorial in this and other erstwhile regards:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 4, 1965]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK: LESSONS OF YOUNGSTOWN

Before the Government embarks on an expanded program of aid to "depressed" areas, maybe the planners ought to take a look at Youngstown, Ohio. The record of that industrial city in recent years certainly tells a lot about the problems, as well as the prospects, of local economic development.

As recently as 1960 Youngstown would have seemed a prime candidate for the attentions of the "Economic Development Administrator," the new Commerce Department officer who, Congress willing, will take over the chores of the Area Redevelopment Administration after June 30. The city's troubles were not only great but gray with age.

Whenever the rest of the Nation's economy boomed, Youngstown hardly even popped. When the country's business sagged, the Ohio city sank almost out of sight. As Mr. Janssen noted in this newspaper recently, Youngstown unemployment at the end of 1960 was 12 percent, nearly double the estimated national rate.

Now, however, the Ohio city's jobless rate has fallen to 3.3 percent, well below the current national estimate. Business has been so brisk that many Youngstown companies are trying to recruit workers from other areas.

How has this dramatic change come about?

One point the Federal planners might note is that the change has not come about overnight. Though Washington sometimes seems to be saying that its area redevelopers can work economic magic, successful economic uplift efforts usually involve far more labor than legerdemain.

In Youngstown's case the hard work began 25 years ago, as a group of local citizens undertook a campaign to attract new industry to the area. While the group for many years had few successes, it continued to push its efforts until they finally began to pay off.

For some people, inevitably, the payoff came too late—and that leads to another point worth Washington's attention. In our dynamic economy, some areas are bound to be more prosperous than others at any given time; so over the years a good many workers moved away from Youngstown and found jobs elsewhere.

The fact is that not every area can be rejuvenated, even in the quarter century that was needed by Youngstown. In some cases the planners would contribute far more to the people of the community if they spent more time helping and encouraging workers to seek jobs in other cities and less time holding out false promises of creating ever-expanding local prosperity.

Youngstown's turnabout required a great deal besides time, money, and effort. It was built on some basic attributes that are absent in certain depressed areas: Location in the heart of a large market region, accessibility of transportation and basic industrial resources.

The Ohio city's rise also was aided, local employers say, by an increasingly understanding attitude on the part of labor union officials. Despite the trend of unions generally, to step up pressure for uniform nationwide contracts, some labor leaders seemed to realize that requiring Youngstown's employers to pay the same wages as those in far more prosperous Pittsburgh would only widen the economic gap between the two cities.

Perhaps the most interesting facet of Youngstown's comeback is that it has been achieved, believe it or not, without any pleas for Federal aid. Washington's assistance may not always be a hindrance, but the success of the Ohio city's self-help certainly shows there are much more important elements in local economic resurgence.

That fairly simple fact is exactly what is overlooked by those Government and local officials who argue that enough Government money can solve almost any area's economic problems. Youngstown's story will serve a useful purpose if it persuades a few people of the depth of this development delusion.

The Flying Tank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the May-June 1965 issue of Infantry magazine—published in Fort Benning, Ga.—carries a timely article by Col. J. H. Reinburg, U.S. Marine Corps Aviation Reserve. In view of the acute requirement for a low altitude close air support—LACAS—aircraft in South Vietnam, it would seem that Colonel Reinburg's article delineates what could be a very useful airplane, designed to save many infantry lives as well as probably a good many flyers.

Three years ago, May 17, 1962, another article by Colonel Reinberg was inserted in the RECORD. In that article he emphasized the importance of this type of plane. It is believed that developments in Vietnam have served to vindicate Colonel Reinburg's foresight. That article, entitled "Close Air Support," contributed to the development of the COIN airplane, now in production. But changes in the basic design of COIN, now called the LARA, airplane would seem to detract from the basic original requirement.

Recognizing the urgent need for LACAS aircraft in South Vietnam, the Department of Defense has been using the obsolescent A-1 aircraft, with reports of good results. The shortage of the A-1 plane may cause the procurement of more of them, but the costs will now be several times the original cost.

Colonel Reinburg flew many hours in the A-1 aircraft operationally as well as in a test pilot capacity. His "flying tank" is projected as the next generation aircraft to the A-1 in that he professes to retain its good features while correcting the few bad ones. Moreover, the "flying tank" uses an engine now in extensive production, thereby allowing it to cost about the same as the original A-1.

Reinburg knows his airplanes. During World War II he flew 287 combat fighter-bomber missions, and many more in Korea. As a LACAS pilot and squadron commander, he has remained current. This is his seventh published article on LACAS, making him something of a prophet on requirements for fighting small wars such as that in Vietnam. And there may be others.

Only last week, in the April 30 issue of Time magazine, an article titled "Mac the Fac's Last Mission," is a report of an Air Force major being killed while flying a LACAS mission in an old airplane. Had he been flying one of Colonel Reinburg's "flying tanks," the result might very well have been different.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Colonel Reinburg's article. It follows:

THE FLYING TANK

(By Col. J. H. Reinburg, USMCR)

It is high time that tactical aviation imitated the ground units it supports and attempted to protect itself from the enemy's weapons.

The vulnerability of ground weapons has always been a problem. Consequently heavily armored tanks equipped with machineguns, artillery, assault guns, and missiles have become an integral part of Infantry operations. This Infantry-tank team has been very successful. A "flying tank" as a third member of the team could make it still more successful.

Tactical aircraft, to be most effective, must work in the dense air of the lower altitudes. Low altitude close air support (LACAS) combat experience indicates that ground targets are difficult, if not impossible, to see from aircraft flying much faster than 400 knots. Moreover, such individual targets cannot be seen at all from altitudes greater than a mile. Slow speeds are excellent for target acquisition, but unfortunately the accuracy and volume of enemy ground fire have made speeds below 200 knots excessively dangerous. Yet the pilot's eyesight is the best target acquisi-

tion device for LACAS missions. These various factors confine successful LACAS combat operations to the 200–400 knot range.

The increasing effectiveness of ground fire has not been countered by additional protective armor because of the inherent weight limitations of aircraft and because the carrying of more and more ordnance has always taken precedence. Also pilot psychology has never been given serious consideration. Any LACAS pilot knows that numerous enemy gunners are trying to use him for target practice whenever he is over hostile territory. It is a well-known fact of combat that efficiency falls off rapidly after more than an hour under such stress. This short time limits ordnance loads.

Aircraft efficiency has reached such a high level of development that LACAS aircraft can now carry more ordnance than a pilot can effectively and accurately distribute on any single sortie. Because the performance of a LACAS aircraft is restricted by target acquisition problems rather than weight, excess weight is available for the incorporation of armor.

Modern technology has reached a point where a flying tank can be practical for LACAS work. The flying tank would be a conventional fixed-wing airplane, which is the best type to absorb the greatest amount of armor. Although called a "flying tank," it would be impossible to make it entirely of steel like a land tank. The salient feature would be a tub of steel encasing the pilot and engine. This tub would be an integral part of the airframe, taking advantage of its strength for maximum design efficiency. A single engine with a one-man crew (pilot) behind it is the best way to provide maximum protection. Because one can never have enough armor, design efficiency is paramount.

The pilot derives additional personal protection by having the engine in front. Better that the engine be incapacitated than the pilot. Human bravery is directly proportional to the amount of metal between man and the enemy.

Some, in the interest of greater versatility and safety, might think a twin-engine, multiseat LACAS aircraft would be preferable, but the extra engine and seats impose weight penalties and preclude adequate armor protection. The extra expense of a twin-engine aircraft is false economy for a frontline airplane, and the carrying of extra people is a careless and needless risk of lives.

All ordnance should be externally mounted for interchangeability and easier maintenance. The old World War II system of having machineguns internally mounted is not the best method in this case because the gun caliber is then fixed to one type. LACAS missions require a selective variety of guns. Internally mounted guns also considerably complicate aircraft design and construction.

With the services of a flying tank, close air support will reach a degree of efficiency never dreamed of by the infantryman, and will be a valuable addition to the infantry-tank team.

Reds List Priority Targets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, the House Un-American Activities Committee, of which I am a member, has been conducting hearings on the proposals which would create a Freedom Academy. As you know the academy would research the techniques used by the Communists and develop countermeasures that could be effectively applied in fighting the cold war. I feel that if we were to have such an institution the conflicts now going on in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic might well be the exception rather than the rule. The Communists have always "telegraphed their punches" so to speak, and it has been our lack of understanding regarding their aims and methods which cause us untold problems throughout the world.

For your consideration and information I submit a newspaper article which appeared on the front page of the Washington Star last Sunday, May 16, 1965, entitled "Reds List Priority Targets." I hope this article will serve to underline the extreme need for the establishment of such an institution contemplated by the bills now pending in the committee which I hope will be reported favorably in the near future:

LATIN AMERICA, 1965—REDS LIST PRIORITY TARGETS

(By Jeremiah O'Leary, Latin America writer for the Star)

(Jeremiah O'Leary has recently returned from a 63-day tour of Latin America. He talked to chiefs of state, diplomats, farmers, teachers, educators, priests, and hundreds of private citizens to obtain material for this report on Latin America today.)

The Communists' priority list for armed action and political takeovers in Latin America is perfectly well known and any or all of the countries on their timetable may require the United States to make countermoves as it already has done in the Dominican Republic.

The prime target of the Communists is Venezuela. Also high on the list are the Governments of Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, Paraguay, and Haiti. What Washington does not know is where or when the Communists will strike next.

The only certainty, as the House Foreign Affairs Committee emphasized in a recent report, is that communism is a very real threat in the area because all of Latin America is undergoing profound social, economic, and political change.

There are other danger points, too. To the Communists' own priority list would have to be added Bolivia and British Guiana.

South and Central America and the Caribbean are political tinder boxes, but the experts do not expect all of Latin America to erupt at once. The area, comprising one-eighth of the world's surface, is far too uncoordinated and geographically fragmented. Rather, what officials look for are soparic outbreaks of violence, continuing attempts at subversion, and even rebellions in one or more Latin nations before the year is out.

The Communists are believed to have set up their priority list at a meeting in Havana last November attended by leaders of all hemispheric Marxist parties. Their development of insurgency groups, guerrillas, and action arms among the students, unions, and other elements of the population is being financed with cash from the coffers of world communism. Their agents are being trained in Havana where Fidel Castro has communism for export and continues to export it.

While it is true that there are sharp divisions among the Latin Communists, who owe allegiance variously to the philosophies of Moscow, Havana, and Peiping, they are united in their determination to plant the red banner in the New World.

They have won the island of Cuba.

Little more than a year ago, they lost in Brazil when a Communist takeover was narrowly averted by the armed forces and most of the state governors. They came within a whisker of taking over the Dominican Republic, but were foiled by the 11th hour intervention of the United States and the action of the Organization of American States.

Where will the next test come?

The biggest prize is Venezuela, fabulously rich in oil resources and controlled by the militantly democratic party of liberal leader Romulo Betancourt and President Raul Leoni, Accion Democratica. No country in Latin America makes Castro's disastrous experiment look less successful than Venezuela which, almost overnight, is achieving the goal of a genuine middle-class population, nearly complete literacy and economic self-sufficiency. It is a showcase of the Alliance for Progress.

It was the discovery of a huge Cuban arms cache on Venezuela's Falcon Peninsula, intended for the terrorist FALN organization, that precipitated the OAS mandate that the hemisphere nations break off trade and diplomatic relations with Havana.

Venezuela has kept the FALN in check, reducing its efforts to hit and run raids and senseless acts of terror. A recent setback to the Venezuelan Reds was seizure of $300,000 in cash at Maiquetia Airport near Caracas. It was concealed on the persons of two couriers for the Italian Communist Party and the money was intended for the FALN.

GUATEMALA POSSIBLE TARGET

Guatemala, another prime spot for trouble, has been in a state of siege since last February because of guerrilla attacks, assassinations, and acts of terror. For nearly 5 years Guatemala has been harassed by the Marxist bands of former Army Officer Marco Antonio Yon Sosa, who was trained by the United States in jungle warfare and has perhaps 500 men.

The uneasy rulers of Guatemala today are military men, headed by Col. Enrique Peralta Azurdia. They have had little success in stemming the periodic Red attacks. An attempt to carry out a coup d'etat in Guatemala is a distinct possibility, whether by the Communists or by supporters of the leftist-leaning exile leader, Juan Jose Arevalo.

Colombia is split by old political animosities between liberals and conservatives and her stagnating economy is a ripe breeding ground for the Communist conspirators. Political kidnapings have become more of a problem to the Bogotá government than the bloodthirsty terrorists in the hills and the authorities have found no way to stem these crimes.

Conservative President Guillermo Valencia offered to resign last week and the Liberal candidate for the presidency, Carlos Lleras Restrepo, has stepped out of the picture for the good of the country. This leaves Colombia with two unpredictable political figures in the fore: former Gen. Alberto Ruiz Novoa, who speaks of social justice but has no political affiliation, and the old former dictator Gustavo Rojas Pinilla.

OTHER TROUBLE SPOTS

Honduras has a military government but a restless Liberal Party of opposition in a situation made to order for Communist troublemaking. Panama, with a hard-core of Havana-trained Communists, could erupt at any time in an area the United States must regard as vital to American national interests.

Haiti and Paraguay have absolute rulers, but there's a difference. Francois Duvalier, Haiti's president-for-life, conducts a bloody rule with the aid of 10,000 undisciplined secret agents and militiamen. Gen. Alfredo Stroessner is a dictator and a political anachronism but he rules Paraguay with at least a surface stability.

In British Guiana, only the presence of two battalions of British troops keeps the Marxist-dominated majority of East Indians and the African population from massacreing one another.

The Communists also are active in the little republics of Uruguay and Ecuador where economic woes are not helped by governmental difficulties. Uruguay, ruled by an unworkable nine-man council, is in a state of stagnation. Ecuador, in turn, is ruled by a four-man military junta with no political base and a gradually slumping economic situation.

In the face of all this unrest, the United States has clearly asserted that it will not tolerate the existence of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere. President Johnson has made it clear that he will use armed force to prevent Communist takeovers in the hemisphere. He would prefer joint action by the OAS, but he reserves the right to act unilaterally if and when the need is apparent.

But the picture is not entirely bleak. The year 1965 can also be described as the year Latin America, propelled by the Alliance for Progress, made the first big breakthrough to the threshhold of modern economic and social life. Now nearly 4 years old, the Alliance dream is beginning to become a reality.

The seeds planted by the charter of Punta del Este are beginning to sprout in a subtle process that in social and economic terms is far ahead of political advancements in Latin America. Even as changes of a dramatic nature are being made in tax and land reform, education, health, diversification of industry and products, more than half of the Latin nations are still being governed in an atmosphere more suitable to the last century.

MIDDLE CLASS EMERGING

Nevertheless, there is unmistakable evidence of advancement through the Alliance on three major fronts:

1. The emergence of a sound and stable middle class to fill a vacuum between the very rich and the very poor.

2. The beginnings of diversified economy and interarea trade to replace the stultifying role all Latin nations have traditionally played as suppliers of raw materials to the more sophisticated countries.

3. The creation of industries and institutions common in the United States but until recently unknown in Latin America.

All three of these achievements were high on the list of necessary advances envisioned by the late President John F. Kennedy and the other signers of the charter of Punta del Este. And if political development is lagging far behind, there are other signs that the cause of democracy has made stalwart advances.

There is a very real tug-of-war going on from the Rio Grande to the Straits of Magellan between the forces of democracy and communism.

Undeniably, all of Latin America is moving steadily toward the left. This does not mean that the democracies of Latin America today are Jeffersonian; it is unlikely they will ever be fashioned in the image and likeness of American democracy.

The Latin American ethos, rooted in the traditions of Spain, is quite different from the Anglo-Saxon and probably always will be. At the same time, there have been marked differences in the evolution of those democracies that now exist.

Mexico, for instance, brought forth in her revolution even before the toppling of the Czars an all-encompassing political party, the PRI, which suits that emerging nation's needs very well. PRI has room for everybody from the far right to the far left, labor and capitalism, white collar worker and soldier. It is government by smoke-filled room, with its own system of rewards and punishments, but it is basically democratic and it works.

Costa Rica, perhaps the purest democracy in the Western World, has learned to get along without an army as the best means of ending the succession of military takeovers that has always plagued Latin America. In Chile and Venezuela, the Christian Democrats have risen to the fore on a democratic leftist platform that takes the wind out of the Communists' arguments. They preach social justice without violent upheaval and the Communists hate them now worse than the center or the right.

There is much political ferment in Latin America amid the population explosion, the inexorable shift of populations from countryside to city and the birth pangs of awakening nations.

But any wholesale shift to communism is unlikely so long as the hungers of the people for jobs, homes, education and a better way of life are satisfied by progressive governments and by programs of growth charted in the Alliance.

Despite the tremendous advances being made, the forms of government in Latin America run the gamut from absolute dictatorships as in Haiti and Paraguay to admirable democracies.

MILITARY MEN RULE

In between are the military juntas. Guatemala, Bolivia and Ecuador are ruled by groups of military men, although in Ecuador, the grip is so light as to be nearly bland. Guatemala, assailed by Communist guerrillas, is a time bomb. Bolivia is so turbulent for reasons of history and economics that civil war is always a possibility.

Brazil, sprawling giant of the Americas, is a special case. It could have become another Cuba little more than a year ago, but the army and most of the state governors intervened in a bloodless revolution. Today, the military is anxious to hand the government over to civilians and the nation has already taken giant steps away from the brink of disaster.

The democracies—Venezuela, Colombia, Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, and Peru—have economic and social problems but they do not have dictators. Their political problems are caused by the great penchant of Latin peoples to be individualistic as well as volatile.

There is discord in the Central American nations, except Costa Rica, but the economic advances being made through the Central American Common Market are steadily changing the backward lives of the inhabitants.

The Central American Common Market is thriving simply because its five member nations all started from about the same level of development, virtually from scratch. Conversely, the Latin American Free Trade Area (LAFTA) is failing because some of the nine members are far ahead of their neighbors in development. Also, narrow nationalistics interests have suppressed efforts at economic integration.

Now, at the behest of Chile's President Frei, four financial experts of the hemisphere have prepared a new plan that, in effect, takes the problem away from the economists and gives it to the highest political levels to solve. The Latin nations will not integrate economically this year or the next but the new approach may break the impasse within 5 or 10 years.

Meanwhile, the signs of progress can be seen everywhere. Factories and new industries are rising beside some of the worst slums in the world. The slums of Rio de Janeiro are slowly vanishing and television aerials can be seen projecting from the roofs of many of the jerry-built shacks.

Signs of greater affluency are evident in the almost classic traffic jams in Lima, Bogota and Buenos Aires where frustrated drivers bang their hands in rage against their cars because the law forbids hornblowing.

Housing projects are springing upon from Mexico to Cape Horn, although not as fast as the population grows.

INFLATION CURBS

Peruvians and Venezuelans by the thousands are joining the new savings and loan associations instead of burying their money in the yard. Inflation is slowly being curbed in the ABC countries—Argentina, Brazil and Chile.

There are still Indians who hunt in the Amazonian jungle with blowguns. And on the Altiplano, there are inert millions of other Indians who live on a diet of frost-bitten potatoes and coca leaf to dull their hunger. Caracas, Lima, Bogota, Rio de Janeiro and Santiago all still have their dreary slums.

But the Alliance for Progress, for all its mistakes, has become a viable, visible force in 4 short years. Most misunderstood of all agreements, the Alliance is not an American charity program for all of Latin America. Most of the money is loaned, not given, although the loans are in soft terms. The overriding requirement is self-help.

For every U.S. dollar, there must be a matching effort from the Latin recipient and there are stipulations that American or local materials must be used. The Agency for International Development has its watchdogs to follow through and there is little waste.

Deputy Coordinator of the Alliance William D. Rogers describes it this way: "There isn't enough money in the world to give Latin America everything it needs. If every man in Peru needed a pair of shoes, would you try to buy them all shoes or build a shoe factory? We're trying to set up the institutions that will persevere and continue until the day that we can pull up stakes and go home."

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPED

Venezuela has earned so much money from her oil that all U.S. aid except food and some technical assistance has long since ceased. Peru is developing new industries, such as fish meal.

Mexico, with 35 years of political stability, is attracting millions of dollars from investors and tourists every year and is making an all-out bid to industrialize. Every Latin leader now realizes that diversification is of paramount importance if the one-crop economy pattern is to be broken.

Colombia and Brazil depend too heavily on coffee, Bolivia on tin, Ecuador on bananas, the Dominican Republic on sugar, and Chile on copper. These nations are all moving as fast as they can to take themselves forever out of the class of producers of raw materials and importers of finished goods.

The most significant bonus of the awakening has been the rise of the middle class. Today, for every half-starved Indian or slum dweller there is another man buying his own home or his own car and with children who have an excellent chance of becoming truly literate, even well educated.

The number of smokestacks, and dams, and highways and middle-class homes, even of supermarkets, is growing every day. There is unemployment, big unemployment, but there are also more and more jobs. There is hunger but there is food. Last year alone, real income increased 6 percent—the growth rate envisioned at Punta del Este.

There will be violence and unrest, and new dictators may arise. But even the strutting soldiers of Latin America seem to realize that the day of the caudillo is passing.

If democracy in the American sense has not won, communism is clearly a failure. And now that the United States has acted firmly in the Dominican crisis the Communists should have received the message: The United States will act forcefully to prevent another Castro regime in this hemisphere.

But U.S. policymakers have made it equally clear that, in the absence of violence, this country's vital interest in the welfare of Latin America will continue to be expressed through the Alliance for Progress.

The Dedication at Runnymede

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, last week Queen Elizabeth II dedicated an historic spot of ground at Runneymede to the United States. The ceremony was a fitting tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy.

But the dedication of this English land to America was, in addition, a reminder that we in the United States are fortunate enough to live under a Government of law.

On June 15, 1215, King John signed the Magna Carta on the meadow at Runneymede. A most significant part of that charter reads as follows:

> No free man shall be taken, imprisoned, disseised, outlawed, banished, or in any way destroyed, nor will we proceed against or prosecute him, except by the lawful judgment of his peers and by the law of the land.

These words, now 750 years old, laid the groundwork for constitutional government and the protection of individual rights. Our Constitution, which is the supreme "law of the land" is heir to the spirit of the Magna Carta.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial from the May 17, 1965, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, which points out the deep meaning of the ceremonies last week at Runnymede.

The editorial follows:

AMERICA AT RUNNYMEDE

The English-speaking world can never be reminded too often of the foundations of its strength and durability. Particularly in these times, when this same world stands at the center of the great struggle to preserve and broaden human rights and freedoms, the English-speaking nations can draw needed vigor and understanding from recalling those qualities which underlie their centuries of progress.

It is for such a reason that we welcome having our attention turned once again to the mead of Runnymede beside the Thames. English-speaking freedom neither began nor ended with what happened there on the bright June day of 1215. But King John's signature on Magna Carta became symbolic of all the freedoms which have grown and prospered so abundantly wherever English is spoken.

The American Nation, where now live a majority of those who speak the English tongue and thrive under English-born freedoms, today feels particularly close to Runneymede. With the dedication by Queen Elizabeth of the gift to the United States of an acre of English ground in memory of President Kennedy, America and Britain have paused for a moment in their busy worlds to contemplate the many ties which bind them.

Of all the memorials to President Kennedy, at home or abroad, none can compare with this gift to his country of a portion of so hallowed a ground. We belive that President Kennedy, with his strong sense of history, would have agreed with this view.

The 750-year road from Runneymede has been a magnificent one. The human spirit, impelled by a higher spirit, has won immense victories. Futhermore, the rate of victory has accelerated with the passing of centuries, as the base of progress grew broader and broader. Wherever their birth, these victories and freedoms belong to all men. It is of this that the ceremonies at Runnymede remind us.

They Hear the Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago it was my privilege to call to the attention of my colleagues the great achievement of blind girls who are holding down jobs as switchboard operators. This was made possible through the invention of a special switchboard by I. A. Vandergriff, an engineer with the Southern Bell Telephone System.

In this achievement we see the finest American traditions at work—the ingenuity and know-how of private industry in constantly working for improving the life of all the people, and the courage and determination of Americans who have never been felled by circumstance nor defeated by adversity.

This one example is a thrilling story and deserves to be told in all its detail. Once again I would like to pay tribute to the courage of the blind girls who have so successfully overcome their handicap, and to the engineer and the Southern Bell Telephone System for their efforts to use highly skilled personnel and technical knowledge in behalf of mankind.

A discussion of the operation of the switchboard designed by Mr. Vandergriff is contained in the Southern PBX magazine. It was written by Mr. H. G. Daugherty of Anniston, Ala., and I include it here as a part of these remarks:

THEY HEAR THE LIGHT

(By H. G. Daugherty, district traffic manager, Anniston, Ala.)

This is another story of the courage of the blind. Respecting this courage, several interested people have dedicated their efforts to the creation of a training program for the purpose of providing well-trained blind girls to serve industry, business, and the general public as switchboard attendants at private branch exchanges. This program has now been in effect for over 5 years at the Adult Blind Department Training Center in Talladega, Ala.—with most outstanding results.

People too numerous to mention here have contributed to this fine program; but it was Southern Bell Design Engineer I. A. Vandergriff, Atlanta, Ga., who received the challenge to design a switchboard which blind girls could efficiently use. Mr. Vandergriff was successful and the program for training blind attendants became a reality.

The training board—as designed by Mr. Vandergriff—teamed with an effective training program for mastering its use, enables blind girls to become efficient attendants through use of several electronic aids. These electronic devices permit trainees to "hear the light."

There are three relatively simple electronic devices which are used together on the training board at Talladega. These devices may be readily adapted to practically any type of PBX switchboard and are provided by the blind rehabilitation program at no expense to the employer.

First, tone boxes are located on either side of the top of the switchboard. When a receiver is lifted within the business, the attendant hears a tone. A high frequency tone identifies the call as coming from one side of the board—a low frequency tone means the call is coming from the other side of the board.

The second piece of equipment adapted to the switchboard is a sectionalizer, which is simply a vertical lamp strip down the center of the board. When a signal comes into the board a light comes on in the sectionalizer on the same line as the particular row of lamps in which the signal may be found.

Using the third device, a photoelectric probe, in connection with the tone boxes and sectionalizer, the attendant can locate the incoming signal quite fast. The light-sensitive probe, when coming in contact with the sectionalizer or burning signal light, emits a tone in the attendant's headset.

Thus, an attendant hears the tone indicating an incoming signal, searches the sectionalizer for the lamp row, then moves to the signal and plugs in.

The training program developed for blind attendants is recognized as one of the best of its kind in the Nation. And the program, considered good from its beginning by all who saw it, has been vastly improved by the dedicated efforts of Mrs. Jerry Johnson, head of the adult blind department's PBX attendant training program at Talladega. Graduates of Mrs. Johnson's course are well-trained attendants whose employment by any businessman is good business.

The training program, as given at Talladega, is not complete until the trainee is able to meet her needs in daily living, travel and personal grooming as well as reaching a maximum level of efficiency at the switchboard. Much time is spent teaching students to make full use of voice quality. The friendly voice of the blind attendant becomes, perhaps, her greatest single asset.

The Center believes, and fully indoctrinates their students in the belief, that nothing enhances the reputation of friendliness and courtesy in a business more than does the girl sitting behind the firm's PBX. Her good training, and subsequent capable performance, can mean dollars for her employer. Only the very best performance the attendant is capable of giving is good enough for this vital spot in any organization. The well-trained and versatile blind attendant provides just this type of service and is, by her example of performing at maximum efficiency, a source of inspiration which has far reaching effects on the morale of all.

"If Vietcong Keeps Sanctuary in North Vietnam It Can Call the Tune"—Gen. E. G. Wheeler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on May 7 Gen. E. G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, addressed the Commonwealth Club of California on the subject "If Vietcong Keeps Sanctuary in North Vietnam It Can Call the Tune." His very enlightening talk was briefed in the flashes in the Commonwealth of May 17. While it is not a complete report of

his discussion, I think the points which he made are well developed.

The report from the Commonwealth follows:

"IF VIETCONG KEEPS SANCTUARY IN NORTH VIETNAM IT CAN CALL THE TUNE"—GEN. E. G. WHEELER

(From address by Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff)

The fact that our forces are supporting the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, a small country on the opposite side of the world, has generated strong currents of confusion in some elements of American opinion. Much of this confusion is reflected by a lack of knowledge of the factual answers to some very basic questions:

"What are the causes of the conflict in Vietnam?"

"Isn't the Vietcong insurgency really a popular uprising of South Vietnamese against the Government? What keeps the insurgency going? Are the South Vietnamese doing their part to defeat it?"

"Why is the United States involved?"

"What are the objectives of the United States?"

"What are the main lines of effort we are pursuing?"

In the time I have this afternoon I cannot answer all these questions fully. But, believe me, all can be answered and well.

Basically there are just two causes of conflict in Vietnam: the intense desire of the average Vietnamese for freedom—a desire he has demonstrated through more than 2,000 years of history—and Ho Chi Minh's conflicting desire to make all Vietnam Communist.

HO CHI MINH'S GOAL NOT NEW

Ho Chi Minh has been seeking his goal since he organized the Communist Party in Vietnam about 1930. He quickly worked himself into what amounted to control of the clandestine nationalist movement, aimed at overthrow of the French.

During World War II, he increased this control when he persuaded other nationalist groups to join his Vietnam Independence League, later called the Viet Minh, and, effectively strengthened the organization of Communist cells throughout Vietnam.

As the war ended, Ho was unquestionably the most popular leader in Vietnam. He was not recognized at the time by most Vietnamese as representing an alien force and had wide support in 1945 when he announced formation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

However, by the time of the Geneva agreement of 1954, which in effect partitioned the country, enough Vietnamese had recognized Ho's true intentions to provide solid support for a democracy in South Vietnam. Almost 1 million moved south to get away from communism as opposed to about 100,000 who moved north—most of these hard-core Communist Viet Minh.

RED UNDERGROUND STAYED IN SOUTH

Not all the hard-core types moved north. Ho Chi Minh directed that a well organized Viet Minh underground network, complete with arms and ammunition, remain in the south. His objective: takeover of the entire country. This is the primary cause of the current conflict.

Although some South Vietnamese are involved, the Vietcong insurgency cannot be called a popular uprising. From the very beginning it has been a carefully planned attempt by a Communist government to conquer a neighboring state.

HO TRIED TO PENETRATE GOVERNMENT

The record shows that in 1955 Ho Chi Minh attempted to penetrate agents into official and quasi-official South Vietnamese organizations and agencies and, through propaganda and disruption, cause the people to lose confidence in the government. By 1956 he realized that force would be required and use of terror began.

By 1958 a marked and continuing increase in terrorist activities was noticeable. Terror was used to back up demands for support from the people, and raise doubts as to the ability of the government to provide security. This campaign of terror, reinforced by periodic military attacks, has escalated ever since.

Hanoi has used every resource of its own government to carry out its aggression. Hanoi controls the war politically and militarily.

Political direction comes from the reunification department within the central committee of the North Vietnamese Communist Party, the Lao Dong Party.

NORTH VIETNAM CONTROLS VIETCONG

On the ground in South Vietnam, headed by a North Vietnamese lieutenant general and taking orders from the reunification department, is the overall supervising agency, the central office for South Vietnam. Under this office are six regional units and the Saigon special zone.

On the military side, the Vietcong is controlled by the high command of the North Vietnamese Army and the ministry of defense, under close supervision of the Lao Dong. The six military regions art the same as those for the political organization, and the military structure and political machinery are closely integrated in support of overall Communist aggression.

Fronting the Vietcong is the so-called national front for the liberation of South Vietnam. It was set up in 1960, and we have irrefutable evidence that it was established at Hanoi's direction.

PROOF OF OUTSIDE RED WEAPONS OVERWHELMING

For example, a document found on the body of a Vietcong soldier in 1961 said in part: "In implementation of the decision of the Third Congress of the Lao Dong Party, the NFLSV (the national front) was set up to unify the revolutionary struggle, to overthrow the United States-Diem regime, to establish a popular government of domecratic union, and bring about the peaceful reunification of the country. The revolution for the liberation of the south would never succeed if the party (the Lao Dong Party) were not directing it." This is proof positive in my judgment as to just who is running the Vietcong.

Hanoi sustains the insurgency through a never-ending stream of personnel, arms, ammunition, and other supplies infiltrated into South Vietnam. Our proof of this has become overwhelming.

Recently captured prisoners and documents have shown that since 1959, at least 39,000 individuals have been infiltrated from the north, with between 5,000 and 8,000 confirmed during 1964 alone. In fact, we estimate that the true figure for 1964 is probably at least 10,000.

Furthermore, we have proof that 75 percent of these 1964 infiltrators were born in North Vietnam, clearly demonstrating that Hanoi is determined to continue support of the Vietcong even though the supply of former southerners ordered north in 1954 is drying up.

Hanoi has now gone so far as to infiltrate at least one entire North Vietnamese Army battalion—and there are probably more.

The same is true of weapons. Although initially the Vietcong used weapons cached in 1954 and those captured locally, in recent years the great bulk of weapons requirements has been met from external sources.

Since 1960, the Vietcong have captured about 39,000 weapons from government sources and lost 25,000 of their own—a net gain of only 14,000. As the Vietcong have about 38,000 to 46,000 hard-core troops and about 100,000 irregulars, you can see that the captured weapons account for only a small percentage of the total weapons needs. In fact, we now know that at least 70 percent have come from external Communist sources.

NEWEST RED CHINESE WEAPONS IN USE

The hard-core Vietcong troops are now being entirely re-equipped and retrained with the newest Chinese Communist family of weapons. Prisoners captured just last month said they had been pulled out of action to receive and train with these new Chinese Communist weapons.

We know from other sources that at least 6 battalions are now so equipped, including the known battalion of the North Vietnam Army, already mentioned.

We are also sure that at least 17 other hard-core battalions are now using 7.62-mm. weapons—weapons not in the inventory of either South Vietnamese or U.S. forces. The ammunition for such weapons must also come from the north, via the infiltration route.

Against the massive aggression through infiltration, the South Vietnamese have shown an unswerving will to resist. More than 50,000 South Vietnamese soldiers have been killed or wounded in battle since 1960. On a percentage basis this would amount to over 600,000 casualties if we were having a similar war here in the United States—about the same loss suffered by the Union Armies during the Civil War.

Absorbing such a casualty rate and fighting with progressively improving effectiveness, indicates a most unusual will to resist.

CIVILIANS FLEE VIETCONG

The Vietnamese civilians have also demonstrated their strong aversion to communism by continuing to support the government, where practicable, despite multiple assassinations, kidnapings, and continuous terror. Over 11,000 South Vietnamese were either murdered or kidnaped in 1964 alone—equivalent to 143,000 here in the United States.

Yet, in recent months over 200,000 civilians have fled Vietcong controlled areas seeking Government protection. After 8 years of this sort of thing, the South Vietnamese are still in there swinging. These people have guts.

I am proud that we are helping this nation. Yet, some ask, how do we justify our efforts in South Vietnam? I have no difficulty answering this question.

LONG-TIME U.S. COMMITMENT

First we are involved from the political standpoint because we have committed ourselves to help them. In 1950, we agreed to furnish military aid against the Viet Minh and in 1951, economic aid.

After the partition of 1954—in 1955 to be exact—we reaffirmed our 1950 commitment to provide military assistance and advice. We did so following a policy supported by four different Presidents who agreed that America must be willing to help nations threatened by Communist aggression.

The Truman doctrine, you will recall, was aimed directly at this target, and Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson have continued the policy.

If we are to believe public opinion polls and the fact that congressional opinion generally reflects public opinion, the great majority of Americans have agreed with their Presidents in this matter.

Whether we, as individuals, agree is now somewhat beside the point as the faith of our friends and the little people who look to us as the pillar of freedom would be badly damaged if we backed down.

FREE ASIAN COUNTRIES NEED U.S. SUPPORT

From the strategic standpoint there are other, equally cogent reasons. Red China is the great power in Asia. Just as the Soviets historically have always sought control of a

major warm water port, the Chinese have longed for control of the rich ricelands of southeast Asia. The Red Chinese are no exception.

The small, relatively undeveloped southeast Asian nations are incapable of defending themselves alone against a great power. Should we not assist these nations, they would be subjected to intolerable Communist pressures which could well force them to accommodate the Communists.

These pressures could not only affect the mainland nations but those offshore as well, including the Philippines, Indonesia, and others.

WITHDRAWAL WOULD NOT MEAN PEACE

The decision, then, is not limited to whether we should help the Vietnamese but rather, should we assist any nation of southeast Asia to resist Chinese pressure and/or aggression.

Should we give up in Vietnam, there is no question that Communist expansionism would be encouraged and pressure on the remainder of the area greatly increased.

Unless we discard our objective of containing Communist aggression, defeat in South Vietnam will force us to draw a new line somewhere in southeast Asia and try to defend that. This would be most difficult.

We would wind up, and probably rather quickly, facing the very same situation we face today in Vietnam, only with weakened morale and political uncertainty on the part of those being supported, plus a much less defensible position, militarily speaking.

Another essential related reason for us to continue our present course is the effect our defeat would have within the Communist world. We are all aware of the somewhat different approaches of the Soviets and the Red Chinese to world affairs.

The violent xenophobic and sometimes irrational tendencies of the Chinese leaders, together with their incipient nuclear power, appear to pose the greater danger to world peace.

MUST SEEK DECISION IN VIETNAM

Our defeat in Vietnam would undoubtedly give great impetus to the Chinese drive to take over the world Communist movement and magnify the immediate danger to newly emerging and unstable nations all over the world, not just in southeast Asia.

We would not only face a new Vietnam type situation in southeast Asia, but could well be involved simultaneously in several such situations around the world.

Finally, from a purely military standpoint, Vietnam is, in effect a bottleneck through which Chinese Communist aggression must pass in order to spread. Although the bottleneck analogy is not literally true, it is militarily valid.

The spread of Communist political poison to Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, and even India could be greatly enhanced if this bottleneck were open to Communist military forces.

We must strive for a decision, now, in Vietnam. What sort of a decision—what are our objectives?

REDS SHOULD LEAVE NEIGHBORS ALONE

As the President has said so often, all we want is to get the nations in that part of the world to leave their neighbors alone, free to find their own destiny without outside pressure. We want nothing more—no land, no special rights. We are willing to help all of the nations in the area to get back on their feet, including North Vietnam.

This objective is a far cry from the classic objective of warfare—the overthrow and total defeat of the enemy. In military terms, our objective is very limited indeed, actually very similar to the Korean war.

We are willing to attain this limited objective through negotiations, any time and anywhere, in lieu of insisting on military victory. This follows very logically from the fact that we have no aggressive, expansionist desires.

We have undertaken an interlocking, two-pronged course of action.

SUCCESSFUL RESISTANCE ESSENTIAL

First, we are assisting the South Vietnamese so that they can successfully resist the Vietcong aggression internally. Success of this effort is a basic requirement, not only because of the importance per se of military victory or loss but also because we cannot permit the North Vietnamese to think they can suffer for a little while our attacks in the north and still win in the south.

The second prong of our effort reinforces the first. We and the South Vietnamese are striking military targets in the north. We are doing this with the objective of actually weakening the capability of Hanoi to continue to support the Vietcong and, at the same time, impressing on the North Vietnamese the irrationality of continuing their aggression.

REDS MUST LEARN: AGGRESSION DOESN'T PAY

The North Vietnamese must be made to understand that aggression, like any other crime, does not pay. They must be made to understand this by the destruction or defeat of their troops fighting under the guise of Vietcong in the south.

They must be made to understand this by the forcible curtailment of the flow of replacement and supplies to these troops through interdicting the supply lines in the north, destroying where possible the military supplies being used, and in general depriving the Vietcong of the sanctuary it was afforded prior to February of this year.

One lesson we have learned about insurgency is that it is most difficult, if not impossible, to defeat if the enemy has a sanctuary.

With a sanctuary, the enemy can control his losses, the rate and types of supplies and reinforcements and, in effect, call the tune. Insurgent defeats under such circumstances are only temporary since replacement personnel and material are soon available, as in Vietnam in the past.

Without a sanctuary, insurgency becomes entirely in-country and provided the government's cause is just, the people can be rallied to win the day.

HANOI FOLLOWING KHRUSHCHEV'S CRY

We are dealing with aggression just as surely as the North Korean attack on South Korea in June of 1950 was aggression. Hanoi is carrying out the instructions contained in Nikita Khrushchev's famous speech of January 1961 in which he told the world that the main Communist tool for expansion henceforth would be Communist inspired subversion—only he used the words wars of national liberation.

Note that 1961 was also the year in which Vietcong increased the tempo of the war to such an extend that South Vietnam made its first request for a major increase in U.S. assistance.

In essence, the war in Vietnam is the first real test of Khrushchev's theory. This war will show whether a free people can be overcome against their will by cold, calculated subversive aggression, planned, controlled and supplied by a neighboring nation.

RED VICTORY WOULD BE DISASTROUS

Successful aggression begets more aggression. As a military man, I am convinced that a Communist victory in Vietnam would be disastrous and would lead inevitably to more of the world falling prey to Communist expansionist subversion.

You will recall that Ernest Hemingway's book, "For Whom the Bell Tolls," makes the point that loss of liberty anywhere threatens the loss of liberty everywhere. Or, to quote in part of the original words of John Donne, from whom Hemingway got his book title:

"No man is an island, * * * every man is a piece of the continent * * * if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less as well as if a promontory were * * * any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and, therefore, never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Question (George Rhodes) Any indications that Soviet missiles, antiaircraft weapons, and radar are in North Vietnam and operable?

Answer. There are a number of antiaircraft guns, field artillery, and automatic weapons along with quantity of radar; site is being built for missiles. Source of antiaircraft and ground artillery weapons not known.

Question (H. Richard Allen) U.S. aircraft losses in Vietnam indicate better-trained guerrillas?

Answer. Losses remarkably small. We've lost 130 fixed-wing aircraft, two-thirds of them from noncombat causes. Same ratio in helicopter losses. Two reasons: (1) Vietcong have more antiaircraft weapons, and (2) they are better trained now.

Question (Peter Haywood) Letters regarding outdated equipment in newspapers factual?

Answer. Investigated all of them to find they represented isolated case. A tiny unit in boondocks needed resupply—which it got by regular requisition at same time letters appeared. Best equipment we have is in Vietnam. Even take modern equipment from forces at home and give to Vietnamese.

Question (Ransom K. Davis). News reports that Vietnamese don't want U.S. forces?

Answer. If so, we haven't noticed. Morale of civilians has gone up as that of Vietnamese Air Force. United States/Vietnamese relationship cordial and close.

Question (Bill Boldenwed). Types of Chinese weapons being introduced into South Vietnam?

Answer. Mostly automatic weapons copied from Soviet types but made in Chinese Communist arsenals. Automatic machineguns, rifles, bazookas, etc. Very well made.

Question (C. F. Runyan). With forces active in two hemispheres, is strategic capability to respond dangerously reduced?

Answer. Don't think so—if we thought so, we'd speak out. Army has eight divisions in United States, Marine Corps one; Tactical Air Force has sizable force and SAC hasn't been touched. Navy also has sizable forces uncommitted.

Question (Arthur L. Brice). Mobilization of Reserve or National Guard in near future?

Answer. Hope not. Do not think so. Right now, no. Who can tell future?

Question (Craig Bull). Us of Formosan (Nationalist Chinese) troops?

Answer. Not used for two reasons: (1) Probably widen conflict, drawing in Chinese Communists; and (2) they contribute to cause indirectly.

Question (Gaynor Langsdorf). Action in North Vietnam slowing down flow of men and supplies to Vietcong?

Answer. Yes. We've put a few obstacles in their way—bridges aren't where they used to be; ammunition reduced in inventory. There's been a definite lull in Vietcong activity.

The Peabody Conservatory of Music in Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Peabody Conservatory in Baltimore, Md., is

the first endowed institution of its kind in the United States and stands among the 10 leading schools of music in the country. It is represented in every American symphony orchestra, in opera companies and on concert stage, in music departments of colleges and schools. Thousands of men and women have carried its marks as performers and teachers.

The Peabody Conservatory is now the only one of 11 independent schools of music in the country to offer a graduate program leading to the degree of doctor of musical arts, D.M.A., which is comparable to the same level implied by the Ph. D. Of course, this world famous institution has for a long time also awarded to its students the bachelor and master degrees.

Peabody has added much to the cultural atmosphere and intellectually stimulating climate of the city of Baltimore. This city, the largest south of the Mason-Dixon line, and the sixth biggest in the Nation, is also the home of other great colleges and universities, such as Johns Hopkins, Goucher, the professional schools of the University of Maryland, and the University of Baltimore.

The Baltimore Sun, on April 11, 1965, published a very interesting article written by Helen Henry, entitled "Peabody Hitting Crescendo Note." In order that my colleagues in the Congress and the general public may know more about the Peabody Conservatory, under unanimous consent I place it in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

PEABODY HITTING CRESCENDO NOTE

(By Helen Henry)

In Mount Vernon place the sound of spring is a cascade of scales and arpeggios bursting out of the conservatory's open windows, pouring a pleasant dissonance down on the square, a sound denizens of the park have been taking with the sun and their idle thoughts for almost a century of warm seasons.

It is the sound of young people developing their musical talents in the studios and practice rooms of George Peabody's gift to Baltimore * * * the unending exercises of ambitious pianists, singers, organists, of string, brass, and wind players, striving to perfect their techniques.

From everywhere in America and many foreign lands, four generations of them have been coming here since the conservatory opened its doors in 1867 to study under masters of the art, to learn its theory and structure, its literature and history—the creative complex of knowledge and skills that characterize musicianship.

These students enlivening the old square, and the conservatory that continues to nourish their talents, are part of the perennial charm in the cultural heart of this industrial city. The civic-minded advertise its old world atmosphere with pride; the music loving, with gratitude.

But masses of Baltimoreans—beyond a vaguely agreeable sense that Mr. Peabody's gift has been a good thing for the city—are unaware of what the conservatory really is.

AMONG TOP 10 IN COUNTRY

The Peabody Conservatory, first endowed institution of its kind in the United States, stands among the 10 leading schools of music in the country. Thousands of men and women have carried its stamp of excellence as performers and teachers to every corner in the land: the conservatory is represented in every American symphony orchestra, in opera companies, and on the concert stage, in music departments of many colleges and schools.

Still more thousands in Baltimore and its environs have received their youthful music instruction, as part of their general education, in its preparatory school.

One of its distinguished graduates, Howard Mitchell, musical director of the National Symphony Orchestra, said in a recent address to Baltimore alumni, "The influence exerted in the world of music by former and present students trained by the excellent faculty of the Peabody is incalculable * * * far more people outside of Baltimore than within the city know its eminence."

Stressing the value of a conservatory in developing the "complete musician," he added. "Nowhere can the wellspring of musical talent be as effectively nourished and supplied as it can in a truly great conservatory of music such as the Peabody."

It is for the musician, particularly the professional musician, that a conservatory exists—an institution of European origin that has developed and advanced the art of music since the 16th century. According to music historians, the conservatori, in which the great schools of Italian music were formed, were so called because "they were intended to preserve (conservare) the science of music from corruption." It is precisely in that tradition of guarding the highest standards of teaching against any cheapening of the art that the Peabody has functioned.

SYSTEM OF TRAINING CHANGED

Its system of training, however, has departed from the European type, just as the center of the music world has shifted from Europe to America in this century.

"The old European conservatory was a sort of segmentalized institution—it never had any connection with a college or university," said Dr. Charles S. Kent, Peabody's director, whose musical education has been wholly American. He is the seventh director in the conservatory's history.

"We are still getting people from them, bringing us things like a certificate in piano or organ * * * but in the United States it is necessary that any institution enter into the American educational plan and offer not only special training in any one instrument, composing, conducting, etc., but add as well the complete college curriculum and offer degrees."

So has this been Peabody's trend since 1928, when the State department of education gave it authority to offer a bachelor's degree. Since then a master's degree has been added. And, more recently, a doctor's degree.

"One of the reasons for my coming to the conservatory was to inaugurate a doctoral curriculum," said Dr. Kent, now in his second year as director. He is successor to Dr. Peter Mennin, with whom he served as dean before Mennin left the Peabody to become head of Juilliard School of Music in New York.

"A Ph. D. degree from a graduate school," Dr. Kent explained, "always implies a degree in research; there never has been a comparable degree in music until a few universities, not long ago, started to offer degrees which they called either doctor of music or doctor of musical arts, to recognize a level of achievement in performance or other musical areas such as composition and conducting, comparable to the same level implied by the Ph. D."

Peabody Conservatory is now the only 1 of 11 independent schools of music in the United States to offer the doctoral program (D.M.A.).

ACCREDITED WITH COLLEGES

It is not generally realized in Baltimore, Dr. Kent pointed out, that the conservatory is accredited at the same level by the same agency that accredits Johns Hopkins University, Goucher, Notre Dame and Loyola Colleges—the Middle States Association of Schools and Colleges—as well as by the National Association of Schools of Music, and that, because of its accreditation, it has a well-rounded academic program. Its academic curriculum includes English composition and literature, modern languages, music literature and history, psychology, social science and pedagogy.

The conservatory has an academic affiliation with Goucher, the Johns Hopkins University, Loyola and Towson State College, whereby their students may receive credits toward bachelor degrees in arts or science for music courses taken at Peabody.

Three years ago a committee of the Peabody trustees made a study of the whole field of education of musicians at the professional level. They first inquired whether in the light of the development of departments of music at such institutions as Harvard, Yale, Boston University, Southern California and Indiana, there was a continuing need for independent schools of music. Leading musicians from all parts of the country were consulted.

"There was remarkable unanimity," said William L. Marbury, president of the board of trustees, "in the view that the professional schools were performing a unique and necessary function. While the universities were training the musical historians, lexicographers, the critics and the academic musicians, it was generally agreed that with rare exceptions the composers, performers, and teachers of music as a performing art would have to be trained in independent conservatories. Moreover, it was the opinion of all consulted that only in an independent conservatory could the student find the necessary flexibility of curriculum combined with the professional atmosphere essential to the development of creative musicians.

"The changes which are planned in the Juilliard School after it moves to Lincoln Center and the gradual integration of schools such as Eastman and Oberlin into the universities of which they are a part," Mr. Marbury continued, "will leave the Peabody as one of a few places in the United States where students who seek to combine a mastery of music as creative artists can find the kind of instruction which they require."

EXCELLENT CONDUCTING DEPARTMENT

This was recognized by the Ford Foundation, Dr. Kent pointed out, when they singled out eight independent schools to receive scholarship grants. He referred to the foundation's gift of $400,000 to the Peabody's 3-year (1961–64) American Conductors Project to train and promote American orchestra conductors—the first undertaking of its kind.

"As a result of that project," he said, "the Peabody now has an excellent conducting department, at both undergraduate and graduate levels. We are careful not to encourage anyone in this direction unless he has talent. Eight students are in this department at present. Incidentally, we found that at least one of our girls is showing exceptional conducting talent."

Another development at the conservatory is in the area of opera. "This year for the first time we have a real opera department in which students are performing leading roles," said Dr. Kent. "We imported the artists who originated roles in two operas—Menotti's 'The Medium' and the recently performed 'Masque of Angels' by Dominick Argento, a Peabody graduate—to stimulate the student singers to rise to the professional level."

A new note in the curriculum is a course in electronic music, an introduction to contemporary techniques and developments in electronic tone production. A young Baltimore audio engineer, Burgess MacNeal, conducts it.

Still in the experimental stage, this development in music is a challenging one to music educators. Dr. Kent, an authority on 16th century polyphonic music, is at the same time a composer and recognized theorist in the field of contemporary music.

"Electronic music," he said, "is only an addition to the musical language, not a new language. We are not fighting the old composers, whose place is secure. I believe this new medium which gives us new sounds will eventually blend in with traditional materials; as a matter of fact, composers are already doing this."

CLASSICAL GUITAR COURSE

Another breakthrough in the curriculum—and this one is quite popular—is the classical guitar. "The heads of music schools are agreed," said the Peabody director, "that the classical guitar, as exemplified by musicians such as Segovia and Bream, has achieved the status of a musical instrument. Few realize that music was composed for it as early as the 16th century."

Last year the conservatory introduced a jazz course in its summer school, which has developed enormously over the last 3 years. The summer session in Baltimore concentrates on special seminars and workshops, besides the regular courses leading to degrees.

Henry (Hank) Levy, a Baltimorean and former Peabody student who is doing experimental composing in the jazz idiom for orchestra, introduced a workshop in the writing and performing techniques for stage band and recording orchestra. "The Peabody is serving contemporary society," said Mr. Levy, "in the educational use of jazz."

The Claremont String Quartet will be in residence this summer session, giving concerts, teaching and coaching chamber music. And a faculty will conduct workshops in choral music, church music, and strings. The latter will feature the first teaching appearance in this country of Shinichi Suzuki, of Japan, originator of a method of violin instruction which begins with babies at the age of 6 months and enables them to perform at the age of 3.

Last summer Dr. Kent started a new Peabody summer school in Northampton, Mass., at the invitation of the president of Smith College. "This school," he explained, "deliberately accepts only a small number of students and is limited to master classes in piano, violin, cello, and church music."

The conservatory, of course, has had a distinguished place in the musical life of Baltimore since its founding. It has brought the world's greatest artists for concert appearances here; it has provided the city with the best in music through its artist-instructors' and students' recitals.

Among the 77 instructors in the advanced school faculty are many top-ranking artists. Among them: Pianists Leon Fleisher, Conrad Wolff, Julio Esteban, Elizabeth Katzenellenbogen, Walter Hautzig, Amos Allen; Singers Martial Singher, Frank Valentino, Wayne Conner, Alice Gerstl-Duschak; Violinists Robert Gerle, William Kroll; Cellists Mihaly Virizlay, Paul Olefsky; double bass, Rocco Litolf; flutist, Britton Johnson. The department of theory, composition, and music literature includes, besides Dr. Kent, experts such as Stefan Grove, Sam di Bonaventura, Louis Cheslock, Robert Hall Lewis, Elliott Galkin, and the conservatory's dean, Ray Robinson.

The fact that a number of the key faculty members are commuting to the Peabody from New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, where they also teach at other institutions or give private instruction, is a matter of immediate concern to the trustees.

"Because of this arrangement," said Mr. Marbury, "it has not been feasible to make permanent appointments with the usual academic tenure.

"While, in spite of these handicaps, the level of distinction of the faculty has been high, there can be no doubt that the institution has suffered, not only in frequent changes in personnel but from its inability to attract certain individuals who would have been only too glad under different circumstances to come to the Peabody and make their residence in Baltimore."

One of the considerations of the Peabody's campaign to raise $2 million is a minimum endowment of five chairs, or permanent appointments, in the departments of composition, conducting, piano, strings, and voice.

The conservatory seeks, in addition to increased funds to support faculty salaries, an increase also in endowed scholarships—a permanent need for so many students of superior ability whose financial status, as Dr. Kent points out, "seems to be in inverse ratio to their talent."

A major objective of the campaign is the building of dormitories. John M. Nelson, 3d, president of the Peabody says, "We are losing promising prospective students because we have no dormitories. About half our students come from out of State and we must have a place to put them.

"Some gifted students," he said, "have gone elsewhere because of inadequate facilities. Dormitories have been planned to include two 4-story pavilions, housing 84 men and 84 women students."

ENROLLMENT TOTALS 437

Enrolled in the conservatory are 437 young men and women. They come from 36 States and 13 foreign countries. Summer school enrollment last year included 375 students, plus 25 at Northampton. "Ideally," said Dean Ray Robertson, "the conservatory's enrollment should never exceed 500."

No problem of housing afflicts the Peabody's preparatory department—generally considered the best and largest of its kind in the country. Its steady enrollment, for years totaling more than 2,500 students, is drawn from Baltimore and the metropolitan area.

About 5 percent of its graduates go on to advanced study in the Conservatory, of which it is a subdivision. Its Towson studios, in a new building, constitute the biggest of its four branches (900 enrolled). Others are at Milford Mill Park School and Roland Park Country School. The main school, adjoining the Conservatory in Mount Vernon Place, rings with activity day and night.

"The school just jumps on Saturdays," says its superintendent, Leah Thorp, whose assistant is Anita Phillips. "Every corner of this five-story building, every studio, plus 12 studios in the Conservatory, the 51 practice rooms, the 3 dance studios (more than 600 dance pupils), are filled with students in every branch of the curriculum."

All branches of study are graded and examinations given in each. The standards for student performances are absolute: every program for a public recital must be passed on by a committee of examiners in advance—just as in the Conservatory. The preparatory department, in fact, has become a model for similar schools throughout the country and abroad.

"For most students here," said Miss Thorpe, "Peabody Preparatory is part of their cultural preparation." Most go on to college, not to major in music—although some discover that music is their real forte.

TEACHERS ON FACULTY, 104

"With 104 teachers on our faculty (including 50 piano instructors), we make a great attempt to match the student with the teacher; we have some teachers who are expert with little children; some who thoroughly understand the teenage group, and some particularly successful with the gifted, extraordinarily talented child.

"We make recommendations, depending on their rating, of graduates who can enter the conservatory's advanced school. There comes a point at which the faculty must pass on the student's potential for a career—must make the critical decision of whether his or her potential is more suited for teaching than performing."

The conservatory is separate from the equally renowned Peabody Library, housed in the same building—but both are related by the terms of their founding as entities of the Peabody Institute. (Originally the institute comprised an art gallery as well; it is now the main recital hall.)

Since its accreditation, the library services for the conservatory's students and faculty have become a function of the Peabody Institute's general library. Its music section occupies the former reading room and holds more than 35,000 volumes and pieces of music. The National Inventory of Musical Sources of the Library of Congress recently singled it out, upon discovering that it "holds more rare early music items than any other school in the United States except the Eastman School of Music."

The conservatory's trustees, Mr. Marbury said, "feel that a heavy obligation rests upon them" to continue the purpose for which the Peabody was founded nearly a hundred years ago. The campaign for additional resources, required to carry out the role they are trying to fill, is well underway.

"So far we have raised about $850,000," he said, "of which more than $500,000 has come from the board of trustees, the women's board and the faculty."

The Ford Foundation is considering a request for a matching grant of $500,000 and, Mr. Marbury added, "we are hopeful of receiving additional funds from other foundations which have local interests."

Fifty Million May Not Be Wrong, but One Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1965, the Sacramento, Calif., Bee carried an excellent editorial setting forth the long record of President Charles de Gaulle, of France, in his efforts to undermine Western solidarity and to embarrass the United States in our relations with other nations. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

FIFTY MILLION MAY NOT BE WRONG, BUT ONE IS

The intractable Charles de Gaulle seems to decide official French policy on the exclusive basis of: Will it injure the U.S. position? In every instance of consequnece the position of De Gaulle reads like something out of the enemy camp.

Take Vietnam. Here France has all but branded the United States as the aggressor. De Gaulle's alinement with Red China in this is crucial and embarrasses and complicates the American interest.

Take Europe. De Gaulle alone has destroyed the solidarity of the Western defense. In his ambition to make of France the dominant power in the Western alliance, he has made all Western defenses weaker—including France's.

Take Cuba. The United States was crying wolf, he said in 1962, over Cuba's ambitions to spread its influence into all of Latin America. He could not see why this nation considered Castroism so dangerous. Recall, next,

the attempt by Russians to turn Cuba into a launching pad for missiles and Cuba's attempts to export revolution; for instance, to Venezuela.

Now take Santo Domingo, still an unresolved issue and still extremely dangerous and where the least incendiary could trigger a new disaster. De Gaulle said he is considering recognizing the rebel "government" of Col. Francisco Caamano Dano. In the same breath, De Gaulle talks of:

Modern imperialism, which, invoking, as always, contrary ideologies, menaces our universe.

The reference pointedly is to the United States.

What De Gaulle is seeking to do can be reduced down to the meanest politics; he is consumed with the ambition to make of France a new, grand power, and before France can become the leader of the West, the present leadership has to give way—and this means the United States.

Moreover, he is running for reelection as President, and he has chosen the United States as his whipping boy in his bid for votes. Lastly, he is playing, obviously, for a wider base of support among the uncommitted nations with his mouthings of "colonialism" and "imperialism." Unhappily, the uncommitted take to this bait like mad.

De Gaulle may have been the one man in all of France who could have ended the political chaos which existed within France when he came into power, yet he is the one man who also can make chaos out of what was Western solidarity; and he seems to be working overtime to do it. Fifty million Frenchmen cannot be wrong, perhaps, but there is one who is way out of line.

The Conquest of Time and Distance Has Helped Floridians in Developing This Fine Peninsula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the recognition given by the Florida Times-Union to the Old Spanish Trail Festival which is now in progress at my hometown of Crestview.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TIME AND DISTANCE HAS HELPED FLORIDIANS IN DEVELOPING THIS FINE PENINSULA

(By Joe Crankshaw)

Horsemen who completed the 5-day Old Spanish Trail ride yesterday are scheduled to be honored at an open horse show in Crestview today. Both the ride and the show are part of the Old Spanish Trail Festival which will last all week in Okaloosa County.

Participants in the ride assembled in Tallahassee last Tuesday and then followed the route of the Spanish Trail for 186 miles to Crestview. At this point, the trail approximates the location of U.S. 90.

The Spanish Trail originally connected St. Augustine, Pensacola, and New Orleans. The Florida segment was probably first blazed by Roman Catholic monks moving out of St. Augustine to found missions in the Apalachee country around Tallahassee and St. Marks.

The portion of the trail between the missions and St. Augustine was relatively well traveled but the section which went on to Pensacola was less heavily traveled. Since the trail was not a road but rather a rutted pathway it was most often used by horsemen. Few carriages and wagons attempted to cross it and east and west Florida generally remained unconnected by land.

Besides being a difficult road, the trail was dangerous. Indians on the warpath, renegade whites, raiders from Georgia, and just plain bandits made it a hair-raising route across Florida. Use of the trail diminished when the English raiders from Georgia virtually wiped out the Spanish missions in the Apalachee region.

Gen. Andrew Jackson and his men marched along the trail when he entered Florida, and his men undoubtedly widened it to accommodate their wagons and artillery. The trail was also used by the men searching for a site for the territorial capital. Gradually it became a road.

The horsemen who made the 186-mile ride followed a broad concrete or asphalt roadway which now connects Jacksonville, Tallahassee and Pensacola, along with all the cities in between. In a way, the whizzing automobiles and the plodding horses which shared the road right-of-way last week were visible representatives of the history of transportation in Florida.

Few visitors and not too many residents know that transportation from point to point has not always been an easy matter. The average visitor or citizen looks about him and sees a broad, generally flat land which has few natural obstacles to bar his path and cannot understand that this State was once divided because of the difficulty of travel.

The Spaniards settled along the coastal and inland waterways because ships and small boats were the principal means of travel. Roads were nonexistent and there were only a few trails which had either been made by Indians and animals or staked out by traders and missionaries.

Communication between east and west Florida regions was by ship and this meant going from the site of St. Marks down the Gulf coast, around the Keys and back to St. Augustine. The voyage took many days but then travel by land would have been no quicker.

The St. Augustine-Apalachee path was opened for mounted troops in 1704, according to State road department records, and a soldier is said to have traveled the 200 miles in about 3 days.

When the English came they built a few roads, the most famous of which, called the "King's Road," ran from St. Augustine to the St. Mary's River on the north and New Smyrna and the Indian River on the south. The English used the Spanish Trail to St. Marks occasionally but there was little travel in that direction.

During the second Spanish period no roads were built and the King's Road, which follows U.S. 1, was allowed to deteriorate.

When the United States formally acquired Florida in 1821, the Federal Government appropriated funds to construct a real road from Pensacola to St. Augustine. This road was large enough for wagons, had bridges over the small rivers and ferries for the larger rives and lakes which could not be bypassed.

Few people can understand how difficult travel in Florida was in those days unless they have had an opportunity to fly over the State and see the thousands of lakes, swamps, and small rivers which break the land up and block any traveler who is not properly prepared to negotiate them.

Needless to say, river boats and canoes continued to be the principal means of transportation for many years.

The history of roadbuilding and other forms of communication in Florida is long and fascinating, including, as it does, the construction of a railroad over the sea, and later a highway over the route followed by the tracks. Unfortunately, it is a story that must be told in many chapters.

Roads, however, have lost none of their interest for Floridians, who are always interested in safer, faster means of linking one section of the State with another, for they realize that as communications become easier and distances are conquered, that it will unite the people of Florida and allow them to devote their energies to the maximum development of this most fortunate of peninsulas.

Situation in the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention a statement made by a very distinguished community leader of Puerto Rico concerning American foreign policy toward the Dominican Republic.

This matter is currently very critical. Mr. Louis Ferre, of Puerto Rico, addresses himself to the issue, and in turn offers some sharp commentary.

For the information of my colleagues, I would like to insert Mr. Ferre's statement at this point in the RECORD:

DOCTRINE OF DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY

The recent landing in the Dominican Republic of U.S. forces to protect American citizens and property and to prevent the Communist takeover of this young Republic, has been criticized by those who would sacrifice the lives of many innocent people in order to stick to wornout cliches of pseudo-champions of democracy. These people belong to two groups. Those who use such cliches and phrases as a smokescreen to induce paralysis of the defensive forces of democracies friends, keeping the way open for the takeover of a Communist protected tyranny, or those who have lost contact with the realities of the mid-20th century world, and continue dreaming of the conditions of the 19th century which gave birth to our present democratic systems.

The world has changed very radically since those days, and what were natural methods for young democracies during their formation periods, are not sufficient anymore to help them through that period. We need to think boldly of new approaches to meet new challenges. Today there is a worldwide conspiracy of Communist centers of power, perfectly organized, with well trained cadres of men and unlimited amounts of military equipment, ready to seize upon the slightest opportunity within an inexperienced democracy, to move in at a moment of crisis and establish the tyrannical government of a well organized minority, such as exists today in Russia, Cuba, or China.

It is against this reality that the true democracies of our time, and principally the United States, with its greater experience in self-government and more military strength, must weigh their responsibilities. In the first place, let us study what are democracies' responsibilities. Democratic government is government by the people, with the consent of the people, for one prime purpose: the elimination of any form of tyrannical government that might endanger the respect to the dignity, the life, or the freedom of all and every one of its citizens. I emphasize "every one," because people have developed the mistaken notion that if a government has been elected by a vote of the majority, it is legitimately democratic, even if some of its citizens are viciously killed or

arbitrarily deprived of their natural rights to freedom and the pursuit of happiness.

This is, of course, a false conception of democracy, and has led to the mistaken notion that when people are being killed and denied their natural rights under a government that is unable to establish law and order even if duly elected, the rest of the world should stand by and permit such crimes without raising a hand to prevent it, even if such situation leads to a Communist takeover and the institution of a tyranny.

Such selfish nationalistic notions are contrary to the spirit of a society which is integrated today into a world community where the more mature and wealthier nations are being daily requested to help the emerging nations with their economic means. The nations of today, under what we might call a law of human solidarity, are responsible not only to their nationals, but also to humanity as a whole. They cannot pretend to commit crimes against innocent human beings within their boundaries unmolested, claiming that their territories are inviolable. Such concept of nationalistic freedom to violate the rights of man, certainly is not in agreement with the concept of a world under the principle of a United Nations and a World Court.

The American foreign aid program was a complete reversal of the old practices of a world where every nation was guided only by selfish interest taking advantages of other peoples through a military conquest and a colonial policy of exploitation. It established what we might call a code of international moral responsibility under which the wealthier nations voluntarily assume the responsibility to help the emerging nations to solve their economic problems. It proclaimed our Christian set of values and our democratic standards, as the guiding principles of the world community. The United Nations with its Four Freedoms and its enunciation of a bill of rights protecting all men, of all races, was the culmination of the U.S. efforts towards the establishment of a world under moral law, in which the human being is fully protected.

To achieve our objective, in the face of the present communistic conspiracy to destroy our democratic concept of life, we must be ready to extend our help with a three pronged approach. Economic, cultural, and military under what we may call the doctrine of democratic solidarity. The democratic community must organize itself to help in extending economic and cultural aid to all emerging democracies. But we must also be ready to offer military protection to prevent the Communist conspiracy from destroying our efforts to help young democracies gain experience and maturity in evolving their free societies. Such military actions which are not inspired by selfish motivation of territorial or economic gain and which conform to the spirit of the Declaration of Bogotá and Punta del Este, cannot be judged in the same light as the old time military interventions. They constitute our acceptance and the acceptance of the democratic community together with us, of our responsibility for protecting the success of our efforts to extend economic and cultural aid to all emerging democratic societies.

Improved Coast Guard Vessels a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, I had the pleasure of attending the launching of the new Coast Guard vessel *Confidence* at the Coast Guard yard at Curtis Bay in Maryland. This is truly a wonderful vessel equipped with every modern device to enable the Coast Guard to carry out the duties assigned to it in protecting our country.

Our colleague, the distinguished chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Congressman BONNER, gave the principal address at the launching of the *Confidence*. Chairman BONNER called attention to many facts concerning the Coast Guard which I feel are unknown to most of us and which merit our serious consideration to insure that we continue to enact the necessary legislation to improve our Coast Guard vessels in the best interests of the United States.

I am sure all the Members of the House will be interested in reading Congressman BONNER's address and under unanimous consent I place it at this point in the RECORD.

REMARKS OF HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, AT LAUNCHING OF USCGC "CONFIDENCE" (WPC-619) AT CURTIS BAY, MD., ON MAY 8, 1965

I am pleased and proud to be present at the launching of this beautiful vessel today.

For all too long, I have observed the Coast Guard struggling with war surplus castoffs to the detriment not only of its missions but also at the risk of the heroic men who make up its membership.

The Coast Guard has always been very close to my heart, living as I do on the coast of North Carolina. I have long known firsthand of the efforts that it makes to protect our shipping. Since I have been a member, and am presently chairman, of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I have had even greater opportunity to get a broad understanding of its many functions.

The necessity for newer and better equipped vessels increases as the missions assigned to the Coast Guard increase. Up to a few years ago, we had no worry about Soviet incursion of our fishing grounds. Now, off Alaska, the New England coast and the Florida coast, this has become a dangerous situation, not only to the livelihood, but also to the lives, of our fishermen.

We have seen the Cuban threat increased, only to be kept under reasonable control through the efforts of the Coast Guard.

The grave situation in the Dominican Republic may mean more work in the Caribbean.

Just a week ago the Navy, with the President's approval, requested the redeployment of 17 of the best of the Coast Guard's versatile 83-foot cutters to patrol the waters off the coasts of Vietnam. The duty is in a field of special competence for the Coast Guard. This instance highlights the huge responsibility of the Coast Guard and the need for it to be constantly ready. Although the move is a clearly necessary one, the fact remains that it deprives major areas of our east, gulf and west coasts of the search, rescue, and law-enforcement protection which these cutters would normally provide. This is a matter of great concern.

This week I and other members of our committee introduced legislation to authorize the immediate replacement of the 17 cutters going into Far Eastern service. I am pleased to report that the committee and the House recognized the emergency and quickly acted. But even so, it will be from 14 to 18 months before the new vessels are constructed and become operational.

As an interim measure our committee directed that I and the ranking minority member, Mr. MAILLIARD, of California, write the Commandant, urging that every effort should be made to acquire vessels from other sources to meet urgent domestic needs in the coming months. I hope and expect that this will be done.

Since the duty of authorizing expenditures for Coast Guard equipment has come to my committee, I have made every effort to expand its requests for new vessels. I have one grave criticism of its actions, however. I feel that the service is much too modest in its requests for new equipment and facilities. Only now is it undertaking the construction of new large cutters to replace the wartime castoffs that it has been using for the past 20 years or more. One has only to understand the severe and dangerous work undertaken by these vessels to realize the necessity for the newest and safest equipment.

I am hopeful that in the future we will be able to do more in this respect to upgrade the Coast Guard fleet. It is performing a vital function, not only for those who use our waters, but also for those of us who are fortunate enough to travel abroad, whether it be by sea or air. Their ocean station vessels and their aircraft are continuously on the alert to respond to any emergency.

We must redouble our efforts to maintain the proud record of safety that has been established through the efforts of the Coast Guard and this can only be accomplished by providing it with the tools to do its work.

It is my hope and expectation that more and more new vessels will be provided to better enable the Coast Gurd to meet its responsibilities as time goes on.

I, for my part, intend to do my best to see that this occurs.

Thank you.

A Policy To Coordinate Social Security Disability and Vocational Rehabilitation Programs To Avoid Shuttling Citizens Back and Forth From One Agency to Another

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, every congressional office which handles a large volume of cases involving constituents in their dealings with Federal agencies has become familiar with the shuttlecock procedure by which the constituent is sent from agency to agency, back and forth. Under the very best of circumstances, some of this is inevitable, because of the specific jurisdiction of agency programs and the fact that, for the citizen's own good, several agencies may have to become involved. But it is indeed infuriating when he is given conflicting advice by several agencies, and sent from one to another in vain.

Recently, I came across a rather classic case in which the constituent was an amputee with other disabilities. He applied for social security disability benefits, but was turned down because it was felt that with a proper artificial limb and other rehabilitation, he could hold a job. The Vocational Rehabilitation Service in Missouri, on the other hand, felt that rehabilitation in his case would not assure employability, and sent him back to so-

cial security, which felt he could be employable if rehabilitated—and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that at my request this man's application for rehabilitation services was further reviewed; it was subsequently approved and he has been fitted with a new artificial limb and efforts are being made to give him every opportunity to return to useful employment. I do not know what the outcome will be—perhaps he will be found to be unable to handle substantial employment, at which point there will certainly be no further question about his eligibility for social security disability benefits.

INQUIRY TO SECRETARY CELEBREZZE

But this case led me to wonder how much coordination there is—and how much there could be—of the social security disability and the vocational rehabilitation programs, both of which are well administered through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by capable and dedicated officials. Consequently, I sent the following letter to Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1965.

Hon. ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: How much coordination is there between the people at social security who deal with the disability benefits program, and the State and local office of the Vocational Rehabilitation Service? I wish you would get both the outstanding Director of Vocational Rehabilitation, Mary E. Switzer, and your fine Commissioner of Social Security, Robert M. Ball, to join in a report to me on how these two programs are coordinated.

My inquiry arises from a case on which I just worked. A constituent was rejected for social security disability benefits on the grounds that with the proper prosthetic devices, and other rehabilitation service, etc., he could be employable; the Missouri Office of Vocational Rehabilitation apparently did nothing to help him because they felt he was more likely a candidate for social security disability. After writing to one agency and then to the other, I am happy to report that the Missouri Vocational Rehabilitation finally is going to provide him some service, but whether he will be employable I cannot say. But for months this man was shuttled from one agency to the other, each saying that he was the other's responsibility.

Since both programs are centered in your department, I am sure you are actively seeking to achieve the best possible coordination between them where they are dealing with the same individual. So I would appreciate knowing what is being done and how it is being done.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. John B. Sullivan,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Mo.

REPORT ON COORDINATION BY COMMISSIONERS BALL AND SWITZER

Mr. Speaker, I have today received a report on this matter from the Commissioner of Social Security and the Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, which I feel the Members would all want to read. I have a high regard for both officials, and I strongly believe in both programs. When I first came to Congress I was proud to vote for the expanded vocational rehabilitation program sponsored in the 83d Congress by two Members from Pennsylvania, Representatives McConnell and Kelley. And of course it was my great privilege to be able to vote for the Mills bills which made it possible for disabled workers to begin collecting social security before age 65; first we reduced this age to 50, then removed the age requirement entirely. As good as these programs are, we must constantly work at keeping them alert to the problems of the individual.

Mr. Speaker, the report referred to is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1965.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: The question contained in your letter of March 22, 1965, regarding coordination between the Social Security Administration and the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration relates to a subject of utmost importance to our department. I am enclosing a report by Mr. Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security, and Miss Mary E. Switzer, Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, on this matter. Please call on me if you desire any further information on these programs.

Sincerely,
WILBUR J. COHEN,
Acting Secretary.

REPORT FOR REPRESENTATIVE LEONOR K. SULLIVAN ON THE COORDINATION BETWEEN THE SOCIAL SECURITY AND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION PROGRAMS

We can assure you that there has been, and continues to be, close coordination between the Social Security Administration and the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration on all matters of mutual program interest affecting rehabilitation for individuals who apply for disability insurance benefits. Our respective staffs are constantly seeking improvements in methods and techniques for coordinating joint efforts. The Social Security Administration and Vocational Rehabilitation Administration endeavors in this area are based on the congressional intent that disability applicants with vocational rehabilitation potential be identified, referred, and given vocational rehabilitation services wherever possible to restore them to productive capacity.

Individual determinations to provide services, of course, fall within the jurisdiction of State vocational rehabilitation agencies. Each agency operates with joint Federal-State financing under a State plan which is consistent with the Federal vocational rehabilitation law and the regulations issued thereunder. We are constantly striving to assure that disability applicants who have a potential for rehabilitation are afforded the opportunity to get those services from the State agency. We have made considerable progress along these lines, with an increasing number of applicants rehabilitated each year; however, we also recognize that more remains to be done.

The large number of applicants for disability benefits presents a continuing problem for the limited supply of State vocational rehabilitation financial resources and facilities. So that these facilities and resources can be utilized most effectively, it has been necessary for State agencies to adopt a rehabilitation screening process to select for rehabilitation consideration those who are most likely to have capacity for restoration to productive activity. We have arranged to have the agency review every disability applicant's file for rehabilitation potential, taking into account, among other things, the nature of his disability and his vocational and educational background. Applicants selected by the State agency are given an opportunity to discuss with a counselor the services that could be made available to him under the rehabilitation program. The agency then determines the applicants to whom services should be offered. The services are available regardless of the outcome of the disability claim—whether it is allowed or denied.

In spite of our activities to achieve maximum coordination with each State agency, it is still unfortunately true that some individuals who are denied disability insurance benefits are also not accepted for rehabilitation services. This occurs in most instances because of inherent differences between the criteria applicable to a determination of eligibility for disability benefits and the criteria applied in determining an applicant's eligibility for rehabilitation within the limits of an individual State's program and resources. It is a continuing objective of the Social Security Administration, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and the State agencies to eliminate as far as possible those situations in which a social security applicant with good potential for restoration to productive employment may fail to receive appropriate rehabilitation services. Whenever such cases are called to the attention of the agencies involved, special efforts are made to correct the difficulty wherever possible and to have the applicant considered for rehabilitation services in as responsive and helpful a manner as possible.

In addition to efforts to improve the case-by-case referral of disability applicants for rehabilitation services, we have been carrying out various joint demonstration projects and activities designed to promote better interprogram coordination. These include:

1. A joint Social Security Administration-Vocational Rehabilitation Administration Handbook is being prepared to afford vocational rehabilitation counselors a more comprehensive knowledge of the Social Security Administration program and procedures and enable them to better plan for the rehabilitation of social security applicants.

2. A demonstration project has been started in Atlanta, Ga., to determine the most feasible time for referral of the social security applicant for vocational rehabilitation and placement services and to determine the most effective way of coordinating the activities of the agencies most directly involved in the disability determination and rehabilitation process—the Social Security Administration, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the State vocational rehabilitation agency, and the State employment service.

3. A demonstration project has been carried out in the District of Columbia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency involving the rehabilitation of social security applicants in situations where it appears that such rehabilitation can be achieved quickly. This project has established the need for looking further into the provision of intensive counseling and placement services to disability applicants.

4. A research project to determine the optimum amount of evidence necessary for effectively evaluating disability for benefit purposes as well as the rehabilitation potential of social security applicants was conducted in three States—Minnesota, Ohio, and Louisiana. A final report on the project is now being prepared.

5. Projects have been undertaken in 11 States to provide data on new techniques for rehabilitating severely disabled beneficiaries. These demonstration projects, now near completion, studied the extent to which those so severely disabled as to become social security beneficiaries and not normally considered as rehabilitation candidates, actually could be restored to employment through the provision of intensive services by rehabilita-

tion centers. A final report is expected soon and undoubtedly will be of considerable help both in program planning and in providing services for this severely disabled group.

ROBERT M. BALL,
Commissioner,
Social Security.
MARY E. SWITZER,
Commissioner,
Vocational Rehabilitation.

Santa Cruz County Will Have the Most Skilled Waitresses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURT L. TALCOTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the administration war on poverty may be largely useless and extravagantly wasteful, but certainly we will have a better educated and more highly skilled army of unemployed than ever before.

In New York and Washington where the politicians stridently deplore the large numbers of unemployed there are no job training programs for restaurant workers—waiters are simply imported from Europe.

In my district, where there is no scarcity of competent, willing waitresses, the Federal Government is financing a school for waitresses at extraordinary expense.

Mr. Frank Orr, the editor of the Watsonville Register-Pajaronian, tells about the training program far better than I. The program is probably not typical—it may be one of the wisest, most efficient, least extravagent and most productive in the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to include his editorial comment of April 30, 1965:

Be of good cheer, oh diners-out. Santa Cruz County is about to acquire a brandnew crop of intensively trained waitresses, familiar not only with practical matters (serve on the left, take away on the right) and quaint folk customs (pour a little wine and the bits of cork, if any, in the host's glass, and wait for him to taste it), but also with something called background and theory, which will help take up 2 weeks of their course.

Not, you understand, that we have even a teensy objection to the exceptional skills and cheerful demeanor of the ladies who make eating out a delightful adventure right now. For patience, good humor, and the ability to get the rare steak in front of the fellow who wants it rare, they are unsurpassed at the Pump Room, Antoine's, the Tour d'Argent or Simpson's-in-the-Strand.

But a new platoon is to go into training at Cabrillo College, under a program financed by the Federal Government at a cost of $25,591, we are informed by Representative BURT TALCOTT. One hundred unemployed women from the Santa Cruz city area will be given 6-week crash courses in how to be waitresses. When they get through, and augment the most excellent force now in action in this area, Santa Cruz County should become a mecca for all those who enjoy gracious dining.

The Government's program for training Americans in new skills is a whole hog proposition. In what other area of the Nation's life would people be trained in such a manner for employment in private industry? (Adult education already is hard at work turning out new crops of bank tellers in Watsonville, a training job which previously was left to banks themselves. The benefits of this training have not yet been extended to the newspaper industry; our printers train our apprentices, and the mysteries of switchboards and news story construction are usually unveiled by office managers and managing editors.)

The supervision of these classes will likewise be of the highest order. There will be a coordinator drawing $9 an hour for a few hours, but the classes will actually be under the supervision of the head of waitresses at a Santa Cruz restaurant. This chief instructor will draw $6 per classroom hour from the Federal grant, and that isn't exactly hay, even if it's realized that outside time will be necessary for preparation.

The instructor's job is not a permanent one, of course. If it were, and if the weekly hours ran to 40, and the job was a year-round proposition, then the salary would be at an annual rate of $12,280.

This may give pause to the regular faculty at Cabrillo, which must draw its pay from local and State funds, not Federal, and which averages $8,900 a year. It might even cause a top-ranking Ph. D. on the Cabrillo teaching staff to add up his own salary, of just under $12,000, and wonder whether he chose the right calling. But let him just wait; chances are he'll never see a drop of coffee spilled in a saucer the rest of his life.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, when these ladies graduate, fresh fruit and vegetable prices may be so high—due to the crop spoilage from lack of harvest labor in the adjoining fields—that the Great Society may not be able to dine out.

Milwaukee Journal Hails the Success of the Manpower Retraining Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial, the Milwaukee Journal hailed the notable success of the manpower retraining program. The editorial set forth concisely and cogently the great value of this program in reducing unemployment and strengthening our economy.

I include the text of the editorial:

TAXPAYERS, NOT TAX EATERS

Signing legislation to extend the manpower retraining program recently, President Johnson remarked that the effort has been "a wise and necessary companion to our efforts in the education field."

The assessment was correct. Nothing demonstrates the program's success better than the fact that three-fourths of those who have received training have been placed in jobs, have in the President's words, become "taxpayers instead of tax eaters."

The latest report on the program from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shows that 320,000 unemployed persons have been approved for training, with 135,000 currently enrolled.

Growth in quality and adaptability of the labor supply is becoming more and more important in order to keep abreast of the changing occupational profile of the economy. Training and retraining, together with a dynamic educational system, are essential to achieve this objective.

Of the 70 million persons 18 years old and older in the labor force last year, 5 out of 9 had completed high school. However, less than one-half of that group had been exposed to some college training. At the opposite end of the scale, schooling had stopped with the eighth grade or below for about one person in four. In other words, the undereducated group (by current standards) is more than twice as large as the number of college graduates in the labor force.

These facts help explain why, despite signs of an increasing volume of unfilled job openings, suitable employment opportunities cannot be found today for many of the 3,750,000 or so unemployed persons. Educational deficiency isn't the only reason, of course. Technological change and growing emphasis upon service industries have given rise to many new occupations and are causing the obsolescence of old ones. Thus, a premium is placed upon a good basic education as a measure of capacity to learn new skills.

As this year's manpower report puts it: "Education is becoming an essential intermediary between man and his work."

Judge or Jury?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, aside from the obvious moral implications involved in the spread of pornographic material among young people, the declining level of cultural quality is a major concern of critics and other distinguished professional persons in the entertainment and publishing fields.

The noted drama and movie critic of the New York Herald Tribune, Judith Crist, has been eloquently outspoken in her analyses of the trashy content of much contemporary dramatic offering. In the last analysis obscene literature and obscene theater are bad art—if they are art at all.

Unfortunately, the current legal test that anything is legally acceptable to the public if it does not offend the lowes common denominator of the community standard, is responsible for this depreciation of culture. The unfortunate connotation of these recent decisions is that the people of a community are not even in a position to develop a practical and acceptable standard of their own, especially as regards the minor children of that community. This is because the courts in an obvious dilemma between the necessary protection of free speech and publication and their inability to ascertain a standard for the community, have chosen to arbitrarily set a standard of the court's own choosing—namely, the community's moral subcellar or nethermost level.

An interesting commentary on this pressing question appeared in the April-May issue of the Newsletter of Operation Yorkville, the community agency in New

York City which is leading the anti-pornography drive in that city.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to this article entitled "Judge or Jury?" as well as the observations of a noted jurist in this connection, immediately following the article:

JUDGE OR JURY

Reflections on recent obscenity decisions, both local and national, require, it seems to us, the posing of three pertinent questions: Should not the test of obscenity rest, after all, on the standard of the community? Does a jury represent the community? Do not the defendant and the people have a right to trial by jury?

The questions must be asked in New York State, for here obscenity cases are tried by judges in criminal court and, if carried through, by seven justices in the State Court of Appeals. The questions must be asked on a national level, for last June Mr. Justice Brennan (Mr. Justice Goldberg concurring) of the U.S. Supreme Court said in his Jacobellis opinion: "The question of whether a particular work is obscene necessarily implicates a question of constitutional law * * *. Such an issue, we think, must ultimately be decided by this Court."

The questions must be asked, for too many justices have proven themselves too specialized, too doctrinaire in their readings of the law and the Constitution.

The December 1964 issue of the Notre Dame Lawyer turns its attention to the question of "Obscenity in the Supreme Court:" "It is impossible to consider this question out of context. It must be considered in relation to the time and place of sale or exhibition of the disputed item * * * the only viable standard is the standard of the community of the time and place; that is to say, the standard of the jury, for, in our jurisprudential system, the jury is the community."

The Notre Dame Lawyer also reflects: "If the (Supreme) Court itself must decide the issues in obscenity cases, why must it not decide for itself, for example, whether a convicted murderer, when he fired the fatal shot, was capable of distinguishing right from wrong and not under a compulsion he was powerless to resist? And, if there is no such duty in a murder case, why is there in an obscenity case? If there is such a duty in obscenity cases, is not the right of free expression thereby given priority over the right of life itself and, if so, what basis is there for this extraordinary preference?

"No one doubts that our murderer is accorded due process of law when he is sent to his death on a jury's finding that he was sane when he inflicted the fatal wound; but the author or publisher or peddler, as the case may be, of "The Tropic of Cancer" is not accorded due process of law until the Supreme Court of the United States decides issues. (Yet) both involve the selfsame provision of the Constitution, namely, the due process clause of the 14th amendment."

We submit, with the Notre Dame Lawyer, "that the Supreme Court would be well advised to reexamine the problem of obscenity and, more particularly, to recognize the jury as the authentic alter ego of the community, reflecting its morals and mores more truly than even the wisest of judges."

We submit, further, that New York State officials would be well advised that the defendant and the people should have a right to trial by jury.

JUDGE HOFSTADTER ADVOCATES: "JURY"

"On the basic assumption that pornography may not find shelter under the wing of the first amendment—that it is not immune from proscription; it is our submission that the desired result in the application of the law, within the criterion established by Roth, can be best achieved by relegating the issue in each instance to a local jury, which shall be the sole judge of the law and the facts—the rule which continues to obtain in libel cases to this day."

New York Judge Samuel H. Hofstadter in part I of an article coauthored with Shirley R. Levittan (New York State Bar Journal, February 1965) says: "It is not surprising that the Supreme Court has not succeeded in drawing 'the dim and uncertain line' between proscribed obscenity and constitutionally protected expression. The Court is hopelessly—and inevitably—divided. And the division cannot be viewed simplistically as one of philosophy only. For the fission crisscrosses the Court,, and the views of the Justices, as judged from their expression, remain neither constant nor confined to the identic spokesman * * * we question that any logical pattern emerges from the Court's swithering course."

Judge Hofstadter sees that "the difficulty is that the Justices have unwittingly followed a line hewn by a simpler age and have sought for mere definitions—and nominal reformulations of definitions—as the key to a solution. It is now eminently clear that no definition, however carefully carved out, or by whomever formulated can ever suffice indefinitely. * * * What is required * * * is a reorientation of both approach and procedure dealing with this matter.

"Obscenity is not a true constitutional problem but rather one of application of generally valid statutes. Hence, when an effort is made to bring matter within its protection, the Supreme Court should be more diffident in arrogating to itself subjective evaluations. This is a jury's function. * * * In the context of pornography, the jury process is uniquely salutary—and imperative.

"The role of the Supreme Court is to announce standards, not to proceed in each instance on an ad hoc basis; for the Court to do so is both sociologically and juridically unsound. * * * The tortuous process of ad hoc decision at the summit in this fluid area has resulted in a 'gaseous expansion' of the penumbra of the first amendment to an extent that has emboldened many to espouse publicly the strange view that pornography enjoys complete immunity as an aspect of freedom of expression."

Judge Hofstadter proposes that "in every case where the question arises and howsoever it arises, the issue of obscenity be relegated to a jury manifesting the community view which reflects the varying imponderables on a local level."

Raise Him Up Again and All of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the 100th anniversary of the burial of Abraham Lincoln, a program was held on Sunday, May 2, 1965, at New Salem Village—Lincoln's home as a youth—during which an eloquent invocation was uttered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Michael O. Driscoll, pastor of Our Saviour Church, Jacksonville, Ill.

This eloquent testimonial belongs high in the literature of Lincoln. Here is the text:

TRIBUTE TO LINCOLN

Who dares to speak the name of God?
We do.
God—Father—your children dare it and do.
And, having risked this, we dare even more;
We ask you to listen.
We demand your attention.

Listen, God,
We have something big to ask;
Something we need,
The world needs.

Here is what we ask.

When men begin to forget you,
Or your Son,
(As they have done and do),
We know you have ways to jog their memories,
To make them remember.

We think you did it once before,
Some hundred years ago or more.

A man came here.
Somewhat like (now be patient, God)
Somewhat like your Christ he was—
To be sure, as a tallow-candle resembles the sun—
But the likeness, was there all right.
Perhaps we didn't know it then,
But now we do.

A log cabin was his Bethlehem.
He was poor,
When we call him a redeemer,
We write the word in lower-case, God, in small letters.
But he was a redeemer.
He delivered men from bondage,
And he preached malice toward none and love for all,
And he, too, like the grain of wheat,
Perished that a harvest could be reaped.
The dreams he forged here in this Nazareth on the Sangamon,
Were to lead him to his Calvary beside the Potomac.
On the hills of Gettysburg, he spoke his Sermon on the Mount,
And then he was murdered on a Friday in Spring,
(Strange, strange anniversary),
And was laid in the tomb.

Tonight, God, we ask for his resurrection,
Not in the bones and flesh that knew this land before,
But raise him up again.
This is what we ask,
(Your forgetful children who have no right to ask).
Let him live again.
Let him think, and love and speak again
In every mind and heart and mouth,
That prays this prayer.
Let him think and love and speak again,
In others, too;
In all men.

They say he walks at midnight, God.
Let him walk in all our mornings
And in the heat of the day
And in our evening's coolness.
Let him walk.

Wherever we walk.
Wherever all men walk, let him walk again.

Raise him up again in all of us.
This is what we ask,
When we pray for his resurrection.

This is what we ask of you, God,
In the name of Jesus Christ.

Amen.

Northeastern Gives Push to Industry Conversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, ever since World War II a number of industrial concerns, in New England and elsewhere, have been largely dependent for business on the defense and defense-related contracts of the Federal Government. It is only recently that we have realized that the predictable adjustments in the pattern of our defense spending will necessitate a review of our production capabilities.

One of the leaders in this effort to think ahead economically is Northeastern University in Boston, Mass. Under the dynamic leadership of its President Asa Knowles, Northeastern has developed an imaginative program to assist New England businessmen in diversifying to commercial, civilian production.

In the Boston Globe for Sunday, May 16, Science-Industry Reporter Donald White discussed the Northeastern program and its new director, Dr. Harry Wilkinson, dean of the College of Business Administration.

I would like to call this important program to the attention of the House by inserting the Boston Globe article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NORTHEASTERN GIVES PUSH TO INDUSTRY CONVERSION—NEW DEAN TO HEAD PROJECT

(By Donald White)

Northeastern University is launching a unique attack on the problem of industrial conversion. Beginning May 27, in conjunction with the management consultant firm Harbridge House, Inc., the university will conduct an executive management seminar to tackle the problem from the top, using the case study method.

The seminars (the one beginning this month is hopefully the forerunner of many) will comprise eight sessions of about 5 hours each. They will be aimed at teams of three to six persons from local companies. One of the team members must be the company president or a key decisionmaking executive.

The need for conversion has been stimulated by rapid technological change and reduced defense spending. Massachusetts' defense-oriented industry is vitally concerned.

Some of the program's objectives are:

Emphasis of the practical difficulties faced by senior executives in small and medium-sized technically based firms in maintaining growth during periods of rapidly shifting markets and technological change.

Demonstrations of how some firms have overcome such difficulties.

Identification of techniques to achieve realistic growth.

Assistance in developing a skeletal plan for practical use.

The program has been about a year developing with $30,000 in funding from the Department of Defense, the Small Business Administration, and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Some indication of the importance attached to it by Northeastern is demonstrated by the fact that it has been directed from the office of President Asa S. Knowles.

Riding herd on the project has been John B. Whitla, assistant to the president. "Direct translation of ideas from classroom to company," is his nutshell description of the program.

Soon, however, the seminars will be under new management. Northeastern has announced the appointment of Dr. Harry E. Wilkinson of Wakefield as dean of the College of Business Administration effective July 1. The new dean's department is scheduled to take over responsibility for the conversion seminars.

Dr. Wilkinson will succeed Dean Roger S. Hamilton of Newton Highlands, who, at his own request, will return to full-time teaching as professor of economics.

Wilkinson is currently a senior consultant and project director for Harbridge House. He will direct all programs in business administration and management sponsored by Northeastern. These include a recently established policy to extend the concept of cooperative education beyond graduate level to practicing executives throughout industry.

The new dean has a B.A. from Princeton, an M.B.A. from Washington University, St. Louis, and a doctorate in business administration from the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.

Dr. Wilkinson intends to establish closer ties between the business and academic communities, to the mutual benefit of both. Toward this end a management institute will be formed within the College of Business Administration to serve companies both collectively and individually.

Of the conversion project, Dr. Wilkinson says: We won't presume to tell the presidents their job but will merely help them reach decisions."

He says the program is more than an alternative to hiring management consultants. I will be considerably less expensive ($300 per person for a minimum team of three) and there will be no time wasted in educating the consultant.

Reply to Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I recently mailed a questionnaire to my constituents concerning matters of national interest.

In response to the questionnaire Mr. Marvin H. Mason, a constituent of mine from Rutherfordton, N.C., made some very sound observations and recommendations which I feel would be of interest and help to every Member of the House.

Mr. Mason's letter is as follows:

RUTHERFORDTON, N.C.,
May 8, 1965.

Hon. BASIL L. WHITENER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITENER: Thank you for your questionnaire, which I have checked and am enclosing with this letter. You are probably making a survey, and I hope I will be of some assistance to you.

Your questions, of course, illustrate the complex problems that you have in acting on and creating legislation for the good of our country. A yes-or-no answer sometimes brings things to a hard decision, but I know you must make them in that manner. Please permit me to expound on an item or two, and I will try to be as brief as possible.

The cotton legislation passed last year, in my opinion, is largely responsible for the present improvement in the overall textile business. I do think that one day the Congress is going to stop subsidizing wealthy Mississippi Delta and west coast cotton farmers. A completely free market without subsidy or controls could be appropriate. I personally think it is.

Foreign aid in many areas certainly has outlived its usefulness. I wish it was kept under the control of the Congress instead of the executive branch. The time is never likely to come when we do not have to be concerned about the economic well-being and the political liberties of our world neighbors, near and far. No financial institution, perhaps, would loan money to individuals, and certainly would not give it without some reasonable expectation of an improvement that indicated stability enough to one day repay. Charitable people sometimes give with no expectations of being repaid, but even they expect the recipient to become mature enough to look after their own affairs except in extreme emergencies. I may be old fashioned in this area, but I even believe the Peace Corps, if it is a good deal, should have its check picked up by those who receive the benefits. Hiring first-class help at low wages should be a good deal for anyone.

On the education income tax exemption for college students, I am in the process of paying bills for a son in Davidson College. My oldest son and his wife have just left my financial care. This son graduated from North Carolina State last year where he and his wife were both students. Presently he is an employee of the U.S. Government as a naval ensign at Pensacola, Fla. My third son is a junior in high school. I speak then with some responsibility when I state that in reality I am opposed to all tax exemptions that cannot be equally claimed by everyone. Lack of a tax angle did not keep me from making necessary sacrifices for this educational expense, and I do not believe it would keep anyone else from doing the same. I think perhaps if we closed all tax loopholes, and I really mean all of them, our tax burdens might be more bearable to all of us.

I am just not rational on the labor question. I do not approve of labor's advantage as a separate segment of society. I can only believe it has gained its present position because of its political force, and I just resent pressures. Even the right to work law is only a step in the right direction in my opinion. I am completely disgusted with the autonomy of the National Labor Relations Board and really cannot understand its existence.

Regarding wage hour law coverage to require minimum payment of $1.25 per hour, I think the Government has a function to set up minimum requirements. The exact amount that these requirements might be can be answered better by your statisticians. A $1.25 per hour may be appropriate.

The antipoverty law may or may not be successful. I have listed no on this questionaire, because I cannot anticipate how effective it will be. I am aware that people who are motivated with less ambitions may not want to leave or cannot leave poverty stricken areas of our country. It does seem to me that being fair and equitable is too harsh treatment for some of our citizens. They need help, and if this help is charity, then so be it. I do think that Puerto Rico has provided a better solution in that business was enticed to these areas. I believe business could be enticed to other poverty stricken places by similar methods. It may be a problem like Moses faced, in that the old generation just will never be able to get it done. Emphasis on youth through education and opportunity should have a fair chance. To be more specific, if $750 million

looks like it is making headway, then we ought to be willing to back a good thing with some more money.

Immigration laws in my opinion should only exclude those unfitted for American citizenship. One day we are going to have an over abundance of population in this country, but I hope civilization will partially solve this one in all countries

I am opposed to mixing religious with public facilities on a compulsory basis. I have never believed in public prayer and certainly no compulsory religious exercises of any sort. Somehow or another my Presbyterian beliefs are not violated by a complete separation of church and state.

Your reapportionment question is a hard one too. I almost believe that the right to govern should be given to those who are interested in government. I fear power blocks of all sorts from unions to the chamber of commerce, from march-ins and sit-ins to appeals from the pulpit. Larger population create different problems than when this State was a rural society. I am not sure that the best government does not usually come from people that weigh causes, results, and possible equitable solutions. I am afraid of block voting, but I think it is unfair to withold equal representation from those interested, so perhaps we do not need a constitutional amendment.

Thank you for reading this for I know it is much more than you bargained for. I really just want to state that I think you are a man without angles and personal axes to grind, and I am real proud that you represent us in our Nation's Capitol.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

MARVIN H. MASON.

Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in "Conservation Department Topics," volume 11, No. 10, dated May 13, 1965, published by the Michigan Conservation Commission, supporting Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

That execellent statement shows the support of the people of the State of Michigan for S. 936 sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator of the State of Michigan, the Honorable PHILIP HART, to establish a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

I believe it is the consensus of the people of the State of Michigan that this is an important and necessary item of conservation legislation necessary to preserve a great national treasure within our boundaries.

The statement follows:

DEPARTMENT SUPPORT OF "BEAR" EXPLAINED

(Deputy Director Harris made a strong statement of department support for the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore at a testimonial dinner for U.S. Senator PHILIP A. HART, in Frankfort, April 23. He also announced the department will welcome any action to place with the department State responsibility for activity-based recreation.)

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY MR. HARRIS

I am confident that the majority of citizens in the lakeshore area support the present bill. I believe that most Michigan citizens support it. I know that the Michigan Conservation Commission supports it, because the commission passed a unanimous endorsing resolution last month. And I know that we in the department of conservation not only support it but are doing everything we legitimately can as State officials to insure that the project becomes a reality.

Our role as servants of the people of Michigan is and must be to make certain that the interests of those people are fully served and protected. In our judgment the passage of Senate bill 936 substantially in its present form would meet that test.

There are some people who say they favor preserving the Sleeping Bear area in public ownership but want our department to do it instead of the National Park Service. Frankly, we would like to be able to do it. It is a challenging project, bigger and broader than anything our department has ever attempted. We have the experience and the competence that the job will require, and we already own some of the acreage. What we don't have is the money. I envision if we were to do the job, it would equal in scope the area recommended by Senator HART. Certainly it would encompass a much larger area than is contained in the present State ownership. This is a project that will require many millions of dollars over many years for land acquisition and development. Annual operating costs could well run into the hundreds of thousands. What I am trying to say, I suppose, is that this project is just too big for us.

In Michigan and elsewhere, we have already lost to uncontrolled residential and commercial development much of our natural resources heritage. If development and use of the lands and waters comprising the Sleeping Bear area are not brought under orderly regulation it, too, is in grave danger of being lost. People by their own hands, and with the best of intentions, can destroy the very marvels of nature which attracted them in the first place. We have seen this happen time and again.

It seems to me that those who live in the area and fear the establishment of a Federal facility really have little to fear. The Lakeshore will protect and preserve those values of nature which are so important and so irreplaceable—and which those who live there enjoy and hold dear. Generally, they will go right on living where and as they do now. Their lives will be changed surprisingly little. I know it is difficult to convince them of this. Like a lot of other things, the proof will be in the experience.

We certainly cannot afford to look only to the needs of the present generation and ignore the future. It must be our goal to use our natural resources wisely and, if possible, to pass them on to future generations in better condition than when we were here. We do not possess resources. We are here by God's grace and by His grace, too, we have been given resources to use. It is our responsibility to insure that our successors have the same opportunities to use them.

The preservation and wise use of natural resources is man's greatest responsibility. The whole purpose of our governmental, educational and economic system is toward that end. Destroy nature and you destroy life itself. Human life would become no more than day to day existence. The world as we know it would die.

During the next 25 to 30 years, millions and even billions of dollars will be spent at all levels of government to provide facilities for outdoor recreation. These vast expenditures, however, will be largely meaningless unless people learn how to make good use of the resources and facilities that will be bought.

Recreation is not just land, water, buildings, swimming pools, and horseshoe pits. It is, even more, the things that people do with those resources and facilities. Until now, we have perhaps been too much concerned with the purely physical side of recreation, not enough with the social and spiritual benefits that it brings if people are taught and shown, literally, how to recreate.

Recreation can be many things, almost anything in fact, that is done for wholesome pleasure. In Michigan, at least, recreation in the past has been primarily a responsibility of local government, when it has been recognized at all. Only a few cities, however, have been able to afford a well-rounded recreation program. The rest have gone without.

We have come to realize that the State has a responsibility to promote recreation programs at all levels of government, inspiring those not now providing such services to do so, and coordinating and strengthening existing programs.

Recreation is so closely related to natural resources that you simply cannot have one without the other. So, if we are to make sure that the public makes the best recreational use of natural resources, there is an urgent need to recognize State responsibility for recreation itself.

The realinement of State agencies under the new Michigan constitution presents an opportune time to give recreation a place in State government. We in the department of conservation have been saying for some time that we would be happy to accept this responsibility and give recreation its rightful place in the new department of natural resources that we assume will emerge from the reorganization. We feel strongly that recreation, as it refers to what people do, is so vital to the planning and development of natural resource use that the two should not be separated.

It is our judgment that, if Michigan is going to benefit to the fullest possible extent from the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, the land and water conservation fund, and other natural resources projects and programs, recreation should become a service of State government. And it should be established in the same agency which has responsibility for management of natural resources. Only through such an organization can we be assured of the necessary close and harmonious working relationship between recreation and resources.

New York City Celebrates Centennial of Its Fire Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, the city of New York will mark the centennial of the inauguration of a paid fire department.

New York City Fire Commissioner Martin Scott has announced that with Mayor Robert F. Wagner as honorary chairman, and Deputy Mayor Edward F. Cavanagh, Jr., as honorary cochairman, a spectacular parade is planned on that date with several hundred neighboring

volunteer and paid fire departments marching in the procession.

Commissioner Scott stated:

A committee of prominent citizens has assisted in the planning of the fire department's centennial celebration. It will be one of the biggest parades ever held here and certainly one of the most noteworthy events in the annals of the city.

Hundreds of contingents will parade with their own bands or fife and drum corps. In the vanguard of the parade will be a cavalcade of the various types of firefighting equipment from the 1865 hand-drawn pumping engines to the ladder trucks and other evolutionary pieces of apparatus, ending with the department's most modern equipment. Firemen drawing and operating the equipment of the past century will be attired in uniforms of the periods represented.

The parade is scheduled to begin at the Battery and march up Broadway to city hall and then proceed to the World's Fair where they will be the guests of honorary cochairman, Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair Corp.

All firemen participating in the celebration will assemble at the Singer Bowl to pay tribute to the department in a brief ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the great service that has been rendered by the fire department of the Nation's greatest city for more than a hundred years, I wish to take this opportunity to call this praiseworthy record to the attention of my colleagues and the country.

Reassuring Speed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the progress made on legislation by this Congress since January has brought out again the charge of "rubber stamp." One of the best refutations of this charge was made recently by the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. I include an editorial from the Post-Gazette of May 6, 1965, at this point in my remarks:

REASSURING SPEED

House Republicans, compelled by their role as the loyal opposition to find something wrong with the astounding progress Congress has made in its work this session, have reached for the old "rubberstamp" charge.

Prodded by favorable comparisons of Lyndon Johnson's success so far with Franklin D. Roosevelt's famous 100 days back in the 1930's, Representative BOB WILSON of the National Republican Congressional Committee professes to see "a dangerous mood" behind the Democratic majority's accomplishments: an inclination to give Mr. Johnson what he asks without arguing.

The result, Congressman WILSON declares with alarm, may well be the end of "a deliberative, and I emphasize the word 'deliberative', legislative branch."

Even allowing Mr. WILSON a fair degree of partisan license to build his case, however, we think he has overlooked a couple of factors that need to be taken account of in weighing the current output of important measures.

One is that few, if any, have gone through the legislative mill exactly as the administration submitted them—which is what is implied in the "rubberstamp" complaint. A major change was made by Democrats themselves in the eligibility standard for aid to education of the culturally deprived, for instance.

And despite their numerical weakness, the Republicans can claim a great share of the credit for substantial alterations in two other important bills still in the works: health care for the elderly and voting rights.

The second factor seemingly overlooked by Mr. WILSON is that most of the priority measures Congress is dispatching this time have been deliberated and deliberated and deliberated—unto death—in previous sessions. So if the lawmakers are impatient to act on them, it is probably because they are simply tired of hearing about them. At any rate, it certainly cannot be claimed that the Congressmen are voting in ignorance of the issues—they know them from every angle.

After the desultory pace of recent years, it is reassuring to see that Congress can bestir itself to the Nation's benefit. If and when it catches up with the backlog of unfinished business, it will, we have no doubt, find it can still deliberate in the grand old manner.

Pan American World Airways Establishes Direct Air Service to Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the importance of close U.S. participation in the economy of the emerging nations of Africa is best manifested in the action of Pan American World Airways in establishing direct air service to Africa through an affiliation with Air Afrique.

Mr. Speaker, the first direct airline service connecting the United States and three independent African nations—Cameroun, Ivory Coast, and Dahomey—has been inaugurated under an agreement between Pan American and Air Afrique, with the flights also serving Senegal and Liberia.

The once-a-week round trip service will be operated with Pan Am DC-8 jet equipment, in association with Air Afrique.

Flights will depart New York each Sunday at 7 p.m. with stops at Dakar, Senegal; Monrovia, Liberia; Abidjan, Ivory Coast; Cotonou, Dahomey; and will arrive in Douala, Cameroun, at 4:45 p.m. local time Monday.

Return flights will leave Douala each Tuesday at 11 a.m., and will arrive at 11 p.m. in New York. Flight time from the United States to Africa will be only 7 hours and 40 minutes with air time from Dakar to Douala just over 5 hours.

According to Harold E. Gray, Pan Am's president:

The service will open up new opportunities for promotion of American business and exports to these African nations receiving their first direct service to the United States.

Cheikh Fal, Air Afrique's president, said:

The new service is a vital link between the independent African nations and the United States. It will help to promote their economy and bring closer ties among the nations. African countries are most appreciative of having the opportunity to work with Pan Am in developing the new service, and Air Afrique is looking forward to the day when we will be operating our own aircraft over the route.

Under the associated service agreement, 35 seats and a portion of the cargo and mail space on each flight will be reserved by Air Afrique.

Air Afrique, one of the largest African airlines, is a unique multination carrier with 12 African countries participating in its ownership. These are: the Republics of Togo, Cameroon, Congo, Ivory Coast, Dahomey, Upper Volta, Niger, Senegal, Chad, the Central African Republic, the Gabon Republic, and the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

The associated service will supplement Pan Am's current three weekly roundtrips connecting the United States with Africa. Pan Am now provides service between New York and Dakar, Rabat, Conakry, Monrovia, Accra, Lagos, Léopoldville and Johannesburg. In addition, Pan Am flights connect Boston with Rabat, Conakry and Monrovia.

Traffic carried by Pan Am over the United States-Africa route continues its upward surge with 1964 revenue passenger-miles 17.7 percent above 1963, and 1963 revenue passenger-miles 9 percent over the 1962 level.

The Pan Am-Air Afrique agreement is for 3 years and is subject to renewals by the governments involved.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy that this arrangement is no longer a possibility but a reality. Let us be hopeful that other U.S. corporations can follow the Pan Am formula and bring even closer the ties between our country and the new and independent African nations.

The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is the 5th chapter in the article written by Mr. William Benton for the 1965 Yearbook of the Encylopedia Britannica.

Mr. Benton's credentials in the area of education and the specialized field of education within the Soviet Union need no explanation. He has long been recognized as a man of great grasp and intelligence and one who understands not only the short-term implications of a problem area but also the long-term aspects.

It is my pleasure to have his article, "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R." reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The 5th chapter follows:

CHAPTER V. SCIENTISTS ON THE SOVIET NEW FRONTIER

(A personal report: "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," by William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Senator from Connecticut; presently U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its executive board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica)

Novosibirsk is a booming industrial city of more than a million people in the very heart of Siberia. It was founded as a railroad town in 1893 and called Novonikolayevsk after the reigning czar. After the revolution its name was changed to Novosibirsk, or New Siberia.

In half an hour's drive on a modern highway from Novosibirsk's central square, one reaches a new and most remarkable city which has been carved out of virgin forests. It is an academic city, devoted solely to scientific study, teaching and research. In 1962 I was the first American to visit it after major construction had been completed.

When plans for Novosibirsk's academic city were submitted to Chairman Khrushchev, the president of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences warned him: "Don't do it; you won't be able to persuade the top scientists to move to Novosibirsk."

Khrushchev said, "Go ahead; you can get the brilliant young ones and you can train them; they will learn to do the best research." And so it promises to be.

Eventually a staff of 50,000—not all of them trained scientists, of course—will work there; 30,000 were in residence in 1962.

I visited Novosibirsk on a warm summer's day, but in the winter the temperatures drop to 30 to 40° below zero. Academic city lies in the heart of a vast plain that stretches westward for 500 kilometers, eastward for 2,500 or 3,000 kilometers, southward for 500 kilometers, and northward to the Arctic. The plain is heavily wooded and rich in minerals.

Fifteen research institutes are being created in the academic city, each devoted to a single field of science or engineering. The first to be completed was the Institute of Hydrodynamics. Its head, and the academic head of the academic city, is Academician Mikhail Lavrentiev. He is vice president of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences and chairman of the Siberian branch. Academician Lavrentiev, a tall stooping man with friendly eyes and a ready laugh, greeted me with a great show of cordiality and introduced me to a number of institute heads. A large map of the academic city was placed on the table between us. Lavrentiev explained that the plans for academic city grew out of "prior experiments and failures to speed the development of science." He set out five principles underlying the plans:

1. Each of the 15 institutes had been allowed enough acreage to build virtually unlimited new structures in the future. They face central streets or plazas, but their properties extend backward into the woods indefinitely.

2. "To solve the problems of science, it is necessary to have many specialists in many fields in proximity," Lavrentiev said. "But each major division must be on its own."

3. It is essential to procure men to head up the institutes who are not only themselves capable scientists, but who can also train young men to follow in their footsteps.

4. Close ties between industry and science are essential—"It isn't merely that industry and engineering need science. It's also the other way around. Science needs industry and engineering."

5. The most important point, insisted Lavrentiev, is the training of scientific workers. "In the United States," he said, "you look to your universities to train your scientific personnel—and not only to train them but to develop them thereafter. In the Soviet Union, achievements in science do not develop within the walls of the universities but within the walls of the research institutes. I won't go so far as to say there is no scientific development in the universities—the universities of Moscow and Leningrad provide examples to the contrary—but in the provincial universities, which operate at a lower level, such examples are not common."

Lavrentiev pointed to a big blotch of oblong red spots at one end of his map, and explained that these were the apartments for the construction workers, covering perhaps 10 percent of the total area. He pointed to a section of squares at the other end of the map and said that these represented housing for the leading research scholars and institute directors. I asked him when he expected to take over the apartments from the construction workers.

His eyes gleamed with humor as he replied, "When we are through * * * don't forget that the institutes can keep expanding into the forests indefinitely."

We were meeting in the Institute of Geology and Geophysics, which happens to be squarely in the middle of the compound. Geology faces mathematics. Next door is the Institute of Automation and Electrical Measuring Techniques. The new University of Novosibirsk is to be in the center of the academic city.

Why would distinguished Soviet scientists choose to come to Novosibirsk's academic city? Lavrentiev said salaries for scientists were uniform throughout the U.S.S.R., but that there was enormous appeal in this new academic city because it would "enable scientists to realize their ideals very quickly," and they would have the newest and best equipment.

Lavrentiev added, "But the scientists are not alone. They have wives and we must satisfy them; so we provide very good living conditions. They also have children and—grandchildren—and we take care of them."

Andrei Trofimuk, head of the Institute of Geology and Geophysics went to a large map of the U.S.S.R. on the wall. Its many colors represented the mineral and oil deposits of the Soviet Union, and the varying shades were to show the age and nature of the deposits and their closeness to the surface.

He pointed out that far more than half of the territory of the U.S.S.R. lies east of the Urals, that all of this territory is rich in hydroelectric power potential and forests.

"Just prior to World War II," he said, "it was believed that Siberia was poor in iron and had no oil. Our research parties have now discovered that Siberia is very rich in iron ore, oil, and gas. Indeed, there is every mineral deposit in Siberia that there is in the table of the elements."

Trofimuk said that the map revealed why geologists want to join his institute in Novosibirsk: "There is so much unknown and so much to be discovered—they can help reveal the riches of Siberia."

Sergei Sobolev, director of the Institute of Mathematics, explained that his institute dealt with abstract mathematics or pure theory—"all forms of pure mathematics"—that it had a computer center, "which has diversified uses, solving problems not only for industry but for all the sciences—and, in some cases, the humanities." There were also divisions of his institute for "economic mathematics" and "mathematical technique." (According to my interpreter, the "mathematical technique" division helps "to determine the true road in the application of mathematics to computers so that the machines will then help to develop mathematics.")

Lavrentiev interrupted to remark that computers were themselves producing greatly improved computers much faster than human beings were able to produce human beings. He challenged Academician Ilya Vekhua, the rector of the new university, to produce a child three times better than himself.

I was then given a complete tour of the academic city by car. Arnold Romanov, head of the laboratory on computers of the Institute of Automation and Electrical Measuring Techniques, rode beside me. A fascinating young man, he spoke English haltingly but well. He said he had jumped at the chance to come to Novosibirsk, and he was now urging his friends to come.

"The competition," he said, "is less here. A young man gets a bigger job much quicker. He is not only in association with top men, but he can go up the ladder faster."

The luncheon which followed our drive was at a clubhouse for the research scholars. We talked about the future. I asked the group to speculate about it.

Sobolev asked, "How can we foresee the future? All we know is that there will be more changes created by science in the next 50 years than have been created in all the past history of the world put together."

I asked him if he agreed with the statement that 90 percent of the scientists who had ever lived are living now. He thought a moment, then nodded his head in agreement. Academician Vekhua, also a mathematician, quickly interjected, "But there is no Newton alive today."

Let me describe the new University of Novosibirsk as seen through the eyes of Vekhua, its rector, who resigned his chair of mathematics at the University of Moscow to respond to the challenge of the new frontier in central Siberia.

Academician Vekhua is a Georgian who entered the Georgian State University, Tbilisi, in 1925. Later he served for many years as prorector of the University of Tbilisi, and for one year as rector. He said that when he entered the university "all the boys had to study the same courses—history, literature, science, etc.—but later this was discarded because we learned that it was wise to start specialization earlier."

He then insisted, "But even when our students begin to specialize here at Novosibirsk, we give them courses in the humanities, philosophy, political economy—we even give them an extended course in the political economy of capitalism."

In 1962 Vekhua had 1,000 students in his new university. None had yet graduated. Only 100 of these students were in the humanities. Vekhua does not intend the number to increase even when the university reaches its anticipated maximum enrollment of 4,000 students.

He said, "We are very lucky to be here in this new academic city. Our university is affiliated here with 15 great research institutes. During the first 2 years, the students devote themselves wholly to their academic studies at the university. But in the second term of the third year, they begin to work with the institute in their field of specialization. This affiliation with the institute brings them step-by-step into research. We shall thus easily be able to spot the gifted students—and these we shall thereafter keep in the institutes."

I asked him whether entrance examinations for the new university were stricter than those of the University of Moscow. He said they were about the same. He said he was afraid right now to be any stricter because he didn't want to scare talented students away.

"There is a chance to create a new team here."

He named Academician Sobolev as an example of a man given high academic rank and responsibility very early in life. Sobolev

had been the head of the mathematics department of the University of Moscow. "But here he has his own institute. He is the head man instead of merely the head of a department. He has 500 young men under him and within 2 years will have 1,000. He can do a better job building his staff. In Moscow, he couldn't get apartments for the new men he wanted. Here he can give them apartments. Further, the apartments are bigger and better—nine meters minimum per person instead of the seven meters which is the goal in Moscow."

Vekhua anticipated that the academic city when it reached its population of 50,000 within 2 or 3 years would be at its approximate limit. "From that point on," he said, "it is better to build other centers. First, there is to be a center comparable to this one at Irkutsk. Then a smaller one at Kemerovo, a coal-mining center 120 kilometers from here—and then—and then—"

Thus he confirmed what Minister Yelutin had already told me. The academic city of Novosibirsk is a pilot city for others yet to come. It is indeed on the "New Frontier"—and not merely the new frontier of Siberia—but the new frontier of scholarly and scientific competition which is to dominate the world of the future.

A Union That Does Something About Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 16, 1965, and tells the story of District No. 65 of the Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Workers Union and its successful effort to include civil rights in collective bargaining.

The article follows:

A UNION FIRST: CIVIL RIGHTS A MAJOR DEMAND

With two successful strikes in less than a month. District 65 of the Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Workers Union has apparently become the youthful hope of the city's middle-aged labor movement.

"You get old and fat," one prominent union official said last week. "You don't want to organize these miserable shops with three workers. Who needs it? It's not worth the trouble any more. Then you get a union like 65 that wants to do it."

"We're organizing the poorest people," said the president of District 65, David Livingston. "We're organizing the people that make $50 and $60 a week."

Mr. Livingston spoke shortly after the union claimed victory in its 11-day strike against garment district textile firms, light manufacturing companies, and direct mail companies. The final contract called for a wage increase, more vacation, higher pension contributions from employers, and a training program to increase opportunities for minority group workers.

The garment strike marked the first time in Mr. Livingston's memory that any union had made civil rights part of its demands.

Last week Mr. Livingston said he thought the union was stronger than it had ever been. The strength, he said, came from two sources: District 65's alliance with the Teamsters Union and its adoption of the civil rights and poverty issues.

The teamsters' cooperation was more than just labor union courtesy. "We built this thing for 3 months," said Nicholas Kisburg, research and legislative director of Teamsters Joint Council 16. In both the Bloomingdale's strike last month and the garment strike this month, Teamsters Union members refused to make deliveries across picket lines.

Mr. Kisburg said that John O'Rourke, the head of Joint Council 16, "felt that the civil rights movement is an economic one. This strike was more the function of a union interested in civil rights than demonstrating to get a Negro served a hamburger somewhere."

Mr. Kisburg also said Teamsters had a selfish interest in helping to organize nonunion shops. Often there is such a difference between nonunion and union wages that the firm with a union contract is at a competitive disadvantage, he said.

District 65's triumphs these days are a far cry from what it was going through in the late 1940's and early 1950's—the McCarthy period. The union was labeled left-wing and Communist. Its officers, including Mr. Livingston, were regularly haled before congressional investigating committees.

The low point came in 1953, during the bitter strike at Hearns department store—a strike that the union lost. Hearns took out large newspaper advertisements attacking the leadership of the union for such things as "following the Communist line."

Soon after the unsuccessful strike, newspaper columnists began reporting that District 65 was abandoning the Communist line. Today Mr. Livingston maintains that the times, not the union, have changed. Much of the misunderstanding, he said, stemmed from the fact that union leaders took the fifth amendment before investigating committees, although they denied being Communists in interviews and in the affidavits required by the Taft-Hartley Act.

The leaders used the fifth amendment, Mr. Livingston said, because a legal technicality made it impossible for them to refuse to answer questions about other people's politics once they agreed to talk about their own beliefs.

Nowadays Mr. Livingston finds himself considered an eminently respectable labor leader and one of the mainstays of the civil rights movement. Civil rights organizations know they can call on District 65 for financial aid and bodies for large demonstrations.

"We're fundamentally a union of unimportant people," Mr. Livingston said last week. "We're not fine craftsmen or something like that. But we do have the necessary aggregation of strength and searching out of the real issues involved. This combination for success will be used over and over again."

Youth's Urge for Usefulness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great uprisings of the day is underway. The youth of our Nation have received much attention lately and one of the commentaries which I have found most interesting and thought provoking on this subject appeared recently in one of the outstanding newspapers in the State of Nebraska.

I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point:

[From the Norfolk Daily News, May 13, 1965]

YOUTH'S URGE FOR USEFULNESS

In a review of current trends and happenings in our larger cities we read that police in the big cities are bracing themselves for a turbulent summer. What they fear is a renewal of outbreaks among the younger element when it warms up and they are trying to forearm for what they expect to happen.

What they and their cooperators seem to be doing to guard against trouble is to provide jobs for the needy. Their interpretation of motives that activate youth leads them to believe that the youngster with a good job won't be found in the streets throwing bricks and clubs.

A professor of psychology, writing in Harper's magazine, expresses his view of what's the matter with youth. He teaches a class in existentialism, and this, our dictionary tells us, is a philosophic study of man's existence and its meaning. He finds the young men and women in his classes at sea as to what to do with their lives. They have one precept—don't follow the crowd, guide your own life.

Coming down a little closer to earth, we find workers with youth concerned because there seems to be a sense among the young that they don't belong, and the explanation they give is, as the professor put it, we are facing a problem of peace and affluence which seems to make the kids superflous. In past generations youngsters had their place in the family. There were chores to do—chores which gave them a sense of being a useful member of the group. But in the modern home there is no woodbox behind the kitchen stove to fill, no cobs to bring in, no horses to feed and in many homes not even a lawn to mow.

These theorists believe that this is the fundamental trouble with the present teenage generation. And planned sports, like kid league baseball, swimming pools, and other planned activities to fill their days, while valuable, do not give them the sense of usefulness that every person craves.

Jobs and organized play have their usefulness in satisfying the urge of youth for meaningful activity, but they can't quite take the place of the woodbox behind the kitchen stove.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate worked on voting rights bill.

House passed Pacific Northwest disaster relief bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 10574–10620

Bills Introduced: Nine bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1992–2000; and S. Res. 106–108.

Pages 10575–10576

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1734, to conserve and protect North Pacific salmon, with amendments (S. Rept. 194)—reported May 18 under prior authorization;

S. 559, to provide for the regulation of the labeling of cigarettes distributed in interstate commerce, with amendments and with supplemental views (S. Rept. 195);

H.R. 6497, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreement Act by authorizing an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the U.S., with supplemental views (S. Rept. 196);

S. Res. 92, to print additional copies of report entitled "Frauds and Deceptions Affecting the Elderly" (S. Rept. 197);

S. Res. 98, to print as a Senate document committee print entitled "Proposed Federal Promotion of 'Shared-Time Education'" (S. Rept. 198);

S. Res. 99, to print as a Senate document committee print entitled "Student's Assistance Handbook (Guide to Financial Assistance for Education Beyond High School" (S. Rept. 199);

S. Res. 107, to print the 67th annual report of the DAR (S. Rept. 200);

S.J. Res. 65, establishing a Commission on Arts and Antiquities of the Capitol (S. Rept. 201);

H. Con. Res. 383, to print as a House document a pocket-size edition of "The Constitution of the U.S.A." (S. Rept. 202);

S. Res. 101, authorizing additional $35,000 for expenditure by Committee on Appropriations (no written report); and

S. Res. 108, providing for payment of gratuity to survivor of deceased Senate employee (no written report).

Pages 10574–10575

Bills Referred: 15 House-passed private bills were referred to Committee on the Judiciary. **Page 10590**

Salmon: Senate passed with committee amendments S. 1734, to conserve and protect North Pacific salmon. Motion to reconsider passage was tabled.

Pages 10592–10595

Voting Rights: Senate continued consideration of S. 1564, to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the U.S. (right to vote), adopting two amendments, as follows, to modified Mansfield-Dirksen amendment as a substitute for the amended committee amendment (in nature of a substitute for the bill):

By 69 yeas to 20 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), a Mansfield-Dirksen amendment to authorize Federal court actions for declaratory judgments or injunctions against enforcement of any poll tax enacted after November 1, 1964, which, as a condition of voting, has the purpose or effect of denying right to vote; and by 56 yeas to 25 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Fong amendment providing for poll watchers when an examiner has been appointed so as to observe whether persons entitled to vote are being allowed to vote and to tabulate the votes cast to observe whether properly entitled voters are being properly tabulated.

By unanimous consent, it was agreed to vote on the pending Kennedy-Javits amendment (to Mansfield-Dirksen substitute for the amended committee substitute) by 1:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 20, with debate thereon to be limited to 1 hour, equally divided, to start not later than 12:30 p.m. at conclusion of routine morning business. The pending Kennedy-Javits amendment would provide that among those educated in American-flag schools in which the predominant classroom language was other than English the right to vote shall not be conditioned on ability to read, write, or interpret any matter in the English language.

Majority leader announced that it is the intention of the leadership to have the Senate meet at noon on Friday, May 21, at which time a cloture motion will be submitted; that it is intended for Senate to adjourn from Friday to Monday, May 24, and at 1 p.m. Tuesday, May 25, 1 hour after Senate meets if sufficient signatures to the cloture motion have been obtained Senate will vote on the cloture motion.

Senator Tower announced that on Monday he hopes to call up his amendment in the nature of a substitute

Appendix

Historical Display Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I believe that historical display boards, erected at rest stops on the Interstate Highway System, would provide an important enhancement for our highways and would give the American tourist information he needs in order to make his trip more interesting and entertaining.

The Hartke bill (S. 1841) to authorize the establishment of these display boards was introduced on April 28. On May 16, the editor emeritus of the Ocala, Fla., Star-Banner, Mr. R. N. Dosh, devoted an entire article to support of this proposed legislation.

I believe that Mr. Dosh's comments merit the attention of all Senators; therefore, I ask consent that his article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORICAL DISPLAY BOARDS

(By R. N. Dosh)

The citizens of Florida should be keenly interested in a proposed amendment to the United States Code, relating to construction of the Interstate Highway System, that has been introduced in the U.S. Senate by Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana.

Why? Because Florida has had a rich historical past and each year millions of visitors from other States travel our highways from one end of the State to the other. They come here because of our incomparable climate, the unsurpassed recreational facilities, and to view the scenic beauty of our State. Every State, every community vies with every other State and community in using all of the advertising media to keep the traveling public informed as to where to go and what to see, and it must be said that a good job is being done in that particular by governmental agencies, both Federal and State, and at the county and municipal level. But it must be apparent to all that those who "read as they run" miss much that is well worth seeing due to a lack of information.

In offering his proposed amendment to the United States Code, Senator HARTKE points out that, while the Interstate Highway System is one of the greatest programs of progress ever launched by any nation, it has by no means reached perfection.

QUICK TRAVEL

"Improvements can be made," declared the Senator. "I have offered these in the past and I offer today a future refinement. Although we enjoy the speed with which the Interstate System permits us to move, a common question is: 'Where have we been?' On the Interstate System we speed almost nonstop through the countryside with little or no idea of what is around. While the superhighway brings us to our destination more quickly, we often find the trip has been quite monotonous and boring.

"I propose, in a bill which I offer today, that display boards listing nearby historical and scenic attractions be erected at each rest stop on the Interstate System. The cost of this project would be low in comparison to the large benefits, not alone for the traveler but for residents of the area as well."

The bill, or proposed amendment to the United States Code, that has been offered by Senator HARTKE is short and simple. He proposes to insert in the second paragraph of section 101 of the Code act, relating to the definition of the term "construction" for the purpose of the Federal-aid highway, the insertion of this phrase: "and also including the costs of display boards placed at noncommercial rest areas on such highway to provide information with respect to the history of the area and noncommercial points of interest."

PROVIDE MARKETS

The Hartke proposal is not without precedent. Many States, including Florida, have for years provided varying types of historical markets along main highways for the information of all who travel by motor vehicle, especially the out-of-State visitor. Such signs remind all who see them of our heritage and enrich their travel experience. Senator HARTKE is correct in pointing out that the country needs such an enriching program throughout the Interstate System, posted at rest stops.

The benefits Florida would obtain from these display boards erected at rest stops is obvious. The official Florida road department map lists approximately 100 "attractions," some of them commercial, but nearly one-third of that number fall into the double category of recreation facilities, including our State parks, or historic memorials. Most of them, however, are located on the primary or secondary roads. No signs have been posted on the Interstate System directing travelers to these recreation, scenic, or historic sites.

HISTORIC POINTS

As the expense of erecting these display boards in the rest areas, as Senator HARTKE has pointed out, is nominal, there is every reason why his proposal should find ready acceptance by Members of Congress who with possibly few exceptions have scenic or historic sites in their States.

The bill offered by Senator HARTKE (S. 1841) to amend title 23 of the United States Code, was read twice and held at the desk for 2 days to enable cosponsors to sign it and then referred to the Committee on Public Works.

As it is desirable that action on the bill should come promptly the suggestion is made here that letters should go forward to Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS urging that they join with the Indiana Senator who has had the forethought to make a suggestion that is undoubtedly in the public interest; that is, by providing information on display boards posted on the Interstate Highway System calling attention of the traveling public to historic and scenic points of interest that can be reached by short side trips.

Address by Deputy Attorney General Ramsey Clark to the American Committee on Italian Migration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the American Committee on Italian Migration held a symposium on May 17 and May 18 in the Hotel Statler in Washington, D.C.

During the course of this symposium, those present had the pleasure of hearing addresses from the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and from the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, and they were welcomed to the city by the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

On Monday evening, May 17, at the banquet held by the American Committee on Italian Migration, the Honorable Ramsey Clark, Deputy Attorney General of the United States, delivered the main address. His address was inspiring, enlightening and well-received by delegates of the American Committee on Italian Migration from all sections of the United States.

Mr. Clark is the son of Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark and is himself a distinguished attorney. He was born in Dallas, Tex., received his B.A. degree from the University of Texas, and his M.A. and juris doctor degree from the University of Chicago. Mr. Clark was engaged in the private practice of law when President Kennedy nominated him as Assistant Attorney General in February of 1961, and he served in this capacity until February of 1965, when he was nominated by President Johnson as Deputy Attorney General of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Clark's address to the American Committee on Italian Migration follows:

REMARKS OF HON. RAMSEY CLARK

The United States must have an immigration policy which accomplishes simple justice: a policy which meets the needs of our Nation and its peoples today and tomorrow rather than one which reflects the fears and prejudices of times past.

In 1902, Mr. Dooley observed, "as a pilgrim father that missed the first boat, I must raise one clarion voice against the invasion iv this fair land by the paupers and anarchists of Europe. Ye bet I must—because I'm here first. In them days American was their refuge as the oppressed in all the world * * * but as I tell ye, 'tis different now. I don't

know why 'tis different, but 'tis different. 'Tis time we put our back against the open door and keep out the savage horde."

Too often we sense today the presence of these old fears. Irrational, they ignore the fact so forcefully demonstrated by President Kennedy that we are a Nation of immigrants. When we speak of the great contributions made by the foreign born in this country, we obscure the truth—the foreign born are only the more recent immigrants. This Nation, a melting pot of the peoples of the world, is comprised of the foreign born and their children. There is not one in a hundred among us who can say with Will Rogers that his ancestors were at the dock to meet the *Mayflower*.

But more pertinent is the ignorance illustrated by such fear. Immigration today is a fundamentally different phenomenon than in days gone by.

From 1880 to 1920 more than 23 million foreigners came to this country. Today, immigration is, by comparison, a trickle. Thus more than a million new Americans arrived on these shores in 1905, 1906, 1907, 1910, 1913, and in 1914; years when our total population was less than one-half the present; years when only 2 million births were recorded, including babies of the foreign born.

Today, quota immigration is only 160,000 people, while more than 4 million infants are born each year, and California alone increases its population by more than one-half million annually.

There were as many foreign born living in the United States in 1890, 9½ million, as there are today, but then they comprised 15 percent of the total population, while today they are only 5 percent. In 1910 there were nearly 4 million more foreign born living in this country than there are today.

The needs of the Nation in immigration are essentially different, and our policy must recognize this fact and fulfill these needs.

As Vice President HUMPHREY has pointed out, "the present system is cruel, unworkable, discriminatory, and illogical." It is absolutely incompatible with the ideals of our system of government and, as such, threatens great injury to our image, our institutions, and ourselves.

This Nation was brought forth with the declaration that all men are created equal and listed as grievances against the King in that declaration were his cruel policies which "endeavored to prevent the population of these States; refusing to pass others (or) to encourage their immigration hither."

Now, we foster an immigration policy harmful to the Nation, that discriminates on the basis of national origin. As President Truman said in 1952, "the idea behind this discriminatory policy was, to put it boldly, that Americans with English or Irish names were better people and better citizens than Americans with Italian or Greek or Polish names * * * such a concept is utterly unworthy of our traditions and our ideals."

To see the senseless injury caused by this policy we need only consider Italy. Remember that between 1890 and 1910, 20 percent of the immigrants to this country came from Italy. Remember that only one nation has contributed more immigrants than Italy. Remember that in 1960, New York City had more people of Italian birth than did Rome. Remember the thousands of Italian families that are separated by our immigration laws. Remember that Italy, the freedom loving people of Italy and the Government of Italy are our strong and loyal ally and that a strong and vital Italy is absolutely essential to the free nations of the world. Remember the immense scientific and intellectual capacity of Italy in these days when brain power and the drain of brain power determines the course of nations.

Then look at our national origins system. Fewer than 6,000 quota immigrants from Italy a year. A backlog of 132,000 applications for immigration. Compare this to Ireland which uses barely one-third of its quota annually.

Our present policy might be referred to in the words of Puccini as "Che Gelida Manina," and as causing, in Domzetti's immortal phrase, "Una Furtiva Lagrima." The reason, to borrow from Turandot, is "Nessun Dorma." And it is only because we are really one people that our loved ones abroad can say, as did Mimi in "La Bohème," "Addio Senza Rancor."

Nevertheless there is reason as Joe Green, that is Giuseppe Verdi, says, for "Dei Mei Bollenti Spiriti." And hope that our immigration policy will be "Un Bel Dì" reflects Tosca's "Recondita Armonia." A time when "La Forza del Destino" will cause us to sing of our immigration laws proudly with "Aida," "O Patria Mia."

Now, the loser is the American people, our Nation, and our ideals. We might remember the sad irony of Mr. Dooley who saw how to keep the savage horde away: "They'se wan sure way to keep them out," he said.

"What's that?" asked Mr. Hennessy.

"Teach them all about our institutions before they come," said Mr. Dooley.

For surely this is the moral of our immigration laws. If they were understood to reflect the ideals of America, few would care to join us.

We cannot fear to face the world or the needs of our times. We must invite to this land of freedom the peoples of all nations and all races equally. We must offer equal justice to the people of all nations and be sufficiently flexible to conduct our international affairs in the best interest of the Nation. We must not permit our laws to cause that most tragic occurrence—the separation of families, of husband and wife, parent and child, of loved ones. We must have laws that afford the country a preeminent position in the search for brainpower, for human skills and imagination. We must have a policy which enables this Nation to harbor and save the refugee from natural and political disaster, from persecution and dictatorship. We must have a policy which causes a constant inquiry, study, and consultation into the current needs of the Nation in immigration. We must have a system which is guided, intelligent, effective, and, above all, just.

President Johnson has proposed the legislation required to achieve these ends. He has noted that four Presidents have called attention to serious defects in our immigration laws. He has keynoted his request with the admonition that "action is long overdue." It is action we must have. It is my judgment that we will have action this year.

Then we can square our ideals with our acts, for as President Johnson has said, "no move could more effectively reaffirm our fundamental belief that a man is to be judged, and judged exclusively, on his worth as a human being."

Bell Telephone Customers To Benefit From Excise Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, now that we know the general areas in which the excise tax reductions are going to be made, I feel that it is pertinent to call attention to a letter which I received last Friday, May 14, from Mr. Larry Borcherding, manager of Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., in Atchison, Kans.

My colleagues will be pleased to note, as I am, that Bell Telephone plans to pass on any reduction in the telephone excise tax directly and immediately to its customers, in the full amount of the reduction.

Since I am the author of legislation which calls for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the excise tax on communications services, it is especially gratifying to me that many of these reductions will directly benefit the taxpayers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Mr. Borcherding's letter appear in the Appendix of the RECORD. The letter follows:

SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE CO.,
Atchison, Kans., May 12, 1965.

Hon. CHESTER L. MIZE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHET: There has been much discussion about what will happen to prices in various industries in the event excise taxes are reduced or eliminated. Some industries have indicated they plan to mark up their prices by the amount of any reduction.

I want to emphasize to you that we plan to pass on any reduction in telephone excise tax directly and immediately to our customers, in the full amount of the reduction.

The amount is considerable. You will be interested in how much is now being collected in your district, and in the State of Kansas. The figures below include both our company and the independent companies.

2d District	$1,528,116
State of Kansas	10,423,572

I hope we can count on your support of this important measure. If you have any questions we can be of help with, just let me know.

I have recently taken Ben Snyder's place as manager at Atchison, and am looking forward to meeting you when you return home.

Very truly yours,

LARRY BORCHERDING,
Manager.

Deadliness of Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Little Rock, Ark., Democrat, of May 4, 1965:

DEADLINESS OF WARFARE

It is a paradox in most areas of armed conflict that while weaponry becomes more sophisticated and deadly, methods of combat remain simple and primitive.

This has been found to be true in the steaming jungles of Africa, in the thick growths of Vietnam, and now in the Dominican Republic. Military activities are not carried out in battle formation. The long guerrilla or the sniper in a tree or building can cause a lot of havoc and can take many lives when he holds a choice position.

Rebels in the Dominican Republic seem to be especially well equipped. One spokesman said the rebel forces may have as many as

10,000 automatic weapons. It will be interesting to learn who manufactured those weapons being used on that little Caribbean island.

Importance of restoring order to this little republic and keeping it free of communism is seen in the fact that President Johnson has sent about 14,000 U.S. troops to the island. That's about half the total of all U.S. forces in Vietnam.

Welcome or not, U.S. forces are on that Caribbean island for one main reason—to restore a democratic system of government. In doing so, they will accomplish two important actions—driving out the Communist influence and giving the people a renewed lease on freedom.

Schweiker Fair Immigration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for new immigration laws—laws which will eliminate once and for all the discriminatory aspects of our immigration policy.

Ours is a nation of immigrants. We have built our greatness from the outcasts of many lands. The persecuted, the oppressed, those who were not wanted elsewhere—all of these found refuge upon our shores and contributed to the making of our mighty Nation. We should never forget that our humble origin had its foundation in the efforts of people who were oppressed elsewhere. I hope that this quality of our history will guide us in humility to eliminate invidious discrimination in regard to our present citizens and in regard to future immigrants. I feel this quality of America in a most personal way. My ancestors came to settle in Pennsylvania as members of the Schwenkfelder sect fleeing religious oppression in Germany. They yearned for peace; they yearned for a place where they could enjoy religious freedom; they yearned for an end to their oppression. If the gates of America had not been open to them at that time, I would not be here before you as a Member of Congress today.

We must keep in mind these aspirations of the oppressed. At the same time we must realize that our own population is growing with great rapidity, that opportunities which existed in 1620, in 1840, or in 1910 are not the same as the opportunities in 1965. Frankly we no longer need large numbers of people to populate frontier wilderness areas. We must reckon with a population explosion within our own borders. We must consider the unemployment of at least 5 percent of our working population. Our Nation is already populated from coast to coast. Today we must seek the skills and talents which new immigrants can bring to our shores. We must seek the quality of their contribution to our Nation, not the quantity of numbers.

Let us fashion a new law which eliminates all discrimination on the basis of national origin and asks only of a man what he can contribute to the American civilization of 1965.

Because I am so deeply concerned with the nature of our future immigration laws, I have introduced this week my own immigration bill, H.R. 8502. I am in general agreement with the basic purpose of H.R. 2580, the administration measure, but I feel that certain important improvements incorporated in my bill are necessary. The Schweiker bill, like the administration bill, would eliminate the discriminatory national origins system devised in 1924 and would establish a preference schedule for immigrants which is based on skills and talents rather than upon race and nationality. The Schweiker bill would also phase out existing quotas over a 5-year period. The admission of immigrants on a first come, first served, skill criteria basis would be a built-in feature. But there are certain problems which the Schweiker bill would reach which the present administration bill does not reach. For example, the Schweiker bill would:

First. Eliminate all national origin preference of immigrants, including existing preferences for Western Hemisphere nationals;

Second. Establish an annual ceiling of 315,000 to cover all immigrants, both quota and nonquota;

Third. Endorse emergency migration for all political refugees without giving national origins preference to any particular geographic area;

Fourth. Avoid possible influx of unskilled labor at times of high national unemployment by using better controls than H.R. 2580 provides;

Fifth. Establish a Selective Immigration Board rather than the proposed mixed congressional and executive Immigration Advisory Board.

1. ELIMINATE ALL NATIONAL ORIGIN PREFERENCES

The administration bill does not reach the desired goal of eliminating national favoritism. The administration bill favors nations of Latin America and North America. It favors nations of northern Europe. It is our task to remove all hypocritical aspects of our present immigration policy. We must fashion a new law which will be completely nondiscriminatory as written and applied.

All nations want equal treatment; all nations deserve equal treatment. Nations of the free world should have an equal chance to send their citizens here. The administration bill quite clearly does not place all nations on an equal basis. Written into H.R. 2580 is the potential for new preferential treatment.

The administration bill would offer preferential treatment to nationals from Western Hemisphere nations by maintaining for them special nonquota status. This preference has existed in the past. It should be abolished. Unless we settle this problem finally, by eliminating all national preferences, questions may be raised in future years as to why a citizen of Peru or Bolivia is given an open door for entry while an applicant from France, Italy, or the United Kingdom must wait in line under the quota system. This inequity can be solved by repealing section 1101(A)(27)(c) title 8, United States Code—Immigration and Nationality Act.

2. ANNUAL IMMIGRATION CEILING OF 315,000

I recommend an annual immigration ceiling of 315,000 to cover both quota and nonquota immigrants. The administration measure contains no ceiling figure on immigration. Presently we accept an average of 273,000 immigrants yearly—95,000 under quotas and 178,000 nonquota immigrants. I suggest, with the administration, full use of quotas to allow immigration of 158,361 yearly. But I also recommend holding nonquota immigration to 156,639 in order to keep within the suggested 315,000 ceiling, an increase of 42,000 over the average total number of immigrants now entering this Nation yearly. In this way we shall be able to advise the American people with full candor the number of immigrants to be expected each year. This will help allay the fears of some opponents of the administration bill that the new law would generate a tremendous increase in immigration.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has said, and I agree with him:

> It would not bother me to say to anyone outside the United States, we are sorry that we cannot admit you because we have run out of numbers.

But it does make it difficult from a moral, political, and psychological point of view to say: "I am sorry but we have run out of numbers for Greeks, or Italians, or Canadians." With the suggested ceiling of 315,000 there would still be adequate room for political refugees to enter as nonquota applicants.

3. EMERGENCY MIGRATION FOR POLITICAL REFUGEES WITHOUT GEOGRAPHICAL FAVORITISM

It has been traditional American policy to offer asylum to the politically oppressed. The administration bill engages in geographical favoritism by singling out one area, the Middle East, for special mention in its provision for political refugees. Certainly there will be persons outside "the general area of the Middle East" who will qualify in the future as politically oppressed. I see no reason to single out the Middle East for special mention in the administration bill. I would point out that our Nation is already participating magnificently in efforts to alleviate the plight of refugees in the Middle East, under the fair share law, Public Law 86-648, under Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program, and by cooperating with the United Nation High Commissioner for Refugees to settle refugees, many of them from the Middle East, in the United States.

4. AVOID INFLUX OF UNSKILLED LABOR CREATING UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

Section (10)(A)(2) of the administration bill offers a fourth preference to immigrants capable of performing specific functions for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States. I believe tighter restriction should be placed on the immigration of persons who might possibly compete with the existing U.S. labor force at a time when at least 5 percent of our working population is idle. Often the claim of "shortage of employable and willing persons" is without foundation.

I recommend strongly that the Congress make clear its intention that, be-

fore any person is admitted under the proposed fourth preference—

First. The Secretary of Labor be required to find that a labor shortage for the specific functions which the immigrant would perform does, in fact, exist and cannot be filled by U.S. citizens;

Second. The Attorney General be in possession of written evidence of the willingness of U.S. employers to hire immigrants for this specific function; and

Third. The immigrant applicant worker be required to show written proof of a job offer for this specific function and his intention to accept the offer.

Only after these three steps are satisfied should the fourth preference provisions become operative. The Schweiker bill contains these provisions.

5. ESTABLISH IMMIGRATION BOARD WITHIN EXECUTIVE

The administration bill creates an Immigration Board consisting of members from both the executive and legislative branches. This mixed membership seems inadvisable. I recommend that the Immigration Board be part of the executive branch without congressional membership. Congressional oversight would be maintained by requiring periodic reports from the Board. The Schweiker bill would create a Selective Immigration Board in the executive branch similar in composition to the Federal Power Commission. The Board would promulgate regulations under the new law, continuously study immigration conditions and recommend allocation of the quota immigration visas under the 10 percent allocated for the politically oppressed.

Mr. Speaker, there is another serious defect in H.R. 2580. Statistics indicate that of the 158,361 quota positions available in 1964, northern European nations received 81 percent, southern European nations 17 percent, and the rest of the world only 2 percent. The United Kingdom never uses half its quota of 65,361, while the quota of 100 for the Philippines is backed up for 90 years and the quota of 308 for Greece, 325 years. Other nations also suffer this hardship of severe oversubscription. This hardship deprives applicants for an entire lifetime of realizing their dreams of life in the United States. The proposed administration bill would make it quite possible for this hardship now suffered by nationals of Italy, Greece, and other nations with backlogged, small quotas to be sustained by future Presidential action.

The administration bill would allow the President to take 30 percent of a reserve pool, intended to benefit victims of the deprived small quota countries, and assign this 30-percent reserve instead to northern European nations which have enjoyed preferential large-quota treatment for the past 45 years. Most of the nations which might be so affected—Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, United Kingdom, Belgium, and France—do not come close to using their present quotas. There is no reason to expect a sudden substantial increase in the number of their citizens seeking to come to the United States. This 30-percent outright grant has no valid statistical or foreign policy basis.

By placing the burden of choosing between nationals of one country over another, on vague undefined criteria such as national security or hardship, we would rewrite preferred treatment into our new law.

There is apparently no reason for the provision other than to increase the President's power in a field where Congress has traditionally reserved policy decisions to itself. The proposed gradual reduction of large country quotas over a 5-year period, by only 20 percent, will avoid the possibility of hardship accruing to these large quota countries. When we look at the small waiting lists for these large quita countries, we realize that each of the present applicants will have a chance to be admitted during the 5-year phase out period of the national origins system. No hardship will result. The suggestion that hardship for large quota countries may result is not supported by available statistics. Furthermore, we would do more for the national security of our Nation, by completely eliminating the possibility of preferential treatment. Otherwise we shall irritate the feelings of friendly nations outside northern Europe who will be disadvantaged by the 30 percent technique. Such Presidential discretion, and its prospective use, will undercut the very purpose of this bill. I am convinced that this delegation of power, which has been reduced from 50 to 30 percent since last year, does not deserve a place in this bill. This section simply reinstates the possibility of discrimination in favor of northern European nations. I do not favor such possibilities.

Mr. Speaker, many years ago one of our great Presidents, Woodrow Wilson, in an address given at Independence Hall in Philadelphia on July 4, 1914, gave a definition of liberty which applies to our efforts today. Wilson stated:

> Liberty does not consist in mere general declarations of the rights of men. It consist in the translation of those declarations into definite action.

We must translate the declaration of liberty into definite action as part of our new immigration laws. Our task is not merely to give a partial response to the demands for change. Our task is to create a clear, comprehensive, and completely fair law. It is time now to offer true equality to all applicants who seek membership in the American community.

The Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7303) to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] such time as he may consume.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Although I realize that each disaster brings its own problems, it does seem to me that the Alaska disaster and the disaster in the Northwest and the more recent disaster in the Middle West caused by floods and tornadoes have pointed out certain deficiencies which exist in our Disaster Act that are pertinent to each disaster. This was particularly brought home to me as I examined the Disaster Act as it related to the Palm Sunday tornadoes which swept from one side of my district to the other, leaving a path of devastation, destruction, and death such as we have never seen.

I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if his committee may not be considering taking a good look at our present Disaster Act with the view of updating it and covering some of these areas which are not covered presently by legislation?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It is the sense of the committee that we reexamine in detail the Federal policy with respect to disaster relief. It is our intention to deal with that subject when we hold hearings on the omnibus flood control bill this year. As the gentleman from Indiana has pointed out, we will make a homesite study of the upper reaches of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers.

Next week we will go down to the Texas area for an examination of the damages as a result of the flood that recently occurred there. I can assure the gentleman we will welcome his suggestion and at the appropriate time, we will take it up.

Mr. ROUSH. I direct the gentleman's attention to certain provisions which I have included in a disaster act which I recently introduced, particularly provisions dealing with relief to individuals who have been adversely affected and provisions dealing with assistance to small unincorporated communities that have been adversely affected. I think these two areas in particular need attention.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The committee will certainly welcome suggestions made by the gentleman from Indiana because we know they will be worthwhile and valuable to the committee.

Mr. ROUSH. I thank the gentleman.

Postal Service Progresses?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Bennett County, S. Dak., Booster, which

gives another picture of the sordid mail situation.

The editorial is as follows:

POSTAL SERVICE PROGRESSES?

People in western South Dakota were blessed Monday, April 26, with their first installment of "Progressive Postal Service." For the benefit of readers who are unfamiliar with the term, it is a fancy name for bureaucratic bungling.

It seemed as though the metro mail service, which was established a few years ago, was doing a pretty good job of getting mail in and out of area post offices with a reasonable amount of service. That's probably what was wrong.

Somewhere, someone got the idea that mail forwarded to sectional centers could be handled in greater volume and faster than through the local area post offices. This plan has been tried in other areas prior to coming to western South Dakota, and apparently is achieving about the same results.

One of these sectional centers has been established at Pierre. And as of April 26, all mail in this area is to be routed to this sectional center.

As a result mail going from Martin to Pine Ridge can no longer go the 45 miles over U.S highway 18. It is to be sent from Martin to Kadoka, to Pierre, to Presho, to Rapid City, to Hot Springs and back east again, to Pine Ridge—a distance of at least 500 miles. Also, mail returning from Pine Ridge to Martin goes back around the same route, instead of coming across U.S. highway 18.

Somehow, mail service between Martin and Pine Ridge isn't quite as good as it was prior to April 26, 1965.

In order to test this new "modernized" service, press time at the Booster was moved ahead in time to catch the 5 p.m. mail Wednesday out of the post office at Martin. Copies of the Booster now have been getting to Pine Ridge Friday morning whereas they previously got there Thursday morning.

The trouble with the postal service, says the head of the General Accounting Office, is too much "modernizing."

The "mail-flo" system is one example cited by GAO. Under "mail-flo" letters and packages were supposed to flit through big city post offices virtually untouched by human hands. The trouble was, said Comptroller General Joseph Campbell, it didn't work.

But before finding out that the pilot experiment in Detroit had serious deficiencies, mail-flo was installed in Philadelphia and Denver, where it increased the costs of postal service by hundreds of thousands of dollars and decreased labor productivity.

Why should adequate service at reasonable cost be an impossible job for the Post Office Department?

Public utilities solve the problem of increasingly complex operations to serve an expanding population. The post office does not.

Utilities, whether publicly or privately owned, give adequate service at lower or stabilized rates as their customers increase. The post office does not.

Utilities put money aside for improvement, and most privately owned utilities manage to pay dividends to their stockholders. The post office does neither.

Why, we repeat, can't the post office do its job?

The fault cannot be blamed on the 500,000 men and women—our friends and neighbors and fellow citizens—who deliver the mail. It has to lie at the very top where decisions are made. And we wonder just how bad the postal service has to get before the public stops bawling out the people behind the post office window, and starts directing its anger at the fumblers in Washington.

Service Pay Plan Criticized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my colleagues' attention to the excellent editorial appearing May 14 in the San Diego Union, entitled "Increase 'Paltry,' Says RIVERS."

The editorial does a fine job in magnifying Chairman MENDEL RIVERS' relentless and well qualified efforts to gain passage and implementation of a 10.8-percent military pay raise.

[From the San Diego Union, May 14, 1965]

SERVICE PAY PLAN CRITICIZED: INCREASE "PALTRY," SAYS RIVERS

U.S. servicemen generally cannot speak for themselves in the political arena, but the reaction of knowledgeable Congressmen to the proposed military pay raise must have echoed their sentiments.

The President has proposed a 2.7 percent pay and fringe benefits increase to men with less than 2 years' service, and a 4.8 percent increase for the remainder.

Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, who thoroughly understands the problem, reacted immediately.

"We have been patient, hoping for something encouraging from the executive branch of government, and now this—a paltry increase based on a false premise—and suggesting an effective date of 1966," Representative RIVERS said.

The figures reveal just how paltry the proposed pay raise really is. An apprentice seaman with a base pay of $85.80 a month would get about $2.40 a month more; an ensign earning a base $241.20 would get $6.51 a month. Other raises would be in the same small proportion.

This is not all "take-home" money, but includes additions to the base pay and "fringe" benefits such as uniform and housing allowances.

The "false premise" Representative RIVERS mentions probably is the President's statement that the pay raise would retain the "proper" relationship between servicemen and civil service workers, who also would get a raise.

The proportion is not the point. The point is that servicemen, like all other Americans, are entitled to a decent wage that will give them and their families the essentials of life.

The failure of Congress to provide the minimum-level pay necessary for the essentials already is strongly felt in the military ranks. All top-echelon officers agree that the low rate of recruitment and high rate of personnel turnover has reached alarming proportions.

The Navy, with a manning level of 684,000 men, has an annual turnover of 150,000. There is a turnover of half of the personnel on a combatant ship at our front lines of defense. Only one-fifth of the Navy men reenlist after the first hitch.

Secretary of the Navy Paul H. Nitze already has asked officers and men to extend their enlistments up to a half year because of the manpower problem created by Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Other trouble spots can arise quickly, and the fleet already is far below manning strengths considered optimum.

The turnover is no reflection on servicemen. They are patriotic and dedicated Americans. However, as with all other Americans, the welfare of their families is highly important. If they are deprived of necessities by remaining in the service or have to hold second jobs, the men lose incentive.

The 37 members of the House Armed Services Committee recommended a military pay raise of 10.8 percent. Even this is a minimum. The administration's proposal is hardly more than a blow to morale.

Wherein We Stumble?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial was recently published in the Cassville (Mo.) Republican of May 14.

The last paragraph summarizes the demagoguery which many responsible Members of this House face in expressing their honest convictions on major issues of our time.

I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

WHEREIN WE STUMBLE?

Last summer Gen. Dwight Eisenhower was watching some youngsters in Gettysburg playing soldier and storming a fort, "My boy" he said to one youngster, "If your side can take that fort in half an hour, I'll give you a quarter." The boy reappeared in triumph in less than 10 minutes to report. "We have captured the fort." The General forked over the quarter, then asked, "How did you manage so quickly?" The boy answered, grining, "It was easy. I just offered the other side a dime to give in."

Perhaps President Johnson had heard this story when he made the offer to North Vietnam and Hanoi of $1 billion. We should have long, long since discovered that money does not buy friends. We have already expended $7.7 billion in southeast Asia—without winning friends or influencing people. I question the wisdom of creating the impression in the world that billion-dollar economic aid program will solve the problems of southeast Asia. This ignores the fact that the war there stems from political and not economic causes. But this is the kind of victory we are now trying for under the present administration.

Under Franklin D., U.S. potential aid and power might have prevented World War II, but failed because we were willing to bargain under the same kind of terms to let us win; we failed because of the administration's pacifist illusion. When F.D.R. finally saw the light and asked Congress to repeal the Neutrality Act—we had offered our 10 cents for victory too late: Roosevelt's successor, Harry Truman, provoked a war in the Far East which his own instinct should have shown him how to avoid. All historians will have to admit that his Secretary of State's failure to include South Korea in America's defense perimeter gave the green light to the Communists to launch its attempt to conquer. Now few can doubt that Truman's refusal to win that war by guaranteeing the Red Chinese a sanctuary above the Yalu River contributed to France's defeat in Indochina which in turn led up to the neutraliza-

tion of Laos and to our present involvement in the present war in Vietnam. If Truman had any military ability he would have allowed General MacArthur to pursue his own course and we would have no trouble in Vietnam today.

In short, during the past half century, three Democratic Presidents have through incurable shortsightedness, blundered into wars which we humbly believe could have been eliminated or escaped by this country.

It looks as if Lyndon Johnson has brought on the fourth for us.

Now and then I wonder what the country would be like if Barry Goldwater had been elected President of the United States. Based on his campaign and his speeches it is a frightening thing to imagine. The mind staggers with my steps as I contemplate this thing. We would probably be bombing North Vietnam now if Goldwater were in office. It would probably have happened in this way. The Vietcong would have blown up an American barracks. Using this as an excuse, Goldwater would immediately call for a strike on military bases in North Vietnam and announce a new tit-for-tat policy. Democrats would be horrified and they would make speeches that Goldwater was "trigger happy" and trying to get us into war with Red China.

But Goldwater would ignore the criticism and to show he meant business, he would continue the raids, using not only Air Force bombers, but jets from the U.S. Fleet. As time went on, the country would be shaken at the recklessness of Goldwater's plan, but he would explain through his Secretary of State, that we now intend to bomb North Vietnam in order to let Hanoi know that they could not support the Vietcong without expecting retaliation.

Senators would get up in Congress and call for some sort of restraint and negotiation. But Goldwater, with his lack of restraint, would retort that there is nothing to negotiate and we would only be selling out southeast Asia if we sat down at a table with the North Vietnamese and Red China. Russia and France would call for a Geneva conference, but Goldwater would reject it. Instead he would recklessly announce that he was calling for a battalion of Marines with Hawk missiles to protect our airfields. His critics would claim he was escalating the war, but Goldwater would deny it. Instead he would bomb supply routes in Laos and Cambodia. To explain the desperate actions Goldwater would have the Defense and State Departments come to his rescue justifying all his military actions and providing that Hanoi was responsible for the revolution in South Vietnam. Then would follow more air strikes, using South Vietnamese planes as well as American B-57's.

The people who voted for the "Great Society" would scream at their Republican friends, "I told you if Goldwater became President he'd get us into war."

It all seems far fetched when you read it and I may have let my imagination run away with itself, because even Barry Goldwater, had he become President, wouldn't have gone so far.

Now that we have said it we know what we may expect, for if you think the "War on Poverty" is duplicative and wasteful, and being turned into pork barrel politics, you're in favor of poverty; if you don't approve of the medicare approach, you're against the aged and the infirm; if you don't favor deficit financing, you're necessarily for higher taxes; if you feel the Appalachia project is discriminatory, you obviously favored blighted areas; if you question the way he has constructed his voting rights bill, you're an obstructionist in racial matters; and so it goes. By saying, "take it this way or not at all" he is saying I am the way, the truth and the light and if any man enter any other way he shall not inherit a place in the Great Society.

CCC Policy Hurts Farmers, Grain Trade, Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Grain Terminal Association Daily Roundup of St. Paul, Minn., indicates that the outcome of the controversy over the farm bill provision relating to the Government's resale price on Commodity Credit Corporation grain means much to the farmer. I concur whole-heartedly.

As the GTA article points out, this low 105-percent resale price actually encourages the Government's acquisition of huge stores of grain, and puts a ceiling on the market price a farmer might receive for his grain. The result clearly is disastrous for farmers, the grain trade, and the taxpaying public.

I include the Roundup at this point in my remarks:

GTA ROUNDUP, MAY 10, 1965

Some farmers may be somewhat uncertain as to just what is involved in the current controversy over the Government's resale price on Commodity Credit Corporation grain. There is dissatisfaction in Congress over this resale price at the present 105 percent of loan. Several bills have been introduced to advance it to 115 percent.

The outcome of this controversy will be quite significant to grain farmers. For example, as a farm businessman, you may have taken a Government loan on your wheat. Naturally you are looking forward to paying off that loan and selling your wheat on the market at some profit.

In order for for you to be able to do this, the market price has to rise above the loan level. Otherwise you have no choice but to let the Government—CCC—take over the wheat, the collateral, in payment of the loan.

In just this manner the Government continues to accumulate stocks of wheat. It has put them on the market at 105 percent of loan plus nominal carrying charges. This naturally discourages, inhibits, price rises in the markets. It has set a low ceiling price on grains.

All that your cooperatives and others are asking is that the Government raise that ceiling price by raising the resale price at which it offers wheat in the markets. That would give market prices the opportunity to rise above loan; farmers would have a chance to pay off their grain loans and sell the grain on the markets instead of surrendering it to the Government. It is widely suggested that this would be just plain good business for the Government and for the farmers, too.

Ironically, if a private banker behaved the way this Government lending agency—CCC—behaves with its 105-percent policy, he would probably be accused by another Government agency of a conspiracy against his customers.

Is it fair for a banker, or any lending agency, to interfere with his customer's ability to market his production and then foreclose on the customer and take over his inventory? That question seems to answer itself, doesn't it?

The President of the United States, Mr. Johnson, was very emphatic in regard to these matters in his farm message to Congress. He said that he is in favor of letting you and your cooperatives and other private business institutions carry on the marketing functions. Unfortunately, Commodity Credit Corporation is not permitting this and continues to operate as the world's biggest grain company.

Farmers know that CCC is supposed to operate as a lending institution to protect farm prices. When it behaves in that way, it is of great aid; but when it behaves as a grain buyer and merchandiser in competition with farmers and their institutions, it sows the seeds of disaster for farmers, taxpayers, and the grain marketing system.

Elbie Jay Battles the Munsters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Hoppe, the columnist, has published another of his articles on the Jay Family, calling attention to the TV programs emanating from the White House as only Arthur Hoppe can write in his inimitable way.

ELBIE JAY BATTLES THE MUNSTERS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Howdy there, folks. How y'all? Time for another tee-vee visit with the rootin'-tootin' Jay Family—starring ol' Elbie Jay, most peace-lovin' man in the whole State of Texas. And he'll lick any fella who says he ain't.

As we join up with ol' Elbie tonight, he's a-settin' in the parlor of his big white house, engaged in his favorite hobby, autographin' his photographs. His pretty wife, Birdie Bird, is watchin' tee-vee and their two cute tads, Myna Bird and Bye-bye Birdie, are over in the corner, doin' the Watusi.

BIRDIE BIRD. Children, come quick and see what's on tee-vee. It's a rare educational opportunity and I don't want you to miss it.

MYNA BIRD (frugging over dispiritedly). Is Daddy on again?

BIRDIE BIRD. No, it's a real surprise. He isn't.

ELBIE (with annoyance). What? Oh, you got the wrong station there, Birdie Bird. On the other one is a repeat of my afternoon speech explaining my morning speech explaining my clear, forthright foreign policy. Switch it over, Birdie Bird, I can't wait to hear my explanation. And I know the kiddies can't, either.

BYE-BYE BIRDIE (swimming over dispiritedly). Yeah, yeah, yeah.

ELBIE (beaming at the television set). Now watch your old daddy. Here's where I explain how I'm for peace, brotherly love, and quote 13 chapters of the Bible.

BIRDIE BIRD. You're getting awfully good at that part, dear.

ELBIE. My, aren't I though? Now here's where I explain why I had to send 30,000 Marines into that poor benighted country to spread peace, brotherly love, and democracy.

MYNA BIRD. Which poor, benighted country's that, Daddy?

ELBIE. I can't rightly recall at the minute. But I'm sure I'll mention it in passing. I most often do.

ANNOUNCER. We interrupt this program to bring you a special bulletin. "The Man from UNCLE," which we are watching in the studio, is trapped by a giant iguana in a deserted Doggie Diner.

ELBIE. What? What? Oh, now we're back to me. Now watch your daddy, here's where I explain why I——

ANNOUNCER. Due to a flood of phone calls, the rest of this program will not be seen at

this time. We switch you now to "The Man from UNCLE."

MYNA BIRD and BYE-BYE BIRDIE (rushing to the set). Hot-ziggety. Whoo-pee. At last.

ELBIE (glowering). Birdie Bird, whyn't you take those kiddies out and show them how to plant flowers on the freeway? (puzzled). But how come they cut me off like that?

BIRDIE BIRD (consolingly). It's because you aren't on regular, Elbie. Just odd hours, night and day.

ELBIE. You're right, Birdie Bird. I'm going to get me a regular peace program—7 to 9 nightly, all three networks. And I even got a title: "My Day and Why I Did It."

Will Elbie explain things? Will he ever stop? Be sure to tune in to our next episode, folks. And meantime, as you mosey on down the trail of life, remember what Elbie's ol' granddaddy always used to say: "Talk is cheap. And there's a lot of other good things to be said for it, too."

Labor's Reward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing a new philosophy in this drive for Central Government control—the drive is for a $2 minimum wage. Of course, we can expect few employers to provide jobs for the young and unskilled at $2 an hour, but the Great Society is going to take care of that by having the unskilled trained in some Government-financed school. Instead of using the minimum wage as a floor below which no one is permitted to fall, the plan is to establish the level as a bed upon which all can rest.

It can only mean deterioration of the presently bad system which keeps young people from finding jobs and puts them on the street to spawn crime.

The Washington Evening Star carried an editorial in the May 19, 1965, issue which is worth serious consideration of every Member of Congress before they consider selling their vote for a mess of AFL-CIO pottage. The editorial is as follows:

LABOR'S REWARD

President Johnson has called upon Congress to give labor a very large slice of the Great Society pie.

This follows the election returns of 1964, in which labor contributed much to the President's victory and to the Democratic sweep of Congress. Political debts of this sort have to be paid, or at least an attempt must be made to pay them.

Clearly, however, the President recognizes the dangers which lurk behind some of the AFL-CIO demands. This is especially evident in his comments on his recommendation to broaden and presumably to increase (no amount was specified in the labor message) the minimum wage. Congress, Mr. Johnson said, should consider carefully the effect of higher minimum wage rates on the incomes of those employed, and also on costs and prices, and on job opportunities—"particularly for the flood of teenagers now entering our labor force." This is another way of saying that if Congress goes to extremes in this area, it will not only be inviting inflation, an unduly high minimum wage will collide head on with the administration's effort to provide jobs for those who are both young and unskilled. The AFL-CIO has urged an hourly minimum of $2. This is more than many employers could or would pay for the services of the unskilled, yet these constitute the bulk of the unemployed. The President and Congress cannot have it both ways. Little or no progress will be made in reducing this segment of unemployment if the cost to prospective employers becomes prohibitive.

Another absurdity in the message is the proposal to spread employment by imposing double, or penalty rates, for excessive overtime. It may be that some employers would rather pay time and a half overtime than to increase their labor force, with accompanying fringe-benefit costs. But this does not take into account those industries in which intermittent peak workloads call for occasional overtime. Why should the Government be trying to force these employers to hire permanent additional workers whose services might be needed only 3 or 4 months in the year?

There are numerous other economic recommendations in the message, and no estimate of costs. The costs, however, will be high.

The proposal with the highest emotional content concerns repeal of section 14(b) of the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act—which permits States which wish to do so to ban the union shop. Under the union shop, employees must join a union, usually within 30 to 60 days after taking a job. It is our view that, as a matter of principle, no man should be compelled to join a union in order to hold his job. This will be a close fight and a bitter one. If Congress finally repeals section 14(b), however, then at least a provision should be written into the law to prevent unions from denying membership to Negroes and thereby depriving them of job opportunities. Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive secretary, has just made an interesting speech to the International Ladies Garment Workers in which he said that "deeply ingrained patterns of discrimination" in labor unions have not been broken. This speech should be read by every Member of Congress who may be inclined to vote for repeal of section 14(b), and then call it a day.

A Salute to Senator E. L. (Bob) Bartlett of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a trip to my home State of Alaska, where I joined with countless other Alaskans in honoring Alaska's senior Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, through the medium of a testimonial dinner, recognizing his 20 years of dedicated service to Alaska in Washington, D.C.—first, for 14 years as Alaska's lone territorial delegate; then, for the last 6 years as U.S. Senator.

On the day of the Bartlett dinner, Alaska's Anchorage Times printed two excellent tributes to this outstanding citizen of the 49th State. In order that my colleagues may be aware of the appreciation which we Alaskans feel toward our senior Senator, I insert those editorials here:

[From the Anchorage Daily Times, May 15, 1965]

WHY ALL THE FUSS ABOUT SENATOR BARTLETT?

Why all the fuss about Senator BARTLETT?

Because he has done so much for Alaska during 20 years as a Member of Congress, that's why.

Alaskans are swarming around to take part in a festive tribute to him tonight. Everybody wants in the act.

They ought to want in. The celebration is more than an opportunity to show proper gratitude for extraordinary service rendered by an extraordinary public servant.

It is also an opportunity to be associated with a man who will loom high in the history of Alaska. A man who inspires good and noble qualities in all of us. A man who has reached the heights of achievement without losing the original quality of humility that makes him a true friend and neighbor.

When the Alaskans are seated for dinner tonight with the Senator in the position of honor, a great moment will have arrived.

Here will be a group of Alaskans who are grateful to their leader. They will be representative of thousands of more who would be present if they were able.

At the same time, the guest of honor will be able to see that good work is not in vain. That constituents are not all greed, selfishness and demanding. That public life is not all tension, anxiety and strife.

Only a great man could have come through 20 years of public service with a record like Senator BARTLETT'S. He was tutored on the ways of Washington in the territorial days when a Delegate to Congress was hardly more than a dignified beggar. He went hat in hand to committees and agencies trying to get them to do him the favor of providing something good for Alaska.

BARTLETT'S training stood him in such good stead that he has grown into a position of influence as a full-fledged Member of the upper House. While Alaska made the transition from Territory to State. BARTLETT made it from Delegate to Senator. And that is no simple task for it meant sharing the responsibility for the Nation and much of the world in addition to the problems pertaining to the baby State.

Historians will tell of the benefits that accrued to Alaska from BARTLETT'S hand. The list will be long.

And no historian can make such a list without emphasizing the work of Senator BARTLETT in winning statehood for Alaska.

For 13 long years it was BARTLETT, then serving as Delegate, who worked with the committees of Congress to win favorable action on statehood legislation. It was BARTLETT who worked with the numerous Federal agencies to win their support.

It was BARTLETT to whom most Members of Congress and the other Federal agencies looked for their impressions and observations that could either help or hinder statehood legislation.

Alaskans take personal pride in BARTLETT. Each one considers him "my man." Each feels he has a proprietary right to a part of him. And why not? His successes are our sucesses, and he has enriched us by providing so many.

[From the Anchorage Times, May 15, 1965]

VIGNETTES AND VIEWS, SATURDAY SUNDRY

(By William J. Tobin)

His real name is EDWARD LEWIS BARTLETT, but if you call him anything but BOB most people won't know who you're talking about. But everybody knows BOB—a childhood

nickname that probably accounts for the use of more parentheses than any other moniker in the public print.

The name sometimes causes confusion. Witness Perle Mesta, the hostess with the mostest, writing in McCall's magazine about one of her galas in connection with the last Democratic National Convention at Atlantic City. Among the guests, she gushed, was her "good friend from Alaska, Senator ED. BARTLETT."

Alaskans wouldn't make such a social blunder about our Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, being honored here this weekend for a distinguished career which now spans 20 years in Congress.

Who is this man among 99 others who sits in the highest legislative body of the land, and represents Alaska with pride and honor on the national and international scene? Well, don't look here for an analysis of his contributions to the territory, the State, and the Nation. But here is an inside glimpse at Bartlett-behind-the-headlines, the Senator who enjoys grapes for breakfast, nibbled while shaving with a cordless electric razor while he studies the latest news from every newspaper published in Alaska.

This is an Alaskan who lives on 49th Street in the Nation's Capital, and zips to his office (a 12-minute drive if he hits the traffic right) in a Volkswagen bearing Alaska license plate No. 49. The Senator from the 49th State arrives at work in the Old Senate Office Building each day with a fresh rose in his lapel. He carries two other roses with him—one of which is given daily to Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine. The other is a spare, in case the steamy heat of Washington wilts the one in his buttonhole.

The roses are cut each morning by BARTLETT from among the many in his backyard—a garden tended with great skill by the Senator's wife, Vide. But the brilliant array of roses must share space in the yard with an old-fashioned grinding wheel, at which BARTLETT occasionally sits, pedaling away at a knife-sharpening chore.

He works at a desk piled high with a collection of papers reflecting the ebb and flow of the affairs of state, using two spindles rising from the clusters of reports and documents on which to spear important memos, reminders, and messages. His work at senatorial duties occupies him from early morning to late in the evening, and the Bartletts shun all but the most important of the countless social functions which sap the strength of many in the Washington whirl.

There's a 7-foot toten pole in his office and an Alaskan bearskin rug on the floor of his den at home and the only television set in the house is on the blink, unrepaired because he reads so much that he doesn't have time to which it anyway. Like all of us, he worries about his weight—but has given up on such things as a grapefruit diet to beat the bulge.

He's one of the most popular men in the Senate, a friend of the President, a friend to every displaced Alaskan in the Nation's Capital. He has an unabashed love affair for Alaska, a deep respect for his office and for the U.S. Senate. The Senate, he once said, is "the very highest goal one can attain, unless you consider the Vice Presidency or the Presidency."

Who's this fellow BARTLETT? He's a man who keeps a king-size sack of dog biscuits inside the kitchen door so he can feed the neighbor's hound every morning. He's an ex-gold miner. He's an ex-newspaperman. And he's rated by the veterans of the Senate Press Gallery as one of the top dozen Members of the Senate. That's who Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT is.

Proliferation of Obscene Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation communities are being made aware of the grave dangers created by the proliferation of obscene literature. It is well known that the purveyors of pornography have concentrated their efforts to get their wares into the hands and the minds of the young. There can be no doubt that this situation has created a national problem of great and growing proportions.

On April 5 of this year, the House of Representatives passed a bill, H.R. 980, the purpose of which was to establish the principle that a parent, as a patron of the postal service, has the right to be protected from receiving through the U.S. mails unsolicited mail matter which, in his opinion, is obscene.

I believe that all of us agree that the most effective way for citizens to combat the spread of pornographic literature is to wage a community campaign on the local level. Such a campaign has been undertaken in the city of Syracuse. The local news media and many civic organizations have joined in an effort to make parents aware of what is being pushed upon their children by the sellers of pornography, to arouse their concern and sense of outrage, and to plan an effort to put an end to the sale of indecent literature to children. I should like to include here a portion of a speech by Mr. Thomas Higgins, who is president of the Merchants National Bank and Trust Co., of Syracuse, in which he mentioned this effort. The occasion of the speech was the annual Tipperary Hill, Post 1361, American Legion award dinner.

The speech follows:

A PORTION OF A SPEECH BY MR. THOMAS HIGGINS AT THE ANNUAL TIPPERARY HILL, POST 1361, AMERICAN LEGION AWARD DINNER

The Tipp Hill Post is to be commended on another score. It has always embraced the principle that we tell all America not just what is pleasing to hear, but what is true and good and right to hear. Furthermore, that we tell all America not only what we have done in the past, but what we are resolved to do in the future.

I think the greatest thing that the Tipp Hill post has done in the past year has been to join forces with our two local newspapers; and with all decent thinking people in waging a war on smut literature which gradually is poisoning the minds of our youth. You may be interested to know that this smut industry is now a $2 billion a year business. Just think of it—$2 billion of dirt and the sad part of it all is that 75 percent of this obscene, foul, and filthy literature finds its way into the hands of youngsters under 18 years of age. The other day I was discussing this smut literature with a friend of mine and he made a statement which really shook me, and I have thought about it many times since. He said:

"Tom, I would rather have a mad dog loose in my backyard with my children than to have this smut literature in their hands."

Tomorrow and for a lot of tomorrows, let us all think of that statement by my friend.

May I suggest to all of you good people that you do one of two things, preferably both. Either join the Citizens for Decent Literature Committee which is active in Onondaga County under the chairmanship of Judge Leo Yehle or at least write to the Reader's Digest and ask for a reprint of an article entitled, "Poison in Print and How to Get Rid of It."

We all owe it to our children, our grandchildren, to ourselves and our community to do everything in our power to help eradicate this vicious disease which is eating away at the minds and souls of our youth.

Please don't be apathetic about this threat to our children. Don't let anyone tell you this is censorship. I abhor censorship as much as anyone else but believe me this is not censorship in any form whatsoever.

I would like to see all of the clergy of Onondaga County unite in a march against smut literature. We all want America to be the greatest country in the world. Let's make certain that she does not become the pornographic capital of the world.

U.S. Acted in Santo Domingo as OAS Should Have Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evansville, Ind., Courier of May 2, 1965:

COURAGE OF COMMONSENSE: UNITED STATES ACTED IN SANTO DOMINGO AS OAS SHOULD HAVE DONE

Sending U.S. forces to the neighboring Dominican Republic was an act of necessity. We may deplore the necessity, but we cannot deplore the action. President Johnson's prompt decision illustrated the courage of commonsense. The action had to be swift, or not at all.

There are signs that some members of the Organization of American States are unhappy with this action. But the United States merely did what the OAS should have done, had it been equipped. If the action had awaited time for the OAS to go through its usual mumbo jumbo, it would have been too late.

The urgent issue was the rescue of Americans whose lives were in danger. That is a first duty of the American Government in any situation. Rescue of other nationals who wanted to leave, including even some Dominicians, could be nothing more than an act of mercy.

At the time of this writing, it still was unclear whether the disorder was being pushed primarily by Communist elements, or whether a few simply had followed the usual Communist practice of joining any disturbance. The presence of some known Communist agitators was enough to indicate the possibilities.

The Western Hemisphere cannot tolerate any more Castros in its middle. Whatever

is necessary to prevent a Communist takeover in any American country, big or little, ought to be undertaken in self-protection for the whole area, especially the countries of Central and South America.

If any of our Latin American friends feel unhappy about this regretful necessity, they need only ask themselves: Which would they rather have? A temporary U.S. rescue mission? Or another Communist dictatorship to be used as a base for new infiltrations in Venezuela or Peru, or some other free American country?

The United States already has announced it is prepared to "transfer its responsibility to the OAS at the earliest possible moment."

The sooner our forces can leave the better Americans will like it. But we will not leave U.S. citizens, or other innocent victims, to the mercies of mob rule, whether inspired by local ruffians or more sinister elements.

Until then, the whole hemisphere should have but a single, prayerful hope: That some leader in the Dominican Republic can establish a stable, non-Communist government, capable of keeping order—and quickly.

Student Opposes United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include a letter written by Billy McIlhany, an eighth-grade student from Roanoke, Va., High School which appeared in the Roanoke World News on Tuesday, April 20, 1965.

It is gratifying to find so many young students in America who do a little thinking for themselves and recognize the dangers which can come to this country by way of a world government.

The letter follows:

[From the Roanoke (Va.) World News, Apr. 20, 1965]

STUDENT OPPOSES UNITED NATIONS

Congratulations to the United Nations and their friends everywhere. Another great success for peace has been accomplished. This is of course in the light of news reports stating that legislation will soon give Alcatraz Island to the San Francisco chapter of the United Nations Association, which will convert it into an international peace symbol, flying the United Nations symbolic flag. And of course most of these good but misguided people do not realize that the peace sought by the United Nations, and to be symbolized by their island, is the Communist peace, which means literally and simply, a situation or condition, in any country or for any people, in which all resistance to communism has been completely destroyed.

For certainly that is exactly where the United Nations flag belongs—over a maximum security prison, or an island which will be remembered in the public mind as a maximum security prison. The action seems to me quite symbolic, as a maximum security prison is exactly what the whole world will become if the United Nations is successful.

Less than 1 month ago a report said how many people the Red Chinese under Mao Tse-tung have murdered since 1949. These were just anti-Communists, citizens in China, killed just to stay in power—only 49 million (13 million people alone in 1962). The U.N. said nothing.

When the United Nations was established in 1945, communism controlled only 200 million people, in and around the Soviet Union. Today, communism strikes terror in some 900 million people in Europe and Asia. Roughly almost one-third of the world's population is living under Communist influence and control. Is this the peace guaranteed by the United Nations?

By all means let's give Communist China a seat in the United Nations—our seat. And since we do not want the Red Chinese coming to New York, let's ask them to move the U.N. headquarters to Peiping or Moscow where it really belongs.

If mere survival has become more important to Americans than freedom, then the men who sacrificed their lives for us in battles of the past have been asked to fight, to bleed, and to die in vain.

BILLY MCILHANY.

U.S. Forces in the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I submit for insertion in the RECORD three highly interesting editorials from recent newspapers: one from the Miami Herald of April 30; one from the Miami News of the same date; and a third from the Herald of April 29.

In the midst of increasing public confusion, these articles enunciate quite simply the reasons for our dispatching U.S. forces recently to the Dominican Republic: to protect American lives; to prevent another Cuban-style Communist takeover in our hemisphere, and to prevent the kind of anarchy which would make impossible any international peacekeeping and stabilizing action.

I strongly recommend these informative articles to my colleagues:

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, Apr. 30, 1965]

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SWIFT RESPONSE

President Johnson's reply to the information that some 2,000 American lives were endangered by the Dominican revolt was swift and effective.

His sending of the Marines may raise some hackles among Latin Americans who recall the "gunboat diplomacy" of earlier years, but those feelings can be soothed later.

The President's immediate responsibility was to respond to a notice that no one could guarantee the safety of U.S. nationals in the Dominican Republic. This is entirely believable, considering that one of the first acts of the rebels was to put guns in the hands of a few thousand unorganized civilians.

U.S. spokesmen have been careful to state that the Marines are there only to protect Americans and other foreign nationals who request aid. Nevertheless, the presence of American forces could, or should, impose some restraint on the Santo Domingo rebels. We shall see.

The U.S. suggestion that the Organization of American States put its peacemaking machinery to work at once was a wise one. The chaos in the Dominican Republic endangers more than the safety of 2,000 American civilians.

It is a threat to the security of the entire hemisphere. The situation is made to order for Fidel Castro and his well-organized subversives in the Caribbean.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Apr. 30, 1965]

MARINES FOR A DOUBLE PURPOSE

The landing of Marines to protect Americans in the Dominican Republic should also serve a larger purpose. This is to preclude a Communist takeover along the lines of Fidel Castro's conquest of Cuba for the Reds.

President Johnson acted forthrightly in sending the Marines ashore. He did so with approval from congressional leaders of both political parties, and we believe they represented the views of their constituents in supporting the President's action.

Mr. Johnson also saw to it that full information on developments was supplied to the council of the Organization of American States. The OAS, representing all the free nations of the new world, is properly as concerned as the United States to prevent another Cuba.

No government in the hemisphere is safe if Communist agents can foment insurrection—whatever the pretext—in order to seize power. Members of the OAS might well send token forces to Santo Domingo to help snuff out the threat to peace there. Such steps are clearly authorized by OAS pacts, and were invoked during the Cuban missile crisis.

Squeals of outrage over the use of Marines already are being heard from the Communist bloc, and may be expected to grow louder. These merely underscore the truth about the bloody doings in Santo Domingo.

President Johnson is proceeding with measured prudence. The lives of the 2,000 Americans in the Dominican Republic certainly must be safeguarded so long as teenage hoodlums with machineguns are allowed to spray bullets where they please.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Apr. 29, 1965]

THE MARINES HAVE LANDED

Yesterday this newspaper pleaded:

"Let's have no second Cuba in the Dominican Republic."

Today it makes no difference whether we said this or whether someone else did. The pertinent fact is that President Johnson has acted swiftly to prevent just such a catastrophe. He has sent a powerful Marine unit ashore for the ostensible purpose of protecting American nationals in the hotted-up civil war. One faction in that conflict would return Juan Bosch to power with the help of undisguised cadres of Communists.

It is all very well to argue that we have no real business in Santo Domingo. The same argument was made—much to our woe—in that vacillating venture known as the Bay of Pigs, which has cost the United States worldwide prestige and a Red foothold one jump from the U.S. mainland.

We think that Mr. Johnson moved wisely last night.

He was careful to consult the friendly council of the Organization of American States.

He conferred with and responded to the Dominican Government in power (though beleaguered) which requested our help.

He brought in the congressional leadership.

It is clear, however, that the marines are there to stay a bit, for their "assistance will be available to the nationals of other countries."

Well, let them stabilize the situation, not in the selfish name of any entrenched and selfish colonialism but to protect the national interests of two proud peoples in political freedom in the Caribbean.

Aid to Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD a series of three editorials by the Riverside, Calif., Press-Enterprise.

H.R. 3220, a bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education, will soon be before the House.

This proposed legislation would provide approximately $1,450,000 to the State of California, a large portion of which would be allocated to the University of California Extension Service which plays an active role in programs relating to community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use.

I believe that the University of California Extension Service has done a remarkable job for the educational system of California as well as for the people of the various communities which it serves.

The following editorials are historically important as few newspapers in this country have become really informed about the possibilities for using the university extension service in nonagricultural areas:

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Press, Apr. 6, 1964]

EXTENSION: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT RIVERSIDE, CHANCELLOR BACKS AID PLAN

Chancellor Herman T. Spieth of the University of California at Riverside, today publicly announced his support of a proposed Federal plan to finance additional university extension programs.

The bill, introduced in Congress by Representative CLEVELAND BAILEY, Democrat, of W. Va., would make it possible for the university to increase its education services to business, industrial, and professional groups and to the general public.

A publicly supported program of general extension as provided by Congressman BAILEY's bill (H.R. 4386), to be operated by State universities and land-grant colleges would stimulate these institutions to bring new research and other knowledge to individual and groups in communities through programs of adult education, Chancellor Spieth said.

The bill provides for a yearly appropriation of $20 million to each State and an additional $8 million to be divided among the States on the basis of population. Each State would have to provide its own matching funds to share in the $8 million fund.

Under the proposed program, each college or university could use the money to offer adult education courses in any field of study taught at the school or in which the school conducts research.

However, duplication of instruction offered by the cooperative agricultural or home economics programs or by federally financed vocational education program would not be allowed.

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Press, Apr. 5, 1961]

EXTENDING EXTENSION

While the program for aid to education which the President is urging on Congress may seem comprehensive, it neglects one important phase of education: adult education.

In an effort to fill this loophole, Congressman Cleveland Bailey, Democrat, of Ohio, has introduced a bill providing a modest plan of support for the adult extension programs of State universities and land-grant colleges.

The plan does not include agricultural instruction. Agricultural instruction is already substantially supported by the Federal Government and has been for many years.

Indeed the record of success in the joint Federal-State program of agricultural extension has undoubtedly contributed in a major way to the unique character of this country's farm problem. We refer, of course, to America's farm surpluses as compared with the shortages which plague most of the world.

Extension of Federal aid to other areas of adult education promises similar benefits.

The increasing complexity of modern industry demands greater knowledge and greater skills. And the task of helping people find this knowledge and skill can't be accomplished entirely during the normal school years. Part of it is the problem of adult education.

The same can be said for the greater demands of citizenship in a shrunken, terrifying world. Here, too, part of the educational task, and an important part, is with adults.

The need for Federal encouragement is indicated by the great disparity in what various States are attempting. Some universities (Southern Illinois University is a notable example) have extension programs which have a constructive influence on almost every phase of community life. In other States nothing at all is being done.

Congressman Bailey's bill would provide a modest push—a $9 million one—toward a national program. It deserves wide support.

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Press, June 1, 1964]

GREATEST EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION

The Nation has just passed the 50th anniversary of the act of Congress which established the Agricultural Extension Service administered by the land-grant colleges.

This program was a sort of internal point IV program. Herbert Hoover once called it "the world's greatest educational institution." Certainly, it has been of great moment to California—now producer of the largest value of agricultural cash crops in the Nation. It has been of prime importance to Riverside, with the remarkable contributions of the University of California's Citrus Experiment Station, now known officially as the Citrus Research Center and Agricultural Experiment Station.

Not only has Agricultural Extension been technical adviser to the Nation's farmers as they reduced the ratio of manpower required to feed the Nation from 1 farmer for every 7 consumers to 1 for every 27. But it has enriched the whole context of rural life with its home demonstration programs, its network of 4-H clubs and other youth activities, and, more recently, its nonpolitical and social problems.

Only more recently have the Nation's universities begun to cultivate a field now far more crowded and just as much in need of help as the rural districts of the Nation. But in the last decade or so they have been coming alive in a variety of ministrations to urban and suburban populations.

University Extension, almost since the founding of the liberal arts college at University of California at Riverside, has been offering a wide variety of adult education courses, seminars, and institutes. In the last 2 years they have come under such subject groupings as "The Executive Profile," "Government in Action," "Value of the Arts," "The Southern California City," "Race, Property, and Government," and "Development of Creative Abilities in Children." To extend its reach the division has spotted its offerings not only in Riverside but also in San Bernardino, Ontario, Barstow, and Palm Springs.

The extension efforts of the university, a fledgling in a limited field a half century ago, now begins to approach saturation coverage of areas which touch the lives of almost every Californian who harbors a desire for knowledge and self-improvement, or an urge to make an informed and effective contribution to his community.

The President Makes Some More Good Appointments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 1, an editorial appeared in the Providence Journal, which voices strong approval of many of President Johnson's recent appointments.

I heartily concur and place the editorial as part of my remarks:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, May 1, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT MAKES SOME MORE GOOD APPOINTMENTS

Several of the Federal appointees just named by President Johnson will find ticklish or controversial problems awaiting them as they step into their new positions. Their approach to the problems is expected to reflect any changes in direction or emphasis that the administration may have decided upon in these various areas.

One area is antitrust activity. Speculation has been heard for some time that the Johnson administration prefers a more cautious and less vigorous prosecution of the antitrust laws. The administration has made great efforts to win the support and respect of the business community, but these efforts have been handicapped from time to time by the energy and zeal of William H. Orrick, Jr., Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division.

Mr. Orrick now is stepping down to return to his law practice in California. He will be replaced by Dr. Donald F. Turner, an authority on antitrust legislation and a member of the faculty at Harvard Law School. It remains to be seen whether the change in the leadership of the Antitrust Division will mean any change in the division's policy, emphasis or scale of activity.

Three of the presidential appointments lie in the field of transportation.

Alan S. Boyd, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, has been named Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. Mr. Boyd has demonstrated exceptional administrative skill while heading the CAB. In his new position, he will assume broader respon-

sibilities over the whole field of transportation.

A frequent criticism in the past has been that the Federal Government has too many separate agencies dealing with transportation—the Maritime Administration, the ICC, the CAB, etc.—and that it has woefully lacked a coherent overall policy. In his new post, Mr. Boyd will be in a position to enunciate a general policy on transportation and perhaps to bring more order into this badly segmented field of Federal regulation.

Charles S. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture, has been named to replace Mr. Boyd as Chairman of the CAB. The present five-member Board often has been divided 3 to 2 on recent decisions affecting route allocations and air fares. The change in personnel could mean a change in coming CAB decisions—including the long-debated future of Northeast Airlines.

Najeeb E. Halaby, who is stepping down as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, has long been the most vigorous advocate in the administration for developing the supersonic transport (SST). His vigorous advocacy has helped to keep the proposal alive despite the doubts expressed in other administration and aviation circles.

Gen. William F. McKee, former Vice Chief of the Air Force, has been named to replace Mr. Halaby. General McKee is an experienced administrator and an authority on logistics. His position on the SST proposal hasn't been disclosed.

The latest appointments by the President conform to the generally high standards he has maintained in earlier appointments. All of these appointees, whatever their personal views on particular matters, are eminently qualified by background and experience to assume the positions to which they have been named.

The Delta Story: Saga of an Airline That Changed the Entire Economy of the South and of the Man Whose Vision Built It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to acknowledge the tremendous contribution that has been made to the economic progress and development of my area by Delta Airlines and its president and founder, Mr. C. E. Woolman.

What began as a one machine crop-dusting operation in the twenties has now become the fifth largest airline in the Nation, linking the burgeoning South to the industrial East and Midwest and strengthening the bonds of interest among our regions from coast to coast and into the Caribbean.

It has been said that "Delta Airlines is Woolman, and Woolman is Delta Airlines." Indeed, it is impossible to contemplate one without thinking of the other, for they are inseparable, and it is generally conceded that Mr. Woolman is probably without a peer among airline executives.

In all of this, Mr. Woolman still projects a personality of grace, charm, and humility. He takes a deep personal interest in the people who work for Delta, and I am convinced that no company executive ever enjoyed greater or more universal affection, respect, and loyalty from his employees. Certainly the outstanding example of the life and career of this remarkable man should serve to inspire American youth to finer and greater accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, the National Aeronautics magazine, the publication of the National Pilots Association, pays an extraordinary tribute to Mr. Woolman and Delta Airlines in its June issue. In order to share this significant account of example and growth with others, I include the text of this article as part of my remarks:

THE DELTA STORY: THE SAGA OF AN AIRLINE THAT CHANGED THE ENTIRE ECONOMY OF THE SOUTH AND OF THE MAN WHOSE VISION BUILT IT

The guiding hand of Delta Air Lines is that of Collett Everman Woolman, modest, hard-working president and general manager, whose personality has quietly dominated this friendly, progressive airline since its beginning as the world's first commercial crop-dusting outfit back in 1924 and 1925.

While a student at the University of Illinois, Woolman attended the world's first aviation meet at Rheims, France, in 1910, and following World War I he learned to fly in a Curtis OX-5 "Jenny." But aviation offered few opportunities in those early years, and he had to be content to enter another field upon completion of his schooling. It was a fortunate field, however, with the extension department of Louisiana State University, and it soon led him right back into aviation.

Throughout the South and the length and breadth of the fertile Mississippi delta, which was to inspire the name of a great airline, cotton production was being seriously reduced by the boll weevil. Based on the experimental work by Dr. B. R. Coad at the Tallulah Cotton Experimental Station, Woolman and several associates became interested in the problem in 1925 and organized Huff Dalland Dusters, the world's first airplane dusting organization. The advanced techniques which they developed proved amazingly potent in the battle against cotton's hungry enemies. Cotton growers began to sit up and take notice. Quickly the company's operations expanded across the southern United States into Mexico and South America. With its 18 airplanes, Huff Dalland Dusters was the largest unsubsidized air fleet in the world at that time.

In 1927 the company in stiff competition from wealthy German firms secured air mail rights in Peru. And C. E. Woolman became the first American operator south of the equator in the western hemisphere.

"The South American operation was getting pretty big by the following year, when we found ourselves right in the middle of a red hot local revolution," Woolman recalls. "Both sides tried to get hold of our airplanes for their armies. We sold our dusters to a local company, and our airmail routes to Pan American Grace. The route became the nucleus of what is now the Panagra system."

But the company's dusting operations never stopped in the South. Taking the name of Delta Air Service in 1928, the company continued its operations in the agricultural field—and its agricultural division is still operating successfully today, under the direction of Dr. Coad, who joined the company in 1931.

But bigger undertakings were afoot. Dreams of expansion led to the purchase of three six-passenger, 90-mile-per-hour Travel Airs, powered by 300-horsepower Wright "Whirlwinds." On June 1, 1929, Delta Air Service inaugurated its first scheduled passenger flight between Dallas and Jackson, Miss., with stops at Shreveport and Monroe, La. As new planes arrived from the factory, service was extended to Birmingham, Ala., and then to Atlanta, Ga.

Delta was squeezed out in the political maneuvers of 1930 when the Post Office Department awarded the airmail contract for the southern route to a rival airline, but Woolman retained faith. In 1934, in new bids, the company, now known as Delta Air Corp., won an airmail contract for a route from Dallas to Atlanta and Charleston, S.C. Trimotored Stinsons were used, which could carry another passenger and fly 10 miles an hour faster than the Travel Airs.

Delta flew its first airmail across Dixie on July 4, 1934. The following year, night flights were inaugurated between Atlanta and Fort Worth, the most heavily traveled Delta route. In 1941, the Civil Aeronautics Board awarded the rising company two new routes—from Atlanta to Cincinnati and from Atlanta to Savannah. That same year headquarters were moved from Monroe, La., where Huff-Daland Dusters was born, to Atlanta.

During the early years of World War II, Delta relinquished half of its planes and pilots to the Air Force and mobilized for other assignments to help the war effort. The company flew military cargo between various military installations, modified aircraft for special purposes, overhauled engines and instruments, and trained hundreds of Air Force pilots and mechanics.

With the war warming up to its hottest peak, the organization could still expand. In 1943 the CAB authorized a new route between Fort Worth and New Orleans, and Delta moved another step toward becoming the "Air Line of the South."

Closely following the atomic bomb and Japan's surrender, came the news of Delta's largest route award to that date—the 1,022-mile Chicago-Miami and Chicago-Charleston, S.C., routes.

On December 18, 1945, the company's name was changed to Delta Air Lines, Inc., and Woolman moved up from vice president and general manager to president and general manager.

The airline expanded rapidly, including a merger in 1953 with Chicago and Southern Air Lines, which had been organized in 1933 on the west coast but shifted operations to the Mississippi Valley in 1934. The merger added 5,854 miles and six Caribbean cities to Delta's route.

In November 1955, the Civil Aeronautics Board awarded Delta 1,075 miles of new routes into "Main Street America," and on February 1, 1956, the airline inaugurated service between Dixie and the New York-Washington area.

Delta advanced into the ranks of the transcontinental air carriers in 1961 when the CAB awarded it the Southern Transcontinental Route from Dallas-Fort Worth to Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Today Delta serves 60 cities. Its 14,119-mile route system serves the centers of government and finance in the East, the industrial areas of the Midwest, the dynamic South and Southwest, the growing west coast, and the vacation playgrounds in Florida and the Caribbean, with headquarters at its main focal point of Atlanta, Ga.

First in the world to inaugurate DC-8 and Convair 880 jetliner service, Delta has a total jet fleet investment in excess of $140 million. The airline has 16 Convair 880's and by the end of 1965 will have 20 DC-8's (including 3 scheduled for delivery in 1966).

Delta received its first DC-8 jet airliner on July 22, 1959, and service was inaugurated on September 18, 1959. Convair 880 service was inaugurated on May 15, 1960.

In April 1963, Delta became the first airline in the world to place orders for the Douglas-built DC-9 twin jet when it announced purchase of 15 short-haul DC-9's at a total cost

in excess of $50 million, including spare parts. Deliveries will begin in early 1966.

In May 1964, Delta and Pan American World Airways inaugurated the first single-place service between New Orleans, Atlanta, and Europe.

All cities on the Delta system will benefit from a new computer-based electronic reservations system which Delta is programing into use, with systemwide completion scheduled this year. The IBM Deltamatic system links Delta's cities to a powerful computer center in Atlanta, and up-to-the-second flight and passenger information is available to reservations agents in a matter of seconds.

Over the years Delta has prided itself on the quality of its service. Passengers have come to expect extra special treatment on Delta, and the airline's continued, steady growth indicates that they aren't being disappointed.

A Great Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, on November 22 of last year, Miss Patricia Letourneau, Brookline Avenue, Dover, N.H., composed a poem saluting our late and beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Patricia is 13 years of age and I am honored to place her fine composition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and before the Members of Congress.

It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to offer this poem to the Kennedy Memorial Library in Boston, Mass., after it is inserted in the RECORD.

A GREAT MAN

(By Miss Patricia Letourneau, Dover, N.H., Nov. 22, 1964)

Four years ago on Thanksgiving Day,
The Kennedy family sat down to pray.
The only thing unusual about this, you see,
Was that John Kennedy has just won the presidency.

And as he slowly said the Grace,
A wonderful expression went over his face.
His eyes lit up, and then he smiled,
And looked to one side at his wife and child.

For, inside his heart he was wondering,
If he could answer all the needs his new job would bring.
To run a country, and be a good father too,
That's a very difficult task to do.

But in his heart he knew he could,
Do all the things for which the Presidency stood.
And then he looked to his side once more,
And found the encouragement he was looking for.

For, his wife, Jacqueline, looked into his eyes,
And suddenly he realized—
As long as he had her encouraging smile,
He could surpass any trial.

This was the scene, 4 years ago on Thanksgiving Day,
As the Kennedy family sat down to pray.

Three years later, on the same joyous day,
A whole new mood had shown its way.
An empty seat, a missing smile,
Were evident all the while.

The same people were there, the traditional food,
But, still no one was in the mood.
For, deep inside, their hearts were chilled,
Knowing his place would never again be filled.

People all over the world conveyed
The feeling they had felt on that bitter day.
We had lost a leader, a really great man,
And Lyndon Johnson had taken stand.
But they took no notice at all of this,
'Cause they noticed so much, all they now missed.

But Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy missed him most of all,
For now there was no answer to her loving call.
Words just cannot explain—
The agonizing misery, sorrow, and pain.

His children, of course, missed him, too,
The youngest one was only two.
How could you tell them—their father was dead,
Murdered by a man—shot in the head???

The worst 2 days in almost everyone's life,
The ones so filled with sorrow and strife,
Were the day of Mr. Kennedy's death,
And the day they laid him down to rest.

The youngest man in history,
Ever to conquer the Presidency.
A very great man at forty-three,
And yet—he was killed deliberately.

A man with love and honesty,
Moral strength and stability,
I salute—John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Gardner Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, Gardner Jackson will be sorely missed by his friends in the House and in the Senate. The kind of lobbying he did, for the poor and mistreated in our society, made a day when he came to call, a better day. In his kindly and selfless concern, his willingness to stick with the fight when it looked hopeless, he inspired others to keep going. There have been many letters and editorials written about this singular man, but I would like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to reprint a letter to the editor of the May 18 Washington Post written by Ludwig Hamburger. He expresses far better than I could how so many of us feel about the loss of "Pat" Jackson:

GARDNER JACKSON

May I request the hospitality of your columns for a footnote on Gardner Jackson? You and others have rightly commemorated his incessant action in fighting for justice, in helping the submerged, and in combating the indignities of the world; and you have rightly praised him for the extraordinary exuberance he brought to all he did, for his sense of ardor and passionate conviction, adorned as they were by modesty, spiced by humor, and devoid of malice.

But there was yet more to the man. Above all Gardner Jackson was selfless. He had no ax to grind and no nest egg to hatch; he never asked for dividends, returns, or credit; his one and only commitment was to the causes he fought and to the people he helped. He, for one, followed—long before it was made—President Kennedy's celebrated call: Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country. And any reward he may have expected (and he received none other) was the consciousness of having been true to that precept.

This was the secret of the impact he made, he, a one-man lobby, who "represented" exactly no one. This won him the confidence, nay, the love of those who associated with him. This opened before him the doors of the high and mighty right up to the White House. This accounted for his extraordinary effectiveness in getting things done that seemed hopelessly tied up in redtape or held up by unawareness or ill will.

Gardner Jackson was, in the finest American and Christian tradition, a rugged individualist who served his fellow man. Speaking, I have no doubt, for hundreds of Washingtonians in all walks of life, indeed for all those who were so fortunate as to cross the path of that unique personality, I wish to suggest that we name a school for Gardner Jackson to preserve his memory and to hold up his example to the young.

LUDWIG HAMBURGER.

WASHINGTON.

Viet Talks on Our Terms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I once heard President Johnson express an idea about foreign policy this way:

Our guard is always up—but our hand is always out.

Today in the Vietnamese conflict we can see this admirable principle at work. Our guard is up; we have committed men, money, arms, and the unbending determination of our Government to arresting the advance of communism in Asia.

Yet the hand of peace and fraternal cooperation is extended—even to our adversaries in the Vietnamese struggle. We have called for unconditional talks—and for a vast program of peaceful, constructive development in Vietnam rather than destruction and waste.

I am one of those who believe deeply in the wisdom and necessity of the President's policy, and I commend to my colleagues an excellent editorial on the subject from the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat:

[From the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune-Democrat, Apr. 28, 1965]

VIET TALKS ON OUR TERMS

Ridiculous pleas for an end to U.S. bombing raids against North Vietnam continue to be issued, and, unfortunately, there is slim chance that the pleas will cease.

The issuers of these requests feel that if we stop attacking supply depots in the north, the path to the negotiating table will be shortened. Obviously, they aren't thinking too clearly—or they have a warped faith in the integrity of the aggressors in the southeast Asia conflict.

It is difficult, at best, to understand how those who want the bombing to be stopped

can even think that this is the key to negotiations. Should the bombings be ended, the North Vietnamese will take swift advantage of the situation to increase encouragement and supplies to the Communist Vietcong in the south. Even now, North Vietnam is sending some of its regular army units into the battle, according to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

Surely these pleaders don't think that South Vietnam is the only target of the Communists in Asia. As with all Communists, the southeast Asia Reds envision conquest of all nations struggling to maintain freedom. And should the United States enter into negotiations on the terms of the Communists, it will be just opening the door to further attempts to expand the Red influence.

In answer to the pleadings of those seeking, a letup in American action in Vietnam, the American Conservative Union has drawn up a list of proposals. Among other specifics, the union calls for an immediate sealing off of South Vietnam's borders by stopping guerrilla operations and forcing the end of unprovoked Communist aggression. The union also states that the United States must win in Vietnam because it is "not an isolated engagement but is the key to Communist expansion in Asia. Loss of the war in Vietnam, militarily or by 'negotiation,' therefore means resumption of hostilities on other fronts on a greater scale at greater disadvantages."

Now that is the type of thinking we agree with. The United States and South Vietnam must win the war. They must bring the aggressors to overwhelming defeat and must make them ask for negotiation—on our terms. Any stoppage of U.S. military efforts short of clear victory will make peace talks more difficult than negotiations with Communist governments usually are.

President Johnson has made a sound decision in continuing attacks on supply depots in the north. And he must remain firm in fighting the war or the result of our efforts to date will be lost.

The bombing raids against the Hanoi government of the north are serving a double purpose. In addition to hindering transfer of supplies to the Vietcong, they are demonstrating to Red China that there is to be no sanctuary for aggressors—no sancutary such as the Red Chinese enjoyed during their involvement in the Korean war. And certainly now, when the Chinese are making "full preparations" to send their own people "to fight together with the Vietnamese people and drive out U.S. aggressors" is no time to stop taking the fight to the north.

The time for the United States to stop bombing the north is when it is clearly apparent that the north itself has stopped sending men and materiel into the south. It is up to the north to stop being an aggressor. Then—and only then—should the United States agree to sit at a negotiation table.

Let Them Rot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz has been doing an outstanding job in trying to improve the programs of recruitment in the area of migrant farm labor. His efforts in this respect have been accomplished by significant progres in achieving a decent wage for migrant farm labor tasks.

The response to these dedicated, enlightened efforts of Secretary Wirtz have too often been scorn and critical abuse. That such criticism is unwarranted is now being borne out by actually experience in California where farm employers find the supply of domestic labor ample where fair wages and working conditions prevail.

For this reason, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the May 14, 1965, issue of the Criterion, the weekly newspaper of the Catholic Archdiocese of Indianapolis. The editorial contains an intelligent, responsible tribute to the courage and wisdom of Secretary Wirtz in the handling of the migrant farm labor controversy.

The editorial follows:

LET THEM ROT

One of the many subdramas of these superdramatic times has W. Willard Wirtz, U.S. Secretary of Labor, as hero (or villiain) and the corporate farming industry as villain (or hero).

We'll take the unparenthesized version.

Wirtz is gambling his Cabinet post on the Johnson administration backing him up on his decision that corporate agriculture should obtain its seasonal workers through the domestic labor market and pay wages that compete with those in other fields.

Those who have enriched themselves on the heartless exploitation of itinerant farmhands have declared war on Wirtz. They have the support of powerful politicians who feel obligated to keep influential constituents happy.

On March 28 Wirtz announced flatly that the 1964 act of Congress ending the importation of Mexican migrants would stand.

Last week California strawberry growers struck back. They said they would let their berries rot unless pickers were made available.

Father John Doran in his syndicated column in last Friday's Criterion said that none of California's unemployed was willing to do the work required.

On Saturday, however, United Press International reported that more pickers had lined up for work than the strawberry growers could accommodate.

This put a large dent in the fiction that unemployed Americans will not do "stoop labor." They are eager to do it for decent pay and working conditions. They are not willing to do it, however, under the scandalous "Grapes of Wrath" conditions which suit too much of the corporate farming industry.

We do not expect the "strawberry crisis" to be the last such effort to perpetuate the immoral, antisocial slaves-for-rent system. There likely will be new crises in Indiana, Michigan, and elsewhere as crops ripen.

There will be threats to let the tomatoes, cherries, apples, and other produce rot. Washington's reply to those threats will be, we hope, "Go ahead and let them rot."

Growers are unlikely to carry out such threats on a large scale. But, if they were to, the country well could survive such shortages in order to put an end to a labor-supply system which nourishes the harshest and most bitter poverty in America.

And growers who refused to put their own houses in order would, in a short time, be replaced by other growers who could make a profit and still live up to improved labor standards.

Meanwhile, the country owes Secretary Wirtz a debt of thanks for making an uncompromising stand against worker exploitation of the worst sort.

Fidel's Sister Warned Dominicans of Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, to those who doubt that the Communist threat in Latin America is very real, I call attention to the following story carried in the American edition of the Times of Havana, April 1965, of the warning given by the sister of Fidel Castro to the Dominicans that a revolt was being planned in their country. This is a timely reminder of the well-known Communist strategy for political takeover in countries undergoing social, economic, and political change.

The article follows:

FIDEL'S SISTER WARNED DOMINICANS OF REVOLT

"I know that Castro wants to take over this country."

The speaker was Fidel's sister, Juanita, and the country she had in mind was the Dominican Republic. She should know.

Early in April Juanita Castro spoke to the Dominican people at Santo Domingo, the capital city. Three weeks later the tragic revolution against law and order began.

"The Cubans," Juanita said, "Do not want the Dominican Republic to travel along democratic paths so that it will become a happy and progressive people."

BROKE WITH FIDEL

She recalled that her brother, Fidel, had been very happy about 3 years ago when he told her that his agents had "cleared the path" for the future.

Juanita fled Cuba about a year ago. She went to Mexico and since that time has traveled throughout the hemisphere.

Some Cuban sources in the underground used to count on her help even while she was still in Cuba. It was long suspected that she would come to a final break with Fidel. This finally happened about a year ago.

WARNING

Less than a month ago she warned the Dominicans that "He has tried to take your country several times. This is not the first time. It will not be the last time that Communist imperialism will use its Caribbean puppet."

She reported that Castro had ordered his agents "to infiltrate all sectors, professional, economic, labor, agriculture, and among students since communism always tries to find allies to reach power and then eliminate."

To block democratic processes at Santo Domingo "many of the local leaders of the Dominican Popular Socialist Party received training in subversion in Cuba.

"The Castro Communists have many tactics. They capture prospects and turn them into fanatics. What Lenin used to call useful idiots. They fall for false promises and are soon used for subversion. In the end they are jailed or shot."

EXILE OPINION

Miami's Cuban colony knows that only quick U.S. action kept the Dominican Republic from taking Castro's road to communism.

They have been through it once. They know it when they see it a second time. Where, they ask, did the thousands of Castro

olive green uniforms come from on the first day of the revolt? The answer to them is clear: from Cuba.

But Fidel's sister called the shots on Santo Domingo. And she did it on the spot just 3 weeks before it happened.

"Preserving Competition"—Statement Supporting the Enactment of the Quality Stabilization Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, since the 1930's many manufacturers, trade associations, independent retailers, State legislators, and Congressmen have worked for the enactment of various forms of legislation which would eliminate or control certain unfair trade practices associated with the resale of brand name commodities. Traditionally attempts have been made on both a national and State level to legislate against such abuses as false advertising, bait merchandising, and excessive price cutting. During this period some of these attempts have been enacted into law, while others have failed of enactment or have been negated by court decisions following their passage. In seeking to eliminate these trade abuses, the proponents of fair trade legislation over the years have continuously argued that such abuses, if left unchecked, would seriously threaten the proper functioning of the American free enterprise system.

Ever since my election to Congress in November of last year, I have devoted a considerable amount of time and study to this matter and I have now come to the conclusion that the Congress of the United States at the earliest possible date must enact a law which would provide added protection to the American businessman from certain unfair and harmful trade practices still being engaged in on a rather wide scale by unscrupulous participants in the free enterprise system. Shortly after reaching the conclusion that additional legislation was needed, I introduced a bill on May 10 of this year, H.R. 7841, which calls for the immediate enactment of a law to be known as the Quality Stabilization Act.

In short this bill, which is quite similar to those introduced in the 87th and 88th Congresses, seeks the elimination of certain unfair trade practices which I, along with other proponents of such legislation, believe not only tend toward monopoly but seriously affect the quality and good name of name-brand commodities. Moreover, and probably most important, this bill would permit a manufacturer or owner of a brand, name or trademark, to protect his property rights attached to a brand, name, or trademark by establishing a price or price range at which goods carrying that brand, name, or trademark may be sold by wholesalers and retailers in the marketplace. I wish to emphasize the point, however, that this law would apply only to those manufacturers and owners whose products are in free and open competition with close substitutes produced by other competing manufacturers.

Before going into a more detailed discussion of the principal provisions of the proposed Quality Stabilization Act, I would like to digress for a moment and recall for you some of the actions which have been taken on a National and State level to legislate against certain harmful competitive practices.

I am sure that many of you will remember that price cutting or sales below cost at the retail level became a serious impediment to the competitive process during the depression of the early 1930's, resulting in the elimination of hundreds of independent retailers. To counter this alarming and dangerous trend, several States during this period adopted fair trade laws which were designed to exempt manufacturers of name-brand commodities from State antitrust laws, thereby allowing them the option to set minimum resale prices on their products shipped in intrastate commerce.

The first of these laws was enacted in California in 1931. In short, it exempted from the State's antitrust laws any contract wherein the seller of a brand-name commodity, which is in free and open competition with close substitutes, bound the buyer, who was reselling it, to charge the price specified by the seller. Initially this law proved ineffective, especially since retailers not signing such a agreement continued to undercut the prices of those retailers who signed resale price maintenance contracts with suppliers. Consequently, an amendment to the law was adopted in 1933 which incorporated a measure termed the nonsigner clause. Such a proviso made contracts maintaining resale prices of name-brand products binding on those retailers who refused to sign such contracts, providing at least one retailer in the State had signed such a contract.

Subsequent to this action taken by California, many other States took steps to adopt fair trade laws which, in most instances, were close copies of the California statute. Shortly thereafter, in 1936, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld these State fair trade laws in the case, *Old Dearborn Distribution Company* v. *Seagram Distillers Corporation* (229 U.S. 183).

Shortly after this important Supreme Court decision, resale price maintenance or fair trade became widespread throughout the Nation. And by 1941, all of the States except Missouri, Texas, Vermont, and the District of Columbia had enacted fair trade laws.

The passage of the Miller-Tydings Act by Congress in 1937 also played a major role in encouraging States to adopt fair trade laws. Prior to the enactment of this act, parties to resale maintenance contracts applied only to intrastate transactions between the supplier and retailer. If, for example, a contract were made between the retailer in one State and a manufacturer in another, such an agreement was automatically in violtion of Federal antitrust laws. Thus, since the great bulk of brand name products traveled in interstate commerce, it proved difficult if not impossible to maintain price schedules under existing Federal laws. For this reason, the Miller-Tydings amendment to the Sherman Antitrust Act was passed, legalizing interstate resale price maintenance contracts between producers and retailers of branded goods. This exemption from the Federal antitrust laws applied, however, only to those States having fair trade laws. Price fixing agreements between retailers and producers in States not having such laws were still in violation of Federal antitrust laws.

Up until 1950, 45 States had fair trade laws. However, in 1951 the fair trade movement was dealt a severe blow by a U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Schwegmann Brothers* v. *Calvert Distillers Corporation* (314 U.S. 384). This opinion held that retailers not signing resale price maintenance contracts could not be forced to abide by such contracts exempted from Federal antitrust laws under the Miller-Tydings Act. This meant, therefore, that the nonsigner provision of resale price maintenance contracts could apply only to those contracts involving strictly intrastate commerce. This obviously greatly reduced the effectiveness of State fair trade laws which applied to both inter- and intrastate transactions covered by resale price maintenance contracts. As a result, price wars became widespread throughout the Nation. And this in turn brought demands for Congress to enact legislation to counteract the effect of the Supreme Court decision. As a result, Congress in 1952 passed the McGuire Act.

This act reversed the Schwegmann decision by making resale price maintenance on branded products, which are in free and open competition with one another, binding to nonsigners in those States having fair trade laws, thereby making interstate transactions covered by resale price maintenance contracts subject to State fair trade laws.

Despite the enactment of this law, 24 States since the early 1950's have had their fair trade laws declared either partially or completely invalid by State courts. Thus, in effect, those States having their fair trade laws declared partially invalid had stricken from their laws the all important nonsigner clause. Such actions by the State courts in these States have, therefore, rendered fair trade laws more or less ineffective, since the nonsigner clause was the key provision in these laws.

To counter these developments the proponents of fair trade quickly came to the conclusion that Congress must enact a Federal fair trade law which would legalize resale price maintenance at the retail level by manufacturers who produce commodities sold in interstate commerce and which are in free and open competition with articles in the same general class. Moreover, such a law would eliminate the problem of the nonsigner provision in State laws since the producer of a brand name commodity would be allowed to stipulate a price without entering into an agreement with at least one retailer in each State in

which the commodity is marketed. Consequently, once the price has been stipulated by the producer, all retailers following notification would be prohibited from selling the brand name commodity at a price lower than the announced price.

Legislation has been introduced proposing such a Federal fair trade law in every Congress since the middle 1950's. However, to date the proponents of such a law have been unable to get Congress to take affirmative action on this matter.

In the hope of getting increased support in Congress for such a Federal law, the proponents of fair trade, after making a thorough reassessment of past legislative strategies, decided in the 87th Congress to adopt a new approach. The sponsors of such legislation changed the title of the bill from "fair trade" to "quality stabilization," mainly because it was believed that the former term had lost its appeal following many years of battle. In making this change in strategy, the proponents believed also that the concept of fair trade or, more precisely, quality stabilization, might be more acceptable to many of the Congressmen and Senators who had opposed it in the past, if such legislation were to include specific references to certain unfair trade practices of retailers which in their opinion were not only harmful to competition but seriously affected the quality and good name of brand name commodities.

With a few minor exceptions, the legislation which I have introduced in this session of Congress is very similar in both scope and content to the bill introduced in the 87th and 88th Congresses.

The key provisions of the proposed legislation can be outlined as follows:

First, it would give the owner of any commodity identified either by a trademark or brand name, which is in free and open competition with close substitutes produced by competing firms, the authority to prevent distributors from handling said commodity if it were determined that the trademark or brand and associated good will are damaged by the following unfair trade practices in section (8) of my bill:

(a) If the person has employed goods bearing such brand name or trademark in furtherance of bait merchandising;

(b) If the person, after written notice given by such owner of such owner's established resale price or price range, had advertised, offered for sale, or sold any such goods, acquired by such person after he has been given such notice, at a price other than such current established resale price or at a price not within such currently established resale price range; or

(c) If the person, with intent to deceive purchasers, has published a misrepresentation or misrepresentations concerning such goods.

Secondly, once the owner has notified distributors of the price at which the brand name commodity must be sold, he may revoke the right of the distributor to market the commodity—for a period not exceeding 1 year—if he can supply evidence that a particular distributor, "within 90 days prior to the date of the written notice of revocation," has resorted to using any or all of the abovementioned unfair trade practices in promoting the resale of the brand name commodity in question.

If any person, following receipt of written notification by the owner revoking his right to continue selling the brand name commodity in question, continues to sell the goods in question, he shall be liable in a civil action for damages and injunctive relief by the owner of the brand, name, or trademark to prevent any further violations of the provisions contained in this act.

In so doing, the owner may sue in any district court of the United States in the district in which defendant resides or does business, and shall be entitled to recover the amount of any damages sustained, injunctive relief to prevent and restrain further violations of the stated provision of the law, and recover the costs of the suit. Any injunction granted by the court under the provisions of the act shall remain in effect for a period of not more than 1 year from the date that such injunction is granted.

Third, this act outlines those transactions which will be exempt from the jurisdiction of its provisions. Such transactions expressly exempted from the proposed law include:

(A) Sales of bulk commodities when sold without wrappers or containers.

(B) Sales by any officer acting under the orders or authority of any duly constituted court; or sales by any person in mitigation of damages or enforcement of a lien or other secured interest in said goods, when such person is not primarily engaged in the distribution of goods for resale.

(C) Sales of damaged, deteriorated, defaced, or secondhand goods, when plain notice of the condition of the goods is given to the public.

(D) Sales of drugs, medicines, and devices for which either Federal or State law or regulations requires a prescription from a physician, dentist, or such other persons as the various States may authorize to prescribe such items.

(E) Sales to or by the Federal, State, or municipal governments or their political subdivisions or agencies.

(F) Sales to charitable, educational, medical, and religious organizations, for their own use and not for resale.

Finally, my bill contains the important proviso which allows any State to adopt a law or constitutional amendment to prohibit resale price maintenance and thereby make a Federal fair trade law inapplicable in those States taking such action. Yet where any State enacts such a law or adopts such a constitutional amendment, the provisions of the proposed Quality Stabilization Act with respect to resale prices would still apply to sales made in that State for delivery to a purchaser outside the State. Such a provision is obviously necessary in order to prevent mail order firms, which do a considerable amount of out-of-State business, from establishing operations in such States for the purpose of avoiding Federal regulation of resale price maintenance activities in other States which have agreed to such Federal regulation.

Before concluding my remarks on this very important matter, I would like to state briefly some of the reasons why I believe that such legislation is essential to the American free enterprise system.

If we look, for example, at the rather phenomenal growth of mass retailers, especially discount chains in recent years, we find in many instances that such merchandisers have not always achieved their favorable competitive position in the marketplace through legitimate competitive means, but through certain trade practices which I believe are unfair and harmful to the efficient independent retailer and misleading to the American consumer.

Discount merchandisers, for example, have often been highly successful in attracting customers away from well-established independent retailers by overstating the quality and content of unknown lower price brand-named or privately labeled commodities.

Moreover, discount houses and other mass merchandisers, because of the lack of effective regulation on a State and National basis, have been able to gain an unfair competitive advantage in the marketplace by resorting to other well-known methods of misrepresentation.

First, there is the practice where a discount house will cite a fictitious price for a well-known brand name commodity which exceeds the actual selling price of the same commodity in most independent retail outlets. Using this as the manufacturer's list price, the firm would then cite a lower selling price so as to make it appear that the consumer is obtaining a substantial bargain. Secondly, there is the practice of selling certain well-known brand name products by discounters and other mass distributors to attract consumers, hoping in turn that they will buy substantial quantities of unknown high-profit-margin products in order to make up for losses incurred from the sale of well-known products at substantially reduced prices. Moreover, in many instances, it has been found that mass merchandisers have resorted to the unpardonable practice of selling these high profit margin and inferior quality goods at prices equal to or higher than those prices normally charged by independent retailers for such goods.

Finally, many large retail chains, especially discount houses, have resorted to the well-known practice of price cutting designed for the express purpose of forcing smaller retailers out of the marketplace, thereby increasing their control of the market in a particular area, and making possible later price increases, once most competitors have been eliminated.

Today it is evident that retail trade in most communities in the Nation is becoming more and more concentrated in the hands of a few giant retailers; namely, the big department store, the discount house, the mail-order house, the chainstore, or supermarket. Thus, if the small businessman is not afforded the opportunity of making a profit by enabling him to compete pricewise on nationally advertised, branded merchandise, we shall obviously find ourselves faced in a few years with a major proportion of retailing concentrated in the hands of a few giant corporations. Such a development would indeed be most serious since the market power achieved by such corporate giants would enable them to force manufacturers to reduce quality in terms of lower costs to

maintain profit margins. Moreover, such a trend would greatly reduce freedom of consumer choice, thereby leaving the consumer at the mercy of a few large retail chains who would then exercise more or less complete control over quality and prices in the marketplace.

Thus, in light of these circumstances, I believe it is obvious that Congress must now face up to the fact that there is a great need for the enactment of a Federal law which will more adequately protect the efficient independent retailer from the various harmful trade practices resorted to today by many large and powerful mass retailers.

In urging that Congress enact such a law at the earliest possible date, I want to make it clearly understood that my proposal, the Quality Stabilization Act, will not bar retailers from engaging in the following practices:

First, it will not prevent a distributor from removing a trademark or a brand name from a product, and marketing it in any manner he wishes as long as he does not continue to use the goodwill of the producer to assist him in the sale of the unmarked commodity.

Second, this legislative proposal will not compel the producer of a brand name or trademark product to avail himself of the rights accorded him. It is quite possible that there are producers who wish not to protect their products and accompanying goodwill from the methods of unfair competition outlined in the bill.

Third, such legislation will not compel wholesalers and retailers to handle brand name and trade marked goods of those producers which have sought the protection of the proposed act.

Fourth, my bill does not contain any provision which in any way would prevent the consumer from enjoying full freedom of choice. He will still have the right to pick and choose between merchandise protected by fair trade and merchandise not so protected.

Finally, the Quality Stabilization Act is in no way inconsistent with the scope and intent of our Nation's antitrust laws. The fundamental objective of this bill is to strengthen the antitrust laws so as to better protect the efficient and hard-working independent retailer from certain unfair methods of competition engaged in by the larger and more powerful mass retailer. This is certainly one of the basic objectives of our Nation's antitrust laws.

Although Congress failed to take affirmative action on the proposed Quality Stabilization Act in the past Congress, it is encouraging to note that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, after holding extensive hearings, did vote to recommend that the House take affirmative action on this bill. Unfortunately, the bill failed to receive House approval because the House Rules Committee failed to release the bill for floor consideration before the end of the 88th Congress in December of last year. The Senate Commerce Committee also held hearings on an identical bill; however, unlike its counterpart in the House, it voted to table the legislation thereby barring any further action on the bill by the Senate in the past Congress.

Nevertheless, because there is considerable support for this measure in the Congress and because this legislation is supported by many leading manufacturers and close to 80 national trade associations representing thousands of independent retailers throughout the Nation who are engaged in a wide range of retailing activities, I believe that all proponents of quality stabilization would deem it imperative that we make another attempt at getting the Congress of the United States to act affirmatively on this very important matter.

We who support the objectives of quality stabilization are already aware of its vital importance to the American free enterprise system. Therefore, our task now is to make sure that Congress reaches a similar conclusion and, without any further delay, enact this bill into law. Such a step on the part of Congress would very definitely be in the national interest.

Economic-Engineering Survey of the So-Called All-American Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution which was recently acted upon by the New York State Senate and Assembly, calling for an additional appropriation for the economic-engineering survey of the so-called All-American Canal. I wholeheartedly support this resolution which was introduced by Senator Frank J. Glinski, with whom I was privileged to serve in the common council, Buffalo, N.Y.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 197

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress to appropriate an additional $600,000 for the economic-engineering survey of the so-called All-American Canal

Whereas the United States has assumed an obligation with its good neighbor, the Government of Canada, to contribute its full share toward the successful operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway-Great Lakes shipping route; and

Whereas the only existing navigable facility connecting Lakes Erie and Ontario is the Canadian-owned Welland Canal which is being sorely pressed to meet present and projected shipping needs; and

Whereas the construction of an alternate ship canal in western New York State would make a major contribution to the welfare of the United States as well as Canada; because (1) In the event of breakdown or destruction of the existing Welland Canal, the commerce of the entire Great Lakes area of the United States and Canada west of Lake Ontario would be denied access by water transportation to the St. Lawrence Seaway and international shipping lanes; (2) It would provide a more secure inland route for the movement of iron ore in the event of war; (3) It would ease the strain on congested rail facilities and east coast ports in the time of emergency; and (4) It would allow the construction and repair of oceangoing vessels in the more secure areas of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the construction of a new and modern canal built to the lock specifications of the Poe Lock now being built by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers at Sault Ste. Marie, would contribute greatly to the prosperity of commerce, industry, and agriculture, not only in those States bordering the Great Lakes, but throughout the entire Nation; and

Whereas the commerce of the State of New York would be enhanced by the benefits accruing from the building of a new canal; and

Whereas the construction of the canal would stabilize employment, provide job security and expand job opportunities; and

Whereas the President and Congress of the United States in their wisdom and foresight approved, in 1962, a $1,825,000 economic-engineering survey of a new Lake Erie-Lake Ontario Canal; and

Whereas the Congress has appropriated to date $650,000 in survey funds; and

Whereas the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has publicly stated that the saturation point on the Welland Canal, including its twinned-lock improvements, will be reached by 1980-85; and

Whereas the period of construction of a new canal would take from 5 to 7 years and thus require that the building phase commence in the early 1970's; and

Whereas there exists a definite need to move the economic-engineering survey along to a speedy completion so that actual construction might begin at the earliest possible date; now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States immediately to provide an additional $600,000 in study funds for use by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to advance the necessary survey and plans for the canal; as aforesaid; and be it further

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted as follows: To the President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress; and to each Member thereof from the State of New York; to the Governor of the State of New York; to the commissioner of commerce of the State of New York; to the chairman of the Port Authorities of Buffalo, Rochester, Oswego, and Ogdensburg; to the Governor and State legislative leaders of the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

By order of the senate,

GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,
Secretary.

In assembly May 12, 1965. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of assembly,

JOHN T. MCKENNAN,
Clerk.

America Beloved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the following poem, "America Beloved," by McClellan Patterson concisely summarizes the very important aspects which have contributed to our country's greatness—

the physical nature of our land which demanded perseverance and ingenuity to exist and progress; the sacrifice to preserve what has been accomplished; and the faith and trust in God to move ever forward:

AMERICA BELOVED

(By McClellan Patterson)

Between the broad Pacific
And the far-flung western shore
Of the turbulent Atlantic
Where the great waves roll and roar,
In an atmosphere of freedom
From the heel of tyranny
Where God alone is sovereign,
Thrives a great democracy,
Where men are all born equal
And accounted what they are
Because of their accomplishments,
Who are claimed wide and far
By an enterprising people
Whose souls and voice are free,
America beloved—
The crib of opportunity.

From the rugged shore of Washington
To Florida's domain,
From sunny California
And back across to Maine,
There's something in the atmosphere,
There's something in the soil
That made men virile, wise and brave,
Who were unfraid to toil
And build their nation strong and free,
With God inspired democracy.
Where motherhood is sacred
Where they enshrined the memory
Of those devoted mothers who gave
Their sons, that you might be
America beloved—
The cradle of the free.

America triumphant. America supreme.
Where the mighty glory of the sun
And stars still shine serene.
Where stately forests flourish
And the mountains kneel to God,
Where free men, loving liberty,
Will always till the sod,
And your righteous stand toward every land
In brotherhood and sanctity proclaiming solidarity,
Where the heritage of Washington
And Lincoln's honesty,
Their nations pride
Stand side by side,
Your pledge to immortality.
America beloved—
The home of liberty.

To thee we pledge, O sacred land,
Our hearts, our fortunes, and our hand.
We weld to you the strength of truth,
And give to you our valiant youth,
Who with youth's ingenuity
Will guide you through eternity.
And in the years that are tomorrow,
Beyond this day of tears and sorrow,
You'll rise to heights unknown of yore,
Triumphant forevermore.
Our God-planned land,
Chose by His hand,
Ordained forevermore to be
In justice, pride, and charity,
America beloved—
The sanctuary of the free.

Definition of Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the author of legislation designed to halt the free flow of unsolicited obscenity through the mails, I have developed a close working relationship with a New York organization whose members are working in an all-out effort to combat the traffic in pornography among children. I refer to Operation Yorkville, an interfaith group of dedicated citizens. They are certainly to be congratulated for their efforts in behalf of New York's children.

Operation Yorkville conducts a very worthwhile educational program through its newsletter. An article in the April-May issue by Edward F. Cavanagh, Jr., deputy mayor of New York City, discusses one of our most serious problems in efforts to rid our society of obscenity, and that is "definition" for use of the courts.

This article follows and I would recommend its reading by all who are interested in protecting our youth from perversion:

TOWARD A WORKING DESCRIPTION

(By Edward F. Cavanagh, Jr., deputy mayor, city of New York)

To meet the growing demand by the courts for clarification, explanation, and definition, there is need for exploration into the concept of obscenity.

It is obvious that there can never be any clearly drawn, concise definition of obscenity. However, such a definition is unnecessary, for an obscene action, and thus the depiction of that action, can be clearly, distinctly described. Therefore, description of obscenity, its degrees and categories should be adequate to support valid legislation upon which courts may act.

Obscenity is an abstraction. The abstract can be fully understood only when its concrete characteristics are fully understood. Thus, one cannot understand the concept of poetry—an abstraction—as such, until he becomes thoroughly familiar with types of poetry: epic, lyric, dramatic—the concrete. So, too, obscenity can be described only after one fully understands types of obscenity—or that which is obscene. The word obscene, therefore, must be fully grasped in its total concrete complexity before the abstract obscenity can be clearly grasped.

To understand the meaning of the word obscene, synonyms and antonyms, even though not formal definitions can be an aid. Synonyms (words of the same or almost the same meaning) found under the word obscene in any dictionary are "dirty," "foul," "disgusting," "lewd." Antonyms (words that negate others by total implication) are "clean," "pure," "uplifting," "chaste." Both synonyms and antonyms are valuable in explaining the word "obscene" in that they are concrete. We think, for example, of a "dirty shirt," a "foul sewer," etc., just as we think of a "clean glass," a "pure chemical," a "chaste woman," etc. Besides being concrete, its synonyms and antonyms present clearly the meaning of the word "obscene."

The problem in describing the abstraction "obscenity" is not in finding synonyms or antonyms, nor in describing the obscene word, gesture, book, or picture, but rather in describing the obscene action. The obscene word, gesture, picture are such purely because of their relation to the action. Basic, therefore, is a description of the obscene action or, synonymously, the "dirty, foul, disgusting, lewd action." These obscene actions may be separated into three areas of somewhat rising intensity. This division, however, does not suggest there be a gradation of guilt and punishment in the distribution of that which is obscene to youth.

Normal sexual obscene action: Actions are obscene or not obscene depending upon whether they are engaged in in public or private. Normal sexual action, or its preludes, when engaged in in public constitute obscene action. Normal sexual action when engaged in by married partners in private, is clean, pure, uplifting, chaste. When performed in public, the same action is dirty, low, disgusting, lewd.

Deviated sexual obscene action: Abnormal or deviated sexual actions, or their preludes, when performed in public constitute obscene actions. This includes manifestations of homosexuality or exhibitionism. Deviated sex actions are more shocking when engaged in publicly, and hence more obscene.

Perverted sexual obscene action: Actions involving sexual violence, when performed in public, constitute obscene action. These actions (sadism, masochism, etc.) represent the depths of obscenity; are most clearly dirty, foul, disgusting, lewd, particularly to onlookers.

All these actions when performed in public make the performers subject to arrest.

In order, then, to understand obscenity, the abstraction, one must think in terms of the mass media which picture obscene action by word, picture, record or tape for circulation in a highly pressurized operation geared to the teenage market. Obscenity, therefore, is simply the imaginative projection in word, picture, magazine, book, record or tape of that action which is obscene. Corresponding to the three categories of obscene action are three categories of obscenity:

Normal sexual obscenity: Imaginative projection in word, sound or picture of normal sexual activity for no other purpose than to stimulate the subconscious into imitation.

Deviated-sexual obscenity: imaginative projection in word, sound, or picture of abnormal, deviated sexual action for no other purpose than to stimulate the subconscious into imitation.

Perverted-sexual obscenity: imaginative projection in word, sound, or picture of sexual violence for no other purpose than to stimulate the subconscious into imitation.

If public homosexual action, for example, is obscene, the imaginative projection of this action is even more obscene, because more public. For, in mass media, the homosexual activity is thrust upon millions, including innocent children, prime targets of the homosexual.

No further scientific definition of obscenity is necessary, because, for legal control and law enforcement, one need only describe the obscene action and that which pictures it—such as the homosexual magazine. No scientific definition of obscenity is indeed possible since the three concepts contained in that which is obscene are so complex and diverse that they cannot be incorporated into a simple definition (that which is clearer than the thing defined and fits only the thing defined).

It is the task of the lawmaker, therefore, to describe in words that action which is obscene, so that law enforcement agencies and the judiciary can give American children adequate protection from the imaginative projection of that action, and eventual imitation.

Senator Russell Recovering and Rearing To Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the May 7 issue of the Sylvania Tele-

phone, an outstanding weekly newspaper in my hometown of Sylvania, Ga., there appeared an excellent editorial entitled "Senator RUSSELL Recovering and Rearing To Go."

Those of us who have been privileged to know and work with Senator RUSSELL are delighted with his excellent recovery, and we look forward to his return to the Senate.

Realizing that Senator RUSSELL is revered as highly in the House as he is in the Senate, I believe my colleagues in the House will be interested in reading the excellent editorial by my longtime friend, Mr. Clyde Hollingsworth.

The editorial follows:

SENATOR RUSSELL RECOVERING AND REARING TO GO

From reliable sources we learn that Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia's beloved senior Senator, is fastly recovering from a recent illness and rarin' to get back in harness.

During the Senator's illness there has been some speculation among politicians in Georgia about opposition for him in 1966 if he is a candidate to succeed himself.

We would advise one and all ambitious candidates for the Senate to look carefully before they leap. The people of Georgia, by a big majority, believe in constitutional government. We do not believe they will forget DICK RUSSELL so soon after his gallant service to the State and Nation. He is one of the most influential men in Washington because of his ability and his dignity. He has never made a play for the rabble rousers at the extreme left and extreme right. He, a conservative, has fought for the fundamental principles upon which the Government was founded.

Georgia owes DICK RUSSELL for a service far beyond the ordinary performance of duty. We doubt they will forget him in 1966.

Back to the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, recent events on the international scene have lent an air of turbulence to our foreign relations. None of these events, however, has carried the impact or the immediate significance of the crisis in the Dominican Republic.

Over a century ago, President James Monroe proclaimed that the Western Hemisphere was henceforth closed to external influence or domination. A few weeks ago, President Johnson extended the Monroe Doctrine. He decreed that not only were foreign powers excluded from hemispheric domination but that their ideologies and puppet governments were likewise repugnant.

Recently, I came across an excellent newspaper editorial which details the historic basis for President Johnson's recent announcement. I was deeply impressed with both the content of the remarks and the analytical way in which it was presented. The editorial, from the May 4, 1965, edition of the Watertown Daily News, follows herewith:

BACK TO THE MONROE DOCTRINE

When President Johnson announced Sunday night that, "The American Nation cannot, must not, and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere," he reinvoked the Monroe Doctrine, making a one-word substitution, "Communist" for "European." The Monroe Doctrine was put forward by President James Monroe in his message to Congress December 2, 1823. In that Western Hemisphere statement, "European" was synonymous with foreign empires, dictatorial exploitation, and the denial of freedom to native Americans.

Most of western Europe today is devoted to freedom and social justice, opportunity, and the right to independence. Eastern Europe is within the Iron Curtain dictatorship of the Russian Communist Government, and freedom is denied. So for President Johnson to reach back to the Monroe Doctrine and reenunciate it with a small change, means that the United States in its relationship to the Dominican Republic is following its traditional view that the Western Hemisphere is not to be preyed upon by the Communists, whose orders come out of Moscow. The inference is further clear that communism out of Peiping will be rejected.

When President Monroe issued his warning in 1823, there was concern lest European countries like Austria and Prussia might be preparing to help Spain recover what it had lost. Canada was still British, Cuba and Puerto Rico were still Spanish. Brazil, which once had been part of Portugal, had declared its independence.

While the Monroe Doctrine is generally thought of in terms of Central and South America, it also has an application to the Pacific, particularly the Pacific coast and the extreme northwest—Alaska today. Russia was in the far west, making efforts along that Pacific coast. In 1821 the czar of Russia ordered that Alaska, which was owned by Russia, be considered as extending south well within what is now the State of Oregon. The Russian dictator of that day denounced the principles upon which every independent country in America was based. Both the noises and the principles from Moscow 1821–23 were the same as 1962–65. The only contrast is that communication is much louder today and the Communists seem to have more agents roaming the West than did the czar.

The forcefulness of the doctrine, together with its expression at a time when the United States was ill fitted to fight wars against European kings who may have sought to colonize the West, may have contributed to the fact that throughout its history it has been criticized more than it has been praised. Another reason for the criticism is that it has been invoked and is not a platitude.

The doctrine was declared with respect to the Dominican Republic in 1861. The United States was in the Civil War. The Dominicans, formerly a Spanish colony, asked that Madrid take them back. Madrid responded. The Dominicans revolted, and the drain on Spain was so great that the Spaniards relinquished their claim. In 1863, the French arrived in Mexico. The United States refused to recognize this occupation. At the close of the Civil War, General Sheridan took with him 100,000 troops to the Mexican border. Nepoleon III, then the Emperor of France, yielded and withdrew.

So again in 1895 the doctrine was declared in an argument between Great Britain and Venezuela over the boundaries of British Guiana. Great Britain sought to extend its borders into Venezuelan territory, and President Grover Cleveland said no. This argument was submitted to arbitration, and believe it or not, there hasn't been a settlement of that border yet. The Spanish-American War is an instance when Cuba revolted against Spain. We helped the Cubans. The United States has intervened on many occasions since then in the Caribbean to maintain order on some of these islands.

In 1905 the United States intervened in the Dominican Republic. Then the European countries were coming over to collect some debts. There was a revolution, and the United States arrived to make sure that order was restored. Germany tried to get into the Western Hemisphere in 1915 by way of Haiti. The Germans were after the Panama Canal. The Marines took care of that one.

Throughout history there has been repetition of this European desire for greater footholds in South America. But this has subsided since the 1930's, to be replaced by Russian Communist ambitions. In 1946–47 President Truman took the Monroe Doctrine and applied it to most of the world, declaring, "I believe it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure." That had to do particularly with Greece. It saved Greece.

President Kennedy took a more literal approach to the problem in the Western Hemisphere when he said at the time of the Cuban missile crisis, "We in this hemisphere must use every resource at our command to prevent the establishment of another Cuba in this hemisphere."

So the Monroe Doctrine is well established in history and in the foreign policy of the United States. The application of the doctrine always seems to make more enemies than it makes friends, but we come back to it because it makes the most sense.

I.U.O.T.O. Symposium To Be Held in Rio de Janeiro from August 12 to August 16, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I enclose a letter received from the Honorable Nelson Carneiro, member of the chamber of deputies and chairman of the organizing committee of the symposium and head of the Brazilian delegation to the present I.U.O.T.O. symposium, which I am inserting in the RECORD for the information of Members of both branches of the Congress:

CÂMARA DOS DEPUTADOS,
Brasilia, April 5, 1965.

Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Interparliamentary Tourism Association, composed of Federal Senators and Representatives, is holding a tourism symposium in Rio de Janeiro this year in honor of the IV centenary of the foundation of this city. The symposium will be international in scope, but more particularly inter-American, and will provide an excellent opportunity for politicians from all over the continent to meet again to discuss matters with a view to promoting a broader development of their mutual relations and effectively strengthening the ties of friendship between their peoples. The symposium will take place at the Copacabana Palace Hotel and last from August 12 through August 16 next.

No fee will be charged for registration, but prospective participants should notify

the Secretary General, Senator Dinarte Mariz (Palacio Monroe, Rio de Janeiro) not later than July 31, so as to enable steps to be taken to insure that Congress Members enjoy maximum comfort and every possible facility. It is hoped that Members will bring their families, for whom a special program is being arranged. The organizing committee is negotiating with tourist agencies with a view to promoting, after the symposium, trips to the Amazon region, São Paulo, Brasilia, the Paulo Afonso falls, the cataracts of Iguaçu, the historic cities of Salvador (Bahia) and Ouro Preto (Minas Gerais), etc. The organizing committee will also undertake to make reservations at whatever hotels our distinguished visitors may chose and a special staff will be on hand to meet at the Galeão International Airport and provide them with every assistance.

The weather is mild and pleasant in August and citizens of the Americas are free to enter and leave the country without a consular visa. Their identity papers are all they need for an enjoyable stay on Brazilian territory as tourists.

Four subjects of general interest have been chosen for discussion at the symposium and motions thereon will be put to the vote. These are (1) tourist exchange between the Americas; (2) tourism and the mission of parliaments; (3) European tourism for the Americas; (4) tentative guidelines for tourism in South America.

Figures of renown for their activities in favor of touring on this continent have been chosen as rapporteurs.

The honorary presidentes of the symposium are His Excellency Marshal Humberto de Alencar Castelo Branco, President of the Republic; Senator Auro Soares de Moura Andrade, President of the National Congress and of the Federal Senate; Representative Olavo Bilac Pinto, President of the House of Representatives; and Mr. Carlos Werneck de Lacerda, Governor of the State of Guanabara. Chiefs of Diplomatic Mission accredited to the Brazilian Government are honorary members of the conference.

Not only will the working papers be translated into the four official languages of the symposium: French, English, Spanish and Portuguese, but simultaneous translation into these tongues will also be provided during the debates.

The high purposes for which this symposium is to be held and the auspicious results expected of it on all hands in benefit of the countries of the Americas entitles us to lay emphasis on the necessity, dear Mr. Speaker, of your Parliament being represented at the meeting, so as to enhance the debates and deliberations with the valuable contribution of your experience, your interests, and your aspirations.

I beg Your Excellency to accept, and transmit to all the eminent Members of your Parliament, the assurance of the utmost esteem and consideration that I am proud to extend to you on behalf of the Interparliamentary Tourism Association.

NELSON CARNEIRO, *Representative, Chairman of the organizing committee of the symposium and head of the Brazilian delegation to the present IUOTO Symposium.*

Federal Water Projects Recreation Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 5269, to provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects, and to provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority for recreation development of projects under his control.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make some inquiries about the project.

In the first place, I understand that this is applicable to all projects, whether they are reclamation projects, or Army Engineer flood control projects, or for whatever purpose it may be.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, I will.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It applies to the projects under the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation projects, and the Corps of Engineers projects. It does not apply to agricultural projects and it does not apply to the small reclamation projects or to other types of projects. Actually, it could be said that it would be confined to the Corps of Engineers projects and the reclamation projects.

Mr. HARRIS. I would also like to ask, is it not true, should it be a project developed by the Corps of Engineers, that then would this not provide a policy whereby whatever recreational benefits could be developed with the project would become a part of the total cost and therefore subject to the consideration on the benefit-cost ratio?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. That being true, do I then understand that the additional cost for the recreational features will be or it is the intention that it would be borne by some local group or public body, and so forth, to a certain extent?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. One-half of the separable costs; that is, the cost over and above the base cost of the project, which would not be included unless arrangements were made for the expansion of, we will say, recreation and fish and wildlife. One-half of those additional costs are borne by the local community.

Mr. HARRIS. Is the additional cost for this project to be incremental, or on that basis?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Of course, we were discussing what is incremental and what is not.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, the gentleman understood the incremental cost is whatever cost is necessary to provide the additional facilities beyond what it would have taken to provide the reservoir up to a certain point.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is the understanding of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. And it would be one-half of that additional incremental cost which some local group would provide?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand, then, the local body would have 10 years to decide as to whether or not it will participate?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Actually, the plan itself is not in the 10-year period. If the local bodies do not indicate a desire to enter into this sort of a situation, provision is made in the bill whereby the Secretary of the Interior may acquire the additional lands in connection with the project. Those lands may be held by the Secretary of the Interior for a period of 10 years, within which time these communities can singly or collectively come in and operate under this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Assuming that a community does develop it, and it does assume the responsibility of developing a recreational area, then do I understand that the community or the public body has the authority to make charges for the utilization of that recreational facility?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes, sir, they do.

Mr. HARRIS. How does that conflict with the bill passed lact year? It seems to me there is a conflict with the bill passed last year which says that if you have a Corps of Engineers project such as a reservoir, that they may make a charge for the utilization of that reservoir. Are you going to have the Federal Government charge for this reservoir and the State, too?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No. There will be no conflict because the gentleman from Arkansas speaks of the bill which is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, or those areas under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. Under this bill, if the local community takes over these recreational and fish and wildlife operations, then there will be no Federal charge, because these will be under the control of the local community and the local community's charge will be the only one. If the local community makes not charge, then there will be no charge.

Mr. HARRIS. The Federal Government retains title to the land?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARRIS. But turns over the recreational area to be operated by a public body, local or State?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for his generosity.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas one question.

You have the provision that the State or public body is permitted to establish entrance fees or user fees as a source of revenue to meet its obligation under the cost allocation. Let us assume that the State or public body establishes entrance fees or user fees and pays off the recreational allocation. Will it be permitted after the expiration of that period of time to continue charging user fees?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There is no reason to prevent it from doing that, because they can then use these user fees and entrance fees for whatever purposes they want in connection with the operation.

Mr. ICHORD. The gentleman would prefer to do that rather than have it go back into the Land and Water Conservation Fund at the expiration of that time?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. You mean the user fees?

Mr. ICHORD. The income from the user fees will belong to the public body or the State itself, will it not?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes. That is exactly right. The gentleman is inquiring as to whether or not that should go into the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund or stay with the State and public bodies?

Mr. ICHORD. I was inquiring as to what the bill contains. I understand the State and public bodies will be permitted to retain the income from the user fees after the amount had been paid back to the Federal Government.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is exactly right.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand from the gentleman from Missouri that the State, once it gets this fee, will have it ad infinitum.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Beyond the life of the payments by the State for the recreational facility?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is the public body that has control of it. Once they assume the responsibility of taking over this recreational area and are paying their 50 percent, no matter how they pay it—if they undertake the responsibility, then under the contract they have the right to control it.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman from Missouri reminded me of another question I should like to ask. I would like to get a response to the matter that the gentleman from Texas mentioned a moment ago, that before these projects are developed the Congress would have the opportunity to pass on them. I ask these questions because I have a project in my own district that is being developed; the Corps of Engineers is considering it. This is one of the features that is being considered and I am sure that I am right that the Congress will not have an opportunity to consider this until the report of the Corps of Engineers has made its way through various channels, as it always does, and comes in for authorization.

I did not understand clearly the gentleman's comment earlier. If we have to wait until a report comes in, I do not see how the committee or the Congress will have any opportunity to look into the matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. My position was simply this, that at the time of the authorization the Congress has the power to make any changes in the proposal, whether it be by the Corps of Engineers or whether it be by the Department of the Interior. At that time if changes need to be made in the recreational or fish and wildlife features or the cost needs to be shifted, we have the power to do so at that time.

Mr. HARRIS. But the gentleman knows from the practical standpoint that the Congress accepts the reports of the technical people, who are the Corps of Engineers, on the justification for a given project. They submit a report to us and we are not going to be changing that.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak for any committee other than the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. If the gentleman from Arkansas wants to hear a heated debate or a controversy, if he will come to that committee he will understand the very point that he is making here now. He will find that we do not accept those reports. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is well known to the Corps of Engineers and to the Department of the Interior as far as his ability is concerned to break these items down. And that is done on every project.

Mr. HARRIS. We have a sufficient number of arguments in my own committee, as the gentleman knows. I should like to ask one more question. Is the Committee on Public Works familiar with this program? I think it is important, because Army Engineer projects will be considered and they have the authorizations for those.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me. As soon as the legislation was introduced, the first bill, No. 52, as well as the bill presently under discussion, letters were addressed to the chairman of the various committees interested in this legislation and they were invited to give their views on the legislation. The staff of each one of these committees, together with the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, have been in constant consultation with each other.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the gentleman and his staff for the courtesies they have shown me during the development of this legislation.

The Futures Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting and imaginative programs of aid to developing countries conducted by a private group is Futures for Children, Inc., which is directed by Dr. Richard Saunders, of Washington, D.C.

Futures celebrated its fourth anniversary in January and is gaining new strength every year. Based on the principle of self-help, Futures attempts to develop techniques and attitudes of initiative and cooperation at all levels of society. The principal work of the group has been in the Department of Antioquia in Colombia. Because the State of Massachusetts has entered into a Partners of the Alliance relationship with Antioquia, we are familiar with Dr. Saunders' work.

So far more than 75,000 children and their parents have benefited from Dr. Saunders' work. Counseling has enabled the underprivileged to develop their own resources; this new interest in self-achievement has in turn led to the enthusiastic participation of many young men and women in the upper classes.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fine work being done by Futures for Children with limited resources, but with unlimited dedication and imagination. Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD following my remarks a descriptive statement about the work of Futures for Children, Inc.:

THE FUTURES PROGRAM

The Futures program is distinctive both in its underlying concepts and its methods of operation. Its effectiveness has been proved over a period of years and under widely differing conditions. The following statement is intended to set forth, succinctly, the bases and methods of the program.

1. Futures believes that any country, in order to be self-respecting, prosperous, and forward-looking, must have a well-educated population with decent standards of living generally. Conversely, no country with the mass of its people poverty-stricken, ignorant, and disease-ridden, can take its rightful place in the modern world.

2. The problem of the developing countries is one, primarily, of making a peaceful, evolutionary advance, enhancing desirable human values and characteristics while raising material standards.

3. The program is designed to aid developing countries to improve significantly expeditiously, and continuously, the condition and effectiveness of their underprivileged peoples.

4. The Futures program is an attack upon the causes of underprivilege rather than an attempt to alleviate or mitigate its results.

5. Inherent in the Futures program is a deep respect for the peasant and his counterpart, the underprivileged urban dweller. Futures recognizes the same range of native intelligence and other personal characteristics as exist in other classes of society; lack of education and opportunity are the principal reasons for the inferior status of the underprivileged.

6. The enhancement of human values is Futures' primary concern: self-respect, self-confidence, competence, and a concern for the welfare of others. Improved economic conditions nearly always are essential to the achievement of this objective.

7. The basic motivation for improvement is the welfare of the children. It is the strongest known incentive to constructive, cooperative action for the common good.

8. The basic means of improvement is education, including counseling and planning with adults, and better schooling for the children. A Colombian collaborator has said, "This program is 95 percent education."

9. The objectives are democratic: to help the people to understand the values of self-government and voluntary, cooperative action for the good of the community.

10. The methods are democratic: seeking the natural leaders, keeping formal organization at a minimum consistent with progress, and obtaining major decisions by consensus in open meetings.

11. Fundamental to the Futures program is the operation of the social process by which men learn how to raise their standards of living economically, educationally, socially, and spiritually. At the heart of the program is professional counseling of a high order.

12. The social process in action produces projects, chosen and planned by the people. This means of conceiving projects is in sharp contrast with the frequently used means of persuading the people to accept projects which are "good for them."

13. The Futures' counselor begins work with the villagers immediately, upon his first visit. There is direct action, with preliminary surveys or investigations unnecessary. A frequently heard complaint by officials in underprivileged areas: "We have been surveyed to death."

14. There is a minimum application of external, including foreign, assistance—money,

materials, and counseling—consistent with the effective use of the assistance to reach sound, agreed-upon objectives. The emphasis is upon self-help and a growing sense of community and individual responsibility. One result of this principle in operation is an unusual economy in rendering assistance; it also runs counter to the concepts of "foreign aid" held by many of its practitioners.

15. There is a maximum use of indigenous resources; always there are resources available to a community, some nearly always unknown to the people.

16. The professional counselors are citizens of the country. The philosophy, policies, and methods of Futures can be, and are, learned. Indigenous men and women of the highest quality, intelligent, sensitive, devoted, and otherwise well equipped to serve the less fortunate, can be found.

17. A modest Futures' loan or grant is essential for some projects. Nominal grants sometimes have great morale value. Loans are made when there is to be an economic return, and always there must be a direct, significant benefit for the children.

18. The Futures program operates successfully in rural areas and in the slum outskirts of urban centers. These are the areas, throughout the world, where underprivilege is most prevalent, with a vast population movement from the former to the latter.

19. Important to an extension of the work is the inevitable "chain reaction" as communities learn from the achievements of other communities.

20. Futures cooperates with institutions and other organizations, foreign, international, and indigenous, which have consonant aims and programs.

21. Futures believes that a nationwide program of improvement is most likely to succeed as the result of collaboration between government and indigenous private organizations developed for this purpose. Such collaboration is already underway successfully on a local and state basis in Antioquia, Colombia, through Futures' counterpart organization, Futuro Para la Ninez. Government can contribute material resources and trained personnel on a nationwide basis while Futuro, with more adequate financing, can furnish professional leadership in the areas of policy formulation, personnel training and inservice development, program demonstration and experimentation, and operational research. In such an arrangement, the private and governmental sectors of society each makes its distinctive and invalu ble contribution to the common good.

Sun Valley Receives International Publicity

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, world famous Sun Valley, in my congressional district, is mentioned in an advertisement being used this spring in 47 leading national newspapers and magazines in England, France, Germany, Mexico, and Australia/New Zealand by the U.S. Travel Service, Department of Commerce.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the U.S. Travel Service has done well to include this rare and beautiful spot in its campaign of "see America." However, I commend Sun Valley to all Americans, as well as to Europeans and those others to whom the ads are directed.

In addition to the recreation and pleasures to be had at Sun Valley, it is just a short distance from Craters of the Moon, unique among all national monuments. It is also a "jumping off" place for the rugged Sawtooth Mountains and Idaho's primitive area.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I place this advertisement in the RECORD. It is also with pleasure that I extend an invitation to all of you to visit with us in Idaho. I know you will like us.

The advertisement follows:

BRONCO-BUSTERS AND BACH—THIS YEAR ENJOY THE ROCKIES AND NORTHWEST: START AT SEATTLE, WASH., AND DISCOVER THE SPECTACULAR UNITED STATES—GLACIERS, TOWERING PEAKS AND DUDE RANCHES

Dine in the revolving restaurant atop Seattle's 60-story Space Needle, golf at the hilltop Jefferson Park course, cruise beautiful Puget Sound. Plan to be there between June and mid-August during the Seattle Seafair—boat races, water shows and gay parades are all part of the festivities.

At Mount Rainier, drive up through the clouds to walk on a "live glacier"; 5,000 wild elk are an attraction at nearby Olympic National Park. So are the lush "rain forests." Ideal growing conditions produce magnificent flowers and trees—spruce up to 51 feet around.

AMERICA'S LAST FRONTIER—ALASKA

The largest State in the Nation—and still not completely explored. Today, dynamic Anchorage is only a 3-hour side trip from Seattle by air. You'll see Mount McKinley, highest peak in North America. Turn south to the State capital, Juneau. Then enjoy Alaska's spectacular scenery by riding the car-carrying ferries along the Inside Passage to Skagway. You'll be fascinated by the city's reenactment of Alaska's gold rush days—complete with can-can girls, gambling halls, and gun duels.

FLY TO THE CITY OF ROSES

One-way air fare from Seattle to beautiful Portland, Oreg., is £4.13s.2d. If you arrive in June, the famous weeklong Rose Festival (June 4–13) will be a highlight of your Northwest tour.

Rent a car and drive to snowcapped Mount Hood, only 60 miles to the east. Another day, see famous Crater Lake, a giant blue jewel set in the heart of an ancient volcano.

COWBOYS AS TOUGH AS SADDLE LEATHER

Sun Valley, the international sports center in Idaho, should be one of your stops in the Rockies. Then on, higher and higher, to Montana's Glacier National Park—nature's dazzling display of jagged peaks, valleys, lakes, and waterfalls—with 1,000 miles of horse and foot trails.

Now you're in the Big Sky country, where a man can breathe deep and free. Stay at a "dude ranch" and have steak and potatoes for breakfast before riding the range with broncobusting cowboys. Dance under starry western skies. Fish trout-packed waters. And stop at colorful, historic Virginia City, Mont., an authentic old mining town.

Yellowstone National Park in Wyoming is a sightseer's paradise. There are over 200 geysers, and you'll like meeting the huge black bears (from inside your car). And the border of another national park, Grand Teton, is only 10 miles away. A £2.2s.11d. car fee entitles you to tour and camp in all 32 great national parks. Then drive on to join the riproaring fun at Cheyenne's "Frontier Days" (July 27 to August 1)—one of the country's most famous rodeos.

BACH IN THE ROCKIES

Drive south to Colorado and take a day's excursion on the cliff-hugging railroad between Durango and Silverton. It will transport you back to the days of the great silver strikes. Nearby, at Aspen, extensive programs (June 28 to August 30) of classical and modern music, lectures, and forums attract international visitors every year.

With One Eye Toward Beauty—And Another on the Dump

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Compost Science is published quarterly, and is sent to about 10,000 municipal and industrial officials throughout the country who are responsible for the treatment of organic wast materials. Its editorial policy has been to stress the importance of utilization of such wastes and report on research and experiences of waste utilization throughout the world. Mr. Jerome Olds, the editor of Compost Science, has brought to my attention the editorial in the current issue. I believe my colleagues, particularly those from large urban areas, will find this editorial of particular interest, and it follows:

WITH ONE EYE TOWARD BEAUTY—AND ANOTHER ON THE DUMP

American research is truly fantastic.

We've been reading about Early Bird—the first "product" of COMSAT and what it will mean to the communications field. We've been reading about Houston's Astrodome—the Eighth Wonder of the World (as long as baseball games are played at night there). And bridges, and antibiotics, and jets. One accomplishment after another. Chalk them up to research.

But one field has been continually plagued by lack of research—the solid wastes disposal field. Somehow when the R. & D. projects were being assigned, this one got left by the wayside. And the result of this no research are showing—stinking and polluting, in fact.

Warned President Johnson earlier this year:

"Modern technology, which has added much to our lives, can also have a darker side. The air we breathe, our water, our soil, and wildlife are being blighted by poisons and chemicals which are the byproducts of technology and industry. The same society which receives the rewards of technology must, as a cooperating whole, take responsibility for control."

In his message on natural beauty, President Johnson had this to say about solid wastes:

"Continuing technological progress and improvement in methods of manufacture, packaging, and marketing of consumer products has resulted in an ever-mounting increase of discarded material. We need to seek better solutions to the disposal of these wastes. I recommend legislation to—

"Assist the States in developing comprehensive programs for some forms of solid waste disposal;

"Provide for research and demonstration projects leading to more effective methods for disposing of or salvaging solid wastes;

"Launch a concentrated attack on the accumulation of junk cars by increasing research in the Department of the Interior leading to use of metal from scrap cars where promising leads already exist."

A START IN LEGISLATION

The legislation recommended by the President has been introduced in the past few months into the House of Representatives. Nine identical bills—whose purpose is to launch a national research program for improved solid waste handling—have been sponsored by the following Congressmen: ROOSEVELT, ROYBAL, HAWKINS, VAN DEERLIN, CORMAN, and BROWN, of California; KLUCZYNSKI of Illinois; CELLER of New York; and DINGELL of Michigan. The bill, known as the "Solid Waste Disposal Act," would provide the funds necessary to carry out the program.

Composting would specifically benefit from the proposed legislation, which would also provide for research into sanitary landfills, incineration, grinding and disposal to sewers. The grants would be used to demonstrate the "reliability, engineering, operating, agricultural, horticultural, and economic potentials of the processes under study."

In order to assist States to inventory existing practices of solid waste handling and disposal and "develop State programs for the improvement of such practices in the interests of protection of the health and safety of all the people," the Surgeon General would be authorized to appropriate $2 million for each of 3 succeeding fiscal years. To provide for the construction of demonstration plants, up to $7,500,000 would be available. An additional $7 million would be authorized to carry out the other provisions of the act.

The act itself would be administered by the Surgeon General under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. The Surgeon General may appoint a Solid Waste Advisory Committee to advise and assist in the formulation of programs authorized by this act. The Committee shall also advise on the establishment of a program for the disposition of grant-in-aid and project grant funds to carry out the expressed intent of the act.

NEED FOR ACTION

There can be no question of the need for this national research program into the solid waste disposal field. The problems are nationwide—rapidly expanding urban areas unable to cope satisfactorily with solid wastes exist throughout the United States. Pollution, health hazards and just plain ugliness have become all-too-common characteristics of our metropolitan areas.

Without doubt, it is time for an intensive national effort to come up with the needed solution.

Sweet Reason Prevails in Big Steel Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's persuasive influence in helping avert a nationwide steel strike is known to most of us. The President's brilliant success in getting men of opposing views to sit down and reason together is interestingly described in an editorial of May 3, 1965, edition of the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee.

The editorial follows:

SWEET REASON PREVAILS IN BIG STEEL TALKS

A new dimension in labor-management responsibility was written in Pittsburg by the United Steelworkers Union and big steel when they agreed to a 4-month interim contract pending final settlement of their dispute—thereby averting a strike which could have depressed, even crippled, a booming, healthy economy.

Up to now steelworkers slavishly had followed that old, old union battlecry, "no contract, no work," and lacking a contract, would strike. By agreeing this time to accept an interim 11.5 cent hourly pay hike while negotiating outstanding differences, the stetlworkers displayed a mature, responsible attitude which does labor proud.

Nor should it be overlooked either that President Lyndon B. Johnson's influence had a part in bringing about this interim agreement. Again his persuasive hand is felt at a critical moment; again men sat down at his urging, and as Johnson fondly likes to put it, "reasoned together."

The interim contract may have a new influence upon labor-mangament relations. If this represents a precedent, hallelujah. If the example may help avert other strikes—hallelujah.

Few realize how disastrous a steel strike could have been to the economy. At the moment the Nation is experiencing a prosperity which has triggered expansion, expansion, expansion at a time when expansion, expansion, expansion is crucial to the national fortune.

The strike called, the long battle begun—all of the gains, or a great part of the gains, could be lost.

Never has the steel industry gone into a strike but that shock waves ricocheted throughout the entire industrial base, producing retrenchment, withdrawal.

For example, the 116-day steel strike in 1959 idled more than 500,000 directly associated with producing steel and 250,000 in industries directly dependent upon steel. Dwindling stockpiles produced black market sales. Foreign steel, taking advantage of the idle furnaces here, rushed in to service markets the American steel industry never has regained fully.

The direct cost to workers was estimated at $1 billion in wages alone. On top of this, the companies lost more than $1 billion in profits, never to be recouped; railroads lost more than $175 million in freight revenues and the Government lost more than $1.2 billion in taxes.

This time commonsense prevailed. Men reasoned, and the furnaces remain lit. Now the pressure is off of negotiators as they proceed toward a solution of their differences.

The Dominican Republic; Why We Are There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the outcome will be of the tense drama now in progress in the Dominican Republic. But I do know that this grave crisis has given all Americans a telling glimpse of the quality of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

He has shown boldness and decisiveness in the face of great danger; resolution in pursuing a difficult and lonely task; dedication and purpose in searching for stability in a highly threatening situation.

Mr. Speaker, I have been particularly impressed by two recent editorials, one in the May 4 edition of Newsday, and the other in the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch of May 7. They comment quite effectively, I believe, on affairs in the Dominican Republic and on the President's conduct, and I submit them now for entry in the RECORD:

[From Newsday, May 4, 1965]

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, AND WHY WE ARE THERE

President Johnson, as of noon yesterday, was sticking to his explanation that Marines and paratroopers are in the Dominican Republic purely to protect Americans still there and to assist in their evacuation. That is the diplomatic explanation. If by chance it happens that the presence of U.S. forces and tanks cuts off a left-wing-cum Castro Communist uprising at the roots, that is so much gravy.

In fact, the United States has every reason to prevent a takeover either by Communists or by those willing to work with them. A little reflection on what happened to Cuba upon Fidel Castro's accession to power will elucidate the reasons. We cannot risk another focus of infection in the Western Hemisphere. If the heads of most Latin American countries could at this moment speak frankly, they would express great relief that we acted as resolutely as we did. The difficulty is that just about every Latin American country has a powerful left-wing component, along with a lesser number of Communists willing to fish in troubled waters. That accounts for the public expressions of shock and dismay by such delicately balanced heads of state as Eduardo Frei, of Chile.

We would not now have Castro in Cuba if we had moved with more toughness at the time of the Bay of Pigs. We cannot afford to have a government in the Dominican Republic that is susceptible to Fidel's influence, infiltration, and possible future takeover.

The Monroe Doctrine was written to deal with foreign infiltration. Communism is the ideology of a foreign power. Perhaps we had better recast the Monroe Doctrine to cover infiltration as well as actual invasion. The events in the Dominican Republic urgently suggest that such a reconsideration is in order.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, May 7, 1965]

HISTORIC STEP BY THE OAS

The Organization of American States took an historic step yesterday when 14 of its 20 members voted to send military forces to keep order in the presently chaotic Dominican Republic. True, it was a close decision, since 14 was the minimum number required for action, but the vote could have great significance for the future.

Details remain to be spelled out, and the OAS will doubtless creak into action with vast heavings, but a far-reaching step has been taken. It may ultimately provide a solution for the urgent Dominican problem. Some such solution is sorely needed.

Various Latin American countries which have dragged their feet when asked to do something effective against Castro's Cuba, opposed the proposed Dominican operation. Those voting "no" were Mexico, Chile, Peru, Uruguay, and Ecuador, with Venezuela (surprisingly) abstaining. Since Venezuela is probably next on the Communist agenda of

infiltration and conquest, one would have supposed that its government would be anxious to cauterize the festering Red sore in the Dominican Republic by joint action.

The percentage of Communists who are in leadership positions in and around Santo Domingo is a subject of dispute. The Johnson administration has been emphatic in declaring that the Reds have been running the show. Even if that is not quite correct, they undoubtedly are in important leadership positions. Let us not forget that in the early stages of the Cuban revolt, few Communists were involved, and Castro loudly denied any connection with communism.

The Christian Science Monitor's correspondent in Santo Domingo lists the principal OAS objectives as follows:

"To bring in at least token elements from a variety of Latin American lands.

"To set up OAS diplomatic machinery to support whatever Dominican Government emerges from the current uncertainty.

"To target in on a date for removal of all foreign troops and hold to that date."

If the foregoing, or most of it, can be achieved, it will be cause for congratulations all around. It is to be presumed and hoped, however, that the OAS would not support just any government that happened to get the upper hand—such as one dominated and controlled by Communists.

Meanwhile conditions in the Dominican Republic, and especially in the capital, Santo Domingo, are indescribably bad. Bodies litter the streets, the smell of death hangs over the city, garbage is uncollected and there is general chaos. Food, medicine, and public order are sorely needed.

Much remains to be done before the situation in the Dominican Republic can be stabilized. It appears, however, that events are moving in the right direction.

The New Jersey Investigation Into the War on Poverty

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the conduct of the war on poverty has resulted in considerable attention to the details of the battle in my home State of New Jersey. Since the appropriate committees of Congress appear too preoccupied to carry out the full study of the program nationally, as suggested by Members from both sides of the aisle, it is encouraging to know that the New Jersey State Legislature will be acting in this area.

Under the chairmanship of State Senator Nelson Stamler, of Union County, a bipartisan committee of three assemblymen and three senators has been created to examine the workings of the poverty program within the State. The justifiable criticism of the high salaries being paid poverty war officials is only one phase of the investigation. Although some partisan outcry has been heard over the study, I think that most New Jersey citizens, and most Americans, will agree with the editorial appearing in the April 30, 1965, edition of the Herald-News of Passaic, N.J. The editorial points out that there has been no difficulty in recruiting workers for the Peace Corps, where no salary complaints have been heard, and that the bureaucrats running the poverty program have as yet to test themselves against the late President Kennedy's admonition to ask not what their country could do for them, but to ask what they could do for their country.

As the editorial concludes, "Let the investigation proceed," at all levels of government.

The editorial follows:

[From the Herald-News, Apr. 30, 1965]

PROBING THE POVERTY WAR

The decision of the Republican-controlled legislature to investigate the administration of the war on poverty in New Jersey may be politically inspired, as the Democrats claim, but no one can deny that there is need for turning the spotlight on the program.

The investigating committee of three assemblymen and three senators is headed by Union County's Senator Stamler, who will be remembered for his gambling investigations in Passaic and Bergen Counties when he was in the State attorney general's employ. Properly conducted the investigation should be much more than the "witch hunt" which Democrats have branded it in an attempt to discredit it before it starts. The high salaries which are being paid to top officials in the poverty war have been widely publicized, not only in New Jersey but throughout the Nation. Criticism of what appear to be exorbitant salaries has been defended by Sargent Shriver, national director of the Johnson administration's poverty program. Mr. Shriver has said that the high salaries are necessary to attract the best qualified people.

But comparison has been made between the war on poverty and the Peace Corps, which is also directed by Mr. Shriver. The dedicated men and women who make up the Peace Corps have not been accused of being overpaid and yet they are among the Nation's most valued servants.

In his inaugural address the late President Kennedy admonished Americans to ask not what their country could do for them, but to ask what they could do for their country. The men and women who are running the war on poverty at all levels apparently have not tested themselves along the lines suggested by the late President.

Let the investigation proceed.

Lawson B. Knott, Jr.: The Logical Man To Head General Services Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson made an excellent choice in selecting Lawson B. Knott, Jr., to head the General Services Administration.

Mr. Knott is a 30-year veteran of Government service. He is a dedicated civil servant, extremely capable, and at 53 has an excellent record of faithful service to our Government.

I personally do not think the President could have selected a more capable executive. Under Mr. Knott's able leadership, I am confident that GSA will continue to render the high quality of service it has provided in past years.

Born in Wendell, N.C., Mr. Knott graduated from Duke University at Durham, and later from the National University Law School here in Washington. He began his Government career with the Resettlement Administration in 1935, and continued his employment when it merged with the Department of Agriculture. In 1942 he joined the Corps of Engineers, and after World War II, served in a legal and administrative capacity until he transferred to GSA in 1956.

His rise in GSA was rapid and within only 3 years his abilities moved him upward to the position of Deputy Commissioner of General Services Administration's Public Building Service. Here he served until November 28, 1961, when he was appointed Deputy Administrator of GSA. He is married to the former Miss Marion Lunt, of Cedar City, Utah, and they have two children, Mrs. Neil E. Churchill, of Atlanta, and Gregory, a college student.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Knott's record serves as a splendid example for young people entering Government service to follow. The purpose of my remarks here today is to warmly congratulate him before Members of the Congress.

Bonneville Power Authority Still Attempting To Invade Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune on Sunday, May 16, 1965. It cogently sets forth reasons why the request of the Bonneville Power Authority for $1 million for planning of transmission lines to southeastern Idaho should be denied.

I commend it to my colleagues for their consideration:

BPA STILL ATTEMPTING TO INVADE AREA

Defeated last year in an attempt to get a "foot in the door" appropriation for a Federal transmission line to southern Idaho, the Bonneville Power Administration is trying again. The request is the same as it was in 1964—$1 million to design the proposed line. But the ultimate cost to the taxpayers has been raised to $80 million from the original $73 million because of the change in routing. The figures, however, are estimates which have a habit of falling short of reality. Moreover, the cost of the 1964 proposal, if related customer facilities were included, would have been $130 million—not $73 million.

But the huge price tag is not nearly as objectionable as the idea behind the proposal. BPA wants to carry federally subsidized power long distances over a federally subsidized transmission line. And this despite the fact that southern Idaho, served by two private utilities (Utah Power & Light and Idaho Power) has ample electric power available.

SUGGESTS JOINT EFFORT

During an appearance before a Senate Public Works Subcommittee, Charles F. Luce of BPA suggested that the Federal Government and private companies might agree on joint construction of the proposed line. This was done on the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie.

His suggestion would be more impressive, however, if BPA had been more successful in carrying out congressional instructions to negotiate with private companies for the wheeling of Bonneville power to southern Idaho. Mr. Luce blamed one private company for the so-called deadlock and explained that as a result BPA is now asking for funds to plan for its own transmission line.

Could it be that BPA hopes to use talk of a Federal transmission line as a lever in negotiations over wheeling?

SELLS AT LOW RATES

BPA sells power at amazingly low rates, now averaging about 2.35 cents per kilowatt-hour, although the agency operates in the red some years. This point was raised during the Senate subcommittee hearing, with Mr. Luce defending bookkeeping methods which, according to the General Accounting Office, enable the agency to hide some costs of power generation.

Mr. Luce explained that GAO accounting methods would not reflect congressional policy requiring Federal investments in Columbia River plants to be repaid in 50 years. Yet he also said BPA is considering a rate raise which would increase power revenues by about 4 percent. Perhaps widespread criticism of BPA's low rates and deficit operation is finally being heeded.

UDALL OPENED WAY

BPA began operating in southern Idaho in 1963 when Secretary of the Interior Udall placed that territory in the agency's marketing area and gave it the marketing function for power generated at southern Idaho reclamation projects. Now BPA hopes to add to its power empire by getting congressional approval of a Federal transmission line.

We opposed BPA's request for planning funds a year ago. We oppose the latest request. And the million dollars for planning is only a first step. BPA appears determined to enter an area where ample electric power is already available, taking advantage of Federal subsidies for the cost of both generation and transmission. Congress said "no" last year. It should do so again.

Bridges Versus People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh, Pa., Press recently carried an editorial entitled, "Bridges Versus People," in which the newspaper expressed its puzzlement over critics of America's policies in Vietnam.

I, too, share the bewilderment of the newspaper. I cannot understand why citizens criticize American and South Vietnamese bombing of Communist bridges, depots, and supply lines in which few if any humans are killed and at the same time overlook Vietcong bombings of the American Embassy and terrorism of villages and hamlets in which many lives are lost and numerous injuries are suffered.

The United States is not in Vietnam by choice. We are not there to gain conquest. We are not there to destroy property and people. Our sole purpose in Vietnam is to protect freedom in this vital area of the world.

If we withdraw from Vietnam now, we break our commitments to these freedom loving people. Then the cause of democracy will be damaged beyond repair.

The people of Thailand, the people of the Philippines, the people throughout southeast Asia are looking to the United States to see if we will adhere to our agreements and if we will fight to protect freedom. We must not let them down. We must keep our word. The President is doing this.

So I am proud of President Johnson's leadership. I am proud of the manner in which he is conducting our efforts in Vietnam. I think recent events have already proven that his policies are paying off with victory and I am sure that victory will be ours.

At this time I include in its entirety the April 28, Pittsburgh Press editorial:

BRIDGES VERSUS PEOPLE

President Johnson at his press conference yesterday expressed wonderment that people who are disturbed by our bombing of bridges in North Vietnam never seem to be upset by such events as the Communist bombing of our embassy in Saigon nor by Vietcong murders of women and children.

That will puzzle others, too.

There can be many arguments against war as an institution. But to condemn the use of force on one side, while condoning it on the other, must be either ridiculous or coldly cynical.

Nevertheless, a good many Americans—not a majority, to be sure—seem to have been caught up in this frenzy.

The fact is that the Communists are counting on just such a reaction in this country to help them achieve their goal. They believe our natural disclination toward the use of force eventually will cause us to give in rather than fight to the finish in Vietnam.

As the President made clear, however, the Vietnam war is not going to conclude that way. We did not make the war, but we are there to stay. We are, in Mr. Johnson's words, not about to "tuck our tails and run home."

Meanwhile, it will be good for the American people to remember that, as the President indicated, it is more useful in war to blow up a cold steel bridge than to murder a child.

No Compromise for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, there are many rumors floating around about the content of the report of the Special Commission appointed by the President to review the closing of 32 Veterans' Administration installations. About a week or so ago our body of the Congress added to the appropriation for independent offices the $23 million necessary to operate these particular facilities for fiscal year 1966. Our action was a direct response to the strange and peculiar circumstance that the Appropriations Committee had provided no money in the bill for these 32 facilities, apparently proceeding upon the premise that the Commission would order all the facilities to remain closed.

It was my understanding the report of findings would not be submitted to the President until on or about June 1. But there must have been some premature leak last week, because the story is going the rounds that 5 of the 11 hospitals, 2 of the domiciliary homes, and 8 of the regional offices would be retained.

May I comment that if there are any who feel this sort of a compromise is a victory over the Veterans' Administration, I do not want to be included within their number. If one single hospital or one single regional office is allowed to be closed, it will be a loss through impairment of services to the veterans of our Nation.

I want to make it very plain here and now that I will continue opposition to all the closings with all the strength I can muster.

I am sure other Members will keep up this fight and it will not be confined simply to those who have districts that have directly felt the detrimental effects of this order. Every Congressman should realize that what can happen to one district can happen very soon to another and that unless there is a determination to fight now the closing order of last January can be just one step that will be followed by others over the years.

Since last January I have voted against several money bills which, if they had been defeated, would have provided the money to replace the alleged $23 million savings many times over. Before this session of the Congress is over I will vote against other authorizations and appropriations in an amount greater than the amount of $23 million which the Bureau of the Budget has said it must save, or should I say take away from our deserving veterans.

Compromise is not enough. The fight must continue for out and out revocation of the closing directive of January 13.

In conclusion, I wish to commend to my colleagues an editorial on the proposed compromise which appeared in this week's issue of the Stars & Stripes and which reads as follows:

[From the Stars & Stripes, May 20, 1965]

VA HOSPITAL REPORT

When the President appointed a special commission to review the closing of some 32 VA installations it was ordered to report its findings to him by May 31.

Apparently some decision has been made by the Commission and what appears to be a premature release was announced last week. It is now reported that the Commission has agreed that 5 of the 11 hospitals cited in the VA order should be retained. Two of the four domiciliary homes would also remain open. It was also reported that at least one regional office in each State should be retained.

Whether this compromise is politically motivated is difficult to say at this time. Some observers feel that the ultimate decision is a victory for the opposition to the VA directive.

However, there seems to be a strong undercurrent of opposition to this particular line

of thought. It is understood that the major veterans organizations are not in accord with the compromise and feel that even if one hospital is closed, that constitutes a distinct loss to the veteran population of this Nation.

Many Members of Congress who have stubbornly opposed the VA decision are apparently in a mood to continue their opposition. This congressional sentiment furthermore does not stem solely from those Congressmen whose districts feel the impact of the order. Many Congressmen express themselves as feeling that the VA directive is only the preliminary step in doing away with rights and benefits that have been granted to veterans and their dependents over a period of years. Indications are that their opposition to any compromise will continue.

Representatives of veteran groups apparently take the position that a battle has been won but the ultimate winning of the war has not yet been completed.

We feel that the order to close the VA installations is a direct encroachment upon the rights and privileges of the Nation's veterans. They have been promised the best medical care available. There is serious doubt that such care can be provided, under announced VA plans, particularly for those ill and needy veterans who happen to reside in rural areas.

Let the fight go on for complete revocation of the VA directive of January 13.

More on Jet Noise: NASA Conference on Aircraft Operating Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have addressed the House in a series of statements on the subject of aircraft noise abatement, in which I have sought to alert my colleagues to both the urgency and the national scope of the problem. On May 6, 1965, I introduced H.R. 7981 a bill to amend section 203(a) on the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide for a program of research and development by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to reduce or eliminate aircraft noise, and for other purposes. On May 6, 1965 I also introduced H.R. 7982, a bill to amend section 302 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the elimination of aircraft noise, and for other purposes. Both bills have been referred to committee.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 13, 1965, under "Extension of Remarks," I informed my colleagues that the floodgates of litigation due to jet noise were now open and I included a summary of aircraft noise litigation pending in 18 States represented by 269 Members of the House of Representatives. The purpose of this summary was to call attention to the national scope of the problem and to interest my colleagues in the proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 11, and 12, 1965, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration conducted a conference on aircraft operating problems at Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va. More than 400 technical experts from industry and government attended the conference and 34 papers were presented by scientists from Ames Reserch Center, Moffett Field, Calif.; Flight Research Center, Edwards, Calif.; Langley; and the Federal Aviation Agency.

I was privileged to attend a number of sessions of the conference on May 10, 1965, because of my interest in the jet noise problem. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the highlights of some papers relating to jet noise presented at the conference. The reduction of aircraft noise will come about only from a coordinated research program framed by the Federal Government and from transmission of technical findings to all Government departments and to the airframe and air transport industries.

Conferences such as the Langley conference serve to expedite this process of transmitting research findings into practical operational techniques and use. The following excerpts from NASA's Report on Aircraft Improvements—NASA Release No. 65-160—are of importance to those engaged in the field of aircraft noise control:

"Factors Relating to Airport-Community Noise Problem," by Harvey H. Hubbard, Jimmy M. Cawthorn, and W. Latham Copeland of Langley, dealt with aircraft noise, factors relating to the noise level imposed on the community by aircraft operations, and with community reaction. Since human sensitivity is the basic factor in the noise problem, considerable attention has been directed to subjective reaction studies.

Two noise properties found to increase the annoyance potential of a given physical noise level are the presence of pure tones, such as jet engine compressor whine, and increased duration of the noise. Reduction of the noise at its source is another area of investigation.

Among the means cited for achieving major reductions in source noise were increasing the by-pass ratios of turbo-fan engines to substantially greater values than presently used, and suppressing compressor whine by such devices as inlet resonators, suitable spacing of compressor stators and rotors, and checking the inlet air flow. Studies of compatible land use is planned as future work. It was noted also that adoption of different operating procedures for aircraft might provide some alleviation of the community noise problem.

"Preliminary Measurements of Takeoff and Landing Noise From a New Instrumented Range," by Carole S. Tanner and Norman J. McLeod of the NASA Flight Research Center, described a new aircraft noise-research range at Edwards, Calif., which is expected to provide an accurate range for future studies of noise problems with operational aircraft.

The new facility consists of an array of 12 microphones installed at intervals along both sides of the runway and beyond the runway for a total distance of 25,000 feet and connected by cables to a van fitted with specially developed equipment for accurately measuring and analyzing the noise levels at each microphone station. Preliminary measurements in takeoffs of the XB-70 airplane and a jet transport have pointed up some apparent inadequacies in noise prediction procedures which this new facility should ultimately help to resolve.

"Preliminary Study of Steep Instrument Approach of Three Conventional Aircraft," by Albert W. Hall, Robert A. Champine, and Donald J. McGinley, Jr., of Langley, summarized an investigation aimed at defining the steepest instrument landing approach paths that might be operationally practicable in the interest of reducing airspace involvement in landing operations and the noise inflicted on an airport's neighbors.

Very limited tests with three airplanes flown by research pilots ranging from a trainer to a large jet transport indicated that a reasonable upper limit for instrument approaches was about 6° angle of glide slope for all three planes, as compared to the 3° presently used in instrument landing systems. Although the guidance equipment used for the tests was capable of guiding the airplane all the way to touchdown, the workload imposed on the pilot in precisely controlling the path of the airplane in two directions, with the limited information display provided, was too great to permit reliable all the way, or zero-zero landings. When his workload was reduced, by the copilot taking over lateral-directional control, the pilot was able, in some cases, to complete his landing on instruments.

Mr. Speaker, I also call the attention of my colleagues to an article appearing today in the Wall Street Journal—first page, offering the hope that "New Design May Ease Supersonic Airliners' Sonic Boom Problem" in which NASA engineers say, "Fuselage Change Reduces Noise Level"; the article by Mr. Richard P. Cooke, staff reporter, refers to the Government engineers who addressed the NASA Conference at Langley Field to which I have already alluded and at which I was privileged to be present.

The Wall Street Journal article follows:

NEW DESIGN MAY EASE SUPERSONIC AIRLINERS' SONIC BOOM PROBLEM—NASA ENGINEERS SAY FUSELAGE CHANGE REDUCES NOISE LEVEL—LOCKHEED, BOEING INTERESTED

(By Richard P. Cooke)

HAMPTON, VA.—Two Government engineers here think they have hit on a way to overcome a major hitch—the sonic boom—in developing a 2,000-mile-per-hour airliner.

The loudest boom occurs when an airplane breaks the sonic barrier, which is about 660 miles an hour at an altitude of 40,000 feet. But a continuous series of lesser booms reverberates through the sky as a plane cruises at supersonic speeds. On the ground the effect of the booms can be shattering to both human nerves and the windows of buildings. Some aerospace researchers have been fearful that the boom problem might seriously restrict the operation of the supersonic transport, commonly known as the SST.

The Government engineers—Harry Carlson and Francis E. McLean, of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, believe the problem can be solved by a change in the proposed design for the fuselage of the SST. Working with a 4-inch stainless steel model in a wind tunnel at NASA's Langley Research Center, the engineers found that by flattening the fuselage just forward of the wing, they could alter the airflow in such a way as to cut the boom to an acceptable level. Much testing remains to be done, and definite conclusions can't be reached until the theory is tried on a full-sized jet. But the proposed design change is generating widespread interest in the aerospace field, including the engineering departments of Lockheed Aircraft Corp. and Boeing Co., both seeking a Federal contract to build a supersonic airliner.

THE FAA SETS A LIMIT

A sonic boom results from the sudden increase in atmospheric pressure produced in the path of an airplane traveling faster than sound. The level of a boom is measured in terms of the added pounds of pressure per square foot produced by the plane. If an SST, as originally designed, crashed through the sonic barrier at 35,000 to 40,000 feet, the excess pressure would reach more than 2 pounds per square foot, according to present estimates. But the Federal Aviation Agency, which has conducted extensive tests of the effects of sonic booms on people and struc-

tures in Oklahoma City, has prescribed 1.5 pounds as the maximum increase in atmospheric pressure that the American SST can produce.

The NASA engineers say wind tunnel tests show their SST design would produce a pressure increase of 1.3 pounds, which would mean the resulting boom would be well within the limits of tolerability established by the FAA. While the new design would not achieve a comparable reduction in pressure when cruising at 1,600 to 2,000 miles an hour at 70,000 feet or more, it would still keep the cruising boom within acceptable levels.

Fattening the SST fuselage forward of the wing might well bring other benefits besides diminished sonic booms. NASA engineers Carlson and McLean say it would help the lift and might permit room for more seats. Present SST designs provide for 200 to 250 seats.

SAVING MONEY FOR AIRLINES

Airline men add that if the NASA design theory proves correct, it might mean important operating economies. The most efficient way for a supersonic jet to fly is to break the sonic barrier and achieve cruising altitude as quickly as possible. But as originally conceived the SST would have to climb to 50,000 feet or more before going supersonic in order to reduce the effect of the sonic boom on the ground.

But if the NASA design works as expected and reduces the severity of the boom created by breaking the sound barrier, this uneconomical flight plan would no longer have to be followed. Soon after takeoff, the plane could be gunned to cruising speed and altitude.

Lockheed's vice president in charge of SST development, Robert Bailey, says the NASA experiments have already prompted Lockheed to begin testing the new design theory on its own. So far, says Mr. Bailey, flight tests of an F-104 jet fighter have confirmed the theory.

NASA's fat fuselage theory is not the only hopeful development in sonic boom research. Some investigators are also coming to the conclusion that the huge supersonic airliners (the American SST will be up to 260 feet long, compared with 55 feet for the F-104 Lockheed is using in its test) may pose less of a sonic boom problem than smaller jets.

Engineers explain the phenomenon in this fashion: As a supersonic plane moves through the air, the nose and wings first create a sharp rise in air pressure. Then, as the air moves farther back along the fuselage, pressure drops below normal. Finally, it rebounds to normal. The initial rise in pressure and the final rebound to a normal level both produce sonic booms. With a small plane these booms occur so close together that they sound like one extremely loud noise. It's believed that with a giant SST, however, the length of the plane will result in two relatively muted booms rather than a single intense boom.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome and invite the comments of my colleagues on this and my other statements in the RECORD, as well as on H.R. 7981 and H.R. 7982.

The Danger of Miscalculation in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the recent pause in our bombing of military and strategic installations in North Vietnam did not produce more tangible results. High hopes may too often hang on fragile threads, but it was a hopeful entree which could have been expanded if the Communists had been willing.

If the pause failed in its major purpose, however, it did serve several other important functions.

It made clear to all who care to listen that our abiding goal is peace and that we are willing to pursue many paths to achieve it.

It made clear, as James Reston pointed out in the New York Times on May 19, that we have no desire or intention to destroy North Vietnam, to change its social order or its political structure.

It made clear that the Vietnamese leaders, at this point at least, have no intention of lessening their aggressive pursuits; that they believe they will achieve their goal of dominating all Vietnam by force, and that they interpret our recess in bombing as a sign of weakness.

It also made clear that we want, that we are encouraging, the negotiations which are essential to any meaningful settlement, and as Mr. Reston further points out in his article of May 19:

This suggests concessions of free elections that previous U.S. Governments were not prepared to risk.

Mr. Speaker, the bombings, sadly, have been renewed. They were renewed because the leaders in Hanoi, urged on by Peiping, refused to accept or even consider our overtures for a peaceful solution.

We can only hope that President Johnson and his advisers will not despair; that they will continue, and even accelerate, the diplomatic offensive which is the essential corollary of our will to resist aggression.

Mr. Speaker, I include the thoughtful article by James Reston, to which I have referred, for our colleagues information:

WASHINGTON: THE DANGER OF MISCALCULATION IN VIETNAM

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The danger now in Vietnam is that the Communists will miscalculate the character and psychology of President Johnson.

The pro-Chinese elements, who are now reported to have the greatest influence over the North Vietnamese Government, have let the pause in the bombing go by without responding to President Johnson's public and private efforts to start negotiations. And they are apparently operating on the assumption that the strategy and tactics they used to defeat the French there in 1954 will succeed again against the United States.

It is a risky assumption. They may be able to bring the war to a critical battle on the ground, as their same general, Vo Nguyen Giap, did in the conquest of the French at Dienbienphu in 1954, but the balance and location of power are now quite different.

THE FALSE ANALOGIES

The American forces are not trapped in the encircling hills of a Dienbienphu. They are concentrated on the coast with easy access to the sea. Even if the American land airfields were knocked out, as the French airfields were neutralized at Dienbienphu, the United States has more power on its aircraft carriers off the coast than both sides could command in the decisive battle against the French 11 years ago.

The Communist hope of a quick and decisive victory during the period of the monsoon rains requires the destruction of the American command, and nothing could be further removed from Lyndon Johnson's Texas frontier psychology than to tolerate such a disaster, no matter what weapons he had to employ to avoid it. This is the danger of any such Communist miscalculation.

It is conceivable that the United States could be invited out by the South Vietnamese, or negotiated out at an international conference, or even worn out in a protracted war, but to be thrown out is the one thing that is least likely under Johnson, and any attempt to throw him out of Vietnam would only unify the nation behind him.

JOHNSON'S INITIATIVES

He believes he has now tried to meet every honorable proposal for a negotiated accommodation, and every military restraint short of nonresistance or ineffective resistance.

He tried to hold the line with a few thousand noncombatant "advisers." It didn't work. He let the advisers fire when they were fired on. He tried limited retaliatory force for attacks on American ships in the Gulf of Tonkin, then retaliation for attacks only on American bases on land, and then retaliatory attacks for Vietcong raids on the South Vietnamese.

He tried not going beyond the 17th parallel into North Vietnam. Then he tried going north, first to hit military targets and then subsidiary transportation targets; and at the private urging of the Russians, the British, the Japanese, and influential citizens at home, he stopped the bombing temporarily and at the same time urged negotiations both publicly and privately, through the Canadians.

The lack of any positive response from Hanoi does not mean that Washington will now order any dramatic increase in the severity of the bombing, and it will go on for a time, and there will then probably be another pause and another call for negotiations.

Meanwhile, the North Vietnamese apparently believe they are still winning and will probably have to go at the U.S. forces on the ground, and this is their dilemma. For every success they have on the ground will cost them at least double in retaliatory strikes from the air until they agree to talk.

This is the policy of the U.S. Government, so far as it can be ascertained. It does not aim at the destruction of North Vietnam or at any change in the social or political structure of the North Vietnamese regime.

SELF-DETERMINATION

It implies the right of self-determination for the South Vietnamese, even the right to create a coalition government with the Communists if they so desire, though Washington certainly does not desire this.

In the view of this Government, this suggests concessions of free election that previous U.S. Governments were not prepared to risk, but the silence of Hanoi and the savage opposition of Peiping to any talks have only convinced the Johnson administration that these offers plus the pause in the bombing were merely interpreted in Hanoi as signs of weakness in Washington.

Accordingly, the bombing has started again, and the battle will probably get worse before the President decides on another pause and another opportunity to talk about peace.

The Loaded Teach-Ins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago there was deep concern in this

country over the apathy and lassitude of college students. Public issues—even crises and conflicts—failed to move our students from their lethargy, and they were dubbed "the silent generation."

Today, however, if we worry about our students it is not for their lack but for their occasional excess of zeal. It is, perhaps, a sign of the growing maturity of our collegians that where once spring was heralded by panty raids we now have the teach-in.

I welcome the institution of the teach-in. It offers, I think, an opportunity for free discussion and debate which is entirely in keeping with our best traditions. But I am disturbed by the prospect that these events may, if seized by the immature and the irresponsible, become mere demonstrations rather than genuine debates.

At Cornell University recently, for instance, Mr. Averell Harriman, our distinguished ambassador at large, was prevented from explaining this Nation's policy in Vietnam by an unruly and hostile mob.

Mr. Speaker, the search for truth can only be carried out in an atmosphere of open-mindedness and between men of good will. The purpose of any teach-in, as I see it, should be to produce clarity—not chaos; perspective—not propaganda.

In this connection, I submit two excellent editorials from the Pittsburgh Press of May 7 and May 13 for insertion in the RECORD Appendix:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, May 13, 1965]

THE LOADED TEACH-INS

Few Pittsburghers were surprised when it was announced that a teach-in would be held on Saturday at the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Institute of Technology to debate U.S. policy on Vietnam. Teach-ins are fashionable on American campuses these days and it was to be expected that the fad would spread here eventually.

It's not surprising, either, that the chief organizer of the so-called debate here is Dr. Robert G. Colodny, associate professor of history at Pitt who was affiliated with the pro-Castro Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

A national Vietnam debate will be broadcast by telephone from Washington to the Student Union Lounge at Pitt and Porter Hall at Carnegie Tech, McGeorge Bundy, special assistant to President Johnson, will defend the U.S. position and he will be opposed by George Kahin, professor of Asian studies at Cornell University.

More than 40 faculty members from 5 local colleges will speak at an 8 p.m. session at Pitt. Perhaps it's too much to hope that a reasonable number of these professors will take the "pro" side of the discussion of American foreign policy. Previous teach-ins throughout the country have been loaded in favor of opponents of Washington's policies.

Even when the Johnson administration's views have been defended, the audiences have tended to be hostile, preferring to ignore some of the frustrating dilemmas of international issues and favoring, instead, simple solutions to complex problems.

For example, at a Cornell lecture this week, W. Averell Harriman, U. S. Ambassador at Large, was interrupted repeatedly by unruly students when he tried to explain American policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. He was unable to conduct a question and answer period and was forced to leave. The boisterous students didn't want to hear the U.S. side of the story.

Properly conducted, the so-called teach-in at Pitt could be an aid to understanding of the U.S. Government's policies in the trouble-spots of the world. But the course of such demonstrations in other colleges and universities does not support such a hope; most of them have given rise to the idea that their organizers were more interested in propaganda than in fact.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, May 7, 1965]

BASED ON ERROR: CRITICS IGNORE VIET FACTS—INTELLECTUALS NEED THINK-INS

(By Bruce Biossat)

WASHINGTON.—America's intellectual community is under the heaviest fire it has felt in many years. It is worth inquiring why this is so.

The attacks, of course, represent a response to the sweeping criticisms many intellectuals (and a lot of others) have levied against U.S. policy in Vietnam. In rebuttal, some of these are now complaining that President Johnson and his supporters appear to want to muzzle them.

Even if the President would like to quiet his critics, he knows he cannot. And many who are assailing the intellectuals among them have no thought of that.

Their real complaint is that they are not being intellectual enough.

The charge is that their critical comment has far too often been founded on the quicksand of factual error, has been painfully imprecise, and has lacked the hard bite of well-thought-out judgments.

The critics' rejoinder has been to fault the President for not giving them the facts. But much vital information is a matter of open record.

WHOLESALE KILLING

Their high-pitched complaints against U.S. bombing of North Vietnam as dangerous, unnecessary, and above all inhumane, seem very close to being hypocritical.

Despite some protests to the contrary, they have not exhibited similar verbal compassion for the many thousands of South Vietnamese killed by the Vietcong since they began their murderous depredations back in 1957.

Nor have the North Vietnamese escaped Hanoi's brutality. Pursuing land reform, the Reds executed 50,000 civilians and jailed another 100,000.

Stripped of obscuring language, the case some intellectuals are making consists of categorical assertions—repeated with a kind of visceral stubborness.

They say bombing is both bad and useless, that the great danger is escalation toward general war, that a proper neutrality can and should be achieved for Vietnam and all of southeast Asia, that America is overextended and has no business in Asia.

PROPAGANDA, NOT FACT

The role of bombing in any war deserves fair debate. In this instance, the complaining intellectuals have, somewhat arrogantly, made their own determination of its purpose and prejudged its effect.

In the nuclear age the prospect of escalation can never be dismissed lightly. But John P. Roche, a Brandeis University professor who is one of the intellectuals' own, is just one among many thoughtful men who can argue plausibly that escalation bringing Moscow and Peiping into the war is an unlikely thing.

What can be levied against some intellectuals, then, is that they have not been living up to the best of their own breed.

They have been making propaganda, not reasoned argument rooted in fact.

They have made their case in a rash of teach-ins around the country. From their performance to date, their greater need would seem to be for a long round of read-ins and think-ins.

Financial Situation in the Nation's Capital

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

(Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. O'KONSKI. The Nation's Capital is like the weather. We all generally talk about it but very few of us do anything about it. I am referring to the financial situation here in the District of Columbia. It is no different from that of any other growing city. The District of Columbia needs more schools. The people here need more policemen. They need more firemen. They need better streets and they need more of everything and anything that any modern growing city needs. Yet throughout the years the District of Columbia has been strapped financially because somehow or other the Congress of the United States has not provided enough money for them to do the job that needs to be done.

This year I decided to do something about it. So I have taken a deep personal interest in this matter and have made a very thorough study of the tax structure and the revenue structure here in the District of Columbia. I am today introducing a bill which I think will help to solve the financial problems of the Nation's Capital. I was amazed to learn, for instance, that the tax burden borne by the people within the Nation's Capital is not fair—I should really say it is small compared to the tax burden that we bear in other parts of the country. I might well say that this is sort of a taxpayers' heaven compared to the rest of the country.

I am glad to observe that the citizens of the District of Columbia realize this is true and are willing to assume a more fair share of the tax burden.

Let me use a few illustrations to show what I mean.

The tax on a package of cigarettes in the District of Columbia is only 2 cents a package. Across the line, in the State of Maryland, the tax on a similar package of cigarettes is 6 cents. How can we justify a 2-cent tax, a small tax, in the District of Columbia, which needs revenue, as compared to the tax in the State of Maryland of 6 cents?

Let us consider the matter of gasoline. The District of Columbia tax on a gallon of gasoline is 6 cents. Across the line in Maryland it is 7 cents. Across the line in Virginia it is 7 cents. How can we justify such a low tax in the District of Columbia, when there is a higher tax in areas surrounding the District? In my own State, incidentally, the tax is also 7 cents a gallon.

Let us consider the matter of beer. The tax on a barrel of beer, across the line in the State of Virginia, is either $7 or $7.50 a barrel. The tax on a similar

barrel of beer in the District of Columbia is only $1.50.

Let us consider the matter of real estate taxes. I own a home here in the District of Columbia, for which I paid $43,500, and it is only five blocks from the Capitol. The taxes on that piece of property are $530. I also own a home in my hometown in Wisconsin for which the market value is $26,000. I pay $870 in property taxes on that home, or almost twice as much.

That gives an idea of the fact that the residents of the District of Columbia are not bearing their fair share of the burden of the tax load.

I have introduced today a bill to raise the real estate taxes by 40 cents per hundred; to raise the individual income taxes, which are "out of this world" compared to income taxes in many States and many localities; to increase the cigarette tax by 1 cent per pack; and to increase the beer tax to $3.50 a barrel, which will still be $4 less than in the State of Virginia.

If we pass this tax bill which I have introduced and give the city the $50 million which is already authorized by law as a Federal payment, then for the first time in the 23 years I have been in Congress the District of Columbia finally will have enough revenue to do the job which needs to be done.

I hope that the Members of Congress will take a look at this bill and examine the tax structure and support my proposal.

President Johnson's Policies in Vietnam Have the Support of the American Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has made it clear to the world that we will not be defeated in Vietnam but that we are willing to enter into discussion with our enemies in southeast Asia if they will do so in good faith. He has shown that we are ready to defend the freedom of Vietnam and we will take whatever steps are necessary to do so.

In this determination, our President has the support and backing of the American people. An editorial in the Beaumont Journal, an outstanding newspaper published in southeast Texas, expresses this support. The editorial which was printed April 26, 1965, follows:

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Journal, Apr. 26, 1965]

IT'S UP TO THEM

Communist China's rejection of a British proposal to reconsider its refusal to allow Patrick Gordon Walker, former British foreign secretary, to visit Peiping for talks on Vietnam is not surprising. Red Chinese leaders had rather fight than talk, probably because they know they couldn't find words to justify their actions in southeast Asia.

But they waste a lot of words in refusing entry to Walker, touring southeast Asia as a special envoy on the Vietnam problem for Prime Minister Harold Wilson. Here's what they say in Hsinhua, the official Chinese press agency, about Britain's attitude on Vietnam and Walker's proposed visit:

"It [the British attitude] inflates the arrogance of the U.S. aggressors." For that reason, the agency explains, the request to allow Walker to visit Peiping "cannot be given consideration."

The refusal dashes the faint hope that if the Chinese were ready to consider President Johnson's offer of unconditional discussions, the presence of Walker would give them a good opportunity to pass the word to the waiting world.

What the Communist Chinese leaders fail to see, or refuse to consider, is the President's determination to hold our ground in South Vietnam. Yet, in a recent ringing speech that echoed around the world, the President made it clear to everyone that "we will not be defeated."

The fact is that the United States is prepared to pursue either of two courses: To step up the shooting in Vietnam or stop it completely. We will escalate the war if the Communists continue their aggression. We will stop the shooting if they show a willingness to talk peace in good faith and on sensible and acceptable terms.

The choice is theirs, not ours. It is up to them to decide whether to widen the war or narrow it; whether to fire the guns or silence them.

The Dominican Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, few Americans want to commit our boys to fight on foreign lands. But in many cases this action is a necessity. When such necessities arise, every American wants his President to act decisively.

I am proud that President Johnson had not flinched, but has exerted powerful and positive leadership. This was never more true than when the President's mettle was tested in the Dominican Republic.

The necessity for American intervention was evident. The actions of President Johnson were truly those of a great statesman, and a great leader.

President Johnson made it clear about our purposes in sending marines into the Dominican Republic. America supports neither side in the Dominican dispute, only the side of freedom and democracy. We support self-determination without the subversive influence of international communism.

I am proud of the decisiveness which President Johnson displayed and I am sure his actions paved the way for progress and peace in that small but important nation.

At this time, with permission, I include in the RECORD, two editorials which comment on America's actions in the Dominican crisis. They are the April 29 editorial from the Chicago American, and the May 6 editorial from the Omaha World-Herald.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American, Apr. 29, 1965]

THE DOMINICAN REVOLT

President Johnson displayed good sense and firmness in ordering a Navy task force and 400 Marines to the Dominican Republic to protect and evacuate Americans. Not only were more than 1,000 U.S. nationals rescued, but the presence of the fleet, including the carrier *Boxer*, undoubtedly helped to stabilize the confused Dominican situation.

In the past, a similar demonstration by American ships helped to quell another Dominican revolt, that time against the junta which had ousted Dictator Rafael Trujillo. Whatever may be the criticism of our foreign policy elsewhere in the world, it seems we do know how to deal with the Dominican situations.

The present uprising demonstrates that the Dominican Republic has not quite come of age politically. But there are signs that this land, the cradle of Spanish civilization in the New World, may yet attain the stability that Venezuela, for example, has been demonstrating in recent years. Caracas, too, has had some recent violence, but on the whole, there has been a continuum of government that in Latin America amounts to stability.

The latest assault on the Dominican Government seems to have occurred because the army commanders were dissatisfied with the economy edicts of the junta leader, Donald Reid-Cabral, who represents the ruling families of the island. They were opposed by the air force commander, Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin. General Wessin led the coup that ousted Dr. Juan Bosch September 25, 1963, making way for President Reid. The navy also supported the government.

President Bosch had been accused of procommunism, although his closest friends are such stanch anti-Communists as ex-Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín, of Puerto Rico, and ex-President Romulo Betancourt, of Venezuela. In the present uprising, in any event, three Communist parties in the Dominican Republic joined the army leaders in favoring the recall of Dr. Bosch.

Under the circumstances, the United States was forced to favor pro tempore President Reid, who was persona non grata with the United States immediately after the ouster of Dr. Bosch. Reid has been proving since that he wants to restore the economy of the Dominican Republic, and that he ultimately favors popular elections.

Also, he definitely will not let Fidel Castro's Communists get a foothold in the Republic. Reid at the moment is not in the new junta but he doubtless will be shortly.

The Communists, for their part, couldn't care less who was causing the upheaval. They supported Dr. Bosch as they support anyone who will destroy the existing order to make way for instability and ultimate communism. The prompt American action, and the support of the Government by the Dominican Air Force and Navy, may have given the ruling junta another chance to work for progress and peace.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald, May 6, 1965]

A VICTORY FOR AMERICA

This has been a week of soul sereaching in America.

Columnists, commentators, editors, and barroom experts (the latter sometimes more realistic than their more learned brethren) have been examining and weighing Lyndon Johnson's blunt and brave words of last Sunday evening. They have been trying to determine whether this reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine in terms of the 20th century has enhanced or degraded the quality of America's leadership among the decent nations of the earth.

Naturally the conclusions vary as widely as the prejudices of those who draw them.

Some writers and speakers of a generally liberal persuasion are shocked and apprehensive.

They see the President's stand as a revival of dollar diplomacy and colonialism. They fear it will alienate the smaller nations. They sense a return of McCarthyism. They are convinced that Communist hands played no important part in the Dominican rebellion, but that, rather, this was a classical case of the downtrodden rising up against their oppressors.

Those who support the President, and happily (in our view) they are in a majority, see the Dominican affairs as a continuation of the Communist attempt to take over the unstable nations of Latin America.

These Americans hold that the evidence of Communist plotting in the island—not only the evidence supplied by Government sources, but also that which has come from experienced reporters—is overwhelming. They are convinced that if the United States had not taken a stand, promptly and vigorously, the Dominican Republic soon would have gone the way of Cuba, and the Communist takeover of tottering regimes in the Caribbean and Central and South America would have taken a tremendous stride forward.

This newspaper has no more knowledge of the events that took place in the Dominican Republic than our readers have had access to.

We could not prove that Juan Bosch or any of the other revolutionary leaders were Communist stooges.

But over the years we have seen an almost uninterrupted succession of Communist victories in diplomatic and military affairs.

We have seen the Baltic States and Middle Europe taken over by the Soviets.

We have seen China seized by "agrarian reformers" who turned out to be violent Communists.

We have seen Cuba occupied by the Communists.

We have seen Communist spies infiltrate the State Department in Washington, we have seen them steal out atomic secrets and deliver them to Moscow.

And through these American defeats, and many more, we have heard from our homebred ultraliberals the endless refrain: Old Joe is a good fellow; Mao is just a reformer; Castro is a man of the people; Alger Hiss was a tragic victim of McCarthyism. And so on and on, ad infinitum.

Now in the Dominican Republic, as well as Vietnam, is heard the same sobbing admonition: We Americans must back down. Revolution, whether Communist or otherwise, must be given a free hand to burn and murder and seize the reins of power.

Quietly but very firmly, Lyndon Johnson said America would not permit such suicidal nonsense.

Instead of calling a committee meeting and consulting interminably with the emerging and the uncommitted, he sent the Marines.

If he stands firm, if he continues resolutely to protect America's interests as he said on Sunday night he would do, we think the Dominician rebellion is already over, and has ended in victory for America.

And for that we say Hallelujah!

Some American liberals will quiver and quaver. Propagandists in the United Nations will thunder and threaten.

But responsible people the world over admire to see a powerful man take a strong position in defense of his own just interests. And as we see it, that is precisely the position Lyndon Johnson has taken on behalf of this Republic.

A Tired American Gets Angry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a vivid, expressive writer, Minnesota's own Al McIntosh, editor of the Rock County Star-Herald, Luverne, Minn., takes a backseat to none. We are pleased to include in today's RECORD one of Mr. McIntosh's latest editorials which, obviously, speaks for many of us in our country today:

A TIRED AMERICAN GETS ANGRY

I am a tired American.

I'm tired of being called the ugly American.

I'm tired of having the world panhandlers use my country as a whipping boy 365 days a year.

I am a tired American—weary of having American embassies and information centers stoned, burned, and sacked by mobs operating under orders from dictators who preach peace and breed conflict.

I am a tired American—weary of being lectured by General DeGaulle (who never won a battle) who poses as a second Jehovah in righteousness and wisdom.

I am a tired American—weary of Nasser and all the other blood sucking leeches who bleed Uncle Sam white and who kick him on the shins and yank his beard if the cash flow falters.

I am a tired American—choked up to here on this business of trying to intimidate our Government by placard, picket line, and sit in by the hordes of the dirty unwashed who rush to man the barricades against the forces of law, order, and decency.

I am a tired American—weary of the beatniks who say they should have the right to determine what laws of the land they are willing to obey.

I am a tired American—fed up with the mobs of scabby faced, long-haired youths and short-haired girls who claim they represent the "new wave" of America and who sneer at the old-fashioned virtues of honesty, integrity, morality on which America grew to greatness.

I am a tired American—weary unto death of having my tax dollars go to dictators who play both sides against the middle with threats of what will happen if we cut off the golden stream of dollars.

I am a tired American—nauseated by the lazy-do-nothings who wouldn't take a job if you drove them to and from work in a Rolls Royce.

I am a tired American—who is tired of supporting families who haven't known any other source of income other than Government relief checks for three generations.

I am a tired American—who is getting madder by the minute at the filth peddlers who have launched America in an obscenity race—who try to foist on us the belief that filth is an integral part of culture—in the arts, the movies, literature, the stage, and the mobs who see Lenny Bruce as brightly amusing and Norman Mailer as compelling.

I'm tired of these artists who scavenge in the cesspools for inspiration and who refuse to look up at the stars.

I am a tired American—weary of the bearded bums who tramp the picket lines—and the sit-ins—who prefer Chinese communism to capitalism—who see no evil in Castro but sneer at President Johnson as a threat to peace.

I am a tired American—who has lost all patience with that civil rights group which is showing propaganda movies on college campuses from coast to coast. Movies denouncing the United States. Movies made in Communist China.

I am a tired American—who is angered by the self-righteous breastbeater critics of America, at home and abroad, who set impossible yardsticks for the United States but never apply the same standards to the French, the British, the Russians, the Chinese.

I am a tired American—who resents the pimply faced beatniks who try to represent Americans as the "bad guys on the black horses."

I am a tired American who is weary of some Negro leaders who, for shock purposes, scream four-letter words in church meetings.

I am a tired American—sickened by the slack-jawed bigots who wrap themselves in bedsheets in the dead of night and roam the countryside looking for innocent victims.

I am a tired American who dislikes clergymen who have made a career out of integration causes yet send their own children to private schools.

I am a tired American who resents those who try to peddle the belief in schools and colleges that capitalism is a dirty word and that free enterprise and privtae initiative are only synonyms for greed.

They say they hate capitalism but they are always right at the head of the line demanding their share of the American way of life.

I am a tired American who get more than a little bit weary of the claque in our State Department who choose to regard a policy of timidity as prudent—the same group who subscribe to a "no win" policy in Vietnam.

I am a tired American—real tired of those who are trying to sell me the belief that America is not the greatest nation in all the world—a generous hearted nation—a nation dedicated to the policy of trying to help the "have nots" achieve some of the good things that our system of free enterprise brought about.

I am an American who gets a lump in his throat when he hears the "Star Spangled Banner" and who holds back tears when he hears those chilling high notes of the brassy trumpets when Old Glory reaches the top of the flag pole.

I am a tired American—who wants to start snapping at those phoney "high priests" who want us to bow down and worship their false idols and who seek to destroy the belief that America is the land of the free and the home of the brave.

I am a tired American who thanks a merciful Lord that he was so lucky to be born an American citizen—a nation, under God, with truly mercy and justice for all.

Amazing Boy, Amazing Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Kansans are proud of the outstanding achievement recorded on Saturday, May 15, 1965, by Mr. Jim Ryun, a senior at Wichita East High School. Jim became the

first high school track athlete in the Nation to crack the 4-minute mark in the mile run in strictly high school competition. He established a national high school record of 3 minutes 58.3 seconds in the mile run during the 1965 Kansas State High School Track Meet held at Wichita State University.

We place great emphasis today upon physical fitness for all Americans. Jim Ryun's accomplishments in track exemplify the results of personal sacrifice, training, and good coaching. His achievements are a source of pride and honor for his school, the city of Wichita, Kans., and our Nation.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wichita Eagle:

AMAZING BOY, AMAZING RACE

Wichita's Jim Ryun is an amazing boy, who ran an amazing race here Saturday, breaking all high school records for the mile with his time, 3 minutes, 58.3 seconds.

Ryun, with his usual modesty, turned the spotlight right back on his teammates and coaches, praising them for their part in helping him set the record.

It does take teamwork to accomplish great things, and it takes nothing away from Ryun's feat to agree with him that he owes much to others. It took great coaching to help him get where he is. Former Wichitan Bob Timmons, who as east high coach was the first to notice Ryun's ability, particularly deserves credit for his patient and intelligent coaching of this great young runner. It's good that KU has won Timmons back as head track coach, and that Ryun will be running for KU next year. The whole State is proud of this boy, and happy that he will continue to run under Kansas colors.

Despite the help, however, Ryun of course owes most to himself. Others could coach and inspire, but nobody could give him the great courage and tenacity to keep working hour after grinding hour to turn himself from a good runner to the best. Nobody else could make him continue simultaneously to work hard to do well in his studies, either. Nor could anyone but himself make him continue to be modest and high-principled in the heady atmosphere of fame.

Kansas is accustomed to turning out great runners. But as the famed Glenn Cunningham said last year, Ryun is potentially the greatest of them all.

We're very proud of him.

The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the race for supremacy of the world has boiled down to the race for supremacy over men's minds.

This is reflected in the classrooms of nations all over the world, and particularly in the classrooms of the Soviet Union. Mr. William Benton's article, "A Personal Report: The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," reflects this thinking on the part of the Soviets as well as anything which I have read on the subject.

The use of television by the masters of Russia gives a good idea of their manner of thinking in the area of education. Mr. Benton explains this in chapter VI of his article.

Chapter VI follows:

CHAPTER VI: THE T IN SOVIET TV MEANS TEACH

(A personal report: "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," by William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Senator from Connecticut; presently U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its executive board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica.)

CHAPTER VI. THE T IN SOVIET TV MEANS TEACH

To Moscow's television chiefs, Minister Yelutin, as chief of higher education, is a close, welcome, and respected collaborator. That is because in the Soviet view the prime purpose of television is not to entertain but to enlighten. This, of course, means primarily Communist propaganda. But it also means culture and education. And Minister Yelutin stands for higher education.

Responsibility for all broadcasting in the U.S.S.R. is placed on the State Committee for Radio and Television. This functions as a ministry. At the time of my visit the chairman of that committee was Mikhail Kharlamov, a handsome and self-assured younger man who had served as Chairman Khrushchev's press officer at the Vienna summit conference, when Khrushchev talked with President John F. Kennedy.

Kharlamov was removed from his chairmanship when Khrushchev was ousted in October 1964. Alexei Adzhubei Khrushchev's son-in-law, was removed as editor of Izvestia at the same time. One may assume perhaps that both were removed partly because they were personally so close to Khrushchev, but partly because the Communist Party and the Soviet Government have always been so acutely sensitive about the control of communications. The new Government wanted its own men in the key posts.

However, the views Kharlamov expressed to me seem so thoroughly representative of the Soviet social process, and so likely to carry over into any new TV regime—and thus to remain valid—that I shall not hesitate to quote them here as representative of Soviet policy and goals.

Kharlamov was wholly confident about the forthcoming rapid development of Soviet educational television. He was almost exuberant about it, and his enthusiasm was contagious. He was convinced that most people underestimate the potential of television for education, and I agree.

"The U.S.S.R.'s forthcoming development of educational TV is the most important venture in the history of television," he declared with absolute assurance.

A joint council for educational television, with representatives from the broadcasting ministry and from the major fields of education, is being established. The council will work with a group called the Television Authority in developing and directing educational programs. Many top educators are to be inducted as consultants. Kharlamov seemed regretful that "the educators don't want to take the authority and the responsibility; it's easier for them to sit around and criticize!" He thus proposed to draft them. He proposed to use them to help him learn better how to use TV to speed up the learning process. Why should students, he asked, spend 10 years in the schools when much less time is needed? TV is part of the answer to the speeding up of education.

"Students now get so much redundant knowledge in the classroom," Kharlamov said. "Why study the history of mankind from Adam and Eve to the present? I don't object to students knowing history, but can't they learn it outside of school? Further, why shouldn't we introduce all kinds of teaching machines (e.g., programed learning) to help them instruct themselves? These new teaching methods will free a great deal of time for students. The teaching machines make it much easier for the students to cover all of mathematics through algebra, geometry, and calculus. Of course, some of these new techniques are experimental. We shall have to await the results of the experimentation. But we want to use not only TV but all modern techniques."

Charles Benton, Milan Herzog, and Ralph Buchsbaum, who followed up my Moscow visit in September, spoke with another key figure in Soviet television, Vyacheslav Chernishov, minister of television for the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. He described to them—as Kharlamov had described to me—the plan for increasing Moscow's present two TV channels to five or six. But whereas I was told that one of the new channels was to be reserved exclusively for educational TV, they were advised that present planning called for the programing of educational material on all channels "interchangeably, so that there will be 24-hour educational television." I suspect both things are planned.

Said Minister Chernishov: "The aim of Soviet television is not to entertain but to elevate." At the present time the TV schedule is so laid out that the very early hours of the morning are devoted to preschool children's programs, with puppets, cartoons, fairy tales, etc. Then come the elementary school programs, and these usually consist of films, with actors, addressed to the 7-to-9-year-old audience. These programs are designed to sharpen the child's ability for observation and perception. They are planned not for the classroom but for the home, and the hours are so set that the children will be at home and able to see them. The current philosophy in television programing for youngsters professes that children get enough curriculum activity in school, and therefore can afford to see at home a broadening rather than a teaching program. A program later in the day called "Outside the School Books"—aimed at the equivalent of our junior and senior high school students—consists of features designed to broaden knowledge. There are contests in geometry, chemistry, physics, etc. The programs have a game spirit—but with the purpose of enlightenment.

Many programs are aimed at the 30- to 40-year age group, especially persons who have not finished high school and are trying to complete their education with the help of television and correspondence ccurses. Special programs are also offered for professionals in various lines of national life; a program period may be directed on one day to the medical profession, the next to biologists, the next to pharmacologists, and so on.

Asked about pure entertainment, Minister Chernishov said, "We have one program called 'The Blue Light.' It is a Saturday evening spectacular and lasts several hours. These Blue Light programs have become so popular that people in the villages dress up on Saturday evening as if they were going out and go to the community television rooms to watch the programs." He made "The Blue Light" sound like an amateur hour version of the "Ed Sullivan Show."

Our Britannica Films people felt that the Moscow programers are slightly chagrined at the fact that Leningrad has moved ahead of them on educational programing; a new third channel in Leningrad, devoted entirely to education, opened in the autumn of 1964. This channel is integrated entirely with the curriculums of the higher educational institutions. It went on the air for the first time with courses in higher mathematics,

descriptive geometry, chemistry, physics, and theoretical mechanics. The programers are especially interested in assisting mature students who are taking correspondence courses.

Pavel Yershov of the Broadcasting Ministry stressed that Soviet educational television is being developed with the full cooperation of the "intellectuals." He pointed out that Academician Mstislav Keldysh, president of the Academy of Sciences, was helping in every way possible. "We want to rally all the top academicians, all the intellectuals around our development of educational television—and we expect to be successful in doing this." Yershov doesn't think a draft will be necessary. Kharlamov observed, "We are in a better position than the United States for the development of educational television. It isn't merely that the public supports us. So do our educators and scholars. So does our government."

Soviet TV planners have, of course, a variety of problems, not the least being the vastness of the Soviet Union and the diversity of its people. "We have seven time belts," I was told. "When the eastern part of the Soviet Union starts to work, Moscow is going to bed. Our broadcasting is further complicated by 70 different languages, and we must have programs in the language of each region. Then there is the need to take into account the deeply entrenched local peculiarities."

(Minister Yelutin once gave me a similar glimpse of the far-flung and diversified Soviet domain when he spoke of establishing a new university in Irkutsk: "Here is a place where the ground is frozen solid, even in summer, 2 meters below the surface. At this level, the earth never melts. Before the Revolution, the people used no alphabet. Now it is a booming industrial center. Still the people in Irkutsk have no idea how the people in Moscow can live without raw meat and raw fish * * *.")

Yelutin and the Broadcasting Ministry plan to reach and teach all the Soviet peoples and at all ages. They talk of using four sputniks as television relay stations, but the Government is prepared to hook up stations throughout the Soviet Union by cables if this method proves more practical. Interesting to us in the United States is that the first use of the channel to be devoted exclusively to educational TV is not to be at the elementary or secondary level, as we conceive our limited classroom broadcasts in the United States, but is to be, as in Leningrad, for the instruction of correspondence students at the level of professional and higher education. Yelutin spoke of these students as "good, hardworking people, people who want to learn and are willing to spend their leisure time to learn, and we should try to help them first." Educational television programing geared to the needs of these correspondence students was to be begun in the fall of 1964. This promises to be education at a much more formal and higher level than almost all educational TV in the United States.

There has been evidence of concern in the Soviet press over the caliber of part-time higher education, and particularly the correspondence training which makes up the bulk of it. The substantial number of dropouts each year—the weakness of graduating students in the theory of their specialties—and the fact that experienced teachers seek to avoid work with correspondence students—these are some of the problems. Educational TV is to be one answer.

"Until we have our national educational networks," Yelutin said, "we shall make tapes of these TV programs and send them all over the country for local stations to use. It's no problem to get the programs on the air because the state owns all the television stations. I'll get a governmental order to finance the development of the programs and also the films—and another order to make sure the stations use them."

That is indeed, one sure way of doing it. The United States is thus to be faced not only with the cold war of the classrooms but with the cold war of classroom TV.

When I visited Moscow in 1962 I heard about the "great new Moscow television center" to be finished in 1965 or 1966. There were then 116 television stations in the Soviet Union, but I was assured there would be many more in 1965.

In May 1964 I asked how these plans were progressing. I was told that the Building Ministry had guaranteed that the new center would be ready for occupancy in January 1967, but that they were moving rapidly toward an earlier completion date—"they are overfulfilling their plan."

When the new Moscow center is completed, the present center—with new equipment—will be used for educational television exclusively. Two types of programs will then be produced in addition to the one for correspondence students enrolled in higher education. One of these will be for enrolled students at the high school level, and the second for adults not formally enrolled at any institution. "Won't you come back in 6 months and let me show you our progress?" Kharlamov asked me.

"Then come back again in a few years," he insisted, "and we shall have even more to show. Then, we can exchange films with you. The logical start in the exchange of classroom films is with Britannica Films in the natural sciences—in chemistry, biology, mathematics, cybernetics. Developing TV for the teaching of the natural sciences is uppermost in the minds of the leaders of the Academy of Sciences."

This was his vision as he saw it marching into reality within the immediate future. Later, he added, "You must understand that our documentary films are not limited to use on television or in classrooms. They aren't produced exclusively to meet TV or classroom standards. There are still vast areas in the U.S.S.R. where there is no television. We need the films for many usages. Thus they can't be compared with your films developed solely for the classroom."

There are, indeed, vast areas for contrast and speculation. I suspect that the reach of the young men in charge of Soviet radio and television must exceed their grasp, at least for many years. The 1963 Yearbook of the Great Soviet Encyclodaedia reports there were 74.3 million radio receiving sets in use in the Soviet Union at the end of 1962. (But in an article in Pravda in May 1963, Kharlamov stated that 33 million of these receiving sets were loudspeakers; e.g., nontunable sets fed by central receivers). From 1958 to 1963, Soviet statistics show that the production of television sets increased at an average annual rate of about 20 percent. In May 1963 Izvestia reported the radio audience in the Soviet Union was 150 million and the television audience 40 million. (The nation's population is 223 million.) Many of the radio and television sets are in clubs, "houses of culture," and in public areas where each set may have a large number of listeners and viewers.

The hope was expressed to me that there would be 40 million television sets in use in the Soviet Union by 1970, as many receivers as there now are viewers.

In the United States by contrast television has the potential of virtually full coverage of the entire population. The Census Bureau reported in May 1964 that 87.3 percent of the families in the United States have at least one television set. Thus the Soviet Union is far behind the United States in both the production and use of television sets. But the more important factor as we look ahead is the programing—how television is to be used. In the Soviet Union, because the state so plans it, TV is to be used for education as well as for culture and propaganda, with unparalleled potential effects. The entertainment will merely be part of the bait.

Before I left Kharlamov's office, he gravely presented me with the first of two issues of a new publication developed by his radio section. This was called Sound magazine. It is a small magazine of text and records, so bound that the records can be played without being detached. He said it was planned to publish similar magazines supplemented by tapes, to teach languages. He spoke also of Sound becoming a "register book of history"—an easy way to present and circulate the voices of political leaders. The first issue had a picture of Chairman Khrushchev on the cover; it contained one of his speeches on a record. Will Brezhnev's be on the next? Will Kharlamov be back? It makes little difference. His ideas, I believe, will be carried on. I even believe they will penetrate the United States. We cannot remain largely impervious to the great potential of TV in the field of education. This should become the more obvious to us when the U.S.S.R. begins to use its power to demonstrate this potential to the world. Incidentally, the Japanese are already demonstrating this potential, both to the United States and the U.S.S.R., and the Soviets are studying the Japanese techniques and are seeking to apply them—while we are not.

Capitol Hill Inactive on Safety Issues—Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of this body an item which appeared recently in Aviation Daily concerning air safety. Our distinguished colleague, the Honorable HENRY GONZALEZ, of Texas, has been a champion of increased air traffic safety procedures and has been recognized for his commendable efforts to point up the dangerous state of affairs in this area of air traffic safety:

CAPITOL HILL INACTIVE ON AIR SAFETY ISSUE—ANALYSIS

What has happened to the concern about air safety on Capitol Hill?

Within the past month the CAB has released a letter which, in effect, said the FAA traffic control procedures may have been a contributing factor in the Eastern Air Lines crash in February off New York. The Board's Bureau of Safety indicated that it would like FAA to change some of these procedures.

FAA, as it has the legal right to do, rejected the Board's recommendations and said it wasn't going to change anything in its ATC procedures. And so the issue presumably dies. Within a few days of its preliminary findings in the New York crash, the Board again criticized ATC procedures of the FAA, this time citing a near miss near Springfield, Va. No comment from the FAA.

Despite this conflict over facts, not one Congressman or Senator, with the exception of Representative HENRY GONZALEZ, Democrat, of Texas, has taken the floor to express concern over what appears to be a dangerous state of affairs. GONZALEZ, not being a member of the proper committee, could not call any air safety investigation by the House

Commerce Committee. In the Senate, there was only silence.

There have not been any safety hearings worthy of the name in almost 3 years on either side of the Congress. In years gone by, a statement such as that issued by the CAB would have triggered instant hearings in both the House and Senate with a race to see who could be first.

Perhaps it is as outgoing Chairman Alan Boyd told the Senate Appropriations Committee yesterday when questioned on the Board's relationship with the FAA on accident investigations, "We're sweethearts," he said.

Camphill Village, U.S.A., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, thoughtful Americans have been encouraged recently by the new emphasis which has been placed both by private groups and Government on research to attack the causes of mental retardation. Each year this scourge denies us the contribution to our national life which otherwise would be made during their lifetime by tens of thousands of infants who are born mentally retarded. The President's panel on mental retardation states that approximately 126,000 are born each year mentally retarded.

It is to be hoped that the $241 million Federal investment—fiscal 1965—which is now being made in the concerted effort to reduce retardation will in the years ahead obviate the necessity for major attention to the care of the retarded. Unfortunately, as in the case of so many causes of disease and death, the dividends of research are not immediate. In the case of retardation, we are left in the interim with a national responsibility to assist in the effort to make more meaningful, useful, and bearable the lives of those for whom present day research is too late.

I have been encouraged and inspired recently not only by the final realization of the importance of research in this field but by the wise and enlightened direction taken by some of the organizations giving their attention to the care of the retarded and particularly to those which seek to meet the challenge presented by the plight of young adult retardates whose problems often become even more overwhelming to the families involved than those of young children.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to share with my colleagues information which has just reached me in the first annual report of an organization known as Camphill Village, U.S.A., Inc. This organization, which is affiliated with Camphill Village Trust, Ltd., of London, has established and maintains a remarkable working community for mentally handicapped young adults at Copake, N.Y.

The movement to which we are indebted for this unique village was founded in 1939 in Aberdeen, Scotland, by Dr. Karl Koenig of Vienna, a follower of the gerat Austrian thinker, Dr. Rudolf Steiner, with the establishment of a small residential nonprofit school based on the belief that the retarded person is an individual with equal needs for his body and spirit. From this beginning other schools were founded. In England, Northern Ireland, South Africa, West Germany, and Holland, the volunteer, or coworkers, as they are called, receive no salary. When the children of the Camphill schools became young adults, the problem of what to do with their newly developed potentialities prompted the establishment of the first Camphill Village in Yorkshire, England, and others followed in Scotland, Northern Ireland, South Africa, and Switzerland.

In 1961, Carlo Pietzner, one of the founders of the movement and a friend of Dr. Koenig, came to the United States, taking over a small school for retarded children in Pennsylvania. Today, two schools in Pennsylvania offer a full program designed to develop latent abilities, play therapy, schoolwork, individual instruction, and the sharing of household chores. I am happy to note that the movement has firmly established its first village in this country under Mr. Pietzner's very able direction, dedicated to helping the retarded young adult who could never do so on his own, integrate himself socially and economically through life in the village by participating in every facet of its life, contributing to its welfare with his own labor and spirit, according to his individual capability.

I am encouraged that this small village, which it is hoped will grow through the support of private and Government organizations and individuals, today is contributing to its own expenses through the sale of the products of its workshops and its bakery. New York's foremost toy shop, F. A. O. Schwartz, now sells the product of the village's doll workshop.

The movement's supporting organization, Friends of the Camphill Movement, now have chapters in New York, New Jersey, District of Columbia, and Massachusetts. It is seeking support to expand the village to accommodate additional retardates from a steadily growing waiting list, and hopefully to establish similar Camphill Villages elsewhere in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the objectives and the work of this organization to my colleagues and to wish it well as it continues its pioneering effort in this country.

The New Atlantic-Pacific Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's New York Journal-American carried an interesting editorial discussing President Johnson's plan to appoint a blue-ribbon committee to study possible sites for a new Atlantic-Pacific sea level canal, to be headed by former Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson.

I commend it to our colleagues and insert the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE NEW CANAL

President Johnson's plan to appoint a committee to study possible sites for an Atlantic-Pacific sea level canal and to recommend a route is an important step toward activating a major national need for which the Hearst newspapers long have pressed.

The committee will be headed by Robert B. Anderson, former Secretary of the Treasury. It will include Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Johns Hopkins University; Kenneth E. Fields, former General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission; Raymond A. Hill, consulting engineer, and Robert G. Storey, president of the Southwest Legal Foundation.

The successful AEC-supervised underground "plowshare" explosions in Nevada and New Mexico point to this method, effecting savings in time and cost, for the excavation work for the new passage. Sites in Panama, Colombia, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica have their proponents. Fortunately, the committee will be constituted of members qualified to make recommendations.

The dedication day is a far distance ahead. But real action is in sight.

Our Good Asian Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, this week we were honored to have as a guest in our Nation's Capital the distinguished President of the Republic of Korea, Chung Hee Park, and his charming wife.

Their 2-day state visit here was a fruitful one which strengthened the ties between South Korea and the United States. It provided an opportunity for mutual exchanges of confidence and respect between our two countries.

President Park's visit was widely reported in our Nation's press. Among the editorials which it occasioned was one in the Milwaukee Journal entitled "Our Good Asian Ally."

It pointed out that the reception accorded to President Park was in recognition that South Korea is one of America's stanchest allies in the Far East.

In order to bring the editorial views of the Journal on President Park's visit to the attention of my colleagues, I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

OUR GOOD ASIAN ALLY

When President Johnson rolled out the red carpet Monday for President Chung Hee Park of South Korea, it was in recognition of one of America's stanchest allies in the Far East.

Park appears at this time to be in a stronger leadership position than at any time since his narrow election victory in October 1963. This is despite the fact that he is plagued by continuing economic problems and student demonstrations against his intention to normalize relations with Japan, which occupied Korea from 1910 to 1945.

Industrial production has increased considerably since last year (up 14.5 percent in January over 1964) and Park sees Korea as "just one step" from economic self-sufficiency. He predicts that by 1967 the country will produce enough grain to feed its people. Resumption of ties with Japan is expected further to improve the economic picture by providing new capital investment and new markets.

United States economic assistance has been running slightly more than $200 million a year. Park is expected in his talks with Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk, and other officials in Washington to urge continuation of aid at the present level. But he his said also to be agreeable to shifting part of the program from grants to long-term loans. In addition to the economic aid, direct American military aid to Korea last year amounted to $140 million, and the presence of approximately 40,000 American troops in the United Nations Command serves as a major boost to the economy.

Other subjects expected to be on Park's agenda are continued military aid, the possibility of a status-of-forces agreement giving Korea the right to try American soldiers for civilian crimes, and the whole question of collective security in Asia.

In view of Korea's demonstrated loyalties, including its 2,000-man army engineers detachment serving in South Vietnam, Johnson is certain to assure Park of continued support. South Korea, where there has been no serious anti-American demonstration since diplomatic relations were established in 1882, well deserves such assurances.

Logic and Emotion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following two articles from the New York Journal American of May 13, 1965.

The first of these analyzes the unfair criticism of our President's foreign policy and the second gives us the reactions of one of those who had to fight to carry out that policy.

The articles follow:

WATCH ON THE POTOMAC: THEY'RE PREJUDGING L.B.J.

(By Robert G. Spivack)

President Johnson, who is a practical man, has understood all along that if his policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic worked, they will be considered good and statesmanlike. But if they didn't work—oh, brother.

When you're President you don't get an "E" for effort; the only marks are "A" or "F." In the final analysis he alone has to make the big decisions, without the benefit of advice from his critics.

As a practical man the President knows that the big risks are in the area of foreign policy. In this delicate area, while nothing may succeed like success, it is equally true that nothing fails like failure, only more so.

President Johnson, however, finds himself in an unusual position. It is not, as his friends feel, that he gets less credit from Washington commentators than any President in recent history, even when things go well. Nor is it simply a clash of egos between certain peacocks in the press and the strong-willed man in the White House.

Johnson finds himself being prejudged in foreign policy just as he was misjudged in domestic policy.

As an example, the usually calm and reflective New Republic has an ill-tempered front-page editorial which declares about L.B.J.'s foreign policy that, "On the results to date, he just misses flunking."

Earlier Herbert L. Matthews, writing in the New York Times, came up with a series of historical analogies between our present policy in the Caribbean and the American role at the time of Teddy Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson.

In the case of the New Republic, it seems to me, the results of L.B.J.'s policies are being announced before all the votes have been counted. Matthews' analysis suffers from one glaring deficiency: he seems totally oblivious to the role that has been played and is being played by the Stalinist-Maoist Communists. He writes as if they don't exist.

There are still too many uncertainties in both Vietnam and the Dominican Republic to offer more than a tentative assessment of the administration's results to date. But it is possible, if only as a guide for historians who will write in more detail, to note certain developments.

What is the situation in Vietnam?

Those who were genuinely worried that destroying North Vietnam's privileged sanctuaries would invite war with Red China have been proved poor students of how the Chinese would react. Galling as it must be to appear a "paper tiger" the chief of the Chinese General Staff, Gen. Lo Jui-ching, now says that China will not fight unless the United States were to attack her territory.

What's more, he writes, there will be no Chinese troops going to North Vietnam unless they are invited.

The comments of General Lo could be the first public sign that the Asian Communists are ready to sue for epace. Granted that Red China may merely want a relaxation of tensions so that 5 years from now, as a nuclear power, she can resume her aggressive posture, this still looks as if it might be the beginning of the end of the war in southeast Asia.

How are things going in the Caribbean?

There is U.S. pressure to bring about the retirement of Brig. Gen. Wessin y Wessin. This is not how the United States would act if our intentions were to install another Trujillo. Although too many critics concede neither his intelligence, nor even sincerity of purpose, it is obvious that what L.B.J. wants is a moderate, constructive, civilian democratic Dominican Republic.

It obviously won't come about overnight; you can't impose democracy from above. But eventually, if they are given any option, the Dominicans' common sense will tell them their future is with the Great Society, not Castro's Cuba.

TALK OF LOYALTY—AND OF VICTORY

(By Warren Rogers)

WASHINGTON.—Barbara Spruill is a young widow who lives in Suffern, N.Y., with her children, Mark, 8, and Elizabeth, 5, and the memory of the bright, warm, courageous young man who was her husband and their father.

James Polk Spruill (West Point, 1954) was a captain of infantry in the U.S. Army. He was born February 10, 1931, in Winston-Salem, N.C., and died April 21, 1964, near Cai Son in the Mekong River Delta, Republic of Vietnam.

Did he die in vain? Barbara Spruill doesn't think so. She keeps in touch with the tiny village of Cai Son, and is sending the people medical and school supplies. The Vietnamese don't think so. They erected a stone memorial in honor of Jim Spruill. And Jim didn't think so, either.

He left Barbara a legacy, the letters he wrote her during his 5 months in Vietnam. She has authorized the Army to publish excerpts. Since this is Armed Forces Week, I thought you might like to join me in reading some of the things Jim Spruill had to say.

On arrival in Saigon, November 9, 1963:

"My Vietnamese language works wonders here. * * * I can't get over how well I understand them."

Getting to know the Vietnamese, December 4:

"The Viets here are really friendly to me—in fact when I ride along it's like being a visiting President. The mothers bring their children to the doors and they all wave and cheer."

Why he was there, February 23:

"When they get wounded, no matter how bad it may be, you never hear so much as a whimper. The only sound comes from the man's buddy who generally bawls like a baby if the wound is serious.

"Above all, this is a war of mind and spirit. And it is a war which can be won no matter what present circumstances are.

"This cannot be done if America loses heart. At the moment my heart is big enough to sustain those around me. Please don't let them back where you are sell me down the river with talk of despair and defeat. Talk instead of steadfastness, loyalty and of victory—for we must and can win here.

"There is no backing out of Vietnam, for it (communism) will follow us everywhere we go. We have drawn the line here and the America we all know and loves best is not one to back away.

His last letter, April 19:

"Chin up. See you later."

Inauguration Speech by Dr. Clifford Lord, President, Hofstra University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include the inauguration speech of Dr. Clifford Lord, who was installed as president of Hofstra University on Long Island, N.Y., on April 28.

Dr. Lord has much to say that is well worth the saying, and I was particularly impressed by his references to the present unrest on our college and university campuses.

I agree with his analysis, and would like to share his address with my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY MR. LORD

Mr. Chairman and members of the board of trustees, Regent King, Commissioner Allen, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, learned delegates, members of the Hofstra Council, faculty, students, alumni, my friends, the problems of higher education have never seemed more numerous, complex, and varied than they are today. Newly arrived at the center of the stage, with the public regarding it as the open sesame to a great society, with government and industry looking to it both for pure and applied research and for expert counsel in every discipline and profession, with students flocking to its doors in unprecedented numbers, with special responsibilities to make come true the American dream of equal opportunity despite cultural or other deprivations, higher education is faced with monumental imperatives which

seemingly must be met within impossibly short deadlines.

It is not my purpose today to rehearse the extent or the enormity of the problems: the shortage of trained personnel, the tailoring of curriculums to the explosion of knowledge, the plethora of students (reminding one of the problems of the sorcerer's apprentice), the proper role of public versus private higher education, the need to guide into constructive channels the human energies and resources of an exploding world population and an exploding number of new nationalisms, the training—hopefully—of a new generation to cope with worldwide problems in terms of the welfare of all mankind, of the mounting pace and pressure of civilization, of the myriad other major problems to the solution of which—again hopefully—higher education can and should and is expected to contribute both directly and through the exercise of its trade. One is reminded that the difficult we do at once, the impossible takes a little longer.

Today I confine myself to one particular problem which has attracted national attention and has been the object of extensive thought, concern, and discussion among college administrators the last 6 months: the wave of unrest, disenchantment, and at times of open revolt which seems to be sweeping our campuses. A great deal of ink has been spilled on the topic since Berkeley—some of it full of insight, some of it a bit silly.

"The spring fashions on the American campus seem to be changing," Scotty Reston recently wrote. "Instead of chasing girls, the boys are now chasing college presidents." College presidents I have known seem singularly unflattered by this attention. This phenomenon has been most noticeable and most noticed in certain large—very large—institutions from the Pacific coast to Long Island. There have been attempts to attribute the difficulties to left-wing agitation. In the nearly half century since the Russian Revolution, it has become transparently clear that there will always be people with megaphones and mimeograph machines ready for leap into any situation where discord can be fomented or disunity promoted in peaceful coexistence. But such leadership can lead only where there is substantial cause, and to treat the symptom as the disease is both superficial and dangerous. Today student protest is common, student radicalism rare.

There have been attempts to dismiss the present unrest as the latest manifestation of energies expended in an earlier generation in stealing the chapel clapper, installing a cow in the belfry, or painting your college's initials on the buildings or sidewalks of the hated rival; or more recently in panty raids, overpopulating telephone booths, or carpeting the beach at Daytona calf-deep in empty beer cans. This—to draw again on the sands of Daytona—is a singularly ostrich-like approach.

There have been attempts to peg this to the latest of a long series of identifiable student generations: the "lost" generation of raccoon coats and hip flasks of the twenties; the "red and pinko" generation of activist social protest of the thirties; the mature, dead serious, hell-bent-for-leather GI's of blessed memory of the later forties and early fifties; the "beat" generation of recent years, and those who played it cool, man, cool. But today's undergraduate body is drawn too broadly from the lively American people to yield easily to such pigeonholing. Its gigantic growth in numbers requires its catholicity of sources. It is as difficult to categorize this student generation as it is to categorize the American public from which it springs and of which it is a vital part.

There have been those who note profoundly that this is a new student generation—a generation that has known neither a world war, a real depression, nor one of our periodic binges of nativism, anti-intellectualism or McCarthyism. "Never," said Newsweek recently, "have so many * * * been such complete strangers to famine, plague, want, or war. Theirs are the blessings of prosperity, theirs the spoils of peace." In a sense this is true, yet surely while this generation may not yet have suffered, it has not been unaware of a cold war which at times—in Berlin, in Guatemala, in the Suez, in the Congo, in Cuba, in Vietnam—gets very warm indeed; nor unaware, just because it has grown up under it and is resigned to it, of the possibility of atomic annihilation. Nor, surely, has it been unaware of the movements, authoritarian in character, led by the George Rockwells or the Gus Halls, which would deeply menace freedom of thought, freedom of expression, freedom of action in this country, should such fanaticism win any wide acceptance. True, this generation has grown up in a period of great and increasing prosperity, of unprecedented use of the general welfare clause, and of general public acceptance of culture as something respectable—indeed in some sets as the smart thing to pursue. This generation is part of an affluent society, the most mature society America has yet produced. The new popular status of higher education and the new public familiarity with at least some elementary aspects of culture are symbolic and symptomatic of the era. But does this make for rebellion?

It is a new generation, obviously. It has benefited from the post-Sputnik revolution in the American schools. It has had academic demands placed upon it that have produced (unevenly) performance far beyond that of its predecessors. This, in turn, has produced (again unevenly) greater sophistication and, in some aspects, greater maturity than its forerunners possessed. This generation has grown up under generally permissive parents and has therefore had a larger share in deciding its own courses of action than did its predecessors, but for every one who has put on a black leather jacket or taken to the needle, several hundred have pursued more conformist and, in the long run, more satisfying careers. What then is wrong?

There are things which disturb this generation. One of these is the perennial one: the mess the older generation has made of things, though this generation somehow seems more tolerant than most of its predecessor's foibles. Another is the denial of the American dream of equality of opportunity regardless of race or economic status—and this it is doing things—sometimes heroic things—about. A third is the omnipresence of change—major, drastic, radical change. It is everywhere: in science and society; in mobility and merchandising; in pills and promiscuity. This makes for lack of stability, for a lack of that security which once stemmed from the certain, the known, the unchallengeable. Relativity shares some of the blame. It is intriguing to some but disturbing to many that 2 plus 2 equals 4 only only under certain conditions. The slowness of morals and ethics to adjust to new circumstances; the failure of religion, based from the beginning of time on the acceptance of the incomprehensible, to capitalize on the awe-fulness of the new knowledge of the body, the mind, the world, and the worlds of worlds of worlds about us—all leave the present generation without many of the guidelines and the few "certainties" of the past. This generation has few rocks on which to build a castle.

But most of the uncertainties seem to revolve around automation, the computer, the mechanization and impersonalization of society. There is abroad a fear of a world run by machines. It is not just the disappearance of manual labor, in which strong young bodies used to revel during summer vacations. It is not just the threat of automated services, of automated transport, of automated inventory control, of data retrieval making obsolete many present forms of research, of decisionmaking by computer for not only the businessman but the diagnostician. It is the far that was parodied in a recent television show in which a worker, known only by a 10-digit number, was interviewed and counseled by an automated psychiatrist. It is the fear of what Robert Hutchins calls the day of zero employment, when all that mankind will have left to do is to study (a traumatic prospect to some undergraduates), reflect, develop cuture, and enjoy life.

There is a fear abroad of the imminent total invasion of privacy, by electronic machines already on the market, with worse to come, by wiretapping and mailtapping, by the use of disinhibiting drugs, by the new use of the social security number whereby the Government knows not only all your income but your resources—where and what they are—and thoughtful students shudder at the possible abuses.

The rise of the megalopolis, the decay of the core city, and the increase of urban crime and danger is also disturbing. We hear that New York is too big to be governed, but hear, too, that before long there will be one great continuous city from Boston to Richmond. One sees city planners with forced removals destroy a functioning neighborhood and replance it with high-rise monsters which increase the impersonalness, the mechanicalness of an area surrounded by greens and gardens—where only danger lurks by night—and one wonders. The seeming impotence of men to cope with the destructive impersonal forces at work in the big city is disturbing.

This is not the day to argue the limitations of the machine, the factors that make it certain that man will control its use and his destiny. This is not the day to argue that the first function of government of, by and for the people is to protect the rights of the individual against the tyranny and abuses of others including government itself, and that traditionally the price of freedom is eternal vibilance. This is not the day even to argue that the increased productivity of the automated world and the resultant reduction of the work week for all but the managerial and professional groups can only open wider the doors of opportunity to the humanizing study and reflection and contemplation on the nature of man and his relationship to his world, which has brought us from savagery to our present high, if spotty, state of civilization.

This is the day to point out the change is all about us, that change substitutes the different for the familiar, and that this to most people is disturbing. To the student, while he accepts change far more readily than do most adults, today's world—the world in which he will soon take his place—seems for reasons I have suggested, increasingly impersonal and mechanical. He may not worry about the specific, but he must at time wonder to what degree he will be the master of his ship, the captain of his destiny. His concern is increased by what confronts him in pursuit of an education.

He has probably heard, as I—unbelievingly—heard not too long ago from the then head of one of the major testing outfits, that in a very few years testing will be so refined that a child will have to make up his mind by age 10 what he is going to do if he is to qualify for the right schools and find the right outlets for his talents. Surely he knows that test scores and grades—mere numbers after all—presently determine his fate, what college, what graduate or professional schools he can go to, what careers are open to him. He registers for college on IBM cards. His transcript is prepared by machine. His grade scores and graduation are determined by

computer. He takes objective tests, making special marks with special pencils to help the machine grade his paper. And while he is aware that the machine will not read the question with all the nuances he does, he may not recognize that the instructor who made out the test and designated the one correct answer would probably grade his paper precisely the way that instructor told the machine to.

He is confronted in larger and larger institutions with larger and larger bureaucracies—tangible, visible evidence of the grace of Parkinson's laws. I'm not concerned today with the growing number of administrators, though proliferation in this field does seem easily overdone. I am concerned with the lower bureaucracy—the second, third, and fourth echelons, where things tend to be done by the book, where the left hand knoweth not what the right hand doeth, and both operate without imagination and without compassion. This phenomenon is known on all campuses. Locally it is known as the Hofstra runaround. But the student's suspicion that his education is thoughtless, heartless, mechanized, gets additional confirmation.

He often finds himself in big classes, taught not by great teachers but all too often by graduate assistants, novices at the art of teaching, and sometimes by machine—by programed instruction or by television in rooms remote from the actual teacher.

He "comes for the best of reasons," as a recent publication indicated. He comes with great expectations, as to a new and different and exciting world. He comes with stars in his eyes. And one of the reasons—one of the best of reasons to the best of students—is to meet with and talk with and learn from better teachers than he has ever had before. And what does he find? He finds great teachers diverted into administration, into research (for, man sagt., one must publish or perish), into government service, into consulting jobs with industry, into TV programs as a resource person, a pundit, a panelist, a lecturer, even as an MC. Famous names are often so busy off campus that, as one student put it, you have to talk to them on the way to the airport. The business of some better known professors even inclucates a feeling that some of them would like to teach as few students as possible so as to have more time for their other activities. The college psychologist at a well-known university told me about 2 years ago that at least two-thirds of the students at that college (carefully selected by test scores and other criteria) were technically "unhappy" and that over 27 percent were so "unhappy" as to require what is euphemistically known as "counseling." Their main gripes were two: they were treated like juvenile delinquents, and they never saw their professors outside of class.

Surely today on most campuses we have less and less a sense of the old collegium—the community of scholars, young and old, gathered to learn with and from each other. There have been attempts to replace it here and there from time to time, at worst by somewhat ludicrous attempts at enforced togetherness sponsored by college employees acting as 4-year cruise directors. This is reminiscent neither of Plato nor of Mark Hopkins.

Surely our present system at its worst does create a sense of grinding out the sausages, putting a 30-foot casing on the nozzle of a high-pressure squirt gun, filling the skin to the bursting point in a minimal time, tying the whole into identical segments—by machine, of course—and then shipping the product off to market untouched by human hands.

It is this, it seems to me, that underlies the mounting student protest. Behind the many varied demonstrations, over, above and beyond the traditional causes which attract student reformers, it is this that spawns student outrage today, this sense of being machine-processed, this sense of facelessness, of loss of identity, of lack of individuality. And if this be the basic cause I rejoice that revolt is come.

James Reston wrote recently of students facing "longer and longer (academic) career(s) under more and more impersonal circumstances." Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education, in a recent speech to the Association of Higher Education, feared that the undergraduate student may become the forgotten man (of higher education)." The passion for anonymity that Franklin D. Roosevelt demanded of his White House assistants is not a common virtue. The individual by definition and in fact is an individual. And he demands recognition as such. James K. Jones, senior at Southwest Missouri State, recently quoted in Newsweek, may be right in suggesting that the "impersonal approach of the large university prepares you for the way the world is," but the average undergraduate, like the average alumnus, the average parent, the average faculty member—all being human beings—needs recognition, needs identity, needs xapis (the "charity" of the New Testament), needs friendship and affection, needs someone to take an interest, someone who cares. He is obviously finding too little of this today at many of our institutions of higher learning.

Some of us are far better off than others. But none is exempt from this student criticism today. Richard Cotton, former editor of the Harvard Crimson, recently wrote, "Perhaps the faculty will consider the reforms necessary to restore Harvard as a leading educational institution, as well as a leading center of scholarship." The protest is widespread. It takes many forms. It involves some confusion: as a former student said to me recently, "We know what we are against, but we are not quite sure what we are for." A new and disturbing element has been injected by the adoption by student groups of the techniques of nonviolent civil disobedience—a revolutionary tactic which is justifiable only where revolution is justified; i.e., where the democratic processes have broken down and offer no chance for dialogue or reform. It is ironic that this antidemocratic, in a sense dictatorial, technique has been used on compuses outside the channels of student government in the name of a greater democracy.

What am I suggesting today? Nothing new, really. Simply that where the students have a grievance, a complaint or a suggestion, they are worth listening to; that they have fresh points of view, fresh questions to raise about rules and regulations and procedures and techniques handed down from the past; that they are more sophisticated and knowledeable than their predecessors; that the great bulk of them are reasonable and responsible—seniors obviously more so than freshmen; that they are worth doing something about: in fact that they have a right to the best that we can give them, in friendship, in guidance, and in good teaching.

"Great teachers," says Carter Davidson, newly installed president of the Association of American Colleges, "make great colleges." The great teacher is more than an inspiring preceptor. He is a model, an agent provocateur of ideas, a sharer of visions, a creator of insights. But he is more. He cares, he takes an interest, he is available outside the classroom for the times he is needed, for the contacts that mean so much to so many.

Teaching is an art, not a science. It is a creative art. Like painting, poetry, sculpture, writing, it depends on mood: the mood created by the teacher, the mood in which the learner learns—not just facts but understanding, new insights, new horizons, new comprehensions, new awareness. The educated man knows more than facts. He can do more than recite the kings of England from Harold to Elizabeth the Second (formidable though that feat may be). He has a well-developed intuition based on knowledge, on the ability to put disparate facts together, on sympathy, on xapis. Facts often seem mechanical, and our world today seems mechanical. Yet though we can explain the chemistry of the body to a large degree, we cannot explain the special something that makes of a body a human being, an individual, a personality. We can explain the mechanics of reproduction, but not the miracle of life, either animal or vegetable.

In teaching—and in administrating—we must keep in the forefront of our thinking and our purpose the individuals in our classes before us; the creation of the atmosphere and mood in which the sparking of intellectual fertilization or cross-fertilization can occur; the importance of the individuals, the minds, the personalities both within our classrooms and laboratories and libraries and without.

The great rewards of teaching come when a young mind suddenly starts to track, to go with you down the starlit path, one day to leap beyond you in the new maturity and through the new insights you have helped stimulate. The rewards of being read and perhaps even appreciated in a certain circumscribed critical sense by your peers is secondary. That is the fudge on the ice cream, the Hollandaise on the asparagus. The satisfactions of the classroom, the colloquium, the seminar, the office hour, the snack bar, are the real ones, the great ones, the lasting ones. That is why most of us went into teaching in the first place. That is why so very many businessmen and lawyers and doctors and salesmen and labor leaders and politicians are frustrated would-be teachers. They lack this type of satisfaction—the most rewarding in the world—in anything like the degree they know it comes to the teacher. This is the ultimate reward: the "well done" of the grateful student, saved from disaster or spurred to unexpected heights. Only the fools or the knaves among us forgo this.

Good teaching is our primary responsibility and our initial answer to student unrest on so many other campuses today. It has been a proud tradition at Hofstra College—and long recognized by poll of the outgoing seniors. It must continue so. It must be rewarded and encouraged. It has been and it will be at Hofstra University. And as we grow as a university, the number of good teachers here must grow too. Parenthetically, may I add that I hope we will never have a senior professor who will be reluctant to teach undergraduates every year. Parenthetically, may I add—as my former colleagues at Columbia's School of General Studies know—that in my opinion the best teachers should teach the introductory courses. Parenthetically, may I add that good teaching cannot long continue divorced from research.

The function of the university was well defined in 1919 by Nicholas Murray Butler in these words: "to conserve, advance and disseminate knowledge": to conserve as a reservoir of knowledge—books, pamphlets, documents, magazines, newspapers, manuscripts, archives, incunabula, works of art, recordings, films; to advance knowledge by original research and study and experimentation; to disseminate knowledge by writing and by instructing. This is an exhaustive and exhausting definition but no university can be complete without all three. It seems clear that advancement of knowledge and its dissemination in print in the past generation has gotten well ahead of the dissemination-by-teaching function. The students ask us to redress the balance.

If the effect of the current unrest is to restore the primacy of teaching in the university, if the present unpleasantness is to re-

focus our attention where it always should have been—on the importance of the individual student who entrusts himself to our tutelage, if the effect is to restore to some appreciable degree the old sense of the collegium, it will be the best thing that has happened to higher education in many moons. As the angry voices of the student protestants are raised across the land against sometimes meaningless ceremonial and ritualistic rules, against the abuse of academic beneficences, against an academic heirachy and establishment too heavily involved in worldly affairs, it is time for us, the professors, to profess anew our fealty to the primary purpose of our profession: to teach, to educate, to lead, to illuminate, to provoke, to stimulate, to urge and guide towards far horizons, toward wisdom and understanding—never in the process forgetting the open door to which Sal Luiso, in his greetings as president of the student council, earlier made appreciated reference, never forgetting to cherish and to care.

This is the end of the formal speech. Let me add a final personal word. A word of thanks first to the trustees of Hofstra for their audacity and courage in calling me to this high post; to Dr. Adams and his colleagues in faculty and administration for the remarkable head of steam they have given to this vigorous young university. And finally, to my old friends from near and far; college classmates, and fraternity brothers, the large delegation from the faculty and Council of General Studies and two former editors of the Columbia Owl, all of whom fought the good fight; my longtime colleagues of the Council of the American Association for State and Local History from Utah, Nebraska, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Tennessee, Florida, Illinois and points north and east, including all three of my presidential successors and the only past director; the president and several curators of the great State Historical Society of Wisconsin; my former colleagues on the staff of that institution now in high positions in historical society work; my fellow commissioners of the New Jersey Tercentennial Commission; my successors at both Wisconsin and Columbia; my good neighbors of New Jersey and Westchester; Dr. Krout; Bishop Cadigan; family; and members of our wedding party, for adding a very special fillip to a very important day for Betty and me.

The Businessman and the Church Facing Up to Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the threat of communism in our country and throughout the free world is one which I feel is of the most eminent danger to our society. We must, in order to fight the spread of communism, take every opportunity at our disposal to further inform our fellow man of the methods and motives of those who seek to destroy our way of life.

I commend to my colleagues the following speech by the Reverend B. G. Stillion of Phoenix, Ariz., that highlights some of these methods and motives:

THE BUSINESSMAN AND THE CHURCH FACING UP TO REALITY

Let us first take a look at the Communist approach. As we see it, communism has consistently made its advances year after year from its inception in the year of 1903 with 17 members and by 1917, with a small band of something like 40,000, they took over the Russian Republic.

From this base they began their steady march toward world conquest, and domination. From inception their steady march forward has not been halted by the West to any degree. The Communists have been consistently gaining—conquering more territory and making inroads—of influence worldwide in all countries, since the date of their conquest of Russia and before.

At the present time they have a three-pronged drive for world conquest. First: The revolutionary Communist conquest of Asia, Africa, and Central and South America. This area of the world is in ferment with country after country falling into chaos or communism while American foreign policy disintegrates. In news conferences, Dr. Schwarz (president of the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade) has asked the newsmen this question, "Can you name one country in the world where American foreign policy is proceeding satisfactorily at the present time?"

Dr. Schwarz says he has yet to meet one newsman who can name one country. We have only to look at such countries as South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Zanzibar, the Congo, Ghana, Cyprus, Cuba, Brazil, and Panama to gain some insight into the magnitude of the Communist success. All of these countries have lessons to teach, but do we have the capacity to learn? Second: The neutralization of Western Europe, which is well underway—France pulling away from the West, recognizing China, De Gaulle making the statement that "worldwide communism is inevitable."

Italy is now practically under Communist rule. So quietly they move across Europe, their final conclusion of supreme domination. Third: The isolation and demoralization of the United States. Viewed in this perspective, the world Communist strategy is making rapid and terrifying gains which no amount of wishful thinking or rationalization can conceal.

The mode of revolution used by the Communists in the United States was designed in Moscow. It is as follows. This outline was secured by the FBI first:

(a) Corrupt the young. Get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex. Make them superficial. Destroy their ruggedness.

(b) Get control of all means of publicity and thereby:

1. Get the people's minds off their government by focusing their attention on athletics, sexy books and plays, and other trivialities.

2. Divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.

3. Destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders by holding these up to ridicule, obloquy, and contempt.

4. Always preach true democracy, but seize power as fast and as ruthlessly as possible.

5. Encourage government extravagance. Destroy its credit. Produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.

6. Foment unnecessary strikes in vital industries. Encourage civil disorder and foster a lenient and soft attitude on the part of the government toward such disorders.

7. By specious arguments cause the breakdown of the old moral virtues: honesty, sobriety, continence, faith in the pledged word, ruggedness, decency, and chastity.

(c) Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext with a view to confiscating them and leaving the population helpless.

As I see it, this is well on the way to being done. This type of revolution will bring about the demoralization of the United States. The Communist strategy aims to isolate and demoralize the United States. The demoralization will be achieved when the will to resist Communist blackmail is inadequate. This point will be reached when a substantial number of American citizens, particularly the youth, believe that their country no longer merits their death and that an accommodation with the Communists is inevitable. This process can be aided and abetted by directing the fears of the American citizens against the programs and policies of other American citizens instead of against the all-embracing Communist threat.

At selected intervals the American moral fiber will be tested as it was tested in the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962. When the will to resist, even at the brink of war, is discovered, the Communists make a strategic retreat. They are confident that one of these future tests will reveal an inadequate will. The blackmail of external, encircling forces will be too great for a demoralized people and an accommodation equating surrender will result.

In the face of such a picture, the revolution is well on its way to bringing about total destruction of our way of life. In my book it is never too late. As long as there is life, there is hope. The date of Nineveh's destruction was set by God himself, but because the people—called to prayer by the king himself dressed in sackcloth and sitting in ashes—repented, God brought deliverance. The Bible says, "There is no thing too hard for God." This is true. It is up to you and me to furnish the men and the women. God will furnish the grace and the victory. With all of the talk of softening up at the present time, that is only the one step backward, waiting for the two steps forward to more conquest for the Communists. Their technique has not changed since Marx wrote his philosophy of life which was the introduction of communism. This was followed by Lennin's book, "World Conquest by Communism," giving the outline for the Communist revolution, to bring about world conquest.

The present Communist doctrine of violence has not changed one tittle. It would be foolish to believe, however, that the Communists have renounced the use of violence and force. They do not make this claim for themselves. A most revealing statement by Herbert Apthaker appears in the December edition of Political Affairs, page 59, "When Marx used the phrase force is the midwife of revolution, he was referring, as Apthaker has pointed out, to the use of force by the revolutionary government after the new class has taken power, merely to clear the ground for the work of rebuilding." This clearing the ground is the message I want to get over to you if you can follow me (which I pray that you can) and see the accuracy with which they work.

Let us look to the Lithuanian takeover. I have a firsthand picture from a minister of the Gospel who was there and for some unknown reason they let him live and preach three Sundays before they decided to liquidate him. His escape is a long story which we will not go into only to say we feel it was by the divine providence of God so that the outside world could get a firsthand picture in the way the Communists proceed in taking over a country. When we thoroughly understand the Communist mind, then we can see the sincerity in the way they carry out their program. Their mind is totally atheistic, Satanically taken over to do the total will of Satan and build his kingdom.

The Communists had been carrying on the revolution since the takeover in Russia, in Lithuania, country and worldwide as far as that is concerned, but they had come to the place very similar to the condition that is prevailing here in the United States today. The Communists were never accepted as graciously and meeting with unusual acceptance in our colleges and places of learning. This was true in Lithuania just before the

takeover. It happened one morning when through all Lithuania there seemed to be reigning a time of peace. Then all of a sudden one morning they took the government and by nightfall from the streetsweeper to the Governor there was a Communist in their stead. Of course the clearing of the ground for rebuilding was in full force, and all the bourgeois (or businessmen) diseased class must be liquidated. So these, including all of the Christians, were liquidated.

The following day they took over all property and by nightfall all the property was in the hands of the Communist state. Not one businessman was left in business. The third day they took over the churches and by nightfall all the churches were state property. Our friend's church and little farm out in the country was taken over and for some unknown reason they told him he could carry on but he could not take an offering or gather funds. He had to pay $200 a Sunday for the use of his own church. His people brought their money in their handkerchiefs and when the services were over they would march around the front and bow down over a high railing and drop their money on the floor while he shook their hands and encouraged them as they wept, and they had plenty to weep about.

During the week before, his first Sunday to preach in the church, he lived in an apartment in the city and all night long he noticed trucks passing his apartment. They would be loaded with people mostly in their night clothing and guards stood around the truck with submachineguns. Then he would hear shooting all night long outside the city. Well, when he got up in his pulpit to preach his first Sunday after the takeover he knew what the trucks loaded with people all night meant. About one-fourth of his congregation was gone. They had been liquidated during the week. Our friend went into a state of shock which lasted for about 3 days. It was so severe that when he would lie down on his bed the bed would bounce up and down on the floor. His good wife seemed to be a great woman. She encouraged him and told him God had a work for him and for him to get hold of himself. He finally got hold of himself but the next Sunday more of his wonderful people were gone. You see, according to Marx, Christianity is the opium of the people so it must be exterminated to the last religionist in the world.

After the first few days, the minister noticed they began to have dual funerals which clogged the cemeteries. Husband and wife were being buried at the same time. What was happening was very simple. You see the bourgeois class (or the businessman) is poison to the Communist movement and must be exterminated. The businessman woke up the morning after the takeover penniless, unless he happened to have a little money around the house that they did not get, as they take business and all bank accounts—everything goes. Well, the businessman goes to the market to buy food and they say "Where is your worker's card?" He cannot buy food without a worker's card. The businessman goes to the Communist office to get a worker's card. They say "'No. You are of the bourgeois class, poison. You cannot get a card." There is only one of three alternatives for the businessman. First, liquidation; second, suicide; third: In many cases they just took all their property, then turned them out to ridicule and abuse until they were just starved to death or killed by brute-beast cruelty.

This is the pattern followed by the Communists. In every country they have taken over they have liquidated upward of 100 million people since the Russian revolution. However, the end is not yet because they are gracious in making their announcements in advance as to what they expect to do. In fact they have told us already that because of our high culture they will have to liquidate upward of 70 million people when they take us over. If there is any question as to the authenticity of the above statements about the Lithuania takeover, living in Phoenix are some of the Lithuanian people who will back up all of the above statements.

In Lithuania, to the best of our records, they liquidated upward of over 800,000 out of a country of about 3 million.

According to the Communists' timetable, we of the bourgeois class only have about 5 to 7 years to live. They have told us for some time they would take us over by 1972 but now they have moved it up to 1970. Things are going better than they expected so they are ahead of schedule. They are very kind to inform us of our day of fate. I have good news for you. I live by the philosophy, "Where there is life there is hope." As it was with Nineveh so it can be with us. It is up to America to face up to reality. A leopard never changes his spots, and an Ethiopian never changes his color. As surely as this is true, the Communists never change their technique in their procedure to carry out the takeover of any country.

This battle is not between us and communism. In fact to call it communism is deception. The whole Communist conspiracy is deception. It is built wholly on deception. The truth is that it is a war of Satan or the devil against God. Hell against heaven—righteousness against unrighteousness. Then let us follow the way to victory. God said, "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and forgive their sins, and will heal their land" II Chronicles 7:14. Face up to reality. The Bible has the answer: As I see it, there are three things we can do. First: Seek God by the way of the Bible and pray. Second: Action back every anti-Communist program we have in being. Third: Inform everybody about the falacy of communism. MacArthur said, "There is no substitute for victory."

To the businessman there is no businessman when he sees his business in danger. He will make whatever investment is necessary to save his business. There was never a time when America needed the investment of the businessman in helping get the truth to the people in order that his business might be saved from communism on the takeover. This also goes for the church. It is time for the church to quit playing church and get in earnest about things Holy and righteous. If the church and the businessman were to awake to the terror before us, there would be an anti-Communist school going in some of our big cities every week, getting the people of our land informed to the coming disaster. But let us not forget, "He that laughs last, laughs best, and our God will have the last laugh."

Robert W. MacGregor Supports Bill for Cabinet Level Department of Housing and Urban Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding public official from Minneapolis testified Wednesday in support of the bill for a new Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Honorable Robert W. MacGregor appeared as national spokesman for the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and gave testimony before Senator RIBICOFF's Senate Subcommittee on executive reorganization.

Mr. MacGregor is a member of the Minneapolis City Council and serves as chairman of two important committees of the city council—the bipartisan committee on legislation and the ordnance and legislation committee. The Presbyterian Church in the United States should be complimented on selecting a spokesman with such broad understanding in municipal affairs. His testimony is worth entering in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TESTIMONY ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.

(Presented by Robert W. MacGregor, before the Senate Subcommittee on Government Reorganization, May 19, 1965)

My name is Robert W. MacGregor. I am a United Presbyterian, and a member of the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn. I also serve on one of the national committees of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., the advisory committee on the problems of metropolitan society. I am grateful for the privilege to address this committee in support of the establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development within the Cabinet of the executive branch of our Government.

The problems of metropolitan society have reached such magnitude and complexity that they must have first priority and consideration in our Government. The General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., have recognized that ours is indeed a metropolitan society brought about by vast population growth, industrialization, and rapid technological change. In May 1961, the 173d general assembly supported "the establishment of a department of urban affairs and housing in the executive branch of the Federal Government."

In May 1964, the 177th general assembly reaffirmed: "The need for the establishment of a department dealing with housing and community development at the Cabinet level for the purpose of giving adequate attention to the problems of urban life and achieving coordination and collaboration among Federal agencies administering or assisting with federally supported projects in metropolitan areas."

Great shifts of people from rural to urban centers of living have created complex and massive problems which require long-range coordinated approaches, new political institutions and boundary lines to replace outmoded, overlapping jurisdictions. The human waste, the social disintegration and decay of crowded slums, and planless sprawl and haphazard expansion of suburbs can no longer continue. To reshape and remold our cities and improve the quality and patterns of metropolitan living, to provide adequate housing for all families without racially restricted and segregated neighborhoods will require bold and imaginative measures on a regional and national basis.

In 1961 the 173d General Assembly stated: "Comprehensive, long-range planning is urgently needed at every level of government. New governmental units with metropolitan-wide powers must be devised to determine public needs and priorities for the use of public funds and to develop integrated plans for land use, transportation, water supply, control of pollution, and other functions.

"A fundamental step in meeting the problems of metropolitan society is a systematic and periodic analysis of its economic development, of population movements, and of industrial expansion. This knowledge is essential to the formulation of responsible public policy for an urban society."

There is urgent need to coordinate our governmental structures so that they may serve the people more efficiently and deal with public responsibilities which transcend the traditional municipal, county, and State boundaries. Comprehensive regional approaches to areawide problems such as transportation, water supply, and land use, we believe, can be best obtained by the establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development within the Cabinet.

Further, the problems of metropolitan society have created:

"A present and future need for trained and competent technicians skilled in political science, economic and social research, social welfare, and community organization. Dealing with the rigid patterns of residential segregation demands wide knowledge and skill in human relations. The need for systematic procedures for collecting data about the metropolitan economy is a matter of national importance.

"Coordination is needed among the many agencies of the Federal Government which are related to urban affairs. Federal leadership is unnecessary in studying coordinated approaches which will enable States and metropolitan areas to deal with mass transportation problems and the conservation of precious land and water resources. Government reports comment on the need for the acquisition of open land to provide reserves for future residential development, industrial expansion, and to make it possible for State and regional bodies to control the rate and character of community development. Since metropolitan areas with their urban and suburban populations now include the great majority of American families and a preponderance of industrial, commercial, and educational resources, a department at the Cabinet level in the executive branch should be established so that the resources of the Federal Government can be coordinated and directed to aid in their solution."

Our United Presbyterian Advisory Committee has noted new directions that have been taken to improve coordination of Federal services in metropolitan areas and increased cooperation among various agencies of the Federal Government within particular regions. But much more must be done to deal with complex urban problems on a comprehensive long-range basis which in our opinion can be best achieved by lifting the problems of our cities to a place of continuing priority in the President's Cabinet.

The general assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, United States of America, has called for the recruitment and training of competent young men and women for careers in such fields as planning, community development, housing, social welfare, and urban administration. Attention to the development of such leadership is not to be improvised. It is a matter for continued Cabinet consideration. Also requiring continued national attention is the need for research and the utilization of the expanding bodies of knowledge about our cities.

We believe all members of the President's Cabinet need to give consideration to metropolitan problems, and that the coordination within regions is dependent on interdepartmental coordination at the Federal level.

Mr. Chairman, the church, because of its sensitivity to contemporary life, is fully aware of the characteristics of urbanization: its social growth, dislocation, and unappeased appetite for land. We hope the church may make a contribution to the development and the enforcement of public policy which will enhance human life within urban society and maximize human potential for all our people.

Our No-Nonsense President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of Congress an editorial which appeared in the May 20, 1965, edition of the Reporter magazine, written by Max Ascoli, entitled "Our No-Nonsense President." This analysis of the current state of events in foreign affairs and the development of our President in this area of endeavor is extremely astute and full of insight.

I hope every Member will find time to study this editorial. It follows:

OUR NO-NONSENSE PRESIDENT

In Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic, President Johnson has more than ever before exhibited his immoderate passion for detail, a passion nourished now by a technology that keeps him in close touch with the soldiers whose lives are endangered by the use he makes of his authority. This consuming passion for personal intervention has been characteristic of Lyndon Johnson ever since he started his career in politics, but as long as it could be thought of as a superb exhibit of a wheeler-dealer talent, it was more admired or envied by his fellow politicians than criticized. He has always known how to make people vote freely as he wanted them to vote. But he had been spared, until comparatively recently, the experience of giving men orders that involved the risk of their life. Neither had he had occasion to command that any wholesale category of people called enemies be killed.

His immense knowledge of domestic politics used to be accompanied by a limited acquaintance with international affairs. When during the Eisenhower administration he was Senate Majority Leader, he played a part, although a secondary one, in all major decisions affecting the conduct of our diplomacy; during the Kennedy administration he became more closely associated with the making of American policy abroad, sat on the National Security Council, traveled widely, and established relationships with statesmen and camel drivers.

Still, as the case with every Vice President, the ultimate responsibility did not lie with him. Once President, he asserted himself from the start as if supreme authority were connatural with his being, and his subsequent triumphal election showed to what an extent the Nation recognized itself in him. Somehow it also happened that he had no compelling international difficulties to face for a time, a respite he used to lay his plans for the Nation's future. He had known poverty and the difficulty of getting an adequate education, and he had known success. He could not legislate his luck for everybody, but he wanted to see to it that a new American breed could grow free from the cruelties of hazard.

The new perils from abroad that came in the first year of Lyndon Johnson's elective Presidency were singularly mean, originating in some of the most improbable spots on earth, either in lands too far away or too close to our shores. In the distant lands, we were hampered by inadequate knowledge of their strategic and political relevance; in the lands close to us, we had always tended to act as colonizers or as imitation natives. Our present perils have been aggravated by the policies of the preceding administrations and by obdurate ways of thinking that are mostly inspired by a desire to negotiate our way toward peace.

Day in and day out, we hear the same old chatter about spheres of influence or about the benefit of polycentrism; we hear about the splintering of monoliths so reassuringly keeping peace with the splintering of what was never a monolith, our alliance. Even before the last war the idea was cherished of the miraculous solidarity and legal equality of the nations, great, medium, or pocketsize, all called American, all sticking together, each of them going its own merry way.

President Johnson is not a man inclined to look for trouble in foreign affairs until trouble stares him in the face. Then he reacts and if he has to react militarily, he does so without any of the bravado of the movie frontiersman shooting from the hip. Now his responsibilities have become far greater than any within the previous range of his experience, and this experience he is compelled to broaden, for it has been the inactions or mistakes of some of his predecessors that have placed him in his present predicament. He cannot, for instance, look back for guidance in his action in Vietnam even if he reaches the conclusion that what is going on there is just a civil war. There was another civil war, in Hungary in 1956, but the West carefully avoided intervening. Should he derive from this the notion that whenever communism, indigenous or imported, fights a civil war, its victory should be considered a natural right?

Vice President Johnson was in Berlin a very few days after the wall was erected. He saw there what defeat looks like. Under the administration Mr. Johnson served as Vice President, there occurred the Bay of Pigs tragedy, and then the missile crisis, which ended without on-site inspection. Once Cuba was made safe for communism, is there any reason to be surprised that communism started spreading all around?

In southeast Asia the President is unrolling his air attacks, each one because of his will and each one under his watchful eyes. As for the Dominican Republic, he reached his decision with great speed, without consulting many people aside from those strictly charged with giving him advice. There is scarcely any comparison between the two situations, except that in running both, he exhibits a supreme sense of personal responsibility. Why is he so overcommitted? people ask. We venture an answer: He is Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States.

U.S. Courts and the Law Explosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Justice Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, before the American Assembly, at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y., May 1, 1965:

ADDRESS BY JUSTICE CLARK

The American Assembly has made another "first." A distinguished American institution, neither governed nor staffed by lawyers or judges, has sponsored this significant meeting of citizens concerned with the present dissatisfaction with the administration of justice. I congratulate the assembly and its learned president, Clifford Nelson, on this accomplishment.

Let us get on with the business of the evening. You have come here to consider ways and means for improving the administration of justice. You have read the enlightening materials that have been circulated. They illustrate the law explosion which faces us today. A widening of our horizons in science, medicine, transportation, and communication—coupled with a modern interpretation of old rights—has brought on a rash of new disputes among and between men as well as with and between governments. These collisions would have been beyond credulity a century ago but today are commonplace in an increasingly complex and interdependent society.

This explosion has bombarded the courts with an unprecedented increase in litigation. For example, the caseload of the Supreme Court of the United States has increased over threefold since I took my seat there 15 years ago. Many thinking people are convinced that this increase is caused by technical court procedures, leniency in sentencing, the enlargement of defenses for the accused and a breakdown in law enforcement at the detection level.

Still, all of us know that the rule of law is the best method yet devised to resolve the ever increasing conflicts between men. The judiciary remains the greatest bulwark of the rule of law so vital to democratic living. The great danger today is that the courts will be so caught up in this deluge of litigation that they will be discredited.

It is my view that this situation can only be remedied by interested public-spirited individuals. Again and again we have witnessed failure in effecting a modern business-like judiciary simply because the individual citizen took a walk rather than an interest. Only an aroused citizenry can solve the problems that face the effective administration of justice today.

And when, you ask, is justice effective? The short answer is when it is fairly administered without delay by competent judges operating in a modern courtroom under simple and efficient rules of procedure.

Now I am sure that we can all agree that something should be done. But we have been hearing that tune for decades. The burning question is, how to go about it and when? I must confess that no definitive answer as to the "how" part of the question has yet come to me. But as to when, it is now. As Professor Jones has explained in his paper, I sit on the most remote court in the United States and some say the most uninformed.

However, during the past 4 years I have supervised the organization of over 50 seminars for the State trial judges of general jurisdiction and attended over half of them. I have personally attended meetings of lawyers and laymen on court modernization in over a third of the States in a shorter period. In addition, the College of State Trial Judges at Boulder, Colo., which was organized in 1963 and whose board I chair, is now in its second year with $2½ million grant to run it for 10 more years. My association with some 3,000 State judges who have been carrying on these enterprises has afforded me an opportunity to hear about their problems.

First, the mass of litigation of which we speak faces the most specialized of our courts—the traffic and magistrate courts. While the judge in a Federal court measures his workload in terms of hundreds of cases per year and the average State circuit and district court judge talks of a thousand or fifteen hundred cases annually, the traffic and magistrate courts measure their workload in terms of thousands of cases each year. Decisions are made on the spur of the moment and after a short period of time the judge, if he is not careful, begins to lose track of the individual nature of each case. The awful job of administering justice in 2 to 300 cases or more each day demands the greatest effort in our entire system of courts and in many respects requires the ablest human beings that can be enlisted into this service.

Needless to say the ablest lawyers are not always attracted to this type of work. Generally speaking, salaries begin well below those of the courts of general jurisdiction which, I might add, are none to high. The courtrooms in which they sit are often inadequate. The offices provided for their work off the bench are seldom satisfactory. The justice they dispense touches almost every citizen and the public image of justice is often formed by what happens there. Still the judges on those benches are treated as second class judges in all respects. The wonder is that many men of ability are willing to and do serve on these courts. The first order of our business in my opinion is to give attention to these courts to the end that they will be recognized as courts of dignity and worth.

At present there are only two organizations actively working in this fertile field: the National Association of Municipal Court Judges and the American Bar Association Committee of Traffic Courts. Though they are working hard they can do little more than scratch the surface of the need for improvement. If nothing more came of the concern expressed by your presence here than to focus on the problems of justice in these courts of limited jurisdiction, the meeting would be a success.

Of equal significance are the courts involved in juvenile matters. In many instances these judges are county magistrates who engage in other business and are paid $6,000 a year or less to hear probate and mental health matters in addition to juvenile cases. They seldom have any staff or trained juvenile workers, and yet they are expected to protect the community as well as rehabilitate offenders. In the larger cities, specialized juvenile courts have developed, often with strong local community support, but in cities of 200,000 population and less there is little hope that the courts will be specialized or have the necessary social services. If, as many believe, the development of crime is in the juvenile mind and the cure is the proper treatment of juvenile offenders these probate and county courts, to be effective, must receive the informed support of the community.

The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges has labored long and hard to train judges for juvenile court work. They have held institutes throughout the country with juvenile judges. In addition the National Council of Crime and Delinquency, through its council of judges, has promulgated guidelines for juvenile and family courts and has set high standards for correction work. But, as with the magistrate courts, these efforts are only a beginning in the task which must be initiated to bring to each community the best thinking on the handling of juveniles.

The greatest concern in recent years has been expressed over the work of the courts of general jurisdiction. In New York State it is called the supreme court, in your State it may be called the superior court, the circuit court, or the district court. It is a court which handles everything from breach of contract, to automobile accidents to murder. In our system of courts the court of general jurisdiction has the widest variety of work and to some, is the most interesting in its scope. But this court, which has long served as the backbone of the American judicial system, has in recent years been bogged down by an ever-increasing concentration of work growing out of physical injuries to persons. The increase of automobiles and traffic has contributed much to the law explosion and especially to its effect on the work of the courts. Many concerned individuals have worried over this problem, but no one has yet reached a satisfactory solution.

Only a fortnight ago I invited the leaders of the bar in the personal injury field to meet with me in Washington. Insurance researchers, plaintiffs' lawyers, and defense counsel sat around the table all day talking over the problems of personal injury litigation. We think we have come up with some helpful answers in this specialized field and a subcommittee is now working on their implementation. Some say that more judges are needed. It may well be that in some areas this is necessary. Indeed, some States relate the number of their judgeships to population, such as Florida where there is a judge of general jurisdiction for each 50,000 of population. Generally, however, we do not need more judges. We have discovered that in the Federal system. We do need to improve the procedures of the courts. This can be done by the adaptation of the most improved business practices to court operation. We shall discuss that proposal and others later. Let me now, however, scotch some suggestions that have been made. One of these is that judges maintain longer hours. I do not share this view. Most judges work over 12 hours a day now. A judge cannot hear cases over 6 hours a day. We only sit 4 hours in argument. I find it quite exhausting. Trial courts have a much more tedious and burdensome role than do we. Besides, judges have many hours of work to perform off the bench. I take work home every night. The public does not see all this work and they cannot recognize the necessity for it. As one who has been on the Supreme Court of the United States for over 15 years I say this is the most important work of the judge. It is during those hours off the bench that he can study the pleadings, research the law, prepare charges, etc., all of which are vital in the adjudication process. Some say summer sessions would help. Perhaps this might be tried. However, the courtrooms must be prepared for air conditioning before it could be effectively pursued. In view of the unavailability of jurors in the summer in most jurdisdictions, I doubt if this proposal would be of much assistance.

A proposal that we abolish the right of trial by jury in civil cases is also being urged. I am opposed to this suggestion. The right of a citizen to a trial before a jury of his peers has for centuries been considered the sine qua non of an enlightened system of jurisprudence. It is the bulwark of our Bill of Rights. It should not be tampered with.

Another suggestion is that personal injury litigation be relegated to administrative boards. Some say that the principles of workman's compensation; i.e., liability without fault, be extended to this type of case. I am opposed to this also. I believe that the unfortunate parties to such a claim are entitled to judicial not administrative process. Our bureaucracy is already under enough stress and strain. Moreover, you would find the personal injury case not adaptable to administrative procedures. In addition, it would be much more costly to administer and more expensive to insurance carriers—and hence to the public itself. Some investigation of the possibility of such handling would be in order but such a major change should come slowly, if at all.

I note also the proposal for the creation of a specialized court to handle personal injury cases. This would be of no benefit whatever and would only transfer our problem to another pocket and entail enormous

expense. In addition, the new courts would soon be bogged down. I am opposed to the plan.

It is my suggestion that we can solve this problem within our existing system. Many groups have been working on it and with some success. They have found that in the area of court administration the judicial system is not operating on a 20th century basis. And further, that the apathy of the public has largely been to blame for the failure to modernize our court procedures. Indeed, our courts in this respect are like the old general store—loaded with items but with no systematic arrangement for their handling. Hence, the customer-litigant wastes all of his time trying to get waited on while some of the management look up lost items—other, as in the general store sit by the pot-bellied stove and whittle. Half of the court systems today have no inventory of cases—as a result judges in rural areas are idle while metropolitan courts are plagued with backlogs.

The American Bar Association was the first to come to grips with this problem. Some 30 years ago it began to work on it through its section of judicial administration. Within the section is the national conference of State trial judges. It carries on a series of programs and seminars in the various States having to do with trial administration. A metropolitan court committee composed of judges from cities of 750,000 population and over work on congestion in those courts. A national College of State Trial Judges was organized last year and conducts a session each year of 1-month duration at Boulder, Colo. One hundred judges who have been on the bench for less than 2 years attend this college with their expenses paid by a grant from the Kellogg Foundation. The American bar also has a distinguished committee chaired by Chief Judge Lumbard, of the second circuit, that is making a survey of the criminal justice field. The American Bar Foundation is conducting research projects on several specific problems of the trial courts, such as counsel for indigents and marriage conciliation services.

The American Judicature Society, through its distinguished Journal, devotes all of its efforts to the improvement of judicial administration, especially with reference to the selection, tenure and compensation of judges. They have, in cooperation with the college, staged a score of seminars in as many States on this subject.

The Institute of Judicial Administration conducts a 2-week seminar for appellate judges each year at New York University. It also conducts special surveys of a State or city court system upon request. Its library on judicial administration is the most complete in the country.

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency has a membership of over 30,000 laymen, lawyers, and judges and provides services to promote the rehabilitation of juvenile and adult offenders. Its mission is the improvement of probation, parole, and institutional services and facilities as well as the prevention, treatment, and control of delinquency and crime.

Finally, in 1964 a coordinating committee for effective justice was formed by each of the above groups plus the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges. Its function is to coordinate the work of these organizations and to be the successor to the joint committee for effective justice which performed this task prior thereto. As you have been advised the joint committee was organized in 1961 and expired in 1964. It conducted seminars for trial judges in all of the States; organized the college heretofore mentioned and contributed invaluable service to the modernization of the State court system.

So far I have talked only of problems and those who are trying to solve them. Perhaps it is time to add in a lawyer's brief some direction that might be followed in attaining a reorganization and effective staffing of the Nation's courts. Though each plan must be tailored to the needs of the local community, we are not without some standards in the pursuit of a practical solution.

Taking the lead from Illinois, a more effective use must be made of judicial manpower. It did so by unifying the courts of the State. Under the Illinois judicial amendment an administrative head supervises all of the judicial functions in the trial circuit from parking fines to murder and on the civil side from bill collecting to million-dollar construction disputes. Judges are assigned according to their special abilities and magistrates are chosen by the circuit judges and are responsible to the presiding judge.

Moreover, a unified system would do away with much of the disparate sentencing now present in the multijudge court. It would also permit the efficient handling of counsel problems in indigent cases. The administrative judge could handle this for all of the judges in the metropolitan areas. And in the rural areas the statewide court administrator could develop a plan that would best serve this purpose. In addition, marriage conciliation services could be developed and used as they presently are in Los Angeles and in Montana.

Furthermore, the bail-bond racket as it is called could be controlled through procedures permitting release on recognizance in appropriate cases and bail commensurate with means, as well as the nature of the offense, in others. Illinois is now studying a State bail bond administration that might be helpful. All this is possible in Illinois because of the unified court system adopted there.

However, we must have more than just a unified court. We must have competent manpower—both judges and staffs. It is a mistake to say that the staff is not important. Sometimes it makes the difference. And, in many jurisdictions it is selected by the judge. That is an additional reason why the joint committee for effective justice declared that judges should be selected through nonpolitical methods based on merit. Otherwise not only the judge becomes political but also his staff. As I have stated most of the States select their judges at the polls. This is a mistake. Judges should be selected on a nonpartisan merit basis. To change the present system is not only difficult but takes time. In the interim, the plan presently used in Pennsylvania and in some of our metropolitan cities might be extended. The chief executive in these places appoints a board that makes recommendations to him from which he selects the appointee when a vacancy occurs. The appointee must stand election—in most States—at the next general election. But this gets a good man in at the start and in most instances he is elected at the polls once he is a sitting judge.

As to the administrators it is best to have a statewide one selected by the chief justice of the State or by the supreme court. The administrator should select his subordinates and also appoint the local administrator of a judicial district when one is needed. This would give you a statewide administration. These administrators must use the most modern business methods, including computers such as those now in use in Pittsburgh, Pa.

It has been suggested that career training for judges be created here along the line of that in England. I believe that the public as well as the bar would be skeptical of this. We have so many more important and urgent problems before us that it would only be a distraction to propose such a plan at this time. In this connection there have been proposals in the Congress that would require appellate judges to be selected from the trial bench. This is, one might say, an alternative to the English system of career training for judges. It is, of course, necessary for the appellate bench to have some judges of nisi prius experience. However, to require all to be taken from trial courts is too much. The appellate courts—especially the Supreme Court—need more than trial judges. Otherwise, why have an appeal? Only to secure the right to a fair trial. This can best be done by an appellate court made up of judges of varied experiences.

There are some who say that judges need disciplining. And in my days at the bar I have thought that perhaps some did need correction, other than in their decisions. California has a commission plan on this which has proven very successful. In fact, so much so that Nebraska adopted a similar plan only this week, April 28, 1965, and Texas is considering it now. Procedures for discipline and removal are necessary. Impeachment is antiquated and cumbersome.

Judges must also be adequately compensated, with fair retirement benefits, widow's pension rights and security of tenure. Only in this way will the most competent lawyers be attracted to the bench. The judiciary needs the best legal talent obtainable and along with it the most efficient supporting staff.

Nor can justice be equal when it is administered with delay. The quest for truth is successful only to the extent that the memory of witnesses is accurate. Delay dims the memory and obscures the truth. In addition, like Caesar's wife, justice must be above suspicion. Appearances are often as important as events. Nothing dims the image of courts more than interminable delays in adjudication. It corrodes, as Chief Justice Warren said, the very foundation of justice.

Moreover, the image of justice depends greatly upon the lawyers. I am sure that you businessmen who unfortunately may have been litigants understand. So many lawyers lay the loss of a case at the feet of the judge or the court. This is natural but is nothing short of a self-confession of error and a hopeful avoidance of responsibility. There are always two sides to a case. If clients corrected lawyers in such instances instead of joining in with the castigation of the courts it would be helpful. But I suppose that is asking too much.

Now what is the relevance of all this to a layman? What can he do to correct these long existing deficiencies in our judicial system? The short answer is that nothing can be done without you. Experience in California, Colorado, Iowa, Illinois, Florida, North Carolina, and New York proves that much can be done with you. Without the support of an informed citizenry judicial reform cannot be attained. Nothing talks as well as the voter. If we are to have an efficient court system we must begin at the grassroots. Your active assistance is needed.

Moreover, while you are here at this meeting why not appoint a national committee to coordinate your efforts with the organized professional associations that I have mentioned. The time is ripe for a stupendous national effort to improve the administration of justice.

The Room-Size World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the world, through the science and technology of communications, electronics and space, has shrunk to a degree beyond

our wildest dreams. The tremendous success of the Early Bird Satellite demonstrates clearly the ability of modern man to span oceans and continents in a matter of milliseconds and communicate with his fellow men quickly and effectively.

In this fine achievement, we Americans can be duly proud of the ingenuity and persistence of our private industry in constantly improving the capabilities and well-being of our Nation. An example of this can be found in the fact that the Hughes Aircraft Co. in California persisted, and I am proud to say, successfully in their belief that the more efficient method of satellite communications was through the use of synchronous satellites, poised 22,300 miles above the earth as if it were a fixed star in the heavens. Through their diligence and technological brilliance, they were successful in providing this Nation with another first.

A discussion of this achievement is contained in an excellent article in the May 14, 1965, issue of Time magazine, which I include here, in part, with my remarks:

THE ROOM-SIZE WORLD

Lyndon Johnson immediately grasped the significance and potential of Early Bird, the new communications satellite hovering 22,300 miles above the equator. Aware that the Russians were flooding European TV stations with films and pictures for the 20th anniversary of V–E Day, the President acted swiftly last week to upstage them.

In Washington, U.S.-network bigwigs were expecting to meet at the White House to complain about the President's increasing preemption of prime TV time on short notice. Instead of a meeting, Johnson produced a new short-notice request. As soon as possible, he said, he wanted to use Early Bird to broadcast a V–E anniversary speech direct to Europe. Three and one-half hours later, in a slow and measured drawl, he was chiding Charles de Gaulle live on British and Italian TV screens, and being taped for later rebroadcast in every every other European nation.

GLOBAL BLANKET

As a means of muting Russia's planned propaganda barrage, European broadcasters called it "a master stroke." But the unprecedented transatlantic transmission of the master's voice and face also gave rise to international problems undreamed of a week ago. CBS's Walter Cronkite noted that the President had violated diplomatic protocol by addressing foreign peoples directly without first notifying their governments. A British Broadcasting Corp. official complained that he was forced to disrupt the normal evening schedule on short notice. Foreign chiefs of state, suddenly alert to the prestige potential of broadcasting directly to foreign nations by satellite, began stirring. German Chancellor Ludwig Erhard immediately requested time to address the American people.

Such new problems only served to underscore the new epoch in communications that rose with the drumshaped, 85-pound satellite. In an age fast growing familiar with man's race beyond the confines of his own world, Early Bird reached back toward the earth and seemed to shrink it almost to room size. All by itself, the satellite blanketed more than one-third of the globe. If two more soar into orbit, for the first time in history it will be literally true that for every nation instant contact will be possible with every inhabited spot on earth.

WORLD TOWN MEETING

In Europe and the United States, television's showmen labored to exploit Early Bird's versatility. At their best, the programs were as moving and immediate as a closeup of Houston's great Surgeon Michael DeBakey repairing a human heart while fascinated doctors in Geneva looked over his shoulder. Europe watched troop movements in the streets of Santo Domingo while bullets still ricocheted across the Caribbean town. The "Town Meeting of the World" turned international as Barry Goldwater in New York, Dean Rusk and Sir Alec Douglas-Home in London, and Maurice Schumann in Paris joined in a transatlantic gabfest. A mug shot of Canada's most wanted man, relayed by Early Bird and recognized by a televiewer in Florida, gave accused Bank Robber Georges Lemay the dubious fame of becoming the first fugitive nabbed by satellite. NBC teamed up with the BBC and, for a refreshing few minutes, Huntley-Brinkley became Huntley-Dimbleby.

Goonhilly Downs, Pleumeur-Bodou, Raisting, Andover—the unfamiliar places where big, ground-based stations were relaying programs to Early Bird—became part of the language of the communications industry. And between the best and the worst that TV had to offer, imaginative men could pick out the promise of a dream born more than a century ago, when the first crude telegraph suggested that man might someday far outreach the limitations of his speech and hearing.

Only a few years ago, before the success of the first experimental satellites, electronic communication was still disappointingly short of its theoretical ideal.

Nothing like a relay satellite was within the reach of the best technology of 1945, but the needed elements were developed as if on cue.

First to fit all the new techniques together was Bell Telephone Laboratories, which built Telstar I, and had it launched at its own expense in July 1962. Circling in a comparatively low elliptical orbit, 600 to 3,500 miles above the earth, Telstar was a striking success; it relayed the first live TV picture (a view of the American flag) across the Atlantic to receiving stations in England and France. Telephone talk over Telstar was as clear as if the speakers were only blocks apart.

But Telstar was only an experiment, as were its successors Telstar II and Relay I and II built by Radio Corporation of America for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. On low orbits, they all whirled around the earth faster than the 24-hour period of the earth's rotation; they could be used for communication only during the brief periods when they were within line-of-sight range of their ground stations. Such a system would require many more satellites to be practical.

DESPERATE PLAY

At Hughes Aircraft Co. in California, however, three young engineers, Drs. Harold A. Rosen, Donald D. Williams, and Thomas Hudspeth, were anxious to shoot for a higher target—nothing less than the 22,300-mile synchronous orbit conceived by Clarke back in 1945.

Syncom I, the Hughes-built oldest brother of Early Bird, reached its orbit in 1963, but an exploding tank of high-pressure nitrogen kept it from succeeding electronically. Syncom II and III, used by the Department of Defense, were successful, but their performance has been kept partially secret. Early Bird, the fourth of the series, was built and launched for Comsat, the private company that was created by Congress to set up a commercial communication satellite system. In the Syncom family, Early Bird was the big, public success.

LEFT TURNS

Early Bird is a miracle of delicate electronics and advanced spacecraftsmanship. The first problem was how to get it into an equatorial orbit from Cape Kennedy. If the cape were on the equator, Early Bird's rocket would have been asked only to carry it to the desired height and push it to the proper speed—about 7,000 miles per hour. But the cape is 28° north of the equator, so Early Bird had to make a more complicated maneuver, turning sideways when it reached orbiting height. This left turn in space was accomplished nimbly, and ever since, Early Bird has kept itself on station by firing delicate burps of steam from its hydrogen-peroxide thrusters.

Early Bird's curved sides are covered with 6,000 solar cells to supply electric power, and the satellite spins like a gyroscope to keep stabilized. One short antenna receives radio signals from the earth. They are fed to a transponder which amplifies them and then transmits them back to earth. Much of the transmitted energy is lost in space, but enough reaches the earth to be picked up by powerful receiving stations in the United States and Europe and amplified once more before being transmitted to home receivers.

LATER BIRDS

According to Rosen, who makes no secret of his glowing euphoria, Early Bird's remarkable success is only a small beginning. In the works at Hughes are much-improved successors: HS– (for Hughes satellite) 304 and HS–307, both of which will have more communication channels, more solar cells to give more power, and a better nudging system to keep them on station. Instead of using hydrogen peroxide to generate high pressure steam, they will decompose water electrically into hydrogen and oxygen and combine the two gases in delicate explosions to counteract drifting. HS–304 will have 1,200 voice channels instead of Early Bird's 240. HS–307 can have as many as 50,000 channels.

Rosen's group is proposing a special educational television satellite for NASA. It is designed to carry perfect color or black-and-white TV direct to home receivers. "You ain't seen nothing yet," says Rosen. "The benefit to mankind of such a system staggers the imagination. It may well be the major return to humanity of man's venture into space. What we're trying to do is to save the world."

Even less dedicated men than Rosen see a startling communications explosion ahead. A sampling of their predictions for the near future:

A world information center will catalog and make available the expanding mass of information now threatening to swamp the world's libraries. With easy access to the center by satellite-relayed phone calls from any spot on earth and with computers programed to do their tedious reference hunting for them, researchers will save countless man-hours as they make use of all the recorded knowledge of the human race.

Medical men in remote regions will be able to keep in constant touch with their colleagues in the most up-to-date cities. Consultation with specialists will be available over color TV. Cardiograms and electroencephalograms are already sent over existing lines for diagnosis, soon everything but the patient himself may be sent to well-equipped centers for analysis and advice.

Worldwide telephoning will become as commonplace as the dialing of local calls. A phone call from New York to Tokyo may cost no more than a call from New York to Chicago, because to the distant satellite relay station, the difference in earthly distance will be insignificant.

Data transmission will bring the skills of giant computers to anyone who needs them. The computers themselves will join forces in a vast network, and automation of industry will become an international reality.

Facsimile transmission not only promises to eliminate the relative slowness of jet-carried airmail, it conjures up visions of home-printed newspapers. With a satellite network to gather information for the editors and the same network to transmit that information to subscribers, an improved version of office copying machines may soon

be hooked to home TV sets to make high-quality reproduction of text and pictures on rolls of reusable plastic.

Educational television will guarantee that all the world's culture will be available to all the world. The receiving dishes pointing at the sky will be able to collect the most sophisticated technical information for the most backward countries.

Poles at Katyn Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD an article from the Wednesday, May 5, 1965, Palo Alto Times, written by Mr. Julius Epstein. Mr. Epstein is a research associate at the Hoover Institute of Stanford University. The article refers to the unfortunate Katyn Forest massacre, which was the subject of a House committee investigation under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

This April marked the 25th anniversary of that massacre which was a historic event.

The article follows:

MILITARY CRIMES BY REDS: EVIDENCE CONCLUSIVE SOVIETS MASSACRED POLES AT KATYN FOREST

(By Julius Epstein)

April and May 1965 mark the 25th anniversary of one of the greatest military crimes in modern history: The Katyn Forest massacre.

It was at Katyn near Smolensk in the Soviet Union where Hitler's army discovered in April 1943, mass graves filled with the bodies of more than 4,000 Polish reserve officers; doctors, lawyers, writers, journalists, priests, the intellectual elite of the Polish nation.

The bodies found in the mass graves at Katyn were part of those missing 15,000 Polish officers taken prisoners by the Red army and after Hitler's attack against the Soviet Union, supposed to lead a Polish army under General Anders against the Germans.

Today, we know all 15,000 Polish officers were murdered by Stalin's NKVD after Stalin himself had given the order: "liquidate." More than 4,000 of them were found in the mass graves at Katyn.

The evidence of Stalin's guilt is overwhelming and has never been seriously challenged, neither by the Soviets nor by Polish authorities if one does not consider the unsupported denial of guilt and the accusations of the Germans as a serious challenge.

The Soviet prosecutor at the Nuremberg trial, General Rudenko, insisted in listing the Katyn massacre in the indictment among the war crimes of the Hitler regime. When the defense called witnesses who would have irrefutably proved the Soviet guilt in the crime, it was not allowed and Rudenko, dropped the whole case like a hot potato and never mentioned it again. Katyn does not appear either in the verdict or in the sentence of the first Nuremberg trial. The world understood. It amounted to a complete acquittal on that count.

After I had published two articles on Stalin's guilt in the Katyn massacre in the New York Herald Tribune of July 3 and 4, 1949, and one in the New Leager of September 17, 1949, I formed the American Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Massacre, Inc., with the late American Ambassador to Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane as chairman, Max Eastman and Dorothy Thompson as vice chairmen and Allen Dulles, Clare Boothe Luce, George Creel, George Sokolsky, Constantin Brown, among others, on the advisory board.

It was the work of that private citizens committee which led to the American congressional investigation of the Katyn massacre after Congress unanimously adopted on September 18, 1951, a bill introduced by Representative RAY J. MADDEN, Democrat, of Indiana, to create a House committee to investigate the Katyn Forest massacre. It was an unprecedent move, the first time in American history that Congress decided to investigated a crime committed on foreign soil, a crime which did not involve a single American.

The Madden committee investigated for more than 1 year. It held hearings in Washington and Chicago as well as in several European cities.

The result of that unprecedented congressional investigation was the publication of a seven-part report. More than 100 witnesses appeared before the committee and hundreds of exhibits were carefully examined.

NO DOUBT

Its verdict: There can be reasonable doubt that the Polish officers, found in the mass graves at Katyn, had been murdered in April and May, 1940, when Smolensk and Katyn were still in Soviet hands. The evidence printed on more than 2,000 pages, was absolutely conclusive.

To give just one example:

On April 16, 1962, "witness B" testified in London before the Madden committee. "Witness B," a Polish professor of economics, had been held as a prisoner of war in the Soviet POW camp of Kozielsk. He was in one of the transports to Gniezdovo, the railroad station near Katyn. At Gniezdovo, empty trucks drove close to the ramp of the train and the Polish prisoners had to enter them, about 30 at a time. The trucks drove away, shots were heard and the trucks returned for the next batch. The witness was sure he would be in one of the next transports, when an NKVD official suddenly took him from his car and placed him in a separate compartment to return to Smolensk. There were several reasons why the NKVD wanted to save him for the time being with which to deal in this article, lack of space forbids.

The clincher of the whole Katyn investigation came when Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, asked Witness B: "Will you repeat for us the day that you left Kozielsk?"

The answer was: "April 29, 1940."

SOVIETS

On that day, April 29, 1940, the Soviets were in Smolensk and Katyn. The Germans did not arrive before 1941. Therefore, the massacre must have been committed by the Soviets. Witness B was also asked to give the names of some of his comrades in the transport. He mentioned three names. All three were found in the mass graves at Katyn.

Witness B, whose true name became later known and appeared in publications on the Katyn massacre, is Prof. S. Swianiewicz, still residing in London where he appeared before the American congressional committee.

Why the Poles never dared to tell the truth about Katyn remains a mystery. That they know the truth cannot be doubted.

A few days ago on April 29, 1965, the New York Times carried a report from Warsaw that the Government-owned Polish newspaper Zycie Warszawy had accused the New York Times' Warsaw correspondent, David Halberstam, of "tendentious and malicious presentation" of present Poland. Halberstam wrote about Poland as a "land of anti-Semitism" and "racial practices." Zycie Warszawy said about Halberstam: "He did not know or maybe preferred to forget that Poland pays homage every year to the heroes of the Warsaw ghetto."

This, of course, is gratifying to know.

The heroes of the Warsaw ghetto were slain by the Germans.

The heroes of the Katyn massacre, Polish authorities pretend to believe, were slain by the Germans.

Why then, does Poland not pay homage to the victims of Katyn?

While there are monuments in Poland to commemorate the patriots who died at Anzio Beach, there is not a single monument commemorating the Polish heroes of Katyn.

Why?

The answer is obvious.

Jim Bishop's Tribute to C. Leo DeOrsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, my good personal friend, the late C. Leo DeOrsey, inspired the confidence and affection of a wide range of people. One of them was the noted author and columnist, Jim Bishop, who has paid tribute to Leo in two most appropriate columns.

I wish to insert them in the RECORD for the benefit of those of Leo's friends who may have missed them:

A WASHINGTON LAWYER AND HIS SEVEN ASTRONAUTS

(By Jim Bishop)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A few days before Leo DeOrsey died, we played Indian Creek and he took a 5 iron on a 490-yard tee shot and said to the caddy: "I don't want to go far. Just straight." They can hang those words on his headstone because Leo DeOrsey was straight. And tough. By trade he was a lawyer, but he knew more angles than a drunken carpenter.

He was short and bald and he had a chimpanzee laugh which fooled his legal opponents. He looked like a soft touch. To the contrary, he controlled the Washington Redskins football team, owned the Kenilworth Hotel and Kenilworth House in Florida, had enough real estate to start his own county, and was counsel to the seven astronauts, Arthur Godfrey, General Omar Bradley, Marlene Dietrich, Eric Severeid, and Curtis LeMay.

Behind him he had a topflight backup team. His wife Helen is a handsome woman who watched "D" sustain one heart attack after another, and managed to keep him alive almost by willpower. She never panicked. Never wept. And, behind the scenes, Helen DeOrsey fought, survived, and beat cancer as though it wasn't worth a second thought.

"D" was a man of lightning fast decisions. His office overlooks the U.S. Treasury and, when the first heart seizure hit him, he took a tall courtly man named Robert Thompson as a full partner. While DeOrsey was still in the hospital, Thompson went out and fought a law case and came back with a fee of over a million dollars.

The Congress of the United States has probed several times to learn the relationship of DeOrsey and Thompson to the American astronauts. The legislators feared that

somehow, the foxy DeOrsey was getting rich on the ground while the spacemen were in orbit. I know the "inside" line by line. In coin, "D" came out exactly 10 cents ahead.

The cherry blossoms were beginning to bloom, in 1959, when Walter T. Bonney, an official of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, stopped into DeOrsey's office on a matter of urgency. He talked to "D" and Bob Thompson about seven astronauts. "The Government is about to name these men," he said, "and they are going to need protection and counsel."

"Like what?" said "D." Bonney said that Life magazine was already offering a large sum of money for the first-person stories of the astronauts, even though they had not been selected. DeOrsey looked at his partner. Thompson nodded. "All right," said "D." "I'll help them get a decent contract and I'll try to spread the payments a little so that they can keep a little of the money."

In this case, Leo DeOrsey was the sucker because the astronauts required a full-time lawyer, and it involved more than a contract. He conferred with the space men and suggested that the original seven pool their income so that, if one went into outer space, all would share in the proceeds from the story. They agreed.

The lawyer then conferred with Life, which offered $490,000 for the space story. "Why not $500,000?" said DeOrsey. Because, the editors said, you can't divide $500,000 by seven, but $490,000 comes out even. DeOrsey smiled. "Make it $500,000," he said, "and I'll do the arithmetic."

He never charged "my kids"—as he referred to them—a fee, and he never recovered from the shock of learning that they needed more and more of his time. He prayed them through every space shot; they called him from "Hangar S" at Cape Kennedy; they never made a financial move without his approval and, in time, they too began to feel that they were DeOrsey's kids.

There was Alan Shepard, Navy commander, life of the party and a shrewd businessman; Gus Grissom, Air Force major, a man who talks like a Biblical prophet; John Glenn, Marine officer and a religious puritan; Scott Carpenter, Navy commander, practical joker and the only astronaut to become an aquanaut.

Walter Schirra, Navy commander who speaks bluntly and follows orders to the letter; Gordon Cooper, Air Force major who, in the middle of an orbital flight, succumbs to thoughts like "I'm now in a capsule built by the lowest bidder," and Deke Slayton, Air Force major who never got off the ground because he developed a heart murmur.

Six years went by. The Nation made heroes of the seven, and they became prey to cheap publicity offers, and expensive gifts. A short time ago, Gus Grissom phoned "D" and said happily: "The mink breeders have offered Betty a full-length mink coat free. Is it okay?"

DeOrsey snapped: "No, you don't want it." Grissom swallowed hard. "Okay," he said softly, and hung up. Daddy "D" had spoken.

THERE WAS A PAYOFF FOR ASTRONAUTS' LAWYER

(By Jim Bishop)

WASHINGTON.—Soviet astronauts are promoted on the spot. When they land, they win increases in rank, pay, and allowances.

American astronauts win a medal and the personal congratulations of the President.

Two of the spacemen, Deke Slayton and Alan Shepard, hopped into a plane because they were a few hours short of their monthly flight time. If they didn't make it up, they would lose about $110 each. The plane was hit by lightning.

They got down safely. They phoned their father-confessor, Leo DeOrsey, who ripped off a string of four-letter words. "America spends millions training you guys," he roared, "and then makes you take chances for a few lousy bucks."

That's the question. A few lousy bucks.

The Congress, as well as the military hierarchy, has kept a suspicious eye on the spacemen. Each of the seven could have resigned after a successful orbit, and become rich by accepting offers. They have 7 wives and 15 children. Sometimes it is costly to be a patriot.

"D" (for Daddy DeOrsey) worked himself toward exhaustion trying to insure their economic future without cheapening these men. It wasn't easy. When the seven were offered a chance to buy 21 percent of a motel off Cape Kennedy, D said, "Buy." They bought. It was a legitimate business deal, but the Congress, which voted itself pay increases and a $95 million office building, was shocked.

DeOrsey had to sell the 21-percent interest quickly. Fortunately, he came out doubling the money. Nobody was hurt. The pooling of such extracurricular income among the seven has kept them working as a team, without rancor, without envy, and it unified them as brothers.

One man, Deke Slayton, never got off the ground. He was found, belatedly, to have a heart murmur. Today, whatever the others earn, a share goes to him. Each astronaut is confident his future is protected by all the others.

Alan Shepard was offered a free house in Maryland. "D" asked him to decline it. Later, all seven were offered free houses by generous Texans. There were no strings attached to the offer. De Orsey wanted his "kids" to accept, but the New York Times published a righteously indignant editorial and the gift was declined with thanks.

The puritanical Congressmen pondered how they could use the spacemen, while denying such use to anyone else. They finally came up with a scheme to ask NASA for astronauts to appear and speak in certain home districts. The seven are not permitted to decline. They say glumly: "It's my week in the barrel."

In 1963, Life magazine and the Field Enterprises Educational Corp., headed by Marshall Field, signed a contract with the astronauts (then increased to 16) guaranteeing each $16,250 a year for 4 years, with an option for 4 more. With it went a life insurance policy for $100,000 each. One man died recently. His widow will get $10,000 a year for the next 10 years.

Three years ago, De Orsey advised his boys to build a 108-unit apartment house in Washington. It is on Wheeler Road and is the first to be desegregated. It cost them $200,000. They could sell it now for $250,000. but "D" ordered them to hang onto it.

Five of the astronauts own part of a Texas building and loan bank. Others have sound stocks and bonds. Shepard is in the oil and bank business. Grissom and Cooper built a ski lodge near Colorado Springs. De Orsey negotiated a contract with Royal Crown Cola for John Glenn when the colonel quit space in favor of economic orbiting.

He will earn $50,000 a year for 5 years, and has an option to buy 60,000 shares of cola stock at $19.81 per share. The stock is selling around $27. Glenn could exercise his option, if he chose, and clear out with $430,000 now. But "D" said: "Stick with it, and work."

The original seven are now 28. There will be more. And the more frequent the space shots, the more unexciting they become. After the first moon shot, outer space may become relatively crowded with flying metal.

The novelty will be tarnished. No one will offer free houses or luscious business propositions, or astronaut pens and medals and kitchen utensils. Each orbit will be another days' drudgery. But that isn't true now.

De Orsey knew that none of it would last. He knew, too, that he wouldn't last. He worked on, driving himself from one heart attack to another. The week before he died, he sat in a beach cabana with his Helen, his daughters and son, and he kept a frowning glance on the grandchildren. "A man has a built-in desire to protect his children and their children. Why shouldn't the astronauts have the same goal?"

I said nothing. There was nothing to say. In 6 years, it cost Leo De Orsey $30,000 of his money to protect his Space Kids and help them protect their children. On his desk he has a plastic case with his payoff. The seven astronauts gave it to him after carrying it in orbit. It's a dented dime.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr* — 1200 S. Courthouse Rd., Arlington, Va.
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C* — 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa* — 301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn* — 119 7th St. SE.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

Address by Arthur J. Goldberg, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, Inaugural Dinner of the Jewish Center for the United Nations, May 2, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg recently delivered an outspoken address on religious freedom at the inaugural dinner of the Jewish Center for the United Nations in New York City. The speech was particularly frank in its assessment of anti-Semitism within the Soviet Union. Justice Goldberg noted that a report by the American delegate to the United Nations' Human Rights Commission has described a pattern of discrimination applicable to the Soviet Union. The pattern involves restrictions on travel, denial of the right to operate secular schools, a prohibition on national organizations, and interference with the publication of Jewish-language books and periodicals.

The Soviet Union has denied that Jews have been mistreated or discriminated against. Justice Goldberg stated if that is true the Soviet Union should adopt the declaration on religious intolerance under consideration by the U.N. Human Rights Commission. "Only by providing a world environment in which differences are tolerated and security provided for all minorities can we hope to provide the world with a foundation for a lasting peace," he said.

Justice Goldberg said of the establishment of the Jewish Center:

> The center for the United Nations and its counterparts will serve as an important symbol of the value to all men everywhere of freedom of religious exercise. Bringing religion to bear upon moral and ethical problems means helping all nations go forward, realizing the just society and the better world which is the hope and aspiration of all men everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I think this admirable statement of religious principle deserves the attention of Members of the House.

Justice Goldberg is to be commended on an outstanding statement of religious principle. It was particularly appropriate that the occasion of this fine declaration was the inaugural of the Jewish Center, which will be a credit to New York City and the United Nations. I commend Justice Goldberg's fine address to my colleagues in the House:

ADDRESS BY ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE INAUGURAL DINNER OF THE JEWISH CENTER FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, N.Y., MAY 2, 1965

I am very pleased to participate this evening in the inaugural dinner for the Jewish Center for the United Nations. This dinner appropriately takes place on the 60th anniversary of the Sutton Place Synagogue. Thus it both commemorates the Sutton Place Synagogue's venerable history of religious service and marks the extension of that worthy tradition through the creation of a center, which will serve both local and international Jewish communities.

On an occasion such as this one, it is fitting to renew our dedication to the United Nations. The United Nations quest for peace has been based upon the theory that "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed." I, together with millions of Americans and hundreds of millions of men and women throughout the world, would restate our conviction that the United Nations is not only a useful but also a necessary tool for building those defenses of peace, and that the United Nations is today the world's best hope for a lasting peace.

The crises—both diplomatic and financial—currently faced by the United Nations hover like a specter over the arena of international politics. Before giving way to pessimism, however, we should remember the numerous achievements of the United Nations in the 20 short years since its foundation. Only 2 years after its creation, the withdrawal of Russian troops from Iran was arranged through the United Nations. It played a part in the creation of Israel. Aggression was contained in Korea by the United States working through the United Nations. Within the past few years we have seen potential sparks that in other times might well have set off major conflicts extinguished by United Nations activity in Suez, the Congo, and Cyprus. And, we have witnessed the unprecedented transfer of political power from European nations to newly independent states—A transfer that could hardly have taken place so peacefully, had the United Nations not been in existence. Moreover, the work of the United Nations in providing economic aid and technical assistance to the emerging nations, its role in facilitating international cooperation in such areas as the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and its undertakings to assure greater respect for human rights are all well known.

The failures which have resulted in the crises through which the Organization is now passing are not those of the United Nations. The United Nations is not responsible for the consistent exercise of the veto by the Soviet Union in the Security Council, which has so often paralyzed effective peacekeeping action. The United Nations is not responsible for its members who refuse to pay the assessments which legally and morally they owe. Rather member states of the United Nations, not the Organization itself, are at fault. Sir Alexander Cadogan once pointed out that "A Stradivarius violin is nothing more than an assemblage of wood and catgut. It takes a musician to get harmony out of it. But if the player is at fault, there is no sense in blaming the instrument—still less in smashing it to pieces." I believe that the problems facing the United Nations can be overcome provided that each member nation, and its citizens, base their actions upon a patriotism in the best sense of that word—this, as Lord Cecil once remarked, is "The patriotism by which a man instinctively sets the highest standard for his nation's conduct. The new patriotism will not be different in kind from the old, but it will be larger and more free from the sordid jealousies and suspicion which now defile international life." As we enter into international cooperation year we must rededicate ourselves both to support of the United Nations and to this ideal of a patriotism that will allow the United Nations to attain its goal of a lasting peace.

The Jewish Center for the United Nations, like the Catholic and Protestant Centers, is itself a reaffirmation of faith in the United Nations. Moreover, it is a reaffirmation of confidence in religious liberty, tolerance, and that freedom of the human spirit which the United Nations Organization, as well as its Secretaries General, continually seek. We have learned that religious tolerance is the touchstone of all freedom, for freedom of body means little without freedom of the mind and soul. It is no accident that the first amendment to our Constitution—an amendment that was necessary to obtain the Constitution's ratification—guarantees the free exercise of religion. The Founders of our Nation were victims of discrimination and religious oppression and were determined in the New World not to repeat the errors of the Old.

America is indeed a shining example of the benefits of religious liberty and tolerance. Our Constitution expressly guarantees to all inhabitants of the land the right of free exercise of religion. Under our Constitution there is a wholesome neutrality by the Government toward all religions: The ideal of our Constitution as to religious freedom is one of absolute equality before the law of all religious opinions and sects: The Government, while protecting all, prefers none, and it disparages none; our constitutional policy does not deny the value of necessity for religious training, teaching, or observance; rather it secures their full exercise without helping or hindering any particular religion.

It is appropriate to note that the United Nations universal declaration of human rights expresses a similar ideal. Article 18, adopted by the General Assembly on December 10, 1948, states:

"Every one has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion: This right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance."

It is significant that freedom of religion is given a prominent position in this declaration of human rights—a declaration which Dag Hammarskjold called "the universal expression in the field of human rights of the aims of our world today, a world where the memory is still fresh of some of the worst infringements of human rights ever experienced in history, and a world which is also facing the problem of human rights in new and increasingly complicated form."

As a reading of any newspaper amply shows, today the attention of the world is

focused upon denials of racial equality. My remarks this evening emphasize religious liberty, not because I would denigrate the importance of racial equality, but because of the nature of this occasion, and because I believe that the ideals of religious liberty and racial equality are equally important. Both ideals spring directly from enlightenment concepts of the natural rights of man. Both of these ideals must be energetically and consistently pursued if they are not to be lost. In a world made up of people of all races, and religions, a harmonious and peaceful world society is impossible so long as men are ill treated either because of their race or their religion.

For these reasons I believe it most important that the United Nations adopt the draft declaration on religious intolerance currently being considered by the Human Rights Commission. I am particularly pleased that the United States, along with India and the United Kingdom, played a major role in the drafting of this convention, and urging its adoption.

The adoption of this convention is, in my view, particularly important because of the unhappy fact that religious discrimination exists in many parts of the new world. This discrimination is particularly notable in the Soviet Union. The American delegate to the Human Rights Commission, obviously referring to the Soviet Union, stated the following:

"Since the defeat of Nazi Germany no state has pursued an overt and declared policy of genocide against an ethnic group. But we must recognize that some states where laws forbid discrimination in the most forceful terms nevertheless carry on policies which are designed to have the effect of obliterating an ethnic group. The biological differences of race cannot be exterminated by cultural deprivations, but ethnic differences, and sometimes nationality differences, are absolutely dependent on language, schools, publications and other cultural institutions in order to survive. Cut an ethnic or national tradition off from these, and it will die, however nourished the body of the citizen is by food, clothing and shelter.

"We must deal with anti-Semitism even when it takes the forms of deprivation of the religious and cultural heritage which makes this group unique. We should make it clear that a state which makes provision for German language schools for that ethnic group should not deny Yiddish or Hebrew schools to its Jews: That a state which can permit national and regional organizations of some ethnic groups should, under the principle of nondiscrimination, permit the same for Jews; that a state which permits recognized leaders of every other group to travel abroad to conferences and holy places should not be able to deny that right to Jewish leaders; that a state that finds facilities to publish textual materials in the language and traditions of some groups should not be able to deny that right to Jewish leaders; that a state that is able to tolerate the differences in 100 nationalities should have no right whatever to extinguish those differences in the 101st."

The Soviet Union has consistently denied the jews are mistreated or discriminated against within its borders. I believe that if the Soviet Government is sincere in its professed desire to eliminate anti-Semitism, it surely ought to vote for the convention on the elimination of religious intolerance; it ought not to slow down consideration of this convention and hinder its adoption. Moreover, I should like to see the Soviet Union adopt the proposal of Mr. Morris Abram, the U.S. expert member of the Human Rights Commission, that a subcommission be formed, which would meet in various parts of the world, including the Soviet Union, to "check fact against claim and hope against reality," in determining the extent to which religious discrimination exists. Such a subcommission, of course, would deal with discrimination against any minority and would meet in any part of the world where discrimination was alleged. By providing such a neutral factfinding body, the United Nations might well destroy much discrimination by exposing it to the cold light of world public opinion.

Lord Action, in the last century, said that "the most certain test by which we judge whether a country is really free is the amount of security enjoyed by minorities." In my opinion there can be no more worthwhile task for the United Nations, or for us, its supporters, than to work for an end to discrimination of all sorts and complete security for all minorities in every part of the world. Only by providing a world environment in which differences are tolerated and such security is provided can we hope to provide the world with a foundation for a lasting peace. All men of good will, therefore, should endorse and support the adoption by the United Nations of the draft declaration on the elimination of religious intolerance.

The Jewish Center for the United Nations and its counterparts will serve as an important symbol of the value to all men everywhere of freedom of religious exercise. Bringing religion to bear upon moral and ethical problems means helping all nations go forward realizing the just society and the better world which is the hope and aspiration of all men everywhere.

Career of Dr. Jeremiah Stamler

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from Dr. Walter Johnson, eminent American historian and educator, I have received a curriculum vitae and statements that tell about the research activities and the many honors bestowed upon Dr. Jeremiah Stamler. These I feel I should share with my colleagues.

Dr. Stamler's chief activity is in local and national research into the causes and prevention of the major cardiovascular diseases—coronary heart disease and hypertension. He is recognized as one of the great authorities of the world in this field.

One major facet is the epidemiologic study of population groups to learn more about the causes of coronary and hypertensive diseases, by following their development in large groups. For the past 7 years several thousand men in a Chicago utility company have been a part of such study, and important information has been gathered that could aid in the preventive effort.

In an attempt to apply this new knowledge, in a research program, men have been identified as high risk in terms of their chances of developing coronary heart disease. Such men have been enlisted in a program to reduce this risk via intervention in several aspects of life pattern and health status—diet, smoking, weight, blood pressure, exercise habits. This effort—the coronary prevention evaluation program—has involved close to 300 men, some for as long as 7 years, and is a pioneer effort in the Nation.

Several major national cooperative studies are in progress and include Dr. Stamler as one of the principal investigators. He is chairman of the cooperative group of investigators engaging in the national coronary drug study.

He has been one of the six principal investigators in the national diet-heart study, a major undertaking supported by the National Institutes of Health, and of critical import to future preventive programs.

Together with several other investigators, he is participating in a national study group on physical activity and coronary disease.

These studies involving years of planning and activity and thousands of participants are all indicative of the important new stage in heart research—the first steps to apply new knowledge to lower the toll of premature death from heart attacks, killer of 600,000 annually in the United States.

Cardiovascular disease is the subject of international concern and study. Dr. Stamler's work and efforts in our country have brought him into working relationships with investigators like himself, throughout the world.

As a member of the International Cardiological Society, its research committee and chairman of its subcommittee on epidemiology, he has aided in the planning of its gatherings and cooperative programs. He is also Western Hemisphere editor of the Journal of Atherosclerosis Research.

Together with this large-scale and long-term research program, Dr. Stamler has been deeply involved in increasing public health service to Chicago's citizens. The division of adult health and aging, of which he is director, annually serves tens and tens of thousands of Chicagoans in programs for early detection of major chronic disease. Such services include a wide spread Papanicolaou smear program to detect early uterine cancer, a throat-culture program—especially in youngsters—to detect streptococcus infections and help prevent rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease as complications. It has included a cooperative effort—a heart sounds project—where thousands of school children were tested for possible heart disease. It includes a large and expanding diabetes detection program among expectant mothers and in residents of several low-income communities. In several community chronic disease detection centers, multiphasic testing for all the major chronic disease serves many thousands each year. Nutrition programs serve in the prenatal stations, nursing homes and many other Chicago institutions.

Support for the research efforts has been awarded to Dr. Stamler in the form of many grants.

Dr. Jeremiah Stamler lives at 1332 East Madison Park in the district I have the honor to represent. He is:

Director, division of adult health and aging.

Director, heart disease control program, Chicago Board of Health.

Executive director, Chicago Health Research Foundation.

Assistant professor, Department of Medicine, Northwestern University Medical School.

Consulting member, Department of Medicine, St. Joseph Hospital.

HIS EDUCATION

A.B., Columbia College, Columbia University, 1940.

M.D., Long Island College of Medicine—New York State University Medical School at New York—1943.

HIS CAREER

Intern, Long Island College Division, Kings County Hospital, Brooklyn, N.Y., 1944.

Medical Corps, U.S. Army, active duty—rank, captain—1944–46.

Fellow in Pathology—with Dr. Jean Oliver—Department of Pathology, Long Island College of Medicine, Brooklyn, N.Y., 1947.

Research fellow—with Dr. Louis N. Katz—Cardiovascular Department, Medical Research Institute, Michael Reese Hospital, Chicago, Ill., 1948.

Research associate—with Dr. Louis N. Katz—Cardiovascular Department, Medical Research Institute, Michael Reese Hospital, Chicago, Ill., 1949–55.

Established investigator, American Heart Association, 1952–58.

Assistant director, Cardiovascular Department, Medical Research Institute, Michael Reese Hospital, Chicago, Ill., 1955–58.

Director, heart disease control program, Chicago Board of Health, 1958.

Associate, Department of Medicine, Northwestern University Medical School, 1958–59.

Assistant professor, Department of Medicine, Northwestern University Medical School, 1959.

Dr. Stamler is a member of the following scientific societies:

American Association for the Advancement of Science—Fellow.

American Diabetes Association.

American Federation for Clinical Research.

American Heart Association.

American Institute of Nutrition.

American Physiology Society.

American Psychosomatic Society.

American Public Health Association—Fellow.

American Society for Clinical Investigation.

American Society for the Study of Arteriosclerosis—Council on Arteriosclerosis, American Heart Association—Fellow.

Association of Clinical Scientists.

Association of State and Territorial Directors and Coordinators of Research.

Central Society for Clinical Research.

Chicago Academy of Sciences.

Chicago Heart Association.

Chicago Nutrition Association.

Circulation Section, American Physiological Society.

Council on Epidemiology, American Heart Association—Fellow.

Council for High Blood Pressure Research, American Heart Association.

Diabetes Association of Greater Chicago.

Illinois Academy of Sciences.

Illinois Public Health Association.

Institute of Medicine of Chicago—Academic Fellow.

Middle States Public Health Association.

Phi Beta Kappa Honor Society.

Renal Club of Chicago.

Royal Society of Health.

Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine, Illinois Section.

He is currently a member of the following committees:

INTERNATIONAL

Advisory Board, International Congress on Smoking and Health, and its committee on program and on exhibits, 1964–5.

Research Committee, International Society of Cardiology, 1962–5.

Subcommittee on Epidemiology, Research Committee, International Society of Cardiology—chairman—1962–5.

NATIONAL

Ad Hoc Committee on the role of the central committee and the future of AHA medical and community programs—chairman—1964–5.

Board of Directors, American Heart Association, 1964–5.

Central Committee for Medical and Community Services, American Heart Association, 1963–5.

Executive Committee, Council on Epidemiology, American Heart Association, 1964–5.

Committee on Nutrition, council coordinating committee for community program, the American Heart Association, 1964–5.

Committee on professional relations, Chicago Unit Professional Education Committee, American Cancer Society, 1964–5.

Committee of Consultant Participants, study on drugs and coronary heart disease—chairman—1962–5.

Committee on Public Relation and Public Information, American Heart Association, 1965.

Advisory Committee, Congenital Heart Disease Research and Training Center, 1961–5.

Executive Committee on Diet and Heart Disease, 1962–5.

National Cooperative Committee for Study on Physical Activity and Cardiopulmonary Disease—physical activity study planning group—1963–5.

Resolutions Committee, Epidemiology Section, American Public Health Association, 1961–4.

Subcommittee on Cardiovascular Diseases, national office of vital statistics, 1961–5.

Subcommittee on Criteria and Methods, Council on Epidemiology, American Heart Association, 1964–5.

Working group on preventive programs, Council Coordinating Committee for Community Program, American Heart Association, 1965.

CHICAGO AND ILLINOIS

Board of Directors, Diabetes Association of greater Chicago, 1963–65.

Board of Governors, Chicago Heart Association, 1963–65.

Business Division for the 1965 Heart Fund campaign—physician cochairman—1964–65.

Chicago Heart Association Committee on Cardiovascular Clinical Services, 1963–65.

Committee on Community Health, the Institute of Medicine of Chicago, 1964–65.

Epidemiology Committee, Chicago Heart Association—chairman—1960–65.

Executive Committee, Illinois Public Health Association, 1963–65.

Director, Chronic Disease Control Division, Chicago Board of Health, 1961–63.

Director, Division of Adult Health and Aging, Chicago Board of Health, 1963.

Executive Director, Chicago Health Research Foundation, 1963.

Consultant in Medicine, St. Joseph Hospital, Chicago, 1964.

Western Hemisphere editor, Journal of Atherosclerosis Research, 1963.

You Can't Negotiate When a House Is Afire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, we would all like to feel that the world has arrived at a time when all aggressors would be quickly tried by international agencies and thus prevented from taking freedom away from innocent peoples and nations. That time has regrettably not yet arrived. The following editorial from the Florida Times Union justly praises our able President for his courage and good judgment in acting as he did in the Dominican crisis. Only the uninformed could feel that the Reds once in power there by aggression would be willing to back out for free local elections just because some international agency condemned the aggression. When a house is afire prompt action is needed.

The editorial reads as follows:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union May 11, 1965]

YOU CAN'T NEGOTIATE WHEN HOUSE IS AFIRE

Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY is concerned because the United States did not consult with the Organization of American States (OAS) before sending troops into the Dominican Republic to save lives and block a Communist takeover. He says that his brother followed such a policy in the Cuban missile crisis and that it should have been done again.

If the Senator's house were on fire, it is doubtful that he would have a conference about it before calling the fire department, but he wants this country to take such action during international crisis. What he doesn't seem to realize is that the Reds have now failed in the Dominican Republic but that they are still in Cuba.

A proposal by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, calling for creation of a Western Hemisphere military police force to handle similar crises, has more merit but it, too, would require much talk. It should be noted that the Reds got 200 miles of South Korean territory

which later had to be bought back with American blood because the U.N. debates went on so long.

No country likes to stick its neck out in a crisis, but the United States must be prepared to do so or see its friends and allies swept under by the Red tide.

Sometimes War Is the Lesser Evil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I know that many in this body have shared my concern over reports of American young men tearing up their draft cards, picketing for peace at any price, and expressing refusal to fight to defend our country.

I am sure those we read about are not typical of our youth, and we should not judge a generation by its aberrations. Nevertheless, these incidents do give us concern.

In this connection I would like to insert the following article from the Arizona Republic which was written by the Very Reverend Paul D. Urbano:

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic, May 15, 1965]

SOMETIMES WAR THE LESSER EVIL

(By the Very Reverend Paul D. Urbano, rector, All Saints' Episcopal Church)

Armed Forces Day will carry many of my generation back 23 years, to World War II and to a world that is no more. It will carry us back to the Garand rifle and to "honorable D bar" and to Higgins boats and lost friends and other memories that, somehow, never grow dim.

War is hell, as Sherman said; but it is also life intensified, because it is life consciously lived in imminent danger of death. War is degrading—and also ennobling. A combat soldier is never quite the same again; he never recovers the happy innocence—or the weakness—he had before. When, even after all these years, one meets a combat soldier, there springs up an instant rapport, a sense of real equality based on fact. And I never met a combat man who didn't say, "I couldn't do it again, but I wouldn't have missed it."

BLIND MEN DESCRIBING ELEPHANT

War, like love, should not be judged by people who have never been in it. The beardless students who, at small risk to themselves, riot in our universities over every military necessity are no doubt motivated, in part, by kindly feelings toward the human race. Many of them are also motivated by political and economic theories more atavistic at heart than any military action. But in any case, they are blind men describing the elephant. And, as Chesterton said, "The first act of a fool is to teach his grandmother how to suck eggs; fools have no reverence; fools have no humility."

What those killed in war would say would not make pleasant hearing, by and large; for the overwhelming majority of those killed in war have died for the wealth, the power, and the egotistic pretensions of small and wicked men.

MOST OF US WENT QUITE WILLINGLY

But in World War II, most of us did not feel that way. Most of us went quite willingly. It was terrifying. It was dirty. It was an agony. But it was necessary.

We knew we would never live, any of us, unless we first risked our lives. We risked our lives to give mankind another chance. And many of us lost our lives. But no one said that it was not worth while.

In those days, the United States was a great power, not just in wealth and technique and military potential, but in heart and will. Not even a quarter century of pacifist propaganda after World War I had extinguished the spirit of the freeman who can say (and mean it), "Give me liberty or give me death." No one that I can remember said, "Better axis than praxis."

The peace of Versailles had been bungled. The League of Nations had been a fiasco. The world had not been "made safe" for anything. But somehow, we realized that the world never would be safe, that it had to be secured over again every day, and that our turn had come to secure it. Our fathers had bled to give us our chance; and now we would bleed to give our sons a chance—a chance at a life of dignity and freedom.

AS IF THEY INCURRED NO DEBTS

But now? Now, no one seems to think of anything but his own short life. Everyone acts as if he had come into the world without incurring any debts. The less morality we have privately, it seems, the more we pretend publicly. People who treat all ethics with contempt are too good to go to war. A generation singularly lacking in conscience at home is wounded in its conscience by our actions abroad. Montaigne said it all: "These two things, I have observed, always go together: supercelestial opinions and subterranean morals."

No Christian can court war. But no Christian can withdraw himself from his brothers or from the struggle for freedom and justice, either. In the world as it now is, we are compelled to choose mainly between evils. And our duty is to choose the lesser evil. Horrible, sinful, agonizing as war is, it is better than some other things, as death is preferable to dishonor.

Quest for Excellence Is New National Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the White House conference on natural beauty, I commend to my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Sacramento Bee on May 14, 1965. The editorial emphasizes the President's concern for a healthy nation which is complemented by the natural beauty of our environment.

The text of the editorial follows:

QUEST FOR EXCELLENCE IS NEW NATIONAL GOAL

The main thrust of this Nation's domestic economy since World War II has been toward abundance of the material things in life. Now there is spreading across the land an awakening to the need for emphasis on quality as well as quantity.

President Lyndon B. Johnson hit upon this note with his February special message to Congress on natural beauty, calling for greater stress on creating and maintaining an environment in which people can live full and healthy lives.

Johnson, summoning a national effort on the part of government, business and private groups, suggested attacks on air and water pollution, the designation of more parks and recreational areas and the elimination of eyesore junkyards along highways. He said:

"We must not only protect the countryside and save it from destruction, we must restore what has been destroyed and salvage the beauty and charm of our cities."

This week, the Nation's first lady made a scenic trip by bus and airplane to spotlight some roadside beauty points in Virginia. She was joined by a host of beautification experts on the tour which was designed to bring atention to a special White House conference on natural beauty. This gathering, a direct result of the President's spur for action, will be held May 24 and 25 under the chairmanship of Laurance Rockefeller.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, historian and former presidential aide, recently talked about this new aspect of the American experiment in a Sacramento speech.

Appearing before a community forum sponsored by the Bee, KFBK and KOVR—TV—Schlesinger described it as a new "quest for excellence" which will be the source of future strength of the democratic system.

There is need for each individual to rededicate himself to raising the quality of his own life as well as applauding the achievements of others.

Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a thoughtful constituent of mine has forwarded to me an item from the Chicago Tribune which I consider to be of such thought-provoking value as to warrant being placed in the RECORD. It will be read, I hope, by my colleagues and by others who search the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for gleanings of wisdom:

MAN OF THE YEAR

The Tribune today presents the real man of the year.

He was not picked by the junior association of commerce, or by the senior association of commerce, or by the politicians, or by any association of newspapermen. You won't find his picture in the papers. You may not recognize him as you pass him on the street. But we hope you do.

Our man of the year is in the middle income brackets. He gets up every morning at 6:30 so that he can get to his job in an office or factory at 8 or 8:30. He works hard, not only because he wants advancement, but because he thinks his employer deserves a fair deal. He is honest and dependable.

Our man of the year manages to get along with one wife. They have three or four children, whom they love so much they teach them to be respectful, law abiding, and self-reliant. They have done their best to earn and save enough money to send their children to college, but the rising costs of higher education make this goal more difficult each year.

The rising cost of everything also makes it harder to put aside money for retirement. Recent Federal income tax reductions have helped the people in high income brackets and low income brackets but the man in the

middle has got little benefit. There are no loopholes in the income tax for him, and he can't put any money into tax-exempt securities.

Social security taxes, which started at $30 a year, are now up to $174. Soon the medicare program will make them much higher. Local property taxes have doubled and so have the various State taxes. Worst of all, the purchasing power of the dollar is only 42 percent of what it was when our man of the year bought his first insurance policy in 1937. The little money which he has set aside for a rainy day is worth about half of what it was when he earned it.

Our man of the year belongs to a church and works at his religion. He is no saint, but he understands the Biblical meaning of neighbor and tries to be decent to men of all races and creeds. You won't find him, however, in civil disobedience demonstrations. He believes laws ought to be enforced.

Our man of the year is not ashamed to be considered a patriot. He flies the flag on national holidays. He can't understand Americans who join organizations dedicated to the destruction of America. He can't understand legislators and judges who strive to undermine law and order, or to feather their own nests.

Our man of the year believes in our system of Government. He votes at every election, but he votes only once.

For all his merits, we salute him.

The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous permission from the House, I include the seventh chapter of the article, "A Personal Report: The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," by Mr. William Benton, in the RECORD.

This study of the Soviet academic system is one of the finest that I have studied and it is certainly of great merit to those who want to understand our competitors for world supremacy more thoroughly than they do now.

The seventh chapter follows:

CHAPTER VII. THE SOVIET FILMMAKERS: IMPORTANT TEACHERS OF THE TAUGHT

(A personal report: "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," by William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its executive board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica)

All types of films in the Soviet Union, whether for entertainment, instruction, or documentation, have always been considered to be a part, and not the most subtle part, of Communist propaganda. This conception is changing for a number of reasons. One is that films loaded with doctrine and exhortation do not attract audiences—even in the Soviet Union. Soviet newspapers publish letters saying that the people want more entertainment in their films—may Lenin forgive them—more escape in their entertainment, and more humor. Accordingly, some entertainment films are being produced in the Soviet Union today which have little or possibly no designed propaganda content. Perhaps they too are designed as bait to bring the people to the theaters for the propaganda films.

It is impossible to discuss Soviet films, or any of the communicative arts in the U.S.S.R., without discussing propaganda. If there is no propaganda in the content of some of the new entertainment films, there most certainly is in their administration. A movie producer or director is expected to be concerned with politics. Usually he is free to seek and express truth only if it is Communist "truth." Few Soviet writers of any kind deviate from this basic principle, even when they believe that they do. This is of high importance in our judgment of the Soviet scene.

When I visited the Gorki Studios in 1962, the famous producer and director Sergei Gerasimov told me, "The time has passed when our films can win prizes because they are ideologically good but artistically bad. We can no longer cover up a bad film with a good idea." (Good ideas, in his view, being good Communist propaganda.)

"The freedom of the artist is now absolute," he said, but he added, "except for abjurations of Lenin, and the presentation of counterrevolution, or pornography."

These are notable exceptions—especially the "abjurations of Lenin." But they apply primarily to the making of Soviet films for public entertainment. There are other categories of films into which it is impossible to inject any form of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Instructional films about the sciences cannot show the workings of a Communist atom, for example, or give a political slant to the principles of chemistry. Most Soviet educational leaders are perfectly aware of this, and teaching films are now being produced in the Soviet Union that are devoid of Communist propaganda.

In 1964 I visited at some length with Sergei Romanovsky, chairman of the U.S.S.R. State Committee on Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, one of whose major concerns is the exchange of films. (Romanovsky negotiated the current cultural exchange agreement with the United States. He served as chairman of the U.S.S.R. delegation at the General Conference of UNESCO in the fall of 1964—at which I served as chairman of the U.S. delegation—and we again visited and lunched together in Paris.)

Romanovsky was incensed that exchange of Soviet entertainment films with the United States was not increasing. High in the party hierarchy, he of course thinks first in terms of the political effect of what he says; but he appeared deeply concerned and frustrated by the lack of interest of the United States in Soviet films. He said that in 1963 the total exchange was one film in each direction. "How can we buy unless we sell?" he asked me. He blamed the lack of sales on the U.S. State Department. He is free to buy U.S. films without selling Soviet films in exchange, of course, but he does not choose to do so. Other countries do. Certainly it is misleading and erroneous for him to blame the State Department for his inability to sell films to the United States.

According to his figures, from 1959 to April 1964 the Soviet Union had purchased 29 American films. Between 300 and 600 prints were made of each, and all were widely distributed and viewed by large audiences. During this time, he said, U.S. exhibitors bought 18 Soviet films and distributed only 12. He did not know how many prints had been made, but he said the films were shown only at "second-rate" art theaters and to small audiences.

"Our best efforts to establish direct contact with the film industry in your country have ended in failure," he said. "You will not take our films."

He seemed to prefer not to understand that the showing of movies is a private, not a governmental, business in the United States: "Why would theater owners show films that customers do not want to see?" I asked him. "The movie 'Tom Jones,' produced by the British, has set an alltime sales record for a foreign film—because the American customers wanted to see it. You will never get good distribution in the United States until you produce films that the American people want to see—and until you learn how to publicize your films in our country."

Romanovsky hammered on his desk and said, "That is not the basic problem."

He went on. "The basic problem is a lack of interest by your State Department in our films. Your State Department doesn't give anyone a list of recommendations of our films. Therefore, the theater owners do not know about them. They do not even look at them or review them. How can your theater owners decide whether to show our films if your State Department doesn't recommend them to be previewed?"

In our way of doing business, achieving either domestic or foreign sales is primarily the task of private enterprise. Furthermore, our State Department does call the attention of U.S. distributors to Soviet films. The Department has every reason to encourage the exchanges. Can it be that Romanovsky does understand our way of doing business but wants to do business only his way—and with inferior films? I report his views to show how a "Berlin wall" of words can be built—and how difficult it is to tear down. Later, however, I took the trouble to read the text of the exchange agreement, and I can see how some of his misunderstanding might have arisen from it.

Some of the language of the agreement is unfortunate. It implies to him that the State Department is more important in relation to the film industry, and to the distribution of films, than it actually is. It implies to him that the State Department can give him U.S. distribution, which it cannot. Of course, the Department does not have the influence and control that the Soviet Ministry of Culture has. The agreement may seem to suggest a parallel role where it states "both parties agree to encourage practical measures for the increase of the sale and purchase of motion pictures to the film industries of their respective countries on the principle of equality and mutually acceptable terms."

But the heart of the problem is the limited appeal of Soviet films to the U.S. public and the lack of publicity for them. In 1958, under the first exchange agreement, seven Soviet films were purchased by U.S. companies, at an artificially high price. Two made a little money; five lost money. In balance, the loss on the seven was $560,000. Understandably, American distributing companies have been wary ever since. Of course, there is some prejudice against Soviet films in the United States. Many people feel that Soviet films are dull and probably loaded with propaganda. Little has been done to change this attitude. But the essential fact in our free market is that good films will find an audience, especially if they are backed with skilled publicity.

The poignant Soviet film "Ballad of a Soldier," for example, got many good reviews but little national advertising or other publicity; it was not a significant financial success. And Romanovsky is wrong in speaking of so-called art theaters (a most unhappy name, I must say) as "second-rate." Some films shown exclusively in the small theaters have earned as much as $1 million for their producers. "Tom Jones" started in small houses. It quickly moved out into the big houses when queues lengthened. It is the first foreign film ever to achieve a gross income of more than $10 million in the United States.

The promised new Soviet version of Tolstoy's "War and Peace" is a film that may be notable for many reasons, but is certainly

newsworthy for the single one that it runs for 10 hours. (It is to be released in four installments.) If the Soviets were to send the beautiful actress who plays the role of Natasha to the United States, and in other ways give the production a rousing buildup before its premiere, they might score a smash hit—either with the four separate parts or after severe pruning.

"In my judgment," I told Romanovsky, "you should have prints of your films in the United States so that they can be readily viewed by exhibitors. You should have a salesman in America, or a distributor who is promoting them. You should have a publicity agent who is arousing interest in them. You should tackle the American market just as the Italians and the English have tackled it. They have learned to make special films for export instead of expecting that the films made for their countries will necessarily appeal also to the United States." (My own reports indicate that Soviet films don't do much better in Western European countries than they do in the United States.)

Some of the same frustrations plague the responsible Soviet officials in the field of teaching and scientific films. Vladimir Baskakov, vice president of the State Committee for Cinematography, compared the U.S. attitude with that of the British. "Even though British production is limited," he said, "they still manage to arrange exchanges with us. You haven't. By contrast, your American officials pay no attention to our films. Why haven't they arranged to show us your educational and scientific films? Why haven't they arranged for you to have a look at our films? Why are the British so interested while Americans are not?"

He said the U.S.S.R. produces 120 to 130 films for classrooms annually. Besides these, they produce another 120 science films each year—for students in higher education, and some for general audiences. Also under Baskakov's supervision is the production of about 200 films annually which are commissioned by various Soviet ministries and industries, and 300 documentaries, including newsreels for theaters and television.

He produced a fat, hard-cover film catalog and waved it at me, saying, "I want you to know everything." The table of contents showed that 140 pages were given to the listing of chronicle and documentary films; 202 pages to popular science; 80 pages to school films and school lectures; and the balance of perhaps another 100 pages to newsreels and health. Baskakov stressed that the listing was complete only through 1962, and said that a more complete catalog would be published in English in the fall of 1964.

He and his associates do not understand U.S. sensitivity to Communist propaganda; they insist that they have many marvelous science films without a trace of bias which could be exchanged for similar films made in the United States. I offered to look at some of the Soviet classroom films, and I was shown five. Baskakov also asked me to look at films about some of the writers of classic Russian literature, such as Pushkin and Chekhov—and he mentioned a 1-hour film of Ulanova, the great ballerina, which he said "of course can be cut down." Most of the films run 20 to 40 minutes.

The classroom films I viewed seemed to be good, but perhaps more the type we would call documentary. For example, a film called "The Universe," for children 10 to 14, opens with an attractive boy poking a campfire at night in a woods. With him is an older man. They begin to talk about the stars. The man, who might be a typical Boy Scout leader in the United States begins some elementary instruction in astronomy. Suddenly the two of them, in astronaut garb, are in a space ship. They fly around in space and the man explains the moon, the sun, the solar system, and much else about the universe, while the boy comments and asks questions.

I saw also a film dealing with an attractive red fish found in Vietnam, a film that depicted the difference between "the vegetable world and the animal world." I saw another about "the beat of the heart" (for children 7 to 10), a geography film for teenagers, and one for primary grades titled "Who Lives in This House?" The last showed a woodpecker boring a hole in a tree—an effort that ultimately resulted in his preparing a home for an owl. The films were in color, and I have no doubt most children would watch them attentively.

Some of these nonpropaganda instructional films may be available for reviewing in the United States in 1965. In negotiations conducted late in 1964 in Moscow by Encyclopedia Britannica Films, Inc., Soviet film officials agreed to supply the company with 10 films (most of them dealing with the natural sciences but including an analytical film on Soviet education based upon a series of critical articles that appeared in Izvestia). They also agreed to purchase a number of United States instructional films, to accept a United States director for a film on geography to be made in the Soviet Union, and to exchange representatives to investigate additional instructional film exchanges. While this is a small beginning, closely scrutinized by both parties to exclude any hint of ideological promotion, it is strictly in line with President Johnson's wish to increase communication between the two countries and to make 1965 a designated "International Cooperation Year."

Soviet educators who were shown Encyclopedia Britannica films by Charles Benton expressed intense interest. Films in biology and other scientific fields aroused far more discussion than films dealing with the social studies. Foreign language films were second to science. The first question always asked was, "Did you test this?" The second, "What are the statistics?" Some Soviet teachers—and this has been true in the past in the United States—seem to regard teaching films as competitors; they have to be reassured that "the teacher can but does not have to use films."

Everywhere, and notably in their interview with the rector of Moscow University, Ivan Petrovsky, the representatives of Encyclopedia Britannica Films found eager ears for descriptions of innovation and experimental work in education. The men responsible for education are searching for "the best techniques in the world," and they seem to be convinced that the United States, through the Encyclopedia Britannica and others interested in "the new techniques," has a great deal to teach them (as indeed we have). One major possibility is that the U.S.S.R. will perk up and apply the new methods developed in the United States far more rapidly than will all but a few of our own school systems.

Although one would have difficulty reading any specific propaganda into Soviet science films which might be offered in the United States, I feel that if they are shown to schoolchildren in the United States, they should be well labeled as products of the Soviet Union. These films will illustrate how the Soviet Union is embracing the use of the film in the classroom. They will show us the vast mine of Soviet educational films. Some of them may open the eyes of American educators.

The present exchange agreement does not mention classroom films, except as they may be included in the category of documentary films. About these, Sergei Romanovsky was almost as disgruntled as he was about feature films. "There is a provision in the treaty concerning documentaries, but there is no exchange," he said.

But in his general attitude Romanovsky may be purposefully pessimistic; there is much more to be said on both sides, as there most certainly is about the exchange of entertainment films. Two years ago, Soviet negotiators seemed to want "West Side Story" very badly. When it was made available to them, they decided they did not want it. Why did they change their minds? The picture, when shown at a Soviet film festival, was wildly applauded. Can it be that Soviet officials originally anticipated that it would produce an unfavorable reaction toward the United States? However, the Soviet audience, like most audiences, apparently so admired the picture they forgot to be critical of New York street gangs. This illustrates one aspect of the problem.

There is greater familiarity with Soviet feature films on the part of the U.S. distributors than Romanovsky appears to realize. American companies literally scour the world for films that will bring audiences into theaters. A United Artists representative visits the U.S.S.R. regularly. Soviet films are shown at festivals and in theaters in various countries, including the Far East and Africa, and United States distributors get reports on them. The Motion Picture Association offered to bear the cost of assembling a group of distributors to look at Soviet films, and has recently received several films for viewing.

The 14th Karlovy Vary International Film Festival in Czechoslovakia, which alternates yearly with the international film festival in Moscow, is considered by many to be a door for entertainment film exchanges between the East and West. In July 1964, showing apparently no political bias, the judges gave first prize to a Czechoslovakian film, Jan Kádár and Elmar Klos's "Defendants"; second prize to a U.S. film, Gore Vidal and Franklin Schaffner's "The Best Man"; and third to a Soviet film, "The Living and the Dead," based on the novel by Konstantin Simonov. "The Best Man," which deals satirically with the selection of a presidential candidate in the United States, happened to be shown at the festival the day after Senator Barry Goldwater's nomination as Republican presidential candidate, and was reported to be a great hit.

"Defendants" is the story of a construction manager who misuses public funds; Simonov's novel, "The Living and the Dead," tells of the Soviet Army's retreat before the German Army's onslaught in 1941.

Entertainment films made in the United States have been purchased widely in virtually every country in the world. They certainly contain no propaganda especially placed in them to promote the American way of life—on the contrary, many of our entertainment films are likely to give a bad impression of life, manners, and morals in the United States. This in my judgment is true of "The Best Man," which I have seen. Far from being a propaganda film, it is a cynical and bitterly unfair indictment of our democratic processes.

The Soviet Union can find a world market for films if it first produces them without regard for the Communist ideology, and then competes in the marketplace on sound economic terms. If the Soviet Union maintains that its films must portray the truth and that there is no truth except within the theories of Lenin and Marx, this admittedly will be difficult. If the U.S.S.R. applies its great artistic and creative skills to its films, admittedly it will become easier.

Meanwhile, let us encourage the possibilities for the exchange of documentary, instructional, and classroom films—and most immediately those wholly devoid of propaganda. Wider distribution of these types of films can add to man's understanding of himself and the world around him.

Appendix

Chicago Tribune Writer Finds Texas Padre Island a Vacation Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the wisdom of Congress in making Padre Island a national seashore is being proven over and over again as more Americans enjoy its beautiful scenery and its quiet solitude. It was my pleasure to work for more than 4 years for the passage of the bill which made Padre Island a national seashore; and it gives me great pleasure to find that columnists across the country have now taken up the cause of trying to describe the beauty of Padre Island.

Hal Foust, the Chicago Tribune's automobile editor since 1929, is now touring the United States and is reporting on his travels. In the May 23, 1965, issue of the Chicago Tribune, there appears an article, which he has written, on the Padre Island National Seashore. The article entitled "Texas' Padre Island Boasts 82 Miles of Beach," includes two pictures of the island's seascape. I regret that pictures cannot be shown in the RECORD, for the beauty of this island can only be seen, not just described, if justice is to be done to its attractiveness. However, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I hope that in the near future the rugged Guadalupe Mountains, in far west Texas, will join Padre Island as a National Park, so that America can enjoy the beauty and the uniqueness of that mountain region in the State of Texas, as well as a seashore washed by the warm waters of the Gulf of Mexico.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS' PADRE ISLAND BOASTS 82 MILES OF BEACH: A PROMISING NATIONAL SEASHORE

(Hal Foust, the Tribune's automobile editor since 1929—with time out for World War II and postwar foreign assignments—is touring the United States. This is the first of a series of reports that will appear in the travel section. Clip and save them as a guide for vacation planning.)

(By Hal Foust)

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.—Robinson Crusoe never had more beach and dunes to himself. With the sun still hidden by a solid dark blue cloud on the Gulf of Mexico horizon, the first light of day faintly illuminated white caps rolling onto 82 miles of vacant beach being acquired by the National Park Service this year, the longest undeveloped coast in the United States.

Padre Island is long, low, unpopulated and mainly impenetrable by ordinary vehicles. Unpopulated by man, that is, but not by other life.

A flock of laughing gulls hovers in the the steady trade wind. When one sees food, it dives and comes up with a small fish in its beak while the others cackle, a call considered a laugh by the ornithologists who named the black-headed white bird.

Sandpipers, stiff little legs racing with the precision of mechanical toys, chase each retiring comber, pecking at vegetable and animate morsels newly washed up from the sea. Willets zoom 20 or 25 feet above the water, an elevation which allows their keen sight to penetrate a foot or so below the waves. When one sees prey, it folds its wings and dives vertically through air and into water.

Ghost crabs, after prowling at night for their food, retire to their self-dug holes in the sand, for with the arrival of daylight they are exposed to their predators, the birds.

Between hills of sand accumulated by seaoats and seagrape, flat little valleys are pocked with pocket gopher dens, which support an abundance of rattle snakes, coyotes, and deerflies.

In Laguna Madre, the shallow water separating the island from the mainland, big blue herons wade or stand stalking fish, immobilized on their long legs. Also fishing are skinny little Louisiana herons with their yellowish crests, the common egrets, and a few rare reddish egrets.

The intercoastal canal traverses this lagoon in a marked channel dredged through shoals 5 to 10 miles wide. The infrequent barges and fishing boats, confined to their course, do not disturb the bird sanctuary. White pelicans are nesting on an island in the lagoon, the main rookery of the Atlantic coast flock of these migratory birds. Roseate Spoonbills have just begun to nest here in the last few years.

"One of our functions is to preserve this refuge of natural life," explains William L. Bowen, superintendent of the Padre Island national seashore. "We must preserve all vegetable and animal life, including those forms unpleasant to man, so as not to disturb the ecology established through centuries."

There are two conflicting philosophies about what the Government should do on Padre Island, protect the natural isolation from man—keeping Padre for the exclusive use of the birds—or build a highway on the island for the 116 miles from the Corpus Christi causeway to the Port Isabel causeway, thus opening the entire island to development of ocean front motels and bay front boat docks.

"In another 5 years," says Bowen, "I visualize the development of the usual national park accommodations at two locations, for a few miles at each end of the island. Tourists and vacationists will not wander far from accommodations if there are no roads.

"By concentrating the lodging, eating, and sanitation facilities at each end of the park, we will preserve 50 to 60 miles of the island as a sanctuary for coastal life, as it was before Christopher Columbus."

There are no accommodations in any of the 82 miles—no picnic areas, no camping grounds, no beach guards. The State of Texas dedicated to the Federal Government its title to the beach below the tidemarks and the submerged land except for certain oil rights. But negotiations for purchase of the rest of the land from 16 private owners are still in progress.

On the island both north and south of the Federal Government's 82 miles of beach, there are presently recreational activities indicating the public's appetite for this fun in the sun on the seashore. The present fishing, bathing, and camping presage an expansion of such recreational pursuits when they are encouraged by the National Park Service standards of accommodations.

On the north end, reached by causeway ($1 toll a car, round trip), is a free, 1,200-foot fishing pier in a Nueces County park.

At the south end of the island, reached from Corpus Christi by driving 160 miles mainland highways to near Brownsville, there is fishing on a long jetty off the Port Isabel Harbor. A sign posted by the U.S. Corps of Engineers says the jetty is dangerous for fishing because the rocks are slippery when wet. About 15 or 20 men and women, defying the sign, were fishing well offshore between highways.

There are two or three motels and restaurants on the south end of the island—no part of the national park plan. However we found one family camped in the sand dunes within sound of the surf.

For those tourists less rugged and venturesome, Corpus Christi and Brownsville offer motels and restaurants. The 1964 Mobile Travel Guide lists 23 motels in Corpus Christi and 9 in Brownsville, smaller city but with the added attraction of being on the Mexican border. Both cities are convenient to Padre Island.

A New Peoria: Born of Foresight, Faith, and $50 Million—Not at Government Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am mailing to all of my colleagues in the Senate and House, a letter with a brochure calling their attention to Peoria, Ill.—"Progress Center of the Midwest." Surely, any city in the Nation would be proud of the record that Peoria has made on local initiative.

I hope all of the Members will take a minute or two to leaf through the brochure. I also take this opportunity to extend an invitation for all the Members to visit our community at their convenience and see firsthand what dedicated people can do when they make a "pledge to progress."

The May issue of Washington World has done a feature article on the Peoria story. Under unanimous consent, I include the article at this point:

DO-IT-YOURSELF RENEWAL—PEORIA STYLE: DOWNTOWN AREA REVITALIZED BY LOCAL BUSINESS LEADERS

Peoria products, such as bulldozers, cranes and scrapers, have been busy in their own front yard in recent weeks, demolishing downtown buildings and preparing for numerous major construction projects costing more than $50 million.

Peoria is a prosperous small city in north central Illinois, a soybean processing and distilling center with a population of just over 100,000 in the last census. The people who live there are like the people who live in dozens of other similar American cities. There is one difference, however, between them and residents in many other cities.

They prefer to use local money rather than Federal funds to improve their community.

As a result, downtown Peoria is undergoing a massive facelifting that has earned it the title of "Progress Center" and the whole expensive rebuilding task has been underwritten by Peoria's financial institutions, retailers and other business leaders.

The amount of new construction—completed, under way or scheduled for later this year and 1966—is unusual for a community of Peoria's size, but the fact it is being done without Federal grants is even more remarkable.

One astounding project nearing completion is a $6 million center for Sears, Roebuck & Co. and Bishop Cafeteria. Not only is it sponsored by Peoria firms and individuals, but some of the backers are, in fact, competitors of Sears. They agreed with other business leaders that it would be unfortunate for Sears to move to a suburban site.

Acting on the theory that what was good for the whole community collectively was good for every merchant individually, downtown businessmen purchased shares in the Peoria Development Corp. in varying amounts up to $200,000. The corporation proceeded to erect a Sears building with 170,000 square feet of floor space and an adjacent Bishop cafeteria, along with a parking plaza to accommodate 1,200 automobiles. The corporation will lease the property to Sears and Bishop's, those two businesses will obtain new quarters without capital investment, and the downtown shopping atmosphere will be enhanced, to the benefit of all concerned.

The home-financed boom in downtown Peoria has fulfilled all the hopes and even exceeded the dreams of the business leaders who cooperated to launch it. Many of them are confident the construction program has proceeded so smoothly, unhampered by the normal delays, because the number of agencies concerned with the various projects was held at a minimum, in contrast to many Federal urban renewal efforts where innumerable delays occur waiting for numerous agencies to unravel bureaucratic redtape.

Another multi-million-dollar project in downtown Peoria is the new headquarters building for Caterpillar Tractor Co. This cross-shaped building and the adjacent parking area will also occupy two square blocks. The full-block parking area is directly opposite the Sears project and the office building is opposite the new Peoria County courthouse. Office space for 1,500 persons will require approximately 300,000 square feet. The Caterpillar cafeteria will seat 520.

The first major construction in this comprehensive program of rebuilding in downtown Peoria got underway when the Peoria Board of Supervisors authorized the public building commission to construct a $4.5 million county courthouse. It was recently completed and the entire square block is now being landscaped.

Construction of an eight-story Security Savings & Loan Association Building, overlooking the new courthouse and the new Caterpillar Building, has begun. New buildings adjacent to the savings & loan building are the Kelly Seed Co. and the three-story building for DeKroyft-Metz & Co., Inc., a pioneer Peoria drug firm. A 63-unit Imperial "400" Motel was opened in 1964 directly opposite the Caterpillar parking area. A 10-story, 105-room Howard Johnson Motor Lodge & Restaurant will be built this year.

A new 17-story savings building opposite the courthouse is another major project under construction in downtown Peoria. This office building, retail plaza, and parking deck will cost $5 million. First Federal Savings & Loan Association will own and operate the first six floors. The 11-floor office building tower will be owned and operated by National Building Corp., of Nashville, Tenn. Part of the building will be ready for occupancy late this year.

A new four-story Peoria Savings & Loan Association Building was completed late in 1964. In the same block, major remodeling of the Jefferson Trust & Savings Bank and the Workingmen's Savings & Loan Association gave a new look to the entire block. The Voyager Inn will begin a $2 million expansion program in mid-1965 which will add 100 units. None of the new projects is more than one block from the new Peoria County Courthouse and all are being done without Federal grants.

Three parking decks at the rear of some of Peoria's largest retail stores have eliminated most of the parking problems that have driven customers to suburban shopping centers in many cities. The several downtown retailers who have established stores in suburban shopping centers in Peoria have continued to operate their downtown stores.

Some of the tremendous amount of new suburban Peoria construction is attributable to the displaced downtown retail establishments, warehouses and industrial plants, but much of it is new to Peoria. It includes numerous new warehouses, apartment buildings, fraternity houses, dormitories, churches, and new industrial plants. Ten new projects, including the construction of a secondary airport, were announced in 1964 for one of Peoria's industrial parks.

Private enterprise is responsible for the South St. Francis project which necessitated the demolition of 70 homes on the fringe downtown area. A five-story Professional Building and a seven-story Ramada Motor Inn are under construction. The State of Illinois has an $8 million mental health clinic under construction on North University Avenue. It is a 200-bed hospital whose emphasis will be on outpatients.

The progressive spirit that made Peoria an all America city in 1953 has continued to provide the leadership that has improved Peoria's schools, hospitals, churches, retail stores, government, and recreational facilities.

One of the recent evidences of Peoria's cultural advantages is the building of a million dollar Lakeview Center for the Arts and Sciences, which is nearing completion. This educational, recreational, cultural center was designed by the California architectural firm of Victor Gruen & Associates. It adjoins the new $100,000 Lakeview Planetarium. Funds for Lakeview Center were raised in a communitywide campaign in keeping with Peoria's policy of using local money rather than Federal funds.

The Successes of Project Hope in Peru and Ecuador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, as a Senator from the State closest to our neighbors to the south, I have followed with keen interest the successes of Project Hope in Peru and Ecuador.

A large measure of Hope's success can be directly attributed to one man, Dr. William B. Walsh, whose dynamic spirit is captured in an article published in a recent issue of the Hollywood, Fla., Sun-Tattler. Interviewed by Dick Thompson, this Washington heart specialist, who gave up his medical practice to turn a dream into reality, explains his guiding principles.

Stated very simply, as outlined in the Sun-Tattler article, Dr. Walsh believes in a direct, person-to-person contact, to best educate the medical corps of a country.

The correctness of this approach has been demonstrated by the adoption of Hope's methods after the white hospital ship SS *Hope* has left, and by the requests that Hope doctors remain, to supervise instruction in their medical schools and treatment in their hospitals.

But, Mr. President—and more important—Project Hope's success is shown by the people Hope touches; by the sincere friendships developed while the great white ship is in port; and by the warm, tearful goodbys when the SS *Hope* weighs anchor.

As Dr. Walsh told Mr. Thompson:

> It is amazing to see their animosity shed, as though they had gotten in a cold shower, and come out with a whole new viewpoint.

Mr. President, I believe that Dr. Walsh's other observations on international relations and medicine merit the attention of all Senators; and I request that the entire Sun-Tattler article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hollywood (Fla.) Sun-Tattler, Mar. 26, 1965]

EIGHT THOUSAND MAJOR SURGICAL OPERATIONS—MESSAGE OF "SS HOPE": GIVE HEALTH TO THE PEOPLE

(By Dick Thompson, Sun-Tattler staff writer)

"Hope is the common ingredient throughout the world."

Dr. William B. Walsh, originator of the idea for the floating school hospital, SS *Hope*, said this Wednesday in Hollywood where he was visiting friends, Mr. and Mrs. Jerome Herbert.

Walsh is a 45-year-old Georgetown University-trained doctor dedicated to using his floating school hospital as the ideal vehicle for extending peace throughout the world.

The project started in 1958 when President Eisenhower, a personal friend, discussed the idea with Walsh. The doctor immediately agreed, receiving the 15,000-ton ship which he says "the Government wouldn't want within 1,000 miles of our fleet in modern times."

The Government still helps underwrite operating costs, along with industrial, private, and community donations.

Walsh will be guest of honor at the Hope ball at 7 p.m. tomorrow at the Diplomat Country Club. The fundraising effort has been sold out for weeks. "This is the kind of community spirit that is helping people recognize that the borders of the community extend throughout the world. I am tremendously grateful to the people in Hollywood who have helped us so much."

Twelve area doctors and many nurses have taken part in the Hope program.

Walsh is a trim, concerned man who shows the lines of responsibility he has assumed in his duties as administrator, fund-raiser, technician, doctor, and international good will ambassador.

"Our purpose is to make others self-sufficient. Without that, there isn't any hope. Disraeli said a nation is only as economically sound as its people are healthy, and we operate on that idea." He consistently uses the plural "we" rather than the singular "I."

"Three-fourths of the children in most countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America die before they reach 5," he said. "We inoculated 80,000 Saigon children against the whole list of diseases. In Ecuador we reached almost every family in the country when we inoculated 250,000."

Facts and figures are quoted as quickly as expressions of his concern or philosophy.

"Tuberculosis and malaria are the two most serious diseases. However, measles is the largest killer among children throughout the world.

"We've performed 8,000 major operations aboard ship and thousands ashore," he said reaching back through the years since 1958 when he started out with just a handful of doctors and nurses.

The SS *Hope* now has 35 doctors, 42 nurses, 240 usable beds and a whole staff of aids and administrators.

"The important thing," he said referring to the figures he had just quoted, "is that all of this work has been done in view of the fact that our major purpose is not administering to the needs of some local disaster, but a systematic program of training.

"Ours is the long-range project of training local people to take over when we leave. We train doctors, nurses, aids, dietitians, secretaries, accountants, and every type of laboratory and specialized technicians.

"We should realize we have helped create a schizophrenic problem among some of the world's peoples. We tell them to industrialize, forgetting it takes people to do it, and at the same time we don't help them to be able to live their lives in order to realize the progress of industrializing.

"We've spent $100 billion in foreign aid trying to effect change, but the people never see it. Bureaucracy causes enormous handicaps. There are plans about plans about more plans. Foreign aid works primarily when it is channeled through voluntary agencies such as ours; it reaches the people and they realize where it is coming from."

As the doctor gets more involved in his subject his speech quickens.

"The one thing you can always reach the people with is health. The Marshall plan worked because we were working with an elite cadre. This is not the case in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

"There are only three continents in my world," he said, referring to Asia, Africa, and Latin America. "And we have to reach these people directly. The reason for their condition is the complete and absolute inefficiency and lack of education.

"We never had trouble with Vietcong. We have a commodity they know their people need. It was very interesting to go into villages and through the jungles unharmed, untroubled. The reason Indonesia went Communist is because only one in seven people are able to work. And they can only work 3 or 4 hours daily. The rest are blind or sick. There is no problem taking over a country that is 30 to 40 percent tubercular."

Walsh divides his time between his administrative duties in Washington where his wife, Helen, and their three sons, William, Junior (Trinity College), John, and Tommy live, and technical duties aboard ship now anchored in Conakry, Guinera.

The doctor says he is "satisfied with 5 hours" sleep a night. He suffered a severe case of malaria himself a year ago and lost a good portion of the hearing in his left ear.

"I only wish the people in this country would realize the real conditions in the world. I've seen it for years and still don't really believe it. We have trainees in Africa that refuse to eat every day because they don't want to return to the starvation diet when the ship leaves.

"The real message in our program is not the facts and statistics, but the satisfaction of watching people become self-sufficient."

Dr. Walsh says one great personal satisfaction is "changing the image of the American people throughout the world. It is amazing to see their animosity shed as though they had gotten into a cold shower and come out with a whole new viewpoint.

"By working together in villages and cities we really get an amazing understanding among the people. We went to Peru and had large demonstrations and signs reading 'Gringo go home'. When we finshed our project there a local editorial read 'Why did the Gringo have to teach us to take care of our own people?'

"I remember reading in that editorial that 'the word "gringo" will never be treated with scorn again.' That is a source of enormous satisfaction."

Operating budget for this year will come to $4 or $5 million. The staff is composed of persons from 43 States and has established three medical centers throughout the world. A 600-bed hospital in Djakarta is operated 100 percent by persons trained by the staff members of the SS *Hope*.

Today's Lack of Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Chula Vista, Calif., Bulletin, of May 12, 1965.

This editorial is most timely, in that it deals with patriotic duties of every American citizen, and compares the current lack of patriotism vis-a-vis to the patriotism which was so strong at the time of the Second World War. There were no American boys tearing up their draft cards and refusing to fight for America. Had they done so, at that time it would have been treason, and should be so regarded today.

The editorial follows:

EDITORIALLY YOURS

(By Larry Jones)

What has happened to the old-fashioned idea that being an American citizen is the greatest feeling in the world? Actually, it depresses me to think that being an American and being a patriot should even be described as old fashioned.

But that's the area in which we're working on this editorial.

OK, I'm old fashioned. I'm 41 years of age, I'm a veteran of oversea action in the South Pacific in World War II and I'm still one of these guys who gets a tear in his eye and lump in his throat when something symbolic of this great country arouses my emotions.

Last week I attended a school meeting where my 10-year-old son is a Cub Scout. At this particular function my Cub was in charge Cub den which presented the colors. He stood up there in front of 200 assorted adults and led them in the pledge of allegiance to our flag, and I am not ashamed to admit that I cried a little bit. I'd also cry a little bit if this same little son of mine ever has to carry or protect our colors on some foreign battlefield. But, like at the school, I'll be proud of him. And I'll be proud I produced him to share his burden in the protection of this country and to help guard all the wonderful things we take for granted in our free society.

I'm old fashioned enough to get sick to my stomach when I read about California college students demonstrating against the American intervention in the Dominican Republic. It wasn't only at Berkeley. It also happened right here at the San Diego campus of the University of California. The daily papers carried the story and pictures of this unsavory demonstration.

In the same paper I read about the 40 or more students on the main campus at Berkeley who gathered in assembly and burnt their draft cards in protest against our militance in Santo Domingo and in Vietnam.

Where have we been lax? Where have we missed the boat? Twenty-four years ago I, and hundreds of thousands like me, flocked to the recruiting stations in a grey December of 1941. The lines of volunteers were so long that the recruiters couldn't find enough hotel rooms and eating establishments to accommodate the enlistees. I enlisted in Dallas, Tex., and we had to wait almost 4 days to get on the train for San Diego. I can go on, and on, and on. No point in doing that. The point is this: What is the matter with being an American? What is the matter with supporting the leaders of this country? What has happened to the idea that "America is our country, right or wrong—our country"?

To me there are no degrees of Americanism. You don't qualify your attitude about how our country acts in an international crisis. You can criticize, you can scream—that's your right. But if all the true values of being an American citizen are imbedded deep down in your insides you'll pitch in and do all you can to help and support the decisions made by those who have been empowered to direct the foreign affairs of this country.

Flag waving? You're damned right I'm flag waving. I'm waving the American flag, voluntarily. You'd better join me, or we may be waving a Red flag—and it won't be because we like it.

And there won't be any draft cards to burn, either. All you'll have to worry about is what labor camp you'll be working in.

James Gerhardt, Winner of the Maryland Optimists Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an optimistic speech by a young Baltimorean, 16-year-old James Gerhardt, the winner of both the Baltimore and the Maryland State Optimists competition. On Friday, the Maryland contest was held in Ocean City and Mr. Gerhardt was named the winner of a $500 scholarship. This accomplishment has earned him the right to compete for a $1,000 scholarship in the national contest, to be held in New Orleans.

I am happy to have received from Jim Gerhardt a copy of the speech, and to share it with other Senators.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPTIMISM: FORMULA FOR FREEDOM

(By James Gerhardt)

Too often we have glibly uttered such phrases as "Vigilance, the eternal price of freedom." Personally, I feel that all Americans should be familiar with these slogans and often ponder their significance. Therefore, I am very happy for the opportunity given to me today to discuss with you, "Optimism: Formula for Freedom."

Without optimism, the idea of independence would never have entered into the minds of those beaten and broken colonists of America. Theirs was a seemingly hopeless plight, as the histories proclaim. They were being unjustly treated by a government in which they were not even represented. Their only resort, revolt, was absurd; for how could a few bickering, uneducated backwoodsmen hope to make any stand against the most prodigious army and navy in the world.

Gazing into the past, we see a handful of gallant rebels gloriously striking lightning blows at a mighty oppressor. Actually, the picture was somewhat different. However, we are concerned only with the rebels. In order to see them in a realistic light, let's compare their situation to one familiar to us. Remember the class elections held in October? Your best friend was nominated for president, but, unfortunately, you seemed to be his only supporter. It was pretty hard to vote for him, wasn't it? You may believe that all the colonists were for independence, but this was not the case. Only one-third of the colonists were for independence, and not even all of these were ready to fight for it.

One year before the war terminated, our Army was composed of approximately 43,750 men. Not only did this feeble army have to contend with the greatest land and sea power in the world, but it also was faced with a civil war as cruel and as real as the one which occurred in 1861.

These patriots weren't superhuman rocks standing against a mighty Atlantic. They were tired, discouraged and desperate men. They had fought and died in weather that we would shrink from. To make this situation real again, look to yourself to see them. We get frustrated from splashing through a few puddles or a couple of inches of snow. This, however, was what they lived in, fought in, fell into and died in. They saw their friends dropped by silver bayonets and hissing bullets. In this crisis there was enkindled the passionate desire to strike back. Momentarily defeated, the burning spark of optimism lit the torch of freedom. They rallied and finally won; they were free. No treasury, no one deed, no monument can ever repay the eternal debt which we owe to these pioneers. Only our constant efforts to preserve this Nation for which they sweated, bled and died can repay our honorable dead. We must give ourselves with our whole heart and soul. We must try, as these frontiersmen did, to strike for freedom wherever and whenever it is possible, not by destroying all people who do not share our beliefs, economic status or political policies, but by being the most perfect citizens we can be, by using our freedoms to preserve our country. This philosophy, combined with a trust in ourselves and the God who gave us life, shall produce an America that our forefathers dreamed of, an America of the people, by the people and for the people.

The Long Upswing—I, II, and III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr Speaker, sometimes when I read a good editorial, I would like to commend the writer by name. Unfortunately, authors of editorials are generally anonymous souls.

Three fine essays appeared on successive days in the Washington Post recently, each entitled, "The Long Upswing." What they were marking was the 51-month anniversary of the longest uninterrupted peacetime era of prosperity in the history of the country.

While I feel that an overemphasis was placed on tax reduction, which was given too much credit for "the long upswing," I still beleive the three pieces extremely worthwhile.

The second editorial answered the question of whether the upswing had been sustained by accident or design by stating, correctly, I believe, that "it was design—the pursuit of appropriate economic policies" that brought about our period of prosperity. I have been saying for a long time that periods of recession or economic progress are man made—that there is no natural law which states that every so often we must take an economic nose dive.

We have discovered a number of ways to stop inflation but we have never discovered a way to end a depression quickly.

I believe that the author might have paid more attention to the fact that interest rates and money supply were managed fairly correctly during the 51-month period. There has been available credit at not too exorbitantly high interest rates.

One of the dangers confronting our contemporary economy is that selfish interests within the banking community may succeed in breaking the 4.25-percent ceiling on interest rates for long-term Government securities, an event that would bring calamity. Such a tragedy would result in a general rise in interest rates, that are totally uncalled for.

It has been apparent for many months that there has been a concerted drive on the part of the American Bankers Association and its propaganda machine and lobby to increase the present rates that have given the banking industry the highest profits in its history.

It is too bad that the author omitted the important role comparatively reasonable interest charges has played, along with an adequate money supply and credit availability, in the longevity of our current prosperous era. The author might well have warned, too, that tightening credit and upping interest at this time would most certainly prove a death blow to the long upswing, which can continue if we so will it.

For the benefit of the Congress and the readers of the RECORD, I now submit the three fine editorials:

THE LONG UPSWING—I

This day marks the passing of an economic milestone. For the past 51 months, the American economy has continued to grow without significant interruption, breaking a century-old record for the longevity of upswings. It is an event that calls not for ceremonial rhetoric or an effulgence of self-congratulations, but rather a sober analysis of the significance of the accomplishment and a consideration of the lessons that it holds for the future.

First, an arithmetic note on the milestone that has been passed. According to the monthly business cycle chronology of the National Bureau of Economic Research, a record of upswings and downswings dating back to 1854, the average duration of economic expansion periods in the United States is 30 months. But if the war years, the years of the Civil War and two World Wars, are excluded, the average duration of peacetime expansion is 26 months.

Of the 22 peacetime expansions, 21 lasted for 37 months or less. The only near rival to the current upswing is the 50-month expansion from the nadir of the great depression in March 1933, to the cyclical peak of May 1937, the upper turning point of the "Roosevelt recession." But the 50-month upswing of the 1930's is a bizarre yardstick with which to measure the longevity of economic expansion. It marked the recovery from the most devastating depression in American history, a recovery so incomplete that more than 14 percent of the labor force was unemployed in the "peak" year of 1937.

The current expansion began rather inauspiciously in February, 1961, following upon a period which can be justly characterized as one of economic stagnation. Before the economy had fully recovered from the 1957-58 recession, a concern for the balance-of-payments deficit and a wholly unjustified fear of inflation led to the adoption of restrictive monetary and fiscal measures. As a result the economy expanded for only 25 months, and at the business cycle peak of May, 1960, 5.1 percent of the labor force was unemployed.

An unbiased measure of the stagnation that afflicted the economy is obtained by measuring the growth, the gross national product (corrected for price changes) between cyclical peaks. Between the peak of 1957 and the peak of 1960, the real GNP grew at an average annual rate of only 2.7 percent, well below the historical average. But between the peak of 1960 and the first quarter of 1965, a period of 4¾ years, the real GNP has grown at an average annual rate of slightly more than 4 percent.

The nearly 50-percent increase in the growth rate and the recordbreaking longevity of the present upswing are developments of which the country can be justly proud. But it is fair to ask whether this economic bounty is the creature of accident or design. An attempt to provide some answers will be made in a subsequent editorial.

THE LONG UPSWING—II

The fluctuations that have characterized economic growth in modern times are compounded of diverse elements. Those which are properly "economic" are related broadly to the making and spending of money; and as such they usually are amenable to statistical measurement. But there is a second melange of forces that falls into a cauldron labeled "confidence." In that cauldron the political and psychological potions boil, filling the atmosphere with vapors that becloud men's vision. Both sets of interrelated forces, those which can be coldly measured and those which can only be adumbrated by

historians, are essential to an explanation of what is being justly celebrated as the longest economic expansion in recent history.

The evidence indicates that the current upswing, while unbroken, has not proceeded smoothly along its upward course. A sharp rebound soon regained the ground lost during the 1960–61 recession. But early in 1962 the vigor of the expansion began to ebb. And by the late spring a chorus of Cassandras was busily prognosticating the onset of the fifth, postwar recession.

The fatigue that almost ended with the death of the expansion in the autumn of 1962 provides a classic example of the manner in which economic and psychological forces interact. On the economic side, a number of factors were responsible for the persistence of excess capacity and a low level of profits. There was the fiscal drag of the high, wartime tax rates. There was the restructive policy of the Federal Reserve authorities that halted the growth of the money supply by mid-1962. But the most menacing blow came from the political and psychological side. The President Kennedy did not gain the full confidence of the business community in 1960, and his reservoir of good will was sorely depleted by the ugly dispute over steel prices and the sharp break in the stock market, both of which occurred in the fateful spring of 1962.

What turned the tide and saved the expansion from an untimely death was the Kennedy administration's shift toward a genuinely expansive economic policy. The investment credit provisions of the 1962 Revenue Act and reform of the depreciation guidelines were moves that helped to check the further erosion of business confidence. But the crucial turning point in business expectations coincided with the administration's active commitment to reduce income taxes. When the drive to cut taxes began to take shape early in 1963, the volume of new orders placed with durable goods industries rose sharply, presaging the expansion of capital outlays that followed.

The revival of confidence would not, of course, have been sufficient to propel the economy along the path of rapid growth. There were other favorable factors. Nearly 57 percent of the automobiles in 1962 were over 5 years old, a factor which set the stage for the subsequent boom in new car sales. Price stability played a significant role in the striking expansion of U.S. exports. Since 1961 private exports have risen from $20 billion to an annual level of nearly $28 billion. Finally, the stability of wages, by permitting unit labor costs to decline, contributed greatly to the growth of profits, profits which in turn stimulated investment.

The first editorial ended with the question of whether the upswing has been sustained by accident or design. The answer is that it was design—the pursuit of appropriate economic policies culminating in the tax cut of 1964—that tipped the scales. Our final editorial in this series will discuss the measures that must be taken to strengthen economic policy in the future.

THE LONG UPSWING—III

There was a time when Americans, like the figures in a Greek tragedy, looked upon the recurrence of economic recessions as a phenomenon over which mere mortals have no control. But the times have changed. The President's Council of Economic Advisers, in its report on the long upswing, states that: "It is premature to say that business cycles have been eliminated. But we now know that there is no necessary reason why an expansion must end in 26 months, 36 months, 80 months or any other arbitrary length of time."

The Council members share the economist's reluctance to write what might be a premature epitaph for the business cycle. They are painfully aware of the fact that consumers will not continue to buy 8 or 9 million cars each year, that housing markets can be saturated, that narrowing profit margins can sour businessmen's expectations and cause the volume of investment in new capital equipment to decline. These developments are inherent in an enterprise economy, but they need not produce recurrent slumps in aggregative business activity. Wise Government policies, by mitigating and reversing the forces of recession can so limit economic fluctuations that they are manifested only as changes, speedups and slowdowns, in the rate of economic growth.

The experience of the past 51 months proves beyond any doubt that there are effective fiscal and monetary tools available for mitigating cyclical fluctuations. But although the tax cut of 1964 has proved a stunning success, the arsenal of policy weapons is far from adequate.

It should not in the future require 18 months of debate to convince the Congress and the American people that the economy can be stimulated by tax reduction. But a considerable period of time would still have to elapse between the appearance of the first danger signal and the time when Congress could be expected to act to reduce taxes. It is this delay that weakens the defense against recessions. Until the Congress grants the President limited authority to reduce payroll taxes—or at the very least establishes special, emergency procedures for dealing with White House requests for tax reduction—the economy will continue to be vulnerable to business cycles.

Endorsement of Vietnam Policy by Chicago Circle Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution adopted by the Chicago Circle Young Republicans dated April 22, 1965, with respect to our policy in Vietnam and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CHICAGO CIRCLE YOUNG REPUBLICANS, APRIL 22, 1965

Whereas U.S. military personnel are in South Vietnam at the request of the South Vietnamese Government.

Whereas these forces are assisting the Vietnamese Government in fighting armed Communist aggression.

Whereas the U.S. current policy in Vietnam is one of peace through firmness and not one of defeat: Therefore be it

Resolved, We, the Chicago Circle Young Republicans endorse the U.S. current policy in Vietnam; be it further

Resolved, We do not approve of those groups which advocate a cessation of the current Vietnamese policy.

Short Talk Before the Boy Scouts Blackhawk Council in Rockford, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was our great good fortune to have as our speaker at the annual dinner meeting of the Blackhawk Area Council, Boy Scouts of America in Rockford, Ill., on May 16, 1965, Gen. James H. Doolittle. His long and distinguished career in aviation has made him a truly, legendary hero. It would be difficult indeed to select from his career any particular event, so many and varied have been his exploits. In World War II his leadership in both the Pacific and in North Africa was a decisive element in our ultimate victory over the Axis Powers. However, even more significant than his wartime exploits is the fact that he has served as a hero for the boys of America—a man to whom they could look for inspiration because of his valor, patriotism, and great contributions to the field of aviation.

America will forever be indebted to General Doolittle. Moreover, because of his interest in the youth of America, and particularly his recognition of Scouting as one of our most useful tools in molding a generation of patriotic and self-reliant young Americans, he has made contributions during peacetime that equal if not exceed his great contributions during time of war.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this point to include the very excellent remarks delivered by Gen. James Doolittle at the Boy Scout Blackhawk Area Council meeting. I am sure that everyone who reads them will be impressed with the succinct and eloquent fashion in which General Doolittle has restated some of our essential American beliefs:

SHORT TALK BEFORE THE BOY SCOUT BLACKHAWK COUNCIL MEETING IN ROCKFORD, ILL.

(By J. H. Doolittle)

I believe in the Boy Scouts and I believe in America.

We Americans are very fortunate.

We live in the greatest country in the world.

It has been said that our country is great largely because of its abundant natural resouces.

This is true, but it must be remembered that our most important natural resoure is our people; and the principal reason for our greatness is the high morality, clear foresight, and abundant energy—willingness to work—of our Founding Fathers and their successors.

We—particularly the young people who will soon be directing the destiny of our Nation—have a solemn obligation to protect and perpetuate integrity, opportunity, and freedom in America.

History teaches us that every great civilization, which has flourished and fallen, has

failed largely because of an erosion of moral values and a gradual unwillingness to exert the considerable effort necessary to continue to progress and to compete.

In the simplest terms: Decline resulted from immorality and laziness.

People who have it too good—that is to say, too easy—for too long incline to get soft and lazy. The motive necessary for great effort and great accomplishments no longer exists.

They are no longer willing to work—physicially and mentally—and to sacrifice in order to maintain their position and prestige. Eventually they are unable to compete and, when it finally becomes necessary, unable to fight effectively for their survival.

Then some more ambitious and aggressive nation comes along and takes them over.

We must be sure that this does not happen to us.

We have had a very high standard of living for along time.

This is good, but we must see that it does not make us soft.

There is a very strong tendency for this to happen; particularly when we forego discipline and responsibility and consistently live beyond our means.

A very wise friend of mine expresses it succinctly by saying: "Beware the ravages of prosperity."

Any attempt to maintain the status quo without progress through effort—any desire to get something for nothing—unfavorably affects our sense of values and—over the long haul—is doomed to failure and disappointment.

Technology, which gives us many good things and should make our lives easier, is posing many difficult problems for which we do not yet have answers.

More leisure is certainly desirable, but it is useful only if we plan the suitable employment of that leisure time.

Time is a valuable commodity. We must not waste it.

Certainly we must help our less fortunate brothers. Jesus said: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." It is our duty to serve our fellow man. But the most valuable help we can give a person—or another nation—is to assist them in achieving the ability—and in some cases the desire—to help themselves.

Education and training are prime ingredients of this help; and we must furnish encouragement and incentives to stimulate effort.

We must help in such a way as to assure that shiftlessness is not encouraged and that the dole does not become a way of life.

Abraham Lincoln said: "You cannot establish sound security by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

If I may indulge in a gross oversimplification of the problem: It seems to me that a fundamental problem in America today is a change in order—an inversion—by many people, of our basic national values.

Our forefathers inclined to think of God, country, occupation, family and friends, and finally self; in that order.

They were religious and put worship of God before everything else.

They were patriotic and were willing to work, sacrifice and, if necessary, die for their ideals and for their country.

They worked hard and had pride of workmanship and pride of accomplishment.

They loved their family and a friend was a cherished possession. But family and friends came after God, country and work.

And last of all they thought of themselves and their personal needs.

Today many people think first of themselves.

Warranted self-confidence and justifiable personal pride, tempered by humility, are virtues. Conceit and selfishness are vices.

Nationally, instead of providing incentives for effort and excellence, it sometimes seems that we act in such a way as to encourage selfishness and laziness.

We are so anxious to protect the rights of the individual that we frequently, in trying to do so, interfere with the smooth functioning of the body politic. We violate the rights of others.

I believe that everyone, regardless of race, color or creed, has the right to think, say and do exactly as he chooses, up to the point where he begins to interfere with the rights of others.

Forgetting the obligation which is a concomitant part of personal freedom is one of the problems which is plaguing us today.

After having taken care of their personal problems some people next incline to think of family and friends. What can they get for them?

Work, to many, has become largely a means to an end. It permits them to eat.

It is rarely that the worker today works for the sheer pleasure of doing. That is, unless he is doing some one, not some thing.

Patriotism. Perhaps the simplest dictionary definition of patriotism is love of country. To me patriotism represents a code to live by. The late, great General MacArthur, in his final address to the Corps at West Point, described it in three words: "honor, duty, country."

To my distress patriotism is often belittled as an old-fashioned, unenlightened and unworthy emotion.

Well, when I can hear "The Star-Spangled Banner" and see our flag pass by and not feel an emotion in my heart and mind, and a lump in my throat—that I have indeed lived long enough.

And far too many people give only lip service—or no service at all—to God, to love, to the Golden Rule and to an ethical standard of conduct.

I am convinced that much of the trouble here in America—and throughout the world—is because of the reversal of those five fundamental values.

I speak, of course, in generalities and on the average. Certainly we have many God-fearing, patriotic, hard-working people in America today—and certainly some of our ancestors were stinkers.

But equally certainly we are not improving as a people and as a nation as rapidly as we might—and should.

How well we would do if all of our people were to live in accordance with the Boy Sout law and the Boy Scout oath.

We would all be trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent.

We would do our duty to God and country, we would help others at all times and would keep ourselves physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.

Let's all live as we recommend that the Boy Scouts live. We will have—and continue to have—an even better, fairer, finer, stronger America.

What a wonderful example we will set for the rest of the world.

And someday perhaps, when people, everywhere, improve, our morality, honesty, compassion, justice, responsibility, intelligence, energy, courage, and strength may be instrumental in achieving what all people of good will hope for: An understanding, friendly, and peaceful world.

Farm Labor To Be Political Issue, Assemblyman Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article appearing in the San Diego Union on May 15, 1965. This article fully supports the statements I made 2 weeks ago on the floor of this House.

(By Arthur Ribbel)

SACRAMENTO.—The lack of farm labor in California, emphasized by crops rotting on the ground, will be a political issue next year, according to a veteran legislator, Assemblyman Alan Pattee, Republican, of Salinas.

Pattee, a rancher, represents a district where crops, notably strawberries, have rotted on the ground for the lack of workers to harvest them.

Pattee and Senator Fred Farr, Demcrat, of Carmel, in the same district, recently distributed boxes of strawberries from Salinas to legislators and newsmen at the capitol, with attached cards saying "SOS—Save Our Strawberries."

The worker shortage occurred after Congress failed to extend the Mexican farm labor (bracero) program which ended December 31. Since then, the State and Federal Government employment experts have been trying to enlist enough domestic workers to fill the gap. Growers said they have failed.

CHALLENGE ISSUED

Pattee put the trouble into the political arena when he said, "I hope that rotting food in the fields will be thoroughly photographed and documented so that in future elections the failure of Washington and Sacramento administrations can be made perfectly plain."

Not long afterward, Representative JAMES B. UTT, Republican, of Santa Ana, demanded the impeachment of Governor Brown for the farm labor situation.

Pattee criticized the administration of U.S. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, who has said he would not recommend any foreign workers be imported into California until domestic workers were placed in the fields.

CALLED "WHIMS"

"Never in the history of this democracy have we seen the entire economy of a State * * * from fields to the grocery shelves * * * dependent on the unknowledgeable whims of one man 2,500 miles away," said Pattee, referring to Wirtz.

"The entire situation has been a mess from the beginning," Pattee said.

"First the Governor failed to go directly to the President to seek assistance in getting in motion the negotiations with Mexico for supplemental help," Pattee said.

"Then the Secretary of Labor came out here with a closed mind and tried to learn in 4 days about one of the most complex problems to confront any State. Later, instead of selecting a panel of knowledgeable growers, labor people and industrial leaders, he selected three academic professors to pass judgment."

Pattee said Wirtz was "too late with too little," in permitting "a dribbling of foreign workers in the fields."

He also said that Brown had become engaged in a political battle over farm labor. Brown has asked Wirtz for more foreign workers, while labor opposes such a move, contending there are enough domestic workers available if wages and working conditions are right.

It would be hard to find a politican at the Capitol who would deny that farm labor will be high on the "hot issue" list next year when Brown's term expires.

Forestry's Part in the Industrial Development of Wisconsin: Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, recently one man who has had a great deal of practical experience is now showing concern with the problem of using our forest resources to the ultimate benefit of the most people made some comments I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues.

John R. Kimberly, president and grandson of one of the founders of the 93-year-old Kimberly-Clark Corp. of Wisconsin, made his remarks at a special Governor's Conference on Forestry and Forest Land Use in Madison, Wis.

Mr. Kimberly's own firm, I might point out, practices the conservation he preaches, planting 20 million new trees a year, or three for every one harvested. His firm also maintains a 160-acre experimental forest to develop new and stronger strains of trees. Finally, his company makes the 11½ million acres of forest land it controls available to the public with minimum restriction.

The significance of Mr. Kimberly's speech is the concern shown by one of the captains of the wood-using industry as to the adequacy of its resource base in the future.

By the year 2000, wood requirements will increase 80 percent and in some categories there will not be enough to meet projected demands. Today, concern of future supplies is being shown by all resource-based industries. All people are becoming increasingly concerned about man's impact on his environment, on the total natural endowment of earth and, in particular, about the intricate web of life, the balanced interdependence of life forms from soil bacteria to the highest mammals, of which we are a part.

The protection and preservation of our natural heritage, the great outdoors, is one of our most pressing problems, as projections show that increased leisure time increase recreational demands to grow a median of 10 times by the year 2000.

The increased used of private lands for recreation must become the means of satisfying most of this projected demand.

The role of government is to do for the people what the people are unable to do for themselves, such as to save a wild river or a significant portion of our shorelines.

I am pleased that Mr. Kimberly's speech, which follows, shows these concerns about the future:

FORESTRY'S PART IN THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF WISCONSIN: TODAY AND TOMORROW

(An address by John R. Kimberly, president of Kimberly-Clark Corp., Neenah, Wis., at the Governor's Conference on Forestry and Recreation Land Use, Madison, Wis., May 14, 1965)

I am convinced that Wisconsin's forests can once again play a significant role in this State's total economy. It may not be the role of the late 1890's when forestry was king, and Wisconsin led the Nation in lumber production, for there will never be that much mature forest land in the State again.

But certainly the potential exists for a much larger and healthier industry. There is potential for more intensive utilization of what we grow, potential for development of new forest lands, and just as importantly, there is a growing market potential for new products made of wood and wood fibers.

The prospect is not all rosy, however. On the other side of the coin our foresters and their customers are faced with growing competition. Wisconsin's forests must vie with the products of other Midwestern States and other regions of the United States on the basis of price, quality, and availability. And they must compete in some cases with products manufactured from chemicals, plastics, and other nonwood materials. And, as is if there wasn't enough competition in the marketplace, there is also competition for the very land on which we grow our commercial forest crops.

For these reasons I am happy that the Governor has seen fit to call this conference. It is time to take a long, hard look at our renewable forest resources and determine their likely condition tomorrow and 35 years from tomorrow.

We should assure ourselves, at the very least, that we know what we are doing when we decide this year and next what the industry's posture will be in the year 2000—for as you well know that is the type of long range planning that the planters and users of trees must engage in. And in fairness it should be admitted that a certain lack of planning has characterized the development of Wisconsin's forests in the past. The charted history of forestry here looks like one big roller coaster ride, a condition for which foresters, farmers and public officials of the past must share the blame.

However, the future of an industrialized State such as Wisconsin demands planning.

Interestingly it was forestry that spawned two of the State's largest industries, machinery manufacture and papermaking, in the late 1800's. Both of these industries grew to their current positions of industrial leadership as lumbering went into a decline and intensive farming—then possible in clearings literally carved from our forests—became for a time the State's No. 1 occupation.

The scales have now tipped again. Today, although our automobile license plates still correctly proclaim Wisconsin as America's Dairyland, only 150,000 persons work regularly in agriculture—half the number so employed 50 years ago—to produce many times what their fathers did from about the same amount of land.

And industry now is the mainstay of Wisconsin's economy, providing 43 percent of Wisconsin's wages and salaries—compared to a nationwide share of 32 percent—with the prospect of even greater dominance in the future.

Where does the forest industry fit into this picture? My own industry—paper—is a good example. Our appetite for wood fibers has grown enormously just in the past two generations.

Kimberly-Clark, for instance, has been a successful maker of printing papers for more than 40 years when the use, during World War I, of a soft, thin form of paper called creped wadding—now commonly referred to as tissue—as a surgical dressing, opened a potentially new and we believed profitable market. Kotex feminine napkins and Kleenex tissues, both introduced more than 40 years ago, opened whole new marketing vistas to the papermaker as well as to the grower of trees.

The trend has since continued and shows little signs of changing. We manufacture more than 100 products today—at least half of them weren't even in existence before World War II. Our research and development scientists are studying more than 100 product designs for possible introduction in the next 2 or 3 years.

As you can see much of the growth of the reemerging forestry industry in Wisconsin can be attributed to the paper industry's growing demand for pulpwood. Pulpwood trees, which play a relatively minor role in the State's wood production at the turn of the century, today account for nearly half of our forest harvest—a tenfold increase over 1900 and double the use of just 10 years ago. Last year pulpwood brought $20 million to Wisconsin's tree farmers.

But even at that, the State's forests produce only about half of our paper industry's total pulpwood needs—the balance must be imported from nearby Lake States and Canadian stands. Just to maintain that 50-percent share of the market the Wisconsin forest industry will have to add measurably to its growing stock in the next few years because economists are already talking of increased demands of 50 percent for paper just in the next 15 years. At least one responsible source sees the total paper and paperboard industry's output as tripling by the year 2000. Wisconsin papermills will play a major part in that growth, I can assure you.

Happily for the State's commercial foresters there are also other customers for his growing stock. Some major investments in recent years have been made in plants to press and shape wood fibers into materials such as hardboard and particle board, and other firms have sprung up to convert these manmade boards to finished products. These new companies use tens of thousands of cords of wood now in surplus—growth that was considered until recently of no value or use to the industry—and large quantities of waste products from saw and lumber mills.

Today the total forest-based industry—combining pulp and paper, lumbering, furniture, and wood products—ranks as the State's third largest employer with nearly 80,000 workers and a payroll of nearly half a billion dollars. Sales of just the paper segment of the industry is estimated at more than a billion dollars annually.

What of the future? I have spent some interesting hours recently studying the U.S. Forest Service's just released survey of timber trends, an attempt to project the growth and demand for U.S. wood to the year 2000—a mere 35 years off. Most of the trees that will be needed by that time are already in the ground, the few that aren't will have to be planted within the next few years.

The report assumes that current population growth trends and the increasing economic health of the country will continue. It projects an increase in demand for all forest products of about 80 percent by the

year 2000. If anything, that is too conservative an estimate.

On the surface you would guess that a projection such as this would be music to the woodsman's ears. Wisconsin's foresters will certainly share in such growth. But the report hits a sour note in the form of a warning which is just as applicable on the State level as on the national level.

And that warning is: timber growth and forest inventories in the United States will be sufficient to meet demands only for the next 20 to 30 years—but not in the last years of this century.

Such a statement worries me, even though the same survey offers some very favorable predictions for the next 35 years and beyond about the availability of pulpwood. The nature and economics of the increasingly interdependent segments of the wood products business today are such that a sneeze in one area of the industry could well cause another segment to come down with pneumonia.

The size of the supply-demand gap, according to the report, looks like this:

By the year 2000, total projected forest growth will amount to an estimated 65 billion board feet of sawtimber; but

Projected demands will then total 81 million board feet.

The difference there is a full 16 percent, or roughly a shortage of 13 billion board feet a year.

The solution to the problem, some experts believe, is intensive forest management efforts. By the year 2000 these efforts could, they say, succeed in a realizable growth of as much as 100 billion feet.

Indeed, the Forest Service's own experts suggest that the Nation's commercial forest lands are fully capable of producing substantially more than the projected growth if current levels of forest management could be successfully applied across the board. It's a big and critical "if."

Most of the methods of better forest management that could be employed are known today and being used to some extent in different parts of the industry. The problem is to make the application of these principles universal.

One example of how that critical 13 billion board feet could be raised is in timber stand improvement by thinning, removing cull trees and other cultural work. In recent years improvement efforts nationally have covered about 1.7 million acres a year—a sizable area but only a small fraction of the young-growth forests in need of such maintenance.

Another method of stimulating increased forest growth involves higher utilization levels of timber, both in the woods and manufacturing plants. Sawdust will probably become a common raw element in papermaking one day, just a larger pieces of sawmill scrap have already made their place in the inventory of the pulpmaker in the form of chips. Ten years ago much of this waste was burned—today it provides Wisconsin papermakers with the equivalent of 24,000 cords of pulpwood annually in the form of chips for pulp.

Still another area in which we could substantially increase our forest reserves would be more intensive protection of growing stock from fire, insects and disease. Despite much work in this area, Wisconsin and the Nation still pay an awful toll in forest destruction by fire and pests. In this State alone some 176 million cubic feet—about 37 percent of our annual forest growth is destroyed each year. This figure is slightly higher than the national average.

And there are also a number of exciting new prospects for increased growth coming from our laboratories. The tree, a most complex organism, is just beginning to reveal some of its closely guarded secrets, and our research scientists are now beginning to isolate some of the key factors which affect the growth and structural development of some of our trees.

The study of forest genetics holds great promise for the wood-using industries; at Kimberly-Clark we are attempting to develop a family of "super trees" with superior papermaking fibers as well as greatly increased growth characteristics. But the realization of these developments is still some years off.

The very real solution to the problem of a projected timber shortage in the year 2000 is the planting or seeding of productive sites. In the United States during recent years tree planting has covered about 1.3 million acres annually—but more than 100 million acres of commercial forest land is described as either nonstocked or poorly stocked.

In Wisconsin an estimated 1.2 million acres of poorly stocked and nonstocked land could be reforested. One expert predicts that an eventual yield of about half a million board feet of softwoods could be realized annually from these currently vacant lands—enough wood to satisfy the current requirements of the State's three pine-using pulpmills all of which must now obtain a major portion of their needs from outside the State.

Our Chief State Forester, John A. Beale, reported last year that the heavily forested stands of northern Wisconsin, where the majority of our commercial wood is grown, are growing about 2.4 million cords annually, which is somewhat more than the annual cut.

But it is only a small fraction of the area's potential. The present growth rate, Beale says, is about one-fourth of a cord per acre. With more intensive management growth of 1 cord per acre—a fourfold improvement—is possible.

Both private and State groups in Wisconsin have, of course, been manfully engaged in the pursuit of planting more trees. Only eight States exceed Wisconsin in total acres planted, according to the American Forest Products Industries Association, a trade group.

Trees for Tomorrow, a nonprofit Wisconsin organization sponsored by some of the State's paper and power companies, gave away some 32,000 trees in a recent year and machine-planted another 500,000 as part of a program to encourage interested landowners to increase growth. Special programs sponsored by the State conservation department are likewise helpful. The Wisconsin Tree Farm system, which is privately sponsored by the forest-using industries, was introduced to Wisconsin at the end of World War II. Tree farm members must demonstrate ability to manage their holdings within standards of modern, professional forestry. And the idea seems to be catching on. The number of accredited farms has jumped from 185 to 731 in the past 4 years with more than a million and a quarter acres enrolled.

Activities such as these are of extreme importance when you consider that small, private forest tracts of less than 500 acres make up more than 80 percent of Wisconsin's commercial forest land. These little farms are big business—175,000 individual owners grow trees on more than 9½ million acres. More than half of this group own forest plots of less than 100 acres.

The nut of our problem then is to motivate and educate these small private operators to adopt modern methods of forestry, for the land buying plans of the forest industry does not and cannot include purchase and consolidation of these independent holdings.

Which brings us to the matter of the increased competition for the forest lands. The national timber trends survey predicts that the coming shortage of wood could be overcome if the intensive forestry methods I've just discussed are adopted, and if present forest acreage doesn't decrease.

While we can provide and practice improved management methods, we cannot plants, raise, and harvest trees on land that isn't there. And there are enormous pressures building up in this State and elsewhere in the Nation to dedicate large tracts of existing producing forest land exclusively to single purposes, much of it to recreational and public monuments use.

Should this happen on a grand scale, all of the intensive development and utilization efforts of the woods products industry, all of the advanced forest management and conservation techniques now practiced, and all of the scientific breakthroughs dreamed of in our laboratories will not close the coming gap between wood demand and supply.

I have no quarrel with recreational planners. I am very much interested in how my grandchildren will spend their increasing leisure time, but I'm also interested in how they and their friends will make a living in Wisconsin that will provide them with those leisure hours.

I believe Wisconsin must plan not simply for the creation of playgrounds, but for the fullest possible use of all our resources, and that means the continuance of multiple use patterns in most of our forests. The theory of multiple use has evolved to answer the equally legitimate requirements of industry for raw materials, and society's needs for watershed and wildlife protection and recreational space. It is a philosophy of accommodating a maximum of compatible uses with the highest single potential use of the land.

Wisconsin's forest industry has not ignored the outdoor and leisure-time values of its operations. It practices multiple-use and has done so for years. Several years ago 19 of the largest landowners in the State, with combined holdings of more than a million acres of forest land, on the subject of public access to their property. The survey revealed that virtually all of their land was open to the public for hiking, picnicking, hunting, fishing, and all but a few acres were available at no cost.

There hasn't been enough publicity about facts such as these, and perhaps there should be even more private land opened to the public, and more formal recreational facilities developed by these landowners, but this million acres is a good start—it's a land area nearly as large as the combined national forests in Wisconsin and more than twice the size of all our State forests.

Part of the so-called "recreational land crisis" fades when you consider that much forest land is already available to the public without the Government having to buy it up and remove it from the tax rolls.

On a smaller scale perhaps, but of just as much significance, is another program now developing with the encouragement of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which helps farmers convert all or part of their lands to commercial recreational areas for the creation of ski hills, golf courses, fishing and swimming lakes, or just in adding to the living space of the basic farm to accommodate city dwellers in search of a real "farm vacation."

These are two existing programs out of probably many that could be developed as alternatives to losing more forest area to single-purpose use such as recreation and in the long haul perhaps losing our forest product markets also.

I would like to recommend that the State undertake a study of the long-range factors that are affecting the health and welfare of the commercial forest industry in Wisconsin and try to determine whether or not some formula—be it tax incentives or whatever—can be created to stimulate more effective forest practices and develop more commercial forest land. It is obvious to me we are not realizing our growth potential at this moment.

At the same time it would be wise to inquire as to the ways and means of encouraging the use of more multiple recreational and commercial use of privately owned forest land as an alternative to removing more prime land from the tax rolls. I am afraid that any further narrowing of the forest tax base will only serve to price Wisconsin-grown wood out of the market.

I think forestry is an important enough provider of raw material and jobs to the Wisconsin economy to warrant such a study. For these next few years will be critical. The reemergence of the woodland industry from its long depression can be stifled overnight if our State planners don't show the same zeal for protecting the future of Wisconsin's commercial forests as they do in promoting the development of tomorrow's playgrounds.

And if you think we've got lots of time to worry about it, remember that the capture of the Milwaukee Braves by the city of Atlanta isn't the first time the South has drawn Wisconsin blood in recent years. First Georgia—and more recently Alabama—have passed Wisconsin in total annual paper production tonnage. And other States with more favorable growing and tax climates and large forest inventories are coming on strong. They know what the size of the market for paper and wood products is going to be tomorrow.

Old Satchel Paige is supposed to have said: "Don't look back—someone might be gaining." I can assure you that Paige's advice is appropriate here. Several somebodies are gaining. Now, with that intelligence at hand, can we start looking ahead—and planning?

The Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, through the arrangements of Mrs. Tagee Bengston of Rockford, Ill., the local chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution had the opportunity of reviewing a number of original poems by Mrs. Guanetta Gordon.

Being particularly impressed by one of Mrs. Gordon's poems, I want to call it to the attention of the other Members. The poem is entitled "The Price":

THE PRICE

The merry-go-round revolves on its axis;
A barker attracts the crowd, a calliope
Plays accompaniment while he waxes
Persuasive in olive-branch soliloquy.

Peace, the shield of festival,
Sparkles hypnotically, dazzling the eyes,
Peace, chants the voice of carnival,
Listen to tunes of compromise,
Listen now to the carousel,
Laugh at the marionettes; try the strings.
Come join the fun, and act your part well,
The cues will come promptly from the wings;
Keep peace, or die by atomic chart,
Unite with the coexistent heart.

I hear, but in the dead of night
I look upon the sleeping face
Of truth, a mask of shadow-light,
And choose the course I must embrace;
Some lone dark moment I shall raise
My head to perform with puppet strut,
Will lift my arm in overt praise,
But hidden will be a knife to cut
The cords. The act a fool's decree
To defend a way of life—but free.

Increases on Federal Highway User Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my constituent, Mr. Sydney Chase of Sanford, Fla., I am submitting for the consideration of the Members the position of the National Highway Users Conference on the matter of increasing Federal highway users taxes. The article follows:

NATIONAL HIGHWAY USERS CONFERENCE DECLARES: INTERSTATE SYSTEM SHOULD BE COMPLETED AS PLANNED WITHOUT RAISING FEDERAL HIGHWAY USER TAXES

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 3.—Completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways should be achieved without again raising Federal highway use taxes, the board of governors of the National Highway Users Conference has declared in a statement released today by H. E. Humphreys, Jr., chairman.

Mr. Humphreys said:

"In taking this action, the National Highway Users Conference Board reaffirms the position adopted 1 year ago which opposes any increase in the rates of highway user taxes dedicated to the highway trust fund.

"The board, composed of principals from some 21 national organizations with a stake in highway transportation, took this firm stand in the face of announced increases in cost estimates for completion of the Interstate System, scheduled to be finished by 1972. The conference has always been a strong support of the Interstate System and backed its acceleration as provided by Congress in 1956.

Some of the reasons cited by the National Highway Users Conference chairman for the strong opposition to any Federal highway user tax increases include the following: many States are already hard-pressed for road funds and a Federal increase would compound the heavier tax burdens now facing vehicle owners; higher taxes on commercial vehicle operators cut into the revenues of thousands of business enterprises that either ship or transport over the Nation's roads and streets; a tax increase at this time which falls entirely upon a selected segment of the economy is in direct contradiction to the atmosphere created and encouraged by President Johnson which looks to reduction, not increase, in Federal tax rates in order to stimulate business activity, prosperity and growth.

The board of governors, according to its spokesman, cited the fact that President Johnson—in his budget message to Congress in January 1965—had mentioned the possibility of extending all Highway Trust Fund taxes beyond the October 1, 1972, expiration date.

In this connection, Mr. Humphreys said: "Continuation of the Highway Trust Fund beyond October 1972, will permit the interstate program to continue at a reasonable rate of progress, and the Board of Governors of the National Highway Users Conference would approve such an extension as an alternative to any new taxes or further tax increases."

The National Highway Users Conference comprises some 2,500 National and State organizations representing passenger car owners, truck and bus owners, agriculture and other major shippers, as well as the motor vehicle supply industries. There are 50 State conferences, made up of State leaders largely from affiliates of the national groups.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY USERS CONFERENCE BOARD STATEMENT ON FEDERAL HIGHWAY USER TAXES

The Board of Governors of the National Highway Users Conference, in a statement released today by its chairman, H. E. Humphreys, Jr., announced firm opposition to any increase of the taxes dedicated to the Federal highway trust fund.

Mr. Humphreys pointed out that it was felt desirable to reaffirm the conference policy, as recommended a year ago by 650 highway user delegates from all over the country, in the face of announced increases in cost estimates for completion of the national system of interstate and defense highways, scheduled to be finished by 1972.

Mr. Humphreys continued:

"The conference has always been a strong supporter of the interstate system and backed its acceleration as provided by Congress in 1956.

"National Highway Users Conference's policy makes clear its continued support and its belief that the system should be completed on schedule if this proves possible.

"The National Highway Users Conference comprises some 2,500 national and State organizations representing passenger car owners, truck and bus owners, agriculture and other major shippers, as well as motor vehicle supply industries. There are 50 State conferences, made up of State leaders largely from affiliates of the national groups. Delegates from these State conferences, assembled in Washintgon for the 10th Highway Transportation Congress last May, recommended the policy just reaffirmed by the National Highway Users Conference Board.

"Because of the scope of its representation, the conference stresses that its opposition to increased highway user taxes is based on an overall regard for growth and stability, and is consistent with the administration's program for tax relief, rather than increases, to keep the economy on an even keel.

"Federal highway user taxes are specifically dedicated to the highway trust fund for the purpose of financing the Federal share of the road program. In assuming this burden, highway users' taxes have risen far beyond the level of increases borne by any other segment of the economy.

"Some of the reasons for opposition to any Federal highway use tax increase are:

"Increasing the trust fund taxes would compel the States—which match Federal interstate funds on a 90–10 basis and other Federal road funds on a 50–50 basis—to raise more money, as well. Many States already are hard pressed for funds. This could set off a spiral of tax increases.

"At the same time, a Federal highway use tax increase would deplete the source of revenue for State, county, and community roads—whose development also is important to highway users and the Nation.

"Heavier highway use taxes would penalize the average family car owner who relies on his automobile for necessary transportation, often essential to his livelihood as well as for recreation.

"More taxes on commercial vehicles cut into the revenue of thousands of businesses that either ship or transport—which spokesmen have made clear the present administration seeks to encourage.

"Furthermore, a highway use tax on business at this time, is in direct contrast to the whole tax reduction trend whereby the administration is hoping to stimulate greater business activity.

"The cost estimates for the completion of the interstate system have now risen 70 percent from the original estimates in 1956 of $27 billion to the $46.8 billion estimated this year. The 1965 estimate, in turn, represents a $5.8 billion increase over the $41 billion of 1961. There is no reason to as-

sume this constant rise—if not stopped—will cease of its own accord or reverse itself.

"The National Highway Users Conference Board of Governors recognizes that the completion of this particular program—scheduled for 1972—cannot mean the end of highway development in this country, where highway transportation daily becomes more closely interwoven with our individual and economic lives. Rather than pushing highway expenditures to higher peaks, the National Highway Users Conference Board feels the economy would be better served by maintaining something more nearly approximating a steady level.

"In 1965, more than $14 billion will be spent through the Federal, State, county, and community governments for highways.

"Nearly $4 billion will come out of the Federal highway trust fund. This—along with highway use taxes paid to other levels of government—already constitutes a sizable contribution to the economy and to highway construction by highway users who, most economists agree, are not the sole beneficiaries of the roads. It would seem that highway users' present contribution should suffice, especially when it is remembered that the users pay these taxes in addition to those paid by every other economic class and that, although it is hoped the load will be lightened, no real end is in sight."

The board of governors, according to its spokesman, cited the fact that President Johnson—in his budget message to Congress in January 1965—had mentioned the possibility of extending all highway trust fund taxes beyond the October 1, 1972, expiration date.

In this connection, Mr. Humphreys said: "Continuation of the highway trust fund beyond October 1972 will permit the interstate program to continue at a reasonable rate of progress, and the Board of Governors of the National Highway Users Conference would approve such an extension as an alternative to any new taxes or further tax increases.

"At the same time, the National Highway Users Conference Board points out that the revenue going into the highway trust fund at current tax levels is expected to yield at least $2 billion more than previously estimated, making the net additional amount stated to be needed in Federal funds about $3 billion. It is conceivable that this $3 billion will be further lessened by much greater highway use and travel in this country, provided the tax burden is not increased."

The statement concluded:

"The Interstate System is well on its way, as is work on the other highways throughout the country due to the total annual expenditures now of $14 billion a year. Highway progress reflects the fine efforts of highway officials throughout the country and is bound to be a greater incentive to highway use."

Mail Service: From Bad to Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, recently I learned that the Post Office Department has proposed to reduce the number of delivery trips on certain multiple-trip routes in many communities throughout the Nation. I have asked the Postmaster General for an explanation and justification of this proposal.

I firmly believe it is high time the Post Office Department stop eliminating postal service and start improving it, and I felt this latest proposal for reducing service should be called to the attention of all Members whose districts would be affected.

In the case of Omaha, Nebr., in my congressional district, the Department proposes to cancel 1 delivery a day on 13 essential business mail routes. This would reduce the deliveries from three to two in three business sections of the city.

The savings that will be realized by the reduction in deliveries in Omaha is utterly ridiculous. The Department figures show there would be a saving of only 13 hours a day in delivery carrier time, out of a total of some 3,000 hours a day carrier time for the entire city. I do not believe the reduction in service to hundreds of business firms warrants this.

In nearby Blair, Nebr., a proposed cut in one delivery on one route would save only 15 minutes.

The businessmen in Omaha—and I am sure in other cities—have been cooperating to the greatest extent in presorting, prepackaging and pretieing their outgoing mail in sequence routes and ZIP codes. I do not believe it is logical, feasible, or fair to propose additional cuts in delivery service to these same postal patrons.

I have received thousands of complaints of poor mail service, and cutting out essential deliveries across the Nation certainly is not going to improve matters. I include just a few of these complaints which point up some of the postal problems we already have:

MINEOLA, N.Y.,
May 14, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: In connection with the House Postal Operations Subcommittee investigation into the mail service, we can offer some choice tidbits concerning that in the New York area, as follows:

1. A special-delivery letter sent from this office to the Department of State of New York on a Wednesday was not delivered until the following Monday, although received in Albany, at the post office, the next day. We demanded and got a refund from the Post Office Department, but this does not cure the inconvenience and expense that such delivery caused.

2. Letters mailed in the town of Syosset to an address in Syosset have taken 2 days for delivery.

3. On March 31, a letter mailed to a client, who lived in East Moscow (but who recently informed us that his post office is Levittown) was never received or returned to this office and took approximately 35 days to deliver.

4. Consistently, special-delivery letters have been delivered with the next regular mail delivery or much later than such delivery, completely disregarding the additional fee paid and the connotation thereon.

5. Intertown mail on Long Island is so ridiculous, as far as delivery is concerned, that many times 5 and 6 days elapse between mailing and delivery.

On the average, once a month, I am obligated to write to the Post Office Department to find out why return receipts on certified mail are not returned. This also applies to cases where a fee is paid to obtain the address where delivered, which address is either illegible or omitted completely.

I can heartedly agree with your quoted statement that the service "stinks."

Respectfully yours,

——— ———.

NEW YORK CITY,
May 22, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: I applaud your efforts to improve the deplorable mail service we receive in this country. From my limited knowledge of service in other countries, ours is poor indeed.

I submit the attached evidence. A letter mailed (first class) from 40th Street in Manhattan to 68th Street in Manhattan, a distance of 1½ miles, required between 3 and 4 days, as the postmarks testify on the attached envelope. Note the double postmark, which I gather indicates that the letter arrived at the branch post office late in the evening of March 19 or early morning of March 20; it was delivered to my home 28 blocks away on March 23.

This, I submit, is inexcusable. I have had several recent instances where letters mailed within the zone of my home post office branch have taken from Friday until Monday to be delivered—and I stress that the letters were posted well before the final collection from the box on Friday.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

NEBRASKA,
April 30, 1965.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Just a few words and an enclosed sample of some damaged mail we received today. We do not get too many parcels, but very seldom get a parcel post package but what it is severely damaged. So guess you are not the only one to receive damaged mail matter.

Sincerely hope you can do something to remedy this situation, which is either caused mechanically or by just plain carelessness.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

DETROIT, MICH.,
May 6, 1965.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,

DEAR SIR: The enclosed mail matter is just another example of the impossible service we are getting in Detroit. Since this exhibit we had another letter (first class) that was mailed to our Edison address from a point 4 miles away in Detroit and it took 1 week to reach us. Impossible, but true.

Yours impatiently,

——— ———.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
April 19, 1965.

DEAR SIR: Today I received a letter from Lincoln, Nebr.—a 40-minute drive from here. It was postmarked April 15. Where was it kept for several days and why?

This is the space age now, not the stage age, which at the above rate of speed, I believe was faster, safer, and surer. Why?

Because this was a very important letter, and because by not receiving it at the proper time it caused great anxiety and hardship, I feel I am justified in complaining.

There are many times that I could complain about mail service, but I am too busy. However, this time I felt compelled to voice my anger.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

L.B.J. Was on Top of the Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to two editorials—one from the Austin, Tex., Statesman on May 7, 1965, and the other from Life on May 14, 1965—concerning the U.S. action in the Dominican Republic. I found the point well taken, and I commend these editorials to the attention of my colleagues. They follow:

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman, May 7, 1965]

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES TO SPONSOR A DOMINICA PEACE FORCE

Though a truce between the contending factions in the Dominican Republic has been signed, its net effect still leaves much to be desired. Communist fire has continued, though seemingly at a lesser pace.

The lesson dealing with communism, hard-learned over the years, is that truces are made to be broken, just as treaties are made to be broken. They serve their purpose by gaining time for the Reds. But inevitably they are junked and conditions then relapse into greater disarray than before.

It required some fast footwork for the President to anticipate the Communist purpose of stealing the revolution and taking it out of the hands of the forces that have a stake in the sovereignty and future of Dominica.

The decision to send U.S. troops to the island Republic was a difficult one, but it was twice justified: To enable Americans and other affected nationalities to get out of Dominica in safety, and to nip in the bud a Communist takeover in the pattern of sequences followed by Fidel Castro in Cuba.

Thus it is a matter of some dismay why some nations of Latin America, all of whom have had run-ins with Communists and terrorists at one time or another, look with hostility on intervention in Dominica by the United States to prevent repetition of the conspiracy that made of Cuba a Soviet satellite.

President Johnson has repeatedly assured these critics that the United States will get out of Dominica when the mission of stamping out the Communist scheme is completed, or when the Organization of American States meets its responsibilities.

The OAS has divided support among the Latin American nations, and has always dragged its feet in an emergency while some members accuse the United States of having improper designs in its effort to prevent Communist takeovers in the New World. Now it has agreed to sponsor a peacekeeping force.

Critics of the President's action might well ask themselves the question of whether it would be right to stand idly by and permit the Dominican trouble to result in the imposition of a Communist dictatorship?

[From Life, May 14, 1965]

L.B.J. WAS ON TOP OF THE CRISIS

President Johnson's decision to send U.S. forces into the Dominican Republic was wise, courageous and timely. Depending on how successfully the United States is now able to follow through in a principled fashion, it may look equally good in longer retrospect.

The moment the rebel leadership was infiltrated by Castroite Communists, the return of former President Juan Bosch to the office he lost in a military coup 2 years ago ceased to be an acceptable solution to the crisis. Under Fidelista auspicies, Bosch's brand of liberalism and ineffectual if well-meant anticommunism would have lasted about as long as an icicle on the Avenida Independencia.

The revolution in a few days destroyed all domestic authority. The rebel side was split three or four ways—among various schools of Communists, apparently sincere anti-Communist constitutionalists and a heavy admixture of trigger-happy kids. The "loyalists"—rightist military leaders—were also divided for a time. The civilian government of Donald Reid Cabral, which succeeded Bosch in 1963, disintegrated altogether 2 weeks ago. The resulting power vacuum has been filled by U.S. marines and airborne troops.

By intervening unilaterally in Santo Domingo, the United States broke the letter of the treaties governing inter-American relations, which called for collective hemispheric action or none at all. We also incurred, as the cost of our decisiveness, a propaganda disadvantage. But President Kennedy had already served warning that we could not afford to be bound to a dangerous do-nothing policy. If, he said in a 1961 speech, "the inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction . . . this government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are to the security of our Nation."

From the very first, however, President Johnson had sought to mobilize the 20-member Organization of American States, which is supposed to deal with crises like this. It proved difficult to get the OAS off the mark. Then last week the necessary 14 members gave grudging recognition to the necessity of our fast action and voted to establish an OAS military force to create "a climate of peace and conciliation" in war-ravaged Santo Domingo. The force will include some of the U.S. troops already there. With this significant break in OAS tradition it may be possible to inter-Americanize the peacekeeping function and eventually to set up a trusteeship council against the time when elections can be held.

The Dominican crisis has shown again that the danger of Castroism is still real. It even raises the somewhat nightmarish thought that a few hundred Fidelistas scattered about Latin America could cause the dispatch of thousands of U.S. troops. While our actions have given new life to the Monroe Doctrine, at the same time the very existence of the OAS makes the Monroe Doctrine a hemisphere affair. Hemisphere security has become a responsibility to be shared. Castorite subversion is far more a threat to other OAS members than it is to the United States. The clear need is for a permanent collective mechanism capable of combating such subversion wherever it surfaces. It is neither to our interest nor to the interest of the OAS that the United States should by default have to do the job alone.

Protesting Too Little

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House will shortly be considering the Housing Act of 1965, I think it is well to give consideration to the points raised in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 19:

PROTESTING TOO LITTLE

People have been tolerating Federal subsidies in one form or another for so long that the administration's new rent subsidy proposal has stirred scarcely a ripple of protest.

The subsidy scheme—which officials call a rent supplement to make it sound more palatable—envisions church or other nonprofit organizations building housing into which eligible families of low and moderate income would move, paying about 20 percent of their annual income as rent. The Federal subsidy would give the owners the difference between that amount and whatever an economic rent would be.

When the plan came to its first legislative hurdle in a House banking subcommittee the other day, the discussion did not center on whether the whole rent subsidy theory is unsound and ought to be thrown out of the proposed housing legislation. The question, rather, was whether the administration's formula was perhaps a bit too generous.

In some high-rent cities, as the administration wanted it, families with an annual income as high as $8,550 could have part of their rent paid by the Government. The subcommittee members evidently concluded that as a little on the high side, for they reduced the ceiling to $6,850, and they proportionately dropped the ceilings for cities where rents are lower.

However, this and other less consequential revisions do not face up squarely to the issue: Should the Government, already deep in the housing business and making a botch of it, go even deeper by handing out rent subsidies, no matter what income limitations arbitrarily are decided on? Surely our social and moral fabric is badly torn when hardly anybody sees anything wrong with a citizen being beholden to the Government for part of his rent for as long as 40 years, which is what the bill provides.

Yet the absence of any widespread outcry is not hard to explain. A sweating farmer on a tractor in Iowa, say, may mutter about the Government making him help to pay the rent for some city people in Pittsburgh or New York. But he isn't going to mutter much when, at the same time, the Government is making those city people help to pay subsidies for his farm. And that is the sorry state to which Government's extension of subsidies has come; who is there left to be free to cast the first stone?

Health and Safety Committee Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Ruth Desmond, president of the Federation of Homemakers, and a tireless worker for the health safety of the people of our Nation, has asked that I commend a resolution unanimously passed by the board of management of her good organization to the Members of Congress for their consideration. I am happy to read this resolution into the RECORD so that my colleagues may have the opportunity to study its contents:

Whereas scientific and technological changes have proliferated in the last two decades as never before, and

Whereas health hazards and threats to personal safety has also multiplied, and

Whereas there has been a vast increase of problems involving health and safety attending the expansion of novel practices in industry, agriculture, and Government, and

Whereas the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has become increasingly burdened by the diversification of modern commerce and problems hitherto unknown to mankind, and

Whereas it is unlikely that even so dedicated a group of legislators as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can devote the necessary time and energy to the myriad tasks and responsibilities facing them, created by the aforesaid technological revolution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federation of Homemakers, a nationwide group of public-spirited housewives, requests the Congress of the United States to create a new standing committee in the House of Representatives to be known as the Committee on Health and Safety, and that this aforesaid committee be assigned the task of studying and reporting to the Congress and the public on all national problems relating to health and safety, and considering legislation which would vitally affect the public in these specific fields.

Unanimously passed by the Board of Management of the Federation of Homemakers at its regular meeting, April 8, 1965.

RUTH G. DESMOND, *President*.

Double Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the enclosed article by Mr. William Loeb, publisher of the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader. This timely and informative article has been reproduced on the front page of the Cordele Dispatch on May 11, 1965. The Cordele Dispatch is a widely read and much respected newspaper which is published by my good friends, E. W. and Jack C. Mathews of Cordele, Ga.

I commend this article to those who would not believe its context had it been written by a southern publisher. Mr. Loeb knows his subject very well and it is hoped that other editors and publishers will acquaint themselves with the subject as it truly exists:

DOUBLE STANDARD

Two men died in the South on the same day. The emotionally hysterical civil rights supporters made sure that you knew all the details regarding the death of one of these men, the minister who was beaten by some white people in Selma after he had invaded their hometown and tragically died.

The other man, the story of whose death was buried on page 14 of our own paper—and probably wasn't mentioned at all in most papers—was that of 71-year-old Bank President Tom C. Woodruff, of Unadilla, Ga., who died from a fractured skull after having his fingers broken by robbers who tried to force him to open the vault of his bank. Two Negro schoolteachers from a nearby town are accused by the police of the crime. Of $3,780 found outside the vault, $3,300 were found by the police locked in a closet in the classroom of one of the teachers.

There were no prayers for 71-year-old Bank President Tom C. Woodruff, who was kidnaped that Monday night when he returned from a church meeting. No ministers wept over him. No cardinal or archbishop offered prayers for him. President Johnson did not send his personal plane to bring relatives to the funeral. The President didn't call the family of Tom Woodruff on the phone.

Why the double standard? This newspaper will tell you why. It is because the uproar over voting rights in Alabama is carefully contrived by the Communists who are attempting to stir up discord between black and white in this country and to keep the Negro situation aggravated to the point when Negroes can be used as the shock troops of the revolution which the Communist Party plans in the United States.

So carefully organized is the hysteria over the civil rights issue that if the right button is pressed newspapers and radio commentators all over the United States go to work with sob stories about the so-called warriors for racial justice.

Whenever an unfortunate tragedy occurs, as in the Evers case or in the case of the Unitarian minister from Boston, this gives the Communists what they always want—a martyr. They have been lugging the bodies of their so-called martyrs through the streets from one end of this world to another ever since the Communist Party came into power in Russia, following the end of the First World War. This is a standard technique. If there aren't any martyrs, naturally, they see to it that some are made.

You don't see any of these sanctimonious civil righters talking about colored murderer, while 30 white people didn't lift a finger when they heard her screams under their windows. You never hear one of these hypocritical civil rights leaders talk about the necessity of Negroes behaving themselves like civilized people, not like animals. Yet when something happens as happened to the Unitarian minister, screams of anguish arise from one end of the country to the other and President Johnson plays right in with the propaganda plan because, of course, there are millions of Negro votes to be considered.

What about the white people? What about Bank President Tom C. Woodruff, who lived all his life as a respected citizen of Unadilla, Ga.? Did you hear any condemnation of this crime from the civil rights people? Did you hear one single word about the fact that the animals who robbed the bank, broke his fingers, one by one, trying to force him to open a vault that he couldn't open because it had a timelock on it and would not open again until the following morning in time for banking hours? Did you hear any outcry over the fact that the robbers fractured his skull and that they shot him once in the side before they fled with the $3,780 that they found in the bank outside the vault? When the police and FBI agents arrested the two Negro schoolteachers, one of whom taught English and the other taught science in a nearby high school, did you hear any cries from civil righters on behalf of dead President Tom C. Woodruff? You did not and you will not.

This newspaper, like any decent American newspaper, detests violence against any citizen of the United States, white or black, but it is sick and tired of the double standard of those who would forgive the Negro every crime and only concentrate their condemnations against the white people in this country.

This is not justice. This is not even commonsense. Just let them keep it up. What will happen in the United States, unfortunately, is not a gradual and sensible adjustment of the relationships between the races. What will come will be a revolution on the part of the black people that they are promoting and, since there are nine whites to every colored person, the revolution will be put down in a bloodbath that will be on the shoulders of these phony crusaders.

WILLIAM LOEB, *Publisher*.

Repairs To Avoid Repairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the international monetary situation and what should be done to protect and enhance our gold supply. The following editorial, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Thursday, May 13, sheds considerable light on this question:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK: REPAIRS TO AVOID REPAIRS

In the view of a number of bankers and economists, as well as an occasional peripatetic prime minister, the world is in danger of running out of spending money. If the international monetary machinery isn't overhauled soon to create lots more "liquidity," they contend, world trade simply may shrivel up.

It's a frightening picture, all right, but it's also one that appears to ignore a few simple principles of economics.

In the first place, as Professor Boarman stressed on this page the other day, day-to-day transactions in the markets of the world are not financed by passing out gold bars or otherwise digging into nations' monetary reserves. Such transactions are financed instead by extensions of ordinary commercial credit.

As a result, there is no necessary connection at all between the rate at which the world's liquidity grows and the speed at which trade expands. In the decade of the 1950's, for example, trade grew almost twice as fast as the world's monetary reserves.

Problems arise principally when one or more nations persistently spend, lend or invest more abroad than they take in from overseas. Other countries can be fairly patient, extending sizable amounts of credit for long periods of time, but eventually they are sure to insist on something more solid than credit.

Foreign nations have certainly been patient with the United States. Despite a healthy excess of exports over imports, this Nation for more than a decade has hardly ever been able to balance its income with its outgo, even for limited periods. Yet its creditors for years went on piling up dollar credits with hardly a murmur.

In the past few years, however, the creditors have become increasingly concerned. So they've been coming around with their dollar credits and insisting that the United States pay them off with its gold; since the end of 1958 America's holdings of gold have shrunk by about one-fourth. The foreigners' willingness to go on piling up dollar credits has been lessened, too, by America's evident unwillingness to put its own house in order.

Confidence in the dollar, for example, was hardly enhanced by Washington's proposed cut in tourists' customs allowances, its efforts to sell savings bonds to servicemen abroad, its emergency borrowings here and there overseas. For a good while the Government's efforts seemed either too small to matter or too likely only to postpone the day of reckoning.

Though Washington has grown a great deal more determined of late, we suspect there's still doubt in some places abroad that it has found the full and final solution, especially in demanding voluntary restraint on American investing and lending overseas. When a company brings back capital it has in, say, France or Germany, it cannot bring it back again and again.

America's dollars, in short, are no longer considered abroad to be such fine things to have and to hold. Nor is the U.S. situation exactly unique. Britain's pounds hardly have the same international popularity they enjoyed before London began having its own balance-of-payments troubles, and the currencies of many other nations have experienced much sharper drops in world esteem.

In the circumstances, it's perhaps understandable that a lot of people in London, Washington, and elsewhere talk of getting together to create a new form of international currency that everyone will have faith in. The fallacy of that approach is that a new world currency in reality could not be sounder than the individual currencies on which it would be based.

A much more promising approach, it seems to us, would be to start building up the strength of the individual currencies. While Washington can't do much about the moneys of other nations, it could do a lot for the dollar if it would give up the notion of always inflating the economy to ever-expanding prosperity with artificially easy money, high spending, and big budget deficits.

Perhaps the world's monetary machinery could use some overhauling; in our changing world our institutions often have to be brought up to date. But in the end the overhaul will be self-defeating if the mechanics persist in believing that by fixing up the international machinery they can forever avoid those long overdue fiscal and monetary repairs right at home.

Swift Action in the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the Stockton, Calif., Record on May 7 printed a fine editorial appraising President Johnson's swift action in the Dominican Republic.

While many may debate the wisdom of these actions, I am certain the vast majority of Americans support the President. His decisive action did at least two things for which we owe a debt of gratitude—lives were saved, and communism was thwarted from establishing another Red tyranny in the Western Hemisphere.

The RECORD editorial follows:

UNITED STATES DOES THE JOB AS CRITICS ARGUE

With the Dominican crisis sputtering to an end, at least in its shooting phase, second-guessers are arguing over the wisdom of President Johnson's rapid dispatching of American troops to their first landing on the soil of a Latin nation in more than a generation.

One question that puzzles some critics is whether or not there ever really was any danger of a Communist takeover of the Dominican Republic. The New York Times, for one, observed that since American troops had intervened, "no one any longer will be able to prove or disprove the thesis that a rebel victory would have brought a Communist government to Santo Domingo."

Presumably, the President should have waited until the new government had signed a trade agreement with the Soviet Union and Russian technicians had begun arriving, perhaps being spared from their duties in Cuba.

Others decry the great damage done the good neighbor policy and the concept of inter-American cooperation and equality and nonintervention in internal affairs, so laboriously built up over the years, by this alleged return to "gunboat diplomacy."

The fact is, however, that the Dominican revolution would have long been over before the Organization of American States could have decided on the need for action, and taken such action, had the United States sat back and waited upon its advice and consent.

The whole Dominican question, of course, should be debated in the councils of the OAS. But it is thanks to the United States that the problem confronting us and our Latin fellow members today is that of building stable democracy in the Dominican Republic and not what to do about another Communist foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

Smut Fighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the author of legislation aimed at combating the obscenity racket in the United States, I would like to commend the General Federation of Women's Clubs upon one of their current projects. The 9 million members of the general federation, which I am proud to say is presided over by a fellow Nebraskan, Mrs. William H. Hasebroock, have taken up the fight to stop the traffic in pornography among children. This is a most worthwhile endeavor on the part of these energetic and civic-minded women.

I think the Members of this distinguished body will be interested in an article which appeared in the Operation Yorkville newsletter, outlining the campaign that is being waged by the women of this country against the smut peddlers.

[From the Operation Yorkville, April–May 1965]

WOMEN OF THE YEAR—GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

(By Mrs. William H. Hasebroock, president)

Members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs—9 million strong across the Nation—have taken up the fight to stop the traffic in pornography among children. Spearheaded by the dynamic and dedicated Mrs. William H. Hasebroock, the drive was begun in November of 1964, when Mrs. Hasebroock said in that month's issue of the federation's national magazine, the Clubwoman: "Join your general federation in this crusade to rid our newsstands of morally destructive magazines."

Mrs. Hasebroock called upon federation clubs across the Nation to "* * * join us in this national campaign. I ask you to work in your communities to eliminate these detrimental magazines from our newsstands." She said: "In recent months I have received a large amount of mail from clubwomen in all sections of the country protesting the emphasis on salaciousness which has gained such newsstand prominence. Consider this: surveys reveal that young people comprise a major part of the readership of these magazines. The results are matters of court records * * * sex crimes, shocking rises in social disease in teenagers, the total result is a lowering of our moral standards, the lives of young people blighted in their teens. It is due time that we clubwomen rise up and attack this problem, beginning with our individual communities * * *. Flagrant disregard of public opinion and public welfare cannot continue indefinitely. There is, inevitably, a day of reckoning. I hope this day now have arrived."

Once this opening salvo had been sounded, subsequent issues of the Clubwoman carried plans for community action: "Familiarize yourself with the obscenity laws in your town and State; appoint letter writing committees; stay clear of censorship; pass a resolution; enlist the support of other community groups and clubs."

Response to the call and to the guidepost for community action was immediate and overwhelming. Typical was a resolution passed by a Missouri group: "Be it resolved that the Quester's Club of Grandview, Mo., representing concerned mothers, joins with the other mothers and housewives of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in a nationwide crusade to remove from our newsstands, offensive and character-undermining sex magazines."

Pornography pushers have been put on notice. Nine million mothers represent a formidable fighting force. It was the general federation clubwomen who played a major role in the passage of the child labor laws; who followed through on the establishment of the children's bureau and legislation for child welfare and maternal care. And they were the motivating force that created the Food and Drug Administration.

Deserving of special mention in the Federation campaign is Mrs. Mary McGinn Taylor, editor of the Clubwoman for her excellent coverage of the problem and presentation of campaign plans.

A fine example of what these women's clubs are doing is contained in resolutions recently passed by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Whereas publishers and distributors of obscene material have taken advantage of the present definition "obscenity" as found in section 311 of the California Penal Code to vastly increase the publication in California and the distribution from within the State of such material: Therefore

Resolved, That the California Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled May 12, 1965, Los Angeles, Calif., urge its membership to redouble their efforts to impress upon all State legislators the necessity of making such changes in the above definition as will facilitate convictions in this field.

RESOLUTION BY THE MAR VISTA WOMAN'S CLUB, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The Mar Vista Woman's Club of the Marina District No. 18, CFWC of the GFWC passed the following resolution on April 12, 1965.

Whereas California's law on obscenity is extremely weak, having been severely damaged by the 1961 amendment to the code; and

Whereas California is now flooded with obscene publications; which have become widely available to our youth; and

Whereas the U.S. Senate Investigating Committee on Juvenile Delinquency has found that 75 to 90 percent of all filthy literature eventually reaches the hands of teenagers and younger children; and

Whereas many of the pornographic publications available in California are little more than handbooks in violence, crime, and perversion, dealing with all manner of immorality; and

Whereas these pornographic publications seek to degrade and destroy respect for the professions and institutions which we would encourage our children to honor; and

Whereas the sanctity of marriage and the home is ridiculed; and

Whereas there is an urgent need for an amendment to the California Penal Code to strengthen the State's antiobscenity law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Mar Vista Woman's Club of Marina District No. 18 of the California Federation of Women's Clubs of the General Federation of Women's Clubs calls upon the government of the State of California to take official cognizance of this critical situation. We call upon the administration to provide leadership in taking action to protect our youth from the flood of printed filth now available on our newsstands, and urge the California Legislature to adopt corrective legislation, and that copies of this resolution be sent to Gov. Edmund G. Brown and State Assemblyman Jesse M. Unruh, State Capitol Building, Sacramento, Calif., and to other women's clubs of Marina District.

Signed this 12th day of April 1965.

Mrs. RICHARD SPRAGUE,
President.

Mrs. VERNON L. GARRETT,
Secretary.

Vietnam Report—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished editor and journalist, Mr. John Seigenthaler, editor of the Nashville Tennessean, has been touring the tortured countryside of Vietnam as an observer and writer.

He is writing a series of articles on this tour that provide fresh insight and added perspective into the situation there. I believe these reports will be of wide general interest.

Under unanimous consent, I include this series of articles—published in the Nashville Tennessean—in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The first of this series, Part I, Vietnam Report, is as follows:

TERROR IN THE SUN—VIETNAM: A LAND OF WAR, SIESTAS

(By John Seigenthaler)

SAIGON, May 16.—Something less than 48 hours before this was written I was in the cool, comfortable, and secure offices of the Nashville Tennesean saying goodbye to staff members as I left on this trip.

Now I am halfway around the world in hot, uncomfortable, insecure Vietnam, where life and labor are cheap—and where the U.S. Government spends more than $1 million a day on the business of war.

As I took my leave from Nashville, Amon Carter Evans, publisher of the Tennessean, shook my hand and we laughed as he asked:

"Are you sure you don't want to back out before it is too late?"

Admittedly, that idea has crossed my mind in the 2 months that elapsed since I was invited by the Department of Defense to come and see first hand how the war goes.

I considered declining the invitation last month after Communist explosives blasted our Embassy. I considered backing out again as U.S. airstrikes against the Vietcong and North Vietnam continued to build tension and danger in this part of the world. And I considered it just last week when I read that military officials believe the Vietcong are building up for a retaliatory attack somewhere in South Vietnam. American officials expect the response to come after the start of the heavy rains, later this month.

TWO-WEEK TRIP

I had wanted to come to Vietnam when I was first invited. And while I wavered—slightly, but never seriously—as the situation heated up, I am still extremely anxious to travel across this country, observing and learning what I can about this sensitive and sometimes dangerous war that concerns the freedom of all of southeast Asia—and, perhaps, the ultimate freedom of the world.

It is impossible on a 2-week trip to analyze in depth the problems plaguing any country—much less complex and confused Vietnam. But I hope to observe the effects of the war; to talk with the Vietnamese—the man on the street, the politician, the fighting man; to confer with American civilians working to build the economic structure in this country; to interview American soldiers who are engaged in the direction of the war; the wounded who are cursing it—and to try to bring home a clearer understanding of where we are going in this effort.

And I hope to be able to put to Americans in Vietnam the same question the publisher put to me as I left Nashville: "Are you sure we don't want to back out before it is too late?"

From the air, Vietnam today seems to be a country at peace. We flew in from Manila by commercial airline—as casually as if we were flying from Memphis to Nashville. The very fact that commercial airlines still fly the daily trip from Manila to Saigon to Singapore was a surprise to me.

Looking down on the lush, green rolling hills and valleys, Vietnam seems not unlike the countryside in middle Tennessee. The Saigon River, a meandering little stream, curves across the land toward the central city, as does the Cumberland. From 20,000 feet Vietnam looks like just another sleepy countryside.

But suddenly the pilot of the airliner reminds his passengers that there is something more than farmlands and wood and streams below.

"I am required to remind our passengers," he announced over the intercom, "that it is a violation of the laws of the South Vietnamese Government to take any photographs from an aircraft over Vietnam."

Almost every passenger on the half-filled jet strained his eyes, to discover what secret armaments were below. Nothing could be seen. There was no evidence of a war or violence. There were no explosions; no orange bursts of gunfire; no troop movements; no bomb craters scarring the earth.

FRENCH INFLUENCE

I had been told that the influence of the French—for years colonial masters of Vietnam before they were driven out in 1954—is still apparent. And it is. The second language here is French. The huge picture on the wall of the hotel room where I am now sitting is of the Arc de Triomphe. Many of the buildings reflect the design of the French. Menus in restaurants reflect the tastes of the French and almost everything from bathrooms to teenaged boys named Jacques leave no doubt that the French were here.

But Saigon is poor and dirty and run down, indicating that the French left some of their culture and little else.

The dominant and overpowering influence obvious here now, however, is not French but American. As our airplane taxied to the terminal at Tan Son Nhut Airport, clusters of American-made helicopters could be seen taking off and landing on the outskirts of the field. Giant C-130 cargo planes, clearly marked "U.S. Air Force," line the parking area. Many among the more than 100 planes I saw bore the familiar tail marking of a lightning bolt through a shield. These planes came here from Sewart Air Force Base.

THIRTY-SEVEN THOUSAND SOLDIERS

Everywhere in Saigon are American soldiers. They scramble all over the airport. They fill the sidewalks, the restaurants, the taxicabs—there are 37,000 of them here as of announcement today. American music blares from radios in the hotel lobby.

The square in front of the city's largest Catholic church is named "John F. Kennedy Square." Hotel employees and waiters in restaurants are making a major effort to keep pace with the American mood sweeping the country.

"Walcome to owah hotel," the registration clerk said as he placed a card before another newsman and me. We flew here together. He quickly added: "Sorry. No single rooms. Double rooms only."

Saigon, a city of 2 million, is not a city of convenience. The war has brought people here from all over the world—an estimated 100 newspapermen are now here, most of them on a short-term basis. There is only one air-conditioned hotel and reservations must be made weeks in advance. It is a bustling, busy city as Asian metropolitan centers go. And the sight of so many people moving so fast, going about whatever is their business, can lead a visitor to the false conclusion that this is a city at ease, surrounded by war.

Walk along the crowded streets and observe these native inhabitants—short, slender brown little people, with large almond eyes—and it is hard to understand that this, their community, is alive with terror. Women, wearing the native Ao Dai dress, seem unconcerned as they shop, many of them walking along with their children, hand in hand. A constant flow of tiny taxicabs pours by the hotels on the corner of Tu Do (Liberty) Duong (Street) at Le Loi (the name of a former president) Duong. Hundreds of bicycles, carrying men, women, and children, vie with the cabs for space at the intersection. Nobody seems to be aware, or care that the Vietcong may be somewhere among them, preparing to create new terror, with bombs and bullets.

We arrived just before noon and the road was jammed with traffic as we started from the airport to the hotel. However, shortly after our arrival Saigon closed up shop—as it does every day between the hours of noon and 2:30 p.m. The heat and humidity are oppressive.

OFFICE CLOSED

Custom simply requires that everybody take a nap—a frustrating tradition that American fighting men can't understand. Shortly after my arrival I went to the office for national press accreditation but even this office was closed. Only a janitor was on hand to announce that those who worked in the business office would be back at 2:30.

How strange for a nation at war to go to sleep each day at high noon. And yet I am

told that tonight in Saigon we will hear the Vietcong mortar fire in the hills.

A careful look around town, however, makes it clear that there is a war. Three blocks from the hotel is the Brinks bachelor officers quarters which was blasted by a Communist bomb last Christmas eve night. Some of those quarters are still under repair. I visited the Embassy to talk with Robert Burke, a member of the staff who is current on political affairs.

All around the Embassy a white barrier of barrels and bars has been put up. This was thrown around the building after the explosion last month which tore into the Embassy. A gaping hole is still only partially filled in the street and the business establishment across the street, which was blown up, still remains an empty hull.

An armed military policeman at the entrance to the Embassy told me he thought Vietnamese officials had delayed repairing the business house so that it would remind the Vietnamese people of the cruelty of the Vietcong in bombing a business owned by one of their own people.

Upstairs in the Embassy Burke conducted a political briefing in the waiting room of Ambassador Maxwell Taylor. The room usually reserved for such briefings, he said, is still under repair.

In front of Thu Vien Abraham Lincoln, the USIA library, there is a barrier identical to the one surrounding the Embassy. There has been no bombing there.

Comdr. Joseph N. Williams, Jr., who is a Nashvillian, and who heads the information office here, said a bombing of the library could come—but the Vietcong would damage its own cause with such a blast.

"Our library is an extremely popular place," he explained. If the Vietcong bomb our library they will be very unpopular in the eyes of the people who enjoy the library's facilities."

And still the barricade is there to make it more difficult for anyone who might decide to attack an unprotected symbol of American democracy.

And so while today Saigon seems placid, there are fresh scars of war—and fear for the future.

Col. Frank W. Chesrow: Papal Chamberlain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the May 20, 1965, issue of the Sentinel, the voice of Chicago Jewry for 50 years, about Col. Frank W. Chesrow, a papal chamberlain.

Col. Frank Chesrow has been president of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago since 1958. He served with the American forces in World War II in Naples where he did an outstanding job in the field of sanitation. For 30 years Colonel Chesrow has served the community of Chicago in many worthwhile charities and is one of the outstanding lay Catholic leaders of our country.

I should also like to mention that he is the son of Italian parents who migrated to this country. Five of their sons became professional people, two doctors, one a lawyer, one a dentist, and Colonel Chesrow, who is a graduate pharmacist.

It is my pleasure to insert the article about Colonel Chesrow, which follows:

LEAVES FOR ROME—CHESROW USED INFLUENCE WITH POPES TO AID JEWISH SCHEMA

(By Bob Gale and Max S. Steiner)

The constant insistence of one of the Nation's top Catholic laymen may have been responsible for the church's declaration absolving the Jews of deicide, it was learned by the Sentinel in an exclusive interview this week.

Col. Frank W. Chesrow, a papal chamberlain of the Roman Catholic Church, left the United States Tuesday for Rome, where he will be in conference with Vatican officials. Vatican leaders, under the leadership of Cardinal Augustine Bea, are discussing the declaration "with a view toward retaining the strong statement taking the blame for the death of Jesus Christ from the Jews," Colonel Chesrow said, just before leaving for Italy.

He related his "lifelong dream to achieve the great goal of brotherhood, by convincing the Catholic Church to once and for all remove the basic reason for persecution—the alleged killing of Christ."

The colonel said that, "I could not reconcile in my mind blame for the death of Christ with the very fine character" of many persons of Jewish faith whom he has known over the years in his business, professional, and political career. Head of the Chesrow drug family, Colonel Chesrow had been president of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago since 1958.

"I have often marveled to my friends of the great generous heart of the Jewish people, and how they rallied to causes sponsored by religions and people not of their faith," he said. "These people gave unstintingly to many Catholic organizations, institutions, and charities without taking into account the terrible stigma that has been placed upon them in the last two centuries—a stigma that was largely responsible for the callous murder of 6 million of their coreligionists by Hitler's terrorists.

"In my long service as a member of the Catholic lay hierarchy, and especially as papel chamberlain, I have been able to come in close contact with Pope Pius XII, Pope John XXIII, and now Pope Paul. During my tours of duty in the Vatican, I spent many hours discussing first with Pope Pius and then with Pope John the great need for a Catholic proclamation for once and all absolving the Jews of the sin of the death of our Saviour.

"In the last few months," Col. Chesrow continued, "I have been able to convince Pope Paul to follow in the great tradition of his beloved predecessor, Pope John, regarding the declaration on the Jews.

"During my service in the U.S. Army, I fought side by side with Jews, and have always found them to be brave and willing to serve their country. In my civic and political life, I have always found the Jews to be in the forefront of any move for brotherhood—to protect the unity of all peoples who believe in the ever living Almighty God."

Colonel Chesrow was first appointed a papal chamberlain to the Vatican (one of two in the city of Chicago) by Pope Pius XII and was reappointed by Pope John and then again by Pope Paul. He has also earned many other Catholic honors, and is active not only in the causes and organizations of the Italian people, but has interested himself in many other worthwhile charities and communal endeavors.

He is a director of the Association for the Jewish Blind, is a trustee of Israel bonds, and has contributed generously to many other Jewish charities.

The President's Boyhood Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the President and Mrs. Johnson are most concerned with the preservation of all phases of the growth of our great Nation, that future generations of Americans can understand and take pride in their heritage. They are working diligently to save the landmarks recognized as links with the past—not only here on the Potomac, but in all 50 States.

I would like to point out what their home State Texas is doing to support their nationwide project on a statewide level.

The Texas State Historical Survey Committee, State agency for historical preservation, and the Texas Historical Foundation, privately supported, nonprofit organization to supplement the State program, are carrying out a dynamic, 5-year plan to save and mark Texas unique past.

No part of Texas history is being neglected, for a basic part of this program is the guidance and leadership of more than 3,000 volunteer workers over the State who are charged with the responsibility of preserving and marking local, county, and State history.

Success of this far-reaching program is measured by more than 3,000 official Texas historical markers which dot the State, giving short "history lessons" to anyone who passes by, a doubling of local history museums in the past 3 years, the saving and restoration of historic structures, and the appropriations by counties amounting to more than $104,000 for the saving and marking of local history in 1965.

The President and Mrs. Johnson have personally worked on this preservation program in Texas. They purchased in 1963 the President's boyhood home in Johnson City. Restoration of the structure followed with Mrs. Johnson personally handling many of the details. Furniture gathered from the Johnson family, pictures, mementos—all are placed to depict the home of the President's youth.

This past week, the Texas State Historical Survey Committee awarded its official Texas Historical Medallion for the structure, thereby making it a recorded Texas historical landmark, recognized by the State for its significant contribution to Texas culture, history, and heritage.

Directors of the Texas State Historical Survey Committee and Texas Historical Foundation were in attendance as special guests.

Former presentation of the marker was made by Mrs. Stella Glidden, friend of the President and Mrs. Johnson; the invocation was given by C. Ray Akin, minister of the First Christian Church of Johnson City where the President has membership; and master of ceremonies was Arthur Walz, chairman of the Blan-

co County Historical Survey Committee.

The formal address was made by the Honorable Homer Thornberry, judge, U.S. District Court, Austin, Tex., and former Congressman from the 10th Congressional District of Texas, which I now have the honor to represent.

Mr. Speaker, the program for this historic occasion is herewith submitted as a tribute to the President and Mrs. Johnson and their personal preservation of our Texas and Nation's heritage:

THE PRESIDENT'S BOYHOOD HOME—PRESENTATION OF THE HISTORICAL MEDALLION, MAY 13, 1965

MR. ARTHUR WALZ, CHAIRMAN, BLANCO COUNTY HISTORICAL SURVEY COMMITTEE

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, welcome to this program. My name is Arthur Walz; I live here in Blanco County and I was requested to serve as master of ceremonies.

In asking for our opening prayer, there are many of us who are acquainted with the wise counsel the prayers of Pastor Akin have offered to us on many occasions and under many different circumstances. To those of you not acquainted with Pastor Akin, I am proud to tell you that for more than 30 years he has combined the honored profession of teaching with the high calling of a man of God. At the present time he is an educator in the public schools of Austin and for more than 5 years has been the pastor of the First Christian Church of Johnson City—the church in which the President holds membership. At this time I call upon Pastor C. Ray Akin to give our invocation.

REVEREND AKIN

Eternal God, with full and thankful hearts we are assembled in this place; we are conscious of the benefit received as we draw inspiration from treasured memories and associations, thereby gaining uplift of spirit to live more effectively in the present, and to face the future with hope.

We are thankful for the family whose name this residence bears and for the son of that family whose outstanding leadership in our Nation and world is advancing justice and human rights and causing the light of hope to shine for countless thousands of disadvantaged.

Bless this house, O God; grant that to all who enter these premises may come the thrill of being in touch with the living past—a sense of being close to times and surroundings important to all because of their special meaning—for as they touched his life so our lives are touched.

May this home be regarded by all as a shrine to be preserved and cherished as an object of interest and a source of pride.

In Jesus name we pray. Amen.

MR. WALZ

Thank you Pastor Akin for your inspiring prayer.

Ladies and gentlemen, we sincerely and heartily welcome you and we do appreciate your sacrifice of personal time and private affairs to emphasize, and by your presence, testify to the historical significance of this occasion. Many people of local, State and National prominence are here. And, I would like very much to pay personal tribute and recognition to all such distinguished guests and visitors. But, if I used our program time to do this I am sure that I would wind up like Christopher Columbus—sailing on and on and on—and our program would never get started. However, on behalf of the people of Blanco County, I do want to thank publicly: the Governor of our State, the members of the State legislature, the president, directors, committee, and staff members of the Texas Historical Foundation and the Texas State Historical Survey Committee, the executive committee of the Blanco County Historical Survey Committee and the directors of the Blanco County Historical Association. I wish to thank all of these fine people for their great interest, their hard work and their special devotion in recognizing and in preserving the rich historical heritage of our beloved State. I believe it would be fitting and proper, at this time, to give these fine people a round of applause.

For a long time, ladies and gentlemen, it has been the earnest desire and fond hope of the people of Blanco County to see this boyhood home as it is now; to realize and to know that it will be used to serve our community needs in a great many different ways; and, through the graciousness of its owners, visitation by the public will enshrine its beauty, its charm and its memories in the hearts of all Americans today and forever more. And now the time has come to memorialize this Texas historic landmark and to dedicate the boyhood home of the President. What we say and do here bequeaths to the heirs of eternity a remembrance on the pages of our history in honor of the vibrant personalities identified with this boyhood home.

Ladies and gentlemen, for the award of the certificate of merit and the presentation of the Official Historical Medallion, there has been chosen a gracious lady of Blanco County whose abiding faith in her community and its people has long been recognized by her many friends and neighbors. Though mature in years, this lively lady is very young in heart. She is the editor and publisher of the Johnson City Record Courier newspaper; she is the Postmaster of Johnson City; she is an active member of many civic organizations and the hardest working member of the Blanco County Historical Survey Committee; and, she is a loving and devoted mother and she is a life-long friend of the President and his family. It is, indeed, a singular pleasure for me to present to you the embodiment of the staunch spirit of our early Blanco County pioneer settlers—Mrs. Stella Gliddon.

MRS. STELLA GLIDDON

Mrs. Walz, ladies and gentlemen. I am very pleased at this time to award to the owners of the boyhood home of the President through the official sponsor, the Blanco County Historical Association, a certificate of merit that formally and officially designates this structure a recorded Texas historic landmark. This certificate reads as follows: "The State of Texas, know all men by these presents—that the Lyndon B. Johnson Boyhood Home of Blanco County has been recognized by the State for its significant contribution to Texas culture, history and heritage. This structure has been entered in the State Archives in 1965 as a recorded Texas historic landmark." This certificate is personally signed by John Connally, Governor; John Ben Shepperd, Historical Survey Committee; Arthur Walz, county chairman.

I ask that Mr. John S. Moursund, president of the Blanco County Historical Association, step forward to receive this certificate of merit on behalf of the owners.

MR. JOHN S. MOURSUND

On behalf of the Blanco County Historical Association it is a pleasure to accept this award. Speaking for the association, we wish to thank you, Mrs. Gliddon. This is indeed a historic occasion to participate in the dedication of President Johnson's boyhood home. I predict that this home will be visited by millions of Americans. As a former neighbor, I can truly say that the President spent his formative years in this home, and, undoubtedly, his happiest years.

MRS. GLIDDON

Ladies and gentlemen, this modest frame home achieved its immortality because it has given to and for the service of mankind a great and forceful Texas legislator—Sam Ealy Johnson, Jr.; a loving and devoted wife and mother whose abiding faith and lofty idealism coronated the highest expression of family love, affection, and guidance—Rebekah Baines Johnson; and an inquiring youth who grew into the inspiring manhood of a free American because he was and still is ready and willing to work and to serve as an American so that freedom may not perish from this earth—our 36th U.S. President, Lyndon Baines Johnson. It is, therefore, with much personal pride on behalf of all of the people of Texas that I unveil and present this official historical medallion as an enduring testimonial to the precious memory of the boyhood home of the 36th U.S. President, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

MR. WALZ

Thank you Mrs. Gliddon for such a nice and gracious award and presentation.

Ladies and gentlemen, for the dedication of the boyhood home of the President, our distinguished guest and speaker is a man well known to most of us. If he was some one strange to us, I would be tempted to indulge in a long and flowery introduction. But, during his many years as a public official, as legislator and as the man who succeeded the President in the Congress from the 10th Congressional District, he has eagerly listened to our problems, recognized our needs, acted in our behalf and he has served his people and the Nation with great honor and distinction. It is, ladies and gentlemen, my personal privilege and high honor to present to you for the dedicatory address a personal friend of the President and his family, the judge of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas—the Honorable Homer Thornberry.

JUDGE HOMER THORNBERRY

Mr. Walz, ladies and gentlemen, this is a unique occasion, not only in the history of this Nation but in that of this particular community.

We meet here to witness the marking of this home as a Texas historical site. As the home where the President of the United States, his father and mother, brother and sisters lived among their friends and neighbors in this community, it receives the Texas Historical Medallion.

The President feels that you, the people of this land, have invested over 50 years of interest and love in him. Another humanitarian President, Abraham Lincoln, said over 100 years ago, when he left his neighbors and friends of Springfield for Washington: "To this place and the kindness of these people I owe everything." The sentiment seems appropriate today.

The President and Mrs. Johnson are anxious for you to feel that this house is your house—all of you who live in Blanco County. They desire that it be used for civic functions and meetings of historical societies, as well as for agricultural and youth groups.

It has become increasingly apparent, since he became President, that the whole Nation is interested in the home where our President spent his boyhood. For this reason, the house will be opened to the public. The ladies of Blanco County have volunteered to serve as hostesses. In fact, it is a heartwarming to President and Mrs. Johnson to know that so many friends have expressed an interest in helping with this project.

In the restoration of this home which has meant much to all the members of this family, the President's sister, Mrs. Birge Alexander, has spent much time and effort in seeing to it that the home represents as nearly as possible, the home she remembers as a young girl. Therefore, it is the wish of the President and Mrs. Johnson, as well as Mrs. Alexander, that the home be dedi-

cated as a memorial to their father and mother, Sam Ealy and Rebekah Johnson.

We recognized that events took place here which contributed to the life, the spirit, and the mind of the man who is called upon to perform the awesome responsibilities of the Presidency. On this day 28 years ago, on May 13, 1937, Lyndon Baines Johnson of Johnson City, Tex., took his oath as U.S. Representative from the 10th Congressional District of Texas, to begin a career of public service unparalleled in the history of this Nation. The proudest people of the United States must be you, his neighbors and friends in this area. From your magnificent, rugged hill country, a native son emerged to occupy the highest office of our land and the most influential office of the free world.

But think—had it not been for his stalwart parents, he probably would not be there. For he is the product, the fruition, of all the years of their struggle through hardship, their loving care, and their skillful guidance.

The President's understanding, brilliant mother awakened in him a quest for knowledge. With her hand and her heart she led him to the threshold of enlightenment. With patience and wisdom, she summoned the teenage youth to high purpose and illustrious life.

His father loved his fellow human beings and believed that the other man had a right to his view, that he had a place in this society. He understood the dreams and ambitions of the next man for himself and his family. He believed that citizenship started at home. He understood the art of politics, which is the art of achieving the possible, and he believed there was more good than bad in every person.

Mr. and Mrs. Sam Ealy Johnson lived in this house during the happiest and busiest days of their lives, making it a good home for their sons and daughters—Lyndon Baines, Sam Houston, Rebekah, Josefa, and Lucia. The Johnsons were active citizens and good neighbors and generous in their devotion to Johnson City. Together, they bequeathed their highest qualities to this family, this community, this State, and—in vision—to this Nation.

The child is father of the man. As Wordsworth said,

"Though nothing can bring back the boyhood hour of splendor in the grass, of glory in the flower, he will grieve not, rather he will find strength in what remains behind."

Here Lyndon Baines Johnson developed the strength of character, the courage, the vision, the sense of realism, the compassion which enable him to perform with effectiveness the tasks of his office.

He moves directly to the solution of age-old problems which have assailed mankind in our beloved country:

He seeks the removal of barriers and limitations which have humiliated fellow Americans.

He seeks the elimination of poverty and ignorance from sections of our Nation.

He seeks the building of a Great Society for all America.

He seeks to accomplish, through every possible avenue, peace on earth.

He delivers the bold and swift challenge to aggressors who would enslave people.

Compassionate beyond belief, he would be a friend to every man—in every city, in every village, in every mansion, in every hovel—encompassing the globe.

He is the living embodiment of our Lord's commandment: Lyndon Baines Johnson is his brother's keeper.

Today, we gather at the very steps the President ran up and down as a boy. I feel privileged and highly honored to be the person who expresses the dedication which the President and members of his family desire:

To the memory of his parents, Sam Ealy, and Rebekah Johnson, and to the people of this community, past, present, and future.

It is now yours. May it be a source of pleasure and inspiration to you, as it has been to the man who is the leader of our Nation.

MR. WALZ

Thank you Judge Thornberry for a memorable address.

Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes our program. Please visit and enjoy this boyhood home.

National Maritime Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a speech made by the Honorable James V. Day, vice chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission on the occasion of the observance of National Maritime Day.

Commissioner Day is a native of the State of Maine and has done a most commendable job as a member of the Federal Maritime Commission.

His remarks as reported in the New York Journal of Commerce, Friday, May 21, 1965, take on added significance in view of the U.S. balance-of-payments problem.

The text as reported follows:

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY SPEECH BY JAMES V. DAY, VICE CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

The foreign trade and commerce of the United States has undergone many changes since SS *Savannah* set sail in 1819 and since 1933 when President Roosevelt first proclaimed May 22 as National Maritime Day.

President Johnson in his Maritime Day proclamation this year stated: "The sea and ships are an integral part of this country's past, present, and future."

Every one of us is familiar with the role of the American merchant marine in the past. So I would like to discuss the future of the American merchant marine and its relationship with the Federal Maritime Commission.

The Federal Maritime Commission is, as you know, an agency of our Government responsible for the performance of regulatory functions.

The Commission has the responsibility to see that the American merchant marine is not discriminated against—to see that American shippers and ship operators receive the same equitable treatment that is accorded the other nations of the free world.

President Johnson has stated: "It is essential that we continue to expand our export trade, so that we may further improve our international balance of payments, accelerate the program of our advancing American industry, and increase the employment of American workers."

One way to increase our export trade is to enlarge the opportunities for global marketing of American products.

However, in enlarging our export markets we must eliminate artificial barriers to our exports.

The Federal Maritime Commission bears responsibility in the field of foreign trade and commerce. The agency was established for the express purpose of administering the regulatory aspects of our shipping laws in a fair and impartial manner. The Commission is concerned about the welfare of world trade and about the welfare of the American merchant marine. It has been demonstrated, over and over again, that there is a strong relationship between U.S. foreign trade and the American merchant marine.

It is the hope and desire of the Federal Maritime Commission that its policies and practices will result in better regulations, better protection of the public, consumers, exporters, importers, as well as ship operators.

The program of the Commission is, of course, of interest to and receives the attention of various committees and Members of the Congress and of the administration.

The interest and vigilance of shippers and ship operators is likewise a vital aid to the Commission where freight rates or other factors may be inhibiting to U.S. trade and commerce.

We are confident that the shipping public is aware of the role of the Commission in the regulation of rates, practices, and agreements of the lines engaged in our commerce. We have had a healthy flow of comments from shippers and receivers of freight, from carriers and conferences, and from other sources relative to operations in our maritime trade.

The Commission is always ready to provide its good offices and its assistance to the industry and all other segments of the public to solve business problems through cooperative and voluntary efforts.

We should explore ways of assuring fair and worthwhile competition and constantly seek new areas of cooperation.

In our relations with foreign countries we are, indeed, striving to explain that the fair, equitable, and reasonable administration of our laws serves the common good, that we do not seek special favoritism and that fairness to all must in the long run increase world trade to the advantage of all immediately concerned.

In the effective administration of our regulatory responsibilities the Commission is likewise concerned with the U.S. offshore trades with particular emphasis on the shipping service requirements and transportation problems of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. We are giving constant attention thereto.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, my second rollcall report of the 89th Congress includes a discussion of these issues which have come before us: congressional redistricting, Supreme Court salaries, District of Columbia crime bill, aid to elementary and secondary education, offensive mail, medical care for the aged and social security amendments, appropriations for an investigation of the Ku Klux Klan, and appropriations for the defense of South Vietnam.

ROLLCALL NO. 35 CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Mr. Speaker, since the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision there has been growing confusion in the States as

court after court has attempted to rule on the validity of various redistricting plans. It was the Court's reapportionment decision that provided the impetus for House passage of H.R. 5505.

There is no question that there are gross population disparities among some of the Nation's 435 congressional districts, with the largest containing 951,000 persons and the smallest only 177,000. In many instances these disparities are a result of gerrymandering, carving up a State so that the political makeup of its congressional delegation is not an accurate reflection of overall voter registration.

Under H.R. 5505 not only will a more equitable population balance be achieved, but gerrymandering will become virtually impossible. The bill provides that no congressional district in a State may vary more than plus or minus 15 percent in population from the size of the average district. It also provides that districts must be contiguous and as compact in shape as practicable. States with congressional districts not meeting this criteria must redraw district boundaries by the time of next year's general elections. Although California falls into this group since 9 of its 38 districts fail to meet the population requirements, I am happy to note that the 3-to-2 ratio of Democrats to Republicans in the congressional delegation already mirrors my State's total voter registration.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the bill passed the House on an unrecorded voice vote, the only actual rollcall being on a proposed amendment which would have allowed at-large elections of all Congressmen in States failing to meet the bill's criteria by 1966. I voted against the proposed amendment because in my judgment an at-large election in a State the size of California would be chaotic. No voter could possibly be familiar with more than a few candidates on such a huge ballot. I think we would find straight party-line voting and almost total victory for one party. Certainly this is not representative government. It would upset the existing situation in California where, as I observed a moment ago, the current congressional delegation properly reflects the registration ratio between the two parties on a statewide basis.

I did not want California to go through the same experience which befell Illinois in November. At-large elections for members of the State assembly required a "bed sheet" ballot, a ballot as large as a table. The election results took weeks to tabulate and created a chaotic condition. The proposed amendment to H.R. 5505 was therefore properly rejected.

Now that the House has taken firm action to regain the status of a representative body, I hope the Senate will act on the bill promptly and favorably.

ROLLCALL NO. 39: SUPREME COURT SALARIES

Mr. Speaker, no matter how one attempts to rationalize House action on H.R. 5374 it can only be interpreted as an act of vengeance on the Supreme Court because some among us do not agree with every decision that it hands down.

Intended to correct an injustice dealt the Court last year by the Senate when it failed to give Justices a salary increase similar to that which it gave itself, the bill endeavored to reaffirm House action which declared that Supreme Court Justices are entitled to the same pay raise as Congressmen.

I voted for the bill not because of the salary increase in terms of dollars, but because the integrity and independence of the Supreme Court was at stake. Justices will not suffer greatly because Congress refused to give them a raise equal to that of other high-ranking Government officials. But the very fact that the salary of the Justices should be dependent upon congressional approval of their decisions is a direct and dangerous blow at the concept of the separation of powers among the three branches of Government.

When there is honest disagreement with Court decisions there are legitimate ways to correct the situation—either by statute or by constitutional amendment. But I submit that it is not legitimate to show displeasure with Justices by trying to hurt them financially.

Carried to other extremes this policy could result in a majority of the Members of Congress cutting the salary of the minority when it failed to support a particular program or measure. Or Congress could even decide to dock the President's salary when he refused to bow to its wishes. Surely such a "salary war" would destroy the separation of powers, one of the chief cornerstones of our form of government since its inception.

One wonders, Mr. Speaker, whether those among us who would insult the Court with a financial slap will be satisfied with this assault on the separation of powers. Will they next try to enact legislation requiring the Court to consult with Congress before handing down decisions?

Defeat of H.R. 5374, however, was not the only danger signal which we should recognize. Not content with striking at the Court as an institution and as an independent arm of government, some Members during debate fell to attacking the Justices personally on the basis of their private lives. We witnessed an ugly spectacle of vituperation rarely seen on the floor of the House.

The Congress, in my opinion, should repair this ill-advised damage as soon as possible. We should restore the Court to its respected and proper position as an independent branch of government. We must not continue to subject it to the momentary whims and tantrums of those who disagree with its decisions.

ROLLCALL NOS. 42 AND 43: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME BILL

Mr. Speaker, as a preface to my remarks on H.R. 5688 I would like to include a portion of an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post following House passage of the bill. The statement accurately reflects my views on the matter:

> The passage of the District crime bill in the House can only be understood if it is regarded as a vote of confidence in the Senate. One cannot believe that the House Members would have passed such a monstrosity if they had not been certain that the other Chamber would rescue them from the consequences of their folly.
>
> While this explains this particular lapse, it hardly commends it. This is a dangerous piece of business and one day the Senate might nod and let some such measure get into law. In this case, the Senate seems fully alerted and has planned hearings that the House did not hold in which the multiple weaknesses of the omnibus crime bill surely will be made apparent. Failure of the House to even hear the administration witnesses who are supporting very different proposals is an act of discourtesy to the President that one might think Democratic Members would have wished to avoid.

The bill is similar to a poor proposal which the House approved in the last Congress. At that time I rejected it and was pleased that the Senate allowed it to die. This year I again rejected it and I will again be pleased if the Senate allows it to die.

In my last rollcall report, Mr. Speaker, I stressed my belief that public hearings on controversial matters are vital to our form of government. Thus, I was extremely concerned that no such hearings were held on the crime bill. My concern was compounded by the knowledge that the bill is opposed by the Attorney General, who was not heard; by the District Commissioners, who were not heard; and by the U.S. attorney for the District, who was not heard.

Their united opposition stems in large measure from their belief that the proposal is dangerous and despotic and, in many regards, unconstitutional. Even the Washington Star, which supported the bill, commented editorially through its television outlet that the omnibus crime bill "Does not necessarily deprive anyone of his constitutional rights." I find it incredible that this major consideration was dismissed in such cavalier fashion.

There are many objectionable features in the bill which would overturn constitutionally based rules in criminal procedure, rules designed to protect the rights of each citizen. The bill would allow police to violate a Supreme Court ruling which requires them to bring an arrested person for arraignment "without unnecessary delay." It would also abolish the court ruling that an accused person is not criminally responsible if his unlawful act was the product of mental disease or defect. It would allow a police officer to detain for up to 6 hours—although a loophole in the bill would permit this period to be expanded almost without limit—for questioning a person

whom he thought was committing, had committed, or was about to commit a crime. Any witnesses to an alleged crime could also be held for a similar period.

The bill completely ignores the President's recent message to Congress wherein he requested a "fair and effective system" of law enforcement, and proposed formation of a District Crime Commission.

By no stretch of the imagination can H.R. 5688 be considered fair or effective, and I doubt that any Member would want his constituents subjected to its tyrannical provisions. Unfortunately, the citizens of the District have no representatives in Congress and cannot register their displeasure at the polls. Perhaps this explains why Congress so frequently treats the District with contempt and abuse.

Roll-call No.	Date	Bill No.	Ronald Brooks Cameron	Vote		Not voting	Brief description
				Yea	Nay		
34	Mar. 16		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Bow, Republican, of Ohio (35 Members absent).
*35	do	H.R. 5505	Nay	147	255	31	To amend congressional apportionment bill to require that candidates run at large if States fail to redraw boundaries before 1966 elections.
36	Mar. 17		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio (35 Members absent).
37	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (36 Members absent).
38	do	H. Res. 276	Yea	202	183	48	To provide for consideration of H.R. 5374.
*39	do	H.R. 5374	Yea	177	203	53	On passage of bill increasing salaries of Supreme Court Justices.
40	Mar. 18		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri (57 Members absent).
41	Mar. 22		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Sisk, Democrat, of California (69 Members absent).
*42	do	H.R. 5688	Paired—Yea	166	216	51	Motion to recommit District of Columbia omnibus crime bill for public hearings (Ronald Brooks Cameron at television interview).
*43	do	H.R. 5688	Nay	131	250	52	On passage of District of Columbia omnibus crime bill.
44	Mar. 23		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (50 Members absent).
45	do	H.R. 5721	Nay	206	170	57	On passage of bill providing acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco.
46	Mar. 24		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, of Illinois (28 Members absent).
47	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (29 Members absent).
48	Mar. 25		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Springer, Republican, of Illinois (18 Members absent).
49	Mar. 26		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Goodell, Republican, of New York (18 Members absent).
50	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Andrews, Republican, of Alabama (35 Members absent).
51	do		Yea	274	119	40	To consider motion that the Journal be approved without further reading.
*52	do	H.R. 2362	Nay	149	267	17	Motion to recommit elementary and secondary education bill to change formula for fund allocation.
*53	do	H.R. 2362	Nay	263	153	17	On passage of bill aiding elementary and secondary education.
54	Mar. 29		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (100 Members absent).
55	Mar. 30		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, of Washington (54 Members absent).
56	Mar. 31		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (43 Members absent).
57	do	H.R. 3708	Yea	391	1	41	On passage of Older Americans Act.
58	do	H.R. 1111	Yea	383	0	53	On passage of Water Resources Planning Act.
59	Apr. 1		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (40 Members absent).
60	do	H.R. 4257	Yea	392	0	41	On passage of Manpower Act of 1965.
61	Apr. 5		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican, of Ohio (62 Members absent).
*62	do	H.R. 980	Nay	360	21	52	On passage of bill providing for return of offensive mail.
63	do	H.R. 7064	Yea	378	0	55	Authorization to build new chancery building for U.S. Embassy staff in Saigon.
64	do	H.R. 7060	Yea	344	7	82	On passage of Post Office and Treasury Department appropriation bill.
65	Apr. 6		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican of Iowa (34 Members absent).
66	do	H.R. 7091	Yea	248	62	22	On passage of supplemental appropriations bill.
67	Apr. 7		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican of Missouri (30 Members absent).
68	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican of Illinois (24 Members absent).
69	Apr. 8		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Anderson, Republican of Illinois (18 Members absent).
*70	do	H.R. 6675	Nay	191	236	5	Motion to recommit Social Security Amendments of 1965.
*71	do	H.R. 6675	Yea	313	115	5	On passage of Social Security Amendments of 1965.
72	Apr. 13	H.R. 2998	Yea	315	65	53	Acceptance of conference report on arms control bill.
73	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Lennon, Democrat of North Carolina (39 Members absent).
74	do	H.J. Res. 1	Yea	368	29	36	On passage of proposed constitutional amendment relating to Presidential succession and disability.
75	Apr. 14		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (86 Members absent).
*76	do	H. Res. 310	Nay	312	43	88	Appropriating $50,000 for investigation of the Ku Klux Klan by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.
77	Apr. 27		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (60 Members absent).
78	do	H.R. 6497	Nay	113	275	45	To recommit authorization for increased U.S. participation in International Monetary Fund.
79	do	H.R. 6497	Yea	301	88	44	Authorizing increased U.S. participation in International Monetary Fund.
80	Apr. 28		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Conte, Republican, of Massachusetts (52 Members absent).
81	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hays, Democrat, of Ohio (71 Members absent).
82	do	S. 4	Yea	396	0	37	Amending the Water Pollution Control Act.
83	Apr. 29		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Springer, Republican of Illinios, (53 Members absent).
84	do	H.R. 7091	Yea	316	55	62	Acceptance of conference report on supplemental appropriations.
85	do	H.R. 7091	Yea	144	228	61	To accept Senate amendment appropriating funds for helicopter service in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York.
86	do	H.R. 4714	Yea	239	115	79	Amending National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 to correct legislative oversight.
87	May 3	H.R. 2986	Not voting	347	0	86	Extending certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act (Ronald Brooks Cameron meeting with members of Los Angeles County Building Trades Council).
88	May 4		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Cederberg, Republican, of Michigan (39 Members absent).
89	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (50 Members absent).
90	do	H.R. 2985	Yea	389	0	44	Amendments to Community Mental Health Centers Act.
91	May 5		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Bow, Republican, of Ohio (26 Members absent).
*92	do	H.J. Res. 447	Yea	408	7	18	Supplemental appropriation for defense of South Vietnam.
93	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Bray, Republican, of Indiana (31 Members absent).
94	do	H.R. 7657	Yea	395	0	38	Authorization for 1966 military appropriations.
95	May 6		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Monagan, Democrat, of Connecticut (43 Members absent).
96	do	H. Res. 366	Yea	389	0	44	To permit consideration of H.R. 7717, authorizing appropriations for NASA.
97	do	H.R. 7717	Yea	389	11	43	Authorizing appropriations for NASA.
98	May 10		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (95 Members absent).
99	do	H.R. 2984	Yea	333	4	96	To provide for construction of health research facilities.
100	May 12		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois (47 Members absent).
101	do	S. 701	Yea	300	97	36	To carry out U.S. obligations under the International Coffee Agreement.
102	May 18		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (54 Members absent).
103	May 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (66 Members absent).
104	do	H.R. 8122	Nay	43	313	77	Motion to recommit authorization of appropriations for Atomic Energy Commission.
105	do	H.R. 8122	Yea	350	1	82	Authorizing appropriations for Atomic Energy Commission.

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance, and a brief explanation is included herein.

California's Cold War GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to provide educational and other benefits for cold war veterans similar to those enjoyed by veterans of World War II and the Korean crisis.

I am proud to note that the State of California has been one of the first in the Nation to write legislation into the books extending veterans benefits to men who are, today, serving their Nation with as much patriotism, surrounded by as much danger, and experiencing as much personal discomfort and disruption of their civilian life and education as was true in previous years.

I insert at this point a news release from the office of California's Gov. Edmund G. Brown, describing the legislation extending farm and home loan benefits to veterans from our State who have served in areas such as Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, Berlin, the Congo, and other danger spots:

CALIFORNIA'S COLD WAR GI BILL

Gov. Edmund G. Brown today signed legislation extending benefits, including those in the Cal-Vet farm and home loan program, to California veterans of Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, and other cold war military operations.

His signature put California among the first of the 50 States in the Nation to formally recognize the service rendered by members of the Armed Forces in hostile cold war engagements.

With the Governor at bill-signing ceremonies were Senator "Jr." Eugene McAtee, Democrat, of San Francisco, author of the legislation (S.B. 511); Joseph M. Farber, State director of veterans affairs; and representing the new veterans groups included in the bill, Army 1st Lt. George Hills, of Piedmont, a Vietnam veteran now stationed at the Sacramento Army Depot.

The Governor said:

"It is fitting and just that we extend State veterans benefits to the Vietnam veteran and others who qualify. As Senator McAteer said when he introduced his bill, the bullets and the death these servicemen face are just as real as those faced by the veterans of the two World Wars or Korea."

The Governor said he had been informed by Farber that at the present rate of return of Vietnam veterans, their benefits can be financed with veterans bonds already voted by the people but as yet unsold.

An estimated 25,000 additional veterans would qualify for benefits under the McAteer legislation.

The department of veterans affairs previously had estimated that the $250 million in veterans bonds already voted should maintain the Cal-Vet program until at least 1970 based on present military commitments.

The Cal-Vet program has extended more than 220,000 loans to California veterans at low interest and at no expense to the taxpayer.

The new legislation extends benefits to veterans of military operations for which the Federal Government has authorized the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal. In addition to Vietnam and the Domician Republic they include service during specified periods in Lebanon, Quemoy, and Matsu Islands, Taiwan Straits, the Congo, Laos, Berlin, and Cuba.

Secretary Connor Comments on Outlook for Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Secretary of Commerce, Hon. John T. Connor, was interviewed in depth on May 24, last, by reporter for the U.S. News & World Report, on the state of our economy and the outlook for business.

Secretary Connor reflects an acute understanding of contemporary economics and the nature of our current prosperity in this interview. He also addresses himself to the broadening area of responsibility in America in which businessmen are assuming greater and greater roles in all dimensions of service.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

OUTLOOK NOW FOR BUSINESS—INTERVIEW WITH COMMERCE SECRETARY JOHN T. CONNOR

Question. Mr. Secretary, business is humming now, but what about next year?

Answer. On the basis of the evidence we have now, it appears that we will continue to achieve economic gains into next year.

Question. Into next year—but can you look through the entire year?

Answer. No. I think it's too early. We still haven't seen the end of the steel-union negotiations, and the questions there overhang the business outlook. Steel production is high compared with user needs.

Question. Do you mean that, once the strike threat is removed, steel operations will decline?

Answer. Inventories of steel will have to be worked off at some point. It's not only the strike threat that causes the current high demand on the part of steel users. There is, also the general high level of business activity in steel-using industries. When there is a lessened demand for steel because of seasonal factors in the automobile industry and other industries, then the production rate will decrease.

Question. But until the strike threat is settled——

Answer. Until then, the consuming industries of steel will continue to maintain high inventories.

The information we have is that many of the users by now have reached the inventories they think they need to see them through a strike of moderate duration. Therefore, they will not build any further, but will hold at about present levels. Then, when the steel situation is definitely settled for a longer period of time, they will eat out of their inventories.

Question. Does your prediction of business growth into next year imply a slowdown then?

Answer. No, not at all. There simply are too many imponderables at the moment to be able to see beyond that.

Question. Some businessmen still seem to feel that there is a possibility of a leveling off in business toward the end of this year. To keep business moving at a brisk pace, do you see the need of Government action—such as a further tax cut, beyond the excise cuts now proposed?

Answer. My opinion is that business prospects through the end of this year and into next year are still sufficiently promising so that no unusual measures are needed—such as a huge public-works program, or substantial excise tax cuts beyond the level recommended by the President.

Question. Do you believe the $1.75 billion of excise cuts recommended by the President are needed?

Answer. Yes, I do. I think these reductions are warranted at this time, and will be helpful to continuation of our high level of prosperity.

Question. Do you see any threat to the economy in the fact that there will be a tremendous stimulus this year in the form of excise cuts and increased social security benefits, followed by a drag on the economy through an increased payroll tax at the start of next year?

Answer. Well, readjustments will certainly be in order, because, as you have indicated, there will be one force flowing one way and a counterforce the other way.

Just what the effect will be would be difficult to forecast. But I don't think that changes of this magnitude month by month will produce immediate reactions in the economy. I think that they can be overbalanced by other factors, such as increased capital investments, increased consumer spending, and so forth. But I think we have to expect some moderating effect on the economy as a result of the balancing of these factors.

Question. Outside of steel, which you have mentioned, are there any particular problems you see in the business outlook that worry you at this time?

Answer. There are some small clouds in the sky here and there, but at the moment things are quite favorable. I'm not being Pollyannaish in saying this. It's a very bright picture as we see it at the moment.

Question. Does your Department accept the idea that recessions are a thing of the past?

Answer. No, we haven't seen any law to repeal the business cycle. But we do think that by looking ahead and getting an understanding of the various factors, and by trying to recommend or suggest adjustments before the full impact hits, the hills and valleys can be leveled out somewhat. Thus we can avoid wild swings such as we have had in the past. We think this process is working now.

Question. Do you think that deep depressions are a thing of the past?

Answer. I think that enough adjustments have been made, and we have enough flexibility in our entire economic picture, so that we can avoid deep depressions, yes.

Question. You talked about the outlook for months ahead in steel. What about another key industry—autos?

Answer. The automobile situation has certainly continued strong for a longer period than even the industry had forecast. This has helped the whole economy.

Question. Do you think the auto boom could go into a fifth year at a rising rate?

Answer. Not necessarily at a rising rate, but certainly at a continued high rate. Remember this: Before long, the replacement market for automobiles bought new at the outset of this recent succession of high-level years will be showning up. This will have an appreciable effect.

There is another important point to note in assessing the outlook for the economy——

Question. What's that?

Answer. The most important development of all, I think, has been the much higher

rate of capital investment than was thought possible as the year started. And this investment that is on such an increasing scale seems to be concentrating on additional capacity in industry rather than on labor-saving devices or on new equipment. This can have far-reaching effects in the economy.

Question. What does this trend of investment mean?

Answer. It means that industry is seeing bigger markets ahead.

Question. And is getting ready for those larger markets?

Answer. Right. The boards of directors of these companies voting the increased capital expenditures, having looked at their business prospects, have concluded that they need larger capacities.

Now, a key factor that hasn't been given enough attention, in my opinion, is the effect of the long-range planning programs that are now prevalent in most important companies. I've seen it happen in quite a few companies where the existence of a long-range plan has led the top executives and the board to be more willing to commit themselves to capital investments that result in facilities to be needed over a period of time, rather than just next year or the year thereafter. I think this is an important factor in smoothing out this whole trend of industrial growth.

Quesiton. Does this mean we won't get a sudden spurt of investment and then a sharp decline?

Answer. Exactly, I think this is happening as a result of greater emphasis on long-range planning in most of the big companies.

Question. They are betting that the economy over the years will grow pretty rapidly——

Answer. That's right.

Question. But, looking at the prospects for business in the period immediately ahead, do you think there will be a wage settlement in steel without a strike?

Answer. Yes, I think it is highly probable that this will emerge, once the steel union's election question is settled. And, even though it may be contested, the decision on the union presidency probably will be accepted by the rank-and-file membership. Then it becomes much easier for the negotiations to proceed.

One of the problems is that, up to the present time in the negotiations, they just haven't been able to get down to brass tacks on some of the most difficult issues—particularly those at the local level. And, of course, in the steel union now, the local-district leaders are playing a much more important role.

So it could be as complicated as it was in the automobile situation to bring about a final settlement, because just settling the national issues is only part of the problem.

Question. Might there be local strikes in steel?

Answer. There could very well be, if these local issues are serious enough and are not resolved by timely attention.

Question. What types of issues?

Answer. Well, it becomes a question of job security as much as anything else. Most of the steelworkers share the apprehension in many other industries that their job prospects are jeopardized by increased automation. And this gets to a very basic problem that is emerging in this country as growing emphasis is placed on the need for productivity increases to keep pace with higher and higher wages. And this can be achieved by greater mechanization, greater automation.

When this happens, you can usually soften the impact on the workers employed at the time by phasing out the improvements that are needed and by having the separations take place over a period of time. Normal attrition thus can be an important factor in easing the human impact.

But the result is that, in the company or industry involved, there are fewer job opportunities for the sons and the grandsons of people then in the labor force, particularly those who are unskilled or semiskilled. This is happening at a time when the supply of unskilled people is growing by leaps and bounds. As a result of school dropouts, and also the baby boom after the war, we are getting a very high increase in the number of youngsters joining the labor force, and many of these are relatively untrained and unskilled.

Question. But they can be trained——

Answer. They can be, and this is something that is a serious national problem. We can't really pin the responsibility on one employer or even one industry to train the next generation, although they certainly should feel a moral concern to help all they can.

This is a situation where industry as a whole and the labor movement as a whole—with the Government acting perhaps as a catalytic agent, or perhaps in a more responsible capacity—must look at the problem on a broad basis.

Question. Mr. Secretary, speaking of unemployment: Despite what the bare figures show on the number of people out of work, do you find that there is a labor shortage developing in this country?

Answer. There's a labor shortage among certain of the skilled occupations. Actually, for the labor group as a whole, you have to look at the segments in order to get a real picture of what's happening.

Among adult men and women, the unemployment rate is, as I remember it, slightly below 3 percent, which is a pretty reasonable figure. But the unemployment rate among teenagers is very high—and it's particularly high among nonwhite teenagers, boys and girls. This should be the focal point of our attention, because this is where the need is greatest.

Question. Is that because a lot of them don't want to work on the kinds of jobs that are available?

Answer. No, I think it's due to the fact that many of them dropped out of school or had poor educational advantages or poor home environments or poor job opportunities in the large cities where they are concentrated—factors such as these.

Question. But don't most of them want jobs that pay a certain amount or meet certain other conditions before they will accept them?

Answer. No, most of them will take whatever job is available if it gives them a living wage.

Question. In view of what we now see going in the country, does full employment look like a reasonable goal?

Answer. Of course, full employment has never been defined to mean zero unemployment. And it becomes a question of just what is meant by "full employment."

The people who have the immediate responsibility in this area and are closer to it seem to think that a level of unemployment somewhere in the range of 3 to 4 percent of the labor force would mean employment opportunities for those who really want work. There will continue to be some unemployment, considering the fact that often it takes a little time between jobs to locate the next one that's desirable.

Question. Does full employment actually mean inflation?

Answer. Not necessarily, although it does add to the pressures.

Question. Where has full employment ever been achieved without inflation?

Answer. Well, they are having it in Australia now, and they don't have an inflationary trend to any great extent. Their price index is relatively stable.

Question. But in Europe they certainly have inflation——

Answer. In Europe they've had inflationary situations. Of course, there they've had overemployment, really. Unemployment hasn't been even 1 percent.

Question. Would you say that the labor unions are showing any signs of increased awareness of the problems of productivity and profit margins in the industries with which they negotiate?

Answer. Oh, yes, you see it reflected in the negotiations that are being conducted in industry after industry.

Certainly the atmosphere with respect to the steel negotiations is radically different from the atmosphere that prevailed at the time of the automobile negotiations and in the service-type activities, such as were involved in the longshoremen's dispute, which did result in a prolonged strike.

STEEL INDUSTRY: TROUBLED

Question. What is different about the steel negotiations?

Answer. The profit margins in the steel industry are below the average for U.S. industry as a whole.

The rising volume of imports of steel products has, within a period of about 5 years, reversed what had been a favorable balance of trade in steel to an unfavorable balance. It's becoming increasingly difficult for U.S.-made steel products to be sold in the world market because of price differentials. So this has become a limiting factor in the growth of that industry in the United States.

The steel industry has benefited from the changed depreciation regulations and from the reduced corporate taxes which have given them the opportunity of calling more earnings back into the capital expenditures that are needed for modernization of their facilities.

But the future prospects of the steel industry in this country are much more limited, because of these basic economic conditions, than are the future prospects of the automobile industry. And I think this fact is now recognized in the steel negotiations.

Question. By the union?

Answer. Yes, by the union.

Question. Is productivity increasing in steel as fast as in some other industries?

Answer. No. Productivity in steel is increasing at a slower rate, and this is another factor.

In many industries—particularly the young industries with great growth potential—you can get very rapid productivity increases.

In the chemical industry—at least many parts of it—because of process improvements and other changes that result from capital investments, you can get rapid productivity increases.

It's much more difficult to get it in an industry like steel.

WHAT GUIDEPOSTS CAN'T DO

Question. Will the Johnson administration insist that the steel settlement be withing range of the so-called guideposts laid down by the Government?

Answer. Well, the guideposts, of course, are not laws. They don't have the force of law, and there is no legal authority to insist upon their being followed.

In situations that we've seen recently the parties, for their own good reasons, have reached agreements that have been below, or in some cases above, the so-called guideposts with respect to wages.

And the guideposts with respect to price changes, by and large, have been only an influence—not having any determinative effect. The price guideposts, I think, are going to have to be looked at carefully in the months and years ahead.

In a dynamic situation like this, I think it would be a mistake to be wedded forever and a day to any particular formula.

I think we all have to keep looking at the formula critically to see whether it still is responsive to the needs.

Question. Do you find that the unions cite the guidepost figure as a floor for their negotiations—meaning that they insist on getting at least that much?

Answer. Oh, sure. And when many wage settlements made 6 or 12 months before your own negotiations start have resulted in increases of 3.2 percent or more, then 3.2 tends to become the sort of minimum bargaining position on wages.

Question. In your conversations with businessmen, what attitude do you find with regard to increasing the minimum wage?

Answer. Most business people, particularly employers in small businesses, are very anxious to keep their costs down, because it has become increasingly difficult to raise prices to reflect any cost increases.

Therefore, there is strong opposition in many business groups to any increase in the minimum-wage law. And there also is strong opposition to double time for overtime.

The feeling is strong, in small businesses particularly, that the overtime proposal would not result in any added permanent jobs, because some of their activities are part time and seasonal, or involve skilled people who would not be employed in greater numbers by this overtime. In their view, it would not add jobs, but simply add to costs and weaken their competitive position.

The administration position with respect to the labor legislation has not yet been determined, but these various points of view from the labor groups and from the industry groups are being taken into account as the legislation is under consideration.

Question. Does the U.S. Department of Commerce have a position on it?

Answer. We are expressing a position through the usual channel of Bureau of Budget procedure in an attempt to evolve an administration position—yes.

Question. Are these discussions or debates what is holding up the President's labor message? It was scheduled to go up about the middle of February. Later, it was scheduled to go up again. Then the line just went dead——

Answer. Well, the whole question is under active consideration.

Question. When we were discussing the problems of the economy that worry you, you didn't mention the dollar—the balance-of-payments problems. Isn't that a worry any more?

Answer. It's still very much a problem, but the recent developments are encouraging. It looks as if the program outlined by President Johnson on February 10 is going to be successful. His meeting on February 18 with business leaders seemed to have an almost immediate beneficial effect.

Question. You are referring to the voluntary program in which companies are asked to reduce their own outflow of dollars for investment and other purposes abroad——

Answer. Yes. This is, of course, only part of a broader program to deal with the balance-of-payments problem.

Question. How can you tell it's successful?

Answer. We got reports from 344 corporations with operations abroad. The prospect is that these companies will be able to improve their own performance, so far as their own balance-of-payments situation is concerned, by about $1.2 billion in 1965 compared with 1964. So we feel that we are off to a very good start. Business is cooperating fully with the Government in this program.

SLOWING THE DOLLAR DRAIN

Question. How are the companies achieving this improvement in their payments abroad? Are they slowing investment abroad, or bringing funds back home from abroad, or what?

Answer. A variety of things. From their comments to us, we know that many of them, for example, are going to increase their exports beyond what would have been their normal expectation because of their desire to cooperate in the President's program.

Question. How does this work? Can businesses just make a dicision that exports will be increased?

Answer. Yes, they can. These are corporations that have extensive foreign affiliates and foreign subsidiares and foreign marketing ogranizations. By putting greater emphasis on making their final products, or parts or intermediates or supplies, in the United States and selling them abroad through their foreign affiliates, they can make a very appreciable contribution.

As a matter of fact, their foreign affiliates and subsidiaries have already become the most important customers of the parent U.S. corporations. And this can be expanded considerably more.

Question. Have some companies cut back on plans for foreign investment?

Answer. Yes. We, of course, have left it to their own discretion and judgment as to where and how this can be done. And we have pointed out that it is only in the marginal situation where we would suggest that they take a second look.

Many of them have indicated that a capital project that might have been on the drawing board for 1965 can be put off into 1966, or one that is now scheduled for late in 1966 can be put off into 1967. Or they can concentrate on completing others before getting started on some new ones.

Question. What else are companies doing to conserve dollars?

Answer. All of the companies we have talked to are taking another look at their acquisition and expansion plans. And the ones going ahead with those plans are looking to see if at least part of the foreign activity cannot be financed in the host country, instead of bringing all the money needed from the United States in dollars.

Others are phasing out their financing, and many are financing out of earnings on the profit returns of their existing foreign investments. As a result, I think the drain on dollars from these foreign investments will be significantly less this year than it otherwise would have been.

Question. You are not asking business to stop investing abroad, even temporarily?

Answer. Oh, no, not by any means. These foreign investments have been beneficial to the United States. The amount of profits and royalties and fees and other income returned to the United States from foreign affiliates is now at a very high level. We expect continued growth on that account.

So it would be penny-wise and pound-foolish to try to discourage further foreign investments. But we are trying to get a moderating effect in the next year or two while we have this serious balance-of-payments problem.

Question. Mr. Connor, you have charge of the business portion of the voluntary program, as well as the trade and travel portions, but what about the bank program?

Answer. The Federal Reserve System runs that program, with the advice of the Treasury Department.

Question. Can you say how the bank program is working?

Answer. Yes. We don't have any figures, but it certainly has resulted in fewer short-term dollars being made available for foreign investments by foreign nationals in their own countries.

Looking at the whole program, in all of its parts, the base is so big that we think that, by reasonable cooperation and planning ahead, this deficit problem can be licked without doing any serious harm to any segment.

Question. Mr. Secretary, what assurance would you give businessmen that this voluntary program still looks like a temporary proposition?

Answer. Just by the nature of the program, you can expect to keep up the enthusiasm and the interest and the active participation for only a limited period of time. We think that if we can keep it going through 1966, this will be about the end of it. It was designed as a short-term program, as a hold-the-line program, while the more basic problems were being considered.

Now, if we, as a result of this program, get renewed confidence in the dollar among the government officials and economists and financiers in European countries; and if, as a result of that, we are able to work out longer-term arrangements in the monetary field, then we think that the temporary program will gradually just drop off.

Question. Suppose we still have a deficit when the voluntary program wears out—what devices are available to us then?

Answer. We have many possibilities, and some of them depend upon the foreign situation.

You have the question of how much additional contribution you'll get from U.S. direct foreign investments, which we know are in an uptrend. Depending upon the economic conditions in these other countries, we probably will get substantial added benefits there.

You have the export-import situation, which is subject to change, depending upon economic conditions in countries throughout the world.

You have our whole military expenditure program abroad, which is subject to change, depending upon our foreign relationships and developments abroad.

So it is with the foreign aid program. You have expenditures of other Government departments abroad. You have the travel expenditure item. You have all kinds of possibilities, and they're flexible.

NO PLANS FOR TRAVEL TAX

Question. What about Americans traveling abroad? Are you still thinking of a tax on people leaving the country?

Answer. No, not a tax. We think that, so far as travel is concerned, our first job is to get a better understanding on the part of Americans about the effects of foreign travel on our balance-of-payments problem.

Question. Specifically, what are you trying to do in your travel program?

Answer. First of all, we have a positive program of encouraging travel in the United States by our own citizens and those of other countries. If this is successful, a lot of the funds available for travel will be drained off in that direction.

It's almost startling to realize that 52 percent of the people in the United States—the adult people—have never been more than 200 miles away from home. This means that there's a large part of the country that most Americans have never seen. And, therefore, there's a great potential travel market within the United States.

Secondly, we are stepping up our program of encouraging people from other countries to visit the United States, and in this we have the full cooperation of the travel agencies and the airlines, shipping organizations, and so forth.

Question. What else?

Answer. And then, with respect to Americans who decide that either their business interests or their personal interests do require foreign trips, we have been suggesting that American-flag air carriers and ships step up their selling efforts and increase their share of the market.

A more vigorous competitive drive by American carriers can mean quite a lot in the aggregate to our balance-of-payments deficit.

Also, if Americans abroad refrain from purchasing expensive works of art and jewelry, and so forth, this can have an effect. We have made a specific legislative proposal that the duty-free allowance for Americans returning home be reduced from $100 wholesale to $50 retail, and we think this will have a beneficial dollar-saving effect, and also a psychological effect.

Question. What do you do about people who abuse the privilige of sending back duty-free packages valued at not over $10?

Answer. There has been some abuse. These have been tested by sample audits.

The conclusion so far has been that the abuse has not been too important. Now this, I think, will have to be reexamined, if there is a reduction in the duty-free allowance on returning travelers, because the abuses could become more signicant.

Question. As to travel abroad, there seems to be some confusion. You do urge people to travel in the United States. Do you take the next step and urge people not to travel abroad unless they have business reasons to do so?

Answer. No. The Federal Government proposes no restrictions on travel.

Question. Will you straighten us out on just what the official position is on travel abroad?

Answer. We leave it to each American to determine—in light of his own personal situation, his business situation, and the national-interest problem—whether a trip should be taken.

All we're attempting to do is to bring the facts of the national problem to his attention, so that he can consider them along with his personal and business reasons. But if his decision, after considering all the facts, is that the trip is desirable, then there's no Government position that would discourage that trip in any way.

We can't possibly try to make the millions of decisions in those cases, and we're not attempting to.

Question. Does a person need to feel guilty about it, if he's planning to take a trip to Europe this summer?

Answer. Not at all. But if he decides he is going to take a trip, we have the additional suggestion that he use American-owned facilities to the extent possible, and that he keep down his purchases while abroad. This apparently is a suggestion that pleases most husbands, but some of the wives are not so pleased.

RESTRICTIONS ON TRADE

Question. Mr. Connor, for years, the United States has been seeking the removal of restrictions abroad on trade and other commercial relations among nations. Are we not now moving in the opposition direction ourselves, with other countries doing the same thing?

Answer. I don't think the trend has changed at all. This balance-of-payments program of ours does not apply official restrictions as a matter of law or Government regulation. The program is voluntary, and this enables business corporate heads to decide in their own cases how they can cooperate.

The enthusiastic response that we have received from the business community indicates that the voluntary program of throwing the bill to them and letting them decide just how to run with it was the right way.

However, you are right that many other countries have had to take positions that amount to trade restrictions—some of a temporary nature and some of a permanent nature.

This all indicates that the negotiations for the so-called "Kennedy round" of tariff reductions are going to be very difficult. There are very difficult economic problems facing many countries throughout the world, and it may be that progress will be slower than was originally contemplated.

SAFETY IN AUTOS

Question. Mr. Secretary, a few weeks ago you said you would meet with automobile manufacturers to discuss speed and other factors involved in auto safety. What would you like to see done in this area?

Answer. Frankly, I don't know. I think that this whole question of safety in the production and use of automobiles on public roads is of growing importance to us as a nation. Since we in the Department of Commerce do have responsibility for the public roads program, and also have the responsibility for relationships with the business community, it seemed to me to be a good idea to arrange a meeting and discuss the whole question of safety.

There are those—in Congress, particularly—who think that perhaps we should control the automobile manufacturing industry to the extent of specifying just what automobiles can and cannot be built. On the basis of all the information available to me now, I would be opposed to any such move.

On the other hand, highway accidents are resulting in more deaths every year, and the figures on the number of young drivers who will be on the highways in the next 5 to 10 years are staggering. Therefore, I think it's an area where the Government can stimulate more thinking among the automobile manufacturers about building in some more safety devices and, on a voluntary basis, to see if this problem can't be brought into sharper focus.

I just have no idea specifically as to what might emerge from these discussions. For a while there was a horsepower race, and then that was submerged in the interest of economy and safety and various automobile characteristics. But, in the last year or so, there seems to be growing emphasis on speed and on the size of automobile engines. It seems to me that some more thought should be given to the question: Is this a wise policy for the automobile manufacturers to follow, in the public interest and their own interest?

Question. On a number of occasions you have urged businessmen to broaden their responsibilities. What do you have in mind?

Answer. For many years we have watched both labor unions and Government widen their responsibilities—and their power and influence have grown apace. By voluntarily inncreasing its responsibilities and human concerns, business today is gaining a more influential voice in our national affairs.

President Johnson has asked the help of American business and he is getting it—the voluntary program on the balance of payments is an outstanding example. Growing business involvement in a broad range of serious problems is having the most salutary effect on our entire national life.

The new spirit of cooperation between business and Government can be a decisive force in the pursuit of our national objectives. I think the same sense of partnership that is helping to solve the balance-of-payments problem can be applied to job development and other critical national needs. In the social and economic gains, everyone will benefit.

Summary of Lions Eel River Development Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, for years we have talked in California about diverting a portion of the Eel River south through Lake County, Lake Berryessa, and points south.

All admit that the current God-made diversion must be changed inasmuch as the last northern California Eel floods will cost the Congress millions of dollars to correct the damage.

To show the enthusiasm for the suggested manmade change of geography diverting the Eel River through Lake County, Alden Jones and the Lake County Lions, recently held a public meeting with Robert Pafford, western Director of the Bureau of Reclamation as speaker.

A summary of the meeting follows:

SUMMARY OF LIONS EEL RIVER DEVELOPMENT MEETING

Because of the urgent need for better control of water in the Eel River development area, many citizens felt that immediate action should be taken now—not in 25 years. The ingredients were there, but it took the eight Lake County Lions Clubs, headed by the Lakeport Lions, to mix them together into what is believed to have been the largest, and certainly most impressive, water meeting held in California.

On Tuesday, March 23, 1965, the idea was broached at the Lakeport Lions Club meeting. The club approved the idea and chose a committee. Alden H. Jones was appointed chairman, Bruce Bruchler, secretary, and Hal Stuart, treasurer. On March 26, the committee met and started movement toward a public meeting to be held April 28, 1965, at the Lake County fairgrounds. Mr. Robert J. Pafford, Jr., regional director of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, would be asked to present the most recent and comprehensive northwestern California plan.

An office in downtown Lakeport was donated by County Supervisor Wes Lampson. Telephone service was installed courtesy of Pacific Telephone Co.; lights and heat were courtesy of Pacific Gas & Electric. A salaried secretary, Dee Barnett, was employed by the board of supervisors. Five thousand printed flyers, 250 quartercards, and 3,000 convention-type badges with inserts, "Remember Eel River Day, April 28, 1965, I'll be there, will you?" printed on them were used to publicize the event. A resolution declaring April 28 as "Eeel River Development Day" was adopted by the Lake County Board of Supervisors.

Letters of invitation were sent to State and Federal representatives and heads of all agencies connected with water development inviting them to take part in the meeting.

Extensive newspaper and radio coverage was given throughout the Eel River Association area. The five county newspapers cooperated splendidly on publicity.

The Lake Times magazine printed a special "Eel River Development Day" edition. Editor Arthur King and his staff worked long hours writing the Eel River material for the edition. The cover picture was provided through the courtesy of the Northwestern Pacific Railroad; several inside pictures were provided through the courtesy of the Eureka Newspapers, Inc. The Times staff prepared special ads for each of the 88 advertisers. Each ad contained the slogan "Remember Eel River Day, Wednesday, April 28, 8 p.m., Fairgrounds, Lakeport—Build Now—Save Millions."

On the day of the meeting, several private aircraft were used in the shuttling service between Sacramento and Lakeport to transport the dignitaries, who, otherwise, would not have been able to attend due to their busy schedules. The dignitaries met and had dinner with the committee and other invited guests before the public meeting.

The main program was held in the large exhibition hall at the Fairgrounds which

was donated by the Fair Board for the meeting. A stage was erected with a backdrop display of pennants of the eight Lions Clubs in the county, the Rotary Club, and the junior chamber of commerce. The speaker system operated with unusually good acoustics on the balmy spring evening not only inside the hall, but for quite a distance surrounding. This was fortunate as later events proved.

The Clearlake Union High School Band, directed by J. Conner Hill, entertained the assembling crowd. Dignitaries were escorted to their seats in a reserved section and on the stage by the Lakeport Rainbow Girls.

The meeting opened with the playing of the Star Spangled Banner by the High School Band. Chairman Alden Jones acknowledged a letter from the Office of the Vice President of the United States and letters and telegrams from many State and Federal Government representatives who were unable to attend. Mr. Jones then introduced Mr. Earle Wrieden, chairman of the Lake County Board of Supervisors, who, in turn, introduced the following special guests:

State Senator Frank Petersen, Assemblyman Frank Belotti, former State Senator Jack Slattery, former assemblyman Lloyd Lowrey, James Coakley, district representative for Congressman ROBERT L. LEGGETT, State Senator James Cobey, Madera-Merced Counties, chairman of the senate committee on water resources, Lake County Supervisors Don Griner, Lilburn Kirkpatrick, Al Shipley, and Wes Lampson, mayor of Lakeport, Ernest Steen, Art King, editor of Lake Times magazine, and Rotary Club Chairman Coke Marston.

Short talks were delivered by Senators Petersen and Cobey, Assemblyman Belotti, and District Representative Coakley.

Mr. Willard Hansen, engineer and manager of the Lake County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, then introduced the representative of various agencies:

Mendocino County Supervisor Avila; State fish and game, Fred Meyers; State division of forestry, William Miller; U.S. Forest Service, Rod Riley; State soil conservation, Dave Dresbach; Eel River Association, secretary, Bob Moir and vice president, Dave Cox; Redwood Empire Association, Carney Campion; U.S. Soil Conservation Service, Andy Andresen; Corps of Engineers, San Francisco district, Oswald Pietsch; Corps of Engineers, Sacramento, Arnold Zimmerman; Department of Water Resources, Dick Lalletin, Gene Serr, Gordon Dukleth, Guy Fairchild; U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Robert J. Pafford, Jr., Vernon J. Hansen, Joseph E. Carson; and Yolo County Supervisors Bill McDermott and Dudley Stephens.

The main address of the evening was then given by Robert J. Pafford, Jr., entitled, "A Preview of Reclamation's Northwestern California Plan."

The official attendance count within the hall was 1,050. At this point, Earl Fuqua, fire chief, would allow no additional audience to enter the building. Crowds listened to the program outside each of the building entrances. The cloverleaf was filled with people. This is a paved section outside the building used for square dances, etc. The parking facilities filled within the fairgrounds and for blocks around. These facilities ordinarily accommodate crowds of 2,000 persons. It was necessary for the law enforcement officers to turn back the remainder of the cars sending them away for lack of room.

It is estimated by the fire chief that approximately 2,100 persons heard the program and approximately 600 more were turned away. The town has a population of 3,400 persons. The entire county population is only 17,000 scattered over 1,256 square miles. The attendance represented 12 percent of the county population or 59 percent of the city population. This event occurred during Public School Week with several open houses on the same evening.

The following communications were received at the Lions Eel River Committee office from the following:

Office of the Vice President of the United States.

U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

Congressman ROBERT L. LEGGETT, Member of the Fourth District, California.

Congressman DON H. CLAUSEN, Member of the First District, California.

Congressman HAROLD T. JOHNSON, Member of the Second District, California.

Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, Member of the Third District, California.

Congressman WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Member of the Sixth District, Ohio.

U.S. Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman, Subcommittee on Public Works, Louisiana.

U.S. Senator PAT MCNAMARA, chairman, Committee on Public Works, Michigan.

Congressman JOHN H. FALLON, Member of the Fourth District, Maryland.

U.S. Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

priations.

Lt. Gov. Glenn M. Anderson.

Assemblywoman Pauline L. Davis, member of the second district.

Assemblyman Jesse M. Unruh, speaker of the assembly.

State Senator Hugh M. Burns, president pro tempore.

State Senator Joseph A. Rattigan, member of 12th Senatorial District.

Edward G. Chandler, consulting water attorney.

Thomas E. Wales, Jr., consulting civil engineer.

Frederick A. Meyer, department of fish and game.

Lloyd Lowrey, former assemblyman.

The following is an excerpt from a report directed to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, by Joe E. Carson, chief of planning, northwestern California water plan: "Because of the great importance of this meeting, the report has been incorporated as part of a scrapbook of material to form a historical account not only of the meeting itself, but also of the planning and promotion which went into it.

EEL RIVER COMMITTEE, LAKE COUNTY LIONS CLUBS,
ALDEN H. JONES, *Chairman*.

Mr. Speaker, certainly all of these gentlemen and the Lake County Lions are to be commended on this public service.

Korea and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Wednesday morning, May 19, 1965:

KOREA AND VIETNAM

President Chung Hee Park of South Korea is in a position to view problems in Vietnam with the perspective of an Asian leader whose own country knows well the peril and the agony of Communist aggression.

His talks with President Johnson in Washington, and their joint expression of unified purpose in halting the Communist tide in Asia, are of timely significance as U.S. air raids on North Vietnam are resumed and the crisis in southeast Asia enters a new phase of intensified uncertainty.

"We cannot and should not budge even an inch from defending freedom," President Park advised in his address to the National Press Club Tuesday. He emphasized that, while there are some differences between the situations in Vietnam today and in Korea 15 years ago, there also are notable similarities. In South Vietnam, as in South Korea in 1950, Communists are trying to expand their empire by conquest. Tactics employed in Vietnam are vastly different from those used in Korea but the objectives are the same.

It is a good idea for Americans to bear in mind that the Reds in Korea did, eventually, come to the conference table, after being reluctant to do so for a long time, and the war was ended by negotiated settlement. The negotiations were painfully prolonged, it is true, and the outcome was not entirely satisfactory. Nevertheless, agreement was reached and South Korea remained free of Communist domination.

Fruitful negotiations may still be possible in Vietnam, even though the present pospect seems dim. The most effective way to obtain negotiations is to convince the Reds that they will be denied victory on the battlefield in South Vietnam as they were in South Korea.

President Johnson took the occasion of President Park's visit to Washington to issue a warning to the Communists not to misconstrue conflicts of opinion in the United States. "Let none anywhere falsely assume." Mr. Johnson said, "that the debate freedom permits reflects division on the decisions and decisiveness which duty to freedom may require."

Leaders in Hanoi, Peiping and Moscow should heed President Johnson's words. They would make an extremely grave mistake to interpret free expression of differences among Americans, on matters of foreign policy, as an indication of weakness.

It was Communist miscalculation of America's strength and resolve in 1950 that brought on the Korean war.

As Ho Chi Minh and his associates in North Vietnam listen to the sound of falling bombs upon their military installations, and tally up the frightful cost of futile aggression, they ought to refresh their minds on the pertinent lessons of recent history in Korea.

Vietnam Report—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Seigenthaler, the able editor of the Nashville Tennessean, is continuing his penetrating reports on Vietnam.

Under unanimous consent, I include the second in the series—published in the Nashville Tennessean on May 18—in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article—part II—follows:

VIETNAM WAR: NO EASY, CHEAP, QUICK WAY OUT

(By John Seigenthaler)

DA NANG, May 18.—The cost of the U.S. struggle in Vietnam is soaring—in terms of men, money, and machines of war—and at this point there is no quick, easy, or cheap way out.

Ten days ago, when I came to Vietnam, 30,000 U.S. fighting men were in the country. There are now 42,000 here—with more reportedly on the way. Another 35,000 Navy men are stationed on ships offshore in the South China Sea.

Now the number of American soldiers, sailors, and Marines dead in Vietnam has crept over 500—5 were slain in 1 attack yesterday—and many more will die in the days ahead. As the monsoon season comes in late May, American air strikes will be curtailed and the enemy—the Vietcong—will become bolder. Then the U.S. casualty list certainly will increase.

I sat today in a jeep at the end of the runway at the huge airbase here and watched flight after flight of U.S. jet fighter-bombers roar from the airstrip and peel off toward the north.

"The birds are flying today and the Vietcong will get hurt," said Lt. Col. Harry Howton, of Birmingham, Ala., formerly based at Sewart Air Force Base, who was with me on the Da Nang flight line.

"It makes me feel damned good watching those birds fly," said Howton. "We let the Vietcong shoot at us all over this country before we hit back. Now it is our turn and we are hitting back."

Howton, the colorful (his men call him Harry the Horse) commander of the 311th Troop Carrier Squadron, is in charge of transporting cargo to rural outposts north and south of Da Nang. He is a commander who believes in taking his turn at flying and when he complains of Vietcong gunfire it is from firsthand experience.

Seven planes he has piloted have been hit by small arms ground fire.

"I wouldn't say getting shot at scares me," said Howton, "but it makes me apprehensive as hell."

With us on the flight line here was Capt. M. E. Bottington, air information officer at Da Nang, who pointed to four jets which were lining up on the strip, preparing to take off.

"Those four planes represent about 6 million American tax dollars," Bottington said, "and that figure, of course, does not include the highly skilled American pilots who are flying the planes."

During the day I saw about $100 million worth of jets take off from Da Nang. Still later I was back on the flight line when the "birds" began to come home to roost—their bomb and rocket racks empty.

I had hoped to talk with some of the pilots, just back from air strikes. But I was not permitted to do so. I was told that there had been no air opposition to the strikes today; flak, for a change, had been light; small arms fire from the ground had been heavy. No planes were lost today—but 43 have been lost over the last 3 months.

The exact number of aircraft on this base is a classified military secret. But as we drove along the edge of the airstrip I saw more than 200 airplanes, of every type: jet fighter bombers; B-57 jet bombers; jet escort fighters; C-123 and C-130 cargo planes; armed and rescue helicopters; light single and twin engine observer planes; and single engine Vietnamese air force Skyraiders.

This airbase is crowded with planes—and so are the other two major bases in South Vietnam at the Bienhoa airstrip 15 miles south of Saigon, and at Tan Son Nhut Airbase at Saigon.

Fly over any one of the three major bases and you can see that planes overcrowd the parking ramps, wingtip to wingtip.

"It concerns me that we have so many eggs in one basket," a high-ranking Air Force officer told me during a briefing at Tan Son Nhut last week. "We need to spread some of these airplanes out in other areas—but we just don't have the landing strips to take care of them."

And Harry Howton told me of a recent accident here at Da Nang that cost a Vietnamese pilot his life—and which could have caused widespread death and damage.

The young Vietnamese pilot, his Skyraider loaded with rockets, was preparing for takeoff when his plane suddenly went out of control.

"It rammed one of our C-123's parked on the ramp and we had a big explosion and fire," said Howton. "Fortunately we were able to segregate these two burning planes before the fire spread to any others. It could have been very nasty."

The Vietnamese pilot managed to get out of his cockpit—but he died on the wing of his plane.

Da Nang Air Base is located in a sprawling valley surrounded by mountains. It occurred to me that this field and the planes based here, are sitting duck tagets for Vietcong hidden in the hills. I said so to Captain Bottington.

We drove into the hills. Almost every foot of ground is occupied by U.S. marines, armed to the teeth, and with tanks and artillery.

Army engineers have carved red clay roads out of the sides of the mountains overlooking Da Nang Air Base.

And on top of one of the mountains we found another multimillion-dollar U.S. investment. On the perimeter of the mountain clusters of radar-controlled Hawk missiles glare out over the countryside. In an air-conditioned cakelike shack, covered completely by sandbags, was the communications center. Three marine technicians sit in this darkened little cave around the clock, scanning three radar screens for incoming enemy aircraft.

This is only one of several such installations, ringing the Da Nang Base and protecting the U.S. aircraft on the field below.

A marine lieutenant who took us around the armed missile site explained that should enemy airplanes dare attack the base the Hawk missiles would destroy them many miles and several minutes before they reached Da Nang.

"They say Ho Chi Minh has only about 30 or 40 Migs up there," said the officer, Lt. G. R. Modiqliano of Trenton, N.J., pointing to the north. "If Uncle Ho wants to lose them, we will be ready and willing to show him how."

From high on this mountain, and even from the airstrip below, American might seems invincible—almost uncontestable. But, unfortunately, this is a strange war—unlike any military struggle in the history of the Nation. To win will cost more money—more lives.

The air strikes have certainly had a military impact and they have lifted the morale of American fighting men here. But these strikes can offer a dangerous and misleading conclusion to Americans at home.

Anyone who thinks this war can be won simply from the air is mistaken, according to every military source I have talked with while in Vietnam.

For this is a shooting war—and the bullets are flying both ways. But it is also a political war, a psychological war, and an economic war.

The enemy, the Communist Vietcong, is clever, elusive, dedicated, and ruthless. American soldiers who have come up against them describe them as well trained, well armed, and fearless.

They wear no uniforms—usually a black pajama-type garb also worn by farmers or peasants. Sometimes during an attack Vietcong are clad only in khaki shorts.

Actually, the Vietcong control much of the rural countryside. They are fed arms and ammunition and, lately, some crack troops from North Vietnam. They draft the sons of South Vietnamese peasants and farmers into their forces. They move into towns and hamlets where the South Vietnamese Government is weak—and after a series of coups there are many such towns and hamlets. They preach and lecture against the Americans and against the government in Saigon.

Many who resist are kidnaped or murdered. The Vietcong concentrate on killing province and district chiefs loyal to Saigon and friendly to the Americans. They also often kill schoolteachers, and others who control and lead community opinion.

The daily briefing sheet prepared for newsmen invariably carries reports such as this one put out a few days ago:

"The following are examples of recently reported Vietcong outrages:

"1. Quang Nam, April 23. The hamlet chief was murdered and 3 civilians kidnaped when an estimated 15 Vietcong entered Phu Phong village.

"2. Phu Yen, April 25. Seven youths were kidnaped by a Vietcong platoon.

"3. Tay Ninh, April 24. The chief of Suoi Nguon hamlet was murdered by an unknown number of Vietcong.

"4. Tuyen Duc, April 17. Five civilians were kidnaped from a new life hamlet by a Vietcong platoon."

When the Vietcong attack outposts where American teams of "advisers" are located the assaults usually are well planned and supported by heavy Vietcong artillery fire. Invariably the assaults come at 2 or 3 a.m., under cover of darkness. The Vietcong hit, murder, and move on.

By the time the government is able to move in reinforcements, they have evaporated into the countryside, or into surrounding villages where they pose as peasants.

U.S. officials have noted a sudden marked increase in Vietcong defectors since the air strikes against Vietcong forces and against Hanoi territory.

There are reports that in some hamlets the Vietcong have recruited women and teenage boys to travel with them through the back country, to carry food and equipment—and after clashes with United States and South Vietnamese soldiers, to bear away and bury Vietcong dead.

In some areas where the Vietcong had been strongest in past months, and where air strikes have been successful, intelligence from civilians, formerly friendly to the enemy, has picked up.

The change has been slight—but it is certain, U.S. Army advisers reported last week.

This is the enemy. And while air strikes will hurt his morale and cut his supply lines along the Ho Chi Minh Trail in neighboring Laos, such attacks will not beat him, American officials candidly admit.

On the other side, the South Vietnamese Government has suffered. There has been great political turmoil—change after change after change in governments.

It is doubtful at present if the average peasant knows or cares about the present chief of state, Phan Khac Suu, or the present prime minister, Phan Huy Quat.

These men have come to power almost as unknown factors. Suu has little background to commend him to the high post he now holds. Quat is an able, dedicated old-line politician.

While he is not a man who seeks headlines, or projects an image to the people, Americans think he has the capabilities of making a go of South Vietnam—if he is given time.

And it will take time. This means that American forces are going to have to be in South Vietnam for a long time while Quat builds an image for leadership, and, more important, builds his country and its armed strength.

How long?

No American I have talked with, including Ambassador Maxwell Taylor and Gen. William C. Westmoreland, will hazard a guess.

But it will take a long time. Americans who have felt a sense of elation over the success of the air strikes should not anticipate an early miracle. The boys won't be home by Christmas, probably not by Easter, and maybe not by the following Christmas.

I came here as a newsman to ask questions and find out about the war and the nation with which we are allied. But everywhere I have gone, American soldiers and civilians, learning that I have so recently come from home, ask the same questions over and over: "Are the folks at home behind us? Are they willing to stay with this fight all the way? Do they have the patience?

They are not satisfied with the only answer they can get: at this point there is no way to tell whether the American people recognize that a long, difficult struggle is ahead.

There is no debate here—as there is in the United States—about negotiating a settlement that will get Americans out of Vietnam. Americans here feel a settlement would give away the investment on which the United States has made payments.

Nobody here talks of peace—not even the Vietnamese who have been at war with each other more than a decade.

Recently, a small group of South Vietnamese began circulating a peace petition. After several weeks there were only a few hundred names on it. Three of the people who organized the petition were escorted by the government forces north to the 17th parallel and pushed into North Vietnam.

I talked with a U.S. Information Agency officer, who was disgusted with student demonstrations in the United States against the war in Vietnam.

"Freedom is at stake here," he said. "Don't they realize that? They should be given the same treatment that those petition signers were given."

He added: "I don't understand just what is happening in the minds of people at home."

And, I told him, a big part of the problem is that Americans at home do not understand what is going on in the minds of people here.

Report From Selma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Reverend Charles N. Arlin, of St. Ambrose's Church, in Groton, N.Y.

We have heard many reports from Selma, from all kinds of people and from varying viewpoints. Mr. Arlin's letter, I believe, represents a sincere and objective analysis of the thoughts and reactions of one who was there during those troubled days, and I commend it to all of my colleagues:

ST. AMBROSE'S CHURCH,
Groton, N.Y., April 30, 1965.

Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The following will be my observations on Selma, Ala., which I promised in an earlier letter to forward to you once the pressures of the Easter season relented somewhat.

The Negro problem is a difficult and complex problem; it will not be solved overnight because people do not yield easily their deep-seated prejudices. Many well-meaning people, unfortunately, consider the Negro as something less than human. At best, in many areas, the Negro is paternalized; so long as he stays within certain bounds, he is accepted to some degree. But he is still subject to the whim of the white man.

I found Selma a shocking experience; I was not prepared for what I saw. When I left for Selma, I knew only what I had read in the press reports; this was, at best, precarious information. I knew that the situation was tense and bitter but this somehow still did not prepare me for what I saw nor for the demonstrations of which I was a part in Selma. The city itself looked as though it were under seige; State Police cars lined streets adjacent to the Negro community and helmeted troopers, city police and Sheriff Clark's possemen were very much in evidence.

Selma is a beautiful city. We were immediately struck by the incongruity of the white area, resplendent with its fine homes and beautiful lawns as opposed to the dirty shabby area which contained in many places shacks, in which many Negroes were living. Many of the streets in the Negro area were unpaved; many of the Negroes were living in abject poverty. I was struck by the odor of hatred and fear on the part of the white population; it was so thick that you could almost cut it with a knife. There was, of course, overt hostility toward those of us in clerical gab. Some of the comments about us made our hair stand on end. We were often referred to as "nigger lovers"; those who used the phrase meant it in the most derogatory sense.

The discipline of the southern Negro was nothing short of phenomenal. There was a strong sense of submerging immediate desires for a larger and more important goal. Even the children were a part of this. Every person in the community submitted to the inconveniences and the discipline imposed and expected without question. Not once in the 2½ days there did I hear a child cry; this in itself is an example of the incredible discipline, maintained despite the constant threat of physical danger and reprisal. In an age when people are prone to give in to short-range demands and shrug off discipline imposed for a long-range goal, I found this nothing short of amazing. The standard reply of the Negro to the query of what he wanted was, "Freedom—now." They also added that their fight for freedom was not only on their behalf but also on behalf of all minority groups who have suffered discrimination in one form or another.

We were housed in the Negro ghetto with Negro families. This was an experience for me, because I had never stayed with a Negro family before. When we protested that we were disrupting family routine, we were told that this was the least that could be done to show appreciation for our presence in Selma, that our presence there meant more to them than we would ever know. We were warned not to leave the Negro community and venture into the white area of the city. To do so would have been very dangerous and might have endangered our lives and safety. As a result of this warning the only contacts that we had with white people, aside from the Roman Catholic priests and nuns at Good Samaritan Hospital, were the city police. I was much impressed with Dr. King's Southern Leadership Conference; the people directing the demonstrations in Selma struck me as responsible leaders who did an admirable job of briefing and controlling the people who poured into Selma. We were ordered to avoid violence at all costs and any and all attempts at provocation. And there were attempts at this. However, we were warned to steer clear of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, primarily because they were prone to provoke violence; as students, they often rushed in "where angels fear to tread." They gave little heed to consequences or to planning.

Mr. Wilson Baker, public safety commissioner of Selma, was the only police officer in Selma who had the respect of the Negro community. Sheriff Clark, I soon discovered, was a man who tried to escalate a situation into violence; on the other hand, Baker did everything in his power to prevent violence on both sides and he was genuinely concerned that everyone be given equal protection. Clark and the mayor of Selma, however, had contrived to limit much of Baker's authority as commissioner and Baker and Clark were at odds on how the situation should be handled. Baker wanted to avoid violence at all costs; Clark would have liked nothing better than violence. The clergy, from what I saw and observed, did their best to assure that there would be no violence and that all of the demonstrations would be peaceful.

On the day that we were arrested (Wednesday, March 17) a group of Dr. King's people had called the mayor of Selma and asked for an appointment. They wanted him to sit down with them and a group of clergymen and discuss the situation in the Negro community. The mayor refused, I understand, in rather colorful language. At that point we were asked if we would be willing to go to the major's house and set up a peaceful protest. We were to picket his refusal to sit down and discuss the grievances of the Negro community. We agreed, but not without some fear and trembling. If we succeeded, we would be the first group to demonstrate outside the Negro community, except, of course, for the marches to the courthouse. We knew that one of three things would happen to us: we would be allowed to peacefully picket with the protection of the police; we would be arrested; or we would be subject to physical violence on the part of the enraged white citizenry because we had carried the protest into their own backyard. This we later found to be a very sore point with the white people in Selma. So long as the demonstrations were taking place in the Negro ghetto or at the courthouse, the white people were not bothered. Most of them could ignore the situation. But they felt severely threatened when the protests were carried into the white residential area.

We were transported to a spot about a block from the mayor's home; there we alighted and lined up two abreast on the shoulder of the street. As I recall, at that particular point there were no sidewalks. We had barely begun to move when a police car cut us off and we were told that we could not march; there was a city ordinance forbidding it. At that point the news cameramen arrived and began filming the situation and Mr. Baker arrived, visibly angry. He informed us all that we were under arrest and that transportation would be provided to the jail. This was in fact provided by Sheriff Clark and his possemen in a schoolbus. Clark himself took command of the bus and when some of the group began to sing a freedom song on the bus, Clark vowed that he would just as soon kill all of us and go to hell for it. You only had to look at his face to know that he meant it.

We were treated most courteously by the local police. When we arrived at the jail we were ushered into the courtroom where we were informed that Mr. Baker had changed the original grounds for arrest to parading without a permit. We were originally arrested for unlawful assembly and illegal picketing. Bail was set at $200 per person and we were told that as soon as we had been booked, we would be allowed to sign out on our own recognizance. Most of us did this, although some, not in our immediate group, argued that if we were protesting unequal treatment, it would make sense that we stay

in jail rather than be released on our own recognizance. Had we been Negroes it would have been hardly likely that we would have been accorded the same treatment. But, we felt that we had made our point; Baker had made his. There was no point in pursuing the matter any further at that particular juncture. Inasmuch as we had our plane reservations for the trip from Montgomery to Atlanta that evening and had promised Bishop Higley that we would return on Thursday, we felt it best to leave.

This, in essence, is what factual part of our story which has been so badly bungled by the newspapers. We went to Selma, not to get arrested, but because a certain segment of our population was being denied the right to vote. People can argue about racism and all of the other issues that they may wish to drag across the path, but many of them have lost sight of the fundamental reason for the trip to Alabama. We felt that man, as a creature of God, has a dignity which cannot be suppressed by whips, clubs, guns or intimidation of any other sort. A human being has the right to live without fear as a constant companion.

I cannot speak for the march to Montgomery, but in Selma I saw none of the activity which has been claimed by the Congressman from Alabama. I saw no drinking of wine, beer or liquor while I was in Selma, although I did see a large quantity of soda pop consumed. Could it be that these cans were mistaken for beer cans? I personally saw no evidence of promiscuity. In fact I was amazed at the discipline of all those who were in Selma and I am certain that none of the people involved in the demonstrations would have jeopardized the Negro cause by careless, unheeding behavior. It was a known fact that every attempt possible would be made by some people unsympathetic with the civil rights movement to discredit by any means possible the demonstrations in Selma and Montgomery.

As to conclusions about the situation in Selma, I would say the following: The situation there is far worse than I had imagined it to be. Yet, I have a feeling that the majority of the people in Selma and in Alabama deplore the violence which has taken place there. Though they may not be in sympathy with the civil rights movement, they realize that there has to be a change in the attitude toward the Negro. There still is discrimination in many forms in Selma—including the churches. There appears to be discrimination on the part of many police officers in the city; following the fiasco at the bridge in Selma there also appears to be some basis for the charge of police brutality. Certainly the Negroes in Selma do not have the same opportunities that their white counterparts have. The literacy tests for voter registration have been so rigged that no one, white or black, could have passed unless the registrar was so inclined. I doubt that I could have passed such a test if they had not wanted me to vote. There is strong need for a voting rights bill which will guarantee people the right to vote. I personally have no objections to literacy tests as a qualification to vote provided that such tests are fairly administered to any person regardless of race, creed, or color. The great crime in Alabama is that the literacy test has been used as a barrier—often an illegal one—to prevent Negro applicants from becoming qualified voters. The poll tax should definitely be outlawed; no voter should be barred from voting because of a tax imposed.

I have nothing but the highest praise for Mr. Wilson Baker, the public safety commissioner of Selma. Although he is a segregationist, this man is a highly competent police officer and he is genuinely concerned with keeping the peace and protecting people on both sides of this issue. To this end, I am certain that many of the arrests that Baker and his men have made in Selma, including our own, while ostensibly on a legal pretext, have in fact been made to protect those arrested from the possibility of violence at the hands of those who might resort to violence. Sheriff Clark I do not consider a competent police officer; he has created far too many situations and then tried to escalate them. I personally consider him a crude and vulgar individual who has grossly misused his police powers. He has little regard for the safety or dignity of the people of Selma. I cannot say much about Colonel Lingo and his State police; I had little personal contact with them. But they have no respect among the Negro community. The wrong people in Selma wore the hard hats when we were there; no one attacked them. The Negroes and marchers should have had the hard hats. Wilson Baker has been the only officer who has been able to go into the Negro community and carry on a meaningful dialog. He alone has the respect of the majority of people on both sides in Selma.

Finally, I am not certain where the Negro revolution is headed, but it is a revolution, a peaceful one at present. There are some aspects of it that I don't care for, because I, too, have ambivalent feelings as a white man. But nothing that I or anyone else chooses to do will stem the relentless tide of freedom for the Negro. Whatever happens, it will cost the white man some pain and many white men don't want the pain. They don't see why they should have to suffer; but aren't all white men to blame in some way for the situation as it now exists? America will never be completely free until all of its citizens can enjoy the guarantees of the Constitution. No citizen will ever be a responsible citizen until he is given the opportunity to be one; freedom entails an awesome responsibility. It is not license to do what we will; it is not license to abuse the rights of fellow citizens. No country has ever been free until it has granted responsibility and then met the problems one at a time as they came up. I am certain from my observations of the Negro determination in Alabama that if the Negro is not treated as a first-class citizen and given the rights which go with this, no matter how much pain it will cost the white man, then the Negro will resort to more drastic measures. Then, God help us all.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES N. ARLIN.

Former Immigrant Gives Six-Story Office Building to Philadelphia Opportunities Industrialization Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in these days when "battle, murder, and sudden death" play such a prominent part in the daily news, it is refreshing and encouraging to read the absorbing story of a dedicated and grateful citizen who has contributed so generously to aid the self-help program of the West Philadelphia branch of the Opportunities Industrialization Center. The extremely interesting story of Mr. Sol Feinstone, a Bucks County, Pa., farmer, as published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 2, is as follows:

EX-IMMIGRANT GIVES JOB CENTER BUILDING AS TOKEN OF HUMILITY

(By Helen Rothbardt)

When the Opportunities Industrialization Center dedicates its West Philadelphia branch at 3 p.m. Sunday, there will be a small, nearly bald 77-year-old man in the crowd. It hasn't been publicized, but he gave the OIC the six-story office building at 17 South 52d Street for its new training center.

Sol Feinstone insisted on anonymity when he offered the building rent free for 10 years, plus $20,000 to renovate it, to the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, pastor of Zion Baptist Church, and organizer of the OIC.

But the Bucks County farmer made a stipulation: at the beginning of each year, he was to be paid "one slice of black bread and one cup of black coffee without sugar."

DECLINES TO EXPLAIN

Curious newsmen pressed, but Mr. Sullivan would not reveal his name nor explain the symbolism.

"Then a nosy reporter had to track me down," said Feinstone resignedly in the rambling home on his 200-acre farm at Washington Crossing, Pa.

He explained the symbolism of the consideration asked for his gift.

"It is a symbol of humility—my humility. I knew hunger, poverty, and bigotry when I arrived in America with an Indian-head penny in my pocket. There was a time I was glad to have black bread to eat."

ARRIVES IN STEERAGE

That was in 1902 when Feinstone, a boy of 14, arrived in steerage and went to work in a sweatshop in New York.

He fingered his shabby workclothes. "Look at me. Do I look like anything but a farmer? I just came in from work—I am a farmer."

And how did a farmer get involved in this unique program that primarily serves jobless Negroes?

Feinstone explained: "I read about what Mr. Sullivan and the other Negro ministers were doing to train people and I wanted to meet them."

MANY APPLICANTS

The OIC began its work on January 26, 1964, in a former police station at 19th and Oxford Streets. The self-help program was swamped with applicants for vocational training. The first center was started with a $50,000 anonymous donation and equipped with gifts from industry. At the end of its first year, the center was established as a practicable program, affording new hopes and opportunities to thousands.

Feinstone explained, "I told Mr. Sullivan it was all well and good to train people in the production fields. But I thought there was a need to train them in the distribution field. Without distribution, production doesn't mean a thing. But first of all, people have to be taught how to dress and act and talk to customers. I specified that the new job training center should concentrate on the merchandising field."

MAKE GEARS MESH

The program got underway through meetings with executives from center city stores, the chamber of commerce, the city administration, and others. Working with them was Feinstone—now a member of the board of trustees of OIC.

"We all worked together to make the gears mesh," he said.

The new center, in the heart of West Philadelphia's bustling 52d and Market Streets shopping district, will concentrate on training in all phases of merchandising. The first

two floors of the building will be a complete merchandising mart, composed of shops offering clothing, furniture, appliances, and other items for sale to the public. The upper floors will be used for training classes in buying, selling, secretarial traning, real estate salesmanship and other phases of merchandising.

CONTINUE PROGRAM

"In the six-story tower of training," Mr. Sullivan said, "we're going to continue our business of helping people help themselves. We want our people to be able to qualify for and get jobs as buyers and sellers and clerks in the big department stores in the city."

OIC, which plans to open another center in Germantown soon, received a $458,000 Federal grant last December.

Feinstone is presenting one more item to the building. It is a plaque which will read:

"Our great country was built by the underprivileged of many lands; by Indian tribes who came before us, by the persecuted Pilgrims, by indentured servants, by Negro slaves, by the genius and blood of the Fathers of the American Revolution and by the 30 million underprivileged immigrants from all parts of the world who came after the Revolution and help build our country in freedom."

DONATES LIBRARY

Feinstone also donated the David Library to the Washington Crossing Memorial Building. In it are Feinstone's collection of more than 600 original manuscripts and war letters by George Washington and other patriots.

Last February he presented to the library of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., a letter written by George Washington from his headquarters there on October 5, 1779, to Gen. James B. Lambert.

Tribute to Spencer Ravel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the postsputnik decade has dramatized to the country the importance of secondary education in our highly specialized and increasingly technological society. There has been greater emphasis upon technicians and science orientation among our high school graduates, who then may be directed toward 4- and 5-year university level courses which are largely removed from the humanities and basic liberal education of the whole man.

Yet there has also been a reappraisal and a reevaluation of the educational process, with the realization that there can be no replacement for the individual attention accorded the student about to enter this age of the technician and the specialist. Those who are fortunate enough to receive this consideration, and the patience and understanding which are found in great educators and administrators, are indeed fortunate.

In the community of Hamburg in my district, Mr. Speaker, young people have been among those who have been afforded that special attention—the element of secondary education which will have an influence on the lives of our citizens and leaders of tomorrow.

Recently the Hamburg community gave its special thanks to this educator, Spencer W. Ravel, in a dinner tribute attended by students, faculty, staff, former students and townsmen. Mr. Ravel has completed a quarter of a century as an educator, principal and friend in the Hamburg schools system.

Spencer Ravel, besides serving his country as an educator—perhaps one of the most important in this period of our Nation's history, has also served her well as an officer. During World War II he was in the Normandy invasion, and later during the Korean conflict was recalled to active duty. He is presently commander of a Naval Reserve unit in Buffalo and instructs a Reserve program weekly.

Perhaps the finest tribute to this educator and friend came from the collection of some 500 statements and letters from former and present students, typical of which were:

You have given us your time and patience so that we may go out into the world as young ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following editorial which appeared in the Hamburg Sun subsequent to this community tribute:

TRIBUTE TO "SPEN" RAVEL

Last Saturday, some 300 students, faculty, and staff members at Hamburg Central High School gathered to pay tribute to Spencer W. Ravel, longtime high school principal and friend to most of the postwar graduating classes here.

The expressions of appreciation found elsewhere in this week's Sun capture the esteem which he has earned over the years, and to which we could supplement only by affirming a similar sentiment from the civic community.

"Spen" Ravel, as educator and administrator, has played a prominent role in guiding and molding the direction of young people from the Greater Hamburg community. His is a contribution which will long be felt in those persons he has aided, who in turn assume their responsibilities and leadership.

Perhaps the student tributes were best summed up by this: "Thank you for always smiling and saying 'hello.' Thank you for making Hamburg High School a school I can be proud of. Thank you for all that you have done and all that you will do for us. I hope that in the future we will always remember to say, 'Thank you, Mr. Ravel,' and if we don't always say it, I hope you know we mean it in our hearts."

Vietnam Report—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Seigenthaler, able editor of the Nashville Tennessean, is continuing his penetrating reports on Vietnam.

Under unanimous consent, I include the third in the series—published in the Nashville Tennessean on May 19—in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

BA DUA SHOWS FIGHTING SCARS, BRAVE WARRIORS

(By John Seigenthaler)

BA DUA, VIETNAM, May 19.—My visit to this rural outpost in the Mekong Delta was supposed to be another brief, routine visit with an American soldier who has a family back in middle Tennessee.

Then American bombs began falling on a Vietcong encampment 3 miles away. It was still a brief visit—I was at Ba Dua only an hour. But it certainly wasn't routine.

I had asked the Defense Department to arrange for me to see as many men as possible from Tennessee during my 2-week visit to Vietnam, and they obliged. One of those I was to see was Capt. David L. Pemberton, stationed at Ba Dua, whose wife, Martha Anne, and 5-year-old son live in Clarksville.

The next thing I knew I was on my way to Ba Dua (pronounced Bah Zooah) 55 miles south of Saigon and the helicopter pilot was saying to me: "We will have to go in very high and then drop down fast right beside the fort."

"Why is that?" I asked.

"The Vietcong are still around this place," he said. "You don't want to give them anything to take a pot shot at, do you?"

His question didn't seem to warrant an answer. I began to wonder if Captain Pemberton really had anything to tell me, after all. Then we were dropping down out of the sky and Pemberton was coming out to meet me.

"Welcome to scenic Ba Dua," he shouted above the roar of the helicopter. The pilot said he would be back in an hour and asked that I be ready. Then he went up and away.

"We don't think it is wise to just leave a helicopter sitting here on the ground for any length of time," Captain Pemberton told me as we walked toward his fort. "It might give the Vietcong some ideas and they might get reckless."

Ba Dua is a South Vietnamese showplace. Until last November the village and the adjoining fort were a Vietcong stronghold. Then the government forces took the enemy Vietcong by surprise and drove the Communists away. Twice since then—in December and again in January—the Vietcong have attacked and tried to take back Ba Dua. Both times the government forces have held on and they still are in control of Ba Dua.

"We are now beginning to spread our circle of influence wider and wider," Dave Pemberton told me. "We have patrols out every night, keeping on the move. We keep the Vietcong guessing. We can't sit here on our tails and be taken by surprise."

The fort is located on a little elevated knob in a clearing surrounded by thick jungle underbrush. A half-dozen zig-zagging rows of barbed wire surround the fort and a short distance away new hut-like buildings are going up.

Pemberton pointed out over the area to where the village is located. "They are good people, the Vietnamese, I like them. They have been kicked around a lot by the Vietcong. But they know things are going to be better for them."

The captain turned his back on the village and pointed in the opposite direction. "We get good intelligence from the villagers and they indicate that there are some Vietcong out there about 2 or 3 miles," he said. "We have given that information to the district and we are hoping to get an air strike out there."

Pemberton didn't know it, and neither did I, but at that moment three American B-57 jet bombers were on the way.

I began to talk to Pemberton about his family at home in Clarksville. His wife, he told me, was the former Martha Anne An-

derson, a native of Clarksville and she and little David live now with her mother, Mrs. Gordon Anderson, at 925 Crossland Avenue, in Clarksville. Mrs. Anderson, said the captain, is employed by McNeal & Edwards Department Store in the children's department.

"I'm crazy about middle Tennessee," said Pemberton, a native of New Orleans and a graduate of West Point. "I might like to live there some day."

Suddenly, as I was asking him questions, Pemberson called to one of his men, a sergeant.

"Go get Dai-uy Ro," he shouted. "We are about to have an air strike." He stood up and pointed out to the area where earlier he had told me the Vietcong were supopsed to be located.

"Look at those planes," he said to me. "We are going to get them. Our information was correct. They are going to hit right out there."

A light, single engine L-5 observation plane was circling low over the heavy brush area where Pemberton had earlier said the Vietcong were located. High above that observation plane three B-57 bombers were circling.

The sergeant, D. C. Rock, of Chambersberg, Pa., was back on top of the fort now with a Vietnamese dressed in a T-shirt.

"This is my friend and my fellow officer," said Pemberton. His name is Dai-uy Nguyen Van Ro." I shook hands with Captain Ro and Pemberton pointed out the planes.

At about this time the three B-57's started to dive. They came straight down toward earth and at the last second, at treetop level, they pulled out.

"I saw their bombs," shouted Pemberton. Others inside the fort began clambering up to see the airstrike. The planes were well up in the air when the first explosion rocked the earth where we were standing. The explosion sounded very loud. There were three of them on that first pass.

"I like it, I like it," Sergeant Rock shouted. By this time the planes were making a second dive. Again they zoomed down to the tops of the trees, then straightened up—and again the three thundering blasts shook the ground.

"What a show," said Pemberton.

I looked at the Vietnamese captain. He was smiling. "What a show, indeed," he said. For about 15 minutes we stood on the top of the fort as the planes made perhaps 20 passes.

Each time they came down they unloaded bombs, and there were shattering blasts.

Once, after they passed, there was a second, louder concussion.

"They got something good, then," said Pemberton, "that was a secondary explosion." Shortly afterward smoke began to climb from the forest area. Pemberton said he was certain that some of the explosions had been napalm bombs.

The airstrikes created considerable excitement in the fort. It continued even after the planes had gone. I got back to my interview of Pemberton. He told me who the men were stationed with him. Rock, and the two other Americans, Lt. Robert C. Johnson of Greensburg, Pa., and Sgt Milton Pollack of New York. Both of them were away from the fort during my visit.

I asked Pemberton about his Vietnamese counterpart, Ro.

"I have heard all sorts of things about the Vietnamese fighting man, but in my opinion you can't give them too much credit. This man is the best. And those he leads are very good.

"Ro's brother was killed by the Vietcong," said Pemberton. "And maybe that makes him a better soldier. At any rate, he is very, very able."

Before I left Saigon I had interviewed Gen. William C. Westmoreland and he had told me that his men in the field, working as advisers to the Vietnamese, "are some of the most dedicated men the Army has ever seen.

"They are working with missionary zeal with these people," Westmoreland said. As I talked with Pemberton I realized that he was one of those about whom Westmoreland was talking. He is tough, bright and completely involved in the business of winning this unusual war by helping make the South Vietnamese better soldiers.

I told Pemberton that many Americans didn't look upon American soldiers in Vietnam as "advisers" but as warriors.

"Well there are four of us Americans here," he said. "I am a battalion adviser. I suggest. I offer ideas. I give advice. And Dai-uy Ro works well with me. We have a good relationship. But he leads.

"There are men just like me all over this land," said Pemberton. "Some of them may not be as fortunate in having a good man like Ro at his side. But all of us are faced with the job of giving advice—not orders. Any American who doubts we are advisers should come out here and take a look, and try to understand," he said. "Sure if we get shot at we shoot back. But that doesn't make us any less advisers and it certainly doesn't make us any less soldiers."

He took me around the fort—which he called "Ba Dua Hilton." The living quarters were underground—tunnels cut out of the clay earth. Two Vietnamese soldiers were operating a radio—one of them churning a manual generator.

Pemberton shone a flashlight into a darkened room where a group of soldiers were sleeping. "They were on patrol last night," he said. In his own quarters he showed me the hammock bunks the Americans have put up along the walls.

"When we first got here we used sleeping bags on the floor," he said. "This is a little more comfortable. He has a tape recorder and he and his wife exchange tapes, in addition to daily letters.

"The mail comes pretty regular," said Pemberton. "It takes about 5 days going and coming."

Outside Pemberton showed me "all the conveniences of home"—his bath: a dirty canal where each day he bathes. "It may look murky to you—but it looks just great to me," he said. About 50 feet from the fort a small hut is located where a Vietnamese woman operates a restaurant.

"I call it the local Howard Johnson," said the captain. He showed me Captain Ro's fighting cock, and the fort's pet dog—a mongrel which has been named "Sambo Molotov."

We sat down in the underground mess hall and Pemberton had beer with ice sent in from the Howard Johnson.

He talked about the unique nature of the war.

"This is really psychological war, with the Vietcong," he said. "We call it psy-war because they are constantly trying to confuse and mislead the people." He lit up the short butt of a cigar he usually clamps between his teeth, and he told about a Vietcong ambush that had taken place April 3 when 10 of the Vietcong soldiers had been killed.

"Outside the two attacks the Vietcong made trying to take Ba Dua back," he said, "that thing April 3 was the worst we have been hit."

Two of the dead, he said, were captured. When it became apparent that they were anti-Vietcong, their hands were tied behind them and they were beaten to death. Two others captured were later released, Pemberton said.

"They kept them for about 3 weeks and they pumped them for information," he said. "During this time they fed them well and fattened them up so when they came back they would tell our soldiers about how well the Vietcong treat them."

Pemberton said when the soldiers came back they told everything they had told the Vietcong.

"Among other things they wanted to know, was who was here for the Americans. They took my name and the names of the others. We later heard they were offering rewards for us. They want to pay about 99,000 piastros for me. That makes me worth about $700," he laughed.

He told of a recent incident in which a Vietcong girl tried to lure government soldiers into a Vietcong trap. She was identified as a spy, however, and the plot was foiled.

"This is a trick they try sometimes," he said.

Government soldiers killed her, said Pemberton. "They showed her corpse to the villagers and they said: "Look here. She was with the Vietcong and this is the fate of all those who help Vietcong—death."

I asked Pemberton if he condoned this type action.

"I don't condone it, but I don't condemn it, either," he said. "This is the Vietnamese way of fighting a war. She would have lured some ARVN (regular army) soldiers to their death. They beat two of our men to death. This is war. I'm an adviser and they don't ask my advice on something like this. And I don't offer it. I think all of us are harder who have been out here for awhile."

Back on top of the fort waiting for the helicopter Pemberton pointed out four huts going up nearby. "That is going to be a new life hamlet," he said. "The government is building it. The army is doing the work on it. Two days ago it wasnt there. Part of psy-war is to get the people to work to help themselves.

"There are many things being done—a pig program; new farming techniques are being taught; medical advice is being offered—the army inoculated the children awhile back. The school, which was practically closed during the time the Vietcong were here, is now back open."

A favorite project of the Vietcong has been to murder teachers who talk to the children about freedom or in favor of the government and against communism.

"Much of the good that is being done is attributed by the people to the Americans," said Pemberton. He told of one incident in which a Lutheran church in Madison, Wis., sent clothing to the villagers of Ba Dua.

"Now my mother has a similar project going at the Lutheran church in New Orleans," he said. "It makes a great difference to these people. They know where the assistance comes from."

Pemberton said in recent days he has noted an increase in the intelligence he has received from villagers. He attributes some of this to the air strikes which the people have heard about.

"We know, for instance, that we have 13 mines in roads around here somewhere. We had 14 until yesterday when we found one. We still don't have the exact locations of all the mines. But I think we'll find them."

By now the helicopter was coming to take me away. I shook hands with Dave Pemberton, Sergeant Rock and Captain Ro.

"Tell the folks at home I'm well and safe," said Pemberton. "And come back to see us again sometime when you can bring those lovely B-57's with you."

And so, as the helicopter lifted me quickly into the air and to the north I said farewell to scenic Ba Dua.

Armed Forces Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed by an address delivered on the occasion of Armed Forces Week by Joseph A. Califano, Jr., the special assistant to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense, at the Armed Forces Week luncheon at the Sheraton Hotel, in Philadelphia, Pa., on May 14, 1965. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the text of this significant message:

ADDRESS BY MR. CALIFANO

Armed Forces Week is primarily an occasion for honoring the men and women, past and present, who have worn the uniform of our country. There could be no more appropriate place to offer such tribute than the city of Philadelphia. This city's contribution to the military history of America is older than the Nation itself.

The first body of troops assembled to defend the 13 American Colonies, the nucleus of the Continental Army, consisted of two companies of riflemen from Virginia, two from Maryland, and six from Pennsylvania.

When George Washington rode north to assume command of the new Continental Army, he was escorted out of Philadelphia by the Light Horse of the city of Philadelphia, which we know today as the 28th Infantry Division of the Pennsylvania National Guard.

This history was very much in President Johnson's mind when he recently addressed the subject about which I will speak this afternoon—the situation in Vietnam. The President said:

"Americans and Asians are dying for a world where each people may choose its own path to change. This is the principle for which our ancestors fought in the valleys of Pennsylvania. It is the principle for which our sons fight in the jungles of Vietnam."

Vietnam is the major challenge which presently confronts this country and particularly the men and women in the Armed Forces. "Some may consider it a small war," President Johnson said, "but to the men who give their lives, it is the last war."

The fact that our forces are supporting the Government of South Vietnam, a small country on the far side of the globe, has generated currents of confusion in some elements of American opinion. Much of this confusion, it seems to me, reflects a lack of knowledge about certain basic facts concerning Vietnam.

There are four principal questions regarding Vietnam which seems to occasion most of this discussion:

Who started the war in Vietnam and how is it being fought?

Why are we involved?

What, exactly, are we doing?

And, finally, what do we hope to accomplish?

To understand the origin of this conflict, we must recall that the Vietnamese are an ancient people who enjoyed independence for several centuries until 100 years ago, when the French assumed control in what is now Vietnam. The Vietnamese people recovered their independence at the end of World War II by successfully resisting the returning French. Unfortunately, as has happened more than once in the postwar world, what may have begun as a broad-based national resistance soon lost control to the Communists—in this case, the forces of Ho Chi Minh, who in 1930 first organized the Communist Party in Vietnam. Eventually, following the settlement in 1954, the Ho Chi Minh forces were given undisturbed control of the territory north of the 17th parallel. South Vietnam, in turn, was to be given an opportunity to conduct its own affairs in peace unalined and apart from the global power struggle.

The United States, under President Eisenhower, attempted to assist the peaceful development of South Vietnam through economic aid and advice. In the 5-year period from 1954 to 1959, we saw concrete evidence that South Vietnam was beginning to achieve its objective. More than 140,000 peasant families were given land under an agrarian reform program; the transportation system was almost entirely rebuilt; rice and rubber production surpassed all previous highs in South Vietnamese history; and construction was underway on several manufacturing plants.

At this juncture, the Communist leaders in Hanoi lanuched in earnest their program for the so-called liberation of South Vietnam. In September 1960 the Third Congress of the North Vienamese Communist Party formally called for a maximum effort to liberate South Vietnam and for creation of a National Front for the Liberation of the South—the organization which became the political arm of the Vietcong. To the Ho Chi Minh Communists, liberation meant sabotage, terror, and assassination. It meant attacks on hamlets and villages. It meant the synthematic, coldblooded murder of thousands of schoolteachers, health workers, local officials, and their wives and children.

Yet today, the propaganda apparatus in Hanoi contends that the fighting is an indigenous revolution—a civil war, they claim, not armed aggression. The facts, however, are incontrovertible:

Since 1959, at least 40,000 trained guerrillas—the equivalent of two U.S. divisions—have infiltrated South Vietnam from the North. (And this figure is low, for each infiltration is established by two Vietcong prisoners, two captured documents, or one of each.)

Guerrilla terrorists, last year alone, killed or kidnaped 9,759 Vietnamese civilians—men, women, and children—who had no official connection with the Vietnamese government. If this had happened in the United States, it would have meant, in proportionate terms, 143,000 citizens slain or kidnaped every year.

Guerrilla terrorists last year also killed or kidnaped 1,536 village chiefs and other local officials in an organized effort to destroy the government's power to function and to protect its citizens.

A combat unit of the regular North Vietnamese Army—the 2d Battalion of the 101st Regiment of the 325th Division—is now operating in the central highlands of South Vietnam.

A major element of the North Vietnamese Army—the 70th Transportation Group—exists solely for the purpose of moving infiltrators from north to south.

We have captured or sunk Communist vessels off the shore of South Vietnam laden with weapons and hundreds of thousands rounds of military ammunition.

The South Vietnamese Army has captured Chinese and other Communist bloc arms and ammunition in virtually every area of their country.

The war in Vietnam is not a war as we have known war. It is not a conflict where conventional military forces face each other across a traditional battlefield. It certainly is not an internal rebellion fought for the benefit of the unfortunate people on whose land it rages. It is thinly concealed aggression—with the unconcealed objective of subjugating an independent people.

The next question which arises is, What does all this have to do with us? Is saving Vietnam worth the American lives that have been lost and the dollars that have been spent to provide economic and military assistance to a small nation on the other side of the earth?

Three American Presidents—Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—have answered this question with a resounding "yes." And for many reasons; the most obvious reason is that South Vietnam is a member of the free world family and has asked for help to preserve its independence. As President Johnson has said:

"Around the globe from Berlin to Thailand are people wh ose well-being rests in part on the belief that they can count on us if they are attacked. To leave Vietnam to its fate would shake the confidence of all these people in the value of an American commitment and in the value of America's word. The result would be increased unrest and instability, and even wider war."

Another reason for our support is that Vietnam is truly a test case of what the Communists call wars of liberation, and what we know to be externally directed terrorist subversion. In Secretary McNamara's words:

"We may be certain that as soon as they had established their control over South Vietnam, the Communists would press their subversive operations in Laos and then in Thailand, and we would have to face this same problem all over again in another place or permit them to have all of southeast Asia by default. Thus, the choice is not simply whether to continue our efforts to keep South Vietnam free and independent but, rather, whether to continue our struggle to halt Communist expansion in Asia. If the choice is the latter, as I believe it should be, we will be far better off facing the issue in South Vietnam."

The next question, then, is, What are we doing to stop the aggression? First, we are continuing the effort which began several years ago—we are assisting the South Vietnamese with economic aid, with agricultural experts, with engineers, and with doctors and nurses and medical supplies. But this aid cannot be truly effective in an atmosphere of terror designed to create anarchy.

The first requirement of any government must be the ability to control its territory and protect its people. The guerrilla terrorism rampant in South Vietnam must be met and overcome. We are assisting the South Vietnamese to accomplish this internally with arms, materiel, and military support and advisers. At the same time we recognize that the guerrilla terrorism in South Vietnam is inspired, supported, and controlled by Hanoi. This is the reality, and we have determined to face that reality. We are taking action both to weaken their effort by forcibly curtailing the flow of men and supplies, and to impress upon the North Vietnamese that continuing aggression will be costly.

We are taking this action with great reluctance after the most careful consideration at the highest levels of our Government, the most specific warnings to Hanoi, and the persistent accumulation of outrages by North Vietnam against South Vietnam and Americans located there. The record of the past year is one of the greatest examples of patience and restraint in the face of extreme provocation. Let me review that record.

On February 9, 1964, the Vietcong exploded bombs under the bleachers during a softball game in Saigon, killing 2 Americans and injuring 23, including 7 women and 1 child. One week later, the Vietcong attacked a movie theater, killing 3 Americans and wounding 35, including 9 women and children. This kind of terrorism persisted in South Vietnam throughout 1964, yet the United States took no action to retaliate.

The first air strike on a North Vietnamese target by American planes did not occur until after two attacks on our own ships in the Gulf of Tonkin last August. On August 2, 1964, North Vietnamese boats attacked the U.S. destroyer *Maddox* in international waters off the Gulf of Tonkin. We took no military action against North Vietnam. Our only response was a clear statement by the President that we intended to exercise our rights to be in international waters, and the dispatch of another destroyer to the Gulf of Tonkin to reaffirm our rights under international law.

North Vietnam boats again attacked our destroyers 2 days later, on August 4. At this point, the United States retaliated by air strikes limied to the naval bases which were the home ports of the boats and an oil storage area which supported them. Our retaliation was appropriate and fitting. It did not extend beyond August 5. As President Johnson said on August 5, "We still seek no wider war."

There were no U.S. attacks on North Vietnam between August 5, 1964, and February 7, 1965—a period of 6 months. During this period, the President reaffirmed his desire for peaceful settlement. "We are willing to go anywhere, any time, talk to anyone, and try to reason together for peace," he said. "We would rather talk than fight."

The Vietcong responded to this restraint and these peace overtures by intensifying their acts of terrorism. On November 1, 1964, they attacked the Bienhoa Airfield, killing 4 Americans and wounding 72. On November 18, 1964, they bombed a snack bar in Saigon, wounding 18 Americans. On Christmas Eve, they bombed the Brink Hotel, killing 2 Americans and wounding 64. Still we took no action.

Finally, on February 7 of this year, the Vietcong attacked the barracks and airfield at Pleiku, killing 9 Americans and wounding 107. As a result, U.S. planes attacked the North Vietnamese Army barracks at Dong Hoi and Chap Le. Again, we made it plain that this was a limited response to a specific attack. As the President said at the time, "The response is appropriate and fitting. As the U.S. Government has frequently stated, we seek no wider war. Whether or not this course can be maintained lies with the North Vietnamese aggressors."

The Vietcong response came on February 10 when they attacked the U.S. enlisted men's barracks at Qui Nhon, killing 23 Americans and 7 South Vietnamese, and wounding 21 Americans. Once again, we responded in a limited fashion by bombing the Vietnamese Army barracks at Chap Le and Chanh Hoa on the following day.

For 3 weeks there were no further attacks on North Vietnam by our planes. The Vietcong, however, continued in their acts of terrorism. Accordingly, at the end of those 3 weeks, on March 2, we struck the Xom Bang ammunition depot and the Quang Khe naval base in North Vietnam.

Again we paused in our raids, and no air attacks were carried out against the North for the next 11 days. During that period the Vietcong exploded a bomb in a bar frequented by U.S. personnel in Saigon, killing two Americans and three Vietnamese, and wounding five other Vietnamese. The Vietcong attempted unsuccessfully to bomb another U.S. barracks in Saigon.

In short, Vietcong terrorism continued unabated, and has continued up to the present day. As a consequence we and the forces of South Vietnam have been obliged to engage in a continuing program of strikes designed to disable the infiltration apparatus in North Vietnam and to lead the regime in Hanoi to abandon its aggression against the South. In this program we have specifically limited ourselves to military targets to avoid civilian casualties. The raids have been frequent, but so have our indications of willingness to talk. And, unfortunately, so have the acts of Vietcong terrorism.

On March 19 a bomb in a loaf of bread exploded, wounding four Americans in Saigon. On March 30, Vietcong terrorist exploded a 250-pound bomb in front of the U.S. Embassy, killing 2 Americans, including 1 woman, and 14 Vietnamese, and wounding 48 Americans and 106 Vietnamese, many of them innocent bystanders. On April 4, a Vietcong terrorist was apprehended at the Grand Hotel at Danang carrying a plastic explosive which he intended to use there. On April 14, Vietcong terrorists exploded a bomb in an ammunition storage site at Qui Nhon, wounding 31 Americans. On April 19, a Vietcong terrorist exploded a bomb in a bar frequented by U.S. personnel in Ban Me Thuot, wounding four Americans.

Only last weekend, the Vietcong mounted their largest offensive in more than 2 months. They overran the capital of Phuoclong Province, occupying the town for more than 6 hours before being driven off by Government forces. Five Americans were killed, and 13 were wounded.

During this entire period, the President has continued to state unequivocally our willingness to seek a peaceful settlement in Vietnam by talking "to any Government, anywhere, and without any conditions." The President said, as recently as last week:

"We will lay aside these weapons when peace comes—and we hope it comes swiftly. But that is in the hands of others besides ourselves.

"For months now we have waited for a sign, a signal, even a whisper, but our offer of unconditional discussions has fallen on unreceptive ears. Not a sound has been heard. Not a signal has been sighted. Still we wait for a response. Still America is anxious for peace."

From Peiping, on the other hand, comes either silence—or active denunciation of the peacemakers and the idea of negotiation. On the anniversary of V-E Day, for example, we find the official Chinece Communist publication, People's Daily, warning that "it is absolutely impossible to gain through talks what is not won on the battlefield."

The issue in Vietnam is clear. The Communists are determined that there shall be no government save on Communist terms. The answer to the fourth—and final—question I have posed is equally clear: Our objective in Vietnam is to assure that a people with the will to remain free and independent shall have their chance to do so. More than 50,000 soldiers of South Vietnam have been killed or wounded in battle for their country since 1960. Last year alone, the South Vietnamese Army suffered 25 percent more battle casualties, proportionately, than we incurred in the entire 3 years of the Korean war. And still they fight on. This is a nation which is strongly resisting, not a popular uprising, but a calculated, brutal, and bloody aggression from without.

A great philsopher once observed that those who cannot learn history are condemned to repeat it. The whole history of our century—and, indeed, all history—proves conclusively that the appetite for aggression is boundless. Aggression feeds on its own success. There is no known instance of an aggressor ceasing his efforts to subvert his neighbor's freedom because his appetite was satisfied. If we do not stand by South Vietnam today, then we will surely be called upon to face the challenge elsewhere, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow. President Johnson has chosen, with the overwhelming support of the Congress, to face reality and meet the challenge here and now. I know that he has the firm support of the vast majority of the people of this American Republic—a Republic which was born in a revolution to secure the right of people to determine their own destiny. It is the preservation of that right, and that alone, which is the American objective in South Vietnam.

Vietnam Report—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Seigenthaler, able editor of the Nashville Tennessean, is continuing his penetrating reports on Vietnam.

Under unanimous consent, I include the fourth in the series—published in the Nashville Tennessean on May 20—in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

SOUTH VIETNAM FACE REFLECTS MANY CONFLICTS

(By John Seigenthaler)

The face of South Vietnam reflects many conflicts, many ironies, many moods.

It is a nation at war—and yet, except during a Vietcong raid on a village, or a terrorist bombing in the city—the civilians seem to be a people at peace.

It is an impoverished nation—but strangely not a hungry one. It is an illiterate nation—but not an ignorant one. It is a nation with little self-sustaining power—but with considerable potential.

The men of Vietnam are intense and hard-working—but they insist on taking a nap for 2 or 3 hours every afternoon, war or no war. The women are lovely, sensitive, and fashionable—but they turn suddenly tired and old in their middle years. The children are captivating and charming—but their darting eyes have seen too much and betray minds much older than their years.

Most of all the face of South Vietnam reflects a nation which has lost its political sense of direction and some of its national pride. And if the people seem to be too free from worry it may be because many of them are cynical and no longer care.

It is strange how foreigners, exposed to Americans, pick up the manner of speech of Americans and apply it to their own needs. For example the Vietnamese all across the land, have adopted four English words—"too bad about that"—for their own.

These four words are used to express every Vietnamese reaction to disappointment. An American civilian official working with the aid program in Saigon, told me he has heard the trite phrase used to express Vietnamese reaction "to everything from a spilled cup of coffee to the bombing of the American Embassy.

"I think these people have seen so much that they aren't shocked anymore," he said. "They ask you for a cigarette and you don't have one. "Too bad about that,' they say. A few minutes later they read in the paper that the Vietcong murdered a hamlet chief friendly to Americans. 'Too bad about that,' they say."

A few days after I arrived in this country I was talking with an American officer in the field and I asked him if he had heard the phrase "too bad about that."

He suddenly became angry. "Shut that up," he snapped. "It is bad enough that we are the pessimistic, cynical people that we are. But we don't have to give it to these people. I hate those words because they show us at our worst—and the Vietnamese at their worst. We are here to try to show

these people how to build themselves up," he said. "And the most popular words we are able to give them tell them how to tear themselves down by not caring. They have got to care."

I thought it was interesting that four simple words of the English language could create such conversation—even such controversy—halfway round the world in this confused country.

And Vietnam is a confused country. It goes beyond not knowing who the enemy is because the Vietcong seldom wear uniforms. It goes beyond the political chaos that has come from a series of coups topping one national goevrnment after the other.

For example, there has never been an effective official census count of the people in South Vietnam. It is estimated that there are 14 million people in the country—but nobody knows for sure. There may be 15 million, or 13 million.

An American visitor who travels to various sections of the country is certain to feel lost as he moves from one area to another. But that is not so strange in view of the fact that many Vietnamese feel uncomfortable when they move from one area to another.

There are four separate sections of this country with distinctly different outlooks, different economies, different environments.

1. The Mekong Delta, estimated to be home of half the population of South Vietnam, is the rice bowl of southeast Asia. Here the peasant farmers grow enough rice to feed all the mouths in North and South Vietnam—with enough left over for many American rice puddings. The delta, which also is coconut country, has been the scene of repeated Vietcong attacks.

"The Vietcong want the delta because it will help them feed North Vietnam and the Chinese," an American briefing officer told me. He pointed to two reports turned in on 2 successive days last week. These charts indicated that on Tuesday 22 of 27 harassing actions by the Vietcong occurred in the delta area. The next day 13 of 17 harassing actions by the Vietcong were in the delta.

The delta farmers are poor, but their children are well-fed if not well-washed. Nobody in the delta must do without food. It came as a shock to me to learn that the Vietcong impose a tax on the farmers. I talked with a Government district chief, Ho Van Trinh, of the Cho Gao Delta district.

He is an appointee of the Government in Saigon and holds the rank of captain.

Through an interpreter he told me the Vietcong tax farmers in his district at least 100 percent more than the Government taxes them. If the farmer refuses to pay, the Vietcong may steal his crops, or burn them, or draft his sons.

For this reason, said Trinh, the Vietcongs are not popular in the delta.

What, I asked, do the Vietcong do with the money they collect in taxes from delta farmers? "They use it to put reward money on the head of Americans, working to keep us in the delta," he said.

2. Saigon, the major city and national capital, is completely different from the delta. The people have come to depend more directly on the influx of American soldiers to improve their standard of living.

"The French never paid good tips for any service they received from people who work as waiters or bellboys," said the manager of the hotel where I stayed. "Now the Americans come and they give big tips. Everybody has a higher standard of living," he said.

The taxation of business and business people by the Vietnamese Government in the central city is substantial. A British businessman who is stationed in Saigon told me he pays 25 percent of his income to the Government—"and I get practically not a damned thing for it.

"I get no police protection. The water is bad. The sewerage system is abominable. The streets are all dirty and they won't collect the garbage regularly. But my firm does well here—and so here I stay," he said.

The Vietcong tries to collect taxes from the cities too—but because the government forces are so strong in Saigon the Vietcong operates subrosa, making demands largely on bar operators who cater to American soldiers. In effect the Vietcong taxes are "protection money" to keep the enemy from tossing a bomb through the front door and blowing up the place.

It has happened several times to bar operators who would not pay. Now the fronts of bars are decorated with iron grillwork—as additional protection against bombings.

Education is becoming more and more recognized as necessary by the South Vietnamese. In 1955, as the French left Vietnam, about 350,000 children were in schools—mostly in the major cities. Now there are 1,200,000 youngsters in schools.

Teaching has been an unpaid profession in Vietnam.

The pay scale is now 1,400 piastras a month. (The official rate of exchange is about 80 piastras to $1 but the black market rate, which is carried on in every hotel and on the street, runs close to 140 piastras to $1). By comparison a regular army soldier makes 1,166 piastras as base pay each month.

I visited a school in Saigon. The children were clean and well dressed—not at all like the urchins I found around the hotel and on the riverfront at all hours of the day and night. The teachers were bright women, most of whom spoke English and French.

Saigon is becoming more and more a cosmopolitan city. There are dozens of beggars and street corner confidence men waiting to pluck unsuspecting Americans. There are places to eat and shops to choose from where merchandise is on shelves—but many Vietnamese make themselves at home on the sidewalk, opening their "shops" there, serving and eating food there and at midday, taking their naps there.

3. The coastal area is supported almost entirely by a fishing economy. Fly along the long coastal area from Bac Lieu which is near the southernmost tip of Vietnam, up to Da Nang in the northern section of the country and you can see little fishing vessels offshore that number in the thousands.

Picturesque fishing villages dot the coastline and some of the most delicious seafood in the world is available in almost every village of any size. Along the coast about a third of the distance up the shoreline between Saigon and the 17th parallel is Nha Trang—called "the Riviera of Vietnam."

It has a beautiful beach and a lovely isolated bay. Here the South Vietnamese have established a recreational and rehabilitation center for their armed forces—and there are reports that the Viet Cong also send their men to this area to recover from hardships of war.

An American civilian located at Nha Trang with the U.S. aid program told me he believes there is an unofficial truce in and around Nha Trang and that both sides observe it so that these soldiers can recuperate without fear of attack or capture.

Americans believe that the big leak in the supply of arms coming from North Vietnam to the Vietcong is by fishing boats, along the coast and then inland.

Several large caches of arms have been located near the coast reecntly—one after a 16-year-old, who has been trusted by the Vietcong, defected to the government.

In an effort to stem the flow of arms from north to south by sea, the U.S. Navy has been aiding the meagre Vietnamese navy in the search of fishing boats.

In 1964, for example, the amazing number of 200,000 junks was checked by officials off the South Vietnamese coast and for the first three months of this year 47,000 more have been checked.

Of these, 1,850 were detained last year and 518 have been detained this year.

This, of course, creates a bad impression in the minds of the loyal South Vietnamese fishermen who go out each morning to fill up their nets—and who curse the patrol boats which frighten away the fish. The fishermen live a hard, rugged life—but again, the food is plentiful along the coastal areas and while few are rich, few are also hungry.

The hot mountain area of South Vietnam, north of Saigon and in the direction of the Cambodian and Laotian broders, is inhabited by primitive tribes known as the Montagnards. These tribes—there are about eight of them—do not consider themselves Vietnamese, even though they reside within the borders of Vietnam.

They live largely from the land, hunting with bows and arrows. Their dress is usually scant and many of them have considered themselves outside the reach of the South Vietnamese Army draft.

They seem to like Americans and are accepting assistance from U.S. military and civilian personnel. The U.S. aid program has constructed a new technical school at Ban Me Thout—the village considered headquarters of the Montagnard Tribes.

Gradually some of the tribesmen have come to accept military training. They seem to resent the efforts by the Vietcong to lecture them on communism. They have presented a perplexing problem to the Government, only emphasizing the differences in people who make up South Vietnam.

A lieutenant stationed at Ban Me Tuoc, working with Montagnard tribesmen, told me: "I'm sure that Ambassador Maxwell Taylor and Gen. William Westmoreland are having their troubles helping the country get a stable government.

"But," he said, "if they want to know what real problems are, they should spend a weekend up here with me dodging arrows."

He said it in a light vein. But his plight serves to bring home the tremendous difficulties Americans face as they try to bring stability to Vietnam by "winning the minds and hearts of the people."

U.S. forces in Vietnam are working hard to try to understand the Vietnamese—and make them understand that the Vietcong forces offer only tyranny and servitude. It will take a long time to teach the Vietnamese all they must know about democracy. It may take longer than it will require to drive the Vietcong out of this country—and that will be a very long time.

Hoosier Capital's Newest Plus; Classrooms and Test Tubes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of interest has been expressed recently by my constituents in the 11th District of Indiana about locating the proposed new national accelerator laboratory in Indianapolis. The Atomic Energy Commission has indicated that a suitable site for the accelerator would contain at least 3,000 acres, have a large supply of water available, and offer good transportation, communication, housing, educational, and cultural advantages.

Indianapolis officials presently are seeking approval of a bond issue which would finance the purchase of land and construction of a 10 billion gallon water reservoir at the northwest edge of Indianapolis. Ample land and water would be available for the 61 to 8-year construction schedule planned for the accelerator. In addition, Indianapolis has other attributes which make it ideally suited for location of the atomic facility.

This fact has been detailed in a feature article on Indianapolis which appears in the April 1965 issue of Industrial Development & Manufacturers Record. The article, written by Herald Latham, states that Indianapolis is a major education research center. Mr. Latham takes note of the unparalleled interstate highway construction in the area and points to the fact that the city is served by 6 airlines, 103 trucking lines, and 6 railroads. In addition, he states that Indianapolis has more than 1,100 manufacturing plants producing more than 1,200 types of products.

The article tells of the expanding educational facilities of Indiana and Purdue University, as well as Butler University, Marian College, and Indiana Central College. And the city is described as one which, "has a big labor pool of industrial-trained workers, plenty of water, realistic tax rates, top-flight utility service, and industrial sites without end."

Because of the excellent presentation of Indianapolis as a community of outstanding cultural, educational, and industrial assets, and great potential, I place in the RECORD the text of the article which appeared in Industrial Development & Manufacturers Record:

HOOSIER CAPITAL'S NEWEST PLUS: CLASSROOMS AND TEST TUBES

(By Herald Latham)

There is rising in Indianapolis what could—and very probably will—become one of the great educational-research centers of the Midwest. At least, that is what its enthusiastic boosters say and confidently believe.

The heart of the complex will be the booming and ever-growing medical center of the Indiana University, which even now is acquiring enough land to more than double its present acreage on the peninsula formed by the White River and Fall Creek, a location only a stone's throw from famed Monument Circle in the center of the city.

The additional land will be used both for medical center expansion and the concentration-expansion of three other Indiana University facilities in the city. Slated for eventual transfer to a combined campus is the university's law school branch in the capital city, its "regular campus" for night students in the downtown area, and the Normal College, which has turned out some of the country's great gymnasts and which specializes in training secondary school coaches.

BIG MEDICAL COMPLEX

With approximately 2,200 students in seven disciplines now, the medical center currently is carrying out research and experimentation to the tune of almost $6 million annually. Subjects range from anatomy to urology, with 18 other titles in between.

A medical center spokesman, in conducting ID on a tour through the vast complex of three complete university hospitals (plus a VA hospital and a Marion County general hospital) pointed out that the center during the last 4 years has enrolled the largest freshman class of medical students in the United States. That doesn't mean, he said, that "we are the biggest—it only gives you an idea of our size."

When the concentration of Indiana University's facilities in Indianapolis is completed by the end of the decade, it will have nearly 7,000 students—even if there is no statistical student growth between now and then. The great probability is, however, that there will be growth in the interim.

Of high interest in the Hoosier capital is the coming expansion of Purdue University's branch in the city. With money appropriated by the last session of the State legislature, the expansion is being studied now. It will round out the city's academic attraction for industry when it is an accomplished fact.

Purdue, one of the Nation's outstanding schools of engineering, currently is offering courses in its capital city branch in a number of technical fields. Officials of the institution proudly point out that courses are designed to fit needs of the community and industry.

BUTLER ENJOYS GROWTH

Butler University, whose campus less than 18 months ago was graced with one of the "10 best concert halls" in the United States, is another fine institution in Indianapolis. With an enrollment of 4,000, Butler officers both B.A. and B.S. degrees and selected graduate studies.

Completed on the campus late in 1963 was Clowes Memorial Hall, a 2,200-seat, $3.7 million edifice given to the college in the memory of Dr. George Henry Alexander Clowes, the late research director for Eli Lilly & Co., one of Indianapolis' major industries.

The concert hall, beautifully designed and acoustically outstanding, is even better than Lincoln Center in New York, according to the artists who have performed in both. To illustrate Clowes Hall's attraction, last February 18, Butler President Alexander E. Jones and Rudolph Bing, general manager of the New York Metropolitan Opera, signed a contract for the premiere performances of the Met's brand new National Co. The National Co. will move to Butler for a 2-month stay (Aug. 2–Oct. 2) while it rehearses its repertoire of 10 operas. The operas will be performed during the last 2 weeks of the stay.

Rounding out Indianapolis' institutions of higher learning are Indiana Central College, with about 2,000 students, and Marian College, with more than 500 students. Both are considered excellent schools, and both have enjoyed recent expansion in their physical plants.

Indianapolis also boasts 12 technical schools which teach subjects ranging from accounting to automation.

Within an hour's drive of the city, which is at the geographic center of the State, are some of the Nation's great institutions of higher learning. This means that industrialists and researchers in the Indianapolis area have a wide variety of academic pursuits available. Among these institutions are Indiana University at Bloomington, Purdue at Lafayette, Depauw University, Indiana State University, Ball State University, and others.

TRANSPORT MEASURES UP

While its educational facilities, both current and future, are of prime importance to industrialists, of more immediate concern are the city's characteristics which apply to manufacturing or product distribution. Indianapolis measures up there, too.

Almost since its founding in 1820, the city has been an industrial city. It continues to be just that, located as it is in the heart of the East-North Central States. It has a tremendous highway system (7 interstate highway legs lead to it), good air transportation, 6 airlines, excellent trucking service (103 lines), and service by 6 major railroads—the New York Central, Pennsylvania, B. & O., Illinois Central, Nickel Plate, and the Monon. It has a big labor pool of industrial trained workers, plenty of water, realistic tax rates, topflight utility service, and industrial sites almost without end.

PLANTS, 1,100; PRODUCT, 1,200

It is characteristics such as these which have helped officials of more than 1,100 manufacturing plants to establish plants in the metropolitan area. At the last count, these plants were producing more than 1,200 types of products, among the most important of which are aircraft and truck engines, communications equipment, auto parts, pharmaceuticals and biologicals, metal casting, phonograph records, TV sets, food products, meatpacking, paper products, printed matter, construction machinery, and many others.

Manufacturing firms with 500 or more employees

Allison Division	12,000
Western Electric	7,800
Eli Lilly and Co	7,200
Radio Corp. of America	6,200
Link-Belt Co	3,825
Chevrolet	3,800
Chrysler	3,600
International Harvester	3,000
Ford Motor Co	2,900
Hygrade Food Products	2,600
P. R. Mallory & Co	1,600
Diamond Chain	1,300
Bridgeport Brass	1,250
Bryant Manufacturing	1,250
Stokely-Van Camp	1,240
Schwitzel Corp	1,200
Pitman-Moore	1,200
U.S. Rubber	1,100
The Buehler Corp	1,000
Fairmount Glass Corp	1,000
Stark, Wetzel & Co	850
Shuron Continental	850
Stewart-Warner	840
Herff Jones Co	700
The Richardson Co	700
Inland Container	650
Bobbs-Merrill	650
Le Tourneau-Westinghouse	650
Peerless Pump	520

FOUR OF THE LARGEST

As of December 1, 1964, there were 20 industrial concerns in Indianapolis which employed 1,000 or more workers, according to a count by Frederic Beyer, assistant general manager of the city chamber of commerce. There also were 9 plants hiring between 500 and 999 employees, and 44 which employed between 100 and 499 workers. A representative listing of these firms is elsewhere in this report.

Four of the 500 largest firms in the country, according to Fortune magazine, are headquartered in the city of the famed "Indy 500." They are Eli Lilly, Stokely-Van Camp, Inland Container, P. R. Mallory Co.

Total industrial employment is more than 100,000.

HUB FOR INTERSTATES

You don't have to visit Indianapolis to spot one of its most noteworthy characteristics. Just look at any recent road map and you'll see an industrial advantage not duplicated in any other city in the country: the convergence and interchange of four interstate highways (seven legs) and the near-complete circumferential Interstate 465. Converging on the city like the spokes of a wheel to its hub are Interstate Highway 65 and 74 north and south, 70 east and west, and 69 northeast.

But this isn't all, in addition to the Interstate System, Indianapolis also has six U.S. highways and several State highways converging on it. And officials of Indianapolis and Marion County, of which Indianapolis is the county seat, long ago recognized the need for major arteries in the metropolitan area and set about building them. The result is well-above-average streets for internal communications.

Before the Interstate System was born, metropolitan officials determined there was a

need for a circumferential route to relieve crosscity traffic conditions. So they built Route 100. Now Route 100 serves a double capacity—that of both supplementing "circum-urban" Interstate 465 and of tying its two ends together pending its competition in the fairly near future.

EIGHT-COUNTY AREA

With a population of approximately 700,000 and an eight-county metropolitan area population estimated to hit almost 1.1 million this year, you can see why officials have been anxious to solve surface transportation problems even before they arise. The eight-county area—consisting of Boone, Hamilton, Hancock, Hendricks, Johnson, Morgan, and Shelby Counties in addition to Marion—is expected to rise to 1.5 million by 1980, with Marion's count to be at about 1.1 million.

WELL-DESIGNED PARK

On the outskirts of Indianapolis across circumferential Route 465 from Weir Cook jet airport is one of the best designed industrial-research and development-office parks ID has had the opportunity to inspect. Called Park Fletcher after its founder, Sam Fletcher of Fort Wayne, the park encompasses 700 acres of level, well-drained land with a high-bearing capacity.

The park is bounded on the west by Route 465 and on the southeast by Interstate 70. Cutting it almost squarely in two is the Airport Expressway to the downtown area. The Pennsylvania Railroad serves it with a spur line.

The northern 400 acres of the park have been zoned for light and medium industry while the southern half has been reserved for research and development and office buildings. It is fully served by all utilities and sanitary and storm drains. The development, with its curving, heavy-duty streets, was designed by the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation—which explains why its various features fit so well into the landscape.

The developers are just now completing two speculation buildings—single story, attractive buildings—of 25,466 and 17,378 square feet respectively. During ID's visit workers were busy erecting a large structure for A. B. Dick. Caterpillar already has a supply depot up and serving its customers.

TWO ADDITIONAL PARKS

Two other industrial parks are located in the outskirts of the city, too. They are Northwest Industrial Park and Sky Harbor Industrial Center. Both are well located in regards to highway, rail, and air transportation.

Sky Harbor, a 67-acre tract subdivided into plots of 2 to 5 acres in size, has a number of modern plants on it already. Protected by covenant, as are both Park Fletcher and Northwest, Sky Harbor is inside the city limits. It is fully severed by utilities, gas, water, storm and sanitary sewers.

Northwest Industrial Park, 150 acres in size, is situated at the intersection of one of the city's main east-west arteries and U.S. 52 to Chicago. Plans call for Interstate 65 to cut through one end of it. It is served by the New York Central.

Within 5 minutes' drive of housing ranging from the modest to luxury, the park has adopted protective covenants. Site sizes are from as small as one-half acre to as much as 15.

FAR-SIGHTED PLANNING

As with most growing metropolitan areas, Indianapolis has had its growing pains. But, thanks to an active chamber of commerce and an interested citizenry, the pains have not been as severe in this case as they might have been. The reason: A far-seeing zoning and planning effort adopted by the Metropolitan Planning Commission of Marion County.

With offices in the 28-story, ultramodern Indianapolis-Marion County Office Building, Assistant Director of Planning Raymond Lee told ID that "we have a plan that has the widest of flexibility, yet more than adequately protects both industrial and residential areas."

About 38 miles of land have been zoned for industry in Marion County (including Indianapolis), which is about 10 percent of the county's area. Of the total, 15 square miles were added when the new plan went effect. But, contrary to age-old criteria of giving to industry what others don't want, much of the industrial land is exceptionally choice for whatever purpose you might choose.

FLEXIBLE APPLICATION

The heart of the plan is this: If the use will not conflict with neighbors and their processes, and meets standards, industry heavier than that for which the land is zoned may be built on it. For example, suppose you want a particular piece of land that just suits your purposes but it is zoned for light industry instead of your medium process. If your work meets performance requirements and does not conflict with that of your neighbor's, you may go ahead with your plan.

With enlightened leadership such as this, you can understand why the Indianapolis area fully expects future growth to insure its continued leadership in diversified manufacturing—a point which over the years has contributed much to the area's economic stability.

And it is this stability and expected growth which have acted as incentives for the Indianapolis Power & Light Co., and the Indianapolis Water Co., which serve the city and its immediate environs, to continue orderly expansion programs in order to give first-rate service.

Last year IP&L sold more than 2 billion kilowatts, an increase of 150 million from 1963. Last year, too, on August 3, the company set alltime records for both hourly (789,000) and a 24-hour (14.8 million) kilowatt output. In order to meet rising demands such as this, the company is erecting now a two-unit generation unit. The first 250,000-kilowatt unit will be in service in May 1967, and the second 450,000-kilowatt unit will start generation in May 1970. Total cost: nearly $76 million. Growth, too, has prompted the electric utility to undertake a complete renovation and addition to its headquarters building in Indianapolis at a cost of $5.25 million. The project will be comleted by next spring.

NO WATER RESTRICTIONS

The water company, which enjoyed an 11.3 percent increase in revenues, to $12.7 million, last year, proudly points to its record of being able to amply supply without restrictions or rationing all Indianapolis water needs even during times of extreme drought.

Credit for such a record, says Board Chairman Jack Reich, should be given to a board of directors of more than 40 years ago. The board foresaw the growth of their city and made plans to meet water demands. According to these plans, two reservoirs were constructed—one each on Fall Creek and Cicero Creek, a tributary of the White River—to undergird the main White River source during times of drought. The plans have paid off, for during the interim, usage has nearly trebled from 26.4 to 75.3 million gallons daily.

There is one more point that should be made about Indianapolis: It is considered one of the top five "test markets" in the country. With such a reputation among the Nation's sellers, it is no wonder the city has been a favorite of industry.

Hon. Harry F. Byrd Honored by Order of Fraternal Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday night, May 17, 1965, the Grand Council of the Order Fraternal Americans, at their State convention, honored U.S. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, a distinguished constituent of the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia which I have the privilege to represent.

This well-known patriotic American organization conferred upon Senator BYRD the Outstanding Virginia Citizen Award as testimony to his dedicated service to his State and Nation. I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD the acceptance remarks made by Senator BYRD on that occasion:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

I am greatly honored to be chosen by the Grand Council, Order Fraternal Americans, to receive your fifth Virginia Citizen Award and Citation.

You are an order of high purposes—a patriotic fraternal benefit society for the working men. Your motto is virtue, liberty, and patriotism. You are dedicated to community service.

And, I know the strict rules under which you give this award and citation to Virginians for "important contribution of service to community and State."

I think it would be appropriate for me to accept the honor with an expression of my deep gratitude to the people of Virginia for allowing me to serve them in State and national office for nearly 50 years.

And, along with this, I should like to say that, as a representative of Virginia in the U.S. Senate, I believe I owe my allegiance to the people of our Commonweath and to the Constitution of the U.S.—partisan political platform planks to the contrary notwithstanding.

I think the great and constructive development in Virginia can be attributed to our adherence to fundamentals as a basis for sound progress.

I watch closely the progress of Virginia. And, compared with national averages, there has been development in the State in which all of us can take great pride.

A few years ago a political opponent of mine made the mistake of saying Virginia was characterized by "dry rot." Facts and figures proved his statement was tommyrot.

If our faith in fundamentals makes us conservative, I am proud to wear the label. But we should be careful when we label people conservative, liberal, etc.

For instance, I have heard these labels defined like this: A conservative defends existing evils; while a liberal wants to replace existing evils with other evils.

Labels like these mean different things to different people. They remind me of the soldier who told the Army doctor he had a pain in his abdomen. The doctor said: "Son, let's get your trouble straight. Only officers have pains in the abdomen. Sergeants have pains in the stomach. You are a buck private, so you have got just a plain bellyache."

Webster says a conservative favors conservation of existing institutions and forms of government. I believe our form of govern-

ment, with its institutional checks and balances, is the finest ever devised.

It was devised to safeguard our liberties through its dual system of State and Federal Government, and through its separation of executive, legislative, and judicial powers at each level.

This is the form of government that has nourished our competitive enterprise system. And it is the competitive enterprise system which has made sound progress possible.

I believe sound progress should be the primary purpose of every man's life—and the primary objective of all government—Federal, State, and local.

I believe progress is not sound if it is based on unsound financing. In Virginia, our financing is sound—without deficits or debt. And, our progress is solid.

I wish this were true in the Federal Government across the Potomac. Over there, they follow the advice of "brain trusters"—which usually winds up increasing Federal debt and concentrating power in Washington.

Sometimes I think "brain trusters" are people whose education does not include horsesense. (Horsesense is just stable thinking). They deal in theory until their theories are kicked out by facts.

When you analyze their theories, it looks like they are trying to tie a lot of holes together with a piece of string. Let me give you just a few examples.

They bring out monthly figures showing millions unemployed, which I want corrected. But in Washington they are proposing to repeal immigration quotas and let in more people to compete for the jobs we have.

They reduced expenditures to an increase of $2 billion over last year. They cut taxes to increase revenue. And the deficit was curtailed down to more than $5 billion.

What does all of this fiscal mumbo-jumbo add up to? They raised the debt limit to $324 billion to take care of the increase in revenue, and the so-called reduction in expenditures and deficit.

Deficits—you know—they are what you have when you've got less than nothing. And debt is what you have to pay interest on when you borrow money. Interest on the Federal debt is $11 billion a year.

Somebody figured that, paying at the rate of a dollar a minute, it would take 600,000 years to pay off the Federal debt as it now stands. But we aren't paying it off. We are adding to it.

The Federal Government has been in the red 29 out of the past 35 years. Continuing Federal deficits can breed inflation at home and lack of confidence in the dollar abroad.

The purchasing power of the dollar has dropped 55.6 cents since 1939. Gold backs our money. But instead of dollars, foreigners have been taking gold in payment of debts we owe them. Since 1949, they have taken nearly half of all the gold we had.

Legend makes a big thing out of George Washington throwing a coin across the Rappahannock River. But since 1945 we have thrown more than $115 billion over the seven seas in foreign aid.

And, as another example of what goes on in Washington, the so-called voting rights bill, now before the Senate, condones an eighth-grade voting test in New York, but it gives Federal registrars authority to qualify morons to vote in Alabama.

I could go on with examples of Federal prodigality and concentration of power through usurpation of the rights of States and individuals.

But I want to mention the world "liberty." I compliment you for including it in your motto. To me it is a word of special meaning, and I think it should be to all Americans.

We hear much talk these days about freedom—and I think there is more talk than thought. But we seldom find attention—or even lipservice—given to liberty.

Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty (not freedom) or give me death." We refer to the great bell in Philadelphia as the Liberty Bell (not the freedom bell). The Statue of Liberty is in New York Harbor.

Our hymn "America" says "let freedom ring," but it calls our country "sweet land of liberty," and it pays tribute to "our Fathers' God", as the "Author of Liberty."

There is good reason to believe our Founding Fathers deliberately chose the word "liberty" for use in our basic documents, and elsewhere.

The preamble to the Constitution says a basic purpose for the formation of the United States was to secure the blessings of "liberty" (not freedom).

The second sentence of the Declaration of Independence holds that "life, liberty (not freedom), and the pursuit of happiness" are among the inalienable rights of man.

And the Declaration of Independence goes on to say "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." And, we, the people, are the governed who delegate powers to the government.

It is clear to me that the Founding Fathers understood the word "freedom" to carry the connotation of unrestrained * * * and that they understood the word liberty to mean freedom restrained by the responsibilities of citizenship, and orderly self-government, under law.

We are in a new era of atomic energy, rockets, and space. We have the capacity and know-how for development. We are a God-fearing people who have demonstrated our courage and capabilities.

With responsible citizenship, responsible Government, fiscal soundness, and adherence to the principles of our system there should be no fear for the future.

Without these, there will be neither solid progress, nor security with military preparedness. I want the life of this Nation to be the longest and best in history.

I commend the Order Fraternal Americans for its dedication to virtue, liberty, and patriotism. I take this gratifying occasion to rededicate myself to your ideals.

Thank you, and you have my very best wishes.

Derwinski Needles Russians in Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, among the most important assignments which are undertaken by Members of Congress are those as delegates to interparliamentary meetings.

Recently, the Interparliamentary Union held its spring Conference in Dublin, Ireland. The activities there drew the attention of Columnist Willard Edwards who reported on the Conference in a penetrating article in the Chicago Tribune of Sunday, May 9.

The key point which the article emphasizes is the effective role played by our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, "ED" DERWINSKI, in representing the U.S. Congress in debate with Soviet and other Communist delegates. It is especially noteworthy that Congressman DERWINSKI, a Republican, was cast in the role of vehemently defending the foreign policy of the Johnson administration.

I believe that the Members will be fascinated to read this account, dramatizing as it does a most unique international meeting, which escaped the attention of most American newspapers:

DERWINSKI NEEDLES RUSSIANS IN IRELAND: ROUSES THEIR IRE AT MEETING OF 45 NATIONS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, May 8.—The spokesman for the Communist bloc was loudly indignant. He shouted a demand for apologies.

The representative of the United States, he fumed, had just used the odious term of "Russian satellite" to describe the free and democratic Socialist republics of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary, and Poland.

Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois, author of the offending term, was unperturbed by the interruption.

"OK," he said mildly. "I'll call them 'puppets' instead."

FORTY-FIVE NATIONS AT TABLE

This was one of the memorable incidents carried back to the capital this week by participants in the latest meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Dublin, Ireland, April 19–25.

Forty-five nations were represented at the gatherings in Leinster House, seat of the Irish Parliament. This sanctum for expression of the Gaelic temperament has witnessed some notable exchanges, breathing passion and fire, in the past.

The recent proceedings, however, by general agreement, were featured not only by frenzied verbal clashes but by odd voting patterns, and unusual political developments.

The assembled Europeans, Asiatics, and Africans were mystified, for example, by Russian attacks upon the United States based upon speeches by prominent Democratic Senators.

CALLS JOHNSON BARBARIAN

They heard I. Spiridonov, head of the Soviet group, call for denunciation of American Armed Forces for using "toxic gases" in Vietnam and buttress his assaults with quotations from speeches by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate foreign relations, ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon.

As the Russian leader referred to President Johnson as a barbarian who fomented war, the delegates waited for some Democratic spokesman to reply to this attack upon a Democratic President.

Instead, they heard DERWINSKI, a Republican member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, defend the American position. He was joined by Representative ALEXANDER PIRNIE, Republican, of New York, who took the place which was to have been occupied by Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia. The southern Senator had been forced to cancel the trip because his services were urgently needed to fight civil rights legislation in the Senate.

AVERTS CONDEMNATION OF UNITED STATES

The 11-man U.S. delegation included 5 Democrats, in addition to TALMADGE, but they were occupied with other duties when the Russian attack took place in the Interparliamentary Council which climaxed the meeting.

DERWINSKI, in the unaccustomed role of defending the Johnson administration, han-

died the task so well that a series of subsequent votes found the Russian bloc losing its attempts to put the meeting on record against U.S. policies.

When a Czechoslovakian delegate joined in the anti-American chorus, the Chicago Congressman reminded him:

"Our armies helped to liberate your country in World War II. We did not stay on as conquerors. And we will leave southeast Asia when peace has been restored."

IGNORES APPEASEMENT

When the uproar broke over his use of the term "Russian satellites," the presiding officer sent him a note, nervously suggesting that he call the Communist bloc countries "associate powers" of Russia. DERWINSKI ignored this plea for appeasement. After provoking more outcries by offering to substitute puppets, he resumed use of the term satellites. The Communist delegates glowered but subsided.

DERWINSKI made use of President Johnson's speech at Johns Hopkins University, emphasizing that the sole purpose of American troops in Vietnam was to restore peace and freedom.

When the Russians quoted Senators FULLBRIGHT, GRUENING, MORSE, CHURCH, and CLARK, noting that these members of the President's own party were vociferous critics of his Vietnam policies, DERWINSKI replied:

"Those men do not speak for the American Government or for the American people."

ODD VOTING PATTERNS

Such details are not reported in the official proceedings. There is no transcript. Only a broad summary of the discussions and a list of adopted resolutions are made available.

Some odd voting patterns were disclosed in a record compiled by DERWINSKI for his own use.

On the first vote on a resolution condemning military intervention by the United States in southeast Asia, Russia collected 19 votes, those of the Eastern European bloc, plus Indonesia and Mongolia. Twenty-nine votes defeated the resolution. Nine countries abstained.

When much of the anti-American language was deleted but condemnation of "aerial bombardments" was retained, the resolution failed, 27 to 27 with 10 abstentions.

WATER DOWN RESOLUTION

The resolution, as finally amended, merely urged negotiations to end the conflict without any preconditions, and it was adopted 42 to 14, the Russian bloc remaining adamant to the end.

Somewhat surprisingly, DERWINSKI noted two votes from the French delegates were consistently cast in favor of the United States position which has been denounced by President Charles de Gaulle. Some African nations, such as Ghana, which are usually hostile, abstained.

"The State Department keeps telling us that the Communist bloc is softening or mellowing and that we should seek a bridge to east Europe," DERWINSKI noted. "It was not evident at this conference. Poland, for example, seemed to be following a harder line than ever before. Yugoslavia stayed with the Soviet bloc except on one vote."

MAKES HAPPY JUNKETS

Although it was founded 72 years ago, the Interparliamentarian Union is virtually unknown and its meetings twice a year are usually ignored. Its membership is open to all nations with a parliamentary form of government which claims to have free elections.

On Capitol Hill, the semiannual gatherings are, to many legislators, an occasion for happy junkets to foreign cities. A score or more of Senators and Representatives are appointed to attend them. Many use the opportunity for sightseeing and ignore most of the meetings.

DERWINSKI was first appointed to attend a meeting in Warsaw in 1959 because he is fluent in Polish but has now become a veteran delegate, sojourning to Belgrade, Copenhagen, and Brazilia in the last 3 years. He said he found the gatherings educational in keeping track of Soviet political strategy and valuable for cultivating friendships with legislative representatives in other countries.

LEARN SHIFTING MOODS

"The Communists, of course, use these meetings, as they use the United Nations, as propanganda sounding boards," he remarked. "If we didn't go to them to defend ourselves, we would be clobbered. We also learn the shifting moods in other countries and sometimes find surprises such as the votes of the two French delegates at the Dublin meeting.

"The new nations in Africa are eager for membership as a status symbol. They watch the encounters between the Communists and the free world nations. It may not be much more than a debating society but the small countries take note of the winners and losers of the debates and draw their own conclusions. Many of them are friendlier to the United States than is generally believed.

"The most important lesson to be learned is that the Soviet bloc seems to be hardening its line rather than softening it as so many in the administration are try to convince us."

Bouquet for Art Modell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Art Modell, has done a wonderful job with the Cleveland Browns, and I am delighted to see the Cleveland Plain Dealer take editorial cognizance of the fact.

Art has proven to be a Solomon in the case of Archie Roberts and I commend the article to sports-loving colleagues:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, May 23, 1965]

A BOUQUET FOR ART MODELL

Art Modell, president of the Cleveland Browns, deserves a special award from pro football and perhaps from the entire pro sports world for his handling of the Archie Roberts case.

In lieu of that, the Plain Dealer sends him a large bouquet as a symbol of appreciation.

Too often a professional sport is found, fairly or unfairly, in a position of selfish gain at the expense of a complete education for a promising athlete. But Modell's arrangement of Robert's future for the next 3 years is unique.

Other pro football players have gone on to become doctors and a few have played pro football to help eke out expenses of medical school. But Robert's case is different.

Roberts will be graduated by Columbia University this term and already he is enrolled at Western Reserve University Medical School. He is a brilliant student and has ambition to become a doctor. He also was one of the East's greatest quarterbacks, prime material for a passer in pro ranks. The problem was how could a man try to achieve twin ambitions almost simultaneously?

Modell had the answer.

Roberts and his wife will receive $14,000 the next 2 years for tuition and living expenses. Meanwhile Roberts will work out briefly with the team at training camp and learn plays and techniques through occasional practice sessions during the season. But he will concentrate for 2 years on medical studies. At the end of that critical period of preparation, in 1967, he will make an earnest effort to try out for the Browns.

The Cleveland Browns' experiment is a fine example of one man's desire to improve professional sport's image in an area where it can stand improvement.

Balance Needed for Probe of Klan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, some time ago when it was first advocated that the Ku Klux Klan be investigated, I addressed myself briefly to the subject on the floor of the House. I pointed out then that it was well to investigate the Klan but that the investigation should not stop there. I expressed the hope that the Committee on Un-American Activities would also investigate the Black Muslims and certain left-wing and communistic inspired organizations such as the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee—SNCC—and other similar groups. I am still in hope, although I must confess that I have not received much encouragement, that Congress will not stop with the Klan investigation.

In this connection, shortly thereafter, the eminent columnist, Mr. Richard Wilson, wrote a timely column along the same line of thought. Certainly no one would charge Mr. Wilson with being a racist or a bigot.

Mr. Wilson's article, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, on March 31, 1965, and in many other respected publications throughout the country, certainly merits consideration.

His article is as follows:

BALANCE NEEDED FOR PROBE OF KLAN

(By Richard Wilson)

When President Johnson publicly advocated a congressional investigation of the Ku Klux Klan, he must have known that the preliminaries of such an investigation already had been laid and a congressional committee was about ready to go ahead with it.

This inquiry was seen by some who favored it as a natural and perhaps necessary preliminary to an investigation of the Communist attempt to penetrate, influence, and exploit the movement for civil rights.

In both cases the Federal Bureau of Investigation has made extensive inquiries of its own. For more than 2 years—in the Kennedy administration as well as the Johnson administration—the FBI has traced Communist influence in the civil rights movement and, in fact, this influence has grown in that time.

The surveillance of the Ku Klux Klan appears to have been far more intensive. The Klan has been infiltrated by the FBI at almost every level, and this probably also is true of the Communist Party.

A thorough congressional investigation of either or both of these extreme elements might be sensational. In one case, that of the Ku Klux Klan, there may have been financial support from otherwise respectable and well-known sources.

In the other case, at least one close adviser of a civil rights leader is classified by the FBI as a hidden Communist, and his participation in the movement runs to the extent of preparing speeches and advising on tactics.

Key civil rights leaders have been warned by Federal officials of the nature and extent of Communist penetration. This needs to be gotten into perspective. No one is saying that the civil rights movement has been taken over by Communists, or that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., or Roy Wilkins are Communists or Communist sympathizers.

Concern is felt at the highest levels of government because the infiltration may have gone farther than the leaders realize, or that their evaluation of it may be faulty. It is recalled that when the labor movement was in its more militant phase 20 years ago, Communist penetration went beyond the control of the national labor leadership. Not until affirmative action was taken to cleanse Communist-dominated locals and industrywide unions was the Communist drive overcome.

Labor leaders recognized that not only was their own power position threatened but that they could not count on public sympathy and support so long as Communists played such a prominent role.

Somewhat the same problem, though in lesser degree, may now face the civil rights movement, particularly as it now tries to use powerful economic weapons to punish and coerce Southern States. One of the targets of Communist infiltration has been the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), giving the Communists their first important entree on college campuses since the anti-McCarthy reaction.

Another target of Communist infiltration, according to Federal officials, is the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, which gained token recognition in the Democratic National Convention. These elements are dissatisfied with the degree of Dr. King's militancy. A leading rabbi, astounded by what he learned when he began to participate in the movement, declares that what the SNCC wants is "dead bodies—our bodies."

At the opposite extreme, the Ku Klux Klan, Federal officials have been probing for the violation of law by the hooded order. Johnson was not speaking rhetorically when he warned members to get out of the Klan and resume their places in normal life, for the FBI has now had ample time to discover just what kind of a conspiracy the Klan is and how it is financed and supported.

If these activities cannot be ventilated in the courts, or even if they can, Congress has a responsibility to inquire into the invisible empire with a view to determining what additional legislation is needed to control the more pernicious extremist groups.

But the inquiry should be balanced and should include also an exposure of the efforts of Communists to influence and exploit the civil rights movement.

Otherwise, the coming investigation may be merely a vehicle for what dedicated Communists would like best—an exposure of a largely imaginary rightist conspiracy to seize control of the country.

The Dutch Don't Fear Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the constant carping criticism of the French, aimed at all things American, it is refreshing to find a contrary view expressed in one of the preeminent newspapers of Europe, the Haagse Post, of Amsterdam.

I include the following editorial as it appeared in the May 1965 issue of Atlas magazine:

THE DUTCH DON'T FEAR US—THEY'D RATHER COPY OUR METHODS

(By G. B. J. Hiltermann)

(NOTE.—It is hardly a secret that part of the reason for the Frenchman's resentment of the United States is his feeling that American bigness—the bigness of industry, of investments—is swallowing up his Nation. In this article G. B. J. Hiltermann, editor of the influential Haagse Post, counsels the French that the way to avoid being swallowed is to take a leaf out of America's book and to make their own industries competitive.)

The French seem haunted by the fear that they will become an American colony or, at best, the 51st State in the Union. Hence the recent decision by Paris to reject the political and military leadership of Washington, and even close cooperation with other members of the Atlantic community. As the French see it, that way lie political and military subservience to the United States. The French also believe that the American political and military leadership is intimately connected with the gains that American industry has already made in the competition for the large and growing European market. France's Finance Minister has repeatedly urged his fellow Europeans to curtail American investments in Europe, especially when American industry not only provides the capital needed, but manufactures and sells the finished products.

What the French have always feared is American industry's ability to supply any mass market with standard products. Not more than four or five European concerns have as much capital investment behind them as dozens of American concerns can boast, and it is this investment which permits the Americans to conduct research on a scale that only a handful of European companies can match. This extensive research, plus long and varied experience and underlying financial assets, enables the Americans to organize distribution on a scale unknown in Europe.

The French line of argument also is much in vogue at present and certainly has its beginnings in the success story of American industry in postwar Europe. Here are a very few typical developments:

Coca-Cola started things off by becoming enormously popular in Europe since the war, even in the wine-drinking countries. The French raised the cry that they were being subjected to "cocacolonization". And, according to Time magazine, more than 2,100 American companies have entered the European market since 1958, and there have been remarkably few failures. During that period, American investments doubled; they now total some $10 billion. The U.S. Department of Commerce estimates that during 1963 Americans invested $17 billion abroad, $2.5 billion in Europe.

Even Europeans who do not read trade magazines have noticed the growing tide of investment. The important computer market now is dominated mainly by IBM and General Electric. GE merged with Bull, the French computer firm, over the objections of the French Government, and is negotiating with Olivetti and Allgemeine Elektrizitäts Gesellschaft, the German electrical concern. Also noteworthy is the establishment in Paris of a large architectural office which has already built the UNESCO headquarters there and the U.S. Embassy in The Hague. Bitterest of all to the French must be the success of a Franco-American enterprise, Duquesne Purina, which crashed the chicken market by opening a virtual factory which puts 50,000 chickens on the market every week. Not only do the French chicken farmers object; the French gourmets also resent the instrusion of standardized American foods.

And the end is not in sight. Five large American furniture manufacturers have come to the conclusion, on the basis of a European market survey, that Europe is simply dying for the standardized products of a furniture company run along American lines. And American motel operators have plans, not for a few scattered motels but for a network that will cover all of Europe. Less striking but much more important is the market research information compiled by U.S. makers of nuclear reactors, who concluded that Europe's preparations to harness atomic energy for peaceful purposes is lagging and would benefit from an American assist.

The fear that the United States will dominate the European market does not run very high among the Dutch. Holland houses three or four European enterprises that are comparable to the American giants. It is also the only European country which serves as the headquarters for two Anglo-Dutch companies of worldwide scope. Thinking in American dimensions, therefore, is not difficult for Holland, where even those who reject liberal views now generally accept the fact that a liberal approach has become the order of the day. Consequently Holland has no great enthusiasm for restricting American investment and business activity. Nevertheless the French feeling that American firms have a big head start, because of their longer experience with mass markets, cannot be denied.

It is therefore all the more surprising that the French Government spends most of its time pleading for measures to keep American industry out, instead of encouraging steps that would provide a new solution for a new situation. What could be more obvious than the importance of promoting the integration and concentration of European enterprises? You wonder whether European firms have the necessary initiative.

It is not so strange that five American furniture factories got the idea of catering to a big European market; what is strange is that five European manufacturers didn't think of it first. If they have been doing this sort of thing, why hasn't their initiative received attention? If they haven't, it is regrettable.

The French have pointed out a real danger, but they haven't suggested any solution. In most cases a colony colonizes itself. A country and a people accept a colonial relationship when they allow others to do what they themselves should have done. The big decolonization process of our time is the creation of new nations and the education of underdeveloped peoples in order to make the colonizer superfluous. The solution for Europeans threatened with colonization is to get busy.

Naturally, this need not be done in every field of enterprise. It is quite possible that we will continue to use American computers, just as Americans will continue to use French perfumes. As for furniture, chickens, architecture and many other items, European industry, planning its operations for a European market, should be the answer to the American invasion.

High-Speed Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am in-

serting into the RECORD the text of a statement I submitted to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics in connection with its hearings on legislation for research and development in high-speed ground transportation to improve the national transportation system.

My statement was as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, OF CONNECTICUT, SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND AERONAUTICS, HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 1965, RE H.R. 5863 AND RELATED BILLS

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am very grateful to you for this opportunity to present my views regarding the bill H.R. 5863 and related bills, which your committee now has under consideration. Your committee is acting with wisdom in considering this legislation and I feel certain it will reach a wise decision and recommendation.

This legislation would authorize research and development in high-speed ground transportation in order to improve our national transportation system. There is no question that improvement is needed; we are all agreed on that. The longer we wait, the more our transportation system appears to deteriorate. As the process of urbanization grows more rapid, the less our transportation appears to satisfy the needs of the Nation.

I am sure there is no need for me to retell to this committee the problem we have in New England and the northeastern part of the country, particularly in regard to the transportation difficulties encountered by the New Haven Railroad. To date we have still not solved these problems and there is no way of knowing when and if they will ever be solved.

In the last Congress, several Members of Congress introduced a resolution to grant the consent of Congress to eight Northeastern States to enter into a compact for the setting up of a multistate authority to operate fast passenger rail transportation service from Boston to Washington, by way of the State of Connecticut. I was one of the cosponsors of that resolution, but unfortunately no action was taken at the time.

This year, four of us in the House have reintroduced the resolution: the Honorable ROBERT N. GIAIMO, of Connecticut; the Honorable FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, of Rhode Island; the Honorable WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey; and myself. Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island, introduced the resolution in the Senate.

In his state of the Union address on January 4, 1965, President Johnson referred to the need for rapid transit in the Northeast. He said: "I will ask for funds to study high-speed transportation between urban centers. We will begin with test projects between Washington and Boston. On high-speed trains passengers could travel this distance in less than 4 hours."

I believe that the proposal contained in our resolution and the proposals in H.R. 5863 and related bills, which deal with the problem on a national scale, constitute a far-reaching approach and a practical solution to the problem of public transportation. The solution proposed in these measures would make possible fast and dependable rail transportation for the urban areas, where the need for this transportation is greatest. It would also help solve the constant problems and losses sustained by the existing lines operating in these areas, problems and losses with which they seem to be unable to cope.

Adequate passenger transportation service is essential to the welfare of the Nation, as well as to the areas directly involved. Unless this problem is solved quickly, unless fast and adequate transportation service is provided soon, the railroad crisis in this country will grow worse and all parts of the country will suffer economically. Industry will be affected. Retail business will be hurt. The whole business community will suffer. The public will be inconvenienced. In New England we may be threatened with the loss of more industries and with greater unemployment. This may be equally true in other sections of the country.

We cannot and we should not ignore this situation. For this reason, I wish to commend this Committee for its timely consideration of these measures. I look forward to your early and favorable action in reporting a bill which will be a definite step in the direction of a solution to the problem.

Station WEVD's Unique Series: The Jewish Home Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to commend radio station WEVD in New York.

Enormous attention has been focused in both the public and private sectors of our community on the war against disease and suffering.

Enormously expanded educational programs, increased research, extensive modernization and expansion of hospital facilities are all a part of this vitally important effort to combat illness. An interesting aspect of this problem has been the efforts of many of our radio and television stations in presenting programs of interest designed to increase the public awareness of the care and treatment of various illnesses.

In the forefront of this effort has been radio station WEVD in New York. Six years ago the station instituted what was then a unique series on "The Jewish Home Show." It provided a weekly program dealing with all aspects of the medical profession. The program was arranged in conjunction with the various medical societies in New York City.

The emphasis was on preventative medicine and a wide variety of public information was disseminated.

The host of this show has been Ruth Jacobs. Sholem Rubinstein has been the executive director and producer, while Violet L. Kanfer is associate producer. With great imagination and ability they have presented a truly outstanding series which has been applauded and honored by hospitals throughout the city.

WEVD pioneered in these medical broadcasts and many other stations subsequently developed regular series, all with the public well-being in mind.

On the sixth anniversary of these medical broadcasts, I would like to call them to your attention, salute them for their effectiveness, and laud them for their important role in our community.

A Bad Firearms Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Beacon dealing with firearms control legislation which has been introduced in the Congress. We must guard against rushing headlong into the passage of legislation which would fail to keep firearms out of the hands of irresponsible and ciminal persons, and infringe upon the rights of law-abiding citizens.

The editorial follows:

A BAD FIREARMS LAW

A Senate subcommittee is conducting hearings that would curb mail-order sales of any type of firearms, curtail importation of foreign weapons, and classify every firearm with a bore diameter of more than one-half inch as destructive weapons. This would embrace three-fourths of all antique guns—subjecting them to Federal registration, confiscation, or defacement at the pleasure of the Secretary of the Treasury.

When he testified in favor of the bill recently, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY said he also would favor disarming private groups like the Ku Klux Klan, Black Muslims, and Minutemen. Private arsenals should be eliminated, said KENNEDY, and at the very least they should be registered.

Unfortunately, the legislation KENNEDY and many other persons support would prove to be largely ineffectual in its declared purpose—keeping firearms out of the hands of irresponsible and possibly murderous persons. What it would do, instead, is work a grave hardship on the innocent—the hunters and gun collectors.

The Treasury Department could impose burdensome requirements and penalties on any person who moves from one State to another and wants to take his personal firearms with him; also anyone who transports a sporting firearm across a State line for hunting or participation in a sports event.

People intent upon crime will not heed the law that would deprive them of weapons any more than they would regard robbery as impossible because it is illegal. They operate outside the law, and have no respect for any aspect of it that is inconvenient to them.

Aside from the impracticality of this proposed law, there is grave doubt of its constitutionality. The second amendment specifically guarantees the right of the people to keep and bear arms.

A far superior proposal has been advanced by Representative BOB CASEY, of Texas. His bill would, rather than infringing upon the right of Americans to buy and bear arms, make it a crime bearing a mandatory 25-year sentence for anyone using or carrying a firearm during the commission of a robbery, assault, murder, rape, or similar crime.

This won't prevent premediated murder by firearms. Nothing will. But it should make the punks and the hooligans think twice before allowing themselves to be caught with firearms during the commission of any other crime. And that is when a large number of accidental slayings occur.

In any case, this would be a far better law than the one now being considered in Congress, which would penalize the many peaceable users of firearms and prove ineffective against the few who carry them with criminal intent.

La Porte, Ind., Herald-Argus Editorial Supports Volunteers in Service to America—VISTA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity, through the program, Volunteers in Service to America—VISTA—is currently recruiting volunteers to serve the less-privileged citizens of our country. This dramatic antipoverty program provides an opportunity for Americans to help other Americans in rural and urban areas, Job Corps camps, migrant worker communities, Indian reservations, hospitals, schools, and institutions for the mentally ill or mentally retarded.

A fine editorial supporting the Vista recruitment drive appeared recently in the La Porte, Ind., Herald-Argus.

The editorial follows:

DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS

This country's domestic peace corps, VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America), is seeking recruits, individuals interested in serving their fellowman for 1 year for $50 a month and living expenses. Applicants must be 18 years of age or older, single or married with no dependents, and both husband and wife may apply. There are other qualifications but these are the major ones; plus a willingness to live sacrificially.

VISTA is a part of the antipoverty program which is now getting up steam in various fields of endeavor. Those who enlist as volunteers will be doing a variety of social service tasks, not as professionals, but as fellow human beings with a dedicated feeling of wanting to be useful. They will be amateurs motivated by a purpose of helping those who need help to help themselves.

Some will serve in preschool programs for 3- and 4-year-olds in culturally deprived homes, to give these small youngsters the chance to "catch up" with their more fortunate fellows before they enter regular kindergarten or first grade. Some will be counseling youths in job training camps, such as the one being opened at Camp Atterbury near Indianapolis.

The teaching of homemaking to slum families so they can make better use of the meager resources they have will be the task of other VISTA people. Conducting of educational activities of several kinds for young and old in poverty-stricken areas will be an important service.

VISTA will not be a forced-draft program imposed on communities whether they want it or not. Its volunteers will be sent only to places where requests for help have been sent out and where there is a sponsoring agency asking for the volunteer services. To date VISTA has requests from local communities in 20 States for about 250 volunteers. It expects to have about 3,000 workers in the field by the close of this year.

Illustrative of how thoroughly volunteer this program is to be is the fact that applicants accepted for service will be given the chance whenever possible to select their own locations. They will go to serve where they want to go.

VISTA is dedicated to the proposition that sentiments of brotherhood can be translated into positive action. As such it would seem to have an important future among some segments of the deprived and the poverty ridden.

Competition Is the Spice of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of Cornell University, I can only console myself with the thought that—as always, and in every endeavor—competition is, indeed, the spice of life.

In addition, as the Representative in this body of the Ithaca, N.Y., community, I can also say, with real pride, how delighted I am in the great forward strides that have been made these past few years by Ithaca's other educational institution, Ithaca College. Much of what has been accomplished by Ithaca College—with the assistance of the recently enacted Federal programs in aid of higher education and of similar programs at the State level—has been due to the vision of the foresight of Ithaca's College's dynamic president, Howard Dillingham.

An excellent summary of what Ithaca College has been able to achieve under Dr. Dillingham's leadership is contained in this report on Ithaca College, as set forth in Time for May 14, 1965, entitled "How To Buy a Campus," which under leave to extend my remarks, I now set forth:

HOW TO BUY A CAMPUS

"Far above Cayuga's waters
There's a place known well.
'Tis our noble alma mater
Higher than Cornell."

A college in Ithaca, N.Y., that looks down on Ivy League Cornell? As recently as 5 years ago the notion would have been considered absurd. Yet today the 2,200 students of Ithaca College sing that song with considerable spirit—and unquestionable altimetric accuracy. After 73 years as mainly a coed music and physical-education school housed in a seedy assortment of Victorian buildings in downtown Ithaca, the college now occupies 250 windswept acres atop South Hill, where the clean bold lines of its new $30 million, 23-building complex do, indeed, soar high above Cornell.

Ithaca's march up the hill has been remarkably rapid, but its real rarity lies in the fact that the private school's fiscally conservative businessman board has leaned on government, Federal and State, every step of the way. With no endowment, no dependable support from foundations or industry and only 4,000 alumni (most of them unaffluent teachers), Ithaca nevertheless managed to raise $30 million in 5 years—all but $250,000 of it through Government loans and Government-floated bonds.

"A GOOD PRODUCT"

The college's decision to explore every governmental source of money was taken at the urging of its horseback-riding president, Howard Irving Dillingham, 60. A Syracuse Ph. D. in education, Dillingham, although a Quaker, was headmaster of Georgia's Riverside Military Academy (Though Quakers are pacifistic, I am not) when Ithaca summoned him back to New York in 1951, made him president in 1957. When he arrived, Ithaca had no accreditation and many of its students were Cornell flunk-outs who, insists on buseinessman, stuck around town "to enjoy the drinking life."

Dillingham pared many elective courses to concentrate his staff to an unusuall degree on interdisciplinary general studies, which attracted national notice. He raised tuition, upgraded faculty salaries (from a miserable median $3,900 in 1953, they now stand at $10,000). Then, on a summer day in 1959, Dillingham rode up South Hill, looked out over Cayuga Lake and instantly decided: "We will build our campus on the hill."

He knew that there must be some Federal money available for college construction, had no idea how much. Board Chairman Herman E. Muller, an accountant, decided it was worth investigating after an outside study showed that Ithaca could expect a rising cash flow from increasing enrollment to handle a heavy loan commitment. "It was a simple business proposition," said Muller. "We had a tremendous demand for our product. We had a good product. We had a good faculty—a good production line." Some trustees fretted about going bankrupt, or feared Government control. Yet the more they looked into the matter, the more plentiful the Government money seemed to be—and they finally plunged in.

Soon Ithaca got more than $17 million in 40-year loans from the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency for 10 conventional dormitories, 2 dramatic, 14-story dorm towers, a student union, dining hall, and health center. New York State floated $12 million worth of 30-year tax-free bonds for music, athletic, library, science, fine arts and other administration buildings. All will be paid off, at the rate of $1,377,000 a year, from student dormitory fees and tuition, which total $2,800 per student. Modern buildings, insists Dillingham, help pay for themselves in lower maintenance costs: "If an act of God suddenly set one of those ivy-covered buildings down on our site, we would have it removed because we couldn't afford to operate it."

"UNMITIGATED BLESSING"

Did Government money bring Government control? "With these two agencies it doesn't distort our picture one damn bit," says Dillingham. "We're just as free as we ever were. It's been a happy partnership." Adds College Secretary Ben Light: "The first time we went to present an application we took our lawyer with us. Since then he's stayed home." Says Architect Robert B. Tallman: "They check the engineering and the financing details, but I can't think of any major engineering or architectural feature they've suggested." Insists English Professor John Harcourt: "It's been an unmitigated blessing."

That blessing has even inspired mighty Cornell to take notice of little Ithaca. "Dillingham's running a doggone tight little ship over there," says a top Cornell administrator. "Their aggressiveness makes us look a little foolish," concedes another.

Hope Sickness Hits Two Local Docs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder why so many doctors leave their practices and their homes to serve as volunteers in developing nations.

A recent article in the Pontiac, Mich., Press partly answers that question. In this article two surgeons explain why they take 2-month busmen's holidays with Project Hope.

They suffer from an incurable disease called Hope sickness. For treatment they fly once a year to wherever the SS *Hope* is anchored and work long, hard hours.

They teach their medical counterparts modern surgical techniques. Last year the surgeons were in Ecuador with *Hope*; this year they were in Guiena.

Mr. Speaker, I think the account of the experiences of these two dedicated doctors is of great interest and include the Pontiac Press article by Janet Chusmir printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"HOPE" SICKNESS HITS TWO LOCAL DOCS

(By Janet Chusmir)

Two Miami Beach surgeons, Dr. Rudolph E. Drosd and Dr. Everett Shocket, are suffering from an incurable disease—*Hope* sickness.

For treatment they fly, once a year, to faraway places and board a ship. Once there, sleeping little, working hard, their symptoms miraculously disappear.

Crew-cut, grey-haired Dr. Drosd spent January on the *Hope* ship; he was one of the volunteer physicians, working without pay, who join the reconverted Navy ship's permanent medical staff on a rotating basis.

But he's home now. And suffering from the *Hope* syndrome—depression.

"The only way to get undepressed is to go back," he says. "Not that it has to be the *Hope* ship. Two thousand American doctors are working and teaching in various parts of the world."

He is depressed because he finds many people living their lives in the same way, obvious to the larger problems of the world: the tremendous amount of disease, malnutrition, and poverty.

"All of which affects us," he says. "Why else do we have a war in Vietnam."

He has found that most of the patients he has treated on Project Hope had never spoken to an upper class person or an American before.

"Being treated as a human being was a new experience for them. Hostilities are broken down, attitudes are changed, friends are made."

He found Guinea full of complex medical problems: parasites, tropical diseases, a 50-percent infant mortality rate, leprosy, and "everyone seemed to have severe stomach ulcers.

"It's not a disease of recent civilization," the doctor explains. "It has been present in the bush jungle for years. They live in a system of terror, witch doctors, neighboring enemy tribes, wild animals, and now some ulcers are complicated by the stresses of civilization."

With no milk, tranquilizers, or antacids available, the only treatment that works, the doctor continues, is surgery. Much of his work was devoted to performing and teaching operations to remove ulcers.

Sterility is also a serious problem in Guinea. Many were sterile from malnutrition, parasites, veneral diseases.

"They plagued the shop for cures; children are so important for protection, hunting, agriculture," he explains.

In Guinea polygamy is practiced. Every man has as many wives as he can afford. Big families are more important than money. The husband spends 2 days with each wife and there is no rivalry, for the newest wife must do the heavy work, so the older wives greet her eagerly.

In that country, he continues, men outlive women.

"A woman who looks 60 is 40, prematurely aged," the doctor says, "from hard work, early marriage, many babies delivered without help, and no medical care. Women had no status."

But with liberation, that is changing.

"It won't be long" Dr. Drosd says, "before they have a matriarchy like us."

He feels the little countries have only one way to go—toward a planned economy.

Dr. Drosd and Dr. Shocket both visited Ecuador last year. This year the ship is spending its 10 months in Guinea. Dr. Drosd was on board in January; Dr. Shocket leaves for his tour of duty May 15.

While the number of people treated during the ship's stay seems like a drop in the bucket in terms of the total population of the country, the doctors say the teaching keeps spreading the effect of the program.

Every operation is witnessed by local doctors who learn American techniques and can in turn, teach others and perform similar services themselves.

The same principle applies to all fields of medicine; training is conducted through actual hospital procedures, classroom lectures and discussions, motion pictures, etc. Teaching is stressed. This enables *Hope* to have a more enduring effect on local health conditions than would attempts at widespread treatment.

The ship's doctors also form mobile inland teams, working with local physicians, surgeons, health officers, midwives, technicians, et al., in their own surroundings.

And in every port of call, a permanent installation is left to continue the work of Project Hope.

In Vietnam, there is now an orthopedic reconstruction center; in Trujillo, Peru, the medical center is being developed, thanks to *Hope;* in other countries, dental clinics, immunization centers—whatever the most pressing need.

As for why a doctor takes a busman's holiday on the *Hope* ship, Dr. Drosd says, "For some it's a desire to see other countries. When you do this sort of thing you get a different point of view.

"Dr. Shocket and I have traveled extensively, but normally you get the tourist channels. Here you get under the skin of a country, you see the people in their most open moments, when they're sick.

"It's tremendously rewarding to do needed work. We work very hard, but the demands are purely professional, there are none of the emotional problems of involved families, and the economic stresses are absent. It's really applying the profession in an uninhibited and unencumbered manner.

"We are getting to the people, bypassing the leaders. It's important to them and at the same time it gives us tremendous insight and information.

"They are aware this is nongovernment, there is little protocol. Some doctors and nurses don't fit in. They drop out."

Dr. Drosd leans back in his chair.

Next year he's going to Nicaragua.

He says, "Everybody, I guess, goes for various motivations.

"But there is one common denominator. They are all there as volunteers."

Question Planned Parenthood as Antipoverty Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a number of citizens of the Milwaukee metropolitan area have become concerned with a proposed antipoverty project and have been frustrated by their inability to get a hearing, in responsible places, for their point of view. Mrs. Ray Kuffel, an active member of an informal organization known as the Civic Awareness Group, has forwarded the following material to me, and I submit it herewith in keeping with my belief that every responsible citizen has a right to be heard by his governmental representatives:

As individual, law-abiding citizens, many of us have submitted letters, legal opinions, copies of negative resolutions passed by local governmental bodies, in opposition to a project under the antipoverty law, in this area. It has indeed been frustrating and has caused utmost concern that not one of the citizens has received any return mail by the office charged with the administration of all antipoverty projects. The law-abiding citizen cannot understand why he does not have a right to be heard, in this, our democratic society. That same citizen cannot understand how a commission can approve a project rejected by local government, especially when that same commission, whose members are neither elected by the people nor responsible to any governmental body, can then supersede the authority of the duly elected mayor, aldermen, and supervisors of this area. If a commission is a law unto itself, does it seem that elected government is jeopardized? When the citizen is denied the right to be heard before a commission or subcommittee of said commission, and when this commission has control of millions of tax moneys, does this represent taxation without representation? We feel that this problem is so serious that the American form of government is being challenged.

Let us now be specific about the particular project, but always keeping in mind, the seriousness of the citizen's right to be heard. In our area, a volunteer organization applied for funds under the Public Law 88–452. This project, family planning, was submitted by another volunteer agency, of which the petitioning agent is not a member. This project did not follow normal committee channeling, and as a matter of record, while it was still in committee, citizens requested the right to be heard; this right was not acknowledged. The commission then moved to hold a public hearing on this same project; the sponsoring agent, the Planned Parenthood Association, brought in speakers from great distances to discuss the local issue; the parliamentary procedure was questioned but ignored; the opposition to the project clearly stated that no where in Public Law 88–452 was there any reference to such projects; furthermore, at seminars on discussion of community action programs, the goal of such community action programs was clearly stated as being one that would unify the community. The public hearing itself, demonstrated the controversial aspects and the division of community acceptance to this project. (The local newspapers printed 200 articles and referred to it as controversial.) The actions of local government, which included placing of county tax funds in a contingency fund for the operation of the commission and the resolution (file No. 64–251) of the Common Council of Milwaukee, were not presented at the public hearing.

When the commission voted on the project, no further discussion occurred and the further statements and signatures in opposition to the project were not considered albeit the fact that the commission stated it would accept all such materials. We ask, then, is this democratic form of government?

Since that time, legal opinion questioning the experimental status of the contraceptive pill, further substantiated by the article in the Wall Street Journal, Monday, April 19, and by the release from London, Baroness E. Summerskill, life peeress, said in the House

of Lords that permission for further sale of the pills should be withdrawn because of possible side effects such as thrombosis, was submitted; medical advice stated that the present patients with complications are not treated by the Planned Parenthood Association but are sent to County General Hospital; further, physicians donate their services at the hospital and thus eliminate the tax moneys in the budget of said project; further, the breakdown of time allotted to the patient by the Planned Parenthood Association project is challenged by highly qualified medical men as being sufficient to make proper medical diagnosis.

We list but a few of the very serious questions raised but the rest of all materials and the "magnitude of the opposition," so stated by a Congressman, is on file at the Office of Economic Opportunity. We ask, then, why should a project so controversial, so opposed by local government, so dubious in the legal and medical realm, be considered under tax moneys collected to help those less fortunate in material goods but not less in human dignity. We ask what effect and reaction any neighborhood in all social-economic status might be to the use of a mobile unit, sex-mobile if you please, or church basement for this extremely personal and medical question. We ask further, why any program is needed when the existing tax-supported, highly recognized medical clinic is available at the county hospital.

Let us complete the total picture of this entire question. Since January of the year A.D. 1965, the mass media, including the television, which can produce powerful effects through the use of pictures, has subjected the entire population with discussions on birth control, homosexuality, and abortion. The reaction of many people, mostly mothers who are responsible for the teaching of the young people, is a disturbing one. They question why this subject must invade their home continually, they question why the programs seem to slant a complete modification of all laws relative to the subject of perversion and criminal abortion. They question why medical research works diligently to save the lives of the unborn and yet another faction warns of having a family and even recommends prescinding the law—that is, modification of the law on criminal abortion. They question if that law can be modified, cannot all laws be modified? They question the rising rate of juvenile delinquency and then read that programs submitted (under tax moneys) for the distribution of contraceptives for the unwed at age 15, in Chicago, for example, are being sent to Federal agencies for tax funds—does this program encourage subsidizing vice? They question the increased rise in venereal disease among the young people and then the same young people will be supplied materials which in effect states the Government condones illicit behavior.

The role of our Government in the world today is one of leadership. The weight of leadership then rests upon our elected officials, not only for the welfare of this Nation but of the entire world. If leadership is to be provided, then it seems prudent to consider the effects of government in the matter of birth control where it has already been an established governmental practice.

Let us consider India: The Prime Minister of Health, Dr. Sushila Nayyar, told the House of Parliament that the results of a 10-year birth control project, costing millions, was a failure; next, Japan, the only country that claims success in the area of population decrease and yet with all means available to all the people, the method used is criminal abortion, which is equal to every live birth. In West Germany, 400 doctors, including 100 gynecologists, have signed a petition deploring the sexualization of modern society and warn that if unlicensed sexuality becomes a public policy, "the free world and the underdeveloped countries will inevitably be led to a catastrophe and an important argument will be provided for the development of a worldwide, nonwhite racial front of the proletarian people"; and, most recently, in India, Acharya Vinobha Bhave, a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi, and one of India's leading laymen, criticized his Government's birth control program, declaring that birth control is a "negation of the Hindu way of life, and a defeat of spiritual of ethical values."

Let us now quote Mrs. Margaret Sanger, the founder of the Planned Parenthood Association, from an article in the Milwaukee Sentinel, February 1965: "Other countries feel that if our Government is against it, it must be bad. Americans would be much more acceptable when they go abroad to work on the problem if we could get our Government to approve it—perhaps under such term as population control." Also, "I don't see how we can control the birth rate until we get the Government to agree that this is something which should be taken up seriously." Let us quote further from the founder, the American Baby Code: "A marriage shall in itself give husband and wife only the right to a common household and not the right to parenthood. No woman shall have the legal right to bear a child, and no man shall have the right to become a father without a permit for parenthood." Does the present situation in Government reflect the philosophy of this organization?

In a recent review of the book, "Children for Adoption," by Pearl Buck, Edmund Fuller states that Parl S. Buck sounds an eloquent and holy and unpuritanical call for a responsible sex code. She reminds us of how infinitely much more there is to sex and love than the physical act with which our culture is so obsessed. Men and women are responsible for their seed. The famous pill cannot end their responsibility. Any sex education "should include responsibility for the unborn child, the possible child. In terms of moral law or health of society whoever supposed they could be separated."

And Rhena Eckert, daughter of Dr. Albert Schweitzer, quotes her father's view on respect for life: "This is a fundamental ethical concept that can be accepted by everyone regardless of religion or philosophy—basically, it is that every person has a will to live, that it is evil to destroy life or hinder its development; that it is good to further and sustain life. All life in every form has value."

This administration has pledged itself to the creation of a great society. Shall it utilize its resources and provide positive leadership or shall it follow a negative approach, and thereby admit defeat, and commit itself to birth control? The plea is to help the welfare of its people, the guise the rising cost of welfare—has, perhaps, welfare been the cause and not the symptom of the problem?

Making the Federal System Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, much is made these days of the alleged inability of the States to cope with new and emerging problems. Continually, it is asserted that only the Federal Government has the resources and initiative to do justice to the ever-increasing demands by our citizens for governmental services and other governmental action to deal with changes brought about by population growth and technological advance.

I do not share these beliefs about the decline of our Federal system. Consequently, I am glad of the opportunity to cite chapter and verse of what one of our smaller States is doing under the leadership of my good friend and colleague, Gov. Robert Smylie. I have had the privilege of serving with Governor Smylie as a member of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. He is one of the four Governors on the Commission. I, along with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], represent this House on the Commission.

The following article, written by State Senator Perry Swisher, of Idaho, highlights the accomplishments of the 38th legislative session in Idaho as one of the greatest in the State's history. I feel certain our colleagues will find this report of great significance and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to bring it to their attention:

THE BARBECUE PIT

(By Perry Swisher)

We were able to do more than any Idaho Legislature before. Till I can get home, this news release from Governor Smylie's staff says something about it:

Gov. Robert E. Smylie hailed the 38th Idaho Legislature as one of the greatest, if not the greatest, session in Idaho's history.

"Any one of a half dozen pieces of legislation enacted in this session would prove a major landmark of accomplishment standing alone. The budget makes adequate provision for providing effective solutions to many of the human problems of our people. The session acted with courage, talent, and skill in moving to do what must be done, and in being willing to face the music and pay the bills.

"The session was conscientiously conservative because it was prudently progressive.

"In the best tradition of American government, the budget approved today will not leave the individual or the community to grapple helplessly with problems beyond their power, nor will it abdicate local responsibility by inviting the Federal Government to resolve our problems from a distance. We have now given the most effective answer possible to the crushing centralism of the Federal Government. We have been willing to meet and to master our own problems here at home. This is a budget for a new day in Idaho, new days of achievement, of opportunity and self-reliance."

Observers have called the session a triumph and a tribute to the Governor's leadership.

The session, responding to Governor Smylie's proposals with what amounts to nearly 95 percent agreement, enacted a brandnew 3-percent sales and use tax, reduced income taxes and property levies by $25 million, passed an improved free-port law, and commenced the job of making sense out of an archaic and obsolete system of property valuation.

The State's books are in balance. The bonded debt is about $1½ million (it is not paid off because the interest rate is a low 1.7 percent). The increased expenditures are supported by the new revenue package.

The Governor said, "The session has achieved a substantial improvement in the business climate of the State. The new broad-based, three-pronged tax program creates a growth climate that will be a real incentive to home-based industry and to a

fast-paced program of industrial recruitment."

The session increased general governmental services by nearly 35 percent and ended with the books in balance. The Governor calls the revenue structure adequate for many years to come.

The session now ending has authorized a 42-percent increase in expenditures for public schools. This is the biggest single step forward in public school education in the State's history.

Appropriations for the support of the two universities will be up 22 percent. The session created a network foundation for a statewide system of junior, or community colleges.

The session created a new State parks and recreation area administration which is a high-water mark in conservation legislation. It may well be a model on which similar efforts in other Northwest States can found similar programs. The bureau of outdoor recreation has called it one of the best park bills in the Nation.

Two new State parks were added to the park system; Peninsula Point at McCall and Register Rock at American Falls.

This legislature created a water resources board which will have authority to initiate, construct and operate multipurpose water projects, with full consideration for the recreational and conservational importance of adequate supplies of clean water. This will be a do-it-yourself-type State agency founded on the frank assertion that we will do it for ourselves better and faster than it can be done by someone else. This legislation was authorized by a constitutional amendment offered for ratification at a special session last summer and ratified by the people in last November's general election.

There was significant legislation enacted for the benefit of the working people of Idaho such as the silicosis amendments and some revisions upward of workmen's compensation benefits.

The State's administration of fish and wildlife resources has long had national recognition. Its superb performance will be strengthened by the new laws enacted in the last 2 months.

The State's programs in mental health, public health and public welfare compare very favorably with States of the same size and are superior to many in the larger States.

The State hospitals and specialty schools receive high ranking in any compilation of effort on a nationwide basis.

The State's public buildings program is permanently funded and has built 73 new buildings at its State institutions in the last 10 years. This session authorized $8 million more in new construction.

The current legislature funded a public employees retirement system, and enacted a statewide system of personnel administration.

A significant start has been made in perfecting the administration of justice through judicial reform.

The session faced up to the need for thoroughgoing constitutional reform and revision. The new legislation will lay the foundation for a fast start on the significant and very worthwhile project.

The building fund package contains a new College of Business Administration at Idaho State, a new College of Education and a new Engineering Laboratory at the University, a start on the badly needed new Penitentiary, and money to complete the new Veterans' Home at Boise.

The program to renovate the capital-building itself can be started in this biennium.

Smylie says "This legislature has faced and solved more of the human problems of our people than any session in modern times and has proved to be a truly responsive instrument of public service. We don't need to worry about any growing sentiment for Federal intervention in Idaho's affairs. We are doing the job at home and we are doing it well."

All this for a State with 700,000 population, 67 percent of the area of which is owned by the United States, and which is spread over 88,000 square miles of mountain, desert and forest is an outstanding record.

"I am confident that the people will reward the membership of this session with the benediction of gracious praise," the Governor said.

Governor Smylie added, "State governments appear weak and feeble only when they fail to keep abreast of the times. A State has to operate on a pay as you go basis, simply because we do not have the Federal Government's unlimited capacity for incurring debt. Where State governments are willing to keep the store and pay the bills, they are doing and will continue to do a good and satisfactory job. Facing up to problems and solving them with courage and imagination is not an exclusive attribute of the Federal Government, and where State Governors and legislatures are willing to do the job and do it right, you hear very little sentiment for going hat in hand to Washington.

"The real effective response to the threatening centralism of the Federal Government is found in records like the record of this 38th Idaho Legislature.

"After the depression years and the war years the federal system is just now beginning to flower again. And it is flowering because States like Idaho are showing increasing willingness to become strong and responsible partners in this uniquely excellent federal system."

Tribute to James P. Vaughan, Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, occasionally a man passes the threshold of history leaving an indelible mark to be respected, admired, and emulated for generations to come. Such a man was James P. Vaughan, educator, humanist, school administrator, and, in a sense, visionary.

Mr. Vaughan, whose story is more adequately told in the accompanying eulogy by Father Evans and the letter from Dr. Lovshin, had the wisdom and the courage and the determination to forge out of a raw pioneer mining community a superior educational system that opened wide the doors of opportunity to an uprooted and thankful people. He saw with unwavering clarity that the promise of the free society would forever remain barren for those who labored in darkness of mind and spirit. He knew instinctively that only through education could these people of diverse cultures from distant lands participate fully in the destiny of their adopted land. He knew that man is not free unless his mind is free—free to inquire, to question, to assimilate, to learn.

In a sense, Mr. Vaughan will remain with us. His memory will always be kept by a grateful community. His work will be extended in life by respectful former students who have been guided by his vision into the mainstream of progress in American society. His legacy to the community is at once an irreplaceable treasure and an exemplary standard of achievement.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the accompanying tributes to James P. Vaughan and under unanimous consent I include them with my remarks:

CHISHOLM'S DR. LOVSHIN PAYS TRIBUTE TO EDUCATOR

Miss VEDA PONIKVAR,
Editor, Free Press,
Chisholm, Minn.

DEAR VEDA: With the death of Mr. J. P. Vaughan, Chisholm has lost its foremost citizen. I fear that those who did not come under the influence of this great man do not fully realize the inspirational force he generated.

When the definitive history of the Mesabi Range is compiled, it should not be forgotten that Chisholm was a unique community during its formative years. Its most influential citizen was not, as is usually the case, a wealthy businessman or one who inherited political power, but rather a great educator. Because of this unusual circumstance, and because of the great character and ability of this man, Chisholm had a record of the performance superior to that of larger towns. It is a source of wonderment that Mr. Vaughan remained, during his active years, in the small community he loved.

It is difficult, also, for those who were not a student or teacher under him to realize what a tremendous role he played in molding the character of others. Though most of us were poor, we never felt underprivileged because Mr. Vaughan and his faculty had prepared us so well.

It is fortunate that a man's worth is not measured by the breadth of his obituary. If this were true, Mr. Vaughan deserved a whole special issue of the Free Press. As a former student who owes a debt of gratitude to the community, the schools, and to this outstanding inspirational leader, I hope that this expression of appreciation will be seconded by many others.

Sincerely,

LEONARD L. LOVSHIN, M.D.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

"LET THE LITTLE CHILDREN COME TO ME" (LUKE 18: 16)

(Eulogy preached at the funeral of James P. Vaughn, Holy Rosary Cathedral, Duluth, Minn., on March 27, 1965, by the Reverend John Whitney Evans, chaplain of Catholic students, University of Minnesota, Duluth.)

In searching for a text appropriate to open a tribute to the memory of James P. Vaughn, I recalled over and over again one I have often associated with educators. We find it in the Gospels where our Lord says, "Let the little children come to Me." In so many ways, Mr. Vaughn's time on earth was spent in saying and doing the same thing.

Perhaps this truth is not obvious at first, for we seldom think that a school superintendent is interested in children. It is sometimes hard for us to remember that all the sophisticated organizational scaffolding that insulates the administrator from the world of the child exists for the sake of the child. There was, however, a directness about the way Mr. Vaughn ran his system. From the planning of English exercises and tooth brush drills to the evaluation of the physical education program, he was not only "on top of his job," but into every corner of it.

We might think that he was able to take so personal an interest in the education of children because—as we fondly imagine—

times were simpler then. But there was something very complicated about the children Mr. Vaughn served. Chisholm, Minn., during those years after 1907, when he began his life work, was not a typical American village. Its population was made up overwhelmingly of new arrivals from southeastern Europe. Mr. Vaughn't system of schools faced the task not only of educating rising numbers of children, but of educating children who came from homes where English was not spoken, where physical hygene was often neglected, where mothers could not cope with the preparation of American foods, and where fathers had never approached the ballot box. These were people whom the historian calls "the uprooted," and Mr. Vaughn had to help them—children, mothers, fathers, all—to develop roots in a new and uncongenial soil.

One almost thinks of the Peace Corps in recalling how Mr. Vaughn and his bride took up residence in the southern quarter of town, down where the immigrants lived. They opened, not only schoolrooms, but their home and their very lives to these newcomers. They tried to make these children of the foreign born proud of their heritage, of their language, of their ancient nations, of their parents; and by building this self-respect in thousands of children of the Old World, Mr. Vaughn fathered in them the most essential trait of the New World: that sense of personal dignity that compels personal responsibility. Philosophers from Plato to Dewey who have written on teaching point out that certain moral virtues must be present in a child if he is to succeed academically. The truly astonishing educational achievements of the Chisholm school system—a system that under Mr. Vaughn became a nationally recognized model—are traceable in large measure to this fundamental moral quality which Mr. Vaughn personally cultivated in and demanded of every parent, teacher, and child he met.

I said that when I thought of Mr. Vaughn's life, I thought of how our Lord told his followers to let the little children come to Him. We must remember, too, that Mr. Vaughn was himself a child, and that now, for the last time, his holy mother, the church, embraces him in her sanctifying rites. Let us ask God to be merciful to our departed brother. Let us seek to imitate his good example by being as dedicated to moral uprightness and human concern as he. And let us remember that our presence here at this sight of death not only honors a life that has ended, but professes faith in a life to come. If we are to live successfully and die happily, we too must become as little children, for of such, says our Lord, is the Kingdom of God.

"The Enemy Is Apathy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of my colleagues the following address by Adm. John M. Will, chairman of the board, American Export-Isbrandsten Lines, Inc., at the Maritime Week luncheon of the Ocean Frieght Agents Association of Chicago, on May 17, 1965:

Since those splendid days when proud Yankee Clipper ships dominated the seas and gained for themselves a near monopoly of the world's ocean cargoes, the American merchant marine has been shipping water badly. Except for the frenetic activities of wartime, U.S. merchant ships have been sailing on an ever-ebbing tide.

Today, far from the lion of yesterday, the mouse of American-scheduled freighter services carries only about one-quarter of the foreign trade tonnage entering or leaving U.S. ports. In nonliner bulk commercial commerce, the appalling figure is less than 5 percent.

The picture grows more dismal each year, yet the means are at hand right now to reverse this ebbing tide and to catapult the American merchant marine back onto the cresting tide of world commerce.

The means for this dramatic reversal lie in high-speed ships powered by nuclear energy. This is neither a fuzzy concept nor a "maybe someday" proposition. The nuclear ship *Savannah* has proved beyond all doubt that the power of the atom is a practical, viable power source for the merchant marine.

Yet, despite our preeminence in the field of nuclear propulsion—despite the incontestable fact that nuclear power offers the only immediately available opportunity for a major breakthrough in marine engineering—we have thus far failed to exploit this chance which is so singularly ours.

We have failed to move forward because we are heeding the cost-conscious cautioners who say nuclear power is not economically feasible. This form of pennywise, pound-foolish reasoning may be of some comfort to comptrollers and accountants, but it is hardly in the American tradition of "can do" and "will do."

At the time of their inception, neither the locomotive nor the automobile nor the airplane were "economically feasible." The first locomotive tore along at 10 miles an hour, the first automobile coughed and sputtered to achieve 4 miles an hour, and Orville Wright's first biplane hung precariously off the ground for 12 seconds to make a good forward speed of about 7 miles an hour. By what rules of economics were these prototypes feasible?

Yet, contrast the progress of these vehicles, none of them suitable for massive over-ocean commerce, with the progress of the steamship. Today's most efficient freighter moves fully loaded at a maximum of 21 knots, a scant four times faster than Mr. Fulton's *Clermont*.

The NS *Savannah* is capable of 23 knots and nuclear-powered aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Enterprise* is rated at more than 30 knots. We can apply the same propulsion principles which have been proven in these two ships to a fleet of 30-knot freighters which would place us immediately in a strongly competitive position for world trade. Still, we, as a Nation, sit back and say, "It is not economically feasible."

If we wait for further developments from the drawing boards, or if we defer our nuclear building program while we "prove out" on shorebased prototypes an already proven propulsion system, we may as well file and forget our hopes for a nuclear merchant fleet.

Then, perhaps, we can send our engineers and technicians to West Germany wher they can observe and report while the Germans install an American-built reactor directly into a new hull. Then, perhaps, we can wait yet another year or so until the Japanese are ready to demonstrate this same technique.

In the meanwhile, we can conveniently ignore the 68 marine reactors now in actual operation in naval vessels at sea—we can brush aside the fact that 54 more are being readied for seagoing operations—and we can assure the Bureau of the Budget that it is available for use in the American merchant tors, the one already in the *Savannah*, is available for use in the American merchant marine.

Even further, perhaps we should hold to the narcotic notion that maritime reactors are, indeed, not economically feasible and surrender by default our chance to reestablish the American merchant marine as an integral and important part of our national economy.

If this is the answer, then we must also be prepared to retire the American eagle in favor of the ostrich and wait, with our heads complacently in the sands, until we can safely and "feasibly" buy nuclear-propelled merchant ships from the Germans or the Japanese—or the Russians.

Chaplain William H. Bucklew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. William Henry Bucklew, national chaplain for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, is rendering our country outstanding service. As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for more than 14 years it has been my pleasure to know many of the great leaders of our veterans organizations. I have never known a more dedicated, devoted, and dynamic patriot than Chaplain Bucklew.

Mr. Speaker, one of the finest things about Dr. Bucklew is that he is a constituent of our beloved and esteemed vice chairman of the Rules Committee, Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER. Our Committee on Veterans' Affairs has always received a warm welcome and attentive ear to veterans needs and problems from Mr. COLMER. The veteran, his family, the widow, and orphan of America have never had a better friend or one more sympathetic and understanding than "BILL" COLMER.

Mr. Speaker, Henry Bucklew, the son of an uneducated sawmill hand and tenant farmer, the fourth of eight children, was born April 10, 1925, in a campcar in the sawmill town of Maxie, Miss., in Forrest County. His family later moved to Sumrall in Lamar County and when he was 2 years old, again moved near Seminary in Covington County, where, in the sawbriars, and sandy newground of Okotoma swamps and the red clay chinquapin hills, he grew up, knowing the extreme poverty of farm life.

The Bucklews have also lived in Hinds and Rankin Counties. He now lives in Laurel, Miss., Jones County.

Dr. Bucklew, age 40, is married to the former Euna Fern Varner of Laurel, Miss. They have two lovely daughters, Cheryl Darlene, age 13, and Twyla Renae, age 9.

He completed high school at Seminary High School; attended Jones County Junior College, Ellisville, Miss., Texas State Teachers College, Huntsville, Tex., and graduated from Mississippi College, Clinton and Jackson's School of Law, Jackson, Miss. He holds two honorary degrees: Doctor of divinity and doctor of literature.

He is a most active Mason and Shriner, having served in several offices in upper masonic bodies in Laurel, including illustrious master of the council and a past officer of Hamasa Shrine Temple.

He is an officer in the local, district and State organization of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and has been actively serving in this organization since his discharge from oversea duty in World War II. He has served 17 years as post chaplain, 10 years State chaplain, and 7 years chaplain of the 14 State Southern Conference.

Dr. Bucklew was elected without opposition, as chaplain for the 1,300,000 member Veterans of Foreign Wars organization in Cleveland, Ohio, last August. He is the first Mississippian to receive this high honor and is presently called on, all over the Nation, as speaker in his duties as chaplain.

He is a member and past officer in the Lions, American Legion, Moose, Woodman of the World, member of the PTA, past Jaycee, Overseas Veteran of World War II, Odd Fellows, Sportsman Club, and Dixie Golf Association.

He is a Baptist and Sunday school teacher, farmer, and newspaper owner and editor.

He is a most active civic leader and during the past years has worked with the Boy Scouts, Red Cross, polio, heart, and cancer drives and has served on several committees of the Jaycees and other civic and fraternal organizations.

He raised $3,300 for the Retail Merchants Association of Laurel, to provide the first permanent Christmas lights for the city. This amount was raised in 10 days.

He helped build and served as one of the directors of Laurel's first youth center.

He served on the board of directors for the National Association for Boys' Homes for 2 years.

He planned, organized, led in construction and served as first president of the Dixie Golf Association, new 9-hole 80-acre development for golfers in the Laurel area. The course has been appraised for $125,000. It cost members less than $15,000.

He is a former first vice president of the National Evangelists Association.

The Southern Baptist News which he owns and serves as editor, has a national circulation.

He has authored three books, his latest being "Your Daily Dozen Spiritual Vitamins." One of his addresses has a printed circulation of more than 800,000 copies.

He served under the late Governor Fielding Wright as vice chairman of the State's Displaced Persons Commission.

Henry received over 50,000 votes for Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi in 1959 in his first offer for public service.

Dr. Bucklew received the Most Distinguished Citizen Award for 1960 by the State organization of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on behalf of his service above and beyond the call of duty as founder and director of Magnolia Boys' Town.

He was again honored by the Mississippi Veterans of Foreign Wars in 1962 and received the State's Humanitarian Award in recognition of his having conducted over 100 military funerals for veterans in south Mississippi.

He received the VFW Literary Achievement. He received this award for the best book published by a Mississippian in 1963.

He is a member of the Speaker's Bureau of the State Sovereignty Commission.

Mr. Paul Harvey quoted one of Dr. Bucklew's prayers during the year on his coast-to-coast news program.

In recognition of his dedicated service to the youth of our State, Henry was appointed by Gov. Ross Barnett to the Youth Committee of the Mississippi A. & I. Board.

The mayor of Laurel has appointed Henry the active chairman of the Jones County Civil War Centennial from 1961 to 1965.

Henry has gained nationwide attention and honors in founding Magnolia Boys' Town, Boys Home in Mississippi and the Deep South for boys who were rejected, neglected, and in some cases unwanted and unloved. His dream is now a living reality with assets of more than $225,000 but, more than fixed assets, 263 boys have been given a home, religious training of their choice, an education, recreation, and most of all, the feeling they are wanted and loved. Thanks to Dr. Bucklew and the many thousands who have shared his dream, these boys now have a fair chance to grow up as mature men, useful citizens, and happy, loyal Americans. Buck has not received any salary for his full-time services in this work. Service to God by helping others, is his creed. "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches and loving favor rather than silver or gold"—Proverbs 22: 1—is his motto.

He is a young Christian statesman with an outstanding record of achievement, who has earned the right because of his proven ability and service to God and his fellowmen, to be heard, respected, and remembered.

Address of Acceptance for the Honorary Doctor of Fine Arts Degree From the University of Notre Dame by Marc Chagall, April 5, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address of acceptance of an honorary degree of fine arts which was awarded to the distinguished artist, Marc Chagall, by the University of Notre Dame on April 5, 1965.

The text of Mr. Chagall's remarks follows:

ADDRESS OF ACCEPTANCE FOR THE HONORARY DOCTOR OF FINE ARTS DEGREE FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME BY MARC CHAGALL, APRIL 5, 1965

I don't know how to express to you in these circumstances how very touched I am by your attention.

How strange and moving it is this passage from one cloud to other clouds, for I who, before my flight in planes, have only flown over my paintings.

I don't come for the first time in this country. I have lived and worked here for a long time and I feel myself obligated to America for the hospitality which she has shown me. Owing to your invitation I am here at the University of Notre Dame and in the environment of this house of American culture.

In speaking of art I have said previously that there exists one color—light. If this is so, this color has in it the other elements: liberty, poetry, everything which gives a meaning to art and to life.

When I was young, I did not look for human glory nor material riches nor honors. I wanted only to be a simple man and an artist, according to my feelings.

I wanted to be without pretentions, just like my father was.

That doesn't mean that I was passive. I did not struggle against others, I did struggle with myself. I had no other pretention in life than to love: to love what is worthy of love, to believe in him in whom one can believe. I believe that only with love can one open the hearts of human beings, bring to them unity and peace.

With age this thought has appeared to me with even more clarity: every man has one end alone. I have, for a long time, decided and preferred to go toward that inevitable end with love in life, in art, and in every activity. Art which has for its basis the continual love for life.

I believe that art must go rather toward the soul than through theories toward the brain. Such an art, in times, becomes more and more vague. On the contrary, we feel it closer to us and its assumes a greater place in our life if it has represented intensely our interior life.

We must not be afraid of these words, nor of ourself, nor of our soul, nor of our times. Our organism has been living like this for thousands of years and for thousands of years it has needed this love.

I am happy to be here with you, in this university whose activity is founded upon human love.

I do not claim however to have chosen a right path in life, and indeed, like so many others, I have my faults.

ART AND LIFE

Art and life itself seem to me to be like a boat upon the waters. To whom is it given this gift of guiding this boat and how to sail it?

Aside from scientific facts, a good many sources of intuitive knowledge are found hidden in us.

I often think of birds who so naturally, and with art, sing their lives. There have also existed such bird-artists as: a Mozart, a Rembrandt, a Masaccio, the Old Titian. I see, in the life of everyday, people and things as though through a tear. I try to offer to them, as I can, a plastic reflection.

The more sincere you are the more people awaken and await, as it were, an answer. I don't believe in technique. It is in us. There is no technical perfection.

Technique is acquired with age and then it is something other than so-called perfection: it has become already qualities of the heart.

With pity we listen to those theories, which in recalling juridicial discourses, do not touch upon the essential or permanent things

in the domain of art. Nothing useful can be given to the soul of art if it contains the least drop of pride or which is lacking in feeling toward others.

THE QUALITIES OF ART ARE WITHIN US

In life, I have always wished to attain this end, and whatever we might say of me or of my art, I have always affirmed and repeated that the qualities of art are only within us and not outside of us. But it is very difficult to recognize these signs. Might it not be the origin of drama and of certain crises?

Today we are, as it were, drowned by quantity and we cannot save the world or ourselves without an aspiration toward quality. There is no law, there is only an interior accord of all the elements of our interior world with the exterior world.

Let us take a look backward into the domain of art: It is not the theory of Cezanne which created Cezanne, it is not theory which created the painter Seurat nor Gaugin. It is not impressionism which created Monet.

Equally, a Rembrandt, or a Mozart, have taken from theories, where they could, what was useful to them. That did not prevent them from being very great. But this is perhaps not the moment to speak to you at great length about art.

I end these few words in commending your work and the cultural life of this great American university.

I express to you also my gratitude for the great honor which you do me.

What Has War Come To Mean to the Vietnamese Peasant?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, an interesting commentary depicting the life of the Vietnamese peasant in his war-torn country appeared in the Sacramento, Calif., Bee on May 16, 1965.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

WHAT HAS WAR COME TO MEAN TO THE VIETNAMESE PEASANT?

Throughout history, war always has commanded the headlines. So it is not surprising that all of the attention in the Vietnam crisis has been directed to the running story of Vietcong raids out of the north, retaliatory air strikes, napalm bombing, and hand-to-hand guerrilla warfare in the jungles.

There is another dimension to the Vietnam story which deserves telling, however: The human story of the average Vietnamese, his fortunes, his misfortunes. The narrative has a very real part in the total plot.

For example: If a Vietnamese lives past 40, he has exceeded his life expectancy. Chronic illness is a way of life. Vietnam is rife with malaria, hepatitis, amoebic dysentery, leprosy, intestinal parasitic disorders. Epidemics of chlorea and plagues are not exceptions; they are the expected.

Medically, there is little to offer. There is only 1 doctor for every 58,000 persons in Vietnam; live pigs serve as hospital disposal units. Hunger, privation abound. Life in Vietnam is bleak.

Consider also that war has been a part of the Vietnamese existence for a generation. The Vietnamese, in a way of speaking, has lived at bayonet point for so long it has become a way of life. He has seen one side or the other gain an inch or two of high ground, only to lose it. For years he has been caught up in a cacophony of appeals for his allegiance. Me must by now be bewildered by it all.

The question then: What is in it for him, this long, seesaw battle for power which has been going on around him for so long? The Communists tell him they are saving him from ruthless imperialism and they call the government they want him to embrace a peoples' democracy. South Vietnam troops tell him they are his true friends, that the invaders out of the north merely want to enslave him; and they also tell him they are bringing to him a peoples' democracy.

Have words begun to lose their meaning to him in his puzzlement? Has he come to understand, or rather to believe, there is only one truth for him and that is the business end of a rifle? And in his confusion does he really care who is at the holding end?

Meantime, if he lives past 40 he has reached old age. He probably never has seen a doctor and would be suspicious of him anyway. And the war goes on around him and two sides smother him with their urgings of their special kind.

To the peasant who has lived with this war for so long, and has seen this uniform give way to that uniform, certainly the war can hold little glamor. And what is important and what is not important, depending upon the telling, must by now have lost most of its meaning.

The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the impact of education on culture is one of the most significant aspects of any analysis of an educational system.

Mr. William Benton has dealt with this most effectively in his article "A Personal Report: The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," which appears in the 1965 Yearbook of the Encyclopedia Britannica. He deals with it particularly in chapter VIII about art in the Soviet Union.

Chapter VIII follows:

CHAPTER VIII. "SOCIALIST REALISM": ART AS PROPAGANDA

(A personal report: "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," by William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Senator from Connecticut; presently U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its executive board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica.)

Communist dogma still affects creativity in the U.S.S.R.—and profoundly. Indeed, it continues to dominate the arts.

But there now appears to be a striving among Soviet artists to escape from the straitjacket orthodox Kremlin line. Although Soviet artists continue to profess devotion to "socialist realism," some examples of today's Soviet art demonstrate that "socialist realism" has softened a bit since Stalin's death. It's a little less socialist, shall we say, a little less real. Artists seem to be struggling to shake off the shackles.

The works of many Western artists—notably the abstractionists—were considered "the decadent art of the West" by Chairman Nikita Khrushchev. Some years ago Sergei Gerasimov, then president of the Soviet Academy of Arts, said, "We respect Picasso as a fighter for peace, but he's no artist." Khrushchev termed abstract painting "pictures where one cannot tell whether they have been painted by a man's hand or daubed by the tail of a donkey."

By contrast, what is "socialist realism?" In 1932 the Central Committee of the Communist Party established "socialist realism" as the basis for all Soviet art and literature. Soviet art had to be simple and obvious enough to be understood by all the people. Its avowed mission was to serve as a propaganda instrument to advance communism. Artists were required to depict "the heroic struggle of the world proletariat * * * the grandeur of the victory of socialism, and * * * the great wisdom and heroism of the Communist Party." In essence, Soviet realism in art is a romanticized interpretation of reality in terms of the Communist Party line. Its closest approach among famous commercial artists of the United States might be the work of Norman Rockwell. An approximation among famous American paintings would be "Washington Crossing the Delaware."

When I visited Kiev in the mid-1950's, Nicolai Skachko, then deputy minister of culture for the Ukraine, sought to explain to me the iron dogma of "socialist realism" in the field of art. "Socialist realism," he said, must have "tone" as well as realism. If applied to the recommended themes, he explained that it would bring recognition and success to the Soviet artist. Some failed to apply it—and they were punished for their lack of perceptivity. Those who successfully portrayed the heroic qualities of the mother of eight hard at work in the fields of the kolkhoz—these were the artists who received the rewards.

In 1948, when Stalin cracked down on Soviet artists and writers who violated his standards of "socialist realism," many vanished suddenly. Some were never heard of again.

Two years ago, when Khrushchev cracked down on artists, sculptors, and writers, none of them vanished. Some quit writing and painting, but all remained safely in their studios. This dramatizes the change.

While I was in Moscow in May 1964, the high Communist Party official who, I was told, "makes ideology," had a meeting with top level intellectuals. The Times (London) reported that he told them they were to be given greater freedom and more opportunity for self-expression "in an environment of greater relaxation." Konstantin Simonov, former head of the Soviet Union of Journalists, told me: "I was not at the meeting. But I had a report it was a good meeting. Those who attended left with a good frame of mind." This is a new kind of language, strictly post-Stalin.

Orest G. Vereisky, corresponding member of the Academy of Arts and a popular and highly esteemed Soviet artist—as was his father before him—gave me a newly phrased defense of "socialist realism." The old definition, he felt, was too strict and too limiting.

During my visit at Vereisky's dacha in the Moscow countryside, he set forth what he suggested was the present credo:

"We are seeking new forms between the state and the artist. Our artists must now try to be individuals. But if an artist tries to become an extreme individualist—if he ceases to care about his viewers—this is indeed a very dangerous step. All Soviet artists feel that our art must be humane. It must be for the people.

"Every Soviet artist must have his own medium—for instance, he may be a landscape artist. But he must recognize his position in society. This doesn't mean that he must downgrade his work to anybody's level. If he wants to try to elevate the

people's tastes—if he thinks he has something to say—he is entitled to try. If an artist wants to preserve communication with his audience, he must expect that his audience will want to understand him."

I commented: "Here in this room—on the wall right above your table—you have a reproduction of a Braque. Don't you regard Braque as an extreme individualist? Was he trying to recognize his position in society? Was he concerned with the art of the people? You have a Van Gogh on your other wall. Was Van Gogh trying to be humane in his approach to the people? Weren't these two artists striving for individual creativeness? Who could tell Braque and Van Gogh how to paint, how to elevate the people's tastes, how to be humane?"

I mentioned a small account in a newspaper about Gauguin—a little squib of Gauguin's writing had sold for $1,500, yet he died in poverty. Vereisky interrupted sharply: "I don't have a high opinion of Gauguin."

He then insisted that there exist now in the Soviet Union "great diversity and freedom." I told him I could not see any great diversity in the output of artists, but merely a glimmering of it. He talked at length about art as it is conceived in the Soviet Union in contrast to the "commercial art" of the United States and Western Europe.

Apparently he had had many arguments on this subject with artists he met in the United States. He explained that there isn't much "commercial art" in the U.S.S.R. used in publicity or advertising. Illustration of books—and apparently he has illustrated many—is definitely regarded as a high form of art in the Soviet Union.

Vereisky was preparing for a Moscow exhibition of his recent work. This was to be strikingly different from the general exhibits as usually arranged by the Soviet Artists Union; in these, artists selected by the union exhibit one picture each. Vereisky was to have what in the United States is called a one-man show, featuring the pictures he drew in the United States. He showed me some of his drawings and watercolors of scenes in New York, Chicago, Milwaukee, and Philadelphia. He had drawn these when he accompanied the recent Soviet show of the graphic arts, the opening of which I had attended in New York, and which toured these cities. I found the pictures most pleasing. Judged by their craftsmanship, they are of high quality.

He had one especially lovely watercolor from the steps of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, with automobiles moving on the street and the skyline looming up behind in gray. There was another depicting a big sign advertising Seagram's whisky, with close-ups of little shops and restaurants, the skyline again looming in the background.

Vereisky explained that in other cities there isn't any background except the sky, but in New York there is the skyline.

Some of his American drawings and watercolors were amusing and witty. He had one of a woman walking with a little poodle titled, "Between Church and Cocktails." Only one of his drawings depicted poverty and deprivation, and he apologized for it. (He said he was not interested in doing "social drawings.") This was a drawing of a down-and-outer slouching in front of a doorway.

He had these drawings ranged around his upper-floor studio. There was one very striking watercolor of an American woman walking down the street with her handkerchief to her face; she was in tears and there was an American flag behind her. Vereisky said he had drawn this on the day President Kennedy was assassinated. There was another of a Negro woman sitting on a bench stitching on an American flag. He said that he had actually seen her, and I doubt that he could have imagined it. (Later, after his show, he sent me these two drawings as gifts for Mrs. Kennedy and Mrs. Johnson.)

There seems little question that art in the Soviet Union is moving toward a more liberal concept since Stalin's death, although there has been nothing like an art renaissance. Even if latitude grows, it will take some years for most artists to realize it. There was a time when virtually nothing could be painted (or printed) if it was not in some way a litany of praise to Stalin or to the Communist Party. Now it appears that it is no longer compulsory for an artist to love either one, or to express adulation in his work. It is now possible for an artist to depict Soviet life, for example, in a form somewhat short of the ideal. This is hardly true artistic expression, but it may be a start.

Of course, the leaders of the party have not given up the notion that they know what is best. If they ever give up in the field of the arts, it is possible that the Soviets, with countless years of artistic frustration damned up behind them, might produce a flood of creative art and literature that would startle the world. The native literacy and artistic talents of the Russians are indisputable. Under the Communist system, many of the most talented and gifted young people are receiving rigorous and expert training in art techniques. They are supported by the state and given fine studios in which to work. This will not make them artists, but for many it is better than the Paris folklore of the poor artist working in a garret while suffereing from malnutrition. A number of them achieve high technical proficiency, and if the shakles ever are withdrawn, some of them are sure to bloom with more than a touch of genius.

It is almost impossible to imagine a President of the United States lecturing artists on their role, but Chairman Khrushchev did just that in his famous speech in 1963, "The Great Strength in Literature and Art Lies in High Ideological and Artistic Standards":

"Our people need a militant revolutionary art. And it is the mission of Soviet literature and art to recreate, in vivid artistic imagery, this great and heroic age of the building of communism, correctly to reflect the assertion and triumph to new Communist relationships * * *.

"Everything depends on how you approach realities, from what positions you appraise them. There is a saying that what you look for, you find * * *.

"Unfortunately, it sometimes happens that art workers judge reality only from the smell of outhouses, depict people in a deliberatey ugly way, use the darkest colors. This can only foster dejection, gloom, and frustration. These artists depict reality in accordance with their own biased, perverted, and subjective conceptions, in accordance with artificial and anemic stereotypes of their own invention * * *. You have also seen some other products of abstract art. We condemn, and shall continue to condemn, such deformities openly and uncompromisingly."

Chairman Khrushchev stated the official view of what Soviet realism in art is not. I suspect his view will prevail in the new regime and in the one after that. Yet the struggle is on. There will be ups and downs. But there are encouraging signs that Soviet writers and intellectuals are beginning to break out of their confinement, that they are determined to fight their way toward freedom—complete freedom. No change in the U.S.S.R. could be more profound—or more hopeful—for the future.

Worker's Rights Seen Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on May 19 last there appeared in the Evening Star an article by the forthright and able journalist, David Lawrence, on the President's message to the Congress asking for the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

While we are, of course, all aware of the President's campaign promises and of the support given him in the recent presidential election by the union leaders, we were constrained to hope that the President would not go so far as to recommend the repeal of this basic guarantee of the American laboring man's rights. We dared to hope that this would not happen because the President has gone to extremes in his stated desire to protect the rights of other groups, particularly the Negro race.

We can think of no more basic right, that we thought was guaranteed to our American citizens, than the right to work. But now the ever-increasing power of the Federal Government over the rights and liberties of the people is threatening to take away the right of the American citizen to earn a livelihood for himself and his family without first joining a union.

As one who believes in the principle of unionism and the right of collective bargaining I find it most difficult to go along with such an invasion of the rights of our American workers. If I were a laboring man I am sure I would join a union. But as a free American I would resist the effort of the Federal Government to tell me I had to belong to a union; just as I would oppose the Federal Government telling me I had to join a merchant's organization, a social club, or even my church.

Is there no end to the ever-increasing encroachment of the Federal Government upon the rights of the States and the liberties of the people?

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lawrence's article is as follows:

WORKER'S RIGHTS SEEN THREATENED

(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson has just asked Congress to pass a law that would, in effect, take away the civil rights of the American workingman by coercing him into joining a labor union. If he refuses, he will be punished either by losing his job or by being denied a job in the future in any plant or factory or business establishment where such a union contract with the employer exists.

This proposal, if enacted into law, would wipe out overnight the laws passed by 19 States forbidding compulsory unionization and upholding the right of the individual to work anywhere without being required to give up his conscientious beliefs.

The Supreme Court of the United States has again and again affirmed the right of a citizen to freedom of belief. There are many

citizens, including some in religious groups, who conscientiously believe that they should not be compelled to join any organization of a private nature.

Johnson, in his message to Congress this week, did not make any reference to the constitutional rights of the citizen, nor did he answer any of the objections frequently raised in the past that the right to work is a civil right. In fact, Johnson, although discussing at length a wider coverage of the minimum-wage law, restrictions on "excessive overtime work" and changes in the unemployment insurance program, made no comprehensive explanation of why he wants Congress to eliminate the right-to-work laws of the 19 States. The President's reference to this proposed amendment of the National Labor Relations Act reads in full text as follows:

"Finally, with the hope of reducing conflicts in our national labor policy that for several years have divided Americans in various States, I recommend the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act with such other technical changes as are made necessary by this action."

Although the President submitted the drafts of bills for the other changes that he requested, he did not do so with respect to the amendment that would abolish right-to-work laws. He merely said:

"Bills embodying the third (proposal) have already been introduced in Congress."

There is hardly any phase of the problem of labor-management relations about which it could not be said that the issues "for several years have divided Americans in several States." Also, it is rare indeed that an important piece of legislation—such as the abolition of civil rights—does not get any more extended explanation from the Chief Executive than was contained in the massage submitted to Congress on Tuesday of this week.

While Congress has been aware of many abuses that have occurred in the exercise of labor union power, it has lately avoided corrective measures. In fact, the amount of pressure exerted by labor unions on Congress and on the executive branch of the Government has been considerable. It is commonly believed that much of the labor union influence is due to the amount of money collected from labor union members and contributed to congressional and presidential campaigns.

The Federal Government, moreover, has been lax in enforcing the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. The labor unions get around some of the prohibitions in the existing law by appointing special committees, but it is well known that the salaries of many of the workers on these committees are paid out of union dues, and the existing statute forbids labor unions and corporations to make any political contributions and defines a contribution as anything of value.

The workers in 19 States who have been free from coercion now may face a compulsory unionization program. Theoretically, a worker who is employed in a business that is not interstate in character could still refuse to join a union under existing State laws. But the phrase interstate commerce has been broadened so much in the recent civil rights law in order to remove racial discrimination in hiring employees that it may be doubted whether any substantial number of jobs in any State could be classed today as outside Federal jurisdiction.

It is indeed ironical that discrimination can be prohibited by reason of race or religion or color but that discrimination is to be permitted as a worker is compelled to join a union or lose his job whenever the union gets the upper hand in any business or industry.

In Russia, every plant or factory is dominated by members of the Communist Party. In America, the law which compels a worker to join a union could perhaps be similarly utilized to require a worker, in effect, to give his support to the political party which the labor union endorses or to risk the disfavor of union chiefs in the plant where he works.

Youth Needs the Out of Doors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sheldon Coleman, a constituent of mine who heads the Coleman Co., Inc., in Wichita, Kans., has written an enlightening and thought-provoking article in the May 1965 issue of Sports Afield magazine.

Mr. Coleman is thoroughly dedicated to the young boys and girls of this Nation and to the great outdoors of America. I commend the article and his ideas to my colleagues for their consideration:

YOUTH NEEDS THE OUT OF DOORS

(By Sheldon Coleman)

You know, sometimes you have to wonder about intellectual America.

We spend billions building schools, equip these schools with the latest and best teaching equipment and then for 12 years cram science, mathematics, foreign languages and other academic subjects into our children's heads. Those who go on to college get 4 more years of much the same medicine and then are turned out in the world to make a living.

These young men and women are then supposed to be properly equipped to fill a niche in our competitive industrial society and to become a part of the vast team designed to keep the United States on top in the race for space and arms supremacy.

We do a good job in preparing the young men and women for this role in society, but we're overlooking one rather important think—we forget to teach them what to do when they're not working.

We overlook the fact that they're probably going to work no more than 40 hours a week, perhaps as few as 30. In addition, most will have a long vacation sometime during the year. This means that they should have about 60 to 70 hours a week of leisure time—almost twice as much as the average person's working time. Yet we're doing very little about teaching our sons and daughters how to use this time to keep themselves healthy and happy.

For too many people today, both young and adult, leisure time is a curse. So very, very many fail to find wholesome activities and hobbies that, to borrow a Boy Scout phrase, will keep them "physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight." And one of the chief reasons why so many today take to alcohol, have nervous breakdowns, wind up in mental hospitals and deteriorate morally is that they were never taught in school how to use their leisure hours in some kind of body strengthening, mentally refreshing, wholesome form of recreation.

Oh sure, they had gymnastics in school; some learned to play football and basketball; but these aren't things you do after you get out of school. Did they get a chance to learn of the delights of camping, fishing, hunting, boating, outdoor photography, bird watching, nature study, hiking, and the dozens of other things they could do the rest of their lives? These are the pursuits I believe can do most to keep America a nation of great people.

I have strong convictions about what the out of doors can do for the youth of our country, particularly in the sense of giving us happier, healthier kids who aren't likely to get into trouble with the law. What I have in mind are such attributes as physical fitness, emotional stability, moral respectability and good citizenship. Boiled down, these things merely mean a proper attitude toward life and toward the society in which the boy or girls lives—something, I'm afraid, a few millions lack these days.

I get the feeling sometimes that we have a tendency to avoid responsibility in these matters. If we worry about it at all, we decide that juvenile delinquency is a problem that should be solved by the schools, the churches, the police or the Government, maybe. But I wonder whether we're not dead wrong in feeling this way, particularly when there's so much proof that we, and I am thinking especially of sportsmen and other outdoor-minded people, could do a lot to keep our youth from going astray.

I discovered that there is positive evidence that real outdoor kids rarely get into serious difficulty with the law. Juvenile Court Judge William G. Long, of Seattle, heard 45,000 cases involving boys and girls over a 20-year period and discovered that not one of these had some wholesome outdoor hobby as his or her special interest.

J. Edgar Hoover, famed Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, came up with just as startling a discovery. Case histories of the most-wanted criminals over the years revealed that fewer than 1 percent had ever been Boy Scouts. This is a tribute not only to scouting but to the outdoors as well. The inference is obvious—the outdoor training and experience received by Scouts keep them from deviating from the straight and narrow path and make them proud to be good citizens.

This character-building influence is not restricted to young people alone, either. J. J. Jones, a jailer of Knox County, Tenn., examined the belongings of 10,000 inmates over a period of years and discovered that fewer than 2 percent had owned a hunting or fishing license when arrested.

Surely, statistics like these should make any responsible individual think. And I believe a lot can be done by the individual. I'm sure many parents and grandparents want to do something for the young people closest to them. And I like to think that an adult's responsibility and interest should not necessarily end with his own. Too many boys and girls today don't have parents who care or who have the time to be bothered.

But to my mind, the real answer to this problem is to move the great outdoors into the Nation's classrooms. Or, if you prefer, move the classrooms outdoors, occasionally. By doing this, I am convinced we would see a startling change in the incidence of juvenile delinquency, the lack of physical fitness, and the growing prevalence of emotional disorders. In fact, I have decided in my own mind that such a move is imperative to the future of America and its people.

Let's digress just a moment and look at these projected benefits. What about this business of physical fitness? If you don't think it's bad, ask your son to do a half dozen pushups. If he's on the football team, he'll be able to do it. If he isn't, chances are he'll be lucky to do one. In fact, he probably won't even want to try.

I'm sure that people today, young and old, need more muscular conditioning. Our way of life works against physical fitness. Too many moderns ride to work or school, sit behind desks, operate machinery to do their labors for them, and sit in front of television sets for their spare-time amusement. Those who develop a keen interest in some active

form of outdoor recreation feel better and live longer than those who participate in sports only as spectators.

I'm positive, too, that the blessings of the out of doors are just as effective for keeping all ages on an even keel mentally. In this age of stress and strain, American people each year consume 11 million pounds of aspirin, 17 billion sleeping pills, and so many tranquilizer pills that it's impossible to keep up with the changing figures, in an effort to ease their psychological problems. This hardly sounds as if we were living well-adjusted, carefree lives, does it? Doctors spend countless hours consulting with patients with nothing more seriously wrong than self-induced aches, pains, and anguish.

The solitude of forest or stream, the relaxation of casting a fly over a trout, the honking of wild geese in the sky all serve as soothing sedatives to frayed nerves and weary minds. A noted Philadelphia physician, Dr. Raymond West, recently made the statement that he firmly believes that the United States could dispense with the services of 50,000 doctors if people would fully utilize the blessings found close to nature.

This simply means that persons who get outdoors regularly seldom become patients in mental hospitals, seldom have nervous breakdowns or mental illnesses and are not often people who suffer with ulcers, insomnia or even bad dispositions. Does a man with a 5-pound bass on the end of his line worry that his income tax is due? And whoever heard of a person who needed a pill to go to sleep after following a bird dog all day? What better tributes can we find for the stabilizing influence of the out of doors?

And while I'm at it, I might mention a sort of bonus benefit. The outdoors and the wonderful variety of recreation it has to offer can do a great deal for family togetherness, too. Families that play together in the wholesome atmosphere of wood and water stay together. This closeness brings a respect and understanding that can be credited with reducing juvenile delinquency and even the divorce rate.

Such an outdoor-education program as I sincerely propose for the country's schools could open up a whole new world for many young people. And as these young people develop an enthusiasm for the out of doors, it could mark the beginning of a benign cycle. Suddenly, they would become aware of the need for clean waters, green forests, the protection of wildlife and the preservation of the Nation's soils. They would become conservation conscious and willing to fight for the good things upon which their good life depended through the remainder of their lives.

We need to act and act fast as the demand for outdoor recreation grows by leaps and bounds. Clean water is perhaps one of the most pressing of the various conservation problems, because about 60 percent of all outdoor recreation is water based, and polluted water has little to offer for this purpose.

The loss of streams and lakes has been staggering in the past half century. Industrial wastes, sewage from towns and cities, and mine seepage have ruined fishing, camping, boating, picnicking, and other activities along thousands of miles of streams and lakes. In many sections, economically depressed areas are contiguous with regions of heavily polluted waters. The recreational industry, the No. 1 source of income in many regions, has been almost completely eliminated by defiled streams, lakes, and bays.

It's extremely important that we strengthen present legislation to encourage cities and towns to build adequate sewage-disposal installations. Through Federal and State action, we need to inaugurate a program of restoration for streams already lost to pollution.

We need, too, to take a new look at the management of public lands. President Johnson has stated: "If we are to do today what tomorrow requires, we must proceed without delay on a national program to set aside the parks and seashores, the wildlife refuges, and the waterfowl wetlands which our future generations will need."

Certainly, because fish and wildlife are vital to so many forms of outdoor recreation, there is a need for more stringent conservation measures to protect these resources.

Now, if I have in any way convinced you as a sportsman that outdoor education would be desirable, or is even necessary, for our 50 million schoolchildren, where do we go from here? How do we go about seeing that every child at least gets an introduction to these leisure-time activities, so that he or she will get to know that there are cool, green forests and clean streams with trout and bass, that there are fishing rods and tents, guns and canoes, birds and flowers, and all the other things that make the out of doors and outdoor sports so fascinating and rewarding?

I think that this has to be a federally sponsored project, with money allocated to help schools set up such a program. I also realize that it will requre acceptance by State educational departments and local school boards.

In addition to the legislative needs and the official sanction within the States, trained instructors are going to be necessary to make the effort a success. Already some universities offer courses in outdoor recreation. At Michigan State University, teachers can get graduate credit in outdoor recreation during a summer short course. Other universities would certainly include this training in their physical education curriculums if the demand were sufficient.

Outdoor education in the Nation's schools is not something completely new and untried. Right now, about 1,000 school districts over the country offer 1-week outdoor schools as a part of the regular program. Other schools have hunting and fishing clubs and general outdoor clubs. Michigan State University has maintained an outdoor education project for 10 years under the joint sponsorship of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation and the American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association. Through the work of Julian W. Smith, director of the project, the university has gained a tremendous amount of knowledge concerning the best methods and techniques for presenting the out-of-doors to students.

The die has been cast and the trail blazed. All that's required now is public awareness of the need, and the advantages, of outdoor education in the schools and action by school officials under a Government-sponsored program. Sportsmen can help activate this program in a number of ways. Once legislation is introduced, individual sportsmen and sportsmen's clubs can let their Congressmen know their feelings in no uncertain terms. And if and when such Federal enabling legislation is enacted, they can make their influence felt at the State and local levels, too.

The sooner we accomplish our purpose, the sooner the boys and girls of these United States will know, and benefit from, the blessings offered by the out-of-doors.

The Reds Don't Want To Talk About Vietnam Until They Have Conquered It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column from the May 21, 1965, edition of the New York Journal American.

The author, William S. White, has put into perspective precisely what the administration has contended all along.

The article follows:

REDS DON'T WANT TALK ON VIETNAM

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The Communist invaders of South Vietnam have again rejected any possibility whatever of any peaceful solution. They have made it triple-plated plain that what they want is not discussion but rather South Vietnam.

Apparently they never got the message of the splinter in the Senate which had so long pictured them as trembling with eagerness for negotiations—if only bad old Uncle Sam would not be so warlike.

The brief and now happily lifted suspension of American bombing against the nests of aggression in Communist North Vietnam—a suspension for which the splinter had clamored to give the North Vietnamese a chance to show how reasonable they could be—has accomplished precisely nothing. The Communists themselves remain curiously unconvinced of those essentially conciliatory intentions which the splinter had so earnestly attributed to them.

They intend to do what they always intended, and what everybody save our little band of Senate foreign policy experts and criers of peace always knew they intended. They intend to overrun South Vietnam—and then perhaps to negotiate over the body of their victim.

They had at least six previous opportunities for honest negotiation, including one offered by neutralist countries which not even the Senate splinter could describe as mere American stooges.

Thus those Senators who had demanded a halt to an American bombing mission which was manifestly necessary to help defend South Vietnam from unbroken Communist assault have now shown the quality of their wisdom. There is no joy in twitting them. For every one of them is a perfectly patriotic man—if also, in this columnist's view, a mortally wrong man.

Still, the public is entitled to know, for reference when yet other proposals are made, the names of some of those Senators who in months past have in one damaging wa or another sniped at a basic and bipartisan policy of three American Presidents not to let armed communisim run loose.

Of course they have had a prefect right to do this. But their only alternatives would demonstrably have let down a South Vietnamese people hard-pressed enough as things stand.

Anyhow, one gain has emerged. Only the most credulous can continue to endorse the cliche that the way to bring an open aggressor to an honorable conference table is to tell him in advance he need never stop his aggression.

And other cliches are now receiving attention. One is that our bombing has made us desperately unpopular "in Asia." Another is that we are identifying ourselves as bad white men attacking good dark men. These, to, will wither under the light of reality now shining upon them. It is a light cast by the Asians themselves in the recent meeting of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. And it is cast by such diverse and on-the-spot observers as the 1960 Republican vice-presidential candidate, Henry Cabot Lodge, and a Democratic Senator from Connecticut, THOMAS DODD.

No, the Asians themselves—men of integrity such as Thanat Khoman of Thailand—are not denouncing us for opposing aggression. They are thanking God that we do oppose it. Even minds enchanted with wonderful, wistful pacifist dreams of a world made safe without sacrifice or struggle surely cannot go that far.

Massachusetts Salutes Hon. Austin D. Rhodes, Mayor of Waltham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday evening, May 18, many hundreds of friends and well-wishers gathered at the Monticello Restaurant in the center of the Commonwealth to honor Mayor Austin D. Rhodes, of Waltham, Mass., and help him celebrate the 80th birthday of his great and good life.

Our best dictionaries define the word "unique" as meaning "the only one of its kind." Austin Rhodes aptly fits this description. The extraordinary character and depth of this man is very clearly revealed by the recitation of a few instances of some of his pertinent words and actions.

When a well-meaning individual approached him, at the time he was leaving private industry, to say:

I hope you will enjoy your retirement.

Austin replied in his typical fashion:

Retirement, hell, I have just begun to live.

When he was informed that his multitudinous friends desired to publicly mark his achievements at a great birthday dinner, he withheld consent until he was convinced the primary purpose of the occasion was to create the Eleanor A. Rhodes Scholarship Fund to help deserving students and honor the memory of his wonderful and beloved wife.

This single instance could well serve to sum up the wholesome character and philosophy of Austin Rhodes, "Reverence for and pride in the past; faith in and hope for the future."

However, above all other things I think the reason Austin Rhodes is held supremely high in united respect, affection, and admiration is because, he has, by his own example, taught his friends and his neighbors to live bravely with faith in God and faith in their fellow men.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, in order to permanently record details of this great occasion and further insight into the character of this unique gentleman, I am pleased to include a pertinent editorial and newspaper article about the birthday salute to Mayor Rhodes which appeared in the May 18 and May 19 issues, respectively, of the Waltham, Mass., News Tribune.

The articles follow:

HAPPY 80TH, AUSTIN

We doubt that there is a mayor anywhere in the Nation who enjoys his job as much as Austin D. Rhodes.

Whether he is the oldest head of a municipality in the United States is beside the point. Waltham's mayor fills every minute of his executive role with a zest that must be unsurpassed anywhere. Ceremonials, conferences, board meetings, controversies—he takes them all in stride.

There are contradictions in Mr. Rhodes, not the least of which is longevity that reckons not with heavy smoking. He shies from conflict and looks to consensus to shape a course of action, yet is supremely confindent when he takes a position on any subject.

He cheerfully accepts the conservative brand, and is downright stingy with the tax dollar, but the municipal service center and public works spending during his administgation represent the largest outlay in many decades.

Apart from political philosophy, the significant thing about Austin D. Rhodes is his fervent, unabashed love for his native city. And Waltham returns the affection in full measure, as will be fully demonstrated in tonight's happy 80th birthday salute to its No. 1 citizen.

ONE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED GATHER FOR BIRTHDAY SALUTE TO MAYOR RHODES

(By Richard E. Booker)

Eight decades of living were packed into a few hours last night when, in a series of vignettes frosted with accolades, the story of Waltham's Mayor Austin D. Rhodes was unfolded before 1,200 well-wishers.

The story was told in superlatives, with unabashed respect and admiration for the man—the industrialist and the politician—who 2 days before had reached his 80th birthday.

Narrators were close and distant political associates and friends, a university president, and churchmen who sat at the head table in the shadow of 400-pound birthday cake fashioned as a model of city hall.

It was told in the words of D. Abram L. Sachar, president of Brandeis University, as an American success story which combined "ideals with the courage and stamina so lacking in American life today."

And, according to Gov. John A. Volpe, who arrived a little late by "plane, not helicopter" from Washington, it was an "extraordinary" story of a dedicated public servant "who would prove stiff competition" in a gubernatorial election.

On the recent Crime Commission report Volpe pointed out "let's not lose our perspective and read things into it which aren't there.

"It does not say all public officials are crooks, but points out too many are violating the public trust. There are thousands of public officials doing a dedicated job.

"And Austin Rhodes is one of them. We could use more like him," Volpe said.

Another head table guest, Congressman HAROLD DONOHUE, admitted receiving his "baptism of fire" in politics under the subtle guns of the guest of honor.

It involved the chapter on Waltham's South Side post office which Rhodes once asked DONOHUE for, and received.

The request, DONOHUE said, came with a smile but it carried with it an implied threat. "I was lucky; he got the post office and I'm still in the capital.

"You have heard of the famous persuasive L.B.J. treatment. I'll let you in one something. He took lessons from Austin D. Rhodes," the Congressman said.

Another student of Rhodes, Council President Richard F. Dacey, Jr., who served as master of ceremonies, remarked of his tutor "no other man could rate a turnout" that filled the Monticello Restaurant in Framingham.

The punchline of the story, of course, comes at the end and the guest of honor delivered it.

Looking over his shoulder at the years, Rhodes commented he was just an "ordinary man" who looks at himself every morning in the mirror and sees himself doing only "a job I'm paid to do."

As for the future, he quipped, "there's no place in heaven for me and I'd be too troublesome in hell. I've got a hunch I'll be around for awhile, yet."

Attesting to his own character, Rhodes summed up his story, saying he had been "reasonably honest, thrifty, and temperate."

Rhodes, slightly hoarse, whose voice broke only once earlier in the evening when the cake was rolled in, closed out his talk by saying he "hoped he could live up to the friendship shown here tonight.

"I feel like a man on a pedestal and a slight breeze might blow me off. I wouldn't want to do or say anything that might spoil what has been done tonight," he concluded.

Managing Editor Thomas J. Murphy, of the News-Tribune, introduced Dr. Sachar. Included in the university president's remarks were barbs on the reluctance of able men to enter public life. He said the country "suffers from the withdrawal of young, intelligent people from public activity because of their inability to puncture the elephantine skin of others.

"What is needed are persons who can combine their ideals with a toughness to stick it out when the going is rough. This is what they are not doing now," he said.

Mayor Rhodes was presented two gifts, a portable television set and a colored picture portrait by Waltham Photographer Make O'Neil.

The giant cake, 400 pounds, 4 feet long, and 3½ feet high, was presented by Melvin Drapkin, vice president of the Waltham Super market.

Head table guests besides the speakers were Rt. Rev. Thomas H. Flynn, Drapkin, Mrs. Charles Malone, Charles Chaprales, James Hart, Rabbi M. Aaron Kra, and the Venerable George O. Ekwall.

Telegrams flowed in throughout the evening, wishing the mayor a happy birthday. One came from President Lyndon B. Johnson in Washington, sent at the request of Congressman DONAHUE.

The longest telegram, three pages, was sent by Attorney General Edward W. Brooke. Others came from Lt. Gov. Elliot Richardson, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, the Red Cross, and many others.

Proceeds from last night's affair, which are expected to be $2,500, will be donated toward a scholarship fund established in memory of the mayor's late wife, Mrs. Eleanor Rhodes, who died last November.

Legislative Resolution 47

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the legislature of the State of Nebraska is deeply concerned about our national boxcar shortage. The legislature has officially requested the Congress to enact legislation which will authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to set the per diem rates at a point that there will be an incentive to construct or purchase rolling stock rather than to rent them from other railroads. I call to the attention of my colleagues, Legislative Resolution 47 which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in the 75th regular session on the 14th day of May 1965:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 47

(Introduced by Rudolf C. Kokes, 41st District; H. C. Crandall, 46th District)

Whereas inasmuch as the present boxcar shortage has been with us for several years and that it appears to be getting worse

instead of better, and inasmuch as it is having a depressing effect on grain markets and thereby on farm income in that export markets are being threatened, if not lost, because we are unable to move grain into export positions fast enough to satisfy shipping movements and thus grain may be more readily bought from other nations; and

Whereas the available boxcar supply is totally inadequate; and

Whereas often months elapse before grain can be moved for which orders for export have been received; and

Whereas the shortage of cars has a serious depressing effect on the grain trade, and consequently on our agricultural economy; and

Whereas Middle Western railroads are building cars but that these cars find their ways to Eastern and Southern U.S. area railroads and are retained there because it is cheaper, under existing levels of per diem rates, to rent a car than it is to own one: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 75th session assembled:

1. That Congress be requested to enact legislation which will authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to set the per diem rates at a point that there will be an incentive to all railroads to construct or to purchase rolling stock rather than to rent them from other railroads.

2. That printed copies of this resolution be sent by the clerk of the legislature to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of Congress from Nebraska, to the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, and to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

PHILIP C. SORENSEN,
President of the Legislature.

I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 47, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 75th regular session on the 14th day of May 1965.

HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

Anniversary of the Independence of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, 17 years ago, on May 14, 1948, a new state gained its independence and took its rightful place as a full member of the family of free and sovereign nations.

This was an independence which had been long sought, for which there had been bitter fighting and which was so richly deserved. The independence of Israel is the story of great determination and courage which lasted for over 2,000 years. During this period there was the continuing struggle of a people to reestablish their country on the site where their ancestors had lived, worked, and prayed. Always there was the one great resounding and unifying spirit—hatikvah—hope.

Israel's independence was gained with the sweat and blood of hundreds and thousands of Jews. Even after it gained its independence this country has had to maintain a continual vigilance against the harassment and aggression of its Arab neighbors. This did not deter them, however, as the Israelis have been steeled to this type of adversity. This strength and determination is exemplified by the term applied to people born in Israel before independence—sabrah—the thorny and tough bush indigenous to that area.

Also, constant intimidation did not hamper the fantastic growth and strengthening of this nation. In many ways Israel's struggle for independence and its growth parallels that of our own country. Perhaps the most noticeable similarity is the pioneering spirit which built our Nation and which is now a major factor in the development of Israel.

Israel is an oasis of growth, stability, and democracy in the Middle East. In a land which was once a desolate and barren desert new cities and flourishing crops now abound. Not only has Israel made great strides in its own economic development but she is now assisting other developing nations of the free world through technical assistance. This country has also become a focal point of culture and learning.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I join my distinguished colleagues in congratulating Israel on 17 years of progress. I wish her all success and good fortune for continued prosperity and growth.

The AID Research and Analysis Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, if the widening of the economic gap between the have and the have-not nations is to be reversed, we must bring to the development of these nations the catalyst of scientific research and development, a catalyst that has spurred our own economy so significantly in the past 20 years. We must use science to leapfrog many of the stages of economic development and to bring the less-developed nations quickly into the modern world, a world, after all, that depends on science and technology for its economic progress.

Recognizing this, the 87th Congress wrote into the Foreign Assistance Act provision for an appropriation for research and analysis. Under this authorization, pioneering work is being carried on by the Agency for International Development aimed at bringing the power of modern science to bear on the complex problems of the less-developed world. Since then, a research program has been developed in AID which spans the broad spectrum of scientific and economic research, from public health to the study of social change, from agriculture to systems analysis, from research on material resources to the development of better education techniques.

One of the major areas of AID research is directed toward that most fundamental problem, the shortage of food. It is a problem whose priority rests not only on humanitarian grounds but also on the fact that economic and social development is firmly linked to the adequacy of nutrition. Whenever the quantity and quality of nutrition is raised, there is an almost automatic increase in productivity, in the effectiveness of education, and in the intangible but all-important spirit of progress. Research on agricultural production is thus a justifiably important phase of AID's program.

One of AID's most dramatic agricultural research efforts is aimed at eradicating the tsetse fly, the carrier of trypanosomiasis infection in both animals and humans; it thus has implications as important to public health as to agriculture. The widespread presence of the tsetse fly in Africa severely limits the utilization of land for agricultural purposes, and the use of insecticides is very expensive and generally impractical. As a result, vast areas of Africa's arable land are today unused, solely because of tsetse fly infestation. An AID research program, conducted through AID financing of U.S. Department of Agriculture scientists, is aimed at developing a method of eradicating the tsetse fly from large areas of Africa. Using techniques of chemical sterilization of the flies originally developed to eliminate the cattle screw-worm in the United States, these scientists have achieved highly promising results and are soon to launch a comprehensive field trial in southern Rhodesia. The results to date show promise that this project may lead to one of the major research achievements of this decade.

Another AID project in agriculture, again executed for AID by the USDA, is showing the potential of making cereal crops in Africa vastly more productive. This program, begun 2 years ago, is attempting to raise the yield of corn, millet, and sorghum, the basic staples of a broad belt of African nations. Results already have yielded an increase in the productivity of corn in experimental plots in Kenya from 25 bushels per acre to almost 200 per acre.

Attacking the problems of agriculture through increased acreage and improved crop yields is not sufficient, however. Recognizing this, AID is sponsoring a number of studies on the economic, political, and social aspects of agriculture. The most comprehensive program in this area is with the University of Wisconsin, whose land tenure center has been created through AID support to examine the vital problem of land reform in South America, in terms of the legal, political, and social systems which are making land reform more or less workable. Field work has been carried out in eight Latin American countries, dozens of Latin American and U.S. scholars have become engaged in attacking these problems, and most important, the findings

of these studies are being used by agrarian reform planners in Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, and other Latin American nations. Possibly the most profound result of the land tenure program is the fact that Latin Americans associated with the program are increasingly being placed by their own countries in policy-making positions.

Another area where both basic human needs and economic necessity compel AID's attention is in the field of public health. Here, AID research is supporting the worldwide effort at malaria eradication. This eradication effort, executed through AID's technical assistance program and the World Health Organization, has had some momentous successes: in India, the number of malaria cases per year has been reduced astonishingly, from over 100 million to less than 100 thousand cases per year. The activities of AID-supported research have not only increased the effectiveness of the eradication program but have resulted in annual savings of over $3 million. In addition, AID research, through an agreement with the U.S. Public Health Service, is initiating a program to discover methods for eliminating the last insecticide-resistant areas of malarial infection. So long as such focuses of resistance exist, the disease can sweep back, at any time, to again subjugate the tropical countries of the world; it is the aim of this research to make available the tools for the complete eradication which is necessary. Thus, a small problem of today is being prevented from growing into a major problem of tomorrow.

Another area of intense AID research interest is in enhancing the development of those human capabilities so essential to the viability of the less-developed nations. AID Research has, for example, embarked on a pioneering program of mathematics curriculum development in the English-speaking countries of Africa. At this time, African children in over 400 schools are learning mathematics the modern way and with examples familiar to them, in a highly successful field test of teaching materials developed by Africans themselves, under the direction of a team of eminent researchers drawn from all over the United States. A similar program is underway in developing science curriculums. Through programs like this, AID is attempting to make it possible for the peoples of the less-developed world to leap, in one generation, from a primitive, preliterate way of life to the mainstream of modern society.

AID has learned, through its operations, that new agricultural methods, new technologies, new ways of doing many things will too often not "sell" themselves. It is true, of course, that even in the most advanced nations like the United States, where change is the way of life, long periods of time are needed for the farmers of a region to accept a hybrid seed, or for teachers to begin teaching math in a manner different from the way it was taught in 1800. The conditions which accelerate and retard the acceptance and disffusion of innovation are thus of vital interest to AID, and a number of studies relevant to this problem are being carried on.

I have touched on only a small sample of the many projects underway. Of particular interest to me are other projects on the development of foam plastics for low-cost housing, the use of new computer simulation techniques for sophisticated economic planning in order to maximize the usefulness of AID's resources and national resources, the role of universities in political change in Latin America, the impact of investments in housing, health, and other sectors on overall economic growth, the creation of high-protein food supplements, the development of national accounts systems in the less-developed countries, the rational planning of transportation, and a number of other important problems, including the evaluation of AID operational programs.

I need not elaborate or expand on these programs, for I believe it is already clear that AID is utilizing its very limited research resources in an imaginative and fertile way. I turn now to what I understand to be new directions for research in AID. Under the leadership of the Science Director of AID, Dr. John Wilkes, and with the guidance of the distinguished scientists on AID's Research Advisory Committee, chaired by Dr. Walsh McDermott, and of AID Administrator David Bell, new spheres of action are being defined for AID's Office of Research and Analysis.

First, there are new areas where modern science must be tapped for its contribution, among them population dynamics, where research on the acceptance of family limitation methods is urgently needed—and where the Catholic Church, particularly in Latin America, is taking the lead; food technology, where great potential lies for alleviating the earth's food shortage, through new preservation and storage techniques; power production and distribution, where nuclear engineering may free the power resources of nations from the limitations of natural resources, and thus provide the widespread powerbase that is essential to industrialization; and the development of a scientific capability within the less-developed nations themselves, so that the catalyst of science can eventually come from within.

And, second, ther are new scientific approaches and technologies that should be of great use in solving the demanding, unusually complex problems of social and economic development. One of these techniques is advanced systems analysis, which my own State of California, under the imaginative leadership of Gov. Pat Brown, is utilizing to help solve several of its major economic and social problems. It has a unique applicability to many of the complex, multivariable problems of development, and I am pleased that AID research is so forward looking as to utilize the power of this new methodology to serve its ends.

Another area of clear applicability in which AID is becoming increasingly involved is the broad area of industrial technology. We are the most technologically advanced nation on the earth; let us, by all means, use this source of strength in our efforts to aid the less-developed world. It will, of course, be found here, as it has in other areas of advanced technology, that simple adoption of American technologies will often not succeed, that research on adapting them to the new conditions of other parts of the world will be required. But the scientists and engineers of this country are well equipped to address these problems of adaptation, if only they are mobilized. This mobilization AID will attempt to accomplish.

Finally, a third new era area of AID interest that is particularly exciting to me is the utilization of space technology. The ultimate implications of this field for the acceleration of development are staggering. I know that AID research is looking with interest at the potential of satellities for both meteorological and educational telecommunications purposes. One of the seldom realized facts about space technology is that, although the engineering development costs are high, the ultimate products may be very inexpensive compared to conventional methods of accomplishing the same objectives. In this instance, for example, local tie-ins with a world meteorological system can provide daily weather forecasts to the less-developed countries at extremely low cost. The effect of having such forecasts available will have an enormous impact in national planning and on many facets of a nation's economic life. Similarly the use of a satellite for broadcasting educational television programs over a wide geographic area could be far cheaper than the usual educational methods. Providing it is feasible to build an entire educational system around television—and the experience of the Department of the Interior in American Samoa indicates that at least under certain conditions it is not only feasible but effective as well—satellite broadcasting could make possible a dramatic upgrading and expansion, over whole continents, of basic education, adult literacy, vocational and skill training, and the communication of information of all sorts—weather, news, methods of agricultural practices, sanitation techniques, and so forth.

These efforts at using science for development of course cost money. The $12 million earmarked for research in this year's bill is a modest sum, indeed, considering the magnitude and scope of the problems that AID faces and the contribution that I believe scientific research can make toward solving those problems. The selection of areas of concentration made by the Office of Research and Analysis has been a judicious one, but it must be recognized that its limited funds have compelled a choice of only a minute number of the problems which it could fruitfully examine. Its $12 million is, after all, less than one one-thousandth of the Federal Government's annual research and development budget.

One of the effects of its modest budget is to prevent it from supporting any extensive engineering development work, or large-scale field trials of new techniques or technologies, or the kind of extensive survey research on the attitudes and motivations of the people of the less-developed countries that most experts agree is essential to development planning, or

use of the pilot study approach of examining whole areas from a multidisciplinary point of view while making a comprehensive attack on development problems.

All these methods could, I am sure, prove themselves most useful in the fulfillment of AID's mission, were funds available; however, they are all of a character that makes them too expensive for the present budget of AID Research. I should like to point out, however, a fact about the economics of science. American industry has learned in the last two decades that investment in research and development pays off handsomely. It is true that research and development is expensive, particularly in the areas of "big science," with its massive hardware of satellites, nuclear reactors, and such. However, the benefits of "big science" are more than commensurate with the size of the initial investment; and certain advances can be made only wtih bigness.

The AID research and analysis program has already demonstrated, within its more limited scope, the dramatic benefits that can accrue from an investment in research on the problems of the developing nations. As it continues to mobilize science in new ways, with huge potential good for the peoples of the world, I wish it well.

Last Chance for the Nation's Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday Review magazine recently published a series of articles dealing with "The Fouling of the American Environment." These articles are written on all aspects of pollution in our environment and I recommend this issue as must reading for all thoughtful persons interested in the war on pollution.

I would like to commend Saturday Review's editor, Norman Cousins, for this great service to responsible journalism. I was particularly impressed by the article on water pollution, "Last Chance for the Nation's Waterways," written by Robert and Leona Rienow. The Rienows have done a superb job of reporting and digesting vast sources of material to come up with a very succinct analysis of the problems of water pollution. They point out in a significant way, that even with vast sums of money expended by Federal, State, and local sources, in the final analysis it is up to the public opinion to pave the way for needed reforms in this area.

Their article appears as follows:

LAST CHANCE FOR THE NATION'S WATERWAYS

(By Robert and Leona Train Rienow)

In the Middle Ages a knight going forth on horseback at dawn found his nostrils assailed by the gutter rivulets that had been casually dumped from second-story windows during the night. Several centuries of enlightenment later, a knight of industry, taking his morning constitutional along a river, finds his nostrils assailed by the same ancient and unwelcome odor. Modern man possesses (or knows how to find) the answers to the disposal of every kind of waste—if he is interested enough. To date, however, he has been too occupied with other matters.

The crime is now catching up with him. The bulldozer operator at the town dump, who for years has been shoving refuse over the edge of a gorge, discovers one morning that the gorge is filled up. And after generations of irresponsibly channeling their wastes into the waters beneath and around the land, Americans now find themselves faced with the fact that the wastes exceed the ability of the surface waters to absorb them. Indeed, where septic tanks are close, even the earth is spongy with wastes that befoul the underground water. The situation is in crisis; the problem must be met, and no longer by halfhearted, niggardly half-financed measures.

So pressing is the issue that President Johnson even championed the cause of clean waters in his state of the Union message, labeling it a primary goal of his administration. Governors, chambers of commerce, and public-spirited industries have begun to pledge their efforts. But how deep have we sunk into the pollution mire? How great, actually, is the need now? And, how can we attack so long-neglected a condition?

There is exciting hope of restoring our waterways, but the effort will be so vast, so demanding, so costly that unless the public is prepared now to meet it, the job will be impossible.

The Mississippi now bears more sludge than mud. The once glittering Milwaukee River is overlaid with a bubbly slime, and one no longer sees the gay throngs of swimmers that once crowded the mill race, or fishermen proudly bearing long strings of pike and bass. The Mahoning steams with heat from coke ovens, all life destroyed. The North Branch of the Potomac is suffused with sulfuric acid that corrodes boats, bridges, even dams. Then there is the storied Potomac itself, upon whose polluted estuary more than 65 million cubic feet of silt descend each year, slowly smothering it. The Delaware's noxious waters threaten the drinking water of Camden, N.J., and other localities. Large areas of the Providence River and Narragansett Bay have been sealed off from fishing because they swarm with infectious diseases. The Kalamazoo can stomach no more industrial poisons.

Yet who can point fingers from the banks of a clean stream? Not the people on the Fox. Nor on the Mohawk, nor on the Huson. Nor on the Connecticut, nor on the Charles. Nor on the San Joaquin, the Colorado, or the Red. Nor on the Coosa or Nolichucky.

These are the flowing surface waters which, with the help of lakes (the pollution of the Great Lakes themselves has risen so greatly that numerous beaches have had to be closed), supply three-fourths or more of all Americans with their drinking water. It is to these rivers that industry must look for its progress, for without plentiful and reasonably clean water, industry dies.

Driving into Biloxi, Miss., from the west recently, we saw the beaches of white sand. Here children splash in the warm bay water and play leapfrog over a series of great conduits that emerge from under the highway and cut across the sands into the water. But we slowed down in disbelief at the sight of the green and black slime at the mouths of the pipes, an excrescence into which the youngsters were digging their toes with glee.

At the next filling station we asked about the pipes. "Just drainage," shrugged the proprietor.

"You don't mean those are sewage outlets?" we asked.

"Oh, I imagine a little sewage here and there, but it flows away fast. Nothing to worry about. It's the best beach in the country—you should see the crowds of kids on a hot day."

Sixty miles along the coast we entered the attractive city of Mobile. Boys and girls were risking their lives in the heavy traffic, stopping cars to sell cartons of doughnuts. "What's the money for?" we asked the pretty teenager who took our cash. "For the children's hospital," she said. "We need a million."

It is unscientific to draw any parallel between the demand for children's hospitals and beaches covered with green or black slime. It is precipitate to link, for instance, the uncounted hordes of new viruses with the increasing befoulment of our world. Yet New York's Governor Rockefeller does not find the two conditions unconnected. Speaking of the historic Hudson, he stated bluntly, and to wide bipartisan applause: "For 10 miles south of Albany * * * there are no fish, but sludge worms, leeches, rattail maggots, the larvae of flies—the handwriting on the wall to us, undeniable handwriting on the wall, that warns us to stop polluting our lakes and rivers, to stop treating our waterways as if they were open sewers." These conditions, he went on, have brought us to the brink of an emergency in which the health and future of the State are at stake.

And, at the recent legislative correspondents' annual show, Charles H. Palmer, the Governor's assistant secretary, offered a ditty, part of which (to the tune of "Lazy River") went:

"Up the dirty river where the
sewage flows,
Say, any time you're near there
better hold your nose.
Swimmin' in that stuff you had best
avoid;
Get yourself a mouthful and you
risk typhoid."

What are the major pollutants that are saturating rivers, lakes, and ocean beaches? What are Americans drinking when they lift their water glasses, their beer mugs, their coffee cups?

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare lists eight major categories: (1) sewage, (2) infectious agents, (3) plant nutrients, (4) organical chemical exotics, (5) mineral and chemical substances, (6) sediments, (7) radioactive substances, and (8) heat.

Sewage includes both domestic sewage and food-processing wastes. Barnett Fowler, columist of the Albany, N.Y., Times Union, writes: "In Troy recently it was brought out that the Hudson there is a slimy cesspool filled with floating garbage and eels clamoring for bloody chicken waste. * * * Divers who worked on the Mohawk have run into water so foul, so murky, that is was an invisible world."

Aerobic bacteria and oxygen are able to reduce a certain amount of sewage, but we have overburdened our streams until the dissolved oxygen has fallen below four parts in a million. At this point all life dies; the river becomes an evil-smelling septic tank, rank with vicious diseases. "Every river system in America is now polluted," asserted the President in his February 8 message.

In 1964, it is estimated, we dumped into our once sparkling streams the equivalent of the sewage of some 82 million persons. By 1980 we expect to load our waters with the equivalent of 92 million persons' sewage. And industry discharges an equal amount of oxygen-demanding wastes. Thus the present sewage load adds up to the equivalent of approximately 165 million, and the figure will be more that 185 million by 1980. But our streams have already given up.

Infectious agents encompass a menacing band of killers, including new viruses of all types. After all, we cannot expect to pour

into our surface waters all the discharges from mortuaries, hospitals, and slaughtering plants with immunity from plague forever. Enteric and tuberculosis bacteria, hepatitis, polio, diphtheria, typhoid—you name it, Old Man River has it. He can even produce a few hundred more you can't name.

The third category of pollution, plant nutrients, is a startler; we have come to think of the 5-10-5 we tote home for our gardens as the gardeners' best friend. But leached out of the soil from vast agricultural areas to saturate our rivers, fertilizers, says HEW, become a real problem. They stimulate rank plant life to choke streams with "an unnatural green soup" causing death to fish, a strong ordor of decay, and toxic materials—not the least of which is strychnine.

However, it is the fourth pollutant the organic chemical exotics, that is the newest and perhaps the most dangerous. Soap manufacturers are now promising that they will switch over from the hard detergents that have been transforming our rivers into avalanches of fluff, and will use a softer brand after June 30, 1965. But we are also flooding our waters with the residues of lethal pesticides and weed killers. DDT has been found in every river in the country; Aldin (one application lasts a full year and kills eighteen types of insects) is universal; 0-nitrochlorobenzine has been traced in 1,000 miles of the Mississippi; benzene compounds and xylenes, naphtholene, and pyridine are present in other rivers too numerous to list. Unfortunately, most of these deadly modern poisons cannot be filtered out, and, more unfortunately, they haven't been in use long enough for authorities to know their cumulative effect on the human body.

There are, in the fifth category, other mineral and chemical pollutants of older derivation—salts from natural rock deposits, sulfates, and the acids from coal mine operations, and "accidents." Serious acid seepages have accurred in the Potomac, Delaware, Susquehanna, Mississippi, and Ohio, as well as in almost all Western rivers. In Minnesota in 1963, when winter burst storage tanks and released 3 million gallons of deadly, sticky fuel oil over the Mississippi nesting grounds of millions of water fowl, Gov. Karl Rolvaag had to call out the National Guard to try to rescue what birds it could from the slaughter.

Sixth, sediment as a pollutant of our rivers has been plaguing us ever since the first watershed was thoughtlessly stripped of its soil-protecting forest and exposed to the ravages of the spring rains. The Mississippi carries 500 million tons of mud into the delta annually, and the beautiful Eel River, which once made a fairlyand of the California coastal redwoods, has now been turned into a rolling flood of yellow mud by the gutted-earth procedures of the lumbermen and an unfathomable blunder by the State iself: a four-lane righway that runs straight through the heart of the groves.

While the silt problem is the oldest, the addition to our water supply of radioactive wastes, the seventh culprit, is one of our most recent contributions to water pollution. Radiation enters our waters from uranium milling, atomic reactors, medical laboratories, mortuaries, hospitals, and industries. At present this discharge is minute, but Dr. Earnest F. Golyna, professor of sanitary engineering at the University of Texas, says that by 1990 such discharges, "safely" diluted, would fill a lake the size of the Lone Star State 15 feet deep. Other experts assert flatly that there is no such thing as safe dilution.

Finally, we come upon a pollutant that few recognize as such: it is heat. Steel mills, coke ovens, petroleum refineries; steam turbine electricity plants, and atomic reactors draw immense quantities of water from streams and return it hot or warm, killing most fish and other aquatic life. We are told that, according to projections of the gross national product, heat pollution will multiply eight times during the next 35 years.

This, then, is the state of emergency we are in at present. What can be done about the situation rests inevitably on how aroused the public becomes and on its willingness to pay the price for partial restoration of America's waterways. (After all, just the separation of storm and waste sewers in Chicago alone—a real necessity in every community if we would save our surface waters—would cost more than a billion dollars. The future depends, too, on the fate of the administration's Water Quality Act of 1965, which is already halfway through Congress. But, in the end, it will depend primarily on public support. How many citizens will demand, for example, that other States follow Nebraska's lead and legally ban hard detergents? When will the citizenry give first priority in its budgets to the elemental matter of treating and disposing of its own waste products? And how long will people allow the timber producers of the West to spray their acres with DDT, against the advice of the Federal Pest Review Board and to the complete detriment of water quality?

Proded by the White House, there is now a pronounced shift in the official attitude toward water pollution. The bureaucratic torpor is dissipating. Industry is no longer brazen about its wastes. But until our well-plumbered citizenry in general commits itself to antipollution appropriations and to strong individual support of clean waters, Americans are doomed to chant, along with Charles Palmer at the Legislative Correspondents' annual dinner:

"You keep going your way,
I'll keep going my way,
River, stay away from our door."

Twenty-five New Food Stamp Projects Eliminated by Appropriations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as the author of Public Law 88–525 establishing the nationwide food stamp program, I am, of course, anxious to see this program expanded as rapidly as possible to areas of the Nation which want, but do not yet have, food stamp projects in operation. The program originally began as a pilot operation with only 8 projects in severely depressed areas; later it was enlarged on an experimental basis to 40 counties and 3 cities, with the entire costs financed out of section 32 funds.

After the enactment of Public Law 88–525 last August, $60 million was appropriated to finance operations for the remainder of this fiscal year—at a level of $75 million a year—and more than 60 additional projects have been added to the program this year. Several more are to be added next month, at which time there will be 110 projects operating in 29 States.

Under Public Law 88–525, the program in the 1966 fiscal year was to be enlarged further to a level of $100 million a year. This would have made possible the addition of 28 new projects, including the District of Coumbia, the city of Baltimore, the city of Providence, and numerous other localities in Alabama, Alaska, California, Georgia, Hawaii, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Texas, Vermont, and West Virginia.

TWENTY-FIVE-PERCENT BUDGET CUT WOULD LOP OFF 25 PROJECTS

However, Mr. Speaker, the action of the Committee on Appropriations in cutting back the budget for the food stamp program in the coming year from $100 million to $75 million would mean—if allowed to stand—that only 2 or 3 of the 28 additional areas scheduled to come into the program in the new fiscal year beginning July 1 could be included.

Thus, 25 of the following 28 areas—listed along with their Representatives in the House—would be forced to go for another year without the benefits of this excellent program, and their needy families would be denied the opportunity to enjoy a well-rounded nutritious diet at a cost they can afford:

Alabama: Lauderdale County, ROBERT E. JONES.

Alaska: RALPH J. RIVERS, at large (specific area not designated).

California (specific area not designated).

District of Columbia.

Georgia: Habersham County and Hall County, PHILLIP M. LANDRUM.

Hawaii: SPARK M. MATSUNAGA and PATSY T. MINK, at large (specific area not designated).

Maine: Androscoggin County, WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY.

Maryland:

City of Baltimore, EDWARD A. GARMATZ, GEORGE H. FALLON, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL.

Dorchester County, ROGERS C. B. MORTON.

Michigan, Wayne County[1]: JOHN CONYERS, Jr., WESTON E. VIVIAN, JAMES G. O'HARA, CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., LUCIEN N. NEDZI, WILLIAM D. FORD, JOHN D. DINGELL, MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, BILLIE S. FARNUM.

Minnesota, Ramsey County, JOSEPH E. KARTH.

Mississippi:

Chickasaw County: THOMAS G. ABERNETHY.

Coahoma County: JAMIE L. WHITTEN.

Harrison County: WILLIAM M. COLMER.

Jones County: WILLIAM M. COLMER.

Loundes County: THOMAS G. ABERNETHY.

Madison County: PRENTICE L. WALKER.

Nevada, Clark County: WALTER S. BARING (AL).

New Jersey: (Specific area not designated).

New York, Erie County Welfare District: RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, HENRY P. SMITH, III, THADDEUS J. DULSKI.

Rhode Island: City of Providence: FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, JOHN E. FOGARTY.

Texas: (Specific area not designated).

Vermont: (Specific area not designated).

West Virginia:

Boone County: JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

Fayette County: JAMES KEE.

Kanawha County: JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

Raleigh County: JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

MORE THAN 300 ADDITIONAL AREAS ALSO WANT FOOD STAMP PLANS

In addition to setting back, for at least a year, the inclusion of the 25 areas which had been scheduled to come into the program during the 1966 fiscal year under a $100 million budget, Mr. Speaker, the action of the Committee on Appropriations would mean further ex-

---

[1] The city of Detroit is one of the 43 pilot areas.

tended delays for 339 additional localities in 35 States, for which State welfare agencies have formally requested food stamp projects. Even under a $100 million annual budget, they could not be included in the coming year; but if the $75 million figure were to stand, it would take a tremendous effort to gear up the program in the 1967 fiscal year to the $200 million level authorized in the enabling legislation. I doubt if the committee, or the Congress, next year would try to go from a $75 million to a $200 million level overnight. On the other hand, if we advance, as scheduled, in the 1966 fiscal year to the $100 million level proposed in the budget, it would be that much more practical to reach the $200 million level the following year, as the law provides.

Those areas on the waiting list, more than 300 of them, and their Representatives, are as follows:

PENDING REQUESTS FOR THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM SUBMITTED BY STATE WELFARE AGENCIES UNDER THE FOOD STAMP ACT, AS OF MAY 21, 1965

Alabama: Greene County: ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, Jr.

Alaska [1]: RALPH J. RIVERS, at large.

Arkansas:

Bradley County: OREN HARRIS.
Crittenden County: E. C. GATHINGS.
Lonoke County: WILBUR D. MILLS.
Mississippi County: E. C. GATHINGS.
Conway County: WILBUR D. MILLS.
Johnson County: JAMES W. TRIMBLE.
Monroe County: WILBUR D. MILLS.
Dallas County: OREN HARRIS.
Poinsett County: E. C. GATHINGS.
Prairie County: WILBUR D. MILLS.
Greene County: E. C. GATHINGS.
Faulkner County: WILBUR D. MILLS.
Ouachita County: OREN HARRIS.
Perry County: WILBUR D. MILLS.

California [1]:

City and county of San Francisco: PHILIP BURTON and WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD.

Los Angeles County: CECIL R. KING, CHET HOLIFIELD, H. ALLEN SMITH, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, JAMES C. CORMAN, DELWIN M. CLAWSON, GLENNARD P. LIPSCOMB, RONALD B. CAMERON, JAMES ROOSEVELT, ED REINECKE, ALPHONSO BELL, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., EDWARD R. ROYBAL, CHARLES H. WILSON, CRAIG HOSMER.

Kings County: HARLAN HAGEN.
Merced County: JEFFERY COHELAN.
Solano County: ROBERT L. LEGGETT.
Butte County: HAROLD T. JOHNSON.
Santa Clara County: CHARLES S. GUBSER.
Imperial County: JOHN V. TUNNEY.
Plumas County: HAROLD T. JOHNSON.
Contra Costa County: JOHN F. BALDWIN.
Inyo County: HAROLD T. JOHNSON.
Sacramento County: JOHN E. MOSS.
San Diego County: ROBERT C. WILSON and LIONEL VAN DEERLIN.
Riverside County: JOHN V. TUNNEY.

Colorado:

Baca County: FRANK E. EVANS.
Bent County: FRANK E. EVANS.
Boulder County: ROY H. MCVICKER.
Cheyenne County: FRANK E. EVANS.
Crowley County: FRANK E. EVANS.
Custer County: FRANK E. EVANS.
Delta County: WAYNE N. ASPINALL.
Elbert County: FRANK E. EVANS.
Garfield County: WAYNE N. ASPINALL.
Gunnison County: WAYNE N. ASPINALL.
Huerfano County: FRANK E. EVANS.
Jackson County: WAYNE N. ASPINALL.
Jefferson County: ROY H. MCVICKER.
Logan County: WAYNE N. ASPINALL.
Mesa County: WAYNE N. ASPINALL.
Phillips County: WAYNE N. ASPINALL.
Pueblo County: FRANK E. EVANS.
Rio Grande County: WAYNE N. ASPINALL.
San Miguel County: WAYNE N. ASPINALL.
Washington County: FRANK E. EVANS.

Connecticut:

Welfare District No. 2, New Haven area: JOHN STEPHEN MONAGAN and ROBERT N. GIAIMO.

Welfare District No. 7, Middletown area: WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE.

Georgia:

Cherokee County: PHILLIP M. LANDRUM.
Bibb County: JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

Hawaii [1]: SPARK M. MATSUNAGA AND PATSY T. MINK at large.

Indiana:

Daviess County: WILLIAM G. BRAY.
Gibson County: WILLIAM G. BRAY.
Lake County: RAY J. MADDEN.
Morgan County: RAY J. MADDEN.
Newton County: CHARLES A. HALLECK.
Orange County: LEE H. HAMILTON.
Pike County: WINFIELD K. DENTON.
Vermillion County: RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH.
Wells County: E. ROSS ADAIR.
Decatur County: RALPH HARVEY.
Franklin County: LEE H. HAMILTON.
Madison County: J. EDWARD ROUSH.
Marshall County: JOHN BRADEMAS.
Switzerland County: LEE H. HAMILTON.
Wayne County: RALPH HARVEY.
Marion County: ANDREW JACOBS, JR.
Crawford County: WINFIELD K. DENTON.

Iowa: Cerro Gordo County: H. R. GROSS.

Kansas:

Atchison County: CHESTER L. MIZE.
Marion County: GARNER E. SHRIVER.

Kentucky:

Knox County: TIM LEE CARTER.
Menifee County: CARL D. PERKINS.
Bell County: TIM LEE CARTER.
Elliott County: CARL D. PERKINS.
Morgan County: CARL D. PERKINS.
Edmonson County: WILLIAM H. NATCHER.
Pike County: CARL D. PERKINS.
Carter County: CARL D. PERKINS.
Harlan County: TIM LEE CARTER.
Bowen County' CARL D. PERKINS.
Campbell County: FRANK CHELF.
Clay County: TIM LEE CARTER.
Jefferson County: CHARLES R. F. FARNSLEY.
Kenton County: FRANK CHELF.
Laurel County: TIM LEE CARTER.
Lee County: CARL D. PERKINS.
Rockcastle County: TIM LEE CARTER.
Whitley County: TIM LEE CARTER.
Wolfe County: CARL D. PERKINS.

Louisiana:

Caddo Parish: JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.
Red River Parish: JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.
Franklin Parish: OTTO E. PASSMAN.
West Carroll Parish: OTTO E. PASSMAN.
Tensas Parish: OTTO E. PASSMAN.
St. Helena Parish: JAMES H. MORRISON.
Richland Parish: OTTO E. PASSMAN.
Vernon Parish: SPEEDY O. LONG.
Sabin Parish: SPEEDY O. LONG.
Iberville Parish: JAMES H. MORRISON.
Jackson Parish: OTTO E. PASSMAN.
Allen Parish: T. A. THOMPSON.
Madison Parish: OTTO E. PASSMAN.
Concordia Parish: OTTO E. PASSMAN.
Assumption Parish: EDWIN E. WILLIS.
Jefferson Davis Parish: T. A. THOMPSON.
St. James Parish: HALE BOGGS.
St. John Parish: HALE BOGGS.
St. Charles Parish: HALE BOGGS.
Iberia Parish: EDWIN E. WILLIS.
Orleans Parish: F. EDWARD HÉBERT and HALE BOGGS.
Lafayette Parish: EDWIN E. WILLIS.
Cameron Parish: T. A. THOMPSON.
Lafouche Parish: EDWIN E. WILLIS.
Jefferson Parish: HALE BOGGS.
Calcasieu Parish: T. A. THOMPSON.

Maine:

Washington County: WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY.
City of Waterville: STANLEY R. TUPPER.
City of Portland: STANLEY R. TUPPER.
City of Bangor: WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY.

Michigan:

Alger County: RAYMOND F. CLEVENGER.
Arenac County: ELFORD A. CEDERBERG.
Berrien County: EDWARD HUTCHINSON.
Clare County: ELFORD A. CEDERBERG.
Clinton County: PAUL H. TODD, JR.
Eaton County: PAUL H. TODD, JR.
Gratiot County: ELFORD A. CEDERBERG.
Hillsdale County: EDWARD HUTCHINSON.
Ingham County: CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN.
Jackson County: CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN.
Kalamazoo County: PAUL H. TODD, JR.
Kent County: GERALD R. FORD.
Lake County: ROBERT P. GRIFFIN.
Luce County: RAYMOND F. CLEVENGER.
Mackinac County: RAYMOND F. CLEVENGER.
Macomb County: JAMES G. O'HARA.
Midland County: ELFORD A. CEDERBERG.
Monroe County: WESTON E. VIVIAN.
Oakland County: WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD.
St. Clair County: JAMES HARVEY.
Van Buren County: EDWARD HUTCHINSON.
Washtenaw County: WESTON E. VIVIAN.

Minnesota:

Stearns County: ALEC OLSON.
Renville County: ALEC OLSON.
Big Stone County: ALEC OLSON.
Becker County: ODIN LANGEN.
Lyon County: ALEC OLSON.
Lac qui Perle County: ALEC OLSON.
Hubbard County: ODIN LANGEN.
Dakota County: ALBERT H. QUIE.
Crow Wing County: ALEC OLSON.
Swift County: ALEC OLSON.
Benton County: ALEC OLSON.
City of Minneapolis: DONALD M. FRASER.
Beltrami County: ODIN LANGEN.
Clearwater County: ODIN LANGEN.
Otter Tail County: ODIN LANGEN.
Kandiyohi County: ALEC OLSON.
Washington County: JOSEPH E. KARTH.

Mississippi:

Adams County: JOHN B. WILLIAMS.
Alcorn County: THOMAS G. ABERNETHY.
Carroll County: JAMIE L. WHITTEN.
Claiborne County: JOHN B. WILLIAMS.
Clay County: THOMAS G. ABERNETHY.
Covington County: WILLIAM M. COLMER.
Forrest County: WILLIAM M. COLMER.
Montgomery County: JAMIE L. WHITTEN.
Jefferson Davis County: WILLIAM M. COLMER.
Lawrence County: WILLIAM M. COLMER.
Oktibbeha County: THOMAS G. ABERNETHY.
Perry County: WILLIAM M. COLMER.
Pike County: JOHN B. WILLIAMS.
Quitman County: JAMIE L. WHITTEN.
Scott County: PRENTICE L. WALKER.
Tallahatchie County: JAMIE L. WHITTEN.
Tippah County: JAMIE L. WHITTEN.
Union County: JAMIE L. WHITTEN.
Wilkinson County: JOHN B. WILLIAMS.
Sunflower County, JAMIE L. WHITTEN.
Wayne County: WILLIAM M. COLMER.
Smith County: PRENTISS L. WALKER.

Montana:

Cascade County: JAMES F. BATTIN.
Deer Lodge County: ARNOLD OLSEN.

Nebraska:

Custer County: DAVID T. MARTIN.
Cheyenne County: DAVID T. MARTIN.
Scotts Bluff County: DAVID T. MARTIN.
Adams County: DAVID T. MARTIN.
Hall County: DAVID T. MARTIN.
Sarpy County: GLENN C. CUNNINGHAM.

Nevada:

Washoe County: WALTER S. BARING, at large.

New Mexico: Colfax County, Union County, Harding County, Quay County, Guadelupe County, Torrance County, DeBaca County, Curry County, Lincoln County, Otero County, Eddy County, Roosevelt County, Lea County, Chaves County: THOMAS G. MORRIS and E. S. JOHNNY WALKER, at large.

New Jersey [1]

North Carolina:

Clay County: ROY A. TAYLOR.
Mitchell County: BASIL LEE WHITENER.
Macon County: ROY A. TAYLOR.

Footnote at end of speech.

Lee County: CHARLES R. JONAS.
New Hanover County: ALTON A. LENNON.
Dare County: HERBERT C. BONNER.
Yadkin County: JAMES T. BROYHILL.
Mecklenburg County: CHARLES R. JONAS.
Hoke County, ALTON A. LENNON.
Caswell County: RALPH J. SCOTT.
Haywood County: ROY A. TAYLOR.
Gaston County: BASIL L. WHITENER.
Catawba County: BASIL L. WHITENER.
Rockingham County: RALPH J. SCOTT.
Pitt County: HERBERT C. BONNER.
Bertie County: HERBERT C. BONNER.
Rowan County: JAMES T. BROYHILL.
Chowan County: HERBERT C. BONNER.
Ohio, Franklin County: SAMUEL L. DEVINE.
Oregon, Curry County: ROBERT B. DUNCAN.
Pennsylvania:
Huntingdon County: J. IRVING WHALLEY.
Philadelphia County: WILLIAM A. BARRETT, ROBERT N. C. NIX, JAMES A. BYRNE, HERMAN TOLL, and WILLIAM J. GREEN.
Bradford County: JOSEPH M. MCDADE.
Washington County: THOMAS E. MORGAN.
Bedford County: J. IRVING WHALLEY.
Jefferson County: ALBERT W. JOHNSON.
Armstrong County: JOHN P. SAYLOR.
Wyoming County: JOSEPH M. MCDADE.
Blair County: J. IRVING WHALLEY.
Schuylkill County: GEORGE M. RHODES.
Sullivan County: JOSEPH M. MCDADE.
Susquehanna County: JOSEPH M. MCDADE.
Venango County: ALBERT W. JOHNSON.
Juniata County: JOHN C. KUNKEL.
Perry County: JOHN C. KUNKEL.
Lackawanna County: JOSEPH M. MCDADE.
Beaver County: FRANK M. CLARK.
Monroe County: FRED B. ROONEY.
Butler County: FRANK M. CLARK.
Montgomery County: RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER.
South Carolina: Allendale County: L. MENDEL RIVERS.
Tennessee:
Clay County: JOE L. EVINS.
Dyer County: ROBERT A. EVERETT.
Jackson County: JOE L. EVINS.
Hancock County: JAMES H. QUILLEN.
Johnson County: JAMES H. QUILLEN.
Meigs County: WILLIAM E. BROCK.
Lake County: ROBERT A. EVERETT.
Stewart County: WILLIAM R. ANDERSON.
Cocke County: JAMES H. QUILLEN.
Morgan County: JOHN J. DUNCAN.
Macon County: JOE L. EVINS.
Cumberland County: JOE L. EVINS.
Hardin County: TOM MURRAY.
Bledsoe County: WILLIAM E. BROCK.
Shelby County: GEORGE W. GRIDER.
Texas [1]:
Cooke County: GRAHAM PURCELL.
Irion County: O. CLARK FISHER.
McLennan County: WILLIAM R. POAGE.
Hardin County: JACK BROOKS.
Cherokee County: JOHN DOWDY.
Jim Wells County: JOHN YOUNG.
Kent County: GRAHAM PURCELL.
Nueces County: JOHN YOUNG.
Carson County: WALTER E. ROGERS.
Maverick County: ELIGIO DE LA GARZA.
Dallam County: WALTER E. ROGERS.
Wilbarger County: GRAHAM PURCELL.
Tarrant County: JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR.
El Paso County: RICHARD C. WHITE.
Hutchinson County: WALTER E. ROGERS.
Hale County: GEORGE H. MAHON.
City of Van Alstyne (Grayson County): RAY ROBERTS.
Nolan County: OMAR BURLESON.
Polk County: JOHN DOWDY.
Garza County: GEORGE H. MAHON.
Bee County: JOHN YOUNG.
Dawson County: GEORGE H. MAHON.
Orange County: JACK BROOKS.
Fisher County: OMAR BURLESON.
Brown County: O. CLARK FISHER.
Swisher County: WALTER E. ROGERS.
Hemphill County: WALTER E. ROGERS.
Howard County: GEORGE H. MAHON.
Franklin County: WRIGHT PATMAN.
Moore County: WALTER E. ROGERS.
Brooks County: JOHN YOUNG.
Henderson County: JOHN DOWDY.
Dallas County: EARLE CABELL.
Utah:
Utah County: DAVID S. KING.
Box Elder County: LAWRENCE J. BURTON.
Cache County: LAWRENCE J. BURTON.
Carbon County: LAWRENCE J. BURTON.
Emery County: LAWRENCE J. BURTON.
Sanpete County: LAWRENCE J. BURTON.
Sevier County: LAWRENCE J. BURTON.
Vermont.[1] St. Albans Welfare District: ROBERT T. STAFFORD (at large).
Washington:
Yakima County: CATHERINE MAY.
Pacific County: JULIA BUTLER HANSEN.
Wahkiakum County: JULIA BUTLER HANSEN.
Thurston County: JULIA BUTLER HANSEN.
Lewis County: JULIA BUTLER HANSEN.
Cowlitz County: JULIA BUTLER HANSEN.
Clark County: JULIA BUTLER HANSEN.
Klickitat County: CATHERINE MAY.
Skamania County: JULIA BUTLER HANSEN.
West Virginia:
Lincoln County: KEN HECHLER.
Wyoming County: JAMES KEE.
Webster County: ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER.
Braxton County: ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
Clay County: JOHN M. SLACK, Jr.
Mercer County: JAMES KEE.
Nicholas County: JOHN M. SLACK, Jr.
Wisconsin:
Dunn County: ALVIN E. O'KONSKI.
Pepin County: VERNON W. THOMSON.
Grant County: VERNON W. THOMSON.
Crawford County: VERNON W. THOMSON.
Milwaukee County: CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI and HENRY S. REUSS.
Lafayette County: VERNON W. THOMSON.
Wyoming:
Uinta County, Niobrara County, Converse County, Sheridan County, Platte County, Goshen County, Albany County, Hot Springs County: TENO RONCALIO, at large.
Park County, Washakie County, Big Horn County, Sweetwater County, Carbon County, Natrona County, Laramie County, Wind River Indian Reservation: TENO RONCALIO, at large.

FOOD STAMP PLAN NOW OPERATING SUCCESSFULLY IN 105 LOCALITIES WITH 5 MORE TO BE ADDED IN JUNE

Mr. Speaker, I submit at this point, for the purposes of completing the record, a list of the 105 projects now operating and the 5 to be begun next month, and the names of the Members of the House who represent those areas. In the list which follows, the June openings are in Connecticut, South Carolina, Utah, Nebraska, and Houghton County, Mich. All of the others are already in operation, some of them since the program was begun on a very small pilot basis in 1961:

Alabama:
Jefferson County: JOHN H. BUCHANAN, JR.
Walker County: JAMES D. MARTIN.
Arkansas:
Independence County: WILBUR D. MILLS.
Phillips County: E. C. GATHINGS.
Pulaski County: WILBUR D. MILLS.
California:
Humboldt County: DON H. CLAUSEN.
Colorado:
Adams County: ROY H. MCVICKER.
Clear Creek County: ROY H. MCVICKER.
Denver County: BYRON G. ROGERS.
Gilpin County: ROY H. MCVICKER.
Jefferson County: ROY H. MCVICKER.
Connecticut, Waterbury District: JOHN S. MONAGAN and ROBERT N. GIAIMO.
Georgia:
Rabun County: PHILLIP M. LANDRUM.
Stephens County: PHILLIP M. LANDRUM.
Illinois, Cook County: WILLIAM L. DAWSON, BARRATT O'HARA, WILLIAM T. MURPHY, EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, DANIEL J. RONAN, FRANK ANNUNZIO, DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, SIDNEY R. YATES, HAROLD D. COLLIER, ROMAN C. PUCINSKI.
Franklin County: KENNETH J. GRAY.
Indiana:
Harrison County: WINFIELD K. DENTON.
Perry County: WINFIELD K. DENTON.
Posey County: WINFIELD K. DENTON.
Spencer County: WINFIELD K. DENTON.
Vanderburgh County: WINFIELD K. DENTON.
Kansas:
Bourbon County: JOE SKUBITZ.
Cherokee County: JOE SKUBITZ.
Crawford County: JOE SKUBITZ.
Rice County: ROBERT J. DODE.
Kentucky:
Breathitt County: CARL D. PERKINS.
Floyd County: CARL D. PERKINS.
Johnson County: CARL D. PERKINS.
Knott County: CARL D. PERKINS.
Leslie County: TIM LEE CARTER.
Letcher County: CARL D. PERKINS.
Magoffin County: CARL D. PERKINS.
Martin County: CARL D. PERKINS.
Owsley County: TIM LEE CARTER.
Perry County: CARL D. PERKINS.
Louisiana:
Acadia Parish: T. A. THOMPSON.
Avoyelles Parish: SPEEDY O. LONG.
Evangeline Parish: T. A. THOMPSON.
Natchitoches Parish: SPEEDY O. LONG.
Pointe Coupee Parish: JAMES H. MORRISON.
Vermilion Parish: EDWIN E. WILLIS.
St. Landry Parish: T. A. THOMPSON.
St. Martin Parish: EDWIN E. WILLIS.
Winn Parish: SPEEDY O. LONG.
Michigan:
City of Detroit: JOHN CONYERS, JR., JAMES G. O'HARA, LUCIEN NORBERT NEDZI, JOHN D. DINGELL, MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS.
Gogebic County: RAYMOND F. CLEVENGER.
Houghton County: RAYMOND F. CLEVENGER.
Minnesota:
Carlton County: JOHN A. BLATNIK.
Itasca County: JOHN A. BLATNIK.
Koochiching County: JOHN A. BLATNIK.
Lake County: JOHN A. BLATNIK.
St. Louis County: JOHN A. BLATNIK.
Missouri, City of St. Louis: FRANK W. KARSTEN AND LEONOR K. SULLIVAN.
Montana, Silver Bow County: ARNOLD OLSEN.
Nebraska, Lancaster County: CLAIR A. CALLAN.
New Mexico: Mora County, Rio Arriba County, Sandoval County, San Miguel County, Santa Fe County, Taos County: At large, THOMAS G. MORRIS, E. S. JOHNNY WALKER.
North Carolina:
Forsyth County: RALPH J. SCOTT.
Halifax County: L. H. FOUNTAIN.
Martin County: HERBERT C. BONNER.
Nash County: HAROLD D. COOLEY.
Northampton County: L. H. FOUNTAIN.
Surry County: RALPH J. SCOTT.
Ohio:
Cuyahoga County: CHARLES A. VANIK and WILLIAM E. MINSHALL.
Hamilton County: JOHN J. GILLIGAN and DONALD D. CLANCY.
Lucas County: THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY.
Oregon,
Multnomah County: EDITH GREEN.
Pennsylvania:
Allegheny County [1]: WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, ROBERT J. CORBETT, E. J. HOLLAND, and JAMES G. FULTON.
Cambria County: JOHN P. SAYLOR.
Clearfield County: ALBERT W. JOHNSON.

[1] Limited expansion was approved under the Department of Agriculture's 1965 expansion plan but the specific area has not yet been selected by the State welfare agency.

[1] Includes the original pilot area of the city of Pittsburgh.

Fayette County: THOMAS E. MORGAN.
Greene County: THOMAS E. MORGAN.
Indiana County: JOHN P. SAYLOR.
Luzerne County: DANIEL J. FLOOD.
Somerset County: J. IRVING WHALLEY.
South Carolina, Dillon County: JOHN L. MCMILLAN.
Tennessee:
Campbell County: JOHN J. DUNCAN.
Claiborne County: JAMES H. QUILLEN.
Fayette County: JAMES H. QUILLEN.
Grundy County: WILLIAM E. BROCK.
Hamilton County: WILLIAM E. BROCK.
Hardeman County: TOM MURRAY.
Haywood County: ROBERT A. EVERETT.
Marion County: WILLIAM E. BROCK.
Scott County: JOHN J. DUNCAN.
Sequatchie County: WILLIAM E. BROCK.
Utah, Weber County: LAURENCE J. BURTON.
Virginia:
Dickenson County: WILLIAM PAT JENNINGS.
Lee County: WILLIAM PAT JENNINGS.
Wise County: WILLIAM PAT JENNINGS.
Washington, Gray's Harbor County: JULIA B. HANSEN.
West Virginia:
Logan County: KEN HECHLER.
McDowell County: JAMES KEE.
Mingo County: JAMES KEE.
Wayne County: KEN HECHLER.
Wisconsin:
Douglas County: ALVIN E. O'KONSKI.
Iron County: ALVIN E. O'KONSKI.
Langlade County: MELVIN P. LAIRD.
Price County: ALVIN E. O'KONSKI.
Wyoming:
Campbell County, Fremont County, Johnson County, Lincoln County, Sublette County, Teton County, Weston County: At large, TENO RONCALIO.

Essay Contest Dedicated to Statue of Liberty Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, to remind Marylanders of a historic anniversary, the centennial of the Statue of Liberty being observed in 1965, the Maryland Improvement Contractors Association of Baltimore, Md., sponsored an essay contest on "The Statue of Liberty as a Beacon of the Free World."

To commemorate the 100th anniversary, in 1965, of the conception of the Statue of Liberty as a gift from the people of France to the people of the United States, a centennial medal has been issued by the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

As noted in an official leaflet, dealing with the Liberty series:

Historically as the Civil War Between the States drew to its close in 1865—freedom of all remaining U.S. slaves thus assured—a great freedom-loving French patriot Edouard de Laboulaye, conceived the idea of a commemorative gift symbol of eternal friendship from a free people to a free people, not from a government to a government. In that historic year, 100 years ago, Laboulaye brought together at his home in Versailles, a group of French men-of-letters, artists, and politicians. Guests included the young Alsatian sculptor, Auguste Bartholdi.

Laboulaye had described liberty as "the daughter of the Gospel—sister of justice and pity—mother of equality, abundance, and peace." This definition inspired Bartholdi with the idea to create in enduring copper the heroic sculptured figure of "liberty enlightening the world."

It was first proposed that this monumental gift be completed for official presentation on the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence—July 4, 1876—the centennial birthday of our Republic. But the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–71 intervened. Not until 1875 did Laboulaye succeed in organizing the Franco-American union to raise funds. The French people were thus to create the statue and transport it to the United States. The American people to build its pedestal here.

By 1882 the moneys were raised in war-impoverished France. Bartholdi had begun work on the statue early. The right hand holding the torch was done and displayed in 1876 at the centennial exposition in Philadelphia and later sent to New York City where it was erected in Madison Square Park. The American people completed the pedestal fund in 1885.

The Statue of Liberty completed here under Bartholdi's supervision, was dedicated in 1886. These ideals of freedom had been forged into sculptured metal and later built into stonework of the American Museum of Immigration now being constructed at its base on Liberty Island down New York Bay, to endure as eternal as liberty itself.

Officers of the Maryland Improvement Contractors Association in charge of the contest arrangements included Gerald I. Libowitz, president; Paul Caplan, vice president; Morris Grossman, secretary; William McIntyre, treasurer; Milton Rabovsky, executive secretary; Maurice R. Shochatt, executive director, and William H. Klarner, vice president of Nersica, Inc.—National Established Repair, Service, Improvement Contractors Association.

Board members who assisted in the arrangements included Reese Chenowith, Charles Butler, Phil Baron, Samuel Moss, and Milton Bates.

Mrs. Ann Albaugh, of 3101 Ferndale Avenue, Baltimore, Md., was the winner of first prize in the essay contest. Former editor of the Baltimore Guide, Mrs. Albaugh won first prize, in 1964, in both the spring and fall poetry contests conducted by the Maryland State Poetry Society. She is active in the Howard Park Senior Citizens' Club, Maryland State Poetry Society, and Park Community Church.

Other winners include Mrs. Stella C. Gersuk, of 4814 Norwood Avenue, Baltimore, Md., teacher of English at Edmondson High School, second prize; Kenneth H. Dashiell, III, of 6929 Conley Street, Baltimore, Employee of Bethlehem Steel Co., third prize; and Mrs. Joseph K. Rogers, of 822 Middlesex Road, Baltimore, housewife and mother of 5 sons, fourth prize.

I want to commend the officers of the Maryland Improvement Contractors Association for sponsoring this contest and under unanimous consent, I include the four winning essays inserted at this point in the RECORD as an inspiration to others who may tend to forget this symbol of liberty:

THE STATUE OF LIBERTY AS A BEACON OF THE FREE WORLD

(By Mrs. Anne Albaugh, Baltimore, Md., first-prize winner)

There she stands, triumphant in the "air-bridged harbor that twin cities frame"
A noble, gracious lady of dignity,
Holding high a blazing torch as blessed beacon.
Enlightening a harassed world, in perpetuation of international friendship.

Statue given as gesture of firm faith and fast fellowship by the French nation and its citizenry
To commemorate the glorious one-hundredth
Anniversary of United States independence.
That truth-inscribed,
Tablet in her left hand, marking historic date,
Unfolds to eager, seeking eyes and yearning hearts an,
Exalted promise of unfettered life in green pastures of liberty.

Offering welcome to the "tired, the poor, the huddled masses"
From lands where free breath and voice are tyrannically stifled.

Lamp lifted "beside the golden door"—giantess of glory—
Illuminated by great floodlights to welcome incoming ships—"imprisoned lightning in her flame"—
Bartholdi's masterpiece is truly the "Mother of Exiles."
Emma Lazarus called it "The New Colossus."
Yes, there she stands—
Resplendent, towering symbol—"at sea-washed, sunset gates"—inviting
The tempest-tossed and the homeless to a splendidly
Young, vibrant country, where teeming opportunity is an
Anchor, "with conquering limbs astride from land to land."

Wake up, world weary with war's unholy urge. Heed wails of anguish.
Open mind and heart to Lady Liberty's Beacon Hands.
Reach up, as she, to heaven's unshadowed blue.
Let the warm rays of man's humanity, symbolized by our metallic marvel, in Liberty's
Diadem of brillance, unite all men in the precious clasp of

Brotherhood, to meet and measure each other's daily need.
Energize in truth and tolerance each heart and hand to
Accept the constantly changing
Concepts, causes and creeds
Of a rich "Great Society," and fervently realize anew that
No man is an island.
Yes, Our Beloved Statue of Liberty is truly
A world beacon for bounteous blessings.

THE STATUE OF LIBERTY AS A BEACON OF THE FREE WORLD

(By Mrs. Stella C. Gersuk, Baltimore, Md., second-prize winner)

The Statue of Liberty, erected in the New York harbor initially in recognition of the friendship and mutual trust of two nations, has became a universal symbol of strength and promise to the peoples of all nations.

To all who seek fulfillment of their cherished dreams—to those who tentatively reach out, hoping at last to find a positive response to their aching needs to establish personal dignity by work and its gratifications, to those who have sought and at last have reached a promise of opportunity to achieve pride in country, freedom of choice, and devotion to a good life—to all these Statue of Liberty is a comforting beacon of strength.

The comfort the Statue of Liberty proffers, the opportunities she extends, and the promise she holds out are evidences of an assurance that consumes uncertainty; of a fulfillment that destroys despair; of a strength that conquer weakness.

Her beacon is a torch held high—a signal, a reminder, and yes, even a warning that blazes eternally for all the world to see and, thus, know and acknowledge unequivocally that here is an enduring truth that will permit no compromise.

For all the world recognizes in the strength of this majestic symbol—the Statue of Liberty—that here is a land dedicated to preserve the rights, the freedoms, and the liberties of all seekers after truth and beauty and honor, and the American way of life.

THE STATUE OF LIBERTY AS A BEACON OF THE FREE WORLD

(By Kenneth H. Dashiell III, Baltimore, Md., third prize winner)

Like the Liberty Bell and Old Glory our Statue of Liberty is symbolic of the United States of America, past—present—future. From her vigil's point Miss Liberty stands proudly defiant of the many and ever present threats to her Nation. She stands there, ready to receive the tired and homeless of those trying lands across the sea, shedding the welcome light of freedom equally over all. Her guiding light is held aloft, its rays penetrating everywhere despotic leaders restrict the freedoms of the people. The eternal beacon burns brightly for the suppressed people of the world.

Pale moonlight, glaring sun, wind, rain and snow descend in turn to shroud her massive image but neither can the darkest night nor the brightest day, nor blinding rain, wind or snow cover or dissipate her glorious beacon. That light is an ideal, a way of life, which she so magnificently represents, and behind the Statue of Liberty stand the people of a mighty nation. We stand ready and able to give real meaning to that piercing light emanating from her uplifted torch.

As long as the agonies of the oppressed are seen, as long as the goat cries of the oppressed are heard, our Nation will continue to feed the fire she holds. As long as tyranny exists the Statue of Liberty will remain as the "beacon of the free world."

THE STATUE OF LIBERTY AS A BEACON OF THE FREE WORLD

(By Mrs. Joseph K. Rogers, Baltimore, Md., fourth prize winner)

How often we take for granted the sights and symbols of our wonderful freedom.

The statute in the harbor of New York is so much more than a piece of art. She is the symbol of everything that we cherish as Americans; she is the shining hope for those who look to us for aid. Her light—her magnificent light—can be seen for many miles out on the sea, but it does not end there. Her torch burns bright in the hearts of all those who are shackled with the bonds of oppression and prejudice. Her hand holds high the flame of freedom—the shining goal for which all men strive.

This beautiful lady is our sacred promise to the world; it is our challenge to all those who would deny freedom to others. Look in the eyes of the immigrants as they near our shores; see the tears of joy as they disembark and take their first steps on our hallowed soil. Look into the hearts of those who have seen loved ones killed in the streets of Communist-ridden cities, and you will see the reflected light of the torch of freedom.

She stands tall—taller than the cold dimensions of her size. Her arms are ready to take all who come to her; her heart is big enough to hold all who seek her shelter. Our young men have fought and died for her right to stand proudly with her light aglow. She is our hope, our lantern of freedom, and the rays of her light reach to every dark corner of this restless globe.

Cherish her, protect her, honor her.

Recent Trends of U.S. Foreign Policy and Their Impact on the Future of the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 21, it was my pleasure to address the Lithuanian American Conservative Club of Cleveland. This club is composed of Americans of Lithuanian extraction who are devoting serious study and attention to our foreign policy and the various problems around the world that bear upon the future security and welfare of our people. In my address I presented what I consider to be the most cogent arguments for widespread public support of President Johnson's policies on Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

By leave previous obtained, I insert in the RECORD my address on "Recent Trends of U.S. Foreign Policy and Their Impact on the Future of the Captive Nations":

I am happy to have this opportunity to give you my impression of recent trends of U.S. foreign policy and their impact on the future of the captive nations.

But first I wish to congratulate all present here this evening for your continuing interest in the plight of the captive nations. I know of no subject more important than the captive nations, in the context of foreign policy consideration. In my opinion the captive nations are the key to peace just as they are the balance wheel against all out war.

Imperial Russia must give more than a second thought to launching open warfare against the free world because such action would open the way for total political revolution within their empire, from the Baltic to the Caspian Seas. The Kremlin is haunted by the memories of World War II, when the peoples of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union rose up against Russian occupation and fought to restore their freedom and national independence. Today the Russian captive empire in Europe includes Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and East Germany, as well as the three Baltic States. The peoples of these nations would join in revolt with their captive, non-Russian brothers in the Soviet Union. That would mean the end of the Russian empire.

By the same token the captive nations are the key to peace with freedom because the peoples of those nations aspire for and work for a return of their freedom and national independence. Those aspirations for freedom and national independence constitute the most powerful political force at work within the Russian Communist empire today. They exert relentless pressures upon the Russian ruling class and create problems which the Communist bureaucrats find to be unsolvable. They mythology of communism, worn paper thin by the harsh realities of life behind the Iron Curtain, cannot contain or turn back the aspirations for freedom in the captive nations. The day of decision will soon be at hand and I am certain the mythology of communism will, like all myths, fade away—exposing in all its ugliness Russian imperialism, the real but hidden threat to peoples and nations.

To understand better recent trends in U.S. foreign policy as they effect the future of the captive nations, we should first look at trends within the Communist empire. There we find ample signs of the growing strength and boldness of nationalism. Even the Communist puppets in some of the captive nations are finding it necessary to stand up to Moscow. Some are even finding it necessary to indulge in anti-Russian statements and public charges. When I say they are finding it necessary, I mean they are aware of the growing storm of resentment among the non-Russian peoples, the failures of the Communist dictatorship to provide the promised utopia on earth and the attitudes of the captive peoples toward their state of human bondage. Like all rogues and rascals, the Communist puppets are opportunists and they recognize the need to establish some line of credit with the subjugated people. Hence, the efforts to exhibit a degree of independence or the indulgence in anti-Russian exercises. Of course they hope to use that line of credit no matter how flimsy it might be when the chains of Russian imperialism are broken by the subjugated peoples.

Red China is feeding the flames of nationalism in the captive nations, by a series of propaganda and political devices hitherto unmentionable within the frozen family of so-called Socialist leaders. Whatever the motives may be, and there is plenty of room for argument on this point, the fact remains that Peiping's maneuvers have had an impact on developments within captive Europe. Let me cite a few examples:

The Chinese central committee has been charging the Russians with great power chauvinism. Interpreted properly this means the Red Chinese are charging that Russian imperialism is the dominant factor in the so-called Socialist camp. This is a very serious charge because it claims the Russian have deserted the principles of Leninism, and have returned to an era of despotic Russia, as it was under the czars. This charge is supported by Lenin himself, who just before his death, expressed the same opinion in letters to the Russian central committee, which were suppressed until somewhat recently. But the Red Chinese charge so offended the new Russian ruling class that they countered with charges against Peiping to the effect that the spirit of Genghis Khan had taken over control of the Chinese Communist Party. Here, in my judgment, is a classic example of Chinese nationalism in conflict with historic Russian imperalism and historic Russian imperalism attempting to disguise its reactionary nature by posing the threat of mongol invasion of Europe.

But let us be wary of all this fire and thunder emanating from the proven Communist propaganda mill. This so-called Sino-Soviet political split may be only a disagreement comparable to a fight between husband and wife, both of whom would turn on any interfering third party. The goal of both Russians and Chinese Communists has been and remains our destruction.

There can be no doubts that this battle of Communist dialectics and double talk is not lost on the peoples of captive Europe. They have been compelled to understand the strange jargon of communism, if for no other reason but self-survival. The kettle of communism calling the pot of communism

black must be a source of great hope for captive Europe. For the people there know that the greater the pressure of any type from Peiping on Moscow the less pressure from Moscow on captive Europe. Moreover, the prospect of captive Europe putting greater pressures on Moscow for freedom and national independence are enhanced by Red Chinese pressures from the eastern end of the empire. Moscow cannot cope with this geopolitical pincers development—it must give ground to either captive Europe or to the Red Chinese ambitions to dominate the worldwide conspiracy of communism.

With this brief background of power analysis within the Russian Communist empire let us look at the recent trends in U.S. foreign policy that bear upon the future of the captive nations. In my opinion, events of the recent past and the present tell us most accurately about these trends.

Take Vietnam as a starter. President Johnson has made three elements of national policy clear through action he has directed be taken in that crisis spot. They are:

1. We have rejected the idea that Communist aggression under any cloak can claim sanctuary or protection by virtue of international boundaries or false boundary lines of division perpetrated upon a nation. The conspirators have been taking sanctuary north of the 17th parallel in Vietnam, from which the aggression and atrocities against the people of free Vietnam are planned, directed and supported. That sanctuary for international criminals has been liquidated—it can no longer be used without retaliation by the forces of freedom.

2. The principle of fresh pursuit of the aggressor has been reaffirmed as a solid part of our policy in dealing wtih the aggressors. This accounts for our hitting the enemy at his source of command and supply of the war against the free people of Vietnam. Further, President Johnson has mad it clear to Peiping that should they enter the Communist aggression in Vietnam, either overtly or covertly, they cannot claim sanctuary in South China. Now it is up to Peiping to either stay out or invite retaliation which they cannot counter or long endure.

3. The tactics of nuclear blackmail, used for too long by the Communist conspiracy, have been rejected by President Johnson. You are aware, I am sure, that the tactics of nuclear blackmail have, to a degree, paralyzed purposeful action by the free world. Even measured responses by the free world to Communist aggression were painted as certain to escalate into all-out nuclear war. President Johnson has put that myth to rest, and more important, he has put the responsibility for escalation where it properly belongs—right on the backs of the Communist nuclear blackmailers.

What do these developments mean in terms of the future of the captive nations?

To begin with they mean President Johnson had exposed what the Communists have been calling national liberation movements to be in fact wars of conspiratorial aggression. He has announced that we will not stand by and see free people and countries swallowed up by this tactic—that we will stand by our friends to throw back the Communist aggressors. This, in my opinion, is a great forward step, putting all the people of the world on notice that the time has come to face up to the realities of Communist world objectives and tactics. This bold facing up cannot help but encourage the peoples of the captive nations—it serves notice that a new policy is evolving in the United States which augurs well for their future.

Now let us examine most recent trends in the Western Hemisphere. I refer of course to the crisis in the Dominican Republic. What does Presidential action in that crisis tell us, in terms of new trends in our foreign policy? In my judgment these are the most obvious:

1. President Johnson has served notice that we will not tolerate a second Russian fortress in this hemisphere, as we now have in Cuba.

2. The bold, resolute, and timely action taken by President Johnson in the Dominican Republic resulted from his conviction that unless he so acted, the Communist conspiracy would wrap its tentacles around that country. Time was of the essence. It is now estimated that had he waited 12 more hours it would have been too late. Those who now criticize him for taking resolute action before consulting with the United Nations and the Organization of American States would now be among the first to blame him for a second Russian satellite in our hemisphere because he failed to so act. Consultation is important and necessary, but it is hardly appropriate when one of our neighbors' houses has caught on fire and would burn to the ground unless immediate steps were taken to put the fire out. What needs to be done now is to take a good look at the machinery of consultation to determine how it can be modernized to meet the practical demands put upon us by the worldwide Communist conspirators.

3. What this trend means to Cuba, a captive nation by any definition, remains to be seen. But the Russian puppets in Cuba cannot fail to understand the full meaning of the resolute action taken by President Johnson in the Dominican Republic crisis. Nor will the captive people of Cuba miss the full meaning of the event.

In summary, I believe we may conclude that recent trends in U.S. foreign policy should strengthen our hopes and expectations for the future of the captive nations. I say this because the action President Johnson directed be taken in two crisis spots—where the cause of freedom was at stake—serves notice that we as a nation are facing up to the realities of the Communist conspiracy. This is an important development—heralding positive policies to come which will advance the cause of freedom and national independence for all nations and all peoples.

Those of us who support those goals should lose no time or opportunity in generating further public support for the actions President Johnson has taken. I am aware that he already enjoys the support of the overwhelming majority of our people, but we must help him keep the initiative which he has taken. Let your voices be heard in support of these new trends in U.S. foreign policy.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Address by Hon. George H. Hearn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by a distinguished Brooklynite and member of the Federal Maritime Commission, Hon. George H. Hearn, before the Maritime Association of Greater Boston at Boston, Mass., on May 20, 1965:

REMARKS OF COMMISSIONER GEORGE H. HEARN, OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION, BEFORE THE MARITIME ASSOCIATION OF GREATER BOSTON AT BOSTON, MASS., MAY 20, 1965

Gentlemen, it is an honor and a pleasure to return again to Boston and respond to your kind invitation to address you here today, in this salute to the American merchant marine, or more correctly, to those who, in various maritime fields, have made our merchant marine the fourth arm of our National Defense Establishment and the essential means of placing American made goods competitively in the marketplaces of the world.

The stature of our merchant marine as the fourth arm of our national defense system was evidenced last October during Operation Steel Pike, which was the largest peacetime amphibious operation ever undertaken in Atlantic waters. This exercise, held off the coast of Spain, consisted of 141 vessels and over 55,000 men. This operation involved, in addition to naval vesels, 10 privately owned and operated American-flag vessels. The testimony of Vice Adm. John C. McCain, Jr., commander of the Amphibious Forces of the Atlantic Fleet, given before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is noteworthy. The admiral has testified that a major amphibious assault, without the participation of privately owned American-flag merchant men, could not be successfully undertaken. This recent experience, of course, merely underscores the tremendous contributions of our merchant marine to our defense efforts particuarly in World War II and the Korean conflict when some 5,000 vessels were provided by the U.S. shipyards, and manned by American merchant seamen.

Our mid-19th century American merchant fleet, which then dominated North Atlantic waters, had virtually disappeared by the turn of the century, and a costly crash shipbuilding program was necessary in order that the First World War could be successfully waged. Again when the war clouds over Europe were seeded in the 1930's, our merchant marine was woefully anemic, requiring once again, a fantastically expensive shipbuilding program. At present, our merchant marine is saturated with vessels moving, with breakneck speed to obsolescence. The replacements to our merchant fleet, while wondrously efficient, have been all too few. If the history of the past 100 years should have taught us any lesson, it is that we must have a merchant marine at the ready. We all are aware of the entire free world's reliance upon us as the peacekeeper of civilization. Our moral commitments through the world are staggering. Not only do we find ourselves intimately involved in peacekeeping here in our own hemisphere but in the Far East as well. And while we realize the adequacy of our airlift capabilities for coping with emergencies everywhere and at all times, I think we should seriously question whether airlift support, over a prolonged period, may be as economically feasible or as logistically desirable as adequate merchant men. One thing, however, is crystal clear: We cannot, in these perilous times, permit our merchant marine to suffer yet another cyclical decline as it did between the First and Second World Wars and as is now threatened.

Equally important in the fierce struggle for the capture and maintenance of commercial markets throughout the world is an adequate American merchant marine necessary. Woefully small is the percentage of our foreign commerce that moves on American-flag bottom. Last year, for example, a mere 9 percent of our commerce was lifted by U.S.-flag vessels. But for the 50-50 laws and the requirements of military shipping, our American-flag lines could not survive. Time and again history has shown that we cannot depend upon foreign-flag vessels exclusively to carry our goods around the world. During the 1920's, for example, a prolonged strike in Great Britain, whose vessels at the time predominated in the movement of our export and import trades, seriously crippled the orderly flow of our foreign commerce. I don't think that we can afford to let something like this happen again. We are the largest exporter and importer in the world but the strides made by European nations and Japan within the last 10 years have provided us with much stiffer competition. It seems shortsighted indeed to rely so heavily on vessels of other nations to move our goods.

The impending decline of our merchant fleet must be avoided if we are to obviate our dependence upon others to get our goods to markets. Our own torpid attention to vessel replacement was brought into sharp focus recently: Japan has announced that it will double its merchant fleet by 1968 and then will have a fleet capable of lifting 55 percent of its exports and 64 percent of its imports.

So, from both the standpoint of an adjunct to our Defense Establishment and as a tool of our own commerce we must insure the existence of an adequate and efficient merchant marine. As Congressman ROONEY, an astute observer of Government spending, especially in the maritime field, has noted recently that "Our country has gotten much more out of the merchant marine than the merchant marine ever got out of the country." I agree with Congressman ROONEY that we can ill afford to neglect our merchant marine, particularly at this point in history.

This afternoon, however, I am going to leave to others the role of promoting our American merchant marine. Unhappily, perhaps, I am going to take this opportunity to state for the record, an area of shipping regulation that is a matter of serious concern to me.

We have a national business policy—an antitrust policy which, as the keystone of our business life, has served us well. Indeed, the Sherman Act has been referred to as our "charter of economic freedom." Few will doubt that our antitrust policy has stimulated competition which in turn has triggered that business way of life which has caused men to "build a better mousetrap." Indeed, our American initiative spurred on by the challenge and response theory, to borrow the sociologists' phrase, has spawned productivity of such magnitude and excellence, that we enjoy a standard of living hitherto unknown in the history of mankind. We are all aware, I am sure, that our friends across the sea have not subscribed, at least so religiously, to such a way of business life. In no small measure, I submit, has our philosophy permitted us to build not only better mouse traps, but automobiles, airplanes, machinery and a myriad of other commodities as well.

A great exception to our national antitrust policy, however, is contained in the heart of the Shipping Act. Prior to the passage of that act in 1916, international shipping cartels were the subject of careful scrutiny by both England and the United States. Curiously, the legislatures of both great nations decided to permit ocean carriers to band together to set rates and conditions of carriage. I say "curiously," because respective national interests in shipping at the time were necessarily divergent: England was substantially a shipowning and ship operating nation. Conversely, then as today, we are primarily exporters and importers as opposed to ship operators. This fact, I believe, is not generally appreciated, and I often wonder, had these different national interests been fully explored, whether our Alexander Committee would have reached the same conclusion as had the Royal Commission on Shipping Rings a few years earlier. In any event, the Shipping Act provided, through section 15, that carriers would be allowed to enter several species of anticompetitive arrangements with each other on condition that such arrangements were given prior approval by that agency of our Government which administered the Shipping Act. In retrospect, it appears that the key to section 15 approval—and approvals were countless—were two magic words, "stability" and "regularity"; presumably, "stability of rates" and "regularity of service." In retrospect also, it is ironic that these two words become the password accepted by the succession of agencies which administered the Shipping Act, for not one of those several agenices ever attained any real stability for itself but on the contrary, each was replaced by a successor with some regularity. Preceding the Federal Maritime Commission, were the Federal Maritime Board, the U.S. Maritime Commission, the U.S. Shipping Board, and the U.S. Shipping Board Bureau.

At the present time, concerted action by carriers in our foreign trades has become a way of life. And section 15 agreements are becoming more and more sophisticated. They run the gamut from mere rate-fixing associations to all-pervasive pools. There are now over 100 conference and rate-fixing agreements, 25 sailing agreements, over 300 transshipment agreements and 31 approved pooling agreements. So complex has the system become, that on a single voyage, a vessel may be sailing under the aegis of a half dozen conferences, and at least 3 of our American-flag lines are members of 30 or more rate-fixing combines. You will note that I have not included the many agreements between terminal operators or freight forwarders.

I think we should all be concerned about the entire spectrum of concerted action

agreements, not merely because they represent a departure from our traditional way of doing business, but because, in the case of carriers, vis-a-vis shippers they necessarily tend to create a seller's—or carrier's—market. In a word, they tend to give an advantage to a carrier in his dealings with a shipper. This is especially true in those trades where the shipper does not have the alternative of a dependable nonconference service. In this vein, I know of only one major trade where there is substantial nonconference competition, and on Maritime Day, I am sorry to say, that this nonconference competition—a natural rate leveler—does not fly the American flag.

Now, I want it made perfectly clear that I am not anticonference. I am sure that, by and large, the conference system does, or should be able to, make a substantial contribution to the development of our foreign commerce. But I want it made equally clear that I view section 15 approval as a license, and that the granting of the license must clearly serve our public interest. Section 15 approval, once granted, cannot lightly be taken away. I submit that it should never be casually granted. And the more anticompetitive the device for which approval is sought, the more carefully must we determine whether it serves our public interest.

My views in this regard are not new. In the famous Isbrandtsen case of 1954 the Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia stated, "The agency intrusted with the duty to protect the public interest (must) scrutinize the agreement to make sure that the conduct thus legalized does not invade the prohibitions of the antitrust laws any more than is necessary to serve the purposes of the regulatory statute." Again, in 1939, in the investigation of Pacific Coast-European Rates and Practices case, the Commission stated, "The advantages of group action in rate matters and exemption from the antitrust laws * * * flowing to carriers by approval of a conference agreement, are not gratuitous grants."

In the Dollar-Matson case of 1938, the Commission stated, "We view the exemption granted by section 15 as a means of regulating competition in order to eliminate rate cutting and other abuses which are harmful to shipper and carrier alike * * *. Whenever it appears to the Commission that approval is contrary to the public interest, it will be withdrawn."

These old and sometimes forgotten pronouncements, to my mind, are entitled to increased significance in light of the 1961 amendment to the Shipping Act, by which the standard of public interest was explicitly added to section 15.

And this philosophy does not differ from that espoused by our sister transportation agencies. The Civil Aeronautics Board, for example, has state in its 1952 Local Cartage Agreement case, "Where an agreement has * * * elements which are plainly repugnant to established antitrust principles, approval should not be granted unless there is a clear showing that the agreement is required by a serious transportation need, or in order to secure important public benefits."

The Interstate Commerce Commission, in a 1961 case stated, "While the policy of our antitrust laws determine the public interest in railroad legislation only in a qualified way, we may not ignore that policy as a relevant factor in fostering the objectives of the national transportation policy."

The recent investigation of shipping by the Celler committee has certainly demonstrated that carriers, acting in concert, have no right to expect the Commission to merely rubberstamp approval of their concerted actions.

Additionally, the increasing difficulty American exporters are experiencing in maintaining their foreign markets, and in giving meaning to the sell American provisions of our Trade Expansion Act, and our national concern with our own economic well-being, absolutely require the Commission to scrutinize carefully, each anticompetitive arrangement to insure that it serves our own national ends.

In closing, I would be remiss if I failed to commend the efforts being made here in Boston to increase your foreign trade. You have great natural advantages. Your port, the oldest major port in the United States, is only a few miles from the ocean, and you have the advantage of a full day's steaming time to northern European ports and east coast South American ports over other major North Atlantic ports. Your great urban renewal program has gained nationwide attention, and, I am pleased to note, that you have embarked upon a renewal of your port facilities. Your aggressive promotional undertakings, particularly throughout the Midwest, are bound to be fruitful in view of the excellent rail and truck service you enjoy. I understand that a truck may now move from your piers straight through to Milwaukee without encountering a red light. This is all the more astounding when, but a few years ago, Boston had almost as many traffic lights as it had trucks. So things are looking up for the port of Boston, and we hope that you regain that level of world trade which made the names Boston and Salem so well known throughout the world in the romantic days of the clipper ships. I thank you.

"The Constitution—It's Gone"—Editorial by David Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the U.S. Constitution is a document which, unfortunately, is given much lip-service, but very little attention, in the three branches of our National Government. This fact has been pointed out in an excellent editorial published in the May 31, 1965, issue of U.S. News & World Report. The editorial is by the distinguished editor of this magazine, David Lawrence, and is entitled "The Constitution—It's Gone."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I urge all Senators to give most serious consideration and study to the points brought out by Mr. Lawrence.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, May 31, 1965]

THE CONSTITUTION—IT'S GONE

(By David Lawrence)

Three decades ago, Justice James C. McReynolds of the Supreme Court of the United States listened to a majority opinion of the Court from which he dissented, and exclaimed: "The Constitution—it's gone."

This has proved true with respect to certain categories of cases wherein the Constitution has been flagrantly disregarded. Over the years, for instance, decisions of the High Court have undertaken substantially to increase the power of the Federal Government and reduce the power of the States.

The Constitution is written in plain language: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The weakening of the power of the States and the enlargement of the powers of the Federal Government have never before reached the extremes which we are witnessing today.

We read in the Constitution, for example, that there must be no "cruel and unusual punishments inflicted" for violation of law or for the commission of crime. Yet the Federal Government has just asserted the right to tell a State what it must do and to mete out punishment to all the people of a State irrespective of consequences to innocent persons.

Never was it contemplated that Congress should pass laws delegating power to executive agencies without prescribing legislative standards to be followed. Yet what do we read in the press today? Executive agencies are telling the States that they must desegregate all public schools according to a specific program set forth by the Federal Government or be punished by the withholding of Federal funds.

State governments are, after all, elected by the people, and if their officials are in defiance of the Constitution, they can be enjoined through proper legal action. But should a Federal agency be authorized to withhold funds from a school district just because a complicated formula invented by bureaucrats in Washington has not been fulfilled?

What kind of system of law is it that permits an executive department of the Federal Government—not the courts—to adjudge the citizens of a State guilty of a crime by a mere finding issued by a Federal agency?

Let there be no misunderstanding—the law of the land today is that public schools must be desegregated and that there must be no discrimination on the basis of race or color. But is it discrimination when certain districts have a small Negro population and Negroes are not in attendance in every school? Is it the function of the Federal Government to require the transportation of children from one district to another in order that there may be racial balance in the schools?

It is being repeatedly denied that racial balance is an objective, and it is being asserted that the sole purpose is to remove intentional discrimination. But these are matters which can be resolved only in courts of law. Was the discrimination accidental—the result of residential circumstances and happenstance—or was it deliberate? The courts alone should decide.

The Civil Rights Act passed in 1964, moreover, gives to the departments of the executive branch of the Federal Government power, in various other programs of Federal assistance, to withhold funds from States if they do not conform to an arbitrary formula.

We have, in effect, a system that might be called legalized blackmail. An example of its manifestation was given the other day in a public speech in behalf of the administration by Vice President HUMPHREY, who issued this warning to the Nation's school boards:

"The choice is simply this: to continue receiving Federal aid and desegregate or to sacrifice Federal aid and desegregate anyway."

This remark confidently assumes that the Supreme Court will continue to usurp legislative functions by applying the theory that the end justifies the means.

This is not the constitutional system that our forefathers ordained. This is not the rule of justice or the rule of law. The truth of the matter is that the Constitution as we have know it is gone. It has not been amended in the way prescribed in the Constitution itself. It has been changed by ar-

bitrary acts no less vicious than the edicts of dictatores who have suppressed democracy in the world. The tyranny of the majority in a legislature, supported by a judicial oligarchy, can be as harmful to free government as the autocracy of an individual despot.

Our written Constitution has been vanishing, presumably in accordance with the spirit of the times. An impression prevails at present in both Houses of Congress that the Supreme Court will at any time amend the Constitution by judicial fiat to conform to ideological or sociological doctrines of the day.

Our forefathers provided us with a legal method of changing the Constitution. It has been used 24 times and is still available to meet the wishes of the people and the spirit of the times.

A Blessed Event

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime advocate of an improved mail service for our country, I was pleased to learn that plans have been approved for a congressional investigation into the Post Office Department's sectional plan for mail processing and the effect it will have on employees and mail service.

The sectional center concept, which will lead to the elimination of many of the railway post offices, is not the answer to improved service in my opinion. I am not alone in this opinion and would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Bennett County Booster II, Martin, S. Dak., on May 13, 1965:

A BLESSED EVENT

People in western South Dakota were blessed Monday, April 26, with their first installment of "Progressive Postal Service." For the benefit of readers who are unfamiliar with the term, it is a fancy name for bureaucratic bungling.

It seemed as though the Metro mail service, which was established a few years ago, was doing a pretty good job of getting mail in and out of area post offices with a reasonable amount of service. That's probably what was wrong.

Somewhere, someone got the idea that mail forwarded to sectional centers could be handled in greater volume and faster than through the local area post offices. This plan has been tried in other areas prior to coming to western South Dakota, and apparently is achieving about the same results.

One of these sectional centers has been established at Pierre. And as of April 26, all mail in this area is to be routed to this sectional center.

As a result mail going from Martin to Pine Ridge can no longer go the 45 miles over U.S. Highway 18. It is to be sent from Martin to Kadoka, to Pierre, to Presho, to Rapid City, to Hot Springs and back east, again, to Pine Ridge—a distance of at least 500 miles. Also, mail returning from Pine Ridge to Martin goes back around the same route, instead of coming across U.S. Highway 18.

Somehow, mail service between Martin and Pine Ridge isn't quite as good as it was prior to April 26, 1965.

In order to test this new modernized service, press time at the Booster was moved ahead in time to catch the 5 p.m. mail Wednesday out of the post office at Martin. Copies of the Booster now have been getting to Pine Ridge Friday morning where as they previously got there Thursday morning.

This is not an isolated example.

Prior to the change, a letter could be mailed at 5 p.m. at Kadoka and it would be placed the next morning on the Kadoka truck arriving at Martin at 6:30 a.m. Now, before the letter can get on that truck, it must first go into Pierre, back to Presho and back to Kadoka to get on that same truck.

The sectional center idea has hit other areas of the country, too. The Pioneer Press of Mott, N. Dak., points out:

"The Bismarck mail bus stops at Burt now and we get all our mail from Dickinson post office. In the past, the Bismarck mail bus came to Mott and laid over until evening. Not true now—the Dickinson bus picks up our mail, hauls it to Dickinson (85 miles) then it goes by train to Bismarck (102 miles) then it is loaded on a bus and hauled to towns east of Mott, to Burt (95 miles). The point is: Burt is 8 miles east of Mott."

The trouble with the postal service, says the head of the General Accounting Office, is too much modernizing.

The mail flo system is one example cited by GAO. Under mail flo letters and packages were supposed to flit through big city post offices virtually untouched by human hands. The trouble was, said Comptroller General Joseph Campbell, it didn't work.

But before finding out that the pilot experiment in Detroit had serious deficiencies, Mail-Flo was installed in Philadelphia and Denver, where it increased the costs of postal service by hundreds of thousands of dollars and decreased labor productivity.

Why should adequate service at reasonable cost be an impossible job for the Post Office Department?

Public utilities solve the problem of increasingly complex operations to serve an expanding population. The Post Office does not.

Utilities, whether publicly or privately owned, give adequate service at lower or stabilized rates as their customers increase. The Post Office does not.

Utilities put money aside for improvement, and most privately owned utilities manage to pay dividends to their stockholders. The Post Office does neither.

Why, we repeat, can't the Post Office do its job?

The fault cannot be blamed on the 500,000 men and women—our friends and neighbors and fellow citizens—who deliver the mail. It has to lie at the very top where decisions are made. And we wonder just how bad the postal service has to get before the public stops bawling out the people behind the post office window, and starts directing its anger at the fumblers in Washington.

The 275th Anniversary of Philadelphia's 21st Ward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the special June supplement of the Review, the community newspaper of Philadelphia's 21st ward, which is celebrating its 275th year in 1965.

Amid buildings constructed long before the Declaration of Independence, the people of Roxborough, Manayunk, and Wissahickon have preserved a community as unique as the one that saw the British march up the ridge early in the morning of May 20, 1778.

Although the little village of Roxborough, which once consisted of a few houses scattered down the road, is now fully grown, one can still see signposts of the past. For instance, Roxborough is one community where you can still see a horse on the street. Many riding stables serve patrons who like to gallop up and down the trails of the Wissahickon.

It is true that there are now more houses and people in the community, which was once known as Roxborough Township. There are also more churches and schools. Television, automobiles, and the Schuylkill Expressway have brought a new era to the formerly isolated ridge of land between Wissahickon Creek and the Schulykill River.

Yet the 21st ward is still an exciting place. Although concrete has covered the fields and pastureland, and shopping centers and parking lots have come to the vales and valleys of Roxborough, Shawmont, and Wissahickon, the unusual loyalty of the people of the 21st ward for their community is one signpost of the past that will never come down.

The Intellectuals and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, this country is witnessing a new development in the arena of higher education. Although it is not listed in the catalogs of some of our leading colleges and universities, and neither is it listed in the calendar of sporting events of these schools, a clique of professors have invented teach-ins. The goal of these is to attempt to persuade anyone willing to listen that this country, in its efforts to stay the advance of communism in Vietnam, has gotten off its course.

Stewart Alsop, writing in the Saturday Evening Post, says:

It is mysterious that so many American intellectuals look forward with complacency—even positive relish—to Communist victory in Asia, which they regard as inevitable.

Mr. Alsop makes a good presentation of this new development in his article which follows:

THE INTELLECTUALS AND VIETNAM

WASHINGTON.—The war in Vietnam has brought to the surface again a mysterious phenomenon. This is the peculiar fatuousness which the profoundly antiintellectual Communist system seems to inspire in a good many American intellectuals and would-be intellectuals.

At least until 1948, it was fashionable among many intellectuals to admire, or find excuses for, the system presided over by that ferocious enemy of the free intellect, Joseph

Stalin. This fatuousness of an older generation of intellectuals provided useful ammunition for the homegrown antiintellectual yahoos, like Senator Joseph McCarthy. Nowadays it is becoming fashionable to proclaim that Mao Tse-tung's version of communism is the wave of the future in Asia, and to castigate the American Government for its blind refusal to permit the future's wave to roll over South Vietnam.

From Berkeley to Harvard, the chic thing for the politically aware professor to do is to conduct teach-ins on the iniquities of American imperialism in Vietnam, or to march in protest demonstrations, or, for the less dashing, to sign open letters to the President, like the remarkably silly open letter of protest recently signed by 149 Yale professors.

Surely this is a mysterious business. Logically, liberal-minded intellectual persons should hate and fear Mao's communism as instinctively as they hated and feared Hitler's nazism. For as an idea killer, an enemy of the free mind, Mao outdoes Hitler and Stalin combined.

The anti-intellectual campaign in Communist China, which began in earnest in 1963, is now reaching a peak of intensity. Chinese intellectuals have been bluntly warned that they are suspect, not only individually, but as a class. Some months ago Hu Yao-pang, secretary of the Communist Youth League, announced that "intellectuals always belong to certain social classes and serve the interests of these classes."

Warnings to intellectuals are now constantly reiterated in the Communist press. In January of this year, for example, Red Flag, the Chinese Communist theoretical journal, thundered against "intellectuals who refuse thought reform, refuse to integrate with the masses, and become 'spiritual aristocrats' perched proudly high above the toiling masses."

According to a leading Government expert on Communist China, the idea that Mao wants above all to kill is "the concept of humanism—i.e., the fraternity of peoples, human dignity, happiness, and individualism." Humanism has become a respectable concept among Soviet intellectuals since the post-Stalin thaw. Therefore Tse-tung is determined to "wall off Chinese intellectuals from any contact with currents of relative moderation in the Soviet bloc," and the whole concept of humanism is now denounced in China as a bourgeois distortion of Marxism-Leninism.

The attack on humanism has its superficially amusing aspects. For example, Prof. Ma Yen-sheng, of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, recently published a long letter of abject "self-criticism." Professor Ma wrote that he had found himself of late increasingly filled with bourgeois sentiments. He began to have strange notions about the idea of universal love, and even to dream of a world filled with friendly love, and forever at peace. Thus was his mind increasingly infected with bourgeois sentiments.

And how did the infection start? Largely as a result of listening to the degenerate, Western, bourgeois work, Beethoven's Ninth Symphony.

A fondess for bourgeois music is deeply suspect, and instantly marks an intellectual as a candidate for a "mental-reform-through-labor camp." Debussy, against whose music Mao is said to have conceived a particularly violent prejudice, is even more dangerous than Beethoven. The periodical Peoples' Music recently anounced that the music of the Chinese patriotic oratorio, "The Long March," had been completely rewritten because in its original form it recalled Debussy's degenerate bourgeois style.

Writers must be especially wary of the taint of bourgeois influence and humanism. The Chinese Journal of Literature and Art has warned writers that the "writing of middle-character stores" is proof of such taint. A middle character is someone not perfect and not totally bad. In Chinese Communist literature, middle characters (i.e., human beings) no longer exist. All characters must be either perfect toilers and peasants, or wholly evil class enemies.

In last October's issue of China Youth Daily, the following sharp warning to a leading Communist Chinese philosopher appeared: "The kind of life advocated by Comrade Feng Ting, which would provide good things to eat and wear, good places to live in, and cordial relations between husband and wife and between parents and children does not accord with the Communist ideal."

On the contrary, the Communist ideal demands that the youth of China make a class analysis of their parents, granparents, aunts, uncles and other relations. Deviationist ideas are to be reported immediately to the local block officer or farm party secretary. Even jokes may smack of deviation—a Peiping newspaper warns that some jokes savor strongly of feudalism and capitalism.

Nor are the dead immune. China Youth tells its readers that "we should make a class analysis of those who have died." Such a class analysis seems likely to lead to the removal of the famous and beautiful tombs of Hangchow. For these tombs "are the graves of poets, scholars, and courtesans, and are therefore * * * serving merely the purpose of spreading the foul odor of the reactionary ruling classes * * * and must be removed."

How is one to avoid being sent to a "Mental-Reform-Through-Labor Camp" as a result of a negative class analysis? Very simple:

"[We must] use the thought of Mao Tse-tung to analyze * * * events. If they correspond with the thought of Mao Tse-tung, they are right. We must support, believe, praise them. If not, they are wrong * * * we must expose and attack them." George Orwell's big brother asked for no more total an abdication of man's right to think for himself.

Perhaps the "Thought of Mao Tse-tung" is indeed the wave of the future in Asia, and the American effort to contain Asian communism is therefore futile, as such intellectuals as Dr. Hans Morgenthau preach. But it does seem mysterious that so many American intellectuals look forward with complacency—even positive relish—to the Communist victory in Asia, which they regard as inevitable. For they are looking forward, of course, to the rapid spread of a system which means the murder of the free mind.

"The Character of Lee"—Address by Capt. Eugene H. Breitenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the military brilliance of Gen. Robert E. Lee is historically documented. The genius and gentleness of Lee, the man, are worthy of emulation. His character was, indeed, inspiring.

The character of Lee was the subject of a presentation at the Robert E. Lee High School, at Springfield, Va., in observing the 100th anniversary of the close of the War Between the States.

The presentation was made by Capt. Eugene H. Breitenberg, U.S. Army, retired, who served as Department of Defense Civil War Liaison Officer to the National Civil War Centennial Commission. Captain Breitenberg is now a member of the faculty of the Annandale, Va., High School.

A taped message from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower was included in the presentation, which was entitled "The Character of Lee."

In view of the national scope of the anniversary observance, I think this tribute to a great American should be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent for its publication in the Appendix.

The presentation was made by Captain Breitenberg, on April 9, 1965, before the principal, the faculty, and the students of Robert E. Lee High School.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHARACTER OF LEE

It is a distinct honor to be privileged to speak to you and especially so on this day, the 100th anniversary of the meeting of Gen. Robert E. Lee and Lt. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant in the McLean house near present day Appomattox, Va. The surrender of General Lee's army of northern Virginia, for all practical purposes, ended a war that had pitted father against son, brother against brother, American against American.

It would seem most apropos to the occasion, consistent with a Presidential proclamation and a public law, if we took stock for a few minutes of the character of Robert E. Lee, especially in light of the fact that this school, your school, is named after that illustrious gentleman, soldier and noble American.

Sir Winston Churchill, proclaimed already by many historians as the one most likely to be honored as "man of the 20th century," had this to say of Robert E. Lee in book 11, chapter 10 of "A History of the English Speaking Peoples": he was "* * * one of the noblest Americans who ever lived, and one of the greatest captains known to the annals of war."

Such is the esteem in which Robert E. Lee is held by practically all historians. Such esteem is further enhanced in the thousands of books written about the Civil War period and by the men who fought in that so called "irrepressible conflict." Said Churchill of the Civil War "* * * the noblest and least avoidable of all the great mass conflicts fought up to that time."

During my tour of duty as Department of Defense Civil War Centennial Liaison Officer to the National Civil War Centennial Commission, with the primary duty of coordinating Armed Forces participation in centennial commemorative events, I often was asked to speak to military, civic, school and other groups. It occurred to me that my talks would be more meaningful if the proclamation could be heard in the President's own voice, rather than quoted. Accordingly, I requested and received the following taped message from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower:

"The years 1961–65 will mark the 100th anniversary of the American Civil War.

That war was America's most tragic experience. But like most truly great tragedies, it carries with it an enduring lesson and a profound inspiration. It was a demonstration of heroism and sacrifice by men and women of both sides, who valued principle above life itself and whose devotion to duty is a part of our Nation's noblest tradition.

Both sections of our magnificently reunited country sent into their armies men who became soldiers as good as any who ever fought under any flag. Military history records nothing finer than the courage and spirit displayed at such battles as Chickamauga, Antietam, Kenesaw Mountain, and Gettysburg. That America could produce men so valiant and so enduring is a matter for deep and abiding pride.

The same spirit on the part of the people at home supported those soldiers through 4 years of great trial. That a nation which contained hardly more than 30 million people, North and South together, could sustain 600,000 deaths without faltering is a lasting testimonial to something unconquerable in the American spirit. And that a transcending sense of unity and larger common purpose could, in the end, cause the men and women who had suffered so greatly to close ranks once the contest ended and to go on together to build a greater, freer and happier America must be a source of inspiration as long as our country may last."

A philosopher once said that music is to the soul as the wind is to the sail. I have read that more songs and music came out of the Civil War period than from any other war in which Americans have fought. To appreciate the feelings and convictions that prevailed 100 years ago, let us listen to two musical numbers that some believe best represent the respective feelings of North and South in that War Between the States of our Union. The first number, "The Battle Cry of Freedom," recorded for Columbia Records by Richard Bales, was a rallying song reported by Conferedate troops to have been sung by Union soldiers during attacks made in the Seven Days' Battles of the Peninsula Campaign. As Union troops charged they would sing at the top of their voices, "Rally around the flag, boys, rally once again."

A few days before his assassination, while being serenaded by the U.S. Army Band on the White House grounds, President Lincoln was asked what he would like to hear. The President replied that his favorite number was "Dixie" and that according to his Adjutant General the song was now Federal property and therefore belonged to all the American people. He requested that the band play "Dixie" for all to enjoy. Let us listen to "Dixie" as an American song.

In a publication entitled "Facts About the Civil War," published by the Civil War Centennial Commission in 1959, President Eisenhower expressed in a letter to the commission his pleasure with the pamphlet as well as with the objective of the centennial observance period. This letter contained in part the following comment which he also was kind enough to tape for occasions such as this.

"I would urge in all our commemorations of the Civil War Centennial, that we look on this great struggle not merely as a set of military operations, but as a period in our history in which the times called for extraordinary degrees of patriotism and heroism on the part of the men and women of both the North and the South. In this context we may derive inspiration from their deeds to renew our dedication to the task which yet confronts us—the furtherance, together with other free nations of the world, of the freedom and dignity of man and the building of a just and lasting peace."

In a biography of John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, William Carr completed his book with a quote from "Profiles in Courage" as expressed by President Kennedy. "The courage of life is often a less dramatic spectacle than the courage of a final moment; but it is not less than a magnificent mixture of triumph and tragedy. A man does what he must—in spite of personal consequences, in spite of obstacles and dangers and pressures and that is the basis of all human morality."

So it was that Robert E. Lee, member of an old and honored family, whose forebears had played distinguished roles in Virginia and early American history; so it was that this Lee, born in Westmoreland County, Va., later graduated with honors from West Point, first distinguished in the Mexican War, and later renowned as a promising soldier and leader of the future—so it was that Lee did what he felt a man must"—he turned down an offer from President Lincoln to command the U.S. Army when civil war appeared imminent. Only a few miles from here, in his home in Arlington, now a national shrine, Lee made his fateful decision that was unquestionably based on a matter of principle and deep conviction. For Lee was a man of exemplary character. He believed in God. He did not believe in slavery and freed the slaves that he had inherited. His decision, from every indication, was based on inner conviction and adherence to duty as God gave him the right to see that duty.

This was the same fortitude displayed by President Eisenhower in proudly displaying a picture of General Lee on his White House Office wall and subsequent reply to a critic in these words: "Gen. Robert E. Lee, in my estimation was one of the supremely gifted men produced by our Nation. He believed unswervingly in the constitutional validity of his cause, which until 1865 was still an arguable question in America; he was a poised and inspiring leader, true to the high trust reposed in him by millions of his fellow citizens; he was thoughtful yet demanding of his officers and men; forbearing with captured enemies but ingenious, unrelenting, and personally courageous in battle, and never disheartened by a reverse or obstacle. Through all his many trials, he remained selfless almost to a fault and unfailing in his faith to God. Taken altogether, he was noble as a leader and as a man, and unsullied as I read the pages of history." And President Eisenhower continued: "From deep conviction I simply say this: A nation of men of Lee's caliber would be unconquerable in spirit and soul. Indeed, to the degree that present-day American youth will strive to emulate his painstaking efforts to help heal the Nation's wounds once the bitter struggle was over, we, in our own time of danger in a divided world, will be strentghened and our love of freedom sustained. Such as the reasons I proudly display this picture of the great Americans on my office wall." Such was the same conviction that has motivated men throughout history to stand for sacred principles. Such is the same conviction that motivates men to volunteer to fight and possibly die in the jungles of confused and strife-torn Republic of Vietnam and wherever the right of free choice is threatened; this is the same conviction that motivates young people today to take a stand, to set a goal and then with stanch determination move to find what can be done for a country in dire need of additional leadership and duty faithfully performed.

Yes, Robert E. Lee, American—did what he felt he must. So it was that Douglas Southall Freeman did what he felt he must—determined that America should never forget, he devoted 20 years in research and study to write three volumes entitled "R. E. Lee" and in those pages, so throughly researched by Freeman, emerges the profile not only of courage, but of stamina, of devotion to duty, of love for God and country, of humility, kindness, and benevolence so sorely needed in the world today. Such was the character of the man for whom your school is named.

In Lee there was no mystery or enigma. He did what he believed was right. And I submit to you that we of the faith of our fathers must do today whatever is required to stand firm in our convictions during these perilous times in which we live. We must keep faith with America. We are told that the time may come soon for honorable compromise to prevent a nuclear war and possible destruction of the human race. With this we can agree. For history teaches that the Government of the United States itself is the result of compromise—of each man taking a little less than he wants so that a meeting of minds can result and thus insure reasonable life for all. We should never forget the inaugural advice of our late President John F. Kennedy, "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

Neither should we forget the words spoken last Wednesday night by President Lyndon Johnson, which said in effect, we shall never abandon those nations, however small, that seek our aid to maintain freedom.

So on this day while some predicted 30,000 fellow Americans are gathering at this moment at Appomattox, Va., as I plan to, upon leaving you today, to pay homage to the character of men who "rendezvoused" there 100 years ago, let us remember the challenge left by the noble and gallant Robert E. Lee. Let us especially remember the last 5 years of his life during which he left a heritage and a message that should be echoed by every American. As president of Washington College, now Washington and Lee University, he advised a Southern lady who inquired as to the rearing of her children, "Madam," said Lee, "don't bring up your sons to detest the U.S. Government. Recollect that we form one nation now; abandon your local animosities and make your sons Americans."

Facing the duty of the hour, Lee realized in the last 5 years of his life that the question submitted to the arbitrament of war had been fully answered. He recognized that the unity of the American people had been irrevocably established. He, therefore, promptly counseled his old soldiers to look upon the great country thus reunited by blood and iron as their own and to live and labor for its honor and welfare. His own conduct was in accordance with these teachings. Day-by-day examples illustrated the declaration of his manly words "that human virtue should be equal to human calamity."

Said Lee after the Confederacy had passed into history, "We had sacred principles to maintain and rights to defend for which we were in duty bound to do our best even if we perished in the attempt." I submit to you, we have sacred principles to maintain and rights to defend in the Republic of Vietnam, in Berlin, in Korea, and in all those places wherever freedom exists.

Students of Robert E. Lee High School, you are to be commended for your achievements both in scholastics and in sports. Greater Springfield and surrounding communities are well aware of your successes. You are recognized as one of the great high schools of Virginia and rightly so in keeping with the spirit and character of the man for whom your school is named. But I leave this thought with you and only you can decide on the merit of my suggestion. On Veterans Day, 1962, it was my privilege to speak to the faculty and students of Walter Johnson High School in Montgomery County, Md. As I entered the main corridor of that school my attention was drawn to a large painting of Walter Johnson, a member of Baseball's Hall of Fame. I was greatly impressed by that well-lighted likeness of the school's namesake and the attention it commanded. Later I was equally impressed by an outside marker to Walter Johnson's memory; at the base of which marker I spoke to the students. I shall never forget the spirit of that school. Since the change of the name of your school from Lee to Robert E. Lee, I have often thought—are the students of Robert E. Lee High School fully capitalizing on the name of their school? And even more important—are you emulating the character of

Robert E. Lee? Can more be done to channel his traits to thousands who will pass this way? Only you can answer this question. In your hearts you will find the answer.

Firearms Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, much discussion has been generated by S. 1592 and H.R. 6628, the controversial firearms control legislation.

I have taken a position in opposition to this legislation on the ground that it was oppressive and unrealistic, particularly that provision of the bill which would absolutely prohibit the purchase of firearms from mail order houses by individuals. I believe this provision would discriminate against gun owners and collectors in smaller cities and rural areas.

Previous legislation introduced in the Congress would permit mail order sales and require the purchaser to register when securing firearms in this manner. I believe this legislation to be beneficial to the general public rather than S. 1592 or H.R. 6628 which flatly prohibits such sales.

Since the introduction of S. 1592 and its House counterpart, my office has been overwhelmed by mail from outraged sportsmen who sought the opportunity to express their opposition to this legislation. For this reason, on May 14, I sponsored a public hearing in Exeter, N.H., on firearms control. Over 300 interested sportsmen attended this hearing to voice their views. Those in attendance presented both their own personal views and the views of organizations to which they belonged. I would like to point out that these people were not unaware of the problems caused by the unregulated traffic in firearms. They were aware of the needs for some regulation to check the sale of firearms to minors and felons. They were, on the other hand, concerned that S. 1592 as written placed undue restrictions on legitimate responsible firearms users. For example, the bill makes no allowances for unserviceable antique weapons. It makes no exceptions for the transportation and sending of weapons to or by law enforcement officers. And, as previously pointed out, it places an absolute embargo on the shipment in interstate commerce of firearms to individuals.

The 300-plus people in attendance at the hearing expressed nearly unanimous opposition to S. 1592 as now drafted. I share this opposition and express the hope that the respective committees charged with the responsibility of dealing with this legislation will see fit to incorporate responsible amendments and revisions which will make this legislation acceptable to legitimate firearms users.

"On Turning the Other Cheek"—Article by Dr. Frederick B. Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, our distinguished Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, continues to write a very forthright and eloquent column on important principles which should be foremost in the minds of all who are concerned with preserving our American way of life. The Sunday Star of May 23, 1965, published another outstanding article by Dr. Harris; it is entitled "On Turning the Other Cheek."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT: ON TURNING THE OTHER CHEEK

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

A certain correspondent has pictured ruthless dictators who, with the godless regimented systems they represent, war against all that makes America other than a cleaner sty. This columnist makes a bid for an appeaser's halo by suggesting, regarding these international bullies, "in spite of all rebuffs and insults, why don't we just turn the other cheek?" In the article there is the implication that such a suicidal policy would be essentially Christian. Here, standing belligerently against all that we steadfastly believe, are tyrants who are the incarnation of brute force and who do not hesitate as do all of their kin, to deceive, to break solemn vows, to plot mischief anywhere across all frontiers, to murder and butcher whenever such tactics further the completion of their diagram of world conquest.

These modern Caesars welcome, as a symptom of weakness, any apparent softness on the part of those who are arraigned against them. Confronting such individuals and the concentration camp systems for which they are the spokesmen, we are advised not to use the hard pebble of truth in the sling of righteousness, making sure it reaches the exposed part of some strutting giant, but to advance against such a foe with no weapon but that of turning one's cheek to take his blows.

Alas, this turning the other cheek technique is at the heart of much of the "peace now" protests which in these days of destiny are coming from church pulpits, from peace-at-any-price pacifists, and from college campuses which prate the same sophistries which brought on World War II. Such vociferous groups chant the demand, "negotiation now." But how utterly true is the burning message of President Johnson, in the midst of the nightmarish days and nights through which we and he, as our leader, are passing that should we agree to a spurious peace in our time, "the future will curse us for losing both the peace and freedom."

True it is that the greatest of all teachers admonished, "If a man smite thee on one cheek, turn to him the other." But, remember Christ was talking about some personal affront. If it is a matter between individuals, then turning the other cheek is in the same moral category as "a soft answer turneth away wrath." But that is by no means the method Christ advised and practiced when He came face to face with evil whose aim was to desecrate the innate dignity of other people. It must never be forgotten that when the Master fronted evil aimed at other people "He looked 'round about on them with anger." He was utterly unruffled no matter what men did to Him and what lies they told, but when injustice and duplicity and cruelty reached out to maim others who were defenseless, His anger rose to the fury of a tempest. It is crystal clear in any study of the words of Jesus that we are not through with Him when we dwell on his sweetness and light. At times He is tender—at other times He is terrible.

As a keen student of the Christ of the New Testament has put it, "any darkening of the world by cruelty or craft brought His soul to its feet fiery eyed and defiant." Who can read the denunciation of the hypocritical religious leaders of His day without realizing that He is in the presence of a wrath like molten lava. If anyone has no name for the strong Son of God but "Gentle Jesus, meek and mild," and who thus assumes that the Christ-like solution for solving any situation is just for one having been slapped on one cheek to meekly offer the other, such a one must be assured that he is looking at only a partial Christ. To be Christ-like is never to be neutral, placid, or complacent when evil is having its malignant way with individuals or with society.

We are grateful that only a tiny minority of sincere people in these days of destiny dare to suggest that the way to deal with ruthless dictators is to give them a chance at the other cheek. Florence Nightingale did not turn the other cheek when she was assailed by those whose hearts were not moved at the horror of hospitals in her day. A modern biographer of her inspiring career pictures her not just as a gentle lady with a lamp, but as a crusading lady with a lash, with the call of God loud and clear, within her uncomfortable soul pounding and bullying government officials into providing decent treatment for the wounded and the dying.

One of the greatest peace advocates of our generation, Harry Emerson Fosdick, in a stirring hymn has written some striking sentences worthy to be written on the protesting banners of millions who could be mobilized to surround the White House, backing the President and the Congress, determined to save both the peace and the freedom. On each banner there ought to be inscribed, "negotiation without strength is surrender." Underneath that could be appropriately put some of Fosdick's lines which do not suggest turning the other cheek. This, for instance—"Save us from weak resignation to the evils we deplore." And this—

"Gird our lives that they may be armored
with all Christ-like graces,
In the fight to set men free.
Grant us wisdom,
Grant us courage,
That we fail not man nor Thee."

Joe Martin Testimonial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most moving tributes ever paid to a Member of this body was rendered to our beloved former Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachu-

setts, by the people of his district at a Newton, Mass., Chamber of Commerce achievement dinner in that city last night.

Your eloquent words, Mr. Speaker, were a moving tribute to a man with whom you have shared the burdens of public service throughout most of your lifetime. The humorous, kindly, generous words of the Vice President enthralled an audience of 800 persons, who sat spell bound as these warm messages came to them by way of a telephone transmission making the first public use of Early Bird, the communications satellite.

We from Massachusetts, who have special reasons to know and love JOE MARTIN, are indebted to everyone who made this occasion such a dramatic success, particularly our minority leader, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, who flew to Massachusetts to deliver a keynote speech.

His words are a rare chronicle of a unique career in public service. They are a valuation summary of the distinctive lifetime of our friend, from birth in North Attleboro to these years of crowing achievements.

Because this biographical address of Congressman FORD will serve a valuable historic purpose, Mr. Speaker, I place it in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks:

TESTIMONIAL FOR JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., NEWTON, MASS., MAY 24, 1965

(By GERALD R. FORD)

Although this is a nonpartisan dinner, I would like to say that I'm particularly pleased to be here because I understand that the city of Newton casts the largest number of Republican votes of any community in Massachusetts. As the leader of the oppressed minority in the House, it's a pleasure to be in such a friendly environment.

While everyone knows that it was Nathan Hale who said, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country," tonight I would like to add a modern corollary to that famous statement. It is this: "The Republican Party regrets that it has but one JOE MARTIN to give to our country." All would agree that more Joe Martins would make America even greater.

I feel a special kinship for our guest of honor. JOE MARTIN once said, "The position of minority leader of the House of Representatives is the most thankless job in Washington. I would not take 10 times $10,000 to return to it." And now I'm the fellow who's trying to fill the giant shoes that JOE wore for so long, with such distinction, dedication and ability.

But JOE MARTIN and I have something else in common. We have both been avid amateur athletes. I was once a fair football player at the University of Michigan, and he was once a very good semipro baseball player.

Many of you may not know that JOE has maintained his contacts with baseball through the years. When the great Washington Senators' pitcher, Walter Johnson, ran for Congress, his friend JOE MARTIN wrote two campaign speeches for him—one to give before labor groups, and the other to give before farmers. Unfortunately Johnson was a better pitcher than politician. He got the two speeches mixed up, delivering the labor speech to farmers and vice versa. Needless to say, he lost the election, which perhaps proves what JOE MARTIN learned a long time ago: It's easier to be a great Washington Senator than a Member of the House of Representatives.

The man we honor tonight has had the most remarkable record of public service of any person currently active on the political scene. So, if he will forgive me, I would like to turn these remarks into my version of "This Is Your Life."

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., was born on November 3, 1884, the day before Grover Cleveland was elected President for the first time. His father wanted to name him Grover Cleveland Martin. But his mother, a staunch Republican, said, "Grover's a dog's name."

His father was a hard-working North Attleboro blacksmith whose earnings were never more than $18 a week.

Since the family was poor, young JOE started to work outside of school hours at the age of six. One of his jobs was to brush the flies off the horses while his father shod them. Another job was as a delivery boy for the North Attleboro Evening Chronicle. (Now probably every newsboy dreams of one day becoming the owner of the paper. But JOE MARTIN was one young man who was to make this dream come true.)

He got his political start by marching in a torchlight parade for William McKinley in 1896. At the time, a family friend told his father, "Don't let that boy go into politics—he's too good a boy."

JOE, who was otherwise a fellow of extremely good sense, did not listen to this sound advice. Traveling by horse and buggy, he campaigned for the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1911, and was elected—age 27.

In 1916 he began attending Republican presidential conventions. This would become a habit of more than 50 years' duration. And today he holds the record—unsurpassed in either party—of having been five times the permanent chairman of national conventions.

His gentle humor has broken many tense moments at conventions, as all of us recall who were at San Francisco in 1956 when a Nebraska delegate tried to nominate "Joe Smith" for Vice President.

But not all moments at national conventions are so supercharged. At his first convention, JOE woke up in the middle of the night to find that a poker game was in progress in his hotel room. And to his astonishment, he discovered that the dealer was none other than the legendary Diamond Jim Brady.

By 1924 JOE was running for Congress, and he's held that office as your Representative every since.

These were the days of great orators in the House of Representatives. However, not all Congressmen could keep from wallowing in cliches. JOE remembers that one of the first "great" speeches he heard began: "I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that politics makes strange bedfellows. Especially since women got into 'em."

JOE was put on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Of course, he really wanted to be on the Post Office Committee. (But not all freshmen legislators could be that lucky.) Interestingly, at that time the Foreign Affairs Committee spent a full week debating such earth-shaking questions as to whether or not to authorize $20,000 for an international poultry show in Tulsa.

The new Congressman began to establish his lifetime reputation as a fighter for New England. But he also learned the pitfalls of his office. After getting a new post office for Fall River, it turned out that the building contract went to a firm in St. Louis. The building was constructed not with Fall River granite, but with Indiana limestone. And to top it all off, the job of night watchman was given to the father of JOE'S Democratic opponent.

Yet, despite such temporary setbacks, he kept getting reelected to Congress. A dairyman from Taunton once said, "I vote the straight Democratic ticket, except for Congressman MARTIN. I always vote for him because my father told me to, 15 years ago." Indeed, JOE MARTIN had become a vital institution in his district.

Much deserved recognition came often to JOE MARTIN. In 1936—he was chosen Republican national commiteeman from Massachusetts. In 1938—he was elected chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee. In 1939—he became the Republican leader of the House. In 1940—he was considered a dark horse candidate for the Presidency, and received 44 votes at the convention. Although he never sought the office, this is what the great Kansas editor, William Allen White, said of him: "He will make * * * if the dice roll right, a liberty-loving President."

When Wendell Willkie was made the 1940 nominee, he begged JOE to become chairman of the Republican National Committee. Putting devotion to party above personal wishes, as usual, JOE accepted the post. As chairman he had the rare distinction of seeing the committee evicted from its building when it was purchased by an organization that hasn't been to friendly to most Republicans. However, although he was far from a wealthy man, JOE took over another building and obligated himself as a personal liability for the $33,000 lease. (Is there any wonder why Republicans love JOE MARTIN?)

The greatest tribute came to JOE MARTIN in 1947 when he was first elected Speaker of the House. Next to the President, as most students of government know, the Speaker is the most powerful elective official in the United States.

But what most people don't know is that besides presiding over the House, the Speaker has a great many other duties—such as supervising a Capitol bank with assets of $4 million. The Speaker also has responsibility for four barbershops and a beauty parlor. But JOE, as a confirmed bachelor, told a colleague, "I think I'll let you run the beauty parlor. You are more experienced with the women than I am."

This question of experience with the opposite sex was to change rapidly. For under the new law of presidential succession, Speaker MARTIN was first in line if anything happened to President Truman. (There was no Vice President when Truman succeeded F.D.R. you will recall.) Of course, the possibility of a bachelor President was a great temptation to the single ladies of this country. JOE MARTIN was deluged with offers of marriage. (One proposal that particularly amused him came from a woman spiritualist in Clarksburg, W. Va., who wrote that the deceased Wendell Willkie had told her to marry JOE.)

There are a great many reasons for JOE MARTIN'S success. But I would like to mention just two of them.

The first is his adherence to the old New England principle of thrift. Once JOE MARTIN invited a President of the United States to his office for lunch. He called a caterer for some box lunches and was told that they would cost $2 apiece. Well, this seemed a bit high to JOE, so he shopped around until he found a man who would provide a box lunch for $1.19. I am sure that this makes JOE the only man in American history to entertain a President at such a bargain price. And, of course, JOE has always applied this same principle to the taxpayer's dollar.

Second, JOE MARTIN is a very likeable person. Even those who are his political opponents have come to have a special place in their hearts for him. For example, there is quite a collection of GOP elephants in JOE'S office, and one of the most handsome was given to him by Harry Truman. The story behind this is that someone sent it to the White House, and President Truman told his secretary, "Take this up to JOE MARTIN.

I don't want any damned dancing elephants around here."

JOE has served our Nation with great skill. He has been a major force in some of the most crucial decisions of our times. To cite just one instance: During World War II General Marshall came to him and asked for $1.6 billion to manufacture an atomic bomb. JOE's job would be to try to get this money from Congress largely on faith—for the greatest secrecy had to be maintained. Thus, to a large extent, JOE MARTIN was responsible for putting through a program that eventually shortened the war and saved millions of American lives.

But speaking to you, in a sense, as a representative of JOE MARTIN's party, I would also like to say a few words about "JOE MARTIN—Republican."

When he was first nominated for House leader in 1939, it was said of him: "We are doing more than electing a floor leader. We are choosing a symbol of the Republican Party."

And JOE MARTIN has been a magnificent symbol of integrity, dedication, honor and patriotism.

Through the darkest days of Republican Party history, he has played one of the most significant roles in keeping the two-party system alive and functioning.

The dedication of JOE MARTIN's autobiography reads: "To the millions of Republicans—and to the many Democrats and Independents as well—who fought with me through the years to maintain the two-party system of government in the United States."

This has been JOE MARTIN's greatest fight. And all Americans, regardless of party, are very much in his debt, and owe him a lasting vote of thanks.

From all of us, JOE MARTIN, thank you from the bottom of our hearts.

Dr. Michael E. DeBakey Praised by Time Magazine for Discoveries About, and Treatment of, the Human Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the cover article and picture of the May 28 issue of Time magazine are about Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, one of the great surgeons of the world.

Dr. DeBakey's accomplishments and ability are of outstanding proportions, and his service to the field of medicine marks him as one of the most prominent doctors in the world today.

He is a personal friend of mine, and I should like to describe his skills and talents at length; but Time has done such a superior job, that I ask unanimous consent that the article from Time, beginning at page 46 and ending on page 55, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that all Senators can read about this amazing and capable person.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TEXAS TORNADO

Heart disease is the top killer in the United States today, and strokes rank third, just behind cancer. But heart disease and strokes both develop from diseases of the arteries, and together they account for 75 percent of all U.S. deaths. The deadly statistics, contends Houston Surgeon Michael E. DeBakey, make cardiovascular (heart-artery) disease the most pressing problem of modern medicine.

Dr. DeBakey speaks with singular authority. Since 1948, the dexterous scalpel and deft needle of Baylor University's professor of surgery have operated on more than 10,000 human hearts and arteries. From the far corners of the earth the great and the humble have traveled to Texas to have Surgeon DeBakey patch up their arteries with Dacron or implant artificial valves of plastic and sophisticated alloys in their hearts.

To Dr. DeBakey went H.R.H. the Duke of Windsor to have a potentially fatal, grapefruit-sized aneurysm removed from his abdominal aorta (Time, Dec. 25). And it was to Dr. DeBakey and Houston's Methodist Hospital that the TV producers of the United States and Europe turned a month ago when they wanted to let 300 million televiewers, aided by Comsat's Early Bird, watch an exquisitely delicate heart operation, with the surgeon literally holding a life in his hand. To Dr. DeBakey both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson turned when they needed a man to head committees and commissions to recommend means by which Americans can get the best of medical and surgical care when they fall victim to heart disease, strokes, or cancer.

While admiring colleagues boggle at the versatility and variety of his accomplishments—the arterial-replacement surgery, the delicate work inside the heart, the bold approach to strokes—DeBakey races on toward more imaginative goals. Now from his busy laboratories comes the confident prediction that surgical skills may soon be equal to the ultimate achievement—the implantation in a human of an artificial heart.

DIET AND STRESS

His vast experience has left Surgeon DeBakey firm in the conviction that the various artery diseases have as many distinct causes as there are different kinds of fevers. He is sure that it will take long and painstaking research to pinpoint all those causes and find cures or preventives. He is sure that causes and cures will eventually be found, but he is frankly disappointed with the results so far.

Diet and cholesterol are still largely unknown quantities. "We have examined thousands of arteries that had been blocked by arteriosclerosis, and we have compared the cholesterol levels of these patients with those of normal, healthy people," he says. "We can find no consistent, significant relation between the cholesterol levels and the extent and severity of the disease." The effects of stress the pragmatic surgeon dismisses with characteristic scorn: "Man was made to work, and work hard. I don't think it ever hurt anyone."

DeBakey is deeply involved in the forward-looking research that may some day do away with the need for his surgical skills. "We can't stand by and wait for final answers," he says. "There are lives to be saved today, and future illnesses to be prevented."

WIDENED HORIZON

The artery disorders for which DeBakey and his colleagues have devised ever more daring surgical procedures fall into two main classes: blockages and aneurysms. Blockages may be almost anywhere—in the greatest vessel of all, the aorta, in the coronary arteries embedded in the heart wall itself, in arteries leading to the legs, and in the carotid and vertebral vessels carrying blood to the brain. The brain itself, however, is the province of the neurosurgeons.

Blockages in coronary arteries may go undetected for years, or cause moderately disabling disease, then suddenly become total or near-total shutdowns and cause the type of heart attacks called coronary occlusions. The reaming out of such an artery ("endarterectomy") is impossible in most cases and immensely hazardous at best.

Partial shutdowns of the aorta are sometimes caused by narrowing ("coarctation"), which may be present from birth, but more often by the later development of obstructive deposits containing calcium and cholesterol. What is responsible for these deposits is one of the basic questions not yet answered. In this area, DeBakey's work first dealt with shutdowns in the abdominal section of the aorta, because there the big blood vessel could be clamped shut well beyond the point where arteries branch off to supply the brain. The lower part of the body could be deprived of its blood supply long enough to let the surgeons cut out the diseased section and replace it with knit Dacron tubing. When the heart-lung machine became a practical adjunct in surgery, the horizon was suddenly widened. It became possible to operate anywhere along the aorta, while the machine supplied blood continuously to the brain.

CLOTS AND STROKES

Obstructions involving the iliac, femoral and popliteal arteries applying the legs and feet are common, and may actually begin in the aorta just before it splits to form the two main iliac arteries. A familiar feature of insufficient blood supply to the legs, which causes pain in the calf muscles so acute that the victim can hardly walk, is its on-again, off-again nature. Ten days after DeBakey has bypassed the blocked artery with a length of tubing, the patient who previously could walk no farther than a city block without disabling pain can usually go a leisurely mile.

The most daring, and still somewhat controversial, of Dr. DeBakey's innovations is an operation on arteries leading to the brain; it is done to ease the effects of a stroke and to reduce the likelihood that the patient will have more strokes. Though some strokes are the result of hemorrhaging from burst arteries, the great majority are caused by clot shutdowns where the arteries are inside the skull and inaccessible. But Dr. DeBakey thinks that as many as 20 percent of the clots occur in the carotid and vertebral arteries, below the floor of the skull, where the surgeon can get at them through an incision in the neck.

Clotting in the carotids, as in the coronaries, results from narrowing of the vessels by atherosclerosis, the deposition of porridge-like material containing cholesterol and other complex chemicals. Again, though theories abound, no one knows the underlying cause of the process or how the sites of deposits are determined.

DeBakey did his first carotid endarterectomy in 1953. Ever since, he has been disappointed that the idea has been slow to catch on. One difficulty is that precise X-ray diagnosis, demanding great skill of the radiologist, is essential to show just which arteries are narrowed and where. Arteriography of this type is also highly uncomfortable, if not acutely painful, since the patients usually are fully conscious and only mildly sedated; partly because they must remain as cooperative as possible during the tests, partly to avoid the risks of anesthesia.

If only one of the four brainward arteries is involved, the operation is not too dangerous when done by skilled hands. But the risks increase if, as is often the case, two or even all four of the arteries are diseased. In any case, when an artery is exposed and clamped on each side of the diseased section, Dr. DeBakey has to slit it before deciding just what repair procedure will be best. It may be enough to ream out the atheromatous stuff from inside the artery. Afterward, however, simply to sew up the wound would make the artery narrower and increase the risk of a later shutdown. The reamed section must be made wider by stitching a patch of Dacron over the slit.

In many cases, the blood supply to the brain through other arteries is too tenuous for even one of them to be clamped shut for long. Then Dr. DeBakey has to install a temporary shunt of synthetic tubing while he works on the diseased section. If the blockage is too severe to be reamed out, DeBakey either leaves a permanent bypass in place or replaces the diseased section completely with a graft.

UP TO THE ARCH

"Aneurysm," first used around A.D. 200, describes part of a vessel that has been "widened across." It remained buried in medical texts until DeBakey made it a household word. Aneurysms arise from two main causes: either an arteriosclerotic process, which weakens the artery wall, or a process by which two layers of the three-ply wall separate and blood forces them farther apart. Doctors call this second class "dissecting" aneurysms. Aneurysms are also classified by shape: saccular (like a bag) or fusiform (spindle shaped). The saccular is likely to be on only one side of an artery, while the dissecting is usually fusiform and surrounds it.

Beginning in 1949, Dr. DeBakey diagnosed many aneurysms among aged veterans and charity patients—but usually at autopsy, for the disease was almost always fatal. Working with Dr. Denton A. Cooley, DeBakey decided that something could be done about the problem if the artery could be strengthened with a synthetic wrapping—or, better still, cut out and replaced. Freeze-dried calves' arteries and segments of human arteries taken from accident victims were tried, but grafts of Dacron tubing proved to be the answer.

Steadily, the Baylor surgeons worked their way up from simplier and more accessible aneurysms in the abdominal cavity. The advent of the heart-lung machine had the same stimulating effect on aneurysm surgery as it had on arterial obstructions: it made possible the removal of diseased sections of the aorta in the chest cavity, in and around the aortic arch, near where the arteries branch off to the arms and head. The Duke of Windsor's case was typical of the more manageable abdominal type, although his aneurysm proved to be larger than expected.

Perhaps the most forbiddingly difficult of DeBakey's aneurysm cases involved a man of 38 with a dissecting aneurysm that began in the chest cavity above the diaphragm and had not only grown in width but had also extended downward through the diaphragm, making a wide split where there is normally a tight fit. Worse still, the splitting of the arterial walls extended into parts of four branch arteries—the two renals, supplying both kidneys; the mesenteric supplying much of the intestines; and the celiac, supplying the stomach, liver, and spleen. Using a graft with six connections, Dr. DeBakey replaced the entire assemblage of arterial piping.

TRIPLE-PLAY TEAM

Surgeon DeBakey performs such intricate operations so often that he seems to be supplied with inexhaustible energy. His 20-hour day begins before dawn, when he tackles the paper work in his den at home. His first chore at the hospital starts at 7 a.m., when he checks three adjoining operating rooms to make sure they have all been set up in accordance with orders worked out with his two chief assistant surgeons, Dr. H. Edward Garrett, 38, and Dr. Jimmy Frank Howell, 32. A typical day's schedule reads:

Room 3: Mrs. A.B.—mitral commissurotomy, with pump stand-by; Mr. C.D.—right carotid endarterectomy; Mr. E.F.—left carotid endarterectomy.

Room 4: Mrs. G.H.—aortic valve replacement, with pump; Miss I.J.—mitral valve replacement, with pump; Mr. K.L.—right carotid endarterectomy.

Room 5: Mr. M.N.—aneurysm of abdominal aorta; Mr. O.P.—right femoral-popliteal bypass, right lumbar sympathectomy; Mr. Q.R.—renal artery bypass.

Surgery begins at 7:30, and in what the Houston virtuosos have come to regard as routine cases, operations may get underway in the three rooms at once, with Drs. DeBakey, Garrett and Howell each taking charge in one. If a case is expected to be of more than average difficulty, DeBakey will have Garrett or Howell as his chief assistant, facing him across the operating table.

Though DeBakey cannot do the entire operations in all the cases he schedules daily, he usually does the major part of three or four and somehow arranges the timing so that he is on hand at the most crucial stage of all the others. In his office he keeps an administrative assistant and three secretaries frantically busy. Except for business occasions, he allows no time for lunch; he keeps going by nibbling snacks in the office and punctuating the day with coffee.

The incredible drive for perfection, the unending concern for his patients, the utter domination of his life by his profession, have won Michael Ellis DeBakey the nickname of "the Texas Tornado." The TV scriptwriter who created such a character would sooner or later conjure up flashbacks to a boyhood in the family drugstore and an early love for medicine. In DeBakey's case, his life outdoes such fiction.

His father, Shaker Morris DeBakey, 80 this week, came to the United States from Lebanon when he was 15. By the time his son Michael was in high school, Shaker DeBakey owned a drugstore where the boy helped out and nourished the desire—acquired years earlier—to become a doctor. From his father, says Mike DeBakey, he learned his early-rising habits, the absolute abhorrence of wasted time that has marked his entire career. His mother, whom DeBakey remembers as "the most compassionate and sweetest person I've ever known," also contributed to his career. She taught her two sons and four daughters how to sew with precision—a facility for which Mike and his brother Ernest, who is a surgeon in Mobile, Ala., are forever grateful.

BANANA BREAKFAST

A straight A student, DeBakey raced through Tulane for both his B.S. and M.D. degrees, stayed to get an M.S. for research on peptic ulcer. He got appointments to the Universities of Strasbourg and Heidelberg, where he also continued courting Diana Cooper, a pretty nurse whom he had met in New Orleans before she went to the American Hospital in Paris. After Europe and marriage, it was back to Tulane to the department of surgery under Dr. Alton Ochsner.[1] During the thirties, young Dr. DeBakey became an expert in blood transfusions and invented a roller pump to assist them. That pump, he thought wistfully, might some day be useful in some sort of heart-lung machine to sustain a patient during surgery. Twenty years later it was.

Wartime service in the Army Surgeon General's Office gave Colonel DeBakey a chance to become an exacting critic of the quality of surgery, and in 1948 he moved to Houston with misgivings. Baylor's College of Medicine was just sorting itself out from the shambles of a wartime move from Dallas, and it was difficult to find a hospital surgical service with enough patients for DeBakey's practice and teaching. But he found a powerful ally in a retiring millionaire, Ben Taub, and soon got a major hospital program rolling. DeBakey and Taub are still fast friends, and breakfast together every Sunday.

Every other day in the week, breakfast is no more than coffee and a banana. By 5, DeBakey is at work in his den, the one room in his comfortable regency house to which not even his wife or the maid has a key. The huge horseshoe-shaped desk (like almost everything else that DeBakey owns, it is the gift of a grateful patient) is crammed with stacked lantern slides of diseased arteries, patients' histories, statistical analyses of the results of thousands of operations, reprints of reports by other surgeons, masses of correpondence, and a tiny portable TV. If DeBakey switches it on, it is only to have it remind him when it is 6:30 and time to head for the hospital.

If, as is usually the case, DeBakey is in a jam between journeys to far cities or foreign lands, he spends the dawn hours writing scientific papers in longhand. He finds that the time it takes to write makes him use words with the precision that is so precious to him. If he has a day or two to spare before a speech or manuscript is due, DeBakey dictates to a tape recorder and later revises the typed draft. His professional bibliography now numbers no fewer than 619 scientific reports.

PRE-OP, POST-OP

Houston's normally seething traffic is mercifully light when DeBakey takes off for Methodist Hospital in his Alfa Romeo Sprint (a gift from a grateful Italian patient) at an unpredictable speed and in no particular gear. A man who never walks if he can drive, he gets his exercise by refusing to wait for elevators. He lopes up and down stairs and covers the hospital's labyrinthine corridors at a brisk pace. Professor DeBakey has a handsome, spacious, blue-carpeted office in Baylor's College of Medicine, and rarely uses it. In Methodist Hospital, Surgeon DeBakey has a tiny office, as cluttered as his den, and runs it like an Army command post.

After the staggering schedule of operations, the afternoons are for staff conferences, with internists, cardiologists, radiologists and his chief assistants. Many an old-time surgeon thought his job was done when he had laid down the scalpel and the last suture was in place. Not DeBakey. He belongs to the latter-day school typified by Harvard's Dr. Francis D. Moore (Time cover, May 3, 1963), which insists that no less important than the operation itself are the study and preparation of the patient beforehand, and his care and study while he is recovering. DeBakey interrupts preoperation conferences for quick trips to the intensive-care area to check on patients who may be just coming out of anesthesia or getting ready to take their first hesitant steps.

Nearly every day there are other hospital or medical meetings to take DeBakey's time. And always there are long-distance telephone calls about patients, or plans to further medical progress. Even when DeBakey promises his long-suffering wife that he will be home for dinner, he is usually so late that she eats alone, then gives him a tray at his desk in the den while he is making phone calls. He takes work into the den and stays until midnight.

His backbreaking schedule of operating and writing has no effect on DeBakey's income. All fees from his operations, running far into six figures annually, go to the college of medicine, and he takes only his professor's salary.

Trips, says DeBakey, are his major relaxation, and next month he takes off for Italy to receive the $16,000 St. Vincent award of the Turin Academy of Medicine. By way of thanks, he will demonstrate some of his operations. There will also be trips to Brussels to see Marie Liliane, Princess de Réthy,

---

[1] One of the Nation's greatest teachers and practitioners of surgery, who first indicted smoking as a major factor in the cause of lung cancer. Many of DeBakey's early writings were on this subject. The admiring DeBakey's have middle-named two of their four sons Alton and Ochsner.

for whose charitable organization DeBakey operates on many Belgian children, and to Paris to see the Duke and Duchess of Windsor. Later come a week in Israel and a busman's holiday in Athens, with DeBakey demonstrating surgery while a guest of Queen Mother Frederika.

GAP AND LAG?

Once back in Houston, back to his wearing schedule, back to the demands of days filled with life-and-death decisions, DeBakey will return to the medico-political battles that he never shuns. A progressive Democrat and an acquaintance of President Johnson, DeBakey favors the use of Federal funds for medicine. "The Federal Government," he says, "has already put a lot of money into medicine, and every physician in the United States is better off for it—better off than he ever was before."

The American Medical Association, which gave DeBakey its distinguished service award in 1959, now finds itself in violent disagreement with almost everything he says. The report of the commission he headed (Time, December 18), recommending the establishment of intensive-care centers for heart disease, strokes, and cancer, and community centers for diagnosis and emergency care, has jolted organized medicine to the soles of its surgical boots.

The report asserts that there is a wide gap between the quality of care available at major medical centers and that available in the smaller cities and rural areas; that there is a lethal lag between the development of new lifesaving techniques and their adoption by physicians in general. The AMA denies the existence of such a gap or such a lag and plans to fight the proposals, which it sees as a plot to reorganize U.S. medicine under Federal control. The DeBakey commission has on its side the President and such powerful congressional allies as Senator LISTER HILL.

Even DeBakey's enthusiasm for an "artificial heart" and his confidence that it can be built stir debate among conservative colleagues. Critics scoff about science-fictioneering. But DeBakey is in good company; the Cleveland Clinic's Dr. Willem J. Kolff, who invented the artificial kidney, is one of the handful of other eminent researchers working on an artificial heart. DeBakey says emphatically that he believes it will ultimately be possible to replace an entire human heart with a self-powered and virtually indestructible plastic pump. But he adds with equal emphasis that the best surgeons are still far from ready to start replacing hearts.

ASSISTANT VENTRICLES

What the medical and physical sciences can do today, says DeBakey, is to produce a replacement for part of the heart—its main pumping chamber, the left ventricle—and use it temporarily to support the failing natural heart, which thus can rest and regain its power. Five years after DeBakey put together a research team that now includes Dr. C. William Hall and Dr. Domingo Liotta, they not only produced a replacement for the left ventricle—or, more precisely, an assistant ventricle—but proved its practicality with actual tests in more than 100 laboratory dogs.

It was tried in a human for the first time on July 19, 1963. The man, a Negro, 42 years old, was almost dead from failing kidneys and a heart hopelessly damaged by a narrowed aortic valve. The assistant left ventricle implanted in him by DeBakey was about the size and shape of a banana. It looked like two Silastic sausage casings, one inside the other; it had a valve at each end of the inner sac and a ¼-inch tubing leading from the outer balloon to an air pump. When it was installed, most of the patient's blood bypassed the natural left ventricle, leaving it free to take a rest. Pulsations of air in the outer sac supplied alternate suction and pressure to send blood coursing through the patient's body.

The doomed man improved markedly and lived almost four days on his artificial half-heart (Time, Nov. 8, 1963). After that, it was no failure of the device that ended his life; it was old and irreversible damage to his liver, lungs, and kidneys.

New models of assistant ventricles have been produced steadily, in improved shapes and for both ventricles. Is is only 7 weeks ago that DeBakey team ran what it thought was a highly successful experiment with a unit that replaced both of a dog's ventricles. Yet progress in the field is so fast that within 4 days the researchers were dismissing their test as old hat. They were getting as good or better results with a single ballooning sac inserted in the left ventricle alone. It seems, says Dr. Hall, that this may be enough in many cases to stimulate, if not precisely duplicate, the work of nature's complex four-chambered heart.

What really counts is a strong and steady beat in the left ventricle to send blood coursing through the trunk to the head and limbs. Once that is achieved, nature is likely to take over and get the rest of the circulatory system, including the three other chambers, to work effectively in unison. However, if both left and right ventricles have been severely damaged, they might be replaced by a two-in-one prosthesis with a single pump.

MUSCLES OR BATTERIES

All artificial hearts or half-hearts so far have relied on an external power source almost as bulky as a washing machine and infinitely more complex and delicate. The patient has to stay in bed, hooked up to this pulsating pump by an air hose passing through a hole in his chest. For a man with an artificial heart to get up from his bed and walk, let alone work, the power supply must be inside him. It may be electrical, depending on the long-lived, high-performance mercury batteries now being perfected for cardiac pacemakers (Time, Jan. 11, 1960). Another possibility would be to install an electric coil inside the body and have it operated through induction by a powerpack worn outside the heart. Either system would supply adequate electrical stimuli but only a smidgen of mechanical power.

Better yet, DeBakey and his coworkers believe, it may eventually be possible to harness one of the body's powerful muscles, perhaps in the shoulder girdle, to such a pacemaker. Then, when the little device gives its electrical command, the muscle will contract, and inbellows, which in its turn will squeeze the left ventricle or both. Like all gadgeteers, the heart researchers also dream of using atomic power.

Just 2 weeks ago, the DeBakey team was well pleased with the results of a 40-hour test in a 150-pound calf with a complete artificial heart. But the problems to be solved before routine use in man are still forbidding. The external heart-lung machine, which Dr. DeBakey has done so much to advance, can tide a patient over for only a few hours, during and after surgery. Dr. DeBakey wants an artificial heart element that can be installed while a patient is still on the operating table and left in place to tide him over the first few dangerous days of recovery. Then it might be removed.

IS IT PRESUMPTUOUS?

When he looks farthest ahead through the tops of his trifocals and peers toward the artificial heart that may be implanted permanently, DeBakey says: "It is deficiencies in materials and our lack of knowledge about how they will work over a long period that are holding us up. The materials we have, good as they are, still damage the blood to some extent, and they may become rigid after long use. I am confident that if $50 million were made available today for just this kind of research, an artificial heart, or the vital parts of one, could be ready for permanent implantation within 3 to 5 years.

Medicine and surgery, Dr. DeBakey insists, have solved most of the problems of heart replacement that lie within their specific fields. What is now needed is a total effort in cooperation with physicists and industry to solve the problems of materials and power supply. "If artificial hearts can work, as they have, for 40 hours or more," says Michael DeBakey, "is it presumptuous to say that it could be done for 40 days or 40 years? Today it may be only a dream; tomorrow it will be a reality."

Pennsylvania Winner in Independence Hall Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania Jaycees recently concluded an Independence Hall essay contest. I am happy to announce that the winning essay in Pennsylvania was written by Margaret Sciullo, of Penn Hills, an eighth grade student at Seneca Junior High School. The State award included a 10-day tour of national historical shrines which has now been concluded.

I am confident you will find Miss Sciullo's essay very worthwhile reading. I am proud to here insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SENECA EIGHTH-GRADER TELLS WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO HER

(By Margaret Sciullo)

The dishes are done. I have a whole evening to do my homework. I am to write an essay on "What My Country Means to Me." The pencil is in my hand and a piece of paper is in front of me, but there is nothing on the paper. Writing this theme won't be easy. I know what my country means to me. My problem is getting it in words. How can I explain it?

Better writers than I have called America the land of freedom, liberty, justice and bravery. I can't seem to select each word and place it in its proper category. It would not be fair to say that when the flag is waving I only feel the freedom America has given me. She has also given me the same love of liberty and justice that brave men felt who have fought to keep her strong enough to inspire the world. These are my thoughts of America.

As I search for the perfect description, freedom, liberty, justice and the love of its people seem to become a torch. It is these qualities which have lit this torch with a flame different than the world has ever seen. It has lit up the old world and given birth to a new world.

As I further search for words to describe my America, I become aware of my family, my home, and my community. Although they seem far removed from America as a world power, they are really my America. I have freedom to leave my own home to attend a school where I can learn what is best for my education without fear of interference. My name, my color, my creed do not have to be explained to anyone. The home which I leave each morning is the home my family has chosen, not one we have been forced to live in. There are times when my parents complain of the many pay-

ments that are needed to keep a normal, healthy household functioning, but there is never a note of fear in their voices.

When we are in school, we are taught to observe the rules of silence for the sake of an orderly system, and not in fear of what might have been said. Our subjects of history, languages, and mathematics are not colored by propaganda to make America seem always right. We are taught to admit our mistakes, and we are taught to correct them.

Each afternoon I come home from school and enter the house to find my baby sister happily playing, and my mother busy with household chores. Dad is out working to support his family in his own chosen field of work. My older sister's career will be her choice, not the state's. When she decides to marry, her marriage will be made for her happiness, and the license will be the only legal paper provided and needed. My brother speaks of becoming an electronics engineer. If, as he grows older, some other field will lure him, only his talents and ambitions will have to be considered. My little sisters, living in their child's world of comfort and happiness, are too little to realize their advantage of being American children. They will grow in the love of their parents, not in the paid love of a state nursery school teacher.

In the evening, when my father reads the newspaper, the facts in the articles are written as they happen, not as the state would like them to happen. As in almost every American home, the family is drawn to the TV set. Programs are selected for the family's enjoyment. Some evenings the choice involves a rather heated family discussion. However, when the program is finally chosen, we know that it is governed by the manufacturer of perhaps a famous soap product, and not a ministry of propaganda. And when, at times, the family decides to go out for entertainment, we choose our own place, and time for return is not governed by a set curfew.

In attempting to show what my country means to me, I have expressed in words the freedom in my everyday life. It is the same freedom every American experiences, and we must fight to keep, so that every future American will experience it.

Tabulation of Results of a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we have just completed an experiment in the First Congressional District of Alabama in order to learn more about the opinions of the district's citizens regarding important national and international issues of the day.

We have been overwhelmed by the tremendous number of persons who took the time to respond to a written questionnaire which we mailed to every home in the district. More than 16,000 persons responded.

This is a great tribute to the First District because it shows that our people want to make their ideas on important issues known to their elected representative in Congress.

In order that representative government can be effective it is important that elected officials know the views of the voters. This is one way that I can be informed as I proceed to serve the First District.

I want to call particular attention to 2 of the 10 issues raised in the questionnaire. Of those responding to the questionnaire fully 86.2 percent oppose President Johnson's proposal to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and thus they favor continuing the State authority to enact right-to-work laws.

On the other hand, 73.5 percent of those responding believe that our national security is at stake in the conflict in Vietnam, giving support to the administration in its determination to help South Vietnam resist outside aggression from the north.

Following is the complete tabulation of results of the questionnaire:

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you favor "medicare" for the aged financed by an increase in social security taxes?	20.5	79.5
2. Would you approve of a Federal law repealing State "right to work" laws?	13.8	86.2
3. Should the Federal Government undertake a program for controlling pollution in lakes, rivers, and streams?	75.9	24.1
4. Do you believe that our own national security is at stake in the Vietnam conflict?	73.5	26.5
5. Would you favor a change in our immigration laws to base a person's admittance to the United States on skills rather than on country of birth?	51.2	48.8
6. Do you feel any State should have the right to apportion 1 house of its State legislature on factors other than population if a majority of the State's voters agree?	74.0	26.0
7. Do you support Federal aid to education?	45.6	54.4
8. Would you support a constitutional amendment to provide for a 4-year term for the U.S. House of Representatives with ½ of the House Members elected every 2 years?	74.4	25.6
9. Do you favor the proposal to give a tax credit to individuals for the costs of higher education?	74.1	25.9
10. Would you support a program of Federal rent subsidies to low- and middle-income families?	18.2	81.8

The President's Position on the Vietnam Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the two following articles on the President's position on the Vietnam situation.

Both editorials are excellent and again demonstrates Mr. Johnson's humanitarianism and leadership.

[From The Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, May 14, 1965]

JOHNSON'S STRATEGY IN ASIA

President Johnson's televised address from the White House Thursday had a ring of similarity to other speeches he has given recently, on the subject of Vietnam, but there were notable and significant differences.

Heretofore, the President had discussed southeast Asia from the standpoint of American policy. On Thursday he talked mostly not of policy but of strategy.

He did reiterate, it is true, the basic U.S. policy of defending South Vietnam against Communist aggression, by whatever military action is necessary, and of making every effort to achieve a satisfactory settlement by negotiation. However, he went on to indicate in considerable detail some of the strategic devices which may be employed in implementation of that policy.

The strategy is complex but it boils down to this: Prevail upon Communist North Vietnam to break away from the dominance of Red China and chart its own course in foreign affairs. Or, to put is another way, the North Vietnamese are being encouraged to stop allowing themselves to be used as pawns of Peiping and to start acting in their own self-interest.

An essential part of this strategy is to convince the North Vietnamese that their self-interests lie in peaceful settlement rather than in continuation of the war against South Vietnam to further Red Chinese ambitions of conquest.

"It would clearly be in the interest of North Vietnam to come to the conference table," President Johnson said. "Communist China apparently desires the war to continue, whatever the cost to their allies. Their target is not merely South Vietnam. It is Asia."

The President went on to portray elaborately the bright economic future that is possible for all the Vietnamese people—to be established primarily by U.S. financial and technical assistance to promote progress in agriculture, in industry, in education, in health, in housing. He made a point of emphasizing that "when peace has come * * * all the people of Vietnam, North and South alike," will share in the economic bounties.

Noteworthy, also, was the President's specific invitation to the Soviet Union to join the United States in helping to "create a better life for the people of southeast Asia."

One exceedingly large question, as President Johnson well knows, is whether the North Vietnamese Communists have sufficient power and mastery of their own house to end the war in South Vietnam against the wishes of Red China. As the air raids on North Vietnam intensify, and the price of aggression rises steadily, the political leaders in Hanoi may well be asking themselves the same question.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 14, 1965]

JOHNSON UNDERLINES IDEALISM IN VIETNAM POLICY

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Firmness, compassion, and conciliation are the watchwords of the great

drive that President Johnson has launched to win support for American policy on Vietnam.

Rarely has the country seen anything like it.

His speech before the editorial cartoonists here May 13 was the 12th time in 2 weeks that he has made public utterances on foreign policy. In addition, so-called truth squads of top administration officials have been sent out to counter opposition. This opposition centers in the academic and intellectual world.

TALKS FAVORED

With a kind of grim patience President Johnson makes these three points:

We are not fighting in Vietnam because we want to but "to make aggressors understand that force will meet force" and that "aggression is not only wrong, but it will not work."

We know that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side." Repeating his earlier Baltimore phrase, the President said here, in his latest nationally televised broadcast, "We are ready for unconditional discussions. Most of the non-Communist nations of the world favor such discussions. And it would clearly be in the interest of North Vietnam to come to the conference table."

Why then, aren't there discussions? President Johnson directly charges that "Communist China apparently desires the war to continue whatever the cost to their allies." He adds:

"I am continuing and increasing the search for every possible path to peace."

Finally, President Johnson emphasizes the constructive and idealistic aspect of what he sees as the basic American goal in Vietnam. It is this nonmilitary aspect that he develops in his latest talk; not what the South Vietnamese are fighting against, but what they are fighting for—food, education, and health.

President Johnson's educational campaign is keyed to the idealistic aspirations of young people. It is chiefly in the colleges that protests against the Vietnam war have centered. He does not sound a martial or belligerent note in his latest talk. He does declare the United States unwavering purpose to meet what he charges is North Vietnamese aggression.

But the whole emphasis is on the idealistic side, with reference to American cooperation to bring material improvement to the South Vietnamese. Such improvement has come, he declares, even in spite of the war. He lists such gains at length, remarking in passing that since 1954 the United States has spent $2 billion in economic help for the 16 million people.

COMMON EFFORT SOUGHT

Mr. Johnson boldly challenges not only the idealistic aspirations of his own citizens but of other countries, including the Soviet Union.

Mr. Johnson painted the struggle as one where the United States is developing food, health, education, and housing for the South Vietnamese but where Communist terrorists are raiding these very improvements in a deliberate campaign.

His speech contained homely details of rice, corn, and pig production, and of an improved sweet potato that promises a "sixfold increase" in yield.

Wistfully at the end he spoke of the hope of peace, when "we can share that gracious task with all the people of Vietnam—North and South alike."

Mr. Johnson's speech was available by TV satellite for broadcast all over Europe. It was another example of diplomacy by satellite. He sought to draw attention to many constructive things done in Vietnam that are obscured by the war. He tried also to refute two assumptions—that the Vietnamese have no interest in the struggle and that American support has brought only war and destruction.

The President gave support to an Asian Development Bank to help finance economic progress.

He spoke in the East Room of the White House to an audience of about 300, many of them cartoonists who draw his picture on editorial pages.

"I call on every industrialized country, including the Soviet Union," he said, "to create a better life for the people of southeast Asia.

"Surely the works of peace can bring men together in a common effort to abandon forever the ways of war."

The critical point in administration arguments is that the war in Vietnam is due to aggression from the North. It would end promptly, according to this view, if outside support ended.

Critics of the administration assert that the war is a civil war, and that the Communist guerrillas, or Vietcong, are indigenous. While undoubtedly aided from outside, the Vietcong, these critics say, would carry on the struggle without such aid.

Mr. Johnson in his latest speech returned to his critics.

"How incredible it is," he said, "that there are a few who say the South Vietnamese do not want to continue this struggle. They are sacrificing and dying by the thousands."

He cited "their patient valor" as an inspiring example for Americans. He quickly added praise for American civilians who have been working in Vietnam. "They toil, unarmed and without uniforms," he said.

Resolution of New York State Student Christian Movement in Support of the Pending Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the very fine resolution on the pending voting rights legislation which was approved recently by the annual spring assembly of this movement.

I might first point out, Mr. Speaker, that this organization has a membership which includes 72 colleges and universities in New York State, and is affiliated with the New York State Council of Churches. The president of the organization is Mr. Thomas Genne of Syracuse University. The vice president is Mr. Richard Schafer of Colgate University. The communication secretary is Miss Shiela Stanley, a sophomore at Keuka College at Penn Yan, N.Y., and a constituent of my district.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT IN NEW YORK STATE

Acting in accordance with the conviction that the Church of Christ to be truly the church must continually reaffirm and implement its traditional role of reconciliation among men, we seek and urge an elimination of all social, political, and economic influences which deny or restrain the full expression of human worth and dignity to any of our citizens.

Futhermore, we deplore and urgently seek to eradicate from our minds and hearts and from our churches and society any feelings, attitudes, and actions which represent or perpetuate injustice to any man because of his creed or race.

Furthermore, we support and urge the immediate passing of such legislation as may guarantee the franchise to all qualified persons and express our considered opinion that such legislation shall in no wise equivocate or compromise the moral and Christian principles of both church and state.

This resolution was passed at the annual spring assembly of the Student Christian Movement in New York State, Cazenovia, N.Y., April 11, 1965.

(Signed) MISS SHIELA STANLEY,
Communications Secretary.

Republicans: Another Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a recent statement by our distinguished colleague from the State of Maine, Representative STAN TUPPER, the full text of which appeared in the Portland Sunday Telegram May 16, 1965.

Congressman TUPPER, in his comprehensive and forceful statement, has placed in proper perspective the problems of the Republican Party; moreover, he advances some provocative proposals for the party's course in the future.

I wish to commend the gentleman from Maine for his contribution to the cause of strong two-party government.

If the Republican Party is to correct the damaging imbalance that exists in the strength of our two-party system, there must be abrupt and bold changes made within the minority party; another year may be too late.

We now have at best a one-and-a-half party system in Washington, with the specter of one-party government in the Nation increasingly before us. The responsibility for this serious imbalance rests squarely with the Republican Party.

If honest with ourselves, Republicans must admit that our party has abjectedly failed to capture the imagination of the voters for well over three decades. Our victories have nearly always been victory of the individual rather than of party. The only Republican presidential victory since 1928 was a reward to a war hero. General Eisenhower could have just as easily been elected as a Democrat, and often gave the impression that he wished he had been.

While it grieves me to say so, the Republican Party is still looked upon by the average run-of-the-mill voter as the party of the wealthy, rather stuffy and lacking in imagination. Despite the considerable efforts of a handful of Republican governors, senators, and Congressmen to change this unfortunate image, it still persists.

It is disquieting to read comments scorning the idea that there is danger of the Republican Party declining to a splinter party status simply because it has managed to survive in the past. This is but wishful thinking; with little better than 20 percent of the registered voters now preferring the Republican Party, we face the ultimate loss of many of these loyal partisans unless we give them a better reason to vote Republican.

It is possible that a number of congressional seats from hitherto Republican districts, but lost to Democrats in the 1964 election, will be restored to the GOP in 1966, but it would be folly to assume that gaining back that which we should never have lost is an indication of progress. On the contrary, it could be the final coup de grace to the Republican Party if these seats are not won back by Republicans in 1966.

There are those who loudly profess that Democratic promises, platforms, programs, and policies encompass solutions to all problems. Currently this is called government by "consensus." We need not dwell upon what has happened in other nations, in other times, when debate and dissent lessened to a point where it was finally stilled, and consensus became tyranny or dictatorship.

Certainly the motives of President Johnson should not be impugned, for he is merely using his vast skills of persuasion to bring his legislative programs to fruition. With dynamic leadership from the White House, it is most difficult for constructive dissent from the minority party to make much of an impact. Yet, difficult as the job may be, Republican voices must be heard and associated with reason rather than reaction.

Both political parties must be pluralistic, with the broadest possible base of responsible support. I say "responsible" support, for inclusion of fringe groups of the far right or left disgust ordinary rank and file members whether they look upon themselves as liberal or conservative.

We need no better example than the election of 1964 when the conservative wing of the GOP defied all logic in carrying out their ill-fated crusade. Rather than to consolidate their forces with those Republicans less conservative in their political orientation, they immediately laid out the welcome mat for support from far right reactionaries. Support from the political shadows responded and the rest is history. The inclusions of extremists into the thinking of the Republican Party produced an almost unparalleled election disaster.

The postelection proclamations by die-hard rightwingers included such nonsequitor statements as "27 million Americans can't be wrong." They point with pride to the statistic that the Conservative Party gathered only about 3 million votes in 1960, and in 1964, under the auspices of the Republican Party, they polled 27 million. Of course they neglected to mention the fact that they temporarily captured the Republican Party, and they fail to note the disastrous results of that act. Republicans cannot take much comfort from a 27-million vote when the Democrats had 43 million in the same election.

The ultraconservative elements that cannot accept the positions and platforms of an imaginative and responsive party should abandon the Republican Party. They would be happier and the Republican Party and the Nation would be better for it. Sincere and constructive conservatism must always have a place in the Republican Party, but that type of ultraconservatism that is nonconstructive, unreasoning, and fanatical in its approach must never again find a home within the Republican Party. By accommodating the radical right, comprising programs and platforms for the sake of hefty campaign contributions, we are keeping millions of people away from the Republican Party.

In charting a new course for the Republican Party we must take a closer look at groups by and large hostile to the GOP, and determine how we can change this hostility to support. The association of the Democratic Party with organized labor, and hence the bulk of working men and women in the United States today, has proven to be of inestimable value to the Democratic Party. As Republicans we must ask ourselves, Do we as a party deserve the support of labor on the basis of past performance?

When labor we engaged in its struggle to achieve recognition, the bulk of Republicans felt themselves to be of the then middle or merchant class. Many Republicans viewed labor's early efforts with scorn and distaste, and pointed to the early strikes and violence that often ensued as examples of irresponsibility. Unfortunately, there are some Republicans today who characterize themselves as being against labor unions.

It is impossible to deny that the enormous strides of our present economy are due in a large measure to the impetus given it by labor through the increased earning power of the American workingman.

If the Republican Party is to flourish again, it must now seek active support from organized labor and establish close and meaningful liaison with them. We must realize that labor is not merely a group identification, but rather citizens, families, children, and leaders. Any party that seeks a majority position must have a clear identification with all the major segments that it strives to lead.

As a Republican Congressman endorsed by organized labor in 1964, I have found labor support tremendously helpful—contrary to what many Republicans believe, labor does not expect 100-percent allegiance to their goals, but merely an open mind and a general sympathy with the problems of workingmen.

The Republican National Committee should now establish a labor division within the national committee. State Republican organizations should institute committees in every State headquarters to work closely with labor organizations. Republican State committees, and State and local officeholders should meet with labor leaders to establish a viable relationship. This new contact and interest with organized labor need not be at the expense of traditional Republican concern for business; rather it should be the purpose of Republicans to return the party to a position of having contact with the entire economic community. The goal of our policy should be to seek a balance of interest, and the improvement of the relationship between labor and management.

Another area where concerned Republicans must devote time and energy is in the task of attracting intellectuals to our party. The wholesale desertion of the intellectual community has arrested the growth of Republican philosophy and the enlistment of youth in the Republican ranks. Educators to a large extent are oriented toward a progressive philosophy and the Democratic Party. To the Democrats great benefit, a large proportion of today's youth is instructed in our schools and colleges by Democratic teachers and professors. Yet the one-party orientation of this academic group can work to the benefit of Republicans, for to a great extent these intellectuals have become Democratic foot soldiers. As their members grow, their individual influence declines. If these intellectuals were given an opportunity to join the vanguard of a responsible, forward-looking Republican Party, the GOP would find an increasing number of intellectual enlistments. This would alleviate the lack of intellectualism from which our party has suffered in the past.

Some Republicans have in the past been fearful of the inclusion of responsible positions for young members of the party. All too often the youthful enthusiasm of our younger members has been derailed by the elders in the party. We should remember that youth seeks challenge and opportunity. Republicans must provide that challenge and that opportunity. It is axiomatic that the area of greatest opportunity lies in the minority party. The need for innovation and experiment that are inherent in a party out of power can be a highly persuasive argument for the enlistment of new members.

The main goal of a minority party is the preparation to assume the mantle of the majority at some future time. The assumption of leadership is the legitimate aim of any constructive political minority. It is, however, most important to remember that a minority that seeks to lead must present such constructive and imaginative proposals that they will be worthy of the majority position by force of logic and reason alone.

There is today a type of thinking that concludes that the Republican Party's only chance of regaining power will be as a direct result of a foreign policy failure or a great economic disaster. Republicans should repudiate this negative form of thinking and strive to gain strength through their own efforts, for this is the only lasting and legitimate source of power. Indeed the new Republican Party must call for a militant initiative.

In the months ahead we must move the party to the people rather than again attempting to bring the people to the party. The Republican failure in 1964 can be traced directly to the efforts of the ultraconservatives for forcing their doctrines upon the electorate. We need not experiment with this further; the rejection was devastating and complete.

The hallmark of Democratic success in the past 25 years has been their vigorous legislative efforts in behalf of social and economic betterment.

Sadly, Republicans as a minority party have sought to check the Democratic proposals with little in the way of constructive alternatives of their own. When individual Republicans have sought to initiate new forms of social legislation or supported Democratic proposals, they have been decried as "me too" Republicans. This is an exercise in silly semantics. We are all Americans first and Republicans, Democrats, and independents secondly. Everyone must out of good conscience stand for what is good, right, and just for his country and put party behind his nation's needs.

Some others say that Republicans are in desperate need of issues. I would reply that there are a great many issues in need of Republican solutions. Since the establishment of the Republican Party, certain basic beliefs have prevailed. One of these is the belief that the individual States should have a more significant role to play. The steady erosion of State governmental powers is of considerable concern to many Republicans. Republican State legislators have a significant contribution to make to their State and Nation by working toward better State management and State fiscal responsibility. Republicans have had considerabl success in the management of governmental affairs in the past and certainly the need is no less today. Republican State legislators should take the initiative in these programs.

In the area of foreign policy, it should be evident to all but the naive that the foreseeable future is fraught with challenge and danger. The responsibility for war is usually put upon the failure of policy. Republican Members of Congress have a duty to offer alternative policies and constructive dissent to the majority to insure that every alternative of policy is explored to its fullest extent.

As our Nation is changing so do the requirements of our society. Modern technological advances create better living, but we should also be alerted to some of the unfortunate byproducts of these changes.

An ever-increasing number of people will be concerned with environmental pollution. We are reaching for the stars but choking in our air on earth.

Automation challenges our aspiration of full employment.

Our cities are in desperate need of rebuilding and reorganizing and the near future is crowding in upon them.

There is and will continue to be increasing public interest in the right of privacy and the privilege of the individual to dissent in what promises to be a future of increasing uniformity. The dignity and privacy of the individual are germane to Republican philosophy.

It is difficult for me to remember a major Republican address without references to protecting the dignity of the individual. We have always claimed a special interest in individual rights, and yet at a time in our history when there is the greatest assault ever against the dignity of the individual, the Republican Party is strangely quiet. We can scarcely open a newspaper without reading of the wholesale use of lie detectors on employees and prospective employees, of the most flagrant invasions of privacy through wiretaps and listening devices, peepholes in washrooms, mail covers by our postal department, etc.

Both parties are apparently resigned to this abhorrent drift, and unless leaders speak up, harassment of the individual and invasions of his privacy will grow worse. The Republican Party should make an immediate study of the problem, and as a party protest loudly and incessantly against this "big brother" concept.

If Republicans do not, we will have to admit that we do not really mean what we have been saying for so many years.

Civil liberties will remain in the forefront of social concern for some time. Although the legal apparatus for equal rights is nearly erected, the moral fulfillment remains.

In a world of exploding population and decreasing food production, the incongruity of our own peculiar farm program remains unsolved. This is an economic tragedy.

While we have been quick to respond to dramatic space challenges by the Soviets, we have been lax in meeting the challenge in the maintenance and development of our merchant marine and oceanographic exploration. Only a few years ago we held a predominant position among the nations of the world in both merchant marine and fishing fleets. In both cases we have fallen far and fast.

Increasing concern is felt throughout the free world in regard to our gold grain. New thoughts and programs have to be devised quickly. We cannot hope to cure such a major financial disease as this with emergency first aid.

Our ever-expanding population will shortly demand new and sweeping programs for the betterment of the individual. Thus far we have approached the educational needs of the Nation in a piecemeal manner. The factor common to every great civilization has been the height and breadth of its education.

It is with these and other problems that the Nation will concern itself in the years ahead. These problems will require intelligent action accompanied by bolder Republican thought.

To serve the principles of democracy, this Nation cannot operate with a party and a half. It therefore becomes necessary for the Republican Party to revitalize itself. Thoughtful Americans of both political parties realize the importance of two vigorous contending parties.

The orientation of the Republican Party during 1964 centered upon the ultraconservative sector of the political spectrum; as a result the party lost ground and political vitality.

It is apparent that another course is needed.

Fighting Poverty and City Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, a controversy has arisen in the city of Syracuse because of a grant given by the Office of Economic Opportunity to the School of Social Work of Syracuse University.

One of the things this controversy has generated is some excellent journalism, and I will include one of the best examples of this. The article below was prepared by Edwin Knoll and Jules Witcover who are correspondents of the Newhouse National News Service. Mr. Knoll and Mr. Witcover have done an outstanding job of researching and reporting an explosive local issue. The depth of their research and the keenness of their analysis are matched by the fullness of the story they have reported:

[From the Herald-Journal, May 12, 1965]

FIGHTING POVERTY AND CITY HALL—OUR WASHINGTON STAFF TAKES A LOOK AT SYRACUSE

(At the local level, President Johnson's war on poverty is raising major questions of philosophy and intent. Two Washington correspondents of this newspaper's national news service visited Syracuse to look at the situation here in the context of the national antipoverty program. This is their report.)

(By Erwin Knoll and Jules Witcover)

Should the Federal Government finance mass social protest? Should it, as part of the war on poverty, help the poor fight city hall?

These questions have been raised as a result of a $314,000 Federal grant to Syracuse University to help organize the community's poor into a pressure group.

The Federal Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) regards the university program as a significant test of the theory that poverty can be fought most effectively when the poor are directly involved in community programs.

Congress, in passing the antipoverty act last year, demanded "maximum feasible participation" of the poor in local planning and administration. The university experiment, a national pilot study, proposes to meet the goal in an unorthodox and potentially explosive way.

It calls for mobilizing the poor into an aggressive and powerful group that can win a voice in community decisions affecting their welfare. Low-income neighborhood organizations will be set up and will elect leaders.

Syracuse has another antipoverty agency, designated as official by the city and county governments. The university program is an effort to work with the poor outside the official structure, rather than within it.

The officially backed program, called Crusade for Opportunity, also has a Federal grant of $483,000. Most of the traditional social welfare agencies in Syracuse are represented in the crusade. "Representatives of the poor," as required by the Federal law, also are included, but they have been selected by the crusade.

The main target of both programs is a deteriorated downtown area that includes most of the city's poor—and 80 percent of its Negro population. Syracuse, with a total population of 200,000, has about 12,000 Negroes. According to 1960 census data, 13 percent of the white population and 30 percent of the nonwhites had family incomes of less than $3,000 a year.

Frictions between the two federally supported programs have produced a jurisdictional civil war among Syracuse's antipoverty warriors' fought over the questions of how the poor shall participate and who shall speak for them.

To the average citizen of Syracuse, it has been an invisible civil war so far. The cab driver who is asked what he thinks about the controversy—or about the war on poverty generally—shrugs and says: "I don't know nothing about it. I mind my own business."

But to the participants, and to the antipoverty agency in Washington, where "involving the poor" is a major issue, the controversy looms as a basic conflict over social philosophy.

Ben Zimmerman, executive director of the crusade, says:

"They (the university's social action planners) are looking at poor people as a class—poor people rising as a class. We're thinking about making opportunities for individuals.

"This makes all the difference. If you're talking about a mass program, you're saying, 'How do you galvanize the poor to break down the walls of the city?'

"Anger and frustration can bring a program together. But you have to keep fanning the flames if that's what keeps the program going. Also, this is the kind of program that really demands an outside 'enemy.'

"They're out organizing on one level and we're organizing on another, and so the chance of collision is great. The worst thing that could happen is for a fight to develop over who 'owns' the poor."

Prof. Warren Haggstrom of the Syracuse University School of Social Work, who is directing the social action program, says:

"Ours is a philosophy of self-help—help the neighborhoods develop strong democratic organizations with as wide a base as possible that will achieve an additional level of power; enough power to enable those individuals excluded from the community to enter it.

"The poor are outsiders. The problem is: how can they enter the community? If you just give them services, it doesn't pull them in. The failure of past welfare programs proves that."

The poor can become a part of the community, Haggstrom argues, "only in a process where people are in charge of their own lives. And in order to be self-responsible, you have to have a certain level of power."

TEMPEST AROUND ALINSKY

Though they head the two programs involved, neither Zimmerman nor Haggstrom is the central figure in the controversy. The tempest really revolves around Saul D. Alinsky, a Chicagoan who has been hired by the university as a consultant and visiting lecturer.

Alinsky is executive director of the Industrial Areas Foundation, a private organization that specializes in setting up urban neighborhood power blocs through the same mobilization of the poor that is being used now in Syracuse.

He comes to Syracuse 4 days a month to lecture to the program's trainees and to advise Haggstrom and Fred W. Ross, the university project's field director and former west coast director for Alinsky's foundation.

REPUTED REVOLUTIONARY

Alinsky is paid directly by the university and avoids any direct contact with the community and the low-income citizens his plan seeks to organize. But his reputation as a "revolutionary" in the field of social work has unnerved community leaders.

A veteran of labor battles in the early days of the CIO and of decades of community organization work in Chicago, Alinsky speaks bluntly of making the poor "powerful enough to help themselves." He contemptuously dismisses much of the conventional welfare approach as "sentimental slop."

"Unless the poor are organized," he said in an interview, "it is impossible for them to get effective representation in policymaking."

PART OF THE FERMENT

Syracuse is not the only city in which Alinsky is involved in antipoverty projects. He is, or is about to become, a consultant to community efforts in Rochester, Buffalo, and Kansas City, Mo. In these cities, as in Syracuse, his program of organizing the poor to fight city hall has stirred debate over the proper limitations on the nationwide war on poverty.

"This is part of a ferment that is developing throughout the country now," Alinsky says.

The alarmed responses of Syracuse community leaders has been stirred not only by Alinsky's tough attitude but also by a brochure issued to describe the university project.

"This program," the booklet declares, "differs from most in being solely concerned with the creation of powerful self-directed democratic organizations in areas of poverty."

SHOULD BE ANGRY

Applicants for the training program, the brochure adds, "should have a controlled but intense anger about continued injustice and should be committed to hard work for people who are grappling with apparently overwhelming problems."

A number of young civil rights veterans have been recruited as trainees, including several members of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and a Catholic priest.

The Syracuse University project is divided into two parts—training under Haggstrom and field demonstration under Ross. Six master's degree students and eight nondegree students without formal social work training, with two trainee organizers in campus seminars and in actual fieldwork.

TEAMS AIR COMPLAINTS

The fieldwork sends the student organizers into six selected low-income areas in Syracuse. In teams of two—usually one Negro and one white student—they conduct house meetings and, later, neighborhood citizens' sessions to air and press complaints. Actions committees are formed to investigate charges of insufficient garbage disposal, excessive rents and gas bills, unjustified evictions, lack of recreational facilities, and other grievances.

Also, a voter registration committee starts at once to put as many low-income citizens on the rolls as possible. This step is the basic underpinning of the program. "Register for Power" is one of the slogans displayed in mimeographed neighborhood newspapers.

LINKUP BLAMED

The program calls for eventual election of permanent officers and the linking of all the neighborhood groups into one organization of organizations that can claim to be the actual representative of the poor in Syracuse.

Elected officers then would take up grievances with city hall or whatever agency might be involved.

Alinsky and Ross contend that this approach, if successfully carried out, could mean less open strife in the community than would occur if the poor were frustrated in pressing their complaints. The poor's power as a pressure group would win redress of grievances, they say, and make open demonstrations unnecessary.

WORRY OVER PROGRAMS

This confidence among the social-action planners that their efforts will not precipiate violence has apparently not been bought very widely among Syracuse civil leaders. They worry about the fact that Alinsky's programs in Chicago included rent strikes and sit-ins even before such tactics were used in the civil rights movement.

Some community leaders also are disturbed about participation in the university project of several active members of CORE, which is conducting a controversal hiring practices drive against the Niagara-Mohawk Power Corp. One of the university trainees is Bruce Thomas, former chairman of the city's CORE chapter.

In this atmosphere of conflict, prominent members of the community see a considerable potential for trouble in the Alinsky approach.

WALSH IS LEARY

"They try to pit the poor against everyone else in the community," says Mayor William F. Walsh. "Such talk as 'guerrilla warfare' and 'agitation to the point of contact' is certainly not in keeping with social work techniques, because the purpose of social work is to help people help themselves."

Walsh, a Republican, says the Alinsky approach can spell political trouble for him. He is likely to be a candidate for reelection this fall and the voter registration drive of the university project is expected to favor the Democrats. In fact, Democratic voter rolls are rising already in the low-income areas where organizers are active.

"These people go into a housing project and talk about setting up a 'democratic' organization—small 'd'—but it sounds just the same as Democratic—big 'D,' " Walsh says. "In a close election, it could be decisive."

PROTEST TO JOHNSON

Reverberations from the Syracuse controversy have already reached the White House. A month ago Charles A. Walker, a commissioner of the Syracuse Housing Authority, wrote to President Johnson to protest that the Federal antipoverty grant was being used to finance "activities which do no good and will ultimately cause serious trouble in our community if allowed to continue."

Walker complained to the President that university-trained organizers "are claiming that all kinds of benefits will accrue to the tenants of our housing projects if they will join these 'action committees.'

PIONEER HOMES CITED

"One of the promised benefits," he continued, "is the improvement of conditions in the housing project known as Pioneer Homes. Conditions in Pioneer Homes are as good as the tenants will permit them to be."

Walker enclosed a memorandum from William L. McGarry, executive director of the Syracuse Housing Authority, who charged that "this social action program follows all of the old patterns of class distinction and hate, so easily identified with Marxism."

Dean Clifford Winters of University College issued a statement branding the charges as "false." The complaint to the White House brought an OEO investigator to Syracuse for 3 days of intensive discussions with parties to the dispute. He has written a report, which has not been made public.

DIFFICULTY COMPOUNDED

The housing authority's letter to President Johnson has only compounded the difficult position of the university. Mayor Walsh met recently with Chancellor William P. Tolley to attempt to smooth over the dispute, but the university has been obliged to take some of the heat off itself.

To this end, a new nine-member board is being established under the Reverend Thomas Costello, superintendent of schools of the Catholic diocese. The controversial action phase of the Federal grant to the university will be subcontracted to this board, which in turn will seek to raise funds of its own.

The object is to leave to the university only the training portion of the program, which is regarded as clearly a proper educational function. The board, made up of community leaders, would then provide a bridge to the crusade, of which Father Costello is also a member.

"BERKELEY" UNLIKELY

But while this device may give the university some technical relief and may placate some community leaders, it is not likely to remove the basic alarm about the organizing the poor project itself.

Some principals in the controversy, including Zimmerman of the crusade, say community pressure could force the university to kill the social action project, thus triggering a campus revolt. But the consensus among a number of faculty members and students is that a "Berkeley" at Syracuse is quite unlikely.

McGarry and the operations of the housing authority have been sharply criticized at tenants' meetings organized by the university trainees. One leaflet circulated among public housing tenants contrasted a photograph of a littered lot in the public housing area with a picture of McGarry's handsome suburban home.

CRITICAL OF TRENDS

In an interview, McGarry was bitterly critical of the university program and the social trends that brought it into being. He stressed that he was not opposed to organizations of public housing tenants, provided they are constructive.

If, for example, the tenants were to organize garden clubs, McGarry said, he would be glad to help them by providing grass seed. But the university's social action program, he declared, "is simply not conducive to focusing the efforts of the people in the right direction.

"To fail to include the established institutions in this community is completely wrong," he said.

BLAMES WASHINGTON

Mayor Walsh, caught between the university and community leaders alarmed by Alinsky blames his dilemma on Washington.

"I feel that the responsibility for this rests with OEO in Washington," he said in an interview. "It was our feeling that nothing should be done in this community without being cleared with the crusade."

Neither the crusade nor the university program has formally ruled out the possibility of getting together, but parties to the controversy say privately that a joint effort in the present atmosphere is highly unlikely.

The crusade is making its own effort to involve the poor in running its programs by setting up neighborhood boards that, according to Zimmerman, will play a genuine role in policymaking. Federal antipoverty officials have made several efforts to promote cooperation between the two projects. A showdown may come when the university's 9-month Federal grant comes up for renewal later this year.

CAUGHT IN MIDDLE

As of now, the Federal antipoverty agency is caught in the middle. Congress has ordered "maximum feasible participation" by the poor, and the university project seeks to achieve it. Congress has also recommended local "umbrella" antipoverty agencies to coordinate all fronts of the war on poverty, and that is what the crusade is.

To date, the Federal agency has shown a disinclination to get involved in local jurisdictional or philosophical disputes. Still, it has been aggressive in demanding genuine involvement of the poor in local programs. Accordingly, it is possible to hazard an educated guess about how Washington will answer the questions posed at the start of this account:

Should the Federal Government finance mass social protest? Should it, as part of the war on poverty, help the poor fight city hall?

Given the prevalent attitude at the Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington's answer very probably will be "yes"—unless more local eruptions and congressional criticism force a reappraisal.

Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, WITI-TV, Milwaukee, recently carried a television editorial entitled "An All-Out Attack Against Water Pollution Needed Before It's Too Late."

The TV editorial showed films of water pollution in Wisconsin's rivers and beaches, and the script carried the urgent message for all-out action against pollution. While the filmed portion of the editorial cannot be reproduced here, the words can be.

Recently, I introduced legislation, along with Senator GAYLORD NELSON to require all ships and pleasure craft which use the Great Lakes system and other navigable waters to be equipped with federally approved facilities for the proper retention or treatment of sewage and other wastes.

I am glad to associate myself with the views of WITI-TV and call to the attention of my colleagues the excellent editorial in support of all-out efforts against water pollution:

[WITI-TV (Milwaukee, Wis.) editorial, May 24, 1965]

AN ALL-OUT ATTACK AGAINST WATER POLLUTION NEEDED BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE

We don't have to look very far to find the sickening results of water pollution. We have it right here in our own front yard. This is where the Milwaukee River empties into the harbor. What was once a clean, fresh stream is now an open sewer.

Now pollution didn't begin here. It started in small creeks and streams and inland lakes. But, it quickly flowed into larger bodies of water, collecting even more pollution. What's more pollution doesn't stop here. This foul, filthy mess dumps into Lake Michigan, the source of drinking water for millions of midwesterners.

Slowly, but surely the Great Lakes are becoming giant cesspools. Officials say a fourth of Lake Erie is already polluted and getting worse every day. Up at Green Bay, pollution has stagnated parts of their harbor. Beaches in and around Milwaukee are contaminated. And, the Public Health Service warns that the quality of water in southern Lake Michigan is in danger. Pollution has grown so widespread it's almost unbelievable. Imagine stagnated, foul-smelling pools of water stretching across the Great Lakes. Impossible you say? Well, health officials aren't that confident. They foresee large areas of fresh water, like the Great Lakes, clogged with debris, coated with slime and algae and turned a sickly brown by pollution.

All this has led more and more people to worry about polluted water and what might be done to stop it. Whatever attack is made, it won't be easy—and it won't be cheap. But, the only choice is action now or a water supply possibly contaminated forever. In Congress there's a bill asking creation of a new pollution policing force. New standards of water quality would be set up and more money would go to communities to improve treatment plants. It's estimated that major sewer improvements alone would cost $20 to $30 billion. In Wisconsin, the Southeastern Regional Planning Commission wants to begin a thorough study of the entire Milwaukee River watershed. All of these proposals require money, a lot of money, and massive, unselfish support.

TV-6 believes everyone should be fully informed about pollution, and then get mad enough to do something about it. There's good reason to be scared about what could lie ahead. An all-out attack is the only answer. We shouldn't settle for less, and neither should our elected officials.

Sixteenth Annual Peninsula Armed Forces Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, on May 14 of this year the citizens of the peninsula area of Tidewater, Va., held their 16th Annual Peninsula Armed Forces Day in honor of the military installations located in this area.

The speaker on this occasion was the Hon. W. C. "Dan" Daniel, member of the General Assembly of Virginia and former national commander of the American Legion.

His interesting speech pointed up the necessity for our Government's providing a pay raise for the members of our Armed Forces.

To my colleagues who have doubts about this issue, I respectfully commend the reading of Mr. Daniel's speech:

REMARKS BY W. C. (DAN) DANIEL, MEMBER OF THE VIRGINIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY, AT THE 16TH PENINSULA ARMED FORCES DAY, LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE OFFICERS' CLUB

We can best observe Armed Forces Day 1965 by recognizing and correcting the economic plight of our service personnel. I should like to devote the major portion of my remarks to that subject. Your chairman has also requested that I give some attention in my talk to current foreign affairs.

Our gross national product in 1964 was $634 billion. This was a 14.4-billion gain for the first quarter of 1965. The current business expansion is now well into its 5th year. It is the longest expansion of the postwar period; $37.7 billion will be spent this year for production equipment. The Federal Government's first quarter purchases amounted to $64.5 billion. Spending by State and local governments was at an annual rate of $65½ billion. One vital segment of our population is not sharing fully in this prosperity. The American fighting man.

Professional and technical workers salaries have increased 56 percent over the past 12 years. Production workers have enjoyed a 52.7 percent increase. The pay of civil service employees has increased 46.3 percent. The pay of our military personnel has increased only 36 percent. Current information indicates that this gap is widening.

We have heard much about first-class citizenship in recent years. I support a policy of first-class citizenship for those who earn it. Our military forces have earned it. They deserve no less than a 10-percent increase in pay. The cost will be approximately $1 billion a year. If we can afford a billion dollars to relieve poverty of friend and foe alike in southeast Asia, we can afford whatever amount it takes to provide our fighting men with first-class citizenship pay.

What are the byproducts of this substandard pay? Reenlistment rates are down. Servicemen are receiving relief benefits. Others need it but are too proud to accept it. The base pay of some is below the Government poverty level. Many of them are moonlighting. Servicemen's wives work to help support the family in many cases. As a businessman, I know the cost of personnel turnover. The reenlistment rate for regular Navy personnel has dropped 13 percent in 3 years. The reenlistment rate in the Army is a little short of disgraceful. In 1962 only 20 percent of Army inductees reenlisted. In 1963 the reenlistment dropped to 11.2 percent. In fiscal year 1964 a 3.6-percent low was reached. What does this personnel turnover cost? The enlisted personnel strength of the Army is expected to be 840,000 for fiscal year 1966. It will be necessary to induct 111,000 men to maintain this strength. The basic training cost per man is $4,000. If you add elementary specialty training, the cost is upped to $5,500 per man.

We invest $20,000 in each 4-year Navy enlistment. The reenlistment rate for regular military personnel is also unacceptable. This problem is defensewide. It is not restricted to any one branch of the service. The reenlistment rate for Army regulars has dropped 3 percent in the past 3 years, the Navy 12 percent, the Marine Corps 11 percent, the Air Force 13 percent. Defensewide the reenlistment rate for regulars is down 10 percent in 3 years.

Retention rate for officers is likewise disturbing. This wholly unsatisfactory experience is also defensewide: 9,207 reserve officers completed their period of obligated service in 1964; 2,092 elected to remain on active duty in a voluntary indefinite category. This represents only 83 percent of the minimum requirements of this category. Obviously, little selectivity could be exercised.

The Transportation Corps requires a long period of training. In 1964 the Corps had 599 reserve officers eligible for retention. Its minimum requirements was 162 officers. Only 91 elected to remain in an indefinite category. A retention rate of only 56 percent.

Basic training for an Air Force pilot is $96,000. It costs $268,000 to train an F-100 pilot, an F-4C pilot $324,000, a B-52 commander, $1.24 million per man, an F-105 $600,000. These figures represent aggregate cost.

For such outlays we are entitled to first-class personnel. In order to get and keep first-class personnel they must be paid commensurate with their duties and responsibilities. Obviously, money will not solve all of the problems. We will not keep all of our trained personnel. However, it is a broad step in the right direction.

What are the causes for this high turnover and low retention? Low pay, poor housing, and career insecurity.

Quality officer candidates from the Air ROTC have deteriorated. Qualifying tests are used for selection purposes. In 1957 the average percentile score for entrance into the Air Force ROTC program was 63. By 1962 the average percentile score was 52. The Air Force retained only 48 percent of its junior officers over the past 3 years.

We cannot justify continued low pay for our service people on the theory that he is being replaced by automation. The black box will never replace these individuals. Although machines have been replacing muscle power for generations, science has not yet found an acceptable substitute for man-

power. Robots are causing a new emphasis on man's eyes to measure, his hands to adjust, and his mind to select. They cannot eliminate, however, the requirement for alert, educated, and trained men. Machines do not create, they only duplicate. Automatic equipment does not think, it follows orders. Individuals must know when to push the button and why.

There is a great stress on education today. This is as it should be. The serviceman is well ahead on this score. He remains behind in financial compensation. The Continental Army Command operates 26 schools. It is based right here at Fort Monroe. It offers a selection of 600 courses. Three hundred and fifty military occupation specialists are available. One hundred and sixty thousand individuals take advantage of this opportunity on site. Another 200,000 are enrolled in correspondence courses.

The educational attainments of the man in uniform are steadily rising. Seventy-three percent of the enlisted personnel are high school graduates. It was 48 percent just 10 years ago. Only 25 percent of the American male population over 25 has graduated from high school. Eight percent of the American men over 25 are college graduates. Sixty-nine percent of the officer corps today have college diplomas, 10 years ago it was only 50 percent. This makes him a better soldier. It entitles him to more pay.

The President appointed a committee to study the matter of military pay. The committee has reported and recommended an upward adjustment of 4.7 percent. This is grossly inadequate.

Congressman MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, has introduced a military pay bill, H.R. 5725, to bring about this objective. I hope you will persuade your Congressman to support this bill.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

May we direct our attention to the subject of foreign affairs. There are some among us who say that the foreign policy of this country should be of no concern to any except the ones directly responsible for its implementation. With this I do not agree. It occurs to me that the foreign policy of this country should be of vital concern to every one who is interested in the preservation of our American way, based upon a fundamental belief in God and propelled by our profit-motivated system.

The purpose of our foreign policy should be to protect and advance U.S. interests in world affairs. The purpose of our national security program should be to provide the muscle to make that policy effective.

The winds of slavery blowing out of the Sino-Soviet countries are on a collision course with the winds of freedom from the West. The future of mankind may very well be determined by which wind prevails.

Although men dream of a more fruitful use of life than to spend their creative energies building the instruments of destruction, there appears to be no safe alternative. Here are some reasons why. On October 15, 1964, Nikita Khrushchev, the recognized leader of the worldwide Communist conspiracy and overlord of the most expansive colonial empire in contemporary world history, was impeached by his own cabinet. Why? Because he failed to practice 100-percent communism. He was replaced by the team of Breznev and Kosygin. In their first policy pronouncements they declared a continuation of the 20-year cold war upon the United States and her allies. They called for an extension of their philosophy of peaceful and competitive coexistence. Stalin, too, practiced coexistence. He joined the hated Socialists in the 1930's. He was allied with the detestable capitalists in World War II. We paid for our naiveness at Tehran and Yalta, Kosygin will present his bill in due time. We will pay again unless we learn from the lessons of history. Peaceful coexistence is a noble ideal but about as practical under today's world conditions and by the Soviet definition as total disarmament.

There seems to be some difference of opinion as to why we are in South Vietnam. Here is my opinion. We are there to fulfill the terms of a contractual obligation. We are there because we were invited by the South Vietnamese to create a climate for political self-determination. We are there in the interest of 250 million southeast Asians and in our self-interest. We are there because our Government feels it is better to fight in Vietnam than in Hawaii, Alaska, or the west coast of the mainland. This is another inning in an overtime ball game.

It is important that we recognize this fact of life. We are not in southeast Asia to impose democracy nor should we be. Representative democracy is never imposed from without. It must develop and grow from within. Only dictatorships and monarchies are made. Representative democracy is an institution of political noonday. It is not the half-light of political dawn.

Having been in southeast Asia recently, I do not share the pessimism of some. I found our military personnel ready to undertake whatever assignment was given them in the interest of freedom. If the politicians make the right decisions, and at the moment they are in my judgment, I have no fear of the ultimate outcome. Planned escalation is winning the war. It should be continued and accelerated if found necessary.

There is a small minority in Congress and elsewhere who advocate a negotiated settlement of the war in Vietnam. This would be an exercise in futility. It might help them to remember that we are in a negotiated situation at this time. Based upon past experience, the enemy would propose as a basis for settlement a coalition government similar to the Laos-Troika. This crumbling monument to our naiveness is not calculated to serve well the interest of freedom. The enemy understands only naked power. I applaud the President's decision to use such power.

While our eyes are glued to the situation in Vietnam, our adversaries are fishing in the troubled waters of the Dominican Republic. Conditions in that island republic degenerated to the point that the President was required to snatch the Monroe Doctrine from the Bay of Pigs and impose its terms there. He was justified in doing so. Our failure to wipe the scum of communism from our doorstep in Cuba produced this untenable situation. President Johnson, subscribing to the theory that two wrongs never make a right, acted with dispatch and restored honor to our country in this instance. Let us not compromise our position there now and lose the peace after having won the war as has so frequently been the case.

We can take little comfort from the rift between Russia and Red China. The Communist camps are barking at one another. This does not mean they have lost their teeth or their appetite. Kosygin preaches goulash over guns. Mao Tse-tung preaches guns over goulash. The quarrel is whether the revolution should be fought on an empty stomach or a full one. Both agree the revolution must continue. The division is not on what communism is. It's how communism can destroy representative democracy. It is an argument of methods, not objectives. World domination is the goal of both, Marx is a prophet of both. We must understand the nature of the protractive struggle. We must have no illusions about the meaning of the ideological conflict.

Our best guarantee for peace is to keep our country economically sound, morally and spiritually right, and militarily impregnable.

Capt. Paul Crawley, U.S. Army, Norwich, N.Y., Soldier, Displays Gallantry Under Fire in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, with all the detailed discussion that has gone on in recent weeks regarding the fighting in Vietnam I sometimes think we are apt to forget that it is individual American combat men who are carrying out, without complaint and with very great distinction, the heavy burden of our commitment there.

One of the most fascinating and impressive stories of personal valor in Vietnam came to my attention the other day with regard to the actions of a constituent of mine Army Capt. Paul Crawley, of Norwich, N.Y. The account appeared in the Norwich Evening Sun for May 11, 1965, and under unanimous consent, I include it at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

NEWSMAN DESCRIBES NORWICH MAN'S GALLANTRY

A gallant Norwich soldier, Capt. Paul Crawley, was featured in a full-color picture and story on the front page of the St. Petersburg, Fla., Times, May 2.

The story, written by a Times staffman who had just returned from special assignment in Vietnam, told of Captain Crawley's gallantry under fire in a combat situation as deadly as any which took place in World War II or Korea. Here is the story as told by George Sweers, of the St. Petersburg Times.

The incident took place on a 5½-hour patrol whose purpose was to capture small Red hamlets during which Captain Crawley acted as an adviser to the actual leader of the patrol, Captain Hong, of the Vietnamese Army. Crawley said "My job is to work with and advise my counterpart Captain Hong * * * everything goes through him.

"Hong does not speak English and Crawley, who has been in Vietnam only 3 weeks, knows little Vietnamese. This makes the advising process a complicated one. Crawley has two interpreters to maintain liaison with Hong."

"The patrol started. I (Sweers) went with Crawley and Hong who were taking 50 of the 200 Vietnamese straight toward the hamlets."

"As we started out, I stayed close to Captain Crawley." When we were halfway up the hill, the first Vietcong opened light sniper fire at the leadmen in our group which had reached the top of the hill. The leadmen returned the fire * * * downhill into the hamlet and the rest of us hurried up to the peak and crouched behind the concrete gravestones that dot Vietnamese hills.

The firing stopped and started again but this time "it was the steady chatter of a machinegun fire raking the cleared area around the village."

"Crawley told his radioman to inform the U.S. helicopter hovering over us that we were pinned down. The copter radioed back to ask if Crawley wanted rocket machinegun-suppression fire into the hamlet to get the machinegun.

"Crawley can't make that decision. He's an adviser. That decision is up to the Vietnamese commander. So Captain Hong came scurrying up to confer.

"Crawley told the interpreter the unit was pinned down. The interpreter told Hong. Hong told the interpreter he realized the situation. The interpreter passed the information on to Crawley.

"Crawley told the interpreter he was advising Hong to ask for some suppression fire from the helicopter. The interpreter told Hong. Hong answered back through the interpreter that too many of his men were too close to the hamlet wall. The helicopter's rockets might kill some of the South Vietnamese troops.

"They talked back and forth through the interpreter and pored over their maps while the bullets cracked overhead. It was a classic example of the language problem that has hampered these joint U.S.-South Vietnamese operations since they began.

Finally Hong convinced Crawley the helicopter fire would be too dangerous and the armed chopper was waved off.

"The Vietnamese were pouring the fire into the hamlet now, the bullets chipping the bamboo wall around the hamlet.

"The fire let up a little. The Vietcong apparently were slipping out the back door and the first Vietnamese were entering the hamlet to mop up.

"The radios started to chatter again. The Vietnamese radioman reported to his captain that one of their men had been hit. The captain told his interpreter who told Crawley.

"Crawley looked around. The wounded man was a sergeant in a platoon to our right. Crawley told his radioman to call for an Air Evac—an ambulance helicopter to pick up the wounded man.

"The wounded man was too close to the hamlet wall, however, and would have to be brought out to an open field where the 'copter could land.

"Crawley looked at his interpreter and then decided not to go through another complicated two-language conversation with Hong and the interpreters.

" 'Let's go get him,' he yelled to his medical aid man and we were off and running. We found the wounded man on a grassy slope. His leg had been crudely bandaged.

"Crawley still had to get the Vietnamese soldier to where the 'copter could land. Without saying a word he picked him up and started to carrying him toward the clearing. Spahn and I followed along as the American captain carried the Vietnamese sergeant through a paddy canal with water up to his waist. We reached a safe area several hundred yards from the hamlet and waited.

"We could look back at the hamlet where the Vietnamese were spraying the thatched huts with submachinegun fire and looking inside for Vietcong. At one point a Vietcong guerrilla bolted from the hamlet and ran for the trees at the edge of the clearing. A hail of fire reached out for him but he made it to the trees, and disappeared into the jungle.

"Now we could hear the whirring of the ambulance 'copter in the sky and Spahn ignited a green smoke grenade to indicate the wind direction to the pilot. He landed. We put the wounded soldier aboard and 'copter lifted off and headed for the hospital.

"The battle was over.

"The Vietcong snipers had fled leaving behind some supplies and ammunition. The hamlet was secure—at least for now. But after the troops left, couldn't the Vietcong come right back, patch up the fort and start sniping at the railroad repair crews again?

"I asked the captain.

"Was it a success?" he asked himself. "In some ways, yes. We got some of their supplies but we didn't get them. I wanted us us to get some of them. But their intelligence and ways of getting out are fantastic. And once they get into the jungle they just disappear."

"How long they disappear, no one knows. It's possible Crawley and his troops will have to come back to this same hamlet in a week and make the Vietcong disappear again.

"For this day anyway, our little part of the war was over. We walked back home."

CAPTAIN IS CAREER MAN

Capt. Paul Crawley attended elementary school in Norwich. He was graduated from Valley Forge Military Academy in 1951 and attended Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in Troy for 2 years before enlisting in the Regular Army in 1953.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Crawley of 17 Miller Street, Norwich, Captain Crawley has made a career of the Army. He was graduated from OCS at Fort Benning, Ga., where he took a ranger course.

He was also with the 82d Airborne Division for 2 years, as a paratrooper, and made more than 30 jumps.

Castro's Subversion in the United States—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the American Security Council is one of the Nation's most respected private organizations dedicated to the preservation of the Nation and of freedom everywhere. Its weekly Washington Report invariably deals authoritatively with national and international developments affecting the Nation's security. The May 17 and 24 issues of this report detailed the pattern of Castro's subversion in the United States as written by DeWitt S. Copp, its able and authoritative managing editor. Part I of the two-part series is as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT: CASTRO'S SUBVERSION IN THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, May 17, 1965.—British historian and philosopher, Arnold Toynbee, before giving a lecture at the State Department on April 16, 1965, was quoted as saying: "It's hard to understand why you make such a fuss about Castro," And then comparing the United States and Cuba to an elephant and its fear of a mouse, he quipped, "It's great fun for the mouse."

Just a week prior to these comments, a CIA report on Cuban subversion was submitted to the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs (Selden committee). The report stated in part that "the Castro regime has in operation (since 1961) a highly professional espionage and subversion agency, the General Directorate of Intelligence (DGI). The DGI is advised by at least five Soviet intelligence specialists. Moreover, one of the purposes of the highly secret meetings of Latin American leaders in Havana last November was to give added impetus to more militant Communist activity in the hemisphere."

Castro's DGI is divided into three units, the largest of which masterminds the training, financing and promoting of subversion, and guerrilla warfare in Ceneral and South American countries. Though the CIA report spelled out in detail the degree of the DGI's activities in these areas, it made no mention of its efforts in the United States. Our own investigation attempts in some measure to fill the gap.

METHODS OF INFILTRATION

There are two known major points of entry by which covert Castro agents infiltrate the United States. One is by fishing boat to Puerto Rico, and then by illegally entering the United States with falsified documents. Congressman WILLIAM CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, in testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security as far back as 2 years ago said that "* * * in excess of 1,000 people have come through this route into the United States as Puerto Rican citizens with falsified passports."

The other method of infiltration is by boat or plane to Mexico. There the Mexican Communist Party supplies the proper papers and the agent crosses the border at Laredo, Juarez, or Tijuana. Infiltrators from Cuba who enter the United States using either one of these routes, or via Canada, masking their identities by whatever manner, are trained agents whose assignments cover the Marxian spectrum of subversive activities.

INDICATION OF ACTIVITIES

On the night of November 16, 1962, the FBI raided a workshop on West 27th Street in New York City. There they seized a secret cache of weapons and explosives which included delayed action incendiary bombs. They also arrested three Castro agents and Roberto Santiesteban Casanova, a newly arrived attaché with the Cuban mission at the U.N. The other members of the Cuban mission, Jose Gomez Abad and his wife, Elsa, were named as fellow conspirators.

The purpose of the weapons and the explosives was for the sabotaging of defense installations and the demoralization of the civilian population. Attorney General Robert Kennedy said the plan was aimed at the heart of the internal security of the United States of America.

Four days later, immigration officers in Brownsville, Tex., reported that Mexican authorities had prevented the blowing up of the International Bridge between Brownsville and Matamoros, Mexico. In doing so, they also nipped in the bud a sabotage plan to destroy major buildings in Matamoros. Two of those apprehended were Castro agents.

Since 1962, there have been several allied cases, one taking place in October 1964, in which a bomb was exploded in the Everglades Hotel in Miami, injuring a number of Cuban exiles attending a meeting.

Some months later, a Cuban terrorist threat to bomb the Roney Plaza Hotel in Miami intimidated the management into canceling a meeting of this same exile organization.

This threat came on the same day the bomb plot to blow up the Washington Monument, the Statue of Liberty, and the Liberty Bell was discovered.

On the surface, this latter episode appeared to be the wild act of a quartet of misguided idiots. But there is sound reason to believe that, wild as the attempt was, the four would-be saboteurs were acting under DGI instructions. Leader of the bomb plot, Robert S. Collier, had traveled illegally to Cuba in the summer of 1964. Upon his return, he formed, with a number of fellow Cuban travelers, a pro-Castro, pro-Peiping group which called itself the Black Liberation Front. In December 1964 a United Nations party was given by the Cuban delegation in honor of its visiting guerrilla expert, Ernesto Che Guevara. At this party, Collier was introduced to Michelle Duclos, a member of an extremist separatist organization in Quebec. Later, the plotters bought the dynamite in Canada, and it was Miss Duclos who transported the explosives to New York in her car.

These five incidents fall under the heading of terror tactics. That only one of them

met with any real degree of success speaks well for the FBI and our law-enforcement agencies. However, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, pointed out in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations last year year that the efforts of the Castro regime to infiltrate intelligence agents into the United States "show that we (FBI) must maintain a broad coverage in this area of our operations."

How broad a coverage can be glimpsed by these additional incidents. In early 1963, a Castro agent was apprehended in a New York City apartment possessing a suitcase filled with visa applications and other documents which would aid fellow agents to gain illegal entry into the United States.

From Caracas, Venezuela, in February of this year came news of another type of smuggling operation, which again pointed toward the activities of U.S.-based Castro agents. By accident, on board the U.S. ship *Santa Rosa* were found 1,000 mail pouches filled with pro-Castro literature. The literature had been printed in and shipped from Miami, Fla.

Just as Puerto Rico has served as an important way station in Castro agents to enter the United States, it has also served as a transit point for still another sort of smuggling—that of narcotic drugs.

In December 1964, three Castro agents were arrested at Miami Airport—one of them a Cuban, Mario Carabeo Nerey. Treasury officials in Puerto Rico said Carabeo Nerey was engaged in drug traffic. How large the traffic is can be measured by the fact that between January and November 1964, narcotics agents seized 697 pounds of drugs being smuggled into the U.S. from Cuba. This was an increase of over 450 pounds seized during the previous year. Included in this amount was heroin, shipped to Cuba from Red China.

In January 1965, a New York police inspector, Ira Bluth, was quoted as saying: "Marihuana used to come to New York almost entirely from Mexico, but recently large amounts of the drug have been discovered coming from Cuba."

On January 15, 1965, Oscar H. Reguera and Elidoro Martinéz were taken into custody in a New York motel with $3 million worth of cocaine in their luggage. Martinéz is believed to be a Castro agent.

Aside from the obvious harmful effects addiction to these drugs creates, the major purpose behind the smuggling of narcotics into the United States by Castro agents is to raise money to finance an insurrection in Puerto Rico.

Castro's DGI is working in concert with Puerto Rican Communists and militant splinter factions of the Puerto Rican independence movement, accelerating their attacks against the social and governmental structure of the island. Since 1961, a number of Castro-supplied arms caches have been uncovered. Gun battles have been fought between the police and insurrectionists. Castro agents have infiltrated both exile and student groups, their purpose being to stimulate the kind of rioting which would require armed intervention. Should this happen, the cry for independence, which 97 percent of the Puerto Rican electorate rejected in the November 1964 elections, would take on a more critical meaning. This is so because the strategy of the movement is tied directly to the November 20, 1964, vote of the United Nations Committee on Anticolonialism. The Committee voted 17 to 6, in direct violation of a 1953 General Assembly ruling, to place the demand for Puerto Rican independence on the U.N. agenda.

This act played directly into the hands of Castro's DGI and Puerto Rican extremists—two of whom are presently members of the Cuban U.N. mission.

When the General Assembly convenes again, there is little doubt that agitation and propaganda will be stepped up in New York and San Juan, with the possibility of more violent actions erupting in Puerto Rico.

SCOPE OF THE EFFORT

Recently, the Puerto Rican newspaper "El Mundo" estimated that since 1960, 12,000 Americans and Puerto Ricans have received subversive training in Cuba.

We cannot attest to the accuracy of the figures nor can we say how many of that number are under the orders of the Cuban Directorate of Intelligence. Although we do not have Castro-trained guerrillas operating in our country as a number of the Latin American countries presently do, we can say that intelligence and law enforcement agencies here and in Puerto Rico take the efforts of the DGI most seriously.

Of course, the publicly known cases outlined in this report can only give an indication of what is afoot. Hoary historians such as Toynbee may look down upon the world and view it from the vantage point of centuries. Unfortunately, we who have to live in the world from day to day and face its reality cannot afford cute analogies of mice and elephants with regard to Castro and ourselves.

In part II of "Castro's Subversion in the United States" we will show how Castro's American supporters, using the techniques of agitation and propaganda; by forming front groups; by infiltrating the civil rights movement, and by attacking our foreign policy are winning important victories in what can best be termed the psychological hot war.

Champion Harebrained Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following editorial by Mrs. Guy Easterly, publisher of the La Follette Press. This timely and revealing editorial appeared in the May 20, 1965, edition of this widely read and respected Tennessee newspaper.

I concur wholeheartedly with the views presented and commend its contents to my colleagues.

CHAMPION HAREBRAINED SCHEME

Many people have thought the national administration in Washington has gone off the deep end so many times that there would be no more deep ends left * * * but these people have underestimated the national administration.

It is with continuing amazement that we observe the proposals put forth by the administration and one of the latest is definitely a prizewinner—something of a humdinger among humdingers.

The administration is proposing that the Federal Government help pay the rent for moderate income and needy families. This facet of the Great Society is called an "effort to improve the American city."

Improving the American city is a commendable idea, but the powers that be call "moderate" and "needy" families those with incomes up to $16,200 per year and who pay as high as $200 per month in rent.

It seems that the time is long past due when the American people—those who strive to make their own way and who believe this striving is a good and wholesome thing—should inform their representatives in Washington that they are tired of supporting such harebrained schemes as paying other people's rent.

Raise Insufficient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Daily Sun, San Bernardino, Calif., under date of May 20, 1965. The concern expressed in the editorial about the proposed military pay increase reflects the thoughts and tremendous interest of constituents who have written to me on this subject.

RAISE INSUFFICIENT

President Johnson's idea of how much pay servicemen should receive is disturbing. He has grand ideas about many expenditures of Government but what he offers servicemen is properly described by Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, as "paltry."

Said the Congressman: "We have been patient, hoping for something encouraging from the executive branch of Government and now this—a paltry increase based on a false premise—and suggesting an effective date of 1966."

The President's proposal is for an increase of 2.7-percent pay and fringe benefits to men with less than 2 years' service, and a 4.8-percent increase for the remainder.

However, it is the total pay and benefits that count: Such as $2.40 added to the $85.80 per month for apprentice seamen and $6.51 added to the $241.20 base pay for a midshipman. Pay in other services corresponds.

Young officers in all the services are dropping out at an alarming rate. They simply cannot raise families on the servicemen's pay. The dropout embraces all types of service; in the U.S. Navy there is an annual turnover of 150,000.

The San Diego Union speaks out strongly in criticism of the President's low estimate of the pay servicemen should receive:

"The failure of Congress to provide the minimum-level pay necessary for the essentials already is strongly felt in the military ranks. All top-echelon officers agree that the low rate of recruitment and high rate of personnel turnover has reached alarming proportions.

"There is a turnover of half of the personnel on a U.S. Navy combatant ship at our frontlines of defense. Only one-fifth of the Navy men reenlist after the first hitch.

"Secretary of Navy Paul H. Nitze already has asked officers and men to extend their enlistments up to a half year because of the manpower problem created by Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Other trouble spots can arise quickly, and the fleet already is far below manning strengths considered optimum.

"The turnover is no reflection on servicemen. They are patriotic and dedicated Americans. However, as with all other Americans, the welfare of their families is highly important. If they are deprived of necessities by remaining in the service or have to hold second jobs, the men lose incentive.

"The 37 members of the House Armed Services Committee recommended a military pay raise of 10.8 percent. Even this is a minimum. The administration's proposal is hardly more than a blow to morale."

The President should increase his recommendation for an increase of 4.8 percent to the 10.8 percent suggested by the House committee. The people have no right to ex-

pect the men of the armed services will continue to work at pay scales far under those paid in private industry.

Aliens and the Half-Open Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, in the Chicago Sun-Times of May 16, Tom Littlewood, of the Sun-Times Washington bureau, describes the aims and obstacles of changing the current immigration policies. Mr. Littlewood does an outstanding job in presenting the facts with reference to our present immigration law and the future of our country in connection with problems of immigration.

Tom Littlewood is an enlightened newspaperman who came to Washington during January of 1965. Prior to coming to the Nation's Capital, he was for 10 years the Springfield correspondent for the Sun-Times covering the Illinois State capital. Mr. Littlewood is a graduate of Northwestern University in Evanston, Ill.

I take this opportunity to call again to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the need for liberalization of our immigration laws in this session of the 89th Congress.

The article by Mr. Littlewood follows:

AN ARCHAIC SYSTEM OF QUOTAS

(By Tom Littlewood)

WASHINGTON.—The world is about to be offered a revealing glimpse into the national conscience of a country whose troops are deployed around the globe inspiring devotion to its celebrated principles of equality and justice.

As have the three Presidents before him, Lyndon B. Johnson has informed Congress that the immigration law has long since outlived whatever alleged usefulness it might have had when the oceans were considerably wider than they are now.

U.S. immigration policy is an outgrowth of the disillusion following World War I which gave citizens of the promised land a feeling of comfort and safety in isolation. The myths of that era have been disposed of, but the mainspring of our immigration policy remains that relic of isolationism, the national origins quota system.

This system can be understood most readily in terms of Peter Petropolous, his maid, and his mother.

Let us assume that Pete is an American citizen of some financial attainment who wants to (1) hire a domestic servant from Ireland or England and (2) bring his widowed mother from Greece to live with his family.

Not unexpectedly, the United States is choosy about who gets in. As the test for admission, the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 perpetuated limits on the number of immigrants based on the white nationality mix of this country in 1920.

More than two-thirds of the 158,361 quota numbers are allocated to Great Britain and Ireland. Neither country consumed anywhere near its quota last year. Pete's maid can be off the boat and on the job in 4 to 6 weeks.

But Greece's quota is about 300 and there is a waiting list of about 100,000.

Even though close relatives of citizens are given preference second only to needed job skills, it will be at least 5 years before Pete's mother will be eligible for a visa. Italy's backlog is still larger, about 250,000.

Plainly put, the U.S. policy is that the maid from Britain is more desirable than the relative from Greece or Italy or Poland or Spain or Africa or the Orient.

The law was written in a spirit of exclusivity to benefit Anglo-Saxons, Scandinavians, Germans, and other northern Europeans whose countrymen had the good fortune to be, like Finley Peter Dunne's Mr. Dooley, a Pilgrim father that missed the first boats." It was Mr. Dooley who insisted he must "raise me claryon voice agin' th' invasion iv this fair land be th' paupers an' arnychists—ye bet I must—because I'm here first."

An even more invidious feature of the law is what has come to be called the Asian-Pacific triangle. This restricts aliens of remote Asian stock to the small Asian quotas regardless of their place of birth. The triangle reaches from India and Pakistan east to China, Japan and most of the Pacific islands, but excluding Australia and New Zealand.

Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach has related the ease of a young man from Colombia who is eligible to come here freely on nonquota status because he is from an independent nation in the Western Hemisphere. His wife, too, is a native and citizen of Colombia. But she is also the daughter of a Chinese father.

She must, therefore, be regarded as half-Chinese and eligible only under the quota for Chinese, which happens to be 105 a year. She ordinarily could reach the top of the list in the year 2048.

All this, President Johnson suggested in his immigration message to Congress, is neither good government nor good sense.

It results in prolonged separation of families. Needed job skills are denied the country. And there is the obvious hypocrisy from those who spout off far and wide about the democratic principles of fair treatment for all and yet insist on measuring potentiality for good citizenship in relationship to where a person happens to have been born.

Mr. Johnson has promised congressional champions of immigration reform that once the decks are cleared of voting rights legislation he will push for the immigration bill. The amount of shove that he supplies will be a true test not only of his liberalism but of this presumably most liberal of all Congresses.

If it cannot be done by this Congress, it is hard to conceive how the system can ever be changed in a meaningful way.

This is, nevertheless, a highly emotional question bringing into play deep-down-inside doubts. It's: Who do you want living in your town? But also: Will he someday be competing for your job?

The pattern of opposition is a familiar one—the American Legion and other veterans groups who merge danger of subversion with the idea that all foreigners are suspect; the Daughters of the American Revolution and other native-born patriotic societies dedicated to a clean white Anglo-Saxon Protestant America. The Steuben Society of German-Americans and some like groups whose memories are short. And some unions who regard the automation and unemployment and relief problems as bad enough already.

Although the national origins system was intended to place specific limits on immigration, broad differences have developed between theory and practice.

During the past decade, an average of 63,000 of the 158,000 annual quota numbers were turned back unused by the desirable nations. The unused portion could not, however, be spread around among the other countries with waiting lists.

Nonquota aliens averaged 178,000 a year. These included the beneficiaries of special laws for refugees, war brides, and skilled persons, a relatively small number by private bill and 11,400 quota-free immigrants from this hemisphere. The last figure has alarmed some Congressmen who have noticed the dark skins and relief incidence of many Latin American aliens. (The Government already has cut off the unrestrained flow of low-cost migratory farm workers, the original purpose of the quota-free provision for Latin American countries.) Total immigration has been running nearly 300,000 a year; from 1931 until the end of World War II, by contrast, immigration never exceeded 100,000 a year.

Although Japan's quota is only 185, almost 5,000 visas have been issued annually to Japanese. The Indonesian quota is 100, but visas 1,657. Italy's quota is 5,666, visas 15,685.

The first half of each country's quota goes to persons with urgently needed skills. Last year, for instance, 568 tailors were admitted, 328 engineers, 200 teachers, 198 doctors. Before he arrives the immigrant must secure a specific job pledge from an employer.

The next 30 percent go to parents and unmarried adult children of U.S. citizens. The remaining 20 percent of the quota numbers are for spouses or unmarried children of permanent resident aliens awaiting citizenship.

A history of certain types of illness, including epilepsy, tuberculosis, and mental retardation, is a permanent bar to immigration. There have been cases in which a family has been prevented from immigrating because one of the children was a mild epileptic, modern treatment drugs notwithstanding.

Hearings have been partially completed by the immigration subcommittees of both Houses on the administration proposal for changing the law.

The overall maximum increase in immigrations would be only about 60,000 a year. Quotas would be reduced by one-fifth in each of the next 5 years, thus phasing out the national origins system over the period, and placing the retired numbers in a pool to be allotted on a first-come, first served basis.

The Asian-Pacific triangle concept, which Secretary of State Dean Rusk has labeled "overt statutory discrimination against more than half the world's population," would be abolished. No more than 10 percent of the total could come from any one country, though.

Order of preference would remain about the same: the first half to those with skills or education "especially advantageous" to the United States; the next 30 percent to the unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens; and the remaining 20 percent to spouses and children of resident aliens.

Parents of U.S. citizens could enter freely.

It would no longer be necessary for skilled immigrants to nail down a specific job before coming here.

Epilepsy would be removed as a ban, and mental illness would not be an automatic prohibition for persons having close relatives already in this country.

A joint congressional-executive immigration board would be created as an advisory body to decide which job skills are especially advantageous to the country.

Among new seed imigrants, the President would be authorized to reserve up to 10 percent for refugees fleeing oppression or catastrophe.

This year the immigration subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee was purposely increased from five to nine members so as to cope with its chairman. He is Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, conservative Democrat from Cleveland, and Repre-

sentative Francis Walter's successor as immigration czar of the House.

FEIGHAN, who has been opposed in the past to comprehensive reform, tried to activate the Joint Congressional Committee on Immigration and Naturalization Policy, complete with large staff and spending money and himself as chairman. But the judiciary chairman, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, protecting his own powers, headed off FEIGHAN's scheme.

In its revamped form, FEIGHAN's subcommittee is more favorably disposed to the administration bill. The chairman himself has pronounced the quota system a myth because of the many nonquota admissions, and has promised to complete the hearings and try to forge some kind of bill.

FEIGHAN chose a speech to the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies to unveil his own selective immigration plan. His program differs with the administration's principally in these respects:

1. Unrestrained immigration from Western Hemisphere countries would be discontinued.

2. Order of preference would be reversed, with first attention to reuniting families and second priority to those with high job skills and crafts.

3. Retained, however, would be the existing requirement that a prospective immigrant have the promise of a definite job.

4. A firm worldwide ceiling would be enforced at about the present level of immigration.

5. Congress, and not the faceless bureaucracy, would keep what FEIGHAN considers its constitutional responsibility for immigration policy.

The chairman of the Senate subcommittee, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, has been every bit as obstructive a force as FEIGHAN, though with fewer troops behind him. This time the administration bill stands an excellent chance of Senate approval if it can survive EASTLAND's little subcommittee.

EASTLAND has defended the present system by explaining that "for maximum assimilation and maintenance of our traditional concepts of liberty, it is in the public interest for us to maintain a pattern proportional to the cultural composition of our population."

Standing between the northern liberals and the southern anti-immigrationists is Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, the son of German immigrants and, until now, at least, opposed to abolition of the national origins quota system.

His vote may be decisive.

In the House the prospects beyond FEIGHAN's subcommittee are dimmer. Many urban Congressmen, representing yesteryear's immigrants, sound as though updating the 1920 quotas to something more reasonable, like the 1960 nationality apportionment, is about as far as they can go.

Now that the job market is being crowded by the arrival of the postwar baby boom, labor unions are naturally concerned about the impact of immigration policy on employment.

Specifically, the AFL–CIO, which otherwise supports the administration bill, has requested two amendments. One would require that jobs for immigrants be permanent rather than seasonal; the other would place the responsibility for defining categories of needed job skills in the Labor Department instead of a joint immigration board.

Only about one-third of the additional immigrants would probably be workers. Mrs. Petropolous, for example, wouldn't be competing for a job, nor would many of the reunited relatives. All would be consumers, though, the net effect being to create more jobs.

In a nation with 3,500,000 to 4 million unemployed, real needs do exist in the job market. The workers who are let into the country presumably possess precisely the talents that are in short supply.

In the last national campaign, Republican vice-presidential nominee, William E. Miller, used South Bend—underemployed and heavily Polish-American—for his warning that immigration reform would flood the job market. His appeal to incite the "ethnic vote" backfired; Miller looked at the unemployment figures but not at the large numbers of disunited Polish-American families with relatives in Europe.

An important factor not often understood is the vested interest that Congressmen, especially the subcommittee leaders, have in the many-layered policy now in effect.

Congress holds the power of mercy, the ability to grant or withhold exceptions to the law. The immigration subcommittee controls the hundreds of private bills introduced by other Members on behalf of some aggrieved immigrant who can't get in. Immigration problems must frequently be referred to a law firm, which, on more than one occasion, has happened to be the Congressman's.

Administration of the law is tailored to individual prejudices. For example, the general undesirability of Spaniards was relaxed by the late Senator Pat MaCarran to permit the importation of needed Basque sheepherders into his State of Nevada. Every so often, the late Representative Walter would magnanimously sponsor special legislation letting in everybody who had been on the waiting list an especially long period of time.

As FEIGHAN has pointed out, the origin quotas are largely academic as limits on immigration. Nonetheless, Rusk remarked that "We continue to be judged abroad by a basic provision of the law which suggests that prospective immigrants are selected on the basis of their national origins."

Last week Mr. Johnson issued a proclamation designating Ellis Island a national monument in New York Harbor. Between 1892 and 1954, this little island in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty was the gateway to opportunity for 16 million immigrants.

The President thought it an apt time to renew his call for immigration reform, saying: "A man should not be judged by the place of his birth, how he spells his name or the church he attends."

The late John F. Kennedy once interpreted the McCarran-Walter Act as adding to the famous words on the Statue of Liberty ("Give me your tired, your poor—") the stipulation—"As long as they come from northern Europe, are not too tired or too poor or slightly ill, never stole a loaf of bread, never joined any questionable organization, and can document their activities for the past 2 years."

The question of how many aliens to admit—and which ones—has been debated since the first Europeans settled at St. Augustine, Jamestown, and Plymouth, long before there was a United States.

Most of the early colonists, realizing that people from the Old World were needed to help develop the country, encouraged immigrants of their own ethnic backgrounds. And when more labor was needed, they recruited "furriners."

The result was that some 43 million immigrants have been admitted since the Republic was founded.

When George Washington became President in 1789, there were approximately 4 million immigrants or children of immigrants—the majority English—in the United States and they became the first citizens. Until 1840, only about 750,000 immigrants came, since many European nations restricted emigration. In the next 20 years, 4,300,000 aliens arrived, about 1,700,000 of them Irish and another 1 million or so Germans.

Immigration by English and Scandinavians reached a peak in the 1880's, augmented by more Germans and Irish. It was after 1890 that southern and eastern Europeans came in large numbers.

From the Civil War to the turn of the century more than 14 million immigrants were added to the population.

Then the deluge began. Almost 9 million arrived during the first decade of the 20th century and another 6,500,000 up to June 30, 1921.

But virtually unrestricted immigration was to end.

From 1925 through 1930 total immigration averaged about 300,000 a year and dropped to less than 50,000 annually from 1931 through 1946, because of the depression and World War II. Since then it has averaged around 250,000.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (the McCarran-Walter Act) exempted spouses and children of U.S. citizens from the quotas and stated that racial bars were being removed. But it actually confirmed the racial quota system by retaining the national origins provision. Congress passed the law over the veto of President Truman, who sought a more flexible law.

In 1964, only 102,844 quota immigrants—about 65 percent of the allotment of 158,161 (the yearly quota fluctuates slightly because of technical reasons)—were admitted. Britain supplied only 48 percent of its quota, Ireland 34 percent, and Germany 93 percent.

But Poland and Italy exhausted their quotas quickly with upward of 250,000 in each country on waiting lists. Portugal and Greece also took their full allotments, both with an estimated 100,000 still seeking visas. Many other countries are in the same predicament.

Congressional Modernization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 1965, our colleague, the Congressman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], testified before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

The problem of congressional reorganization is a great challenge, not only to that committee but, also, to the Congress itself and it is gratifying to all of us to realize that we have taken it upon ourselves to be our own critics in a constructive sense. One of the problems will be to maintain our momentum and to retain a judicial and dispassionate attitude toward all proposals for change.

We have recently made some important improvements in our procedures. I believe that more are necessary and I am confident they will be effected.

Representative MONAGAN's statement made a great contribution to enlightened discussion of this problem and I include this statement with other remarks:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN S. MONAGAN, DEMOCRAT, OF CONNECTICUT, PRESENTED MAY 11, 1965

(Before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, Old Supreme Court Chamber, U.S. Capitol)

I do not come before you today as a belittler of Congress. To me it is not a "sapless branch." Nor is the Chamber in which I serve a "house out of order." It is a viable, active, and responsive political organism and the greatest instrument of free government in the history of the world.

Unfortunately, one of the products of our free press has been a spate of uninformed

and unrealistic criticism of Congress. Even Pageant magazine last November turned an inquiring eye on Capitol Hill and sandwiched its notorious rating of Congressmen between articles on "Kissing After Marriage" and ads explaining how to remove hemorrhoids.

Certainly Congress has its failings as does every human organization. Its procedures could well be upgraded in many instances, but this is different from not being an effective instrument of the public will. To get a proper comparison, one need only look at the other parliaments in the world and decide how many are more truly representative than ours. It is one thing to say that our practices may be improved. It is quite another to attack the adequacy of the institution. The former claim is justified. The latter is not.

Of course, procedural reforms have importance, but I do not attach to them the same significance as do some impatient commentators. Our forms have a protective function and the winnowing legislative process is a guarantor of better laws than action by simple fiat. Surely under our system the will of the people is made effective when it is expressed with sufficient strength and that is the proper measure of popular government.

In view of the jaundiced view of Congress expressed by many, I suggest that it is particularly significant that these hearings result from voluntary action on the part of Congress itself and represent a sort of examination of conscience which is solid evidence of the strength of this institution.

I should like to make one other generalization which to me seems important. It is that the proper relation must be maintained between the legislative and the other branches of our Government. For example, recent years have witnessed a marked increase in the lawmaking activity of the Supreme Court and it may be questioned whether this body, not subject to periodic election, has always been well advised in its lawmaking. Objection may also be made to usurpation of power by executive agencies. The solution of this imbalance, of course, is not rulemaking but a virtue advocated by Mr. Justice Frankfurter and called judicial restraint.

It is important to point out that Congress is not stuck in a mud bog of indifference. I need only point to the passage in the current House of rules changes covering the 21-day callup from the Rules Committee and the provision concerning the unanimous-consent requirement for sending bills to conference, as well as the creation of a steering committee. These were reforms urged by Senator CLARK and Representatives REUSS and BOLLING in their books. Thus, what these commentators have described as major roadblocks to effective operation have been eliminated by voluntary action.

When the current congressional redistricting changes are added to these procedural reforms it appears that most of the objections of these critics have been removed—or will have been removed in a period of 2 or 3 years.

I should like also to emphasize the mercurial character of press and editorial comment on Congress which in the 88th Congress in the brief space of 2 years ran the gamut from hurling epithets like "do nothing" and "lackluster" to showering praise as one of the most effective Congresses in history. This inability to understand the natural and calculated restraints of our system does not help in reaching a fair appraisal of the work of Congress.

I certainly do not mean to say that no reform is possible. In this area, modernization is essential in government as elsewhere if we are to keep up with the increasing and changing demands that are placed upon us.

With salary increases for Members and staffs, and the provision of a legislative assistant in the House, much help has been given in moving toward efficiency, but further steps are necessary. Expert accountants should be provided to put appropriations bills in proper context by informed comment on carryovers, cost increases, and other important elements. Departments should be required to make a clear separation between operating expenses and capital investments. Reports on appropriations bills should more clearly state the impact of each bill on current and future budgets.

Another reform needed for effective operation is the elimination of the capacity of one Member to prevent committees from sitting while a particular Chamber is in session.

I feel, too, that a reasonably adequate staff of each committee should be made available for minority members. This practice is now followed in some committees, but it is not universal and it should be followed everywhere. The capacity of the minority to examine and criticize should not be abridged, but should be preserved as a basic strength of our system.

Another frequent preventive of efficient operation which should be removed is the requirement that the previous day's Journal should be read. In these days of modern printing, this rule is no longer practical and serves merely as a convenient instrument of delay.

While I do not favor required public disclosure of private finances—since I consider it an invasion of privacy and the creation of a presumption against public servants—I do feel that improvement is badly needed in the area of conflict of interest. Here increased clarity is vitally important. What is a "conflict of interest"? In what cases does it arise? When is a Member of Congress going beyond the bounds of propriety?

A review of this field of law is necessary. The provision of proper guidelines after free and open discussion will benefit the Congress and the public.

This is a brief category of possible reforms. Of course, there are many others, not a few of which are appropriate and useful. Each witness will have his own list.

One other change is vital I think. It is the setting of a limitation on the inordinate time spent in our campaigns. This is more true, of course, of presidential compaigns, but it is also characteristic of senatorial campaigns as well.

I hope that this Committee will consider the suggestions which I have made and that through weaving together these proposals and those made by others, we may be able to improve the operation of our fundamentally sound institution—the Congress of the United States.

United Nations Should Conduct Free Elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask the United Nations to request the Soviet Union to withdraw all Soviet troops, secret police, agents, columnists, and all controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and also to return to their homes all Baltic exiles and deportees from Siberia prisons and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union and that free elections be held in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Twenty-five years ago on the coming 15th of June, the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were overrun by the Red army and I am looking forward to the enactment of this resolution to return their freedom to these democratic and peace-loving nations.

Freedom of Information Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, in many ways California leads the Nation, and not the least is the leadership in the approach to problems of government. A step toward the creation of a balance between the need for a free press and the necessity for a fair trial has been taken in the assembly of the California State Legislature. A resolution has been introduced by Assemblyman George A. Willson to initiate a study of the possible conflict between the guarantees of free press and fair trial in both the United States and California Constitutions. The resolution also calls for consideration of a "freedom of information bill of rights" for the news media. I commend to the attention of all Members the following resolution:

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 373 RELATING TO "FREEDOM OF INFORMATION" STUDY

Whereas the Attorney General of the United States has announced a new policy that forbids the disclosure of pretrial information in Federal criminal cases by all Justice Department employees, including prosecutors and the FBI, in an attempt "to strike a balance between the constitutional guarantees of a free press and a fair trial; and

Whereas a Los Angeles County superior court judge has ruled that "a prosecutor has the freedom to comment factually to the press on pending criminal cases"; and

Whereas controversy and uncertainty prevails in the State of California among the members of the judiciary, bar associations, the legislature and law enforcement agencies over the multiplicity of proposals submitted to resolve presumed conflict between the constitutional guarantees of free press and fair trial; and

Whereas in the State of California representatives of all news media that include press associations, radio and television stations and networks and newspapers as well as periodicals are in contention that constitutional guarantees of free press are in danger of serious and unwarranted abridgment; and

Whereas a section of the Revised Code of Evidence of the State of California, in its preamended form, sought to establish that news reporters could no longer retain established immunity from contempt proceedings for declining to disclose sources of information; and

Whereas the Judicial Council of California has deemed it appropriate to recommend that segments of the news gathering and dissemination profession that are required to

utilize sound recording and photographic instruments and devices in the performance of their assigned tasks be denied access to courts, corridors and environs except for ceremonial and educational purposes; and

Whereas the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States establishes a continuing and undeniable free press; and

Whereas the sixth amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides a fair trial guarantee in the right to a speedy and public trial; and

Whereas article 1, section 9 of the constitution of the State of California contains a free press guarantee not unlike the provision established by the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas article 1, section 13 of the constitution of the State of California provides a fair trial guarantee comparable to that contained in the sixth amendment of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate of the United States has disclosed plans to make a study of the possible areas of conflict that appear to exist between the constitutional guarantees of free press and fair trial, conduct hearings on the issue and consider the need for possible legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the assembly committee on rules is directed to refer for study to an appropriate interim committee the area of possible conflict between the guarantees of free press and fair trial that are established in the constitutions of the United States and the State of California; and be it further

Resolved, That the interim study shall also include the feasibility of establishing a freedom of information bill of rights for all segments of the news gathering and dissemination industry that shall permit unrestricted utilization of tools, implements, equipment, and devices deemed essential and appropriate for each distinct news media in the performance of its assigned task and that such interim committee shall report its findings and recommendations no later than the fifth calendar day of the 1967 regular session.

Christian Endeavor Annual Citizenship Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, there is much publicity today given to youths who are called wayward and delinquent and others who find themselves in serious trouble with the law. However, a refreshing bit of news came across my desk this week and I feel that I should share the essence of it here with my colleagues.

The International Society of Christian Endeavor recently announced the award recipients in its annual citizenship awards program. This contest received hundreds of entries, showing that there is indeed a large number of our young people who are interested in practicing good citizenship.

One of the individual award winners is a young lad from my hometown of Evansville, Ind. The boy, Gary W. Haire, is only 17. His interest and his activities, however, show that he is indeed, a mature citizen of this country. He is active in both church and school affairs.

His winning entry, published first in his high school paper, was a cartoon showing a drunken driver saying "Pardon me, I didn't know I was loaded."

For his efforts Mr. Haire will receive a cash award and a grant which will enable him to attend the Society of Christian Endeavor's international convention in Dallas, Tex., this year.

I am very pleased that such a young man comes from my district. But I am even more pleased to learn that such young people are being recognized for their efforts in good citizenship, helping to allay the belief that our young people are not being trained to become good citizens.

U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Binghamton, N.Y., Press recently published two illuminating editorials concerning U.S. foreign policy and the nature of our commitments around the world. In both of these editorials, the Binghamton newspaper praised the decisive action of President Johnson in fighting for the cause of freedom against International Communist subversion.

I, too, join in that praise and I am deeply proud as an American of the resolute and determined leadership which President Johnson has displayed.

His swift response to the attempted Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic certainly gave the Communists reason for reflection.

Every nation should know that America desires to extend its dominion over no new territories. But we nevertheless, are committed that no other nation shall be subjected to Communist aggression.

The Binghamton Press of April 29 gives an informative insight into America's commitment in Vietnam. The Press editorial of May 1 sheds light on the U.S. action in the Dominican Republic.

These editorials follow:

[From the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press, Apr. 29, 1965]

DEBATE ON VIET POLICIES

President Johnson carries the debate to critics of his Vietnam policies. Polls indicate that the majority of the American people are in accord with the President's pursuing national objectives in Vietnam as he sees them.

But the President is not one to be satisfied with a consensus of the majority. He seeks to persuade the minority of dissenters of the wisdom of his policies. The President, Secretaries Rusk and McNamara and others of the administration challenge the premises of criticism and respond to demands for negotiations.

In his press conference discussion of Vietnam this week, the President made as a central point that his offer of unconditional peace talks remains open, but air strikes at North Vietnam would continue.

"I think," Mr. Johnson said, "that if the enemy there believes that we are there to stay, that we are not going to tuck our tails and run home and abandon our friends, I believe in due time peace can be observed in that area."

Secretary Rusk also made a cogent reply to critics of Vietnam policy in a recent speech: "We are not involved with empty phrases or conceptions which ride upon the clouds. We are talking about the vital national interest of the United States and the peace of the Pacific.

"We are talking about the appetite for aggression, an appetite which grows upon feeding and which is proclaimed to be insatiable. We are talking about the safety of nations with whom we are allied, and the integrity of the American commitment.

"I continue to hear and see nonsense," he went on, "about the nature of the struggle there. I sometimes wonder at the gullibility of educated men and stubborn disregard of facts by men who are supposed to be helping our young to learn, especially learn how to think."

The nonsense to which Secretary Rusk referred was the insistence in some quarters that the strife in South Vietnam is a civil war, not a war of aggression directed from Hanoi and Peiping. The Johnson administration's view was spelled out in a State Department white paper of February 27 that emphasized that North Vietnam "has deliberately set out to conquer" South Vietnam and "has used every resource of its own government to carry out its carefully planned program of concealed aggression."

The evidence is conclusive in the training in North Vietnam of the leaders and hard core of the Vietcong, the identification of weapons of North Vietnamese and Red Chinese manufacture, the directive force which is the Lao Dong Party in the north, the administrative setup to supply the assault on South Vietnam, and finally the ever-increasing number of North Vietnamese in Vietcong ranks.

Collegians and their mentors on campuses are carrying on teach-ins and demonstrations calling for U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam. Students by tens of thousands are parroting the Communist line on Vietnam in disregard of the facts.

Americans do not want a major war in Vietnam, but recognizing the stakes, neither do they want the surrender of appeasement. The late President Kennedy once said that a man has to do what principles and circumstances dictate whatever the consequences to himself. The thought has extension to the realities a nation must face.

The President's resolution is firm. He leaves no doubt about where he stands, whatever the outcry of the fuzzy-wuzzies. And he is right.

In his Baltimore speech of April 7, he warned: "Let no one think for a moment that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to the conflict. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another." The President said that America must draw the line in southeast Asia "in the words of the Bible: 'Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further.' "

[From the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press, May 1, 1965]

THREAT OF ANOTHER CUBA

Hysterical screams going up from Havana and Moscow at the landing of U.S. marines in the Dominican Republic to protect American lives pointed up the Communist interest in the latest Caribbean storm.

The Communist pattern of armed insurgency and takeover to the end of making the Dominican Republic another Cuba is clear enough. Originally the insurrection was supposed to be aimed at restoring to

power former President Juan Bosch, ousted in September 1963.

Bosch, a leftist, is not necessarily a Communist nor is it probable that he conspires with the Communists. But his supporters progressively have lost control of the uprising, and extremists identified as Communists are taking over.

While the United States is not anti-Bosch, the best bet for restoring law and order to the tortured island is believed to be in the military forces of Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin. Wessin offers the classic Latin solution to political upheaval—a military junta to be in control until an election can be held.

At this juncture, the United States is not known to be supporting anyone, but the United States certainly cannot permit a Communist takeover. The sending in of marines to protect Americans and other foreign nationals is fully justified, whatever may be the cries of liberals and Communists of gunboat diplomacy.

It is a proper function of the Organization of American States to act in a conflagration such as that in the Dominican Republic. But OAS could not act swiftly enough, and the United States unhappily had to fill the breach. The presence of U.S. forces in the Dominican Republic under the circumstances is not expected to evoke much antagonism in Latin America outside of pro-Communist ranks.

More than 400 have been killed and more than 1,000 wounded in the fighting and general confusion. The terrorism that has marked the upheaval carries a label characteristically Communist. Weapons were distributed to all comers among the purported rebels, even to schoolboys.

Some 4,200 U.S. troops on the island are believed sufficient to set up a zone of haven for Americans and nationals of other countries. U.S. troops will have no combat roles except when fired upon, as at the U.S. Embassy in Santo Domingo.

For the people of the Dominican Republic, the struggle is a cruel and terrible tragedy. The presence of U.S. troops will be a stabilizing influence and an encouragement for the early establishment of peace and order.

President Johnson's decisive and timely action in sending U.S. forces to a strife-stricken neighboring country was well taken. The presence of U.S. troops will serve both humanitarian and political purposes.

Fire Commissioner Hink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I announce the death of our beloved fire commissioner, George E. Hink, of Philadelphia, on May 23, 1965. The Members of Congress from Philadelphia have been fully aware of the merits and competence of this man who was truly a dedicated fireman's fireman, an excellent person, and a dear friend. We will miss him greatly.

George E. Hink entered the fire department in 1921 and his interest in the workings of the department was such as to warrant early promotion. He rapidly rose to deputy commissioner, which position he held with honor until the death of Commissioner Frank L. McNamee just about a year ago. He was credited with saving several foreign-flag ships which caught fire while in port in Philadelphia. He experienced some fearsome fires and had some brushes with disaster during his long career. His advice was sought and his wisdom was shared by members of the department, and his recall from this earthly scene creates a loss which will be felt by his host of associates and friends, as well as by his bereaved family, to whom we offer sincere sympathy and condolences.

Eternal rest give unto him, O Lord, and let the perpetual light shine upon him. May his soul rest in peace.

Fifty-Million-Dollar Loan to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, a unique financial transaction took place in New York City. Eleven U.S. insurance companies, signed a loan agreement with the Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc., providing long-term loans totaling $50 million. The collateral in this agreement is the good faith and credit of the American Jewish community, as represented by the United Jewish Appeal, the guarantor of the loan. I believe that this agreement is a dramatic and concrete tribute to the integrity of the American Jewry and their long tradition of philanthropic activity.

I include in the RECORD at this point a statement by P. Stokes Gaither, vice president of New England Mutual Life Insurance Co., and spokesman for the lending companies, and an article which appeared in the New York Times of April 28, 1965:

This loan is remarkable in that it has been structured upon the established spirit of philanthropy and the integrity of the Jewish people in America.

The guarantor of the loan is the United Jewish Appeal, which is just another way of saying that some of the most respected spokesmen of the American Jewish community are pledging that this loan will be honored.

Perhaps it is because the life insurance industry is attuned to the needs and motivations of people that it was possible for the participating life insurance companies in this transaction to recognize the soundness of a loan such as this.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 28, 1965]

ELEVEN INSURERS LEND TO PHILANTHROPY—AGENCY FOR ISRAEL RECEIVES $50 MILLION TO PAY DEBTS

(By Irving Spiegel)

Eleven major American insurance companies, in an unusual financial transaction, signed an agreement yesterday for a loan of $50 million to the Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc.—the principal beneficiary of the United Jewish Appeal campaigns.

It was the first time in the history of the insurance industry that a loan of such a size was made on "the good faith and credit of the American Jewish community." The United Jewish Appeal is the guarantor of the loan.

The money will be utilized to liquidate outstanding short-term loans granted by American banks in recent years, and which will enable the Jewish Agency, a New York corporation, to have an added cashflow of $4 million a year to meet the needs of immigrants to Israel.

P. Stokes Gaither, vice president of the New England Mutual Life Insurance Co., and spokesman for the 11 insurance companies, said that the loan was "remarkable in that it has been structured upon the established spirit of philanthropy and the integrity of the Jewish people in America." He spoke at a press conference held by the Jewish Agency at its headquarters at 515 Park Avenue.

INTEREST SET AT 5½ PERCENT

Since its establishment in 1939, the United Jewish Appeal has raised more than $1.5 billion to aid more than 3 million Jews in Israel and other areas. Last year, the appeal raised more than $60 million among American Jews.

The loan, at 5½ percent interest a year, is to be repaid in equal semiannual installments designed to fully amortize this loan in 15 years.

Max Fisher, general chairman of the appeal, and Dewey D. Stone, chairman of the Jewish Agency, explained that $44,885,166.22 will be used to liquidate outstanding short-term loans with 97 banks in 39 communities.

The remainder they said, amounting to around $4 million a year, will be utilized for humanitarian programs conducted by the Jewish Agency in Israel and also by the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, another beneficiary of the appeal, which conducts relief, rehabilitation, and welfare programs for Jewish men, women, and children in 30 oversea countries.

SIXTY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS BORROWED IN 1961

In 1961 the Jewish agency borrowed $65 million from the banks, based on advanced pledges to the United Jewish Appeal from American Jews. Jack D. Weiler, a national chairman of the appeal, explained that the payments to the banks required interest and amortization in excess of $9 million annually. He said that loan repayments and interest from the insurance companies would be less than $5 million annually, "thus increasing an additional cashflow to the Jewish Agency."

While this is the first time that American life insurance companies have lent money to the Jewish agency directly on the good faith and credit of American Jews, seven of the companies involved in the $50 million loan have over the last several years made available long-term loans for the construction of immigrant housing in Israel, with rent guarantees provided by the Jewish agency.

These loans totaled $17 million, and made possible the construction of some 12,000 housing units.

Leaders of the United Jewish Appeal, including Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman, executive vice chairman, said that the "massive financial resources of America"—referring to the insurance companies—"were mobilized behind the massive philanthropic instincts of American Jews."

In addition to unusually large contributions from affluent American Jewish leaders, the appeal receives its funds from the annual campaigns of the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York, and from the Jewish federations and welfare funds in 224 major communities and local drives. This year, the appeal is seeking $109.4 million to meet Jewish needs throughout the world, especially in Israel.

Gottlieb Hammer, executive vice chairman of the Jewish Agency, negotiated the agreement with the following insurance companies: Aetna Life Insurance, Connecticut

General Life, the Fidelity Mutual Life, Massachusetts Mutual Life, the Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, New England Mutual Life, the Penn Mutual Life Insurance, Phoenix Mutual Life, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Philadelphia, and the Travelers Insurance Co.

Castro's Subversion in the United States—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, part II of the two part series of the American Security Council's Washington Report dealing with the subject of Castro's subversion in the United States written by DeWitt S. Copp is reproduced below. Part I will be found on an earlier page in this Appendix.

The article follows:

[From the American Security Council's Washington Report, May 24, 1965]

CASTRO'S SUBVERSION IN THE UNITED STATES

At a recent State Department briefing on Latin American affairs, the briefing officer concluded his remarks with the observation that the Communists had a chance to make a show case out of Cuba but they have failed miserably. This conclusion was first offered by President Kennedy 3 years ago and it remains today as the accepted State Department attitude toward Castro and Cuba. Such an attitude fails to take into account that communism has never been a social or economic success anywhere; but as a show case from which to spread subversion, it has done admirably—and Cuba is an excellent example.

Our Washington report of last week illustrated the point by outlining the activities of the Cuban General Directorate of Intelligence. However, Castro's greatest success against the United States has been in the area of agitation and propaganda. Almost all his fieldworkers here are U.S. citizens. They are citizens who follow the Moscow, Peiping, or Trotskyite line. They range all the way from hardline Communists to softline dupes. A 2-year investigation by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security into the activities and membership of the now defunct Fair Play for Cuba Committee, organized in April 1960, proved that FPCC had been heavily infiltrated by known Communists and fellow travelers.

Despite State Department's issuance of travel restrictions to Cuba on January 16, 1961, many FPCC members traveled illegally to Havana and, upon their return to this country, gave lecturers extolling the Castro regime.

One of these was James Jackson, a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Jean Pestana, Rose Rosenberg, and Helen Travis—all identified as Communists in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities—were indicative of the Cuban guest list which numbered in excess of 150 U.S. citizens over a 2-year period.

The FPCC was, by any fair definition, a Communist front. Its effect on the American public was negligible. But through its activities and the close contacts some of its members formed with the Castro regime, there grew up around it other more militant groups. The most important of these was the Progressive Labor Movement.

PLM was organized in January 1962. Its president, Milton Rosen, and vice president, Mortimer Scheer, had both been expelled from the Communist Party for disruptive activities. In December 1962, PLM attempted to send a group of "students" to Cuba and failed because the Canadian Government refused clearance to a Cuban plane to pick them up. A year and a half later, PLM succeeded.

On June 25, 1963, 59 so-called students, ranging in age from 18 to 36, left for Cuba in defiance of the State Department ban on such travel. They traveled to Cuba via Paris, Prague, and Havana. All expenses, including transportation and living expenses while in Cuba, were paid for by the Cuban Government. Each traveler donated to PLM's Permanent Student Committee for Travel to Cuba $110. The air fare alone cost the Castro reigme $30,000.

While in Cuba, a number of the "students" made statements attacking U.S. policies, particularly in the field of civil rights and aid to South Vietnam. Some of these statements were beamed around the world and reprinted in Communist publications.

In June 1964, the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba arranged air transportation to Cuba for 84 "students." Overall direction appears to have been supplied by Lee Coe, west coast editor of PLM publications. Prior to his association with PLM, Coe was active for over 20 years with the Communist Party, U.S.A. This time not only did the Castro government pay for the entire trip, but it also gave each visitor $10 a week spending money.

The leader of the "student" contingent was Edward Lemansky, who has identified himself "as a member of the Progressive Labor Movement, which is a Communist organization, a Communist movement."

An indication of why Castro has been willing to pay out in excess of $75,000 to bring certain U.S. citizens to Cuba may be seen in the declaration signed by 61 of the "students" while they were in Cuba. The declaration said in part: "We, the undersigned young North Americans visiting Cuba, offer these statements of support for the people of South Vietnam in their just fight for liberation from the imperalist oppression directed by our Government. Today our Government is unleashing one of the most brutal and criminal wars in history. All over the world—in Spain and Portugal, in South Africa and Latin America—the United States supports racist and reactionary regimes which oppress the people, and that the intransigence of U.S. imperialism forces the people to take up arms in order to gain and defend their liberty." The essence of this declaration was widely broadcast throughout the world.

On April 15, 1965, Milton Rosen, PLM president, announced the founding convention of a new Communist Party paralleling the Chinese Communist line; 110 delegates attended the New York meeting. A declaration proposed by the PLM national steering committee said in part: "The most hated government in the world today is the Government of our country * * * the initials U.S.A., which once stood for hope, have replaced the crooked cross of Nazi Germany as the symbol of tyranny and death."

One of PLM's vice presidents and its Harlem leader is William Epton, arrested last August after the Harlem race riots on charges of advocating criminal anarchy.

PLM has three offices in New York City and boasts of six others scattered across the country, one in Berkeley, Calif. PLM publishes leaflets, booklets, and a quarterly magazine, and it expects to bring out a weekly soon. Its main political thrust is aimed at disrupting civil rights progress and stirring racial hatred. Its members were active in the recent Berkeley campus revolt and they can be expected to be active in similar undertakings on other campuses.

Victor Riesel in a recent column quoted a top Government security official as saying: "They (PLM) are a very successful and militant band of young revolutionaries and have had ample money since the first day they went into business * * *. They don't just pass resolutions. They're zealously working for a revolution." The question is how much of their financial support is coming from Cuba?

The pro-Castro pro-Peiping Communist movement in the United States has its man in Havana. He is Robert F. Williams. In May 1959, Williams was removed from his position as head of the Union County, N.C., branch of the NAACP for advocating violence as a means to gain social justice for his race. In August 1961, he fled the country following a racial clash which he instigated in Monroe, N.C., and on October 3, 1961, the Castro government granted him political asylum. Since then, he has been spouting racial hatred while offering instructions in terror tactics on his program "Radio Free Dixie" broadcast over Radio Havana and beamed into the Southern States. Williams also writes a monthly pamphlet called the Crusader. Every edition is devoted to the hatred of and the eventual revolutionary overflow of the white man. Publication and distribution costs apparently are taken care of by the Cuban regime.

Lest anyone dismiss Williams as just another fanatical rabble rouser, it should be noted that when he traveled to Red China in August 1963, he was not only greeted by Mao Tse-tung and other high-ranking ChiCom officials, but Mao also chose that time to make his first official policy pronouncement in 6 years. As a result of his statement, Moscow charged that Peiping was guilty of racism and was "trying to set the colored races against the whites."

In the winter of 1963, followers of Williams organized the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM). Today, they have branches in six key cities. It is they who distribute the Crusader and maintain direct contact with Williams. Some of them made the trip to Cuba in the summer of 1964.

When they returned, recruitment was stepped up. They are known to have infiltrated the Black Muslims and the Malcolm X group. RAM's fronts include the Afro-American Youth Council, the Afro-American Student Organization, and in Detroit they set up UHURU, which means freedom in Swahili.

RAM's manifesto advocates organized violence and the formation of guerrilla bands. Alined with PLM, it follows the theories and tactics of the Chinese Communists. Its present membership is small and selective and it refers to itself "as a movement composed of hardcore, young, intelligent, militant Afro-Americans seeking worldwide black revolution."

Until recently, the Communists chains of command could be traced directly from the Kremlin to the party here. Today, whether it be the recently formed W. E. B. DuBois Clubs taking their cue from Moscow, or the Progressive Labor Movement taking its from Peiping, the impetus and driving force for both is channeled out of Cuba. Politically, financially, psychologically, militarily—Havana is the directing center for a major share of the Communist agitation and propaganda in the United States. It is the secured outpost of both Moscow and Peiping in our hemisphere.

In the aggregate, we can say the threat to our own security from Castro himself is nonexistent. However, he is the agent of a world force that does threaten our survival. As its agent, his followers have been at work here; they are at work now. Because our security agencies are competent to handle

such as PLM and RAM is no cause to ignore them. If nothing else, they prove the folly of considering Castro a failure. It is we who will have failed if we allow him to perpetuate his regime, treating it as a nuisance and not a genuine and continuing threat to the entire hemisphere.

"Amazing Grace," a New Book by Robert Drake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, Paul Flowers has written an outstanding column for many years in a great newspaper in the Nation, the Commercial Appeal.

In his column of Tuesday morning, May 11, he properly describes a new publication, "Amazing Grace," by Robert Drake, of Ripley, Tenn.

This column is so outstanding that I thought it should be brought to the attention of the Congress. The article follows:

PAUL FLOWERS' GREENHOUSE

Hail a new mid-south author.

Robert Drake was born in 1930, and blessed with childhood in Ripley, Tenn. He is a member of the English faculty at University of Texas, and enjoys close associations in Memphis, particularly with Dr. and Mrs. Samuel Paster.

His book, "Amazing Grace," is a pleasant collection of nostalgic sketches about childhood in a west Tennessee town, with the traditional embellishment of involved family relationships, and fillips based on the idiosyncrasies of small town characters.

Mr. Drake took his title from an old hymn, and there is a strong thread of west Tennessee religious life running through the vignettes. It appears to be overwhelmingly autobiographical; certainly the author has a photographic memory for faces, scenes, situations and people, and he is preoccupied with the religious life of the community and neighboring places.

Under the title "The Fountain Filled With Blood," he traces the misgivings and doubts of a small boy, pledged for baptism in the Methodist faith, but disturbed by divergent theologies and customs of communicants in other churches, and other forms of baptism.

He recaptures emotions of country and small town funerals, dinners-on-the-grounds, singing conventions; his description of a country store makes quite real the odors of coal oil, fatback, and roasted coffee beans.

His dedication is to Donald Davidson, "Prophet," Austin Warren, "Evangelist," and Cleanth Brooks, "Apostle."

The author is a frequent visitor to Memphis. His volume comes from Chilton Books, Philadelphia, at $3.95.

The dust jacket refers to the contents as "stories," but more properly they should be called sketches or vignettes, unless the reader can accept the modern concept of the short story, which avoids plot and denouement.

Mr. Drake's pen is facile, his eye and ear keen, his feeling intense, and his style brisk. The book should have intense appeal to all old enough to remember small town life, the incidents of birth, death, courtship and marriage, race relations, school, family picnics, church socials, and revivals.

Chung Hee Park, President of the Republic of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 17, 1965, President Chung Hee Park of the Republic of South Korea visited with President Johnson. The high esteem in which President Park is held not only in this country, but throughout the free world, is graphically illustrated by the New York Herald Tribune editorial of May 19, 1965. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial:

A KOREAN REPRESENTATIVE

President Park, now visiting the United States, represents many things. He is, above all, the symbol of a state, South Korea, which proved that a massive Communist onslaught can be thrown back. The symbol stands both as a warning to Red China and as a source of encouragement to South Vietnam, the United States, and their allies.

And President Park is evidence that, once independence is secured, a war-torn Asian country is capable of impressive political and economic progress. Though his critics are numerous, most must agree that the power he holds today is derived from free elections. And though the economic problems are still great, the support of the United States, now being reinforced by Japan, has opened an encouraging future.

The cost of answering the Communist attack on South Korea, 15 years ago June 25, was great. The fruits of that victory were great, too.

Physical accomplishment is often the measure of a man's leadership as well as the country's progress. The following article from the New York Times of May 19, 1965, indicates what hard work and sound leadership can do for a people who want to live in a free society:

YEAR OF HARD WORK—YOUNG COUNTRY WITH OLD HISTORY MARKS PROGRESS; KOREA-UNITED STATES RELATIONS

On January 16, 1965, President Chung Hee Park stated in his new year message to the National Assembly that "the accumulated dirt of the past 20 years, which have been spent in confusion and stagnation, should be overcome and scoured, and it is time that we work real hard." This year, the fourth year of the first 5-year economic development plan; he designated "the year of hard work."

The political, economic, and social circumstances of Korea had been very insecure in the past, as attested to by the two revolutions of April 19, 1960, and May 16, 1961. But with the establishment of the Third Republic, stability has been recovered and things are now beginning to move ahead.

The greatest problem encountered in the 5-year economic development plan was the question of capital shortage. But with cooperation of friendly nations, sufficient foreign capital loans have been acquired and investment goods have begun to flow in.

Furthermore, sufficient energy resources such as electricity, coal, and petroleum have been secured to support industrial development. Thus the base for fruitful work has been laid.

For this year of hard work the Republic of Korea has established increased production, more exports, and greater construction, as her goal.

To support this, many important projects are being carried out. The following is a summary of those plans:

PRODUCTION

Sixty percent of the population depends on agriculture for living. In order not to perpetuate the "intolerable contradiction" that food shortages persist despite such circumstances, the farmland, with an area of 5,020,000 acres, or about 20.6 percent of the area of the country, will be further expanded. Through farm improvement and technical extension programs, self-sufficiency in food grain will be achieved.

To this end, the Government has established a 7-year grain production plan, and has allocated 3 billion won ($11,700,000) to help finance it. Through technical guidance, the utilization of farmland will be improved, and through improved irrigation and other aids the unit yield will be raised. Also more upland will be bench-terraced, and tidal land will be further reclaimed, thus expanding land under cultivation and increasing grain supply.

In addition, the plan provides for adequate domestic production of fertilizer, agricultural pesticides, farm tools, and fishing equipment to help increase agricultural and fisheries production. In mining and manufacturing, coal output will be 10 million tons, about double the 1960 level, electricity will quadruple to 770,000 kilowatts, and cement will increase fourfold to 2,120,000 metric tons. Sheet glass production is scheduled to triple to 600,000 boxes, and other major products will also be expanded. Also articles of daily necessity, including bicycles and sewing machines, will expand four to six times over 1960 level.

EXPORT

Korea depends highly on imports for consumables, equipment and machinery, and industrial raw materials. Compared to the great import requirements, exports amounted to a negligible $20 to $30 million a year, the principal export having been tungsten and a few other commodities.

Fortunately, owing to a concerted national effort Korea was able to expand exports greatly in 1964—to about four times the $32 million attained in 1960, thus achieving a record $120 million.

This year the target has been raised to $170 million, and efforts will be made to export more and more manufactured articles. Thus by 1967 at least $300 million in foreign exchange will be earned through exports, and the aims at exporting $1 billion worth a year within 10 years.

CONSTRUCTION

For promoting production and exports, various new factories to support industrial activities will be built. The nation's resources will be systematically developed by carrying on coordinated programs for construction of powerplants, transport and communications facilities, housing, and so forth.

Two powerplants now under construction will be completed this year and power supply will increase to 111,000 kilowatt-hours. In addition, three new powerplants will be built. Also cement production will be raised, and the fifth cement factory of the country will be completed by the end of the year.

Korea's third and fourth fertilizer plants will be built with the aim of achieving self-sufficiency in fertilizer.

Railway transportation, ports and harbors, shipping and other transport facilities will be expanded and the communications network enlarged. Thus construction projects will progress actively in many directions.

In sum, the Republic of Korea proposes to utilize 1965, the year of hard work, most meaningfully so as to move toward prosperity and progress at an ever-increasing speed.

Vietnam: Digging In and Pitching In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, if U.S. policy in Vietnam could be summed up in two short phrases, they would be "digging in" and "pitching in."

Today in Vietnam our marines, our paratroopers, and our South Vietnamese allies are digging in against an offensive from the Communist Vietcong that is almost certain to come with the inception of the monsoon season.

It will be a long, wet summer in Vietnam and the inclement conditions will favor the guerrilla actions of the Vietcong. The Communists may be hoping to obtain a swift and decisive victory during the coming months in order to force the withdrawal of American support from the South Vietnamese.

We are determined to blunt this attack, to deny victory to the Vietcong, and, thereby, hasten the day when the conflict can be taken off the battlefield and into the conference room.

At the same time that we are making military preparations, we also are pitching in to assist the economic progress of South Vietnam, and to help the Vietnamese people to better lives.

In his recent statement to the Nation's editorial cartoonists, President Johnson described the achievements in development which have resulted from our financial and technical assistance—despite the state of crisis in Vietnam.

It is clear that in Vietnam the United States is pitching in to help defeat those age-old enemies of man—hunger, ignorance, poverty, and disease—just as we are digging in militarily against a 20th century scourge of humanity: Communist aggression and tyranny.

At this point I am pleased to insert four recent newspaper editorials commenting on U.S. policy in Vietnam, including two from the Milwaukee Journal.

These editorials point up both the digging in and the pitching in aspects of the struggle in Vietnam, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 14, 1965]

THIRD FACE OF VIETNAM

Another picture of the Vietnam struggle emerged from President Johnson's statement Thursday to a group of editorial cartoonists. It depicted the steady task of development that continues amidst the shooting and terror.

"It is the most important battle of all," the President said. "For a nation cannot be built by armed power or political agreement. It will rest on the expectation by individual men and women that their future will be better than their past."

The progress outlined by the President is amazing, considering the turmoil that has engulfed the country. Since 1954, the United States has spent more than $2 billion in economic aid for South Vietnam. This has helped double rice production and increase corn output and has brought modern farming techniques that otherwise might never have been introduced.

The United States has helped vaccinate more than 7 million people against cholera and millions more against other diseases. We have helped build 12,000 hamlet health stations. A new medical school is under construction that will graduate as many doctors in a single year as now serve the entire South Vietnamese population.

American money has gone into the construction of more than 4,000 classrooms in the last 2 years; 2,000 more schools will be built in the next 12 months. Our funds have been used to purchase 8 million textbooks and to increase elementary school capacity. Total enrollment, 300,000 in 1955, now stands at 1.5 million.

The struggle in Vietnam has three faces, the President said—armed conflict, diplomacy and politics, and the job of development. The last existed before hostilities began and will be there when peace has come.

"Then perhaps," he added, "we can share that gracious task with all the people of Vietnam—north and south alike." That was the most hopeful comment of all.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 20, 1965]

BACK TO THE BOMBING

The lull in American bombing of North Vietnamese targets is ended, apparently without any response by Hanoi to indicate a willingness to begin negotiations.

The 6-day suspension did, however, serve several purposes: It indicated a response to critics in Congress, in the intellectual community, and among our allies who have been exerting pressure for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam. It demonstrated that President Johnson is not inflexible in the course being followed in the war. It provided an opportunity for a direct approach to Hanoi through a third party—an effort which has so far proved fruitless.

The refusal of North Vietnam to give any positive response to President Johnson's display of good faith is interpreted as evidence of the influence of pro-Peiping elements in the Hanoi government. The Communists are said to hope for a quick and decisive victory during the monsoon season between June and August.

The Americans and the South Vietnamese are preparing for such an effort, hoping that its repulse will bring the Reds to the conference table.

It appears now that the bombings will continue on much the same scale as in the past until such time as developments bring some meaningful response from the north and another bid for negotiation appears to have some chance.

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel, May 14, 1965]

L.B.J. MAKES HIS CASE—ELOQUENTLY

President Johnson never has done a more persuasive job on an issue than he did Thursday morning in his TV appearance to detail again the whys and hows of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Some seem to think the President is making these repeated enunciations of our purpose in Vietnam because a few vociferous professors and others keep ragging him on the subject. L.B.J. isn't going to reverse this particular brand of nonthinking—but addresses such as Thursday's can do a lot to solidify national understanding.

Moreover, this puts it up to the Communists once more. They show no more sign of relenting than the college hecklers. But there are other people in the world who do have open minds.

Our policy, the way Mr. Johnson stated it Thursday, is positive, not merely defensive.

Our preferred priority is on helping the South Vietnamese (and others in southeast Asia) to improve their lot. Since 1954, for instance, rice production has been doubled, new crops introduced, industrial production developed. This all would be much more meaningful, and farther along, except for the Communists who murder and pillage and force the Vietnamese and the United States to concentrate on military defense.

Americans would much rather devote some of their resources to helping others with their economy and their standard of living. Our heavy expenditures on weapons are not by choice, but through necessity.

All the same, the President is still willing to sit down and talk it out.

The North Vietnamese obviously are hard to convince. Probably because for so many of the years this war has been going on they have been getting off easy, giving them the idea the United States was merely a paper tiger and that eventually they could overwhelm the South Vietnamese.

The President's purpose is to disabuse them of both notions—meanwhile being ready to negotiate and even readier to get on with peaceful ways to better life in southeast Asia, a program which would be far more useful to us and to the Asians than fighting.

There is nothing new or strange in this double-edged policy. This is what we did during and after World War II. We went all out to win and when the military job was finished we turned an enormous share of our effort and resources toward peaceful development around the world.

[From the Bridgewater (S. Dak.) Tribune, Apr. 29, 1965]

There are diametrically opposed points of view as to what we can do and should do in Vietnam. But there can no longer be any dissent to one fact: this Government is totally committed to using whatever force and whatever tactics are necessary to preserve South Vietnam from a Communist takeover. The President went all out when, at a conference of Governors, he declared that this would be the policy even if it takes "20 or 50 years." He has also said that he is always ready to negotiate an honorable peace but has found no signs of any willingness on the part of the Communists to move in that direction.

Intelligence Digest, a British publication which deals in world affairs and has a reputation for prescience, quotes one of its special correspondents as saying: "It is now obvious that the United States has worked itself into a monstrous dilemma in Vietnam and finds itself, so to speak, suspended between the devil and the deep blue sea. What is so aggravating to America and her allies is the fact that there do not seem to be any alternatives for the solution of the situation but the following three courses of action: (i) An indefinite prolongation of the present situation; (ii) a negotiated neutralization of Vietnam and subsequent American withdrawal; or, (iii) an expansion of the war at the risk of a conflict with Red China and/or Soviet Russia."

This is a widely held point abroad. And certainly no one can any longer believe that there is a simple solution to the Vietnam problem. The President, it seems absolutely clear, has made his decision and there will be no back tracking. That decision, as U.S. News & World Report sums it up, "is to be generous if the Communists end their aggression, but brutal if they choose a test of military strength." The magazine adds that Red China has been informed that she will be subject to attack with all weapons, including nuclear, if she enters the fight.

In other words, it is up to the Communists to decide whether the war is to grow hotter or not. And in this country, the President's

position is being given the most powerful kind of bipartisan support within and without Congress. For instance, Barry Goldwater, in one of his newspaper columns, writes that the Johnson policy "has worked wonders in turning the war from a hopeless morass into a sharply focused issue." Going on, he suggests that this country issue a "target ultimatum" to the Hanoi government. This would consist of naming a series of targets of increasing importance that would be hit successively until Hanoi accedes to peace terms. He also proposes that we ask our Asian allies such as the Philippines, to enter the Vietnam ground war.

There is another important facet to the picture. Newsweek sums it up this way: "For the time being, at least, Washington's newfound decisiveness has stolen the initiative from the Communist camp. In sharp contrast with the recent past, it is now the leaders in Moscow and Peiping who seem uncertain and confused, who are groping for a way to answer the U.S. challenge." So far as anyone can see now, they don't want to risk direct warfare, on any scale, with the United States, while, at the same time, they are vitally concerned with saving face.

No one knows what the future will bring. But the United States is demonstrating that it is not a paper tiger.

The President's Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the activity of the United States in moving into the Dominican Republic to protect the lives of our citizens has had a serious effect upon our people, who have followed this operation closely. The Hartford Times, which is one of the major newspapers in Connecticut, recently commented on the forthright nature of the President's actions, and I believe it deserves the recognition of all Members of the House. I offer the editorial for the RECORD:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, May 3, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S DECISIONS

The decisions made by President Johnson in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic—to defend our commitments and responsibilities—is bound to have salutary effect. The firming exposition of our attitude will arouse criticism; there always is "another way" to act.

But we think that the President has made our position more creditable, in this way carrying on in the direction taken by President Kennedy at the time of the Cuban missiles crisis.

An overriding disposition to defer, to stand on the beach and talk about rescue when diving in and effecting the rescue is required, always leaves at question whether one can, or will swim.

President Johnson is distinguishing between occasions—the time to talk, and the time to act. And in national affairs such distinction is as important and laudable as is our basic disposition to negotiate or compromise.

One senses an opinion had formed that the U.S. endorsed negotiation and deferment even when that constituted a retreat into words rather than an advance toward a solution. Events in Vietnam and at Santo Domingo have corrected any such misapprehension.

We champion peace, but also we champion responsibility and our commitments. Peace is weakened when we veer off from the job of making our will believable.

Americans Will Do Farm Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Americans will do "stoop labor" if they are paid for it.

This statement of Ralph McGill, writing in the New York Hearld Tribune of May 18, clearly supports the position of Congress in terminating Public Law 78 and the insistance of the Secretary of Labor that domestic workers can be hired if competition is permitted to return to the farm labor market.

At a time of frequent charge and countercharge, and in a further effort to set the record straight, I include Mr. McGill's remarks for our colleagues' information:

NO FOREIGN LABOR

(By Ralph McGill)

It is claimed that "Americans won't do stoop labor." The answer seems to be that they will do it if they are paid for it.

Public opinion in California appears to be rallying behind a congressional act and the Secretary of Labor whose job it is to enforce it. The Congress barred importation of cheap foreign labor to harvest crops.

The outcry from growers in California was loud and angry. They insisted Americans won't do stoop labor—picking vegetables, fruit, and lettuce. They demanded the government allow the import of cheap Mexican labor.

The position of the growers was, to persons outside the State, untenable and somewhat shocking. The growers were among the loudest in their support of free enterprise. Yet, in a State where 400,000 Americans are jobless, growers put themselves in a position of demanding that the Government provide them with labor that would not merely work for wages below the competitive level but would also accept living conditions that all too often involved squalor and misery. Investigations revealed that some growers had provided good working and living conditions for the contract laborer. A majority had not.

Secretary Willard Wirtz, in carrying out the congressional legislation, suggested that jobless Americans would respond if the wages were adequate and the living conditions improved. The contract under which foreign labor was imported guaranteed work for three-fourths of the contract period. The Department of Labor suggested this be tried with U.S. workers. It was. The lettuce crop was harvested in the Imperial Valley. Statistics here indicate the work was done more efficiently.

Some growers continue their demands to bring in foreign labor while their own people are without work. Some canning representatives, in a recent meeting with the Secretary, threatened to move their operations into Mexico, thereby throwing thousands more Americans out of work.

There are indications that American industry leaders outside California are holding up a warning finger to the growers who make free enterprise seem ridiculous by insisting on avoiding the competitive labor market and retaining the special privilege of importing noncompetitive labor with Federal help.

The Secretary of Labor has been consistent. He argues that adequate domestic workers can be hired from the 400,000 unemployed if competition is permitted to return to the farm labor market. Reasonable wages, decent housing and food for field hands, he insists, will bring the workers. Mr. Wirtz summing up included these points:

"Treat your domestic workers right, and you will never lack for them. If you don't treat them right, there will be no certification of foreign workers to ease the transition. Higher wages may mean some slight increase in retail prices, but the American housewife should be willing to pay a half-cent more for a head of lettuce to improve the lot of farm labor."

Mr. Wirtz has been heard to say that the economy of the great factories in the fields resembles the industrial development of the years following the Civil War when millions of immigrants were brought in to fill the new factories and mills, to lay the rails west, to dig the canals, and so on. There no longer is any reason for U.S. agriculture to be allowed special considerations in a State where some 400,000 Americans are out of work.

California's farm economy is the most prosperous in the Nation. Public opinion in the State—and over the Nation—supports the congressional act and the Secretary whose job it is to enforce it.

U.S. Cancels Grand Jury Probe in Social Security Fee Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of acquainting other Members of the House of Representatives with a situation involving social security claims, I have obtained permission to have reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the May 16, 1965, issue of the Des Moines, Iowa, Sunday Register.

While this article deals only with a situation in Iowa, there is evidence that highly questionable practices in the handling of social security claims may be much more widespread. If it does become apparent that an appreciable number of social security beneficiaries have been the victims of sharp practices in the establishment or maintenance of their claims it may be necessary for a proper committee of Congress to delve into the matter.

Following is the newspaper article:

U.S. CANCELS GRAND JURY PROBE IN IOWA FEE DISPUTE

(By Nick Kotz, of the Register's Washington Bureau)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A scheduled Federal grand jury investigation of two Iowa attorneys was called off after the attorneys agreed to refund several thousands of dollars they charged social security applicants.

The Social Security Administration contended that the two attorneys in helping elderly persons get their social security benefits had charged more than regulations permit.

ATTORNEYS IDENTIFIED

In one instance the Social Security Administration said that Max H. Jenk, Dyersville attorney, charged a $2,662 fee where the fee was limited to $50.

In another case, the Social Security Administration said that L. Jack Degnan, Guttenberg attorney, charged a $1,000 fee where the fee was limited to $20.

Both attorneys contended that the fees covered legal services other than just the social security applications.

They complained that because the Social Security Administration and Government attorneys had chosen to bring criminal action instead of following a civil procedure, which would have determined whether the fees were just, that they had no alternative but to give the refunds.

Said Francis H. Becker of Dubuque, who represented Degnan in the matter: "It was either pay the refunds or face criminal prosecution. So we did what we did, but in no way and at no time did we ever admit that they were unreasonable charges."

FINE, PRISON

The Social Security Act calls for a $500 fine, 1-year prison sentence, or both for conviction of fee overcharges.

Administration regulations permit a lawyer to charge from $20 to $50 in social security cases where no court action is involved, unless the attorney applies for, and receives Administration permission to collect a higher fee.

Degnan said, however, he had applied for higher fees but the Social Security Administration never acted upon the application. Jenk said he intends to file an application.

If an attorney has spent a considerable length of time on a case, it is not uncommon for him to apply for and have approved a larger fee for his services. In the case of court actions, the judge decides the proper legal fees.

Social Security Administration officials said their records indicated that Jenk returned $2,612 of the $2,662 fee he had received from Henry Willenbring of Dyersville.

They said their records show that Degnan made the following repayments; $980 of a $1,000 fee received from Felix J. Oberbroeckling of Dyersville; $33 of a $53 fee from John F. Kregel of Guttenberg; $106.20 of a $126.20 fee from Roman Placynski of Guttenberg; $295 of a $315 fee from Frank E. Hyde, Sr., of Colesburg; $840.20 of a $870.20 fee from Louis H. Niemann of Guttenberg.

Willenbring, 77, is a retired farmer. He left the farm 15 years ago.

He said that he applied for social security benefits in 1957 and that Jack, who had handled his income tax returns and legal work since 1937, took care of the application work.

It was not until 1961, he said, that he received the benefits.

The back payments—for himself and his wife—covered the 4 years between the time of application and approval, he said. The total was nearly $8,000.

THIRTY-THREE PERCENT OF TOTAL

He said Jenk asked a fee of 33 percent of the total and that he paid it.

Willenbring said he knew nothing of the investigation of fees until social security investigators from Baltimore, Md., appeared on his doorstep.

The investigation was kicked off by a signed complaint by Oberbroeckling, 74.

He said he took his application for social security benefits to Degnan in 1958.

Approval and the backpayment of $4,900 came in 1961, he said.

He said that Degnan asked a fee of $1,200 but settled for $1,000.

A friend, contending that the fee was high, persuaded him to sign a complaint, said Oberbroeckling.

SEVERAL CASES

Social Security Administration officials in Dubuque, upon receiving the complaint, investigated a number of cases, particularly those where the backpayment was substantial.

Officials explained that a backpayment covering more than 4 or 5 months is rare because it usually takes only about that length of time to process an application.

Social Security Administration officials in Baltimore, the national office, and the Kansas City, Mo., regional office and U.S. Attorney Donald O'Brien of Sioux City said the Federal Government dropped its complaints against two attorneys in September, 1964, after the attorneys repaid the six persons the amounts which the Social Security Administration contended were overcharges.

The decision to drop the proceedings was made jointly by O'Brien, attorneys for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Kansas City, and Social Security Administration attorneys in the national office.

O'Brien said he received complaints against the two attorneys from the regional legal counsel of HEW in Kansas City. He said the regional counsel asked for prosecution against the men after an investigation by the national office of the Social Security Administration.

O'Brien said he subpenaed the six elderly men and other witnesses and was about to submit the complaints against the two attorneys to a Federal grand jury in Fort Dodge when he was contacted in mid-August 1964, by another attorney representing Degnan.

ACCOMPANIED BY DEGNAN

O'Brien said the attorney was Becker, who was accompanied by Degnan.

Becker asked whether cases against the two men could be dropped if they agreed to pay back whatever fees the Social Security Administration considered unjustified, O'Brien said.

O'Brien said he told Becker that he would have to appeal to Joseph Rockwood, the regional Health, Education, and Welfare attorney in Kansas City.

O'Brien said it was his feeling that the Social Security Administration of Health, Education, and Welfare would have to recommend dropping the proceedings, since it had originated them.

Becker then telephoned Rockwood from the U.S. attorney's office, O'Brien stated.

O'Brien said he called off the grand jury session after Rockwood told him repayment of the fees was a satisfactory solution.

O'Brien said his correspondence on termination of the proceedings includes a letter from the Kansas City regional office, which states in part:

"We appreciate the fine way in which you handled these cases for us."

TOOK UP CASE

Rockwood said his office first took up the matter by telephone with the general counsel of the Social Security Administration in Baltimore.

"O'Brien got these people in touch with us," said Rockwood. "They made a proposition to us which was accepted by O'Brien and our central office in Baltimore. It was a decision participated in by a lot of people."

Rockwood said that the decision to drop the complaint against the attorneys was made in a round of telephone conversations between Rockwood's office and O'Brien, Rockwood's office and Becker, and Rockwood's office and the national office in Baltimore.

Harold Packer, general counsel for the Social Security Administration national office in Baltimore, said an attorney on his staff approved dropping the complaint.

Packer said it was the attitude of his office that its objective had been achieved, if the social security recipients got back the fees which they were overcharged.

JUSTICE WAS SERVED

Since the attorneys agreed to return the overcharged fees, Packer said "the ends of justice were served" and his office could see no point in continuing criminal prosecution of the two men.

Lower officials in the Social Security Administration reportedly have said privately they were unhappy that the proceedings against the two men were dropped.

O'Brien said that Becker contended to him that his client did not know of the social security regulations permitting maximum fees of $20 to 50, unless higher fees were applied for.

"The other side of the coin," said O'Brien, "is that these two attorneys (Degnan and Jenk) were supposed to be experts in social security matters.

O'Brien originally said that Becker represented both men and said he told Becker to take their cases up withthe Kansas City office.

Saturday, O'Brien said: "My off-the-cuff memory was wrong. Becker didn't represent Jenk."

ONLY CONTACT

O'Brien said that the only contact he had with Jenk was in a letter from him.

Social Security Administration officials in Kansas City and Baltimore said the discussion calling off the grand jury session involved both Jenk and Degnan.

Jenk, reached at his Dyersville office, said "the whole thing is a misunderstanding, which the Social Security people dropped after I explained it to them."

He said he plans to file an application with the Social Security Administration for permission to collect a higher fee.

Jenk said the $2,662 fee he charged Willenbring covered legal work over a 4-year period other than the social security application.

He said he refunded the $2,612 to Willenbring "on the condition that a later adjustment would be made."

O'Brien and the Social Security Administration officials said the grand jury proceedings were dropped after Jenk agreed to refund the $2,612.

Social Security officials said they have asked the six elderly persons to report to them if either Jenk or Degnan bills them for additional fees.

Degnan, reached at his Guttenberg office, said "it was my position at the time that I didn't charge Mr. Oberbroeckling anything for social security."

OTHER LEGAL WORK

The $1,000 fee, he said, covered other legal work. This a point disputed by Oberbroeckling, who said he owed Degnan only for the social security application at the time.

Degnan said he does not intend to bill Oberbroeckling for the $980.

"No I'm not going to bill it," he said. "They threw me into an investigation by the grand jury. Of course, what could that do with a lawyer in a small town but give him a bad name?

"There wasn't any way I could defend myself, as I see it," said Degnan of the Oberbroeckling case and the four others, "except to refund the money.

"It's not fair, but what could I do?"

Degnan's attorney, Becker, complained that the Social Security Administration followed improper procedures in Degnan's case.

He said that Degnan applied for higher fees in all five cases, but that the applications were never ruled on by the Social Security Administration.

CIVIL MATTER

Becker said the Social Security Administration should have taken the matter into court as a civil case instead of a criminal case.

"It's worse than fighting city hall," said Becker. "You can't do anything but lose in the situation as long as they have a policy of ignoring civil procedure and simply file a criminal complaint."

The three attorneys are leading Democrats: Degnan is Clayton County Democratic chairman; Jenk was an alternate delegate to the National Democratic Conventions in 1960 and 1964; Becker is a former Dubuque County attorney.

Doyle Hagan, Chief of the Social Security Administration's Violation Office, said that two investigators from his office had gone to Iowa and investigated the cases.

Hagan said that the national office recommended prosecution to the regional office.

Hagan said that his office also had agreed to drop the proceedings when contacted on the question by the General Counsel's Office.

"The whole thing was disposed of on the telephone," said Hagan.

Hagan said it was the feeling of his office in originally asking for prosecution that "the facts did show a prima facie case" that the two lawyers had knowledge of the fee regulations.

FILES ON CASE

Packer said his files on the case include two memorandums showing the telephone conversations settling the cases, and receipts showing that the fees had been returned to the social security recipients.

The Social Security Administration has the power to issue an administrative order forbidding its field offices to deal with attorneys who have overcharged recipients.

Officials here turned down a recommendation to do so in the cases of Jenk and Degnan.

President Johnson Making Right Moves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks we have witnessed a growing debate over American policies in South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. I believe that the President has followed a necessary course of firmness in our continuing efforts to achieve peace with justice. I am gratified to report that the overwhelming majority of my constituents support the President. On May 9 the publisher of the Van Nuys News and Green Sheet, Mr. Ferdinand Mendenhall, well expressed this concern and support. I should like to bring his fine editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON MAKING RIGHT MOVES

With Communist-inspired flames flaring up in Vietnam and most recently in the Dominican Republic, President Johnson deserves the support of all Americans and of our companion nations for moving to meet these confrontations with force.

For those who would now pull out of Vietnam and leave the South Vietnamese to domination by Communist occupation and rule, let them be reminded that southeast Asia in effect would thereafter be closed out to the Western nations, and our sphere of sea frontier defense would shrink accordingly.

For those who would decry our action in placing troops in the Dominican Republic, let them be reminded the President had no intention of leaving American nationals in that beleaguered country to the tender care of rabble-rousing rebels; further, he well remembers the Cuban missile sites of not too many months ago and is determined another island takeover, with possible repeat consequences, will not be permitted.

WE SHOULD KNOW TACTICS BY NOW

Surveying the postwar tactics of the Communists, we soon find their plan to be that of the "salami" acquisition of territory. This consists of slicing off small portions of the globe's surface wherever a vulnerable spot is assumed, simultaneously stirring up a propagandist cry of "intervention and imperialism" when the free world makes a move to challenge the slicing. This game is as old as the hills, but it is surprising how many persons in this enlightened (?) century still fall for it.

While Harry S. Truman was roundly criticized by many for his action in meeting the North Korean deluge with armed force, history is proving Mr. Truman made the right decision. After the Communist-backed attackers were hurled back across the Yalu River, a damper was put on their enthusiasm in this area which continues through to the present. This was the first major move of this sort which had been made since close of World War II, and took some particular courage on Mr. Truman's part. He didn't flinch for a second, and the world is better off today.

Mr. Johnson's actions today are no less necessary than was President Kennedy's order to blockade Cuba and tell the Russians and their missile teams to go packing, in 1962. He is merely making clear the U.S. position before events are permitted to travel that far. In other words, the President is exercising a belief that an ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure.

RISE TO VOICE "WELL DONE"

With that thought in mind, let us not fall for the propagandist cries which would weaken us from within, but rise to voice a "well done" to the man in the White House, standing firmly beside him to make sure this Nation—its rights, its dignity, its security—remains inviolate as a champion of justice and hallmark of freedom.

MENDENHALL.

North Country Priest Shows Yankee Spirit; Sparks Industrial Comeback for Village

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, New England is fighting back well from its economic decline of recent years, thanks largely to Yankee spunk and spirit. For some years, we have watched helplessly as our industries drained away to the South and our agriculture contracted. It is a pleasure to salute developments in the other direction and such a development was written up in the Valley News of Lebanon, N.H., has taken place in our sister State of Vermont.

In Richford, Vt., through the ingenuity, hard work and leadership of a remarkable priest, the Reverend George St. Onge, a new local industry has been created and shows every promise of becoming a permanent feature of the community.

I salute Father St. Onge and, with great admiration, submit the article from the Valley News of May 4, 1965, for the RECORD in tribute to him and the people of Richford. This story is proof that the north country spirit is unflagging.

The article follows:

PRIEST'S HOCKEY STICK FACTORY EXPECTS BOOM

RICHFORD, VT.—A hockey stick plant run by a Roman Catholic priest here has been officially dedicated in formal ceremonies.

Several hundred persons toured the prefabricated plant that employs 16 persons in the economically strapped northwest portion of Vermont. The visitors heard Gov. Philip H. Hoff pay tribute to a stocky Roman Catholic priest, Rev. George St. Onge, pastor of all Saints Church in Richford, who conceived the idea of the hockey stick plant and carried it through to its fruition.

Hoff called the ceremonies "one of the happiest days of my life." The mill hopefully will employ 50 persons by next year. Father St. Onge said he hopes the factory becomes 'the hockey stick center of the world." He estimates there will be demands from his plant for 1 million hockey sticks next year.

The factory was made possible through a $111,000 Small Business Administration loan to Border Towns Development Association, of which Father St. Onge was founder and past president.

The Language Is English

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1965, I introduced H.R. 7218, a bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. One of the provisions of my bill provides that the civil service examiner shall, in determining whether a person is qualified to vote under State law, disregard (1) any literacy test if such person has not been adjudged an incompetent and has completed the sixth grade of education in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, where instruction is carried on predominantly in the English language.

I think it is little enough to require that a person be able to read and write the English language as a requirement for voting. It is not unreasonable to expect a voter not only to be conversant with the issues presented by candidates for election but also to understand the language used in connection with voting. If the Congress is not careful with this voting rights legislation, we are going to compel the States to print on the ballots synopses of proposed constitutional amendments, propositions, titles of offices to be filled, and directives as to the use of the paper ballot or voting

machine in a language other than English.

The 15th amendment provides that neither the United States nor any State shall deny or abridge the right of any citizen to vote on account of race, creed, or previous condition of servitude. However, as a Representative from the State of New York, I believe that if the State of New York wishes to exercise its constitutional powers to require literacy in the English language as a qualification for voting, it should be permitted to do so.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared recently in the New York Times entitled, "The Language Is English." As mentioned in the editorial, the requirement to read and write English imposed by New York State has been fairly and impartially administered. It should not be destroyed by Federal law.

THE LANGUAGE IS ENGLISH

Even since 1922 the New York State constitution has required that voters in this State must be able to read and write English. Since most political candidates speak only English, political campaigns are conducted in English and the affairs of the State are transacted in English, this is a perfectly reasonable requirement. A voter who spoke or read no English would have great difficulty in knowing whom or what he was voting for.

There is now pending in the State legislature a bill that would grant exemption from a literacy test to those who have completed six grades in a school where the instruction is primarily in English. This is a reduction from the present requirement of eight grades and should be the irreducible minimum.

But in Congress an amendment to the voting rights bill just approved by the Senate would permit an individual who was illiterate in English to vote if he could furnish proof that he had completed eight grades in a school anywhere in the United States, including Puerto Rico, without regard to the language in which instruction was carried on. This measure would affect principally several hundred thousand Spanish-speaking Americans of Puerto Rican origin who are now residing in New York.

Literacy tests have been misused in some Southern States in the past to keep qualified Negroes from voting. To prevent such misuse, Congress wrote into the civil rights bill a year ago a presumption of literacy for anyone with a sixth-grade education in English. This was a sensible and needed move. But the requirement to read and write English imposed by New York State has been fairly and impartially administered. It should not be destroyed by Federal law.

Statement of Genevieve Blatt, Secretary of Internal Affairs of Pennsylvania, on Need for Mid-Decade Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Miss Genevieve Blatt, secretary of internal affairs of Pennsylvania, testified recently before the House Subcommittee on Census and Statistics on the need for a mid-decade census. I should like to call the attention of my House colleagues to this testimony by one of my most distinguished constitutents. I include it at this point in my remarks along with a recent comment in the Warren, Pa., Observer:

STATEMENT OF MISS GENEVIEVE BLATT, SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND STATISTICS OF THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 5, 1965

Mr. Chairman, thank you for asking me to appear before your subcommittee regarding pending mid-decade (1966) census legislation.

The Pennsylvania Department of Internal Affairs has a particular interest in this legislation. Administering its varied functions the department of internal affairs has bureaus of land records, statistics, municipal affairs, standard weights and measures, and topographic and geologic survey. The bureaus of municipal affairs and statistics use census data most extensively.

The bureau of municipal affairs collects and publishes financial and other data of local governmental units, publishes manuals and handbooks regarding various local government operations, and in general provides whatever advice and assistance is requested by local governments in improving their planning and methods of administration, and in effectively performing their responsibilities. In this work, the bureau of municipal affairs acquires extensive knowledge of local government needs in the statistical field.

The bureau of statistics is the only centralized, general purpose State statistical bureau. Established by the 1873 State constitution, it supplies statistical information to agenices of Federal, State, and local government, planning and promotional groups, private industry, research organizations, educational institutions, and the general public. Annual censuses of manufacturing, utilities, and municipal authorities are conducted. An annual statistical abstract providing information on a wide range of subjects for Pennsylvania and its political subdivisions is published. Census data are a very important part of the base for the activities of the bureau of statistics.

On November 29, 1961, I submitted a report regarding the need for a mid-decade census to this subcommittee. That report was based on a survey of government and private users of statistics in Pennsylvania to determine the uses made of population and housing census statistics, the classifications by characteristics required, and the geographical areas for which various classes of census data are needed. Finally, each respondent was asked to answer the following question: "Considering that added cost must be balanced against additional uses, how often do you feel the census of population should be taken, and why?"

There has not been sufficient time to do a complete resurvey of the respondents to the earlier survey. However, we have checked with a number of the previous respondents and they have indicated their continuing need for a mid-decade census. Several indicated that the need has increased.

In the earlier survey, replies were received from 39 Pennsylvania users of statistics representing a wide range of needs and uses, including the State government, colleges and universities, chambers of commerce, and planning groups. Of the 39 respondents, 21 indicated needs for a mid-decade census.

A census program limited to 10-year intervals is grossly inadequate to meet the needs of all levels of government, business, labor, research and planning organizations, welfare agencies, and others. Changes are taking place too rapidly to rely on 10-year readings of the population and housing and their characteristics. New programs are being developed and old programs are being expanded at an increasing pace. Private industry is investing increasing billions of dollars in new plants and equipment and in commercial and service outlets. More frequent census data are essential for the adequate planning and administration of both government programs and private business and welfare activities.

Information on migration collected annually by the U.S. Bureau of the Census in the current population survey indicates that about one person in five moves during a year. If different persons moved each year, the entire population would have moved in a 5-year period. Actually, of course, there are many repeaters. However, the 1960 census shows that nearly 50 percent of the population 5 years of age and over had moved during the preceding 5 years. Seventeen percent had moved across county lines and 9 percent had moved across State lines. The age, sex, family relationship, race, occupation, and educational status of migrants differ substantially from nonmigrants.

The shifts occurring nationally between the younger age groups (under 21), the productive age groups (21 to 64), and the older age groups (over 65) are accentuated tremendously at the local level. In the first place, the distributions among these population groups vary considerably from one area to another. In addition, migration rates differ widely among these population groups. This causes further shifts among these population groups from area to area. This is of great significance in planning and operating programs to meet the educational, recreational, health, welfare, and other needs of these population groups.

The industrial and occupational classification of employment is shifting rapidly. Labor force is not adapting rapidly enough to these shifts in employment opportunities.

The distribution of families and persons by income level is shifting rapidly, and these shifts vary considerably from one geographical area to another.

Shifts in the geographical location of both workers and employers are causing extensive changes in the volume and patterns of commuting. This is of great significance in planning highways and mass transit facilities.

There are large shifts in the volume and types of housing constructed in various areas.

The decennial censuses frequently miss significant waves of social and economic change that occur between the census dates. For example, the 1930 census came before the depression took full effect; by 1940 there had been considerable recovery. A census in 1935 would have provided valuable information on depression conditions. The 1940 census was taken before we were in the war; by the time of the 1950 census, the war was over. In 1965, the sweeping legislative programs of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations are having extensive social and economic impacts. A mid-decade census would be very useful in the effective administration of these programs and in measuring their impact on the Nation and on the States, cities, and other geographical areas.

Another point I would like to emphasize is that there is progressive and accelerated depreciation in the usefulness and value of census data over a decade. A mid-decade census would not only provide much needed current data, it would also increase the value and usefulness of the regular decennial census for comparative analyses.

All levels of government need mid-decade census data. While the nature of participation and therefore the nature of data needed differs among the various levels of government, they all share responsibility for plan-

ning, administration, and evaluation in the following types of activities—education, health, welfare, manpower development and training, prevention of accidents, civil rights, civil defense, highways, mass transit urban conservation and renewal, water and natural resource conservation, public works, housing, allocation of surface water supplies, taxation, budgeting, analysis of fiscal capacity, revenues, and tax burdens, land use and preservation of open space, and prevention of air and water pollution. In all instances these needs relate to individual geographical areas and to interarea comparisons.

Both the Federal and State Governments need mid-decade census data for the administration of grants-in-aid and tax-sharing.

Both State and local governments need mid-decade census data for industrial, commercial, and recreational development; and for evaluating Government administration and costs and in making workload estimates and allocating personnel.

Business needs for mid-decade census data are indicated to be very urgent. Each year private business makes decisions as to the geographical location and volume of investment of billions of dollars on the basis of census data. Manufacturers make investment decisions on the basis of markets and labor force. Trade, service, utilities, and other commercial activities decide the location of new and expanded marketing outlets and sales effort on the basis of markets. Marketing data needs relate not only to the numbers and characteristics of the population but also to their income and housing.

The present pattern of decennial censuses was initiated in the early days of this Nation. Considering the growth in the Nation's population and its mobility; the growth in income and wealth; the growth in the number, magnitude, and expenditures of Government programs; and the growth in private investment, it would appear to be preeminently appropriate to shift from a decennial to a quinquennial basis for the population and housing census. Many of the needs indicated can be met only by a complete census. This is particularly true of the needs of business and local governments which often involve geographical areas smaller than counties, cities, boroughs, and townships.

Further, many of the needs cannot be met by a simple count of the population by age, sex, color, and marital status. Information on other characteristics such as educational attainment, occupation, and income are essential.

If a full census is not possible, I would urge a 25-percent sample for those areas large enough that data can be published based on a sample. For other areas, I would urge 100-percent coverage. It is in many of these smaller areas that the most rapid changes are taking place. It is also in these areas that there is available less non-census-type data such as employment, trade, industry, and construction statistics.

If the mid-decade census is conducted on a sample basis, it is extremely important that the data be published not only for standard metropolitan statistical areas as a whole, but also for the constituent counties and cities. Constituent counties and areas are experiencing the most rapid changes. It is in these areas therefore that there is the greatest need for up-to-date census data.

I suggest that there be a complete census of population and housing every 5 years. If this is not feasible, I urge a 25-percent sample of the larger areas and a 100-percent coverage of all areas for which data cannot be published on a sample basis.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that a mid-decade census would enable the Pennsylvania Department of Internal Affairs to carry out better its responsibilities as a central statistical agency and as a service agency to the local governments in our State. In addition, such a census would aid many other Pennsylvania State agencies in such areas as the allocation of funds to local communities for health departments, the allocation of State taxes to local communities for highway purposes which are granted on a part-mileage and a part-population basis, the general planning work of our State planning board, and the particular planning of our State's highway program.

Thank you very much for your invitation to me to testify on this most important matter which has so many significant implications for Pennsylvania and its local governments.

[From the Warren (Pa.) Observer]

OBSERVATIONS

(By Bob Walsh)

"We should do this more often," done to music, has become a popular and tuneful statement, and we believe it applies to a proposal relative to more frequent census counts. The age is moving so fast and the population explosion is sufficiently expansive to make the count taken every decade of little value halfway between.

Miss Genevieve Blatt, Pennsylvania's secretary of the department of internal affairs, put in a strong pitch in support of the ieda when she appeared before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics this week. She said it would be very helpful in the business of making fair appropriations to the various political subdivisions, some of which grow so quickly that they labor under an unfair tax burden as compared with more static areas.

A community which has added several thousand people but is receiving financial help on the basis of 1960 census figures is not receiving a fair shake of the tax tree. A neighbor which has done nothing to encourage growth and was the same size as the expanding community during the period of the census continues to receive equal assistance from Harrisburg, whether it be for roads or for some other purposes based on population figures.

In addition to population growth and community promotion we know that one person in five moves every year. Often they are the same people, but figures reveal that about 50 percent of the population, 5 years of age or older, had moved the 5 years preceding a recent study, according to Miss Blatt.

MANY INADEQUACIES

The wide gap between censuses also misses social and economic changes. Miss Blatt mentions the depression as an example. The 1930 census was taken before the full effect of the depression had been felt and the 1940 was made after the Nation had nearly recovered.

The impact of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations in the midportion of the decade will be difficult to measure. If there were a mid-decennial census, not only could the measure be made, but the population proportions would be useful in the administration of the programs.

Miss Blatt contends that both the State and local governments need mid-decade census data for the administration of grants and tax sharing.

Business would find such a census to be invaluable, in that it constantly makes decisions relative to investment of billions of dollars on the basis of census data. Working with 1960 figures in this explosive age, when transportation and communication have eased the flow and shifting of population, is inefficient.

TOO HORSEY

The decennial census is another of our antiquated systems that was adequate in the day of the horse and the ox. Today we not only could use a quinquennial census, but it should provide more than age, sex, color, and marital status, says Miss Blatt. Information on other characteristics, such as educational attainment, occupation, and income are essential, she says.

We will mention as an aside, that you might not find so much effort by the large cities to change methods of monetary allocation if the census were timed so as to show a truer picture. The highway funds are an example. There now is a move on to deemphasize the road mileage and to play up the population. This would not be so important if the population figure were more factual than is the case today.

We know that Warren and other Warren County areas have grown and we not only doubt the accuracy of the 1960 census, but we are certain that the figure today would be even greater than a true 1960 count, and probably by a fairly large amount. This clearly would have advantages, locally and on State and Federal planes.

Orderly Marketing Legislation—Act Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House a bill to provide orderly marketing which I trust will provide a new solution to the hardships being experienced by the shoe industry and other domestic industries currently being burdened down by the steadily growing, and extremely dangerous flood of foreign imports that are coming into this country.

The bill is designed to provide some relief from the inadequacies of present trade treaty and trade laws which have made possible the influx of large quantities of goods of many descriptions. These imports are, as I predicted at the time of the enactment of the trade bill and the reciprocal treaty bills endangering the prosperity and stability, not only of the shoe industry, but of many other American industries as well.

Unless some way is found before long—and the hour is late—to curb the very disturbing flow into this country of these goods and products, irreparable damage will be done to the shoe industry and to the many other industries that are feeling the sharp, crushing impact of cutthroat foreign competition.

I hope that this measure will be promptly considered and acted upon by the Congress, and I hope that when it goes into effect that it will permit the industries concerned to avoid the destructive, unfair competition presently imposed upon them by the operation of existing trade laws.

Personally, I have never been impressed by the difficulty of this problem which stems to my mind from ill-advised policies of this Government which are allowing foreign industries to take over, not only a large portion of our foreign markets but an increasingly large part of our domestic market as well, in some instances as much as 25 percent.

If proper safeguards had been written into the trade laws responsible for this

unfair, cutthroat competition, we would not now be facing the serious situation that is developing in the shoe industry, and in other domestic industries.

I trust that this legislation will be considered at an early date by the House and passed so that the affected industries and their faithful workers now confronted with the prospect of diminished prosperity and disappearing employment will be spared from these dread evils, and so that our American economy may go forward, as it should and can, to higher levels that will insure increased prosperity, larger employment opportunities, and well-being for business, for the workers, and for the American people.

I hope Congress will soon attack these menacing conditions across a broad front with effective measures to furnish relief to the aggrieved industries and workers and our great free economy which is facing such dire and dangerous threats from cheap foreign imports.

The Constitution—It's Gone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, our only assurance that this Republic will stand is the sanctity of the Constitution. The only oath we take when we assume the responsibilities of this high office is to preserve and protect the Constitution. It has been the written guarantee of the freedom of man and under it we have not only built a great nation but have held out the hope of freedom of all mankind.

Now, what is happening to the Constitution? Without the consent of the governed, it is being eroded, it is being changed, in fact, it is being abolished. This is being brought about by edicts of the Supreme Court and by Executive order as Congress more and more abandons its constitutional responsibilities. It is not yet too late. Let us return to the law of the land. If the Constitution is to be changed, let us use the machinery set forth in the Constitution itself, by amendment so that the changes do reflect the will of the people. It is our duty as representatives of the people to protect this basic right for them.

David Lawrence, in an editorial in the May 31 issue of U.S. News & World Report, calls attention to what is happening and what may happen if we continue to ignore what is happening to the Constitution. I include Mr. Lawrence's editorial as a part of these remarks.

THE CONSTITUTION—IT'S GONE

(By David Lawrence)

Three decades ago, Justice James C. McReynolds of the Supreme Court of the United States listened to a majority opinion of the Court from which he dissented, and exclaimed: "The Constitution—it's gone."

This has proved true with respect to certain categories of cases wherein the Constitution has been flagrantly disregarded. Over the years, for instance, decisions of the High Court have undertaken substantially to increase the power of the Federal Government and reduce the power of the States.

The Constitution is written in plain language: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The weakening of the power of the States and the enlargement of the powers of the Federal Government have never before reached the extremes which we are witnessing today.

We read in the Constitution, for example, that there must be no "cruel and unusual punishments inflicted" for violation of law or for the commission of crime. Yet the Federal Government has just asserted the right to tell a State what is must do and to mete out punishment to all the people of a State irrespective of consequences to innocent persons.

Never was it contemplated that Congress should pass laws delegating power to executive agencies without prescribing legislative standards to be followed. Yet what do we read in the press today? Executive agencies are telling the States that they must desegregate all public schools according to a specific program set forth by the Federal Government or be punished by the withholding of Federal funds.

State governments are, after all, elected by the people, and if their officials are in defiance of the Constitution, they can be enjoined through proper legal action. But should a Federal agency be authorized to withhold funds from a school district just because a complicated formula invented by bureaucrats in Washington has not been fulfilled?

What kind of system of law is it that permits an executive department of the Federal Government—not the courts—to adjudge the citizens of a State guilty of a crime by a mere "finding" issued by a Federal agency?

Let there be no misunderstanding—"the law of the land" today is that public schools must be desegregated and that there must be no discrimination on the basis of race or color. But is it discrimination when certain districts have a small Negro population and Negroes are not in attendance in every school? Is it the function of the Federal Government to require the transportation of children from one district to another in order that there may be racial balance in the schools?

It is being repeatedly denied that racial balance is an objective, and it is being asserted that the sole purpose is to remove intentional discrimination. But these are matters which can be resolved only in courts of law. Was the discrimination accidental—the result of residential circumstances and happenstance—or was it deliberate? The courts alone should decide.

The Civil Rights Act passed in 1964, moreover, gives to the departments of the executive branch of the Federal Government power, in various other programs of Federal assistance, to withhold funds from States if they do not conform to an arbitrary formula.

We have, in effect, a system that might be called legalized blackmail. An example of its manifestation was given the other day in a public speech in behalf of the administration by Vice President HUMPHREY, who issued this warning to the Nation's school boards:

"The choice is simply this: to continue receiving Federal aid and desegregate or to sacrifice Federal aid and desegregate anyway."

This remark confidently assumes that the Supreme Court will continue to usurp legislative functions by applying the theory that the end justifies the means.

This is not the constitutional system that our forefathers ordained. This is not the rule of justice or the rule of law. The truth of the matter is that the Constitution as we have known it is gone. It has not been amended in the way prescribed in the Constitution itself. It has been changed by arbitrary acts no less vicious than the edicts of dictators who have suppressed democracy in the world. The tyranny of the majority in a legislature, supported by a judicial oligarchy, can be as harmful to free government as the autocracy of an individual despot.

Our written Constitution has been vanishing, presumably in accordance with the spirit of the times. An impression prevails at present in both Houses of Congress that the Supreme Court will at any time amend the Constitution by judicial fiat to conform to ideological or sociological doctrines of the day.

Our forefathers provided us with a legal method of changing the Constitution. It has been used 24 times and is still available to meet the wishes of the people and the spirit of the times.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

ROLLCALL NOS. 52 AND 53: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time advocate of Federal aid to education I deeply regretted to see the administration push through a bill which is based on the supposition that the ends justify the means. As you well know, when the elementary and secondary school aid bill was before the House, my emotions and my intellect were sorely strained in determining what position I should take. It was my final judgment that we should not strike out on a course so filled with potential peril.

It appears to me, and I have expressed this view repeatedly over the years, that it is an extremely dangerous precedent to subvent Federal funds to nonpublic schools. I think it is an even more dangerous precedent to do so in the manner provided in H.R. 2362.

I have long advocated Federal aid to public education, for surely I know as well as any other taxpayer the inability of the local property tax to continue carrying the ever-increasing burden of public education. Under a sound program this burden can, and should, in large measure be shifted to the larger tax base available to the Federal Government.

This shifting of the tax burden is the one area in H.R. 2362 where I shared the opinion of the majority, although the House unfortunately was not permitted to record its vote on this portion of the bill alone. I hope the legislation marks merely the beginning of the transfer from Federal to local coffers of financial resources earmarked for education. The bill provides a $1.3 billion contribution, only a start. Surely, during the next few years this modest contribution, representing only 5 percent of the Nation's

total elementary and secondary school expenditures, will be substantially increased. This is as it should be, as it must be.

And what of private education?

When I was first a candidate for Congress in 1962, I found myself at odds with President Kennedy on this issue. The President made his position crystal clear during his famous 1960 confrontation with the ministry in Houston. He believed any Federal subvention to private, particularly parochial, education was unconstitutional. He further enunciated this position with legislation he had introduced in 1961 and 1962 for general support of elementary and secondary education. As you know, Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy was not successful with his proposed education bills, and the lack of success is publicly acknowledged to have been occasioned by the lack of provision in the bills for direct aid to private education.

I had hoped that President Kennedy would advance my approach to the problem by advocating a program of tax credits to provide a measure of relief to parents who choose to send their children to private schools. This method not only would make it possible for an individual to render a greater economic contribution to the school of his choice, but it would also permit the parent and child to continue a proper relationship with private institutions, a relationship which has effectively kept private and public education separate and distinct.

But H.R. 2362 did not take this approach. Instead it created a conflict of interest, a conflict of purpose between public and private education.

Under the terms of the legislation, the State superintendent of public instruction, the State school board, the county superintendent of public instruction, and the many thousands of local school boards across the land will be compelled—I repeat, compelled—to actively involve themselves with rules and regulations affecting private schools, rules that will relate to curriculum, to text material, to hours of education, to building plans, to matters ad infinitum.

I am sure that public school officials do not want to stick their noses under the tent of private education. They do not want to impose their will in matters not public. They recognize that as public officials they have only one proper area of responsibility—public education. They have always dealt only with their proper sphere of operations because this choice was theirs to make. But under H.R. 2362, they will no longer have a choice. They must become involved in private education, if they are to share in the financial rewards of the bill. And because of the pressing financial needs of public education, because of their responsibility to provide the best possible education for children in the public schools, local officials will be compelled to swap noninvolvement in private education for desperately needed Federal dollars. They will have no alternative in the matter. Their first allegiance is to the children in public schools. This commitment can be met only at the expense of private education.

As I stated a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this marks only the beginning of a period of expanding Federal financial responsibility for education. But it is also my hope that during this expansionary period we shall all recognize that elected and appointed public officials should not be compelled to accept the responsibility of running private schools.

It is also my fervent hope that when the Congress again considers legislation providing Federal funds to elementary and secondary education, it will modify the provisions of H.R. 2362 in a manner which will reject conformity and return autonomy to all schools, public and private.

For only with autonomy will our entire educational structure continue to flourish and grow strong. Only with autonomy can we continue to remain the acknowledged world leader in mass education.

ROLLCALL NO. 62: OFFENSIVE MAIL

Mr. Speaker, while I agree that obscene and offensive mail is a problem that we must all address ourselves to, I do not agree that constitutional guarantees must be sacrificed on the altar of solution. Thus I voted against H.R. 980.

Commentary on the bill's provisions becomes superfluous in view of the Supreme Court's unanimous decision today—its first unanimous decision in 20 years—which decreed that this type legislation is blatantly unconstitutional on its face, a direct violation of the first amendment.

The 1962 law struck down by the Court was coauthored by my predecessor, John Rousselot, who has always made a great issue of his so-called devotion to the Constitution and all of its safeguards for the individual citizen. It is ironic, but not unexpected, that in his irrational zeal to "protect" the Constitution he was actively engaged in promoting legislation to tear it down. Such is the regrettable pattern of extremism.

I suspect that many Members who voted for H.R. 980 did so not because they thought it was a good bill or that it was constitutional, but because they felt it was necessary to go on record as being opposed to offensive mail, just as many of those who supported the 1962 Cunningham-Rousselot bill—today declared blatantly unconstitutional by a unanimous Supreme Court decision—felt that it was necessary to go on record as opposing communism.

We would all do well to constantly recall the words of Justice Holmes when in a 1921 opinion he said:

> The United States may give up the Post Office when it sees fit, but while it carries it on, the use of the mails is almost as much a part of free speech as the right to use our tongues.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 70 AND 71: SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss the many benefits, both new and expanded, which are contained in H.R. 6675. Countless magazine articles and newspaper pieces have related the bill's provisions at great length, and those citizens who are included in the measure's scope will become expertly aware of their new benefits as soon as H.R. 6675 becomes law. However, I would like to say a few words on the bill's most controversial and least understood aspects—medicare—and outline some of the reasons why it had my stanch support.

No informed person will argue with the fact that older people—those over 65—are a growing segment of our population. While today nearly 1 American out of every 10 is in this age group, the percentage is increasing annually. And while medical care is a serious matter for all Americans, the elderly have special problems because they have less income, fewer assets and more illness. No amount of oratory about self-reliance will change this situation. The question is, what are we going to do about it. The House by a margin of almost 3 to 1 decreed that medicare is a start toward an answer, and I am hopeful that the Senate will shortly concur in our judgment.

I regret very much that the American Medical Association does not share our view, but I never really expected that it would. In my opinion the medical profession has been badly advised and poorly led by its national organization. Too often down through the years the AMA has chosen the path of obstruction when a progressive and humanitarian approach would have been better for the profession and the Nation. Thirty years ago the AMA denounced social security itself as a compulsory socialistic tax which would lead to dictatorship. Later it opposed extending social security benefits to the disabled because it was a serious threat to American medicine. The AMA tried to stop Federal grants for maternal and child welfare programs, charging that they were designed to "promote communism." And the AMA fought tooth and nail against the adoption of Blue Cross-type voluntary health insurance programs, the very thing they now praise to the skies. The old and wornout cliches of yesteryear were all paraded before the American public in this year's AMA assault on medicare. And they were properly rejected by the people of this country.

They know that medicare is not socialism as the AMA would have them believe. On the contrary, it is a strong deterrent to socialized medicine because: Medical care for the aged is one of the biggest drags on the American family budget. Private companies have not been able to provide adequate coverage at premiums within reach for the risks involved. But with medicare, that drag will largely be lifted. The insurance industry will be more adequately able to expand group and other protection plans for the nonelderly, thus easing the pressure for more Federal legislation. In my judgment, this is the sound and sensible American way of government and business moving in to solve a problem that was rapidly getting out of hand.

H.R. 6675 is not perfect. But it can be perfected as we go along if the AMA and other groups and individuals involved will move with the times instead of being possessed by the specter of socialism.

ROLLCALL NO. 76: KLAN INVESTIGATION

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear to all that I have no objections to the Ku Klux Klan being investigated by the Committee on Un-American Activities. On the contrary, earlier this year, long before the public was aroused by Klan activities and President Johnson called for congressional action, I urged the House Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate hate groups such as the American Nazi Party and the Minutemen. I think the Klan warrants an investigation and I think a congressional committee is a proper investigative body.

But, at this time, I do not think the House Committee on Un-American Activities needs additional funds to conduct its inquiry. On February 25 of this year, less than 2 months before the House Committee on Un-American Activities requested an additional $50,000 to investigate the Klan, I voted to give the committee $370,000 for its nine members to carry out their work. At that time, I questioned the need for such a vast sum to run a nine-member committee when other committees, such as Foreign Affairs, get by on so much less. For example, the House Committee on Un-American Activities budget per member under the original authorization was $41,111 compared to $3,195 per member on foreign affairs. This is a 13-to-1 disparity which has yet to be explained to my satisfaction.

It is standard procedure in the House for a committee to come back to the full body later in the session for supplemental funds if they are needed. But I know of no instance, Mr. Speaker, when a committee requested a supplemental less than 2 months after it received its original appropriation. It is not good fiscal practice, nor does it set a good example for the agencies of government, to follow such procedure.

At a much later date, if the House Committee on Un-American Activities comes before the House and requests additional funds to investigate the Klan and other extremists groups—and is able to offer satisfactory evidence that it is making substantial and acceptable progress in its inquiry—I would in all probability endorse the request.

ROLLCALL NO. 92: DEFENSE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. Speaker, for many weeks now I have referred to irresponsible voices of dissent emanating from Washington. I have referred to a few Members of the House and a few in the Senate who have, in my view, by their constant and vocal criticism of the President for his course of action in southeast Asia, begun to undermine the faith of the American people in their President and in his unrelenting search for peace.

I know the dissenters are sincere in their views and that they are dedicated to the American ideals of freedom and self-determination. It is, in fact, their long and proven dedication to these ideals which gives their voices such weight—weight which, in this stiuation, is totally unjustfied by the facts.

As you and my colleagues will remember, Mr. Speaker, on August 7, last, the House voted on a resolution supporting the action of President Johnson in response to the unprovoked attack on the U.S.S. *Turner Joy* in the Gulf of Tonkin. At that time the vote was 417 to 0 in support of the President. I regret that we were unable to show the same unanimity on House Joint Resolution 366.

By my vote in support of the measure I reaffirmed what I said in August 1964—the President deserves the unwavering support of all citizens in any further action which becomes necessary in the critical period ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the United States for more than a decade has spent nearly half of its national income on defense. It has been hoped by all that this expenditure, this great arsenal, would become such a deterrent that no one would question the intent of the American people to live up to their treaty obligations and to their commitment to freedom. But this is not the case.

Red China, since the death of Stalin, has challenged repeatedly and continually the resolve of the American commitment. For nearly a decade it has referred to America as a paper tiger, and during most of this time our answer has merely been to turn the other cheek. Has not our action of the last few years been similar to the handwringing in this country when Japan in 1931 marched on Manchuria, when Italy in 1934 marched on Ethiopia, and when Germany in 1938 marched on Czechoslovakia? Has not this record of U.S. inaction encouraged piecemeal adventure by would-be aggressors? In my view, the answer to these questions is "Yes."

Communist aggression must be halted, Mr. Speaker. I hope, and I fervently pray, that it can be halted at the conference table. But if it can only be halted on the field of battle, then so be it. The choice is the Communists to make.

Labels Are Both Meaningless and Misleading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in considering the difficult problems of Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, in analyzing the handling of Cuba and Berlin, it has become a common practice, although an unfortunate one, to assign such labels as "tough" or "soft," "hawk" or "dove."

As Max Lerner has pointed out in a recent article, appearing in the Berkeley Daily Gazette, these terms are as misleading as they are meaningless. I commend his thoughtful analysis and his brief but pointed comments on our policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic to our colleagues' attention:

LERNER SAYS "HAWK AND DOVE LABELS MEANINGLESS"

(By Max Lerner)

Someone asked me the other day whether, in the present debate on American foreign policy, I should call myself a hawk or a dove. When I find myself, as I rarely do, at the Pentagon or the State Department on some exploratory errand, I hear the terms used with an almost shamefaced self-consciousness.

Sometimes they are used in a half jesting way, as when Johnson, McNamara and McGeorge Bundy are dubbed the "Nighthawks." Every now and then you find someone willinging to call himself a hawk, but I have not yet found anyone of note—whether among policymakers or commenators—who will tolerate being publicly called a dove.

My own feeling is that the categories are pretty meaningless—as meaningless, say, as the factionalisms that split the Italian city-states of Machiavelli's day. Presumably the hawks want a tough policy; presumably the doves want a soft one. But the choice is not between tough and soft: it is between what will work and what will not. All of us like to think ourselves as savoring a policy that will work. The real split is exactly on that question. What is it that actually does work in the world politics, in the sense of being effective?

LABELS

I make my start by saying that I find it not very illuminating today to apply the labels "liberal" or "conservative" to foreign policy. Was Kennedy's policy on the Cuban missile confrontation liberal or conservative? Is De Gaulle's global policy today liberal or conservative? The question becomes pretty meaningless.

A better approach derives from Willam James' categories of the toughminded and the tendermined. As I understand James he was saying that one kind of outlook faces the reality principle in the universe, and does not flinch from it, however harsh it may be; and that the other outlook recoils from the harshness of reality, preferring to see not what is actually there but some picture in the head which tenderizes it, softens its outlines, hides the darkness under a veil of bright delusion. Tender is the night.

I hasten to add that a toughminded foreign policy need not be a tough one. The toughs are those who feel that only power counts as a reality. They have whittled the complexity of the universe down to the single factor of naked force. That is, I suspect, the view of those who feel that a missile showdown would better come now than later, or those who are convinced that it will not come at all if America keeps pushing its superiority of weapons into crisis situations.

I call them, however, not tough minded but tender minded. For in shrugging away every element of policy except force they are left with a distorted view of what moves men, and how they think and feel, and from what sources of action and passion the processes of history are shaped. They are just as tender minded as the doves whom they scorn, who recoil from the fact of power and from its use, and who are so concerned about the American moral image that they would leave the use of power in every situation to the Communist camp which is all too willing to have a monopoly of it.

TOUGH MINDED

I should, for example, call the Johnson policy in Vietnam tough minded in the sense that it refuses to cut-and-run and faces the challenge of Communist expansionism in southeast Asia. But it is not yet clear whether it is also tough minded from the angle of political warfare as distinguished from naked air power.

Does it recognize that the Vietcong is a political as well as military reality, and that the war will have to be fought in the villages by men who live with the villagers and come to be trusted by them? I fear that in the upper reaches of Pentagon thinking there is a dangerous rigidity in the refusal to grasp

the true political nature of insurgency and counterinsurgency warfare.

On the Dominican issue also I take the Johnson policy as tough minded in refusing to accept the outward forms of what paraded as a pro-Bosch rebellion of the Democratic left. But again there is the haunting question of whether Johnson and McNamara adequately assessed the resentment of the OAS member states at the particular handling of the crisis. For in political warfare the mood of the OAS members is as real a factor in the final outcome as the presence of American marines, or some larger design by Communist planners for transforming a pro-Bosch rebellion into a Castro-like dictatorship.

Public Policy, Not Law, Real Issue in Parochial School Aid, Expert Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the issues of church and state with respect to constitutional law are discussed quite frequently on this floor when various questions are before the House. The Hartford Courant, America's oldest newspaper, published an article in 1962 which referred to the fact that what is often at stake is a matter of public policy rather than legal issues.

The article refers to an essay in the University of Chicago Law Review, in autumn, 1961, and it was recently brought to my attention following the passage of the education bill. I believe it makes a number of useful points and that William J. Clew, assistant managing editor of the Courant, has performed an able act of setting them forth. I am placing it in the RECORD so that it may be made available for general study:

PUBLIC POLICY, NOT LAW, REAL ISSUE IN PAROCHIAL SCHOOL AID, EXPERT SAYS

(By William J. Clew)

There has never been any clear-cut decision by the Supreme Court of the United States on which to base a claim that Federal aid to parochial education is unconstitutional.

Neither is there anything in the line of decisions dealing with the sensitive question of separation of church and state upon which one can say with certainty that such aid would be constitutional.

These are the conclusions of a famous authority on constitutional law, Prof. Philip B. Kurland, of the University of Chicago Law School. His 90-page history and analysis of the problem, "Of Church and State and the Supreme Court," appeared in the University of Chicago Law Review for the autumn of 1961, but has not received wide attention.

On the question of Federal aid to parochial schools, Professor Kurland says, "Anyone suggesting that the answer, as a matter of constitutional law, is clear one way or the other is either deluding or deluded." Some authorities who have studied his work have inferred that Professor Kurland believes the question is one of public policy rather than constitutional law.

"There are few issues so likely to generate heat rather than light as the question of the proper line between the realm of the state and that of the church." Kurland says.

Perhaps he had in mind politicians, editorialists, writers of letters to the editor, and other lay "experts" when he quoted another constitutional authority as follows: "The difficulty with the advice in this field, as in so many other fields of constitutional controversy, is that the contestants are more convincing when they criticize their opponents' interpretations than when they seek to establish the validity of their own."

DIFFERS WITH KENNEDY

Although Professor Kurland leaves the vital question unanswered, insofar as it can be judged by what the Supreme Court has done in the past, his paper gives little support to the position taken by President Kennedy and his advisers.

They decided that the Constitution and the Supreme Court decisions, as they read them, prohibit the use of public funds for direct or indirect aid to parochial schools or for loans to these institutions. In taking this stand, the administration did not provide for a constitutional test before the Supreme Court, which is the only branch of the Government empowered to decide such a question.

The basic law involved is the first clause of the first amendment: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

In the bitter arguments over the meaning of this a phrase from a statement of Thomas Jefferson has sometimes become confused with the language of the Constitution. This phrase, "a wall of separation between church and state," is sometimes read out of context. Jefferson actually said, in a letter to the Baptists of Danbury, "I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should 'make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,' thus building a wall of separation between church and state."

(Jefferson's own actions make it difficult to decide just where he himself drew the line. As President he sent a bill to the Senate in 1803 providing funds to build a Catholic church for the Indians of Illinois and for partial support for 7 years of a priest to serve them.)

CATHOLIC VIEW UPHELD

One of the cases, Prof. Kurland says, in which the Supreme Court found itself confronted with the "wall" was *Everson* v. *Board of Education*.

This arose as a result of action by the town of Ewing, N.J., which provided for payment of transportation of children to Catholic schools. The Court upheld these payments as constitutional and incidentally disposed of the argument that to tax everyone for the benefit of Catholic children was illegal. In this age, the Court said, it is much too late for such an argument. The New Jersey legislation, it said, ruling against a classification by religion, "does no more than provide a general program to help parents get their children, regardless of their religion, safely and expeditiously to and from accredited schools."

Professor Kurland points out that here the Court had a very clear opportunity to rule the other way. It is one of the reasons his paper concludes that the question of direct aid to parochial schools is not so easily decided as some people believe. The inference is strong in his paper that one who went to court to oppose, on constitutional grounds, direct aid to parochial education, would have to carry a heavy burden of proof. Professor Kurland points out the Court went a long way to arrive at this decision, patently ignoring a provision in the Ewing ordinance that pupils were to be carried to "Trenton Catholic Schools." It had to ignore the fact that this distinguished in terms of religion in the very manner the Court said a State could not do.

Professor Kurland's study deals with the cases involving religion in public school classrooms, released time from school for religious instruction, and whether a belief in God is required for a public office holder, in fact the whole fascinating history of the problem.

This article is confined to those elements more directly connected with the coming battle in Congress over the parochial school question.

BALDWIN PRAISED

The Everson case was one of those cited by the Connecticut Supreme Court of Errors in upholding the right of the State and municipalities to provide transportation for parochial school children. The Connecticut case was decided last June in an opinion written by Chief Justice Raymond E. Baldwin, James M. O'Neil, another authority on constitutional law describes Judge Baldwin's work as "the most complete and meticulously documented discussion yet written of the legal issues involved in public transportation of pupils in religious schools. This opinion can illuminate almost any problem in regard to government relations with religious education."

Judge Baldwin's position that the law at issue was primarily for health, safety, and welfare and to foster education, was so impregnable that the U.S. Supreme Court dismissed an appeal without granting a hearing.

LITTLE CONSISTENCY

Professor Kurland says the problem that has bemused and confused the U.S. Supreme Court has been that of stating appropriate principles to serve as means to agreed-upon ends. He declares, "There has been no consistency in the judicial opinions of the Court." There is little quarrel, he says, about the goal of keeping church and State separate.

"The seeming simplicity of the 'absolutist' construction of the first amendment is only too patently disingenous. The method of weighing constitutional objectives in order to choose among them affords no guidance for further action, except on what Holmes called a 'pots and pans basis.' "

FOR SIMPLE PRINCIPLE

Professor Kurland says: "This paper has stated and examined, in the context of the Court's opinions, a principle believed to be appropriate to the first amendment objectives. The principle tendered is a simple one. The freedom and separation clauses should be read as stating a single precept; that Government cannot utilize religion as a standard for action or inaction because these clauses, read together as they should be, prohibit classification in terms of religion either to confer a benefit or to impose a burden. This test is meant to provide a starting point for the solution to problems brought before the Court, not a mechanical answer to them. Perhaps such a search for rules of decision is futile or undesirable. Certainly the recent plea for neutral principles of constitutional adjudication has not met with uniform acclaim. Only if equality and certainty are still fundamental objectives of our legal structure do such principles have a function to serve. And perhaps this notion of law is outdated in the society in which we live. But no apologies are offered for the relief that democratic society cannot survive if these elements of the rule of law are ignored."

Christian Science Monitor Urges Establishment of an Administrative Counsel of Congress or "American Ombudsman"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note that the Christian Science Monitor in an editorial of Friday, May 21, supported my proposal to establish an Administrative Counsel of the Congress.

I have been urging creation of the Administrative Counsel, modeled after the successful Scandinavian institution of ombudsman, as a means of helping Congressmen help their constituents in constituents' problems with the Federal bureaucracy.

Recently, I urged the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to recommend establishment of an Administrative Counsel, along the lines proposed in H.R. 4273. H.R. 4273 is also pending before the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration.

The text of the editorial follows:

AN AMERICAN OMBUDSMAN

A constituent writes his Congressman for help. His home was taken for urban renewal. He complains that the Government has not paid him a fair price.

The Congressman would not consider such a letter unusual. It is estimated that from one-third to two-thirds of the letters received by Congressmen are appeals for help involving personal problems relating to such matters as social security, veterans' affairs, military service, housing, education, and agriculture.

A method has been suggested to relieve Congressmen and their staffs of the heavy burden resulting from the handling of these requests. Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, recommends establishment of an Administrative Counsel of the Congress to process constituents' complaints.

Congressmen would refer to the counsel the case of any citizen who claims to have been the victim of maladministration of the law by Federal officials. The counsel would have the power to investigate the complaint, publicize any abuse, recommend corrective action, and report to the legislature.

The Administrative Counsel idea is not new. It is adapted from the ombudsman which "originated in Sweden in 1809 as an agent of Parliament to protect citizens' rights against bureaucratic abuse." Its success caused the idea to spread to Finland, Denmark, Norway, New Zealand, and, for military purposes, West Germany. Bills to create such an office have been introduced into the Connecticut, California, and New York Legislatures.

Not only would such a counsel make for a more efficient Congress, it would promote a more responsible administration. In helping to protect the American people from bureaucratic abuse, it would strengthen their confidence in their government. Its very existence would be a powerful incentive to good administration. We support the effort to establish such a counsel for Congress and recommend it for consideration of State legislatures as well.

Mississippi Business Activity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, business activity in Mississippi continues to increase at an astonishing rate. According to the latest issue of Mississippi Business Review, published by the Bureau of Business and Economic Research at Mississippi State University, business activity in Mississippi for March 1965 was 96 percent above the monthly average of 1956–58. In Jackson, for the same period, the seasonally adjusted index of business activity was 105 percent above the 1956–58 monthly average.

In less than a decade, business activity in Mississippi has practically doubled.

Mr. Speaker, this phenomenal growth is the result of many efforts. High productivity by our citizens, a favorable governmental climate, utilization of our natural resources, intensified efforts of civil, labor and business organizations to build a better Mississippi, are some of the contributing factors which brought about this remarkable progress.

As a part of my remarks, I include an article from the May issue of Mississippi Business Review on business activity in Mississippi:

BUSINESS ACTIVITY

BUSINESS IN MISSISIPPI

As adjusted for seasonal variations business activity over the State of Mississippi continued its upward trend, again reaching a new high during the month of March 1965.

The seasonally adjusted index of business activity throughout the State for March 1965 is 196—96 percent above the monthly average of 1956–58. This index number, 196, is three points (1.6 percent) above that of February 1965, and is 27 points (16 percent) above that of March 1964.

As of mid-March 1965, the civilian labor force of Mississippi was 762,800 (preliminary figure). This total is 2,600 below that of mid-February 1965, but is 13,300 above that of mid-March 1964.

Total employment in Mississippi at mid-March 1965 (including those self-employed) was 729,500 (preliminary figure). This total is 4,000 above that of mid-February 1965, and is 21,600 above that of mid-March 1964.

At mid-March 1965, the total unemployment in Mississippi was 31,900 (preliminary figure). This total is 5,000 below that of mid-February 1965, and is 9,700 below that of mid-March 1964. Unemployment over the State stood at mid-March 1965 (not adjusted for seasonal variations) at 4.2 percent of the civilian labor force—in mid-February 1965, unemployment stood at 4.8 percent of the civilian labor force, whereas it was 5.6 percent at mid-March 1964.

BUSINESS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

During the month of March 1965; indicators of business activity for the United States as a whole rose from the previous month.

The seasonally adjusted index of industrial production of the Federal Reserve System (1957–59 base) rose from 138.9 for February 1965, to 140.1 (preliminary figure) for the month of March 1965, whereas the index stood at 128.3 in March 1964. The seasonally adjusted index of business activity (1957–59 base) of Business Week rose from 137.5 at the end of February 1965, to 139 at the end of March 1965, whereas the index stood at 128.1 at the end of March 1964.

Total civilian employment over the United States rose from 69,496,000 at mid-February 1965, to 70,169,000 at mid-March 1965, whereas the total at mid-March 1964, was 68,517,000.

In March 1965, over the United States, average hourly wages of factory production workers was $2.60—9 cents above that of March 1964. The average weekly pay of factory labor was $107.38—$5.98 above that of March 1964.

Unemployment over the United States dropped from 4,218,000 at mid-February 1965, to 3,740,000 at mid-March 1965. Unemployment (not adjusted for seasonal variations) stood at mid-March 1965, at 5.1 percent of the civilian labor force, whereas at mid-February 1964, it was 5.7 percent and at mid-March 1964, it was 5.9 percent. Unemployment as adjusted for seasonal variations stood at mid-March 1965, at 4.7 percent of the civilian labor force. Seasonally adjusted, unemployment stood at 5 percent of the civilian labor force at mid-February 1965, and 5.4 percent at mid-March 1964.

BUSINESS IN JACKSON

As adjusted for seasonal variations, business activity in the city of Jackson continued its upward trend in March 1965.

The seasonally adjusted index of business activity in Jackson in March 1965, is 205—105 percent above the monthly average of 1956–58. This index number, 205, is 30 points (1.5 percent) above that of February 1965, and is 34 points (19.9 percent) above that of March 1964.

In March 1965, the total of bank debits (checks cashed) of all Jackson banks was $485,078,233. This sum is 12.5 percent above that of February 1965, and is 21.9 percent above that of March 1964. The seasonally adjusted index number of bank debits in Jackson for March 1965, is 243—143 percent above the monthly average of 1956–58. This index number, 243, is 15 points (6.6 percent) above that of February 1965, and is 46 points (23.4 percent) above that of March 1964.

Total employment (including those self-employed) in the Jackson area (Hinds and Rankin Counties) stood at mid-March 1965, at 91,000—700 above that of mid-February 1965, and 1,800 above that of mid-March 1964. Nonfarm wage and salaried employment stood at mid-March 1965, at 73,150—700 above that of mid-February 1965, and 1,800 above that of mid-March 1964. Manufacturing employment at mid-March 1965, was 11,800—50 above that of mid-February 1965, and 750 above that of mid-March 1964.

The collections of city sales tax, etc., indicated that retail sales (as per the definition of the Bureau of the Census) ran in Jackson in March 1965, 14.6 percent above that of February 1965, and 18.2 percent above that of March 1964.

Detente: Cold War Strategies in Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it appears evident to most political observers that the past several years have marked a time of transition from the post-World War II era to a new international

configuration, the outlines of which are not yet clear.

Such phenomena as the Sino-Soviet split, the loosening of bloc ties in Eastern Europe, the new direction in French foreign policy, the weakening of NATO, and the so-called "detente" between the United States and the U.S.S.R. have required new initiatives and responses in American foreign policy.

It has been a time of reappraisal and reassessment of the basic theories which underlie our conduct of international relations. We have heard much of "old myths" and of "new realities."

Recently an outstanding book was published by the Center for Strategic Studies at Georgetown University which provides an intelligent and incisive analysis of both new and old myths, new and old realities. Called "Detente: Cold War Strategies in Transition," this book is thought-provoking reading for those concerned with American foreign policy.

As a member of the board of the center, I have been pleased with the caliber of the publications which it has published and am particularly pleased to recommend "Detente" to the attention of my colleagues. In order to provide further information on this book, I am inserting a laudatory review of it which appeared in the April 17 issue of Saturday Review:

MORE THAN ONE WAY TO WIN A WORLD

("Détente: Cold War Strategies in Transition," edited by Eleanor Lansing Dulles and Robert Dickson Crane (Praeger, 307 pages, $5.95), examines the validity of some of the underlying assumptions of our foreign policy. Frank Altschul is chairman of the Committee on International Policy of the National Planning Association.)

(By Frank Altschul)

In consecutive essays, "Détente" deals with the manifold problems that confront us in the field of foreign policy as we seek to reexamine cold war strategy during a period of transition. It is a rewarding book. The authors, most of them associated with the Center for Strategic Studies at Georgetown University, are highly qualified. In a penetrating foreword Robert Murphy voices the feeling, which will be widely shared, that "if there is a more timely and effective presentation of facts relating to basic elements of our international situation, I am unaware of it."

To test the continuing validity of some of the underlying assumptions on which our foreign policy has long been based is the purpose of this exercise. As Klaus Mehnert remarks in the opening essay, "Political Evolution in the Communist World," "there are times when people must rethink their positions. Such a time came to the world when the beginnings of a possible détente, in 1963, affected the cold war positions to which everybody has grown accustomed during the past 15 years." In a sense this sets the tone of much that is to follow.

In these days, when we are all exposed to the highly cultivated art of the propagandist, it is easy to be beguiled by such attractive but ambiguous expressions as "détente" and "peaceful coexistence." Accordingly, it is the part of wisdom to explore any lurking ambiguity they may contain. In the United States we look upon détente as a step in a continuing effort to relax and, hopefully, to remove the underlying causes of tension and hostility. Malcolm Mackintosh's essay in the present book strongly urges us to guard against the possibility that in the Russian view this represents no more than the well-known maneuver "reculer pour mieux sauter." And Richard V. Allen, in a scholarly examination of the effective use of the expression "peaceful coexistence" as an instrument of Soviet psychological warfare, demonstrates how far removed this is from our conception of a genuine peace. Allen reaches the dismal conclusion that "the great paradox of our time may well turn out to be our inability to recognize that the cold war has in reality become more intense despite the increasing appearances of peace * * * to mistake the illusion of peace for genuine peace would be a profoundly dangerous, perhaps fatal mistake."

General and complete disarmament—a frequently alleged objective of Soviet policy—is exposed for the myth it is in two essays by James E. Dougherty. To its proponents it may be an effective element of propaganda addressed to the almost universal yearning for peace and tranquillity; but, as Mr. Dougherty demonstrates, it has no substance or reality. In fact, he asserts, "at the present time neither the United States nor the Soviet Union are engaged in serious negotiations for general and complete disarmament in the near future." He underscores the many obstacles that lie in the way of its realization, not the least of which is the impossibility of detecting a well-concealed array of nuclear weapons.

The utter suicidal insanity of thermonuclear warfare, today recognized by the Soviet Union no less than by ourselves, is a theme that recurs throughout this book. We are doomed, it seems, to no brighter prospect than a prolonged period of mutual deterrence, during which the struggle between two conflicting ideologies will be waged by all available means short of thermonuclear war. In this struggle the Communists appear to have a genuine confidence in ultimate victory. Their strategy, as Mr. Dougherty indicates, "prescribes the gradual envelopment of the West over a relatively long period of piecemeal conquests, feints, maneuvers, political turnabouts, economic and diplomatic forays, social penetrations, and the psychological manipulation of elite and mass attitudes."

This is the challenge that we are called upon to meet; this is the challenge that, as David M. Abshire suggests, requires the integration of "all forms of power and influence—military, economic, political, and psychological—to further the aims of * * * strategy." And here the finger is pointed at some of the fundamental shortcomings in the present conduct of our affairs. Can we seriously argue that in the psychological field our propaganda has been as effective as that of the Soviet Union, or that our attempts at a discriminating use of our economic potential have always produced the desired result? With a view to the coordination of policy, these questions should be thoughtfully reexamined.

But above all it is in the field of diplomacy that a fresh approach is urgently needed. The broad lines of such an approach are dealt with by David M. Abshire in his chapter entitled "Grand Strategy Reconstructed." He argues persuasively for the necessity of repairing the disarray within NATO: "Any Russian détente," he contends, "must be with the entire Atlantic community—North and South—not just with us while the rest of that community is being subverted * * * real and genuine détente cannot precede a successful strategy of alliance."

The difficulties in the way should not be minimized. They are underscored in the chapters "European Unity, the German View," by Klause Mehnert, and "Nuclear Strategy, the French View," by Pierre M. Gallois. Needless to say, from both chapters there emerges as the unyielding obstacle to unity the towering figure of Charles de Gaulle. To find some common ground with him will tax the ingenuity of no less a person than the President of the United States. The general's aversion to "les Anglo-Saxon" partakes of the pathological; "les Anglo-Saxon" have twice saved France from the Germans. It is just possible that with the exercise of supreme skill they may yet succeed in saving France from De Gaulle.

The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Benton has made nine trips since 1955 to the Soviet Union. This alone should serve to qualify him as one of the most astute observers of the U.S.S.R. in the world today.

His study of Soviet education is indeed enlightening and for this reason I am having it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Chapter IX, "Come Back in a Few Years," follows:

CHAPTER IX. "COME BACK IN A FEW YEARS"

(A personal report: "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," by William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Senator from Connecticut; presently U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its executive board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica)

Mikhail Kharlamov had said to me, "Come back in a few years, and we shall have even more to show" (about educational progress with TV).

"The future is subjective," Vyacheslav Yelutin had said, "and that is probably why I like it best. It calls for imagination" (about new techniques in the field of education).

These two men spoke for many of the Soviet educational leaders with whom I talked. They say, in effect, "Watch our smoke."

True, one did not need to come back in a few years but only a few months to find another man, Nikolai Mesyatsev, in Kharlamov's position. And Minister Yelutin, if he remains, cannot be expected to hold his post for many years in the future. One's view of the future is indeed subjective; it does call for imagination.

But the drive of education for improvement and the extensive use of all the media of communication to educate and indoctrinate the Soviet people are not likely to change. Instead, we can expect acceleration regardless of the men in charge.

Both the teachers and the taught are a part of the thrust of the Communist system, and this thrust does not change basically because new men head it and former chiefs are cast into the shadows. Stalin said in 1928: "Before us stands a fortress. This fortress is science, with its many branches of knowledge. We must capture that fortress at all costs. It is our youth who must capture that fortress, if they want to be the builders of the new life, if they want to be the real successors of the old guard."[1]

Education in the Soviet Union has already brought about a high degree of tech-

[1] J. V. Stalin, "Works" (1954), vol. 11, p. 81, in a speech before the Young Communist League, May 1928.

nological success, as was demonstrated just hours before Khrushchev's downfall by the 24-hour orbiting of the earth by a three-man Soviet spacecraft. Swift progress in the sciences and engineering can be expected to continue. Whether intensified progress in educating all of the Soviet people will result in their demanding greater freedom of action and expression remains highly speculative.

Konstantin Simonov, former head of the Soviet Journalists' Union, novelist, playwright, and poet, quoted to me an epigram of the playwright Anatoli V. Sofronov: "Information is the mother of intuition."

I instantly agreed and asked him how the United States could get more information into the Soviet Union. When would U.S. newspapers, magazines, and books be sold freely in his country? Is there hope that the time will come when the Soviet Government will cease to shut off its people from the free flow of information from the United States and the West?

"An important factor that divides the United States and the U.S.S.R. is the great difference in living standards," Simonov replied obliquely. "Now the gap is decreasing. This makes exchanges easier. We are less afraid now to send our people to the United States. The psychological problem isn't as great as it was. Five or ten years from new, as the gap closes, it will be still easier." Thus he semed to suggest that it will also be easier to reduce the barrier to the flow of information. However, he then went on to say that the freedom of the press as it is practiced in the United States has seved as a damper on the development of freedom of expression in the Soviet Union. Our U.S. press, he suggests, far from demonstrating the values of freedom, demonstrates the evils. He reminded me of Mme. Roland's famous exclamation, "O Liberty! what crimes are committed in thy name!"

I tried to explain to him, as I have at many an international conference, that even though freedom of the press might occasionally involve abuses, it is, on balance, the only possible force that can control its own excesses; that we in the United States did not believe any person or group is qualified to regulate the press; and that diversity of opinion, freely expresed, is our greatest strength.

My trip in May included not only talks with Alexei Adzhubei, then chief editor of Izvestia and a former editor of Komsomolskaya Pravada, but with Nikolai Inozemtsev, foreign editor of Pravada, Nikolai Polianov, a top observer for Izvestia, and Georgi Zhukov, a senior observer for Pravada. However, aside from my dialog with Simonov, I engaged in little discussion of the Soviet press as such. Like every other form of communication in the U.S.S.R., the Soviet press, both daily and periodical, is totally an instrument of party propaganda. As I reported in the 1956 Book of the Year, it is by Western standards, unbelievably dull. I shall not again report on the Soviet press here, nor on literature and the theater which, though they are also instruments of total propaganda, are far less dull. One point, however, is worth noting: because of the absorption of the press with propaganda—and, of course, because of the constant propaganda of the Communist Party, the Komsomols for youth, and the Young Pioneers for youngsters—the schools have been relieved in considerable degree of the pressure to propagandize, and are largely free to concentrate on intellectual development.

As I view retrospect the events of a momentous year, and the talks I have had in the past with Soviet leaders, it appears even more certain to me today than ever before that the struggle between freedom and communism is a battle of brainpower in which all citizens, not merely scientists and engineers, are engaged.

We still do not know what changes will result from Khrushchev's fall from power. More than 2 years ago, Zbigniew Brzezinski, director of the Research Institute on Communist Affairs at Columbia University, said, "It is misleading to assume that Khrushchev * * * would be replaced by a Stalinist successor. The changes that have taken place in Russia since Stalin's death are very profound and Stalinism as a form of government is most unlikely to return."

He recommended that the United States, while yielding nowhere to Soviet pressure, should encourage fraternization of U.S. citizens with Soviet leaders. Exchanges of personal visits, common appearances on television, at some point even good-will visits by heads of state, he maintained, can serve freedom's cause, and "there is no reason why the West could not be the initiator of such contacts and exchanges."

He observed, "Today, the Communist world is facing a mounting ideological debate with many Communists engaging in sincere self-doubt and criticism. The dilemma which many of them face, however, is that there appears to be no alternative to their existing socioeconomic and political system. The West should join in this dialog * * * suggestions should stress the compatability of socialism and pluralism, of national ownership and personal freedom, and should try to stimulate a dialog concerning the future development of Communist societies."

With these views I concur. Indeed, ever since serving as Assistant Secretary of State right after the war, I have been promoting similar ideas. The U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Foy Kohler, recently stressed to me that Soviet leaders, in seeking for more trade and in agreeing to more exchanges of persons with the United States, have at least two objectives in mind: (1) to get as much of our technology as possible; and (2) to give their people and ours and the people of the world the impression that their purposes are wholly peaceful and benign. By contrast, what is our objective? Ambassador Kohler put it simply and well: "To open up the Soviet society." To accomplish this, we must, in my view, seek every form of reasonable exchange with the Soviet Union. We must keep coming back.

President Johnson has committed himself to an intensive personal campaign to break down East-West antagonisms, and he has repeatedly pledged his willingness to go anywhere in the world to discuss policies with foreign leaders when he thinks this will contribute to peace. Clearly he hopes to find new means and to strengthen old means of building "bridges" between the Western democracies and the Soviet bloc and thus permanently easing international tensions. This is a hope that I, and many millions of others in the world, fully share. Indeed, this was one of the major issues on which the American people voted last November. They voted for the effort to build the bridges. But I suspect they share also, as I do, President Johnson's caution. As he has expressed it, "I will keep my hand out, and my guard up."

Dominican Republic: Order Out of Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been most pleased by recent press reports that the Organization of American States has determined to undertake peace-keeping operations in the Dominican Republic in an attempt to help bring order out of chaos in that strife-torn country.

Reflecting the chaotic state of affairs in the Dominican Republic has been the conflicting information which has reached the United States about the struggle there.

I was pleased to note, therefore, a May 21 editorial in the Milwaukee Journal which attempts to untangle the situation somewhat by providing a "cast of principals" in the crisis.

Because I believe this rundown is a valuable reference guide, I include it at this point:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 21 1965]

ON STAGE IN SANTO DOMINGO

Each day's events in the Dominican Republic seem only to add to the confusion. In an attempt to help disentangle some of the recent events, here is a cast of principals:

Juan Bosch, elected President in December 1962, with a 60-percent majority and overthrown on September 25, 1963. Restoration as head of a constitutional government was original purpose of rebel forces. Appears now to have stepped aside. Denies his supporters have ever been Communist influenced as the United States charged.

Donald Reid Cabral, head of the ruling civilian junta when revolt started April 24, presumably because of his intention of shaking up the military high command. Kept in custody for 72 hours, then released. Appears to have had no part in the civil war.

Col. Francisco Caamano Deno, leader of original revolt which developed two factions and turned into civil war. Son of one of former Dictator Trujillo's more notorious army officers. Elected by a rump session of Congress as provisional President with Bosch's blessing and claims to be the legitimate successor to Bosch. United States charged that in early stages of revolt his movement was Communist controlled.

Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert Barreras, head of five man civilian-military junta which calls itself "national government for reconstruction." One of two survivors of plotters who assassinated Trujillo in 1961. Claims "absolute control" of the country and insists he will accept no compromise. Rejects U.S. efforts to form a coalition, saying that to admit Caamano elements into a government would be to let in Communists.

Antonio Guzman, agriculture minister under Bosch. Backed by the United States to head a proposed coalition.

Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, leader in the overthrow of Bosch and participant in Reid's ouster. Set up three man military junta which later was replaced by the Imbert military-civilian junta. Under U.S. pressure, promised to resign from armed forces in a move to reach a negotiated settlement but later changed his mind.

The United States, President Johnson ordered 400 marines to Santo Domingo on April 28 to evacuate American citizens. Troops strength has since grown to more than 21,000. Their activities have tended, successively, to support Wessin, Imbert and now Guzman. The Johnson administration charged about a week after the civil war began that Bosch-Caamano forces were controlled by Communists, but in switching support to Guzman claimed that our intervention had driven Red elements out of positions of influence.

Organization of American States, after endorsing U.S. intervention as necessary, sent a five-man commission to work for cease fire but it has had little success. Group has returned to Washington, charging efforts were undermined by the United States and the United Nations. Its secretary general,

Jose A. Mora, remains instructed to mediate conflict.

United Nations, Secretary General Thant, on unanimous resolution of the security council, sent personal representative, Jose Antonio Mayobre of Venezuela, to Santo Domingo to work for cease fire and peace. Efforts so far appear fruitless.

It is my belief that only time will provide the answers to all the questions which arise about the civil disturbance in the Dominican Republic. The American people know that President Johnson is doing his best to act prudently and wisely in a difficult situation.

Their support has been expressed editorily in a number of papers around the country, including the Milwaukee Sentinel, the Rochester, N.Y., Times-Union and the Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel. Editorials from these newspapers follow:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, May 21, 1965]

KINGMAKING—UNITED STATES INTERESTED IN THE OUTCOME

Whether the United States likes it or not, Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert Barrera, junta president, seems to have emerged as the ruler of the Dominican Republic.

Spurning U.S. efforts to form a coalition government, Imbert is pressing for an unconditional surrender of the rebels. "We have absolute control," he says. "We" must include the American marines, for without their timely intervention the rebel forces might well be the ones claiming absolute control by now. Understandably enough, therefore, Washington is taking keen interest in who will rule the Dominican Republic once order is restored.

Nonofficial reports indicate that the American Government regards Imbert as far from being the ideal one to lead the Dominicans away from the wilderness of communism and into the promised land of democratic freedom.

It is a good time for the United States to reflect a moment on our record of picking horses. Diem offended us, and we quit backing him, at the price of increased grief in South Vietnam ever since.

Tshombe outlived our ostracism to return to the Congo, where he is winning grudging admiration from his erstwhile critics by beginning to bring some order out of chaos.

Imbert, or whoever eventually takes over the reins of free Dominican leadership, may not be all we would like. But it is vain to hope that ideal leadership is to be found. The best we can hope is that the power doesn't fall into the hands of someone who will turn out to be a Castro.

The most promising way to realize this hope would seem to be to quit running down possible leaders on our side or, worse yet, trying to press them into making deals with the Communist-backed side.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, May 3, 1965]

AS WE SEE IT: UNITED STATES ACTS TO BEAT REDS TO PUNCH IN CARIBBEAN

"We are prepared to live as good neighbors with all," said President Johnson in his state of the Union message, "but we cannot be indifferent to acts designed to injure our interests, our citizens, or our establishments abroad."

This sums up the reasons why the President braved a storm of international protests and sent U.S. troops to the Dominican Republic.

The initial reason for this "gunboat diplomacy" was the immediate danger to U.S. citizens. But a broader policy is involved, as Mr. Johnson explained yesterday.

From bitter experience in Cuba, the United States has learned that it is a thousand times easier to prevent a Castro-Communist type of government than it is to get rid of one after it has been established.

The Red threat in Santo Domingo was clear enough to persuade the President of the need for quick, direct action to frustrate those who would use anarchy as a means of establishing another Communist outpost in the Caribbean.

It would be better, of course, if the Organization of American States were able to protect innocent victims of such a rebellion and to prevent a Red takeover.

But it is not. And years of ineffective OAS attempts to get rid of Castro have taught the United States that it must rely on its own resources in this kind of emergency.

Perhaps the OAS will find a means of restoring order and thwarting the Communists in the Dominican Republic. Certainly President Johnson hopes so, for he has quite enough to cope with in Vietnam and elsewhere without still another crisis.

Failing that, however, he has had to choose the best—or more accurately, the least risky—of several distasteful alternatives.

He decided again to serve notice that the United States will not permit its hands to be tied by diplomatic niceties while the Communists fill a power vacuum.

Those who call for a different approach ignore the harsh realities of the dangerous and tense world of today. For if the United States does not act decisively in such cases, it will find itself defeated by forces which have no hesitation in acting with utter ruthlessness when it serves their purpose.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, Apr. 29, 1965]

SENDING THE MARINES

President Johnson's timely action in sending U.S. Marines to protect U.S. citizens in a friendly neighboring country torn by armed strife is well taken—as is his urgent new plea for warring factions within the Dominican Republic to cease fire.

The President ordered the Marines into the island Republic only after new fighting had broken out and Dominician military authorities advised that U.S. military aid was needed to guarantee the safety of American citizens.

The political situation within the Dominican Republic remains unclear. The Dominican Ambassador to the Organization of American States contends efforts to overthrow the Government were the "finalization of Communist plans to make the Domonican Republic a second Cuba."

Although our troops are charged only with the safety of U.S. citizens and other foreign nations who ask protection, perhaps their presence also will exert a stabilizing influence and help encourage the restoration of peace and order among our friends in the Caribbean. We hope so.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

"The Government's Use of Our Dollars"—Statement by Howard C. Petersen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, this week the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations was privileged to receive testimony on economic decisionmaking and national security from the noted banker and lawyer, Howard C. Petersen. Mr. Petersen, president of the Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co., was Assistant Secretary of War in 1945–47, and was special assistant to President Kennedy for trade policy in 1961–62. He is a trustee of the Committee for Economic Development—CED, vice chairman of its research and policy committee, and chairman of its subcommittee on East-West trade.

The state of the American economy and the wise management of the Nation's economic and financial affairs profoundly influence U.S. ability to carry on effective international policies. In a notable career bridging the State, Defense, and Treasury Departments, Howard Petersen has had a rare opportunity to know at first hand the Government's economic decisionmaking process. His review of this process and his suggestions for its improvement will be of special interest to Members of Congress. Therefore, I ask that the statement by Mr. Petersen to the subcommittee, on May 25, 1965, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNMENT'S USE OF OUR DOLLARS

(Statement by Howard C. Petersen before the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations, May 25, 1965)

It is indeed a pleasure to appear before this committee on the general question of Government policymaking procedures. This committee has established for itself an enviable reputation for nonpartisan, objective, and meaningful hearings and staff studies in the area of national security. Your work is highly regarded, not only within Government and academic circles, but also in the business community. We who are in business have respect for those of you who make substantial contributions to the efficiency of the Federal Government—the biggest business of them all. I hope my statement here today will be of assistance in your future work.

I am also delighted that the Senate has expanded your subcommittee's jurisdiction to include international operations and organizations. Efficiency in our foreign relations is certainly as important as efficiency in domestic areas. My interests are largely in the economic aspects of both these areas, and I will confine my remarks to economic policy issues.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ISSUES

Internationally, the United States is faced with one brutal economic fact: the explosion of the world's population. The population of the world today is approximately 3 billion people. The current rate of net increase is about 2 percent per year, which means currently about 60 million additional people—roughly one-third the U.S. population—are added to the world each year. By the end of this century, the world population is expected to be roughly doubled, to approximately 6 billion. This growth, if it continues unabated, will place fantastic demands upon the world's limited economic resources.

The heavy population growth in the United States is not without highly significant impact on our own domestic economy. But—because of our good fortune and our great efforts of the past—we stand in a position of incomparable affluence in contrast to most of the expanding world. However, this very affluence presents a problem as well. It tends to be an isolating force, distinguishing us from the rest of the world.

It is to this international economic challenge and problem that our policies must be directed. We have a responsibility to protect our own economic well-being. We have an equally great responsibility—both morally and economically—to aid the rest of the world in raising their standards of living. We must bridge the gulf of isolation which sets us apart and continue our assistance to other nations in achieving what we have already obtained.

How can we provide assistance to the rest of the world? First, we must recognize the magnitude of the population problem. This may necessitate greatly expanded dissemination of knowledge about birth control methods. Without such control, population growth can overwhelm any other form of assistance we may give.

Second, our assistance—whether by government action, private investment, or trade—in meeting this population problem, depends entirely on the health of the American economy. But the health of our economy has been adversely affected by the chronic balance-of-payments deficit.

I agree with the administration that one of the major causes of this deficit has been excessive outflows of private capital. To curb these outflows, the administration in February instituted a policy of voluntary restraints. These restraints appear to be working; our deficit seems to be vanishing from our international accounts.

But this eradication of red ink does not solve—rather it highlights—our short-run policy dilemma. To meet our balance-of-payments difficulties, we have had to retard the most vital economic link which spans the gulf between our affluence and our neighbors' needs; namely, the flow of private capital with which we can economically grow together. Any cursory student of American economic history knows the essential role which private capital has played in our own amazing economic development. It can perform the same role in foreign lands. Moreover, just as we had to draw heavily on foreign capital in the early days of our own growth, so too do most foreign nations today require our capital to increase their standards of living.

We need no altruism to justify private capital outlays abroad. International investments yield high returns, which are, of course, the clearest evidence of the relative shortage of capital. These are good investments from our standpoint because we acquire profitable assets, we use our own funds most efficiently, and we obtain high interest and dividends. This is a classic case where the marketplace serves as a nearly perfect determinate of policy.

But what of the other side of the dilemma—our continuing balance of payments deficit? This is no more tolerable than the deprivation of capital from capital-hungry nations. To devise adequate policy to meet this dilemma, we must go behind the admittedly excessive private capital flows and ask what caused them. In my judgment, the facts of the recent past are only consistent with one hypothesis: that we have generated excess liquidity by our domestic Government policies.

The fundamental policies, therefore, for our balance-of-payments dilemma must be found domestically. In the recent past, as I will indicate more fully in a few moments, we have followed fiscal and monetary policies designed to bring our domestic economy toward fuller employment. Now, however, we are entering a new stage in our own domestic economic development. It is in times like these that we should begin to apply our powerful fiscal and monetary tools to achieve a sustainable economic growth rate with relative price stability. The weapons that we have to achieve this domestic end also can extricate us from our balance-of-payments dilemma.

In particular, I would mention at this point the applicability of monetary policy tools which can abate the excessive flows of private capital. Since the cost of money will be increased through these policy techniques, investors must take a sharper look at all investment opportunities and reject those which promise relatively lower yields, whether they be in this country of abroad. Investments will be cut back, just as under the present restraints, but only the marginal commitments will be lost and the higher yielding investments will still be made.

Our balance-of-payments dilemma, therefore, will be ameliorated by retaining for foreign countries the supply of capital for the most productive uses and, at the same time, reducing the total outflow of capital.

The interesting facet of this policy from the standpoint of your subcommittee is the employment of market forces to achieve Government policy goals. Our free enterprise economy generates extremely powerful forces, and policymakers within Government should be ever alert to the possibilities of using these forces to achieve governmental objectives. The Federal Reserve could change the conditions within which the investment market functions and this would permit the market itself to determine the restraints on oversea outlays.

These comments are not meant as criticism of the present restraint program. This program has given us time to make other—more basic—policy adjustments. However, one consequence of the present program is that European capital markets have had some of their supplies of funds cut off, with the probable effect of increasing interest rates. Unless we adjust our own interest structure,

the differentials will gradually aggravate the pressures against the restraints.

In the long run, the world's increasing population needs increasing international monetary reserves. This need is twofold. First, nations must have adequate monetary reserves so their domestic supplies of funds can keep pace with their rising demands for capital expansion. Second, increasing monetary reserves are needed in order that countries can participate fully in international trade. These world monetary reserves are made up primarily of gold, dollars, and sterling. These reserves have fallen substantially in recent years relative to the expanding amount of world trade. In 1950, the world's financial reserves for international transactions amounted to roughly 80 percent of world trade. Now such reserves are less than 50 percent.

I will not attempt to project here the ultimate solution to this need, although some policy conclusions can be made. The solution should evolve slowly and as a result of considerable negotiations among many nations. We have already started to move along this route somewhat by our bilateral swap agreements with other nations, by active participation in the International Monetary Fund, and by studies now being conducted among the Group of 10 and elsewhere. The United States certainly recognizes the longrun needs in this area but has been slow in exercising leadership in working toward a solution.

At the same time, we should clearly distinguish this longrun international liquidity problem from our immediate balance-of-payments difficulties. The former is external; the latter is internal. Separate solutions must be found for each.

A number of possible solutions to the longrun problem suggest themselves. Our present bilateral swap agreements might be gradually broadened into some multicurrency international standard with appropriate gold guarantees. More extensive mutual assistance could be obtained among central banks, either directly or through the existing conduit of the International Monetary Fund. Eventually, we may wish to move toward more international centralization of monetary reserves, as several experts have proposed. There are certainly several reasonable possibilities in this area but they need to be explored.

DOMESTIC ECONOMIC ISSUES

Decisionmaking processes on two basic domestic economic issues—in addition to the question of our monetary policy—also deserve discussion. One of these concerns the stabilization of our economic growth on a sustainable longrun trend. Here, the tax policies in our Federal budget are of most immediate significance. The other decisionmaking area involves the efficient use of our governmental resources, which concentrates attention on the expenditure side of the budget.

The specific tax decision which concerns me greatly is the administration's recent proposals for excise tax reductions. I certainly agree with the view that our excise tax structure should be overhauled. These taxes discriminate irrationally among products and therefore distort the consumer decisions which should guide our private economy. These taxes were imposed largely during war time to curb particular types of consumption, and these curbs are as outdated today as gas rationing. Moreover, these excises cut deeply into revenue sources upon which State and local governments must rely for their fiscal independence. Finally, a disproportionate amount of resources—both within the private economy and within government—are necessary to carry the administrative burdens of these excises.

My question here is not on the desirability of ultimate removal of these excises but rather on the timing of their removal. They should be timed to maximize the benefits to the economy, both in terms of removing a discriminatory burden and stimulating the economy. Policy should be aimed in this case to hit two goals with one shot.

Here our experience of the last few years provides an invaluable guide for future policy decisions. In 1961 the Nation was clearly suffering from depressed conditions. The administration—wisely in my judgment—concentrated its fiscal attack on this malady in specific localized sectors of the economy. It first directed attention to the investment sector, because this was the area not only of greatest potential economic growth but also the area which would provide an expanded economic basis for more general future improvement. The investment credit in the Revenue Act of 1962 and the accelerated depreciation guidelines clearly stimulated activity in the investment sector.

Then, in 1963, attention was directed to the general consumption sector where we were suffering from an inadequate aggregate demand. The mammoth dosage of individual tax reduction in the Revenue Act of 1964 was designed to raise our overall economic activity to a level closer to our potential.

As a result of these policies, we now have the type of economic conditions where, by holding Government expenditures down and allowing tax revenues to rise, we can gradually swing from budget deficit to budget surplus and thereby stabilize our economy around a sustainable growth rate. The change from deficit to surplus is a major policy technique for reducing the excessive liquidity which has been plaguing us internationally and which is beginning to disturb us domestically. The principle is exactly the same as intentionally increasing the deficit to increase our liquidity, which we have proven has worked so effectively. Abstention from tax cuts now will place reliance on market forces at the proper time and place us in a stronger position to use fiscal policy in the future.

Incidentally, the abortive grant-in-aid proposals in 1965—which bear the name of the ex-Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Walter Heller—were consistent with this fiscal approach. As we all know from personal experience in our own geographical areas, the unmet demands in the Government sector are largely at the State and local level. The Heller proposals would have allocated a portion of Federal budget surpluses resulting from the previous fiscal policies to the States for high priority Government services.

Instead of permitting the budget surpluses to develop, the administration has now recommended additional tax dosages in the consumption sector. Yet the significant fact evident from the economic signs all around us is that the policies of the last few years have worked. The economy is in generally robust health. The fiscal medicine was powerful; in fact, the most powerful ever administered to the economy. We got our boost when we needed it, and we are enjoying the results. Now we must have the intestinal fortitude not to succumb to the habit. Tax cuts taken at appropriate intervals can be beneficial; tax cuts taken continually can be debilitating. Tax reduction should be held in reserve as a remedy, not injected continually as a stimulant.

The consequence of continuing tax reductions, coupled with a level of Government expenditures in excess of tax receipts, means a further generation of liquidity in an already highly liquid economy. This source of increasing liquidity, along with the continuing easy availability of money from our monetary policies, will serve to continue a short-run growth rate which is manifestly not sustainable over the long run. These policies—appropriate in their time—can generate instability if continued beyond their time.

Our tax policy decisions should be based on our experience. The validity of the tax policy I am suggesting can be proved, I believe, by examining a somewhat longer period in our fiscal past. Since World War II, and especially since the Korean war, we have had a number of cyclical fluctuations in our economy. Our governmental policy during all of these fluctuations except the last was to permit the operation of automatic stabilizing influences which are generated by a steady level of Federal expenditures and a progressive income tax structure. Federal expenditures buoyed aggregate demand in slump times and did not contribute excessively to boom times. Government receipts fell more than proportionately as incomes fell and drained off increasing amounts of income as they rose.

This policy worked too. One proof of effectiveness was the mildness of our fluctuations. Another proof was that we eventually needed to take the policy actions in the 1960's which were a logical extension of—and an implicit complement to—the automatic stabilization policy. As the economy grew, Federal revenues grew more rapidly—as they were designed to—and the consequence was a gradual choking off of our inherent growth rate.

Now we have shifted the gear ratio between changes in gross national product and changes in tax receipts. The result is we can travel at a more appropriate speed. But no law has been passed by Congress repealing the business cycle. We still must design policy to run our course between the Scylla of inflation and the Charybdis of recession.

Our earlier policy of permitting the operation of the automatic stabilizers is appropriate again to keep us on a sustainable, longrun growth rate. Our powerful policy medicine of discretionary tax cuts can—and should—be held in reserve for a future time when economic ills will require them.

I would suggest that the Congress, before accepting the recently proposed excise tax cuts, might well wish to ask two policy questions: (1) in the short run, will these proposals serve to stabilize our present enjoyable rate of economic growth; and (2) in the long run, what Government policies will we employ to combat future recessions if all these discretionary tax reductions are no longer in our fiscal medicine kit?

Some who read these words may, I know, accuse me of inadequate concern for our still regrettably high unemployment levels. As a banker who can obtain more business if more are employed, I am assuredly concerned about the unemployment problem, even if I were not also concerned on social and morale grounds. But I am increasingly convinced—and again the evidence of the last few years seems to confirm this conviction—that (a) excessive dosages of fiscal policy will exaggerate economic fluctuations and thereby lower the average longrun level of employment, and (b) our unemployment is increasingly of a structural nature.

Our economy, in my judgment, has moved forward so rapidly that it is leaving behind an increasing number of those desiring employment. The solution to this problem must be found primarily in specific expanded programs by governments and business designed to train and move potential personnel so they can become contributors to their own—and the Nation's—income. It is wrong to waste such an available and productive national resource. It is also wrong to recognize the malady and then prescribe the wrong medicine just because it tastes good.

As part of these hearings, we must not overlook the economic policy responsibilities of the Congress. I feel strongly that Congress is not provided with adequate analytical tools by which to examine our fiscal policy. One of the inadequacies is the relative concentration within the Congress upon the administrative budget. The justification for using the administrative budget is

that it presents the expenditure figures upon which the Congress must make decisions in the appropriations process. However, the fiscal impact of the Government includes also changes in cash flows which are not part of the appropriations process; for example, changes in social security rates and benefits. The Congress should have some procedure by which individual appropriation and tax policy decisions can be related to the broader measures of fiscal impact such as those shown in the so-called cash budget or the budgetary items shown in the national income accounts.

This brings us to the other side of the fiscal coin: Government expenditure decisionmaking. Here, the businessman can perhaps be most helpful because Government decisions about the level and allocation of expenditures parallel so closely the types of decisions businessmen are in the business of making. The present administration is—in my judgment—to be congratulated for the use it has made of business decisionmaking techniques in determining Government expenditures. My comments in this statement are generally related to the extension of these techniques.

The first ingredient of successful expenditure policy—either in Government or in business—is advance planning. Essentially, this means forecasting anticipated returns and costs. Such forecasting is difficult, and it can never be precise, simply because we never know what the future will hold. These difficulties make guesstimates no less essential. Presumably, the informed judgment of the policymaker meets its ultimate test precisely in this type of planning. His greatest value to his company or his country comes in his mobilization of facts, reasoning, and judgment to plan for the future. He may miss, but if he is competent for his job, the result will be more valuable than having no result at all. No one in a position of policymaking responsibility should be permitted to avoid the planning responsibility.

The most difficult part of advance planning in Government comes in quantifying anticipated returns. In some instances, these can be measured only in social values, not in the dollar values of the businessman's market place. But this is not an adequate excuse for avoiding planning. There is an impressive catalog of Government functions in which at least some dollar measures of returns are available. Just a partial list would include lending and insurance programs, public works, agricultural outlays, subsidies, and many grants-in-aid. Wherever returns can be measured in dollars, an attempt should be made to do so simply in order to isolate—in comparison with cost—the amounts which must be made up by compensation in social returns.

Most of our subsidy programs, especially those in agriculture, can be criticized because they avoid the market place and therefore give us no indication of the true costs of the programs. In many of these subsidies a part of the cost is paid by the consumer in the form of higher prices. To take a crude example, if our agricultural surpluses, in excess of stockpiling needs, were annually placed on open domestic and international markets, we would be able to determine fairly precisely the cost differentials between the prices the Government pays and the prices consumers are willing to pay. Neither the policymaker, the Congress, nor the taxpayer can ever know the economic costs associated with these programs unless market tests are applied.

Advance planning involves the establishment of goals. Simply defining in detail the various targets which an agency is attempting to hit represents an intellectual, informative and indispensable exercise in good management. To analyze efficiency, we must ask what we are trying to do before we assess how well we did it. Our Federal budget—our primary expenditure decisionmaking instrument—has improved substantially in recent years in providing a functional catalog of Government activities. The next step is to indicate the specific objectives of these functions.

Advance planning not only requires insight about individual functions but also forces coordination among functions. In testimony before the Joint Economic Committee several years ago, one witness presented a table indicating some 66 educational programs scattered through 9 separate departments and another 23 programs in 11 other agencies. Precise delineation of objectives provides the only means of obtaining the cooperation and consistency which will maximize efficiency in situations like these.

As this subcommittee knows well from its own past studies, the Defense Department has in recent years proceeded the furthest in these planning techniques. Defense has established functional goals—in effect, types of products which it wishes produced—and then projected the steps toward these goals, including the budgetary cost involved. These projections extend at least 5 years into the future and they are updated monthly. If such decisionmaking procedures are possible in as complex a field as defense, they should certainly be feasible in other agencies as well. This subcommittee would perform a great service to the Nation if it recommended the institution of such planning techniques throughout our Government.

Whenever possible, policymakers should be required to present their forward projections to the Congress and the public. Many new Government programs have been proposed in recent years, and I think it reveals a lack of faith—both in the wisdom of the American people and in the efficiency of our democratic process—when only the first-year costs of these programs are made public. How can intelligent decisions be reached in the Congress or public positions developed when great social objectives are proposed but the future costs are concealed? Insistence upon information about the future fiscal implications of new proposals would significantly improve the operation of our decisionmaking machinery. It should also substantially strengthen the hand of Congress on the decisionmaking throttle.

Associated with the need for forecasting and planning is the increasing use within Government of benefit-cost analysis. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers have used this technique for years in assessing public works, but its potentials have never been adequately considered by other agencies until very recently. The present Bureau of the Budget should be complimented not only for beginning to implement this approach itself but also for insisting upon its use by other agencies as part of budget request justifications.

The genesis of benefit-cost analysis is, of course, to be found in business investment decisionmaking procedures. A firm must attempt to make the closest possible guess of future returns and cost before committing itself to an investment outlay. So too should a Government policymaker before committing taxpayer funds. Any Federal program which involves forward planning should be subject to this type of internal scrutiny. I don't presume to know whether the effect of such analyses will be to justify more Federal expenditures or less, but this is precisely the point. Until we have this examination, we don't know where we are spending too much and where we are spending too little.

Finally, I would urge much more extensive use of electronic aids in Government management decisionmaking. Computers, augmented by recent advances in the general field of operations research, provide fantastic expansion in our ability to handle, organize, and analyze information. These techniques are being rapidly absorbed in business decisionmaking. They are also being incorporated slowly in Government data handling. However, they have been used only to a very limited extent—mostly in Defense—to implement management decisions.

Beyond the obvious applications in the areas of advance planning and benefit-cost analysis, EDP could be used as an aid in many other Government management decisions. One extensive application of computers would, it seems to me, be right here in the Congress. You, gentlemen, have heavy decisionmaking responsibilities, and your scope is both Government-wide and worldwide. The incredible complexity of the issues you face should most naturally lend itself to computer use. In fact, the Congress might well take the lead in employing these techniques and thereby indirectly compel emulation by Government agencies.

I hope my remarks will prove of assistance to you.

Exodus Continues: Low Military Pay Scale Stirring Service Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

EXODUS CONTINUES: LOW MILITARY PAY SCALE STIRRING SERVICE CRISIS

(By James D. Hittle, brigadier general, USMC, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs, Veterans of Foreign Wars)

WASHINGTON.—The United States is facing a military crisis, and this one is not in Vietnam. It's in Washington, D.C. It involves the most basic of all defense problems: How to keep trained, high-quality personnel in the armed services.

As things stand, there is a continuing exodus of the kind of servicemen—officers and enlisted—that we need to man our Military Establishment. Too many of those with valuable experience and skills are doing their hitch, then hanging up their uniforms and heading for civilian life with higher pay and better living standards.

MANY MOONLIGHT

The explanations the departing servicemen give for making the change indicate that most of them bid the bugles goodby with reluctance and even sadness.

"Moonlighting"—taking off-duty jobs—has become a financial way of life for a large percentage of our fighting men.

Last summer an Air Force survey disclosed that 71,000 in that service supplemented their income with outside jobs. Close to 1,000 of these were officers.

Apparently, moonlighting doesn't always pay the bills. Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has charged that, "5,000 Air Force personnel are receiving some form of relief benefits for the poor." Qualification for such benefits is an income below the established poverty level.

MARINES FEEL PINCH

The marines are feeling the pay pinch, too. A recent survey of marines in the Washington area revealed 32 percent are holding outside jobs.

Retaining skilled NCO's is an increasingly difficult problem. Marine Corps Commandant Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr. disclosed that "in some areas we are forced to maintain our combat readiness with only 40 to 50 percent of our requirements."

Uniformed personnel experts say that not only is military pay low in itself, but it is also far out of line with civilian pay. Since the end of the Korean war military pay scales have been permitted to drop far behind the faster rising Government civil service and private industrial rates.

SIDE BY SIDE

This has resulted in situations like this: Skilled, highly trained military technicians, working side by side with civilian contract employees, being paid almost half what the civilian is getting for identical work. Little wonder that when his enlistment is up the serviceman shifts to civilian status and pay scale.

The chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, has introduced a bill that would raise service pay close to 11 percent. He says such a raise is long overdue. President Johnson has proposed an average 4.8-percent boost for personnel with 2 or more years of service.

In the meantime the Army Times is for extending the food stamp plan for welfare and low income families to military commissaries.

Memorial Day Should Be Time for Honoring the Memory of America's Heroes—West Virginian William E. Archey Offers Helpful Thoughts on Significance of This Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Monday, May 31, will be Memorial Day 1965. It is a time of pleasant holidays and recreational travel for millions of Americans, but for each of us it should also be a time for reflection.

On a hundred battlefields, American fighting men have given the last full measure of devotion in order to preserve the way of life which we enjoy. Their sacrifices have bought freedom for the United States. It is appropriate, therefore, that we pause on this occasion to consider the turmoil which besets the world, and to ponder our role as citizens in gaining the long-sought goal of lasting peace.

We echo the words of William E. Archey of Sherrard, W. Va., who in 1952 wrote the following lines:

We pray for nations, to live in peace,
for them, to do Thy will;
God bless our land, our flag so grand,
May it endure, 'till time stands still.

Now, in a letter just prior to another Memorial Day, Mr. Archer offers additional poetic praise for those who have died in the defense of liberty. He writes that we owe a special tribute of respect to the memory of President John F. Kennedy who fell in service to our country. He points out that Mr. Kennedy's life should be an inspiration to all for the betterment of mankind in an atmosphere of selfless devotion to the public good.

Mr. President, I commend William E. Archey for putting into words these thoughts that are in the hearts and minds of so many of us as we approach another Memorial Day.

Pay—Or Get Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, herewith an editorial from the Aurora Advertiser for May 19, 1965, which pretty well sums up thinking based on letters received from both union and nonunion members of that district over the recent weeks. To this might be added the checkoff system of deductions from pay for political education. If there ever was taxation without representation, and usage of such fees for parties and persons other than the choice of the individual from whom the fees were deducted, it is in current big unionism controlled by bosses of questionable lineage as far as true representative elections are concerned.

Secondly, the question of placing big union organizations under the antitrust laws and applying these principles to the NLRB with equal representation for those who provide the jobs, as well as those who fill them, is of vital concern and could well be added to the analogies drawn by the editor of the Advertiser.

I commend the article with its sound, logical, basic, righteous, and down-to-earth thinking to all colleagues:

PAY—OR GET OUT

There is no doubt about it, everyone in a community benefits from the activities of its churches, and one would not even consider moving to a town which had none.

Yet, though all share in the good achieved by the churches, many citizens do not pay their fair part of the cost of operating them. So how about a law which would require everyone to contribute—or get out of town?

Similarly, all merchants, all service establishments, all professional men, share in the achievements of a town's chamber of commerce. When a chamber of commerce does something to improve a city's economic welfare, members and nonmembers alike have a chance to get in on the profits.

Yet not all firms are members, and some who are do not kick in with as much cash to pay the bill as others of similar size. So how about a law which would require that all join and pay their fair share in dues or close up and get out of town?

On the face of it, one can argue the justice and desirability of such ordinances, and they do seem logical, provided one considers individual liberty of no value, and if one believes that the right of personal choice isn't worth raising a fuss about.

Too, if citizens of a town had no choice about contributing to the churches, and if all churches were to share in the take according to some formula, one might raise the question as to whether or not deacons or boards of elders might not adopt methods and measures which they wouldn't dare adopt if members were free to support the church or not, and the possibility that the churches, assured of such support, might not work as hard to do effective work.

And, concerning the chambers of commerce, there would seem to be a chance that compulsory membership by all businesses and offices might create a temptation for the board of directors and the manager to become little dictators, and the incentive to do a good job in order to maintain the membership and financial backing might be lessened.

Well, something exactly parallel to this is being asked of the Congress by a President paying a political debt to the leaders of organized labor, a debt which, in the light of the election results, need not have been incurred.

President Johnson has asked Congress to repeal that part of the Taft-Hartley law which permits States to enact laws which ban the union shop. Some 19 States have such laws, and the threat of enactment of similar legislation in other States has done much to keep big labor leaders responsible.

The union shop plan makes it compulsory for an employee to join a union and pay union dues to keep a job after he gets it. He can pay up or get out. Unions argue that this is fair because all workers share in the benefits of union bargaining, and that if a man works in a plant he should pay dues to the union which represents the workers in that plant, or be fired and replaced by someone who will.

If one agrees that everyone in a town should have to contribute to its churches whether he wants to or not because all share in the benefits of churches; or if one thinks that it should be compulsory for every business or professional establishment join and pay dues as set by a board of directors of a chamber of commerce because the things achieved by the chamber help all business and offices, one can probably go along with President Johnson's demand for repeal.

But if one believes that workers are not faceless members of a mass; that a union should have to sell itself to prospective members by doing a good job for its members; that no one but an employer should have the right to hire and fire; that the working man and woman should have some protection against labor bosses; and that a man or woman should have the right to pick the organizations to which he or she belongs—then one should get behind efforts to retain a provision under which the working people of America have made more steady economic progress without giving up essential freedoms than those of any other country in the world.

And one might point out that compulsory membership in unions, and compulsory payment of dues which are actually taxes, is an essential and universal feature of industrial life in every totalitarian country in the world.

We hope that, having made the gesture to pay his political debt, that President Johnson will not apply pressure on what seems to be the most rubberstamp Congress in our history into carrying out his suggestion. Or, that if he does apply pressure, that Members of this Congress will muster the courage of the one which refused President Roosevelt's demand for the right to pack the Supreme Court, a refusal which not only protected American freedom, but also made Roosevelt a much better President than he would have been had he been handed everything for which he asked.

The Problems of a Dairy Producer—Letter from Lorry I. Madsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, during the 20 years I have had the privilege of serving in the U.S. Senate, I have visited with, and heard from, many farmers and ranchers from North Dakota and across the Nation. At the present time, the situation our farmers face is becoming particularly acute. In recent months, many of the leading farmers in North Dakota have been in contact with me and have discussed these problems and pointed out possible solutions.

One such farmer leader is Lorry Madsen of Wheatland, N. Dak. In a recent letter he does, I believe, an excellent job of outlining the problems he faces as a dairy producer. Particularly important is the information he includes regarding the cost of producing milk. As he points out, he is presently receiving only $3.50 per hundredweight, while the cost of production, including a reasonable profit, totals $5.40 per hundredweight.

Since his letter outlines the cost-price squeeze which our farmers are experiencing, and because this is a matter of national concern, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEATLAND, N. DAK.,
May 15, 1965.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: I am a grain and dairy farmer, farming 1,040 acres and milking 65 cows the year around.

You know, as well, or better than I do, what our costs are today and that our prices we receive are the same or lower than they were 25 years ago, and I appreciate all you have done to try and make it possible for us to make a go of farming. I know it is hard to get any helpful legislation, when so many legislators aren't interested in the farmer anymore and even the farmers themselves can't agree, so I have practically given up for much help through legislation.

We would greatly appreciate your support to the major resolutions recommended to the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee recently by the National Milk Producers Federation which does represent a large majority of milk producers. The dairyman is in a very hard bind and I'm afraid if we don't get consideration somehow soon, I hate to admit this but we will no doubt be on the poverty list for help.

I am enclosing figures which show how much it costs us to produce 100 pounds of milk and if you add a 5-percent profit we should receive $5.40 per hundredweight for our milk but we only get $3.50 per hundredweight.

A lot of people say, "Well, why don't you quit dairying," that's a good question, and there is a lot selling out, but when you have just spent $40,000 in buildings, equipment, and cattle, you have hopes things will get better so you don't have to take such a loss on the cattle and let the buildings set idle.

I will enclose a pamphlet published by the Independent Bankers Association which I think explains what low farm income does to the whole economy, very good.

I do hope you will see fit to help carry through the resolutions recommended by the National Milk Producers Association the best way possible.

Sincerely,

LORRY I. MADSEN.

HOW MUCH DOES IT ACTUALLY COST TO PRODUCE MILK?

Estimates range from a low of $3 to a high of $9 per hundred. Figuring on a business basis: depreciation, interest on investment, labor and management, etc. Figures by R. C. Morton, manager, educational department, Ralston Purina Co. Feed cost was amended from $288.40 per cow to $214.30. Labor from $1.25 per hour to $2.75.

Cost of producing 100 pounds milk in a 40-cow herd averaging 12,000 pounds 3.6 percent

Feed:	
Grain ration, 4,100 pounds at $56 ton	$114.80
Hay, 3 tons at $20 ton	60.00
Silage, 4 tons at $6.50 ton	26.00
Pasture	13.50
Total	214.30
Labor and management, 70 hours at $2.75	192.50
Buildings and equipment depreciation and repairs	37.00
Cow depreciation, $300 value at freshening milking 5 years, cull value $140	32.00
2½ percent death loss	8.10
Interest on investment:	
Cow	300.00
Buildings	200.00
Equipment	100.00
Total	600.00
Plus 5 percent	30.00
Breeding fees	7.00
Veterinarian and medicine	14.00
Milk testing	6.00
Supplies	9.00
Lights, water, and power	8.00
Automobile, tractor, and truck	9.00
Insurance and taxes	2.00
2½ tons bedding at $5	12.50
Miscellaneous	10.00
Total	591.40
Value of calf	20.00
Sold 11,640 pounds (3 percent of milk lost by spilling, mastitis, etc.)	571.40
Cost to produce 100 pounds of milk	4.90
Average cost to deliver milk to market, hundredweight	.25
Total cost	5.15
5 percent profit	5.40

Labor View of Politics and Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, during the past week the President in his labor message has given us his recommendations for amending our basic laws with regard to minimum wages and hours, our system of unemployment compensation, and our national labor-management policy. I am sure every Member shares my desire to give the fullest consideration to all of the arguments and points of view on these proposals.

In this spirit I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent speech by Mr. Joseph D. Keenan, the very able secretary of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Mr. Keenan began his working and union career as an apprentice with a telephone company and grew to maturity in the construction industry as a leader in his union and in the service of his country. In World War II he helped mobilize the manpower which built our secret atomic bomb plants which shortened that terrible struggle by many months and saved many lives. After the war, he helped reorganize the democratic trade union movement in Western Europe as an effective force limiting Communist influence in that vital area of the world.

Mr. Keenan, in his speech to a Chicago conference of IBEW members, points up the labor movement's acceptance of political action as an indispensable means of safeguarding the collective-bargaining process and of expressing the labor movement's concern for the education, health, and living conditions of the American worker and the American people. Mr. Keenan speaks plainly and personally of labor's attitude and, under consent granted, I include his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

TEXT OF SPEECH BY JOSEPH KEENAN

Chairman MURPHY, brothers and sisters of the IBEW, my subject this morning is "Politics and Legislation," and I want at this time to thank you telephone workers for the part you played in the election results last November. We know that we have done a great job and we are now planning a program for the "payoff" so to speak.

I have been active in this political field since 1948. I happened to be in Germany when the Taft-Hartley Act was passed. I can well remember the morning when news came that Congress voted to override President Truman's veto of the Taft-Hartley Act. I was walking down the streets of Paris and ran into the man who was the counterpart of the president of our American Federation of Labor. He started to ridicule the labor movement in America, but I tried to make the point that, in America, things can happen this way—that the pendulum could swing both ways. I told him that I was not a bit concerned about the labor movement in America, that this would excite us and bring us to the peak of shape we should be in to take on a fight.

When I came home later in the year to attend the American Federation of Labor Convention, I stopped in New York and spent some time with Harry Van Arsdale and some of the other leaders in New York and they were talking about setting up an organization to defeat those people who were responsible for the Taft-Hartley. I came to Chicago and found the same sentiments. I then went out to California to the convention and there were 62 resolutions calling for action by the AFL to set up an organization to try to repeal the Taft-Hartley law. In that convention, all of these resolutions were lumped together and a resolution adopted calling for the executive council to set up a permanent political organization. At that time, I was secretary of the Chicago Federation of Labor and I received a call from George Meany and George Harrison

asking if I would take on the job of coordinating the new organization as far as the Middle West was concerned. We made the arrangements and shortly after that I was called to Washington and asked if I would take on the job temporarily of administering the new national organization.

In 1948 we started out under a hopeless set of conditions. It was a 30-to-1 shot that Truman would be defeated and everyone felt that whoever the Republican candidate was, he was a cinch to be elected.

With that hopeless set of facts, we started to move. And things got better and I would say that in 1948 the American labor movement probably produced more finances for candidates than any other single group in the country, and it wasn't very much. I can well remember some of the days with Truman when they had to hold the train in order to get money to pay in advance so it could operate.

The year 1948 was the beginning of politics as far as the American Federation of Labor was concerned. Before that we had been working on a rather nonpolitical basis. In 1940 I was called to Washington by the federation to serve as a representative on the National Defense Council. I went to Washington, and I can tell you, if it wasn't for American labor I doubt if we would ever have been able to win the war in 1945.

One of my earliest assignments was to Corpus Christi, Tex., where the Navy had selected a site for an air base. It was a sandy, hilly area located near the water. It was a sight to see the people being dispossessed, with trucks hauling their furniture out the front door and the wreckers demolishing the structures.

There was a call for construction workers. When this was known, we were still in a depression and thousands moved into the area. There was no housing whatsoever, but people made the best of it and went on to complete the job in record time.

In all sections of the country, sites were selected and there began the building of plants for the manufacture of guns, airplanes, powder plants, shipyards, small arms plants, tank plants—in fact all of the facilities necessary to build the weapons to carry on an all-out war. In every case, conditions were the same as we found in Corpus Christi.

I well remember a visit to Las Vegas where they were building a magnesium plant in the desert 25 miles from the city. Here also there were no housing facilities. People pulled up in their cars. Some brought packing boxes for shelter. In most cases they lived in their cars and stretched a blanket from the cars on poles for shelter. You can just imagine what kind of family life a person would have, especially with small children, but there were no complaints. There was a job to do.

When the size of the program was realized, every branch of the Government was seeking skilled mechanics to complete the work. The only source for this manpower was the skilled mechanics developed by the building trades and the metal trades unions of our country. It was from this source that the nucleus was formed to train the hundreds of thousands of people needed.

Firms that had been operating nonunion came to the union to sign a contract in order to get the manpower necessary to carry out their contracts. The sources they used to operate before 1940 were quickly dried up and their work was regulated so that they never expanded beyond their needs.

I also remember a call to the Pentagon in 1943 asking us to get 200,000 to 300,000 men to build the plants that finally came out with the atomic bomb. We were told on that day that the enemy had the formula and that we were starting from scratch. There was a billion dollars to be spent in the first go-round, but the point that sank into my head was—Secretary Patterson said that whoever was able to control this equipment would win the war. That was the race, the race against time, for the first detonation of the atomic bomb. It probably shortened the war a couple of years and probably saved the United States and Canada 1 or 2 million men. The record gives the answer. We won the war because of a free labor movement.

We furnished the Seabees; we furnished the engineers; and when the war was over and bouquets were being given out, I thought American labor would get their share of praise and receive some consideration for what had been done.

I can say this without fear of contradiction, if there was ever one group in this country that contributed to the very end of the war, it was the working people of this country.

And afterwards I went over to Germany in 1945, just before the surrender, to make arrangements to try to set up an organization to find the old democratic labor leaders and reorganize the trade union movement in that country.

The war ended on August 8, 1945, and we went back to normal. We had people unemployed; we had controls of all kinds; we had a scarcity of everything; we had black markets up and down the country—so the whole working population of our country became dissatisfied. It caused unrest and strikes and 1946 was a pretty difficult year.

Our opposition was very clever. They built opinion against us; they created a nightmare and a bad image. We went into the 1946 campaign and candidates all over the United States were seeking help against their drives. And many Senators and Congressmen were beaten in that election by 500, 600, and 1,000 votes. If we had had a few of those votes in the 80th Congress, we probably could have sustained Truman's veto of the Taft-Hartley Act. The point to remember is that the Taft-Hartley Act was passed under these adverse conditions and with discontent everywhere.

So we have been in politics ever since and we will have to continue because I am sure that in the future, our position—the strength of the labor movement in our society—will be tied to our influence as far as politics is concerned.

They may say we are selfish, but as I have told you many, many times, the American labor movement as such is today the American people's lobby. We are about 15 to 18 million strong in a working population of about 70 to 100 million. And I'm sure that the day has gone when we can entirely meet the needs of our people through bargaining between our employers and ourselves. Your corporations are getting larger and larger every year. They are more difficult to handle. Today, we have four or five large corporations that take the position you either take it or leave it. That is not a very healthy situation; because, when it is take it or leave it, we can only go the next step—trouble and strike. So we have to stay in politics.

COPE has done a great job—COPE and LLPE—since 1948. We still have a tough time getting some of our local union officers and members interested, but I can say to you that whatever benefits, whatever gains we are going to get are going to be measured by our influence at the polling place.

Up until a few years ago we were satisfied to hold a few mass meetings, to hold a few local union meetings, bring in some speakers, and make a speech—and generally speaking, about half were impressed and about half were not impressed whatsoever. They made no effort to carry out a program, and that is understandable. And as long as we had the mass meetings, the political leaders weren't very much concerned.

But when these leaders find our members working in the precincts and when they find them gaining knowledge of what our legislative program is—improved payments on unemployment compensation, better social security, better workmen's compensation, better help for the elderly—all these things affect them in one way or another, and enlightened, they want to know about their votes.

If the Congressmen and Senators know that you understand what is being discussed in the Halls of Congress, they then will concern themselves and they will listen. On the day of the vote, he will remember the people who work and vote for him who are affected by this legislation. I am sure that we will make an impression and I am sure that we will protect our unions and, most of all, we will protect the American people.

We are continuing to carry on a nationwide program to see that every member, all the members of voting age in every family in our brotherhood, are registered. I would like to have you take advantage of the action of the last convention and set up a registrar in your local union. I can't be too strong, I can't be too urgent on this question because we can see the change already.

And so much for precinct politics.

I suppose the most important piece of legislation that we are concerned with is 14(b). We would like to have 14(b) repealed in order to do away with the restrictions in those States as far as union shop and maintenance of union membership are concerned.

We have every assurance that we have the votes to pass it, but I am a little concerned in the delay. The right to workers are organizing their biggest letter campaign. Now that they have failed to have their way at the polls, they are falling back on a crash program of letter writing and telegrams in an effort to sway Members of Congress who are committed or favorable to repeal.

This 14(b) argument has been raging across the country for nearly 17 years now. And as people have learned that it is an antiunion measure they have turned against it at the polls. In California in 1958 such an antiunion shop referendum was whipped good. The same year Ohio voters overwhelmingly defeated the advocates of a right-to-work law and the fight cost John Bricker his Senate seat. After the election he said his support of the right-to-work law in the campaign was an error which was forced on him by too-eager employers. The people also rejected right-to-work proposals in 1958 in Washington State, Oregon, and Colorado. The only place we lost that year on this issue was in Kansas. And last year in Oklahoma, where right to work was thought to be a shoo-in, it was defeated last May by a combination of farm, labor, and Negro groups.

I believe that we should now do in Washington what was done in Indiana and what will be done in the State of Iowa. And I think the quicker it is done, the better.

We are concerned with the minimum wage, although I don't think our Brotherhood is affected in any way. We may have some trouble on this, but personally I would like to see about 6 million more people come under the minimum wage. There are about 12 million people in this country today who are making less than $1 an hour. Some way, somehow, we must find a way to bring them to at least the national minimum.

There are about 9 million families in this country where the breadwinner is making less than $3,000. Now I don't know how they are able to maintain a family. There are thousands and thousands of families in this country who, if the breadwinner works 8 hours, must have supplementary relief in order to maintain the family.

I happen to be on the Federation housing committee and I have had occasion to visit the slums where these people live in order to get evidence to go before Congress to get additional appropriations to clear the slums. I would say, in many sections of the country, these hovels and these conditions are

not very different than you would find in the hells of Calcutta.

And we have many, many other legislative obligations that we are going to support. First of all, we have Appalachia. A person has to go into West Virginia, southern Illinois, and Kentucky where the mines are closed, where the people are staying with nothing to which to look forward, and see the conditions in which they are living. I can recall a statement that Shriver made in the course of his visit down into West Virginia. A young girl came up to him and he asked her what he could do, and she said: "All I want in this life is a husband with a job."

In some cases there are about three generations that have been on relief, continually, without a job.

We have other programs we are interested in—we are interested in housing. We would like to see the housing program expanded and the American Federation of Labor-CIO support the Housing Act of 1949 whose aim was to have a decent home for every family in the United States. The AFL-CIO follows that program 100 percent. From time to time we will write you and ask you to write your Congressman and Senator to support a housing bill when it is brought to the floor of the Congress.

The next is education. We would like to see the day in this country when every child has the chance of exploiting every bit of ability he has. We know that, because of the lack of finances of many families, children have had to drop out of school and it is impossible for them to exploit what they have. We know that there are thousands of scientists and physicists that could be developed if they had the chance for education.

We are going to get a great deal of opposition, but the labor movement must make the fight to make money available so that every family, no matter what circumstances they are in, can send their children to high school and college. This will in some way offset the gain the Russians have on us to date.

Another very important piece of legislation is urban renewal. There is hardly a city in the United States that doesn't need to be rebuilt. We are trying to get an appropriation so we can rebuild these cities. There again, a great many people will get a great deal of that work, especially the outside men. All of these things that we talk about are for the good of the Nation because they create work. I might say that for every urban renewal dollar there are more hours of work in it than in any other dollar that is spent in this country.

We are all concerned in one way or another with medical aid for the aged, and they are trying desperately to defeat it. I believe that there is not a man in this room who is not making some contribution to some relative who has reached that age in life they cannot take care of themselves and they need medical aid. We have supported the medical aid program through social security. I believe that it is sound to have taken out of our pay a certain percentage of money while we are able to work and have it set aside so that we can draw on it when we come to retirement age. I know fellow after fellow that I worked with in Chicago who have been thrifty all of their lives and set aside a nest egg and then before the time their retirement was due, either they or their wives are stricken with a serious ailment. You know that if you are together 30, 40, or 50 years, there is nothing that you would not do to try to preserve the life of either one. They spend their whole life's savings in the course of a year or less. Help must be given such people at that time in life and we support the legislation 100 percent.

We are also concerned about what is going on in Vietnam. We are concerned about what is going on in Berlin. We are concerned about what is going on in Africa.

We realize that we cannot live alone. Today we are part of a world community and we are in this position where we help determine whether we will have a free enterprise system or a Communist or totalitarian society covering the world. We support military aid to the democratic countries and the American Federation of Labor also spends about a quarter of its income in trying to develop free trade unions in all the countries around the world, hoping that we can get them to join together as a force to offset and hold back whatever gains the dictators are making.

We are 100 percent for aid to underdeveloped countries. I know people are saying, "I don't know what we are doing, throwing our money down a rathole, sending money into these countries where it is being exploited and wasted." I can only compare it with an insurance policy. Year after year you buy automobile insurance. You may never have an accident, you may never get a scratch on your car, but as sure as you are born, the day that you don't buy the insurance, you have an accident and pay far and away the cost of the insurance. To me, aid to the underdeveloped countries is just an insurance policy. We spend $3 or $4 billion a year for aid, but 1 day's war or 1 week's war in this modern age would cost $1 to $5 billion—so you can make the comparison. And if there is a world war, we will have to supply most of the wherewithal and manpower.

This is part of the role American labor plays today, and most of our own members know nothing of it. But I know that the greatest force in this country to preserve our American way of life is the American labor movement.

I get quite concerned when we are attacked on every side. Show me a country in the world where a dictator or a dictator government has moved in and you will find that the first group that they must control or destroy are the trade unions. They have to control or destroy all forms of democracy.

I can only say, in closing today, that our international will join with other organizations in making this fight right down the line. We will fight first to make a better life for everyone, and secondly to get relief from Taft-Hartley.

Commonsense tells us that as long as we have a large segment of our population ill fed, ill clothed, ill housed, living in dire poverty, we have something with which to be concerned.

History has proved that the abuses of the centuries force people to organize and unite in order to set up a common front to correct such abuses. The AFL-CIO is in the main the organization in this country destined to help these people in every possible way.

I call on everyone to continue the fight to make a better life for the people mentioned above, and further to do everything possible to bring about a better life for the underprivileged people all over the world.

A Journey of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the St. Petersburg, Fla., Times indicates that perhaps the best weapon we have against communism is the good, simple American.

One such American, Dr. Alfred P. Seminario, an orthopedic surgeon from St. Petersburg in my district, put a dent in Communist influence in Africa as a volunteer with Project Hope.

"HOPE was a magic word with the people," Dr. Seminario reports after his 2-month tour with Hope in Conakry, Guinea.

HOPE's biggest impact, however, is on the nation's medical education system.

During Dr. Seminario's tour of duty, for instance, the SS *Hope's* medical staff conducted 3 clinics a week, with each of the 25 volunteer doctors on the staff examining from 30 to 50 patients a day and selecting the most serious or most instructive cases for treatment or surgery aboard the white hospital ship.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this account of Hope in Africa merits the attention of my fellow Members, and I ask that the Times article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Mar. 30, 1965]

DUTY IN GUINEA GIVES SURGEON NEW SENSE OF VALUES—A JOURNEY OF "HOPE"

(By Sam Mase of the Times staff)

"I've never had such a desire to work—to take advantage of things we have. It gave me a new sense of values."

That is what Dr. Alfred P. Seminario, St. Petersburg orthopedic surgeon, says happened to him as a result of an experience he will never forget—a mission of mercy on the good ship *Hope* in the poverty-stricken Republic of Guinea in Africa.

"We complain because our air conditioning isn't working. They have practically nothing. The people are like zombies. They are unemployed * * * they have no purpose in life. When I took strolls at night in Conakry (capital of the Republic of Guinea where *Hope* has been based) I would see hundreds of homeless sleeping on the sidewalks," he said.

Project Hope (health opportunity for people everywhere) was created by Dr. William Walsh in response to an appeal from President Dwight D. Eisenhower for an international people-to-people program.

Dr. Walsh talked the Navy into giving him a reserve hospital ship, which he converted into a floating medical school. The good ship *Hope* responds to the call for help from underdeveloped nations eager for knowledge to ease the suffering of their people.

The ship's staff includes about 25 physicians, surgeons, and dentists who volunteer their services for brief periods. Dr. Seminario joined the ship when it began its mission at Conakry last October. He spent 5 weeks there before he was relieved by another volunteer orthopedist.

Dr. Seminario describes sanitary conditions in Conakry's hospital: "The lowest in the world. There was filth and dirt all over the hospital, and because there were no screens, flies were everywhere." Therefore, it became one of Hope's missions to teach sanitation as well as medical techniques.

The infant mortality rate in Guinea is one of the highest in the world, due to lack of sanitation, medical supplies, and know-how, he said.

During Dr. Seminario's tour of duty, the medical staff conducted 3 clinics a week, each of the 25 members of the medical staff seeing from 30 to 50 patients each day. Those who were to be treated or operated upon were selected from the clinics.

"Hope was a magic word with the people. Those treated were very grateful."

Dr. Seminario sees the work of Hope as a powerful weapon against the Communist

efforts to win backward nations. He also praises the work of the Peace Corps.

"I was surprised to see a lot of Peace Corps personnel there (in Conakry). And they are doing a beautiful job. Some of them are teaching the natives English; some are teaching technical subjects."

Summing up his reaction to service with Hope, Dr. Seminario says, "This, to me, was one of the most gratifying things I have done in my life."

Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as one who introduced a resolution condemning further persecution, acts of terrorism, and confiscation against the Jews in the Soviet Union, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a similar resolution which was acted upon by the New York State Legislature:

RESOLUTION

(Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to condemn antisemitism in the Soviet Union and to take steps to prevent further persecutions of, and acts of terrorism and confiscation against, Jews residing therein)

Whereas the people of the State of New York and of the United States are deeply shocked by reports appearing in the press and elsewhere concerning the continued oppression, persecution, and tyranny of the Government of Soviet Russia directed toward Russian Jewry residing in Soviet Russia; and

Whereas many acts of terrorism, confiscation, and persecution have already been committed against such Jewry and even more serious acts are threatened; and

Whereas such acts have resulted, unjustly and unwarrantedly, in the confiscation of property and in the deprivation of rights, privileges, and immunities possessed by the Jewish people in that country; and

Whereas the Government of the United States because of its humanitarian interests in the various peoples of this country and their interest in and relationship to the persecuted Jews of Soviet Russia, should register emphatic protest with the Russian Government with a firm request that it should cease and desist in its program of persecution; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has on other occasions intervened and interceded in behalf of persecuted minorities in other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the Senate concur), That the President and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully memorialized to condemn antisemitism in the Soviet Union and that the Secretary of State of the United States of America be and he hereby is respectfully memorialized to lodge an official protest on behalf of the Government of the United States with the Russian Government against the concerted attack presently being continued directly and indirectly, by the latter government toward Russian Jews residing in such country and that the Department of State be and it hereby is respectfully memorialized to employ its best diplomatic efforts in an attempt to persuade the Russian Government to desist from any further persecutions and acts of terrorism and confiscation complained of in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved (if the Senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Secretary of State of the United States and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to do everything possible to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the assembly.

JOHN T. MCKENNAN,
Clerk.

Concurred in, without amendment by order of the senate,

GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,
Secretary.

Presidential Work and Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in the May 15 edition of the Washington Post, staff writer Edward T. Folliard assesses the characteristics which have enabled President Johnson to bring such unparalleled zest and enthusiasm to the most awesome job in the world. To my colleagues I commend Mr. Folliard's article:

PRESIDENTIAL WORK AND PLAY

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Lyndon B. Johnson is not the first President to battle furiously to take over the White House only to become disenchanted with it as a place to live.

All of his predecessors in this century have managed to get away from the historic mansion for varying periods of time—Calvin Coolidge for as long as three months every summer.

Mr. Johnson differs from the others in this respect. When he talks about going to his ranch in Texas, he says that he can get more work done down there. He has even arranged to use an office in Austin, Tex., 65 miles from the LBJ Ranch. He never talks about going to Texas for recreation or relaxation.

There are two possible explanations for this. He does not realize that the American people, most of whom are on a 5-day week, expect their President to take it easy occasionally, or—and this seems more likely—he has never learned to relax in the ways of his predecessors.

President Roosevelt, early in his first term, used to go to Campobello and sail a boat with his sons. Later on he would use a cruiser to take him to blue water so that he could go after sailfish. In the war years, he went to his Hyde Park estate in upstate New York nearly every weekend, leaving Washington Friday and returning Monday.

F.D.R. had work to do at Hyde Park—no President ever escapes work entirely regardless of where he is—but he went there because he wanted to go there and because he felt that it was good for him to go there.

President Truman used to go to Key West twice a year—in the early winter and in the spring—besides taking frequent breathers at his home in Independence. Wherever he happened to be, the Missourian took that early morning walk. That was for his health. For relaxation, he played poker, and there were some mighty games in Key West.

Mr. Truman also had a liking for bourbon, and this and his poker playing led some of his fellow Baptists to scold him on one occasion. The great majority of Americans saw nothing wrong with his outings at Key West, although they sometimes smiled or frowned at pictures of his loud beach shirts.

President Eisenhower used to enjoy long vacations in Colorado, fishing in the Rockies or golfing at the Cherry Hills Club in Denver. He did, that is, until he was hit by a heart attack in 1955, after which he would go to Palm Springs, Calif. He used to spend long weekends at Gettysburg, too, and got in more golf there.

The American people did not mind this at all; indeed, they seemed pleased when they learned that Ike did his own cooking in the Rockies. There was proof that they didn't mind in the 1956 campaign. The Democrats charged that he was a "part-time President," but he won by a bigger landslide than in 1952.

The voters seemed to be saying that they would rather have Ike part time than Adlai Stevenson full time.

President Kennedy was very conscientious about his job. Just the same, he made sure he stayed in shape with long weekends on Cape Cod in the summer and with a sojourn at Palm Beach in the winter. He loved to swim and sail, and to play golf when an old back injury was not bothering him.

President Johnson likes to tell of some advice that he got from an oldtimer when he was a freshman on Capitol Hill—something about the lawmakers being divided between "show horses" and "workhorses." Anyway, he became a workhorse on the Hill, and he remains one at the White House or Texas or wherever he is.

He doesn't play golf, at least he hasn't played for a long time. He doesn't fish and he doesn't play poker. He reads only for information. He doesn't seem to be interested in the theater and watches television only for news.

Photographs showing Mr. Johnson astride a horse at his L.B.J. Ranch may suggest that he spends a good deal of time in that fashion. But he doesn't. When he goes to Texas, he spends most of his time working and usually he has Cabinet officers and other officials down there working with him.

Is this good? Wouldn't it be better for the 36th President—and also for the country—if he gave more time to recreation and relaxation?

The average American probably would say "yes" to these questions, and, if given a chance, would advise Mr. Johnson to take it easy occasionally. But he happens to be a man for whom politics—that is, the art of government—is both a vocation and an avocation.

Test Pilot W. L. (Lou) Everett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the recent tragic death of a courageous and talented test pilot who was involved in development of a revolutionary new aircraft occurred amid circumstances which afforded a maximum of publicity.

This accident occurred on April 27, 1965. A review of data on this aircraft indicates that it is a sound flight con-

cept and that the plane should be further developed as a valuable addition to our air strength.

The U.S. Army, General Electric Co., and the Ryan Aeronautical Co., have made an intensive investigation of the plane's integral systems and its performance data previous to April 27. The conversion from fans for vertical flights to jets for horizontal flight had been made by these planes more than 1,000 times. At the time of the April 27 failure, the pilot was checking the cockpit prior to converting the aircraft from conventional jet flight to the fan-powered mode used for vertical flight and hovering.

The plane involved had logged more than 36 hours of flight time requiring 45 conversions from fans to straight jets.

I share with the Ryan Co., and the family and friends of W. L. "Lou" Everett their sense of loss, and with the rest of the Nation deeply appreciate the contribution to the future of America's aircraft development that his career represented.

The Courts and Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more difficult every day to fight the battle against obscenity and pornography, and one of the principal reasons is the attitude of the courts. There was a time when we could have laws to protect the innocent. But in this modern age such laws, when enacted by the Congress and/or local legislative bodies, are struck down by the courts in their zeal to protect the "rights" of those who would corrupt our youth and our society for the sake of the almighty dollar.

One more example of this attitude on the part of the courts is outlined in the following editorial appearing in the Catholic Virginian recently, which discusses the recent ruling of a Richmond circuit court judge that Virginia's motion picture censorship law is unconstitutional:

[From the Catholic Virginian]

THE BEST CENSOR

A Richmond circuit court judge's ruling upsetting Virginia's motion picture censorship law apparently is going to make it next to impossible, for a time at least, to keep obscene movies off the screens of the State's theaters.

Judge John Wingo Knowles, following the ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court in a similar case involving Maryland's censorship law, ruled that Virginia's act is enforced unconstitutionally. It places unconstitutional prior restraint on film distributors and does not give them speedy relief in the courts.

Neither court struck down censorship itself. In fact, the Supreme Court suggested Maryland might change its law to make it conform to the Constitution.

Virginia could and should do likewise. An effective censorship law is needed.

The Richmond Times-Dispatch, commenting editorially on Judge Knowles' ruling, said:

"Some persons say that regardless of the legal aspects, the censoring of movies should be abandoned in Virginia. Frankly, we, and many other Americans, are sick of the filth with which the public is being flooded today in books, stage plays and movies. Trying to stem the tide may be like trying to stop the flow of the Mississippi with a spoon. But maybe even a gesture in this direction serves a purpose in letting the pornography peddlers know that somebody is concerned about what they are doing to the minds and morals of Americans—and especially to young people."

The question of giving Virginia an effective censorship law in harmony with the Constitution addresses itself to the general assembly. Quite probably, the legislature will be asked to make such changes as are necessary at its 1966 session.

It would probably be the middle of 1966 before a new censorship law with teeth in it could become operative. In the interim, a lot of filth could be splashed on the screen in Virginia.

All of which points up the fact that the best censorship is the individual conscience rightly formed. The Legion of Decency provides closer screening, probably, than most censorship boards.

Unfortunately, some films are not submitted for review by the legion. Moviegoers, as a result, must be alert to the unrated films.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is very discouraging and I suppose the filth peddlers hope we will just give up. But the battle can be won, and it will be won, by an alert and aroused citizenry who will insist on adequate legal measures to solve this serious problem.

Martin Luther King on a Tightrope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly clear to many Americans that the great advocate of civil rights, Martin Luther King, is in fact a disciple of conflicting causes. While supposedly supporting increased freedom for his people at home, his public pronouncements continually echo the Communist line whose victory can end only in slavery for all Americans.

Some of us warned a long time ago that the agitator of violent demonstrations and the defiance of law and order possessed two faces. Now others are worried about where he may be leading his well-intentioned, but unsuspecting followers. There is every indication that one of King's chief supporters, the occupant of the White House, may be losing some of his admiration for the self-styled saviour.

The following column by Holmes Alexander from a recent issue of the Montgomery Advertiser points up some of the problems of the King-Johnson relationship:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DISPATCH

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Dr. Martin Luther King is somewhere in the revolving door between the vestibule of power and the great outdoors of White House disfavor.

There is persuasive information that President Johnson regards the voting rights bill as his last legislative obligation to the Negro revolutionaries whom Dr. King leads, and that the Nobel Peace Prize winner may find himself on the pavement for reasons assigned, such as:

Dr. King still stands under the thunderous indictment of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who called him a continental liar, and it's very difficult for anybody to be simultaneously registered in the good book of Mr. President and the bad book of Mr. Hoover.

Dr. King has publicly deprecated the President's war policy in Vietnam. L.B.J. is apt to be touchy on the point which the Negro leader makes; namely, that we can't afford to support both a war against communism and the war on poverty.

Finally, Dr. King has not fully renounced his shoot-from-the-hip plan for a leftwing boycott of southern industries and products.

Dr. King, in fact, begins to resemble Dr. Nemesis to the Johnson administration. He embodies just about all of the possible disasters which could befall the Great Society and tarnish its record in history, not to say its reelection chances. The catastrophes which the Democratic future watchers most fear are three in number.

No. 1 dread is that the protests against the ground fighting and the air bombardments in Vietnam will reach serious dimensions on the homefront. The President has smashed down most of the opposition he encountered in the Senate. He has been able to keep the big, powerful, pacifist newspapers from treating him the way they treated Barry Goldwater for taking the militant line against communism. But recent street demonstrations which President Johnson had a chance to witness from the White House windows clearly called for harshness against Alabama but softness toward communism in Asia. A marriage of minds, performed by the Reverend King, between the Negro radicals and the peacemongers could breed real trouble for the administration.

No. 2 dread is of domestic lawlessness. The proposed doubling of the District of Columbia police force (following a report which showed violent crime in April 1965 up 25 percent since April 1964) dramatizes the rise of the criminal classes during the Johnson Presidency. It is no longer altogether uncouth to note a connection between the crime rates and the Negro population. A State Governor, holding a Washington press conference, dropped a heavy remark about "nonviolent brickthrowers" with particular reference to some of Dr. King's followers. There is no doubt that Dr. King can give the administration the kind of long hot summer it hopes to avert.

Lastly, Dr. King's threatened boycott, although currently in abeyance, is a threat to the national prosperity in which the administration places so much reliance and pride. Mississippi, one of the Southern States on Dr. King's target chart, has just dispatched a trade mission to Europe with the blessings of the Commerce Department. There is a certain amount of breathholding here for fear that Dr. King's international reputation as a "peace" spokesman may cause trouble for the Mississippians who will be peddling Mississippi products in West Europe.

Right now it's hard to tell whether Dr. King is coming or going through the revolving door.

America, the Citadel of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the excellent programs sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary is its Americanism program. A part of that program is an essay contest conducted in the schools of the State. The title selected this year was, "Americanism, the Citadel of Freedom." The winning essay for the 10, 11, and 12 grades was Miss Pam Widner, of Westby, Wis., and I submit for the consideration of the Members and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the prize-winning essay by Pam Widner. I am proud of the excellent work of this young lady and also of the work of Bill Hasse, of Cazenovia, Wis., whose essay won second place. I hope this recognition will encourage a continuance of this activity by the American Legion Auxiliary and stimulate additional interest in the program among young Americans.

AMERICA, THE CITADEL OF FREEDOM

(By Pam Widner, Westby, Wis.)

What an emotional picture this phrase brings to the minds of Americans. Stirring sights and scenes of past and present America. The red, white, and blue "freedom" flag, the cracked Liberty Bell, Francis Scott Key composing during the heat of a battle while looking at "Old Glory."

A hot, stuffy room where several learned men bitterly discuss and argue over a document which begins "We, the people—." Later, more discussion and argument. This time the subject of attention is called a Bill of Rights. It has to do with the basic freedoms demanded by the States, and again the word. Wars. Men dying to preserve the freedoms they have established—men dying to preserve the country where these freedoms flourish. Development and growth of a nation. An expanding nation of men and women of high ideals and values.

We think too, of the thrill of cheering a gigantic missle as science endeavors to further the borders of freedom. The satisfied and grateful feeling when your contribution to medical research have conquered another enemy of society. The accomplishments and graves of great leaders who have devoted their lives to the preservation of American liberties.

These symbolic footnotes to history are familiar to us all. Not so many of us, however, consider and reflect the most important freedoms that we sometimes tend to disregard and take for granted. But what would happen if we could not go to church of Sunday morning; we could not have Easter and Christmas; if there would be no hope of being saved? Suppose the government regulated all transportation and checked all mail—even letters to your loved ones. Your daily newspaper and news magazines would all give the same views. Or perhaps your children were taken out of school after eighth grade or maybe high school—what about the college you had intended for them? How would you react to curtailing all political activities? No fundraising organizations, nor convention, nor election days.

It's a staggering thought, but many peoples of the world live—rather, exist without even knowledge of such things. A highly organized secrecy machine? No. More correctly a military control system—control of everything. And still such people are complacent. How can you be dissatisfied if you know of nothing better. Only an ugly memory of things much worse. Yet we complain, we criticize, we improve.

This system of freedom was not propounded to be perfect. Very prevalent today is the Negro problem, the Appalachian problem, the query of foreign policy. But ours is fashioned from the greatest political ideas and successful government ideals of the centuries. It is a slow, complicated process; and intricate system, yet so much better than any other form of control it is hailed as the beginning of modern world democracy.

The American system puts the governing power in the hands of its people. They fought and died for the right to do so. They expanded and nourished its growth. They now continue to preserve and improve it. Americans, accept thankfully your responsibility to uphold and protect your America—citadel of your freedom.

Kudos for L.B.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, when going through a backlog of newspapers from my district recently, I was very pleased to come across an editorial from the April 27 issue of the Fresno Bee which so aptly expresses my own admiration for the astuteness and abilities of President Lyndon B. Johnson that I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues and request permission to have it printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

L.B.J. HAS HISTORY WORKING FOR HIM

President Lyndon B. Johnson has every right to look back upon the first months of the present Congress with more than a pinch of self-satisfaction. Up to now, it has been pretty much of a Johnson show.

He already has won a public aid to education program and has signed it into law. He is assured of Federal programs for hospital care for the aged, tied to social security. He will get an expanded war against poverty bill. Congress has made it clear, as well, it will give him a voting rights bill—the only question being when and in what form.

Moreover, Congress is sympathetic to his urgings for legislation to attack water pollution, to buy up park lands for the people, to beautify the countryside, to rewrite farm programs, to assault cancer and heart disease, to turn to that long overdue job of rewriting the Nation's immigration laws, to encourage the arts, to create a more realistic presidential succession statute. These and others.

The Johnson magic is working.

The President has certain things working for him which are indispensable to winning congressional support.

The most important, perhaps, is momentum.

Many of the programs for which Johnson is winning support are based on ideas expressed years ago and which are just now beginning to take hold. For instance: The concept that education is more than a local district concern, it is a national concern; the principle that none of the aged should go without medical attention simply because they have no bank accounts; the fact that despoliation is a national crime against the people as well as against nature; the conviction that poverty is more than a city or a county or a State concern—that it is a social concern and therefore a problem for the general society.

Think back for a moment to the hours of past American Presidents, particularly to Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman and John F. Kennedy, and their urgings for programs geared to the people's needs where they live, and Johnson's urgings sound greatly similar.

All have fn common a broad concern for the people and through the people for the national good. It would be pleasant to include Dwight D. Eisenhower among these but it would not be faithful: He had no less an affection for the people, but he differed sharply, in his attitudes, on means.

Unpleasant Necessity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, editorials recently appearing in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram and the Fort Worth Press concerning Presidential action in the Dominican Republic present commentaries well worth general reading.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the two editorials referred to:

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Press, May 3, 1965]

UNPLEASANT NECESSITY?

Sending U.S. forces to the neighboring Dominican Republic was an act of necessity. We may deplore the necessity, but we cannot deplore the action. President Johnson's prompt decision illustrated the courage of commonsense. The action had to be swift, or not at all.

There are signs that some members of the Organization of American States are unhappy with this action. But the United States merely did what the OAS could and should have done, had it been equipped. If the action had awaited time for the OAS to go through its usual mumbo-jumbo, it would have been too late.

The urgent issue was the rescue of Americans whose lives were in danger. That is a first duty of the American Government in any situation. Rescue of other nationals who wanted to leave, including even some Dominicans, could be nothing more than an act of mercy.

President Johnson says the disorder was being pushed by Communist elements.

The Western Hemisphere cannot tolerate any more Castros in its middle. Whatever is necessary to prevent a Communist takeover in any American country, big or little, ought to be undertaken in self-protection for the whole area, especially the countries of Central and South America.

The United States already has announced it is prepared to "transfer its responsibility to the OAS at the earliest possible moment."

The sooner our forces can leave the better Americans will like it. But we will not leave U.S. citizens, or other innocent victims, to the mercies of mob rule, whether inspired by local ruffians or more sinister elements.

Until then, the whole hemisphere should have but a single, prayerful hope: That some leaders in the Dominican Republic can estab-

lish a stable, non-Communist government, capable of keeping order—and quickly.

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, May 5, 1965]

MONROE DOCTRINE REVIVED?

President Johnson may have revived the Monroe Doctrine in a new form in two addresses about the trouble in the Dominican Republic. He told a television audience that "the American nations cannot, must not, and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere."

Later, he spoke at a Washington meeting of the Legislative Council of the AFL–CIO Building Trades Department and said that "we don't propose to sit here in our rocking chair on our folded hands and let the Communists set up any government in the Western Hemisphere."

When President James Monroe made his famous pronouncement he was warning European nations against attempting to extend their governmental systems in the Western Hemisphere. President Johnson was talking of communism, and he attempted to make it a hemispheric declaration. His success in that attempt will be judged by the support he receives from other American nations.

There is much more reason now than in the time of President Monroe for hemispheric participation in a warning, backed by force where necessary, against extending in this part of the world a system which by the public pronouncement of its leaders has a purpose of promoting revolution in non-Communist countries, with a view to eventual world domination.

A great hindrance to hemispheric cooperation in this matter is the just and proper opposition to any interference by one nation in the affairs of another. This opposition is right. The principle of noninterference is sound, and it ought to be observed. Sometimes, though, the attempts to observe it are self-defeating. They are self-defeating when they condemn as intervention, and sometimes prevent, an action to defend against intervention.

The United States has been showing more military muscle lately in some places where it ought to be shown. It still, however, has not taken the diplomatic offensive at some times when it should not be on the defensive against charges of intervention. Instead of defending its intervention in the Dominican Republic, the United States could have led off with intervention charges against Cuba and, directly or indirectly, against the Soviet Union and Peiping, China. If charges of intervention were placed where they belong and the evidence produced, there would be less reason for Latin American states to look with distrust upon an action by the United States to defend the hemisphere against intervention.

Somehow or other, if the American states hope to protect themselves against intervention, there has to be a way of doing something about it.

Colonel O'Meara and the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration has quite properly become one of our greatest Federal institutions and its important role in the daily lives of many millions of our men, women, and children is understood and appreciated by too few of our people.

One of the most efficiently operated Veterans' Administration regional offices in the United States is the Hartford, Conn., office which is under the direction of Col. Edward W. O'Meara with whom I have had the pleasure of working for many years. I was delighted to read in the May 18, 1965 edition of the New Britain, Conn., Herald, an article by another old friend, Arthur E. McEvoy, managing editor emeritus of the Herald, who in his capacity as "The Observer" brought home the fact that the Veterans' Administration today is the biggest business organization in the United States and detailed its broad and vital services.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the laudable performance of Colonel O'Meara and of the Hartford regional office in its dedication to the administration of an established program of humanitarianism, I attach herewith the text of Mr. McEvoy's column, "State VA Part of Largest Business Firm in United States":

THE OBSERVER: STATE VA PART OF LARGEST BUSINESS FIRM IN UNITED STATES

(By Arthur E. McEvoy)

Twenty years after V–E Day and, the end of World War II the Veterans' Administration, through its Hartford office, is disbursing more than $70 million annually in Connecticut to administer many programs for the benefit of men and women who were in the military service in two world wars and their dependent survivors.

In the new Federal Building in the capital city, around which the activities of the VA in Connecticut revolve, many functions affecting the lives of ex-GI's, their widows and children are carried out by the staff of Col. Edward W. O'Meara, regional manager.

SERVICES LISTED

These include compensation payments, pensions, educational allowances, grants to paraplegic veterans of $10,000 toward building or buying a home and benefits to widows and minor children. The extent of the transactions may be visualized by the number of checks issued in April. In that month chacks went to 42,479 living veterans and 13,973 to widows, widows and children or children alone. Of the latter figure, 6,582 went to the World War I account and 6,401 to World War II beneficiaries.

In a display case in the main corridor of VA regional headquarters is a newspaper article saying "Today, the biggest business organization in the United States is not General Motors or A.T. & T. but the Veterans' Administration. Veterans and their immediate families comprise almost half the total U.S. population and the VA has some 22 million 'customers' in its active files."

UNIQUE SYSTEM

The Hartford office has records of 235,000 of the 350,000 veterans in Connecticut. In a forest of steel cabinets are their military history, data on medical examinations and treatments as well as two-way correspondence. A unique filing system installed as an experiment for possible use throughout the Nation enables members of the staff to find a folder enclosing any veteran's record with a minimum of time and effort.

Specialists fill many posts in the Hartford office. A tour discloses the desks of physicians, lawyers, construction experts, occupation experts, loan administration agents, insurance underwriters and accountants, a cross section of the professional fields. Other employees vital to the operation are Flexowriter operators, stenographers, distaphone operators. In addition are many requiring special skills or understanding.

GOOD MORTGAGE RISKS

In the Loan Guarantee Division are approximately 95,000 mortgage loans which the office has guaranteed amounting to about $1 billion. "Evidence of how our veterans have taken care of their mortgage obligations is indicated by the remarkably low loss ratio which is three-tenths of 1 percent." said Colonel O'Meara, adding, "This, I think anyone would say, is an extraordinary record."

Versatile machines speed the work and make possible swift handling of an enormous amount of business transacted. By means of a telecommunication system about 520 messages are sent out monthly and about 525 received. The office can and does speak with all VA installations in the country through a series of relays.

SUPERVISES ESTATES

The mail desk handles about 70,000 pieces of mail a month, 40,000 incoming and 30,000 outgoing. Of those received about 7,000 are processed by a mechanical locator index that looked to this writer like a small scale ferris wheel. A push of a button brings within reach of the operator's hand the addresses of many thousands of veterans in the State.

Many unanticipated problems are handled by the chief attorney's office which also exercises supervision over estates amounting to $9 million of some 6,300 incompetent veterans as well as beneficiaries and minor children.

During the fiscal year 1964, $72,500,000 was expended in Connecticut to carry out various functions of the regional Hartford office. This undertaking was accomplished by a staff of 118 whose working space and appurtenances occupy 30,500 square feet, the entire first floor of the Federal building.

Colonel O'Meara, who heads this big operation, is no stranger to New Britain. He was the first manager of the social security office in this city.

Biennial Awards Meeting of the Americans for Constitutional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, last evening in the city of Washington, D.C., the biennial awards meeting of the Americans for Constitutional Action was held. Present were the officers and trustees of this body dedicated to preservation of the Constitution of the United States, and their purpose was to award the biennial certificates to Congressmen of both Houses who, in their opinion, had supported legislative measures sustaining, strengthening, and defending the spirit and principles of the Constitution as defined by the Founding Fathers of our Republic.

Many fine words were spoken by Adm. Ben Moreell, chairman of the board of trustees, but I thought in these days when we are considering the reorganization of the Congress, that the words of the president of Americans for Constitutional Action, retired Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, U.S. Army, were particularly apropos. They are:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am greatly honored this evening to be associated with Admiral Moreell, Governor Edison, and other

members of our board of trustees in representing Americans for Constitutional Action. We speak for the thousands of our members throughout the country who are here in spirit to honor our distinguished guests.

The deep and single-minded concern of Americans for Constitutional Action is the election of constitutional conservatives to Congress. We think that the Congress is the very heart of constitutional government. It is the basic branch in our Government of divided powers. Congress can pass laws over a Presidential veto, it can impeach a President or a Supreme Court Justice. The Constitution does prudently divide the powers of Government, but it places the ultimate responsibility upon the representatives of the people in the Congress.

Today, the Congress is challenged by the emergence of a new force in our national life, the political party. The political party bridges those divisions of the governmental power so carefully incorporated in our Constitution. Its interests are to unite the legislative, executive, and judicial powers in service to the party.

I do not suggest that the political party is an evil influence, but only that it is a dangerous influence. It is natural and right that men and women of like mind should be associated in their political endeavors. It is essential, however, that all such associations be subordinated to the fundamental law and spirit of the Constitution. The evil grows when men place their allegiance to party above their allegiance to the Constitution.

Individual Members of Congress cannot alone withstand the pressures of our powerful executive branch. Only the Congress as a whole, conscious of its own responsibilities and aware of the encroachments of the executive and judicial branches, can act effectively to protect its Members from the executive power.

Congress is not an effective body today. It does not protect its Members from the executive retribution.

We honor tonight those Members of the 88th Congress who persevered in their dedication to the Constitution they were sworn to uphold. Like the Greeks at Thermopylae, they hold a redoubt which is vital to the survival of our country. We applaud their vision and courage and we summon all of our people to rally to the noble cause which they so ably serve.

The Great Society Is Not for Indians—Indians Ignored in Great Society Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in a column which appeared in the Gadsden Times of Gadsden, Ala., on May 23, Paul Harvey reminds us of the indifference of the social planners and the architects of the Great Society to the plight of the American Indians.

There is more than a little hypocrisy in the constant beating of the drums for the alleged injustices against Negroes while we complacently allow discrimination, denial of civil rights and abject poverty to exist for the Indians.

I include Mr. Harvey's column and commend it to you for careful study:

THE GREAT SOCIETY IS NOT FOR INDIANS

There's nothing "great" about the Great Society to the American Indian.

His poverty is unimproved and unnoticed. He is as discriminated against as ever.

Nobody is speechmaking or demonstrating in behalf of the American Indian though his constitutional rights are contradicted, and, for many, the economic need is desperate.

Certainly there are enough Federal employees assigned to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We are supporting one bureaucrat for every 30 Indians.

Unemployment nationally is about 5 percent. Unemployment among reservation Indians is 49 percent.

The average American lives to be 62. The average Indian dies at 42.

A diet of cornmeal, flour, rice, beans, lard, and cheese make one paunchy, but not healthy.

A dozen sleeping in a one-room shack is the kind of deprivation we bleed over in Asia and ignore in our own midst.

The Constitution specifically guarantees the rights of "every person * * *."

Yet tribal lands, property, and assets are administered by the Great White Father in Washington.

Further, in much the same manner which the American Negro has found repugnant and intolerable, the American Indian has been denied "equal" employment opportunities.

This stench gets stirred up every few years, but nothing comes of it because the Indian represents only 380,000 votes and many can't, won't, or don't vote anyway.

The American Association of Indian Affairs has urged President Johnson to make a personal inspection of impoverished Indian reservations as he personally inspected Appalachia.

The Association's President, Alden Stevens, specifically urged the President to witness the underprivileged Americans on any of a dozen reservations.

The Sioux at Devils Lake, North Dakota.

Or Rocky Mountain Reservation, Montana.

Or the Shoshone-Bancock Reservation, Fort Hall, Idaho.

You will hear much from the Department of Interior about the "mutual help housing program" for Indians. But the larger issues of discrimination in employment, widespread deprivation and second-class citizenship which characterizes their minority society goes unchallenged and unchanged.

President Johnson has acknowledged that "our Indian people suffer more from poverty today than any other group in America * * *."

So, since "everybody" recognizes the injustice and the need, the conclusion is inescapable:

Our much-vaunted compassion for the rights of minorities is nine parts hypocrisy as long as we continue to exclude this minority from our Great Society. Five hundred years is patience enough.

Now you know why the Indian says "Ugh."

Cross-Florida Barge Canal—Boom to Defense, Economy, Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on July 23, 1942, legislation authorizing the construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal was approved, based on a sound recommendation by the Corps of Engineers. The Engineers testified to the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors:

The value of the barge canal in time of war, together with the prospective benefits to be anticipated in normal times, is sufficient to warrant its construction.

A decade later, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in a memorandum to President Truman, said that the project "will provide an additional and shorter line of communication between the gulf coast and the east coast and would thus reduce exposure of shipping to submarine attack."

Just 10 years after that statement, Chairman Carl Vinson of the powerful House Armed Services Committee, wrote:

The proposed Cross-Florida Barge Canal has great defense potentialities.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell the House that the Cross-Florida Barge Canal is now being consrtucted and funds have been approved by the Congress for the initial construction, which is proceeding at both ends of the 107-mile canal near the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico.

The Corps of Engineers have reported that the canal is economically justified, and this justification is improving with the discovery and development of a large phosphate mining area in north-central Florida. The canal will not only be of prime importance to the national defense of our country, especially in these critical time in the Caribbean, but it will help the economic development of the whole country.

Incidental to the defense and economic factors, the Cross-Florida Barge Canal will also open up large new recreation areas, as pointed out by the following article from the Florida Times-Union, written by Russ Oleson:

[From the Florida Times-Union, May 19, 1965]

CHECKING WITH THE PRESS BOX

(By Russ Oleson)

Pleasure boaters in northeast Florida are going to have whole new avenues of thought and activity once the Cross-Florida Barge Canal is opened to traffic.

Along with the construction of the 185-mile waterway from Jacksonville to Yankeetown will be the development of multiple recreation and conservation areas.

From deep water in the St. Johns River near Palatka to deep water in the Gulf of Mexico near Yankeetown is a distance of 107 miles. Corps of Engineers officials said the canal will be 12 feet deep the majority of the distance with a bottom width of 150 feet.

In a description of what is being planned the canal authority of Florida has given us a preview of what is to come with "long-range and almost unlimited boating possibilities foremost and probably the easiest to foresee at this stage of canal development.

"Literally hundreds of pleasure craft will be able to cross from one coast of Florida to the other on the same day, collectively or individually, and travel a protected waterway. This activity alone will cause, through necessity and demand, the construction of off-canal marinas and overnight facilities. For both pleasure and commercial craft this cross-Florida route would be a saving of 611 miles by the Florida Keys and 356 miles via Okeechobee waterways."

Local clubs have voiced an interest in cruising the canal once it opens.

T. T. Cox, commodore of the Jacksonville Outboard Club, said his group has discussed the possibility of cruising the waterway but

termed any plans premature since the opening is still far off.

"We no doubt will cruise the canal," Cox declared, "and it would probably come off as a 3-day trip, possibly over a Fourth of July or Labor Day outing.

"We probably would put in at Palatka and cruise the 107 miles—that would take us a little over 4 hours actual running time and then add time for going through the five locks that will be on the strip. All in all, it would be a full day's trip," he added.

POWER SQUADRON READY TO GO

Henry Kuehn, safety officer of the Jacksonville Power Squadron, said his group also has discussed cruising the canal.

"It will be something new and interesting," he said. "No doubt we will be using it."

Commodore Joe Flynn of the Gator Outboard Club said his group will schedule trips, probably annually, on the canal. Other clubs in this section of the State which probably will use the waterway include the Fernandina Beach Boating Club, Orange Park Outboard Club, plus groups in St. Augustine, Palatka and others.

"At this stage of the construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal ($17,321,935 in construction work awarded through early 1965 and an additional $12,540,000 planned in fiscal year 1966 for a total of nearly $30 million) it is still too early to pinpoint specific marinas, swimming beaches, boat trails, camping sites, or fishing grounds," the canal authority said.

"But all parties involved, chiefly the Federal Government and the State of Florida, represented by several bodies, are unanimously pledged and obligated to develop multiple recreation and conservation areas," it added.

Some 285 miles of new shoreline will be added within the State along with 30,000 acres of surface water.

So it is evident much land and shoreline for countless parks, camping areas, swimming beaches and fishing areas will be added.

OKLAWAHA PORTION TO BE SPARED

The report was specific to point out that "the Oklawaha River below Rodman Dam (near St. Johns River) will remain as it is, its scenic pleasures untouched and even more valuable because more will be able to enjoy them."

The Oklawaha River is a favorite cruising stream of many boating clubs in the State because of its natural beauty and interesting course.

Gene Brown of the Corps of Engineers said last night the target date for completion is scheduled in about 7 years, "depending upon how fast Congress appropriates the money each year." It will cost an estimated $158 million.

"Five of the one hundred and seven miles have been completed," Brown declared. "We have eight contracts underway valued at $17,346,702, including two for navigational locks, one costing $5.5 million and the other $5.6 million.

"The St. Johns lock is 5 percent completed and the Inglis lock, on the gulf coast side, is just started—the St. Johns lock will cost $5.5 million. Each will require about 2 years to complete.

"Other locks will include Eureka lock and dam, Dunnellon and Silver Springs," Brown added.

Two miles of the canal are now navigable from the St. Johns River to the site of the St. Johns lock, 7 miles southwest of Palatka near Stokes Landing and a portion of the west side of the canal, also is navigable.

President Lyndon B. Johnson has requested $10 million for the barge canal for the fiscal year starting July 1. Brown said if Congress approves it the money will be used to start work on Rodman Dam and on the Eureka lock and dam.

Crime Is the Blight on the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, no matter how its cause is justified or how sugar-coated the sociologists try to make it, Washington is a crime-ridden city. The streets are not safe at night. In fact, daylight muggings, robberies, assaults, and rape are commonplace.

I do not enjoy pointing out these facts. Every American citizen loves Washington, not only because it is the Capital of our great Nation, but also because of its natural beauty, its historic shrines, its hallowed traditions. But the brutal fact is that it is being taken over by the criminal element and good citizens must live in daily fear. The only way we can change this situation is to face the fact, admit our failure to deal properly with those who commit crime, and return Washington to the peaceful, law-abiding city of beauty and inspiration it once was.

The national writer, Andrew Tully, in a recent column in the Montgomery Advertiser, reminds us of things we who live and work in the Washington area know to be true.

His column follows:

NATIONAL WHIRLIGIG

(By Andrew Tully)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation's Capital is making its annual appeal to the citizenry to come one, come all, and see Washington first, and I am for that because I have enjoyed a long love affair with this city. But folks, be sure to bring your own bodyguard.

Washington is a dangerous city these days, and not only for southern mayors seeking midnight excitement in Negro neighborhoods. Given a choice, I would prefer finding myself strolling along the Singapore waterfront after dark than trying to manage three blocks of Pennsylvania Avenue in search of a pack of cigarettes. Capitol Hill at 10 p.m. holds far more terror than a helicopter hop over guerrilla positions in Vietnam.

Blood in the gutters: Headlines in Washington newspapers tell the story daily: "Women Beaten and Robbed," "Youths Slay Liquorstore Owner," "Policeman Killed in Holdup." If the District of Columbia had a government instead of a Congress, it would plead with President Johnson to send troops.

J. Edgar Hoover has put it bluntly. The FBI Director reports that crime in the United States since 1958 had gone up five times faster than the Nation's population. He asserts that citizens of Washington, New York, and Chicago cannot walk the streets "without being mugged, raped, or robbed." And he has put his finger on one of the major causes for this situation, to wit, the tendency of the courts to pay more heed to the rights of the criminal than to the rights of the law-abiding citizen.

Confess—and go free: Washington's courts, which sometimes seem to fill the role of ex officio defense counsel, have been particularly idiotic in this respect. One of many examples was provided the other day by the U.S. court of appeals which reversed a manslaughter conviction on the grounds the defendant's rights had been infringed.

In a 2-to-1 ruling, the court held that the defendant had been subjected to unfair treatment by police because he had been questioned for 5 minutes before he confessed to the crime. It ignored the circumstance that the defendant confessed in his wife's presence after the two had conferred privately.

This reversal, like so many others, was based on the so-called Mallory rule which struck at the ancient and improper police practice of working over a suspect in a back room to force him to confess. But in approving a Federal rule of evidence, Congress had no intention of making it virtually impossible for police to interrogate a suspect. Nor did Congress suggest that a voluntary confession be thrown out merely because of a delay between arrest and arraignment.

MOST ARE REPEATERS

Hoover, in testimony before a House Appropriations subcommittee, noted that a study of persons arrested in 1963 showed that 75 percent had records of previous arrests. This figures. A suspect who cannot be subjected to reasonable interrogation is a lead-pipe cinch to walk out of jail and commit another crime.

I am sorry for kids who never had a chance and so wind up slugging gas station attendants or mugging old ladies. After their first offense, they should be given a chance to go straight. But judges should take a realistically dim view of second and third offenders, who by Hoover's figures are the real threats to law and order. That lady hurrying home after a movie has some rights, too.

Federal Government and Illinois Partners in Crime and Vice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to tell the Members of this House how the Federal Government and the government of the State of Illinois are partners in filth behind a false front of morality. I refer to the fact that gambling remains illegal in Illinois so that it may be the preserve of the mobs who thus finance their many criminal ventures—including the political protection that keeps all varieties of crime and vice free from extermination. Illinois all-stifling crust of crime is the illegitimate offspring of gambling, by government, although this is one case where it is the sire who is receiving the support money.

To me, Mr. Speaker, it is disgusting that our Nation and States can be so ignorant of the cancer that immature government antigambling legislation has allowed to grow in the tissues of our body politic. The extent of this web of filth is fantastic.

Last year, the parimutuel turnover in Illinois came to $425 million. Testimony before the McClellan committee pegged off-track betting $50 billion annually, as about 42 percent of illegal gambling, making the Nation illegal gambling total about $120 billion. On a population basis, Illinois would have $6.6 billion of this. No wonder Illinois is a

dream come true for the mob. They get 10 percent of the gross turnover. The people of Illinois have no one to blame but the duly elected State and Federal Governments who allow gambling to remain illegal and uncontrolled.

Only government controlled and regulated gambling will take essential gambling revenues out of the slimy coffers of the underworld. Until then, the State and Federal Governments will be partners in drug syndicates and prostitution rings just as if those governments were consciously bankrolling perversion and filth. This cocomplacency in crime has made the two governments joint financers of filth, joint fingers on the Chicago killer's trigger or addict's dope needle.

I urge my fellow Members of Congress to mobilize themselves in favor of government-run gambling so that they may overcome this cruel perversion of the relationship between morality and government. A national lottery in the United States would be a forward step in the right direction.

Our Foreign Policy: Enlightened Self-Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Anchorage Times, a leading Alaska newspaper, illustrates well the capability of the press to responsibly report and interpret U.S. actions abroad and our country's foreign policy underlying those actions. Readers of this editorial, which I insert following my remarks, are certainly better able to understand today's world, and better able to understand what lies behind the hard foreign policy decisions President Johnson must make:

COMMIES TO CONTINUE THORNS TO AMERICANS

Fat, prosperous America, although disturbed right now about the war in Vietnam, had better get used to the idea of trouble around the world for many years to come and U.S. involvement in it.

This gloomy forecast is pieced together from statements by President Johnson in the past month. The central theme of his philosophy in foreign affairs—as with Presidents Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy—was this:

Communism, determined to spread its gospel, will try aggression where and when it thinks it can and the job of this country, for its own sake and survival, is to stop the expansion.

When Johnson on April 7 at Baltimore explained American participation in the war in Vietnam, he gave two reasons. But the one he placed second then is the one he has just put first now.

At that time he said the American policy was to help the people of South Vietnam defend themselves against Communist attack to preserve their independence and to prevent the spread of communism.

In the 20 days since that talk two things have happended: the Communists have ignored his proposal for "unconditional discussions" and criticism of Johnson's policy has increased, particularly at home.

Then Tuesday at his news conference, before reporters could ask a question, he again set forth upon an explanation about Vietnam, but the emphasis now was almost entirely upon this:

He said defeat in South Vietnam would not only deliver a friendly nation to "terror and repression" but would "encourage and spur on those who seek to conquer all free nations that are within their reach."

He added: "Our own welfare, our own freedom, would be in great danger."

This makes the basic American policy self-interest. Johnson didn't put it that bluntly. But John Foster Dulles did back in the 1950's when he was Secretary of State. He said American policy was "enlightened self-interest."

To show that he was not originating a policy of stopping communism wherever it tried to push, but only continuing one laid down long ago by his predecessors and that it had been blessed by success, Johnson said:

"Wherever we have stood firm, aggression has been halted, peace has been restored, and liberty has been maintained.

"This was true under President Truman, under President Eisenhower, under President Kennedy, and it will be true again in southeast Asia."

If this seems to say the United States can look forward for many years to getting involved in struggles with communism around the world, Johnson said so plainly enough in his April 7 talk:

"This will be a disorderly planet for a long time.

"We will always oppose the effort of one nation to conquer another. We will do this because our own security is at stake. The central lesson of our time is that aggression is never satisfied."

Just in case affluent Americans got gloomy at the thought of it, Johnson asked a question, citing American involvement in Vietnam:

"Why must this Nation hazard its ease, its interest, and its power for the sake of a people so far away?"

He then answered his own question:

"We fight because we must if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure.

"We must deal with the world as it is, if it is ever to be as we wish."

They Would Drive the South Out of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in the national hysteria under which the Lyndon Johnson voting right bill is being passed, there is grave danger that we are witnessing the end of this Republic. This bill, with so many unconstitutional provisions, is designed to punish the Southern States. It will not change to a single degree the plight of the Negroes; it will not contribute to their greatest needs, education, and economic opportunity. In fact, it will make their condition worse because it will penalize those States where most of the Negroes live and where they depend upon the white community to provide jobs and economic advancement.

The proponents of the bill are not concerned with what this bill will do to people. It was inspired as a punitive measure against the South because the people of these six States dared to vote their convictions in the last election. Its real purpose is to control future elections and to insure the continuance of one-party government in the South. But you of the North cannot deprive six sovereign States of this Union of their rights under the Constitution without destroying the Constitution and becoming victims of the dictatorship which will be the result of this destruction.

The following column by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of May 25, is a dire warning. I hope there are still those who are concerned with the preservation of constitutional government who may heed the warning before this bill becomes law and there is no return to freedom:

VOTE BILL RECALLS "TRAGIC ERA"

(By David Lawrence)

On the day the voting rights bill becomes law, a Federal dictatorship will begin. Some States will, for all practical purposes, be driven out of the Union. They will not be able—as is the privilege of all other States—to enact and enforce certain laws unless the Attorney General of the United States, or perhaps subsequently a Federal court, declares that such State laws may be permitted to operate.

One provision of the pending bill specifies that certain States shall not be allowed to prescribe the qualifications for their own voters if the U.S. Attorney General determines that a test or device has been used during the 5 preceding years for purposes of discrimination in individual cases.

The phrase "test or device" is defined as any requirement that as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting, a person must "demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, demonstrate any education achievement or his knowledge of any particular subject, possess good moral character, or prove his qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class."

The Federal Government, therefore, becomes the judge of whether certain State laws—although duplicating statutes existing in several other States of the Union—shall be permitted to operate at all in what might be called suspicious States.

While there is a provision for court review, the whole issue turns on the circumstance that what is lawful in one State of the Union could be adjudged unlawful in some other State—based wholly on suspicion of alleged abuse or misuse of power.

Hitherto, whenever the Constitution has been violated, the courts have been in a position to punish the guilty individuals, including State officials. But this is the first time that a whole State is to be deprived of its constitutional right to set voter qualifications, even though these may be identical with State laws in other parts of the country which are being left untouched. The phrase "equal protection of the law" becomes a mockery so far as the Federal Government is concerned.

What is happening today is reminiscent of the "tragic era" of 100 years ago, when Congress disregarded the doctrine of Abraham

Lincoln about an "indivisible union," and actually expelled from the Union certain of the Southern States. The whole theory of the Lincoln administration was that there was no right of secession and that the Southern States were a part of the Union, though in rebellion. Indeed, after the War Between the States was over and peace had been proclaimed between the North and the South by President Lincoln, the 13th amendment to the Constitution—abolishing slavery—was submitted in the usual way and the legislatures of the South ratified it.

One year later, however, when the 14th amendment was submitted and the same legislatures in the Southern States rejected it, Congress threw those Southern States out of the Union, denied them seats in Congress and prescribed by law a set of conditions before they could be readmitted to the Union.

New legislatures thereupon were set up, and Federal troops were used to coerce them into ratifying the proposed amendment. When the required number of States, including those in the South, had voted for "ratification," Secretary of State Seward was doubtful about the legality of the process and hesitated to proclaim the amendment as having been adopted. Congress, however, by resolution, ordered him to do so anyway.

The action naturally was protested, and efforts were made to get the Supreme Court of the United States to pass on the issue of improper procedure in the "ratification" of a constitutional amendment. But the High Court declined to hear any case on this point, contending that it was a "political" matter. Not until the recent reapportionment cases did the Supreme Court consent to hear or decide what it called political cases.

Since the voting rights bill which is about to become law deprives certain Southern States of the right to set voter qualifications and puts them indefinitely under supervision by the U.S. Department of Justice and the courts, efforts will be made, of course, to get the Supreme Court to pass judgment on the constitutionality of such a procedure.

Meanwhile, it is surprising that so many men in Congress who are familiar with constitutional law have hesitated to come out in the open and criticize what is being done, though privately many of them express grave doubts about the constitutionality or the wisdom of such coercive legislation. For if the precedent is set and the Supreme Court upholds it, a Federal dictatorship can—by mere act of Congress—operate to deprive any State or group of States at any time of any rights or privileges specifically delegated to the States under the explicit words of the Constitution.

The Weidenbruch Report—1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, recently a good friend of mine, Mr. Peter Weidenbruch, president of Damrow Bros. Co., in my hometown of Fond du Lac, Wis., submitted his annual report to the Dairy and Food Industries Supply Association. As anyone can tell from reading this report, Mr. Weidenbruch is not only a progressive minded businessman, but he also has his finger on the pulse of America. All too often the problems facing America are left unsolved because of sheer partisan considerations given proposed solutions to those problems. I am happy to state, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Weidenbruch does not subscribe to such shortsighted motives. In his report, Mr. Weidenbruch tells his group, "When you disagree, then consider the problem and try to come up with a better answer."

I am happy to commend the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Weidenbruch's report and under unanimous consent place it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE WEIDENBRUCH REPORT—1965

(Report on the 53d annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Apr. 25–28, 1965)

The time is here again when I am asked to submit my annual report on this important event to the members of Dairy and Food Industries Supply Association. I presume that this method of conveying the highlights of the proceedings of this important meeting to you is the "next best thing to being there" yourself.

Again, I will make a special effort to cover only those subjects which will be of interest to us as members of our association.

It was called to our attention that the President of the United States has sent to the Congress the most imaginative, far-reaching set of recommendations for the improvement of this Nation and its 180 million people that has ever been proposed by any President.

He is proposing that we move as rapidly as is humanly possible to educate every young man and woman that they may develop to the fullest extent of their abilities.

He is proposing that we make effective use of human talent that is presently being wasted.

He is proposing that we move rapidly to make best use of our enormous natural resources.

He is proposing that we make best use of our tremendous scientific and technological progress.

He is proposing that we seek to guarantee every citizen full benefit of the tremendous advances which we are making in medical research, that every citizen enjoy better health.

He proposes that we make America beautiful, strong, healthy and intelligent, both in the city and on the farm, from the seashore to the mountaintops.

Some of these ideas which the President has proposed to us may at first seem far-fetched or ridiculous. We were urged, however, to carefully consider each of them on its own merits. The President's proposals are the result of many months of careful study by leaders of business, labor, Congress, education, and the best brains of the executive branch of our Government. Our attention was called to the fact that the President set out in quest of the ideas which found their way into his program by asking the heads of all departments to seek from all of their able personnel the ideas and suggestions which each of them could make. They were urged to pass these ideas along to the President and his Bureau of the Budget. They were urged to provide their ideas without fear of embarrassment if their ideas were rejected. The President wanted the privilege of deciding whether these ideas were good or bad. The department head was relieved of that worry. The program which the President of the United States has placed before us is his best judgment—his own thoughts as to which of the thousands of suggestions that were made contained the most merit.

It may be well to look upon the proposals and suggestions of the President just as the President did. Consider every one of these recommendations in depth. Consider them with an open mind. Support those suggestions with which you agree.

When you disagree, then consider the problem and try to come up with a better answer. At this point we should ask ourselves: Under what auspices will the dream of benefits for all of our people be advanced and realized?

There are those who strongly advocate and champion an all-encompassing program of the public sector by which benefits of all kinds shall be delivered to all people. Public sector means a Federal Government of tremendously increased and constantly expanding scope, size, and cost.

There are those, on the other hand, who contend that the goal of attaining the American dream is best won by restricted Government activity, but with a greater reliance on the private sector with its features of competition and incentive and profit.

These are the contending forces in the mighty political battle now being waged.

The choice is ours, if it is not too late to make one.

A recent survey by Fortune magazine indicated that American businessmen were pleased with the policies of this administration. The climate for business is good, in the opinion of some 30 corporate executives. Taxes have been cut. The budget has been reduced. Free enterprise is functioning as well as could be expected in the very complicated society that we have today.

Remember one of the most important necessities of our system of free enterprise, profitmaking, business and industrial organization in America, that what ever national goals are determined upon, the only way they can be achieved is by continuance of the sound management, prosperity, future growth, and constant innovations in our free enterprise, profitmaking economic system.

Not only is this a self-evident truth, but it does call for the establishment and maintenance of a satisfactory and truly operative working relationship between Government on one hand and business and industry on the other.

All of us who are engaged in the dairy and food processing industries are constantly on the alert for new business opportunities. Diversification in our product lines is one way in which to cope with the ever-increasing competition.

Some of us have made efforts to expand our oversea sales and have made efforts to find new markets in areas where he have not been active.

Representatives of the Federal Government have assured us that it is the desire of the U.S. Department of Commerce to work closely with American businessmen in order to increase our export trade.

It was pointed out that, in spite of our flourishing economy and expanding export business, we are still in the "red" in our international accounts. We had a deficit in our balance of payments for the past 7 years in a row. The deficit on our regular transactions during 1964 was $3 billion.

We have made good progress in reducing the deficit by moving in several directions.

Cuts in dollar expenditures by the Governments for defense and economic assistance abroad, the interest equalization tax, which is effectively restraining the purchase of foreign securities in the American money market, help to reduce the outflow of dollars. In addition, our monetary authorities have exerted pressure on short-term interest rates, and this discourages the outflow of liquid funds.

While we have succeeded in strengthening the U.S. dollar, we have yet to win the battle of the deficit.

We spend more for travel than we bring in. When incomes go up, spending also goes up, and our prospering Americans are spending more for travel. Our deficit on travel account, including passenger fares, was $1.6 billion last year. That is why we are encouraged to travel in the United States.

President Johnson, as you all know, has requested the voluntary cooperation of American business in correcting the drain on our

Nation's cash reserves. Business participation in the voluntary cooperation program launched at the President's direction by Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor is an outstanding example of the willingness of American businessmen to take on the heavy responsibility of helping the United States improve its balance-of-payments situation.

But even though we must restrain, temporarily, some capital outflows to correct our payments situations, we are still determined to contribute to the industrial growth and economic well-being of the less developed countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. This is one of our major national objectives in a world where the benefits of free enterprise are incompletely understood and appreciated.

Americans know that our system is vastly superior—in every way that counts for human welfare and dignity.

Americans assume that people in the developing countries must know this too. But these people can only know what they have seen. And in most of these countries they have seen very little indeed of modern free enterprise in action.

Reference was made to education as "big business." The same principles which have the American business system the envy and the model of the rest of the world can do the same if followed in our biggest business—education.

The successful businessman knows the value of a sound organization. Only too often this is demonstrated in a negative way in the educational system when the members of a school board or a board of trustees start trying to be educators or administrators—when administrators start trying to determine major policies—when faculties do the same, and in addition try to administer.

The results are inevitable—chaos and confusion. This is an area in which the business leader can make a real contribution, one which normally is not within the competence of many other devoted citizens from the professions and elsewhere who give their time and energy to aiding education.

Thus, it is evident that when you see an educational problem, the responsibility of the businessman is to be sure that its solution is organized on sound business principles—but also that it meets the three tests I have named—a clear and proper division of responsibility; built-in advantages for each participant; and built-in restraints against excesses.

It was, of course, expected that a part of the meeting would be devoted to the subject of equal employment opportunity.

We had the privilege of hearing very interesting and important comments in respect to this matter.

Our attention was called to the fact that we are going through a truly revolutionary social change in race relations—and it is nowhere more challenging than in the field of employment. Business and industry have their obligations in the reformation, and I honestly believe we are meeting them. Right now, however, we all need more understanding, more communication, more action, and fewer profound statements.

There are some positive things employers can do to further the cause of equal employment opportunity and the Negro as a full American. Some of these (among others) might be as follows:

1. Formulate and communicate a clear restatement of the company's equal employment policy to all employees, especially the executive and supervisory staff which will administer that policy.

2. On considering employment, some of us should keep in mind any deficiences or imbalances we may have in our own organization, when candidates are of equal merit.

3. Do a bit of catch-up training to help smart, personable, conscientious Negro employees overcome where possible deficiencies in education or environmental training. This bit of extra help may be needed for them to reach their full potential.

Continually upgrade the opportunities for promotion for the Negro within your own enterprise to fit his growing qualifications.

4. Keep the economics of this problem in mind—the failure to take advantage of the latent resources—the potential which the Negro represents to our total society.

5. Make certain that management thinking is straight—at all levels in the area of job standards, qualifications and employment procedures. If you use tests, make sure that they are fairly and uniformly administered.

As more and better jobs are made more readily available, Negroes should be motivated to help themselves and their cause by doing more in preparation and in job performance than they heretofore have done, especially at managerial and supervisory levels. There is no other choice.

It is incumbent on all of us—industry, business, all employers with the encouragement of an understanding Government—to maintain a strong and expanding economy in order to maintain full employment. Last in, first out is a principle most employers live by, and the Negro could well be the greatest victim of added unemployment.

It is time for us to search our conscience—then act. We must not wait for someone else to do the so-called right thing. Morally or economically such a position is unassailable. Face the fact that there are, and perhaps will in some degree always be, prejudices. Only our own personal action can reduce and eliminate these—no one else's.

American businessmen are now involved in something greater than business problems. The task is that of attempting to liquidate in one generation the consequences of 250 years of slavery and 100 years of discrimination and neglect.

Equal opportunity may be the most important issue that this Nation faces for many decades—not only because of its effects on business, markets, and economic growth, but also because the American system itself is being tested. And that, unless we assure equal rights and equal justice for all, our form of government will be in jeopardy.

The cause of individual liberty will fail if freedom of opportunity is not for all; and that American business will do its best to provide equal opportunity because to do so is not only good business but is also right.

For centuries, mankind has been engaged in three great struggles:

First, the struggle for political freedom and against tyranny;

Second, the struggle for economic freedom and against poverty;

Third, the struggle for intellectual freedom and against ignorance. History is the story of man's effort to gain these three freedoms which liberate humanity from tyranny, poverty, and ignorance. In vast areas of the world the plodding generations have followed a slow and painful road in the attainment of these freedoms.

There never has been any question in this Nation of our determination to achieve these objectives. "We hold these truths to be self-evident," said the Declaration of Independence,

That all men are created equal,

That they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights,

That among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,

That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

America is great because individual men have freedom and equality, because individual men have been given the incentive to create, to produce, and to save, because individual men have ben rewarded for their labor with a generous share of the goods they helped to produce. America has taken its place among the great civilizations of history because the cornerstone upon which the Republic rests is the social, economic, and spiritual betterment of individual men.

We live in a world of threatening insecurity and exciting promise. But there is genius enough in the individuals in this Nation to create political and economic policies that will give us in material well-being and social enrichment a future that will exceed even the amazing progress of the past.

We are not in the bleak twilight of individualism, but in the brilliance of its morning. We need to bring to the difficult problems of our time those heroic qualities of character, industry and self-discipline which have made our people strong and this Nation great. We need constantly to reaffirm our deep faith in the dignity and worth of the individual man and of his creation by providence.

I could submit a much better and more comprehensive report covering many timely and very important subjects that were discussed at the meeting if more space were available.

It is always a great pleasure for me to write this annual report for the members of the Dairy & Food Industries Supply Association. I sincerely trust that my observations and comments will be of some value to you.

Respectfully submitted.

PETER P. WEIDENBRUCH,
President, Damrow Bros. Co., Member of DFISA, and DFISA Delegate to the 53d Annual Meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

America, the Citadel of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a prize-winning essay in the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Wisconsin, contest for junior high school students.

The theme of the 1965 contest for high school and grade school children is "America, the Citadel of Freedom." Fran Gregg, Park School, Delavan, Wis., placed first in group II, for pupils in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades.

This inspirational essay by Fran Gregg, which shows the interest of our youth of today in our great American heritage, follows. I commend it to your attention:

AMERICA, THE CITADEL OF FREEDOM

(By Fran Gregg, Park School, Delavan)

It stood high on the hill in a majestic sort of splendor—strong and solid. Strange, I had never noticed the old weatherbeaten castle before. I began to walk toward the building.

It looked like all ordinary castles, walled and fortified, and protected by a moat. A tall tower rose above it. A date on the keystone above the archway leading to the moat

read 1620 A.D. Wasn't that the year the Pilgrims landed on the shores of the New World? Yes, that year marked the unofficial commencement of our country.

At that moment the drawbridge of the garrison swung down and the gate opened. Cautiously, I entered. The gate closed behind me, but I felt no urge to escape. Then, from some unknown niche or crevice a voice spoke to me. A voice I knew but could not place. "You are standing in the hallowed halls of liberty," it said "You are the chosen one of your generation to enter these courts and shall emerge with a deeper loyalty and understanding of your privileges as an American citizen."

I learned that this building was not actually a castle but a citadel symbolizing the goals, opportunities, and freedoms my ancestors had won for me, and that I would be guided on a tour of the structure and symbolization of this citadel.

The tour started with the basis of all architecture, the cornerstone. The cornerstone of our country is democracy, I was told. Without democracy the foundation for such a great country could not have been laid. "Speaking of foundations," the speaker continued, "the floor on which you stand represents history. Each plank denotes a part of the past, whether heartbreak or breakthrough. The roof that shelters this refuge is the future and each shingle on it is an event yet to come.

"The four large pillars in this room represent truth, knowledge, loyalty, and equality. The yet unmended crack in the pillar of equality symbolizes race discrimination, the greatest strife in this country today."

"The walls, do they stand for anything?" I inquired.

"Yes; each block of stone stands for one of the freedoms, opportunities or privileges you have for doing nothing but living in the United States."

As I came in, I noticed a tower topping the castle. "What does it represent?"

"The tower is hope. It stands tall to be seen by all freedom-loving people. It is the sole refuge of the many oppressed of this world.

"The gate signifies the door to opportunity. The opportunity to rise in medieval times, a form of protection, standing for the right to vote. It is the people's protection for the land they love.

"No castle, fortress or citadel has yet been built that is completely free from want, or trouble free. But this Nation, this land, and these people have as their goal utopian peace."

As the voice faded away, I mused, "Surely freedom marked a citadel." Then, as I turned to go, I unconsciously said, "Goodby, Mr. Washington."

University of California Listed as First Test of Red Plan To Embarrass Nation's Universities and Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, Dr. Roswell G. Ham, former president of Mount Holyoke College, spoke to the Commonwealth Club on the subject, "University of California Listed as First Test of Red Plan to Embarrass Nation's Universities and Colleges."

Much has been written and broadcast about the situation at the University of California and I believe this talk by Dr. Ham sheds a great deal of light concerning the activities on the campus at Berkeley.

His talk, as reported by the Friday Flashes in the Commonwealth, follows:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LISTED AS FIRST TEST OF RED PLAN TO "EMBARRASS" NATION'S UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

(From address by Dr. Roswell G. Ham, former president, Mount Holyoke College)

What has transpired across the bay in Berkeley is at least as important to our national existence as what goes on in Vietnam.

On January 4 I circulated (with the approval in substance by three members of the board of regents, Chancellor Strong, and with the help of the alumni association and a large corps of undergraduate students) an open letter to the students and faculty of the University of California. The important part was studiously ignored by press and radio or given merely passing notice.

The key paragraph reads in part: "In all the press coverage of late events (at Berkeley) two facts have been passed over almost unnoticed * * *. Primary is the early statement of President Kerr that the issue was not one of free speech * * *. But more arresting was a small dispatch buried in newspapers of December 11, 1964, and never thereafter referred to. It was from a speech by President Erich Walker of Pennsylvania State University which said that in March he and most university presidents of the country were warned by the FBI of a forthcoming effort to embarrass the universities and colleges of America, utilizing fake students and teaching assistants and using such slogans as "free speech"—all to be financed by "foreign money." He added that contemporary demonstrations at California were part of the plan.

FBI WARNING WAS ISSUED

I know as a fact the warning was issued in March identical in substance to that given by President Walker's speech. California was told in May that it had been chosen as first target. That information I had direct from a member of the California Board of Regents. What are you to make of an alarm issued so long ago as May? Were subsequent events in any way a spontaneous outbreak?

President Kerr is a scholar, a conciliator. His qualities and faith are of the sort the world stands in need of. Unhappily he was entirely miscast to handle an American Vietnam where there could be no conciliation.

SIT-INS FOLLOW RED'S WORLD PATTERN

On two counts someone is to be indicted: Why, with so long a period of warning, was counter strategy so misconceived and why did the President usurp the proper function of the Chancellor?

Defending the students as a whole in my open letter, I remarked that "some of the present generation are woefully uneducated in history"—a limitation, I may add, not of students alone.

Regard Havana University, San Marcos in Peru, the University of Panama, Universities in Japan, students who deface our embassies in Indonesia, Africa, the world over—all on good evidence, heavily pervaded by Marxism. Give me one good reason why American universities should be exempt.

GLOBAL FUND FINANCES STUDENT REDS

Less well-known was the establishment by the Communists of an unlimited global solidarity fund to finance Communist-led student agitation throughout the world. Jules Dubois tells of student sparked demonstrations, Communist financed, to produce instability wherever possible—South American "hate America" riots.

Of particular interest from the Chicago Tribune is the account of schools for subversion established in Cuba and the arrival there of a crack force of 250 Spanish-speaking Komsomol technicians. The Komsomol (20 million members worldwide) aims to train Soviet youth * * * in the theory and practice of communism and in military indoctrination and training.

One might recall the 100 American students visiting Cuba recently without visas—a goodly number of whom took a leading part in the Berkeley demonstrations. Who finances all this world travel?

Altogether too much has been made of student unrest, both national and at California. Youth has always been in unrest. Even so, the number of student dissidents is minimal: on that I would stake my last dollar. But where before has there been a demonstration in the United States so completely unspontaneous, so beautifully organized, so according to a preconceived pattern? Who organized it?

From far and wide 2 years ago the clans began to gather in Berkeley. Savio transferred from Manhattan College. Ninety-nine of the sitdowns in Sproul Hall had no connection with the university. Known to the university and the Berkeley police were six or seven observers from other campuses with orders to participate but not to be arrested.

And by the way, who pays the bill for that huge battery of defense lawyers? Take a look at their past history.

RED-LEANING STUDENT GROUPS CITED

The "Saturday Review of Literature" January 16, 1965 (among other magazines) pointed out the remarkable diversity of the organizations represented in the free speech movement at California. Within their numbers it listed certain activist groups: the W.E.B. DuBois Club (Marxist); Progressive Labor Club (Maoist); Young People's Socialist Alliance (Trotsky); Young People's Socialist League (right wing Socialist); May Second Movement (antiwar in Vietnam); Students for a Democratic Society (liberal-radical Socialist); a half dozen other organizations of as dubious vintage; and the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba.

Does it particularly matter that the list also includes College Young Republicans, Youth for Goldwater, and the Interfaith Council? It proves only that Americans can be led by the nose.

Wave the flag of free speech and academic freedom and some faculty people will act in a totally irrational fashion. It has been amply demonstrated that a few cells, well organized, as in the Bolshevik revolution, can topple a mighty empire, unorganized.

Quoting again from the Saturday Review: "The new name of the organization (Free Student Movement) was psychologically effective, but hardly accurate since the question at issue was whether students had the right on campus to solicit funds, seek recruits, and make plans for off-campus political and social action, aimed at the surrounding community."

UC A "SITTING DUCK"

Why was the University of California Berkeley campus picked as No. 1? It was a sitting duck. A cardinal principle of Communist strategy is that it does not ordinarily create situations so much as exploit them. But for the students—despite their leftist and activist organizations, despite legitimate reasons for complaint against an undergraduate faculty—I know enough almost completely to absolve the vast proportion of the 18,000 undergraduates.

The largest rally in November had 12,000 of every breed present. That was the day of the faculty meeting when Savio proclaimed that he had made history. Given the fact that students and casual observers notoriously do most congregate where there

is excitement, the estimate is to be heavily discounted.

Contemplate rather the day of the general strike. In one class a wild-eyed oriental stood up and called for a walkout answered by another student who said she was there for an education. The room was well filled—but the professor adjourned the class. That phenomenon happened over and over, many professors wearing FSM armbands.

FACULTY LARGELY TO BLAME

No, I would not indict the students so much as the faculty. In the crucial December 8 meeting of the academic senate, 115 men of sense were lost in a vote 7 to 1 on measures submitted to the board of regents (and buried there). As in South America the push here was the intermediate one, for faculty and student assumption of administrative power.

The free speech movement was beginning to run out. But, with adroit strategy, a more legitimate cause, the lack of communication between student and faculty, was exploited. Another division too was exploited: a common distrust by faculties of administrations. With the help of some of the press, they succeeded in getting rid of Chancellor Strong.

As to faculty control, faculties have almost total inability, indeed unwillingess, to handle administrative problems. They are rarely able to agree on an academic curriculum—their legitimate field.

SOME HAVE GONE FAR LEFT

But, I would bring against a measurable proportion of the California faculty a more serious charge. In common with many another university, some part of it has gone far on the road to the left. Reflect on their pursuit of the party line, with petitions and demonstrations for withdrawal from Vietnam and Santo Domingo and earlier exercises in support of Savio et al.

More specifically I would cite conversations I had with a distraught father who claimed his son was being completely communized by two professors in sociology, or with another parent worried by his daughter's entire swing to the left, or with a nuclear physicist who took graduate work at California, where his class was in revolt against the unending Communist propaganda of his professor, or from the many communications to the California (alumni) monthly: "At times he sounds like a Communist but maybe he is just trying to make us think."

WHY ARE SOME OF FACULTY SO GULLIBLE?

Why the undergraduate faculty, with outstanding exceptions, is at such a low ebb—so gullible, why most universities will be increasingly so, has its answer in simple mathematics. There are not trained, in training, or even inclined to be trained, enough first-rate teachers.

When President Kerr's newspaper resignation was argued, one regent is reported to have remarked that if accepted it would have resulted in the resignation of 60 percent of the faculty—a consummation most devoutly to be desired.

I question the threat. Life is too free and easy at Berkeley. It still holds prestige. Prestige is a great matter, deserved or not.

Perhaps the California episode in the grand strategy is nearly complete. Foreign money has sufficiently embarrassed the university. But the cancer remains.

Where the attack will strike next is a question. The New York Times, March 29, reported a meeting in Philadelphia of 200 students from 39 colleges—"All believed that the wave of campus rebellion started in Berkeley last fall should be brought to every American campus." Among those present were members of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Question (L. C. Ames, Jr.). Did FBI issue denial and President Watson issue apology?

Answer. It's rumored from East that FBI issued denial. I checked with a UC regent who said "yes, we were warned we'd be first."

Question (Daniel E. Koshland). Tangible evidence of Communist conspiracy, actual Communists, and/or their sons and daughters, in Berkeley upheaval?

Answer. There were plenty of Cmmunists and sons and daughters among FSM students. If you want to read a Berkeley-Oakland magazine called Tocsin—it tells of these people, completely identifies them—they've never been sued for libel, so far as I know. Actual tangible evidence from the FBI? They'll deny anything said. They are an investigatory organization. If they say anything, they reveal their sources of information. No tangible evidence—I had a talk with them and they said I was absolutely right, long before I issued my open letter. I said it's going completely according to pattern and they'll probably deny I ever had such a statement.

Question (J. H. Clinton). Why are students and faculty so easily duped?

Answer. Because troublemakers use great words like "freedom"—disguise aims behind noble facades.

Question. Your opinion of Byrnes report and committee?

Answer. Byrnes, a lawyer, was assisted by three lawyers and host of graduate students—none experienced in higher education. A most incompetently selected investigative committee—and with no authority or competence to make recommendations on university structure.

Question (Col. Carroll Peeke). Should regents have lifted ban on Communist speakers?

Answer. They were welcome to speak on my campus. A group of educated girls took apart a fired professor from Washington. I believe communism should be taught at all American universities—but not preached.

Question (Bruce Blenn). Opinion on handling of Berkeley crisis by faculty organizations?

Answer. Vote was 7 to 1 for FSM: 115 men made admirable statements and some complete nitwits spoke on other side. Some departments at Berkeley, on direct evidence, have three or four Communists.

The Champions of Civil Rights Would Deprive Workers of Freedom of Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in their grab for more power the northern union leaders are not concerned with the civil rights or the freedoms of individual workers. They demand repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act to give them absolute power over those who toil in America.

They are not concerned with the freedom of religious beliefs of some workers whose religion forbids them from belonging to a union; they are not concerned with the objections of workers who may not want to join a union dominated by gangsters or racketeers. And while many northern union leaders are in the forefront of the civil rights demonstrations in the South, they have done little if anything to remove racial discrimination and racial barriers which prevent Negroes in all parts of the country from equal opportunity for employment. Yet, these same union leaders, backed by the Johnson administration, demands that the right of the people of the various States be prohibited from freely enacting laws to protect individual workers.

A thoughtful editorial from the Daily Mountain Eagle of Jasper, Ala., points out that the charges made by these anti-States rights proponents of the repeal of section 14(b) are false and misleading. The editorial follows:

FREE RIDER CHARGE FALSE

One of the arguments most often waged by those who want 14(b) repealed is the so-called "free rider" charge. A "free rider" is defined as one who reaps benefits without paying union dues.

This argument assumes that the only reason an employee would either refrain from joining or withdraw from a union is to avoid payment of union dues.

Many people desire to stay out of a union for religious reasons, or because they oppose the union leadership on moral grounds. For example: LaRue Berfield, of Driftwood, Pa., was fired from his job he held for 19 years with Sylvania Electric Co. because he objected to joining a Communist-dominated union.

And many don't want their dues money spent for causes to which they object. For example: John Mossberger was expelled from his union, and eventually lost his job, because he wrote a letter to the editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer supporting a political candidate other than the one supported by his union.

Let us face one fact which is evident to all Americans, union and nonunion alike. Only a portion—often a very small portion—of the moneys collected by unions from their members are spent for collective bargaining purposes as such.

Unions spend the funds they collect from union members on many other activities, such as political campaigns, organizing drives, social and economic propaganda, strike benefits to other unions, private benefits to union officers and legal fees.

Despite Federal legislation and a Supreme Court decision, a major portion of the compulsory dues collected by the unions of this country are used for political purposes.

It is apparent that as much as 50 percent of the $924 million in annual dues income actually goes for political purposes. In an election campaign, such as that of 1964, when union resources are applied primarily to political activity the most conservative estimate of staff time spent on politics place the cost at more than $50 million. And this does not include any estimate of the cost of staff travel, printing, and "other disbursements." Realistic estimates of the union role in the 1964 campaign place the figure at a minimum of $100 million.

Rather than benefit the individual, in some cases thees expenditures may actually be detrimental to his interests. They may be used to work for causes opposite to his beliefs.

And so under these circumstances, which are not remote but are rather typical of countless cases, the worker is anything but a so-called "free rider." He is rather a "captive passenger" beholden to the wishes and whims of his labor boss masters.

It should be pointed out that unions fought a bitter, free spending campaign aimed at Congress to win "exclusive bargaining rights"—the right to speak and bargain not only for their own members, but for all others in a bargaining unit. This obligation was established in the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley amendments.

Thus under existing law the union boss who would impose compulsion rather than

the individual worker who would maintain his freedom of choice enjoys a marked advantage.

Anchorage Reborn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on the recent anniversary of the great Alaska earthquake, Alaskans looked back to survey their progress of recovery from the devastation of March 27. In looking back at that year, they were proud of what had been accomplished. In special editions of newspapers, prominent citizens reviewed the work of the year and praised their fellow Alaskans.

Progress since the earthquake in Anchorage, the State's largest city and one that suffered vast destruction, is now the subject of a survey by a national columnist. This writer, Richard Starnes, finds, as Alaskans do, that this year has been one of great progress. His column, "Anchorage Reborn," printed in the Washington Daily News on May 24 follows:

ANCHORAGE REBORN

(By Richard Starnes)

ANCHORAGE.—The story of Anchorage is the story of a city that refused to die.

Thirteen months ago the worst earthquake ever recorded in North America crushed Anchorage and half a dozen surrounding communities. Seismic sea waves completed the destruction. When they had subsided, 115 Alaskans were dead and property damage was counted in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

A hideous, gaping wound ran through the heart of Anchorage. Much of the Fourth Avenue business district collapsed into it; elsewhere homes and apartments were literally shaken to pieces as the very earth beneath them coiled and heaved as if some subterranean monster were in its death agonies. In Turnagain Heights, Anchorage's most fashoinable residential neighborhood, homes were sucked into the ground and crushed by the earth's convulsions.

Loss of life was unbelievably low in view of the awesome destruction wrought by the tremblor, but families saw the work of a lifetime wiped out in seconds—uninsured and irreplaceable.

The most remarkable thing about the giant earthquake was the fact that human beings faced what must have seemed to be the end of the world with superhuman courage. Tales of heroism and sacrifice are commonplace, and accounts of hysteria are notably sparse.

In the epochal year that has passed since the earthquake, Anchorage has performed a miracle of rebuilding a city on the very earth that betrayed it. Today one could spend days in Anchorage and see no obvious scars of the cataclysm that beset the city.

Anchorage looks more like a boomtown than the shattered relic of earthquake. New construction is going on as if the rich oil deposits beneath Cook Inlet are the only future surprises that the earth holds in store for Anchorage. Damaged buildings have been repaired and the wreckage of destroyed structures has been bulldozed away. The J. C. Penney building that was nearly shaken to pieces last March has been razed, and a new steel-reinforced concrete structure has replaced it. The Anchorage Westward, a new 450-room skyscraper hotel that many a larger city might envy, was damaged by the tremblor but is now in full operation. The Captain Cook, another high-rise hotel, is nearing completion. A new hotel is also being planned at international airport and Sears Roebuck has confirmed plans for a new shopping center as grandiose as any in what Alaskans call "the lower 48." School enrollment at 19,100 is higher than it was when the quake struck, and Anchorage is feverishly planning new school buildings to meet the need. The city's population has grown an estimated 13 percent in the last 3 years—and, earthquake or no, it is still growing.

Support of the President's Policy on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a resolution adopted on April 26, 1965, by the Niagara Falls City Council, in support of the President's policy on Vietnam, together with a petition, with 1,561 signatures, initiated by the members of the Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity, at Queens College of the City University of New York, also in support of our present policy on Vietnam.

There being no objection, the resolution and the petition were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT A MEETING OF THE NIAGARA FALLS CITY COUNCIL, HELD APRIL 26, 1965

Whereas North Vietnam Communists, without provocation, have infiltrated and invaded South Vietnam with military force; and

Whereas the United States has committed itself to defend the self-determination of South Vietnam against the North Vietnam attack; and

Whereas the President of the United States has firmly held to this policy, and has taken appropriate military action to defend the right of South Vietnam to govern itself according to its own national interests: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the city council of the city of Niagara Falls does hereby commend our President for his steadfast purpose to defend South Vietnam while maintaining a policy of unconditional discussion on peace; and this city council further resolves to urge our Congressmen and U.S. Senators to stand by the President with unwavering support until a successful conclusion of the conflict is achieved, and be it further

Resolved, That the mayor of the city of Niagara Falls be directed to send this resolution to the President, our Congressmen, and U.S. Senators.

E. DENT LACKEY,
Mayor.

Attest:

HELENE M. BREED,
Acting Deputy City Clerk.

We, the undersigned, support our present policy in Vietnam. We feel that this policy is in line with the U.S. tradition of supporting freedom throughout the world.

Accomplishments of the Johnson Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in editorials which recently appeared in the Nashville Tennessean, President Johnson is commended for his actions in the Dominican Republic and record of accomplishment over the first 100 days of this administration since the inauguration January 20, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to place these editorials in the RECORD and commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, May 3, 1965]

PRESIDENT'S FIRST 100 DAYS EVENT FILLED, PRODUCTIVE

President Johnson has just completed 100 days in office since his January 20 inaugural oath. It has been a busy time, marked by fast-paced activity on the domestic front and days of tension on the international scene.

The war in South Vietnam has occupied much of the President's time and concern. And if that were not enough, at the end of the first 100 days he was also concerned with a revolt in the Dominican Republic.

Despite the clouds of omen, there were a good many bright signs for which the President could feel pleased. The Nation's economy has been booming. Some threatening strikes have been averted, or in the case of steel, at least delayed.

Furthermore, the President should be highly gratified thus far with the first session of the 89th Congress. With successful passage of the sweeping education bill, the aid to Appalachia program, House passage of medical care and social security legislation, and the expected enactment of a voting rights measure, it can be said that Congress is both busy and productive.

In comparison with the first 100 days of President Roosevelt, there are fewer bills and Congress is not booming them through at the same hectic pace. But the 73d Congress had an altogether different economy to deal with; there was less time for debate and study in 1933.

President Johnson was swept into office on a tidal wave of votes. Few, if any Chief Executives have had a larger mandate in terms of ballots. But the President is too wise a political leader to attempt to move mountains suddenly.

Mr. Johnson has retained a friendly and constructive relationship with Congress. Minority opposition is there, but it has been generally more constructive than blindly obstructive.

The President's program is moving ahead at a steady pace, and he has every right to look back on the 100 days with great satisfaction, insofar as domestic problems are concerned.

The war in Vietnam has been his greatest headache, but at the same time extension of that fight and the President's Baltimore speech has begun to change the world's image of him from something of an unknown quantity to one of a Chief Executive with stature, toughness and shrewdness. In short, even with those who disagree with him elsewhere in the world, President Johnson has won grudging respect.

No one can predict with any certainty what the next 100 days in office will bring for the President. It is safe to bet they will be filled with great activity and great events and that the world will have even a stronger picture of the President who is firmly in the saddle, and riding his own horse.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Apr. 30, 1965]

PRESIDENT MOVES TO BAR ANY CUBAN-LIKE TAKEOVER

The dispatch of U.S. Marines into the Dominican Republic was bound to have repercussions in Latin America and elsewhere, but President Johnson obviously felt that there was a greater risk there than any critical reaction.

The Marines went in to give protection to American citizens, but they were subsequently fired on and they fired back. Behind their presence may be the very strong fear that Castro Communists were interested in the Dominican uprising.

President Johnson has made it plain enough that he doesn't intend to have another Cuba in the Caribbean, even if he must risk raising the old specter of U.S. imperialism in Latin America.

Reports from Washington indicate that the administration is concerned with accumulating evidence that the Dominican revolt has gone beyond the normal experience of such revolutions; that several cease-fires have been pledged and broken; and that people have been stood against the wall and executed to cries of "paredon," which means, "to the wall," and was a familiar noise of the Castro takeover in Cuba.

The coup that was attempted nearly a week ago was not so much a matter of issues as an effort by the supporters of ex-President Juan Bosch to restore him to power. The loyalist forces have claimed that Bosch is supported in his bid to regain power by the Communists. The pro-Bosch forces deny this.

But it has become quite apparent that the Communists are looking for a chance to play a role from the sidelines.

At first, the United States apparently decided to remain officially neutral. Its main efforts were to seek a cease-fire, and those efforts had appeared to be a success. But renewed fighting broke out.

At this point, President Johnson announced that he would send in the Marines to protect American citizens. He said he acted after being informed by Dominican military authorities that the lives of these citizens were in danger.

The presence of the Marines and U.S. warships off the Dominican Republic will have a large message to the hemisphere. Undoubtedly it will disturb deeply a good many in Latin America. But it will leave no doubt that the Nation will act when the lives of American citizens are threatened.

The Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, taking note of President's Johnson's recent request for $700 million to finance American efforts in Vietnam, the Dallas Morning News pointed out that the defense of freedom is never cheap, either in lives or in dollars.

In a May 6 editorial, the News goes ahead to spell out the indisputable logic behind the policies President Johnson is pursuing in that embattled southeast Asian nation. The editorial follows:

THE COST

President Johnson's request for $700 million to finance the free world effort in Vietnam was not the first bill to come due for that bloody conflict. It probably will not be the last. Though we often seem to take it for granted, freedom does not come cheap.

It must be won, often at great sacrifice, and it must then be constantly defended against those who would destroy it. The cost, in lives and treasure, is unavoidable if we mean to be free.

We learned long ago that we cannot buy our freedom in the counterfeit coin of appeasement. When we try to trade others' freedom to save our own, we pollute our honor along with our liberty. The loss of freedom by one people diminishes the freedom of all people.

That is why we have assumed the responsibility for helping those nations that are threatened by Communist enslavement. We did not ask for it. But we have it. We have it because no one else in the free world is strong enough to do the job.

This does not mean that we can defend the entire free world alone. Our power and resources are not infinite. But we can and must conceive every nation willing to defend its own independence from Communist imperialists that we will come to its aid if it is attacked.

Furthermore, we must show that we will keep the faith when the going is hard, when the war drags on or when fortune turns against us.

Brave words and firm promises are not enough. They must be backed up by deeds. If we extend our support to an embattled nation, then withdraw it later because the task has become too burdensome, we will not be asked for help again. An ally that abandons its friends in the midst of a conflict when its help is needed most, is worse than an enemy.

The aim of the Communists in Vietnam encompasses much more than the conquest of the southern half of the country. Their goal is to show that the promise of the American Nation to stand firm with a free people is worthless, that communism is irresistible. They want to show every small or weak nation in the world that it is suicidal to fight in defense of its freedom and that an American commitment to that defense will dissolve into a betrayal when the American public tires of it.

If we back out of Vietnam, the Communists' point is made. Thousands of South Vietnamese soldiers and hundreds of Americans will have died for nothing. The destruction and misery suffered by South Vietnam will have been suffered for nothing.

The Communists have told us that they intend to prove in South Vietnam that the inevitable result of a "liberation war" is a Communist triumph and that surrender is therefore the wisest course for any nation coveted by the Communists.

The cost of proving them wrong is going to be heavy, but we must pay it, for it is the cost of freedom for ourselves and for our children.

Two Constructive Statements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks I include therein two very well written and timely editorials touching upon the critical international situation, one entitled, "The Other Vietnam Story" from a recent edition of the Boston, Mass., Globe, and the other one entitled, "No More Cubas" from a recent edition of the New Bedford, Mass., Standard-Times.

These editorials make a real contribution to the discussion of the grave Vietnam and Santo Domingo problems—the first one calling for strength, calmness, and firmness, and the second pinpointing the constructive, humane phases of current developments in Vietnam and the Far East.

I think both of these writings are worthy of careful reading by Members of Congress and the American people.

The articles follow:

[From the Boston Globe, May 14, 1965]

THE OTHER VIETNAM STORY

An inconspicuous press dispatch from South Vietnam recently described the arrival of thousands of native men, women, and children at Saigon, and at a U.S. base area further north on that country's coast. They were terrorized fugitives from inland villages sacked by the Communist Vietcong, who had murdered their local chieftains.

To this tragic human side of the current war, and to the hitherto little publicized story of the help our own nation has been giving the Vietnamese during the past decade, President Johnson addressed himself in his speech Thursday. Seldom has a report so cogent been offered to the American public at a more appropriate moment.

Hitherto during this war the only dramatization of our country's peaceful reconstructive efforts in South Vietnam was the President's disclosure a fortnight ago of his postwar billion-dollar assistance program. That scheme, as he noted yesterday, is already moving ahead.

But the main burden of President Johnson's accounting Thursday was of work in progress, work begun long before present hostilities were unleashed by Hanoi, work that is continuing despite raid, battle, and terror. It is the story of the $2 billion in American aid which began in 1954 and continues the modernization of Vietnamese agriculture, the building of schools, health centers, hospitals and industries, and the training of administrators. His report was a warm and well-deserved tribute to the courageous civilians, Americans and Vietnamese alike, who are carrying that work forward.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, May 3, 1965]

NO MORE CUBAS

The President of the United States, in ordering U.S. fighting men into the frontlines of the Dominican Republic uprising "to help prevent another Communist state in the Western Hemisphere," deserves the fullest support of the American people.

Mr. Johnson's evaluation of the Dominican situation is based upon constantly emerging evidence that, whatever the revolution was when it began, other and sinister forces soon seized control of it. The former U.S. ambassador to Santo Domingo, John Bartlow Martin, commented that he was "convinced" the uprising had been completely taken over by Castro-dominated Communists. Mr. Martin said the insurgency had started as a "genuine revolution to restore exiled former President Juan D. Bosch to power," but added, "Bosch would be heartbroken to see the results now."

It also is evident that the United States delayed its military intervention to the last possible minute when such action could have

been reasonably effective. Even as the President spoke to the American people, American troops took over the burden of preventing a Dominican Red takeover from loyalist fighters no longer capable of effective defense after 8 wearying days of explosive revolt.

The United States, as the only hemispheric power capable of taking effective action, could not stand by and allow what began as a democratic revolution to be controlled by a band of Communist conspirators. At stake, as the President commented, were the lives of thousands, the liberty of a country, and the principles of the inter-American system.

Our road ahead is difficult. It may be that we can prevent another Cuba without major bloodshed, but it certainly will not be achieved without a major storm of criticism from other nations whose inclinations or intentions thus have been thwarted. The Soviet Union and its followers will make an effort to have the U.N. Security Council brand the United States as a violator of the U.N. Charter by interfering in the domestic affairs of another state.

It is too bad the many thousands of Cubans, in the United States and otherwise, who can no longer go home because of Castro communism, could not reply to the Soviet Union. From the bitterness of their experience—impoverished, displaced, disfranchised, and many in fear—they could tell the U.N. what happens when a democratic revolution is captured by Communists. Without a dissenting voice, they could tell the world how much they wish the United States, years ago, when Castro came to power, had done in Cuba what it now has had to do in Santo Domingo.

Thoughtful Americans, both South and North, will realize this and rally behind Washington's firm action in behalf of hemispheric democracy. The Organization of American States, which has a primary responsibility with the United States in preserving Dominican order and freedom, now has the eyes of the world upon it. If it fails to be equally resolute and efficient, non-Americans, through the U.N., will argue that they ought to "resolve" this wholly American situation.

This must not be allowed to happen because it would almost certainly produce an anti-United States, anti-American course of action aimed at creating a Dominican regime primarily responsive to leadership outside the hemisphere, as is the case in Cuba.

The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Benton's 10th chapter in his article, "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," deals with the importance of education to the United States.

He terms it "our best shield" and indeed it is. Here is the 10th chapter of this fine article which appeared in the 1965 yearbook of the Encyclopedia Britannica: "Education—Our Best Shield," chapter X.

A personal report: "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," by William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Senator from Connecticut; presently U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its executive board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica.

EDUCATION—OUR BEST SHIELD

CHAPTER X

How do we keep our guard up? In the long run—assuming we maintain or strengthen our present posture of armed defense—our best shield will be provided by education. This is our best internal shield as well as our best external one. It is the principal hope of the Negroes and all underprivileged groups. It is our best weapon in the President's war on poverty. The more one ponders the nature and dangers of poverty in American society, as Walter Lippmann has pointed out, the more one must face the fact that our whole educational system—public, parochial, and private, with some notable exceptions—"is simply not big enough and good enough to educate the American people today." We should be investing an ever larger measure of our national resources and energies in brainpower. We should be doing this even if communism were to vanish into oblivion.

"I defy anyone to describe in a few pages the organization of education in the United States," James Bryant Conant says in his 1964 report, "Shaping Educational Policy." The book is regarded as the culmination of Conant's extensive survey of American public education which began with "The American High School Today," published in 1959. Conant's statement merely points up that generalizations about education in the United States are hard to make. Each of the 50 States is sovereign in educational matters.

Our American educational system is hardly a system in any sense of the word. There is, of course, no national curriculum, and there are no nationally prescribed academic standards for education at any level. This is not to say that the standards of all public schools are low. In fact, the high range of accomplishments in some instances, differing from the poorest so markedly that they are intellectually unrelated, is one of the best indications of the urgent need for leadership and reform.

Conant, accepting the traditional viewpoint and seeing the shaping of educational policy as primarily the responsibility and function of States rather than the Federal Government, proposes the establishment of an interstate commission for planning a nationwide educational policy to help eliminate what he calls "chaos" in the structure of U.S. education. "Let the 50 States, or at least 15 to 20 of the more populous States," he says, "enter into a compact for the creation of an 'Interstate Commission for Planning a Nationwide Educational Policy.'" I will not here debate this key proposal. However, I am perplexed at his hope for cooperation among the 50 States if we cannot achieve it through our established Federal Government. Dr. Conant feels it is a vain hope to expect educational policy to come from our Federal Government, pointing out that only a constitutional amendment could give the Federal Government the full power to shape educational policies. He concedes that special legislation by Congress has influenced educational policy, but calls this "Federal policy made possible by continuous bribery."

But must the Federal Government have full power in order to exercise much more influence on educational policies?

Certainly the Federal Government could provide for greater leadership and direction for nationwide educational policy without a constitutional amendment. The present fact is that the Federal Government is no better organized that the States in the realm of education. It is even unable to carry out efficiently its educational responsibilities already enacted into law. A study of the Legislative Reference Service at the Library of Congress shows that the Federal Government is presently engaged in more than 300 educational programs, most of them administered by departments and agencies other than the Office of Education. There is scarcely a semblance of coordination among these programs. No constitutional amendment is required to achieve major improvement.

Through Government-financed research largely geared to our defense program, the Federal Government is supplying, in one way or another, a high proportion of the total revenues of many of our leading higher institutions. These programs are having an enormous influence, direct and indirect, upon the shape and direction of education in the United States. But what kind of shape? And in what direction? And what are the consequences? No one in the Federal Government knows, and no one is responsible for knowing.

Considering that one-quarter of the population of the United States is enrolled in our schools and colleges, and that education is the Nation's largest business, our factual information at the Federal and State level about what is now going on is astonishingly inadequate for sensible planning and decision making. Over and above this is the lack of leadership. This is why many favor the establishment of a new cabinet officer wholly devoted to the field of education.

Although the role of the Federal Government in education has been growing ever since President Lincoln signed the first Land Grant College Act, there has been no evidence of any deliberate Federal "interference." On the contrary, the real danger is that through its piecemeal approach the Federal Government is producing unintended distortions in the national pattern of education.

In 1959 I served as chairman of the Education Committee of the Democratic Advisory Council. In our report, some of which subsequently found its way into legislation, we proposed the formation of a small Council of Educational Advisers to the President. No new powers would be given to it. Its duty and opportunity would be to issue an annual report, which would keep the White House, the administration, the Congress, the State and local governments, and the Nation better informed about educational policies, or the lack thereof. If would provide a basis for detecting strengths and weaknesses, for spotting important new trends, and for identifying deficiencies in education. It could be of momentous help, if only through prestige and the ability to correlate educational programs and facts for the shaping of educational policy. It could greatly affect proposals for legislation both at the Federal and at the State levels.

I again renew my 1959 proposal. I know of no quick and easy action with such long-range promise for the improvement of American education as the establishment of a Council of Educational Advisers to give guidance to the administration, the Congress, and the people—as does the Council of Economic Advisers through its annual report and its ready availability.

America has been proud—and righly—that universal education has become a reality within its borders. Nevertheless, in the last 35 years we have permitted the proportion of our national income going to education to decline. Between the Civil War and 1929 our expenditures for education increased at a rate four times that of the increase in the gross national product. Between 1929 and 1960 the rate of increase of expenditures for education was less than the rate of increase in the gross national product.

In the U.S.S.R. education continues to get the intellectual priorities and the budget. Each student is not merely permitted to develop his talent to the fullest. He is pushed and prodded to develop it (provided, of

course, that his talent is of the kind that the state values). We in the United States cannot duplicate the array of pressures and incentives the Soviet Union is able to bring to bear on its young people—and we wouldn't want to duplicate them if we could. But in my judgment we as a nation must be prepared to make a far larger intellectual and financial investment in education than we ever have before. Because the answers cannot be developed merely by bigger appropriations, we must provide education with greatly improved leadership, through both our political and our intellectual institutions. We must launch and carry forward the needed research. Where are our experimental schools, our laboratory schools to match the 100 conducted by the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the R.S.F.S.R.? Yes, we must develop the ideas, the institutions, and the leaders—and put up the money. That is not only the road to survival. It is also the road to a Great Society of which we can be proud.

Never Underestimate the Power of a Soybean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following article from the May 1965 issue of Soybean Digest:

WE CAN INCREASE THE BOUNTY OF ALL

(By Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D.C., before the National Farm Institute, Des Moines, Iowa)

Never underestimate the power of a soybean. In 1961, I confidently predicted—and I quote: "If present trends continue, soybeans will be pushing wheat and cotton for first place (in our exports of farm products) by 1966." Well, in the fiscal year 1963–64, commercial sales of soybeans and soybean products comfortably topped both wheat and cotton, but fell short by just a bit of feed grain sales.

Today I am wiser, and in the future I will leave predictions about the ranking of farm exports to my colleagues in the Agriculture Department, even though my prediction proved cautious rather than optimistic.

If I may be permitted just a few comparisons:

Those two commercial best sellers last year—feed grains and soybeans and their products—earned almost as much abroad as the exports of the whole automobile and truck industry and about $350 million more than the exports of the giant chemical industry. Exports in each category alone earned about half again as much as exports from the coal industry or the oil industry; and each by itself earned more than twice as much as was earned by exports of office machines or metalworking machinery.

THE FARMER'S VOICE

If any of you fear that the farmer's voice may not be heard loud and clear in Washington these days outside the precincts of the Agriculture Department, let me set your fears at rest. In this balance-of-payments business, all of us are listening to you carefully, and we are delighted by what we hear.

I have been doing some homework on one particular partnership, the Soybean Council of America, and I want to report on that homework. The Soybean Council, which was founded in 1956, has just moved to Washington. It has been educating the natives there, including me. I propose that its members be given the title "market builders extraordinary" for their record over the past few years.

Take France. We may have had some differences of opinion with President de Gaulle, but when it comes to soybeans we obviously talk the same language. France is buying 218,000 tons of meal a year and the figure is going up. As recently as 1961, sales amounted to only 20,000 tons. What happened? Well, 4 years ago the Soybean Council opened an office in Paris and hired some nutrition technicians to work with the French companies which supply vitamins and mineral additives for animal feed. There's nothing like good technical diplomacy when it comes to building an export market, and that's just what did the trick. The French became converts to the miraculous soybean and now they hire nutrition technicians and send them to the United States once a year to keep up with the latest innovations.

In Germany, crushers were selling plenty of oil, but they couldn't move their meal. Again the Soybean Council and the Agriculture Department came forward with a little technology, showing the added value of U.S. toasted soybean meal. Not only did German meal begin to move; last year Germany imported 122,000 tons of high-grade U.S. meal.

Or take Spain. Here's a story. The United States began by shipping oil to Spain under the Public Law 480 program. In the first year some 5,000 tons were shipped. Year before last the figure was 200,000 tons—and for dollars, not under Public Law 480. After a recordbreaking olive oil crop a year ago, exports of U.S. soybean oil to Spain are again rising. Recently Spain has developed a soybean crushing industry of its own; last year this industry imported a million bushels of American soybeans. The Department of Agriculture tells me there is a good prospect that this market will grow to between 5 and 8 million bushels in the foreseeable future.

MARKET BUILDING

Behind these figures lies a fascinating story of market building. Working with Spanish canners and bottlers, the Soybean Council made soybean oil respectable in the nation where olive oil is king. And how did they do this? Not by debunking olive oil, but by mixing the two. Technology was combined with the skill of a wine connoisseur to produce a product strictly tailored to the Spanish who like their olive oil strong. The same mixture of diplomacy and technology created new oil markets in Greece and Turkey out of a marriage of olive oils and soybean oil. In Pakistan, a marriage was arranged between mustard oil, a local Pakistani product, and soybean oil, and out of the marriage a new market was born.

What fascinates me about these examples is that in each case the American exporter took a local producer by the hand and set out to build new markets for both. It is not a case of promoting American agriculture against local agriculture, but of promoting local business first with the help of the American product. Here in a nutshell is the kind of development assistance this country should cultivate and refine, for this is the effective way for one nation and one people to help another. In the case of Turkey, for example, the Soybean Council is working with a local supermarket chain—a Swiss firm—to revolutionize the basis marketing structure in the country. Modern bulk handling facilities for oil imports have been built in Spain and Pakistan and are now building in Turkey. In each case handling costs are being reduced, leaving more funds available for imports.

Europe is a red-hot market for fats and oils. Per capita consumption there, I am told, is about 60 pounds a year, against only 46 pounds here. But in most of the rest of the world, of course, there is a desperate need for additional fats and oils. In Morocco consumption is only about 10 pounds per capita; in Pakistan only 7 pounds. Here is the big challenge for the future. Can commercial markets be built in these parts of the world?

FIRST SHIPMENTS TO INDIA

Well, recently the first large shipments of U.S. soybean oil arrived in India under the Public Law 480 program. And on the dock was a technician hired by the Soybean Council to oversee storage and distribution facilities and help to incorporate soybean oil in India's basic shortening product. This is the way dollar markets were built up in Spain and Iran. Turkey, I am told, promises to become a dollar market before another 5 years have passed.

It will, no doubt, be many years before India's 450 millions get the kind of diet they need to work for the modernization of their country without extraordinary assistance from abroad. The same may be true for many other countries. But new dollar markets are being developed nonetheless with each year that goes by. Meanwhile, through such programs as Public Law 480 we are keeping alive the promise of the future.

Sometimes I think we do ourselves a great injustice by the way we talk of these programs as surplus disposal or foreign aid. To be sure, Public Law 480 would quickly lose its support if it began substituting for dollar sales or otherwise disrupting commercial markets. But let us not blind ourselves to the very real marketbuilding potential in these programs. Let's start figuring the profit along with the cost when foreign aid is presented to Congress. The record of America's farm exports suggests to me that the profit in foreign aid is much greater than the name implies.

American agriculture has every right to be very proud of its export record. The partnerships among growers, processors, exporters, and consumers in American agriculture have proved that enduring new markets can be built up abroad. And let's not forget the role which Government has played and is playing in this partnership. It's not just a matter of Government moneys. Complex negotiations, like the Kennedy round of tariff bargaining now going on in Geneva, require the closest cooperation between Government and agriculture.

Finally, if your partnerships include agricultural interests from other countries, as the Soybean Council has made partners out of crushers' associations, feed companies, packagers, retailers, and even Government departments in other countries, then you can expect to add to your commercial success another kind of success of truly historic importance to our country.

Myopia Research Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of material on the Myopia Research Foundation which was forwarded to me by Mrs. Sylvia N. Rachlin, who has long been active on behalf of many good causes in my State of New York and who is now executive vice president of the foundation. The foundation is at work on a problem that afflicts millions of Americans and other people in the world.

I believe that many of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD may be interested in a brief description of the foundation's program and a petition addressed to the Appropriations Committee of this House:

AN ACCELERATED MYOPIA RESEARCH PROGRAM

ORGANIZATION AND SCOPE

A nationwide organized and comprehensive, interdisciplinary program of myopia research has been initiated by the Myopia Research Foundation, Inc.

WHY IS NEW RESEARCH NEEDED?

More than a million American children with progressive nearsightedness (in addition to countless millions of our world neighbors) may be saved from future blindness because of this new research program for children and adults with myopia. Large numbers of American adults are suffering loss of employment because of pathological and degenerative changes in myopia. There is presently no known cure for this type of blindness.

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON MYOPIA

In addition to its extensive myopia research program, the MRF organized and sponsored the first International Conference on Myopia, held in New York City, September 10–13, 1964, at the Hotel Americana. Here a diversity of disciplines, ranging from the licensed clinical professions charged with the care of eyes and vision, to the pure sciences, met together for the first time to review the problems of myopia and chart future research and attack into the causes, treatment, and prevention of nearsightedness.

The U.S. Department of State and Government health agencies cooperated in the invitation to eminent researchers in myopia from this country and other nations. Participants in the conference included doctors from Australia, Canada, Finland, France, Great Britain, Japan, South America, and the United States.

MRF NATIONAL ENLISTMENT OF PARTICIPATION IN ITS RESEARCH PROGRAM

In addition to enlisting the participation of nearsighted adults and children throughout the United States, the MRF is alerting the American public to the need of this coordinated research program. Service clubs, community groups, and individuals are being approached for their support of this vital research program.

WHAT AREAS ARE INCLUDED IN THIS ACCELERATED RESEARCH PROGRAM?

Among the areas included are:

General health (including specific eye research; circular-vascular and other studies in the realm of internal medicine; neurology; biochemistry and the many disciplines related to myopia research), heredity, environmental factors, nutrition, vocational surveys, living habits of nearsighted children and adults, and lenses—including contact lenses.

Cumulative findings will be filed under each eye specialist's name, with a code symbol to assure the anonymity of the patient. These records will be forwarded to a national myopia center, for the establishment of which the Myopia Research Foundation has already petitioned Congress and has had its first hearing. (Copy of petition attached.)

THE NATIONAL REGISTRIES OF MYOPIA PATHOLOGY

The Myopia Research Foundation is sponsoring the development of the National Registries of Myopia Pathology which has been established for the purpose of studying the pathology of myopia from its incipence through its advanced stages.

The clergy of the major religious faiths have indicated their willingness to launch a delicate and thought-provoking educational program for bequests of eyes by myopes and their families to the National Registries of Myopia Pathology. Civic groups will also cooperate in this aspect of the program.

Dr. Lorenz E. Zimmerman, director, registry of ophthalmic pathology, Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, Washington, D.C., is the national director of the National Registries of Myopia Pathology. His office will be the coordinating unit. A list of regional registries is herewith.

PERTINENT FACTS ABOUT THE MRF

The Myopia Research Foundation is idealistic in its plan for operation. Funds obtained will be used for research by doctors and scientists. No money will be expended for professional fund raising nor will any money be spent for MRF administrative salaries.

MEMBERSHIP IN THE MYOPIA RESEARCH FOUNDATION

Membership in the MRF is open to doctors, myopes and their families and any individual who wishes to be helpful in this humanitarian effort.

PETITION: DATE OF HEARING, MARCH 23, 1965

Petition to: Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Appropriations.

By: Myopia Research Foundation, Inc.

Subject: The need for establishment of the National Myopia Center.

The Myopia Research Foundation, Inc., 415 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., respectfully petitions Congress to establish the urgently needed National Myopia Center for the welfare of millions of Americans.

The National Myopia Center, under the aegis of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md., would make possible nationwide, organized and comprehensive interdisciplinary research into the causes, treatment, and prevention of nearsightedness. Doctors, institutions, colleges, and universities with particular interest in, and facilities for, research and treatment of myopia and its related problems, will participate in a coordinated approach.

There are millions of myopes in the United States, many of whom are destined for blindness or nearsightedness unless the riddle of the causation and treatment of this condition is solved. Large numbers of adults have suffered loss of jobs because of pathological or degenerative changes in myopia. There is no presently known cure for this blindness.

For centuries, myopia was considered a helpless affliction. We know that this is not true. However, in order to effect a breakthrough and halt the alarming increase in myopia, a crash program is needed.

Nearsighted children and adults throughout the country could, and we feel would, participate in the studies under the supervision of their own doctors.

A scientific information department should be established for the centralized reporting and analysis of data using the latest analytical techniques and instruments. It should also serve as the information unit for establishing and guiding active research projects in myopia and its related eye conditions.

The National Registries of Myopia Pathology shall be supported in developing its program with university hospital laboratories and cooperating eye banks. Pathologic research findings shall be coordinated with clinical research findings at the National Myopia Center.

In addition to the professional, a lay approach in furthering the National Myopia Center is being used with interest already shown by numerous health, public service, education, civic, and other organizations.

In view of the aforementioned reasons, we, therefore, respectfully request Congress to allocate $25 million over a period of 5 years, for the establishment of the National Myopia Center to further research in myopia and related eye conditions; the Scientific Information Department and the National Registries of Myopia Pathology.

NATIONAL REGISTRIES OF MYOPIA PATHOLOGY

(Dr. Lorenz E. Zimmerman, national director)

(NOTE.—The office of the national director will be the coordinating unit of the National Registries of Myopia Pathology.)

Armed Forces Institute of Pathology: Registery of Ophthalmic Pathology, Washington, D.C., Dr. Lorenz E. Zimmerman, Director.

REGIONAL REGISTRIES

Baylor University: College of Medicine, Texas Medical Center, Houston, Tex., Dr. Milton Boniuk, department of ophthalmology.

Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center: The Institute of Ophthalmology, New York, N.Y., Dr. Arthur G. DeVoe, director.

Harvard University Medical School: Howe Laboratory of Ophthalmology, Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, Boston, Mass., Dr. David G. Cogan, archives of ophthalmology.

University of Iowa: Department of Ophthalmology, Iowa City, Iowa, Dr. Fred C. Blodi, associate professor of ophthalmology, University of Iowa Medical School.

University of Miami: Bascom Palmer Eye Institute, Miami, Fla., Dr. Victor T. Curtin, associate professor of ophthalmology, University of Miami Medical School.

University of Oregon Medical School: Department of Ophthalmology, Portland, Oreg., Dr. Kenneth C. Swan, chairman and professor of ophthalmology.

Subverting the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the detention of mail from Communist countries by the Post Office Department is over at long last. On May 24 the U.S. Supreme Court in an 8-to-0 decision invalidated, under the first amendment, the law which authorized the Post Office Department to withhold mail unless the addressee specifically requested its delivery.

This issue started in 1961 when a bill passed the House directing the Postmaster General to notify recipients of mail he deemed to be Communist propaganda. At that time I pointed out that the bill was probably unconstitutional and voted against it. In 1962 the so-called Cunningham amendment came before the House. It created a program of censorship and interception of foreign mail. I again questioned its constitutionality and made a motion to strike it. I was one of two to vote against the Cunningham amendment. It is this law which has now been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. The New York Times, in an editorial on May 25, 1965, praised the action of the Court and stated:

American liberties are more secure for the abolition of this effort to curb subversion by subverting the Constitution.

The editorial follows:

FREEING THE MAILS

The principle that Americans are entitled to receive their mail without interference by an oversolicitious Government has been upheld by the Supreme Court. The law under which the Post Office withheld what it considered propaganda mail from Communist countries unless the addressee specifically requested its delivery was an indefensible infringement on the free exchange of ideas.

Before the law's adoption in 1962, Byron R. White, then a Deputy Attorney General and now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, warned that it violated the traditions of this country's open society and would damage U.S. prestige in the free world. The accuracy of his warning became evident when it was disclosed that a list of persons receiving Communist publications from abroad had been turned over the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Justice White took no part in yesterday's decision invalidating the mail law, but his colleagues were unanimous in finding it invalid under the first amendment. American liberties are more secure for the abolition of this effort to curb subversion by subverting the Constitution.

Facts To Remember as We Plan a New Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, President Johnson has activated the Commission, which Congress has authorized, to study a new sea-level crossing of the Central American isthmus.

All Americans watch this effort closely. So does the rest of the world.

Many editorials have been written about the need for a new canal, its practicability, and its projected use. However, few have dealt with the subject with the vision shown by John Haydon in his editorial which was published the Marine Digest of May 8, 1965.

As the Commission proceeds with its task, each of us should keep in mind what John Haydon has pointed out so well.

I ask the unanimous consent of this body that the Marine Digest editorial of May 8 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANAL STORM WARNINGS

The President's Committee to seek a location for a sea-level canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific is indeed farsighted. Should the world hold together until its completion, a new era will be opened to deep-sea transportation. Each year ships get larger and larger and a growing percentage is presently unable to use the existing Panama Canal. None realized at the building of the old canal that ships would ever reach the mammoth proportions of today.

The Committee is to be headed by Robert B. Anderson, former Secretary of the Treasury, and will include Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Johns Hopkins University; Kenneth E. Fields, former General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission; Raymond A. Hill, consulting engineer, Pasadena, Calif., and Robert G. Storey, president of the Southwest Legal Foundation. With this qualified group of men, it is assured that good judgment will be used, but we do not hesitate to point out some facts worthy of consideration.

First. If the site chosen for the new canal is not in Panama, the United States should retain its control of the old as well as the new canal. If we turn the old canal back to Panama, it could open the door for cut-rate competition and a possible breeding ground for behind-the-scenes Communist activity.

Second. The United States has paid for, developed, and maintained the present canal to the financial benefit of Panama down through the years and release of this canal could spell trouble if it falls into the wrong hands.

Third. Two canals are essential in time of emergency in case one is damaged. Sites are being considered in Panama, Colombia, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica. There is also a possibility that the present canal could be converted into a sea-level canal. But under any circumstances the U.S. Government should keep undivided control.

America has pledged itself to thwart the spread of communism and the best way to prevent its spread is to control the transportation gateways. The regrettable mistake of the British was that they did not elect to fight to keep the Suez Canal under its control and open to free world trade. They handed it to Egypt as a gift on a silver platter, and to this day the Israel merchant fleet is still forbidden to use that canal. This costly mistake was on par with failure of Uncle Sam to back up the Bay of Pigs invasion which could have kept Cuba from going Red.

Latin America is now ripe for subversion forces and America will never again be able to relax her vigil.

The cost of a new canal will be staggering, but with nuclear know-how in blasting and the engineering innovations, the overall expenses will be cut considerably. Experience gained in underground explosions in Nevada and New Mexico and the one soon to be made on Amchitka Island in Alaska will be invaluable to the forthcoming construction of a new Central American canal.

But, again we stress above all, that this Nation must keep solid control of any or all canals. It represents the lifeline of our country; it is essential to defense of the Americas and a prestige factor in international power.

It was once said that the sun never sets on the British Empire—this is no longer so, and any relaxing of America's might will cast long shadows on our Nation, long before the sun goes down.

Federal Meat Inspection Is a Public Health Service, Not a User Convenience—Remarks at an American Meat Institute Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see in the agricultural appropriation bill scheduled to come before the House on Wednesday that funds have been provided to meet the continuing expansion of the meat and poultry inspection programs. The combined costs of these two inspection services will exceed $52½ million in the coming fiscal year, which is quite a sizable amount more than they cost when I first came to Congress in 1953, prior to the passage of the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957. I am proud of the fact that it was my proposal for compulsory Federal inspection of poultry which led to the enactment of the 1957 act. The Meatcutters Union was instrumental at that time in bringing to the fore the need for such legislation, and in spotlighting the abuses taking place in some of the poultry processing plants which made the legislation absolutely essential.

Until recently, meat inspection was administered by the Agricultural Research Service in the Department of Agriculture, while poultry inspection was administered by the Agricultural Marketing Service. They have now been combined in the newly created Consumer and Marketing Service, which includes most of the agencies of the old Marketing Service. The subcommittee on appropriations has performed a very worthwhile service in nailing down in the hearings the need for continued high professional independence for the meat inspection people, so that this program is not considered primarily a marketing promotion service, which it is not. It is essentially a public health service, and must so remain.

ALL CONSUMER PRODUCTS SHOULD BE AS PURE AND WHOLESOME AS MEAT

Under those circumstances, it is vital that this service not be placed under any control—financial or otherwise—of the industries it supervises. I oppose the Budget Bureau's longtime efforts to have Congress change the law so that meat inspection, and poultry inspection also, would be paid for by the processors rather than by the Government.

I went into my reasons for this position, at some length, in a talk to the wives of the members of the board of directors of the American Meat Institute on May 5. As I took pains to point out, my reasons were far different from those of the meatpackers, although we happen to share a similar position on this issue.

My purpose in speaking to the wives of the executives of the meatpacking industry was not to tell them why I sided with their husbands on the meat inspection cost issue so much as it was to enlist their help in the passage of my bill, H.R. 1235, to make other foods and cosmetics and over-the-counter drugs at least as pure and wholesome as the meat products their husbands make and sell in interstate commerce. While it may never be practical to have continuous Federal inspection of all food processing in the same way meat and poultry are inspected, I feel that if the public has the information about the gaps in our Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act it will demand immediate tightening of the law to close the gaps at which H.R. 1235 is directed. The wives of the meatpackers were gracious and attentive, and I hope they will help in this crusade.

Mr. Speaker, under consent of the House, I submit relevant portions of my speech at the American Meat Institute luncheon, as follows:

"ALL CONSUMER PRODUCTS SHOULD BE AS PURE AND WHOLESOME AS MEAT"—EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSOURI, AT LUNCHEON MEETING FOR WIVES OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE, AT THE INTERNATIONAL CLUB, WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 1965

* * * * *

I came here from the hearings of the National Commission on Food Marketing which began today in the House Caucus Room. I will return to those hearings this afternoon. The Commission is a bipartisan agency created by Congress last year to study all aspects of food marketing from the farm to the ultimate consumer. It is composed of five House Members—three Democrats and two Republicans, including another woman Member, Representative CATHERINE MAY, of Washington; five Senators, similarly divided politically; and five public members appointed by the President. Our assignment is an all-encompassing one, to find out whether the multibillion-dollar food industry in this country is adequately serving the needs of the Nation and assuring sufficient competition under the free enterprise system to provide us with the best food possible at reasonable prices.

In any industry as vast as this one, the rivalries and challenges for dominance among the different levels and segments of food marketing, as well as among individual firms in the same field, are intense and unrelenting. Each segment, of course, believes it could do a better job for the public if its suppliers or customers were not engaged in such cutthroat competition for a bigger share of the consumer dollar. The cattlemen say the chainstores are ruining them, if the packers aren't; the chainstores have a completely different viewpoint, of course; and as for the packers, well, I'm sure they'll have a lot to say for themselves, too. As for those of us on the Commission, we will continue to listen, ask some questions, initiate some independent research of our own, and when we're through—sometime before July 1, 1966—we will be expected to have the true and accurate facts distilled out of all of this controversy. More than that—if you can ask us to achieve more than a determination of the true facts in so complex an economic battleground as this one—we will be expected to reach conclusions about what should be done about the food marketing industry, if anything, to improve the processing and distribution of food for the American consumer.

FOOD MARKETING HEARINGS

Our recommendations, whatever they may be, will then go to Congress where the controversies we will have uncovered and listended to and analyzed and reported on will then be reviewed and debated all over again, before any laws are written to carry out the recommendations we may make.

In the course of our inquiry, we are holding a series of hearings in various parts of the country. The first was held last month in Cheyenne, Wyo., followed by another in Fort Worth, Tex., where cattlemen had much to say—and complain about—in connection with the marketing of beef and veal. Our hearings this week in Washington are on the increased spread in retailing—the difference between the average prices paid by the stores for the merchandise they buy from your husbands' packing plants, or from the other food processors or wholesalers, and the average prices the stores charge the customer. Next week, the Commission meets in Atlanta, Ga., to hear the complaints, suggestions, and operating problems of the poultry industry. Other hearings are scheduled later in Omaha, Nebr.; Minneapolis, Minn.; San Francisco, Calif.; and other localities covering, eventually, all phases of the food industry.

Depending upon the legislation coming before the House of Representatives at those times and dates * * * it is my intention to attend at least some of the out-of-town hearings. For, in getting to the roots of our most important single industry—the one which, more than any other, keeps us alive and healthy and the best fed nation in the world—it is not enough just to sit in Washington listening to the lobbyists and the eloquent spokesmen for big business and big labor and organized consumers. We have to know, too, what the individual in various segments of this industry has to say for himself, on his home grounds.

Of course, as a Member of Congress, I already have a pretty good idea of the views and feelings of executive and working people in the food industry in St. Louis, for they manage to keep me very well informed of their problems and aspirations, and the effect upon their well-being of laws and regulations coming out of Congress or the executive departments here in Washington.

BACKGROUND OF MEAT INSPECTION COST CONTROVERSY

Right now, for instance, I know very well what it would mean to Krey Packing Co., to name one of the firms represented on your board of directors—and to every other packer in St. Louis—and to their customers, including the ultimate consumers—if the Budget Bureau were to succeed in having the costs of Federal compulsory meat inspection transferred from the Federal budget to every meat packing plant engaged in interstate commerce—shouldering them with a $35,700,000 annual cost for a service which has always, except for 1 year right after World War II, been paid for by the Government. Poultry inspection runs to $17,500,000 a year, and that, too, would be assessed against the processors if Congress approved this idea.

I think your husbands in the American Meat Institute know where I stand, and always have stood, on the issue of user charges for meat inspection. I am against the whole idea. I am against it not as a favor to Krey Packing Co., or other firms in St. Louis, or to Armour or Wilson or Rath or Cudahy or any other firms; I am against it because I believe it would be a terrible disservice to the consumer, and to the public health and well-being. And I have never hesitated to say so, ever since the Second Hoover Commission made the recommendation nearly a decade ago that the Government transfer this charge from the Federal budget to the meat processors.

The Bureau of the Budget, which is an arm of the White House, of the President, has persuaded each President since then—Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson—to urge Congress to change the law to bring about this alleged reduction in Federal expenditures. Having fought so hard in 1957 to enact the law which required compulsory Federal inspection of poultry in interstate commerce on the same basis as we have had compulsory Federal inspection of red meats since 1906, I have no intention of seeing this work undermined by putting the inspectors—the watchdogs—in the employ of the processors. One of the reasons we enacted the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957 was to end abuses which had grown up under the previous voluntary inspection system, under which the processor paid for the service and all too often called the tune on how the service was to be provided.

FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION BEGAN IN 1906

So, while I may be on the side of the angels, as far as your husbands are concerned, on this particular issue of user charges for meat inspection, we are not necessarily on the same side for the same reasons.

I am sure that making the packers pay for inspection will not put them into bankruptcy. They would just pass the costs on down the line, in higher prices. Every consumer would pay more for meat and poultry—much more than the cost of the inspection, once markups on wholesale costs are pyramided down the line. This would, of course, hit hardest at the lowest income groups. But this is not the only, or even the main reason I oppose it. Sometimes meat or poultry prices rise for other reasons—or fall. Short of the kind of price control no one seriously, or responsibly, would suggest, we cannot guarantee that the price of ground round or pork chops or chicken parts will always remain constant and static. So, while higher cost to the consumer is a factor—perhaps a few cents a pound more in a particular cut of meat—the basic issue of why I oppose the user-charge idea goes more deeply than that.

Meat is inspected for wholesomeness in order to protect the health of the American people. We no longer buy from a neighborhood butcher who slaughters his own steers and whose reputation for sanitation, or lack of it, is known to everyone in the neighborhood. As long ago as 1906, meatpacking had become endowed with such a public health importance that Congress—under prodding from some "wild-eyed radicals" whom your husband's grandfathers or great-grandfathers must have cursed with heartfelt malevolence—enacted the Meat Inspection Act which assures us that the products leaving your husbands' plants are pure and wholesome—derived from disease-free animals, processed in sanitary facilities, and free from dangerous or harmful additives or from contaminants.

INSPECTORS SHOULD NOT BE BEHOLDEN TO PACKERS

Once the products leave the packing plants, the Food and Drug Administration is supposed to keep an eye on their wholesomeness in transit, and then it is usually up to the State or local authorities to make sure the products are properly refrigerated and protected in the retail stores. Of course, when the housewife leaves perishable meat items in a car parked in the hot sun for several hours with the windows closed, before getting them home to the refrigerator or freezer, that's a different story.

But we know—we know—that when that meat left the packing plant, it was as wholesome as it is possible for us to assure meat to be. I wish every processing plant in the food industry were as sanitary as our meatpacking plants in interstate commerce, and every food product as wholesome upon leaving the factory. I doubt if we could ever succeed in having the kind of continuous Federal inspection for wholesomeness in every food plant which we have now in interstate meatpacking. The Federal meat inspectors are the guards of this purity. I don't want them beholden to the packers for their pay.

In view of the reasons I have given you for my opposition to user charges for meat inspection, you might wonder why I have gone to the unusual lengths today of leaving Capitol Hill during congressional working hours in order to come here to meet with the wives of the directors of the American Meat Institute. Obviously, it could not have been in an effort to try to ingratiate myself with the industry your husbands represent, for I hope I have made it clear my position is based very little on consideration for the cost ledgers of your husbands' firms and very much on considerations of public health and public interest and public policy.

GAPS IN FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

For my answer, I have to go back to an incident last summer when I held an infor-

mal press briefing on consumer legislation with many of the women reporters who cover Washington for newspapers, magazines, radio and television. The more I told them about the gaps in our consumer laws, the more incredulous they were.

These were sophisticated, knowledgeable Washington reporters, sharp and well informed. But, like most women, they were generally unaware of the fact that the beauty preparations we buy for billions of dollars each year are freely put on the market without any required preclearance for safety; that medical devices and materials used in or on our bodies for the relief of pain or the mitigation of illness or disease need not be certified as either safe or effective; that drugs or cosmetics which are poisonous if swallowed or inhaled, or food, drug, or cosmetic items which are packaged in dangerous containers, need not indicate that fact, or provide any life-saving instructions if mishandled by children; that half of all of the pep pills and barbiturates produced in this country—drugs which are supposed to be dispensed only by prescription and which are dangerous when misused—end up on the bootleg market where they are peddled to people, including teenagers, who do misuse them to an alarming extent; that hair dyes are being legally marketed which can cause blindness, baldness, scalp burns, or severe dermatitis in individual cases, and the law doesn't care just so long as the label on the container indicates in fine prints that the product may be dangerous to some users—and, I ask you, what woman having her hair dyed in a beauty salon ever gets to read the warning label on the container in which the dye was shipped to the hair-dressing establishment?

A CAUSE ALL WOMEN SHOULD PROMOTE

When I recounted these and a list of other glaring gaps in our basic consumer protection statute, the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, to the women reporters, they were amazed at how many of these facts were unknown to the public. They promised to do something about it professionally, and I am delighted to say they have done a great deal since then in publicizing the need for corrective legislation such as in my omnibus bill, H.R. 1235. But they gave me a further assignment:

"You will have to get more women interested in these issues," they told me. "See if you can get the League of Women Voters, or the General Federation of Women's Clubs, or other women's organizations behind you. If you can do that, we can help you put this story across."

Ever since then, I have been trying my best to enlist the women of this country in the kind of political campaign in which women are irresistibly effective once they get started. I am not referring to partisan politics, but politics in the broader and deeper meaning as the science and art of government in a democracy. And many of the women's groups are responding and working on this issue. But success is still a long way away.

SLOW PROGRESS IN WINNING REFORMS

I have been introducing an omnibus food, drug, and cosmetic bill in every Congress since 1961—the same basic bill with the same number, H.R. 1235. Parts of my original bill from 4 years ago were enacted in 1962 in the drug control amendments, dealing only with prescription drugs. These provisions were first introduced in legislative form in my bill, and later formed the foundation for the Kefauver-Harris bill which became law. But other features of my original bill are still awaiting action even though they are just as urgently needed as were the drug control provisions enacted 3 years ago. Cosmetics safety legislation has been stalled in Congress for at least 11 years, which is how long it has been since Congressman DELANEY, of New York, and I first introduced companion bills on this subject.

So I am here today not to soft-soap your husbands on the question of meat inspection costs, but to enlist you in a special kind of political campaign—to help get legislation of vital importance to you and to your children and their children taken off the legislative back burner, where it simmers fitfully and ineffectually, and get it on the front burner, where it can come to a boil.

This is legislation in which you, as the wives of leaders of the meat industry, can see some close-to-home relevance. For the issue simply is this: we should expect, and require, that all of the foods we buy and use are as wholesome and pure as the meat which leaves your husband's plants, and all of the drugs—including those bought over the counter—and all of the cosmetics, and also all of the therapeutic devices offered for the relief of illness or disease or pain, are safe to use in the manner indicated and safe to have in the home; or, if they can't always be made completely safe, that then the warnings they must carry are clear and the instructions explicit. For instance, we require bleaches and detergents and paints and solvents and other hazardous household items to be clearly marked as to danger and as to antidotes, but food, drug and cosmetic items are expressly exempt from these requirements. Why? There is no good reason.

NEED FOR POLITICAL ACTION

Your family incomes in the meat business come from a wholesome product which must meet and pass strict Federal inspection and controls. As customers for other consumer products, you are entitled to, and should expect and require, similar guarantees of safety from those whose products you buy for your own homes.

How do we achieve these consumer objectives—and others, too, such as establishing clear-cut national safety standards for automobile tires, which are sold today in a jungle of confusing and misleading claims and descriptions as to quality?

(The other driver's cheap "bargain" tires can take the lives of your entire family on the superhighway.) How do we end pollution of our atmosphere and of our environment? How do we curb the continued improper use of insecticides and pesticides which endanger our food supplies?

The answer is a simple one to state, but difficult to achieve. We accomplish these things through political action, first by arousing citizens to the existence of these problems and having them, in turn, arouse their public officials to the existence of legislative or regulatory means for solving these problems.

I have seen wonders accomplished in this manner—from educational opportunities for retarded and other physically handicapped children to the establishment of a billion-dollar-a-year health research program in the National Institutes of Health; from the development of library facilities in rural areas to our half-billion-dollar-a-year program for expansion of college facilities; from the nationwide polio vaccination program to the creation of an educational television system. All of these things—and many more—were instigated by, or helped to achievement by dedicated women making their voices heard in Washington—by writing to their Congressmen, to their Representatives and Senators, and by talking to other women and encouraging them to do likewise.

PUTTING YOUR FOOT DOWN

When I ask you to enlist in this political campaign for consumer safety, it is primarily for the safety of children, for they are the greatest victims of gaps in our poison control laws. You may not agree with every provision of my omnibus bill; the necessity, however, is to agree on basic objectives, and we can tailor the bills to meet those needs on which we do agree. For example, I propose in my bill a complete ban on sale of flavored aspirin for children. Pediatricians are divided on this idea. If I can't prove the need for it I will back down, but I think I can establish the need. Even so, getting Congress to act on necessary legislation, even when the need is clear, takes a lot of pressure. In that respect, Congress is like the accelerator of your car; you make it go by putting your foot down.

If women generally will help in this drive, we can win our objectives of greater family safety. Knowing that the firms where your husbands work must toe the line on product safety and sanitation and wholesomeness, I feel you can be tremendously effective in calling for similar safeguards in other industries serving the American consumer. That's why I have come here to ask your help.

Independence in Tiflis

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago, May 26, 1918, the people of the independent nation of Georgia proclaimed their independence in Tiflis, the capital of the Georgian Republic. The official act of independence was proclaimed by the Georgian Parliament, meeting in that city as duly constituted representatives of the people. At one time in its period of independence, 26 nations recognized the independence of the Georgian Republic.

Unfortunately, the Georgian Republic and the stalwart citizens of that land fell before the military forces of the Russian Communists, who overran their nation before their independence could be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to remind the Members that the Georgians have a long and honorable history. The people have been Christians since the fourth century and maintained their national identity throughout the ages. After their forcible integration into the Russian Empire, they developed and to this day maintain an ardent anti-Russian nationalism. They are a democratic-minded people who are still vehemently opposed to the dictatorial policies of communism.

Since their forcible reannexation to the Soviet Union, the people of Georgia have persistently maintained their unique nationalistic spirit, looking forward to the day when legitimate freedom and independence shall be restored to their land. This year throughout the free world Georgian leaders are holding commemorative meetings to keep alive the flame of hope in the hearts of their people to maintain their persistent struggle against Communist oppression.

One of the immediate steps that we can take is to approve the creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations so that the plight of the Georgian people and the other captive nations of communism can be exposed.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that the freedom of the United States and all

parts of the free world remain threatened as long as the Communists maintain their imperial policy and their aggressive designs aimed at world control. The legitimate nationalism of the people of Georgia and other captive lands under communism represent the true weakness in the Red apparatus.

Let us encourage leaders of the Georgian people to continue to work for the restoration of freedom of their people, realizing as they do that as freedom is restored to their land, it will undoubtedly be restored to their neighboring states in Eastern Europe which share their present confinement in the Soviet colonial empire.

Excise Tax Repeal Long Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us in the Congress who have been seeking the elimination of the wartime nuisance excise taxes for the past several years are heartened indeed over the President's recent message and recommendations to the Congress since the repeal of these taxes is long overdue.

As Members of this House can well recall, these taxes were originally imposed during the war on toilet articles, cosmetics, jewelry, furs and leather goods, admissions, gasoline, autos, liquor, tobacco, telephone service, air passenger travel, and other miscellaneous articles to secure revenue for the conduct of the war. These war tax levies should have been eliminated as soon as the war ended, and the fact that they have continued to exist to this day, some 20 years after the war, is a sad breach of faith with the American people.

When these taxes are finally repealed, they should go into effect immediately. There should be a minimal gap between enactment and the effective date of the repeal so that prospective buyers will not postpone their purchases. This is little to ask for the American people who assumed these tax burdens willingly, but have deserved better in getting them lifted from their backs over the years.

President Johnson is to be complimented for moving to get rid of these completely indefensible levies, and I now urge the House to repeal these taxes immediately so that consumers can get the benefit of tax reduction on these items right away, and industry will not be harmed in any way by delayed consumer purchases pending the effective repeal date.

The power to tax is the power to destroy. Congress must remember that fact. At the same time, Congress and the people must recognize that the abuse of the power to spend at every level can bring ruin to free democratic government. This is just as true of local and State governments as it is of the Federal Government.

Obviously, we must spend what needs to be spent to provide essential services, but no government should be expected in this modern age, under ordinary conditions, to practice frugality or miserliness at the expense of the people, particularly the sick and handicapped.

Rigid economy is one thing; sheer penury is quite another thing. This is a dynamic, fast-growing country and our economy and social organism must be kept on the move; our standards upheld, protected, and improved.

Let me reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that the repeal of these onerous taxes should be put into effect immediately. This repeal is long overdue, and I am very happy to see these burdens lifted from American business and the American people. It is better late than never, but the sad fact remains that Congress should have repealed these wartime nuisance exactions long ago.

I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks editorials on the telephone excise tax which appeared in the Webster Times and Milford Daily News, highly esteemed newspapers published in my district.

The material follows:

[From the Webster (Mass.) Times, May 6, 1965]

HOW MUCH LONGER?

The Federal excise tax on telephone service—dating back to World War I—burdens subscribers to a greater degree than is generally realized.

The tax constitutes a 10-percent impost on local and long distance service. Developed to help raise war funds and to discourage nonessential calls on crowded telephone networks, the tax was repealed in 1924.

In 1932 Congress again imposed an excise tax on long distance service to help pay for public works projects during the depression. In 1941 the tax was placed on local service for the first time. This was to be temporary.

In today's complex society, communications services rank as an absolute necessity. Yet, telephone subscribers continue to pay a "temporary" tax. To reduce statistics to local level, Webster-Dudley subscribers paid $81,953.04 in excise taxes in 1964. Oxford contributions came to $27,094.44.

There is small doubt that the Federal excise tax on telephone service ought to be repealed. In fact, it should have been repealed a long time ago.

[From the Milford (Mass.) Daily News, Apr. 30, 1965]

"NUISANCE" TAXES

Treasury Secretary Dillon has announced that the administration is seeking the elimination of excise taxes on toilet articles, cosmetics, jewelry, furs, and leather goods during the present session of Congress.

But among the excise taxes which would be left standing are those on admissions, gasoline, autos, liquor, tobacco, telephone service, and air passenger travel.

It will be difficult to make a case for continuing the taxes on the last two items. Established as a wartime "emergency," with a deterrent effect in mind, the emergency no longer exists.

In these days of speed and narrowing boundaries telephone service has become a necessity, not a luxury. And in the efforts of both the Government and the individual States to advertise the Nation's vacation wonderlands air travel is a big factor.

Taxes on essential services like these tend to discourage their use and to hold back their further expansion.

National Issues Poll for 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as in past years, I am inserting in the RECORD the results of the annual national issues poll for the 13th District of Illinois. This 1965 questionnaire was circulated to postal patrons in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois. To date, more than 27,000 people have responded to the 1965 questionnaire, a higher response than in previous years.

In my letter to constituents enclosing a tabulation of the poll, I made the following comments which indicate my conviction that the questionnaire is a most helpful device in the continuing effort to make representative government work properly:

The response to the 1965 national issues poll has been excellent. To date more than 27,000 returns have been received—compared with 19,000 returns in 1963 and 24,000 in 1964—and completed questionnaires are still being received every day. I am grateful for your willingness to participate and for the deep interest it demonstrates in the affairs of our country. While it is not possible to acknowledge individually all comments made on the completed questionnaires, I want you to know that I have read them with great interest.

According to the latest census figures, the 13th district ranks first in the Nation in family income, first in least unemployment, and tied for first in the number of years of residents' education. The unique nature of the district, coupled with your keen and knowledgeable interest in national issues, makes the results of this national issues poll, as shown on the reverse side of this letter, most interesting.

For representative government to work effectively, there must be a continuous two-way flow of information between Washington, D.C. and the district. Toward this end, the poll is well worth the time, effort, and cost if it is informative, stimulates discussion and thought, points out topics where a lack of information exists, and encourages comment and communication from residents of our 13th district. Certainly, the response this year indicates that the poll has served its purpose.

Thank you again for your time and effort in considering and responding to these important national questions. I look forward to hearing from you in the future on matters of mutual concern, and assure you that your letters will always be welcome and your views thoughtfully considered. By calling on me in my capacity as your link between Illinois and the Federal Government in Washington, D.C., you will assist me in providing the type of representation that our district desires and deserves.

The results follow:

RESULTS OF 1965 NATIONAL ISSUES POLL

1. Civil rights—Do you favor legislation:

(a) To permit Federal registrars to register citizens denied the right to vote because of their race? Yes, 67.8 percent; no, 29.1 percent; no answer, 3.1 percent.

(b) To make the Civil Rights Commission permanent? Yes, 42.2 percent; no, 47.9 percent; no answer, 9.9 percent.

2. Do you favor revision of immigration laws to gradually eliminate the "national

origin quota system" and substitute priorities based on needed skills and relationship to U.S. citizens and resident aliens? Yes, 68.4 percent; no, 27.6 percent; no answer, 4.0 percent.

3. Vietnam—Do you favor:

(a) The present U.S. program of stepped-up military and financial assistance? Yes, 48.5 percent; no, 28.7 percent; no answer, 22.8 percent.

(b) An intensified military effort using troops and assistance from other free southeast Asian nations in cooperation with U.S. forces? Yes, 62.7 percent; no, 21.1 percent; no answer, 16.2 percent.

(c) A negotiated settlement for withdrawal of U.S. troops and assistance and establishment of a neutralist government? Yes, 33.7 percent; no, 46.2 percent; no answer, 20.1 percent.

4. Do you favor continued U.S. aid to Indonesia and the United Arab Republic? Yes, 7.6 percent; no, 86.2 percent; no answer, 6.2 percent.

5. Do you favor U.S. trade with Communist bloc nations of:

(a) Food, such as the 1964 wheat sales? Percent yes, 50.1; percent no, 46.4; percent no answer, 3.5.

(b) Industrial and consumer goods? Percent yes, 31.7; percent no, 61.8; percent no answer, 6.5.

6. A bill providing additional Federal assistance for health care for the aged will undoubtedly pass Congress this year.[1] Of the major proposals under consideration, do you favor:

(a) "Medicare"—administration's King-Anderson bill financed by social security taxes? Percent yes, 22.9; percent no, 59.3; percent no answer, 17.8.

(b) "Eldercare"—Herlong-Curtis (American Medical Association) bill? Percent yes, 46.9; percent no, 32.2; percent no answer, 20.9.

(c) "Bow bill"—provides tax deductions and tax credits for purchase of private health insurance? Percent yes, 47.8; percent no, 28.3; percent no answer, 23.9.

7. Do you favor President Johnson's proposal for Federal rent subsidies to low income families in lieu of additional public housing? Percent yes, 25.3; percent no, 66.7; percent no answer, 8.

8. Many education bills are pending in Congress.[2] Do you favor:

(a) Administration proposal for preschool training of youngsters in urban and rural slum areas? Percent yes, 49.2; percent no, 41.7; percent no answer, 9.1.

(b) Administration proposal of $1 billion of aid to elementary and secondary schools allocated by the number of students whose family incomes are under $2,000? Percent yes, 45.6; percent no, 43; percent no answer, 11.4.

(c) Administration proposal for Federal aid to private schools? Percent yes, 21.2; percent no, 67.1; percent no answer, 11.7.

(d) Administration proposal of $70 million for Federal scholarship grants to 140,000 needy first year college students? Percent yes, 52; percent no, 28.1; percent no answer, 9.9.

(e) Return of 2 percent of Federal income tax collections from each State to that State, earmarked for education but without Federal involvement? Percent yes, 69.7; percent no, 20.5; percent no answer, 9.8.

(f) Ayres' bill providing each family a tax credit of up to $100 per year for the amount of State and local school taxes or a tax credit of $50 per year for each child in school up to a maximum of $200? Percent yes, 61.8; percent no, 25.4; percent no answer, 12.8.

(g) Permitting tax deductions and/or tax credits for partial costs of college education expenses? Percent yes, 80.6; percent no, 14; percent no answer, 5.4.

9. Do you favor repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which now permits States to enact "Right to Work" laws? Percent yes, 19.2; percent no, 69.6; percent no answer, 11.2.

10. Do you favor Federal legislation to tighten control of the sale and purchase of firearms? Percent yes, 68.4; percent no, 29.9; percent no answer, 1.7.

11. Do you favor the proposed change in length of term from 2 years to 4 years for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives? Percent yes, 61.7; percent no, 34.4; percent no answer, 3.9.

[1] H.R. 6675, which passed the House on April 8, incorporated mainly the features of (a) above.

[2] NOTE.—H.R. 2362, which passed the House on March 26, included features (a), (b), and (c) above. An average of the responses to these three parts is as follows: Percent yes, 38.7; percent no, 50.6; percent no answer, 10.7.

Draft Statement on Bill To Increase Lump-Sum Payment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker on May 25, 1965, I introduced H.R. 8442 which provides for an increase in the maximum lump-sum death payment under social security from $255 to $312 immediately and to $368 after 1971. The present lump-sum death payment was established by Congress in 1952 and it is apparent that since that time the consumer price index has risen; the cost of funerals has skyrocketed, having risen at least 30 percent; and hospital and medical costs of the last illness has risen approximately 50 percent—all without a corresponding increase in social security death benefits.

My bill, H.R. 8442, incorporates the proposals of the 1965 Advisory Council on Social Security which strongly urged a revision in the maximum lump-sum death payment. The Council specifically recommended that the amount of the payment be changed from the present maximum amount of $255 to the highest family maximum monthly benefit. In other words, under this proposal the maximum death payment would increase whenever the maximum monthly family benefit is increased. At the present time this would mean an increase of the death payment from $255 to $312 and after 1971, when the statutory ceiling for maximum monthly benefits rises, from $312 to $368.

This revision would benefit more than 600,000 families including millions of dependents who face the tragedy of the death of the family breadwinner with insufficient financial resources. While benefiting many, the cost of implementing this legislation would be minimal.

We cannot become complacent with what has gone before but rather we must recognize and deal with, each year, the problems concerning social security which were not envisioned by those who drafted the original Social Security Act. The social security program has been a successful investment for millions of Americans, and its continuing expansion and improvement can be a source of pride for Congress and for every American.

On March 26, 1965, I introduced H.R. 6843 to provide benefits to widows who remarry after age 62 but who under the present social security law forfeit benefits because of their remarriage. I stated at that time that this was but one of many inequities of our present law, inequities which should be corrected at the earliest possible moment.

The proposed increase in the lump-sum death payment is another example of an inequity which has resulted from the lapse of 13 years without an amendment to a section of the Social Security Act which applies to more than 1 million families each year.

I urge my colleagues to give this proposal careful consideration and continue the record of success in working toward an efficient, comprehensive social security system.

Report on Latin America

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the fact that State Department reports on both the policy and details of the situation in the Dominican Republic might lack complete factualness.

Therefore, I insert into the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks an article which appeared in the Sunday, May 23, Chicago Tribune by Columnist Jules Dubois and a report in yesterday's Washington Daily News by Reporter Hal Hendrix, both of which are on-the-spot reports from professional, competent, and respected journalists:

REPORT FROM LATIN AMERICA: U.S. MEDDLING IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC SEEN AS AID TO REDS

(By Jules Dubois)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, May 22.—Exposure to the political meddling by the White House and the State Department in the Dominican civil war has made it easier for this reporter to understand the instability that has afflicted governments in Saigon for so long.

American diplomacy here has created more and more resentment and made enemies of sincere friends of the United States as Washington contributed to the political turbulence and instability in the midst of what was to have been a final and decisive offensive against the Communists.

Every time the anti-Communist, pro-American forces have had the Reds on the ropes, the United States, wittingly or unwittingly, salvaged the Communists.

The fiction that the overwhelming majority of the people want the 1963 constitution restored is belied by the fact that the rest of the country, where more than 2,500,000 citizens reside, has produced no uprisings in favor of the revolution.

Because former President Juan Bosch and his Communist allies effectively smeared

Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin Y Wessin, the United States tried to dump the military man who has been, and who is, the symbol of anti-Communist resistance.

MOVE LAUNCHED TO DUMP HIM

Because Bosch and his Communist allies began to smear Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert-Barrera, president of the government of national reconstruction—whose formation we encouraged—the United States launched moves to dump him.

The United States tried to replace Imbert with an all-civilian junta handpicked by Bosch. As Wessin said the previous week, the United States was about to hand victory here and throughout Latin America to the Communists on a golden platter.

As one bewildered Latin American Ambassador (whose country has been on our side) said to me: "I cannot understand the thinking of the policymakers in the State Department and much less in the White House, which has been most active in this latest maneuver, in trying to dump Imbert. What does the United States expect to gain from that?"

The Ambassador, who said he has been reporting since 1962 to his government about Bosch's anti-Americanism and his alliance with the Communists, issued a warning. He said that if the White House and the State Department fail to untie the hands of the Imbert Government, American troops will have to finish the fight against the Communists.

Lt. Gen. Bruce Palmer, Jr., commander of American land forces here, said earlier that part of his mission was to prevent a Communist takeover and establishment of a government inimical to the interests of the United States.

COULD NOT HAVE DONE MORE TO RILE REGIME

The team sent here by the White House by President Johnson could not have done more to antagonize the pro-American, anti-Communist Imbert regime.

The loyal Dominican navy and air force, whose support was needed by the anti-Communist infantry, were prevented by the United States from taking action because of a cease fire that had long ago become a ceaseless fire.

Because one pilot may have goofed and his machinegun shell fall onto U.S. positions from which 5,000 troops fired back at him and shot him down, an entire air force was penalized by the U.S. Government. The Imbert Government was deprived of two-thirds of its firepower by order of the United States.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, May 25, 1965]

UNITED STATES FLOUNDERS INTO STRANGE KETTLE OF FISH

(By Hal Hendrix)

SANTO DOMINGO, May 25.—Washington's mishandling of the Dominican fiasco seems likely to go down in history as second only to the floundering which permtited Cuba to fall under Communist control.

While the Johnson administration is sending high-powered talent here, it appears to be moving toward only a temporary solution, at best.

The administration also seems to have discarded most of its collection of civilian and military intelligence data to satisfy politicans at home.

In attempting to pressure a political solution to the month-old conflict the validity of Washington's original assessment of the situation has become much obscured.

More than 21,000 marines and paratroopers were landed here. Their mission, as announced by President Johnson, was to protect American lives and property, and prevent the Dominican Republic from being taken over by the Communists.

That mission has not changed.

But diplomats and politicians now contend that the rebel movement they earlier said was dominated by Communist and other leftist extremists is not controlled by these elements.

On the scene, it has become obvious the switch in the Washington line was made to justify negotiations with questionable personalities within the rebel movement and others close to it.

CORNERED

With combat between rebel forces and troops loyal to the U.S.-created junta now blocked by existence of the American-controlled corridor, the rebel faction is cornered in a small downtown area.

Reports that the rebels enjoy widespread popular support throughout the island simply are not true.

The United States is obviously catering now to the rebel leaders who boasted about distributing weapons to thousands of civilians, including known Communits, pro-Castroites and ordinary hoodlums, at the outbreak of the rebellion.

This "arms for the people" action has resulted in the deaths of hundreds of Dominicans and the wounding of thosuands of others. It has also led to the killing of 19 U.S. servicemen and the wounding of 115 more by gunfire from within the rebel zone.

These "constitutionalists" have been charged with more than 1,000 cease-fire violations—provocative shootings into the American-occupied area.

Official sources say Washington has intelligence reports detailing the extent of Communist and Castroite penetration of the rebel movement.

McGeorge Bundy, President Johnson's top troubleshooter here now, says he does not believe Communists now dominate the movement, headed by Col. Francisco Caamano Deno.

IN BACKGROUND

In fact, Dominican Communists are content to remain in the background at the moment. Well-known Dominican Reds and militant members of the pro-Castro June 14 movement avoid rebel press conferences and generally stay out of sight of newsmen.

But the June 14 Movement has infiltrated deeply into the rebel group and its parent Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD). It is in full operation inside the rebel zone, with a new headquarters. It was outlawed before the rebellion began.

As a supporter of Colonel Caamano's "constitutionalist" government, the June 14 movement said in the May 15 issue of its newspaper that "the only path to consolidate a democratic solution is to spread the armed struggle through the country."

The newspaper, parroting the movement's alliance with Castro's Cuba, said the "Dominican imperialists and reactionaries only have the support of the Yankee invaders."

The rebels and their allies have made it known they would welcome a settlement under which Antonio Guzman, Minister of Agriculture under the Juan Bosch government, would become president of a coalition proposed by the United States last week.

Senor Bosch is reported to have suggested Senor Guzman in meetings with U.S. officials in San Juan.

A big question among traditionally anti-Communist and pro-American Dominicans now is why the United States attempts to ram Senor Guzman into the provisional Presidency when it was obvious in advance he would be unacceptable to the anti-Bosch and anti-Communist elements, but pleasing to the rebels.

American manipulators argue that Senior Bosch won the Presidency with about 60 percent of the vote in 1962. But they don't discuss how much of this vote was actually against his opponents. At least 40 percent of the voters still are strongly anti-Bosch.

There is doubt here that Mr. Bundy and others involved in settlement negotiations are fully aware of the backgrounds of some of the constitutionalists and PRD figures they are dealing with.

Washington officials, including Mr. Bundy, contend they are distressed by the lack of capable politicians on the Dominican scene.

There are such capable Dominicans as Dr. Eduardo Read Barreras, former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and now Ambassador to Rome, and former President Emilio de Los Santos. Both have unsullied reputations and are not vulnerable to attack from either side.

It is also puzzling to many observers why the United States is using such emissaries as Dr. Jaime Benitez, chancellor of the University of Puerto Rico, who is well known in this area for his anti-Americanism. He is here now at Mr. Bundy's request.

Disturbing too is the manner in which U.S. diplomats persuaded Gen. Antonio Imbert Barrera and his four associates in the junta to accept the temporary government role, and then attempted to dump them—in an apparent concession to the rebels and the PRD leaders in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, the above reports on the Dominican situation will, I am for sure, arouse the interest of at least a few Members.

Foreign Aid and Protection of U.S. Embassies Abroad

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, last December 9 I informed President Johnson of my grave concern with the unwarranted attacks by unruly mobs upon U.S. Embassies and legations abroad.

I asked the President, as a first step, "to articulate now on behalf of the American people our Nation's extreme disgust and displeasure with such practices, and also our view that each nation is responsible for controlling and curbing such outbursts which result in violence and destruction against the property of foreign embassies."

On February 10, 1965, the President finally did speak out on this matter. The White House statement was provoked by a 1-hour attack on the U.S. Embassy in Moscow by 2,000 unruly demonstrators.

This statement had a good effect. Recent demonstrations in front of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow by contrast have been well controlled by Moscow police. There has not been further destruction or desecration of U.S. property in that city.

As we consider this week the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965, I am indeed pleased to find that the bill contains requirements for U.S. Embassy protection.

Embassy protection would now be established in the law as a precondition for the continuation of foreign aid. I strongly favor inclusion of such a provision.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we stopped our humanitarian assistance to nations whose only response has been a slap in

the face, the burning of U.S. libraries, or the defacing of U.S. property. We are a patient nation; we are willing to help and nurture economies in developing areas of the world. Our efforts through annual foreign aid, through Public Law 480, the food-for-peace programs, through Peace Corps volunteers, and through the education of exchange students from other nations in our own universities and graduate schools, is eloquent proof of our willingness and earnest desire to help. But our help is given in dignity. We expect it to be received with dignity.

The very first section of the proposed Foreign Assistance Act before us today specifically provides:

> It is the sense of the Congress that assistance under this or any other act to any foreign country which hereafter permits, or fails to take adequate measures to prevent, the damage or destruction by mob action of U.S. property within such country should be terminated and should not be resumed until the President determines that appropriate measures have been taken by such country to prevent a recurrence thereof.

Mr. Speaker, this provision is not intended as window dressing. This is a step in the right direction. I trust this section will be given full enforcement and not mere lipservice.

We in America provide the courtesy of protection for all foreign embassies and legations. We are requesting only that the same courtesy be given us by providing inviolate protection of our embassies abroad.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, our Government should help write and enforce an international convention which obligates all nations to protect the premises of embassies and legations against intrusion or damage.

In 1961, a United Nations conference of 81 states drafted the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, article 22 (2) of which provides:

> The receiving or host state is under a special duty to take all the appropriate steps to protect the premises of the mission against any intrusion or damage and to prevent any disturbance of the peace of the mission or impairment of its dignity.

This convention has been ratified by more than 35 countries, but not by the United States, despite the fact that President Kennedy submitted it to the Senate for is advice and consent to ratification on May 14, 1963. It has been forgotten and unpursued since then. Despite the recent attacks on U.S. embassies and the importance of this question of embassy protection to our people, this convention has not been given any consideration by the Congress. It has not been debated in the Senate or even given hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

It is high time, Mr. Speaker, for our Government to take action on this question. Do we support this convention or not? Unilateral action affecting only those countries receiving U.S. foreign aid is not enough. We must work with other governments to obtain adherence to these international standards of behavior regarding embassy protection. There are many countries which do not receive U.S. foreign aid but from which we expect protection for our embassies. The U.S.S.R. and many other Eastern European countries are good examples. Let us go on record by ratification of this convention as a nation which favors the inviolate protection of all foreign embassies and legations from unruly mob attack.

The provision of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 is a good step in the right direction. Let us recognize it as a unilateral beginning toward a multilateral and international rule of law.

Repeal of 14(b)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, one of the most controversial issues this Congress will have to deal with is the proposal to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

California Members are not faced with a difficult decision on 14(b), however, since the people of our State have spoken loud and clear on the subject. In 1958 a State constitutional amendment to activate 14(b) was a major issue in California, promoted by former Senator Knowland in his bid for the governorship. The people rejected the proposal by a vote of more than 2 to 1.

However, despite a clear mandate from the California electorate, one still must come to grips with the apparent paradox of a closed shop in an open society.

The distinguished news commentator, Edward P. Morgan, presented on his May 19 ABC broadcast what to me was a telling analysis of this paradox, and I am pleased to include it in my comments for the benefit of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

Mr. Morgan's remarks follow:

The idea that a person has to join a labor union in order to hold a job has always given me a very uncomfortable feeling. It contains what seems to be a fundamental contradiction: a compulsory sacrifice of individual freedom in order to gain ends that are essential to the mass. The very term "closed shop" sounds antithetical to the open society, destructive of the freedom of choice with the argument that sometimes dictatorial methods are necessary to achieve the opportunities to which all in a democracy are enttiled.

The sad fact is, however, that we have not yet reached the millenium, that the competitive pressures of life bring out or develop a certain amount of cussedness in human nature, that in the complexities of modern industrial society—with all its material bounty—the individual cannot always succsesfully fend for himself and he has to identify with some group in self-protection. If man were a paragon there would be little need for manufacturers' associations or labor unions or, for that matter, police departments. Given the reality that man is still some reach below the angels, the trick is to try to strike some kind of equitable balance between the pressures generated by competing groups of society. The 18th century British political philosopher, Jeremy Bentham, reasoned that the most virtuous social objective was the "greatest good for the greatest number." Bentham once wrote, rather flamboyantly, "the sacred truth that the greatest happiness of the greatest number is the foundation of morals and legislation."

Herein, in large part at least, lies the justification for workers to band together to bargain for wages and working conditions with employers who otherwise—to put it mildly in the harsh light of the history of human exploitation—might not have a conscience lively enough to volunteer a fairer distribution of the wealth.

This, then, is a rather ragged thumbnail background to what may become the most rambunctuous political struggle of the year—over section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which President Johnson in his labor message yesterday gently asked Congress to repeal. Although the Federal law recognizes the right of employers and unions to reach agreements requiring all workers to be union members, section 14(b) provides a curiously inconsistent loophole which allows individual States to ban such agreements.

Nineteen States now have these bans on the books. There were 20 but Indiana recently repealed its so-called right-to-work law. The slogan "right to work" is a monumental misnomer, though whoever thought it up gave the opponents of organized labor a multimillion dollar propaganda line which at once implicitly glorified the proud American legend of rugged individualism and depicted unions, not ruthless employers, as evil conspirators robbing the worker of his rights in their reach for power. The hard fact is that none of this legislation guarantees anybody the right work. Such laws, plainly and simply, are instruments to weaken unions or prevent their growth. This is not to say that some unions have not had too much power or have not misused it. But the further fact is that too often right-to-work laws are a cover for continued exploitation of cheap labor.

The National Labor Relations Board has a wealth of fresh testimony of the systematic intimidation of millhands in the Carolinas responding to efforts of the Textile Workers Union to organize them. Representatives of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers who tried to distribute handbills to employees of an electric lighting equipment plant in Magee, Miss., were threatened by mobs, villified by local newspapers, and finally run out of town with the cooperation of police—who provided no other protection but an escort for their exit. Even so, the IBEW only lost a plant election by 15 votes. All three of these States where substandard wages are prevalent have right-to-work laws to help attract new industry.

These examples are only two of a legion of similar instances. Still this whole boodle of evidence is not enough, alone, to justify repeal of 14(b). The labor movement's most valid argument for a change in Taft-Hartley is increased union responsibility. Is a union totally committed to the welfare of its workers or is its leadership preoccupied in power plays? The recently revealed voting scandals which dislodged James Carey from the presidency of the International Union of Electrical Workers and the irregularities in the Steelworkers Union elections are unfortunate proof that organized labor is plagued with human weaknesses, too. Similar proof is the intolerable footdragging by locals of many unions on ending practices of racial discrimination.

There is no doubt that a certain sacrifice of an individual worker's freedom is involved in a union or a closed-shop contract. This sacrifice is justified if the greater good for the greater number is achieved. This is the very essence of free trade unionism and if American labor, with some humility, demonstrably repledges itself to this goal it can and will and should win the argument for repeal of 14(b).

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

Independence of Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, May 25, the small Arab kingdom of Jordan celebrated its 19th anniversary of independence. On this memorable occasion, we want to extend belated felicitations to His Majesty, King Hussein.

Its future, which once was bleak indeed, now appears among the brightest in the Middle East, and we should take this opportunity to recall both its past and present achievements.

Jordan's position on the crossroads of the ancient world has provided it with an extensive and well-documented history. Today, while archeologists excavate the origins of the city of Jericho, which extend back at least 6000 B.C., the modern traveler is also able to visit the beautifully preserved and impressive sites of the Roman League of Ten Cities—the Decapolis—at Jerash, Philadelphia—the modern Amman—and other places. Lest it be thought that the flourishing civilization which existed in Jordan is derived solely from the nearly 1,000 years of European rule, mention must be made of the Nabataean Kingdom. Located in southern Jordan, this Arab State developed a distinctive blend of Arab and Greco-Roman elements into a culture which has provided Jordan with one of the most overwhelmingly beautiful ruins of the ancient world: Petra. Dubbed "the rose-red city, half as old as time" by its rediscovery in the 19th century, it contains some of the very finest examples of Greco-Roman architecture anywhere in the world. And, the archeologists inform us that the people of this astounding kingdom developed and maintained a system of irrigation canals and conduits in the southern desert of Jordan which far exceeds in extent and workmanship anything which we in the 20th century have as yet constructed for such parched regions of the world.

After long periods of administration by various foreign powers, from the Romans through the Ottomans and, most recently, the British, Jordan finally was allowed to follow its own path after May 25, 1946. The immediate postwar period in Jordanian history was not the most stable imaginable, for the country was involved in serious internal and external issues which unfortunately adversely affected its political and economic development.

Just over 12 years ago, on May 5, 1953, a new king was formally enthroned, Hussein. Heir to the glories of the Hashimite family, the new king was determined that his country would become one of the most stable and progressive states in the Middle East. With the vigor and vision of youth, he undertook, once his internal position was secure, to demonstrate that enlightened constitutional monarchy could provide the citizens of Jordan with an increasingly prosperous and meaningful life.

With American and British assistance, King Hussein set out on a series of industrial and agricultural programs which would increase the national income and provide a better standard of living. It is a pleasure to report that the Government's programs have been extremely successful: Jordan's annual increase in gross national product is running at approximately 10 percent, one of the highest in the world; in contrast to most of the Middle Eastern countries, the land reform program has been outstandingly well implemented, and land ownership is widespread; the 5-year development program is proceeding apace, with new factories and industries providing increased employment in such varied pursuits as mining, textiles, flour, and processed foodstuffs. In sum, it is fair to say that Jordan's economic development is one of the most pleasant items of news to report from the Middle East. In fact, the political and economic stability which Jordan has experienced under King Hussein has nearly eliminated the widespread opposition to the monarchy which for so long plagued the attempts of the Government to improve any facet of Jordanian life.

It is appropriate, therefore, that we as Americans, who have generously assisted the Jordanians in their attempt to achieve economic and political progress, today recognize the effort which this country's courageous king and people have themselves expended toward the same goal. We wish them every success for continued progress in the future.

Student-Teacher Achievement Is Outstanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this method of calling to the attention of the Congress a most outstanding program entitled Student-Teacher Achievement Recognition (Star) Program."

In this program, deserved recognition is given for scholastic achievement, and it is my considered judgment that more such programs should be instituted. In this day and age, we need the best minds that we can possibly find, and those with great ability should be encouraged.

We recognize and encourage the athlete with plaudits and scholarships, but too often we neglect the top student. This should not be so, and the star program is helping to overcome this neglect.

I was most pleased that the star student selected from my district was Miss Beth Roady, daughter of my warm, personal friends, Dr. and Mrs. Elston "Steve" Roady, of Tallahassee, Fla.

She had been selected as the star program winner in my district, with 11 other outstanding students named from our other Florida congressional districts. From their number, a State star student was selected.

One of the outstanding aspects of this program is that it pays well-deserved tribute to the teachers of these fine students.

Each of these students select a teacher who has had the most influence on their academic career. In the case of Miss Roady, this teacher was Mrs. Laura Neubauer, sixth-grade teacher at Frank Hartsfield School in Tallahassee. She is an outstanding example of the dedicated teacher, and I was deeply pleased to see this recognition paid to both of them.

Each of the district winners were guests at a State banquet followed by a week-long tour of Florida. It was a thrilling experience, and the recognition given them will encourage other bright students to achieve their full potential.

I think this is a program worthy of note. Miss Roady is an example of the fine young Americans who have the ability, and should be encouraged and recognized. Our future will depend upon how well we train those who come behind us, and I feel that the star program does this.

I commend it highly, while extending warm congratulations to Beth Roady and Mrs. Neubauer.

Address of President of Polish Republic in Exile to Council of the Republic of Poland

SPEECH
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Government in Exile continues to function, working to develop a program to restore freedom to Poland and other captive lands in eastern Europe.

On April 24, 1965, the President of the Polish Republic in Exile, His Excellency August Zaleski, addressed the latest session of the Council of the Republic of Poland which functions as a parliamentary body in exile.

The text of President Zaleski's speech follows:

Yesterday was the 30th anniversary of the entering into force of the new Polish Constitution of April 23, 1935, which is still binding on every Pole who does not accept the partition of Poland by Russia and Germany in 1939 nor the Russian occupation under which the Polish nation is deprived of freedom and independence.

This basic law was the last important act of state signed by Marshal Pilsudski. We can therefore regard it, in a sense, as his will and testament. Article 24 of this constitution enabled us to transfer the supreme authorities of the Polish Republic to a seat beyond the frontiers of the country and to establish a government recognized by all Poles, a government which conducted the armed struggle against the enemy until the unfortunate Yalta agreements thrust Poland into subjection by Russia.

But even this did not interrupt the efforts of the legitimate authorities of the Polish Republic to restore the freedom, territorial integrity, and independence of Po-

land. We cannot now conduct this struggle with arms in hand. We must restrict ourselves to keeping public opinion in the whole free, non-Communist world informed regarding the real aspirations of the Polish nation and the deplorable situation into which it has been plunged despite the unrivaled courage with which it fought and the enormous losses it suffered.

The very fact that there is a Polish Government in exile—one whose legitimacy cannot be denied by anyone with an honest approach to Polish constitutional law—constitutes a living protest against what has been inflicted on Poland. It must be hoped that a time will came when all Poles in the free world will appreciate the significance of this fact. If they did in the present state of affairs, the Poles in exile and the old-established Polish emigrant centers could do much for the Polish cause.

Communist aggression in southeast Asia has reached such a pitch that the United States, despite her peace-loving attitude, decided to check the march of communism onto the territory of Vietnam still free after the French withdrawal there, onto Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand. Hopes that Russia would gladly see a setback suffered by China—as the Communist country most interested in the issue—have been disappointed. The Soviet Union is not only supplying weapons, which Red China willingly channels through her territory, but has lately expressed readiness to allow Russian volunteers to proceed to North Vietnam for active participation in the war waged by the Communists of Vietnam for seizing the still free part of their country.

If they succeed in this, Russian communism no less than Red China in company with Indonesia as an ally would find it easier to gain control of Malaysia. Such a conquest would in turn open up the way to Australia and, looking into the future, ultimately to South America. It can be hoped this will not come to pass now as both Russia and China realize U.S. power greatly exceeds their potentials. It should be borne in mind, however, that Russia's policy has always been marked by patient persistence and by readiness to accept minor gains if greater ones were impossible at the time. But it has always exploited every opportunity to net even the slightest gain—and this in the aggregate yields sizable advances.

Russia recently signed a new treaty of friendship with the Communist administration imposed by her upon Poland. This accord does not actually differ from the previous one concluded for a terms of 20 years and therefore now due for renewal. Some press commentators in the West stress that the new treaty contains a clause which envisages consultations on concerted policy directives—a stipulation not embodied in the previous treaty. Yet, it is common knowledge that the present Communist administration in Poland is maintained solely by the support of Russia. Probably nobody in the whole world expects that the very first democratic and honestly conducted elections in Poland would leave this Communist stooge administration in power for a single moment. Russia no less than Poland knows this very well. In these circumstances, what other arrangement can there be between Russia and today's Poland than one which requires the present administration of Poland blindly to carry out the orders of their Russian masters?

The Communist regime in Poland gives constant proof of this servility. The outcome is an even greater deterioration of the economic situation of Poland where the population suffers not only constant deprivation of liberty but also cannot satisfy its daily needs for essential commodities. The number of unemployed has risen to 1½ million. This contributes to intensify the dire poverty which the Communist regime is unable to prevent.

Any depiction of the state to which Poland has been brought by subjection to Russian imperialism would be incomplete without mention of the absence of all the democratic freedoms and the persecution of the church so typical of every country under a Communist system. Protests are voiced by the population from time to time, for instance, as was recently the case with the authors and intellectuals in Poland, but such protests are stifled with the utmost rigor.

Despite these deplorable conditions, the Communist regime in Poland has decided to launch a fresh, large-scale campaign designed to hinder the further efforts of the free Poles to restore the freedom and independence of their country. With this in mind, the scope of action assigned to the so-called Union of Combatants for Freedom and Democracy has been extended. The new plan of action for this organization was drawn up by the politburo of the Polish Communist Party and approved by the Kremlin. The chief purpose of this organization is to establish and maintain contacts with the Polish organizations in exile and especially with those of ex-servicemen in order "to convince them that Poland is actually free and independent, that she is developing the prime basis of state independence represented by the economic, material, and cultural strength of the nation." The regime hopes thereby to harness the free Poles and the old-established Polish immigrant centers, those in the United States particularly, to its chariot.

These efforts of the Communist regime in Poland are eloquent proof that the Russian stooges who rule Poland realize and probably assess the importance of emigrant and exiled Poles for the cause of Polish freedom and independence.

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the murder of 15,000 Polish prisoners of war who had been held in the camps at Kozielsk, Starobielsk, and Ostashkov in Russia, a horrible crime perpetrated by Soviet Russia in March, April, and May of 1940. So far only the corpses of rather more than 4,000 officers held as prisoners of war in Kozielsk and murdered at Katyn have been located.

The indignation of the whole world should be aroused by this terrible crime not only as an example of the bestiality of those who committed it but also because it creates a dangerous precedent for the violation of all international agreements on the rules governing the conduct of war. However, those guilty of this crime have yet to receive the punishment they deserve. The Congress of the United States is the only body which had the whole matter investigated: the special congressional committee appointed by it assembled and published a vast mass of evidence which indubitably proves the Soviet Government bears responsibility for this shocking crime. Nevertheless, nobody has so far utilized this enormous material for an indictment before the forum of international justice. We are duty bound not to cease demanding that just retribution be applied to the Russian criminals just as it has been meted out to their German colleagues.

H.R. 1047

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 1047, a bill which would amend section 102(a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944. This would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to eradicate ragweed.

Ragweed is a plant which is injurious to the health of many persons and also impairs their economic self-sufficiency.

Therefore, I earnestly urge that the Department of Agriculture recommend a study to review the most efficient means of destroying this plant in all areas of these United States.

Approximately 10 million Americans suffer from ragweed. They lose about $140 million a year in wages from the effects of this plant. No conclusive data exists to support the theory of hereditary transfer of the allergy although the data does lean toward evidence of allergic family background. It costs each sufferer approximately $100 per year for medication—$60 for injections and from $20 to $40 for other medication. In addition, many serious illnesses do result from this allergy especially bronchial asthma which kills 4,000 persons a year and it has been found that 1 out of 3 hayfever sufferers develop this serious illness. Other serious respiratory diseases and complications may result. The Air Pollution Control Board of the Department of Health of the State of New York considers hayfever to be a major public health problem.

Ragweed is found in every State in the United States. About half the States can be found to have "no refuge areas"—no place in the State where sufferers can find relief. Ragweed is found to be most prevalent in the North Central and Northeastern States followed by the Southern, Great Plains, Intermountain, Pacific Coast States, and Hawaii. There is little beneficial use for this plant and by far it is more unbeneficial. Uses are to cover bare lands and the seeds of the plant are eaten by some birds. The ragweed season reaches its peak in July, August, and September. This plant grows in disturbed soil along roadsides, edges of gardens, and in vacant fields and lots.

There are three methods of control. Herbicides is most effective, however the drift of the chemical spray is known to cause crop damage in farm areas. Cultivation and crowding out of ragweed by planting thick vegetation as grass, alfalfa, clover, and others will stifle ragweed which is not a competitive plant. This method is very much recommended along with the third method, that of cutting. If the ragweed plant is cut before flowering this will eliminate the pollen which is the cause of the allergy. The soil will not be disturbed—mowing will disturb the soil and cause the dormant pollen to germinate and expand plant growth—and the pollen in the air will be controlled. Niagara Falls, N.Y., has a program whereby all citizens are responsible for cutting the ragweed on one's property. If this is not done, then the city will do the cutting and add the bill for this service to the person's taxes.

I believe the most proper and just method of eradication would be and could be carried out by the Department of Agriculture. The taxpayer-consumer is deserving of this service in view of the generous appropriation authorized for the Department of Agriculture today.

Appendix

Conference on Urban Regionalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure last Friday, May 21, to attend the first Conference on Urban Regionalism sponsored by Kent State University in Kent, Ohio. I am very proud that this outstanding university is located in my district, the 11th Congressional District of Ohio. Others attending the conference at Kent State include the Honorable Robert Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine.

In reference to the conference the Kent Record Courier published the following fine editorial:

[From the Record-Courier, May 24, 1965]

KENT STATE ASSUMES VITAL PLANNING ROLE

Rapid expansion of urban regionalism and the necessity for cooperative, intelligent planning to cope with a multitude of explosive problems were the central themes of Kent State University's first conference on urban regionalism this past weekend.

All of the nationally known speakers were in agreement that shifts of population away from the central cities and the development of the urban fringe constitute an immense challenge to American planning.

Kent State leads the way in planning to meet the many problems of a megalopolis which some day will stretch all the way from Milwaukee to Pittsburgh. The "strip city" concept of things to come isn't new; it only now has been recognized as a future reality—a reality that must be met through planning of entire areas. The disjointed approach must be forgotten as planning moves across the traditional boundaries and political subdivisions.

Kent State's decision to establish a center for urban regionalism may prove one of the most significant ever made on the campus. The center may one day become the core of all planning for this sprawling megalopolis.

Importance of developing an intelligent program to meet these challenges was emphasized by one speaker when he said, "I know of no problem more pertinent to today's world."

New approaches must be found to such problems as transportation, pollution, taxes, recreation, education, welfare, race relations, culture, and commerce.

These problems reflect the desires and hopes of our great human resources.

Authorities at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local—must work as a giant team in planning for the future megalopolis. Kent State University has assumed a significant role in this immense task. The weekend conference was an excellent beginning.

The Keynote Address was given by Mr. Thomas Vail, editor and publisher of the Cleveland Plain Dealer and one of the outstanding journalists in the Nation. I am having his address, which is entitled, "The Urban Challenge for America," printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for I am certain that it will be of great interest to my colleagues in the Congress.

THE BEST WORD IS CONTEMPORARY—THE URBAN CHALLENGE FOR AMERICA

(By Mr. Thomas Vail, publisher and editor the Cleveland Plain Dealer)

(Introduction by Congressman J. WILLIAM STANTON, 11th District, Ohio)

Mr. Chairman, President White, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen; recently I made some remarks to a group of advertising men about the changes that are taking place in the world, and I must say I was astonished at the list.

In casting about for a title for the speech I came up with "the best word is contemporary", as this seemed to be the core of the matter.

In the newspaper business and in all walks of life to be contemporary is one of the most important things today.

I compliment President White and the faculty and leaders at Kent State University who have had the foresight to be contemporary about the problems of our growing American urbanization.

This conference on urban regionalism, preceded as it has been by the establishment of a permanent center here to serve as a focal point for discussion and planning of urban problems, shows vital awareness of a major American fact of life.

Everywhere I go in my newspaper or outside it I hear ideas that pertain to this new American "life of the cities."

In marketing and advertising people will tell you that the future economic situation in this country will be decided in the 20 or 30 largest metropolitan areas of the country of which I am happy to say northern Ohio is one.

We are told that in the year 2000 cities of 5 million population will be commonplace rather than exceptional.

Thomas R. Reid, director of civic and governmental affairs for the Ford Motor Co., makes this forecast:

"We are urbanizing even faster than we are multiplying.

"For 40 years past and for 40 years into the future all our net increases in population have taken place or will take place in our metropolitan areas.

"Less than 100 million people lived in metropolitan areas in 1950.

"In the year 2000, statisticians say 255 million people will be living in metropolitan areas."

Some idea of the challenge that will present may be gained from the problems faced today.

They are problems that are growing rather than getting to a solution.

One of the most desperate problems we face is that created by air and water pollution.

Rigorous treatment of sewage and industrial waste is the only way to check and possibly reduce the increasing contamination of our rivers and lakes and seas.

Man's economic advance has thrown nature's system out of balance, and man himself must find the answer to the problem he has created.

This is something private enterprise and governments must work on together.

In this region we have made a bare beginning.

We must move further faster.

The same problem is in air pollution.

Nature has its own purifying methods.

But man has created a problem beyond the power of nature to deal with.

Research has established that the incidence of lung cancer coincides with the presence of heavy air pollution.

In 1952, a heavy smog in London was thought to account for 4,000 deaths.

Agriculture also suffers serious setbacks in many areas from air pollution.

In combating this pollution, as with water pollution, there must be every effort to arouse public awareness of the danger.

Action will come only when the public is aroused to demand it.

Other big changes are related to our new urban life:

In welfare amazing new problems of adjustment are adding new burdens and new challenges to organizations set up in a different era and for different purposes.

In education a fantastic population bulge of young people has created demands for more and better educational facilities and new revolutionary curriculums.

In real estate, Federal urban renewal has started a job of rebuilding our cities which has been only partly attacked by private interests.

With all its thirst for better education, higher standards of living, and smoother ways to get along with their fellow man, the city population of today looks for more cultural and recreational facilities—some adding to the quality as well as the quantity of life.

Even our governments have become outmoded because of this massive movement of people from farms to cities.

Unfortunately, it took the U.S. Supreme Court to point out that many State legislatures no longer reflected the modern population distribution.

On the local level, county governments, formed when there was much less to do, are today trying to deal with enormous problems without the governmental machinery or the personnel necessary to do the job.

I know of no problem more pertinent to today's world than a discussion of urban regionalism and what must be done to meet the problems, the desires, and hopes of the great human resource that inhabits the sprawling metropolis.

No one can ignore it and everyone sooner or later will have to cope with it.

One thing is perfectly clear.

The old methods will not work.

New approaches must be found.

To discover the necessary solutions and adjustments will take many discussions by eminent authorities, such as are being sparked by Kent State during this 2-day conference.

But it will take a great deal more.

These discussions must lead to the exercise of leadership and action by people in our "contemporary society" who are capable and willing and powerful enough to do something about it.

There is a deep crisis in our cities today caused by vast changes in the movement of population from country to city and the emotional strain of people of different backgrounds and races living in a close relationship to each other.

We need very much to deal more realistically with the problems created by discrimination in housing.

Racial, and ethnic and religious restrictions on the freedom of people to live where they want is not merely a hardship on those discriminated against.

It decisively affects the welfare, economy, and orderly development of the cities and the suburbs which surround them.

The flight to the suburbs intensifies the financial plight of cities.

But the suburbs also are under severe pressure to increase their services, their schools, their recreational facilities.

And this without the foundation of a business-industrial development to contribute to the tax treasury.

The tax burden keeps growing. The schools hardly ever catch up.

The problems are not helped by some businessmen working in the city, living in suburbs, and not contributing leadership to the inner cities' problems which will eventually affect them. Happily, many of these effective men are realizing this.

And there are other potentially influential people who must react to the challenge.

Religious leaders confused about what they should do to interest a new, intelligent, competitive generation looking for answers rather than philosophies.

Politicians catering to certain minority groups to perpetuate themselves in office rather than leading the public toward a broader metropolitan point of view.

The job of leading our new metropolitan areas must eventually be shouldered by the practical men of affairs who have profited from the new pace and size of city life.

Where this leadership has been aggressive and effective, substantial progress has been the result.

It can be seen in Pittsburgh, in St. Louis, in Philadelphia, in Boston.

Its absence can be seen in some other cities.

In Cleveland we have had a sudden burst of planning centered about the site of the new Cleveland State University.

The Cleveland Development Foundation, a private group has underwritten plans for a vast new campus and urban renewal in the downtown area.

There is prospect that a magnificent and modern opera house, suitable for all kinds of cultural activity will be located on the campus.

The famous Cleveland Playhouse will build its new home adjacent to the campus.

All this will mean much to the downtown community, not alone culturally, but commercially. It, with Erieview, will drastically change the face and the mood of a downtown that was fading.

President Johnson told me recently he felt that we are entering an era where the "quality" of life will take on a new importance.

In this era the President defines, the thinkers and the planners must somehow stimulate and counsel with the men who have to meet the payrolls.

All in all it will have to be a larger and more efficient "organization of man."

We need a new approach to take on pollution, transportation, taxes, recreation, education, welfare, race relations, culture, and commerce.

But while we work out our new systems we must still retain the individual liberties and freedom of choice which have made the American system a model for the world.

The United States will lead the world in urban regionalism because our high industrialization is so far ahead of any other country.

In other so-called advanced parts of the world like Europe you often hear how mass production, highways, and universal marketing are coming everywhere.

This is simply more of the American system being established throughout the world:

We have mastered our great frontier.

Now we must form a brilliant "society of cities."

An exciting prospect it is, too, for the age of the city is more competitive, more cultivated, more varied, more difficult and more rewarding than our rural past.

The Plain Dealer looks to this new challenge with great enthusiasm, for we see everywhere along with the problems, more opportunities for more people, for a great future undreamed of only a few years ago.

Our horizons are unlimited.

This university and this conference are two of the reasons for our great optimism.

The thoughts and ideas you will produce here today and tomorrow will point the way and help produce the leadership for the great era of America just now beginning.

So much for the problems, now on with the solutions.

Faith for the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this Memorial Day season, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate appropriate sections of a meaningful address by Dr. Martin M. Weitz, rabbi of the North Shore Synagogue, of Syosset, Long Island, N.Y., delivered at Colorado State College, in Greeley, Colo., at this time last year. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITH FOR THE ATOMIC AGE

Today more than ever, education and religion are the supports for the bridge of life, to balance seeming opposites where possible into more meaningful living for more people, a span whereby obstacles are transformed into opportunities, and stumbling blocks into steppingstones—education and religion must cooperate to make ever-new frontiers a supreme pursuit in matters that count. Education, to be more than an intellectual canning process, and religion, to be more than a pious praying exercise, must create new values even more than recreate old values. Both religion and education, more than ever, must utilize youth's love of distant horizons, rededication to search for truth and the freedom to sustain such search, and youth's quick sympathy for the oppressed. If these new frontiers are to add new intellectual power to education and new spiritual purpose to religion, what then are some of the struggles education and religion must free anew today for tomorrow for high human values, in the seeming pace, not peace, of coexistence that has to be waged and won?

Many are the modern parallels available to us and plausible for us—where we may strike a balance and win a reprieve for values at their ablest and bravest, without loss of commitments, without lapse of luster for life. It takes greater courage to confront them, and make something of them; to resolve them than to dissolve them. What then, are some of these new frontiers that may bring balance via education and religion today?

Through education and religion we can build a bridge, and strike a synthesis in both—a balance of ministration and administration in education, and the prophetic and the priestly in religion. This is our second steppingstone from one shoreline to another, as it were, as we step across the mouth of the Mississippi River at Lake Itasca in Minnesota, from past to future. A new look at the old Book—the Bible, especially in its newest translations based on recent archeology, philology, and other disciplines, helps us see the priest and prophet. Not only in confrontation, but in balance, we learn what both mean: the priest looks to the past, the prophet to the future; the priest to conservation of institutions and their values, the prophet to challenge these institutions for greater values; the priest gowns himself with the sacerdotal; the prophet crowns himself with the spiritual; the priest serves the sacraments, as birth, marriage, death; the prophet serves in sacrifice for others as the greatest of all sacraments; the priest is attuned to the music of the Levites; the prophet harkens to "the still small voice," the hymn within. The priest is synonymous with convention, with rite; the prophet, with conviction, with right. We seek to blend the best of both—so that we may better serve others beyond this day.

In this historic and double dynamic role of priest and prophet, which made possible the living legacies of all the Bibles of man, we must ignite new light, else we may know thick atomic-age darkness which can be felt all-about us. We must balance seeming opposites where possible, to save and serve the future. We must pioneer from "either-or" in language into gray "no man's lands" of semantics. We must remake arenas of conflict into areas of cooperation.

This has been done notably in many areas in recent weeks and years. An interfaith rally in Washington, 6,300 in number, April 28, 1964, was a national witness to racial justice, unparalleled in the annals of worldwide religion, where all were prophets for social change and challenge—for the civil rights bill—rather than merely priests for individual solace. Prayer and passage of this were their ammunition in the arsenal of freedom. And President Johnson thanked them, welcomed their spokesmen, and bade them reawaken the conscience of America.

Another example, longer in duration and perhaps deeper in significance for the world at large, is the Ecumenical Council of Vatican II—last year and this year, convoked by Popes John XXIII and Paul VI—to open the windows and also the hearts of men everywhere.

Education and religion may do much together to help lift the pall of poverty over Appalachia and other areas, stay the hazards of industrial automation, alert the public awareness to pollution of air and water, especially near our smog-filled centers of population and increasingly poisoned watercourses across the continent. "The Death and Life of Great American Cities," by Jane Jacobs, may be the answer, the right way to save our cities in this decade, in its agenda for solving crime rates, odious slums, and juvenile delinquency—as was the "Culture of Cities" by Lewis Mumford in an earlier generation, with its emphasis on service rather than power-centered areas, as manifested in Rockefeller and Lincoln Centers in New York, a Penn Center in Philadelphia, civic centers in Denver and San Francisco. Both volumes in their time seek an end of mechanized barbarism and barbarized mechanism in an unplanned American pattern of community and country.

Another zone, for which education and religion may point a new way, is in the syn-

thesis of nationalism and internationalism. How may America, without loss of political unity and cultural plurality, cherish the good neighbor ideal in the family of all nations by such means as practical international peacetime communications, and cooperation in living standards? How may we advance the cause of world peace without loss of creative cultures? How may we best supplement the values of a Ghandi and an Einstein, a Kagawa and a Schweitzer? How may we attain the ripeness of spirit in the midst of a wealth of things? With the emergence of the new independent nation-states across the lost horizon, how may each of them have freedom—for individual and country—without the pressures from right or left in the name of their so-called independence? How may we have national sovereignty, international security and with it, individual liberty? Even as the United Nations needs a permanent police force for a Congo and a Cyprus, so too each nation must yield some of its precious sovereignty to make way for a new shared life for humanity. A stalemate in atomic weaponry is now matched by a stalemate in ideology. Religion and education may help break both via the U.N.'s International Bill of Rights made real, by cessation of genocide in all levels, by learning to communicate in more languages than our own, by universal improvement in health, child care, welfare, sanitation, education, by increasing international student-exchanges, by Peace Corps or their equivalent on all levels for and from eevry nation in the world—under international sponsorship, or as this college's education program in Pakistan this year, by forthright attack on poverty, ignorance, and disease. We recall summer courses here in this very direction: "School Systems of the World," "Revolutions and Social Change," "Youth Movements of the World," and the current projects overseas as the Pakistan program.

We may live to see the ultimate reality in a cycle from war to peace—beyond bloodfeuding by clans, wars by city-states and within states, dueling by individuals, crusades by religionational empires, counteroffensives between world powers. In the phyical acceleration from atom to hydrogen to cobalt bomb, we may perceive the end of imperial unification, balance of power or similar techniques for control, and a beginning for world peace.

The more global, mechanistic, destructive, impersonal, war becomes, the less likely its final employment for victories. In the final analysis, there is naught but paralysis—for so-called victor or vanquished. The warless world may be ours—if we in religion and education, all over the world, will it and work for it, free from military mentality from the past and for spiritual and cultural reality of the future, free from private animosity, major atrophy, and general apathy—to employ military phraseology—for equations of war deeply laden within each of us.

Officer "Raleigh's" Gallant Rescue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it is not often enough that the courage and devotion of our policemen are even noticed—let alone given the commendation they deserve.

Yesterday, James O'Neill, Jr., of the Washington Daily News, devoted his column to telling the story of an able and dedicated officer of the Connecticut State Police. Mr. O'Neill did not mention the officer's name, but offered to provide it to the Senators from Connecticut, "for a man who gives such service—should be commended."

I wholeheartedly agree. I called Mr. O'Neill, and discovered that the officer of whom he wrote is Trooper Stanley Szczesiul, of Lakeville, Conn.—a servant of the law and the people of that beautiful town in northwest Connecticut.

Trooper Szczesiul is a member of troop B, headquartered at the Canaan Barracks, under the able leadership of Lt. Cleveland B. Fuessenich.

I salute Trooper Szczesiul, whose outstanding service typifies the devotion to the public and to duty characteristic of the entire Connecticut State Police, from Commissioner Leo Mulcahy to the newest recruit in training.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. O'Neill's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICER "RALEIGH"—GALLANT RESCUE—SENATORS DODD AND RIBICOFF, PLEASE NOTE

(By James O'Neill, Jr.)

For some 20 years I have been collecting cop stories, because I have a very large admiration for most policemen, for their vocation is most dedicated and they often get shot at, reproved by idiots in autos, and are sometimes considered curmudgeons by various flange-headed members of the community.

A weekend in my Connecticut homestead renewed my deep faith in cops. We have one—a State trooper—in the town of my heartiest approval, and he keeps the law with a minimum of nonsense. He is the law.

Also, in this lovely little village of some 3,000 souls, is a host of nice little old ladies—retired, gentle, and altogether quite wonderful.

GREAT DEVOTION

Officer X is looked upon by one and all with great devotion; but the nice little old ladies absolutely adore him, for he is their rock, their protector, and their adviser.

This gentleman is married, with a houseful of lovely children, and owns a nature which can cope with evil doers with stern admonition and treat the host of nice little old ladies as they should be treated.

A few weeks ago, a nice little old lady, in her eighties, and widowed, was without her constant companion, and she somehow had managed to fall out of bed. What to do? She couldn't get off the floor and back into bed, and the night was wearing its Connecticut chill.

YANKED PHONE

But she just could reach the telephone cord, and thoughtfully yanked the machine off the night stand and onto the floor beside her. She had committed officer X's phone number to her prodigious memory, and quickly dialed his home, from flat on the floor.

Would officer X be so kind as to come over and rescue her from her dilemma, at 2 a.m.? Of course he would. He dressed, bid his wife goodbye, and drove to the nice little old lady's house, valiantly remembering just which rear window she said was unlatched and could be crawled through, for the only key to the house reposed in the lady's pocketbook, far from her bedside, and she not able to rise and get it, let alone get back into bed.

On arrival he found the window, pushed it open, crawled through and called, softly, to the nice little old lady. She directed him through the darkened house to her chamber, where he found her, nightgowned and cold, but unhurt, on the floor.

TUCKED IN

Nice little old ladies weigh very little, and cold ones weigh nothing at all. He quickly picked her up, deposited her in her bed, and tucked her in.

And would she care for anything before he crawled back out through the rear window and went to his wife and family?

Yes, please, she replied. She'd like a cup of hot tea, very much.

So officer X went to the kitchen, put on the teakettle, brewed the tea and brought it to her, sitting beside her bed while she drank it with relish. Then she snuggled down beneath the blankets, thanked officer X, and fell asleep. He crawled through the rear window, closed it carefully, and drove home.

This, I propose, is well above and beyond the call of duty, but Connecticut State troopers are thoroughly capable of performing such delightful tasks, though it causes some rather sleepless nights.

I cannot mention the officer's name, for fear it would cause embarrassment, but should Senators DODD and RIBICOFF, Democrats, of Connecticut, desire it I shall be happy to provide it, for a man who gives such service to nice little old ladies should be commended.

The Heritage of a Kitchen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, if a gentleman named George Washington Arbaugh were alive today and visited the Washington region, he might find the rolling hillsides of Maryland and Virginia, from which his forefathers came, a familiar sight, but I trust that the thing which would catch his eye the fastest is a kitchen.

You see, this kitchen, which Mr. Arbaugh constructed more than a century ago, is a long, long way from home. Mr. Arbaugh built his home in 1860 in the Shasta Valley of Siskiyou County under the shadow of California's spectacular Mount Shasta. Today the kitchen of this home is located in the new Museum of History and Technology here in Washington.

The Smithsonian Institution selected this historic old room to exemplify for eastern citizens the days of the California gold rush. Under the direction of C. Malcolm Watkins, the Smithsonian's curator of cultural history, and his wife, Joan, the Smithsonian did a magnificent job in recapturing the authentic flavor of the Old West.

When discovered through the combined efforts of the California State society, one of its most active members, Washingtonian Ralph Lorimer, and Mrs. Calla Lukes, a Siskiyou County historian, artist and community leader who conducted on untiring search for a proper historic kitchen, the old Arbaugh home

had been abandoned for approximately 30 years. White face cattle grazed by Siskiyou County rancher Robert Wells wandered in and out of the old building, but the tongue and groove pine board walls and ceilings had withstood the rigors of time and weather and the original blue paint still showed on the interior.

Two specialists in construction and restoration of old buildings, George H. Watson and Charles H. Rowell, who have installed all the period rooms of the Museum's Institute of History and Technology, flew to California and took the kitchen apart bit by bit, numbering every board as it came out so that it could be reconstructed in exactly the same manner when moved to Washington.

The kitchen had never been modernized so everything was as it had been more than a century ago when it first was built. None of the original furniture survived, but Mr. and Mrs. Watkins researched the area, talked to many old time Siskiyou County residents and with information thus gathered accurately reconstructed the kitchen's interior with appropriate substitute furniture, untensils and stove, all of which were used in California during the third quarter of the 19th century. So complete is the exhibit that a pair of the original "Levi's" made by Levi Straus in San Francisco during the gold rush days hang on a nail in the wall.

May I commend to my colleagues in the House of Representatives this fine exhibit and urge them to stop by the Smithsonian and take a look at this bit of the Old West. As a period room, this kitchen is unique among exhibits in eastern museums.

This kitchen will help bridge the gap between the past and the future and I am sure that George Washington Arbaugh, truly a 19th century pioneer, would be proud of the way the Smithsonian is trying to tell the people of the 20th century and even the 21st century a little about the life which he lived.

Arbaugh was typical of the men who with their families turned their backs on the comforts of home and went west in search of many riches, land, water, and, of course, gold.

Born in Alabama in 1822, Arbaugh grew up in this land. He and his bride of 2 years moved west to California in 1850. He fought Indians and outlaws. He prospected throughout Shasta County and in the Trinity Alps. He tried his hand in the ferry business before he settled in the Shasta Valley of Siskiyou County in 1855 and turned his efforts to farming. He acquired the Wayside Ranch for grazing of cattle and raising of grain and much of the original ranch holdings remain in the Arbaugh family.

A member of this large family is Mrs. Calla Lukes, Arbaugh's great granddaughter and an active resident of the Siskiyou County community of Etna. I was proud to escort this wonderful lady as she snipped the ribbon to officially open the Smithsonian exhibit a short time ago.

Mrs. Lukes, who has done so much to find the proper kitchen, wanted to see the completed job so she traveled here to Washington where her daughter, Rita Brunner, lives. Mrs. Lukes was properly proud of her pioneer heritage and of her great-grandfather who had done so much for the settling of Siskiyou County a century ago.

She called to my attention a passage from a statement made by George Washington Arbaugh many, many years ago:

> The sum of my political view is comprised in a strenuous desire to mete out equal justice to all men, not being biased by any consideration of selfish interest or self-aggrandizement. I hold that the principles of truth and honor are as rigidly binding upon, and apply as well to, the conduct of government affairs as those of individuals; and that the laws of the country should be so framed that the greatest good may accrue to the greatest number.

This is the type of man who made our country strong. This is the type of man who will keep our country strong today and in the future. It is fitting that a bit of his heritage may be preserved so our children may marvel at the hardships which these people underwent in order to make our Nation great.

Let us measure up to the sturdy example set by these mighty men.

Mrs. Griffiths Wins Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, those of us who know Congresswoman MARTHA GRIFFITHS are well aware of her talents as a legislator. She demonstrated her abilities once again during the deliberations of the House Committee on Ways and Means on the excise tax legislation.

In Michigan these days, Mrs. GRIFFITHS is being called the "car buyers' friend" for the part she played in writing into the excise tax bill provisions to eliminate the inequitable auto excise tax.

Both of Detroit's daily newspapers, the News and the Free Press, have editorially praised the work of Mrs. GRIFFITHS in connection with the actions of the Ways and Means Committee on the excise tax legislation. I join the editors of the News and the Free Press commending Mrs. GRIFFITHS for her contribution to the final form of this important measure.

Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial from the Free Press, which appeared under the headline, "Thanks to Mrs. GRIFFITHS," and the News editorial, headlined "MARTHA Does It Again," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press]

THANKS TO MRS. GRIFFITHS

Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS, Michigan's member of the House Ways and Means Committee, deserves a standing round of applause.

She, more than any other member, was responsible for the committee's decision to kill the excise tax on automobiles. She had labored hard and done her homework.

The only place we might take issue with Mrs. GRIFFITHS is in her desire to eliminate the whole 10-percent tax at once. Every used car dealer in the country, as well as every leasing firm such as Hertz, Avis, and National who carry major inventories of used cars, would immediately suffer a nondeductible 10-percent depreciation in their tangible assets, simply because used cars would be worth that much less. So would every car owner, for that matter.

Phasing out the program over 3½ years will enable them to absorb their losses gradually.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS fears used car dealers won't pass such a gradual cut on to their customers as new car manufacturers have promised to do. The danger is real, but used car prices are set by supply and demand, and if new cars cost less, used cars will automatically be less desirable.

The automobile industry, and Michigan in general, should also be happy at reports that the President doesn't intend to fight the committee's decision. He originally asked that the tax be reduced from 10 to 5 percent, and made permanent there.

With a deficit estimated at $4.4 billion, no one doubts that he needs the money. But excise taxes are not the way to get it. They are sales taxes, pure and simple, whether collected from the manufacturer or the customer.

For Federal purposes, excise taxes were supposed to be temporary wartime levies to reduce consumption and make people buy bonds instead. They have no place at the Federal level in peacetime.

Our compliments to Mrs. GRIFFITHS for her shrewd and dogged fight, and thanks to her from all of Michigan.

[From the Detroit News, May 21, 1965]

CAR BUYERS' FRIEND: MARTHA DOES IT AGAIN

Never underestimate the power of a woman, especially if the woman is Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS.

Men normally regard taxes and the automobile business as their special preserves, but as the first woman ever to serve on the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee, Mrs. GRIFFITHS again has shown that she understands both fields.

More than anyone else, the Detroit Democrat deserves the credit for the Ways and Means Committee vote to eliminate the 10 percent excise on new automobiles by January 1, 1969. The action was unusual because President Johnson, in his excise tax message, had recommended a three-step reduction and permanent retention of half of the 10-percent tax.

Long an opponent of the excise tax on new cars, Mrs. GRIFFITHS proposed at Wednesday's Ways and Means Committee meeting that the levy on new cars be wiped out immediately. That motion drew such strong support that Chairman WILBUR MILLS himself offered as a compromise the plan to phase out the tax on new cars by the end of 1968.

While the bill still has to go through the House and the Senate, the House Ways and Means Committee usually sets the pattern for congressional action on tax bills. Chairman BYRD, of the Senate Finance Committee, has not yet given his blessing, but seldom stands in the way of tax relief. No other obstacles have yet appeared.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS' proposal for immediate repeal of the entire 10 percent tax obviously would provide more immediate stimulus to the economy that the phaseout plan will But the gradual reduction will benefit the auto industry at the very time that auto sales seem to be leveling off. The manufacturers already have pledged to cut prices to reflect the tax slash and to rebate taxes paid by purchasers since May 15.

As Mrs. GRIFFITHS pointed out, it was inequitable for the President to propose outright repeal and a phasing out of many other excises at the same time he proposed to keep a permanent 5-percent excise on new cars.

Now through the efforts of Mrs. GRIFFITHS and the House Ways and Means Committee, this inequity seems about to be removed.

So the next time the male motorist begins to complain about women drivers, perhaps he ought to reconsider in view of what Mrs. GRIFFITHS is trying to do for him.

The Nationality Factor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following editorial from one of our leading county newspapers, the Valley Independent, deserves a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As the son of immigrant parents I applaud the thought behind the editorial. Let us understand each other as Americans and get rid of the idea that equality of opportunity is a substance for Fourth of July speeches and then forgotten. In my 30 years of political activity I can say that this inequity which Mr. Pore addresses goes beyond the voting for local candidates but reaches into county, State, and Federal elections.

Another great source of discouragement is the overpracticed rule of appointments to political office and jobs on the basis of nationality, not of the applicant, but of his forebears.

I agree with Editor Harry Pore—let us live our Fourth of July speeches all year round. We must realize we are all Americans and the days of Ellis Island belong to the past. In fact, I attended the ceremonies at the White House recently when the President signed the proclamation making Ellis Island a Federal park to be known as Liberty Park.

Let us join up and make the whole Nation a Liberty Park.

Mr. Pore's editorial follows:

THE NATIONALITY FACTOR

Are nationalistic differences still a serious factor in the local politics of mid-Mon Valley communities?

It would seem that they are. Nobody talks about it much in public, but the nationality factor enters into much private political conversation throughout the valley. And some candidates seem obviously to plan their strategies with this factor in mind.

Members of this newspaper's staff whose business it is to observe local politics report that, in one degree or another, nationalities played a role in last Tuesday's primary voting in all the larger towns of the valley and in many of the smaller ones as well. In some instances, our reporters feel this factor may have been decisive although of course this would be hard—if not impossible—to prove factually. But the feeling cannot be avoided that considerable numbers of voters are still being influenced in this way.

While we cannot pretend to be surprised by this, we are disappointed and discouraged by it. If important numbers of people in the valley, pretending to be Americans, are still making decisions concerning their local governments and even their public schools on the basis of where in Europe their fathers or their grandfathers were born, what chance do we have of developing the political leadership we need to meet the problems of this area?

It is easy to understand that earlier residents of the valley were concerned that their ethnic groups would be represented as such in the political life of the community. In the first flush of the great immigration tide, it was significant, just in terms of language, whether one regarded himself as "Italian" or "Slovak." Much of his life—social and religious as well as political—fell quite naturally into these patterns.

But we have now had three generations since the great tide. Today's voters, with very few exceptions, have no reason to regard themselves as anything but Americans in making political decisions. The fourth generation is in the schools preparing for citizenship and leadership.

What kind of heritage are we handing these young people, anyway, if they know that many of their elders, who certainly know better, are indulging in wornout old prejudices and group alliances which have no real significance in community life today?

The nation has been greatly concerned in recent years with segregation and discrimination in terms of racial origin. We are agreed that these should have no standing in public life.

Segregation and discrimination based on nationalistic origin deserve no more standing. Men and women have a right to be judged on their merits as individuals.

We do not know how it is going to be done, but we must get rid of these old phobias in thinking about local government and politics. If we don't, if we insist upon letting blind prejudice control political decisions, we are bound to deprive our cities of the leadership talent they sorely need to make consistent progress.

Before another election day comes around, we hope voters who have been voting "Italian" or "Slovak" or something else just as irrelevant will come to their senses and realize the harm they can do to the communities in which they are living, and rearing, and educating their children.

Bishop Creighton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as an Episcopalian I rise to defend William F. Creighton, Episcopal bishop of the Washington diocese, against what was said about him in this House last week by two of my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], who are both also of the Episcopal faith.

In a speech on May 17 here in Washington, Bishop Creighton expressed his opposition to the current rule in the District of Columbia which denies children of an unemployed father the benefits of Federal aid to dependent children payments, although children similarly situated are eligible for such payments in every one of the 50 States of the Union. In making his point, the bishop had something to say about a Member of the other body—some reference or other to bleeding hearts and little children. For this, the bishop was berated for expressing "personal venom," and for departing from the standard of "those who speak from a position in society which clothes them with a high degree of immunity." The bishop was told that "he should keep his nose out of it."

At the risk of sounding like just another organization man, I'm for the bishop. I am very proud that he does concern himself with social issues like the care of the children of the unemployed, and that he and his Suffragan Bishop, Paul Moore, Jr., have identified themselves with the forces in this community—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—who are concerned with bringing about better treatment for children who are condemned to poverty through no fault of their own.

Perhaps the bishop's figure of speech was not the most felicitous he could have chosen. But I would point out that when I last looked at the Constitution it was Members of Congress who are given the legal immunity for what they say in debate, not bishops.

As far as I am concerned, Bishop Creighton is a gentle and saintly man. We should be glad to hear from him.

Fighting Poverty and City Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly evident that the recent abrupt termination of the "anti-poverty" hearings held by the Special Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee was a mistake. Obviously it was premature for that group to terminate hearings before hearing testimony which would have defined some of the serious and evident shortcomings of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

As an example of the difficulties being faced in the operation of the Office of Economic Opportunity, I submit an article from the Reporter magazine of June 3, 1965, by Erwin Knoll and Jules Witcover:

FIGHTING POVERTY—AND CITY HALL

(By Edwin Knoll and Jules Witcover)

SYRACUSE.—The neon sign blinked red and green over the front door of the Apostolic Church, breaking the drab twilight on Cortland Street with its alternating message, "Jesus Saves," "Jesus Heals." Children played on the sidewalk, and adults, some in work clothes and others in their Sunday best that Wednesday evening, filed into the church basement and sat down on plank benches or folding chairs.

When there were 50 in the hall, a tall young Negro stood and started speaking. "I'm a little disappointed in the turnout," he said, "but I never expected to see everyone here. There are those who are afraid.

"The President of the United States has declared war on poverty. There are people who are in want—in want of housing, food, and education. And in want of something else: a voice of their own."

In this setting, the Johnson administration's war on poverty came a few weeks ago to Syracuse. Some Syracusans hope, and others fear that with it came the beginnings of a social revolution.

The neighborhood meetings at the Apostolic Church, and others like it held every second week in six deteriorated areas of central Syracuse, are part of a federally financed attempt to weld the city's poor into an aggressive, effective power bloc capable of wringing meaningful concessions from the community. The effort has raised a fundamental question of public policy: Should the Federal Government, in the interest of truly involving the poor in the war on poverty, help them fight city hall?

City hall in Syracuse is convinced that it is the inevitable target of a $314,000 Federal grant for the training and field operations of 16 organizers of the poor. The program, under three divisions of Syracuse University and with some funds from the Ford Foundation and other sources, has been designated by the Office of Economic Opportunity as a national pilot study on ways to personally involve more of the poor in local antipoverty programs.

When Congress passed the Economic Opportunity Act last year, it specified that there must be "maximum feasible participation" of the poor in the planning and administration of local projects. The requirement is obviously vague, but it has been seized upon by certain OEO officials who are convinced the war on poverty can be won only if old social-welfare approaches, perpetuated by entrenched community leaders, are shunted aside. If the Syracuse experiment works, current attempts by OEO-funded "umbrella" community-action organizations to get by with no more than showcase representation of the poor are likely to be challenged even more vigorously by Federal officials.

REVOLUTION ALINSKY STYLE

The university project is patterned on the techniques of Saul D. Alinsky, a Chicago sociologist who has been building the urban poor into pressure groups for a quarter of a century. Alinsky, who courts controversy and preaches social revolution, serves the university as a part-time consultant and lecturer.

Under the Alinsky system, organizers trained at the university are fanning out into low-income areas and setting up meetings—like the one at the Apostolic Church—in the hope that these will grow into neighborhood organizations strong enough to demand and obtain a redress of grievances. The problems under attack include charges of inadequate garbage disposal, excessive rents and gas bills, unjustified evictions, and lack of recreational facilities.

Accompanying these efforts is a vigorous voter-registration campaign. "Register for power" is one of the slogans displayed in single-sheet neighborhood newspapers distributed as part of the organizing drive. Democratic enrollments in the low-income areas are already rising, a fact that troubles Republican Mayor William F. Walsh, who is up for reelection this year.

"These people go into a housing project and talk about setting up a 'democratic' organization—small 'd'—but it sounds just the same as Democratic—big 'd,'" the mayor explains. "In a close election, it could be decisive."

Local resentment over the university project has reached the White House. On April 12, Charles A. Walker, a commissioner of the Syracuse Housing Authority, wrote to President Johnson protesting that the Federal antipoverty grant was being used to finance "activities which do no good and will ultimately cause serious trouble in our community if allowed to continue."

Walker charged that the university organizers "are claiming that all kinds of benefits will accrue to the tenants of our housing projects if they will join these action committees. One of these promised benefits is the improvement of conditions in the housing project known as Pioneer Homes. Conditions in Pioneer Homes are as good as the tenants will permit them to be."

Walker enclosed a memorandum from William L. McGarry, executive director of the Syracuse Housing Authority, who wrote: "I thoroughly distrust any program that identifies two distinct classes of society. In this case, the poor and the affluent. This social action program follows all of the old patterns of class distinction and hate, so easily identified with Marxism. The obvious cleavage away from the established resources of social welfare and charity in our community by the action group only makes the identity of the classes more distinct. If ever the circumstances that create hostility among these occur, we then have a situation that—by the grace of God—has never happened in our city."

Dean Clifford Winters of University College, one of the units involved in the antipoverty project, issued a statement branding the charges as false. Nevertheless, the complaint to the White House brought an OEO investigator to Syracuse for 3 days of intensive discussions with both parties. His report has gone to OEO Director Sargent Shriver, but it has not been made public.

Such corrosive controversy is not common in traditionally conservative Syracuse, where city hall has been in Republican hands for many years. The city has a diversified industrial base and is not overly dependent on defense contracts. The Negro population is small—some 12,000 out of a total population of somewhat more than 200,000—though it occupies about 80 percent of the low-income target areas of the war on poverty. A current hiring practice drive by CORE against a key local industry, the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., has been so ineffective that CORE recently tried to bring the campaign to life by importing 20 Negroes from Selma, Ala. But with only a 6-percent Negro base in the population and with little active support within that group, CORE's attempt to tag Syracuse as "the Selma of the North" was unsuccessful.

The CORE demonstrations, punctuated by occasional arrests, have at least attracted attention, but the average Syracusan still does not know or care about the antipoverty controversy. Among community leaders, however, there are knowing references to Alinsky's 1946 autobiography, "Reveille for Radicals," and a descriptive brochure issued by Syracuse University's antipoverty project is the subject of angry luncheon conversation.

"This program," the brochure declares, "differs from most in being solely concerned with the creation of powerful self-directed democratic organizations in areas of poverty." Applicants for the training program, it added, "should have a controlled but intense anger about continued injustice and should be committed to hard work for people who are grappling with apparently overwhelming problems." The fact that a number of veteran civil rights workers have been recruited, including several members of CORE, has not reassured those who view the program with concern.

Among those most concerned are the city's established social welfare agencies, which have banded together in the Syracuse Crusade for Opportunity, the officially designated "umbrella" organization for the local war on poverty. Because the university program has received an OEO grant outside the crusade, a jurisdictional conflict is erupting in the low-income target neighborhoods. Crusade officials suspect that planners of the university program have outmaneuvered them, grabbing off an independent OEO grant after having talked about working under the crusade umbrella. Several weeks after the university received its Federal money, the crusade's OEO grant came through. The amount—$483,000—was about a third of what had been requested.

PROJECTS IN COLLISION

But these are minor irritants compared to the abrasive debate over the question of the role of the poor in the war on poverty. The university program's social action approach assumes that the poor have common interests and needs, and that these can be met when the poor are mobilized into powerful and articulate organizations. The crusade also sees its task as mobilization—but mobilization of the established welfare and civic agencies of the community to combat poverty in terms of its individual victims, with representatives of the poor handpicked by crusade officials.

The executive director of the crusade, an anthropologist and former community chest official named Ben Zimmerman, warns that the university project has a potential for promoting civic strife. "If you talk about a mass program, you're saying, 'How do you galvanize the poor to break down the walls of the city?' Anger and frustration can bring a program together. But you have to keep fanning the flames if that's what keeps the program going. This is the kind of program that really demands an outside 'enemy.'"

The chance of a collision between the crusade program and the university project is great, Zimmerman says. "The worst thing that could happen is for a fight to develop over who 'owns' the poor."

The director of the university project, Assistant Professor Warren C. Haggstrom of the school of social work, describes the program as nothing more than encouragement and guidance toward do-it-yourself democracy.

"Ours is a philosophy of self-help," Haggstrom says. "We want to help the neighborhoods develop strong democratic organizations with as wide a base as possible that will achieve an additional level of power—enough power to enable those individuals excluded from the community to enter it. The poor are outsiders; the problem is, How can they enter the community? If you just give them services, it doesn't pull them in. The failure of past welfare programs proves that." The poor can enter the mainstream of the community "only in a process where people are in charge of their own lives," Haggstrom insists. "And in order to be self-responsible, you have to have a certain level of power."

Zimmerman and Haggstrom are on the frontline, but the Syracuse tempest really rages around Alinsky, a man few Syracusans have ever seen or talked to. He comes to the city for 4 days at the end of every month to lecture and consult at Haggstrom's community action training center, but his reputation as a blunt, deliberately vexatious assailant of the status quo has ignited emotions ranging from indignation to near hysteria among downtown community leaders.

A veteran of the early organizing days of the CIO, Alinsky began using union tactics in neighborhood drives before the Second World War, when he and the late Roman Catholic Bishop Bernard J. Sheil organized the Back of the Yards Neighborhood Council in Chicago and helped a group of Irish Americans turn the stockyard slum where they lived into an enviable urban community. In recent years Alinsky has applied his progress-through-power techniques in behalf of low-income Negroes in Chicago and elsewhere. He currently is disturbing the tranquility of civic leaders in Rochester, N.Y., where his Industrial Areas Foundation has been hired for $100,000 by a group of churches to work with the Negro community of 32,000 that erupted in riots last summer.

Alinsky also is about to enter antipoverty activities in Buffalo and in Kansas City, Mo. Hence, the success or failure of the Alinsky approach in Syracuse may have a great impact on the administration's war on poverty.

So far, the OEO is officially neutral on Alinsky. If he makes his mark in Syracuse, other antipoverty community groups will want his help, and the conflict over Federal financing of assaults by the poor on their own city halls will mushroom.

"This is part of a ferment that is developing throughout the country now," Alinsky says of the Syracuse controversy. He dismisses much of the conventional welfare approach as sentimental slop. Perhaps to buffer himself against sentimentality, Alinsky avoids direct contact with the poor of Syracuse, confining his activities to the academic area. He is aware, too, of the pitfalls of Federal financing and insists on receiving his retainer directly from the university.

ORGANIZING THE POOR

A longtime Alinsky associate, Fred W. Ross, is the field director of the organizing phase of the university project, and Haggstrom runs the research and training program. Ross was west coast director for Alinsky's foundation before he came to Syracuse last year to help the crusade with a "community development" program of its own. He switched to the university project when its OEO grant came through.

Basically, the Alinsky system works this way: in each of six selected low-income areas of the city, teams of two—usually one Negro and one white student—conduct about a dozen house meetings in a neighborhood to urge the formation of a citizens' organization to process complaints. When sufficient interest has been aroused, a process that usually takes about 5 weeks, a neighborhood organizational meeting is held. Temporary officers are elected and action committees are formed to handle pressing problems. Regular officers are chosen by the members and a constitution is adopted.

At this stage, the university organizers blend into the background, with the members of the new group in control. Eventually, all the neighborhood groups will be linked in one organization of organizations that can legitimately claim to speak for the city's poor. Issues isolated by the action committees will be taken up with the authorities and, it is hoped, resolved by negotiation. If they are not, Alinsky tactics of the past—including rent strikes, mass sit-ins, and other weapons he used even before they were adopted by the civil rights movement—can be expected.

Alinsky, Ross, and Haggstrom contend that the power of the poor will bring about redress of grievances with less open strife than would eventually occur if the demands of unorganized poor were ignored or suppressed. Haggstrom, a local NAACP official who was arrested and released in October 1963, in a demonstration at a Syracuse urban renewal site, says he and the university will withdraw their support if activities of the neighborhood organizations lead to violence or lawbreaking. But he says legal advice indicates that both rent strikes and sit-ins would be legal in Syracuse.

The social-action planners' confidence that their efforts will not precipitate violence is viewed with skepticism among the downtown community leaders. Mayor Walsh, for one, fears trouble: "They try to pit the poor against everyone else in the community. Such talk as guerrilla warfare and agitation to the point of contact is certainly not in keeping with social-work techniques, because the purpose of social work is to help people help themselves."

Such official criticism, combined with the protest to Washington and the complaints of members of the crusade board, pains top officials of the university, which is heavily dependent on local endowment for its costly building program. Some influential Syracusans hope that Chancellor William P. Tolley will put a stop to the antipoverty project, but any such move would probably precipitate a dispute over academic freedom.

To ease the pressure on the university, a new nine-member board, headed by a clergyman who also serves on the crusade, is to receive a subcontract for the organizing efforts under the university's Federal grant. The board will seek additional funds of its own, and will try to serve as a bridge between the social-action program and the crusade. But while this device may give the university some relief, it is not likely to remove the basic fears about the organizing-the-poor project itself.

Mayor Walsh, caught between the university and nervous community leaders, blames Washington for his quandry. He says that he was distressed when he learned that OEO was giving an independent grant to the university outside the crusade, which he and the Republican county executive had designated as the official antipoverty umbrella agency. "I feel that the responsibility for this rests with OEO in Washington," Walsh said. "It was our feeling that nothing should be done in this community without being cleared with the crusade."

OEO officials have made several efforts, apparently without success, to promote cooperation between the crusade and the university project. A showdown could come when the university's 9-month grant comes up for renewal in October. But before then, OEO will have to face a basic policy decision that can have national ramifications for the war on poverty.

Shriver and the Johnson administration will have to decide first whether it is practical and prudent to award more than one OEO grant within a single community, if the probable result is a jurisdictional conflict. Having encouraged localities to put all antipoverty resources under one organization, OEO must be ready for a storm whenever another project it finances attacks the status quo represented in the umbrella agency. But in view of the congressional mandate to involve the poor in a meaningful way, OEO can hardly turn its back on the Alinsky experiment and others like it.

In the political field, a surrender to community pressures in Syracuse by withdrawing the OEO grant to the university could bring Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of the House Education and Labor Committee into the fray. POWELL, using his committee as a watchdog over OEO, bore down in recent hearings on the Shriver-supported umbrella approach in New York City. He is interested, presumably, because he sees his own primacy in the Harlem program—and perhaps in the program nationally—threatened by the influence of city hall. If he were so inclined, POWELL could blame any scuttling of the Alinsky experiment on excessive local political control.

The Syracuse dispute is, therefore, more than just another local squabble among hundreds that are breaking out on all fronts of the war on poverty. (An OEO official says candidly, "If the mayors of this country knew what they were letting themselves in for, they never would have signed on.") Local leaders may boggle at the notion of Federal financing for an attack on city hall, but the new breed of antipoverty warriors in Washington are likely to shrug and observe that war is hell. Full speed ahead, they say, throw out the old ways and bring in the new, and let them iron out the local arguments on Main Street.

Unprotected Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the migrant farm laborer is the least adequately protected of all American workers. As the New York Times pointed out on May 25:

> No American worker enjoys fewer statutory safeguards than the migratory farm laborer; he is outside virtually all the laws that guarantee any element of decency in wages or working conditions.

And yet, the recent action by the Attorney General in extending the work permits of 500 West Indians harvesting celery in Florida—an action which directly undermines the carefully considered position of the Secretary of Labor—serves only to further depress the American migrant's already meager market.

The New York Times article goes on to make a point that I have stressed several times in this Chamber, and which has been borne out in those instances where it has been practiced:

> Whenever the growers bring farm wages up to some level of parity with the wages prevailing elsewhere in the American economy, there will be no lack of domestic labor to harvest the country's fruits and vegetables.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this perceptive article to all who are concerned with this problem.

THE UNDERPROTECTED MIGRANT

No American worker enjoys fewer statutory safeguards than the migratory farm laborer; he is outside virtually all the laws that guarantee any element of decency in wages or working conditions. Yet, he can always be sure that powerful political and economic interests will combine to erode whatever small measure of protection he finally wins through Government action.

That dismal history is being repeated in California and Florida, where growers are shooting holes in the fences erected by Congress to keep out cheap foreign labor and thus help push up the wretched level of earnings for domestic farmworkers. Secretary of Labor Wirtz, who has fought resolutely to enforce the ban on the importation of Mexicans, has found himself obliged to give ground twice under pressure from California growers of strawberries and vegetables.

Thus far the breakthrough has been confined to 2,500 braceros, but the political heat on Mr. Wirtz can be expected to grow more intense as the harvest season advances. His ability to resist has now been weakened by an undermining action from within the Johnson Cabinet. Attorney General Katzenbach has just overruled Mr. Wirtz by authorizing an extension until June 1 of the work permits for 500 West Indians harvesting celery in Florida.

Unquestionably, the farmowners in both States made a persuasive demonstration that crops would rot if they were denied the use

of foreign labor. They will always be able to make such a demonstration so long as they know there is a door to unlock. Whenever the growers bring farm wages up to some level of parity with the wages prevailing elsewhere in the American economy, there will be no lack of domestic labor to harvest the country's fruits and vegetables. With or without a war on poverty, it is the Government's obligation to convince them that the escape hatch is closed for good.

REA Encroachment—Is the End in Sight?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the past three decades have marked a most unprecedented growth in the size and power of the Federal Government. This growth has been accompanied by an ever increasing encroachment by the administrative agencies upon the prerogatives of the legislative branch even to the extent that the executive has developed a most adept, a most professional ability to circumvent the power granted to the Congress by the Constitution. Today, success in a Washington bureaucracy seems to be measured in terms of its devious ability to thrive, grow, and to perpetuate itself, by administrative actions that bypass and encroach upon the power of the Congress.

The Rural Electrification Administration provides a good example of just such an agency. REA's major objective appears to be aimed at changing its program from the one established by Congress and designed primarily to bring electricity to unserved persons in rural areas into a program involving a full-fledged urban and industrial utility operation and responsibility. Without arguing the merits of whether this reorientation is good or bad, whether it should or should not be done, Congress—not REA—should make this decision, after full hearings, open discussion, and arrival at a consensus that has fairly considered and weighed all points of view.

REA over the years has continuously waged a cold and often successful war to thwart the congressionally approved standards in the 1936 act.

Like all cold wars, it has been long in duration. The strategy has been designed to secure a gradual but steady attrition of congressionally approved REA standards, with the aggressors carefully calculating their actions so as to obtain their objective with a minimum of exposure and without provoking a full-scale counterattack.

THE INSURGENTS

The insurgents in this cold war are not those persons in rural areas who joined together in the cooperative device to supply themselves with electric power. They are not the local cooperative members. The aggressors, rather, are the directors and administrators of the REA program in Washington, and their allies, whose primary objective is to use the Rural Electrification Administration to perpetuate and expand their own bureaucracies even at the expense of sacrificing the objectives of the original program.

Thus, the real problem today is not the basic program itself but the emoluments created by the extreme actions of a Federal agency designed to insure its continued growth and existence. For example, REA now seeks to serve urban as well as rural persons by promoting a concept of exclusive service areas. This can only result in the inevitable assumption of a utility responsibility for electric power in such areas. REA seeks new area development duties which have to do with broad problems of economic stability and growth. It openly espouses a desire to weaken or remove the congressionally established standards throughout its program even at the expense of an increase in interest rates and continually expands its activities in an effort to justify a growing annual payroll which now tops the $11 million mark.

The major objectives of REA's campaign have been aimed at eliminating administratively the "rural area" and "unserved persons" provisions in the enabling legislation and the congressionally accepted "cost and availability of power" yardsticks for generation and transmission loans that accompanied Senate approval of the 1936 act.

Although a rural area was clearly defined by the Congress as one not included within the boundaries of a village having a population in excess of 1,500, REA developed the incidental argument as a means of sidestepping this provision. This philosophy contended that REA could loan funds for a generating plant to supply electricity to a town in excess of 1,500 population if such service was deemed incidental to supplying electricity to unserved persons in the surrounding legitimate rural areas.

ANOTHER PROVISION

REA also contrived a way to bypass the "unserved persons" provision of the act through its "once a recipient always a recipient" policy. Here, REA contends that a borrower not having central station service at the time of its first REA loan continued to be a person without central station service eligible for generation and transmission loans even though its wholesale power was being furnished from another source. Assuming that such policy was desirable, it was a congressional—not an agency—decision. To do so administratively was a clear cut encroachment on the language of the act.

The basic congressionally accepted requirements for generation plants has always been that loans could be made only if there is no adequate and dependable source of power available to meet the consumer's needs or that the rates offered by existing power sources would result in a higher cost of power for consumers than the cost from facilities financed by REA.

This policy was honored by all administrators down to the present.

Claude Wickard, REA Administrator under both the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, contended that "For REA to deviate from this policy—either by refusing to make loans or by making those that do not meet the requirements—would obviously be contrary to the will of the people as expressed through the Congress."

The present Administrator, however, a few months after taking office, changed the generation and transmission ground rules by adding, without congressional approval, a third criterion to REA's policy. This change, which had no basis in law, authorized generation and transmission loans "to protect the security and effective use of REA-financed systems." Although the REA Act does require the Administrator to certify the security of a loan, nothing in the act even implies that this responsibility should be expanded to include the borrower. The effect of this new criterion was to weaken the standards governing generation and transmission loans by permitting other factors to be included as justifications.

This single action brought to a culmination the rural electrification program as Congress has known it for nearly 25 years and substituted a comprehensive generation and transmission program covering all uses of electricity and all types of customers. As a result, loans for generation and transmission facilities took an increasing percentage of the annual loan authorizations.

FULL IMPACT

The increase, however, does not give the full impact of the third criterion. This did not become apparent until it became evident last year that the third criterion was being used to encroach further upon the "unserved person" and "rural area" limitations in the 1936 act. In this instance, the administrator broke off contract negotiations being conducted with power companies—as directed by the fiscal year 1964 Appropriations Committee's reports—when the companies refused to support the establishment of exclusive service areas within their State. He then approved a generation and transmission loan on the basis that exclusive service areas were a prerequisite of a reasonable contract. Thus he used the third criterion, a policy without basis in Federal law, to force the application of a policy that was contrary to the laws of the State under which the co-op operated.

This encroachment by the REA Administrator on the laws and policies of Congress, on the affairs of the States, and the operations of power suppliers within the States is the major REA problem today.

Although congressional committees have made some attempts toward checking this gradual undermining by the REA of congressional standards only firm action can now stem the tide. As a lending agency, REA's broad authority emanates from the legislative committees of Congress but there is no regular monitoring or accounting to these committees for its actions. REA goes scot free, without checks or balances, except for its annual appearance before the

Appropriations Committee for authorization of borrowing from the Treasury.

"REA Encroachment—Is the End in Sight?" Obviously, "No," at least not until the Congress takes a firm stand and stops the administrative rewriting of the law by this agency. There are some constructive steps that can be taken:

First. Item justification: With the exception of REA, Federal agencies primarily involved in power programs present their annual request to the Appropriations Committee on a line item basis. This gives Congress an opportunity to consider and specifically approve their construction programs. To the contrary, REA makes a lump-sum request which is justified by a vague type of survey among its borrowers. In other words, the financier decides how much he will provide for loans on the basis of how much the bank mortgagees decide they can spend. By requiring REA to present a line item budget to the Appropriations Committee each year for all loans over, for example, $2,500,000, would give Congress the same control over this agency's lending activities that it exercises over Federal power construction agencies and would tend to reduce REA's presently increasing encroachment on congressional prerogatives. It would also give the Nation's farmers and their elected representatives a chance to check diversion of the Department of Agriculture's efforts to purposes unrelated to agriculture and rural areas.

CRITERION ELIMINATION

Second. Elimination of the third criterion: The Appropriations Committee could correct this matter and at the same time strengthen generation and transmission standards by prohibiting funds from being used for generation and transmission loans unless they result in lower cost power to consumers. This administrative edict, the third criterion, offers no advantage to the farm user of electricity and negates the longstanding congressionally accepted standards that generation and transmission loans be limited to instances where power is inadequate or where rates can be reduced.

The third criterion was set forth by its proponents as being necessary to eliminate unfair provisions in borrowers' contracts and to insure territorial protection. Territory, however, is a State—not a Federal matter—and many States, without REA interference, have made substantial progress in working out equitable territorial arrangements. As for wholesale contract provisions, every effort should be made to insure their reasonableness, particularly in view of Congress support—and the Budget Bureau's endorsement—of the negotiated contract in preference to construction of generation and transmission facilities.

REA over the years has always taken into consideration the reasonableness of proposed contracts in considering generation and transmission loan application. This was done without a third criterion. Unfortunately, this criterion has become a club in the Administrator's hands which he has used to become involved in matters beyond his authority and a means by which he subtly operates his program contrary to the direction of Congress.

Third. Judicial review of REA loans: Legislation could be enacted to provide for judicial review of the Administrator's decision either by amendment to the REA Act or by amendment to the Administrative Procedures Act. This would provide an aggrieved party, either a cooperative or a power supplier, with an avenue in the courts for review of any generation and transmission loan decision made by the REA.

Regardless of what Congress may choose to do, one thing is certain—REA's abuse of the law and its encroachment upon congressional prerogatives must be stopped. The longer such activity is permitted to continue, the more difficult it will become to correct.

Careful Planning Necessitated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, it has been a source of concern that the State of Indiana and the midwest in general has been overlooked in the location of installations and facilities necessary to our space and scientific advance.

This is particularly tragic in view of the many advantages offered by the midwest, including perfect topography, central location, good climate, fine transportation and communication facilities and a wealth of good science colleges and universities.

Earlier this year, when the Atomic Energy Commission announced plans to build the world's largest atom smasher, I compared their requirements for a site to what Indiana had to offer.

Indiana's suitability matched the atomic installation site requirements, and we suggested that Indiana be considered for this $280 million installation.

Our great universities and colleges were contacted as well as business and civil leaders, in order to organize efforts for obtaining this facility for Indiana.

Since that time the entire Indiana congressional delegation as well as our Governor and other State officials have held meetings to generate enthusiasm for presenting Indiana's qualifications to Federal officials in an effort to bring this atom smasher to Indiana.

The Governor has appointed a blue-ribbon committee group to gather information and present it to the proper officials charged with making a decision on the location of the facility.

Indianapolis television station WISH-TV, channel 8, has presented an editorial citing Indiana's efforts in this venture. The editorial does a fine job in summing up our efforts, and I request it be reprinted in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[A WISH-TV 8 Editorial, May 13, 1965]

CAREFUL PLANNING NECESSITATED

It is an exciting prospect that Governor Branigin has introduced in setting up the machinery to seek a multimillion-dollar nuclear research center for Indianapolis.

From practically every standpoint, the establishment of such a center here would bring almost limitless new opportunities to the State, and to central Indiana particularly. This area would become a scientific focal point of the Nation, and perhaps even of the world.

Educational dividends would be reaped by Indiana's universities. The State's economy would prosper. Industrial development would take on new stature and meaning. So would the State's general image be given a new importance and prominence that would be beneficial in every aspect of its future development.

The forward-thinking of Governor Branigin and other of this State's leaders is to be greatly applauded, then, in their seeking to capture the bid for the nuclear center. For the advantages the center's establishment can bring to a State, as all 50 State governors well know, are enormously significant.

Yet we do feel the need to interject one cautionary word at the outset of the State's efforts to lure the center here. For the need to avoid sacrificing one potential advantage for the people of Indiana to gain another is greatly essential.

In the selection of a proposed site for the nuclear center, in other words, we urge the State's committee of planners not to sacrifice the long-heralded recreational possibilities of the Eagle Creek Reservoir project. For any proposal that includes one without the other will be much less than ideal.

Indeed, there is no question that Indiana's bid for the nuclear center will have that much more weight behind it if we can offer the added inducement of a huge metrolopitan recreational center like that planned for the Eagle Creek Reservoir. If the plans for each are wisely drawn, there should be ample room for both in central Indiana.

USIS Employs Many Methods To Spread America's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, recently I sent to each of our colleagues a copy of an eight-page supplement to the Kansas City Star devoted to Asia. This was largely the result of a trip through the Far East by the Star's president and editor, Richard B. Fowler. It is one in a series of such special reports called "Background for Better Understanding." There are many articles of interest in this supplement but I would like to call attention to one especially. This is the story of how the U.S. Information Service spreads America's message abroad. This agency has more than its share of critics. This article will perhaps help them understand the good work the men and women of the USIS are doing:

USIS EMPLOYS MANY METHODS TO SPREAD AMERICA'S MESSAGE

This week, as every week in many Asian countries, thousands of people will read at the tables of American libraries. The U.S. Information Service (USIS) operates scores of libraries in Asia (14 in Pakistan alone).

While Indonesian mobs were attacking three U.S. libraries, the people of other countries were crowding our buildings to read. These are sizable operations with large selections of books and mazazines in languages required for the country. In those visited on our recent tour of Asia, the users included large numbers of teachers and students, people of present and future influence groups.

One reason for the heavy patronage is the scarcity of good reading (books, magazines or anything else) in a large part of the world. The United States is filling a need and getting audiences.

The USIS system of libraries is big in itself. Still it is only a very small part of the wide ranging communications between the United States and the people of Asian countries. The USIS operates through about every known medium of communication to reach people in the millions.

At the same time, Asians are getting to know America and American thinking by many means, sometimes coordinated by the USIS and sometimes entirely independent. Examples are student exchanges, private foundations, visiting lecturers from American universities and the Peace Corps.

The USIS operation is more than enough to summarize here. It is the one part of the world effort that goes directly to the minds of the people we are trying to reach.

Where an aid program designed to help a nation lift its economy requires many years, a USIS publication may be read by thousands of key people within hours. It is an activity that competes directly with Russian efforts to sway minds. And the cost of the USIS is very small, compared with the costs of military and economic support.

A basic pattern is followed in most countries. Hundreds of writers turn out feature and news stories for use in the newspapers of various countries. A large share of these stories get wide distribution. American material also flows to radio and TV stations.

The USIS is a publisher of slick paper magazines that have surprisingly large circulations in some countries. Specific international issues are discussed from the American point of view in pamphlets sent to key people.

In many of the cities recently visited the familiar faces of American motion picture stars look out from the front of theaters. The pictures are surrounded by the usual motion picture blurbs in Urdu, Hindi, Malay, or Chinese.

This type of private commercial entertainment usually is good for U.S. world relations. The USIS supplements it with more solid information in documentary American films.

Wherever they operate, an important function of USIS people is in personal relations. They maintain close association with leaders in government, newspapers, radio, TV, education, business or any other significant field. In many cases the association must take place in social gatherings. Yet the Government allows the USIS people virtually nothing for entertainment—in some typical cases $165 to $200 a year.

The total number of Asian people reached through the main USIS channels runs into huge figures. Among the more influential Asians of non-Communist countries about everybody comes in contact with the American story.

From many persons outside Government service I heard that the USIS material is well adapted to prospective readers, listeners, or viewers and that it is generally well received. In contrast with some years ago, the USIS today seems to be well aware of the fact that, to get attention, material must be interesting and free from obvious propaganda.

Of course, the programs vary according to the situation in each country. India is a special case because of the awesome problem of how to reach the effective audience among 460 million people. For that reason, the Indian operation is divided into four areas. In addition to the New Delhi headquarters, the USIS has major offices at Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. The population in each of these areas is greater than the population of any European country.

To find the most effective audience, the USIS in India concentrates on influence groups of the present establishment and the country's 1,100,000 students who represent the future.

Among other functions, the USIS in India is a very large publisher of textbooks and translations of many types of books. Last year it translated 509 titles.

In South Vietnam the USIS is geared to war. In Saigon, foreign correspondents get their daily briefing from the USIS, the official spokesman for the military as well as civilian operations. For the military this is an unprecedented delegation of authority. Because of the disorganization of the Vietnam press, 2 USIS publications have an unusually large combined circulation of 390,000.

The Hong Kong USIS office departs from the basic pattern as the headquarters for publications in Chinese, which are distributed throughout east and southeast Asia.

In each foreign capital of our tour, the USIS could point to successful programs designed especially for use in their areas. The network of information in each country is worth a separate story, but the basic pattern and examples given here are typical. The American people can be assured that the American story is being told. It is being told on a far greater scale than most of us have realized.

The Strands of Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the President's V-E speech delivered via Early Bird satellite to Europe was well timed and to the point. Support for his remarks have come from many corners of America, and the St. Petersburg Times, one of Florida's leading newspapers, has treated the importance of the President's speech in a very articulate manner.

Mr. Speaker, it appears as though General de Gaulle has done little recently toward recognizing the cooperation and mutual respect which exists between the French people and America. The path he has led, which includes efforts to reduce the gold reserves of the United States, have called for a reappraisal of France's World War I debts to the United States. France presently owes some $6.5 billion in World War I debts to the U.S. Treasury, and no payment has been made on that debt since 1931.

I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 301, which calls for repayment of France's debts to the United States. Hopefully the President's V-E Day remarks will serve notice that the American people are becoming increasingly concerned over preservation of the friendship between the United States and France.

I ask that the very fine editorial from the St. Petersburg Times be included in the RECORD at this point:

THE STRANDS OF UNION

On the 20th anniversary of V-E Day, President Johnson made a brief but moving appeal to our allies of the North Atlantic Community not to now "forget in success and abundance the lessons we learned in danger and isolation."

Outlining a six-point program of "unfinished and urgent business" for the Atlantic Alliance, the President heavily stressed the need for cooperative endeavor. Without mentioning him by name, Mr. Johnson obviously aimed several of his remarks directly at President Charles de Gaullie of France.

He spoke of "some efforts to replace partnership with suspicion, and * * * a policy of division." He warned that "the peoples of the Atlantic will not return to that narrow nationalism which has torn and bloodied the fabric of our society for generations."

Appropriately, considering that 20 years ago we were allies with the Soviet Union in the triumph of V-E Day, Mr. Johnson urged working toward agreement with Russia. "It is in the interest of the Soviet Union and in our own to seek an end to tensions."

His theme throughout was that of greater unity, and submerging the difficulties and differences between the free nations. He stressed that if the peoples of the Atlantic area are more prosperous and the future brighter, "it is because we have drawn together the strands of union."

With a touch of iron he remarked that "if one of us cannot join in a common venture, it will not stand in the way of the rest." With apparent reference to De Gaulle's preoccupation with the grandeur of France, he added:

"How much grander is that dream than any hope to which a single nation can reach. How much more filled with the prospect of peace and the increasing welfare of man."

As the President spoke, his word and his image simultaneously were flashed to all Europe by the magic of Early Bird communications satellite. It is to be hoped that his stirring words and this electronic marvel can rekindle in all the Atlantic Community much of that great spirit of solidarity which prevailed 20 years ago.

Diplomatic Offensive in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in remarks last week in this Chamber, I expressed my regret that the pause in our bombing of North Vietnam, accompanied by the diplomatic efforts of this country and several other nations, drew only a loud silence from Hanoi and Peiping.

We are in Vietnam today to insure that independence shall be the right of all who want it, and not just the few who can defend it. This is a proper objective, but it will not be achieved by arms alone. There can be no military solution to Vietnam. The war, as the New

York Times so correctly pointed out on May 20, "can only be ended by negotiation and political settlement."

But, as the New York Times went on to state:

The United States has made or agreed to numerous proposals for negotiations ever since the President on April 7 called for unconditional discussions. Yet the Communists, at every turn, have given a negative response.

This is discouraging but it must not deter our efforts to find a peaceful and a meaningful solution. Negotiations are essential, and as I said last week, we must continue and even accelerate the diplomatic offensive which is the essential corollary of our will to resist aggression.

Mr. Speaker, I include the New York Times' analysis for our colleagues' information and attention:

END OF THE PAUSE

The failure of the Communists to respond favorably to the pause in the bombing of North Vietnam is a tragedy for Vietnam and for the world. It inevitably will lengthen and intensify a war which serves the interest of no people and already has gone on too long.

That war, as President Johnson said last week, has "no purely military solution in sight for either side." It can only be ended by negotiation and a political settlement. The United States has made or agreed to numerous proposals for negotiations ever since the President on April 7 called for "unconditional discussions." Yet the Communists, at every turn, have given a negative response.

North Vietnam and Communist China have rejected not only all American proposals but also the plea of 17 nonalined chiefs of state for unconditional negotiations. They have turned down the French suggestion of a new Geneva conference without preconditions, the Soviet endorsement of a Cambodian conference, the British effort to send former Foreign Minister Gordon Walker to consult them, Secretary General Thant's offer to visit Hanoi and Peiping for exploratory talks and India's proposal for a cease-fire monitored by an Afro-Asian force.

Nevertheless, it was essential to make still another demonstration both to American opinion and to the world that Washington was prepared to be flexible and reasonable. Also it clarified whether the bombing of North Vietnam was the chief block to negotiations—as Soviet, French, Indian and even Canadian leaders had suggested.

There can be little doubt on this question now. Hanoi asserts that the pause was accompanied privately by a time limit and an American demand that Vietcong attacks in South Vietnam halt; these are points that Washington would be wise to clarify. But the remainder of the statement by the North Vietnamese Foreign Ministry makes it clear that a decision has been taken against negotiations at this time.

In the end, Peiping's proximity has proved the potent factor, and Hanoi has decided to continue the war—at least through the monsoon offensive that now seems to be opening. It is extraordinary, in these circumstances, to find Prime Minister Shastri of India joining Moscow in calling for an immediate halt in the bombing of North Vietnam—without any reference to the halt that has just been tried.

The focus of attention now will turn to the battlefields of Asia. The summer rains will hamper American air support for Government forces, but the basic military-political balance in Vietnam is unlikely to be altered in the course of the summer or afterward. The negotiations rejected by the Communists now will have to be accepted by them at some later date. When that date approaches, the precedent of a bombing pause undoubtedly will be invoked again to help bring about the negotiated settlement that not only is desirable, but inevitable.

Some Problems Facing Soybean Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following article from the May 1965 issue of Soybean Digest pointing up some of the problems facing the industry:

[From the Soybean Digest, May 1965]

WASHINGTON DIGEST: SOYBEAN EXPORTS HURT BY SHIPPING SUBSIDY

(By Jay Richter)

Soybean exports will they be hurt by special privileges extended to U.S. shipping companies?

Thus far, most people feel, soybean exports have not been unduly harmed by cargo preferences in the law for U.S. shipping. But there is growing concern about the matter—especially with trade loosening up between the free world and the Soviet bloc.

Legal preferences for U.S. shipping have been in force for some while under food for peace, foreign aid, and other Government programs. This means, for example, that 50 percent of soybeans sold for foreign currencies under Public Law 480 presumably have had to be shipped in American vessels.

This requirement has increased the cost of carrying out the program by a substantial amount. U.S. tramp shipping rates on grain are generally about twice as high as foreign-flag rates, according to Great Plains Wheat, Inc., an association of U.S. wheat producers who are protesting preferences for American shipping. USDA's top hands are also unhappy about certain aspects of the subsidy for U.S. maritime interests.

They are especially disgruntled by the fact that the subsidy charge is made against USDA. They feel, if there has to be a shipping subsidy, that it should be charged off against other departments of the Government such as Commerce and Defense.

The 50-percent preference regulation is costly. The last couple of years the U.S. shipping subsidy has increased the cost of the Public Law 480 program by about $200 million each year.

Altogether, since it has been in effect, the subsidy has cost more than $1¼ billion.

That is only part of the story.

For the most part, until recently, there hasn't been much concern about how dollar shipments move abroad. That is to say, if an exporter sold a commodity to a foreign buyer for dollars, he would ship it to him as he pleased—on any vessels he chose.

There have been certain restrictions having to do with recipient countries—the Communist nations, for example—but no requirements as to the character of shipping used by a commercial exporter in a dollar deal. That is, until the wheat sales of about a year and a half ago to Russia.

Although wheat sales to the Soviet Union had been declared "in the national interest," the Commerce Department required that 50 percent of the cargo be carried in vessels under the U.S. flag. Result was that we sold the Russians only about one-half the wheat that we could have, according to Great Plains Wheat, Inc.

USDA officials have stepped into the argument to protest the application of the 50-percent requirement to commercial dollar deals made outside of Government programs. The actual effect is not to provide additional business for the U.S. merchant marine, Under Secretary of Agriculture Charles Murphy recently told a Senate committee, "but to prevent U.S. longshoremen, U.S. exporters, and U.S. formers from having employment and earnings that would otherwise accrue."

Furthermore, he said, the adverse effect on the U.S. balance of payments "might well be in the range of $100 million a year."

What is this power that the Government's Department of Commerce has over independent exporters, and how does it apply to sobbeans? The office in Commerce dealing with export licensing makes these points:

1. Practically all commodities shipped abroad, agricultural and otherwise, require licensing before they may be exported.

2. One type of licensing is called "general." It is routine, applies to most commodities, and causes little trouble to exporters.

3. There is a second type of licensing done by Commerce. It is called "validated" licensing and involves reference to a "commodity control list."

4. Under controlled licensing, certain restrictions may be placed on particular commodities and on dealings with various nations. Until a year and a half ago, for example, U.S. farm products on which our Government paid on export subsidy could not be shipped to countries on the Commerce Department's "Y" list. That list is made up of Russia and most of the Soviet bloc nations except Poland and Rumania. These latter countries are on the "W" list and restrictions on trade with them are less severe than with other Communist countries.

How about soybeans?

The 50-percent regulation does not apply to dollar exports of beans, and it probably won't be applied—or so you gather in talking with officials.

Meantime, however, there is apparently little chance that 480 shipments of beans or other commodities can be made in the future without use of U.S. vessels. Requirements that 50 percent of farm products sold for foreign currencies should move in American vessels are written right into the Food for Peace (480 law) itself.

A TRAGEDY

That is how a representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation describes the soybean provisions in the Administration's farm proposals.

In testimony on Capitol Hill before a House Agriculture subcommittee, the Farm Bureau's legislative director, John C. Lynn, said:

"We are gravely concerned at the inclusion in H.R. 7097 of authority for the Secretary to permit soybeans to be grown on diverted wheat and feed grain acres, and the allotted feed grain base acreage for which the feed grain payment would be made. In our opinion this would be the first step toward getting soybeans in a surplus situation so that controls could be applied to this 'wonder crop.' "

In commenting on testimony before the House Agriculture subcommittees concerning the Administration farm proposals, the Grain & Feed Dealers National Association had this to say:

"If there was any area of agreement by almost all witnesses, it was that of opposition to the Administration's proposal to allow USDA to permit soybean plantings on diverted feed grain acreage. Expressions by witnesses ranged from general concern to strong opposition. Members of the subcommittees also expressed concern. Representa-

tive FINDLEY, of Illinois, told Secretary Freeman last week that he could not find one farmer in Illinois who favored the inclusion of soybeans."

Need for Uniform State Residency Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House a highly informative article written by our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER, which appeared in the Michigan Law Review of February 1963.

The gentleman from Iowa, Congressman SCHMIDHAUSER, then professor of political science at the State University of Iowa, conducted a penetrating study of the various State residency requirements for voting and the effect they have upon our highly mobile population.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, which has recently completed its study of the voting rights bill, I would like to point out to the House that there are other factors besides that of race which disenfranchise a large number of potential voters. The gentleman from Iowa, Congressman SCHMIDHAUSER, estimated that, under our universal suffrage system, some 8 million citizens in 1960 were unable to meet the various residency requirements set up by State statutes and, thus, were denied the right to vote.

As our population continues to show a tendency toward greater mobility, the necessity increases for a uniformity among our State residency requirements. The gentleman from Iowa, Congressman SCHMIDHAUSER, is to be commended for bringing this vital problem to our attention and to all of those who are interested in rectifying this inequity within our system.

The article follows:

[From the Michigan Law Review, vol. 61, No. 4, February 1963]

RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTING AND THE TENSIONS OF A MOBILE SOCIETY

(By JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER) [1]

("No man can boast of a higher privilege than the right granted to citizens of our State and Nation of equal suffrage and thereby to equal representation in the making of the laws of the land. Under our Constitution that right is absolute. It is one of which he cannot be deprived, either deliberately or by inaction on the part of a legislature."[2])

The spirit of contemporary appellate decisionmaking in the field of voting rights is daring and realistic. This spirit is perhaps best exemplified by the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Baker* v. *Carr*.[3] While deliberate deprivations of voting rights assume a variety of forms, the most blatant have been grounded upon racial discrimination. The 1961 report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights indicates that in approximately 100 counties in 8 Southern States most Negro citizens are prevented from voting.[4] Economic conisderations also have been recently invoked to provide a basis for disenfranchisement. In Virginia in November 1962 approval was sought, albeit unsuccessfully, of a State constitutional amendment rendering persons who were not freeholders of land ineligible to vote on bond issue referendums for new schools, streets, libraries, and other local improvements.[5] Most of the deliberate efforts at invidious restriction of suffrage have received searching analysis by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. But one of the most striking examples of denial of voting rights because of legislative inaction, that arising from outmoded State residency requirements for voting, was omitted from the long list of "problems still unsolved" which was compiled by the Commission in 1961.[6]

It is the purpose of this article to determine the extent to which persons otherwise qualified to vote are disenfranchised by the complex of State residency requirements and to assess the practical and constitutional aspects of any statutory prospects for change.

What are the dimensions of the problem of disenfranchisement through the operation of State residency requirements? Two salient factors are involved: the restrictions imposed by the particular State residency requirements and the mobility of the population of the United States. Certainly the restrictive nature of State residency requirements for voting would not seriously affect voting participation if Americans were not inveterate movers.

Geographic mobility has intensified at a comparatively steady rate in every decade since 1900. Historical census data indicate that the percentage of persons who do not live in the State of their birth has in 1960 increased by 5.7 percent over the percentage of such persons in 1900. The shift is much more striking among nonwhites than among whites. The percentage of nonwhites who do not live in the State of their birth has increased by 12.2 percent (27.7 percent of the Nation's population in 1960 as compared with 15.5 percent in 1900). For whites the increase is modest—4.7 percent (26.1 percent of the Nation's population in 1960 as compared with 21.4 percent in 1900). Demographically, the highest percentage of persons living in States in which they were not born is found in urban settings (29.4 percent), the next highest in rural nonfarm areas (22.1 percent), and the lowest in rural farm areas (12.1 percent). These and subsequent migration data were derived from Census Bureau sources partially reproduced in the two charts and the map. [See charts I and II. Map not printed in the RECORD.]

Footnotes at end of speech.

CHART I.—*State of birth of the native population, by color, for the United States, urban and rural, 1960, and for conterminous United States, 1900 to 1960* [1]

Area, census year, and color	Total native population	Percent distribution				
		Total native population	Born in the United States			Born in U.S. outlying area, at sea, etc.
			In State or residence	In different State	State of birth not reported	
UNITED STATES 1960						
Total	169,587,528	100	70.3	26.4	2.7	0.6
Urban	116,773,631	100	66.6	29.4	3.2	.8
Rural nonfarm	39,589,369	100	75.7	22.1	1.8	.3
Rural farm	13,224,528	100	86.9	12.1	.9	.1
White	149,543,638	100	70.7	26.2	2.4	.7
Urban	102,311,633	100	67.5	28.8	2.8	.9
Rural nonfarm	35,592,497	100	74.6	23.2	1.8	.3
Rural farm	11,639,508	100	85.9	13.1	.9	.1
Nonwhite	20,043,890	100	68.0	27.2	4.5	.3
Urban	14,461,998	100	60.4	33.7	5.5	.4
Rural nonfarm	3,996,872	100	85.5	12.3	2.1	.2
Rural farm	1,585,020	100	93.9	5.2	.9	

Area, census year, and color	Total native population	Percent distribution				
		Total native population	Born in the United States			Born in U.S. outlying area, at sea, etc.
			In State or residence	In different State	State of birth not reported	
CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES						
All classes:						
1960	168,805,716	100	70.4	26.3	2.7	0.6
1950	139,868,715	100	73.5	25.2	1.0	.3
1940	120,074,379	100	77.1	22.4	.2	.2
1930	108,570,807	100	76.2	23.4	.2	.2
1920	91,789,928	100	77.4	22.1	.3	.1
1910	78,456,380	100	78.0	21.6	.4	.1
1900	65,653,299	100	79.1	20.6	.3	.1
White:						
1960	149,181,384	100	70.8	26.1	2.4	.7
1950	124,382,950	100	74.0	24.8	1.0	.3
1940	106,795,732	100	77.3	22.3	.2	.2
1930	96,303,335					
1920	81,108,161	100	77.1	22.4	.3	.1
1910	68,386,412	100	77.2	22.3	.4	.1
1900	56,595,379	100	78.2	21.4	.3	.1
Nonwhite:						
1960	19,624,332	100	67.5	27.7	4.5	.3
1950	15,485,765	100	69.8	28.8	1.1	.3
1940	13,278,647	100	75.9	23.5	.2	.1
1930	12,267,562					
1920	10,681,767	100	80.0	19.5	.4	.5
1910	10,069,968	100	83.2	16.3	.4	
1900	9,067,920	100	84.2	15.5	.3	

[1] Adapted from U.S. Bureau of the Census, "U.S. Census of Population: 1960, General, Social, and Economic Characteristics, U.S. Summary," Final Report PC(1)-1C (1962). Table is reproduced with the permission of the Bureau of the Census.

CHART II.—*Residence 5 years prior to census date, by color, for the United States, urban and rural, 1960, and for conterminous United States, 1960 and 1940* [1]

Residence 5 years prior to census date and color	Total	Percent distribution					
		United States, 1960				Conterminous United States	
		Total	Urban	Rural nonfarm	Rural farm	1960	1940
TOTAL							
Population 5 years old and over	159,003,807	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Same house	79,331,022	49.9	47.9	48.7	71.4	49.9	(2)
Different house in the United States	75,185,793	47.3	48.9	49.0	28.0	47.2	(2)
Same county	47,461,137	29.8	31.3	29.0	19.2	29.9	(2)
Different county	27,724,656	17.4	17.6	20.0	8.8	17.4	13.0
Same State	13,583,173	8.5	8.1	10.7	5.9	8.6	7.6
Different State	14,141,483	8.9	9.4	9.3	2.8	8.8	5.4
Abroad	2,002,822	1.3	1.5	1.0	.2	1.2	.3
Place of prior residence not reported [3]	2,484,170	1.6	1.7	1.4	.4	1.6	.9
WHITE							
Population 5 years old and over	141,472,113	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Same house	70,912,796	50.1	48.3	48.1	72.9	50.2	(2)
Different house in the United States	66,704,903	47.2	48.6	49.6	26.5	47.1	(2)
Same country	40,863,788	28.9	30.2	28.8	17.5	28.9	(2)
Different country	25,841,115	18.3	18.4	20.9	9.0	18.2	13.4
Same State	12,762,949	9.0	8.7	11.1	6.0	9.0	7.9
Different State	13,078,166	9.2	9.8	9.7	3.0	9.2	5.5
Abroad	1,834,946	1.3	1.5	1.0	.2	1.3	.3
Place of prior residence not reported [3]	2,019,468	1.4	1.6	1.3	.4	1.4	.9
NONWHITE							
Population 5 years old and over	17,531,694	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Same house	8,418,226	48.0	45.0	54.5	59.5	47.9	(2)
Different house in the United States	8,480,890	48.4	50.8	42.6	40.0	48.5	(2)
Same county	6,597,349	37.6	39.9	31.1	33.0	37.7	(2)
Different county	1,883,541	10.7	10.9	11.5	7.0	10.8	9.4
Same State	820,224	4.7	4.1	6.7	5.3	4.7	5.6
Different State	1,063,317	6.1	6.9	4.9	1.7	6.1	3.9
Abroad	167,876	1.0	1.1	.9	.1	.9	.1
Place of prior residence not reported [3]	464,702	2.7	3.1	2.0	.4	2.7	1.2

[1] Adapted from U.S. Bureau of the Census, "U.S. Census of Population: 1960, General, Social, and Economic Characteristics, U.S. Summary," Final Report PC(1)-1C (1962), table 71. Reproduced with the permission of the Bureau of the Census.

[2] Persons living in the same house in 1935 and persons living in a different house in the same county or quasi-county (cities of 100,000 or more and the balance of their counties) in 1935 not tabulated separately.

[3] In 1960, comprises persons who moved but for whom place of residence in 1955 was not reported. In 1940, comprises persons for whom migration status was not reported.

These three basic sources of demographic information underscore the following salient features concerning interstate mobility: (a) Such mobility has increased steadily since 1900; (b) the rate of increase has been more intense for nonwhites than for whites; and (c) geographically, interstate mobility is most characteristic of urban dwellers, is next highest among rural nonfarm dwellers, and least significant among rural farm dwellers. With respect to intrastate and interstate mobility, the census data indicate that (a) nearly half of the urban and rural nonfarm dwellers moved to a different house in the 5 years prior to 1960, (b) over 17 percent of such urban and rural nonfarm dwellers moved to a different county during the same time period, (c) rural farm dwellers experienced a markedly lower rate of movement, (d) nonwhites generally had a somewhat higher rate of movement than whites, and (e) nonwhites from rural farm areas experienced a markedly higher rate of movement than whites. In short, the foregoing demographic information suggests that the persons most likely to be adversely affected by rigid State residency requirements for voting are those caught up in the two major historic streams of domestic migration—from farm and small town to city, and from the South to other regions of the United States.

Given an intensive rate of geographic mobility in the 1960's, what is the precise nature of State residency laws affecting voting? Modern laws of this genre are surprisingly uniform in regard to their theoretical bases despite considerable diversity in the details of such legislation. In general, State residency requirement laws concerning voting have reflected two fundamental assumptions which were especially important in 19th-century America. First, liberal democracy, while presupposing the accessibility of voting facilities, requires that adequate safeguards be devised to inhibit corruption of elections. Harsh 19th-century experience with "floaters" and the organized voting of transients [7] continues to influence strongly the development of residency provisions relating to the exercise of suffrage. For example, the major concern underlying the voting registration recommendations of the National Municipal League is the desire to thwart voting fraud.[8] Secondly, State residency requirements for voting reflect 19th-century conceptions of federalism which, in practical effect, embody State dominance of the voting process regardless of whether the officers to be filled are National, State, or local. A rationale which has often been invoked to reinforce arguments for State control of voter registration requirements is the notion that a voter should have roots in the community of sufficient permanence to insure adequate familiarity with local candidates and issues. This concept of the "enlightened" voter has relevance for State and local elections, but has been subjected to increasing criticism because it is not germane to presidential elections.[9]

Specifically, the requirements for a minimum term of residence within a State, varying from 6 months in 12 States to a high of 2 years in 4 States, present the greatest difficulty to the mobile who wish to vote in elections for national legislators or presidential and vice-presidential electors. In a few instances, fairly lengthy county, district or precinct requirements also bar voting.[10] The complex of these residency requirements for voting constitutes, quantitatively, the single greatest impediment to voting by those desiring to do so. The American Heritage Foundation has systematically analyzed the causes of nonvoting in several recent presidential and congressional elections. For 1960, the foundation indicated that approximately 104 million adult citizens were of voting age at the time of the November elections. Of these, it estimated that 8 million were mobile adults unable to meet State, country or precinct residency requirements set by State statutes.[11] (See chart III.)

Footnotes at end of speech.

CHART III.—*Residence required by States for country, State, county, and district (or precinct) in 1962* [1]

Required duration of residence	Place where voter must reside for period indicated			
	In the United States [2]	In State [3]	In county	In district (or precinct)
Years:				
2		4		
1		34	3	2
Months:				
12		3		
6		12	9	6
4			2	1
3			3	5
1				1
Days:				
90			7	1
60			6	5
54				1
40			2	1
30			5	16
15				1
10				5
No requirement	53		17	8
Total	53	53	53	53

[1] Informational source: The Council of State Governments: The Book of the States 1962–63, p. 20 (1962); chart form source (with minor revisions): Goldman, "Move—Lose Your Vote," 45 National Municipal Rev. 6, 7, (1956).

[2] States require that the voter shall have been a citizen of the United States for at least 90 days.

[3] Included in these figures are the requirements for voting in Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The American Heritage Foundation emphasizes the impact of residency laws upon what it calls our better educated and more responsible citizens—people with the initiative and character needed to pull up stakes and seek advancement in a new community.

Many are educators, lawyers, clergymen; others are business executives.[12] Disenfranchisement by State residency requirements may, however, have a greater effect upon nonprofessionals, particularly those who through occupational necessity are condemned to ceaseless geographical movement. Perhaps the plight of the migratory farmworker in America best exemplifies this type of disenfranchisement:

"Migratory farm laborers move restlessly over the face of the land, but they neither belong to the land nor does the land belong to them. They pass through community after community, but they neither claim the community as a home nor does the community claim them." [13]

Technological changes have brought forced mobility to skilled as well as unskilled workers. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz has stated that, in 1962, 35,000 persons were being "pushed out of their jobs" by the development of automated industrial processes.[14] Similarly, the movement of economically distressed farmers to urban centers and of ethnically disadvantaged Negroes from the South provides additional evidence that disenfranchisement by State residency requirements is not the unique burden of the middle-class professional.

Viewed from the perspective of the State legislatures, residency requirements for voting are part of a complex of residency provisions governing a wide variety of matters. Not only is voting contingent upon particular State residency requirements, but so also are public office holding, the use of some State courts, the practice of many professions, the securing of public financial assistance, and public medical, psychiatric, child welfare, and adoption services.[15] State legislatures derive their authority to impose residency requirements for voting not only from the provisions of their respective State constitutions but also from the Federal Constitution. But the problems basic to the task of rendering State residency requirements for voting more equitable to the mobile are political as well as constitutional. Consequently, the occasional suggestion that Congress assume responsibility to correct the situation [16] has been treated as being both political and constitutionally impractical. Indeed, the immediate efforts to permit voting by movers were made with seemingly full acceptance of the notion of State primacy in the field. Whether this approach actually meets the test of practicality and whether it constitutes the only constitutionally acceptable course are the questions to be answered.

There is little doubt that the major efforts to alleviate the disenfranchisement of the mobile in the 1950's and early 1960's have been predicated upon the assumption that State action was the only feasible solution. In 1953, the Connecticut Legislature passed a law permitting former Connecticut residents to vote for presidential and vice-presidential electors for 15 months after they had moved from the State or until they had fulfilled the residency requirements of the State to which they had moved, if this occurred within 15 months. In the same year, Wisconsin adopted a different approach by passing legislation permitting new residents—who would have been eligible to vote in the State from whence they came had they remained there until election day—to vote for presidential and vice-presidential electors.[17] By 1959, several additional States had adopted laws embodying either the Connecticut or Wisconsin approach. These inceptions of State legislative activity underscored one of the characteristic practical shortcomings of dependence upon State action—lack of uniformity.

In its initial consideration of the voting problems of the mobile in 1952, the Council of State Governments did not deal with positive legislation but chose to attack possible national intervention in the matter. Consequently, by the time the council made a formal recommendation in 1956, the contradictory approaches made by Connecticut and Wisconsin were being appraised by their sister States. The council adopted a resolution supporting the Connecticut plan. In 1955 the National Congress adopted a concurrent resolution suggesting that the States meet the problem, but the resolution did not specify which of the two solutions it deemed best.[18] Finally, in August 1962, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws adopted a proposed uniform act embodying the essentials of the Connecticut plan. Section 1 of this uniform act provides:

"Each citizen of the United States who, immediately prior to his removal to this State, was a citizen of another State and who has been a resident of this State prior to a presidential election is entitled to vote for presidential and vice presidential electors at that election, but not for other offices, if (1) he otherwise possesses the substantive qualifications to vote in this State, except the requirement of residence [and registration]; and (2) he complies with the provisions of this act." [19]

Even before the drafting of the proposed uniform act by the Commissioners, several States had modified their residency requirements for voting in accordance with the Connecticut or Wisconsin model. Prior to 1950, a number of States had adopted return-to-vote clauses designed to modify residency requirements to permit intrastate movers to cast ballots in their former precincts. The comprehensive study by Yates [20] indicated, however, that no State had used the return-to-vote clause to alleviate the problem for interstate movers. After 1950, several significant statutory approaches were utilized to meet the growing problem of interstate movers and to render voting easier for intrastate movers as well, and the period between 1950 and 1962 was one of intensified although nonuniform activity. Six States have reduced their State, county or precinct time-of-residence requirements for voting.[21] Twelve States have added or extended return-to-vote clauses affecting intrastate movers.[22]

Eight have adopted a suspension of their State residency requirement for voting for presidential and vice-presidential electors (the Wisconsin approach).[23] Two States adopted a return-to-vote clause (actually by absentee ballot) applicable to movers who had left their States.[24] One State has adopted both the Wisconsin and Connecticut approaches.[25] With respect to the espousal of the Connecticut approach by the National Conference of Commissioners for Uniform State Laws, the immediate prospect for uniformity appear to be dim. In fact, three of the adoptions of the Wisconsin approach were made in November 1962, only 3 months after the Commissioners had indicated support of the alternative plan.[26]

Against this backdrop of nonuniformity and strong emphasis upon States rights conceptions of the status of residency requirements for voting, persistent advocacy has developed for a larger role for the National Congress in these matters. As early as 1952, the National Institute of Municipal Clerks advocated action by Congress to alleviate the voting problems of interstate movers.[27] By the late 1950's and early 1960's, increasing emphasis was placed upon the need for national rather than State action with respect to voting residency requirements affecting congressional and presidential elections. Professor Goldman, writing in the National Municipal Review, argued:

"Congress, for example, could direct that no citizen shall be denied the right to vote in a congressional election for failure to meet a residence requirement. To prevent fraud or indiscriminate voting behavior, Congress could make special provision for adequate identification of recently arrived voters in a community." [28]

In particular, the clash of constitutional views which emerged in debates over proposed civil rights legislation in Congress stimulated extended debate in the law journals. From these exchanges a body of doctrines justifying extension of national influence has developed.[29]

What are the salient constitutional issues? Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina, recently summarized the traditional States rights arguments.[30] He argued that "the States alone possess the right to establish qualifications for voting." [31] This derives from article I, section 2, and the 17th amendment which specifically provide that the electors for Representatives and Senators "in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature." Senator ERVIN cited an 1879 Supreme Court decision [32] as evidence that the Court was committed to this viewpoint soon after the Civil War. Supporters of Senator ERVIN's position occasionally invoke the historic experience of residents in Federal enclaves scattered throughout the States as verifying contentions of exclusive State control of the qualifications of presidential and congressional electors. Furthermore, the two major proposals for alleviating the effect of rigid State residency requirements for voting which emerged in the first full-scale congressional consideration of the problem were predicated upon the assumption that State primacy in the matter of voting qualifications was unquestioned.

In 1961 consideration was given to the residency requirement problem in hearings before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.[33] Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee, proposed adoption of a constitutional amendment providing that:

"The residence requirement for voting for President and Vice President shall be residence within one of the several States for a period not to exceed 1 year. A qualified voter changing residence from one State to another shall be entitled to vote for President and Vice President by absentee ballot in the State from which he moves for a period of 2 years after the change of residence, provided he is not qualified to vote in another State within that period." [34]

Senator Keating, of New York, proposed an amendment which would lower the State residency requirements for presidential and vice-presidential electors to 90 days.[35] The fact that both Senators Kefauver and Keating felt that a constitutional amendment was necessary purportedly substantiated (or judiciously sought to avoid) the claims of advocates of State primacy regarding voting qualifications. In terms of the prospects of voluntary and uniform State action to meet the problem, Senators Keating and Kefauver were strong in their expressions of disbelief in the practicality of relying upon State action.[36]

What, if anything, can be said for direct congressional action through ordinary legislation? Pragmatically, the prospects for adoption of a constitutional amendment patterned after those proposed by Senators Kefauver and Keating are exceedingly slim. Similarly, the possibilities for voluntary uniform State action are slight. Not only is the nonuniform and rather sporadic experience of the past decade discouraging, but also, because residency requirements for voting are often written into the State's fundamental law, meaningful change can be accomplished in many States only through amendment of the State constitution. Advocates of State activity argue on the authority of article II, section 1, clause 2,[37] and *McPherson* v. *Blacker*,[38] that State constitutional requirements for a minimum term of residence have no limiting authority in sit-

Footnotes at end of speech.

uations where a State legislature prescribes lesser requirements for those voting for presidential and vice-presidential electors.[39] Yet the strong resistance to this interpretation that developed at recent Governors conferences portends extended political debate and prolonged litigation should an attempt to implement this approach be made. In short, the practical and constitutional difficulties inherent in State activity suggest that a thorough appraisal of the alternative of direct congressional action via ordinary legislation might be appropriate.

Direct congressional action would meet the need for uniformity and could also incorporate provisions which would embody full recognition of the fact that modern America is a highly mobile society. Professor Goldman has specifically recommended that "Congress develop some system of reward for those States adopting reciprocal arrangements to allow recently moved voters to exercise the franchise in presidential elections without undue delay upon arrival to the new residence." [40] Because concern about possible fraud has been a prime topic in every serious discussion about the possibility of minimizing residency requirements, Goldman has also suggested that modern identification techniques be adapted to the registration and voting process. In order to provide an effective and nationwide system, Congress should, he concluded, create a National Board of Elections.[41] These suggestions, if properly implemented, would render State residency requirements more flexible and yet sufficient to inhibit fraud.

What constitutional justification can be found for such congressional intervention? Perhaps the boldest and most direct invocation of constitutional scripture can be made with respect to section 2 of the 14th amendment. Vitalization of this provision would inhibit the setting of residency requirements for voting by the States by reducing a State's representation in the House of Representatives when the right to vote "is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime." [42] The historical record of the adoption of this amendment and the literal interpretation of the penalty clause underscore the fact that this embodies the most direct of Federal constitutional limitations upon the powers of the States.[43]

The considerations in the Slaughter-House cases [44] which impelled Mr. Justice Miller to reject John Archibald Campbell's argument that the relationship of individuals to the Nation had been fundamentally altered at the expense of the States no longer obtained. Indeed, the fact that Mr. Justice Field and his fellow dissenters in Slaughter-House have long been recognized as more successful prophets, as to the due process and equal protection clauses, than Mr. Justice Miller suggests that implementation of the penalty clause of the 14th amendment would be consistent with contemporary developments in Federal-State relations.

The prospect that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment may be invoked as a limitation on State power to set voting qualifications has received extensive consideration as a result of the recent congressional debates over poll tax and literacy test provisions. It is pertinent to note that the clause was first invoked for this purpose in *Pope* v. *Williams*,[45] a 1904 case involving a complicated State residency requirement for voting, and that the possibility was commented upon favorably by the Court even though the circumstances did not warrant application in that case.

In the oral argument for plaintiff in that case, the contention was made that:

"On the transfer of residence from one State to another a citizen of the United States is vested 'with the same rights as other citizens of that State.' * * * This necessarily includes the right not to be arbitrarily discriminated against in the acquisition and enjoyment of political rights, because of his removal from another State. The statute may, therefore, properly be held also to be repugnant to the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States." [46]

In reply, the attorney for the State of Maryland argued:

"Tests, qualifications, disqualifications, denials, abridgments, distinctions, inequalities, may still lawfully be made at the pleasure of the States, provided only they do not discriminate against the Negro.

"If they apply equally, impartially and uniformly to white and black citizens alike, they are not condemned by the letter or the spirit of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments. They may perhaps cost the States a reduction in their congressional representations in the proportion in which the number of adult males disfranchised in such State legislation bears to the whole number of its adult male population. But this is the only legal consequence, and there is not warrant for the contention that the Federal judiciary can also declare such legislation absolutely void." [47]

Mr. Justice Peckham, in ruling against the plaintiff, did not see fit to utilize the equal protection clause, but left no doubt that the clause could be invoked against State voting regulations of a discriminatory nature. He speculated:

"The question might arise if an exclusion from the privilege of voting were founded upon the particular State from which the person came, excluding from that privilege, for instance, a citizen of the United States coming from Georgia and allowing it to a citizen of the United States coming from New York, or any other State. In such case, an argument might be urged that, under the 14th amendment of the Federal Constitution, the citizen from Georgia was by the State statute deprived of the equal protection of the laws." [48]

In the modern context, the unusually long residency required for voting in several of the Southern States may well constitute invidious discrimination against poor whites and Negroes who by occupational necessity are forced to migrate seasonally. This sort of discrimination, properly documented, could provide a judicially acceptable basis for invocation of the equal protection clause as a limitation upon State authority to set voting qualifications.[49] But where the impact of rigid and long residency requirements does not fall in a manner suggestive of ethnic, class, or economic discrimination, public policy alternatives predicated upon assumptions of congressional supremacy in the field of voting rights deserve full consideration and effective implementation.

Electoral procedures which makes citizenship participation difficult affect not only the rate of participation but often influence the partisan direction of balloting. Thus the ethnic, occupational or political groups which have, and realize that they have, only a very limited ability to influence elections and subsequent public policy often are oriented toward the minority political party within their State. When a longstanding majority party enacts statutes which render voting more difficult, it serves not only to enhance its own position but to weaken the sense of public obligation of some elements in the citizenry and to render more difficult the development of effective two-party competition.[50] These latter elements are traditionally considered foundations of the democratic process.

The Supreme Court, in *United States* v. *Classics*,[51] recognized that Congress had a constitutional obligation to protect the integrity of elections for Representatives to the House of Representatives. The salient commitment of Classic is that those elements in such electoral processes which are integral fall within proper congressional authority under article I, section 4, and article I, section 8, clause 18. Specifically, the majority wrote:

"While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States * * * this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution, to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to carry into execution the foregoing powers.' " [52]

Similar interpretative justification for congressional intervention can be found regarding voting for presidential and vice-presidential electors in *Burroughs* v. *United States*.[53] There the Court held that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 could be applied to such electors.

Indeed, Congress has successfully invoked not only the constitutional provisions directly referring to elections, but also the war power and its power to govern Federal territory. In a 1942 act,[54] for example, Congress granted members of the Armed Forces the right to vote for Members of Congress and presidential and vice-presidential electors without fulfillment of various State registration, residency, or poll tax requirements. The validity of this act has not been tested constitutionally.[55] Similarly commentators argue that Congress may, if it desires, draft legislation insuring that residents of enclaves under exclusive Federal jurisdiction may vote for Federal officers in elections regulated by authorities of the State surrounding the enclave.[56] That the Congress has already assumed such authority is found in the statute relating to the voting rights of persons living within the jurisdiction of Shenandoah National Park in the State of Virginia.[57] The statute provides:

"Persons residing in or on any of the said lands embraced in said Shenandoah National Park shall have the right to establish a voting residence in Virginia by reason thereof, and the consequent right to vote at all elections within the county or city in which said land or lands upon which they reside are located upon like terms and conditions, and to the same extent, as they would be entitled to vote in such county or city if the said lands on which they reside had not been deeded or conveyed to the United States of America." [58]

In the final analysis, the solution of the problem of the mobile voter lies not in speculation over alternative modes of constitutional interpretation. Justification for uniform legislation can be derived from a variety of constitutional, stautory and judicial sources. Clearly, impediments to such congressional action are political rather than constitutional. Yet the tensions of our mobile society have themselves pointed toward bolder Federal activity in the field of voting rights. To the extent that urbanites achieve greater representation in the State legislatures and the National House of Representatives, their self-interest renders politically feasible the establishment of a national policy governing residency requirements for voting. The political repercussions of *Baker* v. *Carr* and its progeny give promise of swift developments in this direction.

---

[1] Professor of political science, State University of Iowa.

[2] *Asbury Park Press, Inc.* v. *Woolley*, 33 N.J. 1, 11, 161 A. 2d 705, 710 (1960).

[3] 369 U.S. 186 (1962).

[4] See 1961 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Report, bk. 1, 5.

[5] See Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1962, p. B-1, col. 6; id. Nov. 27, 1962, p. A-16, col. 1.

[6] 1961 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Report, bk. 1, 5-6.

[7] Yates, "Residence Requirement for Voting: Ten Years of Change," pp. 1-2, a paper delivered at the 1962 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Sept. 5-8, 1962, at Washington, D.C.

[8] Harris, "Model Voter Registration System," July 27 (National Municipal League 1957).

[9] Ogul, "Residence Requirements as Barriers to Voting in Presidential Elections," 3 Midwest J. Pol. Sci. 254-56 (1959).

[10] For complete information, see chart III.

[11] Byrne, "Let's Modernize Our Horse-and-Buggy Election Laws", in the Center for Information on America 4 (1961).

[12] Id. at 5. But Census Bureau information indicates that the largest group of migrants comprise "operatives and kindred workers," the second largest consists of craftsmen and foremen, and the third professional and technical personnel. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Mobility of Population of the United States, April 1958 to 1959, No. 104, at 23 (1960).

[13] Report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, Migratory Labor in American Agriculture 3 (1951).

[14] Des Moines Register, Oct. 21, 1962, p. 8-B.

[15] Note, 12 Wyo. L.J. 50-51 (1957).

[16] See, e.g., Goldman, "Move—Lose Your Vote," 45 National Municipal Rev. 6, 46 (1956).

[17] See Ogul, supra note 7, at 258-259.

[18] Id. at 257-62.

[19] "Uniform Act for Voting by New Residents in Presidential Elections," in 71 Annual Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws 1 (1962).

[20] See Yates, supra note 5, at 4-7, 14-15.

[21] Alabama, Louisiana, New Jersey, North Carolina, Rhode Island, and Tennessee.

[22] California, Delaware, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Tennessee.

[23] California, Idaho, Massachusetts, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, and Wisconsin.

[24] Connecticut and Vermont.

[25] Arizona.

[26] Washington Post, Nov. 11, 1962, p. E-3, col. 1.

[27] Ogul, supra note 7, at 256.

[28] Goldman, supra note 14, at 46.

[29] See, e.g., Kirby, "Limitations on the Power of State Legislatures over Presidential Elections," 27 Law and Contemp. Prob. 495-500 (1962).

[30] Erwin "Literacy Tests for Voters: A Case Study in Federalism," 27 Law and Contemp. Prob. 481 (1962).

[31] Id. at 483.

[32] *Ex parte Clarke*, 100 U.S. 399, 418 (1879).

[33] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments concerning the nomination and election of the President and Vice President and on qualifications for voting of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961).

[34] S.J. Res. 14, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961). See hearings, supra note 31, pt. 1, at 13.

[35] S.J. Res. 90, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961). See hearings, supra note 31, pt. 1, at 23.

[36] Hearings, supra note 31, pt. 1, at 34, 275-77.

[37] "Each state shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors."

[38] 146 U.S. 1 (1892).

[39] Lugg, "Memorandum Concerning Election Laws," in 71 Annual Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws 10 (1962).

[40] Hearings, supra note 31, pt. 2, at 349.

[41] Id. at 349-50.

[42] Cf. Everett, "Foreword," 27 Law and Contemp. Prob. 327, 328 n.4 (1962).

[43] See Bonfield, "The Right to Vote and Judicial Enforcement of Section Two of the Fourteenth Amendment", 46 Cornell L.Q. 108 (1960), for an excellent case for utilization of this provision.

[44] 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 36 (1873).

[45] 193 U.S. 621 (1904).

[46] Id. at 627.

[47] Id. at 631.

[48] Id. at 634.

[49] For a contemporary statement of the argument that this clause may be invoked in voting discrimination cases, see Kirby, supra note 27, at 496.

[50] For an excellent analysis of the relationship of State elections laws and political behavior, see Campbell, Converse, Miller & Stokes, "The American Voter," 266-89 (1960).

[51] 313 U.S. 299 (1941).

[52] Id. at 315.

[53] 290 U.S. 534 (1934).

[54] Act of Sept. 16, 1942, ch. 561, 56 Stat. 753, repealed and replaced by Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955, 69 State 584, 5 U.S.C. secs. 2171-2196 (1958).

[55] Kirby, supra note 27, at 500.

[56] Gerwig, "The Elective Franchise for Residents of Federal Areas," 24 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 404 (1956).

[57] 56 Stat. 322 (1942), 16 U.S.C. sec. 403c-1(h) (1958).

[58] Ibid. See also Gerwig, supra note 54, at 421 n.69.

Tribute to Dr. Narot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Miami area is privileged to number among its outstanding religious and community leaders Dr. Joseph Narot who this year celebrates his 25th year as a rabbi.

Recently, the Miami News and the Jewish Floridian had editorials honoring this distinguished spiritual leader whom all Miamians hold in high regard.

The editorials follow:

[From the Miami (Fla.) News]

SILVERY YEAR FOR DR. NAROT

We congratulate Dr. Joseph Narot upon his 25th year in the rabbinate. Some 15 of these fine years have been spent as the spiritual leader of Temple Israel, the city's largest Reformed congregation.

A widely honored lecturer and authority on the church, Dr. Narot is deeply endowed with the qualities necessary to bring men of good faith together. He works tirelessly to encourage his Jewish people to their common goal—that of making Judaism an integral part of the American way of life.

Dr. Narot has served this community long and well in many different civic and charitable areas. His Friday evening sermons attract large audiences because of his vibrant spirit and as a man who expresses himself forthrightly and fearlessly.

We share his congregation's enthusiasm for Dr. Narot.

[From the Jewish Floridian]

TRIBUTE TO DR. NAROT

Temple Israel of Greater Miami will honor its spiritual leader, Dr. Joseph Narot, at ceremonies Sunday on the occasion of his 25th anniversary in the rabbinate.

The function will also install into office Sam Luby, Sr., as president of Temple Israel.

Since his arrival in Miami to assume the Temple's pulpit, Dr. Narot has worked ardently for a variety of causes, civic, educational, and religious, dedicated to the total betterment of the community.

His name has been among the leaders in bringing distinction to Greater Miami, whether as an architect of the Metro Community Relations Board, as a spokesman in behalf of philanthropic causes, or in the capacity of vocal supporter of those movements constituted in behalf of general advancement of human welfare.

Dr. Narot's identification with Jewish organizational endeavor is legion. He is known nationally for his writing on subjects, among others, concerning the Jewish cultural and religious philosophy his pulpit represents.

Throughout his tenure here, Temple Israel has grown in the light of these activities, taking vigor from his contributions. Both the Jewish and general communities, as well as Temple Israel, will join Sunday in paying tribute to Dr. Narot. That on May 29 he will receive an honorary doctor of divinity degree from the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion is indicative of his personal drive toward continuing rabbinic achievement.

Bolivia's Cycle: Revolt, Despair, Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, while most of our attention of late in Latin America and the Carribbean has been focused on the Dominican Republic, a serious problem, with deep roots, is rearing its ugly head in Bolivia.

Marquis Childs, writing in the Washington Post yesterday, points out that the situation in La Paz is "remarkably like that which preceded the rebellion in the Dominican Republic. But it is more complex, with the long-term odds in favor of a civil war that could spill rivers of blood over months or even years."

Mr. Childs has gone on to make the very important point that the cycle of revolt and despair and revolt, which is all-too-common in Latin America, is brought on in large measure because there is an "almost complete lack of individuals trained in management and administration, to say nothing of the essential technologies."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all who are concerned with the future of democracy, stable governments, and sound economies in Latin America will find this article of interest.

The article follows:

BOLIVIA'S CYCLE: REVOLT, DESPAIR

(By Marquis Childs)

In Bolivia's fog-shrouded capital of La Paz, 11,000 feet above sea level, the alarm bell is ringing. While it can be ignored for a time, Latin American observers who know their hemisphere are convinced that before too long it will reverberate far and wide.

The situation is in some respects remarkably like that which preceded the rebellion in the Dominican Republic. But it is more

complex, with the long-term odds in favor of a civil war that could spill rivers of blood over months or even years. Moreover, because of Bolivia's position so close to the heartland of Latin America a civil war could flood over into vulnerable neighboring states. The Dominican Republic is, after all, an island that can be insulated by American air and naval power.

The State Department is less pessimistic about Bolivia than are Latin observers close to hemispheric problems. The belief in the Department is that the current dictator, Rene Barrientos Ortuno, former chief of the Bolivian Air Force, has support among the peasantry and will be able, with a judicious use of force, to keep the mineworkers and the discontented city dwellers from open revolt. It must be added, however, that American diplomats in Santo Domingo and in Washington were unprepared for the timing of the Dominican explosion.

There is agreement that the three left-wing parties in Bolivia have come under the domination of a pro-Chinese Communist faction. A united command grew out of meetings in mid-April centered in the Twentieth Century Mine and the militant, armed-to-the-teeth union that is in control. The three parties are the leftist Socialists of Juan Lechin Oquendo, the Trotskyite Workers Party, and the bulk of the old-line Communist Party of Bolivia.

The parallel with the Dominican crisis is most striking in the sequence of events that led to Barrientos' seizure of power. Last November the air force general overthrew Victor Paz Estenssoro, a popular leader who had striven mightily to create the forms of democracy in a primitive country with a largely illiterate Indian population.

In the Bolivian cast of characters Paz Estenssoro was the Juan Bosch, the progressive, non-Communist seeking to create a going economy and raise living standards by free choice. He was stronger than Bosch and he survived longer and achieved rather more.

But in the end the grim realities of what he faced in poverty and long pent-up hatreds and discontents made his downfall inevitable. In the Dominican Republic sugar is the commodity on which nearly 60 percent of trade with the outside world turns and when Bosch doubled the wages of the sugarworkers after Trujillo was overthrown Dominican sugar was priced out of the world market. The commodity on which Bolivia depends for far more than 60 percent of its outside earnings is tin.

The mines were nationalized a decade ago. They had been owned principally by the Patino family. While the Patinos were not Trujillos, in the sense of being total dictators, they paid starvation wages.

The familiar weaknesses of a nationalized industry were soon evident—inefficiency, featherbedding, graft. Add to this a militant union pushing long suppressed demands and it is easy to see why the mines were run at a loss.

This same cycle of revolt and despair and revolt again repeats itself over and over in Latin America. Why? One reason, in the view of a knowledgeable Latin observor who witnessed the Cuban cycle at firsthand, is the almost complete lack of individuals trained in management and administration, to say nothing of the essential technologies.

"If the Alliance for Progress is to mean anything," this observer remarked the other day, "it should be built around a massive effort—massive—to train personnel to run a big, modern enterprise. Good will is all very well. But without managers and administrators it is of no avail."

On Cuba, "the source of infection," as Members of Congress refer to it, an interesting question is: If there were no export of subversion and sabotage from Havana, would the threat of communism in such desperate countries as Bolivia be negligible? Clearly, a yes or no answer is impossible. But communism thrives on indigenous soil where dire poverty is the rule and where oppression and brutality have left deeply rooted blood hatreds.

As for Cuba, observers had begun to hope that a powerful force within the country grounded in deep discontent with the dictatorship was building up to overthrow Castro. The Dominican crisis checked that hope, since it gave Castro an overwhelming propaganda weapon. These are some of the lessons written large in recent events.

New Soybean Oil for Export

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following article from the May 1965 issue of Soybean Digest. Although the article is somewhat technical, it points up the work being done to develop new uses for the soybean. I am particularly proud of the fact that much of this work is being done at the Northern Regional Laboratory in Peoria, Ill., which is in my own home district.

The article follows:

[From the Soybean Digest, May 1965]

HWSB: HYDROGENATED-WINTERIZED SOYBEAN OIL—A NEW SOYBEAN OIL FOR EXPORT

(By J. C. Cowan, Northern Regional Research Laboratory,[1] Peoria, Ill.)

One of the latest commercial developments in edible oils in the United States is hydrogenated-winterized soybean oil (HWSB oil). Although much technical information on how to prepare this oil has been available to industry for some time, commercial use of this information had to wait for an opportune time. During the past 7 years the average annual differences in prices between soybean and cottonseed oils varied from 1.6 cents to 3.4 cents per pound. These relative price differences gave the necessary impetus to industry to go into the production of HWSB oil.

In 1964, nationwide distribution to the consumer of an oil with the general characteristics of HWSB oil was begun. Previously, regional distribution and marketing tests had been carried out. Considerable amounts of similar oils have been furnished to food manufacturers for salad and cooking oils both for testing and use. Now the potential of the export market should be considered. This article reviews the preparation and quality of the HWSB oils.

The combination of hydrogenation-winterization improves soybean oil by lowering its linolenate content and by removing solids that would cloud the oil if stored in a refrigerator. Soybean oil contains 5 to 9 percent of linolenate (3 double bonds). This fatty ester oxidizes more readily than other fatty esters, such as linoleate (2 double bonds), oleate (1 double bond), palmitate, and stearate. Presence of linolenate lowers stability of soybean oil. Reports show that when linolenate is reduced or removed, soybean oil becomes more stable provided other factors are kept equal. Hydrogenation lowers linolenate. Winterization removes the higher melting glycerides that are formed during hydrogenation to give an oil that will pass a cold test for salad oils. Since 1960, a number of commercial organizations have tried large-scale methods of manufacturing an oil with a lowered linolenate content. Currently, at least three refiners are marketing what analyzes to be a hydrogenated-winterized soybean oil.

To establish the value of hydrogenation-winterization, we initiated studies to learn how much improvement could be made by a combination of hydrogenation, winterization, and deodorization. In our studies, the major improvement turned out to be in frying potato chips.

PREPARATION

Selective catalysts and conditions are desirable for operations involving hydrogenation and winterization. In our work, we used nickel catalysts. One was a nickel in hydrogenated cottonseed flakes; the other was based on electrolytic nickel precipitated on kieselguhr and protected in hardened vegetable oil. We used a commercially refined and bleached oil of good quality that had an iodine value of 128.

The hydrogenation was carried out under both selective and nonselective conditions. The selective conditions used were: (1) a catalyst prepared from an electrolytic nickel to avoid modifiers likely to give a higher content of "trans" isomeric fatty esters in the oil; (2) comparatively higher temperatures, such as 170° C., to accelerate reduction of polyunsaturated esters without formation of stearic esters; and (3) low hydrogen pressures. A special stirrer to give a high dispersion of hydrogen was installed in a 3-gallon autoclave.

Hydrogenations were made to lower unsaturation to iodine values of 117 to 87, but results from only three runs are given here. Winterizations were conducted as follows: The hydrogenated sample was slowly cooled in a 1-gallon wide-mouthed insulated flask in a constant temperature room, controlled at about 40° F. (8 C.) for 4.5 days. The oil was filtered through a coarse cloth onto a large Buchner funnel, and the solid fat was pressed into a stearin cake.

The only practical hydrogenations to give HWSB oils under selective conditions decreased the iodine value of the oil to around 110. This value was chosen because yields of winterized oil are too low with hydrogenated oils of iodine values less than about 105 and improvement in stability is not sufficient with iodine values above about 115.

COMPOSITION

The sample with an iodine value of 111, HWSB oil B-2, is representative of the quality product that can be manufactured. Its analysis by GLC shows about 2 percent linolenate, 39 percent linoleate (diunsaturated), and 45 percent oleate (monounsaturated). Since it contains only 14 to 15 percent saturated fatty ester, it can be classified as an oil low in saturates and high in polyunsaturates.

FLAVOR AND OXIDATIVE STABILITY

HWSB oils are the most stable liquid edible soybean oils we have studied. These oils had good to excellent quality initially and good quality after aging at 60° C. for 4 days (a rather severe aging test).

In our laboratory studies, citric acid improved the HWSB oil more than the unhydrogenated control oil. This difference in improvement is most striking in the peroxide values of the 8-hour A.O.M. test. The HWSB oil improved from a value of 36 to 2.4 whereas the unhydrogenated control oil changed from a peroxide value of 18.5 to 5.

Aging at 60° C., heating to 300° F., or passing air through under conditions of the A.O.M. test gives lower peroxide values for the commercial HWSB oil.

---

[1] This is a laboratory of the Northern Utilization Research and Development Division, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

FRYING TESTS

Tests with HWSB oil for frying potatoes indicate a substantial improvement in its frying characteristics. The flavor scores of the potato chips from HWSB oils and soybean oil, when fresh, are about equal. After continued use of the oils and after aging of the potato chips, however, chips from the HWSB oil are clearly better. These oils were commercially available oils and are not oils A and B used in our laboratory experiments reported on hydrogenation and winterization. Commercial HWSB oils contained added antioxidant to stabilize the fried product toward oxidation.

SUMMARY

Improved soybean oils for salad and cooking use can be prepared by a combination of hydrogenation and winterization. Such oils have good flavor and oxidative stability. They represent a commercial improvement in edible liquid soybean oil, particularly for consumer use as a salad and cooking oil and for frying of foods. Serious consideration should be given to the export of these oils to foreign countries.

The Real Alabama—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the State of Alabama has a story it would like to tell the Nation and the world, a story of which Alabamians are proud. It is a story of great economic growth and of solid prospects for future development. It is also a story of excellent educational institutions, of vigorous communities, of energetic people, and of great natural beauty.

To aid in bringing attention to that story, "The Real Alabama," I will insert items from time to time which show the positive side of Alabama, her progress and future potential.

On April 26, 1965, the New York Journal of Commerce published a full supplement entitled: "Alabama: A Billion-Dollar Story." The paper included a brief introduction to the supplement, saying that in recent months Alabama has been viewed by many people primarily as a testing ground for civil rights issues.

It went on to say:

But there is another Alabama, not so well known afar. It is an important State growing in economic stability and in achievement.

As part I of this series, I want to insert the following article from that supplement of the Journal of Commerce:

ALABAMA PACES SOUTHEAST IN INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

Alabama has aptly been called the No. 1 industrial State of the Southeast, the Nation's fastest growing region.

Last year, it led the whole Southeast in industrial expansion, with a whopping $406 million in new plants.

To meet the needs of this industrial explosion, Alabama took giant steps to boost its transportation facilities, poured millions into research and education, held out new lures for still further growth.

Alabama last year led eight Southeastern States in industrial growth, including Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North and South Carolina, and Tennessee.

What is the background of this phenomenal industrial spurt that has brought Alabama to the forefront?

MANY FACTORS INVOLVED

There are many complex factors, but here are some of the main reasons for this bright new story of American enterprise.

For several years Alabama leaders have seen the importance of bringing new industry into the State, and as far back as 1949, the Cater Act, introduced by Silas Cater, a former State senator, started the ball rolling.

It made many important tax concessions to new industry seeking to locate in the South. It was followed later by the Wallace Act, successfully introduced by present Governor Wallace, which went even farther than the Cater Act in luring industry into the South.

Equally important is Alabama's transportation network by air, sea, and land, which is growing by leaps and bounds to meet the demands of the new plants.

HAS 10 PORTS

Alabama's inland water system from Mobile into the State's heartland, which now has 10 ports and offers integrated transportation to all parts of the Nation, has also helped bring in new industry.

The State's free enterprise system, designed to help industry reap a higher profit from its multimillion expenditures, has also been a factor.

So has the fact that Alabama is one of the right-to-work States, meaning that a worker does not have to belong to a trade union to obtain employment.

A wealth of manpower, aided by the best research facilities in the South, has provided a labor pool to match the demands of new industry.

However, it was the Cater and Wallace Acts that originally opened the floodgates to new industry.

Under the terms of this legislation, industry can now negotiate a long-term lease on a new plant and equipment without any cash outlay.

NO TAXES REQUIRED

Industry is not required to pay any real taxes as long as the municipality retains title to the facility. The rent paid is deductible as an operating expense and reduces the lease costs by 30 to 52 percent of a corporation, or by 20 to 91 percent if the plant is individually owned or is a partnership.

For example, a 52-percent-bracket corporation negotiates a new plant contract with a municipality to cost $400,000. The municipal government or its corporate agent floats a $400,000, 5¾ percent, 30-year bond issue, constructs and equips a plant.

The owner signs a lease renting the plant for 30 years at an annual rent of $28,000, with a renewal option for another 30 years at $1 per year.

By this procedure, the industrialist has acquired the right to occupy and use a new plant and machinery for at least 60 years without 1 cent of capital outlay. The $28,000 rental is an operating expense and is deductible and is worth $14,560 tax dollars.

Under the Wallace Act, a project includes any land and buildings or other improvements, and all real and personal property necessary, whether or not it is now existing, and which is suitable for manufacturing, processing, or assembling agricultural or manufactured products.

It also covers commercial enterprises for storing, warehousing, distributing, or selling products or agriculture, mining, or industry. Any enterprise for research in connection with any of these is also included.

The Wallace and Cater Acts differ only slightly in their aid to new industry. The Wallace Act stipulates that bond issued for a particular project must be paid off solely by revenues from that project.

Under the Cater Act, statutory authority is given to the industrial development boards to issue bonds payable not only from revenue of the project being financed, but also from revenues from other properties owned by the board.

The Wallace Act specifically requires a lease agreement preceding any bond issue. The Cater Act does not require a pre-bond lease agreement. However, it is customary for the lessee to sign an agreement.

There is no precise limitations on length of lease under the Wallace Act, but a Supreme Court ruling said leases should not extend beyond 30 years.

Under the Cater Act, the term of the lease, including renewal option, is not limited.

The Wallace Act authorizes financing and construction and equipping of industrial or business projects, while the Cater Act authorizes formation of municipal industrial development corporations.

Both the Cater and Wallace Acts were intended to promote industry in Alabama, and both have been held constitutional by the Supreme Court.

Both acts exempt the property, income and bond interest of the projects from State taxes.

One of the features that make Alabama a profitable place for industry is corporate taxes. Not only does the State offer industary a favorable tax structure, but a good labor climate, and an abundance of raw materials.

Under the corporate tax setup, a charter fee of $1 per $1,000 of proposed capital stock at time of filing certificate of corporation is payable once, with a minimum of $5. Subsequent increases of capital stock will be taxed at the same rate.

Corporate taxes paid annually are 5 percent of net income. Expenses, interest paid or accrued and taxes paid or accrued, including Federal, bad debts and uninsured losses are deductible.

Corporate income tax for a foreign firm in Alabama is the same, but covers facilities in and business transacted in Alabama. A foreign corporation is required to file a corporation charter with the secretary of state.

Every since he took office over 2 years ago, Governor Wallace has pushed every way possible to make Alabama a good place in which to locate.

EFFORTS PAY OFF

And his efforts have paid off. By the end of May, he will have helped bring in more than $1 billion in new or expanded industry. This amount is expected to grow even more by the end of the year.

However, industry could not live on tax relief alone. It had to have a transportation system unsurpassed anywhere in the Nation, to get its products out and raw materials, not available in the State, to the plants the most economical way possible.

The State won from the Interstate Commerce Commission an equitable list of freight rates for Mobile and other parts of the State.

Today, Alabama's rivers have more than 14 ports on their banks. The channel has been deepened to provide more water for the shallow-draft vessels which are the lifeline now for the industrial might which is developing along their banks.

A new network of highways leading to the river ports has provided integrated rail and truck transport for the first time. And the deeper channels to the gulf have opened up

new vistas for the industrialist with an eye on foreign trade.

TRANSPORT IS KEY

A survey made by the State bore out the importance of this new transportation setup to industrial development. Of several hundred industries queried, 71.9 percent attributed their being in the south to the excellent transportation system.

The port of Mobile in 1964, for the first time topped the million dollar mark in the revenue.

To make Mobile more competitive with other Gulf ports it is planned to pump almost the entire amount back into new facilities, the Governor has approved a $3 million bond issue to provide for even greater services for exporters and importers.

The State is also pushing for an extension of the Tombigbee River to the Tennessee River. If efforts in getting Federal aid for the project are successful, the 175-mile river link would give Alabama its first water transport link with the Mississippi, thus cutting hundreds of miles off the present routing for cargo into the State by the water route, and enhancing not only the State's industrial position, but providing new cargo sources for the port of Mobile.

Lt. Allen Zink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will be equally as touched as I was when they read the following article written by Lt. Allen Zink, which appeared in the San Diego Union, San Diego, Calif., on May 25, 1965.

Lieutenant Zink is serving in Vietnam as an A-4 Skyhawk jet pilot. His unusually moving evaluation of America's purpose in fighting for South Vietnam is worthy of bringing to the attention of every student, and adult too, across our land.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article in the Appendix, as follows:

NAVY FLIER TELLS WHAT SAIGON COMBAT MEANS TO HIM

"Our Communist enemy is a well-trained, crafty fellow in whose heart there is no room for love.

"We are meeting his trespasses head-on with a formidable military power that serves to preserve our freedom, and that is ready and willing to hear and support the tiniest voice that cries under oppression of any kind."

This message on the meaning of the war in Vietnam has come to a class of San Diego elementary school students from a Navy pilot flying missions over Community territory.

Lt. Roy Allen Zink, who flies a jet from the attack carrier *Coral Sea*, sent a three-page letter to his "very dear friends" at Jackson Elementary School.

Mrs. Catherine Came, their teacher, said Zink had often visited her seminar class of gifted children from the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades. He would talk about his experiences as a pilot, or would bring his guitar and sing folk songs.

A bachelor, he is Mrs. Came's nephew, and is the grandson of Mrs. William Zink of 5480 Morenga Dr., La Mesa. His father is Rear Adm. William T. Zink, USN, ret., a professor at Clemson College in South Carolina.

Last December, the 23-year-old lieutenant, a Princeton graduate, left Miramar with other members of Detachment Delta of Light Photographic Squadron 63. Their mission is to fly photo-reconnaissance missions.

In his letter he apologizes for not writing sooner, but says his days have been long and tiring.

"The efforts of the United States here in southeast Asia are not without purpose," he writes. "It has deeply hurt our country that the people of South Vietnam have been denied their rights as free men.

"These simple farm people have been invaded by an ugly agent of communism that, through terrorism and guerrilla tactics, has tried to bring them under its yoke.

"Close friends of mine have been killed here, making the supreme sacrifice for a man they have never seen; a small, tawny-skinned, slant-eyed farmer proud like you, with hopes and hurts and wants not so very different from your own.

"I love my flying. It's carefree when I tumble through the silver-lined clouds alone and on top of the world. It's dangerous when I skim above enemy gunfire at treetop level, 600 miles per hour. It's exciting when I successfully complete my job of supersonic reconnaissance. We are busy flying day and night combat missions, the effects of which you are reading about in The San Diego Union and Time magazine.

"I look forward to returning to my homeland in late June to enjoy the beaches, sailing on Mission Bay, Sunday afternoons in Presidio Park, baseball games at Westgate Park, hamburgers at Jack-in-the-Box, and leisurely strolls through La Jolla.

"I'm fighting to preserve these simple but beautiful pleasures."

Fire Commissioner Hink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I announce the death of our beloved fire commissioner, George E. Hink, of Philadelphia, on May 23, 1965. The Members of Congress from Philadelphia have been fully aware of the merits and competence of this man who was truly a dedicated fireman's fireman, an excellent person, and a dear friend. We will miss him greatly.

George E. Hink entered the fire department in 1921 and his interest in the workings of the department was such as to warrant early promotion. He rapidly rose to deputy commissioner, which position he held with honor until the retirement of Commissioner Frank L. McNamee just about a year ago. He was credited with saving several foreign-flag ships which caught fire while in port in Philadelphia. He experienced some fearsome fires and had some brushes with disaster during his long career. His advice was sought and his wisdom was shared by members of the department, and his recall from this earthly scene creates a loss which will be felt by his host of associates and friends, as well as by his bereaved family, to whom we offer sincere sympathy and condolences.

Eternal rest give unto him, O Lord, and let the perpetual light shine upon him. May his soul rest in peace.

Public Law 480 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note several articles recently printed in newspapers throughout the country that our efforts in January to curtail the sale, for foreign currency, of surplus farm products to Egypt has been effective without hurting our relations with that country. At this point, I include an article from the May 2, 1965, issue of the Washington Star showing that the shipments to Egypt were, in fact, stopped. It was also pleasing to note that President Nasser said he would pay hard cash if he had to. The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 2, 1965]

NASSER RAPS U.S. HALT OF WHEAT SALES

CAIRO.—President Gamel Abdel Nasser accused the United States yesterday of trying to exert economic pressure on Egypt.

At a May Day rally in Cairo, the Egyptian leader also made a new attack on Tunisian President Habib Bourguiba, calling him a supporter of "Zionism and imperialism" for advocating peaceful coexistence with Israel.

An estimated 400,000 Egyptians cheered Nasser's 90-minute speech in a big square.

ANTI-AMERICAN INCIDENTS

Nasser said he had asked Washington to renew its shipments of surplus wheat to Egypt but no renewal was in sight.

Shipments to Egypt were suspended following a series of anti-American incidents in Cairo last November and December.

"Not one Egyptian will give up his honor, dignity, or independence under economic pressure," Nasser said. "We will buy wheat with hard currency if we have to and we are ready to eat half a loaf to preserve our dignity."

Nasser also accused the Western Powers of "encouraging Israel to launch aggression" against the Arab world.

CRITICIZES AID TO ISRAEL

The United States, Britain, West Germany, and France are supplying arms to Israel, he said, because the Soviet Union is supplying arms to Egypt.

Ridiculing "U.S. policy" on maintaining are arms balance in the Middle East, Nasser said: "If Israel gets arms, we will get arms. If Israel gets planes, we will get planes. We will never accept their theory of an arms equilibrium."

"Arabs can mobilize 2 or 3 million men," Nasser said. "The day will come when we will do this and we will liberate Palestine no matter how many arms the West gives Israel."

Following this story, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include at this point an article from the Sunday, May 23, 1965, issue of the Washington Post pointing up the

fact that United States-Egyptian relations are improving:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 23, 1965]

UNITED STATES-EGYPT RELATIONS IMPROVE AT ALL LEVELS

(By Joe Alex Morris, Jr.)

CAIRO.—United States relations with Egypt appear to be quietly improving after reaching their lowest point in a decade late last year.

The improvement is taking place without any publicity from either side, such is the recognized sensitivity on the subject.

Last fall, an Egyptian mob burned the U.S. library here, a private American oil company aircraft was shot down, the U.S. Congress voted to cut off economic aid to President Nasser, and Nasser responded by telling the United States to go drink the Red Sea if it thought it could exercise political pressure on him through its $175 million annual surplus food shipments.

Several of the immediate causes of this freeze were quickly dispelled. Egypt cooperated fully in the investigation of the plane incident and U.S. officials now feel that it was the result of several communications failures.

On the aid question, Egyptian officials have been told repeatedly that this is a political question insofar as the Congress is the ultimate arbiter, and that the administration faces great difficulties in getting appropriations when the recipient country takes positions contrary to expressed American policy. Reportedly, there is now greater understanding of this here.

The biggest obstacle at that time was the fact that the United States and Egypt were on opposite sides in the Congo controversy. The biggest single factor in improving the situation today has been a shift in this Egyptian position.

Nasser recently stopped aiding the Congo rebels. One reason was the steady success of Premier Moise Tshombe's mercenaries in reducing rebel-held territory. More important, Nasser reportedly was fed up with rebel squabbling.

Nasser has further eased the way to a limited rapprochement in several other ways recently.

He has not been pressing his demand that the United States evacuate its big airbase at Wheelus Field in Libya.

He called off at the last moment a major drive against the royalist forces of the Iman Badr of Yemen, which almost certainly would have involved military incursions across the Saudi Arabian border and perhaps a new U.S. showdown.

Also in the Yemen he has promoted a new government which favors a political solution to the civil war there.

There have been indications Nasser will not follow through on his declared intention to recognize East Germany. Informed sources here expect Egypt will establish a consulate in East Berlin, but go no further. He broke relations with Bonn when West Germany recognized Israel.

Few observers here are inclined to ascribe all this to a change of policy by Nasser. They put it down instead as more evidence that Nasser is essentially a political realist ready to moderate his position whenever it becomes necessary.

Essential to this appraisal is the fact that Nasser's surplus foods agreement with the United States runs out June 30.

If it is not renewed, he will have to divert dollars in scarce hard currencies from industrial investment into buying food over the next 3 years.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, to summarize this discussion of the Public Law 480 program, I wish to include at this point an article from the May 1965 Soybean Digest:

[From the Soybean Digest, May 1965]

ECONOMISTS PROPOSE REVIEW OF FOOD FOR PEACE PROGRAM

A review of this country's food for peace program has been suggested by a pair of agricultural economists at the University of Minnesota.

According to J. S. Mann and W. W. Cochrane, the present program, although an important aspect of American foreign policy, is not realizing its full potential in promoting economic development.

In the March issue of Minnesota Farm Business Notes, a publication of the university's Agricultural Extension Service, the economists state that the time has come to review, appraise, and recast the program in order to increase its effectiveness in helping to lift the world out of poverty.

The economists explain that the greatest landmark in the history of food for peace was the passage in 1954 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, better known as Public Law 480.

The original law included provisions for the sale of U.S. surplus farm products for foreign currencies; for donations of such products to foreign governments for disaster relief; and for grants of commodities to promote economic and community development.

The law was amended in 1959 to include provisions for long-term dollar credits to facilitate foreign buying of U.S. farm products.

Foreign currencies received from the sale of surplus farm products under Public Law 480 are to be allocated for—among other things—loans and grants to foreign nations for economic development.

The economists point out, however, that so far utilization of these allocated funds has been extremely slow. In June of 1963, only 48 percent of loan funds, and 30 percent of grant funds allocated to underdeveloped countries had been dispersed.

Another aspect of the present program which needs review, according to Mann and Cochrane, has to do with the granting of food commodities to developing countries.

They explain that many recipient countries view Public Law 480 as a short-run measure adopted by the United States to reduce its farm surpluses. Because of the uncertainty of the length of food aid programs, they fail to adequately integrate such food aid into their development programs.

According to the economists, these programs should be formulated for several years' duration.

They also suggest that the United States make better use of food aid as a leverage for requiring recipient countries to take needed action for supporting and pressing their development programs.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the Armenians have been one of the most persecuted of all peoples in known history, and have suffered most in their historic homeland under conquering alien oppressors. They had lost their national independence more than a century before Columbus discovered America, and since then most of them have been living in dispersion. Their country was divided among their three powerful neighbors—the Turks, Persians and Russians. Under the domination of all three they suffered, yet in suffering they hoped to find their national salvation. During all that time they steadfastly clung to their national traditions and ideals: their Christian faith and their love of freedom. The more they were oppressed, the more firmly they believed that some day and somehow their day of freedom would come. That day came at the end of the First World War.

During that war most of the Armenians in the Asiastic provinces of Turkey—actually ancient Armenia—were deported and massacred. In this holocaust about 1 million Armenians lost their lives and several hundred thousands of the survivors escaped to the Caucasus, the northern part of Armenia then under Russian domination. As a result of the Russian Revolution and the collapse of czarist authority there, Armenians felt free to take their destiny into their hands and proclaim their independence. That was done on May 28, 1918. At the time the Armenians were fighting the Turks, and the population of the country consisted mostly of refugees. Under such difficult circumstances, the existence of the new state was most precarious. But in the midst of insurmountable difficulties the leaders of reclaimed Armenia struggled hard, and did manage to carry on for about 2 years. Then the turn of international diplomacy played a trick upon them. The rising Turkish nationalist state and Communist Russia were determined to put an end to the Armenian state.

Late in the fall of 1920 Armenia was attacked both by the Turks and the Soviets. In a few weeks it was overrun by both. By early December independent Armenia was no more. Then the Soviets set up the Soviet Socialist Armenian Republic within the Soviet Union, and that is the only trace left of the short-lived independent Armenia. But the idea of freedom and independence lives on in Armenia, in the hearts and souls of the Armenian people, and they celebrate their Independence Day as a most memorable event in their turbulent history.

Thirtieth Anniversary of the REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the State of Georgia, I wish to bring the attention of the House to a most significant anniversary which occurred this month—the 30th birthday of the Rural Electrification Administration.

I deem it an honor and a privilege to make this tribute because it was from our State that two of the more outstanding events occurred which made possible the electrification of rural America and the ability to reach unserved farms which would have never been served in any other way.

Although REA is 30 years old, it was as far back as 1924 that Franklin Delano Roosevelt first began thinking about the problem of electrifying rural America. In August 1938, in a speech at Barnesville, Ga., President Roosevelt gave this account of the birth of REA:

Fourteen years ago, a Democratic Yankee came to a neighboring county in your State in search of a pool of warm water wherein he might swim his way back to health. There was only one discordant note in that first stay of mine at Warm Springs. When the first-of-the-month bill came in for electric light for my little cottage, I found that the charge was 18 cents a kilowatt-hour—about four times what I pay at Hyde Park, N.Y. That started my long study of public utility charges for electric current and the whole subject of getting electricty into farm homes * * *. So it can be said that a little cottage at Warm Springs, Ga., was the birthplace of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Today a suitable plaque and marker at Warm Springs remind visitors that here arose the circumstances which started the search and inspired the efforts to light up rural America and bring the blessings of abundance of electric power to the farm homes of this great country of ours.

At the time President Roosevelt issued his executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration, only 6,956 farms in Georgia had service, 2.8 percent of the farms. The national average then was 10.8 percent of the farms electrified and we in Georgia were only a fourth of the national average. In August 1935, REA approved its first loan to the Peach State, and in June of 1936 the first line was energized.

Today 69,000 miles of line are reaching 368,000 rural consumers as a result of this most significant program, one which has done more to change the lives and living conditions of rural Georgia than anything else. The investment to serve these fellow Georgians totals over $166 million and it is being handled through interest-bearing loans to 45 borrowers, of which 44 are nonprofit electric cooperatives.

What a contrast. In 1935, only 2.8 percent of our farms had electric service. Today 98.8 percent of the 92,000 farms in the State are served. And of that percent, three-fourths have received service made possible by REA loans.

But this fine record, repeated in most of the States throughout our Nation, would not have been possible but for a most significant milestone sponsored by a Georgia Congressman. I refer, of course, to Stephen Pace. It was his bill in 1944 which made a significant change in the interest rate on REA loans and the payout period. His legislation removed the shackles which prevented REA from moving ahead rapidly to electrify rural America and reach those thinly settled areas to which no one else could ever bring electric service using conventional means and methods.

The goal of area coverage received concrete support through the provisions of the Pace Act. Farms never before capable of receiving electric service now found this great modern invention capable of application and aid in increasing farm production and making us the greatest food-producing Nation the world has ever seen.

The Pace Act set a uniform, firm interest rate. This made it possible for directors of the hundreds of electric systems to plan their future expansions on a sound basis, without jeopardizing the ability to repay loans on the earlier sections they had built. By extending the payout period the Pace Act provided an extra margin of credit which enabled the REA borrowers to expand and serve more consumers without endangering their ability to meet payments on what had already been borrowed and invested.

Because more money is invested in the electric power business than any other business in this country and because investment capital plays such a large role in developing additional electric service, the wise provisions of the Pace Act made possible one of the most remarkable loan repayment records in the history of finance.

By the first of this year, REA borrowers in Georgia had made a total of $78,297,355 in payments on their Government loans. These included $48 million repaid on principal as due, $6 million of principal repaid ahead of schedule, and interest payments of $24 million. No borrower was overdue in its payments.

The record is also outstanding in the other 45 States in which REA has made loans. The money invested in rural electric systems is coming back to the U.S. Treasury on schedule and even ahead of the contract payment dates.

From time to time there has been opinion voiced that the interest rate set by the Pace Act is not high enough. Yet we must consider that in my State of Georgia, the REA-financed systems, with three-fourths of all the rural load, are still averaging only 4.3 consumers per mile and annual revenue of $437 per mile.

In Georgia, as in the other States, for every $1 invested in our electric lines, the consumers have spent $5 in wiring their homes and farmsteads and getting appliances with which to use the electricity now available to them. In 1953 the average monthly consumption was 208 kilowatt-hours. By 1963 the average had risen to 450 kilowatt-hours, more than double. And it is continuing to rise and double every 8 to 10 years.

Surveys have shown that the nearly 1,000 REA electric borrowers have created a new rural market for over a billion and a quarter dollars for equipment and appliances. Here is a stimulus to the economy which could not be reached in any other way. Workers in the cities, manufacturers everywhere have greater demand for their products as a result of rural electrification. Yes, REA can be proud of the record it has made.

Laurie W. Tomlinson—An Exemplary Public Servant Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the career Federal employee always earns and deserves high standing in our Government. Particularly in Congress we have learned to respect these men and women who dedicate their lives to their country, and we count on them to help us serve our constituencies in a prompt and fair manner.

One distinguished career employee and officer of the Government retires on May 31, 1965, in Jacksonville, Fla., where he went to work for the Internal Revenue Service as a clerk in 1933.

He is Laurie W. Tomlinson, who graduated from the University of Florida law school, and worked up the ladder from an IRS clerk, to chief field deputy in Florida in 1937, to assistant collector in 1949, and to District Director for Florida in 1952.

Laurie W. Tomlinson is an exemplary public servant. Not only did he perform an outstanding service to the Nation in his 32 years with the IRS—that saw the Florida IRS collections grow from $7½ million in 1933 to approximately $2 billion in 1965—but he was also a civic leader of his community. He served many organizations, including the presidency of the Jacksonville Exchange Club and of the Family Consultation Service, and he also served on the board of directors and executive committee of the Community Chest-United Fund.

On May 24, 1965, a large group of Laurie Tomlinson's friends, fellow IRS directors and employees honored him in Jacksonville, Fla. With him were his wife of 30 years—Isabel Tomlinson; his mother, his son, Laurie, Junior, and his daughter, Mrs. Joe J. Stephenson. They all received the blessings of his fellow workers.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the House the following article from the Florida Times-Union, a fitting tribute to this man's great service to our Nation:

AFTER 32 YEARS: IRS BOSS TOMLINSON RETIRES

(By Dick Crouch, Times-Union staff writer)

Florida's Federal tax boss last night got a retirement farewell from the people who know him best—the employes of the Internal Revenue Service.

Some 500 persons gathered at the Robert Meyer Hotel to say goodby to Laurie W. Tomlinson, Director of IRS' Florida district since 1952. He is retiring May 31.

The occasion brought out the brass from Washington as well as local clerks and secretaries. Tomlinson's successor, F. S. Schmidt, who will be sworn in this morning, also was there.

Leading the Washington delegation was Bertrand M. Harding, IRS Deputy Commissioner (the No. 2 job). Heading the regional visitors was W. J. Bookholt, of Atlanta, Commissioner of the southeastern division.

The evening brought out some little-known facts about Tomlinson, who went to work for IRS 32 years ago at $24 a week and now earns $24,000 a year.

The son of a physician, he was born in Lake Butler and lived in Starke and Lake Wales as a boy. He earned his allowance working in a drugstore and a nursery.

After he was graduated from the University of Florida Law School, he practiced for 2 years in Lakeland before joining IRS.

That was in 1933 when Franklin D. Roosevelt became President, which means Tomlinson has served five men of the White House—something few men in Government can boast.

Last night, he received gifts and honors from two employee unions—the National Association of Internal Revenue Employes and the American Federation of Government Employes—and his fellow directors from other IRS districts.

Isabel Tomlinson, his wife of 30 years, was also honored. She recalled her early years as a nursing trainee at Riverside Hospital and how they struggled like everybody else during the great depression.

Mr. and Mrs. Tomlinson's two children also were on hand—Laurie Jr. and Mrs. Joe J. Stephenson. So was his mother.

Although Tomlinson faces retirement (and a week's cruise) with mixed emotions, a poetic employee of his perhaps summed up his feelings best

"No more taxpayers to sue."

President's Action in Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Reno Evening Gazette, Reno, Nev., on May 6, 1965. The editorial sums up my sentiment on President Johnson's action in the Dominican Republic:

PREVENTING ANOTHER CUBA

President Johnson's prompt dispatch of troops into the Dominican Republic to protect American lives and property has the wide approval of American citizens, most of whom realize that decisive action could prevent that Caribbean country from becoming another Cuba.

The President was aware that his move could bring a storm of protest from some quarters. The Latin American nationalists promptly raised the familiar charge of "Yankee imperialism" and "gunboat diplomacy." Expected, of course, was a similar chorus from the Communist countries and from some European quarters where criticism of the United States is a common theme.

The Communist hand in the Dominican civil war already is apparent, and it is also evident that Fidel Castro's agitators have taken a hand in the uprising.

Had the United States acted with such firmness and dispatch at the start of Fidel Castro's revolution in Cuba, it is possible that that island would not have gone through the torment it has experienced in the last 6 years, and the United States would not be faced with a Communist outpost just 90 miles from its shore.

Address by Hon. Carlton R. Sickles at the Graduation Ceremonies of the University of Maryland's School of Social Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a speech delivered last night by my Maryland colleague, Congressman CARLTON R. SICKLES, at the graduation ceremonies of the University of Maryland's School of Social Work in Baltimore.

In his message, Congressman SICKLES impressed upon these emerging professional social workers the importance of harmonious cooperation between public and volunteer agencies, between professional workers and the subprofessional indigenous poor who must be involved in current antipoverty and social welfare operations.

Representative SICKLES' speech follows:

SOCIAL WORK ON THE MOVE

(By Congressman CARLTON R. SICKLES)

I am delighted to be with you on this important occasion.

I commend you who have recently finished the arduous study required for a master's degree in social work, for not having been done the easy thing and decided at some point along the way that you could just as well pursue your career without full professional education.

In earning your master's degree you have equipped yourself to be a leader in the centuries-old effort to see that all of mankind have an equal chance for happiness and satisfaction.

You have earned the right to have your professional judgment respected—and acted upon. You have shown your willingness to tackle jobs that require responsible and decisive action. You have demonstrated your patriotism—for the social well-being of our Nation depends on the social well-being of her people.

Your master's degree means that you have the knowledge and the professional competence to carry out responsible missions in the congested quarters of the inner city and in the barren hollows of Appalachia. You understand and know what should be done about crowded housing, illiteracy and lack of skills, sickly bodies, and—more damaging than all the rest—bias and bigotry—aimed at people solely because they are poor, or poor and dark skinned.

The opportunities to practice your new profession stretch widely across the professional horizon.

Your skills and judgment and your prestige would be equally welcome in dozens of agencies, schools, hospitals, churches, and institutions throughout Maryland and, indeed the Nation. You are badly needed by hundreds upon hundreds of families, children, and adults who are suffering from social, health, and economic problems in every community in this land.

Wherever you go, I am confident that you will be appreciated because the demands upon your profession are greater than ever before.

The rapid growth of our national population—with the great increases in the proportion of young people and the elderly—is, in itself, a major challenge to the social welfare field. Child welfare and health agencies are bursting at the seams and waiting lists are long. Many of the children who need help most are not receiving it because we do not yet have the staffs and the programs to reach out to them and their parents.

Similarly, facilities and services for senior citizens—despite the widespread interest and activity in this field—have not been able to keep pace with the expanding population of the aged.

In our large cities, problems are further complicated by many other changes. Large numbers of relatively unskilled newcomers came to our cities in response to the need for workers during the two decades following the Second World War.

They have now found, in too many cases, that their job opportunities have disappeared with the impact of automation and the large number of unskilled applicants.

Unskilled workers in all age groups and in all parts of the country are feeling the pressure of technological change. While new opportunities are opening rapidly for the highly skilled worker, the worker with few skills has found his future darkened and his hope dimmed.

Statistically we know that nearly one-fifth of all American families, including one-fourth of all of our children, are living in poverty today. We are confronted by a critical situation whose solution will require the best efforts of all of us.

Our cities are involved in an especially difficult set of problems: the high concentrations of population; the continuing decay of the slums, which get older every year and would be decaying even if nobody lived in them; the serious lack of sufficient recreational and cultural facilities in neighborhoods where they are needed the most; and the urgent shortages of health and medical care that press most tightly on those with low incomes. The list of problems that complicate the lives of the poor could be extended almost indefinitely.

It was considerations such as these that led the President to declare unconditional war on poverty in America; to propose the antipoverty bill—the Economic Opportunity Act—which was enacted last year; and to urge a series of measures relating to education, health, welfare, air and water pollution, and urban development.

It was similar considerations that led 3 years ago to the passage of the 1962 public welfare amendments to the Social Security Act, the most far reaching attempt to improve our public welfare programs since they were initiated 30 years ago. These amendments have made possible a wide range of progressive changes in our public welfare programs. I don't need to remind this group that the potential benefits of this historic legislation are only beginning to be realized. States were given a 5-year period in which to fully establish the greatly expanded social services authorized by the 1962 amendments. It was expected also that it would take this period of time to get into full operation the staff development programs that would train the increased numbers of public welfare employees who would be needed to carry out these social services.

Along with this tremendous surge of activity in public health and welfare programs, voluntary agencies throughout the Nation are asking themselves challenging questions about their own programs: Who needs services? What kinds of services are needed? How can changing programs be formulated

to meet changing needs? How is the role of the voluntary agencies changing as public programs are changed?

These questions are crucial. We are living in a period of rapid social and economic change, confronted simultaneously by untold opportunities and telling problems. We can look toward the future with great hope because we now have the economic capability to eliminate poverty. But we must look toward and immediate future filled with the complex social challenges that change inevitably brings.

One of the things I want to stress in my remarks to you this evening is the vital importance of pulling together. Call it interagency cooperation, teamwork, or whatever you want—time is too short, lives are too precious, for two agencies or two workers to dissipate their energies in an argument about which one of them will do what part of the job. You know, there is a lot of criticism of bureaucracy in the Federal Government. Some of it may be deserved, some of it may not. I dare say that all organizations—private business, military, even religious bodies—fall victim to this malady. However common it may be, may I urge you to be constantly on guard against this hindrance to effective social welfare programs.

I caution you to watch for 'bureauitis" in every phase of community activity. It can paralyze the operation of a single welfare agency. It can render ineffectual the working relationship between two welfare agencies or between a welfare agency and a health agency. It can erode the mutual trust and respect that a public agency and a voluntary agency should have for each other and the saddest thing of all is that not the workers in these agencies, but the helpless people who depend on the agencies will be the full recipients of the grief that stems from this lack of cooperation.

There is an old saying that might help to clarify what I have been talking about. It goes like this: "In any endeavor requiring the efforts of several people, you can see to it that something is accomplished, or you get credit for it, but you can't do both."

There is another area that deserves as much attention as the smooth cooperation between all of the various agencies and people whose prime object is helping to alleviate the unhappy conditions that lead to and result from poverty. And this is the use of new theories and methods.

In speaking of this, I do not want to diminish in any way your respect for the classical approaches as used by social workers. Your profession has developed a valuable body of knowledge, and I heartily commend to you the full use of proven procedures. However, the very scope of our present social problems indicates that we must all be more alert and imaginative.

We are living in a period of transition, in which we recognize the insufficiency of some of our earlier methods of dealing with social ills. There is a great ferment across the country in the evaluation of existing structures—the development of research, the testing of new approaches, the use of new techniques—activities which the Federal Government is encouraging and helping to support.

The entitlement of people in need to receive adequate public assistance, medical care, social services, and other benefits which are accepted as appropriate for the use of public funds, should be the same wherever a person lives in this Nation.

This concept of equal entitlement is inherent in our democratic philosophy. But it can be fully realized only if every citizen recognizes that the problems and needs of his fellow citizens are indeed his concern, and if he acts on this concern to assure that full advantage is taken of available resources and funds, both public and private, to provide the best possible programs in this State and community.

One of the surest safeguards for democratic social welfare programs is for agencies to involve the poor themselves in planning and carrying out the programs that are intended to help improve their conditions. I refer especially to the use of what social workers call "indigenous" leaders or helpers. These people come from—in fact, are part of—the disadvantaged communities they serve. They have a close personal knowledge and understanding of the kinds of people and problems with which the organized social work effort is dealing.

You have heard of many ways in which the indigenous leaders are used—as "team mothers" in elementary school programs where classroom teachers are not needed, such as testihg vision, conducting field trips, operating audiovisual equipment, and so forth. In social work settings, former juvenile offenders have been used for interviewing and research in juvenile delinquency. Public assistancce mothers whose children are of school age are used as homemakers and friendly visitors from homebound old-age assistance recipients.

As valuable as all these subprofessional services are, I believe that the most important function of an indigenous leader is to serve as a bridge between the poor and the larger community and indeed between the poor and the professional social worker. There is always the danger that professionals—and this goes for the doctor, the teacher, and the lawyer, as well as the social worker—fall into the practice of one-way communication in their effort to get their client to do what is considered good for him. By making greater use of local people from the slum neighborhoods, social workers can insure that the two-way communication they want and need will really exist. In this way, social workers and social agencies will have the latest and most accurate picture of who the poor really are, the problems they face, and what they need to solve these problems. And at the same time, the poor will be finding out that help is available, where to find it, and how to use it and they will be developing local leadership needed to enable them to cope with their problems.

In conclusion, I want to thank you for inviting me here tonight. It has been a great pleasure to share this momentous event with you.

As you go forth, keep your chin up and your sights high. There is a vitally-needed, important job for each one of you—whatever kind and combination of talents you have. Most of you will find your greatest career satisfaction in direct service to needy people. That is as it should be. Meeting human needs is the heart of your profession. But as time goes on, you will also help meet the demand for experienced people to take responsibility for supervision in social welfare agencies, for directing these agencies, and for service as planners and consultants to those who operate social welfare programs. There is plently of room at the top in this profession and I wish each and every one of you success in fulfilling your goals.

Professional Boxing Stinks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, professional boxing stinks.

Jane's Fighting Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, many of us have talked often about our concern over the Soviet Union's challenge to American seapower. An article by Lester Bell in the San Diego Union reports on recognition of this problem by Jane's Fighting Ships, an authoritative publication that has for years been evaluating the world's seapowers.

Jane's reports that the Russians are modernizing their naval power—changing to rockets and missiles from the heavy cruiser concept, and emphasizing development of nuclear power, especially in the field of submarines. According to Jane's directory, the Soviets now have 430 submarines, including 18 powered by nuclear reactors.

The Russians are also implementing their development of naval power with a comprehensive program of oceanography. They clearly intend to challenge us both on and under the seas. In addition to the naval might which we are turning out today, we need a sound program of oceanography to maximize its effectiveness and to keep up with Ivan in this fast-paced world of rapid change and scientific advance.

I urge that my colleagues read this article by Mr. Bell. The text follows:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, May 2, 1965]

NEW JANE'S ISSUE WARNS OF RUSSIANS

(By Lester Bell)

WASHINGTON.—American admirals who have been warning about the growing menace of Soviet seapower have received a new boost from an independent source.

They find themselves echoed in the new edition of the authoritative Jane's Fighting Ships.

The editors of British-published Jane's say "there is no doubt the Soviet Navy is growing with the object of challenging U.S. supremacy at sea.

MANPOWER CUT

Jane's says a subtle change is at work in the Soviet Navy. It is changing from a colossus of the old experimental ships to a compact and streamlined fleet in keeping with technological advancements.

The transition to atomic power and missiles, in new hulls, has reduced the manpower requirement by 32 percent over the last few years, Jane's observes.

Despite Soviet protestations that a cruiser is outmoded, the Russians have added a new one. They have also brought out a new class of guided-missile destroyers, frigates, submarines, and missile-support ships.

Many torpedo patrol boats have been replaced by rocket carriers.

Jane's appraisal is that the missile-armed fast patrol boats "pose a massive threat to merchant shipping."

MANY SUBS

The most ominous threat, and one frequently cited, is the continuing buildup of the Russian ballistic-missile submarines, many with nuclear power.

Jane's reports eight Soviet E class atomic-powered submarines armed with bal-

tistic missiles. Some of these 6-tube launchers are now in the Pacific.

The "bible" of the world's navies also reports a new type of Russian ballistic-missile submarine, the H class of 10 nuclear-propelled submarines. "All are reported operational and on station," according to Jane's.

The Communists also are said to have 40 G and Z missile submarines, all conventionally powered and previously reported.

Jane's reports 430 Russian submarines, 30 with nuclear power. At least 100, including missile launchers, operate in the Pacific.

Son of Immigrant Wins Small Businessman of the Year Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on May 24 President Johnson presented the Small Businessman of the Year Award to 46-year-old Dominic Donatello, an Alaskan manufacturer, the son of an Italian immigrant, who turned a part-time basement business into a modern soap and animal feed plant employing seven persons. The President awarded the bronze plaque to Donatello at a ceremony in the White House rose garden for "best exemplifying the imagination, initiative, independence and integrity characteristic of America's millions of small businessmen."

Again and again I have reminded my colleagues in the Congress that there are hundreds and thousands of Donatellos in every country of the world, and if America is to remain strong, we cannot lose this brainpower. We cannot afford to lose the imaginative spirit of the pioneers, who developed and made America as strong as it is. These early pioneers possessed strength, determination, initiative, imagination and the ability to create. These very same qualities are reflected in Donatello's contribution to the United States.

Therefore I call upon the Members of the Congress to repeal the anti-American section of the present immigration law, the national origins quota system. Only in this way can we continue to portray to the world that we believe in the principles we enunciate, that all men are created in the image of God, and that all men are to be judged on their merits alone.

The article released by the Small Business Administration about Mr. Donatello follows:

Donatello was selected for the award by the National Advisory Council of the Small Business Administration in cooperation with the National Council for Small Business Management Development, a nonprofit organization interested in developing sound management techniques.

The award was originated last year by Small Business Administrator Eugene P. Foley and is a feature of National Small Business Week, first proclaimed in 1964 by President Johnson. This year, May 23–29 has been designated to mark the major role of small business in the economy.

Donatello's Don Chemical Co. produces soap, tallow, dog food, cattle food, bleach, floor waxes, industrial cleaners, liquid starch, and glycerin. His basic raw material, animal fat, is available in his area.

Through his own skill and ingenuity, he has succeeded in Alaska, a high-cost State which has little manufacturing and is chiefly dependent on goods from the other States. Donatello is working to lower the cost of living in the country's largest State.

And not only has he succeeded in making his products competitive with soap turned out in the lower 48, he has also done what was considered virtually impossible—he trucks soap powder to Seattle, Wash.

Born in Boston, the son of an immigrant Italian laborer, Donatello worked his way through the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He earned his degree in chemical engineering.

Don, as he is called by his associates, had his first taste of Alaska during World War II, when he served with the Army Air Force in the Aleutians. Enchanted by Alaska and seeing a big future for the sparsely populated Territory, he decided to make his home there.

He first went into business on a part-time basis making chlorine bleach at night and on weekends in his basement. He worked with 55-gallon drums and used gallon syrup bottles, and his sales were made in weekend stops at markets and laundries. It was a one-man operation.

Detecting a need for other cleaning products, Donatello became a distributor.

With business flourishing, in 1948 he went into business full time. The following year it became apparent he needed more space, and in the first of four expansions he moved from his basement workshop into two old dairy buildings with about 2,000 square feet of floor space.

In 1955, he again ran short of space. This time he borrowed $30,000 from a bank to erect a new building, renting half the space until he would expand again.

He soon needed more room and turned to the Small Business Administration for assistance. In 1958, he obtained two loans for $160,000 from SBA for new buildings and manufacturing equipment. The following year he got a third SBA loan, this time for $225,000 for further expansion, to give him 50,000 square feet of floor space. On each occasion a bank participated with SBA in the loans. And on each occasion he rented out half the space until he needed it.

Finally in 1962, he sold his distributorship and turned his attention entirely to manufacturing. His work force had now grown to seven.

By using the latest processing techniques to cut costs and by taking advantage of favorable trucking rates to Seattle, Donatello says he is able to keep competitive with manufacturers in the other States.

In addition to making Alaska self-supporting in his soap products, he is able to send about 30 tons of soap powder a month and 50 tons of glycerin a year to Seattle. He also sends meat meal to Seattle.

Through these shipments, Donatello has helped Alaska's own balance of payments by reversing the flow of soap powder.

He has also entered the international market, exporting tallow and meat meal to Japan.

But Donatello isn't stopping there.

He now has his sights set on cutting the cost of milk to Alaskan housewives by manufacturing pelletized cattle feed from surplus meat meal. By September he expects to begin turning out these pellets, which he estimates will cut the cost of cattle feed about $10 a ton and reduce the importing of expensive feed.

Donatello finds time to be active in community affairs, judging for science fairs and garden clubs and taking scouts and school children through his plant. He is a member of the American Chemical Society and the Association of Professional Engineers.

He is married to the former Jean Landstrom of Anchorage. They have five children, three girls and two boys, ranging in age from 4 to 17, (Elizabeth Ann, 17; George, 15; Mary Jean, 12; Ben, 10; Margaret Jo, 4).

War on Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, recently the Johnson administration has taken steps toward curbing the cancer of crime which is pervading our country by increasing proportions. The Federal Government must contribute to a nationwide program if we are to be successful in making the cities and streets of our Nation safe and secure. Of course, local problems need local solutions, but the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice will enable police organizations to get at the grassroots and thus deepen our understanding of the causes of crime and preventive means.

Our cities grow. Crime rates rise, and the fear of our citizens becomes more intense. Fortunately, President Johnson is taking steps in the right direction, realizing that no society can be great unless reverence for the law and obedience to the law are encouraged. Certainly, the keystone of public administration is effective law enforcement which depends, for the most part, upon well-trained, dedicated, adequately paid, and respected law enforcement officials.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the President's concern for police training, and I submit for the RECORD an excellent editorial, "War On Crime," from the April 21 edition of the Missourian, of Columbia, Mo.:

WAR ON CRIME

As a part of President Johnson's program for accelerating crime prevention, Justice Department lawyers are preparing legislation to spend millions of Federal dollars on police training.

The bill will request congressional appropriations to expand the Police Academy run by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Local lawmen attending the FBI Academy receive training in modern crime detection and preventive techniques such as fingerprinting, methods for keeping records on criminals and use of special equipment.

Since only top men are sent by the local police departments, another part of the bill would give others a chance at specialized law enforcement training.

Such policemen, the Justice Department has decided, can best be trained through colleges and universities which have specialized courses in criminology. This added program would eliminate the extra expense of decentralizing the FBI Academy or establishing similar academies throughout the country.

Fighting crime effectively under modern conditions requires professional police who are expertly trained in many skills.

President Johnson is taking a long-needed step in the right direction.

Naive Approach to Weapons Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, sportsmen, gun collectors, and a host of citizens in the 10th Congressional District are writing me their protests against pending firearms legislation. In my opinion they have every reason to be concerned because of the far-reaching provisions of the legislation the administration is supporting.

The Midland Daily News, one of Michigan's fine daily newspapers, very appropriately calls this a "naive approach to weapons control." The paper's editorial on the subject follows:

NAIVE APPROACH TO WEAPONS CONTROL

Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach used most of his testimony this week in support of the administration's gun control bill to attack the opposing view of the National Rifle Association.

He appeared to have become carried away with his own words when he termed the bill as part of a "nationwide battle against rape, robbery, muggings, and murder."

Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY did no better in his testimony attacking the "massive publicity campaign as doing this Nation a great disservice. He added that the proposed bill would save hundreds of lives in this country.

Let us examine what the bill is supposed to accomplish. It would require retail gun dealers to limit sales of hand guns to residents of their States; raise the annual license fee for dealers; and give the Secretary of the Treasury discretion on who should be licensed to manufacture, import, or deal in deadly weapons covered by the Federal Firearms Act.

Anyone who sincerely believes this legislation will save hundreds of lives or halt the illegal use of weapons is indeed naive.

It is one thing to remember that the accused slayer of the late President Kennedy used a mail order rifle.

It is quite another to assume that an individual, bent on assassination, will be unable to get his hands on a weapon.

Criminals do not abide by laws. It simply is not reasonable to expect them to obtain guns only from registered dealers.

Legislation which will but harass legitimate owners of firearms represents useless activity on the part of Government officials. It would be better if the money required for enforcement would be spent upon more adequate investigation and prevention of crime.

The major lesson learned at Dallas was that one branch of Government knew about a potentially dangerous character and did not effectively communicate with the other branch which was charged with guarding the life of the President.

The Attorney General also failed to mention an important fact regarding his statement that more than half the 8,500 murders each year are committed by firearms, many of them assurdly obtained by mail.

Omitted was the fact that most crimes of passion are committed by individuals who had a perfect right to own a weapon and who had no previous history of violence.

A true answer to the crime problem is not easily found. It may be that some form of weapons control law is desirable—along with other measures. But it is too much to expect that the mere passing of a law will be a panacea to the problems involved.

There is much work to be done in crime prevention and this includes early detection of potential killers and the finding of some way to keep them from carrying out their self-assigned missions.

Private Enterprise That Cares

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a unique and highly worthwhile undertaking by the Insurance Co. of North America has come to my attention which vividly illustrates how private enterprise can and is playing a significant role in aiding needy people throughout the world.

Each time an agent sells an INA commercial package insurance policy, a CARE package is shipped for a needy person in one of 38 countries in Europe in the name of the agent. The higher the premium, the larger the CARE package.

It is my belief that such a worthwhile program deserves recognition and applause. I am, therefore, placing in the RECORD a special report on this program by Bradford Smith, Jr., president of the Insurance Co. of North America as well as an article which appeared in the St. Petersburg Independent discussing local participation in this project. The articles follow:

INSURANCE AGENTS SHOW THEY CARE

A dozen independent insurance agencies in St. Petersburg, Pinellas Park, and the gulf beaches have become participants in the INA friendship program, a people-to-people humanitarian aid effort among 20,000 independent insurance agents and brokers in the United States and Canada, the Insurance Co. of North America, and CARE (Cooperative for America Relief Everywhere).

The program was initiated April 1. A CARE package is shipped to needy people in 38 countries in Europe, South America, Africa, or Asia in the name of the independent agent each time he sells an INA commercial package policy. The size of the CARE package shipped is determined through a point system based on the annual premium; the higher the premium, the larger the CARE package. The program has been specifically designed for commercial accounts, such as apartment houses, churches, hospitals, motels, office buildings, schools, colleges, merchants, funeral directors, and newspapers.

Associated with the program from this area are the following agents: Earle W. Day & Associates, 2828 Central Avenue; Foley-Carter Insurance Co., 550 First Avenue North; Given & Bushman Insurance, 840 34th Avenue North; John B. Green Insurance, Inc., First Federal Building; Muller, Stratton & Schroder, Inc., 2605 Ninth Street North; Mutual Insurance Agency of St. Petersburg, Inc., 1411 16th Street North; St. Petersburg Insurance Agency, 248 Third Street North; White & Associates, 5729 Central Avenue; Park Insurance Agency, 4250 Park Boulevard, Pinellas Park; The Fordham Agency, Inc., 85 150th Avenue, Madeira Beach; Cotter Agency, Inc., 6705 Gulf Boulevard, St. Petersburg Beach, and Victor J. Galinis Insurance Agency, 6705 Gulf Boulevard, St. Petersburg Beach.

A SPECIAL REPORT FROM BRADFORD SMITH, JR., PRESIDENT, INSURANCE CO. OF NORTH AMERICA

We've noticed a rare phenomenon in the United States during the past year. Our children—so often criticized by adults—are teaching us a lesson in civilized behavior.

They're asking probing questions. About American life. About worthwhile personal goals. About the business community and its role. They are searching for an opportunity to do something constructive * * * to give their careers a meaningful role in a complex and confusing world.

The remarkable success of the Peace Corps is a living monument to the sensible idealism of today's youth. It teaches a profound lesson in human relationships.

Young people, in particular, may be interested in a program of friendship here at Insurance Co. of North America.

Starting April 1—as the result of a special program worked out with our 20,000 independent agents and brokers, from southern California to northern Canada—a CARE package is being shipped out to Europe, South America, Africa or Asia for every INA "package" policy sold in the United States and Canada. Courtesy of the independent businessman who sold the package.

His profit? The satisfying realization that another human being will have a dream fulfilled. That undernourished children in a remote Colombian village, for example, will soon receive 1,296 glasses of milk because of his interest.

Our friendship program will continue through June.

It is an unusual—and inspiring—example, we think, of the expanding horizons of this unusual group of men. We are proud to join with them in this unique people-to-people program.

BRADFORD SMITH, Jr.

Annual Awards Banquet of Archbishop Carroll High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, last evening in the Shoreham Hotel, the annual awards banquet of Archbishop Carroll High School was held, at which time a number of the student body were accorded recognition for their achievements and participation in school events. The principal speaker at this event was Mr. Joseph San Fellipo, head of the school's history department, and his talk to parents and students was rich in thought and soul searching. Mr. San Fellipo's remarks, which I believe are inspiring, follow:

REMARKS BY MR. JOSEPH SAN FELLIPO AT THE ARCHBISHOP CARROLL HIGH SCHOOL ANNUAL AWARDS BANQUET

Tonight we are here to honor and to give awards to the doers of our student body—to those who by their own volition have laid to rest the outmoded idea that the schoolday spans only the hours of 9 to 3. These young men are living testimony to the fact that the schooldays begin when the first club meets in the morning and ends only when time precludes further service to Archbishop Carroll High School. From a club meeting before classes to a football practice ending at sundown; from serving Mass in the morning to ushering at a play at night, this is their schoolday. Their schedule reads like that of every student enrolled—9 to 2:56—but they are not satisfied by this, no matter how rewarding the classes within these hours. They demand more, they are entitled to more, and to our utmost capabilities, we, their teachers, and you, their parents, must give them these additional opportunities for enrichment. They are not satisfied with merely the routine—though they recognize its values—they are seeking exhileration. President Johnson summarized it in his inaugural: "It is the excitement of becoming, always becoming, trying, probing, falling, resting, and trying again, but always trying and always gaining." This is what our students seek.

Presuming upon my own experience over the past years at Carroll, I find four common threads woven throughout the lives of all of our students who are seeking what President Johnson calls "the excitement of becoming." First, they possess a determination to live a life of service; second, they show a true love of their fellow man which in turn reflects their love of God; third, they exhibit an ability to laugh, to enjoy the life they are part of; and fourth, they display a personal decision to learn and grow in understanding. In summary, they are determined to live, love, laugh, and learn. Let us look at these traits.

First, to live a life of service. All too often our attention is drawn to what I consider to be the minority of the youth of America. We hear of the rebellious youths who, having seen only a small portion of the world and the society in which they are to live, find it convenient to turn away from that society and to defy it and the standards it has set. This is retreat. Second, we hear of the conformist youths who placidly sit on the sidelines waiting for graduation into the world and society. Unwilling to exert themselves, their sole aim becomes one of compromising with society. They hang a "Do not disturb" sign upon their minds and ignore all the turbulence and change around them. They close their eyes to excitement. They merely exist. The rebellious youth, the conformist youth, these we hear much about; but, overlooked too often, is the type of young man present tonight. These young men will not retreat from the world, nor will they blindly conform. They wish to dedicate themselves to the community in which they live. They wish to serve their community by strengthening the good they see and by sharing in the responsibility of correcting its weaknesses. They accept authority as exercised by others and appreciate the achievements of the generations that have gone before, but they are quick to challenge authority if they see it used without justice or prudence. They are unwilling to say that the world they are to inherit is ideal. They have been charged with a challenge to take this world and to change it, not for the sake of change, but for its improvement. They recognize that the word "change" and the word "upheaval" are not always synonymous. Dedicated to probing, challenging, changing, they willingly offer of their time and talents. Within the school community we see these students offering to serve. They could easily step aside and leave to others the burdens of responsibility, but they prefer to assume their responsibilities. They have volunteered for service and have performed in a manner that brings credit on themselves and our school. They have made a personal commitment to serve Carroll today; they make the same commitment of service to their parish, State, and Nation.

Love of their fellow man and of God is the second trait I have seen displayed by these young men. I have never known a student to volunteer to serve in any activity solely out of selfish ambition. The few who may have joined for this purpose have never succeeded. They quickly find out that every organization at Carroll is permeated by a feeling of comradeship, by a sense of sharing in the probing, falling, resting, and trying again. We do not have, we do not want, one-man organizations at Carroll. A primary purpose of every club or society must be to develop in the student an awareness of the dignity of his fellow students. Today they seek common goals of an immediate nature—victory over an opposing team, a round of applause at a recital, a trophy symbolizing efforts well done. From all of this grows the greater realization that all of them share a common goal of an ultimate nature: the achievement of heaven.

The third common thread found running through the lives of those meriting awards is, I submit, the ability to laugh, to enjoy life, to secure a sense of satisfaction out of life. Those capable of work, mental or physical, and who sit idly by and do nothing, exist in the world; they do not enjoy it. Enjoyment comes from the satisfaction of having acted. Enjoyment is participation; it is the giving of oneself. It involves work. Out of this work, whether it be training on an athletic team or writing for the newspaper, comes the sense of satisfaction, the feeling of enjoyment, the knowledge that they have given of themselves and the realization that, in turn, they have been part of a common enterprise. They have lived, they have loved, and they can laugh.

Finally, in each student there can be found the desire to learn. They recognize the importance of their formal classroom training but they have also decided that other forms of training can augment this. Their energy is boundless. They go out for and participate in physical training, joining a wrestling team, a track team, a tennis team, a golf team; they seek intellectual training through membership in the student council, the National Honor Society, the Crescent, the yearbook, forensics, and the library club. Already finding moral guidance in the caseroom they turn to the Sanctuary Society, the Catholic Student Mission Crusade and numerous other activities. Desiring to live a full life, and active life, they seek every outlet available. They seek to grow in knowledge and understanding, probing, falling, resting, and trying again, but always gaining.

Thus far I have directed myself to the question: What motivates the student? And I suggest that it is their desire to live, love, laugh and learn. Now, I would ask what can you, the parents, and we, the faculty, do to encourage the students.

To the parents I would suggest that you can continue to encourage your sons in their extracurricular pursuits, that you accept these pursuits as part of his total education. We must share in the enrichment of his life. By your example you are best able to train him in family life and in parish life. You have the opportunity to control the caliber and character of his intellectual and social pursuits. The faculty and the school can and will try to help you, but we cannot replace you. Seize at every chance your opportunities to complete your son's total education.

To my colleagues of the faculty I offer only one suggestion. Let us continue to expand the efforts we are already making to enrich the lives of our students. Let us join their parents in the effort to bring our students to the fulfillment of their potential. You, the Augustinians, members of an order dedictaed to the teaching of youth, we, the lay members of the faculty, dedicated to the same goal, must continue to realize that the education of the young man entrusted to us cannot be accomplished in 6 hours of classroom contact. We cannot at 3 o'clock, shift all responsibility back to the parents; we cannot on Friday, deny any further responsibility until Monday morning. The primary responsibility for education is the parents, but we share in that responsibility. Regardless of the time of day or the day of the week, their actions form part of our history. Our present students and the students who have preceded them and those who will follow them form part of our history. Ralph Waldo Emerson said: "There is properly no history, only biography." In a sense, the lives of our students form our history. Working together, parents, faculty and students, we shall write a history of Carroll that will give true and significant meaning to our motto—"for God and country."

Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the May 26 meeting of the Republican policy committee, the committee voted not to endorse H.R. 7984, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, in its present form. This action was taken because the rent supplement proposal that is contained in section 101 of this bill is completely unacceptable. It is a complete departure from the ordinary American way of doing things.

Today, in the New York Times, Mr. Arthur Krock has devoted his entire article to section 101 of the housing and urban development bill. In this article he quotes at great length from the views that were filed by the minority members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. He also states:

> The rent supplement plan is merely the latest, though the most extreme, expression of the political philosophy which would create an egalitarian socioeconomy, irrespective of individual merit, with subsidies financed by the ambitious, the industrious, and the worthy. If section 101 is rejected by Congress, this will be the reason.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very thought-provoking article regarding one of the most important questions that will be presented to Congress. It is imperative that every Member of Congress and every citizen carefully study this rent supplement proposal so that the full implication of its extreme provisions will be known and understood by all prior to the time that it is presented for a vote.

I am confident that the American public and this Congress will refuse to accept this incredibly wide-open subsidy

proposal once they are fully advised as to its potential evils.

In order that Mr. Krock's fine article, the views of the minority members of the House Banking and Currency Committee and the statement of the House Republican policy committee may be available to everyone, I am including them as part of these remarks.

We cannot endorse, H.R. 7984, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 in its present form.

The administration's rent supplement proposal contained in section 101 of this bill is completely unacceptable. The proposal would kill the initiative of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts. It would kill the incentive for home ownership and would make renters the wards of the Government. It is a complete departure from the ordinary American way of doing things.

From the outset of the hearings on this bill it has been apparent that section 101, rent supplements, was in deep trouble. Even those persons who normally support broader housing legislation have been unrelenting in their criticism.

The proposed program is essentially a subsidy for middle-income families including those well above median income level. It is a program without effective standards and qualifications.

We are certain that the American public will refuse to buy this incredibly wide open subsidy proposal once it is fully advised as to the potential evils of the program. This is a system of making the rent dollar of the beneficiary worth up to double or more the rent dollar of the unassisted taxpayer. It is unequal opportunity in housing by Government fiat. It is legislated discrimination against the self-sufficient citizen.

The Republican policy committee urges that section 101, the rent supplement proposal, be stricken from the bill.

The article and minority views follow:

IN THE NATION: PAYING OTHER PEOPLE'S RENT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 26.—Of all the legislation proposed by President Johnson for the attainment of what he calls the Great Society, none has raised a more basic issue of political philosophy than section 101 of the administration's housing and urban development bill. This sets forth the rent supplement plan whereby the difference between one-fourth of the income of an applicant for decent housing and its fair market rental would be made up by Government subsidies extracted from the taxpayers in general.

THE MINORITY REPORT

Although the House Committee on Banking and Currency approved the measure by a vote of 26 to 7, grounds for a much stronger opposition to section 101, when it reaches the floor, have been supplied by the minority members of the committee. After a doctrinal attack on the rent supplement plan as the way to economic integration of housing and to the socialistic state, the minority report exposes serious flaws af draftmanship which could be exploited by the Administrator of the program to calculate supplemental rent subsidies on the test of what housing an applicant wants instead of what he actually needs.

While such a flagrant abuse of authority is improbable, the wording of the administration bill does make it possible. But among the sounder points in the minority report are these:

The [subsidy] formula kills the incentive of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts. A family with $250 a month income could live in a $100 a month apartment and pay rent of only $62.50. The disincentive to improve accommodations is readily apparent. It can live in the same $100 a month apartment with $150 a month income as it could if it increased its income to $400 a month.

To own one's own home, no matter how modest, is the goal of the typical American family. The rent supplement kills that incentive. Why strive to own a $7,500 home when for approximately the same monthly outlay for housing (under FHA home-purchase underwriting standards) it could rent a dwelling unit (which, by current estimates, will cost the Government $12,500 to $25,000 to construct)?

"We were told by the Housing Administor * * * that [this] is an experimental program. But involved is authorization [for him] to enter into 40-year contracts with approved housing owners to pay them rent subsidies in amounts not exceeding $50 million prior to July 1, 1966, which maximum would be increased by $50 million on July 1 in each of the years 1966, 1967, and 1968. * * * By fiscal year 1968, $200 million-a-year annual payment contracts would be outstanding, extending for 40 years * * * or potentially an $8 billion program that could extend to the year 2008. To us, that is a whale of an 'experimental' program."

IMPLICATIONS

"Moreover, section 101 states that a family must first pay 25 percent of its income for rent before receiving * * * Federal rent supplements. * * * The rent gougers and absentee slum landlords in urban areas would waste little time [in demanding the same percentage of their tenants.] Their justification * * *? The national standard set by the Federal Government. * * * Precedent for [such] widespread landlords' checks on tenant income * * * would be found in the proposed means test [which, according to testimony by the Housing Administrator], is to be employed in administering rent supplements. * * * The profound economic and social effects [of a private rental requirement of 25 percent of income] can be seen in administration testimony * * * that in 1960 the typical American family paid 13.6 percent of its income for rent."

UNEQUAL OPPORTUNITY

"This [the rent supplement plan] is a system of making the rent dollar of the beneficiary worth up to double or more the rent dollar of the unassisted taxpayer. It is unequal opportunity in housing by Government fiat. It is legislated discrimination against the self-sufficient citizen."

To which could be added that the rent supplement plan is merely the latest, though the most extreme, expression of the political philosophy which would create an egalitarian socioeconomy, irrespective of individual merit, with subsidies financed by the ambitious, the industrious, and the worthy. If section 101 is rejected by Congress, this will be the reason.

For, though the adverse points made by the committee minority are weakened only by the exaggeration of a couple of them, the real issue is whether the Federal Union is to undergo its greatest transformation thus far into a collectivist state.

MINORITY VIEWS

THE ADMINISTRATION'S RENT SUPPLEMENT PROPOSAL

Introduction

The administration's rent supplement proposal contained in section 101 of this bill is foreign to American concepts.

The proposal kills the incentive of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts.

It kills the incentive for homeownership; it makes renters wards of the Government.

It is a system of economic integration of housing through Government subsidy.

It is the way of the socialistic state.

Killing incentive

Under section 101(d) of the bill, the Housing Administrator may subsidize a tenant's rent in an amount up to the difference between the fair market rental for the unit and one-fourth of the tenant's income.

That formula kills the incentive of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts. A family with $3,000 a year income—$250 a month—could live in a $100 a month apartment and pay rent of only $62.50 a month (one-fourth of income) with the Government providing a subsidy of $37.50 a month (difference between one-fourth of tenant's income and market rent for the unit). The disincentive of the family to improve its housing accommodations is readily apparent. Should that $250 a month family's income increase to $300 a month, its rent payment would increase to $75 a month, and the Federal subsidy would drop to $25 a month. And, of course, if the family's income increased to $400 a month, it would pay the full market rent of $100 a month as one-fourth of family income of $400 a month would equal full market rent for the unit. In other words, the family with $250 a month income has no incentive to improve its living accommodations by increasing its earnings to enable it to rent better accommodations. It can live in the same accommodations with $250 a month income as it could if it increased its income to $400 a month.

The formula also produces another type of disincentive to a family improving its living accommodations by its own efforts. That $250-a-month-income family might decide it wants to live in a $200-a-month apartment instead of the $100-a-month unit. Under the formula it could do so. And under the other proposed provisions of this section, this still would be true. The primary requirement for a qualified tenant is that he be unable to obtain standard privately owned housing at a rental no more than one-fourth of his income. As far as the proposed law is concerned, that standard housing could be standard housing suitable to the tenant's needs or suitable to his desires. The administrator could decide either way. The family would pay the same one-fourth of its income as rent or $62.50 a month and the Government would pay an increased subsidy of $137.50 a month to make up the balance of the fair market rent for the unit. Under the formula the way to better housing is increased Federal subsidy rather than increased individual effort.

When another head of a family earning $400 a month and paying $100-a-month rent—without any help from Uncle Sam—saw that his neighbor, earning far less than he, was able to move into a much better apartment with no increase in his rent payments, he suddenly would wake up to the possibility of the fomula. This family, otherwise eligible for rent supplements, by free choice could be living in standard but crowded quarters. The head of the family simply does not want to allocate more than $100 a month of his income to housing. With the balance of his income he prefers to enjoy other amenities of life, such as a second car or an extra week's vacation. Rent supplement is his easy way out. He would be eligible for subsidy in a more expensive apartment. He, too, would move to the $200-a-month apartment. He would continue to pay only 100 a month of this income as rent because the Government would provide the other $100 a month necessary to cover the market rent for the unit.

This formula is a formula for killing the American incentive system of improving one's lot by one's own effort. This would be keeping up with the Joneses via Federal subsidies.

Threat to homeownership

To own one's own home, no matter how modest, is the goal of the typical American family. The rent supplement kills the incentive of a family to achieve that goal. Under FHA underwriting standards a family with $3,000-a-year income can afford to purchase a home costing 2½ times that amount or a $7,500 home. The housing cost of such a home would approximate $60 a month. But as noted in the illustration above, the $3,000-a-year family by paying $62.50 a month as rent could live in a partially federally subsidized $100-a-month rental unit. The cost of such a dwelling unit would approximate $12,500. Or, as above noted, that same family could also live in a $200-a-month rental unit and pay only $62.50 of its income a month as rent with the balance of $137.50 paid by the Government under the rent supplement formula. The cost of the $200-a-month rental unit would approximate $25,000. Why would a family strive to own a $7,500 home when for approximately the same monthly outlay for housing it could rent a $12,500 or $25,000 cost dwelling unit? Not alone would the rent supplement proposal kill incentive for homeownership, it also would be a powerful incentive for a family to discontinue howeownership and become a renter on the Federal dole. That runs counter to the American way of life.

Absurd formula

Although the subsidy formula contains no dollar amount limitations, indirectly there is a dollar limitation because of the maximum mortgage amount per unit in the FHA section 221(d)(3) program. This is the existing FHA program which would have to be utilized in financing the project. That maximum mortgage amount under existing law is $29,000 for a three or more bedroom unit, in an elevator-type building in a high cost area. This would be left unchanged in this bill for a three-bedroom unit but would be increased to $32,987.50 per unit for a four or more bedroom unit under the provisions of section 203(d) of this bill. Such a four-bedroom, two-and-a-half-bath unit would rent for approximately $315 a month. A large, qualified tenant family with only $250-a-month income could live in such a unit with the Government paying a subsidy of $252.50 a month to make up the balance of the market rent for this unit.

But even this does not measure the full amount of Federal subsidy that could be paid. Under FHA mortgage insurance programs, the mortgage limitation is satisfied if the average mortgage for the units in the project does not exceed the mortgage limitation per unit. FHA insured projects can and do have penthouses and our theoretical project would be no exception. It could have a penthouse costing $100,000 and renting for $800 a month.

The occupant could be a large family eligible for rent supplements, with its entire income derived solely from public assistance payments. Under section 101(d) of this bill the tenant's income for purposes of the formula is the "tenant's income as determined by the Administrator pursuant to procedures and regulations established by him" [emphasis supplied]. With this discretionary authority the Housing Administrator might determine that public assistance payments should not be included in tenant's income for purposes of the formula. Accordingly, this family's income would be zero. Applying the formula, one-fourth of the tenant's zone income equals zero, so the tenant would pay no rent. Under the formula the Federal rent supplement may not exceed the difference between one-fourth of the tenant's income and the fair market rental for the unit. So zero (one-fourth of the tenant's zero income) from $800 a month (the fair market rental) leaves the Government paying the full $800 a month market rent as a subsidy. The welfare family can live in the luxurious penthouse.

Fantastic? Of course the results are fantastic. Ridiculous? Of course the results are ridiculous. Absurd? Of course, the results are absurd. But they square with the rent supplement formula. It shows just how fantastic, how ridiculous, and how absurd that formula is.

Surely the Congress could devise more sensible limitations than the wideopen, socialistic subsidy formula contained in section 101 of the bill. The Housing Administrator submitted testimony to the committee (p. 255 of hearings) that under the rent supplement program:

"It should be possible to accommodate families with incomes of between $3,500 and $6,000 in larger cities and between $3,000 and $5,000 in smaller cities where costs are generally lower."

If that really is the objective of the program, then why not write those limitations into the law?

Economic integration

From a social standpoint, few would argue that one man's rental dollar should buy as much in the way of shelter as another's, within the same general area of our country. Moreover, we can support the goal of those who view with alarm the proliferation of drab Federal housing ghettos, built to accommodate a rigid and disheartening packing together of computerized equals.

But, in the disguise of calling for action against these pockets of federally sponsored sameness in our cities and towns that have low-rent public housing, the administration has recommended a program that would force—with the power of the Federal dollar—what we choose to term "across-the-board economic integration." This runs through the thinking on the rent supplement proposal, as well as the various land development programs contained within other sections of this bill.

Within broad areas of our Nation, untouched by the Federal housing dollar, we would argue with those who support an initial allocation of $8 billion for the purpose of creating a national system of unequal opportunity in housing. We oppose the view of those who would move the $2,000-a-year family in the apartment next door to the $5,000-a-year tenant, and into the $15,000-a-year neighborhood, solely through rent subsidies. Moreover, we seriously question whether the man paying $150 a month for an apartment would understand why his next door neighbor should receive equal value for half the rent. From a social standpoint, there is far more to neighborhood preference than the monthly cost of one's dwelling. In short, as the respected Housing Affairs Letter of April 16, 1965, put it: "Can this world's economic lions and economic lambs lie down en masse in the same veldt?"

Keep in mind, it has been made abundantly clear that rent supplements would be a nationwide program. On May 17, during the final stage of hearings on this bill, Congressman CLAWSON asked the Housing Administrator, "This is going to be a rather broad program, then, is it not, if we are going to move the rent supplement program in all areas involved?"

Mr. WEAVER. "Yes, this will be, of course, nationwide."

Upper middle income families

Under date of April 21, 1965, the Housing Agency submitted to the subcommittee, a table showing income ceilings which would be set for individual cities in administering the rent supplement program. The setting of such income ceilings is purely discretionary with the Administrator. From this table it is readily apparent the Housing Administrator will substantially breach the national median family income ($6,249), in the case of large families. Here are the income limits the Administrator proposes to set for such families in several of the larger cities:

Philadelphia	$6,900
Toledo	8,050
Pittsburgh	7,150
Macon, Ga	6,600
Providence	6,650
San Antonio	6,450
Milwaukee	8,300
Paterson, N.J	8,100
New York City	8,900
Newark	8,750
Saginaw, Mich	7,850

Whereas the national median income for all families ($6,249) as shown by census data is total family income, the Housing Administrator is not bound by any such specific definition. Quite to the contrary, section 101(d) provides that income of the tenant shall be "the tenant's income as determined by the Administrator pursuant to procedures and regulations established by him." From total family income the Administrator could and doubtless would make one or more exclusions from total family income and thereby reduce the amount of family income that would be counted under the rent supplement proposal. Precedent for this exists in the public housing program. For instance, in New York City up to $2,400 of income earned by secondary wage earners (wife, children, etc.) in the family, can be excluded from the family's total income for purposes of determining eligibility and rent payments. Should the Administrator make a similar exclusion for the rent supplement program, the New York City family income limit of $8,900, as shown in the above table, actually could mean that the total family income was $8,900 plus $2,400 excluded income, or a total, actual income family limit of $11,300. In other words, the rent supplement proposal can reach well up into the middle-income family level.

Public housing jeopardized

It is little wonder public housing proponents are greatly disturbed by the Administration's rent supplement proposal. (See testimony of the president of the National Association of Housing & Redevelopment Officials, p. 425 of the hearings.) The rent supplement program could run the public housing program right out of business, because Federal subsidies under rent supplements can be far larger per month, per unit than is possible under public housing. Under the public housing program the Federal subsidy is limited to the amount necessary to pay principal and interest over a 40-year period on cost of the unit. There is no such subsidy limitation under the rent supplement program where the subsidy can cover not alone principal and interest costs of the unit over a 40-year period, but also practically all of the operating costs as well. Needless to say, rent supplements can also run the cooperative housing, and 221(d)(3) subsidized interest rate programs out of business.

In short, the rent supplement program has a Federal subsidy potential that no other Federal housing program can even come close to matching.

Eight-billion-dollar experiment

We were told by the Housing Administrator, as well as by other witnesses, that the Administration's rent supplements constitutes an experimental program. But involved in the proposal is the authorization for the Housing Administrator to enter into 40-year contracts with approved housing owners to pay them rent subsidies in amounts not exceeding $50 million prior to July 1, 1966, which maximum amount would be increased by $50 million on July 1 in each of the years 1966, 1967, and 1968. In other

words, by fiscal year 1968, $200 million a year payment contracts could be outstanding, extending for 40 years. Potentially, that makes it an $8 billion program that could extend to the year 2008. To us, that is a whale of an experimental program.

When queried about this $8 billion potential contract cost, the Housing Administrator stated that there was "some exaggeration" in the figures. He referred to it as a $200 million contract authorization program. But turn to page 235 of the hearings. Note the table submitted by the Housing Administrator showing the estimated cost of the rent supplement program for a 100-unit project. Here we find his estimate is that the aggregate rent supplements for this 100-unit project over 40 years will amount to $944,000. That is $9,440 per unit. Since this is supposed to be a 500,000 unit program, the cost of this program alone, based on these figures, is $4.72 billion. We leave it to the reader to decide for himself which of the two cost estimates of the Administrator more accurately reflect the probable cost of the program.

Assuming appropriation and contracting of the full amounts requested ($200 million multiplied by 40 years) there can be no question that the potential cost of the program is $8 billion. With this program dressed up in a $200 million outfit, Congress is confronted with an $8 billion Trojan horse.

The means test

Additionally, we are puzzled that those who for years have objected to the means test on any and all social programs administered by Federal, State, and local governments have now reversed themselves by embracing the means test explicit in the rent supplement program.

Heretofore, means tests have been administered by various levels of government in an effort to insure that those with higher incomes and readily available assets would be ineligible for programs aimed at assisting those who couldn't afford the minimum requirements of food, shelter, and medical services. Although many charged that such tests were socially obnoxious, nevertheless they were aimed at maintaining a degree of equity for the indigent and low-income individuals and families in the total allocation of resources by the taxpaying public. In short, the means test has been restricted to indigents and those with low incomes in order equitably to carry out various social programs of public assistance.

Under the Administration's rent supplement proposal, however, we find means tests applying to those with incomes reaching far up into the moderate income levels. If such a test were condemned as socially obnoxious before, consistency requires that they be similarly treated with regard to implementation of a rent supplement program. Under this proposal, however, the means test does not have in its defense a proper allocation of public assistance funds aimed at the most needy among our citizens.

To those who doubt that such means tests will be employed by HHFA in connection with rent supplements, we direct your attention to the Housing Administrator's colloquy with Congressman FINO, found on page 263 of the hearings, with regard to a hypothetical situation involving an investigation.

"Mr. FINO. All right. How would I be in difficulty if you do not police it or investigate it, supervise it and watch me?

"Mr. WEAVER. You will be in difficulty because there will be spot checks, as there always are on these activities, and if this were found, you would be in difficulty for having made a false statement. I think you would be subject to quite a bit of criminal prosecution as well as being put out of the particular project.

"Mr. FINO. My time is up.

"Mr. WEAVER. And there is one other check, too, which I hate to say.

"Mr. FINO. What is that?

"Mr. WEAVER. But your friends and neighbors would be very much concerned about this. They are the best investigators that you have in these projects."

Upon request, the Housing Administrator supplied for the record the estimated man-hours needed to investigate a prospective list of 100 approved applications for rent supplements. According to the Administrator, in just 77 areas of the country where there are FHA field offices, these investigations would be performed by employees of the HHFA. In all other areas, such investigations would be contracted for with employees and representatives of non-Federal organizations which could be either public or private. It was conceded by proponents in committee that Pinkerton's National Detective Agency could be such an eligible private agency.

The following comprise just a few of the tests that would be required, as submitted by the Administrator:

1. Check of incomes for 100 approved cases: Check W-2 forms presented, or if no W-2 forms telephone or send form letter to employer to determine if applicant is within the income limit for the area.

2. Check of assets on 100 approved cases: Check to see that the form and certification as to assets is complete and assets are within prescribed limit.

There can be no doubt that rent supplements would direct a means test at middle-income families, in support of a highly questionable social goal, while employing "friends and neighbors" in the very unfriendly and unneighborly role of informers.

Birth of national rental standards

Nowhere in the hearings has the administration shown evidence that it has studied the impact rent supplements would have on the prevailing patterns of rental rates. With the formula for virtually open-end subsidies, what would hold back limited-dividend and nonprofit organizations from building far more expensive multiunit apartment dwellings than those anticipated by the administration, with the consequent adverse impact on nonsubsidized rents? Indeed, under the language of section 101, the greatest rewards would derive to those organizations and tenants who build and occupy the most costly units.

Moreover, section 101 states that a family must first pay 25 percent of its income for rent before receiving any assistance from the Federal Government in the form of rent supplements. If this section were enacted, every landlord in the Nation could demand of his tenants that they pay 25 percent of their total family income for rent. Their justification for such a demand? The national standards set by the Federal Government. Anyone paying less, it could be claimed, would be paying less than he should. Such a standard rule of thumb would put enormous pressure on millions of tenants, many of whom voluntarily devote far less than 25 percent of their income for rent. The rent gougers and absentee slum landlords in urban areas would waste little time taking advantage of this.

That this could have a profound economic and social impact can be seen by the administration's testimony on page 218, where it is stated that the median gross monthly rent for families in the United States, according to the 1960 census was $71. The median national family income for that same year was $6,249. From this, the typical American family paid 13.6 percent of its income for rent—a little more than half of that proposed as the "norm" in the bill.

The precedent for widespread landlord checks on tenants' income conveniently would be found in the proposed means test to be employed in administering rent supplements. On page 262 of the hearings, the Housing Administrator states that Federal Income Tax Form W-2 would be checked in order to determine a tenants' income eligibility for rent supplements. In most cases, these forms would be surrendered to non-Government employees. Where this is impossible, "telephone or send form letter to employer to determine if applicant is within the income limit."

Can even the most cautious analyst deny the opportunities this opens to unscrupulous landlords?

WHO IS HOODWINKING WHOM?

From the outset of the hearings, it was apparent that section 101, rent supplements, was in deep trouble. Throughout the hearings, even those witnesses who normally support broader housing legislation were unrelenting in their criticism.

In a last-minute attempt to bail out the floundering rent supplement program, the committee eliminated the income floor for those eligible to receive Federal rent payments. That this change is illusory and an attempt to hoodwink Congress can be seen by the Housing Administrator's answer to a question by Senator DOUGLAS during the Senate hearings, "Is there any reason why rent subsidies could not work for poor families, if the committee should decide to lower the income floor below $3,000?"

"Mr. WEAVER. In the first place it goes back to something you said earlier and that is while we do have a volume of both limited dividend and nonprofit corporations which are ready and able to carry out the rent supplementation in the middle-income fields, it is my strong feeling that first many of these groups, certainly the limited-dividend groups are out, and many of the well-motivated nonprofit groups are really not in a position to take on all the management problems that are indigenous to this particular area of low-income manaegment."

As if to underline this, in answer to a similar question from Senator PROXMIRE, "Why wouldn't they (low-income families) be the ones to get rent subsidies?" the Housing Administrator answered:

"You are not going to get the limited dividend companies building and adequately managing houses in the low-income segment."

From these candid admissions by the Housing Administrator during the Senate hearings, we leave it to the reader of this report to decide for himself the extent to which the most needy families would benefit by the committee action in eliminating the income floor from the original administration bill.

As we have pointed out, while the open-end formula in the amended bill would permit flagrant abuses within both the lower and upper income brackets, the basic socioeconomic inequities remain.

Conclusion

On page 178 of the hearings the Housing Administrator, speaking of the rent supplement program, states:

"This program has received the greatest attention among the President's housing recommendations. It is a vital part of the proposed administration bill."

In our opinion the President has been sold a bill of goods. We cannot believe that he would "buy" such an incredibly wide open subsidy proposal had he been fully advised as to the potential evils of the program. This is a system of making the rent dollar of the beneficiary worth up to double or more the rent dollar of the unassisted taxpayer. It is unequal opportunity in housing by government flat. It is legislated discrimination against the self-sufficient citizen.

We are certain the American public will not "buy" such nonsense as is contained in this proposal.

We hope that the Congress, alerted to the pitfalls of the proposal, will reject it.

Section 101, the rent supplement proposal, should be stricken from the bill.

PAUL A. FINO.
JAMES HARVEY.
W. E. BROCK.
BURT L. TALCOTT.
DEL CLAWSON.
ALBERT W. JOHNSON.
J. WILLIAM STANTON.
CHESTER L. MIZE.

A Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, with the observance of Memorial Day it is fitting and proper that our thoughts should turn to those who made the supreme sacrifice that we who remain might enjoy freedom and liberty.

In this connection, I have received from Mr. Lawrence Timbers, a constituent of mine, a very fine tribute which he read on May 16, 1965, to the conference of the first district of the Disabled American Veterans, Seattle, Wash. Because this tribute expresses so well the thoughts which should be with every American as we observe Memorial Day I include at this point in the RECORD that tribute:

A DEDICATION

(A chaplain's address over the graves of marines who fought on Iwo Jima)

Here before us lie the bodies of comrades and friends—men who until yesterday or last week, laughed with us, joked with us, trained with us.

Men who were on the same ship with us and went over the sides with us. Men who fought with us and feared with us.

Somewhere in this plot may lie the man who could have discovered the cure for cancer.

Under one of these Christian crosses, or beneath a Jewish Star of David, there may rest now a man who was destined to be a great prophet, to find a way for all to live in plenty.

Now, they lie here silently in this sacred soil and we gather to consecrate this earth to their memory.

To speak in memory of such men is not easy.

These men have done their job well.

They have paid the ghastly price of freedom.

If that freedom he once again lost, as it was after the last war, the unforgivable blame will be ours, not theirs..

So it is we, the living, who are here to be dedicated and consecrated.

We dedicate ourselves first to live together in peace, the way they fought and are buried in this war.

When the final cross has been placed in the last cemetery, once again there will be those to whom profit is more important than peace, who will insist that it is better to trade with the enemies of mankind than, by crushing them, to lose their profit.

To you who sleep here silently, we give our promise.

We shall not listen.

We shall not forget that some of you were burnt with oil that came from American wells, that many of you were killed by shells fashioned from American steel.

We promise that, when once again men seek to profit at our expense, we shall remember how you looked as we placed you reverently in the ground.

Thus, do we consecrate ourselves, the living, to carry on the struggle you began.

Out of this will come, we promise, the birth of a new freedom for the sons of men everywhere.

More on Jet Noise, Part IV—the NASA Aircraft Noise Research Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth in a series of remarks to my colleagues concerning the problem of aircraft noise control and the importance of giving recognition to the problem as one which is national in scope. On May 6, 1965, I addressed the House on the subject of aircraft noise abatement generally—see RECORD, pages 9363–9365. When I introduced H.R. 7981, a bill to amend section 303(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide for a program of research and development by NASA to reduce aircraft noise, and H.R. 7982, a bill to amend section 302 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the elimination of aircraft noise, and for other purposes.

On May 13 under "Extension of Remarks" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I addressed myself to the subject "Jet Noise—Opens the Floodgates of Litigation"—see RECORD, A 2377, in which I pointed out that there were already 180 lawsuits in 18 States with claims of over $20 million, and on May 20 to the subject "More on Jet Noise: NASA Conference on Aircraft Operating Procedures"—see RECORD, A2533—referring to a conference at Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va., which I was privileged to attend. It was after this conference that I decided to report to you on the NASA aircraft noise research program.

The following is the first section of a report delivered by NASA to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and explains the current program of research in this field. It is only by the continuation and encouragement of research programs such as this by the Federal Government that we can find the means to alleviate the problem of aircraft noise:

SECTION I. THE NASA AIRCRAFT NOISE RESEARCH PROGRAM AND ITS RELATION TO THE AIRPORT COMMUNITY NOISE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

Noise is often an objectionable byproduct of aircraft operation at airports and in flight. While the disturbance of people, particularly in communities near airports, is commonly known, and a few isolated incidents of acoustical damage to property have been publicized, aircraft noice can also be a serious physiological hazard to operations personnel, and can induce failure in certain aircraft structures. For these reasons, the aircraft noise problem is of great importance, and broad coordinated efforts at its alleviation are underway by the NASA, the FAA, the DOD, the aircraft and engine manufacturers, and institutional and commercial research organizations.

Unfortunately, the airport community noise problem is strongly rooted in the implacable laws of physics and economics, and no simple panacea is likely to be found. While it is expected that advances in technology will make it possible to evolve an efficient combination of aircraft, engine, operating procedure, airport, and community designs that will result in aircraft noise exposures that are acceptable to the airport community, the heavy investments in existing aircraft equipment, airport installations, and community properties are likely to be the controlling factor on the rate and extent of application of an effective solution. At the same time, it is necessary to recognize that all methods for the development of aircraft thrust involve airflow processes that also generate noise, and that it is unlikely that the successful development and application of the most promising noise reduction concepts to new aircraft and engine designs and operating procedures can provide an acceptable noise level for all airport communities and permit the healthy growth of air transportation, unless there is also an appropriate control or adjustment of community property uses in certain critical areas around airports. On the other hand, the untimely imposition by airport communities of arbitrary restrictions on aircraft noise in terms of limits on fight paths, power settings, times of operation, etc., may not provide a truly satisfactory noise exposure for community inhabitants, short of a serious economic compromise or substantial abandonment of air transport operations.

Under these circumstances, there is a growing understanding that efforts at a practicable and mutually effective solution will need to be evolutionary in nature, and involve a dedicated attack on all major aspects of the problem. These include the acquisition of definitive information on the manner in which aircraft noises are generated and propagated, and the associated development of efficient methods for the reduction of adverse aircraft noise at its source; the establishment of safe and efficient aircraft operating procedures that minimize and control the exposure of airport community property to undesirable aircraft noise; and the provision of a rational understanding of the specific aircraft noise factors which produce subjective annoyance for various activities and environments of a community population, and of optimum methods for the control and adjustment of community property usage in critical noise areas in the vicinity of the airport.

For each of these three major approaches to a solution of the airport community noise problem, the following sections describe the nature of the problems involved, review the current state of applicable knowledge, and outline the research efforts that are underway by the NASA for the resolution of these problems. The technical details of specific NASA research programs in these fields are presented in a supplement to these discussions.

AIRCRAFT NOISE GENERATION AND REDUCTION AT THE SOURCE

Research by the NASA on the noise characteristics of conventional aircraft propellers has brought the understanding of their noise generating phenomena to an advanced stage where the effective methods for noise reduction are reasonably well understood. The application of such information to a contemporary turbopropeller powered transport aircraft in its design stages has successfully demonstrated the improvements in noise

characteristics that can be achieved. Since the velocity of the propeller tips is of prime importance in the control of the radiated noise from propeller-driven aircraft, this requires special selection and matching of the propellers, engines, and airframes in the design stages, and frequently cannot be well exploited as a modification to other existing propeller-driven aircraft. This technology is not fully applicable to ducted propellers that are of interest as lift devices for certain classes of vertical and short takeoff and landing aircraft. It is expected, however, that the results of current investigations of noise generation and reduction in the compressor and fan sections of jet engines will be generally applicable to this problem.

For jet-propelled aircraft, the main component of noise during takeoff is generated by the high-speed jet exhaust as it mixes downstream from the aircraft with the lower-speed surrounding air, and is characterized by a distribution of sound energy over a broad range of frequencies. While the detailed mechanisms of jet-exhaust noise generation and propagation are not yet fully understood, the magnitude of the radiated noise has been found to be strongly dependent on the average velocity of the jet relative to that of the surrounding flow, on the patterns of velocity distribution in the flow and manner in which the various flows mix, on the mass of the jet flow, and on the occurrence of mach-wave radiations at higher supersonic jet velocities. The multimillion dollar program for application of noise suppressors to the exhaust of jet transport aircraft was based on preliminary knowledge of these effects, and achieved a substantial reduction in the total noise energy through the alteration of the basic jet flow patterns. This program was carried out, however, before there was an adequate understanding of the particular noise factors that caused annoyance responses among various individuals, and as a consequence, while the suppressors reduced the total noise intensity, it occurred mainly in a part of the noise spectrum that did not significantly alleviate the annoyance character of the sound. It is felt that although the inflight jet-exhaust noise suppressor may find further application in special situations, the known potentials have been substantially exploited, and important prospects for future improvements are expected to reside largely in the successful development and application of advanced engine systems that generate a given level of thrust with inherently lower levels and less annoying spectrums of noise.

The NASA research program on jet exhaust noise, therefore, is directed to the detailed understanding of the basic aerodynamic processes of noise generation and propagation in jets; to the establishment of rational methods for prediction of the quantitative relationships between jet-flow patterns and operating parameters, and the resulting noise levels, frequency distributions, and radiation patterns; and to the application of this knowledge in the development of concepts and design criteria for advanced engines with improved jet-exhaust noise characteristics. In this regard, research has already indicated that designs which lower the average velocity and smooth the velocity patterns of the jet, offer the best hope for important reductions in exhaust noise. Emphasis has, therefore, been placed on investigations of the noise characteristics of jets that are representative of turbofan powerplants, particularly of the high, bypass flow ratio types, which provide lower average jet velocities for a given thrust level.

Noise which radiates from the inlets and fan discharge of current jet transport engines is significant both during takeoff and landing, but is especially important during a landing approach because the normal shallow descent angle to the runway brings the aircraft close to possible observers on the ground below the flight path. The most objectionable component of this noise is the discrete tones that are generated in, and radiated from, the compressor and fan sections of the engine. These tones are subjectively annoying because they occur in a range of frequencies to which the human ear is most sensitive. While it is believed that the noise characteristics are primarily associated with rotor-stator interaction phenomena and periodic load fluctuations on the blades, the pertinent flow processes and basic influence of specific design variations are only beginning to be understood.

The NASA research program on jet inlet noise is, therefore, directed to a detailed understanding of the basic processes of noise generation and propagation in engine air inlets, ducting, compressors, and fans; to the establishment of rational methods for prediction of the quantitative relationships between the geometry and operating parameters of these components and of integrated systems on the resulting noise levels, frequency distributions, and radiation patterns; and to the application of this knowledge in the development of concepts and design criteria for advanced engines with improved jet-inlet noise characteristics. This work has already indicated that some changes in blade geometries, the use of sound resonators, and the blockage of sound transmission by inlet geometry or choking, have some usefulness in the reduction of radiated inlet noises. Emphasis in further work will, therefore, be placed on the resolution and refinement of design criteria concerning these effects, so that an optimum arrangement of inlet, compressor, fan, and fan discharge for a typical turbofan power plant can be developed and demonstrated at full scale.

AIRCRAFT OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES THAT MINIMIZE EXPOSURE OF COMMUNITIES TO OBJECTIONABLE NOISES

The particular manner in which aircraft engines are tested and run up at an airport, and the specific procedures for aircraft takeoff, climbout to altitude, and landing approach, have an important bearing on the nature of the exposure of airport community inhabitants to noise. From this point of view, it is generally desirable that the operating procedures be designed to keep the aircraft at the best combination of distance from the community population, and of engine power setting consistent with performance requirements and safety, that minimizes the area of the airport community that is exposed to objectionable noise.

Research studies and some preliminary experience has suggested, for example, that it may be of overall benefit to exchange a tolerance for a higher noise level close to the airport for a major reduction in noise level over greater areas at a distance from the airport. Aircraft designs which have excess thrust available under takeoff and initial climbout conditions, as is becoming more prevalent in some current high-performance aircraft, can utilize this capability for a more rapid takeoff and steeper climb than has been possible in the past. While this procedure increases the noise level close to the airport, the rapid attainment of an altitude where the power setting can be safely reduced, minimizes the exposure of more distant areas to adverse climbout noise. The usefulness of this technique, of course, is dependent on the acceptability of higher noise levels close to the airport, and varies with individual airport communities. It is expected, however, that this capability will tend to increase in future transport designs, and the possibility for further extensions of this capability with takeoff thrust-augmentation systems, particularly by the burning of additional fuel in the bypass flow of turbofan engines, is recognized. For many current aircraft designs, however, the incorporation of takeoff thrust-augmentation systems may be technically impracticable, or economically prohibitive.

Currently, the noise levels on the ground under aircraft flight paths are highest during the landing approach. This occurs because of the shallow descent slopes to the runway and high-power settings that have been selected to provide ease of control and safety for the aircraft in the transition to the touchdown or waveoff maneuvers under instrument approach conditions.

Because the landing approach operation has been a major and continuing offender, the NASA research program on operations noise has primarily focused on this problem. Since it is apparent that a steeper descent slope to the runway would increase the distance of the aircraft from ground observers under the flight path, and permit the use of lower power settings, an investigation of the feasibility of such a change in procedure has been underway. Preliminary results of flight tests of several different classes of aircraft under simulated instrument landing conditions have demonstrated that it may be operationally acceptable to increase the descent slopes, but have also shown specific problems that will limit the extent to which the slopes can be increased and the power settings can be decreased. Because of the high promise of this technique, however, it is planned to expand this research program on an expedited basis to cover a wide variety of other types of contemporary aircraft, to facilitate establishment of uniform limits for all routine operations under instrument flight rules.

It is also recognized that the testing and preflight runup of aircraft engines at airports is a noise problem of increasing importance. Some use is already being made of ground noise-suppressor installations to alleviate this problem, and it is expected that their application will be expanded as more powerful engines are introduced. Fortunately, such suppressors are not subject to the weight considerations of in-flight aircraft noise suppressors, and can better be designed with the advancing technology. During aircraft taxiing and takeoff ground roll at airports, this approach is not applicable, of course, but atmospheric conditions may focus sounds in such a way that selection of the proper runway will minimize community noise exposure. A study will therefore be undertaken to define a minimum system for atmospheric monitoring that will permit selection of the optimum runway from the noise standpoint.

ANNOYANCE FACTORS OF AIRCRAFT NOISE AND COMPATIBILITY OF AIRCRAFT COMMUNITY ARRANGEMENTS

As has already been indicated, it is highly important that efforts to improve the airport community noise problem be guided by a rational understanding of the specific manner in which the community population responds to various noise experiences. This is a complex problem since the subjective evaluation of the degree of annoyance is dependent not only on the overall intensity of the noise, but also on the specific distribution of sound energy in various frequency ranges as it relates to the sensitivities of the human ear and the masking of other sound communication efforts, on the duration and repetition of the noise disturbance, on the suddenness of onset and rate of change of the sound character and its familiarity, on the types of activities that are being pursued in the area as it particularly affects work efficiency or sleep, on the degree of structural shielding from aircraft noise exposure or the masking by other industrial and commercial noise sources, and on individual acclimatization to the disturbance and economic involvement in its causes or effects.

The NASA interests in this problem are primarily concerned with the development of techniques that will aid prediction of the usefulness of specific changes in radiated

aircraft noise intensities, frequency distributions, and time sequences, on the subjective response of ground observers. The "perceived noise level" (PNdB) method that is widely used in assessment of the acceptability of noise, offers a useful basis for such a technique. Because the method does not adequately account for many situations that are pertinent to the airport community noise problem, however, a contract research program is underway to extend the concept to cover the important variables of aircraft noise.

It is obvious that a major factor in the provision of a long-range solution to the airport community noise problem is the development of practicable methods for the control and adjustment of the uses of community property in certain critical areas around an airport. Optimum applications of noise reduction techniques to advanced aircraft, and the use of steeper climb and landing approach techniques can substantially reduce the critical areas, but it is not likely that they can be completely eliminated. Decisions regarding the development or redevelopment of such land to bring about compatibility are frequently very difficult for existing airport communities because of the high value of the property in question. The needs for such control in the development of new airports should be obvious.

The NASA program in this area has only attempted to define some important considerations that are involved in the adjustments of property usage near airports. The results of these contract studies should be a useful guide for community assessments of prospective measures for the achievement of compatibility.

Mr. Speaker, that is why in H.R. 7981 I urge that all research in the field of jet noise abatement be coordinated and placed in the hands of the skilled technicians and scientists at NASA. No additional funds or appropriation will be needed now to carry on such a program. By consolidating and concentrating all jet noise research now being conducted by NASA, FAA, Army, Navy, and Air Force under NASA direction, supervision, and control, duplication of effort will be avoided, savings will be effected, and confusion will be eliminated.

Basis for Support of Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been proposed a $3.5 billion tax cut and I think it is important that we understand the basis for our support for this measure.

This proposal follows the income tax cut of 1964 of $14 billion. Following that change, consumer buying rose by $28 billion, business investment in plants and equipment rose $6.5 billion, and employment increased by 2 million and unemployment was reduced to new lows. This Nation has enjoyed the longest continued stretch of economic expansion in many years.

The most recent proposal to reduce taxes will have, we are told, similarly beneficial effects on our economy.

In addition to these predicted effects on our economy, I have received assurances that the reductions in the taxes on local and long distance telephone calls will be passed on to the consumers and I expect that the other businesses involved will also pass the reductions to the consumers.

This will mean more money in the pockets of our consumers and will provide a lift to our economy.

I support this measure on this basis Mr. Speaker secure in the knowledge that our people and the economy will be the beneficiaries.

WTOP–TV and WTOP Radio Offers Free Time for Debate on Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial broadcast over WTOP radio and television states the support of WTOP for home rule for the District of Columbia.

Some groups, including the Washington Board of Trade, oppose home rule for a variety of reasons. Attorney Joseph Rauh, Jr., has challenged the board of trade president, William Martin, to debate the home rule issue in a public setting.

In response, WTOP radio and television offered free time to Mr. Rauh and Mr. Martin to debate the issue without cost to them, and Mr. Rauh has accepted. I would hope that Mr. Martin will be able to accept the WTOP offer.

The text of the WTOP editorial follows:

EDITORIAL BROADCAST OVER WTOP RADIO AND TELEVISION

This is a WTOP editorial.

This station has long felt that the District of Columbia should be given a very substantial degree of home rule; that is, the power to manage its own affairs, elect its own officials, decide its own destiny. From the standpoint of democratic principle, it is intolerable to have this city of nearly a million people powerless to participate in local government while all about us freedom is being exercised. In terms of practicality, Washington can never be governed well by a Congress understandably preoccupied with many other problems.

From all the evidence on hand, home rule has majority support in the District. There are, however, reputable groups of citizens—including many respected members of the board of trade—who oppose a grant of local self-government for various and sundry reasons.

Since this is the case, WTOP–TV and WTOP radio endorse the proposal by Attorney Joseph Rauh, Jr., the District of Columbia Democratic chairman, for what he calls a "teach-in debate" with board of trade spokesmen on the matter of home rule. We have sent telegrams to Mr. Rauh and to Board of Trade President William Martin, containing the following language: WTOP–TV and WTOP radio "are prepared to furnish appropriate radio and television time plus studio facilities for the debate without cost to you. The time and the ground rules can be determined by the participants themselves together with our respective program and news divisions. Our offer is made in the belief that the public interest would be well served by a confrontation of opposing points of view on the home rule question."

In other words, this station believes home rule is necessary; that its chances of passage are the best in several years; and that both the opponents and proponents should now make their views known before the widest possible audience.

This was a WTOP editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

What Does the Civil Rights Movement Really Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, with the summer coming upon us the question, What does the civil rights movement really want? will be asked with more and more frequency. In last Sunday's Herald Tribune, John Robert Lewis, the articulate and able chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, wrote an article which I believe sheds much light on this question.

Mr. Lewis reflects the dedication of the civil rights movement to the highest ideals of our Nation. His article should be read by friend and foe alike in order to gain greater understanding of the courage and dedication to democracy of those who participate in this movement.

The article follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 23, 1965]

ARTICLE BY JOHN ROBERT LEWIS

ATLANTA.—More and more, the movement must become politically oriented. We must see the march from Selma to Montgomery not as a civil rights march, not as a march for integration, but as a march for political freedom. Negroes are not asking a white society for a gift of freedom; Negroes are demanding, from a reluctant society, total freedom, now.

I have faith in the impoverished, oppressed, disenfranchised Negroes—the victims of political evils in an oppressive economic structure which in order to sustain itself must perpetuate racism. Negroes have been for a long time that segment of our population which has waited for America to redeem herself. They are the folk who tilled the soil, laid the track, built the buildings.

There are also the disinherited white, as well as the disenfranchised Negro; the robbed American Indian as well as the exploited Oriental and the socially segregated Jew: all minorities. They, the little people, are raising serious questions that must be answered and issues that must be resolved: questions and issues not of a civil rights nature per se. They are saying, "I wanna vote. I wanna job." This means they want to determine their own economic and political destinies.

Selma was not the beginning. Selma was not the first place in this country where Negroes were disenfranchised, brutally beaten, and killed while trying to exercise their constitutional rights: rights and laws that were in fact established by Congress.

Seeing a need for a change in the then existing status quo, Congress declared, "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall note be denied or abridged by the U.S. Government or any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

That was the 15th amendment to the Constitution. An enforcement legislation of 1870 provides a penalty for violation of the 15th amendment, together with the reenactment of the civil rights bill of 1866. Less than 100 years later, Congress legislated another civil rights bill, which is, in fact, meaningless. In 1871 and 1872 Congress passed legislation on a voting bill giving Federal supervisory power over congressional elections. Less than 100 years later there is another voting bill before Congress which, unless seriously amended, will become another meaningless piece of paper. In 1948 Congress passed another in a series of laws making it a felony to "deprive and/or conspire to deprive a citizen of the United States of any constitutional rights." It seems to me that the right to vote is but one of those basic rights of which millions of Negroes are being systematically denied.

Last year's Civil Rights Act (1964) states: "No vote registrar may use different standards of Negroes and/or whites in literacy tests."

I wonder how long will this Government find it necessary to legislate rather than to enforce the laws in existence. On March 15, President Johnson recognized that "a century has passed, more than a hundred years since equality has been promised, and yet the Negro is not equal. A century has passed since the day of promise and the promise is unkept. The time of justice has now come. I tell you I sincerely believe that no force can hold it back. It is right in the eyes of man and God that it should come."

In 1960 we were demanding the right to eat a hamburger at any lunch counter. It took us 3 years to discover that we could not afford the hamburger and that we needed money. Money means economic power. In order to get and to maintain economic power we have to bargain. Bargaining means political power. So it took us 3 years to understand that political power insures the stability of economic power. Every segment of our society must be creative enough to find a role it can play in order for us to assure economic and social justice for all Americans.

People everywhere must make themselves politically aware. They must gain for themselves on every level the same political education that we are hoping will gain in the South: for people all over our country are politically asleep. If they were not so apathetic, such conditions provoking riots in our Rochesters of the north, and massive street demonstrations in our Selmas of the south, would scarcely be permitted to exist. What has not been made clear to most Americans is that this is their problem too. Only when all Americans see the relevance of these issues to their lives will meaningful political activities contribute to their own well-being.

At this point it can be asked, justifiably, what is meaningful political activity? What are the issues and problems internally confronting America today? Aside from the obvious economic and political injustices, there are the triple-threat problems of unemployment, underemployment and unemployables. Giveaway Federal programs—aid to education, medicare for the aged, Manpower Development and Training Act, the inadequate war on poverty—all provide a mere band-aid for the gaping wound of economic injustice. The problems are so tremedous that individual civil rights organizations cannot handle these problems. Citizens of the country must mobilize and apply pressure to the Government to get them to deal with these problems realistically.

SNCC's method of applying pressure will continue this summer by organizing additional freedom schools and community centers in southwest Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, and through the South. Our organizing efforts will include voter registration, political education and support for the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. We believe in interracial democracy can be made to work in the delta and bayous of our Southland as well as in the ghettos and slums of our northern cities.

People ask what will happen in Chicago and in Harlem this summer. When will the next Selma take place? The civil rights movement cannot give an answer. The lack of concern on the part of the American public and the lack of concern and courage of the Federal Government breed bitterness and frustration.

Where lack of jobs, intolerable housing, police brutality, and other frustrating conditions exist, it is possible that violence and massive street demonstrations may develop. Which leads me to attempt to deal with the question about whether the movement is headed toward violence. The movement itself is not headed toward violence. It is an established fact that the movement's activities are all nonviolent in character.

However, we must recognize that the American society. To disagree or to dissent can mean intimidation. Harassment, ostracism, economic reprisals, assassination. We have witnessed the murder of many people during the past few years; Herbert Lee, Medgar Evers, Louis Allen, six children in Birmingham, President Kennedy, three civil rights workers in Mississippi, Jimmy Lee Jackson and others in Alabama this year, to name a few.

Remember, this violence was not perpetrated by civil rights workers; that seems to be a fact that escapes most of the people who direct such questions. The question of preventing or controlling violence should be directed to law-enforcement agencies, local, State, and Federal. Bona fide investigations of the hate groups and prosecutions of the guilty should be urged.

On the other hand, it seems to me that the civil rights movement should, in the north and south, create pockets of political power. In order for the Negro to keep his political power, assuming he will have it and assuming he will get the vote, there must be grassroots political organization through housing projects, neighborhoods, housewife organizations, the churches, the social clubs, etc. The Negro must not assimilate into the structure, but rather remain the conscience of both political parties; i.e. keep people in office who know about the unpaved streets, the inadequate educational facilities, the lack of jobs, the meaningless Federal programs.

Finally, we must keep in mind the principles to which we all subscribe; the principles of economic, social, and political justice. These principles of economic, social, and political justice. These principles are only words if they are not implemented into action and as a way of life involving these principles. Further, the principles and history behind the civil rights movement have no meaning except in terms of reality. Reality now is what happens in the streets of Selma, Ala., and McComb, Miss., and hundreds of Negro communities, north and south, where fear and deprivation form an integral part of daily life. If the Government cannot answer our questions and help us to solve some of these problems, I can only see many long, hot summers ahead.

Partners of the Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, James H. Boren, director of the Partners of the Alliance program, spoke in Hartford. The occasion was a meeting to encourage volunteer funds to finance self-help projects in Paraiba, Brazil.

The guest was Ambassador Juracy Magalhaes, and among the hosts was Gov. John N. Dempsey, of Connecticut. Mr. H. Boren, speaking, reported on the Alliance for Progress.

I believe Mr. Boren's remarks deserve the attention of our Members and I offer them for the RECORD, along with a news account from the Hartford Courant, whose publisher, Col. John R. Reitemeyer, is one of the sponsors of the drive for Paraiba:

REMARKS OF JAMES H. BOREN, DIRECTOR, PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAMS, AT A BANQUET AT THE HARTFORD CLUB, SPONSORED BY THE CONNECTICUT PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE, HARTFORD, CONN., MAY 24, 1965

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ambassador, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a great honor and privilege for me to appear on a program with such a distinguished Ambassador as His Excellency, Ambassador Magalhaes, not only because he is an outstanding representative of a great republic but also because he is in his own right a great man. He is a man of success in many fields—as a leader in business, as a general and leader in a revolution for freedom, as a governor of his state, and, now, as an outstanding ambassador for his nation. He has been a warm and active friend of the Partners of the Alliance and a great supporter of the economic and social development programs of the Alliance for Progress. I join you in looking forward to his message tonight.

As an employee of the Agency for International Development, and thus as one of your employees, I am here tonight to give you a brief report on the Alliance for Progress and to think together with you for a few minutes about the Partners of the Alliance, the grassroots operational program in which you are now involved.

The Alliance for Progress is not a United States program, but rather it is an alliance involving, in the words of the Charter of Punta del Este, "the full energies of the peoples and governments of the American Republics." It is therefore a great joint effort which calls for positive action not only of governments but also of the private sector. This means that the Alliance is a great revolutionary program for progress which must have the active participation of the people of Paraiba—and the people of Connecticut. Business leaders, yes, but this means the small businessman as well as the director of a large corporation. Labor leaders, yes, but also the member down at the level of his local. Professional leaders, yes, but also the young dynamic man or woman who may be starting his or her professional career but can make a contribution to the cause of hemispheric peace.

Through the Connecticut Partners of the Alliance, there is not an individual or neigh-

borhood group that cannot be a working part of this new private sector partnership with the citizens of Paraiba.

Before discussing the specifics of partners program, permit me to give you a brief report on the forward movement of the Alliance for Progress. We tend to focus on the problems confronting us in the hemisphere but we need to also reflect upon the forward strides made in the last 4 years. The task in which we are all involved is not an easy one; it is a "wheels within wheels" process involving dynamic forces demanding or opposing change; it is the developing of Latin American institutions which can attack the barriers to economic and social development in Latin America; it is developing working programs in tax reform, fiscal reforms, land reforms, credit reform; it is planning for the most effective use of available resources in the development process; it is the training of professional and technical men for industrial and agricultural development. And, ladies and gentlemen, it is giving hope for a better life to that man in the rural village who is struggling at the starvation level to put food in the mouths of his children and who dares to dream of a better future for those children. It is giving hope for a better life to that mother in the slums surrounding the cities of most of Latin America who dies within her heart as she sees her first-born live through a long bout with disease only to face a future with little hope of learning to read or write or acquiring some basic skill on which to base a life.

The Alliance for Progress is moving ahead; it is succeeding.

By the end of July, 489,000 new houses or family dwelling units will have been constructed.

By the end of July. 38,500 new classrooms will have been built, over 11 million textbooks will have been printed, almost 2,500 new community water systems will have been built, and 735 hospital and medical posts will have been built extending some type of medical service to nearly 9 million people.

Teachers are being trained.

Roads are being built.

Tax reform and land reform programs are being implemented.

Institutions are being built: savings and loan, private development banks, cooperatives, productivity centers, management and labor training institutions, and agricultural extension systems.

Three hundred thousand agricultural credit loans will have been made.

Yes, the Alliance is on the move. It has its slow periods and it has its violent interruptions. But progress is being made in the cold hard unglamorous business of building and strengthening the institutional capabilities of the various countries to work on their own problems. There is, however, one great gap which needs to be filled, and it is on this need—and this opportunity—that we are directing our attention tonight.

It takes time to build an extension service to the point that they can reach out to the man in rural Latin America. It takes time to develop a savings and loan system which can provide houses for a segment of the society. In short, it takes time to develop and expand institutions. Until this can be done, we have a particular need to give a sense of movement to the Alliance at the grassroots level. We need your help in responding to local self-help efforts in the rural villages and in the favelas and barriers which surround the cities.

The Partners of the Alliance is the channel through which you, as members of organizations or as individuals, can work directly in an alliance with the wonderful people of an important area of Brazil. This is a private sector program which offers to you an opportunity and a challenge. If you believe that we should strengthen the friendly ties with Latin America, you have a specific opportunity now before you.

There are now some 26 States in the United States working with states or regions in 12 different Latin American Republics. Permit me to describe some of these activities.

The Texas Partners of the Alliance, under the chairmanship of Edward Marcus of Neiman-Marcus, has an effective program developing with Peru. The students of 150 high schools, working through the Pan American Student Forum, have provided pressure lanterns and small generators for night literacy classes in rural Andean villages, a cement mixer for a slum improvement association which is constructing community buildings, a chain saw for a village cooperative, and the materials for the roof, doors, and windows to complete village-constructed adobe schools. The Texas Rehabilitation Association and the owner of a private radio school provided equipment for the Peruvian Rehabilitation Institute. The Texas Partners Subcommittee on Education, under the chairmanship of former Assistant Secretary of State Dick Rubottom, is planning a program whereby there will be established a scholarship for at least one Peruvian student in every accredited institution of higher learning in the State of Texas. The Federation of Womens Clubs have provided several "little libraries" to villages and barriadas each of which consist of 200 books plus maps and other materials.

In southern Peru there is a village on the Riotambo—a river which over half of the campesinos must cross to get to the land which they till. They now hand walk a cable which is stretched high over the rushing river. At this moment the Jaycees of Lubbock, Tex., are spearheading an activity which will provide several miles of steel cable in order that the people of Riotambo and other villages may construct suspension bridges.

These are small projects but to villages in which the family income may range from $40 to $80 a year, this is meaningful help. These material projects are only part of the partnership concept, however. The Texas League of Municipalities has offered to make available technicians in the field of municipal administration to assist Andean Valley and altiplano towns and cities in solving some of their pressing problems. The Houston Postmaster, the letter carriers association, and the postal clerks have offered to make available the services of a postal team should this be requested. The University of Texas' radio and television school and a Houston TV station have offered to assist in the development of educational television programs. Thus, the Texas Partners are developing an inventory of specialists in various fields who can work with their partners in Peru—not on the basis of a contract but only on the basis of transportation and per diem. Peru is developing a collection of works of art which will travel throughout Texas.

In January and February of this year, a group of 12 educators from Costa Rica worked as resource specialists with 12 different school districts in Oregon. They helped to upgrade the teaching of Spanish and history, and they received some professional training in teaching techniques and the development of low-cost teaching materials. The Costa Rican educators received half salary, lived with families, and then paid their own transportation back to Costa Rica. Oregon actually received much more than they gave in this partnership activity.

The Idaho Partners of the Alliance are assisting the town of Pelileo in the altiplano or high planes of southern Ecuador complete a number of small projects on which the people have been working for a number of years. Potable water, equipment for their gleaming white adobe and plaster hospital, materials for the schools, a pump for a small irrigation project, and sewing machines for a training school. This town of Pelileo, incidentally, was totally destroyed in an earthquake in 1949. The survivors moved to a site 3 miles up the valley and began to rebuild the town. It was my privilege to be in Idaho a short time ago where I saw the doctor of Pelileo present a marble plaque to the Idaho Partners. He said, "This is from a marble pillar which has been a symbol of our sorrow but which is now a symbol of our hope and determination." The plaque, inscribed "Idaho-Pelileo, Partners," is now on a wall in the Idaho State capitol. The marble from which it was made came from the city hall which was destroyed in the 1949 earthquake which took the lives of an estimated 6,000 people.

Oakland County, Mich., has completed the initial phase of a relationship with Valle del Cauca in Colombia. Massachusetts is developing a program with the Colombian state of Antioquia. Florida is moving effectively under the leadership of the Florida secretary of state, Tom Adams, in an educational and technical program with Colombia.

Maryland and the Brazilian state of Rio de Janeiro are working in a number of activities involving schools, medical posts, and a university cafeteria. The students of the University of Maryland are active as are the AFL–CIO, the Jaycees, Lions, and Rotary.

Colorado is working in a partnership with Minas Gerais in Brazil. Ambassador Magalhaes recently saw three complete dental units in Denver which are destined for rural areas of Minas Gerais. The Colorado Jaycees, the Business and Professional Women, the Colorado Society of Engineers, Denver University, civic and many other groups are active. The Governor proclaimed Partners of the Alliance Day during the visit of the Ambassador. Minas Gerais, incidentally, is sending mineral samples for use in the high school science classes in Colorado.

The Parana Partners of the Alliance will soon be assisting their Ohio partners in a special language program at Miami University. Dr. Maloney, of Miami University, has developed a special 10-week program for high school teachers of Spanish (and others) to learn Portuguese. Parana is sending a professor who can teach the language and also lecture on Brazil. The Ohio Hospital Association has developed an inventory of hospital equipment to send to a hospital in Parana. Other activities are in the mill.

Pennsylvania and Bahia (Brazil) are developing a new partnership as are Wyoming and Goias, Illinois and São Paulo, Indiana and Rio Grande do Sul are moving ahead in scholarship programs and the Indiana Rural Electric Cooperatives are making an inventory of equipment to send to some rural cooperatives in their partner State. Indiana is presently field testing some seed from Rio Grande do Sul which may have application in some areas of this country. They are seeds of a legume plant which send its roots down over 40 feet for water.

To you, the citizens of Connecticut, may I say congratulations for having taken the initial steps in your partnership with Paraiba. I would like to pay special tribute to the outstanding group of Connecticut citizens who constituted your team which traveled to Paraiba in February to develop your first projects. I can assure you that this was no junket. They traveled almost 1,000 miles by jeep as they met with the people of Paraiba. The members of this team were:

Mr. Richard C. Briggs (superintendent of schools, Watertown).

Mr. Daniel J. Gallagher (executive secretary, Connecticut State Labor Council).

Mr. James S. Klar (assistant managing director, Connecticut Development Commission).

Mr. Paul E. Waggoner (chief, department of soils and climatology, Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station).

Mr. David Wiggin (director, sanitary engineering division, State department of health).

Mrs. Chase Going Woodhouse (director, Service Bureau for Women's Organizations).

Special mention should also be made of the interest and encouragement of the Connecticut delegation in Congress. Senator DODD, Senator RIBICOFF, Congressman MONAGAN, Congressman DADDARIO, in fact, all of your delegation have been interested in this private sector activity. Mr. Mackie, of the Governor's office, helped us by bringing together the group at our first exploratory meeting.

Your partners of the alliance committee, under the excellent leadership of Jim Klar, has program ideas and projects. This committee will be in touch with you but I know they will be eager to respond to interest in the program from any person or group in the State.

It was my privilege to serve for 2 years as the deputy director of the U.S. AID mission to Peru. During that time I served as the operations man and traveled extensively throughout the country. Not only did I have the privilege of working with Government officials, but I also worked directly with the leaders of the rural villages, the capensino federations, and the improvement associations of the barriadas which surrounded the cities.

I got to know the wonderful people of that great country. And during the course of my travels to project sites—by jeep and plane in the Andes and riverboat along the Amazon and its tributaries.

Less than a week after I returned to the United States from Peru, I was driving through the Southwest with my family, and I had a sudden attack of chills and fever. As I was driving on to the next town to locate a doctor, I switched on the radio and listened to a well-known commentator as he described foreign-aid officials as having their martinis before breakfast, then going to plush offices to prop their feet on the desks, have more martinis, and think up new ways of pouring the U.S. taxpayers' dollars down the rathole. By the time I located that doctor, my fever was quite high.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am an employee of the Agency for International Development, and I am proud of my Agency. I can tell you that as we sit here tonight, you, as citizens of the United States of Amercia, have reason to be proud of the work being done around the world by your representatives of AID. To that commentator and to those armchair critics who parrot his cliches, I say with Gen. Lucius Paulus, as he said in the second century, B.C., "commanders should be counseled chiefly by persons of known talent and those who are present at the scene of action." General Paulus went on to say:

"If, therefore, anyone thinks himself qualified to give advice respecting the war which I am to conduct, let him not refuse the assistance to the state, but let him come with me into Macedonia.

"He shall be furnished with a ship, a tent, even his traveling charges will be defrayed, but if he thinks this is too much trouble, and prefers the repose of a city life to the toils of war, let him not on land assume the office of a pilot."

You have met the challenge of Lucius Paulus. You have sent your team to the scene of action. You are not sitting on the sidelines parroting cliches but rather you are moving into the mainstream of action in the boldest endeavor in the history of the hemisphere.

The drive, imagination, and initiative of the private sector in Connecticut and Paraiba can play an important part in the Alliance for Progress. This is a partnership which focuses on self-help with dignity, not charity—learning as well as teaching—receiving as well as assisting.

President Johnson, in speaking of the Alliance for Progress, said: "The time calls for more action not more words."

I know that you will choose the course of action.

AT KICKOFF DINNER: BRAZILIAN ENVOY LAUDS STATE ALLIANCE PROGRAM

Brazilian Ambassador to the United States, Juracy Magalhaes, said Monday night that no aid program is trusted more in Brazil than the kind Connecticut is now launching.

The Ambassador spoke to more than 100 prominent State citizens and sponsors of the Connecticut Partners of the Alliance program at a kickoff dinner in the Hartford Club.

The program will solicit volunteer funds to finance self-help projects in Paraiba, Brazil, similar to projects in 26 other States helping other areas of Brazil.

"DIRECTLY FROM PEOPLE"

The Ambassador said the reason Brazil particularly trusted such State-sponsored aid programs, with funds raised locally, was that the funds came "not from the Government but directly from the American people."

James Boren, special assistant to the director of AID and national director of the Partners of the Alliance programs, said these State counterparts of the Federal Government's Alliance for Progress program are not charity programs but self-help, partnership arrangements between a U.S. State and a Brazilian State.

James Klar, chairman of the Alliance's planning committee, said, "there is unbelievable poverty and illiteracy in Paraiba, but not ignorance. The people are forward-looking, ambitious and determined to improve themselves by their own efforts." He said what was needed were investments in these people, particularly in education and health areas.

DEMPSEY PRESENTS SPOON

Governor Dempsey, who is one of the 24 sponsors of the State Alliance program, spoke enthusiastically of the goals of the Alliance and presented Ambassador Magalhaes a silver spoon, inscribed with the State seal, as an auspicious gift with which to begin the drive.

Paraiba was specifically designated by the Federal Government last year as one of the Brazilian States Connecticut could help. Six Connecticut "ambassadors" visited Paraiba in February. The trip was sponsored by AID. Future help will be solicited from State civic groups, labor unions, business and professional groups, State institutions, and private individuals.

Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1966

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

I am not a producer or consumer of tobacco, but I represent more than 2,000 tobacco farmers who earn most of their cash income from the sale of tobacco.

People will continue to consume tobacco products, and will continue to do so regardless of what is done on the floor of this House today. The amendment is wrong in principle and is discriminatory against one class of farmers. If we are going to penalize the tobacco farmers, then we perhaps should penalize and help destroy other segments of our economy.

I agree that use of tobacco is a very complex subject to evaluate. One can secure a professional opinion that the use of tobacco is harmful, and at the same time obtain professional advice disclaiming such opinions.

Research is now underway, and a Tobacco Research Laboratory has been established. The tobacco industry has shown good faith, and we should not be too eager to destroy an $8 billion industry in the United States.

I further agree that if this amendment is adopted it would certainly not cause a decrease in the use of tobacco or related products, because the amendment does not curtail the production, marketing, or sale of tobacco.

Farmers' Shrinking Price Margin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much interest expressed by the people of the First District of Nebraska over the study now underway by the Food Marketing Commission. An indication of this widespread interest was indicated recently by an editorial in one of our finer newspapers in Nebraska, the Norfolk Daily News.

Our interest here is basic to our economy and this editorial deserves a wide audience. I therefore include it in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Norfolk Daily News, May 21, 1965]

FARMER'S SHRINKING PRICE MARGIN

Farmers are always asking why their share of the food dollar is shrinking and they are getting no very satisfactory answer. We may say that the reason is that the farmer is the only one in the line of food distribution who has no bargaining power, yet it is he upon whom we are dependent for what we consume, for our very lives, in fact. Those who have inquired into the costs at various steps along the way, say that it isn't anyone's fault particularly, that if the farmer is shortchanged, it is the result of economic law.

We may get a clearer answer next July when the Food Marketing Commission, which has been looking into the matter, makes its report. Congress has set this inquiry into motion with two suggestions in advance as to what the answer will be.

Senator GALE W. MCGEE, of Wyoming, who represents a livestock-raising constituency, believes that retailers and processors may be "passing the buck" of increased costs back to the farmer. Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky, has a different slant, as he is quoted in Business Week magazine.

Senator MORTON observes that it is obvious that the food processors are simply doing more work for the housewife and charging her for it. TV frozen dinners and preprepared foods which require little cooking, are evidence that there is some truth in what Mr. MORTON says.

Meanwhile two sets of figures already determined by the Commission stand out. The farmer's share of the dollar has shrunk from 51 percent of the retail price of the Agricultural Department's theoretical market basket in 1947 to 37 percent in 1964.

The retailers' net profit, in a typical store, is placed at 2.56 percent of sales in 1955 dropping to 1.16 percent, recovering to 1.80 percent in 1963. One survey shows net operating profits of 1.35 in 1963.

It is evident that it is what happens between the time the food leaves the farm and goes into the housewife's market basket that accounts for the shrinkage. The farmer's price is based on a ratio between supply and demand, and he has found it hard to control this ratio. He has been trying to acquire bargaining power, but finds that difficult as long as supplies looking for a market keep piling up ready for sale.

A more comprehensive picture may be given us when the Commission reports in a couple of months.

Press of Middle West Supports President Johnson's Dominican Republic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include editorials from newspapers in Illinois, Minnesota, and Kansas, that indicate the strong support in the Middle West of President Johnson's handling of the Dominican Republic situation.

Here is the lead editorial in Chicago's American of May 18, 1965:

THE DOMINICAN PROBLEM

The fact that the position of the United States in the Dominican Republic is difficult does not diminish the necessity of the action. We had no choice but to go into Santo Domingo as we did, with overwhelming force. We have refrained from conflict with either side, the ruling junta or the rebels, when it has been possible to do so.

If President Johnson had not moved as swiftly and as decisively as he did, there is every possibility that the United States now would be contemplating another Cuba. While our fleet is sufficiently powerful to prevent Fidel Castro from moving armies into the Dominican Republic and Haiti, there's no doubt whatever that he could have come in by invitation if the insurgent forces had succeeded in their rebellion. That would have been a disaster of first magnitude.

The Dominican insurgents say they are not Communist and some of them are telling the truth as they know it. It is also true that Communists infiltrated the rebel movement, that they took control when the initial revolt sputtered out, and that they are highly influential now. We have learned about this kind of Communist maneuver in Cuba, to our great disadvantage. It would have been madness if the United States had permitted another Cuba in the Caribbean. To the everlasting credit of President Johnson, he has not permitted communism to spread. His policy of decisive, swift action in the Dominican Republic will prove to be the ultimate salvation of the Caribbean.

It is obvious, however, that we are in big trouble in Dominica. Possibly the President's fact-finding mission can find a way out. Unquestionably the problem will be solved, we hope without any type of coalition that will leave the Dominican Republic open to further Castro infiltration. There ought to be a coalition, yes; but it must be an anti-Communist government.

If the United States and the OAS representatives are having trouble finding such a solution, we have a suggestion. Why not call in former President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela to help conciliate the various parties of Dominica? Betancourt is thoroughly respected by both former President Bosch of the Dominican Republic and by the former ruling junta, as well as the present de facto government. Betancourt knows Latin politics. He was a Communist in his youth, but then became the anti-Communist most hated by Castro Reds, who almost succeeded in killing him. He successfully fought off violent Red revolution in Venezuela.

Maybe a commission headed by former President Betancourt could get somewhere with the Dominican problem. Surely the present armed stalemate must be resolved as soon as possible, and Communists must be kept from political control at whatever cost.

This is an editorial in the Topeka, Kans., Capital of May 5, 1965:

NO MORE CUBAS

American intervention in the revolution of the Dominican Republic appears to represent a new "get tough" policy in foreign affairs.

The first concern of President Johnson, of course, is the safety of Americans and other foreigners caught in the middle of a seething revolution. But the President also stated the American position bluntly when he said:

"The American nations cannot, must not and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere."

Ever since our involvement in Vietnam, it has been argued by some that we ought to be more concerned with communism in Cuba, only 90 miles off our shores, than with Red aggression on the other side of the world.

It now appears that developments in the Dominican Republic have made necessary a strong stand in the Caribbean, the kind of stand which, some have contended, should have been made in Cuba long ago.

President Johnson's prompt action in moving in more troops in the Dominican Republic came only after advices that the revolution there had been taken over by Communist conspirators trained in Cuba.

Thus we are now committed to stand firm for the policy of no more Cubas in the Western Hemisphere. This, coupled with our grave responsibility in Vietnam, means trouble on two fronts.

President Johnson, while saying that this country had no desire to interfere in the affairs of a sister republic, added that he ordered more of our military to the Dominican Republic only when there was no longer any choice.

Said the President:

"I don't think the American people expect their President to hesitate—or vacillate—in the face of danger just because the decision is hard.

Here, it appears, is a warning to the world that America doesn't intend to be scared off by propaganda or threats. Probably a lot of our citizens are saying it's about time we stood firm.

The idea seems to be abroad that Uncle Sam is a soft touch who turns the other cheek and hands out money whenever some two-bit politician such as Sukarno of Indonesia sounds off. Americans are weary too of raids on our libraries and embassies abroad.

Nobody wants war but it's our guess that most Americans don't want to be pushed around by Communists, either. Those who have been calling for a more firm American position in foreign policy appears to have gotten what they wanted.

We have already been called warmongers and imperialists and that will continue so long as we oppose communism on any front. But we should remember that if Red militarists don't like what we are doing, they will respect a nation which stands ready to defend its position by whatever action is necessary.

Here is the editorial from the Brainerd, Minn., Dispatch of April 30, 1965:

AMERICAN LEGION STRONGLY ENDORSES JOHNSON POLICY

Strong support for President Johnson's policy in Vietnam has come from the American Legion.

In a formal statement, National Commander Donald E. Johnson emphasized that the American Legion has placed itself on record as supporting fully "the firm stand taken by President Johnson to defend Vietnam and bring a true and just peace to that harrassed area of Asia.

"There has been much confusion—created in part by Communist propaganda machinery but American citizens should not be confused as to the role of the United States in Vietnam," the American Legion statement said.

"The U.S. military is in Vietnam for the express and only purpose of preventing further intrusion of Communist-backed Vietcong armed might within the borders of that small nation.

"Our fighting men are there to stay until the Communists have been stopped. If military action is the only way to halt aggression, then we must speak in the only language the Reds understand.

"President Johnson has offered peaceful discussions; he has offered peaceful economic assistance; he has indicated a willingness on the part of the United States to meet more than halfway any sincere effort of peaceful settlement.

"His honest efforts for a peaceful moratorium from military action to enable such efforts to bear fruit have been rudely rejected, first by Peiping and now Moscow.

"Apparently, the Communists do not understand the President when he declares that we are there, and we will stay there with our combat units, until the Vietcong ceases their invasion of Vietnam borders.

"For college students and even top ranking Members of the Senate, to propose a 'bombing recess' or a 'cease fire' by our military commands in that area approaches the realm of hysteria. Nothing would be accomplished except to aid the Vietcong in the realinement and strengthening of their military positions.

"The mighty bombing blows by our military air actions must be registering severe losses to the Communists, else the current series of vilification against the United States as an 'aggressive invader' would not be so shrill and so constant.

"Military commanders in the area are now in pointblank battle contact with the enemy. If and when there is assurance that the enemy is receptive to peace proposals, the traditional American desire for peaceful settlement of international disputes will assure that such proposals will be offered. President Johnson has indicated fully and clearly the road we would choose, if the Communist aggressors would permit us such a choice.

"This certainly is not the proper time for any indication of hesitancy on our part. Such an indication would be misunderstood and misinterpreted by the military leaders of both Red China and Red Russia."

Neighborly Snooping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the May 26 issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer carried a most interesting article on a most timely subject—the Housing Act of 1965, and the rent supplement program in particular.

Because I feel that many Members are not yet aware of the far-reaching consequences of this new administration program, I am asking leave to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD:

ON NEIGHBOR SNOOPING: RENT SUBSIDIES FACE STIFF FIGHT

(By Thomas R. Guthrie, chief of Plain Dealer bureau)

WASHINGTON.—Should your friends and neighbors be encouraged to tell tales about you if your rent is being subsidized by the Federal Government and you are earning too much money?

On this contentious, invasion-of-privacy score a sharp battle is shaping up in Congress with most of the oral missiles due to be zeroed in on Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Weaver is quoted in the transscript of a recent hearing of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency as saying that "friends and neighbors * * * are the best investigators that you have in these projects."

The statement was made during testimony on the proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. The bill, among other things, would establish a new program of rent supplements to pay a portion of the rent of low-income families.

Republican members of the subcommittee charge that "proponents of the bill" have admitted in executive session that private agencies could be used to aid in the selection of tenants to receive Federal rent subsidies.

"The Pinkerton Detective Agency, it was conceded," states Representative BURT L. TALCOTT, Republican, of California, in an individual report, "would qualify as such an agency."

In a statement yesterday to the Plain Dealer, Weaver strongly denied the inferences drawn by the Republicans on the subcommittee.

"We are not encouraging snooping," he insisted. "I was just reporting a fact of life."

He admitted, however, that should friends and neighbors volunteer information about the income or assets of the man next door, his Agency would institute inquiries based on that information.

He also categorically denied that Pinkerton's would be used to investigate applicants for subsidies. Non-Federal agencies which might be used for such inquiries would be nonprofit groups such as welfare or social agencies.

"It would be comparable," he said "to what happens in private enterprise when a person seeks to rent a home. The renter might call the man's employer. This is standard practice."

Weaver also said that applicants would be asked to prove their income statements by producing form W-2 which accompanies an individual's income tax return.

If the individual refused to produce form W-2, he would lose his subsidy.

The dispute over the "means test" sharpened during Weaver's testimony when Representative PAUL A. FINO, Republican, of New York, asked the HHFA Director about "policing the program," and the administrative costs involved.

Weaver argued the costs would be nominal. The responsibility for making an accurate statement was the tenant's, and "if he does make a false statement, he is in difficulty."

Mr. FINO stated a hypothetical case involving himself with a nest egg of $50,000 an income of $10,000, but reporting it as only $5,000.

"How would I be in difficulty," he asked Weaver, "if you do not police it or investigate it, supervise it and watch me?"

Mr. WEAVER. You will be in difficulty because there will be spot checks, as there always are on these activities, and if this were found you would be in difficulty for having made a false statement. I think you would be subject to quite a bit of criminal prosecution as well as being put out of the particular project * * * and there is one other check too, which I hate to say.

Mr. FINO. What is that?

Mr. WEAVER. But your friends and neighbors would be very much concerned about this. They are the best investigators you have in these projects.

Mr. TALCOTT told the Plain Dealer that he was the subcommittee member who asked if Pinkerton's would qualify as an investigative agency of applicants for subsidies.

Without revealing who answered, because it was in executive session, TALCOTT said. "I got an unequivocal yes."

He disputed Weaver's contention that the Agency was not encouraging neighbors to snoop. "This information not only will be welcomed, but they will follow it up," he said.

Representative J. WILLIAM STANTON, Republican, from Painesville, Ohio, described the program as "the worst legislation to come before Congress in many years. Even Democratic mayors and Governors, as well as public housing advocates, called it socially obnoxious during committee hearings."

First 100 Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, there should be no doubt that in the history of the United States of America, the first 100 days of President Johnson's first full term will rank with that of the first 100 days of Franklin D. Roosevelt. This unprecedented parallel is justly noted by the Wyoming Eagle, of Cheyenne, and under consent I extend my remarks in this RECORD and include their editorial comment of Thursday, May 6, 1965:

[From the Wyoming Eagle, May 6, 1965]

ONE HUNDRED DAYS

The first hundred days since President Johnson's inauguration on the Capitol steps last January 20 have passed—and a productive 100 days they have been.

During these 100 days, a number of measures became public laws. These included such very important measures as the $1.3 billion general aid to education bill, the Appalachia aid bill, a measure eliminating reserve requirements on Federal Reserve bank gold certificates, and the Inter-American Development Bank contribution increase.

Other proposals, such as hospital care for the aged and the voting rights measure, are progressing through the Congress.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, majority leader in the U.S. Senate, recently noted the President has submitted more than 20 reports to the Congress.

Government spending has continued to be curtailed, natural resources to be further developed, and the economy to flourish.

"In our foreign policy," said MANSFIELD, "we have attempted to reach peaceful understanding with some nations, to strengthen and unify others, and to cooperate fully with all in the cause of freedom."

He compared the leadership of President Johnson with that of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

MANSFIELD observed that under Roosevelt's guidance, the Nation came out of the great depression, "people gripped by fear were freed and given renewed faith in their system of government."

He recalled that, in the first 100 days of his administration, Roosevelt sent 15 messages to Congress, and guided 15 major laws to enactment.

Congressional Quarterly recently listed the subjects of some of the major laws enacted during the emergency session of 1933, under President Roosevelt:

Banking emergency, Government economy, legalization of beer, agricultural adjustment, forest camps, direct unemployment relief, securities regulation, farm mortgage relief, Tennessee Valley Authority, loans to homeowners, inflation, railroad reorganization, industrial recovery, control of the oil industry, and gold standard invalidation.

President Johnson's first 100 days probably cannot match the first 100 days of President Roosevelt from the standpoint of the volume of far-reaching legislation.

But the conditions of 1965 are considerably different from those of 1933, too.

Today, the Nation is enjoying unprecedented prosperity as contrasted with the dark days of the great depression.

The sense of domestic emergency and economic crisis is not present today as it was in 1933.

President Roosevelt was faced with the tremendous task of lifting the Nation out of the depression.

President Johnson is faced with the problem of keeping America strong, prosperous, and growing.

And, of course, there are always the numerous and complex problems involved in international affairs.

As Senator MANSFIELD observed, "President Roosevelt's accomplishments are an important part of history."

President Johnson's accomplishments undoubtedly will become an important part of history.

Stopping Mail-Order Guns Won't Stop Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the McPherson, Kans., Sentinel regarding legislation regulating the mail order sale of firearms. The editorial follows:

STOPPING MAIL-ORDER GUNS WON'T STOP CRIME

President Kennedy was assassinated by a rifle bought by mail order and almost at once

a campaign started to pass a law prohibiting all mail-order sales of guns to anybody except licensed dealers.

That campaign now has reached fever heat with both sides indulging in some nasty and disgraceful name calling over a proposal which won't cure anything anyhow.

Mail-order sales should be better controlled but how about secondhand stores, pawnshops and sales between persons who often have criminal records? Those sales, and they are huge, won't be touched by the proposed law.

Rather than hysterically pass a hurriedly written law because of the Kennedy assassination, it would be much better to wopk out a sensible law.

The present proposal simply gets us into something about as unworkable as the old liquor prohibition law.

Soil Stewardship Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, this week is being observed throughout America as Soil Stewardship Week. I want to pay tribute to the soil and water conservation districts of America and cooperating church groups who sponsor this annual observance.

Church observances are being held this week in thousands of communities to place emphasis on man's obligation to God as a steward of the soil, water, and other related resources. It is designed to emphasize that the basic motivation for the orderly conservation and development of natural resources is man's recognition of his responsibility under God to protect and use wisely His precious gifts of soil and water.

The role of the church in resource conservation and development was reviewed in the May issue of the Soil Conservation magazine by Dr. Henry A. McCanna, of the National Council of the Churches of Christ of New York City.

Dr. McCanna pointed out:

> Successful rural area development depends on two important factors that churches can help provide (1) the programs must be based on local initiative; and (2) the people who need help the most must find an articulate voice.

Dr. McCanna then pointed out examples of dedicated local leadership, one of which is in my home congressional district. He said:

> Usually it is the laymen who are the leaders, but pastors also get involved. A pastor in Mayville, Mich., stimulated a concern for the hungry people of the world that has become Statewide in its scope.

Dr. McCanna's full statement follows:

THE CHURCH ROLE IN RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

(By Dr. Henry A. McCanna [1])

The churches of America have contributed significant leadership to all levels of the Rural Areas Development movement. This is a natural result of their concern for good community life and the enhancement of individual personality.

The various approaches of Rural Areas Development are a means of responsible ethical action. Never before have so many groups joined together for a single social objective. The well-being of the 67 million people who live in town and country areas of less than 10,000 population is at stake. Having contributed to the total national wealth far out of proportion of their numbers, these people now have the opportunity to experience full development.

BASIC ELEMENTS

Successful rural area development depends on two important factors that churches can help provide: (1) The programs must be based on local initiative, and (2) the people who need help the most must find an articulate voice.

It is in these matters that dedicated laymen and local pastors can be most helpful. They, more than any other local group, can aid in stimulating local initiative, and they can seek the dispossessed and help them become articulate.

In Custer County, Nebr., a leading church layman is the focal point for local resource development, and the record will show that in nearly every State and local RAD committee such sensitive and effective churchmen provide key leadership.

Usually it is the laymen who are the leaders, but pastors also get involved. A pastor in Mayville, Mich., stimulated a concern for the hungry people of the world that has become statewide in scope.

The need for leadership in area development to provide new jobs in Braxton and Webster Counties, W. Va., caused a local pastor to help organize the Braxton County Development Corporation Committee and to serve as its president.

In Jackson, Ohio, one of the finest examples of manpower training and development was spearheaded by a dedicated minister.

Both the lay and professional leaders of the Arizona migrant ministry and the Mississippi Delta ministry are enlisting large numbers of urban as well as rural people into programs that will enable them to obtain equal economic opportunity.

Economic development, and its consequence, social development, can occur only if resources are adequate.

RESOURCES AND RELIGION

The relationship between the conservation of natural resources and religious development is as old as time and as new as tomorrow. The Bible records that the first commandment given to man was to "replenish (conserve) the earth" (Genesis 1: 28).

Among the reasons for the settlement of America by our forefathers were the basic need for a new freedom of religion and a desire for land ownership. And in the development of the United States, opening up of new lands commonly was accompanied by extension of missionary activity.

The institutions of religion, and particularly the local congregation, have always thrived or waned with the availability of soil and water resources. The conservation of these basic resources has been encouraged by the stewardship teachings of religion, and the strengthening of the land has resulted in a corresponding extension of religion. It is not accidental that at the center of every flourishing agricultural area is a cluster of religious institutions.

RURAL OBSERVANCES

With the increase of urban life in the United States, the churches have emphasized more and more the importance of resource development. There have been ever-increasing observances of Rural Life Sunday, Soil Stewardship Week, Harvest Festivals, Freedom From Hunger Week, emphasis on conservation in Sunday schools and vacation church schools, training courses on the relation of religion and conservation, and outdoor services in State and National parks and recreational centers. Nearly every denominational publishing house includes the concepts of responsible stewardship of natural resources in its literature and especially in worship bulletins and aids.

For more than a decade the "Soil Stewardship" booklet of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts has met an ever-expanding demand. In 1964, more than 75,000 of the booklets and 6 million bulletin inserts were distributed in local communities and churches. These materials are prepared by the Association in cooperation with a soil stewardship advisory committee composed of the national rural church leaders of the major faiths in America.

GROWING NEEDS

The growing interest of churches in rural observances is a response to a new dimension of change in modern life. In one sense, it might be said that the only constant factor in our society is change. And as changes occur man becomes aware of new and growing needs.

The relatively simple needs of the past for food, shelter, rest, and love have been expanded to an extent heretofore only imagined in the wildest of dreams. Industrialization and automation enable man to live in surroundings which would have been the envy of yesterday's potentates.

The new leisure promises to fulfill the ancient hope for a nation of philosophers and artists. Without continuing conservation, however, man's unrestrained appetites can frustrate the fulfillment of his future. As we become aware of growing needs, we must also demonstrate a corresponding increase of responsible conservation. Otherwise, instead of these changes contributing to a healthy society, they may bring forth a diseased giantism that topples of its own weight.

[1] Dr. McCanna is director, Commission on the Church in Town and Country of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., New York City.

Isn't Everyone Subsidized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the bulk of the information available to the public today on farm subsidies is deceptive in effect, if not in purpose.

Consumers and taxpayers generally are led to believe that the total annual appropriations to the Department of Agriculture are subsidies to farmers. Actually, nonfarmers participate in a larger share of this Department's expenditure than farmers themselves.

Approximately two-thirds of the Department of Agriculture's expenditures, in the 1966 budget, are for services which are of primary benefit to the general public. Approximately two-thirds of the Department expenditures in the 1966 budget are for services which are of primary benefit to the general public. About one-third goes for price support and related programs in which farmers are the primary but not the only beneficiaries.

The deception may be erased by a look at 1 year's total expenditures:

[In millions of dollars]

	1964	Estimate, 1965	Estimate, 1966
Programs which clearly provide benefits to consumers, businessmen, and the general public	4,835	4,582	4,373
Other programs which are predominantly for stabilization of farm income, but which also benefit others	3,062	2,276	1,984

There seems to be a planned propensity by some Congressmen and in some areas of our business community to tie a "subsidy" tag to Government programs that seek to bring the income of farmers into a parity position with other segments of our economy. However, the word "subsidy" as a derisive expletive is seldom applied to Government policy and money aids to business and labor.

Publishers of magazines are recipients of Government subsidies through the Post Office Department. The House Appropriations Committee published figures which showed that revenues for mailing 14 national publications accounted for only 35 percent of the cost of handling these publications.

Postal deficits over a 12-year period in behalf of business almost equals the cost of farm price support programs through the Commodity Credit Corporation during more than a quarter of a century.

Take the question of food costs: Food costs have risen less since 1947–49 than most other consumer items in the cost-of-living index. For all items on the list, the increase in cost to 1964 was 33 percent. For all food, the increase was 26 percent. For rent, it was 48 percent and for medical care 72 percent.

The farmer gets none of the increase in cost for the food he produces. In fact, he receives 15 percent less for the farm food "market basket" than he did in 1947–49. The retail cost of this "market basket" has risen only 14 percent although processing and marketing costs have increased 42 percent since 1947–49.

Misleading and incomplete information, given to the American public adds unnecessary confusion to established and proved concepts; and could even place our agricultural policy in legislative jeopardy. Our foreign policy could also be affected as food is an important arm in the program. Food is survival and we should never become so well fed that we forget this principle.

Our agriculture is the Nation's largest and most vital industry. It employs 6.1 million workers. This is more workers than are in the combined employment in transportation, public utilities, the steel industry, and the automobile industry.

The assets in agriculture total more than $230 billion. This is equal to about two-thirds of the value of current assets of all corporations in the United States or about three-fifths of the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

Many are not aware of the fact that 3 out of every 10 jobs in private industry are related to agriculture.

Since here are so many myths relating to subsidies let us look at the historical records of the economy of our Nation. Do you know what the oldest economic principle written into the law of the United States is? It may come as a shock to many people—but it is the subsidy.

The second act of the First Congress in 1789 was to legislate for the new emerging Nation the enactment of a tariff law, to protect and promote the infant and frontier industrial development of America. At that time the United States was almost completely populated by farm people.

More significantly, this tariff law set up a special subsidy program to encourage the development of an American merchant fleet. The law stipulated that goods imported into the United States on American ships should have a 10-percent reduction in custom duties, and a tonnage tax also was imposed in favor of American shipping.

Since the birth of our Nation, subsidies through the years have taken many and various forms.

The Government granted 6,340,339 acres of public lands to private interests between 1827 and 1866, to encourage canal building and river improvement, in addition to rights-of-way grants. The Government made other contributions by direct appropriations, stock subscriptions, and loans to private canal companies.

Approximately 183 million acres of Federal and State lands were granted to railroads between 1850 and 1871.

The first mail subsidy was paid 125 years ago. Since then many millions of dollars have been assigned by the Federal Government to ocean and airmail subsidies, to foster the development of transportation, as was the case in the special considerations for railroads and waterways.

Many millions of dollars have been used to subsidize the building of U.S. ships on American ways. Here is one example: about $40 million in subsidy was paid on the private luxury liner *United States*. The total cost of the ship was given at $76,800,000.

Diverse as these subsidy programs are, it is unrealistic either to condemn or to praise Federal subsidies as such. Each particular program which is determined to contain an element of subsidy must be judged independently, taking into account the economic, social, and political conditions prevailing at the time.

Any broad condemnation of subsidies as such confronts these hard-core facts:

America's infant industry, without the aid of subsidy laws in the early years after the formation of this independent Nation, would have been slow to develop and the emergence of the United States as a world power could have been retarded for many years.

Without subsidy there would have been no early development of an American merchant fleet. The first accomplishments of inland transportation in this country—by canals and river improvements—would have been delayed.

Had there been no subsidy, in the form of extensive assistance to railroads in spanning the continent, the settlement and development of the West would have been retarded for many years.

The age of air travel in America, unless aided by subsidy, would have been late in arriving, and the contribution of airpower to our military preparedness would have been slowed down.

Without subsidy, no commercial seagoing ships—perhaps even now—would be built on American shores.

Subsidy has had a substantial and beneficial role in the Nation's overall industrial development.

It has been essential in stimulating vital production in wartime.

It has financed scientific development.

It has been used in efforts to balance the economic positions of vast segments of our total society.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in a special survey on subsidy and subsidylike programs of the U.S. Government reports that:

> Some contend the tariff system is a subsidy structure, since it involves Government action that enables protected industries to charge more for their goods in the American markets. Moreover, some consider that accelerated tax amortization for defense plants subsidizes the owners of these plants; that "depletion allowances" provide subsidylike benefits to the petroleum and some other industries; that Federal non-interest-bearing deposits of billions of dollars in private banks and certain services of the Federal Reserve System amount to subsidies for large private bankers; that sale of Federal surplus property at a loss is a subsidy to the purchasers, and that the postal deficit on second-class mail is a subsidy to business.
>
> Others confine their definition to direct Government payments, to the remission of charges, and to the supplying of commodities or services at less than cost or market price.
>
> There is one concept of subsidy which extends to all persons and enterprises whose economic positions are improved, or whose purposes are advanced as the result of Government action. This embraces industries whose profits would be less without protection of the tariff laws and the many other statutes that soften the full force of competition in a private enterprise economy; and this broad definition likewise encompasses all working people whose earnings are greater because of minimum wage, collective bargaining, and immigration laws.

It should be pointed out that the economic benefits accruing to industry and labor, from Government policies, are paid for, as are the costs of the farm program by the consumer and taxpayer. Remember this: Consumers and taxpayers are one and the same.

Most of us will agree that all of our citizens feel the social and economic impact of the subsidy programs for industry, labor, and agriculture.

Again, it should be emphasized that in the overall subsidy concept this Nation's agriculture is a lesser recipient than either labor or industry. Yet, the farmer in many areas of public opinion has been cast as the chief villain of all subsidy gatherers.

The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the last day of Mr. William Benton's visit to the Soviet Union during 1964, he had the remarkable experience of being granted a 40-minute interview with Nikita Khrushchev, who was then head of the U.S.S.R.

His last chapter, "Epilogue" deals with the circumstances of this interview. The first part of "Epilogue" follows:

EPILOGUE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Prior to the replacement of Khrushchev on October 15, 1964, Senator Benton had planned to conclude this report, stimulated by his Moscow visit in May, with an account of his visit with the then chairman. He had titled this section, "Nikita Khrushchev, Headmaster." Although the interview dealt chiefly with political and economic questions, Senator Benton felt it was not inappropriate to an article on Soviet education. Chairman Khrushchev, by stressing on the world scene what the Soviets call "peaceful coexistence," obviously was counting on what he regarded as the ultimate educational, scientific, and cultural superiority of the Soviet system to give the U.S.S.R. victory over the West. Thus the U.S.S.R. and its leaders would become the world's intellectual "headmasters."

After Khrushchev's downfall, Senator Benton jestingly suggested that a suitable subtitle might be, "Nikita Khrushchev, Old Boy." He decided to drop the chapter. But the editors feel that this interview remains relevant and thus carry it here as an epilogue. It has historical interest as one of Khrushchev's last extended interviews with an American. More important, it may reflect basic policies, if not the personal "style," to be followed by Khrushchev's immediate successors. No attempt has been made to include interpretive remarks in this section.)

Whether I would be able to see Chairman Khrushchev was a matter of conjecture during my visit. He was in Egypt dedicating the Aswan Dam. Would he return before I left? Would he have time?

The evening before the day of my scheduled departure I dined—in a private room of a public restaurant—with M. and Mme. Mamedov. I had intimated that I would be most happy to spend my last evening in Moscow with just the two of them. There are few couples anywhere in the world to match Enver and Tamara Mamedov in formidability—or in charm. During the dinner they told me that I had an appointment with Chairman Khrushchev for a 40-minute interview at 3 o'clock the next day. My plane was scheduled to leave at 4:45. I would just make it. I should, I was told, allow an hour to reach the airport from the Kremlin.

M. and Mme. Mamedov announced the interview with obvious pleasure, and stressed how remarkable they thought it was that I was to have such a visit with the chairman. The pressures upon him, and demands for his time, were enormous, they said. He had only the day before returned from his trip to Egypt. Nehru had died that morning and the chairman had called at the Indian Embassy. Walter Ulbricht of East Germany was to arrive for a state visit the next day. It did indeed seem extraordinary that the chairman would see me for as long as 40 minutes. Mme. Mamedova said the interview was "a miracle."

I could only agree and express my appreciation. I did not know whether to thank Mme. Popova for arranging this interview—or Mme. Furtseva, the minister of culture whom I had visited, who had told me she hoped it could be arranged—or Alexei Adzhubei—or Mme. Mamedova—or others. I accepted it as the privilege that it was. In preparation for the interview, I studied quotations from Khrushchev's recent speeches which Secretary Harriman had given me. (My only "instructions" from him.) These quotations stressed that high on the list of Soviet promises to the people is raising the standard of living. Toward this goal the Communist government has been digging its way upward for some years, but dirt keeps rolling back in, and progress had been too slow to suit Chairman Khrushchev or the hungry consumer. In the chairman's speeches, he had been making no bones about it.

In April the chairman said in a speech at a Soviet-Polish friendship rally—in a manifest swipe at Communist China, which advocates belt pulling—"How would our party, our people, have taken it if we had convened a party congress and decided the economy has been developed enough; let us produce less, so as not to grow fat and thus prevent our degeneration, a bourgeois degeneration? What should we then do? Switch industry over to the production of belts so we can draw them in tighter, if you please? Is this the inspiration for our people to march ahead? Ahead where? To the grave? No! This is not our approach."

The same month, in a talk at Borsod, Hungary, in another sideswipe at Mao Tse-tung, Khrushchev developed a catchphrase not unlike the "two chickens in every pot" or the "two cars in every garage" of some American oratory. "When a housewife goes shopping," he said, "she wants to buy a bit more. If she has one dress, for instance, she wants to buy another, or even two, especially if she is fashion minded. That is right. There are some who criticize us, who say we are always thinking about living better, who say that these are anti-Marxist, bourgeois slogans. The working people of our country answer such critics: 'Why did we carry out the revolution? What are we fighting for? We did not fight to live worse after the conquest of power.' "

At a talk he gave at a light bulb factory in Budapest, he said with apparent regret: "There are some people in the world, calling themselves Communists and adherents of Marxism-Leninism, who do not consider it important to strive for a better life, but who call only for the making of a revolution." This was a direct reference to the so-called "hard line" of China.

And he added, "The important thing is that we should have more to eat—good goulash—schools, housing, and ballet. How much more do these things give to the enlargement of a man's life? It is worth fighting and working for these things." (Not long afterward the chairman celebrated his 70th birthday. Secretary Harriman ended his congratulatory telegram, "Yours for more good goulash.")

These quotations reflected one of the chairman's major political dilemmas. How could he provide the better life and step up his armament program simultaneously? Manifestly, he could not. He had many other dilemmas, of course, notably those fomented by the Red Chinese.

In his own words on April 6 in a village in Hungary: "The Chinese leaders tell us: If there is war, so what? Suppose one half of mankind will be destroyed? The other half will remain. Time will pass, women will bear children again, and mankind will be the same number as before. In my opinion it is not from an excess of brains but an absence of them that people say such things."

And again, in the address before the Soviet-Polish friendship rally: "It appears I must now, as the Chinese are recommending, gather workers and technicians and say to them: 'Are you for or against the revolution?' [If they say] 'I am for the revolution!' [I answer], 'Then why the hell are you earning so much? Do you know what danger you have degenerated into?' "

Again at Borsod on April 17: "There are people who criticize us for our position on questions of war and peace. These people say, 'You are afraid of war.' I have already more than once answered such 'brave' ones: Only a child or an idiot does not fear war—the child because he does not understand what war is, and the idiot because he is deprived of the possibility of ever understanding it. Is one who jumps head first off a bridge and kills himself showing bravery?"

These are powerful words. But far more indelible in the United States was the impression made by Chairman Khrushchev when he took off his shoe in the General Assembly of the United Nations and pounded on his desk with the heel. To many this seemed to be the act of a "Peck's bad boy"—but I recall it as a symbol of differences of far greater import—and with a chilling feeling that the fate of the world can still depend upon the whims, frustrations, and misunderstandings of a few men.

In his article for Britannica's "The Great Ideas Today" 1964, directed to readers in the United States, Alexei Adzhubei quotes his father-in-law, Chairman Khrushchev, as saying to us, "We have studied under you, and you should not blush for your pupils, but should rather be proud of them if they want to catch up with you." He also gives Khrushchev's elaboration of his famous but often misunderstood remark: "We'll bury you." "Communists, realizing the inevitability of the downfall of capitalism, and rejoicing that such an hour will come, are all the same not guided in their actions by naive feelings and notions and are not preparing to bury each capitalist individually; they understand that capitalism is digging its own grave."

Second Anniversary of the Signing of the Charter of African Unity

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, here is the text of the message from the Government of the United States delivered today by Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams to the African nations on the second anniversary of the signing o fthe Charter of African Unity:

On behalf of the Government of the United States, I extend to the Organization of African Unity warmest congratulations on the occasion of the second anniversary of the signing of its Charter. Americans have watched with deep interest and sympathy the steady progress of the OAU in its important tasks of promoting the unity and solidarity of African nations and coordinating their efforts toward achieving a better life for the peoples of Africa. We have every confidence that in the future, as in the initial years, the OAU will continue to play a most useful and constructive role in the affairs of the continent of Africa.

Mississippi Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out before, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party challenge to the seating of the Mississippi House delegation is proceeding under title 2, section 201 and those that follow. I understand that both parties plan to appear before the Clerk of the House on June 2. The challenge will be referred to the House administration committee very shortly. In order to aid my colleagues in their deliberations concerning this important issue, I wish to bring to their attention an article by George Slaff which appeared in the Nation magazine:

The article follows:

[From the Nation, May 17, 1965]

FIVE SEATS IN CONGRESS: "THE MISSISSIPPI CHALLENGE"

(By George Slaff)

The voting-rights bill which President Johnson sent to Congress as a result of the Nation's anger, and his own, over the callous violence of Alabama State troopers at Selma and the murder of the Reverened James Reeb is a historic step forward—but long overdue and far from enough. (See "The Right To Vote: Small Fruit of a Bold Promise" by William W. Van Alstyne, the Nation, Apr. 19.)

That it is long overdue is certainly no reason not to welcome it. That it is far from enough is certainly reason to point out that the administration has at hand, if only it will use it, a much more effective way to guarantee the vote to Negroes in the South than this or any other piece of legislation that Congress could pass. That is the "Mississippi challenge." If it succeeds—and what President Johnson and his administration do about it may well determine whether or not it will succeed—it will stand as a lesson forever to the Southern States that as long as they prevent Negroes from voting they are in danger of losing their representation in Congress.

The "Mississippi challenge" is the contest—filed on the first day of Congress this year on behalf of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party—to the right of the five Mississippi Congressmen to sit in the House of Representatives. It is based on the allegation that the Congressmen were nominated and elected in a primary and general election from which Negroes "were regularly and systematically excluded by intimidation, harassment, economic reprisal, property damage, terrorization, violence and illegal and unconstitutional registration procedures."

What are the chances of the challenge's success? Good, if the national indignation aroused by Selma and its aftermath does not cool off or become apathetically satisfied with a nominal voting rights bill. Good, if the challenge is determined on the basis of conditions as they exist in Mississippi, as documented by some 15,000 pages of sworn testimony taken in the space of 6 weeks in a modern miracle of legal effort. Good, if the administration and the Republican leadership make the slightest effort when the challenge comes to a vote in the House to support the 149 Congressmen who voted, on January 4, not even to seat the 5 Mississippians until the challenge was decided.

Federal law gives the contestants in such a challenge the right to take testimony to support their claim. The taking of that testimony has now been completed and has gone forward to the Subcommittee on Elections of the House Committee on Administration. From there it will be reported out to the House itself. The Mississippi challenge has scarcely been mentioned in the Nation's press, but Drew Pearson said recently, "The challenge to Mississippi's Congressmen is causing such worry that Gov. Paul Johnson has called off a special session of the State legislature originally planned to denounce the new Civil Rights Act."

Under the Federal Code, the lawyers for the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party had only 40 days from January 4 in which to gather the evidence to support the challenge and put it into deposition form. This deadline presented a challenge of its own, for there were hundreds of witnesses, friendly and hostile, to be interviewed, summoned, and examined, mountains of voting records to be gone over and an infinitude of details to be covered properly. Any ordinary lawyer might be expected to call the undertaking impossible, but the lawyers for the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, headed by William Kunstler and Arthur Kinoy, of New York, Mortimer Stavis, of Newark, N.J., and Ben Smith and Bruce Waltzer, of New Orleans, are not ordinary lawyers. To them, the impossible is simply routine in civil rights matters.

By personal appeal, phone, wire, letter—every form of communication except the jungle drum and the smoke signal—word went out to the lawyers of the country that there was work to be done—and fast—in Mississippi. Between the middle of January, and appropriately enough, Lincoln's Birthday, 96 of them had flown into the State at their own expense, had examined between 500 and 600 witnesses in 30 counties, and had taken approximately 15,000 pages of testimony, recorded by court reporters from outside the State who had also volunteered their services.

In Mississippi, only approximately 6 percent of the eligible Negro citizens are registered to vote. In Panola County, up in the northwestern part of the State, where Mike Lewton of San Francisco, Roy Collins of Danbury, and I held hearings during the week ending January 12, only two Negroes had been permitted to register from 1890 to 1962.

The year 1890 has special significance in Mississippi history. It was then that the white oligarchy of the State, seeking some "legal" means of disenfranchising the half million registered Negroes, adopted a new constitution which required that to be a voter a person had to be able to "read any section of the constitution of this State * * * or give a reasonable interpretation thereof." By strict application of this requirement, with unlimited discretion in the Registrar of Voters as to what constitutes a "reasonable interpretation thereof," more registrar of voters as to what constitutes Mississippi is today barred from the polls. Approximately 28,500 Negroes are registered in Mississippi as against 525,000 white registrants (who, as a practical matter, are not subjected to the test of constitutional erudition), although the Negro population of the State is approximately two-thirds that of the white.

The testimony in the challenge varied in detail from county to county, but the basic pattern was the same. Panola County is a good example of the situation throughout the State.

The hearings were held in "Freedom House," the COFO headquarters in Batesville, the county seat. Close to 200 Negro residents of Panola County were in the hearing room which could comfortably hold about 150. The corridor outside was packed 10 and 12 deep with Negroes who had come from all over the county to listen. Outside, at each of the eight windows, opened a trifle at the bottom, Negroes stood on tiptoe, three and four deep.

Robert J. Miles, one of the leaders in Negro voter registration in the county and a founder of the Negro Voters League and the Freedom Democratic Party, was the first witness. Miles is a quiet, determined, fearless man, 50 years old, whose house was bombed twice last summer and shot at many times. He speaks softly but firmly.

He unhesitatingly told of conditions in Panola County over the years—the fear, the threats, the harassment, the intimidation, the evictions, the economic reprisals that had always effectively stopped Negro voter registration. He spoke of the "Darby days"—the dark periods when Sheriff Darby had ruled the county from 1951 to 1955 and again from 1959 to 1963—and the beatings and killings of Negroes that marked Darby's reign. The hiatus between Darby's terms of office and the fact that he is not now sheriff are due to a Mississippi law that prevents various officials from succeeding themselves.

Miles stated that the Negroes in Panola County, as well as in the rest of the State, bore vividly in mind the death of the Reverend Lee in Belzoni and the killing of a Mr. Smith on the courthouse steps down in the southeastern part of the State. Both had expressed the determination to vote. He told of the cancellation of all his insurance after his first attempt to register and of the threat to kill him made to his neighbor, Mrs. Caldwell.

That pressure from outside and putting Mississippi in the spotlight of national attention have some value became evident when we went to see Sheriff Hubbard at the end of the day to tell him that we expected no harm to come to our witnesses. He assured us that he would have deputies patrolling in the neighborhoods where the witnesses lived and that he had already arranged a meeting that evening with some of the plantation owners and others to tell them that there were to be no reprisals. This solicitude reflected the word that had come down from former Governor Coleman, representing the Congressmen, that there were to be no incidents during the challenge because of the reaction outside Mississippi.

However, it is entirely likely that the moment the spotlight is turned off, the terror that has been commonplace in Mississippi for generations will be unleashed again. Less than a week after we finished taking testimony, the COFO headquarters in Laurel, Miss., was burned to the ground. A few days later, the headline in the Los Angeles Times over a story of the hearings held by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission read: "Mississippi 'savagery' shocks rights prober: Commission Hears Sworn Testimony of Floggings and Slayings of Negroes." Early in March, the New York Times carried the following story from Batesville about what happened there when Negroes gathered outside the court where a group of local Negroes and two COFO workers were being tried on charges of "parading without a permit, blocking the sidewalk, and disturbing the peace":

"A crowd of several hundred Negroes gathered to learn the decision in mayor's court.

"This brought several hundred whites to the scene. Toughs spotted Christopher Williams, of Amherst, Mass., 18-year-old son of Schafer Williams, history professor of the University of Massachusetts. They beat the youth to the ground and stomped on him. He still has a red, 3-inch wound from a kick in the face.

"Six Negroes also were beaten, one requiring five stitches to close a wound over his eye. One Negro, Robert Miles, fought back.

"This started a brawl. The police who had been watching, broke it up. Mr. Miles and two of the whites were arrested and released on bond.

"Then on Sunday night a shotgun was fired through the window of the front door of the Miles home. Pellets just missed Mr. Williams and another white worker, 21-year-old Penny Patch, of Englewood, N.J. The two are living at the Miles home."

Robert Miles surely knew as he testified that day in February that his future would not be free of violence, yet he continued to tell calmly of the efforts made by himself, his brother-in-law, William Kuykendall, C. J. Williams, the Reverend Mr. Middleton, Lamarr Thomas, and others to organize a voters' league among the Negroes of Panola County in 1959. A few of them had begun to study the constitution of Mississippi in detail and had gone in groups of three to register; all had been failed in their applications. Mr. Miles said that Kuykendall had been shot at and that crosses were burned at his home; he said that Town Marshal Ira Seals had beaten 12-year-old Linda Kuykendall so badly that she had been hospitalized, telling her it was "on account of your father being a smart NAACP nigger." He told of the telephone threats and the shots at Kuykendall's home which finally forced him to take his family from Batesville to the safety of Detroit.

Although, by comparison, violence against Negroes has been less in Panola than in some of the other counties in Mississippi. Panola Negroes have been beaten, shot, and killed by sheriffs, by highway patrolmen, and by white civilians—and none of the offenders has been punished by the law. Robert Miles pointed out that the Negroes of Panola always bore this fact of life—and death—in mind and that it had discouraged registration.

All that day and for half of the next, witness followed witness with personal testimony as to why only two Negroes had been permitted to register in Panola County in the 72 years from 1890 to 1962. C. J. Williams looked straight at the lawyers for the Congressmen as he told of the fear that gripped the Negro community when voting was discussed; of nocturnal roadblocks as late as last September, manned by the sheriff, his deputies, and the district attorney in person, to get the names of everyone who attended a voter registration meeting. Rev. W. G. Middleton, 10 years old when the 1890 constitution took the franchise away from Negroes, and who was to say after the hearings were over, "I saw the doors close and now I have seen them open again," sat erectly in the witness chair and looked out at the crowded hearingroom as he might upon his congregation. He gave in measured tones a detailed recital of the absolute deprivation of the rights of American citizenship that had been the Negroes' lot in Panola County. His voice was firm with hope and confidence for the future—the Reverend Middletons, the Mileses, the Williamses of Panola County do not frighten easily or despair readily.

Mrs. Caldwell took the stand to state that the sheriff's son-in-law had threatened to kill Miles if he didn't get those COFO workers out of his house. Sharecroppers from plantations near Batesville and from Crenshaw, 30 miles away, told of coming to register and of being turned away because the registrar was not in his office, or of standing in line all day and having the office closed before they had a chance to get in—and this even after the registrar was subject to a Federal court injunction.

Charles Gardner, who had been a tenant farmer on the McMillen plantation for 8 years, testified that he was ordered to leave shortly after his wife had registered to vote last August. Clara Perry, who had been a tenant for 2 years on the R. L. Milam plantation, was told to get out by Milam himself 3 or 4 days after she registered. And so it went with witness after witness, including two of the unsinkable COFO workers, Penny Patch and Claire O'Conner, and concluding just before noon on Wednesday with Rev. Charles E. Lester, ordained a minister in 1922, now more than 80 years old, who was ordered out of the place he had occupied for 10 years on the Crenshaw plantation a week or so after he attempted to register last summer.

Then it became the turn of the registrar of voters, Ike Shankle, to take the stand and to account, under oath, for his actions. For years Shankle and his predecessors had been requiring Negroes in Panola County to interpret such portions of the Mississippi constitution as section 212 which deals with the interest rate of the Chickasaw School fund and other trust funds for educational purposes for which the State is responsible, etc.

It may thus come as a surprise that the man who determines whether a Negro's written interpretation of esoteric sections of the Mississippi constitution entitles him to vote confessed, in reply to the first question I put to him, that he had not the slightest idea of what a bill of attainder was, although the prohibition against bills of attainder is contained in the bills of rights of at least 34 of the 50 States. He admitted that if that were a part of the Mississippi constitution he would not be able to interpret it—and that when he had first registered he had not been asked to interpret any section of the constitution, but had merely "gone down to the courthouse and signed the book."

For a day and a half Shankle sweated on the stand, trying to explain why he did not consider "No one should be convicted for the same things twice" to be a reasonable interpretation of the "double jeopardy" section of the Mississippi constitution; why he had closed down one of the two voter-registration offices in the county and forced a large part of its Negro residents to trek an additional 25 or 30 miles to register; why he refused to appoint any deputy registrars to handle applications, with the result that Negroes were prevented from registering during the 2 months when he was acting as clerk of the circuit court, while he was on vacation, or during the many other times when he was away from his office; why he had denied a Negro applicant the right to register because, although she had answered perfectly the 21 questions on the application, including the constitutional interpretation and the final question requiring her to write her understanding "of the duties, and obligations of citizenship under a constitutional form of government," she had signed the application in only one of the two required places; why, indeed, he had refused to certify the names of registered voters on a petition to place Mrs. Fanny Lou Hamer on the ballot to contest the congressional seat in the last election, and to place the name of Aaron Henry, president of the Mississippi NAACP, on the ballot for the U.S. Senate.

Sheriff Hubbard, following Mr. Shankle to the stand, spun a fanciful tale of trying to intercept moonshiners as the reason for a four-road block last September by which he and his deputies and the district attorney secured the names of all who attended a voter-registration meeting. The district attorney's presence, he explained, was not an attempt to intimate potential voters; he had "happened" to meet the DA that evening and Mr. Finch was just "taking a ride with me like he often done."

Finch, a filibusterer to put Senator Claghorn to shame, swore to the same thing, although he could not recall where or when he happened to meet the sheriff that evening. He admitted writing down the names of occupants of cars coming from the meeting, but denied that this had anything to do with the fact that they were organizing to vote.

Plantation owners, called to the stand, piously denied intimidation, threat, harassment, as they reluctantly agreed that voting and registering to vote were duties and obligations of citizenship which they recognized and which should not be denied to Negro citizens.

At 11:15 a.m. on Friday, February 12, the hearing ended, and as it did, 200 people stood in the hearing room, joined hands, and burst out with "We Shall Overcome." It was an unforgettable moment for those of us who had come from far away to help the Negro people of Mississippi.

The lawyers for the Congressmen gathered their papers and left the room, followed by the dozen or so white witnesses and spectators. C. J. Williams mounted a table and exhorted everyone in the audience who had not yet registered to "Go down to the courthouse and register now, not tomorrow or the day after, but now. You heard them say it's all right for you to register. Go ahead and do it. Now. Now. Now."

But while such emotional fulfillment is all very well, the important matter is the effect and the effectiveness of the challenge. So far the results have been valuable in two respects. First, the evidence at the hearings is more than enough to provide a solid basis for congressional action to oust the Mississippi Congressmen. Second, the hearings have provided a tremendous boost to the morale of the Negroes over the entire State, both leaders and rank and file.

There remains to be accomplished the third and final result—the actual ousting of the five pretenders. It would be naive to assume that this decisive step will be taken strictly from an impartial weighing of the evidence by individual Congressmen. The Southern bloc of approximately 100 votes will be cast almost solidly against the challenge. Political considerations of every sort will, in varying degrees, enter into the determination of the rest of Congress.

Some Congressmen will satisfy their consciences by voting for the voting-rights bill and then against the challenge, on the theory that enough is enough and why rock the boat of congressional privilege. The administration, too, may decide that there is more to be lost than gained by creating further antagonism among white population of the South. The soft pedal may very well replace the blazing anger that President Johnson displayed in his voting-rights address.

In fact, a great deal could be gained by ousting the five Congressmen, and there is every reason for the administration to give its full force to the effort. All possible steps must be taken by every interested person and organization to see that their own Congressmen and as many others as can be reached, as well as the administration itself, support the challenge wholeheartedly when it reaches the floor of Congress. A successful answer to the Mississippi challenge will go further toward shaping the course of democracy in the South than the voting-rights bill and a half dozen Supreme Court decisions, important as those are. Once the principle is established that Congress itself—without the need for court intervention—will not tolerate Negro disenfranchisement will really begin to disappear from America.

The True Meaning of Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to

include part of a speech by an outstanding constituent of mine, Rabbi Marvin M. Weitz, D.D., Ph. D., of the North Shore Synagogue, Syosset, Long Island, N.Y., which I believe carries a message of truth and insight for all Americans. Rabbi Weitz delivered this speech at the commencement exercises at Colorado State College, Greeley, Colo., on Sunday, May 31, 1964, at which time he was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters:

Today more than ever, education and religion are the supports for the bridge of life, to balance seeming opposites where possible into more meaningful living for more people, a span whereby obstacles are transformed into opportunities, and stumbling blocks into steppingstones—education and religion must cooperate to make ever-new frontiers a supreme pursuit in matters that count. Education, to be more than an intellectual canning process, and religion, to be more than a pious praying exercise, must create new values even more than recreate old values. Both religion and education, more than ever, must utilize youth's love of distant horizons, rededication to search for truth and the freedom to sustain such search, and youth's quick sympathy for the oppressed. If these new frontiers are to add new intellectual power to education and new spiritual purpose to religion, what then are some of the struggles education and religion must free anew today for tomorrow for high human values, in the seeming pace, not peace, of coexistence that has to be waged and won?

Many are the modern parallels available to us and plausible for us—where we may strike a balance and win reprieve for values at their ablest and bravest, without loss of commitments, without lapse of luster for life—it takes greater courage to confront them, and make something of them, to resolve them than to dissolve them—what then, are some of these new frontiers that may bring balance via education and religion today?

We initiate this quest for balance, for force of law, rather than law of force, for cooperation, not conflict, for peace, not war—with this very Memorial Day—our very first frontier, since it is upon us.

The heart of the Nation was tenderly touched when, this very day, in 1867, in Columbus, Miss., southern ladies decorated graves of both, northern and southern soldiers fallen in Civil War. This very act bound the wounds of a nation and made this as a Sabbath among festivals of America. This deed became part of the American creed—to move a Finch to proclaim:

"Under the roses, the Blue,
Under the lilies, the Gray."

and an O'Hara to exclaim—

"And glory guards with solemn round,
The bivouac of the dead."

Memorial Day began with fallen heroes of the Civil War, and was expanded to include the Spanish-American War, and the World Wars—all of them—in the 20th century. It started as a Sabbath of American observances, but, unfortunately, it is becoming a day for motor events in Indianapolis, athletic programs throughout the country, traffic fatalities on our speedways, and other elements that demean it. We, in education and religion, in the words of President Johnson, who think not of the next election, but of the next generation, have the right, nay the responsibility, of deepening this day for posterity, of honoring not only our heroes in war—but also our heroes in peace—so that the race for this great day is not altogether lost to the car races in Indianapolis. We must expand Memorial Day, even as it was last century from one war to another, with more meaning, for otherwise, we may lose it altogether.

First, we surely have need for a more quiet day. With Wordsworth, if we observe, "A Harvest of the Quiet Eye," we sense new significance in the eloquence of silence, for no one need shout in St. Peter's in Rome, nor make noise in Westminster Abbey in London, nor make sounds in the Lincoln Memorial in Washington. The silence sanctifies and the spirit is not only in reverie but in reverence, for its fugitive emotions wear haloes.

Second, we have need for a day of honest memories. On this day, let us park "convenient memories," and confront ourselves freely and fully. If we recall evil about our foes, let us remember some virtues, too, if any are left. Is it not amazing and agonizing that after several decades, our erstwhile enemies—Japan and Germany—are now our devoted allies? If we remember the glories of war (if any), let us recall its horrors (if many)—for many of us stood sentry from the beachheads on Guadalcanal to "der Wacht am Rein." If we see the great parade before war, let us stand in silent meditation before the "Great Divide." If we salute the heroic dead of all our wars, as we surely do this day, let us honor them further by making real the futility of nuclear blast, and the tragedy of international Armageddon.

Third, we have need for a day of expanded meaning. Since Memorial Day was changed to include heroes other than Civil War since 1867, why not expand it to include all soldiers of the general welfare—in peacetime pursuits in sacrifice—as well as war? We diminish not the valor of soldiers dead but why can we not cite equally unknown and unsung heroes who often sacrifice life to preserve life? These could include a Florence Nightingale, whose birth this month, and whose service in the Crimean War (1856) helped create the profession of nursing; a Louis Pasteur who discovered rabies in 1884; a Hideo Nogouchi, a Japanese scientist who died in 1918 to give life beyond yellow fever; a Joseph Dutton, savior to the lepers of Molokai; an Edwin Leman who was victim in 1925 to radium ore for health to man. Countless others are legion this day, alive in their sacrificial roles of reconstruction and salvage for man, as an Albert Schweitzer in mid-Africa, prime organist, great spokesman for "reverence for life" and medical missionary for thousands, and Dean Heinrich Gruber, in West Berlin, whose exploits in saving Jews and others during Hitlerism and his incarceration in Dachau for deeds of mercy, were living testimony that he and others belonged to that other Germany that claimed, not Bismarck and Hitler, but Luther, Goethe, and Einstein.

We should expand this day with more meaning by including also in our common homage to those who served in war, those too who serve even now sacrificially and heroically in peace—the fireman who gives his life often to save life—the policeman who defends the life of the average citizen often at the loss of his own life—the builders of bridges and the diggers of tunnels and the miners of minerals, and the teachers in schools blighted by poverty and ignorance, and, with them all, the mothers of children who gave their lives in the very gift of lives, for they alone have a rollcall of more than a million in the six decades of this very century—more than all our military losses on all fields of battle in all our history.

Our heroes of reconstruction—daily and hourly—are not fighting a lost cause. They, even now, feel divinely and see profoundly a new true way for humanity—for theirs is the ultimate victory. In unnumbered areas of human privacy, civilization is carried forward. Others have bled that we might go healed. The red seal of sacrifice is stamped on our every inheritance. A holy and whole view of life bespeaks endless gratitude to fellow men who did not spare themselves but who buried themselves like seeds in the open furrows of human needs.

Let us expand Memorial Day—this very day—to include our common obligation to multitudes—known and unknown—who serve each of us, and therefore all of us, in sacrifice, that life—all life—be not debased, treated harmfully and spent meanly. On this Day of Memorial, we remember those who gave their lives in war—all the wars of America. We remember too, in a new balance of this Day for a finer way, the greater and larger army of men and women who fought and also died for liberation of man, from disease, ignorance, poverty, tyranny, anxiety, prejudice, fear, and death itself.

A great prayer voices this new need for all:

"How much do we owe to the labors of others: Gifts and blessings unnumbered are laid into our very cradles as our birthright. How toilsome is the way of our brothers through the centuries. Day by day they dig far away from the sun that we may be warm, enlist in outposts of peril that we may be secure, and brave the terrors of the unknown for truths that shed light on our way."

A meaningful poem accents this very expansion of meaning for Memorial Day in this way:

"The bravely dumb who did the deed
And scorned to blot it with a name;
Men of the plain heroic breed that
Loved God's silence more than fame."

H.R. 8442: To Provide Increase in Social Security Lump-Sum Death Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1965, I introduced H.R. 8442 which provides for an increase in the maximum lump-sum death payment under social security from $255 to $312 immediately and to $368 after 1971. The present lump-sum death payment was established by Congress in 1952 and it is apparent that since that time the Consumer Price Index has risen; the cost of funerals has skyrocketed, having risen at least 30 percent; and hospital and medical costs of the last illness have risen approximately 50 percent—all without a corresponding increase in social security death benefits.

My bill, H.R. 8442, incorporates the proposals of the 1965 Advisory Council on Social Security which strongly urged a revision in the maximum lump-sum death payment. The Council specifically recommended that the amount of the payment be changed from the present maximum amount of $255 to the highest family maximum monthly benefit. In other words, under this proposal the maximum death payment would increase whenever the maximum monthly family benefits is increased. At the present time this would mean an increase of the death payment from $255 to $312 and after 1971, when the statutory ceiling for maximum monthly benefits rises, from $312 to $368.

This revision would benefit more than 600,000 families including millions of de-

pendents who face the tragedy of the death of the family breadwinner with insufficient financial resources. While benefiting many, the cost of implementing this legislation would be minimal.

We cannot become complacent with what has gone before but rather we must recognize and deal with, each year, the problems concerning social security which were not envisioned by those who drafted the original Social Security Act. The social security program has been a successful investment for millions of Americans, and its continuing expansion and improvement can be a source of pride for Congress and for every American.

On March 26, 1965, I introduced H.R. 6843 to provide benefits to widows who remarry after age 62 but who under the present social security law forfeit benefits because of their remarriage. I stated at that time that this was but one of many inequities of our present law, inequities which should be corrected at the earliest possible moment.

The proposed increase in the lump-sum death payment is another example of an inequity which has resulted from the lapse of 13 years without an amendment to a section of the Social Security Act which applies to more than 1 million families each year.

I urge my colleagues to give this proposal careful consideration and continue the record of success in working toward an efficient, comprehensive social security system.

A Ship Almost Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding native of Wyoming, Mr. Carroll K. "Buddy" Faught, Jr., recently described his adventures of the great naval battles during World War II. Mr. Faught, now special assistant to the Under Secretary of Commerce and Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Transportation, reminisced his plight of 20 years ago as the only pilot in his readyroom to survive the tragic 8-hour attack on board the U.S.S. *Franklin*—Big Ben—by Japanese bombs.

Listed as lost in action, Lieutenant Faught was rescued from the ocean by the destroyer U.S.S. *Marshall*, but unfortunately suffered the loss of his left leg.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my remarks in this RECORD to include the account of this heroic battle which appeared in the May 14 Washington Post:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 14, 1965]

TWENTY YEARS AGO: A SHIP ALMOST DIES

(By Vern Haughland)

Twenty years ago this month, the Nation learned of one of its most grievous losses of World War II.

A battered and fire-blackened aircraft carrier, the U.S.S. *Franklin*, arrived in New York Harbor, under her own power, after a roundabout cruise.

With the return to home port, the Navy disclosed that the *Franklin*, a huge Essex-class carrier, had been hit by Japanese bombs 60 miles off Japan the preceding March 19, and had been turned into an exploding ammunition dump.

In 8 hours 724 men were killed and 265 wounded.

One of the marine pilots aboard the "Big Ben" when the enemy bombs fell was Lt. Carroll K. (Buddy) Faught, Jr., who was listed as lost in action but who actually survived and is now a Government official.

Faught was the only pilot in his readyroom to survive. Now Commerce aid, he showed up at Mare Island, Calif., less one leg, some 3 months after the disaster.

Faught now is special assistant to the Under Secretary of Commerce and Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Transportation. He lives at 5400 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda.

Faught recalls that on the morning of March 19, 1945, the *Franklin's* planes and crews were preparing to launch a fighter sweep over Japan when an observation plane sighted the battleship *Yamato* steaming out of the Bay of Japan.

Orders were changed. Big Ben's pilots were to get the *Yamato*. This meant a delay in takeoff so crews could be briefed on new navigation information, and changing of the aircraft armament.

It was this delay in launching that led to the disaster.

Most of the *Franklin's* planes were on the flight deck, loaded with bombs, rockets, torpedoes, and machinegun ammunition when a Japanese dive bomber—its approach unnoted—streaked through the early morning haze toward the big ship.

DROPS 500-POUND BOMBS

The Japanese planes dropped two armor-piercing 500-pound bombs. One landed near the forward elevator and the other aft. Both burned deep into the carrier before exploding.

The skipper, Capt. Leslie Gehres, described later how the ship's own 2-ton bombs ripped huge chunks from the flight deck and rockets roared at waist height down the flaming deck. The explosion hurled heavy engines and aircraft parts into the air. Hundreds of men leaped into the water to escape the flames and explosions.

Faught recalls that the pilots of his squadron were in ready room 5, being briefed on the new mission, when the first bomb exploded on the deck directly below.

He said the floor or the room rose like a giant mushroom and crushed many of the pilots against the deck above.

Fought, was standing close to a wall, looking at a map. Both legs and his right arm were broken in the blast.

Faught, described his experience later in a letter to his mother in Laramie, Wyo., in these terms:

"So I crawled out on the catwalk. I sat there for a while and there were explosions that bounced me up an ddown.

"I didn't have a lifejacket, but when the fire started getting out where we were, I turned to Jones and said, 'I'm going over,' and I jumped.

"It was 85 feet to the water and I thought I would never hit, but it wasn't as bad as I thought it would be. The water was pretty cold, but not bad.

"I swam around a while and then I found a seat cushion out of one of the planes and I hung onto it.

"There were guys all around me drowning and there wasn't a thing I could do but watch. After 2½ hours, I was picked up by a destroyer named the U.S.S. *Marshall*.

"It's the best ship in the whole Navy. Boy, was I glad to see it.

"Well the next day we transferred to a cruiser. They had a hosiptal and three swell doctors; one of them was an orthopedist, which was really lucky.

"My left leg didn't seem to have any circulation. After four days they operated on it and found the artery was dead and shattered, so the next day they told me about it.

"The doctor said it would have to come off at the knee and I said, "OK, if it's dead, it's dead.'

"The reason I haven't told you before now is because I wanted to tell you the whole story and I didn't want to tell you over the phone because I didn't want to shock you. I have never for 1 minute felt bad about it.

"I'm so happy to be alive and back in the States. I'm just waiting for the broken bones in my right leg to heal and I'll be as good as new."

Although the *Franklin's* plight appeared for hours to be hopeless, Captain Gehres refused to abandon her. He steered the carrier into the wind—even though it meant pushing closer to Japan—to prevent fires from spreading.

Commanders of other ships moved in close despite the explosions to pick up survivors and help fight the flames. The light cruiser *Santa Fe* made such a daring approach that the carrier's starboard gun platforms smashed against it.

By late afternoon the crippled vessel had been taken in tow. Her crew sweated to get her boilers, electrical systems and ventilating units back in working order. Before dark the ship was proceeding under her own power at 23 knots.

Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the swift success of Project Hope's medical teaching-training program has been capsuled in a recent article in the Jamestown, N.Y., Post-Journal.

In this article by Jennie Vimmerstedt, we see the early beginnings of this unprecedented project, when a young doctor named William B. Walsh propelled an idea into reality.

Under Miss Vimmerstedt's guidance we follow the white hospital ship SS *Hope* on its year-long voyages to Indonesia and South Vietnam, to Peru, Ecuador, and Guinea.

Gradually, we detect the building of a permanent, worldwide program, in which the hospital ship brings medical knowledge to new countries, while land-based medical teams continue programs already initiated by the ship's medical staff.

Mr. Speaker, the account is very illuminating, and I insert the entire Post-Journal article to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Jamestown (N.Y.) Post-Journal, Jan. 23, 1965]

A FIRSTHAND ACCOUNT OF HOPE AND STAFF SCHEDULED FOR HERE

(By Jennie Vimmerstedt, Post-Journal staff reporter)

"Where there is Hope there is life."

Such in brief is the saga of the world's first peacetime hospital ship, the SS *Hope*, in its significant mission of healing and

teaching. Its work is described by President Eisenhower as the single most effective step in presenting America as a warm and good friend.

Project Hope, under which the work is known in the people-to-people program, has a special kind of personal meaning for a quarter of a million people in Asia, Latin America, and Africa who know firsthand of the medical mercy the ship brings.

The SS *Hope* is a self-sufficient floating medical teaching center equipped with 230 hospital beds, class and demonstration rooms, laboratories, and a surgical section as complete as that in a land-based hospital.

Where the SS *Hope* docks, in addition to maintaining clinical and teaching activities aboard the ship, the medical staff sends units inland to bring instruction and treatment to areas far removed from the better equipped, better staffed port cities.

Project Hope (Health Opportunity for People Everywhere) originated with Dr. William B. Walsh, a dedicated young doctor in Washington, D.C., in response to President Eisenhower's appeal for an international people-to-people program.

Dr. Walsh was a medical officer aboard destroyers in the Pacific in World War II. He had seen how a shot of penicillin, the sulpha, or the APC tablet, any medication which he could spare from sick bay, worked wonders to win good will for America.

The plan which Dr. Walsh submitted was a reconversion of the hospital ship, the *Consolation*, a 15,000-ton veteran of World War II and the Korean conflict. The ship was refitted and rechristened the SS *Hope*.

The late Dr. Elmer Hess, of Erie, Pa., who had a part in the promotion of forming the Jamestown Boys Club, also played a part in obtaining the services of Dr. Walsh in the people to people program. When Dr. Hess, a former president of the American Medical Association, was asked by President Eisenhower to be chairman of the Committee on Medicine and the Health Professions of the people to people program, he said he would accept if he could get his longtime friend Dr. Bill Walsh to serve with him as cochairman.

Both Dr. Hess and Dr. Walsh were convinced that one of the many paths to world peace, and probably the most important step, lay in the field of medicine.

This became the very basis and purpose of Project Hope, to bring the skills and techniques developed by the American medical professions to the people of other nations in their own environment adapted to the people in the lands visited.

At the same time, the People to People Health Foundation, Inc., was established, an independent, nonprofit corporation formed by Americans to carry out this important program of cooperation in the field of health, between the people of the United States and the peoples of the newly developing nations.

With a medical staff, chosen from thousands of applicants, the SS *Hope* sailed from San Francisco in September 1960, its maiden trip, with Indonesia as destination upon the invitation of that country.

The results were impressive—18,000 patients treated, 700 major operations performed, thousands examined and X-rayed, 200 Indonesian doctors and 300 Indonesian nurses trained.

In June of the following year, the SS *Hope* docked at Saigon, South Vietnam when that country was under increasing pressure from Communist guerillas. Often the staff took time out from treating others to operate on gunshot or grenade wounds. Another 18,000 patients were treated and 500 major operations performed. Oral surgery was introduced and continues even now as Hope's program in that country.

In the spring of 1962 upon invitation of the Peruvian-North American Medical Association, the *Hope* headed for Latin America, anchoring just off the northern Peruvian city of Trujillo. Her accomplishments in Peru were many, including setting up a clinical program for 500-bed Belen Hospital in Trujillo, training many people of different professions for a staff well equipped to perform functions of the new University of Trujillo Hospital, establishing medical programs in underprivileged suburbs where *Hope* staff members took Peruvian personnel into clinics to train them and later turn over the clinics to the Peruvian health staff. The Peruvians responded enthusiatically to assure continuation of upgraded medical care of the poor.

Its next trip, starting out last October, was Conakry, Guinea, on the West Coast of Africa where President Sekou Toure personally requested the aid of Project Hope and invited medical men from many sections to participate in the program.

Although volumes have been written of Hope and its humanitarian work, among them Dr. Walsh's new book, "A Ship Called Hope," the people of Jamestown will be given a chance next week to hear firsthand from one of the doctors of the *Hope* who will be here to show a film of the Peruvian trip.

He is Dr. Kenneth H. Seagrave, of Buffalo, who since 1949 has practiced in Buffalo as radiologist for the Buffalo Medical Group and is on the staff of the Deaconess Hospital and the Veterans Hospital.

Dr. Seagrave will appear next Thursday at 7:30 p.m., at the annual meeting of the Jamestown Visiting Nurse Association to be held in the First Baptist Church. The meeting is open to the public.

Dr. Seagrave spent the summer of 1961 as a volunteer radiologist aboard the *Hope* in Saigon, Vietnam, and also joined the staff on its second voyage to Peru as a member of the sixth rotator team of specialists from the United States.

The permanent staff of *Hope* includes 5 physicians, 36 nurses and 26 auxilliary personnel. Volunteer teams of physicians working without pay are flown to the ship on a rotating basis for tours of from 2 to 4 months.

Members of the medical staff are assigned to work in small teams with their counterparts in whatever country the ship visits. This enables the American staff members to pass along modern techniques and the latest medical knowledge under real working conditions. Part of the medical staff works aboard; part forms mobile, inland teams. Staff members work with physicians, surgeons, dentists, health officers, sanitation officials, nurses, midwives, and technicians.

Training is conducted through actual hospital procedures, classroom lectures, and discussions, motion pictures and film strips. Teaching is stressed so that the local people can, in turn, teach others.

Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, commenting on the work of the SS *Hope* said, "In the great struggle of our century, we will eventually be judged not by the lethal power of our weapons, not by our promises and rhetoric, not by our boasts and wealth; we will be judged by our leadership for peace and freedom and a better life for all the human family. These are the only issues that unite all the people of the world. I know of no finer way to serve the cause of peace and freedom than to bring to millions of our fellowmen the gift of life."

Where will SS *Hope* go next? It will go wherever the help of keen minds and skilled hands is needed, wherever there are the blind, the lame, the sick, wherever the generosity of the American people makes her mission possible. This is not a Government supported venture. The U.S. Government only supplies a subsidy to help operate the ship. Beyond that expenses are met by private contributions.

Although the work of the SS *Hope* has been praised by three presidents as one of the greatest forces for peace and friendship today, the most moving testimony came from a father of an Indonesian boy whom the doctors' skill had saved from life as a hopeless cripple. As he left the ship with his son who now stood erect and well, the father turned and said in carefully rehearsed English, "God bless America."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3106 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr* — 1200 S. Courthouse Rd., Arlington, Va.
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C* — 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Duiski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa* — 301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn* — 119 7th St. SE.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 3424 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.); *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

Finland's Foreign Trade Policy: Ambassador Olavi Munkki Speaks to the Finnish-American Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been deeply interested in the impressive strides made by the democratic country of Finland under its vigorous private enterprise system. The courageous, freedom-loving peoples of this small Scandinavian nation merit our respect for their achievements in many fields of endeavor, not the least of which are their accomplishments in the area of expanded world trade.

Within the past several months a new Ambassador from Finland has joined the Washington diplomatic corps. This distinguished gentleman, His Excellency Olavi Munkki, has held many key posts in the foreign service of his country and has played a significant role in a number of commercial matters affecting Finland. As Director of the Trade Policy Department in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, it is my understanding that he was responsible for guiding the negotiations which assured Finland's successful relationship with the European Free Trade Association. Prior to his assignment to Washington, he served as Ambassador in Bern, Switzerland.

Ambassador Munkki made his first public speech in the United States on April 20. His address, entitled "The Foreign Trade Policy of Finland and a View of Finnish-United States Trade Relations," was delivered before the Finnish-American Chamber of Commerce in New York City. This group is composed of many leading businessmen, bankers, and others who have been working actively at increasing the flow of mutually beneficial trade between Finland and the United States.

The Ambassador's speech on that occasion, in my opinion, was a notable one which deserves the attention of thoughtful Americans who are interested in the development of improved trade relations and the elimination of barriers to trade between the countries of the world. In this connection, the Ambassador stressed the Kennedy round on negotiations as "one of the best possible approaches to the solution of this problem."

Considerable interest has been expressed in Ambassador Munkki's informative address, and articles reporting highlights of his talk have appeared in recent issues of the New York Journal of Commerce and the EFTA Reporter. The speech and articles follow:

THE FOREIGN TRADE POLICY OF FINLAND AND A VIEW OF FINNISH-UNITED STATES TRADE RELATIONS

Mr. President, gentleman, it is a great honor and privilege to address you today, but at the same time very challenging. For years all of you have been active in Finnish-American trade, and you certainly know much more about the actual details of doing business than I do. Therefore, my purpose today is to talk with you briefly about the importance of increased mutually beneficial trade between Finland and the United States and, at the same time, try to give you a summary of Finnish foreign trade policy in general.

In order to understand the present-day situation, I think it is helpful to begin with a reference to the years immediately following the last war. When the hostilities ended for Finland in September 1944, the economy of the country was in ruins, not directly through the acts of war but indirectly as a consequence of the wartime stress on human beings and especially on the machinery of production. In addition, the burden of big war reparation payments lay upon Finland. Actually, we can hardly discuss a Finnish foreign trade policy for the years 1944 through 1952, when the war reparation payments came to an end. The earnings from the meager exports had to be used to buy badly needed raw materials, and even the elementary needs of the population could hardly be taken care of.

The period from 1952 until 1957 was an easier period for the national economy of Finland, but still it was earmarked, as far as foreign trade was concerned, through strict government control and through bilateral payment agreements with practically all of our trading partners. This strict bilateralism was very strongly felt because it meant that we were forced to use what we earned through our export in the same country where our exports had gone. We had no choice to buy our imports from countries where the terms of delivery and the prices would have been more favorable.

This strict bilateralism came to an end through the so-called Helsinki Agreement, which was signed later in 1957 by practically all Finnish Western European trade partners. From this time on it is possible to speak about a Finnish foreign trade policy. Although Finland had in 1949 joined the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, commonly known as the GATT, this membership in the GATT group had very little effect on Finland's foreign trade policy before the year 1957, owing to Finland's bilateral trade arrangements.

It is a commonly known and acknowledged fact that Finnish foreign policy is based on strict neutrality. Consequently, Finland has taken into account the principles of neutrality in her foreign policy in general. Accordingly, Finland has developed her trade relations in all directions and especially with the neighboring countries, and we have been fairly successful in following this policy.

In pursuing her independent foreign trade policy, Finland has had to take into consideration the present tendency, especially in Europe, toward area integration between countries which either geographically or by their common economic interests belong closely together.

The first step taken by Finland in this direction was our active participation in discussions to form a Nordic Customs Union, comprising the four Scandinavian countries. At the same time Finland, as well as the other Nordic countries, had to watch for the outcome of discussions which were going on in Paris under the auspices of the OEEC organization to form a large integrated market comprising all of the Western European members of the OEEC organization. As you know, these discussions failed. Instead of a large Western European trading group being formed, six continental European countries created through the Rome agreement what is today known as the Common Market of Europe, and Great Britain initiated discussions to form what is today called the European Free Trade Area agreement.

The fact that the European Free Trade Area agreement was coming into existence lessened the interest of certain Scandinavian countries in forming a Nordic Customs Union. For Finland, the formation of EFTA created an important problem which had to be solved—moreover, it had to be solved quickly and without hesitation. Great Britain was, and still is, the most importatn trading partner of Finland. To be discriminated against in that market would have meant an unbearable burden on Finland's economy. A solution had to be found, but a solution which was in harmony with Finland's foreign policy in general and her foreign trade policy in particular.

Late in 1960, Finland informed the EFTA countries of her interest in discussing her relations with that group and about her desire to come to an agreement with the EFTA countries. Finland indicated that the solution she was looking for should be based on three main points. First, the agreement between Finland and the EFTA group should not create a supernational organization. Second, the legitimate interest of Finland's home market industries should be taken into consideration. Third, the existing international agreements of Finland should be respected.

Through long and sometimes difficult negotiations, these objectives were basically achieved. The EFTA countries showed great understanding of the position of Finland, and an agreement based on these principles was signed in Helsinki early in 1961. Thus, Finland became an associate member of the EFTA group enjoying all the material benefits of the EFTA agreement and also undertaking all the material obligations of that agreement, but with lesser institutional ties with EFTA than the other members have among themselves.

Later, when Great Britain, as well as some other EFTA countries, reopened negotiations with the Common Market to form a larger trading unity in Europe, Finland remained waiting but indicated her interest in the outcome of these negotiations. The same considerations which were dominant when Finland arranged her relations with EFTA will still be more dominant if and when Finland's future relations with the Common Market have to be arranged. As you are well aware, the Common Market is a supernational organization and this fact prevents Finland from becoming a member. However, Finland, as well as other EFTA countries, has a great trade interest in the group which now forms the Common Market.

I mentioned earlier that it is the basis of Finland's foreign trade policy to develop her foreign trade relations in all directions and

that we have been successful in achieving this purpose. Today, roughly one-third of Finland's foreign trade is with the countries in the EFTA group, nearly one-third with the countries belonging to the Common Market, and one-third with countries belonging to neither. From this last third, two-thirds are with the countries which belong to the so-called state-trading countries.

A customs union or a free trade area is always bound to discriminate to some extent agains outsiders. The degree depends upon the height of the custom barrier against the outsider. The GATT agreement, which is based on the principle of the most-favored nation clause, acknowledges, as an exception to this rule, the right of member countries, under certain specific conditions, to form a customs union or a free trade area and still remain members of the GATT group. However, the forming of a free trade area or a custom union should not hamper or unnecessarily burden the trade with the nonmembers.

I do not think that we will see an economically integrated Europe in the near future. The Common Market will remain as Common Market, and EFTA will remain as EFTA. Therefore, it is in the interest of every country and every existing group to eliminate as far as possible the barriers to trade between the countries of the world. GATT, as an organization, creates an excellent forum for this, and we in Finland believe that the present American initiative, commonly called the Kennedy round of negotiations, is one of the best possible approaches to the solution of this problem. Therefore, Finland has declared her preparedness to participate fully in these negotiations in order to help insure a successful and speedy conclusion.

We in Finland strongly believe that foreign trade is, and must be, a two-way street. At the same time that we are looking for new markets for our exports, we are opening the doors for increased imports into Finland. We welcome competition in the Finnish market by our various trade partners. I am glad to be able to say, for example, that according to the official statistics of the Department of Commerce, published in January of this year, exports to Finland from the United States showed the largest increase of any Scandinavian country. This fact is a reflection of the increasing consumer purchasing power which has developed in Finland in recent years. At the same time, our goods have found better marketing possibilities is the United States, as well as in other countries. All of you who are actively engaged in foreign trade by buying, by selling, by financing it, or by your work in the investment area affecting Finland and the United States can still do a great deal to help improve our reciprocal trade.

In any reference made to Finland and the other Scandinavian countries, I should add that the interests of Finland in foreign trade and foreign relations in general are identical to those of the Scandinavian countries and the other northern European countries. The prevailing conditions in all of them are more or less the same. Therefore, it has been with appreciation that we have noted that the U.S. Department of Commerce recently underlined this fact in its official classification of countries of the world by regrouping Finland with its Scandinavian neighbors and all other Western European nations. It is my belief that this will prove of benefit to you as it is another informative step to let those who may be doing business with Finland, or those who may be considering doing business with Finland, know more about the orientation and "economic climate" of our democratic country. The potentialities for increased two-way trade were improved by this recent action by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

To summarize the concepts on which Finnish foreign trade policy is based, I should like to do it in the following way. There are at least three fundamental points underlying this vitally important matter. First, Finland believes in free trade between all the countries of the world without any discrimination in any direction. Second, Finland acknowledges the fact and respects it that in some countries there prevails a different economic system. Just as these countries cannot expect us to change our economic system, we do not feel justified in expecting them to change theirs. Third, the legitimate interests of developing countries must be taken into consideration. The developing countries have the right to expect from the industrialized countries not only financial and technical assistance but also measures which would open to them new possibilities for marketing their products.

Mr. President, gentlemen: I feel very happy to have been able, in my first official speech in the United States, to present to this distinguished audience, the Finnish-American Chamber of Commerce, some views about the basis of Finnish foreign trade policy. You all are, as I have said, the active carriers of this policy. When I compare the present situation with that which prevailed when I was first in the United States, from 1945 to 1950, I see that you have done magnificent work. It is a pleasure for me to be with you today and I wish you all continued success. May I assure you, at the same time, that you will receive the most active cooperation from me and all of my associates in this country as you carry on your important work of building increased and mutually beneficial trade between Finland and the United States.

[From the EFTA Reporter, May 17, 1965]

FINLAND'S FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

I do not think that we will see an economically integrated Europe in the near future, Finland's new Ambassador to the United States, Olavi Munkki, said recently in an address to the Finnish Chamber of Commerce in New York.

The Common Market will remain as the Common Market, and EFTA will remain as EFTA, the Ambassador went ol. Therefore, it is in the interest of every country and every existing group to eliminate as far as possible the barriers to trade between the countries of the world. GATT, as an organization, creates an excellent forum for this, and we in Finland believe that the present American initiative, commonly called the Kennedy round of negotiations, is one of the best possible approaches to the solution of this problem. Therefore, Finland has declared her preparedness to participate fully in these negotiations in order to help insure a successful and speedy conclusion.

In pursuing her independent foreign trade policy, Finland has had to take into consideration the present tendency, especially in Europe, toward area integration between countries which either geographically or by their common economic interests belong together.

Mr. Munkki explained that the first step taken by Finland in this direction was its active participation in discussions to form a Nordic Customs Union.

The fact that the European Free Trade Area agreement was coming into existence lessened the interest of certain Scandinavian countries in forming a Nordic Customs Union. For Finland, the formation of EFTA created an important problem which had to be solved; moreover, it had to be solved quickly and without hesitation. Great Britain was, and still is, the most important trading partner of Finland. A solution had to be found, but a solution which was in harmony with Finland's foreign policy in general and her foreign trade policy in particular.

The EFTA countries showed great understanding of the position of Finland, and an agreement was signed in Helsinki early in 1961. Thus, Finland became an associate member of the EFTA group, enjoying all the material benefits of the EFTA agreement and also undertaking all the material obligations of that agreement, but with lesser institutional ties with EFTA than the other members have among themselves.

It is the basis of Finland's foreign trade policy to develop her foreign trade relations in all directions, and we have been successful in achieving this purpose, the Ambassador continued. Today, roughly one-third of Finland's foreign trade is with the countries in the EFTA group, nearly one-third with the countries belonging to the Common Market, and one-third with countries belonging to neither. From this last third, two-thirds are with the countries which belong to the so-called state trading countries.

We in Finland strongly believe that foreign trade is, and must be, a two-way street. At the same time that we are looking for new markets for our exports, we are opening the doors for increased imports into Finland. We welcome competition in the Finnish market by our various trade partners. I am glad to be able to say, for example, that according to the official statistics of the Department of Commerce, published in January of this year, exports to Finland from the United States showed the largest increase of any Scandinavian country.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Apr. 21, 1965]

NEW FINNISH ENVOY HAILS GATT SESSIONS—KENNEDY ROUND HELD BEST STEP FOR REMOVAL OF TRADE BARRIERS

Expressing doubt of a rapprochement between the European Common Market and the European Free Trade Association, of which Finland is an associate member, in the near future. Finland's new Ambassador to the United States said yesterday that the Kennedy round is one of the best possible approaches to the removal of trade barriers in the area and elsewhere.

Speaking before a luncheon meeting of the Finnish-American Chamber of Commerce, at the St. Regis Hotel, Ambassador Olavi Munkki suggested, however, that, with as much as one-third of Finland's trade conducted with the Common Market, his country would be interested in establishing a trading link with the "inner six."

FINLAND'S NEUTRAL STATUS

The Ambassador stressed that Finland could not become a full member of the group because of its neutral status and would have to negotiate an agreement similar to the one with EFTA.

Finland's interest, Mr. Munkki stressed, are closely tied up with those of the Scandinavian countries and other Northern European countries. He praised the U.S. Department of Commerce's recognition of this fact in its recent country classifications.

American traders interested in Finland would do well to keep Finland's affinities with the rest of Scandinavia in mind, he continued.

PURCHASING POWER RISING

The Ambassador noted with satisfaction that increasing consumer purchasing power in Finland had made it the fastest expanding market for U.S. goods in Scandinavia. Finnish products, at the same time, have found better marketing possibilities in the United States and other countries.

In conclusion, Mr. Munkki, who is credited with having developed and promoted policies which made Finland's association with EFTA possible, reaffirmed his country's belief in

untrammeled trade between all countries, in the recognition of the coexistence of differing economic systems and the need for opening up new outlets for products from the developing countries.

Address of Dr. Edward C. Welsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the address of Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council before the St. Louis Bicentennial Space Symposium on the peaceful uses of space. I commend it to each Member of this body:

ADDRESS BY DR. EDWARD C. WELSH, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL, AT THE ST. LOUIS BICENTENNIAL SPACE SYMPOSIUM, FIFTH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF SPACE, ST. LOUIS, MO., MAY 26, 1965

THE SPACE CHALLENGE

This bicentennial space symposium is a tribute to the past, a salute to the present, and a beacon of hope for the future. It marks for our attention those whose enterprise and initiative have made this city a thriving metropolis and those who have contributed their technical and managerial skills to the national space program. I take the opportunity afforded me today to congratulate those who planned and are responsible for this symposium.

DYNAMIC FORCE

The space effort is one of the most dynamic and constructive forces to have influenced this great country's growth. It combines exceptional abilities, private and public resources, the factor of competition, and the pioneering spirit. The future of our country may well rest upon our performance in space. Be assured that space, as a way of thinking and as a vigorous enterprise, is here to stay. It has become a permanent and an essential part of our Nation's institutional structure.

MISUNDERSTANDING

I think my optimism is fully warranted, but it is not so extensive as to leave room for complacency. There are contrary factors with which our national space program must contend both at home and abroad. The adverse forces at home are largely those nourished by misunderstanding. And, I believe, it is the responsibility of each of us to do what we can to dissolve such confusion. I refer particularly to the mistaken thesis that we have so many health and welfare needs for our resources here on earth—so much unemployment, malnutrition, and ignorance—that we cannot afford to spend our money on space exploration and particularly on the moon project.

I believe we should maintain a continuous campaign to improve our way of life, our state of health, our rate of economic growth, and our level of education. I believe in doing everything we can do effectively and efficiently in those regards, but I do not consider those needs to be competitive with our space needs—any more than I consider them to be competitive with our national defense requirements. Rather, they complement each other. We can afford to do what is needed in space exploration just as we can afford to do what is needed for our general welfare and for our national defense. In fact, if we are both patriotic and prudent, we cannot afford to do less.

SPACE BENEFITS

It should be realized that resources devoted to space progress create more resources for other purposes. The way of space is the way of the pioneer, but it is also the way of the builder—the force which adds to the total rather than takes from one to give to another.

If we examine the long list of benefits from our space endeavors, we note particularly that they give stimulation to our economic and our technological growth. Properly managed, I believe our space program can help significantly to pay for many of the other requirements of our Great Society and help strengthen our national security at the same time. Our position as a world leader depends substantially on our space program to do both.

It should be unnecessary to point out that funds devoted to the lunar program will be spent to develop our overall national space capability and consequently have much greater significance than just the successful manned round trip to the moon. Every dime of that money is spent right here on earth, stimulating growth, employing personnel, funding new research, developing hardware, and building laboratories and other useful facilities. And, above all, it strengthens our country in this competitive world.

SPACE COMPETITION

As I stated earlier, the space program has to meet contending forces both abroad and at home. We have many excellent relationships with other countries in the form of cooperation in our space program. But, while we talk of cooperation and we mean it, we must at the same time recognize that there is competition between this country and the Soviet Union in the field of space. It is well for us from time to time to take stock—to take a careful look—in order to see how we are making out in comparison with our main competitor. While it is correct to refer to this as a space race, it is much too complex a venture to permit one to state categorically who is ahead and by how much in the overall effort. Both space programs are broad in scope and are strongly supported. There are, however, differences in emphasis and in priorities. Making comparisons is also hampered by the secrecy which cloaks so much of the Soviet's activity and some of ours.

Before attempting to make any comparison, however, I do want to emphasize one major thesis: The United States should have a vigorous space program and would obtain many benefits from it even if no other nation were engaged in space technology. As Vice President HUMPHREY said at the Goddard Memorial Dinner this March: "If we were the only nation engaged in a space program, it would still be in our best selfinterest to increase our efforts." His thesis is supported by the fact that the space effort helps raise our sandard of living, increases our store of knowledge, and furthers world peace.

We should not forget for a moment, however, that we have very strong competition in space, and that we have, therefore, another big reason for a major space effort; namely, prudence. Some well-intentioned but confused people have suggested that we should slow down in our space program, that we should gracefully accept second place to the Soviets. I cannot agree with that for a moment, either gracefully or gracelessly. Our national security alone would suggest reason enough for us to strive to maintain leadership in this space competition.

In examining the status of the space race, it should be noted that those who were predicting a slowdown in the Soviet space effort because of economic difficulties in that country were wrong—just 100 percent wrong. Not only have the Soviets stepped up their effort during the past year and a half, but they have accelerated even more than we have.

COMPARISON

Keeping in mind the difficulties inherent in making a brief and meaningful comparison between the two programs, I suggest the following few points:

1. In number of earth-orbiting payloads the United States has launched almost three times as many as has the U.S.S.R., although the 1965 rate is less than 2 to 1.

2. In the weight of such payloads, the U.S.S.R. has put up almost three times as much as has the United States.

3. In propulsion, the Soviets have from the beginning enjoyed an operational advantage over the United States. However, we are currently making great strides in this regard and it is hoped that we will keep moving up the propulsion ladder so as not to be overtaken again.

4. In manned space flight, the U.S.S.R. is ahead of the United States, not only in hours of flight but also in multimanned flight and extravehicular activity. So far, the U.S. astronauts have completed 40 orbits of the earth, the Soviet cosmonauts have completed 342 such orbits. Moreover, as our Gemini schedule proceeds and contributes continued progress, we must look for much more activity on the part of the Soviets.

5. In the application of space developments to directly useful purposes, the United States is well ahead, particularly in such fields as weather observations, navigation, and communications. However, the Soviets have potential capabilities of these types and have already begun to show some actual experience in space communications.

6. In lunar and interplanetary activity, the United States may have an edge with the spectacular success of the Rangers and Mariners. We have developed this advantage, even though the Soviets have made a greater relative commitment in this regard, both from the view of absolute numbers of launches and also in regard to weight of payloads.

7. Based upon clear knowledge of our own program and upon assertions by the Soviets about theirs, one can reasonably conclude that both countries have manned lunar landing projects underway. It would be impossible to state definitely who is ahead in this regard but I am hopeful that we will turn out to be.

8. As regards the collection of scientific data from space, both countries have made impressive strides, resulting in a possible advantage to the United States regarding knowledge of space phenomena and the lunar surface, and an advantage to the U.S.S.R. regarding the effects of space environment on human beings.

9. Both countries are in a position to make many observations from space, but both countries have pledged not to orbit weapons of mass destruction and have stressed that their programs are dedicated to peaceful uses. I can only speak for this country in regard to our intent and do state that we will maintain our defenses while pledging not to use space for aggressive purposes.

In commenting upon the comparison which I have just outlined, I would suggest that most generalizations are misleading. We are ahead in some regards and they are ahead in others, and the future of the race depends so much upon how vigorously and how continuously we apply our capabilities to mastering the space environment and perfecting our space technology. There is one generalization, however, which we should constantly keep before us, and that is that we dare not be complacent even while pushing our space program vigorously.

ENERGY FOR SPACE

As we all know, one of the most important keys to space exploration is energy. If there is any area about which we should not become complacement, it is that of generating adequate power to accomplish our future missions. Energy is needed both in propulsion for producing the necessary vehicle velocity and in the auxiliary power for orientation, communications, experimentation, and other related tasks aboard the spacecraft.

We look with some satisfaction at our booster program. New vehicles are being developed for the larger payloads, while increasingly experienced and reliable vehicles are handling the somewhat lesser weights. In addition to the liquid technology, we can be encouraged with the development in solid propulsion as well as in nuclear propulsion. In other words, we have a formidable national launch capability both in use and under research and development. However, we must not be satisfied with what such programs promise and thereby waste the valuable time which should now be devoted to further advancement in research and development of these new technologies.

FUTURE MISSIONS

I stress the importance of energy conversion to useful work as a key to future space adventures, because it truly opens the doors to manned exploration and peaceful exploration of the universe far beyond our atmosphere. We will want to journey to and from the planets in weeks and/or months, not years, and on regular schedules any time in the year. Also, in addition to establishing large bases on suitable planets and logistically supporting them until they can be sustained totally or in part by the natural resources found on those planets, we will want to do many other things, including regularly resupplying and continuously orbiting the earth with space stations. There are both scientific and military missions for which space stations seem to me to be ideally suited. Moreover, we will want to intercept and sample the resources of planetoids and maybe of comets; we will certainly maintain a growing interest in the search for extraterrestrial life. All of these and many more worthwhile proposed future projects require power, as the more power we have guaranteed before the mission, the greater is the payload capability, the safety margin for the crew, and the chance of successfully completing the mission.

LONG-RANGE VIEW

It is, of course, necessary that many of us, particularly those in Washington, look at our space program with a somewhat short-range view, since we have to deal with the annual budgetary process. While I am optimistic about some things, my optimism does not stretch itself to the extent of predicting a less-frequent budgetary exercise. Therefore, even though it is necessary that attention be given to the short run, I urge all who have the competence to look and plan ahead to do so as often and as thoroughly as possible.

WARNINGS

In conclusion, I would like to take this occasion to express several warnings in regard to the space program. Some of these repeat points already made, but I believe that they merit emphasis.

1. Let us not underestimate the Soviet capabilities or potential.

2. Let us not expect our space program to proceed indefinitely without some tragedy involving our astronauts.

3. Let us not overlook the national security insurance flowing from our construction of space competence.

4. Let us not become so blasé about our space accomplishments that we fail to thrill to the excitement of new goals reached.

5. Let us not expect a steady or automatic flow of increased benefits from our space program unless we invest increasing resources and efforts in that program.

"Prizefight" Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, professional boxing, or "prizefighting" needs fumigation.

The American public—not just sports fans—has been "suckered" by the "prizefight" racketeers for many years.

The news media, principally, and a few miserable profiteers who deal in human misery, have succored the "prizefight" business.

Amateur boxing, maybe, but "prizefighting" certainly does not qualify as a sport. "Prizefighting," for the combatants, is a miserable pursuit. Promotion of "prizefighting," as a business, is a wretched racket.

For years, I have expected the news media to expose the "prizefight" racket. The news media are quick and eager to expose every other facet of human activity—especially human frailties. Books, TV documentaries, newspaper exposes, and radio commentaries have investigated and reported—in breadth and depth—about "city hall," dope, Republicans, labor unions, honor-code violations, Selma, ad infinitum. But, all the news media continue to promote and glamorize the "prizefight" game and to lionize the pugs.

The reason for this seeming anomaly has just occurred to me. The news media derive enormous profits from this depraved and fraudulent business.

Without intensive news media promotion and excessive coverage, the prizefight racket would succumb quicker than the most recent heavyweight challenger. If the news media would keep the reporting of prizefighting in proper proportion and perspective, it would quickly wither and die and not be attractive to promoters and racketeers. How can an otherwise reputable industry continue to promote and subsidize such a totally unworthy endeavor?

Is there an area wherein the news media fail more completely to measure up to the standards we expect of other businesses and professions in our society? There certainly are better ways to entertain people and to earn a profit.

I urge Congress to refrain from enacting any regulatory legislation now. I suggest that the news media may wish to salvage their reputations and demonstrate that they can act responsibly in the public interest and forgo the paltry dollars gained at the expense of battered men and a gullible public.

If the news media can expurgate themselves, the absolution would be much more effective than if prizefighting were made subject to Federal regulations.

Mr. Speaker, if the news media can demonstrate their responsibility and capacity for restraint in this area, I would prefer to give them a chance before we impose Federal regulations and controls on the prizefight business.

Other sports have rectified their problems, even scandals, intramurally without Federal intervention. Boxing might do the same if the news media would perform selflessly in the public interest.

Colorado Was First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the State of Colorado was the first in the Nation to join in an official partnership program with a State in Brazil. The partners of the alliance program is in the private sector part of the Alliance for Progress. The State of Colorado joined with the State of Minas Gerais as the two States have many things in common, particularly in the mining and industrial part of each of the respective States. Recently in Denver the people of the State of Colorado had the privilege of receiving Ambassador Juracy Magalhaes who addressed a banquet celebrating the launching of the Partnership of the Alliance for Progress between the States of Colorado and Minas Gerais. They also heard an address by Mr. Wade B. Fleetwood, associate director, partners of the alliance program.

I place both addresses in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR JURACY MAGALHÃES AT THE BANQUET CELEBRATING THE LAUNCHING OF THE PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAM BETWEEN THE STATES OF COLORADO AND MINAS GERAIS, DENVER, COLO., MAY 13, 1965

I thank the sponsors of this banquet for this opportunity to witness the launching of the official partnership program between the States of Colorado and Minas Gerais. It is most gratifying to note that thanks to the civic spirit of the people in Colorado, the Committee of Partners of the Alliance formed in this State is being accepted and welcomed with an enthusiasm and good will equal or perhaps superior to that extended to other committees devoted to other Brazilian States. My satisfaction is increased by the pleasure of visiting this State and this city, to whose population I have conveyed, through its distinguished Governor, the Honorable John A. Love, the special greeting of the people of Minas Gerais, while thanking him for proclaiming this date as the "Day of the Minas Gerais-Colorado Partnership for Peace and Prosperity."

I would be only too pleased to comment at length on the characteristic features and history of Minas Gerais, its immense and varied resource potential, its pleasant spas and its beautiful scenery as well as its hopes for the future, its problems and accomplishments. The amplitude of the subject, equal to the territorial expanse of Minas,

would, however, take up much more time than that which is allotted me. Therefore, I shall try to be brief and will leave to those members of the Committee of Partners of the Alliance who have visited Minas Gerais the mission of supplying to the citizens of this State all the detailed information they may wish to have in connection to their Brazilian partner.

The association between Colorado and Minas Gerais is easily understandable when one is familiar with the various points of contact or, in other words, the affinities of both States. Both their territories are equally ample and mountainous and both are located in an area of intense mineral exploration; as a matter of fact, Minas Gerais owes its name to its great mining activities. In addition, both States dedicate themselves to a large extent to agriculture and the raising of cattle, both work toward the development of their industries, and have equally large centers for cultural dissemination.

Minas Gerais is one of the most active and productive States in Brazil. Its economic achievements in any chosen field—whether in mining, agriculture, cattle raising, or industry—have long constituted a high contribution to Brazilian economic reality. Furthermore, its established or merely prospective potential is enough to insure the State's increasing participation in Brazil's economy.

Aside from its material contribution, however, Minas Gerais is outstanding for the wealth of its traditions and its intense participation in Brazilian cultural life in its own rght. Dating as far back as colonial times, prior to the establishment of Brazil's independence in 1822, Minas Gerais has always held a predominant position within the framework of the country's national life; since those early days the people of Minas Gerais have demonstrated the depth and high aim of its civic sentiments. Minas was the site, in the 18th century, one of the earliest demonstrations demanding Brazil's national independence and this pioneer tradition was strongly upheld and developed by the generations following that which, personified by the heroic figure of Tiradentes, the chosen leader of the so-called Minas conspiracy, planted and nourished with its blood and sweat the seed of national freedom. The State of Minas Gerais has performed for the benefit of the entire nation the role of an actual university of wisdom and sound political judgment; a great number of men either born or raised in Minas have occupied some of the most influential positions in our national life—including that of the Presidency of the Republic, an honor which was conferred on four occasions to citizens of this State. In analyzing the State's contribution to the political format adopted by Brazil the names of two men immediately come to my mind; I cite them in tribute not only to their memory but also to the community of which they were a part. I refer to Antonio Carlos, outstanding Congressman, a worthy and respected politician, and a true representative of the sober minded and wise judgment for which the people of Minas Gerais have been well known throughout Brazil's history. I also refer to Virgilio de Melo Franco, a flawless idealist, a tireless and active defender of the people's rights, a true example of the energetic capacity and vitality of the people of Minas Gerais.

For all these reasons and the well-deserved admiration earned by this still young but enterprising State of Colorado, I feel that I am not being pretentious or insincere in stating that these two States are to be mutually congratulated for the partnership which we are proclaiming in this meeting and which I trust will promote the close association which is its aim.

I feel very confident as to the effectiveness of this program sponsored by the Alliance and I know that both States are not lacking in ways and means required for the establishment of a fruitful, close, and productive partnership based on bilateral foundations. The initiative has the assurance of the unrestricted support of Brazilian officials both here and in Brazil, particularly in Minas Gerais; its importance and the possibilities of its contribution to the worthy cause of the Alliance for Progress as well as to the traditional friendship between our two countries are well understood and more than welcome. I am likewise confident that it will receive the unrestricted encouragement and support of American officials and, further, of this great State, in addition to the interest already shown or apt to develop in Denver, Pueblo, Colorado Springs, Boulder, and other centers.

In addressing you today I am conveying the feelings of the people of Minas Gerais, particularly those of my good and dear friend Gov. Magalhães Pinto, whose inspiration will undoubtedly be of great value to the furtherance of this project. I thank all those who contributed their best efforts to the organization of this meeting as well as all those who are present here today. And I entreat one and all to act as agents and harbingers of my sincere hope and confidence in the success of the Colorado-Minas Gerais partnership.

ADDRESS BY WADE B. FLEETWOOD, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAM, ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON THE OCCASION OF THE COLORADO PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE BANQUET IN DENVER ON MAY 13, 1965

Mr. McCollum, Mr. Ambassador, Mayor Currigan, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a high honor to appear on the same program with the Ambassador of Brazil. I know him as a great man from a great country.

I have come to Denver several times on behalf of the Colorado partners program. I have always found a cordial and friendly reception here and many action-minded leaders in the Jaycees, the Colorado Society of Engineers, the Business and Professional Women's groups and other private citizen organizations. They have all given generously of their time. I congratulate you on this banquet, your planning, and your efforts to reach out to the grassroots of this State for support. For this is the people's program.

You, as the citizens of the first State to be joined in a partnership with Brazil, have responded well. The list of completed projects is impressive and complements the self-help measures undertaken by Brazilians in Minas Gerais. The private sector in this State is extending not a hand with gifts but rather a hand of friendship for constructive mutual good works.

I am proud to represent Jim Boren and serve as associate director of the partners program he heads. For this meeting tonight is another of the tangible results of Jim Boren's foresight and resourcefulness in formulating the partner's concept and a tribute to his vigorous leadership in the development of a nationwide program. There are now 28 States participating in this activity.

To you, Mr. Ambassador, Jim Boren extends his fond and warm greetings and his thanks for your support and active interest in the partners program.

We salute the Colorado partners. We ask that you mark this banquet tonight not as an end but as a beginning and that the partnership between Colorado and Minas Gerais be a long and meaningful association of friendship and respect and mutual helpfulness.

There are now nine partnership programs in Brazil. In the rollcall of great and resourceful U.S. States, Colorado has led the way. You have been followed by Maryland, Indiana, New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, and Wyoming. Each in its own and unique way, through the private sector, is helping to make the Alliance for Progress a living reality. The essential ingredient of people in these U.S. States, in concert with the people in Brazil, is providing the very flesh and blood that will strengthen the bonds of friendship between two great countries. And the total partners program operating in 12 Latin American Republics will assist in the attainment of the broad objectives of the Alliance.

Let us accelerate this vital surge of the people's energy to know and develop this hemisphere and, together, we can do much to lift the burden of poverty and disease and ignorance from this continent and make for ourselves and our children a happier and better life.

President Johnson Heeds Lessons of the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a well considered article written by James J. Kilpatrick and appearing in the Washington Star of May 27, 1965.

This article might well have been termed "Lest We Forget" particularly the events prior to World War II when indecision and weakness in leadership in Great Britain was construed by Hitler as fear, resulting in the road of appeasement and ultimately war. Firm and courageous leadership in Britain and France might have averted World War II. We do not want to make the same mistake now. One thing is certain, there will be no fear, indecision, or appeasement by President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The article follows:

JOHNSON HEEDS LESSONS OF THE PAST

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

It has been 5 years since Charles Malik, of Lebanon, spoke at Williamsburg, 5 years come June 11, but events of the last few weeks have given a brilliant freshness to all he had to say that afternoon.

It is as if the speech just came in from the rain, still wet from the passing hour, sparkling with the clarity of a lucent mind at work.

You should know about this speech. Malik spoke in the restored hall of the colonial House of Burgesses, a small room, dimly lit by shafts of sunlight. A group of distinguished Virginians occupied the north benches; across the narrow chamber, a group of foreign students occupied the others. The benches were hard; no one noticed. Malik spoke for an hour; his audience forgot the time. His face, lit by inner fires, dominated the room. Simply as a speech, as a surpassing example of the orator's lost art, the address was unforgettable.

It was more than oratory. Malik's theme that afternoon was the failure of Western civilization to learn its lessons from the past; and he raised the somber question of the West's survival. He was not talking to the distant past, of the impotence of Greece and the long decay of Rome. He was talking of the immediate past, and he asked repeatedly a question that went to the heart.

"Communism started from zero 43 years ago, and today it rigidly controls one-third of mankind and has penetrated and softened

up in varying degrees the remaining two-thirds. Was this phenomenal development inevitable?

"The victory of communism in the late 1940's in China means that the largest compactly homogeneous mass of humanity, numbering some 600 million people, are now sworn enemies of everything free and Western. Was this development inevitable?

"The Korean war, despite all its heroic exertions, ended in a draw. Was this outcome inevitable?

"Whereas 10 or 15 years ago communism was effectively absent from Latin America, today it is visibly present. Was this development inevitable?"

For 15 minutes, Malik hammered relentlessly at his theme: the advances of communism, the retreats of freedom. Was this sequence of events literally inevitable? Is communism an irreversible tide? This question of inevitability, he said, must be squarely faced, "for either you believe that these things were inevitable, or you believe they could have been helped." For his own part, he was convinced that every one of these tragic advances and retreats could have been prevented or reversed, if only the right persons had acted differently at critical hours.

President Johnson's decision in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic viewed in the light of Malik's perspective, take on a meaning that today's apostles of neutralism and disengagement have missed altogether. History is not alone something that happened 10 years, or a century, or a millennium ago; history is happening now, this month, this afternoon. We are today caught in one of those hours of great decision when the future of the West demands that we redeem the blunders of the past.

Assume for a moment that Johnson had not acted boldly in Santo Domingo, and that a Communist-dominated government had come into power. Assume further that he had cravenly withdrawn from Vietnam and surrendered her people to the gentle mercies of Peiping and Hanoi. It is now clear that we would have taken the very steps that would have permitted a Malik, on some other summer afternoon, 10 years hence, to ask the same terrible question. Was it inevitable?

"If only people rose to the occasion," Malik cried, "if only they were not overwhelmed by their softness and apathy, if only they overcame their greed, if only they were morally strong, if only they were not selfish and narrow, if only they were not petty and spiteful and stupid, if only they were big, if only they knew what was at stake, if only they trampled underfoot the wide and easy way."

That was the climax of his speech 5 years ago. Indonesia had not toppled then. The fate of Cuba was unclear. Africa was transition. We can see now, looking back, that these sad events were not inevitable. They could have been prevented if the right men had made the right decisions. Johnson is just such a man; he is here making the right decisions; and he needs the help of every man who would learn, like Malik, from the past.

Red Roses for Ringo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the May 1965 issue of This Is Arkansas, published by the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission, contains an article on the phenomenal—but highly deserved—success of Florafax Delivery, Inc., a business begun in 1950 by Mr. Kenneth F. Short.

Members will be interested in reading this splendid story of American free enterprise. It proves again that the door to success always is wide open in Arkansas.

The article follows:

RED ROSES FOR RINGO

There are, in the United States, three organizations which specialize in handling wire transfer of orders for flowers. These are the trade services which enable florists to make quick delivery almost anywhere in the world. The largest of the three, with about 10,000 members, is located in Detroit. The second ranking group, with about 5,000 members, is in Los Angeles. The third, Florafax Delivery, Inc., with unique services and over 4,500 members, is located in (and this will probably make you reach for your Atlas) Leachville.

Kenneth F. Short, founder and president of Florafax, has a varied and successful background in other occupations and trades. In 1950, he decided that he wanted to go into the florist business in a small city and a friend in Blytheville, Ark., persuaded him to move to Leachville where he set up a flower shop with branches in the nearby communities of Manila and Monette. This comparatively obscure venture has grown into the present triple-faceted organization which includes:

1. Florafax Delivery, Inc., which now clears wire orders for more than 4,500 florists in all 50 States, Canada, Mexico, and 18 European countries.

2. Publication of a national florist directory which lists just about every florist in the United States and Canada.

3. A modern print shop which uses about six carloads of paper annually.

A new $150,000 building, housing all three units, was completed in May 1964.

Short soon discovered that (a) the retail florist business did not offer sufficient scope for his energy and talents and (b) there was no comprehensive listing or directory of U.S. florists. He told himself that he could compile a national directory in a year, but it took almost 3 years of constant travel to secure enough listings and sell enough advertising space to justify publication of the first edition which came out in 1955. It has been published annually ever since. There are some 26,000 listings in the 1,380-page current edition which weighs almost 7 pounds.

Florafax Delivery, Inc., began operations in September 1961 and has been growing ever since. Currently, members are being added at the rate of 125 monthly. A brief description of the comparatively well-known service might not be amiss here. It simply provides a standardized procedure of intergroup communications, delivery, and payment. For instance, a florist in Denver can accept an order for flowers to be delivered in Philadelphia and can accomplish delivery, usually in less than 24 hours, by wiring or phoning an associate or fellow member in Philadelphia.

In other groups of this kind, the delivering florist periodically bills the headquarters or clearinghouse of his organization showing the amounts due him and the names of the members from whom he received the orders. Under the best of conditions, there is some delay in the matching up of orders and deliveries with consequent delay in collection from the originating florist and payment to the delivering florist.

Under a unique "Instant Payment" plan, Florafax guarantees payment to the delivering florist immediately on completion of an order. The delivering florist simply writes himself a check on the Florafax headquarters bank account. Each member is provided with a supply of special draft forms which clear as rapidly as checks if identification numbers, order numbers, etc. are properly filled in. Needless to say, this "Instant Payment" plan has been largely responsible for the fast growth of Florafax. Mr. Short says that his losses under this plan have been infinitesimal and that about the only problem is the occasional failure of a member to pay himself off promptly.

Another service is a monthly publication, "Florafacts," which includes an up-to-date list of members; a calendar of State, regional and national events of interest to florists; reports of new trade developments; and suggestions for new floral designs, better services, etc. This publication—the May 1965 issue has 360 pages with a four-color cover—is mailed to all members. The first annual convention of Florafax members was held in St. Louis on July 1964. It was an outstanding success and the second gathering will be in Memphis next July.

The print shop is modern throughout with late model offset presses, a completely equipped camera room and a photo-typesetting machine seldom seen outside metropolitan shops. The shop produces the annual national directory; the monthly "Florafacts"; and all of the stationery, accounting forms, and other printed matter needed for the efficient and effective operation of the complex organization. A limited amount of outside work is accepted. As in many print shops, the "front office" carries a nice stock of stationery and office supplies.

IBM machines and other modern equipment handle the accounting demands and the heavy flow of mail. An interesting sidelight is the fact that outgoing mail volume at Leachville has increased 55 percent since Kenneth Short decided to go into the directory and wire service business.

There are about 60 employees on the current payroll. This includes a 15-man sales force which covers the Untied States soliciting memberships and selling advertising space in the directories.

A recent development is affiliation with European groups which enables Florafax members to deal directly with florists in 16 European countries. A current undertaking is the preparation of a floral arrangement catalog in four colors. This will enable member florists to show their customers appropriate arrangements available at the point of delivery. Coded identification of each arrangement will simplify communications and expedite completion of transactions.

Addressing a recent civil club meeting in a nearby city, Mr. Short said: "Many people have asked me why in the world I selected Leachville for my home. Sometimes I don't know myself but I have never regretted the move. Arkansas has been wonderful to me, particularly these folks in Mississippi County."

Leachville is just one of many Arkansas communities in which businessmen and industrialists have found happy homes for themselves and their undertakings. There are many duplications, both large and small-scale, of the Florafax success story and the good industrial climate is not seasonal in Arkansas.

B.C.T.

(AUTHOR'S NOTES.—When I called on Mr. Short last fall, he had just returned from a European trip during which he had completed arrangements for affiliation with European florist groups. Also, on that day Florafax received an order from a Lexington, Ky., member for delivery of one dozen long stem red roses to Mr. Ringo Starr, University College Hospital, London, England, with card reading "From a devoted Beatle fan." At the time, the ineffable Ringo was recovering from a tonsilectomy.)

Prices of Food Higher, Expected To Keep Rising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star carried a front-page story on May 26, 1965, which every Member of Congress, every member of this administration, and the President of the United States should read. It is entitled "Prices of Food Higher, Expected To Keep Rising."

The article follows:

PRICES OF FOOD HIGHER, EXPECTED TO KEEP RISING—COSTS UP AS MUCH AS 15 PERCENT SINCE SPRING, WITH INCREASES VARYING BY REGIONS

NEW YORK.—It is costing more to fill the family dinner plate with meat, potatoes, and fresh vegetables.

An Associated Press survey indicates that the prices will keep rising a while longer.

Beef and pork have risen sharply this spring, after more than a year of bargain levels for housewives.

Food stores generally report markedly higher prices for vegetables, too—as much as 50 percent higher in Kansas City.

"Highest alltime prices," says Peter Asta of Asta Produce Co. in Kansas City.

"Never saw prices so high and quality so poor," says Steve Hatton, Kansas City manager for George De Paoli Co., another produce wholesaler.

FIFTEEN PERCENT HIGHER

Most food stores surveyed put their increase at about 15 percent higher than last spring. It varies by region.

The stores report that the biggest increases are for iceberg or head lettuce, tomatoes, cabbage and potatoes—all big volume vegetables.

Potatoes are double the usual price in many areas.

"Highest that I can remember in 25 years in the business," says Larry Eisenhower, president of L. A. Withington & Co., New York potato brokers.

SEVERAL FACTORS INVOLVED

Behind the high cost of eating are a number of factors: Meat packers are paying more for livestock. Last year, when prices were low, cattlemen cut back on herds; pig growers sold off breeder stock. Now, tight supplies have hiked top prices for steers 13 percent and for top-quality hogs 34 percent—highest in years.

Last fall's harvest of potatoes was poor in the Midwest and West because of a damaging frost. New potatoes aren't due on the market until the end of June and the last of the 1964 crop is running out, brokers report. An early winter freeze and rough spring weather—floods, tornadoes, drought—have cut into the fruit and vegetable crops.

GOVERNMENT GETS BLAME

Many in the produce markets blame the Government's decision to end the "bracero program," under which Mexican workers were brought into California to help harvest lettuce, tomatoes, asparagus, strawberries, and other crops that have to be picked by hand. Acreage planted is down, as well as harvests, produce dealers say. Several grocers, economists and the American Meat Institute argue that because of prosperous times Americans have gotten used to eating the best cuts of beef and pork—and eating them often. They suggest that demand for meat may have reached a new higher plateau.

"People seem to be willing to pay the higher prices," one New York City grocer says.

STEAKS ARE HIGHER

Sirloin steak ranged from $1.05 to $1.09 a pound in Kansas City last weekend, $1.09 in Atlanta, $1.15 to $1.59 in Boston, $1.19 in Chicago, $1.45 to $1.50 in San Francisco—all up some 10 percent over year-ago prices.

Steve D'Arrigo, a New York City produce dealer, says that there still are some vegetables that are lower—corn on the cob, broccoli, fresh peas and squash.

Some sample prices: Chicago—potatoes 9–12 cents a pound compared with 7–8 cents last spring, lettuce 29 cents a head against 15 cents last spring. Boston—Lettuce, 39 cents, up 20 cents; cabbage, 19 cents, up 10 cents; potatoes—5 pounds, 65 cents, up 16.

The Real Alabama—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as part I of this series, I inserted into the RECORD an article describing Alabama's growth as the No. 1 industrial State in the southeast.

The article was reprinted from a special newspaper supplement of the New York Journal of Commerce. As part II of the series I want to call attention to another article from the same publication.

It tells of the great tourist attractions in Alabama. And in a day when Americans are being encouraged to travel America I want to recommend it as an excellent summary of why Alabama has become a State which tourists from all over the country have come to know and enjoy.

To further support the material in the New York Journal of Commerce I want to call attention also to an editorial from the Mobile Register of May 19, 1965. It serves to welcome visitors to Alabama and I join in that invitation.

The articles follow:

TOURISTS FIND COUNTLESS ATTRACTIONS IN ALABAMA

Just as the chemical and transportation industries are writing new figures in Alabama's ledger, along comes the human industry of increased tourism to give further impetus to the economy.

There have always been tourists in this lovely land, but the State is now giving added attention to this aspect of its wealth.

Legislation passed with the support of the Alabama Travel Council and Gov. George Wallace has made available generous funds for telling the Alabama story in travel advertising and promotion.

Anyway, who could resist Alabama? From the rugged Appalachians of the north, down through the lush black-belt—with the richest soil in the Nation—to the talcum-soft beaches of the southern gulf coast, its beauties beckon.

Autumn traveling is steadily increasing, but springtime is entrancing, too. Flowers, masses and masses of brilliant blooms to dazzle the eyes and the camera, are everywhere, and the bird fancier will find 300 different kinds in the State.

The powdery white sand of the gulf beaches is a magnet, as are the tours of antebellum mansions, historic points, elaborate gardens, and famous shrines.

Sportsmen are discovering a new world here, too. The powerful Tennessee River makes northern Alabama one of the finest fishing areas in the country, and it is the only source in the State of smallmouth bass.

FISH ABUNDANT

Along the river are four large lakes, providing the region with an abundance of all the game fish native to north Alabama.

There are a number of waterfowl management areas, which provide hunters with first-rate duck and goose hunting in the northern section. Other managed hunting areas give an abundance of deer, turkey, quail, and squirrel. Dove hunting in Alabama is regarded as the finest in the Southeast.

Moving to the central section, the game includes deer, rabbit, squirrel, quail, dove, waterfowl, and fur-bearing animals. On the fishing scene, bass, bream, crappie, and catfish are favorites.

In both the eastern and central part of this region is found the Talladega National Forest, where thousands of acres of timber provide year-round protection for the vast deer herd. Surf casting is the big story on the white beaches to the south.

Tarpon, snapper, speckled trout, and other game fish are found aplenty off the coast.

In the southern section of the State, top fresh water fishing abounds. Bass, bream, and catfish are found in great quantities in the rivers and lakes.

The southern section of the State also provides some of the best deer, turkey, squirrel, dove, and waterfowl hunting to be found anywhere in the South. In the marshlands around Mobile, duck hunting is supreme.

Not only sportsmen, but just plain travelers, find many attractions. Huntsville has become a national name, as "Space Capital of the Universe," Redstone Arsenal. There are many displays to make the visitor realize how closely he is involved with the space age.

Many tourists take time to visit the storied antebellum home, Forks of Cypress, near Florence. Built in 1820, where Double Head, chief of the Cherokees, once erected his wigwam, the house has an encircling colonnade of 20 magnificent columns.

HISTORIC DWELLINGS

Many historic homes are to be found throughout the State. There is Ivy Green, birthplace of Helen Keller, at Tuscumbia; the home of the State's second Governor, Thomas Bibb, at Mooresville.

The Arlington Shrine in Birmingham was built in 1842 and was used by General Wilson as his headquarters during the first stages of the War Between the States. The Gorgas home on the University of Alabama campus, the Burchfield home in Tuscaloosa, the Rosemont at Forkland, the stately Oakleigh at Mobile, and Bellingrath Gardens, outside Mobile, along with hundreds more, offer a real treasure to viewers.

In Birmingham, many visitors view the city from Vulcan, largest cast-iron statue in the world, and next to the Statue of Liberty, the tallest statue in America.

Among special tourist attractions are Dismal Gardens, Rock Bridge Canyon and Natural Bridge; Hurricane Creek Park, Little River Canyon, Citadel Rocks, Desota State Park and Russell Cave National Monument, all in the north. In the central region are Bama Rock Gardens, Horse Pens Forty and Jasmine Hill, with Clarke, Long and Bellingrath Gardens in the south.

CAVERNS LISTED

Caves and caverns include Rickwood Caverns, Warrior, just off Interstate Highway

65, Cathedral Caverns, Manitou Cave and Guntersville Caverns.

Historic forts include Fort Morgan at Gulf Shores, Fort Gaines, at Dauphin Island, Fort Mims at Tensaw, and Fort Toulouse, near Montgomery. Because the State lived under seven flags, Alabama's historical monuments are noteworthy. One of the most famous is Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, where "Old Hickory" Jackson broke the domination of the Creeks.

Montgomery, the Cradle of the Confederacy, is one of the greatest drawing cards for tourists. She has one of the most beautiful capitol buildings in the Nation, and here, in the legislative halls, the secession act was passed.

The first White House of the Confederacy is located across from the capitol. This is where Jefferson Davis lived after taking his oath of office on the portico of the Alabama Capitol.

TWO BOWL GAMES

Among top attractions in Alabama are two famous football games—the Blue-Gray in Montgomery and the Senior Bowl game in Mobile. The first mardi gras ever held in the United States is a yearly attraction in Mobile. Then there are the Azalea Trail, the Deep Sea Fishing Rodeo, the Peanut Festival, the Peach Festival, the National Field Trials and Union Springs, the Birmingham Festival of the Arts.

State officials say that Alabama has more freshwater shoreline than any other State in the Union, and her 1,700 miles of navigable waterways top all other States.

[From the Mobile Register, May 19, 1965]

VISITORS TO ALABAMA ALWAYS AMONG FRIENDS

Alabama is eager to greet its guests with more than cordiality.

It wants to be helpful to them, in this way contributing to their convenience and enjoyment.

Vacationists, tourists, and other travelers from out of State find that hospitality in Alabama means friendliness turns into helpfulness whenever the need and opportunity appear.

The popularity of Alabama as a tourist and vacation State is pinpointed partly in these words on the cover of a travel brochure prepared by the State bureau of publicity and information:

"It's easy to have fun in Alabama. You're traveling among friends."

Alabama is a traditionally friendly State—a State which not only cordially welcomes its guests but does everything it can during their visits to assure they will be delighted that they came.

The familiar climate slogan chosen for Mobile by the Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce is notable as an illustration of the hospitable spirit prevailing in Alabama.

This slogan, in general usage, has a pronounced economic meaning: "The climate's ideal for progress in Mobile."

But the chamber of commerce tourists and conventions department headed by James N. (Jimmie) Morris gives the slogan a special application to the hospitality of Mobile toward its guests by substituting "visitors" for "progress," so in this express sense it reads: "The climate's ideal for visitors in Mobile."

This utility of the slogan strenghtens its aptness, making it useful in pointing up the fact that Mobile is both a city of progress and a city of hospitality.

Happily, of course, not only the people of Mobile but the people of the whole State of Alabama are known for friendliness. This human quality is a priceless asset to Alabama as an attraction to tourists, vacationists, and other visitors.

Alabama's guests know it is really true: "You're always among friends in Alabama."

A Sound Monetary Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently a group of distinguished Americans in industry, finance, labor, public power and consumer groups, banded together to form the National Council for Sound Monetary Policy. The purpose of this group is to keep interest rates down and the American economy up. They believe in an adequate money supply for the legitimate credit needs of the Nation.

Mr. Milton J. Shapp, Philadelphia industrialist and civic leader, was named chairman of this important organization. I submit for the RECORD Mr. Shapp's remarks at the National Press Club when the formation of the National Council for Sound Monetary Policy was announced. I am also submitting a more recent statement by Mr. Shapp which reinforces the group's determination to pursue the stated desire of the President and his Secretary of the Treasury to keep interest rates down and the economy rolling:

STATEMENT BY MILTON J. SHAPP AT THE OPENING PRESS CONFERENCE ANNOUNCING FORMATION OF NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR SOUND MONETARY POLICY, APRIL 21, 1965

There seems to be a pretty distinguished group here among the press as well as to my right and left.

The National Council for Sound Monetary Policy is a new organization that should be an old organization. There has long been a need for a citizens' watchdog group to keep a sharp eye on the money managers of America. We intend to do that and what we're really doing is supporting the avowed intention of the President to hold interest rates down so we can keep the economy up.

As late as February 10, 1965, in his report to the Congress on our international balance-of-payments situation, he said: "I expect the continuation of essential stability in interest rates."

There's nothing in President Johnson's public statements or actions that indicate that he is a tight money man. There's nobody in our organization who is a tight money man, and there's nobody in our group who favors high interest rates.

The council is like Topsy—it just grew. It's made up of like minded people in various walks of life. We have about 25 officers and board members now, but within 30 days, I would not be surprised if this group more than doubled in numbers. Besides, we are seeking general public support. We are all the public and every one of us has a stake in high or low interest rates and an adequate money supply for an expanding economy. A recession hits the big and small businessman. It means fewer people hired in our shops and factories and farms. High interest rates take money out of the public's pocketbook unnecessarily.

Some wise bankers understand what I've been talking about. Jim Thomas is a good example, and our Floridian treasurer, Dave Stuzin, who is not here because of illness. There are other bankers who will be part of our group, and major builders who know that they cannot build and sell houses if interest charges are exorbitant and credit restricted.

I want it distinctly understood that our group is not antibankers. I believe that many banks do an excellent job in their communities and are helping our economy expand. We merely want to see that the banks, who are in the midst of an evolutionary period of change, are conscious of their public responsibility. In the period of general prosperity such as we have been going through, bank profits have been greater than ever before in banking history. We are not against profits—we don't want profits to be the result of ignoring the public interest.

We will add several distinguished economists to our organization in the near future. There will be many more businessmen, and I want to see the farm organizations represented also.

Briefly, we're just announcing the beginning of the beginning. We have a lot of work to do. We have an educational job to do around the country and up on a little Hill in the city of Washington. A great deal of this work is going to be done by Patrick Gannon, who like most gentlemen of Irish ancestry, is not a stranger to politics. For several years, he was a promotion executive with Look magazine. Prior to that, he had served with publications in the building field. Most recently, he has been a consultant to the Department of Labor.

In winding up, I want to reiterate that we believe that President Johnson has indicated his interest in maintaining reasonable interest rates and an adequate money supply. Just last week, before the Society of Newspaper Editors, his new Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Connor, stated that, "Any substantial tightening of our monetary policy could have painful consequences for our domestic economy. In this, the Council for Sound Monetary Policy concurs. We believe that depressions are man made, and our group is going to do all in its power to keep the economy rolling.

STATEMENT BY MILTON J. SHAPP, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR SOUND MONETARY POLICY, TAKING ISSUE WITH THOSE WHO OPPOSE PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POLICIES ON MONETARY MATTERS, MAY 20, 1965

There appears to be an increasing disregard, in some banking circles, for the express desires of President Johnson, his Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Fowler, and other administration officials, to keep interest rates down and the economy rolling.

In a February statement to Congress on the balance-of-payments situation the President said: "I expect the continuation of essential stability in interest rates."

In March, Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, rejected a drastic, bludgeon tightening of credit which would, in the long run, not strengthen the dollar but weaken it by weakening the economy, our Nation, and ultimately the world economy.

In mid-April, Secretary of Commerce Connor warned: "Any substantial tightening of our monetary policy could have painful consequences for our domestic economy."

In late April, Secretary Fowler was quoted in the Wall Street Journal to the effect that he did not intend to rock the boat by tightening credit or upping interest rates.

Despite the obvious direction given monetary policy by the President and other administration leaders, William McChesney Martin was quoted Monday in the American Banker, principal trade paper of the banking industry, as saying: "I am not saying that there should be higher interest rates now, but the United States cannot be isolationist on interest rates if it is going to stop the flow (balance of payments) * * *.

In the realm of monetary policy, if you wait until prices really rise or wait until there is a hemorrhage in money flow before using policy, then it is too late."

Chairman Martin indicates that his objective is to stimulate economic expansion without pushing the country into a wage-price or cost-push spiral. At the same time he noted that there appears to be enough excess capacity of men, materials, and facilities around to permit policy to go either way.

It would appear that Chairman Martin and the Federal Reserve Board are following their old policies of trying to cure whatever ails the economy by upping interest rates and tightening credit, or if the economy isn't ailing, to induce lethargy into the economy by this means. Businessmen cannot afford to take this type of thinking lying down, nor should labor, agriculture or consumer groups that are affected by a tight money policy and higher interest rates.

Chairman Martin's desire to block inflation is admirable but it doesn't take an education in economics to understand that a major cause of inflation is too much demand for too few materials. Another important factor is an arbitrary price boost of a basic material needed in manufacturing.

While Chairman Martin may not like to accept it as such, money is a commodity, a basic raw material if you will, necessary to the operations of American industry. At the present time, there appears to be a much greater supply of money than there is demand. To arbitrarily increase the cost of money would necessarily force an increase in manufacturing costs and ultimately result in greater end prices for goods and services. This, I strongly contend, would be the first major step in setting off the cost-push spiral which Martin claims is so important to avoid.

Chairman Martin's attitude as reported in the American Banker, throws into sharp focus the problem of who controls fiscal policy in the United States, and raises the question as to who Mr. Martin is now representing—the American citizen who pays for the operation of the Federal Reserve System that he heads, or the American Bankers Association that seems to be working hard and long for increased interest rates and credit restrictions?

I am today contacting all members of the National Council for Sound Monetary Policy urging them to inform any and all groups with which they are associated of the grave dangers facing the country if Mr. Martin's suggestions are implemented.

Armenian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, today is a significant day for freedom-loving people everywhere. On May 28, 1918, the short-lived Republic of Armenia proclaimed its independence.

The Republic of Armenia's independence lasted only until 1920 when this fledgling Nation became the first victim of Soviet military aggression in a pattern that has since become familiar. Armenia, that little ally of the great allies in World War I, alone in the Caucasus and out of the reach of her friendly allies, was looted, devastated, and completely overwhelmed by menacing military hordes and soon swallowed up in the Communist orbit.

In 1921, the flame of freedom flickered ever so briefly in that troubled land. Armenian patriots staged a brief uprising and were temporarily sucessful in winning freedom, but in a matter of months Soviet military might had crushed all resistance.

Today, Armenia is a captive nation, and about one-third the size of that once independent state. Though their freedom has been snuffed out, we here in the United States, whether of Armenian descent or just ordinary freedom-loving Americans, will never forget those brave people who are not free to celebrate their own independence in their homeland. It is therefore important that we celebrate Armenian Independence Day to show that we have not forgotten the Armenian people now living under the heavy bonds of Communist tyranny as we reaffirm the hope that they will again attain their goal and live in peace and freedom in their historic homeland.

Gambling: A Lousy Way To Finance Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD two articles I believe are of real importance in pointing out an ever-growing tendency by our State governments to try to find an easy way, regardless of consequences, to obtain additional tax moneys.

The legalizing of gambling with the excuse of placing a tax on it is a sad commentary on the ebbing of our moral and spiritual values which have been the bulwark of this country. In the recent New Hampshire lottery 1 out of every 639 persons who purchased a lottery ticket will receive a payoff. This is a fraud on the people as well as financial chicanery.

Similar revenue raising suggestions have been made in my own State and I am happy to say, always without success—at least up to now. As has been so properly pointed out by the Tax Institute of America, the search for Santa Claus in obtaining public financing by the use of a tax on legalized gambling is not a painless panacea to this problem—it can turn out to be most painful for society, for our country and for our future.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 23, 1965, and an article from the Christian Century of May 25, 1965, by Virgil W. Peterson entitled, "A Look at Legalized Gambling."

The articles follow:

[From the Christian Century, May 26, 1965]

A LOOK AT LEGALIZED GAMBLING—ARGUMENTS FOR ITS INITIATION LOSE THEIR VALIDITY WHEN WEIGHED AGAINST THE WITNESS HISTORY OFFERS

(Virgil W. Peterson, operating director of the Chicago Crime Commission)

In the 2 years since New Hampshire sanctioned lotteries—the first State to do so since the discredited Louisiana lottery was outlawed in the early 1890's—we have seen a wave of proposals elsewhere for the legalization of lotteries as well as other forms of gambling.

Either overlooked or defied by proponents of legalized gambling is the long American experience with State-sanctioned lotteries. Throughout the colonial period lotteries were commonly used to raise funds for schools, churches, and public works of every nature. During the Revolution a plan was advanced to gain support for the colonial troops through a lottery; it was anticipated that from the sale of 100,000 tickets $1,005,000 would be raised. The lottery was not successful, and as usual abuses immediately arose, including the widespread counterfeiting of tickets. In March 1777 Rhode Island made such counterfeiting punishable by death "without benefit of clergy," plus confiscation of all property. The death penalty was similarly imposed in North Carolina.

With the Revolution over, the various States urgently needed revenue. And since, as historian John Bach McMaster wrote, "taxes the people would not bear," lotteries were authorized to raise money for bridges, schools, colleges, and churches. Meanwhile private lotteries flourished, competing with their authorized counterparts. All, legal as well as illegal, proved uncontrollable. Inevitably there appeared professional lottery contractors and ticket brokers who, sensing enormous possibilities for personal gain, resorted to high-pressure salesmanship as well as outright fraud. It was not unusual for more fractions of a ticket to be offered than were mathematically possible—for example, nineteen-eighths. Among other schemes devised were the renting of tickets and the offering of tickets on the installment plan for people who could not afford to purchase them outright. In 1812 Massachusetts authorized a lottery to raise $16,000 for repairs on Plymouth Beach. After 9 years the lottery was still not completed, and although net receipts had totaled $886,439.75, the intended beneficiary had received only $9,876.15.

Such abuses, together with the exploitation of the lower economic groups, eventually aroused opposition to such methods of raising money for allegedly worthy causes. In New York the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism, formed in 1817, termed the lottery business a principal cause of poverty in that city. At the October 1830 session of the Rhode Island General Assembly the treasurer reported that through the preceding 3 years the State had received only $43,516.69 from $4 million worth of authorized lotteries. In 1828 the Pennsylvania Assembly was deluged with petitions against the lottery, and it became a political issue. In 1833 Job R. Tyson, a prominent Philadelphia lawyer, drew up a well documented report on fraud and crime stemming from lotteries. He cited one-court handling insolvency matters which had dealt with no fewer than 55 cases resulting from lotteries; in some cases the amount owed the ticket agents had been as much as $30,000. In 1834 intolerable abuses led to formation of the Pennsylvania Society for the Prevention of Lotteries.

By the 1830's most of the States had outlawed lotteries. Many of them not only enacted prohibitory laws but inserted provi-

sions in their constitutions designed to prevent the legislatures from ever again resorting to the folly of trying to raise revenue through legalized lotteries.

I

Following the Civil War, however, some of the poverty-stricken Southern States again turned to lotteries to support so-called charitable ventures. C. H. Murray & Co. of New York, a gambling syndicate that already owned three State lottery charters, formed the Louisiana Lottery Co. and obtained a charter to operate in that State for a period of 25 years, beginning January 1, 1869. (According to affidavits later executed by two of the incorporators, at least $300,000 was paid in bribes by the company.) Under terms of its charter, the company was exempt from taxation; its alleged purpose was to raise $40,000 annually for the New Orleans charity hospital. Two Louisiana war heroes, Gen. Pierre Gustave Toutant Beauregard and Gen. Jubal A. Early, were retained at an annual salary of $30,000 each to preside over the monthly public drawings and lend the lottery respectability.

For over 20 years the Louisiana Lottery Co. grew in opulence and power. Stimulated by extensive advertising and the presence of numerous ticket offices, money poured into its coffers. It made big investments in sugar refineries, banks, cotton presses, and land. To accommodate people who could not afford to buy a lottery ticket but could scrape together a few pennies for a policy ticket, policy booths were set up, with local politicians hired to handle the daily drawings. The company could offer hundreds of jobs, obtainable only on recommendation from State legislators or other politicians. When opposition began to mount it secretly purchased a controlling interest in the New Orleans Times-Democrat. Judges, Governors, and U.S. Senators owed their posts to it.

The company eventually built up a political machine that enabled it to control the entire State, and its influence was felt throughout the Nation. On July 30, 1890, President Benjamin Harrison sent a special message to both Houses of Congress that said, in part: "The people of all the States are debauched and defrauded. The National Capital has become a subheadquarters of the Louisiana Lottery Co. Severe and effectual legislation should be promptly enacted to enable the Post Office Department to purge the mail of all letters, newspapers and circulars relating to the business." On September 18 of that year Congress enacted a law which made it a criminal offense to deposit lottery matter in the U.S. mail.

Meanwhile, some of Louisiana's most distinguished citizens were mounting a fight against the lottery. Edward Douglas White, a New Orleans lawyer who later became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, gained national prominence for his courageous leadership in efforts to combat the powerful lottery interests. In the gubernatorial election of 1892 the lottery was the principal issue. The company's paid emissaries traveled throughout the State praising its benevolence and emphasizing the revenue that would result from renewal of the charter. As a clinching argument, they declared that white supremacy depended on the company's continued existence. Fresh in the minds of the citizens, however, were the intolerable economic, social, and political evils that had stemmed from the lottery's operations, and it was voted out of existence.

In his definitive study of American lotteries from colonial days to the 1890's (published in book form as "Fortune's Merry Wheel" by Harvard University Press in 1960), Historian John S. Ezell concluded:

"If history teaches anything, a study of over 1,300 legal lotteries in the United States proves these things: (that) they cost more than they brought in if their total impact on society is reckoned; and that in 160 years' experience indicates clearly that the most careful supervision cannot eradicate the inevitable abuses in a system particularly susceptible to fraud."

Yet only a few years ago the New York State constitution was amended to permit the operation in that State of bingo games "for religious and charitable purposes." A law that became effective January 1, 1958, created a State lottery control commission, gave it an annual appropriation of $250,000 and empowered it to employ a staff to supervise the bingo laws. The New York scheme had barely started when it was rocked by a scandal that attracted nationwide attention. At the conclusion of an investigation and public hearings conducted in 1961 the State commission of investigation issued an official report stating:

"Every regulatory provision in the law has been violated. Revenues which should have gone to charitable purposes were misappropriated in substantial amounts * * *. Otherwise decent citizens were duped or persuaded to commit fraudulent acts and shameful infractions of the law. Public officials who were charged with the direct responsibility for supervision of the legalized gaming were corrupted * * *. The number of bingo halls controlled by commercial renters has mushroomed * * *. The testimony adduced at both the public and private hearings indicates a woeful weakness in the observance and in the enforcement of the bingo laws. The conditions which have developed in the short time since bingo was legalized in this State cannot be tolerated."

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller appointed Thomas B. Gilchrist, a prominent lawyer, to look into the matter. On January 12, 1962, Gilchrist reported:

"Evils have permeated all phases of control and conduct of bingo at all levels * * *. The professional promoters who operated before the laws were passed, and who were all well known to law enforcement officials, all continued their operations after legislation * * *. Human frailties being what they are, it is difficult to predict whether this area of legalized gambling will ever be successfully administered and enforced."

And it should be recognized that problems arising from limited legalization of bingo games are not comparable in magnitude with those that stem from State-authorized lotteries or off-track betting, schemes in which the general public participates.

Though past experience should serve as a red flag halting all blithely proposed gambling schemes, agitation constantly recurs for legalization of lotteries, off-track betting, slot machines, or casino gambling. Perhaps the only thing we actually learn from history is that we learn nothing from history.

II

Almost every proposal to legalize gambling is advanced as means of raising revenue. It is assumed that since only those who gamble anyway will patronize the ventures, the volume of gambling will not be appreciably increased and the State will derive needed funds without creating additional economic and social problems. It is further claimed that through a licensing system gambling will be controlled, the racketeering element will be eliminated along with illegal gambling, and official corruption will be ended. History reveals however that legalization has always resulted in removal of such effective control as previously existed.

That greatly increased sales of legitimate merchandise result from display of products and from advertising is likewise true of gambling ventures. Through advertisements in the press, over the airwaves, and on billboards people are urged to enter the wagering game. With gambling establishments readily available to the general public (including people who would not otherwise gamble), and with constant sales pressure exerted to persuade people to take a chance, it would be strange indeed if the volume of gambling did not greatly increase—particularly among members of the lower economic groups to whom the emotional appeal to gain wealth through wagering is strongest even though they can least afford to take such a chance.

Any State that embraces legalized gambling departs from its proper function of encouraging thrift and productive enterprise among its citizens when it spurs them to take part in its new form of revenue-raising. After it adopted its lottery designed to raise money for schools, New Hampshire engaged in a sales campaign. Heading the staff employed to administer the entire program is high-salaried Edward J. Powers. On June 8, 1964, the National Observer carried this note: "In less than a year the energetic Mr. Powers has assembled a staff of 15, spread his 'prosweepstakes' message with evangelistic fervor all over New Hampshire, and masterminded the decisions involved in getting the sweepstakes underway." On July 15 of that year the first drawing was held. The second ticket drawn was one held by an 8-year-old boy from Vermont whose mother had bought eight tickets, although she was an avowed opponent of gambling. Obviously, the easy availability of tickets, along with the sales pitch directed by the State, is encouraging gambling among people, even small children, who would not otherwise take part in it.

III

It is impossible to devise a legalization scheme that will be free from the influence of criminals and racketeers. In fact, in many instances racketeers have provided the behind-the-scene influence working for legalization. This was true in New York, where though legalization of bingo was alleged to be for the benefit of religious and charitable causes, the guiding genius behind formation of the New York Committee for Legalization of Bingo was one William P. Buckner, an ex-convict and swindler who formerly had been employed in Las Vegas gambling casinos and who had had connections with racket-operated casinos in Havana. In 1961 the New York State commission of investigation reported:

"Nothing short of amazing is the fact that names of persons of prominence in religious, veterans, and civic groups appeared on the letterhead of this committee * * * officials and legislators of the city and State were bombarded with letters from the committee * * * there can be no doubt that the pressures generated by this lobby which Buckner directed and inspired had the desired effect * * *. Within 3 years bingo was legalized."

And after legalization Buckner controlled, operated, or was financially interested in at least 14 authorized and licensed organizations sponsoring bingo games at 4 different locations. The major share of the profits from those operations went to Buckner and his professional gambling associates.

In Nevada, the only State that has licensed almost all forms of gambling, the casinos have served as magnets to attract criminal and racketeering elements from all parts of the Nation. In a number of instances big-name racketeers have been revealed as the proprietors of plush casinos: Benjamin "Bugsy" Siegel and Benny Binion, for instance, and others of similar infamous repute. A determined effort in recent years by Nevada authorities to keep notorious gangsters from frequenting the gambling resorts has met with indifferent results. When an official edict barred powerful gang leader Marshall Caifano from Nevada's casinos, he challenged the State officials in a court action claiming his civil rights had been violated. When in 1963 the license of a Lake Tahoe, Nev., gambling resort was revoked, it was proved that the powerful

Capone gangster Sam Giancana, who had been ordered barred from all such establishments in the State, had been a guest of the licensee for almost 2 weeks.

Gambling has traditionally been the underworld's principal source of revenue—not because it is legal or illegal as the case may be, but because it is lucrative. The underworld inevitably gains a foothold under any licensing system. If State authorities establish the vast policing system rigid supervision requires, the underworld merely provides itself with "fronts" who obtain the licenses, with actual ownership remaining in its own hands; and it receives a major share of the profits.

If the State takes over actual operation of lotteries of off-track betting shops, the underworld eventually establishes rival illegal operations, thus avoiding payment of fees and placing the State-operated venture at a competitive disadvantage. And if, as is frequently contended, the police cannot successfully suppress gambling operations before legalization, they certainly will have less success in suppressing unauthorized gambling after legalization. Neither the public nor the authorities (including the courts) will evidence much concern over an illegal operation when the State is engaged in operation of the same type of venture. A principal argument advanced by proponents of parimutuel gambling has been that since wagering will be limited to those who can afford to visit the racetrack enclosure, bookmaking establishments with their attendant evils will be eliminated; instead, the racetrack inevitably becomes a base of operations for a vast illicit bookmaking empire.

IV

Of primary concern, however, is the tremendous increase in the volume of gambling that inevitably follows legalization. Though the New Hampshire lottery is still in its infancy, evidence of an ominous nature has already appeared. An article in the September 4, 1964, New York Times reported on preparations for a drawing:

"They are pouring into this town (Salem) by the thousands each day to buy tickets ($6 million worth at $3 each). From the teenage waitress * * * to a jockey's wife * * * Salem is in a tizzy of anticipation. Its normal population of about 15,000 has ballooned to a transient 25,000 * * *. A janitor has shown up each week to buy hundreds of tickets on behalf of friends and others who commissioned him to represent them."

This year New Hampshire hopes to double the sale of tickets. And since the sweepstakes commission controls the lottery at every level and the liquor salesmen who purvey the tickets are full-time State employees, the opportunities for building up a powerful political machine controlled by the lottery are unlimited.

Influential in England's enactment of its Betting and Gaming Act of 1960, which permitted the licensing of betting shops, was the argument that it is unfair to deny the betting privilege to those unable to partronize racing enclosures. Following enactment of the act the volume of gambling soared. On June 1, 1961, betting office licenses totaled 8,802; a year later, 13,340; the next year, around 16,000. A scholarly study made in 1963 determined that as a result of the legalization of betting shops the volume of gambling had increased fourfold, and that thousands of new citizens had been attracted to gambling activities. The increase had been greatest in the lowest income stratum. As a result of the diversion of family resources to betting the number of defaults in debts owned small shopkeepers had increased sharply. In many localities shopkeepers were organizing to prevail on local licensing authorities to keep betting shops out of their neighborhoods. And new forms of gambling had appeared to satisfy the public's increased appetite for wagering.

Addressing the University of Chicago Law School alumni association on April 30 last year, Arthur L. Goodhart, professor of jurisprudence at University College, Oxford, and chairman of the Internation Law Association, noted that the previous English law had been criticized on the ground that it favored the rich against the poor. However:

"Those who were influenced by this perfervid egalitarianism did not stop to think that it might be more serious for a poor man, and especially for his family, to lose money on bets than it was for a wealthy one. Unfortunately, Parliament was convinced that these objections to the existing law were so serious that in 1960 it enacted the Betting and Gaming Act which has made legal almost all forms of gambling. The wave of gambling that has spread over the whole country has proved to be far greater than anyone expected. The moral and economic consequences of this freedom to gamble are only beginning to show."

And writing in the Chicago Tribune for May 31, 1964, Arthur Veysey, the paper's London bureau chief, offered this testimony:

"Proponents of the bill expected that by legalizing cash betting the Government would eliminate illegal gambling. The reverse seems to be happening. The number of runners who collect bets has probably increased Now and then gangsters have tried to move in on the shops. A half dozen or so shops have been bombed or fired after their owners declined demands for protection money."

Proponents of legalized gambling stress the large amount of revenue that will accrue to the State. But it has been demonstrated that such projects are perhaps the most wasteful and expensive methods ever devised to raise revenue. Thousands of dollars must be contributed by patrons to produce even a relatively small amount for the State. Even in the more successful lotteries, the charitable or Government project supposed to benefit gets only about one-fourth of the proceeds.

V

In the final analysis, revenue must come from productive enterprise. Gambling produces no wealth; it merely redistributes it from the hands of the many into the hands of the few. A substantial share of the money wagered is "marginal" money—funds available to purchase necessities or pay off debts or to gamble. The revenue the Government gets from such marginal money wagered will probably not offset the loss which should have been forthcoming from taxes on the legitimate goods and services purchased.

Since the emotional appeal of gambling is greatest among members of the lower income groups, a substantial amount of tax money paid to people on relief rolls inevitably makes its way into legalized gambling operations, with a very small portion returned therefrom in the form of revenue. Mass gambling generated by legalization inevitably increases relief costs; this is true even when, as in Nevada, the principal patrons of the ventures are out-of-State visitors. Wrote Editor Joseph P. McDonald of the Nevada State Journal in the May 1960 issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences:

"Prevalence of wide-open gambling has increased the relief burdens for the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, and similar agencies, because so many people, some of whom have families, come here and lose all their money and are destitute * * *. Recognized by right-thinking people as a wasteful, nonproductive business with absolutely no moral basis for existence, gambling on a wide-open plane in Nevada is here to stay * * *. The whole thing has worked into the State's economic and business life to such an extent that it would be difficult to repeal the law."

In its study of lotteries the Tax Institute of America stated:

"The lottery urge is only one manifestation of the pervasive current search for Santa Claus in financing public services * * *. So the great game of dodging the financial burden becomes increasingly complicated, as painless panaceas are feverishly sought. Yet no matter how many ingenious schemes we devise, sooner or later we learn with each of them that there is no Santa Claus and there is no panacea. In the long run, 'painless' methods frequently turn out to be the most painful."

Many people do not consider gambling morally wrong. And in fact most regulatory laws do not affect "private" gambling; they are directed at the business of gambling—a business of exploitation, pure and simple. And while the moral aspects of gambling by individuals may be subject to doubt, there is no question about the moral aspects of a State policy that adopts legalized gambling as a means of raising funds. If it is not immoral, it is certainly highly unethical for a State or any other government body to engage in the gambling business, with all its evil, social, and economic effects. Resort to such endeavor savors of a "public be damned" policy based on a quest for revenue regardless of the means used and the social consequences that are sure to follow.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 25, 1965]

THE 332,812 LOSERS

New Hampshire has just announced 332,812 losers. These are the persons who paid $3 for a lottery ticket on next September 4's sweepstakes race, and came up with a big, round, fat goose egg for their wasted money.

Of course, New Hampshire is not publicizing this long list of in-State and out-of-State losers. Instead it is concentrating on the 522 persons—the one out of every 639—who drew tickets which will eventually pay their holders as yet undetermined sums.

Naturally, it sounds much more inviting to say that 522 persons were winners. But it is part of the turned-around world of gambling that one considers a thimbleful of winners more important than a stadiumful of losers, even though in a moral sense all are losers.

We continue to find it sad that an American State—above all a supposedly frugal Yankee State—could have joined the ranks of those deluded areas which believe that they can solve problems by creating new ones. Indeed, there is something inexpressibly shameful in a public entity deluding the public into hoping to get something for nothing. (According to these particular odds the average player would have had to have begun buying a yearly ticket in the year A.D. 1326 to have had a chance to win.) We hope that there will be an adequate revival of moral, spiritual, and intellectual strength in New Hampshire to rid the State of this deliberate fraud upon so many unthinking individuals.

Pittsburgh: How One City Did It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the May 22 issue of Saturday Review includes

a number of worthwhile special reports on the subject of air pollution. One of them pays appropriate tribute to the pioneer efforts in this area by my own city of Pittsburgh. I should like to include that article, entitled "Pittsburgh: How One City Did It," at this point in my remarks:

PITTSBURGH: HOW ONE CITY DID IT

(By Ted O. Thackrey)

It's possible in Pittsburgh, Pa., these days to wear a white shirt, or a white dress, from dawn to dusk and come home almost spotless. Housewives are able to hang out a wash on a sunny morning in Pittsburgh, if they are so minded, without having the load to do over by noon because of sootfall and dust. The downtown skyscrapers, or most of them at any rate, appear newly constructed, though it may have been 5 years or more since the surface was washed or blasted. Since the middle or late forties, a generation has grown up in Pittsburgh that on any day could look up and see, of all urban wonders, the sky.

Before the forties, however, generations lived in Pittsburgh—once known as the smoky city—that often found it difficult to see the opposite side of the street. Today Pittsburgh, the once murky steeltown at the junction of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers, is one of America's cleaner cities. It has, for example, only half the dustfall registered in New York City; 30 tons per square mile per month on the average, compared with New York City's current 60 tons.

The story of the Pittsburgh renaissance reaches back over more than three decades and is by no means concluded. It has been and continues to be a bitter, emotionally charged battle to keep the atmosphere pure enough to breathe and clean enough to see through. The struggle to rid the mighty rivers of pollutants and to halt the despoiling of the land has barely begun.

Coal and steel interests, along with the railroads, were not only the job-giving lifeblood of Pittsburgh but were also the chief despoilers of air, land, and water in the old days. But Pittsburgh also had many men of determination and vision who foresaw that Pittsburgh could choke itself to death on the smoke and fumes belching from factory and locomotive chimneys. The fight for clean air really began late in 1939, but it was 7 grimy years before any specific results could be seen.

Leading industrial and business executives, including representatives of the steel industry, sparked the renaissance through formation of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development. By 1942 another civic group, the United Smoke Council, was formed by 142 men and women from 71 organizations. World War II was on—and the United Smoke Council entered the battle on patriotic grounds; smoke control, it proclaimed, was essential to save fuel needed for war production.

By 1943 an antismoke ordinance had been passed. It provided that as of October 1 of that year private homes were to burn only smokeless coal, fed to furnaces by stokers. But the effective date of the ordinance was eventually postponed to March 1945, partly because of opposition from soft-coal interests and partly because there weren't enough stokers and other smoke control equipment to go around. Meanwhile, rallies, meetings, and membership campaigns in the fight for smoke control were almost continuous. Finally, in 1945, the United Smoke Council became a part of the Committee on Smoke Abatement, a subdivision of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development.

But something else took place in 1945 that dramatized the struggle for clean air so prominently that most of Pittsburgh's population had to take sides: David L. Lawrence, an independent and well-to-do industrialist, campaigned for the Democratic nomination for mayor, and his major appeal was to those who wanted smoke control.

Not everyone wanted smoke control by any means. Householders were told that smokeless fuel would cost them dearly and that smoke control would drive industry from Pittsburgh; that it would become a jobless ghost town if the Lawrence supporters had their way. "Remember Little Joe," read the opposition placards. ("Little Joe" was a personification of "the little man" who would have to buy smokeless coal, stokers, and other conversion equipment if smoke control laws were enforced.) It was a tough battle, but Lawrence won the nomination and the election. And he proved to be a man who kept his campaign promises, particularly where smoke control was concerned.

One key to Lawrence's campaign was an impressive fact sheet about the high cost of atmospheric pollution. Respected physicians said flatly that Pittsburgh was not a healthy place to live, and statistics on respiratory diseases appeared to bear them out (in 1945, for example, Pittsburgh led the Nation in deaths from pneumonia). It was disclosed that 40 industrial firms had decided to leave Pittsburgh because of smoke, smog, and impure air, as well as because of a recurring danger from floods and contaminated water. A department store estimated that on one winter day alone, smog soiled merchandise and home furnishings so seriously that the loss in cleaning bills and markdowns was $25,000. Nevertheless, the coal industry and the railroads continued to oppose clean air efforts on economic grounds.

In 1946, the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, the League of Women Voters, and other civic groups joined the Allegheny Conference fight to extend air-pollution efforts to all of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh had discovered what many other regions have still failed to grasp: that polluted air knows no political boundaries, it drifts over borders and chokes communities impartially. Mayor Lawrence was deep into the fight by now, meeting around the clock with industrial leaders. In 1947, during a stalemate in the general assembly in Harrisburg over legislation to permit countywide control of air pollution, one of the major opponents capitulated. The Pennsylvania Railroad, which not only hauled but burned coal feared a loss of freight tonnage and was also worried about the enormous cost of converting coal-burning locomotives to diesels. At that point Richard King Mellon, most powerful of the city's financial and industrial giants, was persuaded to use his influence with the Pennsy's directors. The opposition died away, and the legislation passed.

By this time Pittsburgh was basking in some of the benefits of air pollution control. Two years after its smoke control ordinance went into effect, visibility in downtown Pittsburgh had improved 67 percent and there was a 39 percent improvement in days of sunshine observable. The pall of smoke was thinning out.

Under the ordinance, factories, homes, steamboats, and locomotives were required to burn smokeless fuels or install smoke-consuming devices. River boats, which had once fouled the atmosphere, converted to diesel burners. Apartment houses, churches, hotels, and office buildings converted to gas fuel. Schools installed stoking equipment and went to smokeless coal. Private homes, however, were once more exempted for a year, chiefly because of the combined opposition of the owners and unions involved in soft-coal production.

By 1952 industry, public utilities, railroads, and municipalities in Allegheny County were at work on a $200 million air pollution control program. In that year a saving of $26 million was estimated for Pittsburgh in cleaning bills alone. Household laundry bills dropped $5,500,000. Visibility was up 77 percent over 1945. And no one even tried to estimate the benefits to physical and mental health. In the past 10 years, the 132 open-hearth furnaces in Pittsburgh have found out how to limit smoke and fly ash, and are now working on methods of screening dust from open-hearth gas.

The Bureau of Air Pollution Control of the Allegheny County Health Department reports that despite record steel production last year and in the first quarter of 1965, the basic downward trend in dustfall continues (though in April of this year the dustfall registered 30 tons per square mile per month, compared with 1962's average of only 27 tons.) And a 10-year report made available by Thomas E. Purcell, chief engineer for the Bureau of Air Pollution Control, shows an almost continuing drop from 1954 through 1964.

Sunny Pittsburgh has come a long way since the 1940's. Most residents and industries now believe in pollution control—at least in the atmosphere. But other troubles persist. Disposal of rubbish, garbage, and waste by municipalities is still a major problem. Sulphur contaminants, carcinogens, and other airborne health hazards are just coming under serious study by health department laboratories, aided by Federal grants. And the State is only now preparing legislation to eliminate the privileged status of mines and make acid drainage subject to the same regulations as other industrial waste pouring into Pennsylvania's streams and rivers. The mining industry is, of course, opposed. The cost of avoiding such draining, it says, would bankrupt every mine.

To anyone who was around 30 years ago, the arguments sound somewhat familiar. But the participants in the struggle have at least one advantage this time: On good days they can enjoy Pittsburgh's fresh air and bright sunshine.

Let There Be Light in Istanbul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently the Palm Beach Times one of the newspapers in my district printed an editorial calling for a more reasoned and rational solution to the many problems besetting Turkey and Greece as a result of the Cyprus control issue. At this time I place that editorial in the RECORD that the appeal to reason which it suggests to both sides be considered a meritorious suggestion:

[From the Palm Beach (Fla.) Times, May 17, 1965]

LET THERE BE LIGHT IN ISTANBUL

The bitter struggle for control of Cyprus, which flared anew last summer, has revived another ancient feud that threatens to be even more serious.

It involves not only Greeks and Turks, but millions of Orthodox Christians around the world.

Briefly, this is the situation: On the island of Cyprus, a Greek majority holds the upper hand over a Turkish minority. Fighting has died down, but the Turks there live in fear.

In apparent retaliation, the mainland Turkish Government has been deporting Greek citizens living in Turkey and is considering expulsion even of Turkish citizens of Greek extraction.

In addition, it now threatens to "control" or deport the Greek Orthodox Ecumenical Patriarchate from Istanbul—historic seat of Eastern Christendom—in violation of the Lausanne Treaty of 1923.

To the 250 million Greek Orthodox faithful, this is almost equivalent to the threat Roman Catholics would see in a move by the Italian Government to evict the Vatican from Rome.

It is the Turkish contention that the Cyprus issue is inseparable from the status of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul.

Last month Premier Suat Hayri Urguplu said that "if inhuman and unbearable acts on Cyprus continue, Turkey must reconsider the (Lausanne) treaty." The implication is that the Patriarchate is a hostage of the Cyprus conflict and that it will be used to force the Turkish will on Greece.

This ignores both history and today's political realities.

Byzantium-Constantinople-Istanbul has been the spiritual center of the Eastern Church since A.D. 324, and continued in that role even after conquest of the Byzantine Empire by the Turks and the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

Despite continual periods of persecution since that time, the Ecumenical Patriarchate became the center and source of moral, cultural, and religious enlightenment for the whole Eastern world, on a wholly nonpolitical basis.

The Lausanne Treaty, signed by the Governments of Great Britain, France, Yugoslavia, Italy, Rumania, Japan, Turkey, and Greece, reaffirmed and solidified this status, guaranteeing its protection and the free exercise of its prerogatives.

Now those guarantees again are threatened, and the effects could be disastrous to world peace.

Under the "law of the jungle," the Turkish position is understandable. But in the accepted concepts of international law it is indefensible.

The Cyprus conflict and the status of the church are in no way related. The Greeks in Turkey are innocent of any involvement in the Cypriot issue.

Even as a matter of self-interest, the Turkish Government would seem to be embarking on a foolhardy course. Their projected action against the Ecumenical Patriarchate already has aroused the feelings of Christendom, and has brought the dark shadow of communism into the picture.

The Soviet Union, always alert to capitalize on internal strife, has hinted that it may be ready to resume imperial Russia's traditional role as protector of the Orthodox Christians. Any such development could only mean worsening of the relations between Greeks and Turks, and between Turks and Christians of the world.

In the interests of peace, and in the name of humanity, a more enlightened approach to the issues is urgent.

Speech by George F. Rand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, recently, an outstanding banker and civic leader, Mr. George F. Rand, Jr., vice president, Marine Trust Co. of Western New York, delivered a speech before Westfield, N.Y., Chamber of Commerce which I believe deserves the thoughtful attention of all who are interested in making the partnership of Federal, State, and local work in developing community resources.

Mr. Rand makes his points with a clear, incisive analysis of the responsibility involved in making programs which involve Federal funds work effectively to raise the economic level of a community.

His speech follows:

DEVELOPING COMMUNITY RESOURCES

Last winter in Washington I made the rounds of the various Federal agencies concerned with community development. At the HHFA I went to the FHA, the URA, the PHA, the CFA, and the FNMA (known affectionately by bankers as Fannie Mae). Then to SBA and at the Commerce Department the ARA (which now proposes to change to EDA). At the Labor Department the OMAT and MDTA, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (where the departments strangely are not alphabeticized), and finally the independent agency of OEO where I learned how a CAO is formed. Of course, New York State is also playing alphabet with the JDA and the BDC—and, of course, we all belong to the New York AIDA.

But at every one of these Federal agencies I received essentially the same story. Yes, we have a fine program to help local communities with loans, grants, subsidies or what-have-you—but our program will not work without some local initiative, some local leadership dedicated to action, a local program of action, and some local money to back up the program and the leaders. This then is the essence of a program to develop community resources. Government can help, but initiative and action must come from local leadership.

First: leadership. Who are the community leaders? Well, traditionally, of course, they are the big businessmen of a town—the bankers, merchants, industrialists, and chamber of commerce like us with an occasional pet politician or two. Maybe, however, leaders will come from other sources—like labor unions, ethnic groups, neighborhood clubs, PTA's, and just plain citizens—and may be more effective than the business big shots. They must be dedicated to an action program for community development and they must be ready to work—not just to sit at head tables, attend receptions, and get their pictures in the paper. They must be prepared to work together cooperatively, and finally they must be able to muster the support of the community—or they are not leaders.

The community leaders must have a program of action. They must know what they want for the community, what to do, and how to do it. They need action but they can't go off halfcocked without a plan; and this plan of action involves a series of steps some of which may be done concurrently.

The first step is research—a critical and objective self-analysis of the community and its position in the regional and national scheme of things. This involves a thorough study of the economy, geography, and structure of natural resources. It means analysis of the local force and the area's population and population characteristics. Then an assessment of the local man made and institutional capital—not only physical plants and business capital but such things as hospitals, schools, public works, and governmental facilities. Remember we must be honest with ourselves (if not with outsiders). We must objectively appraise our community's strengths and weaknesses. We must try to define our position in the regional and national economy; and we should then try to project this into the future over, say, the next 20–30 year period.

Building on this analytical framework, we must determine a set of community objectives. Subject to the constraints of geography, population, and economics, what kind of a community do we want? Do we want mass production metalworking industry? Do we want many more low-paying industrial jobs? Do we want to emphasize agriculture? Do we want to be a suburban bedroom town? Or do we want a "balanced community" (whatever that is)? Only the community can decide this and only after the kind of analysis I have mentioned.

Then there must be developed a rational well thought out program to attain these objectives. Such a program will differ depending on the nature and characteristics of the community; there is no basic blueprint that can be taken off the shelf, bound into a book, and sold at so much per pound. However, there are certain elements that should probably be borne in mind. Timing should be in three stages—short, medium, and long term—some things should be done immediately (maybe should have been done last year); the intermediate would be, say, 5–10 year projects; and finally long term plans which will pay off for our children or grandchildren but which may turn out to have the greatest potential of all. Secondly, all the resources of the community must be mobilized to attain the objectives noted. This involves financial (like banking resources), commercial, industrial, human (including labor), and governmental. Finally—and possibly most important—all segments of the community, which have often been divergent in the past, must work together and cooperate in a common effort. The job is too important to indulge in the luxuries of traditional likes and dislikes. We must not overlook our weaknesses but rather build on our strengths and work together for well defined community goals.

Finally, we get back to our alphabetical agencies and that most essential—and scarce—ingredient: money. Basically a community cannot have much of a program or its leaders cannot be really dedicated unless they are willing to put up where it hurts—in the pocketbook. All of the Federal and State programs require local financial subscription before being able to obtain assistance. Sometimes it's 10 percent like the ARA, 20 percent like the JDA and SBA section 502, 10 percent for the various OEO antipoverty programs, varying amounts for the public works programs, etc. And I think you'll agree it should be that way; that there should be local control and direction of all local development programs. (In fact that is the way the Federal Governments wants it), and this is the way it is in private business; I don't know of a bank that will lend 100 percent for a private business venture. This is the secret in Dunkirk where, as you know probably better than I, the local community raised a half a million dollars to enable ARA to finance Roblin's new continuous casting steel mill. In Batavia local businessmen raised $200,000 to provide most of the equity for a new half million dollar plant to manufacture home pool tables and other recreational equipment. Thus we must be prepared to "put our money where our mouth is" if we want to have a worthwhile development program. Doing this sensibly and on a well planned basis, it is possible to make a local dollar go a long way in terms of community development.

Summarizing then: dedicated leadership plus a well planned intelligent program plus an adequate fund of local capital can equal a successful program for developing community resources.

Reporting of Financial Interests for Government Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, an important ingredient of any congressional code of ethics is that of periodic disclosure of financial holdings by Members of Congress. I hope that the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress will include among its recommendations an orderly procedure for such reporting.

Along with other Members, I have in the past made such a financial disclosure pending the adoption of a uniform system.

Meanwhile, the President, on May 10, 1965, issued Executive Order No. 11222, prescribing standards of ethical conduct for Government officers and employees. The Executive order requires—part IV, section 401——that executive branch agency heads and top Presidential appointees shall submit to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission a detailed reporting of financial interests. While this Executive order does not apply to members of the legislative branch, I submit herewith a statement responsive to Executive Order No. 11222:

1. A list of the names of all corporations, companies, firms, or other business enterprises, partnerships, nonprofit organizations, and educational or other institutions—

(A) With which he is connected as an employee, officer, owner, director, trustee, partner, adviser, or consultant:

Member, Wisconsin Chapter, National Institute for Infantile Paralysis.

Member, board of visitors, Cornell University College of Arts and Sciences;

Director, American Youth Hostel Association.

(B) In which he has any continuing financial interests, through a pension or retirement plan, shared income, or otherwise, as a result of any current or prior employment or business or professional association: None.

(C) In which he has any financial interest through the ownership of stocks, bonds, or other securities:

Metropolitan Savings & Loan Association.
Home Savings & Loan Association.
Government of Israel.
American Electric Power Co.
American Sugar Refining Co.
Bank Stock Corp. of Milwaukee.
Central Illinois Public Service Co.
Central & Southwest Corp.
Johnson Service Co.
Madison Fund.
Majestic Mines, Ltd.
Niagara Share Co.
Northwestern National Insurance Co.
One William Street Fund, Inc.
Public Service Co. of Indiana, Inc.
Fuget Sound Power & Light Co.
Tri-Continental Corp.

2. A list of the names of his creditors, other than those to whom he may be indebted by reason of a mortgage on property which he occupies as a personal residence or to whom he may be indebted for current and ordinary household and living expenses: None.

3. A list of his interests in real property or rights in lands, other than property which he occupies as a personal residence: None.

Poems of Leon Roseman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, most of us find it all too easy to think of the inmates of our correctional institutions as troublesome riffraff whose primary needs are a strong wall and food and shelter. I wish to take the privilege today of briefly calling to the attention of my colleagues the poetic accomplishments of a 17-year-old constituent in my district, Mr. Leon Roseman, who is an inmate of a correctional institution of the State, the W. J. Maxey Boys Training School in Whitmore Lake, Mich.

The two poems reproduced below, chosen from two books of poems recently published by Leon, show clearly that there is much talent behind institutional walls, much talent to be rescued and nurtured.

The first poem, entitled "I Who Has Nothing," is from "Poems To Warm Your Heart and Soul," dedicated by him "to my mother and father." It reads:

I WHO HAS NOTHING

I don't have anything; every day is the same.
For I have no one you see.
Not one person who cares for me.
Seems as I am a castaway just to live another day.
I sit in my lonely room and wonder why.
What can I do? I can't cry.
For loneliness can be a dangerous thing.
So times I wish I could hang.
I will be looking for the day
When someone comes my way.

The second poem is from "Poems for Young and Old," as he says, "created and written by Leon Carlton Rose Man, dedicated with all humility to Cheryl Jacks."

LONELY AM I

There must be someone,
Somewhere for me.
Oh how I wish I could see.
For a lonely person seems like I always be.
There has to be someone somewhere for me.

My mother and father don't care.
Seems like I'll never anywhere.
For if they just love me you see.
That will be enough for me.

Lonely, lonely am I.
Just watching the days go by.
Drifting away like wood in the sea.
For lonely I will always be.

This youth author has captured the sadness that is felt by many of the thousands of young people in our land who are in institutions, often forgotten, alienated.

It is clearly evident to me, from past years of contact with correctional and penal institutions, that we must continue to increase the number of counselors and psychiatrists available to aid the boys in such institutions, if we are to have any real hope of restoring these young people to productive and contented lives.

Also, we must continue to try to enable boys such as Leon to live outside an institution in a familly setting, with substitute parents, if necessary. The Ribicoff amendment to the social security bill, currently being considered in the Senate, will help in this regard by providing money to aid with emotionally disturbed children; his amendment deserves our support.

The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most fascinating aspects of Mr. William Benton's last visit to the Soviet Union was his interview with Nikita Khrushchev.

The second part of the "Epilogue: To the Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R." deals with this interview. This is the concluding portion of Mr. Benton's article and I am pleased to have had this series appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Certainly it is one of the finest discussions of the educational aspects of the cold war which has been written. My most sincere congratulations go to Mr. Benton.

Epilogue, Part II, personal report: "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," by William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Senator from Connecticut; currently U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its Executive Board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopædia Britannica, appears below.

EPILOG

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Prior to the replacement of Khrushchev on October 15, 1964, Senator Benton had planned to conclude this report, stimulated by his Moscow visit in May, with an account of his visit with the then Chairman. He had titled this section, "Nikita Khrushchev, Headmaster." Although the interview dealt chiefly with political and economic questions, Senator Benton felt it was not inappropriate to an article on Soviet education. Chairman Khrushchev, by stressing on the world scene what the Soviets call peaceful coexistence, obviously was counting on what he regarded as the ultimate educational, scientific, and cultural superiority of the Soviet system to give the U.S.S.R. victory over the West. Thus, the U.S.S.R. and its leaders would become the world's intellectual "headmasters."

(After Khrushchev's downfall, Senator Benton jestingly suggested that a suitable subtitle might be, "Nikita Khrushchev, Old Boy." He decided to drop the chapter. But the editors feel that this interview remains relevant and thus carry it here as an epilog. It has historical interest as one of Khrushchev's last extended interviews with an American. More important, it may reflect basic policies, if not the personal "style," to be followed by Khrushchev's immediate successors. No attempt has been made to include interpretive remarks in this section.)

Officials of the American Embassy in Moscow suggested some "talking points" to discuss with the chairman. These included brief notes about disarmament, the United Nations, Cuba, southeast Asia, Germany, Soviet agriculture, and "the succession ques-

tion." The last dealt with Khrushchev's views of the future leadership of the Soviet Union, a rather delicate question to ask the 70-year-old man who has the job, and one I did not pursue. Many of my ideas and many of the suggestions from the Embassy turned out to be unrealistic for the conversation as it developed.

On the day of the interview I stopped to pick up Madam Popova and we were delivered to the Kremlin before 3 o'clock in a big, black Kremlin limousine. The uniformed guards at the gate saluted crisply, and we rolled through barely slowing down. We walked rapidly through the high-ceilinged inner halls of the 18th-century palace well within the Kremlin walls.

While waiting, I looked at the trophies the Chairman had just brought back from Egypt. There was a striking model of the Aswan Dam, 5 feet high, and in metal. There was an Egyptian flag, and a painting framed in brass. And there was a bronze statuette about 15 inches high showing Nasser and Khrushchev walking toward each other with outstretched hands.

But the delay was short. With Madam Popova I was ushered in to see the Chairman even before my appointed hour. "Punctuality, as they say, "is the courtesy of kings."

Khrushchev's office was a long rectangular room. The approach was through a reception room as big as a major hotel suite. As I entered, the chairman rose from behind his desk and walked toward me. The desk was massive. It was in the far right corner of the room and that must be 80 feet long. Above the desk were the anticipated pictures of Lenin and Marx. In front of the desk was a long table, big enough to seat 20 to 30, stretching between the desk and the door. The interpreter sat at the end of the table in the place normally reserved for the father at the Thanksgiving dinner table. The chairman sat at his left and I at his right. We faced each other directly. Madam Popova sat at his left. There were only the four of us.

The chairman greeted me most cordially. His face was deeply lined and impassive, and he looked very tired, as the London papers had reported. After we were seated, he nodded slowly as if to say, "Proceed; tell me why you're here and what you've been up to."

Accordingly, through the young interpreter, I began to give him a report of my activities during my 10 days in Moscow, mentioning visits with the various ministers. I said I had had an exhilarating 10 days and suggested that more Americans should visit the Soviet Union with the same opportunities I had had for discussion with its leaders. The chairman nodded. He said little. His eyes seemed a bit glazed. I did not know whether I had his attention.

I then eased into political issues. I mentioned that I felt the climate was now more favorable for developing trade relationships, much more favorable than it had been for some time. I said I deemed it to be better under President Johnson than under Kennedy. I discussed at some length Mikoyan's current trip to Japan seeking long-term credits. I suggested the time might be ripe to settle the war debts, a necessary step under our Johnson Act to the granting of credits with the backing of the U.S. Government, and I urged him to consider this. I told him of an English subsidiary of an American company that was negotiating to build pulp mills on credit. The produce would pay off the loans. This was the idea Mikoyan was urging on the Japanese. I then quoted from his speeches on living standards. I tied this up to disaramament. I suggested the possibility, which I had discussed several times in the pervious 10 days, of the Soviet Government setting up a disarmament agency at the ministerial level which would be in constant communication with our disarmament agency in the United States. The chairman appeared interested, but did not comment.

Suddenly his face lit up and he began to talk. He had either planned his talk or I had engaged his interest at last. When I reached for a pad of paper on his desk on which to make notes, he nodded approvingly.

"I appreciate highly your country's genius for developing industry and agriculture. We want all the knowledge that you have in those areas. We need it," the chairman rushed on. "I recently received the president of an American firm that raises pigs. His figures on the production of pigs are very high. We need to learn how to do this. I have just seen the British Agricultural Fair (in Moscow at that time). I don't know whether you or the British are more efficient, but the samples at this fair are very good. We could learn much from it. I am not afraid to say that we can learn. I am not afraid to admit this. In grain selection, we are experienced. Our production is very high. But, in feeding, the United States leads."

About developing trade with the United States, the chairman said, "We want to buy from you, but we understand that business laws prevail. Naturally we buy where it is most profitable for us to buy. We want to trade with you, and we would appreciate your credits. I agree that the climate for trade between us is improving. That is a ray of hope in a dark world."

The chairman then emphasized that the U.S.S.R. wants the products of U.S. manufacturers, but that he would prefer to deal with American industrialists who do not act like "the scourge of God."

Then the chairman swerved into issues more strictly political. About halfway through the interview he took a deep breath and wagged his finger at me. "I want to make one comment," he said. "I want to talk to you about a problem that is most difficult for your statesmen. This problem cannot be bypassed. They must face up to it. They must solve it. The United States operates on an erroneous basis."

He continued to talk in this cryptic vein, and I couldn't tell what he was leading up to. "This problem goes back to Dulles," he said. "He was in error. Today even your own leaders admit that he was wrong. I am referring to this attitude toward those countries which want to pursue neutralist policies. He said that they were amoral. Yet the United States is right now trying to develop neutralist policies in certain countries. The descent of the United States into this amoral position was very swift. Dulles was not yet cold in his grave."

I did not attempt to interrupt and argue with the chairman about this. As a matter of fact, I had no opportunity to interrupt. Besides, I thought the best tactic was to let him talk; rebuttal could come later (but there was little chance).

He went on to admonish me. "Your erroneous stand in this area still remains. President Kennedy argued with me in Vienna that the United States and the U.S.S.R. should try to maintain the status quo for some countries. This is quite correct. I don't deny this thesis. But he gave it a meaning of his own. In theory our policies—the United States and the U.S.S.R.—are the same on this issue. We agree that the sovereignty of all individual countries should be maintained. We agree that there should be no interference in the affairs of one country by another. We agree that each country has a right to pick its own social system. This at least is our position in the U.S.S.R.

Up to this point I still did not see exactly what Chairman Khrushchev was driving at, then suddenly it became perfectly clear. He said, "President Kennedy spoke of not having any subversive activities in any country. Now this is quite another question. I can agree that it may be undesirable for a second country, or a third country, to move in and interfere with the development of another. But revolutions do happen. They do occur, as they did here in the Soviet Union. A political system becomes rotten, and a rotten system leads to explosion. Then the new is born through a struggle with the old. We in U.S.S.R. feel the revolutionary process should have a right to exist. Tender plants can and do break through asphalt and crack concrete. Isn't it strange that a frail plant can break concrete?

The Chairman became eloquent, speaking with fervor. He insisted that people would continue to rebel and continue to succeed in revolution. He said that any policy that opposed the right of people to rebel was doomed—it was like the "sacred union of the emperors in the 19th century." He said "Any policy which throttles new policies will fail."

And then he stated emphatically, "We don't like American forces in Korea or in South Vietnam. In the latter, the ground is aflame. In Korea, your boys walk freely on the streets. But the principle in both areas is the same. Why doesn't the U.S. Government understand the right of people to change? Your Government seeks to rely on reactionary forces. This is your only consistent policy, and it is slowly leading to the isolation of the United States. You Americans are happy at your victory in Brazil, President Johnson has just sent a congratulatory letter. But this is a Pyrrhic victory. It is doomed to failure."

"This indeed may be," I conceded, in an effort to interrupt him and hold him back. "Who can fortell? But it may be a victory for democratic forces."

The Chairman slammed the table with the palm of his hand and said, "Indeed it will be a Pyrrhic victory. Of course, the reactionaries in Brazil can murder those who oppose them. But the people will provide new leaders. New leaders will emerge to organize the masses. This is a very serious and complicated question, and it will not be understood tomorrow by your American leaders. It is the question of questions. It is at the heart of our relations with you. If you of the United States would only recognize the right of people to have the government they want and like, if you would not interfere with them in achieving this goal, it would be the great step forward in the relationship between us.

"You in the United States call every uprising against tyranny a Communist uprising. You do this even in places where there is no Communist Party. We are honored. We are pleased when revolutions by people with no knowledge of Lenin or Marx are called Communist. This shows that our ideas are popular."

The Chairman had been talking almost steadily for 20 minutes, while I busily took notes, but at this point I managed to interject a quick comment. I said I could not allow to pass unchallenged the implied suggestion that the U.S.S.R. did not instigate so-called revolutionary movements. "Let us consider Venezuela," I said. "President Betancourt was legally elected President of a democratic regime which we in the United States respected and admired. An effort was made to assassinate him which was traced back to Castro and Cuba. The Cubans further sought to foment revolution and shipped arms into Venezuela. * * *"

The Chairman did not let me continue. With a wave of his hand, he said, "Who placed the arms in Venezuela? Was it Castro? Or was it the CIA?" Laughing heartily, he added, "Both things could have happened."

Having adroitly shifted both the subject and the argument, he rushed on. "Let me

give you another example," he said. "After our great October revolution, your troops, as well as those of France and Great Britain, came to the U.S.S.R. One of the commanders of these troops later wrote a book called 'Far Eastern Adventure.' * * *"

I interrupted again, saying that many students of history would now agree that was a mistake in policy. I said I did not think we should now argue about it.

Bitterly, the Chairman answered—and I think this was the only touch of true bitterness in our interview—"Yes; after 45 years."

He then spoke at length about Vietnam. Among much else, he said, "The sober and only possible position for you is to withdraw your forces. Otherwise, you will sink deeper and deeper into the swamp."

I did not have a chance to offer a rebuttal to that, partly because the Chairman continued to talk rapidly, and partly because I had my eye on my watch and knew that I was now overdue to leave for the airport. Our 40 minutes had stretched to more than an hour. Khrushchev was saying, "* * * another thing, take your espionage flights over Cuba. These are much more important than the relationship of the United States and Cuba. These flights are of international concern. They involve international law. Why do you need these flights? They can cause very serious trouble. If sober sense doesn't reign, Cuba will shoot down your planes. This can provoke a crisis even more severe than the last one. Neither President Johnson nor I want this crisis. I am greatly concerned about these flights. I don't think you need them. Why don't you stop them?"

I said to the Chairman, "I don't know the facts in this case, but I will find out."

He said, "I'll tell you what you will find out. You will get the classic answer—'intelligence.'"

I tipped my pencil at a 45° angle and suggested that the photographic experts might soon learn to take photographs at such an angle from offshore.

Khrushchev laughed and replied, "If you will stay here, I'll show you photographs of your military installations taken from outer space. I'll even show them to President Johnson when I meet him. I'll offer to exchange them for some of his photographs of our installations. Yes, why don't you fly offshore over neutral waters? You can see just as well. Why don't you fly in outer space to take your photographs?"

(When I reported on this aspect of my interview with the Chairman, on my arrival in Paris the next morning, the fact that the Chairman admitted he had the photographs from outer space of U.S. bases received front page headlines in the press throughout the world. I later learned that it is impossible to take suitable photographs at an angle. Indeed, there seem to be powerful arguments for our overflights apart from those of security. Rumors in Washington persist that the Soviets have reintroduced their installations in Cuba. The overflight photos show that such rumors are false. The fact that we know the rumors are false may be helpful to Soviet policy as well as to ours.)

At this point a secretary brought in a note to Madam Popova. She passed it to the Chairman. It reminded him that I had to catch a plane. I do not know how long he would have continued to talk if this interruption had not occurred. He had shown no inclination to stop. He appeared momentarily disconcerted. I assume it was a rare happening for him to to be told that an interview was terminated. It cannot have been often that anyone walked out on Chairman Khrushchev.

He jumped to his feet. Cameramen entered his office, and the flashbulbs started as they took picture after picture of him shaking hands with me and escorting me to the door. These pictures were shown on Soviet national TV that night, on the big program at 10 o'clock for which I had been taped for 15 minutes—allegedly to 45 million people. (Incidentally, I was told I was the third American to appear on Soviet TV.)

Madam Popova, who rode with me in the Chairman's powerful big limousine to the airport, made me regret that I had not stayed longer. She said she felt the Chairman was only warming up to the interview, and that it was obvious he wanted to talk longer. "No one can ever tell about the length of the Chairman's visits," she said. I reminded her that it was only because I had been warned the interview would be limited strictly to 40 minutes that I expected to leave. "As it was, he stretched it to an hour and 5 minutes," I said.

"One hour and 7 minutes," she corrected.

I made a mistake. I should not have left. The airplane probably would have waited. If it didn't, the Chairman might have sent me to Paris in his own plane. Yes, this was a mistake.

We sped to the airport at something like 80 miles per hour down the center of the highway marked by a big white line. This is the center throughway reserved for the cars of very important officials. At the airport, there was no pause for check-in. Instead, the car virtually careened through the airport gate and out the taxiway to the end of the runway where my plane was waiting to take off. The driver screeched to a halt in front of the jet so that it could not take off, and in that very second he had the car door open for me. My goodby and thanks to Madam Popova were necessarily brief. I ignored the eager reporter from the Associated Press. Yes, it was a dramatic exit. In moments I was airborne for Paris. The interview with the press and apearances on our three TV networks awaited me on the next day.

Nebraska School Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, as we go through the process of considering the shape of agriculture for the future as determined by the farm legislation we pass during this session, it is important that we have the results of these programs in mind.

I would therefore like to consider one aspect of the agricultural programs which is administered by the Department of Agriculture.

The school lunch program in Nebraska has been very effective and beneficial to our students. Over 111,500 children participated in fiscal year 1964 and that number increased to 125,000 in fiscal year 1965. These figures do not include children attending the 120 parochial schools which participate in the program in Nebraska.

The proposals in the administration's program for fiscal year 1966 of $138,590,000 for cash reimbursement plus $2 million for special assistance to needy schools will not permit an average reimbursement of 5 cents per lunch served which the National School Lunch Act proposes to establish.

During hearings on appropriations, the American School Food Service Association requested that the appropriation for cash reimbursement be increased to $176,880,281 with a corresponding reduction in the appropriation for commodity procurement. This would maintain the administration's total request.

The American School Food Service also requested that the special milk program appropriation be increased to provide an amount adequate for full reimbursement. This would require an increase from $100 to $108 million. At present, the available funds must be prorated for part of the year and is both a time-consuming and expensive process.

I appreciate the problems of administering this program under these handicaps and support these requests.

I think it is also in order to congratulate the Department of Education in the State of Nebraska which has been charged with the responsibility of administering this program under these handicaps.

Memorial Day—A Day for the Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, next Monday, as we all know, is Memorial Day, a national holiday set aside to commemorate the many patriots and heroes in our history who have sacrificed their lives in defense of freedom and liberty.

Because it falls on a Monday, it gives us a welcome 3-day weekend, a chance to spend some extra time with our pet projects at home, or take a little trip, or just get in an extra round of golf. For most of us, it is a windfall vacation giving us a little more than the usual 1- or 2-day respite from the daily routine.

And I think perhaps as a result, we may be inclined to give too little thought to the real reason for Memorial Day, the reason we have declared it a national holiday.

We are pleased, of course, to see the ceremonies in Arlington at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. We are pleased to see the President make the pilgrimage to lay a wreath at the foot of that monument. It is a proud, sad, fleeting moment.

The bugles blow and the flags whip and flutter in the breeze and the ceremony is over.

We get quickly back to the business of living.

This is as it should be, of course; to attend to the business of living and not dwell overlong on the memories of the dead. While we feel great pride, we are also disturbed by the thought that here lies a father, a brother, a son, a comrade in arms "known but to God."

But I hope that the feeling of pride, the sad thoughts and the significance of the ceremony will linger long enough to find some meaning beyond the dead past—that they can be applied by each of us to the business of living.

Here in Washington, we live surrounded by statues and monuments to the glories of the past that have made this the greatest nation on earth. We live constantly in sight of reminders of that last full measure of devotion which so many brave souls have laid on the altar of freedom.

And for me, privileged as I am to serve here in a capacity that demands something less than that last full measure, I am never quite able to shake off the feeling of obligation, of duty, and of indebtedness to these silent, ghostly sentinels. They beseech all of us, with their stoney faces and unseeing marble eyes, to safeguard the freedom and liberty of the living which they have purchased with their lives.

I think we have a debt to these ghosts of the past. And it is a debt we can settle up only among ourselves, with each other, with the living of today and the unborn of the future. It is a debt that transcends expedience and political partisanship. It is a debt of honor which calls upon us to repay by pledging our lives to the principles of freedom and human dignity for which theirs were the price.

The process of dying in defense of those principles continues. In spite of ultimate weapons, foolproof treaties, and impregnable alliances, we will still have the Vietnams, the Dominican Republics, the Congos, and the Cubas. We still must demand the lives of a few in defense of the lives of many. Our greatest debt, perhaps, is the one owed to the heroes of the future who may one day be asked to forfeit their lives because we failed to meet our obligations now.

It is a debt which we ignore at our mortal peril.

Pollution Control Key Factor in Water Supply—Blatnik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of American County Government, the official publication of the National Association of Counties, has an excellent article in which Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, outlines his views on the progress of what is being done in the field of water pollution. Mr. BLATNIK is accorded the rightful accolade, "Mr. Water Pollution Control" by this distinguished group. During the past few months I have had the honor of serving on the Public Works Committee with Mr. BLATNIK and I can truly say that his diligent work and leadership was largely responsible for the passage of the 1965 Clean Water Act. Normally passage of such legislation would be good reason to rest a bit, but Mr. BLATNIK is already forging ahead with new ideas and plans to fulfill the Federal Government's role in the war on water pollution. Members of Congress are indebted to the National Association of Counties for publishing this article and for their leadership in preparing an excellent series of community action guides for water pollution abatement and control. The article appears as follows:

POLLUTION CONTROL KEY FACTOR IN WATER SUPPLY—BLATNIK

Three hundred and fifty million gallons a day of untreated sewage pours into Raritan Bay, producing one of the Nation's worst examples of salt water pollution and virtually ruining the once important shellfish industry there.

Industrial waste from major packinghouses in the Omaha area has so overloaded the municipal treatment plants that they cannot handle the volume, and huge volumes of such animal waste pollutes vast sections of the mid-Mississippi.

Pollution of the Merrimack River in New England has become so bad it is partly responsible for a depressed economic situation and interferes with the use of the river for almost all public purposes.

These are but three starkly dramatic instances which illustrate the crisis stage of water pollution in this country.

Responding to such situations with governmental action at both the national and the local level, the Nation is moving to alleviate the problem, however; and no man is more responsible for public activity in the water pollution field than "Mr. Water Pollution Control" himself, Congressman JOHN BLATNIK of Minnesota.

A man who grew up in the lake country of northern Minnesota, where water resources and conservation-mindedness were deeply ingrained in his consciousness, Congressman BLATNIK in this exclusive interview below tells what the problem is, what is being done about it, and how he assumed national leadership with respect to it.

Question. I understand you were the author of one of the first pieces of national legislation on the subject. Is that correct?

Answer. Yes, I was sponsor in the House of Representatives of the bill to authorize the first permanent comprehensive national program for water pollution control. That act became law on July 9, 1956, Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress. It was also my privilege to sponsor in the House the legislation which made far-reaching changes in the law, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961, Public Law 87–88, which was signed by President Kennedy on July 20, 1961.

Question. Has there been a basic reorientation of direction in thinking in regards to water pollution control and abatement since that time, and if so, what?

Answer. Nine years ago pollution control was widely considered to be primarily a public health matter. Today health remains an important consideration, but more attention is being focused on the need to prevent pollution so that waters can be used for recreation, fish and wildlife propagation, agriculture, industry, esthetic enjoyment, and other purposes. Water pollution control is recognized now as part and parcel of water resources management and of the total conservation picture.

Question. What is the extent of the pollution problem specifically, and the overall water supply problem in this country in general today?

Answer. It is hard to overstate the extent of pollution in the United States today. Every major river system is polluted. Total water use in the United States doubled from 1945 to 1962—from 170.46 billion gallons a day to 342.42 billion gallons a day. By 1980 daily requirements for fresh water will reach an estimated 597 billion gallons, and by the year 2000 the demand for fresh water may reach a thousand billion gallons a day. Since engineering works are expected to increase the available fresh water supply to only 515 billion gallons a day by 1980, and to 650 billion gallons by the year 2000, we can foresee a deficit of serious proportions. Reuse of water is the effective answer, and the prevention, control, and abatement of pollution are critically necessary if water is to be fit for reuse.

Question. Is there an answer to the pollution problem in large, landlocked, relatively still bodies of water such as Lake Erie?

Answer. Lake Erie, shallowest of the Great Lakes, has taken in so much industrial, municipal, and agricultural pollution that it is described now as a dying lake. A lake, unlike a flowing stream, cannot flush itself of pollution. To stop the outpouring of pollution into the lake will take expensive measures. To restore the quality of its waters will take a gigantic, concerted, and costly effort. If we make the commitment, I think we can do the job.

The Great Lakes are the largest fresh water source on earth. The condition of Lake Erie and the southern end of Lake Michigan and situations at places on the other Great Lakes, including magnificent Lake Superior, on which my congressional district borders, makes us realize that this resource is not indestructible. The national water quality laboratory for fresh water is scheduled to be completed at Duluth, Minn., next year. The Great Lakes-Illinois River Basin project, a comprehensive program for water pollution control, has been underway for several years. Enforcement actions involving the southern end of Lake Michigan and the Michigan waters of Lake Erie are expected to result in effective remedial action. We are working with Canada through the International Joint Commission on lake pollution and low level problems. We hope that as new knowledge is developed, new courses of action will be opened for the preservation of the waters of the lakes.

Question. One of the great problems in water pollution abatement and control is that of money. What are your opinions on the possibility of the Federal Government establishing a huge revolving fund so that localities could borrow against it now, rather than perhaps be delayed in their projects because this year's funds have been exhausted?

Answer. Money is a problem. Waste treatment works are expensive, and there is competition for the taxpayer's dollar from more glamorous civic enterprises. The idea of a revolving fund on which communities could draw now is an interesting one. Variations of the revolving fund concept have been used with success to finance many activities—houing, agriculture, and power programs, for example. Governor Rockefeller has proposed, on the other hand, that the States advance the Federal share of the cost of municipal waste treatment works, and secure reimbursement later from the State's allotment under the Federal Water Pollution Conrol Act's construction grants program. This program expires in 2 years, and we propose to give it a thorough review before it is renewed.

Question. Do you see any other answer to the financial problem rather than the present method of gradually increasing the amount of Federal contributions and the annual appropriations for the program?

Answer. Our committee took a first step toward increased Federal participation in municipal waste treatment works construction by increasing from $100 million to $150 million the annual appropriations authorization for fiscal years 1966 and 1967. Any funds appropriated beyond the basic $100 million would be allocated to the States on a straight population basis, instead of the present population-per capita income formula, and the dollar ceilings, which we propose to double to $1.2 million for a single project, and $4.8 million for a joint project serving two or more communities, would not

apply to any projects constructed with grants from the additional funds, if the State matched the Federal contribution, permitting a Federal grant up to the full 30 percent of project cost otherwise authorized by the act.

The need is so great that I look for a larger Federal construction grants program when we act to extend it beyond its June 30, 1967, expiration date. The Public Works Acceleration Act, for which implementing funds are now exhausted, the Appalachian Regional Development Act, which became law on March 9, and the public works and economic development bill, the administration measure recently introduced in both Houses, all include provisions authorizing financial assistance to certain communities on more liberal terms than those set by the basic laws authorizing Federal grant-in-aid programs. Over $100 million in APW funds gave added help to hard-pressed communities for waste treatment works construction. More States could participate in the financing of these urgently needed facilities. There are ways to get a better return on the dollars invested—development of advanced waste treatment methods, operator training, and joint use of facilities by communities.

Question. Are applicants for grant-in-aid under present law exceeding the availability of Federal funds, and if so what are the criteria for awarding grants?

Answer. Yes, the testimony of the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control before the House Appropriations Subcommittee this year told of a backlog of 1,500 applications as of December 1964, and an anticipated backlog of about the same number of July 1965. The act specifies criteria for awarding grants. Projects must be certified by the State as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial and water pollution control needs. Public benefits, interests, and necessity are taken into consideration.

Question. Do you foresee any new problems in water pollution control other than the growing magnitude of the present situation?

Answer. A few years ago there was much talk about radioactivity as a new major pollutant. Attention shifted to detergents, then to pesticides. Scientific and industrial progress, or new technology, brings new sources of pollution. Known waste treatment methods cannot cope effectively with certain chemical wastes. Highway construction and suburban development have caused severe siltation problems in nearby streams. Ship pollution, some caused by foreign-flag vessels, has been a problem in the Great Lakes region. The situation requires nothing less than an all-out attack on pollution, from whatever source.

Question. How do you size up public sentiment on the subject? Are the people in a mood to act decisively on this problem?

Answer. There is a mounting public demand for clean water. The fight against pollution, a lonely battle of conservationists and a few others not many years ago, has widespread support today. Public water supply is the highest use of water. But people are not satisfied with just enough clean water to drink and use in their homes. They insist that bays and lakes and rivers be clean enough for swimming, fishing, boating, and water skiing. They resent the necessity to travel long distances for water-centered recreation because pollution makes nearby waters unfit for use. Farmers, commercial fishermen, shippers, industrialists, property owners, and nature lovers all have a stake in clean water. President Johnson's leadership has given tremendous impetus to the drive against pollution.

Question. What is the most important thing a local public official can do to help solve the water pollution crisis?

Answer. He can take an unequivocal stand for clean water, supporting citizens who advocate an antipollution drive, and leading public opinion where it lags. He can insist on the forceful administration of applicable laws and ordinances, and advocate strong measures if they are lacking. He can require new industry to give assurance of effective waste disposal methods, and work out realistic arrangements with existing industry to clean up pollution. He can seek financial and technical assistance from the State, and from the Federal Government. He can explore the advantages of joining with neighboring communities in constructing waste treatment works, and determine that plants are properly maintained. He can work with State officials to overcome any legal difficulties respecting the financing of new facilities and consult with them as to the method of financing which best meets the community's situation.

Question. Do you feel that local officials are aware of the full extent of the problem and that localities are doing all they can to meet the problem? If not, wherein are they lacking?

Answer. There is a vast difference in the degree of awareness and aggressiveness on the part of local officials in coping with the water pollution problem. Federal enforcement action has been necessary to prod some localities which for generations had used the river as a sewer. Other communities have been in the forefront. To the extent that they are not now doing these things, I would urge local officials to take the actions I proposed in answer to your question. Local officials today, in common with the people at large, are increasingly aware of the importance of clean water. Even narrow economic considerations demand it. A water-using industry will not locate a new plant in an area which lacks sufficient good water.

Question. As you know, NACO is carrying on an extensive water pollution abatement and control program in cooperation with the U.S. Public Health Service. What benefits do you see accruing from such a program?

Answer. The topical outline of your Public Officials' Community Action Guides and a look at the guides which you have issued thus far impress me with the fact that you have launched an important educational program. You are disseminating information of great practical value to the officials responsible for putting effective programs into being at the local level throughout the United States. I congratulate NACO on this undertaking.

Smaller Business Association of New England Proposals for Congressional Action—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday representatives of the Smaller Business Association of New England met with New England Members of Congress to present several suggestions for congressional action affecting small business firms.

The meeting was carried out in connection with Small Business Week proclaimed by the President for May 23–29.

The SBANE representatives presented a thoughtful, well-prepared series of proposals that deserve careful congressional consideration. I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks the introduction of SBANE President Ernest H. Osgood, Jr., of Lincoln, Mass., and the proposals on tax legislation presented by Henry J. Griswold of Boston.

I plan to include the remaining portions of the statement in the RECORD next week.

SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND PROPOSALS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION—1965

INTRODUCTION

(Presented by Ernest H. Osgood, Jr., State Street Bank & Trust Co., Boston, president of SBANE.)

Gentlemen, in his proclamation designating this week as Small Business Week, the President of the United States paid tribute to the vital role that small business has played in the development of our cherished system of free enterprise. President Johnson pointed out that the Nation's 4.7 million small businesses include 9 out of 10 firms that supply the needs and wants of the American people * * * that they provide more than a third of the Nation's goods and services * * * and that they contribute significantly to the well being of our citizens, to the defense of freedom, and to the exploration of new scientific frontiers. Moreover, he emphasized that small concerns, by continuing to grow in number and strength, will provide additional jobs needed by a growing Nation * * * that small business holds open the door of opportunity for men and women of all races and creeds * * * that small business is a source of new ideas, new methods, and new products which enrich the lives of our citizens and stimulate our economic growth * * * and that small businessmen are leaders in the business and civic affairs of their communities, and will continue to play a leading role in communitywide action to eliminate poverty wherever it exists.

We thank the President for his recognition of the vital role of small business. As representatives of this dynamic segment of our society, we believe that we have an obligation to provide recommendations for congressional action. Over the years, it has been extremely gratifying to discover that you have not only given us courteous and attentive hearings, but that you have carefully considered our proposals and have taken action on them. Our relationship has certainly been a splendid example of democracy in action.

STATEMENT ON TAX POLICY BY SBANE REPRESENTATIVE HENRY J. GRISWOLD, CPA, PARTNER, LYBRAND, ROSS BROS. & MONTGOMERY OF BOSTON

This year, SBANE offers the following program as a partial solution to other tax problems of small firms.

1. Carryback or forward of surtax credits: Our present tax structure penalizes small businesses when their earnings vary widely from year to year. Because their products and services normally are not well-diversified, their earnings are extremely susceptible to the ups and downs of the marketplace; they may exceed $25,000 one year and be nonexistent the next. Under the current provisions of the Interanl Revenue Code, serious inequities are common.

As an example, let's take the case of two companies that we shall call company A and company B, using 1964 rates. In a 4-year period, company A earns $25,000 per year, so it pays the normal tax of 22 percent only, so that its tax bill is $22,000 on total earnings of $100,000.

On the other hand, company B's earnings vary from year to year. In 1964 and in 1965 it pays the normal tax of 22 percent only;

but in 1966 it pays a 28-percent surtax on $5,000 and in 1967 pays a 28-percent surtax on $15,000. As a result, although the two companies' earnings are identical for the 4-year period, company B is penalized by a tax inequity of $5,600.

In 1964, for the first time, individuals were permitted to use income tax averaging. Companies as well as individuals are subject to fluctuations in income from year to year, so that a method of income averaging would be greatly beneficial to them, particularly to small businesses and new firms.

We propose that the Internal Revenue Code be amended to permit small businesses to average unused surtax credits, through a carryback for 3 years and a carry-forward for 5 years.

Under the terms of our proposal, here is how company B would compute its tax: It would carry forward $15,000 in unused surtax credits from 1964, and another $5,000 from 1965, for a total of $20,000. It would then use $5,000 of these carry-forward surtax credits in 1966, and would pay no surtax; $15,000 in surtax credits would be left to apply against earnings above $25,000 in 1967. As a result, it would pay normal taxes only of $22,000 for the 4-year period, the same as the tax for company A.

Fair enough, isn't it? We urge your serious consideration of this proposal.

2. Increase the income exempted from the surtax to $50,000. In 1941, Congress recognized the need of small business to retain sufficient earnings to operate efficiently, purchase new equipment and expand, by establishing a surtax exemption on the first $25,000 of earnings. This figure has not been changed since the law became effective on January 1, 1942; yet the dollar of 1942 is now worth only 53 cents in terms of the general wholesale price index, 47 cents toward purchase of machinery and motive equipment, and 41 cents toward purchase of machine tools.

We propose that Congress reaffirm its consideration of the needs of small business, by recognizing the effects of inflation, through an increase in the surtax exemption. For example, one method of increasing the exemption would be to use employment levels as a guide to qualify a company for a higher surtax exemption. A suggested schedule could be: Up to 100 employees, $50,000 exemption; up to 250 employees, $35,000; and up to 500 employees, $30,000. But no matter what plan Congress devises, an increase in the $25,000 surtax would produce the following benefits:

(a) Provide needed working capital for profitable small businesses, permitting them to expand and provide more jobs.

(b) Provide additional incentives for formation of small business.

(c) Benefit the efficient small company * * * the type of company which should be encouraged to grow.

(d) Minimize the tax loss to the Government by avoiding across-the-board tax deductions that would benefit large, as well as small, corporations.

To prevent individuals from taking advantage of these tax exemptions by forming several small companies, corporations could be required to disclose stock ownership, in order to qualify for the higher surtax exemption. In this way, the number of companies in which one individual could participate could be controlled, as is now done in apportioning the surtax exemption between commonly owned or related corporations.

3. Liberalized tax deductions for reinvested earnings: Our present standard of living has been achieved primarily through incorporation of technological advances into our industrial economy. We have outproduced other nations because our industrial plant has been considerably more efficient. Today, however, the industrial efficiency of Western Europe is approaching our own, while their wage rates are much lower than those we pay. Foreing industry is modernizing its plants and equipment faster than American manufacturers.

In the 5-year period of 1959 through 1963, American industry increased its annual expenditures for machinery and equipment by 19 percent, but the increase in the United Kingdom was 21 percent; in Sweden, 44 percent; in Italy, 50 percent; in France, 54 percent; and in West Germany, 68 percent. In 1954, one-half of our machine tools were 10 years old or older. Today, the percentage has risen to two-thirds, and one-fifth are 20 years old or older.

Congress recognized the need to provide an incentive for more invested capital through the provision of the 1962 Revenue Act, which permits a credit against taxes of an amount of up to 7 percent of an investment in fixed assets. This is a step in the right direction. More incentives of this type are needed, however, if our economy is to attain the high rate of growth required to sustain and improve the standard of living of our exploding population.

4. Flexible depreciation: Our industrial research efforts are producing technological advances so rapidly that machinery is frequently obsolete long before it begins to wear out. "Useful lives" of machines are shrinking at an accelerated rate. The Treasury Department's 1962 depreciation guideline rules recognized this trend by permitting businesses to reduce the "useful lives" of machinery and equipment in computing depreciation. It has been our experience, however, that these rules have not significantly helped small businesses in allowing increased depreciation rates. Furthermore, the guidelines are so complex that it is often too difficult for both large and small business to understand and apply them.

We contend that set formulas for "useful lives" cannot possibly be applicable to each individual industry or situation. Only the individual company concerned can establish with certainty when a machine has reached a point where it should be replaced by more efficient equipment. For this reason, we urge consideration of a completely flexible depreciation policy, subject to regulation, through which a business would be allowed to write off its investment in machinery or equipment over the useful period.

5. Require IRS and the Treasury Department to abide by court decisions: The failure of the Treasury Department and its Internal Revenue Service to abide by the tax decisions of circuit courts of appeals, district courts, courts of claims, and even Tax Court decisions creates an unnecessary hardship for small businesses, because most of them cannot afford the cost of litigation which results.

Here is a current example of this problem. As we know, there are two allowable methods of obtaining a tax deduction for uncollectable receivables. Under the reserve method of accounting for bad debts, an annual deduction is allowed for a reasonable addition to the reserve, rather than for specific uncollectable accounts. Under the cash basis method, however, the annual deduction is limited to specific accounts which become worthless.

Two recent circuit court decisions permit taxpayers to use the reserve method to provide for anticipated future losses which the taxpayer expects to incur as the guarantor of customers' notes assigned to a bank or finance company. Both the Treasury Department and the Tax Court, however, have announced that they will not accept the principles expressed in these decisions.

One of our members sells frozen food lockers on fairly long credit terms. Since it is a small business, it does not have sufficient capital to finance its own accounts receivable, so it "sells," or assigns, the notes to a lending agency, but it is still required to guarantee their collection.

Here is our members quandry—two circuit court decisions say that our member may use the reserve method to provide for losses which it will incur as a guarantor, but the Internal Revenue Service disallowed its deductions for bad debts when it used the reserve method. As a result, the Treasury Department is favoring large, well-financed companies which do not have to assign their receivables to banks or finance companies.

Here is an example of the tax inequity which results. Company A is large and well financed, so it has its own credit program. Its notes receivable are $1 million. It has a 5-percent historical loss factor of $50,000, so its risk of loss is $50,000. Consequently, the Treasury Department allows it to establish a reserve of $50,000 for bad debts, so no working capital is tied up in "prepaid" taxes or "income" that will actually be lost to bad debts.

On the other hand, company B, which is smaller and lightly financed, sells $1 million worth of its notes receivable, resulting from sales, to lending agencies, but with recourse. It has a 5-percent historical loss factor of $50,000, so the risk of loss is $50,000—the same as company A. Under the Treasury Department's discriminatory interpretation of the Code, however, it is allowed no reserve for bad debts. As a result, at least $11,000 in working capital is tied up in "prepaid" taxes on "income" that will actually be lost to bad debts.

The reserve for future losses is extremely important to small businesses, such as automobile dealers, appliance dealers, furniture stores, etc., which sell their receivables with recourse, because they need such a reserve to conserve current working capital. While of the code, however, it is allowed no reposition of IRS and the Tax Court decisions and found in favor of the taxpayers, most small businesses cannot bear the heavy burden of expense involved in such litigation, and therefore do not dare use the reserve method.

The Treasury Department maintains that it cannot allow deductions for a reserve to firms that sell their notes, because it gives the benefit of these deductions to lending agencies in computing their reserves for bad debts. The American Banking Association has stated, however, that although the lending agencies do bear some risk in handling endorsed paper, for example, through dealer insolvency, the primary risk on recourse paper is to the endorsing dealers. It agrees that the dealers should be allowed to consider the risk of loss arising from dealer-guaranteed consumer contracts sold to lending agencies in computing their reserves for bad debts.

It appears to us that the Treasury Department is ignoring the intent of Congress when it authorized the bad-debt reserve method. Legislation designed to correct this tax inequity is currently being drafted. We urge you to give it your thoughtful consideration and support.

We are also hopeful that legislation designed to make the Treasury Department, IRS and the Tax Court abide by decisions of the courts of appeals will be introduced and passed by Congress.

Hon. A. R. Stout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address

made by the Honorable A. Royce Stout, judge of the 40th judicial district of Texas, before the Ennis Lion's Club, Ennis, Tex., on Wednesday, May 19.

[From the Ennis (Tex.) Daily News, May 20, 1965]

JURIST IS LIONS SPEAKER—DEFEND LIBERTY, STOUT URGES

Ennis-reared District Judge A. R. Stout, of 40th district court brought a forceful message to the Ennis Lions Club yesterday, in which he strongly urged defense of liberty. The judge was engaged to furnish the program by John Byers and Dr. Walter McCall introduced the widely known jurist.

In the business phase of the luncheon, held at community center, with President C. O. Onstead presiding. Raymond Fallen introduced two new Lions, Barry Rhodes and Willie Murff.

"No loftier honor could come to one than that of appearing before your organization, which is dedicated to the preservation of the American heritage that has made us great. Today the American way of life and all that it stands for is assailed by Communists and Socialists from within, and God knows what is going to become of the United States if we do not make some changes in this country. Surrounded from without and ever infiltrated from within, we find our Government today largely in the hands of the ADA and its sympathizers masquerading under the Democratic label. This leftwing group of the ADA and their ilk advocate the admission of Red China to the U.N., the transfer of all armaments to a U.N. force, elimination of trade barriers with Communist countries, a hands-off policy toward Cuba, giving away the Panama Canal, state control of all economic life, an end to loyalty oaths, and a halt to all congressional investigations of Communist activities.

"This group has taken over much of the press and the airwaves and many of the national newscasters like Edward R. Murrow, Howard K. Smith, and Chet Huntley, all three of whom were for Alger Hiss and the Lattimores. Like a majority of the members of the Supreme Court of the United States, they always take the so-called liberal course and usually follow the Communist line. In his book, 'The Last Train From Berlin,' Smith wrote, 'Russia looked better the longer I stayed and the more I saw.'

"Next to the President, the most powerful man in the U.S. Government is Walter Reuther. He can veto the nomination of any man who offers himself for President on the Democratic ticket. In 1934 while he and his brother Victor were studying in Moscow, he wrote the following letter to a friend in Detroit: 'the daily inspiration that is ours as we work side by side with our Russian comrades in our factory, the thought that we are actually helping to build a society that will forever end the exploitation of man by man, the thought that what we are building will be for the benefit and enjoyment of the working class, not only for Russians, but for the entire world, is the compensation we receive for our temporary absence from the struggle in the United States.' After more praise for the Russian system, he concluded, 'Carry on the fight for a Soviet America,' signed 'Vic' and 'Wal.'

"The No. 3 man politically in our Great Society is Rev. Martin Luther King. He thrives and exists solely on the hate and violence that he encourages and fans. He will take over a private business and all other institutions but because he has not been seen to fire a gun or throw a bomb, he has been incongruously presented as a man of peace, when his methods are as pure as those of the Kingfish in 'Amos and Andy' and just as peaceable as those of a fox in a henhouse. Because of their militant and political power and the apathy of the general public—you and me—these two men and their kind can make Congress jump and a President tremble, which is not much of a recommendation to any society. Where are we headed in this country when private property can no longer be protected and nothing is done against the hue and cry to make it free and divide it up?

"It is little wonder that they brand a true American as an extremist when he stands for liberty and the Constitution. They do not even know the meaning of the word 'extremism,' though they do know quite well the Communist game of stabbing you in the back and then howling blackmail when you act in self-defense. Regardless of what they may be or call themselves, they look upon man as a ward of the state, whose suffrage is purchasable by the mere offer of bread and circuses. Very little do they accord him on his own and nothing is granted to him by them under 'Nature and God.'

"The Declaration of Independence was emphatic on such words as 'liberty,' 'usurpation,' 'depotism,' and 'tyranny.' Clear was the ring that man's unalienable rights came from the Deity and not the Government.

"Thomas Jefferson and the other patriots who signed that document listed in part their grievances for which they fought a war of independence the following: (1) invasions of the rights of the people; (2) absolute tyranny over the States; (3) for erecting a multitude of new offices and sending hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance; (4) for sending standing armies into States without their consent; (5) for subjecting us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution and unacknowledged by our laws (our Supreme Court); (6) for depriving us in many cases of the benefits of trial by jury (civil wrongs under the so-called Civil Rights Act); (7) for transporting us beyond the seas to be tried for pretended offenses (General Walker could appreciate that one since he was the victim of one of the most dastardly deeds ever committed by low and conniving men in the history of this Republic); (8) for altering fundamentally the forms of our Government; and (9) for exciting domestic insurrection among us.

"All of these we have and more today—not to speak of oppressive and confiscatory taxation. To prevent these wrongs and usurpations of power, constitutional government was instituted, but our leftwing Supreme Court has reduced this document to a scrap of paper. Our Bill of Rights is construed like "Alice in Wonderland" to favor the perpetrators of atrocious crimes, atheists, and Communists instead of to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity or to promote the general welfare, and the very plain 9th and 10th amendments providing for local government and States rights are nullified.

"The opening sentence of the Texas Declaration of Independence in part says: 'When a government has ceased to protect the lives, liberty, and property of the people from whom its legitimate powers are derived * * * and becomes an instrument in the hands of evil rulers for their oppression: When the Federal Republican Constitution of their country, which they have sworn to support, on longer has a substantial existence, and the whole nature of the government has been forcibly changed, without their consent, from a restrictive federated republic, composed of sovereign states, to a consolidated, central * * * despotism * * * then it is the inherent and inalienable right of the people to appeal to first principles.'

"I do not suggest revolution, but I do urge a rededication to the America we love and the spirit of freedom, enterprise and initiative that have made us great, and that we throw off the Socialist and Communist chains that oppress us.

"We have been run for so long in this country by Socialists, minorities and selfish groups that they have almost accomplished their will of changing our people, and they will do so if we do not change them first. I still believe that we can be free, that one can have his own vine and fig tree and run his own business without having all of his profits filched from him by Fabians, demagogues and no-accounts, but we must be more vigilant than he have been. We must be willing to stand up and be counted. We must be determined also to clean out these Augean stables and to restore this country to true Americans to the end that constitutional government may endure and that history may not be turned back 200 years to the dictator and the despot.

"Times change and men change but human nature has change very little since Christ trod this earth's surface. Great truths and and principles never change. They are fixed and immutable like the stars. Proved experiences change but very little. Patrick Henry said that we can only judge the future by the past and that the only light he had to go by was the lamp of experience. History has taught us over and over, for Lo! these many years, that power tends to corrupt and that absolute power corrupts completely. It has taught us also for centuries that centralization is despotism.

"If all the world's history is wrong, then we do not live under a corrupt despotism; but if it is right and if it repeats itself, then we are living in an ill-fared land and changes should be made. We blushed with shame about mink coats and deep freezes; we were alarmed about Vicuna coats. So great, however, has this high carnival of corruption become that we seem to do little more than wink or despair as our character is debased and the fabric of our society eaten away like a cancer. This corruption reaches higher and higher and constitutional officers continue to seize power that they do not have, with the result that there is little respect for constituted authority and lawlessness stalks our land, some of it being with the aid and approval of our own Government. If there ever was a time when the home should be enshrined and American ideals inculcated in the youth of our land to stave off the moral leprosy that is destroying our honor and eating away the vitals of free government, that time is now.

"It is high time that we recognize a few simple truths and quit playing a shell game upon a national basis. The only basis for a happy, successful life is honest work and a decent, disciplined existence. What a travesty do we play on the average citizen when his Government bonds are not worth what he paid for them when he goes to collect. Oh, how we penalize thrift and industry and put a premium upon sloth. What a con game do we play and what a tragic trick do we work on all people, particularly the poor and those with an insurance policy or fixed income, by the Government inflation of money. The annual interest on our national debt is just a few billion under the total debt in 1928 and is three times as much as Government expenditures for all purposes combined in the 1930's. We are almost financially bankrupt now, but this can be overcome if moral bankrupts do not take us over permanently and if the Government inflation of money is checked.

"For 100 years everyone has had an equal opportunity under our Constitution. No statute can take this right away and none can legally add to it, but it is an opportuntiy to prove unequal talents. How can it be otherwise when no two peas in a pod or two blades of grass are exactly the same? Democracy was never intended to be a leveler of men. Permanent economic equality can only be had under communism or socialism. If men of unequal talents and ability, as nature intended and God created, are not free to use them, then free enterprise is gone and we are all Socialist slaves. Strong is the

snowballing of leftwingers and so-called liberals who would like to see this happen and monstrous is their Frankenstein machine and method as they continue in their mad and ruthless grasp for more power with an ever consequent loss of liberty and private property. Many of them would turn our jails wide open, give Communists their way here and around the world, pull down our last immigration barriers, approve every radical decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, and abolish the belief that 'there is a Divinity that shapes our ends'; and all of them would change our form of government, rewrite our history, and smear all who do not bow and follow. Theirs is the Harry Hopkins slogan of 'spend, elect, and tax.' They look upon the people as morons and imbeciles to be deceived and bribed with their own money and regard elections as mere games which are to be won by fear and fakery, no matter what the consequences to the public might be. They prate about love and a Utopian dream but exist by the hate and violence that they create. Harry Hopkins, the Karl Marx of America, said, 'Never explain to the people, just tell them, for they are too damned dumb to understand.' That is just what they do by mass propaganda in a dishonest fashion.

"They tell the people only what they want them to hear and that which sounds good, and they hide the rest. They are past masters in turning class against class, race against race, and religion against religion. So successful have they been that any trashy book in vilification of this section of the country or its people can become a best seller or qualify its author for the Pulitzer prize. They will be successful if we do not call a halt. If they should succeed, the flower of cultivated and refined living will no longer bloom, and civilization as we have known it will perish from the earth. The American dream will have become a myth, and liberty, as we have cherished it, will be no more. The learned and the industrious will be reduced to the level of the ignorant and the lazy, and the American youth can have no higher goal than that of becoming a power politician among peewee men.

"It is not always easy to protect ourselves against selfish groups and sinister politicians who would buy an office or steal it or sell out the people in order to get or hold it. This is particularly true in our largest cities with the polyglot population where a special appeal is made to each segment. The fact that we have over 100 different types of Federal aid is strong proof of the fact that the whole emphasis in our Government has been for special interests rather than the public at large. The whole push of leftwingers is by catering to groups, telling them what they want to hear and promising all of them the fruits of your toil and labor, and the more they are given and promised, the greater is their clamor for more. Combined together they become the majority when you and I fail to vote and measure up to the duties without raising our voices in protest. As Edmund Burke so aptly said, 'When bad men combine, the good must associate, else they will fall one by one, an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle.' Alexander Hamilton said, "When we prefer disgrace to danger, we are ready for a master and probably deserve it."

"Our greatest danger is not the hydrogen bomb. It is not that our Government is financially bankrupt. Our greatest danger is the pied pipers and Machiavellian manipulators who turn class against class and stir up hate and violence by preaching and promising the false doctrine that the individual is not morally responsible for his welfare or legally responsible for his own conduct. We can rise from crumbled ruins and build again from atomic ashes but we cannot survive as a free people if we lost from within to Fabians and moral bankrupts, for there will be no one left to raise the edifice of constitutional government.

"As I see it, at the rate we have been going and are now going, one plain and simple question confronts us all, and that is whether we shall rise and be free Americans or bow in goosestep and be Socialist or Communist slaves. In what little time I have left, I hope to do something about it, for in the defense of true liberty and real constitutional government no one can do too much or act too quickly."

The Lions directorate met briefly on club business after the luncheon session.

Ready To Give Up—Sadly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, my district is engulfed in a manmade disaster. Crops are turning to garbage in the fields. Enormous amounts of food are being lost. Unemployment is increasing. Vegetable and fruit prices are increasing. All simply because growers cannot obtain adequate farm labor. The effects of our disaster will spread throughout the Nation.

Some uninformed persons within the Department of Labor and the general public seem to believe only the large corporate growers are being hurt. It is true that one strawberry grower will lose approximately $1 million of fruit. This is criminal because it is unnecessary and could have been avoided by the executive department. This grower pays $1.75 to $2.75 and more per hour for pickers; provides the best housing available—called "spic and span" by Secretary Wirtz himself—and has recruited extensively all over the United States. His million-dollar loss is multiplied manifold by packers, package manufacturers, shippers, transporters, and sellers who will not have strawberries.

But an even sadder, and more common, story is told in the following article from the Salinas Californian, of May 25, 1965. If this does not make you sick, it should make you weep. We in Congress must share the responsibility along with the Department of Labor.

READY TO GIVE UP: GROWER X "SICK" ABOUT STRAWBERRY STORY HERE

Grower X, one of the many small independent growers in the Salinas Valley, is getting even sicker of the Salinas Valley strawberry story than the man in the street is.

He has 22 acres of strawberries down near the Salinas River off River Road. It is land his father farmed before him. He is a native son of Salinas Valley, a second generation farmer, and his roots in the soil go deep. The field labor shortage is not just something he has been reading about. He feels it. His business is being wrecked because of it.

On Monday afternoon he said, "I've gotten to the point I'm ready to give this deal up."

Grower X received eight Mexican braceros last Saturday. They represent one-third of his strawberry picking crew. His berries are hitting their peak production period now. Last year during the peak he employed 78 braceros.

Fear of losing the handful of braceros he has is one reason Grower X refused to let his name be used in this story. Another reason is that he fears he may be sandbagged with incompetent help at an exorbitant price. He said he saw a strawberry-growing neighbor get involved in an expensive fiasco with a long-distance day-haul operation, and that he wants no part of one. He is pretty sure he couldn't afford it anyhow.

But Grower X although, as an independent grower, spread pretty thin, has done some recruiting on his own. He buses schoolchildren from Fort Ord every weekend to pick strawberries on his ranch. And he has made two recruiting trips to El Pasco, Tex. It costs Grower X $1,248 to bring 26 workers to the Salinas Valley. He said that the first seven were pirated within 3 days. The remaining 19 are still with him, but they give him no feeling of security. "There is no contract," he said. "They could leave the very next day."

PRODUCTION DOWN

To date this season, Grower X's strawberry production on 22 acres has been 2,500 crates. Last year at this time, total production was 23,000 crates. "For a small grower, that's a helluva loss," he said.

In 1964, Grower X said that 50 percent of his production consisted of fresh market berries. This year, he said, "only about 5 percent" of his berries have been marketed fresh. And some of the fruit now on his vines "is even getting too ripe for the freezer—the dockage will be pretty high."

Grower X said that he has lately been getting about 200 crates of freezer berries from his fields each day, although "I should be averaging between 800 and 900."

It is Grower X's belief that he has done everything within reason to recruit and hold an adequate domestic labor force to harvest his strawberry crop. But he has failed, as he more than half expected he would. "What I can't understand," he said, "is that if we don't have the local labor, why they don't give up the go-ahead for braceros." With a highly specialized crop like strawberries, "to have an efficient operation, you have to be guaranteed the same men on the job every day," he said. Weekend pickers, unqualified pickers, "don't give a damn" pickers do almost as much harm as good.

Grower X said that he, like all strawberry growers, small as well as large, has invested $2,000 per acre in his third- and fifth-year berries. (He gave up trying to stay even with the older berries last week. They have a good set of fruit, but they have effectively been abandoned.)

"I put a lot of money into this crop. I'd hate like hell to see it go down the drain," he said.

MORE ACREAGE

In fact, Grower X is going to be out of pocket more than just the loss of most of his current strawberry crop. Last summer, on what he thought was the assurance of Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz that an adequate supply of supplemental labor would be made available to growers, Grower X prepared to plant 10 more acres of strawberries. He built a million-gallon reservoir ($3,000), leveled and staked out the land ($1,000), installed irrigation pipe ($3,000), and purchased $3,200 worth of strawberry plants. The plants now are in a cold storage plant in Watsonville. He is going to give them up this week. His comment: "They're forcing me out of business."

Grower X will have just 12 acres of strawberries next year, and after that, probably, none. He'll plant beets or beans or "some other crop that doesn't require a lot of labor." He thinks that strawberries may soon revert to their former status as a truck crop: small acreage, low labor demand.

Grower X, a small grower, is paying a $1.40 per hour minimum wage to his pickers with an incentive piece rate of 85 cents per crate for freezer berries. The hourly guarantee matches the highest paid anywhere in the continental United States. It apparently isn't high enough to attract the steady work force he needs, but it may be more than he can afford. "From day to day, I don't know if I'm coming out or going in the hole," he said.

Utah Wants To Keep Her Right-To-Work Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the three largest dailies in the State of Utah—the Salt Lake Tribune, the Ogden Standard-Examiner, and the Deseret News—have recently published editorials in opposition to President Johnson's proposal that State right-to-work laws be abolished by repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. These editorials reflect the attitude of the great majority of citizens in my State, and deserve the studied consideration of all Members of Congress.

The articles follow:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, May 20, 1965]

RETAIN THE RIGHT TO VOLUNTARY UNIONISM

We realize that President Johnson, like Utah's Governor Rampton, has a political commitment to organized labor to seek abolition of so-called right-to-work laws which have been enacted in 19 States. This explains, although it does not justify, the recommendations both executives have made on the subject this year.

As Utah's experience proves, it is simply not true that right-to-work laws in any way impair the functioning of organized labor. Indeed there is good reason to think these laws encourage organized labor to function more effectively and more responsibly.

MAKES LABOR RESPONSIBLE

When the right-to-work law was initially proposed in Utah, the Tribune opposed it on the ground it might be a deterrent to orderly labor organization. But experience has proved the principle of voluntary rather than compulsory union membership operates to make organized labor in this State more responsible and more responsive to its membership.

In order to win and hold membership, unions in Utah have had to prove themselves—and they have done so. Workers have been well represented. Labor leadership has been such as to win the respect and confidence of the community as well as of union members.

And there has been no scandal in Utah unionism such as has beset some unions elsewhere—where compulsory unionism has given labor bosses a vested right to membership and the dues which flow into union coffers.

One wonders if, without compulsory unionism, there could have been such a scandalous vote fraud as was recently exposed in the International Union of Electrical Workers, or if a James Hoffa could be so repeatedly accused of mishandling of union funds and affairs.

JOHNSON A PAST SUPPORTER

President Johnson himself, although he now calls for amending the Taft-Hartley law to make State right-to-work laws impossible, was in the past a supporter of such laws. Frederick C. Fowler, chairman of the National Right to Work Committee, says Mr. Johnson supported the 1947 Taft-Hartley law which contained the section 14(b) which he now proposes to repeal. As Senator, he even voted to override President Truman's veto, and when he ran for the Senate in 1960 (at the same time he was John F. Kennedy's Vice Presidential running mate) he campaigned in Texas on a Democratic platform which praised that State's right-to-work law.

All reports from Washington indicate there will be a hard and close fight in Congress over repeal of section 14(b).

National labor leaders have been campaigning against right-to-work laws for years—more, we think, because it has become something of a symbol of antiunionism than because it has actually impaired their activities. Nevertheless they will make a hard fight for repeal, and many Members of Congress as well as President Johnson are in their debt.

STRONG FORCES OPPOSED

But influential forces are massed against them—the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, states with right-to-work laws, and amazingly a substantial number of union members affiliated with the National Right to Work Committee. The president of the committee is a member of the Order of Railway Conductors.

There is reason to believe there is a good deal of union rank and file support of this kind for right-to-work laws. Utah's Representative BURTON, whose First District includes substantial numbers of union members, reports 68 percent who answered a questionnaire opposed repeal of section 14(b) with another 9 percent undecided.

When Governor Rampton proposed repeal of Utah's law to the last legislature, he said it was "a burr under the blanket of labor." Some rank-and-file members may think of it as a burr under the blanket of labor leaders, encouraging them to do a better and more responsible job of union leadership.

[From the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner, May 20, 1965]

UTAH'S STAKE IN RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW

President Johnson's demand that Congress repeal so-called right-to-work laws in 19 States threatens one of the most cherished rights of Utah men and women.

Utahans now have the right to decide for themselves whether they shall belong to a labor union.

Should section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act be repealed, as requested by the President, workers in Utah would lose this treasured prerogative.

We question whether the U.S. Constitution grants the Federal Government the power to order the repeal of the right-to-work laws in Utah and the other 18 States directly involved.

President Johnson, in his special labor message Tuesday, made the request on the grounds that such repeal would "insure uniform application of our national labor relations policy."

Would it not be just as uniform to urge the other 39 States to enact similar right-to-work statutes and to keep the Federal Government out of this area of democratic expression?

There is nothing in the present laws on the books in Utah and the other 18 right-to-work States that prohibits activity by labor unions.

The only question is whether membership in unions shall be compulsory or voluntary.

Utahans have already spoken by adoption of the right-to-work law in the legislature. Since it passed, all attempts to repeal the law in this State have failed—just as have all moves in Congress to repeal section 14B in previous sessions.

This year, however, the fight in Washington will admittedly be stiffer. Hearings begin Monday in a House Labor Subcommittee on the Presidential request. The subcommittee chairman, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat of New Jersey, has already said repeal is needed to put the U.S. economy on a national basis.

The case for State's right-to-work laws, as now provided in the Taft-Hartley law, was well stated in a recent talk by Utah's senior Republican Senator, WALLACE F. BENNETT.

"I feel that Utah's right-to-work law," he said, "is a protection of a vital civil right of Utah citizens and a definite incentive to economic progress and the welfare of working people in the State.

"No American should be denied the right to belong to a union and neither should any American be compelled to be a member of an organization against his will."

Senator BENNETT pointed out that in the 10 years after Utah adopted the right-to-work law in 1955, manufacturing employment in the State increased 59 percent, against a national average gain of only 6.1 percent.

During those 10 years, total wages paid to manufacturing workers in Utah increased 151 percent and the average monthly wage climbed from $330 to $521 a month, according to Senator BENNETT's figures.

We agree with the GOP Senator that it is impossible for anyone to show that economic growth in Utah has been harmed because the worker has been guaranteed the right to make his own choice rather than to have union membership "by compulsion."

The experience in Utah has certainly shown that when union membership is voluntary, the union and union leaders are, as Senator BENNETT points out, "more inclined to act as agents of the workers and do his bidding" instead of the worker becoming a servant of the union.

Repeal of the right-to-work law would, we believe firmly, be a severe setback to the economic prosperity and growth of Utah.

[From the Deseret News, May 17, 1965]

RETAIN RIGHT TO WORK

In Cleveland, John Mossberger was expelled from his union and lost his job because he spoke out in favor of a political candidate not supported by his union.

In Driftwool, Pa., LaRue Berfield lost the job he had held for 19 years with Sylvania Electric Co. because he objected to joining a Communist-dominated union.

This is what can happen without right-to-work laws guaranteeing the freedom of choosing whether or not to join a union. And this is what Congress should weigh carefully as it opens hearings today on the drive to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, which permits such laws in the various States.

In a country that does not make its citizens pay for the privilege of voting, should they be required to pay for the privilege of working?

In a country where much good is accomplished by private groups like the chamber of commerce, should people be required to join them just because everyone benefits?

In a country where one poll after another shows that people favor a certain course of action, should just the opposite be forced upon them?

If the answer to any or all of the questions is—as it should be—"No," then President Johnson ought to forget about abolishing right-to-work laws in the 19 States that have adopted them.

Fortunately, indications are that the drive to repeal the section of the Taft-Hartley Act permitting such laws is losing some of its steam.

If so, this will represent a triumph of commonsense over an attempt to get the Federal Government into the business of helping trade unions recruit members. It's commonsense to keep right to work because in 1963 strikes in the country as a whole lost 0.13 percent of working time; the average in right-to-work States was only 0.09 percent. In these same right-to-work States the growth in wage rates, personal income, capital investment, and personal savings is, proportionately higher than in the other 31 States. From 1953 to 1963 nonfarm employment increased 23.2 percent in right-to-work States; in the other States the figure was 9.9 percent.

These arguments should be sufficiently convincing. At any rate, most people find them so. According to polls by the Opinion Research Corp., of Princeton, N.J., nearly two-thirds of the adult public is against repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. In fact, only 4 in 10 union family members favor a law requiring workers to join a union in order to hold a job. Instead, most citizens favor a national law making all union membership voluntary. Surely Congress should reflect the wishes of the people it is elected to represent.

With so much in favor of retaining the right-to-work principle, can't we forget about this repeal nonsense once and for all?

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* 4606 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

J
11
R
v. 111
appy
June 1-30

Appendix

Tribute to Mrs. George Ross and Other Volunteer Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise today in praise of volunteer workers, and women volunteers in particular.

During my recent campaign, I depended heavily on these capable, alert, energetic volunteers to distribute literature, ring doorbells, telephone prospective voters, and carry out a wide variety of duties that simply could not be done, and would not have been done, without their services.

Mrs. George Ross, an outstanding and dedicated woman whom I was fortunate to meet during my campaign, is a volunteer for the Urban League of Baltimore City.

For many years, the Urban League has been quietly fighting discrimination, by seeking employment and educational opportunities for Negroes. In 1963, the Baltimore Urban League launched a cultural program that brought to the underprivileged children of the inner city theretofore undreamed of opportunities.

Mrs. Ross, as the coordinator of these activities, brought the delights of the symphony, lectures, museums, university campuses, and historic sites to the attention of those neglected children.

Not only has Mrs. Ross devoted her own time to these efforts, she has also spent many hours cajoling friends and neighbors into involving themselves in this and similar programs.

Mr. President, I salute this woman and the many others like her, and ask that a recent article—from the Baltimore Sun—about her efforts be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HORIZONS OPENED FOR NEGRO CHILDREN

(By Helen Henry)

It was a monumental "first" for the young Negro girl and her 25 fellow junior high pupils of Booker T. Washington P.S. 130: To be inside the red-and-gold richness of the Lyric. To see a full-dress symphony orchestra come out on the stage. To quiver in anticipation to the exciting cacophony of tuning up, the massing of chorus and soloists, the appearance of the conductor. The hush. And then—Verdi's "Requiem."

It happened a year and a half ago, and they've been back to the Lyric many times since then—as they have been to theatrical performances, lectures and the museums, to churches and synagogues, to industrial plants and university campuses, to halls of government and historic places in Maryland, Washington, Philadelphia, Valley Forge, and New York.

But the girl is still inarticulate with the ecstasy of that first wonderful night. She can indeed talk more easily now about the thrills of all the other experiences, but only the big dark eyes glowing in her sensitive face can suggest how the sad, soaring "Requiem" somehow pleased and exalted all the sadness and suffering she had known in her 13 years, an unloved child in a broken home.

ALL EXCEPTIONALLY BRIGHT

She is 14 now, in the eighth grade, as are most of the other 14 girls and 11 boys, all honor students chosen for a pilot youth incentive program sponsored by the Baltimore Urban League. It is called TST—tomorrow's scientists and technicians. Children of the inner city, most of them had never even glimpsed the unimaginable wonders of life and work beyond the ghettos of their neighborhoods until this program exposed them to Baltimore's cultural and educational offerings.

All have shown a high level of intelligence against their varied family backgrounds: some have stable families, some live in broken homes; some are illegitimate, some are on welfare—but all are exceptionally bright children.

Planned to enrich their learning, to direct their interests toward opportunities which haven't always been possible for children on their socioeconomic level, this pilot project is looked upon by administrators and guidance counselors in predominantly Negro schools as a bright spot in Baltimore—a beacon to achievement.

TST is a national movement of the Urban League to salvage waste of human resources by searching out Negro boys and girls in junior and senior high schools who have high potential ability for careers as professional workers and technicians in scientific fields. And to prepare them for the Nation's critical manpower needs, it seeks to raise their educational, cultural, and vocational sights, to evaluate them as future college students and help them accomplish their aims.

LAUNCHED IN 1963

The Urban League launched the enrichment program, now directed by Lloyd Mitchner, at Public School 130 in the fall of 1963, bolstered by the cooperation of teachers and advisers, the encouragement of individuals in Baltimore's business and professional fields, and by grants of $500 each from two large industrial companies, Westinghouse and Bethlehem Steel.

The agency is hopeful of enlarging its funds through contributions to meet the expenses incidental to activities planned for the children, such as bus transportation, and other travel costs, tickets, etc.

The students involved, their parents, school advisers, and sponsors all agree that the success of this pilot program has turned largely on the extraordinary efforts of a volunteer adviser, Mrs. George W. Ross, an engaging dynamo of a woman. Working closely with the Urban League coordinator, the school principal, Mrs. Edna Campbell, and Head Student Counselor Robert White, Mrs. Ross has stirred the children to exciting aspirations.

She has planned, arranged, and conducted adventures for them into the world of art, science, industry, and government; introduced them to distinguished people in those fields—particularly Negroes who have achieved prominence. From them the children have been learning the requirements and disciplines of work in many areas. And they are visiting campuses where the image of the college student is created in their minds.

WARM FRIENDSHIP

Mrs. Ross is a warm personal friend to each child and his or her family, knows their problems and needs, gives them the concentrated interest that a volunteer's own time and stamina can provide. She has scheduled at least one activity every week for the children—and for their parents—not only during the school term but throughout the summer vacation months—"a most vital period," she explains, "especially for these children in the core of the city, for guiding their interests in constructive recreation."

During the summer Mrs. Ross and her husband, an advertising man, frequently invite the group to a picnic party at their house in the country, which formerly was the old Brooklandville railroad station.

Marise Ross has a special rapport with children growing up in difficult family situations "because I too had a rough time as a child who grew up in a broken home in Chicago, and I know the frustration of having to go to work when I longed to go to college."

Mrs. Ross is known as the former TV personality "Penny Chase" who conducted a woman's program, on which she met and interviewed prominent persons and civic leaders, among them representatives of Baltimore's Urban League. She left television to travel as a recruiter for the Peace Corps, lecturing to college students on Eastern campuses.

IN WASHINGTON MARCH

A strong believer in civil rights, Marise Ross participated with Urban League members in the 1963 "March for Jobs and Freedom" in Washington, after which she discussed with Dr. Furman Templeton, director of the Baltimore league, her interest in the education of Negro children—and thus became a voluntary adviser to the initial TST club.

She is an electric personality and can be an irresistible force in persuading people to perform, lecture and otherwise inspire her "proteges." She engages her friends; they suddenly find themselves as chauffeurs and companions in TST adventures. Public relations officers, informed by Mrs. Ross of TST's ideals, organize tours for the children and their parents. They have been guests at every new performance at Center Stage and Painter's Mill. The Urban League had to buy tickets for "A Man for All Seasons" at Ford's—"but it was more than worth the cost," said Mrs. Ross. "The children are still talking about the dramatic presentation of history."

They usually meet the players backstage and have learned some of the theater's secrets and about the profession of acting and preparation for it. "The theater," she said, "has been the most wonderful place for them to learn about ideas."

They've attended travelogues at the Maryland Academy of Science. Before going to a play or concert, they are given lectures about authors and composers, and later they discuss in school what they've seen and heard.

The children are responding particularly to another devoted volunteer in the TST program, Mrs. Arch Houstle, speech instructor at the College of Notre Dame, who is teaching the group speech and drama in a special class every Monday afternoon.

HOW GOVERNMENT WORKS

Their interest in government and politics has been stimulated by visits to the scene of lawmaking. First to the city council, where they met their Fourth District Councilman Henry Parks, who explained its function. Next, they went to the State house in Annapolis, were briefed by one of the Governor's aides, met Senator Verda Welcome and visited the pressroom to see how reporters covered the sessions. While in Annapolis, they toured the Naval Academy.

Then to Washington and the Congress. "This was a high spot in their lives," said Mrs. Ross, "even more exciting than our trip last spring to the United Nations, or the New York's World Fair. The big thrill was the attention they received from then Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who spent 2 hours with the children, giving them a lesson in living history. They will never forget that they sat in on Congress while it was in the midst of the civil rights debate."

Friends of Mrs. Ross invited the group, about 40 children and parents, to dinner at their home in Washington and served them with their best china and silver. "The children's manners were beautiful," she said, "and what touched my friends exceedingly was that the kids, as though by tacit signal, all pitched in to clear the table, wash dishes, and leave everything in sparkling order—all of their own volition."

"Their great desire now," she added, "is to see the President in the White House."

ON TO COLLEGE

This incentive program, of course, is showing the children what education really means. Its goal is to stimulate them to pursue their learning through college, to obtain scholarships and possible financial aid for needy students.

Marise Ross plans to stay with her pilot TST's until they are ready for college ("I am ambitious for them.") Several have passed into senior high school but are still participants in the club activities, and new eighth graders have been admitted to the group.

As new ideas of helping the children strike her, Mrs. Ross acts decisively, as she did last summer when she pondered the question: Why wait for a college scholarship when there are some children in my group who have the potential for a private preparatory school and need for individualized attention? Promptly she took the line of action she constantly is recommending to her group: "Anything worth doing is possible. If one approach fails, there is always another way."

SCHOLARSHIPS GRANTED

In response to her recommendations, three Baltimore private schools tested and granted full tuition scholarships for 4 to 5 years to TST eighth graders. Mrs. Ross presented all the facts about each of the three pupils—their background, potential, and personality—"the things besides the IQ in which headmasters and headmistresses are deeply concerned." Individual sponsors are financing incidental needs and expenses of the scholarship students.

Mrs. Ross is working to obtain additional private-school scholarships for certain boys, and grants for boarding scholarships for two of the girls. ("It's like a fairy tale," one of them breathed softly at the prospect.)

The scholarship students are fulfilling every expectation.

Of Carey Perkins, now at Park School, 13-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. John Perkins, Headmaster Robert Thomason said: "Carey is doing beautifully. He had a little difficulty in adjusting to the demands at Park, which is not unusual. He is enthusiastic, industrious, with a wonderful zest for life and we find him quite exciting. We think he is going to be a leader here in every phase of the school's activities before he is graduated." There are a number of other Negro students at Park School.

Mercedes Sherrod, 14, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. William Sherrod, is the first Negro student to enter Notre Dame Preparatory School, which has an enrollment of 400 girls.

AT HOME IN SCHOOL

"We call her Dee," said Sister Colleen, the school counselor, "and she has adjusted successfully here, both academically and socially. She's a happy child, much at home in the school, an active participant in school activities, class team sports, the library club. Her parents have attended parent-teacher conferences and are happy about Dee. She's an above-average child and works to capacity. She's courteous and unself-conscious. We are thrilled with the entire setup—it is a wonderful experiment."

And Linda Datcher, 13, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Griffin Datcher, is at Friends School, whose headmaster, Dr. Byron Forbush, said:

"She is a definite asset to the school. Linda has been on the honor roll since last September. Negro students are no novelty at Friends; Linda is among quite a few others—not all of them on scholarships. The school has a broad scholarship program unrelated to race.

"I think," Dr. Forbush added, "that this Urban League program is a significant attempt to raise the horizons of youngsters who otherwise would not have had the opportunity. It is a marvelous program, an excellent beginning that I hope will be expanded into other areas."

Linda's father, a painting contractor, said, "All my life I thought I was intelligent and had ideas * * * but I couldn't express them. Now I want this to be possible for my daughter."

Vietnam: A Chronology of Communist Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in looking over the many letters I have received from concerned constituents, it becomes increasingly apparent to me that our people have the right to be fully informed on what is happening in southeast Asia and on the full implications to the peace and security of not just Vietnam, but to all free nations throughout the world.

The chronology that follows, based on information provided by the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Library of Congress, shows the birth and development of the Communist Party in southeast Asia as far back as 35 years ago, providing the foundation for the ultimate takeover of that section of the world from the French.

The lesson of history in this part of the world clearly shows, first of all, that U.S. policy has been firm and consistent. We pledged military aid to Cambodia, Vietnam, and Laos as far back as 1950. It was only when our military aid was not adequate or when we agreed to negotiate that totalitarian communism enslaved more peoples in that area. First North Vietnam was negotiated away and then Laos and Cambodia were neutralized to become transportation routes and havens for Communist forces striking into South Vietnam. If we negotiate South Vietnam away, we will surrender Thailand and find ourselves defending Communist strikes at Malaysia, the Philippines, and Australia.

The negotiations at Geneva in 1954, after the sad annihilation of the French at Dienbienphu, gave the Communists the framework from which to build. When Vietnam was partitioned, thousands of carefully selected party members were ordered to remain in place in the south and keep their secret apparatus intact to help promote Hanoi, the capital of North Vietnam, in the conquest.

The original calculation was that Vietnam would fall under the control of Hanoi without resort to force, and Communist cadres were ordered to penetrate official and nonofficial agencies, to propagandize and sow confusion and generally aggravate war-torn conditions and weaken South Vietnam's Government and social fabric. When this did not work, and South Vietnam conversely achieved a period of steady progress and growing prosperity, outdistancing that in the north, the leadership in Hanoi resorted to open aggression and violence.

By 1958 the use of terror by the Vietcong increased appreciably, to win back prestige and support from the people that political and propaganda appeals had failed to produce, and to create confusion and insecurity in South Vietnam.

As the chronology shows, by the end of 1961, the situation was so grave in South Vietnam that its government asked the United States for increased military assistance, and that request was met.

The Vietcong, however, tightened their organization and adopted new tactics, with increasing emphasis on terrorism, sabotage and armed attacks by small groups. Armor and antiaircraft were introduced, and guerrillas were supplied with heavier weapons. The internal struggles within South Vietnam provided the Vietcong with yet another advantage.

In 1964, 436 South Vietnamese hamlet chiefs and other government officials were killed outright by the Vietcong and 1,131 were kidnapped, destroying the local governmental leadership capability and setting the stage to promote the Communist concept of collectivized conformity under dictatorial leadership.

Though it has been apparent for years that the regime in Hanoi was conducting a campaign of conquest against South Vietnam, the government in Saigon and the United States both hoped that the danger could be met within South Vietnam itself. The leaders in Hanoi, however, responded with greater violence, apparently interpreting restraint as lack of will.

We were then left with a threefold choice:

We could do nothing, thereby permitting the growth of communism and the aggressive forces to surround us, as evidenced by the advance of Castroism in the Western Hemisphere.

We could resort to negotiations, as we did in Geneva, providing the foundation

for peaceful Communist takeover, as evidenced in North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, East Germany, and other Iron Curtain countries, North Korea, and some emerging African nations.

Or, we could stand firm with advice, counsel, and the required military capability and effort to a nation desiring to remain free but yet incapable of developing its own counterforces.

It is naive to think that the Communist line of peaceful coexistence is designed to enhance the concept of freedom as we know and understand it. Anyone familiar with the history of the Communist movement will understand its "sacred historical task" to destroy capitalism—and freedom—by any means available. The Communist objective of surrounding and isolating capitalist countries—with the primary target, the United States—has already achieved devastating strides. It becomes increasingly mandatory that we recognize these international political facts of life and move toward the development of an economic and technological offensive that would promote peace and freedom.

In my judgment, a summit meeting of the free nations of southeast Asia to facilitate political actions is overdue. I have long advocated organization of a civil-political-military complex in each of these countries to resolve problems in their own environments—principally, to combat the insidious encroachment of subversive communism.

Further, I have long advocated the creation of a Freedom Academy designed to train people participating in this offensive in the specific workings of communism, in counterinsurgency techniques, and, generally, in expanding the nonmilitary capabilities of this great Nation and of all nations free and desiring to remain free.

CHRONOLOGY OF COMMUNIST GROWTH IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

In the year 1883: French protectorate established over Tonkin (North Vietnam) and Annam (Central Vietnam).

In the year 1930: Formation of a Communist Party in Indochina, then under protectorate of France.

In the year 1941: Vietnamese Communists form Vietnam Independence League (known as Vietminh).

March 1945: Japanese take over direct administration from the French in World War II.

August 1945: Japan surrenders to allied forces and Vietnamese Communists immediately establish Provisional Democratic Republic of Vietnam in Tonkin under Ho Chi Minh (who still leads Communist Party in North Vietnam).

September 1945: French, British and Indian military forces arrive in Saigon.

October 1945: French begin military and civil operations to reestablish French control over Vietnam, paving the way for continuing skirmishes and negotiations with the Communists over the next 9 years.

In the year 1949: Chinese Communist troops reach the northern border of Vietnam.

January 1950: Vietnamese Communist regime recognized by Communist China and U.S.S.R.

December 1945: United States signs mutual defense assistance agreement with France, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos for indirect U.S. military aid to Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

In the year 1951: United States signs agreement with Vietnam for direct economic assistance.

May 1954: French fortress at Dien Bien Phu surrenders to Vietnamese Communist armed forces.

July 1954: Geneva Conference on Indochina surrenders half of Vietnam to the Communists, partitioning Vietnam along the 17th parallel into Communist North Vietnam and free South Vietnam. Signed by Russia, Communist China, Cambodia, France, Laos, and Vietnamese Communists (Vietminh); United States, and Vietnam do not sign. United States declares it shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections, supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly.

Flow of almost 1 million refugees from North to South Vietnam begins.

January 1955: United States promises direct assistance to Vietnam for support of the Vietnamese armed forces.

February 1955: SEATO (Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty), covering Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, comes into force.

April 1955: Northerners are prevented from migrating to South Vietnam by North Vietnam Communists. Saigon Government appeals to United Nations.

July 1955: Communists initiate first overt propaganda move in South Vietnam by distributing literature signed by North Vietnam's "National United Front."

September 1955: Cambodia leaves French Union; declares itself an independent sovereign state.

February 1956: Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia visits Peiping, China, and renounces SEATO protection.

May 1956: Communist China signs a 2-year economic and technical aid agreement with Cambodia. Soviet Union establishes diplomatic relations with Cambodia.

August 1956: Agreement reached between Prince Souvanna Phouma (neutral) and Pathet Lao leader Prince Souphanouvong (Communist) for establishment of a coalition government in Laos.

In the year 1957: U.S. Military Assistance and Advisory Group (USMAAG) and U.S. Information Service (USIS) installations in Saigon bombed; U.S. personnel injured.

January 1958: Large Communist guerrilla band attacks plantation north of Saigon, reflecting steady increase in Communist armed activity in South Vietnam since mid-1957.

July 1958: Cambodia recognizes Communist China, after verbal attacks on South Vietnam alleging that South Vietnamese have violated Cambodia border.

June 1959: Pathet Lao (Communist forces) in Laos resume attacks in northern provinces of that country.

July 1959: Communist guerrillas attack Vietnamese military base at Bien Hoa, killing and wounding several USMAAG personnel.

July 1959: North Vietnamese Communist regime states "we are building socialism in Vietnam, but we are building it in only one part of the country, while in the other part we still have to direct and bring to a close the middle-class democratic and anti-imperialist revolution."

January 1960: Large Communist guerrilla band attacks Vietnamese army installation at Tay Ninh, indicating growing size and aggressiveness of Communist guerrilla-subversive apparatus and intiating present crisis.

Communist newspaper in North Vietnam states "the North has become a large real echelon of our army" and "the North is the revolutionary base for the whole country."

May 1960: South Vietnam requests increase in number of USMAAG.

September 1960: Resolution adopted by North Vietnamese Congress declares that an immediate task of the "revolutionary struggle of our compatriots in the south" is to overthrow President Diem's government.

June–October 1960: Communist guerrilla activities in South Vietnam increase; series of attacks by large Communist guerrilla force in the Kontun-Pleiku area.

South Vietnam states these attacks are staged from bases in the "north" through Laos in preparation for further actions in Vietnam and that events in Laos had facilitated Communist movements in Vietnam.

October 1960: President Eisenhower states that United States will continue to assist Vietnam "so long as our strength can be useful."

November 1960: South Vietnam says Communist attacks are well prepared, conducted by regular forces trained in North Vietnam and employed weapons made in North Vietnam and other Communist countries.

January 1961: Radio Hanoi states that the "sacred historical task" of the NFLSV (National Front for Liberation of South Vietnam) is to overthrow the United States-Diem clique and to liberate the south.

March 1961: Communists announce guerrilla offensive against South Vietnam will be started to prevent holding of April 9 elections.

March 1961: Pathet Lao renews aggression in Laos to gain control of the country.

May 1961: After months of civil war in Laos involving the attempted Communist takeover, the International Control Commission of the United Nations reports a cease-fire in Laos and a 14-nation conference on Laos in Geneva. A "neutral" Laos is established through negotiations.

September 1961: Stepped up Communist guerrilla attacks; Communist forces seize capital of Phuoc Thanh province, only 60 miles from Saigon.

October 1961: President Diem declares state of national emergency; declares "It is no longer a guerrilla war waged by an enemy who attacks us with regular units fully and heavily equipped and who seeks a strategic decision in southeast Asia in conformity with the orders of the Communist international."

December 1961: U.S. State Department issues "white paper," documenting North Vietnam's direction and support of the Communist guerrilla-subversive war against the Republic of Vietnam through the infiltration of espionage agents, military personnel, weapons and supplies.

May 1962: Communist forces in Laos gain control of large territories.

June 1962: Canadian and Indian members of the International Control Commission find North Vietnam guilty of subversive and covert aggression against South Vietnam.

December 1962: Large cache of Chinese-made weapons and ammunition discovered by South Vietnamese patrol in the central highlands.

September 1963: Cambodia receives from Soviet Union three Mig–17 jet fighters and other military equipment.

September 1963: President Kennedy says "to reduce U.S. aid to South Vietnam might bring about a collapse similar to that of the Chiang Kai-shek government in China after World War II."

December 1963: Report by U.S. military spokesmen on stepped up guerrilla attacks on hamlets, outposts, and patrols in November; enough weapons captured by the Vietcong to arm five 300-man battalions.

January 1964: A Vietnamese Army group seized in the delta area of Vietnam some 300,000 rounds of small arms ammunition, weapons like mortars, recoilless ammunition marked "Made in China." Hanoi primarily responsible for their infiltration into South Vietnam.

January 1964: McNamara—"The survival of an independent government in South Vietnam is so important to the security of southeast Asia and to the free world that I can conceive of no alternative other than to

take all necessary measures within our capability to prevent a Communist victory."

February 1964: Vietcong launches offensive in Tay Ninh Province and the Mekong Delta in South Vietnam. In ensuing fighting, hundreds of Government troops reported dead.

April 1964: Rusk—"Aggression against South Vietnam was organized and is directed, supported, and supplied by the North Vietnamese Communist regime in Hanoi." These attacks are "supported by the Communist regime in Peiping" and "supported at least verbally by Moscow."

May 1964: Johnson—"The Vietcong guerrillas, under orders from their Communist masters in the north, have intensified terrorist actions against the peaceful people of South Vietnam. This increased terrorism requires increased response."

May 1964: Stevenson at U.N. Security Council—"Leaders and armed forces of North Vietnam, supported by Communist China, have abused the right of Cambodia to live in peace by using Cambodian territory as a passageway, a source of supply, and a sanctuary from counterattack."

May 1964: Explosion in Saigon Harbor sinks U.S. aircraft transport ship.

August 1964: Destroyer *C. Turner Joy* and destroyer *Maddox* are attacked in Tonkin Bay off the coast of North Vietnam by North Vietnamese PT boats. Johnson orders U.S. air action against gunboats and supporting facilities in North Vietnam. United States sends reinforcements to Tonkin Bay area.

August 1964: Supporting the President's action, Congress approves southeast Asia resolution (to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia) (House vote: 416–0; Senate: 88–2).

October 1964: Sihanouk of Cambodia, at Communist China's 15th anniversary celebration, says China will grant Cambodia military and economic assistance. United States charges Cambodian troops crossed South Vietnam border and seized a U.S. officer. United States charges Cambodians fired on U.S. helicopter in South Vietnam searching for missing U.S. officer.

November 1964: Russia delivers new arms shipment to Cambodia to replace American equipment.

December 1964: Terrorist bombing in Saigon Embassay kills 2 Americans and wounds 52 Americans and 13 Vietnamese.

February 1965: Fierce Vietcong attack on military compound at Pleiku. Eight GI's killed and 108 wounded. United States says attack ordered and directed from North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi; Vietcong terrorists blow up building housing American enlisted men in Quinhon. Heavy casualties; 49 U.S. Navy carrier planes blast Communist troop staging base in North Vietnam in retaliation for raid at Pleiku; and more than 100 U.S. and South Vietnamese fighter planes strike at military installations in North Vietnam, marking the start of the major U.S. attacks on North Vietnam.

Work Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, within the near future, the Senate will be called upon to vote on the subject of the right to work. In this country there is a group whose members feel that they should be permitted to live without working. Another group feels that a man is not entitled to work unless he joins a union before he is employed. And, of course, there is a third group which believes that it has been the fate of man to have to work; to suffer pain and ultimately to die, because of the sins of our earliest ancestors, Adam and Eve.

Students of the Bible will recall that the angel with the flaming sword which drove Adam and Eve out of the Garden of Eden, where previously they had lived without working, said: "Henceforth in the sweat of thy face, shalt thou eat bread." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter, from a Virginia constituent to his Congressman, in which he quotes the greater interpreter of the new dispensation, St. Paul, as having written to members of the church in Thessalonica: "If any would not work, neither should he eat."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LYNCHBURG, VA.,
May 21, 1965.

Re social security.

Hon. RICHARD H. POFF,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POFF: In dealing with social security, medicare, poverty, and the like, sight must not be lost of the words of Paul, the Apostle, to the Thessalonians.

It is written in Second Thessalonians, chapter 3, as follows:

"Neither did we eat any man's bread for nought; but wrought with labor and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you:

"Not because we have not power, but to make ourselves an example unto you to follow us.

"For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies.

"Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread.

"But ye, brethren, be not weary in well doing.

"And if any man obey not word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed."

You can see for yourself that all these governmental programs above named and others of similar import, are not in keeping with the words of Paul when he wrote: "that if any would not work, neither should he eat," and "now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work and eat their own bread."

It is clear that Paul, in the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ, put each individual upon his own ability to provide for himself, and if he did not, then he should not eat.

Yours truly,

W. G. BURNETTE.

Art Modell Had To Have Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, we in the Cleveland area have long been proud of Art Modell and particularly so in the case of Archie Roberts which has won him national acclaim.

Dave Brady has written an excellent article, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

ART MODELL HAD TO HAVE HEART

(By Dave Brady, Washington Post staff writer)

Phil Burke likes to tell about the wonderous Archie Roberts of Columbia showing up promptly at 1 p.m. last Tuesday for his final examination.

"Archie is prone to be late," said Sports Publicity Director Burke, "he will be late for his own funeral. He is human after all, believe me, no matter what you hear.

"The only trouble was, the examination was offered on Monday. Archie talked his way into a private test and made his usual B, of course. That would be an A at most colleges."

Roberts, the first three-letter athlete at Columbia in 16 years, is newly distinguished as the first postgraduate redshirt signed by a pro football team, the Cleveland Browns.

Cleveland owner, Art Modell, the onetime packager of daytime TV shows who lured Roberts away from New York Jet owner, Sonny Werblin, former president of MCA-TC, coined the "redshirt" term and others.

"We will have the first playing physician to go with the first father-son combination on our team in a few years," Modell said. "Young Lou Groza is now 13."

Modell, who has been described as the first owner in football to have his heart taped before every game because he is so excitable, turned out to be a softie in the bidding for Roberts and it won the battle.

Modell figures to be the first owner who subsidized a "cheerleader" when he contracted to pay the tuition at Western Reserve University Medical for Mrs. Archie Roberts as well as for her husband.

In addition, the Browns are paying Archie $7,000 a year for two seasons, when he will not play, and $14,000 the third season, when he will try to make the "varsity." Asked why he took the gamble, Modell said:

"We do not need a quarterback now. But we have a future quarterback star. But even if he never plays a game I will be satisfied because I will have helped the boy to accommodate a lifelong ambition to be a surgeon.

"I never could go to college myself."

Modell said that Roberts turned down a $100,000 offer from the New York Mets and a "substantial" offer from the Jets "because he knew they had no interest in his outside plans."

Roberts confirmed this on the telephone from the Columbia campus: "I also had offers from the San Francisco Giants and the Phillies in baseball, and from the Montreal Alouette football team.

"I was looking for a combination which would provide a nearby medical school, because it is most important to me to be a doctor, even if I had to drop sports.

"The Alouettes talked about nearby McGill University and the Mets said they would 'try' to work out something, falling short of making me a guarantee. But when I met Mr. Modell and Coach Blanton Collier and the other people at Cleveland I knew they were interested in me as something more than just a football player.

"This was unique."

Modell corrected a report that Roberts would play minor league football while going to medical school in Cleveland.

"That would interfere with his studies. We have had a thousand phone calls from minor league clubs asking for him, but he will play only in some of our exhibition games and help our coaches with some things after the regular season starts."

Roberts says the first 2 years of medical school are the hardest and he should be able to play football in his third year. "The

only thing I worry about is the loss of contact for 2 years. The Browns only scrimmage once or twice a year, in training camp."

Meanwhile, Roberts is taking it easy by working with the Morningside Brotherhood Corp., which helps the underprivileged boys near Columbia; preparing to play in the All-American game at Buffalo; instructing at a football camp in Storrs, Conn.; taking in a few light operas, and doing some "escapist" reading of Hemingway and Ian Fleming.

A lefthanded batting shortstop with good range, a strong arm, and superb hands, Roberts finished second in the Nation with his runs-batted-in average and is the leading batter in the East with a .386 average for his senior year, .374 for his career.

Those same good prospective surgeon's hands and his muscular arm gave him the most football competitions as a passer in the East, not to mention his success as a letterman as a junior in basketball.

If Archie is vulnerable to a second guess, it may come from his wife Barbara. She was something of a whiz herself, completing her 4-year courses at Barnard College in 3, a gynecologist candidate with a year start on him in medical school.

The Challenge of Russian Totalitarianism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the writings of Dr. Stefan T. Possony, an associate of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, and the director of international studies in the Hoover Institution of Stanford University, are always worthy of note. For this reason I call the attention of my colleagues to his recent article entitled "The Challenge of Russian Totalitarianism," which is published in Orbis, a quarterly Journal of World Affairs by the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania:

THE CHALLENGE OF RUSSIAN TOTALITARIANISM

(By Stefan T. Possony)

The removal of Khrushchev from power has done little to diminish the world's hope for an East-West détente. For the first time since World War II, there is a widespread feeling that Soviet affirmations of good will are more than just deceptive maneuvers designed to entrap the free world. There is even the expectation that through peaceful coexistence we may be moving toward a genuine "accommodation" with the Soviet Union.

No person can remain sane in today's world unless he finds solace in hope. But when we transport ourselves from the realm of emotion to the hard facts of foreign policy, we must adopt reliable criteria through which to measure our progress. Has there been any evolution in the Soviet Union? Obviously, all countries, at all times and in all places, evolve incessantly. But have there been enough quantitative changes so that, to borrow a phrase from Marxian dialectics, a new quality has resulted or is about to emerge? Have the structure, the intent and the motivation of the totalitarian government been altered? What changes must occur if the world is to turn toward genuine peace? How long is the road that still lies ahead? Few of those who take the roseate view have ever bothered to ask questions of this type.

Even more perturbing is the considerable confusion that still exists about the most elementary facts of Soviet life. Until we learn to ask the right questions about Soviet evolution, and analyze the facts and trends with precision and objectivity, we will not be able to lay a solid basis for the formulation of a successful, long-term U.S. strategy.

RUSSIA?

Who is the opponent whose mind and behavior must change if a new beginning is to be made? After nearly half a century of "coexisting" with Communist rule, very few Westerners really understand the nature of the enemy. More often than not the opponent is identified as "Russia," yet no such country even exists.[1] Occasionally there is a reference to Russian "imperialism." The Communists, if they are mentioned at all, are usually referred to as "Soviets" and sometimes as "Marxists." These various terms are used more or less interchangeably.

It is frequently assumed that "Russia" is a nation-state which will forever defend its national interests, despite the fact that at present "Russia" is ruled by a Communist (i.e., left radical and internationalist) party. Since the national interests of "Russia" and the United States are deemed to be fully compatible, the transition to a peaceful world looks easy. Indeed, mutual accommodation should be entirely practical if the "Russian Government" were to shed some of its more ambitious objectives and if it could be reassured about the peaceful intentions of the United States.

Unfortunately, this assumption that "Russia," or rather the Soviet Union, is a nation-state is erroneous. The confusion about the ethnic composition of the leading Communist state, which accounts for some major Western errors during the two World Wars, has many roots lying deep in history. One of these roots is linguistic: The Russian language distinguishes between "russky" and "rossisky," but the English language has overlooked this tiny difference. Modern Russian dictionaries also cover up this key distinction, which is similar to the difference between "English" and "British."[2] "Russky" means "Russian" but "rossisky" refers to the multinational "all-Russian" state or empire.

The political structure with which we are dealing is not a national but a multinational state. For the purposes of historical comparison, this state may be best compared with Austria-Hungary—except that (1) the predominance of the Great Russians is much greater than that enjoyed by the Germans in the old Habsburg monarchy and (2) the number of nations and peoples held within the Soviet Union is excessively large and their cultural differential truly enormous. Thus, the U.S.S.R. is both a multinational and a colonial empire.

This peculiar character of the Communist state is not a closely guarded secret that can be discovered only by highly intricate intelligence operations. Communist writings since Marx and Engels, including many pages in Lenin, deal with the "national question" in "Russia." Stalin devoted his major work to this very problem. It was he who put together what article 13 of the Soviet constitution calls "a federal state formed on the basis of a voluntary union of equal Soviet socialist republics." In 1945 the United States granted Stalin the right to seat the Ukraine and Byelorussia as full members of the United Nations. None of the non-Slavic member states of that "federal union" have been accorded this recognition of independent statehood.

According to the Soviet Constitution (as amended in 1960), the U.S.S.R. is composed of 15 "union republics." Some of these, for example, Georgia, are more or less national states; others, notably the R.S.F.S.R., are "federations." According to article 22, the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic embraces 15 autonomous republics and 6 autonomous provinces; an additional number of ethnic groups were recognized before 1960.

There are, throughout the Soviet Union, substantial numbers of non-Russians who do not live within clearly defined territorial boundaries and who do not enjoy recognized territorial or political status (e.g., Germans, Poles, Jews,[3] Finns, Koreans, Mongols and Chinese). There also are about 50 ethnic groups of small size to which no particular status has been granted and which, in some instances, are likely to be absorbed by surrounding populations.

The Soviet Union is a multinational state but not a genuine federation. Since all important decisions are made in Moscow, the U.S.S.R. is in fact a highly centralized state. But multinationality and ethnic and cultural variety are among the outstanding realities of Soviet life and perforce influence every major decision. It may very well be in the interest of the great Russian nation to rule the other nations; or their interest may be to create a genuine federation. The party program of 1961 proposes the fusion of all these ethnic groups into a new and uniform nation; this would be followed in due time by the fusion of all the nations on the globe into a single world nation. By the same token it is clear that the national interests of the other nations within the Soviet Union are not fully in harmony with those of the great Russians. Depending on what the Russians themselves consider to be their national goals, these interests may be entirely incompatible. This, one would suspect, is particularly true of all those nations that have been declining under the Communist regime or that have been the target of Russian immigration. Compatibility might develop, however, if the great Russians strive for cooperation instead of domination.

The Soviet Union is not, as is often believed, a Slavic empire; at least one-quarter of the Soviet population is non-Slavic. The two predominant nations, the Russians and the Ukrainians, are Slavic and in varying degrees have been harboring "pan-Slavic" sentiments, i.e., they are inclined to strive for special relationships with the Slavic nations of Eastern Europe. Yet the European satellites of communism are by no means all Slavic either; in fact, groups like the Germans, Hungarians, Rumanians, and Albanians have a record of incessant struggle against the Slavs and the pan-Slavic ideology. To complicate matters further, some Slavic nations like the Poles have had a long tradition of anti-Russian sentiment. The various disputes which have taken place within the Soviet "bloc," although they also reflect divergent interpretations of the Communist doctrine, on the whole derive from "national-

---

[1] Several Russian dictionaries I consulted do not carry the term "Rossiya" in the Russian-English part. There does exist the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, which is a "union republic" within the U.S.S.R. and which is not a nation-state, but a quasi-federative structure.

[2] Obsolete German distinguished between "Russen" and "Reussen." The tsar, in French, was called "L'empereur de Toutes les Russies," i.e., there were several "Russias." In some 19th century usages, the Ukraine was referred to as "Little Russia," also as "Red Russia."

[3] There is a Jewish autonomous region within the R.S.F.S.R. but it is inhabited by more non-Jews than Jews. Only a very small percentage of the Jewish population in the U.S.S.R. lives there.

ism," from divergent ethnic and psychological "infrastructures" and national values. In brief, the problems which about 50 years ago confronted Vienna in its management of a multinational empire were relatively easy in comparison with the problems currently confronting Moscow.

This complex reality is but dimly understood in the Western World. More often than not the tourist returns with tales that he has found no trace of any "national problems." For decades, if not centuries, Russian propaganda has systematically sought to minimize the differences, for example, between the Russians, and the Ukrainians. More recently, it has exaggerated the degree to which ethnic "mixing" has taken place.

To be sure, there are many elements tending to moderate national conflicts in the Russian area: the lack of "natural" boundaries, large-scale population movements, "melting pot" conditions in new settlement areas, the use of the Russian language as a lingua franca, and lack of self-reliance among some of the eastern nations. Nevertheless, the age-old rules of experience teach us that nationalities may be submerged but do not disappear and that persons of mixed ancestry are particularly prone to uphold the rights of the more oppressed group in their parentage.

With respect to Western Europe, national differences may now be minimized—at least relatively to the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Entire libraries have been written since 1945 to prove that "nationalism" is outmoded and precludes progress. This naive interpretation of fundamental political psychology led to many false expectations, particularly with respect to "European integration." But nationalism, which in one way or another has been the controlling factor over all the world since the American Revolution, is not going to be a quantité négligeable in precisely the one area—the Soviet bloc—where national differences and struggles have been most acute and where no acceptable modus vivendi has been worked out with the dominant nation.

The national question remains of the highest importance within the Soveit Union, and even more so within the entire Soviet bloc, whether one includes China or not. National strife continues—sometimes openly—and is one of the factors which unavoidably imparts "dynamism" to the policies of Moscow. This sort of problem cannot be solved through an "accommodation" between Moscow and Washington or between the Soviet bloc and NATO. The rulers of the Kremlin are caught on the horns of the same dilemma which paralyzed the Austro-Hungarian Empire between 1848 and 1918. If federation is to be pursued as a real goal, then the overall state may weaken or fall apart and military strength and international prestige may be reduced substantially for many years. On the other hand, if the policy of centralism is continued and if nationalist sentiments and ambitions continue to grow, then internal pressure is likely to increase gradually until it culminates in destructive explosions. Austria-Hungary's inability to solve the "contradiction" between power and federalism became one of the predominating causes of World War I. The Soviet Union appears to be repeating the Austrian experience, despite the fact that the Kremlin has shown more dexterity in keeping national strife under control.

Honest differences are bound to arise among those engaged in evaluating the nature and significance of the national problem within the Soviet Union. But it would be foolhardy to ignore this problem, to assume blindly that it has been solved, and to overlook the dangers, pressures and constraints facing the Kremlin. The rulers in the Kremlin are not unaware that they may eventually have to liquidate their empire, and they have begun to consider the concept of "commonwealth." Still there is hardly any willingness to recognize that federalism must be allowed to progress within the U.S.S.R. and that centralism, whether or not required by economic planning, is not compatible with voluntary cooperation among free peoples.

It is only logical to assume that the nationality policy of the Soviet Union as applied within the bloc must be related to the objectives of communism. The "obliteration of national distinctions and especially of language distinctions" remains the Communist objective, as the party program of 1961 discloses. As long as the Communist government adheres to the notions (1) that the nations within the bloc form a "single family"; (2) that there must be ever "greater unity of the Soviet peoples"; (3) that the objective should be the achievement of a "greater social homogeneity of nations"; and (4) that until complete unity can be accomplished, the various nations should develop "common Communist traits in their culture, morals, and way of living," federalism remains a sham. To the Communists, "federalism" is a step leading from independent national statehood to the creation of a global "nation," not a method of preserving national distinctiveness and of combining the advantages of unity and diversity.

Conversely, were the foreign policy of Moscow based on the assumption that further incorporations of nations into the Soviet orbit are unnecessary, if not self-defeating, and that the objective of obliterating national distinctions is unattainable and wrong, then the relations between the nations within the bloc would change almost automatically. After all, the ideals of socialism refer to social structure, property forms and relationships, economic management, and productivity; they are not at all intrinsically bound to the notion of ultimate ethnic homogeneity. The concept of the world nation constitutes a most radical interpretation of the slogan in the Communist Manifesto that the proletarians have no fatherland. This particular interpretation would scarcely have been accepted by Marx and Engels. It never was developed in detail by Lenin or even Stalin, both of whom devoted considerable attention to national self-determination and alluded to the world nation only perfunctorily as an ultimate objective. The party program of 1961 admits that the obliteration of national and language distinctions "is a considerably longer process than the obliteration of class distinctions." (It should be added that class distinctions have not been disappearing within the Soviet Union.) From a strictly doctrinal point of view, the Soviets could shed this ideological baggage simply by leaving open the question of when national differences will have disappeared. In the meantime, as Stalin once stated, nationhood would have to be strengthened.

From a practical point of view, a basic reorientation of nationality policy within the Soviet Union would run into considerable economic difficulties. The planning system which evolved under Stalin and which had been characterized by Lenin as a "bureaucratic utopia" combines both centralized planning and centralized management. As the Soviet economy and social structure become more complex, centralization is proving a hindrance. Repeated attempts have been made to bring about a more decentralized system. The Soviet Government currently attempts to run the economy through more than a hundred regional economic councils which are constitutionally tied to the union republics and which dominate their governments. These councils are supposed to coordinate their decisions with each other but the system has proved to be unmanageable. Thus, a trend toward "recentralization" has recently emerged.

For decades, the Kremlin has been swinging back and forth between centralization and decentralization. But no trick has yet been invented to run a planned economy in a decentralized fashion. The Kremlin leaders seem to realize that they are caught in a "contradiction," but they do not know what to do about it. In some instances, the economic councils are set up in such a fashion that they tend to inhibit national integration within a union republic. Yet to the extent that this problem is soluble at all outside a market economy, genuine federalism might offer a new approach.

Capital in the Soviet Union is extremely scarce. It will remain scarce as long as the Soviet Government persists in continuing the world revolution, places disproportionate emphasis on armaments, attempts to achieve technological surprise, gives support to liberation movements in distant countries, and refuses to stick to its own problems. In the context of national struggle at home, scarcity of capital means that investments are made to strengthen the Communist dictatorship and its Russian power base, but not to stimulate the social and cultural development of each of the several nations. As seen from the national point of view, the Soviet economic system has many features that are reminiscent of colonial structures, where each particular colony was expected to fulfill an assigned economic function. Yet the quasi-colonial system under centralized economic planning entails more than the uneven development among the several "federated" nations: it also results in poor living standards for all.

To generalize from experiences within the free world: If the member states were to achieve political independence and yet maintain the socialist system, their economic interdependence would be broken up and economic nationalism would be rampant. Conversely, close economic collaboration and a "common market" could be preserved over the entire present Soviet territory, if the several states were to run their own economic affairs and were to do so under a market system.

It is highly unlikely that the present Kremlin rulers understand, or are willing to consider objectively, the complex interrelationships between world revolution, centralization, national independence and self-determination, socialism, common markets and living standards. But even if they were compelled, by economic logic or other circumstances, to accept a substantial degree of decentralization (in practice, not only in words) and to write off the world revolution, the Communist leadership—Great Russian in ethnic composition—would find it psychologically almost impossible to accept a political structure where major decisionmaking no longer remained a Moscow monopoly. They would rather give up socialism than take seriously article 17 of their constitution which accords the right "freely to secede from the U.S.S.R." to every union republic.

Thus, our opponent is not a national state, nor a true federation. There is much Russian imperialism, but this term explains merely part of a complicated reality. Many elements of Russian and non-Russian nationalisms, Communist objectives, economic planning and centralized management are intertwined with, and inseparable from, factors of cultural, political and strategic interdependence, centrifugence and centripetence. These inextricable interrelationships preserve the inertia of the overall system. If the world revolution were called off, the interdependence of these factors presumably would be lessened. But to maintain Russian predominance, the psychology of the Great Russian leadership group needs the ideology—or utopia—of secular messianism, the world revolution, and this ideology breeds conflict. Hence a considerable number of fundamental changes within the Soviet Un-

67-354 A A 30 M

ion, including psychological developments and a basic reform of the Soviet economic system, are required before the world crisis can abate.

MARXIST?

It is frequently asserted that the Soviet system is Marxist and hence dedicated to executing the Marxist blueprint for an ideal society. This assertion is on a par with the belief that Russia is a national state. Few people have ever bothered to read Marx, much less study his writings systematically. It may therefore be surprising to learn that Marx not only failed to provide a blueprint, but specifically refused to work out plans for a future society. In his mind, this particular refusal distinguished scientific from utopian socialism. There are, to be sure, passages in Marx which could be used for elaboration of a blueprint, and many quite different and contradictory blueprints have been worked out. There are, moreover, vast differences between the concepts Marx and Engels propounded in their early, middle, and late years. Despite the fact that Marx anticipated a Socialist mode of production, it remains highly questionable whether blueprinting is a proper Marxist methodology.

It may also come as a surprise to learn that (1) Marx was not a philosophical materialist, but is better described as a positivist; (2) the term "dialetic materialism" does not appear in his writings; (3) he was not an egalitarian; (4) he was not opposed to nationhood; (5) he did not believe that a revolution could be made; (6) he was against premature revolution; (7) despite lapses, he was extremely skeptical about political revolution; (8) he was, for most of his life, against conspiracy and dirty tricks; and (9) at least in the latter part of his life, he believed in social reform and to some extent even in democracy. Not political action, but the development of technological-industrial infrastructure was for him the prime mover of social organization. As far as he was concerned, the Socialist mode of production was going to arise because of changes in industrial technology and productivity, not because of revolutions changing the form of the state. The free world might as well admit that, despite exaggerations, confusions, contradictions, and factual errors, Marx was eminently right when he asserted that technology, productivity, and the basic organization of the economy are of overriding importance, whereas political action, in terms of basic social reorganization and economic progress, is an epiphenomenon.

Lenin departed markedly from Marx on most of these points. To him, political revolution was not only feasible but the prerequisite of social revolution. He favored premature revolutions which Marx rejected on the grounds that if the political revolution were to occur before the infrastructure had advanced sufficiently, no new political forms would emerge, but instead the old type of society corresponding to the still existing infrastructure would sooner or later reassert itself. Lenin originally favored a "bourgeoisie-democratic" revolution, but when revolutionary action proved successful, he embraced wholeheartedly the premature proletarian and peasant revolution, and thus abandoned Marx on his perhaps most significant theory. Marx' expectation, one might add, was amply borne out by the experience of the Bolshevik revolution.

Toward the end of his life, Lenin realized that some of his adjustments of Marxist theory were not valid. He came to believe that society would be changed only if and when cultural levels were raised. Since he did not want to negate his own life work, or abandon power, he argued that the dictatorship would facilitate the required cultural development—but he proceeded to tolerate a parital reestablishment of capitalism.

Stalin set up a system of state capitalism. Without compunction he also restored a highly stratified class society. After the extermination of the Bolshevik Party during the 1930's, Stalin in fact built up a structure which in many ways resembled the Nazi model (itself a modified copy of Lenin's state), except that Communist totaliarianism was more radical, notably in the economic sphere. The Soviet state can best be described as bureaucratic totalitarianism. The process through which the permature revolution was "countered" and a new ruling class established was described in truly Marxist terms by Milovan Djilas. Khrushchev deemphasized some "fascist" features of the Soviet state and tried to resuscitate some sort of "progressive" (instead of "fascist") "socialism."

Yet almost 50 years after the founding of the Communist state, none of the objectives for which the Socialists have been fighting has been accomplished. Many Soviet policies are diametrically opposed to the humane policies and ideals propounded by Socialist thinkers. In terms of Socialist criteria, the specific forms of socialism as practiced in the Soviet Union have been unsuccessful. It is admitted in Moscow that there are many different roads to the ultimate society. But it is not yet admitted that many different approaches would be feasible in the Soviet Union also, and that there is no point in sticking to methods that have proved ineffective or counterproductive.

These statements are not made in order to start an academic discussion or a war of quotations. The point is rather that Socialist theory has been little more than a vast generality. Even if this theory were basically true, the practical implementation of socialism could take many diffrent forms. As shown by the current experimentation with decentralized factory management and by the theory of Prof. Yevsey Liberman of Kharkov University according to which central planning, private incentives and profit seeking are compatible, the precise "mixes" between different types of ownership and planning could vary greatly by place and time. (There is, however, far less freedom of choice if in addition to economics, totalitarian politics must be considered.) It is virtually certain that Lenin never would have built the centralized system which Stalin invented. If Khrushchev had been serious about "de-Stalinization," he would not have adhered to this particular system. Nor need his successors retain the type of "socialism" that Stalin imposed.

For example, there is no particular reason why the collective farm system should be considered sacrosanct. Socialist States like Poland and Yugoslavia have found it advisable to modify this system considerably, almost to the point of abandoning it. For that matter, article 12 of the Soviet Constitution upholds the need for personal incentives; this article does not exclude agriculture. But collectivized agriculture permits of very few personal incentives. Fundamentally, the collective farm system is unproductive because the peasant lacks the incentive to do good work. He actually performs best on his private plot from which he supplies more than half of the proteins consumed in the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet Government has been fighting these private plots and has severely restricted them in size. From time to time, campaigns were waged against the practice of illegally expanding these plots. After Khrushchev's ouster, the legal size was increased. But if 1 or 2 acres are compatible with socialism, why not 3 or 4 acres? Does Socialist theory really require that as a private producer the peasant may have as many chickens as he wants, as well as a cow or a bull, but not a cow and a bull together? At present, collective farms are being deemphasized, whereas the state farms are increasingly preferred. These are indeed more effective—the farmer is treated like a proletarian and paid a wage—but this system, too, lacks incentives and hence productivity.

In the early days of the Soviet regime, decrees were issued abolishing money and instituting equal wages. At first Lenin did not know better, but he soon got the point and resolutely opposed this sort of foolishness. He ended up advocating a "conservative" monetary policy. Stalin later reintroduced a system of extreme inequality. The party program of 1961 contained this sentence: "Such instruments of economic development as cost accounting, money, price, production cost, profit, trade, credit, and finance play a big part." The program reiterated the tradition interpretation of Socialist theory that once the "Communist system of distribution is completed, commodity-money relations will become economically outdated and will wither away." Thus, the ideology still exacts obeisance. It is worth noting that in the draft program, the Soviets extolled the good old capitalist principle according to which "it is necessary to promote operations of enterprises to work for lower production costs and higher profitability," although in the version of the program that was finally accepted they talked more bashfully about the need "to work with more economy and frugality for reduction of expenses." The program also called for the "extension of operative independence and of the initiative of enterprises" as being "essential * * * to mobilize untapped resources and make more effective use of capital investments, production facilities and finances." It is hard to see where these notions differ from principles that prevail in the free market society.

There remains, of course, fundamental differences between the two systems. The existence of an enormous economic bureaucracy inhibits the initiative that is so badly needed. During the last decade, Soviet economists have gone to the school of capitalism, as Lenin advised them to, and even the "planners" have learned some lessons. Yet these lessons have not been applied effectively because the Soviet economy—essentially a conflict economy—could not be changed without changing psychology, motivation, and intention.

But there is no ideological reason why the Soviet economy could not be reformed in a very fundamental way. After all, socialism has the predominant objective of better living. This objective, which should have immutable dogmatic value, can only be reached through methods that have been pragmatically and experimentally—not dogmatically—tested. Such methods could very well include capitalist procedures; indeed, capitalism may be the best method of implementing socialism. There is no reason why methods which prove effective should not be adopted, regardless of their origin. On the contrary, the scientific attitude preached by Marx would call precisely for the adoption of the best and most productive methods.

SOVIET?

Bureaucracy in all its manifestations is perhaps the most outstanding feature of the Soviet system. Bureaucratic management of economy, policy, and thought is contrary to the spirit of Marx and Engels. Lenin was a totalitarian, but he too was strongly opposed to bureaucratic rule, especially when it was exercised by a dominant nationalist group like the great Russians. The party program of 1961 faintly echoes this opposition to bureaucracy, but it is obvious that the party does not know how to root out the excesses of bureaucracy and yet preserve the power of communism. If the Communist leaders were to take Marx and Lenin seriously, they would leave no stone unturned to change the system under which all classes of Soviet society

are chafing. But since, inter alia, totalitarianism is bureaucratism, the latter cannot be curbed without abolishing the former.

The official theory is that bureaucracy will be overcome through the institution of the soviet. As already pointed out, the West uses the term "soviet" interchangeably for "Communist" and "Russian." But what does "soviet" really mean, and why is the Communist state styled to be a "union" of "soviet republics?" Soviet means council, and the original soviet institution was democratic in intent, composition and, to lesser extent, function. The style of the Communist state could be translated as "union of democratic socialist republics." In this case, the expression "soviet" would denote merely a specific geographic and historical variant of the basic democratic institution, just as "Congress" and the "House of Commons" are specimens of democratic legislatures. However, the comparison would not be accurate because the soviet originally was a "parliament" of workers only, and subsequently of workers, peasants and soldiers. Thus, it was designed as a "class" and not as a "national" parliament. Nor was it ever a genuinely federative legislature.

There are additional distinctive elements, such as the 32-member "presidium" of the Supreme Soviet (which exercises executive functions) that Western parliaments do not possess. Soviets exist on all echelons of government, from the highest union level to the union republic and the autonomous republic, down to the municipality and the village. Since all these soviets fulfill executive functions, they are not purely legislative bodies. Moreover, many deputies hold jobs concurrently in the executive departments of the government and the party.

The several soviets are constitutionally independent. In actuality, they form one single body for, according to article 32 of the Soviet Constitution, the "legislative power of the U.S.S.R. is exercised exclusively by the supreme soviet." Thus, local legislation or self-government is nothing but implementation of central directives.

According to article 56, the Supreme Soviet, with both of its chambers sitting jointly, "appoints the Government of the U.S.S.R., namely the council of ministers." This implies a democratic selection of the Government. In reality, of course, the Soviet is not a democratic institution and the Government (which is but an executive arm of the party) is "elected" by means of cooptation and power struggles. The main function of the Soviet is to act as a "transmission belt" in order to gain popular support for party decisions. To put it in crude American terms, the Soviet serves as the party's foremost public relations agency. However, more is involved than mere public relations: together with the professed ideology, the Soviet supports the dictatorship's claim to legitimacy.

A few facts about the Soviets will be sufficient to demonstrate their undemocratic nature: Although pro forma elections are held, candidates are appointed by the Communist Party. Since there is just one candidate for each position, there is not even a chance to select from among the appointees. Within the Soviet itself, there is practically no discussion, let alone an orderly parliamentary debate. The sessions of the Supreme Soviet are extremely short and serve largely to ratify budgets or other bills submitted by the Government. Most of the deputies hold full-time jobs outside the Soviet, in many instances far away from Moscow. Their activity as members of the Supreme Soviet is restricted to listening to speeches by members of the Government.

Nevertheless, the Communists are extremely anxious to go through the motions of having their decisions ratified. Through ratification, orders, and decrees are formally transformed into laws and coopted rulers are legitimized as elected officeholders.

Theoretically, the evils of bureaucracy are to be mitigated by rotating a maximum number of citizens through the soviet as one- or two-term deputies. There is not much rotation, even through the lower level soviets, except in the case of mass and individual "purges." Practically all of the effective deputies, in one way or the other, belong to the bureaucracy, and are in line for promotion to higher executive office. Thus, the bureaucracy is little affected by the "control" exercised through the soviet.

In brief, soviet democracy is just as much a sham as Soviet federalism.

PARTY DEMOCRACY?

To understand the workings of the Communist state, it is necessary to look at the party and notably at the Central Committee of the CPSU. The rule is that the lower echelons of the party—via the Party Congress—elect the Central Committee as the party's executive body. The Central Committee in turn elects "its Presidium to direct the work of the Central Committee between plenary meetings" (art. 30 of the party statute). "All party members have the unlimited right to challenge candidates and to criticize them." The election of party bodies in which each candidate shall be voted upon separately "shall be effected by secret ballot" (art. 24). Article 27 calls for "discussion" and insures "for party members the free expression of their views." In the party statute of 1952 "free and businesslike discussion" was described as "the inalienable right of every party member" which "logically follows" from the notion of "party democracy." However, both the 1952 and 1961 statutes stipulated that discussion should serve to "preclude attempts to form factional groupings desroying party unity, attempts to split the party" (art. 27 of 1961). The term "businesslike" precludes discussion of basic principles.

Since 1921 the party has operated under a rule which forbids the forming of "factions." No groups may be formed to oppose the policy of the party Presidium. Persons who embark on sustained criticism are subject to expulsion from the party—or worse. In effect, the discussion is restricted to purely technical points, largely to techniques of implementation. The decisions themselves usually are protected against critical analysis.

This practice of "depoliticizing" allegedly parliamentary debates has been legally founded on the notion that candidates, both to the Supreme Soviet and in many instances also to the Central Committee, should be elected on the basis of their "personal and professional qualities." The electors should choose "the worthiest and most authoritative" of the candidates (party program of 1961). Thus, the members of the Soviet and of the second and lower echelon party bodies are chosen largely by virtue of their technical competence. They are experts and specialists, not generalists; they do not function as politicians (except as they may be involved in political activities on lower levels). Thus, if "parliamentary debates" take place at all, these are instrumental and functional but not political in nature.

In each election at least a quarter of the Central Committee and its Presidium should be renewed. There is the interesting variant that the central committees of the parties of the union republics should be renewed "by not less than one-third at each regular election." This stipulation is paralleled by a rule laid down in the party program (but not in the constitution) according to which at least one-third of the deputies to the Supreme Soviet should be renewed at each election. The "leading officials of the union should be elected to their offices, as a rule, for not more than three consecutive terms." However, in those cases where the incumbent has been making an outstanding contribution additional terms are allowed if he is elected by "no less than three-quarters of the vote." This means that the party and Soviet officials who, theoretically, possess the right to elect the executive officers, serve at the pleasure of the de facto rulers. Incidentally, when partisans of deposed rulers are to be evicted from the Central Committee or the Soviet, they apparently are simply expelled. The stipulated rules for recall are invoked but rarely.

Almost since its inception, the Bolshevik Party has claimed to be operating on the principle of "democratic centralism." This is supposed to signify that the decision-making officials are elected and subject to recall; that decisions are fully debated; that once the decisions are made the debate is closed; and that the entire party executes those decisions with full discipline, like an army, under the central direction of the highest organs. Party documents are silent about the procedures that would be required to bring about reconsideration or modification of faulty decisions; the initiative apparently rests entirely in the hands of the highest party leaders.

In practice, the Bolshevik Party has ignored democracy and insisted on centralism and discipline. According to concept, the Central Committee is a sort of party parliament. In reality, the committee serves as a sort of general staff or, more accurately, as the Presidium's most important strategic planning organ. It also handles operational research and fulfills a few executive functions, for example, in the areas of intelligence, internal security, and propaganda.

The no faction rule is now less rigorously applied than under Stalin. In at least one instance Chairman Khrushchev used the Central Committee and its theoretical authority to defeat his opponents. Similarly, his overthrow was engineered through the Central Committee (with generous assistance from the army and the KGB). Yet in both instances the factions were formed in the Presidium itself.

The secretariat—the executive organ which Stalin had used to seize power—directs party work whenever the Presidium and the Central Committee are not in session. Since 1923, it has been the true locus of the dictatorial power within the U.S.S.R. Apparently it still is the supreme organ. But in Khruschev's overthrow the Central Control Commission—the only important organ that belongs both to the party and the government—for the first time played a key role. Also the secretariat of the Ukrainian branch of the CPSU made an impact for the first time. Obviously since Khrushchev controlled the Central Party secretariat, other organizations had to be used in the attack against him. According to the party statute, these various executive party organs have been exercising power illegally. In any event, they have been exceeding their authority at the expense of the Central Committee.

From a purely formal point of view, the "no fraction" rule amounts to the suspension of party democracy. Assume that the entire nation were wedded to the Communist ideology and that all members of the party were faithful Communists intending to accomplish the ultimate doctrinal aim: there is still no blueprint for the attainment of the Communist objective. Even if there were, changing circumstances soon would render blueprints obsolete. The road toward communism must be walked step by step but the precise nature of each step is not predetermined. Hence vast differences of opinion concerning the most advisable next steps are inevitable, even among the most authentic Communists. An organ to compose those differences through parliamentary debate seems indispensable. But no such organ exists.

MONOLITHIC IDEOLOGY?

Historically, the party always has been composed of a center, a rightist and a leftist

group. By and large, the center group has held power since Lenin's time, but there have been alternations between rightist and leftist, or "reformist" and "radical" periods. Lenin's first year was rightist in foreign and leftist in economic affairs. During 1920 he was leftist in his foreign policy. From 1921 on he was rightist in virtually all his policies and opposed left radicalism as an infantile disease. Stalin veered strongly to the left in 1929 and to the right during the purges. Khrushchev had several left phases, but at the end of his regime he tended toward a right course.

Despite these fluctuations at the center, there has almost always been a left and a right opposition. The right "reformists" or "opportunists" are inclined to adopt cautious policies and are willing to learn from mistakes in a nondoctrinal manner. The left radicals tend toward "adventurism" which in the economic and social sphere often leads them to advocate more or less utopian measures, and in the foreign sphere induces them to revolution making and wars. These radicals proclaim vociferously that they uphold ideological orthodoxy. Naturally, the reformists also claim they are devoted to ideological purity.

Undoubtedly, there are limits to the types of actions Communists can or cannot take as long as they remain Communists. But the range of choices is actually very broad. A whole host of diverse policies could be supported through apt quotations from the pertinent scriptures. In some areas the doctrine never was firmed up by the founding fathers but emerged from Soviet practices. This happened, most surprisingly, with the theory of property, which is widely considered to be the core of the overall theory of socialism. The absence of informed debate among people who profess the same ideal has hampered and not promoted the Communist cause; in fact, it has led to the erosion of the Communist doctrine. At the same time, the increasing variety of East European Communist policies attests to the plasticity of an allegedly monolithic doctrine.

DICTATORSHIP?

There is, for example, no theoretical basis for the argument that Communist society must be built through perennial dictatorship exercised by a usurpatory party clique, nor the contention that those party members who are in power should not be restricted by any law, but should make decisions in the arbitrary way autocratic czars used to rule. This notion was created by Stalin to legitimize his own personal power; Lenin deeded to him certain arguments and precedents.

Marx conceived of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" as the rule of a vast majority; he was thinking also of the Roman model; i.e., of a temporary dictatorship acting lawfully in a transistory crisis situation. Lenin envisaged minority rule and postulated the need for decisionmaking even by a single dictator, but he also called for full debates within the party. Whatever his faults, he would not have accepted Stalin's extreme totalitarianism. The party program of 1961 asserted that since the victory of socialism is now "complete and final," the "dictatorship of the proletariat has fulfilled its historical mission and has ceased to be indispensable in the U.S.S.R. from the point of view of the tasks of internal development." Therefore, "the dictatorship of the working class will cease to be necessary before the state withers away." Statements of this sort are not meant to be taken too seriously. Nevertheless, they do reflect a certain attitude: the dictatorship just is not popular even within the CPSU.

Two key elements are hidden behind the term "dictatorship"; power and decisionmaking. At this stage in history, the Communists cannot possibly compromise with their power monopoly; otherwise they would be "liquidated." On the other hand, the methods of decisionmaking which have been applied in the past—and have resulted occasionally in some excellent, but mostly in mediocre and frequently in counterproductive, types of performance—are in urgent need of reform. Autocracy allows rapid action, but the more complex a society becomes, the less effective is the arbitrary decisionmaking by the power monopolist. Complexity requires that government be broadly based on expert knowledge, different factual interpretations, varied estimates of future developments, and objective auditing of past decisions. In a Communist state, too, the question of optimal governmental organization remains of the utmost importance.

If we assume that the building of a Communist society is a realistic objective—and this assumption certainly must be made by every Communist—it would seem to follow that this difficult undertaking requires the most stringent limitations on the exercise of personal power for personal purposes. A political system which permits an absolutist rule of 30 years by a single tyrant displaying obvious signs of mental illness is an unfit system, whether it proclaims to be Communist or exhibits some other ideological figleaf. Even if the course of history toward communism were predetermined, the awe-inspiring task of reorganizing a multinational society, of developing new types of social institutions, and of striving for the socioeconomic and political reorganization of the entire globe, not to mention the remolding of men, would require the most intelligent and selfless leadership. Such a task, if pursued vigorously, must strain the energies of the healthiest and most energetic person. There is nothing in the theory of communism which calls for personal power. On the contrary, communism purports to strive for the rational organization of society—personal power by aging politicians is the most irrational of all forms of government.

If the essence of the social revolution were deemed to be political struggle, the emphasis on power and even autocratic power might make sense. Lenin and Stalin did play up the significance of the political struggle to the utmost. But theirs was not a Marxist point of view. As early as 1843 Engels, comparing the industrial revolution of England with the political revolution of France, said that the English revolution probably would reach its objective more safely because it was social in nature and therefore more all-inclusive and fundamental. (For this very reason the American Revolution has made a far greater contribution to the emancipation of mankind than the Russian Revolution.)

The very fact that in the U.S.S.R. there has been unlimited tenure in office, that the leading decisionmakers have not been subjected to criticism, nor been replaced regularly by orderly procedure, is evidence enough that power as such has become far more important to Communist leaders than the construction of communism. Lack of provisions for orderly succession in party and government have enthroned the power struggle as the main arbiter in the Soviet Union. But the fortunes of this struggle are always unpredictable, even to the main protagonists. This absence of orderly government has rendered Soviet behavior completely unpredictable.

Suppose the terms of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers and of the First Party Secretary were restricted to 4 or 8 years. Suppose policies were debated in proper parliamentary fashion within the Supreme Soviet and the Central Committee. Suppose there were no restrictions on factions. Suppose there were an arrangement whereby major officeholders could be retired through votes of no confidence. Suppose the governing bodies must enjoy, on each major measure, the support of a majority in the Central Committee and in the Soviets. Suppose elections to the Central Committee and to the various Soviets were genuine and allowed party members and citizens to choose among several Communist candidates. If these suppositions were to come true, the system would have evolved in a truly significant manner.

Reforms of this type would be compatible with the professed Communist doctrine. In fact, only under the conditions of a broadly based political consensus would it be feasible to gain popular confidence and wholehearted support for the construction of communism. Only if there is orderly government that is oriented toward the commonweal can there be assurance that the historically necessary decisions will be taken and proletarian class consciousness will triumph over the power interests of a usurpatory ruling class.

REFORM?

Despite the dictatorial traditions of Bolshevik politics since 1903, an authentic Communist, certainly a convinced Marxist, must devoutly hope for the democratic reform of the Soviet system. This hope should be shared by non-Marxists. If basic reforms could be drawn up and then implemented without triggering an uncontrollable domestic crisis, the dangers of protracted international conflict would be reduced. Instead, peaceful competition could become a reality. Genuine competition need not be detrimental to either of the rival systems, but could stimulate both. Should communism turn out to be more productive than the West anticipated, it might be wise for the West to adopt certain features of the Communist economic system. Similarly—and this would be in line with free world understanding of coexistence and peaceful competition—the Soviets should adopt useful features from the market system or, upon proof of its better performance, even be ready to take over the market system as a whole.

To insure progress in that direction, the Communist doctrine needs to be reinterpreted in the light of changing circumstances. After all while Marx was talking about a future "classless" society, he did not define "class." Many structures are conceivable which could satisfy Marx' definition of "classlessness." He placed major emphasis on the creative role of history; and history has taught us much about effective and ineffective methods of sociopolitical progress. We may grant that Marx' prophecy, according to which the position of the proletariat would be vastly improved and the labor class would be "emancipated," was borne out by events, albeit in forms different from those anticipated. Surely, the Marxists should now be able to admit that there can be no terminal point in history and that therefore communism cannot be the final, complete or only answer to all human problems. According to the historic evidence, the two main types of economic structure, the centrally and the freely managed economies, can exist side by side and can be mixed in different proportions at different times in the same or in different countries. The key point in economics is not whether bureaucratic management is preferable to entrepreneurial management: the key point is to release all those "productive forces" which, because of one constraint or the other, are prevented from functioning at top effectiveness.

In Marxist terms, a state capitalist system was established in the Soviet Union and it represents largely the interests of heavy industry; light industry, trade, transportation, and agriculture have remained underdeveloped. In this system, the surplus value is largely appropriated by the state, which is dominated by a ruling class of party lords. The state insures the exploitation of the proletariat for the benefit of the bureaucracy, parts of the intelligentsia and the ruling class; and the exploitation of the peasants

for the benefit of the proletariat and the city inhabitants. The society as a whole is exploited for the purpose of producing arms needed for the international power struggle waged by the ruling class. Thus, Soviet society is not a society of producers but a conflict society within which the class struggle is suppressed through coercion. At the same time, the productive forces are in contradiction with social relationships and the political superstructure. As a result, productivity is reduced and progress delayed.

This highly non-Marxist structure arose in part because the Bolshevik Revolution was premature. The old political structure reemerged—albeit in different form—in part because the bolsheviks misunderstood and distorted Marxism. The task would now seem to be to overthrow the ruling class of party oppressors, to liquidate bureaucratism as Lenin had demanded, and to complete the social revolution for the benefit of all classes, thereby reducing or overcoming class distinctions. If one so desires, the need for reform can just as well be argued in non-Marxist terms.

THE PROSPECT OF REFORM

The need for reform is recognized by alert citizens throughout the Soviet Union. Even members of the Communist Party appear to have become impressed by the utility of reform. In one way or the other, the political debates since the death of Stalin have revolved around this very problem. The argument now centers around two questions: First, how significant are the reforms that have been accomplished? Second, will there be further reforms which will culminate in a basic transformation?

Traditionally, the affairs of Russia, Rossiya and the Soviet Union have been interpreted by two sharply cleaved schools, the optimists and pessimists. Both schools have their intellectual antecedents in the 18th century and both include Russian and non-Russian observers. Otto Hoetzsch, a foremost representative of the optimistic school, wrote in 1913: "Russia's connection with Europe already is too close, its capitalist and constitutional development too much advanced to allow Russia to fall back into barbarism." For more than a century, the optimists have believed that the Russians are about to adapt psychologically to Western traditions and thought patterns.

This optimistic school has influenced the policies of practically all European states and the United States. By contrast, the pessimists, at all times, have found it practically impossible to gain a sizable following. Before 1917 the optimists were largely recruited among "reactionary elements" like Bismarck and the French general staff; British liberals, especially since 1905, also tended toward the optimistic interpretation. After the revolution of 1917, the formerly pessimistic moderate and radical "left" turned optimistic. Interestingly enough, one of the best informed protagonists of the pessimistic school was none other than Karl Marx, who violently opposed the contemporary version of pro-Russian accommodation and appeasement and who believed that Russian policy had not changed since the 14th century. Marx's analyses of Russian policies still make timely reading.

These two diametrically opposed interpretations still exist and continue to influence Western policies. Both have proved to be vast oversimplifications. What does the historical record really show? Risking oversimplification on my part, I will restrict this discussion to a few salient points.

Among Russian rulers mental affliction has been quite frequent. The really "insane" Russian rulers include such figures as Ivan IV, Paul I, the last czarina, and Stalin. Nicholas II suffered from paralysis of will. His last Minister of the Interior, on whom rested much of the responsibility for the destruction of the czarist system, suffered from cerebral disease. Lenin, and apparently Stalin, too, were the victims of cerebral arteriosclerosis. There are, in addition, two 19th century czars who may have committed suicide: The relevant documentation which would allow the final clarification of this historical mystery has not yet been released, although in the case of Czar Nicholas I an occasional hint that he did commit suicide has appeared in Soviet literature.

During the 18th and 19th centuries, and for most part during the Communist regime, succession usually was achieved according to the rules of Machiavelli: the person who finally ascended to supreme authority usually relied on a series of crimes and homicides. The succession from Alexander I to Nicholas I was not criminal but irregular, and was accompanied by revolutionary unrest within the army. At the moment when Czar Alexander II was about to promulgate a constitutional reform, he fell victim to a bomb thrown by revolutionaries who may have enjoyed the support of highly placed opponents of the czar within the palace. Alexander III died prematurely as a result of medical complications arising, after a delay, from injuries sustained in the bombing of his train. Nicholas II was overthrown through violence and treachery, and he and his family were subsequently murdered. The Kerensky regime also was overthrown by violence and treachery. The sickness and death of Lenin were influenced by criminal—or at least hostile—actions on the part of Stalin, who subsequently murdered most of his other competitors. Stalin's own demise might have been "accelerated" and "insured." Khrushchev's rise to power was marked by the violent death of Beria. Khrushchev's overthrow in 1964 was the most regular change of government which Russia has known for 70 years, but it also was in the nature of a coup.

In addition, a considerable number of important ministers and political leaders, especially those pressing for reform, fell victim to attentats and purges, for example, Stolypin, Kirov, Bukharin, and perhaps Malenkov. Under both the czarist and the Communist regimes the secret police were partly or wholly responsible for these killings.

It does not, of course, follow that the historical pattern must inevitably continue. But it would be foolhardy to disregard the historical record and to assume that there is a Russian tradition of orderly succession, when in fact there is a tradition of succession through violence.

The difficulty of enacting reform has been a second traditional feature of the Russian state. There always has been an excessively long time lag between the moment when the need for reform was recognized and the actual inception of the reform. Furthermore, the reform, even after its adoption, usually was designed to be extremely slow in achieving results. There always has been, especially during the 19th and 20th centuries, a great deal of talk but very little action. The execution of reform measures usually rendered the political struggle more acute. In many instances the opponents of the reform succeeded in overpowering its advocates. The antireform regimes tended to be more stable than the progressive governments.

As an additional characteristic, reforms often suffered from basic defects in concept. This was so partly because Russia lacked economic resources but also because most reforms were in the nature of compromises through which the ruling class tried to preserve substantial parts of the status quo. The classic example was the emancipation of the serfs (1861) which resulted in perennial agrarian crises. Each crisis affected the peasants and the landholders, and weakened the society as a whole. It was one of the causes of the revolutions which occurred half a century later. Even today this misconstrued reform still casts its shadow on Russian society. A wiser reform measure could have been devised, but the problem was not mastered intellectually and it might have been difficult to finance an effective reform; inertia prevented the government from even trying to repair the damage before 1907, i.e., after the first violent revolution had occurred.

This tradition of procrastination and poor planning was perhaps a natural outgrowth of the patience and docility of the Russian people and also of many non-Russian nations. (However, non-Russians, in particular Poles, Jews, Caucasians, Balts and Ukrainians, provided a disproportionately large segment of revolutionary leadership.) Russian patience, to be sure, never was endless and from time to time was broken, in which case anarchy and catastrophes shook the empire for years. The chaos invariably was succeeded by a new experiment in tyranny. Today, the proverbial Russian patience may no longer be what it was. But it is not enough to become impatient; one must also know what one wants to accomplish. The Russians—and possibly also the other nations within the Bolshevik empire—will probably continue to ignore advantagous alternatives.

The many ill-advised experiments with electoral and pseudo-parliamentary systems, which various Russian governments have undertaken since 1905, have so far precluded the development of mature political consciousness. The Russians are highly patriotic, but their attitudes toward the state and toward their own responsibilities as citizens are ambivalent. Their skepticism about the state (paradoxically paired with a naive belief in state ownership of means of production) is so great that they usually prefer inertia and status quo to reform. They adapt best to continuity and prefer a familiar system which they know to an improved system that may call for new behavior patterns. The experience of centuries suggests that this commitment to passivity is by no means irrational. Indeed, meaningful reform presupposes the cutting of a whole string of Gordian knots and therefore implies uncertainty as well as insecurity.

This is not to suggest that the Russians (or Ukrainians or Soviets or Communists) could not carry out effective reforms. The agrarian reform of 1907 was highly successful and demonstrated that the capability for reform exists. Nevertheless, this reform also failed because the ruling group mistakenly believed that its ultimate success would doom the regime instead of stabilizing it. This fear was one of the factors that contributed to the outbreak of World War I. The political and social reforms that characterized the last years of the tsarist regime proved fruitless. Similarly, under the bolshevik regime the new economic policy (NEP) reform worked effectively for about 8 years. But power struggles also brought this attempt at progress to a bloody end.

The traditional Russian state, just as Marx asserted 100 years ago, is essentially an instrument of power and conflict and has not materially changed. It remains autocratic, bureaucratic, militaristic, and oriented to its traditional objective: conquest, expansion, and empire building. The present objective, however, involves all of the globe and all of mankind. This is a fundamental qualitative difference between tsarism and the far more dangerous and skillful Communist totalitarianism.

The Russian state has not undergone much of a structural change. The old nobility was largely of a bureaucratic type and the new bureaucrats enjoy their privileges as did their predecessors: the nobility patent has given way to the party book. In the old days, the tsar was an autocratic ruler; the dictator of the Communist state is nothing less. Just as the tsar was forced to cooperate with the influential grand dukes and the high aris-

tocracy, so the dictator must cooperate with the upper echelon in the party and the managerial-scientic elites. Now as before, the centralized state is the product of the drive and ambitions of the power elite and of the lack of initiative on the part of the "intermediate strata," as well as of the passivity of the ruled. Now as then, there are parliamentary (or quasi-parliamentary) bodies that could be used to better purposes but these potentialities are ignored. Now as before, the Russian aptitude for conducting political business through parliamentary methods remains underdeveloped, and political thinking remains excessively dogmatic and conflict oriented. Under the red as well as under the white tsars the terror machine holds effective powers of veto even against the dominant ruling group.

Thus, we have every reason to predict that the power elite will not abdicate voluntarily. It also can be predicted that this elite, in order to stay in power, must carry out reforms. If the historical pattern remains unbroken, we may also risk the prediction that these reforms will come too late and will not be appropriate in concept. Even if they are properly conceived, such reforms will arouse violent opposition and will accentuate the internal and, in the last analysis, also the external power struggle.

It is entirely legitimate to view the chances of reform more optimistically. Yet this does not excuse us from evaluating the obstacles to reform with the utmost realism.

STRATEGIC CONCLUSIONS

The process of internal Soviet reform is interrelated with U.S. and NATO strategy. In some ways, Soviet reform or lack of reform is a feedback from international developments. Free world strategy could be reoriented to increase the chances that the reform movements within the Soviet Union will be successful. This means that the free world must ally itself with the progressive and liberal elements inside the Communist dictatorship. It must not, as has been the case so far, play up to the reactionaries, for example, by assuming that the totalitarian dictatorship, tel quel, is "here to stay."

This is not to imply that Western strategy should foment revolutions within the Soviet Union; in large measure such an approach would entail the wrong risks and, for all that, might remain impractical. The implication is rather that the free world should take all those measures, including intellectual persuasion and the display of alternatives, through which gradual evolutionary and lasting reform within the Soviet area could be facilitated.

Admittedly, a strategy designed to supply the yeast instead of the change itself may appear to be overly cautious. But our purpose is to establish a foundation for durable pacification and not to impose our will on nations that are entitled to determine their own fate. Lack of comprehension of what constitutes a strategy of pacification (not appeasement) has induced many false steps in the past. These mistakes, inspired by optimism and sometimes by illusionism, did not preserve peace but even helped to bring about armed conflict.

The free world must understand that the great social transformation which began in Russia approximately in 1825 has not been completed; that the present regime represents a backward step on the road toward emanicaption; that the aspirations of the peoples and nations inhabiting the Soviet Union still remain those which inspired the revolutions of 1905 and 1917; and that there has been no end to class rule, exploitation and oppression of man by man in Russia. The totalitarian system remains essentially unchanged. So long as totalitarianism survives, so long the danger of total war will persist. It is as simple as that.

It follows that the proper free world strategy should be one of strength and firmness but also of helpfulness to the population (instead of assistance toward freezing the status quo, i.e., the dictatorship). Such a strategy cannot rely simply on such means as psychological warfare or military pressure, although none of our capabilities can be abandoned or left unused. Free world strategy should seek to promote social and political progress, not just in the underdeveloped areas but also in the Soviet Union. At present this strategy must be implemented largely by intellectual means. Lenin was correct when he wrote in 1904 that "the word also is a deed." This principle, he added, applies to history in general but in particular to those epochs when there can be "no open political action of the masses which can neither be replaced by a putsch nor be created artificially." Western policymakers often fail to see the opportunities for action that exist in the broad area between inaction and extreme action. The intermediary types of action are those which entail lesser risks and which, though their effects are slow in coming, have the strongest ultimate impact on events.

A strategy of the intellect toward social and political progress may be of no avail. In all events, the free world must maintain its military strength as the very foundation on which all constructive efforts must be based. But if a strategy that aims at political self-reform in the U.S.S.R. were to succeed, we might truly enter the hoped-for era of détente and peaceful coexistence. At the present time, the cold war continues and there is no assurance that major catastrophes can be prevented. Hence it is high time to rethink the principles of American strategy.

Banking and Currency Committee Deserves Much Credit for 1965 Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the entire House must be proud of the superb job by the Banking and Currency Committee on the 1965 housing bill. Our distinguished colleague from Texas, WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the full committee, is to be congratulated on this landmark legislative proposal which will come to the House floor very shortly. Representative BILL BARRETT of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, did a very able job of helping steer this very complex bill through many days of hearings where important witnesses were heard.

The bill as reported out of the committee is a very practical and workable proposal, yet admirably suited toward meeting the challenging housing needs of the United States. At the same time, it provides an invaluable foundation for solving our long-term housing problems many years into the future. The May 28 issue of the Washington Post carried an excellent editorial on our Banking Committee's achievement, remarking that the bill represents solid workmanship by the committee and is stronger now than when the committee took it up.

The entire editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 28, 1965]

HOPE FOR HOUSING

Solid workmanship, rather than creative brilliance, is the House Banking Committee's style. It has, characteristically, greatly strengthened the weakest aspects of the administration's housing bill. But it has simultaneously dulled one of its most interesting innovations, the new towns proposal.

Perhaps the committee may be correct in thinking that the country is not yet ready for new towns; certainly the old cities are not, for they sent their mayors to the Capitol with tears in their eyes to plead that the new towns constitute unfair competition. The committee kindly deleted that inflammatory phrase, "new town," to pacify the mayors. But it substituted Federal land mortgage insurance up to $12.5 million for a single development; mortgages for undeveloped land have never before been insurable. Since $12.5 million is nearly the cost of the land on which Reston is being built, the committee can hardly be said to have abandoned the idea of a Federal new towns policy altogether.

The bill will, no doubt, be attacked chiefly on its courageous proposal to subsidize the rents of families with low incomes. The administration had originally intended to give subsidies only to families with too much income to live in public housing, but the absurdity of that policy is obvious in a country where the volume of public housing falls fearfully short of the need. The committee has, very sensibly, proposed subsidies to the very poor as well as to their comparatively more fortunate neighbors.

A series of new departures in public housing will permit local authorities to buy or rent existing homes for families who can pay only part of their rent. Through an ingenious system of pooling mortgages, the committee expects to increase the amount of private money invested at low rates in nonprofit housing. The administration has apparently been persuaded not to give up its program of housing through low-interest mortgages, a program that is only now beginning to pick up momentum.

On balance, the bill is stronger now than when the committee took it up. It gives great promise of becoming a landmark in the development of a broad and imaginative Federal housing policy.

General Jail Delivery in Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the following editorial from the Marion, Ohio, Star as an indication of the thinking in the Midwest about some of the Supreme Court's decisions:

GENERAL JAIL DELIVERY IN OHIO

In 1912, the voters of Ohio amended the State constitution to provide that failure of a defendant in a criminal case to testify might be considered by the court and jury and made the subject of comment by counsel.

This was the year of the Progressive movement led by Teddy Roosevelt, who addressed the Ohio Constitutional Convention and ran for President.

Five judges of the U.S. Supreme Court now have held that this specific provision of the Ohio constitution violates the general rule of the Constitution of the United States against self-incrimination.

Justice Douglas held the Ohio practice "a remnant of an inquisitional system."

We leave the constitutional debate to the judges who divided 5–2–1 in their opinions.

There remains the question how the Ohio procedure can be a relic of the Middle Ages when it was voted by the people of Ohio in 1912 at the high tide of the liberal movement in politics led by Teddy Roosevelt.

Once again, five judges in Washington have outvoted almost 300,000 Ohio citizens. Is this the way to encourage democracy and public votes on issues? Does this promote experiment by trial and error in our Government?

The end result in Ohio and five other "backward" States, like California and Connecticut, will be a general release from jail of murderers, rapists, and others convicted since 1912.

New trials in most cases will be impossible due to the passage of time and disappearance of witnesses. By such decisions, the Supreme Court scarcely "insures the domestic tranquillity" which the Founding Fathers stated as a cherished purpose of our new Nation.

Tennessee's New Technical Information Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, technical information forms the foundation for any successful business today. But sometimes industry has been too far away from the source of information to acquire it quickly.

Recently, however, came the announce that Tennessee was meeting this problem with new technical information centers to be located at the public libraries in Memphis, Nashville, Chattanooga, and Knoxville. In effect, TIC will form a network of special university and metropolitan libraries, tied together as though their combined holdings were a single library.

At each center, a qualified librarian will handle requests relayed from other libraries or received directly from an industrial customer. Requests will arrive by rapid communications, and a thorough search will be made for the desired material from special reference volumes, extensive periodical holdings, and expanded subject interest collections at hand. If answers are unavailable on this level, the doors of every library in the State will swing open to the TIC librarian. If the answer is not in the State, TIC will find it elsewhere.

The service is administered by the Tennessee State Library and Archives Commission and financed with State and Federal funds.

Mrs. Margaret J. Barr, of Memphis, State chairman of National Library Week, told me about this new program. Since Tennessee is the only State to have this type of program in operation, I thought it might be of interest to my colleagues.

Charles F. McCarty, M.D., 1890–1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: tribute to the late Charles F. McCarty, M.D., which appeared in the May issue of the bulletin of the Medical Society of the County of Kings and Academy of Medicine of Brooklyn. Dr. McCarty was for many years the executive director of the society, a distinguished member of the medical profession and an outstanding citizen. He will be greatly missed by the members of his profession and the entire community. I have lost a good and valued friend.

The tribute follows:

CHARLES F. MCCARTY, M.D., 1890–1965

With profound sorrow, we record the passing of Dr. Charles F. McCarty, for many years the eminent executive director of the Medical Society of the County of Kings, a distinguished physician, a prominent citizen, and a valued friend. His death, on January 29, 1965, at the age of 74 years, marks an irreparable loss to this society, to the medical profession, to his colleagues and friends, and to our entire community.

Dr. McCarty was born in Hancock, N.Y., on October 2, 1890. As a boy he grew up in this rural community and was educated in its public schools. In later life, he always had a fond attachment for Hancock, and returned there frequently on weekends and during his summer vacations.

He was graduated from the Fordham University School of Medicine in 1913; and then completed internships at St. Mary's Hospital in Brooklyn and at Misericordia Hospital in Manhattan.

He served as a first lieutenant, later as captain, in the U.S. Army Medical Corps during World War I.

On entering practice in Brooklyn, Dr. McCarty held positions as assistant neurologist, then associate neurologist, at St. Mary's Hospital, Holy Family Hospital, and Greenpoint Hospital, all in Brooklyn. Later he became an assistant, subsequently an associate in physical medicine at the Beekman Street Hospital, 1926–30.

His interest, experience, and development in Brooklyn of the science of physical medicine led to his appointments as director of physical medicine at the Brooklyn Hospital and St. Mary's Hospital (1933–40) and attending in physical medicine at Kings County Hospital (1928–1930). In 1927, he organized the section on physical medicine for the medical society of the county of Kings, serving as its president for the first 2 years.

In 1930, Dr. McCarty was appointed director of physical medicine for the Department of Hospitals, city of New York, and he served in that capacity for 4 years. During this time, he organized the department of physical medicine in 12 municipal hospitals of the city of New York. In 1932 and 1933, he was honored as president of the New York Society of Physical Medicine.

In 1934, he became assistant medical director of the Emergency Relief Bureau of the Department of Welfare, city of New York; and was promoted to medical director in 1935.

He resigned this position in 1939 to assume the directorship of medical activities for the Medical Society of the County of Kings. In 1945, he became the executive director of the medical society, presiding in this capacity until his retirement in October 1962 at which time he was elected to consultant director.

He served as editor of the bulletin of the Medical Society of the County of Kings from 1939 to 1955, and as managing editor until his retirement.

During World War II, Dr. McCarty served as secretary of the War Participation Committee of the Medical Society of the County of Kings. In this role, he was actively interested in the formation of local draft board examining teams, medical advisory boards, boards of appeal, the OPA, local rationing boards, the Red Cross blood program, and the Emergency Medical Service of Civil Defense for the borough of Brooklyn. For his outstanding efforts and tireless energy in these endeavors, he received a citation from the U.S. Government.

Dr. McCarty was an active supporter and firm believer in the functions and purposes of the coordinating council of the five county medical societies, and he acted as secretary for this body from 1939 until 1950. Thereafter, until May 1962 he was secretary of the first district branch of the Medical Society of the State of New York.

Dr. McCarty served as a delegate from the Medical Society of the County of Kings to the Medical Society of the State of New York from 1939 to 1962; and was chairman of the credentials committee to the house of delegates, 1940 to 1960. He was chairman of the board of tellers to the house of delegates, from 1941 to 1960.

Despite his dedication to the activities of organized medicine, Dr. McCarty was a devoted husband and father. On June 18, 1924, he was married to Mary L. Delahanty of Troy, N.Y.; and to this union were born Charles F. McCarty, Jr., a West Point graduate and now a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army; Mary L. McCarty, now Mrs. Schoos, a former wave married to a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis and now a housewife living in New Jersey; and Helena M. McCarty, now Mrs. Miller, a former schoolteacher and now wife of a prominent Brooklyn attorney.

Beneath the mantle of a consecrated doctor and resourceful administrator was a kindly, humble, friendly, lovable, gracious, congenial man, endeared to each of us. Devoted to his religion, yet unbiased and fully respectful of that of others, Dr. McCarty did what was good and what the Lord did require of him:

"Only to do justly, and to love mercy,
And to walk humbly with thy God."

Therefore be it resolved, That in token of esteem and friendship, the secretary be instructed to spread this memorial upon the minutes of this society, and to transmit a copy thereof to the family of Dr. Charles F. McCarty.

THURMAN GIVAN, M.D., *Chairman.*
LOUIS BERGER, M.D.,
WARREN A. LAPP, M.D.,
SOLOMON SCHUSSHEIM, M.D.,
LESLIE H. TISDALL, M.D.

Jobs for Youth: Good Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the fol-

lowing editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Monday morning, May 24, 1965:

JOBS FOR YOUTH: GOOD BUSINESS

Every summer there is a pressing need for gainful and meaningful employment of young people, many of them still in the processes of becoming educated during other seasons of the year. But, as President Johnson has accurately noted, this year the postwar babies are joining the job hunt in large numbers and special efforts must be made.

The Government's finding of 75,000 jobs will be only a drop in the bucket. Mr. Johnson has asked States, cities and private industry to stir around and come up with at least 500,000 new jobs—and the total in the age bracket of 16 to 21 who may be looking has been estimated at up to 2 million.

The use of the State employment offices as clearinghouses for this emergency function is probably well conceived; it may only be hoped that need and response do not flounder under paper shuffling.

In any event, we believe the President is quite right in principle—that really useful work, especially if it has training characteristics, is not only good for the young men and women themselves but also for the community and the Nation. Our supply of the well trained cannot be too great and many, if not all, of the young people with whom Mr. Johnson is now concerned need the money they can earn to continue their formal education.

The specific problems they are beginning to encounter now are, perhaps, only peripheral to the war on poverty proper, but they are worthy of special consideration nonetheless: If for no other reason (and there are many others) than to reduce the artificial and nonsensical barrier between we (elders) and they (juveniles) which sometimes hides the fact that we are all inhabitants of one country, essentially sharing one another's problems, outlook and even identity.

Bloomfield, Iowa, Newspaper Notes 30th Anniversary of the REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration was 30 years old on May 11. Several Members of the House of Representatives commented at that time on the constructive role the REA has played in the development of rural America.

I would like to add to the tributes paid the REA by calling to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the May 25, 1965, issue of the Davis County Republican of Bloomfield, Iowa.

As the editorial points out, the REA is responsible for bringing to farm families many of the benefits of electrical service formerly enjoyed only by those in urban areas. And, as the editorial also notes, there is much work remaining for the REA in the future.

In this connection, I might note that there is legislation pending in both Houses of the Congress that would aid the REA in continuing the efficient operations that it has displayed in the past.

This legislation, which includes a bill I introduced on May 20, would exclude the Federal Power Commission from exercising any jurisdiction over REA cooperatives.

There is nothing in the existing law giving the FPC any jurisdiction over REA cooperatives. Nor is there any indication that the Congress, when it passed the Federal Power Act of 1935, ever intended to confer such jurisdiction on the FPC.

Nevertheless, in July 1963, the FPC attempted to extend its control over certain operations of REA-financed cooperatives. Thus new legislation is necessary to preclude any possibility that the FPC, at some future date, might assume jurisdiction over rural electric cooperatives.

There is certainly no need for FPC control of REA cooperatives. The cooperatives already are under the jurisdiction of the Rural Electrification Administration, which has adequate supervisory power over their activities.

If the FPC did assume jurisdiction over REA cooperatives, it is quite likely that the results would be harmful. Such a situation would produce dual governmental regulation. It would be both costly and confusing. And it would amount to excessive Government regulation in an area already well regulated.

As the editorial from the Davis County Republican points out, the record of the Rural Electrification Administration's financial operations is a good one. The REA should be allowed to continue its important duties without being troubled by the possibility of conflicting regulations from another Government agency.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the editorial:

[From the Davis County Republican, Bloomfield, Iowa, May 25, 1965]

WE STILL NEED REA

May 11, was the 30th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration. The agency was established by Executive order by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Few measures during the Nation's history have been so involved in controversy, and the end is not yet.

Despite strong opposition to the REA its leaders believe that during the next 15 to 20 years, the agency will be called upon to provide more funds for rural electric cooperatives than the nearly $7 billion loaned during the past 30 years.

Opposition to the REA comes mainly from private power utilities, who contend that the agency uses Federal funds to develop rural power as competitors to the privately owned and operated power companies. A source of complaint is the low interest rate charged the rural electric cooperatives, such as the one with headquarters in Bloomfield.

There can be little debate on the fact that the REA has given rural areas electric light and power which have given farm people many of the comforts and benefits formerly enjoyed only by urban residents. The difference in residing on a Davis County farm today compared to the time when the county was not served by our REC, is so great that the younger generation cannot comprehend the change that has occurred.

Norman Clapp, REA Administrator, defends the 2-percent interest rate. Without the low rate, the rural electric cooperatives would have been unable to construct the powerlines, which today serve as an average only 3.3 customers per mile, while most private utilities average is 33.2 families per mile.

The record of payments of interest and principal of the rural electric cooperatives is very good. In our own cooperative, under the administration of the late Colonel Fieker, every cent has been paid as it became due.

An argument often heard is that the REA should be abolished because most of the country's farms have been electrified. In answer to this statement Clapp says "the fact that some 125,000 new consumers are being added to REA-financed lines each year, and that the electric loads of present consumers are doubling every 7 to 10 years shows that the REA has much work yet to do."

Clapp predicts that REA borrowers, the rural electric cooperatives, may need as much as $8 billion in new capital within the next 15 years.

Italian Executives of America Present Citation to ABC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 29, 1965, an article appeared in the National Chronicle, a weekly publication published in Paterson, N.J., dedicated to the encouragement of American-Italian culture and to the fostering of good government, stating that the American Broadcasting Co. would be honored by the presentation of the "Television Broadcast of the Year Citation" by the Italian Executives of America, Inc. This citation is being awarded to the American Broadcasting Co. because of its presentation of the outstanding documentary film, "I, Leonardo Da Vinci."

I am hoping other television stations will follow the example of ABC–TV in the promotion of cultural programs that will serve to enlighten Americans on the contribution that men have made to the cultural enhancement of the peoples of the world.

There is no one country in the world that has a monopoly on culture. Each country, in its own way, has played an important part in the development of the culture of the world.

It seems to me that we should be devoting more time to this type of program so that an appreciation of the arts can be more fully developed by our children. The heroes of our children should be the men and women who have contributed to the arts, to the sciences, and to the cultural advancement of all mankind.

The article follows:

ABC–TV TO RECEIVE CITATION FOR LEONARDO DA VINCI DOCUMENTARY

The American Broadcasting Co. will be presented with the "Television Broadcast of the Year Citation" of the Italian Executives of America, Inc., for televising the documentary "I, Leonardo Da Vinci," it was announced today by former Deputy Police Commissioner Sylvester J. Garamella, national president of the Italian Executives of America, Inc., 51 Broadway, New York City.

The citation will be accepted by Mr. Robert Goldman, general manager of ABC News at the Peter Caesar Alberti Awards Dinner,

honoring Executives born in Italy who have made success stories in business and the professions in America. The Alberti Awards dinner will be held Friday evening, June 4, 1965, at 7 p.m., in the Grand Ballroom of the Hotel Pierre, 61st Street and Fifth Avenue, New York City.

The special citation to the ABC network read:

"Italian Executives of America, Inc., 'Television Broadcast of the Year Citation' to American Broadcasting Co.

"For telecasting on the ABC–TV network, a special documentary 'I, Leonardo Da Vinci' written by John H. Secondari, sponsored by the B. F. Goodrich Co., through the Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn, Inc., agency and making available to millions of Americans a program of the life of Leonardo da Vinci, a great Italian artist, inventor, scientist, and engineer of the Renaissance whose influence on the intellectual history of the Western World is still being realized and brings to Americans a greater understanding and inspiration of the heritage of Italy." Presented at the Hotel Pierre.

Leonardo Da Vinci story was the first presentation of this season's "Saga of Western Man" series on ABC–TV.

Industry Mushrooms in North Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have known about and extolled the virtues of north Alabama as the most ideal location for industry and the best place in the country to live. In a featured story this week, the New York Times called attention to this rapidly growing area and cited reasons for the impressive industrial growth.

The story cites the economical electrical power, the excellent plant sites, abundant water supply, and progressive attitude of the area as factors in the giant industrial strides being made. I also know of the hard work by many civic-minded leaders in the Tennessee Valley area which has been a significant factor in making the natural advantages of north Alabama known to such diversified industrial firms as now make their homes in this section.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD this excellent article on this progressive area:

CHEAP POWER, GOOD SITES FACTORS

(By Edward C. Burks)

HUNTSVILLE, ALA.—This northern Alabama area is enjoying a massive industrial expansion ranging from highly sophisticated spaceflight research to metalworking complexes and synthetic fibers.

Cheap electric power, choice sites along 125 miles of the great bend of the Tennessee River, and the momentum generated by expanding Huntsville are all playing a role.

At the adjacent George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, the great Saturn rockets are being developed including the Saturn V, biggest of them all.

This rocket, designed to launch three Americans to the moon before 1970, develops 7.5 millon pounds of thrust in its first stage, which is 14 stories high and 33 feet across.

The complete rocket will be 37 stories high, making it one of the tallest "structures" in Alabama. It will be able to throw 250,000 pounds into orbit, or the equivalent of 85 capsules of the size that carried John Glenn, the astronaut.

With superlatives like these to toss around, the whole area is bursting with pride and drive. Everyone talks space, and a breakfast menu can send a man hurtling into the morning's work with a choice of "the liftoff" (with eggs) or "the blast-off special" (Danish pastry and coffee).

The 1,800-acre space center is surrounded by the 40,000-acre Redstone Arsenal, the Army's missile-development complex. The two installations together have nearly 27,000 workers including those doing contract work.

Huntsville has had the foresight to annex territory prior to its development in order to apply good zoning and to keep the missile area from being ringed by honky tonks and jackleg businesses.

The latest annexation is giving this fast growing city of 133,000 an area of 106 square miles, making it considerably larger than Manhattan and the Bronx combined.

A new research park of 2,000 acres with tight zoning restrictions has attracted bigtimers in the field of space research and design. These companies include Chrysler, International Business Machines, Boeing, Lockheed, Dow Chemical, Standard Research, Northrop, and Brown Engineering. They have built or have under construction handsome buildings in the park-like setting where zoning allows structures to cover no more than 30 percent of the company's property.

But Huntsville is not resting on space laurels. An industrial expansion committee is also seeking topgrade industry that has no space connection.

The committee includes the city's top business and industrial leaders such as M. B. Spragins, chairman of the First National Bank; W. L. Halsey, Jr., a wholesale grocer, and Carl T. Jones, a consulting engineer.

Expanding Huntsville has a four-lane arterial road that runs nearly 25 miles, all within the city limits. Two giant shopping centers are under construction to go along with three that were built in the last 5 years. There are 3,000 motel rooms and several big motels under construction.

Several slum clearance projects are underway and the city reports that it ranked 17th in the Nation in new building permits issued in the first quarter of this year.

A new eight-story city hall, sheathed with Alabama marble, was opend this month and a new library is nearing completion. As Huntsville grew, the downtown until recently retained its sleepy look of the town of 15,000 of 1950.

Just to the south of Huntsville the Tennessee River makes its great swing through Alabama. Along the way there are three power and flood-control dams of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Although some of the big industrial plants along the river date back to the 1940's, the area is now experiencing its greatest expansion.

Near Scottsboro in northeastern Alabama, a $55 million aluminum rolling mill and fabricating complex is to be constructed.

Under construction at Fort Payne, Section, and Albertville, not far from the river, are three shirt factories (Van Heusen and Arrow) that will use synthetic fibers manufactured farther downstream in the northern Alabama industrial area.

Even chicken feed is a superlative term in northern Alabama. Nebraska Consolidated Mills, on the river at Decatur, manufactures feed as well as flour, and Albertville says it has the largest chicken slaughtering plant in the United States with a turnout of 750,000 broilers a week.

Along the stretch of river from Decatur to the Tri-Cities area (Florence, Sheffield and Tuscumbia) an industrial complex has grown up in the last 5 years.

Power in the area costs only one-third what it did in 1940, and today's figure is also only about one-third of the present national average.

Thomas D. Johnson, executive director of the North Alabama Industrial Development Association, flies prospective buyers up and down the river pointing out the industrial sites and reeling off detailed statistics from memory.

He offers these details on the Decatur tricities complex. Armour is expanding its nitrogen fertilizer plant. Ford is enlarging its plant where aluminum piston rings and other engine parts are made. Reynolds Metals, with 5,000 workers, is the largest, and is expanding operations at its aluminum rolling mill and reduction plant.

Diamond Alkali turns out chlorine and caustic soda for the paper industry. Amoco is building a large new facility to produce raw materials for the growing polyester synthetic fiber industry. Fruehauf has a new aluminum rolling mill and will make parts for large new freight cars to be used in the south.

Chemstrand is turning out polyester fiber for clothing and carpets. Goodyear is expanding to use polyester fiber in tire fabric. Minnesota Mining is enlarging its polyester film facilities. The Worthington Corp. makes airconditioning equipment, and Wolverine Tube is adding aluminum tubing to its production of copper tubing.

The International Stretch Co. is building a plant to make underclothing from polyester fiber.

The northern part of the State has a relatively small Negro population, some counties having as little as 1 percent and others having as much as about 20 percent.

Northern Alabama has taken a far more moderate stand on adjusting to desegregation than the counties with large (up to 80 percent) Negro populations 100 miles south.

At Huntsville about half of the original 125-man team of former German rocket experts headed by Wernher von Braun is still together. He directs the space center and some of the former Germans, now American citizens, are active in civic and cultural organizations.

Commemorating Anniversary of Religious Tolerance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, people from Transylvania commemorate all over the world the passing of the first religious tolerance act in 1557 by their Diet at Torda which is significant because it precedes by long decades all other similar legislation in Europe. It was the small principality of Transylvania, a part of the Hungarian kingdom which had to become independent in 1542 to escape Turkish occupation that led the old nations of Europe to recognize the futility of religious coercion and to strike a blow for religious freedom and a free conscience to the individual.

We, in the United States, cherishing religious freedom which finds its expression in our tradition, as well as in our

Constitution—first amendment—have a special interest and acknowledgment to make to the creators of legislation of religious freedom in Europe at a time when Bloody Mary ruled England and state Lutheran churches were introduced in most German principalities while heretics were burned in Italy and Spain.

Paying homage to the wisdom of the Transylvanian people which faced with the danger of foreign invasion and murderous soldateska realized that national unity must prevail and that such unity cannot be achieved without religious tolerance and freedom, we cannot help but remember the present fate of the peoples of Transylvania.

Our hearts feel sad in seeing them still living under Communist domination, be they Rumanians who were in 1557 only a minority, Hungarians, the state nation in 1557 together with the German Saxons who also survive in Transylvania.

Yet we must also recognize that the Hungarian minority is not only persecuted on ideological grounds, but also on account of ethnic antagonism. Of course, the sympathy demonstrations of students of Hungarian origin in Transylvania during the glorious, but unsuccessful, Hungarian fight for freedom also helped to influence the Communist masters to distrust this proud people. On March 24, 1965, I explained some of the sorry consequences for the Hungarian minority in Transylvania. I also introduced a resolution calling for a condemnation of the discriminatory measures of the Rumanian Communist Government against its Hungarian minority, together with eight other colleagues. I understand that the European subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee is planning hearings on them in mid-June to which I already submitted my written testimony. I trust that the committee will report out the resolution so that the entire House may have an opportunity to vote on this issue of minority persecution both on ideological and ethnic grounds.

Questioning Senator Nelson's Loyalty to His Country Is Ridiculous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, my dauntless colleague from Wisconsin, Senator GAYLORD NELSON, recently was subjected to some sickening censure by what a leading Milwaukee television station called angry, misguided citizens.

This incident was the subject of editorial comment by Carl Zimmerman, director of news and public affairs of WITI-TV, on May 21, 1965.

It is always a sign of healthy stability in this democratic Republic of ours when an independent, nonpartisan, responsible voice comes forward in opposition to an infringement of another's individual freedom.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert that editorial in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

QUESTIONING SENATOR NELSON'S LOYALTY TO HIS COUNTRY IS RIDICULOUS

We haven't always agreed with our junior Senator from Wisconsin, but one of his recent decisions should be applauded by every citizen who values the freedoms on which this country bases its democratic principles.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON refused to be bullied into signing a so-called loyalty oath. A Berkeley, Calif., school principal had asked the Senator to speak at his school, but first he would have to sign an oath indicating whether or not he is a member of the Communist Party. Although the request to sign the oath was later withdrawn, the issue is still ripe among some voters in Wisconsin.

Because the Senator refused to sign that oath, he has become the target of angry, misguided citizens. One letterwriter went so far as to say: "Considerable doubts" have been raised over the Senator's loyalty to his country. Now, what kind of ridiculous logic is that? Senator NELSON pledged his allegiance to his country when he took the oath of office as Senator * * * and when he became Governor of Wisconsin. But, now his loyalty is questioned because he refused to sign a meaningless piece of paper. Loyalty oaths provide no valid, accurate evidence of a person's loyalty. Would a Communist, who is actively trying to undermine our way of life, readily admit his guilt if asked to take such an oath? Of course not. Deceit is a major part of the Communist scheme. Demanding a declaration of loyalty on a slip of paper wouldn't flush him out.

All of us should be proud to publicly declare our loyalty to our country. However, when someone takes it upon themselves to demand an oath * * * a declaration of loyalty * * * must a man be declared guilty if he refuses to sign that oath?

Senator NELSON sums up his feelings this way: "My loyalty is to the Nation and to the principles for which it stands, and I will not sacrifice those principles under a threat of having my reputation smeared." To that, TV6 can only add: Amen.

University of Iowa Symphony Band to Tour Russia, Eastern Europe in 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to commend the University of Iowa Symphony Band on its selection by the U.S. Department of State to represent the United States on a concert tour of Russia and other eastern European countries. We can be proud to have this outstanding group represent our Nation and serve as our cultural ambassadors during the spring of 1966 tour. I am sure these 100 young people look forward to this chance, not only to demonstrate the high quality of their musical accomplishment, but to gain an understanding of the youth of the other countries they visit.

The band will leave Iowa City between February 14 and February 21, and will return to the United States during the first part of May. The director of the band, Mr. Frederick C. Ebbs, has announced that the group will arrive in Moscow on March 21 after playing in several eastern European countries, and will complete the Moscow concerts on April 27. In all, the Iowans will play in 10 or more Russian cities.

President Howard R. Bowen, of the University of Iowa, has made the following comment on the significance of the tour:

The entire university is honored at the selection of our symphonic band as cultural emissaries to Russia and Eastern Europe, and the many thousands of Iowans who have heard these fine young musicians perform will know that the Department of State could not have made a better choice. Their trip should be a wonderful educational experience, one from which we shall all benefit.

Arrangements for the tour have been made by Charles M. Ellison, director of the office of cultural presentations in the U.S. Department of State. Those making the tour will be enrolled as University of Iowa students for the second semester, paying tuition and receiving academic credit in music, but all of their other expenses will be paid by the Department of State, with the exception of lodging, meals, and transportation in Russia, which will be provided by the Russian Government. An interpreter to travel with the band while they are in Russia will also be provided by the Russian Government. In setting up the Russian part of the tour, Mr. Ellison has worked with representatives of the Ministry of Culture in the Soviet Union.

I am in complete agreement with Mr. Ellison's statement that cultural exchanges with other countries are proving very valuable in promoting international understanding, as the performing arts permit us to skirt economic, poltical and language barriers and communicate directly with the people of other countries. An intensive program of activities outside the regular concert schedule has been designed to give the members of the University of Iowa Symphonic Band the unique opportunity to gain an understanding of the youth of the countries they visit and to have a new insight into the lives they lead and the problems which they face.

Economic Trouble Spots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, despite the generally optimistic mood prevailing over the state of the Nation's economy, many forecasters are predicting trouble spots ahead. A recent article in the New York Times by M. J. Rossant points up some of these potential dangers.

One of the most disturbing factors is the administration's failure to plan for a possible letdown in the Nation's economy. The economists of Fortune magazine, Rossant writes, warn that the administration should be prepared for a letdown, but they point out that "such a contingency is not being discussed in Washington or anywhere else."

Trouble spots exist in a number of areas. Spending on inventories has been high, partly as a reaction to a possible steel strike. The diminution of steel stockpiles later on will be a negative influence on activity. Another area of concern is the extraordinarily high level of business investment, which is running 15 percent above the substantial level of a year ago. As Rossant points out, this bodes well for the short run but could hurt later on, simply because so high a rate of spending is unsustainable. There is speculation too that profit margins may finally begin to shrink. And, according to Albert T. Sommers, head of economic research at the National Industrial Conference Board, automobile sales may decline.

At a time when the Council of Economic Advisers feels it safe to proclaim "the beginning of a new era in the economic annals of the United States," many private economists have serious doubts. Their warnings warrant attention, for, as Rossant notes, while the administration can express its hopes for the best, it should prepare for the worst.

Under unanimous consent I ask that the article from the New York Times be included in the RECORD at this point.

TROUBLE SPOTS AHEAD—SOME FORECASTERS WARN ECONOMY MAY BE HEADING INTO DANGEROUS TIME IN 1966

(By M. J. Rossant)

After 51 months of expansion the impression is growing that Washington has developed a formula for growth that is recession-free and inflation-proof. But some economists think that the economy is developing some dangerous symptoms and question whether the Johnson administration will be able to come up with a cure.

Those who are warning of trouble ahead fear that the administration's policies, which have been stimulative up until now, will begin to exert a braking effect. They do not expect trouble this year, but they are concerned about the prospects for 1966.

This is the view of Walter E. Hoadley, vice president and chief economist of the Armstrong Cork Co., who observed recently that "the surface outlook for the economy looks deceiving." He predicted that the pace of business activity would slacken in 1966 if Washington carries out its plans to take more out of the economy than it will be putting in.

WASHINGTON NOT BOTHERED

The economists of Fortune magazine also are concerned about the outlook. They think that the present ebullient rise is tantamount to a spree that will be followed by an inevitable letdown next year. The administration should be prepared to take action in case of a recession they say, but add that "such a contingency is not even being discussed in Washington, or anywhere else."

President Johnson and his advisers are aware that Federal budget policy will not act as a stimulus next year. This is the main reason they decided to increase the amount of excise tax reductions. Yet even this extra boost to purchasing power may fall short of what is needed to keep the expansion intact.

The doubts of private economists do not seem to bother Washington. From the President on down, administration spokesmen are exuding confidence about the business picture.

Mr. Johnson is on record as stating that the latest fiscal dividend in the form of excise taxes will keep the economy prosperious. Vice President HUMPHREY boasted last week that the administration had a variety of instruments at hand in case the expansion ran into trouble. And the Council of Economic Advisers has proclaimed "the beginning of a new era in the economic annals of the United States," one that demonstrates that recessions can be avoided.

PAST RECORD IS GOOD

Those who are concerned about 1966 concede that the administration's past record is good. They point out, however, that what has happened to date is no guarantee for the future. As they see it, Washington cannot be certain the rise in activity will continue. If it does not, it may find that its magic touch fails to keep the economy from sliding downhill.

There are a number of potential trouble-spots. Business spending on inventories, for example, has been strong, partly as hedge buying against a steel strike. But the working down of steel stockpiles later on will be a negative influence on activity.

Business investment in new plant and equipment is also very strong, with the latest surveys reporting a 15-percent increase over the substantial level of a year ago. If past performance is a guide, actual outlays may be even higher than expectations, which will help in the short run but may hurt later on, simply because so high a rate of spending is unsustainable.

PREDICTION ON PROFITS

According to Mr. Hoadley, profit margins, which have been improving, are due to shrink. According to Albert T. Sommers, head of economic research of the National Industrial Conference Board, automobile sales, which have provided a lot of lift to overall activity, will undergo a decline.

It may be that some of the most troublesome symptoms will not flare up. But what alarms the pessimistic diagnosticians is that the administration's economic policies may be aggravating rather than ameliorating the negative tendencies in the private sector.

All during the expansion, the administration itself has been an expansive force, first by combining an easy credit policy with increased spending, then by combining easy credit with tax reductions. But by next year, it will be swinging to policy of contraction that may be enough to tilt the economy in downward direction.

If that happened, the administration could not revert to its old formula. It has already made its move on fiscal policy by requesting a cut in excise taxes. And it may not be able to move at all on credit policy, because the need to keep money from seeking higher yields abroad will limit the freedom of the money managers.

The minority who fear that 1966 may mark the beginning of a new recession instead of a new era has not come up with any preventive medicine. But its warnings are a useful reminder that while the administration can express its hope for the best, it should be preparing for the worst.

Handout Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, soon the House will be considering the administration's housing bill and its novel "rent supplement" proposal. The Republican-Courier, Findlay, Ohio, comments on this and other "handout" attractions of the Great Society in the following editorial which I think is pertinent at this time.

HANDOUT SOCIETY?

This is a time for paradoxes, politically and otherwise, it seems.

President Johnson, speaking to the students of the University of Kentucky the other day called upon them and all other young people to "work, sacrifice, and dare" in the Great Society. Those were his exact words.

He went on to point out that they were living in the wrong generation if they "want a sheltered and uneventful life." The inference was strongly there that they should learn to become resourceful and cultivate self-reliance.

But as the Wall Street Journal observed after the Chief Executive's address, "at every turn, almost every day, come fresh proposals for sheltering the individual, for ruthlessly degrading the value of working and sacrificing and daring."

How can our young people, who see, hear, and read about Federal subsidies at every turn, learn the virtues and rewards of self-reliance and initiative?

The Federal Government's latest scheme, made known only a few weeks ago, is to put up part of the rent money for families earning between $3,000 and $8,000 a year that can't find a decent place to live at a rent they think they cannot afford to pay.

The Government terms it a "rent supplement." It sounds more like a genuine subsidy and gets pretty close to a dole. When we start to handout supplements to those in the income brackets specified, we are getting pretty close, not to what would seem to be a Great Society, but to a form of society that reduces us all to a handout type of living.

The Real Alabama—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the story of the real Alabama includes rapid growth of our State economy in many ways. In this development the port city of Mobile leads the way.

The New York Journal of Commerce on April 26, 1965, recognized Mobile's industrial strength in its special newspaper supplement devoted to Alabama.

Following are three articles from that newspaper describing economic growth in Mobile:

NEW INDUSTRIES ENTER MOBILE

Growing faster than the United States, the State of Alabama, and most of the southern communities, Mobile, the only seaport city in southwest Alabama, leads the State in industrial expansion. During 1963 this surging bay region accounted for one-third of the industrial growth in the State of Alabama. Over 130 million new dollars went into industry.

Mobile, growing at about 2½ percent per year with a population of 415,000, has seen most of its growth come in new and expanded

facilities in the chemical and paper industries.

Scott Paper Co. is presently adding $55 million in facilities; International Paper Co. is building a new corrugated box plant, and modernizing the large, sprawling Mobile mill; Geigy Chemical situated in the upper delta region of the Mobile River along Highway 43 recently completed three new plants in its chemical complex; Courtaulds North America has added 50 percent to its rayon capacity and completed a new nylon-6 plant, and next door neighbor Stauffer Chemical is completing a carbon-tet plant alongside a new caustic chlorine facility.

Union Carbide, with the first plant since the pilot operation for the production of molecular sieves, goes into production in May. Add to these blue chips the names of National Gypsum, Ruberoid, Alcoa, Olin Mathieson, Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical, and Ideal Cement.

SMALL BUSINESS, TOO

In the wake of large industry growth has come a surge in small industry and distribution which has accumulated each year in poultry processing, southeastern distribution in soft goods, metal fabrication, textiles, seafood processing, and plastics.

To undergird this growing industrial complex, the community has stepped up programs to develop its highways, education, and research.

The chamber initiated the establishment of the State's first public institution for higher learning in 70 years, the University of South Alabama. It opened with 1,000 students this past year. All indications point to a student body of 5,000 in 5 years.

To complement this facility a move is being made to develop a medical center. This, along with two biological research laboratories on the nearby gulf, is increasing the research capability. A third laboratory for game fish research is next on the schedule.

Mobile College was chartered 2 years ago by the Baptists in the area with the assistance of the Mobile business community and serves 350 undergraduates.

The $118 million highway development principally in Interstate 65 and Interstate 10 which juncture in middle Mobile County is facelifting the countryside as well as the city.

In recent months there has been a strong trend toward metal fabrication to meet the great and growing demand of the chemical and petrochemical industries. Probably due to the geographical location of Mobile, its port facilities, and barge water connections at the rail terminus, there has been a great interest in manufacturing for these type requirements.

Is there a dim spot in this apparently bright picture?

Last November the Secretary of Defense announced the closing of a large number of Defense installations. Among those was the Air Logistics Command Depot, Brookley Air Force Base. This Government facility employs 13,600 civilian and 1,400 military personnel. After the initial psychological impact the community moved into action.

Fortunately, the chamber of commerce had formulated and established a program called Task Force 200 some 8 months earlier. Its 5-year goal: $200 million in new and expanded industry. Originally it was established to move this growing community even further ahead of its competitors but the plan of action became more important than ever with the announcement of the Defense cutback.

The program was beefed up even more than it had been originally and called for some $70,000 a year in industrial promotion and research. The challenge is to take up the slack as the Defense cutbacks dig into employment. So far Task Force 200 is on schedule.

NEW MOBILE TERMINAL FOR CONTAINER CARGO

A special new terminal, projected for the port of Mobile, will bring significant benefits to shippers using containers for their cargo.

Plans for this facility—a containerized cargo terminal for handling of containers out of and into containerized ships—include a 1,000-foot wharf. There will also be two berths with ample maneuvering space for trucks and containers, and a 30-ton crane with rail tracks for moving the crane along the entire length of both berths.

Houston Feaster, director of the Alabama State Docks at the port of Mobile, noted that benefits to the shipper included the obvious lower costs.

"His product is loaded at his plant, and unloaded at his customer's door, and eliminates two handlings at two points, that is, at the U.S. port and the oversea port," Mr. Feaster pointed out.

"Besides, there are the other not so obvious advantages, still representing important savings. Losses due to breakage are minimized, also losses by theft and pilferage.

AMONG THE FIRST

"We are proud to be able to establish one of the first containerized cargo terminals, on the Gulf of Mexico, as one of the newer ways of handling freight at U.S. ports."

The docks director requested the State legislature for authority to issue $3 million in general obligation bonds, half of which will be used for the new terminal, and the other for building an International Trade Center.

(The Alabama State Docks is a self-sustaining department of the State of Alabama, does not receive tax moneys, and will retire the bonds from earnings.)

The new facility will be located adjacent to the 29 general cargo berths of the docks, on property already owned by the latter.

SERVICE TO PUERTO RICO

One of the users of the terminal will be Waterman Line of Puerto Rico, which announced plans for operation of its container ships from the port of Mobile to Puerto Rico.

The terminal will be for multiple-use—for completely containerized ships; ships that may be just carrying a partial load of containers, even to the extent of a few containers on deck, or for ships of the regular break-bulk type, handling cargoes requiring open areas at shipside.

Specific in its purpose, the new terminal is an important part of the Alabama State Docks $4 million program of expansion, with doubling in size of the public grain elevator, and special facilities for storage and loading of bulk soybean meal; a vegetable oil handling plant for storage, bulk loading, and drumming, already completed; doubling of the shipside storage area for imported ores at the bulk-terminal plant; increasing terminal railroad locomotives from 7 to 11.

Also being purchased is an inactive ammunition depot on lower Mobile Bay, for $975,000. This has been declared surplus by the Federal Government.

The docks will operate it as another unit of its many facilities, for the loading of explosives, dynamite, bagged ammonium nitrate, and other dangerous cargoes.

MOBILE MAJOR COTTON PORT

Back in the stern-wheeler days, cotton used to tell the whole story of the port of Mobile.

Today, it is only one of the hundreds of commodities being shipped through the port; nevertheless, the Alabama State docks' bonded cotton warehouse and cotton compress are worth particular attention.

The high-density compress has a capacity of 80 to 100 bales an hour, and the huge warehouse, built in 1926, handles 2 types of cotton shipments—cotton in transit to world markets and cotton stored for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The transit shipments are primarily trucked from Alabama, as well as Mississippi and Georgia points. The cotton is compressed and loaded on ships bound for the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, West Germany, Italy, Hong Kong, India, and Japan.

Commodity Credit Corporation cotton comes via rail for storage, until it is sold to the highest bidder.

Twenty-five Jailed During Soledad Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is plagued with a manmade disaster in my district. Corps are spoiling for lack of competent harvest labor. Growers have tried every proposal for securing farmworkers. One suggestion of the U.S. Department of Labor was to transfer unemployed and disadvantaged persons from pockets of poverty to the California farms. These attempts to solve the social, economic, and racial ills of other sections of the Nation by transfer to California have been spectacularly unsuccessful.

A recent example of transferring Sioux Indians from South Dakota is reported by the Salinas Californian. This experiment was given high prospects for success by the Department of Labor. Among other aspects, please note that only 54 out of 112 recruits showed up for work. This is a wasteful expense which must be added to consumer prices.

The article follows:

INDIANS ON WARPATH: 25 JAILED DURING SOLEDAD BATTLE

SOLEDAD.—This city's police force and the Monterey County Sheriff's Department had a busy time of it Saturday and Sunday night, subduing several Sioux Indians who apparently went on the warpath.

The Indians, recently imported from four South Dakota reservations as strawberry pickers, started fighting among themselves Saturday night and kept it up until 25 of them had been arrested and three hospitalized.

Soledad Police Chief Red Skinner said that 10 of the berrypicking recruits were booked at the Soledad police station, 4 in Greenfield, and 10 in the Monterey County jail.

A spokesman for Salinas Strawberries, which employs the Indians said that just 54 out of 112 showed up for work today.

Skinner said that one barracks at the Jiminez camp in Soledad was "pretty well torn up" during the post-payday knuckledrill. Windows were broken and doors torn up. "They were fighting each other," he said.

The three men taken to Monterey County Hospital were reportedly suffering from facial lacerations. No names were available as the Californian went to press today.

Most of the men received suspended sentences in court today. But one, Curtis Dean Marshall, 20, of Gettysburg, S. Dak., started serving 27 days as a minor in possession of alcoholic beverages and for possessing a false identification card.

Al Trimble of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Los Angeles office and Walter J. Knodel, chief of the branch of employment assistance for the Bureau of Washington, D.C., went to Soledad to help calm down the situation.

The sheriff's report said that the Indians "had been fighting most of the night and day off and on," and that there had been "many, many fights." But Trimble said that most of the trouble was confined to the Jiminez camp where the men are staying.

It is illegal to sell alcohol to Indians on reservations, which are under Federal jurisdiction. But no California law prohibits such sale off reservations.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, my good and learned friend, Father G. G. Grant, S.J., is a man of very strong opinions. He was particularly incensed with the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities which were conducted in Chicago last week. He expressed himself most forcefully in a speech which he gave to the First Congregational Church of Chicago on May 23. I believe the Members will be interested in the viewpoint expressed by Father Grant, which follows:

SPEECH GIVEN BY REV. G. G. GRANT, S.J., AT THE FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH OF CHICAGO

I believe I am particularly well qualified to address this meeting. We are here concerned with defense of the first amendment of our Constitution which deals not only with freedom of speech but with religious liberty. As an educated Catholic, I am all too familiar with the experience my church had with the Inquisition. Looking back, a Catholic can only wonder how much good it ever did. And today, he and the church regret that they ever resorted to a method of this kind to protect, as they thought, the truth. In the long run, we are agreed that the Inquisitors did more harm for the church than good. Today, in it's council, the Catholic Church is putting a capstone on its long established teaching in favor of religious liberty.

We are concerned here with a committee that has had a long tradition of abuse of the first and fifth amendments to the Constitution. The same secret hearings that characterized the Inquisition of the past, the same unsupported testimony, the same refusal to allow the accused to face his accuser or to have counsel has stained the good reputation of Congress. We have scorned the propaganda trials of Moscow and yet at times the open hearings of some congressional committees have approached these propaganda trials in their atmosphere of fear and in their results of ruined reputations.

It would be bad enough to anticipate continuation of this same kind of thing, but now it seems a further attempt is to be made to extend to the whole civil rights movement the smear of un-Americanism.

You are right to protest as Americans in defense of a most fundamental and precious liberty. Catholic Americans, especially, ought to be in the vanguard of this protest for, remembering their disabilities in former times, they should realize that their own freedom would be most precarious if it were not for these amendments.

I would not wish to attack Members of Congress who serve on this committee. They are all, I am sure, good Americans. They think they are saving and serving their country.

Nor would I wish to attack the committee itself. With you, I deplore its tradition of highhanded abuse of congressional privilege. But if HUAC were not conducting such hearings, very likely the Judiciary Committee would be doing the same thing. You might think that this would be an improvement, but I firmly think in the present conditions in America there would be little difference in the procedure, since Congress has never adopted adequate rules to safeguard witnesses before its committees.

When you attack HUAC, you are attacking a symptom. You may treat the symptom, but the disease will remain, and it is the disease that we must cure, if the Constitution and its precious amendments are to be protected. The disease is fear, a fear that that is all pervasive, a fear that has corrupted debate in these United States so that men have given over reasoned discourse for slogans and shibboleths. This fear has, in effect, developed into a national paronoia which Eric Fromm has so brilliantly described. You see it in otherwise sane men whose mental processes freeze when the topic of communism is brought up. The John Birches and the Minute Men merely represent an extreme form of this fear, but it is very widespread throughout America in a lesser degree.

We fear Russia, we fear her allies, we fear the atomic attack they might launch upon us, we fear the intrigues and secret conspiracies for which she is held responsible. And this fear has gone on for so long, with no prospect of relief, that it has become in truth a national illness.

All this is an outgrowth in America of the anarchy that exists on the world scene, a result of the arms race and our intimate knowledge of the effects of atomic warfare. And, in these times of fear, the almost natural reaction is a phenomenon like HUAC. Would Congress be engaged in such inquiries into men's opinions if the people concerned were merely believers in a social system? I am certain they would not, and I am certain that the country would not tolerate their inquiry. But because every man who is sympathetic to radical social change is felt to be a potential or actual member of an international conspiracy whose headquarters are in Moscow and whose ultimate objective is military conquest, this terrible fear drives patriotic Americans to subject their fellow man to a deprivation of his liberties which in more sane times they would never tolerate.

But what if Russia were no longer an enemy? What if law and order could be established on the world scene so that we would no longer have to trust to armaments to protect us? What if there were no longer a fear of conquest by a foreign power—no longer fear of atomic attack—no longer fear of a revolutionary conspiracy against us?

Then fear would go. It is up to us to help make it go, if we are ever to get rid of the thing that makes HUAC and Birchism possible.

There is only one remedy. We must establish international authority, we must establish law and order on the world scene, we must establish a world federal government that can oversee and compel disarmament and establish security, not only of our people, but of all of the peoples of the world.

It was Pope John who called on us "to banish the fear and anxious expectation of war by which men are oppressed," who warned us that "the law of fear still reigns among people."

How can this be brought about? Some people think we can do it by radical reform of the U.N., turning it into a true international authority; a true parliament of men. Pope John with thousands of other wise men has pointed out that until world authority is established, the problems of mankind cannot be solved, insecurity will prevail and fear and persecution and inquisitions will go on. If you really want to banish the atmosphere out of which this committee has grown and which it represents—this atmosphere of paranoia and hate that poisons and paralyzes the political processes of America, the greatest thing you can do would be to work for law and order on the world scene, for world peace through enforcible world law, for a strong U.N. that can guarantee us the security and peace which our terrible armaments cannot give us in any way today.

Many Jobs Go Begging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the administration's repeated insistence that expansionary fiscal and monetary policies are needed to fight unemployment, there exists untold numbers of job vacancies in our economy. Until we develop a statistical series on job vacancies, we will never know how many, nor will we know the true employment situation in our society and the degree of stimulation or restraint in economic policies that may be required to deal with it.

In the May 27 edition of the New York Herald Tribune the city's acting commissioner of labor is reported to have announced that 50,000 jobs, paying $90 a week or more, are going begging for lack of qualified people to fill them. The commissioner has some telling criticism of training and retraining programs and a number of useful suggestions on how such programs can be improved.

Under unanimous consent, I place the Herald Tribune article in the RECORD at this point.

FIFTY THOUSAND JOBS GO BEGGING—NEEDY NOT QUALIFIED

(By Newton H. Fulbright)

James J. McFadden, the city's acting commissioner of labor, acknowledged yesterday that 50,000 jobs paying $90 a week and more are going begging in New York City because none of the tens of thousands of needy are qualified to fill them.

Mr. McFadden said 520,000 are illiterate, that 70,000 adults among the needy never finished elementary school, but that efforts to train these people for semiskills have been a failure, despite the expenditure of millions in public funds.

He was hopeful of better success, however, with a new training program that begins June 1. He described it on the WABC-radio "press conference" program.

He called it a practical job-training program authorized by Mayor Wagner to be operated in cooperation with the Port of New York Authority.

LITTLE TROUBLE

"We're having the port authority train truckdrivers," he said. "Now, a truckdriver can be trained in 2 to 4 months * * * if he completes the training, we will make every effort to fill jobs that are now vacant in

town for truckdrivers, and we also point out to him that those jobs pay at least $3 an hour."

Mr. McFadden was of the opinion there would be no problem with dropouts and that his department would experience little trouble finding 6,000 applicants for truckdriver training.

The trouble in the past, he said, resulting in a 35-percent dropout rate, arose from too much theory and not enough practicality.

Another cause of past failure, he said, was the complicated procedures for enrolling trainees. He likened it to an obstacle race to get involved in one of these things, I think on one program alone they interviewed 35,000 people to get 2,000 people in a program.

The fact of the matter is that the Government training programs so far are needlessly complicated. They have operated basically through our vocational educational system which has a tough enough time handling what it has anyway. There has to be some drastic changes made.

"That's why we are utilizing, for example, the Port of New York Authority facilities, and that's why, in some of the new programs President Johnson has started, he has made contracts with private industry like we have with the port authority to do this work."

Mr. McFadden expressed hope that antipoverty programs "don't get bogged down like the manpower development and training programs do.

BOARD PROPOSED

To keep check on the antipoverty programs, "to see that the public is going to get its dollar value," Mr. McFadden proposed "a public evaluation board" to check on operations. Such a board, he said, should include representatives of the mayor and minority groups and should have "three distinguished citizens at large * * * to examine every one of our poverty programs in the city of New York."

Reports, he thought, should go to the New York City Council Against Poverty—a 62-member body of city officials and volunteer social service agencies.

Mr. McFadden said the city was in a bad way educationally to deal with the problem of poverty which he found peculiarly centered here.

He saw New York City at the bottom of the list of 30 major cities in the average income per worker. The reason for this, he said, was a heavy immigration of Negroes from the South and Puerto Ricans who lack training for skilled jobs. He acknowledged that Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, Philadelphia, Detroit, and other major cities had experienced a similar immigration—but the difference, he said, was that these other cities had shared heavily in Government expenditures in newly developing industries.

The major industry in New York, he said, was the garment industry, which had provided no great increase for production workers. While the city had bettered itself as the center of "white collar services" employment, it had suffered greatly, he felt, from the poor rate of pay for production workers. And the problem of training, to qualify the untrained for skilled and semiskilled jobs, he felt was the problem of the future—the peculiar problem of the city of New York.

Legislation To Aid Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a package of bills to aid postal employees, supplementing an initial group of bills I introduced earlier this year.

My four bills, all of which amend title 39, United States Code, are aimed at, first, raising mail foremen to level 8 of the postal field service schedule; second, raising the nightwork extra compensation rate from 10 to 15 percent of their hourly base rate; third, correcting certain inequities with respect to promotions of postal field service employees; fourth, providing intervals of 1 year between steps for purposes of automatic advancement by step increases for postal field services employees.

These bills represent a step in the direction of much-needed improvement in benefits for postal supervisors. I hope that this Congress will take the opportunity to put its stamp of approval on the hard work of our Nation's supervisory postal employees.

The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most fascinating aspects of Mr. William Benton's last visit to the Soviet Union was his interview with Nikita Khrushchev.

The second part of the "Epilogue" to "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R." deals with this interview. This is the concluding portion of Mr. Benton's article and I am pleased to have had this series appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Certainly it is one of the finest discussions of the educational aspects of the cold war which has been written. My most sincere congratulations go to Mr. Benton.

"EPILOGUE," PART II

(A personal report: "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," by William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Senator from Connecticut; currently U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its executive board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica.)

EPILOGUE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Prior to the replacement of Khrushchev on October 15, 1964, Senator Benton had planned to conclude this report, stimulated by his Moscow visit in May, with an account of his visit with the then Chairman. He had titled this section, "Nikita Khrushchev, Headmaster." Although the interview dealt chiefly with political and economic questions, Senator Benton felt it was not inappropriate to an article on Soviet education. Chairman Khrushchev, by stressing on the world scene what the Soviets call peaceful coexistence, obviously was counting on what he regarded as the ultimate educational, scientific, and cultural superiority of the Soviet system to give the U.S.S.R. victory over the West. Thus, the U.S.S.R. and its leaders would become the world's intellectual "headmasters."

(After Khrushchev's downfall, Senator Benton jestingly suggested that a suitable subtitle might be, "Nikita Khrushchev, Old Boy." He decided to drop the chapter. But the editors feel that this interview remains relevant and thus carry it here as an epilog. It has historical interest as one of Khrushchev's last extended interviews with an American. More important, it may reflect basic policies, if not the personal "style," to be followed by Khrushchev's immediate successors. No attempt has been made to include interpretive remarks in this section.)

Officials of the American Embassy in Moscow suggested some "talking points" to discuss with the Chairman. These included brief notes about disarmament, the United Nations, Cuba, southeast Asia, Germany, Soviet agriculture, and "the succession question." The last dealt with Khrushchev's views of the future leadership of the Soviet Union, a rather delicate question to ask the 70-year-old man who has the job, and one I did not pursue. Many of my ideas and many of the suggestions from the Embassy turned out to be unrealistic for the conversation as it developed.

On the day of the interview I stopped to pick up Madam Popova and we were delivered to the Kremlin before 3 o'clock in a big, black Kremlin limousine. The uniformed guards at the gate saluted crisply, and we rolled through barely slowing down. We walked rapidly through the high-ceilinged inner halls of the 18th-century palace well within the Kremlin walls.

While waiting, I looked at the trophies the Chairman had just brought back from Egypt. There was a striking model of the Aswan Dam, 5 feet high, and in metal. There was an Egyptian flag, and a painting framed in brass. And there was a bronze statuette about 15 inches high showing Nasser and Khrushchev walking toward each other with outstretched hands.

But the delay was short. With Madam Popova I was ushered in to see the Chairman even before my appointed hour. "Punctuality, as they say, "is the courtesy of kings."

Khrushchev's office was a long rectangular room. The approach was through a reception room as big as a major hotel suite. As I entered, the chairman rose from behind his desk and walked toward me. The desk was massive. It was in the far right corner of the room and that must be 80 feet long. Above the desk were the anticipated pictures of Lenin and Marx. In front of the desk was a long table, big enough to seat 20 to 30, stretching between the desk and the door. The interpreter sat at the end of the table in the place normally reserved for the father at the Thanksgiving dinner table. The chairman sat at his left and I at his right. We faced each other directly. Madam Popova sat at his left. There were only the four of us.

The Chairman greeted me most cordially. His face was deeply lined and impassive, and he looked very tired, as the London papers had reported. After we were seated, he nodded slowly as if to say, "Proceed; tell me why you're here and what you've been up to."

Accordingly, through the young interpreter, I began to give him a report of my activities during my 10 days in Moscow, mentioning visits with the various Ministers. I said I had had an exhilarating 10 days and suggested that more Americans should visit the Soviet Union with the same opportunities I had had for discussion with its leaders. The chairman nodded. He said little. His eyes seemed a bit glazed. I did not know whether I had his attention.

I then eased into political issues. I mentioned that I felt the climate was now more favorable for developing trade relationships, much more favorable than it had been for some time. I said I deemed it to be better under President Johnson than under Kennedy. I discussed at some length Mikoyan's current trip to Japan seeking long-term credits. I suggested the time might be ripe to settle the war debts, a necessary step under our Johnson Act to the granting of

credits with the backing of the U.S. Government, and I urged him to consider this. I told him of an English subsidiary of an American company that was negotiating to build pulp mills on credit. The produce would pay off the loans. This was the idea Mikoyan was urging on the Japanese. I then quoted from his speeches on living standards. I tied this up to disarmament. I suggested the possibility, which I had discussed several times in the previous 10 days, of the Soviet Government setting up a disarmament agency at the ministerial level which would be in constant communication with our disarmament agency in the United States. The chairman appeared interested, but did not comment.

Suddenly his face lit up and he began to talk. He had either planned his talk or I had engaged his interest at last. When I reached for a pad of paper on his desk on which to make notes, he nodded approvingly.

"I appreciate highly your country's genius for developing industry and agriculture. We want all the knowledge that you have in those areas. We need it," the Chairman rushed on. "I recently received the president of an American firm that raises pigs. His figures on the production of pigs are very high. We need to learn how to do this. I have just seen the British Agricultural Fair (in Moscow at that time). I don't know whether you or the British are more efficient, but the samples at this fair are very good. We could learn much from it. I am not afraid to say that we can learn. I am not afraid to admit this. In grain selection, we are experienced. Our production is very high. But, in feeding, the United States leads."

About developing trade with the United States, the Chairman said, "We want to buy from you, but we understand that business laws prevail. Naturally we buy where it is most profitable for us to buy. We want to trade with you, and we would appreciate your credits. I agree that the climate for trade between us is improving. That is a ray of hope in a dark world."

The Chairman then emphasized that the U.S.S.R. wants the products of U.S. manufacturers, but that he would prefer to deal with American industrialists who do not act like "the scourge of God."

Then the Chairman swerved into issues more strictly political. About halfway through the interview he took a deep breath and wagged his finger at me. "I want to make one comment," he said. "I want to talk to you about a problem that is most difficult for your statesmen. This problem cannot be bypassed. They must face up to it. They must solve it. The United States operates on an erroneous basis."

He continued to talk in this cryptic vein, and I couldn't tell what he was leading up to. "This problem goes back to Dulles," he said. "He was in error. Today even your own leaders admit that he was wrong. I am referring to his attitude toward those countries which want to pursue neutralist policies. He said that they were amoral. Yet the United States is right now trying to develop neutralist policies in certain countries. The descent of the United States into this amoral position was very swift. Dulles was not yet cold in his grave."

I did not attempt to interrupt and argue with the Chairman about this. As a matter of fact, I had no opportunity to interrupt. Besides, I thought the best tactic was to let him talk; rebuttal could come later (but there was little chance).

He went on to admonish me. "Your erroneous stand in this area still remains. President Kennedy argued with me in Vienna that the United States and the U.S.S.R. should try to maintain the status quo for some countries. This is quite correct. I don't deny his thesis. But he gave it a meaning of his own. In theory our policies—the United States and the U.S.S.R.—are the same on this issue. We agree that the sovereignty of all individual countries should be maintained. We agree that there should be no interference in the affairs of one country by another. We agree that each country has a right to pick its own social system. This at least is our position in the U.S.S.R."

Up to this point I still did not see exactly what Chairman Khrushchev was driving at, then suddenly it became perfectly clear. He said, "President Kennedy spoke of not having any subversive activities in any country. Now this is quite another question. I can agree that it may be undesirable for a second country, or a third country, to move in and interfere with the development of another. But revolutions do happen. They do occur, as they did here in the Soviet Union. A political system becomes rotten, and a rotten system leads to explosion. Then the new is born through a struggle with the old. We in the U.S.S.R. feel the revolutionary process should have a right to exist. Tender plants can and do break through asphalt and crack concrete. Isn't it strange that a frail plant can break concrete?

The Chairman became eloquent, speaking with fervor. He insisted that people would continue to rebel and continue to succeed in revolution. He said that any policy that opposed the right of people to rebel was doomed—it was like the "sacred union of the emperors in the 19th century." He said, "Any policy which throttles new policies will fail."

And then he stated emphatically, "We don't like American forces in Korea or in South Vietnam. In the latter, the ground is aflame. In Korea, your boys walk freely on the streets. But the principle in both areas is the same. Why doesn't the U.S. Government understand the right of people to change? Your Government seeks to rely on reactionary forces. This is your only consistent policy, and it is slowly leading to the isolation of the United States. You Americans are happy at your victory in Brazil. President Johnson has just sent a congratulatory letter. But this is a Pyrrhic victory. It is doomed to failure."

"This indeed may be," I conceded, in an effort to interrupt him and hold him back. "Who can foretell? But it may be a victory for democratic forces."

The Chairman slammed the table with the palm of his hand and said, "Indeed it will be a Pyrrhic victory. Of course, the reactionaries in Brazil can murder those who oppose them. But the people will provide new leaders. New leaders will emerge to organize the masses. This is a very serious and complicated question, and it will not be understood tomorrow by your American leaders. It is the question of questions. It is at the heart of our relations with you. If you of the United States would only recognize the right of people to have the government they want and like, if you would not interfere with them in achieving this goal, it would be the great step forward in the relationship between us.

"You in the United States call every uprising against tyranny a Communist uprising. You do this even in places where there is no Communist Party. We are honored. We are pleased when revolutions by people with no knowledge of Lenin or Marx are called Communist. This shows that our ideas are popular."

The Chairman had been talking almost steadily for 20 minutes, while I busily took notes, but at this point I managed to interject a quick comment. I said I could not allow to pass unchallenged the implied suggestion that the U.S.S.R. did not instigate so-called revolutionary movements. "Let us consider Venezuela," I said. "President Betancourt was legally elected President of a democratic regime which we in the United States respected and admired. An effort was made to assassinate him which was traced back to Castro and Cuba. The Cubans further sought to foment revolution and shipped arms into Venezuela. * * *"

The Chairman did not let me continue. With a wave of his hand, he said, "Who placed the arms in Venezuela? Was it Castro? Or was it the CIA?" Laughing heartily, he added, "Both things could have happened."

Having adroitly shifted both the subject and the argument, he rushed on. "Let me give you another example," he said. "After our great October revolution, your troops, as well as those of France and Great Britain, came to the U.S.S.R. One of the commanders of these troops later wrote a book called 'Far Eastern Adventure.' * * *"

I interrupted again, saying that many students of history would now agree that was a mistake in policy. I said I did not think we should now argue about it.

Bitterly, the Chairman answered—and I think this was the only touch of true bitterness in our interview—"Yes; after 45 years."

He then spoke at length about Vietnam. Among much else, he said, "The sober and only possible position for you is to withdraw your forces. Otherwise, you will sink deeper and deeper into the swamp."

I did not have a chance to offer a rebuttal to that, partly because the Chairman continued to talk rapidly, and partly because I had my eye on my watch and knew that I was now overdue to leave for the airport. Our 40 minutes had stretched to more than an hour. Khrushchev was saying, "* * * another thing, take your espionage flights over Cuba. These are much more important than the relationship of the United States and Cuba. These flights are of international concern. They involve international law. Why do you need these flights? They can cause very serious trouble. If sober sense doesn't reign, Cuba will shoot down your planes. This can provoke a crisis even more severe than the last one. Neither President Johnson nor I want this crisis. I am greatly concerned about these flights. I don't think you need them. Why don't you stop them?"

I said to the Chairman, "I don't know the facts in this case, but I will find out."

He said, "I'll tell you what you will find out. You will get the classic answer—'intelligence.'"

I tipped my pencil at a 45° angle and suggested that the photographic experts might soon learn to take photographs at such an angle from offshore.

Khrushchev laughed and replied, "If you will stay here, I'll show you photographs of your military installations taken from outer space. I'll even show them to President Johnson when I meet him. I'll offer to exchange them for some of his photographs of our installations. Yes, why don't you fly offshore over neutral waters? You can see just as well. Why don't you fly in outer space to take your photographs?"

(When I reported on this aspect of my interview with the Chairman, on my arrival in Paris the next morning, the fact that the Chairman admitted he had the photographs from outer space of U.S. bases received front-page headlines in the press throughout the world. I later learned that it is impossible to take suitable photographs at an angle. Indeed, there seem to be powerful arguments for our overflights apart from those of security. Rumors in Washington persist that the Soviets have reintroduced their installations in Cuba. The overflight photos show that such rumors are false. The fact that we know the rumors are false may be helpful to Soviet policy as well as to ours.)

At this point a secretary brought in a note to Madam Popova. She passed it to the Chairman. It reminded him that I had to catch a plane. I do not know how long he would have continued to talk if this inter-

ruption had not occurred. He had shown no inclination to stop. He appeared momentarily disconcerted. I assume it was a rare happening for him to to be told that an interview was terminated. It cannot have been often that anyone walked out on Chairman Khrushchev.

He jumped to his feet. Cameramen entered his office, and the flashbulbs started as they took picture after picture of him shaking hands with me and escorting me to the door. These pictures were shown on Soviet national TV that night, on the big program at 10 o'clock for which I had been taped for 15 minutes—allegedly to 45 million people. (Incidentally, I was told I was the third American to appear on Soviet TV.)

Madam Popova, who rode with me in the Chairman's powerful big limousine to the airport, made me regret that I had not stayed longer. She said she felt the Chairman was only warming up to the interview, and that it was obvious he wanted to talk longer. "No one can ever tell about the length of the Chairman's visits," she said. I reminded her that it was only because I had been warned the interview would be limited strictly to 40 minutes that I expected to leave. "As it was, he stretched it to an hour and 5 minutes," I said.

"One hour and 7 minutes," she corrected.

I made a mistake. I should not have left. The airplane probably would have waited. If it didn't, the Chairman might have sent me to Paris in his own plane. Yes, this was a mistake.

We sped to the airport at something like 80 miles per hour down the center of the highway marked by a big white line. This is the center throughway reserved for the cars of very important officials. At the airport, there was no pause for check-in. Instead, the car virtually careened through the airport gate and out the taxiway to the end of the runway where my plane was waiting to take off. The driver screeched to a halt in front of the jet so that it could not take off, and in that very second he had the car door open for me. My goodby and thanks to Madam Popova were necessarily brief. I ignored the eager reporter from the Associated Press. Yes, it was a dramatic exit. In moments I was airborne for Paris. The interview with the press and apearances on our three TV networks awaited me on the next day.

Memorial Day, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I would like to include the following editorial from the May 30, 1965, issue of the Long Island Sunday Press.

I believe this thought-provoking editorial deserves commendation for contributing to an understanding of the conflicts we are engaged in around the world today:

MEMORIAL DAY, 1965

A few years ago a book about the Spanish-American War came out entitled "The Splendid Little War."

It was a war full of the sound of bugles, the sight of flags waving and a universal sense of pride and exultation as our swashbuckling boys marched off to do without too much dying. After the last charge was over, after the last Spanish ship was sunk, we won our little war—with just 487 killed.

That was the last "fun" war.

Since then war has grown uglier and uglier and bigger and bigger.

On this Memorial Day, 1965, our sons are still on the line, from the Caribbean to the Tonkin Gulf. What they are enduring is neither splendid nor little, with the total number of American deaths in Vietnam now close to the total of the Spanish-American war.

Technically, legally, we are at peace. But realistically, we are at war—and from the look of things we shall be at war for a long, long time to come.

After each of the great wars of this century it was felt that at long last we were done with such madness. Yet, as each war generation grew old, the seeds of conflict took root and flourished anew for still another generation to do and die.

Did they do and die in vain? Over and over we torture ourselves with this question at this time of the year. If they did and died, why must our sons go out and do the same? There is no simple answer. Some say that each generation must solve anew for itself what the previous generation thought it had solved for good.

Another answer is that mankind, so advanced in science and technology, is still in its infancy in the matter of learning how to share the world. We know what ought to be done; we just don't know how to do it in the steaming cauldron of experience where exploding populations clamber over each other for the limited space and things the planet has to offer.

In technical matters we have learned to live in international amity. The Universal Postal Union is a going concern; telecommunications work fine all over the globe; the World Health Organization carries its works to all parts of the world in a splendid spirit of cooperation.

But the moment the technical is displaced by the political, we falter. Wherever we turn, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, treaties and international organizations are weak, ineffectual or simply failures. The United Nations is powerless; the Organization of American States is rent by bickering and indecision; our various alliances from NATO to SEATO, are held together by weak paste. And even the Communists can't get together, with East Europe restive and the giants, Russia and China, gulfs apart.

And it is into this vast, complicated sea of trouble we are sending our boys—not because we have any jingostic, naive ideas about splendid little wars, but because imperfect man has not learned how to live with his imperfect world; because there are forces abroad that would destroy us if we do not stand up to them. We fight because the alternatives at hand won't do. But even though we no longer fight with joy and a martial spirit, our determination to defend freedom must be no less. If anything, it must be more.

Local Effort Scores Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a small community in my district has recently demonstrated what can be accomplished by determined local effort in cooperation with Government assistance.

The Sentinel-Age of Scottsboro, Ala., of which Mr. Fred J. Buchheit is editor and publisher, has printed an editorial citing the efforts of the Pisgah community in securing a Small Business Administration loan to expand a local business enterprise.

With the expansion of the industry, more jobs will be available and the economic benefits of the loan will be multiplied many times the original investment.

Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues might have the advantage of this interesting success story, I wish to insert the editorial from the Scottsboro Sentinel-Age at this point in the RECORD:

PISGAH COMMUNITY ACTION

The determined and imaginative people of Pisgah have scored another success in their program for economic development by obtaining a $90,000 Federal loan through the Small Business Administration to help expand further a local business enterprise.

It has been brought to our attention by Congressman BOB JONES that Pisgah has now won national recognition as an example of what a small town can do for itself in the field of economic development. JONES commented that Pisgah has become a "national example of what can be done if community leadership has what it takes." He reported that Eugene P. Foley, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, said in a recent address:

"Let's talk about the energetic, courageous little town of Pisgah in northern Alabama in Jackson County. It became obvious to the people in this community several years ago that something needed to be done to bring in industry to create jobs for its citizens. They discussed this with business and industrial leaders and came up with a firm proposition. But to make this become a reality they really had to put their shoulders to the wheel and muster their resources."

Mr. Foley described the founding of Pisgah Development Corp. in 1960 and traced its success under the community development plan of the Small Business Administration. Mr. Foley said:

"I can think of no better example of community responsibility than this one. The Federal Government simply provided the means for these citizens to translate their sense of responsibility and their energy and their resources into concrete and productive action. Where there is a will there is a way. Where there is a community determined to move ahead, there is a way to do it."

The Sentinel-Age salutes the people of Pisgah. They have brought credit to Jackson County and to the State of Alabama. They have shown the way to the Pisgahs all over America. Truly, they have a right to be proud of their accomplishments.

Congressman Cohelan's Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleagues will share my interest in the results of the questionnaire poll which I mailed to 130,000 of my constituents in late March. The results represent a return of 10 percent:

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Health care: The House Committee on Ways and Means is meeting in executive sessions on the long-discussed program of insured hospital and nursing home care, financed through Social Security, for all Americans 65 and over:			
(a) Should Congress enact this program?	60.1	31.1	8.8
(b) Should a voluntary insurance plan be added to cover doctors' fees and prescribed drugs?	54.4	21.4	24.2
2. Elementary-secondary education: The House Education and Labor Committee has approved a program of Federal assistance to elementary and secondary schools with the major emphasis directed at helping communities where large numbers of children come from families earning less than $2,000 a year. Do you favor this program?	71.3	21.8	6.9
3. Higher education: President Johnson has recommended an expanded program of loans and grants to institutions of higher education. This includes construction of college classrooms, libraries and laboratories, and scholarships for able but needy high school graduates. Would you support this program?	70.3	21.7	8.0
4. Voting rights: The U.S. Civil Rights Commission has reported that many minority group members are still being denied the right to register and vote:			
(a) Do you feel existing law is sufficient to protect voting rights?	27.9	57.1	15.0
(b) Do you feel stronger enforcement of existing law is possible?	62.6	17.0	20.4
(c) Do you feel Congress should enact stronger voting guarantees, including the use of Federal voting registrars?	64.8	24.5	10.7
5 Cities: In a special message to Congress, President Johnson pointed out many of the serious problems confronting our urban areas and he proposed several measures to improve and rehabilitate our cities:			
(a) Would you favor a program of rent supplements to families with incomes above the poverty level yet with incomes too low to afford privately built housing?	27.8	53.3	18.9
(b) Would you favor establishing a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs to coordinate all Federal programs in this field?	45.8	37.2	17.0
6. Immigration: The House and Senate Judiciary Committees are considering legislation to amend our present immigration law which assigns national quotas based on the 1920 population makeup of the United States. It would eliminate this "national origins system" over a 5-year period and give priority to those with exceptional skills or education, and to spouses and children of U.S. citizens. Should Congress approve this legislation?	71.5	16.7	11.8
7. Presidential disability: The Senate has passed and the House will soon consider a constitutional amendment which would enable the President to nominate and the Congress to elect a Vice President whenever there is a vacancy in that office. It also provides a formal procedure for determining Presidential disability. Would you favor this amendment?	84.3	7.3	8.4
8. Reapportionment: Several bills are pending before the House and Senate which would allow one chamber of a State legislature to be apportioned on "factors other than population." This would overturn the Supreme Court's "1 man, 1 vote" decision of 1964. Would you favor these bills?	44.9	32.9	22.2
9. Firearms: Testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee in 1963 indicated that no effective controls exist over the interstate shipment of firearms:			
(a) Would you favor a law which would prevent the mailing or delivery of firearms to persons under 18 years of age?	86.3	7.7	6.0
(b) Would you favor a law which would require a person to obtain a police permit before buying a gun?	69.5	22.9	7.6
10. Migrant farm labor: Several different bills have been introduced in the field of farm labor:			
(a) Would you favor extending the national minimum wage of $1.25 per hour to agricultural workers?	74.6	14.1	11.3
(b) Would you favor resuming Public Law 78, the importation of Mexican farmworkers (braceros), which was ended by Congress in 1964?	45.2	37.9	16.9
11. Manpower: The House Committee on Education and Labor is considering legislation to continue and expand the Manpower Development and Training Act established by Congress in 1962. Should this measure be approved?	56.5	13.6	29.9
12. Water pollution: The Senate has passed and the House Public Works Committee is holding hearings on a water pollution control bill. This measure provides matching Federal-State grants to help with pollution from sewage and storm systems, and authorizes Federal standards of quality for interstate waters. Would you support this legislation?	85.7	5.5	8.8
13. Redwoods: The Deaprtment of the Interior is preparing legislation providing assistance to California in rounding out and preserving existing redwood State parks, and also Federal acquisition of additional outstanding redwood forests for a major national park. Do you favor this proposal?	87.8	6.8	5.4
14. Foreign aid: President Johnson has asked Congress to continue the foreign aid program. His request was for the smallest amount of money since the program began in 1948:			
(a) Should Congress continue this program of military and economic development assistance?	46.1	31.3	22.6
(b) Should the economic and military sections be considered separately, as recommended by Senator Fulbright?	72.4	10.6	17.0

Thank you for your assistance. The results of this questionnaire will be tabulated and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as well as distributed to our local newspapers.

I would also like to call your attention to a 5-minute television program which I present every Monday during the 10 a.m. and 10 p.m. news programs over station KTVU, channel 2, Oakland. This program gives me an opportunity to discuss briefly some of the current issues before Congress, and I will welcome your comments.

JEFFERY COHELAN,
Member of Congress.

Tunisia's National Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the 1st of June marks the national day of the people of Tunisia, and I think it is appropriate that on this day we pay tribute to them and their leaders.

Under the leadership of President Habib Bourguiba and the Destourian Socialist Party, Tunisia since independence has achieved very impressive economic and social prorgess. The most heartening part of this progress is the fact that it has been achieved under a government dedicated wholeheartedly to democratic principles and practices. Under President Bourguiba, the Destourian Socialist Party has worked diligently at obtaining the cooperation and assistance of Tunisians from all classes and occupations in the task of improving the country and its economy.

At the same time, the Tunisian Government has developed for itself an enviable record of moderation and good counsel in the international arena; it presents us with a refreshing case of a country following a responsible independent course, a useful guide for other newly emerging nations throughout the world.

We in the United States have recognized the sincere commitment of the Tunisians to an amelioration of their problems, and we have therefore seen fit to assist in a number of different ways. It is a pleasure to report that our projects in Tunisia are among the most successful in all of our programs overseas. It is, therefore, with particular pleasure that we congratulate the Tunisians on their national holiday, and extend our best wishes for the future.

Driver Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, once again we have witnessed the annual slaughter on our Nation's highways during the Memorial Day weekend. As this toll increases annually we hear a lot of talk about safety but very little action. I am pleased to note that General Motors Corp. took an advertisement last week in our own congressional newspaper, Roll Call, to emphasize to the driving public the importance of safety. I wish to commend them for this public service and their interest in curbing a situation which transforms hundreds of holiday celebrants into mortality statistics each year. I hope that continued efforts along this line in future years will result in success in curbing Memorial Day weekend fatalities. The advertisement is reproduced herewith:

You'll probably be on the road over Memorial Day, so here are some suggestions to make your trip more enjoyable.

These tips from the people at the General Motors Proving Grounds in Michigan and Arizona aren't an all-inclusive course in safe driving, but rather some extra guidelines. Insights that have been arrived at in over 300 million miles of test driving.

First, have your care safety checked. Make sure everything is working just right. If not, have it taken care of before you leave.

Next plan to stick to the freeways as much as possible. Even though those backroad shortcuts seem a good idea, you may find out a lot of other people had the same idea. Besides, our own testing on all kinds of roads proves today's modern highways—with limited access rights-of-way, generally easier curves and hills—are safer as well as faster.

DRIVING AND SCOLDING DON'T MIX

If you have youngsters, decide in advance which of you is going to be the driver and which is going to be the disciplinarian. From

driving with our families and from driving with test equipment, we know the value of letting the driver keep his full attention on the road. If that calls for rearranging your usual seating, do it. It can be worth it. And let the one who's not driving be the navigator, too.

DRIVE DEFENSIVELY

On the highways, keep in mind what you'd do if the other guy does something wrong. Use your turn signals. Watch for conditions at least a half mile or more ahead. (With practice, you can learn to look through the cars ahead of you.) Include your rear-view mirror in the regular sweep of your eyes, and keep your eyes moving.

A special tip about passing: Before you pull out, look for some indication that the driver in front has seen your signal—like his slowing down or moving slightly to the right.

USE THOSE SEAT BELTS

The first thing to do behind the wheel is buckle up those seat belts. As you drive, grip the rim of the steering wheel instead of the spokes. Many of our drivers vary the grip every so often, for less fatigue.

We tell our drivers who drive alone to keep the radio on—and switch stations now and then. A variety of programs will help you fight drowsiness. Take time off, too—at least once every 2 hours, and oftener at night.

Now about speed. You know that if you drive like there's no tomorrow, there very likely won't be. But, beyond that, it's good to keep in mind what our test drivers keep in mind: Adjust your speed not only to the posted limit, but to road conditions, too. Cut it down if it's wet, if the highway is crowded, and at night.

THE MOST IMPORTANT THING

But, remember, the single most important factor in driving safety is still the one that can't be built in any factory: the driver himself.

He can make all the difference in the world.

We hope these suggestions will help make your trip more pleasant. And your Memorial Day holiday the most enjoyable you've had in years.

Remarks of Commissioner George H. Hearn, of the Federal Maritime Commission, at the 12th Biennial Convention of the Seaman's International Union of North America at Washington, D.C., May 28, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Commissioner George H. Hearn:

REMARKS OF COMMISSIONER GEORGE H. HEARN OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION, AT THE 12TH BIENNIAL CONVENTION OF THE SEAMAN'S INTERNATIONAL UNION OF NORTH AMERICA

"International commerce and the ships which make it possible have contributed immeasurably to America's greatness. The seas and ships are an integral part of this country's past, present, and future," words of President Lyndon B. Johnson delivered in his recent maritime proclamation. These words have a very serious meaning to all of the maritime and commercial world and particularly to you, the representatives of our merchant seamen. The Chief Executive, in his desire to insure the continuance and growth of our free enterprise system and the maintenance of our tremendous commercial success, has again reiterated not only the Government's interest in, but its dependence upon maritime endeavors and all those employed therein.

Gentlemen, it is indeed an honor to appear before you, who, as representatives of an important segment of organized labor, hold a high position of trust with respect to your members who possess those skills which constitute a very essential national asset. In this day and age, we can ill afford to squander this national asset.

I suggest that I do not miss the mark when I say that your purpose at this 12th biennial conference is to reappraise your own past, to analyze the present posture of seafaring men, to attempt to anticipate the foreseeable future in an effort to secure for your membership those economic benefits which the dignity of man demands and which are commensurate with the service provided and the perils suffered.

We in Government, no matter how slightly connected with the day-to-day operational problems of ocean shipping, can no longer sit silently by and listen to orators who, all too often, degrade the part that our Government has played and is playing in developing this essential and important industry. All segments of our Federal Government legislature as well as executive have been criticized for the alleged wanning, unhealthy posture of the maritime community. This gentlemen, is a fallacy and you as American citizens, who represent seamen whose livelihood is so dependent upon a strong, healthy, viable merchant marine, must be aware of this. Honest criticism, of course, is always appropriate and appreciated. All of us who are concerned with ocean shipping, must know of the administration's strong interest in the posture of our merchant marine. They must be aware of the fact that the President has engaged a special task force at the Cabinet level, known as the Maritime Advisory Committee, to carefully examine and make recommendations regarding the strengthening of our merchant marine. These critics must know that a serious, comprehensive study cannot result in a grand panacea overnight, and that a meaningful study certainly requires some time. All should know that in the maritime community labor, management and U.S. Government are all interested partners. And it is the Government above all whose public interest will chiefly benefit from the successful efforts of this partnership. The Government is criticized for injecting itself into areas which some claim to be the exclusive domain of managerial discretion. On the one hand, when the Government tries to encourage free enterprise to work on its own through some degree of competition, we are criticized for nonaction. On the other hand, when we attempt to enforce the statutes committed to our care by Congress, we are criticized for over regulation. Blaming the Government solely, for the unfulfilled expectations of American ocean shipping, while fashionable, is both inaccurate and nonconstructive.

Personally, I look upon the role of the Federal Government in the transportation field, as the coordinator of all the important and necessary segments of experienced expertise that we have developed, and as the promoter of our commerce. Accordingly, it is the function of Government to harness the best efforts of labor and industry, port authorities, terminal operators, freight forwarders, shipbuilders and all other groups associated with our maritime community, in order to build a harmonious merchant marine. Such a merchant marine would be second to none in the commercial world and ever ready to assume its traditional role as our fourth arm of defense. I need not reiterate how often the merchant marine has been called upon in the past to keep and secure the continued existence of our American way of life.

I appear before you as a member of the Federal Maritime Commission, an independent regulatory agency, an arm of the Congress, whose mandate from the Congress is to administer the Shipping Act. The Commission no longer has promotional obligations toward the merchant marine per se, but our statutory obligation, nevertheless is to insure that the foreign commerce of the United States is not impeded by anyone subject to our jurisdiction. On the positive side we have an obligation to see to it that our superior American products reach all of the markets of the world at prices which are competitive with those products exported by other countries.

However, we must all agree that without the ever-increasing exportation of American goods on American ships our merchant marine will dwindle. Consequently, the national investment in American seamen will diminish. Therefore, the aim of every citizen should be to make sure that more and more of our commodities are shipped in our foreign commerce on American-flag vessels, and a byproduct of your endeavors will surely be an ever-increasing American-flag merchant marine.

It is an unhappy fact that less than 10 percent of American manufacturing firms export their products to foreign markets. Recent innovations in marketing concepts currently being developed by steamship companies and ports to educate American manufacturers to the fact that there are presently in existence, or can easily be developed, lucrative foreign markets awaiting our better made products. I confidently expect that the proper exploitation of these marketing concepts will attract additional commodities and an entire new group of exporters to engage in our foreign commerce. I sincerely believe that American-flag bottoms will substantially participate in the movement of these additional cargoes, and such participation by U.S.-flag vessels must naturally be translated into more jobs for American seafaring men. It would be a tremendous waste if the ingenuity and efforts of all American businessmen failed to insure an increased participation in the carriage of these cargoes aboard American vessels. More commodities are being produced every day because of superiod American know-how and these commodities must be allowed to be competitive in the open markets of the world so that our trade will expand. The success of this program will alleviate a most vexing problem, the outward flow of gold, and establish for the United States a favorable balance of payments.

Other nations are becoming more and more competitive with us as purveyors to the world. Because of this we are in a struggle for commercial preeminence. We must succeed if we are to insure a strong merchant marine and your own livelihoods, as well as a dynamic economy.

We are all aware of the strides made by the European Common Market and more recently the advancements made by the Japanese concerning their plans for an increased merchant fleet. This increasingly competitive challenge is thus brought into sharper focus. The Japanese have announced that they will double their merchant fleet by 1968 and at that time they will have the capability of lifting 55 percent of their exports and 64 percent of their imports. We cannot allow our merchant marine to reach those low ebbs that it had in 1916 and in the late 1930's. You, above all, realize the tremendous peace-keeping obligations this country had met throughout this century. In a word, we are the peacekeepers of civilization and this awesome task requires a

strong American merchant marine particularly to support broad and sustained missions. The contributions made by the American merchant marine are many and have been eloquently exalted in the annals of our beloved country's history. The dominance of American-flag vessels in the North Atlantic and throughout the world in the 19th century is a happy chapter in American history. We are all aware of this historic role played by the merchant fleet in the First World War, World War II, and during the Korean conflict in this century alone. During World War II we suffered the loss of 5,600 of our seamen and 700 merchant vessels. In the event that this Nation needs reassurance of its reliance upon a privately owned fleet, I would like to remind you that just last fall the largest peacetime amphibious operation ever undertaken in Atlantic waters was held off the coast of Spain. I refer to Operation Steel Pike. It involved more than 55,000 men, and implemented the use of 10 privately owned and operated merchant vessels successfully. In fact Admiral McCain, the admiral commanding this tremendous naval exercise, recently testified before a congressional committee that an amphibious operation without the participation of privately owned vessels could not be successfully accomplished. This testimony immediately raises the question whether as a nation we can afford to permit those essential skills found in our maritime callings to atrophy. If there are still any doubts as to the essentiality of maintaining a strong, viable privately owned fleet employing American seamen, those doubts should be dispelled when we consider our important commercial role, and as the protectors of the free world.

We realize that shipbuilding and ship operating are very expensive undertakings in our country, however, these endeavors are very important to our national well-being and, in my opinion, our builders and operators are competing with their less costly counterparts in foreign lands and in my opinion they are competing against less valuable ships services whose nations have more limited goals. Having momentarily touched on some of the overall maritime problems, I would now like to address myself, as I did in San Diego recently before receiving the invitation from Mr. Hall to attend this convention, to the problems confronting American seamen.

The talents of our seamen must be maintained, their initiative must not be jaded; their well-being must be preserved. American seamen represent a national investment which this country can ill afford to lose. All too often we hear of how grandly they are compensated and how lavishly they live aboard our ships. However, all too often, their compensation and working conditions are compared with those of their foreign counterparts and not with that of the white- or blue-collar worker here ashore in our country. Both you and I know only too well that American seamen possess special skills. We all know of the rigors of their lives and are all aware of the economic opportunities which are ever increasing and are currently enjoyed by shoreside workers. I, for one, am delighted to have this opportunity to publicly salute the American seamen who are not only willing to but do, day in and day out, serve our Nation by forgoing, for long periods of time, the fruits of our American high standard of living enjoyed by us here at home. They do not enjoy the companionship of their families as other shoreside American citizens do. They are on call 24 hours a day during all types of weather and other hazards in the furtherance of their occupational pursuits. Their families also make these sacrifices not having the man of the house at home to instruct and give example to the young ones as they grow up. And, I need not remind you that it is no longer fashionable, novel, or a delightful experience to stroll along any of the port streets in other lands. American seamen exposed outside the confines of their country to certain dangers that are unknown to us here at home and the orderly police protection assured to us is not available to them in other lands. They daily come in contact with not only acts of God that can be dangerous, climatic and other changes in the elements. These conditions make this life a distasteful undertaking to others. However, we are fortunate in having a skilled labor force that is imbued with a sense of adventure and purpose. The fact that American seamen have entrusted to their care daily vessels worth millions of dollars bespeaks an appreciation of their skills. To a small band of dedicated men goes a debt of thanks for a difficult, distasteful job, expertly done.

Thank you.

This Way to Utopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, soon the House will consider the 1965 Housing Act, a bill of highly dubious nature which has been ramrodded through the Banking and Currency Committee.

The Citizen newspaper, serving the southwest suburban area of Chicago, in an editorial on May 6, commented on the objectionable features of the housing bill, and I place the editorial in the RECORD to give the Members an indication of the grassroots analysis of the bill:

THIS WAY TO UTOPIA

"Pie in the sky" is an old description of legislation purporting to bring manna from heaven, via the Government.

If the U.S. Senate's scheme, titled "Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965," becomes law, the pie will be brought down from the sky, and, to mix a messy metaphor, the fat will be in the fire.

Realtors, whatever their motivation, have expressed concern, even alarm, over the proposal. Other citizens should do likewise, and before it is too late. (The House is considering an identical bill.)

Unless we misread the language of the bill, it appears to be the greatest boondoggle in the country's history.

Under the provisions of the act, it is conceivable that you or I (had we enough larceny in our hearts) could purchase housing at the Government's expense.

All that we need prove is that we (or our spouse) are 62 years or older, or that we have been displaced by Government action, or physically handicapped, or—and this takes the cake—that we have been occupying substandard housing.

The ground rules—definitions of what is "substandard" or how much of an impediment it takes to be handicapped, etc.—are to be laid down by a bureaucrat: the administrator.

"Substandard" in the Chicago slums would be one thing; but what would "substandard" be in Western Springs, Lake Forest, or Scarsdale, N.Y.? In some areas a one-bath three-bedroom ranch house might be grossly below the "standard" set by the more numerous stately residences in a prestige community.

Another question arises: How hard of hearing must an applicant be to succeed in getting a grant on the basis of physical handicap? We know of amputees who, by diligent application of their skills, manage to earn excellent incomes. Would they be eligible? We presume so.

The amounts of the grants to be made under the act are not stingy. The amount to be given, the bill says, may not be any more than the amount that fair market rental costs of the property in question exceeds one-fifth of the tenant's income. (The one-fifth changes to one-fourth if the housing unit is occupied by a tenant with option to buy).

Thus, for example, if a handicapped person or an occupant of "substandard" housing, enjoying an income of $8,000 a year desired to move into a $200-a-month ($2,400 a year) apartment or house, the Government would pay him $800. Should he aspire to finer things, like a $300-a-month palacio, the Federal gift would be a handsome $2,000.

We are not naive enough to think, however, that you or I might benefit in such great measure, but we have heard the Bobby Baker Bedtime Stories, and the Billie Sol Estes Escapades.

There is much more to the bill than this: urban renewal, community development and so forth. But discussion of those matters would take another editorial.

Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof: sufficient is the evil hereinabove mentioned to require a quick death for this bill (it's number is S. 1354 in the Senate, H.R. 5840 in the House).

Parents in at Least One Community Want Freedom of Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much publicity on the civil rights demonstrations and the demands of the agitators that we have lost sight of some of the freedoms being taken away from the people. In at least one community in the Seventh District of Alabama, the area which I have the honor to represent in Congress, both colored and white parents are very much concerned with keeping their freedom of choice as to where they will send their children to school. Is it not a matter of justice that we consider the rights and freedoms of these people as well as those who demonstrate in the streets and threaten to tear down our country unless their particular demands are met?

In Cullman County we have a very old and fine school for colored children. Colony High School is the only Negro school in Cullman County. It has a proud record, cherished by its faculty, students, and alumni. The Federal Government is demanding that this school be closed in order to force integration in Cullman County. The school board is trying its best to comply with the dictatorial orders from Washington, but the people most affected do not want to lose their school, nor do they want to travel many miles to go to an integrated school. But the Washington czars who demand integration regardless of its cost to the pride and traditions of the people

involved have no regard nor sensitivity for the feelings of the people.

I say this is wrong. It is wrong to deny people the freedom of choice. It is wrong to take away from the people glorious traditions and the price of generations that has gone into building a school or a community. This is the trouble with dictatorship. It is probably more efficient than a democratic system. It may be able to make the trains run on time and be the first to get a spacecraft in orbit, but in all its efficiency it tramples over the people. In the end the dictatorship loses both its efficiency and the people lose all their freedoms.

There are those who, to punish the South, will take away the freedom of choice of our people in sending their children to school. They have not asked how the people felt, they do not care about the people. For those who pride themselves on being liberals and who, at the same time, have so little feeling for people as people, I call attention to two articles which appeared in the Cullman Times, Cullman, Ala., concerning the Colony High School. You will note in the article, "Our Views on Integration," the colored students of the senior class make an eloquent plea for continuation of their school. Please, you who would dictate to the South, consider the feelings of our people of both races.

The articles follow:

COLONY PUPILS TO ATTEND SCHOOL AT HANCEVILLE HIGH THIS NEXT YEAR

(By Marc Miller)

A plan to desegregate four grades at Hanceville High School this fall has been submitted to the Federal Government by the Cullman County Commission on Education.

The plan, calling for the consolidation of Colony High School with Hanceville, was submitted last week.

Parents and school officials of both communities already have been informed of the plans, according to School Superintendent Earl York. York said the plan, drawn up by the county board, "is in the best interest of the children and the school system."

However, York told the Times yesterday he and the board are still probing the possibility of a freedom of choice plan rather than follow the plan they have submitted for approval. He said they will meet with Federal authorities to determine if they would approve a freedom of choice plan for his county, at least for the coming school year.

While the plan which already has been submitted will require the attendance of the Negro students an Hanceville High School, the freedom of choice plan would allow the Negro students a choice of attending classes either at their present school or at Hanceville.

Complete desegregation of local schools must be done by 1967.

At stake is $700,000 in Federal money which will come to the local system provided they meet Federal laws pertaining to racial discrimination within the school system. In order to get their allocation of Federal money for the coming school year, the local system must desegregate, York said.

The county plan also calls for the assignment of school personnel without regard to race color or nationality. Regular inservice training for various schoolworkers also will be conducted on a desegregated basis this summer.

York said a a majority of the parents attending a PTA meeting at Hanceville Thursday night approved the board's action and accepted their plan to desegregate. However, a letter following this article from the Colony senior class, objects to the move, saying they had rather have improved facilities in the Colony community and allow white students of the area attend classes at their school.

York said parents in the Negro community reluctantly accepted the plan submitted by the board rather than to send 1st, 7th, and 12th graders to Hanceville by bus. They said they had rather have the older students transported to Hanceville rather than the younger students.

Although the plan has been submitted for approval, it is not effective until it is approved by the State and Federal authorities.

Federal funds involved in the issue include those for vocational agriculture and home economic programs, Economic Opportunity Act, reimbursement of lunchroom and free commodity programs which enable the schools to feed students at a low rate.

If the plan is approved, students in the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grades at Colony School will attend classes at Hanceville beginning in September. Elementary school students will, under the proposed plan, be given a choice to attend classes in the Colony School or attend classes at any other school in the county system. Students in all other areas of the county will be required to attend the school within their immediate vicinity.

The following is the entire plans submitted by the County Commission on Education:

Cullman County, Ala., is divided into 17 school districts. Six of these schools have grades 1 through 12, eight have grades 1 through 9, one has grades 1 through 7, and two have grades 1 through 6.

Colony School, with grades 1 thorugh 12, is the only Negro school in Cullman County. In the latter part of the 18th century, a colony of negroes located in the southwest part of the county and this school was established for their convenience. This school is located about 12 miles from Hanceville High School and about 18 miles from Cold Spring High School.

At a meeting of the Cullman County Commission on Education, held on May 11, 1965, the following plan for desegregation was adopted:

1. The high school grades, 9 through 12 in Colony School will be consolidated with Hanceville High School, beginning with the 1965–66 school term. It is the thinking of the commission on education that these students would have access to better equipment in home economics, agriculture, advanced mathematics, language, and science than could be offered at Colony. Credits toward graduation from high school are earned in the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grades. By moving these four grades to an accredited high school, the students would have more encouragement to continue in school and there would be fewer dropouts.

2. The principals of both Colony and Hanceville Schools will be notified of the consolidation prior to the end of the 1964–65 school year.

3. The parents of children in the Colony School District will be given written notice that grades nine through twelve will be consolidated with Hanceville School, beginning with the 1965–66 school year. Notice will also be given through the radio, newspapers, and by personal contacts.

4. There will be no discrimination whatsoever because of race, color, or national origin as to room assignment, use of facilities of the school, use of materials, participation in the lunch program, band, clubs, etc.

5. The students from Colony district will ride the school buses, as do all other children, and there will be no discrimination whatsoever in the transportation service.

6. Notice will be given in the local newspaper and by written statements that registration for the 1965–66 school year will be held during the week of May 17 through 21. For the convenience of the students in Colony School, the principal of Hanceville School, or his representative will go to Colony to register the students for enrollment in the Hanceville School for 1965–66.

7. Because of the geographic locality, etc., grades one through eight will continue to be taught at Colony School. All parents in Colony School district will be given the freedom of choice however, to send their children in these grades to any school in the county. The children are to ride the buses which are scheduled to transport children in the district. Some buses are routed to Hanceville and some to Cold Springs. There will be no discrimination in the transportation service to the children in the Colony district.

8. Assignment of personnel at all levels and to all positions shall be made without regard to race, color, or national origin. Beginning with the 1965–66 school year the inservice training programs will include all teachers, bus drivers, lunchroom employees, etc., reardless of race color, or national origin.

9. All children residing in other districts in the county will attend the established school for the particular district.

OUR VIEWS ON INTEGRATION

Colony High School is the only Negro school in Cullman County, therefore, desegregation will either move it from the community completely or leave it a junior high. If desegregation moves our school it will have taken our heart.

Since the Federal Government says that we must desegregate, we feel that for all concerned it would be better to integrate Colony than for us to go to any other school throughout the county. We would surely welcome other students and teachers wholeheartedly. We realize we would have to have a new school, additional teachers and equipment, but we feel that we could welcome others better than we would be welcomed.

By integrating grades 1 to 12 it would give all students the opportunity to show the abilities they possess such as sports, choir, band, and dramatics. Due to insufficient transportation, we would be unable to participate in these activities after school hours. For the same reason we could not attend any of the social activities held after school hours.

We will extend a great welcome to any other teachers that may come to our school, for we know that they will help us to the best of their abilities to further our education. We will treat them with dignity and respect and make them feel completely at home.

We feel that if a new school is built here, our community will grow and will promote better relationship. If we develop better relations with each other, it will solve any future problems. Better relations now will produce better citizens in the future.

A deep and great plea goes out from us and our community which says, "Please don't take our heart."

ETHEL L. MALCOLM,
GWENDOLYN C. JOHNSON,
ODIS L. MINNITT,
ALBERT W. TWITTY,
WILLIE J. TWITTY,
The Senior Class, Colony High School.

[From the Cullman (Ala.) Times, May 23, 1965]

CULLMAN COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION ISSUES SCHOOL DESEGREGATION STATEMENT

Whereas it appears the Johnson administration is determined to force integration on the people of Cullman County even though it is repugnant to both races, the board of education feels that the people are entitled to know the unreasonable demands of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The board sent to the HEW a pledge not to discriminate against any race and told of plans to construct a new Colony School, it being the desire of our colored citizens that they be allowed to go to school in their own community, they feel this would be best for them and our county.

This plan was rejected by the Federal Government.

The trustees and principal of Colony School stated they will go any place, any time, before any Federal judge. Attorney General, or Governor with a petition signed by the citizens of the Colony asking that their school be left as is.

We feel all citizens of our county should be gratified for this very wise feeling among our colored citizens. The Federal Government has been informed of the desire of our colored and white citizens to attend their own schools in their own communities.

We have been informed by the said Federal officials that if the colored children are not willing to go to a school other than Colony School, then we had better get them in the notion.

The desegregation plan drawn up by the Cullman County superintendent of education was according to the dictates of the Federal Government. We believe such Federal power is tearing down the very foundation of our Nation. Freedom has suffered and America can truly bow their head in shame. The liberty that was bought by the blood of our loved ones and friends is now issued to us according to the whims and desires of power hungry men in Washington.

We believe the people of our county should know that the money from our sweat and hardship, taken in Federal taxes, is now being used as a club over our heads. These Federal officials know that if they withhold the $700,000 in Federal funds from this county, the schools cannot operate this fall. Yet, this is our money. We heartily recommend that more thought be given to local aid to our school systems and less crying for Federal aid to education which carries with it the brute force of the Federal Government.

We hope this is a lesson to all who have continually pushed for Federal aid to education. Those of our representatives in Congress who in the past have deceived themselves by fighting integration in the Halls of Congress and at the same time pushed for Federal aid to education have, through this Federal aid, given us integration just as much as if they had voted for it in Congress. May all bow their heads in shame at this lack of foresight in the failure to see the true design and danger of Federal aid and an uncontrolled Federal Government.

The board of education and superintendent have toured the county and are aware of the destitute needs of our schools and feel that we all must search for progressive plans to improve our schools. We cannot do less for our children. We pledge our dedication to this cause and at the same time we pledge our continued efforts to resist this tyranny and force from Washington and we ask that in prayer of God, we all humbly beg that He will guide us through this situation, provide us a way that liberty may be restored and that He will give us God-fearing men as leaders of our Nation.

Passed unanimously by the board of education, this the 21st day of May 1965.

HOYT PERDUE,
Chairman.

Ellis Island a National Historic Site

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Ellis Island for decades was the gateway to America for millions of immigrants. I applaud the Presidential proclamation that makes this legendary island a national historic site, as I do the conversion of the nearby Jersey City waterfront to a recreation area.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I would like to include the following editorial from the May 13, 1965, edition of the New York World-Telegram and Sun:

A GATEWAY REMEMBERED

If all the wild ideas on what to do with Ellis Island had ever been put together, their weight would have been sufficient to sink the island.

Fortunately, Ellis survived intact—and now, by Presidential proclamation, has been designated a national historic site. Officially made a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York Harbor, Ellis Island will be improved and beautified to commemorate its historic and symbolic role as gateway to 16 million immigrants.

Further improvement in the vicinity was announced by President Johnson. A Job Corps conservation center will convert a blighted section of Jersey City waterfront opposite Ellis and Liberty Islands into a 500-acre recreation area.

Score two victories for enlightened, foresighted conservation of valuable public assets that might have been lost.

Can Government Guarantee Prosperity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, our present and continued prosperity tends to lull us to sleep with the idea that a depression can never happen again and that the Government, by juggling taxes and with grants and the spending of money can regulate our economy.

Mr. Robert C. Tyson, chairman of the Tax Foundation, and chairman of the Finance Committee, U.S. Steel Corp., has just prepared a paper entitled "Can Government Guarantee Prosperity?" which is worthy of the study of every Congressman.

Also along the same lines Constantine Brown had an article published in the Washington Star on May 29.

Both articles follow:

REALITIES MAY END U.S. OPTIMISM

(By Constantine Brown)

Political "Coueism" has become a must in Washington, since it is so essential to keep up the optimism of the American people at a time when our domestic and international problems are becoming so difficult.

A realization on the part of our people of the essential dangers we are facing might create an unpleasant situation; even the apathetic Congress might wake up and begin to check what the appointed officials are doing. The somnolent Senators and Representatives on key committees such as Armed Services and Appropriations might adopt more than their perfunctory examination of the legislation presented them by Secretaries McNamara and Rusk.

Congressmen usually are awakened when they receive a mass of communications from the electorate. These days, outside the pressures from certain organized groups that are easily detected, the legislators are left on their own—to think how they will be reelected in the coming years.

The American people see only great prosperity, and a life of leisure through the Great Society, ahead of them. The stock market is booming; employment is satisfactory; income from wages and salaries is steadily increasing; business is prospering. Anybody can buy anything at 10 percent down or even less, with the balance over a lifetime. Why worry about such trifles as meeting installments when one is sure of his job and next year will earn more?

Thoughts as to what may happen if the present prosperity cycle is halted by circumstances outside the controlling power of the Government are being lightly dismissed.

The belief is strong that we shall meet the millennium in the course of the years if we press the present war on poverty, ignorance, and disease. It must not be shaken by such trivia as our involvements in Asia and to a smaller degree in Latin America. America the Beautiful is no longer a song—it is becoming a reality on orders from the White House and by congressional legislation.

Yet there are many who are worrying about these trivia. Unquestionably we are the richest if not the most powerful Nation in the world. But our worldwide involvements are unprecedented. The friendships and alliances we have established since World War II are doubtful at best.

The Pentagon released last week the information that by the end of July we shall have about 70,000 American combat troops in South Vietnam. What is not being spelled out is that we shall need at least twice that number by the end of the year if we want to continue our presence in that area.

The optimistic reports from Saigon that we are close to having a stable Government there and that the South Vietnamese forces now are in a fighting mood are more fiction than reality. The fact is that the present civilian administration is shaky and might be overthrown as were its predecessors. The Saigon forces are fighting only sporadically.

To gain stability in that area we must have a crushing victory over the Vietcong. So far we have had only paper ones. Despite the daily airstrikes by our land- and carrier-based planes, the North Vietnamese continue to move troops and supplies to the south. Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung are as defiant and as sure of victory as ever.

The Russians, on whom a number of advisers of President Johnson pin their hopes, give no indication that they will confine themselves to cheering for their fellow Communists from the sideline if it comes to a showdown between Washington and Peiping. Quite the contrary; in all the utterances of their leaders, including Party Boss Brezhnev and Premier Kosygin, who reflect the decisions of the military, they demand that we get out of Vietnam if we want to avoid another world war. There may be some propaganda in their assertion of another world war, but this does not justify the estimates of the Washington Kremlinologists that eventually we shall find the Soviet Union neutral since the Kremlin is deathly afraid of the Chinese. Neither does the continued arrival of Russian sophisticated weapons (and of skilled Russian personnel) in North Vietnam by way of Haiphong.

There is no point in underestimating the intelligence of the Chinese leaders. They are aware that a war with the United States would be devastatingly destructive to them. But they feel that we will not push things that far because America is alone. They know that the Soviet Union will be on their side, if not military (the Red general staff prefers not to become involved in a major shooting war) at least politically; they see our French ally adopting a policy that in fact supports their policies. And they know that Britain, despite her special relations

with the United States, will remain on the sidelines if for no other reason than that she no longer has the wherewithal to fight.

It is unpleasant to be a Cassandra. But the actual realities, the real facts of life, cannot be hidden for long by Coueism without hurting the patient.

CAN GOVERNMENT GUARANTEE PROSPERITY?

(By Robert C. Tyson, chairman, Tax Foundation)

Relaxing in a period of unprecedented prosperity, many Americans appear to accept the idea that their economic worries are mostly a thing of the past, that Government will insure permanent boom conditions with a new kind of modern economics based largely on adjusting Federal taxes and expenditures at will to create prosperity.

But let's stop and think for a minute. Are we really at the front door to the millennium? Some people—and I am one of them—have been having some second thoughts about the inevitability of permanent prosperity. In a very real sense, as a Nation, our forward momentum is by no means assured. We do not face up to certain critical situations; we appear to lack the discipline to deal with several major national problems of the utmost gravity.

For example, we have drifted into a dangerous situation with regard to our international balance of payments. Every January now, it seems, we make hopeful plans to solve the payments problem and halt the gold outflow. Every January, we hear, "This is the year we will lick it." And, as year follows year, the payments problem stays with us—the smaller payments deficit projected in January somehow swells by the year's end. Each "solution" weakens our position. We pass an interest equalization tax in direct contravention of traditional U.S. policy on international trade and investment. That doesn't quite do the job so we try to extend its effect to cover more international business transactions. We remove the gold backing from reserve deposits in the Federal Reserve System.

In the latest step, businessmen and bankers are entreated to limit stringently any business that supposedly hurts our payments position, however profitable that business would have been, and however helpful it would have been to our long-run payments position.

I suggest that such drifting can well lead to a flight from the dollar and perhaps to eventual devaluation, with all that entails.

Similarly, in the area of taxation and fiscal policy, we find further evidence of failure to exercise proper discipline in dealing with the financial affairs of government.

It was 3 years ago when the late President Kennedy promised reform of the Federal tax structure. Two years ago, he presented to Congress a plan in which extensive income tax reductions were balanced off in part by tightening up what were called loopholes in the tax system.

The tax cut, as it was finally worked out, was propounded on the basis that it would encourage economic expansion and reduce unemployment. There is no doubt the economy received a shot in the arm last year, which has continued into this year, as billions of new dollars have poured into the private spending stream. But unemployment near the 5 percent level persists and the long-range effects of additional huge Federal deficits are not clear.

LONG-RANGE NEEDS IN THE TAX STRUCTURE REQUIRE ATTENTION

To be sure, we can all be grateful that the heavy burden of Federal taxation was eased somewhat, but we would do well to look beyond the immediate effects. What if the economy slows down again, as some are predicting it will? Does that mean another big income tax cut? Already, to help maintain economic expansion, the administration has proposed a $1.75 billion cut in excise taxes. The excises should, of course, have been cut long ago; they are irrational in scope and in rates; they were increased in wartime to restrain consumption and thus no longer fit our current situation. These considerations, however, apparently are secondary; the proposed cut in excises has been identified as part of a program to stimulate further an already highly stimulated economy—a program that also embraces increased social security benefits as well as a substantial increase in new or expanded domestic spending programs.

Long-range needs in the tax structure require more attention. For example, as finally passed by Congress last year, the income tax reduction attempted to benefit the lower income brackets heavily. But part of the original goal was to increase incentives to invest and thus encourage economic expansion. However, even the relatively lesser reduction in rates in the middle and upper brackets of the individual income tax was partly counterbalanced by substantial changes in previously allowed tax deductions and exclusions. This pattern certain was not designed to increase job-creating investment. Indeed, the effective degree of progression in the income tax rates was actually increased and not, as commonly believed, reduced, thereby further diminishing relatively, the incentives to work and invest.

So far as the corporate income tax was concerned, few people realize that corporations would be better off today from a Federal tax standpoint if Congress had taken no tax action last year, for the corporate income tax rate was scheduled to drop automatically to the pre-Korean rate of 47 percent last July. Instead, corporations got a cut to 50 percent last year, and to 48 percent this year, but with a speedup in tax payments eliminating the cash benefit of the tax cut for up to 7 years.

URGED ANNUAL 2-PERCENT TAX CUT UNTIL CORPORATE RATE HIT 30 PERCENT

To me it is incredible that, with tax policy ostensibly designed to encourage economic growth, corporations in this country continue to be taxed at more than twice the level in the late 1930's. These corporations produce the bulk of the country's total output, provide most of the jobs, and account for a major part of our economic progress. Corporations accounted for three-fifths of the income originating in the private sector of the economy in 1963, and we continue to hobble them with high taxes not only at the Federal level, but in the States and localities as well.

We didn't really "think" our way into this kind of tax system; we drifted into it, beginning with the blind antibusiness attitudes of the 1930's. Despite some improvements in the tax acts of 1962 and 1964 and the desirable changes in depreciation practices, we have not exercised the fiscal discipline to remedy our basic error of putting an excessive burden of taxes on business.

My esteemed predecessor at the Tax Foundation, the late Roswell Magill, spent a good deal of his life working to reform the Federal tax structure. His view was that if we removed tax obstacles, private enterprise would do the job of economic expansion the Nation needs to provide jobs and improve the standard of living even further.

I commend to you the last report of the Magill Committee on Federal Tax Policy in October 1963. For if we do "think" our way to a proper Federal tax structure, we will recognize that a great unplumbed area for growth lies in reduction and reform of the corporate income tax. The Magill committee called for a 2-percent cut in corporate income tax rates every year until the rate reaches 30 percent.

DISCIPLINE NEEDED TO RELATE SPENDING, TAXES, AND DEBT

To me, this is not a businessman's "pie-in-the-sky" but a concrete plan to let business and industry do what they must do to insure the future prosperity of America. The principal fiscal merit of this idea is that it looks ahead to a long-range, better tax structure in which all our eggs are not in the same income tax basket. If more revenue is needed in the future, there are types of nonincome taxation which would add greater balance and eliminate some disadvantages from our present tax system. Quite a few economists are showing considerable interest, for example, in the value-added tax.

Nor can we ignore the spending side of the Federal budget. In our new fiscal economics, taxes, spending and debt are seldom considered together. Putting these elements into separate mental compartments makes it possible to ignore even the recent theory of many economists that "the budget should be balanced over the business cycle."

It was only 2 years ago that the proposed Federal income tax cut nearly foundered because it was to be accompanied by a record $98.8 billion budget. President Johnson rescued the tax cut last year by projecting an image of economy and fiscal prudence. Congress echoed this view. In fact, in passing the tax cut bill, Congress urged in the preamble that any revenue growth be used first to eliminate the deficits and reduce the public debt.

The budget situation has changed in 1965. Anyone who studies the fiscal 1966 budget carefully will probably come to the conclusion that Federal expenditures will rise rapidly. This applies not only to the so-called $100 billion barrier in the administrative budget; the significance of this total seems more political than fiscal or economic. Already Federal expenditures in fiscal 1966 in the cash budget, which includes payments from trust funds, are projected at $127 billion, not $100 billion.

Without the discipline needed to relate spending, taxes and debt, there is little to prevent administrative budgets totaling far in excess of $100 billion. The situation is further complicated by steady increases in State-local spending, at a rate now surpassing the Federal increases. Total Federal, State, and local spending now approaches $200 billion, or an average burden of some $1,000 on each man, woman, and child in America.

One of the major fiscal disciplines, now honored in absentia, is to look beyond the immediate budget to what lies ahead. The Federal Government's new administrative budget of $99.7 billion calls for an increase of something over $2 billion in the year ahead, but new spending authority totaling some $11 billion more than the amount Congress approved last year is requested.

This indicates that the potential additional revenues from economic growth—some economists calculate these at about $6 billion a year currently—are in effect being earmarked in advance for new programs. In the Federal budget for 1966, budget balance receives only passing mention. The target date for budget balance, once 1967, has now been set back to 1968.

WE HAVE GONE TOO FAR IN PILING UP FEDERAL DEFICITS

Rigid budget balance every year is not the consideration here; obviously there are years when it would be foolhardy to try to balance a Federal budget. But it may not be unreasonable to suggest that we have gone too far in the past 5 years by piling up cumulative Federal budget deficits, pregnant with inflation, of over $30 billion.

This trend leads, moreover, to a larger and larger role for Government and further limitations on the private sector. Already it

is being argued by some that the only way to solve the balance-of-payments problems is by imposing more controls. And if there is a miscalculation somewhere in the new fiscal economics, if employment cost increases outstrip productivity, if instead of permanent boom we have rapid inflation and dangers of collapse, it is being intimated by some that we may need to revive the wartime controls over prices and wages.

Disaster lies along this path. Our Nation became great and stays that way because of the operation of its private enterprise system, which encourages individual initiative. I believe our economy will remain strong and productive only if we prevent its domination by government. A half-century ago, total government spending was about 7 percent of gross national product; last year it was about 28 percent, or some four times as great. Apart from the monetary aspect, Government has moved in with regulations and so-called "moral suasion" for the large segments of the private economy.

MUST HELP IN JOBS OF LIMITING GOVERNMENT TO GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONS

I believe it is the duty of every American businessman who helps in making our enterprise system work to help also in a job that is just as important—to limit Government to governmental functions, and those functions very definitely do not include running American business.

Historically, some of the sharpest lines limiting the power of Government have been drawn in the fiscal area. Freedom and fiscal policy are closely related. Loose fiscal disciplines have undoubtedly been an element in the increasing centralization of power in Washington.

The fiscal area is one of the best we can choose to start solving our national problems. Let us begin by honestly evaluating the effects of present tax and spending policies—not just tomorrow's effects, or next year's, but the long-range effects of our present fiscal policies. How much will this year's new Federal spending programs cost 5 years from now; the record is blank in this respect. Is there a practical limit on how far we can go in piling up Federal deficits and debt? If added future spending programs are in fact necessary, how can we improve our Federal tax system to enable it to provide the added billions that will be needed without handicapping the private economy on which we must depend for both jobs and economic growth?

These questions will not be answered merely by adopting expedients to keep the economic pot boiling. But if we do not find the answers—and soon—the future well-being of all Americans may well be in serious jeopardy.

Past National Commanders Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most exclusive and interesting organization's in our country is the Past National Commanders Organization. Referred to by its members as Panco, its membership eligibility includes past national commanders of seven different national American veteran organizations.

These are the American Legion, AMVETS, Catholic Veterans of the U.S.A., Disabled American Veterans, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Military Order of the Purple Heart, and Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

In the future, other organizations may be approved by Panco members present at any regular semiannual meeting.

As a past national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, it is my privilege to be a member of Panco, an affiliation I value most highly.

During a recent luncheon with my predecessor as commander in chief of the VFW, Cooper T. Holt—presently the assistant adjutant general of the VFW and the executive director of its Washington office, located near the Capitol—conveyed to me some interesting facts about Panco, which was organized some 3 years ago, under his chairmanship, for the purpose, briefly to create and foster a patriotic and educational forum to study the great issues of our time and country and to speak out on subjects of mutual interest.

Panco now has 65 members in good standing, with 20 other past national commanders being eligible to become members, upon payment of the annual fee of $10, mailed either to its secretary-treasurer, Mr. Sam Shaikewitz, past national commander of the Jewish War Veterans and presently a general insurance agent at 722 Chestnut Street, St. Louis, Mo.; to its president, Mr. Erle Cocke, Jr., past national commander of the American Legion and presently connected with the Peruvian Airlines, at 5108 Balton Road NW., Washington, D.C.; or to its vice president, Dr. Winston E. Burdine, past national commander of AMVETS, who is both a psychiatrist and a lawyer, at 849 Peachtree Street NE., Atlanta, Ga.

At its last meeting, in the assembly hall of the American Legion's headquarters building, on Wednesday, April 28, 1965, Panco was presented with its certificate of membership in the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, by the chairman of its Disabled Veterans Committee, Mr. Clarence Bird, on behalf of the chairman of the President's Committee, Mr. Harold Russell, together with a very nice letter welcoming Panco into its membership, together with some 600 other prominent individuals and national organizations. As a past national commander of AMVETS, three times, Mr. Russell is a Panco member. His immediate predecessor as chairman of the President's Committee, Gen. Melvin J. Maas, had so served for precisely 10 years up to the date of his death on April 13, 1964. General Maas had served as a national commander of the DAV, and also of several other smaller veteran organizations, and has also served in the U.S. Marine Corps during World Wars I and II and during the Korean war, as well as a Congressman from Minnesota for some 18 years. Incidentally, the senior surviving past national commander of the DAV, Millard W. Rice, the sponsor of Panco's membership of the President's Committee, has served on its executive committee since its inception in 1957 and has long been chairman of its awards committee.

Several Panco members and eligibles—all of whom had received White House invitations—attended the meetings of the President's Committee during the 2 days following the Panco meeting. Many more are expected to be attending future annual spring meetings of the President's Committee, with an increasing number participating in the activities of the Governors committees of their respective States. One of the semiannual meetings of Panco has been scheduled to meet each spring just preceding or following the annual meeting of the President's Committee. Panco's last prior meeting had been held during the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of President Lyndon B. Johnson, with all Panco members having been invited to participate in same.

During the last Panco meeting, its president, Mr. Erle Cocke, Jr., reported that Panco's 1963 and 1964 resolutions had been exposed to the President's special assistants and that several of the specific recommendations therein have been reflected in various White House messages to the U.S. Congress and to the American people, thus indicating that Panco has already made valuable contributions to our beloved country.

All Panco members and eligibles have played significant roles in our changing, expanding American society. In addition to having served as elected leaders of their respective national veteran organizations, for one or more terms, they have served their fellow Americans in many different capacities, including U.S. Representatives, State Governors, city mayors, members of State legislatures, governmental officials, judges, lawyers, doctors, business executives, contractors, lobbyists, national legislative directors, national service directors, executive directors, national service officers, radio commenators, and so forth, as well as having served in the U.S. Army, Air Force, Navy, or Marine Corps as generals, colonels, captains, sergeants, corporals, and privates.

One Day's Report of Crime in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the glowing stories of how Lyndon Johnson is making such great progress in bringing beauty, peace and harmony, and progress to the Nation's Capital City, the shame of our daily crime record continues to grow.

We are all in favor of a beautiful city and a beautiful Nation, but beauty must come from the people. It cannot be bestowed by a government, no matter how benevolent. It cannot be legislated. It cannot even be forced upon those unwilling to accept a beautiful city.

It is difficult for people, citizens of Washington and the thousands of tourists, to enjoy the beauties of this city because they dare not go about the streets in safety. Good people are at the mercy of vicious criminals, in many cases turned loose by lenient courts and judges, to prey again and again upon the innocent and the law abiding.

In a single column in this morning's issue of the Washigton Post, is a sordid 1-day record of crime in Washington. In this column there are seven separate news stories of robbery and assault. I would also like to include a news story from the Sunday Washington Post, May 30, detailing the stripping and molesting of one of the young girls who is a secretary in the office of a Member of Congress. Also an article from the Washington Post of May 29 in which the head of the bus company in this city, O. Roy Chalk, is pleading for 250 extra policemen to protect the people who ride the buses in Washington and the drivers from attack by criminal gangs.

I would like to point out that in no city in Alabama is there such a record of violence, lawlessness, and crime.

The articles from the Post follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 1, 1965]

SWEATERED GUNMEN GET $2,167

Two gunmen with turtle neck sweaters pulled up over their noses held up the owner of the 11th Street Liquor Store, 3102 11th Street NW., at about 1 p.m., yesterday and escaped with $2,167, police said.

Owner Morris Gerger, 57, said he and his wife and Raymond Iverson an employee, were ordered into a backroom while the men rifled the cash register.

The holdup men, each carrying a pistol, were described as Negroes in their late twenties. Both were tall and lean. One wore a plaid shirt and the other wore brown pants and a baseball cap.

BANDITS GET $1,000, BAR FOUR IN CELLAR

Two men held up a McDonald's hamburger stand at 6801 Annapolis Road, Landover Hills, early yesterday and left four employes in a cellar, blocking the door with sacks of potatoes, while they dashed next door to rob a service station, according to Prince Georges County police.

McDonald's assistant manager, Wesley Ormrod, 43, was forced at gunpoint to open the safe, from which the men took more than $1,000, police said. Then Ormrod was made to join three other employes in the cellar, which the bandits blockaded with sacks of potatoes.

Next door, Scot Service Station attendant, Allen W. McNair, 50, yielded only $4 from his pocket. The men, both white and in their twenties, escaped into the woods. One carried a pistol and the other was unarmed.

SINGER IS ATTACKED BY THIEF IN CHURCH

A young man who tried to yank a ring from a woman's finger just before choir practice Sunday night at Foundry Methodist Church, 16th and P Streets NW., is being sought by police.

Police said Winifred C. Short, 54, a Defense Department employee who lives at 1339 Fort Stevens Drive NW., was assaulted in the women's lounge by a man who threw a white choir robe over her head and began wrestling for the ring. It didn't come off. When Pat Clingan, 30, of Arlington, entered the room and began yelling, the man fled.

Police broadcast a lookout for a Negro in his late twenties, tall and lean, wearing a light blue jacket and dark trousers.

LORTON STORE OWNER BEATEN AND ROBBED

Thomas W. Helms, 82, proprietor of Helms store in Lorton, was slugged three times over the head Sunday evening by two thugs who escaped with $350, Fairfax County police reported.

Helms was treated for head gashes at Alexandria Hospital and released after insisting he could take out the stitches himself, hospital officials said.

Police said the two men entered the store at U.S. Route 1 and State Route 748 about 6:30 p.m. One knocked Helms to the ground with two blows on the head while the other looted the cash register. Helms was struck again before the men escaped, police said.

CABBIE ROBBED BY TWO PASSENGERS

Two men, one armed with a long-bladed ivory-handled pocket knife, took $21 from Earnest Johnson, 45, a driver for Imperial Cab Co., about 11:30 p.m. Sunday, police reported.

Johnson said he picked up the men in the 4100 block of Georgia Avenue NW., and drove them to the 4300 block of Ninth Street NW. There, they pulled him into the back seat and tied his hands with a necktie before taking his wallet, Johnson told police.

MERCHANT ROBBED AND LEFT IN COOLER

George Hadadee, 53, owner of the Seaton Market, 1822 North Capitol Street, was robbed of $250 yesterday afternoon by two men who tied him and shut him in a walk-in cooler, police reported.

Hadadee told police one of the men hit him on the head with a bottle. He was treated at the Washington Hospital Center for a cut scalp.

HAINS POINT COUPLE ROBBED BY TWO MEN

Two persons parked in a car at Hains Point were robbed of $23 early yesterday, police reported.

Jose Luis Zayas, Jr., 22, of 1900 South Eads Street, Arlington, told police he was beaten with a stick by one of two men who approached the car in which he was sitting with Guiomar Mejia Palacio, 20, of 4201 Cathedral Avenue NW.

GIRL, 20, STRIPPED AT GUNPOINT BY MAN WHO INVADES CAPITOL HILL APARTMENT

A 20-year-old Capitol Hill secretary was sexually molested and robbed of $65 at gunpoint Friday night by an intruder in her apartment house. She told police the man was abducting her when she escaped from his car as it stopped for a traffic light.

A suspect, arrested at his home after the victim supplied police with his tag numbers, was booked as Thomas Cunningham, 26, of 1239½ D Street NE. He was charged with housebreaking, robbery, and assault with a dangerous weapon.

Police said the victim told them she had just returned to her apartment near the Capitol about 10:15 p.m. when she answered a knock on her door and thought she recognized the voice of a neighbor. When she saw the gun, she tried to slam the door shut, she said, but the man forced his way in.

Police said the woman told them the man took the money from her purse, forced her to undress and molested, but did not rape her. She said the man, talking in rambling fashion all the while, ordered her into her clothes again and made her get into his car parked outside the house.

When he stopped for a red light at North Carolina and Pennsylvania Avenues SE., she said, she jumped from the car, got into one that had pulled up behind it and was driven to the fifth precinct stationhouse.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 29, 1965]

TWO-HUNDRED-AND-FIFTY-MAN POLICE SQUAD SOUGHT FOR CITY BUSES

O. Roy Chalk asked creation of a special 250-man police squad yesterday to protect his D.C. Transit System busdrivers and passengers against armed robberies and assaults.

Chalk said he made his request by letter to Police Chief John B. Layton, copies of which he supplied to the District Commissioners, the White House, and members of the House and Senate District Committees.

Chief Layton said last night he had not yet received Chalk's letter and that he would have no comment on the reported request "until I've seen what he has to say."

A wave of robbery-assaults on busdrivers last winter prompted the assignment of 16 men to combat the banditry. It usually was committed late at night at the ends of bus routes in outlying areas. Subsequently, about a dozen precinct men were assigned to beef up this "transit squad."

The extra protection was assigned then at the request of company officials and representatives of the busdrivers' union, local 689 of the Amalgamated Association of Street Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, police recalled.

Robbery squad detectives said busdriver robberies usually are commited by juveniles or groups in their late teens and, like cabdriver robberies, they appear to occur in cycles. A robbery squad spokesman said they have been averaging five a month since January 1.

Chalk said Congressmen got copies of his request because it is going to take money to put it into effect. He cited as a precedent for establishing such a special task force New York City's assignment of nearly 1,000 policemen to ride the subways and other transit lines for the protection of workers and patrons against hoodlums.

Chalk also has based much of his opposition to subways for Washington on a contention that they present ideal locales for robberies and other hit-and-run crimes of violence.

Earlier this month, Chief Layton asked Congress to finance a $4 million program under which he plans to put 200 or more policemen (or their equivalent in overtime man-hours) on street patrol beginning sometime next month.

His request followed a suggestion by President Johnson that more policemen be assigned to street duty here in an effort to halt the rise in street crime.

The Space Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, 6½ years ago we began our national space program with a grim sense of urgency and determination to overcome the dramatic lead of the Soviet Union in the exploration of space. Over those years, the American people have invested billions of dollars and have worked hard to achieve many outstanding successes in which we can now take proper pride.

We are already reaping untold benefits from great and unmatchable achievements in space technologies that are influencing to some degree our daily lives, and that are having an unprecedented peacetime effect upon our Nation's economy. We are discovering almost daily new knowledge of the physical universe of which we are a tiny part, and are

enlarging man's understanding of his environment far beyond the expectations of scientists a generation ago.

But as great as these achievements have been, as monumental as we think our success in space has been, we are still only at the very threshold of discovery, still in the early stages of taking the first tottering steps into an age of untold dimension and challenge.

Last week, Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, delivered an address at the Fifth National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space of the St. Louis Bicentennial Space Symposium. Dr. Welsh is in a very unique position from which to evaluate the status of our national space program. He also has a very unique talent to express lucidly and pointedly his sound convictions and assessments.

He spoke of the challenges of space that still confront us, of the need for faith and optimism in the space program we have laid out for ourselves, of the difficulties that lie ahead. He spoke also of the continuing need to invest our enthusiasm, our energies, and the resources adequate to make sure our space program will remain dynamic and rewarding.

I strongly urge all the Members of the House to read Dr. Welsh's address which I have included here, and, after reading it, to think about the ideas he has expressed. The mature and tested logic of his thoughts cannot help but serve to increase our understanding of what we have accomplished so far in space and to strengthen our confidence of great successes in the future.

THE SPACE CHALLENGE

(Address by Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary, National Aeronautics and Space Council, St. Louis Bicentennial Space Symposium, Fifth National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space, St. Louis, Mo., May 26, 1965)

This bicentennial space symposium is a tribute to the past, a salute to the present, and a beacon of hope for the future. It marks for our attention those whose enterprise and initiative have made this city a thriving metropolis and those who have contributed their technical and managerial skills to the national space program. I take the opportunity afforded me today to congratulate those who planned and are responsible for this symposium.

DYNAMIC FORCE

The space effort is one of the most dynamic and constructive forces to have influenced this great country's growth. It combines exceptional abilities, private and public resources, the factor of competition, and the pioneering spirit. The future of our country may well rest upon our performance in space. Be assured that space, as a way of thinking and as a vigorous enterprise, is here to stay. It has become a permanent and an essential part of our Nation's institutional structure.

MISUNDERSTANDING

I think my optimism is fully warranted, but it is not so extensive as to leave room for complacency. There are contrary factors with which our national space program must contend both at home and abroad. The adverse forces at home are largely those nourished by misunderstanding. And, I believe, it is the responsibility of each of us to do what we can to dissolve such confusion. I refer particularly to the mistaken thesis that we have so many health and welfare needs for our resources here on earth—so much unemployment, malnutrition, and ignorance—that we cannot afford to spend our money on space exploration and particularly on the moon project.

I believe we should maintain a continuous campaign to improve our way of life, our state of health, our rate of economic growth, and our level of education. I believe in doing everything we can do effectively and efficiently in those regards, but I do not consider those needs to be competitive with our space needs—any more than I consider them to be competitive with our national defense requirements. Rather, they complement each other. We can afford to do what is needed in space exploration just as we can afford to do what is needed for our general welfare and for our national defense. In fact, if we are both patriotic and prudent, we cannot afford to do less.

SPACE BENEFITS

It should be realized that resources devoted to space progress create more resources for other purposes. The way of space is the way of the pioneer, but it is also the way of the builder—the force which adds to the total rather than takes from one to give to another.

If we examine the long list of benefits from our space endeavors, we note particularly that they give stimulation to our economic and our technological growth. Properly managed, I believe our space program can help significantly to pay for many of the other requirements of our Great Society and help strengthen our national security at the same time. Our position as a world leader depends substantially on our space program to do both.

It should be unnecessary to point out that funds devoted to the lunar program will be spent to develop our overall national space capability and consequently have much greater significance than just the successful manned round trip to the moon. Every dime of that money is spent right here on earth, stimulating growth, employing personnel, funding new research, developing hardware, and building laboratories and other useful facilities. And, above all, it strengthens our country in this competitive world.

SPACE COMPETITION

As I stated earlier, the space program has to meet contending forces both abroad and at home. We have many excellent relationships with other countries in the form of cooperation in our space program. But, while we talk of cooperation and we mean it, we must at the same time recognize that there is competition between this country and the Soviet Union in the field of space. It is well for us from time to time to take stock—to take a careful look—in order to see how we are making out in comparison with our main competitor. While it is correct to refer to this as a "space race," it is much too complex a venture to permit one to state categorically who is ahead and by how much in the overall effort. Both space programs are broad in scope and are strongly supported. There are, however, differences in emphasis and in piorities. Making comparisons is also hampered by the secrecy which cloaks so much of the Soviet's activity and some of ours.

Before attempting to make any comparison, however, I do want to emphasize one major thesis: the United States should have a vigorous space program and would obtain many benefits from it even if no other nation were engaged in space technology. As Vice President HUMPHREY said at the Goddard memorial dinner this March: "If we were the only Nation engaged in a space program, it would still be in our best self-interest to increase our efforts." His thesis is supported by the fact that the space effort helps raise our standard of living, increases our store of knowledge, and furthers world peace.

We should not forget for a moment, however, that we have very strong competition in space, and that we have therefore another big reason for a major space effort, namely prudence. Some well-intentioned but confused people have suggested that we should slow down in our space program, that we should gracefully accept second place to the Soviets. I cannot agree with that for a moment, either gracefully or gracelessly. Our national security alone would suggest reason enough for us to strive to maintain leadership in this space competition.

In examining the status of the space race, it should be noted that those who were predicting a slowdown in the Soviet space effort because of economic difficulties in that country were wrong—just 100 percent wrong. Not only have the Soviets stepped up their effort during the past year and a half, but they have accelerated even more than we have.

COMPARISON

Keeping in mind the difficulties inherent in making a brief and meaningful comparison between the two programs, I suggest the following few points:

1. In number of earth-orbiting payloads the United States has launched almost three times as many as has the U.S.S.R., although the 1965 rate is less than two to one.

2. In the weight of such payloads, the U.S.S.R. has put up almost three times as much as has the United States.

3. In propulsion, the Soviets have from the beginning enjoyed an operational advantage over the United States. However, we are currently making great strides in this regard and it is hoped that we will keep moving up the propulsion ladder so as not to be overtaken again.

4. In manned space flight, the U.S.S.R. is ahead of the United States, not only in hours of flight but also in multimanned flight and extra-vehicular activity. So far, the U.S. astronauts have completed 40 orbits of the earth, the Soviet cosmonauts have completed 342 such orbits. Moreover, as our Gemini schedule proceeds and contributes continued progress, we must look for much more activity on the part of the Soviets.

5. In the application of space developments to directly useful purposes, the United States is well ahead, particularly in such fields as weather observations, navigation, and communications. However, the Soviets have potential capabilities of these types and have already begun to show some actual experience in space communications.

6. In lunar and interplanetary activity, the United States may have an edge with the spectacular success of the Rangers and Mariners. We have developed this advantage, even though the Soviets have made a greater relative commitment in this regard, both from the view of absolute numbers of launches and also in regard to weight of payloads.

7. Based upon clear knowledge of our own program and upon assertions by the Soviets about theirs, one can reasonably conclude that both countries have manned lunar landing projects underway. It would be impossible to state definitely who is ahead in this regard but I am hopeful that we will turn out to be.

8. As regards the collection of scientific data from space, both countries have made impressive strides, resulting in a possible advantage to the United States regarding knowledge of space phenomena and the lunar surface, and an advantage to the U.S.S.R. regarding the effects of space environment on human beings.

9. Both countries are in a position to make many observations from space, but both countries have pledged not to orbit weapons of mass destruction and have stressed that

their programs are dedicated to peaceful uses. I can only speak for this country in regard to our intent and do state that we will maintain our defenses while pledging not to use space for aggressive purposes.

In commenting upon the comparison which I have just outlined, I would suggest that most generalizations are misleading. We are ahead in some regards and they are ahead in others, and the future of the race depends so much upon how vigorously and how continuously we apply our capabilities to mastering the space environment and perfecting our space technology. There is one generalization, however, which we should constantly keep before us, and that is that we dare not be complacent even while pushing our space program vigorously.

ENERGY FOR SPACE

As we all know, one of the most important keys to space exploration is energy. If there is any area about which we should not become complacent, it is that of generating adequate power to accomplish our future missions. Energy is needed both in propulsion for producing the necessary vehicle velocity and in the auxiliary power for orientation, communications, experimentation, and other related tasks aboard the spacecraft.

We look with some satisfaction at our booster program. New vehicles are being developed for the larger payloads, while increasingly experienced and reliable vehicles are handling the somewhat lesser weights. In addition to the liquid technology, we can be encouraged with the development in solid propulsion as well as in nuclear propulsion. In other words, we have a formidable national launch capability both in use and under research and development. However, we must not be satisfied with what such programs promise and thereby waste the valuable time which should now be devoted to further advancement in research and development of these new technologies.

FUTURE MISSIONS

I stress the importance of energy conversion to useful work as a key to future space adventures, because it truly opens the doors to manned exploration and peaceful exploration of the universe far beyond our atmosphere. We will want to journey to and from the planets in weeks and/or months, not years, and on regular schedules any time in the year. Also, in addition to establishing large bases on suitable planets and logistically supporting them until they can be sustained totally or in part by the natural resources found on those planets, we will want to do many other things, including regularly resupplying and continuously orbiting the earth with space stations. There are both scientific and military missions for which space stations seem to me to be ideally suited. Moreover, we will want to intercept and sample the resources of planetoids and maybe of comets; we will certainly maintain a growing interest in the search for extraterrestrial life. All of these and many more worthwhile proposed future projects require power, as the more power we have guaranteed before the mission, the greater is the payload capability, the safety margin for the crew, and the chance of successfully completing the mission.

LONG-RANGE VIEW

It is of course necessary that many of us, particularly those in Washington, look at our space program with a somewhat short-range view, since we have to deal with the annual budgetary process. While I am optimistic about some things, my optimism does not stretch itself to the extent of predicting a less frequent budgetary exercise. Therefore, even though it is necessary that attention be given to the short run, I urge all who have the competence to look and plan ahead to do so as often and as thoroughly as possible.

WARNINGS

In conclusion, I would like to take this occasion to express several warnings in regard to the space program. Some of these repeat points already made, but I believe that they merit emphasis.

1. Let us not underestimate the Soviet capabilities or potential.
2. Let us not expect our space program to proceed indefinitely without some tragedy involving our astronauts.
3. Let us not overlook the national security insurance flowing from our construction of space competence.
4. Let us not become so blase about our space accomplishments that we fail to thrill to the excitement of new goals reached.
5. Let us not expect a steady or automatic flow of increased benefits from our space program unless we invest increasing resources and efforts in that program.

Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials concerning the proposed repeal of section 14(b), Taft-Hartley Act, which is advocated by the administration. The first editorial was published in the Peabody, Kans., Gazette-Herald while the second was broadcast over WTOP radio and television here in Washington. Essentially both editorials reach a similar conclusion in opposition to Federal action which would nullify the right-to-work laws of 19 individual States.

The editorials follow:

RIGHT TO WORK OR RIGHT TO ANYTHING

President Johnson last week threw the not inconsiderable weight of his office behind a move to amend the Taft-Hartley labor law in a manner to repeal the right-to-work laws of 19 individual States. One wonders whether the master politician really wants this to come about or is just sacking up a few millio labor votes with his stand.

Since, deep down in his southern heart, Lyndon B. Johnson was once sort of a conservative and since he started his political career in Texas, one of the States having right-to-work legislation on the books, it is hard to escape doubting his sincerity in this bold public stand on dumping all right-to-work legislation in every State. One feels almost certain that he is not looking at the issues but at the fact that the well-organized national labor movement can deliver substantially more votes than the right-to-work organizations; and that while organized labor fully understands the issue as it affects them, the mass of the public are not nearly so interested in the issue one way or another. Most farmers, business people, and workers in nonunion employment areas, have little feeling on the issue.

Right to work has been said to mean that a laborer does not have to pay tribute to a private organization (a union) to hold a job. Unions say, with some justification, that workers not belonging to a union in a firm which has one, reap the benefits of union efforts but "free ride" so far as helping pay for union work.

Proponents of right-to-work laws base their stand on the freedom of the individual to join or not to join any organization, and to hold a job and progress in his work by his own efforts, rather than his allegiance or lack of it to a union.

Both arguments have some merit and it pretty much depends on whether you are more a believer in the individual's rights or the rights of the "masses" as to what your own feelings on right-to-work laws will be.

Another issue crops up in the Johnson stand, however, and that is the rather impressive number of times in the past few months in which the Federal Government has pulled rank on the States to nullify decisions made by citizens of one State or another, or by their elected representatives. The list includes civil rights, of course, but also includes methods of election of State officials and now, the rights of States to have their own labor laws.

It is ironic that States rights have taken their most severe beating in two centuries under a politician who started his career and spent most of it as a dedicated States' righter.

EDITORIAL BROADCAST ON MAY 26 AND 27, 1965, OVER WTOP RADIO AND TELEVISION

This is a WTOP editorial.

The Presidents' effort to get repeal of the so-called right-to-work provision of the Taft-Hartley Act seems to us to create a great deal of ado about a matter which doesn't deserve it. Granted that the AFL–CIO very much wants to get rid of that section of the act which permits States to forbid union shop contracts if they wish. But in practical terms, the law is not bad as it stands. Permitting individual States to make their own decision on union shop contracts is a satisfactory compromise between fiercely opposing points of view.

Right to work is a subject very difficult to argue objectively. Union leaders insist that they should be allowed to negotiate union shop agreements—that is, agreements requiring an employee to join the union as a condition of holding his job. A union shop, the argument goes, is simply a means of safeguarding union security and compelling all members of a bargaining unit to share in the costs as well as the benefits of union organization.

On the other side, there's the impressive contention that nobody should have the right to force any American to join anything. Right-to-work advocates maintain that if unions want members they ought to use persuasion and performance, rather than resort to a kind of coercion.

The observer who tries to be impartial finds himself agreeing with some of both claims. The union shop issue is not clear-cut; neither side is completely right or completely wrong.

That is why we think Mr. Johnson's attempt to eliminate the right-to-work clause in Taft-Hartley is unnecessary. The present arrangement represents a workable compromise which need not be disturbed. Only 19 States—none of them highly industrialized—have chosen to invoke right to work. Conflicting interests are in balance and, in our opinion, the law should be left as it is.

Tunisian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, today, June 1, is the Independence Day of Tunisia.

It is proper that we honor the long fight for independence of the people of Tunisia which finally came to fruition on this day.

It is equally proper that we honor the outstanding record of internal development and responsibility in foreign relations which are characteristic of the development of Tunisia in past years. Under the able leadership of President Bourguiba, Tunisia has set an outstanding record not only in her foreign relations with African countries, but also throughout the world. In particular, Tunisia's position as an independent nation resting between Africa, the Meghreb and the West has been a source of strength for world peace.

It is appropriate that on this day we honor in the House of Representatives a valued member of the world community and its able leader.

The Homing Dollar Is Not Homesick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult problems that our Nation has confronted is that of balance of payments. Much study has been given to this problem, and many solutions have been suggested.

Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, has recently written a paper entitled "The Homing Dollar Is Not Homesick." In this paper he has given us suggestions as to how we can undertake to improve our balance-of-payments situation. I urge all of my colleagues to read Mr. Strackbein's article:

THE HOMING DOLLAR IS NOT HOMESICK

(By O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy)

Classical economic theory holds that trade and payments balances will correct themselves through the operation of changing price levels and accompanying shifts in the direction of imports and exports among the trading countries.

The theory for its efficacy in practice, however, calls for the operation of free market forces. When these are subjected to controls and regulation the looked-for self-corrective forces may become distorted and the normal results will not necessarily be produced.

Economists have continued to rely on this theory even though the free market forces have been subjected to many far-reaching controls and interferences in recent years. When the heavy postwar outflow of dollars was underway, economists gave soothing assurances that the dollars would come back in the form of orders for American merchandise.

Today billions of dollars have accumulated abroad; and they are not straining themselves to return to this country. They give no hint of homesickness and seem to be happy enough where they happen to be. In a hearing before a subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in March of this year, Assistant Secretary of the State Griffith Johnson expressed the general concern by noting that the question might be raised "whether much quicker progress in our exports could be made if those countries which are complaining about 'excess dollars' created by our deficits would spend them on imports from the United States."

In reviewing the testimony that had been given before the subcommittee, Dr. Woodlief Thomas, chief economist of the parent committee, also posed a question: "Why," he asked, "have recent large outflows of dollars not been matched by increased exports? Why do foreigners prefer to build up liquid dollar balances and eventually withdraw gold, rather than use dollars to buy more U.S. goods and services or make long-term investments in this country? What are the implications of this accumulation of dollar liquidity?"

Very well, let us see if it is possible to get at the bottom of the mystery.

If other countries are not doing what classical economic theory would demand; namely, suffering from prices so high that they would be glad to buy from this country, which should have relatively low prices, what, indeed, are the implications?

1. Perhaps our prices are not lower than foreign prices;

2. Possibly the other countries do not want or need more of our goods than they now import;

3. Conceivably they can get the goods cheaper from other sources, quality for quality;

4. Other obstacles may inhibit larger purchases from us.

The area of the world that is most able to buy from us because of a plenitude of dollars are the European countries.

A guess could be ventured that they do not stand in distressful need of more imports from us. They are doing quite well with home production and with imports from other sources. The fact is that they do indeed import quite heavily from us; more, in fact, than we buy from them; but not enough to overcome our balance-of-payments deficit; nor as much as they could import in view of their heavy dollar holdings.

This being the case we may ask what effect if any the state of our balance of payments should exert on the flow of trade between this country and the rest of the world.

Why do other countries buy from us in the first place, and what determines how much they buy?

We will do well at the outset to brush away the obstruction to clear thinking that lurks in the notion that England or France or Japan, as countries, buy from us. Except as state trading is engaged in, as in Russia, countries do not buy from one another. This fact is well understood but become obscured when we use terminology such as we universally employ, as when we say, "Italy imported X number of millions of dollars from us in 1964." Italy did nothing of the kind. Italians did.

In all areas where private international trade prevails, imports and exports are carried on by private firms, merchants, brokers, distributors, agents, etc. Their motivation is profit.

Import merchants often have diverse sources of supply, and are in a position to shift from one source of supply to another, depending on price levels, likelihood of selling this product rather than another, etc. Distributors in a foreign country, on the other hand, are often bound by exclusive arrangements with the manufacturers they represent. They may sell one brand of goods, such as machinery, from a particular source and no other; and thus do not have a range of competing goods to offer. They sell, when they can, in competition with other goods both from this country and from other countries. Whether or not their sales boom, proceed steadily or falter, may depend on a variety of factors. Their customers are the judges. These customers, who may be wholesalers, jobbers, dealers or retailers within the other country, because of their own quest for profits, may switch from one distributor of a foreign brand to another. They little care whether their hoped-for profits come from the sale of American goods, German goods, Swedish goods or goods from anywhere else. We may be sure that they do not ask about the state of the balance of payments in various parts of the world.

A West German distributor of a brand of American TV sets is interested in the number of sales he can make and at what margin of profit. If his agency is not exclusive and he has competing sets from Japan or Holland, he will sell what he can of this set or that set. He will hardly consult the financial section of his newspaper to become current in the relative state of the international balance of payments, before he sells. He will also hardly say to himself "The United States is in a bad state in her balance of payments. I will sell the American product rather than those from other countries. I do want to help Uncle Sam."

No. If his markup on all his sets were the same he would be quite indifferent over the customer's own preference. He would not try to influence him. Should his margin of profit on a Japenese set, however, be distinctly higher than on the American he would be more interested in selling the Japanese set; or if the prospective customer showed evidence that price means much to him, the salesman would concentrate on the lower priced sets lest he fail to make a sale at all. If non-American sets should fall into a lower price category he would favor them over the American. Again, he would hardly stop to mutter to himself "Those Americans, God bless them, they do need more exports. They were so good to us when we were down." Should he, nevertheless, as the result of some rare mental aberration, be stirred by such a thought we may be sure that he would quickly obliterate it, if (1) he were about to lose a sale because of the customer's preference for a set from another country, or (2) he reflected that his profit on the American set would be $50 while he would reap $100 from the sale of a competing product.

Assume now that someone told him, assuming he were a West German, or French, or Belgian, "They tell me that our country has quite a load of dollars. You should push American goods in order to help right the balance. Dollars are an American currency, you know."

He would perhaps reply "Dollars? I don't have any dollars. What would I do with dollars? I don't pay my rent or grocery bill in dollars, nor my help. Where did you get the idea that I am loaded with dollars?"

"I read it in the newspapers. That is, I read that our country is swimming in dollars. It just occurred to me that you could help our relations with the Americans by keeping that in mind."

"Oh, I will keep it in mind, all right. That won't cost me anything; but I am not in the diplomatic business nor am I in business for my health. Why should I carry our country's diplomatic burdens? That's what we have a government for, and ambassadors and bankers. If anybody has dollars it must be the banks. I don't see any dollars anywhere." He has enough troubles without getting himself entangled in the international financial flypaper.

Then there is the private consumer in a foreign country. This customer is perhaps a woman out to do her shopping. She carries francs or liras or shillings and pounds, depending on which is her home country. She does not, strangely enough, have her pocketbook stuffed with dollars either. She goes to her favorite dress shop or grocery store and has in mind some fair

notion about how much she intends to spend. Neither the shop nor the store has an American section whither she could direct her steps in order to help Uncle Sam out of his balance-of-payments straits. (Perhaps this is something our State Department should look into.) In fact, it is doubtful that her mind even turns to thoughts of the United States while shopping, strange as that may seem.

If she buys bulk groceries, such as vegetables, they are likely from her own countryside. If she buys bananas or oranges they are probably from a tropical source in the case of bananas, or from Italy or Spain, Israel or Africa, if they are oranges. If it is canned goods she wants, she may indeed encounter some American goods. The prices are likely to be high. How well-heeled is she? Perhaps she likes American canned peaches and will pay a premium price once a month. However, the American canned goods are mixed on the shelves with those from the home country and from other foreign sources.

Does she know of the superior American quality? Perhaps the American advertisers have reached her and she knows that Swift is American, and Kraft and Heinz; and if there are plenty of cans of American goods she may by the sheer weight of the law of averages put some in her marketing basket. However, the comparative prices will speak louder than pleasing labels; and more people have less money than more money, which means that fewer people have enough money to reach for luxuries.

Let us assume the somewhat improbable, and say that her heart beats for America for reasons that may be inscrutable, and loads up on American goods. She wants to help us—in a gesture of reverse foreign aid, so to speak. When she comes home and, as it happens her husband is there, she runs to him and exclaims exultingly "Look what I have bought—all American or nearly all. Don't you think that is wonderful."

"Who told you to buy American?" he asks in a tone taxed with impatience.

After her reduced allowance thereafter she often walks by the canned goods shelf and glances longingly at the forbidden fruit, but moves on; and the American balance-of-payments difficulties have to look elsewhere for succor.

The fable could go on; but is it not enough to suggest that we will not get very far doctoring our balance-of-payment malady unless we make a more realistic diagnosis than is accomplished by talk of liquidity, debt management, retarding the flow of investment dollars from this country, shrinking the tourist outgo, etc.?

Private commercial foreign trade represents the efforts of thousands of merchants exporters, importers, distributors, agents, etc., to turn a profit through their transactions. Patriotism is not a moving element or a motive in this endeavor. It is a question of turning goods, no matter from what source, for profit. With respect to importers who purchase the imported materials for processing or conversion into finished goods which in turn are hoped to be disposed of at a profit, the question is simply one of relative cost, relative quality, reliability, etc. Timeliness and credit sometimes enter as factors; but the determining considerations are always the relative outlook for profitable enterprise. Errors of judgment may enter; but in time of peace, preference of one country of origin over another, does not enter into the equation. The driving and determining motive comes from the profit incentive.

Why then do the dollar-burdened countries not buy more from us?

That is the wrong question. We should ask, Why do the importers, merchants, producers, distributors, and so forth, in foreign countries with heavy dollar balances not increase their purchases from us when the abundance of dollars held by their banks, institutions, or citizens would make this both convenient and helpful?

What possible answer can be found to that question other than lack of need for more goods from us, in the case of industrial users, or the availability of competing goods from other sources to the other importers, at prices that promise better profits?

If there is no other reasonable answer than this we should look to the factors that determine relative competitive standing of this country compared with its competitors. Unquestionably, by and large, relative prices represent the most compelling factor.

The conclusion is unavoidable that American goods are priced too high, especially finished consumer goods, to sop up the dollars floating about in such quantity overseas. Producers, fabricators, processors, and manufacturers in yet other or third countries, aided and abetted by lower wages and rapidly rising productivity, can outbid us as guarantors or promisers of profits to prospective importers of our goods.

Foreign trade statistics demonstrate conclusively that our competitive contest in the field of finished goods has been going surely, unmistakably and heavily against us, both in terms of imports and exports. We are importing a rising share of them and, with the exception of machinery and other items sucked outward by our booming foreign investments, our exports are shifting toward subsidized farm products and foreign-aid-tied goods. A number of our leading mass-production industries have shifted from a net export to a net import position (i.e., total imports exceeding total exports). Among these are automobiles, iron and steel, cotton textiles, petroleum, typewriters, sewing machines, shoes, and so forth.

The result has been unemployment in the very industries that should provide expanding employment, i.e., finished goods industries which are the most labor intensive.

When our exports of farm products increase, as they have been doing, reaching 25 percent of our total exports, the increase does not improve the competitive position of steel, textiles, petroleum, etc. Foreign merchants, distributors, etc., are not moved to buy more of these American products merely because we are exporting more wheat, feed grains, soy beans, etc. They will not forgo profits in their own fields in order to help American industry. To think so would be a mark of extreme naivete. In many instances our own industries have entered the leading foreign markets by establishing themselves within them. Why should the foreign customers, even if they can buy American satisfactorily, seek goods manufactured 3,000 or 4,000 miles away, if they can get them made in the homeland, and at lower prices? Where is the mystery?

In order to export successfully we must be competitive in each individual product concerned. If we expect to export steel we must be able to offer the foreign buyers a level of prices that will enable them to make a profit equal to or exceeding that offered by our competitors; or if the steel is to be used in construction or fabrication, then prices that are below those offered by our competitors, other things being equal. If we cannot do that our exports will not thrive nor will they be profitable if we insist on exporting in any event, no matter how many dollars foreigners have on hand.

We cannot penetrate foreign markets by humming the tune that says that we can do what they can do and do it better. Manufacturing costs are the determining factor in extensive foreign trade; and in total corporate costs of manufacturing in this country employee compensation represents 80 percent. Other countries need to be only a half to a fifth as productive per man hour to outdo us in terms of unit production costs. Many of them are catching up and passing those levels.

Are we then to reduce wages? Or are we to accomplish the same end, i.e., cost reduction by "modernizing" our factories, installing new machinery of magic deftness and speed, to replace thousands upon thousands of our workers, thus reducing the payroll just as surely as if we reduced wages?

What then becomes of total consumer purchasing power, the indispensable absorbent of the goods that come tumbling off our production lines? Will this contraction not produce a pinch?

When our housewives go shopping in this country they encounter a great variety of imported goods. Many of these carry price labels that make our manufacturers look like pickpockets. Our shoppers, too, have some notions about how much they may spend. If they can save 25 to 50 cents on the dollar by buying Japanese goods or somewhat less, by buying British, German, Italian, or what not, will they bite their nails, ponder the mysteries of economics, and after a few moments of struggle say "Oh, I must buy American goods because more people will be employed here if I do"? Or will they reflect that they can either buy more other goods if they pay less per article or, if not buying more goods, save more money for other purposes? Ask any shopper; or rather than asking them, watch them. Or, better yet, observe yourself when you buy. The lure of a bargain or seeming bargain, is very powerful.

Now ponder what the shopper's predilection for lower, distinctly lower, prices means to the American producers and manufacturers whose costs are buoyed skyward by the very factor upon which they depend to absorb their goods, i.e., wages. If the shopper has the choice of bypassing the domestic goods in favor of the foreign because foreign manufacturers do not pay nearly as high wages as the domestic but have in recent years greatly increased installation of machinery and modern equipment, thus improving greatly their productivity, what effect does this choice of our shoppers have on the confidence with which our own manufacturers are likely to view the future? Will they be inclined to expand or will they "modernize" yet more, hoping thus to cut costs and not suffer the cold shoulder from our shoppers? The question will answer itself. Unfortunately in striving thus to remain competitive by automating, computerizing, etc., as a means of remaining competitive, i.e., to hold the price-conscious customers, our manfacturers run into two backfiring effects: (1) they reduce employment, and (2) they do not enhance sales sufficiently to lead to rehiring and expanding their work forces—simply because imported goods kill the very precious principle contained in the classical sequence: lower costs leading to lower prices, and these to ballooning consumption and expanded employment, to which we looked hopefully and with justified confidence in the past to expand our economy.

Today we are left only with the hollow shell of this principle. We are left with net unemployment or insufficient additional employment (including the indirect) to beat the upward population curve.

Unless we become competitive with the rest of the world through lower costs we will not export enough additional goods to take up the slack. We cannot become competitive unless we reduce our costs; but cost reduction of any significance can be achieved only by reducing employee costs (which, to repeat, represent 80 percent in the corporate manufacturing field). Such reduction can today be achieved only by further modernization, etc., because wage rates cannot be halted, much less reduced. However, in reducing labor costs we shrink consumer purchasing power; and if we do that we upend our system as we know it. Why? Because,

to repeat for emphasis, imports prevent, on a rapidly growing front, the consumption of the old reliable equation of cost reduction equals swelling consumer sales. We relied successfully on this formula and grew to world industrial leadership by resort to it. Of course, it really worked only with respect to goods that enjoy an elastic demand, meaning the nonessentials or goods that we can do without, or consumer in reduced quantities if income drops but goods which we may buy in multiple units, and successively as they wear out or lose their sheen. Yet, even though the formula only worked with respect to the nonessential goods these have come to dominate our economy; and it was this fact that gave us our world lead.

And that is also the base on which our economy today rises or falls.

The oscillation of our international balance of payments represents but a symptom of our international operations. Today, moreover, it contains political and other elements that do not take their cue from private international trade.

The upshot is that in addressing our inquiry into the problem of balance of payments we should take care lest we stray from the fundamental factors which are merely echoed and then not neecssarily clearly by the state of that balance.

Let us keep our eyes on the private sector, consisting of buyers and sellers seeking a profit, and shoppers and other consumers who determine which way the money flows. Then we may get some usable answers.

Government Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the "Introduction and Statement on Tax Policy," of the congressional presentation of the Smaller Business Association of New England.

Also covered in the SBANE report was a statement on "Procurement." In that statement the group pointed out that we must often be careful to bring our procurement practice in line with our procurement policy as it affects the participation of small business in production and research contracts. We must never equate "bigness with excellence and smallness with inferiority" if we are to bring the highest state of technological development to bear on our current problems.

In the summary of the presentation, it was pointed out that the efforts of business and government at all levels will be necessary if we are to meet the challenge of increasing population and the consequent demand for new jobs.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, following my remarks, the statement on "Procurement," by Paul W. Otto, president, United Engineers, Inc., of Boston, and the "Summary," by Laurence K. Hamilton, president, Tecnifax Corp. of Holyoke, Mass.:

STATEMENT ON PROCUREMENT BY SBANE REPRESENTATIVE PAUL W. OTTO, PRESIDENT, UNITED ENGINEERS, INC., OF BOSTON

Because of the increasing complexity of military, naval, and space systems, Government contracts tend to be concentrated in the hands of industrial giants. Last year, 100 firms accounted for 73 percent of defense procurement. Twenty-five of these firms received 52.9 percent of the contracts and one firm received 5.8 percent. Yet 300,000 small businesses received only 18 percent.

It is true that many prime contracts can be handled only by large firms, but positive steps must be taken to make sure that as many contracts as possible are assigned to small business. Government procurement is such a vital segment of our economy that small business must receive a larger share, or it will deteriorate to the point where the national economy will suffer. Congress has taken such steps, but the intent of the legislation it has enacted is not always observed in procurement practices.

On June 4, 1964, while testifying before the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, the Honorable Eugene P. Foley, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, stated that he was convinced that the top officials of the Department of Defense were sincerely and energetically carrying out the small business policies and programs that have been established by Congress and supported by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. He went on to say, however, * * * and this is the point we wish to stress * * * that in his opinion, these policies were not being administered in the same spirit at the far reaches of Government procurement agencies, that is, by contracting officers and others who are directly responsible for purchasing. His observation is based on the experience of SBA procurement personnel and it is confirmed by the personal experience of many of our Members.

We urge, therefore, that positive steps be taken by top Government procurement officials to inculcate in all personnel at working levels an understanding of the reasoning behind the small business programs established by Congress, so that they will be executed in a sincere and realistic manner. In addition, we urge that action be taken in the following specific areas:

1. STRENGTHEN SBA SET-ASIDE PROGRAM

The Smaller Business Association of New England appreciates SBA's efforts in the joint set-aside programs and urges that its work be encouraged and expanded. In 1964, SBA was responsible for 51,417 set-asides with a total value of $3,041,055,857; as compared to its 1963 record of 45,628 set-asides with a total value of $2,381,315,350—an increase of 27 percent.

However, small business sharing of defense procurement is only 18 percent. This is 2 percent below the peak reached in 1957. The trend shown by this chart indicates that small business needs all the help that it can get from SBA just to hold its own.

Nevertheless, pressures are being exerted to remove SBA from joint set-aside activity in favor of unilateral action by the procurement agencies. Such a change would emasculate the set-aside program of denying small firms effective representation in procurement offices. Elimination of SBA's procurement center representatives would remove the foremost champions of the cause of small business.

These capable and dedicated men are primarily responsible for the set-aside increase I cited earlier. There are only 46 of them and it took 12 years to acquire this number. In addition to pressing for more set-asides, they are constantly seeking break-outs from large systems of items that can be efficiently and economically supplied by small concerns. They insist that the small contractor be given the same attention and consideration as the industrial giant.

We appreciate the helpfulness of the small business specialists in procurement agencies but it should be recognized that no man can equitably serve two masters. There is no doubt that the interests of small business can be served much more effectively by SBA personnel than by assigning responsibility for small firms to procurement personnel as a collateral function. Effective representation cannot be insured when there is divided responsibility and diluted interest.

SBANE urges that SBA's role in the set-aside program not only be preserved, but encouraged and expanded, so small business will receive its just share of the Government's requirements for goods and services, including research and development and military and civil construction.

2. ENCOURAGE SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION IN R. & D.

This chart [not printed in RECORD] reveals the minimal participation of small business in Defense R. & D. projects—only 3.7 percent of $6 billion of awards in 1964. This small percentage is a reflection of administrative attitudes that seem to equate bigness with excellence and smallness with inferiority. As a result, competent scientific resources are being wasted. We contend that greater use must be made of the capabilities of small research and development firms if we are to preserve this reservoir of scientific knowledge which is essential to the Nation's well-being. "Breakouts" of R. & D. contracts should produce as good, or better, results than awards to big firms because of the specialization and dedication of the small businessman. As a matter of fact, many small firms are operated by men who were formerly executives of big corporations.

We suggest that the following steps be taken:

(a) Adoption of a procurement procedure that will give reasonable assurance that competition is not available before sole source contracts are negotiated.

(b) Early and wide dissemination by Government R. & D. centers of information on upcoming unclassified contracts and technical projects for which R. & D. proposals are desired.

(c) Establishment of safeguards to protect proprietary information submitted in connection with unsolicited proposals and subcontracts.

3. SBA CERTIFICATION IN LIEU OF SURETY BONDS

For what appear to be arbitrary reasons, surety companies refuse to issue bonds in behalf of small concerns that have SBA loans. This policy is not relaxed even when SBA agrees to subordinate its interest to those of the bonding company. This arbitrary practice prevents many small concerns from receiving Government contracts that require bid, performance or payment bonds.

Protection of the interests of small business requires alternate arrangements that will be acceptable in lieu of surety bonds. SBANE proposes that SBA be authorized to issue certificates that would be accepted by contracting officers when surety bonds are not obtainable, provided that SBA has determined that the financial status of the company justifies such certification.

SUMMARY OF SBANE PRESENTATION BY LAURENCE K. HAMILTON, PRESIDENT, TECNIFAX CORP., OF HOLYOKE, MASS.

We are now entering the fifth year of an economic upswing. Spurred by the $11.5 billion tax cut, the gross national product climbed 6½ percent last year to $623 billion. Industrial production was 137 percent of the 1957–59 average. The number of business failures was the lowest since 1956. New business incorporations reached an alltime high of 198,000.

Figures like these are certainly the basis for an optimistic view of our economic future, but we should guard against a natural tendency for optimism to develop into complacency. After a relatively slow rate of growth in the 1950's, our gross national product has taken an upturn. But we will need our present rate of growth and more just to keep pace with our soaring population. It is true that unemployment dropped to 4.7

percent in March of this year, the lowest percentage since 1957, but it will rise sharply next month as hundreds of thousands of high school and college graduates enter the labor market. Over 1 million new persons are joining the work force each year. By 1970, our economy must have jobs for over 86 million workers.

Total employment is now at an alltime high of 75 million. According to the Labor Department, however, 7 million new jobs will be needed in the next 3 years just to offset automation. Normal population growth will add 4 million job hunters for an 11-million total. Yet, even with the economic boom of the past 4 years, our civilian employment total has increased only 7.6 million since 1957. According to these projections, our economy must provide 50 percent more jobs in the next 3 years than it has produced in the past 8 years.

The antipoverty program, job retraining, and the Job Corps are intended to provide economic opportunities for underprivileged and technologically displaced persons, but the success of these programs is dependent upon the ability of our economy to produce enough jobs for everyone. Since small business employs three out of seven persons in this country, it has a vital role to play in meeting this challenge. But it needs your help.

It is true that the total number of small businesses is growing, but growth is concentrated in the retail, service, and wholesale trades. The number of small manufacturers is declining—down 3.2 percent, from 304,000 in 1960 to 294,000 in 1963.

There has been a marked trend toward bigness in American manufacturing in the past 15 years. According to the SBA, between 1950 and 1962, the share of manufacturing assets held by the 200 largest corporations increased from 49 to 57 percent.

This situation is aggravated by the difficulty that small firms encounter in obtaining Government prime and subcontracts. Government procurement plays such a vital role in our economy today that small business must receive a just share if it is to survive and grow.

Small business can contribute much more to our defense effort and save the taxpayers money in the bargain. A recent SBA survey of 57 small business set-asides revealed that they saved the Government a total of $7 million compared to the prices of previous large suppliers. In a single instance, when a contract for 90,000 bayonets was awarded as a result of bidding by small firms, the successful contratcor delivered the bayonets at a price that was $200,000 lower than was billed by the previous sole-source supplier.

In the field of labor relations, we are opposed to repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. We believe that no American should be forced to join a union to hold his job.

The program we have presented today represents a concerted effort by all members of our association to offer practical solutions to some of the problems which confront small business. We urge your careful consideration of our proposals which are summarized as follows:

1. Stimulus to increased investment—freeing of capital for economic growth through liberalized rates of taxation.

2. Increased share of Government procurement—more set-asides, breakouts, and subcontracts. We are not seeking special privileges. All we ask is equal opportunity for all businesses, regardless of size.

3. Improvement of the labor climate—management and labor must pool their resources to raise productivity to higher levels. Labor must accept the responsibility of full partnership in this endeavor.

The Smaller Business Association of New England appreciates the consideration you have shown to small business in the past, and we offer our sincere thanks for the time and attention which you have given us today. May we look forward to continuing cooperation between our association and the Congress of the United States.

Thank you.

Discrimination Against Southern States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks and to include extraneous material, I would like to call your attention to a telling editorial from the Daily Mountain Eagle of Jasper, Ala. I hope my colleagues may heed the warning voiced by this editorial. You cannot continue to take away the rights of the people of my State and my section of the country without seriously endangering your own:

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL VERY DISCRIMINATORY

Congressional liberals continue to discriminate to great extremes in their alleged efforts to eliminate discrimination in Dixie States.

Latest example is the anti-poll-tax amendments proposed pointedly against four Southern States because they collect a poll tax and which would allow the Federal Government to regulate said poll tax in these States.

No Alabamian, regardless of race, creed, political affiliation or otherwise should be in favor of a poll tax used simply as a vehicle to deny the right to vote. On the other hand, the simple right to collect a poll tax, returns from which go into Alabama's educational treasury, should not be denied by the Congress.

Daily, cancerous Federal encroachments, hidden and disguised in the false robes of antidiscrimination are being pushed and broadened to cover more and more areas of life. In the end they will benefit neither race, but will subdue the powers of the States to virtually none.

The constitutionality of poll taxes has been sustained previously by the Federal courts, but this doesn't sway the liberals. The small amount charged in Alabama as a poll tax should not discourage anyone from voting, but if it does it will discourage whites as well as Negroes, male as well as female, Democrat as well as Republican. If it discriminates, it discriminates against all people.

The basic question is not whether there should be a poll tax or not. The amounts collected in past days would not make or break Alabama. The question at hand is a principle, whether the State or Federal Government shall decide. The Constitution has left the matter to the States in the past.

Why should a Senator in Colorado or California or Hawaii decide whether or not Alabama can have a poll tax?

This is no different than having Alabama citizens say they can't wear grass skirts on Wakiki Beach.

Here is hoping our Senators and Congressmen from Alabama, Republican or Democrat, will cast unanimous ballots against the anti-poll-tax legislation.

A Monument to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, many of us have filled requests for American flags which have flown above the Capitol. On a recent visit to my San Diego, Calif., district, I was able to fulfill a more unusual request. It was from the students of the Horace Mann Junior High School, who wanted a Colombian flag.

They wanted it to help mark the completion of a school project so laudatory that I wish to share the information about it with House colleagues.

Because of the imagination and efforts of these young people, a remote community in the southernmost Province of Colombia will have a public school for some 400 children—a school it might otherwise have waited a long time for.

The project was undertaken with Peace Corps cooperation. That agency put the San Diego school in touch with community leaders in Barrios Unidos, Garzon, in the Province of Huila. The children of this village were without any school whatever. An aroused citizenry had earmarked the land needed, and was getting it cleared for construction—mainly on hope—when the San Diego school youngsters entered the picture. It was then estimated that as little as $1,400 in outside money would cover the cost of sand, rock, cement, and fencing needed for the physical plant—utilizing contributed labor.

Despite offers of assistance from adult groups, the Horace Mann students decided that this was to be their project. And early in the spring they launched a whirlwind round of money-raising activity: a student jazz concert, a benefit student-faculty basketball game, a bake sale, a weekend carwash center, the gathering of trading-stamp books redeemable in cash.

Slowly, the funds accumulated—to the full $1,400. Under the direction of Peace Corps volunteers on the scene in Garzon, the money is making possible a five-room school where no school existed before.

As Horace Mann's principal, C. Russell Henzie, puts it—

The benefits flow both ways. An urgently needed school is being built for children woefully lacking in education. It is not financed with Government funds or foreign aid, but by private funds from our San Diego students and self-help from the people of Garzon.

The people building the school will feel the pride and satisfaction of having participated to their capacity, and the students of Horace Mann can be proud of the fact that they have helped build a lasting monument to freedom. It has been said that "Only the educated are free." What better way to promote freedom than to build a school?

Due special mention for their efforts in this great project are James Harring-

ton, faculty advisor to the Horace Mann student body, and the following students: Earl Altshuler, student president, Pete Keyser, Kirk Kiloh, Bobby Belkin, Randy Flynn, Rod Boone, Bill Coady, Becky Overton, Mike Drakulich, Linda Moore, Kathy Crosthwaite, Glen Skirvin, Frank Apgar, Pete Snyder, Carol Knott, Sandy Overton, and Carol Lamden.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Tunisian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, June 1 is a significant day in the history of the Tunisian people; for on that day in 1959 a constitution which established the Republic of Tunisia was promulgated. Today, on the sixth anniversary of that day which marked the beginning of a government for, and by, the people, of Tunisia, I would like to express my admiration for the achievements the Tunisian people have made in this short period of time.

In recent years, which have seen the emergence of many new nations, Tunisia is an outstanding example of what a free people with determination and will, led by a man of foresight, understanding, and intelligence can do. I refer of course to the distinguished President of Tunisia, Habib Bourguiba.

Indeed, the Republic of Tunisia stands as a proud symbol of the democratic system of government and as a living example that democracy can succeed in newly established nations.

The Tunisian people did not achieve their independence easily for the French protectorate was ended in 1956 only after several years of strife and bloodshed. Following the signing of the protocol in which France recognized Tunisia's sovereignty and independence, a Tunisian Constituent Assembly was convened. This Assembly abolished the monarchy, drafted the Constitution, and named Habib Bourguiba President. The first elections under the Constitution were held November 8, 1959.

The Constitution and establishment of the Republic marked the achievement of a drive for independence which began in 1934 with the founding of the Neo-Destour—New Constitution—Party, of which Habib Bourguiba soon became president. In October 1964 the party was renamed the Destourian Socialist Party. The second presidential and parliamentary elections under the new constitution were held in November 964 and President Bourguiba was reelected for a second 5-year term.

Mr. Speaker, I believe President Bourguiba and the Tunisian people deserve the heartiest congratulations and best wishes of the American people on this anniversary date.

Address by Senator Muskie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 22, 1965, the Nebraska Democratic Party held its annual Jefferson-Jackson Day banquet in the State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebr. In every respect this gathering was a success. The highlight of the evening was an inspiring speech by the banquet speaker, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of the State of Maine. Senator MUSKIE gave to those in attendance his clear-cut answer to the question, "What is the Great Society?—What Does it Mean?" I believe his speech is so important and relevant to our day that I would like to commend it to my colleagues in Congress, and therefore include it with my remarks in the Appendix:

REMARKS BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE AT LINCOLN, NEBR., MAY 22, 1965

Governor and Mrs. Morrison, Lieutenant Governor and Mrs. Sorensen, Congressman and Mrs. Callan, and Cornhuskers, this is my first visit to Nebraska, and I am delighted to be here. I like what I have seen, and I like what I have heard in the few hours I have been here.

Although this is my first visit, Nebraska was not unknown to me before I came. I had heard that Nebraska has a football team. And I knew about Willie Greenlaw, of Portland, Maine, who used to play on that team. The fiction of Willa Cather had made Nebraska a vivid land for people in the remotest corners of our country.

William Jennings Bryan and George Norris are beacons of dedication, courage, and leadership to all Americans. And your new leaders are adding distinction to Nebraska's name.

Governor Morrison, impressive to me because he is an effective Governor in dealing with the difficult problems which I know Governors face, is achieving a nationwide reputation—in part because of what he is doing for Nebraska, a story you know better than I—but, even more important, because of what he is, because of the things for which he stands, and because of the qualities of leadership he brings to American public life.

We would be proud to have him in the U.S. Senate.

Lt. Gov. Phil Sorensen is the envy of those of us who are past the half-century mark because he is already running fast at an age when we had not yet reached the starting line. He is clearly a young man of ability and talent who knows how to get things done and who will go far.

Congressman CLAIR CALLAN is a distinguished freshman Congresman who is already making an impact and getting results in Washington for Nebraska and Nebraska farmers. That isn't easy for a freshman to do. I know, because my freshman years are not too far behind me.

He takes his place beside the majority leader of the Senate, a distinguished Senate committee chairman, a former Attorney General of the United States, a powerful House committee chairman, in saving veterans hospitals which had been scheduled to close in their States. I am going to make an appointment with him next week to learn how he does it. I am impressed, as I know you are, by these leaders and their high promise for Nebraska and our country.

It is my task tonight to speak to you of victory of the Democratic Party, of the Great Society, and of what they mean to America. It is customary to do so, on an occasion such as this, with some fire and brimstone directed at the opposition. I will disappoint those who expect that touch. I have been courting Republicans so long that I find it difficult to speak harshly of them. More importantly, there is constructive work to be done.

What is the Great Society? What does it mean?

It was the dream of Jefferson and those others who wrote and signed the Declaration of Independence in the exciting and perilous days of 1775.

It was the goal of the Constitution makers of 1787.

It is what Americans have worked and struggled and fought for ever since.

It is nothing more and nothing less than the belief that our country will achieve fulfillment in the fulfillment of each of her citizens.

In 1810, Jefferson phrased it this way: "The freedom and happiness of man are the sole objects of all legitimate government."

Washington's victory at Yorktown did not achieve these objects, but rather the freedom to pursue them. His victory did not win for his countrymen a system of government, but rather the freedom to choose one. And their first choice was a bad one. Having fought a war to escape the abuses of the King's government, they were afraid to create an effective one of their own.

The results were predictably bad, and almost disastrous for the cause of freedom. The world saw emerging on this continent, not a single, united country, but 13 small and quarrelsome ones—erecting trade barriers against each other—creating competing and worthless currencies—ignoring national problems and national responsibilities at home and abroad.

Doubts arose on both sides of the Atlantic as to whether freemen could govern themselves. The veterans of Washington's armies begged him to make himself king.

When the forefathers gathered at Philadelphia in 1787, they had one overriding responsibility: to find a way for freemen to consider their common problems, to form common judgments, and to make effective common decisions.

Some 30 years later, Jefferson, in the evening of his life, writing to a friend in England said: "We have demonstrated on this continent that a government so modeled as to rest continually upon the will of the whole society is a practicable government."

That has been the test and the measure of our national policies even since—to find practicable ways to meet the problems and to overcome the obstacles on the road to the fulfillment of man. It is the test and the measure of the Great Society and the man who leads us toward it—Lyndon Johnson.

And our system has worked. It has enabled us to preserve freedom and, at the same time, to deal effectively with our common problems.

Consider where we began and where we are. Three million people clustered in 13 weak colonies, huddled on the Atlantic seaboard, have become 190 million people, spanning the continent, who are the most powerful influence and force for good on the face of the globe.

To travel that distance we have moved successfully through a great Civil War which threatened to destroy us; we have filled and developed the vast open spaces of the West; we have met and mastered the industrial revolution in a way which is the supreme example of the world, friend and foe alike; we have absorbed millions upon millions of immigrants from overseas, who spoke with a variety of tongues, and so many of whom had no tradition in the practices of free-

dom; and we have dominated the victories and the aftermath of two World Wars.

There are those who say that we achieved the form and the purpose of our society in 1789. That was only the beginning of the long journey toward our goal. We must press on. We have been committed to our goal from the beginning of the Republic. But we have learned that the achievement of that goal has become more difficult, more complex, more frustrating—yes, almost more impossible—with every passing day.

We all know the problems. Here at home—

The growing pressures of population and what they are doing—to our cities, to our highways, to our schools, to the air we breathe, to our water, and to our people.

The incredible impact of science and technology—which lengthen life, shorten distances, and produce new and marvelous and even useless physical things almost faster than we can use them constructively.

The accelerating obsolescence and waste of these physical things—but, even more importantly, of yesterday's ideas and answers to the accompanying problems of living together and working together.

The greed and the dishonesty, the crime and the corruption, the prejudice and the discrimination which threaten the deterioration and break down of decency and order, and of the civilizing qualities which prompt men to love and respect and help each other.

Around the world—

The prospects for the ultimate triumph of decency and the fulfillment of the nobler instincts of man are no less discouraging.

The drive and determination of peoples for better lives, above the level of ignorance and poverty and disease, are caught up and frustrated by ignoble men, ruthless systems of government, ancient prejudices and hatreds.

These problems and these obstacles—here at home and in our world—are the day-to-day work of our country. Are they more than we can manage? That depends upon how much we are willing to try.

At the very outset of my political life, I expressed some doubt, to an old friend, about the wisdom of my decision to subject myself to the burdens and the sacrifices, the slings and arrows, of a political career. The wise old man—an ardent and lifelong Republican, I might add—said to me: "MUSKIE, as long as you are in this world, you should be a part of it."

His own life was the best definition of what he meant. He did not have a political career, but, in every way, he was very much a part of his community and his State.

To a noteworthy and unusual degree, he seems to have cast his actions and thoughts, in his law practice and in his business affairs, in the context of his concept of the larger public interest.

He believed that man can improve—both his purposes and his ability to achieve them.

He believed in the essential desire of man to do so and, in so doing, to advance the welfare of his fellow man.

He believed that, in order to do so, each of us must apply our intelligence, our creative force, our will, and our courage to the task.

He believed that each of us can be sustained by faith in each other, notwithstanding the human weaknesses and the shortcomings which accumulate so much evidence to undermine that faith.

These were not the innocent beliefs of a child, but the hardened convictions of a warmhearted, tough-minded old man who, for more than 90 years, lived constantly as a part of this world.

Unfortunately, there are many who do not share my old friend's attitude toward democratic government. There are the doubters—the cynical citizens and the cynical leaders—who generate apathy to public wrongs and resistance to change.

In many ways, they are the most dangerous enemies of the public interest. For wherever there is cynicism, there is distrust. Wherever there is distrust, there is fear, and wherever there is fear, faith in each other is endangered.

There are the cynical leaders. We all know them. Some of them entered public service as cynics, looking to public office as a means to wealth and power: and betrayal of the public trust is their daily practice.

Some of them have become cynics because of the wrongs they have suffered and the injustices they have seen committed. In them the light of public life has burned out. And there are the cynical citizens who, for good reasons or none, distrust politics and political leaders. They are like the soap manufacturer who advertised that his soap was so strong it could "wash the reputation of a politician clean."

They discourage public participation in the political process.

They encourage the destruction of confidence in law and in the men who make and administer the laws.

In extreme cases, we find them in open defiance of our institutions and of the rights of free people under our Constitution.

These cynics, citizens and leaders alike, are not justified—by our national experience or by the story of man. But their numbers and their influence are growing.

My father came to this country at the turn of the century. He spent long hours telling me of what he left behind and what he found here.

I cannot understand how anyone who knows our national experience, who has studied the American story, who fully realizes the obstacles we have overcome, can but believe deeply that we have found the best way ever conceived for men to live and work together in order, justice, and peace.

Jefferson and his colleagues created the Great Society. My father came to it. I was born in it. You and I, as members of the only political party founded by men who also helped establish our system, understand the duty and the responsibility imposed upon each of us in that society. And we have a clear vision of the future and its promise when we finally achieve the fulfillment of man.

President Johnson Commended for His Decision To Make Ellis Island a Historic Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Milwaukee Journal very properly commends President Johnson for his decision to proclaim Ellis Island a national historic shrine. The President's wise decision means that the island will be dedicated as a memorial to the role of immigrants from every land in building the great Nation we have today.

I include the text of the editorial:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 16, 1965]

SYMBOL OF THE MELTING POT

It is proper indeed that President Johnson has cast aside alternative proposals and proclaimed Ellis Island a U.S. historic shrine. As the gateway for 16 million immigrants between 1892 and 1954, it is the symbol of the melting pot idea of America.

The 27½-acre tract with a conglomeration of buildings and fenced-off areas did not provide a very warm welcome to the "huddled masses yearning to breathe free." Some immigrants arrived without money, and for this and other reasons, spent long periods in unhappy detainment until they could persuade authorities that they would not become public charges. That is now past, however, and those who passed through Ellis Island, and their descendants, occupy almost every corner of the land.

A Manhattan merchant, Samuel Ellis, sold the island to New York in the late 1700's and in 1808 the Federal Government purchased it as an arsenal and base for harbor defense. After the Immigration Department took it over, up to 5,000 future citizens a day were processed during the peak influx in the early 1900's. When the facility was closed in 1954, the General Services Administration tried to dispose of the island, but President Eisenhower decreed that there should be no sale until consideration was given to plans to preserve it.

Ellis Island is one of our great monuments. From it immigrants looked out with awe and hope to the Statue of Liberty less than a half mile away. Then the island became a memory as they took a ferry and began a life in the New World.

Dollar Proposed as Currency King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on May 7 I called the attention of House Members to a proposal by Mr. Donald C. Cook, president of American Electric Power Co., for a new gold policy and to his urging that we move toward a new international reserve currency.

It has been my position for some time that the United States should have a gold policy which does not protect speculators from loss. It has also been my feeling that the entire international monetary system should be studied with a view toward establishing a new world monetary reserve unit.

In this connection, the distinguished financial writer for the New York Times, Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., outlined on May 30, a proposal by Stanford University economist, Emile Despres, which would make the dollar, instead of gold, the centerpiece of the world monetary system. I include Mr. Dale's article, "Dollar Proposed as Currency King," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DOLLAR PROPOSED AS CURRENCY KING—PLAN WOULD HAVE UNITED STATES CHANGE ITS GOLD-BUYING POLICY BUT KEEP SELLING PROCEDURE—SOME INTEREST SHOWN—THEORY HOLDS A UNILATERAL SHIFT WOULD ADVANCE INTERESTS OF ALL

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 29.—Can the United States, by a unilateral action, transform the world monetary system, dethroning gold and crowning the dollar in its place?

A proposal to do just that is circulating in high levels of the Government. There is no hint yet that it is being favorably received, but it is being read with interest.

The proposal comes from a Stanford University economist, Emile Despres, who is an adviser to the Government on international financial questions. His underlying hypothesis is that the dollar is inherently far more valuable than gold and that, after the U.S. action he proposes, the world would awaken to this fact.

The Despres plan is not alone in its basic proposition. This is that the United States could advance the national interest and the world interest as well by a unilateral change in its gold-buying policy, as distinct from its selling policy. At present the United States, under a unilateral declaration that is now 30 years old, both buys and sells at $35 an ounce in transactions with foreign official holders of gold.

UNEQUIVOCAL PLEDGE

The pledge to continue to sell gold at $35 an ounce is unequivocal, having been reiterated by the last three Presidents. But the buying pledge does not have the national honor behind it. It could be changed. And proponents believe such a change would immediately show the true strength of the dollar as compared with gold.

Among those who have suggested a change in the gold-buying policy are Donald C. Cook, president of the American Electric Power Co., who was long under consideration as Secretary of the Treasury, and Howard S. Piquet, specialist on international economics at the Library of Congress.

The Despres suggestion is in these three parts.

First, the United States would continue to abide by its $35 selling price for gold.

Second, the United States would invite all reluctant foreign holders of dollars to concert them into gold at once.

Third, after the conversion the United States would modify its gold-buying policy. With a special exception for Britain and less developed countries, the United States in the future would offer to pay dollars for only one-third of any nation's gold holdings as they existed before the change in policy was announced.

Two-thirds of the carefully acquired gold of France, for example, would suddenly become ineligible for conversion into dollars. What would it be worth? Mr. Despres does not make a guess, but he insists that it is worth $35 an ounce now only because the U.S. Treasury is willing to pay that much for it.

He and others suggesting similar policies are convinced that, among other things, the free London price for gold would plummet soon after the announcement of the new U.S. policy.

Underlying the view of Mr. Despres and others is the fact that, without anyone's exactly planning it that way, the dollar has now become a wholly special international currency to private bankers and traders as well as to governments.

A Japanese export to Germany is as likely as not to be billed and paid for in dollars. A Dutch bank will lend dollars (called Eurodollars) to an Italian exporter of refrigerators to finance a sale to France. A Norwegian bond issue in Luxembourg is denominated in dollars and paid for in dollars.

MAINSTAY OF RESERVES

All of this is in addition to the dollar's role as the mainstay of the official international financial reserves of scores of nations. It is the dollar that nations use in the foreign exchange markets to support their own currencies when necessary.

It is widely believed that the growth of the world economy now clearly needs a growth in foreign dollar holdings—private as well as official. The United States is literally the world's banker and its "deposits" must grow with a growing economy.

This implies a deficit in the U.S. balance of payments as it is now defined. But, regardless of this point, the dollar has now become essential to foreigners. It is the only truly world currency that can be used in settlement of all kinds of payments.

Thus, no government can dare to permit its own currency to appreciate in terms of dollars. And no government would long hold much gold if it could not be converted into dollars. It is the dollar that is now defending gold, rather than the other way around, Mr. Despres holds.

Part of the dollar's strength, in this view, stems from the underlying strength of the U.S. balance of payments, with its huge surplus of exports over imports. The present payments deficit comes chiefly from exports of private capital which build up the assets of the U.S. "bank."

Furthermore, the internal purchasing power of the dollar has been maintained far better than almost every other currency, both in the recent past and over a longer period. And finally, the U.S. economy is overpowering, the largest in the world, and growing rapidly.

TECHNICAL QUESTIONS

A number of technical questions arise from the Despres and other suggestions for a change in the U.S. gold-buying policy. The Despres plan itself is far more detailed than can be described here. For example, it includes a provision for U.S. credits to countries whose gold may become virtually worthless.

But its basic proposition is clear—that the United States, far from being weak, is now so strong that it can change the world monetary system by a unilateral action, without the laborious process of international negotiations. And the change would lead to a more rational system than at present, it is felt.

Mr. Despres calls President de Gaulle's effort to use French gold buying as an instrument of international power politics "laughable." He adds:

"If General de Gaulle, by posing the issue with absolute starkness, precipitates a fundamental reconstruction of the international monetary system substituting the dollar for gold as the preferred reserve asset, we will owe him our thanks.

"There can now be little doubt that the crisis of the international monetary system which we have been experiencing for the past half dozen years will culminate in the dethronement of gold and its replacement by the dollar. The only question is whether this transition will be effected deliberately, or by the compulsion of events and with considerable injury to the free-world economy.

This country's international financial position gives it the power to decide whether to carry out the transition deliberately or await the compulsion of events."

Lincoln Statue for Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to offer my congratulations to the Members of the House of Representatives on today's overwhelming approval of the appropriation bill which included necessary funds to operate the State Department during the coming fiscal year 1966.

A relatively modest part of the State Department's $388 million appropriation, $100,000, has been set aside to cover the expenses of presenting a statue of Abraham Lincoln to the people of Mexico in commemoration of their nation's independence.

As one of the coauthors of last year's Public Law 88-399, which authorized this presentation, I am highly pleased at the favorable action taken by the House today because it brings closer to a successful conclusion our more than 5 years' effort to secure enactment of this worthwhile legislation.

In addition, I am confident the nearly 4 million U.S. citizens of Mexican descent are especially honored by such a fitting gesture of recognition and token of esteem for the great contributions to the cause of freedom and liberty made by our neighboring Republic of Mexico.

This gesture is an important step in promoting closer relations with Mexico as a symbol of America's deep commitment to the principles of the Alliance for Progress, and the continuing economic development of our sister nations of the Western Hemisphere.

As an expression of mutual friendship and good will toward the people of Mexico, a statue of Lincoln would seem to be particularly significant and appropriate, not only in view of the 100th anniversary of this world-revered statesman's death this year, but also because the memory of Lincoln is cherished by the Mexican people for his sympathetic concern for them during the period when Mexico was struggling to regain its independence from European domination.

Moreover, the common purposes and developing unity of interest between the historic contemporaries, Benito Juarez, Father of modern Mexico, who fought against a foreign invader, and Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, who fought to preserve the Union, testify to the close spiritual identification of our two nations through the years.

Like all our relations with our Mexican friends, the Lincoln statute presentation will not be something we do because we have to. It will be something we do because we want to, as an act of good will between friendly neighbors in a world too often racked by hostility and conflict.

Much of the credit for our current friendly relations with Mexico should go to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt as a continuing legacy of the good neighbor policy he initiated during the difficult years of the 1930's.

In more recent years, we can look to the dynamic inspiration and youthful vigor of our late beloved President John F. Kennedy in promoting the imaginative goals of the Alliance for Progress and in starting the highly successful people-to-people, self-help program that is known as the world famous Peace Corps.

In addition, President Kennedy was responsible for starting the statesmanlike negotiations with Mexico which led to joint ratification under the then President Lyndon Johnson of the historic Chamizal Treaty in December 1963, finally settling a thorny, century-old dispute caused by shifting of the channel of the Rio Grande along the Mexico-Texas border.

Finally, President Johnson has had a series of very cordial and mutually satisfactory meetings with both former Mexican President Lopez Mateos and the current President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz.

Their vigorous bilateral efforts have been able to work out an agreeable compromise settlement of the long-standing problem of excess salinity in the Colorado River water that flows into Mexico.

All these recent developments constitute added evidence of the strong bonds of mutual respect and affection existing between the citizens of our two neighboring republics.

And for these reasons, I again thank my colleagues in the House for their support of this appropriation bill, for I know that the presentation of the Lincoln statue to the people of Mexico will further strengthen the cause of hemispheric solidarity at a time in history when unity and mutual understanding are essential to the peace and freedom of the world.

Miami's First Regular Rabbi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, human relations are a constant theme of today's news stories, but for many years before their efforts became public many men worked to make brotherhood a reality.

Miami's first regular rabbi, Murray A. Alstet, is one of those men who long ago began efforts toward better racial relations.

I am sure my colleagues join me in congratulating Rabbi Alstet for a life of dedicated service. The story of Greater Miami's first regular rabbi is told in the following article in the Miami Herald:

HOMAGE TO BE PAID FIRST RABBI

Miami's first regular rabbi will be honored by the city's pioneer Jewish congregation during its final late Friday service of the season at 8:15 tonight.

Members of Beth David Congregation, 2625 Southwest Third Avenue, will pay tribute to Rabbi Murray A. Alstet on the occasion of his 50th anniversary in the rabbinate.

Many of Miami's prominent men and women who were in Rabbi Alstet's confirmation classes from 1926 to 1928 will be present. The honorary chairman for the night, Attorney Stanley C. Myers, was principal of the religious school at the time. The chairman, Louis R. Seitlin, was one of the students.

Representing the confirmation class of 1926 will be Alex Mechlowitz, one of the organizers of Temple Menorah in Miami Beach; representing the class of 1927 will be Judge Sam Silver; and representing the class of 1928 will be Attorney Alvin Cassel.

Speakers for the occasion will be Rabbi Philip R. Alstet, New York, brother of the honoree and noted columnist for the Anglo-Jewish Press; Rabbi Herbert M. Baumgard, retiring president of the Greater Miami Rabbinical Association; Judge Milton Friedman and Seitlin.

Now living with his son, Dr. Maynard Hillel Alstet, who is a member of Beth David Congregation, Rabbi Alstet thinks the growth in tolerance and understanding is the greatest development in this area since those early days.

"There was a hooded Klu Klux Klan organization here then," he recalled, "and at 5 p.m. a whistle would blow for Negroes to get back to their section of town."

Rabbi Alstet considers one of his greatest contributions to the area a start toward today's atmosphere of good human relations when, with the help of Isidor Cohen, Miami's first and best-known pioneer Jew, he organized the first community union Thanksgiving service in Bayfront Park.

When illness forced him to leave Miami, Rabbi Alstet served congregations in Pittsburgh, Pa., and Fayetteville, N.C. He returned here 5 years ago and serves as auxiliary Jewish chaplain for Homestead Air Force Base.

Memorial Day, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 30, and Monday, May 31, I had the privilege of participating in Memorial Day exercises at a number of outstanding service organization ceremonies. I want to congratulate the post commanders of the following organizations for their magnificent tribute to our fallen war dead:

The American Legion of Richmond County, Ed Ringle, commander.

Veterans of Foreign Wars, Richmond County, Arthur Vomero, commander.

Henry & Stanley Cichon Post No. 1578, the American Legion, Chester Wydrinski, commander.

Anderson Lagno Post No. 5090, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Peter Chaston, commander.

Cespino-Russo Post No. 1544, the American Legion, John Gerbino, commander.

Patrick J. Dalessio Post No. 1310, the American Legion, Andrew Fallucca, commander.

Post Office Department Post No. 930, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Kings County, Murray L. Linker, commander.

Marine Corps League, Staten Island Detachment, Arthur Foley, commander.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my Memorial Day message:

MEMORIAL DAY, 1965

Ladies and gentlemen, it is customary and, of course, fitting, on Memorial Day to pay tribute to those who have given their lives to hold the torch of freedom high above the waves of tyranny that from time to time threaten to engulf the world. Once, almost 50 years ago, we were joyously convinced that we had rolled back the waves of tyranny for all time with the surrender of Imperial Germany on November 11, 1918. We counted the cost—53,402 killed in action and 204,002 wounded—and found a measure of solace in the thought that their sacrifice had made the world safe for democracy.

Perhaps we were naive; we were young and inexperienced in the wiles of global politics, unfamiliar with international rivalries and hostilities, and unaware of the hunger for power and dominance that can consume some men and nations. So it was that we drifted back into preoccupation with our own affairs, little realizing that another wave of tyranny was gathering in Nazi Germany to deluge Europe in blood and terror. The cost of stemming this evil tide was 291,557 dead and 670,846 wounded. In paying it, we came painfully of age, aware for the first time that tyranny is never really conquered; it is only subdued.

It came as no real surprise, then, to most of us to find that we had crushed one form of tyranny—Naziism—only to preserve another—communism—which, because its perverted ideology is international rather than narrowly national, is a far greater menace to the free world. The echoes of the guns had hardly died away when our erstwhile ally, if hostile and suspicious Russia could properly be called that, became an active enemy in everything short of actual war. The Kremlin's successive attempts to bully us out of Berlin left no doubt in anyone's mind that we faced an implacable foe, patiently dedicated to our destruction. Aware of our peril, we reacted with the vigor that we, as a people, have always displayed in emergencies.

But again, preoccupation, this time with the Russian threat, cost us dearly. With our attention riveted on Europe, we paid scant heed to the few who warned that communism was infecting Asia, that another wave of tyranny was gathering at our back while we built a defensive dike to contain the wave to our front. On a summer's dawn in 1950 this wave surged out of North Korea—a Communist enclave in an ancient nation ironically known as "the land of the morning calm"—and caught us woefully unprepared. The price we paid to repel and eventually contain this onslaught was 33,629 dead and 103,284 wounded.

So, in a few years short of half a century, we have paid 378,588 in dead and 978,132 wounded—keep in mind that I have counted only combat casualties—to keep the torch of freedom aloft.

It would be gratifying on this Memorial Day to say that these gallant men had made the world safe for democracy. Sadly, this is not the case. Democracy is threatened as never before. There is hardly a section of the globe where Communist intrigue and subversion doesn't smoulder, awaiting only a favorable wind to burst into flaming revolt. Need we look farther than the Dominican Republic to be reminded of this grim fact? No, the deaths and wounds of our young men in three world wars have not made the world safe for democracy, but their sacrifices have made us realize, at last, that constant vigilance, and vigilance everywhere, is the price of liberty.

Today we are engaged in another struggle with the Communist foe, this time in remote South Vietnam, a land that only a few years ago was totally unknown to most Americans. Already in this "dirty little war," as someone has so aptly called it, 385 Americans have died and 2,176 have been wounded. But unlike those who gave their lives and blood for the cause of freedom in three previous wars, the men who are fighting and dying in South Vietnam are largely unsung, and, shockingly, even reviled.

The vast majority of us, of course, honor these men and their cause even though some—and I am not one of them—might doubt the wisdom of the policy that sent them to South Vietnam. But not all of us, not all of us.

Two weeks ago, a jeering, unruly mob swarmed into the streets carrying crude placards proclaiming "Yankee killers go home" and "Stop the war in South Vietnam." And where was this? In Peiping? In Moscow?

In East Berlin? No. It was right here in New York City, on the occasion of President Johnson's visit, and those degrading our troops and embarrassing the President were Americans. Not long ago the President was shrilly denounced as, and I quote, "The most dangerous man in the world." And who denounced him? Castro? Kosygin? Mao Tse-tung? No. It was a college professor, an American college professor. Just recently, a policeman assigned to help keep a noisy delegation of demonstrators under control at a Manhattan parade overheard one of them say, as the flag passed by, "There goes that rag again." And who said it? A U.S.-hating foreigner? No. It was an American.

These incidents were the work of what is becoming known as the new far left, a loudly dissident group that has sprung into rebellious, contentious life on many American college campuses in the past year. They are a minority, and a tiny one, but the attention they attract is far out of proportion to their numbers. Though ostensibly pacifist, they voice no objections to the shedding of American blood.

These are the students, most at least, are students—though their demonstrations inevitably attract a certain percentage of beatnik drifters—who staged a liedown—to coin a phrase—at the recent Armed Forces Day parade here?

The students who have brazenly disrupted ROTC ceremonies at more than one Columbia and Cornell college, the students who, in some cases, have attempted to persuade other students to resist the draft, the students who, according to one outraged undergraduate who wrote a New York newspaper, have even advocated taking up collections on campus for the Vietcong, the students who can find nothing right with their country's policy and nothing wrong with the policies of their country's enemies, the students who apply the epithet "Yankee killers" to the men who are giving their lives daily in South Vietnam to protect the right of free speech for everyone—even those who degrade them.

The logical question, then, is: Are these militant dissidents Communists? Probably not. My own view is that they are mainly naive, totally ignorant of the basic realities of the worldwide Communist conspiracy, and quite likely unaware of the damage they do their country and, ultimately, themselves. But there is no doubt at all that the Communist Party, U.S.A., exploits their irresponsible and often outrageous words and deeds. Let me repeat to you what FBI Chief, J. Edgar Hoover, had to say recently in hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives:

Said Mr. Hoover, and I quote: "Regarding our youth, the Communist Party, U.S.A., has made clear its purpose and interests. The language jargon utilized is directed toward a single aim—the inculcation in young minds of a perverted theological faith in the ideals and objectives of a Communist society.

"The increased number of public appearances by leaders of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in the last few years, whether it be in the form of press conferences, on radio programs, or on college campuses, is utilized in an effort to project the image that the party is a legitimate political party; to gain increased acceptance and respectability for the party; to generate an atmosphere of good will and understanding; and to spread Communist propaganda.

"Since students constitute a primary Communist target group, party leaders in their public appearances continue to concentrate on college and university campuses throughout the country. Over the past 3 school years, party spokesmen have averaged 50 campus appearances each year. Their audiences ranged in size from an intimate 13 to a huge 4,000. The latter number heard Dorothy Healey, a member of the party's national committee, when she spoke in the stadium of the California State College at Los Angeles on May 20, 1964. Audiences from 500 to 800 were common."

Those are Mr. Hoover's words. It is hardly necessary to add that he knows what he is talking about.

There may be some among you who feel that I have exaggerated the importance and the impact of this noisy minority. I don't think I have. Let me remind you that, back in 1933, some 300 youthfully cynical and militantly pacifist students and England's ancient Oxford University signed what became known as the Oxford pledge, in which they vowed never to fight for King and country. The incident was publicized over the world, and nowhere was it read with greater interest than in Berlin, where Adolf Hitler was even then plotting Britain's downfall.

To Hitler, knowing as he did that Oxford was the training ground for England's leaders, the pledge was taken as certain evidence of Britain's weakness and decadence. It was, of course, nothing of the sort. It was simply a harebrained idea, and the signers, almost to a man, flocked to the colors when Germany leaped at England's throat. But the damage had been done. Today, Hitler's misreading of the Oxford pledge is considered a factor in his decision to challenge Britain and the democratic world, a decision that plunged the world into the most terrible conflict it has ever known.

We have a similar situation—or problem, to be precise—with the far left on our college campuses. We know that the vast majority of Americans back the President's resolute stand in South Vietnam. There is honest, responsible disagreement with his policy, certainly, and that is as it should be in a democracy. But total, irresponsible condemnation is something else again. It can be misread in Moscow and Peiping, and likely is, as an indication of a growing disenchantment in this country of our Vietnam stand.

Obviously, this misinterpretation of our national determination bolsters the Communists in their delusion that, ultimately, we will tire of the struggle in South Vietnam and withdraw our forces, thus leaving all of southeast Asia to fall like a ripe plum into their hands. The plotters in Moscow and Peiping read only the unruly demonstrations against this country's policy; they have no like means of gaging the massive but chiefly silent support our policy actually has.

What can we do to counter this dangerously misleading minority, whose irresponsible words and deeds are feeding Communist propaganda mills the world over? We cannot silence them; the right of free speech cannot be made selective; it must be extended even to those who flagrantly abuse it. But we can fight them with truth.

First, let us look to our children, particularly those of college age. Are they aware of the true nature of the Communist conspiracy? Do they know that it is remorseless in its aim to destroy all freedoms, including the academic freedom they now enjoy? Or are they being subverted by the Communist line currently being pushed on American campuses? Find out what they think and correct them if they are being mislead. Remember what Mr. Hoover said: the Communists aim at youth; and also remember a quotation attributed to Nikolai Lenin, prophet of world communism: "Give me a child of 8 years and it will be a Bolshevist forever."

Second, speak out. Arouse an active interest in behalf of our country's policy in your veterans, civic, and fraternal organizations. Get on the record in support of President Johnson's resolute stand in South Vietnam and see that the record is brought to public attention. Demand to know how your political leaders stand—and stand up and be counted yourself. If you do this, the Communist leadership will get the message, and the message is that America will stand firm, determined as always to fight for the cause of freedom everywhere.

And in doing so, you will be paying tribute in deeds—not just words—to those gallant men who have in the past and are now holding the torch of freedom high above the waves of tyranny. Thank you.

Nigerian Praises Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent statement of praise for our Peace Corps volunteers made by the Honorable Julius Momo Udochi, a member of the House of Representatives of Nigeria.

In his remorks, he commends highly the work of the Peace Corps and expresses gratitude to "the people" who are responsible for sending these dedicated men and women in his country.

Mr. Speaker, Nigeria is the largest country in Africa and was one of the first to request volunteers. Today, there are 510 volunteers teaching in the high schools there, 30 teaching in universities, and 80 are conducting rural and agricultural programs.

By the end of the current year it is expected that some 700 Peace Corpsmen will be working in Nigeria.

The comments of Chief Udochi are a deserved tribute to the Peace Corps. Further, his expression of gratitude to the people of the United States for having made the Peace Corps possible is emphatic evidence that the efforts of our Nation to assist in international development and understanding are recognized and appreciated.

The statement of Chief Udochi follows:

NIGERIAN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, APRIL 23, 1965

LAGOS

Chief J. M. UDOCHI (Afenmai). My comments will be very brief. I wish to seize this opportunity in commenting, on this vote on education, on a body of young men and women who are working very tirelessly in our educational vineyard. I refer to the American Peace Corps volunteers.

When the late President of the United States inaugurated this scheme many people had some doubts as to the possibility of its success. Some felt that it was a very laudable scheme and that it was a scheme that was likely to bring many people of various countries together. Some were very doubtful and they thought it was another American propaganda stunt that would do no good.

Some were even very cynical and they thought it was another American scheme of trying to send a spy ring around the world. But I am glad to say that many of these evils prognosticated have proved false.

The Peace Corps program has succeeded very wonderfully and I think, if the taste of the pudding is in the eating, the fact that many underdeveloped countries are request-

ing for more and more Peace Corps men and women show the degree of their success.

There are many of them in this country. We have over 300 of them now working in our rural areas and I would ask members to take some interest in the work being done by this devoted body of young men and women. I am just told that the number has increased now to over a thousand.

One would like to know how these young men are recruited for this kind of job. An honorable member is saying that I do not mention women because I do not like them, but I do like them very much.

Now, they are all usually men of university standards who, after a broad training, are sent to training camps and given special training and orientation. They are then sent out to the various countries to do the work they are asked to do and those of us who have come across many of them in our various rural areas teaching in the secondary schools and colleges will appreciate their devotion to duty, their sense of duty and how they try as best they can to ingratiate themselves with the people among whom they live.

I think that it will be a good thing if we all take an interest in their work and show them that we appreciate the work they are doing amongst us. I, therefore, wish to take this opportunity on the floor of this house to say how grateful we are to the people who had been responsible for sending us these young men and women.

Northwestern College, Watertown, Wis., Observes 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, Northwestern College in Watertown, Wis., observed its 100th anniversary yesterday. From an initial student body of three, this college has grown to become a small college recognized and respected throughout the country. Founded by the Evangelical Joint Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin, Northwestern College has emphasized the education of young men who will enter the ministry.

I congratulate Northwestern College on its first centennial and wish it another 100 years of growth and success in educating our young people. As a resident of Watertown, I can testify to the local pride in and respect for this college which has made a valuable contribution to our community.

I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Saturday, May 29, Watertown Daily Times.

The article follows:

CONGRATULATIONS, NORTHWESTERN

Northwestern College will observe its 100th anniversary on Monday.

From a small beginning a century ago with just three students, Northwestern has grown to become one of the better known small colleges of the country.

It has attained its present stature not by chance, but by concerted effort and sound planning. Throughout its 100-year history, it has had an outstanding faculty which has attracted students from a wide area.

One way of judging a college is by its product. Primarily interested in educating young men who plan to enter the ministry, its graduates, who later became ministers, have distinguished themselves by the quality of their work and devotion to their duties.

Northwestern can justly be proud of the young men it has educated, and the graduates, too, can speak with pardonable pride of their Northwestern education.

We are indeed fortunate to have Northwestern College in Watertown. It is one of our very fine and very valuable community assets, and a cultural center very few towns our size possess. We are happy the governing body of Evangelical Joint Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin, now Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, 100 years ago, by a 49-to-14 vote, decided upon Watertown over Milwaukee for the location of the college.

In the 100 years that have passed since that vote was taken, we feel certain there have been no regrets. In the quiet, peaceful atmosphere of our small community, the college has grown. Over the years, many buildings have been added on its 14-acre campus, its enrollment is high, and the quality of its education cannot be surpassed anywhere.

On the occasion of Northwestern's 100 years of existence, we extend our sincere congratulations and best wishes.

Calendar of Events at the National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events at the National Gallery of Art:

MONDAY, MAY 31, TO SUNDAY, JUNE 6

Painting of the week: Redon. "Pandora" (Chester Dale collection) gallery 84, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "The Artist Learns From the Past." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Monday, 1; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "John Constable: From Sketch to Finish." Guest speaker: Graham Reynolds, keeper, department of prints, drawings and paintings, Victoria and Albert Museum, London; Lecture Hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Twenty-second American Music Festival: National Gallery Orchestra. Richard Bales, conductor, Charles Crowder, pianist, East Garden court, 8.

MONDAY, JUNE 7, THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 13

Painting of the week: Degas. "Girl in Red." (Chester Dale collection) gallery 89, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "The Artist Learns From His Contemporaries," rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Dutch Little Masters," speaker: Frances Robb, staff lecturer, National Gallery of Art, Lecture Hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Maxine Makas, soprano, Anthony Makas, pianist, East Garden court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, JUNE 14, THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 20

Painting of the week: Rembrandt. "Portrait of the Artist's Son Titus." (Lent by the Norton Simon Foundation.) Lobby B, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "The Artist Learns From His Master." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Line, Plane, and Form in Pictorial Composition." Speaker: Grose Evans, curator of extension services, National Gallery of Art, Lecture Hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Hugh O'Meagher, harpsichord, East Garden court, 8.

MONDAY, JUNE 21, THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 27

Painting of the week: Monet. "Rouen Cathedral, West Façade" (Chester Dale collection), Gallery 84, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "The Artist as an Expatriate." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Albert Pinkham Ryder." Guest speaker: Dondal McClelland, assistant to the director, National Collection of Fine Arts, Washington, Lecture Hall, 4.

Sunday concert: "Elizabeth Marshall, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, 737-4215, extension 272.

Gallery hours: Weekdays, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.; Sunday, 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Collections: Paintings and sculpture from the Andrew Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are on the main floor. The American primitive paintings from the collection of Edgar William and Bernice Chrysler Garbisch, Kress renaissance bronzes, and Widener decorative arts are on the ground floor.

New exhibitions: "Portrait of the Artist's Son Titus," by Rembrandt, lent by the Norton Simon Foundation. Main floor lobby B, through June.

Sketches by John Constable lent by the Victoria and Albert Museum. Central gallery, June 6 through July 5.

Publications: Catalog—Sketches by Constable. Ninty-six pages, seven and one-half by ten inches, with introduction and catalog notes by Graham Reynolds, 58 black and white illustrations. $1.75 postpaid.

Publications of the National Gallery of Art research project, Mellon Institute:

"Control of Deteriorating Effects of Light Upon Museum Objects," by Dr. Robert L. Feller. $1 postpaid. (UNESCO, 1964).

"On Picture Varnishes and Their Solvents," by Feller, Stolow, and Jones. $4 postpaid. (Intermuseum Conservation Association, 1959.)

"Subject Index to Technical Studies," compiled by Mrs. Bertha M. Usilton. $2.50 postpaid. (Tamworth Press, 1964.)

Concerts: The concert on June 6 marks the 1,000th Sunday evening concert at the National Gallery, as well as the closing concert of the 22d American Music Festival, sponsored by the Gulbenkian Foundation.

Following the program of June 27, the concerts will be discontinued until fall.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday, 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday, 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

Judge Edgar J. Nathan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Judge Edgar J. Nathan, New York recently suffered the loss of one of its great men. As a jurist he was known for his conscience and his courtesy. As a citizen of the community he gave of himself fully to furthering philanthropic and educational institutions. As a man of deep religious conviction, he devoted himself to the affairs of his synagogue and its people. To those who knew him, Judge Nathan was an inspiration in nobility.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the permission of the House to insert in the RECORD two pieces about Judge Nathan. The first is the eulogy delivered by a longtime friend of Judge Nathan's, the minister emeritus of the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue, Dr. David de Sola Pool, The second is the obituary which appeared in the New York Times of May 2, 1965. The articles are as follows:

[From the Bulletin of the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue, May 7, 1965]

IN MEMORIAM: EDGAR J. NATHAN, JR., PRESIDENT OF OUR CONGREGATION

Our congregation mourns the loss of our parnas, Justice Edgar J. Nathan, Jr. On Friday night, April 30, after a prolonged illness, our parnas passed away in his residence, 271 Central Park West.

On Sunday morning, May 2, at 11 o'clock, a solemn memorial service was held for him in our synagogue, which was filled almost to capacity with congregants and representatives of various Jewish organizations, among which were the American Jewish Historical Society, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, Yeshiva University, the Jewish Theological Seminary, the Sephardic Jewish Community, and its women's division, the World Sephardic Federation, and also Justices of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and many other dignitaries.

The "Banca," the seat of the parnas on the right side of the Ark, was draped in black. Prior to the service the coffin was placed in the vestibule leading to the synagogue proper, and flanked on either side by two of our own young men, Jack Salomon and Haskell Baher, with the synagogue doors left open. Our traditional funeral service was conducted by our Rabbi Dr. Louis C. Gerstein, assisted by the Reverend A. Lopes Cardozo. The eulogy, preceded by the reading of the 23d Psalm was delivered by our Minister-Emeritus Dr. David de Sola Pool, the text of which follows:

"By these words of perfect faith, the words of the 23d Psalm, Edgar J. Nathan, Jr., lived. To this shrine where we are gathered to bid him farewell, he gave his soul and he dedicated his strength; it was his spiritual home for all the years of his life.

The noble history of this congregation, its unswerving loyalty to its traditions and its beauty of holiness, all were a part of him. And he was a part of them. When he stood before the Ark, one sensed that he knew the meaning of the words inscribed thereon: "Know before whom thou standest." Edgar J. Nathan, Jr., knew with what the Creator may endow man's spirit and what divine gifts would belong to man if mankind but recognized before Whom it stood. As he looked above the inscription, he would see the 10 Commandments. And the meaning of these too he knew well. He lived by them.

The story of his life spells the fulfillment of these behests. One by one his spirit was illuminated by, and his spirit illumed, those immortal words by which someday with God's help all mankind will live. He honored his father and mother in the unforgettable home in which he grew up. Love, truth, kindness, and high nobility permeated that home. He honored his far-visioned parents-in-law, Israel and Bella Unterberg. He honored his forebears who for more than three centuries were pioneers, builders, patriots, and men of faith who helped mold the America we love. From Abraham de Lucena, one of the stalwart founding fathers of our congregation 300 years ago to Simon Nathan and Rabbi Gershom Mendes Seixas, in the days of the Revolution, Edgar Nathan remembered whence he came. When he stood where now I stand, and beside him his sons and grandsons, commemorating the building of America's first synagogue under the presidency of his forebears, one sensed that both the past and the future were living here before our eyes. Edgar Nathan lives in Congregation Shearith Israel and he will live on in the generations to come that will cling to the faith, the traditions, the ideals that were his.

Deep as his roots in his faith were his roots in his country. His whole life was a flowering of his American heritage. He served the State, the Nation, the city with inspiring integrity. Wholly honest and wholly selfless he showed by example the meaning of dynamic citizenship, seeking national weal and humane service. Crowning a public career that began in Washington in World War I and included service on the New York State constitutional convention, and presidency of the Borough of Manhattan in New York City, Edgar Nathan became supreme court justice of New York State.

"Justice, justice, you shall pursue in righteousness" is the Bible's behest. This characterized the life of Justice Nathan for well nigh 20 years on the bench. He allowed himself no rest from the pursuit of inner-truth and complete justice in the cases that came before him. Sometimes he would discuss ethical and philosophical aspects of human problems with me and I could sense his deep and earnest search for righteousness.

It was natural that one such as he should seek many ways of serving his fellow men. A dozen educational and philanthropical organizations are represented among those who mourn him here today. We shall all grieve for the empty seat, but we shall all know that the imprint of his life will remain in social service, religious education, civic responsibility, historical consciousness, interfaith understanding, and human friendship. We shall all be grateful that we knew one such as he, that we worked together with one so faithful and of such perfect faith, one so warm and human and humane.

What then can we say to his nearest and dearest ones? How rare it is, alas, that a great public career is matched by a perfect, private life. In Edgar J. Nathan, Jr., the son, the brother, the husband, the father, the grandfather, assumed luminous meaning and thrilling qualities. Who can forget with what loyalty and selflessness he worked with his brother-in-spirit Henry S. Hendricks, his brother-in-law, who though stricken by illness, was able to continue to serve Shearith Isreal as its president to his utmost? This is perhaps not the time to talk of the ineffable values that are personal, however, one would wish to emphasize his wondrous devotion, his limitless love, his delightful sense of human, his good comraraderie with every generation in his family. But surely this is the place to say to his beloved and devoted wife, to his children and grandchildren, his sisters and all members of his warmly knit family: "Be strong and of good courage." Cling to your beautiful memories and therein find solace. Cling to the ideals he bequeathed to you and therein find courage. Cling to the faith that was so nobly his and that is so fully yours, and therein you will find strength, you will find understanding, you will find guidance, throughout your lives. You will fulfill as your dear one would have wished the age-old cry of faith of our people:

"The Lord has given, the Lord has taken, blessed be the name of the Lord."

[From the New York Times, May 2, 1965]

EDGAR NATHAN JR., JUSTICE, DIES AT 73—SERVED ON STATE BENCH—EX-BOROUGH PRESIDENT

Edgar J. Nathan, Jr., a State supreme court justice since 1946 and borough president of Manhattan from 1942 to 1946, died on Friday night in his home at 271 Central Park West. His age was 73.

Justice Nathan, a Republican, was perhaps best remembered by New Yorkers for his work during World War II in spurring the city's civil defense effort, war bond sales, war relief aid, and metal salvage drives.

In his term as borough president, concurrent with the last years of Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia's administration, the East River Drive was completed and the Second Avenue elevated structure removed.

As a trial judge, the quiet, reserved Mr. Nathan was noted for his courtesy and devotion to his work. Always mindful of the principle that justice delayed is justice denied, he spent as much of the court day as possible on the bench, saving his paperwork for nights and weekends.

In marital litigations, Justice Nathan considered the problems of the children of prime importance and frequently insisted on seeing the children in his chambers and in obtaining guidance from leading psychiatrists.

A SAD COMMENTARY

In the 1959 custody battle between Leopold Stokowski, the conductor, and his wife, the former Gloria Vanderbilt (now Mrs. Wyatt Cooper), he awarded custody to the mother and visitation rights to the father.

"It is a sad commentary," he said, "that an entire month of the court's time and energy has been devoted almost exclusively to the resolution of problems which mature, intelligent parents should be able to work out themselves for the sake of their children."

That year he upheld the State law requiring the certification of clinical psychologists to protect the public from charlatans and unqualified persons who represent themselves as psychologists.

Mr. Nathan was born in New York, the son of Edgar J. and Sara Solis Nathan. He was a descendant of Abraham de Lucena, one of 13 Jews who came to New York in 1654, and Rabbi Gershon Mendes Seixas, spiritual leader of the Congregation Shearith Israel during the American Revolution and a trustee of Columbia University. He was a cousin of the late Associate Justice Benjamin Cardozo of the U.S. Supreme Court and of Emma Lazarus, whose poem is inscribed on the Statue of Liberty.

Mr. Nathan was graduated from the Collegiate School in 1909, Williams College in 1913, and the Columbia Law School in 1916.

In 1918-19 he was chief of the division of restricted imports of the War Trade Board in Washington. He began his legal career with Cardozo & Nathan, of which he was a member from 1923 to 1941.

Before entering public service, Mr. Nathan was also the first chairman of the Domestic Relations Court Committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

In 1938 he won election as delegate to the State constitutional convention by a significant majority, although running on the

Republican ticket in a Democratic district. He served on the judiciary, bill of rights, and cities committees at the convention.

After his term as borough president, Mr. Nathan returned briefly to private law practice with Gale, Bernays, Falk, Eisner & Nathan.

REELECTED IN 1960

In March of 1946, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey appointed him to the State supreme court for the first judicial district, embracing Manhattan and the Bronx. He was elected to the office in November of that year and was reelected in 1960.

Justice Nathan, who had been certified by the administrative board of the State judicial conference, continued to serve on the bench after the statutory age limit of 70.

He was convinced that in government people get what they deserve. "They are always sitting around at home crabbing," he once said, "but are entirely willing to let George do it.

"I would urge them to get into politics actively—on either side. In that way they can lift up the whole system. In that way they can keep democracy rolling instead of drying up."

Justice Nathan had been president since 1951 of Congregation Shearith Israel, the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue. This is the oldest Jewish congregation in the United States, dating back to 1654.

He was active in behalf of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the Jewish Social Service Association, Goodwill Industries, the Judeans, the Jewish Education Committee, the American ORT Federation, and Knickerbocker Hospital.

He was a director of the American Jewish Historical Society, an honorary member of the New York Historical Society, and a member of the Williams Club and the Sons of the American Revolution.

Justice Nathan leaves his wife, the former Mabel Unterberg; two sons, Frederic S., and Edgar Nathan III; two sisters, Mrs. Henry S. Hendricks and Emily S. Nathan, and six grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held today at 11 a.m. in Temple Shearith Israel at Central Park West and 70th Street.

Reapportion California State Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was most gratified to learn that the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce has joined leaders of labor and local government in efforts to give southern California an equal voice in State government. The chamber wisely recognizes that fair representation depends upon immediate reapportionment of our rurally dominated State senate.

Two prominent Los Angeles attorneys, James L. Beebe and James A Doherty, have prepared an excellent statement calling for the reapportionment of the California State senate. This statement, which reflects the chamber's position on reapportionment, is extremely well-documented and counters some of the illusory arguments which are being used to defend California's grossly unfair senatorial apportionment scheme.

I wish to insert this statement in the RECORD so that my colleagues will have the opportunity to review it:

THE CALIFORNIA SENATE MUST BE REAPPORTIONED

(By James L. Beebe and James A. Doherty, attorneys at law)

FOREWORD

Reapportionment of the California State Senate is being widely discussed. We believe that in the interests of good government it must be reapportioned. This memorandum sets forth briefly the historical background of the present California Senate apportionment provision. It states briefly the present law on apportionment of state legislatures as laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States. It also points out some of the illusory arguments which have been widely spread to defend the present unfair California senatorial apportionment method. We hope it will be useful.

On December 3, 1964, in the case of *Silver* v. *Jordan* (No. 62-953 MC, in the U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, central division), a three-judge district court by a vote of 2 to 1, citing as authority U.S. Supreme Court decisions upon apportionment laws (Colorado a constitutional amendment) in the following States: Tennessee, *Baker* v. *Carr*, 369 U.S. 186 (decided March 26, 1962); Georgia, *Gray* v. *Sanders*, 372 U.S. 368 (decided March 18, 1963); *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1 (decided February 16, 1964); Alabama, *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (decided June 15, 1964); New York, *WMCA, Inc.* v. *Lomenzo*, 377 U.S. 633 (decided June 15, 1964); Maryland, *Maryland Committee* v. *Tawes*, 377 U.S. 656 (decided June 15, 1964); Virginia, *Davis* v. *Mann*, 377 U.S. 678 (decided June 15, 1964); Delaware, *Roman* v. *Sincock*, 377 U.S. 695 (decided June 15, 1964); Colorado, *Lucas* v. *Colorado General Assembly*, 377 U.S. 713 (decided June 15, 1964); ordered the Legislature of the State of California to reapportion the California State Senate in a manner consistent with the Supreme Court decisions so that the Reynold's doctrine of a "substantially equal" population basis is followed. The court further retained jurisdiction so that if the legislature does not act by July 1, 1965, the court can. An appeal has been taken to the Supreme Court of the United States.[1]

The first case listed above involved Tennessee.

In this case, *Baker* v. *Carr*, the Supreme Court decided, in practical effect, that the apportionment of members of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee among the State's 95 counties debased the votes of the plaintiffs and denied them equal protection of the laws under the 14th amendment (the various differences in representation in Tennessee were not nearly as great as those which exist in senatorial representation in California).

Justices Frankfurter and Harlan dissented, Justice Frankfurter in particular pointing out that the Court was in effect overruling some earlier decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 1963 and early 1964 two cases decided by the Supreme Court involved Georgia and on June 15, 1964, a whole series of cases, listed above, were decided and in these decisions the Supreme Court held:

1. "One person, one vote."

"By holding that as a Federal constitutional requisite both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned on a population basis, we mean that the equal protection clause requires that a State make an honest and good faith effort to construct districts, in both houses of its legislature, as nearly of equal population, as practicable" (*Reynolds* v. *Sims*, supra, p. 577).

In *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, supra, and the other cases decided June 15, 1964, the Court followed *Gray* v. *Sanders*, supra, in effect, holding that in apportionment of both houses of the legislature the standard must be "one person, one vote" (Reynolds case, p. 558).

2. The so-called Federal analogy is inapplicable.

On the so-called Federal analogy, in which State apportionments are arranged with one house based on population and the other based upon political subdivisions, such as counties or cities or townships, the Court, in *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, page 573, said:

"We agree with the district court, and find the Federal analogy inapposite and irrelevant to State legislative districting schemes. Attempted reliance on the Federal analogy appears often to be little more than an after-the-fact rationalization offered in defense of maladjusted State apportionment arrangements. The original constitutions of 36 of our States provided that representation in both houses of the State legislatures would be based completely, or predominantly, on population. And the Founding Fathers clearly had no intention of establishing a pattern or model for the apportionment of seats in State legislatures when the system of representation in the Federal Congress was adopted."

The constitutions of 27 States stipulated that population should be the sole basis of legislative apportionment.

From the time Vermont was admitted in 1791 until Montana became a State in 1889, no State entered the Union without stressing population as the basis of apportionment. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 guaranteed the inhabitants of that vast territory equal representation on the basis of population in their territorial and State legislatures.[2]

The Supreme Court in the Reynolds case, page 573, in a note states:

"Article II, section 14, of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, stated quite specifically: 'The inhabitants of the said territory shall always be entitled to the benefits * * * of a proportionate representation of the people in the legislature.' "

Actually, the requirement in the Federal Constitution for two Senators from each State is based upon a compromise made at a time when the States, which had formerly been colonies, were actually new nations (usually referred to as sovereign states) and there was no basis upon which they would form a Union other than a voluntary one.

The larger States, notably Virginia, New York, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania acceded to the demand of the smaller States for equal representation in the Senate; so in order to form the United States of America the members of the convention agreed that the U.S. Senate was to have two Members from each of the several States.

Counties and cities are in no way sovereign nations or sovereign states; they are merely subdivisions of a State, formed by the State for the purpose of local government. The Supreme Court in the Reynolds case, supra, pages 572 to 576, discusses this at some length. At page 575, the Court states:

"Political subdivisions of States—counties, cities, or whatever—never were and never have been considered as sovereign entities. Rather they have been traditionally regarded as subordinate governmental instrumentalities created by the State to assist in the carrying out of State governmental functions. As stated by the Court in *Hunter* v. *City of Pittsburgh*, 207 U.S. 161, 178, these governmental units are 'created as convenient agencies for exercising such of the governmental powers of the State as may be entrusted to them,' and the 'number, nature

Footnotes at end of speech.

and duration of the powers conferred upon [them] * * * and the territory over which they shall be exercised rests in the absolute discretion of the State.' The relationship of the States to the Federal Government could hardly be less analogous."

Similarly, the Federal Government creates the Federal judicial districts, Federal Reserve districts, and other Federal agencies for Federal governmental purposes.

3. Area and economic representation theories rejected.

Concerning arguments for area or economic representation, the Supreme Court, in the Reynolds case, page 580, declared:

"Citizens, not history or economic interests, cast votes. Considerations of area alone provide an insufficient justification for deviations from the equal-population principle. Again, people, not land or trees or pastures, vote."

4. Constitutional right to equal protection of the laws.

The Colorado case of *Lucas* v. *Colorado General Assembly*, in which the U.S. Supreme Court held a Colorado constitutional amendment invalid, brought judicial rejection of one final argument—that citizens of a State should be able to adopt any type of apportionment they want. The Court said, pages 736–737:

"An individual constitutionally protected right to cast an equally weighted vote cannot be denied even by a vote of a majority of a State's electorate, if the apportionment scheme adopted by the voters fails to measure up to the requirements of the equal protection clause * * *. A citizen's constitutional rights can hardly be infringed simply because a majority of the people choose that it be."

WHAT NOW?

Will the legislature reapportion the senate on the basis of population by July 1, 1965?

We do not know, but the reasonable course would be for the legislature itself to comply with the Court's order rather than have reapportionment by a court decree.

The Los Angeles Times, March 21, 1965, had an article relating that in 1964 court actions to compel reapportionment were filed or implemented in 39 States. The article states that State legislatures reapportioned themselves in 10 States, the court reapportioned in 4 and, at the start of 1965, 24 States were under court orders to reapportion.

POSITION OF THE LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce opposed the erroneously called Federal plan in 1926, submitted the bill apportioning the districts under the so-called Federal plan to a referendum in 1928, opposed the senate reapportionment measure proposed in 1948, and supported both of the senate reapportionment initiatives proposed by Supervisor Bonelli, one in 1960 and the other in 1962.

In 1962, in approving the Bonelli plan of senate reapportionment (proposition No. 23) the board of directors of the chamber took the following position:

"(1) That the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce endorse proposition No. 23, as a step in the right direction—even though the chamber believes that the membership of the senate should be limited to 40 and, upon any fair basis of representation, southern California, Los Angeles County, and the urban areas of California are entitled to greater representation than is provided in the proposition; and

"(2) That, whether or not proposition No. 23 is approved by the electors, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce continue its efforts to obtain representation in the State senate which will give southern California and the urban areas, both north and south, more equitable representation than now exists or is proposed by proposition No. 23."

(The Los Angeles County vote in 1,353,849 for, against 432,187. The vote in Orange County was 148,750 yes, 91,885 no.)

The board of directors of the chamber this year (1965) has approved the following policies on reapportionment:

1. That the legislature proceed without delay in accomplishing the reapportionment of the State senate,

2. That reapportionment be accomplished by legislative act, not by referral to the electorate, and

3. That reapportionment be accomplished so as to avoid the device of at-large senators.

The chamber of commerce position has been based upon serious injustice to Los Angeles County and to southern California under the amendment of 1926, the so-called Federal plan.

There are some illusions about the method of districting the California State Senate under the amendment of 1926, erroneously called the "Federal plan."

ILLUSION NO. 1. THAT THE ERRONEOUSLY CALLED "FEDERAL PLAN" HAS BEEN IN EFFECT IN CALIFORNIA FROM THE BEGINNING

Apparently many people believe that the erroneously called "Federal plan" has been in effect in California since the beginning. Actually, the constitution of 1849 made white inhabitants the sole basis of apportionment and the constitution of 1879 made population the sole basis of apportionment of the assembly and of the senate.

Population was actually the basis of senatorial apportionment until the amendment of 1926 and the first senate elected under the amendment took office part in 1931 and part in 1933 (due to staggered terms).

In 1851, as provided in the constitution of 1849, until a census be taken, all of southern California had only 3 senators, northern California had 24 senators.

Illustrative later years are:

Year	Southern California Senators	Northern California Senators
1853 [1]	[2] 2	31
1857	2	33
1861 [3]	[4] 3	37
1891	7	33
1911	12+	28−

[1] Based on 1852 census.
[2] A 33⅓-percent loss.
[3] A membership of 40 had been established in 1861.
[4] A 50-percent gain.

In 1853, both Eldorado and San Francisco Counties had four each, all of southern California had two.

In 1861 San Francisco had 4½, Los Angeles had one.

In 1873–74 San Francisco reached its high-water mark with 10½, Los Angeles still had one.

In 1891 San Francisco dropped to nine, Los Angeles was up to three.

In 1901 San Francisco had nine, Los Angeles had five.

In 1911 San Francisco had seven, Los Angeles had eight.

The tabulation given above shows that in the early years in California the northern counties had a preponderance of the population. The northern gold field population vanished and, beginning in the late 1880's, southern California began to grow, with the resulting shift in weight of population to southern California.

In 1911 the northern-dominated legislature refused to reapportion at the regular session but did reapportion at a special session.

In 1921 the northern-dominated legislature (assembly, 56 north, 24 south; Senate 28− north, 12+ south) faced with a big increase in senatorial representation from southern California (from 12 to 17 based on 1920 census), refused to reapportion and in 1926 the erroneously called "Federal plan" (proposition 28) was presented by San Francisco and some farmers' organizations and carried in every county except Los Angeles, but still was adopted only by a very narrow margin.

The San Francisco Chronicle, in commenting upon the action of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce in endorsing proposition 28, said:

"Desire to conciliate the rural counties no doubt influenced the San Francisco civic leaders somewhat, but the important factor in the situation was undoubtedly fear of the growing power of Los Angeles."

San Francisco and the bay area had teamed with the northern counties to get the erroneously called "Federal plan."

We do not know the facts but it seems quite probable that the erroneously called "Federal plan" proponents must have offered, quietly, as bait, to influential people in each of the southern California counties which were not entitled to one senator on a population basis, a senator for that county.

It is a good guess that leaders in each of the smaller population southern California counties were given that assurance. It is small wonder that they supported the program. The Senate apportionment in 1927 under the amendment of 1926 reduced southern California representation from even the 12 of 1911 to 10.

Where the representation based on the 1920 census should have been southern California 17 Senators, northern California 23, under the amendment of 1926 it became southern California 10, northern California 30. Northern California took southern California 3 to 1. Los Angeles footed the bill but all of southern California lost.

ILLUSION NO. 2. THAT THE ERRONEOUSLY CALLED FEDERAL PLAN WAS THE ORIGINAL BASIS FOR APPORTIONMENT IN MOST OF THE STATES

Another illusion is that the erroneously called Federal plan was the basis for apportionment originally in most of the States.

As we have pointed out above, that is not true. Of the original State constitutions 27 stipulated population should be the sole basis of representation and 36 required that representation be based predominantly upon population.[3]

ILLUSION NO. 3. THAT THE AMENDMENT OF 1926, THE ERRONEOUSLY CALLED FEDERAL PLAN, WAS FOR THE BENEFIT OF FARMERS

It is claimed also that the erroneously called Federal plan actually gave agriculture representation and that it was primarily for the benefit of farmers. That is another illusion.

According to the census of 1925 (production year 1924) Los Angeles County was No. 2 in agriculture in the State of California.

By the 1930 census (1929 production year) its production had increased 4½ times, so it probably was first in production in 1926.

By the census of 1930 (production year 1929) Los Angeles County's agricultural production was more than double that of the leading northern California county.

For over 20 years thereafter Los Angeles County was the leading agricultural county in California and for many years was the leading agricultural county in the United States.

Other leading agricultural counties in California include Imperial, Orange, Riverside, Ventura, Kern, San Bernardino, Tulare, Fresno, Contra Costa, San Joaquin and Stanislaus. (At the present time, because of cotton acreage, Fresno, Kern and Tulare lead.)

On the basis of value of agriculture certainly Los Angeles, Kern, Orange, Ventura, Riverside, San Bernardino, Tulare, and Imperial would have been entitled to much more representation than they received, and so

Footnotes at end of speech.

would some of the great agricultural northern counties.

In the 1924 production year (U.S. Agricultural Census, 1925) when 10 southern California counties had more agricultural production than 33 of the northern California counties, the amendment of 1926 gave these northern California counties 16-plus senators, southern California only 10.

In the 1929 production year (census, 1930) the 10 southern California counties, paced by Los Angeles, had a production of $429,528,922 while 46 (that's all but 2) northern California counties had a production of only $429,664,058.

The top 10 counties in agricultural production in 1963 (6 of them in southern California) produced 58.5 percent of all the agricultural products in the State, yet had only 10 of the State's senators. The senate is heavily weighted in favor of the counties with smaller agricultural production. The claim that the amendment of 1926 was to protect agriculture breaks down completely when one looks at the facts.

In 1962 five southern California counties (including Los Angeles) exceeded by $150 million the total agricultural production of the five leading northern California counties. In the 1963 top 10 counties in California in agricultural production 6 are southern California counties. On the basis of agriculture alone, southern California would have been entitled to many more senators than it received.

Even today after subdivisions have contracted its agricultural acreage Los Angeles County is seventh in total agricultural production (with no cotton production), first in dairy production and in dairy cattle, first in total horses, and second in horses and mules on farms.

Under the leadership of F. Q. Story (president of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce in 1902 and a chamber director for 25 years) the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce contributed greatly to agriculture, especially to citrus production and marketing.

Later in the twenties and thirties and early forties the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, through its agricultural department headed by Dr. Clements and with a strong chamber committee of agricultural leaders, did more to increase, develop and improve agriculture in southern California than any organization in the State.

Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce advertising and agricultural exhibits at fairs in Midwest and eastern areas brought many residents and farmers to southern California and increased farm acreage and farm production in Orange, Ventura, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties as well as in Los Angeles County.

In manufacturing of food products the Los Angeles metropolitan area (Los Angeles and Orange Counties, 2 senators) in the first quarter of 1962 had over 35 percent more employees than the San Francisco Bay area 7 counties (7 senators): Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Solano.[4]

ILLUSION NO. 4. THAT THE AMENDMENT OF 1962 GIVES AREA REPRESENTATION

Nor does the area argument (another illusion) hold weight. Nine Northern California senatorial districts contain only 22,176 square miles of area, while San Bernardino County alone has 20,131 square miles but only one senator.

No matter what the disclaimer may be, one of the real purposes of the amendment of 1926 (the erroneously called Federal Plan) was to keep growing Los Angeles from having more representation than San Francisco in the State senate. The other real purpose was to preserve northern domination of the senate.

Footnotes at end of speech.

ILLUSION NO. 5. NORTHERN RURAL LEGISLATORS ARE MORE CONSERVATIVE THAN SOUTHERN LEGISLATORS

It is claimed that the northern rural counties send more conservative representatives to the legislature than southern California. That was true for a time in the thirties when Los Angeles County had Utopians, EPIC, and other radical movements centered here and it continued in part into the early forties. But it is no longer true.

In spite of substantial gerrymandering and inequalities in district size, the population-based House of Representatives of the Congress has a more conservative representation from California than does the State Senate.

One organization which keeps voting records on important bills in the legislature has a chart which shows liberal and conservative votes on 15 key rollcalls on important issues in the 1963 assembly.

The record shows that 8 northern California assemblymen cast conservative votes while 24 southern California assemblymen voted conservative.

(NOTE.—If a majority or more of the votes of an assemblyman on these issues he voted on were listed conservative, we class him as a conservative voter. If a majority or more of his votes were listed liberal, we class him as a liberal.)

State Senator Tom Rees, Democrat, is quoted in the Los Angeles Times of March 14 as follows: "If the one-man, one-vote rule is followed, the California Senate will lose the real, tough strength of the Democratic Party representation in the senate."

Jesse Unruh, speaker of the California Assembly, Democrat, talking to the State and Local Government Committee of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce December 30, 1964, said, in part:

"But I would like to speculate just for a minute on what might happen after senate reapportionment and this is why I think the Republican Party leadership in the legislature is very shortsighted. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind whatsoever that the Democrats will lose senate seats under senate reapportionment on a one-man-one-vote basis, because the principal beneficiaries will be the 3 large counties in southern California and I think, without any question of a doubt, that the Republicans are going to do better than 13 members in the senate when electing some 25 of the senators from southern California."

ILLUSION NO. 6. NORTHERN DOMINATED SENATE IS FAIR TO LOS ANGELES COUNTY

It has been said that the northern-county-dominated senate has been fair to Los Angeles County. That, too, is untrue.

Some of the northern counties have paid less taxes into the State treasury than they have received in subventions of various kinds from that treasury.

Six northern counties received more in subventions than their inhabitants paid in States taxes in 1963–64, from 118.8 to 318.8 percent of taxes paid (report of State of California Legislative Analyst, dated March 26, 1965, on State tax collections, State subventions and property tax collections by counties).

Nine more northern counties each received subventions ranging from 80 to 99.3 percent of the State taxes paid by their inhabitants that year, and nine more received subventions ranging from 70.8 to 79.1 percent of the State taxes paid by their inhabitants that year (same report).[5]

On the important rules committee there has seldom been more than one southern California senator (there is none in 1965).

The southern California area contains over 60 percent of the people and pays over 60 percent of the State taxes. The State Legislative Analyst's report of March 26, 1965, shows that Los Angeles County alone in 1963–64 paid almost the same amount of State taxes as all of the northern counties combined and over seven times as much in State taxes as San Francisco. Southern California does not have enough senators to have adequate representation on the standing committees.

The most important committees have no southern California senator as chairman.

With the wide variety of agriculture, industry, fishery (the greatest in the United States) and other business in Los Angeles County, Los Angeles County needs more senatorial representation and deserves it. All of southern California needs more senatorial representation and deserves it.

But propaganda has built up an unjustifiable fear about the power of Los Angeles if the senate were reapportioned in accordance with population. This fear is based upon the illusions mentioned above.

History, however, shows it to be unjustifiable. Los Angeles did not object to San Francisco's representation way back in the period when San Francisco had 10 senators and Los Angeles only 1.

The State had no problem in 1913 and for 16 years thereafter (based upon the 1911 reapportionment) when Los Angeles had eight and San Francisco seven senators and there is no valid reason to believe that the State would have any problem at the present time.

But some say: "See how the people have voted in favor of the 1926 amendment." The two big arguments were (1) it's the Federal plan on a State basis. On June 15, 1964, the Supreme Court of the United States pointed out that the Federal analogy is phony. (2) The amendment was to protect agriculture. We have examined that argument, too, earlier in this memorandum and shown it is a phony.

But these arguments sounded virtuous and some voters swallowed them hook, line, and sinker. And propaganda against growing Los Angeles made it the bogeyman.

However, the real motivation to vote for the amendment of 1926 was the belief in most of the other counties that they were going to get something for themselves out of the program and take it from Los Angeles. And they did.

Under the Constitution of 1879, based upon the 1920 census, Los Angeles County was entitled to 10.9 senators and all southern California counties to 17.1.

Under the amendment of 1926 Los Angeles County was cut down to one and southern California counties not entitled to one senator on a population basis got one under the amendment at the expense of Los Angeles.

And the seven additional senators southern California was entitled to on a population basis were taken north for safekeeping—a neat trick and the northerners got away with it. They have successfully retained the amendment, using the same illusory arguments but guided by the same real motive.

Northern California senators can be expected first to look after their own districts; second, to take care of northern California. That is a natural attitude. We do not blame them.

We merely recognize the facts of life. Nor do we say that they do not look at the needs of the entire State. Certainly they do but they take care to protect their own.

No great county in the United States has been treated so shabbily as Los Angeles in State senate representation, and it will continue as long as it is to the advantage of the other counties to do it, if they can put it over. Some southern California senators undoubtedly have been able to get an advantage for themselves at times by working with the northern senatorial bloc. Some third house men may like it. We do not criticize them. But in the end penalizing Los Angeles is bad government.

When senators representing less than 10 percent of the population can block any

measure in the senate; when senators representing only 10.7 percent of the population can pass any measure requiring only a majority vote; when the solid senatorial vote of all southern California counties plus the 3 biggest urban northern California counties could be overridden on budget, taxes, bond issue, or any other measure, urgency or otherwise, by the votes of 27 northern California senators representing less than 33½ percent of the population and taxpayers of the State, and when this is made possible by depriving the people of the most populous and richest county in the State of fair senatorial representation, there is bound to be trouble ahead.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA DESERVES MORE REPRESENTATION IN THE SENATE

If the total population of California in the 1960 census of 15,717,204 were the basis of apportionment this year, the population per senator (40 senators) would be 392,930. As will be shown later, this would give the 10 southern California counties 24-plus senators, the representation to which they are entitled by reason of population, taxes paid, and importance of production of every kind.

Actually, the 10 southern California counties have most interests in common. What helps one in the long run will help others. What hurts one in the long run will hurt others.

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce in its drive for population and agriculturists never limited its recommendations to Los Angeles County. It encouraged settlement in any southern California county.

The chamber in its drive for industry has not limited its promotion and location efforts to industrial sites in Los Angeles County. Location in any of our southern California counties benefits all. The All Year Club in its phenomenal promotion of tourist travel brings income to most of the southern California counties.

The hotels, motels, and restaurants in other southern California counties get a big weekend boost from Los Angeles residents. Los Angeles furnishes a large market for much outside county production (from alfalfa to table produce, fruit and food processing).

The chamber of commerce battle for the harbor and lower freight rates has benefited all southern California shippers of produce and manufactured goods out and of manufactured goods and raw materials in Los Angeles City at its own expense provides southern California with one of the world's greatest and best laid out national and international airports. And if it were not for the enormous amount of money Los Angeles County pours into the State treasury, the southern California highway system, with its great benefits to other southern California counties, could not be built.

Water systems delivering Metropolitan Water District water in southern California counties outside Los Angeles are living evidence of Los Angeles' cooperation with and contribution to other southern California counties.

Sharing water originally provided at large cost by cities in Los Angeles County (only three small Orange County cities originally included in the district) has greatly aided the economy of the other counties in southern California where it is used and has also benefited Los Angeles County.

Making available water for expanding populations and making possible the settlement and high use of otherwise arid or insufficiently watered acres has helped the owners, the counties in which the lands lie, and has benefited Los Angeles County, both directly and indirectly. But there is no need to further illustrate the point of our mutual interest and the advantages of cooperation.

A well-financed campaign, backed by some major corporations, has been launched to try to create support for a Federal constitutional amendment which would permit the senate to be apportioned on some basis other than population.

The election campaign firm of Whitaker & Baxter has been employed for this purpose. The State chamber of commerce is beating the drums for this constitutional amendment and trying to round up supporters for it.

It is shouted that States rights are imperiled by the Supreme Court decision. The people of southern California should not be fooled by this campaign.

It is intended to and if successful would mean a continuance of northern California dominance of southern California and would keep Los Angeles County in its present state of peonage in the senate.

California State senators are scurrying to legislatures in other parts of the country and to Washington to try to whip up sentiment for his constitutional amendment. Lobbyists in Washington are striving mightily to do the same thing and the propaganda mill is busy.

Those who are interested in defeating such a constitutional amendment, which would continue the gross unfairness under which we have suffered for years, should write our representatives in Washington and reponsible people in both parties urging its defeat. Should it pass we could expect northern California to keep the saddle on our backs.

We want what we are fairly entitled to—no more—and we will not be satisfied with less.

The senate bill proposed by Senator Teale is deliberately or otherwise unfair to southern California. The 10 southern California counties, on the basis of the 1960 census, are entitled to 24-plus senators. On the population basis estimated by the department of finance as of July 1, 1964, the 10 southern California counties are entitled to 24-plus senators.

Yet even though the Teale committee combines Kings County and San Luis Obispo County with southern California counties (which 2 are not in our count of southern California counties) the committee allocates only 22 senators to the southern group.

It gives only two to San Diego, which we would give three. And the committee deliberately or otherwise endeavors to make reapportionment unpalatable to Los Angeles County by providing 12 senators elected at large.

Los Angeles is entitled to 15. Imagine the cost of a primary and a general election for a candidate (1 of 12) who must campaign for a population of 6,800,000.

The cost would be far too great for 12 individual campaigns.

Further, elections at large would keep some minority groups entitled to senatorial representation from electing their own senators and would do the same injustice to some areas of the county. Also, the legislative counsel of the State of California in a presentation February 25, 1965 before the senate committee on reapportionment stated: "California's constitution provides for the election of only 1 senator from each district." and advised the Senate that in his opinion at-large elections could not be held under the California constitution.

In Georgia, where the court sustained at-large voting for senators when a county had more than 1 senator, the largest county, Atlanta, had a total population of only 556,326 (1960 census) and the whole State of Georgia a population of only 3,943,116, compared with Los Angeles County population by the same census of 6,038,771.

Yet in that case, *Fortson* v. *Dorsey* (1965), 379 U.S. 433, the U.S. Supreme Court said, pages 438–439:

"In reversing the district court we should emphasize that the equal protection claim below was based upon an alleged infirmity that attaches to the statute on its face. Agreeing with appellees' contention that the multimember constituency feature of the Georgia scheme was per se bad, the district court entered the decree on summary judgment. We treat the question as presented in that context, and our opinion is not to be understood to say that in all instances or under all circumstances such a system as Georgia has will comport with the dictates of the equal protection clause.

"It might well be that, designedly or otherwise, a multimember constituency apportionment scheme, under the circumstances of a particular case, would operate to minimize or cancel out the voting strength of racial or political elements of the voting population.

"When this is demonstrated it will be time enough to consider whether the system still passes constitutional muster. This question, however, is not presented by the record before us.

"It is true that appellees asserted in one short paragraph of their brief in this Court that the countywide election method was resorted to by Georgia in order to minimize the strength of racial and political minorities in the populous urban counties. But appellees never seriously pressed this point below and offered no proof to support it, the district court did not consider or rule on its merits, and in oral argument here counsel for appellees stressed that they do not rely on this argument.

"The record thus does not contain any substantiation of the bald assertion in appellees' brief. Since, under these circumstances, this issue has 'not been formulated to bring it into focus, and the evidence has not been offered or appraised to decide it, our holding has no bearing on that wholly separate question'" *Wright* v. *Rockefeller*, 376 U.S. 52, 58.

It may well be that this flagrant flouting of fair play is designed to provoke a lawsuit to prevent or delay compliance with the order of the court by keeping reapportionment in litigation.

Whether this be true or not, unfortunately unfairness to Los Angeles and to southern California seems to be the attitude of some of the northern senators.

Southern California counties are growing rapidly. Their citizens should resist all efforts by any group to continue the minority northern domination of the senate. Working together, southern Californians can get the representation which the growth and importance of the southern counties warrant.

---

[1] California senatorial districts are now apportioned under the amendment of 1926 of article IV, section 6, of the California constitution, which provides for 40 senators from 40 senatorial districts, numbered 1 to 40, and states: "Each senatorial district shall choose one senator * * *" and "* * * in the formation of senatorial districts no county or city and county shall contain more than one senatorial district, and the counties of small population shall be grouped in districts not to exceed three counties in any one senatorial district."

The first apportionment under this amendment of 1926 took place in 1927 and the senators under it were elected in 1930 and 1932 and some took office in 1931 and some in 1933 (this was because of staggered terms). Under this 1926 amendment Los Angeles County, with a 1960 census population of 6,038,771 (a population greater than that of any one of 43 States) has one senator, compared with a population of only 6,231,123 for all of the 48 northern counties, which have 30 senators. The counties we consider as southern California counties are Imperial, Kern, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San

Bernardino, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Tulare and Ventura. These 10 counties, with 60 percent of the State's population (1960 census) have only 10 senators. The northern 48 counties, with only 40 percent of State's population (1960 census) have 30 senators. The smallest senatorial district in population is composed of three counties with a population of 14,294 (1960 census), compared with Los Angeles County's population of 6,038,771. A vote in that senatorial district has 422 times the weight of a vote in Los Angeles.

[2] William J. D. Boyd, senior staff associate of the national municipal league in National Civil Review, vol. LIII, No. 10, November 1964.

[3] William J. D. Boyd, National Civic Review, vol. LIII, No. 10, November 1964.

[4] Booklet, "Did You Know?" published by Council of California Growers, San Francisco.

[5] The legislative analyst computes State tax collections shown in his table as: "total revenue from major taxes and licenses for 1963–64 as shown in the printed budget allocated to counties on the basis of collections reported for sales tax and personal income tax and on a population basis for all other taxes," and subventions as: "direct contributions to counties plus shared revenues as reported by the State controller, including payments from highway users tax fund to cities. Does not include subventions indirectly distributed."

Wood, Wis., Memorial Day Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, while realizing that all around our Nation last weekend thousands of communities were celebrating Memorial Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities, I should like to draw attention to the services which were held at Wood, Wis., the Veterans' Administration Center in Milwaukee.

These services were, in my judgment, particularly impressive because of their solemnity and simplicity. The message of the principal speaker, the Very Reverend W. F. Kelley, S.J., president of Marquette University, was eloquent and inspiring.

He was introduced by the Center Director, D. C. Firmin, while the Assistant Director of the Center, W. J. McComb, presided at the graveside ceremonies.

The invocation was by Chaplain Eustace F. Brennan, and the benediction by Chaplain Benjamin D. Willetts. Joseph J. Bronesky, a Marquette University High School student, gave a stirring rendition of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Music was provided by the Blatz American Legion Band, under the direction of its director, Everett Kisinger, and members of the nursing staff sang "Ave Maria" during the wreath laying.

I am pleased at this time to include Father Kelley's remarks on that fine occasion in the RECORD at this point, and urge the attention of my colleagues to them:

EVERY DAY IS MEMORIAL DAY

Fellow clergymen, my longtime friend and esteemed Congressman, CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, parents, relatives, friends, Americans all, you have honored me this morning. You have brought me back into my boyhood neighborhood situated just east of the soldiers' home gate on Blue Mound Road. Before bigleage baseball had transformed the Menominee Valley, it was a rough country, quarry country, and hill country to challenge venturesome young boys. The soldiers' home, with its neat patches of serried memorial crosses, was familiar ground.

Also, it was sacred and hallowed ground. Now a great medical center with its new name of Wood, Wis., it is still the place where, most easily, a loyal American can feel gratitude to great fellow citizens who did not think their own lives were too much to offer if America's welfare asked for it.

This is a spot for reverie.

Where better could we gather for Memorial Day. Since my boyhood, our great fraternity of honored war dead has expanded astronomically. Then Civil War veterans and those from the Spanish-American War were swollen by crushing numbers from the World War. Now to these have been added a new group of heroes from the Second World War, and the Korean conflict—men and women who symbolize profound love of country.

Memorial Day is daily. Who can criticize us for setting aside each May 30 as Memorial Day?

My feeling, however, is that gratitude and thoughtfulness cannot be budgeted or compartmentalized. We have to keep alive each day the spirit that wells up in us today on a beautiful occasion such as this.

In a parallel way we scorn the church member who feels that he can exhaust his obligation for corporate worship by church attendance only at Christmas or perhaps in a burst of fervor on Easter as well.

Each day, every day, we should be profoundly grateful because, in God's good providence, we either were born here or we made our way under the protective mantle of the United States.

Here is a country where a man can grow. He is free to speak, free to write, free to assemble with his fellows, and free to worship his Creator. He is important here because he is a person, an individual.

Here in America we have everything working for us. Someone said very well that "there is only one thing you can give to the man who has everything—namely your sympathy." This is related in a certain sense to the jaded, sophisticated fellow citizens we occasionally, perhaps too frequently, encounter. Compared to citizens of other nations across the world, relatively we do have everything. But, will the cynical malcontents acknowledge this? They pout, they cry, they whine like petulant children. Nothing in America is right in their book. They flirt with the blandishments of other countries. They hide behind the unique freedoms that are ours in order to sabotage, to undermine, to snipe at, and to ridicule our most cherished heritage. These jaded ones scoff at the concept of patriotism; it is obsolete, meaningless, and as dated as high button shoes. Respect. Respect for officials, for customs, for symbols is well-nigh forgotten. These are those who like to think of themselves as emancipated Americans.

I do not believe in a simplistic interpretation of the modern man, the American of today. I do, however, feel sorry for a citizen of the United States, whether in Seattle, Santa Fe, Salem, or Schenectady, if he cannot feel his heart pick up a beat when he sees a President (of either party), or an American flag, or a parade of Americans, or a resting place for decreased soldiers, or a Kansas wheatfield, or a Milwaukee industrial plant, or the Rocky Mountains near Denver, or the Mississippi River tumbling at St. Louis, or a bustling public school, or the sand dunes along Lake Michigan, or the glacier lakes of Minnesota.

These are small items, but each is a chip, as it were, in the giant and marvelous mosaic that is America. This is our home; this is our native land.

Remember the forgotten ones. It well may be that each of us today is thinking of one or another of the brave souls buried here or elsewhere in America or across the world. And indeed, it is right and just that we should pray for those who were closest to us. There is, however, this morning a great opportunity for self-forgetfulness. We can concentrate very well on those to whom we are indebted for life, or love, or protection. This morning I think we should, in a gesture of greatness, turn our prayers and our thoughts toward those forgotten ones whom nobody remembers. We can almost see this morning the Tomb of the Unknown Soldiers at Arlington, where we honor in a single monument all those who sleep unidentified in our cemeteries across the world.

We can well offer a prayer, then, for those even in this cemetery—identified, correctly tagged—but in a certain sense, forgotten in the prayers and thoughts of their own people. Or perhaps they were the last in a line of a family and there is no next of kin still alive to ask God's blessing upon them. Perhaps this can be our commission this morning, to intercede with our prayers for the welfare of the forgotten ones.

On Memorial Day, too, there is room for a little healthy selfishness. We ask our Creator to guard with His paternal love those whom we cherish here on earth and whose memory is, for us, an inspiration. And what of ourselves? First of all, to borrow the perfect expression of Lincoln, "Let us take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure."

A prayer for ourselves: John Henry Newman encompassed beautifully what I think is the perfect prayer against this setting for each of us as we assemble here in loving memory today. It is something of an evening, or twilight prayer, but it seems to be especially appropriate this morning, Memorial Day, 1965. Newman put his request in this fashion:

"May God support us all the day long
Till the shades lengthen,
And the evening comes,
And the busy world is hushed
And the fever of life is over,
And our work is done.
Then, in His mercy
May He give us a safe lodging,
And a holy rest,
And peace at the last."

This prayer should keep a certain bond between us and those dead whom we have loved. It establishes our common sonship under God, and our common determination to see His kingdom realized in peace, and mercy, and justice. This is the lesson of Memorial Day. We shall not be derelict in our readiness to carry forward steadfastly the challenge in our own day.

In closing, it is easy to hear, almost as if whispered to us, the earnest entreaty of those who have died for our country: It is poetry of the First World War, but is as true and vivid today as if freshly written for us.

"Take up our quarrel with the foe.
To you, from failing hands, we throw the torch.
Be yours to hold it high.
If you break faith with us who die,
We shall not sleep, though poppies—
in Flanders Field."

—JOHN D. MCCRAE.

"Flanders Field," yes, and the place was France and the flowers were poppies, but the admonition is just as true in Wood, Wis., with

our beloved dead resting to your right, to your left, before your eyes, and behind you. Here they sleep beneath these elms, these oaks, these lilacs, these tulips.

My friends, let us walk away from here this morning determined to be more grateful, more courageous, and better Americans.

Chester Dale Collection—National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker we in the United States are fortunate that the National Gallery of Art has been given the extraordinary and magnificent Chester Dale collection.

As it can now be seen at the National Gallery in Washington, D.C. I am calling this fine opportunity to the attention of the Congress and the American people.

If you would like to view masterpieces of all types, and see what you really like, the month of June is the time to take the time to enjoy this wonderful addition to our national assets. It will surprise people to find the many varied aspects of art, painting, and sculture, that can be seen in the beautiful surroundings of the National Gallery, donated to our country by Andrew Mellon.

In enclose for the RECORD the article from the April 1965, issue of the magazine "Art in America":

CHESTER DALE COLLECTION—NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

(By Lester Cooke, curator of painting at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.)

"Collecting is a sort of devil," Francis Henry Taylor once wrote, "of which great personalities are frequently possessed." Few men have been more fortunately possessed by that devil than Chester Dale, who by any standards was as extraordinary as the collection which he has left to the National Gallery of Art in Washington. The son of an English father and American mother, Mr. Dale left the Peekskill Military Academy after an uncompleted formal education, and with an unextinguishable zest for the hurly burly of New York's business world, got a job as a runner for brokerage firms in Wall Street. Before he was 35, his collection of railroad and utility shares placed him firmly among the most successful men of his generation. During the early twenties, aided and abetted by his wife, Maud, a good painter in her own right, he turned his attention to art. Understandably, the first painters that appealed to him were those who caught the spirit of the New York world in which he reveled. "George Bellows' rise and fruition in lithographic art," wrote a surprised journalist during the twenties, "can be traced on Chester Dale's brokerage office walls" The writer might have added that some of Bellows' best canvases, including portraits of the Dales, together with an outstanding group by Guy Pène du Bois, adorned the walls of his home.

Contemporary American art was, however, only the prologue. Before her marriage in 1911, Maud Dale had moved from New York's Art Students League to Paris for study with Steinlen, and had become engulfed in the Ecole de Paris. Under her insistent guidance, Chester Dale began to plunge on the Left Bank. Major works by Toulouse-Lautrec, Cézanne, van Gogh, Degas, and Monet quietly entered his domain. He became the power behind New York's Museum of French Art, and here enjoyed a position of unique advantage in the market. Perched like a kingfisher over the stream of French art flowing through both Paris and New York, he swooped when the really exceptional prize came within range. Behind a bluff and peppery exterior, he concealed a gimlet eye for quality, a cautious appraisal of lasting values, and a sort of paternalistic love for the masterpieces he lived with. He had supreme confidence in his own judgment. "No dealer," he once was quoted as saying, "ever sold me a picture. Talked me into buying one, that is."

By 1928, some 300 canvases, many acknowledged masterpieces, were hung and stacked in the Dale residences, and the first public exhibition was arranged. Looking back we can see that this event was a turning point in the history of American taste; 1928 was the swan song of an era. Impressionism and postimpressionism were known, but not condoned. Monet's "Cathedral" still recalls the sugar conceits of the East Side's master wedding cake artists," wrote the critic of Town Topics in 1927. The Museum of Modern Arts was a gleam in the eyes of a distinguished group of patrons, and Alfred Barr was still teaching at Wellesley College. The Dale exhibition did not alter any fundamental trends but it did roll out the carpet for a decisive change in the pattern of collecting in America.

The opening was a gala affair at Wildenstein's. Entrance: $1 for the benefit of the French Hospital. New York's society flocked to acknowledge allegiance to the new trend. The catalog by Maud Dale was sold out in 3 days, and quotations from the introduction reverberated throughout the Nation's press. Americans by and large were delighted and proud; Europeans were chagrined at the migratory flight of masterpieces across the Atlantic. The reaction of the press gives a fascinating insight into the climate of opinion during the late twenties. Conservative critics apparently realized that it was a lost cause trying to save their readers from impressionism and postimpressionism, but newer comers like Modigliani, Vlaminck, and, to a lesser extent, Matisse were considered fair game. "Not unlike an uncensored movie queen she (Modigliani's nude) displays her charms coyly but surely," ran an Art News editorial. "Hot, beefy figure pieces," commented the Christian Science Monitor, also about Modigliani. "Bad drawing and modeling and unreal color of Modigliani [sic] * * * woefully bad piece of painting by Maurice de Lamink [sic] * * * amidst so much slovenly craftsmanship it is a delight to see the portrait of Jane Avril by Lautrec," and "that the public curiosity has been aroused to such a pitch by the artistic adventures of a private individual is somewhat surprising," wrote the critic of the New York Times. Another New York art editor whistled in the dark and reassured his readers that "adherents of the academic school just returned from Paris declared that this modernism was in its last stages of decay in France." In spite of these hoots from conservative quarters, in general praise for the Dale Collection was unstinted, particularly for its consistently high level of quality. "Obviously," ran an editorial in Art News, "the pictures have been selected on their own merits * * * and not because they were painted by famous men."

The Paris press also was caught by surprise. The Frenchman's view of America at that time was dominated by gangsters and the mystery of prohibition, and the widespread acclaim for contemporary French art was an unexpected phenomenon. "No one killed her," a Paris newspaper noted about Mrs. Dale, "no one thought she was crazy * * * she and her husband were hailed as benefactors * * * the Dale Collection is now considered to be the finest in its field."

During the late twenties and thirties, as one world-famous masterpiece after another was added and widespread appreciation for French 19th century art gathered momentum in America, it became known that Mr. Dale intended to leave the collection to a public museum. It thus became one of the greatest prizes still uncommitted in America and the question of its ultimate destination became a burning issue. Selections of paintings were exhibited for extended periods in Philadelphia, Chicago and New York, but always in the legal purgatory of indefinite loan status. Hopes soared, fluttered or faded in half a dozen great galleries. In 1942 a large group, including most of the better-known canvases, were lent to the newly opened National Gallery. Here the spacious setting and natural lighting were ideally suited to the brilliant colors and bold designs of impressionism, and the public immediately beat a path to the section where they were exhibited. Overnight Renoir's "A Girl with a Watering Can" became the most popular picture in the Gallery, and the phrase "Chester Dale Collection" became a household word in America. The great majority of the paintings remained on an indefinite loan basis.

In December 1962 Chester Dale died at the age of 79, and in his will the paintings which had been exhibited at the gallery were given to the National Gallery and to the people of the United States. Added to these were the pictures which Mr. Dale had never been willing to part with during his lifetime. About 80 of this latter group will be exhibited with the others in new galleries to be opened this May. The Chester Dale bequest therefore becomes the greatest single legacy in its field ever to be left to a public institution since the Caillebotte collection was bequeathed to the Louvre in 1894.

As a donor to an institution which must by its nature and charter never lose touch with the millions who come to experience, if only for a few hours, the magic of great art, Chester Dale was a tremendous asset. Perhaps because he had risen through the ranks of taste himself he had a sixth sense and a personal preference for art which, as time is proving, has lasting appeal for the great majority of visitors. He never compromised on excellence; however, he tended to choose paintings with a common denominator of human experience, and he had no fear of sentiment. These qualities have found a wide response in the American public. Among the new additions, most of which have never been publicly displayed before, there are paintings which will soon rank with the established drawing-cards in his collection. There is no need of a poll or computer to forecast that Degas' stunning portrait of "Mademoiselle Malo" will soon receive the accolades it so well deserves. Who can see this painting and not be overwhelmed by the sheer beauty of its paint surface? The Vuillard portrait of the writer, Théodore Duret and his cat, Lulu, amidst the clutter of a lifetime, seems an idyll of contentment. Another view of middle-aged entertainment in Paris is Toulouse-Lautrec's "A corner of the Moulin de la Galette." The finesse of line, strangely combined with the boredom of life, leaves a haunting image of gaslight society. Also a candidate for highest honor will be Renoir's "Girl with a Hoop." Perilously close to the razoredge of sentimentality, nevertheless the warm heart which inspired it, and the superlative control of color which brought it to realization make this a universal image and nostalgic reminder of charming childhood. Not all

canvases are by currently famout masters. Henner, the darling of Victorians, famed for his alabaster bodies in the moonlight, is represented by an irresistible portrait of a child. Another child who is certain to gain a place in the American art world is Picasso's "Le Gourmet." In contrast to the indigo mood of the color scheme is the sense of hope and healthy appetite. This may be the bottom of the bowl from the child's point of view but it is the cream off the top of Picasso's blue period. A painting which leaves nothing to be desired is the "Pot of Geraniums" by Matisse. "He painted," wrote Maud Dale, "in line and color that simplest of all emotions, the joy of life possible to every living thing." In 1928 a writer for the New Yorker singled out this canvas and with an almost audible sigh added that it was a painting "that we would walk almost any distance to own." The writer, and his descendents, do own it now, and the distance will be no farther than the main floor of the National Gallery.

"Every picture," Mr. Dale told an interviewer in 1958, "will go to the public. I consider myself the custodian." Future generations of grateful Americans will add that he was also one of the most generous and imaginative benefactors in the history of art collecting in America.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr* — 1200 S. Courthouse Rd., Arlington, Va.
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C* — 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1705 Longworth House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa* — 301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn* — 119 7th St. SE.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 3424 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, each year the Nebraska Rural Electric Association sponsors an essay contest among the rural youth of Nebraska. The title of the essays for this year is "What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community."

I am pleased and proud to ask that these essays be included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I take pride in presenting these essays and hope that the essays will serve as an inspiration to the many Americans who are interested in this important subject.

The four young people who wrote the essays are Cheryl Adams, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Russell Adams, Jr., Broken Bow, Nebr.; Gary Tobiasson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Tobiasson of North Platte, Nebr.; Pamela Kaiser, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Halsey Kaiser, Hildreth, Nebr.; and Skipper Buell, son of Mr. and Mrs. Barney Buell, Bassett, Nebr.

I join the families and friends of these fine young men and women in a feeling of great pride over their accomplishments. Their essays are well worth reading, and I want to share these messages with my friends and colleagues in the Congress.

The essays follow:

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Cheryl Adams, Broken Bow High School)

Electricity—a dynamic force of nature's energy, harnessed and controlled, has enabled man to create a manufactured product which travels over many miles of line to become an invaluable servant at our fingertips. The result, rural electrification has extended innumerable values to our home and community, a few of which can be summarized in the word "help."

H—HELPMATE

Always available and always reliable, REA becomes the farmer's hired hand as it runs such laborsaving equipment as motors, milking machines, power tools, and pumps—a few of the over 600 different farm electrical uses. The housewife is aided by this helpmate through its electrification of timesaving benefits as kitchen appliances, home freezers, lights, heat, washers, and dryers. Through these facilities, rural electrification contributes many hours of consistent service, instrumental in keeping American agriculture and rural living standards the most modern and efficient in the world.

E—ECONOMY

Rural electrification and telephone loans have enabled farm families to run their farms more economically and efficiently. The dry land farm potential changes to higher productivity through the use of power irrigation wells, just as electricity has brought about a new era in dairying through the use of milk cooling systems.

This newly created era, as well as the use of more electricity to produce better food at a lower cost, improves the financial status of the farmer. Likewise, this pliable, inexpensive commodity becomes a food insurance for all when the farmer is able to produce enough for 27 people now, and by 1995, enough for 49 people. Electricity, which has helped triple food production in only 25 years, was just a dream for most farmers as late as 1935, the year the Rural Electrification Administration was established.

L—LEISURE

As more of the endless tasks are shortened by this modern electrical miracle, the rural area people have found time for leisure. Home relaxation for the family is created in television, radio, and stereo from the use of electricity. Away from home, leisure may include more civic and social activities taken part in by the farmers' wives as well as the farmers. Through this participation, REA plays a large role in creating the closer relationship that exists between farmers, ranchers, and townspeople.

P—PROSPERITY

Rural electrification has been the motivating force in the creation of thousands of new jobs and additional prosperity to the community. Ninty-eight percent of the rural families now have electricity. This wide use brings about the purchases of new appliances and conveniences that in turn add substantially to the business volume of the local area. Jobs are provided by these purchases for wholesalers and retailers in the community as well as the service people. Thus money is kept in the community, increasing its assets as a whole, as well as each person. Developments in electrical use are even more dramatic, keeping the wheels of our Nation's commerce constantly turning.

The value of rural electrification in our home and community is so great that its scope is almost limitless; it is a helpmate, a strong factor in the economy of our living, a creator of more leisure time, and the prosperity from it is evident in the lives of all in the rural area. Each benefit extends to another, just the same as dominoes fit together as the game progresses. The hidden values of this dynamic new force in rural America are brought forward and put to use in the home and community.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION TO MY COMMUNITY

(By Gary Tobiasson, North Platte Public High School)

Let us begin this story a mere generation ago and see the development that has occurred in this short span of time.

Twenty-five years ago rural electrification was an oddity. Electrical appliances such as washers, dryers, refrigerators, and electrical stoves were things to be had in the future. We can readily see that the reason we are privileged to have these modern conveniences is that our standard of living has risen to a point where they are the usual rather than the unusual comforts of life.

The farmer finds more free time by using new chemical fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides which step up his efficiency and make the farm more productive. But these modern scientific developments have not helped the farmer in as many ways as his electrical equipment. Through such electrical equipment as power tools, electric tank heaters, electric fences, and electric heaters, the farmer can improve the efficiency of his labor and at the same time increase his profits.

The housewife is also greatly aided by electrical appliances, which make her work more enjoyable and allow her to take part in more social activities. She accomplishes 10 times as much each day as her grandmother did. After the family contentedly pushes back the plates from a meal cooked in an automatic electric oven, it is mother's turn to put the dishes—pans and all—into the automatic dishwasher.

In 1933, the leadership of Senator George Norris of Nebraska created the Rural Electrification Administration which made the benefits of electrical power available to the Nation's farms and ranches. Mr. Norris was also influential in making Nebraska the public power State, where public ownership helps provide low-cost power to our cities and rural areas.

Electricity performs some 400 tasks that were formerly accomplished by manual or animal labor on the farm. Now about 98 percent of American farms have electric service, compared to only about 7 percent in Nebraska in 1935.

During 1964, 114 of the rural electric systems financed by the Rural Electrification Administration reduced the rates they charge to their customers. The reductions will save at least $1.5 million annually for the customers. Only four systems raised their rates during the same period.

All over the Nation, directors and employees on rural electric systems are helping to stimulate the local economy through the attraction of new industry.

Throughout America rural electrification systems are leading the way in the development of the rural areas they serve. They are doing their part to prove that electricity powers progress. Are you helping to develop your State, your community, your country? In America's youth rests the future of America. Let's hand the world we live in to our children better than we received it with electricity's help.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Pamela Kaiser, Hildreth High School)

Back in the days of the depression, only 1 farmer in 10 enjoyed the use of electricity in his home or enjoyed power machinery that would ease his work.

When the New Deal came into effect and Congress created the Rural Electrification Administration the benefits of electricity were brought to more farms. In 1935, when Rural Electrification Administration began, only 10.9 percent of the farms had electricity. After 28 years, the total has risen to 98 percent. Today only a few scattered farms do not enjoy REA.

A look into the future tells us that in 1980 the atom will be giving the United States approximately one-fifth of all its electricity. By the year 2000 about one-half of all electricity will come from the atom. It is predicted that Americans will be using nearly three times as much electricity in 1980 as now. This shows that there will be a continuing rise in the demand for electric power.

The industry has been doubling its production every 10 years.

There are many reasons why this demand will continue to rise. For example, 15 of every 100 homes in the United States have air conditioners, compared with only 1 per 100 10 years ago. Also in 1964, some 340,000 new installations for electric home heating were added. Such luxury conveniences as electrically heated walks and driveways, outdoor lighting for decoration and protection, and home elevators demand more electricity. These luxury conveniences have greatly increased in our homes and communities in the last 25 years and will continue to increase in the years to come.

The luxuries brought to us by electricity are of real value in our homes and communities. For example, our communications are better. We now have radios and television to bring the news to us faster. Entertainment for the adults, teenagers, and children has become a wide subject because of electricity. If one prefers to stay home he may enjoy watching TV or listening to the music on the radio or phonograph. While he is enjoying this entertainment, he is keeping warm by electric heat.

If one chooses to go out for entertainment, he may wish to go to a movie. This certainly would not be possible if it weren't for electricity.

Children are fascinated by the electric toys which have come out on the market within the last few years. These toys keep them entertained while mother is busy.

The housewife gets her household chores done much quicker. With all the modern appliances it is possible for her to get her work done and still have time for outside activities.

The farmer also has electric tools which aid him in getting his work done in a shorter time. Rural electricity aids the farmer in keeping his livestock safe and his machinery in good condition.

Farm families have found that rural electrification in the home is hard to get along without. It doesn't cost, it pays.

THE HELPING HAND

(By Skipper Buell, Rock County High School)

In January 1949, one of the worst blizzards ever recorded in this area struck. Later that same year when the blizzard was at its peak, rural electrification helped save a life. It was during the spring when the cows were calving. The hired men had gone out to check them. The visibility amounted to almost nothing. As the men were returning to the ranch they got lost. When it was getting close to dark and they had not yet returned, my mother decided to turn on all the lights in the house hoping they might see them. As the men passed right in front of the house they caught a glimpse of the light. By following the light, they found their way back safely. Without this light to follow they might have become victims of the clutching arms of the snowstorm. Instead they were saved by rural electrification.

Let us go on a tour of my home seeing what rural electrification means to my family. We first go into the barn. There above a box is a heat lamp which is used to keep sick calves warm. This same spring this heat lamp has helped in keeping alive many calves. Two weeks ago when my father and I were checking the cattle we found a new born calf which was very sick. We took it to the barn and put it under the heat lamp. We also gave it some medicine. Because of these two things combined this calf lived. Electricity is also used to run electric clippers and other appliances in the barn. In other words REA means money in the bank for my family.

We will now go to the shop. Electricity is used a great deal here. It runs the welder, the sickle sharpener, the grind stone, the drill, the saw, and various other things. I remember one time about a year ago when the electricity went off. Without it we could use none of the tools run by electricity such as the ones mentioned above. I then first realized how important electricity is to our everyday work.

After leaving the shop our tour leads us to the house. Electricity is used more extensively here than on any other part of our ranch. In the line of household work, electricity is used to run such things as our washing machine, dryer, iron, electric beater, electric stove, and innumerable other articles. My mother once said: "Without electricity I would not be able to get half as much done as I do in a normal day." Electricity is also used for entertainment. It runs such things as radios and television.

Our tour now comes to an end. Let us review what we have learned. Rural electrification means more money in the bank, the ability to accomplish more work in a day's time, and it provides a means of entertainment. In a broad sense, rural electrification makes for a more pleasurable and enjoyable life.

"The Outside World"—Address by David Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have long admired the writings of David Lawrence. I regard him as one of the best informed, most courageous, and clearest thinking journalists of our times.

Mr. Lawrence displayed all of these attributes in an address he delivered at commencement exercises at Limestone College, in Gaffney, S.C., on Sunday, May 30. He gave the students of that institution some sound advice on the principles that should guide young Americans as they venture forth from college. I ask unanimous consent that his address, entitled "The Outside World," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OUTSIDE WORLD

(Address by David Lawrence on the occasion of the award of an honorary degree of doctor of letters by Limestone College, Gaffney, S.C., at commencement exercises on Sunday, May 30, 1965)

I feel honored that Limestone College has invited me to deliver the baccalaureate address today. Perhaps it is recognition of the fact that I have spent nearly 55 years writing in the political atmosphere of Washington and haven't grown tired of it. Perhaps it is a tribute also to my colleagues who have tried to inform the public about what's really going on at the seat of their government. Indeed, all of us have become more than ever convinced that an informed electorate means an intelligent and effective electorate. George Washington in his Farewell Address said: "In proportion as the structure of Government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion be enlightened."

I have selected as the title of my address "The Outside World." You have been leading a more or less secluded life here in college. You are soon to feel more directly the ebb and flow of the many currents of community and national life.

The world is always changing—not always for the better but not always for the worse, either. You will be told that times are different in each generation—that ideas and principles which were proclaimed many years ago are obsolete and that a new generation must look upon things differently than our forefathers did.

Granted that population grows and cities alter their appearance as the problems of congestion become more and more challenging, I still would remind you that fundamentals which have long been cherished persist in being pertinent right along. For, despite outward impressions and a natural urge toward experimentalism, the guidelines of human life remain the same. The Ten Commandments, for example, are just as valid today as they were thousands of years ago. Indeed, I read a book the other day, called "The Essential Unity of Religions," which traced the origin of the Ten Commandments back into the ages, as almost identical concepts were expressed in the religion of ancient Persia, in the teachings of Confucius, Mohammed and Buddha, and in the tenets of many other faiths which sought in different languages to introduce a fundamental morality for the conduct of the individual.

What is the outside world like? Whether it is the political world or the business world or the social world within our own country, or whether it is the international world, you face a simple truth—namely, that individual human beings of various kinds control governments, control politics, control business, and furnish the ingredients of what we call the social life of our times.

Similarly, nations are merely a collection of individuals. And the morals of a country are related to the morals of the individual. Honesty and fair dealing—the equitable treatment of the citizens who are deserving and who play their part in the conduct of our everyday life in America—are widely recognized as desirable but not always practiced. There is no doubt in our consciences as to what is honest and what is dishonest. But again and again, we see tendencies to look for loopholes, to rationalize injustice and to twist even the simple words of a Constitution into a meaning which the Founding Fathers never intended—as if the end justifies the means.

We have our courts of law to punish those who are guilty of wrongdoing, but there are many injustices which are never remedied. There are many evils which go untouched. This is unquestionably due, not to a failure to recognize the difference between right and wrong, but to an increasing inclination on the part of the citizen to leave it all to someone else to tackle.

The biggest single defect in our democratic system today is the lack of interest on the part of many people in the affairs of their own government, whether it be Federal or State or county or city. What is the basic reason for this apathy? Is it a lack of information? We have newspapers and magazines. We have radio and television. We have the public forums in which discussions are held that cover almost every conceivable subject. Yet, as the public-opinion polls indicate, the average man or woman often makes a judgment on the basis of inadequate or even incorrect information.

In a democracy, we believe in discussion. We believe in debate. We believe in the right of the individual to express himself fully. But we do not believe it is anybody's right to coerce another human being into a belief which he or she does not conscientiously accept. We have gone so far as to permit those individuals with conscientious objections to be spared the necessity of engaging in military conflict. We have recog-

nized the rights of persons who believe in one religion not to be compelled to accept another religion. We have built a democracy that is designed to give the individual freedom of thought and freedom of belief.

But you will find, as you become a part of the outside world, that there is sometimes an impatience to secure conformity and that, in order to make other persons adopt a point of view which may be unpalatable to them, measures are now and then proposed and adopted which never will be accepted voluntarily, but only by compulsion.

This sort of impatience has been the root of trouble and friction in many a country, and has toppled many a government. It reflects an indifference to, if not an unwillingness to depend on, the processes of conciliation or the rule of reason.

We shall make progress in the controversies of our times when we begin to understand that conformity in human conduct can be achieved only by voluntarism—by the use of reason and persuasion. Adjustment is not mere expediency. It is often a step in the evolution toward a desirable goal.

We hear a good deal about the rights of the individual as they are emphasized again and again. But we hear much less about the obligations of the individual to society. These obligations do not change with the times. They require us to treat other persons fairly and with human compassion as well as understanding.

All men, we are told, are born free and equal. But in reality, individuals vary in their abilities and in their competence. One workman may not be qualified to do a particular job, and the employer seeks out someone who can do it. We have different types of work, skilled and unskilled. They are not equal in the wages paid. But there is room in our economic system for both the unskilled and the skilled. We could not make much progress if it were decided that all individuals must be paid the same wage, irrespective of what work they may do.

You will find in the outside world a system of written laws designed to govern our behavior in community life. But, actually, there are many unwritten laws which the individual must apply as he tries to live with his conscience.

The underlying concept is found in the word "justice." What does it mean? How shall it be attained?

Our forefathers wrote in the Constitution a set of principles which they hoped would provide a fair system of representative government for a free people. But they recognized that, as our country grew, it was not going to be possible to leave the Constitution unchanged. The Founding Fathers, therefore, prescribed a method of making changes that might be needed from time to time. The Constitution provided that an amendment could be offered in Congress, or at the initiative of the States. A constitutional convention may be called to consider amendments, but all amendments must be ratified by the legislatures of conventions of three-fourths of the States of the Union. Oddly enough, it wasn't deemed necessary to get the consent of the President of the United States during the process of changing the Constitution. No President is required to approve or disapprove of a proposed amendment.

The President's leadership, of course, not only in his own party but in the country at large, can be an important influence in the adoption or rejection of constitutional amendments. But at least our forefathers provided that there should not be any one-man veto of proposals for constitutional amendments. The people alone, through their chosen representatives, decide whether the specific amendment proposed shall be adopted or rejected.

But although there is adequate machinery in the Constitution for making changes, there is a school of thought which believes that the process is too cumbersome, and that it is far easier to let the Supreme Court rewrite the Constitution at will. Our forefathers, to be sure, established the Supreme Court to interpret the Constitution, and for decades and decades it was taken for granted that, once the Supreme Court made a decision as to whether the Constitution had been obeyed or disregarded, the only recourse for those who wished to repeal a decision was to use the process of amendment prescribed in the Constitution itself.

Our forefathers anticipated, indeed, that there would be a need for changes in the Constitution and they stipulated the method for accomplishing it. What is significant is that there are so many persons in America today who wish to bypass this particular provision and find some easier way to do what is not truly constitutional.

I cite this as an example of the roundabout devices that are being employed and the tricks that are being used in order to get around the law and the Constitution. There is not much difference between that kind of procedure in governmental life and the evasion of statutes and laws by citizens in private life. Both represent a disregard of the obligation placed upon us by a written contract.

The Constitution itself was proclaimed as a compact between the Thirteen Original States. It specified the powers delegated to the Federal Government, but it reserved all other rights to the States or to the people. Through the years, 37 more States have become parties to that contract as they have been admitted to the Union. But today, this compact is being disregarded. Yet, in private life, when several persons sign a contract, there is no question but that they are obligated to adhere to its provisions and that the signatories cannot at will change it to suit themselves without the consent of all parties.

So when a contract as basic as the Constitution of the United States is circumvented as it is in certain things today, we see manifested a kind of unmorality that does not diminish but actually increases friction and tensions.

Something of this same nature is to be found in the relations between governments in the international scene. Agreements are made and treaties are signed. And yet there are governments which feel they have the right to ignore the obligations written in these documents and to do as they please in international life.

But, you may say, why should all this concern you? You probably think you aren't going to be active in civic or political affairs. But you are a part of the citizenry of this country. And if the people at the grassroots take no interest in what is going on—if they do not fulfill their obligations as citizens—there is less and less hope that we can make our form of government succeed.

You will have an opportunity as mothers to train your sons and daughters to participate in the civic life of their own community and to take an interest in what is going on around them. You do not have to serve in public office in order to serve your country.

Actually, women today are taking a greater part in the affairs of their communities and the Nation than they have at any other time in the history of the United States. This is partly because communication is better. But it is also due to the fact that women have more time—or find more time—to learn what is going on.

What is more important, for example, than the problem of crime today in America? Why has it been neglected? Why do the police departments have inadequate personnel? Why have large sums of money been spent for many other things, and yet the safety of human beings on the streets of our cities has been neglected? This is the responsibility of every community and of every citizen in the community. It relates to self-protection and self-preservation.

But it is not enough to punish crime. We must prevent its growth—find out the causes of crime and bring to bear the power and influence of government to improve the life of our country so that it can be made safe for all of us. But, even more, we must be concerned with homelife, parental teaching, economic barriers, and the sad results that often ensue from unemployment.

A citizen's interest, moreover, can be even more extensive than in training children to become good members of a community. Often women have the time to become familiar with current issues and with what goes on in government—Federal, State, and local. They are able to inform their husbands of the pros and cons of many subjects. Indeed, I have wondered why it took such a long time to grant women the right to vote in the United States. I, myself, shared the enthusiasm of the proponents of the 19th amendment when it was first brought to public attention. I knew many of the leaders of the women's suffrage movement. And, I assure you, theirs seemed like a lost cause at first, but, in the long run, by persistence and persuasion, they made their point and won victory for their cause.

One of the things that influenced my thinking was a recollection of just how the vote was mishandled among men. It was my chore, at the age of 10 in a northern city, to carry election returns on my bicycle from a certain election precinct to the city hall, where the votes were counted. Naturally, I stood around the open lot where the voting booths were located and watched the procedure. Much to my amazement, I saw two lines of persons queueing up to collect money from two different individuals—one had $2 bills and the other had $1 bills to distribute. I don't recall just what distinction was made, but I do know that, even though some of the voters were inclined to vote in a particular party anyhow, they felt they should be financially rewarded.

But is it very much different today? We don't see much open bribery at the voting booths, but we do still see large campaign contributions made by interests which have axes to grind and we do see legislation passed and voted on by legislators who have received such campaign contributions.

We see Presidents, moreover, elected to high office through the help of pressure groups and we see them recommending legislation desired by these groups, irrespective of whether it really is for the benefit of the people as a whole.

You will not find the outside world a perfect world. Democracies have risen only to fall because of vices from within. But this should not discourage us. It's our basic duty to see that our democracy shall constantly improve as an example to all the world. And this can only be accomplished by the united efforts of men and women—those who are honest in their votes and who must, in the long run, outnumber those who are influenced in their voting by improper considerations.

All over the country, persons of my age bracket are addressing graduating classes. We are expected to give advice—based on our long years of experience—on how to live in this changing world.

You may feel that preceding generations have made many blunders. Was it because they were not adequately informed? Did they lack a sufficient interest to find out what the governing authorities were doing? Did our schools and colleges fail to emphasize the importance of the obligations of citizens? Did parents care enough to teach their children the simple rules of life? Many a difficulty arises when we try to apply these teachings. And that's the crux of the whole problem.

We have plenty of theory—but how do we apply our theory in practice? We as individuals must try to make ourselves better understood, and try to understand others. "Love thy neighbor" can mean "understand thy neighbor." Try reason and persuasion, and, above all, be amenable to reason and persuasion yourself.

We as individuals make up the Nation, and if we conscientiously try to elect persons to public office who are honest and capable—persons who will serve the public interest—persons who have learned by experience and from each other the true meaning of life itself—we will create a better country for ourselves and a better world for mankind. From my half century of experience, I can think of no more important piece of advice than this to give you today as you move into the outside world of tomorrow.

District of Columbia Picked Again as Movie Location

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of a writer which my State of Ohio has produced, who has climbed by her own bootstraps from a beginning reporter on the Washington scene to authorship of 10 books.

I have known Miss Frances Spatz Leighton for many years and I know how dedicated she is to her craft. She is from the little town of Thompson in Geauga County. She attended Ohio State University on a scholarship where she studied English, poetry, and fine art.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on last Friday, May 28, 1965:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PICKED AGAIN AS MOVIE LOCATION

Washington is about to again be the scene of a motion picture.

The picture will be adapted from the book "I Married a Psychiatrist" which is written by the well-known Washington author, Frances Spatz Leighton, "as told" by Louise Pfister. The latter is the woman's maiden name but she is the one that married a psychiatrist.

The two collaborators on the book were honored yesterday at a luncheon at the Woodner Hotel given by Mrs. Ella Macey, sister of the owner of the hotel. This marked the announcement of the forthcoming movie, which should be in production in October.

The film will be made by Joseph E. Levine for Paramount release with George Sidney as producer and director. There is a hope that Peter Sellers will carry the leading role.

HUMOROUS COMPLICATIONS

The story as related by Louise Pfister is her own true life experience of the girl who marries an impulsive psychiatrist and finds that her new household is invaded by his odd collection of patients with many humorous complications.

Louise Pfister, whose husband is a well-known psychiatrist in the local area, was a psychiatric nurse before their marriage.

Lively Louise, as she can be easily called, is now the mother of two sons, 17 and 19, and both with college on their minds. She has a slight complaint that child "rearing" wasn't all simple in that the good doctor-father didn't believe in spankings.

PINPOINTS LIFE

As for her life today, she has it pinpointed to a good degree:

"If you marry a psychiatrist, you need one.

"My husband met his patients in the den, but the kitchen is the secondary psychiatry center.

"Fifty years from now (in speaking of life's problems) it won't make any difference.

"Life at it's worst is the most fascinating."

As for the upcoming movie from the book of Mrs. Leighton and as told to Louise Pfister, look out for a shocker. A man will walk in with his true love. She will be wrapped in sheets, will be in the patient's arms, will have long flowing locks and will not speak.

New England Business Up Sharply in Quarter, Over a Year Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, this month's Business Review, published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, highlights New England's share in the Great Society.

According to the report, employment, capital spending, and sales in New England are all up in this first quarter. The threat of a declining economy has been temporarily put off. New England, which has been fighting for its share of the national market, now has a real chance to move forward to reach greater heights.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "New England Business Up Sharply in Quarter Over a Year Ago." The article was published on May 31 in the Boston Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL SPENDING TO RISE: NEW ENGLAND BUSINESS UP SHARPLY IN QUARTER OVER YEAR AGO

The New England economy shared in an exceptional surge of economic activity during the first quarter of 1965, the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston reports.

"The facts of the present trend make good reading," the bank added in a quarterly review of regional business conditions published in its monthly Business Review.

Nonfarm employment in New England was reported at 3,843,900 in March, a 2.3 percent increase over a year earlier, with gains ranging from 1.4 percent in Rhode Island to 4.6 percent in Vermont. Even the lagging manufacturing sector reached a 12-month net gain of 2 percent, the report said.

JOB TREND FAVORABLE

Unemployment trends also were generally favorable. By March, total adjusted unemployment in the region dropped to 4.4 percent of the labor force from 4.9 percent in December. Insured unemployment was 22 percent less than a year ago.

The Reserve bank's adjusted production index for New England rose to 130 in March from 119.6 a year ago. In the same month, total man-hours for all manufacturing production workers were higher on an adjusted basis than for any other month since May 1962.

According to a Reserve bank survey, New England manufacturers now plan to increase capital spending by 19 percent in 1965. A large portion of this total is intended for plant expansion, the survey also showed.

During the first quarter, total construction contracts awarded in New England were 12 percent greater in dollar value than for the same period a year ago. Nationally, there was a slight decline.

In the nonelectrical machinery industry, March employment showed a 1.7 percent gain over a year ago. Employment in electrical machinery plants was up 2 percent for the same period, and sales are expected to increase 3 percent in 1965.

The bank report said the region's transportation equipment industry increased employment by 7 percent during the 2 months ending in March, despite a strike early in this year. The revival of operations at Quincy, Mass., was a principal source of this growth, the report added.

By March, employment at primary metals plants was beginning to grow and workweeks were expanding. At fabricated metal plants, March employment was 3.5 percent better than a year ago.

In the furniture industry, the report said, the first quarter of the year began what might be a fifth consecutive record year in sales, with shipments 12 percent better than a year ago.

Also labeled as "headed for another record year," is the region's pulp and paper industry, with current operations using 95 percent of capacity, and prospective sales up about 14 percent over 1964.

Although overall employment continues to decline in textiles, the bank said that sales are currently "trending upward," and for the full year are expected to exceed those of 1964 by 8 percent.

For the first quarter, March employment in the New England shoe industry was 3 percent better than a year ago; while the rubber products industry reported an increase of 4.5 percent for the same period.

The Real Alabama—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Alabama ranks as second State in the Nation in the production of pulpwood, and this vital industry in our State is fast on the rise.

An article outlining more about the paper and forest industries in Alabama was included in the New York Journal of Commerce special supplement of April 26, 1965, and that article follows:

PAPER AND FOREST INDUSTRIES SCORE RECORD GROWTH

The impact of the paper industry on the Alabama economy in 1964 was nothing short of profound, reflecting not only increased output, but additional employees, increased dollar volume of its output, and new installations added to those already in existence.

The same thing can be said of Alabama's forest industry, which last year saw its greatest economic growth. State agency officials said this would be more than equalled this year because of steadily growing demand for the forest products.

Actual production of pulp, paper, and paperboard in 1964 rose at least 4 percent over the 1963 figure. With the influx of new industry into Alabama, this increase is expected to be even higher by the end of this year. The added output is also expected to push paper products higher up in the list of items which presently are bringing Alabama its greatest economic growth.

The pulpwood industry planted 14 times as many trees in the decade of the 1950's as in the previous 10 years, and this is now paying off. It is estimated that 1.1 million acres of land has been reforested in Alabama, thus insuring future generations the benefits of this important industry.

Most of the pulpwood produced by this industry is used within the State. It is estimated that 60 percent of Alabama's pulpwood output is consumed at home. The remainder is sent chiefly to States adjacent to Alabama.

BILLION DOLLAR VALUE

A recent U.S. Forest Service report estimated the value of the South's annual timber harvest at more than a billion dollars. This does not include the value added through manufacture.

Total value of Alabama's shipments, figured on a yearly basis, is estimated in excess of $500 million, and still growing.

Forestry officials estimate that Alabama's 21 million acres of woodland produce 2 billion board feet of timber each year. It is also estimated that two-thirds of Alabama's surface area is woodland.

State forestry officials said that the quality and quantity of Alabama's timber crop is such that the State will double its output of forest products while continuing to increase timber reserves.

For example, over 13,000 workers are employed in the State's pulp and paper mills, with an annual payroll estimated close to $80 million. Almost 85,000 workers are employed in timberland operations. Harvesting and other operations account for more than 45,000 more workers. Secondary manufacturing and timber construction account for 25,000 more jobs.

One of the promising factors in Alabama's forest growth is that new forest-based industries are coming into being throughout the State. At the same time the existing ones are expanding at a greater pace than ever before.

NEW MILLS BUILT

By the end of 1964, well over $150 million was invested in Alabama for pulp and paper manufacturing, new paper mills, and plant expansion.

Alabama's production of paper and paperboard has more than doubled over the past 12 years. The State now ranks second in the Nation in pulpwood production.

Forestry officials said that because the bulk of Alabama's pulpwood is either consumed at home or in neighboring States, it is evidence that despite the rapid growth of the industry, paper manufacturing in Alabama still does not utilize the State's current capacity for pulpwood production.

It is estimated by State officials that demand for paper products will double by 1975, and that much of the woodpulp for these products will come from Alabama and the South. They estimate that Alabama and the South will eventually become the main sources of the Nation's total lumber supply.

Rich potential lies in lumber-based enterprises, including furniture manufacturing and a new engineering procedure for manufacturing giant arches and beams of glued laminated lumber and engineered wood components, such as trussed rafters.

Other pine-using industries due for large expansion include naval stores, chemicals, and "forest factories," or lumber companies which make a variety of products from pine logs.

On another forestry front in Alabama, more and more new forest-based industries are coming into being in the State. A new plywood industry based on southern pine began operation last year. As is the case with lumber, plywood utilizes saw-timber trees.

INDUSTRY AUTOMATED

Another big factor in Alabama's forestry growth has been the introduction of many new automated changes in the handling and treating of lumber. These technological advances have made it possible for the home industry to engage in domestic, and in some cases, export markets, which had previously been the sole property of some of the other lumber-producing States, principally in the West.

With the opening of several new inland river ports which not only bring the hinterland of Alabama closer to world markets, but also those at home, the State's woodland industries are getting an additional boost.

These new river ports provide low-cost transportation for the mills to the markets, and this year will bring further prosperity to the woodland industries.

The inland ports will also help to create new markets as well as new outlets for the forest industries. They are also expected to bring new plants, either using or manufacturing forest products, into their regions.

The rebirth of the forestry industry is also expected to stem the flow of agricultural workers into the cities by providing more jobs, and better paying ones. Alabama's forestry payroll is among the highest in the Nation, and growing every year.

By the end of 1965, forestry experts believe that Alabama's woodland industries will have shown the biggest annual increase in the State's history from the standpoint of new mills, new construction, and annual output.

Four-Year Congressional Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, during our hearings of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress a great number of constructive recommendations have been made by Members of the House and Senate. Many Members of the House have endorsed the long-delayed proposal to extend the terms of Members of the House from 2 to 4 years.

Over the years, I have received numerous inquiries from my constituents in the First Congressional District of Indiana asking why the House Members must be candidates for reelection every 2 years when almost all of the officials—Federal, State, county, city, and township—have had their terms extended to a period of 4 or more years.

The following editorial by Charles Bartlett in last night's Evening Star brings out some further comments regarding the advisability of Congress taking action on this much-needed change in the terms for Members of the House of Representatives:

IMPROVING THE LOT OF CONGRESSMEN

(By Charles Bartlett)

Three weeks of hearings on congressional reform have surprisingly indicated that it may be possible to amend the Constitution to accord 4-year terms to Members of the House of Representatives.

This is a widely wished reform that the experts have viewed as beyond reach. Senators have shown little appetite for a change that would enable House Members to compete for Senate seats without sacrificing the seats that they hold. The necessity of this sacrifice under the present system has often restrained the ambitions of Congressmen.

Representative RAY MADDEN, the Indiana Democrat who is cochairman of the joint committee studying congressional reform and an unbashful enthusiast for the 4-year term, conceived a way to win Senate approval one day last winter during a discussion in the cloakroom. He proposes now to require Representatives to resign their seats if they run for the Senate during their 4-year terms.

MADDEN is pressing the 4-year amendment in the long hearings on reorganization and the response to date has encouraged him. The Senators, reassured that they will not be unleashing a pack of competitors, now show some enthusiasm. The biggest remaining barrier may be the reluctance of the House Members to assume the onus of voting to extend their own tenures.

However, samplings of House opinion indicate that at least two-thirds of the Members are eager to put an end to biennial elections. Most observers of congressional life support this aspiration as justified and sensible. All but the most entrenched Members now lead lives that only restless spirits could deem attractive.

Since elections occur every other year and since politicians tend increasingly to believe they do their most effective politicking in the off-years, the House is now like a ship on which most of the crew must work constantly at the pumps. There is little time for sailing on such a ship and few find time for thoughtful legislating in the frenetic atmosphere of the present House.

In the last century, when Congress sat usually for less than half a year, only Members with private means brought their wives to Washington and the rest lodged impatiently in boarding houses. George F. Hoar, of Worcester, wrote in 1890 after 20 years in Congress that he had never managed to afford a house in Washington and that he and his wife had lived a good deal of the time "in a fashion to which no mechanic earning $2 a day would subject his household."

Some Members still stay in hotels and leave their wives at home, but the length of the sessions has encouraged most Congressmen to establish residence in Washington. There were 314 Members who listed homes or apartments as their addresses in the 1964 social list of Washington.

As the Washington life has improved for Members of the House, the challenge of reelection has become more rugged. The formidable costs of campaigning which run as high as $50,000 in an urban district, and the prolongation of the campaigns, which now require all the time that can be spared for them, have combined to create a biennial ordeal.

The historical basis for the 2-year terms was a shadowy fear of legislative tyranny in the Constitutional Convention James Madison anticipated the inconvenience to the Representatives and warned that they would be districted from their duties by their wariness of rivals. A 3-year term was approved in committee but subsequently shortened by the delegates from seven States who insisted that the people like frequent elections.

The taste of the people for frequent elections has not been affirmed by their low turnout in the off years, when the Presidency is not at stake, or by the fact that only 13 States now restrict their Governors to 2-year terms. The tenure in most local and county offices is being lengthened from

2 to 4 years. These are signs that the people like frequent elections less than they like good government.

The off-years elections are chiefly valuable as weathervanes of public sentiment on national issues. This would not be lost in the amendment proposing that half the House Members be required to run every 2 years. These elections, added to the professional polls, the telephone calls, and the letters, should keep the Government in touch with the voters.

A career in the House is most practical now for men who relish the pursuit of votes and live easily with the pressure groups that finance campaigns. It seems possible that the Nation could be better served by legislators given an opportunity to develop broader capacities and to lead lives similar in some degree to the lives of the people they represent.

Federal Government and Rhode Island Partners in Crime and Vice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the unhappy collaboration of the Federal Government and the State of Rhode Island in promoting the physical and financial well-being of the underworld.

I refer to the 17th century morality of the Federal and Rhode Island officialdoms who refuse to decontaminate illegal gambling by controlling it and making gambling revenues work public good rather than mob mischief. It is common knowledge that gambling profits finance every loathsome form of crime and vice known to man. This will be true so long as gambling is both illegal and widespread. The paragons of public virtue who merely sweep gambling under a social carpet of illegality rather than attempt to deal with it constructively are limited partners in every vice they help perpetuate.

Rhode Island, Mr. Speaker, is a hotbed of gambling that would be harmless if it were Government-regulated. But as it is, the Rhode Islander's fun money is the syndicate's gun money. Nor is Rhode Island gambling a smalltime operation. Rhode Island is a small State, but it has more illegal bounce to the ounce than States many times its size.

Last year, the parimutuel betting in Rhode Island came to $106 million. The real loot, however, turns on illegal gambling. Testimony before the McClellan committee pegged national off-track gambling at $50 billion annually. Other testimony indicated that off-track betting accounts for only some 42 percent of illegal gambling. This would put yearly illegal gambling in the United States at $120 billion or thereabouts. On a population basis, Rhode Island would have about $600 million of this total. The crime rings get to keep about 10 percent of this money as profit.

By keeping gambling illegal, the unholy partnership of the Federal and State Governments makes all this possible. So long as gambling is illegal, it will work against, and not for, the people. The governments that team up to keep gambling under the rug and out of the sunlight are fullfledged partners in the dirt that ensues.

I ask the Members of Congress to look at the relationship between crime and gambling, and to ignore the bleats of the wounded lobbyists of the syndicate-bluenose alliance who hate the truth. We need a national lottery in America to make the ineradicable gambling instinct work for the national good and not the national detriment.

President Johnson Makes the Right Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the recent events in the Dominican Republic have shown to the American people that we intend to protect freedom not only where free people are threatened at distances throughout the world, but particularly when there is a threat in our own backyard.

I have applauded the President's actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic on prior occasions because I felt he had taken the proper steps at the proper time. All Americans are grateful for this strong and speedy action to preserve freedom around the world.

An editorial in the May 27, 1965, Jacksonville, Fla., Journal, written by Rex Edmondson, praises President Johnson's decision to move troops into the Dominican Republic when our citizens in that country were threatened, and when there was fear of a Communist takeover. I commend the editorial to the House and to the country.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, May 27, 1965]

THE RIGHT MOVE

Some semblance of normality appears to have returned to the Dominican Republic, but it will be a long and frustrating period of adjustment if those people are to establish a government that can live within the framework of the Latin American nations.

With the crisis sputtering to an end, at least as far as the shooting is concerned, President Johnson still has the problem of when to withdraw American troops, amid the clamor of second guessing that he acted wrong in sending them there in the first place.

The question persists, was there really any danger of a Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic? The New York Times observed that since U.S. troops had intervened, "no one any longer will be able to prove or disprove the thesis that a rebel victory would have brought a Communist government to Santo Domingo."

Still others decry the great diplomatic damage done the good-neighbor policy and concept of inter-American cooperation and equality.

The truth is that the Dominican revolution would have long been over before the Organization of American States could have decided on the need for action and then taken such action, had the United States sat back and waited upon its advice and consent.

Maybe these critics would have felt better had President Johnson waited to make sure the Commies were, in fact, the threat. That is, until the new government had signed a trade agreement with the Soviet Union and Russian technicians had begun arriving.

Then perhaps the new Dominican government could have been palsy with Cuba and this Nation would know for sure.

It's fortunate that the United States did not feel as indecisive this time.

The Dominican question should still be debated in the councils of the OAS, but it is because of our quick action that there is anything left to debate.

What Ethics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the article "The Johnsons and the FCC" in the Washington Star of June 1, 1965.

The facts relative to the television holdings of the Johnson family and the decisions pending before the Federal Communications Commission that may influence the future value of those holdings are important for examination by Congress and the public.

The picture of the Johnson administration's FCC struggling with decisions involving the Johnson family's television interests demonstrates that the ethics code signed by L.B.J. is a sham. It also dramatizes that the so-called trust that is now alleged to control the Johnson television interests is a farce when it comes to actual applications.

Even the cute Abe Fortas manipulation of changing the name from "The L.B.J. Co." to "Texas Broadcasting" has not fooled anyone and least of all the members of the FCC. They know that the largest stockholder listed as "Claudia T. Johnson" is none other than Mrs. Johnson, wife of the President. They know that it is the President who will make the decisions on whether they are reappointed or dropped from the FCC.

This whole setup makes a mockery of the Johnson code of ethics which warns all executive branch officials to "avoid any actions which might result in, or create the appearance of giving preferential treatment to any organization or person."

All indications are that business is booming for the Johnson television interests. News stories and magazine articles indicate it is booming as much as business at the Abe Fortas law firm and at Bobby Baker's Serv-U Vending Co.

The article follows:

THE JOHNSONS AND THE FCC

(By Walter Pincus)

The license renewal applications of the Texas Broadcasting Corp. illustrates how deeply the Johnson-owned radio and television stations are involved in controversial

broadcast decisions now pending before the Federal Communications Commission.

That involvement is of special interest in view of the President's recent order prescribing standards of ethical conduct for government officers and employees.

A close reading of the ethics code points up not only the potential conflict inherent in the Presidential family's chief business asset being regulated by a commission whose members are appointed by the President, it also sets up as one code intent that employees—in this case the members of the FCC—"avoid any action * * * which might result in, or create the appearance of * * * giving preferential treatment to any organization or person"—in this case the President. That's a task that, under the circumstances, is difficult to perform.

Though the Johnson stockholdings in Texas Broadcasting Corp. have been placed temporarily in a trust, everyone who deals with the company either in Washington or in Texas is aware of the Presidential interest.

BRIEF REMINDERS

Two quick illustrations come to mind. In a recent telephone call, an Austin woman who participated in the sale of land to a newly formed subsidiary of Texas Broadcasting remarked, "Of course the Johnsons own it indirectly." And for those here in Washington there is the one-paragraph reminder on each of Texas Broadcasting's FCC license renewal forms—"Claudia T. Johnson, stockholder, whose stock is in trust, is also a landholder."

Texas Broadcasting has some interest in each of the three FCC priority issues Commission Chairman E. William Henry presently outlined to a Senate subcommittee.

According to their FCC filings, the Johnson corporation has options to purchase prior to January 28, 1966, up to 50 percent of the stock of Capital Cable Corp., the firm which owns and operates Austin's community antenna television system (CATV). One broadcaster has estimated this option to be worth $1 million.

Last month, after several years of study, the Commission issued new rules for CATV's that use microwave transmitters, a rulemaking procedure for off-the-air CATV's and an inquiry into other CATV matters. Among those other matters is the question as to whether television station licensees should be permitted to own CATV systems within their own service areas. In addition, the Commission now has before it several cases where a decision may set a policy on this particular issue.

If the FCC rules that television station licensees, cannot own CATV's in their areas, Texas Broadcasting's option would be worth nothing. Thus the FCC decision—even the very timing of it—could be worth an estimated $1 million to the Johnson-owned broadcasting company, depending on if and when it chose to exercise its option.

PROGRAMING ISSUE

The second most pressing FCC business, according to Chairman Henry, is the rulemaking on limitation of network ownership of prime evening programing to 50 percent from the more than 90 percent of today.

The three networks have banded together to fight the proposed rule. They in turn have sought support from their affiliated stations. Recently, in Hollywood, the CBS affiliates organization passed a resolution authorizing steps to be taken to present their opposition to the proposal to the Commission. Among the television stations making up the CBS group is KTBC–TV of Austin, the Johnson-owned station.

The third big issue before the Commission is the question of multiple ownership of television stations. FCC rules now limit an owner to five VHF stations—the number at present controlled in whole or in part by Texas Broadcasting. The Commission recently announced that a hearing would be held on any sale of television property that involved—on either side—the owner of more than 1 station in the top 50 markets.

Though this temporary rule would not automatically require a hearing if the Johnsons sold their broadcast holdings, it does limit the persons or corporations to whom they could sell. Station owners dislike the prospect of an FCC hearing, and for the Johnsons such a necessity—with the possibility that a Republican would intervene—could prove politically embarrassing.

Although the FCC has focused its multiple ownership rule on the top 50 stations, Chairman Henry has told Congress that consideration is being given to changing the rules so as to affect all stations—a move that would bear directly on the Johnson interests.

STATION FINED

Aside from the broad policy issues there are smaller, individual matters that bring the FCC Commissioners directly into contact with the Johnson stations. For example, they recently set a fine of $1,000 on KNAL, Victoria, Tex., a station in which Texas Broadcasting holds a minority interest. The station was found to have violated several FCC operating rules. KNAL has asked the Commission to set aside the fine, saying the violations have been corrected and "no useful purpose is to be served by assessment of a fine against the licensee."

No matter how they act, the Commissioners will be open to allegations that the Johnson ownership influenced them. This is true whether they drop the fine—as they have done in other cases—or affirm it—possibly just to prove they are not under Presidential influence.

Stories published last year when the Commission ruled on a petition involving Austin CATV systems proved this point.

Capital Cable's competitor asked the Commission to waive its rules to permit it to better compete with the system in which the President's family had an option.

The FCC, following its past decision, turned down the petition and the news stories that followed headlined the action as favorable to the Johnson interests.

The situation is such that the Commission, through no act of its own, is doomed to face continued charges of influence because of the Johnson holdings. The paradox of it all is that to dispose of the holdings—except through distribution in small pieces—almost by necessity would require a public hearing and therefore publicity of a nature that the President most certainly would not find desirable.

The States on Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Thomasville Times-Enterprise appearing in the May 26 issue. This editorial is factual and timely—it certainly is in concert with the specific thinking that prevails in the Second District of Georgia—namely, "You cannot get something for nothing." I commend this article to those who care about what happens to our freedom and solvency:

[From the Thomasville (Ga.) Times-Enterprise, May 26, 1965]

THE STATES ON WELFARE

By their constant visits to Washington for financial assistance and their continuing dependence upon the Federal Government for handouts it seems the several States are themselves now to be considered as welfare recipients.

There's little difference in the status of the individual and the State, insofar as being the recipient of Federal assistance, except the States get more. The principal is somewhat the same, however, with thousands of communities virtually giving up their autonomous status is order to conform to some Federal regulation as a prerequisite to some grant, loan or outright gift.

It's surprising, in fact, amazing, how rapidly this practice has grown in the past 30 years, when the New Deal began to flower and statehood began to wither. At that time our national debt was only a few billions, less than 30 as we recall. But as rapidly as the Federal Government began moving into the position of a guardian angel for the various States and cities, with handouts of money ranging from a few thousands to many millions of dollars, the debt began to grow.

It all started as an emergency aid to meet the conditions of the depression era. Legislation of many kinds was passed at the request of the President (F. D. Roosevelt) to make possible all the new gifts from the great Croesus who ruled in Washington. Many of the measures were classified as temporary, and a servile Congress acting as a great rubber stamp passed virtually any bill presented to it. That was their answer to the alarming situation caused by the depression. It was equivalent to the call of volunteer firemen to come and help at a neighborhood blaze.

But instead of going back home after the fire had been extinguished, the number of firemen in Washington began to grow by leaps and bounds, and they began to cook up all kinds of schemes to help the people, as they said. With each handout, however, they sent a regulation or passed a new law to give authority to them, to require local compliance.

From a little trickle of Federal aid in the beginning to the floodtide of Federal assistance in 1965, the thing we call Federal aid has grown by leaps and bounds. So great has become the trend to send help into communities, that from time to time we hear of Federal aid being sent into an area, whether requested or not. Emergency help for so-called stricken areas has become the order of the day. Progressively it has now brought us to the flowering of the antipoverty program, which will involve the expenditure of hundreds of millions, even billions of dollars.

Now, our welfare rolls over the Nation have reached astronomic proportions with millions of people receiving help from Washington. At the same time, our States, cities, and counties look to Washington for the answer to virtually every problem, especially in matters of finance.

And it should be remembered that many of the emergency laws enacted in the early thirties are still operative, and the controls that were imposed under this or that regulation then have persisted and in many cases have been broadened and tightened, the tentacles of bureaucratic control now reaching into every phase of life.

Out of all this has come a weakening of the public will to do for itself that which is asked of Washington, and with each new grant, loan, or gift from Washington more local independence is surrendered.

Now we have a national debt of over $315 billion, and we have become so accustomed to deficit financing (another depression era product) that no one gives a second thought to payment of the big debt or an end to the

practice of spending money the Government doesn't have. And as the demand on Washington grows with the two political parties vying one with another to see how much of your money they can give away in exchange for your vote and surrender to the welfare state, we find that as our inflated dollars grow bigger and more numerous in volume, they are dwarfed and shrunken in purchasing power.

Future historians will very likely look back upon this era of the Great Society as also the era in which free spending and deficit financing made this a sort of "fool's paradise."

Needed Immigration Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following letter in the Gary, Ind., Post Tribune, May 22, 1965, authored by Miss Elizabeth N. Wilson, executive director of the International Institute of Gary, Indiana, Inc., sets out some very important and essential facts regarding the pending legislation on immigration changes which the Congress will consider in the near future. I would hope that this session will bring about an equitable and long delayed change in our quota system and other practical and fairer methods of admitting future Americans within our borders.

The letter follows:

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune, May 22, 1965]

OUR "ANTI-GREEK" LAW

We will have the great privilege of watching a live broadcast from Greece on the "Today Show" on channel 5 from 7 to 9 a.m. next week. We will see the glories of ancient and modern Greece.

American tourists have discovered Greece during the past 10 years and it is said to be the most popular country for tourists today. Greece will be crowded during August as over 7,000 American citizens of Greek birth or background will attend 2 international Greek conventions, the AHEPA (American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association) in Athens and the Pan Arcadian in Tripoli, Peloposessus, Greece.

All Americans visiting Greece this year and all those who wish they could, should be embarrassed and indeed apologetic to the Greek people that the United States still has a law discriminating against them—our immigration law. Out of a total quota of 165,000 numbers, the Greek people are assigned 308 numbers. The British are assigned 65,361 numbers, the Germans 25,814, and the Irish 17,756, a total of 109,931 numbers or 70 percent for these three "Nordic" nations.

Worse still, many of these numbers go unused and cannot be transferred to Greece and the other small quota countries. Two-thirds of the huge British and Irish quotas are wasted each year and the German quota has long been current.

Underlying this most discriminatory legislation of our country is the assumption that the Greek people are inferior to the British, German, and Irish. Does anyone in this country believe this any more, if they ever did?

While communing with Greece this coming week let us all think of this legislation which prevents uniting of families. What can we do? Write to our Senators endorsing the Hart bill S. 500 and to our Congressman endorsing the Celler bill H.R. 2580. These are administration-sponsored bills which would provide a different plan for handling immigration without greatly increasing the number of immigrants. The national origins quota system under which immigrants are selected first by country of birth would gradually be eliminated.

ELIZABETH WILSON.

The Enemy Is Apathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in a hard-hitting speech entitled, "The Enemy Is Apathy," Adm. John M. Will—retired—has taken a long look at what is happening to the American maritime industry and came up with some suggestions which should be of immediate concern to all of us.

The admiral is the chairman of the board of the American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, Inc. In the best tradition of straight-spoken naval officers, he outlines the problem facing this country's merchant fleet—a problem we ourselves are responsible for.

This matter is of vital importance to the welfare of our Nation, for we have sat idly by while other nations developed modern merchant fleets. The admiral points to past examples of American industrial and commercial genius and asks, in effect, "What is happening?"

The text of his remarks follow:

EXCERPTS FROM "THE ENEMY IS APATHY"

(An address by Adm. John M. Will, chairman of the board, American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, Inc., at the Maritime Week luncheon of the Ocean Freight Agents Association of Chicago, May 17, 1965)

Since those splendid days when proud Yankee clipper ships dominated the seas and gained for themselves a near monopoly of the world's ocean cargoes, the American merchant marine has been shipping water badly. Except for the frenetic activities of wartime, U.S. merchant ships have been sailing on an ever-ebbing tide.

Today, far from the lion of yesterday, the mouse of American scheduled freighter services carries only about one-quarter of the foreign trade tonnage entering or leaving U.S. ports. In nonliner bulk commercial commerce, the appalling figure is less than 5 percent.

The picture grows more dismal each year, yet the means are at hand right now to reverse this ebbing tide and to catapult the American merchant marine back onto the cresting tide of world commerce.

The means for this dramatic reversal lie in high speed ships powered by nuclear energy. This is neither a fuzzy concept nor a "maybe someday" proposition. The nuclear ship *Savannah* has proved beyond all doubt that the power of the atom is a practical, viable power source for the merchant marine.

Yet, despite our preeminence in the field of nuclear propulsion—despite the incontestable fact that nuclear power offers the only immediately available opportunity for a major breakthrough in marine engineering—we have thus far failed to exploit this chance which is so singularly ours.

We have failed to move forward because we are heeding the cost-conscious cautioners who say nuclear power is not economically feasible. This form of pennywise, pound-foolish reasoning may be of some comfort to comptrollers and accountants, but it is hardly in the American tradition of "can do" and "will do."

At the time of their inception, neither the locomotive nor the automobile nor the airplane were "economically feasible." The first locomotive tore along at 10 miles an hour, the first automobile coughed and sputtered to achieve 4 miles an hour, and Orville Wright's first biplane hung precariously off the ground for 12 seconds to make good a forward speed of about 7 miles an hour. By what rules of economics were these prototypes feasible?

Yet, contrast the progress of these vehicles, none of them suitable for massive over-ocean commerce, with the progress of the steamship. Today's most efficient freighter moves fully loaded at a maximum of 21 knots, a scant four times faster than Mr. Fulton's *Clermont*.

The nuclear ship *Savannah* is capable of 23 knots and the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Enterprise* is rated at more than 30 knots. We can apply the same propulsion principles which have been proven in these two ships to a fleet of 30-knot freighters which would place us immediately in a strongly competitive position for world trade. Still, we, as a nation, sit back and say, "It is not economically feasible."

If we wait for further developments from the drawing boards, or if we defer our nuclear building program while we "prove out" on shorebased prototypes an already proven propulsion system, we may as well file and forget our hopes for a nuclear merchant fleet.

Then, perhaps, we can send our engineers and technicians to West Germany where they can observe and report while the Germans install an American-built reactor directly into a new hull. Then, perhaps, we can wait yet another year or so until the Japanese are ready to demonstrate this same technique.

In the meanwhile, we can conveniently ignore the 68 marine reactors now in actual operation in naval vessels at sea—we can brush aside the fact that 54 more are being readied for seagoing operations—and we can assure the Bureau of the Budget that it is not important that only one of these reactors, the one already in the *Savannah*, is available for use in the American merchant marine.

Even further, perhaps we should hold to the narcotic notion that maritime reactors are, indeed, not economically feasible and surrender by default our chance to reestablish the American merchant marine as an integral and important part of our national economy.

If this is the answer, then we must also be prepared to retire the American eagle in favor of the ostrich and wait, with our heads complacently in the sands, until we can safely and "feasibly" buy nuclear-propelled merchant ships from the Germans or the Japanese—or the Russians.

Silver Year of a Bishop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, a special Mass will be celebrated tomorrow at the

Sacred Heart Cathedral in Newark for the nuns of the archdiocese of Newark to commemorate the silver jubilee of the elevation of Thomas A. Boland to the rank of bishop.

The last quarter century has been a period of great achievement for the Catholic archdiocese of Newark under the inspired leadership of Archbishop Boland. He has been not merely a faithful shepherd to his flock but a true friend to people of all faiths.

The Hudson Dispatch, one of the great newspapers in New Jersey, has spoken eloquently for all the people of northern New Jersey, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, in paying editorial tribute to this man who so richly merits the Scriptural, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

I am proud to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial which appeared in the June 1, 1965, edition of the Hudson Dispatch:

SILVER YEAR OF A BISHOP

Twenty-five years is not considered an exceptionally long period in time. The significance and value of a quarter century is better measured by what has been attained and achieved during the era rather than by its chronological length.

For Archbishop Thomas A. Boland, shepherd of the Catholic archdiocese of Newark, the past score and 5 years has been a period of tremendous achievement and fruitful service to God, his church, and the people. He can look back with utmost satisfaction to the first day he was elevated to the distinguished rank that permitted him to don the miter and bear the scepter. That was back on May 21, 1940, when he was appointed titular bishop of Hirina and auxiliary bishop of Newark archdiocense. He was consecrated July 25 of that year with his predecessor, the late Archbishop Thomas J. Walsh as consecrator.

This year, the silver jubilee of his episcopacy, is a time for reflection and solemn celebration which will be inaugurated on Thursday with a mass in Sacred Heart Cathedral for the nuns under his jurisdiction. A similar ritual will be held on June 23 for priests and brothers.

Archbishop Boland, a genial, outgoing person of sharp wit and keen sense of humor, last week conducted an unprecedented press conference during which he reviewed his episcopacy and discussed numerous matters of the church to which he has dedicated his life.

In the aegis of Archbishop Boland, the archdiocese has witnessed a remarkable increase in facilities and membership and marked changes in liturgy as the result of deliberations of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council which the energetic priest attended and brought back with him many lasting impressions.

Archbishop Boland has gained a reputation as a builder. Under his direction an archdiocese development campaign was organized and launched in 1961 with a goal of $31 million for the construction of 4 homes for the aged, 7 high schools to provide accommodations for 10,500 students, and expansion of the seminary in Darlington. Inestimable benefits have been derived by the four counties, Union, Essex, Hudson, and Bergen, which make up the archdiocese. The program is rapidly nearing fruition. His desire for further expansion of educational facilities and for full-scale education on both the elementary and secondary levels are well known.

Besides education and the spiritual welfare of the more than a million and a half persons he maintains an unwavering interest in civil rights, elimination of poll tax where such an excise prevents anyone from voting, urban renewal, and antipoverty programs. These are things he heartily endorses for they affect the little people.

The native of Orange and son of Irish parents was ordained a priest on December 23, 1922, in the basilica of St. John Lateran in Rome. He served in many offices before his consecration as a bishop. In 1947 he became the second bishop of the diocese of Paterson, succeeding the late Bishop Thomas H. McLaughlin who had died on March 17. After the death of Archbishop Walsh on June 6, 1952, Bishop Boland was again elevated. He was installed at Sacred Heart Church, Vailsburg, on January 14, 1953.

Partners of the Alliance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the bright spots in Latin America in recent months has been the improvement in economic status of Brazil and the restoration of traditional good relations between that great country and the United States.

One of the noteworthy activities toward restoring the friendliness of these relations has been the efforts of citizens of Connecticut. On May 24, 1965, in Hartford a partners of the alliance program was inaugurated to foster friendly connections between the State of Connecticut and the State of Paraiba. Surely nothing but good can come from this mutual effort and I am happy to commend those citizens of both countries who are working for better understanding and firm cooperation between the greatest nations of the two countries.

In this connection I wish to give circulation to the eloquent and pertinent remarks of Ambassador Juracy Magalhães, the Ambassador of Brazil, as delivered in Hartford at the time of the inauguration of the partners of the alliance program.

I am sure that all of us share the hopes of Ambassador Magalhães for the stability of the ties which join Brazil and the United States.

AMBASSADOR JURACY MAGALHÃES' REMARKS AT THE OFFICIAL LAUNCHING OF THE PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAM BETWEEN CONNECTICUT AND PARAIBA, IN HARTFORD, CONN., MAY 24, 1965

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for me to take part in this festive event of Brazilian-American friendship which marks the official launching in this country of the partners of the alliance program between the States of Connecticut and Paraiba. I thank very much the Partners of the Alliance Committee of this State for its kindness in extending to me a special invitation to this ceremony and I assure all its members that I note with great satisfaction the depth of their enthusiasm for the program of this partnership and the broad range of their purpose of cooperation and exchange with the State of Paraiba. To this satisfaction it is added the pleasure of visiting this city and this State, to whose people, represented by its prominent Governor, the Honorable John Dempsey, I have already presented my personal salutations, together with the special greetings of the people of Paraiba.

If the time which is allotted me would allow it, I would not hesitate to extend myself on the characteristics and the history of Paraiba, on its considerable tradition and its interesting cultural features, on its tangible realizations and its varied resources, its hopes for the future and its problems. Special ties of fondness have bound me to Paraiba for more than 30 years, since the time I served, at the beginning of my military career, as company commanding officer in a rifle battalion stationed in that State. I did not stay long in Paraiba that time, but that period of my life was very significant to me and is well engraved in my memory because it was then and there that I actually initiated my part in the revolutionary movement for democratic renewal that came into being in Brazil in 1930 and whose high ideals manifested themselves again, this time in an irreversible way, through the victorious revolution that took place in March last year.

The report by the members of the Partners of the Alliance committee of this State who already visited Paraiba and the amount of data and information they collected, will be go far toward making Paraiba well known to its Connecticut partners. I am sure that, after their report, there is very little about Paraiba that I can add, but still I wish to say a few words about that State.

In view of the enormous territorial expanse of Brazil, which is comparable to that of the United States, Paraiba occupies a relatively small area, and that is one of the affinities of the two partner states. Nevertheless, as happens with Connecticut vis-a-vis the United States, Paraiba has found ways of making the best of its possibilities, so as to play in Brazil a role proportionally larger than its part of the national territory. Though Paraibans are interested and active in the exploitation of their mineral resources and look to a still incipient industrialization, they occupy themselves mainly with rural and agricultural activities, in which, by the way, the drought—a regrettable phenomenon which affects Paraiba, as well as practically the whole of Brazil's northeastern region—is particularly felt. Paraibans do not have an easy living environment, which, on one hand, explains the economic difficulties noticeable in their State, while, on the other hand, it renders their efforts and their achievements all the more praiseworthy.

Paraiba has a prominent place in the history of Brazil and, again as it happens with Connecticut vis-a-vis the United States, its participation in Brazil's life started quite at the beginning, dating back to colonial times, during which many Paraibans made an effective contribution to the formation of the national conscience. This tradition has been kept and there have been many Paraibans who have played an important part in Brazil, particularly through cultural activities and through the tenure of official capacity. Among such Paraibans I may mention Epitacio Pessoa, a great jurist and politician, who was a senator and a justice of the supreme court before becoming the 10th President of the Republic, and José Américo de Almeida, a remarkable politician and writer, who was a candidate to the presidency of the Republic, a Governor of Paraiba, a Federal senator and, more than once, the head of the important department of transportation and public works. To me there seems to exist a true constellation of prominent Paraibans, whom I greatly admire, and I cite only two of them—one belonging already to the past, while the other is still happily active—because, in view of the short time at my disposal, I might easily commit an omission which would be contrary to my friendly feelings toward all of them.

I have great confidence in the effectiveness of the Partners of the Alliance program and I know that Connecticut and Paraiba are not lacking in imagination and resources to build a fruitful and growing partnership on enterprising and bilateral foundations. I assure all here present of the comprehension and support of all Brazilian officials, especially those of Paraiba, and I am sure that you may count on the encouragement and equal support of the officials of this country and of this State. It is my confident hope that this partnership will probe to the peoples of the newly related States that they care for one another and, that besides making specific projects come true, it will promote a direct exchange between the two partners and will develop between the peoples of both States the spirit of understanding which is fortunately traditional between our two countries.

Interpreting the feelings of the people of Paraiba, especially those of Gov. Pedro Gondim, I thank the organizers of this ceremony for the keenness and efforts they put into making this occasion possible, and I thank all here present for their attention to me. I conclude by urging one and all to act as agents and harbingers of my best wishes for the ever closer friendship between our two countries and for the success of the Connecticut-Paraiba partnership.

Layne R. Beaty, Former Resident of Ardmore, Okla., Receives Superior Service Award for Improving and Expanding the Broadcasting of Agricultural and Consumer Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to advise my colleagues that Mr. Layne R. Beaty, Chief of the Radio and Television Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, recently was presented with the Superior Service Award by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, for having improved and expanded the broadcasting of agricultural and consumer information.

All Oklahomans are proud of Mr. Beaty. He was born in Caddo, Okla., which is in my congressional district; graduated from high school in Ardmore, Okla., also in my congressional district; and received his college education at Southeastern State Teachers College in Durant, Okla., still in my congressional district.

Layne Beaty has done a magnificent job with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Secretary Freeman cited him "for his achievement of more efficient radio-television service and a wider use of department programs through his work with broadcast media." Under his leadership, weekly radio tape distribution from the Department of Agriculture increased from 374 stations to 630 stations. He established the highly successful weekly half-hour program, "Across the Fence."

I salute Layne Beaty for this recognition of his fine contributions to our country. I also congratulate his fine parents, Mr. and Mrs. E. Carl Beaty of Ardmore, Okla.

New Jersey Homing Pigeon Fanciers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring to the attention of my colleagues the good works being accomplished in New Jersey by a group of sportsmen who previously came to their country's aid during time of war.

I am speaking of the more than 500 members of nine racing pigeon clubs who live in my district and the entire northern New Jersey area who have been giving aid to Cerebral Palsy Centers in Bergen and Passaic Counties during the past 6 years.

These men spend much of their free time, Mr. Speaker, engaged in a very fascinating hobby, the breeding, training and racing of long-distance homing pigeons.

It was not so very long ago that these same individuals came to their country's aid, not only by donating birds that were used during both World Wars by our Armed Forces as message carriers, but also by serving themselves with the Army Signal Corps, Air Force, and Navy, training message carriers and developing the use of pigeon communications.

In each of the two World Wars the Armed Forces of the United States drew upon the lofts of civilian fanciers for more than 50,000 valuable, highly tested racing pigeons, which served as breeding stock to produce the message carriers used in combat. A very high portion of this number came from my State, which is a leading center of the racing pigeon sport.

Descendants of these civilian pigeons established a remarkable record during wartime in the percentage of messages delivered. It was rare indeed when the pigeon-borne message failed to go through. If one, two or three were shot down—often the case—there was another to take its place.

Many of the fanciers from my district were in the combat areas, setting up the message centers and instructing troops in the use of pigeons.

There are legendary stories to tell about the pigeon heroes of our armed forces. Thousands of soldiers and airmen were saved by these feathered messengers in all theaters of operations in both wars. Many men today owe their lives to the valor of these birds.

A number of the feathered warriors turned in such outstanding feats that they were decorated for heroism and extraordinary performance. To them have been awarded the Dickin Medal, the counterpart of the Congressional Medal awarded to the human members of our Armed Forces.

From these civilian pigeons came the fabled "Cher Ami," who as a bloodsmeared ball of feathers, one of his wings shot through, one leg gone, he carried the message dangling from its ligaments which saved the famous Lost Battalion of the Argonne. There also were "Big Tom," "President Wilson," "Mocker," "Blackie Halligan," the priceless "GI Joe," who saved the lives of 1,000 British infantrymen, "Wickie," "Paddy," "Ruhr Express," "Burma Queen" and others who survived and surpassed shellfire and weather to carry vital messages to their soldier-trainers.

Today, although refinements in electronics apparently have made pigeon message carriers obsolete in warfare, New Jersey fanciers still say they are ready to help if needed. Indeed, a number of them are now using their birds for message carriers during drills held by civil defense units. All of them are continuing as sportsmen to develop better techniques of conditioning and training pigeons and are flying them with remarkable speeds for distances up to 500 and 600 miles.

But they also are showing the same spirit and willingness to help their community in my district as they did during the war—this time in a far different direction.

Annually, the outstanding members of the Bergen County, Passaic, Paterson, North Jersey, Westside, North Haledon, Little Falls, Lyndhurst, and Garfield Homing Pigeon Clubs give young pigeons bred from their best birds to the Bergen and Passaic Counties Pigeon Fliers Cerebral Palsy Fund.

Others are donated to the fund by fanciers from many parts of the United States. On several occasions, European fanciers, impressed by the effort on behalf of children, have shipped birds to the sale.

The annual auction of these young racing pigeons, each with a pedigree as impressive as a thoroughbred, draws fanciers from many State to compete in the bidding. Prices range as high as $100 per pair—and all of this money is donated annually to the Bergen and Passaic Counties Cerebral Palsy Centers.

The most recent auction was held several weeks ago and Arthur Kachadrian, treasurer, informs me that the homing pigeon fanciers donated $2,700 to the cerebral palsy centers this year, a record high.

This amount, added to previous donations, makes a total of more than $15,000 contributed by these civic-minded sportsmen for the aid of stricken children. Their efforts have provided much help through needed therapy and hope through the promise of research.

This effort, and the time-consuming job done by the men in charge of the fund, is worthy of accolades, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud to have such sportsmen living in my district and home State.

The Sorry Condition of Boxing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Congressman CHARLES S. JOELSON, of New Jersey, has shown me an article which was published in the Paterson News the day following the Clay-Liston heavyweight fiasco. Since it was written by Abe J. Greene, Commissioner of the World Boxing Association, I think it merits our careful consideration. Mr. Greene is a knowledgeable gentleman whose words should be carefully heeded.

I include the article which is as follows:

COUNTRY IS SUCKERED SECOND TIME BY LISTON; CONGRESS SHOULD ACT

(By Abe J. Greene)

RINGSIDE, FABIAN THEATRE.—America got what it asked for in tolerating a return bout between Cassius Clay and Sonny Liston Tuesday night in the hideaway town of Lewiston, Maine.

The contemptible spectacle picture of Liston, once a vaunted heavyweight champion, ex-goon, rolling around the canvas in the standard act of the fallen gladiator told the story of the worst fraud perpetrated in a heavyweight championship bout.

TWICE IN A YEAR

Twice now, in little more than a year, Liston has tricked the sports public.

A man drawing nearly a million dollars in his first bout with Clay, Liston had quit then ignominiously in his corner, the first time a heavyweight champion had ever lost his title without being knocked down and out.

Last night, in the obscure Maine hall, with less than 5,000 people present at the kill, Sonny Liston went out even more mysteriously than he did in the first "contest."

He and Clay had sparred around the ring, the current champion emulating the butterfly he had described himself as he flitted around the ring, the burly Liston tossing an occasional punch which Clay caught on the arms.

A GREAT ACT

Suddenly, after Clay had shot a short right-hander which the camera just barely caught and most ringsiders had missed, Liston was rolling around on the mat.

Clay was surprised. Referee Jersey Joe Walcott, of Camden, N.J., was shocked beyond belief and faltered in the count.

Liston, meantime, was "struggling" to get to his feet, fell again, rolled over on his back in thespian style, there was confusion over the count and it was all over.

The great Muhammud Ali—erstwhile Cassius Clay—had won again while the crowd booed, the ringside teemed with confusion and Liston's entourage prepared to collect their heavy boodle.

The "fight" should never have been permitted to go on. The World Boxing Association had tabooed it. Sports writers had ridiculed it. It was booked in Boston, was herniated into a postponement several months ago and then chased to Maine.

IT'S UP TO CONGRESS

Last night's debacle was the payoff.

If the U.S. Congress doesn't make good its promise to put boxing under Federal control so that scheming promoters will be stopped in their tracks with rotten deals like last night, then boxing is asking for it if the reformers demand its demise.

A million or more suckers packed hundreds of showplaces around the country and paid up to $10 a throw to see the alltime burlesque on sports.

Liston and his crowd will "take down" goodness knows how many thousands of dollars close to a million.

Clay will do ditto, in addition to which the stage is already set—right now, today—for his big killing with ex-Champ Floyd Patterson late in the summer.

CHAMPION SUCKERS

Champion of the world? It's the American public which is a champion sucker for this kind of circus.

Temporary Debt Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the May 26 issue of the Thomasville Times-Enterprise carried a most interesting editorial on a most timely subject, the temporary debt ceiling.

My friends, Publisher Lee E. Kelly and Editor L. Edward Kelly, as well as the majority of the citizens of the Second District of Georgia are most concerned over the amount of our national debt. I think there is much merit to this concern. It gives me pleasure to submit this editorial for the attention of those who feel likewise. The editorial is especially timely since the administration is now asking the Congress to once again increase the debt limit:

TEMPORARY DEBT CEILING

In 1918 Congress passed a law, which said the Federal debt should not go over a certain sum. As we recall President F. D. Roosevelt later during the New Deal days said that whenever the national debt reached $30 billion it would be a matter of concern. And President F.D.R. was a free spender, as the record shows.

The debt ceiling has progressively moved upward and at the time President Eisenhower held the office of President, it reached the sum of $285 billion, and everyone then thought the limit had about been reached.

But as the country grew and got bigger and bigger the demand for finances for the Government kept growing and the ceiling was pushed higher and higher.

It will be recalled that in 1959 a temporary ceiling was created, and every year since, that temporary ceiling has stood just above the permanent ceiling, the permanent ceiling standing at $285 billion. Last year the temporary ceiling reached $324 billion, and the permanent ceiling still stands at $285 billion.

Now the annual request for another boost is due, and it is expected the Congress will do this year what it has been doing in the past—raise the temporary ceiling to the figure which the administration asks. There will no doubt be the usual speeches pro and con, but in the end the debt level will be moved skyward.

If President Roosevelt could come back and see where the debt ceiling figure now stands, he would have to admit that his fears of the danger which a higher ceiling posed, are now out of keeping with the times.

Judging by the record of the past several years, a temporary ceiling of at least $400 billion is likely to be reached during the next 6 or 8 years, which means that the annual interest on the national debt will move nearer the $15 billion figure.

Meantime, why worry about the national debt? "Let's eat, drink, and be merry for tomorrow we may go broke."

A Tribute to the People of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, today is an appropriate occasion to pay tribute to the people of Italy for their amazing accomplishments since the end of World War II and for their steadfast devotion to the cause of European unity and of Atlantic solidarity. Nineteen years ago, on June 2, 1946, the Italians held their first elections following World War II and rejected an unhappy past to set out on a new course. The tasks at hand were enormous. Fascism and war had brought large-scale destruction to the country. Large portions of the population suffered from severe shortages of food and clothing. There was almost a complete absence of consumer goods. The currency was weak. A large and well-organized Communist Party posed an ominous threat to newly established democratic institutions.

These conditions could have led to despair and chaos. That they did not is a measure of the spirit, the vitality, and the determination of the Italian people. In the relatively short period of 20 years, prewar industries not only have been rebuilt, but also expanded and modernized. Northern Italy has become one of the leading industrial centers of Europe. Persistent efforts are transforming the once underdeveloped region of southern Italy. New sources of energy have been exploited to compensate for Italy's lack of raw materials. Unemployment has been reduced to manageable levels. Measures to protect the currency have proved effective. Foreign trade has soared while the foundations for maintaining a favorable balance of payments have been laid. The Communist Party, while still uncomfortably large, has been effectively excluded from power. Democratic institutions have taken firm root. Italian leaders have consistently promoted the movement toward European unity. They have made the Atlantic alliance a cornerstone of their foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there can be no dissenting voice when I express my esteem for the Italian people and my admiration for their achievements. I am sure that my fellow Americans would wish to join with me in sending them greetings on the occasion of the 19th anniversary of the founding of their Republic.

Vietnam Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, inevitably when any man takes positive action and asserts strong leadership, there is going to be some criticism of the action that he has taken.

This was true when President Johnson responded to the danger in the Dominican Republic and sent a contingent of Marines to protect the lives of Americans and thousands of other nationals and to thwart any advancement of communism in the Western Hemisphere.

It has been most heartwarming that a great majority of the newspapers of our Nation and a great majority of the American public has been solidly behind President Johnson in his role as leader of the free world.

As an example, I include the following editorial from the Denver Post:

L.B.J.: TAKE-CHARGE MAN IN ACTION

If humans can be divided into thinkers and doers, let neither friend nor foe doubt, after the last few days' developments in the Dominican Republic, that Lyndon Johnson is a doer.

Confronted last Wednesday by the chaotic collapse of government in that unhappy republic, with many lives hanging on his decision, he had to decide right then whether to act, to send troops, or to delay until he could consult with other Latin American nations—as most thinkers would have preferred.

Like a true doer, President Johnson sent the troops.

We had hoped he would just rescue those foreigners in danger, then pull out the troops until the Organization of American States decided what more, if anything, to do.

We should have known this would not be L.B.J.'s way. He obviously intends to do the whole job. Fearing, if he didn't, that Communists would do the job their way, he has undertaken to restore peace and some kind of a government before pulling American troops out.

Thus the President takes the big risk we had feared—that his actions will infuriate and alienate every Latin American who recalls U.S. gunboat diplomacy of bygone days. After all, the OAS charter is quite explicit about such action. It says, "No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state."

The only saving feature of all his actions is that President Johnson obviously is keenly aware that he is twanging the rawest nerve in the Latin psyche—the fear of the intervention by the Colossus of the North. Hence he is doing his utmost—and that is plenty—to remove that fear and swing them behind our course of action.

First, in his Sunday night speech he made a clear differentiation between the standard Latin revolution and one perverted by Communists, as Cuba's was by Castro.

Second, he pledged the United States will use its power to try and see that the Dominican Republic emerges from this trial with a government "freely chosen by the will of all the people" and "dedicated to social justice for every citizen." And he repeated his invitation to OAS nations to join in that effort.

Third, he is pouring in the troops to make sure that no one doubts American will or purpose to restore order.

Oddly, although many at home will deplore all this, we don't believe all Latin American leaders will. The proof of the pudding, in their eyes, will be what comes of it.

If the United States pursues a steady course, with OAS collaboration, which results in some sort of government freely chosen and aiming at social justice for Dominicans, the President will disarm most of his critics on the Latin left. And if he continues to act with boldness and decision, he will gain a grudging sort of admiration from Latins of all ideologies. For this is "machismo"—masculine strength and decisiveness—and they like to see a leader who has it, particularly if he uses it with compassion and wisdom.

In short, Latins, like Americans, respect a doer—a man who does what he thinks is right and just.

And we hope most Americans, as long as the President shows every sign of keeping a steady eye on what is right and just, will try to quiet their misgivings and support what that doer in the White House is doing.

Houston All-City Symphony Invited to Beyreuth Music Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in its renowned history, the Beyreuth Wagnerian Festival in Germany has invited an American high school orchestra to perform at its festivities.

We, in Houston, are extremely proud that the honor goes to our own Houston All-City Symphony Orchestra, composed of 105 talented junior and senior high school musicians.

Sponsored by the music department of the Houston public schools, the All-City Orchestra has appeared on television, recorded albums, and plays for outstanding civic occasions in our city and State. This invitation is an honor they richly deserve, and is but one more in a growing list of such distinctions. They were selected as the most outstanding in the Nation by the National School Orchestra Association, and they have performed for the National Mid-West Band and Orchestra Clinic in Chicago.

In this day, when we read and hear so much about our "lost generation" of teenagers, the beatniks and the delinquents, it is indeed gratifying that such a fine group of boys and girls as this can go abroad to show the world the true caliber of the youth of our Nation. They will make great ambassadors to the world's finest music festival. They will be a credit to our Nation, our great city, and to their distinguished director, Harry Lantz, who has worked so hard and patiently to develop them into the artists they are.

At the moment, the youngsters and the many civic-minded citizens of our area are engaged in raising the $65,000 needed to defray the expenses of this magnificent trip. I certainly intend to do all I can to help them in this worthwhile endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to share the news of this great honor to a fine group of youngsters, for I know my colleagues share my own pride that such a distinguished student orchestra will represent the United States. We all have every reason to be proud of them.

Anniversary of the First Religious Tolerance Legislation in Transylvania of June 1, 1557

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the most important date in Transylvanian history is June 1, 1557, for on that date the Diet of Torda in Transylvania passed the first religious tolerance edict.

June 1, 1965, marks the 408th anniversary of the act of 1557 which provided for freedom of conscience and for the free exercise of religion, the first of its kind in Europe which was torn by religious warfare between the Catholics and Protestants, and often between the various Protestant denominations themselves.

This religious tolerance edict speaks of the great wisdom and courage of the Transylvanian people in that they could so early realize that true religion comes from the heart and from the love of God and mankind.

Today, when Transylvania is under Communist domination and when its Hungarian and Saxon minorities are especially oppressed, it is well that we pause to commemorate this historic event.

The history of Transylvania is replete with examples of tolerance toward mankind. The act of 1557 was followed, in 1571, by the final act which provided that "the word of God shall be preached freely everywhere; no one shall be harmed for any creed, neither preachers nor listeners." The tenor of the acts sound almost like the spirit of our own Constitution and the first amendment, and expresses the highest ideals for which our forebears often fled from Europe: individual and religious freedom.

The people of Transylvania can point with pride to some of their ancestors who provided the statesmanship and culture of that country. Transylvania gave Poland one of its greatest kings, Stephen Batory; Queen Isabella who signed the 1557 Act of Tolerance into law was the daughter of a Polish king and her son, John Sigismund, was the first Prince of Transylvania.

The famous mathematician, Eugene Bolyai, the founder of non-Euclidan geometry, and the great Hungarian prince and freedom fighter Francis Rakoczi, the ally of Louis XIV and the great explorer of Tibet, Alexander

Korosi-Csoma are examples of Transylvanian citizens who became known throughout Europe and the world. Another is the famous Prime Minister of Hungary, Count Paul Teleki, who committed suicide rather than break his word and attack Yugoslavia in 1941 in league with Adolph Hitler.

What is the present fate of Transylvania? After World War II it was given to Rumania, between 1940 and 1944 it was divided between Hungary and Rumania and, at present, is again a part of Communist Rumania. Its Hungarian population is still numerous despite decades of Rumanianization, reaching about 1.75 million in population. Communist oppression constitutes a heavy burden on Rumanians, Hungarians, and the German Saxons alike in Transylvania. The middle classes were economically and often physically destroyed. The Hungarian minority is regarded as suspect ever since student demonstrations, which often also involved Rumanian students as well, in Transyvlania; showed that the Hungarians sympathized with their brethren across the frontiers who were writing a glorious, but unsuccessful, chapter of their history with their fight for freedom from communism and the Soviet Union in 1956.

Mr. Speaker, the future destiny of this minority group is far from being bright. In 1957, there were still 1,116 schools which taught the Hungarian language. Now there is no independent Hungarian language school left in all Rumania, only integrated schools with a Hungarian branch in which an increasing number of courses are taught in the Rumanian language.

Between 1952 and 1961 there was at least a semblance of local autonomy in the form of the Magyar autonomous province in eastern Transylvania, though it never did comprise more than 28 percent of Transylvania's Magyar population. In 1961 even this was changed by assigning several purely Hungarian districts to the adjoining Rumanian province and by adding Rumanian districts to the autonomous region.

This served as a pretext for decreasing the number of Hungarians in the local councils to less than one-third of the total membership, although the Hungarians were still making up 63 percent of the population of the area.

Hungarian professionals who still must overcome heavy odds in obtaining their diplomas in courses of higher education are assigned by the state into Rumanian areas in Transylvania or to other Rumanian regions outside Transylvania.

By virtue of the 1963–64 amnesty, political prisoners were released from prison confinement, although many clergymen and political figures still remain in custody. Moreover, as a result of street brawls and unrest, large groups of Hungarians were arrested last summer on the charge of agitating against the treatment of the Hungarian minority by the regime; or on disorderly conduct charges when they tried to defend themselves from bodily attacks by the Rumanians who were incensed by the fact that the Hungarians dared to use their own language in public places. The November 19, 1964, issue of the Reporter carried a story by George Bailey who stated that the Hungarian salespeople in a store in the capital of the autonomous region refused to talk to him in Hungarian lest they should be summarily dismissed from their jobs.

Religious freedom is also sharply curtailed or totally absent. Several people who have relatives in Transylvania have told me that they have received letters which state that "going to church is still a sin against the Government." Two Catholic bishoprics are vacant and in the third the bishop is still not free to freely exercise his ecclesiastical rites, nor was he permitted to attend the meetings of the Vatican Council.

Industrialization is also used to artificially promote Rumanization of compact Hungarian areas. At Marosvasarhely—Tirgu Mures—at the powerplant at Erdoszentgyorgy in the autonomous region and many other places where new plants and factories were established, the Government uses imported Rumanian labor and technicians instead of local Hungarian labor which is, in turn, encouraged to migrate into the Rumanian areas around Brasov or to the capital city of Bucharest.

Many other instances of discrimination could be cited, including the three officially admitted death sentences in 1957, the hundreds of arrests between 1957 and 1961. According to affidavits of local residents who were part of the 3,000 persons living in one village in the autonomous area between 1954 and 1963, not less than 17 Unitarian ministers were imprisoned and 54 people sentenced to long prison terms because of alleged infractions of the law.

Under the circumstances, I am happy to note that several of my colleagues have already raised the Transyvanian question in this House during the latter part of March and have introduced resolutions condemning the discriminatory practices of the Rumanian Government. It is my understanding that the European Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has scheduled hearings for mid-June on this subject. I hope that our Government will do its utmost during the economic and cultural negotiations with Rumania to ease the situation of the people of Transylvania, especially that of the oppressed Hungarian minority.

The National Day of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today is observed by the Italian people as the anniversary of their Republic, for June 2 is the anniversary of a 1946 referendum in which the people of Italy voted for a republic rather than a monarchy.

The strides of the Italian Republic since that date have been great. From the Trentino to Calabria, from Sicily to the Alps, Italy is humming with progress and alive with pride in her achievements. The Republic has proven itself, and proven the decision made on that remote postwar June day. Italy has carved out a viable political and economic place in the new Europe and the New World.

The Republic has not proved itself without pain. Democracy has not always been the easy way when predicated on the shifting sands of coalition government. Nor is the economic picture of Italy wholly rosy. There is still grinding poverty in the Italian south, just as in our American South. But just as I have faith in America's future, I have faith in Italy's. Our two great Republics, united in friendship—past, present, and future—have only begun to realize their place in the sun.

Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, Fiscal Year 1966

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8639) making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill of broad coverage. Page 1 of the committee report lists 15 major departments and agencies of Government. Yet there are many others, all of them important. The summary at the end of the report gives a complete listing of the work areas covered by the committee and its saving. In a $2 billion bill, reductions of $82 million below the fiscal year 1966 budget and $87 million below the fiscal year 1965 budget represent one of the principal savings of the year.

Even so this committee is bound by legislative restrictions in areas where spending curbs are badly needed. I refer principally to contributions to international organizations, now totaling $97 million annually. The funds show a $9½ million increase since last year. The cost constantly is growing, but without restrictions from the authorizing committee, our hands are tied. There appears to be no inclination to hold down expenses within these organizations as long as the United States is the principal contributor.

This bill reflects small cuts in some of the civil rights programs. They are too small. More realistic reductions are in order to stop unwarranted meddling by these commission.

Nevertheless in most areas this is a realistic bill which reflects careful

scrutiny by a thorough committee and staff. The vote which I shall cast against the bill is directed in protest against agencies and courts which I cannot in good conscience support, not against the bill itself.

Kimberly-Clark Boosts Memphis—And Vice Versa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, each of us likes to brag on his hometown, pointing out leading factors that make it a better place for industry, tourists, or new residents.

In Memphis we have low-cost TVA power, the finest water on earth, excellent transportation facilities, and other factors that set our city apart. But the best thing about Memphis is the people who live there.

A recent event at the Kimberly-Clark plant in Memphis points up the fine spirit of cooperation that exists. Two members of Local 704 of the Pulp Sulfite and Paper Mill Workers came up with the idea of "Operation Tell and Sell" to promote their products, their company, and their community. Fellow members of their local and members of Local 313 of the United Paper Makers and Paper Workers join with the management of the mill in endorsing the idea.

I toured the plant recently during an open house which climaxed this promotion and you could feel the spirit that prevailed. Here is a report on the event as recorded in the April 1965 issue of the Cooperation, a quarterly publication of Kimberly-Clark Corp.:

A MILL FULL OF SALESMEN

Twelve hundred salesmen are working for Kimberly-Clark in Memphis, Tenn.

They have other jobs there, too, in one of Kimberly-Clark's largest production plant for consumer products. They work in maintenance and bookkeeping. The operate fork-lift trucks and the four creped wadding machines that turn out 240 tons a day. They run floor waxers and the telephone switchboard. They man the teletype machines and the guardhouse.

And they sell Kimberly-Clark products—the products they make in Memphis.

They call it "Operation Tell and Sell" and man, how they're telling.

How do you make a salesman of every employee in the plant? Well, you take a couple of idea men like Lester Henson and Mark Plunk, stir in the production skills of Memphis K-C'ers, blend in the interest of their wives, husbands, and children, season liberally with pride in job, company and products, bake in a spirit of cooperation between sales and production, frost before it cools with the icing of local pride to catch the eye of the community—and watch 'er go.

If this doesn't sound like the recipe for success, have a look at what's been going on in Memphis. The campaign has been rolling for about 4 months now and there's scarcely a Memphian who isn't aware that Kleenex tissues, towels and napkins, Kotex and Fems feminine napkins, and Delsey bathroom tissue are "made right here in Memphis by your friends and neighbors."

Henson, 45 and an 18-year K-C veteran, is a maintenance mechanic. Plunk, 27 and now in his fifth year with Kimberly-Clark, works in the instrument shop. The "Made in Memphis" idea was not new, but Henson thought that a little more steam behind it could make a good idea better. He was sold on the fact that a better industrial climate in Memphis would help the town, his company, and himself. He was aware of efforts to support local industries made by the city government and industrial leaders, but figured a mass push could really do a job.

He talked things over with Plunk, who agreed. Together they contacted several outside associations and organizations, found them sympathetic but unable for various reasons to get behind such a program 100 percent. And it was 100 percent these K-C'ers wanted.

They turned to their fellow K-C employees and found them enthusiastic. Equally important, they were willing to work. To work they went. Original proposals for selling the "Made in Memphis" theme were determined to be too grandiose to be realistic. So they backed off and started over on a smaller scale. The program snowballed and the snowball is still rolling.

In the best American tradition, a committee was formed to set up the program. Its members were drawn from all departments of the Memphis plant. They elected Henson and Plunk cochairmen and worked closely with Richard Hupp, personnel superintendent, in developing a plan to put the program across.

The movement had two basic purposes—to increase sales of Kimberly-Clark products in Memphis and to strengthen the K-C image there. It did more than that. It almost knocked the whole town on its ear.

Memphis is a city of about half a million people and is the major distribution center in the Midsouth. Kimberly-Clark is the only manufacturer of tissue products there (although there is some rugged competition nearby) and is among the city's largest industrial employers with 1,230 people.

The "Made in Memphis" promotion was to have four major parts: A payroll check-cashing spree in grocery stores, an exchange of product displays with six or eight other Memphis industries, an instore campaign to sell K-C products, and making the townspeople aware of the effort through bumper stickers, newspaper, and radio.

Contests were employed to whet employee interest. A poster contest for children of Kimberly-Clark employees drew 150 posters and provided plenty of bulletin board material: Some 150 entries were submitted in a Name the Project contest. Poster contest winners received a case of Kleenex junior tissues and colorful parkas similar to those being offered as premiums with Kleenex tissues. David Lumley, an electrician, received a case of product for submitting "Operation Tell and Sell." Mostly, though, this was considered to be a labor of love.

The snowball started to roll: Training sessions were held to inform all employees about the program. The two major newspapers in Memphis quickly picked up the story and gave it wonderful use. Radio and television joined the parade. Kimberly-Clark counter displays blossomed in major supermarkets. Memphis salesmen were unable to keep up with the demand for store displays and extra help was called in from Nashville. Mill employees were taken from their jobs when they could be spared to help set up the store promotions.

Not 6, but 15 other Memphis industries joined Kimberly-Clark in the effort. Plant product displays were exchanged with Plough, Inc., Firestore Tire & Rubber Co., Kellogg Co., Shulton, Inc., Purex Corp., Humko Products, Armour Co., National Rose Co., General Electric Co., Cleo-Wrap Corp., Mid-South Milling Co., Morrell Meats, Memphis Light, Gas & Water Division Container Corp., and Memphis Public Works.

A weekly bulletin board sheet called Memphis Mill News kept employees up to date on what was happening. A box was set up in the cafeteria where employees could submit suggestions.

Advertising tied the "Made in Memphis" idea with the introduction of family napkins in the Memphis market. Employees began to regard every phase of operation at Memphis as their business from the time raw materials arrived at the plant until the finished product was safely tucked away in a shopper's cart.

Here are just a few examples of what has happened because of the "Made in Memphis" program:

1. Distribution of new Kleenex family napkins has been achieved in every important Memphis outlet. Last fall, K-C salesmen were battling to get the new product onto limited store shelf space. Byron Velie, Memphis division consumer products sales manager, in a bulletin board letter, asked employees to do something about it. They did. "One hundred percent distribution in important outlets was achieved as a direct result of the 'Made in Memphis' program," Velie said. "Employees and their families kept asking store managers for family napkins."

2. Employees have become acutely conscious of quality problems. They purchase poorly wrapped or shopworn goods themselves to get them off the store shelves. More important, they report quality shortcomings to the proper authorities and, because of their intense interest, follow up to see what's being done about it.

3. Kimberley-Clark products are being given their share—and then some—of display space, usually made even easier to spot by signs identifying them with the "Made in Memphis" theme.

At the crew training sessions, Henson told his fellow workers how he felt about things. "I've observed some shopping habits. We have people in our own mill who don't always support K-C products. Your family needs to know what products we make and to consider that we won't make customers of friends and neighbors who see competitor's products in our homes.

So they told—and sold. The "Made in Memphis" program brought a proclamation from the mayor, a radio program salute to Kimberley-Clark, continuing mention of the program and Kimberly-Clark products in the newspapers, stories in grocery magazines and the magazines of other participating companies, a Memphis populace alert to the brightly colored bumper stickers promoting our products, a check-cashing program that made store owners aware of what the Kimberley-Clark payroll means to Memphis ($8 million a year), a month-long display of products and information on Kimberley-Clark in two main Memphis libraries.

It also resulted in well over 200 employees volunteering two or more hours of their own time to actually sell the products they make in about 15 supermarkets of a single chain during a March weekend. They attended, again on their own time, a training session to hear helpful hints on how to best represent the company and point out the advantages of using its products.

Climax of the program, although not directly a part of it, was a mill open house in April. The plant always has been open for tours since K-C moved into the converted bomber parts plant in 1946, 5 years after becoming a Memphis citizen, but no formal open house had ever been held. One was planned for next year as part of a 25th anniversary observance, but the date was moved up to take advantage of the tremendous enthusiasm and interest generated by the "Made in Memphis" campaign.

The employees' "Made in Memphis" committe acknowledged from the start that even doubling Memphis sales would make only a small impression in the total overall production of the Memphis mill. It also recognizes that a "Made in Memphis" program isn't worth much in Fort Worth or Tallahassee.

But committee members were convinced it was good for Memphis, good for the Memphis Kimberly-Clark mill, and good for themselves. One walk through that sprawling plant with more than 28 acres under roof is enough to catch the atmosphere of pride, cooperation, and enthusiasm that will convince any skeptic how right they are.

Robert Johnson, columnist for the Memphis Press-Scimitar, asked Les Henson why he got so involved in the "Made in Memphis" program. Les told him:

"In 1946, we had 156 people working 29,000 man-hours. Now we have over 1,200 working over 200,000 man-hours. Think what that means to the city. And I want this city to have more jobs so my children will have a place to work."

"It's as simple as that," Johnson commented. "They should take him on the next industry hunting expedition."

Foundation for the New South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, for the past 30 years the Memphis Commercial Appeal, an outstanding newspaper of the Nation, sponsored for the Midsouth a plant-to-prosper contest. It was very successful, but since our section has made such a rapid transition in modern methods of agriculture, they have decided to end the plant-to-prosper program and to sponsor industrial development of our great area.

There appeared an editorial in the Commercial Appeal on Sunday, May 30, that is so outstanding that I wish to bring it to the attention of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, May 30, 1965]

FOUNDATION FOR THE NEW SOUTH

Thirty-five years from now, we are told by scientists, the water needs of the western half of the Nation, excluding the Pacific coast, will exceed the maximum flow of rivers, streams, and lakes.

California is seriously contemplating tapping streams in the Canadian Pacific to supply its barest needs.

The Great Lakes are at the lowest levels in history, forcing ships to sail with part cargoes because of shallow water at docks. In Minneapolis, ground water supplies have run so low that the city's lakes have been in danger of disappearing.

New York City again has water rationing this spring. Reservoirs were running dry there last summer.

But in the lower Mississippi River Valley, water is abundant.

Fed by the Missouri River, the Ohio and its TVA and Cumberland River complexes—all with storage reservoirs of vast capacity—the lower Mississippi Valley is in an enviable position. In addition, this region is blessed with the highest average rainfall of any major region in the Nation, assuring replenishment of ground water supplies of great purity and water for growing crops and grasslands.

What does this mean?

It means that the lower Mississippi Valley is the one area of the Nation which in the future can assure industry the water it needs. It means that the Midsouth is the one region to which industry must look for future locations to ease the strain on the already overburdened East, North, and West.

What is being done about capitalizing on this unmatched resource?

All the three major States of the region have been active in seeking new industries and have been successful in attracting them. This has not all been "smokestack chasing"—the term some cynics use to refer to the policy of getting companies to close old plants in other areas and relocate in the new area. Much of the new industry in this area has been established here when companies outside the area have sought additional capacity.

The Delta Council, which serves the 18 counties of northwest Mississippi, is an example of what has been done. In the 8 years its industrial and community development board has been at work, the number of manufacturing plants in that area alone has grown from a pitiful 36 to 116. Industrial employment has grown from 6,000 to about 25,000 and payrolls from less than $15 million a year to more than $42 million last year.

Progress in industrialization seems to be coming easier in the delta now. Five new industries located there last year alone and 16 existing industries made substantial expansion. Indications are growth will be even greater this year.

Arkansas and Tennessee have made similar progress.

Such advancement does not come about by itself despite the existence in this region of water, transportation, and a good supply of labor.

The Delta Council, for example, has employed consultants to write detailed reports on what flood control has done to make industrial location in this area safe. It has surveyed industrial sites along the navigable waterways of the region and compiled a report on these. It has prepared booklets telling prospective industries of 20 ways in which the council can help in finding locations. And it has sent representatives around the country to offer this help to industries seeking new locations.

The other States have carried on similar work.

All this has resulted in what Maj. Gen. Ellsworth I. Davis, who heads the lower Mississippi Valley division of the U.S. Engineers, has referred to as "a phenomenal development" in the valley.

He said last March that the rate of growth in this valley "has far exceeded the national average. Between 1940 and 1960, the value of the gross national product increased about fivefold * * * value added by manufacture in the alluvial valley increased sevenfold * * * Personal incomes have increased 12 times."

Obviously, this is not the poverty-stricken region it once was and that far too many people across the Nation still think it is.

But the Midsouth—the lower Mississippi Valley—started from a low base. The Civil War and the decline of agriculture, which for so many years was the entire economic foundation of the area, left the region almost destitute. But it has built back by main force.

What needs to be done now that the region has come to full realization of its opportunities and potentials?

Obviously, the first task is to speed up the movement which already has begun. Industries which are beginning to encounter difficulties in other regions must be made fully aware of the potentials of the Midsouth.

Wherever possible there should be an effort to develop here a coordination of industries, the introduction of plants whose products invite the coming of other industries which can use those products in further processing. In this the Midsouth can learn something from the experience of areas such as California where the conversion of the aircraft industries after World War II led to production of missiles which in turn attracted industries supplying that new output and then led to the development of the computer industry there.

There will be a great need for individuals and financial institutions of the Midsouth investing in homegrown industries. The Midsouth welcomes the establishment of units of northern and western industries here, but it must be recognized that capital resources of this region will develop fastest if the existing capital of the region is invested where the greatest return will accrue to this region rather than fattening the others.

If all this is done, it will mean greater concentration of the population of the region in certain centers which already are quite well defined. It will mean, too, that the movement toward larger and more efficient farms will be accelerated to give the Midsouth a still greater forward thrust.

All of this, however, must be buttressed by a strong educational system.

The industrial growth which developed in the Northeast, the Midwest and on the Pacific coast came about in large part because those regions had such an educational foundation and made it grow.

Industries today are swiftly moving and intricate operations. Most require highly skilled workers and technically trained personnel both in production and in management. Men who enter these industries on leaving college soon are lost in their businesses or professions if they do not have readily available to them institutions where they can keep abreast of new developments.

This requires a complex of institutions of higher learning. Such institutions are expensive to establish and expensive to maintain. If the Midsouth cannot now afford to develop them in each of the States, perhaps a greater coordination of these institutions is called for to assure the highest possible development in some field at each of them.

Finally, there must be available in this region sufficient culture to attract and hold the highly educated and trained people that this new economy requires. Living can be easy, but life must be attractive.

All these are thoughts which went into the decision by the Commercial Appeal this month to end the plant-to-prosper program this newspaper has sponsored for the last 30 years during which this transition from a weak agriculture to a growing industrialization has been developing.

The Commercial Appeal will continue to give the new agriculture of the Midsouth all the support possible, but it recognizes that change has come and must be fostered. Let us hope that enough of the leaders of the Midsouth recognize the opportunities of the region in time to nurture the natural advantages the area possesses.

If they do, the Midsouth will indeed be the foremost region of this Nation.

Spayth's Story Outstanding Record of Oldtime Newsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly great newspapermen, editors,

and publishers of New Jersey, is George W. Spayth, of Dunellen, N.J.

His remarkable career has ranged from editorial cartoonist to publisher of one of the State's most widely read and respected enterprises—the Spayth Weeklies—of Middlesex County, N.J.

Now over 70, but still vigorous and active, George Spayth has added bookwriting to his long list of achievements. His book, "It Was Fun the Hard Way," is one of the most interesting, best written, and inspiring I have ever read. I recommend it to every person who is interested in good writing, adventure, and versatility.

It has received a good response from readers and reviewers. One of the reviews by Bill Dorr, editor of the Publishers' Auxiliary, summarizes the feelings of the many people who know, respect, and love George W. Spayth. An excerpt of the review points out that, "George Spayth is a writer of great talent." More important, however, is the fact that George Spayth is a man of great compassion, fairness, and dedication to truth.

The review of the book, "It Was Fun the Hard Way," follows:

SPAYTH'S STORY OUTSTANDING RECORD OF OLDTIME NEWSMAN

(By Bill Dorr, editor, Publishers' Auxiliary)

Few newspapermen, including the reviewer would ever believe that any other newspaperman had ever had more varied or interesting experiences than himself.

Reading "It Was Fun the Hard Way" (Spayth Press, Dunellen, N.J., 249 pp., $4.75) refutes any such self-centered nonsense. Undoubtedly George Spayth has, at least, equalled the most adventurous of us. I'd dare say that few newspapermen would care to assess experiences with this weekly editor, daily cartoonist, adman, publisher, and what-not.

Starting as the projectionist in a nickelodeon, Spayth has lived what others find in old magazines, TV documentaries, and nostalgic reminiscence from old folks. From Ashland, Ky., his beginning, through the interesting small towns and big towns, small papers and big papers, Spayth may have failed to conquer the economics of newspapering, but he never failed to conquer the interests of fourth estate living.

Spayth gave up a high-paying high-traveling job as a photographer to become a cub reporter on the Janesville, Wis., Reporter, beginning what may have been an unhistorical, yet unparalleled, career in journalism.

Alexandria, Fort Wayne, Galveston, newspaper towns and newspaper names followed. He was a photographer for the Galveston News (now the News-Tribune) who became a top ranking editorial cartoonist with the Houston Chronicle. He has been an editorial William Allen White and a cartoonist Ding Darling and a photographer to compare with some of the finest.

Most essential to his book, however, George Spayth is a writer of great talent. His most important attributes are a remarkable memory and an ability to reincarnate the past to present interest. Minute details are remembered with a clarity reminiscent of Mark Twain or Will Rogers and placed into a continuity that makes this book possibly the most graphic, humorous autobiography in newspaper history.

Spayth, in an article in the May 23, 1964, Auxiliary, described himself as "not a Christian, atheist, Democrat or Republican, I'm simply a 'Spaythist.'" He is presently publisher of the Dunellen (N.J.) Call, the Piscataway Chronicle and the Middlesex Mirror. He considers himself a mellow man at 70-plus years.

Still a columnist who gets his kicks out of an editorial battle now and then, Spayth adheres to an old style of journalism now on the wane ("In the old days if you went to a school of journalism you kept it a secret").

Spayth possesses however, a trait unhampered by time or style changes. A magnetic personality, a great interest in (and memory of) the past, ability to write without restraint of inhibitions or lack of energy, and a great quantity of that essence of the blood necessary to any book on newspapering, printer's ink.

"It Was Fun the Hard Way," may well have been a bestseller if produced by a national name in publishing, and one may wish this had happened. However, Spayth Press has done an excellent production job; illustrations are good and typography is first rate.

But the oldtime, great time newspaperman, George Spayth, is the real flavor of this book that may long stand on its own in journalism's bookshelves.

Making America More Beautiful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the response of the responsible press of outstate Michigan to the concern President Johnson has shown about making our cities more attractive and our countryside more beautiful, has been most popular. As an example, I include an editorial from the Grand Rapids Press of May 10. I am sure that such editorials will increase our sense of urgency in implementing a program which can bring beauty to all our society.

The article follows:

MAKING AMERICA MORE BEAUTIFUL

Later this month a conference headed by Laurance Rockefeller will discuss in Washington ways of putting President Johnson's national beautification program into effect. The President has proposed establishing more parks, beautifying highways, shielding automobile graveyards from view, eliminating billboards along the highways, making the Nation's Capital more attractive, improving the appearance of our waterways and similar measures.

Although Mr. Johnson has emphasized the role that the Federal Government can play in such projects, he also has said that any program of this tyype to be successful will have to have the active participation of the States and local governments. This would seem only reasonable. But curiously enough, no mention has been made of the individual, of the part he can and should play in making America more beautiful.

Beauty, it would seem, ought to begin at home, in the front yard. Better looking yards will automatically improve the appearance of any community. A national program of beautification ought to start with the home and work through the neighborhood to the city and beyond. If enough interest can be generated in the great majority of citizens to beautify their own places, interest in making neighborhoods and whole cities and States more beautiful will come as a matter of course.

What we are speaking about, of course, is gardening in the broadest sense of the word. Gardening already is one of the American people's most popular, and rewarding, pastimes. And it has much to recommend it in addition to the beauty it brings, as Dr. Abe S. Tuinman, agricultural attaché to the Netherlands Embassy in Washington, recently observed. "Gardening," he said, "balances the strain and stress of the day-to-day life. Gardening gives a feeling of partnership with nature, and the satisfaction of creating something; and it can be done with little financial means * * * it is a happy marriage where the gifts of nature and man's ingenuity in perfecting its flowers yield ever more beautiful results."

Helping to beautify America by starting at home is, therefore, within the reach of almost every family. And probably every family would be better for whatever it did along these lines. For new young families that may know little about gardening, it might be a good idea to set up demonstration gardens. The garden clubs could be especially helpful in such projects. If Mr. Rockefeller's conference hopes really to promote a national beautification program let it look to grassroots.

Four Freedoms Award to Carole Kanny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the four freedoms were enunciated for the first time by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt in an address to Congress January 6, 1941, and are today known to all:

Freedom of speech and expression, everywhere in the world;

Freedom of every person to worship God in his own way, everywhere in the world;

Freedom from want, everywhere in the world;

Freedom from fear, everywhere in the world.

The Four Freedoms Foundations, Inc., a nonpolitical membership corporation was organized in 1951 under the laws of the State of New York to implement the principles of the four freedoms throughout the world. The activities of the foundation include distribution of literature through the schools, essay contests and other similar projects. An award is given annually by the foundation in recognition of distinguished service in the cause of freedom.

Previous recipients of the award are: Hon. Alben W. Barkley, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Dr. Ralph Bunche, Gen. George C. Marshall, former President Harry S. Truman, Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, Hon. W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo, Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, George Meany, and Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Added to this list of distinguished recipients for the year 1964 is our late President John F. Kennedy. The 1964 Four Freedoms Foundation award was made posthumously on May 25, 1965.

Winner of first prize in the students' essay contest on the subject of freedom was 11½-year-old Carole Kanny of my

congressional district a sixth-grade student at P.S. 87 in Manhattan. In her essay she included a poetic tribute to our late President. Both her prize-winning essay and her tribute to the late President are worthy of the consideration of this body and I am therefore pleased to include same in the RECORD with some degree of pride in the accomplishment of this young lady in my district and a sense of security that a fundamental belief in freedom and democracy are inherent in our younger generations:

THE FOUR FREEDOMS

(By Carole Kanny, P.S. 87, Manhattan)

What is the greatest link between liberty and security? F.D.R. was the builder of the structure of a way of life called the four freedoms. It was a declaration of independence from prejudice and preference. Each of the four freedoms is a response to human needs and provides a timeless ethic to be followed from generation to generation. F.D.R. was the pioneer, in 1941, for the new society. He charted the course with a concept of compassion and courage to guard civil liberties in our complex communities. He trod new paths where preseverance and protest and public spirited purpose achieved goals. With mind and heart, he had a feeling for his fellow man, for one man is all men.

We must carry on this heritage guaranteeing for posterity, their place with a blueprint for peace and prosperity, for all men forever and ever. Ours is the heavy responsibility not to forget the good words given to us, but to remember we are links in the chain of human endeavor. In unity, the chains are forged of the bright metal of freedom. This means that each link must have every freedom or the chain will lose its continuity. The world can be a Utopia right now if we all will give of ourselves to help our fellow man achieve a higher standard of living and a bond of universal fellowship, more important than bread alone.

Be forewarned, friends and foes, democracy denotes denial of despotism and affirmation of all the aims of amity. We are the guardians of the four freedoms everywhere.

POETIC TRIBUTE TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Carole Kanny)

In the 20th century
J.F.K.'s legacy
The credo of democracy
Like the decalog of Biblical days
Taught people the ways
To make theory a reality
For freedom means totality.
The goal of economic security
Must retain human dignity
Oh world we beseech
Give all people freedom of speech.
Each can pray, none can say
Mine's the only way
Hear our cry. Remember why
Four Freedoms strength and might,
Our covenant to J.F.K.'s eternal light.

Clearinghouse for Teen Summer Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a Chicago Sun-Times article of March 21, 1965, which tells the story of yet another example of local initiative in solving local problems. Faced with an increasing number of requests from college students for summer employment to help defray their college expenses, the Jewish Vocational Service of Chicago put forth a special effort to find summer jobs for their local youth, and points out that any local agency whose membership includes the businessmen of the community can do as well with proper planning and adequate effort.

The article follows:

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR TEEN SUMMER JOBS

Somebody ought to get a degree out of this.

Somebody will. Jack L., for instance, whose summer would have been dismal last year, and who might not have gone back to college last fall for his junior year if he hadn't gotten this good-paying job. He's out for another one this summer and by a year from June should have his collegiate bachelor of science diploma landed.

Or Melissa S., who wrote the Jewish Vocational Service a thank-you note for helping her.

"It's very difficult to get a good job for the summer only," she said. "I needed to earn as much money as possible to help me through this year of college. The JVS people not only provided me with employment and a salary, but didn't make me feel as if I were committing a crime by wanting to continue my formal education."

An average of 1,200 to 1,500 requests from needy students hit Jewish Vocational Service annually for vacation jobs. Until last summer only about 100 of these could be filled.

Then Seymour Nordenberg, president of JVS and also president of a business, called the board members and professional staff of the service together and suggested that they get busy—that every board member take the responsibility of finding work for at least two student applicants whose continuance in college depended on earning money during the summer.

Board members looked into their own companies first, then to those of friends and associates. They came up with 60 new placements and a total of 335 jobs.

Any agency which has a board of businessmen can do proportionately well, with planning and effort, JVS maintains.

"Summer employment is vital to about 25 percent of all college students," says Vernon FOX, head of the Work Scholarship Committee of JVS. "This goes even for those from middle-income families."

Hiring college students for temporary work is not solely an act of good will. It is frequently also good business.

"The young man we hired through your service did a very good job and we are presently planning with him regarding part-time work during his school term," writes a metal specialist firm. "If you have any men next spring who have some college drafting and engineering background, please keep us in mind."

A chemical company was even more emphatic. "We checked the cost of temporary help during our last vacation period and found we could effect economies through Jewish Vocational Service," its personnel manager wrote.

"The girl you sent was greatly superior to the temporary help we usually get on a part-time basis. Other businesses should study their peak period relief help costs. They can obtain a better quality employee, save money and at the same time do a great amount of good helping young people get through college."

Anti-Semitism: A Catholic View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the March 1965 edition of the Anti-Defamation League bulletin by the managing editor of Commonweal magazine.

The article concerns a Catholic view of anti-Semitism and is adapted from James O'Gara's address before a Catholic-Jewish conference sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith jointly with Mercy College, Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.

The article follows:

ANTI-SEMITISM: A CATHOLIC VIEW—WHAT DIFFERENCE WILL THE VATICAN COUNCIL DECLARATION MAKE? WHY DOES IT MATTER?

(By James O'Gara)

Last fall in Rome an overwhelming majority of the fathers of the Second Vatican Council voted their approval of a declaration on the relation of the church to the non-Christian religions. An important part of that document was its explicit rejection of any presentation of the Jews as a deicide people. Those of us who had supported and worked for the passage of that declaration were overjoyed, both at the victory itself and at its size—out of 2,000 votes less than 100 were "no" votes. We considered the passage of this declaration important. Yet since I have been home from Rome, various people—Chistians and Jews alike—have asked be what difference the document really makes. "What," they ask, "does its approval by so overwhelming a vote matter?" I think I can best begin to discuss the question in terms of one Jewish boy on the East Side of New York, Mike Gold.

Mike Gold eventually became a well-known figure in the Communist Party in this country. Back in 1930, however, while he was still a young man, he wrote a book called "Jews Without Money." It was an earthy, autobiographical account which told of Mike Gold's boyhood on the East Side, in the heart of the Jewish ghetto. In it is this story:

"The boy had wandered away from the ghetto; that was his mistake. Then—'Bang. I had been slugged over the head,' he wrote. 'I jumped in surprise to see who hit me. I was in the hands of the enemy. Eight Italian boys with sticks surrounded me, whooping like Indians. Their eyes gleamed, their faces were cruel. The thing I feared most had happened. The leader, a big strong boy, clutched my collar, and asked fiercely: "What streeter?" I was confused, and made a great tactical blunder. I told the truth. "Chrystie Street," I said.

"'"Hooray, a Jew, a Jew," he screamed, his face lighting up with a boy's joyous cruelty. He slugged me with his stick. The others yelled and joined in the slugging. I fell to the pavement, then fought to my feet and ran. Down Mulberry Street I ran. They pursued me, throwing stones, bricks, and vegetables.

"'"Christ killer!" someone yelled. All the boys took up the ancient cry. The mob grew; there must have been 50 boys chasing me now. A stone caught me in the temple, and I tasted blood on my lips. A brick cut my right shin. My ribs were bruised by the sticks; my shirt slimy with horse dung and

rotten vegetables. I couldn't breathe; my lungs pricked me like needles. The grown-ups lined the curbing and watched the chase without much interest. Some of them laughed at the juvenile tragedy. I sobbed and ran. I grew weaker.

"'At last I came to the Bowery and managed to cross into my own Jewish land. The Italians were afraid to follow me across the Bowery; some of my gang might attack them there. They remained on their own side, and yelled a last exultant "Christ killer!" as they watched me trot safely home.'"

I am not suggesting that every American Jew is a Mike Gold who first learned the name of Christ from the lips of young Christian hoodlums. I am not suggesting that every American Jew has been called "Christ killer." I am suggesting that enough Jews have been called "Christ killer" to make this a significant fact in our relations. I am not denying that the juvenile tragedy described by Mike Gold belonged in a special way to New York, and to the East Side of New York as a particular time as well. I am saying that similar incidents have happened in every city in the United States, indeed, a polite, respectable version of exactly this story took place in my own polite respectable suburb a few months ago.

Prof. Jules Isaac said that we Christians have received from childhood on "a certain instruction in contempt." No matter how good our parents or our teachers, I think there is a profound truth in this statement, and I think Catholic-Jewish relationships will never be right until that fact is faced honestly.

It is not the Christian gospel itself which is at fault. But if we are to be honest with ourselves, we must say that Christians, if not the Christian gospel, have been at fault. The well-known ecumenical scholar Father Gregory Baum, put it this way: "A certain way of preaching the gospel, and certain theological theories passed on in these writings, have been contributing factors, at least remote ones, to the anti-Jewish feeling so widespread in the Christian world."

What are these theological theories that have contributed to anti-Semitism? There is the teaching that would blame "the Jews" exclusively for Christ's death, ignoring the Christian teaching that all of us individually and together are by our sins responsible for Christ's death. There are those who spread the myth that the Jews were condemned to wander through the world until the end of time—a myth so strong that many Christians feared that the establishment of the State of Israel contradicted the Sacred Scriptures.

What is Catholic teaching in this matter—teaching newly amplified and emphasized in the Vatican Council? The church teaches that the Jewish people were not and are not cast away. The church deplores and condemns the abuse of speaking of the Jews as a "deicide people" or putting them outside the law. The children of Israel are neither rejected nor cursed by God. On the contrary, they are cherished by God, not solely because of merits of their own but because God is faithful and His gifts irrevocable. In Catholic thought the Jews will be forever in a special way objects of His love.

These are the facts. But why the gap between official belief and popular practice? How did it come about that Christian behavior did not match the teaching of the church? As Father Baum notes, when we examine critically Christian authors from the fourth century through the Middle Ages "we find that the proclamation of the gospel was often, though not always, surrounded by legends regarding the Jews." Because church and synagogue were often in direct competition in early centuries, too many Christian writers and preachers tried to glorify the church by degrading the synagogue. The Jews were often depicted as a perfidious, stiff-nicked people. Often they were presented as an accursed people, condemned for the crucifixion of Jesus and reaping their just punishment in this world.

Let me emphasize, as the council fathers did, that this is abuse, not official Catholic teaching. Most of the Jews did not accept Christ as the Messiah, and this divides us. But to the Catholic the two covenants, the old and the new, are not separate attempts by God to reconcile men with himself, but one single drama of redemption. The God of the Old Testament and the God of the New are one.

The study of Christian textbooks in the light of our new understanding is still underway. Already we know, however, that many Christian writings have inculcated a certain contempt for the Jewish people because of their religion. Too many Christians forget that Christ Himself was born of a Jewish maiden, that He was obedient to the law—indeed, in Christian teaching if Jesus had not been the Son of Israel, the ancient promises would not yet be fulfilled and we would still be unredeemed. Yet, as Father Baum put it, "We must confess that in the imagination of the Christion people, Judas is more Jewish than Jesus. This is, of course, absurd."

Today, in America, in 1965, I think we can thank God that we have put much of the bitterness of the past behind us. We can thank God that the bitter religious divisions that set brother against brother in Europe are not known here in their full strength. At the same time we must face the fact that past history taints our relations, and we can resolve to work to eliminate this fact from American life.

Those of us who are Catholics must take positive steps to undo the harm of the past. We must remember that Jesus was born of a Jewish maiden. We must remember that His first disciples, the Apostles and the first martyrs were Jews. We must avoid belittling biblical Judaism as a means of exalting Christianity. We must avoid presenting the passion of Jesus as if all Jews, or Jews only, had been responsible for the crucifixion.

In all these matters Catholics could do no better than to make their own the spirit of the Vatican Council document on the Jews.

I am a Christian, a Catholic. These things I would say to my fellow Catholics. I cannot say what Jews need to do. I know that the dialog between Christians and Jews has barely begun; we need much more of it. We need to give pluralism a chance to work—we badly need to have patience and understanding with each other.

Are there Jews who would regard me only with deep suspicion? There are. Are there Jews who still believe that when you scratch a Christian—any Christian—an anti-Semite bleeds? There are. I do not know what it would take to make some Jews look at me honestly. Some Jews, I know, would turn their backs on me; some would dismiss me as one of the enemy without even knowing me. How numerous such Jews are I do not know, but we all know they exist, just as Christians tainted with anti-Semitism exist. This problem, however, is something on which I can offer little or no advice; in the last analysis it seems to me a problem only a Jew can wrestle with.

I must address myself to Christians, and primarily to Catholics. And as a Catholic I must make my own the recent words of Cardinal Cushing during the discussion on the Jewish declaration in St. Peter's.

"We must condemn," Cardinal Cushing said, "every attempt to justify hatred, to justify iniquities and persecution as Christian actions. We have all seen in our time the evil fruit of such attempts. We should really think whether it would not be just to confess humbly before the world that Christians have often failed to live up to Christ in their relations with Jews. In this age of ours, how many Jews have suffered and died because of indifference, because of silence. If not many Christian voices were lifted in recent years against this great injustice, let our voices humbly cry out now."

As a Catholic I must know that anti-Semitism is not dead, that anti-Semitism exists—"polite" anti-Semitism, "moderate" anti-Semitism, but anti-Semitism. As a Catholic I must denounce this; I must proclaim that anti-Semitism is a blot on civilization, and I must insist that no one can call himself a Christian if he does not do all in his power to blot it out, if he does not love with his whole heart the people who gave us our Lord.

All this I would say as a Catholic, and I am proud that the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council have taken the first major step toward affirming this, in a voice immeasurably louder and clearer than mine. And then I would turn to Jew and Catholic alike, for do we not both worship the God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob? And I would remind Christian and Jew alike of their solemn religious obligation, citing for the Jew, Leviticus, and for the Christian, Matthew, but reminding them that in each case the message is the same: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." And when I had said that to the Jew and that to the Christian, I would stop, for when that has been said, what remains? What else needs to be said? "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Tunisia Celebrates Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to call our colleagues' attention to the fact that on yesterday, June 1, the Republic of Tunisia celebrated its sixth independence day.

Less than 10 years ago Tunisia was a French protectorate. Today she not only proudly, and rightly so, possesses her independence, but she is making vigorous efforts both to develop her economy and to bring new stability to the shores of the Mediterranean.

Unfortunately, all too few Americans know very much about Tunisia, whose written history dates back to the 12th century B.C. Accordingly, I am including, at the close of my remarks, some background notes prepared by the Department of State.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that our colleagues will join with me in extending best independence day wishes to the courageous people of Tunisia. I know we all wish President Bourguiba and the members of his government every success in their efforts to bring greater peace and prosperity to this great country and to their neighbors:

BACKGROUND NOTES ON TUNISIA

Capital: Tunis.

Population: 3,900,000.

Tunisia regained its independence on March 20, 1956, with the signing of a protocol between Tunisia and France by which the latter recognized the sovereignty and independence of Tunisia and thereby ended the French protectorate that had been established in 1881. On July 25, 1957, the Tu-

nisian Constituent Assembly voted to abolish the monarchy and to establish the Tunisian Republic.

The assembly named as President, Habib Bourguiba, who had led the country's struggle for independence. The same assembly drafted a constitution which was promulgated on June 1, 1959. This Constitution provides for a presidential system and is similar in a number of other respects to that of the United States. On November 8, 1959, Tunisia held its first elections under the new Constitution. President Bourguiba was unopposed and assembly candidates, backed by Bourguiba's Neo-Destour Party and affiliated labor and professional groups, had only token opposition.

THE LAND

Situated on the northern coast of Africa between Algeria on the west and Libya on the east, Tunisia has a coastline on the Mediterranean Sea extending for nearly 1,000 miles. Its area is 48,332 square miles or about the size of Louisiana.

The country is subdivided by climate into a northern area, which is wooded, fertile, and the source of most of Tunisia's agricultural production; the central area, comprising the coastal plains noted for livestock grazing and olive groves; and the southern region, which borders the Sahara Desert and lacks sufficient rainfall to support more than grazing herds and seminomadic peoples. A rainy season extends from December to March followed by an almost rainfree summer season from June to September.

THE PEOPLE

The population of Tunisia was 3,783,169 according to the results of an official Tunisian Government census of February 1956. About half the population is below the age of 21; there is an annual increase of about 80,000. Over 95 percent of the population is Moslem.

The European population has dropped since independence and constitutes about 4 percent of the total population. Largest European communities are the French (30,000) and the Italian (30,000). There is also a Maltese community of several thousand. Islam is the official religion. The official language is Arabic, but French is widely used and continues to be taught in Tunisian schools.

GOVERNMENT

The President of Tunisia appoints the ministers, who are responsible only to him. He is responsible for determining national policy, and his bills have priority before the single-chamber assembly. He may legislate by decree when the assembly is not in session. The President is elected for 5 years, renewable for two additional 5-year terms.

The Assembly, which is also elected for 5 years, meets twice a year. During its recess its interests are assured by standing committees. The Assembly's principal legislative task is to approve the budget.

The Constitution provides for an independent judiciary and a Council of State having functions similar to those of the Court of Claims and the General Accounting Office. Tunisian legal codes and court organization and procedures are based to a considerable degree on those of France.

HISTORY

Tunisia's written history dates from the arrival in the 12th century B.C. of Phoenician traders who established permanent settlements, the most famous of which was the city of Carthage. After being occupied by the Romans, Tunisia was conquered in the seventh century A.D. by the Arabs and became a major center of Western Islamic culture and political power. The Turks invaded Tunisia in 1574. A French protectorate was established over Tunisia in 1883. The outward forms of the Tunisian monarchy which had been established in 1705 continued in force, but all the power was in French hands.

Following World War I the Destour (Constitution) Party asked unsuccessfully for moderate reforms, including a legislative assembly. But the founding in 1934 of the Neo-Destour (New Constitution) Party of which Habib Bourguiba soon became President, marks the real beginning of Tunisia's drive for independence.

In March 1952, following the breakdown of negotiations with France, Tunisian guerrilla fighters (fallagha) took to the hills, and in 1954 France found herself using about 70,000 troops in an effort to restore order and security. In July 1954 France promised the Tunisians full internal autonomy. In December the fallagha were persuaded to accept a French amnesty, turning in some of their arms.

After 9 months of negotiation the Franco-Tunisian conventions on internal autonomy were signed on June 3, 1955, but from the moment the conventions were put into effect it became apparent that the Tunisians would demand their early revision and review. Events in Morocco, Algeria, and throughout the Afro-Asian world hastened this process, and Bourguiba began to press France for independence. On March 20, 1956, a protocol was drawn up in which France recognized Tunisian independence.

The March 20 protocol also specified that Tunisia and France would negotiate new "interdependence" relations, particularly in the fields of foreign affairs and defense. Considerable progress has been made on some important issues in Franco-Tunisian relations, but intense feelings over Algeria and Bizerte have slowed progress toward definitive arrangements on other matters.

France and Tunisia reached an agreement in June 1958 which provided for the evacuation of French forces, except for those at Bizerte, and for further negotiation of provisional arrangements concerning the status of Bizerte. Negotiations over the ensuing years failed to produce agreement. In July 1961, bloody clashes between French and Tunisian forces took place in the town and environs of Bizerte. A period of extreme tenseness in Tunisian-French relations followed. Direct contacts were maintained, however, and diplomatic relations were resumed in September 1962. Relations have since improved steadily. In 1963 French economic aid to Tunisia was resumed, and in October of that year the last of French military forces left Bizerte.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

Tunisia believes that it cannot formally aline itself with the West but should maintain such relations with both West and East as best serve Tunisian interests. Most Tunisians consider, however, that particular emphasis should be placed on Tunisia's relations with the West and with Tunisia's African neighbors. In addition to being a member of the United Nations and many of its specialized agencies, Tunisia is also a member of the Arab League and the Organization of African Unity.

ECONOMY

Agriculture, although handicapped by inadequate water supplies in many parts of the country, is the backbone of the Tunisian economy. The principal crops are wheat, olives, citrus fruit, grapes, truck crops, and esparto grass. Agricultural exports include grains, olive oil, wine, esparto grass, and citrus fruit.

Although no extensive mineral deposits have been found in Tunisia, there are commercially exploited deposits of phosphates, iron ore, lead, and zinc that are the source of substantial foreign exchange earnings. Extensive exploratory searches for oil have been undertaken since the recent oil discoveries in neighboring Algeria and Libya.

Tunisian foreign trade is largely oriented toward the franc zone, which since 1958 has taken about 60 percent of Tunisian exports and supplied about 60 perecnt of imports. The United States generally supplies less than 5 percent of Tunisia's imports and takes about 3 percent of her exports, though as a result of the U.S. aid program the proportion of imports supplied by the United States has increased somewhat in recent years. Tunisia traditionally has a substantial deficit in her trade balance.

Tunisia refused to follow France in the devaluation of December 1958 and now has its own currency, the dinar. The Tunisian and French currencies exchange on the basis of 1 Tunisian dinar for 11.75 new French francs. One dinar equals $2.38.

Tunisia faces difficult economic conditions and widespread unemployment. However, these problems are chronic rather than acute, and the last elections in November 1959 gave a resounding vote of confidence to Bourguiba and the Neo-Destour. Since the elections President Bourguiba has placed special emphasis on programs designed to provide jobs and develop Tunisia's economy.

U.S. ASSISTANCE

The United States provides economic and technical assistance to Tunisia under the mutual security program pursuant to an agreement signed on March 26, 1957. Such assistance to the end of fiscal year 1963 amounted to approximately $200 million.

The United States has also been furnishing assistance in the form of surplus agricultural commodities under title II of Public Law 480. Such assistance was first extended under an agreement signed in September 1956 providing wheat for famine relief. Since then other programs have been undertaken to provide surplus agricultural commodities for a child-feeding program, for the relief of civilian refugees from Algeria, and as a basic part of the Tunisian battle against underdevelopment through the use of the unemployed. Under these various programs the United States has contributed over $100 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities since 1959. The United States provided a $180 million long-term commitment to the Tunisian 3-year plan (1962–64). A 4-year plan (1965–68) has been prepared and is now ready for implementation. The United States has reaffirmed its willingness to continue its association in Tunisian development efforts and to provide major support on a continuing and sustained basis within the context of the 4-year plan.

New Tunisian Government: In October 1964 the Neo-Destour Party was renamed the Destourian Socialist Party. Presidential and parliamentary elections occurred on November 8, 1964. President Habib Bourguiba was reelected for a second 5-year term. The new Cabinet was announced on November 11, 1964.

Principal Government officials:

President of the Republic of Tunisia: Habib Bourguiba.[1]

Personal representative of the President: Mongi Slim (former Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs).

Secretary of State for Justice: Hedi Khefacha.[1]

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Habib Bourguiba, Jr.

Secretary of State for Interior: Taieb Mehiri.[1]

Secretary of State for the Plan and National Economy: Ahmed Ben Salah.[1]

Secretary of State for National Education: Mahmoud Messadi.[1]

Secretary of State for Cultural Affairs: Chedly Klibi.

Secretary of State for Youth, Sports, and Social Affairs: Mondher Benammar.

Secretary of State for Public Works and Housing: Ahmed Noureddine.[1]

Footnote at end of speech.

Secretary of State for Public Health: Fethi Zouhir.

Secretary of State for Information and Guidance: Abdelmajid Chaker.

Director General for Postal Service, Telegraph, and Telephone: Abdallah Farhat.

Director for Radio and Television: Mohamed Mzali.

Director of President's Office: Taieb Sahbani.

Habib Bourguiba: President of the Tunisian Republic. Mr. Bourguiba was born on August 3, 1903, and is credited, more than any other individual, with being the author of Tunisian independence. Tunisians have conferred upon Mr. Bourguiba the title of "Supreme Combatant," which is perhaps the most eloquent description of his special position in Tunisian public life. He was Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs and Defense in the first Tunisian Government formed in April 1956 following independence this government remained in power until July 25, 1957, when the Republic was proclaimed. President Bourguiba also heads the dominant political party in Tunisia, the Destourian Socialist Party. Mr. Bourguiba visited the United States most recently in May 1961.

Bahi Ladgham: A native of Tunis and Vice Prime Minister of Tunisia until July 25, 1957, Mr. Ladgham was named Secretary of State to the Presidency for Coordination and Secretary of State for National Defense in the Cabinet. He is a vigorous nationalist and one of the leaders of the Destourian Socialist Party.

Habib Bourguiba, Jr.: Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Mr. Bourguiba, Jr., is the son of the President of Tunisia. He was appointed Foreign Minister in November 1964. Born in April 1927, Mr. Bourguiba was educated in Tunis and Paris. He has served as Tunisian Ambassador to Italy (1957–58), France (1958–61), and the United States (1961–63). Before nomination to the position of Foreign Minister, he served as Secretary General to the Presidency.

Principal U.S. officials: Ambassador Francis H. Russell; Deputy Chief of Mission, Leo G. Cyr; Director, U.S. AID mission, Daly C. Lavergne; public affairs officer, William Astill.

[1] No change from same position in previous Cabinet.

John Shissler Retires From Lakewood Ohio, Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, after 43 years my good friend, John Shissler, is retiring as president and editor of the Lakewood Post, serving the residents of the Lakewood, Ohio, area in the 23d District which I represent.

The Post will continue its contribution to the community under the very capable supervision of John's longtime copublisher, David R. Hawley, and Harry Volk and Milton L. Friendlander, owners and publishers of the Heights Sun Newspapers, who have purchased his stock interest in the newspaper.

John Shissler began his newspaper career as a reporter with the Cleveland Plain Dealer while attending Western Reserve University. He was graduated in 1921 and a year later took over editorship of the Post, launching a career in journalism which has played an important part in the impressive growth of the city of Lakewood.

John is a quiet, unassuming man who probably would deprecate the praise his friends in greater Cleveland are voicing as they review the many years he has dedicated to the interests of the west side.

It is good to know he plans to spend much of his time traveling, adding to the store of Travel Vignettes which he wrote for the Post over the years. I am pleased to report that he plans to publish them in book form.

John Shissler's many loyal readers will miss him. I personally regret the loss of his wise and valuable counsel and the thoughtful editorials he wrote which kept a finger on the pulse of his community. John has been a wonderful friend to me over the years. He has my affectionate regard and good wishes for the future.

I wish too to express my confidence in his successors. As John said of them in his farewell statement in the Post, Harry Volk and Milt Friedlander are newspapermen "uniquely fitted by demonstrated competence, successful experience and earned respect to aid in carrying forward the traditions which have so long characterized" the paper.

Plenty of Water, Few Good Places To Swim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, as the swimming season gets underway in my district which borders Lake Erie, I would like to point out a dilemma which faces State and local health officials. Marshall Brown, staff writer for the Buffalo Courier Express, has written an excellent article outlining the problem of keeping beaches free from water pollution during the summer months. The fact of the matter is that Erie County really does not have a "safe" beach and it looks like the problem will be worse in years to come. Since coming to Congress in January, my main efforts have been directed in trying to seek new solutions for these problems of water pollution. I have stressed—and will continue to stress that cleaning up Lake Erie will require a massive effort at all levels of government. On June 17, the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Water Pollution, headed by Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, will hold hearings on these problems. I believe the Federal Government is moving ahead on attacking water pollution problems. These hearings will provide an excellent opportunity for Niagara frontier communities to make the case for increased Federal-State-local partnership in this area.

Mr. Brown's article appears as follows:

PLENTY OF WATER, FEW GOOD PLACES TO SWIM—POLLUTION BLAMED

(By Marshall Brown)

"Water, water everywhere, but scarcely a decent public place to swim."

That is the lament of many western New Yorkers who live near two of the largest lakes in the world, but who for reasons natural and man-made, must journey to Canada to find a sandy beach with clean water.

The fact is that only 10 miles—2 percent—of the 402 miles of shoreline of lakes Erie and Ontario in New York State have been developed for public recreation.

The ratio applies to the shoreline of both lakes in Chautauqua, Erie, Niagara, and Orleans Counties. Of 150 miles of shoreline, about 3 miles have been set aside for public recreation. And many of the swimming areas leave much to be desired.

"Let's face it, the good swimming is on the Canadian side of the lakes," Ralph M. Barnes, Erie County planning commissioner, told the Courier-Express.

He said prevailing winds and currents contribute to beach buildup on the north (Canadian) shores.

"The south shore of Lake Erie has never built up a decent beach," he said. He added that his planning division is not contemplating development of the shore for future recreational purposes. Instead, he said, western New Yorkers must develop multipurpose water resources inland—lakes in county parks, and reservoirs for flood control, drinking water, swimming, boating, and fishing.

COMPLACENCY BLAMED BY CONSERVATIONIST

While agreeing with Barnes about development of inland waters, Stanley P. Spisiak, chairman of the State conservation council's water resources committee, does not agree with Barnes on the reasons for the ruination of Lake Erie beaches.

He recalled that as a young man he found Lake Erie beaches in Erie County "so crowded that you couldn't find a place to lay your blanket down."

Belated conservation and complacency about pollution ruined Lake Erie's beaches on the south shore, Spisiak said.

The south shore had a number of "wonderful beaches," he said, but they were destroyed by sand and gravel companies which were permitted to operate on the shore until 1940. Federal law put a stop to the commercial operations, he noted.

As for pollution, Spisiak asserted: "I would not swim at any beach between Buffalo and Pennsylvania line unless I had a chemist and a weatherman at my side."

The chemist, he said, would be needed to measure the extent of pollution in the water. If the water proved fit for swimming, the weatherman would be needed to interpret weather factors which could bring pollution to the beach from nearby sources.

Health officials in Erie and Chautauqua Counties concede that most of the public beaches in use now are subject to high levels of pollution.

SAFEGUARDS CITED BY HEALTH OFFICIALS

They maintain it would be unfair to close popular beaches for the summer solely because the beaches are liable to become polluted on certain days. The health officials argue that testing the water, inspecting the beaches for signs of pollution and checking possible sources of pollution serve to safeguard the public.

In the same breath, however, the officials complain their departments ar understaffed and overworked. They concede that it is pos-

sible that pollution might be discovered at some beaches only after a lot of swimmers became ill.

Yet Lyle D. Franzen, Chautauqua County health commissioner, said that "people would swim in worse water" if beaches, licensed by the department, were closed for the season because of possible contamination. Many creeks are heavily polluted, he said.

Franzen's view is shared by Michael J. Stankewich, environmental health director in Erie County.

"People will swim anyway," he said, "they don't care about what our department says."

He believes it's safer to swim where there is at least some inspection and control by health authorities.

LACK OF MANPOWER TO LIMIT TESTING

He added that manpower shortages will prevent his department from making the rigorous checks it made last year. He said beach operators in Hamburg, where there was pollution trouble last year, will be advised to close the beaches if the water becomes turbid (cloudy).

"I wouldn't advise swimming during or after a heavy rain," Stankewich said. He noted that rain swells creeks and the runoff, including untreated wastes, flows into the lake at far above the normal rate.

Stankewich said his men will concentrate this year on beaches that yielded high coliform bacteria counts during tests last year. The coliform test gives an indication of the level of bacteria found in human and animal excrement. If the count in a series of 10 tests averages 2,400 or under, the water is considered suitable for swimming, provided also that no illness erupts, there is no evidence of sewage on the beach and no pollution outlets are emptying directly into the swimming area.

Under these conditions, the Erie County Health Department has allowed swimming at Hamburg Town Park Beach, Town of Evans Beach, the city of Buffalo's Bennett Beach in Evans, Evangola State Park Beach in Evans and Brant, Miller's Beach in Brant, all on Lake Erie, and Beaver Island State Park's Beach on the Niagara River.

The health department closed Hamburg Town Park Beach for several days last August when coliform tests revealed counts as high as 200,000 (on August 17). Bear in mind that along with other factors, the "safe" count is 2,400 or less.

Stankewich said remedial work involving diversion of sewage from the Mount Vernon treatment plant, which was overloaded, should curtail pollution this year.

Beaches that were not closed turned in some high coliform counts on individual days, but the average counts were well under 2,400. Some of the highs last year were 45,000 at Beaver Island Beach, 25,000 at Miller's Beach, 25,000 at Town of Evans Beach, 7,500 at Evangola Beach, and 4,500 at Bennett Beach.

SCARES OVERRATED, SAY HEALTH OFFICIALS

The Chautauqua County Health Department, for the same reason, will permit beaches to open next month, even though some of them were closed by local health authorities for periods last year and in previous years.

Dr. Franzen and Leonard Facciani, director of environmental health for the county unit, which began operating January 1, said the pollution scares were overrated. The officials cited closings at two city of Dunkirk beaches, other lake beaches, and Jamestown's municipal beach in Chautauqua Lake.

Facciani said each of the beaches bear watching, but he said they should not be closed for long periods on the basis of "unprofessional tests." He said he has made sanitary surveys of Lake Erie and Chautauqua Lake beaches and all appear to be suitable for swimming. He said routine checks will be made later this year.

In spite of Facciani's assurances, Dunkirk's Mayor Joseph J. Steger said a city chemist will test water daily at the city's two public beaches. He noted the city has undertaken measures to divert sewage from the lake but he said sewage is entering the lake from sources outside the city limits.

"We feel badly about the pollution," he said, "but the people have brought it on themselves. And it will take 15 to 20 years before we'll be able to get the water back to the condition where we'll feel completely safe."

Eugene Seebald, assistant commissioner for environmental health in Niagara County, said he has found no reason to withhold beach permits on the basis of pollution in Lake Ontario. He said a pollution scare which caused the closing of Olcott Beach several years ago was unjustified.

CREEK POSES THREAT ON STORMY DAYS

Polluted 18 Mile Creek empties into the lake several hundred yards west of the beach, which is the only public beach for swimming in the county. But Seebald said the pollution does not enter the swimming area because of natural and manmade barriers, including long concrete piers. Again, turbulent weather conditions can pose a beach pollution problem and therefore surveillance must be maintained, Seebald said.

He and Keith R. Hopkins, supervisor of park operations for the Niagara Frontier State Parks Commission, attribute the dearth of public beaches along Lake Ontario to natural factors. Among them are shore erosion, rock and stone instead of sand in offshore waters, and the deep lake's notoriously cold temperatures.

Health officials are reluctant to approve creeks and rivers for swimming for two reasons—the rate of flow is slow during the swimming season and pollution is apt to build up and most of the swimming holes are not supervised.

"We've lost a lot more people by drowning than by pollution," Seebald said.

Spisiak, the conservationist, chuckled at the health officials' view that swimming near sources of pollution is okay if routine checks are made.

"What about the periods between the checks?" he asked. "I value my health to the degree that I would not jeopardize it and make it dependent on the vagaries of weather conditions."

He also questioned the health departments' confidence that people will report they have been made ill by swimming in suspect water.

He doubts that most adults or children would ascribe upset stomachs, ear aches, eye infections, skin rashes, and colds to swimming a few days earlier.

"These are definite cases which might be traceable to swimming in polluted water," he asserted.

What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, each year the rural youth of Nebraska compete in a very worthwhile essay contest sponsored by the Nebraska Rural Electric Association. These young people are asked to write essays on "What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community." The winners of this essay contest take part in a Youth Tour to Washington each year to see our treasured democratic form of Government in operation.

It is a real honor to be able to include four of these prize winning essays in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope my distinguished colleagues and the people of the United States will find them as interesting and informative as I did:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND THE VALUE OF ELECTRICITY IN THE HOME AND ON THE FARM

(By Judy Curtis; age 17; grade, junior; school, Palisade Public School; name of father, Charles Curtis, Palisade, Nebr. Contestant sponsored by the Southwest Public Power District, Palisade, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

"If everyone lit just one little candle what a bright world this would be." There is much truth in this but by merely substituting Thomas Edison's invention of the light bulb for the candle, can you imagine the brilliance this added to our drab earth.

So it began 30 years ago when the Rural Electrification Administration was created. These rural electric systems are locally owned, controlled, and operated by the people they serve. Members elect directors, who establish system policy.

In 1935, only 7.1 percent of the farms in Nebraska were receiving central station electric service. According to the census taken in 1954, 94.9 percent of all farms were being served.

Farm electrification has greatly increased the efficiency of the work, both around the farmstead and in the home. It has literally "lifted the load from the bended backs." Through the medium of light it promotes safety, increases work efficiency, and stimulates poultry and animal production. In the form of heat, electricity provides comfort and a supply of hot water.

In the form of power, electric energy has perhaps its widest applications. Through motors it drives conveyors and grain elevators, grinds feed, air cures grain and hay, insures automatic water supply, and refrigerates storages. Electric power has practically taken the place of the farm gas engine and the hand crank.

In the home the silent servant not only heats and cools the home but washes and dries clothes, cooks meals, washes dishes, and cleans floors. This is bound to result in a happier homelife, for the timesaving devices, provides for more leisure time together which proves we live better electrically.

Although the Rural Electrification Administration has progressed immensely since its origin, the extent of its progress is still unlimited.

For example, electricity, which was produced by dammed rivers, steam, and other such methods, that seem somewhat primitive now that we have moved into the atomic age, is now being manufactured by the atom in plants such as the one located in Hallam, Nebr. By harnessing this power, which was originally intended to destroy human lives, we are now using a lethal weapon for peaceful purposes, proving once again we "live better electrically."

This advancement of the invisible power by the atom is proof that the public power companies are not resting on past laurels but are keeping abreast of the times.

And may I say, the farmer, above all, should be eternally grateful for the inspiration which caused Benjamin Franklin to "go fly a kite."

PLATTE VALLEY ADVANCES THROUGH RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

(By David T. Scharff; age, 15; grade, sophomore, St. Bonaventure High School, Columbus, Nebr.; name of father, Paul E. Scharff, Route 3, Box 131, Columbus, Nebr. Contestant sponsored by the Cornhuskers Public Power District, Columbus, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

The late Senator George Norris, father of REA, would be amazed if he were alive today to see the many uses of electricity on the farms of his native State. In his autobiography, "Fighting Liberal" (1945), he wrote, "The farmers of the United States should have the benefit of cheap electricity. Fundamentally, I felt the farmer would become a more satisfactory consumer of electricity than the city individual. His needs were greater. On the farm there would be all of the applications of electricity that the city dweller made—with many additional requirements."

In the beginning, farms were wired for electricity primarily for more convenient lighting and, in some cases, heating. A farmhouse equipped with electric lights was considered to be an extraordinarily luxurious one. Now, however, entire farms are wired to provide efficient, laborsaving methods of doing work on the farm. Farm electrification is no longer a luxury—it is the No. 1 necessity.

Today farms must produce on a large scale. Never has the urban population been so large and the rural population so small. Every farm must be operated at top efficiency. Electricity is the main source which makes this possible.

Our Platte Valley has the best farmland in our State and is producing top yields because of water brought to the fields from electrically powered irrigation pumps. Great amounts of feed are vital to feedlot and dairy operations. These irrigated fields produce it. Electric grain drying and handling equipment is also vital to these operations. Electric-powered feeding equipment enables Nebraska feeders to market astounding numbers of livestock to provide meat for the Nation and the world. Electric milkers, refrigerated bulk tanks, and separators have made Platte Valley farms leaders in the grade A dairy industry.

Electric welders, drills, power saws, etc., help farmers to keep their equipment up to peak performance at a low cost. Electric mercury vapor yard lights discourage prowlers and illuminate feedlots at a cost of pennies a week.

Farmers are fortunate that the farsighted Senator Norris and other Congressmen and executives had the initiative to create the REA. It has proven to be far more successful than they hoped. It has brought farmers an efficient, economical means of production, besides giving them comfortable homes with labor saving appliances. Electric heating and airconditioning provides good farm living all the year around. Platte Valley farmers, with electric stoves, refrigerators, deep-freezes, TV's, etc., are able to live as well—or better—than city people.

Never before have farmers been able to live as well as they do now—because of electricity. Never before have so few farmers been able to produce such quantity and quality to support such a large number of consumers as farmers do now—because of electricity.

More people are leaving the farm each year. Fewer farmers are left to feed the growing population. They need more and better equipment to do this. Progressives in the manufacturing companies—like those in Columbus—realize these needs. They are constantly producing new and better equipment to enable farmers to increase capacity. These teamed up with the REA are making the farms of America and especially our Platte Valley able to produce at peak capacity. Senator Norris would find it hard to believe how far beyond his dream cheap electricity has taken the farmer of Nebraska.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Barry Bruns, age 16; sophomore, Duell County High School; name of father, Dale Bruns, Chappell, Nebr.; contestant sponsored by the Wheatbelt Public Power District, Sidney, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

Electricity is helping the farmer fulfill his role in our modern society. Without electricity, it is doubtful whether the farmers of this Nation could continue to supply enough food for the growing population, and the Nation as a whole would be weaker.

The farmers are absolutely essential to the communities where they live. The businesses in these communities sell their goods to the farmer, and in many cases, as grocery stores, the farmer may supply the business with goods for sale to the common customers. This interdependence keeps rural communities the prosperous communities that they are.

Electricity supplied by the rural electrification companies is indeed one of the most important commodities that keeps the farmers so modern and efficient. This electricity speeds and increases production on the farm. It allows the dairy farmer to milk more cows in less time and at a smaller cost than was possible before electricity. The farmer that raises a beef cattle herd finds that he can use electric devices to mix feed rations faster and more exactly than ever before. Because of this he can feed more cattle with less waste. This same electricity pumps the water needed by the farmer's stock automatically and dependably. The grain raised on the farm can be moved effortlessly by electricity; the same electricity that enables a farmer to salvage an otherwise lost crop by drying it to a moisture level that allows safe storage.

Today's farm families would be lost without the conveniences provided by electricity in the home. This same versatile electricity that helps the farmer earn his yearly income helps him live comfortably and healthfully.

It heats his water, stores his food for indefinite periods of time, cooks his food, lights, heats, and cools his home, brings him up to the minute reports on the all-important weather, market reports, and the news. And these are only a few of the wonderful current's uses.

It is easy to see how anything that benefits the farmer benefits his community, State, and Nation; and I can think of no other thing that benefits the farmer more, or on such a broad scope, as rural electrification.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND THE VALUE OF ELECTRICITY IN THE HOME AND ON THE FARM

(By Dan Goodenberger; age 16; junior, Trenton High School; name of father, Marvin Goodenberger, Trenton, Nebr.; sponsored by the Southwest Public Power District, Palisade, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

(From a speech by Senator John Smith before the unicameral)

Fellow legislators, the planning committee for the new State archives building has asked us to decide what one factor has played the most significant role in the history and development of Nebraska. A suitable symbol of this influential element is to be placed in the entrance hall of the museum. I would like to propose for this body's consideration the familiar power pole which represents the REA. Why do I think it is so important? Let me explain.

Before REA the farmer was a slave to his land. He lived and died there, knowing all of the sweat and drudgery and few of the joys of life. All his work was accomplished by the strength of his body or with the help of draft animals. His wife's lot was no better. She toiled over her washboard and wood stove endlessly. They worked from dawn to dark, and their day usually ended with sunset because of the expense and general inefficiency of coal-oil lamps. In short, modern man was farming with medieval methods, and the farmer was becoming a second-class citizen in comparison to his city brother.

But in 1935 the outlook for the farmer began to brighten. By Executive Order No. 7037, the REA was formed. The founding of the organization was due largely to the foresight and vision of one man, Morris L. Cooke, who later became first administrator for the project. However, when it became clear that commercial companies wanted nothing to do with providing electric power for farmers, it was obvious that the project needed legislative help. At that time bills were introduced in Congress by Representative Sam Rayburn and our own Senator George Norris. The passage of these bills provided Government loans for construction of electrical facilities. This led to the successful electrification of the rural areas of our Nation, including Nebraska.

The results of rural electrification exceeded its promoters' fondest hopes. Many of its detractors had gloomily predicted failure of the project, for, as they said, how could farm families use enough electricity to make electrification profitable? Well, the farmers showed them. In no time at all they were using considerably more electrical power than urban consumers. And what a host of benefits it has brought them. Clean, bright electric lighting was a welcome improvement. Electric irons and washing machines made washdays less of an ordeal. Radios brought weather and market reports, entertainment, and contact with the outside world. Electric water pumps, refrigeration, air conditioning, cooking appliances—all these improved household conditions. Out in the barnyard electric motors began to be used for many jobs formerly done by muscle power—everything from augering grain to to milking cows. Farmers found that irrigation with electric motors increased crop production. Brood lamps for small animals such as chickens and pigs came into use as farmers discovered that this reduced the percentage of animal losses. Electrification really lightened the workload of the farmer and made farming more efficient and profitable.

But the REA program did more for our Nation than simply making life easier for the rural family. It created a demand for electric equipment which opened new jobs and played a large part in freeing this country from the grip of the depression.

Ask yourself what it would mean to individual Nebraskans and to our whole economy if the REA pole and all it represents were removed from our past, our present, and our future, and you will realize why I deem this symbol our logical choice.

Fifty Thousand Jobs Available in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 500,000 people on the wel-

fare rolls in New York City. Not all of them are adults and not all of those who are adults are able to work. A large number of the adults, however, are capable of working and according to New York City's acting commissioner of labor there are 50,000 jobs available.

The following article from the June 1, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune describes where those jobs can be applied for:

HOW TO FIND ONE OF THOSE 50,000 JOBS

(By Newton H. Fulbright)

Job opportunities in abundance. Fifty thousand jobs going begging in the city for lack of skilled or semiskilled workers. Youth jobs, summer vacation jobs. Permanent jobs for the heads of families now on relief—jobs paying $100 to $200 a week.

This rosy employment picture—with a promise of aid in job training—has been offered in recent days by the city's acting commissioner of labor, James J. McFadden.

Where does one apply?

Mr. McFadden had some enlightening comment yesterday on this and on job training.

Three years ago, after a telephone call to the Army's job training center, he hit upon an idea for training the unskilled.

"I got to thinking," Mr. McFadden said, "if the Army could train a man for almost anything in 7 weeks, why couldn't the city do it in 14 weeks? We are getting started, and I believe we have something."

But first, where should the applicant go?

SUMMER WORK

Students interested in summer work, who cannot locate a job themselves, are instructed to bring a brief résumé of their background and qualifications to the city's department of labor, 93 Worth Street, fifth floor, just west of Broadway. The office is within walking distance of the IND subway, Chambers Street station, or the Franklin Street station, of the West Side JRT.

Telephone numbers are 566-4862 or 566-4863.

"The résumés save time," Mr. McFadden said. We can tell what a student can do—we may have just the job. Typing, for instance. If a student can type 40 words a minute, we can probably recommend a job. If the student can type, say 75 words, we have jobs paying real money.

"One of the biggest demands in this city is for secretaries. If a girl can type and take dictation, we can send her right out. But we have found from experience that when someone tells us they can type, it does not necessarily mean they can type professionally—fast enough to hold a job.

"So we give tests right here in the office. But any student who comes here, we will try to find him a job. There are plenty of jobs—that is not the problem. The problem is finding people qualified to do the work."

The adult training program helps solve that problem—it trains men to do the work.

The city, in cooperation with the Port of New York Authority, is opening a training program next Monday for six categories—from truck driving to gardening. For anybody wanting to apply, here are Mr. McFadden's instructions:

Go to the Hudson Terminal Building, 30 Church Street. Signs in the building direct job training applicants to a second floor office, where a labor department receptionist will take applicants in tow. (Applicants living in Brooklyn and parts of Queens may go to a similar office at 1178 Fulton Street, Brooklyn.)

"The Port of New York Authority," Mr. McFadden said, "has one of the best training schools in the country. IBM is one private company with a training program. And with the telephone company—they have training programs for their employees—you can go on to get a Ph. D. if you want one."

Mr. McFadden insisted that he was on the conservative side when he said 50,000 skilled and semiskilled jobs were going begging in the city.

"Actually," he said, "it's more like 150,000, but I didn't want to sound too optimistic."

He listed jobs such as general repair, which will be one of the subjects taught at the port authority 2-month school; tailoring, cobbling, television repairing, and air-conditioning repair and installation.

One of the toughest problems, Mr. McFodden said, has been to find jobs for people of 45 and above. Many such people, he said, are skilled but new companies are reluctant to hire them because they would be eligible for pension and retirement funds relatively quickly.

COOPERATION

Mr. McFadden said his office was working on this problem "in our retired workers job center." "Since February," he said, "we have placed about 750 people in part-time work. These are people who retired, or maybe they got squeezed out of a job because the company they worked for went out of business."

He said the department of labor had found many companies in the city that could use part-time workers and had agreed to cooperate.

"I am convinced," he said, "we could do a lot more in this field with publicity and the exchange of information on both sides. Companies could use part-time workers, and we want to explore and develop these opportunities. We're just scratching the surface in this thing."

Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6400, the so-called voting rights bill, will soon be on the floor for consideration by the House of Representatives.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary I have joined with my colleagues, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. JOHN DOWDY, and the gentleman from South Carolina, Hon. ROBERT T. ASHMORE, in preparing and filing minority views. I ask unanimous consent that this statement of our views be made a part of the Appendix of the RECORD.

MINORITY VIEWS OF BASIL L. WHITENER, JOHN DOWDY, AND ROBERT T. ASHMORE, MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON H.R. 6400

H.R. 6400 is a legislative proposal of questionable constitutionality but unquestioned harshness. It has been characterized by its author as "strong medicine."

As legislators under a sworn duty to support and defend the Constitution of the United States we are compelled to register our strong disagreement with the majority of our colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary. This compulsion results from our firm conviction that the majority of the committee would lead the Nation down a path of destruction of basic principles which have made our Nation the envy of the people throughout the world.

We recognize and applaud the provisions of the Constitution of the United States which guarantees to all qualified citizens the right to vote. We do not condone discriminatory practices of any type which would deprive a qualified American of this right. Our opposition to H.R. 6400 is strong, but it is not one whit stronger than our desire to see that the right of qualified persons to vote is protected within the framework of time-honored constitutional principles.

Thoughtful people in areas of the Nation other than those made the target of this iniquitous legislation have sounded a warning to the Congress. On March 22, 1965, the Wall Street Journal discussed the legislation in an editorial entitled "An Immoral Law." This editorial so clearly registers our views that we quote its full text at this point:

"AN IMMORAL LAW

"When President Johnson last Monday asked Congress for a new law to safeguard the voting rights of Negro citizens he rested his case on the Constitution and on a basic principle of morality.

"What he has now proposed that the Congress do is enact a law which would violate that Constitution he asks us not to flout and, more, which is itself immoral.

"If you think not so, consider:

"The administration's bill offers a formula—a complicated one, which we will come to in a moment—to prohibit certain States from using any test of a citizen's ability to read and write our language as a qualification for voting.

"The argument for doing this is the 15th amendment to the Constitution which provides, clearly enough, that neither the Federal Government nor any State shall deprive a citizen of his vote "on account of" his race or color.

"But the proposed bill does not stop with providing means against the violation of the 15th amendment. It does not aim at insuring that any such State literacy test shall be fairly drawn and impartially administered so that it may not be used as an excuse to deprive anyone of his vote "on account of" his race.

"The effect—and indeed the purpose—would be to abolish such tests entirely in the affacted States. And that flies squarely in the face of this selfsame Constitution which the President professes to uphold.

"The very first article of that Constitution authorizes the individual States to decide the qualifications of voters in both Federal and State elections, subject only to the proviso that whoever is deemed qualified to vote for "the most numerous branch of the State legislature" is automatically qualified to vote in Federal elections.

"Making this a State function was no casual decision. It was reaffirmed in identical language in the 17th amendment—adopted, incidentally, more than 40 years after the 15th amendment—which provided that all such qualifications should be impartially applied among all citizens.

"This principle in the Constitution has been repeatedly upheld and affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, not merely in dusty antiquity but as recently as 1959 by judges presently sitting upon that bench.

"Now we are well aware that there are a good many people, and perhaps the President is included, who oppose any literacy requirement. They say that a man's illiteracy is irrelevant to the question of having his judgment counted in public affairs. No man can quarrel with the right of such people to argue their case and, if persuasive, to alter the Constitution so as to prohibit them.

"But the requirement that voters be able to read and write is by no means restricted to those Southern States now the object of this special legislation. Many others—including New York State—require that qualification, as the Constitution entitle them to do.

"If it is immortal, as the President says, to deprive a qualified citizen of his right to vote 'under color of a literacy test,' is it moral to violate one part of the Constitution under the color of upholding another which is in nowise in conflict?

"Nor does the question end there, for what this bill propose to do is to set up a double standard. Some States would be permitted to keep their literacy requirement; others would not.

"The formula prescribed is that of a ratio between the number of persons of voting age within a State and the number of voters in an election. If 50 percent or more of the voting age inhabitants do vote, then the State is absolved. The Federal authorities will keep out, and the State may set its own qualifications for voters, including literacy tests; otherwise, no.

"This formula has been carefully devised so that in practice it is expected to apply only to six States—Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia. In these States the Federal authorities would not only have the right to supervise voter registration but to abolish the voter qualifications they don't like.

"A few moments' reflection on this formula will suggest such weird paradoxes, and the possibility of such strange discriminations, as to stagger the mind.

"A minor one is that a strict application of the formula would probably make it applicable to Alaska. However, a way has been devised to exempt it, which as much as anything suggests that the intent is not to write a general rule of law but to subject certain States to special laws.

"Not so minor, but certainly weird, is the provision that a person once registered as a voter by the Federal authorities will be stricken from the list if he fails to vote 'at least once during 3 consecutive years while listed.' In short, you have to vote or you can't.

"Of more consequence is the fact that if we have this law a citizen, white or Negro, can be entitled to a vote in Alabama no matter how illiterate he is or, for that matter, even if he is a moron. But if the same citizen, white or Negro, lives in New York State he will not be entitled to vote.

"This would create a truly ingenious paradox. The illiterate citizen, Negro or otherwise, would find himself with more 'rights' in Alabama and her five outcast sister States than in the great State of New York. More, the educational level of the voting citizens of Alabama, the low level of which is part of the general complaint against it by civil rights leaders, would be further reduced. And this by Federal sanction.

"Unfortunately, the irony is not funny. Beneath the paradox lies a serious question. Is it moral that our national laws should apply one rule to one State and another to another, requiring that the people of one State abolish qualifications for voters while the people of another State may uphold their standards?

"Nor is that the end of the consequences of that weird formula. Recall that it permits the Federal Government to put all this machinery in motion, the takeover of the whole voting procedure by Federal authorities, only when the voting percentage of a State falls below 50 percent of the voting-age population. If there was ever a device open to what President Johnson calls manipulation, this is it.

"So long as a State contrives that one-half of its adults vote, it is free of the formula. This will not be overlooked by ingenious men who can contrive many things when justice is measured by percentages.

"And this brings us to what we think is the fundamental immorality of this proposed law, unintentioned though it may be by those who drew it.

"Any citizen, white or Negro, has the right to be treated by the law like all other citizens. If he has to meet qualifications to vote—age or any other—they must be only the qualifications asked of all. If he qualifies like any other he has the right to vote and to deny him that right is to deny him what is inalienably his.

"It makes no difference whether 99 percent of his neighbors vote or whether only 20 percent do. It makes no difference whether he has voted in the last three elections, or in none at all before he presents himself at the polls. His right is to vote or not to vote as he pleases.

"That is the whole of the moral issue. And the whole duty of government, insofar as it touches this matter, is to see that all equally can exercise this right.

"The constitutional duty of the Federal Government is to see that this right is not abridged—anywhere, populous States or sparse States, Northern States or Southern States where many go to the polls or where few take the trouble to. The means of assuring this, everywhere, is what any Federal voting law ought to do, and all it ought to do.

"To play with complicated formulas, to measure justice by percentages, and to aim punitive laws at some States, not only violates both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution but buries the real moral question in sophistry."

Many outstanding legal scholars have expressed views in accord with the foregoing comment of the Wall Street Journal. One of those was the distinguished attorney general of the Commonwealth of Virginia who testified before Subcommittee No. 5 of our committee that the bill was "among the most dangerous pieces of legislation ever offered in the Congress of the United States. I make this statement advisedly, for I earnestly believe it goes further than any step yet attempted to erode the basic concepts of constitutional government in which the individual States are acknowledged to be sovereign. The legislation is not only patently unconstitutional, but it is shockingly discriminatory."

H.R. 6400 discriminates in an arbitrary and unjustifiable manner against States which are free of any racial discrimination in the conduct of elections by the use of the phony formula set forth in section 4(b) of the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. This formula makes the bill applicable to States and political subdivisions in which less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age were registered on November 1, 1964, or less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964. It further infringes upon the constitutional power of the States to require nondiscriminatory qualifications of voters.

The effort to establish by a simple mathematical stratagem a conclusive finding of fact that discrimination has occurred is without precedent in the legislative history of our country. If this strategem is accepted as a sound basis for legislating it is difficult to envision all of the disastrous consequences which may ensue in our Republic.

If by a strong medicine legislative action the Congress undertakes to strike down nondiscriminatory voter qualifications which have been, or may hereafter be, prescribed by the several States, such action will be inconsistent with decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

In *Lassiter* v. *Northampton County Board of Elections* (360 U.S. 45 (1959)), the Supreme Court said:

"The States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the right of suffrage may be exercised * * *. So while the right of suffrage is established and guaranteed by the Constitution * * * it is subject to the imposition of State standards which are not discriminatory and which do not contravene any restriction that Congress, acting pursuant to its constitutional powers, has imposed * * *. While section 2 of the 14th amendment, which provides for apportionment of Representatives among the States according to their respective numbers counting the whole number of persons in each State (except Indians not taxed) speaks of 'the right to vote,' the right protected 'refers to the right to vote as established by the laws and constitution of the State.' "

On March 8, 1965, in *Carrington* v. *Rush*, —— U.S. ——, the Court again stated:

"There can be no doubt either of the historic function of the States to establish, on a nondiscriminatory basis, and in accordance with the Constitution, other qualifications for the exercise of the franchise. Indeed, 'the States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the right of suffrage may be exercised * * *. In other words, the privilege to vote in a State is within the jurisdiction of the State itself, to be exercised as the State may direct, and upon such terms as to it may seem proper, provided, of course, no discrimination is made between individuals in violations of the Federal Constitution.' "

It will readily be seen that the U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that the several States are vested by our Constitution with the power to determine conditions governing the exercise of the right of suffrage and that the only limitation upon the States is that there must be an absence of discrimination in their electoral process. The proponents of the instant legislation now ask the Congress of the United States to disregard these fixed constitutional principles.

Section 10 of the committee amendment would prohibit a requirement by the States that a person "pay a poll tax or any other tax" as a prerequisite to participating in local elections. The majority of the committee contends that such requirements are in some way discriminatory as to certain voters on the basis of their race or color. This, to us, is an absurd conclusion even though we do recognize that such taxpaying requirements may constitute a hindrance to voting by certain individuals.

We cannot see, however, that the requirement of the payment of a poll tax or other tax as a prerequisite to voting in a State or local election can be equated with discrimination on the basis of race or color. In our judgment the race or color of an individual has no relationship whatever to his payment or nonpayment of poll taxes. There is no evidence before the committee that any political subdivision has ever barred any individual of any race or color from freely paying such taxes as are imposed by local government authority.

We further point out that in the 88th Congress it was the judgment of the Congress that in order to strike down the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections a constitutional amendment was necessary. It seems strange to us that some of the advocates of that constitutional amendment who agreed with us at that time now feel that the poll tax payment requirement for voting in local and State elections can be stricken down by statute.

It is our view that if a constitutional amendment was required in that instance the same requirement faces the Congress if it would strike down the poll tax requirement for local voting.

Section 3(c) presents another unconscionable legislative proposal. As far as we know it is unprecedented for Congress to suggest that the Attorney General of the United

States should have veto power over State legislation. This would be accomplished under the terms of the bill by providing that the Attorney General would have 60 days within which to object to State legislation which provided a qualification, prerequisite, standard practice, or procedure, with reference to voting which was different from that in force and effect at the time a proceeding had been instituted by the Attorney General against a State or political subdivision in a voting rights case.

We unhesitatingly condemn this proposal. We affirm our strong conviction that no nonjudicial Federal official should be given the arbitrary power to nullify legislative action by the duly elected representatives of the people in any State or political subdivision.

Another unpalatable provision of the committee bill is contained in section 5. This would require that a State or political subdivision would have no tribunal to which it could resort other than the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. The Federal courts in all other districts other than the District of Columbia would be barred to any State or political subdivision falling within the "50-percent formula" which sought to have a legal determination as to the validity of its electoral procedures.

This requirement places an undue hardship upon the local governments involved and constitutes an expression of lack of congressional confidence in the willingness and ability of Federal courts outside the District of Columbia to sit in judgment in cases of this type. We are astounded that such a proposal would be advanced by the Attorney General of the United States and ratified by the great Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill in its entirety is an example of gross discrimination against a few of the sovereign States of the Union. It was deliberately designed to have unequal application as between the several States. That alone is sufficient to condemn it.

During the course of the debate in the House of Representatives it is contemplated that there will be an opportunity to offer amendments which will eliminate some of the provisions of the committee bill. There will be amendments offered which will seek to add new matter to the legislation. It is our fervent hope that this bad package of legislative proposals can be substantially amended in a way that would eliminate at least some of its bad features.

It will be our role to seek to improve the legislation. If this effort should fail we would urge that our colleagues assist us in providing the proper antidote to this constitutionally poisonous "strong medicine." The proper antidote is a defeat of the measure and an adherence to constitutional principles.

BASIL L. WHITENER.
JOHN DOWDY.
ROBERT T. ASHMORE.

Nebraska Rural Electric Association Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nebraska Rural Electric Association an- essay contest on rural electrification in electrification in Nebraska. This is one of the fine contributions to scholarship by this organization and the winning essays invariably indicate keen insights into the role of public power and the rural electric cooperatives in Nebraska.

Because of the high quality of these essays they deserve the widest possible audience and I include the essays of the following students in the RECORD: Miss Jo Ann Weber, Madison, Nebr.; Miss Bonnie Krol, Stromsburg, Nebr.; Miss Margaret Ekstein, Dwight, Nebr.; and Miss Mary Odland, Meadow Grove, Nebr.:

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME

(By Margaret Ekstein, age 17, junior, Aquinas High School, David City, Nebr. Father's name: Frank C. Ekstein, Dwight, Nebr. Contestant sponsored by the Butler County Rural Public Power District, David City, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

What does rural electrification mean to me? Up to now, I have never thought about electrification as anything more than some sort of power running through wires. Being born into the age of electricity, it seems I have taken electricity for granted. I was 2 when the electric line first reached our farm in 1949, and I can't remember life without electricity. It has been so much an everyday part of my life, that I cannot imagine what life would be like without it. It doesn't even seem possible that as late as 15 years ago, there wasn't any easy flip of the switch when you wanted light.

It takes a blackout to make me realize how our parents lived without electricity. Out of storage come the old candlesticks and oil lamps. Water must be pumped and brought in.

This makes one realize the hardship and work the last generation had to undergo to make a living. Who can imagine a world without refrigeration? This means no stored meat, good cold drinks, or other refrigerated foods. Jobs like washing and ironing clothes must have been a drudgery to grandmother. Our parents could find no relaxation through television and radio. The family found that there was no time for fun. They worked from sunrise to sunset.

However, since rural electrification started 15 years ago, great progress has been made. In these few short years, electrification has creeped in even to the most isolated spots. Also, it is used everywhere, from Mother's kitchen to Dad's workbench. At this time, almost all buildings are wired for light.

I have in my own life seen the changes caused by electricity. Much has been done in the way of research to make it possible to have instant light at the flip of a switch and immediate enjoyment by the turning of a knob. Through modern scientific research, we may soon be discovering new and unheard of ways to use electric power.

Electricity has become the hub and center of all farm life. It has proved to be the necessary basis of our whole life. Electricity, above all else, is the one factor that keeps farms growing, and prevents them from dying out.

Were it not for the benefits of electricity, the already poor state of farmers would be pathetic. There would be no question as to where the money for President Johnson's war on poverty would go.

There is still another aspect of the wonders which electricity works. Because it is time-saving, it lets the farmer and his wife attend social affairs which were not possible for their parents. They are able to join their community in projects which help to better that community for more enjoyable living.

I come back to the opening question, "What does rural electrification mean to me?" To me personally, rural electrification means the source of power to make a fuller and more enjoyable life. And so, I fervently hope, it shall continue on through future generations, making it possible for better living through electricity.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

(By Bonnie Krol, age 17, junior, Stromsburg High School. Father's name: Victor Krol, Stromsburg, Nebr. Contestant sponsored by the Polk County Rural Public Power District, Stromsburg, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

As the day is dying in the west, it sure is nice to have our new mercury light go on automatically. After supper is cooked on our electric range everyone can settle down to a comfortable evening in front of the television set. Now the ladies of the family don't worry about dishpan hands anymore, because of the newest addition to the family: the dishwasher. When the 10 o'clock news is over, the problem of a cold bed is solved by pushing the button on the electric blanket.

This average evening at home would not have been as convenient or comfortable, if President Roosevelt would not have established the Rural Electrification Administration in 1935. The REA does not construct, own, or operate the electric facilities it finances, but instead lends money to various companies and associations. This made it possible to establish power districts such as ours.

What great progress this organization has made since then. For in Nebraska in 1935 only 7 percent of the farms had the convenience of electricity and now more than 95 percent are supplied with electricity.

This means a great deal to me and all my neighbors. I have never had to do the chores in the dark, haul cobs for the stove, or pump water by hand, because since 1938, when Rural Electrification was first established in our country, the lights go on at dark, stoves are electric and a flip of a switch starts the water pump. I'm sure that if I ever had to do these things I would appreciate Rural Electrification much more, but I appreciate it because it is so convenient.

I have used the words "Rural Electrification" many times. These words mean many more things. For example the "R" in rural might mean ready and reliable. The work crews are always there ready and willing to come to your farm home in case of any emergency. In a storm when lightning causes a power failure their services are really appreciated. "R" also represents rapid. The crews are rapid in everything they do whether it is an emergency or just daily business. To me this is one of its finest qualities because waiting isn't very pleasant.

Next the "E" in electrification symbolizes efficiency. Every job is made more efficient by Rural Electrification, whether it be in the home, the barn, the shop, or in the field with the irrigation pump. "E" also represents the effort that is put into each job. If it had not have been for effort, Rural Electrification would not have been brought into Polk County so early and made life a bit easier.

In these few words I have tried to express the role Rural Electrification plays in my life and the life of all people who live in rural America. It is difficult to express my gratitude and appreciation to the leaders of this organization which makes such a wonderful world of light and convenience.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION—"THE GREAT EMANCIPATOR"

(By Jo Ann Weber, age 17, junior, Madison High School. Father's name: Art Weber, Madison, Nebr. Contestant sponsored by the Stanton County Public Power District, Stanton, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

Rural electrification has proven to be the Abraham Lincoln of my county as well as other farm communities. It was the birth

of a new freedom to Stanton County and all rural America. No longer are we slaves to darkness, drudgery, and endless toil. We are no longer chained to the immedicable hardships of farm life.

Since its inception 35 years ago, the benefits have multiplied so rapidly that its success is immeasurable. The revolutionary changes in every basic necessity of life are felt most acutely by our farm families. No longer does today's farm wife have to look with envy at her city friends' conveniences. Our homes are just as comfortable and attractive as those of the city dwellers. Perhaps it can be said that today our way of life is envied by the city residents, as indicated by the influx moving to the suburbs. They are clamoring for the space, privacy, and fresh air that we have in abundance plus all the advantages that electricity makes possible.

The speed with which our farms were wired for electricity was due to its low cost. Even today, while the price of nearly every commodity is rising, our electric rates remain low and in some instances are being lowered. It is the most economical service available and the farmers put it to work for them to cut the cost-price squeeze. Our Nation is rapidly becoming automated and thanks to our electrical power the farmers in my community are able to keep pace with the trend. It makes them more efficient and thus they are able to enlarge and diversify their farming and dairy operations with increased returns on their investments.

A specific example of electricity serving my community is the repair shop of a skilled machinist. With his ingenious know-how and complete line of power-equipped tools, he is able to build and repair our machinery at a cost much below city charges.

Rural electrification is beneficial to us culturally as well as physically. It has greatly improved our rural educational institutions due to well-heated and lighted classrooms. Radio and television provide excellent educational material. With more leisure, farm families have an opportunity to keep abreast with worldwide happenings and develop their cultural interests.

We are assured of a constant, dependable source of power by our Stanton County Public Power District. We have complete confidence that power will be restored as quickly as possible in time of power failure. We owe a great deal to the diligent workers of the past and to those who serve us today. The Stanton County Public Power District has made our county a modern rural community of which we can all be proud.

We will continue to make even greater use of this freedom which grows and grows.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

(By Mary Odland, age 17, junior, Meadow Grove High School. Father's name: O. M. Odland, Rural Route 1, Meadow Grove, Nebr. Contestant sponsored by the Elkhorn Rural Public Power District, Battle Creek, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

Benjamin Franklin made history when he discovered electricity and a new era was started when a small group of men had the foresight and the initiative to carry through their dream of supplying rural America with electrical power. This project is a benefit to every member of my family and to practically every member of my community, for 98 percent of the American farms have electric service. It performs some 400 tasks that were formerly accomplished by manual or animal labor.

The "whether" has been taken out of farming with the electrically controlled irrigation system assuring the proper amount of moisture at the proper time. Electric operated machinery dry the hay and silage and grind the feed for livestock feeding. Use of welders and shop equipment have made former costly time-consuming trips to town unnecessary. This all adds up to the farmers' satisfaction of a days work well done, and he has enough energy left to take part in outside activities and community projects.

No longer can the city folks look upon the farm home with disfavor as the rural homemaker has every convenience that urban cousins enjoy, plus the serenity that only comes with country living. She knows that her family will be well and nutritiously cared for with food prepared on her modern electric range—food that in many instances had been previously prepared and safely stored in her deep freeze or refrigerator. Every day is a "good wash day" with the electric washer and dryer to simplify the task. The family is healthier than those of a generation ago with controlled electric heat, proper humidity, air conditioning and adequate lighting helping to make it so.

Teenagers may not remember the preelectric days but are appreciative of the many conveniences we now enjoy. Hair dryers, shavers, modern bathrooms all contribute to better grooming. Everyone knows that "it's impossible, utterly impossible" to study without the sound of the record player soothing our nerves, and one must admit that junior gets much enjoyment and some weird and interesting tones out of his electrical guitar.

The television and radio has accomplished a great deal to bring our family closer together. We can sit in our country home and enjoy the Olympic Games in a foreign land, opera from the Metropolitan, and other forms of entertainment. News events are instantaneously brought into our home and one has a much better perspective and understanding of government affairs and of the pertinent happenings in this world and outer space. We are also warned of inclement weather and impending dangers.

Everyone in the community now has more time to attend meetings to plan and carry out projects that promote better relations among themselves and their city friends.

United States has always been a country unparalleled in progress and we're proud our agricultural community is one that has been able to keep pace and contribute to that progress—beginning the day rural electrification came into our lives.

It was indeed a happy day.

Commencement Address of Dr. Santha Rama Rau at Russell Sage College, Troy, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I had the pleasure of attending the commencement exercises at Russell Sage College at Troy, N.Y., and of sharing the day with Dr. Santha Rama Rau, of India, who, like myself, was honored by the college with an honorary degree of doctor of humane letters.

Dr. Rau's commencement address was one of the finest I have ever heard. I would, therefore, like to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

Dr. Rau's remarks were addressed to all the young people who are completing their schoolwork and moving on to positions of responsibility in the world. Dr. Rau pleaded with them to join wtih those of our generation in working for peace and progress in the world through better understanding of, and respect for, the peoples of different lands and different cultures.

I commend Dr. Rau for her sentiments and I share her view that the alternative to improved world understanding is war and destruction. As a member of the greatest legislative body in the world, the U.S. Congress—as an American—I have been working for such understanding between and among all peoples. I believe that such an understanding is essential to the attainment of the goals which our country has pursued consistently, and sometimes almost alone, on the world scene.

I am grieved at times at the lack of understanding—at home and abroad—of the objectives which we have pursued, and are pursuing, as a nation. We do not desire additional territories. We seek no domination over other peoples. We would welcome the opportunity to summon our boys back home from distant parts of the world. And we would like to use the resources which we are now compelled to expend for military purposes, to improve the living conditions of our own people and of those less fortunate than we. We want peace—peace with justice and freedom—not only for ourselves, but also for those in other lands who seek to work out their destinies in an atmosphere of peace and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my distinguished colleagues and others concerned about the future of our world, will read Dr. Rau's address.

The address follows:

RUSSELL SAGE COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

Mr. President, distinguished members of the faculty, honored guests, and more important than any of the others, you ladies and gentlemen who are graduating today from one of America's most eminent colleges, I know that the correct way to address a graduating class is to begin with pious reminders that the future is in your hands, that we older people rely, not unfortunately from choice, but from necessity on what you will and can make of what we innocently think of as our world.

Well, having got that necessary sentiment out of the way, let me now speak of the matters that interest me more than banal reiterations of old precepts.

Let me, for instance, remind you that while the world is shrinking in one way—in the sense that one can now travel in the briefest time from continent to continent—it is expanding in a far more important way. I call that way understanding.

There are other more erudite ways of describing what I mean, but I am talking about a matter of the heart and the individual intellect, not of sociological or economic theories.

Let me illustrate what I mean by a story I was once told. It went something like this: A traveled and expatriate American, living in Paris, met a friend from his hometown in America. Inevitably, the newcomer asked, "How do you like the French?"

"Oh, no. Too mercenary, too snobbish, interested in nothing but food * * *."

"Do you like the Germans?"

"The Germans? Goodness, no. Too heavy, too consumed with being the master race."

"The Italians?"

"Never, never. Feckless, improvident, no respect. All emotions."

"What about the British?"

"Impossible to like them. They are eaten up with class consciousness. Besides, they are reserved, old-fashioned, and they talk with a funny accent."

"The Russians?"

"All those deliberately smiling peasants photographed in front of new tractors? Such knuckling under to authoritarianism? Such rigidity of mind? No, certainly not."

At last, in despair, the friend asks, "Well, whom do you like?"

"Whom do I like? I like my friends, naturally."

Well, naturally, but how does one make friends? These days politicians, economists, sociologists, all tell us that we must "understand one another." They almost never tell us how to understand. Or indeed how to become friends. And with good reason. This is a matter of the human heart.

I hope that your years at Russell Sage have in the process of teaching you the humanities also instilled in you the value of the human heart. For "understanding" is not merely an exposure to facts, to knowledge—though knowledge is an indispensable help—it is much more a question of an attitude of mind, a willingness to occupy the uncertain, dangerous, but ultimately rewarding middle-ground that is the fundamental area of understanding, a habitable ground that is compatible with originality, yet founded on principle. The principle, for example, that I might cite, is that there is a right for everyone to live, where they agree or disagree with you, a ground where a climate of inquiry flourishes and where good sense and kindness prevail.

To me it is a remarkable and valuable fact that your commencement address is given by a woman who comes from half-a-world away from you. Between us we must put our mutual knowledge of the expanding and the shrinking world to use. I am very aware of the difference in our generations. Please believe me when, speaking as a mother, I tell you about a chilling moment when the telephone rings and some woman you have never met says, "This is Petie's mother, are you Jai's mother? Can Jai come for lunch on Saturday?" Well, when it happened to me, all of a sudden I was a generation older and realized that some child called Petie and my son were, in the not too far distant future, going to determine my life. And yours. They come from countries as distint as possible but they like each other. They are friends. Between them, on whatever basis, there is an understanding.

This is why I want to talk to you about understanding. It is not a question so much of whether politicians agree, because the people determine those politicians. It is not an expedient accord between nations, but a human accord between the people that make up those nations that seems to me important.

At one time I had the privilege of dramatizing a novel by an eminent English writer, E. M. Forster. His novel was called "A Passage to India," which I made into a play for Broadway. However, the thing that I remember best about him has nothing to do with his brilliant writing on the subject of my country. During the Second World War he made speeches from time to time on England's Government-controlled radio network, the BBC. This was a time when patriotism was very much an issue in England, a time when the European part of the Second World War was raising impenetrable barriers between nations, and when trouble, dissension, revolution in Britain's colonies and areas of its farflung empire made national affiliations exaggerately important. Yet it was precisely at this time that Mr. Forster chose to make what I think of as one of the most profound statements of our time. From a friend who heard this particular speech, I learned that he talked in a quiet, donnish, modest voice. He remarked—almost in passing—that if he had to choose between betraying his country and betraying his friend, he hoped he would have the courage to betray his country.

Although I hope that none of us are ever driven to such an extremity, I do feel that Mr. Forster's comment conveys to you the vital necessity of friendship, the fact that there are values that transcend national boundaries, the fact that people and their values are to be considered above conventional slogans. Briefly, then, this is a time to stop thinking in terms of countries or nationalities and to start talking of human values. It is indeed for these human values that your education at this college has trained you.

For this noble task both the West and East must be well equipped.

But how, anyone must legitimately ask, do we begin on the vast undertaking of—another eternal ambition which can only be stated in banal terms—of universal brotherhood? I don't know the answer, but I will be brash enough to suggest a few paths that have in their time been shortcuts to me. I am convinced, you see, that one cannot understand something one doesn't like and that one cannot like something one doesn't enjoy. So, although this may sound frivolous to you, I mean it seriously. Start by enjoying yourselves. But enjoy yourselves in a foreign territory.

I can use myself as an example in a small and admittedly absurd way. It is virtually impossible to believe, but I was quite good at mathematics when I was in school. These days I have the greatest trouble checking my son's homework in the new math. Still, I will remember forever reading Emily Brontë's "Wuthering Heights" at an English boarding school. Mathematics were required classwork, but the novels by the Brontës were read, illegally, with a flashlight under covers at night after "lights out." I don't suppose anyone will ever ask me to give a detailed picture of life in Haworth Parsonage more than a century ago. Nevertheless, it stays in my mind. Its record was read for pleasure. In a sense, a small but moving world was explained to me. Please search for such worlds yourselves. They are easy to enter and they will welcome you. They may even enlighten you.

A few years ago my husband and I had an opportunity of visiting Russia and I realized then that most of my information about that country came from literature I had read. Tolstoi, Dostoevski, Turgenev, Gogol, Chekhov had through novels, short stories, plays—even in translation—given me an insight into the society, ambience, way of thinking in Russia. They told me in part why Russians behaved like Russians. Do you see that what I am asking you to do is to use the arts in the same way to introduce yourselves to new worlds?

Dedicated as I am to literature, it seems natural to me to suggest first of all the same sort of reading, that is reading for pleasure, from my part of the world. I could just as easily give as an example the fact that dedicated capitalists in the United States paid a great deal of money for each ticket to see either the Bolshoi Ballet or the Moscow Arts Theater. It isn't merely snob value. Novels, plays, short stories, they do in fact explore the personalities and conditions of very foreign lands to make them accessible to you, give you an understanding and eventually a friendship with the people with whom you must in the end live if, indeed, we are all to live in one world.

Won't you, then, from hearing such remote people speak to you from their innermost beings, learn to regard them at least with trust in their honesty? Artists don't usually lie, not good artists, that is. And since the arts in their varying forms make up so much of the pleasure and entertainment of our life, they seem a relatively pleasant and appealing way to begin an understanding of and an affection for a foreign world.

Some years ago when I first traveled through the countries of Asia—a continent that holds more than half the population of the world—I found myself asking things that need to be called serious questions. This endeavor got me nowhere. People are understandably timid about discussing their private or even their public national lives. Why should they expose themselves to strangers, particularly to strangers that they cannot even be certain are trustworthy?

In many ways Asia knows much more about the West than the West knows about Asia. It has been a necessary condition because for something like 300 years we lived under colonialism. We had to know about you. The time has now come when the situation is changed and perhaps you have to know about us. I learned in nursery school in India that "A is for apple," in a part of the world where apples don't grow. Equally, I knew a distinguished old man in Indonesia who tried to establish the first schools in his country to have as a medium of instruction the Indonesian language. He was considered so dangerous that he had to be punished by the Dutch rulers of his country. It always seemed to me that his punishment was a rather quaint one—he was exiled to Holland.

It is from this atmosphere that I speak to you. Where we were compelled to learn about the West, much more than the West had ever had to learn about us, matters have now so changed that some kind of equality, if friendship and understanding are to be established, must be reached between the two sides of the world. I can give you another example. Even my mother, a generation older than I, educated entirely in India, which was still under British rule, would lull me to sleep with recitations from Shakespeare or—far more soporific—from Tennyson. When we first went to England I was only 6 years old and I remember my mother taking me to stand on Westminster Bridge in London and reciting the famous Wordsworth poem that begins with these lines:

"Earth has not anything to show more fair.
Dull would he be of soul who could pass by
A sight so touching in its majesty."

And we both stood and looked down at the muddy little Thames and wondered what it was all about. We were used to the grand Ganges, so wide in my mother's hometown, Allahabad, that you cannot see across the river.

Now that in a sense the tables are turned and if, for instance, you go to the United Nations General Assembly and look around at the famous horseshoe table, you will notice that most of the world is colored, comes from Asia or Africa, parts of the world that still seems too remote for comfort. Yet we must all live together and as friends, and obviously with some understanding of each other.

I have found that in the foreign countries I have visited, where I have asked about the arts of the nation, a totally different attitude has been shown by the people to whom I spoke, a freedom to express not only their pleasures and their joys which may be shared but also their problems and their worries, their day-to-day exacerbations which will emerge in plays, in films, in books, in any form of art—an attitude far removed from the responses to my earlier serious questions, the ones about politics and economics. It is for this reason that I suggest to you that art is a shortcut to what we are all searching for, an understanding between people

and a brotherhood that makes it possible for all of us to be friends. It has, after all, been said that art is mankind's most authentic record. To this I can only add that it is the quickest and the pleasantest introduction to another civilization—a necessary step in the building of a safe and trusting world.

I would like to close with a quotation from India's late Prime Minister Nehru. This comes from a speech which he made the night that our country became an independent republic. Bells were ringing, drums were beating, private houses and public buildings were decorated with lights. It was a joyful time, a festival. For us it was a very personal moment of achievement. For you I hope his words will convey some of the sense of the importance of arrival at a turning point in history when world understanding must be achieved since the alternative is war and destruction:

"Long years ago we made a tryst with destiny, and now comes a time when we shall redeem our pledge, not wholly or in full measure but very substantially * * *. At the stroke of the midnight hour, when the world sleeps, India will awake to life and freedom. A moment comes, which comes but rarely in history, when we step out from the old to the new, when an age ends, when the soul of a nation, long suppressed, finds utterance. It is fitting that at this solemn moment we take a pledge of dedication to the service of India and her people and to the still larger cause of humanity."

The Population Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, the National Research Council announced the publication of its booklet, "The Growth of U.S. Population," at a breakfast sponsored by the Planned Parenthood Foundation. This breakfast was attended by many Members of both Houses of Congress, adequate evidence of the rapidly growing interest of Members of this body in problems developing out of the population explosion.

Last week, the Department of Agriculture released a report entitled, "Increasing World Food Output" written by the noted economist, Lester R. Brown. This authoritative study calls attention to the frightening statistic that many countries are now faced with declining per capita food supplies, because their population is growing more rapidly than their ability to increase agricultural yields. This, more than ever points up the urgency of making available, to all who wish it, our increasing knowledge of family planning techniques.

This week we approved the foreign aid authorization, and I want to commend our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman Brown, for describing the programs which AID is willing to undertake in cooperation with governments requesting them. I should also like to note that strong support exists for legislation introduced by five other Members of the House.

For the benefit of Members interested, I include an excellent summary of the booklet on the world food crisis which appeared in the Washington Post on May 27:

UNITED STATES PESSIMISTIC ON WORLD FOOD CRISIS

(By Jean M. White, Washington Post staff writer)

The food shortages in the world's hungry countries are likely to get worse before they get better because there is little chance for a "yield takeoff" under present conditions.

An Agriculture Department report, just released, sees no realistic hope for a quick jump in food production in most of the underdeveloped lands, in which two-thirds of the world's population lives.

The food problems, the study emphasizes, is more involved than seeds, fertilizer, machinery, and modern farm technology.

Since the world is running out of new land to plow, the only answer for the land-scarce, less-developed countries is to raise their crop yields per acre.

But here these countries are handicapped by low literacy rates and low income levels without a market-oriented agriculture. Farmers who can't read are hard to reach with new farming methods, to be taught, for instance, that they can't keep hybrid corn seed from year to year. If they have to eat up 80 percent of their crop to subsist, they don't have money to invest in seeds, fertilizer, and the machines to increase the yield of their land.

"Food shortages emerging in the less-developed world are not due to a lack of technology but to the inability to apply existing technology as fast as current and projected rates of population growth require," the report observes.

Lester R. Brown, agricultural economist, who recently returned from a trip to India, is the author of "Increasing World Food Output."

He applies the "takeoff" concept, used by economist W. W. Rostow for income per person, to yield per acre.

As Brown sees it, there are four major "pre-take-off factors" for a sudden, sustained rise in peracre crop yields. These are a relatively high level of literacy, an income level to provide capital to invest in yield-raising capital inputs, a market-oriented agriculture, and support from the nonagricultural economy in such things as fertilizers, pesticides, and transportation.

The big jumps in yields in the last few decades have come chiefly in the developed regions. Between 1934–38 and 1960, grain yields in North America increased 109 percent. But in Asia, where food needs are much greater with a rapid population growth, they rose only 7 percent.

Before World War II, the less-developed countries of Asia, Africa, and South America were mostly exporters of grain. Now they no longer can grow enough food to feed their growing populations and are steadily losing ground in the race with expanding population.

India new needs 7 million tons of imported grain to feed its people. China needs 6 million tons. In his report, Brown warns that it will be "very difficult to establish a secure and lasting world order in a situation where the less-developed world continues to become increasingly dependent on concessional food shipments from the advanced countries."

And in the future, the notes, food shipments cannot account for more than a small part of the projected increase in food needs over the next several years. The solution, he emphasizes, must come from improving agriculture within the less-developed countries of the world.

Concealing Public Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, our democratic form of government is based on the belief in the right and the ability of the individual to govern himself. A democracy cannot function if the citizenry is uninformed as to what its government is doing or contemplating. As the following editorial of the Chicago Daily News, May 14, 1965, points out, the increasing restriction on information from departments and agencies of the Federal Government can no longer be tolerated. I share the hope expressed therein that the Congress will make clear the extent of legal authority of the Federal branch of our Government to withhold information from the public, from the press, and from the Congress, as proposed in pending bills, one of which, H.R. 5017, I have introduced for this purpose.

The article follows:

CONCEALING PUBLIC BUSINESS

The issue of secrecy in Government is under study in the U.S. Senate this week as a subcommittee hears testimony on Senate bill 1160, the freedom-of-information bill. The newspaper profession's interest in seeing the measure passed is prompted by a glaring flaw in the existing Administrative Procedure Act of 1946.

Section 3 of that act, aimed at prohibiting unwarranted secrecy within Federal regulatory agencies, actually provided Government officials with language under which they could secrete from public knowledge almost any information that might embarrass themselves or their superiors. "For good cause found" is an example of the ready excuses made available by the act. A politican unable to cook up a cause that at least seemed good to himself and his bosses would be unresourceful indeed. But if that were not adequate, the news suppressor could—under the law—find that the person making the request was not properly and directly concerned, or even that the public interest would be best served by sweeping the matter under the rug.

Any Washington newspaperman can cite innumerable examples of arbitrary and unwarranted secrecy by public officials performing public business. The great majority would testify that the practice has been growing more and more flagrant, particularly in the Defense Department. And while the national security has often been sanctimoniously invoked as the excuse, later disclosure has all too often revealed (in the words of Representative WILLIAM E. MINSHALL of Ohio) that "more times than not the only security involved was the political security of the present administration."

This week a representative of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, John H. Coburn, of the Wichita Eagle and Beacon, presented his organization's view to the Senate subcommittee, and made, among other points, one that is often missed.

"Reporters and editors seek no special privileges," he pointed out. "Our concern is the concern of any responsible citizen. We recognize that certain areas of information must be protected and withheld in order not to jeopardize the security of this

Nation. We recognize legitimate reasons for restricting access to certain other categories of information.

"What disappoints us keenly * * * what we fail to comprehend is the continued opposition of Government agencies to a simple concept. That is the concept to share the legitimate business of the public with the people."

We urge the Senators to give those words serious thought. For this Nation, its institutions and its very freedom cannot be safe unless the people, themselves, are informed—informed well enough to correct abuses, to turn out the cynical and the self-servers, to vote wisely upon the great issues that must be decided by the electorate. To safeguard the channels through which the public may keep itself informed is the purpose of the freedom of information bill, and we look to the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure to recommend its passage to the full Senate.

President Speaks for Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the President's announcement at his news conference yesterday that it is now possible to remove additional U.S. troops from the Dominican Republic came as most welcome assurance that our policy there is being successful.

All Americans are relieved that conditions there have improved to this point, realizing that all danger is not yet over and a stable basis for a new government is yet to be found. It now appears, however, that the Communists are running for cover and U.S. action has prevented another "Castro" takeover in the Caribbean.

The Tallahassee Democrat, a leading newspaper of the Florida panhandle, indicated its support of the President in his difficult decision to first send troops into Santo Domingo, and as it reflects the feelings of the vast majority of all our citizens on this matter I place the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Tallahassee (Fla.) Democrat, May 3, 1965]

PRESIDENT SPEAKS FOR NATION

The world should be convinced that President Johnson was declaring the sentiment of most of this Nation last night in his statement on our role and our determination in Santo Domingo.

Our marines are there for the sole purpose of protecting the lives and properties of our citizens, and other foreigners, who are there on legitimate business.

This includes both immediate protection from death and destruction in the revolution which is sweeping the country, and protection from the very real danger of a Communist takeover by classic Red methods during the confusion. Such a conquest would imperil the lives and property of our people—and the Dominican people, too—as certainly as do the bullets of snipers and strafers.

For nearly a century and a half, the United States has guaranteed the little nations of this hemisphere against conquest from abroad. Never, in upholding that guarantee, has it stopped to conquer itself. We have successully resisted such encroachments, except in the case of Castro's Cuba, where communism entered by deceit and made this strategic island off the coast of Florida a Russian satellite.

It is clear that Castro-brand Communists, allied with if not subservient to the Kremlin, are trying to grab control in the neighboring nation of Santo Domingo.

Communism entrenched in Cuba is too much. A Communist base in Santo Domingo would be intolerable for the defense of the United States, and for the defense of those Latin American nations we have vowed to protect.

The United States wants nothing from the battle-battered little nation of Santo Domingo except the chance for free and peaceful commerce—and that depends on a free and peaceful population of the island republic.

The President again declared our position forcefully in his warning aimed squarely at the Kremlin: "We do not want to bury anyone * * * but we do not intend to be buried."

All the world had better be sure we mean it.

Russia, of course, is calling for a United Nations debate on our position in Santo Domingo. We shouldn't take anything off the Reds in that forum.

Russians and their henchmen should not be allowed to speak until they have agreed to pay their dues.

If they ever get around to restoring themselves to good standing from a financial standpoint, they should be put immediately on the defense by reading the record which shows the Communists never have gone to the aid of any country under any circumstances and later withdrawn.

They must not be allowed to throw up so much smoke that the people of the world can overlook the sorry Red record in Hungary, Rumania, the Baltic nations, Korea and dozens of other spots where they have made trouble their dish.

New York State Legislature Adopts Resolution Calling for Constitutional Amendment To Prohibit Discrimination on Account of Sex

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have supported the proposition that the fair sex should be treated equally under our laws and not be discriminated against in employment opportunities or in salary on account of their sex.

I am not totally convinced that all or even a majority of American womanhood really wants to be treated equally; they have it so good now that equality might well diminish some of their advantages.

I am, nevertheless, still in favor of equal rights for women and I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following resolution adopted recently by the New York State Legislature memorializing the Congress to give favorable consideration to the passage of the required resolution to provide for an equal rights amendment to the Constitution.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 27 BY LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Whereas the women of our Nation have enjoyed full civil rights since the adoption of the 19th amendment; and

Whereas all citizens of our Nation should not only share equal civil rights but also equal legal rights; and

Whereas there exist many statutes discriminating against women; and

Whereas such legal differentiations, merely because of sex, lower the Nation's prestige and status in the world community; and

Whereas both political parties announced support of equal legal rights in their respective platforms; and

Whereas such a discriminating situation is outmoded and intolerable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to give favorable consideration to the required enabling legislation to present to the States for adoption an amendment to the U.S. Constitution providing, in substance, that "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex"; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York.

In senate, May 20, 1965, concurred in, without amendment.

By order of the senate:

GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,
Secretary.

By order of the assembly:

JOHN T. MCKENNAN,
Clerk.

Tunisian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in commemorating the sixth anniversary of the independence of Tunisa.

We are proud to call Tunisia our friend and to her President, Habib Bourguiba, our congratulations are extended for the part which he played in bringing about its independence. Under his guidance the country has achieved a praiseworthy degree of economic and technical assistance which our own country has extended to her. Her students study abroad and return to their homeland to participate in the programs initiated by her Government which are making her a dynamic and powerful influence in the Afro-Asian assembly of nations. The results which this young Republic has achieved are impressive. Her political stability can be envied by any newly independent country.

Tunisia has demonstrated great maturity in her relations with other countries and has been a leader in developing greater mutual cooperation among both the nations of the Mediterranean

and of Africa. She has been in the forefront of the efforts of the newly independent nations to promote national self-government, economic development, and peace among all the countries of the world.

The courage and farsightedness of President Bourguiba in suggesting the unmentionable among Arabs—that peace should be made in the Middle East with Israel—marks him as a statesman a cut above the others in the area. He alone, not only recognized that peace would be beneficial to the entire Middle East, but was brave enough to publicly say so.

We salute the Tunisian people, and their great leader and wish them every success for future success.

Memorial Day Address of the Honorable James Kee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and beloved colleague, the Honorable JAMES KEE, of West Virginia, was invited to deliver the Memorial Day address at the Veterans Memorial in Bethesda, Md., on Monday, May 31, 1965. The program was sponsored by representatives of veterans and other patriotic organizations of Montgomery County, Md.

Congressman KEE prepared a most eloquent speech but due to the death of his aunt, Mrs. C. T. Smith, of Bluefield, W. Va., the Congressman could not deliver his address in person. Congressman KEE's superb and timely address was read at the memorial services by his able administrative assistant, Frank Gus Tsutras.

Congressman KEE's address was truly magnificent and I commend this classic oration to the attention of the entire Congress and the people of the United States:

Mr. Master of Ceremonies, reverend clergy, members of the Veterans Memorial Day Committee, representatives of participating organizations—ladies and gentlemen, it is with a humble heart that I join with you on this sacred day.

Memorial Day has a special significance for each of us because this day of reverence for our militray dead—including both men and women—had its humble origin in the hearts of the American people.

It is proper that we assemble here at your Veterans Memorial.

The story has been told many times before but in the retelling it never loses the freshness of its simple grandeur.

About a century ago the most dreadful war in the annals of our country was coming to a close.

It was a civil war, a war between the States, a war of neighbor against neighbor, of family against family, of brother against brother.

When the hostilities finally ceased—in both North and South—grief-stricken mothers and fathers set aside this day to place wreaths and flowers on the final resting place of their loved ones who had paid the supreme sacrifice.

It was a spontaneous gesture.

In the beginning the day was known as Decoration Day. Flowers were chosen by the mourners as the appropriate symbol to express eternal devotion to the gallant young men who had gone before.

Later, this day was enshrined in the calendar of our sacred holidays and officially proclaimed as Memorial Day.

But even today, a century after, there are millions of Americans who prefer to call this historic day by its homely name of Decoration Day.

Since the dawn of recorded history, men have sought to find appropriate words and ceremonies to express our love and gratitude for the heroic dead who died in war.

Down through the centuries, the story of the small band of Spartans of Ancient Greece who held the pass at Thermopylae has become a treasured legend.

According to tradition, a simple marker was set up to recall their deeds—a marker inscribed with a few words which the noted English author—John Ruskin—described as "the noblest group of words ever uttered by man." Let me quote those words to you:

"Go tell the Spartans, thou that passeth by, that here, obedient to their laws, we lie."

Suppose we adapt those inspiring words to this occasion. We are the passers-by. Upon us, there lies the holy duty to tell this generation of Americans—and the next generation of Americans, that our military dead rest content because they died in the defense of our liberties. In a thousand hallowed cemeteries across this broad land, there lie buried untold numbers of young Americans whose names will never be known to us, who fought to save their country with the same gallantry which made immortal the Spartan youth who died at Thermopylae.

This is the true meaning of Memorial Day. This is the reason why the memory of our military dead must never be erased from the tablets of our memory. This is the reason why Memorial Day has now been set aside to honor the dead of all wars in which our country participated.

There is another lesson of deep meaning to be gleaned from the story of the Civil War. In the third year of that conflict, there was fought at nearby Gettysburg, the greatest battle, and the most costly in terms of human sacrifice, ever fought on the American continent. We are inclined to think of the soldiers of the past as mature men and seasoned veterans. But the official records reveal that the average age of the Union soldiers who fought at Gettysburg was 19 years and a few months. The average of the Confederate soldiers who fought there was slightly less. So the issue of Gettysburg was contested, not by mature men grown old and hardened by war but, by youngsters and, if you will, by competing hosts of teenagers.

This has been true in practically every war. Young men must do the fighting. This is the ultimate meaning and the deep mystery of war. The greatest sacrifice is demanded of those who have the most to lose.

The young men who died on a hundred American battlefields like Gettysburg, passed on just when the golden promise of life was at its zenith. Like the young people of today they looked forward to a happy life, to the joys of courtship and to the deep satisfaction of founding a home and rearing children of their own. But duty called them to a sterner fate and they responded. They gave up the golden future because there were some values which they valued more than life.

We glory in the gallantry of the Union soldiers who died at Gettysburg. But the wounds of war have long since healed and I believe—like Abraham Lincoln—that we must cherish the memory of the young Confederate soldiers who died so bravely for the lost cause. What happened at Gettysburg is now enshrined as a sacred part of our American heritage. In our charity, and compassion, let us rest content that divine providence and not us will pass final judgment on the merits of the boys who won and the boys who lost.

I am pleased to see so many of our younger generation participating in this ceremony—to pay reverent tribute to the men and women who died on land and sea to preserve America. There is a message of inspiration to be garnered from this annual day of recollection. This gathering has a dual purpose: to express our gratitude to the heroes of the past and to rekindle the flame of our own patriotism. I am happy that you young people are privileged to live in the fairest land on the face of the earth: and I ardently trust that every one of you will go away conscious of the truth that every liberty you possess was earned in the blood of America's martyred dead. You are the most valued asset of America—the time is rapidly coming when the responsibility of the leadership of our Nation will be in your hands.

The men and women of my own generation have their lesson to learn from this observance. As in ancient Sparta—we are the passers-by—we are the ones who must never weary in telling the next generation about the enduring value of our precious American heritage.

The United States became a Nation in a mighty protest against tyranny. It has been truly said that the soldiers and sailors of the Revolution did something more than win liberty for their own countrymen—they lit the torch of freedom all over this globe. They taught the race of mankind that no matter how hard or how long the struggle, freemen will always prevail over tyranny.

This Nation is now nearing the end of the second century of its existence as a free nation. But the struggle against tyranny still goes on. The United States fought in two World Wars to halt the spread of despotism that threatened to engulf Europe and ultimately ourselves.

Hardly more than a decade ago this Nation fought a war in faroff Korea to contain the onward sweep of the most hateful tyranny that ever cursed this earth—the conspiracy of international communism. Today the soldiers and sailors, the marines, and airmen of the United States are battling against a new encroachment of Communist tyranny—this time in faroff Vietnam. The cast of participants has changed, but the issue remains the same. The issue is freedom against tyranny.

In every time of crisis there are timid souls who believe that the easiest way is to yield. Just now there is a vigorous and clamorous minority telling the youth of America that in Vietnam we are fighting a war in which we have no business—fighting a war which we cannot hope to win. They seek to intimidate the American public by warning of what Communist China will do or what Communist Russia will do if we persist.

For the sake of our young people who may be misled by this clamor, suppose we set the record straight. This Nation gave a solemn pledge to stand by its loyal allies in South Vietnam and a resolute President of the United States with the backing of the Congress has decreed that we shall honor that pledge.

Are we in danger of defeat in Vietnam?

Suppose we turn once again, for light and guidance, to our own Revolutionary War. The story of Valley Forge is engraved on the heart of every American boy and girl. George Washington was there with an army of young country boys who knew very little about the science of organized warfare. He had an army short of guns and muskets and short of ammunition. An army without de-

cent food or shelter, to fight the rigors of a terrible winter. Against this rabble in arms there was arrayed the world's strongest military power. Close by in Philadelphia was a well-supplied army supported by a navy of unrivaled might.

The critics in those far-off days said that George Washington couldn't possibly win against such tremendous odds. But the critics were wrong—because they failed to count the spiritual weapons in General Washington's Army. They overlooked the fact that free men were fighting against tyranny.

I sometimes feel glad that today's timid souls were not at Valley Forge. Not that their gloomy pessimism would have discouraged George Washington. But in times of stress—the general had a hasty temper—and he might have lost patience with those who preached that he and his hungry lads should forsake the cause of freedom because they were outgunned and outmanned.

Let me give this word of assurance to the younger generation. We shall not be deterred from doing what is right in Vietnam by Communist threats or Communist bullying. We are not outgunned—and we are not outmanned—and we are going to prevail. The United States is going to accomplish what it set out to accomplish—to help preserve the liberty of a brave people. Just that and nothing more.

On this Memorial Day, let us re-learn the grandest lesson that history has to teach—the lesson—that until the last trumpet sounds—your country will not give ground to the evil power of tyranny. This much we owe to the brave men—and women—who died that our country might live.

We will not fail our obligation.

Federal Coal Mine Safety Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3584) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join with so many of my colleagues today in support of the proposed amendments to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. As a member of the General Subcommittee on Labor I had the opportunity to examine the facts and consider the many arguments, both pro and con, which were presented to the subcommittee.

I am convinced by the record that this bill will improve safety in all coal mines in the United States. I am convinced that improved and enlarged Federal enforcement will reduce casualties in coal mines. And I can say without equivocation that the intent of the Committee is to achieve the goal of mine safety with minimum burden upon the coal industry.

We considered many proposals. Some were extreme to the degree of delegating great discretionary authority to inspectors of the Bureau of Mines to close what they deemed to be unsafe mines. Others were mild to the degree of only authorizing appropriations for expanded safety education programs. Between these extremes we settled upon a moderate and justifiable bill. This proposal is before the House now. It is the fruit of extended hearings and several executive sessions of the subcommittee. It is a compromise bill. This does not imply that it is weak, but rather that it was considered with an open mind regarding constructive criticism. Several amendments were made to the bill in executive sessions. I believe that each of these amendments effectuated a fairer enforcement procedure and a bill better directed toward promoting safety without undue burdens to the industry.

The enactment of these amendments to the Coal Mine Safety Act would improve safety in all coal mines, both the so-called small mines and those already covered by the act. It would improve Federal-State coordination and cooperation. It would promote both Federal and State safety education programs. And, it would lay the groundwork for more thorough consideration of the very technical provisions of section 209 of the act by requiring that the Secretary of the Interior study the effectiveness of these provisions and report back to the Congress within 6 months.

Though I do not come from a coal-mining district, I cannot abandon this field only to such Members. The lives of thousands of human beings are at stake and the welfare of still thousands more are involved. I am not an expert in coal mine safety, but I have learned much during our hearings and consideration. I believe that we can reduce the toll of human lives in the Nation's coal mines by enacting this amendment. I urge my colleagues to join with me in taking this humane step by voting for passage of H.R. 3584, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1965.

Foreign Assistance Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the foreign assistance authorization bill, H.R. 7750, now before this House for its consideration.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have been privileged to participate actively in the hearings and discussions of this year's foreign aid program. From this participation I have had the opportunity to examine the overall assistance effort, as well as the individual country programs and the major categories of economic and military aid.

Although it would be expecting too much to hope for complete agreement among the Members of this House on each and every aspect of the President's program, I believe President Johnson deserves full credit for adhering to his expressed determination to "impose the smallest assistance burden on the American people since the beginning of the Marshall plan in 1948." In carrying out this objective, the President has sent us a foreign aid request for fiscal year 1966 that is both highly selective and at the same time represents the result of careful review and critical analysis.

Therefore, as we debate the pros and cons of the various military and economic assistance programs, it is important that we in Congress also take a cold, hard, and thoroughly businesslike look at each of them. Our final decision should rest on whether or not, or to what extent they contribute to and advance our national interest, and the interest of the other freedom-loving countries of the world.

Certainly, none of us wants any part of a giveaway program that does not advance the cause of our national security. We do not have, never have had, and never will have sufficient resources to be able to afford any wasteful or extravagant programs that do not stand on their own merit by helping to make the world a more secure and a better place in which to live.

On the other hand, who among us can doubt that the military and economic assistance we gave to the war-ravaged nations of Europe, and later to Greece and Turkey, was not a major cause of their stout and successful defense against the threat of Communist takeover during those perilous days after World War II?

Many nations, who once had received large amounts of assistance from us, are today able to stand on their own, and in fact, have now become donors of assistance to less fortunate nations.

Other countries are in what we might classify as a middle position: They continue to receive some assistance from us, but they are steadily moving in the direction of economic independence, and in the not too distant future should be entirely on their own.

There is also a third category, made up largely of the underdeveloped countries of Africa, southeast Asia, and Latin America, which will need substantial amounts of financial, technical, and related assistance for some time to come.

One essential requirement for this third category of nations is that they bend every effort to help themselves, that they be willing and able to make the necessary changes and reforms to enable outside assistance to be effective.

The Alliance for Progress is the name we use to describe this joint economic assistance and self-help effort in the Latin American area. Though not living entirely up to our most ambitious hopes, the Alliance has made solid gains, and gives promise of greater accomplishments in the future life of our good neighbors to the south.

But, as President Johnson has said:

A vast revolution is sweeping the southern half of this globe. We do not intend that

the Communists shall become the beneficiaries of this revolt against injustice and privation. We intend to lead vigorously in that struggle.

With these thoughts in mind, I would urge my colleagues to consider carefully all the aspects of the legislation before us, and weigh the cost of the program against the pressing needs around us.

Then, I am confident that a majority of the Members will cast their ballots in support of the President and in support of meeting our national obligation to do our part in the defense of freedom wherever it is challenged around the world.

Congressional Trainees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, some Members of Congress have introduced bills to allow a Member to use part of his clerk hire allowance to employ two high school graduates who are enrolling or enrolled in college, for a 3-month summer period for not more than a total of $1,500 or $750 each. As a member of the committee that is studying this proposal I am enthusiastically in full support of it.

If I had any doubts as to the value from all angles of this summer trainee program my doubts were washed away by the success story of one of my own students whom I placed upon my summer payroll for 3 months each summer, although it meant losing the balance of the year's base pay allowance.

Kassian Kovalcheck, son of Mr. and Mrs. Kassian Kovalcheck, of Irwin, Pa., was a summer employee of mine for the past 2 years. I thought I saw a great deal of potential in this fine young man for future success. His work for me was outstanding and I realize that my first impressions were quite accurate. In addition, I was very pleased to note that Kassian was recently awarded a $2,000 graduate assistantship to Indiana University for the study of speech and a $2,250 graduate assistantship to the University of Illinois.

Many of you will remember his father, Kassian, Sr., a great football star for the University of Pittsburgh. Young Kassian did not distinguish himself athletically, as did his father, but it must certainly be recognized that he distinguished himself academically.

His experience here on the Hill was undoubtedly a valuable one in his development, and I am sure it will play a role in his future. We should encourage more young men like Kassian to come to Washington and work for the legislative branch during their free summer months. I therefore ask all Members to consider the proposals before the Congress with respect to summer trainees and to act favorably thereon.

Cheers for Gov. Bill Scranton—$102 Million Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to report Pennsylvania progress. Under Gov. Bill Scranton, first, the lowest Pennsylvania unemployment figures on record. And now the State government operated with a surplus of $102 million, the largest on record.

We are certainly going places in Pennsylvania under the leadership of Gov. Bill Scranton. What a real tonic is success.

The Republicans and Democrats who joined together in 1962 to elect Gov. Bill Scranton certainly were right.

The present State administration in Pennsylvania is working and succeeding for all our citizens. This is good government at its efficient and heart-warming best.

Keep your eye on Pennsylvania—we are really working with high hopes and courage.

I offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the front-page article of the Pittsburgh Post Gazette of June 1, 1965, showing this fine progress by Gov. Bill Scranton and his successful State administration:

ONE HUNDRED AND TWO MILLION SURPLUS SET BY SCRANTON—WHOLE SUM DUE TO GO TO SCHOOLS, URBAN BETTERMENT

(By Frank M. Matthews)

Gov. William W. Scranton said tonight that Pennsylvania's general fund surplus for the fiscal year that ends June 30 will climb to $102,713,000.

Since the State is prohibited by its constitution from saving money, the whole sum will be allocated to increased spending in 1965–66, with emphasis on education and community improvement.

The $1 million increase for the Pittsburgh Board of Education which would be obtained through Scranton's proposed revision of the school subsidy formula may be almost doubled for the year.

SIXTY-ONE MILLION DOLLARS ALLOCATED

Of the $102,713,000 surplus, $61 million already has been allocated in the budget message proposed to the general assembly early in this legislative session.

That was the amount of surplus the department of revenue had estimated for the fiscal year. Now that the new estimate of surplus this fiscal year has been made, the revenue department has also increased its estimate for 1965–66 by $42 million.

Thus the actual new spending that Scranton will recommend in the general appropriations bill which will go to the general assembly tomorrow will be $83,700,000, the total of the unallocated portion of the surplus and the increased estimate of revenue during the fiscal year.

Pennsylvanians are going to have to wait until tomorrow to know just how the $83,700,000 will be spent. But since submitting the budget in January, Scranton has indicated in speeches and otherwise that he will recommend that $13 million be put into mass transit aid, $2 million into a State collegiate scholarship program, $2 million to build community health centers, and $2 million to Temple University in Philadelphia to reduce tuition there.

SURPLUS SAME AGAIN

The $42 million increase in estimates of revenue in 1965–66 just matches the increase in the 1964–65 surplus.

The Governor said that does not mean that he believes Pennsylvania's economic growth is to halt. The estimate was held to that figure, he said, because this fiscal year there has been $20,000,000 in windfall taxes which will not be repeated.

The Governor's increase in the estimate of surplus caught up with Democratic predictions since the beginning of this legislative session. In January the Democratic prediction was that the excess revenue would top $100 million, and recently Senate Minority Leader John H. Devlin, of Pittsburgh, forecast that it will top $132 million.

Tax collections boomed in all but one field in May. Corporate net income tax was up 20.7 percent, capital stock and francise revenue was up 25.8 percent, and selective business taxes were up 26.7 percent.

Sales tax revenue was up 6.9 percent, cigarette taxes 2.2 percent, and liquor taxes 9.5 percent. The inheritance tax income was up 33.7 percent, and realty transfer revenues were up 1.7 percent.

ONLY BEER TAXES DIP

Only beer taxes were off. A loss of 28.6 percent in May—$595,000—was due to a slowdown in the purchase of tax crowns because of a bill now moving in the general assembly which will provide for postpayment of the beer tax.

Thus the decline in beer revenue will not be continuing.

Scranton said that the surplus is the largest single-year overage in the history of the State.

Announcement of the new surplus estimate came as the bureau of employment security estimated that at mid-May the State unemployment total had dropped to 3.8 percent, a decrease of 77,000 from May of last year. That ties the previous low record of October 1952.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Representative Henry B. Gonzalez Addresses Graduates of St. Mary's University, and Receives Doctor's Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last Sunday, May 30, Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, of San Antonio, Tex., delivered to the graduates of St. Mary's University, in San Antonio, Tex., an inspiring address on the meaning of education, and was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Representative GONZALEZ is a distinguished alumnus of the law school of St. Mary's University, and is now in his second term as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, representing the citizens of Bexar County.

HENRY B. GONZALEZ is a very able Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, and is an outstanding Texan, being the first Texas citizen of Spanish-Mexican descent to be elected to our State senate since 1846, and the first Texas citizen of Spanish-Mexican descent ever to be elected to the U.S. Congress. His ability is matched only by his dedication and concern for his constituents and their welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Representative GONZALEZ' commencement address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY

(By HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Member of Congress, San Antonio, Tex., May 30, 1965)

"Certainly it is heaven on earth to have a man's mind move in charity, rest in providence, and turn upon the poles of truth."

SIR FRANCIS BACON
(of Truth).

"Disciplina praesidium civitatis."
(Motto of the University of Texas.)

"Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

HERBERT G. WELLS
(The Outline of History).

Reverend Father, deans of the University, distinguished faculty, alumni, friends and members of the graduating class, those of you who are receiving your baccalaureate degrees tonight are going through one of the most significant and memorable of the experiences of life. Your degrees will not automatically assure you of future happiness or success. Neither will your degree signify that your education is now complete. No man is ever fully educated, because no single mind can encompass all the knowledge that this world has to offer. But you who have earned your first degree can be justly proud of your achievement, because you now have enough experience and enough knowledge to understand some of the great complexities of our world and our times and you possess the background that will enable you to plumb ever deeper into the depths of the unknown.

And those of you who have earned your second degree, the masters degree, can be proud that you have mastered at least one small portion of the field of your choice. You can be proud that you not only know more than you did a year or two ago, but that you have made a contribution to the store of knowledge by writing and defending a thesis. You have the satisfaction of knowing that you have learned in greater depth and are prepared now to learn in ever finer detail.

Not everyone is educated, and not all of us are educated, though we possess varying kinds of academic degrees and though we have devoted long years to study. Great learning is worthy, and great scholars are justly proud of their knowledge, but great learning, before it has any meaning, must be devoted to one single goal—the pursuit of the truth. If any one of us is truly educated, we must seek the truth, and if we fail to seek the truth we are not educated. The man who devotes his energies to the pursuit of truth obtains the greatest of all life satisfactions. The great English essayist and scholar, Sir Francis Bacon, perhaps said it best when he wrote, "Certainly it is heaven on earth to have a man's mind move in charity, rest in providence, and turn upon the poles of truth." If you would be satisfied with life, and if you would be truly educated, you should live by those words.

Never in all the history of our world has education been so important as it is now. If there ever was a time when the truth could make us free, then that time is now.

Our technology, gained through billions of hours of research, bought by billions upon billions of dollars, has given us great blessings and placed our lives under deep shadows. We all live in great affluence, and our wealth and power is increasing daily. But at the same time we are forced to live in the very shadow of death, so that in our daily lives we all remember Herbert Wells forbidding words, "human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

And this is true. We must in our time solve the riddle of whether we are the masters of our own inventions or whether we are slaves to them. We must solve the issue of whether we can control the atom or whether it shall control us. The contest is not decided. That is why education is more important today than ever and one reason why your being here is important, not just to yourselves, but to the world around you, a world that is racing against time to solve its tangled problems—to feed the hungry, heal the sick, and free us all from the scourge of war and the disaster of utter destruction.

I am not saying that education alone will solve all our problems, and I am not saying that we must have an educated elite. What I am saying is that this world has such fantastic problems that we must better equip all our people to deal with those problems.

We have great difficulties in this world. But adversity is just one side of the coin. We have great opportunities. This is the best of times. We may well want to think that it is the worst of times, but it is the best of times. The opportunities that lie ahead are difficult to imagine, yet they are there if we grasp them, and we can grasp them only by preparing ourselves.

We must have a population that is not only educated, but a population that is flexible and able to react to changing times. These are times in which staggering changes take place almost overnight. Those who would not be crushed by change must be able to react to change and control it and bend it to their own will and make it accrue to their advantage.

Let me reduce this proposition to simpler terms.

Here in San Antonio we have often failed to keep up with changing times, and we have lost much by not taking advantage of opportunities that we have been confronted with. We have very often been asleep at the switch during the 20th century, and the results are painfully clear. We have the lowest per capita income of any of the great cities of this State. One person out of every four in this county is poverty stricken, and it is not infrequent that people here actually go hungry for lack of the price of food.

Let me cite a single statistic educational attainment. The average citizen of Bexar County in 1960 had the same education as a man in Dallas had in 1940. We are no less than 25 years behind. Whereas the average citizen of Dallas County in 1960 had a high school education, the average citizen of Bexar County had only 10 years of school. Since 1940, we have made less progress in almost everything than any other metropolitan county in Texas. We have not been prepared for the 20th century. If we ourselves as a great city are not to trail behind forever and not to be always left in the economic backwaters and out of the mainstream of life, we must use our energies and imaginations and leadership to better advantage. We have lost much time, and cannot afford to lose any more. Our hope is in you, and I know that you will not fail us.

If you perform as you can, by 1980, or by 1990, Bexar County will no longer be the poorest big city in Texas, and will no longer be the least educated and will no longer depend on an uncertain Federal payroll for its economic lifeblood.

Education is not the sole problem that we have, but we do know that poverty and ignorance go hand in hand, and hunger follows not far behind.

Education alone may not solve the problems of the world or of Bexar County, and education alone may never solve the problems of Mississippi or Appalachia, but it will help.

I believe that if we are to win the race between education and catastrophe we ought to concentrate greater resources on our schools, from kindergarten through the university. I have always supported, with my voice and my votes, investments in education.

Education is expensive and it is hard to get. It will become even more expensive and even more hard to get in the future. We are committed to education as a people and we must see to it that our commitment is carried out, for the benefit of ourselves and for all people.

Adequate educational legislation must not mistake beautiful schools for good schools. We must not only build classrooms and laboratories, but we must be willing to pay the price that is demanded to get better teachers, teachers of better ability and who are better prepared. We must upgrade the

quality of our education as well as the quantity of it.

We are not doing enough for education in Bexar County, and we are not doing enough in Texas. Unless we make the sacrifices that are required to upgrade our schools—sacrifices at the local and State and Federal levels—then we are leaving our children behind in the starting gates of life. There are those who know horses better than I, but I know enough to assure you that a horse who is last out of the starting gate is going to have to outrun the whole field or finish last.

As a nation we are confronted with the fact that not all States and not all localities can afford the same level of education, no matter how hard they try. How can we assure that a child in the Deep South be as well educated as the one from New York? How can we see that the children of the District of Columbia get the same quality of education as those across the District line in suburban Maryland or Virginia, and how can we see to it that Bexar County has as good schools as Houston or Fort Worth or Dallas?

I do not believe that these problems can be solved all at the local level, and they cannot be completely solved at the State level. Nor can Federal action alone assure a national standard of education that is adequate.

Educational leadership involves a great deal. For a while we felt that the race for education was merely a race to see who could reach the moon first, but today we know that there is much more at stake than a mere moon race.

The motto of one of our great universities here in Texas is in Latin, "Disciplina Praesidium Civitatis." In English, this means roughly that discipline is the guardian of the state. Discipline—learning, understanding, rational action—is the strength and fortress of a free state and a free society. A freeman knows that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. He also knows that freedom depends on decisions that he alone can make.

A free, democratic society is based on the pure and simple proposition that men are capable of self-government. The assumption is that all men are rational—not just one man or a few—and that, therefore, all men should decide for themselves how they should be governed. In such a society much depends on the governed. They must be ready, willing, and able to act for themselves. They must not be willing to let others act for them. They must be able to be members of the majority when they are in the majority and to be members of the loyal opposition when they are in a minority.

Aristotle did not have a great deal of faith in democratic government, believing that it was inclined to extremes. Plato and Polybius believed that governments moved in a cycle. Of course they felt that the first form of government was non-government—anarchy, and that from a state of anarchy men would turn to democracy. But, men being as they are, and human nature being what it is, they felt that the people in a democracy would soon begin to tire of their task of self-government and would begin to let fewer men make all the decisions. An elite would develop, and democracy would then become a state of oligarchy—government by a few. As life progressed onward, the great philosopher felt that oligarchy would become monarchy, and that monarchy itself would become absolute and despotic, so that at the end of the cycle, anarchy would have passed to freedom and freedom to slavery.

In this country we have been fortunate enough to show that a free, democratic government can stand the test of time. We have discovered, as the Republic has grown and matured, that the true basis of a viable and lasting democracy is education. We have discovered that education and education alone can prepare a citizen to uphold the responsibilities of self-government. That is why we can truthfully say that learning—discipline, as the Romans put it—is the guardian of the state and the basis of our freedom.

You have now, by virtue of long years of schooling, earned your diploma, which is a passport into a new life, and which is the key to the kingdom—the key to knowledge, wisdom, and virtue, the keys to truth and light.

You have earned the right to citizenship, the right to take up the full burden of self-government and self-discipline—for yourself and for your Nation.

May your life be filled with the satisfaction of knowing that you have pursued truth all your days, so that at the end of your life you can say that, as Sir Francis Bacon did, "Certainly it is heaven on earth to have a man's mind move in charity, rest in providence, and turn upon the poles of truth."

Panel on Red China Reveals Curious Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, a recent column from the Indianapolis Star reveals, as its editor indicates, some curious views on Red China.

Particularly noteworthy and sound, however, are those attributed to our colleague, Representative WILLIAM G. BRAY.

The column follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star, May 19, 1965]

PANEL ON RED CHINA REVEALS CURIOUS VIEWS

(By Thomas G. Karsell)

A pair of speakers at the recent all-day institute on Chinese-American relations proved to be a font of misinformation on United States attitudes toward China and American conduct in South Vietnam.

Edward B. Jolliffe, a member of the Canadian Democratic Socialist Party from Ontario and recent visitor to Red China, came as no surprise to anyone familiar with his pro-Chinese inclinations.

But Stanley Greenspan held a curious position indeed. As assistant to the director of the International Affairs Department, American Federation of Labor, he sounded a bit out of line with American trade union policy toward Red China. Greenspan got himself in the bizarre position of demanding American willingness to trade with the Chinese Communists, who offer coolie slave-labor prices for their goods, competing with unionized Americans.

One supposes he may have some difficulties explaining his attitudes to his superiors, who have said they wished no part of diplomatic recognition or trade with Red China.

PRESIDENT MUST DECIDE

Jolliffe distinguished himself by claiming that "admirals and generals" were the big influence in American foreign policy. The President of the United States sets American foreign policy, after consultation with his Cabinet and with members of the Military Establishment. But it is the President who decides, not the military.

Indeed, Dr. Daniel Wit, professor and chairman of the Department of History and Political Science of Northern Illinois University—also a panel member—correctly pointed out that the military frequently complains that it isn't heard enough. But the chief of state who fails to hear his armed forces commanders, as Dr. Wit wisely noted, is a fool indeed.

Dr. Wit was a splendid voice of moderation throughout the panel discussion.

And Indiana's Representative WILLIAM G. BRAY sat through the doubletalk from Jolliffe until smoke began to pour out his ears.

As a Member of the Government, BILL BRAY said, he could not sit silent and hear Jolliffe attack the United States. Moreover, BRAY said, Americans wishing to trade with Red China must be willing to foot the bill because the Chinese are poor pay. What's more, "what have they got that we want?" BRAY asked succinctly.

DELIVER OR SURRENDER

About Vietnam, BRAY—seconded by Wit—took the position that the United States must either fulfill its commitment to South Vietnam "or surrender." Happily, Americans don't like surrendering and it appears most likely that we are in South Vietnam to get the Communists out of that troubled nation.

Because the institute was sponsored by the American Friends Service Committee—an arm of the Quaker Church—it was fortunate that BILL BRAY was present to dissent from the "let's recognize Red China" group. BRAY is himself a Quaker and far better informed than most Americans, being a member of the House Armed Service Committee for many years.

But one wonders how the local labor groups and the Indiana State Council of Churches, together with the Bureau of Public Discussion at Indiana University got into cosponsoring this affair.

It is sad that misinformation gets swallowed by the gullible, some of whom actually prefer to believe the bad things that are said about our Government rather than what our President and other responsible Government officials tell us.

Free discussion on any topic is certainly a good thing. And it is possible that the reasoned argument of Dr. Wit more than offset the caricature of the United States drawn by Greenspan and Jolliffe. But what a pity it is that otherwise educated men attack motives of the Government, which seeks only to keep world peace.

Idahoan Spreads Good Will in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, for some time the administration has considered devoting greater attention to social and economic measures to supplement the military and political means already being used to fight the Communists in Vietnam.

I am pleased to be able to point out that U.S. Army Lt. John H. Damewood, of Pocatello, Idaho, is taking these new programs seriously. As Columnist Hal Boyle pointed out in the Lewiston Morning Tribune of Friday, May 21, Lieutenant Damewood has been a one man good-will mission among 3,000 inhabitants of 12 straggling hillside bamboo-hut hamlets in Vietnam. In several weeks of activity, this hard-working special forces officer has established two dispensaries, taught the rudiments of

sanitation, organized a 40-pupil school, and helped plant some 500 fruit and nut trees.

I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Hal Boyle's article on Lieutenant Damewood and an editorial, by Lee Ester, which was published on May 23 in the Idaho Sunday Journal. I applaud Lieutenant Damewood for his sense of responsibility and his dedication; and I commend the article and the editorial to the attention of all Senators.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, May 21, 1965]

IDAHO OFFICER FELL IN LOVE WITH VIETNAM

(By Hal Boyle)

CAMP GIA VUC, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Some U.S. soldiers regard Vietnam as a muddy wasteland which they hate the whole time they are here. Others, fall in love with the land and its people and try to perform a real service during their tour of duty. One of these is Lt. John H. Damewood, of Pocatello, Idaho, an idealist in uniform.

This rugged, 27-year-old officer has the job of handling civil affairs for a U.S. Army Special Forces unit stationed in a key position astride the famed Ho Chi Minh trail.

GOOD WILL MISSION

He has been a one-man good-will mission among 3,000 inhabitants of 12 struggling hillside bamboo hut hamlets.

In several weeks of whirlwind activity Damewood has done these things:

Set up two dispensaries and taught the villagers the rudiments of sanitation.

Organized and provided books for a 40-pupil school for children who had never seen a classroom.

Arranged a program under which the villagers can exchange their rude crossbows and other handicraft items for tools, cloth, blankets, and hardware.

"They are also planting family gardens for the vegetables they need to vary their diet," Damewood said. "And we are also planting some 500 fruit and nut trees, and starting other projects to provide them with fish ponds and help raise the quality of their pigs and rabbits."

The lieutenant gives out 4,800 bars of soap each month. He pointed at a flapping laundry line stretched between two huts.

"You never used to see that here before," he said. "Many of the children now are brushing their teeth regularly. We are trying to get them to realize that most of their diseases are caused by dirt and lack of hygiene.

"Our theme is that self-sufficiency is the first step toward self-government. And these people show a real willingness to try to improve their lot.

"Our goal is to get these betterment programs going so well that when we pull out, the villagers will be able to make a go of things themselves without further assistance."

Damewood's pride is the "New Life Hamlet," a community of 175 huts built from scratch to house 750 Montagnard tribesmen driven from their homes farther north by Vietcong guerrillas.

"We provided the materials, but they put up the houses themselves," he said. "They have a wonderful spirit. You can't help liking and admiring them."

There are an estimated 750,000 of the mountain tribesmen in South Vietnam.

"I think the future of the country may depend on whether they stay with the government or swing to the Vietcong," he said. "These people here are staying with the government—and risking their lives to do it."

[From the Idaho Sunday Journal, May 23, 1965]

MORE OF THE SAME

Columnist Hal Boyle's report of the humanitarian work of a Pocatello man in South Vietnam is a reminder of what we should have been doing more of for a long time.

The report Friday concerned the work of 1st Lt. John Damewood, son of Mr. and Mrs. Harold Damewood, 534 No. 11th Avenue, Pocatello. Calling Lieutenant Damewood a one-man good-will mission, Boyle wrote that he has established two dispensaries and taught sanitation, organized and provided books for a school and encouraged the planting vegetables and food and nut trees. "Our theme," Damewood said "is that self-sufficiency is the first step toward self-government." And he adds hopefully: "These people show a real willingness to try to improve their lot."

If we had done this kind of thing in earnest years ago, there is a good chance we would not be trying to find military solution in South Vietnam now. We should have learned by now that peoples of underdeveloped nations are less impressed by a military power than by efforts to improve their lot. They cannot be blamed if they find it difficult to understand how we help them by killing people.

In the 10 years we have been in South Vietnam, we have poured in millions of dollars in military and economic aid. Judging from the support we have been getting from the people, it has not been very effective.

Perhaps the kind of work Lieutenant Damewood is doing will make amends for our past mistakes. Judging from Boyle's report, his efforts are effective, for they meet basic human needs of the people of South Vietnam. Quite obviously, our cause and theirs will be helped by much more of the same.

U.S. Policy in Dominican Fighting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy and proud to commend my hometown newspapers—the Times-Picayune and New Orleans, La., States-Item—for their fine editorials early last month in support of President Johnson's unhesitating and wise decision to dispatch U.S. Marines to the Dominican Republic as soon as the President realized that the revolution there had gotten out of control and that American lives and property were in grave peril.

The editors of the Times-Picayune and the States-Item recognized the seriousness to American life and limb at the time; and also the possible seizure of control of the revolt by Communist agents. They lauded President Johnson for his perception and his incisive action in not only safeguarding American citizens and their property, and evacuating them and nationals of other countries, but also in preventing the establishment of a second Communist-controlled government in the Western Hemisphere.

It is a pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, to call to the attention of all of my colleagues in the Congress two very fine editorials by the Times-Picayune and the New Orleans States-Item. I also would like to say that the editors of these two newspapers—George W. Healy, Jr., of the Times-Picayune, and Carl Corbin of the States-Item—have displayed another example of the fine work they are doing for the benefit of the people of the city of New Orleans, and of all of south Louisiana.

The editorials from the Times-Picayune and the States-Item of May 4, 1965, follows:

UNITED STATES HAD JOB TO DO AND IS DOING IT

Latin American nations concerned over the U.S. military presence in the Dominican Republic have been informed precisely how they can assist in effecting withdrawal.

Establishment of a joint peacekeeping force, with units contributed by those South and Central American nations that are capable of doing so has been proposed by the United States in a draft resolution presented to the Organization of American States.

The inference is clear that some kind of military power is absolutely necessary in the revolt ravished island to prevent a Communist regime from capitalizing on the current chaos and to help the Dominicans restore order.

President Johnson Monday night detailed the tragic turn whereby "a popular democratic revolution, committed to democracy and social justice (in the Dominican Republic) was taken over and really seized and placed into the hands of a band of Communist conspirators."

And, he asserted, "The American nations cannot, and must not, and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere."

The President was eminently correct, we believe, in saying the U.S. intervention was necessary and is equally right in advising other countries that the United States must remain until the killing is stopped and order restored.

The United States was the only nation in the inter-American system capable of the prompt military action necessary to protect foreign nationals. While most Latin Americans look uneasily upon the presence of U.S. troops, they should recognize the justification for the initial deployment.

Now, as evidence mounts of the effort to subvert what may have begun as a democratic revolt, they ought also to face up to the shared responsibility for the security of the region.

It is necessary that if lasting order and a truly popular government are to arise out of the current turmoil, the cooperative assistance of many institutions in the inter-American system must be turned to the support of the Dominican Republic. For it is evident that any regime that may come to power as a result of the unilateral action of the United States will labor under a sore handicap in subsequent political and diplomatic undertakings.

Presumably the U.S. Government would like to be out of Santo Domingo as much as some of the Latin States would like to see it out. But OAS deferment of action on the U.S. resolution Monday indicated hesitancy on the part of at least several governments to cooperate in taking over the task this country has invited them to assume.

U.S. POLICY IN DOMINICAN FIGHTING

For escalation, the fighting in the Dominican Republic is difficult to parallel. One day it's a revolt of young army officers against the three-man ruling junta.

But the next day it's veered left into a bloody effort, captured by casehardened Communist schemers, to set up Red government No. 2 in the Western Hemisphere.

Propriety of President Johnson's sending U.S. Marines into the chaotic country to protect lives of Americans and other foreign nationals is unassailable.

Now that purpose has been broadened by the President to prevent establishment of another Communist government on this side of the Atlantic. U.S. fighting men on Dominican soil will be increased to 14,000.

Despite the delicacy of the situation, Mr. Johnson has decided wisely. Ideally, of course, the Organization of American States should have taken the lead, but it has no police force with which to work. Prompt response to the situation was the ruling factor and promptness is not yet one of the laudable qualities of the OAS.

When Castro Communists smuggled arms into Venezuela, for example, to influence the forthcoming Venezuelan election in 1963, the OAS didn't get around to voting sanctions against Cuba until July 1964.

A delay of any such proportion in the current situation would serve the purpose of the Communist takeover admirably.

When there suddenly is no government, it is foolish to sit back and wait for an appeal from a government.

Mr. Johnson knows he is walking on eggs, else he would not have gone to such lengths as addressing his fellow citizens three times within 5 days. Nor would he have hustled our diplomats off to make our motives clear to sister republics.

Our foes in Latin America have quickly dusted off the old "Colossus of the north" label and Moscow, Peiping, Havana, and other points are exploiting their propaganda opportunity.

As ever, the best defense is the truth. The President has carried his story to the world quickly and with candor.

Now it is for the members of the Organization of American States to respond with their contributions of peacekeeping forces. None of them should want the prospect of having to fight on home grounds the Communist terrorists exported by two Red bases within the hemisphere.

C. Oscar Tate, Jr., Veteran West Virginia Flier, Employs Experience to Advantage as President of National Air Taxi Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, C. Oscar Tate, Jr., is a West Virginian who has been instrumental in the growth of aviation in the Mountain State and a leader in national development of the air taxi system. Now president of Greenbrier Airlines and Greenbrier Airport, Inc., White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., Oscar Tate has been engaged in commercial aviation for 32 years. He has amassed more than 18,000 accident-free hours of flying, and it has been my pleasure to fly as one of his passengers for thousands of miles.

During his career, Oscar has been a barnstorming pilot, a flight instructor, airline pilot, and air taxi operator. He is now a respected and effective community leader as well as one whose judgment is sought in matters relating to national aviation policies. He is in constant contact with influential men and women in business, government, and the entertainment world since Greenbrier Airlines services those famous resorts, the Greenbrier and the Homestead Hotels.

In the May–June issue of the Flight Service Journal there appears a concisely written article on the contributions of C. Oscar Tate, Jr., in the aviation industry. This publication is the official magazine of the National Association of Air Traffic Specialists, Inc., and is known as the voice of the flight service specialist. I ask unanimous consent that this article appear in the Appendix at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix an article by C. Oscar Tate, Jr., which appeared in the May issue of Air Transport World. As president of the National Air Taxi Conference, Mr. Tate has authored an informative article which outlines the expansion recorded by the air taxi industry in recent years—an expansion which will be meaningful to the traveling public.

There being no objection, the two articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

[From the Flight Service Journal, May–June 1965]

MEET YOUR CORPORATE MEMBERS

GREENBRIER AIRLINES

C. Oscar Tate, Jr., president of Greenbrier Airlines and Greenbrier Airport, Inc., White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., has been engaged in commercial aviation for 32 years. His no-accident record covers over 18,000 hours of flying, from barnstorming in OX–5 biplanes, flight school operation, airline piloting, and air taxi operation.

Tate learned to fly as a youth while endeavoring to obtain appointment in flying cadets, soloing in Huntington, W. Va. Employed at Huntington Airport for several years, in various capacities, he began barnstorming in an OX–5 Waco in 1934 and 1935, in West Virginia and Kentucky hills and mountains.

He operated a small airport at Huntington 1936–39, and then opened the Greenbrier Hotel's airport in August 1939. A stint of 6 months at United Airlines' Cheyenne Flight Training Center followed Pearl Harbor, which closed the Greenbrier Airport.

From 1942 to 1949, Tate was a pilot for TWA, first on the Air Transport Command Intercontinental Division flying out of Washington across the South Atlantic and North Atlantic, then on the Trans World International Division after the war, flying DC–4 and Constellation equipment.

Although his first interest with TWA was in piloting duties serving over 2 years as check pilot, he had secondary interests in passenger service and public relations, and was selected to captain the 1946 flight to Rome carrying Cardinal-designates Spellman and Glennon.

Leaving TWA in 1949, Tate resumed operation of Greenbrier Airport and has specialized in air taxi and charter service, building up one of the outstanding services of its kind carrying important passengers of the business, entertainment, and government worlds to and from the Greenbrier and the Homestead Hotels.

Finding time for community service as well, Tate is past president of the White Sulphur Springs Club of International Rotary, past president of the chamber of commerce, past chairman of the board of Emmanuel Methodist Church, current member of the State aeronautics commission. He is a longtime member of Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, OX–5 Club, and the Air Line Pilots Association.

Greenbrier Airlines recently celebrated its 25th anniversary, having operated during that time without an injury to passengers or pilots.

[From the Air Transport World, May 1965]

YEAR 1964 BRIGHT, FUTURE BRIGHTER FOR AIR TAXI

(By Charles O. Tate, Jr.)

Practically everything in the air taxi business in 1964 was "up." The outlook for continued growth and expansion of air taxi service in 1965, and in the immediate years ahead, is excellent.

When effected, the recently announced plan of the Civil Aeronautics Board to extend the operating authority of air taxi companies indefinitely, and to authorize them to carry mail under certain conditions, will be a great boon to this industry.

This not only will give air taxi operators greater confidence in their future but will encourage and stimulate them to make larger investments for expansion of their facilities, equipment, and personnel to meet the anticipated growing demand for their services.

We air taxi operators also were pleased by the CAB acknowledgment that air taxis "have become an established part of the transportation system."

The CAB development follows closely the announcement last February by Postmaster General John A. Gronouski that his Department will send to the Congress, for enactment before 1967, a plan that would abolish airmail postage, and provide for movement of all first-class mail by the most expeditious means of transportation. He said air taxis, as well as scheduled airlines and supplemental air carriers, would be used for the expeditious transportation of first-class mail under his proposal.

We air taxi operators, individually and as a group, are pleased by our progress to date. But we well realize we have just scratched the surface of the potential in the United States.

A definite trend toward greater use of air taxi by the traveling public is developing. There is a major reason for this. The speed of point-to-point jet travel has increased the traveling public's impatience with slow—and often exasperating—surface means of getting to and from major airports.

The common complaint today is that the time it takes a passenger using surface transportation to get to a metropolitan area airport, and from a major airport to his ultimate destination, is much longer than his plane trip. People, especially businessmen, know their time is valuable; that hours lost in surface transit represent a loss of productive time.

Our great potential and ultimate goal lie in getting the vast majority of air travelers to "fly all the way"—from their closest airport to the airport nearest their destination—via the combined services of air taxi and the scheduled airlines.

We are promoting this concept now and it is producing results. But our success is being limited by several factors. To name a few, the 23 scheduled airlines, participating in the air taxi service agreement for the interchange of passengers and freight, are not now permitted to issue tickets covering both airline and air taxi services; air travel insurance for air taxi flights costs more than that for airline travel; and air taxi rates are usually higher than airline passenger fares.

The National Air Taxi Conference and its membership of nearly 200 independent air taxi operators in 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, look forward to the day when one ticket and one travel insurance policy can be issued to a passenger for eco-

nomical and expeditious travel all the way by air.

We of the air transport industry, and those who regulate and serve the industry, must strive now to pave the way, and make it possible, for the public to "fly all the way," with much the same conveniences and economies offered the trunkline passenger today.

NATC is endeavoring, through a concerted membership drive, to offer the public a more complete network of air taxi service across the country. Meanwhile, we are hopeful that additional airlines will provide ramp and gate facilities at their terminals at hub airports, so that passengers and their luggage arriving by air taxis, may be transferred to airline planes without inconvenience and delay.

To prime cooperative action, we realize we must convey to the scheduled airlines, appropriate Federal Government agencies, to aircraft manufacturers, and to travel agents, the need for air taxi service as an integral part of modern air transportation.

This requires essentially an educational effort on the part of NATC, which we are prepared to undertake. Airlines have to be shown that air taxi is a valuable and important adjunct to their own service; that it is no more a competitive form of transportation than the auto rental services; that everyone will benefit from providing passengers with complete, rather than partial, air transportation.

We need to reach travel agents and tell them how to make use of air taxi on behalf of their clients, especially businessmen and vacationists. Some of the more progressive agents already have doubled and even tripled their use of air taxi facilities.

We must also make aircraft manufacturers aware of the role we are now playing and hope to play in the future so they will give increased attention and thought to designing aircraft best suited to our types of operation.

We must make the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government aware that demand-type air taxi, scheduled air taxi, and so-called third level airlines are filling a vacuum at the local community level that developed in air transportation all over the country subsequent to World War II.

Too few people are aware of the circumstances that led to the growth of the air taxi business, and of the rate of expansion of that business. After World War II aviation in general experienced good growth as a result of aircraft development, economic strides, public acceptance, and other contributing factors.

Then the need arose for more communities to be served with more frequency, and to more connecting points. This gave rise to the feeder airlines—now more commonly called local service carriers. A number of them sprang from fixed base operators who branched out into the small airline business.

Then came the jet age. Trunk carriers are now going 100 percent jet, serving metropolitan areas on long- and medium-length flights. Regional carriers, with jet and high-capacity turboprop equipment, presently are seeking the profitable high-density markets.

Local service carriers are becoming more selective and careful about new stops, and are looking over their present stops with a use-it-or-lose-it policy in mind. They gradually are working toward less Federal Government subsidy year by year.

In general, every carrier has several airports at which it would like to terminate service because of economics. The CAB is operating under a policy of constant review and close scrutiny of the economics of local service carrier stops.

As a result of all this, many small stops are being eliminated. In some cases, the frequency of service has been reduced. Air taxi and third-level airlines have stepped into the breach and are providing services to meet local community needs for air transportation. Air taxis generally charge by the trip rather than by the passenger. Passengers, however, can save money by sharing a ride with others.

More and more private companies are giving up their own "executive" aircraft in favor of using air taxis because they realize they can save money by such action.

For example, Raytheon Co. in 1963 sold its six executive planes and has been using air taxis to transport its officials to hub airports, where they can board commercial flights for long trips. Gerald P. O'Neil, Raytheon's director of manufacturing and purchasing, says this arrangement is almost as quick and is much more economical than flying by company plane all the way.

John C. Ellis, chairman of Rowlan Controller Co., a Westminster, Md., electrical equipment manufacturer, says his company sold its twin-engine plane and uses air taxis for its executives. He figures Rowlan's annual air taxi fares amount to about a half of the $40,000 a year it had been spending to operate and maintain its own aircraft.

Unless you fly at least 500 hours a year, it's much cheaper to use air taxi," Mr. Ellis explains. "Besides, with air taxi, you use what you need. We used to find our private plane sitting idle 1 out of every 2 days. But when we needed to make trips to three places at once, we had problems."

Business firms use air taxis to haul their cargo as well as transport their officials. General Motors, for example, has used air taxis to fly parts from GM warehouses to auto assembly plants where they were needed to keep production lines rolling.

During the past 10 years members of NATC—on the basis of voluntary monthly statistics provided, which are extremely conservative—carried more than 1 million passengers. NATC members flew more than 198,000 passengers in 1964, contrasted to only some 79,000 in 1955. Revenue miles rose from 5,600,000 in 1955 to 16,800,000 in 1964. Load factor increased from a low of 1.8 passengers per flight to 3.6 passengers in this period.

Air taxi passengers carried to the airlines increased in 10 years from 5,600 to 37,500; and passengers carried from the airlines rose from 6,000 to 35,000. Other passengers than airline connections rose from 67,000 to 126,000.

A recent survey of NATC members reveals that they have 758 aircraft in operation and have additional equipment available for use when needed. While single-engine craft outnumber twin engine equipment 394 to 364, the trend is toward greater procurement of multiengine planes.

As a result of NATC's 4 consecutive years of operations without injury to passengers, the so-called T-9AV flight insurance policy was established in 1959. Mutual of Omaha is the underwriter of this policy. This flight insurance covers both air taxi and airline passengers.

NATC members are now listed in a 56-page off-line city section in the Official Airline Guide's travel planner together with fares for single and twin engine equipment. Notices throughout the quick reference edition of the OAG refer readers to the travel planner for services and fares from hub airports to thousands of U.S. cities not now served directly by scheduled airlines.

The Association of Local Transport Airlines is considering a NATC proposal that ALTA members include in their route maps published in OAG, and in their rate schedules, asterisks to indicate the cities where air taxi service is available, with appropriate explanation at the bottom of the maps and/or timetables.

Members of the NATC and of the Air Traffic Conference of America in 1954 signed an air taxi service agreement that fitted air taxi into the national air transportation system. Twenty-three scheduled airlines and all NATC members are parties to this agreement. It provides for the acceptance, by the airlines and air taxi operators involved, of reservations initiated by either party on behalf of their own passengers.

NATC is hopeful that through the Air Traffic Conference of America, the air taxi service agreement of 1954 soon may be updated to permit participating airlines to issue passengers ticket for both airline and air taxi transportation to ultimate destination, where air taxi rates and flight service are published.

Such an agreement would pave the way for insurance companies to establish one travel insurance policy, at one low economical rate that would cover a passenger's entire journey from point of origin to destination via both airlines and air taxi.

A through-ticketing arrangement plus low-cost, through-travel air insurance would prove a boon to the air transport business, with passengers, scheduled airlines, and air taxi operators all benefiting.

The recent promotion of air taxi service by United Air Lines, as an aid to its trunk passengers, has begun to pay dividends, both for United and air taxi operators. United's coordinator of air taxi relations, Robert Shippee, says that since it began in May 1964 to indoctrinate reservation and sales personnel into the advantages of air taxi, United has been getting at least 30 percent more passengers from taxi flights than it did during a like period last year.

United also has published a leaflet "The Shortest Time Between Two Points—Air Taxi and United Air Lines." It points up the personalized, fast, efficient air taxi service that is convenient to thousands of airports not served by scheduled airlines.

"With population growth and decentralization of industry," Mr. Shippee said, "there has been an increasing demand to carry the business traveler all the way by air, using air taxi connection service.

"There are more than 6,000 communities with local airports and the scheduled airlines service about 600 of these areas," he added.

It is significant that other airlines are now following United's lead, and are training reservations and sales personnel respecting air taxi operations, and are appointing representatives to serve as liaison with the air taxi industry.

United is planning to pave an air taxi loading area near its Kennedy Airport terminal in New York at a cost of approximately $50,000. United also has established procedures at some of the major airports it serves for fast ramp transfer of incoming air taxi passengers making close connections with its departing flights and it is working with other carriers to improve further the handling of this interline traffic.

NATC recently surveyed its membership to determine the progress made by individual air taxi operators in 1964, problems facing the individual operator as well as the air taxi service as a whole, and prospects as they see them for future expansion.

With one exception, all operators reported steady growth of their business in 1964—with their business volume increasing anywhere from 10 to 100 percent. The lone dissenter, located in North Dakota, said bad weather in the first quarter of the year was responsible for his business not showing an increase in 1964.

As evidence of 1964 progress, responding NATC members also cited:

An expansion of passenger service to and from major airports; the institution of scheduled flights; almost a complete elimination of single engine usage and changeover to twin engine equipment based on customer demand; an increase in multiengine service; increased airline "hookups" necessitating the procurement of additional aircraft, as a

result of local promotion campaigns; development of additional cargo and air ambulance business and the uniforming of pilots; causing a "miraculous transformation" and a business "upturn."

Problems that face the entire air taxi industry, brought to light by the responses, included:

The need for more airline awareness of air taxi service and cooperation with it; failure of some airline personnel to seek and take reservations for air taxi service and to notify air taxi operators of reservation cancellations; lack of followthrough by some NATC members who have failed to suggest that their passengers also take air taxi service "at the end of the line"; high insurance rates; the need for fast, efficient maintenance; a pressing need for effective public relations and publicity and education of the public; the broad misconception that air taxi charter rates should be strictly competitive in all instances with scheduled airlines; shortage of good trained pilots and personnel; and regulations requiring two pilots under IFR conditions.

One NATC member aptly summed up the air taxi problem by saying:

"There are many (problems), but they can be lumped together into one requirement: education. The public, airline personnel, travel agents, aircraft manufacturers, and governmental agencies all need to be made more aware of just what the air taxi industry does, and how it goes about doing it.

"Some might call this publicity, but I don't. Publicity is not enough. There must be a reason for air taxi before we can establish ourselves as an economic force within the industry."

As for the prospects for future expansion of air taxi, NATC members cited:

An intention to employ more pilots; to acquire more and larger aircraft; to institute or increase scheduled air taxi flights; to plan programs involving close work with sales, reservation, cargo, and administrative personnel of scheduled airlines and calling for greater promotion of "Fly All the Way" in their areas and to enlarge their cargo-carrying capacity and expand their air ambulance business.

"If we can come up with workable solutions to the problems of creating an impressive and lasting image of air taxi in the minds of airline personnel and of travel agents," wrote one member, "expansion will become our number one problem. Air taxi will grow faster than we can keep up with it."

There are 3,026 firms in the United States that currently offer air taxi service, according to the latest Federal Aviation Agency figures. Many of these firms, however, are very small operations with only one or two aircraft—often piloted by the owner himself—and presently cannot meet the high standards and qualifications required for membership in NATC.

The large number of firms currently in the air taxi business is not indicative of the NATC membership potential. For example, of these 3,026 air taxi companies, only 46 provide scheduled flights (20 of these already are NATC members); only 739 hold IFR authorizations from FAA and only 1,302 operate multiengine equipment.

The conference, formed February 6, 1950, with 28 members, is dedicated to raising the standards of air taxi operators; and its objective is to win for its members the approval, acceptance, and confidence of the scheduled airlines and of the traveling public.

NATC is the only organization of member air taxis affiliated with the Air Traffic Conference and the Association of Local Transport Airlines, for legal economic and responsibility ties. We are officially recognized by the Civil Aeronautics Board as a segment of air transportation, under part 298.

Some of our members have been air taxi operators for 35 years; many have 25 years of operation behind them. Our safety record is impressive, with some members having perfect safety records over 20 and 25 years of continuous flight operations.

Membership in NATC is open to air taxi operators holding effective air carrier operating certificates issued by the FAA, to air carriers having an effective temporary or permanent certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the CAB, and large irregular air carriers with economic authority from the CAB that have a fixed base division utilizing in air taxi service aircraft units of less than 12,500 pounds maximum gross weight.

Among other requirements, prospective members must abide by the NATC's code of ethics; and for a period of 2 years preceding their membership application, must have derived 30 percent of their business income, or $10,000 in annual gross revenue, from operations as an air taxi operator; or 50 percent of their business income from air taxi and fixed base operations.

NATC membership offers air taxi operator listings in the Official Airline Guide's travel planner showing services and fares from hub airports to thousands of cities not serviced directly by airlines; reduced rates for display ads in OAG publications; prestige through exclusive use of NATC's Flying Kangaroo insignia; the benefit of the interline agreement with 23 major airlines that helps to increase air tax use; flight insurance covering air taxi and airline flight, at 4 cents per thousand dollars; exchange of promotional and sales ideas through NATC newsletters and its national annual conference; Government regulatory, legislative, and legal action in the best interest of air taxi operators; and national promotion and publicity.

State Expenditures Are Inadequate for Combating Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the June 1965 issue of the Connecticut State Journal carries a clear and thoughtful article on the need for increased Federal participation in carrying out an effective program of water pollution control and abatement. This article was written by our colleague, Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN, who serves with great distinction on the House Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power, which has for the past 2 years been working intensively on problems of water pollution. Congressman MONAGAN has brought to the subcommittee a wealth of experience from his service as a former mayor of Waterbury, Conn., and as Congressman of Connecticut's Fifth District since 1958. He has been a tower of strength and assistance to me in my work as chairman of the subcommittee.

Representative MONAGAN's knowledge of both the technical and policy aspects of water pollution is probably as comprehensive as that of any legislator in our country.

Congressman MONOGAN's article, "The Costs of Combating the Evils of Water Pollution: State Expenditures Are Clearly Inadequate," discusses many important features of the Water Quality Act of 1965, which has passed both the Senate and the House and is slated to go to conference in the near future. I believe it will be very informative to all Members of Congress as well as the general public, and I therefore request unanimous consent to have it inserted at this point in the RECORD:

THE COSTS OF COMBATING THE EVILS OF WATER POLLUTION—STATE EXPENDITURES ARE CLEARLY INADEQUATE

One point that is perfectly clear about water pollution: All levels of Government must do more in research and enforcement, provide additional trained personnel to do the job, and, spend more money, if we are to combat effectively the Nation's single most serious domestic hazard.

As our population increases and our economy grows, the demand for usable water also increases and, despite all current abatement efforts, we have been fighting a losing battle.

Water pollution is a problem which affects every community and every State in the Nation. It must be attacked at each of these levels of government, but the cost of mounting the attack places full emphasis on the responsibility of the Federal Government to assume the leadership.

The Natural Resources Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, of which I am a member, has held exhaustive hearings on pollution during the past 3 years in various parts of the United States and we have developed one of the most definitive records on this subject that has ever been compiled.

One of our most interesting and informative hearings was conducted in Connecticut on October 4, 1963. One of the principal witnesses at the Hartford hearing, over which I presided, was Mr. William S. Wise, director of the Connecticut Water Resources Commission—a public official of many years standing and a very faithful servant of the people of Connecticut. I am sure that there is no more qualified expert on the subject of water pollution in Connecticut than Mr. Wise.

In the course of his testimony, Mr. Wise gave a succinct answer to the question, "How can the goal of water pollution abatement be reached?"

"The path to a goal of clean water for the use and enjoyment of every one," he said, "is obstructed with several hurdles. First, there is the money hurdle, especially when these projects compete for funds with other public and private projects for a more glamorous appeal. There is also the difficulty, in getting pollution control placed on a priority list for proper consideration by both public and private officials."

He pointed out that there are many who contend that water pollution conditions can be remedied by the mere issuance of a directive by an administrative or control agency. He quite properly placed first emphasis on the money hurdle.

The House and Senate have recently approved different versions of a Water Quality Act of 1965 which I am confident will become law in the immediate future when the conferees reach agreement. Both Houses of Congress agree that there is urgent need for immediate action. There are some differences of opinion as to the procedures to be followed.

The House bill includes an amendment, which I proposed, to increase the authorized appropriation for sewage disposal plant construction grants from $100 to $150 million for fiscal years 1966–67.

While the work of the Natural Resources Subcommittee of the House has not been completed, we are in a position at this time

to make recommendations on the basis of our studies, and the more we probe the problem of water pollution control, the more convinced I am that corrective measures must be taken immediately and that the Federal Government must bear the role of greatest responsibility.

The situation calls for increased expenditures at this time as an investment in the Nation's future. Our studies have shown that local communities and States cannot or will not provide adequate funds to meet the problem. It is, therefore, my feeling that the Federal Government must step up its participation if we are to meet the crisis which confronts us. We must be shamefully aware that in spite of current efforts, all of our major streams, rivers, and lakes are growing dirtier apace.

President Johnson has stressed the importance of water quality standards and has recommended increased grants for sewage treatment projects, improved administration of the Federal water pollution control program and a research and development program to cope with the problem of storm and sanitary sewage. The President has asked the Nation to recognize the fact that water pollution is a threat to the health and the economic welfare of all Americans.

This growing menace is jeopardizing our water supplies, threatening the public health, destroying aquatic life, and disgracing our environment. Domestic sewage is but one of the pollutants. They include oils, garbage, chemicals, acid drainage from mines and from industry, discharge of new chemicals such as synthetic fibers and detergents, pesticides, and radioactive wastes.

Our own Federal installations are at fault, too, and I am happy to be able to state that our Natural Resources Subcommittee is today focusing specific attention on this phase of the problem in order that Congress may be able to approach a national disgrace with clean hands in this respect.

The Water Quality Act, which has been approved by the House, is similar to my bill, H.R. 3716, which I filed to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. It would establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, provide grants for research and development, increase funds for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, and authorize standards of water quality.

I have successfully recommended that existing construction grant limitations be raised from $600,000 and $2.4 million for a single and combined sewage control project, respectively, to $1.2 million and $4.8 million. One cannot ignore the evidence compiled by the subcommittee as to Federal obligation nor avoid the conclusion that the national interest requires a stepping up, not only in research but also in construction of facilities and, above all, in enforcement activity if the Nation's water resources are to satisfy the tremendous demands which will be made upon them.

As a stimulant to the abatement of industrial pollution, I have also filed legislation to encourage the construction and installation of control equipment by providing tax writeoffs to business and industries for that purpose. This bill is currently under study by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Money is the principal solution to the evils of water pollution. This was painfully evident in the testimony given by Mr. Wise during the Connecticut hearings of the Natural Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. Wise testified that "under the grant program, the number of municipal treatment plants installed per year is limited by the amount of funds allocated to the State."

He added, "because of its per capita income status, Connecticut is near the bottom of the totem pole on per capita allotments."

The Connecticut commission has adopted a policy of allocating available Federal funds on a priority basis and in such manner as to assure construction of the greatest number of plants per year. The water pollution control program in Connecticut is carried on under two agencies—the water resources commission and the State department of health. The water resources commission has the major responsibility for carrying on thre comprehensive program. The department of health inspects the municipal sewage treatment plants, conducts laboratory analyses, and carries on other important activities in this field.

Connecticut does not provide State aid for the construction of sewage treatment works, or any treatment works. In the words of Mr. Wise: "Connecticut has two problems. One is the limited funds that are made available by the legislature, and the other is the salary schedule which is not adequate to compete with that set up in surrounding States and the Federal agencies."

For the years 1963–1964, the Connecticut Legislature appropriated $99,950 for the operation of this program under the water resources commission. In addition, approximately $65,000 was appropriated to the State health department to carry on its water pollution control activities. These amounts are clearly inadequate to make a dent on a program requiring much more than these amounts to construct one plant.

In the course of our hearings at Hartford, I asked Mr. Wise, "Have you found that the Federal construction grant program has been helpful in accelerating the pace of construction of sewage disposal plants?"

He answered, "Well, because of the limited amount that is allocated to the State it means you can't build more than three or four projects per year."

Mr. MONAGAN. By that do you mean that more funds would mean more construction?

Mr. WISE. Yes, sir, it would.

Mr. MONAGAN. And that funds that have been granted in the past have accelerated the construction?

Mr. WISE. I would like to say that we have a terrific headache right now in trying to allocate these funds in accordance with our program to produce the most, to get the most plants and the most treatment. There are a number of requests for funds that we cannot honor, at least within this year or within a year or two to come. So that the amount of funds we get limits the number of treatment plants; because obviously, as a State agency, it would be most difficult—I don't say it would be impossible, but it would be very difficult and very cumbersome—to try to force a municipality to build a treatment plant without Federal funds.

Talkathon Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the need for free speech and open discussion of relevant choices in a democracy has been pointed out many times, but rarely as clearly and cogently as in an article written by Perry Swisher, Republican State senator from Bannock County, Idaho.

His commentary on a recent discussion meeting held at Idaho State University emphasizes that the students and faculty at that institution deserve commendation for their interest in public affairs and their dedication to the search for information.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, from the May 20 edition of the Pocatello Intermountain, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD; and I commend it to the attention of all Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 38TH PRECINCT—THE TALKATHON

(By Perry Swisher)

Two years ago they would have turned out for a hootenanny, if the singers were headliners. Four years ago a crowd like that would have meant a personnel recruiting team was on campus in behalf of a major corporation. But at midnight Friday at least 400 students, teachers, and spouses were gathered in the student union lounge at Idaho State University talking about American foreign policy.

The session had begun at nightfall. Nearly half the crowd stuck it out till the end, an hour past dawn. This was a talkathon, an all-night public debate over Vietnam and the Dominican Republic in particular and foreign affairs in general. A national version of it took place last Saturday in Washington, D.C., where President Johnson's McGeorge Bundy skipped out on the program.

The talkathon has spread from campus to campus, sometimes spontaneously and sometimes because of letters flying between academic organizations. Open discussion is suddenly so popular in college that, I am confident, the Manions and Smoots and Rousellots will attack it forthwith. The only question is whether they tag it as Communist-inspired or just a matter of bearded boobs playing into the hands of our enemies.

A GREAT MIX

Well, here at Pocatello, I went to this animal fair. The beards and the boobs were there. Every campus variety. And, praise be, once again there is great variety. A few of the bearded ones gave the impression they were on hand because it was show up or shave. I mean, really, Gary, if you are not protesting our foreign policy, what are you protesting?

Proceeding on the assumption that whiskers aren't per se childish or subversive, I managed to hear some pretty sharp comments emanate from beards and some claptrap come out of smoothly shaven faces. It was altogether a mix.

The format called for a fresh speaker every half hour. He had 10 minutes to say what he thought. The rest of the time was the audience's, to ask questions or sound off. The roster leaned to social science faculty and their students, but it also included an Army colonel with Vietnam experience, a math professor, an education professor, and conservative Congressman GEORGE HANSEN via telephone and his brother Dean in person. I was on, early, as proof you didn't have to be an expert to stand up. I recall no females as scheduled speakers but I didn't see the whole show.

IKE AND KOREA

If the experiment offered nothing else of value—and I think it offered lots—it should have supplied a little perspective to anybody who went there with half an ear.

ISU's librarian was irked and amused that former President Eisenhower would urge critics of L.B.J.'s interventions to confine themselves to writing letters to the White House—the librarian recalled that Ike in his 1952 campaign was pretty outspoken about the Korean war.

The anthropology department head offended some liberal sensibilities. He said two-thirds of mankind are peasants or primitives, not equipped to maintain freedom no matter what kind of imperialism you lift off their backs. Their transition will take hard work—literacy, land management, marketable skills, and production place a priority on know-how as distinct from power diplomacy at one extreme and romanticism at the other. He was not the most popular speaker.

TATTERED DOCTRINE

In the 19th century, said a history professor, Americans believed it was our manifest destiny to put the world right—and we seem to believe this still. It was he who dared to mention that the Monroe Doctrine, cited since Castro as the basis for our policy in Latin America, included an American pledge to stay out of the affairs of Europe.

A favorite point with questioners in the audience is that State Department concern for the freedom of others is expressed against unfriendly tyrants. The subjects of tyrants allied with us must look elsewhere, presumably to communism, for succor.

THE DIRTY WORD

This was a political forum about political problems and remedies, but the word "politics" was the cussword of the evening. Without a qualifying adjective. Not power politics, dirty politics, etc. Just politics. Because the news stories haven't told us, I wonder now if this was the obscene word lettered by rebel students on their posters of protest in the University of California uprising.

They may not like the word, but the American student and teacher have rediscovered politics. It could be bad news for my generation of politicians—so be it—but it does my heart good.

A National Bouquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mrs. Alice K. Salathe, of Harrisburg, Pa., has written me a letter describing her idea for a bouquet to be adopted as a national emblem. Her letter is a really beautiful one. I commend her idea to my colleagues and to all others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We are all aware that there have been a number of suggestions for a national flower in the past and that there is a great deal of competition as to which flower should be selected. But this may be the first time a national bouquet has been proposed in Congress. A limited search by the Library of Congress has not disclosed any previous suggestion of a floral arrangement as a national emblem.

Needless and sad to say, now that one national bouquet is being suggested, others are almost sure to follow. Such is the price we pay for the illimitable inventiveness of the human mind. Therefore, though I do not invite additional proposals, I would not discourage them. I would, however, urge that they be completely original. There can be no additions to or subtractions from a work of art except by the artist himself. Indeed, it is said that a camel is a horse that was drawn up by a committee. I would be deeply grieved by any such desecration of Mrs. Salathe's work of art. Her letter follows:

HARRISBURG, PA.,
April 26, 1965.

Hon. JOHN C. KUNKEL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUNKEL: I understand the idea of a national flower is being discussed. It was called to my attention that as a Representative of this district you were the correct person to contact regarding same.

I have no idea for a national flower, but I feel a national bouquet far more appropriate.

This is my idea:

A branch of dogwood in memory of Valley Forge, and the early settlers; with a cross in the center as a symbol of their faith in God, which brought most of them to this land of promise.

A red poppy in memory of those men and women who died in Flander's Fields, and in all foreign wars against oppression.

A sheaf of wheat in memory of Gettysburg, and the Civil War; when brother fought brother, for what each thought to be the right.

A white daisy, which grows in some form or other, in all of our 50 States.

A blue cornflower symbolic of the courage of the men and women who braved the elements and fought Indians clear across our country to build new frontiers or for religious freedom.

A piece of green cedar for our youth, so they may grow as straight and tall as the Cedars of Lebanon.

And at the bottom of the arrangement, a bunch of small pansies with the little faces of all the peoples of the world, we have welcomed to our shores; the children, the old people, people of all races, political beliefs and religions.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. ALICE K. SALATHE.

"Project Head Start" in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, children living in poverty are vulnerable to various risks to their health, education, and welfare. Medical care is usually inadequate; immunizations are frequently incomplete; and physical problems may go uncorrected, thus handicapping the children in their adaptation to school.

In addition to physical problems, poverty-stricken children often show learning difficulties as they approach school age. They frequently are handicapped in their ability to communicate—especially through speech. In addition, they may see people outside the family as strange and threatening. By the time they reach school age, they may have experienced repeated failures and feel a lack of confidence.

It is apparent that efforts aimed at meeting these problems are necessary. Project Head Start has been established to assist in the development of programs for preschool children, to prepare them to meet the requirements of school.

I am particularly pleased that Project Head Start will support training centers for preschool children in a number of Idaho communities this summer.

Bill Hall, newly appointed editorialist of the Lewiston, Idaho, Morning Tribune, has succinctly summarized the merits of Project Head Start. I ask unanimous consent that his editorial from the May 21 Tribune be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL CHANCE FOR DEPRIVED CHILDREN

President Johnson launched one of the most practical projects in his war on poverty this week with the formal beginning of a program to give children from low income families a headstart on their education. Project Head Start will provide preschoolers from low-income families with what amounts to a very specialized kindergarten.

The public schools necessarily must assume a certain level of readiness among students entering the classroom for the first time. But not all students are ready for training or even the social contact they find in the average public school first grade classroom.

Some among what the President terms "poverty's children" are not familiar with the knife and fork they find in the school cafeteria. They are unacquainted with indoor plumbing. Some come from families where neither parent can read or write. Many need the attention of a doctor or a dentist. Most of them never have been exposed at home to books, children's magazines, good music, or literate conversation.

Under the existing system they are placed in the classroom with healthy, well-nourished children who have been trained in the social graces, have been exposed to literate parents, and have been taught rudimentary arithmetic and the alphabet.

The children from the families with higher incomes have a headstart. Studies in New York schools showed that the achievement gap between the two groupings of students widen as they progress through the grades. Pilot programs—notably one in Baltimore—showed that preschool preparation will close the achievement gap between the two economic groups. Students who received the special early training were tested in later grades and found to be nearly on a par with those from families with less restricted incomes.

There is little correlation between income and intellect, but there is a correlation between income and academic achievement. Project Head Start seeks to alter this correlation.

It will establish special training centers in communities throughout the nation, including Kootenai County, Idaho Falls, and Aberdeen in the initial phase. Operation Head Start programs also are scheduled at Lapwai and Kamiah under a community action grant to the Nez Perce Indian Tribe. Students from low-income families will be given the preparation for school, the medical treatment, and meals that are a matter of course in other families.

The tragedy of the poorly prepared student is that he falls behind, often drops out of school and eventually establishes a home of his own in which his offspring are ill prepared for the public school classroom. President Johnson called it part of poverty's curse, passed on to the next generation "like a family birthmark."

Project Head Start is one of the most specific battle plans in the sometimes hazy war on poverty. It reaches toward the roots of better publicized national problems, such

as school dropouts, the crime rate, and unemployment. Those are symptoms of poverty; Project Head Start is one possible preventative.

The new program raises a broader question: Does public schooling for all children begin later than it should? The children from the literate, solvent families learn before the formal learning process begins. Many children from low-income families fail to learn before the start of formal schooling simply because there is nothing from which they can learn. It would appear that the children are ready to be taught even if the schools are not ready to teach them. One response in Idaho could be the establishment of public school kindergarten statewide.

Meanwhile, Project Head Start will serve to equalize the educational opportunity for many children who begin their training several paces behind the more fortunate.

The 408th Anniversary of the Act of Religious Tolerance by the Transylvanian Diet on June 1, 1557

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, as Americans we are all proud of all heritage of religious freedom. We all worship freely in the churches and synagogues of our own choice and can send our children to private and church-supported schools if we so wish. Our churches play an important role in our society both as educators, dispensers of charity and culture, and nobody suffers for believing in any creed or sect.

While we all know that there is only one truth, we let the individual fulfill his quest for the search of truth. This inheritance came to us first through the Founding Fathers who have designed the first amendment forbidding an established state church and establishing freedom of conscience, and before that it came from their forebears, many of whom left their ancestral countries exactly to avoid religious persecution, be they the Puritans of Massachusetts or the Catholics of Maryland. For the history of the 16th and 17th centuries in Europe is full with wars, atrocities, and persecutions between the Christian denominations in the name of religion. Not until the Peace of Westphalia—1648—on the Continent and until the coming of William of Orange to the English throne did the period of religious bias and warfare come to the end in Europe.

It is, therefore, with special fondness that we remember today the anniversary of the first religious tolerance legislation in Europe which was not passed by any of the western or southern European parliaments and diets, but by the Diet of Transylvania at Torda in 1557 amid the ferment of reformation and beginning counterreformation. Transylvania at this point was nominally independent, but only for a few years and only by the necessity to survive the Turkish onslaught while the Hapsburg kings of Hungary were powerless to ban the Asiatic invader.

The text of the act which was passed by a Protestant dominated Diet, only the Polish court minister Novocampius spoke for the Catholic religion, but signed into law by the Roman Catholic Queen Isabella, a daughter of the Polish king, contained the seeds of all later tolerance legislations all over Europe and the United States. It stated:

> Each person may hold any religious faith he wishes with old or new rites, while we at the same time leave it to their judgment to do as they please in the matter of their faith, just so long, however, as they bring no harm to bear on anyone at all, lest the followers of a new religion be a source of irritation to the old profession of faith or become in any way injurious to its followers.

The Transylvania of the 16th century had its trials and tribulations but it was a country which sent hundreds of its students to Western European universities and where culture and literature and theological discussion equally flourished despite the periods of devastating wars. Also it was the recognition of the common danger faced by the Turks and by the impotence of the Habsburg kings to deal with them while claiming Transylvania as part of the Hungarian Kingdom. There was, however, no question that Transylvania formed part of the Hungarian Kingdom. The three "nations" as the estates were called contained the two branches of Hungarians—Magyars and Szekelys—and the German Saxons while the Rumanians at this time only formed a minority which usually restricted itself to shepherding in the mountains or shared the life of serfdom with Hungarian and Szekely peasants alike.

On April 28, 1965 in my speech I dealt in more details about the history and fate of the peoples of Transylvania. I did not go into many concrete cases about the present today, commemorating this anniversary which shows the wisdom and cultural maturity of the Hungarian and German peoples of Transylvania already in the 16th century, I cannot refrain from more direct remarks about the sad destiny of these peoples under Communist Rumanian rule.

There is no political or economic freedom in Transylvania today, much less real religious freedom. The dictatorship of the one-party, Marxist-Leninist state has created oppression and the silence of the graveyard in this country for all elements not fully subscribing to the goal of a Communist society. This is true despite the 1963–1964 amnesty which let psychological and physically broken persons who were lingering in the jails often for 10 to 15 years out into freedom but without any pensions and often banning them to return to their cities or professions. This is true despite the relative easing of visa requirements to western tourists and the relative safety the tourists enjoy which was not the case 4 or 5 years ago.

Let me illustrate what political freedom is in Communist Rumania for anyone. Some people were discussing in private over a couple of bottles of wine what would happen if the Hungarian revolution was to be victorious and the Stalinist regime could be changed in Rumania. They wrote down certain names of well-known Hungarians and Rumanians who might be asked to become the leaders. One of them was an informer drinking with them and egging them on. A few weeks later not only were the participants of the discussion in the hands of the secret police but also those persons whose names they jotted down on a paper. The end result was the show trial of Kolozsvar Cluj in 1957 which resulted in three death sentences—openly admitted—and in 18 long prison terms. Two of the defendants sentenced to death belonged to the group whose names were jotted down.

For religious freedom a few other data shall suffice. According to affidavits received in one Hungarian village in the autonomous region not less than 17 Unitarian ministers were arrested in the period between 1954 and 1962 and not less than 50 persons arrested and sentenced to long prison terms for "having been in league with the ministers against the security of the Socialist state." Out of the three bishoprics of the Roman Catholic Church—almost strictly Hungarian—two remain vacant and in the third the bishop still has no full freedom to exercise his ecclesiastical duties. And letters still come and visitors still state in affidavits that "going to church is a sin against the government in Rumania."

As to economic freedom in a nationalized industry and collectivized agriculture, it would be foolish even to discuss the rights of the individual to contract his work and talents freely.

Until this point I consciously avoided to single out the persecution of the 1.75 million Hungarian minority as such since Communist oppression is also felt by the Rumanian-origin citizens of Transylvania as well.

However, it would be sanctimonious hypocrisy to state that everyone is equally badly off in Rumania and that there exists no unjustifiable and undeserved persecution of the Hungarian minority which at times approximates a gradual, but not less deadly genocide.

I realize that our foreign policy officials shake their heads when one talks about genocide in this case, to them apparently it means the physical extermination by massacres, gas chambers, or by deportations into inhospitable climate zones of the members of an ethnic group. Yet even by this standard the recent past could be counted as qualifying for the genocide description. Between 1944, the return of the Rumanian Army and irregulars in the wake of the Red army which they joined after fighting it in bloody battles for 3 years, and 1961 the losses of the Transylvanian Hungarians by massacres and deportations into the inhospitable regions of the Danube Delta amounted to about 250,000, or about 15 percent of the ethnic group as of 1947.

But what would be the name for a linguistic, cultural, and psychological forced assimilation that the Rumanian Communist regime implements in Transylvania. Is it permissible under the peace treaties to which our country

remains a signatory and which provided that Rumania shall not discriminate against any of her citizens of the grounds of sex, religion, and language when the term "Hungarian," nay even the term "Rumanian Hungarian" cannot be printed in any press products, but only cohabiting nationalities within Rumanian, when the schools have been merged with the Rumanian ones and the number of Hungarian courses are decreasing year by year and new and new scores of students are forced to join the Rumanian branches though they are Hungarian by ethnic background and language?

Is a lack of discrimination toward the Hungarians in Transylvania when those who still survive the selective examinations in Rumanian language and receive their diplomas are assigned by the Communist state into areas outside of Transylvania or in the southern districts where Rumanians form the predominant nationality? When the few new plants and factories which are established in Hungarian areas of Transylvania—while new industrial complexes are being established in the former old kingdom of Rumania—are used to settle Rumanian workers, craftsmen, and engineers into compact Hungarian villages and towns while local labor is encouraged to migrate into the Rumanian areas of Brasov and other southern Transylvanian regions, is it what the peace treaty stipulated? When nobody even in the autonomous region which never comprised more than 28 percent of the Hungarians dares to speak Hungarian in the public places lest he be attacked by Rumanian hooligans and additionally arrested by the police for disorderly conduct while defending himself, is this in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations or the universal declaration of human rights?

The list could be continued endlessly from the truncation of the autonomous region to the systematic removal of even the Hungarian Communists from many administrative positions in the autonomous region and to others.

We find that the protagonists of the present policy of expanded trade and cultural exchange with Rumania counter these facts with the argument that Rumania's dependence on Russia has been decreasing and that Rumania might become another Yugoslavia or even leave the bloc. While disagreeing that Tito's Yugoslavia ever was an asset to the free world in its struggle with international communism, what are the facts? On June 8, 1964, Representative GLENARD LIPSCOMB proved on the floor of the House that Rumania served as an intermediary for the transhipment of American grain sold to Russia to Castro's Cuba. That trade and political-ideological relations with Red China has increased for the past 2 years and that as David Binder from the New York Times reported it Gheorghiu-Dej's funeral this March had been attended by Chou En-lai and that the query of the American correspondent was answered by the Rumanian spokesman by pointing to the close and intimate friendship between the two countries. Lately one organization circulated photographs showing Rumanian trucks sold to North Vietnam ferrying North Vietnamese troops, which photographs seemed to be bona fide. Such is the world political attitude of our newly found Rumanian Communist friends. Nota bene, there has not yet been even one Transylvanian Hungarian included into the cultural and student exchange program agreed upon by the State Department and the Rumanian Government in an exchange of notes.

Mr. Speaker, considering the evidence, I cannot help but suggest certain courses of action to the State Department regarding Rumania and her suppression of its citizens, especially the Hungarians in Transylvania.

First, there should be no more extension of technical data involving patents, plant construction plans, and testing equipments in petroleum industry and other aid until further concessions are extended by the Rumanian Communist regime to its citizens and relief is granted to the Hungarian minority facing a gradual genocide.

Second, these concessions should include Rumanian Communist measures resulting in a halt of further Rumanization of the schools, the cessation of dispersal of Hungarian professionals, the restoration by administrative decree of the autonomous region in its 1953 boundaries, the holding of elections free of Government pressure on the local levels to insure the proportionate share of Hungarians in the local administration and restoration of the independence of the Hungarian University at Kolozsvar—Cluj—and the medical college at Marosvasarhely—Tirgu Mures.

Third, there should be an official diplomatic démarche by the United States Government to the Bucharest Communist regime on the basis of American obligations under the 1947 peace treaty listing the continued violations and reminding the Rumanian Government that Rumania's claim to Transylvania in the peace treaty is based in part upon the nondiscrimination clauss of the same, and that the U.S. Government will consider itself free to change its position on the territorial issues unless relief is granted to the persecuted and the minorities.

Fourth, should the cessation of aid and the diplomatic démarche fail to achieve any concrete and positive results, our Government should raise the issue of minority persecution in the United Nations Social and Economic Council, or even in the General Assembly if need be.

Vardis Fisher Revisited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on political matters, I often find myself the favorite "whipping boy" of Idaho Columnist Vardis Fisher. But Mr. Fisher is not only a political columnist; he is also nationally known as one of America's outstanding writers. As such, Mr. Fisher has won the respect and the appreciation of the citizens of my State. Recently, a study of his work, written by Prof. Joseph M. Flora, was published by the Twayne Publishers. A fine review of this book, written by Nancy Stringfellow, was published in the May 20 edition of the Idaho Observer. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VARDIS FISHER REVISITED

(By Nancy Stringfellow, manager, the Book Shop)

"Vardis Fisher—Twayne's U.S. Author's Series," Joseph M. Flora, $3.50, Twayne Publishers.

It is a great pleasure to me to be able to review the latest book in the distinguished Twayne's U.S. author's series. Ever since 1928, when I first picked up a copy of "Toilers of the Hills" and read it with complete fascination, I have followed the career of Vardis Fisher with interest and with pride in the fact that his roots are deep in Idaho.

In the 1930's Fisher was regarded as one of the decade's most distinguished writers. He was compared with Hamlin Garland, with Erskine Caldwell, then with Theodore Dreiser and with Thomas Wolfe. But he was a writer who would not stay conveniently labeled. His autobiographical tetralogy, "In Tragic Life," "Passions Spin the Plot," "We Are Betrayed," and "No Villain Need Be" had established him as a novelist of ideas; "April: A Fable of Love" was in a completely different vein, a delicate, almost fragile book, and invited comparison with Nathan and Cabell.

His most financially successful novel, "Children of God," won the Harper Prize Award, and rated as one of the best historical novels of its decade. He could have easily pursued that vein, but he was not looking for a comfortable niche in the hall of fame. His uncompromising refusal to write for the popular taste and his undoubted talent for antagonizing influential reviewers prevented him from becoming a fat and happy dean of letters; reaching deep into the past, he embarked on the difficult and monumental "Testament of Man," a search for the development of man's mind and spirit through the ages.

It was a long and arduous journey, and a lesser man might have abandoned it for more profitable pursuits. For the reading public was demanding, in that era, reassurance rather than uncomfortable questions.

Between the 11th and 12th volume in the "Testament," Fisher published the best novel on Lewis and Clark that has ever been written but he could feel no real peace until he had finished his project. His public dwindled for a time, but now that 12 of his novels have been reprinted in paperbacks a whole new generation is reading him, and there is a new surge of interest in this writer of many facets.

Professor Flora's study of Vardis Fisher is an informative and interesting one. As he states in his foreword, it is not exhaustive. He does not dissect all 29 volumes, nor does he—and this is a pity—even mention Fisher's invaluable work on the Idaho Encyclopedia, the Idaho Guide, and his delightful collection of Idaho lore.

His highest ambition, Flora says, is to assist in the revaluation of an author whose fame has fluctuated over the years, but whose ability is unquestioned. To that end he gives

a survey of the world of Fisher's fiction, points out major themes, and explores the artistic accomplishments as they serve or hinder these themes. Only incidentally biographical, the book outlines the chief struggles of the author's life in anticipation of his autobiographical fiction, which is, he considers, pivital.

The bulk of the study, understandably, is concerned with the tetralogy of Vridar Hunter and with the ""Testament of Man." His analyses of both are able and conscientious, although each reader will always find something different in each book.

Flora devotes one excellent chapter to the novels of the Antelope country, and another to the American historical novels. The concluding chapter inspects the total range of work and ends with the assessment that Vardis Fisher's power of vision and his ability to portray human character should mean a continuous and growing number of readers.

Hawaii-Dooley Foundation Joint Project in Nepal—A New Foreign Aid Concept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the State of Hawaii, jointly with the Thomas A. Dooley Foundation, is undertaking a project in the Kingdom of Nepal that is probably the first of its kind since our Union was formed. The project is a national public health survey and training program in Nepal involving as joint participants the department of public health of the University of Hawaii, the Bishop Museum in Honolulu, the Institute of Technical Interchange of the East-West Center, and the Dooley Foundation.

Dr. Verne Chaney, executive director and cofounder of the Thomas A. Dooley Foundation, in a recent address before a joint session of the Senate and House of the State Legislature of Hawaii, said:

> In this Hawaiian health survey program for His Majesty's Government of Nepal, we have the first example of a State providing foreign aid to a developing nation with private financing.

Dr. Chaney said that the undertaking "heralds the beginning of an entirely new concept in foreign aid."

Praising Hawaii for leading the way in the search for world peace and understanding among peoples, he summarized the Dooley Foundation's purpose in jointly administering the program in Nepal with these words:

> The Dooley Foundation feels that it has an unusual opportunity and role to play in the world mess of things.
>
> We are not political; we are not sectarian; we are simply people helping people because they need help and because it is right.
>
> We wish to help bridge the gaps of friendship and understanding between peoples. Our tool for this shall be medicine.

The program will commence in August of 1965 and continue for a period of 15 months at a total cost of $270,000. All funds will be privately contributed, and much of the money will be raised right in Hawaii. The program will consist of a public health survey in the fields of infectious disease, nutrition, sanitation, anthropology, and entomology.

Technicians from the three participating institutions in Hawaii will also help the people of Nepal to set up their own public health program for the future.

Among those who will work on the project are: Dr. Robert Worth, consultant, professor of public health at the University of Hawaii; Robert Murphy, administrative assistant; Dr. N. K. Shah, program director; Dr. L. Poudayl, laboratory director; Miss Carolyn McCue, chief technician; Miss Phyllis Morita, laboratory technician; Dr. Alan Howard, anthropologist; Mrs. Kajorn Howard, nutritionist; Peyton Rowan, sanitary engineer; Mrs. Peggy Rowan, public health nurse; and others yet to be selected.

Heading the local committee of distinguished citizens to raise funds for the project are: Retired Navy Admiral Harry D. Felt; Chinn Ho of Capital Investments; and Ernest Albrecht, Pan American World Airways.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of the youngest State in the Union, I take great pride in calling to the attention of the Congress, the leadership which Hawaii's private citizens are assuming in fostering better understanding with with other peoples of the world.

Former Congressman and Mrs. Izac Observe Their Golden Wedding Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to advise my colleagues, that on Saturday June 5, former Congressman and Mrs. Edouard Victor Michael Izac, of San Diego and Washington, D.C., will observe their golden wedding anniversary. It was my pleasure to serve with Ed Izac, when I came to the Congress many years ago. He has a splendid record of service to our country. I know you join with me in wishing Congressman and Mrs. Izac many more years of health and happiness.

Congressman Izac, a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, class of 1915, was married the day following his graduation to Agnes Cabell, daughter of the late Maj. Gen. De Rosey Carroll Cabell. They have six children, five of whom are living. Three will attend the private ceremony here in Washington. The other two, in service and stationed overseas, are not expected to attend.

Congressman Izac, holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor, served in Congress for 10 years, representing San Diego and Imperial Counties of California. Presently retired, he and Mrs. Izac have traveled extensively in Europe and the Holy Land. Mr. Izac is the author of "Prisoner of the U-90", his autobiography of World War I while held prisoner. He has written articles for current magazines and lectured extensively since his congressional terms.

A Mass is to be celebrated Saturday morning in the private chapel of His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate. The Mass will be celebrated by the Izacs' youngest son, ordained a Catholic priest a year ago. He will be assisted by two monsignors and the delegate will bestow the pontiff's special blessing upon the couple. The Mass, to which the children and grandchildren have been invited, will be followed by a private breakfast.

Congressman Izac, when asked about the celebration, said:

> It is a very quiet affair. We look back with fond memories on San Diego days and watch from afar its growth and prosperity. We are here in Washington because most of our children reside in the area.

These include his eldest daughter, Cabell Waller Berge, who served as her father's secretary in Congress—with three children and two grandchildren—Comdr. Edouard V. Izac, Jr., stationed in Naples, Italy— with four children—who will try to fly home for the occasion; Charles D. Izac, serving in a civilian capacity with Army materiel here—and his wife and three children—Mrs. Eugene Fenton Smallwood (Suzanne) whose husband, Major Smallwood, and six children are shortly to leave their assignment in Hawaii for Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; soon to visit their parents before the new assignment; and the Rev. Carroll Andre Izac, presently assigned to Our Lady of Victory Church, in Washington, D.C. The sixth child, Forrest Rene, deceased, is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

Early this fall, the Congressman's book, "The Holy Land—Then and Now" will be published.

House & Home Endorsement of Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to place in the RECORD for our colleagues' attention, an excellent editorial on the urban renewal program by Mr. Richard W. O'Neill in the June issue of House & Home. The editorial is a ringing endorsement of both the objectives and the accomplishments of the urban renewal program and a forceful answer to critics of the program.

Mr. Speaker, we hope to have the omnibus housing bill on the floor soon. One of the most important titles of that bill is title III which would provide sufficient Federal funds to keep the urban renewal program going in high gear for another 4 years. Also, title IV of the bill contains important provisions to help minimize the hardship caused by dis-

placement of families and small businesses. I might point out that Mr. WIDNALL, the ranking minority member of our committee, was the author of all of title IV and most of title III.

When the bill reaches the floor, I urge the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, not only for titles III and IV of the bill which deal with urban renewal and related problems, but for the overall bill which will provide the necessary legislative framework over the next 4 years for healthy urban and suburban growth, a prosperous homebuilding industry, and a substantial improvement in housing conditions in both urban and rural communities.

The editorial follows:

URBAN RENEWAL: A WORKABLE TOOL THAT NEEDS SHARPENING

Since World War II, growing decay at the heart of our cities has been the No. 1 urban problem. In those 20 years, slums have proliferated, real estate values—and the municipal tax take—have dropped, the affluent and then middle-income families headed for the suburbs and downtown areas deteriorated.

Well aware that these conditions could become a nationwide trend, the Federal Government began urban renewal under the 1949 Housing Act. The program was, and is, designed to do what the private market clearly cannot do. No entrepreneur can assemble the fragmented land of a slum area into a marketable tract, because slum buildings produce income (and have a market price) too great for the entrepreneur to absorb. Urban renewal simply makes funds available to cities to assemble land for private development according to to publicly approved plans.

Renewal projects are essentially local in character. They are directed and run from city hall, not from Washington. Cities must want urban renewal assistance to get a program going. Community leaders have effective veto power over every urban renewal project. (Strangely enough, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has always been against urban renewal, but last year the U.S. Conference of Mayors polled 220 local chambers of commerce and found only 5 opposed to renewal.)

Urban renewal's record of accomplishment since 1949 is truly impressive.

Urban renewal has triggered striking physical changes in Boston, Hartford, Honolulu, Columbus, New Haven, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Washington, Norfolk, Atlanta, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, San Francisco, and hundreds of smaller cities. Today, there are 1,545 urban renewal title I projects in 765 cities, and 72 percent of these areas have populations of less than 50,000.

In all of this huge volume of work, distribution of urban renewal grants has been both fair and amazingly free of scandal. There has been no reported misuse of public funds even though more than 150,000 pieces of property have been acquired under the program. And 20 States that have 78 percent of the urban population and 77 percent of the deficient housing in urban areas have received 78 percent of urban renewal grants.

Urban renewal has done an exceptional job of housing families forced to move by renewal projects. The 1949 Housing Act specified that an urban renewal project cannot be carried out unless and until standard housing is available for evicted families. The latest census count finds that 94 percent of relocated families now have standard quarters. At the end of 1964, half of the $2 billion worth of private construction in renewal projects was in housing. Some 62,000 units have been built and 150,000 more units have been planned on land committed to renewal. Furthermore, 60 percent of all housing units committed in 1964 were within reach of low- and moderate-income families.

Urban renewal is beginning to fill municipal coffers. There has never been any question that slums are a real economic drain on cities. For instance between 1950 and 1960 in Boston's deteriorating core, $78 million of taxable assessments simply vanished. In New Haven, completed renewal projects will return 10 percent per year of the city's total investment in renewal; in Baltimore the figure is 15 percent of the city's investment.

Urban renewal has broadened the role of private enterprise in the center city. About $6.90 of redevelopment investment (excluding land costs) is generated for each dollar of Federal grant. Of this $6.90, about $5.45 represents private investment, excluding land. To date the Federal Government has committed $4.7 billion to urban renewal projects, which will generate $25.6 billion of private investment. This does not mean that private enterprise could do the job alone. In fact, slums and blight owe their existence largely to the past inaction of the free marketplace. Entrepreneurs alone cannot correct problems that developed through decades of nonplanning and unconcern for anything but fast profits.

Forcing people to leave their old neighborhoods is probably the major source of bitterness and opposition to slum clearance. Social ties, developed over the years, are destroyed and many small businesses are uprooted. Rehabilitation of residential and commercial structures both within and next to renewal sites could do much to solve this problem.

This approach is as sound economically as it is socially. We cannot meet the country's huge housing needs unless we rehabilitate buildings that are worth saving as well as replace the ones that are not. Rehabilitation generally costs less than complete redevelopment, and it spreads beyond the urban renewal area to help check the creation of new slums. But only now after a decade of well-intentioned efforts by FHA and URA is rehabilitation beginning to work in our cities.

In the years ahead, renewal and rehabilitation will generate much housing activity in our economy. In a decade's time over half of our dollar volume may be derived from urban renewal activity. We must solve the social and economic problems inherent in relocation and rehabilitation. The result would benefit not only the entire community but the housing industry as well.

RICHARD W. O'NEILL.

Inadequacy of Unemployment Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial on May 18, 1965, the Wall Street Journal has called attention to deficiencies in our unemployment statistics which has concerned me as a member of the Economic Statistic Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee.

Citing investigative work undertaken by Samuel Lubell, the Journal endorses his conclusion that the national unemployment rate is in several ways misleading and in need of considerable revision. The unemployment figure which is used as a critical basis of making public policy provides no accurate estimate of the seriousness of the need for new jobs, nor of the degree of hardship that exists among the jobs.

Part of the trouble lies in the sampling techniques and in the sweeping definition of unemployment which gives the same weight to a coal miner whose job is probably gone for good as to an autoworker who has been temporarily laid off during a model changeover, and who is drawing 70 percent of his pay.

One corrective, which I have long endorsed, is the development of a statistical series on job vacancies. A recent pilot study in Rochester, N.Y., by the National Industrial Conference Board, indicated the feasibility of collecting such data as well as uncovering the existence of a pool of job vacancies which virtually equal the number of unemployed in that city.

Under unanimous consent I place the Journal article in the RECORD at this point:

POOR STATISTICS AND WORSE ECONOMICS

As a voice in the statistical wilderness that has long questioned the validity of the Federal unemployment estimates, we naturally welcome Samuel Lubell's call for a new and sharper definition of the jobless.

Mr. Lubell, the diligent and perceptive political pollster, has spent many recent weeks interviewing hundreds of people out of work in 21 cities around the Nation. His overriding conclusion is that the national unemployment rate as proclaimed by Washington is in several ways misleading and in need of considerable revision.

It is not only that the figure distorts the actual condition. What is worse is that it has come to be regarded as the single most important barometer of the Nation's economic climate. It can be, and is, used as the basis for vast new public spending programs, however irrelevant or wasteful they may be. Another way of putting it, in our somewhat jaundiced view, is that it has become a convenient tool for politicans eager to tap the Treasury.

Yet this sacrosanct statistic, as Mr. Lubell observes, does not provide an accurate estimate of how serious is the need for more jobs. For one thing, the Government does not even attempt to measure the job vacancies that exist along with unemployment. Nor does the announced national rate yield, in the interviewerw's words, "a sensitive picture of the shifts taking place in the quality of the unemployed and of the changing nature of their problems."

Moreover, the figure does not tell how much, or how little, hardship there is among the jobless. To us this is a particularly important point. Surely a humanitarian nation should be more concerned with the actual cases of hardship than with statistical veneration. Beyond that, we reject the proletarian doctrine, implicit in governmental attitudes, that everyone should work regardless of need. If some people can make a decent life without working, we would say that is their privilege and pleasure.

Part of the trouble with the official unemployment rate stems from the sampling methods used, a survey of 35,000 households in which the main question is, "Have you been looking for work?"; if the answer is yes, the individual is counted as unemployed. As sampling techniques go, 35,000 households might be considered adequate, though obviously capable of producing only a broad national guess. The loose questioning is another matter.

One of its results, Mr. Lubell writes, is that "the identical label 'unemployed' is

applied to such an astonishing variety of situations that it has been robbed of much of its real meaning. A coal miner who has lost his job for good is given the same statistical weight as an auto worker who is guaranteed 70 percent of his pay even when laid off for model changes."

The sweeping definition of "unemployed" also leads to abundant abuse: People who are on jobless relief but won't look for work, people who won't take jobs at pay lower than they had been making, people who don't need to work at all but receive compensation. One young man interviewed at an extension university admitted that he was a full-time student and shouldn't be getting unemployment checks.

To give the Labor Department its due, it does put out certain breakdowns of unemployment by groups. Unfortunately the more significant of these figures are usually granted scant attention by the public, the politicians and apparently Labor Department officials themselves, since they are among those who constantly contend that the aggregate level of unemployment is intolerable.

Almost certainly, it seems to us, the most revealing estimate, in terms both of degree of hardship and of economic significance, is not the national rate, currently given as 4.9 percent of the labor force, but the jobless rate for married men. These, after all, are generally speaking the people who do need to work and who comprise the bulk of the labor force. By any standard they are far more deserving of concern than the jobless teenagers about whom there is so much weeping.

That rate for married men is presently put at 2.5 percent. If it is anywhere near a correct approximation, it represents not a state of intolerable unemployment but for all practical purposes full employment. In a huge, complex, and mobile economy with a considerable amount of seasonal employment, it would be difficult if not impossible to attain a much lower rate of unemployment.

The deficiencies of the jobless tabulations suggest their own remedies. One private group, the National Industrial Conference Board, has just shown, in a local survey, the way to correcting part of the problem—the compilation of job vacancy figures. It is by no means unlikely that a national survey would indicate more job opportunities than qualified jobseekers.

But what is needed most of all is public realization that the lot of the genuinely unemployed is being employed for questionable political purposes. In such a climate, it is at least encouraging when attempts are made to expose an arrangement which builds, on a foundation of faulty evaluation, a pyramid of bad economic policy.

James A. Farley at Stony Point Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to share the same platform last Sunday with the Honorable James A. Farley of my State. It was the occasion of the opening of the Stony Point, N.Y., centennial. I was impressed with the remarks of Stony Point's first citizen and I offer them for the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, THE COCA-COLA EXPORT CORP., AT THE TOWN OF STONY POINT CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION, STONY POINT, N.Y., MAY 31, 1965

We are constantly being told that the past was the time of great adventure and of great romance. This, of course, is entirely proper if it is taken in perspective. The fact of the matter is that we can mark the progress of the human race by the adventures it has eliminated.

Bearing a child in those days was a tremendous adventure because the mortality rate was so much higher for mothers. It was a new and dangerous adventure for the newborn child, too, because more than half of them died before the age of 2.

Drinking a glass of water then was part of the perils of life. Typhoid fever struck at families like serpents in the water. Tuberculosis ran through the country to such an extent that it was called the white plague—and it was as unconquered then as cancer is now.

In counting our present blessings, I do not wish to deride the past. I simply want to record why I am a buoyant optimist. No one could honor the pioneers more than myself; but because they were hardy does not mean they were idiots. I am sure that if Daniel Boone, Kit Carson, and Buffalo Bill were alive today they would be among the first to acclaim the wonders of the jet airplanes which cross the same plains in hours which took them months to ride by horse. Gen. George Washington, who suffered untold agonies because of the primitive dental methods—without anesthesia—would be the first to bless the advances in modern dentistry.

Actually, a hundred years ago, two great inventions were changing the world at a rapid rate. They were the steam engine and the telephone. Railroads were just starting toward the West; the continent was not spanned until 1868. The telephone had received wide use in the Civil War but the Atlantic cable had not yet been laid.

Ships at sea were isolated—there was no radio. In case of distress, flares were sent up—most often a forlorn gesture. Today, a computer directs all ships in the area of the stricken vessel within seconds after an S O S is received.

Thus, part of the adventure of the good old days was drowning at sea—but who would concede that it was desirable?

The communication between individuals was severely limited. There were no telephones. Today the American people place 250 million telephone calls every day. There are those who wish it never had been invented. They insist life was better then. But, of course, few of them ever had their isolated farm burn when the sole signal in the night was the flames of a man's home.

There was no radio nor television in those days either. Whether or not the worshipers of the past refuse to admit it, life was hard and life was lonely. I am aware of the argument that the television has brought the Beatles into our home. But I respectfully call attention that the same instrument also brings the President of the United States into the same room—and such is our state of freedom that either can be denied access by merely turning a dial.

There were no airlines then either—and there are those who wish they never had been invented. To these I say it is still a free country. Those who wish may still go to California by prairie schooner if they so desire.

For myself, I derive deep satisfaction from the fact that I, as Postmaster General, promulgated the first flights of the clipper ships across the Pacific. Indeed, I was present when the first clipper took off from Oakland for Manila in 1936—and the sense of history present at that moment was not less, I am sure, than when Columbus left Palos in his great quest. This is the kind of adventure man seeks—not the kind of watching his dear one die of appendicities, lockjaw, or diphtheria. And we have only begun that great adventure.

Looking at the supermarkets around our country reminds me of over 60 years ago when in the fall cabbages were buried in the ground, vegetables in the cellar, apples in the attic and fruits preserved in jars—all by the American family itself. Each family killed its hogs in the fall. Some of the pork was put in brine and the hams were smoked. How good was that old-fashioned food? Well, nobody is stopping anyone else from continuing those methods but an awful lot of people prefer to use the supermarkets.

Fifty years ago anyone who predicted today's civilization would have been called stark, raving mad. All this goes to prove, as both our philosophers and even the Supreme Court have said, that the last 50 years of history have been more significant than the previous 5,000.

I predict that the same thing will be said, even more strongly, of the next 50 years.

As, 30 years ago, I stood on the shores and watched man wing off across the Pacific this generation stands watching man blast off into space. I predict that great new energies and great new worlds will open up before us, and that we can no more imagine them now than Columbus in 1492 could have imagined the New York City of 1965.

Not only new worlds of energy but whole new fields of human opportunity and discovery. Why 55 percent of the American people earn their living in industries which did not even exist 100 years ago. The fact is that this land of opportunity multiplies the chances for its growth every time it makes a new discovery or produces a new invention—and that happens several times a day.

And so I make no apology for my unbounded optimism. Indeed, I am glad you invited me here on this 100th anniversary because, in my opinion, just listing a few of the great changes which have taken place indicates how badly wrong were the pessimists of a hundred years ago. I find it impossible to believe that the divine providence which has taken man nearly to the stars intends to drop him back into the swamp, the mud and the jungle.

Because I note the new changes in the physical world, please do not, for a moment, entertain the thought that I think less of the old spiritual values. On the contrary, I value them more highly. Indeed, I believe that no physical progress is possible for any length of time if these old values are ignored.

For example, I do not think our patriotism is less because we now have a safe and sound Fourth of July. Standing on the hallowed ground of Stony Point, it is not lost in even our children and grandchildren nor us, that the same American spirit which brought cannon and shell by oxcart from nearby Sterling Forest to the docks of Grassy Point in the Revolutionary War is manifesting itself this very hour in Vietnam. It took courage, fortitude, and strength to move those Revolutionary cannon over the primitive mountain roads. It takes the same kind of determination to transport American strength and purpose across the Pacific to the dangerous jungle trails of Vietnam. The weapons certainly are different and the methods of war have changed. But the essential values of the heart and soul of our country haven't changed a bit. "Mad" Anthony Wayne charged up the promontory of Stony Point. The U.S. Armed Forces in the suceeding generations did the same from the plain of San Jacinto to the beach of Normandy and they are carrying on the fight for freedom even as we talk. An awful lot of water has

flowed down the Hudson and a great amount of American blood has been shed in the four quarters of the globe, since the Revolution. But that is the price we paid for our freedom at Valley Forge and it is the price we are paying and are willing to pay right now from the Dominican Republic to the South China Sea.

And we will emerge triumphant again so long as we stand by our principles.

In the 19th century an American philosopher said, "Hitch your wagon to a star—hang right on—and there you are."

He thought he was merely writing poetry. But by 1970 we will not only have hitched our wagon to a star but, literally, the man in the moon will be an American.

In closing, I again thank you for inviting me here today and ask that you take especial note of my predictions—because I expect that such progress will be made that a much larger gathering will meet in Stony Point a hundred years from now and I am confident enough to predict that the speaker on that occasion will say, "Jim Farley said so, didn't he?"

Remarks of John M. Drewry, Chief Counsel, House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, at National Maritime Day Ceremonies, U.S. Pavilion, New York World's Fair, Friday, May 21, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 21, 1965, Mr. John M. Drewry, chief counsel of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, delivered the principal address at National Maritime Day ceremonies held in the U.S. pavilion at the New York World's Fair.

The speech he delivered is a cogent presentation of the sad plight which the American merchant marine now finds itself. He makes constructive suggestions which are well based and which, in my opinion, if carried out, would prove helpful.

I quite agree with Mr. Drewry that now is the time to take action. Everyone who is knowledgeable about this complex industry is in full agreement that aggressive steps should be taken by the administration.

I commend the reading of this speech to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF JOHN M. DREWRY, CHIEF COUNSEL, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, AT NATIONAL MARITIME DAY CEREMONIES, U.S. PAVILION, NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1965

Mr. Shapiro, Mr. Johnson, Captain King, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. As Mr. Shapiro has said, Mr. Bonner had to ask to be relieved of his commitment to be here with you, due to pressing personal obligations. He asked me to tell you how sorry he is that he cannot be here on this very significant occasion as we commemorate National Maritime Day.

National Maritime Day has been officially celebrated only since 1933. Traditionally, it has become a time when all Americans pause to reflect, appraise and worry about our condition as a maritime nation. But—expressions of concern about our merchant marine have been with us for a good part of the life of this Republic. They have been with us for so long a time that I sometimes wonder whether many do not merely pay "lipservice" to this concern for our merchant marine, while less talk and more progressive activity is generated in other fields of transportation. An ardent spokesman for a strong, healthy American merchant marine made the following comparison of Government aids to other transportation sectors, and I quote:

"There is nothing that we have not done in this country to encourage railroad building. We have gone wild on that. We have built them where they were needed, and we have built them where they were not needed. We have built those that paid well, with much doubt and blind distrust; and we have rushed with blind confidence into building roads that, after they were built, did not pay a penny. In this multiplication of lines of transportation, we have brought all our vast national products to the seaboard, and think that that is to be the end of the line. We have reaped the profits of it so far, and then are willing to let foreigners have the rest of it. Why, it is one continuous route from Chicago to Liverpool; but we take 1,000 miles and give 3,000 to the foreigner, and that is the way we are dividing our carrying trade."

He concluded his remarks with "Just so long as this country fails to become, or delays its arrival at the position of a great and triumphant commercial nation, just so long it is defeating the ends of providence."

That statement with the familiar ring, ladies and gentlemen, was made more than 80 years ago, in May 1879, by Senator James G. Blaine, of Maine, as he delivered an address on "Our Merchant Marine" at the annual banquet of the Chamber of Commerce of New York—an affair similar to this.

In recent years we have seen our foreign trade increase and our gross national product rise to heights undreamed of not so long ago. We have seen war-ravaged fleets of foreign maritime nations become replaced and expanded with modern, new vessels in every category. Nations formerly without ships of their own now possess substantial national-flag tonnages. And the maritime buildup of Soviet Russia is a miracle of peacetime effort of this century.

Without commenting on the billions we are pouring into the space program, I think it is significant to note the program presently underway for developing a supersonic air transport, the development cost of which alone will be more than $1,200 million in Federal funds in the next year. I understand that current negotiations contemplate the Government underwriting from 75 to 100 percent of this cost. The Government has already invested vast sums in other aircraft programs which will contribute know-how to the SST. And shades of Senator Blaine, we are talking about multi-million-dollar investment of Government funds in the development of very high-speed rail service between the metropolises of the east coast.

Yet, when it comes to support of our American ships, which must compete with the lower standards of foreign maritime countries, the current view of high Government authority seems to be that notwithstanding the clear need for increased carrying capacity, any enlargement of our capability must be within the limits of appropriation ceilings which have been approved in the past.

The picture with respect to the American merchant marine today is exceedingly confused.

On the one hand there is in being a long-range program for the replacement of that portion of our liner fleet under subsidy contract with the Government. That program, initiated in 1955, calls for the construction of over 300 of the most modern vessels in the world today. But it is maintaining momentum at a depressingly low rate of not more than 16 to 18 new ships per year.

There are some who state that our liner fleet is not doing too badly because it is carrying approximately 30 percent of the liner cargoes in our foreign commerce. This is 5 percent less than that which was so disturbing in 1935 when the President and the Congress took urgent steps to revive our maritime posture in the interest of our economy and security. That 30 percent carried by our liners today is participated in by some 94 vessels not under subsidy—and with no replacements in sight.

Today, contrasted with 1935, about 85 percent of our exports and imports are made up of bulk cargoes. Our tramp operators are carrying only about 5 percent of the bulk tonnage in vessels largely of World War II vintage.

These and many more facts and statistics—some favorable—more unfavorable, are, I am sure, well known to most of you.

That part of the merchant marine which is relatively healthy today is actively engaged in a variety of efforts to improve its effectiveness as an element of our national economy and an instrument of national policy.

The industry generated mobile trade fair program bids well to make a major contribution to our export expansion efforts and the balance of payments.

The subsidized lines are cooperating in the national oceanographic program by testing the "ship of opportunity" concept. As the feasibility of using merchant vessels for the collection of much needed oceanographic data is tested and proven we may foresee vast savings and great acceleration in the herculean task of studying the oceans.

Operators in both foreign and domestic trade have made substantial progress in the development of container ships.

One company is actively working on an imaginative new approach in water transportation systems: the high speed transport of barges in international trade.

Though they are building no new ships, the unsubsidized portion of the fleet is managing to hold on by upgrading their ships under the vessel exchange program, which, by the way, was sponsored by industry—not government.

Reference to such items, together with reports of research and development work by the Maritime Administration on exciting projects such as hydrofoils and ground effects machines and the economic potential of the industry's retrofit mechanization program might well lull some into a sense of complacency.

The facts are well known in the industry—in maritime labor—in the Congress—and in the executive branch of the Government. Chairmen of congressional committees, other Members of Congress, Cabinet members, executives of industry associations, leaders of maritime unions have all deplored our condition and urged corrective action. Government leaders in this and the preceding administration have embarked upon broad studies with a view to finding solutions.

President Johnson, early this year in his state of the Union message, said he would recommend "a new policy for our merchant marine." The situation was recently summed up as follows:

"In recent months, the full spectrum of U.S. maritime policies, programs, and problems has been given more public airing than at any previous time in the last decade. This development has been helpful in focusing attention on the complexities of present conditions within the U.S. merchant marine community; in focusing attention on the relationships between shipping and shipbuild-

ing; and in focusing attention on the role of maritime endeavors in our national economy, national security, and global strategy, as well as in our national aspirations for expanded and commerce.

"It has been a long time since the spotlight of public attention has been so comprehensively placed on these factors, and for this overdue service, credit must go to President Johnson, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, and Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson."

Only this week the Secretary of Commerce reiterated the oft-mentioned concern for our present situation and the need for early solutions with the statement, however, that "there is still no new Government policy for the merchant marine."

But, must we wait for a new policy before we move ahead?

The many studies which have been undertaken in and out of the Government in recent years have for the most part been constructive in their objectives, but how long do we continue to study without taking some action?

The atomic merchant ship concept is a good case in point. It has been 10 years since legislation was introduced to authorize the construction of the nuclear ship, *Savannah*. She has been built, delivered and tested extensively. She has proved the energy of the atom as a practical power source for the merchant marine.

The shipping industry is interested in atomic powered ships. Yet, despite the fact that some 68 marine reactors are now in actual operation in naval vessels, with more on their way and numerous shore based installations, there are some who now seem to feel that we should continue to wait for a further program of prototype construction and experimentation. In a report released on May 14, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy expressed its dissatisfaction with the direction "which has been provided in the past within the administration for this country's merchant ship reactor program. The program has suffered from the lack of clear cut objectives."

The time has surely come when the administration that has been responsible for developing marine reactors and the nuclear ship *Savannah* should stop studying and turn their time and energy to leadership and coordinated effort which will move us forward to the logical and necessary next step in this field—building for commercial operation. If industry will strain a little to assume a portion of the cost and risk, I believe they will receive wide support.

The charter of the NS *Savannah* announced yesterday is a small step in the right direction.

Much has been said about our serious and very real deficiency in the field of modern bulk-carrying vessels. Here there is no need to wait for the creation of new policy. The policy already exists, having been enacted into law as far back as 1952. Applications presently pending before the Maritime Administration for construction subsidy for seven fully modern dry bulk carriers have been pending for as long as 2 years. I understand that applicants for an additional seven vessels are ready to move the moment there is an indication that serious consideration would be given. Nobody seems to be opposed to these proposals. It is just that nothing happens.

I am not familiar with the details of the applications I mentioned. Perhaps there are good reasons why they should not be approved. If that is the case, again existing policy under title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 gives the Maritime Administration authority under which a start could be made toward overcoming our bulk carrier deficiency.

Initiation of such a program now, whether in response to particular applications or for Government account, would go far to demonstrate the determination of the Government to build up the merchant marine as our needs increase.

A further step which could now be taken is the provision of construction reserve fund authority for nonsubsidized operators similar to that which the subsidized lines have enjoyed. There was such a proposal as far back as the late 1940's and early 1950's which made notable progress in the Congress but due to a combination of Administration opposition and apathy, it failed of enactment. Such a bill is presently pending in the House and Senate. I think that it is safe to venture the guess that had such authority then become law we would today see a number of new vessels in the nonsubsidized segment of our fleet, instead of none. It may not be too late to revive this proposal.

I have only mentioned three areas in which constructive action can and should be taken now. Certainly there are many avenues which should be explored if we are to have the merchant marine we need on the most economical and efficient basis. But it could be suicidal to continue to wait—and pile study upon study—in the hopes of creating a complete and perfect package before we proceed at all.

I certainly hope on this anniversary next year no one will be saying that a country with a gross national product of $650 billion cannot afford to build the transport tools it needs and display its flag in full competition with the other nations of the world.

L.B.J. Grasps Realities of World as It Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us are aware of the great work our President is doing in the field of foreign affairs—in his untiring, devoted efforts to maintain world peace and subdue the forces of totalitarianism.

I am especially pleased to call to the attention of the House a most appropriate and timely editorial from the May 6, 1965, issue of the San Angelo, Tex., Standard-Times which cites the responsible, realistic role our distinguished President is playing to preserve peace and freedom.

The editorial follows:

[From the San Angelo (Tex.) Standard-Times, May 6, 1965]

L.B.J. GRASPS REALITIES OF WORLD AS IT ACTS

It is surprising, and we believe pleasantly so, for Americans once again to hear the President of the United States call a spade a spade.

Americans have learned a lot in the years since World War II. We have learned that revolution (which, after all, is our own tradition) is seldom synonymous in our time with improvement, and that communism, no matter what vehicle it rides to power, is never liberation.

We have learned that China's revolution is not agrarian reform but rather a colossal police state which suppressed human values to a degree unexampled in recent history. We have learned that Sukarno does not represent merely a predictable postcolonial manifestation, but a dedicated totalitarianism of distinctly Muscovite tendencies. Cuba under Castro—no matter how bestial the Batista regime—is scarcely an inspirational chapter in man's upward struggle toward freedom and fulfillment.

It is reassuring, we find, to see a President who dares to deal with the most vexing problem of foreign affairs today, which is the subversion by totalitarians of man's legitimate search for social justice. Lyndon Johnson proclaimed openly Monday night a truth we all should learn about revolutions in our revolutionary age: That they are frequently subverted by Communists. "We are not the interveners in the Dominican Republic," he said. "The people who intervened were people trained outside the Dominican Republic in guerrilla warfare to overthrow the Government and have a Communist seizure of that country."

He further stated that in the future the United States will act, at least in parts of the globe, "to preserve freedom and to save people from conquest."

The legalists, the doctrinaire liberals, and in this instance, many Latins will wail in anguish. But we believe the vast majority of Americans sense that the President grasps the realities of the world we live in. Undeterred by the "conventional wisdom" of American foreign policy, he has opened a new chapter in America's struggle to preserve order, human dignity, and the freedom of the individual. It's high time.

Birchite Misrepresentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 16, 1965, the John Birch Society had published a so-called report on its organization through an advertising supplement in the pictorial magazine section of the Detroit Free Press, one of our home city dailies. Under the heading "What National Leaders Say" about this organization, the society published the picture of one Rev. J. L. Ward, minister, Memphis, Tenn., a Negro, who allegedly in an August 29, 1964, statement praised the John Birch Society as "one of the greatest organizations in the world today; not subversive, but concerned with justice for all and the peace and dignity of everyone."

Mr. Speaker, I have made a check on this man through highly respected Memphis contacts. I am informed that the Reverend Ward is an itinerant preacher; that he has no stature in the community, let alone on any national level. Mr. Speaker, we resent this attempt by the John Birch Society to clean up its image by falsely representing to the public that any responsible Negro leader has endorsed its organization and the undemocratic principles for which it stands.

Grand Knight Order of Merit Tendered Congressman Peter Rodino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable PETER WALLACE RODINO, JR., when he was tendered the Grand Knight, Order of Merit of the Italian Republic by the Italian Ambassador, His Excellency Sergio Fenoaltea on June 2, 1965. The Grand Knight, Order of Merit of the Italian Republic is one of the highest honors that the Republic of Italy can tender on a non-Italian.

My distinguished colleague, Mr. RODINO, who is an attorney, was one of the first enlisted men to be commissioned overseas. He served with the 1st Armored Division and Military Mission Italian Army. He was discharged as a captain in 1946 and spearheaded the drive against communism in the April 1948 elections in Italy. Mr. RODINO has been decorated with the U.S. Bronze Star, the Star of Solidarity of the Italian Republic, and has been honored as a Knight Commander of the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic. He has received many awards and citations including those from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Amvets, and the Catholic War Veterans, and the 1964 Bill of Rights Award for distinguished public service in the field of government.

Mr. RODINO has served his country in war, and he has continued to serve his country in the highest legislative body in the world. In his 17 years as a Member of the Congress of the United States, he has earned the admiration and respect of all of his colleagues for the humility that he possesses and the concientious manner in which he has applied himself to his legislative duties. He is affectionately called "PETE" by all of his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks of Congressman RODINO follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN PETER W. RODINO, JR.

I am grateful, indeed, for the high honor that is being tendered to me today.

Haunting thoughts and powerful emotions race through my mind as this cherished moment becomes an unforgettable memory for me.

First, I think of my father, a son of Italy and an immigrant in America, who taught me many things—not the least of which is humility.

I think of Italy's abundant, everlasting contributions to the cultural enrichment of the civilized world. Michelangelo in sculpture, DaVinci in art, Verdi in music, Dante in literature—to name but a few in that long parade of creative genius.

And, because this is Italian National Day, I think of Joseph Mazzini, an idealist motivated by the loftiest aims, a soldier of democracy and herald of liberty.

A man of courage and vision, in the tradition of Christopher Columbus, Mazzini foresaw a golden age when all peoples, having established free governments, would prosper together in peace and in justice.

The dream of Mazzini is yet to be realized, but the inspiration remains alive and compelling—undiminished by the passage of time, undimmed by the frustration of temporary failures.

In the 13 decades since Mazzini bravely unfurled his banner of freedom, the United States has grown in power and prestige and has emerged as the strongest, most influential nation among the nations of the world.

The goal of the United States is no less than the dream of Mazzini: to encourage the establishment of free governments everywhere, that all peoples might dwell together in a golden age of peace, prosperity, liberty, and justice.

It is the pursuit of this unselfish and noble goal that shapes, limits, defines and gives direction to American foreign policy. This explains why the United States readily extends a helping hand to nations in need. This is the reason President Kennedy established the Peace Corps to furnish technical assistance to struggling young democracies. And this is why President Johnson is quick to respond when weak and disadvantaged countries are menaced by stronger, predatory neighbors.

But the United States cannot achieve success alone. America needs and America seeks the counsel, support, and active participation of all free nations to spread the breath of liberty and to carry the seeds of democracy to the farthest outposts of civilization.

And so this occasion today transcends the tendering of an esteemed and coveted award by the Government of Italy to a citizen of the United States. I view it as the strengthening of the bridge of friendship that links two great nations in the cause of global freedom.

This bridge of friendship, forged on the anvil of mutual respect and anchored in the bedrock of mutual understanding, carries the hopes of mankind to fashion a better world, where peace with honor is no longer a dream, where human dignity has been secured for all.

In leading this struggle for universal freedom, this generation—in Italy and in America—is proving itself worthy of its nation's heritage, and faithful to the traditions of democracy that have given meaning and purpose to each nation's history.

The dedicated effort to bring about a better world is now in strong and capable hands. There is good reason for optimism. Important progress has been made, and ultimate success is within reach. Let us continue to march forward.

Adoption of the Swedish Constitution of 1809

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, June 6 is an important date in Sweden and for Swedish Americans since it commemorates the adoption of the Constitution of 1809, which heralded the advent of constitutional democracy in Sweden. The Constitution of 1809 is still part of Sweden's fundamental law, thus making the Swedish Constitution the oldest written Constitution still in force in Europe. Like our own Constitution, the Swedish Constitution has proved flexible and adaptable to the needs of an evolving democratic system. The Swedish Constitution of today comprises four separate parts: the basic Instrument of Government of 1809; the Act of Succession of 1810; the Parliament—Riksdag—Act of 1866; and the Freedom of the Press Act of 1949.

In actuality, the beginnings of parliamentary government in Sweden reach back far before 1809. Sweden's first Riksdag, or Parliament, met in 1435. Consisting of four estates—nobility, clergy, burghers, and peasants—it was one of the earliest parliaments in the world. The Parliament provided for by the Constitution of 1809 was based on the same four estates. In fact, the 1809 Constitution in many respects simply reaffirmed the parliamentary principles and individual liberties which had by that time become traditions of Swedish Government. In another sense, however, it was an important new step toward parliamentary government since the respective powers of executive and legislative were for the first time specifically defined.

The following year, in 1810, the Act of Succession, establishing the provisions for accession to the Swedish throne, was adopted, and the Bernadotte dynasty, which is still Sweden's royal family, acceded to the throne. The constitutional limits of the monarchy require the King to accept the advice of his ministers and to choose his ministers from among the group which controls Parliament. Thus, the decisive power actually rests with the party in majority in Parliament, making Sweden a genuine parliamentary and democratic monarchy.

The chief significance of the Riksdag Act of 1866 was that it replaced the unicameral legislature composed of the four medieval estates with a bicameral legislature elected by restricted suffrage. From this beginning of genuine elective government the suffrage was expanded until universal male suffrage was adopted in 1907 and universal adult suffrage was enacted in 1921.

One of the most interesting and progressive aspects of the Swedish Constitution are the freedom of the press laws formally adopted in 1949 but in principle based on earlier laws of 1766 and 1812. The basic principle of the laws is that the public is entitled to as complete information as possible on government policies and actions if it is to be able to assess these policies objectively and thereby intelligently exercise its electoral responsibilities. Thus, the laws emphasize the public character of official documents and state that, with certain specifically enumerated exceptions, every citizen is entitled to gain access to government documents.

Under this Constitution, which has been added to and revised as the times have demanded changes, Sweden has evolved into a prosperous industrialized society with one of the most stable democratic political systems in the world. On the occasion of Swedish Flag Day it gives me great pleasure to congratulate

the people of Sweden on their accomplishments and to join my fellow Americans in extending our best wishes for continued success and prosperity to our good friends in Sweden.

Inadequate Little Appalachias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the urge of governments to expand existing programs and spend even greater sums on doubtful projects masked in the guise of economic necessity seems inconquerable.

It is matched only by the eagerness of some Congressmen and Senators to make sure the areas they represent receive their fair share of new Government largess.

At the time the bill to establish the Appalachia program was passed, we were made well aware of attempts to include extraneous regions in the program. A commendable attempt was made to limit these incursions, and fortunately they were, with one exception, successful. The Appalachia program, as passed, kept much of its original relatively pristine nature. Even so, justifiable criticism has been leveled against the Appalachia plan for failing to attack the fundamental causes of the human and economic poverty of the region.

But the new Economic Development Act of 1965, as noted in a May 11 Wall Street Journal article, will spawn baby Appalachias all across the country. Those programs, if as poorly planned as the Appalachia one, can be expected to have no meaningful effect on the problems they ostensibly are intended to cure.

The public spending projects that would be provided by the bill are now disguised as efforts to create the backdrop for private economic growth. Instead they very often distort the economic and efficient distribution of resources to the detriment of the communities being helped. Such projects seldom create new industries. They might induce an existing industry to move to a locale to take advantage of special offers of aid, but this is simply a redistribution. Sometimes artificial industries are created which compete with existing hard-pressed industries.

The best policies to achieve sound economic growth by individual firms are sound fiscal and monetary policies which create a stable basis for the growth economy.

The article referred to follows:

APPALACHIAS ALL OVER

As you might expect, the rush is on to set up Appalachias all over. Unfortunately, the result is likely to be a lot of depressed-area projects that won't help matters much and others that may make things a good deal worse.

The multibillion-dollar program to cure the economic ills of Appalachia, the 11-State area in the East, obviously has stirred the envy of politicians from other parts of the Nation. In an effort to calm these parochial pressures, the administration is proposing the Economic Development Act of 1965, which would make a start toward sprinkling Appalachia-like projects across the country.

To its credit, the administration would like to put a restraint or two on the new program—in the beginning, anyway. Federal planners insist that they want to help finance only those public works projects that will aid in attracting industry, instead of putting up cash for each and every court house or water works that some city covets. Moreover the planners contend they are interested only in "development districts," areas that have a true potential for economic expansion.

Even these restraints, though, may disappear in the dust stirred up by the political gold rush. As Mr. Cordtz reported in this newspaper recently, one Senator argues that the administration's "woefully inadequate" allotment for public works ought to be nearly tripled right off the bat. When it comes to limiting the number of "development districts," another Senator says, "The howls are going to be deafening when some of these towns are singled out for special help and others find out they've been bypassed."

The new Federal activity might make a little sense if the Government actually had found a way to assure instant prosperity to any community which dips into its grab bag of grants and low-cost loans. The truth, of course, is that Federal administrators have found no such formula; they've merely decided to shrug off its absence.

Concedes one official: "We can't be certain all of this is going to work. But the Federal Government has a responsibility to try something, and not to excuse doing nothing on the grounds we have to wait until we're sure."

There is ample reason for such uncertainty. For doing "something" largely means doing things the Government has tried many times before, seldom with success that could be called conspicuous.

The professed aim of economic revival efforts, now as in the past, is to attract job-providing private industry to distressed communities. The flaws in the usual Federal approach, however, long should have been apparent.

Even when a low-cost loan may induce a company to put up a new plant in a town, it won't help the town very much if, as has happened, the new plant only pulls business away from an existing local factory already having trouble staying afloat. Furthermore, a company which moves in mainly because it can latch on to some cheap Federal money often isn't the most solid, long-lasting type of enterprise.

Similarly, a new sewage disposal plant or a highway might bring some industry to a community. Yet the fact remains that such facilities are seldom the main considerations that lure companies to an area.

An official of Fantus Co., a firm which specializes in finding plant sites for industry, says the most important demand of his company's clients is usually a readily available supply of labor at advantageous wage rates and without an antimanagement attitude. Other influences include State and local taxes, land and construction costs, the availability of markets and raw materials. These are things that Washington can do little or nothing about.

If the Government nonetheless persists, as seems probable, it risks something besides disappointment. The more a community leans on Washington, the less likely it is to muster the local initiative that might do much to ease its problems. Federal aid may encourage the community's jobless to remain where they are, instead of moving to areas where employment prospects are brighter. Most important, perhaps, the immense cost of the Government program will drain the resources the private economy otherwise could use to provide new jobs.

It's sad enough when Washington, in its costly effort to cure community economic ills, pushes on with little idea what it's doing. It's even worse when its grossly political treatment promises some of its patients only a painful relapse.

Workers for Apple Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in my district, the apple industry which conducts extensive operations in that area, is facing the prospect of inadequate, labor supply to complete apple picking and the harvesting of that delicious fruit. Obviously, unless sufficient, qualified labor supply is found, the apple industry will be facing hardship conditions and the prospect of staggering losses.

Since the lack of adequate, efficient labor, could well cause the crop to spoil in the orchards, or as the result of improper handling, many large and small growers are becoming concerned, and these are obviously conditions that compel immediate and appropriate attention by the Department of Labor.

So far as the apple industry is concerned, on previous occasions in previous years, while there has been some stress and strain in securing adequate, experienced workers, the Government has cooperated, and at length, a generally adequate labor supply was realized.

I take this opportunity to urge that the Department of Labor give renewed and most vigorous attention to these serious problems affecting my district, where they are giving rise to increased concern that apples may be wasted and great losses sustained because of a failing supply of capable, experienced apple pickers.

I think that almost everyone will agree that to allow valuable foodstuffs and standard crops like apples to rot in the fields, because of lack of qualified labor, would be unthinkable and would bring tremendous losses to the industry concerned, and would be a great personal misfortune to many honest, industrious, hard-working, patriotic farmers and business people who are doing their best, under difficult and ofttimes adverse conditions, to harvest their crops and put them in the market with the legitimate hope of some reasonable profit.

To allow waste and heavy losses to afflict this industry would truly be a serious blow to the free enterprise system which applegrowers represent. It would also be responsible for considerable unemployment and dire economic waste hardly imaginable in these modern times when man-produced spoilage of valuable

crops would be a grevious offense against good moral principles as well as sound, prudent economic policy.

I cannot urge the distinguished Secretary of Labor and his staff too strongly to give high priority and attention and study to these vexing labor problems of a great American industry and hope the Government will take prompt, effective action to assure the apple industry that it will be assisted in every way possible to secure all necessary, qualified workers to pick its crop.

The Secretary has been most considerate and helpful in this matter up to this time and I believe he is anxious to assist the apple industry and hope he will evolve and effectuate an effective program real soon.

The President Chooses Wisely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's splendid appointment of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., as chairman of the new Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was eloquently endorsed recently in an editorial in the Baltimore Afro-American which I respectfully commend to your attention:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Afro-American, May 22, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT CHOOSES WISELY

President Johnson, delayed by his determination to select the best qualified person, has chosen wisely and with an eye to history, in naming Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., as chairman of the new Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Mr. Roosevelt's father 24 years ago by his Executive Order 8802, created the first Fair Employment Practices Commission to eliminate widespread job discrimination during World War II.

A true son of his father, Mr. Roosevelt as Congressman and more recently as Under Secretary of Commerce has carried on his family's long traditional interest in the problems and welfare of minority groups.

He thus brings to the new commission, created by title VII of the 1965 Civil Rights Act, a dedication of purpose and a longstanding concern with the employment disabilities suffered by Americans of color.

The President selected with equal care the other four members of the Commission.

In an effort to achieve selectional as well as a racial balance, the nominees include a Texas minister, a Wisconsin engineer, a Kansas attorney, and the assistant chief of the California FEPC. Two of the nominees are colored.

The new Commission, which should be quickly confirmed by the Senate, faces a herculean task of organization with but a few short weeks to accomplish it.

Scheduled under the law to begin functioning on July 2, the Commission's first major hurdle is to employ and organize a staff of some 200 persons.

It's job, under the law, then is to see that there is no discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in industry, labor unions, or employment agencies.

Employers of 100 or more workers will fall within its jurisdiction the first year. This maximum number is to be reduced in succeeding years to 25.

While the major emphasis is to be placed in persuasion and voluntary compliance, the Commission does have authority to enforce its directives through the courts.

If title VII of the Civil Rights Act was to be made meaningful, the first task was to appoint members who themselves firmly believe in equality of job opportunity.

President Johnson is to be congratulated for having performed this duty with diligence and a remarkable understanding of the need and responsibility of this important agency.

With the long experience of some 26 State FEPC agencies from which to draw, the new Commission under Chairman Roosevelt's direction, should have little difficulty in getting on with the important job to be done.

The Heavyweight Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues should consider carefully the following editorial which appeared in the Paterson News in New Jersey. I am thankful to Mr. JOELSON, of New Jersey, for calling it to my own attention. Its authority is indicated by the fact that the associate editor of the Paterson News is Abe J. Greene, commissioner of the world boxing authority, who has such a wealth of information and background with regard to prizefighting and all its ramifications.

The editorial which appeared on May 27, 1965, follows:

WHERE TO BOXING NOW?

The bandwagon solons in Washington are acting their usual lock-the-door-after-the-horse-is-stolen selves in the farcical aftermath of the boxing match (?) between former champion Sonny Liston and Champion Cassius Clay.

They think the fiasco in Lewiston, Maine, on Tuesday night, calls for investigation. There ought to be an injunction against them if they try it. Where have they been while earnest men in boxing were asking their help?

Washington knew all about the connivance between Clay, Liston, and their coteries of advisers but they turned their heads and permitted it to be foisted on the American public. Yes, on the international public since now we have world TV via Telstar.

Now that the predicted "job" has been done, they are indignant pro bono publico. By golly, they're going to show these miscreants. What are they going to show? The perpetrators of the latest Clay-Liston fraud don't have to be told what they've done. They planned it that way.

And Washington knew about it because it was only a repeat of the smelly job between the same pair of fighters, the same combinations of managers, promoters, etc., etc., in Miami Beach a little over a year ago.

In Miami Beach, Liston, who was a 7-1 favorite to beat Clay, folded up in his corner in the sixth round because the poor boy had injured his shoulder. That's what they said.

This was the first time in championship history that a champion quit cold in the corner. Four-round preliminary boys wouldn't do that—they'd fight for their very lives. But Liston, with a solid contract for a return bout with Clay which guaranteed him a crack at another half or a million dollars, wasn't taking any chances. Better to be scorned for taking the easy way out than to blow another such golden opportunity.

The bold, crass, craven promoters who paid Clay $50,000 in advance to guarantee them a return cared neither for boxing as a sport, for boxing commissions, for the contempt of the crowd. They knew the American public's gullibility and the greater the scandal, the bigger the fall guys. It didn't matter to this same crew that the World Boxing Association had ruled against a return bout. They knew they'd find a craven commission to OK them. They did—Boston, Mass. But after a couple of months of whispers of scandal, a courageous district attorney in Boston upset the cowardly commission which had welcomed the bout and chased them.

The promoters knew they'd find a new sucker State. They did—Maine. And in a small, depressed town like Lewiston, they nestled, staged the bout almost in a studio, knowing full well that there were enough gullibles around the country to fill their coffers in theaters via closed television.

This time Liston didn't quit in his corner. He did a graceful imitation of a dying swan via one of Clay's mystical, Mohammed-guided lethal punches which not too many saw, and in less than half a minute, he was rolling around on the canvas.

Down the drain the millions laid out by boxing fans; on the dungheap, any respect for boxing; over the airwaves, America's shame.

But no one held up the fighter's money, nor the promoter's.

"Black eye for boxing" rose the cry.

Boxing did try to do something about this match but all it got for its troubles was scorn and the sharply turned ridicule of sports pundits. These are the same ones who today are crying fake, fraud, and who let those birds do it.

There is only one thing which can save boxing from its phonies, its evil perpetrators: that is Federal control which will prevent phony promoters from staging these fake contests. Wave the wand of a tough law in front of them and they'll scurry to the ratholes.

If this isn't done, boxing, which has been the leveling sport which has given millions enjoyment, enabled poor boys to come out of the ghettos to become champions, will be doomed to outlawry.

Will the politician-orators move in this direction?

Lockheed Joins Science Elite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a significant tribute to my hometown of San Diego, Calif., that the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. is establishing its ocean research center there. The editorial from the May 26 San Diego Union is worthy of the full attention of my colleagues and the many CONGRESSIONAL RECORD readers across the country who

are interested in the advance of the field of ocean sciences.

The editorial follows:

OCEANIC RESEARCH CAPITAL: LOCKHEED JOINS SCIENCE ELITE

When Lockheed Aircraft Corp. establishes its ocean research center in San Diego it will join a community of specialized scientists without a peer in the world.

By the same token, Lockheed's facilities here will improve the oceanic community and enhance San Diego's role as the sea research capital of the world. We believe more oceanographic work should be channeled here.

Most scientists in the specialized field agree there are good reasons for San Diego's eminence in the field of oceanics. The scientists conducting research in the field, and the facilities, including complementary educational plants, are world renowned.

The climate is moderate and constant. Not only is the ocean relatively calm, it also has a fairly constant temperature and salinity, and reaches substantial depths quickly off San Diego's shores. In addition, the scientists like to live in San Diego because of the many cultural, recreational, and educational advantages. The chamber of commerce has done an excellent job emphasizing this.

San Diego's thrust into the leadership of oceanography came with the dedication of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in 1909.

To this day Scripps is a world leader in ocean research. Its fleet of more than seven ships circumvents the world and top men in the field are among its staff of 1,000.

With the renewed attention to oceanics, Scripps' staff may be doubled in the next decade and tripled within 15 years, adding an important economic element to the community.

Complementing Scripps is the Navy electronics laboratory, an outstanding and world-renowned military research organization.

Other valuable sea research is conducted by a number of organizations, public and private. These include more than 50 businesses directly related to the ocean; the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the International Tuna Commission, the Mission Bay Research Foundation. The private research is done by both large and small corporations.

The total oceanic complex has already resulted in commercial production of materials from kelp, a new project for the famed bathyscaph Trieste which now has a larger mission, and the exciting Sea Lab II project to be sponsored by the Navy this fall. Men will live under the ocean off La Jolla during the program. Because of San Diego's natural advantages, the stay of the Costeau diving saucer also has been extended.

It is for some of the same reasons that the drilling rig for Project Mohole to drill through the crust of the earth will be tested at San Diego first. A local firm is among seven bidding to construct part of the equipment.

The economic value of oceanics to San Diego is inestimable and the future is bright. An estimated $1,389 billion, producing economic benefits of $6 billion, will be spent on oceanographic research in the next decade. Breakthroughs under the surface, like those in space, may increase the figures.

San Diego is in an excellent position to get a substantial amount of the total because it already is the oceanography capital of the United States.

However, competition is increasing for oceanographic work. The future of oceanography here is bright only if the public is alert to its potential and offers its full support.

GOP Turns Artillery on Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times of Sunday, May 30, carried a front-page article on the housing bill which I believe merits the consideration of my colleagues in the House for its treatment of the points at issue in this precedent-setting measure. The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, May 30, 1965]

GOP TURNS ARTILLERY ON HOUSING BILL—HOUSE REPUBLICANS HOPE TO DEFEAT RENT SUBSIDY PLAN

(By Thomas J. Foley)

WASHINGTON.—Republicans, aiming for their first legislative victory over President Johnson, are mounting an increasingly sharp attack on his proposal to subsidize rents for low and moderate income families.

Democrats, cognizant that the rent program breaks new ground in Government programs, are beginning to get nervous about its chances.

The battleground is in the House where the Banking Committee already has approved the proposal as part of an omnibus housing bill. The measure now is before the House Rules Committee.

FAIR RENTAL

On the rent subsidy issue Republican leaders are temporarily abandoning their constructive alternative approach to Great Society legislation and are driving simply to strike down the plan.

They expressed their views in the committee report on the housing bill in the strongest language heard from the Republicans in several years.

The proposal itself calls for the Federal Housing Administration to pay the difference between one-fourth of a tenant's income and the fair market rental for a housing unit in any area where a Bureau of Census survey finds there is inadequate housing.

Those eligible would be persons displaced by governmental action such as in an urban renewal program, the elderly or physically handicapped, and families occupying substandard housing.

The top limit on income for any of these categories would be four times the minimum rent required to obtain standard private housing.

HOW IT STARTED

The GOP attack in the housing bill report started this way:

"The administration's rent supplement proposal is foreign to American concepts. The proposal kills the incentive of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts.

"It kills the incentive for home ownership; it makes renters wards of the Government. It is a system of economic integration of housing through Government subsidy. It is the way of the socialistic state."

The Republican report, signed by 8 of the Banking and Currency Committee's 11 minority members, then went on to list several horrendous examples of what might happen under the rent proposal.

A family with a $250 a month income, the Republicans said, would pay no more than $62.50 for rent and could live in a $100-a-month unit with the Government paying the other $37.50. What incentive, they ask, does the family have for improving its housing accommodations?

Furthermore, the Republicans charged, if the tenant's income went up to $400 a month, thus making him ineligible for subsidy since one-quarter for his wages exactly equaled the rent, the tenant could decide to move to a $200 a month unit, with the subsidy running to $100 a month.

"Under the formula, it [a family] could do so," said the Republicans, although this is disputed by the bill's backers.

In any event, the Republicans also raised a question about the first family's neighbors who had been living in an adequate $100-a-month unit on a $400 a month salary. Would not they, too, desire to move into the better place for the same outlay in rent?

"This would be keeping up with the Joneses via Federal subsidies," they said.

Republicans admit privately that some of their examples are exaggerated but say they are nevertheless possible under terms of the bill as now written.

They say the bill would cover persons with incomes up to about $10,000. This prospect prompted the comment in separate views expressed by Representative BURT L. TALCOTT, Republican, of California, that "America's great middle class does not need or want part of its rent paid by fellow taxpayers."

TALCOTT also charged that the bill ignores housing for "the most disadvantaged family in the country—the migrant farm laborer" while proposing to subsidize rents of those with moderate incomes.

Democrats, on the other hand, justify the program by saying that most rental housing constructed in recent years is "beyond the economic reach of many people who live in substandard housing or who have been displaced or who are elderly."

The existing Federal and State housing programs, they said, have reached only a very small number of persons in these lower income categories, leaving 8 million families in substandard housing.

Of these, half involve elderly or handicapped persons. In addition, the Democrats said, another 300,000 families will be displaced from their homes by governmental action in the next 4 years, many of them in the low-income bracket.

The crucial vote in the House will come on a GOP move to accept virtually all of the housing bill except the rent supplement proposal. The Republicans hope to attract enough southern Democratic support to put this across.

Democrats at present think they can hold their ranks, noting that six southern Democrats on the Banking Committee voted for the entire bill.

However, the Republicans are building up a head of steam on the rent issue and believe that by the time a House vote comes—probably in about 2 weeks—they will have a chance to taste victory for a change.

Beirne Spragins, LL.D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep pride that I bring to the

attention of my colleagues this tribute to Beirne Spragins, of Huntsville, Ala., for his record of community service. Mr. Spragins has worked diligently and effectively for the improvement of the Huntsville community and the State of Alabama. A banker, he has been a true servant of the people and an indefatigable worker for progress in the field of education. I submit for the consideration of the Members the following editorial which appeared on May 30, 1965, in the Huntsville Times:

BEIRNE SPRAGINS, LL.D.

Truly merited. That's the way we feel about the honorary degree of LL.D. which the University of Alabama today confers upon Marion Beirne Spragins at commencement exercises in Tuscaloosa.

Mr. Spragins received his first degree from the university in 1914—the usual A.B. degree, won in the way any senior due to be graduated today could tell you degrees are won: by hard, long work.

Beirne Spragins' new degree honors him for another kind of long, devoted work. The Huntsville banker has been impressively instrumental in the growth of the university's Huntsville campus. As chairman of the campaign which has raised $900,000 for constructing and equipping facilities at this new educational complex, his graduate work has been distinguished indeed.

His work on behalf of the Huntsville campus is typical of the spirit in which he has helped lead his city, his region, and his State. For those labors, honors rightfully have accrued in number. But we suspect that none will be valued by him more than this new recognition by his alma mater.

We're proud for him. We're proud of him.

The 19th Anniversary of the Italian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the fortunes of Italy have always been followed with particular concern in this country. The people of the United States have always treasured the bonds of affection and interest that link them to the people of Italy. The Italian heroes Christopher Columbus, Giovanni da Verrazano, and Amerigo Vespucci are also our heroes. Insofar as the glories of ancient Rome and of the Italian Renaissance belong to the world, they also belong to us. In our midst, we can count more than 5 million citizens who can trace their origins to Italy, and who have contributed much to the life of our Nation.

It therefore gives me particular pleasure to extend my best wishes to the people of Italy on an occasion that holds much significance for them. Nineteen years ago, on June 2, 1946, the people of Italy held their first elections following World War II and took the momentous decision to become a republic. Every year since that time, they have set aside the second of June to commemorate that decision, which marked the beginning of a period of vast change and astounding achievement in Italy. Few developments in the postwar period have been followed with so much enthusiasm and excitement. The achievements of the Italian people have captured the lasting respect and admiration of the American people.

South Carolina's Alleged Voting Liberality Is a Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, as we move toward House consideration of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, I want to focus the attention of our body on a report I received from the South Carolina Voter Education Project which reflects the continuing contention that there is a free and open registration process in that State.

I call particular note to the fact that on the 1 day per month registration at the county courthouse, a day off work and round trip of 80 miles may be involved for Negro citizens, who, even at that, face a deliberate slowdown in registration process designed to disenfranchise. The voting rights legislation which we will be considering would thwart these century-old schemes in South Carolina and elsewhere to keep the Negro away from the polls in any numbers.

The report follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA,
VOTER EDUCATION PROJECT,
May 8, 1965.

DEAR SIR: Virtually every South Carolina Congressman and political figure has issued a statement opposing S. 1564, the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Such statements usually include references to the free and open registration process as it is practiced in South Carolina.

The fact is that this alleged liberality is a myth.

The bare statistical facts show that as of November 1, 1964, 19 of the 46 counties in South Carolina had a Negro registration rate under 30 percent of the total number of eligible Negroes in the respective county. Two counties of the State had Negro registration rates lower than 10 percent.

Not a single county in South Carolina, however, had a white registration rate lower than 45 percent, and 7 had a white registration rate in excess of 100 percent of the total number of eligible whites.

South Carolina is one of two States which does not have a compulsory school attendance law, and the economic facts of life in South Carolina keep a great many Negro children from ever obtaining even a basic education. Sixty-one percent of the State's Negro population over 25 years old have only a sixth-grade education or less. The literacy test used in South Carolina effectively disfranchises a great portion of these citizens.

In addition, in off-election years, registration books in most counties are open only 1 day per month at the county court house and even then only from 9 to 5 with an hour or more off for lunch. In many cases it is extremely difficult for Negroes to obtain time off from their jobs in order to go to the county seat to register. A trip to the county seat may involve a round trip of as much as 80 miles, and, of course, there is no guarantee that the prospective voter will be able to register during this day due to slow-down tactics which have been used in some counties.

There are also very strong psychological barriers inherent in a situation where Negroes must face an all-white and often hostile registration board in order to complete the registration process.

Last, but by no means least, many, many Negroes feel that their jobs would be placed in jeopardy if they were to register to vote. This is particularly true among the tenant farmers and domestics who make up a large percentage of the total Negro work force in South Carolina.

For all of these reasons and more, the executive committee of the South Carolina Voter Education Project strongly supports S. 1564, the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD MILES,
Field Director.

RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA VOTER EDUCATION PROJECT

Whereas despite percentage increases in the numbers of Negroes registered to vote in the State of South Carolina, tremendous difficulties remain to be overcome in the area of voter registration in South Carolina; and

Whereas the lingering effects of a long-standing system of legal, political, and social segregation hinders the completion of the enfranchisement of all qualified voters; and

Whereas these effects vary greatly in intensity from county to county in South Carolina; and

Whereas the key provisions of S. 1564, the proposed Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965, contain procedures designed to mitigate in part these discriminatory effects: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of the South Carolina Voter Education Project formally endorse S. 1564, the proposed Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965, and

That the executive committee of the South Carolina Voter Education Project urge the immediate passage of this act by the Congress; and

That the executive committee of the South Carolina Voter Education Project strongly urge each Representative and Senator from South Carolina to support this act, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Murski, of Brenham, Tex.: 64 Years of Married Bliss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of widespread family separations, broken marriages and alarming divorce rates, it is especially heartwarming to see a somewhat rare example of a lifetime of marital bliss.

In my district, there lives a couple now approaching the 64th year of married life; and I take this opportunity to bring this remarkable couple to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Murski of 405 Peabody Street in Brenham, Tex., are the

oldest married couple in Washington County. Both are 85 and are retired farmers. They were born and reared in Washington County and have lived there all their lives. They have three children now living in Brenham—Mrs. Janie Rutkowski, Mrs. Robert Bunzel and Ben Murski.

Last year, Mr. and Mrs. Murski were honored by the Diocese of Austin as one of the oldest married couples. Their picture was published in the Lone Star Register, official publication of the Catholic Diocese of Austin.

This charming and inspirational couple has the love, admiration and respect of all the citizens of Washington County, and, Mr. Chairman, it is with much pride and pleasure that I congratulate and salute this wonderful marriage and partnership, and extend to them warmest, best wishes for many more years of marital bliss.

The Real Alabama—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the State of Alabama is making significant contributions to our country's space program. And today, as the 4-day Gemini space flight launching is planned we appropriately call attention to Alabama's participation in this dramatic and ambitious series of exploration projects.

Following is an article of May 17, 1965, by Dr. Rudolf Hermann, director of the University of Alabama Research Institute at Huntsville:

OUT OF THE MUD, THE STARS

In the tremendous national effort of space research and development, the State of Alabama plays a vital role of which every man and woman in Alabama can be proud.

At Redstone Arsenal at Huntsville, the Army Missile Command of the U.S. Army has developed for the past decade missiles for military purposes. One of the missiles, however, was used to launch Explorer 1, the first satellite of the free world, into orbit, and many have been used to orbit later satellites. The missiles that brought up the first two American astronauts in the so-called suborbital flights were also built there.

In 1960 the Marshall Space Flight Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, consisting of Dr. Wernher von Braun and his team of experts, was established within Redstone Arsenal. This center is responsible for developing the Saturn I, Saturn I–B, and Saturn 5 rocket boosters. The later will be the booster to launch the Apollo moon vehicle.

A considerable amount of supporting research necessary to attain this goal is carried out in Alabama—for example, at the University of Alabama main campus, at Auburn University and at private institutions such as Southern Research Institute at Birmingham.

And now, a high point in Alabama's rich rule in the space effort—a new research center for aerospace—is about to be realized at Huntsville.

Under construction for about 2 years, it is the University of Alabama Research Institute. I have the honor to head the center as director.

The people of Alabama made possible this institute, by authorizing a $3 million State bond issue in December 1962. It will open in June.

As the American astronauts progress to the moon and to the near planets, and the space probes explore farther and farther into the solar system, new and more complex problems will arise.

Space research has no horizons.

The first component of the research institute, a combined laboratory-office building of 64,000 square feet, will contain 10 distinct laboratories and a most modern, large scale digital computer system, the Univac 1107. A second laboratory component is under preliminary design.

The institute will be dedicated to research in the aerospace physical and engineering sciences and thereby will strongly support the national missile and space effort.

By nature, most space problems are extremely technical and complex: For example, high speed and reentry; changes in the composition of the air at various speeds of nose cones or capsules; effect of airflow around reentry bodies; high altitude effects on space stations; and dangerous space environment.

Suffice it to say that we have to solve these problems. We eagerly grasp for solutions.

The urge of man to discover the unknown is as old as the human race. What he has discovered he wishes to understand fully.

Celestial happenings frightened man before he had the knowledge to predict them. As his understanding of nature grew, he used the knowledge to control his environment. The history of man is full of such examples, in particular, during the past few hundred years. Since the beginning of the technological age, for instance, he reduced steam and electric power to help him heat his homes and to perform work in tremendous dimensions that otherwise only armies of slaves could do.

Research is an organized effort of a scientific community, a country, a nation, to make discoveries, understand nature, and apply the results for their benefit.

Our national goal, as it was formulated by the late President John F. Kennedy, is to put an American astronaut on the moon and bring him back alive within this decade. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is in charge of this tremendous project. It is supported in research efforts by universities and in development and vehicle construction by American industry.

But going to the moon is only the first goal.

We will send unmanned, instrumented probes first to the close planets such as Mars and Venus. They will be followed, after 1975, by manned vehicles to the close planets; first, reconnaissance missions for necessary scientific investigations; finally, space trips with landings on these planetary surfaces, if this is at all physically possible as it appears to be for Mars. The manned trips must provide for return to Earth.

Later decades will bring journeys to the farther planets.

And there is no doubt that once the planetary system is discovered, investigated, measured, and better understood, desire and urge of mankind will go beyond and outside of our planetary system to the next fixed stars within our galaxy, about 7,000 times farther than Pluto. Of course, that may take at least 100 years.

Problems in such efforts as these are in the long-range program of the University of Alabama Research Institute.

The long-range goals were selected as a result of the close cooperation between the Federal agencies at Redstone Arsenal, both the U.S. Army Missile Command and the Marshall Space Flight Center with the faculty of the research institute.

Even though the research institute is now still in its developing stage, quite a number of the problems mentioned have already been attacked in one or the other particular aspect. So far, almost all those studies have been theoretical, because of the lack of laboratories.

Thanks to the $3 million State bond issue, the laboratory-office building is now under construction. As soon as it is finished and the laboratories are equipped with the most modern instrumentation, more scientists and research engineers will be hired to work in those laboratories trying to solve those space research problems.

When the present problems are solved, other ones will appear. There will never be an end to search and discovery, to research and new discoveries.

There is no horizon in outer space.

Negotiations at Geneva

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his full and informative report on the progress being made in the Kennedy Round tariff and trade negotiations over in Geneva. The gentleman's remarks about the importance of acceptable access for U.S. agricultural products in European markets are, of course, particularly interesting to me. We in the great plains area of the Nation are always glad to be able to make the bounty of our vast high-protein grain production available to hungry consumers everywhere in the world, especially when those consumers are able to benefit themselves by paying low prices for our high quality grain as against high prices for grain of less suitable quality.

The point I would like to emphasize today, as I did in my Additional Views in the 1965 Report of the Joint Economic Committee, is the importance for all concerned of making sure that acceptable access for U.S. agricultural products mans competitive access rather than so-called guaranteed access. The development of so-called guarantees of quantitative access would be a step in the opposite direction from freeing up world trade: it would introduce new rigidities into the free flow of foodstuffs over the face of the globe. On the other hand, an arrangement providing for reasonably fair competitive success would benefit European consumers, would give American agriculture a fighting chance at the market, would be less likely to cause international political problems in the future, and would have a less severe effect on our balance-of-payments problems.

I join with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] in saluting our negotiators at Geneva for their outstanding work, and urge them to press for competitive access negotiations for our agricultural products to European market.

Fairleigh Dickinson University Opens Campus in England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have within my district Fairleigh Dickinson University, which has become one of the Nation's outstanding educational achievements.

A pioneer among American community colleges, this school was born as a 2-year college on the eve of the attack on Pearl Harbor, survived the war and in only 24 years emerged into the Nation's 10th largest private university.

Today, it is fulfilling a vital need, educating thousands of young people, most of them residents of the communities surrounding the university's four campuses.

This university, young and dynamic, recently revealed plans to establish a fifth campus at Wroxton Abbey, a beautiful centuries-old structure located halfway between Oxford and Stratford-on-Avon, England. It will be unique as an English college, since it will be fully owned and operated by an American institution.

So that others might learn of this remarkable educational venture launched by Fairleigh Dickinson University, I present the following article from the Herald-News of Passaic-Clifton:

FDU PREPARES TO DEDICATE CAMPUS IN RURAL ENGLAND

RUTHERFORD.—A group of 40 advanced American students of Shakespeare and the contemporary British literary scene will live and study this summer in a centuries-old abbey midway between Oxford and Stratford-on-Avon in England. The name of the property, however, will change from Wroxton Abbey to Wroxton College, when it is transformed into a fifth campus of Fairleigh Dickinson University and becomes a unique English college fully owned and operated by an American institution.

An international conference attended by more than 120 educators, public figures, and guests from 18 nations, will precede the formal dedication of the college on June 30.

The conference, conducted by Fairleigh Dickinson University both at Oxford and at Wroxton will explore the question, "What should be the common elements of a university education in all nations of the world." For 3 days this problem will be discussed in an effort to develop guidelines to aid new and emerging nations. Participants will include historian, Dr. Arnold Toynbee; Economist Barbara Ward; Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, president of the University of the Philippines; Dr. Kenneth P. Holland, president of the Institute for International Education; Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president emeritus of Brown University and president of the American Assembly; and A. L. P. Norrington, president of Trinity College and provice-chancellor of Oxford University.

TRADITIONAL CEREMONY

The formal dedication of the college, following the English tradition, will be a colorful and solemn ceremony, with dignitaries and guests marching from the abbey to a beautiful medieval church in nearby Wroxton village. There the lord bishop of Oxford will bless the banner of the new college.

"In establishing a campus near Oxford," Dr. Peter Sammartino, president of Fairleigh Dickinson University, noted, "Fairleigh Dickinson University has come to the source of the multicampus concept which has made Oxford one of history's most important seats of learning. Oxford University consists of 32 separately operated colleges, few with more than 200 students. This concept has aided Fairleigh Dickinson in growing within 24 years into America's 10th largest private university.

"Relatively few American students have the opportunity to study in the stimulating environment of Oxford, and to see Shakespearian plays presented regularly in the town of Shakespeare's birth. By sharing the advantages of Stratford and Oxford, as well as some of the nearby library facilities, Wroxton College will enable a substantial number to study in an enriching academic and cultural climate."

Beginning as a monastery in the reign of King John, Wroxton Abbey was rebuilt in Jacobean times. It played host to James I, Charles I, and the Georges. During the American Revolution, it was the ancestral home of Lord North, Prime Minister for George III.

The lower section of the abbey illustrates early monastic architecture, and the area surrounding the abbey is rich in remains of prehistoric Britain, the Roman occupation, and the medieval era of castles and magnificent churches.

Wroxton Abbey has had a long academic association. The abbey, also the park and lakes of the property, were part of the founder's original endowment to Trinity College, Oxford, and remained in its possession from 1554 until it was purchased by Fairleigh Dickinson University 2 years ago.

Since then, the abbey building, which contains 43 suites, a banquet hall, the regent's dining room, 9 classrooms and a chapel, has undergone major restoration and modernization of utilities. The improvement program will continue for several years. The complete purchase and restoration of the abbey, and its transformation into a modern college, are being accomplished through special gifts made to the university by serveral trustees and friends.

FIRST SUMMER SESSION

The first summer session, from July 5 to 30, offers courses in contemporary English novel and the Shakespeare seminar I; from August 2 to 29, the second session courses include contemporary English theater and the Shakespeare seminar II. Each session carries six semester credits toward a master's degree. Included in the summer session are weekly visits to Shakespeare performances at Stratford-on-Avon, as well as trips to areas of archelogical, historic, or industrial importance.

The program is under the direction of Dr. Loyd Haberly, former Rhodes scholar at Oxford, and now the dean of the College of Liberal Arts at Fairleigh Dickinson. The first session is completely filled, but applications are still being accepted for the second session.

Students will live in the abbey, occupying rooms which have entertained kings and queens, and some of the most distinguished people in English history during the past three centuries. Among the library guests who wrote of the abbey were Samuel Pepys, diarist; Horace Walpole, letterwriter; and Harry James, the novelist, who described the abbey at length in one of his books.

Among those enrolled for the summer session are graduates of Barnard College, St. Mary's College in Michigan, Caldwell College, Randolph-Macon Women's College, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Beaver College, Illinois College, Michigan State University, Notre Dame, Long Beach State College of California, Montclair State College, Boston State Teachers College, Washington University of St. Louis, and University of the Pacific.

Further information is available from Dean Haberly at the Rutherford campus of Fairleigh Dickinson University.

Address by the President of the United States at Commencement Exercises, Baylor University, Waco, Tex., May 28, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of President Lyndon B. Johnson:

TEXT OF THE REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, WACO, TEX., MAY 28, 1965

Mr. President, members of the board of trustees, faculty, student body, my fellow Americans, this is a moment I deeply wish my parents could have lived to share. In the first place, my father would have enjoyed what you have so generously said of me—and my mother would have believed it.

More than that, the honor you pay me is, in a real sense, honor that is due my mother. All of her life she spoke often of Baylor—a trait I have found not uncommon among all of your alumni. Her pride in Baylor—and in being the granddaughter of a president of Baylor—passed on to me early and influenced the course of my own life more constructively than I could ever describe.

So, I am most grateful to you for this moment—and for its meaning to me.

Woodrow Wilson once told the men of Princeton that: "It is not learning—but the spirit of service—that will give a college place in the public annals of the Nation."

For 120 years, Baylor University has touched the lives of many generations with an unusual spirit of selfless service. That spirit—expressed in the works of ministers and missionaries, public servants and public school teachers, of devout parents and dedicated citizens—has not only won for Baylor a place of esteem in this State and this Nation. It has served the betterment of the condition of man to the remote ends of this earth.

On this occasion, we meet here today at an historic hour in the life of the American nations.

In Washington, leaders of this hemisphere are meeting to work together to open a road to durable peace in the Dominican Republic.

Their efforts will have our full support. For at stake is the future not only of one of our sister republics but the principles and the values of all the American Republics.

We are members of an inter-American system in which large and small nations are partners in the defense of freedom and in the progress of economic welfare and social justice.

That partnership must be constantly strengthened. Our common aim and our combined ability must increase—in crisis as well as in calm. The tragedy of the past 4 weeks in the Dominican Republic renews our common resolution to accept common responsibility in dealing with common dangers.

In that unfortunate nation, 4 weeks ago, the legacy of dictatorship exploded in fury and anarchy. Hundreds of Dominicans died, leaving thousands of widows and orphans of

war. Nineteen of our own American boys lost their lives. The capital city, birthplace of the Western Hemisphere, was split asunder. Blood and hate drowned ideals. And for days freedom itself stood on the edge of disaster.

In those early terrible hours, we did what we had to do. Remembering Simon Bolivar's admonition that "To hesitate is destruction"; as your President, I did what I had to do.

Since then, working with the Organization of American States and its distinguished Secretary General, Jose Mora, the forces of democracy have acted. The results are clear.

More than 6,500 men, women, and children from 46 different countries have been evacuated. Not a single life was lost.

A cease fire was achieved, bringing an end to the threat of wholesale bloodshed.

An international zone of refuge was opened as a haven for all men of peace, and a safe corridor 17 miles long was established by American men.

More than 8 million pounds of food have been distributed to the Dominican people.

A well-trained, disciplined band of Communists was prevented from destroying the hopes of Dominican democracy.

Political avenues were opened to help the Dominican people find a Dominican solution to their problems.

Today those achievements are guaranteed—guaranteed by the troops of five nations representing this hemisphere. They are under the command of the able Brazilian general, General Alvim.

For the first time in history the Organization of American States has created and sent to the soil of an American nation an international peacekeeping military force.

That may be the greatest achievement of all.

The United States made its forces a part of that inter-American force. And, as the contributions of the Latin American nations have been incorporated into the OAS force, in the past 2 days the United States have removed 1,600 troops from the island.

I am issuing orders this morning to remove an additional 1,700 men on Saturday. I have also instructed our commander, General Palmer, to discuss possible further withdrawals with General Alvim. Such action will be taken when the military commanders believe it is safe and warranted by the arrival of further Latin American forces and by the continued stabilization of the military situation.

Now we ask ourselves this morning: "What is next?"

The answer to that question rests partly with the people of the Dominican Republic and partly with their neighbors throughout this hemisphere.

Already, under the distinguished leadership of Secretary General Mora, the broad outlines of a reasonable settlement are beginning to emerge—outlines which meet the needs and respond to the desires first of the Dominican people themselves and then of all the people of this hemisphere.

First, the Dominican people—and the people of their sister republics—do not want government by extremists of either the left or right. That is clear. They want to be ruled neither by an old conspiracy of reaction and tyranny nor by a new conspiracy of Communist violence.

Second, they want—as we do—an end to slaughter in the streets and to brutality in the barrios.

Third, they want—as we do—food and work and quiet in the night.

Fourth, they want—as we do—a constitutional government that will represent them all, and work for all their hopes.

Fifth, the Dominican people know they need the help of sympathetic neighbors in healing their wounds and in negotiating their divisions, but what they want ultimately, is the chance to shape their own course.

Those are the hopes of the Dominican people. But they are our hopes, too. And they are shared by responsible people in every nation of this hemisphere.

Out of the Dominican crucible the 20 American nations must now forge a stronger shield against disaster.

The opportunity is here now for a new thrust forward: to show the world the way to true international cooperation in the cause of peace and in the struggle to win a better life for all of us.

We believe the new world may most wisely approach this task guided by new realities.

The first reality is that old concepts and old labels are largely obsolete. In today's world, with the enemies of freedom talking about wars of national liberation, the old distinction between civil war and international war has already lost most of its meaning.

Second is the reality that when forces of freedom move slowly—whether on political, economic, or military fronts—the forces of slavery and subversion move rapidly, and they move decisively.

Third, we know that when a Communist group seeks to exploit misery, the entire free American system is put in deadly danger. We also know that these dangers can be found today in many of our lands. There is no trouble anywhere these evil forces will not try to turn to their advantage. We can expect more efforts at triumph by terror and conquest through chaos.

Fourth, we have learned in the Dominican Republic that we can act decisively and together.

Fifth, it is clear that we need new international machinery geared to meet the fast-moving events. When hours can decide the fate of generations, the moment of decision must become the moment of action.

Just as these lessons of the past 4 weeks are clear, so are the basic principles which have guided the purpose of the United States of America.

We seek no territory. We do not seek to impose our will on anyone. We intend to work for the self-determination of the peoples of the Americas within the framework of freedom.

In times past, large nations have used their power to impose their will on smaller nations. Today we have placed our forces at the disposition of the nations of this hemisphere to assure the peoples of those nations the right to exercise their own will in freedom.

In accordance with the resolution of the eighth meeting of the ministers at Punta del Este, we will join with the other OAS nations in opposing a Communist takeover in this hemisphere.

And in accordance with the charter of Punta del Este, we will join with other OAS nations in pressing for change among those who would maintain a feudal system—a feudal system that denies social justice and economic progress to the ordinary peoples of this hemisphere.

We want for the peoples of this hemisphere only what they want for themselves—liberty, justice, dignity, a better life for all.

More than "a few agitators" was necessary to bring on the tragic and the cruel bloodshed in the Dominican Republic. They needed additional help and a deeper cause. And they had both.

For the roots of the trouble are found wherever the landless and the despised, the poor and the oppressed, stand before the gates of opportunity seeking entry into a brighter land.

They can get there only if we narrow the gap between the rich nations and the poor—and between the rich and the poor within each nation. And this is the heart of the purpose of the United States.

Here on the campus of Baylor University we will reaffirm that purpose on June 26 when almost 50 Peace Corps volunteers will begin training for service in the Dominican Republic. These young men and women will go to the barrios of Santo Domingo and Santiago to work with and to work for the people of the Dominican Republic in attaining a new life and new hope.

At home, with the strong cooperation of our Congress, we are waging war on poverty; we are opening new paths of learning for all our children; we are creating new jobs for our workers; we are providing health care for our older citizens; we are eliminating injustice and inequality; we are bringing new economic life to whole regions. These objectives we will continue to pursue with all of our strength and all of our determination.

As peace returns to the Dominican people and as a broad base is laid for a new Dominican Government responsive to the people's will, the United States will be prepared to join in full measure in the massive task of reconstruction and in the hopeful work of lasting economic progress.

For in bold ink our signature is on the charter of the alliance. That charter commands a peaceful democratic social revolution across the hemisphere. It asks that unjust privilege be ended and that unfair power be curbed. It asks that we help throw open the gates of opportunity to these millions who stand there now knocking.

Just as we have joined in the Dominican Republic to bring peace to a troubled land, we have joined with these forces across the hemisphere who seek to advance their own independence and their own democratic progress.

We work with and for those men and women not because we have to. We work because morality commands it, justice requires it, and our own dignity as men depends on it. We work not because we fear the unjust wrath of our enemy, but because we fear the just wrath of God.

In Santo Domingo the last month has been grim. The storm there is not yet over. But a new sense of hope is beginning. Across the angry arguments of the opposing forces, the voice of good sense is now beginning to be heard.

As the Organization of American States recommits itself to the hard efforts of peacemaking, the Government and the people of the United States proudly pledge full support to the peacemakers.

The path ahead is long, the way ahead is hard. So we must, in the words of the prophet, "Mount up on the wings of eagles, run and not grow weary."

Thank you.

Radio Adman Pledges War on Smoking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I enclose an article from the Los Angeles Times of April 30, 1965, entitled "Radio Adman Pledges War on Smoking":

RADIO ADMAN PLEDGES WAR ON SMOKING

Al Petker, chain-smoking radio advertising man who quit smoking when he suffered a heart attack 6 weeks ago, Thursday pledged $1 million in air time for a nationwide anti-smoking campaign.

Petker said he was moved not only by his own experience, but also by the death of Edward R. Murrow "and thousands like him."

The Beverly Hills promoter said he will campaign against smoking on hundreds of

independent radio stations with which he owns broadcasting time.

He was a pioneer in development of the radio prize contest as an audience-builder and merchandising outlet.

MILLIONS FOR RESEARCH

Petker said millions are being spent on research to prove that cancer and other diseases are caused or aggravated by smoking, "but no one is battling to help people overcome the habit."

He called smoking "an insidious habit" which is "almost impossible to quit" when smokers are "constantly inundated" by cigarette advertising by television, billboards and magazines.

Thousands of independent radio stations and newspapers are the best hope of counteracting the manufacturers' campaigns, he said.

Learning To Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the full extent and depth of the war on poverty has been realized and carried into effect in the city and county of Denver. Recently, steps were taken to prepare 50 people in the objectives and purposes of this program. An excellent article concerning this work was written by Mr. Zoe von Ende, Denver Post staff writer, and I now wish to have the same inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point:

"POVERTY" CLASS OF 50 STARTS

(By Zoe von Ende)

Fifty Denver men and women generally classified as poor—from an economic standpoint—are going to school these days. They're being taught the goals of the war on poverty, how they can help, why it's important that poor people themselves participate. When they finish in June, they'll go to work in antipoverty projects all over the city.

The program potentially could answer a frequent criticism of the Nation's antipoverty effort: That the poor are not involved in its planning.

The program is called the Neighborhood Corps training program. It is taught from 7 to 9 p.m. Monday through Friday at the University of Denver Business Administration building in downtown Denver. It will be 10 weeks—April 19 to June 25.

About 40 of the 50 students are women.

DR. HYMAN DIRECTOR

Dr. Bernard Hyman, a Denver University assistant professor of psychology directs the program. It is financed by a $38,000 Federal grant, provided by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) under the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act, a major part of the President's antipoverty program.

As far as Dr. Hyman knows, he said, Denver University's is the only college-based program set up so far designed to train the indigenous (the poverty class) eventually to help themselves.

"This program was suggested to me by Bernard Valdez, the Denver welfare manager," Hyman said. "And the class we had at Denver University this summer training workers in the poverty program showed that we needed to train members of the poverty class, as well as the middle class, to take a hand in all this."

LOOKING FOR LEADERSHIP

Both the university and the OEO approved, so Hyman and his colleagues went to work. The requirements they established were somewhat unorthodox. They weren't interested in the usual things such as age or amount of education.

"We were most interested in leadership potential," Dr. Hyman said. "Our theory was that there are many members of the educationally and economically disadvantaged groups who have leadership qualifications."

The potential trainees were recruited through community organizations such as the PTA, tenant organizations in housing projects, churches, political and language groups, and fraternal organizations. In addition to filing out simple, seven-question application forms, applicants had to have letters of recommendations from such persons as a school principal or a priest.

A total of 243 persons—about two-thirds of them women—applied. The class includes "a preponderance of Negroes and Spanish Americans," both poverty-ridden groups, although they were not selected solely on the basis of race, Dr. Hyman said.

Instructors will include people from many types of social-oriented programs. There'll be secondary school teachers from "disadvantaged" parts of Denver; a State welfare department official who grew up in a Spanish-American community in southern Colorado; a Notre Dame sociologist; an official of New York City's mobilization for youth, a project dealing mainly with Puerto Ricans. Sympathy with the poverty programs goals was the main requirements for the staff.

When the course ends in June, the students will go to work in several antipoverty programs planned throughout the city by governmental and nongovernmental agencies which have applied for Federal money through OEO. These include the Denver public schools' after-school study halls, a tutorial program scheduled by the American Friends Service Committee, and a Visiting Nurse Association-Denver Housing Authority plan to train clinical aids to work with visiting nurses and physicians.

STUDENTS TO BE PAID

After their initial indoctrination in the philosophies and goals via the DU program, the student will be introduced to the specifics of the projects they'll work in and will be paid.

"We're not promising jobs," Dr. Hyman said, "but we have commitments for at least 50. We had to have that many or OEO wouldn't have approved our project."

While the students are in training, they're paid about $20 a week.

"This helps pay the babysitter, of course, but it also has symbolic importance," Dr. Hyman said. "At long last, the people in poverty can say the other people—the community and Washington—really mean business."

Gigantic Atom Smasher Is Sought for Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out previously, the extensive scientific and technical advantages of the Chicago metropolitan area make it an ideal location for the proposed new atom smasher. I would like to call attention to the following Chicago Tribune article of May 26, 1965, which points out that three or four possible sites are available in the Chicago area which will meet the requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission. I am hopeful that those who will be analyzing the bids submitted for the location of this new and vital facility will give close study to the proposal that will be presented by the State of Illinois.

The article follows:

GIGANTIC ATOM SMASHER IS SOUGHT FOR CHICAGO

(By Ronald Kotulak)

City and State agencies are urging the Atom Energy Commission to pick the Chicago area as the site for the world's largest atom smasher, a $280 million proton accelerator, the Tribune learned yesterday.

Preparation of the bid was undertaken by the mayor's committee for economic and cultural development and the Illinois Department of Economic Development shortly after President Johnson authorized construction of the 200- to 300-billion-electron-volt atom smasher. Construction is scheduled to begin next year.

AN IDEAL LOCATION

"Chicago is an ideal location with all the scientific, technical, and cultural assets needed for this project," said David M. Kennedy, chairman of the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, who is also chairman of the mayor's committee.

"I am not only hopeful, but I think we have a good chance of getting the big accelerator."

The accelerator, which will be 10 times more powerful than the biggest existing atom smasher, will probe the deepest secrets of nature which have tantalized but eluded scientists using smaller machines.

The proposed proton accelerator, which will be built in a ring with a diameter of one mile, will be about 24 times more powerful than the zero gradient synchrotron at Argonne National Laboratory, near Lemont. The two strongest machines in existence, both 30 billion electron volts, are at the Brookhaven National Laboratory in New York and in Switzerland.

The proposed accelerator, which will make the area in which it is located a worldwide center for nuclear research, fires protons around the ring and sends them crashing into target atoms at enormous speeds. The target atoms are broken up into their component pieces which are then studied by scientists.

RUSSIA BUILDING ONE

In opening the door to the study of the very smallest building blocks of all matter and energy, scientists have found a confusion of subatomic particles, whose roles are little understood.

Scientists maintain that the super atom smasher is needed not only to explore and understand this tiny world but also to keep pace with European research. Russia is building a 70-billion-volt accelerator and a number of European countries are studying plans to build a 300-billion-volt machine.

Locations for the proposed accelerator are being evaluated by the National Academy of Sciences under a contract with the AEC. All bids must be in by June 15 since the academy expects to announce its decision later this year.

STAFF PREPARING BID

Kennedy said the Chicago bid will be in before the deadline. It is being prepared at the IIT Research Institute under the direction of George Philips, vice president of the institute and general manager of Corplan Associates, which is affiliated with the institute.

Philips said six staff members are working full time on the bid in addition to a num-

ber of other persons whose time and talent are being donated.

Philips said his group will be able to recommend at least three or four sites in the Chicago area that will meet all or most of the AEC requirements.

Sound Counsel From a Noted Texas Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished editor of the Amarillo, Tex., Globe-Times, last week addressed the commencement exercises at Vega, Tex., High School. He is Mr. Thomas H. Thompson, who recently led his newspaper in a Pulitzer Prize-winning campaign to root out corruption in law enforcement afflicting his home community. Tommy Thompson is widely known throughout the United States as a most able columnist and news executive.

To be addressed by Mr. Thompson was a special honor for the 24 graduating Vega seniors. He writes as he speaks, in a solid and straightforward way, and it is always a treat to be in an audience he addresses.

I wish to commend Tommy Thompson's thoughts to a wider audience. The following is the text of his May 26 observations to the senior class of Vega High School:

ADDRESS OF THOMAS H. THOMPSON

Members of the class of 1965, platform guests, parents, and well-wishers, it is a pleasure to be with you this evening. I am sorry that you must listen to a pinch hitter and it is regrettable that the demands of the Nation keeps Congressman WALTER ROGERS in Washington to vote his views on foreign aid and agricultural legislation.

I am a newsman and certainly you will hear a different point of view listening to a working newspaperman than you would listening to a working Washington lawmaker.

My remarks may not challenge you. I only hope that I will be able to hold your interest for the next 20 minutes.

Certainly this is wishful thinking on my part.

My own commencement I recall vividly. It was at the municipal auditorium where my daughter will be graduated tomorrow night. I recall it was a hot night. I remember sweating under my cap and gown. I remember the hardness of the folding chair and that Thompson was a long ways down the alphabetical list when it came to handling out diplomas. I remember my fellow students, particularly how pretty but remote some of the girls looked, but for the life of me, I can't recall the commencement speaker or a thing he said.

This commencement is a new beginning for 24 Vega High School students. It is a new start, or a new launching, if you will. More than half of you will continue your formal education. Then there will be other new beginnings.

Where you will go from here, I have no idea, but judging from my own class, I may be addressing my remarks to a future mayor, a merchant, a TV repairman, a lawyer, a doctor, a couple of scientists, several teachers, some educated farmers and ranchers, a law-enforcement man. I hope I am addressing a professional nurse or two, and for selfish reasons, I hope I am talking to a future newsman. Not many high school graduates end up as jailbirds. Maybe I am addressing a professional crapshooter?

I joke about this crapshooting, but it takes all kinds of people to make a world. Once several years ago I did a profile of Charlie Guy, editor of the Lubbock Avalanche-Journal, for a trade magazine, and in talking to his friends, I asked each what would Mr. Guy have been if he hadn't been a newspaper editor. Some said he would have been a lawyer, a Congressman, a figure in the entertainment business, but one of his offbeat friends, a banker by the way, said if Charlie Guy hadn't been in the newspaper business, he would have been a crapshooter.

Tonight, as you members of the class of 1965 look back over your school years, you can recognize, whether you do or not, that you have received advantages no longer available to a great majority of American students. Throughout your 12 years in this fine school, those of you who have spent your lives in Vega and Oldham County, have received instruction from alert, qualified teachers in small classes where each student receives individual attention. Few high school classes graduating in the whole Nation have this great advantage. Over the Nation most students in the class of 1965 have been taught by inadequately trained teachers and in overcrowded classrooms with poor instructional facilities. Also, you have reached today's milestone in as secure and stable environment as can be imagined in today's world.

You will be grateful in the future, as you seek your fortune in America's bustling cities, and you will look back on these years with nostalgia. Fewer and fewer Americans, as our population continues to grow, will know as you do the wonder of having grown up surrounded by and sustained by love, friendship, trust, and confidence.

The future is studded with opportunities for the graduating class of 1965. My high school class walked out in their caps and gowns to face the great depression. It was a bleak and heart chilling experience and I am not grateful for it. I don't think it built character in me or my contemporaries. Years of discouragement, plus a world war, were in store for many of the young men and women of that day.

Unless technology fails, you are not apt to experience hunger, lack of comfortable clothing, shelter, medical care, or personal transportation with some kind of horsepower inside. A car for every person seems to have become a way of life, if not a necessity in this country.

Opportunities are vast for the skilled worker, or for the professional man. Electrical engineers with a bachelor of arts degree this year are being offered starting salaries of $637 a month. Mechanical engineers—$629 a month. The Christian Science Monitor says opportunities are prodigal in the field of journalism. Salarywise, I know that the starting reporter makes about five times what cub reporters were paid when I entered the newspaper game.

In the back shop, in the composing room, in the technical end of our business, there are just as many opportunities. The whole newspaper industry is going through a change that makes some of our equipment obsolete overnight.

I understand that Dennis Krahn, your valedictorian, will study math or science in college. As your counselors have told you, there are tremendous opportunities for mathematicians and physicists of this day and time. In my day about the only occupational opportunity in this field was teaching.

The old want ads of my day were confined to jobs wanted, for in the depression, America's industrial plants had all but shut down and our farmers were also in deep trouble. Now the classified sections of the newspaper list jobs that by their very title illustrate the sophisticated degree of skill and knowledge necessary for their performance. With the proper educational background for college, any one of you have within your capacity to be a thermodynamic engineer and an environmental control or life support system engineer, a data processing manager, a programer analyst.

Congressman WALTER ROGERS would invite you into the realm of politics.

"Public service," he said, "provides an opportunity equal to any calling. Politics is the science of government. Our philosophy of government is the finest ever fashioned by mankind. If this philosophy is to endure, there must be active, vigorous participation in public service. If you shrink away from politics, you are shrinking away from life itself."

I am told that Elizabeth Janhsen, your salutatorian, and several other members of the class may elect to become teachers. This is a extremely rewarding profession, as well as a challenging one.

And by the way, one of the most overlooked areas in public school education is the lower grades. Here is a specialized field all its own. Properly exposed, a child can learn in great gulps without realizing he is putting forth a new effort. Last fall a year ago, Mrs. Thompson and I were in Zurich, Switzerland. I had some business at the American Embassy. A cab summoned by the hotel doorman was driven by a young woman, possibly in her early twenties. I asked if she spoke English.

"Certainly," she said. In fact, she spoke four languages, in addition to her native tongue. As a child she had picked up these languages. To her ears they weren't foreign. They were familiar languages. Perhaps by the time you have children of kindergarten age, educators will have produced a synthetic language environment that will permit your children to absorb foreign languages as this petite young Swiss cab driver had in schools as on the streets of Zurich.

We don't know how much the mind can retain. Particularly we are in the dark about the very young mind.

I mentioned there are great opportunities in the field of journalism. I should have said communications. I also should have said need, need for self-expression in all lines of work. The verbally stumbling expert on farm management is a handicap to himself and frustration to his students. A geologist who can't spell out his thoughts in understandable terms is like the rancher who must leave two-thirds of his oil underground because he hasn't the know-how to get it out.

A year ago, Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, speaking for a college commencement address, said, "The first quality which I would ask the educated man to have may seem surprising to some of you. It is this: a primary duty of a college graduate is to achieve clarity and precision in his spoken and written communication. A college graduate who has not learned to use his mother tongue with grace, precision and clarity simply does not deserve the diploma of a first degree. He is not an educated man, no matter how great the quantity of information that he may have stored away for some future use."

Many of you have participated in the spelling bee sponsored by our newspaper. You have learned the meaning, the spelling of a thousand words. I assure you this is a tremendous head start, a start I wish I had had.

But I am not here to sell the virtues of my line of work. In virtually every occupational field the demand exists for able, properly trained young men and women who will

give the job their best effort. Small business opportunities can continue great for those who wish to be their own bosses. There are countless good corners left for good, well-run service stations. One of the rarest specialists to be found is not the doctor who can perform brain or open heart surgery, but the mechanic who can make an automobile run properly.

Those of you who will pursue careers in agriculture will face problems as farmers always have.

But I predict that the current problem of large surpluses will not be when your grandchildren mark high school commencement day. The day will come and your class of 1965 will see it when every bit of America's agricultural productivity will be required to feed our population and that of a very crowded world.

I venture this last prediction in the full knowledge that forecasting is dangerous, although newspaper people are not expected to be infallible.

Making predictions in Oldham County has proven especially risky from the very start. One hundred and sixteen years ago next month, Capt. R. B. Marcy led his party across what was to become Oldham County—and that night in his journal he set down a rather grim picture of what he had seen. Captain Marcy wrote: "When we were up on the high tableland, a view presented itself as boundless as the ocean. Not a tree, shrub, or any other object, even animated or inanimate, relieved the dreary monotony of the prospect; it was a vast expanse of desert prairie. It is a region almost as vast and trackless as the ocean. A land where no man, either savage or civilized, permanently abides. It spreads forth into a treeless, desolate waste of uninhabited solitude which always has been and must continue uninhabited forever."

A man who had a kinder and certainly a more imaginative view came along later. He was the town's first settler, Mr. A. N. Miller. He knew about the rich, nutritious grass of the western panhandle so he named what was to be your town—Vega—meaning "grassy plot." Oh, yes, his second choice was Gusben, combining the names of his sons, Gus and Steven. Gusben, to me, sounds like the kind of commonplace name they would pick over in Oklahoma. Vega sounds just right.

Even the forward-looking Mr. Miller could not foresee what has happened to the farming area surrounding Vega in the past 10 years. The irrigation well has replaced the windmill, and has made this land bloom like a garden. Farmers are not farmers in the old sense. They are industrialists. I don't know how many of you plan to make your homes here where you were born and reared, but there is opportunity here and if you can't see it, outsiders will.

Now we have talked about the opportunities of this age—let's turn the coin over. What about its liabilities?

One thing, the miracle drugs and the wonders of surgery are augmenting an overcrowded world that is bound to have mankind warring for space on the planet. Communism has produced a godless and materialistic credo that has seized and saturated the minds of the world's two largest nations.

Some people profess to be neutral on communism, but if you expect this country to survive, you can't be neutral on communism.

This is your world—it belongs to you, not to people of my vintage, your parents, or most of your teachers. Fifty percent of the population of the United States is now under 25 years.

Yours is a precocious age; 1965 high school graduates are destined to ride to the Moon and consort with the men from Mars on Mars if Mars is inhabited.

But not all of the secrets are being unlocked. The secret of happiness is not. There is a decline in a belief in a higher being. Young people are making themselves miserable with doubt and questioning. I'm not saying that the pursuit of the truth is not worth the price, but while your age may be precocious, it will have its casualties in shattered minds and distraught personalities.

The social manifestations are calculable. Crime rate is four times the increase in population. The divorce rate is astounding. Youthful homicides and suicides are almost daily newspaper fare.

You get the feeling of deep desperation sometimes. Francis Thomsen, the poet, wrote: "I run to death and death meets me as fast."

A year ago out at Pearl Harbor, I heard a young marine officer who had botched his marriage say, "I'm shipping out to Vietnam, where life is simple."

These broken marriages are doubly sad, because in most cases small children needing the security of two parents wind up with crippled strength of only one.

Not long ago I happened to be in a courthouse on "divorce day." This was the day when the judge was handling uncontested divorces.

I was amazed at the number of pretty, intelligent-appearing, well-dressed women who waited their turn in the divorce mill. And many were so very young. Of course, there were broken hearts under the bravado.

These are not pleasant problems to mention at commencement, but they exist and won't be solved by turning the other way.

In the past few days I have heard commencement addresses and have read a dozen new and old.

I like the hard-nosed specifics laid down in the speech by Gene Steed, Perryton attorney, and former Ochiltree County judge. In a commencement address to the Booker High School, he urged graduates going away to school to stay clear of roommates with poor study habits and to first of all buy a bound spiral notebook for each subject. He said, "If you got a fine leather notebook case for graduation, just leave it at home. Don't use loose leaf notebook pages. Just don't use them. Buy yourself a spiral note pad that is hooked together. You may want to tear some pages out, but just leave it together. When you go to class, take down everything the teacher says. I mean everything. Anything he writes down on the board, take it down. Put it in your notebook.

"Those of you who haven't been to college probably haven't seen the handwriting of persons who have been to college. Generally, it looks like hen scratching and I'll tell you the reason why. In college you have to write 90 miles an hour, but that is very important. If you miss something of what he says, borrow it from your neighbor, but put down everything he says. Come time for an exam, review those notes. Review them, review them. Memorize, memorize, and go in and take the exam and come out with an A-plus. Keep all of your notes for each course in one book. I still have over in my files in my office in Perryton every one of the notebooks that I had in college and I refer to them. I really do."

Here is more specific advice from Frederick R. Kappell, chairman of the board of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. He says, "Bear down on good marks." His company looks first at grades. He says that scholastic achievement is the first most important single indicator for predicting success in business. He says that when his company takes the second look at an applicant, it is at the quality of the college. Good grades from a fair school can't be considered in the same category with good grades from a top school.

Personally, I would go further than just picking the school. Picking the right teacher is more important. There is a world of difference in teachers and if you are an upperclassman, or in graduate school, you won't have difficulty in choosing between the professor who provides his student with routine handouts of knowledge and the professor with a probing mind and the challenging classroom manner.

Then there is the teacher who is something more than the honest scholar. He is that rare bird who fires the imagination and makes your scholastic chores a labor of love. He is worth looking for and you don't necessarily find him in the ivy colleges of the east coast, or the shiny citadels of learning on the west coast.

Back 25 years ago, history majors weren't at West Texas State University by accident. They were there to study under Dr. L. F. Sheffey. Jim Thomas, our outdoor editor, is also a student at West Texas State University. He was attracted there to study paleontology and geology under Jack Hughes.

I understand that David Mathis, Emilio Caballero, and Dr. Matty Swain Mack are also teacher's teachers. At Amarillo College we have Dr. John F. Meade, who is absolutely great in languages and there is Dr. Lucille King Linn and Miss Birdie Warren, who taught chemistry to thousands of Amarillo and Panhandle students and inspired hundreds to choose the scientific field as their lifework.

I've noticed from reading commencement speeches that most are closed with a bit of Kipling or Browning, but I am not a reader of poetry. Besides, in the newspaper business, when we have had our say, we stop. I have had my say. Best of luck to all of you.

Matanuska Pioneers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, in May 1935, 200 families from northern Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan began arriving in Alaska's Matanuska Valley, transported there under a New Deal program to establish an agricultural settlement. That settlement prospered, and those who came and stayed are marking this 30th anniversary in their annual Colony Days celebration.

An important event in this 30th anniversary year that was not a part of earlier celebrations is the inauguration of two new organizations in Palmer, the principal town of the Matanuska Valley. These two organizations—Pioneers of Alaska Igloo 31 and Pioneers Auxiliary 11—are being inaugurated as 57 men and women who were Alaskan pioneers are formally initiated as pioneers of Alaska.

Inauguration of the igloo and the auxiliary in Palmer and initiation of their first members comes at first opportunity, for basis of membership in the Pioneers of Alaska is, except for those born in Alaska, 30 years' residence.

In recognition of these Alaskan pioneers, Mr. Speaker, I insert here a background article from the Anchorage Times of May 29, by Mrs. Evangeline Atwood, on the Matanuska Valley Colony and a second article from the Anchorage Times of June 1, which tells who these honored pioneers are:

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Times, May 29, 1965]

DEPRESSION "PETS" NOW BIG SUCCESS

(By Evangeline Atwood)

Thirty years ago they were front-page news in practically every newspaper across the Nation. They were labeled "creampuff pioneers," "red plush pioneers," "pets of the depression," "pilgrims in search of a brave new world" and "new Israelites going to a new Canaan."

They were treated like national heroes as they traveled across country, with gala celebrations welcoming them each step of the way. Three special trainloads brought them to the west coast from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. A large, white Army transport, the *St. Mihiel*, lay at anchor at San Francisco, and later at Seattle, waiting to take them to what some columnists called a frozen promised land and others a cold-storage El Dorado.

When they arrived in Seward, and later in Anchorage, the whole town turned out to greet and entertain them.

Today the Matanuska Valley colonists of 1935 are again accorded special recognition; this time by their friends and neighbors with whom they have lived and shared the trials and tribulations of carving a livelihood out of a primitive wilderness.

SPECIAL RECOGNITION

They, and their children, were guests today at a banquet sponsored by the Alaska Rural Rehabilitation Corporation and on June 6 another banquet is planned for them by the Palmer Pioneers' lodge and women's auxiliary, following their initiation into membership in these two exclusive organizations. Thirty years' residence in Alaska is a membership requirement.

There are approximately 350 original colonists and their immediate descendants who are living in Alaska. The majority are living in the Matanuska Valley but others are scattered over the State from Ketchikan to Dillingham. About a hundred make their homes in the Anchorage area.

When Franklin Delano Roosevelt became President in 1933, the Nation was in the throes of a great economic depression. Millions were on relief because they could not find a job. One million farm families were living on public funds. Thus one of his first New Deal acts was to request Congress to pass a $4 million relief appropriation to give immediate aid to the unemployed.

Roosevelt quickly appointed Harry L. Hopkins as Federal Relief Administrator and he began priming the country's economic pump by launching colossal works-relief projects.

One of the earliest projects in the relief program was moving tens of thousands of farm families from their submarginal land, which could not provide them a livelihood. The prairies of the Midwest had been overgrazed, the trees which once held moisture in the earth had been cut and not replaced, and the land was exhausted from overcultivation. In addition, great dust storms had swept away the fertile soil.

In looking for new land on which to transplant farm families, Alaska was a natural.

PROJECT LAUNCHED

Here was a huge, underpopulated area crying for people to come and develop its natural resources. Col. Otto F. Ohlson, general manager of the Alaska Railroad, got together with Washington officials and the Matanuska Valley colonization project was launched.

It was decided that a pilot project involving 200 families would be started in the Matanuska Valley, adjacent to the Alaska Railroad, and perhaps similar projects would be established in other parts of Alaska, depending on the success of this first one.

The 200 families were selected from northern Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan because of similar climatic conditions. Most of them were of Scandinavian extraction and between the ages of 25 and 40 years.

They arrived in Palmer in May 1935 and were housed in tents while their log and frame homes were being built.

Four hundred single men, taken from the California Civilian Conservation Camps, were sent north to help the colonists get established. By November the colonists were in their homes and the transient workers were sent back to California.

MANY GAVE UP

The social and psychological problems were many as this community of 1,500 human beings set about organizing itself into a workable unit. The usual human frailties, such as jealousy, arrogance, dishonesty, impatience, and loneliness, played their role in causing problems. Sixty families gave up in despair and returned to their stateside homes during the first year, even though it meant going back on the relief rolls.

In addition to personality clashes, there were basic concepts which were changed in later years and had those changes been made within the first few months, undoubtedly many fine colonists would have remained to become Alaska's leading citizens.

For example, since it was strictly a relief project, only subsistence farming was permitted. No consideration was allowed for commercial farming; the tracts of land were too small, the buildings were inadequate, and the colonists were forbidden to seek employment away from their land. Also, it started out as a social cooperative experiment so ordered by the official Washington agency, the Resettlement Administration, with Rexford Tugwell as director.

SOME COULDN'T ADJUST

The rugged individualists who were picked for pioneering a frontier could not adjust to the regimentation of a social cooperative. As they saw themselves going deeper into debt to the Government and being deprived of finding ways to make a living while their farms were being slashed out of a dense forest, they became discouraged.

Representatives of the Nation's press, radio, and motion picture industry were almost as thick as the mosquitoes which hovered about the colonists.

With this publicity, officials both in Washington and Palmer had thousands of applicants begging to join the project. When the discouraged left, others came to take their places. * * * There is no question about its being a success from the point of view of Alaska.

It introduced a psychology of permanent residence; it proved that agriculture could be developed into a basic industry; it brought in its wake hundreds of new citizens who have helped to develop other sections of the State, particularly the Kenai Peninsula and Tanana Valley.

As one of the original colonists, who lives in Palmer, remarked recently, "If every $3,500,000 expenditure made by our Federal Government during the past 30 years had paid off as well as this one, our problems in the world would be over."

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Times, June 1, 1965]

PIONEERS LODGE OPENS ROLLS FOR VALLEY COLONISTS

PALMER.—Twenty-five men, all but two who are colonists who came to the area 30 years ago, have signed up for membership in the Pioneers of Alaska Igloo 31.

Just eligible for membership in the lodge which has a 30-year Alaska residency requirement, they will be initiated in the special ceremonies June 6, at the Palmer Elks Hall.

At the same time, 32 women will be initiated into the Pioneers Auxiliary 11.

Special events honoring the colonists, brought to the Matanuska Valley by the Federal Government during the depression to carve a new life out of the Alaska wilderness, begin this weekend with the annual observance of Colony Days.

Colonists—and sons of the early-day settlers—joining the lodge include:

William Bouwens, Raymond Rebarchek, Virgil Eckert, Paul Nelson, John Hermon, George Hermon, Joseph Loyer, Kenneth Loyer, William Smith, Anthony Vicharyous, Byron Anderson, Wayne Bouwens.

Ronald Rebarchek, William Lentz, Henry LaRose, Joe A. Lentz, Carl H. Meier, George Venne, Allan Scheibl, Louis Burcher, Raymond Jenkins, Robert Pippel, Einer Huseby, and Lawrence Vasanoja.

Max Sherrod, who came to Alaska 30 years ago from Michigan not as a colonist but as a nurse to work with the colony, will also be initiated. The other noncolonist initiate will be Louie Alfred Burcher.

Women joining the auxiliary are:

Mrs. Dexter Bacon, Mrs. Louie Burcher, Mrs. Harold Boice, Mrs. Benjamin Cottle, Mrs. Jack Cunningham, Mrs. Raymond DePriest, Mrs. Virgil Eckert, Mrs. Claude Harter, Mrs. Patrick Hemmer, Mrs. Einer Huseby.

Mrs. Lucille Hutchinson, Mrs. Jalmar Kerttula, Mrs. Cecil Kurtz, Mrs. Henry LaRose, Mrs. William Lentz, Mrs. John D. Linnebur, Mrs. Joseph Loyer, Mrs. Richard Marshall, Mrs. John Meehan, Mrs. Carl Meier, Mrs. Owen Moffitt, Mrs. Thomas Moffitt.

Mrs. Paul Nelson, Mrs. Bill Patrick, Mrs. Ray Rebarchek, Mrs. Betty Rice, Mrs. Gust Scheibl, Mrs. Earl Simpson, Mrs. William Smith, Mrs. Anthony Vickaryous, Mrs. John Weisenberger and Mrs. Eino Wirtanen.

The colonists and their families will be honored Saturday at a 30th anniversary dinner being hosted by the board of directors and management of the Alaska Rural Rehabilitation Corp. The event is scheduled for 2 p.m. at the Elks Lodge.

It was this corporation which was formed 30 years ago to conduct the Matanuska Valley Colonization Project with Federal relief funds.

The Colony Days program begins with a parade Saturday with entertainment to center on a rodeo and horseracing.

To prepare for the June 6 initiation, a special meeting of Pioneers Igloo 31 has been called tonight at the Moose Hall.

Pioneers of both the Anchorage and Matanuska Valley igloos will have their annual picnic June 20 at the Heinie Snider home and the adjacent Pioneer Park at Lake Lucille.

The Sniders donated to the Pioneers the property for the park which is to get such improvements as picnic tables and benches, a barbecue pit and parking area.

Address of Morris D. Crawford on the Role of Savings Banking in the War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, 1964 my good friend Morris D. Crawford, Jr., president of the Bowery Savings Bank in New York and at that time president of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, addressed the 47th annual convention of

the Savings Banks Associations of Massachusetts at Bretton Woods, N.H.

Mr. Crawford's address concerned the part that the savings bank industry can and should play in the war on poverty. As pointed out in the following editorial from the American Banker of September 22, 1964, Mr. Crawford especially urged savings banks to aid in the education of the young in their communities:

SPECIAL HELP FOR EDUCATION

The deep involvement of the bank in its community, which should be the natural condition of the institution, time and again reduces major problems to detailed, personal transactions. The tidal drift of great economic trends, under the free enterprise system, is actually comprised of myriad private decisions and actions.

And so it is that the exertion of individual intiative, multiplied many times over, can act to influence these trends.

There is widespread agreement, for example, that poor education—or none at all—is one of the root causes of poverty in the United States. And there have been numerous ideas advanced as to what to do about it.

Banking, by and large, has responded well to the challenge. But so far, much of the response has taken shape in the form of support of institutions, or in the granting of loans to deserving applicants who ask for them.

A much more aggressive role for banks in building against poverty in the future was suggested last week by Morris Crawford, president, National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, and president, Bowery Savings Bank, New York, in a speech at the annual meeting of the Savings Banks Association of Massachusetts.

This role is for banks to find and encourage young people in their communities who have the potential to go to college, but who do not realize that it is possible for them financially.

"If we are really to make a contribution, we may have to seek out worthy students, rather than wait for them to come in to apply for loans," Mr. Crawford said.

"If we can get somebody to go to college who otherwise wouldn't have gone; if we can finance technical training for a skill that otherwise would have been wasted," he asserted, "we will have helped to reduce the potential for poverty in our communities."

The form of the assistance matters little—it could be scholarship, loan, or help in arranging an orderly financial program. The important element in Mr. Crawford's proposal is bank initiative.

And while he was talking to an audience composed of savings bankers, Mr. Crawford was delivering a message to the entire financial community.

Here is an area where all banks can play a more important part than they ever have before. It is quite reasonable to build upon Mr. Crawford's idea, and to suggest that concrete steps be taken to encourage initiative in this direction. Could not bankers and high school principals meet to work toward this common purpose—the principals to identify good students who face financial problems in the continuation of their education; the bankers to work on the solution of those problems?

In so many of these cases, once the possibility of further advance is opened up, the key second step is the providing of professional skill in working out the best ways to achieve it. The bankers can work with the schools to find the students; and the bankers can then work with the students themselves in solving the financial problems.

Perhaps the most appealing thing about Mr. Crawford's suggestion is that banks of almost any size can lend a hand. Obviously, the smaller banks will not be able to hand out scholarships—but they can participate in a program to build financial props for some of their local youngsters to advance their education.

"I would remind you that while we are in the business of capital formation, we must not restrict our efforts to providing funds for brick and mortar," Mr. Crawford told his savings banker audience. "If we are to live up to our historic tradition of self-help, we must assist people—people who, by improving their minds, can make an economic contribution through the use they make of new skills and training. This provides a return not only to the lending institution, but to the community and to society as well."

This is a specialist's role that Mr. Crawford described, to be played in the growing struggle to reduce poverty in this country, and one in which all forms of banking can play their part. And because it is a role that only these institutions can play effectively, it is all the more important that they accept his suggestion to play it to the utmost of their capacity.

Mr. Speaker, Morris Crawford's words and the role of the Bowery Savings Bank in education as a part of the war on poverty, deserve the attention of all of us and I commend his remarks to our colleagues:

THE ROLE OF SAVINGS BANKING IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

(Address by Morris D. Crawford, Jr., president of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, and president, the Bowery Savings Bank, New York, before the 47th annual convention of the Savings Banks Association of Massachusetts, Bretton Woods, N.H., Sept. 19, 1964)

The savings bank industry is robust and healthy. We are continuing to experience record growth with assets totaling $52 billion and deposits totaling $47 billion. We had record gains in deposits for the first 6 months of this year and we have continued to set records in the 2 succeeding months. August deposit gains of $360 million were more than double the gains in August a year ago. Reflecting the Nation's health economy, Americans are saving at record rates today, and we are getting our share of their increased savings. We can look forward to continuing prosperity and to continued record gains by mutual savings banks in the months immediately ahead.

While achieving these record deposit gains, savings banks have kept their operating costs low and paid their depositors high, competitive rates of interest. Furthermore, we have seen a welcomed reversal in the downward trend in number of accounts that has plagued our industry for several years. Nationally, the number of accounts in savings banks dropped by 338,000 in the first 7 months of last year, but in the first 7 months of 1964 the number of accounts increased by 86,000. In Massachusetts, where the loss of accounts was arrested earlier than in other States, the net increase in number of accounts in the first 7 months of 1964 was 75 percent higher than in the comparable period last year.

Savings banks have achieved all of this despite geographic restrictions, relatively few offices and a limited range of services. There is no reason for savings bankers to be on the defensive. We have clearly demonstrated that there is a need for our institutions and that the public has confidence in them. From this position of strength we may look ahead to new growth and new fields for savings banking.

We can be proud of our efforts in the area of geographic extension. Legislation authorizing the establishment of mutual savings banks was signed into law in Puerto Rico on June 26, climaxing 2 years of counseling and guidance by the national association, working closely with local business leaders. Your former bank commissioner and my Harvard contemporary, Ed Counihan, was most helpful in his support of the measure. We will offer technical assistance to local business people in the establishment of the first savings bank in San Juan as we did in connection with the Alaska Mutual Savings Bank. In this past year we helped modernize and expand the services of the New St. Croix Savings Bank in the Virgin Islands.

On the national level, we can be most gratified that the administration has sponsored Federal chartering legislation, which it sent to congressional leaders at the end of July. That action served as explicit recognition of the importance of savings banking in our economy and of the need to extend savings banking throughout the United States. Hearings are expected to be held next session. All of you have received a packet of materials on the bill from the national association, and you will be kept informed of further developments. I urge each of you to discuss Federal chartering with your congressional representatives whenever the opportunity arises.

Also in the field of extension, you should be interested to know the national association is studying an industry program to assist in the establishment of new savings banks and to help provide (in appropriate cases) additional capital for institutions having extraordinary deposit growth.

Now, let us turn for a moment to the services you offer to the public. We should all make full use of the services now permitted our banks. Savings bankers in Massachusetts are particularly fortunate in being able to offer such a broad spectrum of services, which gives you far more latitude in your operations than is the case in New York and many other savings bank states. I hope you will make full use of them and then seek new powers as the need for them becomes apparent.

In this connection I should like to plead the case for a special effort that savings banking can make in an area that has been much in the news this year. As you know, Congress recently enacted legislation authorizing special programs designed to attack the causes of poverty. Poverty prevention, of course, is not a new objective for savings banking. We have aided in the prevention of poverty in at least three ways.

First, our industry was born early in the industrial revolution, in response to the need for institutions to encourage thrift and provide savings facilities. From the start, savings banks helped to counteract the specter of financial insecurity that faced the new class of wage earners. Throughout its existence the savings bank industry has pursued this objective of thrift promotion.

Secondly, by stimulating thrift and channeling savings into productive, long-term investments, savings banks have participated in the process of capital formation which is basic to economic expansion and the reduction of poverty.

Finally, savings banks have joined in Government anad private programs designed to alleviate specific aspects of the poverty problem, particularly inadequate housing.

Poverty has long been with us, and certainly, there is no quick cure for it. No one group has all the answers. There is a role, of course, for the Government. But there is an important role for the business community. While the weapons to combat poverty are important, no real progress can be made until those for whom the weapons have been forged are persuaded to use them.

Before discussing in more detail the role of mutual savings banks in the war on poverty, let us review how those concerned with eradicating poverty in years past turned to financial institutions for assistance. Before

the opening of the first mutual savings bank in 1810, a variety of schemes were tried to alleviate poverty and provide economic security. In general, there were three broad approaches to the problem: first, public or private charity; second, mutual aid through some form of contributory insurance, pension or annuity scheme; and, finally, self-help, which has since found its fullest expression in the mutual savings bank.

Savings banks today pursue the same basic objectives of their predecessors: to encourage people to save systematically, not only for future security, but for special purposes such as getting an education or buying a house. Savings banks make a basic contribution to good citizenship by fostering financial discipline that not only stimulates savings, but also provides a respect for property and instills prudence in the allocation of resources.

Mutual savings banks have made an impressive contribution to the economy of New England, particularly in Massachusetts. During the past 15 to 20 years, when a substantial segment of the textile industry was moving to the South, the New England habit of thrift came to the aid of many who had accumulated sufficient savings to sustain them during the difficult days between the departure of the textile mills and the arrival of the diversified industry that was to take its place.

In many eastern cities savings banks have made important contributions toward eradicating one of the corollaries of poverty—substandard housing—through leadership in establishing and financing urban renewal programs. Because they are concentrated in the same eastern metropolitan areas where more than 600 communities have established local public agencies to deal with urban renewal, savings banks are strategically located to play a major role in urban redevelopment. I am pleased to say that mutual savings bankers were quick to recognize the importance of these programs designed to wipe out the breeding places of poverty and crime.

Our industry became so interested in urban redevelopment that the National Association's Mortgage Investments Committee, under the chairmanship of Bob Morgan, created an urban renewal subcommittee, which conducted a comprehensive study of the possibilities of participation by our banks in this program. Following the publication of this study in the Savings Bank Journal last November, Representative Albert Rains, considered one of the top experts on housing, commented that the study was the best he had ever seen on urban renewal. Similar compliments came from others in government.

Savings banks have participated in renewal and redevelopment housing programs since the problem of urban blight began to attract attention in the years following World War II. In particular, they have responded impressively to recently established Federal urban renewal programs. Following the adoption of sections 220 and 221 of the Housing Act of 1954, the industry's combined holdings of FHA-insured urban renewal and redevelopment loans rose to $190.4 million by the end of 1963. This was nearly 20 percent of such holdings by all private institutional investors combined. Savings banks also have been important participants in the financing of other special purpose housing, such as nursing homes and housing for the elderly.

Boston now ranks fourth among U.S. cities in terms of Federal commitments for urban renewal. The Boston savings banks have joined with cooperative banks and Federal savings and loan associations to form the widely hailed Boston Banks Urban Renewal Group, which has provided the permanent financing of virtually all of the projects completed to date. The Boston group is to be particularly commended for its work in connection with the Washington Park rehabilitation area project in Roxbury. Federal funds were not available to modernize existing substandard private housing in this project, so the Boston group moved in and financed the renovation of what has been described as an utterly impossible situation.

Boston was the first city to use Federal urban renewal loans to improve public transportation. New horizons are opening up in this area as a result of the newly enacted mass transportation bill.

Now, may I suggest a new endeavor that could enable our industry to strike boldly at one of the main causes of poverty. Few would quarrel with the conclusion that people with substandard educations usually take their places at the bottom of the economic ladder—the lowest paid, the last to be hired and the first to be fired. Much of the unemployment among young people today can be traced to inadequate education and training. Certainly, raising the educational level of our population would constitute a frontal assault on poverty.

As we all know, there are large numbers of qualified high school graduates who are unable to attend college for financial reasons. Many of them possess talents which, unless developed through education, will go unused—a shocking waste of the Nation's resources. Savings banks can play a major role in helping the needy, but deserving, to continue their educations. While a start has been made on college aid by a number of public and private programs, it doesn't begin to meet the need, if we are going to give adequate training to the record numbers of people passing through our secondary schools today.

Massachusetts is among the top three States in terms of the number of scholarships provided by the colleges and universities within its borders. Massachusetts also rates very high in scholarship aid provided by the State. I note that an increasing number of business corporations are offering scholarships both in Massachusetts and nationwide. It occurs to me that a savings bank might very well consider offering scholarships, limited perhaps to their communities or possibly even to depositors.

You perhaps noted that savings and loan associations were granted authority in the recently enacted housing bill to make educational loans throughout the United States. Perhaps when we get our Federal charter bill it can provide similar authority for broad-scale educational loans. Until then, we must depend on our State legislatures for power to make low-cost educational loans. In 1962, the Massachusetts Legislature passed a law permitting savings banks to make loans to students guaranteed by the Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corp. This loan program, which has become identified as HELP, has been most successful, and I hope all savings banks will actively support and promote this plan.

In New York a similar loan guarantee program was inaugurated in 1960, and I am pleased to report that savings banks hold nearly 42,000 of these loans, amounting to more than $31 million. The Bowery Savings Banks was one of the first to participate in this education loan program, and we are still very active in it. At the Bowery we have a special subsidy program to encourage employees to continue their education, either in special banking courses or in college courses leading to a degree. This program has been well received and we are currently broadening and strengthening it.

On an industry level, savings banks have been provided an opportunity to contribute to economic education through the Mutual Savings Foundation of America, which was established in 1961. Thus far, it has awarded two study grants—one to Alaska Methodist University and one to a Columbia University graduate. Next year the foundation will underwrite a fellowship in finance at Brown University, which has contributed so much to our gradutae school of savings banking. Several Massachusetts savings banks and bankers have contributed to the foundation and I hope others will find it possible to support this small but worthwhile endeavor.

But getting back to college aid on the State and local level, it seems that if we are really to make a contribution, we may have to seek out worthy students, rather than wait for them to come in to apply for loans. Perhaps we must take on the job of ascertaining which local students will need financial assistance to attend college. I am sure our secondary school principals will be glad to cooperate. We can discuss frankly with these students their financial situations and suggest practical programs to get them into college and keep them there. If we can get somebody to go to college who otherwise wouldn't have gone, if we can finance technical training for a skill that otherwise would have been wasted, we will have helped to reduce the potential for poverty in our communities.

It will be up to the individual bank to determine the most desirable type of assistance. In some cases a scholarship may be in order. It seems to me a college scholarship might be an attractive adjunct to a school savings program. On the other hand, it might be more practical to arrange a low-rate, long-term loan for an especially deserving applicant. Going beyond what we would do routinely in the case of such loans may prove one of the most fruitful and rewarding investments in our banking careers.

I would remind you that while we are in the business of capital formation, we must not restrict our efforts to providing funds for brick and mortar. If we are to live up to our historic tradition of self-help, we must assist people, who, by improving their minds, can make an economic contribution through the use they make of new skills and training. This provides a return, not only to the lending institution, but to the communty and to society as well.

I am not sure just how you will be able to adapt a student aid program to your operation. Surely a small savings bank cannot afford many, if any, scholarships. Participation through a savings bank group might be more practical. Further, it might be more desirable from a tax standpoint. The important thing is that mutual savings banks do not neglect the opportunity to strike a blow at poverty through participating in some form of practical student aid aimed at lifting the educational level of our communities.

Perhaps some of these suggestions may seem a bit radical to you. Nevertheless, helping people to help themselves rise from poverty is not only within the historic traditions of mutual savings banking, it is the very reason that mutual savings banking came into being. By tying our antipoverty drive to education, we will be meeting the challenges, not of yesterday, but of today and tomorrow. Let us, as citizens and as savings bankers, take the lead in this vital effort.

Haiku

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to bring the haiku—an unrhymed Japanese poem of

three lines containing 5, 7, and 5 syllables respectively—written by Mrs. Mamie Ferris Gardner, of Oakland, Calif., to our colleagues' attention.

Mrs. Gardner's thoughtful series of haikus should be appreciated by all who are concerned with insuring equal rights for all Americans:

HAIKU

(By Mamie Ferris Gardner)

A whole nation moves,
Tense and determined, this March,
Nineteen, sixty-five.

Decisive action
Is mandatory, to meet
Stubborn aggression.

Ideologies,
Atheistically bent,
Serve not common good.

God's painting of man
Shows flawlessly blended hues
With accent of black.

Man and music need
Ebony and ivory
For true harmony.

Understanding hearts
Sense not origin, creed, hue,
Only the soul's depth.

—Mrs. MAMIE FERRIS GARDNER.

MARCH 15, 1965.

Code of Ethics for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the lack of a code of ethics for Members of Congress has long been of concern to me. In the absence of an officially adopted procedure for disclosing our personal holdings, I have made my financial statements public from time to time and have frequently urged other Members to do the same. As elected officials, holding positions of public trust, it is essential that we adhere to the highest ethical standards and provide the public with a means of evaluating our adherence to such standards. Accordingly, I was pleased to see that President Johnson has issued an Executive order requiring the filing of financial statements by various Government officials. This procedure makes appointed officials responsible to the Executive. Congressmen should make similar reports and similarly be responsible to the people who elect them.

In this respect, I recommend to the Members of the House an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal, Monday, May 17, 1965. The editorial relates to the President's Executive order on the ethical conduct of Government personnel who have dealings with private interests. The comparative inactivity of Congress in this area has understandably aroused the criticism of the Journal, among others. Congress would be wise to follow the President's action by instituting such a code for its own Members and staff.

The editorial referred to follows:

PRESIDENT ORDERS OFFICIALS TO FILE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

There was a welcome note of firmness in President Johnson's statement recently about the new Executive order on ethical conduct of Government personnel in dealing with private interests:

"We cannot tolerate conflicts of interest or favoritism, or even conduct which gives the appearance that such actions are occurring, and it is our intention to see that this does not take place in the Federal Government."

The new rules are mainly a codification and clarification of existing ones, but notably they require for the first time the filing of financial statements by the 200 agency heads and other Presidential appointees who report directly to him, and by some 2,000 others involved in decisions on Government contracts.

Since these statements will be confidential, with apparent violations reportable to the President personally, it will just have to be taken for granted that he is being a strict enforcer. He has given at least one clue that he will be, however, when he forced out an Assistant Secretary of Commerce only 4 weeks ago, in a situation that appeared improper.

But the main thing is that these key people in the executive branch will now know that any missteps will readily come to the notice of their superiors. Also, administration of ethical rules is placed in Chairman John Macy, of the Civil Service Commission, from whom timely guidance may be had in the many judgment situations that occur.

By way of practicing what he preaches, the President reportedly intends to file with Macy a statement of his own private financial involvements. These actions put the executive branch in sharp contrast with the legislative. Congress is very righteous about the ethics of others in Government, but still holds its own Members and staff above the need for any rules or enforcement of any standards.

Whether the President meant to be this pointed, the point is there. May Congress begin to get it.

Stricter Gun Control Laws Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us in Congress have been concerned with the need to revise Federal laws governing the interstate shipment of firearms.

In an excellent editorial, the Los Angeles Times declares that a way must be found to halt the unrestricted traffic in lethal weapons. The Times supports passage of a Federal gun control law and asks that the public give firearms legislation serious consideration and enlightened debate free of emotionalism.

The text of that editorial, which appeared on May 23, follows:

STRICTER GUN CONTROL LAWS NEEDED

Urging passage of Federal gun control laws before a U.S. Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, California's Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch ably epitomized the problem confronting both law enforcement officers and law-abiding citizens.

His testimony presented cogent reasons not only for overhauling the 30-year-old Federal statute but for tightening existing State laws.

A way must be found to halt the unrestricted traffic in lethal weapons and the administration's proposals, in concert with properly drawn State legislation should go a long way toward accomplishing that objective. Obviously all the loopholes cannot be plugged but the pending bills would appear to be a step in the right direction.

The Federal law would halt any interstate shipment of weapons except between licensed dealers and would impose restrictions to make certain such dealers are legitimate businessmen. It would also ban sale of weapons except to persons who are residents of the State in which the dealer does business.

Of equal if not more importance to residents of Los Angeles County, and certain other areas of the State, is a section which would place restrictions on destructive devices.

That should put a crimp in what seems to be a thriving business retailing antitank guns, mortars, and bazookas to any and all comers at bargain prices.

We find no validity in the contention of opponents that such regulations would be violative of the second amendment to the Constitution which provides: "A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be abridged." Certainly the paramilitary organizations, the crackpots, mental defectives and criminals at whom the legislation is aimed do not constitute a well-regulated militia.

The attorney general pointed out that the bills would set up guidelines which will allow California to determine its own course in firearms control.

Bills to do just that are now moving through the legislature. They merit serious consideration and enlightened debate free of emotionalism.

Monterey County, Calif., Welfare Costs Drop as Local Workers, Taxpayers Benefit From End of Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to read a recent Associated Press release from Salinas, Calif., county seat of Monterey County, and the largest city in the rich agricultural Salinas River Valley.

Appearing in the May 27 edition of the Los Angeles Times, the Associated Press article indicated that the end of the bracero foreign farm labor program last December 31 had resulted in a substantial increase in agricultural job opportunities for our own U.S. domestic workers, as well as in a marked reduction in county welfare costs—directly attributable to increased employment this year of local citizens on Salinas Valley farms.

In fact, according to Monterey County Welfare Director William Leach, the end of the bracero program has been the major contributing factor to a more than 75-percent reduction in the number of

families receiving welfare aid this year as compared to 1964—down from 313 families last year to only 77 families at the present time.

Mr. Leach's contention would certainly seem to be supported by the official May 29, 1965, report of the California Farm Labor Panel to Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz. The report declared:

Data supplied to the panel make it clear that there has been a great increase in the number of domestic workers in Monterey County this year. The number of domestic seasonal workers as of May 16, 1965, was 5,590, compared with only 1,270 at the same time last year.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House can take some justifiable pride in their part in making possible this increase of 4,320 jobs—4,320 gainfully employed men and women—in a county whose entire population is only about 200,000, and accomplished in the short space of 1 year as a direct result of congressional refusal to perpetuate the bracero foreign farm labor program.

Our efforts here in Congress have been rewarded by significant improvement in job opportunities for our fellow American citizens, an increase in the economic prosperity of an entire region, and a drastic reduction in the welfare costs of the taxpayers of that area.

It is not often that we are able to see such an immediate and beneficial impact of our congressional handiwork. And it should be highly gratifying to know that we have helped to eliminate some of the poverty and hopelessness from the lives of the most underprivileged and poorly paid group in America: our migrant domestic farmworkers.

We trust that the last "Harvest of Shame" has now been gathered in.

And, with the united effort of the Federal, State, and local governments, together with the wholehearted cooperation of grower and worker groups, we can now move forward to develop a comprehensive domestic farm labor system that will provide an adequate supply of capable and willing workers to meet the needs of our agricultural economy, and, at the same time, will offer decent wages, decent working conditions, and a decent life for our farmworkers and their families.

The Los Angeles Times article follows:

WELFARE COST DROP LAID TO CUTOFF OF BRACEROS

SALINAS.—Monterey County Welfare Director William Leach said Wednesday that the virtual cutoff of Mexican field labor in the Salinas Valley has given job opportunities to domestic workers and has reduced welfare costs.

Leach said 77 families received welfare aid this past April compared to 313 in April 1964.

More men previously on welfare have found work picking crops worked a year ago by Mexican nationals, he said.

The substitution of domestic labor was still insufficient as far as growers were concerned.

The Salinas Valley Vegetable Growers Association asked the U.S. Department of Labor for 1,150 more Mexican laborers beyond the 2,500 authorized.

In Watsonville, growers asked the Labor Department for 800 more foreign laborers.

A Backward Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to reversing the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote rulings.

The following article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, points out some of the reasons why the decisions should be allowed to stand. The article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 2, 1965, and follows:

A BACKWARD STEP

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The Dirksen amendment to mute the Supreme Court decision that State legislatures be apportioned on a population basis seems to me an unwise and backward step.

Senator DIRKSEN's plan to overrule the Court's reapportionment decisions would permit a majority in any State to give some citizens enlarged voting power and others reduced voting power in one of the two houses of any legislature. This is the effect of apportioning one house on the basis of "factors other than population."

Further—and worse—the Dirksen amendment would make it impossible for majority of the voters of a State ever to change the situation if they wanted to.

Two questions go to the heart of the matter.

Question. What is the one political trend which all conservatives, most moderates, and many others want to see arrested and reversed?

The answer is "The massive and mounting trend to center more and more political power in Washington."

Question. Is there anything that will stop this trend?

Only one thing—more representative, more responsive, more modern State legislatures prepared to deal with the whole range of social, economic, and urban problems which have caused cities to turn to Washington.

Charles S. Rhyne, past president of the American Bar Association and a specialist in legislative reapportionment, puts the case accurately when he says:

"State legislatures have shirked their responsibilities in meeting the social, economic, and political needs of the people. For the past 30 years and more the people have bypassed State legislatures and have turned to Washington for solutions to one problem after another: housing, mass transportation, public works, health, airports, highways, crime prevention, education, poverty, and on ad infinitum.

"States today are largely administrative provinces of the Federal Government in carrying out Federal-aid programs. The vacuum created by State legislative inaction has been filled by congressional action."

The central reason why State legislatures have been unresponsive to public needs is because they have been unrepresentative of the electorate—the fewest voters have elected the most legislators, the most voters have elected the fewest legislators. Some rural voters have votes that are worth 2 to 1 to 1,000 to 1 of those of citydwellers.

The Dirksen amendment would arrest the most needed political reform in the United States—the reform of the egregiously malapportioned State legislatures and would vastly reduce the prospect of ever arresting the flow of political power to Washington.

Dr. Robert G. Dixon, professor of law at the George Washington University Law School and a distinguished scholar in this field, opposed that part of the Dirksen amendment which would "give a State carte blanche to put one house of the legislature on a mixed representation basis" and keep it that way until a majority of sitting legislators was willing to make a change. "This," he says, "would open the way to a further political freeze, and I am afraid the slogan 'S O S'—translated as 'Save Our Seats'—would carry the day."

But Dr. Dixon favors what he calls the middle way which is to permit a State to use a "mixed representation system in one house" on two conditions: (1) approval by a majority of the voters and (2) an opportunity to change the system every 10 years by popular vote.

I find it hard to believe that there is merit in empowering the States to give voters unequal treatment. But of one thing I am sure: nothing can do more to erase all possibility of arresting and reversing the steady flow of political power to Washington than to hold back the urgently needed reapportionment of the State legislatures.

Polish Voting Shows Red Discipline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as administration spokesmen and the nonofficial vocal leftwing of the country continue their efforts to appease the Communists and rush headlong into subsidizing the autocratic Eastern European regimes, true conditions behind the Iron Curtain must be duly noted.

Therefore, the article by Columnist David Lawrence in yesterday's Washington Evening Star is especially appropriate for our review:

POLISH VOTING SHOWS RED DISCIPLINE

(By David Lawrence)

For several months the impression has been conveyed to the people of the United States that somehow or other the satellite states in Eastern Europe now are being given more and more freedom and are being subjected less and less to Communist dictatorship. But the facts which came out in the open this week show how mistaken such an impression really is. What are those facts?

1. While about 18.5 million people voted in the national elections in Poland for parliamentary and local government candidates, there was no opposition party. The Communists dominated the single party whose candidates were on the ballot.

2. Although the voting was said to be not compulsory, it was considered unwise to abstain. More than 90 percent of the electorate turned out to vote. This is evidence of how well disciplined is the Communist organization.

3. Each of the 616 candidates for the 460 national parliament seats was pledged to support the Communist-drafted platform.

A dispatch from Warsaw by United Press International, describing the elections, said that some curtained booths were provided for those voters who wished to strike out certain names where there was more than one candidate for the same post, but that few voters went into the booths. The dispatch added:

"Most voters considered the results were preordained and that making a public show of secret balloting would be a futile and perhaps ill-advised gesture."

The Communists have maintained complete power over the conduct of the five elections after World War II, which have been held in 1947, 1952, 1957, 1961 and 1965. Thus, in a period of 18 years, there have been only five opportunities for the people to go through the form of voting. But, in each case, the Communist leaders have taken charge and no opportunity was given to cast votes for an opposition party.

By maintaining such complete control over the elections and by selecting candidates who are thoroughly indoctrinated with Communist ideology, the Russians have no need today to station their troops in Poland, or in any of the other satellites. Such is the recognition of Communist power and the effect of an involuntary acquiescence to it. The Moscow government controls what is going on just as effectively as if it had military rule in each of the satellite countries. Indeed, civilian Communists are as thoroughly trained in how to maintain discipline as any army could be.

What occurred in Poland this week is a sample not only of what happens in the other Communist-bloc countries in Eastern Europe but of what is planned for every country in Latin America in which the Communists today are seeking to take over the sovereign governments by an infiltration process.

Cuba is a significant example of how the Communists work. They send to a country trained leaders who know how to pick out the officials to supervise the operations of the national as well as the local governments. If the Dominican Republic fell into the hands of the Communists tomorrow, a similar plan would be used there. Likewise, if South Vietnam were taken over by the North Vietnamese Government, which today is Communist-controlled, it would mean the end of the present government at Saigon.

Yet there are many so-called "liberals" in America who are willing to accuse their own Government of imperialism, notwithstanding the fact that the objective of the United States is plainly designed to emancipate the peoples of the smaller nations who currently may be under Communist rule or who are being threatened with conquest through the intrigue of the Soviet regime.

The way by which the Moscow government administers a country as big as Poland is clear proof of why it is so often said that it isn't necessary for the Russians to land troops in any Latin American country. Once the election machinery comes under the control of the Communist Party system by infiltration within a country, there is no need for military action.

It is this kind of strategy which deceives many gullible observers, who seem to think that Communist infiltration is insignificant because the actual band of Communists may be small in size. They little realize that it doesn't take a large number of persons to form a ruling group and that, once a political party is established under Communist auspices, the discipline soon covers every worker in the factory and every peasant on the farm. Thus, the Communist organization in Poland today is known as "the United Workers Party" which in turn dominates "the United Peasant Party" and "the Democratic Party," and in nearly all instances they have the same slate of candidates.

The so-called elections in Poland this week are a tragic reminder of the failure of the United Nations to take effective steps to remove the aggressors from the territory of peoples who once enjoyed self-determination and freedom.

Fairness and Understanding to the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, appearing in the May issue of the American Press, there is a letter by Mr. Charles R. Jacobs, of the Leader-Advertiser of Brookhaven, Miss., that I wish every American could read. It expresses a plea from a member of the press to his fellow members of the press for them to give the South a little understanding and fair play in their reporting.

By unanimous consent of this body, I am happy to enter this letter in the Appendix of the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues:

UNFAIR

(By Charles R. Jacobs)

I have just read your "Civil Rights" article in "Person-to-Person" covering the library campaign of Editor Ed Sweatt, of the Cheraw South Carolina Chronicle.

It was interesting and no doubt factual. However, as an adopted southerner of about 10 years duration, I wish to point out that it would only be fair for you to carry another story of a southern newspaper that points to some of the many good things that happen in this section that no one north of the "paper curtain" ever hears about. We who live down here resent the constant spotlight being played on relatively isolated instances of unfair discrimination by the liberal northern press and TV.

Before going any further, let me introduce myself. I was born and raised in Winnetka, Ill., which you know is only several miles from your publication office. I was subjected to much of the same misinformation about the South that probably you too have been. When I moved to this part of the country, I was of the impression that the Negroes of the South were mistreated. Since living with the situation, I can truthfully say that about 90 percent of the northern impression is either based on deliberate misrepresentation of facts, half truths, or a just plain lack of understanding by reporters who have come down here to cover stories.

Don't get me wrong now. I'm not trying to place a halo over the heads of all southerners. We have our crackpots and extremists just like there are in every State in the Union and every nation in the world. My point is, however, that every time we have any kind of disorder here with racial overtones, the liberal-oriented press and TV give it high priority. Emphasis is placed on unfortunate southern happenings while very similar occurrences in northern cities are either ignored or played down.

We resent this type of unconstructive publicity just like you would resent it if as, an example, the Nation's do-gooders decided to meddle and widely publicize unsavory conditions in Chicago which your leaders were quietly trying to solve.

I don't know Editor Sweatt, or anything about him, but I do think that he has done his town and State a disservice by allowing a local problem, as unfair as it may be, to be used to further create an overall wrong impression about the South. I know of several editors who have used this national civil rights hysteria to receive the plaudits of people far removed from the problem. Some have won Pulitizer prizes, but in so doing, they too have earned a lack of respect of their fellow citizens and have done incalculable harm to their States.

How about giving us a constructive story about the good that has been done for racial relations in the South? There are many, many good examples of interracial understanding and friendship that are seldom reported.

The Hall of Fame for Great Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include at this point an address made by our colleague, Hon. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, of New York, on May 30, commemorating the founding of the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University in New York City.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 23D DISTRICT, NEW YORK, HALL OF FAME, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, MAY 30, 1965

I am privileged to participate in today's ceremonies at the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University. Today's occasion is doubly significant, for we are commemorating both the anniversary of the founding of the Hall of Fame on May 30, 1901, and Memorial Day. In a sense these ceremonies are not unrelated, for the Hall of Fame represents the heritage of America, and the dead we honor throughout the Nation fought to preserve it.

It is fitting to pause today and ask ourselves whether our country is fulfilling the expectations of those enshrined here. How satisfied would these honored men and women be with the quality of American life were they to come alive today? Would they be as encouraged to achieve excellence in the United States of 1965 as they were in earlier years?

To these questions, I submit that we can give, on the whole, affirmative answers. For all the difficulties that we face in the world and all the unsolved problems at home, I agree with our ebullient Vice President that we live in a time of unparalleled challenge and excitement.

While Jonathan Edwards might frown on the secularism of much of our life, Roger Williams would applaud the total religious freedom we enjoy. While Alexander Hamilton would be appalled at the power of the people, Andrew Jackson would be delighted that the rampaging American public is playing a constantly increasing role in the guidance of its own destinies. While George Washington might grieve over the decline of the aristocracy, Henry Ward Beecher and Harriet Beecher Stowe would be incredulously thrilled at the steady progress toward full participation in their national life of the descendants of America's slaves.

And so one could go on through the entire list.

Today, however, I would prefer to consider one of the men enshrined here and to inquire what meaning his life and his thought may have for us today. I refer to the man who perhaps could have been elected to the

Hall of Fame under more categories than any other of those who were elected: Thomas Jefferson.

Elected among the first group of Americans chosen for the Hall of Fame in 1900 as a "statesman," Jefferson would have merited consideration in the categories of "authors; educators; humanitarians, social and economic reformers; engineers, architects; and inventors." If there were a category of "parliamentarians," Jefferson would qualify for that too: One of his signal, but less well-known, accomplishments was his "Manual of Parliamentary Practice," compiled while he was Vice President and Presiding Officer of the Senate. Jefferson's manual, as it is called, still provides one of the foundations for the present rules and practice of the Congress. In addition, Jefferson was an amateur violinist (an interest which also I share), but I suppose his ranking as a performer would scarcely qualify him for election to the Hall of Fame in the category of "artists."

This very catalog suggests a first point of significance for us today in Jefferson's life. Often called a renaissance man, his versatility and breadth of interest stand in noteworthy contrast to the increased specialization with which we are too often oppressed today.

Yet, at the same time that in our professional lives we may be constrained to pursue increased specialization, in our leisure hours—and no society has ever offered a comparable degree of leisure—we are challenged in an unprecedented way to give constructive and imaginative meaning to Jefferson's phrase "the pursuit of happiness." Who among those statued here—indeed who in world's history—has more to teach us about that very pursuit of happiness than Jefferson himself?

While the problems of education in Jefferson's day and in ours are vastly different, Jefferson's stress on the importance of education for the successful functioning of a democratic system is totally relevant in this year 1965. In his "Notes on Virginia," Jefferson said:

"Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves are its only safe depositories. And to render even them safe, their minds must be improved."

Jefferson espoused a broad system of public education, of public library, and the establishment of the University of Virginia. We are still working at what he started. Vast progress has been made in extending the benefits of education to millions of young people, yet the problems seem to grow with even greater speed than our achievements.

In the field of human rights, one can hardly present Jefferson as an exponent of racial integration. He was, after all, a man of his time. Yet he was ahead of his time in his vitriolic condemnation of slavery and, in the opening words of the Declaration of Independence, he presented to us and to all the world an inspiring ideal—an ideal which demands equality of opportunity for all our citizens—an ideal toward which we are striving daily but which yet remains far from fully realized—the ideal that "all men are created equal." While Jefferson is not known as a religious man in a conventional sense, I have always felt that the principle of equal opportunity for all men necessarily is based on a religious foundation. It can scarcely be defended on the basis of the kind of rationalism which was so popular in Jefferson's time.

As for Jefferson's general views of government, and his distrust of a strong Federal Government, it should first be noted that he was living in a largely rural and agricultural society. I submit that he was pragmatic enough so that, if he were alive today, he would recognize that the tremendous demands and complexities of our largely urban society call for a comparably complex and far-reaching governmental structure.

That Jefferson was not loath to exercise the powers of the Federal Government when he felt the national interest so demanded was abundantly illustrated in his courageous action for purchase of Louisiana Territory.

Jefferson was deeply concerned with individual freedom. In his day, with the closing of the frontier almost a century away, individual freedom could be achieved with a minimum of government protection. Today, true freedom for the individual—the right to seek, on an equal basis with others, the fullest realization of the individual's potential—cannot be secured by the inaction of government. The vicious cycle of poverty, generation after generation, is a prison. Narcotics addiction is a prison. The denial of equal rights and opportunities because of skin color is a prison, and so indeed is the hopelessness and despair that that denial begets. Fear is a prison, whether it be fear of muggings in the streets or subways, or fear of being destitute in one's old age because of overwhelming hospital and medical bills.

In all of these respects and more, government today must seek to give to our people freedom in the largest sense. And, by force of circumstance and the relatively slow growth of local government resources, it is especially the Federal Government which must play an increasingly important role in this endeavor.

I cannot believe that Jefferson, with his essential humanitarianism, would have come to any other conclusion.

There is one other aspect of Jefferson's philosophy I would like to touch on. He was a great believer in revolution. The American Revolution, he predicted, would be "immortal" and in 1790 he wrote:

"It is indeed an animating thought, that while we are securing the rights of ourselves and our posterity, we are pointing out the way to struggling nations, who wish like us to emerge from their tyrannies also."

In his belief that our revolution would be regarded as a milestone in the march of all mankind to freedom, Jefferson was eminently correct. I can testify, from my dealings with representatives of many newly independent countries at the United Nations, that our Declaration of Independence is one of their sacred documents and that our example in breaking free of the colonial yoke has inspired them.

It is true that Jefferson, because of his intense distrust of government, had a somewhat romantic view of the need for perennial revolutions. Thus, you will recall the famous statement he made in a letter written in 1787: "The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants."

Without suggesting that we must take that admonition literally, I do submit that in the eyes of much of the world we seem to have lost sight of our own past, of the necessity, when tyranny emerges, of revolution. Too often these days we seem to be committed to the status quo.

Recently I heard it stated by a high official of our Government that today, in some countries, we can no longer run the risk of letting revolutions take their natural course. To me this is at the same time a depressing and a dangerous doctrine.

I realize that this thinking reflects the presence of a new factor in the equation. The existence in every area of trained Communists ready at a moment's notice to move in on a indigenous revolution and seek to pervert it to the purposes of international communism.

I fully recognize that danger. Yet I wonder whether, in the long run, we will not increase, rather than diminish, the chances of ultimate Communist takeover by inevitably charging in ourselves, with or without the approval of other nations in the community, in an effort to dictate how the revolution will come out.

I have enormous sympathy for the shattering dilemma which confronted our President the day he decided to send American marines to the Dominican Republic. Moreover, I applaud the President's current efforts to transfer as much responsibility as possible to the Organization of American States and to seek the formation of a government which can command the loyalties of the vast majority of the Dominican people. Yet, even if these efforts are successful, our initial unilateral intervention has, I am afraid, set us back 50 years in our relations with Latin America. This was a fearful price to pay for whatever was achieved.

And I wonder how far we can carry the doctrine that we will prevent the coming to power of Communists in any other country of this hemisphere. Would we send our troops to Brazil or Argentina if we were fearful that a revolution in one of those great countries were to be taken over by the Communists? And if the doctrine is valid for all of Latin America, why is it not valid for a country such as India where we have an immeasurable stake in the preservation of a non-Communist democratic regime? And what about the case—which has never yet occured but which is not inconceivable—of a pro-Communist party gaining power through free elections?

One of the worst features of this policy, it seems to me, is that it simply invites frantic calls for assistance from every right-wing dictatorship who will quickly cry "help, help, Communists."

By relying on force of arms instead of the force of ideas of education, of the desire of people to solve their social and economic problems in a context of freedom, we may well be falling into a Communist trap.

Let us instead marshal our ideas and our ideals, let us marshal our immense resources to help the Betancourts, the Figueres, yes, and the Freis win their battles for progress and human decency. Where no such leaders appear, let us bend every effort to find and train them. Let us redouble our efforts under the Alliance for Progress to help build throughout Latin America a strong, freedom-loving middle class, especially through education. If we have to repel force with force, let us at least do so in concert with our friends who have demonstrated, more recently than we, their belief in the right of revolution when oppression and reaction offers no alternative.

Let us not, above all, become identified with oligarchies and juntas that use the cry of anticommunism as a cover for a determination to maintain the status quo—a status quo where the rich are very rich, the poor are very poor, with no one between.

In short, and in conclusion, we must be true to ourselves and to our heritage—a heritage which Thomas Jefferson so splendidly exemplifies. In so doing, we shall also, in Jefferson's phrase, be showing "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 8371 to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the constructive efforts

of the chairman and members of the House Ways and Means Committee in formulating this excise tax reduction measure. This bill will, in my estimation, stimulate the American economy by ridding our tax system of burdensome excises which have endured since World War II, long after the basic reason for their original passage had gone.

I especially applaud the action of the committee in providing for the removal of the 10-percent tax on mechanical pencils, fountain pens, and ball point pens by July 1, 1965. The city of Fort Madison, Iowa, is the home of hundreds of skilled workmen who have contributed a great deal to the economy of southeast Iowa in their work for the Sheaffer Pen Co. The removal of this excise tax is especially important to the economy of southeast Iowa and should provide impetus for the growth and expansion of this fine industry with its skilled and talented craftsmen. The products of this industry have not only achieved notable distinction in our Nation's economy, but have become the basis of an exceedingly important export trade.

Address by Governor Smylie, of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Idaho Gov. Robert E. Smylie, dean of Republican Governors and chairman of the Republican Governors' Association, on May 13 delivered a speech at a luncheon meeting of the District of Columbia Republican Committee which I commend to my Republican colleagues, and which I believe my Democrat colleagues should also read—and heed.

Governor Smylie graphically points up the resurgence of the Republican Party following the elections last fall, and the reorganization within the party which we are confident will lead to new victories. But he also points up the hard work we must do to achieve this end.

To Bob Smylie hard work is nothing new. A tireless campaigner, he puts forth the same efforts in the fulfillment of his duties in office. We, in Idaho, are proud to have him at the helm where his hard work and administrative ability have contributed greatly to the welfare of our State.

We have a lot of work to do in the 2- and 4-year periods ahead if we are to achieve the successes which can be ours. But if all Republicans will pitch in with the same vigor and steadfastness of purpose as Governor Smylie, those successes most assuredly will be ours.

Governor Smylie's speech follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. ROBERT E. SMYLIE, AT A LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPUBLICAN CENTRAL COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Postoperative procedures have been successful, the patient is making a steady progress and full recovery is assured.

In the world of medicare, this would be an appropriate description of the convalescence of the Republican Party, except that we made no stop in the nursing home. We went back to work.

We have put behind us the constriction of the spirit that was born in November's disaster. The transitory fears that alienated whole groups of voters in America have begun to fade. We are beginning to reattract the vanguard of those returning forces which will give us dramatic victories in 1966, and an even chance at the big job in 1968.

The Republican Party is not yet saved, but the work of total reconstruction is well underway.

And from that reconstruction, all Americans who love freedom and individual human dignity can take great heart. The two-party system on which so much depends is again a living vibrant machinery for the protection of human rights.

These bright beginnings are based on a strong and affirmative Republican performance on Capitol Hill, aggressive modern statesmanship in the Republican State capitols, and brilliant new leadership in the Republican National Committee.

It is true that "unity," if there is any such a thing as useful unity of policy in a national political party, is still an elusive thing. But there is unity of purpose in our intention to furnish a workable, positive political alternative to the party so overwhelmingly in power.

This is why the real leader of the Senate, EVERETT DIRKSEN of Illinois, and Congressman FORD have backed the President so strongly when he was right. They have done it because "he was right, and all of us are interested in doing what's best for America."

Of course, in support of the President's decisions for freedom abroad, Senator DIRKSEN and Congressman FORD don't have the problems of 13 Secretaries of State—1 in the Cabinet and 12 more in the Senate.

Looking backward is seldom profitable, but it is sometimes instructive. The long walk back up the hill began on a day in Denver in December. In what was one of the notable political declarations of the decade, the Republican Governors associated themselves together as a working instrumentality designed to achieve a basis for united can constructive effort at party reconstruction.

The Denver declaration did much to calm the transitory fears that had robbed us of electoral strength in November. It pointed out with clarity and brevity the directions that our party would have to travel if it was to summon the resolution and strength to win elections and then to govern America.

The joint congressional leadership quickly responded with the proposal for the new coordinating policy council, and it is noteworthy that for the first time every elected Republican Governor will have a place and a voice is the establishment of policy for the party on a national level. It is also notable that some of the vanquished champions of last November's passage at arms will head the task forces of the coordinating committee, and thus Charles Percy and Robert Taft can give of their great talent and skill to the work of party policy reconstruction.

The work of those 2 months was culminated in the meeting in Chicago when Ray Bliss, of Ohio, was elected to the chairmanship of the national committee. While Bliss says he is no magician, it is fair to say that somehow he has proved that he knows what sort of tools and powders it is that magicians use and he has contrived to lay hands on a pretty good recipe book.

You can tell that the effort to restructure and reconstruct the party in the broad middle road where America has always found progress and sustained freedom, has been successful. If it had not been, there would have been no oddball congress of conservatives meeting behind closed doors in Chicago a week or so ago, trying to organize a machinery with which to abscond with the noble and traditional banners of political conservatism.

All of this "happy talk" does not mean that there are no problems. There is some concern that the Republican Party speaks with a multiplicity of voices; that there are too many organizations engaged in policy research and practical political activity.

I do not share this concern. In a two-party system, a party that can win and can summon the strength of will to finally govern America will be no centralized, monolithic structure. It will be a party as broadly based, as widely diverse, as sociologically diffused as the great Republic itself.

The party must literally mirror the Republic, faithfully reflecting every changing segment of opinion, every need, and hope and aspiration of this swiftly changing Nation.

Yesterday's solutions will never solve tomorrow's problems and a continuing intraparty dialog about the problems of today and those that have not yet developed will give new spirit to our policies, freshen and inspire our current campaigns, and finally lead us to the next great American consensus.

There is need for us to hasten on with this work, even as there was in the dark dawn of last November.

This new found unity of purpose, this broadly based machinery for evolving policy, must not succumb to the councils of division and exclusion that even now are heard in the land. We traveled dangerously near to the point of no return on those exclusionary and divisive pathways. Now that we have found our way back we must make certain that we never take that road again.

The national committee is constructing workable political machinery with which to win elections; and the policy committee will soon be at the task of establishing new and current policy positions from which all in the party can take guidance. These policy positions will be guidelines, and not outward boundaries, and nobody will be required to regard them as Holy Writ.

They will be notable political papers designed to provide ideas with which dedicated Americans can construct a free society in the great Republic.

In a time when a current consensus is evaporating the opportunity to construct the next great consensus of freedom and dignity is at hand. And make no mistake about it, the current consensus is evaporating. If this were not so, the Presidency would not be drawing its strongest support in this hour of danger for America, from that resolute minority band in the Congress who are making the enactment of the most worthwhile legislation in the entire executive program.

Already we can see the fitful glow of victory fires in the field. There have been substantial wins in Kentucky and in the outridings of Chicago. The performance of the Great Society in the States and the localities has been something less than great.

The war against poverty is fast becoming an administrative maze that will defy even

the best efforts of a madhatter on the other side of the looking glass.

A tax cut was appreciated, but that stimulating drop in the withholding rate had a depressant aftereffect in April—and already a clinical observer can see withdrawal symptoms setting in.

The peculiar stance of the majority party in the Congress with respect to voting rights legislation is cynically and certainly understood in the country. If there is an American consensus in this field it is that no American should be denied the right to vote as a full-fledged citizen for any reason having to do with race, creed, color or national origin. And I would submit in all candor that any party tinged with the attempt to deny those inalienable rights is simply courting national political disaster.

Our Republican posture on human rights and the defense of freedom is being reenforced day to day.

Our policy committee task forces will develop understandable and workable policies for the promotion of job opportunities for all Americans, which is the only really dignified security any of us will ever know.

The administration's foreign policy is already ours. We have stood, and with impressive long-time unity, for the defense of the perimeters of freedom against Communist aggression wherever it occurs. This is why we can support a President who is right, in Saigon, as well as in Santo Domingo.

And that is why we must oppose him when he lessens our commitment to freedom and human dignity anywhere in the world.

The Republican Party is a pretty vital institution. It has had to be to survive. But survive it has. The vitality is still there, and it is growing.

There is no need to strike up the slow music, or to intone any requiem. Not for us.

At the grassroots, out in the city halls and county courthouses, the unity of purpose is a growing, vibrant thing. We will win elections there, and soon.

Strength will move up as it always does in a developing consensus, through the courthouses to the statehouses, where the most dramatic victories of 1966 will occur in the governorships and the State legislatures.

And with it will come substantial gains in the Senate and House of the Congress of the United States.

Then, shorn of the divisive and exclusionary influences which have robbed our best efforts of effect, we will be situated in the power bases from which a strong and effective campaign for the Presidency itself can be mounted in 1968.

Now we are right, because we chose the broad middle road, and we are on our way.

Address of Hon. Charles H. Silver Commemorating the Liberation of Nazi Concentration Camps, May 9, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Charles Silver, executive assistant to the mayor of New York for Educational and Industrial Development, recently addressed a group gathered together to commemorate the liberation of Nazi concentration camps.

His remarks have meaning for us all and I commend them to the attention of our colleagues.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE MAYOR FOR EDUCATION AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, AT CEREMONIES MARKING THE LIBERATION OF NAZI CONCENTRATION CAMPS, HUNTER COLLEGE AUDITORIUM, MAY 9, 1965

We have gathered to mark this "Liberation Day" as a lesson to mankind, as living proof that mercy will ultimately triumph over madness, that honor will eventually avenge inhumanity, that righteousness can someday stamp out evil from the hearts of men. These are the things in which we believe, you and I, and, particularly, the distinguished moderator of this occasion, James Donovan, who served as chief of the war crimes division of the office of strategic services and was responsible for collecting the fatal evidence including actual films of the foulness and filth, the degradation and death, in the concentration camps.

I am grateful for the opportunity to represent the mayor at today's ceremony, not only because it commemorates an event that concerns profoundly the principals of human decency, but also because we share this occasion with a man whose work for liberation and justice is written on the pages of freedom and in the heritage of all who love liberty.

His career abounds in unbelievably bold feats of valor. He has created living legends of courage, like the hazardous mission behind the Berlin wall to effect the freedom of U-2 pilot Francis Gary Powers and other American prisoners, or like the cloak and dagger negotiations that convinced Castro to release nearly 1,200 helpless captives seized in the ill-fated invasion of Cuba.

These deeds are history—written in our own time—the thrilling acts of a daring, dynamic, divinely endowed maker of legal and diplomatic miracles.

No words of mine could do sufficient honor to Jim for the devoted service he renders to the cause of humanity, or for the time and energy he gives as general counsel to the Nazi victims organization, or for the genius he constantly devotes to the pursuit of justice, the cause of education, and the dignity of man.

Nor could any words of mine begin to match the epic drama of anguish and despair we recall today. I know that its lesson of man's inhumanity to man will remain an indelible scar on the heart of civilization forever.

We are far removed by time and distance from the world of Auschwitz, Buchenwald, and Dachau; from the burning ghettos of Warsaw, the gas chambers and the doomed refugee ships. But, how far are we removed in fact?

The shadow of the concentration camp still casts a pall over middle Europe, and its symbol is a wall in Berlin. The chain reaction of nazism in the United Arab Republic and behind the Iron Curtain of Soviet Russia is making life increasingly intolerable for millions of men, women, and children.

The harrowing recitals during the Eichmann trial, the books and films and documents of the Hitler terror, remind us of the terrible fruits of conflict and hate, the indescribable indignities that man can heap upon his fellow man. It is too much for the mind to accept those scenes of desolation and despair, those days when there was a darkness in the soul of mankind, and a nation's consuming purpose became the extermination of an entire people.

As the testimony of the war crimes trials unfolded, tedious at times, but always terrifying in its human implications, we became aware that not just a few arch-criminals were being tried, but all mankind. If we felt dismayed at being obliged to witness an unsavory spectacle as the curtain rose each day on this manmade hell, there was even less comfort in realizing that it was partly a hell of our own making.

The criminals sat alone—grotesque in their bravado and bold everyday appearance. But there were others beside them and behind them whom we did not see. Invisible, but present, were the vocally compassionate citizens of a world that waited, smug and silent, while the Nazi brutality spread its madness unchecked. Alongside sat the world's leaders, the men of God and the men of commerce, the idealists, the thinkers, the philosophers. A whole generation of the guilty who looked on silent or only mildly grieved while the headlines screamed that a whole people was being destroyed. Surely, their statute of limitations has not been reached.

The diplomats of that day, the dictators of policy, the generals of armies could have given the orders to bomb the barracks at concentration camps. They might have heeded the exhortations to permit battalions of paratroopers to invade the crematoria before it was 6 million souls too late.

But the horror is that there was no horror, not even then, not even while it was actually happening. There were just the headlines, and the cozy, harmless home fires burning. The holocaust was a healthy distance away.

Now, although it has again come disturbingly close, it can be avoided by merely turning a page or twisting a dial. And yet, can we completely escape? Or will we always be haunted by Eichmann and the countless others who stand beside him in some of the most tragic chapters in human history.

And what of the nameless ones who still slink through the night to desecrate cemeteries or deface the walls of synagogues or paint symbols of hate on our city streets?

They stood trial, they stand trial along with all humanity. And the verdict—however just, proper and legal—will be meaningless unless the world can root out the bitterness of hate, whether expressed on a battlefield or in a segregated school. The ancient teachers and sages admonished us that the wise man must have a passion for truth. Above all, they say: "Love one another and seek justice." This precept was laid down by Moses and the prophets. It was echoed by the Greek and Roman philosophers. It can still inspire us today to mold a world in which "brotherhood" is not just a word, but a way of life.

Let us not forget that a few have always had to struggle against the greatest odds in their desire to create an enduring democratic society. The struggle is not over.

We have not failed the lovers of freedom and human decency in the past, and we shall not let them down in the future.

That is the high place, the summit of the human spirit we must tirelessly seek to attain. It is another Zion, another Holy Grail.

With the help of God, we shall still keep the liberated soul of man faithful to the image of his Creator and worthy of His blessings.

Heimerdinger Directs Work of Cleanup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Members are all aware of the tragic tornadoes that swept across sections of the Midwest on Palm Sunday; my own district was struck, with loss of life and property.

It has been a tradition in the United States, particularly in rural areas, that when ill fortune befalls a member of the community, their friends and neighbors pitch in to help. I can assure you, Mr.

Speaker, that this tradition is not dead, as the folks around Tecumseh, Mich., can testify.

The farm areas around Tecumseh were badly hit; homes and barns were destroyed, livestock killed, and fields littered to a degree that often made spring planting impossible.

The first job was to begin the cleanup in the damaged areas. This job now has largely been completed, and the citizens in the Tecumseh area give much of the credit to Clarence Heimerdinger, Clinton, Mich., dairy farmer. Clarence pitched in the morning after the disaster struck and provided constant leadership and encouragement until the task was completed. I am certain that the Members will be interested in a Tecumseh Herald article on Clarence, members of the local agriculture stabilization committee, farm bureau members, and others who pitched in to help their neighbors when help was most needed. The Tecumseh Herald article, by Maxine Calhoun, follows:

HEIMERDINGER DIRECTS WORK OF CLEANUP

(By Maxine Calhoun)

CLINTON.—Residents of the area have marveled at the rapid cleanup of tornado damaged farms in Clinton and the northeast Tecumseh areas.

Much of the credit for this big task well done goes to Clarence Heimerdinger, 72, a well-known Clinton dairy farmer who directed the volunteer work for 3 weeks without pay.

The morning after the Palm Sunday disaster struck, the agriculture stabilization committee, of which Mr. Heimerdinger is chairman, and the supervisors, Edward Hulett, of Clinton, and Arthur Eaton, of Tecumseh, asked Mr. Heimerdinger to begin directing the cleanup work.

By 10 a.m., Clarence had rounded up his neighbors and work was begun at the Martin Halley farm, where a dozen cows were buried, some still alive.

The live cattle were moved to the Heimerdinger dairy farm to be milked. By Wednesday the last of the 12 live cows and many dead ones had been lifted from the fallen barn.

Then Clarence's big task was to decide where help was needed next. After the livestock had been rescued, hay and grain were salvaged and then the complicated task was begun to raise trapped tractors and equipment.

An example of one such problem was on the George Dinius farm where a barn had fallen on a combine, driving the rear end of it 8 inches into the ground, raising the front end over the top of a manure spreader, with the spreader tongue half way through the radiator of a pickup.

Clarence had the imagination and ingenuity for that task and many more like it during the next 3 weeks while debris was cleared at the farms of Charles Allen, Herbert Murphy, Edward Solarski, Jim Howard, James Tonneberger, Richard Sherman, Allen Rupert, Glen Simmerson, Donald Murphy, Tom Murphy, Wendell Reums, Floyd Spence, Walter Simons, Clayton Cousino, and John Kotts.

A ground swell of help began arriving by the first Saturday after the storm. Joining Don Lutton, of Ogden, vice president of the county farm bureau board and Lewis Ruesink and many others who had worked all week.

Carloads of farm bureau members came from Eaton, Monroe, Wayne, Livingston, Ingham, and Jackson Counties for various days.

The staff of the extension department at Adrian and others came from Williamston, Riga, and Onondaga.

Seven executives of the Consumer's Power Co. at Jackson spent one Saturday working at the wreckage of the Felipe Valdez home in Newburg.

Several Clinton Rotarians and a group of Clinton High School students came out to work two Saturdays and during the Easter vacation.

These folks had to be told where and how to make the best use of their volunteer time—and Clarence Heimerdinger was the one individual who had the "know how."

President Lyndon B. Johnson Returns to Waco, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following newspaper articles on President Lyndon B. Johnson's visit to Waco, Tex.

[From the Waco (Tex.) News-Tribune, May 28, 1965]

AN OLD FRIEND RETURNS FOR ANOTHER WARM GREETING

The expected presence in Waco today of President Lyndon B. Johnson is another evidence of his long friendship for this community as well as a time to remember his ancestral links to Baylor University. The associations climaxed by this latest visit to Waco by Lyndon Baines Johnson are interesting and valuable and worth remembering.

It also is worth remembering that every time Lyndon Johnson's name has apeared on an election ballot in this county, the voters have given him solid approval. Their strongest tribute to Mr. Johnson came last fall when 70 percent of McLennan County's votes in the presidential election went to him. The President will be in friendly territory when he lands here this morning, God willing and a crisis doesn't prevent it.

This is as it should be. From the time he headed the National Youth Administration, on through his years in the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, Lyndon Johnson has lost no opportunity to advance the economic well-being of Waco. The assets funneled into Waco and McLennan County through his efforts, if totaled in dollars, would run well into nine figures. Their value to the Nation, in terms of human resources and natural resources put to maximum use, would exceed their value to Waco itself.

We are honored today that the President of the United States is planning to visit Waco again. It may well be an historic occasion for an official utterance by this man who is leader of the free world. Whether it is or not, we are happy whenever he returns here and we hope he will come again as time and circumstances permit. Welcome to Waco, Mr. President.

[From the Waco (Tex.) Tribune-Herald, May 30, 1965]

L.B.J. ADDRESSED ALL OUR NEIGHBORS IN WACO SPEECH

President Lyndon B. Johnson talked to a large audience at the Heart O' Texas Coliseum here Friday but his real audience was the people of our sister republics in the Western Hemisphere.

His firm and reasoned discussion of the Dominican Republic tragedy contained the clear warning that unless the free nations of this hemisphere devise a means to act quickly against Communist terror, other tragedies of the Dominican Republic pattern lie ahead.

Lack of such an effective force when the Communist grab at the throat of the Dominican Republic suddenly materialized made it necessary for the United States to intervene massively: "In those terrible early hours," said Lyndon Johnson here Friday, "we did what we had to do."

In succeeding days, the U.S. effort in the Dominican Republic has resulted in a cease fire, in the first inter-American military force being assembled to thwart Communist aggression, and in rescue and relief efforts for the innocent victims of the Red-inflamed rebellion.

How it will all end is still a matter for conjecture this morning. But even if by some stroke of the miraculous the Dominican Republic is put on an even keel and kept there, Lyndon Johnson knows better than any other American citizen the other possible ignition points for similar Communist revolutionary efforts: Venezuela, Colombia, Bolivia, Guatemala today; possibly others tomorrow.

That is why Mr. Johnson urged Friday, and undoubtedly will urge again and again, a truly effective, instantly ready inter-American peacekeeping device so that when the Communists grab again, they will face a united front for freedom and not only a contingent of U.S. marines or paratroopers.

Mr. Johnson's address here Friday was an historic utterance indeed. It contained words of hope and faith for the people of the hemisphere based on his firm determination to use every means to safeguard their freedom. On their response to his invitation that they join effectively in that defense will hinge the question of whether the Communist threat in the Americas can be blotted out, or whether the United States must continue to be the only effective fireman when the blazes flare.

We hope Mr. Johnson's address in Waco is translated and repeated to the point of utter saturation in all the nations of the hemisphere. In it are the seeds for a greater society for all of them, if they have the will and wit to nurture those seeds, and the courage to defend them against ruthless tyranny and terror.

In Mr. Johnson's reassurances that the United States covets no territory, seeks no dominion over its neighbors and only wants what our neighbors want, a better life for everybody, is the plain answer to the jealous, sensitive critics of our Dominican Republic response to communism. Those critics should study Lyndon Johnson's words well, ponder their meaning, and thank God that here is a man brave enough to "do what we had to do" regardless of criticism or misunderstanding.

The Waco address by the President of the United States could become a landmark document in the history of Western freedom. That is our devout hope.

[From the Waco (Tex.) Times-Herald, May 28, 1965]

MR. JOHNSON'S HALLMARKS ARE FAMILIAR LONG SINCE

Lyndon Baines Johnson's public appearances in Waco thus far have spanned 30 years in time and have covered many facets of history.

It was about 30 years ago that young Lyndon Johnson, State director of the National Youth Administration, made his first speech in Waco. His audience was the Baylor University student body, which in those days was required to attend chapel exercises every morning, Monday through Friday. He was

introduced to the students by President Pat M. Neff, an old political ally of Lyndon Johnson's father. His subject that day was the role of the NYA in making possible the education of young men and women who could not otherwise afford to go to college. To many of his listeners that morning, Lyndon Johnson symbolized a ray of hope in a dark and depressed world, a hope of staying in school and completing an education. To many Baylor students of that era, the NYA made this hope a reality, as it did for scores of thousands of others in Texas.

The political campaigning in later years that brought Lyndon B. Johnson back to Waco put him variously on the courthouse lawn in 1941, at the Cotton Palace grounds in a helicopter in 1948, at downtown hotels and at the Heart O'Texas Fair grounds. He brought then-Air Force Secretary STUART SYMINGTON here to dedicate James Connally Air Force Base. He appeared once at Waco Rotary Club.

As Vice President, Lyndon Johnson last spoke in Waco to the annual dinner of Waco Chamber of Commerce in February 1963, introducing Gen. Bernard Schriever for a talk on the space age.

In all his visits to Waco, Lyndon B. Johnson has preached the gospel of progress, of a better opportunity for all the people to improve their lots in life, of the benefits that flow from united determination and effort, of the need for a strong and resolute America to defend our liberties. In short, the hallmarks of the Lyndon B. Johnson administration over the past 17 months in Washington have been familiar to Wacoans and other Texans for a long, long time.

Mr. Johnson's visit today to receive an overdue honor from Baylor University adds luster to our associations with this great man. We can hope that there will be subsequent and equally lustrous chapters to come in the continued friendship between Lyndon Baines Johnson and Waco.

Training Dropouts Nothing New in San Jose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Dick Barrett, an outstanding columnist for the San Jose News, wrote an outstanding column for the May 24 issue of that newspaper which is an intelligent critique of the Job Corps Center program. I am hopeful that other enterprising columnists and reporters across the Nation will follow Mr. Barrett's lead. By so doing, they can prevent the Job Corps program from continuing its present headlong dash toward becoming the No. 1 boondoggle of the 20th century.

I believe my colleagues would be interested in seeing what the San Jose Adult Education Center is already doing for school dropouts and would like to give some consideration to the question Mr. Barrett raises as to whether it might be better to use Job Corps money in the expansion of presently existing adult education programs operated through our school system.

The article follows:

TRAINING DROPOUTS NOTHING NEW IN SAN JOSE

(By Dick Barrett)

On Tuesday evening, June 15, a ceremony will take place at Civic Auditorium which will have a special significance.

At that time 230 former high school dropouts will receive diplomas they have earned through the San Jose Unified School District Department of Adult Education. This will dramatize the fact that for a long time now the San Jose Evening High School has been doing a job that the Federal Government is just starting to take an interest in, and the latter with lavish outlays of the taxpayers' money.

Some idea of comparative costs can be derived from the fact that Litton Industries has $13,400,000 to conduct the Job Corps training center at Camp Parks for an ultimate enrollment of 2,000 young men. It is estimated that this year the State of California will spend $12 million on adult education for a million students, and that doesn't include the ones who are under 21.

Nowhere have I seen a total figure of the cost to the taxpayers if Videosonics Systems takes over the Sante Claire Hotel as a training center for girls, but the earlier estimate of $560 per girl per month (and there will be 400 girls) is described as twice the cost of sending one to Vassar or Radcliffe, two of the most exclusive women's colleges in the country.

Clearly, on a nationwide basis, the cost to the taxpayers is going to be many millions of dollars per year. It is interesting to contemplate what could have been accomplished by funneling these Federal funds into the public school system where dropouts would have been trained by professional educators experienced in the problem. Teachers who work in the canneries during the summer vacation could have used their special skills to increase their income.

There are more than 2,000 students enrolled in the San Jose adult center's evening high school credit program. Nearly all of them are people who learned the hard way that a high school diploma has value in the job market, and they are to be applauded for having the gumption and determination to go back and complete their studies without being paid for it after the manner of the Job Corps.

Furthermore, the diplomas they receive will be from an accredited high school where they have been taught by trained, capable (if underpaid) teachers. The unaccredited Job Corps schools are mainly conducted by defense contractors whose previous experience has been in the manufacture of electronic gear and missile hardware.

Many of the evening high school grads will have had instruction in such down-to-earth, job-oriented classes as printer maintenance and electronic assembly, and the program could be widened to include the whole Job Corps spectrum if the same kind of money were lavished on it.

It has been suggested that the people who are already in the business of educating high school dropouts lost out in the Job Corps training program because they do not have as loud a voice in Washington as the defense contractors. But two paragraphs in an article in the May 15 Saturday Review indicate the Job Corps has a double purpose:

"The proposals that the Job Corps is receiving from industries to operate training centers is a first indication of the movement of industry into the field of education, as Government begins shifting funds from defense to education.

"One of the ironies of our times is that the high school dropout and the defense contractor, both victims of shifting patterns of employment, are now helping each other out of their respective economic holes through the Job Corps."

San Jose's adult evening school program is not unique. The Campbell school district also has a good-sized schedule for dropouts.

San Jose's program is directed by Principal Ray McCall, recently elected to the board of directors of the National Association of Public Schools Adult Educators, running against three other candidates from California. He was also elected second vice president of the California Association of Adult Education Administrators, and has just served a year as president of the California Council of Adult Education.

Further evidence of local leadership in the field was the election of Ed Stanley, director of the Campbell program, and Nero Pruitt, dean of extended day at West Valley Junior College, to the board of directors of the California Association of Adult Educators.

Principality of Transylvania

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, 408 years ago in the Principality of Transylvania, a part of the Hungarian Kingdom that had to become independent to escape Turkish domination a few years before 1557, the Diet enacted a statute on June 1, which said as follows:

> Each person may hold whatever religious faith he wishes, with old or new rites, while we at the same time leave it to their judgment to do as they please in the matter of their faith, just so long, however, as they bring no harm to bear on anyone at all, lest the followers of a new religion be a source of irritation of the old profession of faith or become in any way injurious to its followers.

This act signed into law by a Catholic, Queen Isabella, is a predecessor of that article of our Constitution which establishes the freedom of conscience, the first amendment. It is also a too early forerunner of the present ecumenical spirit in the Catholic and Protestant churches which is, in turn, a result in part of militant atheism under the guise of communism trying to take over countries and continents of the globe.

When we remember the wisdom of these Transylvanians who knew from personal experience what slavery meant by the Turkish raids, we must, however, remember the present plight of the peoples of Transylvania suffering under the yoke of dictatorial communism, and particularly that of the Transylvanian Hungarians who were the spiritus rector of the 1557 Act of Tolerance. On March 24, 1965, I joined with my colleagues in deploring the discriminatory practices of the Rumanian Communist government against them and on the next day I also introduced a resolution together with several other Members to condemn these discriminatory practices. I am happy to know that the European Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign

Affairs is planning hearings on the resolutions by mid-June, and I trust that the resolution will finally come to the House floor before adjournment.

Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A., Meet in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like printed into the RECORD at this point the following statement I received from Mr. Joseph L. Pudlo, Jr., national commander of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A., concerning resolutions they adopted which indicate their stand on national policies:

POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS, U.S.A., MEET IN PHILADELPHIA

The National Executive Committee of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A., met in the Benjamin Franklin Hotel in Philadelphia, Pa., on May 21, 22, and 23, 1965.

Led by Comdr. Joseph L. Pudlo, Jr., of North Chicago, Ill., 40 executive committee members attended these sessions. The following resolutions, which indicate the organization's stand on national policies were adopted:

1. We commend the action of President Lyndon B. Johnson in reconsidering an earlier decision to close veterans hospitals, Veterans' Administration regional centers, domiciliary facilities, and other Veterans' Administration establishments. The PLAV is of the opinion that the original recommendation was ill advised and was not based on a thorough knowledge of all of the pertinent facts. We are mindful of the fact that economics must be practiced by our Federal Government but that must not be accomplished at the expense of any large group of citizens who would be denied equal protection of the laws and equal justice under the laws.

2. We laud the action of the Congress of the United States in reopening national service life insurance to those veterans who have disabilities, whether service connected or not, and are thereby precluded from purchasing commercial life insurance. We urge Congress to expand veterans life insurance so that those young men who at the time of their separation from military service did not continue their life insurance, may be allowed to do so where it appears their original action was based on their immaturity and not wisdom in such matters.

3. The PLAV is mindful of the horrors and hardships of war and the resultant suffering and privation. Nevertheless, we commend the action of our present administration in carrying on the defense of the people of South Vietnam and the resistance to communism and Red Chinese aggression in southeast Asian countries. It is through the firmness demonstrated by President Johnson and Secretaries Rusk and McNamara that we can keep the world free from communism and totalitarianism. It is our sincere hope that the military action will be followed by establishment of democratic institutions in southeast Asia and mutual assistance to the affected countries so that the standard of living for these people will be made decent.

4. The action of President Johnson in sending American Armed Forces into the Dominican Republic in order to prevent the establishment of a communistic bastion in that country has won the wholehearted support of the PLAV. We urge that the United States bolster the establishment of a democratic government in the Dominican Republic and accomplish the necessary economic steps to raise the standard of living for the peoples of that country, and that we resist the creation of another dictatorship on the island of Hispaniola.

5. We support the pending legislation to change our immigration policy in order that discriminatory quotas be done away with and our country admit persons with needed occupational skills and also their families be reunited. Our immigration policy should be based on the economic needs of the country and humanitarian consideration.

6. We urge the enactment of pending legislation to increase compensations and pensions of veterans and their dependents by such amounts as will reflect the increased cost of living since the last revision of these benefits.

7. Many of our members face the problem of making funeral arrangements for themselves and their wives. We are aware that national cemeteries are being filled and closed very rapidly; therefore, the PLAV favors that existing cemeteries be opened.

Reference is made specifically to Beverly National Cemetery in New Jersey, which should be expanded, the land at Fort Custer, Mich., which should be made into a national cemetery, and other similar installations which should be converted into national cemeteries.

We further urge a close study of the problem of national cemeteries because many larger northern States are without them, and as a result, our members cannot be buried in national cemeteries. Recently, many military installations have been deactivated. This surplus land can and should be converted into national cemeteries.

The foregoing resolutions, drafted by the resolutions committee, B. C. Stanczyk, Michigan, chairman, and M. J. Misiur, New Jersey, cochairman, adopted by unanimous action on the 22d day of May 1965, by the National Executive Committee of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A., assembled in conference in Philadelphia, Pa.

JOSEPH L. PUDLO, Jr.,
National Commander,
Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A.

John Lindsay—Next Mayor of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Life magazine, issue of May 28, 1965, has the front cover picture—Congressman JOHN LINDSAY of New York.

JOHN LINDSAY has made such a fine, excellent record in Congress, and shows such progressive leadership, the citizens of New York City will gain greatly by JOHN LINDSAY's race for mayor.

On behalf of the personal friends of JOHN LINDSAY who know him so well, we say cheers for JOHN in his campaign for mayor. And every success to JOHN and the citizens of New York City regardless of party in this time of advance and progress.

I place in the RECORD the fine article from Life magazine: "Why the GOP Is Smiling Again: LINDSAY Is Running":

WHY THE GOP IS SMILING AGAIN: LINDSAY IS RUNNING

With youthful verve and the long-legged grace of a heron, JOHN VLIET LINDSAY, 6 feet 3 inches tall, strode into the race for mayor of New York and Republicans all over the country broke into ear-to-ear smiles. Overnight LINDSAY alchemized what had promised to be another dreary local election—and an easy fourth term walkaway for Democratic Mayor Robert Wagner—into a contest of national importance. Despite the crushing 3½-to-1 voter registration edge the Democrats hold in New York City, the GOP has high hopes that LINDSAY can break the pattern of Democratic supremacy in big cities where Republicans have been clobbered consistently since New Deal days.

LINDSAY is 43 years old and possesses enormous personal charm. A leader of the liberal Republican Wednesday Club in the House, he has been elected to Congress four times in Manhattan's "silk stocking" district. LINDSAY rolled up a bigger plurality each time, the biggest of all last year when he refused to support Barry Goldwater.

The mayor of New York has a job which in its administrative and political complexities is probably second only to the task of the presidency. To win it, LINDSAY must overcome a Democratic organization which is highly officient at the precinct level, where the GOP is weak. Supported by 280,000 municipal employees and the power structure of organized labor, Mayor Wagner was unimpressed: "Sure I can beat him. Can you imagine a Republican winning in New York City?"

But talk of a LaGuardia-type fusion ticket that would cut across party lines was in the air, and dissatisfication with Wagner's 12-year-old regime is widespread, even among Democrats. Moreover, LINDSAY has always been able to attract backing from voters of all parties. As one supporter put it, "In his district, you don't have a Republican Party, you have a Lindsay party."

The reaction of GOP leaders around the country was instantaneous and exhilarated. National Chairman Ray Bliss eagerly pledged money to help LINDSAY's campaign, Michigan Governor George Romney sent a warm telegram, Massachusetts Attorney General Ed Brooke, highest elected Negro State officeholder in the country, wanted to come and help.

Back in New York LINDSAY jumped into the campaign as though he had been in training for months. He walked in a Greek parade in Manhattan, rushed over to Brooklyn to attend a Norwegian festival, turned up at a Negro cotillion and told the debutantes: "Well girls, we're coming out together."

LINDSAY moves always with a fast springy step; he leaps up the steps in an apartment House, knocking at every door. Women surround him quickly. Their eyes light up and they try to prolong his handshake, a reaction that inevitably reminds many of Jack Kennedy's campaign days. But, like Kennedy, LINDSAY can transform his boyish look into a serious presence. At a Brooklyn GOP ball, the roomful of noisy dancers fell silent as LINDSAY told them in his deep voice: "I need you, I need your family life, your business life, I need your every waking moment to win."

In the first week after LINDSAY announced, hundreds of young people turned up at his headquarters wanting to work. He will set up his own organization in each of the city's 75 State assembly districts, unheard of for a GOP campaign in New York.

At the end of the first week's campaigning, LINDSAY sat in his small hotel room and talked eagerly about these conflicts. "That's what's so exciting about this campaign. If

we can't run these swollen cities, then the cities are doomed. And we've got to get the Republican Party into these cities—or the party is doomed.

"I'm going to get inside every home in this city. I've got to get these people coming into the voting booth saying, 'Where's that LINDSAY?' Otherwise I'll lose it."

The American Patent System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Congressman RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, of Indiana, is leading the fight for corrective legislation to curb foreign drug pirates who are injuring American industry and labor.

Congressman ROUDEBUSH's efforts started in the 87th Congress, and have since gained wide nonpartisan support among Members who have become aware of the situation in some industries.

Fifteen Members of the House have followed Congressman ROUDEBUSH's lead and cosponsored legislation in the House, and Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey has introduced similar legislation in the Senate.

As the leadoff witness of Senator WILLIAMS' bill held Wednesday, June 2, before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Congressman ROUDEBUSH explained the problem in detail.

Under unanimous consent, I request his Senate testimony be reprinted in its entirety for the information of all Members of Congress.

Congressman ROUDEBUSH's testimony follows:

The American patent system is as old as this Nation of ours, and I am here today to add my support to Senate bill 1047, introduced last February 8 by the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., distinguished U.S. Senator from New Jersey.

Senator WILLIAMS' bill is designed to protect the American patent system, American industry, and the American worker.

I am the father of this legislation, so to speak, and have introduced bills identical to Senator WILLIAMS' bill, in not only this Congress, but in the 87th and 88th Congresses.

My current bill in the House—H.R. 150—was introduced last January 4, on the first day of the 89th Congress.

Since January 29, 1962, I have made 11 speeches on the floor of the House of Representatives, citing the advantages of the American patent system and the necessity for protecting and preserving this system.

After working during three Congresses to enlist support for this most needed legislation, we were greatly encouraged and very proud and pleased when Senator WILLIAMS offered the bill in the Senate.

Quite deservedly, this legislation enjoys wide bipartisan support because of its unique need in the field of patent law.

There are a total of 16 bills in the House similar to Senator WILLIAMS' bill. Besides my own bill, similar legislation has been offered by Congressman BRAY of Indiana, Congressman HALL of Missouri, Congressman RODINO of New Jersey, Congressman ADAIR of Indiana, Congressman O'KONSKI of Wisconsin, Congressman CAREY of New York, Congressman HARVEY of Indiana, Congressman CARTER of Kentucky, Congressman DONOHUE of Massachusetts, Congressman DOW of New York, Congressman ST. ONGE of Connecticut, Congressman MCDADE of Pennsylvania, Congressman POOL of Texas, Congressman NELSEN of Minnesota, and Congressman TENZER of New York.

This bill is picking up more support all the time, and both American industry and organized labor have indicated interest in its passage.

The bill would prohibit the Federal Government of the United States from purchasing foreign-made articles which have been manufactured from processes protected by American patents, where the patent and invention knowledge has not been obtained legally, or properly licensed.

The proposed legislation, however, contains an emergency provision that would permit the Secretary of Defense to purchase these foreign items if he deemed it necessary to the national security of the United States.

Need for this legislation has arisen from the purchasing methods of the Defense Department, Veterans' Administration, and other agencies, which have been making oversea purchases, chiefly of drug and pharmaceutical items, from concerns which obtained the formula for such products from American inventions by illegal methods.

These foreign manufacturers, using American patents, have been able to undersell their American competitors because the foreign concerns have had no scientific research expense.

As you know, great expense of American industry is involved in the research and development of new products which have enabled our Nation to reach its present pinnacle of success and achievement.

But, when foreign competitors can obtain these secret American processes without benefit of lawful transaction and then reproduce American products at exceedingly low costs, both American industry and American jobs are endangered.

The latest figures made available to me reveal that for the current fiscal year, total Government purchases of drug items are about $80 million.

Of this amount, an estimated $2 to $3 million involve offshore purchases of items manufactured with American patents not legally obtained.

This is a tremendous blow, not only to the American drug industry, but, in terms of jobs, an estimated $10 million has been lost in employment over the past 5 years.

Four hundred jobs have been lost in the drug industry, and another 100 jobs lost in related fields during this 5-year period.

Loss of business to foreign markets involving illegal patent acquisition is costing an estimated 100 to 150 new jobs in the drug industry each year.

American industry and American labor are not afraid of fair competition. But, when American capital is forced to compete with foreign manufacturers who have gained their advantage illegaly, Congress should act.

At present, the Federal Government, through its Defense Department and Veterans' Administration agencies, encourages circumvention of American patent and research rights by purchasing items from these oversea sources.

American economic growth depends today more upon technological advances than upon any other single factor. And new technologies in turn depend on advance in sciene.

Advance in science depends, of course, on American research and development.

The Federal Government should be doing everything possible to encourage this research and development in American industry, instead of discouraging and retarding it by rewarding oversea patent parasites.

Research and development by American industry will create more new products and new jobs. This progress must not be impeded by shortsighted Federal agencies.

Instead, the Federal Government must lead the bandwagon to encourage and promote this continuing research.

Tens of millions of American workers can trace their jobs directly to inventions; almost no jobs can be found that are completely free from the effects of patents issued in the past century.

Now 175 years old, the American patent system has issued 3,250,000 patents, outlining the greatest technological revolution the world has known and detailing everything from mousetraps to the $126 million Mercury space capsule.

Today the Patent Office receives more than 1,000 applications weekly.

Ours is a system of free and competitive enterprise, and in such a system, if it is to be preserved, business and industry must take the initiative in research. Government can and should help when and where it can, and as frequently as it can, but without usurping prerogatives that belong in the private sector or undermining the basic incentives of our free enterprise system. One of the best means we have to help the private sector is in strengthening our patent system, for the patent system is at the very core of our technical effort and is a powerful stimulus to industrial growth.

Senator WILLIAMS' bill will help strengthen the American patent system, and I respectfully urge your support. It is no accident that the strongest patent system in the world is located in the strongest nation in the world.

Thank you.

Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3584) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS] for his knowledge of the mining business and his ability to speak on this particular issue. I also would like to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], for his excellent work in investigating the mines. Despite his 6 feet 4, I saw him go down in the mines in West Virginia and Virginia. I would like also to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for his fine efforts and for his ability to work out some compromise on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

Sixteenth Annual Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards—Address by the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as president of the National Council to Combat Blindness—Fight For Sight, Inc., I had the privilege and the pleasure of attending the 16th annual Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards luncheon on May 21, 1965. The distinguished Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY was the guest speaker at the luncheon.

The awards are made annually for reporting on medical research and public health programs.

The Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation announces the 16th annual Albert Lasker Awards for Medical Journalism. These awards were first presented in 1950 to encourage the writing and publication in general newspapers and national magazines of outstanding articles on public health and medical research. In 1955 the awards were extended to include television broadcasts.

The purpose of these awards is to create increased public and professional interest in the advances that are made in laboratory and clinical medical research, and in the actual or possible application of these advances to public health programs. The benefits to mankind of medical achievement can often be greatly increased if the lag between a laboratory discovery and its application in clinical medicine is shortened by public knowledge of research findings.

The Foundation seeks especially to recognize outstanding articles and broadcasts on those diseases and public health problems which are the main causes of death and disability in the United States.

The Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards consist of $2,500 each, an engraved citation and a statuette of the Winged Victory of Samothrace, symbolizing victory over death and disease. When special citations are given, the award consists of an engraved citation.

Announcement of the winners of the awards for work published or broadcast during 1964 will be made in May 1965.

In 1964 the foundation established the Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Fellowship Award. Previous winners of an Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Award are eligible for the fellowship award under the following conditions: starting with articles published or programs broadcast during 1963, winners who, in subsequent years, receive the journalism award three times will become "Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Award Fellows." At the time the journalism award is given to a winner for the third time this winner will receive an honorarium of $1,000 in addition to the $2,500 Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Award. The fellowship award was established in celebration of the 15th anniversary of the presentation of the Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards.

The continuing purpose of the Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards is to honor writers and television broadcasts that focus, with appropriate urgency and authority, national public attention upon a major research discovery and its clinical application, or upon a significant public health problem or program.

The address of the Vice President of the United States follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE 16TH ANNUAL ALBERT LASKER MEDICAL JOURNALISM AWARDS LUNCHEON, SHERATON-EAST HOTEL, FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1965

We honor today the best in medical journalism.

These awards have a meaning far beyond the recognition of excellence in medical reporting and interpretation. They symbolize the winged victory of man's understanding over ignorance, man's conscience and the triumph of the healing arts over pain and death.

There is special significance in these 16th annual Albert Lasker medical journalism awards. 1965 is truly a year of health decision. It is a year of policy breakthroughs against the backlog of American health needs. Our country is poised today to achieve many of the goals which Lasker awardees of previous years had envisioned in their pioneering articles, their broadcasts and telecasts.

The Congress is now in the process of considering and—hopefully—enacting the most comprehensive, enlightened program of health legislation ever recommended by an American President.

The goal of this program is to protect, to enhance, to strengthen the most important asset this Nation possesses—our people. We seek to conserve our most precious resource—human lives—from the ravages of man's most ancient enemy—disease. This deadly foe will, by three diseases alone—cancer, heart disease, and stroke—kill two out of every three of us—if we do not strike back now. In material costs, these three diseases will exact an estimated $31 billion toll this year alone.

To defeat these three scourges and many others, President Johnson has submitted to the Congress a wide range of legislative weapons. His proposals are designed to make available modernized and increased numbers of medical facilities; to overcome critical shortages of skilled, professional personnel—as in new community mental health centers; to provide a sound financial basis for health services for the elderly; to offer expanded service against mental retardation as well as against other forms of disability; to foster loans for comprehensive group practice; and to give added health protection to consumers.

Of the President's many notable recommendations, few will, I believe, be more highly esteemed—and rightly so—by the present and future generations than the proposed establishments of multipurpose regional medical complexes. These complexes, as urged by the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke, will assure more—and more uniform—excellence in research, in education and in patient care. Not just in a few big cities, but to service every town and hamlet in every region; centered not just in great teaching hospitals but in community hospitals and geared—not just for specialists, but for general practitioners.

We laymen know—we are proud and grateful—that American medicine, including post-graduate medical education, has long been preeminent in the world. But many of our ablest physicians have reminded us that, in these fast-moving times—with new information and new techniques proliferating—professional knowledge becomes rapidly obsolete. Professional skills, unless sharpened, rust. The result can be—has been—a serious lag in putting new medical discoveries to work. Thus, many a patient receives less than the best that medicine wants to—and might otherwise—provide.

We Americans believe in equality and in quality. When life or death is at stake, there should be no second-class patients in our land.

American doctors do want to practice the very best medicine for every patient. Physicians know better than anyone that, in medical diagnosis, in treatment and rehabilitation, too little too late can spell heartbreak for patients and their loved ones.

Time is of the essence in all war—no less so, in the universal war against disease.

So, we must not needlessly lose a day or a month in conquering avoidable death and pain.

In 1964, 1,800,000 Americans died. Of that number, 985,000 Americans were lost to cardio-vascular-renal diseases, and 290,000 to cancer.

These deaths are conventionally attributed to what are termed "natural causes" (as distinguished from deaths by manmade violence).

But man has proven there is little that is really natural or inevitable about many once fatal diseases. Polio was once considered a natural cause of disability; so was rheumatic fever. Influenza and tuberculosis were long viewed as naturally heavy killers.

Today, we have tamed these and other killers and cripplers. We are determined to wipe them out and lots more disease, too. Not just some day, but at the earliest possible day. Not just for the well-to-do, but for every income bracket.

In medicine, as in so many other sciences, there is an unbeatable combination—will and skill. We Americans must make up our minds to achieve our medical goals, as a people. History confirms what a free people can accomplish when it lifts its medical and other sights. Throughout the annals of time, most progress has occurred when men and women, once passive, have risen up against what they had considered their fate and have chosen to defy the so-called inevitable. At those times, they have declared: This evil condition need not be. So it was when man decided, for example: Slavery need not be. So it was last year when America affirmed: Poverty need not be. And, now we declare: Most diseases need not be. So-called incurable diseases can one day be cured, provided we give men of science still more of the means—the money, the personnel, the equipment, the facilities, as well as the respect and the freedom—to do their work.

The war against disease is one war we do want to—we must—escalate. We must seek out and attack this enemy in its home base, wherever we find it.

That is why many of the next great advances will come in preventive and diagnostic medicine.

The world looks to America for medical leadership. There are few institutions in this vast country which are capable of doing so much additional good for humanity as a great organization in Bethesda, Md.—the National Institutes of Health.

When an NIH delegation has gone abroad, no foreign mob has ever hoisted a sign, "Yankee Go Home." No American flag has ever been torn down because the United States shipped Salk or Sabin vaccine to a people fearing a polio epidemic.

Medical research and medical aid do cost money. But death has no price tag—its cost is beyond estimate.

This country loses a precious asset every time one of our citizens needlessly dies. America's most important budget—its human budget—has always been in a certain sense unbalanced. Why? Because hundreds of thousands of our citizens have died ahead of their time.

Saving life, prolonging meaningful life—even for a month or a year—is an achievement beyond comparison.

How much might humanity have benefited if, for example, medical science could have added 1 year of productive life, to say, Albert Einstein or Enrico Fermi? Who can estimate what mankind has lost from the untimely deaths or other great scientists—and of statesmen, humanitarians, artists? But famous or unknown, important or ordinary, every human being deserves every year that science can win for him.

We are determined to extend life expectancy—for every group in our population. To do so, science must learn more about the very process of life, about what goes on at the cellular level in elderly years. In exploring these mysteries, we may find answers of incalculable value to the conquest of specific diseases.

Some day, we will be able to tell the world that science has discovered the secrets of aging or of cancer or of muscular dystrophy, or multiple sclerosis. That news will outrank, in importance, even the wonderful tidings that man has landed on the moon.

Our people hunger for more news about health.

The American public is eager to learn still more about how to keep well and get well. An informed layman is a crucial ally of medicine—both on broad issues of public policy and as an individual patient. Professionals recognize that particular skill and care are necessary in communicating complex medical facts to laymen. But doctors also appreciate the tremendous value of sound medical communication to the public. Outstanding journalism—such as you honor today—stimulates the very best in society.

Excellent journalism focuses, informs, arouses, inspires—for readers, listeners, and viewers. Such journalism raises neither false hopes nor false fears.

Great medical journalism is a cornerstone for the good life in the Great Society. It helps make whole—man's understanding and thereby helps make possible—man's healing.

For this, it deserves our respect, our praise, and our everlasting gratitude.

The 16th Annual Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards were made to the following:

SIXTEENTH ANNUAL ALBERT LASKER MEDICAL JOURNALISM AWARDS

NEWSPAPER AWARD PRESENTED TO ALTON BLAKESLEE AND DR. JEREMIAH STAMLER

For their valuable 12-part series, "Your Heart Has Nine Lives," released by the Associated Press in May 1964; for the sound and careful research done in preparing this series, which constitutes a valuable compendium of our present knowledge about heart disease and stroke; for informing and advising the public of the suspected factors in these diseases; and for pointing out that men and women can and should begin to act intelligently concerning the new knowledge which has come to us from medical research, and thus begin to reduce the enormous toll of heart disease, the No. 1 cause of death in this country.

MAGAZINE AWARD PRESENTED TO MATT CLARK

For his article, "Birth Control: The Pill and the Church," which appeared as the cover story in Newsweek magazine on July 6, 1964, shortly after Pope Paul VI issued his historic pronouncement that the Church of Rome took new cognizance of the moral and practical questions raised by the subject of fertility regulation.

For reviewing, in his article, what oral contraceptives are, and what they can and cannot do; what the historic position of the church has been, and how it may change in the view of informed churchmen; what the public mood is on this question, and on using the new oral method of conception control.

For bringing to realization the fact that no medical or scientific issue in history so completely involves the conscience, morality, religious belief, and economic well-being of so many people as does the question of family size limitation.

And for projecting the great news value of a definite and growing attitude within the Roman Catholic Church for a movement toward new doctrinal positions on the purposes of sexuality in marriage and responsible parenthood, in the light of emerging attitudes, new discoveries, and the problems of world population growth.

TELEVISION AWARD PRESENTED TO FRED W. FRIENDLY AND JAY M'MULLEN

For the courageous program, written by Jay McMullen, Fred W. Friendly, executive producer, and broadcast over the CBS television network on January 22, 1964.

For revealing—through pictures often made with hidden cameras, and through interviews with pushers, addicts, a Mafia mobster and law enforcement officials—the sordid and fiscal details of the multimillion-dollar business of heroin.

For tracing the illicit route of heroin traffic from the poppy fields of Turkey, through Syria, Lebanon, Italy, and France, to America.

For suggesting that the medical treatment of heroin addicts is not the whole answer to the heroin problem, but that stopping the business of heroin—along every step of the way, back to its source—is fundamental to a solution of this problem.

SPECIAL CITATION PRESENTED TO JACK NELSON

For his 10-part series, "Milledgeville—Reform and Crisis," published in the Atlanta Constitution in April 1964—another important contribution to the development of a sound mental health program in Georgia.

For his serving as the conscience which spurred public officials from apathy to action.

For reviewing the present state of the reforms accomplished 5 years earlier, and for courageously pointing out the shocking conditions still tolerated.

For focusing public attention on the official reports that confirmed his findings, and recommended major reforms and a change in the local community's attitude toward the care of the mentally ill in Georgia.

SPECIAL CITATION PRESENTED TO EDGAR T. BELL

For the program, "The Twilight World," on mental retardation, broadcast over station KWTV in Oklahoma City, on October 14 and 28, 1964, and written and produced by Harlan Mendenhall.

For the high standard of excellence which Edgar Bell, general manager of station KWTV, has maintained in presenting this program, which challenges other stations and producers to investigate local health problems with the same community responsibility and urgency.

For involving the participation of families, schools, voluntary agencies, and legislators in the problems of the mentally retarded, this special citation is given.

The Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation is to be especially congratulated for its outstanding community service.

The Arts in the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, as long as the District of Columbia does not control its own finances, the Congress will have responsibility for a variety of municipal activities more appropriately reserved for a city council.

One such activity is the support given to the Washington Civic Opera Association by the District of Columbia Recreation Department. The association exists to encourage the development of outstanding opera and operatic talent by providing a workshop for training in all facets of opera production—singing, stage design, set construction, and so forth.

In the process, Mr. Speaker, the Washington Civic Opera Association has made opera accessible to all interested people who live in or visit the Nation's Capital. Over 70,000 people have attended performances sponsored by the association; over a thousand have participated in the various phases of production; over 150 people from the Washington area actively participate in each performance.

One fact has become very clear to all of us, it costs more to do anything these days. We voted Federal employees a raise in recognition of that fact last year, and this year the civic opera association needs more money to continue its critically acclaimed work.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, the opera association needs $20,000 instead of the $6,000 usually appropriated in recent years. I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD the statement of Mrs. Ester Coopersmith, chairman of the Washington Civic Opera Association, before the Senate Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations and in support of this increased request.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ESTHER LIPSEN COOPERSMITH, CHAIRMAN, WASHINGTON CIVIC OPERA ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, ROOM 1224, NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Chairman BYRD, and members of the subcommittee, my name is Esther Lipsen Coopersmith; I am chairman of the Washington Civic Opera Association. The association was established by the District of Columbia Recreation Department and under its sponsorship provides training in all aspects of the production and presentation of opera and trains young artists as well as mature singers. Many of the local singers who have performed with the Civic Opera Association have attained outstanding professional success, for example:

Eva Baber is now one of the most sought-after coloratura sopranos in European opera companies and guest soloist in many European capitals.

William Dupree is now a leading tenor with the City Center Opera in New York for the Tanglewood Festival for the coming season.

Bernice Fraction is now a scholarship student at the Julliard School of Music, studying with Mme. Blanche Thebom.

Carl Kaiser is now the leading tenor of the opera in Bremen, Germany.

Tom Paul was the leading bass with the Goldowsky New England Opera, and is now a leading bass with the City Center Opera in New York City.

David Small is now a scholarship student at the opera school in Bayreuth, Germany.

Jeannette Walters has just received a scholarship for opera workshop study in Spain.

Metropolitan Opera audition winners (regional) in the last 3 years include: David Small, William DuPree, Donald Boothman, Jeannette Walters, Brown Bradley, David Beckwith.

The association functions effectively as a workshop for singers and a training ground for all other facets of opera production. Those who are interested can learn and practice stage design, set construction, costuming, lighting, acting, and choral singing. Over a thousand people have participated in all phases of opera production in the past 10 years.

In the decade the association has been in existence over 70,000 people have seen and heard its productions. Under the direction of Dr. Frederick Fall, the company has presented "The Telephone" and "The Medium," by Menotti; "The Bartered Bride," by Smetana; "The Gypsy Baron," by Johann Strauss; "Tales of Hoffman" by Offenbach; "The Merry Widow" by Lehar; "Madame Butterfly," by Puccini; "The Student Prince," by Romberg; "LaTosca," by Puccini; "Faust," by Gounod, and "Der Freischuetz," by Von Weber, and "Don Pasquale," by Donizetti.

The association, as the name implies, is a civic organization which provides this community with musical productions of artistic merit, directed to the largest possible audience.

From a modest beginning in 1954, the association has grown until it is now presenting local, homegrown, grassroots opera of professional caliber. Performances have always been acclaimed by overflowing crowds at Constitution Hall, Cramton Auditorium, Carter Barron Amphitheater and the Watergate. Thus the work of the opera association is of vital importance to the District of Columbia. It satisfies the growing demand by the District's citizens who are deeply desirous of a share in the District's spreading cultural life and it provides an educational opportunity for talented young people who by direct participation can learn great music and thus fit themselves for later professional careers. For the benefit of the less affluent such opportunities should be furnished with at most a token charge.

In the past 12 years the District of Columbia Recreation Department and the Washington Civic Opera Association has strained all available community resources to fulfill their objective and has in many cases been able to offer opera productions free to the public. In 27 productions, of 43 performances 26 have been free to the public. Over 150 people in the Washington area have actively participated in each performance. Statistically as well as artistically judging from the acclaim of critics and public the mission of the group has been accomplished. However, the future of this artistic program is viewed with considerable concern by both the association and the District of Columbia Recreation Department. The concern is based on the increased costs in all areas of stage production, the necessity of using an all-union orchestra, and the urgent need to expand the program.

This subcommittee has appropriated $6,000 each year to the District of Columbia Recreation Department for musical activities. The association is not requesting a new item, it is requesting a larger sum and asking that you earmark it for the Opera Association's work so that it can continue to expand its services to the people of the District of Columbia and so that it may carry out the mandate which Congress gave the Recreation Department in the 1942 act—to give aid to the arts.

Therefore, the following request is made: That the appropriation for the production of opera by the District of Columbia Recreation Department be increased from $6,000 per annum to $20,000 per annum.

Such an increase would enable the Opera Association to stage two performances of one fully staged grand opera production; two performances of one fully staged operetta production; two performances of one fully staged Christmas opera for children; one opera in concert form; and one concert of opera excerpts.

This request is not only supported by the District of Columbia Recreation Department, but on a bipartisan basis by Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, and Congressman JOHN DOWDY, Democrat, of Texas. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to include the text of their letters as part of my remarks.

I should like to include as part of my remarks a study on "municipal financial support of artistic and cultural activities in U.S. cities," made by the Library of Congress which Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 1960. The study shows that the District of Columbia does less for the arts than most U.S. cities.

President Lyndon B. Johnson in calling for increased aid of all kinds to the arts is responding to a consensus of the American people. Equal opportunity to enjoy the arts must be a cornerstone of the Great Society.

The Congress and America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 13–16, 1965, it was my pleasure to participate in the George Washington University American Assembly conference on "The Congress and America's Future," which met at Airlie House, Warrenton, Va. Also among the distinguished group of participants was my colleague from Ohio [Mr. MOSHER]. Director of the assembly program and editor of the final report was John Anthony Brown, Jr., vice president and dean of facilities, the George Washington University.

Participants included many of the leading authorities on Congress and governmental affairs from the House and Senate, the executive branch, the academic community, business, labor, and the professions—men and women with broad practical experience in the field.

The Airlie House conference was one of a series of regional meetings being held throughout the country under auspices of the American Assembly, Columbia University. The first in the series was held at Arden House, New York, last fall, which produced a number of sweeping recommendations to modify the structure and functions of the Congress.

The assembly is a national, nonpartisan, educational institution established by Dwight D. Eisenhower at Columbia University in 1950. It has sponsored several dozen assemblies of national leaders to discuss important public issues and has published a number of books to stimulate further study of such issues. The assembly and the George Washington University is to be congratulated for the service it has rendered to the Congress and to the Nation in providing a forum to discuss the important questions involving the work of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the recommendations of the Airlie House conference differ greatly with those adopted last fall at the Arden House meeting. Many of us felt at the time that the earlier report and recommendations was overly critical of Congress and its institutions. The report of our conference, on the contrary, was in my judgment a positive and realistic document which recognized the underlying strength of the legislative branch of our Government. It did recommend a number of important programs that Congress could consider to enable the House and Senate to improve its operations.

One reason for the widely differing views of participants in the two conferences undoubtedly was the significant reforms which the House adopted in January of this year—proof that Congress is able to act on its own to correct procedural defects that have deadlocked its consideration of major legislation in the past. It was logical, therefore, that the participants at the recent Airlie House conference would take a more positive view toward the Congress as it is presently functioning.

The Airlie House conference in its final report praised the "recent reform and modernization of the rules and procedures of the Congress" and asserted "that they have had a beneficial and constructive legislative consequence and that additional reforms will follow." It applauded the decisions of the Democratic caucus of the House as well as actions by the Republican conference to improve organization and procedures. It recommended that these rules, reforms, and procedural changes be continued in future Congresses. The conference report also welcomed the establishment of the Joint Committee on Organization of Congress. The recommendations of the Airlie House American Assembly conference should receive the close attention of members of the joint committee. I also hope that our colleagues will find the report and recommendations of interest.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of the final report of the George Washington University American Assembly Airlie House conference on "Congress and America's Future," along with a list of the conference participants:

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY AMERICAN ASSEMBLY: "THE CONGRESS AND AMERICA'S FUTURE"—FINAL REPORT

(Director and editor of the report, John Anthony Brown, Jr.)

At the close of their discussion the participants in the George Washington University American Assembly on "The Congress and America's Future," reviewed as a group the following statement. Although there was general agreement on the final report, it is not the practice of the American Assembly

for participants to affix their signature, and it should not be assumed that every participant necessarily subscribes to every recommendation.

The mood of our age is a restless concern lest the basic ideas and institutions which underlie our freedom and well-being fail to respond to the mark of our age, which is swift and even violent change. In order to cope with rapid changes in the economic, social, and scientific order, we concern ourselves with the responsibility to bring about appropriate changes in the political order. In the political order the legislative area has seemed to respond to pressures for change more slowly than the executive.

If the first two-thirds of the 20th century has been hard on legislatures, and dangerous to the institutions by which freemen govern themselves, will the final third of the century require us to find alternative political institutions, or revise, reform, and update our traditional institutions? It is to this broad concern and to this basic question as it applies to the Congress of the United States that we have addressed ourselves.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

This assembly asserts that the Congress has responded and will respond to a national consensus or clear and present danger to our national security. There are many examples to prove that it has responded to the national will and the national need.

We believe there is always a place for the deliberative process. The timing of legislation involves interaction between the general public and the Congress. We believe that Congress, with its effective sources of information and broad overview of the national well-being, has a responsibility for educating the people as well as responding to the public's clear demands for legislation.

There are those with much to say about Congress who have limited understanding of the National Legislature and National Legislators. There is much to be done to improve the effectiveness and validity of the reporting of the mass communicators—the press, radio, and television. And there can be improvement in the academic analyses of the legislative process.

This assembly has accepted as a basic assumption the view that recent reform and modernization of the rules and procedures of the Congress have had a beneficial and constructive legislative consequence and that additional reforms will follow. Nevertheless, the further strengthening of legislatures cannot be dealt with by procedural changes alone. In improving the quality and efficiency of the Congress we recognize that in the final analysis it depends on a rising caliber of candidates elected to serve in the Congress.

We have noted a new interrelationship between the executive and legislative branches which has come about as a consequence of the industrial, technological, and social development of our society.

We have rejected the assumption that there is a cause and effect relationship—a necessary plus and minus interplay—which mandates that a strong executive will be master of a weak legislature, or that a strong Congress must repel the legislative advances of a President. The modern interplay between the executive and legislative branches has given the executive increased influence over the process of initiating and shaping legislation. Nevertheless, the Congress in recent years has in fact exercised more initiative than the public thinks, and the critics admit.

If the executive branch has moved dramatically into legislative matters, the legislative branch has had its own development evidenced by multiple functions which may be categorized as investigative, legislative, review, and oversight constituent service, and educative.

This assembly believes the absence of strict party discipline in legislative matters is not a threat to our representative system as some have argued. Ours is not a small nation; we are a complex society in which majorities shift and political alinements regroup in ways that may be more responsive to the public will than to a party platform. We make our recommendations from the point of view that this recurring regrouping is a truly constructive response to the needs of our complex and heterogenous society.

It should also be pointed out that the absence of strict party discipline has the additional merit of permitting the individual to vote according to his intelligence and conscience.

This assembly commends those Members of Congress who have long been striving to create a mechanism within Congress to achieve congressional reform and welcomes the establishment of the Joint Committee on Organization of Congress. While the limitations of its scope are regrettable, the provision for action on many problems and a forum for discussion of congressional procedures is a useful step toward making Congress a more effective body.

With these general convictions in mind, this assembly:

1. Applaudes the steps taken by the House at the initiation of the Democratic majority at the beginning of the 89th Congress in (a) restoring, the 21-day rule and giving the Speaker increased discretion therewith; (b) removing the requirement of unanimous consent to send a bill to conference and curtailing the power of the Rules Committee to kill a bill by denying a rule. We recommend that these actions be continued in future Congresses.

2. Applauds (a) the decision of the Democratic caucus to review all committee assignments; (b) the decision of the Republican conference in the Senate to amend the seniority rule by permitting junior Members a wider share of major committee assignments; (c) action by the Republican House Members accomplishing positive improvements in their organization and procedures. We recommend that these actions be continued in future Congresses.

This assembly recommends:

3. Each House should develop uniform committee rules assuring control by a mamajority of members and insuring adequate professional staff.

4. Legislative hearings, particularly appropriations hearings, should be held in open rather than executive session, except where national security is involved.

5. Diligent and conscientious efforts should be made to strengthen congressional machinery and procedures aimed at making possible an integrated approach to fiscal and monetary policies.

6. Diligent and conscientious efforts should be made to strengthen congressional machinery and procedures aimed at giving the Congress sufficient information in the areas of foreign policy and national security to enable the Congress better to discharge its constitutional responsibilities in these areas.

7. Except where otherwise provided by law, Congress should not agree to respond within a stipulated period of time to a legislative proposal from the executive branch.

8. Congress should divest itself of its special legislative role vis-a-vis the District of Columbia and grant home rule to the District.

9. In order to provide more time for matters of national importance Congress should consider divesting itself of responsibility for appointments to the service academies, confirmation of postmasterships, and consideration of matters involved in private immigration bills and small claims legislation.

10. Members of Congress should be provided with adequate staff assistance to aid them in the analysis and evaluation of pending legislation. Toward this end, consideration should be given, among other things, to providing each Member with one legislative assistant for each legislative committee on which he serves.

11. The travel allowance for each Member of Congress should be increased to 12 round trips to his district annually and 12 additional trips should be made available for members of his staff.

12. Adequate allowances should be provided for maintenance of congressional district field offices, and greater differentials in terms of allowance should be provided for those who represent distant and/or populous States. This recommendation is made with the view that it is clearly much more expensive to maintain good communications with a congressional district that is at greater distance than with one close at hand, and more expensive, particularly in the Senate, to represent the populous States. Present recognition of this difference in the cost of communicating with a constituency is inadequate.

13. To help meet constantly increasing costs of campaign financing and to broaden the base of public support of campaigns for office, a $10 tax credit provision or a $100 deduction should be applied to contributions made to a candidate for election to the Congress or his designated campaign committee. A central Federal registry should be established with full powers to obtain full reports of all spending in primary and general election campaigns for Federal offices. Ceilings on spending in Federal elections should be revised to realistic levels.

14. Adequate annual public disclosure of the assets and income of all Members of the Senate and House and their immediate families should be required. The same regulation should also be applied to all candidates for the Senate and the House of Representatives.

15. The 2-year term for Members of the House of Representatives has our endorsement and should not be changed.

PARTICIPANTS

Albert E. Abrahams, executive director, Republicans for progress, Washington, D.C.

Col. Daniel J. Andersen, lawyer, Trustee Gettysburg College, Washington, D.C.

Grover L. Angel, dean, College of General Studies, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Member of Congress, Ohio.

Mrs. Robert Low Bacon, civic leader, Washington, D.C.

Louis H. Bean, economic and political analyst, Arlington, Va.

John H. Beidler, legislative director, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C.

Ralph E. Becker, general counsel to John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts, Washington, D.C.

Andrew J. Biemiller, director, Department of Legislation, AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C.

Kurt Borchardt, legal counsel, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Wayne W. Bradley, director of administration, National Republican Congressional Committee, Washington, D.C.

Harold F. Bright, associate dean of faculties, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

David S. Brown, professor of public administration, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

John Anthony Brown, Jr., vice president and dean of faculties, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Millard C. Browne, chief editorial writer, Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y.

The Very Reverend Edward B. Bunn, S.J., chancellor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C

Charles [illegible] legislative assistant to Senator SALTO[illegible], U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Charles W. Cole, professor of American literature, dean of the summer sessions, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Clarence E. Deakins, Acting Director, Division of Student Financial Aid, Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

Robert G. Dixon, Jr., professor of law, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

John A. Gosnell, general counsel, National Small Business Association, Washington, D.C.

Harold P. Green, professor of law, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Daniel S. Greenberg, news department, Science magazine, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, D.C.

Ernest Griffith, dean, School of International Service, the American University, Washington, D.C.

D. B. Hardemann, legislative assistant, democratic whip, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Brooks Hays, Arthur T. Vanderbilt professor of government, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.; consultant to the President of the United States, the White House, Washington, D.C.

John W. Holton, Federal legislative counsel, The American Bankers Association, Washington, D.C.

Stephen Horn, legislative assistant to U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Washington, D.C.

Harold H. Hutson, provost and executive vice president, the American University, Washington, D.C.

Roger W. Jones, special assistant to the director, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C.

William T. Kendall, administrative assistant to Representative Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, Washington, D.C.

James Jackson Kilpatrick, editor, the Richmond News Leader, Richmond, Va.

Wolfgang H. Kraus, professor of political science, acting chairman of department of political Science, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Hugh L. LeBlanc, professor of political science, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Lord Lindsay of Birker, professor of Far Eastern studies, the American University, Washington, D.C.

Richard L. Lyons, reporter, the Washington Post, Washington, D.C.

Neil MacNeil, chief congressional correspondent, Time magazine, Washington, D.C.

Carl Marcy, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Martin A. Mason, dean, School of Engineering and Applied Science, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Arnold Mayer, legislative representative, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen (AFL–CIO), Washington, D.C.

Louis H. Mayo, dean, Graduate School of Public Law, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Gardiner C. Means, economic consultant, Vienna, Va.

Arthur S. Miller, professor of law, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Benjamin R. Miller, director, Industrial Relations Department, American Trucking Associations, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Lambert H. Miller, general counsel, National Association of Manufacturers, Washington, D.C.

CHARLES A. MOSHER, Member of Congress, Ohio.

Peter P. Muirhead, Associate Commissioner for Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

Micah H. Naftalin, legislative liaison officer, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Clifford P. Nelson, president, the American Assembly, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Neal R. Peirce, political editor, Congressional Quarterly Service, Washington, D.C.

Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, and Assistant Secretary of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Oliver A. Peterson, visiting professor and acting director, Program for Overseas and International Labor, School of International Service, the American University, Washington, D.C.

George W. Petrie, director of university relations, computer science, International Business Machines Corp., White Plains, N.Y.

William G. Phillips, staff director, Democratic study group, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Ralph E. Purcell, visiting professor of political science, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Vincent P. Rock, director, Program of Policy Studies in Science and Technology, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Richard P. Sanger, editor of the editorial page, Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Wilmington, Del.

William K. Selden, executive director, National Committee on Accrediting; (July 1) vice president, the American Assembly, Washington, D.C.

Robert P. Sharkey, professor of economic history, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Jouett Shouse, trustee, Tufts University Civic Education Center, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Joy R. Simonson, chairman, Alcoholic Beverage Control Board, District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

Julian H. Singman, partner in law, Landis, Cohen & Singman, Washington, D.C.

George T. Smith, speaker, House of Representatives, Legislature of the State of Georgia, Atlanta, Ga.

G. Kerry Smith, executive secretary, Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

Harold E. Snyder, director, the International Affairs Seminar of Washington, Washington, D.C.

Kathryn H. Stone, member, Virginia House of Delegates, the Virginia General Assembly, Arlington, Va.

Lewis L. Strauss, rear admiral, U.S. Naval Reserve (retired), former Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Brandy Station, Va.

Mrs. Robert J. Stuart, president, League of Women Voters of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Miss Pauline Tompkins, general director, American Association of University Women, Washington, D.C.

Leo S. Tonkin, executive director, District of Columbia Commissioners' Advisory Council on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

Charles C. Turner, executive vice president, Stillman College, Tuscaloosa, Ala.

Kent Watkins, staff director, Subcommittee on Standing Rules, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Donald A. Webster, minority economist, Joint Economic Committee, Washington, D.C.

Elmer D. West, executive secretary, Joint Graduate Consortium, Washington, D.C.

Sam Zagoria, member, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C.

Naive Professors Can Hurt Freedom's Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Americans have become concerned once again of the activities on many college campuses across the country. Student demonstrations and teach-ins are taking place in increasing numbers.

Students and faculty alike claim academic freedom and freedom of speech as open license for expressing their views. Every American, from President Johnson down, supports the rational exercise of these rights. Some, however, apparently ignore the warnings of history which has clearly demonstrated the result of the abuse of these rights.

In particular regard to U.S. foreign policy, some professors have been speaking out against a strong position taken by our Government. They apparently see wisdom in weakness. There are those who go so far as to say we should sit by and permit a Communist takeover of a major part of the world. The irony of their position has apparently escaped them, but it places them in support, but exercising their freedom of speech and opposition here at home, of the enslavement of additional millions of people. And those so enslaved will not have the right of free speech, or assembly, or opposition to their Communist masters.

The Jacksonville Times-Union, leading north Florida newspaper, recently commented on the dangers of the activities of some college professors and their naive view of the world today.

I insert this editorial at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union, May 13, 1965]

NAIVE PROFESSORS CAN HURT FREEDOM'S CAUSE

It will be interesting to see what happens to Dr. Arthur Larson, special consultant on world peace matters to President Lyndon Johnson, now that he has blasted this country's foreign policies in Vietnam.

Dr. Larson, director of the Rule of Law Research Center at Duke University, joined with his brother, Don, a political science professor at Duke, to publish a booklet which hailed U.S. policy as "out of date, transparent and naive."

What will be most interesting, however, is to hear the two Duke teachers define exactly what they mean when they talk about world peace. The reason for this is that they are advocating the abandonment to the Communists of all small, economically poor lands with few natural resources.

Under the Larson plan for "selective containment" of the Communists, only highly industrialized lands like Japan and Germany would be defended by the United States against the Reds.

Red propagandists should have a field day with the two teachers' dissent. Copies of the proposal will undoubtedly be obtained and reproduced by the Communists in every

poor, little nation in the world with emphasis placed on the fact that Dr. Larson is a Presidential adviser. The results are almost predictable.

Other copies of the proposal will probably be circulated through the so-called nonalined nations to prove that U.S. actions in Vietnam are not supported by even the President's advisers. It would seem that the Duke professors are the naive people in this situation.

Domestically President Johnson answered the professors when he said: "We would rather men quarrel with our action to insure peace than curse us through all eternity for inaction."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

International Crossroads Sunday Morning Breakfast Organization Celebrates Its 19th Anniversary—Paul Brindle Provides Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the 19th anniversary of the International Crossroads Sunday morning breakfast at the Central YMCA in Washington was held on May 2. It was the 991st consecutive weekly breakfast session of this group in extending hospitality and appreciation to 16,853 persons from 127 countries and geographical areas, who have met and passed at the Crossroads.

This interesting activity of person-to-person contacts has great significance because the visitors from abroad are comprised largely of students and other selected young men who may rise to positions of leadership in their countries. It is important that they understand our attitude toward personal freedom during their visit to Washington and the United States.

The attendance at the sessions is usually between 50 and 60 persons of which an average of 17 attend for their first time. The groups are addressed by distinguished speakers. Members from both Houses of the Congress and men of the professions and of education have supported the effort by speaking. The talks cover a wide range of subjects and are frequently followed with questions.

This venture is carried forward on a voluntary basis by the many forward-looking individuals who have cooperated, with the major responsibility falling to the committee of dedicated persons. The organizer and chairman is Paul L. Brindle, a Washington attorney, who devotes most of his time to this program. He is truly a citizen of the world through his kindly touch with so many wayfarers.

It is a laudable practice of this committee to maintain contact by correspondence with the visitors after they have returned to their homes. Active contact is being maintained with about 2,000 visitors abroad. Many of these have sent cards, letters, or other messages to the 19th anniversary. One former visitor, Prof. Dr. Frederick W. von Rauchhaupt, professor of space law at the University of Heidelberg, planned his trip to be present personally on this occasion.

The good will and kindly response on behalf of these former visitors is reassuring and contributes to better understanding toward peace, freedom, and progress in the world today. It is for these reasons that I desire to bring these encouraging indications to your attention.

A considerable portion of the anniversary session was given to the messages from abroad. William L. Robinson, an official of the American Automobile Association, was the narrator and he was assisted by 14 visitors from nine other countries.

Extractions which follow are representative of a larger number of the thoughts, hopes and aspirations of our friends all over the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these extractions be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extractions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Jacques Guerin-Desjardins, psychologist, Paris: "Your steadiness of purpose, your devotion to the work you have undertaken, are most inspiring. I have suggested to the central Paris YMCA to study the possibility of organizing something similar. It cannot be exactly the same thing (as breakfast in France is a small and very quick meal); but the idea underlying the plan may be a 'sister idea' to yours. Thanks for all you do to bring friendship and understanding between people and nations."

V. R. Katre, of Lakheri, India: "Our country is vast with a population (440 million) which has yet to know the real meaning of freedom, and the one man (Nehru) who was perhaps doing the service of educating his people is no more. But as the saying goes—'time and tide wait for no man'—we have to go ahead. * * * You have taken on yourself a real goal in the ICSMB—the universal brotherhood—and this objective will have to be carried on and on like a wheel revolving. People will meet and part, carrying with them an everlasting impression—as I am carrying with me."

Olindo Parachini, national secretary, YMCA, Rome, Italy: "It is with sincere pleasure that I send you my best wishes for the 19th anniversary of the crossroads breakfast. * * * Your idea should be spread among many more YMCA's, as for a foreign traveler it is a blessed experience to be personally invited to a friendly meeting like the crossroads breakfast, thus emerging from the uncomfortable feeling of loneliness that one inevitably finds in a large city."

N. W. Yang, of the Taiwan Sugar Corp., at Taipei, China: "It really gave me an impressive experience to participate in the breakfast sessions. I think this is one of the best ways to cultivate mutual understanding worldwide. * * * I wish to extend my hearty thanks for your entertainment rendered me during my stay in Washington."

Roy Palmer, Bristol, England: "How glad I was, like so many others, to receive your letter of January 24, together with the activities report for 1964. * * * You certainly are the center of the world these days, and your country bears a heavy burden in its responsibilities in endeavoring to maintain world freedom and peace. How much we all long for these and how high the cost you are now paying in working to this end. Once it was the headache of the British Empire, but the Empire has gone, but not all our troubles, though we are fighting hard to survive in a new sphere, if we can but produce a few more Churchills. * * * It only remains for me to wish you health and strength to continue in your good deeds and to express the hope that, some day, I may have the pleasure of meeting you again."

Gunnar Jansson, director, International Centre Castle Mainau, Germany: "It is certainly a wonderful work you are doing with your international crossroads Sunday morning breakfasts and every time I receive your annual report, I am amazed at the great scope of interests you cover and the number of outstanding personalities that you are able to get as speakers and, above all, you are doing a fine service in bringing together so many men from all parts of the world. * * * May I use this opportunity to send to your annual meeting a greeting from another international crossroad; namely, the International Centre Castle Mainau. This center is situated at a real crossroad: we are living on an island in the Lake of Constance on the German side but we look over to Switzerland every day and several times a week we also cross the frontier and go into this country. Not far away is Austria, and going westwards it is not so very far to France. On this island thousands of tourists every summer come from all parts of Europe and from other continents to admire the real international mixture of trees and flowers which are planted on this island. We have cedars from Lebanon and Himalaya and banana trees from Africa, Hibiscus from Brazil and Emperor's trees from Japan, and mammut trees from California. * * * In the castle on the island there is also the international center run by the world alliance of the YMCA where every year about 1,500 people from, last year, 32 nations come together for consultations and fellowship. * * * In this international cooperation year it is good to be reminded of all the forces which are at work in different parts of the world to overbridge antagonism between nations and individuals and to remind ourselves that in reality we are brothers and sisters in spite of nation, language, color, creed and other distinctions that may separate people. May God bless your work in future years."

Dr. M. Camitan Magboo, hospital medical director and member of the national board of the Philippines YMCA: "The tremendous task that you have been handling in promoting world understanding and mutual respect among the nations of the world is reflected by the diversified topics and personalities in your International Crossroads Sunday breakfast. You have kept alive the interest of your inspiring work by communicating with us religiously and sending us the subjects in your breakfast meetings, serving us food for thought. In the Philippines the idea has caught fire for we have several breakfast meetings of different groups * * *. Wishing you and the ICSMB continued success."

Philippe Gallet, fontaine les Gres, France: "I shall never forget the breakfast that I had in Washington a few days before my return to Europe. It was a great pleasure for me to meet the friends who were there. I have since spent 1 year outside of France. I was in Djibouti for my military service but I have never lost contact with the breakfast. I correspond with another friend of the ICSMB, Jacques Dunselman of the Netherlands."

J. C. J. Dunselman, correspondent in Holland: "The idea of corresponding with other breakfast members works out all right. Jim Oungre and Philippe Gallet of France, have

become my friends. I am wondering if more breakfast members are writing each other. The breakfast meetings are the start of international understanding and not only a nice breakfast party."

Dr. Alan G. Maclaine, educator, Australia: "Over the past several years I have seen the Sunday morning breakfast go from strength to strength and the number of participants makes an impressive total. I trust that God will give you long life, strength and faith to continue this good work. I feel that these weekly sessions are contributing significantly to a common realization of the brotherhood of man. * * * I hope that the life members, coming as they do, from almost every country in the world today, will constitute everywhere a fellowship of faith in humanity which transcends the manmade barriers of country, color, class, or creed."

Ghanem Q. Mohammed, a language student, Iraq: "The International Crossroads Sunday breakfast was very impressive to me and I was so delighted because of my attending it. This meeting where we spoke and made dear friends from many other countries was very interesting to me."

Liang, Hsing-Yi, Taiwan, China: "It was lucky for me that I took part in the International Crossroads breakfast, where I made the acquaintance of many new friends. I will never forget the real welcome and the useful maps. These meetings are a help to travelers, in my circumstances, to help people to understand one another and to develop friendship built from this contact."

Henry Rank, British Columbia, Canada: "Your circular letter of the 24th ult., reminded me of something I should have done quite a long time ago; i.e., to thank you very much * * * I rejoice with you in the fact that there are many good people in the world—they are the salt of the earth—but I could add: there is not one too many."

Toshihiko Suzuki, electrical engineer—graduate student at Westinghouse, Japan: "Many changes have happened since I wrote you last year, and it seems hard for me to write all of these. But I would like to tell you some of these which may interest you. * * * First, baby Kimiko was born last September 18. She is now 7 months old and becoming lovely day after day. Sawako, first daughter is 2½ years old. We are all quite well and enjoy our life very much. * * * Second, last June I got another promotion in my company and now working at Kyoto branch office of Kansai Electric Power Co., as an underground distribution section foreman. What we do is to construct underground distribution line in Kyoto City and its suburbs. Eight engineers make our section and I sometimes talk about your International Crossroads Sunday morning breakfast, of its wonderful performances to know and understand each other through friendship and hospitality. The scale of your meeting is very large as its members are scattered all over the world. While our section has only eight people and seems very small meeting—but it has the same kind of difficulty in our small group to get together and do the best job. We need the same spirit of friendship and hospitality in our group as in yours. In Japan, most people make plan of 1 year on New Year's Day. * * * I would like to do my best in next 1 year and hope to be able to report many good news to your next anniversary again. * * * Please tell my best wishes to all of my friends all over the world."

Frank Eustance, Doncaster, England: "I appreciate my enrollment in your Sunday morning breakfast growing number of members and send hearty congratulations and good wishes for May 2, 1965. May the movement go from strength to strength in its good work in bringing together representatives from many nations and encouraging them to meet in friendship and common understanding and respect. In these days of distruct between nations on the part of those in high places any movement to encourage mutual respect and understanding is to be encouraged."

Nirode Ranjan Das Gupta, of Calcutta, India: "When the report reaches me, it reminds me and I feel once again, along with you in the meeting of Crossroads an international exchange for good will, understanding and comfort for life. I still fervently cherish the occasion, and the report is the link that binds me ever strongly—revealing ideas, purpose, and values of life."

Dr. Ugo M. Colombo, director of public assistance, Milan, Italy: "Every year you call on me for the anniversary celebration. It is, indeed, very significant to recognize that everywhere in the world there are spiritual forces, as we are, which are devoted to the supermacy of common ideals: peace with honor, freedom with dignity and justice for any human being."

Dr. M. J. Meimandi-Nejad, professor of plant ecology and dean of students, faculty of agriculture, Karaj, Iran: "Every bit of experience I gained while attending lectures sponsored by the ICSMB in the Washington WMCA between 1950 and 1954, during my academic career, has been fruitful not only for my person but rather for the benefit of students with whom I work."

From J. McInnes, a Scot residing in England: "I had a 3-week trip round the eastern part of the United States and arrived in Washington on the 20th of November 1964, and breakfasted with you on the 22d of November. * * * The democratic idea—the resolving of conflicts without warfare or suppression, is a hope. My country, Great Britain, demonstrates this in the uniting of old enemies—Scotland and England. Your country demonstrates it—the Union of 50 States, which are as 50 countries on a European scale. It may take some hundreds of years before the world is united in this way. So keep giving everybody who comes to your breakfast copies of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America, that they can take with them the idea of 'peace with freedom' to all quarters."

Dr. J. B. Barclay, department of extramural studies, University of Edinburgh: "Your letter of 24th of January 1965, duly arrived to remind me of that room at Washington, D.C., where the breakfast is held and its international flavor. * * * The signpost at the crossroads shows pleasant and attractive roads to the right and left already made and easy to negotiate. The signpost straight on shows a track, rough, unmade and difficult, almost an obstacle course which we have to tame with our bulldozers of idealism, charity, faith, and sympathy where we may all live in peace, plenty, and friendship within our own frontiers and in our relations with one another * * *. All best wishes to everyone."

V. O. de Alwis Gunawardane, manager, publishing department, the Associated Newspapers of Ceylon: "These last 4 years were years of tension and uncertainty in Ceylon; and the symbol of the Crossroads breakfast was nearly manifested here in its opposite or negation, meaning, crossroads or parting of the ways. * * * We have now a new government, enlightened and competent to serve the people in the democratic ways of life. * * * This turn of the wheel is final; and the clutch of the will of the people allows no more turns to the left. * * * So it is that I write to you as a freeman in a free country rejoicing with a free people on this occasion of the meeting of free and independent travelers of the earth."

John R. MacKay, newspaperman at Victoria Park, and now secretary of the YMCA, Perth, Australia: "It was a great delight to receive your annual communication last week. My attendance at your breakfast left me with a lasting impression of the fellowship and human relations engendered in that room. * * * Two years ago, as reported to you at the time, a number of us in Perth ate breakfast at the very moment you would have been sitting in Washington, D.C. (This meant bacon and eggs at 8:30 in the evening.) We will do this again this year. We will be thinking of you and we would like to know that you are also with us in spirit."

Robert H. Binney, engineering student at Churchill College, Cambridge: "Although it was last July that I had the pleasure of your hospitality at the ICSMB, in many ways it was only yesterday that I was in Washington. Now with its successful completion, my trip to the States provides many stories and the introduction I have had thereby to American life and people is an invaluable assist to a greater understanding of the role of Britain and America in the world today and of the closeness of the ties that connect them. I sincerely hope that when time and money permit I shall be able to return to your wonderful country and renew the friendships I made, not least on that Sunday morning in Washington."

Prof. Esteban A. De Ocampo, chairman, Department of History, University of the East, Manila: "I am certainly glad to note the growth and expansion of your brainchild, which is a unique organization of worldwide dimensions for the simple reason that its members hail from every region and clime of our planet. The mutual understanding and good will and the genuine spirit of brotherhood and friendship that characterize each Sunday morning breakfast gathering are of inestimable value in helping bring about the one-world idea, which is so necessary in these days of tensions and conflicting ideologies."

Dr. Arunendu Sarkar, research and teaching in chemistry, India: "It is a pleasure to become associated with the ICSMB, an organization which stands for the cause of extending brotherhood throughout the world. As an Indian and as a Hindu I am happy to come in contact with an organization whose goal is also the same as that of Hinduism i.e., the universal brotherhood. The mutual understanding between the people of the world is an urgent necessity of the day and I believe this organization plays a great role for the same."

E. G. Peters, educator, Germany: "I always remember such a great day when I was in Washington in summer 1958, and I was very happy leaving that meeting as a life member of the worldwide Young Men's Christian Association. * * * May the newcomers also leave Washington with the feeling of the common bond of brotherhood of this association."

Juan Cortez, television writer and producer, London: "My best wishes to all and my thoughts will be at the anniversary breakfast on Sunday next. May I quote from Longfellow's 'The Lighthouse'? 'Be mine to guard this light from all eclipse—Be yours to bring man nearer to man.' "

Alvaro Molano Cano, aviation, Barranquilla, Colombia: "Only one in my situation can appreciate the feeling of sadness because I am unable to be with you on May 2, when you commemorate another anniversary. With the assistance of the Divine Being, I wish all kinds of success to you. To His care I am commending all of you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend to me. I am sending the flag of my country as a contribution to this anniversary."

Heinz Gechter, director, American division, Carl Duisberg Society, Germany: "Please do not conclude that we have lost contact—only the line is busy. * * * Enclosed with this little letter is our program brochure. If you know of any young men interested in coming to Germany to work and to study, we would be happy to receive their application just on your recommendation. If you know

so many, I'll send you more pamphlets on request. Happy anniversary."

William V. Barker, British Government Service, London: "It is something to remember from my short visit, the assembly of brothers and one or two sisters, too, who take the trouble to leave materialism and the rat race (as it seems in the big cities of industry) to feel the affection and love and the words of pleasure and enjoy them for a few golden moments. And to experience the opportunity to stand still in time as it were and take stock of ourselves and relate ourselves to the greater world of life, knowledge, and activity which seems to come closer to us in the conditions you have created and prepared for us each Sunday morning over so many years."

Herman Buys, attorney, Suriname: "I wish I could join you again. I have been very happy in your company and I wished we could establish such a center in this country. The time is not yet ripe, but let's hope for the future."

P. B. Murphy, Department of Atomic Energy, India: "The potency of an idea is no longer questioned. Since the infancy of our civilization, ideas have flourished to usher in a better understanding world. Paradoxically, even good ideas permeate sluggishly making for martyrs now and then. Nevertheless, noble ideas are welcome as they tend to uplift human thought and endeavor. Sooner or later, they should pervade and unite us all in mighty global bonds. * * * You have set the ball of international brotherhood rolling at the international crossroads."

China: The Arguments for a New Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been sobered by the events in Asia in the last year. The Communist Chinese have exploded their second atomic bomb, and it is clear that Asia is a much different place from the Asia of 15, 10, or even 5 years ago. In this light, we must reevaluate our policy toward the two Chinas.

The American Friends Service Committee performed a great public service recently by conducting an excellent discussion of the issues by eminent teachers and students of Asian problems.

I have, therefore, asked unanimous consent that a summary of the conference deliberations, which appeared in the Providence Sunday Journal for May 9, 1965, appear in the RECORD:

CHINA: THE ARGUMENTS FOR A NEW POLICY

(By Lewis W. Wolfson)

"China and the United States seem now to be on a collision course, with rather little time left * * * our chief danger is that our national posture may get out of balance.

"Much as in judo, if we push unwisely in one direction only, relying on one kind of power and neglecting others, we may find ourselves overextended and get tripped up."—Prof. John K. Fairbank, director, East Asian Research Center, Harvard University.

WASHINGTON.—There are serious men here who believe that the U.S. policy of isolating Communist China has succeeded mainly in isolating the United States from China—as well as from other nations with different views—and that it is time to give it up.

They are willing to bet that such a new departure would deprive China of its best card in the game, and they are saying that the current high degree of Chinese belligerence is, in effect, the best argument for a new turn in American foreign policy.

China, according to this view, yearns for the prestige and authority of a great power but acts in the world with the irresponsibility of some minor underdeveloped nation.

Seize the initiative from her with a sweeping new approach, the argument goes, and she no longer will have the easy advantage of profiting from instability in the world and, instead, will find world responsibilities thrust upon her.

CONFERENCE

This view was put forward at an unusual 2-day National Conference on the United States and China held here a week ago. Although the conference was apparently not a sounding board for any changes in administration policy, a device sometimes practiced here, it had considerable respectability.

The conference was planned nearly 6 months ago, before the escalation of the war in Vietnam, and thus the organizers were more than worried about the timing. But no rightwing groups picketed it, no bearded radicals tried to seize the spotlight, a few notable administration officials participated and 600 to 700 professors, teachers, students, women from civic organizations, and a sprinkling of embassy officials, journalists, and clergy made up an enthusiastic audience.

Two Senators spoke at one of the luncheons, and a total of about 50 Congressmen attended breakfasts held for them on both mornings of the conference.

Prof. Robert Scalapino, chairman of the political science department at the University of California, summed up the conference theme as follows:

"The U.S. policy of containment by isolation can never be successful."

The idea, he went on, is rather to force the Chinese to make more and more big decisions on the critical issues of our time. From this will come doubts about how simple the world is, necessitating a more cautious foreign policy.

"They will resist this. Isolation helps totalitarian policy. They like our policy just as it is. They don't want us to change it. They feel they have a better chance of isolating us than we them."

But how can the United States possibly take any course other than the current one of military containment when that country pursues such an aggressive foreign policy?

Nearly every nonadministration speaker at the conference insisted that the United States had painted itself into a corner with its narrow official view and its narrow policy of trying to isolate China.

Of course, at this conference, which was run by the American Friends Service Committee and sponsored by Georgetown and American Universities, there were some politically naive, gratuitous or absurdly total denunciations made of United States China policy.

These had a variety of grounds: The United States had been unmoral, or it had forced the Chinese to a policy of hostility, or it had fallen into a false view of the Chinese Communists because of blind support of the Nationalists, clinging to the myth of their return to the mainland.

HARDER VIEW

But a more hardheaded view also was put forward.

Professor Fairbank of Harvard stated:

"With the Russians we have found that wholehearted national attitudes of fear and hate are a luxury we can no longer afford in the nuclear age. Now that China is beginning to be a nuclear power, our 15-year mutual antagonism may become undesirably dangerous."

How do you put them on the defensive? Or, to put it in terms of the less pragmatic variant heard in the conference, how do you "achieve understanding between peoples"?

The theme that pervaded the conference was open up the lines, even unilaterally if necessary, and put the onus psychologically on the Chinese.

Some, though not all, of the experts expressed a warning that military pressure must also be kept on to convince China that the United States is no paper tiger. Denied the option of aggressiveness, they said, China may then have to turn a softer policy line.

Mr. Scalapino summed it up by saying that the United States must stick to a policy of military firmness but that "important from our standpoint is the kind of psychological, political stance we take.

"Now is the time to say we will trade, exchange scholars, under certain conditions accept you in the United Nations."

Even, he said, take the initiative on the real sticking point of Sino-American policies, the continued existence of an independent Chinese Government on Taiwan.

The United States should continue to make it clear to Peiping that it cannot annex Taiwan, that we shall not allow it, but at the same time say to the Communists, "let all the people of Taiwan make the final choice for themselves."

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, told the Conference, "As long as we treat China like an international outlaw, we cannot be surprised if she reacts by scorning our standards and judgments. Through greater contact with other nations, it would be far more difficult for Communist China to act as a law unto itself."

The more outspoken participants in the Conference insisted that the United States had nothing to lose by taking such an initiative.

A report by the sponsoring American Friends Service Committee, for example, called "A New China Policy," said this: "We do not know whether China would stop its virulent attacks on the intentions and the good faith of the United States if the United States accorded China the normal courtesies of international relations, but we do know that China is not likely to change if we do not."

Other acknowledged varying degrees of risk—especially to the current war effort and morale in southeast Asia—but saw such offers as tossing the ball to the Chinese in the eyes of peoples they are as anxious to court as we are.

REBUFFS

It is, of course, always easier to take potshots at the policymakers than it is to take on the responsibility of making policy, especially when it must be meshed, as it must be currently, with military moves.

Every one of the previous points has been made and looked over before both inside and outside of government circles.

Officially, all have been put down as offers that would be unrealistic in the light of U.S. commitments to other countries in Asia, or exercises in futility, or, at best, gestures which might be used another day but would be ill-timed now.

When a reporter approached a knowledgeable Government official here and asks, why aren't we doing more about China, the result usually goes something like this:

He is shamed into acknowledging that a number of bright, thoughtful people in the White House and State Department, who are just as enlightened as all the academic and journalistic China experts, have devoted a good deal of attention to trying to answer the question.

But then he is told that the intransigence of the Chinese leaders thwarts any approach. Every trial balloon has been shot down. A surplus food offer? No. The beginnings of trade? No. Visits by journalists? First, yes, then no.

And look what happened, they say, when the then Assistant Secretary of State Roger Hilsman, proposed in December 1963, the open door to discussions with Red China, given certain policy changes. Vehemently rebuffed.

Change in policy is never precluded, but the Chinese have not shown the slightest interest, administration officials say.

Several experts felt that this attitude means a further locking of U.S. policy into a narrow, military posture toward China to preserve her containment. In the long run, they say, this is impossible, so something else must be tried.

Further, a number of the speakers righteously proclaimed (with variations) that "America can no longer ignore the existence of one-quarter of the world's population."

It was an oversimplification, but to be expected at a conference where those attending spoke of bringing a great nation with understandable aspirations into the family of nations. There was a great effort to counter the customary image of a menacing monolith led by unreasonable men.

STUDY RESULTS

An important motive force for the conference was a thorough survey released last December which found that 28 percent of the 1,500-person select sample did not know that Communists ruled mainland China.

But it found that of those who did know, 71 percent favored a discussion of mutual problems with the Chinese Communists, 73 percent favored exchanges, 51 percent diplomatic recognition and 43 percent sale of things like wheat.

There neither was, nor is, evidence that more Americans would rather ignore China than would want to understand it.

THREE ASPECTS OF CHANGE

Opening up the lines in three policy areas is most talked about by the idea men on China policy. These areas are seating in the United Nations, trade, and the lifting of the travel ban along with the promoting of exchanges of newsmen, scholars, and professional men, and of all kinds of information.

U.N. RECOGNITION

For 16 years the United States has kept Red China out of the U.N. and kept Nationalist China's permanent seat on the Security Council as one of five big powers.

The theory, expressed at the conference by Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, is that Red China could subvert the U.N. faster than the U.N. could liberalize China's policies.

"Only if they modify their hostility toward the community of nations can they really expect to play an acceptable role in that community for the benefit of themselves—and the rest of us, too," Mr. Cleveland said.

Now there is some indication China could gain membership on the next vote. There is also a question about whether she wants it.

At the conference, John K. Fairbank, director of the East Asian Research Center at Harvard, had this view:

"The argument for bringing China into the U.N. is not that we are now forced to do so nor even that we ought to, but rather that it would be our smartest move in the current situation.

"By keeping China out of the U.N. for so long we have built up a bargaining position, just as our bombing North Vietnam tries to build up a bargaining position. If we seem likely to gain more by giving up these tactical policies, we can do so."

Arthur Lall, former permanent representative of India to the U.N. had another rarely heard argument:

"There is the feeling that if China, outside the U.N., can get on fairly well—in the view of many Asian countries, very well—then why should we continue in the U.N.?

"I will not name the states I have in mind, but I can see certain other states leaving the U.N. in the foreseeable future if China continues to be virtually excluded from the organization."

TRADE

Red China now trades with more than 100 nations and its trade with non-Communist countries in 1964 totaled more than $2 billion worth of goods.

They forswear interest in trade with the United States. In turn, this country not only has had a blanket bar to China trade dating back to the Korean War, but also has tried to discourage others from trading.

Advocates of trade usually concede that there is not too much in the way of needed goods or quality that the Chinese can offer us, and that China well may turn down any proposal.

But it is the political advantage of an offer that is prized. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce calls it a move "to more effectively open channels of communication." Pragmatists say it will put the Chinese on the spot in the eyes of the world.

Said Howard R. Stephenson, executive secretary of the San Francisco Area World Trade Association:

"This trade, were it to develop, would also benefit the Chinese. It would help them build their economy. But if we really trade, the benefits to us will be greater than the benefits to them. If we believe in the competitive system, let's compete. We can't compete by maintaining a policy of economic isolation."

Said Senator MCGOVERN, who wants to sell wheat and other surplus food to the Chinese:

"Removing the political barriers around food for peace might not prompt all foreign governments, including mainland China, to admit U.S. food.

"But at least we would have taken a positive position before the world that will enhance both our moral and political capacity as a great power."

EXCHANGES

What is considered by many the first key to contact with the Chinese is to get American journalists into China.

It now stands that about 50 news outlets have approval from the State Department but are refused Chinese visas. They have tied this to a settlement of the Taiwan issue (to which nearly every strand of the web of Sino-American nonrelations is tied).

Said Robert W. Barnett, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs:

"We would like to have our people meet with the people of China. In this field of relationship, it is Peiping which is blocking the exchanges of newspapermen which many see as a needed first forward stride for wider association between our peoples."

But this has gone up and down, with periods when the State Department was against and the Chinese for. Moreover, the U.S. approval of newsmen's travel are exceptions on a general ban on travel to China and travel of Chinese here.

Break through this barrier, say the critics, and follow with exchanges of all kinds of data, and of scholars, teachers, students, business and professional men, agricultural technicians, cultural exchanges, and tourists.

Said the Friends report:

"Despite the informed dedication of many U.S. officials, governmental policy has tended to become the prisoner of public ignorance and prejudice.

"Our first policy changes ought to be devised to assure that our public information about China will be greatly increased, so that subsequent policy changes can be based on the public understanding that has been lacking for many years."

Frederick Nossal, a correspondent for the Toronto Globe & Mail who served in China called for an eye-catching challenge:

"Offer aid, surplus grain, agricultural experts. Start a vast propaganda offensive. Open the U.S. universities to Chinese students, including Communists, and offer them courses in Marxism * * *

"We have the means but so far have lacked the will to move ahead much faster if we are to achieve progressive results."

"Congress Should Vote Like L.B.J. Did"—Keep Right-To-Work Legislation as It Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD a most informative and persuasive editorial from the Daily Argus-Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. The editorial deals with the coming legislative battle on section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, and I present an eloquent plea for the right of the States to determine their own legislative decisions. It quotes from President Johnson's record as a Member of Congress, and demonstrates his support at that time of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. It suggests that Mr. Johnson was right then, and is wrong now, on his approach to this type of labor legislation. It presents a convincing argument in support of section 14(b).

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, May 20, 1965]

CONGRESS SHOULD VOTE LIKE L.B.J. DID—AND KEEP CITIZENS' RIGHT TO WORK

South Dakota's constitution, like the U.S. Constitution, has a bill of rights. Section 2 of South Dakota's constitution reads:

"No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. The right of persons to work shall not be denied, or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union, or labor organization."

This was put in the South Dakota constitution by a vote of the people of this State, 93,035 to 39,257, in the 1946 election, following referral of the proposed amendment by the 1945 legislature.

This is the right-to-work law of South Dakota which President Lyndon B. Johnson wants eliminated by repeal of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations (or Taft-Hartley) Act. This section of the Taft-Hartley Act permits States to decide for themselves the question of whether or not a worker must belong to a union.

Union shop contracts requiring all workers to join the union after they are hired are legal in 31 States that do not specifically out-

law them. President Johnson's action would legalize union shop contracts in the 19 States that now forbid them.

The closed shop, requiring union membership before a man is hired, is banned in all States under Federal law. National labor legislation permits the union shop which requires a worker to join the union after he has been hired, usually within 30 days.

President Johnson, in calling for repeal of section 14(b), said he did so "with the hope of reducing conflicts in our national labor policy that for several years have divided Americans in various States."

CITIZENS VERSUS BIG LABOR

We think it will be a sad day for South Dakota and America if the mighty U.S. Government goes all the way in its aid to big labor and tells our citizens they must join a union if they are to hold a job.

Repeal of section 14(b) will not unify Americans on this issue. The provision in the Taft-Hartley Act was passed to protect the American worker from union bosses. What are they afraid of, may we ask? Why do they have to have compulsory membership, and with it, the dues of every worker in a plant, or in a business? Where are the guarantees that a worker's dues will be used for a union, and not political purposes?

South Dakota workers have a vital civil right today, guaranteed by their constitution. If President Johnson is successful in his plea to repeal the law, the workers lose that right. Union bosses would win one more round in their quest for domination of the Nation's political and economic life.

Nineteen States would see further diminution of their power in favor of Federal regulatory agencies.

Another State where workers will lose this civil right is President Johnson's home State of Texas. As a Member of the House when the Taft-Hartley Act was passed April 17, 1947, Johnson voted for passage. There was no separate vote then on section 14(b); it was one of the key features of the act.

On June 20, 1947, Johnson voted to override President Harry S. Truman's veto. Johnson was in the Senate when that body voted down an attempt to strip section 14 (b) from the law. That was June 30, 1949. Johnson voted with the majority to retain section 14(b). Now he wants to repeal it.

A POLITICAL APPEAL

We think President Johnson's call for repeal of the right-to-work section is strictly political, to make good on a 1964 campaign promise to big labor. Congress should turn it down—vote the way Johnson himself voted when he was a legislator.

We hope South Dakota's four Members of Congress will consider citizens' rights ahead of convenience and power for big labor and big government.

The President Makes a Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, newspapers across the country have indicated their support for President Johnson's policies in Vietnam and the Caribbean.

Florida newspapers have been particularly favorable. The Tampa Times has supported U.S. policy in an editorial taking particular note that the Communists can tear down but cannot build.

Too deep a devotion to ideology has handicapped Russian industry and agriculture; it has forced Peiping to deliver words instead of rice to its hungry masses; it has sent both Russia and Red China into the world market for wheat and feed grains, seeking from the capitalist surplus food to make up for the Communist deficit.

The Times reports.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in full at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Times, May 14, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT MAKES A POINT

President Johnson revealed a little told side of the South Vietnam story yesterday in a radio-television address from the White House. Most of the news coming from that battle-torn southeast Asian state has to do with war and fighting, death and suffering. Most news accounts present a picture of a country barely holding its own in a struggle against the Communist Vietcong. But the President produced facts and figures which demonstrate that despite the constant pressure from Red forces, South Vietnam has registered important gains in areas such as health, agriculture, and education.

American technical aid is daily opening new doors to a better way of life for the Vietnamese people—and it is no wonder that the Communists fear this example and are doing all in their power to retard its progress. If South Vietnam should emerge as a showcase for democracy, a land of plenty next to the hungry Communist-controlled areas, Mao Tse-tung would be hard pressed to keep his millions from revolting. They, too, would develop an appetite for the fruits of freedom.

Our investment in South Vietnam has been a large one. But it also will have been a wise one if it turns the tide against communism in this area. Since 1954, said Mr. Johnson, the United States has poured more than $2 billion into the little country. What has it bought?

The President put it this way:

Rice production has been doubled.

A new variety of sweet potato, promising a sixfold increase in yield, is being planted this year.

Corn output should rise from 25,000 tons in 1962 to 100,000 tons by 1966.

Pig production has more than doubled since 1955.

In other areas of assistance:

A medical school is being built with American aid in a country which has only 200 civilian doctors to serve a population of 16 million.

Seven million people have been vaccinated against cholera and U.S. assistance has constructed and stocked more than 12,000 hamlet health stations.

Americans have help build more than 4,000 classrooms in the last 2 years and by 1967 more than 15 million textbooks will have been supplied to Vietnamese children.

The Communists have demonstrated their fear of these programs by destroying agricultural stations, burning medical centers, murdering Vietnamese malaria fighters and capturing or killing U.S. aid officials.

Nowhere in the world can the Communists match the constructive efforts of the United States. In Cuba where Moscow and Peiping might have established a Communist showcase, there are critical shortages, a comedy of mismanagement in industry and agriculture and an educational program which deludes the young into believeing there are solutions in slogans.

The Reds can tear down but they cannot build. Too deep a devotion to ideology has handicapped Russian industry and agriculture; it has forced Peiping to deliver words instead of rice to its hungry masses; it has sent both Russia and Red China into the world market for wheat and feed grains, seeking from the capitalist surplus food to make up for the Communist deficit.

Here, then, is another reason we cannot "cut and run" from South Vietnam as some U.S. "liberals" demand. To desert these peoples and these gains and all the hope embodied in accomplishments to date would brand us as utter cowards and destroy forever all confidence in our courage of conviction and strength of determination.

Here we must stand; and here we must fight.

More important, here we must win and win decisively.

There are no other choices.

An Address by Associate Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, of the U.S. Supreme Court, on the Social Responsibility of the Churches, May 24, 1965, All Souls' Church, Unitarian, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the text of an eloquent address by the distinguished Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Arthur J. Goldberg, concerning the social responsibility of the churches and synagogs of our country.

Mr. Justice Goldberg spoke as a pulpit guest at the All Souls' Church, Unitarian, in Washington, D.C., on May 24, 1965.

The text of his address follows:

REMARKS BY HON. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, ALL SOULS' CHURCH, 16TH AND HARVARD STREETS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 23, 1965

In 1949, William Faulkner brought honor to himself and to the United States when he was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature. In his acceptance speech, he stated a conviction that I share, and that motivates men of good will the world over.

"I decline," he said, "to accept the end of man. It is easy enough to say that man is immortal simply because he will endure. * * * I refuse to accept this. I believe that man will not merely endure; he will prevail."

The triumph of man is uniquely in the keeping of religion—the informing of his spirit, the firing of his conscience, the awakening of his soul to the fact that in observing the spirit of God he is exercising the only true freedom.

But these need not be slogans on banners nor messages on wreaths laid at the feet of monuments to past and meaningless events. They need not be so incarcerated into history as to be beyond the reach of living men.

In one of the great passages of Homer, Ajax, surrounded by darkness and facing his foes, prays for light "that we may see our fate, and die at least, if such they will, in the open light of day." He does not pray for victory; he does not pray to live; he prays

for light, that he may stand to the full height of a man and we face his fate.

WE SEEK LIGHT

Today, we also seek light. We also seek it—not to avoid our problems but to face them as true men. We do not seek religion to remove our trials, to transquilize our problems—but for light, for illumination, for the true meaning of moral and ethical imperatives.

Over 63 percent of our population are members of churches. Over 114 million persons of all faiths, testifying to a greater Power, and practicing religion in their own way. Perhaps a great number of them do not realize the stakes in the world, unless the read of the recent suppressions and prosecutions of Jews in the Soviet Union, unless they hear of the closing of Catholic churches behind the Iron Curtain, unless they read of the arrest and convictions of Protestant missionaries.

Religious tolerance has become a touchstone of freedom. Where tolerence is found, there also free men dwell. Religious intolerance has become a touchstone of totalitarianism, as Hitler and Stalin demonstrated.

The history of all churches, through all ages, has demonstrated that religion must recognize its obligations as well as its rights to preach and practice moral values, or fail in its mission. This is the light that illuminates a real democratic political system. Involvement for the churches and synagogues is necessary for society—and for the churches and synagogues themselves if they are to maintain their vitality as living forces in a society whose fate will be decided by the pressing social problems of a modern age.

Socially minded churches and synagogs are guarantees that religion will be an ally, not an enemy, of democracy.

RELIGION IS FREE TO SPEAK

In our blessed land, religion is free to speak. Our Constitution expressly guarantees that there shall be no law prohibiting or impairing the right of free exercise of religion. Under our Constitution there is a wholesome neutrality by the Government toward all religions; the ideal of our Constitution as to religious freedom is one of absolute equality before the law of all religious opinions and sects; the Government, while protecting all, prefers none, and it disparages none; our constitutional policy does not deny the value or necessity for religious training, teaching, or observance; rather it secures their full exercise without helping or hindering any particular religion. Indeed, thte constitutional protections of religious tolerance were designed for a pluralistic socienty that had seen enough, and knew enough, of the devisive influence of censorship of belief in the Old World. While we share the common heritage of our beliefs, we do not give up the right to practice in the light of our own doctrines.

If we are, each of us, members of an ancient unity of belief, then I believe there is one aspect of that unity and heritage which we are bound to implement—together as men and women who share the heritage, and separately as those subscribing to different doctrine.

TO SEEK JUSTICE

Certainly, at the root of the moral and ethical doctrine of both the Old and the New Testaments is the instruction to seek justice and righteousness, to act as a person of God. All of the great prophets were deeply involved in the society of their time. Christ's Sermon on the Mount brought comfort to the poor and sorrowful. Can we, in good conscience, do otherwise? If religion is a sermon for the individual, a refuge and a shelter, its great traditions have also been stated in the words of its leaders as instruments with which to change the world, to seek justice and righteousness.

Today more than 30 million Americans are living substandard lives; 10 million children are being raised in poverty. There is not enough work, in a generally rich and productive economy, for the unskilled. The numbers of the long-termed unemployed are shockingly large; the tragedy is that among them are millions of young people who enter their adult lives without any experience of the promise of American life.

Many of our citizens are denied solely because of race or color equal protection of the laws; many others are denied the equal justice under law guaranteed by our Constitution to the rich and poor alike. I would make note, also, that in a nation of religious tradition and commitment, our public face is often profane and secular, with serious moral problems apparent in the conduct of our enterprises. We see it in businesses and in labor unions and sometimes we see it in Government also.

Now many of these problems are the proper concern of the political leadership we have entrusted with the conduct of government. Others are the proper concern of the judicial system. In neither of these areas is it appropriate for me to comment. But all of these problems are the proper concern of religion. They are a part of the ancient evils that have burdened man; it is religion's part to confront them.

THE FAILURE OF RELIGION

The failure of religion to do so is compounded by the fact that here it is free to do so. There is a neutralism between church and state in our country, but there can be no neutralism between our churches and the problems around them. The concept of religious liberty and toleration is a vote of confidence in the ability of religions to lead active, useful, even determinative roles in the making of a better world.

The new heritage of religion, here in the New World, is a return to the old heritage of involvement in the temporal condition as well as the eternal destiny of man. Ministers and rabbis and priests and the laity who stand aloof from the problems that grip individuals today are asking those individuals to stand aloof from religion.

I do not mean to suggest that our faiths have forsaken their proper roles as a matter of course. More and more, the voices of the religions are being heard—in protest and dissent as well as in commendation and counsel. Pope John XXIII's two encyclicals on world social and economic conditions and world peace are monuments of the commitment of his faith to an active role in the troubled world. The National Council of Churches has taken strong and positive positions on poverty and unemployment and discrimination. The leaders of my own faith have been vigorous advocates of equality and respect for human right. Clergymen of all faiths are participating actively in the effort to achieve civil rights for all citizens.

THE COMMITMENT OF LEADERSHIP

The problem seems to be that the commitment of leadership on the highest levels does not always penetrate to the membership of churches and synagogues—to laymen or, to put it another way, to you and to me. Yet if commitment does not penetrate, it fails to reach our lives.

Bringing religion to bear upon moral and ethical problems means helping this Nation go forward here at home—realizing the just society, defending the rights of all citizens to full citizenship, commending and supporting good legislation, speaking out on important matters, leading in the fields of equality of opportunity for all and an economic chance for every man.

And it means helping this Nation to realize its objective abroad—peace in freedom for all who seek it.

I believe that the fate of free religion in the world is part and parcel of the fate of our own Nation. The survival and success of our political ideals is crucial to the survival and success of the free religions that flourish within our borders.

RELIGION AND DEMOCRACY

Not only Judaism and democracy, not only Christianity and democracy, but religion itself and democracy have a mutual interest in this troubled world. When communism comes—whether to a Buddhist or a Moslem or a Hindu or a Christian or any other nation—religion goes.

President Kennedy described the path to freedom as a lonely one. We have no illusions about the difficulty of the road or the perils that lie along it.

But we will make that journey in good spirit. While preserving the separation of church and state in our country, we proudly assert the right of all religious groups, all churches, and synagogues, to preach what is good, and what is more important—if a layman may say so—to practice what is good.

Erie County Democrats Gain Strength Under Peter Crotty's Leadership—Continued Gains Seen Under Joe Crangle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, with the election of Joseph F. Crangle as Erie County, N.Y., Democratic chairman, I predict a new era of youthful zeal and dedication for the Democratic Party in western New York.

Joe Crangle is my personal friend and neighbor. We went to Canisius College together. He lives three doors from me in Buffalo and I have a great deal of respect and admiration for him. My wife and I are very fond of his beautiful wife and four little girls.

Joe Crangle, as a member of the new breed of political leaders of the John F. Kennedy school, will continue the tradition of seeking out and supporting only the finest type of dedicated candidates for public office.

I am happy to add my name to those who will support Joe Crangle in all measures that will add strength, vigor, and higher purpose to government. He comes to this job with impressive credentials and a willingness to face the issues squarely and intelligently.

I would also like to pay my respects to the man who built up the Democratic Party in Erie County to its majority today—Peter Crotty. A colorful, intellectually stimulating political leader, Peter Crotty led the party through an exciting and turbulent era.

In this very difficult and demanding position as county chairman, he wrote an absorbing chapter in the political history of western New York.

When he took over the reins of the party in 1954, Republicans outregistered the Democrats by more than 50,000. Today Democrats enjoy a 4,700 registered voter margin in Erie County.

Peter Crotty's fame and reputation are nationwide. Here in Washington he is acknowledged in the highest circles as one of the most astute politicians in the United States.

With his wonderful Irish wit and charm, Peter Crotty will long be remembered as one of the most engaging politicians of this generation of Americans.

Bob Williams, staff writer for the Buffalo Evening News, recently wrote an article on Joseph F. Crangle. The article appears as follows:

POLITICS, HARD WORK IN CRANGLE'S BLOOD SINCE SCHOOLDAYS

(By Bob Williams)

"The one constant thing in life," said Joseph F. Crangle, "is change."

With those words, the new chairman of Erie County Democrats explained his party's philosophy and his own rise to power as its leader.

Mr. Crangle, a 33-year-old practicing attorney who has never run for public office, took over the duties of Democratic chairman Tuesday shortly after the resignation of Peter J. Crotty, the controversial and powerful leader of Democrats here for the last 11 years.

Despite his youthful age and even more youthful appearance—he looks more like 26 than 33—Mr. Crangle tackles his new job with experience and finesse, both learned at the master's knee.

PRESIDENT OF EIGHTH GRADE CLASS

He has been Mr. Crotty's executive assistant for the last 5 years and worked closely with him even earlier.

In a statement Tuesday, Mr. Crotty said Mr. Crangle is a fine organizer. He's probably right.

As an eighth-grade pupil in Holy Spirit School, young Joe Crangle swung a class election for himself as president. Not only that, but he took along his twin sister, Betty Ann (now a nun), as vice president.

That may have been the factor that made him decide at an early age to get into politics.

At any rate, he became president of the student council in Canisius College—somehow skipping the political field in 4 years at Bishop Timon High School, from which he was graduated in 1950.

JUNE IMPORTANT MONTH

His organizational ability became apparent when, as head of the Canisius Student Council, he reorganized the method of choosing its officers.

Since only a few students were interested in holding office, he reasoned, why not set up half a dozen groups, each of which could choose an outstanding member as a candidate?

His plan was put into effect during his tenure.

A native of Buffalo, Mr. Crangle is married to the former Rita J. Henry. They live at 22 Linden Avenue in a four-bedroom two-story white frame house they bought 3 years ago this month.

June, as a matter of fact, has been an important month in Joe Crangle's life.

SERVED IN ARMY

He was born June 12, 1932, and the Democratic chairmanship—which may well lead to even bigger things in his career—came to him just 11 days before his 33d birthday anniversary.

And, of course, he was graduated from Holy Spirit, Bishop Timon, Canisius College, and the University of Buffalo Law School, traditionally, in June.

A practicing attorney since 1960, Mr. Crangle is associated with Attorneys Lester H. Block, Anthony J. Colucci, and Daniel J. Callanan, in the firm of Block, Colucci, Callanan & Crangle.

Commissioned a second lieutenant after finishing an ROTC course at Canisius, Mr. Crangle served 6 months in the Army on active duty at Fort Benning, Ga.

INTRODUCED TRUMAN

He holds the rank of captain in the U.S. Army Reserve and is assigned to the 390th Regiment.

While in school, Mr. Crangle was elected to several extracurricular offices:

Diocesan president of the Catholic Youth Organization; president of the National Council of Catholic Youth; charter member of Alpha Sigma Nu (Jesuit national honor society); DiGamma Honor Society of Canisius College.

He was president of the Canisius Alumni Association in 1955–57.

He once introduced former President Truman at a CYO meeting in St. Louis.

"One ex-president introducing another," said Joe Crangle. He was then finishing his own term.

ALWAYS WILLING TO WORK

The new Democratic boss learned long ago that contacts are helpful to a successful project. His sister, Maureen, went to St. James School with a pretty girl he remembered later on. He married the girl.

Politically, Joe Crangle is grass roots.

His first contacts with Democratic headquarters here several years ago put him to work at such volunteer tasks as mailing literature, checking voter lists, ringing doorbells and, if the occasion called for it, sweeping the floor.

He was around headquarters more than most other volunteers, and that's how he came to the attention of Mr. Crotty.

Mr. Crangle became a committeeman in the 1st district, 16th ward; director and charter member of the University District Democratic Club; member of the Democratic Lawyers Club, and Democratic chairman of the 16th ward—a post he probably will resign.

HAS FOUR DAUGHTERS

He belongs to the Knights of Columbus, Council 184; Reserve Officers Association; Erie County and New York State Bar Associations.

In the Crangle home, where he'll spend less time in the future, are four daughters, Mary Elizabeth, 5; Catherine Ann, 3; Elizabeth Ann, 2; Brigid Marie, 1.

Mr. Crangle's father was the late Edward J. Crangle. His mother, Mrs. Marguerite A. Crangle, lives with two daughters at 331 East Amherst Street.

The chairman has three brothers, John J., Edward C., and Navy Air Corps Comdr. Eugene V. Crangle; three sisters, Miss Margaret Mary Crangle; Sister Mary Denise, OSF, in Rome, Italy; Miss Maureen Crangle.

CONFIDENT OF VICTORY

With three meetings scheduled Tuesday night, Mr. Crangle took the opportunity during a short breather following luncheon with a few close friends to expound upon politics in general and Erie County politics in particular.

"The party," he said, "is not afraid of new faces, new people and new ideas. My selection as chairman exemplifies this vital characteristic."

And, naturally, he had a few words to say about the coming election. They offer no solace to Republicans.

"At the next election," he prophesied, "every elective office can be won by a Democrat."

A confident young man, Joseph F. Crangle.

LAWMAKERS GIVE CRANGLE SUPPORT

ALBANY, June 2.—Erie County's Democratic legislators have assured the new county Democratic chairman Joseph F. Crangle "of our fullest cooperation in the coming primaries and elections."

The seven assemblymen and three senators expressed their best wishes to retiring Chairman Peter J. Crotty, as well as their "gratitude for a great job of leadership."

United States Is Using More Than Guns in Vietnam War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial on May 25, 1965, the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee calls to the attention of the public the significant assistance the United States is providing in South Vietnam other than military. The editorial rightly points out that the United States is also fighting communism by attacking disease, poverty and privation, and by creating educational and medical opportunities which never existed in South Vietnam.

The editorial follows:

UNITED STATES IS USING MORE THAN GUNS IN VIETNAM WAR

President Lyndon B. Johnson has disclosed the United States is doing more than moving up guns to stem communism in South Vietnam. It is fighting communism, as well, by attacking disease, poverty and privation, and by creating educational and medical opportunities which never existed in the peasant provinces.

In his recent talk to the Nation about American policy in Vietnam, the President termed this assault as the "most important battle of them all." And it is. Communism can be stayed with guns; it can be defeated, however, only by creating the abundant life and eliminating reasons for a people to adopt such an extreme.

The President put it well when he said:

"A nation cannot be built by armed power or by political agreement. It will rest on the expectation by individual men and women that their future will be better than their past."

The American outlay in South Vietnam has been abundant. In the 11 years this Government has spent more than $2 billion for assistance. The result: Rice production has doubled; for the first time, modern agricultural methods are being introduced, albeit slowly, to that land where ancient methods have prevailed.

The United States has constructed more than 4,000 classrooms in the last 2 years alone. It intends to build thousands more in the next year. As a measure of the expanding interest in education, schools had an enrollment of but 300,000 in 1955 and today,

in the midst of deadly war, enrollment is 1.5 million.

In a direct assault against epidemics and plagues, the United States, moreover, has introduced public health programs. It has helped, for example, to vaccinate more than 7 million persons against cholera which strikes with all too monotonous regularity, and has assisted in the creation of 12,000 hamlet medical assistance stations.

These are positive programs. In the end, they could win more favor for the American effort than guns and planes and tanks, as important as these are to the immediate containment effort.

Further Amending the Reorganization Act of 1949

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4623) further amending the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me state that the question before us is not a question of partisan, political nature. The real question before us is the basic question of the separation of powers; the constitutional creation of a government composed of three equal and coordinate branches of government.

The history of the reorganization legislation and the Presidential requests for plans for reorganization, I think, are interesting in the context of this debate. The reorganization procedure goes back to approximately 1932. I might state that the original plan or the original enactment of reorganization powers in the executive did have the feature of granting this power on a permanent basis, so that there is some legislative precedent for the bill now before us for a permanent granting of this power to the President. However, it is also interesting to note that the Congress did not wait long to remedy what it considered to be the mistake of granting this on a permanent basis. Within 7 months, after the original reorganization plans were granted they took away the feature of permanency and made the limitation 2 years.

From time to time subsequent to the original enactment reorganization powers were granted, but always on a basis of having the short termination date, usually a period of 2 years. During the war years these powers were extended on an emergency basis without limitation, the only limitation being that the powers would lapse 6 months after the termination of hostilities.

The act that we are now amending is the Reorganization Act of 1949, which is the result of the activities of the Hoover Commission. At the time it was enacted, the period of time that the powers existed was specified to be 4 years.

Since that time the Congress has extended these powers at 2-year intervals and, as has been mentioned before, on one or two occasions there have been lapse periods of time when these powers were not in force.

It is also interesting to note when I mention this is not a partisan political question, but really a question between the legislative and the executive branch of Government, that three Presidents have requested that this power remain permanent; first, President Truman in 1949, then President Eisenhower in 1953, and now President Johnson in 1965.

In addition, former President Hoover recommended that these powers be made permanent. However, the Congress has been jealous of its legislative prerogative and as yet has not seen fit to grant these powers on a permanent basis.

Let us also understand that the Reorganization Act does grant legislative authority to the Executive and there have been some fine constitutional questions raised as to the power of the Congress to do so. Let me state that in my opinion, this is, and there is no question but what it is, a grant of legislative powers to the Executive. However, there can be such a grant without it being an unconstitutional grant, and I believe the reorganization powers that have been granted to the President is a constitutional grant of the legislative powers because the act itself sets the guidelines under which the President can act.

This question has not per se been decided by the Supreme Court though some related cases have been.

In effect, we are, under the reorganization procedure, reversing the legislative process. The President is given the power to promulgate legislation. The President in doing so prepares a plan of reorganization within the limits of the law, that is the Reorganization Act, and submits this to the Congress. Under this procedure, the Congress is given the ordinary executive power of veto because this is the only power that we can exercise in the reorganization procedure.

Once the Executive has filed the reorganization plan, Congress has the power of veto for a 60-day calendar period which it can exercise or not as it sees fit. We do not have the other ordinary legislative powers, the power to amend and so forth.

Some have asked, since the power to veto has been made more liberal as the years have gone by, why is it not now possible to extend the reorganization powers on a permanent basis? I think we should recall that over the years the veto process has been changed considerably. At one time to override a presidential reorganization plan required a constitutional majority of both Houses acting together in concert. Later it was made within the power of one House acting with a constitutional majority to veto a reorganization plan and most recently, and under the present law, either House of Congress, acting alone with a simple majority of those voting, can override or veto a reorganization plan.

But I point out to you that these substantive changes in the law have been tied to extensions of the power. If this power was made permanent in the President, it would then be very easy for the President to veto bills that contained such substantive changes. So that the periodic extension of the powers of this act gives the opportunity then to tie in one legislative enactment substantive changes that Congress deems necessary together with the extension, thereby giving the President a choice either of vetoing the bill and destroying his power, because the extension had not been signed into law, or of signing the bill into law which gives the extension power and also because Congress changes any substantive portion of the act that Congress may from time to time deem necessary.

It is not only that question that concerns us, the question of the method of overriding the plan or vetoing the plan. There are other substantive changes that have been necessary from time to time and the most recent and outstanding was the amendment that was adopted just last year by the Congress.

You may recall that President Kennedy submitted a plan for reorganization which incorporated the creation of a new executive department. This was the Department of Urban Affairs. At that time Congress balked and said it was never the intention of the Congress to grant to the Executive power either to abolish or create new departments. The power of the President under the Reorganization Act lapsed as a result of this dispute.

Congress in its wisdom last year, in extending the plan, also amended the Reorganization Act to specifically prohibit the creation or abolition of departments.

I believe it has been shown that the periodic extension gives to Congress power to make substantive changes in the act which are necessary.

Another objection to extending the act for a long period of time is the fact that within the act itself are specified rules which apply to the procedure for overriding or disapproving plans.

It is historically true that we adopt our rules on a 2-year basis. We do not adopt permanent rules in the House. Every 2 years the new Congress has an opportunity to reexamine the rules and to change the rules.

In effect, if we should extend this act without limitation, or extend it beyond the 2-year period, we would be adopting rules for a period beyond this Congress and binding future Congresses.

I believe it goes without saying that over the years there has been constant interaction among the three coordinate branches of Government—the judicial, executive, and legislative. At one time one was predominant and at another time another was predominant. I am sorry to say that at the present period

in history I doubt if any political scientist or historian would say that the legislative branch of Government was predominant. Certainly the executive, since the early 1930's, has become stronger and stronger and has become a more predominant branch of our Government. In more recent years our Supreme Court and the judicial branch of Government has become stronger and stronger and in some instances, in my opinion, has entered into the legislative field.

The question before us really involves the power of the Congress, our power as an equal coordinate branch of the Government. We, the Congress, should be jealous of our constitutional prerogatives. We should guard with every effort we can put forth the rights we have as legislators.

I have no objection, nor does anyone of whom I know on the minority side, to the extension of this act. We feel that under the circumstances it has been a constitutional delegation to the President. But we do feel there should be periodic reexaminations of the use of this power of reorganization.

I understand, from the gentleman from California, that an amendment will be offered at the close of the debate in the Committee of the Whole to extend the act, rather than permanently, for a period of 3½ years.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Does the gentleman not believe that this is a reasonable compromise between those who feel that 2 years should be the time limit and those who believe the act should be extended on a permanent basis?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I do not, for two reasons.

First is the fact that it would bind a future Congress, if we made the extension more than 2 years. Second, I believe a fatal error in picking this particular time—I believe it is really 3 years and 7 months—is that it would make the act expire on December 31, 1968. I believe that using this particular period of time, which the other body has and which the gentleman proposes in his amendment, would almost guarantee that the power would lapse, because it would lapse at a period of time when Congress would not be in session. The next session would begin in January of 1969. Therefore, the power would lapse, and it would take some period of months for Congress to extend the power.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman will yield further, I will say it is customary to extend acts some time before the expiration dates. There would be nothing to prevent our committee, which is a diligent committee, from extending the time prior to the expiration of the act.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I would say to the gentleman I understand from a reading of the hearings in the other body the purpose of the extension for this period of time was to make it coextensive with the term of the President, so when a new President came into office the new President could reexamine this power. I submit to the gentleman if the extension occurs in 1968, before the expiration of this time, the Congress will not know who the new President is. So this argument is no longer valid.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I want to commend and congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for this very fine presentation and analysis of this rather complex question. I certainly concur in much of what he has said. I quite agree with him that while the proposed 3½-year extension is a considerable improvement over a permanent extension, the 2-year extension, which he was discussing and which was discussed in great detail in the minority views, is certainly preferable. Again let me acknowledge the very thoughtful contribution which has been made by the gentleman from Illinois.

A Policy for Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a special statement to the House of Commons, reported by Karl Meyer in this morning's Washington Post, British Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart has clearly outlined a reasoned and reasonable path to peace in Vietnam.

Mr. Stewart has suggested:

First, a conference under whatever auspices can be agreed—a ceasefire could either precede such a conference or be achieved at the conference.

Next, a settlement which assures South Vietnam against any form of aggression. Once so assured, South Vietnam would be a country in which there would be no foreign troops or bases and which was tied to no military alliance.

And third:

The future relationship between North and South Vietnam should be a matter for free decision of the peoples of both countries.

Mr. Stewart stated to the House of Commons that the barrier to peace in Vietnam is the "refusal of the Governments of North Vietnam, China, and the Soviet Union to negotiate at all."

He also made clear that his proposals had not been specifically agreed upon with the United States, but as Karl Meyer points out, they are in accord with stated American policy.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that negotiations and a diplomatic settlement are essential if peace and independence are to be secured in South Vietnam. Foreign Secretary Stewart has outlined a meaningful path to that objective. Despite the intransigence evidenced to date by our adversaries, we must pursue this course with diligence and with vigor if a better alternative to war and aggression and uncertainty is ever to be offered the people of South Vietnam.

I include the article of Karl Meyer for our colleagues' information and attention:

BRITISH OFFER VIETNAM PLAN, SCORE RED REFUSALS TO TALK

(By Karl E. Meyer)

LONDON, June 3.—British Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart said today that the barrier to peace in Vietnam is the "refusal of the Governments of North Vietnam, China and the Soviet Union to negotiate at all."

In a special statement to the House of Commons, Stewart set forth more explicitly than before those steps his government would like to see taken to a conference table.

"There is no reason, in common sense or humanity," Stewart said, "why the following sequence of events should not occur:

"First, a conference under whatever auspices can be agreed—a cease-fire could either precede such a conference or be achieved at the conference.

"Next, a settlement which assures South Vietnam against any form of aggression. Once so assured, South Vietnam would be a country in which there were no foreign troops or bases and which was tied to no military alliance.

"The future relationship between North and South Vietnam should be a matter for free decision of the peoples of both countries."

As Stewart spoke, the Foreign Office released a white paper describing recent British efforts to call a Geneva conference at which Vietnam could be discussed.

As related in the 24-page white paper, the recent effort grew out of a Communist-supported proposal last March 9 for a new Geneva conference to provide guarantees for Cambodia's neutrality and territorial integrity.

The British were co-chairmen with the Russians in the 1954 Geneva conference that ended the French war in Indochina. On April 26, the British asked the Soviet Government to join in calling a new conference that would discuss Cambodia but could also take up the Vietnam war.

Stewart told commons that he had on several occasions proposed to Soviet Foreign Secretary Gromyko that a new conference be called, "but he has so far refused."

"I now say," he went on, "that I am ready at any time to join with him in this purpose."

Observers here saw three levels of meaning in Stewart's statement to an overflowing House. First and most obvious was the British desire to put the blame on the Communist powers for refusal to negotiate over Vietnam.

Yet Stewart was also speaking directly to members of his own party who are critical of Britian's unwavering support for the United States in Vietnam. At least 50 leftwing backbench members of the Labor Party are wholly opposed to this policy, and many more express private misgivings.

At the third level, the Stewart statement came amid growing restiveness over that many Britons feel is inadequate consultation with the American Government on Vietnam.

Stewart said in reply to questions that his statement was not an agreed one with the United States, though every item in it was in accord with stated American policy.

The Ave Maria After 100 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 100th year of weekly publication of an outstanding journal, the Ave Maria, which is published by the congregation of Holy Cross at Notre Dame, Ind.

The Ave Maria, although written by Roman Catholic clergy and laymen and designed as a challenging journal for members of the Catholic faith, provides for persons of every faith perceptive and thoughtful analyses of important issues in American life.

The journal was established in the spring of 1865 by the founder of the University of Notre Dame, Father Edward Sorin, C.S.C.

The present editor of the Ave Maria is a distinguished and dedicated priest, the Reverend John Reedy, C.S.C.

I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues this important date in the life of this outstanding publication, and I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the text of an article by another distinguished priest and educator at the University of Notre Dame, the Reverend Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., entitled, "The Ave Maria After 100 Years."

The text of the article follows:

THE AVE MARIA AFTER 100 YEARS

(By Rev. Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C.)

The mood of so many Catholic writers of the past 2 years has been a kind of fear to look back as if opening the window of the church to let in fresh air means closing the door on the past. The affection expressed by the Western World for Pope John XXIII, and the admiration for the openness of the Second Vatican Council are in such marked contrast to the attitude of the Western World toward Pius IX and the Roman Church of 1865 that one almost hesitates to look back. But such an attitude toward our history is not only crass pragmatism, it is stupid. Perhaps the great-grandparents of the youngsters who now crowd American colleges and haunt our radio and television programs were illiterate, plodding peasants in Ireland, Germany, France, or Italy, but had they present-day opportunities their strong faith and physical stamina would outstrip 20th-century youth. But that is not the only reason why we contemplate the past. Generally, one cannot understand the better things of today unless he compares them with what went before.

When Father Edward Sorin, C.S.C., the founder of the University of Notre Dame, established the Ave Maria in the spring of 1865, he was creating something new for the United States—a devotional periodical. He was planning how he could bring to the pioneer country of the Middle West the benefits of Christian civilization, and an important agency for that was a Christian family magazine. In 1865 Father Sorin was 51 years old, a swarthy, well-built man with dark shining eyes, whose quick speech was still touched with a French accent. He was creating a college on the plains of northern Indiana with little more than willpower and daring. The college had survived the Civil War, despite the fact that eight priests had been spared by the small community to serve as chaplains in the Army. Two of them had died in the service and there were other trials during the war years. But the war was nearly over and new hopes were rising. Father Sorin planned to share in the prosperity of the Northern States and to increase the number of students, already numbering 345 in a variety of departments and schools. Besides the traditional bachelor of arts, Notre Dame offered for the first time a bachelor's degree in science.

The starting of the Ave Maria was part of this new world. In the very first month of the Ave Maria, lumber and stone were being stacked around the college building because at the end of the summer the 4-story hammer-shaped building would become 6 stories, topped with a dome and eventually crowned by a statue of Father Sorin's patroness, Our Lady of the Immaculate Conception. The Ave Maria was to share in the dedication of the enlarged building in 1866. At the dedication prizes were offered for the best essays and poems on Our Lady, which were to be printed in the magazine.

The spirit of Father Sorin in his prosperity and his ambition, while Catholic, were truly American, in contrast to much of the leadership of the church in Europe which was cringing and shaking from the tremendous blows of European rationalism as it forcefully drove the church out of her churches and out of her schools. The conditions of the church in Western Europe explains why Pope Pius IX, the previous December 8, issued his encyclical "Quanta Cura" and the "Syllabus of Errors." The vehemence of that document must be understood as the words of a Pope fighting for his life and for the life of his church in one of the darkest hours of the church in Europe. The papal syllabus rejected article 77: "In the present day, it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the state, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship," and article 80, "The Roman Pontiff can, and ought, to reconcile himself to, and agree with progress, liberalism, and civilization as lately introduced."

Archbishop Martin John Spalding of Baltimore, the leader of American Catholicism, included the Pope's encyclical in his own pastoral letter of February 8, 1865, and explained to American Catholics that the strictures of the papal message were not aimed at American liberty, secured under our "noble Constitution in regard to the liberty of conscience, of worship, and of the press." Archbishop Spalding drew the contrast between the shrinking church of Western Europe and the expanding church in the United States. Quoting the first amendment of the Constitution, he said the Founding Fathers who had composed that law did not intend "to pronounce all religions, whether true or false, equal before God, but only to declare them equal before the law" and added that under the circumstances they could have adopted no other course.

Father Sorin, like his friend Archbishop Spalding, appreciated the difference between the persecution of the church in Europe and the liberty of the church in the United States and intended to take full advantage of the glowing future of the new country.

Notre Dame, in 1865, was in the middle of the country, but not in the center of American catholicism. Most of the prosperous Catholic America lay south of the Mason-Dixon line before the Civil War, and because the chief Catholic centers were in the border States of Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri, the church suffered with the South, not only from the devastations of war, but also from the upset economy of the Southern States resulting from the destruction of the country by war. Nor were there many Catholics with the financial means to profit by the industrial expansion of the North in the decades after the war. Numerically, the Catholics were a northern church with her concentrations in the cities and mill towns of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and New York, but these, mostly Irish immigrants, had not yet recovered from their flight from poverty and disease during the famine panics less than a generation before. These were to rise, too, but slowly and chiefly by political organization and power.

Considering these facts one can understand why several of the bishops whom Father Sorin consulted about starting the Ave Maria told him that his prospects of success were nil. He admitted to Father Neal Gillespie, C.S.C., his successor as editor, that he began in fear: "I may be deceived, disappointed, laughed to scorn * * *." He intended the Ave Maria as something new. There had been Catholic literary reviews before, although they had not lived long, and in April 1865, the Catholic World, "a monthly eclectic magazine of general literature and science" had been founded, but it consisted almost entirely of reprints and translations from Europe.

Father Sorin called the Ave Maria a "family newspaper in which we intend to speak exclusively of our own family affairs." There were in it some translations from European periodicals, but the heart of the magazine was original, prepared in part by Father Sorin but more often by Mother Angela, C.S.C., the foundress of the modern St. Mary's, and her brother, Father Neal Gillespie. Soon there was a page for children and a column of news of happenings in the Catholic Church. There were short stories and full-length fiction from the few Catholic writers of the day.

Father Sorin sought contributions from the chief Catholic thinker of the day, Orestes A. Brownson. This convert from free-thought, Protestantism, and Comtism did not have an easy life in Catholicism. His efforts to reconcile Catholicism with the American way of life had brought him the disfavor of both the Irish Catholic immigrant and the native American Protestant. In 1864 he had stopped printing his Review because he no longer had enough supporters to pay the cost of printing. The fact that Father Sorin had sought his advice on starting a magazine as early as 1854 and had visited "the Great Reviewer" in his home in the interim indicate the ambitious plans of Father Sorin. Later, when Father Sorin questioned some phrases in one of Brownson's essays to the Ave Maria, Brownson said he would no longer contribute, but Mother Angela was able to bring peace between these two strong spirits.

ARCHBISHOP PURCELL

Mother Angela had to play the peacemaker between Father Sorin and another strong mind, the Archbishop John Baptist Purcell of Cincinnati. Archbishop Purcell and Father Sorin were on the same side of most arguments, but the archbishop did not foresee the value of the Ave Maria, possibly because he thought it would compete with his own Catholic Telegraph, edited by Father Edward Purcell in Cincinnati; but when teased about his silence by Mother Angela he gave in after a few issues and wrote a letter of approval. Perhaps the archbishop also saw that Father Sorin's proposed "newspaper" was going to

be successful and not a competitor of his own paper.

Within a few years Father Sorin was elected superior general of the congregation of Holy Cross and Mother Angela became superior of the Sisters of Holy Cross and Father Gillespie worked on alone. Father Neal Gillespie, of Lancaster, Ohio, was the first graduate of the college at Notre Dame and continued his studies in Europe. Like his sister, he combined superior mental power with a command of clear language; but in 1874 he was cut down in the prime of life by a combination of grave illnesses. A committee edited the Ave Maria for a year. In 1875 the youngest member of the committee, Daniel E. Hudson, was ordained a priest and became the editor. Of subscribers—contrary to predictions—there were soon more than 10,000. Where they were no one knows now, but most likely among the Catholic clergy, the convent schools, and the lay graduates of Catholic academies and colleges. Two things were distinctive of the Ave Maria—its fostering devotion to the Blessed Virgin and its excellent English. By the time the Ave Maria reached its silver jubilee in 1890, practically every important Catholic writer had made a contribution to its pages.

On May 3, 1890, the silver jubilee, Father Hudson wrote confidently of the progress and the future of the periodical. The first essay in that issue, "The Month of Mary," was undoubtedly written by him. Already the "Notes and Remarks" contained a strong and independent opinion on matters that affected the church, especially in the United States. The small priest with the Vandyke beard and the soft voice seemed mild but he wielded a strong pen. Bishops sought his counsel, many Catholic writers welcomed his guidance, missionaries in China, Japan, and India felt the beneficence of his appeals for aid. One friend particularly welcomed his help, Brother Ira Dutton at Molokai.

The story of Charles Warren Stoddard and Brother Joseph Dutton—he was not really a brother—is a tale of the power of the pen. Stoddard, a kind of Bohemian, wrote glowingly of the South Seas. There he had come to know the story of Father Damien DeVuster and the colony of lepers on Molokai. Stoddard later came to Notre Dame to teach and to be directed by Father Hudson and wrote a series of articles on "The Martyrs of Molokai" for the Ave Maria, which was later published as "The Lepers of Molokai." These essays happened to fall under the eyes of Ira Dutton, another repentant young man of Tennessee, who wanted to know more about Damien. He, too, came to Notre Dame for a retreat and under the guidance of Father Hudson and Charles Warren Stoddard sailed from San Francisco for the leper camp. Father Hudson and Ira Dutton corresponded until neither was able to continue the letterwriting, and Hudson also collected money for a tabernacle and a bell for Father Damien. When the character of Damien had been attacked Father Hudson arranged for a printing and wide distribution of Robert Louis Stevenson's powerful defense of the martyr priest. Father Hudson seldom left the campus of Notre Dame, but his letters sought out many a hidden martyr, missionary, and saint in all parts of the world. He also helped some struggling and impoverished writers in the United States.

CONTROVERSIES

Father Hudson watched closely the controversies that shook American catholicism from the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore to the condemnation of modernism in 1907. Generally, Father Hudson sided with the progressive Archbishop John Ireland and Bishop John Keane, although Bishop McQuaid who generally opposed them was also one of his familiar correspondents. In the crisis over Americanization, misnamed "Americanism," Father Hudson was independently on the side of the Americanists, although he was constant in his support of Catholic schools. Although he welcomed English writers and English subscribers the influence of so many helpers of Irish origin made him favor persecuted Ireland against conquering Britian. Any unfair critic of American Catholicism in the secular or religious press soon felt the sting of Father Hudson's precise sentences, both in print and in letter.

Perhaps Father Hudson's affection for the Irish led him to oppose any friendship in the American Government toward the British Government as the Ave Maria approached its golden jubilee in 1915. Earlier he had been critical of the American Government's handling of affairs in the Philippines, and had helped force a reconsideration of the policy of sending Filipino boys to non-Catholic colleges in the United States. Here Father Hudson began a friendship with the Governor General of the Philippines, William Howard Taft, that brought Taft to Notre Dame and the publication of one of his speeches in the Ave Maria. Probably their mutual friend, Archbishop Ireland, may have helped here. But when Woodrow Wilson became President, he did not receive the same friendliness from the editor of the Ave Maria. Later, when Wilson showed his definite unfriendliness toward the Irish, the editor was quick to reject the League of Nations sponsored by Wilson that seemed too friendly to England. Perhaps the style and the opinions of Father Hudson were a bit outdated long before ill health forced him to retire in 1928, but his opinions were always clearly stated.

The veteran editor did not take too well to some of the new departures in American life. Once he published a caustic note on the scanty dress in which a team of Catholic girls had been photographed for the press. Someone wrote in to tell him that if he had been a bit more observant he would have noticed that what the girls wore were not dresses but athletic uniforms. The editor merely remarked that so far as he could see they wore hardly anything at all. On another occasion the editor, bored with the overwhelming self-praise which cluttered up so much of the Catholic press, remarked that he feared that many Catholics were in danger of breaking their arms in the constant efforts to pat their own backs.

Under Father Hudson's editorship the circulation of the Ave Maria rose to over 35,000. In this production and growth, besides Father Hudson, must be recognized the contributions of such priests as Fathers John W. Cavanaugh and Arthur Barry O'Neill and Brother Angelus Dolan, the indefatigable canvasser, and Brother Martin Fiffe in the pressroom and many others through the years whose unsung labors were services of zeal without price.

Before the diamond jubilee of the Ave Maria had come, Father Hudson was gone and in his place was the selfless generosity and sparkling goodness of Father Eugene Burke, C.S.C. Father Burke was loved and honored by Notre Dame graduates and alumni wherever they could gather around him, from New York to Oregon. The magazine soon took on the spirit of his joyfulness, something badly needed in the dark era of the depression of the 1930's. For the few years of his editorship he had about him a group of young and spirited assistants who sometimes tweaked the noses of more conservative writers, yet who were devoted in a special way to the "new humanism" to which they hoped to add a Catholic purpose.

Some remember well the shake of the curly head, the sparkle in the eyes behind those pince-nez glasses and the gentle smile and quick wit of Editor Father Eugene Burke. Probably he and his fellow editors were too advanced for the conservatism that blanketed American catholicism during and after World War II, but he had just begun to achieve success when assigned to another task. His successor was Father Patrick Carroll, C.S.C., a native Irishman who never forgot either the suffering of his homeland or the persecution of its conqueror. He and his associates were perhaps more in the conservative trend of the last years of Father Hudson, but unfortunately that age was long past.

Father Carroll was robust, fullfaced, and already gray. His brogue was noticeable as his strong voice argued vehemently with his taunting fellow writers. He did not believe in new methods in education or in government. His faith was that powerful spiritual conviction that has made Irish zeal the guardian of Catholicism in the English-speaking world. And that faith was needed in the cold war.

For the historians, the period of the cold war is just beginning to fall into perspective. The bitter feelings aroused by the shift in the American press, from a rage against Hitler to a cold and calculating resistance to Soviet aggression, upset many people. American Catholics were not the only ones upset, but they, more than anyone else, had held the Russian allies at a safe distance during the drive against nazism.

The balanced judgments of a publicist such as Waldemar Gurian, who had warned of the treachery of Marxist expediency and had suffered the persecutions of nazism, were not always heeded by Catholics who felt that their aversion to Soviet communism, held in check during the war, was now fully justified. As usual there were the demagogs ready to incite and lead the excited, and among them Senator Joseph McCarthy rushed into the headlines. There arose a strange alliance between the disinherited of large cities and the isolated farmers of Texas and Arkansas to drive out the Communist threat. There were, indeed, vulnerable men in the Government, and some whose political ideals were far to the left. As has happened so often in American politics the battle became a confusion of personalities and insinuations in which the real moral issue was ignored. In politics the adept politician often manages to seem an angel of the light even when his total ambition is election. In this conflict over McCarthyism the truism was confirmed that when religious editors indulge in politics, religion usually suffers.

In the turmoil of the decade after the war, the Catholic press did not offer much direction to the returning veteran who had rediscovered the church on the eve of battle. Catholic spokesmen were noticeably absent. Each one seemed to be trying to get someone else out front. The best description of American Catholics after the war was massive mediocrity in which the advance of the millions of Catholics got nowhere; there were no leaders, no capable spokesmen.

One can almost hear the gulp in the leading editorial of the Ave Maria on November 20, 1948, when it began: "On All Souls' Day the American people decided to give the Presidency to Mr. Harry Truman, not as an accident of succession but as a free will bestowal within our constitutional tradition. We should say the element of surprise was the most immediate and most general reaction that resulted from the vote verdict." There were more pungent editorials later.

Father Felix Duffey, C.S.C., during his editorship introduced the new presses which added color and photography.

FATHER JOHN REEDY

Now comes the centenary and the age of Father John Reedy, C.S.C. Beginning with the pontificate of Pope John XXIII Catholic

discussions have had vigor and frankness that have attracted the attention of many who knew little about Catholicism. The Ave Maria has felt the impact of praise and blame as Father Reedy added the interview article and participation in current discussions.

There are many things done today and said under the name of aggiornamento that have disturbed the complacency of the older generations, especially those who think of the church as a conservative institution. But not everything called Catholic belongs to the church. One thing that an intelligent scrutiny of American Catholic history does show is that there has never been a unanimous opinion about the external services and manifestations of Catholicism in the United States. The non-English Catholic immigrants came to live among English Catholics who had become Americans. The early immigrants were pushed aside by later Catholic immigrants. Some spoke English, some did not; some were exuberant, some were cold. The fear and trembling of Father Sorin when he founded the Ave Maria arose from his knowledge that the United States was predominantly an English Protestant country in which devotion to Our Lady was not welcomed. But he knew that he was speaking to a daring, devoted Catholic minority whose devotion to Our Lady would be much stronger in the face of such criticism, and who would rush to his aid if he were attacked.

Today, even non-Catholic writers speak of "post-Protestant America" in which religious people with church membership are in the minority. The conditions are, in this, remarkably like those in 1865. The vast majority of the younger generation do not have Christian affiliations. This then must be the work of the Catholic journalist of the later 20th century: to win these promising but religiously bereft Americans. Just as Father Sorin had to sacrifice to create the Ave Maria in Protestant America so the successful Catholic journal of today can exist only by hard work and by sacrifice. The family life that Father Sorin appealed to is almost nonexistent today, but other entertainments, other interests, and, above all, other knowledge has become available. Some older persons would like to go back to the days of Father Hudson if not to the days of Father Sorin—if they could avoid old-fashioned living. To them the photographer who gets between the priest and the altar, and between the surgeon and his patient is a nuisance, and modern music seems something borrowed from the African medicine man. But the spirit of Father Sorin who created the Ave Maria was of America of 1865, and the successful Catholic journalist of 1965 must try to imitate him with a spirit of the later 20th century.

The greatest Catholic publicist American Catholics have had was Orestes A. Brownson and he stood out in his day above such capable men as James A. McMaster of the Freeman's Journal and Jedediah Huntington of the Metropolitan. They were all three converts who could write. Their chief qualification was not that they were converts, although that was necessarily in the background of their writing, but because they had studied theology. The one great handicap of American Catholic journalism since 1907 has been essays and reports that were devoid of theological learning.

While the correspondence of the early editors of Catholic weeklies before 1865 was filled with protests against the heavy theology that filled their pages, no reader could say he did not know what the church held on disputed points. Some read with amusement about the informal school in theological jargon conducted in Rome for American journalists when the Second Vatican Council opened. But unfortunately most of the American secular journals keep publishing articles by journalists who have never understood even the penny catechism. The Ave Maria, in its attempt to speak of the new theology and liturgy, has not published many theological disquisitions but on the other hand it has not published too many of the emotional self-accusations on the other extreme.

The present-day Ave Maria is different from that of 1865 and that of 1915 and 1930. Modern means of communication have brought to the ordinary man sights and messages that were reserved for the few 100 years ago; undoubtedly the disturbed or the unguarded cannot grasp all they hear and see. But man, the object of all this talk and argumentation, remains much the same as he was in 1865 because the human body and the soul are practically the same. There is market for sound ideas, for moral goodness, for the Christian gospel. The Ave Maria was appealing to a minority in 1865, and the proportions have not changed greatly in 1965.

The 19th Anniversary of the Italian Republic

SPEECH

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most exciting countries to watch in the world today is Italy. Only a few short months ago the prophets of doom were at work. They were saying that the Italian miracle had come to an end, that governmental instability was growing, that the Communist Party was securing new bases of power, that the inclusion of Socialists in the government would lead to a weakening of Italy's alliance ties, and that some Italians were interested in following in the footsteps of De Gaulle. They were also saying that development efforts were flagging, that industry was overextended, that unemployment was sure to grow by leaps and bounds, and that balance of payments difficulties could only worsen.

True, in the last few years, Italy has experienced inflation followed by recession and there have been moments when it has been difficult to form a government. But if we look at Italy today, we can readily conclude that the prophets have been confounded. The Communist Party leadership is divided and it has been losing its traditional hold in many localities. Vigorous measures to combat first inflation and then recession have brought encouraging results. A favorable balance of payments has been restored and shows every sign of lasting. Italy has a new President, a Premier, and a Foreign Minister who are firmly committed to the causes of Western European integration and Atlantic unity and who are working hard to combat the disruptive influence of De Gaulle. Industry is beginning to hum again after the briefest of pauses. Unemployment is giving ground. New and ambitious plans have been drawn up to continue and expand development efforts in the south.

Indeed, nothing shows better the continuing determination of the Italian people to adhere to the goals they set for themselves 20 years ago than their concern with conditions in the south of their country—the so-called Mezzogiorno. In the past 15 years, more than a million acres of underutilized land have been redistributed in this region. Land reclamation has proceeded space. Irrigation systems have been developed. Roads, bridges, and dams have been constructed. Electricity has been brought to rural communities. State industry, private industry, and foreign industry have been encouraged to establish plants in the region. New technical schools and education and training programs have begun to provide skilled labor for new industries.

There are still great disparities between north and south, but these are being rapidly overcome. In the last 10 years alone, per capita income in the south has doubled. Currently, the Italian Government is preparing a bill to extend the life of the Cassa per il Mezzogiorno—the fund that finances development in the south—for another 15 years. In the next 5 years alone, the amount that will be spent in the south will be double the amount spent in the last 5 years. Intensive efforts will be made to increase tourist facilities, to encourage agriculture in irrigated zones, and to spur the further development of industry in the industrial triangle of Bari, Brindisi, and Taranto.

In short, Mr. Speaker, if we look at Italy today, we can only conclude that the political institutions of the country are well-founded and that the economy is basically strong. The vitality of the people is as evident as ever. Their confidence in the future of their country is undiminished. On the occasion of the 19th anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic, it is a pleasure to send greetings to a people who are profoundly devoted to democratic institutions, to economic and social progress and to the cause of Western unity.

Appointment of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7777) to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (U.S. Air Force, retired) to the Office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, in listening carefully to the thoughtful debate of the Members of the House of Representatives on this proposed exception to the original action of Congress which provides that the office of head of the Federal Aviation Agency shall be filled by a civilian, I have not

heard a single criticism of the purposes and the provisions of the original enactment. I feel that the decision of the Congress in this original enactment was sound. I, therefore, stand in opposition to the proposed exception to this well-designed congressional act and its purposes.

I want to make clear that this in no way reflects a criticism on my part of the career and services of General McKee, but it does reffect my conviction that in all of the numbers of people in the population of the United States, it is my belief that the President could have found someone qualified for Administrator within the intent of the original act of Congress.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Twenty Thousand New California Jobs Open as Bracero Foreign Labor Program Ends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, since Congress terminated the bracero foreign labor importation program last December 31 by refusing to extend its life beyond that date, thousands of Americans, who otherwise would be out of work today, have been able to find gainful employment in America's fields and orchards.

Moreover, their wages and working conditions have begun to improve to a level where they and their families see some hope of being able to live in decency and dignity.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take California, my home State, as an example to illustrate the tremendous progress that has been made in the surprisingly short period of less than 6 months since the end of the bracero program.

First, according to official figures from the California Farm Labor Panel, there are nearly 20,000 more California citizens gainfully employed in agricultural work today than at this time last year. This means that some 20,000 California men and women are now able to support themselves and their families, and have jobs that last year went to workers who had been brought in from outside the country to work in American fields.

Second, farm wages for domestic workers in California have gone up substantially, increasing on an average of perhaps 35 to 40 percent statewide. This means more actual take-home pay in the pockets of our hard working agricultural laborers, a group that has historically been the worst paid and most underprivileged in the country.

Third, California's economy has been given a multimillion-dollar shot in the arm. And local businessmen and retail merchants all over the State have felt the most immediate impact in increased sales from the literally millions of dollars—formerly earned by foreign workers and sent outside the country—which are now being earned by American citizens and spent locally on food, clothing, housing, transportation, and all the other necessities of life for the U.S. domestic worker and his family.

Fourth, there has been a drastic reduction in relief costs in California counties where large numbers of foreign workers used to be employed. These counties are reporting up to a 75-percent reduction in the number of families receiving welfare aid this year compared to last—directly attributable to the fact that men and women can find agricultural work this year, whereas they were unable to compete with the foreign imported laborers last year and had to go on relief. Thus, the local taxpayers in these areas have also been among the prime beneficiaries of the termination of the bracero program.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the latest and most encouraging report of the California Farm Labor Panel to Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz. This report from Dr. Benjamin Aaron, chairman of the panel, was dated May 29, 1965.

After unanimously deciding not to recommend the granting of any pending requests for bracero labor, the panel concluded its report with the optimistic finding of "considerable evidence that the program of transforming the seasonal agricultural labor force in California from one dependent primarily upon bracero labor to one that is totally self-sufficient and based entirely upon domestic labor is making considerable progress."

The California Farm Labor Panel report follows:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
SCHOOL OF LAW,
Los Angeles, Calif., May 29, 1965.

The Honorable W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Pursuant to your request, the California Farm Labor Panel submits herewith its unanimous report and recommendations in respect to the following requests for supplemental agricultural workers: (1) San Joaquin Farm Production Association—500 additional braceros to harvest asparagus; (2) Growers Farm Labor Association—the balance (1,150) of a previous request for braceros to be used in harvesting strawberries and in hoeing, thinning, and transplanting miscellaneous vegetable row crops in Monterey County; (3) Blythe Growers, Inc.—949 braceros to be used in harvesting melons. Our findings and recommendations are based in part on the record made at public hearings previously held in Stockton and Salinas, to which we have referred in our earlier communications to you, and also on the record made at a public hearing held on May 20, 1965, in Blythe, Calif., by the panel's hearing officer, Mr. E. West Parkinson, and the panel's administrative officer, Mr. Kenneth C. Robertson. Additional information has been supplied by various agencies of the Federal Government and the State of California, as well as by individual growers.

On the basis of all available information, the panel has unanimously decided not to recommend the granting of any pending requests for bracero labor at this time. Our reasons are as follows:

First, the panel has been informally advised by the manager of the San Joaquin Farm Production Association that its request for 500 additional braceros has now been withdrawn.

Second, insofar as Blythe is concerned, the picture is extremely encouraging. We wish to take this opportunity to commend all groups in the Blythe community for their outstanding efforts to recruit an adequate supply of domestic labor. To our knowledge Blythe is the first community to take advantage of the domestic manpower made available through the A-team program. In order to make this program attractive to the outside youth, Blythe growers and the 10 cooperating shippers and growers sharing the costs have taken the following steps: (1) rented 25 new apartments to house the teams; (2) secured the services of the Palo Verde Valley High School District nutritionist, as well as the use of the school cafeteria and staff to feed the recruited workers; (3) arranged for recreation with the school recreation director, and obtained swimming passes to local swimming pools at no cost to the recruits; and (4) agreed to hire the A-team coaches as supervisors and to provide transportation between the housing facilities, the eating facilities, and the fields. We understand that the first of these A-teams will arrive on or about June 5.

We believe that prospects for securing the additional workers needed in the Blythe area to harvest melons from the available domestic supply are very good. Some of the additional workers can doubtless be provided through the A-team program; the balance can be obtained by more aggressive recruitment of adult domestic labor both within and without the State. Authorization of bracero labor in this area at the present time would, in our opinion, seriously retard the momentum of the present drive for domestic labor.

We think it important to emphasize in this connection that the A-team program is now in its most critical phase. Reports from 11 States received only yesterday by the panel indicate that over 4,700 young athletes have been organized into teams, and that most of them could be made available for agricultural work in California within a few days time. It is extremely important, therefore, that growers in need of additional domestic labor make the necessary arrangements to recruit A-teams within the next few weeks, before this important source has been committed or allowed to disperse. It is equally important, however, that any arrangements for bringing in A-teams to California should include plans for shifting these teams from one crop or area to another according to the needs of the farmers.

Third, the situation in the Salinas strawberry industry is still far from satisfactory in respect to the recruitment of domestic labor. The evidence shows that there are only 3,500 braceros and other foreign laborers in the entire State of California; yet 2,250 (approximately two-thirds) of this number have already been allocated to harvest strawberries on 3,600 acres in the Salinas area. Moreover the second group of 750 braceros recently authorized by you on the recommendation of this panel have just arrived; the strawberry growers have thus not yet enjoyed the full benefit from this foreign labor. Data supplied to the panel make it clear that there has been a great increase of domestic workers in Monterey County this year. The number of domestic seasonal workers as of May 16, 1965, was 5,590, compared with only 1,270 at the same time last year. Practically every other crop in Monterey County has made use of this increased

domestic labor force; only the strawberry industry has failed to secure a proportionate share. From these indications we conclude that the efforts of the strawberry industry to recruit domestic labor have fallen short of their full potential. We recommend that an immediate, all-out effort be made to recruit both A-teams and adult domestic workers and their families to harvest the strawberry crop. The panel will continue to follow the situation closely and to lend whatever assistance it can to the affected growers.

The panel has been informally advised that additional requests for supplemental bracero labor may be filed for other crops in other areas of the State in the near future. Although no such requests are presently before us, we wish to take this opportunity to urge both growers and processors to commence intensive and aggressive recruiting procedures at once, without waiting for their requests for supplemental foreign labor to be reviewed and processed. We wish to emphasize that the size of the available domestic labor force is not a static statistic; it is, rather, a purely operational phenomenon that can be substantially affected by intensive recruiting effort. In this connection the panel offers its good offices to assist growers and processors in planning for preseason training and conditioning of inexperienced harvest crews, and we strongly urge that financing for such programs be made available by the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training of the Department of Labor.

Finally, we are pleased to report considerable evidence that the program of transforming the seasonal agricultural labor force in California from one dependent primarily upon bracero labor to one that is totally self-sufficient and based entirely upon domestic labor is making considerable progress. For example, as of May 15, 1964, the total seasonal domestic labor force in California amounted to only 120,000; on the same date this year, that number had increased to 139,400, and by now it is doubtless larger. It also appears that the increased use of domestic labor, as opposed to bracero labor, has not only provided job opportunities for more domestic workers, but has also reduced welfare costs. For example, on May 27, 1965, the director of county welfare in Monterey County announced that only 77 families had received welfare aid during the month of April 1965 compared to 313 in April 1964.

Respectfully submitted.

CALIFORNIA FARM LABOR PANEL,
BENJAMIN AARON, *Chairman.*

The Republic of South Africa—Interview with Thomas S. Gephardt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recently, Thomas S. Gephardt, editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer, returned from a visit to South Africa. Subsequently, he appeared on the Manion Forum, and delivered a most interesting viewpoint on the Republic of South Africa, a viewpoint which is very much in contrast with most of what we read in the newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that the interview with Mr. Gephardt be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MIND YOUR OWN BLOODLY BUSINESS"—ALL SOUTH AFRICAN FACTIONS SUPPORT SELF-DETERMINATION

(By Thomas S. Gephardt)

Dean MANION. The Republic of South Africa is just about as far away from the United States as one can get without starting back home. It isn't as far removed from this country, however, as its geographical location would indicate. We have many vital interests rooted in South Africa and these interests have excited the attention of thinking people who have begun to investigate the area for themselves. I have one of these enterprisers here at the microphone with me today.

Mr. Thomas S. Gephardt is the Hoosier-born editor of the editorial page of the Cincinnati Enquirer. I perhaps receive more copies of the Cincinnati Enquirer editorials than I do from any other newspaper in the country and they all measure up to the same high standards. Mr. Gephardt recently spent a month in the Republic of South Africa, informing himself about the future of that country, the unusual conditions there, and the relationship of all of this to the future of our own country, the United States of America.

He's back here with a rich story, full of adventure, facts and statistics which will be as interesting to you, I am sure, as they have been to me. Mr. Gephardt, we are very fortunate to have you here at the Manion Forum. You're very welcome.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Thank you very much, Dean Manion.

Dean MANION. Now I don't propose to inhibit your account of this journey at all, but tell us something about the history of the Republic of South Africa. Who got there first?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The answer to that question is a startling one to most Americans who are probably only casual students of African affairs, because alone among the countries of Africa, South Africa was settled initially by white people. The first recorded settlement, the first recorded landing in South Africa, was made by the Portuguese at roughly the time Columbus was discovering America. Then some two centuries later, in the middle 1600's, when the Dutch settlers of Peter Stuyvesant were establishing their colony in New York, another group of Dutch settlers were settling in South Africa. When their community became established on South African soil, they found that they had discovered, for all practical purposes, a vacant country. There were, to be sure, a few Hottentots and Bushmen inhabiting what is now the Republic of South Africa in very scattered communities, but for all practical purposes they came upon an uninhabited country.

Dean MANION. Would you say, Mr. Gephardt, that they found fewer Africans there than the folks who landed at Plymouth Rock saw of the Indians?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Yes, indeed. That is very clear from history.

Dean MANION. That is a point which I think most Americans forget; that this was a vacant country. And what has happened in the meantime?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The Dutch established their community principally around Cape Town, and over the years, just as our pioneers moved inward from the Atlantic coast, the Dutch pioneers moved inland from the Cape colony. In so doing, they began, maybe a 150 years ago, encountering their first black neighbors who were moving southward from Central Africa, into what is today part of the Republic of South Africa. So the black migrations into South Africa began, I should say, in the middle 1700's.

Dean MANION. Now this brings up the muted question of segregation in the Republic of South Africa. We have heard a great deal about this. What is the straight information on that subject as you observed it?

Mr. GEPHARDT. South Africa is embarked upon a course that is as completely different from our own as it's possible to imagine. Here in the United States we are trying to achieve integration by law, and South Africa is embarked upon a program in just the opposite direction, to achieve segregation by law. They have a system that has become known over the years as apartheid. This is a Dutch word meaning separateness or apartness. The system is probably more widely known today as "separate development" which is, in fact, the more accurate term because what the system tries to achieve is the separate development of the four predominant racial groups within the Republic of South Africa, the development of each group to its full capacity, but the development to be achieved separately.

Dean MANION. There are three groups there, I understand, the whites, the blacks, and what are called the coloreds?

Mr. GEPHARDT. That's correct. And there is also a rather sizable Asian community made up mostly of Indians and Malayans who came to South Africa maybe a century ago to work in the sugarcane industry.

Dean MANION. And this apartness contemplates that each of these groups will develop apart from the other, develop their capacities without mixture?

Mr. GEPHARDT. That's correct, yes.

Dean MANION. What is the relative proportion of whites to the rest in South Africa?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The white people of South Africa probably comprise about one-fourth of the country. The black races are perhaps 11 million, the white people are 3½ million, and the remainder would be made up of Asian and colored, the colored community being composed of people of mixed racial backgrounds.

TAX DOLLARS BACK CONVICTIONS

Dean. MANION. Mr. Gephardt, did you observe that this system of apartness is succeeding, has it a chance of success?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The system is probably in its very initial stages today, I should say, but I think the record thus far has been a good one for all concerned. I must confess I went to South Africa with the conviction that apartheid, or separate-development, was more of a slogan than a program. But one cannot spend very much time in South Africa, talking with business, educational and political leaders, without coming to feel that there is a very sincere and conscientious commitment to make the system work.

More important even than the verbal commitment is the fact that the South Africans are investing their hard earned tax dollars in the success of the program, and it is not a cheap program. It's a very expensive and difficult program to undertake and to achieve.

Dean MANION. What is the cost for the average white taxpayer per year in order to carry out this program with subsidies to the other races?

Mr. GEPHARDT. In the most recent year for which figures are available, the cost for each white family is roughly $280, that would be in the form of benefits for the nonwhite races.

Dean MANION. Now there is a great deal of interest in South Africa as we can see in our newspapers and as we listen in on the debates at the U.N. Why is South Africa important to us and to the rest of the world, Mr. Gephardt?

Mr. GEPHARDT. It's important to us, I should say, principally because South Africa is the source of 70 percent, almost three-fourths, of the free world's gold. And those of us who believe that gold is one of the very basic commodities in the world cannot help

feeling that the country, the force in the world that can control South Africa is far along the road toward controlling the entire world.

Gold, of course, is not the only resource. South Africa is very richly and lavishly endowned with natural resources, but gold, certainly, is one of the most basic. Diamonds are another source of revenue for the South Africans, another source of fame throughout the world. So the importance to the world of South Africa stems principally from its rich endowment in natural resources. Its importance stems also from the fact that the newly independent states of Africa have made almost a moral commitment to South Africa's destruction and independent entity.

Dean MANION. We saw what happened in the Congo, to the resources that had been lifted up and developed by the Belgians, as soon as the Belgians left and gave this country over to the tribal wars of the Congo. Would you envision the same sort of thing happening in the Republic of South Africa if by any chance the Dutch would be overcome?

Mr. GERHARDT. It's hard to believe that there would be any other course. I was in South Africa at the time of many of the rebel atrocities in the Congo. And those lessons were certainly not lost upon the South Africans. I think one result of that experience has been the solidification of South African opinion behind South African Government.

Even many of those who are not wholehearted supporters of the apartheid system, and there certainly are many of them, came to share more fully than ever before the Government's position that this system was the best suited to South Africa's peculiar problems. It's not a system that they want to export. They aren't telling us in the United States that this is the way we should run our affairs. They are not telling the Congolese that this is the best answer for the Congo, but they do feel that it is the best answer for South Africa, and they do feel that we, in turn, owe them the opportunity to give the system a trial and to give them an opportunity to let the system work.

Dean MANION. They have the right, which we have always regarded as the natural right of areas, to self-determination. Do you think if they are let alone that this separate system will develop satisfactorily?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I'm rather convinced of that. There is a strong commitment to that end among a majority of white South Africans and among rather sizable groups of nonwhite South Africans. There is a great deal of optimism in the country, a great deal of determination to face the future boldly. There is confidence in the economic, the business future of the country. South Africans look to the future with as much optimism as you would find in any part of the world, Dean Manion.

RESENT OUTSIDE INTERFERENCE

Dean MANION. As an editor, Mr. Gephardt, you must know that the South African Republic has had a very bad press in this country, and most people jumped to the conclusion that they are dealing in oppression and violation of the natural laws, and so on and so forth. How do you account for that, and what can be done to bring out the true picture?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Well, South Africa is a very distant, very remote country from our own. It's a convenient whipping boy, I suppose, for American journalists and commentators. Certainly there is no substitute for a first-hand look at South Africa, the kind of first-hand look that I had the privilege of taking. Short of that, there is an obligation, I think, to look beyond the headlines, the sensation headlines, into what is actually transpiring in South Africa. And I think we will find that the picture is far different than the one most Americans possess today.

Dean MANION. Is it your considered judgment that the interests of the United States lie in the direction of self-determination for the Republic of South Africa, whatever that may be, without outside interference by us or by the United Nations or anybody else?

Mr. GEPHARDT. That would certainly be my feeling. Yes, sir.

Dean MANION. In other words, they envision the "11th commandment." I think you told us that's all they want us to observe, and what is that again?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The "11th commandment" is simply: "Mind your own bloody business," as they put it in South Africa.

Dean MANION. The question is raised, Suppose we had not been permitted to mind our own bloody business when we were settling this country and pushing the Indians around and so on and so forth. The history of the United States might have been radically different; isn't that so?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I'm certain of that. I suppose there would have been a United Nations inquiry into the fate of the American Indians and the whole course of our history. I am certain it would have been altered very substantially.

Dean MANION. My friends, my interest in this account was excited by a series of articles Mr. Gephardt wrote in the Cincinnati Enquirer, which I had the privilege to read, and I have been urging him here to publish those in pamphlet form. I believe if you wrote to the Cincinnati Enquirer and asked them for Mr. Gephardt's articles on the Republic of South Africa, they might just produce them. And, incidentally, it would be a great boon to our own information about what is really at stake in that important country. Thank you, Mr. Gephardt, it's been a pleasure to have you with us.

Mr. GEPHARDT. My pleasure, Dean Manion.

Prompt Action by President Indicates Needed Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, my hometown paper, the Galveston News Tribune, published what I then thought was a very fine and a very wise editorial concerning the President's courage in the Dominican crisis.

Today, as we read of the removal of the marines from that area, a happy circumstance that tells us most clearly that the President's course was wise, it is timely that the News Tribune editorial be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a compliment both to the President and to the publishers of the paper.

The editorial follows:

PROMPT ACTION BY PRESIDENT INDICATES NEEDED COURAGE

The situation remains very confused, and it is far too soon to be excited about it. However, there are encouraging indications that another Cuba has been averted in the prompt, decisive action taken by the United States in the latest Dominican Republic revolt.

It took considerable boldness and courage on the part of President Johnson to move thousands of troops into the situation as promptly as he did.

Those who have accused him, unjustly in our opinion, of wanting to "govern by consensus" will have to admit that this was a situation calling for action before a consensus could be ascertained. He has moved with such dispatch before, notably in Vietnam last summer.

There will be some who will hark back to the old cries of gumboat diplomacy or dollar diplomacy. Our friends in Mexico, who are so hard to understand, and some of the other Latin American nations are complaining bitterly about unilateral U.S. action. Perhaps this was to be expected.

The hue and cry from the Communist world, if anything, confirms our already strong feeling that it would have been tragic for President Johnson or the United States to have done anything less. There seems to be reason to suspect that Communist elements, as they frequently do in Latin America and elsewhere, were quickly taking the reins of the vague, disorganized revolution.

In short, there's reason to believe that we had—and may still have, though the firm U.S. action has blunted it—a possible Castro Cuba regime taking shape. Even one such problem, oriented to Havana, in the Western Hemisphere is enough. We do not need another.

There are the usual charges and countercharges on the sounding board of international opinion which is the United Nations. The United States, however, can hold its own there. It would be unheard of for the Communists not to make a big thing of this in the U.N.

But of real significance in addition to the prompt, decisive U.S. action, it seems to us, is the manner in which the Organization of American States was brought immediately into the crisis. And apparently its special mission to the Dominican Republic and other efforts toward pacifying the situation are having some effect.

The prompt appeal of the United States to other Latin American nations to contribute troops, the U.S. willingness to work within the framework of the OAS all give the lie to charges of aggression and Yankee imperialism. These facts alone are pretty impressive evidence that we have indeed come a long way from the gunboat diplomacy of the Theodore Roosevelt era. It will take time and patience on our part, but gradually our Latin American friends are going to realize this.

The Importance of Peanuts to the Economy of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently, Mr. James E. Mobley, president of the Alabama Peanut Producers Association, delivered an informative speech on the importance of peanuts to the economy of Alabama and particularly to the southeastern counties in our State. I ask unanimous consent to have this speech, as printed in the Abbeville (Ala.) Herald, placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEANUT FARMERS' ROLE IN STATE'S EXPANDING AGRICULTURE

(By James E. Mobley, president, Alabama Peanut Producers Association)

Peanuts are grown to a limited extent in almost every county in Alabama, but the commercial peanut producing area is located in 15 southeast Alabama counties known as the Wiregrass. In many of these counties peanuts would be the major cash crop. Down through the years cotton has been singled out as king of the crop, but this is not true in the Wiregrass. Here peanuts reign supreme.

In southeast Alabama 15,500 growers plant about 200,000 acres of peanuts annually. Alabama's production totals about 122,000 tons annually and is valued at about $25 to $27 million. In spite of the fact that peanuts are produced by a relatively few growers in a rather small area, peanuts are the third ranking cash row crop in Alabama and occupy only about 6 percent of the total cropland.

A few years ago most of Alabama's peanuts were being placed under the Government loan program and crushed for oil or disposed of as surplus peanuts. To correct this situation, Alabama peanut growers set up an organization to promote the consumption of Alabama grown peanuts. They assessed themselves a dollar per ton to finance their program, employed a promotional organization to conduct a nationwide campaign to increase the consumption of Alabama peanuts. This program has been very successful. Now 90 percent of Alabama's peanut crop is being used in the manufacturing of peanut butter. Alabama grown peanuts are being shipped into every State in the Nation.

Alabama and Georgia growers have joined hands in a joining promotion program and launched out on a vastly expanded campaign selling southeastern peanuts far and wide. Also, the Alabama-Georgia Peanut Association initiated a joint quarterly publication, Southeastern Peanut Farmer, to inform growers on the action of their organization and keep them posted on developments in the peanut industry.

In the last 32 years, Alabama has increased her peanut yields from 561 pounds to 1,300 pounds per acre. This is an increase of about 230 percent. Even more significant is the fact that the State made half this gain in the last 10 years. It took about 22 years to make the first half of this increase.

In the Alabama-Georgia-Florida area, about 50,000 farmers produce $70 million worth of peanuts annually. This three-State area grows about one-half of all peanuts produced in the United States. In Alabama peanuts are the major source of income and provide about 30 percent of the cash farm income in southeast Alabama counties. Also peanuts provide employment for 1,000 to 1,500 nonfarm persons in handling, transporting, and the manufacture of peanuts and peanut products. This channels an estimated $4 million into the economy of the Wiregrass.

The investment in the peanut crop itself is important to the business community in southeast Alabama. Peanut growers invest annually an estimated $4 million in fertilizer and soil amenders, $3 million in seed, $1 million in fungicide, $500,000 in herbicides and $1.5 million in miscellaneous expenses.

Peanuts play a most important role in the economy of the Wiregrass. The growth and development of the livestock industry in southeast Alabama has come about through the use of peanuts and peanut byproducts. Hogs at one time were used to harvest peanuts from the field and more recently they are used to clean scattered peanuts. Drought cattle brought in from the West in 1933 were fed on peanut hay and until the advent of machine harvesting, peanut hay was the mainstay in the winter feeding program for beef and dairy cattle. At one time more peanut hay was bailed in Alabama than all other hay crops combined.

In conclusion let me say that I realize that peanuts play a rather small role in the State's total farm economy, but they are the most important crop grown to the people who depend upon them for a living.

The New Economics—Limited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most popular and respected economists in the Nation is J. A. Livingston, who writes a column in "Purchasing Week," the McGraw-Hill weekly for purchasing agents. In his May 31 column, Livingston points up the critical issue underlying the current national debate on economic policy so clearly that I am placing it at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues in the Congress:

THE NEW ECONOMICS AND ITS NEW HIGH PRIEST

(By J. A. Livingston)

Let me introduce a new phrase, if you haven't already heard it—"The new economics." It comes straight from the White House. Its high priest is Gardner Ackley, Chairman of President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers. The President, himself, is an ardent subscriber.

Ackley's predecessor, Walter W. Heller, was the first high priest. He promoted Government policies to keep prosperity rolling, ever rolling. The 1964 tax cut was his idea. It broke tradition: To reduce taxes during a period of expanding business when, at the same time, the Federal budget showed a deficit. But Heller persuaded first President Kennedy and later President Johnson that too high tax rates skimmed the top off prosperity and impeded economic growth.

Perhaps readers will remember the term "Keynesianism extended." That was how Sir Roy Harrod, famed British economist and biograhper of John Maynard Keynes, describes the new economics. He put it in three words: "Grow, America, grow."

Economics has gone beyond Keynes, Sir Roy Harrod said: "We want to insure that the productive potential is fully utilized. If plant capacity is idle, we must use it to increase total output and living standards.

"And since populations are growing and plant capacity is becoming more efficient, it is essential that growth keep pace with an ever-moving target. Keynes said that it is the government's responsibility to guard against unemployment during recessions—to prevent recessions from spiraling into a depression. Today it is equally important for the Government—by appropriate policy—to guard against an insufficiency of growth and hence against pernicious and continuing unemployment and underutilization of resources."

And here is how Ackley put it in an address called The New Economics for the Great Society:

"The new economics of fiscal policy was given its more significant test in the Revenue Act of 1964. Federal taxes were cut by $14 billion (at this year's level of incomes)—not because expenditures had declined, or because we had a budget surplus to share; and not because we were in or about to plunge into recession.

"Rather, it was done deliberately, boldly, on the explicit premise that, given our then existing tax structure, total demand had not grown, and could not reasonably be expected to grow sufficiently fast to catch up and to keep up with the growth of our potential output.

"The experiment has been a stunning success, convincing even many of its critics. An expansion which on the basis of all past history was overdue to slip off into recession took on new life. This month—May 1965—we have broken all peacetime records for the duration of expansion, and no end of prosperity is in sight."

The new economics is more than tax or fiscal policy. It calls for the proper mixture of fiscal, budgetary, credit, and wage-price policies to assure adequate growth without inflation.

What is adequate growth?

GUIDELINE FOR GROWTH

Imagine if you will the potential output of the Nation—the gross national product—in terms of full utilization of manpower, machinery, and industrial know-how. It's probably too much to expect that this potential can be realized all the time. So the architects of the new economics settle for 90 percent. If that's achieved, well and good, but the achievement must be continuous against Sir Roy's ever-moving target.

As Ackley puts it, "The potential grows because our population and therefore our labor force expands. It grows because capital accumulates through saving, providing more and better machines for the expanding labor force to use. It grows, further, because output per worker steadily rises—as management and organization improve; as better educated and better trained workers become more skilled, adaptable, and strongly motivated; and as science and technology provide new and better ways to produce the goods and services we value."

It is the function of the new economics—the proper mix of policies—to "contribute positively" to demand—to keep prosperity climbing. Another term for it is "gap economics." It was presented to the New Frontier Society in 1962 in a chart entitled "Gross National Product, Actual and Potential, and Unemployment Rate." This was in the first such Kennedy report to Congress. Heller was the Chief Economic Adviser.

In each report since, that chart has reappeared—brought up to date. One line shows the Nation's economic (GNP) potential based on 96 percent use of the Nation's resources. Another line shows actual output. It's lower, of course and the gray-hatched difference is the gap—the underutilization of resources. Then, separately, is shown unemployment. The narrower the gap, the lower is the rate of unemployment.

In both the 1964 report and the 1965 report, the Council of Economic Advisers was able to report progress toward diminishing the gap. But not until the gap has been closed will the "new economists" be satisfied.

MARTIN HAS DOUBTS

The new economics has not, however, nationwide support. One nonworshiper is William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. At the recent convention of the Society of American Business Writers, he said: "I am not sure that the policy of perpetual growth will be vindicated by easy money and perpetual deficits."

Martin understands what President Johnson and Gardner Ackley want. But he feels that the capacity of men to control events is counterbalanced by the power of events to get out of hand and control men. Martin is concerned about the balance-of-payments deficit and the consequent outflow of gold.

He, therefore, is apprehensive about the new economics when leans toward easy money—plenty of credit—so long as a gap between actual and potential gross national product exists.

Herein lies danger—danger of head-on conflict between orthodox monetary policy and the new economics, between Martin and Ackley on money-and-credit policy.

Compared to interest rates abroad, money is cheap here. This has been an important factor in the outflow of capital, in the transfer to funds abroad. Just as water seeks its own level flowing downward, money seeks its own level flowing upward to where interest rates (and safety) are highest.

Once the United States could be an island of low interest in the world, because of doubts—about other currencies—the mark, the franc, the pound, the lira. But now these currencies are convertible—interchangeable with the dollar. The dollar can't be an island of low-interest unto itself.

The other day Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY made a significant speech in New York. He emphasized—as does Chairman Martin—that it is "imperative" that the United States bring its balance-of-payments deficit to a swift and sure end. Of greater significance was his statement that it is a complex task because many factors are beyond our control. This is a stride toward understanding.

The new economics cannot function independently of foreign affairs. We cannot disregard the attitudes of President De Gaulle of France and the finance ministers and central bankers throughout the world. Our policies may be right for us and the world in the long run.

But if foreign countries, which control huge dollar balances, consider U.S. policy wrong in the short run, we're in trouble. We'll lose gold—steadily, uncontrollably, irreparably. Hence we can't give the new economics free reign.

This is what the new economics is up against.

Washington: The Impulsive Giant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the current foreign situation is, naturally, a matter of vital importance to the people of the United States and the U.S. Congress. James Reston, in two recent commentaries in the New York Times, reflects the concern shared by many of our citizens and an even higher percentage of our friends abroad over the impulsive unilateral action by our administration in both Vietnam and Santo Domingo. This concern involves not so much criticism of the decisions reached, but, in the words of Mr. Reston:

> Rather a feeling of uncertainty about the way policy is made, even among those who favor the general lines of the policies being adopted * * * Washington can talk of nothing else * * * The administration is not giving the impression that it is working away steadily and calmly on these critical issues, but that it is frustrated and a little rattled.

The two commentaries follow in their entirety:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 21, 1965]

WASHINGTON: THE IMPULSIVE GIANT

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 20.—The Johnson administration looks a little these days like those popular cartoons of the President himself—the two-gun Texas Ranger, the impulsive giant, tough, restless, fitful, and unpredictable.

It is a damaging picture, for it conforms too neatly to that other popular caricature of America as the all-powerful but awkward and inexperienced Goliath.

All sorts of things have contributed to this picture over the last 7 months, culminating in the extraordinary fits and starts in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

THE SWITCHES

After the election last November, the administration was concentrating on the creation of a multilateral nuclear force in the Atlantic, and then suddenly dropped the project and has been comparatively passive in its European policy ever since.

President Johnson could scarcely have been more outspoken in his opposition to bombing North Vietnam at the end of last year and the beginning of this, but he switched. That war, he at first insisted, had to be won by the South Vietnamese, with U.S. advice and support, but now it has become a vital interest of the United States.

He started out by refusing to talk very much in public about the objectives of his attacks on North Vietnam, and then began talking about them almost every day. He was unalterably opposed to the unconditional negotiations over Vietnam, and is now almost pleading for them.

He was irritated by those who suggested a pause in the bombing and then agreed to the pause. Meanwhile, he has steeply reinforced the American ground troops in Vietnam, and expanded their missions, though his major theme last year was that a land war on the Asian continent was the last thing America should risk.

WHAT GOES ON?

The military and diplomatic moves in the Dominican Republic, coming on top of all this, have added greatly to the uneasiness in the Capital. The President acted within an hour to land the Marines in that island on the basis of cables from his Ambassador in Santo Domingo, though the Ambassador is now being widely criticized and pushed aside within his own administration.

The marines were to be neutral in the Dominican Republic, but were at first "neutral" on the side of the junta, and then on the side of the rebels, and then back again to the junta until a new order of "strict neutrality" went out today.

The Organization of American States was at first ignored, and then persuaded to take responsibility for settling the political dispute in Santo Domingo, at which point the President dispatched a powerful delegation of his own to Santo Domingo under his personal aid, McGeorge Bundy, to do the same thing.

This is not an example of Johnsonian "consensus" policymaking, except in a certain sense. It is almost as if the President has done one thing to please one group of his critics one day, and something quite different to placate another group the next—or that, determined to do something, he was trying anything.

The effect of all this has been more serious than the sum of the various parts. For it has created a feeling of uncertainty about the way policy is made, even among those who favor the general lines of the policies being adopted.

So completely is the President himself dominating the scene here, following the details of every move in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, making the tactical as well as the strategic decisions, defending them on the air, presenting them in endless sessions with Congressmen and reporters, that everything suddenly seems an extension of his personality.

THE ONE-MAN SHOW

Washington can talk of nothing else. More important, the diplomatic corps is just as intrigued by his way of operating as everybody else and is constantly explaining each move to the various capitals in terms of the President's personal decisions and political judgments.

In short, the administration is not giving the impression that it is working away steadily and calmly on these critical issues, but that it is frustrated and a little rattled.

When President Johnson took over the White House, he determined to give the Government a style of his own, and in this he has succeeded. It has worked brilliantly on the home front. He has designed his legislative program and even seen it through the Congress, but he has not organized the Government so much as he has made it over in his own image.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 28, 1965]

WASHINGTON: WHO SPEAKS UP TO JOHNSON?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 27.—Criticism in Washington never ends, but the object of criticism seems to change with the personality and methods of each administration.

When Dwight Eisenhower was President, all the blunders of his administration were blamed on somebody else, usually John Foster Dulles, Sherman Adams, or Vice President Nixon.

In the Kennedy administration, the resident devil of the critics was Bobby, or in the first Cuban crisis, the Central Intelligence Agency. But under President Johnson, all criticism is directed at the President himself, probably because everybody really is under Johnson who presides as Chief Executive, Commander in Chief, Secretary of State, majority leader, White House press secretary, and everything else.

THE CABINET'S PROBLEM

Nobody who dominates the scene so completely and so personally can avoid the main brunt of public criticism, and yet there is a fundamental problem here which is so delicate that it dominates private conversation in the Capital but seldom becomes part of the public discussion of national affairs.

This is that the men closest to the President in the Cabinet and the White House staff do not seem to be speaking plainly and bluntly to the President about the conduct and substance of some of his policies.

They are close to him—no Cabinet or White House staff in this century ever had such easy access to the central source of power—but the impression of well-informed people here is that they are not frank in expressing their opposition to the style and substance of many of his actions.

ADVISERS' ROLE

This is not always true, but it is true enough to raise the basic question of whether the Cabinet and the White House staff are meeting their responsibilities.

Secretary of State Rusk's stock taking on the crisis in the Dominican Republic at his press conference this week illustrates part of the point. President Johnson has given the impression in his private and some of his public remarks on this problem that he landed the marines on that island not only to save American lives but to avoid an imminent Communist conquest—another Cuba—in Santo Domingo.

This was given as part of the official explanation of why it was impossible to take even a few hours to consult the other nations in the Organization of American States before landing the marines in opposition to the prohibition against military action in the hemisphere by any one nation. But Secretary Rusk talked in his press conference this week merely of the possibility of a Communist takeover.

Secretary Rusk confirmed that the administration acted quickly on the basis of a top secret telegram from the U.S. Ambassador in Santo Domingo. He explained, with some regret, that this seemed to be the thing to do at the time and he spelled it out in one of the most remarkable examples of bureaucratic gobbledegook in recent history.

"It was that telegram," he said, "which was emergent, which was what we call a critic telegram—that is, it's the fastest and most emergent kind we have. That is, it was, that telegram that indicated that there was a most immediate problem on the scene."

That kind of language by itself is enough to make the critics wonder, but that is not the main point. It merely gives credence to the feeling among watchful people here that the President acted quickly in Santo Domingo on the basis of an emergent and critic telegram—whatever that is—and without even an hour or two of discussion of the implications of breaking the Nation's treaty commitments against unilateral military intervention.

THE BASIC QUESTIONS

The main questions being asked here, therefore, are not about American action in the Dominican Republic itself, but about the way the Johnson administration decides on actions, and particularly what part the informed members of the Cabinet have to play in such decisions.

Is the United States going to act whenever it gets one of these emergent cables from some Ambassador in some other Latin American or other capital?

Does the President, it is being asked here, mean it when he says that he will oppose any threat of any Communist influence in any uprising in this hemisphere?

Is it likely that there will not be at least 54 or 58 identifiable Communists in any uprising in any country in this hemisphere, and is American action in the Dominican Republic to be regarded as a model of U.S. policy in future rebellions in the hemisphere?

Traffic Safety Signal Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Congress has before it a number of proposals to improve traffic safety. I helped to write four of the bills myself and am eager to endorse any worthwhile program which will reduce the outrageous loss of life and property which we witness each year.

For this reason I call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial appearing recently in the Hammond, Ind., Times. A Hammond resident, Roy Sigmundi, has suggested an improved method of operation for traffic signals which, I believe, merits the careful consideration of us all.

I ask unanimous consent, that the text of the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTERING TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Many a Calumet region motorist has had the experience of seeing a traffic signal change in an apparent split second. This can be dangerous. The sudden stop required can injure passengers when they are suddenly thrown forward in the car.

The suggestion of a Hammond man, Roy Sigmundi, of 4139 Sheffield Avenue, therefore, makes a good deal of sense. Sigmundi proposes a device to flash the green signal on and off during the last 5 seconds of its cycle.

At present, Sigmundi points out, a motorist has only 2 seconds warning, on the average, from the yellow signal, before the traffic light changes to red. His plan for a green flasher would give motorists 7 seconds to slow down before a signal turns red.

Sigmundi has submitted his idea to local traffic and safety officials, and is seeking to interest the National Safety Council. The flasher idea certainly has merit, since a yellow signal in itself has the drawback, if timed long, of tending to make motorists careless about running the light.

Which brings up the subject of pedestrian traffic signal cycles in downtown Hammond. The "leave curb" signal advises that traffic has been stopped so people can cross safely. By the time the average pedestrian walker is halfway or so across the street, a "don't leave curb" signal flashes.

Unconsciously, many pedestrians become worried when this happens and begin to walk more hastily, or even run, to beat the light change which they feel is imminent.

Actually, they have several seconds more of protection, enough to complete their crossing of the street, before the signal will change to allow cars to move once more.

"Walk" and "don't walk" signs were in use at one time, but some pedestrians became confused at this one, too, so that the other wording was substituted.

Sigmundi has come up with an idea to improve the warning system for motorists. Perhaps he can evolve an improvement in the pedestrian light slogans, so that people crossing the street will realize they have full protection for several more seconds, without running and risking a stumble and fall.

The 50th Wedding Anniversary of Former Representative and Mrs. Izac, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it was my privilege to enter the 75th Congress with Congressman Edouard Victor Michael Izac, a Congressional Medal of Honor winner, from San Diego, Calif. This past weekend, Congressman and Mrs. Izac celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary.

Recently I had the opportunity of reading an item about former Congressman Izac and his family. I ask unanimous consent to have this informative item printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am sure that other friends of the Izacs will be interested in reading the account, also.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLDEN WEDDING ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATED

Former Congressman and Mrs. Edouard Victor Michel Izac, of San Diego and Washington, D.C., celebrate their golden wedding anniversary Saturday June 5.

Congressman Izac, a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, class of 1915, was married the day following his graduation to Agnes Cabell, daughter of the late Maj. Gen. De Rosey Carroll Cabell. They have six children, five of whom are living. Three will attend the private ceremony here in Washington. The other two, in service and stationed overseas, are not expected to attend.

Congressman Izac, holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor, served in Congress for 10 years, representing the San Diego and Imperial Counties of California. Presently retired, he and Mrs. Izac have traveled extensively in Europe and the Holy Land. Mr. Izac is the author of "Prisoner of the U-90," his autobiography of World War I while held prisoner. He has written articles for current magazines and lectured extensively since his congressional terms.

A mass is to be celebrated Saturday morning in the private chapel of His Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate. The mass will be celebrated by the Izacs' youngest son, ordained a Catholic priest a year ago. He will be assisted by two monsignors and the delegate will bestow the Pontiff's special blessing upon the couple. The mass, to which the children and grandchildren have been invited, will be followed by a private breakfast.

Congressman Izac, when asked about the celebration, said: "It is a very quiet affair. We look back with fond memories on San Diego days and watch from afar its growth and prosperity. We are here in Washington because most of our children reside in the area." These include his eldest daughter, Cabell Waller Berge, who served as her father's secretary in Congress (with three children and two grandchildren); Comdr. Edouard V. Izac, Jr., stationed in Naples, Italy (with four children) who will try to fly home for the occasion; Charles D. Izac, serving in a civilian capacity with Army Materiel here (and his wife and three children) Mrs. Eugene Fenton Smallwood (Suzanne) whose husband, Major Smallwood, and six children are shortly to leave their assignment in Hawaii for Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; soon to visit their parents before the new assignment; and Rev. Carroll Andre Izac, presently assigned to Our Lady of Victory Church, in Washington, D.C. The sixth child, Forrest Rene, deceased, is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

Early this fall, the Congressman's book, "The Holy Land—Then and Now," will be published.

Morning Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Abe Mellinkoff, a daily contributor to the San Francisco Chronicle, under the title of "Morning Report" offered suggestions as to modern-day diplomacy. The first column appeared on May 17 and the second one on May 24:

MORNING REPORT

As a guess, I'd say there must be tens of thousands of self-appointed, ad hoc secretaries of state roaming our streets these days. And all of them say we should be negotiating in Vietnam instead of fighting.

This would be a splendid idea except for one thing: Nobody will negotiate with us. By radio and newspaper, China has turned us down. For a while, there was a chance of negotiating slyly about Vietnam at a conference to be called to discuss Cambodia. But then Cambodia declined.

Peiping did say she would talk if first we got out of South Vietnam. That's not very promising either, because once we got out, there would be nothing left to negotiate about.

ABE MELLINKOFF.

MORNING REPORT

In the olden days, I am told, foreign affairs were conducted quietly at diplomatic teas or at secret meetings by middle-aged gentlemen in darkly paneled conference rooms. We've come a long ways. Boy, have we!

It's now done at mass meetings. Spats have given way to sandals or even bare feet in extreme cases. Vietnam experts, who never blossomed, bloom happily. And a psychiatrist with a microphone is transmuted into a specialist in Caribbean politics. For those who tire of world affairs, there are interludes on the guitar.

I think Mr. Johnson will have to fight fire with fire. Make his next TV appearance shoeless and break up his speech with selections on the banjo.

ABE MELLINKOFF.

California Agricultural Production Increases Despite End of Bracero Foreign Labor Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, in view of recent discussions of the effect of last year's congressional refusal to perpetuate the bracero foreign farm labor importation system, I believe many of the Members would be interested in reading a most enlightening Los Angeles Times article on this subject.

The article, written by Times Labor Editor Harry Bernstein, and appearing in the May 25, 1965, edition of the Times, was entitled "State Crop Gains Reported Despite Labor Controversy—Vegetables and Fruit Above 1964."

The article follows:

STATE CROP GAINS REPORTED DESPITE LABOR CONTROVERSY—VEGETABLES AND FRUIT ABOVE 1964

(By Harry Bernstein, Times labor editor)

California production of fruits and vegetables is slightly higher than at this time last year despite the bitter farm labor controversy, it was reported Monday.

On prices, L. N. Gardner, head of the Department of Agriculture's Market News Bureau here, said:

"Prices at the wholesale level vary widely from crop to crop, but in view of the increased volume generally, it is difficult to see how the prices which are higher can be attributed to labor shortages or wage increases.

"There is no single explanation for the situation, and labor costs could be one of many factors, but the major explanation seems to be, as it always is, the vagaries of weather and the mood of the buying public."

MORE MEXICANS APPROVED

The crop analysis came as State Employment Director Albert Tieburg approved a grower request for the use of 500 more Mexican nationals in the harvesting of asparagus in the San Joaquin farm area, where about 1,000 Mexicans and Japanese have already been authorized for use.

Nearly 2,000 Mexican nationals have been authorized by the Department of Labor for the Salinas area, and other requests are pending from the Blythe area.

Growers have contended that the Mexicans are needed because of extensive crop losses resulting from the end of the old Mexican farm labor import program, and because of an inadequate number of Americans for the jobs.

Gardner said there "may be losses, and it is difficult to take into account all of the factors involved, but all I can do is give the statistics as they have come in so far."

BREAKDOWN GIVEN

He gave this breakdown of volume and prices of several key crops this year compared to last year, emphasizing that these figures, too, may not fully reflect the entire picture because of variations over periods of several years, including those when labor was not regarded as a problem:

Lettuce: Total volume of lettuce through the last full reporting date of May 13 was 19,138 carlots from California this year, compared to 19,096 at the same time last year.

And Imperial Valley winter lettuce this year was actually held back from the market by "harvesting holidays," because growers reached an agreement on marketing quotas to stop the flooding of the market, he explained.

The prices at the start of 1965 were down to $1.75 to $2 a carton of 24 Imperial Valley winter heads each, compared to between $5 and $5.25 at the same time last year.

But by the third week of this month, prices were ranging from $3 to $4 a carton, compared to $1.35 to $2.25 at the same time last year.

Joseph Campbell, another market service analyst, said a check of the Los Angeles lettuce market Monday showed "good supplies, with prices holding firm, and rising slightly."

"It is difficult to explain why prices are still pretty good (high) now compared to last year, but it cannot be explained by a lack of volume in production and this would indicate it is not really a labor problem," Gardner said.

Tomatoes: California volume as of the last complete reporting period of May 13 was 10,419 carlots compared to 10,130 a year ago.

The national tomato total was even higher this year, 20,726 carlots so far compared to 19,232 in 1964. Some observers have blamed this increase on imports from Mexico.

The totals for the Nation include shipments from Mexico, but as of May 13 the shipments from Mexico were down this year: 5,690 carlots compared to 5,713 in 1964.

HARVEST JUST STARTING

California tomato harvesting is just getting started but prices are running higher than last year for Mexican tomatoes: $3.50 to $4 for a 20-pound flat in 1964 compared to $5.50 to $6 this year.

Gardner noted, however, that the higher Mexican tomato prices cannot be attributed to labor problems in California, and that at this time last year there were no tomatoes coming from California fields while there has been some production already this year.

Asparagus: California rail shipments this year total 1,713 carlots compared to only 1,452 carlots last year at the same time.

Asparagus prices are somewhat higher this year: 19 to 25 cents a pound compared to 15 to 20 cents last year.

Strawberries: Carlot shipments of fresh berries total 1,912 this year compared to 1,958 carlots last year, but berries sent to processors have jumped substantially by around 70 carlots to a total of 1,480,268 pounds, compared to only 366,574 pounds last year.

Also the overall increase is from a smaller acreage of strawberry plantings, but the money earned by growers from selling to processors is less than the sale to the fresh market.

Prices for fresh berries from the Orange County area, Gardner reported, ranged between $2.25 to $2.50 a 12-pint tray this year, compared to a somewhat higher range of from $2.50 to $2.75 last year.

But berries from the Watsonville area, where the season is now peaking, are selling wholesale for $3.50 to $4 a tray compared to $3 to $3.50 last year at this time.

But Gardner noted that last year, berry prices in early April were ranging up to $4.75 a tray compared to this past April's $2 to $2.50 a tray.

Oranges: Navel orange production so far this year is running about 7 percent behind last year's harvesting rate, Gardner said, but total figures are not available because harvesting is continuing.

However, the end result will be approximately the same as last year, or down slightly, he said.

Prices of oranges vary according to size, but the large sizes (56 to 72 a carton) were selling for between $2.60 to $2.75 early this month compared to $4.50 to $5 in 1964.

Smaller oranges (88 to 138 per carton) ranged from $2.50 to $4.25 last year compared to $2.75 to $3.25 this year.

The longer fruit stays on the trees, the larger it gets, so it was easier to see a direct effect of fewer workers in the citrus industry, Gardner said. Thus, the large-sized fruit was in heavy supply due to slower picking, with prices down as an apparent result. (The State's Valencia crop is just coming in now.)

Lemons: Lemon harvesting is behind last year by an estimated 11 percent, but "it is too soon to say that there will be any substantial number of lemons left on the trees unharvested."

"But the bulk of the crop available can still be picked, even though more of it may go to processing instead of the fresh market," he said.

Lemon prices are up to an average $3.69 this season compared to $2.78 a carton last year.

Tax Increase on Retread Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, soon the second phase of the Johnson administration's excise tax program will be before the House. Included in this revenue-increasing portion is a proposal for doubling the tax rate on tread rubber. The measure is aimed at heavy trucking outlets and is supposed to generate additional revenue.

However, the primary burden of this increase will be carried by the customer

and smaller, independent trucker because of the great impact upon the retreading industry. The projected 100-percent increase is an unfair tax and would probably raise the price of a recapped passenger tire by at least 50 cents.

Retreading companies would have to raise the price of their tires, an increase which would be passed on to the consumer, and more people would be induced to buy cheaper, new tires which are marketed with no restrictions as to price or quality. A tax doubling would put retreaders who are trying to hold up tire standards in a difficult economic pinch.

It is economically wise to maintain and raise some forms of revenue to meet our deficits caused by spending in other areas, but it is totally incongruous to aim increases at the very same people who were offered tax relief by the reductions last week.

I ask unanimous consent that two letters I have received from retreading companies on this issue be inserted into the RECORD:

RAPID CITY, S. DAK.,
May 26, 1965.

Hon. E. Y. BERRY,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BERRY: It is with keen interest that I follow the inconsistency of the Johnson administration in regards to tax cuts. While proposing to lower the tax on luxuries, they have called on Congress to double the tax on tread rubber.

The recapper is one of the few independent businessmen in the rubber business today, and I am proud to say that Eddies Tire & Glass can still call themselves independent in the respect we are privately owned. The proposed 10 cents per pound excise tax on retread rubber is unjust, unfair, and discriminatory for the following reasons:

1. One hundred percent increase in any tax is unfair.
2. It puts a tax on small business, with a product that is primarily sold to low-income customers.
3. Knowing the retread business, I can justly say that quality retreads are safer than cheaple new tires. The proposed tax would have the tendency to induce people to buy new cheap tires with low safety standards. (Manufactured by all tire companies.)
4. One-third of our tire business is represented in the retreading field; this also represents a like number of our employees, and their well-being financially is directly connected to the retreading business.
5. It is inconsistent with the proposed tax reductions on cars, etc.

I earnestly request you use all the means available to you in opposing this tax increase on retread rubber.

Yours respectfully,
EDDIES TIRE & GLASS, INC.,
MILO RYPKEMA,
District Chairman, National Federation Independent Businessmen.

JUNE 3, 1965.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a small truck operator, I wish to voice my objection to the administration's proposed Federal taxes that are to be increased on diesel fuel, retread rubber, and highway use tax.

In the first place, I do not believe there is any justification for these proposed increases at all. From all I read about the interstate highway program, it is progressing at almost the planned rate although some of the States' cost of construction has risen. For the overall program, it would be much more sound to stretch the completion date out a year or two, rather than raise these various taxes on the highway user, just for the sake of a crash program.

Secondly, the trucking industry is now paying more than their fair share of all highway costs. As you know, in 1963, trucks which comprise 15 percent of all vehicles in the United States, paid 32 percent of all special motor-vehicle taxes collected by all of the States.

Third, any increase of taxes on the trucking industry will result in many of us going out of business. I know in the petroleum hauling business that the competition from pipelines and railroads that any rate increases to offset a tax increase would be a resulting loss of business. If we have to raise the rates, we aren't going to have any business left.

The social planners in Washington would like to see this tax bill passed for it would be another nail in the coffin of a free transportation system and a step further toward nationalization of all transportation. I urge your committee to resist administration pressure and table this bill.

Very truly yours,
ELDON D. AYRES.

In Education Rests the Future of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1965

My BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening every time we see evidence of appreciation by our young people of the value of education.

An essay by a high school senior, Stephen Birringer, of Manitowoc, in the Eighth Wisconsin District, is just such evidence. Stephen's essay won first place in a senior high contest sponsored by the Women's Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He placed second in the schoolwide competition as a freshman, first as a sophomore, second as a junior, and now again first as senior.

"In Education Rests the Future of America" is the title of Stephen's essay, which follows:

IN EDUCATION RESTS THE FUTURE OF AMERICA

Thomas Jefferson warned, "No nation can be both ignorant and free." Education is our key to freedom and our insurance against ignorance.

Let's consider how education is shaping America today and what prospects it holds for continued achievement. In our schools, students express ideas with very little restriction. They can defend the merits of their convictions and thereby become thoughtful individuals, not merely gears in a machine of conformity.

Education forms the three basic challenges of American society: cooperation, competition, and conflict.

Cooperation is stressed in our families, our schools, and our community projects. Education prepares Americans to work effectively with others to accomplish civic, religious, and political objectives.

Out of our schools come America's leaders. They cooperate. But just as important, they compete. Through competition, individuals utilize their abilities and work to get ahead. Our educational system places great stress on competition so that students work hard to improve, build better character within themselves, and achieve goals they have set.

Education plays another important role. It meets conflict with our enemies. Opposing systems and ideas can be handled very well, thanks to our educational system. Ideologies threatening to subvert our free society can be defeated by a clash of ideas among enlightened and trained citizens. We are able to keep our freedom and wage victory for America.

We have made the choice between ignorance and education. But the task is still not complete. Scan the globe and you will envision the challenges we still must face. Dictators are trying to smash the pillars of freedom. They seize emotion, play upon ignorance and use every conceivable device to bring us to our knees. In the face of these assaults, we have marked our road to greatness and insured our destiny. For in education rests the future of America.

Ed Foreman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, recently there has come to my attention an editorial about one of our good friends and a former colleague, Mr. Ed Foreman of Texas. Those of us who served in the Congress with Mr. Foreman knew him to be a capable leader, a distinguished gentleman, and, indeed, an outstanding young man. I ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial tribute of the Odessa American, Odessa, Tex., be included as a part of the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Odessa American, May 27, 1965]

ED FOREMAN

Ever since Odessa's Ed Foreman lost his bid for a second term to Congress last November, there has been considerable speculation as to what the defeat would do to the political career of this ardent spokesman for conservatism.

It was in December of 1960 that Foreman sought out a member of this newspaper's staff to confide that he was going to challenge the Democrats' entrenched J. T. Rutherford. Also an Odessan, Rutherford had become a formidable power in west Texas politics and he was gaining national stature in Washington.

Soon, Foreman took to the campaign trail where he began to attack big government, socialism, and Rutherford's "go-along-to-get-along" policy of supporting a liberal, free-spending administration.

After months of relentless campaigning which saw his crowds grow slowly but surely larger, west Texans still could not bring themselves to take seriously Foreman's chances of unseating the Democratic Congressman. Rutherford chose to ignore him, and the clever incumbent continued to speak ceremoniously of "fiscal responsibility" back home while voting the big-spending ticket in Washington.

Then came that fateful election year of 1962. Rutherford steamrollered over four fellow Democrats in the May primary which he won without a runoff. Foreman, un-

opposed, was nominated by the Republicans.

Shortly, newspapers across the country and especially in Rutherford's hometown proclaimed that a $1,500 campaign donation from a wheeler-dealer in Pecos had been cleverly concealed from the public since long before the primary.

"I could have dropped my teeth," Rutherford exclaimed as the impropriety of the gift was brought pointedly to his attention. That quotation came back many times to haunt him.

Along came November and the voters ignored the oddsmakers as they kicked Rutherford out of office. In his place, they named Ed Foreman who had traveled the district in a Model T Ford bearing the slogan: "Cars go out of style; honesty in Government never should."

Foreman did what he said he'd do in Washington. He voted a straight conservative ticket, he fought socialism in and out of Government, and he pleaded for a return to free enterprise principles along the way.

Some folks complained that the National Republican Party made too many demands of Foreman's time by sending him all over the country to speak at Republican rallies where the theme of "less Government, more individual initiative" was stressed.

Others thought he was too conservative, and that he ought to seek, rather than oppose, the many Government services available to his district. The overwhelming liberal element in El Paso made this district predominantly Democrat country, so it was natural that Foreman's criticisms of the administration didn't set well with the Democrats. And, since Billie Sol Estes was no longer an issue in west Texas politics, it was no great surprise when an El Paso Democrat of the moderate variety (RICHARD WHITE) defeated Foreman in 1964.

Since his defeat, Foreman has been traveling throughout the United States, speaking to civic, professional, and political groups in behalf of the crusade he chooses to continue for conservative government.

He has consistently refused to discuss his political plans, but just recently the first tangible clue as to what he plans to do leaked out. It may not have leaked, however, and it may prove to be a deliberate plant in order to test prevailing attitudes.

R. F. Juedeman, Foreman's campaign manager in 1962 and 1964 who maintained a Government office here during Foreman's tenure, distributed a news release last weekend regarding Foreman's appearances in Maine and in Washington, D.C.

The report said Foreman, a trustee of Americans for Constitutional Action, would attend a program honoring Congressmen with conservative voting records. It noted that "because of his consistently liberal voting record," Representative RICHARD C. WHITE was not among the 100 Representatives and Senators so honored.

Highlight of the release came near the end when Juedeman wrote, "The articulate young conservative is considered by many political analysts as a strong potential candidate for reelection to Congress next year."

It continued, "Should Foreman decide to seek a return to Congress in 1966, he would probably face incumbent Congressman O. C. FISHER, of San Angelo, or RICHARD C. WHITE, of El Paso, depending on the outcome of the present Congressional redistricting controversy now in the Texas State Legislature."

After pointing out that Foreman, his wife, and two children reside in Odessa, that Foreman maintains an office in Odessa and has made some investments in New Mexico, the article signed off.

To us, it sounded like a preliminary announcement.

Foreman is an aggressive, hard working, and dedicated young man who, we believe, sincerely wants to stem the tide of socialism. He preaches that people should do things for themselves instead of looking to the Government to do it for them.

But one man alone cannot slow the pace of big government. And it is very difficult to convince people they ought to refuse cash handouts from Uncle Sam when neighboring districts on all sides of them are getting fat off of the same source they are asked to reject.

There's an epidemic of socialism afoot. It goes by the name of L.B.J.'s Great Society program, and it's contagious. Ed Foreman and others like him may be the best antidote available to us.

Portrait of President Johnson Unveiled in the Senate Chamber of the State Capitol in Austin, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, in the Senate Chamber of the State Capitol in Austin, Tex., a portrait of President Lyndon Baines Johnson was unveiled following a most stirring presentation address by State Senator Dorsey B. Hardeman of San Angelo, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD Senator Hardeman's magnificent speech of tribute to our great President:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DORSEY B. HARDEMAN, OF SAN ANGELO, TEX., AT THE UNVEILING OF A PORTAIT OF PRESIDENT LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, SENATE CHAMBER, MAY 28, 1965

Mr. President of the United States, this is an inspiring and moving occasion for Texas.

This fine gathering is indicative of the genuine pride we all have in you, our fellow Texan, who has gone from the Pedernales to the Potomac, through dedication to your State and country.

Your apprenticeship in leading began as a Member of the National House of Representatives. Advancing to the U.S. Senate, you quickly became the most effective majority leader in our Nation's history, through your philosophy of "reasoning together." Then, as Vice President and now as President, you have demonstrated your abiding interest in improving the lot of your fellowman, both at home and throughout the world.

Your legislative, diplomatic, political, and native abilities, together with your masterful skill in the science of government, have provided you with experience available to no other man on the American scene—a source of knowledge essential and peculiar to the office of President.

These qualities, and your patriotism, gave assurance and confidence, as the reins of our country passed into your capable hands 18 months ago. Your strength was comfort to "the flaming ramparts of the world" amid the sadness of the dark and tragic event when your predecessor was slain, and our distinguished Governor seriously wounded.

With your steadily upward climb in public service you have been blessed, as have most great men, by a faithful helpmate. You proudly acknowledge that since college days, the charming, intelligent, and understanding companionship of "Lady Bird" Johnson has profoundly influenced your course and career.

It was my honor a good many years ago to present you to a San Angelo audience and, later, at a 1959 testimonial dinner in Memphis, Tenn., honoring my father. I recall my expressed hopes and the accuracy of my prediction, on both such occasions. I stated that as Texas' most famous living son and the Nation's most important figure, you would be utilized in a greater field of service to the American people and for the everlasting good of mankind.

The record of illustrious actions is most safely deposited in the universal remembrances of mankind. Our object, by the unveiling of your portrait in this chamber, is to show our deep appreciation of your notable achievements.

We wish that whosoever, in all coming time, may behold your likeness will reflect upon the tremendous problems with which you have been beset and will continue to be faced during the next 7½ years as our President. We wish that this portrait may proclaim the magnitude and importance—and encompass your role—as our President, in domestic, as well as in international affairs.

We wish that infancy may learn the purpose of its display from maternal lips; that middle age may look upon it and be proud of its contributions and toil; and that weary and withered years may behold it—solaced by the history it represents.

We pray that in days of national despondency that patriotism may turn its eyes hitherward and be assured that the foundations of our national power are still strong in your command.

We hope that your growing influence of enlightened sentiment may establish the permanent peace of the world for which you so earnestly strive.

It is indeed a singular and touching tribute that while in the fullness of our country's happiness, we offer this painting in your honor—not as a mere work of art or memorial of glory, but for our country's own existence, which you symbolize.

And now, as this picture is presented, let us indulge an honest exultation of pride in you. This pride is sobered only by the knowledge of the awesome responsibility that is ours.

The last hope of mankind rests with America. If it should be proclaimed that our example has become an argument against the experiment of representative government, the knell of popular liberty would be sounded throughout the earth. The great trust of our forefathers—the principle of free governments which adheres to the American soil—has descended to you.

In your time there remains to us the great duties of defense, preservation, and improvement. Let us advance the arts of peace and the works of peace. Pursuing these high objectives under destiny's assignment, let us act under a settled conviction that our 50 States are one country. Let our conception be enlarged to the circle of our duties, and let us extend our ideas over the whole of the vast field in which we are called to act.

May this portrait of you, displayed in this magnificent temple of government upon which Texans, and the world, may gaze with admiration, remind us of our charge.

I, therefore, on behalf of the generous and public-spirited donors, present to the Senate of Texas this portrait of the 36th President of these United States.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Hoppe, the columnist for the San Fran-

cisco Chronicle and other papers throughout the country, had three recent columns on Washington affairs which again display his marvelous ability at satire.

The first column appeared May 26, the second one on May 31, and the third one on June 3.

The columns follow:

THE MAKING OF A FOREIGN POLICY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

The magazines these days all seem to be running articles about our foreign policy, with titles that end in question marks. Like: "Policy or Drift?" or "Whither the U.S.?" and the general tenor is that Mr. Johnson is just the man to press forward a vigorous foreign policy. If only he had one handy.

Indeed, you get the impression that no one in Washington is making foreign policy. This is highly unfair. Actually, almost everyone in Washington is. No area of Government receives greater attention than making foreign policy. Each year, billions of dollars and trillions of man-hours are invested in making foreign policy.

Today, of course, these efforts are coordinated by the vital Foreign Policy Manufacturing Agency, located deep within the bowels of the Washington Monument. For the benefit of nervous magazine readers, the agency's director, Dr. Homer T. Pettibone, D.V.M., agreed to grant a conducted tour of the streamlined facilities.

Question. Dr. Pettibone, exactly how is foreign policy made?

Answer. Well, the heart of our operation is this giant 707-LAK computer you see lining all four walls of this vast subterranean chamber. Our personnel feed in the data. The computer digests it, calculates probabilities and eventually produces a foreign policy.

Question. What kind of data?

Answer. All kinds. For instance, these girls here are feeding in columns by Washington pundits. It's a slow process as the machine can only digest so many past pluperfect subjunctive participial clauses at a time.

Question. And what are those scowling men there doing?

Answer. Oh, they're grinding up militant speeches by Congressmen and stuffing them in.

Question. Just militant speeches by Congressmen?

Answer. That's the only kind there are. Now over here, Mr. Aberworthy is slicing up intelligence reports from the CIA.

Question. But they seem to be written in invisible ink. Can the computer read them?

Answer. No, but we find we get more accurate results that way. Now Miss Taylor here is in charge of policy statements by high officials which she carefully * * * oh, oh. We seem to have a blockage. Really, Miss Taylor. You've fed in two of the President's statements on the Dominican situation simultaneously—the one where he explains he sent 23,000 troops to fight communism and the one where he says they're strictly neutral. You know the computer can't handle more than one Presidential statement at a time.

Question. You seem to have many problems, Doctor.

Answer. Making foreign policy isn't simple. Now over here we have technicians feeding in State Department predictions, horoscopes, public opinion polls, sheep entrails * * *. Look at that. See those flags waving? Hear those bells ringing? You're in luck. A vigorous, purposeful foreign policy is just now emerging. From the far end of the computer over there.

Question. Marvelous. That ought to dispel any doubts as to whether Mr. Johnson has a foreign policy or not. Only where is that conveyor belt carrying it?

Answer. To the incinerator. In the President's defense, we never let him see a foreign policy once we've made it.

Question. You mean you think it's to his credit that he has no foreign policy and is just drifting?

Answer. Good Lord, yes. Do you want people to think he got us into this mess on purpose?

AND MAY THE POOREST MAN WIN

(By Arthur Hoppe)

"If nominated, I will not run," said Mr. Jud Joad, slamming down his borrowed copy of the Appalachia Corners Gazette. "And if elected, I will sell out cheap."

"What are you not running for this time, Jud?" asked his wife, Maude, looking up from the flour sack she was darning.

"The local Poor Folks Council. All over the country, it says here, the Government's telling poor folks to elect other poor folks to run the local antipoverty programs. You got to make less than $3,000 a year to run. It's kind of government of, by, and for the people. And I say it ain't the American way."

"Oh, Jud, you just got to run," said Maude, pride shining in her old eyes. "I known you nigh on 60 years. And I always figured that deep within you was the makings of a real poor leader."

"That's right kind of you, Maude," Jud said patting her arm affectionately. "But tell the truth, I doubt I could lick old Hank Caldwell down the road. You know what a poor mouth he is. Well, let him be a glory-grabber, I say, and get hisself elected to the Poor Folks Council. Me, I can't stand his poorer-than-thou attitude."

"Jud," cried Maude. "You got to have faith in yourself. You're twice as poor a man as him. Oh, I can see it now. There you are, eyeball to eyeball with him in one of the great debates. He hints you're a corrupt tool of Wall Street. The way they always do. But with a foxy look, you make public a certified list of your financial earnings for the past fiscal year—namely $412.08, a half barrel of coal oil and that hogshead of blackstrap."

"Yep," said Jud, getting interested. "And the photographers could take a picture of the log cabin I was born in. If'n you wouldn't mind them barging in on us."

"Then," said Maude, all excited, "you could hit 'em with all the familiar slogans: 'A half a chicken in every pot.' 'More surplus commodities is just around the corner.' and 'All we have to fear is a cut in the dole itself'."

"Maude," said Jud, admiringly, "you're a regular Jim Farley. With a woman like you at his side, there's no reason a man couldn't rise to the top of the heap of poverty."

"Don't you see, Jud?" said Maude, chin high. "This here's our chance. The Government at last is going to let us run our own affairs. Just like rich folks. At last, just like them, we'll choose our own leaders from amongst ourselves. At last, just like them, we'll work hard at being citizens of this great democracy. At last, just like them, we'll be eager to share the heavy burdens of high office. At last * * * By the by, Jud, what's this here breathtaking new big job pay?"

"That's what I mean about it being un-American," said Jud, suddenly frowning, "It don't pay nothing."

"Oh," said Maude, going back to her darning. "So what else is new in the paper?"

MR. JOHNSON HAS THE ANSWER

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—Every once in a while the President holds a press conference because he loves to be asked hard-hitting questions by us ace newsmen. Through his answers he states his case before the bar of public opinion. Thus this cherished American institution satisfies all parties involved.

And of all our recent Presidents, Mr. Johnson clearly holds the most mutually satisfying ones. Never before, I'm sure, have the purposes of the Presidential press conference been better served. Take his latest one, which I was fortunate enough to attend.

There were a couple of hundred of us ace newsmen waiting grimly for him in the East Room of the White House, running through our hard-hitting questions in our minds, glints of steel in our eyes, scornful snarls on our lips. I only hoped we didn't cut him to shreds in full view of the nationwide television audience before he got to state his case.

But Mr. Johnson had obviously thought of that danger, too. Because he opened the proceedings by stating his case.

This he did by making three speeches. In the first speech he said he was doing a great job in the Dominican Republic. In the second speech he generously said the United Nations has been doing a great job elsewhere and he was proud of them. And in the third, he said Asians are very poor, but he was going to do a great job and make them rich.

That took up the first 10 minutes of network television time. Then, having stated his case, he hesitantly asked us impatient ace newsmen if there were any hard-hitting questions. It was like tossing raw meat to a pack of starving wolves. Indeed, in the carnage that followed I lost my notes. So I can only try to reconstruct the hard-hitting questions and Mr. Johnson't answers from memory. I only hope I get them all straight.

Question. Where'd you get that silly idea, Mr. President, of a permanent OAS force?

Answer. Let me take this opportunity to explain to you what a great job I'm doing in the Dominican Republic. (Which he then did.)

Question. Do you realize your trigger-happy, half-baked adventurism in Vietnam is going to cause World War III, sir?

Answer. I'm glad you want to know about the great job I'm doing in Vietnam. I'll explain it to you. (Which he then did.)

Question. How do you get us into all these stupid messes, sir?

Answer. And I want to say my Cabinet's been doing a great job and my Army's been doing a great job and Luci's been doing a great job and * * *.

And so it went. We got to ask 18 hard-hitting questions. And Mr. Johnson got to state his case 18 times. Thus you can see how mutually satisfying a Presidential press conference is these days. It gives us ace newsmen a chance to get our hard-hitting questions off our chest. And Mr. Johnson gets to state his case over and over.

The only thing I don't understand is why two such totally unrelated activities should be held in the same room at the same time.

Vice President Humphrey Addresses Syracuse University Graduates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my great privilege and pleasure to accompany Vice President HUMPHREY to the commencement exercises at Syracuse University. Vice President HUMPHREY delivered a thought-provoking address to the 2,700 graduates and

their guests on the role of the Congress in the formulation and execution of national policy.

The Vice President paid us a great tribute by centering his remarks on the tremendous responsibility that the Congress has as a constitutional instrument designed to promote the actualization of democracy. I commend his address to my colleagues, knowing that all of us appreciate his words of praise and his wise counsel.

AN ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT THE 111TH COMMENCEMENT OF SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, JUNE 6, 1965

Chancellor Tolley, members of the board of trustees, distinguished deans and faculty, members of the class of 1965, parents, and distinguished guests, the honor you have done me today is most deeply appreciated. I am especially delighted that the chancellor and the board of trustees extended their invitation as a result, in part, of a vote of the senior class.

I have always been friendly to votes, and I am always pleased when votes are friendly to me. I do not, of course, know against whom I was running, but I trust that it was some worthy Republican—of which this State has many.

My presence here today is particularly satisfying because this year marks the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Maxwell School. Syracuse University has made many contributions to scholarship and to professional excellence in a wide variety of fields. But, as one who has devoted his life to the public service, I want to express my personal gratitude and the gratitude of the U.S. Government for the work of the Maxwell School.

In addition to Maxwell's outstanding contributions to social science scholarship and the upgrading of the public service, its undergraduate course in public affairs and citizenship is world famous.

Your chancellor tells me that more than 20,000 Syracuse undergraduates have taken this course over the past generation—20,000 citizens who have been educated to their continuing personal responsibilities for the preservation and extension of human freedom on this globe. It is difficult to think of a more fundamental contribution which a university can make to society.

My congratulations go to the Maxwell School for what it has already accomplished and for what I know it will continue to accomplish in the years ahead.

As a former university teacher, I am aware of the pitfalls of commencement speeches. It is so easy to follow the formula: The world is in a mess, the older generation has failed, it is up to the graduating class to put things right. But platitudes rarely change attitudes, and baneful criticism and vapid exhortations are cheap substitutes for hard thought and analysis.

I prefer to take my stand on the proposition that the American people, working through democratic institutions, have met, are meeting, and will continue to meet the complex problems of our age.

If we still have a long way to go—in achieving human equality, in securing international and domestic tranquility, in extending the benefits of our technical genius to all citizens in the American Republic and to all mankind—let us glory in the unfinished agenda.

Let us glory in the fact that we still possess the wit and the wisdom to continue making our American democratic system responsive to the terribly complex problems of this turbulent age.

I want to discuss with this graduating class the importance of one of the great constitutional instruments at the disposal of the American people in the business of making democracy work. I refer to the institution of the U.S. Congress.

What I have to say, I think, needs saying because all too many of our citizens take an indifferent, or even a hostile, view toward the legislative branch.

This is not to underestimate the need for strong and able Presidential leadership or for wise and humane judicial decisions. It is, however, to reaffirm the vital role of Congress in our constitutional system.

Few persons can deal directly with either a President or a Supreme Court. But any person can communicate with his elected representatives in Washington.

The Members of Congress provide a direct link between the National Government and the almost 195 million persons who comprise this Republic.

Surely this connection is vital in keeping our National Government responsive to the needs and opinions of the American people.

I have found congressional service to be a remarkable form of higher education. My teachers have been Presidents and department heads, constituents and the press, and, above all, a group of wise and distinguished colleagues in both Houses.

I cannot in a few minutes convey to you all that I have learned from these teachers. But perhaps I can suggest some lessons in democratic theory and practice which I have gained from my collegial experiences in Congress.

The first lesson has to do with the creative and constructive dimension of the process of compromise.

There are 100 Members of the U.S. Senate; 435 Members of the House. They come from States and districts as diverse as Nevada and New York, Alaska and Alabama. No two States or regions of the United States have identical interests or prejudices.

One of the jobs of Congress is to reconcile such differences through the process of compromise and accommodation.

What sometimes seem to the untutored eye to be legislative obstructionisms are often no more than the honest expressions of dedicated representatives—trying to make clear the attitudes and interests of their States and regions.

As Sir Richard Grenfell once observed: "Mankind is slowly learning that because two men differ neither need be wicked."

From the earliest days of this Republic—at the Constitutional Convention of 1787—the leaders of this Nation have maintained an unwavering commitment to moderation. If our Founding Fathers had not understood the need to overcome extremes in drafting our Constitution, this noble experiment in the art of self-government would have surely foundered on the rocks of dissension and discord.

As in the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention, the heart of congressional activity are skills of negotiation—of honest bargaining among equals. My willingness to compromise—and I have done so more times than I can count—is the respect I pay to the dignity of those with whom I disagree.

Through reasonable discussion, through taking into account the views of many, Congress amends and refines legislative proposals so that once a law is passed it reflects the collective judgment of a diverse people.

Surely this is a remarkable service. Surely, the habits of accommodation and compromise are of universal consequence. These are the skills and attitudes so desperately needed on the larger stage of world conflict.

World order and the rule of law will be secure on this earth only when men have learned to cope with the continuing conflicts of peoples and nations through peaceful processes of legislative bargaining.

A second lesson I have learned from my congressional teachers is the importance of the congressional role of responsible surveillance. There are roughly 70 separate departments and agencies of the Federal Government. Some are small; some are large. All are engaged in carrying out the will of the people as expressed through Congress.

In the interests of efficiency, economy, and responsiveness, these departments and agencies need a continuing critical review by the committees and Houses of Congress. The genius of our Founding Fathers is nowhere more in evidence than in those sections of the Constitution which provide for checks and balances.

Through its review of the executive budget, in the appropriations process, through committee investigations, through advice and consent on appointments and treaties, and through informal discussion, Congress seeks to improve and to support the executive branch of the Government.

This exercise in freedom protects and extends freedom. If legislative voices are occasionally strident, citizens should take stock of what their world would be like if no legislative voices were heard at all.

We know what happens in countries without independent and constructively analytical legislatures.

Mankind invented a word for such systems centuries ago. The word is "tyranny."

But there is a final lesson I have learned from my congressional teachers: the creative joy of politics. Each Congress is devoted in substantial measure to the depelopment of new public policies designed to promote the general welfare and the national security of this Nation. Congress is not a battlefield for blind armies that clash by night. It is a place where national objectives are sought—where Presidential programs are reviewed—where great societies are endlessly debated and implemented.

If, as Emerson once wrote, Congress is a "standing insurrection," it is a standing insurrection against the ancient enemies of mankind: war, poverty, ignorance, injustice, sickness, environmental ugliness, economic and personal insecurity.

Few careers open such remarkable opportunities for translating dreams into reality. A new bill, a creative amendment, a wise appropriation, may mean the difference between health and sickness, jobs and idleness, peace and war for millions of human beings.

Stemming from ancient parliamentary origins, the main job of Congress is to redress grievances, to right wrongs, to make freedom and justice living realities for all. What higher calling exists? This is the essence of politics: to translate the concerns and the creative responses of a vast citizenry into effective and humane laws.

I cannot conclude without a personal note. For almost 20 years, Congress has been my home. As Vice President, my relationships with my former colleagues are inevitably more formal and more intermittent than in past years. Yet I can say unashamedly that I cherish them dearly. I have seen their weaknesses as they have seen mine.

I have on occasion been restive of delays and procedural anachronisms—and so have they. But I have seen in the Halls of Congress more idealism, more humaneness and compassion, more empathy, more understanding, more profiles of courage than in any other institution I have ever known. Like many of you today, I find it in my heart to praise and to thank my teachers.

Perhaps some of these brief words of tribute to the institution of freedom known as the U.S. Congress may stay with you. As long as Congress continues to function as a responsible and viable element in our constitutional system, the promise of American democracy will forever endure—the torch of freedom will forever light the path of the future.

Each of you, however, must also assume a personal responsibility for preserving freedom in these perilous times. And the nature of this responsibility is best illustrated by John Adams' notion of the spirit of public happiness.

It was this spirit, said Adams, that possessed the American colonists and won the revolution even before it was fought—a spirit which is reflected in delight in participation in public discussion and public action. It is a sense of joy in citizenship, in self-government, in self-control, in self-discipline, and in dedication.

An important part of the mission of this great university has been to instill in each of you this spirit of public happiness. And it will be this dedication to public service—found in the hearts of Americans alive today and of generations yet unborn—that will insure the ultimate victory of freemen in their struggle against the forces of tyranny and oppression.

Strengthening Gold and Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Las Vegas Review-Journal, Las Vegas, Nev., of Sunday, April 4, 1965. The article concerning the gold and silver problem confronting us today typifies my opinions in this regard. The article points to the existing economic factors and the historic usage of gold and silver in currency.

The article follows:

MONEY MATTERS: CAN GOLD HIKE BE JUSTIFIED?

(By Arthur P. Alexander)

Current events, domestic crisis, and foreign machinations will continue to capture the headlines, but of prime importance in the news will be demands for a raise in the price of gold, which can be anticipated at an early date to echo from the Halls of Congress; the object being to recapture depleted gold reserves rather than stimulate the mining industry.

At present, there is approximately 49 percent of the world's monetary gold held in this country which is adequate to maintain the stability of the dollar and for settlement of international obligations. However, it is essential to augment this reserve for this Nation would be hardpressed to prosecute a prolonged war, which is imminent, without possessing a surplus of gold, consequently, raising the price of gold now to create this surplus would be timely.

There exists certain economic factors that will be influenced by any change in the price of gold which must be first considered: The dollar, today, is the most stable currency in the world and a raise in the price of gold would unbalance the dollar by proportionately decreasing its gold contents while its silver value would remain unchanged, thereby reducing the dollar purchasing power and weaken its position—unless, an equitable ratio between gold and silver is established, that in event world economy demands an increase in the gold market the silver value of the dollar would be proportionately strengthened.

Establishing a commensurate ratio between these two metals is feasible and should be appraised as it would tend to stimulate the mining industry in North America, raise the price of silver and justify resumption of mining that metal.

Throughout history, gold and silver have been employed as a convenient medium of exchange to secure needed and desirable commodities and services by the coinage of domestic money and as bullion to effect the settlement of international balances; the reason being that these two metals possess immutable and durable attributes that cannot be ascribed to any other mineral.

These metals have been highly valued from ancient times, being used in jewelry, tableware, in the arts and for coins, even moulded into gods and worshiped—perhaps because their attributes are symbolic of man's desires. Today, these metals are also valued for their uses in the electronic industries, photography, and medicine.

In 1785 Congress adopted the silver dollar as the monetary standard of the United States, which was to contain 416 grains of standard silver as a nominal value and in 1849 the gold contents of the dollar was fixed at 25.8 grains (9-10 fine) as a parity, creating a ratio between the two metals of about 1:16 and placing the United States on a bimetallic standard which continued until the Civil War.

In 1873 Congress adopted the gold standard, however the gold content of the dollar was not disturbed until after the passage of the 1933 Banking Act, when, by Presidential proclamation in January, 1934, the United States abandoned the gold standard and raised the price of gold from $20.67 to $35 per ounce, reducing the gold contents of the dollar to 15.24 grains (59.06 percent of par), a sharp and drastic reduction, resulting in the dollar being worth but slightly more than 59 cents, working a hardship on long term contracts, investments, and savings for it subsequently required $1.69 for properties, commodities, and services that could formerly be obtained for $1.

The strong position of the dollar in world currency today is due to this country being the greatest creditor nation in history, demonstrating that in international trade, credit money is the controlling factor, nevertheless, the adequacy of money, under the present system, depends upon its gold contents. Twenty-five percent of the currency of the United States is backed by gold, silver being utilized only as a convenience in coinage of the silver dollar and some subsidiary coins and as no coin contains its nominal value in silver (the silver dollar contents are 412.5 grains of silver, 0.900–1.000 fine), an appreciable raise in the price of silver can be effected without disturbing the silver contents of existing coins.

The buying, sale and possession of gold is regulated by law, the purchase price and quantity contents of the dollar are arbitrarily fixed by the Government. The Silver Purchasing Act of 1934, fixing the price of silver at slightly above $0.905 per ounce created an ignoble disparity of value, in ratio of about 1 to 39, between gold and silver. A reappraisal of the monetary policy of this Government is essential; with a view to raising the price of silver and to establish a commensurate ratio between gold and silver to be constantly maintained, and where any change in the price of gold would be concommitant with that of silver, before considering any further raise in the price of gold.

It is imperative that this country seize the initiative to strengthen both metals and a correct approach would enhance the financial leadership of the United States. The ways and means to procure a workable monetary standard that would be universally acceptable is another subject, but one that must be accomplished to provide a true parity in exchange where silver would be acceptable as gold in the settlement of international balances which could not be feasible if one metal is strengthened at the expense of the other.

Mr. Johnson's Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, with increasing frequency and unanimity, many of the featured columnists in the field of foreign policy have been criticizing the arbitrary, unilateral action of our present administration in "going it alone," without consultation with, or concern for, our loyal friends abroad. In an article in the Christian Science Monitor on June 2, Joseph C. Harsch observes that our current foreign policy actions are "right now scaring the daylights out of America's most loyal friends and allies."

The entire commentary follows:

MR. JOHNSON'S STYLE

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

BONN.—President Kennedy used to pride himself on the style of his administration. He is quoted as once having said that if he couldn't change American national policies he could at least execute the same old policies with new style.

There is nothing essentially new in President Johnson's policies toward the Dominican Republic and Vietnam. In both cases he is executing old policies.

Assertion of a predominant American interest in the Caribbean is as old as the Monroe Doctrine. The attempt to defend South Vietnam against Communist subversion dates from the Eisenhower administration and was advanced under Kennedy.

RISING ANXIETY

But something has gone wrong in the execution of these policies. There is widespread criticism at home and steadily rising anxiety among the Allies.

This is not essentially because there is disagreement about the policies. No ally of the United States seriously questions the right or even propriety of the United States taking what action it deems necessary to safeguard its interest in the Dominican Republic. But there is doubt over whether Washington read the Dominican situation accurately. No ally seriously doubts that it would be a desirable thing to check the advance of both Communist and Chinese influences in southeast Asia.

In fairness to President Johnson it needs be said that the Kennedy style in the Bay of Pigs affair was small compensation for an overall job of seldom surpassed bungling. Mr. Kennedy took the blame gallantly, which was where style counted, and learned a lot. He never repeated that mistake. But the style did not avert the bungling.

CLEARLY BUNGLED

One may hope that Mr. Johnson will learn lessons about execution of foreign policy from his present difficulties. One point where he has clearly bungled has been in inviting his allies to interpret and support his bombing truce in Vietnam and then resuming bombing without telling them.

This episode has had a deeply disturbing effect among the Allies. It is callous to say the least to ask them to support a diplomatic operation of great delicacy and then pull the carpet out from under them by resuming bombing without having given them either the time to carry out the assignment or get out of the way.

It would have been both good style and good manners either to have used the Allies more considerately, or not brought them into the play.

Also, from across the Atlantic, one can't help wondering why an experiment in suspended bombing was tried for only 5 days. Anyone familiar with Soviet and other varieties of Communist life know that places like Moscow and Peiping cannot react that fast to initiatives taken in other places. The Soviet machine is slow and cumbersome. Five days might be enough to circulate preliminary papers among the interested ministries in Moscow, but not enough for a decision at the top.

CONFIDENCE UNDERMINED

Two weeks would have made sense. The failure of response after a 2-week lapse could have been significant. Failure of a response after 5 days is meaningless. America's allies read in it evidence not of forthrightness and rigor but of ham-handed lack of knowledge of how the world runs. It undermined confidence in Washington's technical competence.

There is no perfect definition of good style. Certainly Mr. Johnson has a style all of his own. To many Americans it may be a welcome relief after the courtly 18th-century style of the Kennedys. But, rightly or wrongly, it is right now scaring the daylights out of America's most loyal friends and allies.

The Real Alabama—Part VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the vigor, abilities, and forward-looking nature of Alabama's people are to be seen in many ways. One of these ways is the development of research of many kinds on a national scope. This aspect of Alabama progress was the subject of an article in the New York Journal of Commerce special supplement on April 26, 1965.

The article follows:

ALABAMA IS FOSTERING RESEARCH

Even before Alabama's industrial boom was on the horizon, farseeing State officials, realizing that research went along with industrial growth, set out to establish a research program that would assist the State's industrial plans.

Over the years this research program has been continued. It is now getting an even greater boost from Gov. George Wallace, who sees research as one of the chief factors in his State's industrial boom and plans to back it up with more State funds as a move to increase the State's economic outlook.

Presently Alabama stands high in the South in research and plans to shoot for the top spot by expanding facilities in many parts of Alabama.

MANY FACILITIES

At the present time, Alabama has many outstanding agencies engaged in research of many kinds with specialized personnel, fine laboratory equipment, libraries, and other facilities.

Birmingham has the Southern Research Institute, which was set up to provide scientific knowledge and know-how in the South. It also was designed to encourage southern industry to make greater use of today's technology.

One of the significant factors in Southern Research Institute's functions is that while it is located in Alabama, and much of its research has been sponsored by Alabama and southern industry, many of its largest and most significant projects have been sponsored by national concerns, the Federal Government, and other agencies outside the South.

EXPANSION PLANNED

Now Southern Research is planning to expand its facilities with the addition of new buildings, covering wto blocks, near the heart of Birmingham.

The present facilities carry on research for hundreds of different concerns, some of them small industries with no research facilities of their own, and for many of the largest corporations in the Nation.

The University of Alabama located at Tuscaloosa, has for a long time been a major factor not only in southern but national research. It covers a wide range from textiles to physics. The funds for research provided to the university run into millions of dollars, and are being increased annually.

As a result of an assist from Alabama's citizens, who voted an additional $3 million bond issue to construct and equip a research center at Huntsville, the U. of A. opened up new avenues for space research.

RESEARCH CENTER

Huntsville, in addition to being the new research center for the University of Alabama, has many other research institutes located in its territory.

The space activities, which have made Huntsville grow from a small town to an important cog in the Nation's space program in a decade, have attracted numerous engineering and research firms into the area.

A plant for chemical research is located at Tuscaloosa, where studies of metal castings, special paints, laminating problems, waterproofing of paper bags, and other problems facing industry are carried on.

Other producers of materials for manufacturing in several areas offer research facilities for experimenting and testing.

There are several private laboratories and engineering services which offer research facilities located in such centers as Birmingham, Decatur, Mobile and Montgomery.

Besides the research centers the State has technical schools at Gadsden, Dothan, Mobile, Tuscaloosa, Decatur, Ozark, Montgomery, and Normal.

Stop Preferred Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a timely editorial from the St. Petersburg Times of May 29, 1965, entitled "Stop Preferred Treatment."

It refers to congressional hearings on the Alfred I. duPont Estate which, under a legal loophole, is exempt from the Bank Holding Co. Act of 1956.

Our esteemed colleague, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, has led the fight to end such special treatment and has introduced legislation to close this loophole.

The editorial follows:

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, May 29, 1965]

STOP PREFERRED TREATMENT

The Alfred I. du Pont estate, Florida's most powerful and often most ruthless economic trust, enjoys preferred treatment under Federal law. Because of a legal loophole, the estate is exempt from the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, which prevents bank holding companies from controlling nonbanking enterprises.

There is no justification whatsoever for this exemption.

Quite the contrary. The record of Ed Ball, who through the estate rules an empire of 31 banks, millions of acres of Florida timberland, the St. Joe Paper Co., the Florida East Coast Railway, and large blocks of General Motors and Du Pont stock, testifies to the need for bringing the estate under the Federal law designed to prevent monopolies and banking conflicts of interest.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, chairman of the House Banking Committee, has led the fight to end the special treatment that violates the spirit of the national law. His efforts last year were unsuccessful because some Congressmen felt his bill was aimed too directly at the Du Pont estate.

Now he is approaching Ball's special status in a general way that could not be objectionable to anyone familiar with the situation—except Ed Ball. PATMAN's new bill, on which the Banking Committee will vote soon, simply makes the Bank Holding Company Act applicable to any trust, controlling 25 percent or more of the voting stock of two or more banks, that doesn't terminate within 25 years.

PATMAN has impressive support. His bill was endorsed by C. Canby Balderston, Vice President of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Balderston issued a warning that should be noted in Florida. He said the exemption, besides creating the normal dangers of banking monopolies, also tempted Ball's banks to make unsound loans to Ball companies.

Ball's power in State politics is well known. Floridians may know soon to what extent it reaches the State's delegation to Washington.

If and when the Patman bill comes to a vote in the House and Senate, Florida's Representatives and Senators should support it as a clear matter of sound public policy. It will be interesting to hear from those who don't why they join Ed Ball in thinking that his empire should be above and beyond the law.

Unknown Soldier's Monolog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Kenneth Kunde, a distinguished member of the Wisconsin Legislature and a constituent of mine, composed and delivered the Memorial Day address at Sheboygan, Wis., on May 31.

Title of this address was "Unknown Soldier's Monolog, the Soldier Speaks to Us From the Grave."

Mr. Kunde is unusually well equipped to author such sentiments, since he, himself, served in the U.S. Army for 4 years during World War II, was an organizer of Wisconsin Veterans of World War II, twice was commander of the State Am-

vets, and served that organization for 10 years as business manager and legislative director.

Mr. Kunde also is a director of the Wisconsin Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert the Honorable Mr. Kunde's address in the RECORD so that all who read these pages may benefit from his composition:

UNKNOWN SOLDIER'S MONOLOG: THE SOLDIER SPEAKS TO US FROM THE GRAVE

(By Kenneth Kunde)

Dedicated in memory of our departed comrades.

I rest here on the east front of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater. Across the Potomac, is Washington. The white marble over my tomb is inscribed, "Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God."

How I got here is a long story. But let's take the last step. Four caskets were taken to Chalons-Sur-Marne, France. In October 1921, Sergeant Younger, a wounded soldier, placed a spray of white roses on my casket. And I was taken home, to sleep here, always.

Funny that white stone, and white flowers should be my companions in death. Because going backward it was always mud, black mud, that I remember. When the bullet hit me, I was surprised that I could not walk, or crawl. I just lay there in the mud. I sort of felt I was going to die, and I didn't want to. Just me, and the black soil of France. Wettened by rain.

And as I lay dying, I thought of other mud back home on my father's farm. I was a little boy and it was fun to run in the mud barefoot, after a rain. I thought of how I got into this war. Sort of like falling in love. You first meet the girl, she is nice. Then you know her better and better, and before you know, you're married. Nothing like, should I get married or not, but gradually, step by step.

And it was this way with my going to war. I did not hate anybody, and I still don't, now. I wasn't oriented with the grand strategy, or even the corps tactics, or the purpose of the war. I just joined up because my buddies did. And it was the thing to do. The President said so, and Congress too.

It was my duty. What's duty? I'd say, it's the right thing to do at the right time. And there was more mud. This time lighter gray but still mud. In Texas where we trained.

Funny that mud should be so a part of my thoughts. But that's the idea. Life is always a lot of simple things to remember. Like little letters and kisses and pillowcases with "Mother" engraved on them. And it was little things that folks back home got from the Q.M. when the effects of the dead were sent home in a separate box. Little souvenirs, like snapshots, pocketknives from a big life.

The inscription on the front of my tomb reads "Victory through valor attaining peace." Big words, these are, and great thoughts hard to figure. Me, like you, I like the simple things to remember.

Like my mother's worried eyes, and her tears as she said goodbye at the railroad station. She knew, and I didn't, that I would not some back. Mothers know.

So I ask one prayer for the young ones and the old ones and let them say it real simply, "I love my country like I love my God." And I would always try to do the simple things for my America and the neighbor next door.

A little kindness, a little love, should always be given at the right time. There is no later or tomorrow for the right thing to do.

So this Memorial Day, 1965, a lot of commotion will go on above me, just like Arlington had since 1868.

Now you, too, will honor your soldiers, sailors, and marines. But don't worry because you don't have the biggest bands or the snappiest drill team, that your memorial isn't as important as ours. You see, I could have come from your very hometown. I wish I knew, but I know that God knows, and that's OK with me.

Texas House Passes Resolution Honoring Mrs. Kate Craddock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives of the State of Texas recently paid special tribute to a very outstanding lady in my district, Mrs. Kate Suford Craddock, of Burnet, Tex. This wonderful woman is widely loved and admired for her many accomplishments and her unselfish community service.

I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to place in the RECORD a copy of the resolution adopted by the Texas House in recognition of Mrs. Craddock's contributions and achievements.

The resolution follows:

H.S.R. No. 340

Whereas Texas has many outstanding women leaders, both career women and homemakers, and the city of Burnet is particularly proud of its own Mrs. Kate Shuford Craddock; and

Whereas Mrs. Craddock is beloved and admired by all who know her, and her many contributions in providing civic leadership and devoted Christian service to her friends and neighbors, as well as to outsiders in need who have passed her way, are well known throughout Burnet County; and

Whereas Mrs. Craddock, the oldest of eight children, was born on Houston Creek, 7 miles southwest of Burnet, on May 15, 1883, and her parents were Edward Daniel, and Margaret Jane Shuford; and

Whereas she attended short-term schools in the county through the eighth grade and on November 25, 1900, was married to Ernest Craddock; the couple had five children: Fannie (now Mrs. J. W. Phillips); Fred, of San Raphael, Calif.; F. D., of Hamilton, Tex.; Edward, of Hitchcock, Tex., and Ernest Lee (Buster), who is now deceased. The Craddocks also have six grandchildren and three great-grandchildren; and

Whereas Mrs. Craddock is a lifelong member of the First Methodist Church in Burnet, and has given many long hours in service for her church; she is also a member of the Eastern Star; and

Whereas she has always had an active interests in politics, local, State, and National, and has attended political rallies for 64 different campaigns; she was the first woman to become a director of the Burnet Chamber of Commerce, and served two terms in that position; and

Whereas another first acquired by Mrs. Craddock, which demonstrated her sense of civic responsibility and her popularity in her hometown, was her election as the first woman to serve on the Burnet City Council, a post she held for 3 years; and

Whereas she is a Democrat and during the last presidential campaign, she was a dynamic leader in the "Ladies for Lyndon" group; and

Whereas citizens of her city and county recognized Mrs. Craddock's outstanding accomplishments by naming the Burnet airport "Kate Craddock Airport" in her honor; and

Whereas the house of representatives of the 59th legislature wishes to pay tribute to this outstanding and worthy Texas citizen in recognition of her many contributions and accomplishments: Now, therefore, be it *Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the State of Texas by this resolution comments Mrs. Kate Shuford Craddock for her unselfish devotion in her life of service to family, friends, and community, and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be prepared for Mrs. Craddock under the seal of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas in token of the esteem which this body holds for her.

BEN BARNES,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that H.S.R. No. 340 was adopted by the house on April 14, 1965.

DORTHY HALLMAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Our Constitution: Safeguard From Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a winning essay entitled "Our Constitution: Safeguard From Tyranny," written by David Ellis, a high school student from Clairemont High School, San Diego County, Calif.

It is an outstanding essay, and points up the great danger to our Republic when the executive extends its power over Congress to a point exceeding constitutional provisions. He also warns against the judiciary becoming a legislative institution in violation of the Constitution, and compares the present situation to what happened in the fall of Rome.

The essay follows:

OUR CONSTITUTION: SAFEGUARD FROM TYRANNY

"Tyranny is the exercise of power beyond right, which nobody can have a right to; and this making use of the power anyone has in his hands, not for the good of those who are under it, but for his own separate advantage."

"It is a mistake to think this fault is proper only to monarchies. Other forms of government are liable to it as well as that; for wherever the power that is put in any hands for the government of the people and the preservation of their properties is applied to other ends, and made use of to impoverish, harass, or subdue them to the arbitrary and irregular commands of those that have it, there it presently becomes tyranny, whether those that use it are one or many."

As early as the ninth century, B.C., farsighted citizens realized the need for protection from tyranny, either from a single ruler, or mobocracy, tyranny from the masses. According to Plutarch's "Lives." Lycurgus, a legendary king of Sparta, set up a senate which produced the desirable condition of 28 (the senate) always adhering to the kings as far as to resist democracy, and on the other hand, supporting the peo-

ple against the establishment of absolute monarchy. However, the mere formation of a counterbalance to a king is enough protection. Therefore, the ancient Athenians, under the guidance of Solon in 496 B.C. made a constitution, the formation of which is described by Aristotle. John Locke, whose works were an inspiration for the Declaration of Independence, wrote in 1690, "Whatever form the commonwealth is under, the ruling power ought to govern by declared and receivevd laws, and not by extemporary dictates and undetermined resolutions," so that "the rulers, too, (be) kept within their due bounds, and not to be tempted by the power they have in their hands to employ it to [their] purposes."

The difficulties of forming a constitutional government were expounded upon by Baron de Montesquieu in 1747 when he wrote "To form a moderate government it is necessary to combine the several powers; to regulate, temper, and set them in motion; to give, as it were a ballast to one, in order to counterpoise the other. This is the masterpiece of legislation; rarely produced by hazard, and seldom attained by prudence."

He clearly recognized the merits of a republican form of government. "Liberty is generally said to reside in republics * * * while democratic states are not in their own nature free." He saw the complete and eternal antithesis of republican and totalitarian governments; since "In republican governments men are all equal; equal they are also in despotic governments; in the former because they have everything; in the latter because they are nothing." Finally, in 1785, only 2 years before the Constitutional Convention, Immanuel Kant wrote "the only rightful constitution is that of a pure republic." Our farseeing forefathers were very cognizant of the words of these great philosophers of the past. They knew as did Aristotle that "That which is common to the greatest number has the least care bestowed upon it" and its corollary, expressed by Locke: "The supreme power cannot take from any man any part of his property without his own consent. For the preservation of property being the end of government, and that for which men into society, it necessarily supposes and requires that the people should have property * * *. Desiring to protect individual freedom and liberty, they realized that "A government may be so constituted, as no man shall be compelled to do things which the law does not oblige him, nor forced to abstain from things which the law permits." Therefore the United States of America was created as a constitutional republic. The creators of the Constitution produced a document uniquely adaptable to the exigencies of our complex changing nation. It cannot become outmoded as some charged.

To suggest this would be to say that the entire range of man's experience from Plato to Aristotle, to Locke and Montesquieu, and to Jefferson and Madison, is not applicable to modern times. It is to arrogate oneself above the wisdom of the combined philosophers of the last 25 centuries. The Constitution, through separation of powers, and a system of checks and balances, protects all citizens against a cumulation of power in one person or group of persons. Edward Gibbon wrote in "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," "The principles of a free constitution are irrevocably lost when the legislative power is dominated by the executive." Also being aware of Montesquieu's dictum warning, "When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, there can be no liberty," the Convention established the Presidential veto, and congressional overriding of this by a two-thirds majority. Provision for impeachment of the President by Congress was also included.

Montesquieu and Gibbon were also worried about judicial excesses. "There is no liberty if the judiciary power be not separated from the legislative and executive * * * for the judges would then be the legislator." Gibbon believed, "The discretion of the judge is the first engine of tyranny." However, "In republics, the very nature of the constitution requires the judge to follow the letter of the law; otherwise the law might be explained to the prejudice of every citizen, in cases where their honor, property, or life is concerned." To ameliorate this, the delegates provided for the impeachment of the Justices of the Supreme Court, and also for amendments nullifying Supreme Court decisions.

Ranking in importance with other areas of the Constitution is the Bill of Rights. These first 10 amendments provide guarantees of freedom and liberty for all citizens in all spheres of life. They include freedom of speech, religion, and press, the right to bear arms, the right to a jury trial in civil cases. However, the 10th amendment which reserves the powers to the States not delegated the Federal Government, has been practically usurped by clause 18 of section 8, article 1. This, the so-called elastic clause, has been used by the Federal Government to take over many States rights and functions. Moreover, while the fifth amendment is being greatly abused by Communists and fellow travelers who do not wish to answer questions of congressional investigators, organizations of American citizens exercising their right to keep and bear arms are being harassed.

The American people should awake to the gradual disintegration of their freedoms resulting from the concommitant destruction of the Constitution by unconstitutional laws and practices, as well as de facto legislation by the Supreme Court. While telling of Coriolanus, Plutarch wrote, "For it was well and truly said that the first destroyer of the liberties of the people is he who first gave them bounties and largesses." Reiterating this in 1762, Jean Jacques Rousseau prophesied, "Make gifts of money and you will not be long without chains." All Americans know that welfare comes from income tax, but how many know that Rousseau also wrote, "I hold enforced labor to be less opposed to liberty than taxes"?

Apparently the apathy of Americans has sunk to the depth described by Plato when he said, "The greatest ignorance is when a man hates that which he nevertheless thinks to be good and noble, and loves and embraces that which he knows to be unrighteous and evil." America must escape the prophecy of Rousseau: "As soon as any man says of the affairs of the state: What does it matter to me? the state may be given up for lost." Shall it be written in 1984 perhaps that, "Truly there is no great wisdom in knowing, and no great difficulty in telling after the evil has happened; but to have foreseen the remedy at the time would have taken a much wiser head than ours"? However, there is one clear and evident remedy, of which all informed and patriotic Americans are aware. The remedy is a return to the principles of our Republic's Constitution, the greatest safeguard ever devised against tyranny.

Tabulation of Public Opinion Poll; Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the results of a survey of my district, Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District. Nearly 9,000 people took the time and trouble to answer. And, for the most part, they agree with me: They like the programs of the Johnson administration.

The administration's approach in Vietnam was supported by 2 to 1 over the nearest alternative.

The administration's proposal for gradual elimination of the national origins quota on immigration also was endorsed by a 2 to 1 margin.

And more than half of those expressing an opinion favored either the administration's original medicare bill or its substitute version, passed by the House, providing for hospital, doctor and major medical expenses.

This is good showing by any standards, and it becomes more impressive when you consider the Republican leanings of the Fourth Congressional District, which, when it sent me back to Congress last fall, made me the only Democrat in the 20th century ever to win a second term in the district.

The results are as follows:

I. Vietnam: What approach do you favor for the United States in Vietnam?

1. Expand war into Communist North Vietnam and go all-out to win, 25.3 percent.
2. Military support of South Vietnam, including attacks in North Vietnam, until a satisfactory settlement can be negotiated, 50.1 percent.
3. Restrict efforts to South Vietnam and negotiate best settlement possible, 10.5 percent.
4. Withdraw troops and advisers immediately and let Vietnamese solve their own problems, 6.9 percent.
5. None of the above, 2.4 percent.

Blank, 4.3 percent.

II. Immigration: The administration has proposed gradual elimination of the national origins quota system, and replacing it with a system favoring skilled workers and relatives of people already in the United States. Do you favor:

1. The administration's proposal, 57.4 percent.
2. No limitations on immigration, 4.7 percent.
3. Present system, 21.8 percent.
4. No immigration, 5.2 percent.
5. None of the above, 5.8 percent.

Blank, 5.3 percent.

III. Transportation: The New Haven Railroad as it now stands cannot continue commuter operations much longer. Do you favor:

1. Expanded bus service instead of commuter railroad, 3.4 percent.
2. Letting private group try to provide commuter service, 17.2 percent.
3. A multistate authority with Federal and local assistance running the railroad or contracting commuter service, 62.7 percent.
4. Having the Federal Government pick up deficit and run the railroad, 9 percent.
5. None of the above, 3.5 percent.

Blank, 4.2 percent.

IV. Medical care for elderly: Which of the following approaches to medical care for those over 65 do you favor:

1. Administration proposal, financed by payroll taxes, providing hospital and nursing home care, home health care visits, and outpatient diagnostic services, 27.6 percent.
2. AMA proposal, financed by Federal-State funds and participant contributions to private insurance companies, providing voluntary comprehensive health coverage, 25.5 percent.
3. House Republican leadership proposal, financed by Federal-State funds and participant contributions to national insurance

fund, providing voluntary comprehensive health coverage, 13.3 percent.

4. Combination of administration approach for basic benefits and Republican leadership plan for doctor, drug, and major medical expenses, 19 percent.

5. None of the above, 7.6 percent.

Blank, 7 percent.

V. I have listed below a number of issues of vital public concern. Please "X" the three items you feel deserve highest priority in Congress.

1. Aid to education, 11.9 percent.
2. Narcotics and crime, 14.2 percent.
3. Space research and exploration, 4.3 percent.
4. Taxes and economic growth, 9.8 percent.
5. Reexamination of foreign aid, 16.5 percent.
6. Needs of our senior citizens, 4.5 percent.
7. Reapportionment of State legislatures on population basis, 2.5 percent.
8. Regulation of mail-order purchase of firearms, 3 percent.
9. Reexamination of national defense requirements, 5.7 percent.
10. Training and employment opportunities for youth, 8.8 percent.
11. Water and air pollution control, 9.2 percent.
12. Commuter railroads, 6.1 percent.

Blank, 2.9 percent.

VI. My age is:

1. Under 25, 5.2 percent.
2. 25 to 34, 16.8 percent.
3. 35 to 44, 28.7 percent.
4. 45 to 59, 31.4 percent.
5. Over 59, 16.1 percent.

Blank, 2.1 percent.

VII. I live in:

1. Bridgeport, 14.6 percent.
2. Darien, 7.7 percent.
3. Fairfield, 4.9 percent.
4. Greenwich, 11.9 percent.
5. New Canaan, 4.9 percent.
6. Norwalk, 17 percent.
7. Stamford, 24.2 percent.
8. Weston, 1.6 percent.
9. Westport, 8 percent.
10. Wilton, 3.9 percent.

Blank, 1.6 percent.

VIII. Do you favor your Congressman asking for your views?

1. Yes, 96.6 percent.
2. No, 7 percent.
3. Undecided, 7 percent.

Blank, 2 percent.

IX. How often do you use the New Haven?

1. Regularly, 27.7 percent.
2. Occasionally, 57.1 percent.
3. Never, 12.4 percent.

Blank, 2.8 percent.

The Agricultural Situation in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] is directing our attention to a situation that merits the attention of all Members. The artificially created manpower shortage for which the administration, and in particular Labor Secretary Wirtz, is responsible, has had repercussions throughout the entire country. This situation described by the gentleman from California adversely affects not only producers but consumers throughout the country.

The producers of vegetables in my district are indirectly feeling the adverse results of the administration's indifference to the facts of life as they pertain to farm labor.

For years U.S. citizens whose normal residences are in the Southwest States move up to the Midwest during growing seasons to care and harvest the vegetable crops. A substantial number this year have gone to California where they have failed to meet the real manpower needs. In so doing, a manpower shortage is beginning to develop in midwestern farm regions.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I anticipate numerous economic and social problems that will beset us from the redevelopment of the "wetbacks"—illegal entrants from Mexico. In past years I have struggled to aid individuals who have become victimized by legal complications caused by illegal entry into the country. When the bracero program was effectively functioning, the problem of illegal entry vanished.

United States in Vietnam To Stop Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, at this stage in our history a noisy, radical minority of college students are calling for this Nation to abandon its defense commitments across the world and to pull back from the threat of communism. This vocal minority has alarmed the American people, because their irresponsible comments have appeared to drown out the majority of students who are standing by their Nation in its times of danger; many of this majority have already given their lives for freedom in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from a South Dakota college newspaper which expresses the opinion of the responsible majority of our college students. I am proud of the South Dakota Collegian of the South Dakota State University for expressing sentiments which recognize the magnitude of the Communist threat in southeast Asia.

The enclosed editorial "United States in Vietnam To Stop Red China," from the South Dakota Collegian, May 20, 1965, South Dakota State University, follows:

UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM TO STOP RED CHINA

Students and professors on university campuses across the Nation are jumping on the bandwagon in protest of our role in the war in Vietnam. They usually follow the line of thinking that "it's not our war, it's thousands of miles away, and therefore we should get out as soon as possible."

Why is America involved in the Vietnam conflict? Our Federal Government has maintained that we are there because the South Vietnam Government invited us there to help defend its country from Communist terrorists and invaders. This is true and is, on the surface, a pretty noble reason. But almost anyone who has studied the situation must agree that the most important reason we are there is to help contain the advance of Communist China.

Red China's expansionist policy has only one goal: world domination. Southeast Asia is only the first step. Control of southeast Asia will alleviate Red China's biggest problem, 700 million hungry, crowded people within her borders. China's military efforts have taken away resources badly needed for economic and agricultural development. She has been forced in the past few years to buy millions of bushels of wheat from other countries to feed her people. Thus southeast Asia, a rich rice-producing area, is an important price to the Red Chinese leaders.

Our Government must feel that Vietnam is the logical place to assert our policy of containment. The side effect of helping defend South Vietnam from Communist aggression is used mainly to help qualify our presence here.

Surely those who deplore our role in Vietnam do not think the Red Chinese will go only as far as the shores of South Vietnam and Laos and simply call it quits. This is just the first step in their drive to dominate the world. From there, the Philippine Islands, Malaysia, Austrialia and Japan are tantalizing targets. After that, the progression is pretty evident.

We know that we will be forced to stop the Communist drive someplace, sometime, if we are to survive as a democracy. The sooner this is done, the better. Red China's new-found nuclear power adds to the urgency of the inevitable task.

Perhaps our action in Vietnam will prevent an even worse future confrontation. Perhaps it will accomplish nothing. Freedom has never come cheap and, looking at it realistically, it is better to stop freedom's greatest threat in already war-torn Vietnam than on the shores of Hawaii.—W.A.

Tribute to Champion McDowell Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALTON LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, a very significant occasion took place recently when the trustees of the Cornelia Nixon Davis Nursing Home, to be constructed at Wilmington, N.C., honored Mr. Champion McDowell Davis, the principal benefactor of the home.

Mr. Davis is known to many Members of Congress as a former president of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad and director of the National Chamber of Commerce. I commend to our colleagues a splendid article from the Wilmington Morning Star of May 26, 1965, which reflects an outstanding citizen's generous spirit of charity and service to others.

The article follows:

BEQUEST PROVIDED BASE TO CREATE NURSING HOME

WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH.—A $50,000 bequest made to Champion McDowell Davis by a friend 23 years ago provided the base for creation of the million-dollar-plus Cornelia Nixon Davis Nursing Home, Davis revealed at a testimonial dinner in his honor here Tuesday night.

The dinner was given by trustees of the Davis Charitable Foundation at the Blockade Runner Motor Hotel.

It also was disclosed by the architect, Frank Ballard, that work has been started on the 83-bed home by the sinking of a 180-foot well.

Speaking before 250 friends, Davis, 86-year-old retired president of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, gave details of the gift. It has been developed into a total of $800,000 for beginning of construction of the home named in honor of his mother and to be located on a large tract at Porters Neck Plantation, his ancestral home.

"The main source of a beginning of my modest estate was derived from a $50,000 bequest in 1942, taxes all paid and bequested to me by another bachelor and intimate friend, the late Mr. Walter P. Murphy, of Chicago, an Irish gentleman. We chummed together during my many annual visits to the Battle Creek, or Kellogg, sanitarium in Michigan.

"With the surprising bequest, I was enabled, by fortunate investment and reinvestment, to create what I called a modest estate, and I have truly found untold joy—I repeat untold joy—in giving away the bulk of it, and at one time, to assist the elderly," Davis said.

He reported that when he turned over 20,000 shares of stock, for which he had paid $289,000, to the foundation in late 1963, the securities had a market of about $650,000. The latest calculation sets the value of these shares at $800,000. Additional gifts to the foundation by 25 contributors, including the Nemours Foundation grant of $75,000, now total $100,000.

Davis praised the trustees as "dedicated men and women, who serve well in payless and unselfish lifetime assignments." He also complimented the administrator of the home, Ervin P. Stack, Jr.

"The joy of giving is our greatest joy if and when we really acquire the deep and beautiful spirit of charity," Davis said. "Giving does not mean necessarily giving of money, but if giving of one's self in service to others."

Davis called upon his lisenters for support of the home, through visitation, assistance in beautification of the grounds and inexpensive gifts.

"We all want you to feel you are a part of us and that you can and should do something, however inexpensive, to make the home particularly much more homelike and become thus to its residents a 'real home away from home'," he added.

The staff of the home, he explained, will include the administrator, registered and practical nurses, aids, housekeepers, maids, and orderlies, and complete kitchen and dining room personnel.

Applicants must be at least 60 years old. Room rates or charges have not been established.

"I want to reemphasize that we're not asking for money tonight but for services that can be helpful in innumerable ways.

"Please remember, too, that when death comes, as it will to each of us, all we can carry in our still and cold hands will be the record of what we have given to others here. Yes, nothing more.

"We are all keenly aware of the wonderous age in which we are privileged to live; we have controlled the atom. The challenges to outer space grow daily in thrilling successes. But there are other near miracles. Mine has been the conversion of some seldom-looked-at dry and dull papers (stock certificates) into steel, bricks, and masonry, etc., for buildings. But whether those buildings become a home in the fullest sense of the word depends in good part on your loving and continuing support.

"I ask you as an old man and friend, to please promise me such support—for the elderly, of course, not for my personal benefit. I'm confident you will.

"As I said earlier, this is my happiest hour. May the God we love bless you and help us make this our finest hour," he concluded.

In painting a word picture of the home, Ballard explained that the well was the initial step since water is a prerequisite for actual construction.

"This preliminary act, to be followed by ground breaking, was the culmination of approximately 2½ years of research planning and drawing, and involved the efforts and cooperation of many persons," Ballard said.

The architects and trustees first visited many other nursing homes and receiving the counsel of several consultants, including authorities of the Duke endowment, North Carolina Medical Care Commission, State Board of Health and the U.S. Public Health Service. The result, Ballard said, was the ability to "produce what we believe is the most up-to-date, modern facility of its kind to be constructed anywhere."

The home will occupy 21 of the 85-acre tract deeded to the foundation by Davis. The site has been planted with pine, has fresh water ponds and eventually will have a complete system of walks, drives, parking areas, and both flower and vegetable garden plots.

"The nursing home is designed to provide the most pleasant and stimulating environment possible for its residents, with provisions for every conceivable need," Ballard reported. "In reality, it is similar to a hospital in all respects, except there is no operating suite."

The buildings are designed in the shape of an "H," with each long leg of the "H" representing a resident wing with its own nursing station. The central portion of the "H" contains the service core of the buildings, and will house the Central lounge, physical therapy, crafts, kitchen, commissary, central storage, chapel, and other service elements. Preparations for future expansion have been planned in the initial structure.

Each nursing station will oversee approximately 40 beds. The complex has a total of 51 resident rooms. Each room will have its individually controlled airconditioning and heating unit and equipped with its own telephone, television service, direct audio communication with nursing station, and AF-FM piped-in music.

The buildings will be completely fireproof, with a sprinkler system fed from a 75,000-gallon overhead water tank.

The entire complex will occupy a total of about 45,000 square feet of floor space, with about 10,000 square feet allotted to resident bedroom area. The remaining space is devoted to special services, including six resident lounges, doctors and dentists offices and examining rooms, beauty and barber shops, future X-ray facilities, conference rooms, chapel, physiotherapy, arts and crafts, library and many other services devoted specifically to nursing care.

"From its inception, Mr. Davis, the principal donor, joined the trustees in insisting that the total design of these buildings be geared with one goal in mind—to produce the most complete and modern facility of its kind, with the cost being secondary to completeness. The end result, I believe, will show that this goal has been accomplished. We are proud to have had a part in this great undertaking," Ballard said.

Michael C. Brown, trustee and treasurer, served as toastmaster. He introduced fellow trustees and members of Davis' family.

Trustees introduced were:

Carl J. Oldenbuttel, chairman, and Mrs. Oldenbuttel; Mrs. Katherine McClelland and General McClelland; Mrs. Jeannette W. Bluethenthal and Mr. Bluethenthal; Cyrus D. Hogue Jr., and Mrs. Hogue; Dr. R. T. Sinclair, Jr. and Mrs. Sinclair; Peter Browne Ruffin and Mrs. Ruffin; Walter Taylor, Jr., and Mrs. Taylor; Mrs. Hannah K. Wright and Bishop Wright and Mrs. Elizabeth Brown.

Trustees who were unable to be present were Harmon C. Rorison and George Cain of Jacksonville.

Members of the Davis family presented were Mrs. Mildred Davis Adams, his sister; Mrs. Mary Nixon Darden Hardwick; Mrs. Elliott Williamson; Robert Davis Darden; Bishop Wright; David S. Harriss; and Mrs. Nellie Corbett Brown. Unable to be present was Mrs. Elizabeth Hardwicke Yow.

Also presented were Mrs. Mary F. Ormond, widow of the first chairman of the board of trustees, the late Lewis F. Ormond.

Invocation was by Rt. Rev. Thomas H. Wright, bishop of the east Carolina diocese of the Episcopal Church.

Religion Is of Essential Importance to Every Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, during the week of May 10–13, the Slovak Catholic Federation of America held its 43d annual convention at the Hotel Commodore in New York City. The convention was deeply concerned with the education and training of American and world youth.

The convention opened with a pontifical Mass at the St. John Nepomucene Church in New York City. Its parrish, founded 70 years ago, is known as the Slovak basilica in America and its spiritual leader, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Stephen J. Krasula, P.A., is known as a patriarch among Slovak priests in America.

Most Rev. Bishop John J. Maguire, vicar general, brought greetings from His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman. In his message, Cardinal Spellman stated that:

> It is a day for remembering with pride the long and honorable Catholic traditions of the Slavonic nations, and for recalling their important contribution both to the church and to this beloved land of ours.

Mayor Robert F. Wagner stated:

> New York City is proud of its Slovak citizens, who, with their brethren of Slavonic nations, can trace their history to the days of Capt. John Smith in building Jamestown, the first permanent English settlement in Virginia, and here in our great city, to the famous Peter Stuyvesant, who sought their counsel and aid in the establishment of a firm government.

A special guest at the convention and, later, at the Vatican and New Jersey pavilions at the World's Fair was Msgr. Stefan Nahalka, director of the Slovak Institute of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Rome. American Slovaks had erected this institute at a cost of a million dollars for the training of priests for Slovakia, now under Communist domination.

The highlights of the convention were a message and blessing from Pope Paul VI and a sermon by the Most Reverend Andrew G. Grutka, D.D., bishop of Gary,

Ind., an American of Slovak extraction. Bishop Grutka, who has many friends and relatives in New Jersey, also celebrated pontifical mass in the Slovak language at the Vatican Pavilion on Thursday, May 13. Later he visited the New Jersey Pavilion where the federation held its day in conjunction with the graduates of the Perth Amboy, N.J., Holy Trinity Parochial School. It was a distinct honor for the New Jersey Pavilion to be so recognized by Bishop Grutka and the Slovak dignitaries from all over the United States.

Bishop Grutka is the protector of the federation of which Rev. Michael J. Churak, pastor of the Holy Trinity Parish, Perth Amboy, is supreme chaplain. Bishop Grutka's sermon is a message not only to the members of the Slovak Catholic Federation but to all peace-loving people, who in this period of strife and chaos should pay close heed.

The sermon appeared in "The Falcon," the official organ of the Slovak Catholic Sokol, edited by John C. Sciranka, of Passaic, N.J. I include it in the RECORD at this point:

RELIGION IS OF ESSENTIAL IMPORTANCE TO EVERY MAN

Like never before the attention of numberless persons is focused on religion these days. For this we can be truly thankful to Almighty God. We also owe a heavy debt of deep gratitude to a genuinely loveable person, the late Pope John XXIII. His inspired convocation of the Second Vatican Council has left an impact of universal proportions on religion in general. Very warm sentiments of appreciation are likewise due Pope Paul VI for his courageous leadership in directing the council toward a conclusion which will affect the cause of human relations everywhere on this earth.

Because of this concentrated attention to religious matters very significant consideration is being given to the much-longed-for ideal of unity among Christians. In the fact of increasing atheism, materialism, and indifferentism, unity among Christians is not just desirable but absolutely essential.

If the influence of religion loses its forces of motivation and inspiration for modern society, the consequence can only lead to an abysmal tragedy. If belief in life eternal after death should progressively become weaker so that it loses all vitality, then the hope of peaceful living on earth will become an elusive fantasy. Only the belief in an all-just, all-wise, all-merciful, all-understanding God, who will reward the good and punish the wicked makes life bearable under many circumstances and in countless instances.

It is a fact that no one asks to come into this world and no one really has anything to say about departing from it. The big questions are: Who did place man here? For what reason? Why? All man's happiness in time and for all eternity depends on the correct answers to these questions. These answers can only be found in religion. Religion therefore is of essential importance to every man.

The essence of religion is simply the conforming of the human will to the divine. This can best be accomplished by the strict observance of the divine laws which are found in and promulgated by the church established by God. No laws, however, are completely adequate or perfectly efficient without a living authority. No church, no society, can do without this necessity—each must have a master.

Authority is a much misunderstood word and very often abused. In the government of people a sound solution to the vexing problem of how authority and liberty can be fully reconciled is still unavailable. Statesmen work for a solution incessantly. They devise and revise constitutions—add bylaws, indicate separations of offices and balance them ingeniously. Assignments are issued in such proportions and with such restrictions that they leave in the hands of those who preside over public affairs the least bit of initiative. Efforts at securing the inviolability of individual liberty are mostly just pretense but the only truly effective curb on human activity is conscience. To guide and restrain human activity properly can be done only by reaching the souls of men.

For peace and harmony among people the exercise of authority on the part of someone is an absolute requisite. Without a guiding authority societies of men will invariably break out into feuding factions and end up disorganized, confused and scarred.

To complicate the proper exercise of authority in governing, there is the consideration that must be given to the spiritual and eternal welfare beside, and over, and above the physical and temporal welfare of men. Any consistent disproportion in this regard will always lead to dissatisfaction and emotional disturbance.

Since all authority comes from God those rulers who in our times are desperately striving to construct a morality without God are only exposing their foolishness and their absolute impotence to fashion any real authority.

They may be able to suggest, threaten, brainwash, or compel, but genuine authority will always escape them. Fundamentally no man is of any more value than his fellowman, and consequently neither wealth, scholarship, cleverness nor forcefulness is able to procure a right to absolute authority. Authority in man's hands—any man's hands—is always a delegated power, delegated from God.

Unlimited and arbitrary authority may not be assumed by anyone. When exercised beyond its limits no authority is lawful. God does not support and cannot be held responsible for the use of authority which He has not granted, and much less for any which militates against Himself. God cannot be in contradiction.

Authority in general is being questioned rather freely and capriciously nowadays, religious authority not excepted. This attitude provides strong evidence that religion's influence is not as convincing as some of us would like to believe. This questioning of religious authority is particularly disconcerting for its points toward an estrangement with things divine. Strangers to God end up strangers to each other.

The time of trouble and especially war, authority is exerted more forcefully but at the same time finds more willing compliance. The church on earth is known as the church militant because of its never ending struggle against evil. This really means all-out war with the highest possible prizes for victory or the worst conceivable punishment in defeat—eternal bliss or eternal damnation—heaven or hell.

Under the circumstances it would seem that the authority of the church should always be regarded with the highest respect but especially in these spiritually disturbed days.

Slovak Catholics for over 1,100 years, since the days of SS. Cyril and Methodius, have regarded the authority of the church as divine and have accepted it without question. This loyalty of Slovak Catholics to the authority of the church has enabled them to profess and practice their faith with a warmth and simplicity that is absolutely unique. It is a social phenomenon of marvelous significance in the face of a political existence which for centuries has kept them in bondage and has allowed them to breathe the air of freedom and experience the exhilarating satisfaction of self-government for only a brief moment.

We of the Federation of Slovak Catholics of America are gathered here in act of divine worship. We come to thank Almighty God for his blessings and by humble prayer to obtain his favorable attention to our pleas which seek religious freedom for our countrymen and all people, for the preservation of the faith of our fathers.

Americans Are Losing Their Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Tip Mills, editor of the Hutchinson, Minn., Leader, in a recent editorial observed "unless the people are constantly on the alert, their hired public officials tend to expand their powers in ways that cause government, little by little, to encroach on individual freedom and opportunity." Certainly, Tip's disturbing analysis of how this is happening today is thought provoking, and with unanimous consent I insert his excellent editorial in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

AMERICANS ARE LOSING THE FREEDOMS THEY FOUGHT TO WIN

A reading of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights points up the fact that governments themselves do not produce freedom. People have to wrest freedom from government.

After they secure freedom, it is an endless task to retain it. Government authorized by the people provides laws, order, and protection. Of necessity, it must be restrictive in many ways.

But unless the people are constantly on the alert, their hired public officials tend to expand their powers in ways that cause government, little by little, to encroach on individual freedom and opportunity. It is all done in the name of the people and paid for through massive taxation. The people vote for hobbles when they sanction a welfare state.

This Nation took a big step in that direction last fall, when Lyndon Johnson was elected President. Now a rubberstamp Congress eagerly does his bidding.

How is our individual freedom being encroached upon? Primarily, for the moment, in the area of spending our income. The administration and its supporters feel that Washington officials are better qualified to decide how to spend our money than we ourselves are. True, there is the much ballyhooed income tax cut. But that will be followed shortly by a steep increase in social security taxes. Young parents with children to raise and educate will be faced with stiffer taxes in order to pay health bills for people over 65, many of whom don't need the help. Workers will have thus lost the freedom to spend that money as their own needs indicate.

Then, when they face the prospect of educating their children, and of helping, through their own local elected school officials, to shape that education, they will find those Washington officials on the job. The Federal Government, through its carrot and stick technique using financial grants and accompanying requirements, will have gradually encroached upon the right of local school districts to control their own schools.

And still another encroachment has been and will be in the field of on-the-job training. Time was when an unskilled lad could get a job, at low pay, and learn a trade which would eventually lead to a better-paying position. But now, through the establishment of minimum wage rates which steadily creep upwards, the Government is choking off this field of training. Employers find it uneconomical to hire unskilled youths at minimum wage rates. So young people can't get jobs because they don't have the experience, and they can't get the experience without a job.

The Washington solution is typical. Instead of removing the cause of the problem, Washington passes a new law and appropriates more money to set up something called a job corps, which will train youngsters at low pay, far below the minimum wage private employers are required to pay. The taxpayers, of course, foot the bill.

Meanwhile, freedom and opportunities of both employers and prospective employees have been encroached upon. Encroached upon? Trampled is a better word.

These are some examples of how the American people, who once wrested freedom from government, are now slowly losing it back to government.

The 408th Anniversary of 1st Law for Religious Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was in Transylvania, in 1557, that mankind took the first formal step toward that human right which is only now beginning to be universally recognized: the right of each man to the protection of government in his exercise of religion.

Transylvania, a semi-independent principality, preserving its practical independency by playing off against each other the rival claims of the Austrian and Turkish Empires, suffered internal dissensions on religious grounds. The reformation had pitted against each other adherents of various forms of Christian belief: Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist, and Unitarian.

Out of the desire of the ruling classes in Transylvania to maintain their power in tranquility, and to keep their ascendancy over the Greek Orthodox peasantry of the Transylvania countryside, came a move craftily politic in its motive, but vastly important as the first step toward a generous statesmanship. On June 1, 1557, the legislative body of Transylvania, called the Diet, passed the first of a series of laws establishing, for the Christian religion in these four forms, free exercise and equal rights for all time.

Eugene Horvath, in his monograph, "Transylvania and the History of the Rumanians," says of the period from 1556 to 1570:

The most important event of the period outlined above was the spread of Protestantism, and Transylvania is usually regarded as the country where religious liberty was first formally insured. While conceding that this was the outcome of a struggle in which every denomination demanded exclusive rights for itself, it cannot be denied that as a result of that struggle an equilibrium was established, which had no counterpart in the other Christian countries of Europe.

More important, though, than this local and transitory success of a political expedient, was the example it gave, of the establishment by law of the principle of religious freedom. It is to the imitations and extensions of this first tentative legislative step that we owe, now, the freedom of each man and of all men, in America and in many other countries, to pray, to preach, to teach, and to assemble for worship, in accordance with the dictates of our own conscience.

Rightly, then, do we do honor in our own day to the Diet of Transylvania on the 408th anniversary of the act of June 1, 1557.

WTOP Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frank Wilson, editorializing for WTOP on June 4 and 5, over both radio and television, expressed what I believe to be the thoughts of most Americans with respect to the magnificent achievements of Majs. Jim McDivitt and Ed White.

I am happy to insert in the RECORD, for the benefit of those who did not hear it and to preserve for the future, Mr. Wilson's editorial:

[This editorial was broadcast on June 4 and 5, 1965, over WTOP radio and television]

WTOP EDITORIAL

Americans are finding new cause for pride in their men of space. Maj. Jim McDivitt and Maj. Ed White in their *Gemini 4* flight have already added important proof of more progress in the space program. Thanks to efforts such as theirs we now are well along past the halfway point in time and technology between our first tiny space capsule, Explorer 1, and the huge Apollo rocketship that is being developed to take three astronauts to the moon and back by the end of this decade.

Each new flight brings its own new glimpses of the care, the power, the skill, and the spirit that are making space a part of man's expanding environment. In the *Gemini 4* shot we saw once again the vast outpouring of power that can punch a 90-foot rocket through a "keyhole in the sky" into orbit. We heard again the always-calm, mostly business-like, often humorous talk between ground control and capsule—talk that reveals the grand alliance between man and computer, between courage and lightning-quick mathematics, between planned systems and on-the-spot intellect that typifies the space effort.

This time we had a new achievement, the walk in space taken by Major White, a strange and wonderful mixture of scientific adventure and sheer delight. Major White is the man whose bright-faced wife, Pat, sent him off to his 4 days work with a breezy, telephoned "have fun."

He did just that on his space walk and said as much. Like a schoolboy prolonging a recess from a crowded classroom, White stayed out 20 minutes, nearly twice the intended time. And it took a brisk order from ground control and a friendly reminder from McDivitt, "you've got three and a half more days to go, buddy," to get White back inside. The end of his walk was a sad moment for him, but how much closer his cheery courage seemed to bring the moon!

This was a WTOP Editorial, Frank Wilson speaking for WTOP.

Washington in the District of Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Washington is a city of contrasts and contradictions. Nowhere is this more apparent than in Government.

Congress has lowered income taxes in the name of giving Americans more of their own money to spend. It also is raising taxes on their incomes in the name of social security.

The country is fighting a war in Vietnam and simultaneously repealing wartime excise taxes because we are not at war.

Our prosperity is the highest in the Nation's history and we are embarking on a massive antipoverty campaign.

Secretary McNamara is sending troops to the Dominican Republic, cutting back our Reserve forces and closing military bases.

We face a long hot summer of discontent and violence on the streets of our cities and a gigantic domestic Peace Corps is being formed.

Beauty has become a national objective and yet we are constructing some of the ugliest public buildings in the world.

The poverty program to help the poor is lining the pockets of its well-to-do administrators.

The administration wants to spend $3 billion for foreign aid in the name of friendship while Uncle Sam is badgered by over a hundred nations at the U.N. and "Yankee Go Home" signs are posted on five continents.

The Pentagon spends $50 billion a year for an Army, Navy, and Air Force and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency clamors for total and complete disarmament.

The President calls for pay raises for Government civil servants and disapproves the size of military pay boosts needed to get many service family incomes above the poverty program level.

We plead with other countries not to develop nuclear weapons and, at the time time, double the overseas stockpiles of our own.

Mountains of surplus crops are stored around the country while the Agriculture Department spends millions of dollars a year learning how to produce more of the same.

In order to maintain a sound dollar, we no longer mint them.

Togetherness and interdependence with Communist countries is being urged

at the State Department while Russia expels our diplomats and we expel hers.

Cigarette packages will bear health hazard labels; the National Institutes of Health carries on a vast anticancer crusade; tobacco crops receive Government subsidy.

These are but a few examples of the perplexing ways of Washington. All this may seem confusing to the average person, and the reason it seems confusing is because it is.

However, there is no reason for alarm or despair. It confuses our enemies, too. They have no idea what we are up to either. Therefore, they cannot possibly devise countermeasures to thwart us.

Mill and Mine and Forge—The Heritage of Southwestern Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the city of Pittsburgh and all of southwestern Pennsylvania have capabilities and resources with which they are singularly endowed. They are helping to carve out a prosperous and strong economy for our region. The Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania—RIDC— points out that when all the factors considered in industrial plant location are measured, it will be found that southwestern Pennsylvania has all of them. I should like to include as part of my remarks portions of a new publication by the Regional Industrial Development Corp., entitled "The Southwestern Pennsylvania Region Is on the Move":

MILL AND MINE AND FORGE—THE HERITAGE OF SOUTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

For more than a century, southwestern Pennsylvania stood unique in the industrial pattern of America. As though Nature herself anticipated the industrialization of the growing young country, she cached here the basic elements—rich veins of coal, limestone, salt, sand, clay—and provided broad rivers for easy transportation of other raw materials, and the shipment of finished goods.

Where coal was so abundant and cheap, there sprung up the furnaces to pour out iron and steel, and the mills to roll it, shape it, forge it to fit the ever-increasing demands of a growing, expanding economy.

But for all of natures generosity, and the creation of a vast industrial complex based on coal and steel, southwestern Pennsylvania eventually paid a price.

In the early decades of the 1900's the supremacy of coal as a fuel began to be threatened by gas, petroleum, and electric power. Industry began ranging farther and farther afield for sources of raw materials, and steadily improving transportation facilities provided greater latitude in the establishment not only of basic industries, but of the processing and fabricating plants and factories that inevitably locate near their source of materials.

Southwestern Pennsylvania — and the Pittsburgh area in particular—paid a physical price as well in the choking pall of smoke from its mills * * * in its dependence on heavy industry * * * in the recurring fluctuations in the economic development of the country.

THE DYNAMICS OF CHANGE

With its position at the heart of the southwestern Pennsylvania industrial complex, it was inevitable that, if change was to come, it had to start at the famed Point in Pittsburgh.

Facing squarely up to the problems, community leaders inspired an alliance of industry, labor, and local governments, and formed the Allegheny Conference on Community Development for the purpose of furthering the "sound growth and healthy development" of the region.

From this sprang what is now nationally famous as "the Pittsburgh renaissance."

The early character of Pittsburgh's renaissance was both recreational and commercial, beginning in 1950 with the development of 59 acres of blighted riverfront real estate at the historic point of the golden triangle.

This area, now referred to as Point State Park and Gateway Center, now contains 7 new office buildings, a hotel, a 27-story apartment building, and 2 garden plazas landscaped over underground parking garages. Four of the office buildings, developed by Equitable Life Assurance Society, house headquarters and regional offices of some of the Nation's leading corporations. Other buildings include the Pennsylvania State Office Building, the Bell Telephone Building, and, just completed, the IBM Building with its new and unique architectural style.

Crowning the upper elevation of the golden triangle are three modern skyscrapers of postwar construction that complement the city's redevelopment program—the Alcoa Building, the Mellon-United States Steel Building, and the H. K. Porter Co. Building.

Other significant construction includes the recently completed headquarters for the Blue Cross Association, and the new Federal Building designed to consolidate a number of Government agencies under one roof.

In addition to construction of completely new facilities, there is continuing activity in renovation of a number of older structures.

In all, more than one-fourth of Pittsburgh's business district has been rebuilt to meet the promise of the future.

At the eastern edge of the central city, another 95 acres of marginal property has been cleared for redevelopment. This has made possible Pittsburgh's "showcase" Civic Arena, modern apartment and motel buildings, and other facilities of a civic nature now in the blueprint stage.

Beyond the business district—to the east and west, and across the Allegheny River to the North Side, urban renewal is presently represented by 18 projects and a total investment of $737 million, of which private investment is carrying the major share.

While much that is spectacular about the Pittsburgh program appears, at first glance, to enhance only the central city—the impact of this sweeping redevelopment and renewal program goes far beyond the limited area, and both directly and indirectly benefits the whole of the nine-county region of Southwestern Pennsylvania.

In the retention of heavy industry—as exemplified in the multimillion-dollar capital investment by Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.—in the growing attractiveness of the city as executive and management headquarters—in the tremendous growth of research facilities of all kinds—in new and improved educational facilities at the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, and Duquesne University—the development of a tremendous medical center including Pitt's Graduate School of Public Health—are elements and factors that are creating a new vitality and new capabilities. And a vast system of expressways and highways interconnects the entire region with all these new assets within the area.

The success of the program in the central city has constructively influenced and encouraged programs for the renewal and redevelopment of communities and whole areas throughout the region. There is scarcely a municipality that is not now proceeding with plans and projects that will contribute to the total prosperity and economic growth of the entire nine-county area of southwestern Pennsylvania.

Practical Aid to the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, hearings are currently being held by a House Judiciary Subcommittee on the proposed revision of the archaic Copyright Act of 1909. For more than half a century the defects in this act have brought frustration to struggling writers and composers.

A strong and cogent editorial in support of this legislation appeared in the New York Times of May 30, 1965, and I am happy to include it herewith as I express my support of H.R. 4347 and my own bill, H.R. 6835:

[From the New York Times, May 30, 1965]

COPYRIGHT FOR CREATORS

For the last few years culture has been "in" in Washington. A playwright, a composer, even an unshorn painter may find himself only slightly below the salt in the White House. Artistic achievement is honored by East Room musicales and rose garden handshakes, duly recorded by still and film cameras, for the folks back home and the people out there.

This is admirable. But the administration and the Congress now have a splendid opportunity to add practical necessities to the social amenities for many creative persons in the United States. The House Committee on the Judiciary has begun hearings on a new bill to revise the archaic Copyright Act of 1909. For more than half a century the shortcomings in this act have contributed to the struggle of struggling writers and composers.

The key change in the revised law would protect the creator's work for the term of his life plus 50 years. The outmoded present term of copyright is 28 years, renewable by certain persons for a second period of 28 years. Ironically, many American writers have better protection abroad: in most civilized countries in the Western World, copyright already runs for life plus 50 years.

Other proposed improvements include a time limit on long-term acquisitions by publishers; compensation for certain "nonprofit" broadcasts and performances; elimination of the so-called jukebox exemption, meaning that jukebox operators would have to pay royalties to composers. Surely one area that needs exploring in the hearings is fair use and compensation for writers whose works are copied indiscriminately.

Respecting the property rights of writers, composers, and playwrights is the most fundamental way for the Government to foster an atmosphere to encourage the Nation's creative elements.

Idaho Chapter, American National Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, we in Idaho are extremely proud of the Idaho Chapter, American National Red Cross. Year after year this great organization carries on its work with little fanfare.

It is true that, in the event of a disaster of some sort, they do receive publicity—but not, in my opinion, commensurate with the great good they accomplish. In the little things, however, the behind-the-scenes activities, the person-to-person and person-to-group contacts, we hear very little of the work they do.

In order that, in some small way, this humanitarian group may be accorded a portion of the recognition due it, I include in the RECORD a report on the activities of the Idaho chapter during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

The report follows:

IDAHO REPORT, AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

The American National Red Cross summarizes in this report activities in Idaho during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

BLOOD SERVICES

Volunteer donors contributed 22,703 pints of blood through the Red Cross regional blood center in Boise and its bloodmobiles. Whole blood was provided for patients in 42 hospitals serving 28 counties in Idaho. The Boise center also supplied whole blood to hospitals in five counties in eastern Oregon and one in eastern Washington where local chapters participated in the Red Cross blood program through the Boise center's bloodmobiles.

Some of the blood collected was processed into fractions and other derivatives used to fight disease. Through this phase of the blood program, 59,091 cc. of gamma globulin and quantities of five other blood derivatives were provided by the Red Cross for patients in all sections of Idaho. Additional quantities were distributed in Oregon and Washington.

SERVICES TO THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS

At military installations in Idaho, 1,961 servicemen were given Red Cross help through field director offices. In Idaho communities, Red Cross chapters assisted 1,531 military men or their families and 427 veterans or their survivors. In cases where financial assistance was necessary, Red Cross disbursed $44,782 either in interest-free loans or in outright grants where repayment would have caused hardship.

Patients in the Boise Veterans' Administration Hospital and in military hospitals in the State were served by Gray Ladies and other Red Cross volunteers who visited them regularly.

One hundred and sixty veterans were helped in development of their claims for Government benefits by a Red Cross Field Director on itinerant visits to the Veterans' Administration Regional Office in Boise.

SAFETY SERVICES—NURSING

Many Idaho residents are alive today because of Red Cross training in first aid, swimming, lifesaving, and home nursing techniques.

Three thousand four hundred and twelve persons were trained in Red Cross first aid skills by authorized volunteer instructors.

Nine thousand one hundred and sixteen persons were taught swimming, lifesaving, and water safety practices by authorized water safety instructors.

Sixty-four additional first aid and water safety instructors for local communities were trained at a Red Cross National Aquatic School conducted at Twin Echo, near Rathdrum.

One thousand six hundred and seventy-seven persons were trained in home nursing skills through courses in care of the sick and injured and mother and baby care.

An additional 3,071 persons received informal instruction in first aid, water safety, and home nursing skills through demonstrations and film showings.

Forty-two mobile first aid units and two Red Cross highway first aid stations contributed to improving safety for travelers using the State's highways.

DISASTER SERVICES

During the year there were no large-scale disasters in the State. June 1964, floods in Clearwater, Idaho, and Shoshone Counties and fires in Wallace, Regans, and Pocatello, however, brought Red Cross workers into action to help those affected. In addition, emergency feeding was provided for a sheriff's search party on Iron Mountain. Disaster relief expenditures amounted to $10,899, a large portion of which went for postdisaster recovery help for 47 families.

Idaho chapters cooperated with civil defense agencies in preparedness planning for disaster situations which could happen at any time in any community.

RED CROSS IN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

More than 6,300 children and youth in 26 Idaho elementary and secondary schools last year were enrolled members of Red Cross.

Two hundred and thirty-three students and faculty members in six colleges and universities participated in Red Cross service programs.

VOLUNTEERS

The work in Idaho was made possible by almost 4,000 volunteers who gave service through the State's 44 Red Cross chapters.

In addition to the programs carried on for the military and veterans hospitals, Red Cross adult and youth volunteers performed services for 37 other community agencies, including civilian hospitals and clinics, nursing homes, health and welfare institutions, and the State hospital south at Blackfoot, where they took recreational activities to patients and assisted the hospital staff in therapy programs.

Michigan's Pictured Rocks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join my colleague, Congressman CLEVENGER, in his efforts to safeguard and preserve one of the Nation's natural treasures, Michigan's Pictured Rocks shoreline.

The rapid disappearance of open space in general and unspoiled natural areas in particular makes it mandatory that we quickly do all we can to guard and maintain as much of the American wilderness as possible.

In view of our rapid population growth time runs short for the initiation of a really meaningful conservation program. This bill to save Michigan's Pictured Rocks national lakeshore is an important effort in an important direction.

I am privileged to join my distinguished colleague and to sponsor his legislation.

Nuclear Propulsion for Merchant Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert, for the information of this body, a statement by Adm. John M. Will, U.S. Navy, retired, before the Reactors Subcommittee of the General Advisory Committee to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission:

STATEMENT BY ADM. JOHN M. WILL, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, AMERICAN EXPORT ISBRANDTSEN LINES, INC., BEFORE THE REACTORS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, MAY 25, 1965

I am grateful to Mr. Swartout for his invitation to participate in this meeting today. He has asked that I express my views concerning the application of nuclear propulsion to merchant shipping.

Gentlemen, my views are these:

I am in favor of nuclear propulsion for merchant ships. And I am in favor of proceeding with its development right now; not in the uncharted and ill-defined future.

I favor nuclear propulsion for merchant ships, first, because our experience in operating the *Savannah* has convinced me of its practicability, and second, because I believe most strongly and steadfastly that it affords us the only means now available to rescue the American merchant marine from the serious inroads of foreign-flag competition and to restore it to its rightful place in the world of merchant shipping and in our national economy. Other esoteric proposals may be on the drawing boards but nuclear reactors are on the high seas. Their success has been proven, not only by our Navy but also by the NS *Savannah*, the world's first—and for a limited time longer—the world's only nuclear-powered commercial vessel.

The United States still enjoys a vast lead over other nations of the world in the shipboard application of nuclear reactors, but other nations are entering the field. Time is not on our side. Let us not forget that while we were testing and debating, the Soviet Union launched sputnik and relegated us to our present position of followers rather than leaders in outer space. Despite our present impressive position in the maritime reactor field, we can still test and debate our way into second or even third place.

Our maritime reactor program today is on top dead center. It has been on top dead center for nearly 2 years. There are 69 reactors now in actual operation at sea—68 of them in naval vessels and one in the American merchant marine. Fifty-four more reactors are being readied for seagoing operations—none of them for the American merchant marine.

I should think the Maritime Administrator would be hammering at the door of the AEC, demanding that this situation be corrected.

I should think the Members of Congress would be asking pointed questions as to the reasons for the orphaned state of our merchant ship reactor program. I should think the American people would want to know why the millions of dollars poured into the Savannah program have produced no more tangible results than a single ship.

I wonder too why we read press reports from the Maritime Administration with vague references and hints about an interest in purely experimental craft. How much of MarAd's slender R. & D. budget will be allocated to novel principles, to the detriment of the maritime reactor program? Or, indeed, is there any provision at all at this time for the support of a reactor program in the Maritime Administration?

There are two groups whom I believe to be chiefly responsible for the inertia shackling our progress, the accountants and the testers. One group says, "Let's wait until it's more economical." The other says, "Let's wait until we run a few more tests." The lyrics may differ slightly, but the chorus is "let's wait."

Gentlemen, I submit that we can no longer wait. We must act. We must undertake a strong cooperative effort in which the Atomic Energy Commission, the Maritime Administration, the shipping industry and the reactor manufacturers are joined to produce for the American merchant marine a fleet of nuclear powered merchant ships capable of competitive operation in world trade.

There are two immediate benefits to be gained from nuclear power applied to a merchant ship—significantly increased speed for sustained operations and a vastly improved ratio between cargo space and space required for machinery and fuel storage. Such a ship would best be employed over long distance routes just as the jet airliner is more advantageously employed between New York and San Francisco than between New York and Washington or Boston.

A fleet of 30-knot nuclear powered freighters would be almost as much of a step forward as today's steamships were over Robert Fulton's *Clermont*. Nuclear energy applied to bulk carriers, container ships, tankers, and more sophisticated types still to come from the drawing board would open a new and wonderful age for the commerce of the world's nations.

To those who are fearful of the cost—the accountants, as I referred to them earlier—I say we cannot afford not to proceed with this program immediately. The shipowners and the shipbuilders cannot be expected to shoulder alone the extra expenses involved in this investment in our country's maritime future. Our Government must be prepared to support a program which promises such great potential benefit to our economy as a whole.

As an example that these problems are not unique to America I quote from a recent issue of Marine Engineering/Log relating to foreign problems of financing nuclear ship development:

"Reports reaching us from Norway indicate that country and Sweden may be the next builder of a nuclear-powered merchant ship. The estimated costs of building and operating such a vessel there have reached a stage where one is so close to being economically competitive that the next logical step is actual construction of a trial ship.

* * * * *

"On the subject of who should foot the bill, Norwegian project manager, Jens Wilhelmsen says that 'the shipowners and the shipbuilding industry cannot be expected to shoulder alone the extra expenses involved in a trial ship. The project is of such importance to the entire economy of the country that it would be reasonable for the Government to step in with its support.' "

In the same article U.S. Congressman GARMATZ is quoted as saying "No one operator should be expected to bear the full costs of an undertaking so important to the shipping industry."

At the time the *Savannah* design was first under consideration, the Isbrandtsen Co. offered to make available a ship's hull—the hull of the tanker *Hans Isbrandtsen*—then on the building ways—for experiments in the maritime application of a nuclear reactor. Today, American Export Isbrandtsen Lines is willing to risk its capital to support an advancement in this already proven art.

The company risks loss of investment, or smaller returns on investment, if our proposed nuclear ships fail to produce the revenues projected for them. The novelty of nuclear power is not worth a dime on the market unless the ships themselves are capable of sustained, efficient express operations.

In a letter dated October 23, 1964, and addressed jointly to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Maritime Administrator, American Export Isbrandtsen Lines said: "With the United States offsetting the higher capital and operating cost associated with this pioneering endeavor in commercial nuclear marine applications, we are willing to commit ourselves to an immediate program of nuclear vessel construction for service on Trade Route 12 using a pressurized water reactor. American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, Inc. would expect to bear its fair share of the cost of the vessels and would contribute an amount towards the nuclear ships which would equal the expected cost of ships of conventional speed, type and design."

Later in that same letter, we spelled out some of the details of our proposal: "Since this direct application may require extensive testing or otherwise experience construction delays due to the uniqueness of the reactor or the propulsion system, we believe it prudent to have the ships constructed for the Government's account initially in a manner comparable to vessel construction under section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act. We would purchase the ships upon completion of such trials as appear warrented to permit their licensed operation by us. We do not consider it prudent to advance our funds to a shipyard for construction progress payments because of this hazard of potential delay, but we would be willing to escrow or otherwise segregate moneys in our reserve funds for use on the nuclear vessel purchase. Indeed, we would be willing to execute a contract with the United States prior to commencing actual vessel construction which incorporated this or a comparable financial arrangement and such other terms and considerations for transfer of title that may be mutually agreed upon."

Today—8 months after that letter was written—we are still awaiting replies from both Marad and AEC.

The initial outlay for a nuclear ship is, of course, greater than it would be for her oil-fired counterpart. Yet there are so many other considerations involved that a painstaking cost analysis tends to suggest a parity between the two.

For example, if we add to the cost of the conventional ships the cost of 7 years supply of black oil, we have lessened the imbalance considerably.

Of greater significance is the fact that four nuclear-powered 30-knot freighters employed on long-haul routes can replace six conventional cargo-liners in the same service. The acquisition cost is roughly the same, yet the Government can save the operational differential subsidy on two ships a year for 20 and more years.

The matter of nuclear propulsion versus conventional power costs has been subjected to the closest scrutiny by the Navy Department. The Navy has found that the cost differential in 1960 was on the order of 50 percent. In 1962 the figure was 30 percent and in 1963 it was 20 percent. An even greater narrowing of this cost ratio is forecast in the very near future.

It would appear to me that the accountants have less reason than they think to justify their cry of "let's wait until its more economical."

I think it of interest that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, acting on its own initiative, raised the Atomic Energy Commissions 1966 budget request in the maritime reactor field from $1.4 million to $2.5 million. The committee report states, "The committee recommends this increase because it believes this application of nuclear energy has the potential of contributing significantly both to our national security and to the commercial posture of the United States.

"The committee is not satisfied with the direction which has been provided in the past within the administration for this country's merchant-ship reactor program. The program has suffered from the lack of clear-cut objectives."

To this I heartily agree.

But, as commendable as this positive action is, it represents only an extremely small expenditure for the beneficial results which I think could be realized. In addition, it is intended to expend these funds in what I consider to be the wrong way. The $2.5 million is in reality only the down payment on a program which will result—perhaps as much as $50 million and 5 years later—in a new form of prototype reactor. It will not put us any closer to a nuclear-powered merchant fleet or even to the beginnings of one.

And here is where I take issue with the second of the "let's wait" groups, the testers.

While there is no doubt that design refinements can eventually produce a better and more efficient maritime reactor, we cannot afford the delay which a new prototype program would require. We think we will have available a reactor based upon thoroughly proven principles for which a reputable company is willing to quote a fixed price and offer a performance guarantee. We know others are willing to do the same for reactors of more advanced concept. Our job is to place the ractor directly into a new ship and get on with the creation of a nuclear merchant fleet.

I would remind you that the Ford Motor Co. sold a lot of model T's before they developed the Mustang, and they made money on both.

I would also remind the testers that prototypes are not always a guarantee of success. For proof of this we need look no further than the submarine *Seawolf*, our Navy's second venture into nuclear power. Her sodium-cooled reactor had all of the advantages of a developing technology plus many months of operating experience on a shorebased prototype. However, when the reactor was installed in the submarine, serious problems developed, problems not experienced with the prototype. The high costs in time and money required for the prototype operation were thoroughly invalidated when the sodium plant was removed from *Seawolf* and replaced by a pressurized water reactor.

Gentlemen, the single most constructive step which the Atomic Energy Commission could take at this time is to free the maritime ractor development program to private enterprise. We do not need a Government effort now which would result in another long-range prototype program. We need a direct ship application and private enterprise is ready, willing and able to proceed with it right now.

In his testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Mr. Milton Shaw said, "the industry has been given the opportunity to do the best job it can [about] reducing cost and improving reliability and has produced fairly well; better than in any other technology."

Despite Mr. Shaw's restrained praise, the facts are evident—"better than in any other technology."

If we are permitted this course of action, we can, I believe, put a nuclear reactor of vastly improved design in a new hull and have that ship sailing on commercial service prior to 1970.

With AEC cooperation, private enterprise is adequate to the task and eager to undertake it. Moreover, such an arrangement is far more in keeping with the American tradition than to vest full responsibility for development in the hands of an agency of the Government.

Unless we are allowed to proceed—unless Government and industry move forwardly, boldly together—then we must reconcile ourselves to the role of a spectator. We can watch while in West Germany they install an American-designed reactor, a *Savannah* improvement, into a new hull. And we can ask ourselves, "Why are we letting them get the jump on us?"

Only One Final Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, as an indication of the widespread support for the President's position on certain foreign policy issues which have been under attack lately, the Lincoln Star has no parallel. I believe that an editorial of June 2 was very indicative of the sympathetic analyses which have been characteristic of this Nation in the last few weeks. I therefore, include it in the RECORD at this point:

ONLY ONE FINAL DECISION

The unique and often lonely role of the President of the United States was demonstrated by President Johnson at the commencement of his daughter, Luci, and her classmates. Criticism of administration policy is welcome, said the President, but in the end the decisions can be made by only one man.

He said he makes his decisions no matter how "the transient winds of opinion blow." He was referring specifically to foreign policy and the commitment of U.S. men and arms in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. There isn't any question that Johnson knows this commitment is an unpopular one.

There is not an individual in the Nation who wants this Nation to be fighting anywhere. They do not want American servicemen dying on foreign soil. But Johnson also knows that it is not a popularity contest in which he is engaged. He must do what he feels is right, whether it is popular or not. And then he must rest his case on the basis of need, the demand of the times.

He hopes that the American people, too, know the difference between what might be desirable and what is essential. In the President's decision, there is no room for the use of chance, either. He must proceed on the basis of what action holds the greatest promise with the least risk. What might be called long shots are plentiful but not as a part of any final reckoning.

It is a job that demands the kind of bipartisan support our foreign policy has and the understanding that is a part of such support. Criticism, of course, is an other essential part of our national life but it should not completely dominate the scene.

Congress and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial in today's New York Times speaks eloquently for many Americans in calling for more vigorous congessional interest in the Vietnam war. Congress has a responsible role to play in the conduct of our foreign policy. By questioning, as the Times editorial does, the reluctance of Secretary Rusk to employ the full resources of his department and give independent advice, the meager use of the President of nonofficial task forces in the foreign policy field, the overall dependence on military and intelligence agencies, the reasons behind the divorce between the administration and the Nation's intellectuals, as well as the nature of the war and its conduct, Congress can perform a great service to the Republic.

Debate over Vietnam policies undoubtedly will result in publicizing some differences of opinion between Congress and the President which were largely glossed over by recent votes on additional appropriations for Vietnam. The resolution of these differences, however, can only result in a more enlightened and strengthened foreign policy for the United States. Furthermore, although publicizing differences may expose the day-to-day conduct of the war to some tactical disadvantage, the overall advantage to be gained from congressional debate in the conduct of our foreign policy greatly outweighs the tactical risks involved.

Thus, while 28 Congressmen recently requested Chairman MORGAN of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to hold hearings on administration policy in Vietnam, I believe there are many others who agree such hearings would be in our best self-interest.

I accordingly urge your serious consideration of the following New York Times editorial and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, June 7, 1965]

CONGRESS AND VIETNAM

Signs are growing of congressional interest in ending the leave-it-to-Lyndon era in American foreign policy.

There is Senator FULBRIGHT's new proposal to give the OAS a major voice in channeling American military assistance to Latin America. There is the provision in the new foreign aid bill for a thoroughgoing congressional investigation and for terminating the aid program in its present form in 1967.

There is the trip to Europe, at their own expense, of four House Republicans to investigate the crisis in NATO. And there are the recent criticisms of administration policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, plus his current charge that the United States is neither meeting its aid responsibilities to the underdeveloped countries nor identifying itself with the world revolution underway in those areas.

Factors that go beyond the President's limited experience in foreign affairs and the extraordinary vacillations in Dominican policy have set off the present questioning at home and abroad. The reluctance of Secretary of State Rusk to employ the full resources of his Department and give independent advice, the meager use made by the President of nonofficial task forces in the foreign policy field, the overdependence on military and intelligence agencies and the divorce between the administration and the Nation's intellectuals—all point to a need for more vigorous congressional interest.

Nowhere is this more vital than on Vietnam, where grave constitutional questions are raised by the official acknowledgement of an increasing combat role for American troops. During the 18 months of the Johnson administration, the number of American troops in Vietnam has been tripled to about 46,500; a further buildup to more than 60,000 appears imminent. American planes have entered into combat both in South and North Vietnam—in the latter case openly attacking a foreign country with no declaration of war. American warships have bombarded the North Vietnamese coast. And there are indications that American ground troops—first employed as advisers in South Vietnam, then deployed to defend American installations and now directly engaged in patrolling action—will soon take on a full combat role as a tactical reserve aiding South Vietnamese units in trouble.

Yet, at no point has there been significant congressional discussion, much less direct authorization of what amounts to a decision to wage war. That is why 28 Democratic Congressmen, on the initiative of Representative ROSENTHAL, of Queens, now have wisely asked the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to hold public hearings on the administration's Vietnam policy.

American casualties in Vietnam, while still relatively minor, already exceed those of the Spanish-American War. The choices open to the President are exceedingly difficult ones; they should not be his alone, either as a matter of sound policy or of constitutional obligation. If he takes it upon himself to make an American war out of the Vietnamese tragedy—without seeking congressional and national consent—he may open the country to divisions even more dangerous than those that developed out of the Korean conflict.

Project Neptune-Atlantic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a new and rapidly expanding State university in my district, Florida Atlantic, has recently been selected as the participating university in Project Neptune-Atlantic. The Neptune project is a cooperative venture between the privately owned American merchant marine and the scientific community in furtherance of the national oceanographic program of the United States. Under this program a team of oceanographers will collect oceanographic data while aboard a merchant vessel without interfering with the ship's normal operations.

In participating in this project, Florida Atlantic will use what has come to be known as the "van" concept of data col-

lection. Their Department of Ocean Engineering will equip a portable van with scientific instruments. This van will then be transported to New York where it will be loaded upon the SS *Export Champion* and utilized during the ship's normal run to the Mediterranean. Upon return to New York the van will be unloaded and returned to the university where the data collected on the trip will be analyzed and appraised.

I am extremely proud of the part Florida Atlantic will be playing in this cooperative venture. The field of oceanography is so vast and so full of challenges that utilization of our merchant fleet in cooperation with the scientific community will provide the opportunity to release our specialized oceanographic vessels for more sophisticated research tasks. Florida Atlantic is well on the way to becoming one of the Nation's leading institutions for ocean research and ocean engineering.

Tribute to a Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, my district is proud to acknowledge the presence of an outstanding American who has attained success, honor, and distinction, not only in one career, but in two. He was a great military leader in World War II where he achieved the rank of vice admiral. Upon retirement from the Navy, he retired to Pensacola where he was promptly placed into service as mayor. His work in that capacity has been outstanding in every respect. Now, he is insisting upon taking another well deserved retirement. He takes with him the very best wishes of every person who has been privileged to know him.

I am glad to propose for reprinting in the RECORD a tribute to him from the Pensacola News-Journal of May 30, 1965:

TRIBUTE TO A LEADER

Great leadership is much in demand these days.

And Adm. Charles P. Mason, aviation pioneer, military commander, civic worker, and spirited mayor of our growing city, has been a great inspiration for high-quality leadership in Pensacola.

We need more leaders like Mayor Mason.

And we pay tribute to him upon his second retirement from the official duties as mayor of Pensacola. To us, he will always be Mayor Mason, a lifetime honor bestowed upon him by the Florida Legislature following his previous term in city hall.

The admiral epitomizes the brightest of leadership images, fulfilling a task which will long serve as a lofty goal of those who follow him to city hall.

Mayor Mason steps out of his high office at a time when Pensacola needs men of high caliber to inspire us and lead us through a period of municipal and community growth and prosperity.

It is a time of reason, of positive thinking, of reaching out and grasping for more progress. We welcome the new faces to the city council, men chosen by Pensacolians to carry out the policies and chart a proper course of high purpose through their talents as elected officials. The next few weeks, during a period of change at city hall, should not be a time of indifference but a time of calm, thoughtful reflection and positive direction.

We hope our elected officials will keep alive the leadership demonstrated so admirably by such men as Charles P. Mason. He has always shown the highest character and integrity. And he stepped into the breach of municipal government to contribute great service after a long and honorable career as naval flier, innovator, and wartime commander.

He has led many community endeavors, from all types of civic projects as well as service in Florida civil defense and the establishment of the Pensacola Historical Museum in Old Christ Church at Seville Square. His versatility is indicative of the type of leader so vitally needed in our city.

'I live in Pensacola by choice, primarily because I like the people," Mayor Mason said in announcing his first retirement as councilman-mayor in 1953. A council resolution said: "He has brought to the office of mayor his attributes of dignity, distinction, zeal, firmness, and graciousness in such measure that he has given new meaning to the office which shall forever remain as a challenge to his successors and as an example to his fellow citizens * * * (his) leadership has brought about the greatest period of growth and the most outstanding era of expansion and prosperity in the history of the city."

Mayor Mason was a 38-year naval veteran when he retired here in 1946. A native of Pennsylvania, he was graduated from the Naval Academy at Annapolis in 1912. He first came to Pensacola in 1916, training to become naval aviator No. 52 in 1917. He saw service in France during World War I and served on the Armistice Commission in Germany in 1918. The mayor later commanded the first seaplane squadron of the Pacific Fleet.

Mayor Mason married the former Ralphine Fisher in Pensacola in 1917 and returned here in 1921 as superintendent of naval aviation training. He later served on the first aircraft carrier, the U.S.S. *Langley*, making the first night takeoff and first catapult launching.

He commanded the U.S.S. *Hornet* when the aircraft carrier went down during the Battle of Santa Cruz during World War II in 1942. In 1943, the admiral was elevated to command of all air forces in the Solomon Islands. His many decorations include the Navy Cross, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, and honors from Mexican, Chilean, Peruvian and Brazilian Governments. He has been president of the Association of Early Aviators, or "Bald Eagles."

Returning to Pensacola after his retirement, Mason was named deputy State director of Florida Civil Defense and later headed the Pensacola Historical Society during the time when the organization was developing plans for its museum.

Mason, 74, was first chosen Pensacola mayor in June 1947, then as now not a member of the council. He was reappointed in 1949. In 1951, he ran for and was elected to the council and was renamed mayor, serving both as councilman and mayor until June 1957.

Upon his retirement as mayor, the Florida Legislature designated him honorary Pensacola mayor for life.

The words of a Pensacola Area Chamber of Commerce resolution, paying lasting tribute to Mayor Mason, clearly bring into focus his long dedication and excellent service to his community:

Mayor Mason is "deserving of the highest praise and commendation from the citizens of Pensacola, the metropolitan area and all areas that have come within his sphere of influence" and further commended him for "devotion, loyalty, unselfishness, industry and fidelity that he has unceasingly given to each and every undertaking of both his public and private life.

We sincerely hope that our newly chosen slate of municipal leaders will continue to draw inspiration from the long service of Charles P. Mason, a real leader whose retirement leaves big shoes to fill.

The Importance of Price to the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the St. Paul Grain Terminal Association's Radio Roundup for June 1, looking at the dismal farm price situation, indicates "We ought to take a lesson from what is happening in other nations before it is too late."

Certainly, this clear appraisal of our troubles with the Common Market, and the sharp contrast between Government controlled versus free world agriculture is most helpful in understanding what is at stake. I hope my colleagues will take time to read it, and for that reason, I place it in the RECORD:

You can't kid the farmer about farm prices. He knows how important they are. And that's true the world around.

The economists talk about efficiency, the scientists about production, the Government people talk about regulation, but the farmer knows that it is the price he gets that counts first and most. Some governments have a hard time learning this, although the farmers tell them in a thousand different ways.

For example, you know what a hassle we're having with the Common Market over in Western Europe. We've been telling those EEC nations that our farmers can produce grain for less so they should import from us instead of growing their own and holding their farm prices up high. We tell them that they should reduce their support prices, divert farm capital (and people) into industry, and buy their farm products from us because we can produce them so much cheaper. However, our European customers don't seem to be much impressed with that argument. They insist upon putting first things first, and they say that fair prices to farmers come first in the European Common Market organization. They're mighty firm on that point.

When you put yourself in their shoes and examine their point of view, they have good reason to be firm about fair farm prices. The West Germans, whose farm prices are tremendously high compared to ours, can peek over the Berlin Wall and see the depressing results of enforced low farm prices. They see East Germany, Hungary, Romania, the Soviet Union, countries that were the breadbasket of Europe before World War II. Today they must import food.

Why? Well, for more than 20 years those Eastern European countries have been suffering under the yoke of enforced low farm prices. The plan apparently was to build industry and bleed agriculture to do it. The whole story of this sad affair is written up in an English-language publication which prints the text of a report by Comrade Brezhnev, First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. He openly ad-

mits in this document that enforced low prices have been the cause of the disintegration of the agricultural economy of Eastern Europe. And he tells how farm prices now are being raised by as much as 50 and 100 percent to put profit back into farming. Farms can't operate without a profit, this Communist official says, but it took them 20 years to learn it.

So that's what the Common Market people of Western Europe see on the other side of the Iron Curtain. They see an agricultural economy wrecked by enforced low farm prices, and they don't like what they see. When American negotiators argue in favor of low farm prices, the Western Europeans just can't buy it.

Meanwhile, in this country we have our own farm problems, and increasingly they are concerned with price, as farmers can tell you. Wheat is a prime example, because it has a flat, low, administered ceiling price enforced by Commodity Credit sales whenever the price tends to rise.

The United States has the finest agricultural system in the world, the efficient family farm system. We ought to keep it that way and take a lesson from what is happening in other nations before it is too late.

Federal Reserve Threatens Money Growth, the Keystone of Our Recent Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this, the 89th Congress, WRIGHT PATMAN, our distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, saw fit to appoint me to the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance. I take my new responsibility on this important subcommittee very seriously. I have long been aware of the importance of money and credit to the small businesses, miners, farmers, and ranchers in my own district.

So it is only natural, Mr. Speaker, that so soon after assuming a certain degree of responsibility for monetary policy I was disturbed to learn that the Federal Reserve money managers, operating under a cloudy congressional delegation of power have just, within a few short weeks, plunged commercial bank reserves down to a minus $173 million. Now where does this leave that Idaho businessman? I know well where it leaves the money-market banker in New York—in the driver's seat where he usually is. My question, Mr. Speaker, is just how long can we hold out and what will happen if this credit squeeze is not reversed: Recession—as in 1957 and 1960, caused by similar credit squeezes. Even as proud as the administration is of the results of the recent tax cut—and they have every right to feel proud, and so does the Congress—the administration has not failed to give due credit to monetary policy in our unprecedented prosperity. Otto Eckstein, of the President's own Council of Economic Advisers, on May 19, in New York City, advised the National Association of Purchasing Agents that, and I quote:

These expansionary fiscal policies could work so successfully because monetary policy also facilitated expansion. This time—in contrast to previous experience—the money supply was permitted to expand along with the economy. The short-term rates important for international money flows have increased, but long-term rates have not risen substantially, and the supply of credit has remained ample to finance sound investments.

While some authorities question whether short-term rates truly affect international money flows, the heart of Mr. Eckstein's analysis is sound. This is the administration thinking that has served the Nation so splendidly since 1961. I will do my utmost to prevent abandonment of these sound and proven policies for a drastic course of action unwillingly imposed upon the American people by those powerful few who are able to profit at the same time their fellow citizens may suffer in an economic slowdown.

Location of Scientific and Manufacturing Industries in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an address by John E. McKeen, chairman of the board of Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., given at the joint conference of the Chemical Industry Council of Connecticut and the Connecticut Industrial Development Council at Hartford on April 26, 1965.

The subject of Mr. McKeen's talk was "Connecticut's Scientific and Manufacturing Potential." The purpose of this joint conference was to encourage the location of new industries in Connecticut, and to stress the many advantages for locating in Connecticut. Of particular interest is the fact pointed out by Mr. McKeen that the Pfizer Co. came to Connecticut in 1946, starting with one employee, and today the firm has about 2,000 men and women on its payroll. I am pleased to commend his address to those interested in future growth and location of industry in Connecticut:

A TALK BY JOHN E. MCKEEN, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, CHAS. PFIZER & CO., INC., AT THE JOINT CONFERENCE OF THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY COUNCIL OF CONNECTICUT AND THE CONNECTICUT INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, HARTFORD, CONN., APRIL 26, 1965

Mr. Jennings, Governor Dempsey, fellow members of the Chemical Industry Council of Connecticut and the Connecticut Industrial Development Commission, on this, the first day of Chemical Progress Week, I am honored to address a group which could well serve as a model for the progress, chemical and otherwise, of many other States across the Nation.

For you have shown what the combined efforts of industry and Government leaders, vitally concerned with the future of the area in which they live, can accomplish. I refer not only to the fine spirit of cooperation which is so much in evidence here tonight and which is so important for positive action, but I refer as well to the tangible accomplishment which this cooperation has brought.

This afternoon you heard several excellent presentations outlining the many advantages for chemical companies in Connecticut. As the representative of a chemical company which came to this State almost 20 years ago, I can bear witness to these many features—which range from excellent freight transportation facilities and ready accessibility to markets, to fine school systems for the children of our employees.

But, over and above these advantages is an element crucial to the great scientific and manufacturing potential of this State. And that is the realization that brains make jobs.

For, inevitably, where there are concentrations of first-rate scientific minds gathered to pursue industrial research, there you will find innovation and creativity; there you will find industry thriving; there you will find a high standard of living; there you will find the majority of that community's men and women gainfully employed.

Looking beyond the States borders, it should come as no surprise that southern California, for example, is booming. Because brains make jobs; because that State has attracted scientists of top calibre who have, in turn, created jobs through the fruits of the research they have undertaken.

Research is particularly important to the chemical industry. In the industry as a whole, it has been estimated that for every 10,000 people in production there are 749 engaged in research in this country. In 1963, the chemical industry expended more than $1 billion for research and development, the highest privately financed research budget of any single industry.

The men who conduct this research are, of course, the scientists, the architects of technology without whose vision and plain, hard work this fantastic 20th century of ours would not have been possible. But of great importance to all of us gathered here tonight is the simple fact that scientists, over and above their continuing contributions to our progress, are the creators of jobs.

You, as a group, have already shown your awareness of these realities. We have only to refer to the Connecticut Economic Planing and Development Committee report which points out that 85 percent of the total employment gain in expanding New England industries, for a recent 5-year period, was traceable to six industries. And those six industries had allocated the largest amounts to research and development.

The report also points out that in May 1960, 7,300 jobs in this State could not be filled because of a lack of qualified applicants. Your response to this problem—the need for skilled, well-trained men and women in Connecticut—was immediate and constructive. Through the combined efforts of State and industry leaders, who sat down together at the conference table some 4 years ago, the technical institute program was developed. This program accomplishes the dual task of leading the youth of this State away from unpromising futures and providing trained manpower for an industry which needs it for continued growth.

In January of this year, the Chemical Industry Council and the State department of education assembled 500 leading citizens to focus attention on the need for trained personnel and the importance of supporting the institute program.

Senator RIBICOFF spoke at this highly successful meeting and I was interested to note his statement that he was preparing legislation to grant companies tax credits for setting up community job training and re-

training programs. The Senator said (and I quote) "We must find and use every teaching and educational resource at our command * * * without question, one of these resources is the American corporation, which could, in the long term, constitute something in the nature of a new kind of community technical classroom."

Both Senator RIBICOFF and Governor Dempsey, who has taken the lead with his support in such diverse problem areas as the trained manpower shortage, area development, and the continued operation of the New Haven Railroad, have shown that they aer leaders of a State which is fully aware of the need for industry and government to work together toward common goals.

By the same token, industry has an equally strong obligation to fulfill. It must assume the responsibilities of corporate citizenship; it must strive to be a good neighbor. These responsibilities encompass a broad area. They can be the payment of taxes; the preservation of the scenic beauty of the land a company occupies; the payment of a decent wage to employees; or the responsibility to control pollution of the water and air.

This recognition, this realization of the modern, interdependent relationship of Government and industry, is a key to our growth and of paramount concern to all of us gathered here tonight. It is imperative that both the corporate leader and his political counterpart follow on open door policy and maintain accessibility to each other, so that when problems do arise, they may be met in a spirit of mutual understanding. This is not a matter of choice in these complex times; it is clearly the practice of wisdom. The open door is clearly already a reality in this State, as evidenced by your achievements and by this very meeting here tonight.

For the people who are meeting here this evening exemplify the Connecticut spirit, a spirit which prompted Pfizer to settle here in this State, and which has played an important role in our corporate growth.

Some 25 years ago, just after World War II, Pfizer was faced with a decision. We were a growing company and needed room to expand. At that time, we had no idea that the scope of this expansion would be given tremendous dimension, only several years later, by the discovery of antibiotics such as terramycin and tetracycline.

In 1946, Pfizer made its decision and came to Groton. On December 18, our first day on the Connecticut shore of the Long Island Sound, we had one employee. Today there are 1,900 Pfizer men and women at the Groton plant. They produce a greater volume of drugs and pharmaceuticals than any other of the company's 78 manufacturing facilities throughout the world.

In addition to research, this high production output has come about through continual expansion in personnel, products, buildings, and equipment. To cite just one example, our ability to expand our facilities at Groton again and again was made possible by the people of the community who took timely steps to increase the output of power and other facilities to provide the electrical energy needed to run our expanded plant.

They took these steps because they realized that a growing industry would mean a growing community. In the early 1950's, for example, the borough wardens and counselors of Groton floated a bond issue to finance a needed increase in the fresh water supply vital to industrial production. As a result, both Pfizer and the community benefited.

And Pfizer is still building at Groton. In recent months, our continuing program of expansion in Connecticut has included the startup of several significant new production units.

Back in the late 1950's, Pfizer was again faced with a decision involving Connecticut. Again, the problem was needed space for expansion; this time, in the vital area of medical research. Our scientists were engaged in an increasingly diverse range of investigative effort. To obtain maximum results from our research in these areas, it was decided to centralize the company's chemical, biochemical, and macrobiological research departments under one roof.

Several areas were under consideration. But, once again, we decided to build at Groton. One factor in our decision was, of course, the establishment of research facilities in close proximity to our plant so that ideas could, so to speak, go right across the street and be tested, then implemented into products for the people around the world who needed them.

But a major and convincing consideration for us was our experience in Connecticut. By this time, more than a decade had passed since our coming to the Groton-New London area. Pfizer knew Connecticut and Connecticut knew Pfizer. We had tested, and found true, the many advantages for the chemical industry in Connecticut. We had found the men and women of Connecticut to be skilled and highly adaptable to the demands of our industry. We had found a progressive political climate. We had found the transportation facilities for shipping our products and raw materials—by highway, rail, and sea—to be excellent. In brief, we liked Connecticut, and we were here to stay.

In 1960, we dedicated our Groton medical research laboratories. Today, more than 400 scientists and supporting personnel are engaged in a fully integrated program covering a variety of important, still unsolved medical problems.

Yes, research has been the backbone of Pfizer's corporate growth and, without the research we have been able to undertake here in Connecticut, we would not have been able to develop the antibiotics and other important pharmaceuticals which have resulted time after time in expansion of plant, equipment, and personnel.

Pfizer's commitment to research can be illustrated by the fact that this year we have budgeted more than $21 million for research and development, a record high for our company in this area. It is also evidenced in our 1964 annual report, in which we have devoted a significant portion to molecular biology, a new science of great promise, and currently the center of much attention at our Groton laboratories.

Many of the companies represented here tonight—Dow, Olin, Du Pont, American Cyanamid, U.S. Rubber, to mention just a few—are equally concerned with research. But what has this research, and the expansion it has lead to, meant to these companies and to Connecticut? For Pfizer, for example, it has been an essential factor in our worldwide growth and diversification. For Connecticut, it has mean jobs for its citizens, jobs which in 1964 brought Pfizer's Groton payroll to $15.3 million in wages and salaries. Other areas reveal equally impressive totals—the millions paid annually for the purchase of goods from local suppliers, the totals for utilities, local, and State taxes, and to our local resident contractor.

In other words, ladies and gentlemen, both the community and the company have reaped mutual benefit from industry. And once again, we have an example of brains creating jobs.

Which brings us to some important questions. How does a State attract those new industries which are committed to research and the growth it will bring? How does it both provide and attract the ambitious young scientists who want to spend their lives in significant research, who have just graduated near the top of their classes, who have bachelor of science or doctoral degrees?

Here, Connecticut has a headstart. As evidence, we have only to look at the impressive concentration of scientific personnel already in the State, and at the number of Connecticut colleges and universities training the scientists of tomorrow.

There is another area where Connecticut has a headstart; one might call it an almost insuperable lead in the competition to attract the talent necessary for realizing this State's potential.

That area is liveability, a term which might strike the ear as vague, but one which takes on real meaning after an afternoon's drive through the Connecticut countryside. Connecticut's liveability is a stand of pine trees, a secluded little lake for swimming and boating, a quiet stream for trout fishing, a beautiful stretch of seashore. For Connecticut, while close to the teeming metropolitan centers of the East, is still open, unspoiled country, retaining its New England charm against a backdrop of growing industry.

There are practical aspects to this State's liveability, above and beyond the lakes and streams and beautiful countryside. There are good schools, both public and private; a number of excellent colleges and universities; and well-stocked libraries. Connecticut offers its citizens cultural programs through community symphonies and theaters, from the professional variety to the amateur, such as the productions which Pfizer people at Groton stage every year for charity. Beautiful homes, excellent recreational facilities, convenient shopping centers—these are among the other outstanding features which will attract the young scientist who has an important choice to make.

The sum of these advantages gives this State liveability which few can match. And this should be given every emphasis in your drive to attract the new chemical research centers and the men who will staff them and help continue the chemical industry's position as the fastest growing in Connecticut.

None of the elements I have mentioned—from schools to symphonies—would be possible without the support of the people who live in each community.

It is this participation, this concern for the needs of the community, which we at Pfizer find so typical of Connecticut people.

At Groton, for example, our employees are heavily involved in a wide range of community activities to which they devote a major portion of their leisure hours. These can include service on a town council, membership on the school board, charity work, and many, many others.

These men and women represent still another aspect of what I referred to earlier as the Connecticut spirit, an essential element in this State's past growth, and one which will contribute to its bright future.

You have heard many statements about Connecticut during the course of this day. Several weeks ago, I came across a succinct, compelling commentary on Connecticut in, of all places, the pages of a New York City afternoon newspaper. The statement was the headline of an employment ad placed, coincidentally, by an industrial neighbor of ours in the Groton-New London area. The headline read, and this could apply to any area in the State, "Find a Better Way of Life on the Connecticut Shore." I can speak, I think, for our people at Groton, and as well for our people at plants in Wallingford and Canaan, when I say that Pfizer has indeed found a better way of life in Connecticut.

Thank you for asking me to speak to you this evening. You have my best wishes for a most successful future.

Address by Hon. Horace R. Kornegay, of North Carolina, Veterans of World War I State Convention, Greensboro, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague and friend, Congressman HORACE R. KORNEGAY, of North Carolina, recently was asked to be a principal speaker at the annual convention of Veterans of World War I in his hometown of Greensboro, N.C.

On that occasion, our colleague, who is a combat infantry veteran of World War II and who now serves as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, delivered a cogent and elogent address in which he supported the foreign military actions of President Johnson in South Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

This very able young Congressman, who fought valiantly for his country in the Second World War—and who holds the Purple Heart award for his own personal sacrifice and contribution—warned the veterans of the First World War that a "misguided philosophy of appeasement and pacificism" could lead to a repeat of history that got us into both World Wars.

His voice to that group on May 29 is one that should be heard by many and I would like to call his address to the attention of the Members of Congress:

PEACE AT ANY COST: WE CANNOT AFFORD IT

(Address by HORACE R. KORNEGAY, Member of Congress, Sixth District, North Carolina, at Veterans of World War I State convention, King Cotton Hotel, Greensboro, N.C., May 29, 1965)

I am honored to be asked to address this group tonight and I welcome the occasion. That is, I did until this day grew closer and I began to think about what I should say. By the way, if you ever want to get somebody to do something, just ask them to do it a long time in advance. Invariably, they will agree. That's what happened to me. I was tickled to death to get an invitation to come here tonight and agreed readily several weeks ago to come. But, as Saturday, May 29, got closer to us I wondered if I hadn't accepted too hastily.

My talk tonight may be like that of the young preacher's. He had just returned home from delivering a sermon at a larger church to which he hoped to be called. "How was your sermon?" his wife asked. "Which one?" he responded. "The one I was going to give, the one I did give, or the one I delivered so brilliantly on the way home in the car?" I am sure that after I leave here tonight I will think of a number of things I should have said that I failed to mention and that speech will probably be a better one than this one.

But, I am happy to be with you and to be a small part of this wonderful occasion.

Those of you who answered freedom's call during World War I served notice that the United States of America does in principle and in fact believe in freedom and will fight to preserve it wherever necessary.

You were called to arms to "make the world safe for democracy" in a "war to end all wars." The fact that these noble objectives were not 100 percent attained does not preclude the fact that the basic purposes were fulfilled, that the world was made safer—at least for a quarter of a century—for those who desire freedom from tyranny.

You were not the first to go forth in pursuit of our country's quest for world peace and freedom from fear—nor were you the last. For, a generation later, I personally "plowed some of the same ground" that you did in Europe, in another great conflict.

But, the fact that you did, in great numbers and in great strength, go forth into a strange land and engage in mortal combat with an enemy you did not know and who spoke in a strange language made it known that we intend to defy aggression and that we will use whatever force necessary wherever it is needed to defend and protect that cherished freedom which we hold so dear.

This national determination existed then. It exists today. At this very minute, other brave young Americans are standing guard on foreign soil to defend against assaults on freedom. On a narrow strip of rich coastal moutnain and delta lands running 900 miles in the tropics along the South China Sea to the Gulf of Siam, there are American troops. They are there tonight—in South Vietnam—because the independence of a nation and the freedom of its people are being threatened by Communist aggression and terrorism. In response to requests from the Government of South Vietnam, the United States has been providing assistance to the Vietnamese in their struggle to maintain their independence and their freedom. We have been there for more than 10 years, during the tenure of three different Presidents of the United States.

In another section of the world, there are other American men and women in uniform, bearing arms in an attempt to halt another Communist takeover in the Western Hemisphere. President Lyndon B. Johnson sent U.S. troops into the Dominican Republic to prevent another Castro-type success in Latin America. His actions were in the interest of national self-defense, since the further extension of communim in this hemisphere would be a very great danger to the peace and safety of the United States.

As we meet here tonight in comfort, in peaceful surroundings up to 100,000 Americans are actively committed to finding peaceful solutions to wartime conditions—in South Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic. Once again, it might be said the United States is a nation of war, for to these 100,000 young men and women, it is a war. Manq have died in these far-off places; many more have been wounded in battle. But, even though they are serving in a cold war grown hot, they bleed and die just as your friends did in World War I and mine in World War II.

I think we should support and applaud their efforts, just as you and I were supported in the wars we fought. For some strange, unexplainable reason it has become the "chic" and popular thing to do—especially on college campuses in other parts of the country—to decry this nation's so-called imperialism in Vietnam and to denounce American intervention in Latin America. Taking a lesson from others who use civil disobedience in furtherance of their own personal causes, some of these self-appointed, political experts conducts teach-ins in our inequities, march in protest demonstrations, and write silly open letters to the editor.

This mysterious business is hard to fathom. At the very time when we should let the President and the world know that we approve of defending democracy—at any place, at any time—and at a time when we should make it known to those young soldiers that they are not dying and bleeding for a vain or iniquitous cause.

Just recently Time magazine—certainly no ardent supporter of Lyndon Baines Johnson—described President Johnson as "one of the most remarkable of all wartime Presidents." In a recent speech, the President stated our position in simple, but unmistakable terms. He said, "I think that if the enemy there believes that we are there to stay, that we are not going to tuck our tails and run home and abandon our friends, I believe in due time peace can be restored in that area."

In another talk, in Baltimore last month, he warned: "Let no one think for a moment that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to the conflict. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another." The President said, and rightly so, that America must draw the line in southeast Asia and in the words of the Bible, he said, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further."

You and I know what would happen if we did follow the advice of the "ivory tower intellectuals and their bearded young pseudo-intellectual friends" and withdraw from Vietnam—and Santo Domingo. We all know what would happen; in just a short while, the red flag of communism would fly over yet another section of the world.

The Kremlin would extend its tentacles to other peoples who are unwilling to come under the sphere of communism, but who are unable to resist.

This well-meaning, perhaps, but misguided philosophy of appeasement and pacifism has a long history. It is not new. But, we are in imminent danger of seeing history repeat itself at this particular moment. Those who picket the White House, the petitioners who buy full-page newspaper ads, the professors and students engaged in weekend teach-ins and even some Members of Congress who proclaim loudly and forcefully for the United States to get out of Vietnam apparently have no concern for what will happen afterward. Surely, they must care; they just don't happen to think about the ultimate consequences and the dangers to America.

Those seeking peace at any price might be reminded that it was just this type of thinking that got us into both World Wars. As you here remember, Congress refused to allow Woodrow Wilson to arm American merchant vessels as protection against submarine attacks. This convinced Germany that the United States would not fight, and as a result the President had to later call for a declaration of war.

Franklin D. Roosevelt had the same experience when the Congress refused to relax the restrictions on the most severe neutrality law in the country's history. Again, our actions encouraged aggressors and led them to believe that the United States would not fight. Then came Pearl Harbor.

This type of exhibitionist conduct on the part of some of our people is giving Peiping, Hanoi, and Moscow, as well as Havana, the impression that we do not support President Johnson. This is evidenced in the various demonstrations, the published petitions, and pacifist speeches.

A short time ago, Secretary of State Dean Rusk said: "This is the clearest lesson of our time: From Munich until today we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of a lasting peace."

What is it that we want in South Vietnam? What are we doing there? First, and most importantly, we have been told by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara that the simple fact is that South Vietnam, a member of the free world family, is striving to preserve its independence from Communist attack. The Vietnamese have asked our help. We have given it. We should all hope that we shall continue to give it.

We do so in mutual interest, theirs and ours. Basic to the principles of freedom and self-determination which have sustained our great country for almost two centuries is the right of peoples everywhere to live and develop in peace. Our own security is strengthened by the determination of others to remain free and by our commitment to assist them. We cannot let this member of our family down, regardless of the distance in miles from our own shores.

The ultimate goal of the United States in Asia, as in the rest of the world, is to help maintain free and independent nations which can develop politically, economically, and socially, and which can be responsible members of the world community. In this region and elsewhere, many people share our sense of the value of such freedom and independence. They have taken the risks and made the sacrifices linked to the commitment to membership in the family of the free world. They have done this in the belief that we would back up our pledges to help defend them. It is not right or even expedient, nor is it in our nature, to abandon them when the going is difficult.

Southeast Asia has great strategic significance in the forward defense of the United States. Its location across east-west air and sea lanes flanks the Indian subcontinent on one side and Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines on the other, and dominates the gateway between the Pacific and Indian Oceans. In Communist hands, this area would pose a most serious threat to the security of the United States and to the family of free world nations to which we belong. To defend southeast Asia, we must meet the challenge in South Vietnam.

The United States' role in South Vietnam, then is: first, to answer the call of the South Vietnamese, a member nation of our free world family, to help them save their country for themselves; and second, to help prevent the strategic danger which would exist if communism absorbed southeast Asia's people and resources. Also, this will prove that the free world can—and will—cope with Communist "wars of liberation" as we have coped successfully with Communist aggression at other levels.

I am not suggesting that it will be easy—or cheap. But what is the cost of freedom? How valuable is it? I think you will agree; our freedoms are not for sale, nor will we abdicate them to the Communists.

To move quickly to another part of the world, in our own hemisphere. What is our objective in the Dominican Republic? This should be clear enough. It is: a freely elected constitutional government which can undertake the social, economic, and political reforms that a majority of the people there seem to demand. But, it is also clear that the Dominican people are not yet capable of attaining their goal without help. If a democratic government were established as a result of the revolution and the subsequent occupation, it might be an easy target for a new military dictator—like Castro—unless some protection could be offered from the outside. In addition to bringing a halt there to a bloody civil war, we are paving the way for the establishment of a free society and a government of the Dominican people's choosing. I am happy that other member nations of the OAS are now sending troops into the Dominican Republic and that some of our own soldiers are returning to their normal duties—the protection of America.

I would remind you of a quote from President Johnson: "Wherever Americans go, the American flag goes also."

It is my opinion that every American—North American and South American—should be grateful that we have a President who believes in defending our freedoms from any who would defile them.

And, we can be grateful to the hundreds and thousands of young men and women who now serve their country in the uniforms of the various military services—as you did. I can vouch that their Government will be grateful to them.

I have the honor and the privilege to serve on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and I know firsthand something of the appreciation that this country has for those who served. Your Government has spent a grand total of more than $131 billion on veterans benefits. At the end of the last fiscal year of the Government, there were 2,226,000 living veterans of World War I. Some 1,129,444 of them were receiving pension or compensation payments and in the last fiscal year, this group received over $2 billion.

I know that you are interested in the current controversy regarding the proposed closings of several hospitals operated by the Veterans' Administration. Our House Veterans' Committee held its longest hearings in 15 years, from February 18 to April 1—and recorded some 2,400 pages of testimony on this subject. As a result of these voluminous—and often tedious—hearings, sufficient evidence was presented to show that the President should take another look at the proposal. I am certain that because of this evidence and the efforts put forth by you and many like you that some of the VA hospitals will be saved that otherwise would have been lost.

As you know, our committee secured the passage of Public Law 88-450 which permits the use of 4,000 additional nursing-care beds in the existing Veterans' Administration hospital system. We are also doing all we can to implement the installation of these much-needed nursing-care beds. Committee Chairman OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, recently wrote to President Johnson to urge that these facilities be put into operation as rapidly as possible.

I am pleased to call to your attention that the last Congress passed a better pension bill, Public Law 88-664, which liberalized pension payments. I realize that it was not as much as some of us had hoped for, however, it is better than what we had before. It might interest you to know that World War I veterans have received over $37 billion in benefits, and that more than $13 billion of that sum has been in the form of pension payments. This is more than 10 times the amount of pension, laid to any other group of veterans.

Another part of Public Law 88-664 is a great help in a much-needed area of service. It provides aid and attendance to severely disabled and handicapped veterans. Now housebound veterans are able to receive assistance that was not available. This section alone has been of tremendous aid to those less able to help themselves.

My point in emphasizing some of the legislation that has been enacted to aid and benefit the veteran is that he has not been—and will not be forgotten or neglected by his grateful nation.

I can assure you that neither you, those who served later, those who are serving now, nor those who will serve in the years to come will be ignored. We are ever grateful to you, as we will be to them.

You and this occasion reminds be of a poem which typifies such brave men as yourselves. It was written by one of America's greatest veteran leaders, Bryan Gentry. It is called G. I. Joe and one verse goes like this:

"Every ounce of him a soldier;
Every inch of him a man—
When he fought your battles for you;
Ate with fingers from a can.
And the courage of his laughter
Dulled the panic of his fear—
When it came his turn for dying,
He stepped up without a tear."

Thank you.

The Threat of Industrial Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday edition of the New York times there appeared a news account which indicated that U.S. chemical manufacturing companies were being cautious about entering into arrangements for construction of plants behind the Iron Curtain. I believe their reluctance is based on sound judgment as to the long-term interest of the security of the United States when this type of facility is constructed behind the Iron Curtain.

Although I have a serious concern about any trade of strategic implications with bloc nations, I think that a distinction should be made between the sale of finished chemical products and the sale to Iron Curtain countries of the productive capacity to manufacture these chemical products behind the Iron Curtain.

It has been pointed out that the Soviet Union lags badly behind the West in its chemical industry, and to furnish to the bloc countries the capacity to produce chemical products is not only contributing to a critical area of their economy which is directly related to their warmaking potential, but it would also give them the means whereby they could engage in economic aggression against the Western World.

We have before us the example of how the Soviet Union is using crude oil as a form of economic blackmail as a hope of disturbing normal trade patterns, and therefore, the action of American chemical companies in demonstrating reluctance to enter into trade arrangements including the construction of facilities in the bloc nations should be applauded.

In my opinion, it is unfortunate that we find an official position of the U.S. Government encouraging this sort of trade arrangement, and it is my hope that American companies will not succumb to these official inducements to do that which history and current policy pronouncement of bloc leaders indicate will not be in the long and best interest of either their company or the United States.

For the information of the House, I include the news report appearing in the New York Times, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, June 6, 1965]

BUT THEY ARE WARY OF RED NATIONS

(By Gerd Wilcke)

Major domestic chemical manufacturing and construction companies that discovered the profitability of foreign markets long ago are still stepping gingerly in trying to penetrate the Iron Curtain.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., for instance, whose own balance of payments showed a net profit of no less than $1 billion for the years 1958-64, has no present plans to venture into the Communist orbit.

Although it may some day consider selling its products to Russians, Rumanians, or Hun-

garians, its chief effort today is directed at putting up plants in Latin America, Canada, Japan, West Germany, or Luxembourg for the manufacture of a variety of products ranging from manmade fibers to gasoline additives.

Likewise, the Dow Chemical Co., which just opened a $100 million plastics plant in the Netherlands, has merely "talked sales" to the Russians and Bulgarians.

NEGATIVE RESULTS

The results so far have been negative, but the company insists it has no intention of selling technical knowledge to Communist nations. Some of the company's major objectives abroad at the moment include a polyethylene plant in Colombia, a poultry research station in England, and other chemical plants in West Germany and Spain.

The Monsanto Co., another leading manufacturer whose foreign sales last year accounted for about 21 percent of total sales of $1.3 billion, is not looking behind the fence that divides communism from the free world.

Yet, the company is not reversing its policy of foreign expansion. This is underlined by Monsanto's start of 10 new overseas ventures since May 1964, including an acrylic fiber plant in Israel, nylon plants in Luxembourg and England, a phenol plant in Australia, a plastics plant in Japan, insecticide plants in Guatemala and El Salvador, and a plant for the production of rigid vinyl in Mexico.

CELANESE PLANTS

The Celanese Corp. of America, a producer of chemicals, fibers, plastics, paints, forest products, crude oil, and natural gas, now has its hand in the operation of 70 plants all over the world. However, none of them are behind the Iron Curtain. Instead, Celanese is lending its help to preparing facilities for the production of paperboard in Sicily, Arnel triacetate yarn in Belgium, and petrochemicals in Mexico and the Netherlands.

Spokesmen for the Litwin Engineering Co. of Wichita, Kans., a company that has been trying to get a foothold in the Communist market, thought that the reluctance of other American companies to follow suit might be based on a strong feeling of anti-Communism.

The company, which is active in such free countries as Israel, made headlines earlier this year with the disclosure that it had been discussing the possibility of constructing a synthetic fiber plant in East Germany.

The fact that 5 months later the project is still in the talking stage indicates that other than political considerations could have kept American companies from joining many European corporations in courting the Communists for business.

Recently it was announced that the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., had broken off negotiations with Rumania looking toward a synthetic rubber plant in that country.

There was no explanation for the sudden change in a development that originally had been praised as a major breakthrough in relations between the United States and Eastern Europe.

There were strong suggestions, however, that Firestone backed down in the wake of pressure from conservative groups in the country. Another explanation was that interlocking licensing agreements for various components of the plant made it impossible for Firestone to act singlehandedly.

NO AGREEMENT YET

The Universal Oil Products Corp., Des Plains, Ill., which was selected to build a catalytic petroleum cracking unit in Rumania and early this year shared headlines with Firestone, still has not reached final agreement with the Communist rulers in Bucharest.

A check with at least 12 other companies with foreign projects showed that only 1 is actively discussing a venture with a Communist power.

Charles C. Bonin, who recently became president of the Chemical Construction Corp. (Chemico), an operating subsidiary of the Electric Bond & Share Co., said his concern is negotiating with Rumania about the construction of a $45 million, 1,000-ton-a-day ammonia plant.

What has delayed the signing of a contract is the financing of the project, but Mr. Bonin insisted that the contemplated venture has the blessing of the U.S. Government.

The 48-year-old executive, who aims to increase the share of foreign operations of his company from the current 25 percent to 50 percent, made it plain that he rates business as high as politics.

"In the long run," Mr. Bonin said, "this country is credited in the minds of other people with what we are doing now, not for what our propaganda says."

A LONG LIST

Although the company has done work in a Communist country—Yugoslavia—before, it has a long list of accomplishments elsewhere in the world.

Mr. Bonin asserted that plants designed by Chemico account for an estimated 25 percent of the world's production of ammonia, more than 30 percent of the world's production of sulphuric acid from contact plants, approximately 35 percent of U.S. production of nitric acid and an estimated 65 percent of U.S. production of acetylene from natural gas.

Aside from the dozens of fertilizer plants Chemico put up all over the world, the company is now preparing to open sales offices in Western Europe and Latin America. The most recent expansion in Japan links the American concern with Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. This is a joint venture that calls on Chemico to provide overall design and engineering consultation for its Far Eastern partner's activities in the chemical field.

Other large companies with global operations, such as the Lummus Co., Foster Wheeler Corp., and Kellogg Co., have profited from the world's growing need for fertilizer, fibers and petro-chemicals.

The chemical manufacturing and engineering concerns account for hundreds of projects that have sprouted up on a global scale. They also have helped increase foreign sales of chemicals produced abroad by U.S. companies to nearly $6 billion a year by the end of 1968.

Commencement Address of the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey Before the University of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, we in the Free State of Maryland were deeply honored to have the Vice President, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, make the commencement address Saturday, June 5, 1965, before 4,301 graduates at the University of Maryland. This great American, who has been in the forefront of the fight for human rights in our country, gave the graduating class an address which certainly should stand the test of time in history. It was particularly appropriate that the Vice President selected the University of Maryland—a leading institution in our great Free State—to make his inspiring speech. He certainly set the stage by clearly defining the burden these graduates will carry into their adult lives in our country. I am positive that they will carry this responsibility to guarantee every American equal rights in our society.

The Vice President was honored at a luncheon after ceremonies and Mr. HUMPHREY was kind enough to pay a personal visit to my family in Hyattsville later that day where we were honoring my daughter Sue, who just graduated from the University of Maryland, with a reception for the family and personal friends. I would like to take this opportunity to express the gratitude of my family, myself, and the University of Maryland to the Vice President for giving of himself to us in a great speech and in his personal visit.

Because of the significance of the Vice President's speech it is an honor for me to include it here in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COMMENCEMENT, JUNE 5, 1965

President Elkins, members of the board of trustees, distinguished deans and faculty, members of the class of 1965, parents, and distinguished guests, it is with a deep sense of honor, mixed with a special feeling of pleasure, that I accept this degree from the University of Maryland.

I am honored because I receive this degree from one of America's great institutions of higher learning.

Chartered and opened in 1807 as the College of Medicine of Maryland, this institution became a university in 1812. Today your schools and faculties cover almost every field of human endeavor, and you carry the lamp of learning to every corner of the globe.

In particular, I noted with great pride that Chancellor Ludwig Erhard received an honorary degree from the University of Maryland at the recent commencement of your university's branch in the Federal Republic of Germany. And it is also a matter of some pride to speak at the commencement of the IC4A track and field champion.

But I am especially pleased to be here today for another and quite personal reason. For the past 16 years the Humphrey family has considered Maryland to be its second home. We moved to Maryland in 1949, when I began my freshman term as a U.S. Senator and we have come to cherish our home in Chevy Chase. Despite suggestions to move the Vice President to larger quarters, the Humphrey family is still happily in residence at the same old stand. And we love it.

Today I wish to raise for your consideration a question of utmost importance facing the people of this Nation: How can we conserve most effectively the human resources of America?

President Woodrow Wilson once observed: "I believed in democracy because it releases the energy of every human being."

It has been our remarkable capacity to release the energy of the American people, which has set this Nation apart from all others of the world.

And it will be the energy, creativity, and determination brought by Americans to the task of democratic government which will preserve this Nation as a beacon of hope in a weary and struggling world.

The American people must take seriously the necessity of using to the fullest our vast reservoirs of untapped human skills, intellect, and ability existing in this country.

We can no longer afford the luxury of squandering these human resources through

poverty, disease, illiteracy, unemployment, or discrimination.

We must, in particular, come to understand that discrimination can assume many forms and many guises. Rural families trapped in the never-ending cycle of low income and inadequate educational opportunities are the victims of discrimination just as directly as Negro families striving to free themselves from the hopelessness of the urban ghetto.

Unskilled workers cast on the scrap heap of the technologically unemployed are lost to this Nation just as completely as Spanish-speaking Americans unable to locate sustained and meaningful employment opportunities.

The simple truth is this: America needs everybody in the difficult business of making democracy work. And, for the first time in recorded history, we possess the economic wealth and the intellectual attainment required to make every American a full partner in this noble enterprise.

I wish to reflect briefly upon one area of particular significance at this juncture in our Nation's history: our efforts to root out and destroy in America the ancient curse of racial prejudice.

Today we stand upon the threshold of a challenging new era in this struggle for civil rights and equal opportunity in America.

Looking back over the past generation, we see a historic victory has been achieved: Namely, the elimination of legalized prejudice and discrimination in America.

Where schools, hotels, restaurants, hospitals, public parks, and public transportation facilities operated on a segregated basis, they usually did so with either the explicit or implicit consent of local, State, or National law."

Whether in a court of law, or on the sidewalk in front of a segregated restaurant, the civil rights movement has been primarily concerned with tearing down these barriers of legalized discrimination.

With the series of historic Supreme Court decisions culminating in *Brown* vs. *Board of Education* in 1954—and with the series of congressional actions leading to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965—this initial phase of the civil rights struggle is now drawing to a close.

I am especially pleased to report that the response to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has been most heartening. In our Southern States, in particular, we have encountered determination to comply with the provisions of this legislation.

And while the press has told of instances where people attempted to thwart the law, the real story has been the far greater evidence of widespread compliance in all sections of the country.

Many brave and courageous persons, both black and white, have been willing to risk their lives, and sometimes to lose their lives, in carrying forward this assault upon the barriers of legalized discrimination.

In large measure we can look with pride upon the dignity and compassion, yes, even the love, which has characterized the efforts of these courageous Americans.

Their actions have demonstrated for every person in this country and around the world that freedom still lives here. They have shown us again that the quest for freedom is the strongest and most compelling force in the world.

We see that victory is not far off, yet, we also know that the struggle has only begun.

And, in many respects, the most difficult and challenging days for America lie just ahead.

In the next few years, we must determine whether or not we can build successfully on this foundation of equal rights and opportunity.

We must discover whether or not American Negroes and other minority groups can now be brought fully into the mainstream of our political, economic, and social life.

Our task will be one of complementing the reality of equal rights with the attitude of equal respect among all peoples and races in America.

For only when equal respect drives out completely the false doctrines of racial superiority will we have fashioned in America a national community worthy of our promises of the past and our hopes for the future.

This is, of course, basis for equality of regard and respect between Negroes and white persons. It is found in history. It is found in the arts. It is found in the great achievements of countless men and women.

On too many occasions we have failed to acknowledge the remarkable contributions of Negroes particularly to the sum total of human knowledge and achievement. From earliest times in Africa up to the present day in America, the accomplishments of Negroes have been obscured by false history, incomplete history, and rationalized history. And this misleading and misread historical record has played its part in discouraging a climate of equal respect among peoples of all races.

With the help of archeology, with the careful study of African art, with ancient documents and writings, we are just now beginning to rediscover Africa's many contributions to the expansion of human knowledge.

Negroes participated from the very beginning in the discovery and exploration of the New World. And they participated not simply as slaves, but just as frequently as soldiers and sailors, as Jesuit missionaries and as free settlers.

Twenty-six of the forty-four settlers who established Los Angeles in 1781 were Negro. The founder of Chicago was a Haitian Negro, educated in France. When he encountered job discrimination in New Orleans, he traveled up the Mississippi, eventually establishing the first permanent residence on the site of the present-day metropolis.

How many of us recall that the first man to lose his life in the cause of American independence was a runaway slave, Crispus Attucks? You will find his name on a monument on the Boston Common, commemorating the Boston massacre of March 5, 1770. And do we realize that 30,000 Negroes fought shoulder to shoulder with General Washington in our War of Independence?

How much do we remember of Frederick Douglass, a self-educated former slave who overcame tremendous obstacles to attain world renown as an abolitionist orator and publisher and who served in high Government posts in the administration of five Presidents?

How many of us realize that the man credited with perfecting the technique of blood transfusions was a Negro, Dr. Charles Drew? How many millions of persons are alive today because of the pioneering research of this skilled physician?

There are, of course, many more instances and many more names of Negroes and people of other minority groups who have made outstanding but unsung contributions to this Nation's history.

And there exists today across America what Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, has described as the quiet revolution, a revolution stemming from the dramatic increase of Negro enrollment in college and professional schools, from the rising level of income among Negroes, and from the declining rate of school dropouts among Negroes as compared to the population in general.

These men and women are succeeding despite the handicaps of prejudice, of closed doors, of limited or nonexistent educational opportunities, and of the deep psychological wound of being a Negro in a period where this often implied second-class citizenship and back of the bus.

Will we be able ever to calculate the loss to America, and to the entire world, of the potential talent among our Negro citizens which nevertheless sacrificed, and are still sacrificing, for reasons of prejudice and discrimination?

Will we be able ever to realize the terrible human price we have paid in supporting this system of second-class citizenship?

Today we have finally struck down the supporting members of this structure of prejudice. And today we are taking long-overdue steps to build a climate of equal respect for Negro Americans—a climate where each person will have an opportunity to seek fulfillment as a unique and creative individual.

For surely these are the essential elements of man's humaness: The potentiality for creativity and the ability to pursue excellence. In business, in education, in the professions, in the arts, we are striving to provide Negroes and other minorities with the chance to exercise their uniquely human qualities.

And through such massive efforts as the antipoverty program, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, we are attempting to reach down into the ghetto, into the slum, and into rural areas to give the forgotten youngster a chance to function as a creative, productive, and responsible human being.

We must extend the hand of opportunity to this forgotten individual caught in the ghetto. But it must necessarily remain the responsibility of the individual, as it is the responsibility of every human being, to grasp this hand firmly and with determination.

For any person, whether white or Negro, the pursuit of excellence and creativity involves the willingness to accept responsibility and the courage to take risks. These are the qualities upon which respect thrives. And these are the qualities so abundantly evident in the lives of the Negroes I have noted.

History is written about persons who accepted the challenge of excellence and creativity and ultimately prevailed. I am fully confident that this era will be remembered as the time when America provided every person with an opportunity to accept this challenge, when we discarded forever the shroud of hate and bigotry for the shining mantle of human freedom and dignity.

This will be the time when the human resources of America were truly harnessed in the exhilarating work of extending the blessings of freedom and justice to peoples everywhere.

Communists Behind Peace Demonstrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover is our country's foremost authority on the sinister designs of the Communist conspiracy in the United States.

The following article, quoting Mr. Hoover, appeared in the Federal Bureau of Investigation Law Enforcement Bulletin, in June 1965. I commend its reading to every student, teacher, and citizen in the Nation:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
June 1, 1965.

To All Law Enforcement Officials:

America today is engaged in a deadly struggle for the survival of the free world. While our Nation is fending off the strangling grip

of international communism on foreign soil, attempts are being made at home to undermine and distort its actions.

Tremendous pressure and criticism are being leveled against the President and the Congress to confuse and mislead the American public. Irresponsible charges of invaders, brutal aggression, and sneak attacks are used to discredit our Government in hopes it will be forced to abandon its role as defender of freedom. Some of this protest comes from legitimate peace groups and others who are opposed to the course of action being followed in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. However, much of the agitation is part of a diabolical scheme contrived by the Communist Party, U.S.A. (CPUSA), an integral arm of the international Communist conspiracy, the materialistic, godless ideology dedicated to ruling the world.

The CPUSA and other Communist groups are seizing this opportunity to advance their cause by false statements and half truths. Particularly, the party is seeking to influence the youth of our country through the Communist-controlled W. E. B. DuBois Clubs and similar organizations.

The CPUSA encouraged and endorsed the student march on the Nation's Capital on April 17, 1965, protesting U.S. intervention in Vietnam. Although not in actual control of this demonstration, the Communists participated in the march and distributed copies of the Worker, an east coast Communist newspaper. Communist marchers from all over the country were present, and Communist leaders claimed a major role in the demonstration.

This is a typical example of the party's widespread campaign to influence our country's foreign policies. The strategy is not new, but it is effective. The party is working through non-Communist groups and front organizations to embarrass our Government and disrupt its efforts. Communist leaders are striving to initiate other marches and demonstrations to keep their campaign of fear and terror rolling. We can expect that the party will push for some type of nationwide action similar to "peace" strikes or work stoppages to emphasize their aims. These are methods which have served Communist causes so well since the days of Lenin.

Party leaders hope, of course, that more and more Americans will be duped and misled by these tactics. They envision a commanding wave of hostility against American policies abroad. The goal is to incite citizens to the point that they will demand American forces be withdrawn from Vietnam and other places, allowing international communism to take over and engulf more defenseless countries.

Fortunately, the strength and greatness of our Nation lies in its millions of patriotic and loyal citizens—Americans who will not swallow the Red bait of the cunning Communist emissaries; Americans who will rally behind our Government leaders at this crucial time; and Americans who are still proud to state, "I was born an American; I live an American; I shall die an American."

J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

The Kremlin's Worries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an article published in the April 20, 1965, issue of Look magazine. The article entitled "What Worries the Men in the Kremlin," is written by William Benton, former U.S. Senator from Connecticut and now chairman and publisher of the Encyclopaedia Britannica and U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO.

The views expressed by Mr. Benton on political and economic problems in the Soviet Union are based on several visits to that country, the last of these in 1964. Of interest are his observations the Soviet leaders, burdened by vast expenditures for armaments, are no longer talking reassuringly about surpassing U.S. production by 1970. The Soviet people are demanding better housing, better clothing, automobiles, and other consumer goods. I am pleased to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues:

WHAT WORRIES THE MEN IN THE KREMLIN

(By William Benton)

Kremlinologists now agree on at least one proposition: Chairman Nikita Khrushchev was tossed out because of his personal traits and tactics—he was called erratic, impulsive and highhanded—and not because of any basic policy differences with the party Presidium or Central Committee. Some of the very qualities that gave him color and dynamism in the West proved most disconcerting to the so-called collective leadership.

The party's principal worries remain the same.

During my visit to the Soviet Union last year—my fifth since 1955—I talked with some 40 Soviet officials, including the then-chairman, Khrushchev. Many said repeatedly, as their words were translated to me, "I am gravely worried," or "I am deeply concerned."

The American people relieved the Soviet Union (and many other countries as well) of one worry when they overwhelmingly rejected Barry Goldwater. The Russians attached much importance to Senator Goldwater. His comments about Cuba and Vietnam, for example, made him sound reckless and irresponsible to Soviet ears. They looked upon him as a symbol of "American monopolistic capitalism." They still worry about American capitalism, but not quite so acutely.

Khrushchev agreed with me that there's a better chance for improved trade relations under Johnson than under Kennedy. However, most of the problems that plague the Soviet Union, the American people can now do little about.

Every Soviet political leader has worries. This isn't new. What is new is the tone of candor with which the Russians discuss their concerns. Some of the worries are kept under the table, particularly with an American. But there are at least two themes with variations that recur in almost very conversation. These are (1) improving the Soviet standard of living, and (2) achieving peaceful coexistence with the West. There is, of course, a third worry, although it is never mentioned to strangers: how to resolve differences both within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and with other Communist nations, especially China.

In the Soviet Union today—under the Brezhnev-Kosygin leadership, as under Khrushchev's—the attempt to achieve one goal sometimes seems to mean working against another goal. The goals often are mutually exclusive. For example, the Soviets believe, as we do, that peace and security are guaranteed partly by armed might—but unlike us, they cannot combine armaments with prosperity. They haven't learned how to have their guns and butter too. Or both sputniks and motorcycles. This is frustrating for Soviet leaders—and confusing for those who try to understand them. It means wearisome worry in any language.

For example, hardly any visitor in the Soviet Union will fail to learn the Russian word "mir." "Mir" means "peace," but it happens to be one of those words with a double meaning: "mir" may be translated correctly either as "peace" or "world." Are Soviet leaders sincere in their constant use of the word? I believe they are, if peace includes intensive competition among social systems. "Miru Mir," say the billboards—"Peace to the World." The Russians vividly remember the 20 million lost in World War II. They want peace all right. The dilemma is that they also want the world.

Marxist-Leninist communism is now, as it has always been, a world concept. According to theory, communism cannot be fully realized until it is worldwide. Josef Stalin and Leon Trotsky fought over whether socialism in one nation was possible. To the Communist, "peaceful coexistence" does indeed mean peace—but it also means time to reach communism's goal of universal communism. Khrushchev's definition of "peaceful coexistence" is a perfect description of the cold war. To Brezhnev, "peaceful coexistence" includes a vow that nothing and no one will shake the Soviet Union's resolution to struggle consistently for the triumph of socialism and communism.

Yet while Soviet propagandists preach peace to their own people, as well as to the rest of the world, their country's budget for armaments is greater in proportion to national product than that of the United States or any other major nation. And while such high expenditures prevail, it is all but impossible for the U.S.S.R. to satisfy the rising demand for higher living standards. To Soviet leaders, this is clear, and it is vexing.

I asked Mme. Ekaterina Furtseva, minister of culture, and the first and only woman to serve on the Presidium of the Communist Party for the entire U.S.S.R. (which was formerly known as the Politburo), how the Soviet Union could ever hope to improve living standards without disarmament. Her answer was long, and I took almost verbatim notes. In part, she said, "All reasonable people now understand that war means annihilation. The fact is that both the United States and the U.S.S.R. have tremendous forces. If war breaks out, catastrophe is unavoidable. Neither country can stand aside.

"You of the United States like your way of life. Very good. We don't object. We like our life. Thus, the United States and the U.S.S.R. must find ways to live side by side. Disarmament is the biggest issue of the day between our nations—and by far. If we can progress with disarmament, everything else is easy to solve. All else is subordinate. Cultural matters are easy and relatively insignificant. So, too, with the issues of East Germany and trade.

"Rapprochement with the United States is very important to us in the U.S.S.R., and it is also important to you. Our revolution is now 47 years old. My country was almost completely destroyed at the end of World War I. I will not even speak of the last war. Our people have a right to a normal, peaceful life."

Michael Millionshchikov, vice president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, readily agreed that higher living standards for the Soviet people are impossible without disarmament. "Our armament program prevents putting enough of our resources into improvement of living standards for our people," he said. He, too, spoke of the Soviet people's horror of another war, of their deep desire for peace. "We of the Soviet Union know what total war is," Millionshchikov said, "We know it so well that we are those who most want peace."

Some of these factors were taken into account by Premier A. N. Kosygin when he addressed the Supreme Soviet (parliament) last December 9. He pledged more and better consumer goods, higher living standards, expansion of agriculture, improved public services and better economic planning. He also said the Soviet Union would reduce its military budget by 500 million rubles ($555 million). The 1965 military budget will total 12.8 billion rubles ($14.2 billion), or 12.9 percent of the Soviet national budget. Last year, military expenditures were 14.5 percent.

Kosygin did not announce any dramatic new policies. Rather, his pronouncements constitute a promise to expand and render more efficient the basic Khrushchev policies.

The refrain I heard most often in the Soviet Union was worry over the prospect of a united and militarily powerful Germany. Then, as now, Soviet leaders invariably spoke bitterly of a vengeful Germany.

Pavel Romanov, head of the State Committee on Publishing, which controls all books, newspapers, and periodicals in the Soviet Union, was among the most vehement. He told me he had fought in Leningrad, where 600,000 peple died of starvation during the German siege. "Let me make absolutely clear to you," he said, "that we shall never yield to the revenge-seeking forces of Germany."

When I asked him what these forces are, he cited those in Germany who are pressing to revise the eastern border. "[Konrad] Adenauer and [Ludwig] Erhard both publicly proclaim they will not abide by the present borders. Is this not a revival of the military spirit? Everywhere, there are evidences of this revival. Do you know what they are teaching their young people? Are you reading their newspapers and magazines? Have you studied their articles extolling the heroism of those who carried out the last war? Won't you admit that the Germans waged the last war for world domination? Aren't they again building submarines? Aren't they pressing for atomic weapons? Doesn't all this show their desire for revenge?"

He paused for breath. "Suppose Germany were Canada," he asked, "wouldn't your people then feel gravely concerned?"

Sergei Romanovsky, chariman of the State Committee for Foreign Cultural Relations, named the home cities of each of a half dozen men at our luncheon table. "Every one of these Soviet cities was destroyed by German military forces in World War II," he said.

Yuri Zhukov, a senior editor of the Communist Party newspaper Pravda, spoke with equal fervor. "I'm alarmed," he said, "that Germans are attempting to move into command posts in NATO." And he told a long, bitterly ironic story comparing Germany to the cuckoo that lays its eggs in the nests of other birds.

Only Mme. Furtseva managed to remain calm when I suggested that the reunification of East and West Germany is inevitable—perhaps not soon, but at some time. "Isn't it possible," I asked her, "that the division of Germany stimulates the tendencies in that country which are viewed with such fear by the Soviets?" She did not answer directly. Obliquely, she replied, "The worst policy is that of standing still. The worst policy is doing nothing. We must constantly reexamine our policies. Any decision is better than no decision."

Soviet leaders worry acutely about U.S. policies that they feel might precipitate nuclear war. (They do not appear to worry so much about "provocative" policies and actions on the part of the Soviet Union.) "I am gravely worried about Cuba," Yuri Zhukov told me. "Cuban emigrés could not be doing what they are without plenty of American money. Your Central Intelligence Agency is said to be a state within a state. You must know the situation is very tense. We don't want to interfere, but we could be forced into a position where we must interfere. We need help from the United States to insure that this does not happen."

I interrupted to challenge some of his statements and interpretations, though I realized that no single discussion would change his views. Nothing in international affairs is ever quite so simple and clear cut as the Soviets see it—through Communist-colored glasses. It seemed to me his criticism would have made more sense if he had applied it to his own government—but I report what he said, because I believe it is typical of top-level Soviet thinking.

"I cannot understand some U.S. policies," he continued. "You seem to be like the chess player who is willing to sacrifice his chessmen on the theory that this will win the ultimate victory. But who wins and who loses? Take Laos, for example. The situation is rapidly becoming more complicated. The United States could have prevented the rightist coup d'etat. Instead, you give bombs and planes to be used against the Pathet Lao. You confirm the Chinese claim. The Chinese have always insisted that a neutral Laos is impossible."

And about Vietnam: "The United States shouldn't have interfered with Vietnam to begin with. Your best chance now is to restrain the evil. If you bomb North Vietnam, this can lead to the bombing of China. The risk of war is very great."

Recently, Brezhnev—reiterating Soviet support of the Hanoi regime—warned, "Let the imperialists be careful when playing with fire." Nikita Khrushchev, with many worries to choose from, also elected to lecture me on the risk of war. He spoke gravely: "Take your flights over Cuba—these flights are of international concern. They involve international law. I am greatly concerned about them. Why do you need these flights? They can cause very serious trouble. If sober sense doesn't reign, Cuba will shoot down your planes, and thus provoke a crisis even more severe than the last crisis over Cuba. Neither President Johnson nor I want this crisis.

But Chairman Khrushchev was laughing when he offered to exchange with President Johnson photographs of military installations that he said were taken from outer space. "Yes, why don't you fly offshore in neutral waters?" he asked, still laughing. "You can see just as well. Why don't you fly in outer space to take your photographs?"

Brezhnev, in a solemn statement following Khrushchev's "resignation," declared: "Economic blockade, provocations, violations of the sovereignty of Cuba seriously poison not only the atmosphere in the Caribbean area, but also the international climate as a whole."

While the Soviet Union appears to be doing well in outer space, its accomplishments are lagging down on the farm. Agricultural production is far below what Khrushchev had hoped it would be. There will probably be some changes in agricultural policy—perhaps a modification of Khrushchev's effort to emulate the Iowa "corn-hog" cycle he admired so much. The Soviet Government also has admitted a decline in its rate of industrial growth in 1964. Retarded economic growth has been interpreted as a key grievance behind Khrushchev's overthrow. And yet Premier Kosygin can only predict continued shortages in milk, butter, and meat in the year ahead. The next 5-year plan, which is scheduled to start in 1966, is supposed to beef up consumer goods production.

In contrast, the U.S. economy is booming, and the gap in absolute production between the two nations is widening. This is another nagging worry for Soviet leaders.

The people of the Soviet Union, of course, want to live better. They are beginning to demand better living—and Soviet leaders worry about that. It is what U.S. politicians might call a "gut issue." The young, especially, are weary of the housing shortage, of having to camp with the old folks in cramped quarters when they marry, perhaps waiting for years to be assigned a tiny apartment of their own. They are tired of shoddy clothing and the high price of it. They would like to be able to buy automobiles, television sets, and modern household appliances at prices they can afford to pay. The Soviet people are getting more of these things today—but far from enough.

Soviet leaders do what they can to placate hungry consumers. Things will be better soon, says the Kremlin (though there is no more talk about surpassing U.S. production by 1970). But the Soviet leadership—Brezhnev and Kosygin, no less than Khrushchev—are harassed on many sides. Some of their critics, including Chinese leaders, feel that for the Soviet Union to concentrate on improving living standards at this stage is contrary to Communist ideology.

In an address that Khrushchev gave last April at the Borsod chemical plant in Hungary, he used a catchphrase comparable to the "two chickens in every pot" of American political oratory. Khrushchev came out in favor of "two new dresses for every woman."

In Moscow, Kosygin—speaking more like a Western corporation president than a Communist leader—promised higher wages, lower prices and more goods in the stores in 1965.

The Soviet leaders are very much aware that the working people in the U.S.S.R. do not believe that better living is anti-Marxist. "Why did we carry out the revolution?" "What are we fighting for?" "We did not fight to live worse after the conquest of power * * *." These are real concerns, and they must be dealt with by the Kremlin.

Plenty of Communists ask these questions. That they are at variance with those espoused by the Chinese leaders has been widely advertised, but the course of true communism does not run smoothly within the Soviet Union itself. Probably more than any other party leader since the revolution of 1917, Khrushchev was a politician. He tried to demonstrate the worth of his policies to the Russian people. He was toppled from power, accused of nepotism and of having fostered a Stalinlike cult of personality around himself. The power struggles within the Communist Party are usually well hidden, but they are bitter unto death, as past shifts of power have disclosed. Top Soviet officials have no more certainty than anyone else as to who or what elements of the party will take charge when their turn comes to relinquish command. Those now steering a middle course hardly know which way to lean. And, of course, that's no minor worry for them.

Soviet leaders continue to deplore what they say is the pernicious nature of capitalism. They still ask: When will it collapse of its own internal contradictions? One official told me he felt capitalism was now "less primitive" than it once was, but his view is the exception. What puzzles and exasperates most Soviet leaders is that 20th century capitalism isn't performing according to Marxist prediction. Theoretically, the lot of the exploited working classes should be getting worse—but it is obvious to the Soviets that living standards are in fact sharply rising in the United States and Western Europe. At an informal luncheon with eight "rising young men" in the Soviet hierarchy, I learned how hard it is to explain the U.S. economy in 50 minutes. They still think in terms of 19th-century European capitalism as depicted by Karl Marx.

When Khrushchev paid a state visit to this country in 1959, he was given a luncheon by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, at which Henry Cabot Lodge, as President

Eisenhower's special representative, spoke briefly about U.S. capitalism. The remarks of Mayor Wagner and those of Khrushchev (but not those of Ambassador Lodge) appeared in an official Soviet publication in English, Khrushchev in America. "God knows," the former Chairman is quoted, "I see no difference between the capitalism Marx wrote about and the capitalism Lodge spoke of today. I speak bluntly so you should know who you are dealing with. Such clarity improves relations."

I am personally persuaded that the anxieties poured out to me in Moscow were genuine, even if some were based on misunderstanding of the United States. Assuming this, what are their implications for U.S. policy? Do they not enhance the possibility of agreement on some of the specific issues in controversy—for example, on the manifold problems of Berlin and East Germany; or on the settlement of Russia's lend-lease debt to the United States, which affects credits for future trade; or on the minimum level of inspection necessary for disarmament; or on the development of zones free of nuclear weapons?

Two broad implications emerge for me:

1. An astute American in Moscow described the major U.S. objective in the Soviet Union: "to open up this society." I applaud the goal. For the first time, there seems a glimmer of hope; and Soviet worries are a symptom of it. It involves a very long-range effort—but definite progress in infomational and cultural exchanges is now a reality. Many Russians seek more such exchanges. Gradually, those differences between our two peoples that spring from misunderstanding, rather than from fundamental antagonisms, may be stripped away—and that is a gain.

2. As the danger of a global shooting war diminishes, the importance of other forms of conflict will rise and come into focus. I am not one who accepts easily the "convergence" theory—that the two systems, Russian and American, will come to resemble each other. I believe each country will continue to ascribe its strengths and its gains to its own system.

Thus, competition will sharpen in economic productivity and in ideological dueling, and in the nature and scope of assistance to underdeveloped countries across the world.

Competition will be redoubled in education, in science and—yes—in culture. I have said that the proportion of Soviet national income devoted to arms is higher than that of any other major nation. It is also true, according to a new report written by Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS and released last summer by the House Education and Labor Committee, that Soviet expenditures for education are as high as those for arms—some 14 billion rubles a year for each. This has not been changed appreciably under the Brezhnev-Kosygin regime. But this is more than we Americans can claim. If Soviet arms costs go down, we must assume that spending for education, science and the arts will go up. Will they go up here?

That kind of competition, said Yuri Zhukov to me, "is how we see the 21st century."

Rehabilitation in Old Gloucester

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, it is always inspiring to hear of the achievements of persons who overcome physical or other handicaps and lead exemplary lives. The story of one such man comes from the fishing center of Gloucester, Mass., in my congressional district.

Leo J. Kennedy recently retired as traffic manager of Gorton's of Gloucester, Inc., the well-known fish product concern. This moved Agnes M. Callahan to write his life story, which so impressed the editors of Performance, the monthly publication of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, that they have printed it as the opening article in their June 1965 edition.

In the hope that the message about Leo Kennedy will help more people to recognize the desirability and importance of hiring the handicapped, I am pleased to submit the text of this Performance article, as follows:

REHABILITATION IN OLD GLOUCESTER

(By Agnes M. Callahan)

Rehabilitation, as we all know, has not always been an everyday word, and rehabilitation services in today's sense have not always been available. But in the days before common acceptance of either the word or the services, countless men and women experienced rehabilitation and through it overcame sever physical handicaps to become productive, useful and independent citizens. They did it themselves. Their achievements little known outside their own communities, they fought against great odds, using the only tools they had—courage, resourcefulness and determination. Such a man is Leo J. Kennedy of Gloucester, Mass., recently retired traffic manager of the seaport city's widely known fish concern, Gorton's of Gloucester, Inc.

Times were generally good in Gloucester in the early 1900's when Leo Kennedy was a small boy. The fishing industry, lifeline of the city, was doing well; new vessels were being built—12 at a time under construction in some year—to increase the fleet and to replace those inevitably lost at sea each year. Stages in the flake yards were fully spread with split cod drying in the sun, and fishermen were known to have earned "lays" (shares) of as much as $1,214 in 1 year, an amount which the local newspaper considered "a grand year's work truly."

The city had yet to face its first big labor strike. The Nation had yet to gird itself for a major war in Europe. Life in the seacoast community was normal and reasonably pleasant, with one grave exception—the appearance of a baffling new disease, infantile paralysis. Leo Kennedy was 4 years old when it struck him, crippling one leg so severely that he would always need the support of a heavy iron brace and highly built-up shoe in order to walk.

From polio-crippled child to manager of the trucking department of a good-sized business operation was a long trek, but Kennedy got there. Along the way were years of elementary and high school studies, of watching other youngsters run the bases, climb the fences, play the games. There was commuting by train to an out-of-town business school, then clerical work in the traffic department of the then Gorton-Pew Fisheries Co. And there was the determination to show that he, like any other young man, could drive an automobile—even a truck, if he wanted to.

After 3 years at Gorton's, Kennedy bought a car, proved to doubting motor vehicle inspectors that he was well able to drive, and, operating a specially equipped Model T Ford, became one of the first disabled persons licensed to drive by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Subsequent cars had no special equipment and he drove them with no noticeable difficulty, moving his "good" foot from clutch to brake to gas pedal with an unobtrusive skill.

His confidence in his driving ability spilled over onto others. One was never nervous riding with him, whether he was at the wheel of a huge truck, backing and turning close to the edge of a slippery wharf, or in his own car bucking road-blocking snow drifts on a challenging pleasure ride through the midst of a roaring Cape Ann blizzard. Although driving the trucks was never a part of his job, he was often seen skillfully maneuvering one of the big ones through Gloucester's narrow crowded streets. He did it simply because he liked to.

Like many similarly handicapped people, Kennedy became an ardent sports fan, one not content with remaining a mere spectator. True, he could not run, but he could swing a bat and toss a horseshoe with the best of them and his powerful arms helped him achieve a phenomenal batting average in the amateur baseball games in which he took part. The yard of one home in Gloucester still bears the print of his heavy shoe and marks the spot where he spent scores of summer weekend hours, clouting drives to center, right and left fields to the dismay of his more mobile opponents.

A patient teacher—and again a lover of challenge—he took on the task of driver training for some of his younger friends, arduously preparing them for the day when they would try out for their licenses. Many a middleaged Gloucesterite whose operating record is still accident-free owes that record to Leo Kennedy, who taught the fine points of car operation along with the requisites. A Kennedy pupil, for instance, would be told to put his car deliberately into a skid so that he could get the practical working know-how of getting out of one should the emergency arise.

On the job, in addition to dispatching trucks, making major decisions on transportation and handling an inventory of millions of cases of fish, Kennedy broached ideas and devised techniques which are known to have saved his employer thousands of dollars. Through his ingenuity, the unloading end of trucks was brought to a level with boat decks and the floors of freight cars, a skid was devised to carry loads of boxes at a time, a motorized fork truck was put into use, and skids were motorized. On his retirement after 48 years with Gorton's, 40 of them as traffic manager, Kennedy was praised by company officials who noted that "he anticipated the advent of mechanization and, through his ingenious foresight, put the company in a position to meet the new age even before it arrived."

Those old-fashioned tools—courage, resourcefulness, and determination—Leo J. Kennedy had them. At 67, he still does.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Santo Domingo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, an excellent editorial was published in the Washington Daily News on June 4, 1965, entitled, "Santo Domingo."

This editorial is an exact reprint of an editorial which had previously appeared in the newspaper Los Principios, of Corboda, Argentina. Los Principios is one of the leading newspapers in Argentina. Its publishers, Dr. Enrique Nores Martinez, is a former Argentina Ambassador to Chile.

The comment which this very distinguished Argentinian makes with regard to our going into Santo Domingo, I think, would be of great interest to every Member of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, June 4, 1965]

SANTO DOMINGO

The issue at stake in the serious events taking place in the Dominican Republic is one of the greatest concerns to the Western Hemisphere; namely, how far, really, can the nonintervention principle be applied when faced with the Communist coup to establish this regime on American soil?

In recent times, during three consecutive meetings of the Ministers of Foreign Relations of the OAS, in Washington, 1951; Santiago de Chile, 1959, and San Jose de Costa Rica, 1960; a unanimous declaration was issued rejecting and opposing Marxist regimes as being absolutely incompatible with the forms of government and ways of life of countries in this hemisphere.

This rejection applied as well to these elements working from outside or within the continent to establish such a regime.

It must not be overlooked either that later, in January 1962, at the second conference of Punta del Este, Cuba was expelled from the OAS. This sanction was applied precisely for imposing a Marxist regime on the people by force.

The present struggle in Santo Domingo, where chaos and disorder were created once its government was deposed, has been characterized by the active participation of perfectly trained groups who acted amid the general confusion in ways similar to those employed in Cuba.

To alert observers the face of communism started to appear, as it did in Cuba.

In this intrinsically Pan-American problem which affects not one or several but all countries in this hemisphere, one of them was able to act unilaterally. It had in its possession reliable and conclusive information of such a serious nature that, added to this proximity to the country, it would imperil its own national security.

This measure, imposed only on a preventive basis and because of extreme urgency, was to be followed immediately by the joint action of the rest of the nations in the hemisphere. These would in either case ratify or rectify the former preventive unilateral action.

Can it possibly be maintained that the principle of nonintervention is a blind law, which instead of fulfilling the purpose for which it was created—which is that of defending the spiritual values of the continent—can be used on the contrary to destroy them?

Some decades ago the great Argentinean statesman Joaquin V. Gonzalez, in analyzing this principle, quoted the wise Professor Antoine Rougier as saying: "Nonintervention in its absolute form could only mean the consecration of the most barbaric tyrannies of those systems which are most repulsive to freedom and morality."

Therefore, a matter of international politics as delicate as the one posed by the Dominican case to the American hemisphere cannot be contemplated, much less solved, under an emotional state of mind which has its roots in past experiences, which occurred under conditions very different indeed from those existing in the world today, and particularly in this part of it.

To equate the present landing of troops with those that took place half a century ago would be a grave error which would only help to consolidate in this continent systems which all its nations have repudiated in their charters and treaties but which, nonetheless, seem to be allowed once they actually take place.

Maybe the hidden motive for this is none other than the one pointed out by the penetrating intellectual Gregorio Maranon, in his studies of the causes and forces involved in the bloody Spanish Civil War, which halted the spread of communism in Europe at the cost of 1 million casualties and extraordinary destruction to Spain.

Said Gregorio Maranon: "If the causes of this great catastrophe could be theoretically reduced to only one, I would not hesitate to say that this cause has been the gigantic misunderstanding of the liberals of the world, who originally represented the humanistic aspect of civilization.

"Now, in their majority, they have come to sympathize with the most antiliberal and inhuman of all political doctrines which have ever existed—that of communism. I would say that today the majority of liberals suffer from Altonism; from color blindness for red."

The ardent campaign immediately unleashed at the U.N. by Soviet Russia, China, and Cuba in defense of the groups who have identified themselves as supporters of ex-President Bosch provides us with the last significant element in this analysis.

The determined and strong attitude assumed by the United States in the Dominican crisis constitutes a positive step in the defense of continental democracy.

In this matter it is necessary to speak clearly and decisively, leaving aside subtle interpretations or suspicious insistence on principles which were created to solve problems of a different nature.

We do not doubt that history will record this gesture of the United States of North America as a ratification of its traditionally Western and Christian international policies.

The sad example of Cuba cannot and must never be repeated in America.

Governor Knowles at Harvard Milk Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Harvard, Ill., "Milk Center of the World," celebrated the 24th annual Harvard Milk Day on Saturday, June 5, 1965, under the very able chairmanship of Dr. Martin Bergsjo.

The special guest of honor at this year's Milk Day celebration was the distinguished Governor, Warren P. Knowles, chief executive of the neighboring State of Wisconsin which prides itself as America's Dairyland.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the attractive personality and great public attention which Governor Knowles brought to this year's successful Harvard Milk Day, he delivered an address on the subject of American agriculture which was particularly significant in the light of today's events. I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and of the American public to this speech of Governor Knowles which follows:

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY GOV. WARREN P. KNOWLES AT THE HARVARD, ILL., MILK DAY CELEBRATION

I am particularly delighted to be here today for two reasons. One, Illinois and Wisconsin have been good neighbors through long illustrious years of development and, second, you are paying tribute today to a phase of our American life for which we in Wisconsin have more than a passing interest—dairying. After looking at the production figures for 1964 I think you will agree that Badger farmers loom large in the total U.S. dairy picture.

I would like to think, too, that in paying tribute to the dairy farmer and the dairy industry here today you are also saluting the entire field of agriculture—because nowhere in this rapidly shrinking world of ours is there now, or has there ever been, a human endeavor that has accomplished so much for so many people.

The very fabric of American freedom was woven by the pioneer farmer—both men and women—who defied nature, hostile enemies and countless other frustrations to build a strong foundation for a young struggling nation. American agriculture from the very first days of this Republic until today is a monument to rugged individualism and free enterprise.

As this Nation grew step by step, year by year, surmounting a series of crises that threatened at times to destroy it, it was the farmer who led the way—not only in producing enough foodstuff for the growing number of Americans, but also by wise counsel in the halls of legislatures.

The exuberance of a youthful nation was tempered by the conservatism of a farm population that embraced progress, the kind of progress that was lasting and sound. This

has characterized American agriculture for more than 180 years.

The American farmer and his family were free. They were free to operate their land holdings as a family unit and they guarded that freedom with jealousy. This was self-enterprise, this was free enterprise and one only has to look at American agriculture's tremendous records today to know how right these early pioneers were.

American agriculture's fundamental feature is independent private ownership of land. The American pioneer farmer had to struggle, work, suffer and even risk his life to be able to secure himself on the new land; but he was rewarded as no other farmer in any other land has been, by becoming a free and independent operator. He met the many challenges knowing that the land and the fruits of his labor were his.

The significance of the farmer's ownership of land went beyond the capacity to produce amply for his own needs and for national and world markets. It lay in the heart of his steady development as an independent self-reliant individual. This pattern of development spared the growing United States the trials and upheavals that have destroyed countries where a chasm separated those who tilled the soil and the elite.

One of these periods of trial came in 1861 when a nation, not yet a century old, faced its Armageddon in the guise of a civil war. Despite the threat of dissolution as a United States, the sun continued to set, harvest followed seedtime. People ate, slept, worked, dreamed, hoped—as men do in fear and in faith.

On American farms food was mostly grown and preserved at home. Much of the clothing was homespun. Homemade candles and the flicker of a fireplace provided light. Animals and men provided the power to till the soil.

Buildings were erected from home-sawn trees and even from the sod of the prairie. Fuel came from the woodlots and, yes, from the cow chips that littered the pasture.

Despite the dark clouds of civil strife that covered the Nation, Isaac Newton, then Commissioner of Agriculture under President Lincoln could report this to his Chief Executive. Newton said:

"Having reached this agricultural vantage point by honest toil, guided by the lights of experience and science, it is an interesting question to every American: 'What are the conditions of a still grander progress and prosperity?'

"The essential conditions are peace; a continued and increasing demand for agricultural products; an increased respect for labor; a more thorough knowledge and practice of agriculture as an art and science; and, finally, a more thorough education of our farmers in the physical sciences, in political economy, in taste and general reading."

Secretary Newton closed with these words:

"Whatever improves the condition and the character of a farmer feeds the lifesprings of national character, wealth and power."

Many have expressed a deep concern over trends in today's agriculture. These concerns cover a declining number of farms and farmers, growth in the size of farms, replacement of farm manpower by machines and technology and the pressure to get farmers to produce more than the market will absorb.

These concerns are understandable. We have fewer farms. Many who want to farm have been forced to leave their green acres for life and work in nearby urban areas. Those who remain on the farm, those who want to remain a basic part of the free enterprise system, have been beset with problems. The spread between the prices a farmer receives for the fruits of his long hours of labor and the prices he must pay for the things he buys to help produce enough food to feed our growing Nation as well as others in foreign lands, is widening.

Concerned as the farmer is with these problems, he is even more concerned and disturbed by the possibility of losing his enterprise operation to a sometimes well-meaning but nevertheless frustrated Federal Government.

One of the ways to clear the mind and restore confidence is to explore what we really want, and come to some conclusion as to what is "good and right."

What is good and right is the farmer-owned family enterprise. It is not only morally right but basically right if we are to continue to hold our hard-won freedoms. This farmer-owned family enterprise has and will continue to produce food in this Nation in abundance. One only has to look at the Soviet Union and China as prime examples of what happens to agriculture when government becomes the farmer and citizens become only serfs.

A second look at our present system of free enterprise farming reveals the American farmer as one of the biggest customers of the huge industrial complex of our Nation.

If someone tells you agriculture isn't important anymore, you can tell them that agriculture is the Nation's biggest buyer and seller. The farm inventory of machinery alone is greater than the assets of the American steel industry.

Farmers use more steel than the auto industry, enough rubber to make 300 million tires, more petroleum than is used in any other industry, and more than 22 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity.

Agriculture is a giant that provides jobs for 40 percent of the Nation's working force. Sixty percent of the raw materials flowing through American industry originates on the farm.

To illustrate agriculture's impact on the job picture, let us follow just briefly the employment opportunities offered as the result of a dairy farmer's efforts. The men or women who are involved in the production and sales of fertilizer, the factory worker who helped build the tractor used to till the soil. The seedman who played a part in the planting of the farmer's acres, the craftsman who helped build the truck that transports the milk to the intake plant where many hands are needed to prepare the milk for bottling, the trucker who transports the finished product to the retail store, the store clerk, the home-delivery routeman. These are only a few whose jobs are interrelated with agriculture.

It is not difficult to understand why 4 out of every 10 jobholders today are dependent on a sound agriculture.

Yes, agriculture is a giant, and it has problems to match its size. Most perplexing is that of surplus production but I shudder to think where we would be or what the chances for the survival of freedom in this country if that surplus should suddenly be turned in to a deficit. Those problems of surplus which plague us now would pale into insignificance.

America's strength today is due a great deal to the efficiency and productivity of its free-enterprise agriculture. Agriculture must continue to progress within the framework of the family-operated farm or we invite our enemies to move ahead of us.

There are bright days ahead for the American farmer. Our own population is growing at a rapid pace. By the year 2000, experts predict we will have more than 300 million Americans within the boundaries of this great Nation of ours.

These 300 million will have to be fed. They will expect to be fed as well as you and I. The American farmer—given the opportunity to pursue his occupation within the framework of a family-owned enterprise—will provide enough food.

The American farmer accepts responsibilities as no other farmer ever has. He is a partner of technological change. All he asks is to share in the economic progress of his beloved land. In my opinion, he is not asking too much.

Today's farmer—and his family—deserves to be praised, not damned for his efforts. You have showered some of that praise on him today with your recognition of the dairy industry. It is well for all of us to remember the role of the farmer every time we bow our heads to say grace for the blessings bestowed upon us by an understanding creator.

Much of America's strength today comes from the foundations that were so carefully prepared when this was an argriculturally oriented Nation. We cannot remove any part of that foundation without forcing a collapse of the entire structure.

To paraphrase the late Winston Churchill, never have so many Americans owed so much to so few farmers for producing in abundance. And although this abundance has created economic problems, it also serves a vital function. It is a cushion against natural or manmade disasters, and also is of great importance in the strategy of peace. In this era, we can claim as enormous advantages our reserves of food and our ability to produce food in spectacular abundance, something no Communist country has ever been able to do.

It was not too long ago when one of our American Secretaries of Agriculture was being blasted because we were producing too much food. In Russia at the same time, his opposite number was being exiled because Soviet farms were not producing enough. Our abundance is being used today to lend a helping hand to the less fortunate in many lands. Those of our own, whose income leaves much to be desired, are also being aided. Can we really say that our food surpluses are a burden which we cannot bear? Or are they a blessing without which we cannot do? I know you will agree that the latter is the truth.

City dwellers, used to a choice of food almost without limit in their supermarkets, are prone to forget that this choice is the result of the American farmer's untiring efforts to provide high quality food at a fair price. And these efforts will remain untiring so long as the family-owned, family-operated farm remains an integral part of our economic system.

Communal farms, government operated agriculture, and 5-year programs have failed completely in other countries. In all of these grandiose schemes, three basic factors have been missing. The pride of ownership, self-reliance and self-esteem. We in America still have these fundamentals and we want to preserve them not only for our industrial giants and small businesses but also for our family-operated farms.

If there is one reason for America's greatness it lies in our refusal to bargain our freedoms for the easy route to affluence. There is no easy route to freedom. It is something we ought to be guarding jealously.

Those of you who have come here today, those of you who worked diligently to make this day a success recognize that farm and city must be partners in progress.

I hope that this feeling of being good neighbors with agriculture lasts the year round until you gather again next year to salute the dairy industry.

You are providing a dramatic means to tell the farmer and all of the agricultural complex that you, too, are interested in a free-enterprise, successful family-farm life.

Education and Today's Challenges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, in this year of 1965 when voices are heard in the land murmuring with dissatisfaction about education and intellectuals as a class, it is heartening to hear some forthright defense of education and the need for it. I give you Prof. James A. Armstrong, chairman of the General Studies Division of the Agricultural and Technical College at Delhi, N.Y. On June 6 he delivered there the splendid commencement address which I insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY PROF. JAMES A. ARMSTRONG

Commencement addresses are traditionally paternalistic. You graduates must be admonished to work hard, to live a clean life, and go forth to capture that world which is your oyster. The catalog of pitfalls and opportunities awaiting you in the workaday world of the adult have been pointed out to you on many, many occasions.

Such advice, of course, is timely and desirable, and represents a continuation of that facet of the process of education whereby the senior citizenry attempts to pass on to the junior citizenry those values and principles considered basic to the perpetuation of the particular society—its traditions, its standards, its aspirations, and especially its status quo.

This type of indoctrination was more easily accomplished a century or 10 centuries ago, for then the adults had a fairly practical understanding of what youth needed in order to survive and to propogate the culture. The conditions of livelihood in 1665 were essentially those of 1565 and 1775—for the typical man, the willingness to enslave himself to a world of drudgery, usually not leaving the place of his birth, rational to the extent of recognizing his lot as the lot of humanity.

We adults of today are extremely unsure of ourselves in offering counsel for the future. Of this, however, we are sure—the work world of 1970, 1980, and 1990 will be incredibly different, not only in its demands but also in its rate of change. Neither muscle nor good intentions alone will assure employment, prosperity, and happiness. Nor will most skills and techniques of 1965 be adequate for 1975. Education on a continuing and ever-increasing intensity will be the open sesame to a productive, responsible, and rewarding life.

It is about your stake in, and responsibility for, education that I wish to share with you a few thoughts, and frankly, I am at a loss to find the appropriate example, metaphor, or tone through which I can underline the urgency and long-range importance of the topic.

In a 1964 study sponsored by the American Council on Education, Dr. Grant Venn expounds the thesis that "technology has created a new relationship between man, his education, and his work in which education is placed squarely between man and his work."

"Although this relationship has traditionally held for some men and some work," says Dr. Venn, "modern technology has advanced to the point where the relationship may now be said to exist for all men and all work. Yet, though technology today in effect dictates the role that education must play in preparing man for work, no level of American education has fully recognized this fact of life."

I choose to quote Dr. Venn verbatim, not because what he has to say is new to our generation, but because he has artfully distilled what thinking men for ages have been preaching about the growing importance of education as the keystone of civilization.

Allow me to go back roughly 50 years to a quotation so often repeated that it has become almost trite, yet its repetition serves to accentuate its greatness. Alfred North Whitehead, one of the 20th century's greatest minds (on both sides of the Atlantic) warns us with his classical simplicity:

"When one considers in its length and in its breadth the importance of this question on the education of a nation's young, the broken lives, the defeated hopes, the national failures, which result from the frivolous inertia with which it is treated, it is difficult to restrain within oneself a savage rage. In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute, the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated."

I believe it worth noting that Whitehead had the courage and conviction to bring such a matter to the attention of the British people in one of England's darkest hours—the terrible year of 1916—because, I suppose, he felt what he had to say was as important to humanity as cannons and conscription.

For the most part we ignored his pleas, as we ignored those of Jefferson a century before. The point I try to make here is that we still ignore, or at best give lip service to, the utterances of like intent from the most perceptive and knowledgeable men of our day. True, we do believe in compulsory basic education, we do maintain schools and pay taxes—grudgingly. We provide and pursue advanced studies—too often for credits and sheepskins themselves—too seldom for the education.

We become readily involved in massive foreign aid spending, poverty programs, rural beautification and electrification, urban renewal, civil rights, and Asian entanglements. We expend staggering amounts of economic and human resources into these activities, but we are still essentially in the dark ages regarding our personal, social, and financial commitment to education as the foundation of 20th century human welfare.

We must, of course, be our brother's keeper. Freedom cannot flourish where hunger, misery, and prejudice abound. I would be the first to concede that to a starving man the problems of high school curriculum are a hollow joke, that to a man deprived of his right to work or to vote the potential rewards of a doctorate in classical language is likely to seem peripheral.

Nonetheless, we persist in emphasizing treatment of the symptoms of human misery and relegate the causes to a we'll-get-at-that-later category.

American education, I admit, has accomplished some remarkable feats. But it can and must do much more, much better. The so-called democratizing feats of public schooling are to many Americans a myth. Our literacy rate is certainly not the world's highest, and unemployment has become an albatross around our collective neck.

We must heed and rectify these social and economic ills, I repeat, but I also am of the opinion that such action does not and cannot preclude our getting at the roots of the matter. We must all join in a more determined attack on ignorance in all its trappings: primarily, illiteracy, civic apathy, prejudice, provincialism, and stereotyped thinking.

As I see it, your role in this mission is twofold:

1. You must continue your own education as vigorously and as continuously as life allows. There can be no doubt in your mind that education today must be a lifetime process.

2. You must accept the challenge as an informed and responsible citizen, parent, and taxpayer to see that the process of American education is given the financial and moral support that it now so sadly lacks.

I believe that as a beneficiary of our struggling system you are both qualified and obligated to see to it that America has a citizenry of trained minds and hands capable and eager to build a world in which the seeds of suffering and hate and war will never germinate.

As for your own education, I urge you to continue to develop your occupational and personal attributes to the heights of your potential. Your achievement as of today represents but another step in that direction.

We at Delhi Tech do not claim you as a finished product. The faculty would be the first to deny any rumor that you now are educated or properly trained. We have attempted here to give you what we consider to be a few of the appropriate academic tools and technical skills to better fit you to continue your lifelong task.

The primary emphasis of any college worthy of the name must be essentially intellectual. It should attempt to develop in you the ability to think, the reason and desire to be concerned in significant problems, and some ability in the discovery and management of knowledge—not just knowledge per se, but knowledge alive and growing and working for humanity.

In your future education, regardless of its form, be watchful of its spirit. It is well to be wary of those who could make up your mind for you, beware the teacher who offers to do your thinking, stay clear of pat answers and stereotyped solutions to complex human problems. The road to freedom is education in its most liberal and comprehensive sense—the road away from freedom is indoctrination and the easy way out.

Your responsibility to education in general will always be before you. As a citizen you must insist on the most competent and dedicated people available—and if they are not available, make them available. From the highest public officials to the lay school board and classroom teacher you and your fellow citizens must demand and get only the best, and you must demand the public resources that will keep them there.

A school board not too far from here—once asked the faculty spokesman when the teachers were going to stop asking for salary raises. The teacher's answer to the board—which consisted mainly of Ivy-League lawyers, doctors, and businessmen—was, I think, at the very heart of the matter: he answered simply, "When your children begin to say they want to be teachers."

Our population is booming, we are short thousands of qualified teachers and the shortage will increase. This shortage extends from kindergarten through the universities. The sad part of it is that the shortage need not exist. It can be corrected. But it will not be corrected until an informed and concerned citizenry decides to put first things first.

We can and must have our people educated and trained to their capacity. We can start with you today. We can start on the street corner, in the office, at the voting machine, at school meetings, in the Job Corps, in VISTA,

in the factory, in church, and at home for dinner. Most important, you and I must start to repair and streamline our educational system. George is probably busy in Santo Domingo.

With these thoughts I bid you goodbye and good fortune.

Why Housewives Are Paying More for Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said in the press recently about rising prices in our food stores. As might be expected, some of the editorial comments on the "why" of these price rises have been rather irresponsible. Today's food world is vast and complicated and is also going through tremendous changes. Therefore, it is not to be wondered that at times various symptoms of economic maladjustment make their appearance. Those who seek to blame any one factor or attempt to find a whipping boy do a disservice to all those involved in attempting to make a really responsible examination of the totality of the marketing system to determine how well it is working and how it may be made to work better. Such a study has been undertaken by the National Commission on Food Marketing and it is gratifying to have a national magazine make comments that are truly responsible on this situation. I am referring to the article which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of June 7 titled "Why Housewives Are Paying More for Food" and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

WHY HOUSEWIVES ARE PAYING MORE FOR FOOD

(NOTE.—Prices in food stores creep higher and higher. Yet prices that farmers get for producing the food show little change. What goes on? One answer, officials say, is that housewives want frills and variety in foods, fancy stores, many services—costing money. But there are other findings, too, in a new study of the food industry launched by Congress.)

The cost of feeding the family is edging higher right now. Meat is being marked up in price. Vegetables cost more. The price of milk has been raised in many areas. Bread has become more expensive.

Even so, food takes a smaller and smaller portion of the income that Americans enjoy after taxes.

Income of the average American family, in other words, has been rising faster than the cost of food.

As a result, Americans still can buy their daily fare and have more money left than ever before to spend on other good things of life.

But the farmer who produces the food has been left at the tag end of the procession. There has been virtually no increase in the price he gets for the raw foods as they leave the farm.

As shown in the chart on page 94, the income of the average family is less than that of most workers in the food industry.

CONGRESSIONAL STUDY

To seek an answer to this paradox of what people consider to be high prices paid in the grocery for food while the farmer complains of low prices for what he produces, Congress has set up a National Commission on Food Marketing. This body is now taking testimony at all levels of the industry but will not make its report for at least another year.

It appears, however, that, when all the studying is done, the answer to the paradox of food is going to be found in two major areas. For one thing, workers in the food industry have been gaining steadily higher pay. For another thing, housewives are demanding more and more products offered in more and more variations, packaged in fancier containers, and sold in fancier stores.

The new Commission set up by Congress has found that, on the average, the cost of retailing food alone accounts for 21 percent of the total cost of that food. That is an increase of 4 percentage points over the average cost of retailing food 10 years ago.

Testimony given to the Commission in hearings early in May indicated that emphasis on attracting customers is a major factor in the increased cost of retailing food.

BIGGER STORES, WIDER AISLES

Supermarket officials told the Commission of the nationwide trend toward bigger stores with wider aisles, ever-larger parking lots, piped-in music, and other attractions for the shopping housewife.

Said one supermarket executive:

"We are now dealing with an ever-changing, younger consumer. A group who have been brought up during the most prosperous period this country has ever gone through. A group who feel two cars, two television sets, two telephones are the expected thing.

"They are ready purchasers of the great mass of new products coming like an avalanche from every food manufacturer. It costs more to service their needs and desires.

"It's a group that is not satisfied with a can or package of frozen peas, but prefers a package of boil-in-the-bag vegetables in butter sauce at 10 cents a package more. Fresh potatoes and onions are making way for a whole new world of processed products—whipped, mashed, au gratin, and scalloped potatoes prepared in a few minutes."

Shoppers, said the supermarket executive, want a wide variety of products from which to choose. From his testimony to the Commission:

"We have 216 dog and cat foods to offer the customer—twice as many as 3 years ago. Pets are not eating more per animal, but we have to stock twice as many items at a higher cost.

"Sometimes I wonder how we got along for so many years without chocolate parfait angel food cake mix or double Dutch devil's food moist or applesauce raisin early American cake mixes, or 98 other exotic flavors."

The supermarket official noted that consumers wanted greater variety in nonfood items, too, saying:

"Life used to be so simple when we had 200- and 400-count facial tissues, in white only. Now we have pocket pack, juniors, man size * * * and a special pack that contains 14 aqua, 12 peach, and 10 lilac."

The Commission heard complaints that the supermarkets are giving the housewife more than she really wants in the way of variety and service. It was suggested that savings could be passed on to that housewife, if some of the frills in food retailing were eliminated.

FANCY STORES PREFERRED

Supermarket operators contended that there is ample evidence to show that the majority of housewives do prefer the modern food store. They said that discount food stores, in which frills have been eliminated and savings on food offered, are available in many areas, but the fancier stores still attract far more business.

Nationally it is estimated that the big supermarkets get about 70 percent of food sales and the discount stores no more than 5 percent.

THE FARMER'S SHARE

As evidence that the farmer is not benefiting from higher prices paid by housewives, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives presented these figures: Of the $312 spent on food by the average U.S. citizen in 1950, the farmer got $132. In 1964, the average person spent $417 on food, but the farmer got only $133 of that.

Meanwhile, wages of workers up and down the line between the farmer and the consumer have been rising steadily. The National Association of Food Chains told the commission:

"Supermarket Institute studies indicate that food-chain wage rates have been increasing during the last 10 years at an average rate of 5.8 percent a year. Additionally, the number and expense of fringe benefits have also risen dramatically during this period. * * * Fringe benefits for large chains added about 15.6 percent to regular payroll costs in 1963–64, as compared to 8.15 percent in 1955."

The food-chain association said that increases in production of workers had offset about half the increase in wages and fringe benefits. Some union spokesmen held, however, that productivity of workers had increased as much as wages and fringe benefits.

Official studies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture show that labor costs generally in the food industry have been in a steady rise. Taking into account both wage increases and increase in productivity of workers, the Agriculture Department studies show that labor costs per unit of output have risen 11 percent in the past 5 years.

CULPRIT IS HUMAN NATURE

Supermarket spokesmen agreed that the housewife herself must accept major responsibility for rising food costs. One chain-store official summed it up this way:

"If there is a culprit in this present era of food marketing, then it seems to me that this culprit is human nature, a human nature that desires personal attention, new and better products, and release from household drudgery. And we are living in a generally affluent society which in most cases permits gratification of these desires."

Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill, H.R. 8371, to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I have long felt that proponents of the Federal excise tax ought to be called woman taxers because these onery taxes seem aimed almost exclusively at women. The women are accustomed to being irritated every time they go shopping for toilet articles for themselves and families and for cosmetics. These include baby oils and powders and anything in the way of creams or ointments advertised to improve one's appearance. Such items have long since passed out of the luxury classification so far as American women are concerned yet they have had to pay this so-called luxury tax with every

such purchase. I do not blame them one bit for being irritated. In a less stable society such a thing could bring down a government.

I strongly support H.R. 8371 and the administration's efforts to end these taxes. In fact, in previous years I have introduced bills to repeal them. They should have been done away with a long time ago but we can't turn back the clock. If H.R. 8371 is enacted the wartime nuisance excise taxes will be ended. I favor passing it as soon as possible and I am in favor of the proposed retroactive features which will permit refunds to those who have paid the tax recently.

These taxes were originally applied during the war not only to raise revenue but also, and some say more importantly, to discourage the purchase of autos, gasoline, admissions to entertainment, furs, leather goods, telephone service, air travel, jewelry, tobacco, liquor, the toilet articles and cosmetics I mentioned and other items. Now, with the passage of this bill, the consumer will realize a savings of $2 on a $20 telephone bill, $10 on a $100 leather suitcase, $60 on a $600 fur coat, 5 cents on a 50-cent jar of face cream, and so forth.

Aside from being a nuisance to both purchaser and merchant, these taxes have been a positive drag on our economy. They have certainly discouraged buyers in notable instances.

Mr. Chairman, I think the removal of these taxes will actually increase revenue. Lower sales prices of goods in the marketplace customarily result in greater sales volume, higher profit and more tax revenue.

In addition, less tax collection effort will be required by the retail merchant who is overburdened with the present necessity of computing the tax and the accurate selection of the taxable items through the use of Government directives, the labeling and collecting, the bookkeeping and accounting. With these unproductive duties removed the merchant will have more time for sales producing, revenue producing activities. In my opinion it is wrong anyway to make a merchant be a tax collector without pay. It is involuntary servitude.

I want to reiterate my support for H.R. 8371. It seems to be a good bill from every point of view.

Federal Protection for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to make it a Federal crime to assault or kill postal supervisors acting in official capacities.

I firmly believe that the Nation's postal supervisors are entitled to the protection of the Federal criminal law when attempts are made to kill or injure them while they are performing their official duties. I urge the Congress to spell out to evildoers the fact that the long legal arm of the Federal Government protects Federal employees.

Commencement, Aquinas Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure on June 5, 1965, to be invited to the ninth commencement of the Aquinas schools in Milton, Mass., as principle speaker. This school was established in 1956 by the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph. Aquinas was founded as a nonprofit educational institution for training young women for successful careers in business and was accredited as a 2-year school of business in 1962 by the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools, Washington, D.C. It is located on a beautiful 15-acre campus at the foot of the Blue Hills in Milton.

Following is my address:

THE STREAMS AND THE OCEAN

(Commencement address delivered by Congressman JAMES A. BURKE to graduates of the Aquinas School for Girls, Milton and Newton, Mass., Saturday, June 5, 1965)

Sister Superior, Sisters, members of the faculty, parents and friends of the graduates, and members of the class of 1965, it is a distinct pleasure for me to be here with you on this significant occasion which marks another milestone in the lives of these attractive and hard-working young ladies. It is a pleasure because each commencement ceremony brings another group of American youth closer to what must be the goal of a great democratic nation; the full participation by every citizen in the economic, social, and political workings of that nation.

I am especially honored and pleased to have the opportunity of attending the last joint graduation of the Aquinas School. Your Sisters tell me that by next year the beautiful new facilities at the Newton campus will be completed, and that separate commencements will be held. Therefore, in the future, two graduation speakers will be able to share the pleasure that is undividedly mine today.

The schools of one's community, whether public or private, are a matter of vital concern to every thinking citizen. Such concern is vividly intensified if one has the privilege, as I do, of representing his area in our National Government. It is, therefore, a great source of inspiration and confidence for me, and I am sure, for others, to know that there is within our district an organization which is selflessly devoted to providing the best possible opportunities for further Christian education. The contribution of this order, the Sisters of St. Joseph of Boston, is not limited to this one institution, nor to this one period of time. For nearly 100 years now, the Sisters have played a large and expanding role in the educational history of our State and Nation. The size and diversity of the school program supported by the Boston Sisters alone is eloquent testimony to the vision and devotion of the order. For Aquinas is but one of the more than 100 educational institutions operated by the Sisters, institutions that range from a college to grammar schools, from academies to an educational clinic. And across the land, in Chicago, Los Angeles, Santa Fe, and many other cities, other Motherhouses of the Sisters of St. Joseph are also engaged in this great work.

Thus, we can see that it was not a new departure for the Sisters when Mother Mary Euphrasia established your school a decade ago, but only a further instance of the order's continuing commitment to education. In the past decade, I have viewed the growth and progress of this institution with great pride and satisfaction. Ten years ago, 30 young ladies enrolled in your new school to prepare themselves through Christian education for useful and satisfying professional careers. Next fall, 400 students will begin the same experience on two campuses. This record of service is one in which all of you—administrators, teachers, and students—can take justifiable pride, one for which the sincere gratitude of our area, our State, and our Nation is your due.

It seems particularly fitting to me that your institution established by an order of Christian educators, should bear the name of one who throughout his life was directly involved in the various processes of education and who is the patron of all Catholic schools. As you recall, St. Thomas was born in the first quarter of the 13th century, a period which also saw the birth of the university as we recognize it. St. Thomas began his formal studies at one of these infant universities—the one of Naples—and remained, of course, in the scholastic milieu the remainder of his life, both as scholar and teacher.

In later life, when St. Thomas had become famous through his writings and his reputation for general erudition, many younger people sought his counsel on various matters. On one occasion, a young Dominican asked for advice on how to pursue learning. St. Thomas' answer, stemming as it did from the experience gained through a lifetime of seeking knowledge, seems to me as valid today as it was when given seven centuries ago. He wrote, in part:

"Brother John, since you have asked me how one should set about to acquire the treasure of knowledge, this is my advice to you concerning it: namely, that you should choose to enter, not straightway into the ocean, but by way of the little streams; for difficult things ought to be reached by way of easy ones."

Now I think the wisdom in this advice is enhanced when we remember that St. Thomas was indeed a scholar, but not merely a scholar. Although the writings for which he is celebrated are mainly theological in nature, St. Thomas was really a many-sided broadly based individual quite aware of the real world about him. It has been said of him that he was as interested in politics or mysticism as in metaphysics or theology. From this, it would appear that his advice is applicable not only to the formal, scholastic study of the schoolroom variety, but to the greater, even limitless, study which is the living of life itself.

Today, you young ladies are passing your second significant milestone, leaving the second of the major divisions of your lives behind you. I think the two periods you have come through are examples of the little streams mentioned by St. Thomas. The first period, and the first little stream, can be equated with your life as a child in the lap of your family. When you entered the first grade, the stream of your childhood entered a larger tributary represented by formal education. There, you learned lessons from a new set of adults—your teachers—and from your new classmates as well. But just as a small brook enters a larger one and makes it even larger, so with your life: the ex-

periences and knowledge gained in your childhood were not lost when you entered school, but joined with the new experiences and knowledge you gathered in the schools.

And now, you are at the mouth of the second stream, preparing to enter upon the ocean of the everyday world. To say that the streams traversed by you thus far are little is not to say that they are insignificant. As St. Thomas has said, the easy should come as a preparation for the difficult. The lessons you have learned may have seemed difficult at the time of learning, but they were easier than many you must learn on the ocean of the future.

In your travels on that ocean, your experiences and encounters will be more immediate and intense than those to which you are accustomed; your lessons will be more varied and less susceptible of copybook solutions; and your teachers will often be impersonal and less benign than those you have known heretofore. I must add, however, with certainty and with great delight, that if your lessons will be harder, then in like degree will your satisfaction on mastering them be greater.

You are on the threshold of a full and variegated future. The first transition you must make is that from schoolgirl to career woman. Most of you will make this change effortlessly, for, thanks to Aquinas and to your own diligence, you now possess marketable skills in a specialized, high-demand, field. As members of the American labor force, you will become producers as well as consumers. One of the problems you will face is how to balance these two functions. But then we all face that problem, whether we are Congressmen or caretakers.

You will be molders of public opinion and full partners in the governmental processes of your Nation. This may seem purely a privilege, a thing to be looked forward to. It is that indeed, but it also carries with it responsibilities. Citizenship in a democracy is exercised through the ballot; but to exercise good citizenship, you must form opinions, speak out, debate, argue, consult, persuade, read, listen, shout if necessary, and then vote.

You will be the protectors and the agents of transmission for our country's cultural, social, and religious heritage. It will not be enough for you to do your paid work well and neglect these other aspects of life. You must strike a balance, you must set up a system of priorities among many diverse matters.

And most of you will become wives and mothers. The homes you establish will be the sources of new little streams down which you will guide the next generation on its journey to the great ocean you yourselves are about to enter upon.

There are also other large problems, other tough challenges that you will face, ranging in area of occurrence from the local to the extraterrestrial. There is the outgoing ideological struggle being waged between the East and the West, with authoritarianism or freedom as the ultimate outcome, and world peace and survival hanging in the balance. There is the disconcerting split that may be developing within the very ranks of the Western allies. There is the contest being waged for space, and there will be new problems once space is conquered.

Nearer home, there are several troublesome areas of great import. There is the disgraceful situation of poverty and hunger in the most abundantly endowed land on earth. There are poverty's concomitants, ignorance and crime to be dealt with. These problems will be further complicated by the expected advances in technology and the increased incidence of automation. There is the war to be waged on killing and crippling diseases, those of the mind as well as those of the body. And far from least critical, there is the nagging, morally-upsetting problem of racial equality, understanding, and civil rights.

Now it may seem to you that most of these issues will be worked out at rather a far remove from your personal lives, that their resolution will scarcely concern you in a direct manner. If you feel that way, I must respectfully say that you are mistaken. In the world of today, there can be no isolation. The problems I have cited are American problems, and as Americans you will be involved in them and affected by their resolution.

I paint a drab picture of the ocean you are embarking upon. But I firmly believe that all is not darkness. I would remind you of the words of William Faulkner upon receiving the Nobel Prize for literature, and who was one of America's greatest literary spokesmen, a man who indeed saw the world darkly, but who could say: "I believe that mankind will not merely endure; he will prevail."

Your futures, then, will be complex and demanding. They will be frought with grave issues, decisions, problems, and quandaries. I am confident, however, that through diligent exercise of the moral values, discipline, and special skills that you take away from the little streams of home, school, and Aquinas, your futures will be bright.

I thank you and extend to each of you my best wishes on your voyage.

Strengthening Gold and Silver—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the second of a four part series of articles appearing in the Las Vegas Review-Journal, Las Vegas, Nev. This one, appearing Sunday, April 11, 1965, deals with the usage of money as a method of exchange throughout history. It points out interesting and informative aspects of the gold standard and the use of silver in coins. It also explains the economics of gold and silver.

The article follows:

MONEY MATTERS: HISTORY OF MEDIUMS OF EXCHANGE

(By Arthur P. Alexander)

Throughout history many objects, perishable and durable, have been used as money because of their value in exchange. History does not record where or when money first came into use in the form of gold, silver, and bronze coins, but the fact they have been customarily used by ancient civilizations indicates that the immutability and durability of gold and silver were early discovered.

Alchemists, experimenting in the transmutation of baser metals into gold, found that by combining a small amount of phosphorous with bronze it became durable and resisted corrosion. Consequently, bronze so treated has been utilized from antiquity for coins designed as a convenience for small value in exchange.

Nickel was not known until the middle of the 18th century, and like bronze, was discovered to possess the same durability and resistance to corrosion, making it valuable as an alloy in coinage. True, any suitable and durable alloy can be used in coinage, however coins stamped from a base metal would create a fiat money (a legal tender without backing) and have little intrinsic value.

Minting coins from baser metals would also encourage and facilitate counterfeiting by unscrupulous individuals and afford an excellent opportunity for the enemies of a country to create havoc in causing considerable financial losses by flooding the market with counterfeit and worthless coins, so for their own protection, nations used gold and silver in their coinage to make those ventures unprofitable.

Modern nations first used silver as their standard for coinage of domestic money and foreign exchange but silver, adopted as a lone standard showed weakness and under economic pressure gradually gave place to bimetallism, or double standard, of gold and silver, which in turn was, without substantial reason, abandoned in favor of the gold standard, universal adoption of the single gold standard being due primarily to the discovery of gold in California and Australia.

The recent position taken and expressed to the effect that there can be no other standard than gold is a fallacy in economics as it places all else subservient to that metal.

By anology, as time is the measurement of motion, there exists a mutual dependence between the two on which their very entity hinges, so, too, this same mutual dependency exists between gold and silver as evidenced in the weakness of silver when adopted as a sole standard, and the failure of the gold standard to avert the economic crises that ensued after World War I.

The most stable of past standards was bimetallism under which money did enjoy a somewhat secure position, but its weakness lay in the fault that the fixed price of gold was too cheap and the price of silver too dear to establish an equitable ratio between the two metals. Today the situation is reversed.

The present disparity between gold and silver resulted in fixing the price of gold at $35 per ounce, far beyond its substantial worth, and the retention of silver at the ignoble price of $0.90½ plus per ounce, neither extremities being justified by the then prevailing economic conditions. This "noble experiment" at once degraded the purchasing power of the dollar to its lowest ebb in history, from which it never recovered.

Whenever the price of gold soars it requires proportionately more dollars to purchase the same quantity of gold, and consequently even more for commodities and services, as profits are based on a percentage of cost.

Raising the price of gold to that exaggerated level was effective only in sharply reducing the gold contents, or intrinsic value, of the dollar, impairing its worth as a medium of exchange by reducing its purchasing power beyond justification. But the damage was done and will yet take considerable time to repair. The first stride in that direction would be to establish an equitable parity between gold and silver by raising the price of silver to its proper position, and considering the present price of gold, silver should command $1.25 per ounce, fixing a ratio of 1:28, a fair and proper proportion in value between the two metals.

Gold and silver are commodities and as such are subject to the economic law of supply and demand, but as these metals constitute the intrinsic value guaranteeing the paper money and notes of a nation, their price, purchase, and sale are regulated by national governments. Nevertheless, they still remain subject to economic law and not to the capriciousness of governments that have it in their power to regulate domestic currency, but may abuse this power to serve nationalistic interest by inflationary tactics, upsetting the economy of their country, and as economic influences are widespread, what

affects one nation, indubitably affects the community of nations.

It is for this reason that standards have been adopted by international agreements as well as to regulate commerce between nations and establish a parity in exchange that in turn would influence the stability of domestic currency: As a basis, in past agreements, what is called 900/1000 fine was adopted as a standard to fix the purity of gold and silver bullion for settlement of international balances and to be used in domestic coinage.

This constructed a double scale; in measuring the fineness of coin metal by the metric system and using troy weight to determine the purity of the same metals employed in the arts and industries.

These standards of the past, silver, bimetallism, and gold, have each in their turn failed in their purpose and have been forsaken, so today the world is without any definite standard of parity in international exchange.

Some norm that would be universally acceptable is essential, but one can only be implemented by a complete reappraisal and revision of the monetary system and raising the price of gold will not solve the problems confronting foreign exchange, as troy weight is universally employed in measuring precious metals, the metric system cannot be properly applied in fixing the fineness of gold and silver.

"Memorial Day, 1965, at Forest Lawn": Address by Brig. Gen. Howard E. Fuller, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day, May 30, 1965, it was my privilege to participate in the memorial service held at Forest Lawn Cemetery in Buffalo, N.Y. The principal address at this service, sponsored by several veterans groups of Erie County, was delivered by Brig. Gen. Howard E. Fuller, retired.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include General Fuller's address which follows:

MEMORIAL DAY, 1965, AT FOREST LAWN

Memorial Day is to me a kind of holy day. It is a day to stimulate and stir our thoughts and reflections—a day for reviewing the ideals and values that give meaning to our lives. This is the day for the living to honor the dead—here and in all the cemeteries and on the battlefields where they have shed their blood. They have given us a precious gift. We here honor those who gave their lives to preserve our freedom and the way of life we enjoy.

Over the years we have hoped that their sacrifices would have won a lasting peace. At the end of World War I we thought the world had been made safe for democracy. At the end of World War II we thought we could win the peace, but soon came the bitter conflict in Korea and we found there was no peace. And today with the bloody, dirty business in South Vietnam, with revolt and subversion in the Dominican Republic, with Cuba a Communist puppet on our doorstep spreading poison in South America, there is no peace.

On March 4, 1865, Abraham Lincoln spoke these words to be long remembered, "With malice toward none, with charity for all. With firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and his widow and orphans. To do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Lincoln's words are as important and meaningful today as when he spoke them 100 years ago. Democracy and freedom are threatened for many today—they now face the bitterest tests in many parts of the world.

We need to be strong and united more than ever before, and I believe our Government is following the only policy that it could possibly follow. If we do not win in South Vietnam, can anyone believe we shall not soon have a greater war on our hands? Let us now do everything we can to support our Government in our fight to protect weaker people against the aggressors.

Shortly after Theodore Roosevelt led the Rough Riders to victory up San Juan Hill, he said, "Above all let us not shrink from strife, provided we are certain that strife is justified."

Before sending his 3d Army into one of the war's bitterest actions, Gen. George S. Patton said to his troops, "Our basic plan of action is to advance and to keep on advancing regardless of whether we have to go over, under, or through the enemy. Remember that from here on out, until we win or die in the attempt, we will always be audacious, brave, and courageous."

In 1953 Gen. Dwight Eisenhower said, "We must be ready to dare all for our country. History does not long entrust the care of freedom to the weak or timid. We must acquire proficiency in defense and display stamina in purpose. We must be willing individually and as a nation to accept whatever sacrifices may be required of us. A people that values its privileges above its principles soon loses both. Whatever America hopes to bring to pass in the world must first come to pass in the heart of America."

The Communist rulers through their propaganda have tried to capitalize on love of peace and the horrors of war as a means of extending their rule over all the human race. They have tried to divert the people of the free world from taking the necessary measures for their adequate defense, and they have tried to create throughout the world a popular demand for peace at any price. The Communist leaders know that if pacifism and appeasement become a prevalent mood among the free people, then they can easily conquer the world. They strive to confront the free people with a choice between peace and surrender. If for any of the free people peace becomes the most important goal, then surrender will become inevitable. While modern war is becoming more and more terrible, so the consequences of retreat and surrender can be more and more terrible.

There is a great struggle going on in the world for the minds of men. This struggle will last for a generation and perhaps much longer. But this world of individual nations must not fall under the control of any one power or group of powers. And the world must not fall into the control of any one ideology. The dream of world domination by any one power must be shattered and proven to be a very empty dream.

There is no other course open to us than to keep America very, very strong.

We must grow ever stronger in our military might, stronger in the vitality of our economy, stronger in our national unity, stronger in our religious convictions, and in the strength of our ideals which proclaim the dignity of man and the value and sanctity of the individual.

Our honored dead have written much on the pages of history. They were equal to the demands of their time. Their sacrifice ought to furnish us with the needed courage and motivation to meet the great challenge we face in our time. We must strengthen and improve our democracy. Now it is for us to lead the way—it is for us to set the example. We need to have deep and abiding faith in our way of life, believing that God is at work in every situation.

There are too many about us who are not standing firmly behind the position our President and our Government have taken. American critics of the policy of our Government serve to encourage the Communists and to prolong the war in Vietnam or wherever we may be engaged in a struggle with them. Those who are soft on communism, who preach pacifism, and talk of appeasement, only serve to weaken us and make the enemy stronger. Walter Winchell recently had this to say: "The new left has the same tactics and objectives as the old Reds. The fact that they don't call themselves Communists isn't as important as the fact that they act anti-American. Castro didn't call himself a Communist until after he grabbed power." Some of the demonstrations we have seen lately and the teach-ins and other behavior on the part of leftwing groups are giving the enemy too much encouragement.

We must convince our enemies that the United States will stay in South Vietnam indefinitely and that we will protect the people of that nation no matter how long it takes—that all our people will firmly and with unity support our President, our Government, and our Armed Forces, with all our will and our strength. If we are united and strong, we will win. If we are divided and weakened, and they know we are weakened by disunity, they will be encouraged.

We are here today to honor our hero dead.
That from these honored dead we take increased devotion.
With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right.

There is so much each one of us can do to help strengthen and improve our democracy and our country. Our destiny is in our hands. We are the product of our thinking and our actions. We all have tremendous ability and power to influence others by our example and our actions, if we try hard enough. Let us not falter or fail in the strength of our purpose.

In the words of Edward Everett Hale, let each of us here and now resolve: "I am only one, but still I am one. I cannot do everything but still I can do something, and because I cannot do everything, I will not refuse or fail to do that something that I can do."

And in the words of General Patton: "We will always be audacious, brave, and courageous."

About a year ago we lost one of our greatest soldiers, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Two years before he died, when he was 82, he gave his last farewell to the cadets at West Point and spoke these words: " 'Duty, honor, country': Those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be. They are your rallying point to build courage when courage seems to fail, to regain faith when there seems to be little cause for faith, to create hope when hope becomes forlorn."

"Duty, honor, country." Can we think of any better words to live by?

The Real Alabama—Part VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in Alabama we are proud of our extensive system of transportation, and over the years our State citizens have put forth considerable effort to create and retain excellent transportation facilities. The New York Journal of Commerce on April 26 included an article regarding Alabama transportation in its special supplement devoted to development in the State.

The article follows:

TRANSPORTATION KEY TO GROWTH

A good transportation system is one of the keys to Alabama's spectacular industrial growth.

The State boasts a coordinated transportation system by land, sea, and air, offering industry speedy handling of freight to all parts of the Nation.

For example, 10 railroads link every industrial area in Alabama to almost every market across the country. Over 600 interstate truck carriers are certified to handle cargo over State highways. Five of the Nation's top airlines, United Air Lines, Delta Air Lines, Southern Air Lines, Eastern Air Lines, and National Air Lines, offer air transport in Alabama.

Railroads include Louisville & Nashville; Southern Railway; Atlantic Coast Line; St. Louis-San Francisco Railway; Central of Georgia, Illinois Central; Gulf, Mobile & Ohio; Seaboard Air Line; Tennessee, Alabama & Georgia; Western Railway of Alabama.

Trucks offer overnight service to all points in Alabama, second day service to New Orleans and St. Louis, third day service to Chicago, and New York with truckloads, and to Dallas, 4-day service with less than full truckloads.

RAILS BOOST INDUSTRY

Over the years, the railroads have worked with communities in Alabama to improve rail service as an industry lure. One excellent example of this is the 300-acre industrial site at Montgomery, purchased by L. & N. Initial development, including installation of access streets and utilities, has been made and industries are fast making commitments to purchase sites.

The railroads have also extended lead tracks to sites on their own property, and numerous pieces of real property adaptable for future plants have been purchased with an eye toward conversion into industrial sites.

At present, there are more than 4,700 miles of railway in the State, and more spur lines being built into industrial sites daily.

Annually the airlines handle over 500,000 passengers from the numerous commercial airports located at key cities, with feeders at some of the smaller ones.

Cargo handled by air has been mounting steadily as some manufacturers, seeking the fastest method of moving perishables, have taken to the air with their goods as never before.

CARGO ON RIVERS

Alabama is depending heavily on the established transportation service to help bring in new industry, but also is looking on another—water transportation by inland rivers, now really coming into its own—to present an even better picture for the State.

A few years ago, Alabama's low-draft rivers moved little more than cotton. Today, one sees anything from long steel tows to spacecraft bound downstream from the NASA site at Huntsville for the launching platforms at Cape Kennedy.

Engineers say that within the near future work going on at the river ports and deepening of the river channels up from the gulf, will enable the inland routes to carry anything that can be turned out in the Nation. Fourteen ports, all with transportation at their doors and new cargo-handling facilities, have been built by Alabama State Docks at important industrial sites leading inland from Mobile.

On the Chattahoochee River, Columbia, Eufaula, and Phenix City have been linked with foreign commerce through Mobile. The industrial plants at Montgomery are within easy reach of the Alabama River.

NEW TERMINALS

Birmingham and its mighty steel mills are not far off the Warrior River, as are Cordova and Tuscaloosa.

New terminals have also been built at Jackson and Demopolis on the Tombigbee River, and at Selma, on the Alabama River.

Because of the facilities built at these ports, industry has shown greater interest in locating nearby. This year alone, several millions worth of new plants will locate in their vicinity.

Already some of the bluebloods of the industrial world are located along the banks of Alabama's rivers, plants like Ford, Armour, Goodyear, Chemstrand, and Minnesota Mining, as well as the leading electronics firms supplying the NASA base at Huntsville.

"Diabolical Social Work"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable publicity recently about the feeling common among many mayors that the Office of Economic Opportunity, presently headed by Mr. Sargent Shriver, has been bypassing them. So much concern was expressed at the recent meeting of mayors in St. Louis, Mo., that a representative group of mayors yesterday visited Vice President HUMPHREY to discuss this problem. Apparently they were given some reassurance that local governments would not be bypassed by the OEO.

An editorial from the Paterson, N.J., News of June 5, 1965, discusses the difficulty which our mayors have been encountering:

"DIABOLICAL SOCIAL WORK"

Big city mayors have discovered a "most diabolical social work" in the insistence of the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity for a dominant role in the antipoverty program for the poor themselves. It has resulted in militantly active local antipoverty groups "trying to wreck local government by setting the poor against city hall."

This angry reaction of city administrators was led by Mayors John F. Shelley, of San Francisco, and Samuel W. Yorty, of Los Angeles, both Democrats. They drew a resolution that would have put the United Conference of Mayors behind their charges that the antipoverty campaign was fostering class struggle against city government. They were supported by Mayors William F. Walsh, of Syracuse, and Herman W. Goldner, of St. Petersburg, Republicans, and Merle E. Allen, of Ogden, Utah, Democrat.

However, for fear they would be labeled as "against the poor," the conference resolved the issue by appointing a committee to lay their charges before Vice President HUMPHREY, President Johnson's liaison with mayors on poverty and civil rights matters. This way they hoped to avoid the political pitfalls that might aline the poor against them at the polls.

There is considerable evidence that the antipoverty program was seized upon by political adventurers as a base of operation for their own purposes. In large cities, the charge was made and not refuted that Communists infiltrated it. Putting the poor in charge raised the question whether it was a case of the blind leading the blind.

There is no question that the antipoverty program is full of political innuendos as well as opportunity. Like the WPA of other days, it can create a potent political machine. The mayors may yell, but the chances are the poor will get the reins. They are more amenable to Federal direction.

Vietnam and Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, there are many theories and there have been volumes of writings and months of discussion on our Vietnam posture and our part in American-Asian geopolitics generally.

An excellent article from volume No. 1 of the Suffolk Almanac, a conservative digest, is worthy of consideration of the Members of the House.

The article follows:

ACT I—CHINA

"Our relationship with China since the end of the Second World War has been a tragic one, and it is of the utmost importance that we search out and spotlight those who must bear the responsibility for our present predicament. * * * It was clearly enunciated that the independence of China and the stability of the National Government was the fundamental object of our Far Eastern policy. That this and other statements of our policies in the Far East led directly to the attack on Pearl Harbor is well known. * * * During the (post war) period began the great split in the minds of our diplomats over whether to support the government of Chiang Kai-shek, or force him as the price of our assistance to bring Chinese Communists into his government to form a coalition. * * * Our policy in China has reaped the whirlwind. The continued insistence that aid would not be forthcoming unless a coalition government with the Communists was formed, was a crippling blow to the National Government. So concerned were our diplomats and their advisers, the Lattimores and the Fairbanks, with the imperfections of the diplomatic system in China after 20 years of war, and the tales of corruption in high places, that they lost sight of our tremendous stake in a non-Communist China. * * * This is the tragic story of China whose freedom we once fought

to preserve. What our young men had saved, our diplomats and our President have frittered away."—John F. Kennedy, Salem, Mass., January 30, 1949.

ACT II—LAOS AND CAMBODIA

After the French debacle in Indochina, our diplomats cooperated at Geneva (1954) to partition the area and eventually, in 1962, Ambassador Harriman insisted upon a government including the Communists for shattered Laos. The 1962 agreement was approved by President Kennedy.

ACT III—VIETNAM 1965

In 1954, the French left Vietnam after suffering a humiliating defeat at Dienbienphu. Unless there is a sharp change in U.S. policy, another "Dienbienphu"—whether military or diplomatic—is in the making. For too long we have deluded ourselves with the belief that time is on our side. The course of events in Vietnam over the past 10 years culminating with the present crisis there, should convince us otherwise.

The predicament in which we find ourselves in Vietnam can be attributed to three major causes: (1) the 1962 negotiated settlement (read surrender) in Laos (2) the leadership vacuum created by the murder of Diem, and (3) the continued refusal of the past three American administrations to heed our military leader's advice to cut the Vietcong's supply lines.

(1) The Kennedy administration's failure to support the anti-Communist forces in Laos opened the door to stepped-up Communist activity in South Vietnam. The Lao agreement permitted the Communists to develop an uninterrupted supply line from their sanctuary in North Vietnam, through the jungle trails of Laos, and into anti-Communist South Vietnam. Since 1962, the flow of well-trained Communist guerrillas and materiel has intensified. Secretary McNamara testified to that during several TV press conferences in February. Perhaps of equal importance, was the adverse psychological impact the Lao agreement had on the South Vietnamese.

(2) Political instability in South Vietnam has reached farcical proportions during the past few months. It is now apparent that the American news media badly misjudged the Buddhist opposition to the murdered president Diem, a Catholic. Rather than a religious feud, it was primarily a power struggle with Diem's political opponents using the cloak of religion to gain control. That famous dull New York newspaper added another inglorious chapter to its record. Remember the agrarian reformers in China, and the bearded Robin Hood in Cuba? Add to that crowd the peace-loving Buddhist leaders of South Vietnam. And you can bet, there will be more.

Now mark this: Diem was an imperfect leader, as most leaders are. But he recognized the need for strong leadership in his troubled country, and he exercised that leadership far better than any of his successors. Until we had someone better, we should have supported him. If we did not recognize that fact in late 1963, certainly in retrospect we must see it plainly now.

Some influential people in the United States screamed for Diem to institute sweeping reforms. Ironically, it was precisely those reforms—political, economic, and social—which brought about an intensified effort by the Vietcong to undermine his legally elected government. Now Diem is gone from the scene, the Communists have created an environment of disorder, and no reforms are in sight.

(3) From the very start, American military advisers advocated a program which would deny the Vietcong a privileged sanctuary in the north. The lessons of the Korean war and the Manchurian sanctuary were all too fresh in their minds. Recent uncovering of large caches of military supplies proves that the Vietcong are dependent on outside sources. The heavy attacks by the Communists in recent months indicate that those supplies are being put to use. In order to defeat the Vietcong guerrilla forces, their logistical support must be interdicted. This was proven in the successful anti-Communist wars in Malaya and the Philippines. The February and March air strikes on North Vietnamese supply depots were cases of the right action at the wrong time. This policy should have begun at least 2 years ago. It was then that the Vietcong, in effect, "declared" war on the Republic of South Vietnam. As retired Air Force Chief Curtis LeMay so aptly put it: "Don't swat the flies. Go after the manure pile."

This suggestion presupposes that our goal in South Vietnam is victory over the Communist forces. That is the crux of the problem. Until we make that determination, there isn't the slightest possibility of bringing the war to a successful conclusion.

An American defeat in South Vietnam would be disastrous. It makes no difference what form that defeat takes—outright withdrawal, "neutralization," or a United Nations-supervised "peace." The editors of Orbis recently wrote that a U.S. defeat would "* * * dwarf the French debacle of just 10 years ago." The sequence of events can easily be foretold. Within a short space of time, all of southeast Asia would be lost to the Communists. But more important than that, a defeat in South Vietnam could easily destroy what little unity of purpose the free world has remaining in the worldwide struggle against communism. No comfort would be gained in the knowledge that "we told you so."

This, Too, Happened in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to believe that the incredible crime reported in the Washington newspapers over the weekend could actually happen. Who among us, can bring himself to believe that more than 40 people crowded into a bus could watch a woman beaten and robbed without lifting a finger in her defense? Who could believe that their only reaction was to become impatient with her when her assailant knocked her down and she fell against them? Who could believe that the driver of the bus was more concerned with keeping his schedule than in moving as rapidly as possible to get police aid for the victim?

Yet, according to the newspapers, this is exactly what happened. I ask you, as Representatives of the people of the United States, what are we going to do to bring an end to the lawlessness which is gripping Washington?

The news story of the incredible episode as it was reported in the June 6 issue of the Washington Sunday Star is included as a part of these remarks:

WOMAN BEATEN AND ROBBED ON BUS AS RIDERS LOOK ON

If it weren't for the cuts, the bruises and the missing $59, Anne Doreen Weary would find it hard to believe it really happened.

Mrs. Weary, 24, was beaten, kicked and robbed on a D.C. Transit bus Friday afternoon. Not only did none of the 40 passengers make a move to help her, but the ones nearest to her complained bitterly when she was pushed onto their laps by the youth who attacked her, she said.

The driver, she told police, stopped the bus when she started screaming and pushed the attacker off the bus—even though Mrs. Weary said she told the driver the man had her wallet.

The driver let her off across from the 11th precinct, about 20 minutes after the incident.

It wasn't until she stumbled, dazed and bleeding, into the station that Mrs. Weary finally found someone who sympathized with her plight, she said.

POLICEMEN SHOCKED

"The policemen were very nice," she recalled yesterday. "They were shocked when I came in. They thought I had been hit by a car."

The attack occurred about 3:30 p.m., shortly after Mrs. Weary had boarded a No. 94 bus at Seventh Street and Florida Avenue NW.

Usually, she said, a friend drives her from the Silver Spring Bakery where they work to Eighth and H Streets NE., where she catches a bus to her home at 3310 Croffut Place SE.

But Friday the friend was going shopping downtown, so Mrs. Weary had no ride.

She no sooner had taken her standee position at the rear of the bus when a youth about 17 or 18 began jolting her, she said.

"I said to him, 'Are you crazy?' " Mrs. Weary recalled, and she turned her back on the youth. At that point, she said, he began beating and kicking her, and grabbed her handbag.

CONTAINED HER PAY

"He broke the handle and broke open the clasp and grabbed my wallet," she said. The wallet contained $59, as she had just cashed her paycheck in Silver Spring.

"He pushed me onto the people that were sitting down, and they just kept saying, 'Get off of me, get off of me,' " Mrs. Weary said. "No one tried to help me.

"Then the bus driver stopped and he came back and pushed past me. He didn't ask me what was wrong, or was I hurt, he just pushed that bum off the bus," she said.

"I started hollering, 'He's got my wallet.' but the driver just ignored me. He just went back up front.

"TYPICAL AMERICANS

"As soon as the man was off the bus, everyone began hollering about what they should have done. Typical Americans."

The police drove Mrs. Weary home in a squad car, and she spent the day yesterday nursing her bruises—and her shattered faith in mankind.

The driver, James E. Ford, 1100 block 48th Street NE., disputed Mrs. Weary's account of the incident. He said he thought there was merely a fight at the rear of the bus, and told police that when he got back there "it seemed to have calmed down."

Several people go off the bus then, he said, and he could not catch the man Mrs. Weary said had hit her. Although he admitted having seen the contents of her bag on the floor, Ford told police he did not know a robbery had been committed until several blocks later when Mrs. Weary came up to the front of the bus.

Inspector John L. Sullivan said the driver "used extremely poor judgment" in not driving immediately to the nearest police station when he was informed that a felony had been committed. Sullivan noted that the bus passed only three blocks from the ninth precinct.

Also, Sullivan said, he finds it difficult to believe that at rush hour the driver could not have spotted a policeman to inform of the espisode.

The driver told police he saw "no useful purpose" in leaving his route to go to the police station, and said he advised Mrs.

Weary to make a report on the incident when they arrived at a precinct station.

The 11th precinct, where Mrs. Weary finally reported the incident, is several miles from the scene of the beating and robbery.

The Present, Seen From the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to see another Maine newspaper give support to the President's foreign policy. The following is an editorial from the May 8 edition of the Bangor, Maine, Daily News:

THE PRESENT, SEEN FROM THE PAST

Americans were dancing in the streets 20 years ago.

Hitler and nazism had been destroyed. Japan's defeat was assured.

Peace was at hand and would stay. Victors and vanquished would work together to make a better world in which there would be no war, no oppression.

It was a beautiful picture—but utterly false. The trustful West agreed to the partition of Germany and the isolation of Berlin within what was to become Communist East Germany. Communism was allowed to take over the China mainland, driving out Chiang Kai-shek. U.S. military forces were rapidly demobilized.

Then things began to happen. Joseph Stalin gave the West a bad time in Berlin. Then came Korea, in which 34,000 American GI's died to salvage a stalemate against Communist aggression. Soviet tanks and guns crushed the Hungarian freedom revolt.

Communism continues to stab at the free world. It wants South Vietnam and all of southeast Asia. It is astir in Africa and Latin America. Cuba has become a Communist outpost. The Dominican Republic is a second Caribbean plum the Communists would like to seize.

President Johnson, thankfully, has chosen to take a tough stand against the latest machinations of Moscow and Peiping. He knows peaceful solutions are not made upon the battlefield. But he also knows that retreat only invites fresh aggression and can lead only to ultimate defeat.

As for those who are calling for U.S. withdrawal from South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, U.S. Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington has a good answer. Discussing the lessons of history before an audience of Boston College students this week, he said:

"It is not a pleasant fact to recall, but the truth is that the peace movement of the thirties helped to bring on World War II, not prevent it. It is a fact that the well-intentioned advocates of immediate withdrawal of our Armed Forces should ponder."

The Munich of the thirties which was to assure peace in our time lead, instead, to a war which would never have been fought if the West had kept its powder dry and slapped Hitler down before he could set forth upon his insane campaign of conquest.

Tyranny, by whatever name it may be called, has existed throughout human history, and human nature has not changed. Freedom must either resist or surrender to it.

The last 20 years have taught afresh a lesson that should never have been forgotten.

One Year of Action for Bridgeport Community Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in Bridgeport, Conn., a comprehensive human renewal program has been initiated by the founding of Action for Bridgeport Community Development. ABCD is coordinating the various facets of Bridgeport's fight against poverty and its enveloping cycle.

Time today is one of our greatest challenges. The war on poverty is a race against time—the time of human losses, human despair, and the depressing and tightening grip of poverty. Bridgeport through ABCD has taken up time's challenge; this is reflected in the progress ABCD has made during its first short, but fruitful, year of operation.

ABCD is coordinating not only the many facilities but also the many individual ideas and programs which alone could not thrive. Such an organization is severely needed in our endeavors to meet the problems at the neighborhood level. For instance, it can give support to the small tenant association by being a link with the rest of the city. The poor are not the only persons involved. Every individual in the community is faced with this problem. Thus, all must actively meet the challenge.

Poverty affects every aspect of a man's being. So, we are compelled to attack at once all the impinging elements of poverty. Too often, because comprehension of the complexities extend beyond man's rationality, we are inclined to work with only one facet at a time. This is an easier course, but a far less successful one.

ABCD has done an important job in this respect by including the economic portion of man's existence. The Bridgeport area business-labor-private community has pledged to finance 5 percent of ABCD's efforts. This is only a tangible reflection of the more important pervasive contribution they will be making in this human renewal program.

An address was made to the Bridgeport Area Chamber of Commerce by William Hart, chairman of ABCD. On May 17, he described to the business leaders of the Bridgeport community the progress ABCD has made in its first year. I should like to bring my colleague's attention to this report on the problems and progress in "One Year of Action for Bridgeport Community Development."

ONE YEAR OF ACTION FOR BRIDGEPORT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

(By William S. Hart)

Teachers who supervised a hot lunch program in an elementary school in Washington, D.C., noticed that one of their charges, a little Negro boy, disappeared every day a few minutes after the lunch hour began. But because he always returned in time for class, they made no issue of it. But one day last week he did not return. When teachers inquired they discovered that each day when the hot lunch was served, he had been running home as fast as his legs would carry him, to share his lunch with his younger sister—while the mother was at work. On the day he did not return he had been run over by a truck as he ran back to school.

In one of the national Job Corps centers instructors noticed that one young man from a city slum retreated from the group every chance he could get and went off in some corner by himself. When they finally inquired into his behavior, they found the young man didn't have a sound tooth in his head. His teeth ached all the time and he had been afraid to confess the fact for fear of being discharged from the Job Corps, which 250,000 young people are storming to get in to learn to be somebody.

In Bridgeport last week a woman, living in public houisng, the mother of three children under five, was taken to the hospital for a major operation. A week ago she lost her fourth child. Two weeks ago her husband, aged 28, was killed in an auto accident.

These are not the most dramatic stories one might unearth—but multiply stories like these several million times and the face of poverty in America begins to emerge.

Let me quote: "Not for a moment should the problem of poverty in America be underestimated. * * * Poverty is significant enough to make its alleviation a prime social and national goal."

Those are not the words of a social reformer, professional do-gooder or politician. Those words introduced a report made 2 weeks ago by the Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity, a group of more than 100 leaders of industry, business, and finance brought together by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to make an independent, constructive examination of the poverty problem.

This report emphasizes that the problem of poverty is a problem involving particular persons, families and groups, and that its solution requires priority be given to human resource development programs that "provide people with the help and opportunities to move out of poverty and become productive citizens."

There is nothing new about this discovery. All over our country community action groups have been springing up in awareness of this problem. But it is heartening to have this kind of public confirmation that Action for Bridgeport Community Development, which was midwifed just about a year ago by the Bridgeport Community Council with a strong assist from the Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce, has been on the right track. All of ABCD's labors since birth have been directed toward this priority. On your luncheon tables today you have extracts from ABCD's charter which illustrate, we trust, the comprehensive nature of ABCD's goals and objectives and its ambitious purpose to improve the character of the total environment of Greater Bridgeport. These are objectives of which we have not lost sight, but our priorities have been dictated by the most obvious and compelling needs.

In Bridgeport today 10,000 people receive their sole support from some public welfare program. Seven thousand are unemployed because they lack either the skills or the motivation to accept jobs which go begging. Sixty-five percent of the adult population did not finish high school and 25,000 failed to complete elementary school. Four hundred youngsters drop out of school each year. These figures do make up a prognosis of community health.

Let me hasten to add that neither the problems these figures imply, nor any of the whole gamut of social problems which affect our city have gone totally unattended. The professionals of many private and public agencies and many dedicated individuals have been working conscientiously to do

what they could to alleviate them. But it was, in part, the sheer frustration of these citizens, who saw community problems accelerating faster than solutions, which brought ABCD into being. They invested in ABCD the hope that it could generate the necessary resources of manpower and money, that it could help coordinate already existing efforts, eliminate wasteful duplications and take other necessary action to make the assault on community social problems more effective.

I wish we could say to you at this time that any of us who have served with the Steering Committee of ABCD since its inception are satisfied with the progress we have made toward the alleviation of these problems or the achievement of ultimate goals. But, if results could be shown in proportion to the dedication of the members of this committee throughout this past year, and the hours of arduous work they have invested, Bridgeport would, right now, be on the threshold of a new day.

Although ABCD's steering committee has been expanded to 30 persons from its original 15, every member of the original committee is still with us despite incredible impositions on their time and energies. They have been faithful to their charge in the highest sense and deserve the community's genuine gratitude.

But the requisites and dynamics of community action being what they are, we have to confess we are still only at the beginning; but now it is, at least, a promising beginning.

I wish it were possible to cite all the members of this committee and others who in the course of the year have contributed to ABCD's effort.

But I would be very remiss if I did not acknowledge the debt we owe to Dick O'Connor, executive director of the united fund, who was ABCD's faithful pediatrician, attending us through all our childhood ailments, and who held our hands as we learned to walk.

And to Parker Lansdale, who came in as our temporary executive director in November and taught us to run—and has us still panting for breath.

And to Herb Harris, who came as our first full-time staff member and deputy director 2 months ago and has made a tremendous contribution in that short period.

And to Vice Chairmen Bernard Green and Bill Fitzpatrick who have carried large shares of our volunteer burden.

Officially, I suppose, ABCD was born last June. The summer months were principally involved with organization, self-education, and orientation. In October we were incorporated. In November we contracted for the services of Parker Lansdale. In December we received a community action grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In January we determined that our first line of attack should be in six pocket-of-poverty neighborhoods of our city. For some weeks now we have had six professionals borrowed from private agencies in the city, at work in each of these areas seeking to arrive, from firsthand experience with the people in those neighborhoods, at a consensus of their special needs. What they have discovered has served to confirm or help us interpret what a statistical study of the population complexion of those same neighborhoods made for us by the Greater Bridgeport Regional Planning Agency seemed to be telling us.

As a result of this study, the personal experiences of workers and studies performed by the school department and others, we have in Washington at this time, applications for funding, under the antipoverty program, for a dozen or so programs addressed to our community's need. Our applications are for over $1,300,000. The formulas by which poverty fund moneys are distributed will probably limit us to less than half that amount. But the thorough work of Parker Landsdale and Herb Harris, in preparing and documenting our proposals has received such general approbation in Government quarters that we are at least hopeful for more.

Depending on the size and nature of the grants we receive (and we expect grants within the month) some of the following programs will begin this summer:

1. Project Head Start: A project designed to prepare about 600 prekindergarten and prefirst grade children for successful school careers, by helping compensate for the handicaps of their environment, their speech, sight, language, and hearing handicaps; by developing parental understanding of these handicaps; by improving their muscular coordination and general health; and by instilling a spirit of enthusiasm for entry into school this fall.

The public and parochial schools are working closely together in this venture, which was prepared by Assistant Superintendent Les Silverstone and Monsignor John J. McGough for the diocese.

2. Neighborhood youth corps: Barring unforeseen difficulties we will have two such corps operating in Bridgeport this summer, employing 431 youths between the ages of 16 and 21 from low-income families, who would otherwise be unemployed and spending an aimless summer. Many of these young people will be working under the supervision of the department of parks and recreation. Some will work as greenskeepers, assistant gardeners and so on, others as recreational junior leaders. Some will get experience in painting or carpentry. Goodwill Industries will enroll 10 young men to learn to service automobiles and trucks. Hall Neighborhood House will enroll 10 young men and 5 young women as special aids to handle groups of underprivileged children in a playground setting. The Archbishop Shehan Center, the board of education, the Boys' Club of Bridgeport, the YMCA, and the YWCA will employ others in similar programs. In every case supervision, which will help instill good work habits and a sense of responsibility in these youngsters, is a prerequisite.

3. ABCD has been cooperating with the school department and the State department of education to establish in Bridgeport this summer a vocational opportunity center, a project designed to meet needs not now being met by traditional methods in the vocational training schools or by any other program now available under the auspices of either State or Federal Governments. This center will provide specialized and personalized skill training for Bridgeport's school dropouts, while at the same time helping to correct their inadequacies in reading and arithmetic, and seeking to motivate them toward pride in their work and in themselves.

4. Still other projects which ABCD will seek to fund and help implement are:

(a) A study and recreation program at the University of Fairfield for youngsters from underprivileged backgrounds.

(b) A tenant relations program in the public housing areas.

(c) A program in cooperation with the Bridgeport Bar Association designed to provide legal services to the poor.

(d) A small business development program, providing the volunteer counsel of local business leaders, and, Government-backed loans under the Small Business Administration for persons who do not qualify under normal loan procedures.

(e) A free summer school program in the six target areas of Bridgeport.

(f) A center for human resources development and services at the University of Bridgeport.

(g) An oral communications and dramatics program for the target neighborhoods.

Time does not allow me to give you more than a hint of the content of these programs. I have simply named most of them as evidence that ABCD has not been idle.

They do give credence, I think, to the statement we have made a good beginning. If not for the promise they hold of exerting a wholesome influence on the life of Bridgeport, for the evidence of the numbers of people from every walk of life in this area who have been involved in bringing us this far.

For they have involved public agencies of city, State, and Nation. They have involved the professionals and boards of many of the cities' private agencies. They have involved businessmen and labor leaders, educators, lawyers, and bankers; Negro and white; Catholic, Protestant, Jew, and, yes, Muslim; Republican and Democrat.

One of the hypotheses of the ABCD program when it was given birth last year was that no community action program of any real moment could be born unless most of us in this community were willing to transcend parochial and partisan loyalties to work together. Consequently, one of the major thrusts during the year has been to obtain the involvement of the total community.

We have worked hard to encourage this involvement, as we have worked hard to obtain a consensus of community need.

To a healthy and promising degree, I believe, we have both. And on Thursday of this week at the University of Bridgeport still another opportunity will be presented the citizens of this community to express their views regarding the directions ABCD should take, when we meet in day-long convocation for that very purpose.

I am told that we already have 350 people registered for this event, and this is a measure again that the objectives of ABCD are not being taken lightly by the community.

All this is not to say that the path of ABCD has been a bed of roses. We have met with some open hostility and some passivity. This was to be expected and is still to be expected. First, because ever since Adam turned to Eve in the Garden of Eden and said, "You know, Eve, we're living in a changing world," some men have resisted change. There are those among us still who can't quite understand why history cannot be repealed, and who think that if the proper scapegoats can be found to accept blame for the revolutionary character of our modern world, all will be right again.

In the second place it is always dangerous to a community's stability to offer hope to people who have taught themselves to live without it. As an associate of mine has put it, "Lifting the lid of social pressure is like taking the cap off an overheated radiator: You must expect steam to escape."

So we have had steam, but we have also had the infinite patience, labor, and an incredible amount of good will from those who are earnestly concerned for the well-being of this community.

We have had a good share of concerned commitment, but we need more, especially from the business community.

Where community action programs have been successful across the country, they have had the consistent commitment of the power group in that community. There are some communities in America today where business and industrial leaders do not constitute the power group. But in this community power rests with industrial and business leadership to an extraordinary degree.

There is, of course, little doubt that the chief social service of the businessman is still in providing good jobs, good products, a healthy economy, and all of its implied benefits.

But businessmen in our Nation have, almost since our national beginnings, been accorded an elite status the like of which no other nation or civilization has accorded them. But from the beginning also they have been expected to ally themselves with

the national purpose or the American dream or whatever other names, in the process of our history, have been used to identify the pursuit of our national values and ideals.

For the most part, in peace and in war, they have responded responsibly to expectations. On some occasions when they have subordinated the national purpose to their own selfish purposes, they have been roundly chastised. But the record is undeniable that business leadership in America has played an extraordinary role not only in manufacturing its wealth, but in shaping its institutions.

Precisely because he has played such an important role in both, more is demanded of him today than ever before. We know that social and political concerns impinge upon how a man operates his business to an evermore pressing degree. We know that how a man operates his business also influences social and political considerations. We know that the private interest and the public interest no longer exist in compartments hermetically sealed against each other. All these facts dictate the involvement of business leaders in the social and political arenas. But beyond all this his involvement is dictated by the fact that our society casts him in the role of community leader and social architect.

Our free enterprise economy can rarely be assailed on the ground that it is inefficient or unproductive. With all its defects, it remains the most effective and most humane system for producing and distributing goods in the annals of mankind.

The most dangerous attack on free enterprise, an attack which could be fatal, is not that it is inefficient, but that it is cynical or uncaring, that it lacks the enlightened self-interest to see that the fundamental threat to free enterprise is not economic, but psychological and is to be found in the loss of belief and confidence in it. It is the erosion from this source that we must now face and stare down.

In the Greater Bridgeport region, ABCD is the made-to-order instrumentality which enables business leaders to demonstrate in practical day-by-day activity that they are where they should be; namely, in the forefront of those who comprise the community of the concerned.

It is the vehicle, by means of which, business leaders can show they mean what they say about the advantages of local initiative and local knowledge in meeting local needs in the fields of ABCD's concentration, that is: employment, education, housing, social services, health, and recreation.

To any here who may still have reservations about the purposes of community action efforts, I can only inquire: What is your viable alternative? No one any longer seriously thinks that the problems which afflict our cities are going to yield to drift or laissez faire. At least no one who confronts the facts that within the next 15 years 30 million people will be added to our American cities, and in less than 40 years the urban population of this country will double and we will have to build as much as we have built since the first colonists arrived on these shores.

But the social needs which will only be accelerated by such a population influx, are already here in large measure. They are evermore urgent and visible. They can be denied, and I say this advisedly, only at the risk of violence in the streets.

If we as businessmen, as a leadership group in the community, fail to do our share to meet those needs in a positive spirit, then by default it must be the government which will meet these needs exclusively, thereby extending government intervention into local decisionmaking by that much more.

Dr. Carl H. Madden, Director of Economic Research of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in a recent address on "The Economics of the Great Society" described the business community as "standing at the crossroads" and added:

"The Great Society will be built. It may be a free society, and so a truly great society, or it may be a repressive society, great in name only. As citizens, businessmen, I think, have two choices. They can either be passive and led or active as leaders.

"Business can provide and help to build the truly great society, or it can continue to focus simply on economic advancement, on generating additions to the national economic pie, which will be used to finance whatever the administration's Great Society may become.

"As a citizen first, and an economist second, I profoundly hope that the business community will choose the active role."

And may I add, as a citizen first and a businessman second, so do I.

And one very good reason is this. Apart from an initial grant of $8,000 from the united fund and community council, the total income of ABCD to date has been from its initial planning grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity. We have no other resources immediately in sight. But the Economic Opportunity Act is too limited in scope and size to do the total job of dealing with poverty, much less embrace the varied and comprehensive goals to which ABCD has addressed itself. If the job in Bridgeport needs doing, and we are really to do, all sorts of private efforts and commitments must be added to anything Government does for us.

In the next fiscal year it is likely that ABCD, an agent for poverty fund moneys in this community, will channel between $500,000 and $700,000 through its treasury.

Already, as you know, in some communities there is criticism of salaries being paid poverty fund executives, although the kind of person who possesses all of the qualities to promise significant performances in community action programs comes from a rare breed, requiring, as I see it, the virtues of a saint, the courage of a martyr and the wisdom of Solomon. The Office of Economic Opportunity is already scaling down salary requests in their grant allocations. The next public criticism, of course, will be, that we haven't hired competent people.

To enable us to supplement salaries, to enable ABCD to attract and retain the kind of people it must have, people who have both high dedication and high competence and who can work with leadership personnel in business, in government, in labor, in the church, in communications and other areas, we would like to ask the business community to become 5 percenters in the financing of ABCD efforts. This would not only provide half of the 10 percent requirement by which the communities qualify for Federal grants, but would be a symbol of business' commitment to the proposition of accepting local responsibility.

If you are doing mathematics in your head what, we are talking about is a commitment of about $35,000 per year for 2 years.

So important is this effort to this community I would have no hesitation to ask for far larger sums, did I not know that many businesses are substantially committed to the capital interests of this community.

We are heartened, however, to anticipate a favorable response by the fact that one Bridgeport employer, with 60 persons on his payroll has already given $600 to ABCD's purposes.

It is no little burden to present a talk like this to such an important group, because one feels he is talking not merely in terms of dollars or programs and principles. One feels he is bespeaking the future welfare of hundreds of little boys and girls, and numbers of adults to whom, for all our affluence, society is still unjust. And one feels that if his sales pitch is inadequate the response to their needs will continue to be inadequate.

If, of course, you feel that Bridgeport is all right just as it is, that its sores will heal themselves, that none of their infection will cross boundary lines into the suburbs, that beyond the problems of poverty Bridgeport has no cultural or aesthetic or educational defects, there is no need for your commitment.

If you feel that George can handle the whole problem, please identify George.

But if you feel, as I'm sure most of you do, that we cannot in conscience allow this old industrial city, whose population composition is a microcosm of the Nation, to become a symbol of civic lassitude, the commitment you give ABCD's efforts will mean a great surge of vitality and extra promise to its efforts.

It is even conceivable that future generations may thank you for your stewardship and your vision.

An Arizona City Is Born

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, nowhere is the pioneer spirit more evident than in my home State of Arizona. Although the raw frontier has largely been tamed, there are still new horizons to be crossed. As recently as the 1940's, Arizona gave birth to a new community—a rugged construction town in colorful Mohave County.

My good friend, Mrs. Billie Ann Fancher, has written a brief but interesting account of that birth and the subsequent naming of the community. The story was carried in the Mohave Miner, one of the finest weekly newspapers in the Nation. I commend to my colleagues this further evidence of Arizona's great vigor and growth:

HOW DID BULLHEAD CITY GET ITS NAME?

This recreational-retirement community which includes Lake Mohave, Davis Dam and the valley below Bullhead City with its number of riverfront homes and subdivisions, and farm areas is growing steadily. In 1960 the year population was a total of 1,000 today that number is tripled, total is 3,400.

Bullhead City was born a construction town in the 1940's when the construction began on the $77 million Davis Dam project. The town which sprang up to support the workers at the large dam was named Bulls Head named for a rock shaped like a sleeping bull's head at the damsite. When the rising waters of Lake Mohave came up and drowned the bull, the name was changed to Bullhead City by post office officials. Davis Dam was completed in 1953. The construction workers moved on to other projects, slowly at first resorts and trailer parks began to take their place.

As Lake Mohave backed up behind Davis Dam, fishermen, and water sport enthusiasts were attracted in ever growing numbers. Local businessmen realized the resort potential and lots along the river were quickly purchased.

Summer cabins, homes, then trailer parks, motels sprung up along the Lake Shore and river bank. Planned communities started forming in the lovely valley below Bullhead City.

Bullhead City today thrives on a brisk tourist business which increases annually.

Permanent population alone exceeds the number residing here during the construction of Davis Dam at its peak.

This number then triples on weekends and holiday weekends and during the winter months. A total of 12 new businesses since the first of 1965. Plans are now in process of being prepared for both a city sewage system and a community hospital, for the entire Colorado River area.

Respectfully submitted for your pleasure,

BILLIE ANN FANCHER.

One Day's Crime Record in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, violence, robbery, murder, rape, continues to inflict ugly scars daily on the Nation's Capital City. Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I will include the stories of crime from just today's issue of the Washington Post. They include one murder, a hijacking, the robbery of a bus driver, a holdup of a liquor store and an attempted purse snatching.

These daily acts keep the people of the city in fear of their lives. While the Great Society advocates ask for millions of dollars to build cultural centers and plan art exhibits and musical events, the citizens of Washington and the tourists must go in groups to any nighttime event.

Nowhere in my State of Alabama is there such a shameful record. No city in Alabama is so crime-ridden, nor are any people in Alabama subjected to such terror, such brutality at the hands of thugs, brutes and those who glory in the law of the jungle. Yet, in this city where many of the Nation's leading clergymen live and have their offices, not a word is said by them about this shame. Many of the clergymen who went to Selma and who continue to villify the people of Alabama and the South are absolutely silent about the violence in the streets of Washington and the violation of the right of all the people to live free from fear. No sermons are preached against the lawless element in Washington. No prayers are said for the victims often left bleeding and dying in the streets after being gouged and kicked by hoodlums just for the fun of it.

Mr. Speaker, the rising rate of violent crime in the Nation's Capital and other metropolitan areas must be our concern. It must be the concern of all the people. We dare not continue to allow this lawlessness and excuse it with some sociological argument or by weeping for the criminal instead of the victim.

If our present laws are not tough enough to put an end to this criminal tide, let us strengthen them. If our judges are too timid or too weak to deal with these criminals, let us change them. It is time for Congress to let it be known that the laws of the land must be obeyed and that the forces of law and order will not longer be held in leash while the vicious brutalize innocent citizens. Let us restore respect for our police departments and back them in their efforts to protect us rather than, as too many Members of Congress often do, join the mob in hurling insults and downgrading police officers whom we are asking to risk their lives in defense of law and order.

I ask you to read carefully the record of one day's crime in Washington and then ask yourselves if you have contributed to it through indifference and apathy.

The articles from the Washington Post of June 8, 1965, follow:

PHONE BOOTH FIGHT ENDS IN SLAYING

Kemp Davis, Jr., 56, whose last known address was 2246 12th Place NW., was stabbed to death in a fight outside a telephone booth in the 1300 block of Belmont Street NW., early yesterday, police reported.

Detectives later arrested Amos Eugene Craig, Jr., 20, listed at 1355 Park Road NW., and charged him with homicide. Craig was arraigned before U.S. Commissioner Sam Wertleb and was held in $2,000 bond.

Homicide Squad Lt. Arthur Weber said investigation indicated that Davis and Edward Arnold, 18, of 1350 Clifton Street NW., were walking on Belmont Street when they saw a man sleeping in the telephone booth and tried to pull him out to save him trouble with the police. A fight ensued, and Davis was stabbed in the chest, Weber said, The victim was dead on arrival at Washington Hospital Center.

CHASE NABS THREE SUSPECTED OF HIJACKING

(By Richard Homan)

Three suspected whisky hijackers were injured early yesterday when their truck crashed into an embankment on Kenilworth Avenue after a chase in which more than 15 shots were exchanged, Prince Georges County Police reported.

None of the three was injured seriously and the shots hit nobody.

Connie Wilkins, Jr., 37, listed at 1009 7th Street NE., Eugene M. Jones, 31, 7 18th Street SE., and James W. Kelly, 34, listed at 5109 Mann Street, Deanewood Park, were charged with breaking and entering. Jones also was charged with assault with intent to kill.

Det. Lt. Richard A. Pearson said the chase began when a man stopped Patrolman Robert M. Gross. He pointed out a truck and said its occupants had been taking whisky from another truck parked at Interstate Systems, Inc., 5470 Lafayette Road, Edmonston.

When Gross attempted to stop the truck the driver stepped on the gas and an occupant of the truck began shooting. The chase wound through Fletcher's Field to Riverdale Road as Gross radioed for help. Pvt. James Harden tried to stop the truck near Kenilworth Avenue and also was shot at.

On Kenilworth near the Washington line, the truck hit a construction barricade, crossed the median strip, brushed an oncoming car and crashed, police said. They reported five cases of whisky were found in the truck.

The occupants were treated at Prince Georges Hospital and ordered held for the grand jury after a preliminary hearing in Hyattsville. Bond was set at $2,000 for Jones and $1,000 for the others.

THUG ROUTED, PURSE SAVED BY WOMAN

Sandra Nickerson, a 25-year-old employee of the Building Service Employees International Union, was walking on the Capitol Grounds about midnight Sunday when a man approached and pulled at her pocketbook.

She wouldn't let go. They struggled, and though the strap on the pocketbook broke and Miss Nickerson was thrown into a prickly hedge, she kept screaming and resisting.

Finally the man gave up and fled without the pocketbook.

Miss Nickerson, who lives at 235 Second Street NE., went to Casualty Hospital in a taxi, was treated for scratches and an ankle sprain and released, police said.

Her assailant was described as a Negro, about 25, 6 feet 2, wearing a blue jacket and tan trousers.

MASKED PAIR GETS $1,600 IN HOLDUP

Two bandits, one armed with a pistol and both wearing handkerchiefs over their faces, escaped from Weiner's Liquors, 2200 Georgia Avenue NW., with nearly $1,600 yesterday, police reported.

Police said $1,532 was taken from the cash register, $30 from the purse of the owner, Bella Weiner, 55, another $33 from the wallet of a clerk, James Bradley, 28, and $1 from a customer, Joseph Williams, 53.

The lookout was for two Negroes, one about 28, 5 feet 11 inches, thin, light skinned and neatly dressed, wearing a light yellow shirt with a cream-colored handkerchief over his face and armed with a pistol. The other was also about 5 feet 11 inches, and thin, but wearing a brown and white checked sport shirt, green trousers and a polka dotted blue handkerchief over his face.

YOUTH WITH GUN ROBS BUS DRIVER

An armed youth robbed bus driver Walter H. Braswell of $25 and 70 tokens at the D.C. Transit terminal at 14th Street and Colorado Avenue NW., early yesterday, police reported.

Braswell, 42, told police the youth knocked on the bus door about 4:40 a.m., and asked what time the next bus was leaving. Braswell answered 5 a.m. The youth then came aboard, drew a pistol and told the driver to put the change carrier and the money from your shirt pocket in the trip box.

Taking the box, the youth, about 17, ran across the terminal lot and south in an alley in the rear of the 5400 block of 14th Street NW., Braswell said. He was described as 5 feet 6 inches, a Negro, clean shaven, weighing 150, and wearing a blue, waist-length jacket and tan or brown trousers.

The President's Policy in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, as Congressman at large for the State of Ohio, it is extremely interesting to me to take note of three editorial comments concerning President Johnson's policy with regard to the war in Vietnam, which appeared in the Martin's Ferry Times-Leader, the Columbus Citizen Journal, and the Toledo Blade, all during the month of May 1965.

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that these editorial comments are extremely comprehensive and in support of policies that the President has pursued with reference to this most difficult war.

As Congressman at large for the Buckeye State, I am tremendously pleased that the gentlemen of the fourth estate have taken particular note of the com-

ments of President Johnson to the effect that:

This is the clearest lesson of our time. From Munich until today, we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of a lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, I sense that on both sides of the partisan aisle, there is great support of the policies of the President in connection with Vietnam. Like all policies, perhaps, there is always need and room for efforts to improve. However, with respect to the continuing struggle against atheistic communism, it is pleasing indeed to note that, as a nation, we stand as one.

The editorial comments of these newspapers follow:

[From the Martins Ferry (Ohio) Times-Leader, May 2, 1965]

PRESIDENT'S TERMS FOR VIET SETTLEMENT

"I say again that I will talk to any government, anywhere, any time, without any conditions; and, if any doubt our sincerity, let them test us."

President Johnson could not be clearer or more emphatic in his desire to settle the war in Vietnam in these words, which he uttered in his recent press conference.

He anticipated that this offer may be rejected, as it was in the past, but said "it will remain open, waiting for the day when it becomes clear to all that armed attack will not yield domination over others."

There are a number of reasons inherent in his words for the rejection of his peace offer now. First, he takes care to say he will deal with any government. The Chinese and North Vietnamese insist on the fiction that the rebel Vietcong guerrillas are the only ones who can speak for South Vietnam. They are hardly a government.

Second, the President rightly made the war in Vietnam the continuation of our war of liberation, fought for a generation. He has reminded the Reds that wherever we stood firm, aggression has been halted, peace has been restored, and liberty has been maintained.

The Chinese Communists know that. They tasted it in Korea. The Soviet Union tasted it in Greece. There has been no advance by aggression either in Europe or Asia since this policy of containment began.

To change this policy would be to jeopardize our own welfare, our own freedom. It would surrender to Chinese aggression, which is beginning to seek foreign conquest. It must be stopped, as Russian aggression was stopped in Europe, before it gathers strength.

As the President said, "This is the clearest lesson of our time. From Munich until today, we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of a lasting peace."

Those are our terms. They have brought a restive peace for a generation. They will continue to keep the peace as long as we firmly adhere to it.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen Journal, May 15, 1965]

L.B.J. MAKES HIS CASE—ELOQUENTLY

President Johnson never has done a more persuasive job on an issue than he did Thursday morning in his TV appearance to detail again the whys and hows of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Some seem to think the President is making these repeated enunciations of our purpose in Vietnam because a few vociferous professors and others keep ragging him on the subject. L.B.J. isn't going to reverse this particular brand of nonthinking—but addresses such as Thursday's can do a lot to solidify national understanding.

Moreover, this puts it up to the Communists once more. They show no more sign of relenting than the college hecklers. But there are other people in the world who do have open minds.

Our policy, the way Mr. Johnson stated it Thursday, is positive, not merely defensive.

Our preferred priority is on helping the South Vietnamese (and others in southeast Asia) to improve their lot. Since 1954, for instance, rice production has been doubled, new crops introduced, industrial production developed. This all would be much more meaningful, and farther along, except for the Communists who murder and pillage and force the Vietnamese and the United States to concentrate on military defense.

Americans would much rather devote some of their resources to helping others with their economy and their standard of living. Our heavy expenditures on weapons are not by choice, but through necessity.

All the same, the President is still willing to sit down and talk it out.

The North Vietnamese obviously are hard to convince. Probably because for so many of the years this war has been going on they have been getting off easy, giving them the idea the United States was merely a paper tiger and that eventually they could overwhelm the South Vietnamese.

The President's purpose is to disabuse them of both notions—meanwhile being ready to negotiate and even readier to get on with peaceful ways to better life in southeast Asia, a program which would be far more useful to us and to the Asians than fighting.

There is nothing new or strange in this double-edged policy. This is what we did during and after World War II. We went all out to win and when the military job was finished we turned an enormous share of our effort and resources toward peaceful development around the world.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade, May 14, 1965]

THREE FACES OF WAR

President Johnson had little that was new to say yesterday as he spoke to American editorial cartoonists at the White House and to the Nation over television and radio.

Coming a day after the announcement that American troops in Vietnam now number 46,500, however, his address restated the position of our Government forcefully and comprehensively.

There are three faces of war in that faraway country where the United States is determined to block Red China's effort to bring all of Asia under its domination, he said.

First, there is the face of armed conflict in which "our only object is to prove that force will meet force" and to show "that aggression is not only wrong, but it will not work."

Next, the second face of war is the search for a political solution—"the face of diplomacy and politics"—and Mr. Johnson repeated his offer to hold unconditional discussions looking toward a peaceful settlement in Vietnam whenever the Communists are willing to hold them in good faith.

Finally, the third face of war, which he described as, "at once, the most tragic and the most hopeful," the face of human need—the effort to give the Vietnamese and all the peoples of southeast Asia a brighter future than their poverty-stricken past.

Needless to say, the hot war phase of the cold war which seems to drag on endlessly in Vietnam, with its three faces, is not a simple conflict. But a workable settlement there, if not victory, is essential to the vital interests of the United States and the entire free world.

The editorial cartoonists of the country, the Herblocks, Mauldins, Hungerfords, and their like, have been given a tremendous challenge by the President. If they can clarify the complexities of the Vietnam situation with sharp, penetrating drawings, they can make a great contribution to this struggle for men's minds.

Law Day, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Georgia, JAMES A. MACKAY, recently addressed the Atlanta chapter of the Federal Bar Association in observance of Law Day, U.S.A. His address dealt with the Federal system; its development and progress today. His comments are relevant to many problems of Federal-State relations. I ask unanimous consent that it be entered at this point in the RECORD.

The address follows:

LAW DAY, U.S.A.

Mr. President, members and guests of the Federal Bar Association, it is a pleasure to be here today to participate in the observance of Law Day, U.S.A.

Last week I had the pleasure of listening to Attorney General Katzenbach speak at a similar observance of Law Day at Emory University. He was speaking to law students, young lawyers, and alumni, most of whom were in the civil practice of the law.

He emphasized that the real strength of the law is in its acceptance in the minds and in the behavior of individual citizens who understand and respect it, and who help those charged with law enforcement in the discharge of their duty. It was a great speech. It was basic.

In thinking about what I might say to you who are members of the Federal Bar and who hold so many positions of high responsibility in the Federal Government, it occurred to me that I should like to make one point: the time has come when we should mount a vigorous counteroffensive against those who create disrespect for law and Government.

Actually, I do not suggest a counteroffensive against these individuals who generate so much talk and publish so many pamphlets. I suggest that our counteroffensive be accomplished by an affirmative effort to create new understanding of the wisdom and worth of our Federal system.

Georgia can take pride in the fact that Georgians joined with citizens of the other 12 Colonies to shape the Articles of Confederation and then the U.S. Constitution. The Federal system is literally ours.

In retrospect, it is a remarkable event of history that the political leaders of the late 18th century did not just repeat the political fragmentation of Western Europe. It is a miracle that they conceived and carried out the principle of the separation of church and state. It is surprising that they could so clearly define the rights of man with which no government should interfere, as they did in the Bill of Rights. It is astounding that they could appreciate the need for a common market nearly 200 years before this idea gained currency in the countries they left. We are the beneficiaries of the fact that they did not quit trying when the Articles of Con-

federation failed to accomplish what was needed.

One reason we stumbled into a swamp of negativism is that we quit reading the Federalist papers and the Constitution of the United States. They are worth rereading.

Furthermore, it is important to read that phase of our history because these men lived in a time when, on the one hand, there was vast apathy and, on the other hand, there were those who stood ready to attack and criticize anyone who dared to try new solutions to old problems.

That is our situation today. We fight apathy. Someone has said that apathy is the treason of America. There is too much of it. There are those today who criticize new ideas and experimentation. There are those who like to refer to our Federal or National Government as the Central Government. This slick term tries to associate this term with the central committee of the Communist Party.

My friends, how do we take the offensive?

I believe that the truth is mightier than the half-truth and a straightforward statement is more powerful than innuendo. You and I and all of us must again examine and understand the great legal principles on which this country was founded. We must look at the reasons why we have a Federal system. The Federal system was established by the people to provide for the common defense. That is why we have it today.

The Federal system was created to facilitate domestic and foreign commerce. That is why we have it today. The Federal system was established to insure justice. That is why we have it today.

In the first half of the 19th century, a debate raged as to whether the power of Federal taxation should be used for national improvements.

The Civil War resolved on the battlefield the question as to whether every human being would be a whole human being or whether some would remain three-fifths of a human being.

The last half of the 19th century saw the emergence of national problems which could not be solved by State and local governments.

The 20th century saw more of the same and it saw the increasing importance of the Federal Government in the common defense of our country and the free world.

The 1930's saw more experiment to find national solutions for national problems in our domestic economy. The search continues. We saw the drift-away from representative Government, a dangerous drift, and we paid a price for it in the decline of State governments.

We saw this drift stopped and reversed by the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Baker* v. *Carr* and subsequent decisions.

Today we need to again examine the reasons for our Federal system. We need to be sure that we have a rational, commonsense Federal system, and we need to guard against drifting into a lopsided federalism.

As in the days of the beginning of our Nation, we need our Federal system to provide for our common defense. Vietnam and the Dominican Republic remind us of those tyrannical forces which would like to destroy for all time the idea of representative Government and the rule of law.

We need our Federal system to insure justice for every American citizen whether he be in Selma or Manhattan, in Texas, or Alaska.

A new element has been added. A great scholar in the Library of Commerce pointed out to me that today the movement of people is just as important as the movement of goods. He said that the makers of the Constitution thought mainly in terms of the movement of goods. Now, he said, every American has a stake in the health, education, and welfare of every other American because, who knows, at the rate people move about the other fellow may be your next door neighbor. Or, who knows, you may leave that subdivision in DeKalb County, Ga., and move to De Kalb County, Ill., or Seattle for that matter.

Last week I spoke to the Atlanta Lawyers Club and I made this point to them. All of us who are legally trained and who are interested in Government have a duty to adapt our Federal system to the realities of today. We need to make it work for us and not against us. We can and must make our Federal system a great instrument for the rule of law and reason. It is not "that" Federal Government—it's "our" Federal Government.

If we do this, we will do much. Arms are needed in Vietnam. But of equal importance in this world struggle are individual men and women who will, in their daily lives, build respect for the rule of law and for our Federal system of government.

Washington's Winning the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Arthur Hoppe, the columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle, was in Washington and evidently the following piece of satire was gleaned from his trip here. It appeared in the Chronicle on June 4:

WASHINGTON'S WINNING THE WAR

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Adjusting my combat helmet at a jaunty angle, I made an exhaustive tour of the lines. And I want to assure all you moms and dads back home that morale is high and victory is in the air. I'm speaking, of course, of the war on poverty.

The war is now being fought from a brandnew eight-story building. On the ground floor is a brandnew interior decorator's shop and a brandnew dimly lit restaurant called the Embers, where you can get a nice lunch for less than $10. On the top floor are the offices of Mr. Sargent Shriver, who does not like to be called poverty czar.

Down branching corridors from the poverty czar are offices containing such things as plans and evaluation, private groups, deputy directors, general counsels, correspondence control (that's the mail room) and public affairs (that's the press agents). A sign saying Stairway Men leads to the seventh floor.

On the seventh floor we find signs saying Logistics, Please Open Door Gently, Conservation Centers, Urban Centers, Women's Training Centers, Operations Center, Programs, Program Development and Evaluating, Community Relations, Men's Urban Centers Section, Women's Urban Centers Section, Technical Support Section, and Stairway Men.

On the sixth, we have signs reading Director of E. & P., Field Placement Branch, VISTA Screening Board—evaluators may bite the head off anyone inquiring as to the status of an applicant—Pax Vobiscum, Vista Evaluation Branch, Personnel, Urban Projects Division, Training Division, Volunteer Assistance, Personnel (again), Stairway Men and a bulletin board with two long lists of "Civil Service examinations offering the best job opportunities," which a young man was studying thoughtfully.

On five are Community Action Programs, Projects and Files, Program Director Project Head Start, Mr. Sexton and Mr. Drob Have Moved to 508, Policy Development, Field Operations Division, Program Support Division, LAP Processing and a note on a closed door saying, "Note, this door is closed."

On four, to name a few, are Office of Management, Audit Division, Contract Division, Management Support Division, No Admittance, Budget Division and Travel Has Moved to Room 410. On three are the Bureau of Employees Compensation, the International Manpower Institute and what not. And on two are the various offices of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, plus a big seal in the corridor over the legend, "U. Department of Labo," several of the three-dimensional letters having already peeled off.

In the lobby, a receptionist was explaining the shuttle bus schedule to the Colonial Hotel, where a lot of other poverty fighters are still fighting poverty because there isn't space enough for them to fight it in this new eight-story building.

Weak with combat fatigue from my tour of the lines, I staggered into the Embers for standard battle rations—a dry martini, cherrystone clams and eggs benedict. And as I sat there, surrounded by our poverty fighters, let me tell you moms and dads at home that they've got poverty licked.

True, there may be a few poor folks holding out somewhere in the boondocks. But one thing's for sure: We've got 'em outnumbered.

Lyndon's Economics Costing the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Lyndon Johnson administration is building power and preparing to perpetuate itself in office through intensive application of making the people believe they are getting something for nothing.

Unfortunately, the largess for which the President takes all the credit costs him nothing. He is not spending his own money. He is spending yours. The trick is to get the people to pay for their own gifts and then be so grateful that they will just go on voting for Lyndon Johnson's Great Society. With the help of the liberal press he has been able to fool most of the people up to now. It could be, however, that the day of reckoning is close at hand. There is no way the President can continue to promise something to everyone without sooner or later having to deliver on the promises.

The fuzzy economic thinking that we can spend ourselves rich or lay up treasure by increasing our debts may be leading us to disaster. We have already been warned by the responsible head of the Federal Reserve System, William McChesney, Jr., that the dangerous theory of deficit spending is bringing us perilously close to disaster. The tax cuts for which the President is taking so much credit are being more than wiped out by increasing inflation and the further cheapening of our dollar. The people are

paying for the magnanimous gifts from Lyndon Johnson by being able to buy less groceries and shoes for junior with the dollars he allows them to keep.

The political economics practiced by this administration and its corps of fuzzy economists is a cruel hoax upon the people and those who are hurt most are those least able to pay. On the one hand the Johnson administration cries crocodile tears for the aged, the low paid, the pensioners and at the same time robs them of the value of their dollars through inflation.

I hope this Congress and the American people will have the courage to demand a return to sound fiscal policies which will protect the value of our money and will prevent the disaster which is bound to overtake us if we continue to follow the wholly unrealistic economic theories of L.B.J. and company.

The following editorial from the June 8 issue of the Wall Street Journal points out the evil in the shoddy bookkeeping in which the Johnson administration indulges:

A SURPLUS OF STIMULATION

The Federal planners are worrying about one of their favorite bugaboos again—the possibility of a balanced budget. Their concern reveals, we think, a good deal about what's wrong with prevailing economic theory.

At first glance there would seem little prospect of black ink any time soon; the Federal deficit for the 1965 fiscal year closing at the end of this month is now figured at $4.4 billion, and the prediction for the new fiscal year is about the same. But by another accounting method, as Mr. Janssen reported in this newspaper the other day, the budget is close to balance at the moment and may even be showing a tiny surplus.

The alternative method is the so-called national income accounts budget, which is similar to the cash budget. Both include the Government's mammoth trust funds as well as administrative income and outgo. The main difference is that the national income accounts budget is on an accrual basis. As estimated last January, Federal spending for fiscal 1966 by this calculation will total $127 billion, only slightly below the figure for the cash budget.

If balance is being achieved in the national income accounts, the Government economists fear the economy will be getting no stimulation from Washington, although it is recognized that some additional stimulation may come from excise-tax reduction and increased social security benefits. Accordingly the officials are thinking of still more tax cuts in the years ahead. At the same time it is altogether likely that Federal spending will continue its upward trend.

Now the first thing that might be said about that kind of economic policy is that it appears to rule out budget surpluses permanently, and indeed there have been extremely few of them in recent decades. Still, the new theorizing is a drastic modification of the notion that deficit financing is appropriate for recessions but that budgets should be balanced in prosperous years; today's attitude evidently is that the red ink should flow regardless of economic conditions.

How valid is this whole concept of economic stimulation? It is certainly true that a combination of budget deficits and easy money can spur economic activity for a time. The danger lies in the fact that the policy is inflationary, and apart from all the other evils of inflation, the customary upshot is a recession or worse.

Beyond question we have been having a marked inflation of the money supply for quite a while, and the signs of overheating are abundant. They are to be found notably in specific price increases and the general rise in the cost of living, plus the inferior quality of much current credit. It's high time the Government stopped its inflationary exercises in stimulation, and in our opinion that means balancing not only the national income accounts but also the administrative budget.

For one thing, it is not true that a surplus has to be a drag on the economy; it depends on what is done with it. Retiring some of the obese public debt would tend to strengthen the dollar and confidence in it. Making tax cuts on the basis of a balanced budget, in conjunction with a sound-money policy, would strengthen the economy.

Such a course could, to be sure, be called stimulation, too. The difference is fundamental, however. It would be letting the people keep more of their earnings without running the risks of inflation. It would be the most promising route to sustained and supportable economic growth.

Unfortunately the planners are so enamored of deficits that they have difficulty seeing the merit of commonsense economics. A main reason is that inflation makes possible more political spending and more of a super-boom atmosphere than is usually achieved with policies of fiscal and monetary restraint. In this sense, the fashionable brand of economics is not primarily economic theory at all but plain old politicking in a new guise.

All in all, it makes an unflattering commentary on the wisdom of Washington when sound bookkeeping is regarded as an evil to be studiously avoided.

Department of Agriculture Implements Directives on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that in an article in the New York Times of May 23, 1965, and from statistics supplied me by the Department of Agriculture, it is apparent that positive action has been taken by an agency of the Department of Agriculture to implement congressional and executive directives regarding civil rights.

The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the Department, under the able administration of Horace Godfrey, of North Carolina, reports that, as of May 14, 1965, there were 2,629 minority group members employed in ASCS county offices throughout the United States.

Of this number employed, 2,414 are Negroes, or about 92 percent. Negroes held 1,839 field positions in the county offices.

For the United States as a whole, 575 Negroes hold positions within the county office organization.

The heavy concentration of Negroes in farming areas is in the South. The concentration of Negro employees is in the States of Maryland, Virginia, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, West Virginia, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I place the New York Times article and a table of ASCS employees in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 23, 1965]

NEGROES GETTING FARM AGENCY JOBS—SOUTHERNER AIDS INTEGRATION DRIVE IN THE SOUTH

(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, May 22.—A former farmer from Waxhaw, N.C., is taking racial integration to some of the most remote counties in the South. As a southerner, he is amazed at how easy it is.

Horace G. Godfrey is administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, a huge agency that administers the crop allotment and price support programs of the Department of Agriculture.

The agency has more than 1,350 offices in the Southern States. Until this year it could count no more than eight Negroes among its technical, clerical, or professional staffs in the South.

The county committees, elected by the farmers, never considered hiring Negroes to staff the offices and measure crop acreages. But now they have—and the results have been startling.

ACCORDING TO TRADITION

As Mr. Godfrey put it, they followed the traditional southern pattern of "the white man deciding what to do and the Negro following along."

Even after passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, some southern officers of the agency were jolted to receive a directive from Mr. Godfrey saying that they would have to achieve racial balance in their offices.

Section VI of the civil rights law bans discrimination in federally assisted programs. Salaries of employes of the stabilization agency are paid by the Federal Government.

In an interview, Mr. Godfrey cited as an example North Carolina, where he was State administrator for a number of years before coming to Washington, more than 4 years ago.

"The ratio of Negroes to whites there is 23 to 77," he said with a Southern drawl. "I told them to shoot for as a goal 23 percent Negroes in the county offices. But we don't expect them to fire anybody to meet these standards."

By the end of this week approximately 2,000 Negroes had been hired. Most of these are in temporary jobs, measuring the number of acres planted in crops subject to control.

"Most of our permanent employees worked at one time on a temporary basis," he said, "and this seemed to be the best way to start."

The agency's officers and the farmer work together in measuring the crops. Mr. Godfrey said he does not expect trouble when a Negro agent calls on a white farmer.

"Our policy is to provide one free measurement," he explained. "If he says no (to the person assigned by the agency) then he has to pay for the measurement."

DIFFERENCES NARROWED

Mr. Godfrey said that Negroes were being moved into permanent positions as fast as they opened up. In many counties, he said, his agency has been the first to bring about integration in any public office.

"There have been some difficulties," he said. "But I have been completely amazed at how well it has gone. In one county we integrated the courthouse for the first time and after we did, others in the building came to us and said they had been wanting to hire Negroes and were glad we had opened the door."

Mr. Godfrey said in some counties the directive to hire Negroes had opened communications between the races.

"The white people had to ask the Negro leaders for help in getting the best people to do the job," he said. "For the first time in history they were able to sit down together and talk things over, and they found out that their differences were not as great as they had thought."

Mr. Godfrey, a rough-hewn man who will be 50 years old in August, talked as though he had just been relieved of a tremendous burden.

"You know the traditional Southern attitudes on this subject," he said. "It's amazing the cooperation we have had. People say, 'We knew it was coming and we have to have the farm programs.' They are complying not only with the letter but with the spirit of the law."

Civil rights leaders say that Mr. Godfrey's agency has done more than any other in the Agriculture Department to end discrimination. Last March, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights issued a special report saying that because of the Department's practices the 4.7 million Negroes living in Southern rural areas had not participated fully in Government programs.

ASCS minority employment in county offices for period ending May 14, 1965

State	On county office rolls				Total		
	In office		In field				
	Negro	Other	Negro	Other	Negro	Other	Minority
Maryland			2		2		2
Virginia	13		30		43		43
Alabama	63		78		141		141
Florida	15		15		30		30
Georgia	83		221		304		304
Kentucky			1		1		1
North Carolina	134	6	477	21	511	27	538
South Carolina	84		524		608		608
Tennessee	102		44		146		146
West Virginia							
Missouri	7		3		10		10
Arkansas	14		53		67		67
Louisiana	21		41		62		62
Mississippi	4		307		311		311
Texas	29	60	37	54	66	114	180
Total, 15 selected States	569	66	1,833	75	2,402	141	2,541
Total, United States except Alaska and Hawaii	575	95	1,839	120	2,414	215	2,629

Discipline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Tri-City Advertiser, an independent publication serving the communities of Dolton, Riverdale, and South Holland, Ill., in its Thursday, June 3, edition, carried a most forceful, timely and thought-provoking editorial which I feel deserves widespread attention.

The editorial follows:

DISCIPLINE

Seems strange, doesn't it, that we send well disciplined men of our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps into countries presumably to suppress revolts or to contain insurrections within limits and then have groups of agitators and college and other kids doing exactly what we sent our troops to suppress.

There is no inference here that valid and purposeful demonstrations, kept within the bounds of decency, are unlawful. But we, as you must be, are about fed up with these notoriety seeking, brash and certainly undisciplined kids and oldsters acting as though the show of passive or unrestrained resistance could solve any problem.

Arnold Toynbee, the well known and respected historian pointed out that the collapse of a nation rarely came from the outside but from "spiritual decay within," and it looks as though we are beginning to head that way for if any of these demonstrations display any evidence of spiritual thinking, then we haven't seen it.

A great many people, and many of our young men joining the Armed Forces, have a sort of clouded appreciation of what discipline is. Without it there could not be any Armed Forces and without it spiritual living becomes a mockery.

After all, discipline simply means adherence, strict and without recourse, to certain laws of combat and training. Obey the orders and you have a successful and worthwhile army. Disobedience can always mean disaster in fighting a war. One must obey the orders, which after all are formulated by men of long experience and are designed to bring any conflict to a successful conclusion with the minimum of time and the maximum of safety.

Spiritual decay, they tell us, can only be obliterated by the obedience to a very few simple rules. After all the Master Christian made it plain that if one obeyed 2 of the 10 Commandments, he need not worry about the others as they would automatically be obeyed through obedience of the 2 mentioned.

Two plus two equals four as every school child knows. But if one puts down two plus two equals five one can never come to a correct answer to the problem—not until one changes that five to a four—and not until then.

The rule of mathematics can never be altered by anyone. Therefore the only correct solution to any mathematical problem can only come by strict obedience to the rules.

No doubt spiritual success and peace can only come in a like manner.

Utah and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith my address to the House of Delegates of the Utah Education Association in Salt Lake City on April 24, 1965:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE LAURENCE J. BURTON, OF UTAH, BEFORE THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF THE UTAH EDUCATION ASSOCIATION IN SALT LAKE CITY, APRIL 24, 1965

It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to speak to the Utah Education Association House of Delegates today about matters of mutual concern. I am grateful to the officers and members of this body for extending this courtesy.

As a member in good standing of the UEA for a number of years, I like to think that I have some understanding of the scope of the problems, responsibilities, and opportunities that the education profession has in our State.

Utah and its educators have a rich and distinguished heritage. Without fear of contradiction, I think it can be said that no people anywhere in America put more responsibility in the hands of their educators or place more emphasis on education and expect more from their public schools than do the citizens of Utah.

As a matter of fact, it is this very heritage—our tremendous effort in support of school programs, the unusually large enrollments in Utah, the great responsibility that we place on our teachers, and the high expectations that we have always had for education—that has caused our systems in every Utah county to be stretched and strained, perhaps not to the breaking point, but certainly, to a taut position. Consequently, we have our problems today. But then, we have had them in the past. We will certainly have them in the future. The fact that problems, like the poor, will be always with us, does not relieve us of trying to solve them, just as our predecessors in this field have done before. In our efforts to make better, to refine and specialize our educational services, we seem, in a sense, to be adding to our burden. But that's all right. It is the way it ought to be.

An excellent personal education has become something that is no longer merely nice to have or desirable. Today, a good education is all but necessary if a person is to become a good citizen, a provident parent, and, as President Johnson has said, "a taxpayer, instead of a taxeater."

My short record in Congress, I think, would show that I am not nearly so sympathetic with pain-relieving welfare programs as I am in favor of programs designed to effect a permanent cure. By strengthening education, we are helping to cure, not merely relieve, some of our national problems.

While education is not the sole prescription for all the social, economic and cultural problems rampant in mid-20th century America, it is, in my judgment, the best great hope to help us achieve our national goals.

In good consicence, I have supported Federal aid to vocational schools, higher education, and manpower retraining, as well as Federal loan programs for college students.

Finally, with some reservations, I supported the recently passed, so-called Federal aid to education bill which will give Utah approximately $4,100,000 this coming year. I say I supported it with reservations because in terms of what is best for Utah we could have had a better bill if the majority party had allowed some amendments. My reference to the majority is not designed as a political commentary, for indeed, it was a member of that party, Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, who sponsored the key amendment that would have made possible a more fair distribution of Federal funds among all States.

Under title I of the bill, as it passed, apportionment of funds is made to school districts on the basis of the number of school-age children living within the districts who are from families with an annual income of less than $2,000. It is estimated that Utah has 13,989 such children. However, the amount that will be granted by the Federal Government to the districts for each child in this classification will vary from State to State. This is because the Federal grant in each State will be equal to the average expenditure per student that State has already been making.

The purpose of the Green amendment was to eliminate this variance. Under terms of this amendment each State would have received the same amount of money for each qualifying child.

For example, had the Green amendment passed, Utah's per student share under title I of the act would have been approximately $201 per qualifying student as against the $187 we will receive under terms of the bill as passed. In terms of total dollars, Utah would have received some $2,811,000 under the Green amendment instead of the $2,627,000 apportioned under the approved bill. There is a danger that this bill may merely help the "rich get richer and the poor get poorer." In a colloquy with Mrs. GREEN on the House floor during the debate, I asked her, in substance, if that would not be the net effect of the apportionment formula unless her amendment were adopted. She agreed that it would be.

For example, one of our problems in Utah, as any superintendent who is trying to hire teachers can tell you, is the great disparity between what our Utah districts can pay a teacher and what the same teacher can obtain for his services in a wealthier Western State, such as California. The present bill, under title I, will give Utah the aforementioned $2,627,000 and will give California $73,145,000. Utah's per student share will be $187 as against California's $265 per student share. Other wealthy States are treated even better by this bill. New York gets $353 for each qualifying student. Connecticut gets $276; New Jersey $283. This is not an equalizing bill; I believe it should have been. It certainly does not award any E's for effort. My purpose here is not to indulge in a sour grapes recapitulation. I do think, however, that it is important to point out that now we are going to have Federal aid in the form of this act, it is not going to be a panacea for all of our Utah educational headaches.

Another aspect of title I of the bill was cause for considerable concern for Utah during the House debate. It was originally represented by sponsors of the bill that small counties having less than 100 school-age children from families in the less-than $2,000 category would not qualify for aid. Eleven Utah counties were in this group. I urged in debate on the House floor that the bill be amended to eliminate the arbitrary 100-student minimum. Although my proposal was rejected, I have since been advised by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education that smaller counties will be eligible for aid, provided that a minimum of 3 percent of school-age children residing therein are from families earning less than $2,000 per annum.

Many people, including me, who finally voted for the bill had some genuine reservations about the role private and religious schools would play in participating in the funds. Generally, we wrote a good legislative history during the debate on this subject, and it is the intent of Congress that any services given private and religious schools should only be given through the aegis of the public schools.

My apprehension on this point stems not so much from lack of concern about the quality of private schools as it does from concern for the future of public schools. If the time ever comes that private schools have equal access to public moneys with the public schools, that will be "all she wrote" for the public school system of America. Those of us who interested in strengthening and improving public schools must always be alert to this danger—and it is a danger. If your church or my church wants to operate its own school system, then you and I ought to pay for it—and not the public treasury.

We are all aware of the fact that many people opposed to any form of Federal aid have used the oft-heard cry of Federal controls. But make no mistake about this, there are many people sympathetic to educational problems for whom this is a real threat. Now that Federal aid is here, it is incumbent upon those of you who have said for so many years that there would be no Federal controls with Federal aid, to make Billy-Well sure that there aren't any.

Some opposition locally has developed because it is said that Utah's share of the total cost of this educational bill in terms of Utah tax dollars contributed is almost $5 million, and the total that Utah stands to collect is only $4,100,000. I recognize, from a strictly parochial point of view, that this is a legitimate area of concern. Personally, however, I am not impressed with this argument. We come from a State that through reclamation projects, forest and park developments, public lands expenditures—not to mention defense outlays—receives much more in return from the Federal Government than we contribute in taxes to the Federal Treasury in those particular areas. If every State delegation merely voted along self-interest lines, all Federal programs would become enmeshed in a selfish morass and few would ever be authorized.

The bill as passed contains the following provisions in terms of Utah's participation:

Title I allows for direct aid to Utah school districts in a total amount of $2,627,783, the money to be apportioned on a formula which grants the equivalent of the average expenditure per student in Utah ($187) for each school-age child from a family earning less than $2,000 annually.

Title II provides for the expenditure of $587,662 in Utah in support of a State plan for the acquisition of library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials.

Title III would make available an estimated $690,284 for financing supplemental educational centers and services in Utah.

Title IV authorizes the expenditure of $100 million for the construction of national and regional education research facilities. No specific grants would be made to Utah under this title, although the Utah education system would certainly stand to benefit directly, together with her sister States, from the establishment and operation of such facilities.

Title V provides for a grant of approximately $207,310 to Utah to be used in strengthening the State department of public instruction.

A general provision of the act also extends for 2 more years the granting of aid to federally impacted areas under Public Law 874.

Finally, in conclusion, let me tell you that I want to help men and women of good will and sincere intent, both in and out of the Utah Education Association, achieve those high aspirations for our profession that we all seek. There may be times when we will not agree on the best course to travel, but at least I think our destination will be the same.

While I am privileged to represent this State in the Congress, it would be my hope that you will consider me a "friend at court," so to speak.

In terms of the problems of education in general, and Utah educational problems in particular, it would be my wish always to try to be a party to their solution and not a part of the problem. I hope my vote for Federal aid to education was just that.

Thanks again for the opportunity to speak to you.

Trees Don't Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the April bulletin of the Sierra Club carried an outstanding article by Mr. Davis E. Pesonen, former conservation editor of the Sierra Club. In this article Mr. Pesonen ably unmasks the arguments that the Dirksen amendment would serve the cause of "minority rights," "checks and balances," or the "Federal form of government," as mere facades for the amendment's basic objective of serving special interests. It is our responsibility to defeat efforts to void the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision and to insure that our State legislatures shall serve the people and not the special interests. Mr. Pesonen's article follows:

TREES DON'T VOTE

(By David E. Pesonen)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—David E. Pesonen was formerly conservation editor of the Sierra Club and the executive director of the Northern California Association to Preserve Bodega Head and Harbor. In the latter capacity, he gained much practical experience in politics at State and local levels. In this article, Mr. Pesonen develops the thesis that the Dirksen amendment would tend to perpetuate rural domination of State legislatures, and that this would be inimical to the cause of conservation nationally.)

An axiom mulled over at every Sierra Club Wilderness Conference is that the power of the conservation movement in America has swelled in proportion as the Nation has become urbanized. But imagine the following circumstances:

The location of new dams on the Colorado River is decided largely by Utah and Arizona reclamationists.

U.S. Department of Agriculture policy on the use of pesticides is drawn principally by the Agricultural Chemists Association.

The final decision on building a trans-Sierra highway lies with the Fresno and Mono County Boards of Supervisors.

Reclassification of remaining primitive areas under the Wilderness Act is chiefly influenced by local timber and mining interests.

Legislation affecting air and water pollution is controlled by the Farm Bureau Federation.

The selection of freeway routes through redwood groves follows the recommendations of the Humboldt and Del Norte County Boards of Supervisors.

The location of powerplants on the California coast is decided mainly by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Most conservationists would call this state of affairs a catastrophe. An astute political observer would also recognize it as the ultimate effect of the Dirksen amendment to the U.S. Constitution. What is the Dirksen amendment?

ONE MAN, ONE VOTE

In the summer of 1964 the U.S. Supreme Court handed down the last of six decisions that challenged the constitutionality of State legislative apportionment by criteria other than population. In retrospect, these cases were historically inevitable. Until this century, America was predominantly a rural, agricultural nation; but population and urbanization have accelerated over the years until about 70 percent of the citizenry now lives in urban areas. Representation of this majority in State legislatures has not kept pace with the shift.

Chief Justice Warren's opinion in what have come to be called the 1964 reapportionment cases, stated the Court's argument this way:

"Legislators represent people, not trees or acres. * * * A citizen, a qualified voter, is no more nor no less so because he lives in the city or on the farm. * * * As a basic constitutional standard, the equal protection clause [of the 14th amendment] requires that the seats in both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned on a population basis. * * * one man, one vote."

The Dirksen amendment (S.J. Res. 2), currently before Congress, seeks to amend the Constitution—with the explicit objective of overturning the "one man, one vote" rule—by adding the following language:

"SECTION 1. The right and power to determine the composition of the legislature of a State and the apportionment of the membership thereof shall remain in the people of that State. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit the people from apportioning one house of a bicameral legislature upon the basis of factors other than population, or from giving reasonable weight to factors other than population in apportioning a unicameral legislature, if, in either case, such apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue."

The enormous implications of this amendment, I believe, have not been fully recognized by conservationists or, for that matter, by the general urban public. Note that under the amendment (1) both the "right" and the "power" to determine the "composition" and the "apportionment" of State legislatures is vested exclusively in the State. And (2) the amendment is not limited to one house of a bicameral legislature; conceivably both houses could be apportioned on factors other than population.

Some scholars feel that, regardless of the merits of the one man, one vote rule, the Supreme Court has ventured to the limit of its powers in interpreting the Constitution and that a curtailment of those powers is in order. Indeed, the Court itself split 6–3 in the reapportionment cases, largely on the issue of jurisdiction. Although I do not share the view that the Court has gone too far, I recognize it is a point on which reasonable men may differ. There is no question, however, that the Dirksen amendment goes far beyond rescinding the reapportionment cases. It would throw out the democratic baby with the jurisdictional bath by freezing into the Constitution a principle that is repugnant to every vestige of democratic theory. Under the term "factors other than population," for example, could be encompassed voting criteria based on sex, property, income, religion, race, or annual rainfall.

The population standard in apportionment is of course a guarantee that each person's vote carries equal weight with every other person's vote—where these votes ultimately count—in the chambers of the legislature. The practical need for the one-man, one-vote rule is suggested by a recent study, which found that there is some rural domination in both houses of almost every State in the Union: "97 of the 99 State legislative bodies [Nebraska's Legislature is unicameral, accounting for the odd number] as of 1960, were so apportioned as to give an advantage to the rural population." (17 Western Political Quarterly 724, 726.)

In California, for example, one State senator represents a district with 14,000 people, while another is elected from a district with 6.5 million people. Each vote in the smaller district is, in effect, 565 times as powerful as each vote in the more populous district. In Alabama, only one-fourth of the total population elect a majority of the members of both the house and senate; a vote in the State's smallest district is 15.6 times as powerful as one in the largest district.

As any candid lobbyist will testify, it is generally much easier to influence the vote of an elected representative who comes from a small district with a few dominant economic interests than it is to swing a representative from a large, pluralistic, and often more articulate urban constituency. (This is only a general rule; California happens to enjoy quite a few enlightened senators from rural districts, but there is no assurance of this state of affairs in the future.) It is the lobbyist's business to know the pressure points of legislators. He will also admit that control of one house in a bicameral legislature amounts to a veto over the entire body. The shelves groan with political science theses documenting these facts, which are the bread and butter insights of legislative advocacy.

THE VESTED INTEREST THEORY

Supporters of the Dirksen amendment point out that it permits apportionment on criteria other than population only after a vote by the people; this provision, it is argued, insures democratic control. They point out that in one of the reapportionment cases the Supreme Court overturned a State senate apportionment plan in Colorado that had been approved by the voters.

In 1943, Supreme Court Justice Jackson wrote in an opinion: "One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections." It is hard to imagine a right more fundamental than the right to equal representation—which is simply the other half of the right to vote. And when the Court struck down the Colorado apportionment plan in 1964, it said: "A citizen's constitutional rights can hardly be infringed simply because a majority of the people choose to do so." As a practical matter, it is no secret that the outcome of a referendum can be powerfully influenced by money.

But what has this to do with dams on the Colorado River or reclassification of primitive areas under the Wilderness Act?

The theory behind the Dirksen amendment can be described as the "interest theory of representation." It states that abstract (economic) interests have rights on a par with people and that these rights must be defended from people; these interests are more closely allied with the economic viewpoint of rural than of urban populations. The theory says: since an "interest" has no legal vote the best defense is to vest a bigger vote in the hands of a rural person than in the hands of an urban person. And one needn't look far to identify these interests; they are what used to be called vested interests, the same ones that blocked passage of the wilderness bill for 8 years—lumber, mining, reclamation, agriculture, grazing, petroleum, hydroelectric power.

These are the interests that continue to maintain that wilderness areas are enjoyed only by a small minority of urban zealots, that a reservoir in Glen or Grand Canyon would be a tremendous recreational asset to the region, that it is a waste of resources and a blow to the economy to lock up mature redwood timber. And they are the interests that on the whole shake their heads at such unrealistic prose as David Brower's description of a conservationist: "* * * and by conservationist I mean a man (or part of him) concerned with what natural resources do for his spirit, not his bank balance."

Abstractions and generalities on a constitutional scale always have their exceptions, for which we should be thankful. But does anyone seriously doubt that conservation legislation would have much tougher sledding, both nationally and on a State level, if a system of rural domination were sanctioned for all time by an amendment to the U.S. Constitution?

AMIABLE PLATITUDES

When a resolution was introduced in the 1964 Congress to delay enforcement of the Supreme Court's ruling, most urban spokesmen tended to discount its chances of passage. But it was defeated only after the national council of mayors belatedly opposed it, followed with a marathon filibuster by 15 Senators from urban States.

The forces promoting the Dirksen amendment are better organized in 1965. They have hired the public relations firm of Whitaker & Baxter to propagandize the issue in California. They are well financed and quite sanguine about their prospects. Red white and blue brochures have been printed and distributed by the thousands with the two-point theme: Fight reapportionment—to protect minority rights and to maintain the time-tested system of checks and balances in government.

The Santa Rosa Press Democrat, one of the most reliable barometers of the rural viewpoint in California, editorialized along these lines on April 9: "The fundamental right of minorities to have their viewpoint heard and considered has been struck down, and action to restore that right is overlong in emerging from Congress." This seems to imply that rural districts will be stripped of all representation in the legislature. Obviously, however, the Supreme Court has not deprived rural citizens of the right to be heard and considered; it has simply guaranteed that they will no longer speak louder or carry a bigger legislative stick that their numbers justify.

A different argument against the Supreme Court's decision contends that the wisdom of unequal representation in one house is supported by the Constitution's provision for two Senators from each State, regardless of population. The analogy is spurious; it fails to distinguish the difference between a State, which is a constitutionally recognized and originally sovereign political unit that existed before the Constitution was written, and an election district whose boundaries are fluid and can be redrawn at will be the legislature.

Very little reflection is required to see that the "minority rights," "checks and balances," and Federal analogy arguments behind the Dirksen amendment are not fundamental—they are derivatives that boil down to amiable platitudes masking the interest theory of representation.

STRATEGY

California affords an excellent example of the strategy to promote the Dirksen amendment. The Sacramento Bee reports a "hurried conference" on the evening of April 9 in the senate lounge of the State capitol, by the Citizens Committee for Balanced Legislative Representation, attended by five State senators from northern California, one from Los Angeles,[1] Mr. Whitaker, of Whitaker & Baxter, and the following well-known conservationists: Albert J. Shults, lobbyist for Standard Oil and other major oil companies, and A. Ruric Todd, lobbyist for the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. According to a separate report, several other groups represented were the California Farm Bureau Federation and the California Bankers' Association. The Chairman of the "citizens committee" is James Mussatti, former general manager of the California State Chamber of Commerce. The committee's latest report quotes Mussatti as follows:

"In all, 25 or one-half of the States have petitioned Congress for reapportionment action in one form or another and it is our belief that at least another 10 States will take action in the near future. It is time that all interested persons make their voices heard on this issue to their Senators and Congressmen. This critically important issue can be won if all of us, to whom the decision is so important, do our part."

Senator Hugh Burns, of Fresno County, president pro tempore of the senate, who attended the meeting, said that the U.S. Senate "is for the [Dirksen] amendment generally but work needs to be done on the Representatives." As a result the "citizens committee" is arranging "a series of small social affairs in Washington for Members of the House of Representatives." The committee is sending spokesmen (aboard the oil companies' private aircraft) to testify before State legislatures that are considering resolutions on the Dirksen amendment—Louisiana, Oregon, Florida, New Jersey, and New York.

RATIFICATION

If the amendment were passed by Congress it would still require ratification by 38 States to become the next amendment to the U.S. Constitution. What are its chances?

Splendid.

Virtually every State is now subject to the Supreme Court's reapportionment mandate. In 1964 alone, the apportionment plans of 32 States were held to violate the one-man, one-vote rule. Only a handful (perhaps four or five) are so balanced as to avoid reapportionment today, and the courts have shown an increasing willingness to grant delays in compliance with reapportionment orders. It is hardly to be expected that this willingness would diminish if an amendment affecting apportionment were to pass Congress and go to the States for ratification.

Therefore, a constitutional amendment passed by the Congress this year would be submitted for ratification to the very same rurally skewed legislatures that are currently fighting reapportionment.

There is a further joker in this setup. State legislatures draw the boundaries of congressional districts.[2] And under present conditions a State legislature can use the power to redraw district boundaries with great persuasion on Congressmen now in office. It has been reliably reported that this is precisely what the California State Senate is now doing—flying its representatives to Washington with a sheaf of very interesting maps of possible new congressional district boundaries for the edification of Congressmen who have dragged their feet on the Dirksen amendment.

Congressman HAROLD T. JOHNSON, of Roseville, Calif., who favors reapportionment, is reported to have taken an informal poll during the first week of April in Washington: the poll found that 60 Senate and 240 House votes could be enlisted for the amendment right now. And a Newsweek poll a few weeks earlier also showed this type of amendment to be close to passage. According to Representative JOHNSON's poll, the "citizens committee" has 6 Senators and 50 Congressmen to go before this magnificent monument to the rotten borough is well on its way toward being written into the Constitution.

COALITION

At the 1965 wilderness conference, a widely reported address by University of California Professor of Political Science Albert Lepawsky urged a coalition between civil rights organizations and conservationists whenever they had common cause. It is not difficult to imagine the effect of the Dirksen amendment on President Johnson's voting rights bill. As the President said in his address on March 15: "Every device of which human ingenuity is capable has been used to deny this right." And the Dirksen amendment would deliver into the hands of southern legislators a razor-sharp device to gerrymander into subservience any area with a substantial Negro registration. This same ingenuity can be used by rural legislators on behalf of the logger's chain-saw, the prospector's jeep road, and the sheepman's flocks. If there is any issue before the American public where conservation and civil rights organizations find common cause, opposition to the Dirksen amendment is it.

So far, the mail to Congress has reflected urban apathy on this issue. But like most apathy it is the sin of oversight. There is precious little time to shift our sights. This is a watershed issue with profound implications for all further conservation legislation. If the Dirksen amendment is to be stopped, it must be stopped in Congress. Your Congressman and Senators may be interested in your views on the subject.

[1] Senators Hugh M. Burns, Fresno County; John F. McCarthy, Marin County; George Miller, Jr., Contra Costa County; Howard Way, Tulare County; Joseph A. Rattigan, Sonoma County; Thomas M. Rees, Los Angeles County.

[2] The Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote rule in no way affects this power of the legislatures.

Afraid of a Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while the administration frantically tries to set up some procedure for elections in the Dominican Republic, it is interesting to note that despite U.S. promises made at the time, the Surkano government is refusing to hold a plebiscite in West New Guinea as promised by their agreement made in 1962. This matter is very appropriately pointed out in an editorial which appeared in last Saturday's Washington Evening Star.

The editorial follows:

AFRAID OF A VOTE

The history of our grievously troubled and complex time demands many footnotes, and here is one that should be particularly emphasized.

Back in 1962, under unwise pressure from our Government and the United Nations as a whole, the Dutch handed over West New Guinea to President Sukarno's ever-hungry Indonesia. They did so, however, with the explicit understanding, the explicit condition, that the inhabitants of the island would be allowed to decide their political fate, before 1970, in a plebiscite supervised by the U.N. But now Sukarno has suddenly dismissed the whole idea by declaring that he wants no part of it.

This is noteworthy. Indonesia's playboy President, it would seem, has chickened out. He apparently feels that a free vote on the issue would leave him with egg on his face. We can't think of a better place for egg to be.

Nigerian Representative Praises Work of Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, by all accounts one of the most successful programs now being run by the Peace Corps is the program in Nigeria. By the end of 1965 almost 700 Peace Corps volunteers will be working among Nigeria's 55 million people, teaching in high schools and universities and carrying out rural and agricultural programs. I take particular pleasure in inserting in the RECORD a significant statement recently made by the Honorable Julius Momo Udochi, a member of the House of Representatives of Nigeria, in which he points out that the Peace Corps program has succeeded very wonderfully, and expresses his gratitude to the people who are responsible for sending these young men and women to Nigeria.

The statement follows:

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, APRIL 23, 1965, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, LAGOS

Chief J. M. UDOCHI (Afenmai). My comments will be very brief. I wish to seize this opportunity in commenting, on this vote on education, on a body of young men and women who are working very tirelessly in our educational vineyard. I refer to the American Peace Corps volunteers.

When the late President of the United States inaugurated this scheme many people had some doubts as to the possibility of its success. Some felt that it was a very laudable scheme and that it was a scheme that was likely to bring many people of various countries together. Some were very doubtful and they thought it was another American propaganda stunt that would do no good.

Some were even very cynical and they thought it was another American scheme of trying to send a spy ring around the world. But I am glad to say that many of these evils prognosticated have proved false.

The Peace Corps program has succeeded very wonderfully and I think, if the taste of the pudding is in the eating, the fact that many underdeveloped countries are requesting for more and more Peace Corps men and women show the degree of their success.

There are many of them in this country. We have over 300 of them now working in our rural areas and I would ask Members to take some interest in the work being done by this devoted body of young men and women. I

am just told that the number has increased now to over a thousand.

One would like to know how these young men are recruited for this kind of job. An honorable Member is saying that I do not mention women because I do not like them, but I do like them very much.

Now, they are all usually men of university standards who, after a broad training, are sent to training camps and given special training and orientation. They are then sent out to the various countries to do the work they are asked to do and those of us who have come across many of them in our various rural areas teaching in the secondary schools and colleges will appreciate their devotion to duty, their sense of duty and how they try as best they can to ingratiate themselves with the people among whom they live.

I think that it will be a good thing if we all take an interest in their work and show them that we appreciate the work they are doing amongst us. I, therefore, wish to take this opportunity on the floor of this House to say how grateful we are to the people who had been responsible for sending us these young men and women.

Lt. Gov. Patrick J. Lucey's Support for One Man, One Vote Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments has recently concluded hearings on Joint Resolution 2, popularly known as the Dirksen amendment. We, in the House, may soon be considering such an amendment. The passage of this amendment would be a departure from the Supreme Court's decision, announced in Baker against Carr, of one man, one vote.

In Wisconsin, the apportionment of both houses of the State legislature is based, constitutionally, upon population factors. This system has worked well. In fact, the fears of some that the apportionment based on population alone will give urban areas added political power at the expense of rural areas is not borne out by the Wisconsin experience where rural interests have been protected in the State legislature.

In my judgment, the extent to which you depart from the "one man, one vote" principle, you depart from democracy.

In his connection, I would like to recommend to the Members of the House the testimony given by Patrick J. Lucey, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Wisconsin, before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments on May 21, 1965. The Lieutenant Governor has recognized the dangers of such an amendment and in voicing his opposition to such a proposal, Mr. Lucey has rendered a great service by coming to the defense of the basic principles of our representative system of government:

TESTIMONY BY LT. GOV. PATRICK J. LUCEY BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to thank you and the committee for this opportunity to appear in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 2.

Joint Resolution 2 would amend the U.S. Constitution to permit one house of State legislatures to be apportioned on a basis other than population. This would reverse recent rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Baker* v. *Carr, Reynolds* v. *Sims* and similar cases which held that all State legislative bodies must be apportioned according to population in order to meet the equal protection requirements of the 14th amendment.

I oppose Joint Resolution 2 on two grounds: first, that it violates basic principles of our representative system of government; and second, that it will have a highly detrimental effect on the effectiveness of State governments.

A great deal of testimony has already been offered the committee on the proposition that Joint Resolution 2 is incompatible with our system of government. On March 4, Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, offered excellent testimony pointing out that the basic principles of the American system require that representation be based on population. The Senator also cited the strong views held by leading American constitutional thinkers, including most of those active in drafting the U.S. Constitution, that population is the only proper basis for legislative representation. I wish to associate myself with Senator PROXMIRE's testimony that the Joint Resolution 2 is violative of basic principles of representative government in America.

I recognize that the U.S. Senate does not meet the test of population apportionment, but it has been clearly pointed out during your hearings that the Senate was a compromise necessary to bring sovereign States together to form a Nation. The example of the U.S. Senate is clearly inapplicable to State legislatures whose districts are not independent or sovereign.

It is fair to note that Joint Resolution 2 lends itself to gross abuses of fundamental democratic principles far beyond the inequality of representation which marks the U.S. Senate. No limits are set upon the bases which may be used to determine apportionment of the second legislative house. It would be constitutional within this language to base representation on income or on education or on race, color, national origin or religious affiliation as well as on area. These criteria—all of them—are utterly irrelevant to the basic premise of our governmental system that majorities are entitled to set public policy within certain constitutional limits.

The most important argument against Joint Resolution 2 is undoubtedly its violation of fundamental democratic principles. However, as a State official, I am also concerned about its adverse effect on State government.

The role of any government is to meet those public needs which its citizens cannot meet as individuals or through joint action in private groups. In the American Federal system, vast responsibilities are left in the hands of State governments and they must be able to meet the needs of their citizens.

To the extent that State governments are not representative of their citizens, they will not be responsive to the needs of those citizens. In short, State governments cannot fulfill their obligation to meet public problems if State legislative bodies do not reflect the views of those citizens who face these problems.

This is exactly the result which Joint Resolution 2 will have upon State government. The pressures for public services are basically population pressures.

The avalanche of new students in our elementary and secondary schools, the doubling enrollments in our colleges and universities and the enormous demands upon our welfare programs all reflect the sharp increase in our population—and particularly those segments of our population in the service-using age brackets under 21 and over 65. Since State problems are basically population problems, our State governments will fully understand and meet these problems only if they are representative of the people who have those problems.

America is now an urban society with more than 70 percent of its people living in urban areas. It is our urban communities which face the massive problems of a growing population. State governments cannot meet their obligations to the urban majority if State legislative bodies are forever to have a veto power vested in the hands of rural minorities.

Rural legislators have historically been reluctant to provide the scope of public services essential to an urban community. To a large extent this reluctance has been based upon a failure to understand urban problems. In addition, however, there has been rural opposition to spending the amounts of money necessary to provide the high level of public services which urban centers require. The failure of State legislatures to meet public needs is directly related to the unrepresentative and unresponsive nature of these bodies.

The States cannot survive as viable units of government if they do not provide the public services which are essential to their citizens, and State governments will not provide these services as long as their legislatures are unresponsive to public needs because of apportionment which deprive the people of a full voice in the operation of government.

During the last 30 years there has been a substantial growth in the domestic public services provided by the Federal Government. Many of these functions have become Federal responsibilities as a result of our nationally interdependent economy. Others of them, however, should properly have fallen to State governments. The failure of the States to do their job caused our people to turn to the Federal level to meet public needs. It is my belief that the most important reason for the failure of State governments to assume their responsibilities has been the unrepresentative and unresponsive nature of their legislative bodies.

As a State official, I believe that State governments should be strong, active agencies in meeting the problems of a modern society, but I do not believe that State governments can fulfill their role as full partners in our Federal system as long as they do not reflect the public policy views of the people.

Finally, I want to point out that legislative bodies based on population do not pose a threat to the rural minority. Wisconsin has been a leader in the field of population apportionment. In the early 1950's and again in the early 1960's we reapportioned both houses of our legislature on a population basis. There is no evidence that either of these apportionments worked to the disadvantage of our rural citizens. In fact, the programs of greatest importance to rural Wisconsin have been strengthened in recent years. The programs of the State department of Agriculture and the University of Wisconsin Agricultural Extension Division

have been expanded since Wisconsin achieved population reapportionment.

Our State's program of school aids to local communities tends to favor rural areas and small towns because the aid formula is based partly on the local tax base. Not only has the reapportioned State legislature maintained the formula which favors our rural minority, but they have increased the percentage of local school costs which are borne by the State treasury.

I do not know of a single instance in which the rural minority in Wisconsin was denied the benefit of State government help to meet their problems because of population reapportionment. The impact of population apportionment has not been to diminish the concern of State government for our rural citizens, but rather to mobilize State government to also meet the problems of our urban majority.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that on both fundamental democratic principles and practical considerations of the future of State government, Joint Resolution 2 would be detrimental to the public welfare. I respectfully urge the committee to recommend the defeat of this measure.

Rev. Henry Joseph Browne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 27 a unique low-income apartment house was dedicated in my congressional district. The project, at 120 West 94th Street in New York City, is unique because of its size, which is only 70 apartments, and its name, simply 120 West 94th, and its history—for the history of this development reflects the intelligence and dedication of Rev. Henry Joseph Browne. As President of the Strycker's Bay Neighborhood Council, Father Browne fought for years to have the city construct vest pocket low-income public housing projects. Father Browne's tireless efforts to make the West Side a better place to live has commanded the respect and gratitude of the residents of the West Side. On May 28, 1965, the New York Times published a profile of Rev. Henry Joseph Browne which I hope will be read by all my colleagues.

The profile follows:

[From the New York Times, May 28, 1965]

CRUSADER FOR HOUSING

(By Henry Joseph Browne)

"Even the Indians wouldn't live on the West Side," said the Reverend Henry Joseph Browne yesterday, discussing the neglected upper West Side where he has spent 6 years fighting for what he calls "the human approach" to urban renewal.

"The Indians didn't like the lousy soil," explained Father Browne, history teacher at Cathedral College, 87th Street and West End Avenue. "It wasn't good for planting and there were cold breezes from the [Hudson] River."

Father Browne said the Indians only used the West Side for an occasional clambake, to judge by archeological remains. Fittingly, he himself was the star of another West Side clambake yesterday, marking the opening of the 120 West 94th Street housing project.

He had led his fellow West Siders in the fight for the project and pressured and cajoled officials to make sure its 70 apartments were used for residents of the neighborhood.

HIS NATIVE LAND

Born and bred on the fringe of the old Hell's Kitchen, the Roman Catholic priest is crusading to make the upper West Side as livable as possible for those who make their homes there.

After his teaching chores are done, Father Browne, who is 45 years old, repairs to a drab storefront office at 89th Street and Columbus Avenue, where he presides as president of the Strycker's Bay Neighborhood Council.

The council helps neighborhood residents find quarters, and tells them what to do when landlords violate their rights.

Neighborhood people—Negroes, Puerto Ricans and others—bring a broad spectrum of problems to Father Browne for solution. Some discuss marital troubles, others report evidence of neglect by landlords, such as no heat or water, broken front door locks and rats.

Father Browne is occasionally somewhat cool in his views of welfare officials, and others who deal with the poor.

To small public gatherings he has described welfare officials as "the paid leaders of the poor, who have a vested interest in poverty." Occasionally he speaks of "colonialistic, paternalistic social agencies" including certain Catholic charitable undertakings.

Before an audience of 250 at a neighborhood meeting the other night, Father Browne described himself jokingly as "a heretic."

He added with a smile that he might someday be excommunicated for his irreverent remarks.

"This might not be too bad," he said, noting that as a priest he earned about $3,000 a year, while as a layman he would qualify for double that salary in social work.

Yesterday, however, Father Browne had a sympathetic word.

PRAISES BUREAUCRATS

He said much of the praise for the successful completion of the 94th Street low-income project should go to "the people we usually abuse, the bureaucrats, the guys behind the scenes who cut through the red tape and don't have the satisfaction of seeing how happy the people are up here."

Father Browne reaped that satisfaction yesterday, as he sat on the flag-decked platform at the opening ceremonies, smiling frequently at members of the audience whom he knew.

His mother, once a maid for the Squibb pharmaceutical family, was reared in County Wexford, Ireland. His father, born in what was then Queen's County, Ireland, had worked the furnace at the Astor Hotel before proudly donning a stiff white collar as a shipping clerk.

As a boy, Father Browne, then known as Harry, romped the avenues near his family's Old Law tenement on West 35th Street between 9th and 10th Avenues.

Old Law tenements are those constructed before turn-of-the-century reforms required minimal standards of light and comfort for tenants.

"I find it very difficult," Father Browne said, "to feel that as a design they should ever have been used for human habitation."

The Browne family, including three children, lived in cramped quarters. Father Browne's only brother, a longshoreman, now lives in Flushing. His sister lives with his widowed mother in the Bronx.

After graduating from St. Michael's Parochial School on West 33d Street, Father Browne attended Cathedral College, where he now teaches, before transferring to St. Joseph's Seminary in Yonkers. He was ordained by Cardinal Spellman in 1944, then took a Ph. D. in American history at Catholic University of America in Washington.

A guiding influence in Father Browne's life was Father John Monaghan, a liberal priest at the 2-year Cathedral College. His teaching emphasized the social content in religion.

Father Browne speaks religion and its social content in tones which echo his native 10th Avenue. "He talks like a cabdriver and looks like a truckdriver," said one West Side admirer.

The States of the Union—Shape Up or Ship Out—Chapter I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, according to Ray Morgan, the Kansas City Star's Kansas correspondent, the States of our Union have got to "shape up or ship out"—an old Navy phrase meaning that a crisis of responsibility is at hand. In a series of four outstanding articles datelined Washington, appearing in four consecutive days' issues of the Kansas City Star, Mr. Morgan sets out the scope and nature of the crisis of federalism and points the way for responsible resolution of that crisis. These four articles are so immediate in the context of our work here in the Congress that I am placing them in four consecutive issues of the RECORD, for all my colleagues. Chapter I follows here; chapters II through IV will appear in succeeding RECORDS.

(By Ray Morgan)

WASHINGTON.—Have the States and local governments of this country become useless relics of an era when the pace of the Nation was much slower and transportation and communication more difficult?

Are the growing millions of dollars being pumped by the Federal Government into grants-in-aid programs in the States, such as in Kansas and Missouri, beginning to forecast the day when the Federal Government will be the sole proprietor of government function?

EYED BY MANY

These questions are getting a great deal of attention these days from President Lyndon B. Johnson and his staff, the Congress, the organizations here which represent the State and local governments and of private pressure groups which have a special interest in the program.

House and Senate Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations, headed by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, and Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, are seeking in hearings now underway to determine whether Congress needs to take further legislative action to define the roles.

Some Federal officials are saying privately that State and local governments only impede the goals the Nation has set for itself. Some county and State officials argue that the Federal Government has usurped the powers of the State and local governments.

The issue is nothing new. From the establishment of the Republic, the division of authority and responsibility between the Na-

tional Government and the States has been debated with fervor.

What has brought this into new and sharper focus is the growing entrance of the Federal Government into such fields as public housing, urban renewal, air and water pollution, water treatment, and sewage facilities, and mental health.

SOME NEW FORMS

In some areas, these programs have been channeled through existing governmental units. In others, these have been bypassed in favor of newly created local agencies such as public housing and urban renewal agencies.

This is what has brought into debate at all levels the question of whether the time has not come for Americans, through their elected representatives at all levels, to reexamine their positions to determine how government in a new era of free society can function.

One finds an increasing awareness here in Washington, particularly in view of international and domestic developments since the onset of World War II which have given special importance to the structure of this Federal system.

The sequence of international crises has brought into sharp focus the contrast between the Federal form, which has powers divided among the parts, and the unitarian systems under which all public powers stem from the Central Government.

ASK MORE SERVICES

At home, the Government has expanded its role with problems of national economic growth and stability, with accelerated population mobility, particularly into and around large urban areas, and with the insistence of the voters on more and improved governmental services.

W. R. Coleman, a former Missouri State official and now Director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations created by Congress, is one of the most articulate spokesmen on the crisis.

"Growth and complexity of our modern life and governmental activity has added greatly to the variety and extent of interaction among the several levels of government," Coleman said.

"The increased interaction has expanded opportunities for actual accomplishment of a greater range of intergovernmental cooperation. However, such expansion of governmental activities at all levels has correspondingly increased the number of actual and potential frictions within our Federal system.

"In the process, municipal and State officials have become increasingly more concerned with intergovernmental relations. Similar attention also has emanated from a succession of recent Congresses and Presidents.

HELD MISSOURI JOB

Coleman, who holds degrees in public administration and political science, served as director of the merit system for Missouri following his graduation and in State governments of Louisiana and Oregon. He also service as Assistant Director of the National Science Foundation before becoming Director of the Commission when it was established in 1959 under President Dwight D. Eisenhower. His mother still lives in Callao, Mo.

"During the administration of President Truman, the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the Hoover Commission, addressed itself to the Federal-State relationship," he said.

"It concentrated especially here with reference to administration of Federal grants-in-aid programs. In one of its reports it recommended that a permanent agency 'be created with primary responsibility for study information and guidance in the field of Federal-State relationships.' "

In 1953, President Eisenhower again called for a thorough review of intergovernmental relations and the Congress responded by authorizing the creation of a commission made up of persons appointed by the President and designated Members of Congress.

CHICAGO MAN AT HELM

"This Commission came to be known by the name of the Chairman, the late Meyer Kestnbaum of Chicago," Coleman said. "In 1955, the Krestnbaum Commission issued its formal report, the most comprehensive review of intergovernmental relations since the adoption of the Constitution. That resulted in the creation of this Commission."

The Commission, on which John Anderson, Jr., of Kansas, served during the time he was Governor, has looked into the matters thoroughly and systematically. What Coleman sees ahead for the States as a result is what the Navy has expressed as "shape up or ship out."

"We need the States, but they must modernize if they survive," Coleman said in his office at 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue.

"They must reexamine and update their constitutions, provide incentives for cooperative efforts between cities and counties, allow cities and counties to band together to create authorities to handle certain functions of government, and help local areas to obtain a certain degree of autonomy to deal with problems."

Tunisian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the sixth anniversary of the Constitution of the Republic of Tunisia. This was a most significant reminder of the praiseworthy degree of economic and social progress which has been realized in this African nation in recent years, and is just cause for our sincere commendation.

It was just 9 years ago, in 1956, that Tunisia achieved her independence after a long struggle of several decades. A year later the Republic was established and Habib Bourguiba was named President by the Assembly. Finally on June 1, 1959, the Constitution drawn by the Assembly was promulgated.

Though this Republic is comparatively new, the area in which it lies is rich in culture and tradition. Originally the site of Carthage, a Phoenician trading center and rival of the Roman Empire, the nation's history provides a fascinating study of the determined efforts of these people to achieve a stature of independence and progress.

Under President Bourguiba the Republic of Tunisia has taken great strides toward the fulfillment of these goals. Imaginative and dynamic programs have been initiated resulting in economic growth and a greater measure of political stability. As a recipient of U.S. foreign aid, Tunisia typifies a desirable example of the proper use of our assistance by a nation which is willing to at the same time help itself.

In the brief period of its independence, Tunisia has made substantial progress in the areas of agriculture, education, technology, and industrial development. President Bourguida has proven himself a true leader of his people and a remarkable political figure.

The people of the United States are pleased to be associated with the development we have seen to date, and we congratulate the leaders and people of Tunisia for their notable progress. On this important occasion we offer our very best wishes for continued success to President Habib Bourguiba, Ambassador to the United States Rachid Driss, and the people of Tunisia.

Silver Experts Give Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the statements of two respected mining authorities, Robert M. Hardy, Jr., and Simon D. Strauss, both of whom testified today on the silver coinage bill before the House Banking and Currency Committee:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT M. HARDY, JR.

Mr. chairman and members of the committee, my name is Robert M. Hardy, Jr., and I reside in Santa Barbara, Calif. I am chairman of the Silver Committee of the American Mining Congress.

It is a privilege and a pleasure to appear before you today to discuss the legislation confronting you. I am grateful for the opportunity.

The American Mining Congress has brought to the attention of the executive branch of the Government and both Houses of Congress its views on the constitution of silver coinage. We feel very strongly that a coinage of intrinsic value is the coinage that will demand the respect not only of all people but of all nations and will best serve the purpose as a circulating medium. We have pointed out that the silver content must be reduced; the simple reason being that there is too much silver in the individual coins now being minted. We have considered the arguments advanced for the elimination of silver in the 25-cent piece and the 10-cent piece, and we do not find that they override our viewpoint. We feel that there is enough silver for retention of some in not only the 50-cent piece but in the 25-cent piece and in the 10-cent piece.

The main problem seems to be one of looking ahead to the supply of silver that will be available. I would like to point out that the present price of silver has existed since September of 1963 and that the short time since then has not really been long enough to properly assess the potential of the future. We of the American Mining Congress have been studying this problem for some time and last fall released some of the results of our studies in that we would see by 1968 an increase of 38 million ounces in worldwide silver production, which I must say was a very conservative estimate and in no way optimistic. The figures were derived from projects either already underway or for which the capital had largely been committed, and was a first appraisal of a situa-

tion which changes continually and, I must say, on the upward side.

We see underway throughout the world at the present time not only the reopening of old mines, but the exploration for and the development of new properties which will, I am sure, increase that production potential remarkably over the 38 million ounces seen last fall. After all, the production of a metal from the ground is not a procedure in which you plow, seed, fertilize, cultivate, and harvest. It is a process in which you must find the deposit and then force the earth to disgorge it. This is a project which takes time, toil, and effort and, I must say, a good deal of money.

I would like to call to your attention the story of uranium which, while not under discussion here today, illustrates so well what happens when one considers a metal that must be found and produced.

Back in 1949 we supposedly had very little uranium in this country, being dependent upon the Great Bear Lake deposit in Canada and mostly upon the Belgian Congo. Russia had just exploded her first atomic bomb and we were desperate.

After due deliberation, a price of $3.50 per pound for uranium oxide was announced and the search commenced. By 1953, the development of the Colorado Plateau deposits was underway. Soon the extensions of the area into New Mexico and Wyoming were outlined, as were the Blind River, Ontario, and other Canadian projects.

Ten years from the announcement of the guaranteed price, we had more uranium in sight than we could use for the time being, whereas we had been woefully short in 1949.

Again, the point is that it takes time and effort to bring about the development of a mineral deposit so that it goes into production. It does not occur overnight, yet production does answer the call of price. Price in this instance does not mean that the producer is looking for a higher profit. It means that price must cover the cost of exploring for, developing, and paying the cost of production so that the mineral may become ore and pass into trade and commerce.

Another example that I might point out to you has already been brought to your attention through the introduction into these hearings of the Treasury staff study of silver and coinage by the Secretary, Mr. Fowler, and I quote, "Increases in copper and zinc production in the postwar period have far exceeded the expectations generally held in the early 1950's. It is interesting in this connection to compare the actual increases that have occurred with the projections for 1975 made by the Paley Commission in 1952."

The Treasury study goes on to show that by 1962 copper production had already exceeded the Paley Commission's estimate for 1975 by a wide margin, that world copper reserves are very large and that the Paley estimate for 1975 is quite unlikely to be accurate.

I might say the same is true of any Treasury estimates of the production of silver.

Another aspect which has received little attention is that of the newer techniques of exploration which are just beginning to be utilized. You have all heard of the Timmins discovery of Texas Gulf Sulphur. That was made by the diamond drilling of an anomaly initially outlined by airborne electromagnetic detection methods. There was no surface exposure, but the techniques pinpointed the deposit.

These geophysical techniques are strikingly effective, and we have many areas in this country alone which are susceptible to their employment. For instance, I have information concerning a deposit of over a billion tons located in the California desert which has been outlined by the newer techniques and is said to contain mineable values in molybdenum and gold, with about one-half an ounce in silver per ton. If this is brought into production on a large scale, the U.S. production of silver will be enhanced remarkably.

In summation, there is silver to be had, enough to satisfy the needs for coinage and for industry. However, it must be wrested from the earth by toil and effort, and will not spring forth readily in answer to a cry of panic. On the other hand, that cry of panic will not stop it from coming forth in answer to a need.

STATEMENT BY SIMON D. STRAUSS

Mr. chairman and members of the committee, my name is Simon D. Strauss. I am a vice president of the American Smelting & Refining Co., a large miner and refiner of silver. I am also a member of the Silver Committee of the American Mining Congress.

For 173 years the subsidiary coinage of this country, based primarily on silver, has been maintained without substantial change—a record that is unique in economic history. The legislation before this committee would end that era—primarily because of the dwindling reserves of silver held by the Treasury.

Silver miners have been calling attention for years to the problems that would certainly arise because new silver production, lacking sufficient incentives, was lagging behind demand. Until recently these representations were given little heed.

We agree that a change in coinage cannot now be avoided. But in agreeing we do not mean to imply acceptance of the suggestion, made by some, that silver has no place in the country's coinage system.

On the contrary, we believe the lesson of history is clear that currency systems based exclusively on fiat money are, in the long run, doomed to drastic devaluation. The ancient Greek city states and the great Roman Empire started out with coinage of intrinsic value, but as they gradually watered their coinage down so did their economies suffer. In modern times we have seen the currencies of great industrial nations—Germany, Japan, Italy, and France—depreciate in value almost to the vanishing point as their governments resorted more and more to the printing presses and to token coinage. It is to combat the loss of confidence by their citizenry, as a result of this harrowing experience, that all four of these countries in the postwar period have resumed the coining of silver.

These governments could realize a larger seignorage profit today by issuing coins only of base metals—why do they spend the money to buy silver instead? Because they seek the confidence of the man in the street and they know that silver coinage helps. It touches a deep instinct in the average human, the desire to possess something of intrinsic value or to have it readily available to him.

One cannot deny that a base-metal coin, bearing the imprimateur of the U.S. Government, will be accepted at full face value over the shop counter. It will be legal tender if the Congress says it is, and as your chairman remarked yesterday it can be used in the discharge of all debts. But in the long run, if only base-metal coins and paper bills are available to the average citizen, will his confidence in his currency, will the purchasing power of the dollar hold up as well as under a system where part of the circulating medium of exchange carries intrinsic value? The learned economists give you one answer, but the history of the world gives another.

Today it is true that Great Britain does not have in circulation any currency of intrinsic value—the change having taken place in 1964. Whether the British will succeed in the long run has yet to be determined.

So, gentlemen, while we agree that a change in coinage is now unavoidable, we urge you to retain silver to the maximum extent feasible. The Treasury Department is recommending to you the retention of silver in the 50-cent piece and is suggesting that the question of the $1 coin be reexamined by the proposed Joint Commission on the Coinage after the termination of the transition period for issuing the new subsidiary coins.

This strikes us as an absolutely minimum program with respect to silver. Just as we called attention to the deficit in silver supplies when others considered the supplies ample, so now we believe many of the statements with respect to the shortage of silver are exaggerated.

For example, attached to Secretary Fowler's statement before this committee on June 4 was a tabulation that showed a deficit of 205 million ounces in supplies in 1963 and of 335 million ounces in 1964—huge figures in relation to the present Treasury stock of 1 billion ounces.

But the Secretary compared total demand for silver—industrial and coinage—with new mine production. Those of us in the metal industry know only too well that on the supply side one cannot overlook the flow of metal salvaged from scrap and residues. Good figures on this supply are hard to come by. Handy and Harman estimated that in 1964 20 million ounces were recovered from demonetized coin of countries other than the United States and that salvaged scrap amounted to about 11,400,000 ounces—but frankly our impression, as a large refiner of silver, is that this latter figure is much too low. Work now being done on recovery of silver from photographic scrap shows great promise for increased yields.

More significant in judging the extent of the true gap between demand and supply are two other factors—the accumulation of inventories by speculators and consumers (estimated by Handy and Harman at 70 million ounces last year) and the inflated demand for silver coinage in the United States. A major factor in the latter was, of course, the minting of the Kennedy half dollar, most of which disappeared into private hands and did not circulate. It would take a mindreader to ascertain how much of this withholding was due to sentimental desire for a memento of our late President and how much of it was due to hoarding for the silver content, but our guess is that sentiment rather than greed was the major factor. In any case over one-third of our total 1964 use of silver for coinage was in the Kennedy half dollar. The heavy demand for the dime and the quarter was out of all proportion to previous years, even allowing for growth in population and higher rate of business activity.

Thus, in our view, the realistic gap between demand and supply in silver—instead of being 335 million ounces—is more probably in the order of 150 million to 180 million ounces annually based on 900-fineness coins.

We agree that part of this gap must be met by cutting down on coinage requirements. The figures in the Treasury Staff Study indicate that the 900-fineness coin normal demand would be on the order of 100 million ounces a year and that a 400-fineness clad coin for the 10-cent, 25-cent, and 50-cent pieces would require about 50 million to 60 million ounces annually after the transition period had been ended. To meet this the Treasury has available not only the billion ounces of silver in its stocks but also the silver content of 1,900 million ounces contained in coinage now circulating. How much of this the Treasury would recover is, perhaps, debatable, but no one should make the mistake of assuming that this huge stock of silver has forever disappeared from the marketplace. In one form or another, most of it will eventually find its way back and will be available either for the minting of

new coins or for the satisfaction of industrial requirements.

Mr. Hardy is dealing in detail with the outlook for supply. Let me say only that the failure of mine production in this country to rise has been due primarily to the lack of economic incentives. While the price of silver is up, it has risen less than the other major nonferrous metals in the postwar period and much less than operating costs. Nevertheless, because two-thirds of the increase in price has occurred within the last 3 years, more exploration and development work is now underway on silver projects than at any time in the last 30 years. If exploration expenses could be written off currently for tax purposes, this would give a further incentive for more prospecting. In any case, mine production is now rising—in the first quarter it was up 17 percent over the corresponding period of 1964 in the United States—and substantial further increases can be expected.

The legislation before you contemplates the fixing of a minimum price of $1.25 an ounce for domestically mined silver. This floor was not sought by the mining industry; we do not attach any great importance to it. Past experience has taught us that if we accept floors we may also expect ceilings. So far as we are concerned we would be just as happy wtihout it.

We share with the Secretary of the Treasury his grave reservations about a system of elaborate controls on exports, hoarding, etc. We recognize and sympathize with the motives that prompt legislators to outlaw speculation and accumulation of silver at this crucial time with respect to coinage. However, silver is a very valuable commodity and controls that will be observed by honest people are an open invitation to the racketeer and the criminal. A two-price system in silver, with higher prices abroad, would invite reverse smuggling across the borders. Considering the large numbers of our citizens who work in Mexico and Canada and Mexicans and Canadians who work in the United States and cross the borders daily, policing the regulations would be a herculean task. They would involve invasion of personal privacy to a degree that might be intolerable to many.

Gentlemen, we fully recognize the gravity of the situation but we do not believe it justifies swinging to the extreme of completely eliminating silver from coinage. We feel that the Treasury program for continuing silver in the half dollar is a minimum step and that actually a greater use of silver could be contemplated with reasonable safety.

Jim Austin of Northeast Airlines—A Fighter Who Refused To Be Licked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, those of us in New England are deeply aware of the vital importance to our region's development of full and proper air service. We have, therefore, been following anxiously the developments affecting Northeast Airlines. The health of this company is of immense concern to us. All throughout the lengthy hearings and trials before the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal courts, we were certain that once the facts were clearly brought out, that Northeast's position would be vindicated as it has been now. To an immense degree, the credit for this victory belongs to Northeast's president, Mr. James W. Austin who refused to give up even when this tortuous proceeding was going against him and the outlook was at its blackest.

Publisher William Loeb of the Manchester Union-Leader spoke eloquently for many of us in New England in a June 4 editorial on the front page of his paper. I second his comments wholeheartedly and offer the editorial for the RECORD at this point:

GUTS AND PERSEVERANCE

Next to Prime Minister Winston Churchill's example of guts and courage in propping up a defeated England and, in the end, seeing the downfall of the evil forces represented by the Nazis, we can think of no better illustration of persistence and courage than that exhibited by James W. Austin, president of Northeast Airlines, in his long nerve-racking fight to save New England's principal air carrier.

When the CAB voted against renewing Northeast's license to fly its most lucrative routes between Boston and Florida, few gave Northeast much chance to survive—but survive it has. At long last, after many court battles, the CAB has decided to grant Northeast another chance to apply for the continuation of its service to Florida.

Mr. Austin, beset by financial difficulties of his growing airline and harassed at every step by the powerful interests supporting Eastern and National Airlines, who were anxious to have the Florida route to themselves, never lost faith and never ceased to fight. Now it would seem as if victory is coming much closer.

Aside from this newspaper's admiration for Mr. Austin's capacity for doing battle and not quitting, New England, itself, had much at stake in the outcome of this struggle. It would certainly seem highly probable that, deprived of the lucrative Florida route, Northeast would have had to curtail its service inside New England, and it is on this service that New England transportation largely depends.

Incredible, also during this fight, were the stabs in the back that Austin and Northeast received from people who should have been supporting them. For instance, the New England Council dropped its support of Northeast. Large newspapers, such as the Portland, Maine, Press-Herald, urged Northeast to "see its way to forget the doubtful benefits of fighting powerful competitors for the Florida trade."

Many New Englanders have been too quick to criticize Northeast's service in New England, but the cold facts are that New England, by and large, hasn't patronized Northeast or any other airline. You can't have plush service if you don't have the passenger traffic which will support it.

However, as New England grows, and as the traffic on Northeast's southern route increases, as it is bound to do, Northeast's earning picture should improve. When that time comes, we have every confidence that President Austin and Northeast will give New England the very best airline service available.

Congratulations to a great fighter who didn't know when he was licked.

WILLIAM LOEB,
Publisher.

The Supreme Court and Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by Rev. John J. Regan, C.M., dean of St. John's University Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the quarterly meeting of the John Carroll Society here in Washington on May 2, 1965.

The problem of obscene material reaching our children is one that has been with us for many years. No one was yet devised a satisfactory way to keep this material out of the hands of young people. Certainly, as Father Regan stressed, the first step is the vigilant parent and the well-formed conscience.

Father Regan's remarks follow:

THE SUPREME COURT AND OBSCENITY

It was with a certain amount of apprehension that I accepted Bishop Hannan's and Mr. Powell's kind invitation to address you on the topic of obscenity and censorship. My position today is somewhat ambivalent. I come to you as an armchair lawyer who has never represented a client. I come to speak on obscenity, and yet I cannot say that I habitually read pornographic material. And I come as a priest in these days of the aggiornamento and the emerging layman, when it is not quite fashionable for a priest to speak to laymen about a nontheological problem.

Be this as it may, we cannot lightly dismiss the problem of obscenity in our American society.

We have come to expect periodic outbursts from the American public at the Supreme Court's decisions dealing with obscenity. The people are rightly concerned. Our society is in the middle of an anti-Puritan revolution in morals. Any writer who manages to shock is automatically entitled to respect as a worthy rebel. William Phillips, editor of the Partisan Review, has labeled the heroes of today's avant-garde as "the new immoralists." He adds: "To embrace what is assumed to be beyond the pale is taken as a sign of true sophistication. And this is not simply a change in sensibility; it amounts to a sensibility of chaos."

In reaction to this revolution, the ordinary citizen is developing a neurosis about courts and judges. He sees the flood of pornography inundating the newsstand and the local movie theater, and flowing steadily into the private home through the mails. In desperation he is turning to the legislatures and ultimately to the courts for protection. But he is frustrated by the apparent lack of concern in the courts for his problem. He sees little of the delicate judicial task of balancing the public interest in the moral fabric of society with the equally important public interest in free speech.

This morning I wish to discuss with you two aspects of the problem of censorship, the constitutional issue and the moral issue, and then to offer a few suggestions.

Just what has the Supreme Court been up to in dealing with obscenity? Generally speaking, it has been wrestling with two major problems for nearly a decade. The

first is to hammer out a workable definition of obscenity; the second is to surround the standard with adequate procedural safeguards for those accused of violating the standard and for the circulation of the material itself. I should like to develop the first of these points at some length to give you an idea of the complexity of the Court's task.

The problem of defining obscenity has been a recurrent one. The story is told of the delegates to the old Geneva Conference on the Suppression of the Circulation and Traffic in Obscene Publications, who discovered that they could not define obscenity. Having triumphantly asserted that they did not know what they were talking about, they settled down to their discussion. The courts have not oversimplified the definitional problem to that extent, but they have experienced great difficulty.

The English courts formulated the first such test in *Regina* v. *Hicklin* in 1868: "The test of obscenity is this, whether the tendency of the matter charged as obscenity is to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences, and into whose hands a publication of this sort may fall."

The Hicklin test proved inadequate in protecting the right of free speech. It permitted the courts to judge a complete work to be obscene by reading only isolated passages out of context. The availability of a book to a susceptible audience could also result in a judgment of obscenity. Thus, adults might be deprived of a book which might disturb the young. Finally, the Hicklin test made no provision for the literacy, medical or sociological value of a particular work, and it considered irrelevant the author's motive in writing the book.

The test nevertheless became quickly established in the American courts, but not without objection. In 1913, Judge Learned Hand, while feeling obliged to follow the test, added a note of personal protest: "Indeed it seems hardly likely that we are even today so lukewarm in our interest in letters or serious discussion as to be content to reduce our treatment of sex to the standard of a child's library in the supposed interest of a salacious few, or that shame will for long prevent us from adequate portrayal of some of the most serious and beautiful sides of human nature."

The famous "Ulysses" case marked the first departure from the Hicklin rule. Judge Woolsey denied the motion of the United States for a decree declaring the book not importable into the country on the ground that it was obscene matter under the Tariff Act of 1930, and for the seizure and destruction of the book under the act.

Judge Woolsey declared that the author's motive in writing the book was relevant in deciding whether the book was written for the purpose of exploiting obscenity, even though this intent was not the test of obscenity. He then defined "obscenity" as material "tending to stir the sex impulses or to lead to sexually impure and lustful thoughts." In deciding whether material was obscene, the Court should consider the book's effect on the person with average sex instincts, just as it would use the "reasonable man" test in a tort action. Finally, the trier of fact must read the entire work.

In affirming this decision, Judge Augustus N. Hand formulated a new test for obscenity which was a considerable advance over the Hicklin norm:

"We believe that the proper test of whether a given book is obscene is its dominant effect. In applying this test, relevancy of the objectionable parts to the theme, the established reputation of the work in the estimation of approved critics, if the book is modern, and the verdict of the past, if it is ancient, are persuasive pieces of evidence."

The definitional problem first reached the Supreme Court in 1957 in the Roth-Alberts cases. The issue presented by the cases was an abstract one: "Whether obscenity is utterance within the area of protected speech and press." The Court, speaking through Justice Brennan, held that obscenity was "utterly without redeeming social importance" and, therefore, was "not within the area of constitutionally protected speech or press." The Court, however, was careful to point out that "all ideas having even the slightest redeeming social importance—unorthodox ideas, controversial ideas, even ideas hateful to the prevailing climate of opinion," are protected against governmental restraint.

Justice Brennan went on to formulate the constitutional definition of obscenity: "Whether to the average person, applying contemporary standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to a prurient interest."

On its face, the definition seemed eminently sensible. Indeed, some Catholic comment applauded it as roughly equivalent to the canonical meaning of obscenity. But over the years following the decision, what appeared so clear on the surface has proven to be strewn with pitfalls.

Take the term "appeal to prurient interest," for example. Justice Brennan noted that it was not the same as interest in sex. Not every portrayal of sex was obscene. Rather, prurient interest was a "shameful or morbid interest in nudity, sex, or excretion." Material was said to appeal to this interest when, of itself, it has "the capacity to attract individuals eager for a forbidden look behind the curtain of privacy which our customs draw upon sexual interest."

What does this mean concretely? The Roth case gave no examples. But later in 1957, the Court decided three cases which furnished some guidance. In them it held that nude photographs and stories appealing to homosexual interest were not obscene. At first impression, one would judge that material of this type certainly appealed to prurient interest and had a tendency to excite lustful thoughts. Apparently some further characteristic was required to make such material obscene.

The missing element was supplied by the Court in 1962. Justice Harlan stated that two distinct elements as required for matter to be obscene: (1) appeal to prurient interest, and (2) patent offensiveness. The latter is a quality in a publication which makes it so offensive on its face that it affronts current community standards of decency. In the case at hand, Justice Harlan concluded that the magazines consisting of photos of male nudes designed to appeal to homosexuals were "dismally unpleasant, uncouth and tawdry, but this was not enough to make them obscene."

From these cases we can conclude that the Court's concept of obscenity is a narrow one. Some experts have therefore argued that obscenity is practically speaking limited to "hard-core pornography."

What is "hard-core pornography?" Dr. Margaret Mead defines pornography as material "calculated to stimulate sex feeling independent of the presence of another loved and chosen human being." Its essential element is "the daydream as distinct from reality. It feeds the erotic fantasies of the immature, the perverted and the senile." The adjective "hard-core" is added to indicate that the material is grossly shocking.

The Court of Appeals of New York has described "hard-core pornography" in much the same way: "It focuses predominantly upon hat is sexually morbid, grossly perverse and bizarre, without any artistic or scientific purpose of justification—the obscene is the vile, rather than the coarse, the blow to sense, not merely to sensibility. It smacks, at times, of fantasy and unreality, of sexual perversion and sickness and represents—'a debauchery of the sexual faculty.'"

Whether the Supreme Court has actually equated obscenity and hard-core pornography is still debatable. Justice Harlan believes that the two are identical. The Chief Justice asks "who can define 'hard-core pornography' with any greater clarity than 'obscenity?'" And Justice Stewart doubts whether he could define the term, but states that he knows it when he sees it.

Let us turn to a second line of thought suggested by the Roth definition of obscenity: The Court stated that the "average man" was the norm to be used in determining whether material appealed to prurient interest. Again, the norm seems logical and sensible. After all, the normal adult should not have the level of his reading reduced, as Judge Learned Hand put it, to a child's library.

But again the problems. Some writers have found great difficulty in reconciling the average man test with the peculiar appeal of hard-core pornography. By definition, pornography is supposed to appeal only to the immature, the perverted and the senile. To the average man it is supposed to be repulsive, or as the Court put it, patently offensive. If obscenity must attract the average man and yet repel him, are we not close to a self-contradictory definition? Have we not said, practically speaking, that nothing is obscene? Moreover, have we not exposed the weakest members of society, our youth, to material which even the strongest adult finds hard to stomach?

As a way out of this dilemma, other writers have suggested that it is quite possible that obscene material may contain prurient appeal and offensiveness simultaneously. They believe that the average adult can simultaneously be attracted by the lure of pruriency and yet be offended by it. The explanation lies in the psychological makeup of man. The interest in stag movies of many adult males is a case in point. The suggestive theme of the movie stirs up and arouses and is attractive in the sense of offering erotic stimulation. This appeal may be only monetary, but it is still present. Yet the adult also knows, as a rational being, that the movie offends a social norm or ethic which he cherishes. Thus, while he watches it, the movie simultaneously offers on the sense level a prurient appeal and offends on the intellectual level the viewer's social and moral sense.

There is yet another problem suggested by the "average man" portion of the Roth definition of obscenity. The Manual Enterprises case will illustrate the problem. In this case material appealing to homosexual interest was judged by the "average man" test and found not to be obscene. The result of this decision is to put a premium on perversion. Or consider the equally undesirable result in the 31 Photographs case in which obscene material destined specifically for a group of social scientists could not be imported into the country.

The suggested answer to this problem is to apply the average man test only when there is a reasonable possibility that the material in question will reach a cross section of the community. In the special cases mentioned above, however, a "variable" standard would be used. This standard would be based on the appeal to the prurient interest of the special audience alone. It would avoid the unhappy results of the Manual Enterprises and 31 Photographs cases and would make for easier regulation of material directed specifically at youth, a point which I shall develop later.

A third main avenue of thought is suggested by the Roth requirement that contemporary community standards be applied in determining whether material is obscene. There is little difficulty in asking that standards be contemporary. But it is quite another matter to determine what the community is in a nation as large and diverse

as ours. May New Yorkers apply one standard and Nebraska another?

Even the members of the Supreme Court cannot agree. In the Jacobellis case, Chief Justice Warren held for local community standards.

"I believe that there is no provable 'national standard,' and perhaps there should be none * * *. This Court has not been able to enunciate one, and it would be unreasonable to expect local courts to define one."

But Justice Brennan argued for a national standard. A local one would have, in his opinion:

"The intolerable consequence of denying some sections of the country access to material, there deemed acceptable, which in others might be considered offensive to pervading community standards of decency * * *. To sustain the suppression of a particular book or film in one locality would deter its dissemination in other localities where it might not be held obscene, since sellers and exhibitors would be reluctant to risk criminal conviction in testing the variation between the two places."

He concluded, in a paraphrase of Chief Justice John Marshall's dictum: "It is, after all, a National Constitution we are expounding."

But whether the standards are to be national or local, we can rightly ask: who is to determine what are contemporary standards? We have moved in 17 years from a condemnation of Lillian Smith's "Strange Fruit" to an approval of Miller's "Tropic of Cancer." Are Americans indulging in an orgy of openmindedness that will suddenly pass, or is the change the hasty demise of an overripe Puritanism? Some groups have argued strongly that most Americans are living by traditional standards of sexual morality and that they are affronted by the openmindedness going on about them, but that they have no way to express their feelings.

Justice Brennan believes that the jury is the proper agency for determining contemporary community standards. In his view the jury represents a cross section of the community and thus has a special aptitude for reflecting the view of the average person. But Justice Brennan's regard for the jury trial is not shared by other members of the Supreme Court. Justice Harlan, for example, stated in the *Roth* case:

"Many juries might find Joyce's 'Ulysses' or Boccaccio's 'Decameron' was obscene, and yet, no such verdict would convince me, without more, that these books are utterly without redeeming social importance."

The final point suggested by the Roth decision which I wish to develop this morning is the question: Why should society ban material because it stimulates sexual thoughts and desires? Or to put the question in the terms used by the Court, why ban communication which is socially worthless? To point to history alone does not give a substantial answer, since history indicates only the existence of a consensus, not the reason for the consensus. Nor is it satisfactory to say that prurient thoughts and desires are sinful. Legislation based on the theological concept of sin might be challenged as a violation of the establishment of religion clause of the first amendment.

A better answer is that obscenity corrupts individual morals and indirectly public morality. The power of the state to protect the public morality is largely unquestioned.

Another good reason for banning obscenity is to prevent exploitation of psychosexual tensions. Many psychiatrists hold that exposure to pornography may lead a person to become a sexual pervert or deviate, or at least it may stunt or retard the normal psychological growth of some persons, particularly adolescents. Note, however, that this is not to say that pornography causes antisocial behavior. That controversy has plagued psychiatrists and social scientists too long for me to take sides today.

So much for the constitutional problem. As you have seen, I have raised more questions than I have answered, which is always the mark of a law school teacher. Borrowing the expression of Prof. Philip Kurland, one can describe his reaction to the Court's handling of the problem in the words of a wall plaque hung in a saloon of frontier times: "Don't shoot the piano player. He's doing his best." The man in the street may wish the Court to stick to the piano and not try to be a one-man band. He may even ask the Court to take piano lessons. But unless he can play the tune better, he'd better just sit and listen.

I suppose that by now you're wondering how a Catholic priest can be so tolerant of legislation which does little to control obscenity. This observation leads me to the second major issue that I wish to discuss with you today—the moral issue. I believe that the dissatisfaction of many segments of the American public with the Supreme Court is based on a misunderstanding of the relation between the legal order and the moral order. Because an act is immoral does not mean that it should also be illegal. By moral standards a work is obscene if its instrinsic tendency is such as actually to arouse or is calculated to arouse sexual passion in the viewer or reader, but comparatively few works judged immoral would be illegal under the Roth definition of obscenity and its later interpretations.

St. Thomas Aquinas pointed out this distinction between the legal and the moral orders 700 years ago when he wrote: "Human law is framed for a number of human beings, the majority of whom are not perfect in virtue. Therefore, human laws do not forbid all vices from which the virtuous abstain, but only the more grievous vices from which it is possible for the majority to abstain; and chiefly these that are to the hurt of others, without the prohibition of which human society could not be maintained; thus human law prohibits murder, theft, and suchlike."

Our sad experience years ago with prohibition should have taught us that good morals do not make good law. We are presently reappraising other laws with strong moral overtones, for example, those controlling the use and sale of contraceptives and those outlawing homosexual conduct between consenting adults.

In trying to control obscenity, the legislator or judge must consider primarily the social aspects of a ban on such material. He must ask whether such a ban might deter the dissemination of ideas and the distribution of worthwhile literature, both essential to the political processes and the intellectual growth of our democracy. He must also recognize that men can be legally coerced into only a minimal amount of moral action, especially in sexual matters. He will, therefore, often settle for a minimum of constraint because of the tension in moral outlook inherent in a religiously pluralistic society. The law will tolerate many evils that morality condemns.

Is this to say, then, freedom is to be absolute and obscenity is to run rampant? By no means. The legislatures and the courts have provided a safeguard, even though it be very limited. There still remains an important job to do, that of protecting the youth of our society from the corruptors. This is a task to be undertaken in a responsible way by two groups, legislative bodies and private agencies. Our legislators, National, State and local, must still draft effective legislation to prevent the distribution of obscene material to the young.

The Supreme Court itself has indicated as recently as last June in the Jacobellis case, it would consider favorably a separate standard for youths. Justice Brennan stated: "We recognize the legitimate and indeed exigent interest of the States and localities throughout the Nation in preventing the dissemination of material deemed harmful to children. But that interest does not justify a total suppression of such material, the effect of which would be to reduce the adult population * * * to reading only what is left for children. State and local authorities might well consider whether their objectives in this area would be better served by laws aimed specifically at preventing the distribution of objectionable material to children rather than at totally prohibiting its dissemination."

Chief Justice Warren and Mr. Justice Clark expressed a similar view in a dissenting opinion in the same case.

The Court could hardly have been more explicit in urging that legislation designed to protect children be drawn up and enacted. Those of us concerned about the impact of obscenity on our youth should be using all available means to press for the enactment of such legislation on the Federal, State, and local levels.

The work of the legislatures can also be aided by the work of responsible voluntary private groups. We cannot underestimate the effect of concerted private action and group pressures upon the reading and viewing habits of Americans. Such groups as Anthony Comstock's New York Society for the Suppression of Vice and the New England Watch and Ward Society exercised a potent influence for two generations. More recently, the National Organization for Decent Literature, the Citizens for Decent Literature, and interfaith movements such as New York City's Operation Yorkville have been attempting to control the flow of obscenity through publishing lists of objectionable material, addressing community groups, and in some cases conducting cleanup campaigns of local newsstands and theaters.

Such groups perform a valuable service when they seek to educate the public to the prevalence and danger of obscenity. In their own way, their activities are related to the Supreme Court's emphasis on contemporary community standards in the constitutional definition of obscenity. Such groups not only reflect contemporary standards but may legitimately work to raise them.

At times, however, voluntary groups have gone too far in the use of coercive tactics to achieve their goals. Regardless of the wisdom and sanity reflected by a national goal, there will appear inevitably the case of the local zealot whose zeal outshines his commonsense. Certainly each organization should exert unstinting efforts to control the activities of its local representatives. Without going into the question of the right to picket or to boycott, one can certainly ask whether such tactics are prudent. Father John Courtney Murray fears that the chief danger of such tactics by Catholic groups is that the church itself will be identified in the public mind as a power association:

"The identification is injurious; it turns into a hatred of the faith. It has the disastrous effect of obscuring from the public view the true visage of the church as God's kingdom of truth and freedom, justice and love. Our purpose is to stand before the world as men and women of courage, ready to face any issue; but also men and women of prudence, who understand the art of procedure and understand too that we are morally bound, by the virtue of prudence, to a concrete rightness of method in the pursuit of moral aims."

We have covered a great deal of ground today. Let us not forget that, in the last analysis, censorship, governmental or private, is only a defensive weapon. It does little to form the moral climate of the Nation. Excessive reliance on it only weakens the cause of morality. The vigilant parent and the well-formed conscience are still the strongest opponents of the purveyor of obscenity.

Our chief work for the future is to encourage the reading of good literature and the patronizing of good films. It is a sign of hope to read in recent months in Time, the New York Times Book Review, and Harper's magazine a call for restraint by authors and moviemakers for the sake of good art. Certainly the paperback revolution has made good literature available to our high school and college students as it has never been before, and it is being purchased and read by them. I was heartened recently at St. John's when three different student groups approached me, independently of and unknown to one another, to describe their plans to organize film study clubs.

Perhaps I can best summarize my position in the words of Father Murray: "Our chief problem * * * is not literary censorship, but literary creation."

Some Answers to Second Guessers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of June 6, 1965, appeared an article by columnist Eric Sevareid, reprinted as a public service by International Latex Corp. The article deals with the actions of the United States in the Dominican Republic.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that International Latex Corp. has, indeed, performed a great public service. I, for one, had missed Mr. Sevareid's column and I am deeply grateful to the corporation for bringing it to my attention.

In case some of my colleagues may also have missed the original article, I include it, together with a foreword by Mr. A. N. Spanel, founder-chairman of International Latex Corp., in the RECORD.

The foreword and article follow:

SOME ANSWERS TO SECOND GUESSERS

(The following article was written by one of America's distinguished journalists who is as all embracing and objective in his reporting as he is fearless.

(Mr. Eric Sevareid has built a brilliant reputation in three distinct fields of communication: press, radio, and television. He is highly respected in all three media.

(We believe that freemen everywhere will profit from Mr. Sevareid's astute conclusions resulting from his personal observations and studies in the Dominican Republic. We especially recommend his findings to those who take strange comfort in criticizing President Johnson for his courageous decisions there.—A. N. Spanel, founder-chairman, International Latex Corp.)

The tide of second-guessing about the American intervention in Santo Domingo—as to its justification, its size, its methods, and its aims—had reached oceanic proportions by the time this writer managed to get to the first European city established in the New World. Here in what Columbus called "the land of God," had come the first teachers and preachers, yet here remains, after five centuries, one of the political hellholes of the hemisphere, its soiled streets once again thronged with armed men from abroad.

The scenes of bitter sorrow in Santo Domingo have been well described; there are other things, perhaps, worth putting down at this late date. I thought I had rarely seen such brave work by combat reporters, rarely such emotional involvement on the part of some of them, rarely such a wealth of unconfirmable reports and rumors, rarely such a disastrous lack of contact between reports and American officials who were not only physically remote but for a long time silenced by Presidential orders. And rarely have I read such certain conclusions in American press editorials about a phenomenon in which so much was uncertain and inconclusive.

COMMUNIST THREAT NO MYTH

For me it is impossible to believe that the Communist threat was a myth, impossible to believe that a democratic and stable government could have been formed by the impassioned leaders of thousands of armed and impassioned people, a vast number of them youngsters. It is hard for me to believe that we could not have prevented the tragic fighting in the northern part of the city, easy to believe that we did prevent an even more awful bloodletting in the congested downtown region.

I cannot understand the cry that we put in far too many men. An airport, several miles of corridor, and a safety factor with a long perimeter require thousands of soldiers who require other thousands to support and supply them. Nor can I understand the complaint that the President acted with too much haste.

Over many years I have been adjusted to the complaint of "too late with too little." I find it hard to make a quick switch to the complaint of "too soon with too much." I fail to understand the editorialist who points out with disdain that after all, there were only a few handfuls of Communists present.

THEIR LETHAL NUMBERS

In a very real sense their lack of numbers is their strength. It was because they were few that President Bosch had not bothered to deal severely with them. It was because they were few that they could do much of their work undetected. It was because they were few that they could act with rapidity when the explosion came. It was because they were few that foreign opinionmakers could make the Americans seem ridiculous and give us a propaganda defeat. As John Bartlow Martin reminds us, Communists do not make revolutions, they take them over.

Partly because of this—their small numbers—American troops could not invade the heart of the city, or allow anyone else to invade it.

You cannot risk causing many deaths in order to capture a few individuals and expect, ever, to justify such an action to anybody, certainly not to the American people. So, at this writing at least, the Dominican Communists remain, finding safety as they first found strength, in their numbers—their small numbers.

And their small number in various other Latin American countries lies near the heart of the profound dilemma that confronts the United States for the future. Revolts are brewing in other nations to the south. In all these revolts Communist elements will be present. Are we to put down every uprising because a Communist threat is present? Obviously we cannot, even though some of these uprisings probably will produce Communist governments. This is why Castro laughs in his beard. He believes the political metamorphosis of Latin America is not manageable on our terms.

FREEMEN'S ONLY CHOICE

But nothing in this realm of human action is inevitable; the game is not lost as long as we act on the assumption that it can be won. There are Latin societies strong enough to handle the Communists on their own. Others will be galvanized into counteraction by Communist victories or near victories close by their borders.

INFECTIOUS NONSENSE

Meantime the nonsense arguments should stop. To say that the United States has kept the Dominican Republic from enjoying a free, stable democratic government is nonsense; we have given them another chance to find their feet on the long, hard road to democracy. To say that the real fear in Latin America is of American gunboat diplomacy is nonsense; every literate Latin American knows that American interventions have always been temporary while communism is permanent, permanent.

It is nonsense to indulge any longer the self-conscious idea that Latin America's trouble are the fault of the United States. Some are; most are the fault of Latin America. Its ways of life are superior to ours in more than a few respects, but not in respect to the art of government. In the last century and a half there have been in all of Latin America approximately 3,700 coups, rebellions, and civil wars.

Pittsburgh and Southwestern Pennsylvania: Greater Basic Capabilities—Far-Reaching Diversification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of Members of the House to additional information about Pittsburgh and southwestern Pennsylvania as published recently by the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania:

FOR THE ENTIRE REGION, GREATER BASIC CAPABILITIES

While the physical changes exemplified in the central city are dramatic and photogenic, the really significant effects of the new dynamism—from a long-range economic standpoint—are becoming increasingly visible throughout the entire region.

Such effects have taken two distinct, yet complementary, forms.

First, the "vote of confidence" in the region expressed by major industrial and business organizations:

By tremendous capital investments in modernization of plants, the expansion of facilities, and the introduction of revolutionary new processes—as in the case of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

Realinement of corporate operations—and by centralization of management, marketing and selling to establish this as the "headquarters region"—as in the case of the United States Steel Corp.

By heavy investment in facilities and personnel, both in the field of pure research, and product development.

In these, and related activities, are included such major companies as IBM, Koppers Co., United States Steel Corp., Westinghouse Electric Corp., Crucible Steel Co. of America, Alcoa, Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., Allegheny Airlines, Copper Range Co., St. Joseph Lead Co., Washington Steel Corp., Radio Corp. of America, Armco Steel Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh Corning Corp., Westinghouse Air Brake Co., Pullman Standard, Latrobe Steel Co., and Pittsburgh Steel Co.

While it is recognized that no great expansion in production capacity can be anticipated in the traditional basic heavy industries of the region—other important factors give promise of offsetting this situation.

New production methods and techniques * * * can and are making plants competitive. New uses and applications of materials give promise of reviving and even expanding markets. And, equally significant, the trend toward broadening and diversification of corporate interests and activities opens many possibilities within the region.

THROUGH THE ENTIRE REGION, FAR-REACHING DIVERSIFICATION

A second force in the emerging new "image" of this southwestern Pennsylvania region is the tremendous growth in diversification.

This is a form of diversification that goes beyond the conventional meanings of the term, even though it stretches comprehensively from "A for aircraft" to "Z for zirconium, powdered."

In the usual sense, diversification may connote a heterogeneous collection of small, and not necessarily related industries.

In the case of this nine-county Pittsburgh region, however, there is an emerging pattern of interrelationship. Here, for example, where atomic power is harnessed for military purposes—and where its application to peaceful uses has been tested, there is a widening chain reaction—generating a host of new, highly specialized "industries"—opening up undreamed of fields where these scientific breakthroughs are translated into established manufacturing techniques in such opposite fields as metallurgy and medicine.

It is almost impossible to gage today how far this force of diversification will go toward welding this nine-county area into one, virtually homogeneous technical complex. The research and development operations of major companies like Westinghouse Electric Corp., or Radio Corp. of America, in the electronics field alone have encouraged the establishment of numerous component specialists, and such Pittsburgh region products find uses, not only here, but throughout the world.

Science fiction at its most imaginative could never begin to match the scope or pace of these atomic and space-age developments. Today's catalog of private researchers, component designers, and manufacturers, subassembly contractors, etc., is out of date by tomorrow. Engineering know-how, and tool and machine skills once oriented only toward the commonplace metals are now being diverted to the exotic.

Accompanying this development is the natural and parallel growth of service industries and operations—serving not only the myriad of new companies and industries, but also the personnel they attract.

The Prayer That Startled Old Gloucester

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, no matter how old some things grow, they can still retain a freshness and a current-day application. Back on January 6, 1916, the Rev. Levi M. Powers, D.D., delivered such a message on the occasion of the inauguration of the Municipal Council in Gloucester, Mass.

The "prayer that startled Gloucester" was recalled this past January by Yankee magazine, and that led the Reader's Digest to find out more about it. It was then reprinted in the April 1965 issue of the Digest.

With some introductory comments, the Gloucester Daily Times next reproduced the prayer in an editorial, using the same title as appeared in the Reader's Digest. Because of the unusual nature of this prayer, I believe it deserves even more widespread reading. While at the time of its original pronouncement in 1916 it prophetically predicted that one day women would vote, much of the rest of it well might have been said today. I am, therefore, happy to present herewith the text of the Gloucester Times editorial, which quotes the prayer in full:

THE PRAYER THAT STARTLED OLD GLOUCESTER

Nothing gets better news coverage than when a clergyman leaps out of the rut of routine and prays for justice—in more or less specific terms.

Recently a staff member of the Reader's Digest called the Gloucester Times asking for the full text of a prayer delivered by the Reverend Levi M. Powers, at the inauguration of the Gloucester Municipal Council in 1916. The Digest was interested in "the prayer that startled Gloucester."

We looked it up in the old Times edition. We found the prayer on page 1. As the Reader's Digest's April edition notes, the Times reported in 1916:

"Some of those present sat as if stunned. Some were plainly shocked. But there was a noticeable tendency to applaud at the close."

We were also glad to note that the publishers and editors of the Gloucester Times in 1916 weren't afraid to print a strong slap at newspapers. By printing the prayer the Gloucester Times preserved for posterity a message for democracy that will be timely until the end of time.

The complete prayer, including the parts left out by the Reader's Digest, follows:

"Almighty Father, we begin today a new year of civic life. We know that no matter how much you may want to bless this city, you cannot do it unless the citizens want to be blessed.

"We pray therefore, first of all, for the voters of this city. There are some too lazy to vote, but not too lazy to grumble. Bless them.

"We pray for the taxpayers who want good streets, good schools, good fire and police protection and good health officers, but who wish other people to pay the cost.

"We pray for those businessmen whose votes are determined by the expectation of special favors for themselves. Bless them if you can.

"We pray for those who believe that all laws should be enforced except the laws they do not like.

"We pray for the comfortable who do not care about anything so long as they are left at ease.

"We pray for political managers who swap votes and sell out their friends and let bad candidates go unopposed.

"We pray for those who vote for the saloons simply because they have property that rents for more for that than for any other purpose.

"We pray for men so mean they are not willing to give their sisters the same privileges of voting they have themselves.

"We pray for ministers who say what is pleasant to hear rather than what is true.

"We pray for all connected with the newspapers who openly advocate civic righteousness and secretly promote crooked politics.

"We pray for the lawyers, to whom law means only a knowledge of helping those who wish to evade the law to do so safely, and so enable themselves and others to get something for nothing.

"We wish, O God, that all these people might be blessed, but perhaps we are asking too much. It may be that the only thing you can do is to let them go to hell where they belong. You know best.

"But, O God, before Thee are those who can be blessed, those who may be a blessing to themselves and to the world. Here today are hundreds of young men who soon will be voters. Bless them with a vision of the world that ought to be and will be when we are wise to our own good. May each one think of his home, not merely as the house in which he lives, but as a city of which he is a part. May he see how much finer and better life will be for all when each one works for all and thinks for all and all for each.

"We dare to hope, O Lord, that these young men will have the sense to see that to get the most out of life for themselves they must think of how to make life good for all, and that to be good to themselves, they must be good for others. So shall a cleaner, fairer, better Gloucester some day come.

"We ask Thy blessing also upon these young women. Some day they, too, will vote. May they have understanding minds and sympathetic hearts, so that when the time comes, they may be fitted for the larger things of life, in which it will then be their privilege and duy to share.

"We are here this morning, O God, to induct five men into office where for a year it will be their duty to work for the common good. They are to think and plan not for any one class, but for all of us, not for those who pay taxes merely, but for those who earn the money to pay the taxes. We the people, have chosen these men to represent us. Help them, O God, to plan and act honestly, bravely, and efficiently for the good of all."

Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, with the escalating losses of fruit and vegetables now spoiling in California fields, with the enormous losses of investments in crops which cannot be harvested, with the increasing costs to the consumer throughout the Nation, many Members of Congress are reconsidering their positions on the bracero program. At least seven who voted last year to terminate Public Law 78—which authorized the entry of Mexican farm workers—have told me they would vote differently today. Many others have said they did not believe any Secretary of Labor would ever permit valuable food to rot in the fields for lack of harvest labor.

No group of farmers, or other businessmen, could possibly cope with the sudden withdrawal of 100,000 competent, experienced, reliable workers. Most persons who study the problem objectively are sympathetic with the farmer and consumer, and would reinstate the bracero program in some form—preferably on a gradually declining basis over a period of several years to allow sufficient time for other arrangements to be developed.

Two recent congressional questionnaires document this view.

First. In my questionnaire, I, as an advocate of the bracero program, and representing a predominantly rural agricultural area, asked this question:

Do you favor Federal legislation which would permit temporary admission of foreign nationals under strict supervision to help harvest farm crops if domestic labor is not available and prevailing farm wages are paid?

The tabulation of over 18,000 answers was:

	Percent
Yes	86.9
No	11.5
No answer	1.6

Second. Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN, of Berkeley, an opponent of the bracero program, and representing a predominately urban industrial area in Alameda County, asked these questions. The tabulation of about 13,000 answers was:

Migrant farm labor: Several different bills have been introduced in the field of farm labor:

(a) Would you favor extending the national minimum wage of $1.25 per hour to agricultural workers?

	Percent
Yes	74.6
No	14.1
Undecided	11.3

(b) Would you favor resuming Public Law 78, the importation of Mexican farmworkers (braceros), which was ended by Congress in 1964?

	Percent
Yes	45.2
No	37.9
Undecided	16.9

A larger percentage of responders in my district answered affirmatively on the question of importing Mexican farmworkers, but, nevertheless, the concensus is clear and substantial in both instances.

I believe that an overwhelming majority of the American people would approve action either by Congress or the administration to permit the entry of workers from Mexico in sufficient numbers to help prevent crop spoilage. Should not the administration, the Secretary of Labor and Congress conform to the will of the people—and remove the specter of continued crop losses, spoiled food and higher consumer prices?

The Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 1965, WBTV, Charlotte, N.C., televised an editorial entitled "The Voting Rights Bill." I believe that this editorial is of such significant value that it should be made available to our colleagues. I, therefore, insert the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

In the early part of this century, a vigorous campaign was successfully conducted in most States of the Union to provide literacy qualifications for voters.

The reason for that campaign was that many thousands of immigrants came to this country in the first 10 years of the century. A great many of them were illiterate. Many had never voted before. A large number of them could not even speak English. As a result, their votes were being bought and sold like commodities on the open market.

The reformers argued that nobody could vote intelligently if he could not read and write. Adopting the literacy tests was considered necessary to preserve the integrity of the American system of free elections.

In New York, whose metropolis had become almost like a foreign city, the law went further and required that the voter be able to read English.

Now, the Senate has passed a bill to suspend the literacy test in some States but leaves it untouched in others. And the strongest support for this act of discrimination comes from representatives of the very same States that once led the campaign for the literacy test.

This new law suspends the test in any State in which less than half the voters went to the polls in the last previous election, and in which the population is 20 percent Negro. But so long as half the voters in a State cast their ballots, that State does not come under the formula.

For example, an illiterate could vote under certain conditions in South Carolina, but could not vote in New York. A person who speaks only Spanish could vote in South Carolina, but not in New York.

This law would violate one part of the Constitution under the pretext of upholding another one. The first article of that document leaves the fixing of voter qualification to the States, with four exceptions provided by amendments: no discrimination because of race, color, previous condition of servitude, and sex. And in Federal elections, the poll tax cannot be a voting qualification.

With these exceptions the Federal Government has no authority to set the qualifications for voters, and no powers under the Constitution to touch the literacy test in any State.

If a literacy test is used, it should be the same for everyone. If it is used as an excuse for discrimination by a State, the constitutional ban against that is already a law which can be enforced. Or if Congress is determined to do away with the literacy test, its only honest and constitutional means is by amendment to that effect. Any Federal law which governs voting must apply with equal force to all States, not be just a temporary punishment for 5 States out of 50.

Invitation to respond has been sent to: Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York.

Honest Boxers Can Save Their Sport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, many persons in and out of Congress have called for Federal controls over boxing, in the wake of last week's heavyweight championship fiasco at Lewiston, Maine.

Even before the Clay-Liston bout, several Members had offered legislation to establish a national boxing commission, or proposed a single czar who would regulate the sport. And since the fight, two distinguished committee chairmen have indicated the likelihood of public hearings on boxing reform.

My own inclination has been toward Government action, but I will admit to some second thoughts after reading a column on the subject recently in the San Diego Union. The writer, Joe Stone—a general assignment man, not a sportswriter—relates how western cowhands cleaned up the once disreputable sport of rodeo.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Stone's views to congressional colleagues and others who may be interested in saving boxing:

HONEST BOXERS CAN SAVE THEIR SPORT

(By Joe Stone)

Several thousand fight fans who paid several million dollars to see a recent heavyweight championship boxing match feel that they did not get their money's worth, and again the cry has gone up for Federal control of boxing.

The first question to ask is, Is boxing worth saving? The answer is "Yes."

The next question is, Should it be saved by Federal control? The answer is "No."

How can it be saved without Federal control? Only by the athletes.

Boxing is worth saving because it is, perhaps, the most thrilling and colorful of sports. It produces some special athletes.

No athlete is required to have and to master more combinations of skills than the boxer. No athlete is asked to have the endurance, the physical stamina, of the boxer. He is required to suffer everything the long-distance runner suffers, and take punishment at the same time.

The hairbreadth speed and timing developed by an Archie Moore or a Ray Robinson is almost unbelievable. An opponent once told the great lightweight, Joe Gans, how he marveled at the speed with which Gans reacted to a punch and countered it.

"I can see what you're thinking," said Gans.

Fine as the sport can be, it is ridiculous to call upon the Government of the people of the United States to save it. We have too much Government meddling in the affairs of its citizens now.

And, frankly, boxing is not that important. Neither is any other sport. If the people who love boxing and make a living from it can't save it, it deserves to die.

For an answer to their problems the honest boxers of this country and their friends should look at another sport—the rodeo.

Rodeo was once a disreputable sport. The performers were cheated by crooked promoters who absconded with gate receipts, entry fees and prize money. Some of the performers were bums. They left trails of bad checks and unpaid hotel and board bills wherever they went.

Finally the Rodeo Cowboys Association was organized. It now has about 3,000 members, has agreements with 500 rodeo promoters, and has offices in Denver, Colo., where it maintains a staff of 14.

The staff is hired by the cowboys. The cowboys are the association. It is a democratic organization. It protects its own and it disciplines its own.

Arenas in which it performs must meet its safety standards. Livestock used in rodeos must be healthy and ready to compete with the cowboys. Promoters no longer abscond with the money. The cowboys no longer beat bills or write bad checks.

A sport which is part of the American heritage has been preserved because the cowboys, to paraphrase the words of a famous sports lover, John K. Kennedy, did not ask what America could do for them.

Address of George H. Hearn, Federal Maritime Commissioner, Before the Convention of the Seafarers International Union, May 28, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the 12th biennial convention of the Seafarers International Union of North America was held here in Washington during the week of May 26.

On May 28, 1965, the convention delegates were addressed by Commissioner George H. Hearn of the Federal Maritime Commission.

I commend Commissioner Hearn's remarks to the attention of our colleagues:

REMARKS OF COMMISSIONER GEORGE H. HEARN OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

"International commerce and the ships which make it possible have contributed immeasurably to America's greatness. The seas and ships are an integral part of this country's past, present, and future." Words of President Lyndon B. Johnson delivered in his recent maritime proclamation. These words have a very serious meaning to all of the maritime and commercial world and particularly to you, the representatives of our merchant seamen. The Chief Executive, in his desire to insure the continuance and growth of our free enterprise system and the maintenance of our tremendous commercial success, has again reiterated not only the Government's interest in, but its dependence upon maritime endeavors and all those employed therein.

Gentlemen, it is indeed an honor to appear before you, who, as representatives of an important segment of organized labor, hold a high position of trust with respect to your members who possess those skills which constitute a very essential national asset. In this day and age, we can ill afford to squander this national asset.

I suggest that I do not miss the mark when I say that your purpose at this 12th biennial conference is to reappraise your own past, to analyze the present posture of seafaring men, to attempt to anticipate the foreseeable future in an effort to secure for your membership those economic benefits which the dignity of man demands and which are commensurate with the service provided and the perils suffered.

We in government, no matter how slightly connected with the day-to-day operational problems of ocean shipping, can no longer sit silently by and listen to orators who, all too often, degrade the part that our Government has played and is playing in developing this essential and important industry. All segments of our Federal Government legislature as well as executive have been criticized for the alleged waning, unhealthy posture of the maritime community. This, gentlemen, is a fallacy, and you as American citizens, who represent seamen whose livelihood is so dependent upon a strong, healthy, viable merchant marine, must be aware of this. Honest criticism, of course, is always appropriate and appreciated. All of us who are concerned with ocean shipping must know of the administration's strong interest in the posture of our merchant marine.

They must be aware of the fact that the President has engaged a special task force at the Cabinet level, known as the Maritime Advisory Committee, to carefully examine and make recommendations regarding the strengthening of our merchant marine. These critics must know that a serious, comprehensive study cannot result in a grand panacea overnight and that a meaningful study certainly requires some time. All should know that in the maritime community labor, management, and U.S. Government are all interested partners. And it is the Government above all whose public interest will chiefly benefit from the successful efforts of this partnership. The Government is criticized for injecting itself into areas which some claim to be the exclusive domain of managerial discretion. On the one hand, when the Government tries to encourage free enterprise to work on its own through some degree of competition, we are criticized for nonaction. On the other hand, when we attempt to enforce the statutes committed to our care by Congress, we are criticized for overregulation. Blaming the Government solely for the unfulfilled expectations of American ocean shipping, while fashionable, is both inaccurate and nonconstructive.

Personally I look upon the role of the Federal Government in the transportation field as the coordinator of all the important and necessary segments of experienced expertise that we have developed, and as the promoter of our commerce. Accordingly, it is the function of Government to harness the best efforts of labor and industry, port authorities, terminal operators, freight forwarders, shipbuilders, and all other groups associated with our maritime community, in order to build a harmonious merchant marine. Such a merchant marine would be second to none in the commercial world and ever ready to assume its traditional role as our fourth arm of defense. I need not reiterate how often the merchant marine has been called upon in the past to keep and secure the continued existence of our American way of life.

I appear before you as a member of the Federal Maritime Commission, an independent regulatory agency, an arm of the Congress, whose mandate from the Congress is to administer the Shipping Act. The Commission no longer has promotional obligations toward the merchant marine per se, but our statutory obligation, nevertheless is to insure that the foreign commerce of the United States is not impeded by anyone subject to our jurisdiction. On the positive side we have an obligation to see to it that our superior American products reach all of the markets of the world at prices which are competitive with those products exported by other countries.

However, we must all agree that without the ever-increasing exportation of American goods on American ships our merchant marine will dwindle. Consequently, the national investment in American seamen will diminish. Therefore, the aim of every citizen should be to make sure that more and more of our commodities are shipped in our foreign commerce on American-flag vessels, and a byproduct of your endeavors will surely be an ever-increasing American-flag merchant marine.

It is an unhappy fact that less than 10 percent of American manufacturing firms export their products to foreign markets. Recent innovations in marketing concepts currently being developed by steamship companies and ports to educate American manufacturers to the fact that there are presently in existence, or can easily be developed, lucrative foreign markets awaiting our better made products. I confidently expect that the proper exploitation of these marketing concepts will attract additional commodities and an entire new group of exporters to engage in our foreign commerce. I sincerely believe that American-flag bottoms will substantially participate in the movement of these additional cargoes, and much participation by U.S.-flag vessels must naturally be translated into more jobs for American seafaring men. It would be a tremendous waste if the ingenuity and efforts of all American businessmen failed to insure an increased participation in the carriage of those cargoes aboard American vessels. More commodities are being produced every day because of superior American know-how and these commodities must be allowed to be competitive in the open markets of the world so that our trade will expand. The success of this program will alleviate a most vexing problem, the outward flow of gold, and establish for the United States a favorable balance of payments.

Other nations are becoming more and more competitive, with us as purveyors to the world. Because of this we are in a struggle for commercial preeminence. We must succeed if we are to insure a strong merchant marine and your own livelihoods, as well as, a dynamic economy.

We are all aware of the strides made by the European Common Market and more recently the advancements made by the Japanese concerning their plans for an increased merchant fleet. This increasingly competitive challenge is thus brought into sharper focus. The Japanese have announced that they will double their merchant fleet by 1968 and at that time they will have the capability of lifting 55 percent of their exports and 64 percent of their imports. We cannot allow our merchant marine to reach those low ebbs that it had in 1916 and in the late 1930's. You, above all, realize the tremendous peacekeeping obligations this country had met throughout this century. In a word, we are the peace keepers of civilization and this awesome task requires a strong American merchant marine particularly to support broad and sustained missions. The contributions made by the American merchant marine are many and have been eloquently exalted in the annals of our beloved country's history. The dominance of American-flag vessels in the North Atlantic and throughout the world in the 19th century is a happy chapter in American history. We are all aware of this historic role played by the merchant fleet in the First World War, World War II, and during the Korean conflict in this century alone.

During World War II we suffered the loss of 5,600 of our seamen and 700 merchant vessels. In the event that this Nation needs reassurance of its reliance upon a privately owned fleet, I would like to remind you that just last fall the largest peacetime amphibious operation ever undertaken in Atlantic waters, was held off the coast of Spain. I refer to Operation Steel Pike. It involved more than 55,000 men, and implemented the use of 10 privately owned and operated merchant vessels successfully. In fact, Admiral McCain, the admiral commanding this tremendous naval exercise, recently testified before a congressional committee that an amphibious operation without the participation of privately owned vessels could not be successfully accomplished. This testimony immediately raises the question whether as a nation we can afford to permit those essential skills found in our maritime callings to atrophy. If there are still any doubts as to the essentiality of maintaining a strong, viable, privately owned fleet employing American seamen, those doubts should be dispelled when we consider our important commercial role, and as the protectors of the free world.

We realize that shipbuilding and ship operating are very expensive undertakings in our country, however, these endeavors are very important to our national well-being and, in my opinion, our builders and operators are competing with their less costly counterparts in foreign lands and in my opinion they are competing against less valuable

ships services whose nations have more limited goals. Having momentarily touched on some of the overall maritime problems, I would now like to address myself, as I did in San Diego recently before receiving the invitation from Mr. Hall to attend this convention, to the problems confronting American seamen.

The talents of our seamen must be maintained, their initiative must not be jaded; their well-being must be preserved. American seamen represent a national investment which this country can ill afford to lose. All too often we hear of how grandly they are compensated and how lavishly they live aboard our ships. However, all too often, their compensation and working conditions are compared with those of their foreign counterparts and not with that of the white-collar or blue-collar worker here ashore in our country. Both you and I know only too well that American seamen possess special skills. We all know of the rigors of their lives and all are aware of the economic opportunities which are ever increasing and are currently enjoyed by shoreside workers.

I for one, am delighted to have this opportunity to publicly salute the American seamen who are not only willing to but do, day in and day out, serve our Nation by foregoing, for long periods of time, the fruits of our American high standard of living enjoyed by us here at home. They do not enjoy the companionship of their families as other shoreside American citizens do. They are on call 24 hours a day during all types of weather and other hazards in the furtherance of their occupational pursuits. Their families also make these sacrifices not having the man of the house at home to instruct and give example to the young ones as they grow up.

And, I need not remind you that it is no longer fashionable, novel, or a delightful experience to stroll along any of the port streets in other lands. American seamen exposed outside the confines of their country, to certain dangers that are unknown to us here at home and the orderly police protection assured to us is not available to them in other lands. They daily come in contact with not only acts of God that can be dangerous, climatic and other changes in the elements. These conditions make this life a distasteful undertaking to others. However we are fortunate in having a skilled labor force that is inbued with a sense of adventure and purpose. The fact that American seamen have intrusted to their care daily vessels worth millions of dollars bespeaks an appreciation of their skills. To a small band of dedicated men goes a debt of thanks for a difficult, distasteful job, expertly done.

Thank you.

The 20th Anniversary of the United Nations During 1965—International Cooperation Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an important resolution has been introduced today by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In recognition of the United Nations 20th anniversary celebration scheduled for San Francisco on June 26, 1965, the resolution declares the sense of Congress "that the United States of America rededicates itself to the principles of the United Nations to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

Because 1965 is International Cooperation Year, the resolution also calls on the executive branch to strengthen international peacekeeping machinery and to try for progress in disarmament.

I have unanimous consent to set out the resolution in the Appendix. I am happy to join the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], in sponsoring this concurrent resolution:

H. CON. RES. 429

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the twentieth anniversary of the United Nations during International Cooperation Year, and for other purposes

Whereas the year 1965 marks the twentieth anniversary of the United Nations, which will be celebrated in San Francisco on June 26, 1965; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly has designated the year 1965 as International Cooperation Year; and

Whereas the President of the United States has proclaimed 1965 as International Cooperation Year, and has set up a broad program within the executive branch to review our present international policies in cooperation with a bipartisan group of distinguished private citizens; and

Whereas the President has charged those participating in the International Cooperation Year program to "search and explore and canvass and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace"; and

Whereas the International Cooperation Year program will culminate in a White House Conference on International Cooperation which the President has announced he will convene in November 1965; and

Whereas during the twenty years of its existence the United Nations has played an important, and at times crucial, role in pursuit of one of its stated purposes "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind"; and

Whereas during that time the United Nations has also performed a valuable service through the specialized agencies and otherwise in helping to establish human rights and to eliminate those ancient enemies of mankind—hunger, poverty, disease, and ignorance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States of America rededicates itself to the principles of the United Nations and to the furtherance of international cooperation within the framework of law and order; and that all other members of the United Nations are urged to do likewise.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that in connection with the examination for International Cooperation Year of United States participation in international cooperative activities, the executive branch should (1) review with a high sense of urgency the current state of international peacekeeping machinery with a view to making specific suggestions for strengthening this machinery, (2) review other major elements of international community and cooperation with a view to making specific suggestions to promote the growth of institutions of international cooperation and law and order, and (3) review urgently the status of disarmament negotiations with a view to further progress in reducing the dangers and burden of competitive national armaments.

SEC. 3. In order to provide for participation by the Congress in the White House Conference on International Cooperation, subject to an invitation by the President, there is hereby created a congressional delegation of twelve members to be composed of six Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Any vacancy in the membership of the delegation shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointments.

Duncan Urges National Research Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN], has recently expressed grave concern over the extensive concentration of Federal programs of scientific research and the impact of these concentrations on the Nation's higher education system—and ultimately upon the structure of our economy. In testimony last week before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower he made a strong case for a coordinated policy of Federal research and development that would recognize the very real national danger in such concentrations and would provide that future funds for research and development be allocated in the long range national interest.

I know that this information is important to those of our colleagues who share a concern over the present trend, and place the text of the gentleman from Oregon's [Mr. DUNCAN] testimony in the RECORD at this point:

URGES NATIONAL RESEARCH POLICY

(Statement by Representative ROBERT B. DUNCAN, of Oregon, before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee during hearings on the impact of Federal research and development policies on scientific and technical manpower, June 3, 1965)

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I appreciate your kindness in permitting me to appear before your committee this morning. I requested this opportunity, not because I pretend to any expertise in research and development policies, but because I am deeply concerned about the impact of these policies on the educational, economic, and social fabric of our Nation.

That I am not alone in this concern is evidenced by the fact that you are holding these hearings to determine the impact of the Federal Government's research and development policies on scientific and technical manpower.

I hope as a result of these hearings and those held last year by the Select Committee

on Government Research of the House of Representatives, as well as the consideration given to basic policy problems in federally financed research and development by the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House, that Congress will set a definite policy for the distribution of research and development funds that will represent the national interest, rather than the specific and fragmented short-term mission interests and agency goals of a multitude of executive departments, agencies, services, bureaus, and divisions.

My examination of the hearings and committee reports available on this subject indicates that there is no coordinated executive policy for distribution of research and development funds that is correlated with the broad and long-term national interest as contrasted with immediate, short-run agency missions.

I am concerned because the information available indicates that a severe imbalance in the geographical distribution of Federal research and development funds is producing an imbalance in educational opportunities in our Nation. And that this then produces a further imbalance in the distribution of Federal research and development funds. During the past decade and a half, during which the major acceleration of Federal activity in research occurred, a vicious cycle has been established. And its existence is used by Federal agencies to justify its continuance.

At the risk of repeating information already in the hands of committee members, I am including with my remarks several tabulations from a report by the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives. These are from the committee print entitled "Government and Science, No. 4" and give a factual basis for the balance of my statement.

Prime contracts and grants awarded by DOD, NASA, AEC, HEW, NSF, Agriculture, Interior, and Commerce in fiscal year 1963 for performance of research and development

[In thousands of dollars]

Rank	State	Total	Profit organizations	Educational institutions [1]	Nonprofit organizations	"Other" performers [2]
1	California	3,807,821	3,239,856	426,778	137,540	3,647
2	New York	917,419	711,615	126,725	75,896	3,183
3	Massachusetts	451,918	214,534	175,226	61,381	777
4	Maryland and District of Columbia	445,055	323,620	89,065	31,135	1,235
5	Pennsylvania	348,986	276,669	50,581	21,096	640
6	Texas	330,870	298,163	27,062	5,035	610
7	Washington	321,273	301,886	18,108	[4] 1,053	[4] 226
8	New Jersey	287,758	255,227	28,770	2,853	908
9	Florida	247,808	230,727	14,808	1,343	930
10	Missouri	232,842	214,460	14,372	3,485	525
11	New Merico	226,207	141,250	83,451	[4] 1,083	[4] 423
12	Colorado	221,581	201,859	14,889	4,082	751
13	Illinois	191,143	63,922	105,537	21,113	571
14	Ohio	185,735	140,332	28,577	16,274	552
15	Louisiana	181,964	171,077	9,679	[4] 1,045	[4] 163
16	Arizona	139,460	131,449	[4] 4,864	2,827	[4] 320
17	Alabama	137,314	127,569	[4] 7,302	2,257	[4] 186
18	Tennessee	133,623	121,045	[4] 10,523	1,780	[4] 275
19	Michigan	133,518	89,865	39,233	3,472	[4] 948
20	Nevada	124,474	111,921	[4] 12,324	3	[4] 226
21	Connecticut	122,985	102,974	17,516	2,270	[4] 225
22	Utah	120,019	110,970	8,774	99	[4] 176
23	Wisconsin	95,024	74,504	18,356	2,083	[4] 81
24	Virginia	73,104	60,290	[4] 9,559	3,047	[4] 208
25	Minnesota	68,853	45,584	18,632	4,106	[4] 531
26	Indiana	[4] 49,681	31,525	16,318	1,623	[4] 215
27	Idaho	[4] 27,621	[4] 21,453	[4] 5,961	60	[4] 147
28	Delaware	[4] 24,490	[4] 23,236	1,150	104	----------
29	North Carolina	21,972	3,512	[4] 13,681	4,050	729
30	Kansas	20,380	[4] 13,303	[4] 6,383	[4] 646	48
31	Iowa	18,537	1,339	16,364	707	127
32	Arkansas	17,133	[4] 14,007	2,744	81	[4] 301
33	Georgia	15,341	5,589	9,208	135	409
34	South Carolina	14,689	[4] 12,451	2,085	46	107
35	New Hampshire	14,199	[4] 10,692	3,384	49	74
36	Oklahoma	13,058	5,489	[4] 6,479	802	288
37	Oregon	12,630	1,322	[4] 9,230	1,614	464
38	South Dakota	12,216	[4] 11,112	983	40	81
39	Rhode Island	9,711	2,120	[4] 7,105	356	124
40	Kentucky	5,647	369	4,976	179	123
41	Alaska	5,554	59	4,762	48	685
42	West Virginia	5,434	1,062	2,312	1,796	[4] 264
43	Vermont	4,904	2,256	2,549	25	[4] 74
44	Montana	4,799	3,006	1,336	71	386
45	Hawaii	4,126	996	2,255	[4] 692	[4] 183
46	Mississippi	4,008	302	3,448	94	[4] 164
47	Nebraska	3,665	308	3,086	71	[4] 200
48	Maine	2,967	156	943	1,711	[4] 157
49	Wyoming	2,342	1,470	537	----------	[4] 335
50	North Dakota	2,284	1,165	926	80	113
	Total [3]	9,864,142	7,929,673	1,488,916	421,438	24,115

[1] Amounts shown include awards for operation of contract research centers.
[2] "Other" performers include all other miscellaneous performers not otherwise classified; e.g., State and local governments and private individuals not associated with institutions or companies.
[3] Does not include U.S. territories and possessions, foreign awards, and unallocated funds.
[4] These figures are within ±50 percent of the geometric mean for the column.

Source: National Science Foundation report to the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, April-July 1964.

Dollars for R. & D. to profit organizations per industrial employee

1.	Nevada	$21,081.37
2.	New Mexico	10,067.71
3.	Arizona	2,556.92
4.	California	2,383.80
5.	Utah	2,201.91
6.	Colorado	2,042.85
7.	Louisiana	1,312.23
8.	Washington	1,306.97
9.	Maryland and District of Columbia	1,177.40
10.	Florida	1,150.94
11.	South Dakota	772.85
12.	Idaho	728.50
13.	Texas	600.48
14.	Missouri	559.91
15.	Alabama	543.01
16.	Delaware	403.94
17.	Tennessee	380.59
18.	New York	373.40
19.	New Jersey	316.98
20.	Massachusetts	299.16
21.	Connecticut	246.09
22.	Wyoming	[1] 210.96
23.	Virginia	[1] 203.59
24.	Pennsylvania	[1] 196.29
25.	North Dakota	[1] 193.75
26.	Minnesota	[1] 191.84
27.	Wisconsin	[1] 158.62
28.	Montana	[1] 158.44
29.	New Hampshire	[1] 131.71
30.	Arkansas	[1] 122.71
31.	Kansas	[1] 116.61
32.	Ohio	[1] 114.78
33.	Michigan	[1] 95.95
34.	Vermont	62.93
35.	Oklahoma	59.79
36.	Illinois	53.58
37.	Indiana	52.83
38.	South Carolina	49.20
39.	Hawaii	43.98
40.	Rhode Island	17.87
41.	Georgia	17.03
42.	Alaska	10.89
43.	West Virginia	9.45
44.	Oregon	9.22
45.	Iowa	7.74
46.	North Carolina	6.89
47.	Nebraska	4.87
48.	Mississippi	2.52
49.	Kentucky	2.10
50.	Maine	1.53
	National average	473.27

[1] These figures are within ±50 percent of the geometric mean of $149.14.

Dollars for performance of R. & D. to educational institutions in fiscal year 1963 per scientist employed by the institutions in calendar year 1962

[In thousands of dollars]

1.	New Mexico	163.0
2.	Nevada	109.1
3.	California	63.8
4.	Alaska	62.7
5.	Massachusetts	55.4
6.	Maryland and the District of Columbia	52.8
7.	Illinois	29.6
8.	Idaho	28.1
9.	New York	[1] 18.8
10.	New Jersey	[1] 18.4
11.	Rhode Island	[1] 18.2
12.	Utah	[1] 16.8
13.	Colorado	[1] 16.7
14.	Connecticut	[1] 16.1
15.	Alabama	[1] 15.3
16.	Michigan	[1] 15.1
17.	Washington	[1] 14.5
18.	Pennsylvania	[1] 14.2

Footnote at end of table.

Dollars for performance of R. & D. to educational institutions in fiscal year 1963 per scientist employed by the institutions in calendar year 1962—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

19. Minnesota	[1] 13.8
20. Tennessee	[1] 13.6
21. Vermont	[1] 13.3
22. Hawaii	[1] 13.1
23. Iowa	[1] 13.1
24. Texas	[1] 13.1
25. Missouri	[1] 12.3
26. Georgia	[1] 12.3
27. Florida	[1] 12.0
28. Louisiana	[1] 11.9
29. Mississippi	[1] 11.6
30. Ohio	[1] 11.3
31. Virginia	[1] 11.1
32. North Carolina	[1] 11.0
33. Wisconsin	[1] 10.9
34. Oregon	[1] 10.8
35. New Hampshire	[1] 10.6
36. Oklahoma	[1] 9.5
37. Arizona	[1] 9.1
38. Indiana	[1] 9.0
39. Kentucky	[1] 8.9
40. Arkansas	[1] 8.6
41. West Virginia	[1] 7.5
42. Kansas	6.8
43. Delaware	6.5
44. Nebraska	6.5
45. South Carolina	6.3
46. Montana	6.0
47. South Dakota	4.5
48. North Dakota	4.2
49. Wyoming	4.1
50. Maine	4.0
National average	24.9

[1] These figures are within ±50 percent of the geometric mean of 13.8.

Dollars for R. & D. to educational institutions in fiscal year 1963 per student enrolled in the fall of 1963

1. New Mexico	$4,002
2. Alaska	2,863
3. Nevada	2,201
4. Massachusetts	1,132
5. Maryland and District of Columbia	782
6. California	749
7. Illinois	450
8. Idaho	405
9. Rhode Island	399
10. New York	311
11. Colorado	[1] 303
12. Connecticut	[1] 291
13. New Jersey	[1] 265
14. New Hamsphire	[1] 253
15. Iowa	[1] 247
16. Washington	[1] 239
17. Minnesota	[1] 235
18. Vermont	[1] 230
19. Pennsylvania	[1] 225
20. Utah	[1] 216
21. Michigan	[1] 213
22. Oregon	[1] 203
23. Wisconsin	[1] 202
24. Georgia	[1] 165
25. North Carolina	[1] 164
26. Alabama	[1] 161
27. Delaware	[1] 160
28. Missouri	[1] 157
29. Hawaii	[1] 156
30. Virginia	[1] 153
31. Florida	[1] 147
32. Tennesseee	[1] 142
33. Louisiana	[1] 140
34. Indiana	[1] 139
35. Ohio	[1] 138
36. Texas	[1] 119
37. Arizona	[1] 107
38. Kansas	[1] 102
39. Oklahoma	99
40. Kentucky	89
41. Arkansas	88
42. Montana	86
43. Mississippi	84
44. Nebraska	81

Dollars for R. & D. to educational institutions in fiscal year 1963 per student enrolled in the fall of 1963—Continued

45. Wyoming	$75
46. Maine	72
47. West Virginia	68
48. South Dakota	63
49. South Carolina	62
50. North Dakota	61
National average	353

[1] These figures are within ±50 percent of the geometric mean of 203.

Dollars for R. & D. to educational institutions in fiscal year 1963 per advanced degree conferred during the 1962–63 scholastic year

[In thousands of dollars]

1. Nevada	195.6
2. Alaska	136.1
3. New Mexico	123.3
4. California	46.7
5. Idaho	27.6
6. Massachusetts	27.0
7. Maryland and District of Columbia	25.8
8. Illinois	16.9
9. Rhode Island	16.8
10. New Hampshire	13.9
11. New Jersey	[1] 13.0
12. Washington	[1] 12.1
13. Utah	[1] 11.4
14. Minnesota	[1] 11.1
15. Virginia	[1] 10.9
16. Iowa	[1] 10.9
17. Florida	[1] 10.3
18. Pennsylvania	[1] 9.6
19. Hawaii	[1] 9.2
20. New York	[1] 8.9
21. Georgia	[1] 8.7
22. Vermont	[1] 8.1
23. Connecticut	[1] 8.1
24. Wisconsin	[1] 8.0
25. Louisiana	[1] 7.6
26. Colorado	[1] 7.2
27. Ohio	[1] 7.0
28. Oregon	[1] 6.9
29. Texas	[1] 6.7
30. Alabama	[1] 6.7
31. North Carolina	[1] 6.6
32. South Carolina	[1] 6.4
33. Missouri	[1] 6.3
34. Michigan	[1] 6.3
35. Delaware	[1] 6.2
36. Tennessee	[1] 5.8
37. Kentucky	[1] 4.9
38. Mississippi	[1] 4.7
39. Arizona	[1] 4.6
40. Montana	[1] 4.6
41. Nebraska	4.4
42. Maine	4.2
43. Arkansas	4.2
44. Oklahoma	3.9
45. Kansas	3.8
46. West Virginia	3.5
47. Indiana	3.4
48. North Dakota	2.6
49. South Dakota	2.5
50. Wyoming	2.1
National average	14.3

[1] These figures are within ±50 percent of the geometric mean of 8.9.

In our failure to date to set a firm national-interest policy for the distribution of Federal research and development funds, now in excess of $15 billion a year, we have in fact made the decision that these funds will be distributed without full regard to the broad long-range national interest.

The huge research and development contracts and grants to a limited number of institutions has strengthened the faculties of these institutions and improved their facilities and equipment, and thus increased their appeal as recipients for Federal research and development contracts and grants. This, I suggest, is at the expense of other fine institutions throughout the country.

But this extends into the industrial field with both direct and indirect results. Proximity to the laboratories and research centers with major Federal contracts is both useful and important to industrial concerns engaged in production for various Federal programs, particularly in military and space-related fields. The existence of these basic resources, educational, scientific, and industrial, then encourages the location in relative proximity of second tier and related enterprises.

The spinoff from the exotic and sophisticated processes being developed for the new technologies is beginning to feed civilian industry. Processes developed for space or destruction are being adapted for earth and construction. These tend to locate near the source of the process and the means for testing and developing it. This too is fed with Federal dollars, for the seeds were planted and nurtured to maturity under Federal research and development grants and contracts.

As you are well aware, a major concern is how to more rapidly and more effectively make available to industry the knowledge gained from federally sponsored research projects. And some progress is being made in this field with Federal help, for example, the Aerospace Research Applications Center at Indiana University, a joint Federal, private, and Indiana University enterprise.

But the location of major Federal research and development contracts in an area gives a substantial impetus to the development of the more modern technological industries that feed on the results and utilize the research personnel. And the location of these newer industrial complexes attracts additional firms and related industries. The civilian economic impact of Federal research and development contracts is significant.

The failure to set a policy in the national interest and the policy of permitting agencies (despite the oft made protests of executive coordination) to assign these projects and grants on the basis of short-run agency missions is widening the gap between first-, second-, and third-rate universities. There exists in fact as former Secretary of the Army, Elvis Stahr, Jr., now president of Indiana University, has pointed out, a brain drain on some sections of the country. This may be to the advantage of the agency in the short run, but the long-range effect is weakening to the Nation.

For the finest minds of the pockets of technological poverty created by the ad hoc research and development policies of Federal agencies are going to the already favored centers which have reached their preeminence as a direct result of Federal support. Unless Congress acts, the rich will continue to get richer and the poor poorer.

The universities of this Nation have several roles to play. Among these are being the producers of increased knowledge and producers of highly trained manpower. In the scientific and technical fields, the research and development policies of the Federal Government will be the determining factors in how well this assignment can be carried out.

For it is a fact, liberal arts colleges and technical institutions which do not have Federal research programs have difficulty in attracting capable scientists. Yet the Department of Defense has argued that it "must secure contracts with organizations which can carry out a research and development program in the most efficient manner. Therefore, excellence of the contractor in the field of science or engineering is the primary consideration when contracts are let." I challenge this assertion on the grounds that the mission approach of the Department of Defense cannot be considered apart from the broad national interest, nor apart from the necessity in the long run for a broad base for our defense efforts.

But a Department spokesman told a House committee that it had tried dispersion during the 1950's in "areas remote from traditional

areas of concentration." None of these attempts, the Department testified, has "materilaly affected the role of major R. & D. complexes."

As a matter of fact, the Stanford Research Institute completed a study for the Department of Defense to use in determining "what factors are pertinent to geographical distribution of defense R. & D. industry." Without casting any aspersions on the objectivity of the Stanford study, this is something like assigning the fox the task of mapping the defense of the chicken coop.

In my judgment, it is against the national interest for any region of the country to be denied access to the mainstream of America's accelerating technological and scientific society. For in this denial we will freeze into the future the unfortunate imbalances of today and, in fact, make the disparity greater.

The National Science Foundation's program to develop centers of excellence is a fine gesture, and the great University of Oregon, in my district, is one of the beneficiaries of the program. A recent grant of slightly over $4 million will be very helpful. But the magnitude of the Federal research and development programs, expected to continue to expand in coming years, makes the NSF program as useful from a national point of view as using a tack hammer to drive a railroad spike.

From statistics I cited earlier, no matter what measure is taken, whether dollars of R. & D. funds per capita, per scientist, per industrial employee, per advanced degree, per student or whatever, a few States, and within them, a few areas receive a disportionate share of Federal funds, and in gross contracts and grants a very few receive the preponderance of dollars. And because these funds have been distributed in this manner over the past decade and a half, and perhaps more, institutions and industrial complexes have been created which in turn are used for justification for continuing to place these funds in such a manner.

We are thus creating several sections of the Nation, most particularly southern California, the San Francisco Bay area, New York City and northern New Jersey, and the Boston-Cambridge areas, that under criteria apparently currently being used by NASA and the Department of Defense (two major contracting agencies) are destined to continue to expand and draw, as a magnet, the brightest and most able scientists and engineers from throughout the Nation.

I believe that it is a truism that scientists and engineers, no less than others, will go where the challenges and the opportunities are.

The massive and demanding research activities of the Federal Government have been opening the greatest opportunities and presenting the most stimulating challenges in science and engineering. It is no wonder that the brilliant men and women, often trained out in the remote areas described by the Department of Defense witness, are drawn to southern California or to the Northeast. And this in turn attracts the students who want to study with the top professors and research men who have moved into the great institutions as federally created opportunities are presented.

For the most part, the creation of these great institutions and these sophisticated industrial complexes, represents a multitude of agency decisions. And these decisions were carried out with tax dollars paid by all States. Despite chamber of commerce boasts, there is nothing unique in the southern California climate or topography, nor in the New England or Middle Atlantic States that makes research more effective or more efficient if it is conducted there. The quality of the individuals and the facilities, purchased or employed for the most part with Federal dollars, is the difference.

Advanced computers and laboratories, intricate testing and engineering facilities, and the highly knowledgeable scientists and engineers to operate them can be placed as well at the University of Oregon or Oregon State University as at California Institute of Technology; as well at the University of Wisconsin as at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and produce as much in association with the University of Michigan as with Harvard University.

People and facilities make the difference and these are where the opportunities created with Federal dollars are. Where these Federal dollars for research and development are put are conscious human decisions made most often here in Washington by a multitude of agencies, each concerned with its particular task and mission, and none with on overall national policy viewpoint.

It is this viewpoint of the national interest that we in the Congress must provide or in our failure to do so, acquiesce in the continued and greater concentration of scientific and technological brainpower and research and development facilities in a very limited number of places in the Nation. If it is our responsibility to set national policy, and I believe it is, then can we any longer defer establishing national policy and national goals in a segment of Federal activity that has such a large impact on our educational, economic and social development?

The ten States in the Northeast, the Midwest and the Far West which receive the most Federal research and development support have an annual average of 100 Ph. D. graduates per million population, as compared to 50 Ph. D. graduates per million population in the other 40 States.

As the Federal Government pumps money into the admittedly first rank universities in a limited number of areas, these expanding institutions exercise a strong stimulus on the high school students of the surrounding areas. Studies have shown that high school graduates near these educational institutions are three times more likely to go on to doctoral work than those not in favored areas, and relatively few go more than 500 miles for this opportunity.

What is the result? Can part of it be the fact that more than 75,000 high school graduates a year are capable of Ph. D. level work as compared to the 10,000 degrees actually granted? I do not know, but I hope this Committee will find out, for the 65,000 young men and women of outstanding ability each year who do not reach their full potential is a shocking failure of our educational system, in which Congress may have a direct share of the blame.

I am unwilling to concede that a youngster born in southern California or Massachusetts or New York is smarter or more able than one born in Oregon or Florida or Michigan or Alaska. I am likewise unwilling to suggest that the Federal Government should be a party to making one section of the country a better place in which to be educated than another. Yet there are some schools better than others, and among the first rank universities, and those in close behind them, it is Federal support of research and development that is making the difference.

But whether the phenomenal growth of research activities at some of our superior institutions receiving huge Federal contracts and grants contributes in fact to greater advantages for te undergraduate or post-graduate doctoral candidate would be worth exploring. We know able students swarm to the doors of these institutions with great hopes for learning at the feet of today's famous scientists and engineers and participating in meeting the challenges of tomorrow, but are these hopes realized in fact, or is education becoming secondary as Federal funds flow in, and top scientists and engineers leave classroom assignments for the disciplines of the laboratory?

As Federal funds finance the growth of so-called "traditional centers" of concentration of research and development funds, are we producing factories of education, with famous names on the marquee, whose roles are played in the classrooms and teaching laboratories by stand-ins, for the principals are busily engaged elsewhere on Federally financed research? Are institutional laboratory and testing facilities to become separate and distinct from the educational and training function of the university?

I do not know the answers to these questions, and many more to which you, as well as I, should seek answers. I do know that there is no doubt that Federal funds are having a profound effect on American higher education. I know that most universities and colleges are wary of this effect lest they become in practice under Federal direction and control. But the impact is there, and perhaps the question with which we are faced is not whether there should be an effect, but rather whether it shall be as the result of many agency policies directed toward various and limited agency goals, or whether the Congress of the United States shall establish a broad national policy within which academic freedom can be preserved and the entire higher educational system of the Nation consciously and deliberately improved.

The National Science Foundation in making a study of this problem used language somewhat reminiscent of the foreign aid program. The report was in terms of "emergent universities," "developing universities." Federal policy—or in fact lack of it—has turned differences into virtual uncrossable chasms—and now those left behind by conscious decision are to be treated as we would an "emergent" nation on the African Continent.

I contend that this is pure nonsense. And I protest it. I want, and I think that this view is shared by most of my colleagues and yours, that the youth of America, all of America, can share in the scientific and technical age we are in truth just entering. If the Federal Government is to engage so heavily in research and development, which I believe it must, and if it is to have such a critical effect on our development as a people, then we have the responsibility to develop those policies which will insure that all America will have the opportunity to contribute its energies and intelligence to this effort. We create the opportunities and the challenges as we will. We cannot deny them to most of the country, in favor of some of the country.

And surely, we cannot continue to create the severe disparity of opportunity on the basis that, that which was, is and shall forever more be.

Judy Holliday, Actress, Is Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I should like to note for the record here in the Congress of the United States that a wonderful American, Judy Holliday, died in New York on June 7.

This talented young actress, who leaves a 12-year-old son, put up such a courageous fight against her illness that she sets an example of courage and human toughness and goodness for everyone to admire and remember.

As far as we could see she never once broke down and did not permit her illness to interfere with the excitement that she found in life and the joy that she gave to others.

My wife Mary and I were delighted to have seen Judy in her last show on Broadway, "Hot Spot." Even then she was far from being well, but not a living soul who saw her performance could possibly have detected it.

Judy was a New York City born gal who made it the hard way—somehow she always seemed to be fighting against odds—and her wonderful laugh and twinkle never left her.

As Miss Holliday's Representative in Congress and friend I salute her memory and extend most personal sympathy to her mother, her son Jonathan, and to her many friends and admirers. New York City, and the country, is the sadder and the lesser for her untimely death.

I should like to include in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the New York Times on June 8:

JUDY HOLLIDAY, 42, IS DEAD OF CANCER

Judy Holliday, whose portrayal of a junk dealer's doxy in "Born Yesterday" created a new kind of beautiful-but-dumb blonde, died of cancer yesterday. She was 42 years old.

In one line, she managed to forge the image:

"Do me a favor, will ya, Harry?" she told her villainous lover in the comedy: "Drop Dead."

With an immaculate sense of timing, some venom and a good deal of passion, she made it the most memorable line of the play that became a hit of Broadway and Hollywood. Where such a role was usually characterized merely by gumchewing, sinuosity, and unalloyed brassiness, she made it not only funny but also human and moving.

For the film of "Born Yesterday," the role she had created on Broadway, Miss Holliday won an Academy Award in 1950 as the best actress.

Six years later, her performance as the wish-fulfilling telephone operator in Broadway's "Bells Are Ringing" won her the Antoinette Perry Award as the outstanding female lead in a musical.

In all, Miss Holliday appeared in only five Broadway shows between 1945, when she made her debut in "Kiss Them for Me" and 1963, when she starred in the short-lived musical "Hot Spot." She made a number of movies but always felt that she was not a Hollywood type. She was a native New Yorker and never took herself away from the metropolis for very long.

HAD A HIGH IQ

Acting was work to her, partly perhaps because it was not what she had set out to do (she wanted to be a writer and director) and partly because she was a perfectionist. Her stage stupidity was the product of an extremely alert and high intelligence, attested to early in life by a score of 172 in a public school intelligence quotient test.

"I'm not an instant actor," Miss Holliday once said. "To really do anything I've got to try it five or six or a dozen times."

Adolph Green and Betty Comden, two of the "The Revuers," the group in which they and Miss Holliday rose from obscurity to fame as entertainers in Greenwich Village, recalled years later that when "Bells are Ringing" was in its final weeks and set for closing, the actress would still call rehearsals to keep the cast from getting sloppy.

Miss Holliday was shy and never anxious to be known as a star anywhere but in her performances. She rarely indulged in lavish clothing and she fought a perennial war against a waistline that tended to expand and threaten her 5-foot 7-inch, 125-pound figure that went so well with her large expressive brown eyes and natural blond hair.

Her life was a succession of breaks predicated on talent and determination, but rarely in overconfidence. She encouraged her friends to see her and tell her how she did. When she went before her first audiences at the Village Vanguard in 1938, she became so nervous that she became sick.

In 1945 she was chosen at auditions by Herman Shumlin for the role of a prostitute, in "Kiss Them for Me." She was frightened at the possibility that her low-pitched voice would not reach the back of the house. Mr. Green recalled that she came to him and Miss Comden and confessed, "I don't know if I can make it."

"She did," said Mr. Green. "The whisper became a roar." For her efforts she won the Clarence Derwent Award as the best supporting actress that year.

Her performance in this show caused Max Gordon to think of her when "Born Yesterday" ran into trouble a year later just before trying out in Philadelphia. Jean Arthur, who had been chosen to star in the show, fell sick.

LEARNED PART IN 3 DAYS

"The minute she walked in I knew she was it," Mr. Gordon wrote in his memoirs. "I listened to her talk—even without giving her a script to read—and was certain that she would make an ideal replacement if she were needed."

She was needed, and only a few days later, when it became certain that Miss Arthur could not go on. Miss Holliday memorized the script in 3 days and the show opened in Philadelphia that weekend.

The late Paul Douglas and Gary Merrill played opposite her in the stage comedy, which ran for 3 years. Broderick Crawford and William Holden were in the film of "Born Yesterday."

Judith Tuvim, who was born on June 21, 1922, took Holliday as her stage name. It is a variation of the Hebrew translation of her family name, which means holliday.

Her father, Abraham Tuvim, was active in Jewish organizational affairs. Her mother, Helen, was a music teacher. Her parents were divorced when she was a child.

Young Judy grew up in a house in Sunnyside, Queens. She soon showed that she had been endowed bountifully with brains and drive. She read voraciously (adult books when her contemporaries were going through "The Bobbsey Twins"). Her mentor was an uncle, the late Joseph Gollomb, who was an author of novels and biography.

Although she was shy, she plunged into group activities at school. She wrote a Christmas play, "The Tucker Family's Christmas," which she also directed and starred in. She edited the school newspaper and one of her early literary efforts won an essay-contest prize: "How to Keep the Streets, Parks and Playgrounds of Our City Clean."

She was graduated from Julia Richman High School and then, because she could not enter the Yale Drama School, set about getting into show business from the bottom. The bottom was the switchboard, which she was hired to manage backstage at the Mercury Theater, then under the direction of Orson Welles.

It was one of the few assignments she failed. Calls became snarled and 6 months later she left, but with memories that later helped her play the dreamy operator in "Bells Are Ringing."

Her mother took her to a Catskill resort on vacation and she met Adolph Green, who was then performing in the Borscht Belt. The two became good friends.

That fall, in 1938, Miss Holliday took refuge from a sudden downpour in the Village Vanguard, a type of place that served soft drinks and hard poets who declaimed their works.

Max Gordon (not the Max Gordon who put her on stage) was the proprietor. He was impressed by her manner and intellect and they struck up a friendship.

"She was a Village kid, just group together to go on Sunday nights for $5 apiece for each show."

Miss Holliday assembled Mr. Green, Miss Comden, Alvin Hammer, and John Frank. They were all very nervous, Mr. Gordon said.

"None of us were what you might call actors," Mr. Green said.

From the very start, the Revuers, as they called themselves, scrounged for material. When they could not get enough, they began writing it themselves. They did take-offs and skits. They memorialized the man who invented the shoehorn and they made fun of Joan Crawford fans. Most of what they did went over well.

From there, all roads went up—for a while. They played the Rainbow Room and other top clubs. An agent hinted to them that Hollywood held out promise. With nothing more than this lead, the group entrained for the west coast in 1943. There were no film jobs in Hollywood, but they played the Trocadero, where movie ex-executives caught their acts, laughed and came up with little except offers to hire Miss Holliday.

"All the companies wanted her," Mr. Green said. "Nobody wanted us."

It was, according to all concerned, like a grade B movie plot. Miss Holliday refused to enter films without her friends. They urged her to accept and, finally and reluctantly, she did, with an agreement that provided for the Revuers to have a part in the first film and for her to remain for six more.

In the first movie, the Revuers ended on the cutting room floor and Miss Holliday did not create any stir in her own role. Her other early experiments were also less than rewarding, although she drew a good review in "Winged Victory."

In 1944, she had one line as a wartime welder in "Something for the Boys." She later said that the filmmaker wanted someone who could speak quickly and that she had whipped through a 3-minute bit in 30 seconds.

In 1945 she returned, dispiritedly, to New York, where Mr. Green and Miss Comden had a hit in "On the Town." They encouraged her to apply for the part in "Kiss Them for Me."

After the role of Billie Dawn in "Born Yesterday," demands for her came from Broadway and Hollywood. She was in the films "The Solid Gold Cadillac," "Adam's Rib," "The Marrying Kind" and "Phfft."

On Broadway she also performed in "Dream Girl" and "Hot Spot." She persuaded Sydney Chaplin, now starring in "Funny Girl," to audition to play opposite her in "Bells Are Ringing." Mr. Chaplin, son of the famous movie comedian, had difficulty getting started in the theater. However, she worked with him and he got the part and a start.

Miss Holliday testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1952 at the height of the McCarthy era. The Senators did not accuse her of being a Communist but they said that she and others had been duped by the Communists.

She readily acknowledged that she had been taken advantage of and said that she had even hired two investigators to find out what she had been doing.

In 1948, she was married to David Oppenheim, a musician and head of the classical recording division of Columbia Records. The couple moved into the Dakota, at Central Park West and West 72d Street, where the actress continued to live after they were divorced in 1957.

Recently, Miss Holliday had been writing lyrics for songs by Gerry Mulligan, the jazz saxophonist, but none have been published.

Miss Holliday underwent cancer surgery 5 years ago. She entered Mount Sinai on May 26 and she died in her sleep.

She is survived by her mother and her son, Jonathan, 12.

A funeral service will be held at 1 p.m. tomorrow at Frank E. Campbell's Madison Avenue and 81st Street.

Dr. Frederick A. Cook Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday the citizens of Callicoon in Sullivan County will honor the centenary of the birth of their most illustrious native son, Frederick Albert Cook. Together with representatives of the town of Delaware, the Sullivan County Historical Society and the Dr. Frederick A. Cook Society they will join in according fitting and long-overdue recognition to a pioneer explorer of the ends of the earth, the first man to have described the area at the top of the world.

Dr. Cook is now recognized by geographic and scientific circles as one of the foremost American Polar explorers, and by many as the discoverer of the North Pole on April 21, 1908. The New York State Legislature, the Boards of Supervisors of Erie County and Sullivan County, the town of Delaware and the city of Buffalo are among the official bodies who have paid tribute by proclaiming today as "Dr. Frederick A. Cook Day."

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join with our distinguished colleague from Sullivan County, the Honorable JOHN G. DOW, in sending greetings to the Cook Centenary Celebration in Callicoon this Sunday.

Dr. Cook is buried in Buffalo's Forest Lawn Cemetery in my own Erie County, and he spent many of his last years in this part of the State. Therefore, we share in a small way the life and career of this man, who was the first to lift the Stars and Stripes at the Boreal Center, the top of our earth.

Fifty years ago, Dr. Cook was in Washington at the time that hearings were held by the 63rd Congress regarding the proper recognition of this Polar explorer by his country. Unfortunately, the impending entrance of the United States into the conflict that then engulfed Europe, and especially the sinking of the *Lusitania*, deferred any action which accorded such recognition. It is my sincere hope that at some future date fitting acknowledgement of this pioneer American Polar explorer will be made by Congress.

At that time he addressed an open letter to Congress which was prophetic in several instances. He projected the value in strategic and mineral resources of this Far North country to the United States, and the past half century has borne his predictions out.

I include part of Dr. Cook's letter as inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 10, 1915, in the 3d session of the 63d Congress by the late Congressman William J. Fields, of Kentucky:

[Excerpts of a letter of Dr. Frederick A. Cook to the Congress of the United States]

FEBRUARY 9, 1915.

My appeal to Congress and to my fellow countrymen is not entirely personal. The polar regions have certain valuable resources which will be an important asset to future generations. It is true the North Pole is in the center of a deep sea. It has no value, either scientific or commercial, and no explorer ever supposed it would have. The poles of the earth could be better and more accurately located from Washington than in the regions of the poles. To touch the pinpoint of the pole, therefore, is not the object of polar exploration.

Our main object is to pierce the unknown and replace the blank spots upon our charts by the topographic outline of lands, the delineation of seas, and above all to bring back a knowledge of the physical condition about the top of the globe. Such knowledge is very important to the people of all sections of the earth. For example, our weather conditions are not entirely understandable until we know the weather of Canada. In Canada weather is a mystery until the storm-delivering centers about the pole are studied. The same is true of geology, of biology, of anthropology and of every branch of natural science.

There is an interlinking of all the terrestrial conditions and, therefore, to know the globe as a whole there must not be large blank spots on our maps. To meet this demand is the object of all exploration. This has been met by the recorded results of my attainment of the pole. It is certified by the expert opinion of my own peers—the Arctic explorers of all the world.

The polar regions will at some time in the near future become valuable, and, therefore, it would seem to be the duty of those who guard the destiny of the state to take some steps to protect the interests of American explorers, for in so doing our claim upon the future resources will be protected. My appeal, therefore, is not one of selfish gain, but in the national interest of the work of all American explorers.

The time will come when human life will extend to within 500 miles of the pole. To that point there is an abundance of animal and plant life. The Arctic is not, as is generally supposed, always blanketed with ice and snow. The long summer sun gives a double daily growth to plant life. The best proof of the wealth of the North is the existence of a permanent land fauna, for animals do not eat rocks and snowballs. They must have food. They do have food; and they adapt themselves to the frigid environment. In Prince Edward Island some $16 million have been made during the past 4 years breeding foxes. The same can be done with all the fur-bearing animals. The farther north we go the cheaper the food, the better the fur. In furthering the interest of this animal industry we will establish for farming, which will give wealth and comfort to millions in the near future.

The Arctic Sea has in it more usable life than the Gulf of Mexico, and there, by an international agreement, seal farming can be established.

There are many minerals in the far north, and mining difficulties are not greater than in Alaska, while transportation is easier and cheaper.

Now, what has been done to secure these resources for future Americans? Canada has quietly spent more than a million dollars to file claims on everything reachable, because her statesmen have realized that all lands sooner or later become valuable.

The claim by right of discovery gives a nation the first call upon new lands, but that claim goes by default unless supplementary steps are taken.

Why, may I ask, have we closed our eyes as a Nation, to the discoveries of the American explorers?

American fishermen have used Hudson Bay for 100 years. This bay is the most wonderful inland sea of the world. Its marine life will feed millions during ages to follow. Canada has closed the door of Hudson Straits to our seamen. Here is a problem for immediate adjustment. These pioneer fishermen were explorers; their rights cry for protection.

American sailors explored the uttermost reaches of the Antarctic before other nations woke up to the possibilities of the far south. A proper protection of their claims would have given us hundreds of islands and a valuable coastline with harbors and mines and undreamed of industries. These islands will at some time become the best fur farms of the entire world, but not a voice has been raised by our statesmen to protect the discoveries of these brave explorers.

Our forefathers with a worthy pride, recorded the splendid pioneer efforts of Admiral Wilkes in the frozen south. He discovered a new continent and explored islands and seas about the South Pole. Fifty years later by one stroke of the pen a certain British armchair geographer, in the Encyclopaedia Britannica and on the maps of the world, took American honors and American claims from the Antarctic Continent. This was officially done by the mapmakers of Europe. To this sacrifice of American prestige, to this insult upon the flag there has been silence in Washington. Why?

The geographic historian, Edwin Swift Balch, called a halt upon this kind of national insult. (Antarctica, by Edwin Swift Balch), but to the present although the discoveries of Wilkes have been verified by the Australian expedition, no official action has been taken to guard the honor of Antarctic pioneers.

In the Arctic there is a long list of worthy achievement which, with inconceivable indifference, has been given official absent treatment.

American fishermen have always been pioneers in the north; they needed harbors and boating and land facilities. They require some assistance to determine the position and extent of submarine banks, and they require some enlightenment on the food and propagation of submarine life. Other nations here gave much assistance to their marine explorers, but what have we done?

The discoveries of Drs. Schwatka, Kane, Hays, and Bessell are lost among old books under dusty shelves. The works of Wellman, Baldwin, and Fiala is lost in the ungravious controversy of rival newspaper publicity.

The splendid pioneer's work of discovery by Lieutenant de Long, of Captain Hall, of General Greely, and Engineer Peary, by which the United States could add hundreds of miles of seacoast and thousands of square miles of terrestrial wealth, are locked up in forgotten archives.

The conquest of the North Pole is, therefore, only a part of a long list of American achievements which should be given official recognition and protection by those who guard our national honor and the future destiny of our heritage to the resources of the world. If in future years, a controversy arose about the validity of the source of these discoveries, it would be difficult to prove up our claims, except by the bleached bones and fox-emptied graves of those whose lives were sacrificed in the war with the ice world.

In the Arctic there are at least 5 million square miles of territory not now in use, upon which animal farming, mining, and other industries can and will thrive in the years to come. There the high cost of meat, the high cost of living can be reduced. In that great, lone land there is elbow room for the millions now at war, wherein the only real result is to fertilize with human remains the soil that must support future generations.

The lot of an Arctic explorer is not an easy one. If he succeeds he is disputed. If he fails he is called a weakling. In either case he goes to oblivion under the snow of a cold and unappreciative world.

In the better perspective of later generations communities engage in the battle of body snatching to place his remains under domes that represent millions of dollars, to flatter the vanity of the community boosters. These same pioneers, during the lifetime of their declining years, have been usually denied butter for their bread and honor for their children.

How much nobler would the world be if these same men had been given the glad hand of brotherly appreciation in some tangible, unforgettable way by the nations which profited by their conquests. I appeal not for myself, but for the whole family of pathfinders, past, present, and future, for the determination of the validity of the polar claims is but a part of our duty to future posterity.

FREDERICK A. COOK,
Ebbitt House, Washington, D.C.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Ambitious Road Beautification Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 28, the Providence Journal of Providence, R.I., printed a fine editorial entitled "Ambitious Road Beautification Program."

It is a most enlightening editorial and expresses my sentiments and I hope the sentiments of our citizens. With permission to revise and extend my remarks I include this excellent editorial:

[From the Providence Journal, May 28, 1965]

AMBITIOUS ROAD BEAUTIFICATION PROGRAM

President Johnson has mapped an ambitious program to restore and enhance the entire relationship between men and the natural world as the basis for making the Nation's roads its highways to the enjoyment of nature and beauty. His program challenges some of the most deeply vested interests in the Nation.

The President conceded that in our drive to build the highways we need the Nation has destroyed much beauty and has failed to recognize the dangers that swift urbanization of the countryside has posed. His purpose, he said, is to restore what can be restored and to guide future growth for protection of natural beauty.

To accomplish his overall goal, he proposes:

1. To make Federal highway aid contingent on action by the States to set up controls over outdoor advertising wherever land is not already zoned for commercial and industrial—a major concession. The present program of voluntary State cooperation in control of outdoor advertising is an almost total failure.

2. To forbid new junkyards within 1,000 yards of the pavement of new roads and visible to motorists, again under penalty of Federal aid withdrawal, and to require effective screening of existing junkyards. Today, the only controls over such eyesores are those imposed by the States—and few have effective controls.

3. To use Federal funds on a matching basis to pay for costs of landscaping and roadside development. The program would permit the acquisition and creation of rest and recreation areas. Today, the States are allowed to use 3 percent of Federal funds for road beautification, but no matching funds are required.

4. To require that States use one-third of Federal aid each now receives for secondary roads to build scenic roads, to construct access routes to scenic and recreational areas, and to provide for landscaping and roadside developments along Federal-aid highways. These kinds of roads do not presently figure in road programs.

Mr. Johnson certainly took a bold step in proposing to require outdoor advertising controls if States want Federal road help. The failure of the voluntary program is serious. Since 1958, when States could qualify for extra road aid if they set up such controls, only eight States actually have become eligible for help.

Behind this failure is the concerted activity of the outdoor advertising interests to minimize such controls. Further, the fact that local communities are involved because of the need for changing zoning controls complicated State legal action, and many did nothing at all because the extra cash for cooperation was not great.

The battle now will move to Congress where the same pressures that resisted the voluntary program are certain to organize in opposition to the institution of Federal orders for such controls. This is a cause, however, which the State has the right to expect its congressional delegation to support wholeheartedly.

Control of junkyards also has been difficult to achieve in some States although generally more action has been taken in this area than in the control of outdoor advertising. Again, local pressures operate to stall State action; the threat of loss of Federal road aid may force action where there has been none in the past.

The President's third and fourth points will carry ironic overtones for many planners who for years have tried to get highway engineers to include programs of road beautification and scenic development in road construcion blueprints. The new move is belated but the two interlinked proposals are welcome.

For too long, the highway engineers insisted on laying road lines as if they were laying railroad lines: the shortest distance between two points being the governing factor in planning. Lately, as in Rhode Island, there has been a solid break from such hard-nosed planning, and Mr. Johnson's proposals are in line with much current thinking.

There is no indication in Mr. Johnson's message of any new costs in the Federal highway program. Much of what he hopes to accomplish would be done through creation of authority to refuse help to noncooperating States. Some new funds may be necessary for such proposed work as scenic highways.

But Mr. Johnson has set down a program to which all Americans can pledge their support. Roads are tremendously important to the economy of the Nation; they are equally important to the enjoyment of movement within the Nation, and Mr. Johnson's program would go far to making this a better country in which to move, play, and live.

The 50th Anniversary of Right Reverend Monsignor Bankemper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, from the Kentucky Post-Times Star of April 27, 1965, regarding the Right Reverend Monsignor Bankemper's 50th anniversary in the priesthood. It has been my pleasure to know this outstanding priest; and I know his service has meant much to thousands of people in the Newport-Covington area.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MSGR. JOHN BANKEMPER: A PRIEST FOR 50 YEARS

"Hell in town" centered around 13th and Wheeler in Covington before the turn of the century.

The people were rough, the living was wild. It was a tough environment in which to rear a boy like John A. Bankemper.

But, Butcher J. C. Bankemper and wife, Mary, did their best for their son and eight other children.

Their best paid off.

A daughter is Sister Mary Evangelista, teacher at Blessed Sacrament, Fort Mitchell.

And, John is the Right Reverend Monsignor Bankemper, pastor of Mother of God Church, 119 West Sixth, Covington.

"Being a priest was my only ambition, to serve the Almighty God and labor in the vineyards," he said.

"As a child, I copied them. I was pretending to baptize and to marry my little friends. I never wanted to be anything else."

He achieved his goal when he was 26 years old. On June 10, he will celebrate a goal seldom reached by priests. That will be his golden jubilee of priesthood.

Of 22 classmates ordained May 29, 1915, the 76-year-old Bankemper is one of 6 surviving.

Some of the six may attend the jubilee. Other guests are being invited from around the world because Father Bankemper is widely traveled.

One has already promised to attend. He is Father Killoran, Johannesburg, South Africa, who became Father Bankemper's closest friend after they met a year ago during the Covington priest's travels.

"I never bought a machine because I wanted to see distant places," said Father Bankemper. "I use my money to travel. I walk where I want to go around here. I walk an hour each morning at mass."

Since 1931, the father has visited almost every nation. He has been in Europe, the Far East, Ireland—"I kissed the Blarney Stone. I wasn't going to walk up those 120 steps without doing that"—Alaska, Africa, the Near East, South Pacific, and South and Central America.

"I liked Hawaii best," he said. "It was so beautiful, so picturesque."

To become a priest, the boy, John, had to overcome his father who found jobs four times for him. Four times the son failed them.

When he was 15 years old, he won out. He began training. He graduated from St. Joseph High School, 12th and Greenup, attended St. Gregory Minor Seminary for 3 years until it closed, St. Meinred College in Indiana, and studied philosophy and theology 6 years at Mount St. Mary of the West, Mount Washington, Ohio.

His first assignment was as assistant curator to St. Stephen Church, Newport.

He came to Mother of God in 1960. His assistants are Father Clarence Heitzman and Father Maurice Brinker. They tend the spiritual needs of 500 families.

Commencement, Aquinas Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure on June 5, 1965, to be invited to the ninth commencement of the Aquinas schools in Milton, Mass., as principle speaker. This school was established in 1956 by the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph. Aquinas was founded as a nonprofit educational institution for training young women for successful careers in business and was accredited as a 2-year school of business in 1962 by the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools, Washington, D.C. It is located on a beautiful 15-acre campus at the foot of the Blue Hills in Milton.

Following is my address:

THE STREAMS AND THE OCEAN

(Commencement address delivered by Congressman JAMES A. BURKE to graduates of the Aquinas School for Girls, Milton and Newton, Mass., Saturday, June 5, 1965)

Sister Superior, Sisters, members of the faculty, parents and friends of the graduates, and members of the class of 1965, it is a distinct pleasure for me to be here with you on this significant occasion which marks another milestone in the lives of these attractive and hard-working young ladies. It is a pleasure because each commencement ceremony brings another group of American youth closer to what must be the goal of a great democratic nation; the full participation by every citizen in the economic, social, and political workings of that nation.

I am especially honored and pleased to have the opportunity of attending the last joint graduation of the Aquinas School. Your Sisters tell me that by next year the beautiful new facilities at the Newton campus will be completed, and that separate commencements will be held. Therefore, in the future, two graduation speakers will be able to share the pleasure that is undividedly mine today.

The schools of one's community, whether public or private, are a matter of vital concern to every thinking citizen. Such concern is vividly intensified if one has the privilege, as I do, of representing his area in our National Government. It is, therefore, a great source of inspiration and confidence for me, and I am sure, for others, to know that there is within our district an organization which is selflessly devoted to providing the best possible opportunities for further Christian education. The contribution of this order, the Sisters of St. Joseph of Boston, is not limited to this one institution, nor to this one period of time. For nearly 100 years now, the Sisters have played a large and expanding role in the educational history of our State and Nation. The size and diversity of the school program supported by the Boston Sisters alone is eloquent testimony to the vision and devotion of the order. For Aquinas is but one of the more than 100 educational institutions operated by the Sisters, institutions that range from a college to grammar schools, from academies to an educational clinic. And across the land, in Chicago, Los Angeles, Santa Fe, and many other cities, other Motherhouses of the Sisters of St. Joseph are also engaged in this great work.

Thus, we can see that it was not a new departure for the Sisters when Mother Mary Euphrasia established your school a decade ago, but only a further instance of the order's continuing commitment to education. In the past decade, I have viewed the growth and progress of this institution with great pride and satisfaction. Ten years ago, 30 young ladies enrolled in your new school to prepare themselves through Christian education for useful and satisfying professional careers. Next fall, 400 students will begin the same experience on two campuses. This record of service is one in which all of you—administrators, teachers, and students—can take justifiable pride, one for which the sincere gratitude of our area, our State, and our Nation is your due.

It seems particularly fitting to me that your institution established by an order of Christian educators, should bear the name of one who throughout his life was directly involved in the various processes of education and who is the patron of all Catholic schools. As you recall, St. Thomas was born in the first quarter of the 13th century, a period which also saw the birth of the university as we recognize it. St. Thomas began his formal studies at one of these infant universities—the one of Naples—and remained, of course, in the scholastic milieu the remainder of his life, both as scholar and teacher.

In later life, when St. Thomas had become famous through his writings and his reputation for general erudition, many younger people sought his counsel on various matters. On one occasion, a young Dominican asked for advice on how to pursue learning. St. Thomas' answer, stemming as it did from the experience gained through a lifetime of seeking knowledge, seems to me as valid today as it was when given seven centuries ago. He wrote, in part:

"Brother John, since you have asked me how one should set about to acquire the treasure of knowledge, this is my advice to you concerning it: namely, that you should choose to enter, not straightway into the ocean, but by way of the little streams; for difficult things ought to be reached by way of easy ones."

Now I think the wisdom in this advice is enhanced when we remember that St. Thomas was indeed a scholar, but not merely a scholar. Although the writings for which he is celebrated are mainly theological in nature, St. Thomas was really a many-sided broadly based individual quite aware of the real world about him. It has been said of him that he was as interested in politics or mysticism as in metaphysics or theology. From this, it would appear that his advice is applicable not only to the formal, scholastic study of the schoolroom variety, but to the greater, even limitless, study which is the living of life itself.

Today, you young ladies are passing your second significant milestone, leaving the second of the major divisions of your lives behind you. I think the two periods you have come through are examples of the little streams mentioned by St. Thomas. The first period, and the first little stream, can be equated with your life as a child in the lap of your family. When you entered the first grade, the stream of your childhood entered a larger tributary represented by formal education. There, you learned lessons from a new set of adults—your teachers—and from your new classmates as well. But just as a small brook enters a larger one and makes it even larger, so with your life: the experiences and knowledge gained in your childhood were not lost when you entered school, but joined with the new experiences and knowledge you gathered in the schools.

And now, you are at the mouth of the second stream, preparing to enter upon the ocean of the everyday world. To say that the streams traversed by you thus far are little is not to say that they are insignificant. As St. Thomas has said, the easy should come as a preparation for the difficult. The lessons you have learned may have seemed difficult at the time of learning, but they were easier than many you must learn on the ocean of the future.

In your travels on that ocean, your experiences and encounters will be more immediate and intense than those to which you are accustomed; your lessons will be more varied and less susceptible of copybook solutions; and your teachers will often be impersonal and less benign than those you have known heretofore. I must add, however, with certainty and with great delight, that if your lessons will be harder, then in like degree will your satisfaction on mastering them be greater.

You are on the threshold of a full and variegated future. The first transition you must make is that from schoolgirl to career woman. Most of you will make this change effortlessly, for, thanks to Aquinas and to your own diligence, you now possess marketable skills in a specialized, high-demand, field. As members of the American labor force, you will become producers as well as consumers. One of the problems you will face is how to balance these two functions. But then we all face that problem, whether we are Congressmen or caretakers.

You will be molders of public opinion and full partners in the governmental processes of your Nation. This may seem purely a privilege, a thing to be looked forward to. It is that indeed, but it also carries with it responsibilities. Citizenship in a democracy is exercised through the ballot; but to exercise good citizenship, you must form opinions, speak out, debate, argue, consult, persuade, read, listen, shout if necessary, and then vote.

You will be the protectors and the agents of transmission for our country's cultural, social, and religious heritage. It will not be enough for you to do your paid work well and neglect these other aspects of life. You must strike a balance, you must set up a system of priorities among many diverse matters.

And most of you will become wives and mothers. The homes you establish will be the sources of new little streams down which you will guide the next generation on its journey to the great ocean you yourselves are about to enter upon.

There are also other large problems, other tough challenges that you will face, ranging in area of occurrence from the local to the extraterrestrial. There is the ongoing ideological struggle being waged between the East and the West, with authoritarianism or freedom as the ultimate outcome, and world peace and survival hanging in the balance. There is the disconcerting split that may be developing within the very ranks of the Western allies. There is the contest being waged for space, and there will be new problems once space is conquered.

Nearer home, there are several troublesome areas of great import. There is the disgraceful situation of poverty and hunger in the most abundantly endowed land on earth. There are poverty's concomitants, ignorance and crime to be dealt with. These problems will be further complicated by the expected advances in technology and the increased incidence of automation. There is the war to be waged on killing and crippling diseases, those of the mind as well as those of the body. And far from least critical, there is

the nagging, morally-upsetting problem of racial equality, understanding, and civil rights.

Now it may seem to you that most of these issues will be worked out at rather a far remove from your personal lives, that their resolution will scarcely concern you in a direct manner. If you feel that way, I must respectfully say that you are mistaken. In the world of today, there can be no isolation. The problems I have cited are American problems, and as Americans you will be involved in them and affected by their resolution.

I paint a drab picture of the ocean you are embarking upon. But I firmly believe that all is not darkness. I would remind you of the words of William Faulkner upon receiving the Nobel Prize for literature, and who was one of America's greatest literary spokesmen, a man who indeed saw the world darkly, but who could say: "I believe that mankind will not merely endure; he will prevail."

Your futures, then, will be complex and demanding. They will be frought with grave issues, decisions, problems, and quandaries. I am confident, however, that through diligent exercise of the moral values, discipline, and special skills that you take away from the little streams of home, school, and Aquinas, your futures will be bright.

I thank you and extend to each of you my best wishes on your voyage.

COMMENCEMENT PROGRAM

Academic procession: Graduates, guests, faculty.

Chorus: The National Anthem.

Invocation: Rev. William J. Melea; theology instructor, Milton Aquinas.

Welcome: Sister M. Blaithin, CSJ, director of the Milton School.

Reading of award for Secretary of the Year: Barbara M. Curley, the 1964 recipient.

Presentation of the award: By Mr. James L. Barnes, S. S. Pierce Co., to Kathleen M. Murphy, class of 1962.

Introduction of speaker: Mr. Daniel E. Duggan, chairman of the Milton Selectmen, representing Mr. William White, selectman, town of Milton.

Address to the graduates: Hon. JAMES A. BURKE, Congress of the United States.

Reading of the diploma: Sister M. Roberta, CSJ, director of the Newton School.

Presentation of diplomas: Sister M. Blaithin, CSJ, director of the Milton School.

Blessing of graduates and assembly: Rev. John E. Foley, theology instructor, Newton Aquinas.

Chorus: America, the Beautiful.

Recessional: Organists—Frances M. Santacross, Margaret S. Coleman, class of 1966.

MILTON GRADUATES

Two-year medical secretarial

Elaine Theresa Chipman, Milton.
Mary Katherine Coleman, Hyde Park.
Kathleen Jane Collins, Braintree.
Janet Mary Concannon, Dorchester.
Mary Margaret Curran, Milton.
Janice Elizabeth DaDomo, Hyde Park.
Carol A. DaRu, Medford.
Patricia Marie Davis, Dedham.
Carol Anne Downes, Dorchester.
Susan Marie Fitzgerald, East Weymouth.
Barbara E. Folsom, Avon.
Karen Marie Foye, Mattapan.
Kathleen Ann Gately, Brockton.
Jeanne Frances Henning, Braintree.
Barbara Helena Hoy, Milton.
Patricia Ann Kenney, Milton.
Mary J. Kosboski, Bridgewater.
Susan Elaine Krauss, Randolph.[1]
Marjorie Ann Lievi, Milton.
Nancy Ada Lyons, Mattapan.
Susan C. MacCarthy, Brookline.[3 4]
Christine M. MacDonald, Milton.
Geraldine Marie Manning, Canton.
Marilyn Lee Marney, Wollaston.[1 4]
Joanne Patricia McDonald, Braintree.
Carole Ann Meehan, Wollaston.
Deirdre Marie Moriarty, Canton.
Elizabeth Ellen Scanlan, North Quincy.[1 4]
Denise Marie Sullivan, Milton.
Mary Alice Sweeney, Brockton.
Stephanie Francesca Talkowski, South Boston.[1]

Two-year legal secretarial

Roberta Claire Anderson, Brockton.
Judith Anne Cassidy, Westwood.
Judith Eileen Flaherty, Braintree.
Barbara Ann Greene, Wollaston.
Myra Irene Jackson, Wollaston.
Donna-Marie Leaman, Newton.
Christena Gordon Minukas, Wollaston.[1 4]
Anne Marie Power, Dorchester.[3 4]
Patricia Eileen Regan, Dedham.
Christine Marie Rizzo, East Boston.[3]
Janet Marie Towle, Cohasset.

Two-year executive secretarial

Maureen A. Berry, Quincy.
Elaine C. Bellinghieri, Canton.
Patricia Lorraine Colarusso, Randolph.[3 4]
Bernadette E. Curtin, Dedham.
Georgieanna C. Dalton, Norwood.
Maurita A. Dalton, Norwood.[1 4]
Jeanne F. DeLucca, North Quincy.
Dolores Colette DuBuc, Dorchester.
Cheryl A. Egan, Quincy.[3 4]
Joanne Marie Francis, Quincy.
Geraldine T. Fraser, Quincy.
Mary T. Grimshaw, Braintree.
Dale J. Henderson, Quincy.[1]
Constance Ann Langone, Mattapan.
Marie Therese McLellan, Assinippi.
Diane M. Mello, Milton.
Sandra Jean Pylant, Hanover.
Eileen Ann Renna, Connecticut.

One-year executive secretarial

Gail Beverly Andersen, Randolph.[4]
Carol A. D'Angelo, Norton.
Paula F. Fitz, Milton.
Sheila P. FitzGerald, East Milton.
Louise E. Galvin, Canton.
Kathleen Marie Hanlon, Braintree.[4]
Mary Ellen Hickey, Rockland.
Eileen Marie Joyce, Roslindale.
Jean Marie Leardo, Revere.[4]
Paula Marie Maham, Braintree.
Anne Marie Mahoney, Milton.
Leona Eugenie Maraget, Weymouth.
Mary Ellen McMorrow, Dorchester.
Frances Louise Nolan, Westwood.
Sheri L. Wetzel, Brockton.
Priscilla Jane Winston, Hanover.

NEWTON GRADUATES

Two-year legal secretarial

Geraldine Cynthia Fleming, Newton.[1 4]
Maureen Teresa Foley, Newton.
Kathleen Mary Keating, Boston.
Carol Anne McCarthy, Lexington.
Mary Louise McClellan, Cambridge.[4]
Catherine Agnes O'Leary, Brighton.
Elizabeth Anne Scribner, Arlington.
Mary Catherine Vose, Framingham.

Two-year medical secretarial

Mary Susan Bonacci, Cambridge.
Elizabeth Jane Caminiti, Waltham.
Roseann Marie Cutroni, Cambridge.[4]
Beverly Ann Cuzzi, Watertown.
Joanne M. Devereaux, Needham.
Annette Claire Doucet, Waltham.
Ann Marie Dussault, Needham.
Barbara Marie Fernald, Connecticut.[1 4]
Arlene Frances Giordano, West Newton.
Carole Jeanne Hayes, Auburndale.
Marie Elaine Martel, Winthrop.[4]
Frances Helen McCaffrey, Brighton.[3 4]
Maureen Elaine McCormack, Brookline.
Mary Therese McKinnon, Cambridge.
Patricia Anne McMillan, Lowell.
Lorraine Rita Merola, Winthrop.[3 4]
Lorraine Anne Nolan, Newton Centre.
Janet Marie Nyren, Natick.[1 4]
Jacqueline Patricia O'Connor, Watertown.
Theresa Ann Shannon, Somerville.[3 4]
Margaret Ann Tully, Brighton.
Mary Eileen Walker, Cambridge.

Two-year executive secretarial

Maureen Theresa Carr, Brighton.
Carol Lynn Clark, Ashland.[1 4]
Patricia Marie Clark, Waltham.
Therese Anne Colandreo, Somerville.[1 4]
Louise Marie d'Entremont, Waltham.
Rita Mary Donovan, Belmont.[4]
Mary Louise Grew, Somerville.
Mary Rita Hall, Newton.
Paula Jean Irwin, Milford.
Dianne Frances Marcin, Somerville.
Virginia Anne McBride, Belmont.
Joanne O'Connor, Lowell.
Marie Rose Myrtho Plaisimond, Haiti.
Patricia Ann Sullivan, Waltham.
Judith Marie Wells, Natick.

One-year executive secretarial

Joanne Mary Callen, Watertown.
Kathleen Mary Carney, Arlington.
Geraldine J. Cioppa, Auburndale.
Anne Marie Flaherty, Brighton.
Susan Jane Galgay, Belmont.
Grace Marie Harrington, West Newton.
Nancy Ann Hawke, Arlington.[4]
Katherine Ann Healey, Waltham.
Judith Ann Johnson, Woburn.
Mary J. Maguire, Wayland.
Joan Kathleen McQuaid, Belmont.
Clara Marie Montillo, West Newton.
Joanna Scrooc, Newton.
Patricia Anne Sullivan, Tewksbury.[4]
Mary V. Toomey, Brighton.
Maureen E. Weker, Winthrop.[4]

USHERS

William Jackson.
Stephen Langone.

[1] Honors.
[2] High honors.
[3] Highest honors.
[4] Member of National Business Honor Society.

Illinois Seeks Accelerator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an article from the Christian Science Monitor of June 5, 1965, giving some details of the magnitude of the Atomic Energy Commission's planned particle accelerator. The National Academy of Science would do well to look thoroughly into the many obvious advantages that the Chicago area offers for this new accelerator.

The article follows:

ILLINOIS SEEKS ACCELERATOR

(By John Allan Long)

CHICAGO.—The Midwest is putting in a bid to make this area a center for high-energy physics in the United States.

At least one Midwestern State, Illinois, now is proposing sites for the Atomic Energy Commission's planned 200- to 300-billion electron-volt accelerator.

The particle accelerator would be the largest in the world and built at a cost of $280 million. For the relatively few particle physicists in this country, the accelerator would push their work to the very frontier of the study of the material universe.

The accelerator would be big. A mile in diameter, it would be built on a 3,000-acre site, near abundant electricity and water.

The most powerful particle accelerators now operating are the 28 billion-electron-volt synchrotron in Geneva, Switzerland, and the 33 billion-electron-volt unit at Brookhaven National Laboratory in New York.

ARGONNE TESTS DESCRIBED

A newer, though smaller (12.7 billion electron volts) accelerator, is in use at Argonne National Laboratory, southwest of Chicago. These accelerators move subatomic particles, generally protons or electrons, at speeds near that of light. They strike and interreact with the nuclei of atoms and form new particles.

These particles, though short lived (about 100 have been found to date), are the physicists' clues to understanding the structure of matter.

Existing accelerators, says Dr. Lee C. Teng, director of Argonne's particle accelerator division, have carried the discovery and behavior of particles about as far as possible.

He says the next step is an accelerator in the range of the proposed 300 Bev. It would throw protons or electrons at their targets much harder. The result, he feels, will probably be discovery of new particles or even different behavior of known ones.

CHICAGO PREPARES BID

The hope of having such a particle accelerator in their area has sent Chicago in hot pursuit. The Illinois Institute of Technology's research institute is preparing the bid.

"We have the assets to support the accelerator," says George Philips, vice president of the institute. He has a full-time staff working up several Chicago-area sites which meet AEC requirements.

This bid will be the first effort to land a major Federal research project since Chicago lost out to Cambridge, Mass., for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Electronics Research Center last year.

Why the huge size of the new accelerator?

"Ideally," explains Dr. Teng, in his office at Argonne, "we physicists would like to have table models. One for each office," he says with a smile.

MAGNETS "BEND" PROTONS

The size is determined by the magnets which bend the protons (which the Argonne accelerator uses) around and around in a circle until they reach the high energy needed to bombard the targets. Technologically, smaller magnets cannot be built just now and do the job.

The main unit of Argonne's accelerator is a doughnut shaped vacuum chamber, 200 feet in diameter. Around this are eight sections of a magnet weighing 4,000 pounds.

The Real Alabama—Part VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the story of great economic growth and vigor in Alabama is a story that gradually is becoming better known throughout the Nation. The New York Journal of Commerce on April 26, 1965, issued a special large supplement on this subject.

Following are four articles from that supplement:

SOUTHERN INDUSTRIES OFFERS TO ASSIST OYSTER INDUSTRY

At the commissioning ceremonies in Mobile of a $1.5 million oyster shell dredge on April 25, Southern Industries Corp. officials made sweeping offers to the Alabama seafood industry aimed at improving live oyster production.

R. H. Radcliff, Jr., president of the Mobile-based corporation that dredges dead-reef oyster shells in Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, and Virginia coastal waters, said:

"Southern Industries needs oysters that died a thousand years ago, but we're vitally interested in becoming the live oyster industry's best friend."

Mr. Radcliff said Southern Industries was ready to retain a marine biologist, selected by seafood and conservation groups, to survey Mobile Bay and other Alabama coastal waters to determine the best areas for scientific oyster production. Southern Industries would also provide shell for new oyster beds, and use its dredges to help regulate the flow of fresh water into coastal bays.

Mr. Radcliff said, "It has been estimated that 4 acres of suitable water bottom can be made to produce 36,000 pounds of oysters (net, after shucking) in 3 years, while the same area of dry land will, in a like period, produce only 700 pounds of dressed beef.

"In short, it is possible to produce 51 times more oysters by edible weight than beef per acre in a world that has many acres of oyster land."

Southern Industries dredges and processes about 6 million cubic yards of dead-reef oyster shell for the manufacture of Southern Industries' poultry feed, road building materials, masonry units, lime, ready-mix concrete, asphaltic concrete, and for sale to other users.

In 1964, oyster shell processing for poultry feed and roadbuilding materials accounted for more than half of SI's nearly $48 million net sales.

Southern Industries' Henderson Sugar Refinery, Inc., had sales of $21.5 million. Revenues from the nationally famous Grand Hotel at Point Clear, Ala., and other sales hiked 1964's total net sales to $47,824,275, with a net income of $1,220,691.

The company has plants and material distribution centers in Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Maryland, and Virginia.

PORT RAILWAY SPEEDS CARGO

An accent on quicker, better terminal service to importers, exporters, railroads and industry is revealed in the Alabama State Docks Department's latest report on improvements.

At the end of fiscal 1964—September 30—some $541,000 had been either spent or earmarked for rail improvements.

The Terminal Railway's 11 diesel locomotives switched 119,121 loaded rail cars, of which 33,000 were export cars, coming to the port of Mobile for unloading onto steamers, during 1964. Some 23,000 were loaded at the port with imported material, and the remaining loaded cars were switched to plants served by the Terminal Railway: Ideal Cement Co., Scott Paper Co., International Paper Co., Alabama Power Co. and others.

BULK LIQUID PLANT IN USE AT MOBILE

New and bustling is the bulk liquid handling plant, completed for the Port of Mobile.

Able to unload an 8,000-gallon rail car in half an hour, the plant can also pump 20,000 gallons of oil directly into a ship's deep tanks, drum 300 gallons a minute in a shipside drumming plant, and also provide storage of 21,000 tons, or 5,500,000 gallons, at a nearby tank farm.

BUSINESS IN STATE EXPECTS 1965 TO SCORE NEW RECORDS

Alabama business last year continued its upward climb. Retail trade hit an all-time high and at this point in the year, failing some unforeseen setback, another record year is anticipated.

This is the bright picture painted for Alabama, which is now in its 50th month of steady business increase.

In the industrial sector all segments showed big increases, with the exception of oil where the gain was small.

Retail sales rose about 9 percent because consumers purchased $3.5 million worth of goods from retailers, topping the national average by more than 2 percent.

Despite some signals that the economy might be in for a leveling off this year, both the business climate and industrial sales continue to improve.

BUILDING UP

The construction industry had a particularly good year in 1964, with contracts awarded amounting to $744 million, or 1.5 percent higher than the previous year.

People continued to move into the State in the wake of the industrial boom, with the result that residential construction accounted for almost half of the construction total.

The building boom also reflected the greater spending power of Alabama's workers, who bought more homes last year than for many years.

Other indicators of current construction activity, cement consumption and employment in construction, both showed major increases last year. Slightly more than 6 million barrels of cement were consumed during the 12-month period by the construction industy. This is 27 percent higher than the 1963 figure.

On the retail front, foods store sales climbed by 8 percent, and judging by the more than $809 million disbursed in food in 1964, Alabamians were eating well.

Clothing sales went up by more than 8 percent, and auto sales went up by 10 percent.

GOOD YEAR SEEN

Now economists are peering into the crystal ball to see what is ahead for the balance of the year. The consensus is "another good year for 1965."

Economists say that in spite of the length of the current expansion it is difficult to find a voice of pessimism anywhere. Economists base this optimistic outlook on expectations that the economic climate will continue throughout the year, on the impact personal and corporate tax cuts will have, as well as an unprecedented fourth consecutive year for high output by industry. Investment for new plants is also expected to increase.

It is believed likely that the building boom has hit its peak but still could retain last year's level, economists said.

However, construction in nonresidential and public works and utility sectors could push up to a new record by year's end.

"At this point, Alabama's economic outlook never looked better," a leading State economist said. "While we have seen signs of slowdowns in some segments of business, the same as all over the Nation, the prospects for a good year in Alabama are excellent. We could see another recordbreaker by the end of the year."

President Leads Fight on Billboard Blight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, the desire of many Americans to upgrade the scenic aspects of our highways and to restore America's natural beauty would get a big boost from four new bills the

Johnson administration has sent to Congress.

These bills would provide for strict control of outdoor advertising along the new Interstate freeways and most primary highways in all States; screening or removing junkyards that are near the Interstate and primary highways; use of Federal-aid highway funds to restore, preserve, and enhance natural beauty adjacent to rights-of-way; and use of some of the Federal-aid secondary road funds for scenic and recreational roads.

The foremost campaigner for the President's beautification program is the First Lady, and she is getting enthusiastic support from people all over the country.

As evidence of this support, Mr. Speaker, I include editorials from the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star of May 27, 1965, and the Cincinnati Enquirer of May 28, 1965:

PRESIDENT LEADS FIGHT ON BILLBOARD BLIGHT

Reporting the findings of the White House Conference on Natural Beauty to President Johnson, Fred Farr, California State senator, said:

"The average American spends about 2 months of his life each year behind the steering wheel between home and job, not to mention leisure-time driving. Overcrowded streets, the constant viewing of automobile junkyards and ugly billboards makes driving a nerve-wracking experience. It's time to give the American motorist a better break."

President Johnson has asked Congress to give the motorist that better break. He has sent Congress four bills to make our Nation's roads "highways to the enjoyment of nature and beauty."

Chief of these is the bill which provides that States, as a condition of receiving Federal-aid highway grants after January 1, 1968, exert control over outdoor advertising along interstate or primary systems except where zoned or used predominantly for commercial or industrial purposes. The bill would ban billboards within 1,000 feet of the pavement and visible to the motorist. Existing signs would have to be removed by July 1, 1970.

The President points out that in 1958 Congress authorized a bonus payment to the States which agreed to regulate outdoor advertising along interstate roads. But only eight States actually have become eligible for the bonus. The carrot was ignored; now the Nation must use the stick.

We warmly welcome the President's leadership in this field. We would like it even better if the bill would do what the President suggested to the White House Conference—"eliminate outdoor advertising signs * * * from the sight" of the motorist. We fear what towering monstrosity might be erected just beyond the 1,000-foot limit.

Equally welcome are Mr. Johnson's other proposals on highways. One would require States, on condition of receiving Federal aid, to control junkyards. Another would require, instead of merely permitting, States to use 3 percent of their Federal-aid funds, without matching, to acquire land alongside highways and make that land a source of scenic beauty. The fourth bill proposes that each State use one-third of the Federal aid it now receives for secondary roads to construct scenic roads, some of them leading to scenic and recreational areas, and to provide landscape and roadside developments.

L.B.J. commented:

"A highway is not just a ribbon of concrete. Its purpose is not just to get people from one place to another. It is to enrich the journey."

Right, Mr. President.

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer, May 28, 1965]

MORE THAN CONCRETE

I think that I shall never see
A billboard lovely as a tree.
Perhaps, unless the billboards fall,
I'll never see a tree at all.

—OGDEN NASH.

Not many Americans will quarrel with the findings of the White House Conference on Natural Beauty or with President Johnson's remarks to its closing session.

As a means of implementing the conference's recommendation, the President is sending to Congress a series of proposals covering billboard control on the Nation's interstate highways and other principal traffic arteries and the elimination of automobile junkyards in the proximity of these same thoroughfares. He will also seek a positive program aimed at highway beautification.

The President spoke out of his conviction that a highway is "more than a ribbon of concrete."

"It is," he went on, "a way for people to travel; and it should serve all their human needs. Its purpose is not just to get people from one place to another. Its purpose is to enrich the journey."

No one who has ventured frequently onto the highways of America can challenge Mr. Johnson's assertion. And no one, we think, will quarrel with his conclusion that there has been an appalling lack of vision in controlling what the highway traveller sees. There is an axiom that everybody's business is nobody's business, and its validity is nowhere more apparent than on our highways.

One of the participants in the White House Conference underscored the importance of the problem with which the Conference grappled. State Senator Fred Farr of California reminded us that the average American spent 2 months a year behind the wheel of his automobile. For many Americans, the experience has been anything but pleasant. But there can be no doubt that it can be made considerably more pleasant by some of the steps Mr. Johnson and the White House Conference on Natural Beauty are advancing.

It would seem, on the surface, that everyone is for beauty and that, as a result, the President's program will encounter little opposition. The truth of the matter is that the billboard industry will put up a stiff fight—just as it has opposed the payment of premiums to States that bar billboard advertising from the Federal Interstate System. There are others with a vested interest in programs that have the despoliation of the countryside as an inevitable byproduct.

Wars and Rumors of Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Huntsville, Ala., Times on May 11, 1965. The editorial deals realistically with the situation our Government faces today in all sectors of the globe. It is timely and to the point.

The editorial follows:

[From the Huntsville (Ala.) Times, May 11, 1965]

WARS AND RUMORS OF WARS

"The intelligence reports each morning indicate difficulties in dozens of spots throughout the world. We were due at least one revolution in another country yesterday. It didn't come through but the intelligence reports had indicated it might."—President Johnson, briefing congressional leaders last Tuesday.

Forewarned is forearmed, says the old adage. And the likelihood of more Communist-instigated outbreaks seems to us to make sense if we are correctly assessing the Communists' overall purpose. That purpose may be to tie down U.S.forces in many parts of the world, try to spread them dangerously thin and thus to lessen pressures on the Communists in Vietnam.

Colombia, for instance, may be due for an immediate Red revolution. A bloody insurrection has raged off and on for several years in the Colombian mountains. The next step may be for the Communists to move in on the cities—the reverse of the pattern in the Dominican Republic.

Guatemala may also be hit. Also Venezuela. In North Africa, the tender spots are Libya and Tunisia. And watch out in South Korea.

Such new conflicts, if they come, will be applications of a "wars of liberation" technique, in which highly trained Red leaders seek to turn the citizens of a nation against their own government by subversion and terror. Indeed the technique is so well-developed in theory that its authorities now are publishing books available to apt students in several nations including our own.

If this is to be the way the wind blows, the United States might as well be prepared to adopt a realistic view.

And that means prospects for substantial help from this country's allies are not good. Some lack the manpower. Some lack the will.

Wars and rumors of war—"liberation" style—are going to dictate an American program that must remain fluid. It means also that we, as U.S. citizens, must understand that fact and be prepared to give those who must devise a program and defenses full empathy.

The 1965 National Award Honorees: Cushing, Graham, and Kronheim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, several distinguished Americans have received National Citizenship Awards from the Military Chaplains Association of the United States for making outstanding contributions in the field of strengthening the spiritual foundations of citizenship.

At the 40th anniversary convention held this year, national award honorees selected were: His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston; Dr. Billy Graham, of Montreat, N.C., and Milton S. Kronheim, Sr., of Washington, D.C.

These three honorees join such illustrious past recipients as: Gen. Douglas MacArthur, John Foster Dulles, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, J. Edgar Hoover, Francis Cardinal Spellman, Col. John Glenn, Jr., Bob Hope, and Dr. Raymond B. Walsh.

The purpose of the Military Chaplains Association is "to safeguard and to strengthen the forces of faith and morality of our Nation; to perpetuate and to deepen the bonds of understanding and friendship of our military service; to preserve our spiritual influence and interest in all members and veterans of the Armed Forces; to uphold the Constitution of the United States; and to promote justice, peace, and good will."

This is a noble purpose, but the association has succeeded in its programs. I congratulate and commend the Military Chaplains Association of the United States and its national award honorees. They have indeed helped make our Nation stronger and greater.

Federal Government and Florida: Partners in Crime and Vice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the unfortunate partnership of the Federal Government and Florida in making the Sunshine State a palmy paradise for syndicated crime. I refer to Florida's partnership with the Federal Government in keeping gambling illegal in Florida despite a recognition of the fact that it is widespread and ineradicable.

Skeptics say that legalization of some gambling would merely lend respectability to remaining gambling, much of which would still be in syndicate hands. I suggest that the Government ought to jump into the gambling business feet first. I would start with a national lottery, which has had the effect of diminishing other forms of gambling in countries where it has been tried, thus removing potential sources of money from the underworld. The lottery has proven itself in Scandinavia and the low countries to be a useful tool of social progress. It has struck at the crime rings.

The refusal of the Governments of Florida and the United States to institute Government-controlled and regulated gambling has made them partners in the crime they refuse to thus diminish and in the slime they thus spread, for gambling's profits are behind everything from prostitution in Pensacola to murder in Miami and dope rings in Daytona Beach.

Testimony before the McClellan committee pegged off-track betting at about $50 billion annually, which figure was said to constitute 42 percent of the national annual illegal betting total, which would thus come to about $120 billion. On a population basis, Florida's share of this would be $3.6 billion. This is more than enough money to provide profits to support every depth and shade of vice, including perversion of the political and law enforcement process to keep gambling illegal and lucrative for the gangs.

Florida has every known form of gambling—from Miami's bolita, the game of the poor, to the highlife of plush casinos. All of this flows into underworld coffers to subsidize the spread of crime because the Federal Government and Florida are partners in criminal neglect. I say that it is time to put an end to this tacit alliance of Government and immorality by establishing a national lottery.

Congress Looks at the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to serve as a member of the House Republican task force on urban-suburban affairs which attended the U.S. Conference of Mayors annual meeting in St. Louis on May 31.

The highlight of the conference was an address delivered to the delegates by my distinguished colleague and friend, CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota.

The context of his speech was inspiring, enlightening and well received by all who attended.

I believe Congressman MACGREGOR's remarks merit the attention of everyone interested in improved urban-suburban affairs. I, therefore, take this opportunity to share his views with my colleagues by including the text of his address at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS LOOKS AT THE CITIES

(Address delivered to the delegates, U.S. Conference of Mayors Annual Meeting, St. Louis, Mo., May 31, 1965)

(By Congressman CLARK MACGREGOR)

There is a growing number of Congressmen who recognize the challenges of our fast-expanding metropolitan areas. Because of this I am hopeful that our efforts on the House Republican task force on urban-suburban affairs will help bridge the gap which too often exists between those who govern these metropolitan centers and the Congress of the United States.

You do not need an elementary course in urban affairs. You deal with the problems. You are the workshop. You already are aware that approximately 125 million Americans and nearly 80 percent of our productive capacity are now located within our 212 metropolitan areas. You already know that within 25 years, these urban areas will increase by another 100 million people. I can spare the statistics. You need no further proof that there are multiplying problems of core city deterioration and unhealthy suburban growth.

With this phenomenal growth, the problems of urban life—education, employment, housing, transportation, crime, air and water pollution, discrimination, open spaces, planning, and all the rest—have become increasingly complex.

There is no escaping the fact that the role of the Federal Government has assumed increased importance in metropolitan affairs. Competition for industry between the States and a wide variety of other factors have presented State and local governments with an increasingly difficult job in raising the revenues they need to meet their problems—problems which are increasing in magnitude and which frequently cross local and even State boundaries.

Despite all this, is there a mayor here who would say that the States and localities do not have the primary responsibility for meeting these problems? The American system has made the responsibility yours. Who can deal better with the problems than those who know them best?

Each of us at all levels of government needs to help provide you with the muscle it takes to get the job done. And it is not merely bigness, or just money, or only slogans which are going to do it. You know that, too.

I am going to propose here a number of steps which I believe can and should be taken: I don't mean to suggest that this is the policy of the Republicans in the House of Representatives. But it does represent the thinking of many of us. I come from a metropolitan area. My congressional district has added more than 100,000 people since 1960. It will have increased by over 100,000 more persons by the 1970 census. My background is the city.

First of all, Americans need, and need badly, an office of community development in the Executive Office of the President. Nearly 30 Republican Members of the House have introduced legislation to accomplish that purpose. For even if we were to get a Cabinet department of urban development tomorrow, the need for an effective office in the White House to coordinate the proliferating activities of the Federal Government, as they affect urban and suburban areas, would be no less desirable.

Here is why. By ignoring some 80 other Federal programs concerned with metropolitan problems and by simply elevating the Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet rank, a Department of Housing and Urban Development cannot hope to achieve coordination, efficiency, or economy. Urban problems cut across departmental lines, and as urban life grows increasingly complex, more and more of the problems can be expected to cut across these lines. The necessary coordination can be achieved without any increase in Federal control, and without any significant increase in the burgeoning Federal bureaucracy, by an Office of Community Development in the White House.

A bit later, I would like to return for a closer look at this proposal.

Secondly, as we attempt to improve the capacity of the executive branch of the Federal Government to give more effective help in the solution of metropolitan problems, we would be well advised to give thought to improving the way Congress itself functions in this area. Today, for example, an agreement between States on resolving problems of water and air pollution would be passed upon, not by the congressional committees which deal with health problems or with urban matters, but by the Judiciary Committees of both Houses. I am hopeful that the present commission which is studying the problems of congressional organization will provide some answers to the problem of congressional jurisdiction of metropolitan area affairs.

Third, consideration should be given by the Federal Government to the development of metropolitan service agencies in the field. To offer a single agency with which mayors could deal would avoid duplication, would review on a more comprehensive basis than is possible today the applications of local government for Federal assistance, and, in general, could afford all of you the opportunity to discuss your needs with a single

repository of information on Federal programs. Too often a project application approved by a field agency of the Federal Government is now rejected, on the same set of facts, by the Washington central office.

Why should Federal regional offices be spread over the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Public Health Service, representatives of the Bureau of Public Roads, the Federal Aviation Agency, and countless other agencies, each dealing in a fragmented fashion with bits and pieces of urban problems. We should consider a union of Federal agencies at the field level. Since Federal regional offices are, by and large, not decision-making agencies, we should, at the minimum, help simplify the service potential to the communities and States by bringing their functions under a single roof, subjecting local plans to a comprehensive and unfragmented review.

Fourth, renewed consideration should be given to the program sparked initially by Republican Governors for the sharing of Federal tax revenues with State and local governments. This program was given consideration by the administration of President Eisenhower—and reportedly since then—and was recently revived by Dr. Walter Heller. We welcome the bipartisanship. We are pleased that the chief economic adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson has joined Republican Governors who have, over a period of years, proposed the reallocation of revenue resources so that communities and States would be better prepared to meet their responsibilities.

This proposal needs further public discussion. A more equitable sharing of tax revenues, with no strings attached, can have a profound impact on the future of our cities.

I would now like to take that second look I promised at the proposed Department of Housing and Urban Development. To understand why a mere change in the status of HHFA won't do the job, let's look at the relationships of some Federal programs today. Take the Federal Bureau of Roads, under the Commerce Department, and the HHFA, for example. Under the proposed Department, activities of the Bureau of Public Roads would not be included. Highway planners, as you all know, find their concern is often exclusively with traffic needs. On the other hand, local housing agencies have as their objective the avoidance of new slums and the replacement of existing ones. Clash for space, as each seeks to accomplish its own task, is often inevitable. The Federal Government, through two separate agencies—the Bureau of Public Roads and the HHFA, proposed to change to department status—provides funds for each, in cooperation with the States and localities.

But these objectives can and do clash. And, in some urban places in America, that clash can raise havoc with the dream of a beautiful America. Rather than elevating HHFA to Cabinet level, we need a referee. A White House office, such as we propose, would be an appropriate umpire.

The proposed Johnson administration bill creates neither a Cabinet-level department to coordinate the Federal programs geared to the needs of the urban communities nor a Cabinet-level department to administer the principal programs of the Federal Government which provide assistance for housing. Less than one-third of the Federal Government's housing activities would be encompassed in the new department.

I have already mentioned that the Bureau of Public Roads is not included. It will stay in the Department of Commerce.

Water pollution and sewage disposal programs will stay in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Vocational education funds, social security activities, welfare activities, disposal of surplus Federal properties to schools and hospitals and other municipal entities, Hill-Burton funds, activities designed to promote public health, all will remain right where they are now. And, the more than 40 separate programs of financial aid for urban development involve some 13 departments and agencies.

We cannot divide responsibility and expect sound decisions for the most efficient use of the taxpayers' dollars in meeting overall community needs.

This is precisely why I favor the establishment of an office of community development in the White House. Your efforts to overcome the problems of air and water pollution, crime, education, public health, and others deserve equitable assistance, and we are determined to provide that assistance. This Republican proposal, if adopted, would not discourage local and State initiative or direct the development of appropriate solutions, but would provide State and local officials with a coordinating point of reference for all Federal programs. This coordination can be achieved with efficiency and economy.

If we establish an office of community development, if the Congress will improve its handling of metropolitan affairs, if the executive branch will develop metropolitan service agencies in the field, and if steps can be taken to share Federal tax revenues with State and local governments—if these four proposals can be adopted, we will have taken the first steps toward strengthening our metropolitan centers and improving the relations between these centers and the Federal Government—both Executive and legislative.

But the very first step is to build and strengthen the liaison between the city officials and the Members of Congress. This is the primary reason for the creation of the House Republican task force on urban-suburban affairs. Too often we find that the Congress tells the cities what they need without first asking a true cross-section of city leaders. This method of operation must not be allowed to continue. The cities must tell the Congress what Federal programs the cities properly need and want before the Congress takes action.

The challenge of our great metropolitan growth is a challenge for every American. It is a challenge which must be met with boldness and determination to recognize a problem and to get at the heart of that problem. But the first responsibility is with the local and State governments. It must be with those who know the problems best. The Congress hopes to work more closely with you in helping to meet that responsibility.

Executive Restraint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Great Society, it appears, has a new vocabulary. Such words as "controls" or "regulations" have been replaced with "voluntary restraint." George Champion, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York has pointed out, however, that "in the background is a subtle threat that failure to comply with the guidelines voluntarily will bring sternly coersive measures." It is time for the executive branch of our Government to try voluntary restraint in my opinion. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring an article which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report on June 7 to the attention of my colleagues:

A TOP BANKER ASSAILS GOVERNMENT BY GUIDELINE

One banker speaking up about Government inroads into the business world is George Champion, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York.

Mr. Champion criticized Government by guideline as a threat to economic freedom and the most insidious and dangerous trend on the national scene.

Striking out at the absence of constructive critical comment from the business community with regard to the administration's programs, Mr. Champion told the Illinois Bankers Association on May 25: "Nobody talks any more about such mundane matters as controls or regulations. Now that the New Frontier has come under the civilizing influence of the Great Society, terms like these are considered uncouth. Instead, the talk is about reasoning together and voluntary restraint," Mr. Champion said. "The bureaucrat has been replaced by the consensuscrat.

"But always in the background is that subtle threat that failure to comply with the guidelines voluntarily will bring sternly coercive measures—measures applied, for the most part, without public debate in the Halls of Congress or legal appeal in the courts."

Mr. Champion warned: "If we have men afraid of standing up to the Government, then we have the strongest indictment of big government that could ever be imagined. When that happens, economic freedom in our country will be dead."

Congressional Medal of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the magazine This Week, dated May 30, 1965, there appeared a very informative article on the Congressional Medal of Honor recipients. It is a timely one, in view of the fact that the latest award of this medal has been made to Capt. Roger H. C. Donlon for service in Vietnam. Under leave to extend my remarks, I will include a portion of this article.

THE HIGH COST OF HEROISM—OUR MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS HAVE A BRIEF MOMENT IN THE SUN AND UNFORTUNATELY A LONG TIME IN THE SHADE

(By Joe McCarthy)

ROLLCALL OF FAME

Today's living 283 honor medalists range in age from 89-year-old Maj. Frank C. Anders, who won his medal in the Philippine insurrection of 1899, to 30-year-old Capt. Roger H. C. Donlon, decorated last December by President Johnson for bravery in Vietnam. They include such well-known names as Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, Gen. Jimmy Doolittle, cowboy movie star Audie Murphy, Marine flyer Joe Foss, who was elected Governor of South Dakota and is today commissioner of the American Football League, and Charles A. Lindbergh, who was given the medal for his solo flight across the Atlantic in 1927.

THE MEDAL OF HONOR IN VIETNAM

Newest recipient of the Medal of Honor is Capt. Roger H. C. Donlon of the Army's Special Forces in Vietnam. Captain Donlon was awarded the medal by President Johnson for his heroism on the night of July 6, 1964, when the Vietcong attacked north of Saigon. Wounded four times, Captain Donlon continued to fight, refusing aid for himself until his men were cared for.

Captain Donlon was the 3,171st to win the Medal of Honor since its institution by Congress in 1862. Fifteen hundred and twenty-seven were awarded during the Civil War, 541 in the Indian wars, 111 in the Spanish-American War, 123 in World War I, 430 in World War II, 131 in Korea, the rest in such "interim" actions as the Philippine insurrection. Seven have been awarded for peacetime feats.

Many of the medal holders have stayed on in the armed services until retirement, or are still on active duty waiting to retire, and a large number of them are in modest-paying Federal and State government jobs. There are 27 medalists working in various cities, for example, as employees of the Veterans' Administration, Department of Veterans' Benefits, the result of an order issued by President Harry S. Truman at the end of World War II directing the VA to hire any Medal of Honor recipient who applied for a job in that Department.

A typical medalist employed by the Veterans' Administration in Newark, N.J., is Nicholas Oresko, who singlehandedly charged and demolished two enemy machinegun positions in Germany in 1945, wiping out the second emplacement with grenades and rifle fire while severely wounded.

Not so typical is Henry E. "Red" Erwin, the only enlisted airman to win the medal in the Pacific in World War II, and now assigned to the VA office in Montgomery, Ala. To make himself presentable enough to hold a job with many contacts, Erwin spent more than 2 years in a veterans' hospital after the war undergoing skingrafting surgery on his burned and disfigured face. In a B-29 on a bombing mission over Japan, a phosphorus bomb caught and ignited in the plane. To save the plane and the other men in its crew, Erwin groped for the burning bomb, picked it up and carried it forward to the copilot's window with his hands and clothing in flames, and dropped it outside.

Most of the medal holders are members of the Medal of Honor Society, which meets every 2 years at reunions and publishes a quarterly bulletin and newsletter to keep the highly exclusive group informed of each other's doings. The current president of the society is Thomas J. Kelly, a New Yorker who worked his way through law school after winning the Medal of Honor and now serves as an administrator in the Manhattan office of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Even among the annals of Medal of Honor citations for the past century, which crowd every page with unbelievable stories of selfless daring, the account of Kelly's award-winning exploit under fire stands out.

As a 21-year-old medical aid man, Kelly was attached to an armored infantry platoon which was caught by a surprise attack while crossing an open clearing in Germany. The platoon and Kelly ran from the plateau-like exposed ground to the protection of a downhill slope, leaving dead and wounded Americans behind them.

Going back into the clearing to bring the wounded to safety meant crawling and running under fire from the surrounding woods for a distance of 300 yards, but Kelly decided to try it. On his first trip he led out a group of seven blinded and shocked casualties who were able to walk under his guidance. Then he went back across the exposed terrain again and again, carrying and dragging more wounded soldiers. Two other GI's, who tried to help him, were both killed. Kelly made 10 trips in all, rescuing 17 fallen men from the field of sweeping machinegun fire and exploding mortar shells.

"YOU KNOW WHAT'S RIGHT"

"I thought of Sister Saint Peter, one of the nuns who taught me in parochial school," he said recently. "I could feel her gold ring tapping against my forehead, as it did when she was trying to teach me something, and I could hear her saying, 'Tom Kelly, you know what's right and what's wrong. There are wounded men out there—go and get them.'"

As president of the Medal of Honor Society, Kelly hears more about the problems of medal winners than anybody in the Pentagon or the Veterans' Administration. Many of the war heroes in his fraternity feel that they get too much recognition—of the wrong kind.

"Wearing the Medal of Honor can be harder than winning it," Kelly says. "A medal holder sometimes finds his commanding officer, or his boss in civilian life, leaning over backward, making sure he isn't treated any better than anybody else because of his medal.

"If he makes a mistake, or gets into trouble, he's likely to be given a rougher punishment than he would have gotten if he didn't have the medal. He's always carefully walking a tightrope in the glare of the spotlight."

TROUBLE MAKES HEADLINES

An automobile accident or a bankruptcy, a divorce trial or a friendly party turning into a noisy brawl, any of the misfortunes that ordinarily wouldn't be mentioned in the newspapers can make headlines if a Medal of Honor hero is involved.

"The ones you read about are the few who are having personal troubles," Kelly says, "so people think many Medal of Honor men have a terrible time trying to adjust to civilian life. Nobody writes about all the rest of us who are quietly raising families and worrying about the mortgage payments like everybody else."

The Medal of Honor heroes best known by postwar newspaper readers are indeed the ones plagued by the most troubles, such as tobacco-chewing Charles E. "Commando" Kelly, from Pittsburgh, the 36th Division's one-man army in Italy. Chuck Kelly, as he was called in his outfit, has occupied more space in newspapers since the war than during it—thanks to his prolonged struggles with unemployment, illness, and financial woes. Sgt. Alvin C. York, who died last September at the age of 76, became almost as famous in the last 20 years for his income tax litigations as he was for his World War I heroism. Sergeant York's feat of 1918 was hailed by Marshal Foch as the greatest accomplishment of any soldier in all the armies of Europe. In a 4-hour skirmish in the Argonne Forest in 1918, York and a few companions killed 25 Germans and captured the rest of an enemy machinegun battalion, 4 officers, and 128 enlisted men.

A modest and unpretentious Tennessee mountaineer, York firmly refused after the war to capitalize on his Medal of Honor. Finally he was persuaded that a movie biography, starring Gary Cooper, could inspire patriotism. For the film rights to his life story, York was paid some $150,000, most of which he gave away to worthy causes and needy friends.

Then York was hit by an income tax and interest bill for $172,000. His case dragged through courts for years. The Internal Revenue authorities finally agreed to settle for $25,000, raised by public donation.

Probably the most shaky postwar readjustment attempted by any Medal of Honor recipient was the one tackled by Audie Murphy. Murphy, who won more decorations than any other soldier in World War II, received his Medal of Honor award for holding a woods attacked by the Germans almost singlehanded, personally killing or wounding 50 of the enemy. He left his cotton-growing hometown of Farmersville, Tex., after the war and went to Hollywood to become a movie star.

Now 40—he was only 20 when he won the Medal of Honor—Murphy is comfortably and solidly established in filmland and as a millionaire cowboy movie star, the only horse-riding actor still working regularly in motion pictures. He appears in four or five Westerns a year, low-budget films that are shown mainly in small town theaters.

Murphy was regarded as a "hot" prospect when he first came to Hollywood, and Murphy's friends believe that he might have become a glamour star if he had patronized the right people in Hollywood. But he kept the right people at arm's length and never regretted it.

"I have only a nodding acquaintance with Hollywood-type people," Audie once said. "I say nodding to them and they say nodding to me."

Murphy enjoys his role as a Western performer. His peaceful existence in Hollywood is marred only by gossip column mentions of a Medal of Honor hero being thrown out of Sunset Strip night clubs. It's another holder, but everyone thinks the columnists are writing about Murphy, who never goes to night clubs.

Murphy makes a point of never identifying himself publicly with his Medal of Honor, which he has given, along with his other medals, to his two young sons. He avoids meetings of the Medal of Honor Society and turns down invitations to appear in his reserve uniform at parades. However, he went to a PTA meeting in Gardena, Calif., recently and made a speech on "What the Constitution Means to Me."

SALUTE TO GLORY

The most impressive salute ever given to Medal of Honor holders and perhaps from the looks of things, the last one, was a special reception attended by 240 wearers of the award at the White House on May 2, 1963, the largest gathering of the medalists in one place in the history of the United States. As the heroes of six wars filed past President Kennedy, shaking his hand, some in wheelchairs and others on crutches, the President's sister-in-law, Mrs. Robert F. Kennedy, made a remark which well described the emotion of the spectators:

"It's like watching a million flags march by."

Are Farm Prices Too High?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, apparently some groups hostile to agriculture have opened a well-financed campaign to discredit the pending wheat bill. This campaign seems to be based more on prejudice than upon reason, more upon slogans than upon facts. It boils down to the slogan which was used by the former chairman of the Republican conference of this House some 3 or 4 years ago. This propaganda is summed up in the quotation "Bread Tax." The implication is that if the Government is to help the farmer to receive a fair price

for the wheat he produces that the Government will be imposing a tax on the "poor man's" bread.

Actually, there is so little to support this kind of theory, it seems to me that I shoudl present a few of the facts. The facts are basically that there is very little direct relation between the price the farmer receives for wheat and the price the consumer pays for a loaf of bread.

A few weeks ago the Agriculture Committee of this House published a bulletin entitled "Food Costs—Farm Prices." I wish that each Member would get a copy of this report, which can be had from the House Committee on Agriculture, and study the charts beginning on page 3 and running through page 12. They are all extremely interesting. But chart No. 4 on page 7 shows the relationship between the index of retail bread prices and the index of prices received by farmers for wheat. This chart shows that as of the end of 1964 the retail price of bread and other bakery and cereal products stood at 145 percent of the 1947–49 base period while the price farmers received for wheat was just above 91 percent of the same base. In terms of money, a 1-pound loaf of bread retailed for $12\frac{7}{10}$ cents during the 1947–49 base period. In 1964 that same loaf of bread retailed for 20.7 cents—U.S. average.

During this same base period, the farm value of a bushel of wheat had dropped from $2.29 a bushel to $2.08. Thus, while the price of wheat was dropping by 9 percent, the cost of bread to the consumer was going up by 74 percent. Certainly, this increase in the price of bread can not be charged to any excessive farm prices because farm prices were going down—not up.

The present proposal to restore the farmer's price on a bushel of wheat used domestically to just a little above what it was in 1947 will only add seven-tenths of a cent to the cost of the ingredients going into a loaf of bread. I do not know how much the milling and bakery industry can charge the public, but it is very certain that this restoration of farmer income cannot justify any substantial increase in the price of bread. As a matter of fact, the miller will still be buying their wheat for just a little more than what they paid when bread sold for 11.9 cents per loaf.

I think it is clear to any fairminded person that if there is to be an increase in the price of bread—and there doubtless will be because there has been a constant rise in the price of bread even during every one of 14 consecutive years while the price of wheat was declining—that the farmer and the farm price of wheat will not be responsible for that rise. If the baking industry is to justify these higher prices of bread, they must look somewhere other than to the farmer for the culprit. We are but asking for domestic price on approximately 45 percent of the wheat produced.

We are but asking a restoration of income in behalf of a group whose wages are notoriously low. According to the U.S. Department of Agricuulture Economic Research Service, the realized returns per hour to all farm labor and management last year amounted to only $1.06—only 5 cents per hour more than 17 years earlier—whereas the average real earnings of employees in the food marketing industry average $2.25 in 1964—more than twice their average earnings in 1947. Do you wonder that these farm people are often a little cynical about our efforts to alleviate poverty by helping those, by farm standards, seem affluent.

Finally, let me repeat what should be common knowledge: the American farmer has for years been subsidizing our consumers. He has worked for a substandard wage. He has sold his food far below parity, and the American consumer is today buying more and better food for a far smaller part of his disposable income than are the people of any other major nation at any time in history.

Strengthening Gold and Silver—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the third in a four-part series of articles appearing in the Las Vegas Review-Journal, Las Vegas, Nev. This one appeared on Sunday, April 18, 1965. This one concerns mainly the use of gold as a coin. At this point in the series, I would like to explain about the author of the series.

Arthur P. Alexander is a cartographer. He also has done writing on economics and current events which have been published in various periodicals.

Early in his life, Alexander pursued the study of medicine but abandoned the calling in favor of a military career, serving on the Mexican border with the 5th U.S. Cavalry and later with the military intelligence as scout for the 1st Cavalry Division.

Upon mechanization of the cavalry, he returned to civil life to pursue his occupation as a cartographer and soon secured an appointment as a map editor for the Army Map Service in Washington, D.C.

He then transferred his civil service activities to the newly formed Air Force as analyst and statistician at SBAMA Headquarters in California.

The article follows:

[From the Las Vegas Review-Journal, Apr. 18, 1965]

MONEY MATTERS: GOLD COIN FALLACY LEARNED HARD WAY

(By Arthur P. Alexander)

Volumes could be compiled on the many factors influencing money since its inception as a convenient medium of exchange, the effects of one factor becoming the cause of an ensuing effect, with each effect in turn becoming a cause, evolving money through many stages until it has occupied its present status.

Gold and silver have been found to be the ideal basis for constituting the intrinsic value of mony but have never been suitable material for use in its actual coinage, except in the use of silver as a convenience in coining the dollar and some subsidiary coins, and then to contain less silver than the nominal value, but in sufficient quantity to protect the money of a nation by making it unprofitable for an enemy to flood its market with spurious coin.

It required many years of painful experience for nations to learn the fallacy of minting their primary money in gold coin, as it afforded an opportunity for dishonest citizens to increase their wealth at the expense of their government and fellow countrymen, employing nefarious practices of "striping" gold pieces of grains of that metal by devious means and then returning the coin to circulation, receiving its nominal value in exchange, and later, selling the accumulated gold thus reclaimed, annually swindling their country out of a considerable amount.

Too, capturing the gold coin of a nation enabled an enemy to use this gold as a powerful weapon against them, a prime factor often contributing toward their defeat in war.

Again, for self protection and to discourage these abuses, governments were hard-pressed to discover a suitable substitute for gold moneys, until it was provided for by the advent of paper currency, emanating from the exigency that arose during the Civil War, and later consuming many more years to educate its citizenry to accept gold certificates as currency having the same value as gold coin, and then only by withdrawing gold pieces from circulation.

Here again the problem of protecting paper currency from the same abuses suffered by metallic money stimulated the development of a specific paper and particular inks, and necessitated the employment of expert engravers and the appointment of special agents to detect bogus bills and apprehend counterfeiters.

As currency, paper was found to possess many advantages over coin; its nominative value being wholly secured by the gold and silver, which it represented, being safety deposited in well-guarded vaults, effecting a money that could be circulated and yet safeguard its metallic contents.

To ease the economic situation that developed from the financial panic of 1907, national banks were chartered by the U.S. Government, and granted authority to issue and circulate negotiable notes that were secured by Government bonds, as a legal substitute for script which had been issued illegally as a supplement for currency, the result is being the use of Government credits, as well as bullion, to secure domestic currency.

Further, the Federal Reserve Act of 1914 created the Federal Reserve System with the objective of establishing a private institution under Government supervision, empowered to issue circulatory notes to insure an adequate supply of currency, and though this currency is an obligation of the United States, it is secured by the assets of the issuing bank which must also maintain a minimum of 25 percent of the notes it issues, in gold certificates on deposit as a reserve.

Federal Reserve notes are thus secured by money kept in circulation, and are, in effect, a credit money, possessing no intrinsic value in themselves but are actually secured by the integrity of the Government and private institution only, and as such have a tendency toward inflation or deflation, as the Federal Reserve System has the power to fix discount rates.

The act creating this system formulated, as it were, a partnership between a private institution and the Government, the object being to centralize banking resources (the Federal Reserve banks being otherwise known as the "bankers bank"), as a precaution to prevent recurrence of a shortage in currency that caused the financial panic in

1907, and was designed as an expediency in the then prevailing economic conditions.

Having served their purpose, the National Bank notes and the Federal Reserve notes are presently being gradually retired, their employment demonstrating for more than half a century that the credit and integrity of a government can be as valid as gold and silver bullion in securing a domestic currency.

Replacing these notes by Government certificates that will supersede all previous currency will return the United States to the conventional currency and monetary system that existed prior to 1913, except that gold pieces will not be minted and with a probable reduction in the silver contents of the dollar and subsidiary coin, but possessing the potential of aggravating an economic situation similar to the conditions existing prior to that time.

Money has, figuratively, "crossed the Rubicon," there can be no return to a system that has been tried and found inadequate, and in danger of again causing a shortage of currency is to be avoided, which can only be accomplished by a calculated revision of the present monetary system with a view to inaugurating a primary money that would be an "exact" gold standard, legal tender-paper currency, secured on a bimetallic basis of gold and silver bullion, established at 11-12 fine as standard and at the previously mentioned ratio of 1:28 in value, which will provide that every dollar of currency shall, taking the nominative value as a basis, be secured 100 percent by bullion at all times.

This reappraisement should further provide that the gold contents of the dollar should be adjusted periodically to contain whatever volume of gold is necessary to conform to current economic conditions, by decreasing the nominal contents when the price of gold soars, and increasing it when the price declines. As a criterion, a fixed quantity of gold must be designated as a "par" value of the dollar.

The present gold contents of the dollar is nearly 15.24 grains, 9–10 fine, or as previously cited, 14.96 grains, 11–12 fine, that is, containing slightly over 13.71 grains of pure gold. Using 11–12 fine as a standard, this norm can be established at 24 grains to the "par" dollar, which would nominally contain 22 grains of pure gold, setting a par value of gold at nearly $21.82 per ounce where any deviation in the price of gold would be proportionately reflected in the gold contents of the 24 grain, 11–12 fine, dollar.

Under this operation the nominal value, the legal value and the exchange value will remain constant, and $1 of currency or its multiples, will truly represent all the attributes of an economic money, for the reason that each dollar of this currency will exchange for $1 worth of bullion, whether the quantity of the bullion be more or less, or remain at the established par, and will be the only true representative of an exact standard of value, where the dollar will never depreciate but will always be worth 100 cents.

As paper currency superseded coin, this primary paper money will transcend all previous and existing forms of money and is applicable to the monetary system of any nation without changing the denominations of their present currency and subsidiary coins, and if adopted and maintained as outlined, it would be impossible to inflate or deflate the prevailing value of their monetary unit.

This would also promote an enduring standard in international trade that would be acceptable to all nations, and provide a just parity in exchange. This system would also form the ideal basis for the development of an "international trade dollar" so much desired as a universal monetary medium.

New Realities and Newer Realities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following article points out a very disturbing fact. Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the President of the United States have manufactured two sets of "realities" in order to justify our foreign policy positions. Senator FULBRIGHT, traveling the road of compromise, developed his set of realities to fit his conclusions. President Johnson was maneuvered by circumstances into a position proposed by a Republican leader which he once professed to abhor. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this editorial which appeared in the June 5 Chicago Tribune be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

NEW REALITIES AND NEWER REALITIES

Those "realities" about communism which Mr. Johnson mentioned while speaking about the Dominican Republic the other day sounded remarkably like some of the "old myths" which Senator FULBRIGHT tried to bury a little more than a year ago.

Having determined that we should give up trying to resist the advances of communism, Mr. FULBRIGHT promulgated a set of "new realities" based upon the premise that there are such things as good Communists.

Nowhere, he said, was the divergence between "old myths and new realities" more apparent than in our attitude toward Latin America. He suggested that social revolution there should be met with sympathy and help, not intervention on the side of established authority. To Mr. FULBRIGHT, quite clearly, revolutions in Latin America were not the work of bad Communists.

Mr. Johnson said nothing at the time to repudiate the Fulbright realities, and even spoke of improved relations with Russia under Khrushchev's successors. Senator Goldwater denounced the assumption "that communism has so changed that we can now accommodate it" and recommended policies based "upon the observable facts of communism's continued, unchanged, and unabated intentions to destroy Western society."

Today Mr. Johnson is following Mr. Goldwater's advice in the Dominican Republic as in Vietnam. By our intervention against the revolution in the Dominican Republic, he said (perhaps prematurely), "a well-trained, disciplined band of Communists was prevented from destroying the hopes of Dominican democracy."

And to support this conclusion, he offered a new set of "realities."

The first reality is that "old labels are largely obsolete" and that "in today's world with the enemies of freedom talking about national liberation, the old distinction between civil war and international war has already lost much of its meaning."

Thus, to Mr. FULBRIGHT, revolutions are social upheavals to be sympathized with, and to Mr. Johnson they are part of the Communist plan to conquer the world.

Mr. Johnson's second reality is that "when forces of freedom move slowly, whether on political or economic or military fronts, the forces of slavery and subversion move rapidly." Thus, while Mr. FULBRIGHT's realities call for caution and collaboration, Mr. Johnson's call for action.

Another Johnson reality is that "when a Communist group seeks to exploit misery, the entire free American system is put in deadly danger." Compare this with Mr. FULBRIGHT's rationalization of Latin American revolutions.

Mr. Johnson's realities come a good deal closer to the truth than Mr. FULBRIGHT's but the disturbing thing about the two sets of realities is that each was "discovered" in order to justify a position which had already been taken. Mr. FULBRIGHT, having settled upon a course of compromise, developed his set of "new realities" to fit his conclusions. And Mr. Johnson, having been maneuvered by circumstances into a position which he once professed to abhor, finds his solace in a set of newer "realities" wholly contradictory to Mr. FULBRIGHT's.

Back in school we were taught to start with the realities and work up our conclusions accordingly. If the Democrats had recognized Mr. Johnson's realities back when Mr. FULBRIGHT was building on his conclusions, we might have saved ourselves a good deal of trouble.

Extension of the Export Control Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7105) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

I notice, in the amendment offered by the able gentleman, the language which reads:

And at page 6, immediately after line 7, add the following:

"(d) Section 3(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Such rules and regulations shall implement the provisions of Section 2(4) of this Act'."

In the first place, section 2(4), if I understand it correctly, refers to the policy declaration on page 5, which reads:

(4) The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

Is that correct?

Mr. MULTER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. The language is that "such rules and regulations shall implement the provisions" of that section just read. Who makes the rules and regulations relevant to our export trade and its government?

Mr. MULTER. Under section 3 of the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, which we are extending by this bill, the President of the United States makes the rules and regulations.

Mr. PEPPER. In other words, the Congress, pursuant to its legislative responsibility, is imposing a mandate upon the President effectively to carry out this policy which the Congress is declaring.

Mr. MULTER. That is precisely the point I have been trying to make.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Prayer on Behalf of President Lyndon Baines Johnson, McCormick Place, June 3, 1965, Delivered by Rabbi Seymour J. Cohen, Spiritual Leader of the Anshe Emet Synagogue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and constituent, Dr. Seymour J. Cohen, rabbi of Anshe Emet Synagogue in Chicago, today was elected president of the Synagogue Council of America, the national coordinating agency of rabbinic and congregational organizations of Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Jewry. Dr. Cohen has had a distinguished career as a servant of congregation and community, and his election to the council presidency marks another important milestone in his service as a spiritual leader in Chicago and in the Nation.

Last week Dr. Cohen was called upon to give a prayer at a meeting in Chicago that was attended by President Lyndon B. Johnson, Gov. Otto Kerner, Mayor Richard J. Daley, and other State and local leaders from Illinois. I was particularly moved by his prayer on behalf of President Johnson, and on this appropriate occasion I would like to submit it for the RECORD:

PRAYER ON BEHALF OF PRESIDENT LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, MCCORMICK PLACE, JUNE 3, 1965, DELIVERED BY RABBI SEYMOUR J. COHEN, SPIRITUAL LEADER OF THE ANSHE EMET SYNAGOGUE

O Heavenly Father, who dwellest on high, yet is near to the prayers of men, we are assembled in times that test man's spirit. Like the prophet of old, we moan that "the whole head is sick and the whole heart is faint."

In this age which has witnessed tragic brutality and violence, where compassion has been sucked out of man's soul, we are grateful that in Thy wisdom Thou raised up a faithful shepherd for Thy children. We are thankful that we Americans are blessed with a beloved teacher President who instructs us daily to have the courage to face our duties (who taught us bravely in that dark November hour—"Let us continue"), a Chief Executive who has helped focus our attention on our duties as leaders of the free world, a Commander in Chief of an army of peace who has united America in an effort to use man's knowledge for the good of all mankind, to eradicate poverty and to bring an end to racial discrimination. We are thankful for President Lyndon Baines Johnson who has summoned us to spiritual greatness demonstrating that in our day the road to holiness is astride the road of action. We are thankful for this great leader who has taught us courage in crisis, responsibility in the face of challenge, strength in the sight of danger and hope in the presence of despair. We are reassured that his brilliant administration will grant America a future as glorious as its past. May our beloved land under Thy divine providence be an influence for good throughout the world. May there be fulfilled the ancient promise heard first in Judea that the day will come when nation will no longer lift up sword against nation, nor men learn war any more; when all people, both small and great alike, will know Thee and in that knowledge find their peace. Amen.

Prompt and Vigorous Action of President Commendable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, many persons have made statements concerning the U.S. recent action in the Dominican Republic. In this regard, I would like to call the attention of the Congress and the President to an editorial which appeared May 10 in the Richmond Registrar, Richmond, Ky.

In my opinion this editorial which clearly supports the action taken by our President, represents the views held by many of the citizens of the Sixth District of Kentucky who think that the President was correct in his quick action to protect the lives of U.S. citizens in the Dominican Republic and to prevent Communists from seizing control of this Caribbean nation. Having ended unnecessary bloodshed, the United States is now actively working to seek a peaceful solution in order that this island which has known brutal tyranny in its past, may achieve an enduring democratic form of government, free from domination by any extremists from the right or the left. The United States believes in democracy and will exert every effort to help this Republic achieve this goal for itself.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Richmond (Ky.) Register, May 10, 1965]

PROMPT AND VIGOROUS ACTION OF PRESIDENT COMMENDABLE

When revolution erupted in the Dominican Republic President Johnson promptly ordered U.S. troops into the revolt-disrupted area. We are glad he acted quickly and the American people generally support his action.

The first thing that had to be done was to provide measures by which several thousand U.S. citizens, living in the Dominican Republic, could be removed from the trouble spot. Peoples from other countries were evacuated along with our citizens. That in itself was sufficient justification for the President's action.

As chaotic conditions became more pronounced it became apparent that a group of professional Communist leaders were attempting to get control of Santo Domingo. The President announced that the vigorous action taken was for the purpose of preventing the development of another Communist Cuba on our doorstep. Certainly the American people approve whatever action is necessary to prevent Communist directed forces from getting control of another Caribbean island.

The President's action has been criticized as too hasty. Communist Russia insists that the manner should have been referred to the United Nations. Others say it should have been presented to the Organization of American States.

While this was going on, had either course been pursued, the revolt in the Dominican Republic would have increased in intensity and the best interests of the United States would have suffered.

A committee from the Organization of American States was finally directed to go to Santo Domingo and try to arrange a cease-fire. Their task was made much easier by the fact that the U.S. forces had smothered the flames of a revolution.

President Johnson has given assurance that as military forces from other members of the OAS move into the Dominican Republic for the purpose of preserving order, U.S. military forces will be withdrawn.

The criticism that has been voiced by other nations of the movement of U.S. troops to the trouble zone, of which Russia is the most vociferous, can be disregarded. We are thankful that the leadership of the man in the White House was prompt and vigorous.

The Smut Explosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the battle to rid our Nation of the menace of the smut peddlers continues. At times it seems that no progress is being made against the ravages of these money-hungry muck merchants and that our youth are doomed to despoilment by those who would capitalize upon their innocence and naivete.

A helpful note is the fact that the danger of this situation is being increasingly recognized, and parents especially are going to work to clean up the sources of pornography and indecent literature in their communities. A good explanation of the existing problem and the action being taken to eradicate it is outlined in the following article which appeared in the June 1965 issue of the magazine Report:

PORNOGRAPHY, U.S.A.: THE NATIONAL SMUT EXPLOSION

(NOTE.—A $2 billion business in raw and rampant pornography is poisoning our youth. What can be done to alert our Nation to take action against the peddlers of sick sex?)

(By Jeffrey St. John)

"Start a stamp collection," read the ad in a national Boy Scout magazine. Clipping the coupon, a 14-year-old Nebraska scout enclosed his name and address along with 25 cents and sent it off in the next mail. Back in a matter of days came a colorful assortment of stamps.

Two years later, however, parental pride in a boyish initiative turned to hostile anger. Another collection arrived, this time unsolicited and not of stamps.

But let the father of this boy tell it in his own words. He is Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, a member of the

House Subcommittee on Postal Operations. He states: "The stamp people, in order to make a little pocket change, sold that list (containing his son's name along with thousands of other teenagers) to a list broker. These list brokers, knowing that these young people, by and large, are the ones that start stamp collections, wait 2 or 3 years until he is a little more mature. Then they start sending this filth, and this happened in my own home—and I have six children."

Shaken by this firsthand encounter with obscene literature sent via the mails, Congressman CUNNINGHAM has launched a one-man war against this vicious racket. The subcommittee on which the Nebraska Congressman serves, estimates that it is a $2 billion a year business. Yet the direct mail pitch by pornographic peddlers is just one phase of a murky operation that is growing each year.

The U.S. Post Office reported recently that almost 2 million teenagers, like Congressman CUNNINGHAM's son, are solicited in the same way. One postal inspector told Report that the output of smut sent through the mails "must be measured in tons, not pounds."

James J. Kilpatrick, in his highly readable book "The Smut Peddlers," concludes that the target of these trash merchants is "not the grownup sucker. It is the curious adolescent, 16 or 17, receptive to a little dirty sex sent to him by plain envelope under first-class mail."

What effect is this having on young minds just awakening to sexual awareness? "None," says one group. However, a growing number of men and women concerned with the problem are not that sure. In fact, Congressman CUNNINGHAM recently stated: "We have testimony from psychiatrists, doctors, mental health people, and others that this material largely contributes to juvenile crime. * * * You can not send dope through the mail. Dope wrecks the body. This type of material destroys the mind. Which is more important?"

And the traffic in pornography goes far beyond what the post office might control anyway. In their frustration some parents are making an Alamo-like effort within their families, while scattered community groups are wrestling with the elusive monster in the local candy store and movie houses, in the courts as well as in State legislatures and Congress. But the Vietcong is hardly so formidable as this. Witness:

Besides the more than 2 million teenagers solicited through the mails, the Post Office estimates that about 750 overtly lascivious magazines are turned out each calendar year in the United States, the "girlie" type beating out the homosexual-slanted ("body-building" and "health" journals) 3 to 1. Often their owners switch titles after one or two issues in their successful attempts to beat the law.

In paperback pornography, the number of copies sold last year surpassed the 500 million mark. A New York distributor told Report that "actual readership may exceed that estimate by as much as 4 or 5 times because of pass-on readership." Swap systems and sencondhand outlets abound.

Stag films, erotic slides (color is extra), records and tapes of stereophonic passion and lusty love letters are produced with amazingly low overhead. A shabby walkup, a cheap camera and a set of lights puts a producer of obscene photos and films in a business that reaps handsome profit—if that is the word for it.

Models, many of them engaged in the oldest profession known to mankind, can be had "for a few extra bucks." Some money-grubbing producers appeal to the craving of young people in search of fame and fortune in the movies, seducing them with a pittance and the glittering offer to "break into the big time." One such producer in an interview said he could make a fortune with a full-length "nudist film" with a cast of hundreds for as low as $35,000.

Book and magazine production costs are minimal, as their shoddy quality attests. The cheap pulp paper, printing and binding may amount, for a press run of 20,000, to no more than $1,000. Sold at 50 or 75 cents, the profit comes easy, even including the enticing markup this allows for the dealers. A pocket-size "novel" can cost its publishers as little as 10 cents a copy and is usually sold at slightly under a dollar.

Newsstand dealers are easily cut in on this kind of money. As one of them shamelessly confessed to Report, "The legit magazines offer us a small margin of profit from the big distributors. The guys who handle this trash are small operators who offer us a better deal. Even though we don't like it, it's hard to turn them down." Pressures to give in often come from underworld racketeers and the Mafia as well.

Easy money, to be sure, has played a decisive role in this muck explosion. But its growth has largely capitalized on the decreasing moral tone of our society. The subtle and sometimes not so subtle exploitation of sex, especially in advertising, has set the pace for supposed "standards." Some of the "nudist film" producers are even complaining of loss of revenue: "legitimate" movies have invaded their field. And parents now are concerned about what shows up in even the most respectable daily newspapers and "family" magazines.

Not long ago, British editor and essayist, Malcolm Muggeridge, pinpointing American preoccupation with sex, wrote: "Sex has been overplayed. It has become an obsession, a mania, a sickness. In America particularly, but to a lesser extent through the Western world, we all have sex on the brain. Never, it is safe to say, in the history of the world, has a country been as sex ridden as America is today."

Muggeridge recounts a Sunday visit to Racine, Wis., but it might just as well have been anywhere in the United States. "Among the paperback books and magazines displayed for sale," he wrote, "there was enough salacity to have made any under-the-counter Paris dealer turn green with envy. Extraordinary. On free sale on a Sunday morning in Racine, Wis. Not just the old familiar 'classics' * * * as well as these relatively benign examples, there was also included the really vicious stuff about flagellation, wife changing, every sort of kinky practice and perversion. As I ate my sandwich and drank my coffee, I glanced through some of the advertisements * * * it was like lifting up a stone and watching all the creepy, crawly creatures underneath it—in this particular case, the squalor and filth underlying the sex-ridden society."

Operation Yorkville, one of many community efforts to fight this situation, is an interdenominational group headquartered in New York City. Its secretary, Father Morton Hill, S.J., told Report that while the problem is, as Muggeridge stated, symptomatic of a sex-ridden society, it also shows that "There's a new amorality in society * * *. Our society does not even recognize it as being wrong."

Rabbi Julius G. Neumann, also of Operation Yorkville, pointed to one of the most significant effects of pornography. "The basic unit of our society is the family," he said in an interview. "Yet how are we going to establish family patterns in the thinking of our young adults when these pornographic magazines show these young adults their opposite numbers as simply animals, vehicles which may be used to satisfy a sexual hunger and then discarded when the hunger subsides?"

The need for a solid human and spiritual formation in our youth and responsible attitudes in parents in the face of this onslaught will be treated in the second article in this series. Nevertheless, because of the undoubted broad social effects of pornography, many realize that the law and social action still have an important, though not complete, role to play.

In 1957 the Supreme Court declared that the control of obscenity does indeed fall within the province of the law. In the Roth-Alberts case, the Court determined that constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech and press does not cover obscenity, defining it as material "utterly without redeeming social importance."

Nevertheless, in practice the Supreme Court has defeated itself in its inability to come up with a really useful test for determining obscene materials. Some think that the problem has arisen because the Court's job, they say, is to deal with obscenity only according to national standards. And as Chief Justice Warren has said, "There is no provable 'national standard.' "

If Muggeridge is correct in his view of American society, then national standards are as low as they can get and the law will always allow the worst. The lawyer who successfully defended "The Tropic of Cancer" stated: "To be obscene a book has to go significantly beyond what has already been declared not obscene, and that is impossible. You can't talk about sex any more frankly than is being done now."

But is this all the law can offer? Increased lawlessness in the streets of our cities, the upsurge of sexual offenses, vicious attacks on old and young alike—these are hard realities of modern American life that cannot be ignored. And who can dispute the obvious correlation between blatant pornography, sexual permissiveness, and the growth of sex-oriented criminality?

Others therefore insist that the Court has an obligation to work in terms of a moral responsibility regardless of current so-called standards. It is not a question of setting up morals for individuals, which would be beyond the Court's ability; it is a question of protecting society itself.

Scarcely anyone has missed the tendency of the peddler of pornography to link violence and sadism with sex to make his product more appealing and increase his sales. But psychologists have pointed out that illicit sex is unavoidably associated with violence in its very nature.

The American Civil Liberties Union has vociferously argued against the idea that lewd literature has any significant impact on the young. "There is no medical evidence to support the claims," the ACLU recently contended. But to reduce a question that includes social morality and lawlessness to a matter of "medical evidence" is preposterous. FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover has flatly said. "The circulation of periodicals containing salacious materials plays an important part in the development of crime among the youth of our country."

Yet, in its failure to broach this aspect where the law could operate, the Supreme Court has, in effect, adopted the position of the ACLU. And this is in spite of the growing number of specialists whose observations over a period of years provide a solid case against pornography as a contributing factor to the increase of violent crime among America's young.

The most compelling statement contradicting the ACLU and the present drift in our courts came, ironically, from a recent conference on crime at the United Nations. A report stated that 85 nations attending the conference found the U.S. delegation "pretty much alone on the issue of mass media. It seems that the portrayal of crime, violence, brutality and sadism has a bad effect on youth and is directly conducive to crime. The mention of lack of scientific proof by the U.S. delegation," continues the report, "was met, by and large, with incredulity—perhaps one should say with utter amazement and a certain amount of hostility."

For this reason many feel that if in present circumstances it is impossible to make a broad legal attack on obscenity, it is still possible to concentrate on the more blatant pornographic items and rally more support at the local level in the fight against overtly calculated smut.

Operation Yorkville has adopted this attitude, coupling it with a demand that a law be passed forbidding sale of lewd literature to minors. We now forbid the sale of tobacco and hard liquor to minors in many States. In the French journal Hygiène Mental, P. Menard recently wrote: "Even those who advocate a free press to the greatest extent bowed to the slogan: the press has every right but that of poisoning youth."

Other communities have found that laws and ordinances do indeed exist, but are only weakly enforced. Local action that does not leave the cop on the beat to feel that he is alone in an unwanted and thankless task has had good effects.

Through the National Organization for Decent Literature (NODL) other communities have discovered that newsstand dealers can be found who will cooperate in controling the flow of filth. Members of the community are alerted and encouraged to patronize stores displaying the NODL placard.

But such movements are not as widespread as they might be. Operation Yorkville is making a valiant effort to rouse the citizenry not only in its own area but elsewhere too. Through lectures, pamphlets and even a documentary film they have inspired the formation of similar nondenominational movements in other cities.

But the fight has barely begun. The cancer eating at the vitals of a potentially great society is not dormant. It is malignant. As Dr. Max Levin, a New York psychiatrist put it in "The Pornography Racket": "Let us not delude ourselves that pornography is a beneficial outlet for unwholesome sex tendencies. The smut merchants have no medals coming to them; they are not to be regarded as benefactors, contributors to mental health. On the contrary, they are crippling our youngsters by encouraging the expression of their sex impulses in an unhealthy direction."

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to overemphasize the seriousness of this problem and the need for accelerated effort to rid our Nation of this cancer. The alternative is eventual destruction of America as a world power by gradual erosion of the moral fiber of our people.

The Honorable Luther Alexander Johnson

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the passing of our late colleague from Texas, Luther Alexander Johnson. I had the privilege of serving with Judge Johnson in the House from the date of my election until he resigned in 1946. As a new Member of the Congress, I was privileged to enjoy his friendship and counsel which I valued very highly.

In addition to the distinguished career which he enjoyed in his many years of service in the House of Representatives, he also added luster to his many achievements through his service on the Tax Court of the United States from July 1946 until his retirement in September 1956. He brought learning and integrity to the Tax Court and his contributions are legion. It is always sad when those with whom we have associated closely must leave us, and particularly so when they are individuals of integrity, wisdom and knowledge and have devoted a lifetime to the service of their district, State, and Nation.

My sincerest consolation to the surviving members of his family.

Case for Repeal of 14(b)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this Congress I introduced H.R. 1151 to amend section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act to prohibit the States from passing so-called right-to-work laws. And all during this first session of this Congress I, like all of my colleagues, have been asked for my views on the question of repeal of section 14(b). Both repeal of section 14(b) and amendment of section 14(b) are proposed for the same reason—to restore free choice to labor and management alike when faced with the question of union security.

I am happy to insert in the RECORD the text of an article I wrote for Drive, in which I present my reasons for supporting repeal or amendment of section 14(b):

THE CASE FOR REPEAL OF 14(b)

(By Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT)

Congress over the past 30 or more years has adopted the policy that free collective bargaining is to be favored and encouraged. What laws it has passed affecting collective bargaining have primarily been for the purpose of establishing ground rules for its conduct. As such they have been essentially procedural in nature. There has been a reluctance by Congress to interfere with the substantive terms of what is actually agreed to by the parties. Even in the procedural area Congress has acted with restraint. Only if it felt that legislation was required to increase the utility and effectiveness of collective bargaining did it take action.

It is my belief that the 89th Congress must act to assure the vitality of the collective bargaining process. And it can best afford such protection by repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. By so doing it will strike down the so-called right to work acts which 20 States have enacted, and will restore to labor and management in these States the right to fully agree upon mutually aceptable terms of employment.

FAVORS COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

I firmly believe that union membership as a basis of continued employment should be neither required nor forbidden by law, but that the decision should be left to agreement by management and labor through the process of collective bargaining.

The effect of section 14(b) is to forbid an employer and a union to agree that union membership shall be a condition of employment.

It is not my intention, either now or when this matter comes to the Congress, to argue only that the union shop benefits both labor and management through the stability it brings to labor relations, the orderly and uniform contract administration it secures, the more effective voice it gives to employers or the assurances of greater union democracy it provides.

Nor shall I stress only the strict codes of democratic conduct which the Government by law has imposed on unions. No other voluntary organization must meet such requirements of secret ballot elections, frequently held, freedom to criticize elected officials without reprisal, and democratic procedures for setting policy and making decisions.

MUST REPRESENT ALL

Nor shall I emphasize solely that the union shop operates only where a majority of the workers have decided in its favor and where the employer has agreed with the union to a union security contract. Under Federal law, the union which is selected by a majority of the workers must represent all the workers in the factory or shop in collective bargaining relations with the employer. The union has no choice. Even if it wanted to, it could not refuse to represent any individual worker or group of workers. It must represent them all.

What I do urge as the most basic argument for repeal of section 14(b) is that, consistent with the clearly stated congressional policy mentioned above, unions and employers should be free to negotiate union security provisions if they wish to do so. And, they should be free to exclude such provisions if they cannot agree on them. What I want, and what repeal of section 14 (b) would assure is freedom for American unions and American employers—freedom to agree or disagree on union security, without interference from State government.

I am equally convinced that section 14(b) and the right-to-work laws it fosters result in an out-and-out contradiction on the one hand, and repudiation on the other, of that congressional policy which I urgently commend as being most compatible with our American traditions of free democratic action.

American Institute of Nutrition Supports Change to Metric System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have for many, many years sponsored legislation to authorize a study of whether or not the United States ought to convert to the metric system of weights and measures for general use in this country.

Recently the broad and beneficial implications of such legislation were again pointed out to me when I received a copy of a resolution of the American Institute of Nutrition. I am delighted to insert the text of that resolution in the RECORD today, in the hope that other organizations and individuals will be encouraged to express their views on this matter:

Whereas, more than 90 percent of the world's population now operates under the metric system; and

Whereas the Journal of Nutrition, Poultry Science, Journal of Animal Science, Journal of Dairy Science, Food Chemicals Codex, and publications of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council now use or will use metric weights and measures exclusively: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the American Institute of Nutrition in its annual meeting, April 10, 1965, recommends passage of the bills now before Congress to study feasibility and practicability of conversion to the metric system of weights and measures for general use in the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to committees concerned with metric conversion study bills S. 774, H.R. 2626, H.R. 38, and H.R. 1154 to achieve the above objective.

State Right-To-Work Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, last week Kenneth C. Kellar, a Lead, S. Dak., attorney, led off testimony on behalf of State right-to-work laws. He was appearing for the National Association of Manufacturers before the Labor Subcommittee of the House.

His testimony, as follows, is one of the most articulate defenses of the Taft-Hartley Act's section 14(b) that I have ever heard. It is a great and compelling statement not only in defense of voluntary unionism but in defense of the larger issue, individual freedom.

Mr. Kellar makes clear, I believe, the vital issues that are before the Congress now. He delineates the grave responsibility we are assuming in our present circumstances.

I respectfully submit this statement for your consideration:

STATEMENT OF KENNETH C. KELLAR PRESENTED JUNE 4, 1965, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

My name is Kennth C. Kellar. I am a practicing attorney in Lead, S. Dak. I appear before you today on behalf of the National Association of Manufacturers to present their position in opposition to H.R. 77 which, if enacted, will repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I am a former director of NAM, and currently I am a memebr of NAM's industrial relations committee.

While the NAM embraces on its membership rolls most of the largest corporations in America, significantly, it is the middle-sized and small companies which comprise the backbone of our organization without whose existence and productive capacity even the corporate giants would falter in their economic stride. Eighty percent of NAM's member companies employ 500 persons or less, and about 50 percent of our members employ 100 persons or less. The voice of NAM reflects the opinion of a large cross section of the business community of this Nation that 14(b) should be retained to properly safeguard the liberties of the citizens of this Republic despite union protestations to the contrary.

NAM's consistent and unambiguous stand in opposition to compulsory unionism is based on the premise that voluntary unionism will encourage more responsible union leadership. Hence, our declaration of policy states:

"The right of employees to join or not to join a union should be protected by law. In exercising the right to organize in unions or the right not to organize, employees should be protected by law against coercion from any source."

In our policy statement, "Industry Believes," we state as follows:

"a. Freedom of choice in union membership. Every employee and prospective employee should be guaranteed freedom without intimidation or coercion from any source to join or not join a labor organization and to maintain or discontinue his membership and participation in its activities."

Certainly this forthright declaration is but a further expression of the inalienable rights guaranteed our citizens under the 5th, 9th and 14th amendments of the Constitution of the United States which implicitly protect the right to work since they prohibit the deprivation of life, liberty or property without due process of law, and forbid abridgement of the privileges and immunities of our citizens.

Simply stated, right-to-work laws provide protection so that the inherent right of an individual to secure and hold a job shall not be abridged by a union security agreement entered into by the employer and the union. More properly stated, voluntary unionism embraces a concept of human liberty quite as fundamental as freedom of speech, religion or assembly. By the enactment of 14(b), the Congress of the United States recognized and preserved to the citizens of the several States the right, if they so chose, to enact statutes or constitutional amendments protecting the freedom of choice of their individual citizens so that their very jobs and livelihood could not be placed in jeopardy through compulsion by an agreement entered into by an aggressive union and an acquiescent employer. We believe that the principle of voluntary unionism is not open to compromise. Either one must believe in the freedom of individual choice or must accede to the view that it is proper to shackle the will of the unwilling employee, through compulsive union devices.

In our belief in the inviolability of human freedom involved in the cause of voluntary unionism, we find support from an array of liberal thinkers who certainly cannot be accused of being hostile to the labor movement. Samuel Gompers, whose contributions to the growth of the American labor movement need no elucidation, saw the issue much more clearly than some of his modern day successors. Gompers stated:

"I want to urge devotion to the fundamentals of human liberty, the principles of voluntarism. No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion. If we seek to force, we but tear apart that which, united, is invinciple."

Mr. Justice Frankfurther, in the State right-to-work cases, quoted extensively from the late Justice Brandeis who held that:

"The ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable, and yet to have in the trade outside its own ranks an appreciable number of men who are nonunionists. Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the unions as the unions check oppression by the employer."

Even George Meany, who so vociferously opposes right-to-work laws, when speaking to the U.N. in his initial address as a delegate, stated:

"The extent to which any society is truly humanitarian, democratic rather than paternalistic, depends in very large measure on the initiative and energy displayed by the voluntary organizations in the community, on the extent to which the people themselves through organizations of their own choice and direction mold the domestic and foreign policies of their country."

Certainly this principle so ably enunciated by him can be related not only to such voluntary organizations as churches, service clubs, lodges, chambers of commerce, but union organizations as well.

President John F. Kennedy signed a law March 15, 1961, which by clear implication recognized the inherent strength of the right-to-work principle. I refer to the Manpower Development and Training Act, which had received the prior endorsement of Secretary of Labor Goldberg, and to section 307 of the statute which provides:

"The selection of persons for training under this act and for placement of such persons shall not be contingent upon such person's membership or nonmembership in a labor organization."

The nations of the world regard the United States as the citadel of democracy and individual liberty, an image which will be tarnished if, by legal recognition of compulsory unionism, we become, except for nations inside the Iron Curtain, the only major power to reject voluntarism. Compulsory unionism is prohibited by the constitutions, laws, or judicial decisions of Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and Western Germany.

The past several decades have witnessed a colossal growth both in the political and economic power of unions in this country. Today, in a matter of hours, one or a few unions can bring the economic life of this Nation to a crashing halt. Now the unions seek a further extension of power so they can have in the iron grip of their discipline every worker in America through the devices of compulsion. The last hope to protect the public from such a dangerous growth of monolithic control over the affairs of the people lies, in my opinion, in the courage and wisdom of the Congress of the United States.

Why are the unions so intensively and aggressively demanding repeal of 14(b)? Union opposition to right-to-work laws is based upon four chief arguments which we believe are based upon invalid premises. With all the acknowledged skill of the corps of experts and publicists at their command, the unions have sought to becloud the right-to-work issue in the public mind by four clever, classic arguments. Union spokesmen contend that right-to-work laws:

(1) Provide a union-busting weapon for utilization by employers.

(2) Result in economic stagnation.

(3) Are contrary to the principle of majority rule.

(4) Insure a free ride for nonunion workers in a union plant so that such individuals receive all the benefits of collective bargaining without paying dues or moneys into union coffers for such services.

The free-rider situation seems the most irksome to union officialdom.

Last year, Al Barkan, National Director of COPE, publicly stated: "If we can elect 20 to 30 new congressional friends, we can get rid of that union-busting, union-smashing 14(b)."

This startling statement is completely in error and at variance with the facts. Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor establish that union membership increased in every one of the right-to-work States in the immediate years following passage of such statutes, which trend continued until several years ago. The most recent survey by the Labor Department, covering the period 1958–62, discloses that union membership has increased again in about half the right-to-work States, and in the other half has declined slightly. The loss merely reflects some decline in union membership throughout the Nation, not attributable to State

right-to-work laws but to other factors. This conclusion is borne out by the fact that in a number of the largest industrial non-right-to-work States, union membership declined by 11 percent, while in the same period in the right-to-work States, the percentage decrease was only 4.6 percent. This record clearly does not support the cry of corporate wolves in the union sheep pen.

Another argument voiced by the unions in opposition to 14(b) is the claim that any State which adopts a right-to-work law will lapse into a swamp of economic stagnation. Again, statistics from two Federal agencies, the U.S. Department of Labor, and Commerce, belie these contentions. For the decade ending in 1963, determinative factors of an expanding economy such as wage improvement, increased number of production workers, greater capital investment, higher bank deposits, accelerated personal income, and other similiar indexes of increased prosperity, showed a greater percentage rate of increase in right-to-work States over both non-right-to-work States and the national average.

Quite significantly, 6 of the first 15 States with the highest average weekly earnings for production workers are right-to-work States. While I realize Members of Congress are besieged with statistics, and statisticians in opposing camps take great pleasure in refuting the arguments of their opponents by interpretation of the variables, we submit that the indices of prosperity in the right-to-work States present strong evidence negating the union contentions that right-to-work laws have a debilitating influence upon the economy.

Another focal point of attack by union spokesmen on right-to-work laws is that these statutes result in the violation of the democratic principle of majority rule. Thus the union becomes the exclusive bargaining representative of all employees, and the minority, by analogy to political elections, are subject to the policies, programs, accomplishments or failures of the representatives of the majority, but with a very fundamental difference, that minority members of a political party, while they must abide by the majority vote in a popular election, are not compelled to join the prevailing party. Fortunately, in the field of public affairs, a dissenting minority is not required to stop its opposition nor is it required to contribute to the political support of the majority party. Even members of the majority are at liberty to withdraw from such an association. The claim of democratic majority rule by compulsory unionism is pure sophistry. Our democratic principle of majority rule is based on the preservation of minority rights and minority opposition and even the possibility, or probability, of shifting the majority power. When employees are compelled to join a union, the entire democratic basis of majority rule evaporates and is supplanted by a doctrine or monopoly rule which has no place in a democratic society.

George Meany, who supports wholeheartedly union doctrine assailing right-to-work laws, must have some difficulty rationalizing the argument on majority rule, since I note in recent press dispatches that Mr. Meany, in his role as leader of the AFL–CIO, is considerably discomfited by the impact of majority control in the ILO being exercised by the Communist-bloc nations who have the support of the African-Asian bloc and other countries with extreme Socialist learnings. The situation has become so intolerable that Mr. Meany has been threatening to withdraw representation by AFL–CIO in the sessions of the ILO. Mr. Meany reserves the right of minority dissent and in this particular instance I agree 100 percent with his disillusionment over the ILO, because of my own personal experience as a former delegate to sessions of the ILO.

Probably the greatest objection of unions to right-to-work laws relates to the free-rider thesis. Unions assert that in a unionized plant, nonunion employees get all the benefits of the collective-bargaining process without paying any dues or service charges to the union treasury. This fallacious, weak reasoning of the compulsionists is based upon the violent assumption that union negotiations per se are good for all employees and completely ignores the fact that many nonunion employees may well question whether excessive union demands are in their ultimate best interests, particularly when they are involved in costly long strikes over issues which are primarily for the aggrandizement of the union hierarchy control. Such, for example, as lost wages through strike action where the issue at stake resulting in deadlock between employer and union may be the checkoff, the union shop, maintenance of membership, the agency shop, excessive economic demands upon financially weak employers, or other similar demands primarily directed to the extension of union power. While the free-rider argument has superficial appeal, it is basically unsound because, in addition to the objection above noted, everyone well knows that throughout America in the life of our Great Society numerous voluntary organizations carry on meritorious work which benefit many persons who contribute neither financial nor other support. This is almost axiomatic with fraternal organizations, churches, civic, and political organizations. Reductio ad absurdum, followed to its logistical conclusion, the Congress should consider a law to compel anyone who derives benefits from a voluntary organization to contribute support. We believe that any organization so lacking in the confidence of its members that it can only exist through the protective cloak of compulsion rests on such insecure foundations that it needs a reappraisal by its membership.

Another facet of the right-to-work controversy is the claim asserted by those who favor the repeal of 14(b) that labor disputes and violent disruptions of harmonious employee relations emerge from those situations where union and nonunion employees must work side by side as in the right-to-work States. Again, may I say that the evidence against such generalization points decidedly in the other direction. Again, U.S. Department of Labor statistics support the desirability of voluntary unionism because their reports show that the incidence of strikes is less acute in the right-to-work States than in others in the Nation. The ratio of man hours lost per employee by reason of strikes is less in those States where voluntary unionism has been given statutory protection.

A good union, competently administered by responsible officials, need fear nothing from voluntary unionism. Such a union will attract and retain employees if it merits the confidence of its membership by the exercise of a high degree of responsibility. We believe this objective is much more apt to be obtained in those States where the employee has the legal right to join or to refrain from joining a union.

We do not believe that there is any credible evidence to establish that the economic power of unions or their ability to engage in the legitimate objectives of collective bargaining have been injured through the enactment of right-to-work laws. In fact, we believe that a critical analysis leads to the opposite conclusion. On the political scene, it must be assumed that right-to-work laws have not prevented the ascendancy of union power since union leaders now publicly proclaim that by their political support the complexion of the 89th Congress is such that they expect the enactment of their legislative program with the chief objective 14(b) repeal.

Over the years, the Congress has been more than generous in granting special legislative privileges and immunities to labor unions which clearly contributed to the extension of union power. Whether warranted or not, the justification in each instance was the same as that now urged upon this Congress, that is, to protect weak and exploited labor unions from a massive corporate conspiracy to destroy them. We submit that, in this day and age, such an argument is sheer arrant nonsense. One has but to look around Washington to see the physical evidence of union prosperity, power and well-being. The impressive array of new union office buildings here, the ownership of banks, real estate, insurance companies, the vast financial resources available for interunion loans, strike benefits and political purposes, all bear testimony to the fact that unions are now big business with economic and political power unmatched by any other segment of our economy. Certainly it would seem that under such conditions there would be little need or justification for an additional legislative crutch such as that you are now asked to supply by repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. Certainly no man in this room, or in industry anywhere in this country, is so naive as to think that unions are not here to stay.

It seems farfetched and unrealistic in the extreme to suggest that unions need the additional weapon of compulsory union membership to accomplish their purposes. The major impact of this legislation would fall on medium and small sized companies which could not possibly withstand the assault of such organized power in a demand for a union shop and compulsory membership. Thus you come to the agreement between a union and an employer entered into under the coercion of a potentially ruinous strike and without regard to the ultimate desires or wishes of the employees who will be compelled to sign up or look elsewhere for a job. This, we submit, is discrimination of the highest order, and all for the benefit of private union organizations which should be able to survive on the worth and merit of their product the same as any other private organization in this country.

In conclusion, we reiterate our firm conviction that the Congress of the United States should not strike down the legislative protection of 14(b) which guarantees to the several States authority and jurisdiction to preserve individual freedom through enactment of State laws, or adoption of constitutional amendments, or both, to establish legal sanction for the principle of voluntary unionism thus enabling employees to exercise their free will in deciding whether or not to join a union. Permit me to comment upon the anamolous situation in which the 89th Congress finds itself. Further Federal intervention in the affairs of the several States is being requested to protect individual liberty for Negro citizens and other ethnic racial groups with respect to voting rights. Protection of civil liberties has been the prime concern of not only this, but several past sessions of the Congress, and a great deal of time and careful consideration has been given to the enactment of several civil rights acts. Therefore, it seems to us a bit incongruous that, at the very time the 89th Congress is on the verge of enacting the proposed voting rights bill protecting civil liberties, you are being asked to support Federal intervention into the affairs of the several States by repeal of 14(b) which will lead to Federal preemption calculated to destroy and suppress individual liberties for employees regardless of race, creed or nationality who may not wish to join unions and who may desperately desire freedom of choice in this all-important aspect of their lives and livelihood. We believe that the right to join or not to join a union is a civil liberty entitled to the

protection of this Congress through the retention of 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Gentlemen of the committee, we submit that repeal of 14(b) is an unnecessary intervention into State affairs, unnecessary for the protection of unions and union members, and un-American in concept. We urge, therefore, the defeat of H.R. 77.

Research Facilities: Los Alamos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, an article of significant interest was printed in the June 4, 1965, edition of Science magazine. Mr. Daniel S. Greenberg has capably detailed for his readers an informative report on the record decision by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy when it authorized the first step toward the construction of the meson facility at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory in New Mexico.

I am pleased to submit the text of this article, and insert it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESEARCH FACILITIES: LOS ALAMOS DESIGNATED BY JCAE AS THE SITE FOR NEW $55 MILLION ACCELERATOR

During the past few years, various regional interests have come forward to stake their claims whenever it became known that the Federal Government was contemplating the construction of a major research facility. Such was the case with the NASA Electronics Research Center, the Environmental Health Center, and the 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator now under design at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory.

The Electronics Center went to Boston after a lengthy row, the Environmental Health Center was cut into three parts to assuage the contenders, and, in an effort to dampen the strife, the National Academy of Sciences has been asked to provide recommendations on a site for the accelerator.

Now and then, however, the regional lookouts fail to detect who has the ball, and the decision on locating a major facility goes through without a squabble. A case in point occurred a few weeks ago when the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy (JCAE) authorized the first steps toward the construction of a $55 million, 800-million-electron-volt linear accelerator, also referred to as a meson factory, at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, in New Mexico. The JCAE took the action despite an administration decision not to go ahead with the project at this time, and it is not certain whether Congress will appropriate the requested $3.2 million in design funds or whether the executive will spend the money. But the JCAE generally has its way in atomic energy matters, and the odds are that the machine will be constructed, and constructed at Los Alamos.

Both scientifically and politically, the JCAE decision seems to have ample support. Early last year, after the administration vetoed the high-intensity accelerator proposed by the Midwestern Universities Research Associations (Science, January 31, 1964) a panel chaired by Hans Bethe, of Cornell, recommended construction of a meson factory and all but came out explicitly for placing it at Los Alamos. The matter was understandably of some interest to Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, who is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and chairman of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.

The Atomic Energy Commission included design funds for the machine in its submission to the Bureau of the Budget last year, but following consultations involving the Bureau, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Office of Science and Technology, and President Johnson, it was decided to remove the item from the budget.

In defense of the Los Alamos site, the JCAE included in its annual hearings an analysis which stated that the meson factory would contribute to the scientific strength and morale of the Los Alamos nuclear weapons laboratories.

"The weapon research and development program at Los Alamos," it stated, "is in an extremely effective and vigorous state at the present time. It is essential for national security to keep it so. Even if nuclear weapon testing is continued at its present basis indefinitely, it will be necessary to provide the Laboratory with means to attract new generations of scientists to provide new ideas and new stimulus. The meson factory will not be an isolated part of the Laboratory; it will be an integral part of our scientific work as are all our research activities. If, on the other hand, the nuclear weapon testing is stopped—and even when there are rumors that it might be stopped—it is equally essential that we maintain Laboratory morale and viability. The Laboratory and the country would have to plan for the possible resumption of testing on the basis that the U.S.S.R. or some other nation might resume testing. We would have to put devices on the shelf for possible further testing. This would have to go on for 2, 5, perhaps 10 years. It can go on if the Laboratory staff believes that Los Alamos has a future with or without weapon testing. Construction of the proposed meson factory will provide tangible evidence that Los Alamos is here to stay."

This argument, along with the accelerator's scientific and political support, is potent stuff, and it therefore appears that this is one case where a multimillion-dollar research facility may go through without stirring a nasty porkbarrel fight.—D.S.G.

Equal Opportunity: To Fulfillment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer, on Monday morning, June 7, 1965:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 7, 1965]

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY: TO FULFILLMENT

President Johnson's call for a White House conference—to discuss problems and solutions relative to the Negro quest for full equality in the mainstream of American life—is a profoundly significant step forward for the Nation and all its people.

In presenting his carefully considered thoughts on the subject—in a compassionate and down-to-earth commencement address at Howard University in Washington—the President sharply defined the distinction between simply proclaiming the principle of equal opportunity for all race and actually practicing the principle.

"It is not enough just to open the gates of opportunity," Mr. Johnson said. "All our citizens must have the ability to walk through those gates." The great need for American Negroes, once their basic constitutional rights are secured, is to be able "to move beyond opportunity to achievement."

This means not only the availability of jobs but the education and the training to qualify for them. This requires persistent effort by Negroes, with the help and encouragement of all Americans, not merely to surmount the barriers of discrimination and injustice but to break the shackles of poverty and ignorance and disease.

President Johnson's address at Howard University, and the White House conference to be held this fall, should be important landmarks in a vast national effort to attain a better understanding of Negro problems and to give Negroes a truly equal opportunity not just to seek a better life but to achieve it.

Debt Limit Boost Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the action today of the House in increasing the public debt limit from $324 to $328 billion raises the average amount of this debt owed by the head of each family in America to $6,936. I voted against increasing the debt limit because I am firmly opposed to continued deficit spending, especially in times of prosperity such as exist today. Having voted against foreign aid and a number of other costly programs, I feel justified in registering my opposition to this debt ceiling increase.

Mr. Speaker, the public and private debt in the United States is $1,172 billion; that is an average amount owed by each family in America of $24,936.16. Personally, I remember prior to the crash of October 1929 that my banker warned me against excessive borrowing. He said everyone was borrowing too much money, and he was proved right.

To me the same thing is true today. The Federal Government and likewise State and local governments are not exercising restraint in spending; they are not being prudent or frugal and on all levels our Nation is going deeper into debt.

If the House Ways and Means Committee would give us a meaningful, realistic permanent debt ceiling—something that Congress could live by and would live by—I would support it. There should be a permanent ceiling which would cause the administration to apply a brake in spending and to end all these new centralized welfare programs.

Until a policy of restraint is offered I must continue to protest deficit spending by opposing this practice of adopting regular periodic increases in the legal debt limit.

The People of the Seventh District of Alabama Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege as representative of the great Seventh District of Alabama to give the people, for the first time, an opportunity to share with their representative in Congress their views on the vital issues of the day. The return on the questionnaire I sent to my constituents exceeded 11 percent and is an indication of the interest and concern of our people in all of the problems facing our Nation and the world.

In addition to answering the questions, many of the returned questionnaires were accompanied by letters and remarks detailing a specific concern of the writer. This free exchange of views between the people and their representative is an important part of the successful functioning of representative government.

I want to congratulate the people of the Seventh District on the thought and care with which they considered this questionnaire. It is a tribute to the intelligence and dedication to democratic principles of the people I have the honor to represent. I am sure my colleagues would be interested in the results of this poll and I include it as a part of these remarks:

Results of 7th District, Alabama, questionnaire

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you believe the Federal Government must operate within a balanced budget?	89.6	6.9
2. Do you favor a medical care program for the elderly through—		
(a) Increasing social security taxes?	16.2	18.2
(b) Purchase of private insurance that is tax exempt?	27.6	5.6
(c) Voluntary plans without Federal participation?	40.1	4.2
3. Would you favor Federal aid to education even if it meant Federal control of schools—		
(a) For teachers' salaries?	11.8	78.4
(b) For school construction?	16.8	71.8
(c) For any other purpose?	9.1	71.6
4. Do you favor the proposal to change the present quota system to increase immigration from the Pacific-Asian and African nations?	4.1	89.6
5. Do you favor a sharp reduction in—		
(a) Foreign aid to Communist nations?	81.8	12.9
(b) Foreign aid to our allies?	63.8	28.1
(c) All foreign aid spending?	69.5	23.0
6. Do you favor a minimum guaranteed living of $3,000 per year at taxpayers' expense for all Americans whether or not they earn it?	4.6	91.3
7. Labor:		
(a) Do you favor repeal of sec. 14B of the Taft-Hartley Act which would make State right-to-work laws illegal?	16.4	64.0
(b) Do you favor leaving the right-to-work laws on the books under the control of the States?	79.2	8.9
8. Do you favor expanding peaceful coexistence with Soviet Russia and other Communist nations?	40.0	46.8
9. Do you favor an amendment to the Constitution which again would make prayers legal in our schools?	89.9	5.8
10. Do you favor—		
(a) Repeal of the civil rights bill?	62.3	10.2
(b) Modification of the civil rights bill?	34.8	6.5
11. Do you favor an agricultural program which will—		
(a) Maintain rigid supports and quotas to regulate farm economy?	16.7	6.6
(b) Gradually ease supports allowing farm commodities to seek a free market?	60.9	1.9
(c) Have no supports, no controls, immediate free farm economy?	14.9	5.6
12. Do you favor doing away with the Army Reserve and combining its functions with the National Guard?	36.0	46.1
13. Do you favor a proposal now being discussed for introduction to Congress that would require you to register your firearms?	38.3	54.9
14. Do you favor reapportionment of the State legislature by—		
(a) Federal Government	4.7	26.4
(b) State Government	89.0	3.0

America the Beautiful—And Long Island, Too?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, action to restore the natural beauty along our Nation's highways is long overdue. Recently the President proposed much needed legislation which will implement a program to rid the areas near our highways of unsightly junkyards and an overabundance of billboards. I commend Newsday for the following informative editorial and urge every Member of Congress to support the President on this legislation:

[From the Long Island Newsday, June 1, 1965]

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL—AND LONG ISLAND, TOO?

President Johnson, at the conclusion of a conference last week on the preservation of national beauty, announced some bold steps essential to any sound program. For years, there has been hand wringing about the state of American highways—the billboard blight always, the cancerous growth of auto junkyards recently. Robert Moses, through his Long Island parkways, first reversed this trend by establishing the precedent of a green barrier strip to shut out unsightliness. The Federal Government, through its vast interstate highway system, sought to achieve the same end through bonuses to the States. The assorted State turnpike authorities or commissions, to a greater or lesser degree, set up some controls. But nobody laid it on the line better, or more clearly defined the issues, than did the President last week.

Mr. Johnson asked Congress to take four significant steps:

1. Except in areas "zoned or used predominantly for commercial or industrial purposes," the States would be required to prohibit billboards within 1,000 feet of interstate and primary Federal-aid highways, these in New York including major State highways. The penalty: the loss of Federal-aid moneys for the construction of such roads.

2. New junkyards would be banned within 1,000 feet, and existing eyesores of this type would have to be screened or removed by 1970. The same penalty could be invoked.

3. States would be required to use 3 percent of Federal highway aid (about $120 million at present levels) for beautification along the roads.

4. One-third of the Federal aid received for secondary roads (about $100 million) would have to be used to construct scenic secondary roads, or to construct access roads to beauty spots, or for landscaping along present roads.

These are all concrete suggestions. Surprisingly, the billboard industry, after its long fight against regulation, has said it will go along. The Johnson bills are fine. Instead of simply wringing his hands at the erosion of natural beauty, the President has proposed some solid remedies.

Knowledge Exported to Poor Neighborhoods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, college students in my congressional district in Pittsburgh have undertaken in recent months their own war on poverty by tutoring children in poor neighborhoods of our city, thus making a positive contribution in helping those children keep up with classmates who have had greater educational advantages.

Mr. Kenneth Eskey in the June 8 issue of the Pittsburgh Press has written an excellent report on this significant activity. I include Mr. Eskey's report at this point in my remarks:

KNOWLEDGE EXPORTED TO POOR NEIGHBORHOODS

(By Kenneth Eskey)

This has been a banner year on college campuses for demonstrations, protests, upheavals, and revolts.

Generally overlooked was a quiet form of activity known as tutoring.

Hundreds of Pittsburgh college students spent their afternoons and evenings in settlement houses and church basements, helping boys and girls learn arithmetic and spelling, physics and French.

If campus debates on Vietnam are teach-ins, perhaps the tutoring sessions in city neighborhoods can be called teachouts.

The teachouts here stem from the civil rights and antipoverty movements. Much of the tutoring is done in poor neighborhoods, where children often need extra help to keep up with more fortunate classmates.

Chatham College students have been working at Fifth Avenue High School and Herron Hill Junior High School since 1963.

Action-Housing has been using college students as tutors in Homewood-Brushton, Hazelwood, and the Perry Hilltop area.

But the largest tutoring programs in town are the Hill education project (HEP) at the University of Pittsburgh and the North Side tutorial project in Manchester.

HEP is strictly a student operation. Pitt's contribution is a room on the fifth floor of Schenley Hall.

This year's cochairmen were Irv Garfinkel, a history major from Squirrel Hill who wants to be a social worker, and Marcia McNutt, a doctor's daughter from Ford City who considers HEP a full-time job.

Marcia figures HEP is a good energy outlet.

"Some students just sit around smoking marihuana and drinking booze," she said, without citing any cases.

Her biggest problem—a shortage of tutors.

"See those files," she said, pointing to an open drawer. "Those are requests we can't handle."

As many as 250 students have been active tutors during the school year, and another 50 to 75 worked as supervisors or youth club directors.

The tutoring force has dwindled to about 30 since the end of Pitt's winter trimester in April, but a major summer program is planned for July and August.

Most of the tutoring is done at the Heidman Center in the Hill district. Tutors are expected to work 2 to 4 hours a week, usually late afternoons and evenings.

There is no pay, only the satisfaction of doing a job.

The North Side tutorial project uses students from other Pittsburgh colleges. Like HEP, it started in 1963.

Supervisor of the North Side program is Mary Frances Brown, who gets a salary through the United Fund, operates out of Manchester House and attends Duquesne University part time.

The 110 tutors in her program are unpaid and generally put in one afternoon or evening a week.

Many of the tutors come from the other side of town.

Janet Braunstein, a sophomore at Carnegie Institute of Technology, commutes from her home in Greenfield each week to the Bidwell Street Presbyterian Church to tutor a fifth grader in English.

How many tutoring programs there are in the city no one knows, but the list is growing rather than shrinking.

Duquesne and Mt. Mercy College students have been tutoring at Brashear Center in the South Side and the Mount Mercy students also tutor at St. Clair Village.

The School of Education at Duquesne has a special program for teachers preparing for jobs in poor neighborhoods and runs its own tutoring program on the side.

College students will serve this summer as assistant teachers in Project Head Start, an antipoverty program to prepare children for kindergarten and first grade.

Literacy and Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned at the inconsistency of a voting rights bill which purports to give every citizen the right to vote by eliminating literacy tests but gives only passing recognition to the more widespread discrimination from the levying of a poll tax.

A Toledo Blade editorial of May 27, "Literacy and Poll Taxes," points up the incongruity in the argument over the constitutionality of prohibiting literacy tests and the unconstitutionality of banning poll taxes and logically concludes that a poll tax actually results in wider discrimination by keeping more people, both white and Negro, from exercising their right to vote than literacy tests aimed at racial discrimination. This is a point well worth considering in the days ahead, and it is my hope that this body will act to eliminate the poll tax as well as to outlaw literacy tests. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include as part of my remarks the Toledo Blade editorial to which I referred and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

LITERACY AND POLL TAXES

With administration leaders planning to invoke cloture to force a vote in the Senate on the voting rights bill, two arguments continue on its constitutionality.

The effort by northern liberals to impose a flat prohibition on poll taxes in State and local elections has been sidetracked, at least temporarily.

By a slim majority, the Senate voted against that provision, on the grounds that it was probably unconstitutional. Instead, it adopted a declaration that in certain States the right to vote is denied or abridged by requiring poll tax payments.

This is intended to strengthen the hand of Attorney General Katzenbach in getting the Supreme Court to invalidate poll taxes for that reason.

On the other hand, the Senate majority brushed aside southern opposition to a provision of the bill which will prohibit literacy tests in five Southern States and parts of two others. It rejected an amendment which would have required a voter, regardless of race, to prove only that he could read and write English.

Favoring a strong voting rights bill though we do, what baffles us is the inconsistency by which the Senate majority goes adamantly ahead in banning literacy tests but hesitates to do the same for poll taxes.

Poll taxes, on their face, restrict voting rights to those who can afford to pay for the privilege. If they have been employed for years to bar Negroes from the polls in some of the Southern States, they have also been equally effective in keeping a great many whites from voting.

Their elimination would extend voting rights to both groups indiscriminantly.

Barring literacy tests only in five Southern States and parts of two others would be Federal discrimination with a vengeance. In New York State, where uniform literacy tests are required for voters who cannot produce an eighth-grade certificate, it is estimated that 15 percent of those taking the test fail every year.

Is Federal law to presume that all the people in Alabama and Mississippi are smarter than these New Yorkers?

As for the contention that any literacy test could be employed to deny Negroes their voting rights, what about California's, where a person seeking to register need only be able to write his name in English?

A key provision of the voting rights bill is that Federal examiners shall register voters in areas where discrimination is practiced. What could be simpler than to have them register by signing their names in English, as is done in California?

New York State Legislature Urges President and Congress To Condemn Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York on May 12, 1965, urging our Government to take an official stand against Soviet anti-Semitism:

RESOLUTION 90

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to condemn anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and to take steps to prevent further persecutions of, and acts of terrorism and confiscation against, Jews residing therein

Whereas the people of the State of New York and of the United States are deeply shocked by reports appearing in the press and elsewhere concerning the continued oppression, persecution and tyranny of the Government of Soviet Russia directed toward Russian Jewry residing in Soviet Russia; and

Whereas many acts of terrorism, confiscation and persecution have already been committed against such Jewry and even more serious acts are threatened; and

Whereas such acts have resulted, unjustly and unwarrantedly, in the confiscation of property and in the deprivation of rights, privileges and immunities possessed by the Jewish people in that country; and

Whereas the Government of the United States because of its humanitarian interests in the various peoples of this country and their interest in and relationship to the persecuted Jews of Soviet Russia, should register emphatic protest with the Russian Government with a firm request that it should cease and desist in its program of persecution; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has on other occasions intervened and interceded in behalf of persecuted minorities in other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the President and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully memorialized to condemn anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and that the Secretary of State of the United States of America be and he hereby is respectfully memorialized to lodge an official protest on behalf of the Government of the United States with the Russian Government against the concerted attack presently being continued directly and indirectly, by the latter government toward Russian Jews residing in such country and that the Department of State be and it hereby is respectfully memorialized to employ its best diplomatic efforts in an attempt to persuade the Russian Government to desist from any further persecutions and acts of terrorism and confiscation complained of in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Secretary of State of the United States and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to do everything possible to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the assembly .

JOHN T. MCKENNAN, *Clerk*.

In senate, May 12, 1965, concurred in, without amendment.

By order of the senate.

GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN, *Secretary*.

David Rockefeller Says United States Can Absorb Slash in Defense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I have long believed that an economy as buoyant and imaginative as that of the United States should look upon projected reductions in defense spending as an opportunity rather than a problem.

I was delighted to note in the Monday, June 7 issue of the Wall Street Journal that one of the most thoughtful members of the business community, Chase Manhattan Bank President David Rockefeller, expressed a similar view in a recent Seattle address.

Mr. Rockefeller pointed out that leading defense firms need not be restricted to defense problems. He said:

The fact is that they are in the problem-solving business and this Nation is a long way from running out of problems.

I commend Mr. Rockefeller's remarks to all of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent to include the Wall Street Journal account of his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks:

DAVID ROCKEFELLER SAYS UNITED STATES CAN ABSORB SLASH IN DEFENSE SPENDING: CHASE BANK PRESIDENT CITES NEED TO STRESS GROWTH POSSIBILITIES MILITARY CUTBACK WOULD AFFORD

NEW YORK.—David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank, said the United States could stand a heavy reduction in defense spending in the next few years without serious disruption of the national economy.

In a Seattle speech, Mr. Rockefeller said the cutbacks could be absorbed if business, communities, and Government take "sensible steps to regear the defense machinery to civilian needs."

"I feel that too much emphasis has been placed on the problem of conversion and too little on the opportunities it affords for strengthening our longrun growth potential," he asserted. "Fear of the economic impact of defense cutbacks has been exaggerated to the point where it has obscured for many people the underlying dynamism of our economy and its remarkable resilience in adjusting to change."

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

Mr. Rockefeller suggested that the current 9 to 10 percent contribution of defense activities to the gross national product could safely be cut back to 5 percent or even lower if, as projected, the gross national product rises to about $780 billion by 1970 from the present $660 billion. That reduction, he said, could be effected "without imposing an unsustainable burden and, I would hope, without weakening our defenses."

Already, Mr. Rockefeller noted, there are many instances in which communities where military installations have been closed have replaced them with nondefense industries. Also, he said numerous industries are applying techniques learned in defense production to new types of civilian-goods production. He cited specifically the success of Seattle-based Boeing Co. in expanding commercial aircraft sales as military sales declined.

"Many defense contractors do themselves an injustice in conveying the impression that they can work only on missiles and space vehicles," Mr. Rockefeller said. "The fact is that they are in the problem-solving business, and this Nation is a long way from running out of problems.

SPACE AND URBAN TRANSIT

"The market for systems-oriented companies that offer scientific, manufacuring, financial and training skills is expanding daily. Imagine the results of applying the countdown, precision of a space launch to such problems as urban transportation, improved air travel, better communications and weather forecasting, and more reliable highway traffic-control systems.

"It seems reasonable to assume that the 'brain teams' that have figured out how to put a man on the moon should be able to get a man to work a little more quickly and efficiently."

As areas in which money saved by lower defense spending could be used to "provide rich dividends in terms of enhanced human well-being," Mr. Rockefeller mentioned education, urban rehabilitation, health, highways and conservation. A major part of Federal tax savings, he urged, should be channeled into private hands "to support private investment in the vast task of rebuilding our cities," with State and local governments given access to more money for schools and other community facilities.

Griffin Is Right but Cause Is Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law has been the subject of newspaper editorials throughout the United States. Few, however, have so dramatically called the attention of their readers to the provisions of H.R. 4350, introduced by my colleague from Michigan, the Honorable ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, as the editorial published May 31 in the Jackson Citizen Patriot, a newspaper published in my district. I commend the editorial for the RECORD at this point:

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, May 31, 1965]

GRIFFIN IS RIGHT BUT CAUSE IS LOST

Michigan Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN has a just cause in his formula for repealing and modifying the controversial right-to-work section of the Taft-Hartley law.

But his cause is lost. He lacks the support of President Johnson, is violently opposed by organized labor, and the liberals who should be backing Representative GRIFFIN are looking the other way.

The Michigan Congressman and coauthor of the only major change made in the Nation's labor laws since Taft-Hartley has put forth a right-to-work repealer which is magnificent in its simplicity and potential effectiveness.

Briefly, his measure would deny the union shop concession to unions which practice discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or color, which use mandatory union dues for political purposes, and which deny members the right to disagree with union leadership.

These propositions seem fair enough but GRIFFIN hasn't a chance of winning approval for them.

As a Michigan representative, Mr. GRIFFIN has no objections to repeal of section 14-B of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to enact right-to-work laws. These are statutes which make it impossible to demand union membership for an individual as a condition of employment.

An area which achieved a great deal of maturity in labor-management relations, Michigan has no need for a right-to-work law. Such a statute never has been seriously considered here.

The necessity for unions and the need for security for them long have been recognized here. Right-to-work laws too often are used by States as a method of suppressing the union movement and thus offer lures to industries which don't want to deal with organized labor. Such laws inevitably lead to the curtailment of the rights of the worker to organize and bargain collectively.

Michigan industrial leaders, especially those heading large companies, will admit privately they would find it extremely difficult to do business without the unions.

The equal job opportunity feature of the Griffin proposition is one that should fit in with the effort today to strengthen the civil rights of all individuals.

The argument against it and the other proposals by the Michigan congressmen is that there are laws on the books which cover the situations involved and that it would be better to strengthen these than to provide remedies for injustice in the Taft-Hartley law.

The trouble is that the laws do not work well, or have been weakened by court decisions which give a special status to labor unions. The tendency is to be most lenient with the unions.

Discrimination is not universal in the unions by an means. Many organizations have done extremely well by the minorities and especially the colored workers. They have every right to membership and to employment on an equal footing with all others.

The abuses in this field, however limited, should not be tolerated.

The Congress or State legislatures may pass all sorts of civil rights law giving the Negro the right to vote, to patronize any business establishment, live where he pleases, send his children to any school, and so on and on. But one of his most important rights is that of making a living. The Congress doesn't seem disposed to enforce that right if it means coming head to head with the leadership of the unions which do practice discrimination.

The President's failure to mention or indorse any qualification of the section 14(b) repealer perhaps is undertandable. He owes a political debt to organized labor which he must pay.

He has to do this, as a politician, because he has been making friends in the business-management community. No Democratic President since Wilson has been so kindly received by businessmen.

Because organized labor is one of the foundation stones of the Democratic Party, the President has to make certain that he does not offend union leaders by ignoring their demands while getting along well with the persons on the other side of the wage contract bargaining table. The party, as well as his own fortunes, is involved.

Not so understandable is the opposition GRIFFIN is meeting from the hot-eyed liberals who make civil rights a holy cause.

They make rafter-rattling speeches about the rights of man. They condemn discrimination, particularly in the South.

But given a chance to strike an effective blow for those rights, and particularly that most basic right of equal opportunity on the job, they seem not at all interested.

Perhaps their reasons are the same as we accorded to the President. They, too, depend on union help in getting elected. They are wildly vocal on civil rights until a stand on a definite issue might interfere with their own political fortunes.

Statesmen are not measured by this standard.

May Day or Law Day—Which?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the text of an article written by Hon. Warren Jefferson Davis, a distinguished member of the bar of the State of California. In his article, Mr. Davis sounds a warning against the trend toward the concentration of power in the Federal Establishment, and calls for a rededication to the basic principles of constitutionalism. Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to the attention of the House, as follows:

MAY DAY OR LAW DAY—WHICH?

(By Warren Jefferson Davis)

May Day, which falls on May 1, is commonly thought to stand for the success of the Russian Revolution. The true significance of the date can be understod, however, only in terms of the continuance of the "World Revolution".

The date has its antecedent in the founding of the "Illuminati," on May 1, 1776, by one Adam Weishaupt, after he had spent 5 years formulating the idea and methods of deception.

The "Illuminati" was exposed by the Bavarian Government in October 1786, after the seizure of documents exposing the methods used by the conspirators. The organization went underground, and was succeeded by various and sundry organizations fronting for it.

On page 22 of "World Revolution," by Nesta H. Webster, we find the aims of the "Illuminati" reduced to a simple six-point formula:

1. Abolition of monarchies, and of all ordered government.
2. Abolition of private property.
3. Abolition of inheritance.
4. Abolition of patriotism.
5. Abolition of the family, which is to say, of marriage and all morality, and the institution of the communal education of children.
6. Abolition of all religion.

"Now", says the author, "it will surely be admited that the above forms a program hitherto unprecedented in the history of civilization. Communstic theories had been held by isolated thinkers, or groups of thinkers, since the days of Plato, but no one, as far as we know, had ever yet seriously proposed to destroy everything for which civilization stands."

This code is carried out by communism today, and is celebrated each year on May Day, in memory of the "Illuminati," and not just for the success in Russia, which was really their first big success.

Law Day is the answer by lawyers to the attacks made on the rule of law, at home and abroad. Its annual observance by bar associations, and lawyers individually, is made necessary by the phenomenal rise of socialism and communism throughout our country, and in the world at large.

The president of the Los Angeles Bar Association, in a message to the membership, 6,000 or more, has called attention to the efforts of lawyers, at the time of the American Revolution, through letters to friends, to defend "liberty throughout the world." He has asked each member to write 10 letters on the significance of Law Day, thereby enabling our association to contact some 600,000 people.

You comprise the audience with whom I would like to share my thoughts on Law Day, as opposed to May Day, 1965. My message to you might well be entitled: "The People Versus Federal Officials Who Have Violated Their Oath of Office."

At Runnymede, England, in the fall of 1957, members of the American Bar Association dedicated a lasting memorial to the principles of Magna Carta.

On their return home from their pilgrimage, they could have issued a call for rededication of our 250,000 lawyers and our entire people, to the Constitution and Bill of Rights, and to the preservation of our republican constitutional form of Government.

Instead, the national voice was stilled when both a Federal statute and the Constitution itself were violated by the invasion of a sovereign State of the Union by armed forces of the United States, under order of the then Chief Executive.

Our people have been so brainwashed by Communist doctrines that they no longer protest when the majority of "activist" members of the U.S. Supreme Court, as now constituted and led by Earl Warren, operating under the spell of psychosociological fantasy, appears in the role of chief offender against the rule of law.

A rededication of our entire people to the Constitution and Bill of Rights is imperative if our republican constitutional form of government to survive.

Accordingly, I am writing to you, and others, in the effort to achieve this objective.

An incoming President takes an oath to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies—foreign and domestic. Foreign enemies probably will give Mr. Johnson less concern. But what of domestic assaults on the Constitution?

The American formula for survival in this atomic age is strict limitation upon the power of government. Some professed liberals, however, are seeking to undermine our Constitution, and liberate our Government from all constitutional limitations. This process has taken the form of unlimited taxing and spending by our Government.

Over 700 Government-owned corporations are operating in direct competition with private enterprise. Where is the constitutional authority, in the original document or through amendment, that permits the Federal Government to operate power companies, insurance or manufacturing businesses, or other components of the welfare-illfare state? The powers not specifically delegated are reserved to the States under the 10th amendment to the Constitution.

In these crucial times, is not too much emphasis put on so-called rights, when wrongs are being inflicted on the Constitution?

The field of education, for example, is not excluded from State control, but it is excluded from Federal control, because it has never been delegated to the Federal Government, and is reserved under the 10th amendment.

The 14th amendment, if relied on for justification, was never legally adopted. Three-fourths of the States failed to ratify, and New Jersey and Ohio rescinded their previous ratifications. The 14th amendment, however, has never been legally applicable, because only to the Congress is given the power to enforce its provisions.

The Constitution has been grossly disregarded, and the socialistic theories of a Swede, Gunnar Myrdal, substituted, by means of a court decision, under which the Constitution is thought to be outmoded as impractical and unsuited to modern conditions; that its adoption was nearly a plot against the common people. In recent years, court decisions have ranged from forced integration to forced reapportionment. Such decisions, is not conforming to the law of the land, fall under the heading of what Justice Cardozo would have called enforceable decrees, but not real decisions. Such decisions are thought by many to be lawless, in that the court presumes to make law, a power it does not have.

Article IV, section 4, guarantees to every State a republican form of government, and protection against invasion either by Federal troops or U.S. marshals, except on application of the legislature or the State's executive. The use of force, to implement an invalid decree, is in direct violation of the constitutional provision.

The Civil Rights Act of 1960 was alleged to contain 11 or more specific violations of the Constitution. The Civil Rights Act of 1965, illegal and unconstitutional on its face, is to be used as a club against Virginia and States in the Deep South, which did not support the administration in the recent presidential election.

Will there be anything left of the Constitution, unless these usurpations of power by Federal agencies are checked?

The Federal Government is today imposing on the States and the people in the same manner that the central government under George III imposed upon the American colonists in 1776.

"The British monarch has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance."

Does that sound familiar?

Federal bureaucracy is rampant throughout the land, to the point of confiscation, and Federal agencies operate to enforce centralized authority, rather than reflect the will of the people.

Through abuse of the treatymaking power and the use, or misuse, of Executive agreements, our entire system of government by delegated and limited powers, is being changed to a system of undelegated powers, without amendment to the Constitution, or by legal construction.

We must return to the fundamentals of our constitutional system, as provided by article 10 of the Bill of Rights.

National defense is something more than marching men in uniform. Defense is a way of life. It requires the maintenance of sound ideological principles. The Constitution is not flexible. It does not change to meet changing conditions, as leftist-radicals assert. "Activist" members of the Supreme Court cannot read new meanings into the document, or in between the lines, and change the law of the Constitution to meet changing needs, aspirations, and even the predilections of those currently members of the Court. New doctrines come and go. They must always be subordinated to the basic concept of the supremacy of the Constitution and Bill of Rights. This concept must be kept inviolate from judicial and other encroachment, and from the contamination of foreign ideology and subversive influence.

To understand what is happening to our country, we must be alerted to the dangers of centralized power, whether exerted by the Congress, the executive, or by a simple majority of the present activist members of the Supreme Court in their attempts to legislate, rather than construe judicially.

Responsible citizens call for an immediate end to foreign giveaway programs—imperative in order to save the value of the rapidly vanishing dollar. There is no constitutional justification for the expenditure of the taxpayers' money on programs involving waste and governmental inefficiency. The taking of money by the Government, and the bestowing of it on favored individuals of foreigners, is none the less robbery because it is done under the form of law and called taxation.

Today, under the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1957, Federal judges may order American citizens imprisoned and fined up to $300, without trial by jury.

Today, under contempt proceedings of questionable authority, American citizens may be imprisoned without trial by jury, for what amounts to freedom of speech. Is the denial of this right—the constitutional right of trial by jury—any more to be accepted in 1965 than in 1776?

Tomorrow, if the President's determination to force repeal of the Connally reservation is gratified, and we submit, withoue reservation, to an International Court of Justice, on which Communists will be in control, we may see American citizens arrested and haled before courts in various parts of the world, and the right of trial by jury, in the place where the alleged offense is committed, violated. What is urgently needed is a revolution in American thought, an appeal to public opinion to regain the freedoms as defined in the Constitution, and reverse the trend away from usurpation of power by Federal agencies, and centralization of government.

In these days when the present administration is not conforming to due process, but restoring to overwhelming force, coercion, and intimidation, to compel compliance with illegal and unconstitutional court decrees, distinctly not the law of the land, the public needs to be educated as to what the law is, not what the leftist-radicals claim it to be.

I have asked the President to call a national conference of the chief justices of the State supreme courts, and chief executives of the 50 States, for the purpose of determining, and curbing, Federal encroachment on States rights, and to define various aspects of Federal relations. In 1870, Alexander Stephens in a public speech, said that, had Mr. Lincoln called such a national conference of State and Federal officials, the War Between the States might have been averted. In the interest of preventing further encroachment by Federal agencies on the reserved rights and power of the States, I hope you will join with me, and interested organizations, in urging that the President act without delay in calling such a conference.

This is my suggested way of observing Law Day 1965.

Klan Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 14 the House authorized $50,000 for an investigation of the Ku Klux Klan by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I was unavoidably absent from the House on the occasion of that vote, Mr. Speaker, but I would like the RECORD to show that had I been present and voting, I would have opposed this additional authorization, just as I have consistently opposed any increase in appropriations for this committee.

Lest my absence from the House leave any doubt as to where I stand on the issue, Mr. Speaker, I request permission to have inserted as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Toledo Blade on April 17. I support and endorse the editorial position taken by the Blade—one of America's leading newspapers—and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

KLAN INVESTIGATION

Although the House of Representatives has voted overwhelmingly to give its Committee on Un-American Activities money for an investigation of the Ku Klux Klan, reservations and objections have been voiced about this assignment. Primarily they arise not from sympathy with the Klan but out of distrust of this particular committee.

Some are concerned lest what starts out to be an inquiry into the Klan may wind up as mostly a hunt for Communist influence within the civil rights movement. In recent years the Un-American Activities Committee concentrated on Communist subversion—tarring liberals with the Red brush in the process—and showed little interest in any other kind. Also the committee's past record of sensationalism and abuse of witnesses, and its poor showing in terms of actual legislation produced, raise the question whether it, rather than some other committee, should have been entrusted with the Klan investigation.

The subject of Communists attaching themselves to the civil rights movement would be bound to arise, quite apart from the committee's own predilections. After all, the Klan, and many southerners who do not belong to the Klan, have all along attempted to justify denial of justice to Negro citizens by damning the whole civil rights movement as a Communist conspiracy. So the big question is whether the House Un-American Activities Committee will be able to put any Communist influence, real or alleged, into perspective and resist the temptation to distort and exaggerate it.

Although five of the committee's nine members are southerners, a new member from Atlanta, Ga., did push for an investigation of the Klan even before President Johnson denounced this organization. And the committee announced February 12 that its staff was making a preliminary inquiry to determine whether an investigation should be made not only of the Ku Klux Klan, but of the Black Muslims, Minutemen, American Nazi Party, and similar groups on the right.

As to the House Un-American Activities Committee's methods, since this committee has for years been criticized for its high-handed treatment of witnesses in the name of anticommunism, and of seeking to punish people with whose views it disagreed by pillorying them on the witness stand, the committee should now be equally exhorted, in the Klan inquiry, to respect the investigative proprieties. The committee is not a court. Its legitimate function is to gather information that may be of legislative use in coping with the criminal violence and subversion of the law the Klan has been accused of fostering.

The large sums that the House has voted the House Un-American Activities Committee year after year to pursue its own often peculiar activities have not, it seems fair to say, necessarily reflected a high congressional regard for this committee's competence. The House Un-American Activities Committee has the opportunity now to polish up its tarnished image. It can do so by conducting the Klan inquiry with thoroughness, dispatch, and fairness—and by concentrating on trying to produce worthwhile legislative proposals instead of spectacle and propaganda.

A Comparison Between McLean Schools and Those in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has read the Washington Post in the last 6 months has read that the schools of the District of Columbia are a national scandal. Anyone who visits the schools here knows that the Post has not misstated the case.

The District school system does not have sufficient libraries or librarians. It does not have sufficient physical education facilities. It does not have sufficient classroom space or teachers. It does not have enough teachers with the special skills necessary to meet the special problems of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the District does have dedicated teachers and administrators and a population which needs and wants quality education for the children. The District of Columbia Citizens for Better Public Education, Inc., is working hard to help improve the District schools. One of the committees of this group recently interviewed Mr. Eugene E. Griffith, former principal of Anacostia High School in Washington, D.C., who is now principal of McLean High School, Fairfax County, Va., to get a comparison of the two school systems. Mrs. Harris Wofford and Mr. Harry Merican also took part in the interview on behalf of the District of Columbia Citizens for Better Public Education, Inc. I have, therefore, asked

unanimous consent that the notes of Mr. Griffith's interview as recorded by Mrs. Gilbert Harrison, committee chairman, be included in the RECORD.

The notes on the meeting with Mr. Eugene Griffith follow:

NOTES ON A MEETING WITH MR. EUGENE E. GRIFFITH, PRINCIPAL OF THE MCLEAN HIGH SCHOOL, FAIRFAX COUNTY, VA.

1. The two high schools have approximately the same number of pupils, around 1,780, but in Anacostia he had 10 or 11 fewer teachers.

2. For approximately 1,800 students in Anacostia he had two counselors, while in McLean he has six 9¾-month counselors, and one 11-month director of counseling and one half-time counselor. In Anacostia, the ratio of 900 children to one counselor meant teachers had to spend time on counseling to the detriment of their work. The counselors at Anacostia were overloaded to the point of impossibility.

3. McLean has a "visiting teacher" with social work training who is shared with two other schools and works with the counselors and the children's families when a child is in trouble. There is no such person in a District of Columbia high school.

4. McLean has one 11-month librarian and one 9¾-month librarian, with a library of 17,000 volumes. Anacostia has a library of 7,000 or 8,000 volumes and one librarian for 9 months. McLean also has 133 periodicals, many more than Anacostia.

5. Both high schools have two assistant principals, one for instruction and one for administration, but in McLean they have much more secretarial help and so can accomplish a great deal more. McLean has one 12-month secretary, one 10-month secretary, one 9¾-month guidance secretary, and one 11-month financial secretary. In Anacostia he had two clerks and a part-time book clerk on a per diem basis to check books out to teachers. In McLean the books are checked out by a teacher, which is not a good situation and he hopes to change it. They are also automated to some extent, and have a part-time data-processing person. McLean handles more money and has a more decentralized bookkeeping system than the District, so more financial work has to be done there than in Anacostia. It is the secretarial help that he wishes he had had in Anacostia.

6. Mr. Griffith felt very strongly that the uniform pay scale in the District was unfair to the prinicpals of junior and senior high schools. He feels that in the high schools which have much bigger plants and more children, and where the principals have more responsibility they should be paid more. Although he earns approximately the same amount as he did at Anacostia, he feels his status is better in McLean.

7. In Anacostia, athletics are handled by the principal because there is no athletic director. In McLean there is an athletic director who supervises the coaches and the teams, and there is an assistant director for girls. In the District of Columbia, the girls get very little athletics at all.

8. In McLean, teachers get extra pay for doing various extra jobs, such as coaching teams, supervising the yearbook, and being chairman of a particular department. The chairman of the science department gets pay for an extra period of work a day for doing this job. In the District of Columbia, all such extra jobs were on the teachers' own time, except for athletics. In athletics, the District of Columbia teachers can get some compensatory time off in exchange for their athletic work, but not enough to carry them through the year. Therefore, the teachers do the work until their compensatory time is used up and then someone else takes over. This makes for lack of continuity and raises the pupil-teacher ratio in a way that the statistics do not reflect.

9. The band master in McLean gets extra pay for instructing the band. The music program in Anacostia was poorly supported.

10. Permanent teachers in the District of Columbia schools are required to have an M.A. while McLean has slightly lower requirements. However, the teachers in McLean are capable, young, and enthusiastic. The working situation in McLean lends itself to more enthusiasm and harder work. The working conditions in Anacostia are more difficult and the teachers frequently are exhausted at the end of the day. "The thing that made me leave the District of Columbia was 60 children in the classroom. Congress didn't appropriate money until December in 1963 and we taught double- and triple-sized classes all fall."

11. There are more and better organized supervisors in the District of Columbia than in Fairfax County. Each subject has a supervisor, which is not true in Fairfax County. But Fairfax County is quicker to update its curriculum and use new methods.

12. The pupil-teacher ratio in Fairfax County high schools is 22 to 1. In the District a ratio is claimed of 25 to 1, but Mr. Griffith feels it is closer to 30 or 35 to 1. "In the District of Columbia the academic track is the one that suffers." McLean is highly oriented toward college—about 80 percent of the children plan to go. This is probably true only in Wilson High School in the District of Columbia. All the others would have a lower percentage.

13. Fairfax County schools have a full-time public relations officer who sees to it that notices of changes in personnel in the schools get into the papers, etc. Mr. Griffith feels very strongly that this kind of psychic income is necessary for teachers, particularly when they work under the difficult conditions of the District of Columbia schools. He said that not a single paper had carried a story about his retirement or his new job in McLean and cited other examples of this lack.

14. In summary, Mr. Griffith felt that he has much more help of various kinds in McLean (he cited the fact that he has a small travel allowance) than in the District of Columbia, and therefore fewer frustrations. Implied in all the conversation was the fact that with an 80 percent orientation toward college, a larger percent of students were brighter and easier to teach. But the corollary that was also implied, was that where the District of Columbia conditions are worse, even more staff is necessary, particularly in such areas as counseling and clerical help.

J. Stewart Riley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I note the passing of Mr. J. Stewart Riley.

He had been a great force for the progress of southern Indiana for almost a quarter of a century. In his role as publisher of two excellent daily newspapers, he contributed in the finest tradition of journalism to the growth and development of this area.

Among many eloquent tributes to Mr. Riley, I would like to include in the RECORD the following from the Indianapolis News:

J. STEWART RILEY

Southern Indiana has lost a stanch supporter and a vigorous leader in the death of J. Stewart Riley.

Although not a native Hoosier, Riley loved his adopted State of Indiana and, as publisher of two leading southern Indiana newspapers, did a tremendous service for that area of the State in which he lived.

He moved to Bedford in 1942, where he bought the Bedford Daily Mail and Daily Times, merging them into the Bedford Times-Mail. He established the Bloomington Daily Herald which subsequently was merged to become the Bloomington Herald-Telephone.

As publisher, Riley exercised the responsibility of his position with good judgment and consideration for the welfare of the communities served by his newspapers. He saw the great potentialities of rugged and beautiful southern Indiana and, to help realize them, founded Southern Indiana, Inc. This was an organization to promote conservation, tourism, and establishment of new industries.

A man of energy and wide interests, Riley was also concerned with education. He served as trustee of Indiana University from 1957 to 1963. A former high school teacher, he had been trustee of Rockford (Ill.) College, in the city where he was born.

Riley was a man who vigorously supported causes in which he believed and if events proved him mistaken, he was quick to admit it.

The respect in which he was held by fellow newspapermen is indicated by his selection as president and chairman of the board of the Inland Daily Press Association. He held membership in many professional, civic, and fraternal organizations.

It was fortunate for Indiana that J. Stewart Riley moved to our State in 1942. His death at 66 has removed one of our leading citizens.

From the Indianapolis Star:

A HOOSIER PUBLISHER

A publisher in a one-newspaper town has many temptations and a big responsibility. J. Stewart Riley showed that he could resist the temptations and carry the responsibility with strength to spare.

Much of southern Indiana journalism was still creaking along in horse-and-buggy fashion in the 1940's when this tall, spare, witty native of Illinois became a transplanted Hoosier and formed the Bedford Times-Mail and the Bloomington daily Herald-Telephone.

He hired seasoned, capable editors and energetic young reporters and gave them a free hand. He approached the daily news with seriousness, humor, and zest. He liked to be involved. He insisted that both sides of a story be told. He put high value on individual judgment. To a young reporter who once asked, "How much space should I give this story," he answered tersely, "What it's worth."

"Stew" Riley was a man of strong personal opinions and a gusto that made him throw himself wholeheartedly into controversies and projects. He helped breath new life into southern Indiana's limestone industry. He fought successfully for a Grade A milk program in Bedford. As a founder of Southern Indiana, Inc., he helped build industry in southern Indiana, promoted fuller development of the area's grazing, dairy, and agricultural resources and spread the fame of the colorful southern Hoosier hill country as a tourist region.

He might show up anywhere—at a city council meeting, political rally, auction, county fair, 4-H exhibit or farm crop demonstration.

"Stew" Rileys newspapers set standards at once high and lively in an important field of daily journalism. His papers accurately reflect life in their communities and offer leadership.

They have helped lead the way for what once was called country journalism in the not-always-easy transition from the age of old Dobbin to the era of *Gemini 4*—under the hand of a man of character.

And from his own Bloomington, Ind., Herald-Telephone:

FAITH

Stewart Riley's message was faith.

It took him through a remarkable life.

Not once did it waiver.

Decisions came easy to Stewart Riley, because he had long ago computed the standard for making them, based upon honor, integrity, fairness, kindness and, yes, fearlessness.

The word, dilemma, was not in his vocabulary. He had no patience with indecision.

Nor small talk.

To have taught so many so much, he was always the student, piercing the problems of the day like an X-ray—reading, searching.

He was long on faith in the family unit. He quoted the teachings of his father verbatim as he went about living up to the hopes his parents had in him. His wife, a full partner. And all this goes on for yet another generation.

Incalculable is the force of his faith on his community. It has challenged Bloomington, Indiana University, Bedford, his family, friends, professional associates across the land.

Thank God there are newspapers, for, without them, he would have been lost. Or, at least, his wisdom might not have touched those who read.

A delight was investing in stocks and bonds. It was simply that he had faith in the American free-enterprise system.

Yet, his greatest investment was in people. When he wrote, he sought to help them. But there were those individuals in need who came for help—wisdom, faith, or money, or all three—and they never left empty-handed.

Certainly not complacent. Always a goal. His house always in order. A firm, sound base. Modern. Resolute. Kind.

Stewart Riley was tolerant of another viewpoint, but absolutely intolerant of the lack of one.

A Herald-Telephone reader last week wrote critically of the newspaper but commented, in closing, "At least you have a beautiful building."

This reader could not have touched closer to Mr. Riley's pride, his knowing that the new Herald-Telephone building stood as a sturdy monument to the progress and vitality he so wanted for Bloomington.

He liked to illustrate his formula for community growth with a comment: "What any town needs is a few fires and a few funerals." Stewart Riley feared neither.

The Herald-Telephone is the image of Stewart Riley—the product of his faith.

It will continue in his tradition, to the eternal credit of this man.

Preserve Pictured Rocks Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Detroit, Mich., News of Thursday, June 3, 1965, urging the preservation of Pictured Rocks Area of the Upper Peninsula of the State of Michigan as a national park.

This fine editorial well sets out the support of our people of the State of Michigan for a national park in the Pictured Rocks Area.

The editorial follows:

PRESERVE PICTURED ROCKS AREA

Forty years ago the News editorially supported a proposal to make the Pictured Rocks area of the Upper Peninsula into a park. Unfortunately nothing came of the idea, and today the land remains primarily in private hands.

It is, perhaps, little short of a miracle that the Pictured Rocks area has remained almost totally unspoiled in the intervening years. A combination of economic troubles, enlightened owners, and natural isolation has somehow spared the area.

Again this year an attempt is being made in Congress to have 67,000 acres set aside as a Pictured Rocks National Park. Pending further information as might develop at a public hearing, it would appear the proposal would permit normal hunting and fishing activity and carefully controlled lumbering over much of the inland sections.

Today access to the area is severely limited. Tourist boats are available in nearby Munising from which views may be had of the spectacular granite cliffs arching over icy Lake Superior. But from the inland side of the rocks, only a few rutted sandy lanes penetrate the forest, and then only partially.

For the more rugged hiker, tramping along the 38-mile stretch of coastline from Munising to Grand Marais offers rewards as wondrous as anywhere this side of the Rocky Mountains. Whole forests of white birch, countless waterfalls, and jewel-like lakes make it one of the Nation's loveliest areas.

Preservation of the Alger County site as a national park would permit its gradual development for recreational purposes in keeping with its rich natural beauty. It would certainly mean added tourist revenue for the hard-pressed Upper Peninsula. Careful attention to the needs of the local interests would prevent Federal ownership from impinging unfairly on present landholders.

But most of all, it would help conserve a unique natural resource for other generations. For better or for worse, the next 40 years are not likely to pass without leaving some mark on the Pictured Rocks.

The Pacific Community: Let's Hear More About It

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, this Representative has long been calling for a closer look by my fellow Americans at the ever expanding opportunities presented by the tremendous progress now being achieved in Asia. Sadly, however, news of Asian adversity all too often obscures news of Asian achievement. The happier view of progress in Asia generally lies hidden behind headlines of gloom and news of disaster. We constantly read of war in Vietnam, confrontation in the Strait of Malacca, tension in the Formosa Straits, or earthquakes and mine disasters in Japan. As a result when we Americans think of Asia we usually think of trouble. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is important for us to know and comprehend the story of troubles in Asia. For in a world made so tiny by missiles and jet planes that there is no longer any such thing as a "far off place," the problems of Asians have become more than ever the problems of Americans. But, Mr. Speaker, it is equally imperative for us to know the "other" story of Asia—the story of increasing progress and prosperity, of millions of people moving vigorously toward a better life for themselves and for their children. This is an exciting story. Mr. Speaker; it tells of glittering opportunities for America in Asia, and I think that all Americans should know about it and take cognizance of it.

I am therefore absolutely delighted, Mr. Speaker, that the Washington Post saw fit to devote an entire 16-page section of its Sunday, June 6, edition to this "other" story of Asia. The section is entitled "Pacific World," and the opening headline proclaims: "Nations Rimming Ocean Are Surging Ahead." The lead page of the section calls attention to the fact that, "An economic revolution of major importance is occurring in the countries of the Pacific Ocean," and observes that they "are now developing faster than many of those in the Western World." The lead articles note further that, and I quote:

> The Pacific represents new frontier societies, new governments faced with the enormous challenge of meeting the needs of their peoples. These peoples know that as a result of the intercourse of the smaller, modern world, their children's future need not necessarily be the same one of hunger, illiteracy, and physical exhaustion that they have had, and that their parents and grandparents had before them.

Then, in a series of articles these forward surging nations of the Pacific pass in review. Led by Japan who in 20 short years has dramatically risen from the ashes of military defeat to become a mighty economic giant and "the third pillar of the free world," it is truly a spectacular, exciting, colorful parade of countries on their way up: Australia, rich in oil and minerals; Taiwan, whose economic and agricultural achievements are the talk of the Orient; the Philippines, progressing steadily forward; Korea, struggling successfully to pull itself ever upward; Malaysia, the world's leading producer of rubber and marching "second only to Japan in economic strength and stability"; Thailand, where ever increasing surplus crops are being harvested and where budding industries are sprouting everywhere; Little New Zealand, the world's largest exporter of lamb, mutton, butter, and cheese; and tiny Hong Kong, the "jewel of the Pacific" where the "piledrivers have drowned out the yells of the hawkers."

In these articles opportunities for the American entrepreneur in Asia do not go unmentioned. For here is the great potential of a market composed of almost 240 million people. Here, and again I quote from the Post, are:

The attractions of governments gaining in stability, of a rising middle class with the healthy appetites of the middle class, of official policies that encourage the establishment of pioneer industries and of a market for a widening variety of goods—a market that is close to the source of the primary materials, to modern factories, to cheap and trainable labor and to the good ports of the Pacific Ocean.

This then, Mr. Speaker, is the other story of Asia. It is dramatic. It is exciting. And it is terribly important for America. It tells of rapid industrialization and rising incomes, of developing markets and expanding opportunities. It tells of the emergence of what I call "The Pacific Community"—a community composed of the free nations of Asia and the Americas no longer separated by a great ocean but instead drawn closer together by it. The United States is an integral part of that community. Mr. Speaker, and my own State of California serves as the great window of the United States on the Pacific. This is a young community, and its great vigor has been dramatically attested to by statistics released on January 15 of this year by the Department of Commerce. These statistics, based on a survey of America's 1963 exports, showed that, and I quote the report:

California has displaced New York as the top exporter of manufactured goods.

Moreover, statistics also show Japan as one of America's biggest customers; that country is certainly far and away California's best customer, buying over 45 percent of my State's waterborne exports. Conversely, Japan is California's single biggest supplier. America and California are thus deeply involved in the Pacific community, Mr. Speaker. We are all benefiting greatly from the tremendous trade that is going on in this area, and we are enriching our cultural horizons as a result of increased contact with east Asian civilization. But, I submit that with respect to the mighty potential of the Pacific community, we have only begun to scratch the surface. Within the Pacific community, Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing an exciting phenomenon—a chain of development is taking place, and I believe that this is providing the basic force behind the upward movement of the entire membership of the Pacific community. The Washington Post article by Joseph Paull superbly describes the dynamics of this chain of development:

Undeveloped countries are becoming developed countries and developed countries are becoming sophisticated. The movement is up the scale, rapid and accelerating.

As development and industrialization occur, there is a simultaneous tendency toward nationalism on the one hand and regionalism on the other. Here are countries which are learning to substitute the dignity of self-reliance for the dependency of colonialism.

At the same time, farmers are learning to appreciate the security of a cash return as against the perils of a hand-to-mouth subsistence. As the middle class rises, it develops its own sources of power.

Wealth is being poured into these countries and is being translated into factories, dams, highways, and skyscrapers. Manpower is being used more effectively and more government brainpower is being devoted to economic planning, finance, and industrialization.

Mr. Speaker, this dynamic chain of development signals that a great victory is being won within the Pacific community over economic poverty and social stagnation. America has been a decisive factor in that victory and we can justly share in its glories. American business and American government have played and are continuing to play a great role in Asia, and we as Americans can indeed be proud of that role. But primary credit must certainly go to the peoples of Pacific Asia who have put our help to good use, who are building island and peninsular showcases of prosperity and progress throughout Asia. Those people are working hard, Mr. Speaker; they are working 10 and 12 hours a day, 6½ and 7 days a week. And they are succeeding. They are dramatically demonstrating that free enterprise and hard work, not communism, constitute the real wave of the future. We cheer their progress. We salute their achievements. We earnestly hope for their continued success. For we are all neighbors in the Pacific community. Their success is our success.

And, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Washington Post for bringing word of this great story to its reading public. In so doing, it has performed a truly outstanding service for America. I hope that the "Pacific World" section will be widely read. I also hope that the Post will continue to bring us news of this kind about Asia. More than that, I hope that other newspapers and other news media will emulate the Post in this regard. Let us hear more news of the great story of Asian progress and development. We need to know.

Statement Before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, June 3, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the text of my statement before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress on June 3, 1965.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS, DEMOCRAT, OF INDIANA, BEFORE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS, JUNE 3, 1965

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. The hearings and work of this committee are among the most important enterprises before the 89th Congress and I am glad to have been one of the cosponsors of the resolution authorizing this effort. Surely one of the critical tests of the greatness of any institution is its capacity for self-appraisal. That Congress is willing to take a long and careful look at its own procedures and practices is evidence of the continued vitality and viability of the legislative branch of our Government.

We are fortunate indeed that the cochairmen, and other members, of this committee bring such vast experience to this undertaking. Senator MONRONEY has once before in his legislative career contributed decisively to reappraisals of congressional organization, and my fellow Hoosier and dean of my delegation, Congressman RAY MADDEN, brings to this task his many years of experience in Congress and as a member of the important Committee on Rules.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak today not only as a Member of Congress, now serving his seventh year in the House of Representatives. I wish also to comment on the place of Congress in the National Government from my experience as a political scientist and as a college teacher of American government. As a teacher, I used to discuss the role of Congress as a check and balance participant in our National Government. As a Member of Congress, I have come to appreciate that the importance of maintaining an effective check and balance system is matched only by the difficulty. It is easy enough to say that the three branches of the National Government are coordinate and equal; but it is a continuing responsibility, and an extraordinarily difficult one, for the National Legislature to find ways of safeguarding its own place in the check and balance system. Not only in this country, but in governments around the world, legislatures and parliaments are challenged by the increasing power of executive branches, and my experience as a Member of the House has reinforced the thesis that I used to try to communicate to my students, namely, that one of the purposes of Congress is to be an effective and viable participant in our system of checks and balances.

I want to address myself to one aspect of the congressional role in the checks and balance system that seems to me to be of increasing importance.

I refer to the responsibility of Congress for what the political scientists call "oversight of administration", and I here cite the language of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1947, which declares that Congress shall exercise "continuous watchfulness over administration of the laws".

With the passage of new welfare and education bills which authorize programs of large sums of money and which involve new patterns of relationships among Federal, State, and local governments as well as private agencies, Congress will, in my judgment, find it increasingly important to exercise this task of overseeing the administration of the new laws. I refer, for example, to such programs as the Economic Opportunity Act, the Appalachian Act, and the Elementary and Secondary School Act.

I realize that the appropriations subcommittees, especially in the House, have historically been most active in carrying out this responsibility of oversight. But it seems to me that the legislative or authorizing committees must, for the reasons I have suggested, anticipate a more vigorous role as watchdogs of the administration of the laws they have produced. I would add that the more initiative in the drafting of legislation passes to the executive branch, the more important this function of oversight by Congress will become.

Yet Congress is not as well equipped as it should be to do the job of overseeing the administration. In this respect it is ironic that we authorize the President and the heads of executive agencies to name many advisory councils and committees of experts outside Government to monitor Federal programs but we are reluctant to provide ourselves in Congress with enough qualified staff to enable us to do our own evaluating in a thorough way. I may say that there is a growing

feeling among members of the House Education and Labor Committee that if we are going to authorize advisory councils to the Office of Education to review education programs, we should authorize at least one advisory council of nongovernmental experts to our own committee to make studies and recommendations with respect to programs within the jurisdiction of the committee.

But Congress must do more than check and balance the executive branch in the conduct of our national affairs. Surely we have as well the equally important task of making creative contributions to public policy. Congress is not only an institution for overseeing the Executive's conduct of affairs, or for legitimating proposals and decisions arrived at by members of the executive branch. It is also of great importance that Congress play a full part in the legislative process by initiating ideas and offering constructive proposals for dealing with the critical problems our Nation faces.

I think it is worth examining for a few moments the experience of Congress and the Nation in the 20th century with respect to achieving both these overriding goals: helping to maintain the check-and-balance system and making creative contributions to solutions of public problems. I am frank to say that I think we are barely holding our own. To be sure, individual Congressmen make important contributions to public policy and to balancing the executive role in national life. But as an institution, I believe that forces are at work that challenge the future of Congress as a creative and initiating institution in national politics. Many of these forces are inevitable, although the decline of Congress is not inevitable. Around the world, in other countries, parliamentary bodies have confronted the same forces, but with regrettably less success than we have mastered them in this country.

The forces I refer to are not subversive or darkly hidden; they are the inevitable consequences of the complex problems and difficulties of modern policymaking. Let me say that I think there is virtually a consensus among political scientists and students of government that more and more power is being shifted from the legislative to the executive branch.

Let me here interject that I appreciate that there are understandable reasons for the increased power of the executive branch in our Government not only with respect to initiating legislation, but generally. Two world wars, a depression, the cold war, the general acceptance of a wider role for government in modern industrial society—these are some of the factors which have enhanced the power of the President and the executive branch vis-a-vis Congress.

Power in itself is not dangerous; it is dangerous only when it is unchecked and unbalanced by other sources and centers of power. What disturbs me is that Congress is less and less an effective source of new ideas and of the initiation of legislation and more and more has had to fall back on the role of amending, accepting, or legitimating proposals brought to it by the executive. More and more often legislation is drafted first in the executive departments and then submitted to Congress for its acceptance, amendment, or rejection. This is true not only in the immensely complex fields of foreign affairs and defense policy, but in the traditionally domestic realms of national policymaking; such as education, labor, and transportation. If Congress is to be a full partner in the check and balance system, and if it is to make creative contributions to public policy, it must, it seems to me, not only legitimate and check, but it must initiate and propose. The business of Congress is not, in my view, simply to dispose of what the President proposes but to propose as well.

One of the principal factors, of course, that contributes to the threatening decline of Congress is that the problems that now cross the desk of a Congressman and come into the hearing rooms of our committees are more complex and numerous than ever before and involve often highly complicated information and debatable interpretations of that information.

President Kennedy used to say that a Member of Congress in the early 19th century needed to be informed about only three public problems, internal improvements, the tariff, and slavery. If a man came to Congress in the early 1800's and served 20 or 30 years, he would have very few important matters to pass on other than these three. And what he learned about each of them in his first years in Congress served him in good stead for the rest of his congressional career.

Would that the life of a modern legislator were as simple as in the days of Webster and Calhoun. The agenda of Congress not only consists of many more than three perennial problems, but it is constantly shifting. One year it is renewal of the trade agreements program; another year it is education; another year it is transportation. And mixed in with these problems of vast national and international scope are many others of great technicality and immense subtlety. The speeches that we make in our freshman years in Congress soon perish; they are hardly relevant to the needs of our later years.

The implication of the complexity of public problems is that the executive branch, with its bureaucratic advantages, is better organized than Congress for dealing with such problems. To be sure, Congress is not as bad off as it was in 1946, thanks to the La Follette-Monroney Act. The reduction in the number of committees, and the reorganization of committee jurisdiction, and the creation of professional committee staffs helped to slow down the decline of Congress, but as the appointment of this joint committee signifies, the tide still runs against us.

That public problems are changing and growing more complex is never more dramatically felt than with respect to those policies and problems relating to science. The world is undergoing a knowledge explosion as vast and troublesome as the population explosion. In the sciences, fields and disciplines merge and change, curriculums go out of date, and much of the education that many of us had before we came to Congress seems less and less pertinent to the demands now placed upon us.

Unfortunately, we cannot expect Members of Congress to bring with them skills sufficient to cover all of the many complex issues that face us. Consider scientific problems again. As we all know, it is relatively easy for a lawyer or a businessman, or even a college professor of government, to move in and out of politics, to spend a few years in Congress or in the service of the executive branch and then to return to his other career. But for a scientist in the laboratory to depart from his natural habitat for a term or two in Congress is virtually to forsake his career as a scientist. For by the time he returns to his laboratory, the structure of his professional knowledge will have so changed that he will have missed out on many important new developments. We are unlikely to expect to have among our colleagues many men with the technical training to advise us on the difficult and knotty questions of science and policy.

We must, therefore, look for ways to provide ourselves with sufficient staff or other forms of assistance to make up for our natural disadvantages.

For if Congress is to contribute effectively and creatively to the shaping of public policy, it is essential that we in Congress as well as officials in the executive branch should be thinking, searchingly and critically, about the great issues that face our country and the world.

It seems to me therefore imperative that we maintain a flow of ideas between the elected politicians in Washington and the intellectual community throughout the Nation.

This is a much more difficult enterprise for Congress than it is for the executive branch. The executive agencies, most obviously the procurers of scientific knowledge, such as the Defense Department, NASA, the AEC, and the National Institutes of Health, have direct links with both university-based thinkers and people at the Rand-type institutes and the great foundations.

I think we must do more to improve the relationship between the scholars and the legislators. I think we should consider, for example, the proposal of the then Senator HUMPHREY in 1963 for a new arm of Congress—what he called a "Congressional Institute"—a group of scholars selected by their peers, who would serve Congress as "a pool of knowledge, thought, and expertise."

Such a group could help Congress to think ahead about the problems we all know will be with us in the coming decade—the Atlantic Alliance, population growth, tax policy, Federal-State relations, China, international peacekeeping machinery.

A group of scholars serving from 1 to 3 years could rotate to Washington from our best universities and thereby maintain a flow of ideas both in Congress and in the university community. But for such a project to be effective, it would have to be more than a front operation. It would have to be of very high quality.

I think no one would quarrel with the proposition that the Library of Congress, as presently organized, is not able to provide Members of Congress with such knowledge, thought, and expertise, nor, I must add in all fairness, is it expected to. But the problem is still there.

Not only are we overwhelmed by complicated information in vast amounts, and not only is the executive branch much better organized for processing these vast resources than we are, and for initiating access to the thinkers of the country, but in our inevitable specialization to deal with these problems, we neglect another side of policymaking processes. I refer to the capacity of Congress—or lack of it—to integrate and combine our specialities in to some relatively comprehensive view of public problems. Often I hear Members of Congress complain that only part of the problem comes before them and their committees. Other parts of the problem fall within the jurisdiction of other committees. We have seen in recent years the way in which foreign policy merges into defense policy and defense policy overlaps foreign policy. Yet we have two committees to deal with these subjects but no single committee to take a comprehensive view of their interrelations. Likewise, tariff and trade policies, with important foreign policy implications, are handled by the Ways and Means Committee. In my own committee, the Committee on Education and Labor, we have jurisdiction over national educational policy, but the work of the National Science Foundation, which makes such important contributions to education and research, falls under the jurisdiction of the Science and Astronautics Committee, and there is little communication between the committees.

I believe that the explanation for the relative diminution of legislative power vis-a-vis the executive lies in large measure in these two conditions, first, the increasing complexity and amount of information about public problems, for which the executive is

better organized than Congress, and second, in the overspecialization of Congress and the minimum of facilities we have for integrating policy in a comprehensive fashion.

If we look to the future and assume that no changes are made in current legislative practices, what can we expect? I think we can only expect these trends to continue. I cannot imagine that the problems confronting modern government will grow any simpler or any less numerous. I cannot believe that information available to policymakers will decrease; it can only increase. Fortunately we need not expect things to get worse before they get better. The work of the Joint Committee on The Organization of Congress will hopefully lead to some innovations in legislative procedure that can help us check the tide and contribute to Congress' effectiveness in the check and balance system and as a creative contributor to national policy.

I have already offered a few modest suggestions for strengthening our capacity to handle the problems that confront us.

I have suggested that congressional committees be less hesitant to name advisory councils of nongovernmental experts to advise them on legislative programs within their jurisdiction.

A related suggestion, for which ample precedent already exists in a number of congressional committees, is that committees consider holding seminars or special panels at times other than when specific legislation is under consideration. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report, the Ways and Means Committee, the Committee on Aeronautical Sciences, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have, in varying ways, instituted such a practice. Sometimes the procedure is for a small panel of experts to gather for the discussion of a paper or a document written by a member of the panel. On other occasions, a larger group convenes to hear a preliminary statement by a member of the committee or a member of the seminar panel, and afterward other panelists and committee members discuss the problems raised in the initial presentation.

I believe that such seminars, drawing upon the talents in and out of Congress, would help us not so much in our day-to-day decisions about legislation but in anticipating problems that we are likely to confront next year or the year after and furthermore would give us broad perspectives, if not concrete details, from which to consider both current and future policy issues.

In a similar vein, I urge that congressional committees make greater use of the research resources in universities and private organizations. What the Rand Corp. has done for the Air Force is something that might profitably be undertaken by some legislative committees. I refer to the commissioning or contracting of studies and reports by private research firms or universities. Earlier I referred to the knowledge explosion that has swept our century. Executive agencies take advantage of contracting for the advice and research of the Nation's leading scholars, but we have not always been so alert to having these materials made available to us in Congress.

There is, of course, precedent for such investigations and studies. For example, the Committee on Foreign Relations several times has conducted excellent studies of current and future problems of foreign affairs. And the Commission on Money and Credit and the Hoover Commissions similarly undertook contract research. This is one way of bringing fresh insight to Congress, without burdening the committees with enormous research staffs.

The suggestions I have made, advisory councils to congressional committees, a congressional institute, committee seminars, the use of research consultants, and also increased staff for individual Members, are intended to contribute to an improvement in our sources of information and judgment about contemporary problems. Such proposals would go some way, I am sure, toward making us more effective partners in the system of checks and balances and in initiating solutions to important public problems.

But as I indicated earlier, I think we also need to find ways of integrating and combining our specialized information in more intelligent ways. As I noted, I am concerned about subjects that fall between two committees. We are all familiar with the disjuncture that occurs when the authorizing committees study a matter in great detail and then see the House adopt a policy, only to find that when the Appropriations Committee brings in its bill to pay for the programs, the policy has been significantly altered or the program reduced. I think there is very little we can do about coordinating the authorizing committees and the Appropriations Committees, but there may be some other steps we can take to coordinate the work of the legislative committees.

For example, I would urge the Joint Committee to recommend that the leaderships of both Houses increase the staff facilities and resources available to the majority and minority leaders. I think we have to look to our leadership to consider the work of the committees not committee by committee but in a somewhat comprehensive and universal way. In the days when the present occupant of the White House was the majority leader of the Senate he began to create precisely this kind of staff that could comprehensively follow the work of the Senate. He was, however, obligated to create such a staff out of his various committee assignments instead of employing a staff directly at the service of the majority leader.

I hope that when the Joint Committee meets with the leadership of the two Houses it will explore ways in which their staffs may be augmented to monitor the work of Congress as a whole.

Likewise, I think there are some other steps that can be taken to coordinate effectively the work of committees with similar responsibilities. Without radically altering the committee structure, I think something might be done by which committees such as those on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services could meet together from time to time to consider ways in which their policies intersect with each other. Of course, I do not propose that one committee dominate the other, but rather that the two committees discuss subject matters that are related to each other.

I have already suggested meetings at which at least some members of the Education and Labor and Science and Astronautics Committees of the House could on occasion discuss problems that touch directly the work of both their committees.

Opportunities for joint discussions of other problems by other committees will easily suggest themselves.

I wish to conclude my remarks by urging upon the committee the value of undertaking additional research on Congress. I am sure that the committee will draw on the wisdom and experience of many Members of Congress. I am sure that it will also draw on the work of students of Congress. In addition to this, I recommend that the committee seriously consider commissioning further research on Congress. As a former teacher of government, and as an admirer of the work some political scientists have done to date in studying Congress, I cannot help saying that we are still short of the adequate knowledge we need to assess the strength and weakness of this body.

The American Political Science Association, under a grant from the Carnegie Corp. of New York, has already taken a major step to increase the availability of scholarly and scientific research on Congress. I refer to "The Study of Congress," under the direction of Prof. Ralph Huitt, of the University of Wisconsin. Those studies, however, are reasonably small and are not likely to be completed by the time that this committee completes its work. I am sure, however, that the committee could engage, in consulting capacities, the research skills of a number of able political scientists to participate in committee studies that could be completed during the 89th Congress.

In any such research, I would urge this committee to collect information on the way other legislative bodies conduct their business. An inventory of the parliamentary practices and procedures of democratic legislatures around the world might be quite useful to the committee. Something like this has already been undertaken in a study for the New Jersey State Legislature by the Eagleton Institute of Politics.

Mr. Chairman, many other Members of Congress have testified before this committee and have made suggestions for improving the organization of Congress. I have made no effort to repeat all the laudable suggestions you have heard but have touched on only a few ideas that seem to me worthy of consideration.

I would like to go on record, however, as endorsing the proposed 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives. I shall not here rehearse all the arguments for this proposal; they must be familiar by now and I think they are compelling.

I would like also to endorse the proposal of our colleagues, Congressmen BOLLING and UDALL, for a modification of the present seniority system in selecting committee chairmen. The suggestion that members of the majority caucus should be able, on a secret ballot, to vote for one of the top three majority members as chairman of each committee seems to me at once to respect the real values of the seniority system while providing a greater degree of responsiveness on the part of the committee chairmen to the Members of the House of Representatives.

Spouses' Annuities Under Railroad Retirement Act of 1937

SPEECH

OF

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to speak for a bill that is before the House that will benefit women. The purpose of the bill is to permit the spouse of a railroad employee to receive a spouse's annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act along with any social security benefits she might have accrued.

I feel, where the women have rightfully earned social security benefits, they should not be penalized by a law that prohibits them to enjoy these benefits simply because they happened to marry a railroader.

As the wife of a railroader and as an employee under social security, the women should have the right to benefit from retirement benefits like anyone else. There should be no discrimination made against them, simply because their husband's job comes under the Railroad Retirement Act.

It has been brought out that the amount involved, some $14 million, would

not have an adverse effect on the retirement fund itself. Therefore, I wholeheartedly support this legislation which will not penalize an American woman just because she happened to be married to a railroader who is covered under the Railroad Retirement Act rather than some other pension or retirement system.

Cadet Daniel W. Christman: Top of His Class at U.S. Military Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, at the invitation of the Defense Department, I today attended the graduation exercises of the 1965 class of the U.S. Military Academy, at West Point, N.Y.

I always consider it a great privilege to attend any ceremony at this great institution but this visit transcended any previous visit for the top graduating cadet was from my congressional district and had been named for the entrance examination by me.

I do not claim any special honor for this for I feel certain that any Member of this Congress who had reviewed the scholastic record of Daniel W. Christman would have felt that he would make a fine officer in our Armed Forces.

As I reviewed his record and endorsements, in 1961, I could not but feel that Dan Christman was a dedicated and patriotic youth. He early showed his leadership qualities in Boy Scout work.

Daniel Christman had a very fine scholastic record at Western Reserve Academy in Hudson, Ohio. Here was proof that extracurricular activities do not detract from educational values.

He was not only an outstanding athlete but played in his school orchestra.

His record at the U.S. Military Academy was outstanding. A cadet captain, he was in the top bracket in all of his classes for the entire 4 years of his West Point training. Today, he was honored as being the top cadet amongst the 596 graduating class.

We may be certain that the future defense of the United States is secure as long as we are graduating men of the caliber of Lt. Daniel W. Christman.

I was also deeply impressed with the fine address of Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Wheeler's record, both as a combat and administrative officer, could well be an inspiration to all of the cadets at West Point.

His address follows:

A RARE PRIVILEGE

(Address by General Wheeler)

Thirty-three years ago, come tomorrow, I was sitting in the seat occupied today by Cadet Koropey, except that the class of 1932 was assembled at the Battle Monument rather than in Michie Stadium. Perhaps I am putting myself too far forward in the array of seats because our class numbered only 262 compared with the 596 graduating today, so proportionately speaking, my relative class standing would have put me in Cadet Fligg's chair.

In any case, on that day in 1932 I certainly did not expect to be standing here today—or any day, for that matter—giving the commencement address. In fact, I did not foresee very many of the things which have happened during the intervening 33 years.

Frankly, aside from the scientific marvel of man having just achieved the speed of 400 miles an hour in an airplane, my thoughts on June 10, 1932, were basically that the world was in rather sad shape; world affairs seemed to me to be in more turmoil than they have ever been. And, gentlemen, I reckon this same thought is in the minds of most of you today, just as I suspect it has been in the minds of each graduating class during the last 33 years—and during the 100-plus commencement exercises prior to 1932.

Every generation seemingly believes that the sky is falling on them. For example, a well-known writer once expressed his feelings about youth and juvenile delinquency in these words: "Our youth now love to indulge themselves, they have bad manners, contempt for authority, disrespect for older people. Young people nowadays are tyrants. They no longer rise when older people enter the room. They contradict their parents, chatter before company, gobble their food, and tyrannize the teachers."

That sounds like many an article written recently, doesn't it? Well, it is not. It was written by Socrates about the year 420 B.C. I think it is a revealing example of just how little people change as the years go by.

You gentlemen are probably only imperfectly aware of the problems facing the world on June 10, 1932. The most urgent and widespread problem, of course, was the great depression which was at its height (or depth) all over the world. The "bonus marchers" were descending on Washington demanding that Congress authorize $2 billion in cash for immediate payment to World War I veterans. The unemployed numbered many millions and one of the jokes of the day commented that "at last this country has arrived at equal division of capital and labor. Nobody can find any work and nobody has any money." Unfortunately, this was literally true in communities throughout the Nation and the world.

I remember that one of the horrible examples cited in the Literary Digest—the Time and Newsweek of that day—was that young women seeking to enter the clothing trade in Connecticut were hired as apprentices for only 10 cents a week. If they made the grade, they received the munificent wage of between $3 and $5 a week.

But the economic depression was not the only thing troubling the world in June 1932. Europe was already alarmed by the rapid rise of Hitler. The week I was graduated, Heinrich Bruening, a middle-of-the-road Democrat was replaced as Chancellor of Germany by Fritz von Papen who was widely and correctly feared to be a Hitler man. The Communist threat was also becoming increasingly apparent, a threat signalized near the time of my graduation by the assassination of the President of France by a suspected Communist. About 2 weeks before graduation, the Hindus and Moslems in Bombay had a vicious clash in which there were over 1,600 casualties—a precursor of the Pakastani-Indian troubles of today. Thinking Americans were alarmed by the recent creation of a Socialist state in Chile. Japan had just conquered Manchuria in 1931, and many political experts were predicting a war between the Soviets and Japan. In sum, things looked bad everywhere.

Succeeding graduating classes have found the situation equally bad. The actual rise of Hitler, the Spanish Civil War, the Italian adventure in Ethiopia, the events leading to World War II, and World War II itself certainly did little to give graduating classes a sense of optimism. And, even though we won World War II, the established order in our civilization was changed drastically and probably for all time. The great British and French Empires began to break up. Nationalism became a powerful force in the resultant nation explosion—some 13 new countries in Asia and 33 in Africa bringing many problems with them affecting world stability and peace. A Soviet Empire was established, and the way was prepared for the creation of a Chinese Communist Empire. Communist expansionism and the possibilities of all-out nuclear war became primary problems for concern.

You gentlemen admittedly face a world equally replete with problems—Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, the Dominican Republic, the development of the nuclear weapon by Red China are just a few. But the pertinent point is the fact that a world plentifully supplied with troubles and short on solutions is nothing new.

Now, you might draw the conclusion from what I have said so far that, since the world is always in bad shape, there is no need to bother. However, that is not the point I am trying to make, nor is it true. Despite the troubles in this best but admittedly imperfect world, there is one powerful, surging current in history which gives me great hope for the present and future and should do the same for all of us. This current is the steady surge of the American Revolution—the emergence of the United States from colonial status and its development into a world power—a world power based upon moral and inspirational strength as its driving force even though it also possesses almost boundless physical strength in every category of power. This revolution, in my opinion, is the most meaningful development of our times, and perhaps the most meaningful for mankind since the birth of Christ.

The American Revolution—despite the fact that it is two centuries old—should not be referred to in the past tense. It is a continuing revolution which aims at achieving the basic hopes of man—freedom with dignity, equality in the sense that every man merits equal opportunity, and the overall goal of betterment of life for all—not primarily through the efforts of the state but through the efforts of the individual.

The American Revolution was and is an unique revolution. It was not, and is not, a revolution initiated and sustained by wild-eyed radicals. Rather it was and is the revolution of educated, successful, respected citizens. Our Founding Fathers were solid citizens who fully recognized the values for which they risked—in their own words—their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, and soberly and rationally decided that these values were well worth fighting and dying for, if need be.

You gentlemen are the fortunate inheritors of the benefits of this American Revolution. You are part of it as well as the products of it. Let us examine the essence of your inheritance. I would say that it is comprised of four major elements.

First, it is religious. Our American Revolution was and is based on the Christian concept of faith in God and doing unto others as we would have them do unto us. This is the root of our desire for freedom, our understanding of individual human dignity, our moral and ethical standards. Our troubles, external and internal, can largely be traced to our deviations from this concept.

Second, our inheritance is cultural. It features a modern adaptation of the Greek democratic concept that man, as an individual, is the most important element of society. The Greeks, however, modified man's importance as a human being by also disciplin-

ing him an ascribing to him a personal obligation to support and defend those principles which endowed him with freedom. From the Greeks, essentially, we obtain our idea that man is born with an inherent right to be free.

The third tenet of our inheritance comes basically from the Romans. This is the concept of an ordered and disciplined society living under a written code of law which guarantees to all men justice under that law. You will recall that no man claiming the rigth of Roman citizenship, were he born Roman, Briton, Gaul, Spaniard, or Jew could be sentenced by a Roman court unless he had been confronted by his accusers and given the opportunity to defend himself. St. Paul on trial for his life in Jerusalem, could say, "Civis Romanus sum" ("I am a Roman Citizen") and Roman law reached out and protected him. This Roman concept of pure justice and the later evolution of English common law based upon the customary rights of free men remain today as fundamental elements of our American inheritance.

The fathers of our Founding Fathers brought with them from Europe the quintessence of the political and ethical thinking that had sprung from the three elements I have just mentioned and which had been reborn, restructured, and nurtured through the Renaissance and the Reformation. Their sons were destined to found a republic based on the principles of an ideal democracy, stemming from the fundamental concepts of man's birthright of equality. In other words, the ancient world bequeathed to the American Revolution its religion, culture, and law. Our Founding Fathers bequeathed to us the fourth element—the Revolution itself—the cause which incorporated the best of religion, culture, and law and made it available to every American.

I would not blame you today if the thought is crossing your mind: "What kind of a world mess must I face up to after a graduate." I would blame you, however, if you termed the mess "hopeless." It is not hopeless because there is a clear, bright light shining in the midst of global gloom—the light of the American Revolution—your revolution. If ever a generation possessed a great cause, you possess one.

This inheritance, this cause of ours grants to us a rare privilege. However, every privilege establishes an obligation. Every right and freedom carries with it a concomitant duty. The fact that you are inheritors of the American Revolution, that you are privileged to live as freemen within a free society, establishes your obligation and duty to maintain and, if necessary, to defend that society.

This fact is particularly important to you gentlemen, the class of 1965, graduating today from the U.S. Military Academy. History appears to have ordained that our Nation in our time must be the foremost champion of the values which make up the American Revolution. And you, as officers in the Armed Forces of the United States, will find yourselves in the forefront of those advancing and defending this cause. In peace, you will help constitute the forces deterring war, thereby making it possible for other men to pursue, however painfully and slowly, their basic objective of freedom. Should deterrence fail, you will help make up the forces which will defeat aggression and safeguard those who have achieved freedom. This unusual opportunity to contribute to the furtherance of the American Revolution will make your personal obligation even more meaningful. You will be measured by and will receive your greatest satisfaction from the dedicated and intelligent manner in which you safeguard our cause.

We all want peace and tranquillity along with our freedom. We consider these to be God-given rights. But, as our Founding Fathers realized, these rights often must be fought for—and they are worth the fight. We believe this today and have proved it through our defense of freedom in such places as Korea, Laos, South Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic.

My message to you today, then, is quite simple. The problems which trouble the world today are not unique to this decade; they are but recurring proof that man can control his environment far better than he can control mankind. In this regard, Mark Twain said, "Man is the only animal that blushes, or has any need to." Moreover, these world problems are merely obstacles—surmountable obstacles—in the path of Western civilization whose goal is world peace, law, and freedom. Your personal contribution to overcoming the obstacles created by other men will be in the tradition of the American Revolution. That great jurist and humanitarian, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, faced a situation similar to yours just a little over 100 years ago. He was an officer in the Union Army in the Civil War, saw much combat action, and was so seriously wounded that his family despaired for his life. Certainly, those were troubled times—probably the most traumatic in our Nation's history.

In his later years, Mr. Justice Holmes states that he believed his Civil War experience to have been the opposite of ill fortune. Rather, he considered that those violent years had rewarded those who participated in the conflict by molding their characters and conditioning their minds to be unawed by problems and to be receptive to progress. He summarized his feeling in these words, "Through our great good fortune, in our youth our hearts were touched with fire."

Gentlemen of the class of 1965, your hearts, your minds, and your characters have already been touched with the fire epitomized in the motto of the U.S. Military Academy: "Duty, Honor, Country, West Point." I congratulate you today on achieving the rare privilege of being active participants in furthering and defending the freedom bequeathed to you by your forebears. And, with my congratulations I express the hope and belief that the fire which has here touched your hearts will never be quenched by the problems you must face and overcome in the interests of freedom and justice for mankind.

Tribute in Song to Frances P. Bolton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, this week the Women's National Press Club paid their annual tribute to the women Members of Congress by giving a dinner in their honor which, as is traditional, was a delightful affair.

As part of the evening's program a special tribute was paid to the two women Members of Congress who have reached the quarter century mark in giving devoted service to their country in their congressional positions—Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH and Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON.

Introduced into this tribute was a clever song about our own House Member, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON of Ohio. Since it so well delineates her multiple activities in music, I felt that our colleagues would enjoy having me share it with them. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the song inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

MRS. BOLTON

(Tune: "Around the World in 80 Days.")

Around the world the Bolton way.
No counterparts, no foreign marts, there's never time to play.
From Africa to Old Red Square
She's seen them all, she's had a ball, you name it—she's been there.

With world affairs come other cares
Mount Vernon's view, what nurses do, what others fear, she dares.
The first 25 have been lots of fun
And the best years are still to come.

SECOND VERSE

Election day is play for her
She runs with ease, wins in a breeze, it's hip-hooray for her.
In Washington, she's on the go
A headstand here, a hearing there, and on to Embassy Row.

Oh, in the House she's found a home
She sets the pace in that rat race beneath the Capitol dome.
The first 25 have been lots of fun
And the best years are still to come.

Quotes From Industrial Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Regional Industrial Development Corp., of southwestern Pennsylvania, in its excellent new publication entitled "Southwestern Pennsylvania on the Move" includes several letters from industrial leaders in the Pittsburgh area. I should like to include those letters as part of my remarks:

QUOTES FROM INDUSTRIAL LEADERS

When I came to Pittsburgh to live, 15 years ago, people here had some big plans about what they wanted to do to improve our city. Today, many of these plans have become realities. Our skies are clean, a vast flood control system has tamed our rivers, beautiful new skyscrapers stand where dingy lofts once marred the business area, fine parks dot the Golden Triangle and wide parkways link it to all the points of the compass.

People in Pittsburgh still are making plans—a fine new sports stadium, a mass transit system which will introduce Pittsburgh-developed innovations in rapid transit, more new buildings, fine luxury apartments right in the downtown area for maximum convenience.

The people of Pittsburgh know how to get things done. Perhaps this ability to create, plan, and successfully carry out many ambitious civic improvement projects—in a minimum of time—is the most important advantage which the Pittsburgh area has to offer to business and industry.

And this ability to create and plan and execute successfully is not limited just to commercial ventures. Pittsburgh has a heart too. Since the United Fund was introduced here in 1956, it has never failed to surpass its annual goal. A fine symphony, a great new medical center that is second to none in

the country, three fine and growing universities; all of these attest to the determination and ability of Pittsburgh to achieve excellence in every phase of community life.

FRED C. FOY,
Chairman of the Board, Koppers Co., Inc., Chairman of the Governor's Council of Business and Industry.

A Florida businessman was once asked to describe his State and he said, "Why, it's 500 miles long, 200 miles wide, and 3 feet high." Pennsylvania is a lot bigger, and higher, and sometimes hotter, and often colder—but there is truly no better place in the United States in which to establish a business, and to do business, than our State. And especially the southwestern end of it.

Our company has its headquarters and two of its large steelmaking plants in this area. A large portion of the approximately $100 million in capital expenditures we have made in the last 10 years has been invested in our activities here. We recently optioned an additional 223 acres of land near our Brackenridge Works—for future expansion. And we are looking seriously into a new steelmaking process which, if it is applicable to our business, could involve an investment of more than $20 million here.

The advantages of this area are obvious—and oft repeated. We have an outstanding group of people here; fine workmen who can provide a newcomer with any skill that he requires. We have a tradition of good workmanship and a history of industrial achievement. Our transportation facilities, schools, industrial land areas, research, nearness to the great markets of the East and Midwest, availability of raw materials, of electricity and natural gas, and many other assets rest heavily in favor of our district over many others.

And atop all of this, there is a new spirit in southwestern Pennsylvania—a new "climate" that welcomes new enterprise. From top officeholder in public life and across-the-board to the man in the mill, there is a new determination to do better than ever before for the businesses that are here and for the many that we hope to attract. We hope yours will be one of them.

E. J. HANLEY,
Chairman and President,
Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp.

Almost every product we make is used somewhere, somehow to protect human life. As a result, our very existence as a company depends entirely on our ability to build absolute quality into our products. We know from long experience that, in the final analysis, this can only be accomplished by the individual employee on the production floor. The finest research, engineering, development, and production techniques are worthless without the responsible, attentive efforts of all our employees. We like Pittsburgh because we have found here a ready source of people who are willing to accept this responsibility. They know and understand that every hour of every day people are staking their lives on how well we have done our job, and they are willing to work with us to meet this responsibility.

JOHN T. RYAN,
President,
Mine Safety Appliances Co.

Western Pennsylvania is ideal for any manufacturer who ships to major market areas as well as to a broad market coverage. Our present location is a selling point to chain operators; note how we constantly use our location map to play up geographic location and more than adequate truck and rail facilities.

We were also extremely pleased with the development of our production team. The one big question—can people in a prime industry area adjust to other type operations?—is definitely answered in the affirmative. Production employees in this area have a strong desire to learn new operations and are readily accepting the industry rate of pay. The extreme depth of female help is most gratifying to us in light manufacturing. We have also experienced excellent results in hiring a local middle- and top-management team without the necessity of moving families.

It would be remiss not to mention the fine cooperation our State has rendered under administrations of both political parties. As you know, our New Castle Area Development Corp., in conjunction with State PIDA and local funds, enabled us to expand through product diversification with no strain on company capital. Coupled with the top-notch services of our State employment office in the areas of hiring, testing, and training, we were ahead and running long before we anticipated.

JAY H. WEINER,
Executive Vice President,
Reliable Luggage, Inc.

In the first place, for quite a number of years now, the supply of trained labor here has been more than adequate. As you know, we have more than doubled our sales volume in the past 5 years and this required the addition of considerable staff in all of our departments. We have had no difficulty in finding suitable personnel for practically all our departments from the Pittsburgh labor supply.

There are adequate supplies of all kinds of material available in Pittsburgh. It is unnecessary for us to carry a large inventory of any of the raw material items.

Pittsburgh has outstanding medical facilities. The educational facilities are good, particularly the technical schools where we occasionally have to draw on information that is not as yet in textbooks. We find it also advantageous to make use of the outstanding research facilities in this area.

LOUIS L. VAYDA,
President,
Bacharach Industrial Instrument Co.

As evidence of faith in the future of this area, Rockwell Manufacturing Co. recently expanded and dedicated its multimillion-dollar research and development center in Pittsburgh. Its staff will perform a variety of basic and applied research tasks in a search for newer and better products in the areas in which we now and perhaps in the future will do business.

Additionally, manufacturing facilities are being expanded considerably at the company's Uniontown, Pa., operation.

Rockwell Manufacturing Co., producing basic products for many industries, is a highly diversified company, representing the type of diversification through which western Pennsylvania is growing. The company's technological advances will have much of their genesis here.

The talent needed to underpin this new technology can be supplied in western Pennsylvania. Here there is awareness of this educational need, a willingness to respond to it, and the technical, physical, and financial resources to produce the technologists who will achieve it.

Rockwell-Standard Corp., a company unrelated to Rockwell Manufacturing, is equally diversified. Its facilities at New Castle, Pa., rely on the plentiful and skilled labor supply of this area.

Both companies, with plants and sales operations all over the country as well as the rest of the world, have their focal points here. They are in a good spot.

WILLARD F. ROCKWELL, Jr.,
Vice Chairman of the Board,
Rockwell Manufacturing Co.

Gateway Industrial Exhibits is proud of its association with Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania. The immense strides made in industrial growth, the concentration of technical resources and highly skilled trades, and the cooperative labor policies have made this area an ideal location for a commercial display firm. We have every confidence that the vital industries in this area will continue to progress and grow in the years ahead.

W. H. D. KOERNER,
Executive Vice President,
Gateway Industrial Exhibits, Inc.

We have been operating a zinc smelter in Beaver County for approximately 33 years and have been well satisfied. We have found the tax structure to be reasonable, the county officials cooperative, and the people in general to be friendly and cooperative. There is definitely a smalltown atmosphere of neighborliness which we have found attractive. The labor supply is ample and orientated toward plant work.

Transportationwise, adequate rail, barge, and trucking facilities are available.

In our particular operations we find the adequate supplies of coal and coke available in this area to be extremely advantageous.

Perhaps the best measure of our thinking concerning the county is that in the years to come we hope to both expand our present smelter and construct additional facilities of a diversified nature.

C. D. HENDERSON,
Manager,
St. Joseph Lead Co.

Westinghouse is closely associated with western Pennsylvania through history and through choice.

More than 77 years ago, George Westinghouse launched electric power research and development and began the manufacture of electric equipment here. In recent years, the company's pioneering research in atomic energy has led to the creation of an entirely new industry. The Pittsburgh area has become the atomic power capital of the world.

The desirability of western Pennsylvania as a stimulating locale for the generation of new and advanced ideas has caused Westinghouse to complete here within recent years three major laboratories which bring to more than $225 million the research, development, and engineering facilities it owns or operates in western Pennsylvania. Some 25,000 Westhouse people are actively employed in this area, creating, building, and selling electrical products for use throughout the world.

DONALD C. BURNHAM,
President,
Westinghouse Electric Corp.

Washington Steel Corp. has grown and prospered in southwestern Pennsylvania. In considering locations for our new melting facilities, we reviewed our present advantages and the advantages of remaining near our present facilities.

An ideal location for our new plant was found at Houston, Pa., approximately 6 miles from our headquarters. Skilled labor, necessary to our melting operations, was immediately available in the area.

The site, adequate for present plans and future expansion, is near a hub of national and State highways and is served by rail and all utilities. A ready access to the Pittsburgh Airport was a major consideration.

T. S. FITCH,
President,
Washington Steel Corp.

The geographic-economic center of our market east of the Mississippi River is very near to Pittsburgh, Pa., and as a result we selected Uniontown, Pa., for the location of our eastern manufacturing warehouse operation. It is close enough to Pittsburgh for a

major source of supply, and transportation is such that a wide number of truck fleets serve Uniontown on major highway systems so that Philadelphia, Cleveland, Detroit, Baltimore, and other major trading areas are overnight away from us. This is advantageous both for supplies coming in and for prompt service to our customers.

The community effort and attitude was the real clincher. Not only was a good finance program offered to us but we were really sold on the desire of the people to perform for any industry that came to their area. Our results have confirmed this initial feleing. Our costs are comparable or lower than in our western plant, and our service to our customers from this centrally located eastern plant has helped our sales tremendously.

Our initial feelings that we had selected the right location for our eastern operation were evidenced shortly after we started operations. Now, after over 2 years, we are firmly convinced that our decision on western Pennsylvania, and specifically Uniontown, was a good one on our part.

WALTER F. MALSBARY,
General Manager,
Malsbary Manufacturing Co.

I am delighted to summarize a few of the reasons which make Allegheny County such an attractive location for our operations.

First, and most important, the vigorous programs of research in the Pittsburgh region, particularly in fields of nuclear technology, provide a stimulating climate for the scientists on our staff. We find researchers in the universities and other private laboratories most cooperative and frequently call upon them for skills which complement our own. In addition, however, we should note the excellent air freight service (which enables us to serve our radioisotope customers promptly and economically), the diversified recreational and cultural opportunities of western Pennsylvania, and the encouragement which all levels of government give us in our research and development endeavors.

R. A. BRIGHTSEN,
President,
Nuclear Science & Engineering Corp.

I have been asked a number of times why Magnetics, Inc., was established in Butler. There are a number of very good reasons for this. It is halfway between the east coast market and the Midwest markets. It is in a good industrial area, so that most of the services we require are convenient. There is a ready supply of competent labor. It is close to our major suppliers. The attitude of the community is very favorable toward business.

ARTHUR O. BLACK,
President, Magnetics, Inc.

H.R. 7465

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have received mail from all parts of the United States in support of my bill, H.R. 7465. Leaders of youth groups, lay and religious leaders, and just plain parents have volunteered their services in the war to rid this Nation of smut. There is no question in my mind that there is a great groundswell of public opinion rising in opposition to the smut peddlers.

The only answer to this cancer which is eating at the moral underpinnings of this Nation is an aroused America. I am happy to report that there are signs that the people of this Nation have finally reached the point where they have had as much as they can take.

It is a special source of pleasure to me that nowhere is there greater opposition to filth than in the district which I have the honor to represent.

On Friday evening, May 28, 1965, at a regular meeting of the executive board of the Newark Archdiocesan Federation of Holy Name Societies, held at the chancery office of the Newark archdiocese, a resolution was unanimously passed to give full support to H.R. 7465. The Archdiocesan Federation represents some 500,000 Holy Name members in Hudson, Essex, Bergen, and Union Counties. I am proud to insert at this point in the RECORD the evidence that, in northern New Jersey, something is being done to combat smut. The resolution follows:

Whereas widespread public concern has been evidenced relative to the continued traffic in obscence matters and materials, causing grave national concern; and

Whereas the Federal Government has a responsibility to find more effective ways and means of preventing the transmission of such matters and materials through the instrumentalities which, under the Constitution, are subject to Federal regulation; and

Whereas the State and local governments have perhaps an even greater responsibility in the exercise of their police powers to protect the public, and particularly minors, from the morally corrosive effects of such matters and materials; and

Whereas effective governmental action needs the support and cooperation of an informed public; and

Whereas there is an immediate need for a coordinated effort at the various governmental levels, and by public and private groups, to combat, by all constitutional means, this pernicious traffic; and

Whereas the purpose of H.R. 7465, in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, is to create a commission, known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials, and which Commission shall consist of 15 members, appointed by the President of the United States, as follows:

(1) One from the Senate;

(2) One from the House of Representatives;

(3) One from the Post Office Department;

(4) Two from the Department of Justice; one of whom shall be from the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(5) One from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(6) Three from the clergy; but no two members shall represent the same faith;

(7) One who shall be a prominent librarian;

(8) One who shall be a prominent representative of the book publishing industry;

(9) One who shall be a prominent representative of the newspaper, magazine, and periodical publishing industry;

(10) One who shall be a prominent representative of the motion picture industry;

(11) One who shall be a prominent representative of the radio and television industry;

(12) One who shall be a chief prosecutor of a city or county government;

(13) One who shall be a prominent educator; and

Whereas this Commission shall be invested with the powers of investigation, analysis, and recommendations and shall report their findings to the President of the United States and to the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Newark Archdiocesan Federation of Holy Name Societies, representing the 500,000 Holy Name men of the counties of Bergen, Essex, Hudson, and Union, in the State of New Jersey, does most fervently represent to the Congress of the United States the enactment into law of H.R. 7465.

GEORGE E. DAVIS, K.S.G.,
Secretary, Newark Archdiocesan Federation of Holy Name Societies.

"The States of the Union: Shape Up or Ship Out"—Chapter II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this is the second installment of the brilliant series of four articles by the Kansas City Star's correspondent, Ray Morgan, dealing with the crisis of responsibility in our Federal Union today. Chapter III and IV will appear in succeeding issues of the RECORD:

(By Ray Morgan, the Star's Kansas correspondent)

WASHINGTON.—Insensitivity by the States to the needs of their own areas and their refusal to finance solutions adequately brought on the crisis that resulted in the Federal entrance into new fields.

This is the consensus of official groups connected with State governments such as the Council of State Governments, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Federal officials, President Lyndon B. Johnson, and Members of Congress.

BEGINNING TO SEE JOB AHEAD

There are signs the States realize they face going the way of the dinosaurs unless they provide their own solutions. Everywhere here there is a great scurrying by State officials to show they want to be helpful partners.

As a spokesman for the Council of State Governments said: "Strong State leadership will determine its role within the Federal system in influencing the character of development within its boundaries."

There is an aroused public concern being indicated by citizen groups to help the sagging States regain their feet to offset what appeared to be a near-breakdown of State influence. This comes in the face of growing Federal action to fill the vacuum created by the failure of the States to act.

One such group, the Citizens Conference on State Government, is Kansas City-oriented, with Homer Wadsworth, president of the Kansas City School Board and director of the Kansas City Association of Trusts and Foundations, as the chairman.

LEADERS AMONG TRUSTEES

Its influential members include as trustees such men as Benson Ford, of the Ford Motor Co.; Clarence Shuman, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and Neil Haggerty, of the AFL-CIO Building Trades Department, who are devoting their efforts to helping the State governments.

William G. Coleman, executive director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Affairs, said the group had applied

for grants from the Ford and Carnegie Foundations to help it in its studies, and that the Commission and Members of Congress were watching its activities.

"The idea was originally incorporated by George Morgan, a Kansas City lawyer and a former member of the Missouri General Assembly; Dr. Warren Peterson, of Community Studies, Inc., of Kansas City, and Horace Sheldon, of the Ford Motor Co.," Coleman said.

Morgan is temporary director of the group and the trustees will meet in July in Detroit to consider appointment of a full-time director. Its primary concern will be to beef up State legislative functions to make State government more efficient.

A FORD GRANT FOR RESEARCH

Another indication of the growing concern for the States is a similar grant recently issued by the Ford Foundation to Terry Sanford, former Governor of North Carolina, to engage in independent research on the growing crisis of State governments.

A Federal economist, Laslow Ecker-Racz, is quick to point out that State and local governments still bear the major share of the cost of government as compared with the share of the Federal Government.

Ecker-Racz, who is assistant director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations here, has large multicolored graphs of 2 years of research by his staff. The charts show graphically how State and local governments have had sharp rises in expenditures to meet the crisis.

"The problem, of course, is that both State and local governments waited too long to start," Ecker-Racz said.

STATES FAILED TO ACT

"Local groups and urban areas tried to get the States to try to do something about problems such as public housing, urban renewal and air and water pollution. For one reason or another, the States were reluctant to act.

"These groups conceived the idea of going to the Congress, the President or Federal agencies with their problems. In the more politically oriented atmosphere in Washington where the value of votes is recognized, they found a ready ear and a willing purse. That was the beginning."

Another factor, of course, was the unwillingness of the States and the legislatures to provide the funds. They have been too prone to look at the short-range tax rate. As one Member of Congress said at recent hearings on intergovernmental relations: "All of the States would have begun to act if they could have found an easy way to get the funds."

The statistics prepared by Ecker-Racz show, ironically enough, a growing dependence on State and local governments to meet costs compared to the Federal Government. State and local costs of government rose from $51 billion in 1948 to about $201 million this year.

Federal costs of government rose, on the other hand, from around $43 billion in 1948 to around $107 billion in 1965.

In the same period, Federal debt limits remained fairly constant, moving from about $275 billion to just over $300 billion. In the same period from 1948 to 1965, State and local debt soared drastically from just under $20 billion to more than $100 billion.

All over the Nation, States are under pressure from their own citizens to revamp their constitutions in the light of modern-day needs and to reapportion legislatures. Federal officials and Members of Congress warn, however, that reapportionment will only get the reins of government back in the hands of the majorities and will not bring any immediate panaceas.

Perhaps the greatest thing on the side of State survival are its supporters as an equal instrument of the Federal system. Representative ROBERT ELLSWORTH, Republican, of Kansas, for instance, points out that many of the programs which became Federal responsibility were experimented with and perfected at State levels.

There are indications that some groups are trying to pull the States back by their bootstraps. As John C. Davidson, vice president of the government finance division of the National Association of Manufacturers, said at House and Senate Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittees here last week:

"We do not believe that too much stress can be placed on the importance of again focusing public attention on the strategic position of the States in our open society. In our opinion, it is time to close down the bypasses of State governments in dealings between the Federal and local governments and give renewed recognition to the dependence of our system on strong and resourceful State governments.

"In short, we believe that in this era a save-our-States approach should be the key to resolving problems of intergovernmental relations. We believe an increase of pace in redressing the balance of the Federal system is needed for its greater effectiveness and that every effort should be made to encourage the States and their localities to accept and discharge greater responsibility for the performance of public services appropriate to their jurisdiction."

The Supreme Court Hands the Communists Another Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is almost unbelievable that a majority of the Justices of the Supreme Court would participate in the recent decision which will permit Communists to hold office in American labor unions. Are these Justices so far removed from reality that they believe the Communist Party to be harmless?

The American people, the responsible labor unions, the Congress of the United States have been deeply concerned with the danger of allowing Communists to control unions or to be in a position to dictate union policy. Congress, in its wisdom, and reflecting the attitude of the people, enacted a law which made it illegal for Communists to hold office in a labor union in this country. Now, with one stroke of the pen, these Justices have flaunted their authority in the face of the people, responsible union members, and Congress itself.

The decision just rendered by the Court now will make it possible for dedicated Communists, sworn to the overthrow of the Government of the United States and pledging allegiance to a foreign power, to take over labor unions, many of whose members are engaged in sensitive work in our missile program and our defense industry.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must speak up before such irresponsible decisions render our country helpless before an enemy whose goal is world domination. We must face up to the danger of allowing the Supreme Court to amend the Constitution or to rescind careful considered laws passed by Congress.

In my opinion, this one decision is ill considered, ill advised, and certainly a dire threat to the security of this Nation.

The following column by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star of June 8, deserves careful reading:

COURT RULING ON REDS IN UNIONS

(By David Lawrence)

The Supreme Court of the United States, by a 5-to-4 vote, has just ruled, in effect, that members of the Communist Party cannot be prevented from holding office in labor unions and causing political strikes in national emergencies. The law which Congress passed has been declared invalid.

This means that, although the Communist Party in the United States is dedicated to the objective of bringing about the overthrow of the American Government, its members cannot be prevented from carrying out their purpose by subtle methods of intrigue and control over labor unions.

Many countries are today suffering from Communist control of labor organizations and in the last several years Congress has attempted by statute to prevent such control from being achieved in this country. In fact, a governmental agency known as the Subversive Activities Control Board, has found that the Communist Party's "principal leaders and a substantial number of its members are subject to and recognize the disciplinary power of the Soviet Union and its representatives," and that there is evidence of the domination and control of the Communist Party here by the Soviet Union for the purpose of advancing "the objectives of the world Communist movement."

The Supreme Court did uphold the findings of the Subversive Activities Control Board in several cases nearly 10 years ago, but now the new ruling of the Supreme Court raises the question of whether even the Subversive Activities Control Act will become taboo by a future Supreme Court ruling. Justice Byron White, who was joined in his dissenting opinion in the case this week by Justices Tom Clark, John Marshall Harlan, and Potter Stewart, said that the reasons given by the Court for invalidating the law that prohibits Communists from holding office in labor unions can also be applied throughout the Government. He said:

"By the same token, a statute disqualifying Communists, or authorizing the executive branch to do so, from holding sensitive positions in the Government would be automatically infirm, as would a requirement that employees of the Central Intelligence Agency or the National Security Agency disclaim membership in the Communist Party, unless in each case it is proved by evidence other than membership in the Communist Party, the nature of which has already been adjudicated, that the individual would commit acts of disloyalty or subordinate his official undertakings to the interests of the party."

What this means is that in the future it will have to be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Court in each instance that a Communist has the intention of actually doing something to overthrow the Government.

The four dissenting members of the Court ask how it is possible to prove that a person intends to become disloyal. Their opinion continues:

"The Communist Party's illegal purpose and its domination by foreign power have already been adjudicated, both administratively and judicially. If this does not in itself provide a sufficient probability with respect to the individual who persists in remaining a member of the party, or if a

probability is in any event insufficient, what evidence with regard to the individual will be sufficient to disqualify him? If he must be apprehended in the act of calling one political strike or in one act of disloyalty before steps can be taken to exclude him from office, there is little or nothing left of the preventive or prophylactic function. * * *

"Examples of statutes that will now be suspect because of the Court's opinion but were, until today, unanimously accepted as legitimate exercises of legislative power could easily be multiplied. Such a catalog in itself would lead one to inquire whether the Court's reasoning does not contain some flaw that explains such perverse results."

The Supreme Court rulings have in recent years been making it more and more difficult to get at the Communists. There is a tendency on the part of the justices to regard the Communist Party as just another political party, like the Republican or the Democratic. What is not recognized apparently is that a political party ceases to be a normal expression of political viewpoints when it is transformed into an abnormal instrument designed to overthrow the American Government itself by subversion or by actual force.

The majority in the latest Supreme Court ruling—consisting of Chief Justice Earl Warren and Justices Hugo Black, William O. Douglas, William J. Brennan, Jr., and Arthur J. Goldberg—contends that the language of the law inflicts a punishment on individuals in preventing them from holding office in a labor union and that, while an individual can be convicted of disloyalty, he cannot be prevented from holding office in a labor union merely because he belongs to an organization that seeks the overthrow of the U.S. Government. It is judicial technicality carried to extremes.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

A Faith for Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last Sunday, the historic College of William and Mary celebrated its 272d anniversary and gave diplomas to a splendid group of young ladies and young men, numbering more than 500. The baccalaureate sermon was preached that morning by an outstanding minister of the Presbyterian Church, Dr. Ernest Gordon, presently serving as dean of the chapel at Princeton University.

In presenting Dr. Gordon to an audience of over 2,000 students, relatives, and friends, President Paschall, of William and Mary, called attention to the fact that in the early part of World War II, Dr. Gordon has served with a Highland regiment, was captured by the Japanese when they overcame the British defenses at Singapore, and thereafter served for 3 long, miserable years in a Japanese prison camp. The primary purpose of his captors seemed to be to get as much labor out of the prisoners as possible before they died of overwork and starvation. At that time, Dr. Gordon was not a spiritually inclined man; but he was endowed with a wonderfully strong constitution, which survived his prison hardships. However, during his prison years, he saw man after man give up in despair, and die, while one of his comrades who apparently was frailer than most of the rest, and who developed first one and then another killing disease, was sustained through that ordeal by his undying faith in God and in God's power to give him the victory.

As a result of those war experiences, a previous British soldier decided to dedicate his life to preaching the existence of the true God and the importance of faith in His omnipotent power. By a singular and happy coincidence, another brilliant Scotchman, so well known to us when he served for a period as our Chaplain—Dr. Peter Marshall—in referring to the terrific destruction of property and loss of life in World War II, said, in a famous sermon at his New York Avenue Presbyterian Church: "But faith in God was the major casualty of the conflict."

Students of current trends are deeply concerned over the trend in this country to materialism, and the resulting loss of faith in the truth of Benjamin Franklin's statement that "God governs in the affairs of men."

It was to warn the splendid young graduates of the College of William and Mary against that trend that, on last Sunday, Dr. Gordon selected as his theme the oft-quoted 11th chapter of Hebrews, on the subject of faith: "The substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of Dr. Gordon's inspiring sermon.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hebrews XI: 37: "They were stoned, they were sawn in two, they were put to the sword, they went about dressed in skins of sheep or goats, distress and misery. They were too good for this world."

I like the 11th chapter of Hebrews. It is one of the great passages in the Bible. We don't know who wrote it. All we know is that a Christian, steeped in the tradition of the Hebrew people, wrote to Christians of the same background in order to strengthen their flagging spirits at a time of persecution. Whoever that writer was, he was a man who understood human nature extremely well. He knew why his friends were depressed, and why they were trembling Christians. They had almost been overpowered by the might and majesty of Rome. Here was their little colony of young Christians, impoverished, lonely, rejected; and over against it stood the powerful empire of Rome with all its status symbols showing, and the physical evidence of its authority on display everywhere. What can you do when you are weak, poor, and few in number? The answer some might have given is, "Nothing, just nothing at all. What can the weak do in the face of the strong, and what can the few do in the face of the many?"

The answer given by our unknown friend is that there is precious little you can't do as a Christian. In effect he tells them, "What is Rome compared to the heavenly Jerusalem, what is Caesar compared with God?" If Jesus learned obedience in the school of suffering, why can't you? You've got all that matters on your side." The 11th chapter is the climax of the whole argument. Look at your history he writes. It is a record of men who were weak in physical power but great in the strength of their faith. It is the record of heroic men who lived out their faith: who moved out of the imprisoning security of affluence to explore the unknown wildernesses, who overthrew empires, who lived victoriously, and so on, and so on, but read it for yourselves. It is all there in this chapter.

The power which enables men to live so proudly, defiantly, and nobly is the power of faith. The point our friend makes is that ultimately reality is not limited to or by that which we can see, touch, and hear. It is always more, it is always beyond that. Faith is the response to the eternal: the response which motivates men to go forth courageously to goals dimly perceived and to frontiers never perfectly attained.

A man's life is given validity by responding to this unseen dimension rather than by responding to the seen, the measurable, the known. Doesn't this make a great deal of sense? To commit your eternal destiny to that which is hard and fast is to deny it, and to trust only that which is seen, is to narrow your life to an intolerably small dimension.

The reason why I am speaking on the subject of "A Faith for Heroes" is because I'm bored stiff with the complaints of those who affirm so boastfully and noisily that there are no heroes, and that there is no substance to faith. The death hand of secularism weighs heavily upon our spirits to depress and enslave them. Now is the time when the word of faith must be spoken and the life of faith lived. In a recent review of Sartre's new book "Situations" in the New York Times, Charles Poore, the reviewer, had this to say of Sartre, "He prefers the security of despair to the risk of victory." This, in my view, is a valid criticism of so many current attitudes and ways of life. The security of dispair is our inheritance from secularism or positivism, and "the risk of victory" is our inheritance of faith. These are the two poles between which most of our lives are held in tension. Here is how one of our seniors expressed it in a letter to his girl friend, "In the modern world, the things of this earth, the scientific world, and the political relations between bodies of men have become so complicated, so confusing that we little men, cannot rise out of our own existence to see the God beyond, who can be a basis for existence. In other words, there is too much to do in this world, too many hugely oppressing forces on our lives that we cannot control—politics, wars, bombs—that we cannot see the use or goodness of God." The interference is obvious: because we cannot see, we dare not hope. The world is too big and strong for us. We must bow in defeat and accept the security of despair. In many ways this kind of situation was that to which the writer of the "Letter to the Hebrews" addressed himself. His answer, as I have indicated, is the answer of faith: of faith which proves itself in action. The proof of the pudding is in the eating of it, is what he says. To understand faith you have to understand the men of faith: the prophets who were stoned for their faithfulness or sawn in two like Isaiah, or who like the patriots of the Maccabean revolt of 165–135 B.C. were put to the sword or forced to seek refuge in the wilderness, and to be hunted like wild animals. There is more to life than physical ease and comfort, and "the security of despair."

1. In the face of almost overwhelming evidence faith dares to be optimistic. It doesn't deny the existence of the available evidence in order to live in a fool's paradise, what it does, is to see beyond the evidence, and to see that good must ultimately prevail over evil. The fear that this will not ultimately happen is what drives so many to "the security of despair." We are suffering from the influence of too many Voltaires and too many Lytton Stracheys. Voltaire, you remember, wrote "Candide" in order to show that this is not "the best of all possible worlds," and to refute Leibnitz for believing in such an absurd premise. Lytton Strachey wrote "The Eminent Victorians" to show that they weren't really great, but sinful like everyone else. What they both forgot to say was that good and evil exist together. This is something any person instructed in the Christian faith knows only too well. The experience of evil does not deny the existence of good. Indeed, we would not be aware of evil if we did not have some knowledge of good. A bad apple is bad, but it is also good because it is still an apple. It is like the curate's bad egg,

it is good in parts. According to Jesus' parable of the weeds, righteousness and unrighteousness are permitted to exist together in the world until the day of judgment; i.e., the ultimate issue is in God's hands.

What we, and particularly the young people of our time, are suffering from, is a serious case of shortsightedness. The good has been subject to so much debunking that we can see only the evil. Last fall I mentioned to a group of undergraduates that I was interested in the way William Golding's "Lord of the Flies" had caught the imagination of this college generation to the extent that many identified themselves completely with the book's pessimistic outlook. One undergraduate stayed behind to talk to me about this subject, and to tell me that he had no alternative but to be pessimistic. The world, he believed, was in the hands of the "Lord of the Flies," Beelzebul, and there was, therefore, no hope for humanity. In discussion with him, I gathered that the Cuban crisis, and the assassination of President Kennedy had made a deep and depressing impression on him. He could see nothing in this world but the mastery of lust, and the victory of power. According to the evidence presented to him, he did not see how it could be otherwise. And a sad and pessimistic lad he was, a lad to whom winter had come at the beginning of spring.

This feeling he had about the futility of life was, I think, very largely the result of a heavy diet of pessimistic literature, and concourse with victims of misanthropy.

Romain Cary in his recent novel "The Ski Bum" gives us a picture of those dispossessed of hope, of the ski bums who withdrew—or attempt to withdraw from existence—in order to pass their lonely days of pessimistic alienation among the cold, pure, snowclad mountains where no demand is made upon them by human beings.

In one scene, we are permitted to view the ski bums enjoying their despair in a hip joint known as the Red Button Cafe. The only one out of place in this hip joint is a Dominican father who has dropped in on his way from his mountain monastery. He listens to the sick, slick talk and to the remarks made about him as a priest. Then he replies by analyzing the situation of his young friends, "Your generation is suffering from, what for lack of a better word, I shall call overdebunk. There was a lot of debunking that had to be done, of course. * * * But your generation and the generation before yours went too far with their debunking job. You went overboard. Overboard, that's what you did. It's moral overkill. It's like those insecticides Rachel Carson speaks of in her book, that poison everything, and kill all the nice useful bugs as well as the bad ones, and in the end poison human beings as well. * * * You are all no more than 22 years old, but yours is a silent spring."

Any man, at any time, and in any place, may be quite easily overcome by the chills of existence and the acids of modernity, for the material of pessimism is always with us. The man who lives by faith, however, lives by and for the highest, and greatest, and best. His faith convinces him of the goal to be attained, the good to be accomplished, and the victory to be gained.

2. Another aspect of faith is that it can never be tied down, nor hemmed in, nor confined, nor enslaved. The man of faith, in responding to that which is beyond himself, never limits his frontiers, nor fences himself in. The prime example of this kind of adventurer, according to Hebrews, is Abraham. He is the man who obeyed the call to leave the comfort and security of Ur in the "Chaldeas" to go out into the unknown to find a land for his people yet to be born. Instead of living in a split-level suburban home, he lived in a tent going from place to place. Hebrews tell us, that "he was looking forward to the city with firm foundations, whose architect and builder is God."

This was our friend's way of reminding his troubled people that life has no terminus. The man who arrives never goes anywhere. The man who has reached his terminus, closed his door and his mind, hung up his knapsack, and taken off his boots is dead. That is what death is. It is a full stop in nowhere.

I think we are much too concerned these days with terminals and fences rather than with advancing frontiers and the eternal city. We urge the college student to find his academic security in completing so many courses, so many credits, and so many hours of work, all of which are registered in the heavenly halls of ivy; and we urge so strongly that we fail to point to the fascinating horizon of truth which lies beyond the outreach of our courses, textbooks, words, knowledge, and understanding. Occasionally a lad or lass looks up long enough to see a glow in the heavens, and has a brave enough heart to follow it to exciting new territory and to thrilling new adventures.

Similarly society urges our young people to be satisfied with the status quo and gilt-edged securities. But life is more than three square meals a day, a safe place in the city, and in suburbia.

The first time I was in this country, it was as a student. During our first summer, my wife and I traveled by road to Colorado. Every so often, we saw a statue dedicated to the American mother of the frontier days. In her arms she carried a baby, infants tugged at her long skirts, and she was looking westward to a frontier that was as yet unseen.

That pioneer mother is a powerful symbol of those who journey toward unseen frontiers, confident that there is a land destined for them, and that the adventure of faith is wonderfully worthwhile. Faith opens us to the adventure of new ideas, the adventure of vital friendships, and the adventure of journeying with God. Faith is not only the source of the adventuring mind, heart, spirit, and life, it is in itself the greatest adventure of all.

3. Lastly, the man of faith identifies himself with the tradition of heroes and saints, with those who have done the best with what they possessed, and adventured continuously in strange lands—with those who have dared to live faithfully.

The heroism with which the writer of Hebrews is concerned is not the spectacular kind which is reported in the magazine entitled "Life," but the everyday kind of heroism which endures under constant and heavy pressures in life. To live for others, to be loyal to a just cause, to be faithful in the execution of difficult tasks, to labor without reward, to go on living optimistically while everybody else has given up in despair, is to live at the heroic dimension of life. Jesus, you remember, did not call His disciples to a life of ease and prosperity but to a life of cross bearing; i.e., a daily acceptance of burdens, challenges, threats, and anxieties. "Come," said He, "take up your cross daily and follow me."

In one of the Japanese prisoner-of-war camps where I was imprisoned, there was with me a young soldier from Aberdeen. He was a good lad—a lad of strong, if simple, faith. The burden of starvation, overwork, and disease was too much for him. His body was broken, but not his spirit. He had advanced beriberi, malaria, dysentery, ulcers, heart trouble, and stomach trouble. But you'd never have known it. He limped around on little errands of mercy, with the twinkle of life still strong in his eyes and the humor of good spirit still bright in his smile. And then cholera struck him. He was carried to the cholera camp to die. But he did not. He came back, weak, paralyzed, but alive. There was nothing he could do but lie there on the ground on a filthy old rice sack. He couldn't do brave deeds, but he was brave with the bravery of faith. His life was a continuous blessing to those around him. The last time I ever saw him I asked, "How are things today, Jock?" He replied, "Just fine, just fine, can't help but worry a wee bit though for all the folk at home. They must be having a hard time of it—what with German bombings and rations." He smiled his goodby, and I went to my day's work. When I returned in the evening, he was no longer there. He had been buried.

Robert Louis Stevenson was another like Jock, who lived bravely in the midst of pain. One time he was crippled with sciatica, weak with hemorrhage, and blind with ophthalmia. His wife looked at him with a breaking heart, and said with bitter sorrow, "I suppose you will say, as usual, that things have fallen out all for the best, if only we look at them in the right way?" His answer reflected his high-hearted gallantry. "It's odd you should say that, for that's exactly what I've been thinking. What I needed was a rest, and this has forced me into it."

Those two men, to all intents and purposes, were obviously defeated by "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune," by the vicissitudes of existence. They were immobilized by illness. They were flat on their back in the position of defeat, yet they did not accept this as their ultimate destiny, they dared to risk the possibility of victory and to live by faith. For them to live by faith meant battling with the forces of self-pity, self-concern, fear, doubt, and hatred of life. It is in the battlefield of the heart that the great human battles are fought, lost or won. We cannot win those battles if we do not believe that there are unseen forces, regiments of angels, at our command. True heroism, as I understand it, is that of the free spirit which loves the battle, the ones for whom it is fought, and the One who is life's champion and victor. When Paul wrote to the Gallatians telling them not to abandon their freedom as Christians, he reminded them that what is of ultimate concern and significance is, "faith active in love." This is about the best definition of heroism I know: it is "faith active in love."

A short time ago I listened to a young theologian tell a meeting of graduate students that faith was no longer acceptable as a working premise. The theologian of today had to be true to the facts, that is, to the evidence provided by scientific analytical research, therefore, there was nothing he could say as a theologian about God, or Christ, or Easter; at best he could only say what is not and what is, according to the evidence. The flatness of his message was only exceeded by the flatness of his presentation. As I sensed the mood of that meeting the only contribution he had made was one of unyielding despair.

The only effective answer I could think of was, not in terms of a philosophical argument, but in terms of men who evidenced in their lives those qualities of the divine and the eternal—those who expressed by action faith's optimism, faith's adventuring, and faith's heroism. And quite frankly, I have not been able to find stronger evidence to the contrary, for in the end the unseen and intangible, which gives depth and dimension to human existence, is measured or known not by words and arguments, but by life and action. The meaningful, the divine, the eternal is known in human terms, in terms, that is, which transcend those of our space-time limitations, in terms of those who, "were stoned, who were sawn in two, who were put to the sword, who went about dressed in skins of sheep or goats in poverty, distress, and misery," in terms of those who "were too good for this world"—too good for this world because they were bigger, better, stronger, greater than the world of power symbols and physical might.

Economist Calls Railroad Safety Claims Inaccurate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the findings of a leading economist, Eli L. Oliver, who is associated with Labor Bureau of Middle West, with respect to railroad safety. Mr. Oliver's findings contradict the claim of the railroads that railroad safety has improved since the layoff of firemen on freight and yard locomotives.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the June 8 issue of News from the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Cleveland, Ohio, entitled "Economist Calls Railroad Safety Claims Inaccurate," and an article from the Washington Daily News, dated June 1, 1965, entitled "Look, Congress":

[From the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen News, June 8, 1965]

ECONOMIST CALLS RAILROAD SAFETY CLAIMS INACCURATE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A claim by the Association of American Railroads that railroad safety has improved since the removal of about 15,000 locomotive helpers (firemen) from freight and yard locomotives is manifestly inaccurate, a leading economist said today.

Eli L. Oliver, associated with Labor Bureau of Middle West, charged that safety statistics used by the railroad management group in nationwide ads last June 1 and 2, were generally misleading and grossly misrepresentative of the facts relative to railroad safety.

Oliver advised the Washington Post, in a letter, that the railroad group used statistics that cannot be checked from any published Government reports.

He said Government reports that are available to all and that can be checked closely by all, show a much different picture.

According to Oliver, in the first 11 months of operations without helpers (firemen) on 40 percent of yard and freight locomotives, Government accident reports show:

1. A 15.6-percent increase in the number of train accidents.
2. A 14.4-percent increase in the number of train accidents resulting in casualties.
3. A 15.1-percent increase in the number of employees killed per 100,000 employees.
4. A 5.5-percent increase in the overall employee casualties (killed or injured) per 100,000 employees.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, June 1, 1965]

LOOK, CONGRESS

The Brotherhood of Railroad Firemen and the AFL–CIO have made a good case in asking that Congress take a look at results of last year's ruling which ended the long dispute over featherbedding among rail employees.

The union and rail management are at odds over the effect of the decision by an arbitration board which permitted elimination of up to 90 percent of firemen's jobs on freight engines. Chief areas of disagreement are over the extent of unemployment among discharged firemen and whether rail safety has been impaired.

We don't pretend to know which side is right in the argument. But Congress did create the arbitration panel and passed legislation which made its decision compulsory on both parties.

In that case, Congress has a responsibility for taking an impartial look at what happened as a result. The investigation should produce useful guidelines for dealing with future labor-management disputes of a similar nature.

Strengthening Gold and Silver—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the fourth and final article in a series which appeared in the Las Vegas Review-Journal, Las Vegas, Nev., on Sunday, April 25, 1965. This article deals with the value of gold and silver.

The article follows:

[From the Las Vegas (Nev.) Review-Journal, Apr. 25, 1965]

MONEY MATTERS—PART 4: CAN A U.S. GOLD HIKE BE JUSTIFIED?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the fourth and concluding article in a series on the subject of gold, silver and money matters.)

(By Arthur P. Alexander)

It is not only the scarcity of gold but its attributes of immutability and durability that constitutes its value as a medium of exchange, but if money were to depend upon gold alone as a basis, there would be a very meager supply, so gold must be supplemented to provide the necessary amount of money to meet economic requirements.

True, other metals may command a greater price than gold, due to their demand and limited supply, but they lack the attribute of immutability. That is, they are subject to transmutation, corrosion and disintegration, or destruction, and are not suitable material for money.

This leaves only silver as a supplement to gold because it possesses the same attributes, but as it is supplied by nature in a greater abundance than gold it consequently commands less value in exchange.

Money then, must depend on gold and silver together for its basis; gold, because it depends upon silver as a quantative supplement, and silver, because it depends upon gold as a qualitative substance. Therefore each are interdependent. The intrinsic value of a monetary unit may be measured by its gold contents, or backing, but this content is also interchangeable with a proportionate amount in silver of equal value, therefore, a standard can be said to be true, or exact, if expressed in terms of gold, but based on both gold and silver.

It is an axiom in economics that value is power in exchange; the adequacy of the dollar is in direct proportion to its gold contents, representing its intrinsic value, or purchasing power.

The greater the quantity of gold securing the dollar the more that dollar can buy, and as has been cited in the preceding articles, raising the price of gold only serves to reduce the quantity of gold to the dollar and weaken its purchasing power, which can only be justified if prevailing economic conditions require a surplus of currency to avert a financial fiasco.

Money is defined as a convenient medium of exchange and a standard of value, and to have it properly measure the relative value of properties, commodities and service it is absolutely necessary to free the unit of money from a fixed quantity of gold, or other metal (which are themselves commodities of a certain quality, subject to the operation of the economic law of supply and demand) and allow the gold contents of the dollar to be adjusted periodically, and proportionately, to conform to economic conditions.

It should be manifest that if the relative value of gold and silver be established at an equitable ratio and their fineness properly defined, these commodities can be established as a true, or exact, standard, for then the relative commercial value of any number of commodities can be fairly determined.

Gold and silver bullion, whether as bars, ingots, or coin, have been acceptable by civilized and semicivilized nations for the settlement of international balances at the prevailing market price of those metals, and what is universally acceptable, is indubitably eminently proper and thoroughly practical for any nation to use as a basis for its domestic money. No nation has ever employed a paper primary money, used an exact standard of value, nor has been able to establish and maintain a sufficient volume of money to adequately supply its domestic requirements. Neither has an appropriate basis for money ever been provided, and as primary money has never been made of a suitable material its circulation has always been retarded by artificial obstructions.

These errors and omissions have been the cause of instability in prices, unfair level of values, and justice between buyer and seller made difficult, for if the debtor is to be protected from payment of an unjust tribute to the creditor and is to be assured that payment is not made in a dearer money than originally stipulated, and if the creditor is not to be compelled to accept a cheaper money than what is due, then a rational approach must be observed before determining any reduction in the present gold contents of the dollar and with due care to prevent an inflated currency.

In the first article on this subject, cognizance had been taken of the expediency of replenishing the dwindling gold reserve by raising the price of that metal, but it must be recognized that this country, in 1948, deliberately chose to distribute its gold reserve surplus to provide Western Europe with the opportunity to recapture stability and confidence under the Marshall plan, setting the pattern for the postwar program of U.S. foreign aid which has subsequently proved to be sound diplomacy that will eventually return big dividends.

Contrary to some opinions expressed at that time, this aid was not charity; distributing the gold reserve surplus was a prudent investment, motivated by the exigency of assisting those countries victimized by an inimical ideology, and the need to strengthen this Nation's position of dominancy as a world power. The charity phase of foreign aid is being capably administered by Catholic, Jewish and Protestant relief organizations.

As this country has a large surpulus of grain and other commodities needed by other nations, the gold reserve can be augmented by promoting foreign trade to where exports will exceed imports, but the most economical approach would be to stimulate exploitation of this Nation's natural resources: More gold, silver and other valuable minerals still remain concealed in the great western expanses of the United States, including Alaska, than have ever been reclaimed.

Though it is imperative to increase his nation's gold reserve by some 28.5 million troy ounces of gold and a like amount or more of silver, in bullion, and no avenue should

be left unexplored to accomplish this purpose, it is just as essential to reappraise the monetary system with a view to adopting the primary paper money, outlined in the preceding articles, if the dollar is to be fortified, which can only be feasible when a sufficiency of gold and silver is provided to assure an adequate supply of currency, secured 100 percent, and as a surplus in bullion accumulates to provide for a gradual increment in the gold contents of the dollar toward the goal of establishing the aforementioned "par" dollar of 24 grains of gold, 11–12 fine.

As the economic conditions of this country does exert a powerful influence on world economy, a firm and positive position assumed by the Government of this country declaring the adoption of 11–12 fine as a monetary standard and fixing the ratio between gold and silver at 1:28 providing thereby an exact gold standard on a bimetallic basis, will at once posit this Nation as the financial leader of the world, establish a just and enduring parity in international exchange, and form a firm foundation for establishing an international trade dollar.

This criterion will also provide the basis for all nations to maintain a healthy domestic economy, and will further promote international trade and harmony.

In recapitulation, further consideration of economic factors that would be influenced by any change in the price of gold at this time, exhibits that a raise in the price of that metal would seem to be unwarranted unless the dollar be firmly stabilized beforehand and the price of silver increased, with a proper parity fixed between the two metals. It is only through a thorough examination of these factors and current economic conditions of the world that the question, "Can a raise in the price of gold be justified?" Can be resolved.

Let Us Speak Loud and Clear in Support of the War Action of Our Overseas Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, four servicemen from my district have lost their lives in Vietnam. I am certain that my district is not unique in this regard.

Still there are many, even in the highest governmental posts who will not admit that we are in a shooting war. Now we are told that the American forces are sometimes to be considered as combat troops in Vietnam.

The Vietcong and their Chinese Communist supporters have shown no doubt about this being a shooting war. Our American troops have been their targets. The casualty lists show that they are intensifying their efforts.

This is war. Those members of our armed service who survive should be regarded as war veterans. Our Government has refused to so consider them. This is an injustice that should be immediately rectified.

On January 12, 1965, I introduced a bill (H.R. 2364) titled the "Overseas Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1965." This measure would have given the discharged servicemen of Vietnam and the Dominican Republic some of the benefits that other veterans of shooting wars have received.

I am of the belief that the Veterans' Affairs Committee should give consideration to legislation that would place the veteran of Vietnam or other combat areas on an equal footing with the veterans of other wars. I shall ask the committee to expedite this subject.

I must take exception with the Defense Department on this matter. In a letter to me, they have stated that they do not favor such proposals as mine "during a so-called peacetime-cold war period."

I say that we should not deny our fighting soldiers their full rights and privileges under the subterfuge that the battlefields that they have just left, or are fighting on, are of a peacetime-cold war nature.

It had been my hope that the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces might personally endorse a measure that would give adequate protection of rights to these veterans. Certainly such action would benefit the morale of our fighting men.

Action on this matter should be taken at this session of the Congress. I will work toward this end.

I am pleased to see that the Republican policy committee has fully endorsed action that would give adequate protection to our men serving on the firing line.

Just last week, I attended the funeral of a fine, patriotic citizen of my congressional district. He had lost his life in Vietnam. I am speaking of the late Air Force pilot, Capt. Andrew Kea. I had known him for many years. His father was a good friend. Captain Kea was a brave man. He had made the supreme sacrifice for his country. Now at the early age of 35, he was dead.

Can we tell his brave widow and two young children that their father died as a fighting soldier or must we say that he was just an observer?

As I followed the caisson bearing Captain Kea's body to its resting place in Arlington Cemetery, I could but feel that I was attending the funeral of a casualty of war. It would be degrading to him and to those others who have lost their lives in Vietnam to think anything less.

I would not disguise from you, Mr. Speaker, that I too, had concern for my own son, serving in the Far East. While the fortunes of war have spared him, every parent must know that death can come to anyone in the armed services.

Death in combat has come to four boys from my 14th Ohio District. The first to go was Pfc. Paul Heltsley III, who was killed by a Vietcong sniper in July of last year.

Within the past week, two other members of the Armed Forces in Vietnam have been killed. They were Sgt. George Howard Frazee, Jr., and Corp. Frank Wilson. Both of these men were killed in helicopters.

Thus, in this one congressional district, four servicemen have been destroyed. Let us recognize their great ultimate contribution to their country by giving full recognition to them and their surviving comrades in arms.

I cannot close, Mr. Speaker, without urging that we all speak out on our unification of purpose in combating our Far Eastern Communist foes.

Let us speak loud and clear in support of the war action of our overseas forces. Let us drown out the voices of those who serve the interests of our enemies by attempting to mislead our people.

As I returned last week from the burial of the hero who gave his life for us, I passed the White House. Here, in full view, was a group of beatniks who were picketing the President of the United States. In their eyes, he was the warmonger and our enemies were in the right. I was sickened.

I certainly hope that Captain Kea's widow and children took a different route back from the funeral and were spared this disgraceful sight.

Justice Robert E. Noonan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, one of western New York's most prominent citizens, State Supreme Court Justice Robert E. Noonan, died recently at age 57. He was first elected to the supreme court in 1948 and was one of the youngest men ever to assume the office. Justice Noonan had recently been elevated to the court's appelate division. Since 1957 he also was a member of the New York State Judicial Conference which supported a major reorganization of the court.

Justice Noonan had a fondness for what he termed "the human side of the law" and enjoyed his relationship with all participants in the judicial system. The judge was a native and lifelong resident of Batavia, in Genesee County, and one of his lifelong associates, Mr. E. R. Gamble, recently discussed his life on the "Town Crier" broadcast of station WBTA, Batavia.

Under unanimous consent I insert this tribute to Judge Noonan in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE WBTA TOWN CRIER BROADCAST OF MAY 30

Surely it cannot be done today, and it may be months or even years before total assessment can be made of the loss suffered by the community and the law fraternity in the sudden death on Thursday of our distinguished citizen, Supreme Court Justice Robert E. Noonan. It is worthy of note that death came to him in familiar surroundings * * * a festive gathering at which he was the guest speaker.

A coronary occlusion brought the end suddenly soon after Justice Noonan had started to address the annual meeting of the Chautauqua Bar Association in the Town Club at Jamestown.

We were privileged to have known Bob Noonan, dating back to his days as a high school football and basketball star and to have been in almost daily association with him during his years as a practicing attorney. He was an inspiring and stimulating companion with a great zest for life and seemingly inexhaustible energy applied to

both his work and his hours of pleasant association with friends.

Long before he was elevated to the supreme Court bench in 1948 his professional judgment and personal advice were sought by people in all stations of life. His steady progress to a place of highest regard of lawyers of the 8th judicial district and rating as an outstanding jurist selected to serve in the appellate court never put him out of reach of his friends and fellow residents of Batavia and Genesee County.

As a trial judge he ran an efficient courtroom and at the same time gave courteous and considerate treatment to lawyers, court officers and litigants. When a coronary heart attack struck him in April of 1952 he responded with typical wisdom and ability to adjust to circumstances and surroundings. On advice of his physicians he regimented his life conserving his strength while continuing to give full time service to his duties as a jurist.

At 57 he was in the full bloom of his judicial career. As Justice Noonan he left a record of high achievement and as Bob Noonan he left pleasant memories to last through the lifetimes of the many people privileged to know him well. We are among those to treasure these memories of a truly great friend.

May the grief of his family be made more bearable by the fact that it is shared by so many.

Superb Opportunities in Smaller Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the Second District of Iowa was recently privileged to host Eric Sevareid, one of the Nation's most respected commentators, when he spoke at the commencement ceremonies at Luther College in Decorah. As a native of the Midwest whose parents were raised in Decorah, Mr. Sevareid has since written ia column of reflections inspired by this visit.

It was most gratifying for me to read his vivid description of the strong appeal offered by the way of life in this pleasant part of the State. Moreover, as a district singularly blessed with a wealth of excellent smaller colleges, I was particularly pleased to read Mr. Sevareid's comments regarding the unique educational opportunities available in these colleges.

I would at this time like to call the attention of my colleagues to this notable column which appeared in the Washington Star on June 8, 1965:

THE GREEN VALLEY OF RECOLLECTION

(By Eric Sevareid)

DECORAH, IOWA.—There is a corner of America here where the spring is lovely beyond belief, the land rolling and intensely green like the center of France, the rivers small between oak-covered bluffs and crossed by quiet bridges where boys still sit with pole and line, hook and worm. The great jet planes do not roar down in this region where Iowa and Wisconsin and Minnesota come together; the trains are few and even the highways bear a light burden of billboards and traffic.

It seemed to my brother and me, as we drove down here from the great traffic nexus of Minneapolis and St. Paul, that this corner of land was a vividly remembered part of our childhood; yet I had never traveled here and he only fleetingly, many years ago. This was because of the constant talk of our parents out on the far prairies of North Dakota. This was the green and mystical "east," where my father had lived as a farm boy and my mother as a happy girl in the pastor's house here in the town of Decorah.

This winding cement highway we followed—it must have been a muddy road around the turn of the century. Along here my father must have driven by horse and buggy when they sent him off to Luther College from the family homestead near Wanamingo. Thirty years before that my mother's father had come by wagon up from the south, from Norway, Iowa, to do his 7 years of college and seminary study here.

The mother is 80 now and too frail to make even this easy journey. (On the phone later she said, "I got through the day by imagining where you were each hour. At breakfast you would be in the old Winneshiek Hotel. In the afternoon I could imagine you speaking to the graduating class and then I wondered if you went to see the parsonage.")

The father is gone, but his youthful fame astonishingly persists. Elderly men, strangers to me, came up to tell how they would walk barefoot several miles as boys to watch Al Sevareid pitch baseball; the time he struck out 19 men against the University of Nebraska was vividly remembered. They spoke as if Luther had never known such an athlete, but perhaps they were trying to please a sentimental son.

This valley of the upper Iowa River is glory and paradise for children. There are a thousand secret places in the woods; the hills seem like soaring mountains to them, but there is really no place they can get hurt. It is the land of adventure for them, but sanctuary as well; home is never far away when the shadows and the evening fog creep down the valley.

Not a great deal happens here and, of course, generation after generation, the young mature go away to the big and crowded cities. But their hearts never seem to leave this place and today, they tell me, more and more drift back here in their older years, trying—I hope not vainly—to find the magic talisman of peace. One is a successful broker who said goodby to Wall Street without regret and now manages a farm or two and helps the college with its problems of increasing complexity.

The connection with Norway has never been entirely broken. The Norwegian consul general from Chicago was present at the pregraduation luncheon, and little Norwegian flags adorned the table along with American flags. The students must find it dull at times, but there was a bright vigor about this graduating class. Slowly, the old repressions give way; 3 years ago the college held its breath and ordered that dancing be permitted. A professor's wife said to me, "The original Norwegian scholars around here, like your grandfather, Hougen, were not stuffy bluenoses at all. They liked to drink and laugh and dance. But I think the influence of the frontier Methodists and Baptists finally absorbed them and we are now breaking away from all that."

It seemed to me that current public opinion has missed the point about some of these small colleges like Luther and St. Olaf's, up at Northfield. I wonder how many Americans, frantic about getting sons and daughters into the big-name schools, understand the quality of scholarship in these rare little places. Where else would you find a man who could alternately coach football, master five languages and teach the classics? Latin and Greek remain honored here for what they are—the keys to the past and the proper tools for honing the mind in the discipline of exactitude.

These superb little colleges are not dying out, thank heaven. Their enrollments and their endowment funds are growing. But they run little risk of the curses of bigness. Students at Berkeley or Columbia may feel lost—digits on a computer card in an anonymous mass of humanity. Here each boy and girl is not numbered, but known. Not only are their faces known, but their families, their qualities, their troubles and their dreams.

Facts About the Woodside Power Poles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, several newspapers have commented editorially on the AEC's attempt to run a high-voltage line through the city of Woodside, Calif., in order to supply necessary power to the $114 million Stanford Linear Accelerator. This is a vital tool for keeping America ahead in the area of high energy physics. The controversy over the power poles is delaying putting this investment to work for the Nation and is to be regretted. Much of the editorial comment has been misinformed and erroneous in its content. The following letter, giving important corrective information was written to the editor of the San Francisco Chroncile. Whether or not it was printed I do not know.

EDITOR OF THE CHRONICLE:

In the discussions on the manner of supplying electric power to the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, a number of serious errors of fact and highly questionable opinions have unfortunately crept into statements by the Chronicle and others.

As a consultant to SLAC, but with no assignment on power supply, I developed in late 1963 on my own initiative the compromise plan to install a single steel-pole line, instead of the two lines previously being considered for installation either on ordinary steel towers or underground. Because of my familiarity with this situation and as one who has been active in the field of underground cable systems for 44 years, I should like to set forth the following facts:

1. The use of underground construction for transmission lines has been increasing only gradually and for only very special situations because the costs per mile are 7 to 25 times the cost of overhead. This situation applies both in this country and abroad. Since the installation in 1927, under my engineering supervision, of the first extra high voltage underground transmission line (138,000 volts), unit costs have decreased some 60 percent.

2. The original plan for supply to the Stanford Accelerator called for two 220,000-volt overhead lines to be installed on one set of large latticed steel towers, along the route. This construction is commonly used all over the world. Some residents of Woodside then proposed instead the installtaion of two underground lines, which would have increased the cost by more than $5 million.

3. It was at this point that I evolved the compromise based on taking advantage of recent technical advances to use slender tapered camouflaged steel poles, special insulators to be attached directly to the poles, omission of steps, etc. Also the height of the poles would average only half the height of towers.

4. Furthermore, I proposed the installation of only one line instead of two 220,000-volt lines, and some strengthening of the existing 60,000-volt supply to take care of lights and minor operations during emergencies. SLAC and AEC eventually agreed to make the sacrifice of having only one 220,000-volt line.

5. Less than half the route of the line passes through wooded areas. As a result of careful studies by Stanford, AEC and outside engineers (other than myself) and the use of helicopters and other modern methods, it would be necessary to remove only some short stretches of trees from the wooded areas.

6. The proposed line (not lines) would be unobtrusive and far more attractive than the wood poles and appurtenances that have been installed all over Woodside. Even in the past few years, the residents there (as well as elsewhere) could have obtained underground distribution lines at an incremental cost in excess of that for overhead construction, but have not seen fit to do so.

7. The cost of the steel-pole line would be greater than that for the combination use of steel towers and wood-pole structures for one line.

8. If AEC installs the one underground line instead of the steel-pole overhead line, the excess cost of the underground line would be about $1.9 million, not $1.6 million as mentioned in your editorial. (My cost estimates are $2,800,000 and $900,000, respectively, for the underground and overhead line.)

9. The proposed underground line would have to be supplemented by another such line about 1972, while the single overhead line would have adequate capacity throughout the load growth of the project. The excess cost of the underground supply with its two lines would then become about $4.8 million, or three times the figure so frequently mentioned.

10. The San Mateo Planning Commission at a well-attended public hearing held in March 1964, approved unanimously the steel-pole construction. One commissioner went so far as to say that there were overhead lines in the heavily populated section where he lived, and it would certainly be nice if somebody would spend a few million dollars to install underground instead.

11. Wherever it has seemed justifiable, I have been actively promoting the use of underground construction. This has been increasing particularly for distribution facilities in new residential subdivisions where the cost is only about twice that of overhead construction.

12. It is expected that electric-line facilities for both distribution and transmission will double within the next 15 years. If underground construction were to be employed in cases where overhead has heretofore been used, the extra cost to the people of this country would be well over $100 billion and there would be many serious technical problems, some of them insurmountable, in connection with transmission lines. If only the facilities for urban territories and scenic areas were placed underground, the extra cost would be of the order of $50 billion, or more.

13. It seems to me that underground construction should be encouraged and that its use will continue to grow as our growing economy and other competing demands for our funds permit. However, it appears unwarranted and not in the public interest for the general public to pay the extra $4.8 million for the power supply to the Stanford accelerator nor an extra $50 billion for undergrounding in more or less similar special situations throughout the country.

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN HALPERIN.

Gov. John N. Dempsey, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will be interested in the fine personality sketch of Gov. John N. Dempsey, of Connecticut, in today's New York Times. I had the pleasure of serving as Governor Dempsey's campaign manager in 1962 when he led the ticket, and I know from firsthand observation that he is a very warm person and a capable Governor. And I am sure the people of Connecticut will demonstrate in the 1966 elections that they feel as I do.

The article follows:

JOVIAL GOVERNOR: JOHN NOEL DEMPSEY

A few days ago, Gov. John Noel Dempsey, of Connecticut, commented that a friend had told him he was moving from a small town in the southeastern corner of the State to Stamford to take a job as an assistant vice president at $41,000 a year. "Gee," said the Governor, "I didn't know they paid salaries like that in plants around here." The statement was typical in its openness and its mild naivete and good humor of the 50-year-old Democrat's easy way of talking. The preface is one of his favorite terms—"Gee."

But apart from that, the sentiment of the remark may have come straight from the hip pocket, which is where the Governor keeps his wallet. * * *

In the eyes of many that wallet has not been oversupplied by the State. But yesterday, the State assembly voted a raise in the Governor's pay, from $15,000 to $35,000 a year, effective January 1, 1967. Mr. Dempsey signed the bill, but he will have to win another term to get the money.

* * * * *

The chief key to Mr. Dempsey's personality and manner seems to be that he is a man who likes to be liked fully as ardently as he despises to be disliked.

"He is a worrier," one capital observer said. "He doesn't want to make people unhappy, and he worries when things are controversial."

At his plainly furnished office, the Governor sits with his back to a high window, looking across his desk and over a conference table with seven leather chairs just in front of his desk.

MARK TWAIN ADVICE

In one corner of the office there is a bust of John F. Kennedy on a pedestal. On Mr. Dempsey's desk there is a small, gold-lettered plaque bearing 14 words of advice by Mark Twain:

"Always do right," it reads. "This will astound some of the people and gratify the rest."

Mr. Dempsey is a warm, very outgoing, sometimes self-effacing man. He stands 5 feet 10 and looks robust at 178 pounds. He has dark hair, hazel eyes, and a strong figured countenance that suggests his Irish origin. He was born January 3, 1915, in the town of Cahir in County Tipperary. He went to Putnam, Conn., as a boy of 10.

There is a bit of Irish jocularity in him yet, and aids say that no matter how much tension and pressure are on him, he is always able to lighten it with a quip, usually something extraneous to the matter at hand.

One observer says he is never crochety, never angry and about like a "friendly parish priest type." He is a work-at-it Roman Catholic who attends mass at the Cathedral of St. Joseph in Hartford and likes to take strolls with his wife, Mary, after the service. His oldest son, Edward, 23, is a seminarian in his last year at St. Sulpice Seminary in Issy, just outside Paris, France, studying for priestly orders. His daughter, Margaret, 18, graduated last night from the Northwest Catholic High School. The Governor likes to go duckpin bowling with his two younger boys, John 19, and Levin, 16.

Mr. Dempsey has a longtime interest in the Boy Scouts. His father, the late Edward Dempsey, was a sergeant major in the British Army in the Boer War under the command of Lord Baden-Powell founder of the Boy Scout movement, and he kept in touch with the founder after his Army service. On one busy week during the legislative session that ended yesterday, Mr. Dempsey went out and made speeches at two Boy Scout functions.

The Governor attended public schools in Putnam, Conn., but did not finish the bachelor's course at Providence College, choosing instead to run for alderman when he was 22 years old. He won and was reelected four times. In 1947 he became mayor of Putnam, a small manufacturing city in the northeastern part of the State, and was elected six times.

He played baseball, football, and soccer in school and later played semiprofessional basketball and professional soccer. For years he kept in shape by running up and down court as a referee at high school basketball games. In 1959 he injured a leg when he attempted to play the game again and hobbled through most of the legislative session that year.

Food Is Still a Real Bargain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the public dialog over the recent rise in food prices continues and I happen to think this is a good thing for the country. If all the facts and factors are given a complete airing then I believe it will result in a better understanding on the part of all consumers as to the intricate relationships that exist in the American food industry—whose accomplishments are the envy of the entire world.

Mr. Paul S. Willis, president of the Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., has just written an excellent letter commenting on this food-price situation and making a very sound analysis of why food continues to be a real bargain for the American consumer.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Willis' letter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC.,

New York, N.Y., June 4, 1965.

DEAR FRIENDS OF AGRICULTURE: The Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, as you know, releases a monthly report on the cost-of-living index, drawing

comparisons with the same month in the previous year. When the report shows a percentage increase, especially as it applies to food prices, it usually gets front page position in the press, and the radio-TV people give it special emphasis.

Conversely, when there is a price decline, this usually gets small space in the back pages, and little or no mention by the commentators.

While we accept this situation, we feel, however, that the public is entitled to fuller information for its own guidance.

The recent BLS report shows that the April 1965 cost-of-living index was up 1.4 percent, and food-price index was up 1.5 percent over April 1964. The overall cost-of-living index was up mainly because of higher prices for cigarettes (due largely to higher taxes) gasoline, medical services, barber and beauty shop services, college fees, consumer services, and apparel. The food price index is up mainly because of higher prices for fresh strawberries, apples, green peppers, potatoes, and cucumbers. These prices were up because of crop losses due to unfavorable weather and growing conditions; and higher costs of harvesting due to labor shortages mainly because the Federal Government clamped down on bringing in the usual number of stoop-labor people, traditionally brought in from Mexico and elsewhere for harvesting seasonal perishable crops.

As it applies to food supplies and food prices, the American homemaker, who has some 8,000 items to choose from, can wisely do her shopping without increasing the cost of her grocery basket by avoiding those few products which might be temporarily in short supply or up in price. The vast assortment of canned and frozen fruits and vegetables, available at normal prices, provide homemakers with a wide selection of tasty, nutritious foods for their families' needs and enjoyment.

While food prices, according to Government figures, were up 1.5 percent this April over April 1964, actually in dollars and cents, this is what it amounts to: If the Government's grocery basket cost $10.39 a week in April 1964 this same grocery basket cost $10.55 a week in April 1965—an increase of 16 cents per week.

Over that same period, April 1964 to April 1965 the average wages of factory workers rose $2.59 per week. So, after paying the extra 16 cents for the grocery basket, the homemaker still has $2.43 of the weekly wage increase left over with which to buy other things.

Within the last 5 years the average wages for factory workers increased by $15.84 per week, rising from $89.72 in 1960 to $105.56 in 1965. During this time the price of the identical Government's grocery basket at the grocery store increased only 49 cents.

A leading food chain recently ran a full-page advertisement featuring a list of 60 items which it advertised originally in April 1955 at a total cost to the consumer of $25.78. In April 1965 it advertised the identical 60 items at a total cost of $27.10—an increase of $1.32, or 5 percent. The headline of the ad read: "A list of foods that would feed a family of four for a week."

In 1955 when this ad was run the average wage of factory workers was $75.70 per week. Now it is $105.56 per week—an increase of $29.86 per week in wages while the price of food increased $1.32. It is interesting to note that the comparison of food prices as advertised by the chain shows a 5-percent increase from 1955 to 1965, which is the same percentage of increase the BLS reports for the past 5 years.

These are all Government figures, both for food prices and wage rates. So, when you compare increased wage rates with increased costs of the grocery basket, food continues to be the real bargain, not only from the standpoint of cost, but in terms of convenience, timesaving, nutrition, tastiness, variety, and quality.

We feel that the people are entitled to this factual information for their own guidance.

Best regards.

Cordially yours,

PAUL S. WILLIS,
President.

Tomorrow's Doctor: A Team Player?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the Chicago Daily News of May 22, 1965:

TOMORROW'S DOCTOR: A TEAM PLAYER
(By Arthur J. Snider, Daily News science writer)

The practicing physician, one of the few remaining emblems of self-enterprising, rugged individualism, would be cast in a new role as a team performer, in a proposal for revamping medical education.

While the doctor would be team captain and coordinator, his authority and some of his identity would be diluted as auxiliary lay personnel takes over responsibility for parts of the Nation's health care.

This new direction for medicine, pointing to a heightened social outlook, was mapped in a 107-page report by Dr. Lowell T. Coggeshall, vice president of the University of Chicago. The report was released Saturday by the Association of American Medical Colleges.

The report has been termed the most significant since the famed Flexner study of 1910 stimulated a rebirth of medical education and routed the "diploma mills."

Dr. Coggeshall noted that "self-sufficient independence" has historically been the character of the physician but stressed that for future health needs there is "no alternative" to the team approach.

"Teamwork is mandatory in industry, communications, education, and other fields," he said. "It should not be impossible in the health sciences."

The distinguished medical statesman called for physicians' education to be increasingly weighted in management training and problem solving rather than in encyclopedic capacity.

One of the measures of a physician's competence would be his ability to use technical assistance and work cooperatively in a team.

"He must have the broad familiarity and competence to marshal the appropriate expertise and resources beyond his individual skill," the report urged.

Purpose of the Coggeshall report, initiated about a year ago by Dr. Ward Darley, then executive director of AAMC, was to determine whether modern medical education is properly geared for the developing trends in health care.

The Chicago leader was assisted by Dean William N. Hubbard, University of Michigan Medical School; Dr. Michael De Bakey, professor of surgery, Baylor University; Dean John E. Deitrick, Cornell University Medical College; Dr. Clark Kerr, president, University of California; Dr. George A. Perera, professor of medicine, Columbia University, and Dr. Robert C. Berson, 1964 president of AAMC.

They and their consultants interviewed Governors, legislators, Congressmen, university presidents, deans of medical schools, physicians, executives of insurance and pharmaceutical companies, and other key people across the Nation.

In a letter accompanying the report, Dr. Coggeshall wrote:

"Few persons interviewed believed improvements needed are matters of minor adjustment. Most pointed to the need to take major steps to enable the Nation to produce more and better prepared physicians and other health personnel."

The report recommended replacing the concept of medical education as a single discipline, concerned with single patient, with one that would be concerned with society as well.

This would mean working with those professionals involved with the impact of environment on health, for example.

"The physician working with colleagues in nursing, pharmacy, and dentistry no longer represents the spectrum of service for promotion of health," he said. "There must be collaboration with social scientists, economists, social phychologists, engineers, community planners, and others."

While medical schools must continue to be concerned with training more and better doctors, it also should have the responsibility for making sure that other groups on the health team are properly trained, the report said.

The training of individuals to perform specialized tasks under the physician's leadership was deemed inevitable since there are not now and apparently will not be enough doctors to keep up with the demand.

"Fortunately," the report said, "an increasing number of physicians is gaining more enthusiasm for development and use of such lay helpers."

Another reason for teaming medical care is the desire of patients to have service in one place.

"The patient, in a department-store-dominated age, is often unable to perceive the logic and desirability of 'shopping around' for health care—seeing one physician here, another there, stopping by a laboratory to leave blood and urine samples, visiting another office to have an X-ray made and returning to the original physician's office to learn the outcome," the report continued.

"Moreover, he often fails to find in his own physician's office the diagnostic equipment that he knows to be in use elsewhere."

Coggeshall also called on medical schools to view education as a continuum. Instead of dropping the student after his M.D. degree, it should eventually control his internship and residency training. It also should make available to practioners continuing postgraduate study to keep up with new knowledge.

Ultimately, the university should become the center of all medical education, the report said.

Commitment in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. RACE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, the news from Vietnam today, as distressing as it is to all of us, should serve, in my judgment, as a strengthening of will and determination by this country to repel Communist aggression with ever-increasing firmness.

The headline of today's Washington Post reports: "14 Americans Die in Viet Battle."

The news report with that headline goes on to detail the deaths and casualties of thousands of soldiers and civilians on both sides of the Vietnam conflict.

Criers of doom and the fainthearted ones throughout this country will point to this loss of American boys as further reason why we should withdraw from Vietnam.

To them I say, as the Washington Post editorializes today:

Painful though the decision is, the continuation of a strong posture of resistance to aggression in South Vietnam still appears to be less dangerous than either defeat or withdrawal.

I commend the analysis of this entire editorial to my colleagues and without objection request that it be included in the RECORD:

COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM

The White House statement of yesterday does not change the fact that American forces in Vietnam may now be used in regular fighting alongside the Vietnamese if the American commander deems it to be necessary. In this comment on a previous announcement that had come out of the State Department the White House insists that no new order has been given to General Westmoreland. Nevertheless, the current statements gives the public a somewhat different understanding of the policy than had been given in previous official discussion of it.

As we understand the order that has been given, American troops in South Vietnam will not engage in general combat. Their primary duty is the patrolling of important military installations and the adjacent areas. But within the scope of this mission they may fight with Vietnamese troops when the latter are aggressively attacked, if the Vietnamese commander requests it and the American commander thinks that the military situation requires it. Undoubtedly this will mean some further involvement of American forces in the Vietnamese war than the public had previously contemplated.

Yet the basic problem in Vietnam has not changed. Nor has the basic policy of this Government. The administration has merely indicated in more explicit terms that it is following a somewhat flexible policy of helping the South Vietnamese resist the aggression from their northern neighbors.

Six weeks ago President Johnson described his policy as one of "firmness with moderation." That is still an accurate description. What has happened since then is an intensification of the Vietcong's efforts to strike a series of climactic blows at South Vietnam. In response the United States has continued to bomb supply lines in North Vietnam and has stepped up its patroling operations and resistance to attacks in the vicinity of military bases. Yet the United States commitment remains limited. In purpose it will remain defensive.

In effect the administration has reaffirmed its determination not to abandon South Vietnam to Communist conquest. This is a policy that appears to have strong national backing. Congress recently voted overwhelmingly to support the continuation of aid to South Vietnam in its fight for survival, and this determination will not waiver because the struggle in that unhappy land is undergoing some measure of transformation.

The dangers involved in this course are well known in the White House, in the State Department and in virtually every American home. But the perils of each new step that is taken have to be measured against the perils of not taking it. Painful though the decision is, the continuation of a strong posture of resistance to aggression in South Vietnam still appears to be less dangerous than either defeat or withdrawal. For such a victory for militant communism would doubtless bring an escalation of armed aggression on a broad scale, with a graver menace for both peace and freedom.

Secretary of State Rusk took occasion to reiterate the eagerness of the United States to join in peace negotiations. Some wishful thinkers are saying that Hanoi cannot be expected to negotiate so long as the United States is bombing its territory. But the entire history of the Vietnamese affair indicates that Hanoi is even less inclined to talk when the pressure is relaxed.

The United States is trying to show the North Vietnamese that they cannot dictate the terms of a settlement by the continued use of force and violence against their neighbors. However disagreeable and costly that task may be, it still seems to involve less risk to our freedom and security than any form of knuckling under to the Communist threat in Vietnam.

Eskimo Olympics and Nuchalawoyya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, two of the most unusual and colorful celebrations in North America will soon be staged in interior Alaska. These are the Nuchalawoyya and the Eskimo Olympics, both of which are derived from the customs and traditions of the original people of the 49th State.

The Nuchalawoyya, to be held June 11 through 13 at Tanana, will include authentic Indian dancing, canoe and foot races, contests, and an outdoor potlatch.

The Eskimo Olympics, to be held July 21 through 23 at Fairbanks, will include Eskimo dances and sporting events, and a native beauty pageant.

So that these two excellent events may be better known, I insert here two recent items from an Alaskan newspaper that itself is extraordinary, the Tundra Times:

[From the Tundra Times]

EDITORIALS: ESKIMO OLYMPICS

One of the really fine spectacles to see in Alaska is the annual Golden Days celebration in Fairbanks. This exciting event will take place this year starting July 21 and it will last for 3 days. The celebration is uniquely Alaskan because it has spontaneity arising from the fact that it draws its ingredients from our State's rich heritage—its romantic past of the gold rush era and the colorful customs and traditions of its native inhabitants—the Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts.

The Eskimo Olympics section of the Golden Days has more than come into its own in the past few years and has become a definite must as a spectacle to see. It is exciting, unique, and a memorable performance.

The Golden Days Committee of Fairbanks has now wholeheartedly recognized the uniquely colorful value of the Olympics and has, this year, planned to make it even more exciting. The committee, of course, will have to have assistance from the villages and towns that will be involved so this can become a reality. One significant change the Golden Days group made was that the Olympics performances will be held indoors. This arrangement should help to give dignity to the native beauty pageant which it deserves.

A beautful native girl will be selected to reign over the Eskimo Olympics events and she should be the fairest of them all in Alaska. Some of the candidates will be those picked during Fourth of July celebrations in villages and one of them will be the queen of the Midnight Sun Festival at Nome. It is not too early to sharpen one's eyes for beauty and the appraisers of the comely lasses should keep their wary eyes open in places like Nome, Kotzebue, Barrow, Fort Yukon, and other places. To be the elected queen of the Eskimo Olympics has become a rewarding experience for the winners, and it should be the most sought after title by our beautiful native girls. Let this be the harbinger of spring when beauty oglers turn their fancy into thoughts of girls with pleasing personalities, intelligence, contour, and a nice turn of the ankle.

As usual, Eskimo dance contests will be held and the villages represented should endeavor to add to their repertoire and come up with some really fine dances. There should also be some additional performances, besides the popular high kick, like the hand-hop that is done by putting one's legs over each elbow and balancing with one's hand on the floor and hopping forward to see how far the performer can hop without losing his balance. This is a difficult sport but it is highly amusing to see. There are other Eskimo sports that should be introduced and they would surely please the audiences.

The Eskimo Olympics promises to be even better this year and villages and towns can play a big part in making it a reality. It is none too early to plan to present a really fine performance by each of the participants. The idea of putting on best performances ever, could perhaps be done with the thought of looking ahead to the Alaska centennial celebration in 1967.

[From the Tundra Times]

NUCHALAWOYYA

NU-CHA-LA-WOY-YA,
TANANA YUKON FESTIVAL,
Tanana, Alaska, May 14, 1965.

TUNDRA TIMES, INC.
Fairbanks, Alaska.

DEAR FRIEND: With the arrival of spring it is time to announce our annual Nu-Cha-La-Woy-Ya Indian celebration. This year we are having it on June 11, 12, and 13. Some of the main events are the authentic Indian dancing, archery contests, the awe-inspiring canoe racing, cross-country footracing, etc. On the evening of June 11, we will have our big outdoor potlatch.

In the past we have held these good times to coincide with the chiefs conference and the boat marathon, but this year we will have to do without them. This is the fourth time we are having this particular celebration within recent years and, of course, we would like to make it known that this big event is sponsored by the generous people of Tanana. We do this so people from outlying villages can come and share our good fortune with us, and it is always a fine time to renew old friendships and make new ones. In the past, we have had excellent dance groups from the villages of Minto and Stevens Village, and you can be sure we appreciate their splendid cooperation by sharing our fun with us.

Usually folks have people stay with them during their visit here in Tanana as we do not have a hotel or a roadhouse for our visitors. So with this in mind, we hope everyone will be able to come this year.

Sincerely,

MILTON NICHOLIA,
President.

ALFRED GRANT,
Vice President and Publicity Chairman.

HARRIET R. GRANT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

How To Avoid a Coinage Crisis While Reducing the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the public I have asked that the letter I have today addressed to my colleagues be reproduced in this RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 10, 1965.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In almost no time the bill to remove silver from dimes, quarters and half dollars will be on the floor for action. The haste in enacting this legislation is understandable because changing the people's money is a touchy business. When it has to be done action should be expeditious. The world shortage of silver makes such action necessary.

The issue here is not whether the new coinage legislation should be enacted. It should be.

Rather the issue is what provisions it should contain to manage wisely the transition period from our old silver coinage to the new nonsilver coinage.

Gresham's law that good money is driven out of circulation by bad money has not been repealed. It will go into full operation when these new coins of nominal intrinsic value start circulating side by side with present silver coins which are intrinsically valuable. People will start to hoard the coins and we are headed for one of the most drastic coin shortages this Nation has ever faced. You are seeing the beginnings of it already.

The mint cannot possibly keep up with the demand for new coins and the consequent public inconvenience will be politically explosive. The only remedy being asked by the administration is standby authority to issue regulations against melting down coins for the purpose of selling their silver content at a profit when the price of silver eventually goes up. Shortage of U.S. silver stocks will not permit sale of silver for long at the Treasury's $1.29 per ounce price. Thereafter the price could climb as high as $2.50 according to monetary experts.

To avoid the impending coin shortage crisis—or to ameliorate it when it comes—I will offer two amendments to the bill giving the Secretary of the Treasury discretionary authority as follows:

1. To add a small quantity of very rare metal (to be selected by him) to the new coins and to establish a monetary price on this rare metal equal to the value of the silver in existing coins. This will keep the old and new coins at parity in intrinsic value and tend to avoid the operation of Gresham's law.

2. To issue paper fractional currency in 10 cents, 25 cents, and 50 cents denominations if needed for the public convenience in carrying out daily transactions under conditions of a coin shortage.

The bill before us also neglects to provide for another important subject—the matter of seigniorage. This is the profit the Government will make on the difference between the face value of the new coins it issues and its cost of making them. This profit will be at least 80 percent of the face value of each coin and probably more.

The value of present coins in circulation is $2,230,100,000. Thus the seigniorage—profit—on replacing them will be about $1,780,080,000. During the estimated 3-year replacement period, increasing needs for new and additional coins will amount to around $1,150 million for another $920 million profit. Total profit: $2,700,080,000.

Thereafter the Treasury should continue to make around one-quarter billion dollars a year profit on additional new coins it issues.

In fairness to the citizen public whose money is being tinkered with I think these seigniorage profits should be applied against the national debt rather than allowed to be sublimated into a mass of Treasury statistics, the net effect of which would be to make the administration budget look $2.7 billion better. I will offer an amendment for this purpose also.

I surely hope you may agree that these three amendments will assist us to handle a difficult situation in a better way and that you will support them when offered.

Thank you for your courtesy and consideration.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

Russian Fisheries Make Money and Serve Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Undersea Technology of May 1965:

RUSSIAN FISHERIES MAKE MONEY AND SERVE MILITARY

As part of his statement to the Senate Committee on Commerce hearings on S. 944, a bill to establish a National Oceanographic Council, Dr. Wilbert M. Chapman, director, resources division, Van Camp Seafood Co. and member of numerous professional committees, had some revealing things to say about Russian progress in fisheries. Here are his key quotes. Some of his remarks on other subjects appear in the accompanying story.

As a result of the rich unused resources off our coasts, fishermen from Asia and Europe are coming to fish them in increasing variety and volume. Our impoverished and underequipped coastal fishermen resent this competition. This erodes continuously the law of the sea and our full freedom to use the high seas for all purposes. This freedom has been a prime objective of U.S. policy since Thomas Jefferson first enunciated the adherence of the United States to the 3-mile doctrine for the breadth of the territorial sea.

Our domestic fisheries jog along on an even keel. We do little of a practical nature to assist the developing countries in solving this problem themselves.

Russia does otherwise. They long ago replaced us in the rank of No. 2 fish producer in the world. Then they were replaced in this position by bustling Peru, but the Russian high seas fish production has continued to increase steadily according to planned schedule in all of the seas of the world from the Arctic to the Antarctic, and in the Indian, Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with their communicating seas and gulfs. It is now double ours, and their production is still increasing rapidly, a little ahead of their planned schedule. Our production stands still, and actually fell back some last year.

The most rapidly increasing domestic fishery in Africa is in Ghana. This is moving with massive and practical help from Russia. In addition Russia is landing 20,000 tons of fish per year in Ghana from its own vessels' catch off Angola and Senegal, to the great benefit of Ghana and to its own profit. Russian vessels at present are landing 2,000 tons of fresh frozen fish per month in Nigeria where the need for protein is great. It is planned that these landings will treble within 18 months to a level of 6,000 tons per month, which Nigeria so badly needs.

The same thing is going on in Congo (Brazzaville), Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea. In Senegal, Russia bought $6 million worth of surplus peanuts last year and for this has contracted to build for the Government of Senegal a modern fishing and fish processing industry. Algeria has just been the recipient of an ocean research vessel from Russia. Russia is building a modern fishing harbor for Egypt at Alexandria on the Mediterranean and another at Ras Banas on the Red Sea.

Russia is fishing for various kinds of fish in the Gulf of Aden and landing much of its catches in Sudan and Egypt where animal protein is badly needed, again at its profit. Russia is building a modern port for Somalia at Berbera on the Gulf of Aden. Russia has offered to do the same for Zanzibar in east Africa. Russia has recently offered to land large quantities of fish regularly from its Indian Ocean fleets in India, whose people need the protein.

Similar overtures are underway with Ceylon, which is desperately short of fish. Russia is building a $12 million fishing port in Cuba, which also needs animal protein. It has made approaches to Brazil to aid that country in this matter.

This does not begin to cover the impact of the Soviet fishing revolution. There is little wonder that Russia has some impact in these developing countries.

It must be plainly noted that whatever military, diplomatic, and political benefit Russia derives from all this abroad, the whole operation is soundly based on a competent, expanding fishing industry at home and it does not appear to me to be operating at anything except a profit from the fishing activities themselves.

Th tactical defense posture of the United States suffers vis-a-vis Russia because Russia has fishing operation where it needs them for these purposes and the United States does not.

It is no accident that the fishing base in Cuba is in a good position to interdict commerce headed for the Panama Canal, if need be. The same is true of the fishing developments in the Gulf of Aden and the Red Sea in their relation to transit through Suez; and the gift of a merchant marine and navigation academy to Indonesia, which lies athwart the routes of access between the Pacific and Indian Oceans.

Russia has sought for years, at times with success but not so much now, to aid Iceland and the Faroe Islanders in fishery matters and by so doing win them allies. It is no coincidence that these islands lie adjacent to the main commercial artery between North America and Western Europe. Having numerous and large fishing vessels working normally off West Africa makes them handy to keep an eye on what is going on down the Atlantic Missile Range. Russian fishing vessels turn up wherever the United States is shooting off something interesting, and for the most part they are making a living fishing there at the same time.

The worldwide strategic posture of the United States suffers in a major way vis-a-vis Russia because Russia has concrete plans for the full use of the ocean. The United States has no such plan for using the ocean.

Russia set out in the early 1950's to build up its world fisheries. It has proceeded methodically to do so. It passed us a long while ago because we were standing still. It is still picking up momentum. Its world-

wide fishery activities now about match those of Japan, and my guess is they will soon exceed those of the Japanese. It has, from the start, closely and carefully applied science and technology to this purpose at all levels from the education of scientists, marine architects, and fishermen, to daring design and equipment of vessels, and to the development of operational research to maximize their efficiency of operations at sea. It has not spared capital or labor in this endeavor. We can laugh at their agricultural and consumer goods industries, but in space and on the ocean they are good.

The Russians have now set out to do the same thing with their merchant marine. They are overtaking us according to their plan and expect to exceed our carrying capacity on the sea during the 1970's. I see no reason to expect that they will not succeed.

Statement of Mr. Everett Ware Smith, President, the New England Council Before the Special Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, 89th Congress, 1st Session, Hearings in Portland, Maine, June 2, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, last week in Portland, Maine, a special Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution met to hear testimony on S. 4 and H.R. 3988, legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Mr. Everett Ware Smith, president of the New England Council testified at this hearing in support of the above mentioned legislation.

Mr. Smith's testimony, I believe, was extremely thoughtful and constructive. The following is the text of Mr. Smith's testimony:

STATEMENT OF MR. EVERETT WARE SMITH, PRESIDENT, THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIR AND WATER POLLUTION, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, HEARINGS IN PORTLAND, MAINE, JUNE 2, 1965

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the New England Council, I would like to take this opportunity to submit for your consideration our views on the necessity of water pollution control legislation, and specifically, S. 4 and H.R. 3988, similar bills to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The provisions of these bills have been the subject of intensive study and debate and it is not necessary for me to review them in detail. However, I do want to discuss certain aspects of these measures which I believe warrant the careful attention of this committee.

First, the proposed Water Quality Act of 1965 would grant the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare authority to establish water quality standards designed to enhance the quality of interstate waters. In establishing such standards, the Secretary is required to consider the use and value of such interstate waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes and agricultural, industrial and other legitimate uses. These standards are to be published only if, within a reasonable time after being requested by the Secretary to do so, the appropriate State and interstate agencies have not developed satisfactory standards. Certainly, this committee recognizes the problems facing our State and interstate authorities in their quest for effective performance regarding such standards. Nor should the record of performance of such organizations as the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission go unnoted or unappreciated. Yet, today's compelling need to continue an all-out effort toward the prevention, control, and abatement of pollution suggests that this provision for compliance by State and interstate authorities is reasonable in terms of overall public interest.

Second, I wish to comment on that portion of legislation authorizing more research into methods of combating all forms of pollution. The causes of pollution are too well known to this committee for me to go into them in any great detail other than saying that it is a combined municipal and industrial problem, and that vigorous action must be taken as soon as possible if the problem is to be controlled and eliminated. Furthermore, the problem crosses State lines with such frequency that it can clearly be termed a matter for Federal consideration.

However, one matter of need become apparent. Any legislation that proposes assistance for municipalities in the treatment of their segment of the problem should make similar provision for assistance to industry. It is my understanding that legislation to this effect has been introduced by Senator RIBICOFF, and that it would permit Federal aid to industry in order to help meet required standards. This aid would include Federal loans at a relatively low-interest rate and tax relief to encourage the construction of necessary treatment plants. Such an approach is essential to the overall success of any pollution prevention, control, and abatement program. There is no question of the appropriateness of this approach in view of the fact that few industries can afford to invest large sums of money in nonproductive assets such as treatment plants. Clearly then, some form of aid to industry is required. I would urge that this committee concentrate on this aspect of water pollution control legislation. In many parts of New England today, it is of greater importance to secure the compliance of industry than of municipalities.

New England is beyond that point in time which permits local political interests or private economic interests to be placed above the public interest. That was yesterday. Today, we need action programs, based on strengthend powers of enforcement, coupled to adequate financial aid, and supported by an enlightened public opinion. Nothing is to be gained from further delay of this process. We believe that the legislative needs which this committee is considering are of tremendous importance to the future well-being of New England and we hope that the Congress will provide for sufficient financial support and technical assistance in both municipal and industrial areas to make for an effective water quality program. We would only counsel that this be done without creating undue economic burdens for the public and private parties concerned.

Thank you.

Writing in the Sky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, there have been many columns and editorials devoted to the Vietnam situation in the past weeks and months.

An excellent to-the-point editorial titled "Writing in the Sky" apeared in the New York Journal American Thursday, May 20, and appropriately, I believe, points up our position.

The editorial follows:

WRITING IN THE SKY

The United States has resumed its bombing attacks on installations in North Vietnam—and President Ho Chi Minh has no one to blame but himself.

North Vietnam is conducting a war of aggression against its South Vietnamese neighbor. Without the material support of Hanoi, the guerrilla war in the South would dry up.

North Vietnam has been offered a chance to begin unconditional peace talks in order to end the war. It has declined. It was granted a respite from the systematic bombing of its military potential—which means the potential of the Vietcong guerrillas—but maintained silence on peace overtures.

It is clear, then, that North Vietnam is determined to continue the war against South Vietnam, and is therefore paying the price. The resumption of air attacks comes, moreover, at a time when heavier ground fighting is anticipated in South Vietnam—fighting which could involve American troops in an outright combat role.

Thus every bridge destroyed, every barracks shattered, every rail line smashed in North Vietnam is one for our side. Perhaps Ho Chi Minh will realize this after a while, and call a halt to the war in southeast Asia—as only he can.

U.S. Public Is Strongly Opposed To Easing of Immigration Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Louis Harris, pollster, of the Washington Post Co., conducted a poll to determine the views of the American people regarding the immigration law changes proposed by the Johnson administration.

The results of that poll were printed in the May 31 issue of the Washington Post.

I believe Members of the House with due regard to the type questions, will be greatly interested in the attitudes of our people across the Nation on almost a 2-to-1 basis; determined by the poll, which follow:

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 1965]

THE HARRIS SURVEY: U.S. PUBLIC IS STRONGLY OPPOSED TO EASING OF IMMIGRATION LAWS

(By Louis Harris)

The American public, although largely descended from people who came to a new land to escape the persecution, famine, and chaos of other lands, today by better than 2 to 1 opposes changing immigration laws to allow more people to enter this country. What is more, President Johnson's proposal that immigrants be admitted on the basis of skills rather than by country quotas meets with a tepid response.

In fact, a survey of public opinion reveals that Americans prefer people from Canada and Northern and Western Europe as immigrants and tend to oppose immigrants from

Latin America, Southern and Eastern Europe, Russia, the Middle East and Asia.

A national cross section was asked:

"President Johnson has proposed that the immigration laws of this country be changed to allow more people into the United States as immigrants. From what you know or have heard, do you favor or oppose letting more people come to the United States as immigrants?"

Favor or oppose more immigrants

[In percent]

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure
Nationwide	24	58	18
By religion:			
Protestants	18	65	17
Catholics	33	44	23
Jews	44	41	15
By income:			
Under 5,000	15	64	21
Under $10,000	27	55	18
Under $15,000	28	53	19
By religion:			
East	37	43	20
Midwest	20	63	17
South	12	69	19
West	21	61	18
By size of place:			
Cities	33	47	20
Suburbs	33	49	18
Towns	19	64	17
Rural	7	76	17
By key ethnic groups:			
English	10	70	20
German	12	76	12
Italian	38	30	32
Austro-Hungarian	38	47	15
Eastern European	38	46	16
Polish	40	44	16

On both sides of the issue, people are outspoken about their feelings.

A 53-year-old businessman from Macon, Ga., said of immigrants from abroad, "Most of them are just like Negroes and will only bring trouble." A 42-year-old third generation white-collar worker of Irish descent from Mount Vernon, N.Y., said, "Just ride New York's subways and you will find the immigrants smell and are dirty and impolite, push you around, have no respect. Keep them out." A 54-year-old farmer in Centerfield, Ky., said, "When they come in, we can't tell whether they are Communists. The Reds say they will take us over without firing a shot. Immigration is the way they plan to do it."

But a 61-year-old skilled worker in Brooklyn disagreed: "The country was founded by immigrants and I myself am one. It's what can keep us great." The wife of a businessman in San Pedro, Calif., said, "Very often immigrants make better citizens than the native born." A Wisconsin salesman said, "We have gotten a lot of well-educated and brilliant scientists from other countries. Look at that Von Braun and the space program." Then he added, "Of course, it all depends on who they are and where they are from."

In an effort to meet criticism of existing immigration quotas, President Johnson recently proposed that the laws be changed as indicated in the following question:

"One of the proposed changes in the immigration laws is to base quotas on the skills of people to be admitted to the United States rather than on the basis of their country of origin. Would you be in favor of such a change in the immigration laws or do you think a country quota system is right?"

Base immigration on skills or quotas?

[Total public percent]

Base more on skills of individual	36
Base more on country quotas	29
Makes no difference	15
Not sure	20

Part of the reason for the reluctance of Americans to lower the barriers to immigration obviously rests in the aversion many Americans express to people from countries covering over three-quarters of the world's population. People were asked:

"Here is a list of countries and parts of the world. If we are going to allow more people into this country as immigrants, which countries or places on this list would you most prefer they come from?

"And which countries or places would you least like to see immigrants into the United States come from?"

Most and least desired immigrants

[In percent]

Country of immigration	Most preferred	Least preferred
Canada	28	1
England or Scotland	22	2
Scandinavia	20	1
Germany	17	6
Ireland	16	1
France	9	4
Italy	7	6
Poland	6	8
Mexico	5	11
Latin America	4	9
Eastern Europe	3	7
Middle East	3	14
Asia	2	15
Russia	2	26
Makes no difference	34	30
Not sure	13	15

NOTE.—Percentages add to more than 100 because some respondents gave more than one answer.

It is ironic, perhaps, that the people who most tend to oppose more immigration—those whose ancestors came from Western and Northern Europe—are also the very groups which most Americans would most welcome as immigrants.

Dr. Frederick A. Cook Centenary Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, on June 13 the people of Callicoon, N.Y., and indeed many others in near and distant places, will have occasion to honor the memory of a most unusual man. On that date, in this small community in Sullivan County, N.Y., there will be celebrated the centenary of the birth of Dr. Frederick A. Cook.

Dr. Cook has been acclaimed by many to be the discoverer of the North Pole. His claim to this distinction predates by 1 year that made by Robert E. Peary. Through the intervening years, these two counterclaims have been the center of a wideranging controversy. By and large it has been Peary who has received the lion's share of the publicity. This unfortunately, has led to a popular belief in the legitimacy of Peary's position. However, in recent years, in years of more sophisticated technical knowledge, there has grown a most impressive record of evidence which has led many to believe that Dr. Cook was truly the first man to reach the North Pole.

The following article written by one of the most renowned scientific reporters of our time, Mr. Walter Sullivan, is from the New York Times of May 8 this year. It adds one more link in the ever-growing chain of belief in Dr. Cook's marvelous accomplishment:

COOK-PEARY DISPUTE OVER NORTH POLE IS RECALLED

(By Walter Sullivan)

A Navy icebreaker has reached a rocky, hilly, island that is drifting down into the warm Atlantic Ocean. Her mission is to rescue 18 residents before the island melts.

For 4 years the island has served as a Navy research station, known as Arlis 2. It has drifted from north of Alaska, almost directly over the North Pole, and is now slipping past Iceland into the North Atlantic. The distance between is 1,500 miles.

Arlis 2 is a platter of ice about 70 feet thick. It measures 2 miles by a mile and half and is sprinkled with huts as well as rocky hills. Although its surface, including its air strip, is a slushy morass, according to Navy reports, the ice beneath is still solid.

It is feared that the island may drift far south with its crown of boulders, some of them 6 feet in diameter, still intact. It would then constitute a serious menace to shipping.

Arlis 2 looks so much like solid land that some suspect it may have played a strange role in one of the most bitter personal disputes of the century.

The rivals, Dr. Frederick A. Cook and Robert E. Peary, both claimed discovery of the North Pole. Both claims were disputed in part because each said he had seen land far out in the Artic Ocean where, as shown later, no land exists.

A recent issue of the journal Arctic carried a commentary on the 100th anniversary of Cook's birth. It pointed out that he may have seen an ice island, such as Arlis 2. Some have even proposed that both he and Peary sighted Arlis 2 itself. The commentary urged that Cook's claim be reconsidered.

Cook said he reached the Pole on April 21, 1908, after sighting a 50-mile stretch of land 1,000 feet high. He named it Bradey Land for his chief backer. Peary reported reaching the Pole a year later.

DISPUTE NEVER SETTLED

The rival claims set off a controversy that has never been fully laid to rest. Cook originally had the support of the Explorer's Club in New York and the New York Herald, which later merged to form the New York Herald Tribune. He was met on his return to Annoatok by Harry Payne Whitney, uncle of John Hay Whitney, who is now publisher of the New York Herald Tribune.

Harry Payne Whitney described Cook and the two Eskimos who accompanied him as "half starved and very thin, terribly dirty and Dr. Cook, like the Eskimos, had long hair reaching to his shoulders." Mr. Whitney reportedly believed Cook's story of reaching the pole.

Peary, who had the backing of the Peary Arctic Club and the New York Times, soon won wide acceptance for his claim, whereas many doubted Cook, despite his earlier feats in both polar regions. Cook's case was further damaged when mountaineers discredited his claim of having ascended Mount McKinley, the highest peak in North America.

Cook was expelled from the Explorer's Club and later was jailed for fraud in a case unrelated to his exploration. Yet a number of explorers, such as Roald Amundsen, stood by him. They noted that Peary, too, had reported sighting a nonexistent island, Crocker Land, on a journey toward the pole in 1906.

The ice islands are platters of ice as much as 150 feet thick. Some are several hundred square miles in area. Most, if not all, are born from the Ward Hunt Ice Shelf, an apron of floating ice attached to the north coast of Ellesmere Island. The apron is fed by falling snow and by glaciers on the island. The glaciers carry rock from the land.

During the winter of 1961–62 the Ward Hunt Ice Shelf gave birth to a new genera-

tion of ice islands, at least three of them larger than Arlis 2. Its predecessor as a Navy station, Arlis 1, rode a floe and was short lived. Both were established by the Arctic Research Laboratory, operated by the University of Alaska for the Office of Naval Research at Point Barrow, Alaska.

The name Arlis stands for "Arctic Research Laboratory Ice Station."

The hills on Arlis 2 are only about 50 feet high, compared to the 1,000-foot elevation claimed by Cook for Bradley Land. However, heights and distances are deceptive in the polar regions. Furthermore, as noted by present-day historians, both Cook and Peary tended to overdramatize their discoveries.

URGES REEXAMINATION

The commentary in Arctic was written by John Euller, a writer on polar matters. Walter A. Wood, president of the American Geographical Society, is among those who have recently expressed the view that Cook's claims regarding his polar journey should be reexamined.

Yesterday, the Office of Naval Research in Washington reported that the U.S.S. *Edisto*, after weeks of maneuvering through ice fields, had reached Arlis 2 and tied up to the island. A tractor airlifted to it as part of the station's equipment is being used to haul salvageable gear to the icebreaker. The vessel's helicopters are ferrying more fragile items.

In recent years the United States and the Soviet Union have each maintained one or two stations on the drifting ice of the Arctic Ocean. Some were on ice islands and others on the thinner ice floes.

Both nations have kept a constant record of ocean depths as wind and current carried the ice hither and yon. Samples have been hauled up from the ocean floor.

Observations have been also made of the aurora, the earth's magnetism, and its gravity. Samples of sea life were collected and a variety of other observations made, too.

The Achilles' Heel of Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, in the April edition of Traffic Management there appears an excellent editorial by Mr. Stephen Tinghitello, editor in chief, which is an interesting and provocative discussion concerning a very timely topic. The editorial describes the far-reaching effects of transportation strikes. The lead sentence, "Nothing except war upsets the economy more than a transportation strike," is significant.

I commend the reading of this article to my colleagues:

THE ACHILLES' HEEL OF TRANSPORTATION

Nothing except war upsets the economy more than a transportation strike. It cannot be stated as simply a transport industry struggle to settle its differences with labor on problems of working conditions. When it happens it affects the entire industrial economy, reaching most segments of trade, workers on a broad scale, and even the general public. Sad to say, this is an infirmity that is without too much hope for correction in the near future. The greatest transportation system in the world has its Achilles' heel in labor relations.

Looking back into recent years and reviewing the longshoremen's strike which just ended, we see the same monotonous pattern. Here is the picture: A fever-pitch prestrike rush period to meet deadlines at piers. Embargoes by land carriers for port shipments when the strike is announced and complete inactivity at affected ports. Settlement after 2 months and then all hell breaks loose for export delivery and pickup of imports. Eventually things drift back to normal. But what really is the total cost of such strikes? It should run well over $2 billion in direct losses alone. It's impossible to assay all costs for industry, labor, Government and consumers as well.

Apply all this to similar labor disruptions in trucking, railroading, or air transport and you would see pretty much the same scenes. We talked about water transport because a session just ended in that area. Shippers, who are bystanders (except when private carriage is involved), have little or nothing to say about negotiations or conditions in bargaining. But they pay in extra operating costs before, during, and after a strike. The old whip of inflation comes out of the closet. Costs go up for carriers because of higher labor rates. Carriers can't absorb these and invariably pass them on to users in increased freight charges.

This persuaded us to ask traffic executives what they thought about the transport labor situation regarding all modes. Their answers ranged from "we've grown to accept it and do the best we can," to "there ought to be a law prohibiting transport strikes." Then we went a little further and asked them how they handled their traffic during such times. Here are some interesting off-the-cuff answers:

"Long before a strike is called I report the matter as I see it. I write my superior about the issues involved, whether a strike is imminent, what we can or cannot do to receive materials and ship to customers, and what plans are being made by my department to handle our traffic generally. Personally, I think it's wise to prepare for the worst and hope for the best rather than be optimistic and get caught short."

"When it looks like a strike is in the offing and we have enough leadtime, we step up production and ship heavily in large lots. Sometimes this is costly because of overtime, but it's better to supply your customers through various warehouses of it's a domestic problem or get an early sailing if it's foreign business. Too many times if you can't supply a customer during strike periods he gets his orders from other sources (either locally or from foreign competition, depending upon the type of strike) and you have a hard time getting the business back. Reliability is important to our customers, and excuses are no substitute."

"There's nothing more demoralizing than laying off help because you can't move your production. The onus is on the traffic department when we have to lock our doors because of inability to ship, particularly when other companies are doing so. This is a challenge to the traffic manager to use whatever means are available to get the stuff delivered. The higher cost of shipping puts a dent in the report showing savings, but then the traffic manager is not an accountant. He's got to see that the firm's products reach the customer."

"I'd rather switch than fight for a principle especially when my boss says, 'We have our own business to worry about; get the orders off the platform and on their way.' I sympathize with the transportation company's position when it courageously holds out against unfair demands, but who am I to argue with the boss. So I find a carrier who has abandoned the fight and use him even though I dislike him. This happens often in trucking strikes."

"I'd rather spend more money in setting up distribution points outside strike areas to cover as much territory as possible. I work from a map so that no type of shipping combination is overlooked. Shipping during a strike is like fighting a battle where every detail is weighed for importance."

"If it looks like a total shutdown of transport operations is imminent, then I advise our sales manager to push for larger orders before the deadline date so that customers can stock up. Customers are not reluctant to order more in troubled times because they know that they can return goods later if it's beyond their capacity to consume or sell them."

"Inform the boss about the trouble that's brewing but keep the problems out of his hands. That is why he has a traffic manager. He will understand the need for a higher delivery cost whether it's a warehousing proposition, private trucking or premium routings. But production shutdowns because of no transportation are serious and he cannot help but think that his traffic department let him down."

"Here is where a close association with carrier executives is important. They usually know what is cooking with unions and how determined they are. This information is relayed to my management, who know the value of inside reports."

"We have seasonal business which must be delivered at all costs. Our investment becomes a total loss if we miss the season because of non-delivery. So we manage to get our shipments delivered and bill the customer for extra shipping costs."

It's not a pretty picture, is it? Questions in our mind are:

How can the traffic man help management more in such matters?

Should Congress review collective bargaining processes in an industry so vital as transportation?

Is this a "hands-off" situation strictly between transport management and labor, even though all industry and the general welfare is affected?

Laws were not made to be static if they do not meet the needs of a dynamic economy such as ours. We feel that traffic executives who see things at close range and keep the "pipelines" of commerce open during strike periods should take the initiative. They should certainly report to management about their companies' extra costs following a transport strike. Beyond that, management should be provided with solid recommendations for legislative action. This more powerful voice could be addressed to such groups as the Transportation Association of America and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Teamster Testimony Declares 14(b) Repeal Needed To Insure Uniform Labor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, hearings on H.R. 77 and related bills, repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, have been concluded and a favorable report has been submitted to the full Committee on Education and Labor.

A statement by Mr. Sidney Zagri, legislative counsel for the Teamsters, was included in the testimony presented in favor of this very important legislation.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to include below an article that appeared in the latest issue of the International Teamster which provides a concise résumé of Mr. Zagri's statement:

TEAMSTER TESTIMONY DECLARES 14(b) REPEAL NEEDED TO INSURE UNIFORM LABOR POLICY

Teamster Legislative Counsel Signey Zagri made a powerful plea for a uniform national labor policy when he testified May 26 in favor of repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to enact compulsory open shop laws.

Zagri appeared before a House Select Subcommittee on Labor hearing testimony on H.R. 77 and related bills. As a spokesman for 1,743,000 teamsters and their families, he said:

"In the year 1965, we believe as we did in 1947. There is probably no right—other than the right to strike—which organized labor seems more consecrated or more indispensable to its continued well being than the right to seek and obtain union security agreements through the process of collective bargaining."

Zagri said the union shop principle has become a "characteristic and an established part of the American industrial system."

He cited recent Labor Department statistics showing that approximately 85 percent of all workers in all industries covered by union agreements are working under one form or another of union security provision, and added:

"In the Teamsters Union, over 92 percent of our members are presently covered by union shop contracts."

The remainder of the membership, Zagri said, does not receive the protection of the union shop and must work against its will with nonunion members who are free riders "and obtain the benefits of the union contract without sharing in the responsibilities."

"In the year 1965, the facts about our national economy are such as to require a uniform national labor policy," Zagri said. "Two hundred of America's largest corporations are responsible for 40 percent of the total manufacturing output."

He continued:

"Section 14(b) has been a strong deterrent to the formulation of such a uniform policy. The absence of a uniform national labor policy has resulted in a great economic loss to the workers in 14(b) States."

Zagri estimated that on the basis of population figures for 1962, the net loss in personal income for the right-to-work States was $8.3 billion below the national average. Compared with free States in the same year, the compulsory open shop States suffered a net loss for total population of more than $12.6 billion.

The Teamster spokesman cited the precedent of 1951 amendments to the Railway Labor Act after Congress recognized the inconsistency in the policy of authorizing the union shop at the Federal level and denying it at the State level.

"The union shop proviso of the amendment to the Railway Labor Act supersedes all State laws," Zagri said. As a result, railroad workers enjoy a higher standard of living and railroad profits have reached record highs.

"After 14 years of favorable experience with the union shop proviso in the railroad industry," Zagri asked, "why not extend the same principle to all industries through the repeal of section 14(b)?"

He listed four results of this basic inconsistency in our national labor policy which has:

Emasculated collective bargaining in right-to-work States.

Denied federally protected rights to individual workers and their representatives under the guise of right-to-work laws.

Divided Americans and promoted class warfare destroying stable collective bargaining relationships.

Promoted low-wage competition for industry among the several States offering as inducements low wages and weak unions.

Zagri cited numerous examples to illustrate the inconsistencies in the country's labor policy, offered several exhibits, and concluded:

"The elite troops in the war on poverty are the trade union organizers. Give them the tools and they will finish the job.

"The repeal of section 14(b) would release the trade union movement and its historic mission of organizing the unorganized. Less than 8 percent of the total membership of the Teamsters Union is in compulsory open shop States. I am reasonably certain that this percentage would apply with some degree of accuracy to the rest of the labor movement."

The Real Alabama—Part IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the economy of any area depends heavily on transportation, and in Alabama we have one of the finest transportation structures of any State in the Union.

Through the efforts of our people we have developed fast and efficient networks of water, rail, and highway transportation systems.

I would like to highlight our highway developments, and what they mean for truck transportation in Alabama. The following two articles appeared in the New York Journal of Commerce special supplement on Alabama, April 26, 1965:

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS SETS RECORD

Highway department figures show Gov. George C. Wallace's administration has broken all records for highway construction. The road program totaled $277 million from January 1963, to January 1965.

Construction contracts amounted to $202.6 million; right-of-way totaled $34.2 million; relocation of utilities cost $10 million; engineering and aerial surveys cost $2.2 million, and maintenance and special surfacing cost $28 million.

Since the beginning of the administration, interstate contracts totaling $121.8 million have been awarded. The $53.8 million let in 1963 alone exceeds the combined total of $41 million for the 2 preceding years.

The 1964 investment in interstate construction was even greater—$68 million.

Alabama's Interstate System now has 257 miles open to traffic and 229 miles under construction. Another 83 miles will be opened in 1965. Highway engineers estimate that 424 miles will be in use by the end of the Wallace administration—almost one-half the State's 878-mile system.

Improvements on the primary system cost $37.1 million for the 2-year period—$28.7 million on State and U.S. routes and $8.4 million on urban links. This work is aimed at widening and four-laning certain major highways carrying heaviest traffic.

The highway department has signed agreements with 236 of the 347 eligible municipalities in the State. Work totaling $13 million is either completed or in progress. Street improvements are 100 percent complete on projects costing $2.3 million. According to present scheduling, 95 percent of the $20 million municipal aid allocation will be under agreement by the middle of 1965.

Although classified as a "secondary system," Alabama's farm-to-market network got first-class improvements during the past 2 years. Contracts for new construction and reconstruction on county roads totaled $41 million and covered 1,800 miles in all 67 counties. An additional $3.8 million was spent for 2,000 miles of resurfacing.

TRUCKS SERVE AS MARKET LINK

The influx of new industry into Alabama, the opening up of the river ports from Mobile north, and industrial diversification, are combining to create a whole new transportation concept in the State.

This is becoming more evident daily in the trucking field, where the network of new highways is linking all sections of the State and the Nation with an integrated transport system for the first time in Alabama's history.

The new plants springing up throughout Alabama are locating near their markets or within a few hours overnight distance from markets outside the State. This is a new pattern that has become more evident daily in the South, where major industries are seeking to bring in satellite plants to use the products in an effort to cut cost.

Over the years, Alabama's rising economy has brought more and more national trucking lines into the State. These, coupled with domestic intrastate common carriers, give Alabama one of the best highway trucking systems in the South.

Paper, fuel, lumber, building materials and coal, are some of the major items being handled by the trucking industry in Alabama.

The State's industry also depends on trucking for the shipment of supplies and raw materials and for the shipment of products.

RIVER PORTS

But it was the opening up the network of 14 inland river ports by the Alabama State Docks, plus the deepening of the rivers leading into the ports, which gave the trucking industry a lot of its new impetus.

Now, for the first time, barges drawing more water can carry more cargo from the gulf at Mobile to the hinterland ports where it can be made available for the trucks at the piers.

It is still too early to determine the extent of impact these ports will have on trucking in the State. But surveys by the lines indicate it will be substantially felt, once the port network and the river work is completed.

State officials believe that perhaps trucking's greatest contribution to Alabama has been in enabling industry to decentralize, bringing industrial payrolls to the smaller towns and communities which lie off the well-traveled routes.

Approximately 38 percent of all Alabama's post office communities and 19 percent of all Alabama county seats depend solely on trucklines to service industry with the raw materials needed for production, and for the transportation to markets of the finished products of industry.

TRUCK GROWTH RAPID

Alabama transportation officials said the State is the second fastest growing truck State in the Nation, with an increase from 1941 of 115 percent.

They said that as Alabama surges forward on the wave of the industrial boom, the trucking industry is keeping pace, expanding services, purchasing new equipment, installing more up-to-date equipment installing more modern communications, adding more employees and improving training programs.

State officials also credit the trucking industry with opening up other new horizons of development. One official said that growth and vision of the industry has also enabled the State to offer more flexible and faster transportation to incoming industry.

By going direct to the fields and rural shipping points in the State, trucking has also become a partner in the burgeoning farming boom in Alabama. This impact has been most greatly felt in Birmingham, which claims steel manufacturing as its leading industry.

The trucking industry has put major consumer markets within overnight reach of the farmer, and has made Birmingham the leading fresh fruit and vegetable market in the Nation. More than 90 percent of this produce is moved in by truck.

As a result of the growth of the trucking industry both interstate and intrastate, officials said that Alabama now finds itself in an enviable position that allows the businessman to locate nearer to the natural resources required by his industry, thus cutting costs, and permitting more funds for expansion.

Thus, today any industry coming into Alabama, or industry already located in the South, can make its decisions free from worry about transportation to the major markets in the State and the Nation.

Improved Barge Lighting on the Ohio River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, recreational boating is increasing everywhere in the United States. Because of the increase in the number of boats using our waterways, as well as the increase in evening boating, some changes of lighting of towboats and barges are required.

Many recreational boaters fear what they consider to be insufficiently lighted commercial tows, which may lead to serious accidents. At a conference I called in Cincinnati on March 27, 1965, to discuss this problem, it was revealed that not only the recreational boaters are concerned about the problem, but also the commercial tow owners have a positive willingness to help solve a problem they are confronted with daily. It is a problem they cannot solve individually, because there are national and regional regulations for lighting—indeed if they would attempt a solution themselves they might well be breaking regulations.

Since March I have been in contact with the Coast Guard, attempting to help solve this problem. Vice Adm. W. D. Shields, Acting Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, and his office have been most gracious in their dealings with my office.

Yesterday I received from Admiral Shields proposed regulatory changes affecting barge lighting on the western rivers. There will be presented to the Western Rivers Panel for comment in October of this year. There will be a public hearing on the proposals in March 1966, and the resultant amended changes will be promulgated as regulations.

We all recognize that this is a national problem, and not confined to any particular congressional district. I am proud to say, however, that Mr. Danial Pinger, editor of "99 Miles of River," Mr. A. C. Hauck, and Mr. Jerry Hurter, all of Cincinnati, were instrumental in working for changes to the current regulations.

Because it is a national problem, and because the western rivers, to which the proposed regulations apply, include the Mississippi River and all its tributaries, the Atchafalaya River, and the Red River of the North, the solution must be a national solution. The proposed regulatory changes, then, are a proper object of study of the Congress, and I include them in the RECORD Appendix.

I am hopeful that in the future other changes will be made, including the standardization of foot-candle power of barge lights, as I believe the present standard of 2 miles visibility is insufficient.

TITLE 33—NAVIGATION AND NAVIGABLE WATERS

CHAPTER I—SUBCHAPTER F—NAVIGATION REQUIREMENTS FOR WESTERN RIVERS

Part 95—Pilot Rules for Western Rivers

(This change is intended to accomplish three purposes: (1) Increase boating safety by making long tows pushed ahead in Western Rivers more easily identifiable to small boat operators. This is necessary because several lives have been lost due to motorboat operators failing to see barges pushed ahead at night; (2) remove the existing differences between lighting required for barges pushed ahead and towed alongside, which should eliminate the ambiguity that results when barges are pushed ahead and towed alongside simultaneously; (3) bring all lighting requirements for barges underway on Western Rivers more closely in line with International Rules.)

95.29 Lights for Barges Towed Ahead or Alongside

Reason for change

To eliminate the differences between lights prescribed for barges pushing ahead and towed alongside; to keep all lights for barges identical with International Rules, with the addition of amber lights for added safety. Amber was chosen so the color would not be mistaken for existing range and stern lights.

Proposed regulations

(a) When one or more barges are being towed by pushing ahead of a steam vessel, or alongside a steam vessel, or combination of the two, such tow shall be lighted by:

(i) An amber light at the extreme forward end of the tow, so placed as to be as nearly as practicable on the centerline of the forward end of the tow;

(ii) A green light on the starboard side of the head of the tow, so placed as to mark the maximum projection of the head of the tow to starboard and placed as far forward as possible;

(iii) A red light on the port side of the head of the tow, so placed as to mark the maximum projection of the head of the tow to port and placed as far forward as possible;

(iv) An amber light at each outboard forward corner of the tow which is not at the head of the tow and at each after corner of the tow; and,

(v) If the distance between any of the lights on either side exceeds 300 feet, an additional amber light or lights so placed that the distance between lights on either side of the tow never exceeds 300 feet. However, where barges are towed alongside, navigational lights displayed by the towboat shall be considered and counted as amber side lights for the purpose of spacing lights at intervals not greater than 300 feet.

Reason for change

There is presently no requirement that the navigation lights on barges be visible from the surface of the water close to the barge. As a result some lead barges have carried lights showing only above the horizontal from a height of over 6 feet. This has resulted in motorboat operators failing to see barges from dead ahead in some instances, and had led to more than one death on Western Rivers during the past year.

Proposed regulations

(b) The colored side lights shall be so constructed as to show a uniform and unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of 112½ degrees (10 points of the compass), so fixed as to show the light from right ahead to 22½ degrees (2 points) abaft the beam on their respective sides, so placed that it is visible on the surface of the water from any point 50 feet from the light out to the maximum distance the light can be seen within the prescribed arc of visibility, and of such character as to be visible at a distance of at least 2 miles, and shall be fitted with inboard screens so as to prevent either light from being seen more than half a point across the centerline of the head of the tow.

Reason for change

All the amber lights are 20 point lights so that towboats will be required to carry only 3 different types of portable lights to mark tows underway; red 10 point, green 10 point, and amber 20 point.

Proposed regulations

(c) The forward amber light shall be so constructed as to show a uniform and unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of 225 degrees (20 points of the compass), so fixed as to show the light 112½ degrees (10 points) on each side of the tow, namely, from right ahead to 22½ degrees (2 points) abaft the beam on either side, so placed that it is visible on the surface of the water from any point 50 feet from the light out to the maximum distance the light can be seen within the prescribed arc of visibility, and of such character as to be visible at a distance of at least 2 miles.

Reason for change

The amber side lights are intended to make long tows pushing ahead readily visible to small boat operators. There have been attempts on the part of motorboat operators to cut between the first barge and the towboat in long tows, due to the operators not recognizing that there was a tow at night. Several lives have been lost due to such attempts in the past few years, one of which was as recent as July of 1962.

Proposed regulations

(d) The side and forward corner amber lights shall be so constructed and so fixed as to show a uniform and unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of 225° (20 points of the compass), so fixed as to show the light from right ahead to right astern on their respective sides, and, from right ahead over an arc 45° (4 points) on the opposite sides, so placed that it is visible on the surface of the water from any point 50 feet from the light out to the maximum distance the light can be seen within the prescribed arc of visibility, and of such character as to be visible at a distance of at least 2 miles.

Reason for change

The optional position of after corner lights is included to allow that light to be placed so that it does not interfere with the night vision of the towboat pilot.

Proposed regulations

(e) The amber light at each outboard after corner of the tow shall be so constructed

and so fixed as to show a uniform and unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of 225° (20 points of the compass), so fixed as to show the light from right astern to right ahead on the side upon which it is mounted and from right astern through 45° (4 points of the compass) on the opposite side, so placed that it is visible on the surface of the water from any point 50 feet from the light out to the maximum distance the light can be seen within the prescribed arc of visibility. However, in any instance of barges pushed ahead wherein the arc of the after corner light extends to the pilothouse of the towboat, the light may be rotated so that it conforms to the requirements for amber side lights.

(f) All the lights shall be carried at approximately the same height above the surface of the water and shall be so placed as to be clear of and above all obstructions which might tend to interfere with the prescribed arcs or distance of visibility.

An Address by Donald E. Johnson, National Commander, the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will find of great interest the analysis of our foreign and domestic responsibilities concerning the Vietnam situation by the distinguished national commander of the American Legion, Donald E. Johnson.

The following is an address by Commander Johnson:

AN ADDRESS BY DONALD E. JOHNSON, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION

My friends, it is with a feeling of great pride in young Americans, tinged with a bit of shame, that I come before you today. If that sounds like a contradictory statement, it is only because of conflicting conditions within our young adult population which make it so.

As you know, I have recently come from a tour of the Far East, ranging the entire free world defense perimeter from South Korea to Australia and New Zealand. This included a 3-day stopover in the war-ravaged land of South Vietnam. There we were accorded the courtesies of our Defense and State Departments in top level briefings on the situation as it then existed, and their aspirations for a successful prosecution of the campaign and an ultimate success in maintaining the freedom of South Vietnam, and contributing to the establishment of stability in government there.

More importantly, with regard to my opening statement, we were privileged to visit one of the last outposts in the famed Mekong Delta, the fortified village of Mo Cay, where the basic United States advisory team was observed in operation working with the Vietnamese village chief and the people of the village. Here, indeed, the realities of life are faced by young Americans whose lives are in constant danger. Yet, they have confidence in themselves, compassion for the people with whom they work, courage to face the work in which they are engaged, an outlook that is completely optimistic, and an almost missionary zeal for the cause in which they serve.

I say to you here and now, and without reservation, that all Americans may take tremendous pride in our young servicemen who man this frontier of freedom. They are dedicated young men devoted to the cause of freedom in the true tradition of Americans who fought to gain freedom and who have fought to preserve it for nearly two centuries. This is America at her very best, a champion of freedom, and a people willing to sacrifice for the principles and ideals of a great nation and willing to share the burden of others who would win and maintain their own national integrity.

Yet, within a matter of hours after witnessing this stirring display of true spirit of America we were shocked to see the other side of the coin as reported in Time magazine, May 14 issue—an account of the disgraceful reception accorded to representatives of our State Department on the campuses of the State University of Iowa, Drake University, and the University of Wisconsin. Knowledgeable people in high places in Government have taken the time and expended the effort to attempt to inform the uninformed and they are jeered and insulted. They are denied the common courtesy of being permitted to present a differing point of view without being heckled. The right to dissent is an established fact in a democracy. Refusal to accept informative facts simply to sustain one's point of view is sheer nonsense.

There is a strange paradox here in that some of our young intellectuals, and some who are not so young, express their horror of the American Legion's position that Communists and Communist-oriented speakers should not be permitted to appear on the campuses of our tax-supported colleges and universities. They protest loudly that academic freedom and freedom of speech are being abridged. They shout from the soapbox that the purpose of an academic institution is to permit full learning and true expression of all points of view. I would say to this small but loud minority that you are totally inconsistent and that you are guilty of denying the very thing you claim to champion. I would say further, and emphasize strongly, that there is a tinge of something un-American in denying the free expression of an American point of view.

The young American in fatigues maintaining a vigil from an entrenched position, gazing across barbed wire fortifications into territory where he knows the enemy lurks, lays his life on the line for the cause in which he believes. In comparative comfort at home this small minority of his campus cousins questions the morality—yes, his very right to be doing the job he knows must be done.

Here we too become engaged in the question of the morality of war. The American Legion freely concedes there is little to be said for the morality of war. Yet, we strongly contest the morality of abandoning a free people, who lack the capability of defending themselves, to a ruthless invader. The South Vietnamese Government has requested American help in defending itself against this invader and to deny that help would give us small claim to morality, or national integrity, in the eyes of our free world allies.

As an example of the type of Communist atrocity we seek to eliminate in South Vietnam, permit me to relate the episode that was described to us by a young American officer at 7th Division Headquarters in My Tho Province—an event that took place just 6 days prior to our visit in that sector.

In the predawn hours of a Monday morning a young Vietnamese came into the joint American-Vietnamese headquarters, dripping wet and shaking with fright. He reported an infiltration by the Vietcong of a group of unprotected farm homes a short distance away; and he had escaped in the darkness and swam the river to get help. The American officer dressed hurriedly and, with Vietnamese soldiers, accompanied the man who made the report back across the river to his village. There in the breaking dawn, the full horror of the event unfolded. The Vietcong had come demanding food, clothing, and money from the villagers. Being refused, they took three women and four children and killed each with a single shot through the head.

Who would dare rise to the defense of American morality if we should fail or refuse our assistance to a people who, for 11 years, have sought to rid their land of this type of beast who has less claim to humanity than the beasts of the jungles of Vietnam?

I should like to suggest that students and professors alike—and again I emphasize that this is a minority element, who would raise money for demonstrations and advertisements in opposition to present American policy in Vietnam—that they pool those resources and send representatives of their own groups to this unhappy land and there learn for themselves the true facts of life. They might not be able to convince those of their numbers who refuse to be convinced—or even to listen courteously—but I venture to say that those who make the trip will become believers in the morality and the propriety of the American course of action. Those in high places in Government who sound off in opposition to this course already should know better.

As I report to you in general on our observations in Vietnam I would say that we do not pose as 3-day experts. I do feel, however, that with the benefit of fine cooperation from both our military and civilian personnel, that we learned about as much of the situation as we could possibly hope to cram into a 3-day period.

We had the benefit of military briefings from General Westmcreland, Commanding Officer of the Military Assistance Command Vietnam and the staff of MACV Headquarters. We then visited the 7th Division Headquarters for briefings by the senior adviser of the division and members of his staff. From there we went to the fortified village which I mentioned earlier, and with each succeeding step down the echelons of command, the pattern of American-Vietnamese strategy began to fall into place and became increasingly clear. I might add that with each succeeding step down the chain of command, the higher the optimism rose. I should immediately clarify that by saying our top command has an air of optimism but that it is expressed a bit more cautiously there than by the advisory team in the village.

As matters of interest with regard to the military aspects of our trip I should report that the Sunday morning when we were boarding the helicopter for the trip to My Tho and Mo Cay, we observed a mushroom-shaped cloud of black smoke in the distance. We soon learned that this was the tragic explosion of American aircraft on the ground at our airbase at Bien Hoa, which destroyed several planes and claimed more than 20 American lives, with nearly 100 injured. Our information was that it was strictly a tragic accident and not a result of enemy action.

The helicopter in which we traveled was armed with a machinegun at each side and those guns were loaded and manned throughout the trip. The farther into the field we went, the tighter the security became. When we landed at Mo Cay the pilot was instructed very precisely as to how to land over the village to reduce the possibility of drawing Vietcong fire. On landing, the American advisory team was prepared for anything and the copters went back aloft rather than wait for us on the ground.

Our civilian briefings were just as complete, from Ambassador Maxwell Taylor and the embassy staff, through whom we were privileged to meet and visit with many influential Vietnamese leaders, including those of the religious facets that we hear so much

about, Catholic, Buddhist and Cowdai. The Vietnam phase of our trip was concluded with a visit to South Vietnamese Premier Quat. Dr. Quat was most gracious with his time, and frank in his observations. He told us he doubted either the current ability or willingness of the Communists to mount a full-scale military offensive in Vietnam. Rather, he confirmed beliefs held by the American Legion for some time, that the Communists consider southeast Asia as a total package and are willing to wait for more favorable time and circumstances when their chances for success are better than they are now.

We found here a new kind of war, completely different from anything we have known before. This is a war waged in the hamlet and village on the military, political, social and economic front. There is no front within the terms of reference of earlier wars. There are no masses of troops contesting well defined land areas. The front is in every hamlet and village. The front is every individual, for the friend is Vietnamese, the foe is Vietnamese, and his political beliefs are invisible.

Yet, this is not a civil war as many would have you believe. It is a war of infiltration, subversion, terrorism, and invasion. It is armed conflict between the forces of freedom and the forces of tyranny and the sooner the world awakens to that fact the sooner the war in Vietnam will be brought to a successful end.

We come away with four basic conclusions regarding the American presence in South Vietnam:

1. The American people can be tremendously proud, as we were, of the American personnel in Vietnam, and of the job they are doing. Both from the civilian side and militarily, we have a topflight team in Vietnam, one that is doing America proud in the eyes of all who love freedom.

2. The air strikes to the north have been effective:

(a) From the standpoint of morale, both of our men and of the South Vietnamese, these strikes are producing the desired effects.

(b) Militarily there is increasing evidence that the supply lines from the north are being interdicted. That the Vietcong forces are not as well equipped to fight and that there is some disarray in their ranks. The evidence is in an increasing number of Vietcong defections and in increasingly favorable casualty rates between Government forces and the Vietcong.

3. That dissension at home is providing a disservice to the American men in Vietnam. I'm happy to report to our dissident students and professors that the men who are fighting for your freedom could care less about what you say and do—for they are too busy to pay any attention to you. Your disservice makes its presence felt more with our allies who show some concern over American intent to follow through to a successful conclusion. This we found to be true particularly in Australia which is just now ordering support to South Vietnam. During our stay in Australia, Prime Minister Robert Menzies delivered a stirring speech in support of U.S. policy in Vietnam saying in part: "We are not going to secure peace by appeasement and surrender." He continued to say it is "not in the Australian spirit to deliver millions of people into the hands of the Communists by yielding in South Vietnam." In case there are any doubts as to why Australia was included in our itinerary I think the answer should be made infinitely clear by that statement, indicating that here is one of America's stanchest allies.

Finally, let us set the record straight once and for all that it is the South Vietnamese who fight this war. They have fought it for 11 years and have sustained enormous casualties. It is the consensus of both the civilian and the military that the Vietnamese must fight this war and that it would be a grave mistake should we try to make it our war.

The American Legion can have but one message for the American people in an hour such as this. This is it: Inform yourselves fully and factually on this vital issue. Having done so, we believe you cannot help but conclude that our course is proper and our cause is just.

Long Island Strawberries and Duckling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Hon. OTIS G. PIKE, First District, New York, and I were pleased to sponsor today in the House and Senate dining rooms delicious Long Island strawberries and famous and delectable Long Island duckling, made available through the cooperation and courtesy of Morris Karp & Son, Farmingdale, Long Island; Long Island Duck Farmers Cooperative, Inc., Eastport, Long Island; Long Island Agricultural Marketing Association, Inc., Riverhead, Long Island.

The story of Long Island duckling is romantically told in a brief history entitled "Seven Little Oriental Ducks and How They Grew to 7 million Long Island Ducklings":

SEVEN LITTLE ORIENTAL DUCKS AND HOW THEY GREW TO 7 MILLION LONG ISLAND DUCKLINGS

While visiting in China in 1873, a Yankee clipper captain was deeply impressed by the stately White Pekin ducks he saw walking around in a garden. After he had dined on one, he resolved that he must have some. He set about accumulating a small flock which he took aboard his ship and started the long journey around the cape.

When he arrived in New York Harbor, 14 of the ducks had survived the long passage. A few quickly found their way to ovens but six ducks and one drake were saved and taken to a friendly Long Island farm. These 7 found the climate, sandy shores, and abundant water supplies in their new home exactly to their liking and became the venerated ancestors of today's annual crop in excess of 7 million Long Island ducklings.

With such a precious, but small flock to work with, American ingenuity was immediately put to the test. Chickens were conscripted to hatch some of the early eggs to insure that each egg would produce an addition to the flock. Today, many of the 43 duck farms on Long Island have their own incubating systems, and the C. & R. Duck Farm, at Westhampton, Long Island, produces nearly 2 million baby ducklings a year in its commercial hatchery. While many of these day-old ducklings are distributed throughout the world, only those hatched and raised locally may bear the proud name of Long Island duckling.

Feeding, once a haphazard affair, is now a miracle of scientific perfection. Each pellet of food contains in exactly balanced proportions the necessary ingredients to provide top quality meat.

In the early days of the industry, the numerous farms in the area kept the ducks until an order was received for marketing, at which time the ducks were killed and packed into barrels of ice for shipment. Today, ducklings are processed consistently at from 7 to 8 weeks of age to assure constant succulence and prime quality. Many of the farms produce two crops of market-age ducklings each week throughout the 10-month growing period.

The Long Island duck industry pioneered processing in ready-to-cook form, as well as the use of flash freezing and of the thin, transparent, shrinkable films that maintains the high quality of the product until it reaches the consumer. Today, approximately 95 percent of the Long Island ducklings are sold in this form, providing the consumer with maximum protection and immediate inspection of the product. Temperature-controlled, refrigerated trucks deliver the product rapidly to all points in the continental United States and Canada, while some of the ducklings again board ships for delivery to the major cities throughout the world. An interesting point is that the Orient, the original home of the White Pekin duck, now imports Long Island ducklings because of their superior quality.

The Long Island duck industry was also a leader, prior to presentday mandatory regulations, in requesting and paying for Government inspection to guarantee to its customers the wholesomeness of its product. Government grading also guarantees that only the best is labeled "Grade A."

In a continuing effort to provide a superior quality product, the industry, in cooperation with Cornell University, supports a research laboratory, the only one of its kind in the world. Through this research, the strain of duckling and its feeds have been improved to raise the quality of the meat and to reduce the fat content to the lowest point consistent with quality.

In 1960, the duck farms of Long Island were divided into several groups, each competing for the same markets. At this time, they formed the Long Island Duck Farmers Cooperative, Inc., which today processes and markets over 90 percent of the ducklings raised on Long Island. In turn, this represents over 70 percent of the national production of commercially grown ducks. Each of its two modern, sanitary plants can process 20,000 ducklings per day, which are flash-frozen at 60° below zero. The ducklings are packaged under various private and cooperative-owned labels and, because of the volume, can supply markets in all areas with a continuous quality of top grade ducklings, including Kosher and Cantonese styles.

As a model for efficient use of a product, the Long Island duck industry is outstanding. The duck feet are exported to Hong Kong, where they are highly regarded as a delicacy by the Chinese people. The feathers are also a valuable commodity. Four ducks produce about 1 pound of feathers and approximately 1,475,000 pounds are produced annually. The Armed Forces of the Federal Government purchase most of the feathers for use as insulating material in cold weather clothing and sleeping bags. The viscera is converted to mink food. Finding an outlet for the "quack" has not yet been abandoned.

The entire Long Island duck industry, with a total estimated value of $30 million, lies within a 35-mile radius and provides a major support to the local economy, employing approximately 1,000 people with an annual payroll of approximately $3,500,000.

The Long Island duck industry is proud of the fact that it is self-supporting and has never depended upon Government subsidy. In a continuing effort to help itself, the Long Island Duck Farmers Cooperative, Inc., is conducting an active program to market its product in new, convenience forms requiring a minimum of time and effort on the part of the housewife. It also operates test kitchens where simple, easy, and tasty recipes for the uses of its product are developed.

Long Island's strawberries also present an interesting story.

HISTORY

Strawberries have been grown for the commercial market in Suffolk County, Long Island, for about 75 years. In the old days, the Lond Island Rail Road operated a strawberry special, which made early morning pickups on main line stations throughout the harvest season.

They are now produced on some 300 farms, chiefly in the North Shore berry belt between Wading River and Orient. Fruiting fields this year are estimated to total about 700 acres (of which 550 acres are in the berry belt). Farm beds vary from less than an acre to the Lewin & Sons planting of 50 acres in Calverton.

While secondary to potatoes and cauliflower, berries are the first important spring crop, and bring in cash money when it is most needed.

PRODUCTION

Long Island growers specialize in improved modern varieties that excel in flavor, uniformity of size, and keeping qualities. Plants, purchased from leading breeders in Maryland, Michigan, and other areas, are set out in April for next year's fruiting.

From 4,000 to 7,000 plants are used per acre, depending upon variety, soil, and the method of row-crop planting employed. Fertilization, cultivation, spraying, and mulching (to prevent heaving and other winter damage) keep the growers busy. Virtually all beds can be irrigated when natural moisture is lacking, thanks to the pipeline irrigation systems in general use.

HARVESTING

An acre of strawberries may produce 6,000 to 8,000 quarts, or even 10,000 in an exceptionally favorable season.

Memorial Day is the traditional kickoff date, although for several years past, the crops were behind schedule. This year, the first exploratory pickings were made on May 28, and the commercial movement started June 3. Strawberry picking is a fussy operation; growers and/or their wives customarily supervise harvesting and packing, and the smaller producers make it a family affair, with the whole household pitching in. The berries are harvested red, naturally vine-ripened; this is impossible in distant production areas, where the fruit is picked green and ripens in transit. An experienced picker can harvest 200 quarts in a day; the customary piecework pay for picking is 10 cents per quart.

MARKETING

About one-third of the crop is sold locally on Long Island, in stores, at roadside stands, and to self-service customers. The remaining two-thirds is shipped out of the area, moving in fast motortrucks, and under refrigeration on the hotter days and longer hauls.

Because strawberries are highly perishable, distribution is almost entirely confined to the Northeast, with New York, Boston, and Philadelphia the largest receiving centers. More than one-half of the berries marketed off the island are sold through the Long Island Cauliflower Association's strawberry auction in Riverhead, where buyers come to bid for the freshly picked fruit brought in on farm trucks.

"Git-Fiddle" Blues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the House Committee on Un-American Activities held hearings in Chicago and was subject to a massive, well-organized, Communist-directed agitation. The Suburban Life newspapers, which serve substantial regions of Chicago's west suburban area, in their issue of June 3, discussed an interesting aspect of the performance of the organized agitators who attempted to disrupt the committee hearings:

"GIT-FIDDLE" BLUES

If one were to meet on the street a character with a long scarf, beard, tennis shoes, and a placard it would be a safe guess that the fellow or girl (sometimes it's hard to tell the difference) would be headed for the hearings on communism conducted in Chicago by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The committee's success, or lack of it, will be recorded by the historians. Much pro and con comment has been heard as to whether the committee should be retained.

But the characteristics and the actions of the beatniks, hoodlums, American Nazis, and the just plain duped are enough for one to vote in favor of keeping the committee working.

Where do these characters come from? All of a sudden there they are. Do they come out of the woodwork to badger officials who are trying to save the country from being destroyed from within?

The primary purpose of the committee is to seek out and expose Reds and Communist front organizations. We believe this is a good thing, but at the same time we don't believe in witch hunting.

What is most objectionable, however, is the prancing and parading, bawling, and brawling done by those cats who are hep enough to feel somthing is wrong and who fight against this "wrong" by growing a beard, squatting in the middle of a foyer or singing folk songs which proclaim, "How sad am I."

They add nothing to the scene, Jackson.

If they have a beef, it would receive a darn sight more attention if it were presented by a lass with her hair combed and wearing a presentable dress or a lad with a clean shirt and a tie.

Furthermore, an intelligent presentation by a clean-cut youth in a moderate tone is much better than one delivered by a crybaby with a guitar.

Salute to Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 3, 1965, I had the good fortune to attend a luncheon held at the Theodore Francis Green Airport in Rhode Island by Allegheny Airlines as a salute to Rhode Island.

This luncheon marked the initiation of improved air service between Washington, D.C., and Rhode Island, and we were honored to have Hon. Robert T. Murphy, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, as principal speaker.

The fine speech made by Vice Chairman Murphy follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT T. MURPHY, VICE CHAIRMAN, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

I need not say how pleased I am to participate in this salute-to-Rhode-Island luncheon marking the initiation of improved air service to and from providence by Allegheny Airlines. After all, I do belong here and share your common interest in the welfare of our native State.

It is not out of a sense of duty, however, that I have joined with our congressional delegation in convening here today. Rather, it is with a sheer sense of pleasure that we hasten to commemorate the beginning of better service to the South now being offered by Allegheny. Any time a transportation company upgrades service anywhere in New England then nt is a real cause for celebration and, like the Plymouth Pilgrims of old, it is only fitting that we gather in our friends and offer up a thanksgiving. We extend, therefore, our sincere and profound congratulations to Allegheny Airlines. This new nonstop service to Washington with jet-powered Convair 580's is a great advance for the thousands of air travelers who have long patronized Allegheny's service at this airport. I am confident that it will redound, of course, to the benefit of Allegheny itself simply because this is a busy and growing air center and improved service will unquestionably stimulate an improved traffic response. In that connection, let me say that we have every reason to believe that Allegheny is setting a pattern for other air carriers to follow here.

We know that Allegheny has made a carefully reasoned business judgment in this connection. But, I believe that the aviation facts of life justify that decision for here, under the dynamic and able administration of Albert R. Tavani, our State administrator of aeronautics for almost two decades, there has been developed a modern, integrated air facility. It has an FAA control tower, an ILS system with radar control and VOR, to which DME has been added. It bears the honored name of one of our greatest fellow Rhode Islanders and one of this Nation's most devoted statesmen, Theodore Francis Green, who as Governor in the early 1930's initiated and established it. Last year, almost 400,000 air passengers enplaned and deplaned here and some 8½ million pounds of commercial airfreight, aircargo, and mail were processed. Allegheny alone brought in and out almost 100,000 passengers and received or delivered 1.3 million pounds of cargo. From first quarter reports this year made available by Mr. Tavani, these traffic figures are showing a vigorous growth and we may expect a 15- to 18-percent increase by this year's end.

Obviously, the focal point of Rhode Island's present trade and commerce, whether industrial or recreational, is right here at this airport. More than a century ago it centered about the docks and wharves at the headwaters of lovely old Narragansett Bay; and when the clipper ships and schooners gave way to the rails it was union station, overlooking exchange place, which became the symbol of an advancing transportation technology upon which we would principally depend. Today, water, rail, and surface transportation are very essential to our continued economic health and progress but, in this jet age, it is this modern airport served by a number of our great air carriers which is truly the front door for our entire State. More than that, in a true sense, it is the gateway to all of southern New England. For it is important to realize that there are 1,100,000 people residing within a radius of 25 miles and within 40 minutes driving time of Theodore Francis Green Airport.

With the construction of a connecter from Interstate Highway 95 which will lead directly to the airport gate, the traffic growth in both passengers and freight in the years ahead will even exceed the healthy progress that has been made in the years recently past. We have an airport, then, which serves, not only several cities or an entire State, but rather a region comprising portions of both Connecticut and Massachusetts as well.

This airport, in which Rhode Island has already invested over $11 million is an airport with a great future. Additional funds must be programed to keep the facility current with the technological advances in air transportation and to permit the widening of our aviation service horizon through the phase-in of the very latest airline equipment by all of the air carriers serving it. If we keep moving in that direction we will be making the best possible investment in our future and the best possible contribution to the growth and developmentof Rhode Island's economy and, thus, to the national trade and commerce.

For being a part of that move forward, Allegheny merits our compliments and will, I trust, receive the full measure of local passenger support in the months ahead.

Beginning of a Great Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, tonight in Seattle, Wash., the first graduating class of Nathan Hale High School will receive their diplomas.

This newest of Seattle's high schools which is located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent is trying hard to live up to the words in the old proverb which begins, "What's in a name counts." The students of this school are working to make this proverb a reality in practicing the patriotic spirit which motivated Nathan Hale in his love for his country.

In this connection, I wish to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Don Duncan, of the Seattle Times, describing how these students are starting a great tradition.

NATHAN HALE BUSY WITH TRADITIONS

None of that "Far above Cayuga's waters" jazz for Nathan Hale High School when its first senior class bows out shortly. Seattle's 12th and spanking newest high school, the only one with its own creek (Meadowbrook), has gone overboard to build its own traditions.

Let other schools play around with Cornell's alma mater. Hale hasn't done anything unoriginal since it got caught short at its first football jamboree, a few weeks after opening its doors, and had to use "Yankee Doodle" as a fight song.

Hale's senior breakfast next Tuesday has flair. Some 450 seniors will partake of a sumptuous early morning steak in the Space Needle Restaurant—while the school's 13-star flies on top.

At the base of the Needle, "George," the school's chrome-plated cannon, will be unlimbered at exactly 7:15 a.m.—probably awakening, rather rudely, many of Queen Anne Hill's snoozing residents. The police department has given the blast its blessing.

"George" is from the Liberty ship *Nathan Hale*. It is just one of many Hale treasures.

The school has adopted the Hale family coat of arms (with Old English lettering) and "Spirit of '76" uniforms for a band that is preceded by a drummer, fifer, and flag bearer.

Hale's motto is "Ever Alert," its nickname is Raiders, its yearbook is Heritage, and its school newspaper is Sentinel.

If that isn't traditional enough for you, there are the Letterman's Club (Minutemen), the school colors (red, white, and blue), a Freedom Foyer (with a photograph of Nathan Hale's statue) and some authentic-looking, pupil-built stocks (for locking up principals and class leaders).

Pupils regularly correspond with the crew of the submarine *Nathan Hale*, and if a sophomore hasn't memorized "I only regret that I have but one life to give for my country" by the end of his first day, he is in deep trouble.

Gene Sorenson, a junior and a band member, is related distantly to the Revolutionary War hero. When Gene is graduated, you can bet some fancy family-tree sleuthing will spot another authentic descendant.

Like all senior classes, Hale's class of 1965 will present a gift to its school. The seniors chose a portable public-address system and, get this, a Revolutionary War musket.

On June 9, Hale will honor five senior boys and five senior girls who "best exemplify the spirit of Nathan Hale."

Fred Klingback, activity coordinator, explained that "spirit."

"Nathan Hale wasn't a great leader like George Washington," Klingback said. "He was just a young man who went through Yale University, became a commissioned officer and, when called upon, didn't wilt under pressure as some of the GI's did in Korea, but stood up and died for what he believed.

"We want to honor the seniors who work after school and before school, putting in countless hours without any glory, because they believe in doing a job right.

"Each year on Constitution Day, we will have a school assembly and explain what we mean by the 'Nathan Hale spirit.' We are certain the pupils will do the rest."

Hale's seniors will be graduated the evening of June 10 in the Seattle Center Opera House. A reception, by the junior class, will follow in the Seattle Center Exhibition Hall.

It looks like the start of a great tradition.

Results of Questionnaire Submitted to the 10th District of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I mailed a questionnaire to several thousand of my constituents in the 10th District of North Carolina. The mailing list that we used covered a wide cross section of our citizens, and we believe that it elicited a fair consensus of the thinking of our people.

We were pleasantly surprised at the extent of participation of our constituents in this poll. Approximately 35 percent of the questionnaires have been returned to us as of this date. I am sure that others will be forthcoming in the future.

Eight major questions of legislative policy were listed on the questionnaire. I believe that the results of the poll will be of interest to our colleagues in the House of Representatives. Therefore, the results of the poll follow:

Results of questionnaire submitted to the 10th District of North Carolina

COTTON

1. Do you favor extension of present cotton legislation which eliminates the 2-price cotton system and makes the domestic textile industry competitive with foreign textiles?

	Percent
Yes	84.82
No	9.32
No opinion	5.86

FOREIGN AID

2. (a) Do you favor continued military assistance to friendly nations?

Yes	84.47
No	12.59
No opinion	2.94

(b) Do you favor economic assistance for other nations?

Yes	29.81
No	58.56
No opinion	11.63

EDUCATION

3. Do you favor a program of partial assistance to higher education by giving the parent or sponsor of a college student a tax credit for a portion of the tuition paid?

Yes	82.96
No	15.71
No opinion	1.33

LABOR

4. (a) Do you favor Federal legislation which will repeal State right-to-work laws?

Yes	9.67
No	85.98
No opinion	4.35

(b) Do you favor extension of wage-hour-law coverage to require payment of $1.25 per hour plus overtime minimum wage to laundry, restaurant, hotel, and other employees not now covered?

Yes	54.66
No	38.33
No opinion	7.01

ANTIPOVERTY

5. Do you favor increasing the antipoverty program from $750,000,000 annually to $1,500,000,000?

Yes	13.22
No	82.96
No opinion	3.82

IMMIGRATION

6. Do you favor changing the present national origins quota system?

Yes	18.01
No	69.48
No opinion	12.51

PRAYER AND BIBLE READING

7. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to permit prayer and Bible reading in the public schools on a voluntary basis?

Yes	88.82
No	9.23
No opinion	1.95

REAPPORTIONMENT

8. Do you favor a constitutional amendment allowing State legislatures to reapportion 1 house of a 2-house State legislature on the basis of factors other than population?

Yes	40.28
No	47.56
No opinion	12.16

The Supreme Court on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court decision holding unconstitutional a section of the Landrum-Griffin Act pertaining to Communists in union offices not only is important because of the surprising and inconsistent decision of the Court but because of the pending congressional debate over labor law amendments.

The question will naturally be raised as to whether it is the intent of Congress that known Communists be permitted to exercise leadership in U.S. labor unions. The Chicago Tribune, in a hard-hitting and most pertinent editorial on Wednesday, June 9, discussed this Supreme Court decision. Since it is possible, Mr. Speaker, for the Members of Congress to make necessary legislative corrections in the near future, I feel a review of this editorial comment is in order:

THE SUPREME COURT ON COMMUNISM

The Supreme Court has reversed itself once again, this time by ruling that acknowledged Communists cannot legally be prevented from holding union offices in which they can tie up industry by political strikes in time of national emergency. A majority of five, including Chief Justice Warren, held that the section of the Landrum-Griffin Act of 1959 which makes Communists ineligible for union office constitutes a bill of attainder and is thus unconstitutional.

The majority opinion was devoted largely to a denunciation of bills of attainder, which the Court has defined as "a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial." Congress, according to this opinion, cannot properly impose sanctions on a man simply because he is a member of the Communist Party. The task of adjudication, it says, must be left to the courts.

All of this would be true enought if the matter hadn't already been adjudicated, and by none other than the Supreme Court itself. Four dissenting Justices, in an opinion written by Justice White, pointed out that "the Communist Party's illegal purpose [to overthrow our form of government] and its domination by foreign power have already been adjudicated, both administratively and judicially."

In 1950, with respect to the non-Communist affidavit required of union officials by the Taft-Hartley Act, and in 1960, with respect to the registration of Communists as foreign agents, the Court ruled that the Communist Party is "substantially directed, dominated, or controlled" by the Soviet Union, that it "operates primarily to advance the world Communist movement," and that Congress was "justifiably concerned" with the "disorganizating purposes of Communists who hold positions of official power in labor unions." The Communist Party, it has said, is like no other party "in its utilization of positions of union leadership as means by which to bring about strikes."

If a law directed at anybody who is a member of the Communist Party is a bill of attainder, the dissenters said, then so are laws which prevent certain men, by virtue of the offices they hold, from being bank directors. So are conflict-of-interest laws, and so are those which prevent ex-convicts from holding certain Government jobs.

What is more, the Court has already ruled that "the loss of a particular position is not the loss of life or property" and thus should not be regarded as punishment. If this were punishment, then the Constitution itself would be wrong in "punishing" everybody under 30 by denying him the right to sit in Congress.

We can only conclude that the Court has reversed itself not on the basis of law, but on the basis of what it thinks the law ought to be today. Like Senator FULBRIGHT, it seems to have decided that communism is no longer a threat. If this is to be its approach, then all of the laws which protect us against communism are in jeopardy and J. Edgar Hoover's lifelong career has been a waste of time.

The final irony is that at a time when we are trying to alert Latin Americans against the danger of Communist takeovers, especially in the Dominican Republic, and are fighting communism in Asia and Africa, our own Supreme Court should blandly decide that Communists are not even to be feared right here at home. To the Communists, the power to control unions and to tie up the country in strikes is worth more than an army of spies.

Repeal of 14(b)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will soon decide whether or not to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This repressive section has no place in our labor laws. Local 62 of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union—one of our great unions—recently passed a resolution urging the repeal of this section. The resolution cogently sets forth the arguments for repeal.

I draw the attention of my colleagues to the following resolution in the hope that it will aid in their deliberations concerning this important matter:

RESOLUTION OF LOCAL 62, ILGWU

Right-to-work laws, permitted under section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, do not give anybody the right to a job, do not create even one job, do not help unemployed workers;

Right-to-work laws are an attack on labor unions, weakening the power of workers to win better conditions through collective bargaining, a recognized form of economic democracy in our country;

Collective bargaining depends basically on the union shop, which provides security to working people. "Free riders" enjoy, under the provisions of 14(b), all the benefits of union negotiations without supporting the union. Those who benefit from a union should join the union at their plant;

The right to be hired or promoted without discrimination is not aided by right-to-work laws. States which have right-to-work laws do not have fair employment practices acts. In the majority of such States, employers may work children long hours;

Wages in right-to-work States are lower than the national average. Such States are not concerned with protecting the rights of working people. They are concerned with the profits of a few, which provide unfair competition to employers who pay decent wages and have union contracts: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this body go on record in strong support of H.R. 77, to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, in the name of economic justice, in the fight against discrimination, as an aid in the war on poverty.

Congress Should Ban Roadside Billboards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the President has proposed that this Congress enact legislation to control unsightly billboards, junk yards, and other eyesores along our Nation's highways. In urging this step, President Johnson has touched upon a problem long familiar to every American motorist. The Sacramento, Calif., Bee of June 3, 1965, editorially supported the President's proposal. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. It follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD BAN ROADSIDE BILLBOARDS

President Lyndon B. Johnson's urging upon Congress to enact a billboard control act with muscle in it and to restrict ugly junk automobile wrecking yards—and otherwise to create incentives for beautifying the roadsides—was a thing of sweet reason and hits America where it lives.

The President was quite right when he argued the voluntary billboard law of the late 1950's, where in States were encouraged to restrict billboards and to clean up the highway scene through a small financial incentive, has not worked. It has resulted in grand end of restricting only 183.4 miles of roadway in eight States; this hardly could be called a success.

The blunt truth is that if the Nation is to control highway billboards and reserve the highways for scenic as well as transportation purposes to get the motorist from point A to point Z reforms must be sweeping. The Johnson measure attempts to do this by denying Federal funds to those projects which permit indiscriminate billboarding and also through the creation of hard money incentives.

The present scene across America is disgusting and offensive to the eyes. Grand vistas have been turned into pitches for just about any commodity for sale in the corner drug store or the supermarket.

The President spoke effectively and eloquently when he said the duty of Congress is more than the housekeeping chore of building roads, etc.; it also has a responsibility to make beauty a part of the daily life—and to resist those things which deliberately scar the natural scene in the haste to make profits.

President John F. Kennedy was the first President to warn that in this generation's rush to build, it is destroying part of its heritage. President Johnson has added his voice, effectively and meaningfully, to the ambition to preserve, not demolish. The essence of all beauty, it is written, is love; those who love this land will preserve, protect, and husband it. Johnson proposes a beginning.

Tribute to the Guard Force at Electric Boat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, a word of praise to those who help protect our defense industries is always timely. I am sure many of my colleagues who have such installations in their district have had occasion to observe the devoted service and the loyalty of those entrusted with the task of watching and guarding over these installations.

We are very fortunate to have in my district of eastern Connecticut the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics, located at Groton, Conn. Nearly 18,000 people are now employed there, working on the design and construction of Polaris and nuclear attack submarines, on the overhaul and repair of such ships, as well as on other ships for use in the Nation's defenses. They are not only loyal citizens, but skilled men, hard working and industrious. They point with a great deal of pride to the long history in the construction of submersible ships, including pioneering in the early perfection of diesel engines.

The record also shows a long and happy relationship with the U.S. Navy in the production of underseas craft of various classes and nuclear-powered ships, both Polaris and attack vessels. The quality of these vessels, I am sure the U.S. Navy will testify, is incomparable. An Electric Boat designed and constructed submarine has never been lost due to faulty construction.

At this time, I want to specifically pay tribute to the guard force, the men who watch and guard over these installations at Electric Boat. In 1923 there were only two watchmen during the day, Dan Sullivan and George Patton, stationed at the main gatehouse. There were four watchmen at night. In those days watchmen worked 12 hours. The watch force increased as the contracts for U.S. submarines awarded to Electric Boat grew in number. From 1932 to 1939 the watch force increased very slowly. From 1940 on, the force increased to a peak of almost 300 men and women in the 3 shipyards producing submarines.

At peak wartime construction, Electric Boat was turning over to the Navy a completed submarine every 2 weeks—an unprecedented record. In 1944 the workmen voted by secret ballot to join the American Federation of Labor union. The guards were charter members, in joining the AFL. They were given their own charter signed by the then Secretary George Meany, of the AFL, today president of AFL–CIO. The Metal Trades Council then was formed uniting all the workers. Again the guards were charter members in joining the Metal Trades Council.

After World War II was over, submarine building was drastically curtailed and the guard force was reduced in size, to approximately 50 people. Then came the Korean conflict of 1950 and the start of nuclear-powered submarines.

Under the leadership of its vice president and general manager, Mr. O. P. Robinson, Jr., Electric Boat, working in close cooperation with the U.S. Navy and Adm. Hyman J. Rickover, the U.S.S. *Nautilus* was designed, constructed, and launched. The results are history; the United States produced the world's first atomic-powered submarine.

In conforming with the Security Act of 1950, Electric Boat appointed Capt. Eric L. Barr, U.S. Navy, retired, as its security director. As a former submarine officer, Captain Barr had an outstanding record, and under his supervision at Electric Boat adequate security measures were introduced and are still in effect today. The record will show that they are faultless.

The Electric Boat guard force has the distinction of guarding Presidents of the United States, their wives, dignitaries from foreign countries, top military men, Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, and other VIP's during their visits to Electric Boat. They have handled many a would-be crisis, including pacifisits, sabotage, espionage, subversive activities, fires, thefts, and also handled various other duties pertaining to the protection of this defense installation.

The quality of work turned out at Electric Boat is known throughout the world and takes first place among leaders of workmanship in the submarine field today, in both design and craftsmanship. The skill of the labor force has been cited time and time again. They have responded to do a better job for their country on many occasions. This is the reason why I am pleased to commend the force which is responsible for the protection of these programs and all the various duties connected with them.

The versatility of the Electric Boat guard is numerous; he performs in the background quietly, but effectively; it is security at its best and the record proves it. They are proud of their record and proud of the part they are playing in their country's efforts to protect its citizens.

A few facts about the guard force at Electric Boat:

First. Average age 37 years.

Second. Three-fourths of the force have military service for their country—World Wars I, II, or Korea.

Third. No discrimination of race, color, or creed.

Fourth. No great turnover; all are cleared for secret or higher clearance.

Fifth. Well trained.

Sixth. Belong to State and local law-enforcement agencies.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and pleasure that I commend these men of the Electric Boat guard force for their untiring and unselfish efforts, their constant vigilance in protecting the U.S. Polaris and nuclear weapons, programs, designs, and personnel, in the highest traditions of our country. As Representative of the Second Congressional District in Connecticut, it gives me great pleasure to have men of this caliber in my district. I want to thank them for a job well done and to urge them to continue their relentless loyalty toward the United States of America and the company with which they are associated.

Hamburger Dimes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the proposed minting of deflated-looking hamburger dimes might be interpreted as a symptom of the coming state of our economy. The following editorial points out that "the kinds of stuff that pass for legal tender to some extent reflect the image of the nation that issues it." Before the U.S. Treasury begins the minting of such "pennycore" coins, it should study the possible effects of a cheapened appearance for our coins on an international and national scale. It may well be necessary for congressional action in the areas of dealer hoarding of silver coins.

The editorial referred to above appeared in the Peoria Journal Star on June 8, 1965, as follows:

HAMBURGER DIMES?

President Johnson's proposal to mint "hamburger" coins has been cheered by vending machine operators, silver users, and professional coin collectors, but it is going to take a lot of catsup to make it palatable to us.

Dimes and quarters with red edges where the copper cores show through aren't our idea of what the coinage of the world's leading realm ought to be.

Anybody who has ever had the coins of many nations jingling in his pocket knows that there are some rather basic differences in the kinds of stuff that passes for legal tender, and to some extent it reflects the image of the nation which issues it.

Great Britain's heavy half-crown pieces and florins feel good. So do Switzerland's 5-franc pieces. They seem to bespeak the strength of the nations which issue them, whether or not the strength is really there.

France's coinage system, like many things in France today, is ridiculous. Here is a new franc which is worth so much and there is old franc which is worth so much. The visitor can't tell which is which from what it says on the face, but he can tell by close inspection that there is a real difference.

When you cross from free West Berlin into Communist Germany you have to trade your solid West German coins for pieces of aluminum which pass for money but even by the pocketful fail to jingle.

Indian coins are squarish, some Japanese coins have holes in them, and the coinage of the changing nations of southeast Asia have their own special look, but none of them have a phony appearance, which when we get right down to it is what Johnson's new coins will have.

They may have silver heads and tails, but that red core is going to say that on the inside of this silver piece is, in fact, a penny. And that is going to cheapen not only our national image, but possibly the coins themselves in the long run.

We appreciate the necessity to do something about the coin shortage. Certainly

there is a shortage of silver and certainly the increasing demands of automatic vending machines and grand scale coin speculators have combined to make the situation exceedingly difficult. But we don't think Johnson has found the right answer.

We don't propose any solution, but we do think that consideration ought to be given to a couple of things.

First, we think some real effort should be made to break loose the treasure chest which is now in the hands of people who speculate in coins in current use.

Great stores of recent coins have been purchased by dealers who store them for a few years, building up false values toward a day when they can release them at a profit or at the very worst get the face value they paid for them.

We read recently of hoards of silver coins which have been deposited in some California savings institutions by coin collectors with the agreement that they would draw interest on the face value and when the collectors wanted to withdraw their money they would get the selfsame coins back. In the meantime, the Nation bleeds for dimes to feed into the candy machines.

Perhaps this kind of banking should be outlawed. Perhaps dealers ought to be made to buy a license or pay a fee for interfering with the normal commerce in coins. Collecting coins fresh from the mint has become too widespread and on such large scale that it ought to begin to pay its way—or at least pay for the problem it is causing.

Second, we think that some of our Government economists ought to take a realistic look at the silver sales policy of the U.S. Treasury Department and decide whether or not keeping the price pegged at $1.29 an ounce isn't discouraging the mining of silver and contributing to the shortage of this metal.

The hoard of silver in the U.S. Treasury so dominates the silver industry that half of the free world's supply of the metal, which increasingly is finding industrial and mechanical uses, is purchased from the Treasury. Yet, despite the demand, the price stays the same.

It is probably that the real value of silver has risen so much above the value pegged by the Treasury that our silver coins are worth more melted down than they are as coins, and something must be done or this will become a further complication to the coin shortage.

Obviously, our coinage system is going to be changed and our new coins are going to contain less silver, but it seems—at the very least—that something ought to be figured out to avoid the cheap-looking "hamburger" sandwiches.

Extension of the Export Control Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 7105 to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] to protect American firms and American interests from the Arab boycott of Israel.

As we know, the Arab League, in attempts to further its economic boycott of Israel, has required American firms doing business with any of its member nations to state, among other things, that they do not do business with Israel, that they do not employ Jews, and that the majority ownership of their firms is not held by Jews.

These requirements are not only deplorable and onerous, they are completely contradictory to the policies and the principles of this country.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the committee's bill sets forth a declaration of policy against this practice. But a declaration of policy is not enough. We need language, which this amendment provides, to prevent American firms from participating in any boycott which is carried out by a foreign nation or nations to further its own political objectives and which is aimed at a country friendly to the United States.

We cannot, of course, legislate as to what a foreign power can do or cannot do in regard to its own nationals. But we certainly can and should legislate as to the standards of our own practices.

This is what this amendment seeks to do. It implements the declaration already included in the bill by giving it the teeth which can make it effective. As support for the very principles and policies of our country, this amendment should be approved overwhelmingly today.

Time for Debate on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcements concerning the commitment of ground troops to combat raises serious questions. The history of the war in Vietnam is one of gradual escalation. The time has come for full hearings and full debate concerning this most crucial international issue. Twenty-seven of my colleagues have joined with me in signing a letter to the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee asking for open and full hearings on Vietnam. The New York Times today in an editorial strongly suggests:

> The time has come for the President to take the country into his confidence and to give the Congress time for a full debate before the war is escalated any further.

I urge my colleagues to read the following editorial:

[From the New York Times, June 10, 1965]

GROUND WAR IN WASHINGTON

The Johnson administration's decision authorizing a combat role for American troops in South Vietnam is only confirmed by yesterday's White House statement; yet the statement is carefully drafted to give the impression that the United States is not embarking on a radical new course.

The White House admits that General Westmoreland, since March, has had the secondary mission of providing combat support to South Vietnamese units in trouble.

But why did Secretary Rusk at the time say that "ground combat personnel is not what is needed" and that there would be "a problem about foreign ground troops undertaking the kind of pacification effort that is required in South Vietnam"?

The White House denies that the President ordered the new combat role in March "or at any other time." It is explained that General Westmoreland's authority was "implicit" in the assignment of Marines to Danang. Yet, how could "implicit" authority have been so explicitly defined all along as was finally claimed in yesterday's White House statement? It is there limited to instances when South Vietnamese forces are "faced with aggressive attack when other effective reserves are not available and when in his [Westmoreland's] judgment the military situation urgently requires it."

As recently as last Saturday the State Department did not mention this role when, at the request of newsmen, it redefined the mission of American troops in a statement reportedly approved at the highest levels of the Department. It admitted that American troops had stepped beyond an advisory role, but described their function simply as defense of American installations and patrolling nearby.

The new role of "combat support," which the State Department finally announced this week, seems to be one of serving as a strategic and tactical reserve for the South Vietnamese Army. It presumably can take American combat troops anywhere in the country. Despite an effort semantically to exclude "offensive" campaigns, it appears to include aid to South Vietnamese units that get into difficulty during offensive as well as defensive operations.

A land war on the continent of Asia, which many of the country's leading military men long have opposed, is not undertaken lightly or without premeditation and careful planning. The doubling of American troops in South Vietnam since March and the reports that the 54,000 now there are being increased to 70,000 suggest implementation of a plan approved in February and prepared much earlier.

The time has come for the President to take the country into his confidence and to give the Congress time for a full debate before the war is escalated any further.

When the Truth Pops Out It Lands Right in Phoenix

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial "When the Truth Pops Out It Lands Right in Phoenix" by Richard Wilson, which appeared in the Arizona Republic of May 12, 1965. It is worth reading and considering—with the thought that fairness and openness of mind is necessary to the understanding and evaluation of any policy or philosophy:

WHEN THE TRUTH POPS OUT IT LANDS RIGHT IN PHOENIX

(By Richard Wilson)

PHOENIX.—One has a strange feeling in this sun-swept city of more than half a mil-

lion that the truth had been revealed to him but that he listened not. This city was and still is the home of former U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater whose advocacy of more militant U.S. action against Communist expansion cost him millions of votes in the presidential election last November.

It was en route here midway in the campaign that Senator Goldwater stood in the midsection of the chartered campaign plane and discussed off the record with reporters some of the implications of his more militant policies.

At the time, there seemed to be a not of incongruity in a presidential candidate discussing in such technical detail the nature of modern military applications. Such applications had not really figured in a presidential campaign before; prior war and peace issues had been in larger generalities.

Is it essentially true that President Johnson has now adopted policies for which his opponent last fall was pilloried? Is it essentially true, as was charged by a prominent editor at a seminar of public relations executives here, that Goldwater was "lynched" by the press and by his political opposition? There is too much truth in both charges for a light dismissal.

Now, with 200-plane air raids on North Vietnam, 45,000 troops there and 15,000 in the Dominican Republic, one must certainly conclude that the general sense of what Senator Goldwater was talking about last fall is now in fact being carried out.

The supply lines to the Vietcong are being bombed with increasing intensity and to an extent which may not even have been envisioned by Senator Goldwater. Nuclear weapons are not being used to defoliate the forest and expose the Vietcong, but Goldwater did not advocate that. Areas have been defoliated, however, by conventional bombing, and it has been stated—only for background information, to be sure—that we do not recognize a limitation on the use of nuclear weapons.

Yet, it will be recalled that in television films paid for from Democratic campaign funds, the intentional impression was given that Senator Goldwater would expose small children to the hazards of nuclear radiation.

As for some of the more general aspects, President Johnson has not moved toward the withdrawal or threat of withdrawal of diplomatic recognition from the Soviet Union, as advocated by Senator Goldwater to deter Russia from new expansionary acts. But the sternest of warnings have been given publicly and privately to the Soviet Union on the repetition of offenses against the American Embassy, and the general line of policy on an accommodation with Russia has become harder.

Many passages can be found in Senator Goldwater's controversial book, "Why Not Victory?" which are now in the fabric of national policy under Johnson. One of them is: "We must stop believing that our primary objective must be to humor the public opinion of neutral or uncommitted nations rather than to defend our strategic interests, cooperate closely with our allies, and advance our positions of strength."

Another which has a current application in the Dominican Republic: "We must make it absolutely clear, in the most explicit terms, that Communist governments will not be tolerated in the Western Hemisphere." The U.S. Marines are now making this as explicit as possible under Johnson's orders.

To cite these examples of Senator Goldwater's prescience in U.S. foreign policy is not to endorse everything, nor even anything, that he said and wrote. But it is to suggest that Americans must open their minds to rational analyses of controversial policies, and not to reject such analyses as the ranting of trigger-happy wild men.

It must be evident by now also that if Senator Goldwater was not "lynched" for his views, as the editor charged, he was not given much of a day in court either.

Nor is it a sound reason that because Goldwater advocated some phases of the policies now pursued by Johnson that Johnson is therefore wrong. We see today on the university campuses young and old minds frozen in the kind of concepts that rejected serious consideration of Goldwater's views and now reject Johnson's policies.

We read critics who link the war in Vietnam with the race problem in this country in the leading non sequitur of current academic logic. We hear unfledged opinion from uninformed minds on the nature of the Asian struggle as a civil war comparable to our own between the North and South.

These voices are at least consistent. They oppose the Johnson policies for the same reasons they opposed Goldwater's. If they run true to form, Johnson will soon be pictured as a reckless extremist unhinged by the pressures of the White House.

Philippine Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1898, the great and distinguished patriot of the Philippine Islands, Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, declared the independence of his country from Spanish rule. The historic day is honored and celebrated by the people of the Philippines as a national holiday. On this important anniversary, I would like to extend warm congratulations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic of the Philippines, Diosdado Macapagal, and to His Excellency, the Ambassador of the Philippines to the United States, Oscar Ledesma.

The Philippines is located in one of the most troubled parts of the world. Not far from its shores are the crisis areas southeast Asia: Vietnam and Laos. Its neighbors, Indonesia and Malaysia, are embroiled in a bitter feud with each other. The Philippines is one of the few stable and serene features in a landscape of conflict and confusion. What is the explanation for this phenomenon?

There are many contributing factors, but none are as important as the long history of responsible democratic government in the Philippines. The United States can afford to show some pride in this achievement, because its administration of the Philippines was from the first declared to be temporary in nature. We had as our goal the development of institutions which would permit and encourage the eventual establishment of a free and democratic government.

That momentous occasion arrived on July 4, 1946, the day the Philippine Islands became the independent Republic of the Philippines.

Ever since then, the Philippines has been a valued friend and ally of the United States. Our country has a profound interest in the welfare of the people of the Philippines because of our long and close association with them. While minor irritants have arisen occasionally—as between all good friends—the underlying mutuality of outlook on the important matters has kept the basic fabric of our friendship intact.

I know that all Americans join me in saluting the people of the Philippine Islands on the anniversary of their independence.

U.S. Policy in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered on Saturday, June 5, 1965, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the founding of Post 10004, Veterans of Foreign Wars, at Jewett City, Conn., in my district. In this address I discussed the situation in Vietnam and I emphasized the fact that our Government is pursuing the right policy there.

The text of my address follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

Commander Kowalski, officers, and members of post 10004, friends, it is a great pleasure for me to be here with you on this occasion when you celebrate the 10th anniversary of your post in Jewett City. I am very happy that Henry Pincherra, past State commander who originally installed this post 10 years ago, is here today. I am sure he is very proud, as we all are of your post and its accomplishments over the past decade. As a member of the VFW and as one who is almost a neighbor of yours, I am familiar with some of your activities and, therefore, wish to take this opportunity to commend you for all you have done.

I should like to devote my remarks to a discussion of the situation in Vietnam, where we are presently embroiled in a war. Naturally, it is very much on our minds to keep this war to a limited basis, not to let it get out of hand and become another world conflagration. Most of all, we are interested in bringing the conflict to an early termination, so that the bloodshed may cease and our men may return to their families.

This possibility, of course, is easier said than done. We are dealing with a ruthless and fanatic enemy—and let me say at the very outset that the real enemy in this case is not the Vietnamese people, but Communist China which stands in back of the North Vietnamese and is egging them on to wage their attack on South Vietnam. In other words, Communist China is merely using the North Vietnamese as a tool against the free world. As a matter of fact, North Vietnam could not wage this war, except on a very limited basis, were it not for the substantial help it has received and is receiving from Communist China.

The situation in Vietnam has during the past year assumed large proportions all over the world and has become a matter of universal concern because of the grave threat it poses to world peace. I have received letters from people who want to know why we are there, why don't we get out of Vietnam, and why don't we enter into peace negotiations with the Communists, and similar questions.

The official reason given by our Government for U.S. presence in Vietnam is that we were invited to help that Republic, created by the Geneva accord of 1954, to organize and defend itself. It is also obvious, however, that we are in Vietnam because we think it is in our best interests and for the security of our country and the whole free world to see that the Communists do not gain control over it. Our military and economic assistance to Vietnam is almost certainly the major factor which has prevented that country from falling victim to Communist guerrilla warfare directed from the north. Consequently, it is perfectly clear that our presence in Vietnam is abhorrent to Red China and its stooges in North Vietnam.

Let me emphasize the point that the conflict in Vietnam cannot be separated from, or viewed apart from, the context of the balance of power in the Far East and the larger scheme of world affairs. Communist China would very much like to have a free hand to exercise its influence and power in southeast Asia. Indeed, its leaders have already called for "a war of liberation" against Thailand. They did not, of course, bother to ascertain whether the people of Thailand want to be liberated, Communist style.

It is perfectly obvious that the fall of Vietnam to the Communists would be followed shortly thereafter by a similar conflict and the establishment of Communist dominion over Thailand.

Malayasia's position would become untenable. Burma and India, and possibly Pakistan and other countries in that part of the world, would find themselves outflanked and at the mercy of a hostile power which has already seized a number of strategic mountain passes leading to those countries. With a situation of this sort developing in the Far East, how long do you suppose it would be before Australia and New Zealand were confronted with this threat? Or Korea, Japan, and Formosa? Or the Philippines? Or even Hawaii?

The basic questions being asked by the American public are these: Is it in our best interest to assist the Republic of South Vietnam maintain its identity? Is it in our best interest to frustrate Communist Chinese designs on southeast Asia? For the past decade the judgment of our national administrations under both political parties has been and still is "Yes" to both questions. Moreover, we have by treaty solemnly committed ourselves to this course—and the United States has not made a habit of breaking its international treaties.

The fact of the matter is that the United States cannot and will not enter into negotiations at the point of a gun. It has not done so with any adversary throughout its nearly two centuries of existence, and it will certainly not do so with the Communist who openly advocate our destruction. When peace negotiations are to be undertaken, we must enter into such negotiations from a position of strength and in the interest of world peace.

We have always been and still are a peace-loving people. We do not wage aggressive wars for conquest. We stand for peace, we want peace and we want it very badly. Yes, the United States will negotiate and President Johnson has stated on several occasions that he is willing to go anywhere and anytime to discuss matters of world peace. We shall not do so at the point of a gun or when the terms are set in advance.

In this connection, I think it would be wise for us to recall the words of the late President Kennedy who said: "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

I am convinced that the Chinese Communists would like to take us on eventually in an aggressive war in southeast Asia. That is why they are constantly spreading hatred of America and presenting us in the image of imperialists in the eyes of other nations in Asia. Therefore, it should be clear to all of us that the closer we keep our line of defense to Red China, the better off we shall be in the long run.

In February, when the United States started bombing North Vietnam, the war entered into a new phase. The United States is showing that it means business, that we are taking our commitments seriously, that we have adequate power to maintain our position and the moral courage to persevere and we are not a "paper tiger," as the Chinese believe us to be. The United States is also making it as clear to the Chinese as possible that we are not going to accept their terms, and that we are not going to retreat from that part of the world and give Communist China a free hand to extend its domination. Furthermore, the United States is showing the Red Chinese that they cannot get away with aggression against their neighbors and against the free world.

I am in favor of President Johnson's policy in Vietnam because I believe it is right and it is in the interest of our country. It is most unfortunate that we have to bomb those places and that we have to send our men to fight there, but we have no other recourse. War is always dirty, but then again, guerrilla warfare of the type in operation in that country is the most hellish and the dirtiest imaginable. The Communists are using force, terror, persecution, cruelty, and deception of every kind in their efforts to gain control over Vietnam because this would open the gates for them to eventually establish their domination over all of southeast Asia.

Whether we like it or not, we are faced with a bad situation—a situation that cannot be handled with kid gloves. We have had to retaliate, we have had to bomb them, we have had to send in our men to do the job. Certainly, we are losing some of our men there, certainly, there is great danger of escalation of the war. But we are doing our best under the circumstances to keep the number of casualties down and to keep the danger of escalation at a minimum. For this reason we are concentrating primarily on bombing military targets, railroad facilities, depots, bridges, and the like. We have avoided bombing the North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi. We stopped our bombing recently for nearly a week in the hope that the Communists would show some sign of willingness to sit down and neogtiate with us. But it was all in vain—not the slightest indication that they want to talk peace.

Under those circumstances, it would be a very grievous mistake on our part to pull out of Vietnam. For one thing, it would immediately be interpreted by the whole world, by friend and foe alike, as a sign of weakness on our part. The nations of the free world would see it as a sign of our unwillingness to defend the free world and, in turn, they would be reluctant to support us. The Communists would interpret it as a sure signal to go ahead with their plans to subjugate other nations and to take over one country after another. I believe that within a year or a year and a half we would be facing the same situation in the Philippines as we are facing today in Vietnam. If we gave in there, the next step would be Hawaii, and then the Western Hemisphere.

So you see that much depends on the outcome in Vietnam where our whole southeast Asia policy is at stake. But it is not merely southeast Asia alone, it is also our own defense that is at stake. This is not a matter to be easily dismissed or ignored. It is for this reason that I say to you today—and believe me that much thought has gone into it over these many weeks—that our Government is doing the right thing in Vietnam. It is pursuing the right policy there, because to do otherwise would be almost suicidal for us.

Now, I know that we are not a very patient people. We would like to see this situation over with as soon as possible. But this is exactly what the Communists are trying to exploit for their purposes. In addition to fighting men, modern weapons, and wise diplomacy, we also need a considerable amount of patience to match the patience of the Chinese. By now it should be clear to all that the conflict in Vietnam is not going to be resolved overnight, or in a few months, or even in a year. Experts are talking in terms of 5, 6, or 7 more years. We cannot afford to waiver, we cannot afford to weaken, but we must see this thing through.

It is worth remembering too that our intervention in Vietnam began about a decade ago under the Eisenhower administration, although the buildup in manpower did not start until about 4 years ago. President Johnson is anxious to reach a settlement in Vietnam, but we cannot simply pull out or surrender. The President has stated on several occasions that the United States will "not grow tired" in Vietnam and it will "not be defeated." At the same time, he has made it clear that the United States has no desire to conquer North Vietnam, and that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side." In other words, the Communists must realize that fighting is no longer profitable, that North Vietnam is being shot up and gradually destroyed, and that it is becoming more and more a drain on Red China. When they realize that, then they will be ready to talk peace.

Thus, they are hanging on because they believe we are weak, we are decadent capitalists, we are exhausted, and our patience is about gone. They believe that our people are divided and are clamoring for peace and for getting out of Vietnam. I believe they are mistaken. Germany made the same mistake in both World Wars. Japan made the same mistake, and so did Communist China during the Korean conflict. They are repeating the same mistake today.

I believe with the President that the United States will not weaken, it will not grow tired. I believe it will see this thing through, no matter how long it takes. We have much more at stake here than mere honor or glory. The whole future of the American people and of the entire free world is at stake. The sooner and the better the whole world understands our position, the more hopeful this position will become and the greater will be the chances for ultimate victory.

George Washington once said:

"Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the rest is in the hands of God."

I believe that the American people are wise enough and honest enough to see the standard that has been raised and what it represents for us now and in the future, and I think they will rally to this standard. For the rest, we must trust in God.

And so, in conclusion, I want to leave with you the thought expressed so well by a modern-day American poet, Russell Davenport, who in his epic poem, "My Country," says as follows:

"Freedom is not to limit but to share,
And freedom here means freedom everywhere."

Recent Books on Major U.S. Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of our distinguished

colleagues two books which have recently been published by Oceana Publications of Dobbs Ferry, N.Y. These books, which deal with separate but vital aspects of our present foreign and domestic policies, are "Breakthrough to the Great Society" by David Cushman Coyle, and "Vietnam: A Diplomatic Tragedy," by Victor Bator.

Mr. Bator, an international lawyer and former diplomat, documents the history of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam from the policies of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles in the mid-1950's. He points out that we must now live with the policies which were promulgated at that time. Mr. Bator contends that patient diplomacy should have been utilized in this area instead of the military action which was actually employed and which has continued.

In "Breakthrough to the Great Society," with forewords by the distinguished Senators from Illinois and Pennsylvania, Messrs. DOUGLAS and CLARK. David Coyle analyzes the Federal Government's basic responsibility to take action to meet the needs of the country and to recommend ways of using national economic power to meet those needs. The author delves particularly into the impact of automation on the American economy and examines the use of education as a solution to the technological unemployment caused by automation.

Mr. Coyle, author of several works on national and international affairs, has skillfully utilized the testimony befor various congressional committees on the war on poverty in discussing many of the problems which confront the United States today. He treats creatively subjects of vital domestic importance such as the rehabilitation of the handicapped, conservation of natural resources, and public finance.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that many of our colleagues would find these books both timely and of interest.

The War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Defender, Thursday, May 25, 1965, concerning the war on poverty in Chicago. This editorial highlights the excellent manner in which the Chicago program on urban opportunity is being administered. It is an answer to the criticism that was levied when the program was initiated and clears up the misunderstanding that took place at the time.

The editorial is as follows:

THE WAR ON POVERTY

The storm of criticism with which the Chicago program on urban opportunity was greeted, has now subsided. Unfortunate and unsettling as were the critical darts, they, nevertheless, served to clear the air of much apprehension and misunderstanding.

The Chicago program was hit the hardest. Yet it has been from the very beginning the best organized and the most studiously and imaginatively conceived effort toward systematic eradication of the blight of poverty and ignorance.

Criticism sometimes is a much needed therapy. Coming at the initial stage of a newborn mission, however, it could have blunted its growth and immobilized its functions.

The leadership here is competent and has the necessary intellectual buoyancy to measure up to the complex sociological facet of the problems facing it. From the administrative angle, the working units are staffed with experienced and well-trained professionals.

Responsible community leaders who are not directly involved in the crusade against poverty have begun to appreciate the magnitude of the task. The criticism by the uninitiated that the poor were not woven into the fabric of the operation proved to be an erroneous assessment.

Dr. Deton J. Brooks, executive director of the Chicago project, saw to it that the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act were scrupulously observed. He has established key units in strategic localities making it possible for the residents of slum neighborhoods to have a meaningful voice in solving their own problems.

Of course, there was much wailing among those persons who sought to transmute the antipoverty war into governmental subsidies for demagogs and crackpots. They were startled when they discovered that the power to fix policy resided in a council broadly representative of all factors in urban Chicago—social work, neighborhood antipoverty organization, industry, labor, religion, as well as the city government.

The execution of the economic opportunity program is entrusted into the hands of a very skillful and experienced administrator. Dr. Brooks has been a teacher, social worker, newspaper editor, statistician, and university lecturer. Few men, Negro or white, have his qualifications and brilliance. Under his able supervision, the Chicago urban economic opportunity has evolved into a shining model for other large metropolitan centers to follow.

Credit for this appointment belongs to our perceptive Mayor Daley who didn't seek a ward heeler to head the antipoverty project and uproot the social evils incidental to poverty and want.

American Library Trustee Association President Outlines Function of Nation's Libraries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate condition of many of the libraries in our Nation is well known to all of us. The concern of Congress in this area was expressed by the extension and implementation of the Library Services Act last year.

The importance of a superior library system to the Nation cannot be questioned. It is extremely imperative that good library facilities be available to all who desire to use them and that the facilities be in such a state that the library itself is able to make a positive contribution to the development of the community.

A constituent of mine, Charles E. Reid, of Paramus, N.J., is currently serving as president of the American Library Trustee Association, which is vitally concerned with the development of the library system of this Nation. In an address at the ALTA congressional luncheon, Mr. Reid provided an excellent statement on the responsibilities of the public libraries. As Mr. Reid pointed out, the public libraries have a considerable task confronting them in catching up with the requirements of the citizenry.

Libraries provide young people with an opportunity to broaden the scope of their education. They expand the recreational time of the youthful citizenry, assist the culturally underprivileged, and broaden the potential of the gifted.

Libraries are not only important to the youth of the Nation but to the adult community as well. In fact, through programs of research and adult education, the library can be a means of cultural development for each and every individual at all levels and can lead to the establishment of social and economic equality.

Mr. Reid noted that the ALTA is working in each of these areas and emphasized especially the library trustee's role in the implementation of library policy. I believe his remarks merit the attention of Congress.

Mr. Reid's speech as reprinted in the midwinter 1965 Public Library Trustee follows:

A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN LIBRARY TRUSTEE ASSOCIATION

We are meeting here today to honor those whom we have elected to represent us by reflecting their respective analysis and interpretation of our Nation's needs through legislative programing.

In our complex social and economic society, this is no mean job. It is my privilege as president of the American Library Trustee Association to greet you on behalf of more than 40,000 public library trustees serving as local, State, and national representatives of libraries.

We in the American Library Trustee Association are extremely cognizant of our responsibilities as elected and apopinted officials for the establishment and maintenance of those lines of communication on all levels of government necessary to enable you to more effectively and efficiently serve your electorate.

As policymakers of our Nation's libraries, it is also our responsibility to see that those legislative program which have been established on a national level by you are properly utilized back home—not as a substitution for local programing, but as a true reflection of Federal responsibility to establish, stimulate, and maintain libraries as the solid foundation for our educational and social processes and policies.

We know of the tremendous impact and value of the Library Services Act. It has served to prove to all those concerned that we, in failing to recognize the needs of libraries in the past decades, have established a tremendous backlog of work to accomplish.

As participants in the political process, I pledge, on behalf of the American Library

Trustee Association, our full assistance and cooperation.

Libraries have an important and expanding role in all educational programs which affect our Nation. We have an important role in establishing social and economic equality to all our people through the cultural development of each and every individual at all levels, as well as the promotion of adult educational programing. This role also includes programs of continuous education, retraining programs and others to assist the culturally underprivileged and to broaden the potential of the gifted.

We must continue to serve the informational center by which the varied philosophical and scientific facts and theories are made available to all for evaluation with complete freedom.

We must provide the facilities by which the expanding recreational time of our citizenry can be used to strengthen and revitalize our understanding of the basic dignity and responsibility of man to himself as well as others.

All this can best be established through effective library programs—not limited to those individuals or political subdivisions that can afford it, but to all.

The strength of our Nation has historically been built upon the creative and aggressive minds of our people, through which we have been able to meet the challenge of the past centuries. In our exploding world of knowledge, the library's role becomes more and more important and we as trustees are aware of the grave responsibilities of our office. We are grateful to you for assisting us in meeting these responsibilities through effective legislative tools. We pledge these tools will not gather rust, but will be kept bright, clean, and sharp through our cultivation of our most important commodity—the human mind. Working together, we can irrigate the deserts of despair and apathy, cultivate the mountains of prejudice and fear until they are tillable and productive. We can use all the rich resources in the valley of knowledge until all our land is abundant with the fruits of free men, confident, through knowledge of themselves and of their nation.

I thank you for all that you have done and are doing towards these ends.

Federal Reserve Board Split on Credit Policy—Robertson Takes Issue With Martin—Backs Patman Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, not only are the views of Federal Reserve Chairman Martin out of step with administration programs for prosperity, but he is getting static in his own backyard as well.

J. L. Robertson, a highly regarded member of the independent and all-powerful Reserve Board yesterday took issue with Martin's now famous Columbia University speech last week where he likened the current state of our economy to 1929. The financial markets and business community in general are still badly shaken by Martin's alarmist tactics aimed to pave the way for a general tightening of credit which many feel is already underway.

Robertson told a bankers meeting in Pittsburgh that "tight money is not now an appropriate prescription for our domestic economic problems," that tight money is not appropriate for our present balance-of-payments situation either.

Robertson brought home the fact that we are not suffering from domestic inflation and that higher interest rates now would jeopardize our domestic economy which, Robertson said, "is the real source of our strength."

This is what our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, WRIGHT PATMAN, has been saying for years and I am very glad that someone with such stature and ability to act on these matters is in full agreement with the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

An article from the Washington Post newspaper June 10 on Governor Robertson's speech to the bankers follows:

FEDERAL RESERVE AID DISPUTES MARTIN VIEW

PITTSBURGH, PA., June 9.—A member of the Federal Reserve Board took issue tonight with recent statements by Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., regarding the U.S. economy and balance of payments.

J. L. Robertson told a meeting of bankers that higher interest rates would be bad medicine both for business at home and for the dollar abroad.

"Tight money is not now an appropriate prescription for our domestic economic problems, given the current slackening in the rate of business expansion and our sizable remaining margins of unutilized resources—both human and material," Robertson said.

As for the dollar outflow, Roberston said that "our balance of payments is not suffering from the 'traditional' ailments for which tighter money has come to be regarded as the 'traditional' solution.

"We are not suffering from domestic inflation, with a resulting excess of imports over exports and accompanied by a flight from the currency," he said in a speech prepared for delivery to a meeting sponsored by the directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

Martin had compared the present prosperity to the roaring twenties which preceded the great depression. He said the Government must remain "willing and able to prevent orderly expansion from turning into disorderly boom."

Raising U.S. interest rates to make them more competitive with European rates would simply drive up European rates, too, Robertson said.

"Consequently, I would not favor higher interest rates here unless and until it seemed likely that higher rates would either be needed to contain or curb inflation at home or would significantly improve the balance of payments without jeopardizing our domestic economy—which, of course, is the real source of our strength," Robertson said.

Johnson's Coinage Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Friday, June 4, 1965:

JOHNSON'S COINAGE PROPOSALS

Long-awaited recommendations by President Johnson on changes in the metallic content of U.S. coins, necessitated by the shortage of silver, were submitted to Congress Thursday in a special message that lays the groundwork for sensible and reasonable solutions to some serious monetary problems.

Silver stockpiles are diminishing rapidly and there is no prospect, in the foreseeable future, of silver mines producing ore in sufficient quantities to provide the American people with enough dimes, quarters, and half dollars unless their silver content is diminished or eliminated. The President proposes that a combination of copper and nickel be used in dimes and quarters. He suggests that the silver content of half dollars be reduced from 90 to 40 percent. There would be no changes in size.

Coinage experts have advised the President that the new-style dimes and quarters would have a shiny surface similar to the nickel and presumably would be no less durable. The new half dollar would look virtually the same as the present type. These are important considerations. Good appearance, quality and durability of coins contribute to public confidence in their value.

It is said the new dimes and quarters will be acceptable in vending machines with no adjustment necessary. This would be a noteworthy technological accomplishment.

The vending machine industry has been filled with anxiety at the prospect of making costly and time-consuming alterations to millions of coin-operated devices.

As the President emphasized, altering the metallic content of coins would have no effect whatever on purchasing power. A dime would buy the same cup of coffee whether or not the coin were made of silver just as coins of the same denomination are uniform as a medium of exchange no matter what face may appear on them.

The urgent need remains to expedite construction of the new mint in Philadelphia so the Nation can be assured of an abundant supply of coins during and after the transition period.

Research Is the Key to Growth and Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith another report from the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania entitled: "Research Is the Key to Growth and Stability":

RESEARCH IS THE KEY TO GROWTH AND STABILITY

While for many years the Pittsburgh region has been, in fact, a center of impressive research facilities and engineering skills, the emergence of the nuclear age has brought about a rapid and spectacular buildup that makes this one of the great research and development centers of the Nation.

The growing major industrial laboratories, with their highly trained technicians, while they may pursue projects of pure research, are daily meeting the challenge of applying scientific breakthroughs to new products, new equipment, new methods, and materials.

The effectiveness of this research is significantly evident in a report by Industrial Research magazine indicating that 10 of the 100 most important new products of 1963 were from Pittsburgh area laboratories.

The Pittsburgh region leads the world in two important areas of research and development.

In materials research, giants of the steel industry such as United States Steel, Jones & Laughlin, Crucible, and Allegheny Ludlum have invested in extensive laboratory facilities. The pioneer in aluminum—Alcoa—is constanly developing new methods and applications. In glass and polymers—Pittsburgh Plate Glass, Mobay Chemical, and Koppers Co. In the ceramic field, Harbison-Walker, Westinghouse, and many others have expanded research operations. In addition to such basic materials—the area is also rapidly becoming a center for research in many exotic materials, single crystals, electronic, and magnetic materials, superconductors—and a host of other items undreamed of before this space age.

The future of the coal industry may well be decided in the laboratories devoted to searching out new uses and applications of this basic material, just as new vistas of opportunity are being explored in research on petroleum and petrochemicals.

In atomic power, this area has the distinction of the first commercial atomic powerplant, at Shippingsport. It is one of the largest centers of commercial powerplant development led by the Westinghouse atomic power department. The Bettis Laboratory is credited with the application of atomic power to naval propulsion, and in space propulsion the Westinghouse Astronuclear Laboratory is the center for the most advanced developments. With this leadership, it is entirely natural that the area has also attracted the establishment of suppliers of nuclear fuel, precision components and instruments, and many types of equipment peculiar to the atomic power industry.

One of the Pittsburgh region's most famous research centers is Mellon Institute, where research ideas have grown into giant corporations. For example, the research on polymers and development of Bakelite and other products led to the giant Union Carbide Chemical Corp. Research here on synthetic rubber helped to solve one of the real crises of World War II.

Matching the tremendous growth of industrial research capabilities are the stepped-up programs at the universities. For nuclear physics research, both the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Institute of Technology have built large accelerators. The newly developing Space Center at Pitt opens the door to advanced research work in this field. Medical research at the University of Pittsburgh and its associated hospitals has achieved worldwide acclaim. The Salk vaccine is a case in point, and rapid progress holds the promise of other equally spectacular advances in man's fight against disease.

The MPC Corp. was formed recently to bring together the efforts and facilities of Mellon Institute, Pitt and Carnegie Tech on projects too large or too complicated for one institution to handle. This joining of the three institutions will carry out research projects and operate facilities for the U.S. Government, for industry, and for other organizations. In many of these programs there will be strong industrial flavor and, therefore, the corporation will invite the participation of industry.

Thus, the research and development horizons in the Pittsburgh region are almost unlimited. The very presence and concentration of scientific research skills in one industrial field tends to attract related industries with their own material and product development interests.

Congressman Case's Challenge to Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, June 12, will be the 20th anniversary of a memorable event in the history of this body and in the career of one of our most distinguished former colleagues and present U.S. Senators, my friend and predecessor in this House, the Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE.

On June 12, 1945, Senator CASE, then a first-term Congressman, took the floor of the House to reply to the late Member of Congress from Mississippi, John E. Rankin, who the day before had attacked the late Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter and impugned the war record of his State's Negro population.

Congressman CASE accepted the challenge implicit in Congressman Rankin's remarks and in brief and measured terms he defended those whom Mr. Rankin had attacked. In doing so, the young Congressman from New Jersey's Sixth District demonstrated a persuasive and evenhanded skill in debate, but, more important, he displayed a sensitive and enlightened conscience and the courage to act on the dictates of that conscience.

That speech, Mr. Speaker, attracted and deserved nationwide attention. For those of us who know so well and respect so deeply the senior Senator from New Jersey, the speech still stands as a symbol and a prophecy of a career of great public service, unsurpassed for its consistent devotion to the demands of conscience and to the rights and liberties of all Americans.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, it seems most appropriate on this occasion to include the text of the speech as a part of my remarks:

A CHALLENGE TO PREJUDICE

(Speech of Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New New Jersey, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, June 12, 1945)

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am native-born, white, a gentile—a Protestant. That I am these things entitles me to no special status or distinction. Indeed I had no choice as to any of them, except the last. But because I am these things, and thus a member of the comfortable majority in this country, I find myself under compelling obligation to express my disagreement with certain remarks made yesterday in this Chamber by the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Rankin.

As to Mr. Justice Frankfurter:

I am not personally acquainted with Felix Frankfurter. My last and only direct contact with him was as a student for a few weeks, nearly 20 years ago. But several of my close friends and professional associates have long known him intimately and I have had occasion, of course, to follow his decisions and opinions in my practice over the years.

I am convinced not only that he is not a Communist, but also that he has no more sympathy with the Communists' philosophy or their political, social, or economic beliefs or methods than does the gentleman from Mississippi or than I do myself.

He is utterly devoted to our American democratic system and the great principles of liberty, equality, and justice under law upon which it rests. His devotion, I suggest, is but the deeper because he springs from a race which has known little but persecution since it history has been recorded; because, alien-born, he does not regard the great blessing of American citizenship so casually as his natural right as do many of us to whom it has come by birth.

He is a resourceful and energetic student of the law and our institutions; a fair-minded and stimulating teacher; always a crusader for justice for the individual; he has become one of the outstanding Justices of the Supreme Court, where he is regarded, I venture to say, by his brethren on the bench, as he is by the profession generally, as somewhat conservative in his views. He has the most profound respect for the Court, for its traditions, and for the law which it has made. I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that our American system, our constitutional democracy, will come to no evil at his hands.

Mr. Chairman, one word more.

The gentleman from Mississippi also said that, while in Mississippi the population is about equally divided between whites and Negroes, at least 90 percent of the casualties during this war from Mississippi have been gentile whites.

Mr. Chairman, no group in this country has a monopoly on patriotism. Men of all races, colors, and creeds, whether native- or foreign-born have equally sacrificed their lives or given the best years of their youth in this war. The casualty lists show that, as do the gold stars in the windows of homes, both high and humble, in every city, town, and hamlet, and on the farms throughout the land. I suppose there are not many Jews in the State of Mississippi, but I am convinced that their casualties are in proportion to their number in the population, as they are over the country as a whole. And, if that be not true also of the Negroes, it is due, I am sure, to no lack of courage or patriotism on their part, but rather to these two reasons:

First. That, because of poverty and lack of equal educational and economic opportunity for generations, the percentage of Negro draft rejections on medical and mental grounds is far above the average for other groups.

Second. That, to some extent, they may have been given noncombat service of one kind or another more often than most other groups.

Obviously, both of these factors have been quite beyond the control of the Negroes themselves. I am sure the records of this war will vindicate fully the heroism of the Negro combat soldier.

Mr. Chairman, I did not rise in defense of Mr. Justice Frankfurter or of the courage and patriotism of minority groups in this country. They need no defense by me. I rose because I could not by remaining silent permit any inference that I acquiesced in the sentiments to which I have taken exception. And, more important by far, because of my deep conviction that whenever we of the majority in this country permit such sentiments to be unchallenged, not only are we guilty of a wrong to the minority groups concerned but we risk the greater danger of brutalizing ourselves.

"The States of the Union: Shape Up or Ship Out"—Chapter III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as most of our colleagues know, I am placing in the RECORD the four articles, datelined Washington, written by the Kansas City Star's Kansas correspondent, Ray Morgan, on the crisis of responsibility that is upon us in the area of Federal-State relations. These articles appeared originally in the first 4 days of June in the Kansas City Star and are so outstanding that I am placing them, one by one, in succeeding issues of the RECORD so that the Members of Congress may have the benefit of the entire series. Chapter III, today's chapter, sketches some of the hopeful initiatives that are being taken by some local leaders to modernize local government.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON.—It may well be that the decade from 1965 to 1975 may be known in Federal, State, and local government relations as the decade of the three R's—reapportionment, reorganization, and revitalization.

Already the leaders of such local government units as the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, and the National Mayors Conference are rushing here to convince Federal officials they are casting off their archaic structures for progress.

KANSAS IS EXAMPLE

States that see the handwriting on the wall are revising their constitutions to give greater autonomy to counties and cities to deal directly with pressing problems and tax needs. State legislatures, as in Kansas, are providing authority to local governments to cooperate with each other in solving issues.

The reason, of course, is that Congress has allowed the Federal Government to create its own local agencies, bypassing the existing city and county units, in such areas as public housing, sponsored by the late Senator Robert Taft; urban renewal, and now the antipoverty programs.

One of the most articulate spokesmen for the cause of revamping and revitalizing local government to give it the stature and thinking to deal with domestic problems is a bright young man, Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director of the National Association of Counties here.

"It certainly appears to us that the Supreme Court's one man, one vote rule is likely to stick and bring in its wake not only legislative reapportionment, but the precious byproducts of reorganization and revitalization of State and local government," Hillenbrand said.

"This is almost certainly the decade of decision for the future role of State and local governments in our Federal system. Our hope is that when the dust settles, counties will emerge as very powerful and forceful partners in the family of State and local governments."

MUST CHANGE THINKING

One of the first things citizens must do, Hillenbrand believes, if they are not to go the route of default to local Federal administrative agencies is to rid local governments of "retired thinking," a term he uses to describe the obsessive preoccupation with holding down the local property tax.

"What has happened in many instances is that most of us seem to be too busy making a living and we have let only the very wealthy or the retired who have the time to take over county government," Hillenbrand said.

Edward G. Michaelian, an industrialist who has taken an interest in local government by being elected to the governing board of Westchester County, N.Y., and who is president of NACO, has brought definite ideas to Washington on the problems of local government.

One of his pet ideas is that the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a bipartisan group created by Congress under President Dwight D. Eisenhower, be expanded to include private citizens of the stature of Harry S. Truman and Eisenhower.

"We are now in the age of partnership and governmental togetherness," Michaelian said. "In modern America, we are increasingly aware that the concept of separate levels of government, operating with exclusive sources of revenue, is now obsolete. We have embarked on bold national partnership programs, designed to bring the combined resources of the Federal, State, and local governments to bear in solving basic problems.

STRESS ON PARTNERSHIP

"Our purpose is to support vigorously the partnership programs; to call attention to some of the counties' problems in partnership and finally to suggest ways and means of increasing the effectiveness of the Federal-State-local partnership. There is special need to strengthen both the financial and policymaking roles of local government in national programs."

To accomplish these objectives, the county officials, through their organization, have submitted a white paper to Congress and President Lyndon B. Johnson calling for the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to be expanded and undertake a study of Federal, State and local government financing; that policymaking boards on all interrelated Federal programs be expanded to include State and local government representatives and that the White House name a staff member to deal with local government problems.

A hopeful sign that the States and the local governments are becoming increasingly concerned about regaining their partnership role effectively in the intergovernmental partnership is that the National Association of Counties, the National Governors Conference, and the Council of State Governments will meet jointly for the first time to discuss the problem early this fall.

AFRAID OF BEING LEFT OUT

At a recent meeting of the National League of Cities at the Washington Hilton Hotel here, Allen Pritchard, former executive of the League of Kansas Municipalities and now administrative assistant to Senator JAMES B. PEARSON, Republican, of Kansas, said the cities have now swung full pendulum from turning for help to the Federal Government instead of the States to finding themselves concerned over being bypassed by Federal agencies.

Pritchard said national planners have begun to question the ability of transitory local political leadership to deliver the city vote and are innstead turning to other types of voting blocs.

"I would warn, however," Pritchard said, "against those who often appear as champions of the city but who, in fact, use local government as a mechanism of defense—sort of a Maginot line against what they refer to as Federal centralism. Their tear shedding for cities is used to block Federal urban-oriented programs and does not represent a constructive attitude toward local government or any real faith in cities as institutions. Instead, it simply accepts cities as something less evil than that which is proposed.

"Constantly frustrating Congress and the executive agencies is administrative confusion at the local level. There is constant complaint about the proliferation of local government. With some considerable justification, they question the capacity, legal, administrative, and financial—of many of these units to deal effectively with these problems.

MUST SPOT PROBLEMS

"The thrust of both executive and congressional planning is, therefore, to identify a national problem, develop an answer, and then worry about how to work out an administrative arrangement which respects the States and tolerates local government confusion."

It could not be clearer. Citizens who want, as most Americans do, a voice at the local level must bring the structure of city and county government out of the 18th century into modern 20th century America.

Wilbur J. Cohen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, today you administered the oath of office to an extraordinary public servant: Wilbur J. Cohen, who today became Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Wilbur Cohen is a man who has served his country for many years, devoting to it his incisive mind, his unrelenting determination, his inexhaustible energy—and most of all, his love of and respect for people.

When in 1961, Wilbur Cohen was appointed Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs of the Department, by President Kennedy, he was serving as a professor of public health at the University of Michigan, in Ann Arbor. But teaching was only a part of Wilbur Cohen's lifework. In the early 1930's, after graduation from the University of Wisconsin, he came to Washington to enter the fight for social decency that during that period drew so many young men and women into the Government or into the labor movement. He was one of the drafters of the original legislation establishing the Social Security Act, and remained with the social security agency, in a number of policy positions, for over 20 years.

But as anyone who knows Wilbur Cohen is well aware, Mr. Speaker, the most impressive thing about this man is not his background—it is the man himself.

Even now, at his most productive years, Wilbur Cohen has retained the idealism and energy of youth. To Wilbur, the issues have not dulled, the zest for challenge has not faded, and his drive continues to provide others opportunity to achieve greater dignity and security.

His record as chief legislative architect, and advocate, for the Department is to me unsurpassed in the Federal Government. Prior to the beginning of this 89th Congress, he and his associates had

succeeded in creating and piloting through Congress over 40 important bills. During the first 5 months alone of this 89th Congress, Wilbur Cohen has guided through this House such major legislative acts as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Older Americans Act, and the Water Resources Planning Act; and, after years of attempts, he has seen adopted by this House, the Social Security Amendments Act which provides hospital and medical care for the elderly under social security—an act often called the Medicare Act.

Earlier today, Mr. Speaker, you presented to Wilbur the gavel you used on April 8 of this year, the day the medicare bill passed the House. Wilbur Cohen's work day on that day of April 8th is indicative of the unrelenting energy that this man devotes to his work. April 8th was the 27th wedding anniversary of Wilbur and his wife Eloise. Early on that day, we, in my office, received an unscheduled but much enjoyed visit from the then Assistant Secretary, who had come by to see his "bride", Mrs. Cohen, who was helping my office staff. He then went to the committee rooms of the House for the entire day and early evening, staying with the legislative leaders for the bill, until the bill was passed. He had waited for this day for over 30 years. Then, he and an aide rushed to the Senate to work out a sticky problem on the water pollution bill, remaining until 10:30 in the evening. Returning, Wilbur stopped in to pick up his understanding wife and go out to a quiet dinner to celebrate the day.

Our colleague, Mr. KING, of California, recently praised Wilbur Cohen by describing him as "one of those Government officials ready to risk their reputations and their professions to do their duty as they see it." As most of the Members know, Wilbur Cohen is an articulate and aggressive advocate for the ideas and programs in which he believes. Those of us who have had the opportunity to observe him know he is invariably well informed and eager to educate or be educated.

But Wilbur Cohen's extraordinary energies, talents, and good spirits are not conserved for just legislators and administrators. The Cohen's home nearby is located on almost three acres of rolling wooded land—a touch of citybound wilderness, a land of fascinating diversions for the very young. To watch Wilbur Cohen dig and explore; race and chase; trek off with youngsters to track the wildest of imagined lions and tigers, is a happy experience. On Sunday, little boys with balls and bats and toy guns can absorb the total attention of this fine man, and stir all the abilities that we on the Hill have learned to expect and appreciate from him on the other 6 days of the week.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure it pleases all who know him, that President Johnson has promoted Wilbur Cohen. It would be difficult for me to bring to mind recognition more deserved. I was proud and happy to attend today, with other Members of the Michigan congressional delegation, the ceremony in which you, Mr. Speaker, administered his oath of office. I would surmise that seldom have you performed that task for a man who brought greater talent, experience, and energy to public office.

Education in the Modern World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered at the commencement exercises of the Mairanapolis Preparatory School, Thompson, Conn., in my district, on Sunday, June 6, 1965. My son, William H. St. Onge, was one of the graduates of this very fine school. Needless to add, I felt quite proud to participate as guest speaker on this occasion.

The theme of my address was education, and I emphasized particularly the accomplishments of the U.S. Congress in the field of education during the past few years.

The address was as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

Your Excellency Bishop Hines, Father Petrauskas, reverend clergy, honored faculty, members of the graduating class, ladies, and gentlemen, I am delighted to be here on this very happy occasion. I am very grateful to Father Petrauskas for inviting me to address you today because I have more than just a passing interest in this celebration. My presence here today is not merely as a public official and as one who is deeply interested in the Marianapolis School, but also as a proud parent.

First, let me say that I shall try to keep my remarks as brief as possible. I am reminded of the experience which a colleague of mine in Congress from a neighboring State had on Memorial Day last week. When he arrived at the meeting, the chairman handed him a note which said:

"Our Memorial Day program includes a talk by the mayor, a recitation by a student, then your speech, and then the firing squad."

No doubt it has been emphasized to you that Marianapolis is a preparatory school, as its name states. But it would be erroneous for you to think that your preparation ends today. On the contrary, it begins today. The more preparation you have, the more basic knowledge you acquire, the better you will be able to meet the challenges of the future. You have reached a good starting point, you are on the threshold of a new and wonderful life ahead—a life that holds much promise for you. You are now about ready to face the world.

Marianapolis has given you an excellent start, I am sure. By modern standards, this is not considered a large school. But it is intensive, it seeks to develop both body and soul, it aims to sharpen the mind and to mold the character of its students. Above all, it encourages them to think clearly in accordance with Catholic principles and with their own conscience as Catholics. All of this should enable you to continue with your studies on the college and university level in the years ahead. When you get to the college or university next fall you will first then begin to appreciate what Marianapolis has done for you and how well it has prepared you to face the world.

You may find that the world is rather a complex thing, the requirements are many, the challenges are almost insurmountable. At times it may not even make sense to you. Let me quote to you a brief passage from the opening paragraph in Charles Dickens' "A Tale of Two Cities." Surely, you have read it and will recall how Dickens describes that period in human history. It reads as follows:

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times; it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness; it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity; it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness; it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair; we had everything before us, we had nothing before us."

How much like the present is the period which Dickens describes. We, too, in our day, are faced with the dilemma of having everything before us, or nothing before us. Upon our efforts, our will, and our actions today and in the years ahead will depend whether we and future generations will have everything before us—and by that I mean freedom, justice, human dignity, and genuine peace—or whether we shall have nothing before us, which in this instance means enslavement, human degradation, a godless society, and the destruction of our civilization and our way of life.

Russell Davenport, in the last two lines of his epic poem, "My Country," says as follows:

"Freedom is not to limit but to share,
And freedom here means freedom everywhere."

The people of America have long ago recognized the importance and the value of freedom. We have sought to share it with other nations. We have fought hard to maintain it in our own country. We have realized that before a man can be a good scientist, a good engineer, a good teacher, or whatever he may aspire to be, he must first be a rational human being, believe in the ways of God, cooperate with his fellow men, and be able to find his proper place in society. It is the concept of freedom which makes the difference between life in a democracy and life under a Communist dictatorship.

A major part of the concept of freedom is the acquisition of knowledge, the education of our youth. In recent days we hear much about the war on poverty and the use of education to fight poverty. For too many Americans, poverty is still a bar to the education of their children. But today we are well aware of the fact that poor educational attainment goes hand in hand with poor economic, social, and cultural achievements. Small wonder, then, that the war on poverty is putting so much stress on education.

Actually, this is not a very new idea. The need for education in a democratic society was recognized by Daniel Webster, who stated 140 years ago:

"Education should be universally diffused. Open the doors of the schoolhouse to all the children of the land. Let no man have the excuse of poverty for not educating his children."

Since the days of Daniel Webster the need for education for all Americans has become greater and more urgent. Congress has recognized this fact and in recent years has enacted a series of measures to bolster our educational system and to attain a goal for which all of us are striving, namely, quality education for every American child from kindergarten on, including those who are seeking higher education.

A similar thought was expressed earlier this year by President Johnson who said:

"I wish to see an America in which no young person, whatever the circumstances,

shall reach the age of 21 without the health, education, and skills that will give him an opportunity to be an effective citizen and a self-supporting individual."

As many of you undoubtedly know, I first came to Congress in January 1963—less than 2½ years ago. Much important legislation has been adopted in this short space of time, but to my mind the most important of all is in the field of education. More has been done to advance education and to achieve our goal of quality education for all American children in these past few years than ever before. As yet, it is too early to visualize the great impact this legislation will have on our educational process, our youth, our whole Nation, but its effects will surely be felt more and more in the years to come and, I am certain, for the good of all concerned.

Let me just enumerate some of the more important measures adopted by Congress in these last few years. Unfortunately, time will not allow me to discuss them in greater detail.

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, which provided $1.2 billion for the construction of college classrooms, laboratories, and libraries over a 3-year period to help meet the population explosion now hitting the American colleges and universities. By 1970, enrollment in our colleges is expected to reach 7 million—which is twice as many as we had in 1960. This act will enable hundreds of thousands of young people to enter college, who would have otherwise been deprived of such an education.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963: This is also a 3-year program which makes available $175 million in grants for the construction and expansion of medical, dental, and related health school. The purpose of this act is to ease the increasing shortage of doctors and dentists, and to assist young people in entering these fields.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963: This is a 4-year program which authorizes $956 million for vocational education. We now have some 4 million young people in the country receiving vocational education, and by 1968 their number will also reach 7 million. The purpose of this legislation was to shift the emphasis away from outdated job skills into teaching these people new, modern, and up-to-date job skills needed in the rapidly changing American economy.

The National Defense Education Act: This act was greatly improved in 1964 and extended for another 3 years. It provides loans for needy college students, fellowships for college teaching, as well as certain benefits to private schools and teachers in private schools. You may be interested to know that under the loan program a total of 318,000 students borrowed $170 million to help pay for their college education during the current school year, 1965, and it is estimated that by 1968 some 450,000 students will obtain about $265 million in such assistance. This merely shows how helpful the program is, and the extent to which it is aiding our college youth.

And allow me to say a brief word about the programs which provide aid to school districts in the so-called federally impacted areas. These are the areas where there are Government military and civilian installations which brought in many families and children. The local school districts were not able to cope with this influx and Congress voted some years ago to extend help to these school districts. In round figures, about $250 million a year is provided annually which benefits nearly 2 million children. Connecticut has been receiving about $4½ million under this program, and the number of children in our State who benefit by it is around 14,000. Incidentally, the first bill I introduced when I came to Congress in 1963 was to extend this program for another 2 years because I had discovered that it was due to expire at that time.

There are many others that I should like to discuss, but time won't suffice. I shall only mention such programs enacted by Congress in the last few years as the Library Services Act to build more libraries, the Nurses Training Act to provide more nurses and nursing schools, education for the blind and the deaf, educational assistance to children of disabled veterans, education for handicapped and crippled children and the mentally retarded, and others.

There are, however, two other programs I cannot omit. One is the Higher Education Act of 1965 which is now under consideration in the House Education and Labor Commitee. This is planned as a 5-year program of approximately $250 million a year to provide loans and scholarships to college students, work-study programs to give such students part-time employment, improved college libraries, adult education, and other programs. This legislation which is intended as a further step in meeting the constantly growing enrollment in the colleges, will come up in Congress in the near future.

The other is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 passed by Congress this year and signed into law by the President on April 11. There is no question about the fact that this act represents the greatest single commitment ever made by the Federal Government for the improvement of the Nation's schools—and that means all of our schools, public and private, including Catholic schools. This is the first time that religious schools will benefit directly from Government assistance, and I regard it as a gain for education in the whole country and as a further sign of growing toleration.

It is estimated that some 5 million children in the Nation, particularly from low-income families, will benefit under this program. Actually, there are five different programs under this act, the most important of which is aid to children of low-income families. This is a 3-year program which will cost about a billion dollars annually and will provide funds for school districts for many purposes, beginning with more teachers, more books, and more programs; to health and food services; transportation; and even clothing and shoes to needy children.

The other four programs will help the States obtain more school libraries, textbooks, communitywide educational centers, training of teachers and other school personnel, and expansion of State departments of education.

All of this, taken together, represents a major breakthrough in the advancement of education. The measure on Federal aid to education is now the law of the land, and before many months the entire school system, public and private, will derive many benefits. Millions of schoolchildren will enjoy full educational opportunities which they would not have had otherwise.

With the costs of education spiraling to ever greater heights, it has become very difficult for church schools and other private religious schools to provide all the necessities of present-day education. While this new law does not provide direct funds to such schools for teachers, or the construction of buildings, or certain equipment, it will be helpful in other ways which will save the religious schools some of their expenditures. Thus students in church schools will be able to take some of their classes in the public schools where they can use their science laboratories and other educational equipment, they will be able to use their facilities for shop courses and physical education, they will be entitled to use the after-school study centers, they will be able to participate in educational television and in the special Saturday and summer programs, they will be eligible for health services, the school breakfast and lunch programs, the guidance and counseling services, funds for the purchase of textbooks, library books, and various teaching materials, etc.

You can readily understand how all this will be helpful to the religious schools. The Right Reverened Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt, who is the director of the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, expressed the view that this constitutes not only a revolutionary new concept of cooperation between public and private schools, but that the new Federal aid program will spur "monumental changes" in the Catholic school system in the United States.

I am inclined to the view that the most significant fact about this new law is that it recognizes the Catholic schools as a part of the American educational system. As such, it encourages a new respect for the contributions of the Catholic schools, which today provide an education for about 5½ million children.

What is also important is that through this aid from the Federal Government we shall now have a full opportunity to raise the level of education all over the country. It is likewise important to emphasize that our Nation as a whole is, through this aid, assuming greater responsibility for the proper education of all children to become decent and useful members of society. Thus, not only the children themselves, but the entire Nation will be the beneficiary of this legislation.

In looking back over all this legislation of the past few years, you can see why the last and the present Congresses are known as "education Congresses." You can also appreciate why I, as a Member of these two Congresses, feel so proud over the achievements and the fact that I supported every one of the measures I have enumerated. I know that all of you graduating today, your brothers and sisters still at school, and all the young people coming into our schools and colleges now and in the years ahead will derive great benefits from all this legislation which will provide them with fuller opportunities to develop their talents, to pursue the right profession or vocation, and to be better Americans and more informed citizens.

As you say farewell to this school, I want you to know that we are proud of your achievements. Your teachers have given you more than mere knowledge—they have given you part of themselves. That is why we recognize teaching as a valued and honored profession. Your parents have provided you with the material assistance and with the love and care which enabled you to pursue your education until now. I can assure you this assistance and love will continue in the future, too. I hope you are as proud of them on this memorable day in your life for their help and patience over the years, as they are of you.

Above all, let us be grateful that we live in a free America, where we have the opportunity to acquire an education in accordance with our principles, where we can partake of the bounty of this great land of ours, and where we can contribute to its welfare and its way of life according to our talents and ability.

The great American Poet Carl Sandburg, in a poem entitled "A New America," wrote:

"I see America, not in the setting sun of a black night of despair ahead of us.
I see America in the crimson light of a rising sun fresh from the burning, creative hand of God.
I see great days ahead, great days possible to men and women of will and vision."

To you, my young friends, I say: Be men of will and vision, and you too will see America as Carl Sandburg sees it—not a land of despair, but a land created by God. We have

built this land, we have made it what it is today. Let us together continue to preserve it, to guard over it, to maintain it as a happy land—for us and for all future generations.

I congratulate you and wish all of you the fullest measure of success in all your endeavors in the years ahead.

New York State Osteopathic Society and the Osteopathic Society of the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the osteopathic profession has long been in the vanguard of progress designed to improve the health and well-being of our citizens. In New York, the New York State Osteopathic Society and the Osteopathic Society of the City of New York have for over half a century been dedicated to the goal of the best possible total health care for our citizens.

Last month, both of these respected societies elected new officers and directors for the coming year—men of proven ability, wisdom and supreme devotion to their profession and to those they serve.

In connection with the New York State Osteopathic Society's 66th annual convention last month in New York, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY commended the organization for its efforts in "strengthening the healing arts." Both the NYSOS and OSCNY are engaged in programs which are indeed worthy of the Vice President's tribute.

Of special importance is the profession's efforts with regard to the persistent shortage of physicians in our country. The societies are working closely with high schools and colleges with a view to encouraging greater numbers of qualified men and women to pursue careers in osteopathy and thereby make an invaluable contribution to their community.

Osteopathy is a school of medicine whose most distinctive quality has been and is the constant development of techniques for releasing man's natural abilities to combat stress and strain which could conceivably result in disease.

Osteopathic physicians and surgeons integrate all accepted methods of treatment of disease and injury, including manipulation, drugs, operative surgery, and physical therapy, as dictated by diagnosis of the individual patient.

Health is held to be a total condition of the entire body; moreover, the focus of osteopathy is upon treating the man, not just his disease. Osteopathic physicians favor those treatments which stimulate or assist man's natural abilities to maintain or return to a state of health.

Osteopathy contends that early symptoms of functional disease may be projected in the musculo-skeletal system of the patient. The osteopathic physician in his examination of this system often discovers these irregularities and can apply corrective treatment. Thus, stress and strain may be removed, preventing a more serious condition from developing. The appreciation of the interrelationship of the structure and function of the human body is basic to understanding osteopathy. Emphasis is placed upon the maintenace of health through prevention of disease by osteopathic management.

The preprofessional requirement for a career in osteopathy include at least 3 years in college. The professional education and training given in each of the approved osteopathic colleges requires a minimum of 4 years' study and training in all branches of medicine and surgery. This basic 4-year course is designed to train and educate physicians and surgeons qualifying for the D.O. degree—doctor of osteopathy. Graudates then participate in the intern and resident training programs of the profession.

I think it is significant to point out that osteopathic physicians serve our country in a variety of ways—in departments and agencies of State and Federal Governments and as officers in the Medical Corps of the Armed Forces. The Nation's health is one of its most essential resources. The presence of these resources and the conquering of disease and suffering are the goals of the osteopathic profession and I believe that the men who serve in this profession are to be saluted for their manifest devotion to these admirable goals.

I would like to commend the new officers of the NYSOS and OSCNY. The State officers are: Dr. Phillip E. Greenman, president; Dr. Ben C. Scharf, vice president; Dr. C. Fred Peckham, secretary; Dr. C. Gorham Beckwith, treasurer; and Dr. Arthur Prestine, sergeant at arms.

NYSOS directors are: Dr. Floyd Boshart, Dr. Harold S. Goldberg, Dr. Wendell Bizzozero, Dr. Morton H. Rothstein, and Dr. Max L. Kamen.

The new officers of the city society are: Dr. William D. Miller, president; Dr. Melvin Weiss, president-elect; Dr. Jerry Rosenblatt, vice president; Dr. Harry Teplitz, secretary; and Dr. Viola C. Kreuner, treasurer. Directors are: Dr. Stanley Schiowitz, Dr. Albert Heyman, and Dr. Aaron Weintraub.

Stream Pollution Abatement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of Members of the House to some views on stream pollution abatement recently presented to the Allegheny County Council of Leagues of Women Voters in Pittsburgh. Mr. Ford T. Shepherd, vice president of the Mead Corp., expressed a positive attitude toward stream pollution problems in a speech May 14 which I should like to include as part of my remarks:

REMARKS OF FORD T. SHEPHERD, VICE PRESIDENT, THE MEAD CORP., PRESENTED TO ALLEGHENY COUNTY COUNCIL OF LEAGUES OF WOMEN VOTERS, WATER RESOURCES WORKSHOP, PITTSBURGH, PA., MAY 14, 1965

All of us in industry are grateful to the Allegheny Council of Leagues of Women Voters for sponsoring this water resources workshop. Too, we in the paper industry appreciate the opportunity to participate in the discussions on incentive programs for the abatement of industrial pollution.

As I understand it, the Leagues of Women Voters support the idea of tax incentives based on the following reasoning: "If the water is to be cleaned up, industry must do a great part of the job, must carry out much more pollution control and abatement than it is doing at the present. This cleanup serves the health and welfare, the safety of the public. It does not increase profits. We think it will be necessary to have some public sharing of abatement costs. A sharing of costs could be expected to have a multiplier effect similar to that of grants-in-aid to municipalities."

And, we thank you for that commendable attitude.

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary defines the word incentive as "incentive, noun, that which incites or has a tendency to incite to determination or action; motive; spur."

Actually, incentives can be of two types. The stick type, which are generally regarded as unfavorable, and the carrot type, which are generally regarded as favorable.

Under the heading of stick-type incentives, our industry, as well as every other industry, has internal, natural, or built-in incentives:

1. Loss of production, sales, or earnings.
2. Loss of company goodwill (loss of good corporate image).
3. Stockholder complaints.

Other stick-type incentives are externally applied by people outside the industry and, in the area of stream pollution abatement, these break down into:

1. Direct incentives: River standards, effluent standards, regulations, river classification, and enforcement (of laws and regulations).
2. Indirect incentives: Television and radio commercials on clean water and newspaper and magazine "horror" stories on pollution.

Under carrot-type incentives, we have internal or built-in incentives, all of which increase or have a tendency to increase the company's earnings:

1. Increase in sales, production, and earnings.
2. Decrease in costs of production.
3. Increase in quality of product.
4. Removal of a competitive disadvantage.
5. Obtaining a competitive advantage.
6. Favorable publicity about a plant.
7. Stockholders' favorable comments.

Externally, the carrot incentives have been described as tax relief: rapid amortization, investment credit, reimbursement of costs, etc.

Actually, what we are talking about can be described better, I think, as "sanctions" and "inducements," which Webster's defines as: "Sanction, noun, penalty incurred by the infringement of a command," which industry suffers if it doesn't advance its pollution abatement programs, and "inducement, noun, that which induces or leads one to act; a consideration that leads to action," which industry needs to advance its pollution abatement programs and, at the same time, maintain feasible production costs.

Going back over our experience and the progress made to date in stream pollution abatement in our industry, I, personally, believe that the following reasons account for our industry's progress:

1. Increased earnings through: (a) improved quality resulting in additional sales, and (b) decreased production costs.

2. Our desire to be a good neighbor—civic pride.

3. Demands by State (and interstate) regulatory agencies.

4. The threat of more restrictive Federal laws.

In our industry, a number of companies are building new mills which will go into production in the next 2 or 3 years. These mills are being built with stream pollution control equipment which will enable the mills to conform to today's State "standards" and the restrictive regulations of the Federal agency, Health, Education, and Welfare.

Therefore, it is clearly evident: (1) That the companies know how to control their wastes, and (2) that they can fulfill the requirements of the regulatory agencies and operate the mills profitably at the same time.

What, then, is the incentive which underlies the action of building these mills costing in the range of $40 to $50 million per mill?

The answer, of course, is money. These investments will provide earnings to the company. The decisions to build these mills have been made primarily on the basis of the economic value, the esthetic value is secondary. Here's how this comes about:

In designing a new mill, the formula is rather definite. There are five primary factors:

1. The assimilative capacity of the stream, determined by the volume and condition of the stream.

2. Meeting State standards or regulations. This is a prerequisite to obtaining the State's permission to use the stream.

3. Type of in-plant equipment necessary and the amount and type of external waste treatment required. This is provided by technical knowledge and experience.

4. The capital investment to be made. This is determined by the cost of equipment, waste treatment plant, land, etc. In addition, the annual operating costs are known.

5. The profitability of the required capital investment is acceptable. This is determined by the other factors.

Obviously, the last factor—profitability—is an important one in financing any project today.

Most of the industry's serious stream pollution problems exist at the industry's older mills and there is no magic formula for solving all the old mill problems. We know that mills vary from operation to operation and that rarely are two problems alike. This dictates that practically every problem must have its own distinct approach. For example:

1. The overall economic posiiton of an old mill may not justify even a very modest capital expenditure to reduce pollution.

2. The manufacturing process used in an old mill may require extremely expensive changes to accomplish acceptable results in pollution abatement.

3. The annual operating costs of new equipment and waste treatment facilities may be beyond the prevailing product cost limitation of the old mill, which must compete with all the other mills if it is to stay in business.

4. The physical location of an old mill may not permit the acquisition of additional land (at any reasonable price) for effluent lagooning, etc.

Now, it is obvious even to the most casual observer that an old-mill situation—where the real problems in our industry are located—is vastly different from that of designing and building a new mill.

In either a new-mill situation or an old-mill situation, the management of the company must justify the expenditure on the basis of the rate of return on the dollars invested.

The projects yielding the highest return on the investment have the highest priority. This has to be or the company will not be competitive in the marketplace—it won't be able to sell its goods—and if it isn't competitive there, it won't be competitive in the financial market—it won't be able to keep its stockholders very long.

Most waste treatment control expenditures in an old mill do not provide a suitable return on the dollars invested.

So, the dilemma confronting the professional manager today is summed up like this:

(a) The general public wants "blue water" in the streams and adequate employment for the community.

(b) The older plant may not be able to afford "blue water" so the only alternative may be to shut the operation down—so the community can have "blue water."

(c) But the employees of the operation and the community cannot afford to have the plant shut down. They cannot afford to lose the employment furnished by the operation.

The question, then, facing our industry's top executives is simply: "How can we, as community-minded citizens and as professional managers, solve the exsiting stream pollution problems of our older operations?"

None of the Federal legislation submitted to date will help solve both parts of the problem. Almost any legislation can deal effectively with pollution situations to the end that there is "blue water" all right—but no plant, no employment.

The pulp and paper industry has had a positive attitude regarding its stream pollution problems since 1939 when the Sulphite Pulp Manufacturers Research League was formed in Wisconsin. Early in 1943, 16 companies in the industry formed the National Council for Stream Improvement in the Pulp, Paper, and Paperboard Industry. The reason for the formation of the council: "The pulp and paper industry recognizes the necessity of conserving available water supplies for essential public, industrial, and recreational uses."

The industry has proven, I think, its attitude in solving the stream pollution problem. It has proven, too, I believe, that its efforts are constantly going forward.

Seventy-five percent of the mills in our industry have installed waste treatment facilities. The cost of operating these facilities is in excess of $14 million per year and the replacement cost is in excess of $182 million. That record speaks for itself.

So much for the past, what about the future?

Mr. David C. Knowlton, president of the national council said during Paper Week in February: "It has been estimated that to accomplish these reductions (85 percent reduction in the BOD load and virtually complete removal of the settleable solids) in the case of pulp and paper industry wastes would require an expenditure of $1 billion without considering future capacity increases. If this could be accomplished over the next 10 years, the annual expenditure would be $100 million."

If the pulp and paper industry were to spend $100 billion per year on new waste pollution abatement facilities, this $100 million would be the equivalent of: 20 percent of the net profit of the primary pulp and paper industry; or 33 percent of the primary pulp and paper industry dividends; or 15 percent of the whole pulp and paper industry's annual capital expenditures on new plants and equipment; or the total interest payments of the whole pulp and paper industry.

Obviously, the solution of the industry's problems, is of considerable magnitude, not only from a technical standpoint, but also from a financial standpoint. Obviously, too, a job of this size cannot be done overnight. amount of progress can be made on a planned basis over a reasonable number of years.

So what about the future?

First, the industry's philosophy is pretty well known because of its accomplishments to date.

Second, the industry is not about to turn into "bad" citizens in the communities where our operations are located.

Third, the industry wants to do what is right when it knows specifically the practical requirements of all the regulatory agencies.

Fourth, unquestionably, the industry needs considerable inducements in view of the magnitude of the overall problem. The industry does not want subsidies from the Federal Government. However, it recognizes the fact that those situations which present real, substantial economic hardships to the communities and to the plant managements involved may not be solved by regular means and, as a consequence, direct financial assistance may be basic if the pollution problems and the communities' economic problems are to be solved satisfactorily.

Fifth, the requirements of the appropriate regulatory agencies, State, interstate, and Federal, must be equitable to all users of the streams. The benefits, as well as the burdens, of the streams must be fully considered. Sensible water resource management must be the objective and feasible procedures to reach the objective must be followed.

The Unequal-Vote Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in his Newsweek column of June 14, Mr. Kenneth Crawford analyzes those forces both supporting and opposing the Dirksen amendment. Mr. Crawford reports that the prospects for passage of the unequal-vote amendment have considerably dimmed over the last few weeks. This welcome development has been caused by the able defenders of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision whose ranks are growing within the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Crawford's article follows:

THE BIG GAME

(By Kenneth Crawford)

They are choosing up sides in the Senate for the reapportionment game, which will be to this congressional session what the Rose Bowl game is to the collegiate football season. One side will defend the Supreme Court's goal: to give every voter an equal voice in the composition of State legislatures. The other side will attack this principle.

CLARK, of Pennsylvania, one of the stars of the defending team, already has threatened to use filibuster tactics, which he normally disapproves but considers justified in this

case because the stakes are so high. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, who led a filibuster on this issue once before, is prepared to do it again. They have picked up some of the fastest of the young talent—KENNEDY of New York, who has testified for their side in committee, and TYDINGS, of Maryland, who in his rookie tryout last week delivered a brilliant speech upholding the one-man, one-vote formula.

DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the man who thought up the game and owns the ball, will lead the attackers. He wrote the proposed constitutional amendment which would in effect cancel the Court's orders by permitting States to base apportionment for one branch of their legislatures on factors "other than population." This would free the States to favor landowners over renters, white over Negroes, or any category of voters over any other. It would tend to perpetuate present inequalities between rural and urban voters. And it might well add new injustices to the electoral system.

PRESIDENTIAL ALOOFNESS

DIRKSEN's players will be mostly from such southern campuses as Ole Miss and from conservative small States conscious of their smallness, protective of their equal status in the U.S. Senate and obsessed with the fallacy that State senates should follow the national example.

Either side could be reasonably sure of winning if it could recruit President Johnson. So far he has refused to play. At a recent press conference he expressed sympathy, in theory, with the Supreme Court position and its friends. But he hastily added that the President has no responsibility in the Constitution-amending process and that he was not, as yet, taking a hand. DIRKSEN applauded the President's aloofness. He thinks he can win on his own if Mr. Johnson doesn't help the other side. And maybe he can, if he can break a filibuster.

But his prospects are not as bright as they were a few weeks ago. What has happened in these weeks to change the outlook is that the Court's defenders have made mincemeat of most of the attackers' arguments in practice committee scrimmages. They also have pointed up some of the dangers inherent in the Dirksen proposal. The most telling witness was Burke Marshall, former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division. He argued that Southern States could, and some doubtless would, use the amendment, if it were adopted, to rig their legislative districts in such a way as to minimize the potential of the Negro vote.

MINORITY RULE

Drawing on Marshall's expertise, TYDINGS told the Senate that DIRKSEN's rotten borough amendment posed a clear civil rights issue. If the House passes the voting rights bill already approved by the Senate and then Congress accepts the Dirksen proposition, said TYDINGS, it will enfranchise the Negro with one hand and devalue his vote with the other.

TYDINGS also referred to the committee record to show what present malapportionment means in terms of legislation. In Missouri, for example, 83 State senators representing 1.3 million voters defeated a bill to establish a $1 an hour minimum wage even though 68 Senators representing 2.6 million voters supported it. Similarly, in Michigan, Senators speaking for 2.8 million voters beat a bill to provide children with free polio shots even though Senators representing 3.2 million voters were for it.

These same minority-ridden State senates, under the Dirksen amendment, would have a large measure of control over rulemaking for the conduct of referendums to decide what other-than-population criteria were to be used in defining legislative voting districts. This, TYDINGS contends, would give the old order too much chance to cheat.

Sarah Dyer, Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Miss Sarah Dyer, of the Peace Corps, assigned to QR College, Okoyong, Mamfe, West Cameroon, West Africa, recently wrote a letter to the congregation of St. Andrew's Church, Staten Island, N.Y., and described the devoutness of the people in her mission area. I think the sentiments are worthy of note. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of her letter:

GREETINGS: I thought you might be interested in hearing about a church service which I attended yesterday. It was held here on the school compound where the 40 Presbyterian students form the nucleus of a Basel Mission congregation * * * and lead services and carry on religious instruction in nearby villages.

The pastor treked for 3 days to be here so that they had everything at once—baptism, confirmation and Holy Communion. It started at 7:15 a.m. and lasted until 10:30. People trekked in from as far as 20 miles away and there were well over 200 people present. Others came by land rover, minibus, mammy wagon (see my slides), Honda, bicycle and on their mother's backs.

There were two baptism services—one for adults and one for children. The adults were dressed in white and the women had huge white scarves on their heads—the infants were also dressed in white. Most of these people have only a few rags * * * I have no idea where they got those white clothes. The vows were made in English, Pidgin, and Douala and everything had to be read three times. Then these illiterate folk recited the Apostles' Creed in Douala. Several of our students were sponsors for the infants so they were baptised in English. The people knelt on the floor and were baptised with water from a bucket which one of our students had carried on her head from a stream.

Between the infant and adult baptisms a choir (40 of them) sang and danced. The choir was from Besongagang—a village 8 miles away * * * and all of the women had babies on their backs. (I couldn't help thinking about all the reasons why people don't sing in the choir at St. Andrew's * * *.)

After more singing there was confirmation * * * several school girls and two men from Kokyong Village. Since the pastor had to trek for 3 days I'm glad these people don't have to wait for a bishop for confirmation. Most of these congregations are led by lay men and women * * * most of them very young since the ability to read and write is generally limited to the very young who've had a little schooling. In fact, what has impressed me most about all the churches in West Africa is that the burden is carried almost completely by laymen—pastors and missionaries serve only in advisory capacities. This is, of course, less true of Catholic churches. There is an Anglican congregation in Victoria, for instance, where a priest from some other country may be found two or three times a year * * * but the church functions, church school and all. The amazing thing about that congregation is that it is almost all Englishmen. I've grown used to seeing Africans "do it themselves" but was still shocked at seeing white men assume responsibility for their own church.

I don't mean this as a criticism of our churches—only as an explanation of why churches which are so poor and so understaffed can be so vital here * * * in spite of so many obstacles. Would that we could combine the educated clergy and the financial resources of American churches with the enthusiasm and total involvement of the laity in "primitive" countries.

After the services were over those who had been baptised and confirmed were given a flower by each member of the congregation and then the entire congregation escorted each one to his home—marching and singing hymns. It was a moving sight to see them march off—I bet they were walking all day.

Sincerely,

SARAH DYER.

Resolution Honoring Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted on May 19, 1965, by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut honoring the U.S. merchant marine on the occasion of the observance of Merchant Marine Week. The resolution honors the men of the merchant marine for their "loyal, dedicated and courageous" service. I am happy to join in paying a well-deserved tribute to these men for their services to the Nation both in times of peace and war. The resolution follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 181

(Resolution honoring the merchant marine service during the observance of Merchant Marine Week)

Whereas the President has proclaimed the week beginning May 18 as Merchant Marine Week in honor of the loyal, dedicated, and courageous men who constitute the merchant marine service; and

Whereas it should always be kept in mind that the merchant ships, which first carried our young Nation's flag to the four corners of the earth, are America's lifeline to the free world; and

Whereas the maritime service performs its duties in time of peace by bringing our products to foreign markets, and in time of war by transporting supplies to our fighting men on foreign shores; and

Whereas many Connecticut men have made limitless contributions to the glories of the merchant marines in the past, and many more are now being trained in the various maritime academies to uphold these highest traditions of courage and duty; and

Whereas special tribute should be paid to a Connecticut son, Capt. Peter K. Wurschy, of Meriden, regimental commander at the Maine Maritime Academy, as well as the many other Connecticut cadets at this fine institution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we of the general assembly extend our most sincere congratulations to all the men of the merchant marine, and express the confidence we have in them to continue to serve their country with the same valor has that made them men apart; be it further

Resolved, That the clerks be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the following: John Connor, Secretary of Commerce; Nicholas Johnson, Maritime Admin-

istrator; Capt. Edward A. Rodgers, superintendent of the Maine Maritime Academy; Cadet Capt. Peter K. Wurschy, of the Maine Maritime Academy; Gov. John H. Reed, of Maine; Capt. John S. Everett, U.S. maritime service; and the Connecticut delegation in the U.S. Congress, as permanent evidence of the high esteem in which the maritime service is held.

DAVID GILL PROCTOR,
Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN L. GERARDO,
Clerk of the House.
ELLA T. GRASSO,
Secretary of State.

More on Jet Noise: Part V—FAA Aircraft Noise Symposium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 9, 1965, the Federal Aviation Agency sponsored a National Aircraft Noise Symposium at the International Hotel, John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York. The purpose of the symposium was to focus the attention of the aviation community on aircraft noise and its associated problems and also to highlight recent accomplishments as well as current research in this field.

The distinguished participants were: Mr. Najeeb Halaby, administrator, FAA; Mr. Harold Gray, president, Pan American World Airways; Mr. D. D. Thomas, associate administrator for programs, FAA; Mr. E. C. Wells, vice president, product development, the Boeing Co.; Mr. William T. Burns, president, Airport Operators Council; Mr. Mel Nolan, analytical chemist, division of air pollution, USPHS; Mr. Beverly Shenstone, chief engineer, British Overseas Airways Corp.; Mr. Gordon Bain, deputy administrator for supersonic transport development, FAA; Mr. John Tyler, Pratt and Whitney; Mr. James Woodall, program manager acoustics, FAA; Mr. Charles Harper, director, aeronautics division, NASA Headquarters; Mr. Harvey H. Hubbard, head, acoustics branch, NASA, Langley Research Center, and Capt. Robert Buck, Trans World Airlines.

This is the fifth in a series of statements on the problem which I have made in an effort to stress that aircraft noise abatement is a national problem. On May 6, 1965, I introduced H.R. 7981, a bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act of 1958 to provide for a program of research and development by NASA to reduce aircraft noise, and H.R. 7982, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the implementation of operational techniques to reduce the effect of jet noise. During the past month, both NASA and FAA have sponsored symposiums for the purpose of discussing the aircraft noise problem, recognizing it as a national problem. I am in agreement with this position and will continue to urge congressional action in recognition of the problem of aircraft noise and its effect upon our citizens and our communities as a matter of national concern and one which cannot be helped, let alone solved by independent local community action.

I commend to my colleagues the remarks of Mr. Harold Gray, president of Pan American World Airways, delivered at the FAA symposium. Mr. Gray's address follows:

REMARKS OF HAROLD E. GRAY, PRESIDENT OF PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, DELIVERED AT THE FAA NOISE SYMPOSIUM, JUNE 9, 1965

Sharing the speakers rostrum with Mr. Halaby and with such a large distinguished group of coparticipants has marked advantages while listening, but it is full of hazards to the speaker. In preparing my notes, I reviewed the proposed program for areas of possible uncovered interest only to find that each facet of the sound problem was assigned to a technical expert. As, in fact, each of this program's speakers is an acknowledged authority in a manufacturing, regulatory, or operational field that in total cover almost every facet of airline operation, some may wonder what is left for the airlines to contribute.

Perhaps the biggest role of the airlines is to recognize the problem, stimulate effective action by all concerned, and eventually pay most of the bills associated with such action.

As I look back to the inauguration of jet service in 1958 I recall that noise was not a new problem associated only with jets. We were worried then about Constellations and DC-7's taking off with a full load generating up to 120 PNDB's, 250 or 300 feet over some of our nearest neighbors. I recall having a conviction that we must be able to operate jets in a manner that would improve safety around airports and at the same time make less noise. And I remember the vast amount of work that our staff, the Boeing people, and the Port of New York Authority put in on the problem. I finally became convinced that jets could be operated in a manner that would assure airport neighbors lower sound levels and a vastly decreased probability of accidents. A limit of 112 PNDB's was adopted as an outside figure for noise on takeoff. Very few people realize that this criterion was substantially below the noise levels then being produced by prop airplanes taking off fully loaded for Europe.

Even before the arrival of the first jets the airlines' concern, along with the manufacturers', had resulted in design elements that would add many thousands of dollars to airline costs.

Fifty million dollars was spent to develop sound suppressors. In the period 1960–64 an additional $15 million was invested in the further reduction of noise in jet engines. By early 1962, the airlines had invested $73 million in engine sound suppressors, at that rate the sum is probably doubled by now. An approximate 4 percent reduction in operating efficiency has been accepted with the use of these sound suppressors. It has been estimated that this amounts to an approximate $10,000 cost per aircraft per month, or as one analyst has put it, a $36 million annual penalty to the airlines in lost revenue. Other millions have been spent on high lift devices, runway extensions, special operating procedures, and operating restrictions. More money is going into these areas every day. Our industry has indeed invested tremendous amounts of cash and effort in a sincere continuing attempt to reduce the effect of jet sound on the ground community. The statistics involved are impressive to us who are making the investment, but I do not believe they mean much to the man who has just spent $15,000 or $20,000 for a new home a mile off the end of a service runway.

We all recognize that there is a problem—an expensive problem, a technical problem, a human problem. A man's right to a home not shattered by outside influence of noise and vibration is appreciated; however, at some point the homeowner must compromise to some extent with the inevitable march of progress.

The pastoral life may be the better one, but it grows increasingly difficult in this modern world to insulate oneself in such surroundings. We are cohabitants of a world of machines, many of them noisy or unsightly. Among the things we live with are the motor vehicle, the railroad train, and the aircraft. The motor vehicle often seems to overwhelm us, the railroad rests in its static maturity, and the aricraft, relatively, is in its very beginnings. Roads—rail and macadam—cobweb our civilized landscape, sometimes desecrating our view by themselves, or by the often less than agreeable artifacts that roll upon them. These, in the end, we accept seemingly as more need than nuisance.

With the new one, the aircraft, we have the only vehicle whose grace of line is unquestioned and the only vehicle that takes its noise and goes away. Only its terminals are to be seen, there are no roads, no rails, no service stations, no horns, no fumes, no clutter beyond the occasional contrail. We have compromised with the great visible structure that supports the wheeled vehicle; our society cannot do less with the almost invisible structure that supports the winged vehicle. The aviation transport industry would, of course, be more than pleased to have a silent vertical rising aircraft, and within the realm of feasibility will work toward such a goal; however, in our foreseeable future, if the community wants air transport it must accept the fact of noise-producing engines.

Do not misunderstand me, I am not saying that aircraft-produced surface noise is a blessing that each airport area householder must patiently accept. I am saying that a certain amount of noise in the present state of the art is inevitable, that we have and will continue to develop procedures, equipment, and facilities to reduce it, but that noise will remain. In a metropolitan airport community, this means that people, lots of people on the ground, will be affected in some way.

There appear to be only three areas of endeavor that can generate improvement in aircraft sound levels—aircraft equipment operational procedures, and ground zoning.

Aircraft equipment, as I mentioned earlier, has been the recipient of a tremendous sound-control investment in the way of sound suppressors, high lift devices, and structural design. The industry has continuously devoted its best skills to the development of increasingly better sound-control measures. Further advancement will be made through painstakingly slow, long-term research. However, I do know that every new aircraft design on the drawing boards or in construction is predicated on lower sound levels including the supersonic.

Operational procedures have very definite limitations. To the best of our present knowledge, there are no further major steps that can be feasibly taken. Pan Am was, by necessity, a leader in developing jet noise abatement takeoff procedures. All airlines now use approximately the same procedures; some use our mobile ground control countdown facility at New York and at London. As an example of the effectiveness of this procedure and of the effectiveness of constant emphasis to our pilots of the importance of sound control, the number of Pan Am flights departing Kennedy International Airport that inadvertently exceeded 112 PNDB dropped from 11.6 percent in 1962, to 2 percent in 1963, to 1.5 percent in 1964. We sincerely believe that close control and monitoring does have a significant effect in

restricting violations to a minimum. We also believe that further significant advances cannot be made in this area with existing aircraft, the techniques having made full use of the available performance under the existing first premise of safe operation.

Beyond the considerations of equipment and procedures remains the third leg of the tripod, ground zoning. It would appear that this is the one item that has not been given sufficient emphasis; I say that it would appear that this has not had sufficient emphasis in noting that in areas directly off the ends of runways at some major airports, frame residences are continuously being erected, this despite the fact that there can be little doubt as to the eventual reaction of the new owners to aircraft noise. Mr. Oscar Bakke has been instrumental in the presentation of a program of compatible land use planning which should receive support. Further to this point of zoning, including land acquisition by the Government, Congressman TENZER, of the Fifth Congressional District of New York, made pertinent proposals in favor of Government assistance. These appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 6, 1965, under the heading, "Aircraft Noise Abatement."

An airport is truly more than an aircraft bearing surface; inclusive within its perimeters should be reasonable arrival and departure overfly zones or sound clearways. If the local, State, or Federal Government can obtain rights-of-way for highway construction, areas for urban redevelopment or park construction, certainly the same principle can be applied to the establishment of sound clearways. A minimum distance of 2 miles from runway lip, or that distance necessary to provide at least 1,000 feet vertical ground clearance, is suggested.

These sound clearways may, as suggested by NANAC, be used for parks, industrial storage, highways, or manufacturing, but not for frame houses.

The acquisition of such land areas cannot, of course, be done directly by the airlines. It must, because of various implications, be financed and handled by Government agencies.

In conclusion, let me summarize briefly the airlines' attitude with respect to noise as I see it:

1. The last thing any airline wants to do is to alienate anyone by reason of the noise it makes.

2. The airlines believe that no amount of noise is justified or tolerable unless it is determined as being absolutely essential to the public interest.

3. The airlines believe that in a community such as the Greater New York area, where more than one-quarter of all wages derive from port activities, air transport is absolutely essential—and a certain amount of noise is, therefore, unavoidable and in the public interest.

4. The airlines have accepted noise abatement as one of their primary responsibilities, as evidenced by their major efforts in aircraft procurement, operating procedures, and vast expenditures of money.

And finally, I think I can speak for the whole industry when I say that the airlines will continue to regard noise abatement as one of their primary responsibilities.

Johnson View of Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert at this point an article which appeared in the New York Times on Monday, June 7, by Tom Wicker, entitled "Johnson View of Negro."

I believe it warrants reproduction in the RECORD. The article follows:

JOHNSON VIEW OF NEGRO: PRESIDENT TAKES SAME ADVANCED POSITION ASSUMED BY SUPREME COURT IN SCHOOL CASE

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, June 6.—President Johnson has now taken the same advanced view of the Negro's role in American life that the Supreme Court took of his role in the American school system in the famous Brown decision of 1954.

Prior to that case, the Court had held and it was accepted American doctrine, that "separate but equal" schools satisfied all the Nation's legal and moral obligations to Negro education. So long as the facilities and curriculums of segregated Negro schools were "equal" to those provided for whites, it had been asserted, it was all right for them to be "separate."

But in the Brown case the Supreme Court swept that doctrine aside with one sociological stroke. It held that segregated schools, no matter how "equal" technically, were inherently unequal because of the fact that they were also "separate." Segregation itself, the Court said in effect, enforced and perpetuated the role of inferiority that had been assigned to—and largely accepted by—the Negro.

At Howard University Friday night, Mr. Johnson laid down much the same principle on a far broader scale.

Providing for the Negro an equal "right" to vote, to get a job, to go to unsegregated schools, to due process of law, Mr. Johnson was really saying, provided him with no more than "separate but equal" citizenship. And just as had been true in education, so it was true in the broader view that "separate" is inherently "unequal."

Up to now, Mr. Johnson argued, the Negro population really had made up "another nation" within the United States—poverty stricken, ill educated, crowded into ghettos without gates, despised first for the color of their skin and only a little less for their ignorance and poverty. Therefore, it really was but little more than an empty gesture to make legal decrees of equal rights and equal opportunity for them.

For these things could not, in fact, exist for the Negro until he had the ability and the standing to take advantage of them. And after a century and more of oppression and persecution, after generations of the inherent inequality of separation, he had no such ability or standing.

Thus did President Johnson face squarely what must be ranked as the most difficult problem in American life. That problem is not the enforcing of legal equity for the Negro. It is, rather, the acceptance of the Negro as an equal human being rather than a separate but equal human being—a man with a darker skin rather than a black man.

That difficulty is symbolized in countless ways—perhaps first of all in the fact that since the beginning of time white has been the symbolic color of purity and hope, and black the color of evil and fear. Carried into racial attitudes, Mr. Johnson said Friday night, color sensitivity is "a feeling whose dark intensity is matched by no other prejudice in our society."

Even he chose the word "dark" to make his point.

That is why some civil rights experts are convinced that the greatest civil rights progress in coming years will be legal progress in the South. For in the Southern States, with their long history of slavery and segregation, the comparatively easy battle for legal equity is still in progress and that equity is likely to be widely attained in the foreseeable future.

When it is, the South then will be joined with the great cities of the North and the other centers of Negro life in what the President called the next and more profound stage of the battle.

In Mr. Johnson's speech there was a hint of bafflement and frustration, as if he could not confidently suggest how that stage of the battle were to be won. More and better jobs, more and better homes, more and better schools, more and better welfare and social programs—all these he suggested as "part of the answer," and added:

"An understanding heart by all Americans is also part of the answer."

That was the nub of it, as Mr. Johnson seemed to know. The Government can provide the schools, the homes, the programs, perhaps even the jobs, although it will take time and massive effort. When the Southern States resisted school desegregation, troops could be sent to enforce it; when a southern Negro is disfranchised, court orders and Federal referees can award him the vote.

But if absolute equality for the Negro depends, finally, on the absolute end of separation for the Negroes, then troops and courts will be of limited use. For they have no jurisdiction over the human heart, where the ultimate problem lies.

General Farley Supports Strong Administration Stand in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of foreign affairs in the world of today, and particularly in view of the attacks that have been mounted against the administration's handling of the crises in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, it is important that the American people be knowledgeable and kept fully informed in this area.

A man well qualified to speak out on matters of foreign policy and the administration's conduct thereof, is former Postmaster General James A. Farley.

Jim Farley, frequently referred to as the "friend of Presidents" has known many of the world's leaders and statesmen almost as well. An excellent example was his longstanding friendship with the late Sir Winston Churchill.

Recently General Farley revealed the secrets of a private discussion he had with the late Prime Minister in 1947 which concerned the world situation at that time.

Mr. Speaker, because of the prophetic importance of that meeting and the application which General Farley makes of their conclusions to the problems of today, the full text of his views follows:

FARLEY URGES PRESIDENT TO CONTINUE USE OF FORCE IN VIETNAM AND SANTO DOMINGO—REVEALS SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL TOLD HIM HE WOULD HAVE ATTACKED STALIN WITH BOMBS UNLESS HE GOT OUT OF BERLIN AND EUROPE

President Johnson can no more abandon South Vietnam now than President Wilson could have abandoned the freedom of the

seas in 1917, or President Roosevelt could have abandoned Hawaii the day after Pearl Harbor. I would strongly suggest to that group of educators who have been holding unrealistic seances, which they have been presumptuous enough to call teach-ins that they qualify themselves by a few learn-outs themselves.

Thus, the teacher-inners have indicated that President Johnson has made hasty and dangerous decisions in the Far East policy. The slightest glance at the record and even a touch of fairmindedness will reveal that Mr. Johnson did not set the American eagle screaming. The fact is that he inherited 20 tragic years of chickens coming home to roost. President Johnson did not create the Far East crisis. The Far East crisis was thrust upon him.

By an ironic circumstance, a great deal of the Far East tragedy was precipitated by our Government taking as doctrine the preachments of the theoretical academicians of 25 years ago, among them notably Owen Latimore and Lauchlin Currie. A Red China was no threat because it was overpopulated and underresourced and only an agrarian movement at that. The persuasive arguments this shool of pundits made was buttressed by selected footnotes at the bottom of each page. But their gigantic misapprehension of the nature of the problem has had to be corrected by the millions of footprints of our forces in Korea and South Vietnam, punctuated with the headstones of nearly 50,000 American graves.

Over 10 years ago, a Republican Secretary of State hesitated when the French called for assistance in Vietnam. It is my opinion that these same "teacher-inners" who now bitterly attack the President for not consulting our allies would have denied help to our French allies when they were protecting the same territory.

Moreover, the Communist leaderships, Russian and Chinese, have never regarded a treaty as a binding instrument. They have invariably used such an agreement as a mere armistice while they massed for the next blow.

Thus, while they were talking peace in Korea they were mounting an attack on southeast Asia in general. And they succeeded so well that while they were paralyzing Laos with a laughable so-called neutralist government they were mounting their attack on South Vietnam.

Thus, if President Johnson vacates South Vietnam or compromises on it it will not stop the war. It will simply bring it closer to our ally, Australia, and closer to home for us.

While I am at it I have no hesitation in saying that the President had no other course in Santo Domingo. Those who now deplore the use of force in that area, including some of the countrys leading newspapers, were among the first to hail Castro's ascendancy in Cuba and indeed had something of a hand in bringing it about. Apparently unabashed by their stupendous blundering they continue to offer the President daily advice on how to pursue their disastrous policies.

President Johnson did not precipitate the Caribbean crisis. He inherited it and let us thank heaven he had leadership enough to use sufficient force. Failure to use enough force at the Bay of Pigs is a catastrophe, the dimensions of which cannot yet be measured. Failure to use enough force in Santo Domingo would compound that disaster. Had the President not used massive force in the first instance far more American troops would have had to go in than he is drawing out. His great leadership has saved thousands of lives and the freedom of the world.

President Johnson has been handed these diplomatic failures which are not of his making. But he has had the courage to take the American people into his confidence and tell them the stark truth as we start the long trail back—back to a pasture which our country should never have abandoned.

In direct contradiction to the teacher-inners it occurs to me that it might serve a useful purpose if I here set forth the general views of a scholar at least as eminent as any of them—Sir Winston Churchill. Sir Winston invited me to luncheon at Chartwell in 1947. Sir Winston characteristically came to some sharp points. He told me we had learned the hard way, that we could not rely on treaties with the Communists because more than breaking them they used them as an offensive weapon against us. He said that had he had his way he would have given the Russians 30 days to start retiring from Europe. If they had not started retirement then he would have given them an additional 30 days warning. If at the end of that time they had not withdrawn he would have issued a 30-day ultimatum—90 days in all—at which time he would have attacked the Russians with the full atomic arsenal. This was before Russia had armed herself with those weapons and effected the atomic stalemate.

Have the teacher-inners ever considered the implications of the growing atomic power of Red China?

I am confident that these great war leaders, President Woodrow Wilson, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Sir Winston Churchill would endorse wholeheartedly the policies of President Johnson. President Eisenhower and President Truman have already done so.

Primarily, because experience teaches what many academicians seem to have missed: No man and no nation ever succeeded in compromising a principle. It succeeds only in compromising itself. Further in this test of strength our country cannot haul down our flag without converting it into our shroud. A military withdrawal from South Vietnam at his time would be a moral rout for the forces of freedom.

The principles at Valley Forge and at South Vietnam are the same. Then we fought for the freedom of our country; now we fight for the freedom of the world. And as President Wilson told the American people in 1917 President Johnson has told them in 1965:

"God help us, we have no other choice. And with God's help, as in the past, we cannot fail."

[From the New York (N.Y.) News, May 28, 1965]

FARLEY, AT 77, RECALLS WINNIE AND REDS

(By Neal Patterson)

Winston Churchill told James A. Farley in 1947 that, if he had had his way, the Russians would have been ordered to get out of Europe in 90 days after V-E Day under threat of being attacked with the full atomic arsenal.

Farley, Democratic elder statesman and onetime Postmaster General, made that disclosure at a prebirthday conference yesterday. Farley will be 77 Sunday.

Farley in other remarks endorsed President Johnson's use of massive force in Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

"President Johnson," he said, "can no more abandon South Vietnam now than President Wilson could have abandoned the freedom of the seas in 1917 or President Roosevelt could have abandoned Hawaii the day after Pearl Harbor."

His conversation with Churchill about Russia's occupation of Eastern Europe took place, he said, during a visit he and his son, James, Junior, made to the wartime Prime Minister at the latter's Chartwell home.

"Sir Winston said that had he had his way he would have given the Russians 30 days to start retiring from Europe," Farley said. "If they had not started retirement he would have given them an additional 30 days' warning.

"If at the end of that time they had not withdrawn, he would have issued a 30-day ultimatum—90 days in all—at which time he would have attacked the Russians with the full atomic arsenal."

This 1947 conversation, Farley pointed out, was before Russia achieved nuclear weapons and produced an atomic stalemate. Churchill by that time was out of power.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 28, 1965]

FARLEY ASSERTS CHURCHILL PROPOSED ATTACK ON SOVIET

James A. Farley said yesteday that Sir Winston Churchill once told him the Western powers should attack the Russians "with the full atomic arsenal" if the Russians did not get out of Europe.

The former Postmaster General said at a news conference that the late British Prime Minister expressed that opinion during a conversation at Sir Winston's home in 1947. At the time Sir Winston was leader of the Conservative opposition.

Mr. Farley mentioned Churchill during a defense of President Johnson's Vietnam policy. He said he believed Sir Winston would have endorsed President Johnson's actions.

"He told me we had learned the hard way," Mr. Farley said, "that we could not rely on treaties with the Communists because more than breaking them, they used them as an offensive weapon against us."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, May 28, 1965]

FARLEY AND CITY POLITICS

With machinegun rapidity, James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former Democratic national chairman, gave a birthday interview (he will be 77 Sunday). Items: Mayor Wagner will win over Republican John V. Lindsay; the "squabbles' in the Democratic Party engineered by the mayor are "bad politics"; Farley will not offer himself as in intermediary to patch up the Wagner fights against Charles A. Buckley, crusty Bronx leader, and Assemblyman Stanley Steingut, Brooklyn boss.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, May 28, 1965]

FARLEY ON VIETNAM

(By James L. Kilgallen)

Urging President Johnson to continue using force in free Vietnam, James A. Farley said the President could no more abandon Vietnam than President Roosevelt could have abandoned Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Farley made his statement at a party given him by friends in his offices at 515 Madison Avenue yesterday in honor of the elder statesman's 77th birthday next Sunday.

He also lashed out against opponents of the use of force in Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

"I would strongly suggest to that group of educators who have been holding unrealistic seances, which they have been presumptuous enough to call 'teach-ins.' that they qualify themselves by a few 'learn-outs,' " Mr. Farley said.

BACKS DECISIONS

"The 'teacher-inners' have indicated that President Johnson has made hasty and dangerous decisions in the Far East policy. The slightest glance at the record, and even a touch of fair mindedness, will reveal that Mr. Johnson did not set the American Eagle screaming.

"President Johnson did not create the Far East crisis. The Far East crisis was thrust upon him.

"He can no more abandon South Vietnam now than President Wilson could have aban-

doned the freedom of the seas in 1917, or President Roosevelt could have abandoned Hawaii the day after Pearl Harbor."

Pulling our troops and aid out of Vietnam, Mr. Farley said, will not stop the war. "It will simply bring it closer to our ally, Australia, and closer to home to us."

Turning to the Dominican Republic, the gray-haired, ruddy-faced septuagenarian said he could not hesitate "in saying that the President had no other course in Santo Domingo.

"Those who now deplore the use of force there were among the first to hail Castro's ascendancy in Cuba. President Johnson did not precipitate the Caribbean crisis," Mr. Farley stressed. "He inherited it."

THIRTY-DAY DEADLINE

Then, turning back the clock 18 years to 1947 when he lunched with the late Sir Winston Churchill, Mr. Farley recalled the British statesman's ideas on how to deal with the Russians.

"If he had his way," Mr. Farley said of Sir Winston, "he would have given the Russians 30 days to start retiring from Europe. If they had not begun withdrawing, then he would have given them another 30-day warning.

"If they had not started retiring by then," Mr. Farley said, "he would have issued a 30-day ultimatum—90 days in all—at which time he would have attacked the Russians with the full atomic arsenal.

"This was before Russia had armed herself with those weapons and effected the atomic stalemate."

Mr. Farley told well wishers he felt fine, except for a slight head cold. "This is just another birthday," he said.

Mrs. R. Templeton Smith: Pittsburgh Civic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania have been greatly blessed with outstanding citizens who have contributed so much to the progress and cultural development of the region. One of our most honored citizens in the city of Pittsburgh during her lifetime was Mrs. R. Templeton Smith, the former Eliza Jane Kennedy, whose tireless efforts over the years gave so much toward improving the civic life and governmental structure of Pittsburgh. Mr. and Mrs. R. Templeton Smith have made a fine team in our business and civic life that is deserving of every respect.

As president of the Allegheny County League of Women Voters, Mrs. Smith was known as the "conscience of Pittsburgh." Her study was directed at nearly every facet of city, county, State, and Federal government in her drive for economy in public spending. She led the fight for women's right to vote in the Pittsburgh area, and she devoted her whole life to personifying the contribution of the American Woman to our public good, and integrity in government.

As an admirer of Mrs. R. Templeton Smith, it is a pleasure to commemorate her efforts with these following tributes:

[From the North Hills (Pa.) News Record, Nov. 11, 1964]

FRIEND OF GOOD GOVERNMENT

Good government never had a better friend than Mrs. R. Templeton Smith, of Pittsburgh, who died recently at 74 years. For a half century and more she fought the good fight in its defense in Allegheny County and in Pittsburgh. There has been none like her and there may never be again.

Mrs. Smith was first of all a woman of courage and conviction. She had a deep sense of civic responsibility and of justice. She recognized much that is wrong in government and she did her best to correct it. Her persistent activities brought her into contact at some time or other in her career with nearly every public official in the city and county.

She did not harangue, scold, threaten or browbeat. What she had to say she expressed in calm words and in logic. She was sure of the rightness of her cause. She was the bitter foe of injustice, inefficiency, waste, and complacency in government. She hounded alike Democratic and Republican officials for what she considered to be mistakes, blunders, and plain stupidity. Some of them winced when she spoke but they admired her for her sincerity.

For 40 years, as its president, she made Allegheny County League of Women Voters a power in the community. In earlier years she was an active suffragist.

Few women—or men—succeed in crowding so much activity into their lifetimes as did Mrs. Smith. She leaves her community a better place than she found it. Every resident of Allegheny County now and for years to come will be in her debt. There is none to take her place. We hope some fitting memorial will be raised in honor of this woman who gave so much while asking nothing in return.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Oct. 23, 1964]

MRS. R. T. SMITH: VOTERS LEAGUE HEAD SPURRED CITY REFORM

Mrs. R. Templeton Smith, long prominent on the Pittsburgh public scene, died in her sleep during the night at her home in Squirrel Hill.

The death was discovered at 7:25 a.m. She had been a patient at Presbyterian Hospital but returned recently to her home at 1336 Shady Avenue.

Mrs. Smith, born December 11, 1889, at Latrobe, was a relentless, tenacious watchdog of the city's purse strings. She probably attended more budget sessions over the years than anyone else in Pittsburgh—either in or out of government.

Her scrutiny was directed at nearly every facet of city government—from bridge painters to rubbish collectors. She also spearhearded drives for grand jury investigations into the rackets and alleged vote frauds.

But her vigilance was not partisan. She hounded the coattails of both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Only once in her long career of civic ventures—which spanned a half century—did Mrs. Smith go after an elective office above that of committeewomen.

Despite failing health she joined with retired Adm. Ben Moreell to seek posts as delegates to the GOP National Convention at San Francisco in 1964.

Though they both lost, their conservative hero, U.S. Senator Barry M. Goldwater, won the nomination to oppose President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Born Eliza Jane Kennedy, she was a daughter of Julian and Jane Brenneman Kennedy. Her father was a widely known engineer.

The family moved to Pittsburgh when Eliza Jane was only 3.

She was the only woman ever to have her hands on the city purse strings and she pruned the budget like no other housewife ever did. Mayor William McNair, whom she supported in 1932, gave her the post of budget adviser which she held for 2 years.

Later, she complained that she couldn't even get a look at budget figures.

At a time when the city paid for garbage disposal by the pound, the vigilant Mrs. Smith claimed that collectors were watering down the refuse in order to collect a higher fee.

In the aftermath of a wave of sex slayings, she led the fight for a revamped and modern central communication center in the police bureau. It began operations in 1950.

A graduate of Thurston Prep School in 1908, Mrs. Smith went on to study economics and political science at Vassar, where she received her degree in 1912.

She attended a school operated by Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt for suffrage work. With a sister, the late Mrs. T. O. Miller, and her mother, she marched in suffrage parades and devoted most of her time to obtaining the right to vote for her sex.

At the time she was treasurer of the Equal Franchise Federation. But with the passage of the 19th amendment—women's suffrage—in August 1920, the federation was changed to the Allegheny County League of Women Voters.

She served as president of the league from 1924 until her death.

STUCK NOSES IN

A petite woman who shunned jewelry and cosmetics, she claimed of the league: "We stuck our noses into everything."

She married R. Templeton Smith, former executive vice president of the old Pittsburgh Coal Co. in 1915. Mr. Smith later headed a pharmaceutical laboratory firm here.

A stickler for economy in government, Mrs. Smith was a formidable foe of most governmental authorities. She opposed them on the grounds that they were not responsive to the electorate and in a position to circumvent legal debt limits.

Her sons, Kennedy and Templeton Smith, are both lawyers in Pittsburgh. She also leaves eight grandchildren.

Friends are being received at H. Samson's, Inc., 537 Neville Street, Oakland, from 2 to 4 p.m. and 7 to 9 p.m. and from 10 a.m. to noon Monday.

Services will be at 1:30 p.m. Monday at Shadyside Presbyterian Church.

The family suggests contributions be made to the Allegheny County League of Women Voters, 817 Bigelow Apartments.

ELIZA KENNEDY SMITH: BORN DECEMBER 11, 1889, AT LATROBE, PA.—DIED OCTOBER 23, 1964, AT PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mrs. R. Templeton Smith, formerly Eliza Jane Kennedy, was born at Latrobe, Pa., December 11, 1889, to Jane Eliza Brenneman Kennedy and Julian Kennedy, internationally known engineer. The family moved to Pittsburgh when she was 2 and she was a resident of Pittsburgh for the rest of her life. She was reared in the First United Presbyterian Church but subsequently became, and was at the time of her death, a member of the Shadyside Presbyterian Church.

Eliza Kennedy graduated from Thurston Preparatory School in 1908 and from Vassar College in 1912 with an A.B. degree. Her majors were economics and political science.

In 1915 she married R. Templeton Smith, of Pittsburgh, later to become executive vice president of Pittsburgh Coal Co. and now president of Ben Venue Laboratories, a pharmaceutical firm which pioneered in the development and manufacture of hormones and antibiotics. They have two sons, and eight grandchildren.

From college days, Mrs. Smith had concerned herself primarily with the education of women for citizenship. After attending Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt's school for suffrage workers, she became treasurer of the Equal Franchise Federation and gave most of her time to the educational campaign for

full franchise. She stumped the State, speaking for the cause of women, and with her mother and sister (the late Mrs. J. O. Miller), marched in suffrage parades. Immediately after women secured the vote, she was active in transforming the Equal Franchise Federation into the Allegheny County League of Women Voters and later active in the formation of the State and National Leagues of Women Voters. The objective of these organizations was to educate women to assume their new responsibility to be informed, independent, and conscientious voters. She served for many years on the board of the State league, and from 1938 to 1945 as its president.

However, her most important work was done as president of the Allegheny County League of Women Voters, a position she held from 1924 until her death. During this 40-year period she devoted the bulk of her time, without pay, to the activities of the league. Being under financial or political obligation to no one, she was in a position to fight vice and corruption wherever she saw it, an opportunity which she utilized to the utmost throughout her career. However, she never acted until she was in full possession of the facts. In 1929 she headed the women's division of the citizens committee which conducted an investigation of Mayor Kline's administration. Mayor Kline was indicted, convicted and sentenced, and from the investigation grew the famous food probe, which ultimately resulted in important savings to the taxpayers.

In 1933 she was appointed by Mayor-Elect William N. McNair to serve as his budget adviser, a position she held for 2 years. For him she prepared, in collaboration with M. C. Conick, CPA, of Main & Co., a comprehensive budget for the city of Pittsburgh which eliminated political sinecure jobs from the public payroll and proposed streamlining of many city operations in the interest of economy. Efforts by political enemies to get rid of her by abolishing her salary from the public payroll were unavailing because she served without pay.

In 1949 Mrs. Smith directed the league's campaign for an efficient, nonpolitical police force, for a central communications and records room, a crime laboratory, an FBI survey of the entire police department, collection of delinquent parking tags, and an improved training and promotion system for the police force. This campaign has been partially successful. As part of a campaign to get the city to collect delinquent water rates, she refused, for an extended period, to pay her own water bill, using this as proof positive of the city's dereliction when no action was taken against her.

The league in 1950, under Mrs. Smith's direction, was primarily responsible for securing the independent probe carried on by the Pennsylvania Attorney General's office into corruption and rackets in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County. Working through the league, she instigated in 1961 an investigation of the Allegheny County voters lists, which resulted in the elimination of thousands of fictitious names from the rolls.

Only once in her entire career did she run for public office for a position above that of committeewoman. This was in 1964 when, despite failing health, she joined Adm. Ben Moreell in seeking, unsuccessfully, to become a delegate, committed for Goldwater, to the Republican National Convention.

The foregoing are only a few of the more spectacular of Mrs. Smith's activities. Through this league she has instigated all sorts of educational programs, such as election schools, jury schools, voters directories, studies on reapportionment, legislative letters on State and National legislation, current affairs courses by the Extension Division of Penn State College, Friday morning lectures on national and world affairs, digests of important bills, and analyses of current local issues, such as zoning programs and public authorities.

In addition, her activities have included legislative work at the local, State and National levels. In particular, she helped to instigate the Pittsburgh smoke elimination drive, worked for flood control (excluding the Kinzua Dam project), for centralized assessment and collection of taxes, for the abolition of the fee system of paying tax collectors, for the purchase of adequate voting machines for Allegheny County, for permanent registration, and for the city manager form of local government. Although many of these things are simply taken for granted today, they were once topics of bitter controversy. She opposed the formation of most authorities as bodies not responsive to the public will which are in a position to circumvent legal debt limits.

Always she fought tenaciously for economy in government, and three generations of Pittsburgh City Councilmen have known her well and have heard her sharp criticisms of waste and inefficiency in the handling of city funds. She was a consistent foe of municipal bond issues, believing that debt was not the happiest legacy that can be left to coming generations.

Over the years, her office became something of a nonpartisan clearinghouse or directional center for all kinds of community problems. The uninformed turned to her for information on where to take their complaints on the functioning of local government and on such things as how and where to register. Many citizens who were frightened and intimidated by corruption and rackets turned to her for information on how to get their facts safely into proper channels. She had a sizable following of friends and admirers who sought her advice on whom to vote for, particularly with respect to local offices.

Mrs. Smith's achievements have been recognized by three outstanding honors. In 1950 she and her husband were named co-winners of the Annual President's Award of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, he for his many years of work in public charities and for heading the Community Chest, and she for her long drive for decency, efficiency, and honesty in government.

She received in 1953 the rare award of Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania and joined the thin ranks of the other great ladies of the State who have been given this recognition for eminence in their chosen life work.

In 1959 she was named a director of Americans for Constitutional Action and served as the only woman member of this distinguished board of important national figures.

Over 600 people attended a testimonial dinner in her honor in 1962, at which congratulations were received from Senator JOHN TOWER, Senator HARRY BYRD, Senator Barry Goldwater, and a number of other prominent conservative public officials.

She was a member of the DAR, the 20th Century Club, and the College Club. She has served on numerous boards and committees concerned with civic or social betterment, among them the Women's Educational Foundation, the Curtis Home for Girls, the Pittsburgh Housing Association, and the Committee for the Study of Sex Crimes, and the Winchester-Thurston School.

While she frequently became involved in national issues, her primary interest has always been the improvement of local government. This she regarded primarily as an educational problem. She was fond of paraphrasing Jefferson to the effect that "Eternal vigilance is the price of good local government," thereby recognizing that reforms are not things which can be done once, but which must be done continually. It was her thesis that local government is the place a citizen can make himself most effectively felt. She regarded as the greatest waste of manpower in the country the intelligent women who did nothing constructive with their time, and sought to channel their interest and energy into studying and participating in local government activities. She felt strongly, also, the importance of businessmen taking an interest in local politics.

She spoke calmly, rarely raising her voice, but there was never any doubt in the minds of her children, her friends, or the officeholders to whom she spoke—whether they agreed with her or not—that she meant exactly what she said.

The career of a person like Mrs. R. Templeton Smith cannot be measured merely by her tangible and positive accomplishments. As with a dedicated teacher or minister, there is no way of telling how much corruption and evil she deterred in Allegheny County by her mere presence on the local scene.

ELIZA KENNEDY SMITH: DECEMBER 11, 1889–OCTOBER 23, 1964

(Written by a college classmate)

Eliza Kennedy (Vassar 1912) (Mrs. R. Templeton Smith) died unexpectedly on October 13, 1964, in her sleep, while recovering from a serious illness.

Eliza was a leader in a ceaseless battle for what she felt to be right and just. Graduating from Vassar at the height of the influence of "Millisie," Eliza moved directly into the struggle for women's suffrage. Once the suffrage amendment was won, she transformed the Equal Franchise Federation in Pittsburgh into the original League of Women Voters (the Allegheny County League of Women Voters), which she served as president for 40 years.

Eliza and her colleagues in the league constantly exposed and highlighted weak spots in government, particularly at the local level. She was a clearinghouse for complaints about civic misdeeds but never exposed a source of information nor leveled a charge without provable evidence, even if she had to get it herself by following a garbage truck at dawn or taking a light meter through badly lighted streets at night. Although a lifetime Republican, she attacked bossism in either party with equal vigor. The only official position she ever held was unpaid budget adviser to Democratic Mayor W. N. McNair.

In 1950 Eliza and her husband, R. Templeton Smith, president of Ben Venus Laboratories, a pharmaceutical research firm, were the first husband and wife to win the annual President's Award of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh. In 1953 she was named a Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania. In 1959 she became the only woman director of Americans for Constitutional Action, serving under Adm. Ben Moreell with the Honorable Herbert Hoover, the Honorable Charles Edison, and half a dozen other distinguished Americans.

Neither public abuse nor failure of favored candidates ever deterred her. She stood by her principles and was satisfied by the support of her husband, her two sons, and the loyal members of the Allegheny County League.

This classmate, who has lived in Pittsburgh 40 years and has known Eliza not only at work, but in her home in Pittsburgh and at Emerson Point in Maryland, feels herself fortunate in knowing her as a serene wife, mother, and grandmother. As grandmother she enjoyed making clothes for as well as playing with and teaching her grandchildren. In the years ahead, more than one grandchild is destined to walk firmly in Eliza's civic and political footsteps.

RUTH CRAWFORD MITCHELL, 1912.

Polish Peasant Party

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective pillars of resistance against communism, wherever that false ideology is imposed on people, is the rigid independence and spirit of the farm populations, or, as they are more historically known in Europe, the peasants. This past weekend, the Polish Peasant Party in Exile commemorated the 70th anniversary of its creation and its effective service to the cause of freedom and economic advancement of the Polish people.

In this year's resolution the leaders of the Polish Peasant Party, speaking from a free world forum on behalf of their oppressed brethren, issued a most compelling statement. I include as part of my remarks excerpts from this statement which I feel are of special significance:

PROCLAMATION OF THE POLISH PEASANT PARTY ON THE PEASANT DAY OF THE YEAR 1965

In this year's Peasant Day, while tendering our heartfelt greetings to our fellow members in Poland and to those dispersed in the free world, to the peasants, workers and to the working intelligentsia, to the Polish nation as a whole on the 70th anniversary of the creation of our party celebrated this year, we wish to assure you, that today and in the future, as it was in the past, our efforts within the framework of the Polish Peasant Party will unshakenly aim at fighting and winning a free, independent, democratic and socially just Poland.

The peasants with the support of the church constitute to the present day a pillar of the passive but conscious resistance to those who surrendered our country to the colonial dependence from Moscow.

The peasants and workers fight against the Communists and have become the bitterest opposition to the ruling dictatorial Communist system of the Moscow imperialism of the colonial exploitation.

Just as the Bolsheviks' defeat near Warsaw in the year 1920 was caused by the national-conscious peasants and workers and their collaboration with the whole Polish Nation, we may be certain of a complete final victory over the tyranny, foreign violence, exploitation and social injustice, so inhumanly applied in Poland by the Communist regime. In pursuit of this aim one needs a broad collaboration with the whole Polish nation, cal and social factions.

Let's bear it in mind that the Polish nation is waiting for our contribution, for the contribution of our generation into a build-up of the foundations for a new edifice of the Polish state:

A state which will become a homeland of all the Poles.

A state in which hatred, disdain, and injustice will be replaced by a just social order.

A state in which only our own and all citizens will decide upon their own and the country's fate.

A state which will honor the Polish tradition, the Polish cultural achievements, religious freedom, right of property, the right of expression of one's thoughts.

A state in which will rule harmony and legal order.

A state honoring all laws.

The work to reach this goal will be accompanied by the deception and many disappointments. The weaklings will fall off.

Peasants and workers in Poland constitute a power, which nothing can withstand if it is well directed.

Victory lies in the hands of those who do not become discouraged with the adversities.

No system lasted forever. None of them escaped the historical justice. The experience of the Communist systems will also end and maybe sooner than the various pessimists think. Today, it is already visible a distinct breakup of the Communist systems, caused by the errors and contradictions of their doctrines and by the abuses of power. This breakup is visible not only in the economical field, but also in the social and political domain.

Even the partners of the Communist bloc did notice it that the communism is subordinating their respective nations' interests and states to the imperialism of the Soviet Russia and sells them out in the servitude of Moscow.

Twenty years of the occupation of Poland and the countries of the east central Europe by the Soviet Russia and her policy of oppression and exploitation did convince them that the Communist ideas serve Russia to spread her world aggression through the medium of the international character of the Communist doctrine, which Russia has sponsored and has been shrewdly spreading it in every country naming herself a sole exponent and guardian of the purity of the Communist ideas.

We here in the free world do not need Moscow's and Gomulka's protection. We need an independent Poland, a Poland which will take under her care all of her children. We need a free Poland just for all her citizens regardless of social origin, political or religious convictions.

Such a Poland will not be built by Mr. Gomulka. Mr. Gomulka is building Poland for the ruling elite, for a "new class" of the Communist rulers, living in the affluence and harboring only disdain for the wornout but hard-laboring masses of the common people. He stressed it in his speech announcing this year's elections to the "Sejm" and National Councils. In his speech he refused even a passive electoral right to the believing Catholics. It means, he denies this right nearly to the whole nation. Only and exclusively a handful of opportunists engaged in the "building of socialism" in Poland will have their right to be elected. They will enjoy the right of making up resolutions of orders in accordance with the needs and aims of Soviet Russia and in accordance with the security of the authority of the ruling elite.

This handful of the godless people decides if the children will get religious instructions, how many children are to be born in Poland, when and which convents and churches are to be robbed and closed.

This handful will decide how the working people are to be materially exploited, whose property is to be taken away from him, when a peasant is to be deprived of his land and the best way to subordinate and subjugate him.

This year's Communist elections in Poland, as the previous ones, we regard as a great trickery. There is no freedom where a citizen is ordered and forced to vote for the candidates of a single Communist bloc list.

There is no freedom in Poland because the nation has no right to present the candidates whom it trusts. We condemn this kind of electoral comedy in Poland and are against such elections. Whatever result of such kind of elections will be announced by the Communist regime in Poland we shall regard it as a result of rape committed on the Polish nation. The Polish nation knows best how it should estimate such elections and what its attitude toward these elections should be.

Mr. Speaker, each year in its proclamation on behalf of the peasants of Poland, the Polish Peasant Party voices the demands of the silenced citizens of Poland. This year in the proclamation they asked for the following:

1. The withdrawal from the Polish soil of the Soviet armed forces and Soviet functionaries.

2. The release of all political prisoners in Poland and the repatriation of all Poles still in captivity in the Soviet Union.

3. To submit for the deliberation of the United Nations Organization the matter of freedom for Poland and for the other enslaved nations from the central European countries.

4. We demand in accordance with the principle of the self-determination of Nations that free elections in Poland must be conducted under the international control.

5. Recognition by the United States of America and Great Britain of the frontier of Oder and Nysa in the west of Poland.

6. Discontinuance of the persecution of the church, abolishment of the censorship, and the reestablishment in Poland of the freedom of speech, rights of congregation and creation of the independent political parties, independent social, youth and cultural organizations and full territorial self-government.

7. Reestablishment of a governmental system based upon the liberty, democracy, social justice, respect of the laws of the citizens and of the Nation.

8. Liquidation of the Soviet colonialism in the countries of the central, eastern Europe and the unification of the whole Europe, in liberty as a factor of the lasting peace in Europe and in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I now add as part of my remarks resolutions which were approved at the annual meeting of the Polish Peasant Party, held Sunday, June 6, in Chicago, Ill.:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE CELEBRATION OF THE POLISH PEASANT DAY IN CHICAGO ON JUNE 6, 1965

Assembled at the celebration of the Polish Peasant Day, held in Chicago on June 6, 1965, we—

1. Pay our tribute to the Polish nation, which has been living in the Communist slavery for 20 years, and declare our solidarity in its fight for survival, for its culture and its independence;

2. Pay our tribute to the Polish peasants for their defending of their native land and the Catholic faith, for their adherence to the principles of freedom, independence, democracy and social justice;

3. Send our great respects and express our gratitude to His Eminence Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, the Primate of Poland, to the Polish Episcopate and clergy for their defense of faith, moral rights of the nation and for their devotion to the Polish people;

4. Join the entire Polish nation in its preparations to celebration of the Millenium of Christianity of Poland in 1966, the foundatin of our culture and our adherence to the West;

5. Pay our great tribute to the memory of the great pioneers and leaders of the Peasant movement in connection with the 70th anniversary of the establishment of the Polish Peasant Party, and promise to continue under the leadership of the President Stanislaw Mikolajczyk our work for the achievement of freedom and independence of Poland, democracy, and social justice;

6. Protest against the depriving Poland of independence and the Polish nation of freedom by the Soviet Union, against the persecution of the church and religion, against the persecution of the Polish writer, against the falsification of the will of the nation in the so-called "elections", against the inhuman exploitation of the Polish peasants, workers, artisans and the intelligentia;

7. Condemn the Warsaw agents of Moscow for their betraying of the most essential interests of the Polish nation, for their dissipation of the hard-earned money of the Polish people in the interest of the Soviet Union and the Soviet world aggression;

8. Condemn them for their helping out Moscow in biological destruction of the Polish nation through demoralization of the Polish youth and through their depopulation policy;

9. Condemn them for their continuous sharpening of censorship and limiting freedom of the Polish science;

10. Condemn them for their disgracing the Polish people by their subversive activities among the Poles living in the free world and by their espionage conducted in the free world in the interest of Moscow;

11. Condemn them for their irresponsible attacks against the people of the United States for whom the Polish nation has a great regard and shows great friendship;

12. Demand that the Governments of the United States and Great Britain put the question of freedom of Poland and other countries of central-eastern Europe on the agenda of the United Nations;

13. Demand that the monstrous crime committed by the Soviet Union in the Katyn Forest 25 years ago be put on the agenda of the United Nations;

14. Demand that the United States and Great Britain recognize the western border of Poland on the Oder and Neisse line as right and just, and that Polish eastern territories, grabbed by the Soviet Union, be restored to Poland;

15. Demand that the Red army and various Soviet officials be withdrawn from Poland;

16. Demand that full religious freedom be restored in Poland, that Poles still held against their will in the U.S.S.R. be repatriated from the Soviet Union to Poland, that all political prisoners be released, that freedom of speech and assembly be restored, that true local government be established, that independent political parties, cooperative, professional, youth and cultural organizations be reestablished;

17. Demand that free and democratic elections be held in Poland under the international control; and

18. Appeal to the entire Polonia and to all patriotic organizations for an absolute resistance against the attempts of Gomulka to subordinate Polonia and the political emigress to the Communist regime to frustrate their fight for freedom of Poland and against the infiltration and diversion of various open and disguised Communist agents.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we recognize the fundamental weakness of the Communist world. This weakness is dramatized by groups such as the Polish Peasant Party, which both within the country and through spokesmen in the Free World, very effectively and persistently struggles to restore legitimate freedom and progressive government to the millions of people now suffering under Communist enslavement.

A Realistic Appraisal of American Foreign Policy in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the academic community has apparently been having a field day over the past month isolating various and sundry portions of American foreign policy in southeast Asia and heaping and compounding criticism upon the same.

American foreign policy in southeast Asia is complex but I do not believe too complex for reasonable people to analyze the facts and come to conclusions other than that suggested by academic community leader, Hans Morgenthau, that it is inevitable that communism take over southeast Asia lest there be total war with Communist China.

Assistant Secretary of State, Douglas MacArthur II has recently factually analyzed the American policy in Vietnam, I believe convincingly, in the following communication.

I would hope over the coming weeks to insert further and additional material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which would be further supportive of the American position:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 7, 1965.

The Honorable ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEGGETT: Thank you for your letter of June 2 enclosing a letter concerning the situation in Vietnam.

Your constituent raises several points with which I must disagree. The main point seems to be that the conflict in Vietnam is a civil war. I will address myself primarily to this point. In response to the other issues that your constituent raises I am enclosing material which she should find of interest.

Far from being a civil war, the war in South Vietnam is the result of the announced attempt by the Communist regime in North Vietnam to conquer South Vietnam in violation of the 1954 Geneva accords. In Communist propaganda this form of aggression masquerades as a "war of national liberation." In reality, the war which the Vietcong are waging against the South is directed politically and militarily from Hanoi, the capital of North Vietnam. It is commanded primarily by leaders and specialists infiltrated from north of the 17th parallel. It is supplied by weapons and equipment sent by North Vietnam, which in turn is supported by Red China. Its aim is to win control of South Vietnam for communism in violation of solemn agreements and with no reference to the wishes of the South Vietnamese people.

In December 1961, the State Department thoroughly documented North Vietnam's efforts to conquer South Vietnam in its white paper entitled "A Threat to the Peace." The February 1965 State Department white paper entitled "Aggression From the North" adds documentation on how Hanoi has masterminded the Vietcong campaign in South Vietnam. The 1962 report of the International Control Commission for Vietnam spelled out North Vietnam's aggressive actions in flagrant violation of the 1954 Geneva accords and the 1962 agreement on Laos.

What Hanoi was up to then is even more apparent now. In the ICC report of February 13, 1965, the Canadian delegate to the ICC, Mr. J. B. Seaborn, says that "The events which have taken place in both North and South Vietnam since February 7 are the direct result of the intensification of the aggressive policy of the Government of North Vietnam." He points to "the continuing fact that North Vietnam has increased its efforts to incite, encourage, and support hostile activities in South Vietnam, aimed at the overthrow of the South Vietnamese administration."

In a recent network television interview, Mr. Seaborn said that perhaps even more significant than the actual numbers of North Vietnamese infiltrators is the quality and type of people Hanoi has been sending, in that they are essentially the trained officers and specialists who serve as the backbone of the Vietcong movement.

Another aspect of this is that within the last year Hanoi has been sending primarily native-born North Vietnamese to fight in the south. From 1959 until last year, North Vietnam primarily utilized a pool of South Vietnamese who had fought with the Viet Minh against the French and went north in 1954 to become citizens of North Vietnam.

The Communists are fond of saying that whether the Vietcong are born in the north or south, they are still Vietnamese and therefore an indigenous revolt must be taking place. Certainly, they are Vietnamese, and the North Koreans who swept across their boundary in 1950 to attack South Korea were also Koreans. However, this did not make the Korean war an indigenous revolt from the point of view of either world security or in terms of acceptable standards of conduct. By the same token, if West Germany were to take similar action against East Germany, it is doubtful that the East Germans, the Soviet Union, and the rest of the Communist bloc would stand aside on the grounds that it was nothing more than an indigenous affair. The simple issue is that military personnel and arms have been sent across an international demarcation line (just as valid a border as Korea or Germany) contrary to international agreements and law to destroy the freedom of a neighboring people.

The hard core leaders and technicians serving the so-called National Liberation Front of South Vietnam are not serving the interests of the people of South Vietnam, but were sent by and are serving the interests of their masters in the north. In addition to them, there are, of course, a substantial number of South Vietnamese who, largely by terror and intimidation, have been recruited into the Vietcong movement.

But, as the President recently put it, Hanoi's support of the Vietcong is the heartbeat of the war. It is for that reason, and because Hanoi has stepped up its aggression that the Government of South Vietnam and the United States have been forced to increase our response and strike through the air at the true source of the aggression—Nort Vietnam. This does not represent a change of purpose on our part—but a change in the means we believe are necessary to stem aggression.

Prior to our stepped up assistance to South Vietnam in 1961 in response to increasing aggressive actions against the South, U.S. military aid to South Vietnam was carried out within the limits imposed by the 1954 Geneva Accords.

It was in response to North Vietnamese violations of the Accords (documented in 1962 by the ICC in Vietnam and reconfirmed by the February 13, 1965, report of the Canadian delegation to the ICC) that the United States responded to the Government of Vietnam's request for stepped-up assistance to help defend itself. We believe our aid is justified in view of North Vietnam's flagrant violations of its obligations under the 1954, and 1962 (Laos) Geneva agreements.

The liberation front is no more than just that—a front for North Vietnam's aggressive campaign against South Vietnam. It has no legal basis under international law, no real support from the people of South Vietnam and no ability to survive without continuing support from North Vietnam and other Communist nations. It was Hanoi's creation in 1960 and to this day Hanoi is directing and supplying it with its essential men and material.

Some individuals are concerned that the Government of South Vietnam does not represent the people; we would like to point out, however, that there is more evidence to

show that the Government of the Republic of Vietnam is based on the consent of the people under its jurisdiction than is the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. There is a free and open exchange of ideas in South Vietnam; political parties, trade unions and religious groups, among others, not only exist and express independent opinions but have a definite influence on governmental policies. Nothing of this sort is evident in North Vietnam; nor are there indications there of freedom of the press or assembly, a striking contrast with the situation in South Vietnam.

The attitude of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam toward communism is unmistakable: even though there has been a series of governmental revisions since the fall of the Diem government in November 1963, every administration has operated from a basic policy of anticommunism, and a staunch determination to continue the struggle against Communist aggression. The South Vietnamese people themselves have given undeniable evidence of their allegiance by "voting with their feet"—since the beginning of this year, approximately 200,000 have become refugees, choosing to abandon their homes and leave the Vietcong-controlled areas in the north central portion of South Vietnam. The close to one million persons who fled from North Vietnam to the South after the Communists assumed control are more impressive testimony still to the allegiance of the Vietnamese people.

We do not find any significant body of people or opinion in South Vietnam among these 14 million people, other than the Vietcong themselves, who are looking to Hanoi for guidance. The Vietcong use the old instrument of terror to induce passivity. As a result, in those areas which have been secured and cleared, there is no problem about the cooperation of the people in South Vietnam when they can be given reasonable assurance that their cooperation will not lead to their throats being slit on the following night. In addition, when one speaks about the attitudes of the villagers, one must remember that these people want to live lives in decency and security, grow their own crops, raise their families, and improve their land if they can. And they are not asking the north for the answer.

As a result of the 1954 Geneva accords, South Vietnam as well as North Vietnam is an international entity with independent international status. Under those Accords, Vietnam was temporarily divided into two separate zones each to be administered by the authorities in North and South Vietnam, respectively, until the unification of the country. The accords, then, endowed both North and South Vietnam with spearate and distinct status. For example, diplomatic or consular relations have been established with Saigon or Hanoi or both.[1]

At the same time, the provisional military demarcation line established by the Geneva Accords, although not a "political or territorial boundary," is still an international frontier that must be respected under international law. In this respect the division of Vietnam is similar to the division of Germany or Korea. It is obvious that if a state is divided by an internationally recognized demarcation line, each part of that state must refrain from the use of force or hostile acts against the other. Thus, an attack by North Korea on South Korea or East Germany on West Germany would be illegal. Such attacks are no less aggression or armed attack than an attack by one state aaginst another.

The point about the French failure to win in Vietnam is one that is often heard, but has little application to the present situation. The French were fighting to preserve some sort of continued French Union presence in Vietnam and actually exercised military command over the Vietnamese forces; we are assisting the Vietnamese in their own fight to preserve their independence and way of life against Communist imperialism and are rea..y to pull out once our help is no longer needed.

If I may be of any further assistance to you, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

[1] The Republic of Vietnam has de jure diplomatic relations with 52 nations including France, United Kingdom, West Germany, Brazil, Mexico, Switzerland, and Ethiopia. North Vietnam has full diplomatic relations with 24 countries, 12 of whom belong to the Communist bloc. This recognition ratio is comparable to South Korea which has full relations with 64 nations while North Korea is recognized by 25. West Germany has de jure recognition from nearly 100 nations while East Germany has full diplomatic relations with only 12.

As far back as 1955, South Vietnam was recognized, de jure, by 36 nations, and North Vietnam had full relations with 12 countrites.

Traffic Relief Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting public service program is being developed in New York by Robert Joseph, a prominent real estate executive, in cooperation with the United Taxi Owners Guild, and many leading New York citizens.

The program seeks to develop new suggestions aimed at traffic relief. Inasmuch as the problem of growing traffic congestion relates to all of our urban areas, I would like to have the following material placed on record detailing some of the efforts of private individuals to curb mounting traffic congestion.

Traffic congestion threatens to strangle the economic life of New York and something practical must be done about it—with this in mind, a group of prominent real estate executives, public officials, civic and business leaders have organized a traffic relief contest to be run on an annual basis.

Robert Joseph, chairman of Robert Joseph & Co., Inc., a real estate firm, conceived of the contest and helped organize it. His company is posting $500 in prizes to help stimulate specific and imaginative solutions to the traffic dilemma. Cosponsor of the contest is the 2,000-member United Taxi Owners Guild.

The contest will be open to any licensed real estate broker or salesman and to licensed taxicab drivers and owners. The entrant must submit in writing a description of his idea on how to help ease the traffic problem. The idea can involve a limited intersection or traffic artery, or may span a large geographic area.

The entires must be submitted on or before June 15. They must be no more than 500 words in length, and must pertain to any or all of the five boroughs of the city.

The entires are to be submitted to Assemblyman Alfred A. Lama, 395 Pearl Street, Brooklyn. Mr. Lama has accepted the position of secretary of the committee.

The first prize will be $300 in cash; the second prize, $200, and both will be presented at a luncheon.

Members of the panel of judges include: State Senator Thomas J. Mackell, Democrat, of Queens; State Senator Frederic S. Berman, Democrat, of Manhattan; City Councilman Thomas J. Cuite, Democrat, of Brooklyn; Assemblywoman Aileen B. Ryan, Democrat, of Bronx; Congressman JOHN M. MURPHY, Democrat, of Brooklyn-Staten Island; Herman B. Glaser, president of the New York State Association of Trial Lawyers; Leon Teuch and Salvatore Baron, president and executive manager respectively of the United Taxi Owners Guild; and State Senator Guy James Manago, Democrat, of Brooklyn.

The traffic suggestions will be offered to the city as a public service in an effort to focus attention on the problem and in an attempt to develop worthwhile ideas that could lead to an improvement in traffic control.

The city, under Commissioner Barnes, has done a heroic job and the committee feels that the citizens who have a stake in seeing that traffic congestion is eased, can offer much in terms of good concepts.

The cabdriver and the real estate man live with this problem everyday, and their attention to the problem may prove extremely rewarding to the city.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Commencement Address by Representative Hastings Keith, at Mount Vernon Seminary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 11, 1965

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, last Monday, June 7, it was my good fortune to attend the graduation ceremonies at Mount Vernon Seminary, here in Washington, as a proud parent of a graduating daughter.

The graduation ceremonies on Monday, like the Baccalaureate Service on Sunday, at the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, were carried out in an atmosphere of academic dignity which did credit to Mount Vernon's President Pelham.

My New England colleague, Hon. HASTINGS KEITH, of the 12th District of Massachusetts, who also was a proud parent of a graduating student, delivered an excellent commencement address, full of wise advice and counsel for the graduating class.

Representative KEITH, whose district includes Cape Cod, where I have spent some of the most memorable summers of my life, addressed the group on the subject of planning. Planning and preparation, he pointed out, are the essential factors in a rewarding adult life; and the responsibilities and challenges of leading such a life are faced squarely by every graduating class. As he pointed out:

> The door you step through today will close behind you and lock irrevocably. You cannot go back to the past. But you can learn from it, if you try.

This is the central fact facing graduating classes throughout our Nation today.

Mr. President, I believe that the address deserves the wider reading which publication in the RECORD will bring. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I accepted President Pelham's invitation to talk to you today, I determined that I would try to avoid some of the worst features of other commencement addresses I have heard over the years. I also hoped to shun some of the errors I have made in my own right, from time to time, in various private, perhaps even a bit pompous, speeches to a much smaller Mount Vernon audience—my daughter Carolyn, or Carrie, as students have come to call her.

Should I come to you here today, I pondered, and speak of the path that lies ahead, or of the trials you will face? Should I say that "A commencement is a beginning," and that now you are about to set out on the greatest adventure of life? Should I bemoan the fate of the world, and regret that I and my generation could not have presented the future to you on a silver platter? Should I begin a crusade, and launch you on your way toward the horizon?

The possible choices seemed endless: Some of them, I am sure, guaranteed to make you sigh deeply, and say "Oh, no. Not again." But I hoped that some of the thoughts which came to my mind would catch your attention, and that after the festivities were concluded, you'd take them home and mull them over.

I think a little vanity was mixed in with my trying to make up my mind. After all, a speaker likes to think that his words will be remembered. You know, planned obsolescence may be fine for the automobile manufacturers, but immortality, in however small a way, is, frankly, the secret dream of most men.

So, when I had accepted your invitation, I sat down to plan out what I was going to say. I swiveled my chair around to the window, looking for some inspiration from outdoors, and thought to myself: "I must prepare this speech very carefully: First of all, because Carolyn will be among the graduates, and, out of affection, will be gently critical, to say the least, of her father's contribution to this day which is so important to her. But also because in whatever we do, whether it is preparing a speech, scheduling a vacation or drafting a program for the future, planning, itself, should be an integral part of living.

Living and making a living involve taking chances. But those who conduct their business and the business of life, with a minimum of worry are the people who minimize the possibility of adverse chance by planning ahead.

In the business world, and in life generally, there are some people who stake their capital, their talent and their energy upon the caprice of circumstance. Others use their talent to direct their capital and their energy in an ordered way so as to gain the greatest chance of success.

Thus, most success results from two things: Planning and preparation.

Planning is the process of charting a course toward a goal, whether it be general, such as gaining an education, or particular, such as to become proficient in a particular skill or profession.

Preparation, on the other hand, is the work we do to achieve a desired goal. It is sort of planning in action.

Speaking of preparation, there is an old saying I heard once to the effect that "Opportunity knocks only when you are ready for it; otherwise it was merely a chance you did not deserve."

The singer or dancer who fills in at the last moment for a star who is ill; the officer who comes up with the answer to an impossible situation during battle, the lawyer or businessman tapped out of the blue for a government or diplomatic post—pure luck did not give them their chance. They were prepared for the opportunity when it arrived, and they were equal to the assignment given them. They had prepared themselves. Their planning may not have envisioned such luck, but their preparation allowed them to take advantage of it.

You will all remember the story of the apple which fell on Newton's head, and suddenly he had discovered the theory of gravity. Was it magic? Luck? An accident? Not at all. Apples had fallen for centuries without anyone's coming up with the concept of gravity. But Newton's years of dealing with science and mathematics enabled him, at the moment when the apple collided with his head, to put together the many scraps and facts he already possessed, and to crystalize a concept that had eluded men for centuries.

As with most great inventions and discoveries, his flash of creative genius was based on a long period of planned and painstaking research. He wasn't looking for the law of gravity when he found it. But the individual who has planned his or her course, and is going in the right direction, can set up a group of circumstances which will, in the end, contribute to his success. He is then in a position to turn every incident, and even most every accident, into something for his good. The lucky man, as we call him, is usually the man who knows how much to leave to chance, but who realizes that it is a mathematical certainty that chance is no respecter of persons but is absolutely impartial. And unless there is planning based on information and preparation, the chances of success are minimal and you can find yourself helpless before the impact of an unexpected problem or turn of events. When you provide for known eventualities, you are left free to deal with the unforeseen probabilities.

As I said previously, there is a bonus value in planning: it avoids worry. The wise man, although he will not buckle under preventable misfortunes, will see to it that he is not forced to waste time and emotion upon those problems which can be avoided by careful forethought. The vast majority of things which give you happiness and a sense of accomplishment are the things that are within your control.

This is true not only for an individual, but also for our country. Preparations for the future need to be made by considering first what is necessary and important now, and then, what will be necessary in 2, 5, 10, or more years hence. The leaders of our Nation thus must consider the present state of world affairs and make treaties and alliances for the purpose of preserving the peace, and thereby, the future of our country.

The United States at the present time is a partner in several international organizations or alliances designed primarily to preserve this peace and prosperity for the free world; for example, the United Nations, SEATO, and the OAS. One of these alliances, which has the particular objective of trying to halt the spread of Communist power, is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, more commonly called NATO.

NATO was on my mind as I was preparing this speech, because I am leaving later this week on a factfinding visit to its European headquarters.

This organization was set up, as you will recall, a few years after we had fought and won our battle against the powers of facism in World War II. A new age was emerging from the chaos of that conflict. We visualized ourselves at the threshold of a peaceful era. At the same time, the explosion of an

atomic bomb had ushered in the possibility of a total war. And this was, to alter Hamlet's phrasing slightly, a "consummation devoutly to be avoided." The combination of nuclear power and the space age had brought the world's struggles at last to the door of our own country. It now became apparent that whenever the bell should toll it would toll for us, even though the seas might separate us from the scene of battle. In John Donne's words, we had become involved in all mankind.

At that time we could have ignored the lengthening shadows cast by the rising red sun in the east, burned our backs, and gone home; or, as we did, we as a nation could plan for the future of the free world; for the free European nations were, and continue to be, most important to us, both politically and economicaly, for the simple facts are that were the Soviet bloc to gain control over Western Europe, it would possess a productive capacity and a military strength which would be vastly superior to that of the free world. So we must plan and prepare for the possibility of any reversal of the existing balance. We must, then, recognize and deal with the problems—both internal and external—which face the NATO alliance today.

In our NATO treaty we have recognized the importance of a unified approach to the military problems of the free world. And the countries of Western Europe, which have a common heritage of a Judeo-Christian ethic and culture, should recognize that, in the long run, we must remain united, not only militarily, but to a larger degree, economically and politically, against the encroachment of communism. In this way, we shall be working effectively for the preservation of freedom.

But what has all that I have just said to do with you who sit before me so patiently, today?

Let me remind you that, the door you step through today will close behind you and lock irrevocably. It is a similar door to that through which your country and the world stepped following the last war. You cannot go back to the past. But you can learn from it if you try. And you are prepared for stepping through that doorway. There will be other educational doorways later on. Although, at this point, you have had far more formal training than Abraham Lincoln ever obtained. But, whether you go on to college or not, the process of learning will stay with you all your life. You are quite well trained already to deal with the problems of living. You are not going to believe me, I'm sure. But the process of thinking logically which you have learned through your science, math, and language courses will really serve you well. This ability to think is one of the major goals of education and you have learned it well at Mount Vernon.

No one argues, of course, that young people need a formal education. It is a universally accepted proposition. Here and there disagreements crop up, however, as to what education really means, what its goals are and, of course, what methods should be used.

Two ideas, however, are not debatable. One is that young people have to learn, and do learn, the habits and customs of the society to which they belong and into which they grow. They have to assimilate the religious, moral, and political traditions of their elders, not word for word, or prayer for prayer, or even party for party, but, rather, what we refer to—all too lightly sometimes—as their heritage. These constitute the canvas and the black and white outlines of the final portrait we call an adult.

Your parents and teachers have attempted to fill in the colors of this portrait by helping to prepare you for your later lives and for the specific tasks which you will shoulder by choice or by necessity.

So you have been prodded and pushed and helped up the first set of steps—whether willingly or not can best be remembered by your parents and teachers.

What you have learned is yours to do with as you will. You are now the masters of your fates and the captains of your souls.

These are not idle words. That is why they have been said so often. You have been given the tools for dealing with what lies ahead. Part of what we have tried to give you is the individuality and the confidence that will enable you to lead when you should lead and yet the strength of character to follow when you must follow. We have tried to instill a feeling of patriotism: Not the casual statement of fact that allows you to put U.S.A. in the blank labeled "country of birth," but a true feeling of respect and love for the land to which it is your privilege to belong. Because a person is not strong in the defense of what he owns unless he loves and understands it. The honor and knowledge of your country, and the national self-respect you take with you wherever you go, make you a better representative of this country abroad, and a better defender at home.

But most of all, we have tried to make you capable of grappling with events and at the same time keeping your heads, so that you will be able to solve the problems as they come along.

More of the realities of life are about to confront you. College has long been known as a time of mental warfare. Much of what you have learned, scholastically, morally, and even politically, will be called to question and mercilessly examined. Truth and life will suddenly become words with capital letters taller than the eye can see, and they will loom before you at every turn. And those of you who stay through the next few years to achiece an A.B. or B.S. degree after your name—or that much coveted degree in front of your name, a Mrs.—you will be discovering that living is something beyond the utopia of class assignments and nagging parents, rules of residence or making an agonizing choice of what to wear. Decisions on such things as "yes or no" to another drink, a second pack of cigarettes, or cutting a curfew, will be fought through only to find yourselves confronted with the agonies of choosing a career, finding a job, helping a husband make his way, or raising a family.

We need people who can face life squarely: People who have been trained as you have to understand the interrelationships and transitions through which the world moves, and to have the courage to face what the future holds and the vision to mold it. The country and the world cry out for young people who have been educated to a sympathetic understanding of situations not ordinarily recognized as being interrelated. Many of the Nation's greatest economic and political problems stem from the inability of leaders to comprehend and interpret the significance of events coming from more than one direction. Never before has a liberal education been more essential to social, political, and commercial progress. But this demands individuals who have come to terms with the world and found themselves.

You have been trained by the teachers and faculty of Mount Vernon. You have been guided by your parents and friends. You have been tested by the trials and tribulations of final examinations and college boards. Your diploma is indicative of the confidence that all of us have in you.

Recognize that you have the basis upon which to build a future. With the knowledge that you now have, you can aspire to any heights of learning. Believe this, work with it in mind, and there will be nothing for which you cannot strive. Just keep in mind this old Scottish saying: Grasp a thistle firmly: For if you hesitate or touch it timidly, a thistle stings. But grasp it firmly, its spines crumble harmlessly in your hand.

So, in life. Each of us must bear one burden or another. But face the problem boldly, come to grips. And, strangely, the thorns that might have hurt, lose the power to sting.

William C. Sullivan of the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored with unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent article from the Clinton Daily Item relative to the highest honor award of the American University Alumni Association to my good friend and former neighbor, the able, distinguished Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. William C. Sullivan, formerly of Bolton, Mass., in my district.

In granting the award, it was noted that it was the highest honor that the alumni association can bestow, presented annually to alumni who have won distinction in professional fields or in outstanding service to the university and community.

The award relates to Mr. Sullivan's long, highly meritorious service with the FBI in various capacities throughout the United States and in other nations.

It also alludes to the national reputation Mr. Sullivan has achieved as a lecturer and writer on the complexities of the Communist challenge to American principles of human dignity, individual freedom, and the rule of law, a field in which Mr. Sullivan has made most conspicuous contributions.

Mr. Sullivan is also a research associate in the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University.

Mr. Sullivan's career has been very brilliant since the time of his early youth. He is highly trained for the important tasks now committed to him, and his magnificent service, complete dedication, patriotism, and zeal are indelibly stamped upon the annals of the great agency of our Government which he so faithfully, so unselfishly, and so outstandingly serves.

I take great pride and pleasure in congratulating Mr. Sullivan and his charming wife and devoted family upon this honor, and I am very proud indeed to call him my friend and constituent. He is a great credit to community, State, and Nation, to the great Bureau of our Government he serves and the great American who heads it, J. Edgar Hoover.

The article follows:

[From the Clinton (Mass.) Item, May 22, 1965]

FORMER BOLTON MAN HONORED BY AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

William C. Sullivan, formerly of Bolton and Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of

investigation, has received an alumni recognition award by the American University, Washington, D.C.

Alumni officials on giving this award wrote:

"It is the highest honor the alumni association can bestow. It is presented annually to alumni who have won distinction in professional fields or in outstanding service to the university and community. * * * Mr. Sullivan is an Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. * * * He served in various capacities throughout the United States, and, during World War II, served in highly confidential assignments outside this country.

"He has won a national reputation as a lecturer and writer on the complexities of the Communist challenge to American principles of human dignity, individual freedom, and the rule of law. He is also a research associate in the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University."

Mr. Sullivan is well-known in this community, having been born in Bolton where his late parents operated a farm for about 50 years.

Mr. Sullivan taught school in Bolton and subsequently was chairman of the school committee and also chairman of the Joint Union School Committee of Bolton, Stow, Harvard, Littleton, and Carlisle.

He attended American University on scholarship and was graduated with honors in 1936. Throughout school and college, Mr. Sullivan was also very active athletically engaging in baseball, basketball, football, and intercollegiate wrestling.

Donald A. Horn, of Houston, Assumes New Role in Labor Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the most dedicated, responsible, and capable men in the labor movement of Texas—Donald A. Horn, of Houston, Tex.—has recently been elected to the important post of secretary-treasurer of the Harris County AFL–CIO Council.

His overwhelming election, after being drafted to run, is an indication of the respect and confidence which the union members of Texas have of him. Mr. Horn's record of military service, his civic work, and his efforts on behalf of the Texas union movement have distinguished him as one of the most dedicated and capable labor leaders in Texas.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Newest AFL–CIO Council Official Self-Made Man in Labor Activity," from the Houston Chronicle of June 6, 1965, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWEST AFL–CIO COUNCIL OFFICIAL SELF-MADE MAN IN LABOR ACTIVITY

(By Bob Tutt, Chronicle reporter)

Donald A. Horn, newly elected secretary-treasurer of the Harris County AFL–CIO Council, thrives on challenges.

And he will find no lack of challenges as the full-time executive officer of the council, which represents unions with a total membership of more than 50,000.

For one thing, Horn, along with council President Harry Burk, will have the responsibility of guiding the diverse union elements in the county on a course of unified action.

This can become very difficult at times when, as often happens, economic or political interests of different unions conflict.

The 43-year-old electrician was overwhelmingly elected to fill out the remaining 15 months of the 2-year term of the late N. E. Coward. He was drafted to make the race.

On July 1 Horn will leave the job he has held for the past 4 years as business agent of Electrical Workers Local 716 to assume his post with the council.

"I hope we can revitalize the council and make it a more vital part of the labor movement in this country and stimulate programs, especially in politics and education, that we can all work on," said Horn.

The AFL and CIO merger has "proved that there is more to unite than to divide us," he said.

Other labor leaders describe Horn as brainy, articulate, aggressive, fairminded, dedicated, as "a man who always speaks his mind" and "who has vision."

Horn is a tall, ruggedly good looking man with an athletic build. His hair is receding and graying. Although a native of Montclair, N.J., he speaks with a slight Texas accent.

He has made Houston his home since the late 1930's.

His father once was a printing pressman and a stanch union member. This gave Horn an early interest in unionism.

After graduation from high school, Horn became an apprentice electrician and joined the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

In 1942, shortly after American entry into World War II, he enlisted in the Army Air Force. He became a bombardier on a Liberator and flew 30 missions over Europe. He was a technical sergeant.

In the summer of 1944, his plane was shot down over occupied France, but he and other crewmen parachuted, then made their way to the lines of advancing Allied forces.

After the war, Horn returned to Houston to resume his trade as an electrician. He met and married his wife, Ruth, now a 9th grade math teacher at Hartman Junior High School.

Under the GI bill, he studied electrical engineering at the University of Houston part time and nights.

He also plunged into union and Democratic political activities which have catapulted him to his present position.

Horn served as president of the Young Democrats at U.H. and helped organize the liberal Harris County Democrats.

He describes his political philosophy this way: "I am a liberal on many issues, but you will have to define each issue before I can state my position."

As a union business agent Horn has often worked 121 and 13-hour days and put in 6-day weeks. He can expect similar long hours as an official of the labor council.

Horn and his family are members of the Southminster Presbyterian Church where he is an officer and Sunday school teacher. He is an assistant scoutmaster of Boy Scout Troop 60, sponsored by Riverside Methodist Church.

One of his great pleasures is camping out with his family. He also collects books, primarily volumes on politics and history.

Horn and his wife and their sons, Melvin, 19, and George, 16, and daughter, Sharon, 7, live at 4349 North MacGregor Way.

Why has he taken an active role in the labor movement?

"I think the consummate accomplishment is in helping others," Horn answered. "That's the purpose of the labor movement. And there is always something new and different coming up. There are always challenges."

On East-West Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I was interested to note a letter to the editor of the Arapahoe Herald. The writer of the letter was Mrs. Virginia Fraser, of Littleton, Colo. The editor is Mr. Houston Waring.

I insert both the letter and the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a tribute to the resposible position taken by the Littleton League and the Arapahoe Herald. It is extremely important at this time especially, with the impending Kennedy round negotiations and the strain in the Western Alliance, that people realize that trade between nations can increase cooperation and lessen friction in the world.

The articles follow:

LEAGUE OF VOTERS FAVORS RELAXATION OF TRADE BARRIERS

DEAR EDITOR: The Littleton League of Women Voters was pleased to note your interest in the problems of East-West trade as expressed in your editorial of May 11, in which you discussed the overtures to trade being made by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Committee for Economic Development.

East-West trade has been one of the national items studied by our Littleton league as well as the 1,185 leagues throughout the country in the past 3 years.

We considered the relative advantages and disadvantages of trade with the U.S.S.R. and the bloc countries, whether it is desirable to treat each country differently, and whether or not basic changes are needed in the U.S. trade policies.

As a result of the study a national consensus was obtained. The league recommends that trade policies with U.S.S.R. and the bloc countries move in the direction of:

1. Relaxation of export controls, and other trade restrictions where appropriate; frequent reevaluation of regulations to permit gradual expansion of East-West relations.

2. Flexibility in policy formulations, allowing for exercise of executive discretion and for adaptations in policy to meet changing conditions and the requirements of overall policy aims.

3. Selectivity on a country-by-country basis in the application of more liberal trade policies to a Communist country (e.g. extension of most-favored-nation treatment).

The league favors cooperation with other Western nations on East-West trade policies and practices, with emphasis on lessening frictions and holding consultations on policy differences rather than on striving for strict uniformity.

Sincerely,

MRS. VIRGINIA FRASER,
Chairman, Trade Study.

[From the Littleton (Colo.) Arapahoe Herald, May 11, 1965]

TRADE WITH COMMUNISTS?

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has called for opening up communications with the people of China.

The Committee for Economic Development (CED) Policy Committee, headed by Theodore Yntema of the Ford Motor Co., is looking into East-West trade.

These are two good signs.

The new president of the U.S. chamber has said that the chamber in his admin-

istration is not going to be against everything. It is going to be positive.

The CED has always been a leader in economic thinking since Paul Hoffman's group created it in 1942.

CED stresses the difference between Western and Eastern economic systems and the difficulties of doing business with the centrally controlled Communist economies. Since the rules of Western multilateral trade cannot be extended to Eastern trade, says a CED report, "it will probably continue in most cases to be governed by agreements between pairs of Western and Eastern countries specifying, positively or negatively, and in greater or less detail, the goods they will permit to be traded and on what conditions, including tariff rates."

Other CED recommendations:

Western nations should in general avoid barter agreements under which a Western exporter to the East undertakes, as a condition of sale, to accept in payment certain products from the East which it will probably resell.

To avoid market disruption, each Western country should retain freedom to restrict imports from the East that would cause injury to it or to other Western countries, whether the injury results from "dumping," dissimulation of the origin of products, or from other practices.

Private Western firms should be able to market their products more actively than is now possible in Communist countries; increased opportunities for sales promotion and direct, individual contacts with final consumers would be in the interest of East and West. A practical step would be to give both East and West the right to establish permanent agencies and exhibitions in each others' countries.

The Soviet Union has indicated its intention to sign the Paris convention for protection of patent rights. In addition, Western countries should insist on the inclusion of provisions for protection of industrial property rights in trade agreements with the East, as already has been done in a number of cases with results that some Western participants have regarded as satisfactory.

The economic and ideological differences between East and West, and the insecure position of the private Western company in the event of disputes over contracts, make it important to set up a process of arbitration that provides protection against the risks involved in the public character of the other party to the contract.

Western Europe has built up an enormously profitable trade with Communist countries, and American businessmen have been looking down the road.

When, they ask themselves, public opinion here permits them to resume world trade, will the markets all be tied up by industrialists in West Germany, Italy, Japan, and other countries?

Economic reasons will govern our foreign policy just as they have for 150 years. This time, happily, the step should lead to good relationships and a peaceful era.

Invest in America Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11, 1965

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the nationwide observance of invest in America Week was climaxed on May 3 here in the U.S. Capitol at a luncheon at which the Honorable Paul A. Volcker, Deputy Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs of the Department of the Treasury, was the principal speaker. May I commend to the Members of the Senate the remarks of Secretary Volcker. He touched on the great investment opportunities in the United States as a vital part of the effort of the U.S. Government to eliminate this country's balance-of-payments deficit. He recited this Government's efforts to improve the investment climate within the United States as a means of encouraging expansion opportunities within our own borders.

I believe that the Invest in America Week Council should be congratulated for its nationwide program in educating all Americans about our financial opportunities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Volcker's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF PAUL A. VOLCKER, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY FOR MONETARY AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE NATIONAL INVEST IN AMERICA COMMITTEE, METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON CHAPTER, INVEST IN AMERICA WEEK LUNCHEON, MAY 3, 1965

I am very glad to participate in your Invest in America Week this year, and to bring you the best wishes of Secretary Fowler for the success of your efforts.

I am glad to be here, first, because you are working in an area of critical importance for our domestic growth and prosperity. But I must also admit to another more immediate reason. Measures to encourage investment in the United States are a vital part of our effort to eliminate our balance-of-payments deficit. In a very real sense, the Government of the United States has vigorously undertaken its own invest-in-America program in the firm conviction that an improved climate for domestic investment is a basic prerequisite for a better balance in international capital flows and an essential element in any lasting solution to our balance-of-payments problem. I hope, therefore, you will permit me to take advantage of this forum today to talk as much about our program as about yours, for that is my intention.

I need not, before this group, linger long over the importance of encouraging savings and investment among our citizens, for that process lies at the very heart of an effectively functioning system of free enterprise. Our ability to grow rests in good part on our ability to provide our growing population with more tools of production—with more power to operate those tools—and with ample supplies of the basic raw materials necessary for production. Equally important, we must stimulate the research and innovation necessary to achieve better equipment and methods, and to bring these innovations into use rapidly. All of this requires a vast amount of capital, and a willingness on the part of our citizens to provide the savings essential to finance that capital.

In our economic system, we cannot look to Government or even to business to provide those needed savings. In 1964, for instance, the financial savings of individuals approached $28 billion. These funds were equivalent to almost 80 percent of our total investment outlays, apart from that portion represented by depreciation and other capital consumption allowances which are, of course, designed only to assure replacement of our existing capital stock.

That is why your efforts, aimed at the general public, are so useful. For, without private individuals willing and able to save and invest in large volume, we would necessarily have to accept one or a combination of totally unsatisfactory alternatives. One of these would be simply to accept a much lower rate of economic growth. Another, in theory, would be to force investment through a huge expansion in the money supply and in Government deficits, at the expense of inflation. A third might be to permit Government to raise the needed funds through taxation—and to make the investment decisions for us.

Clearly, none of those alternatives would represent realistic or desirable solutions—all would exact an intolerable cost in terms of both economic performance and damage to our system of competitive private enterprise. But, if our present system is to work, and work effectively, it must be widely understood. For that reason I hope you will continue your increasing emphasis of recent years upon the education of our high school youngsters, and their teachers, in the role of savings and investment in our free economy.

Now let me make my pitch. I want to describe to you, as I see them, the links between what you are doing in encouraging saving and investment in the national economy and the success of the national effort the President has undertaken to overcome our balance-of-payments difficulties.

First, perhaps a word of two on past developments will help put this rather complex problem into perspective. We have had balance-of-payments deficits in most years since 1950—for a decade and a half now. And, however you keep the books, it became obvious by the late 1950's that these deficits had become far too large to be sustained for long, averaging about $4 billion a year from 1958 to 1960 under our standard accounting methods. These deficits meant, in essence, that foreign countries were accumulating more dollars than they wished to hold. As a result, they were calling on our gold in exchange for those dollars, and while our gold stock was and is large, it is not inexhaustible.

Consequently, when the Kennedy administration took office, a many sided program was launched to reduce our deficit and to protect the stability of the dollar. Four years later, in 1964, evidence had accumulated that this program was beginning to pay off in a number of directions.

Most significant, our international competitive position was beginning to benefit from our ability to maintain price stability during the current business advance, and our exports consequently have risen more than our imports. This brought our traditional trade surplus to a new record of $3.7 billion in 1964 even after excluding all shipments financed by foreign aid funds—the largest trade surplus, by the way, for any country in the world. At the same time, more and more of our foreign aid has been provided in the form of U.S. goods and services rather than dollars, sharply reducing the drain on our balance of payments from that source. Reductions in military spending abroad also have helped reduce the pressures upon our balance of payments, and important gains have been made in selling more of our military goods to our allies. Meanwhile, our income from foreign investments has risen sharply.

Taking all of these elements of improvement together, the gains from 1960 to 1964 totaled some $3.6 billion. That, as a matter of simple arithmetic, should have brought us close to balance in 1964 if all other things held unchanged, but, of course, they did not. Instead of a balance in 1964, we had a disappointingly large deficit of around $3 billion, a deficit that, coming after almost 15 years of earlier deficits, was simply too large.

The reason for the lack of overall improvement on the scale anticipated was readily apparent. The improvement in our trade position, and the reductions in the burdens of military payments and aid, was offset by an accelerating outflow of American investment to Europe and elsewhere. In 1964, this outflow of private capital, after increasing every year but one in the past 5 years, reached nearly $6.4 billion.

Clearly, foreign investment provides long-term benefits to the Nation in future earnings, as well as in its potential for strengthening the free world economy as a whole. Moreover, the world's largest and richest nations should, over the long run, be in a position to provide capital to assist the development of poorer countries. But, we simply cannot afford to transfer capital abroad in such volumes as to undermine the stability of the dollar itself.

This was the setting for President Johnson's balance-of-payments message in February, in which he presented a vigorous 10-point program for correcting our deficit. A key element in this program is the call to banks and other businesses to review their own foreign operations and voluntarily cutback on the flow of dollars abroad.

To this end, the Government has provided American banks and businesses with a set of guidelines, worked out in consultation with the business community itself, for their international transactions, including their foreign lending and investment.

I will not review these guidelines in detail, but I do think it fair to say that the first reports reflecting this voluntary program do indicate that the American business community is responding with awareness of the urgency of the problem. It is essential that no one be lulled into a false sense of security, for the success of the program will depend upon performance over a period of time, not just the first few months. But, I believe there is reason for confidence that, with the continued cooperation of the business community, this voluntary program will bring our deficit under control.

My main point today, however, is to emphasize that this kind of program to stanch the investment outflow cannot be regarded as the basic and permanent solution to our balance-of-payments problem, however necessary and successful it may be. The lasting solution must be found in forces that will be felt in the marketplace. In other words, we cannot be content until improvements in the investment climate of the United States—along with other changes at home and abroad—have persuaded both American and foreign investors to place more of their funds to work in this country on the basis of normal profit-and-loss considerations rather than appeals to patriotism. Only then can we claim a fundamental solution firmly rooted in the forces of the marketplace, the forces that, in our free enterprise society, we rely upon for guidance in making all our economic decisions.

This does not argue against, nor in any way depreciate, the importance of the present voluntary action program. The situation is such that the voluntary program is required, and the situation is such that the voluntary program will continue to be required for some time. And the continued cooperation of the business community in making the voluntary program a success is essential.

But, so long as we want to engage in mutually beneficial commerce and financial transactions with the rest of the world on the basis of free markets, we must be alert to the need to maintain a balance in our international accounts through the operation of basic market forces and incentives. That is why we must look beyond the present voluntary program—however necessary that program is now and in the period ahead—and continue our efforts to improve the climate for investment in this country. It is in this area, of course, where the efforts of your Government coincide directly with your own efforts in the invest-in-America program.

Let me review with your briefly the steps that we have taken, and are taking, in support of greater investment opportunity within the United States. In doing so, let me emphasize, too, the double-barreled benefits of an improved climate for investment for our balance-of-payments position. First of all, more dollar funds will stay home if the profitability of investments in the United States improves relative to profit on investments elsewhere, risks and other considerations being equal, and more foreign investors will want to place their funds here. That helps our balance of payments directly. Less direct, but no less important, is that more investment in modern plant and equipment means greater efficiency and productivity, and our whole export effort must rest on our ability to produce more at stable or declining costs.

Recognizing these fundamentals, the effort to improve our investment climate got underway in a serious way several years ago. The 7-percent investment credit and the depreciation rules changes were undertaken as a matter of first priority in 1962, for they directly and significantly added to the profit potential of domestic investment. The 1964 tax law extended this process by reducing the tax liability on corporate profits from 52 to 48 percent in two steps. We estimate that these reductions should increase the profitability of new corporate investment in representative types of equipment after taxes—and that is what counts—by as much as 35 percent or more.

Equally important, the general reduction in personal income taxes in 1964, and the other measures to sustain our rapid economic advance, assure markets for the added production made possible by new investment, and are key elements in the maintenance of profit margins and investment incentives.

I do not need to rely upon forecasts to make the case for these measures. Data on corporate income and profits already show that the profitability of investment in America has risen, and substantially. For example, in the fourth quarter of 1960 the after-tax profit per dollar of the sales of U.S. manufacturing concerns was 4 percent; in the fourth quarter of 1964 it was 5.4 percent, a rise of a third. At the same time, before-tax profits per dollar of sales rose by a quarter. In the same recent 4 years, the total before-tax profits of U.S. corporations increased from $41.1 billion to $57.4 billion, and their profits after-taxes increased from $20.4 billion to $31.7 billion. After tending to decline for a good many years relative to total national income, the share of profits has risen again to levels more typical of prosperous periods in the past.

I think that these figures are ammunition that you can use to good effect in your campaign to make known and understood the advantages of investing in America, and I hope that you can and will be putting them to work through the activities of your most useful organization. But I have saved for the last another small set of numbers that you may find the most useful of all, since they relate directly to the profitability of investment itself. This is the annual rate of profit upon stockholder's equity in the United States. In the final quarter of 1960, after-tax profit on stockholder's equity was 8.4 percent; 4 years later, it was 12.4 percent, a rise of very nearly one-half in this short time.

Considerations such as these, I think, should be increasingly convincing to American and foreign investors deciding where to put their funds to work over the years ahead. At the same time, we are working to remove unnecessary impediments in our tax system to foreign investors attracted to our expanding investment opportunities. As this invigorating tonic for our free enterprise system is more fully appreciated—and provided we can maintain our healthy economic advance with stable prices—market forces will greatly assist our effort to avoid excessive capital outflows in the years ahead.

This must and will be a fundamental answer to one of the most critical elements in our present balance-of-payments problem. It is an approach which necessarily takes time and effort, but it is also an approach that, in the end, will pay high dividends in time of a stronger economy at home and progress toward our goal of free trade and payments among the nations of the free world. It is an approach that you and the efforts of your organization are helping to implement as you work to preserve and strengthen our system of enterprise through greater investment at home, and bring to the attention of our younger citizens the value of investing in America.

Two-Year Colleges Provide Valuable Flexibility in Higher Education: Their Graduates Are in Great Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, recently I testified before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Education Subcommittee on S. 600, the Higher Education Act of 1965.

At that time, I urged that 2-year junior or community colleges be included for assistance under all sections of the proposed act. I pointed to the great value, growth, and potential for a strong system of 2-year institutions of higher learning.

On the front page of the Wall Street Journal's June 10 edition, I read with great interest an article by Mr. John R. Barnett which points up the flexibility of the 2-year institution, and the great demand which exists for their graduates. Mr. Speaker, I place this article at this point in the RECORD:

RECRUITERS SNAP UP JOB-TRAINED GRADS OF 2-YEAR COLLEGE—SAN FRANCISCO SCHOOL PRODUCES FLORISTS, JUNIOR ACCOUNTANTS, AND HARD-TO-GET TECHNICIANS

(By John R. Barnett)

SAN FRANCISCO.—Job recruiting at City College of San Francisco combines aspects of a commando raid and a church picnic. It's executed with lightning speed and a good time is generally had by all.

Just recently, for example, 70 recruiters representing 48 employers arrived here en masse, were treated to a cozy communal breakfast prepared by students, had a group photo taken, and then interviewed 200 job-seekers. By the next morning all had vanished—after hiring 75 students and booking dozens of others for further interviews with their personnel departments.

None of the eagerly courted prospects will get so much as a bachelor's degree in June. Instead they will be handed certificates showing they have completed City College's 2-year "semiprofessional" program, which trains students for skilled jobs in 35 classifications, ranging from many technical areas to advertising art and even ornamental horticulture.

City College is one of a growing number of the Nation's 719 2-year community or junior colleges offering such programs. They help fill a gap in the educational system by training students to function in occupational gray areas—jobs which don't often require the talents of a degree-bearing college graduate, but ordinarily call for skills and knowledge that most high schools and trade schools can't provide. The annual Recruitment Day stampede at City College indicates the strong demand for such "semipros."

COULD PLACE HUNDREDS MORE

In fact, the school comes close to guaranteeing results. "When a youngster signs up," says Dean Louis Batmale, "we make a contract with him, in effect. If he works hard for 2 years we'll find him a good job when he gets out." Says Placement Director Joseph Amori: "If I had the kids, I could place hundreds more."

Naturally, occupational training isn't all City College offers. As in other 2-year colleges, most students are enrolled in an academic, or university program, which places heavy stress on liberal arts and gives the student a start toward a major he can pursue further after he transfers to a 4-year school. But the occupational program does account for 45 percent of the student body of 7,800, and demand for its graduates is even greater than those recent 75 hirings would indicate.

For one thing, some students participating in Recruitment Day were choosy enough not to take the first job offered. One is Arlene Weitzman, a merchandising student who turned down an offer from Macy's. "I want to see what's available all over, and what I find out will eventually lead me to the right job," she says. Others, such as Ernie Wong, a civil engineering technology student, already had jobs and participated just to see what rival companies were offering.

Also, 250 other students finishing the job training program this year didn't show up for Recruitment Day. They already have lined up work or will locate it through their teachers, many of whom are fresh from industry and maintain close contacts with employers.

COURSES WEIGHTED TOWARD JOBS

The study regimen prescribed for all these occupational trainees reverses that required for students in the academic program. There's only a smidgin of liberal arts courses and electives; the total curriculum is weighted instead toward specific job areas. A student in mechanical engineering technology, for example, must take 44 credit hours of engineering courses and 3 in physics, 2 hours each of personal health and physical education, 3 of political science, and is granted only 11 hours in elective courses.

When he's through, he may work as an assistant to a graduate engineer or as a shipyard supervisor, a machine tool salesman, or an airline mechanic—all jobs that mechanical engineering graduates from City College are now doing. The school's chemistry program turns out skilled technicians who operate complex lab gear and perform experiments, leaving evaluation to graduate chemists. Another program turns out junior accountants who handle payrolls and do some auditing chores under direction from full-fledged accountants.

Job trainees are supported in their studies by a wide array of physical facilities. Horticulturists have a floral laboratory where they learn the florist's art, a workroom for ornamental horticulture, plant potting and making cuttings, and three greenhouses. The hotel and restaurant services department has its own building with classrooms for such courses as cake decorating and nutrition, and a library devoted to hotel and restaurant reference material. The scrambled eggs and sausage breakfast served to recruiters was whipped up in a big hotel-type kitchen, where students in the program also prepare all the meals regularly served in the school cafeteria and faculty dining hall.

This program prepares students to do far more than cook, illustrating the school's emphasis on the broadest possible training within relatively narrow occupational areas. "We give him a solid base of theory in the business as well as in specific skills. He can cook—but he can also be assistant manager of a restaurant, a headwaiter, a food purchaser," says Dean Batmale.

Such programs, particularly those producing skilled technicians, make City College a favorite stopping place for recruiters. "The community college is the place to find these people," says James Kain, personnel manager for Livermore Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, Calif. "I've been calling on colleges all over the place trying to convince them to expand technical training." Mr. Kain says he's halfway committed to seven or eight students he interviewed on Recruitment Day.

A recruiter for Safeway Stores, Inc., observes: "The nice thing about these kids is that they're not as sophisticated and demanding as 4-year graduates, who don't bother to tell you whether they can do anything for the company. They want to find out what the company can do for them—period. They want to be certified, guaranteed successes even before they show up for work."

All this doesn't mean that every student of City College emerges from interviews with a plum of a job offer. A few, such as Beverly Vargas, are a bit disillusioned. "I took a rough program to learn how to be a medical secretary," she says, "and I got a job paying $353 a month. But some of my friends are getting ordinary secretarial jobs for as much as $375 to $380."

Most students, however, have little to complain about. Many probably couldn't have been admitted at many of the 4-year schools they might have been interested in, or wouldn't have been able to maintain passing grades. And some probably wouldn't have been able to pay tuition. But City College accepts all high school gradutes, giving preference to those from San Francisco, and charges no tuition to California. Dropout rates are, therefore, high—up to 30 percent of the boys and 70 percent of the girls never finish their 2-year stints. For most of the others, however, the college can provide a niche in life.

"The big pressure for kids today is to get a 4-year degree," says George Stewart, head of the college's business training department. "So a lot of them keep batting their heads against this wall until someday they wake up and realize they're just not equipped to get it. What happens? They don't jump off a bridge—they just go downtown and get jobs. But they'd get better ones if they came in here and got some training first."

Jefferson Davis, Patriot and President—Memorial Day Address by Dr. R. Stuart Grizzard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on June 5, Dr. R. Stuart Grizzard, pastor of the National Baptist Memorial Church, in Washington, and previously pastor of outstanding Baptist churches in Norfolk and Richmond, delivered at the Memorial Day services, in Statuary Hall, an inspiring address entitled "Jefferson Davis, Patriot and President." I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEFFERSON DAVIS, PATRIOT AND PRESIDENT

(Address by R. Stuart Grizzard at Statuary Hall, for the District of Columbia Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, June 5, 1965)

It is not hard to find biographical facts about Jefferson Davis. His life is well delineated. He moved with quiet, competent dignity, and reserve through a controversial era. The facts about his life are easy to discern, their meaning and his inner life are harder to ascertain.

He was born in 1808 in Todd County, Ky. His advent was only a few months earlier and the place not far removed from that of his great protagonist in the irrepressible conflict of the sixties, Abraham Lincoln. Early in life he removed, with his parents to Mississippi. He was not born to the landed aristocracy but attained to it by his culture and hard work. His education was at Transylvania University and the academy at West Point where he was graduated in 1828. For 7 years thereafter he served in Army posts on the northwest frontier. He did serve in the Black Hawk War as did Abraham Lincoln. He married the daughter of then Col. Zachary Taylor, later to be President, but within 3 months was bereft. For 10 years after her death he lived the life of a Mississippi planter. In 1845 he was elected to Congress and married Varina Howell. When the Mexican War came on he resigned to command a regiment from his State of Mississippi. He served with distinction under his former father-in-law, General Taylor at the siege of Monterrey and Buena Vista. In 1847 he was appointed to fill an unexpired term in the Senate and was subsequently elected on his own. In 1851 he resigned to run for Governor of Mississippi against his senatorial colleague H. S. Foote. Davis offered as a proslavery, States righter. Foote, a Unionist, was elected by less than 1,000 votes. In 1853, when Franklin Pierce was President, Davis was his Secretary of War.

We would speak with some emphasis of his services to the United States in the Cabinet of President Pierce. He was a most efficient Secretary of War. This part of his career has never come in for the proper amount of evaluation. He was an able administrator in this responsible post. He used his influence to offset William L. Marsy, Secretary of State, who did not share Davis' States rights convictions.

In some of his views Davis was prophetic. He favored the acquisition of Cuba foreseeing that her presence 90 miles off the coast of Florida presaged danger and involvement for the United States. His motive for this probably was a desire for territory for the expansion of the States rights theory. But he was quite correct in his prediction that we might get into war with Spain over Cuba. In the Ostend Manifesto affair he opposed concessions to Spain.

He also favored U.S. expansion in the Southwest. To make a railroad to the Pacific possible he favored the Gadsden Purchase. In 1853 he sponsored expeditions to survey projected routes for railroads and recommended the southern route at the 32d parallel.

At the conclusion of his service in the Cabinet in 1857 he reentered the Senate from which he resigned in 1861 when his State seceded. He was immediately made a major general of militia.

It should be noted at this point that Jefferson Davis had no ambitions to serve in a political capacity for the Confederacy. He wanted to fight in her armies for he was by training and inclination a military man. But he was a compromise choice to head the Confederate Provisional Government at Montgomery and, of course, when the Capital was moved to Richmond he was inaugurated President of the Confederacy.

Any evaluation of his civilian role as President should be seen in the light of the stirring military days in which he served and his own frustrations at not being an active soldier though he was Commander in Chief and took seriously this aspect of his work.

How did he perform in this capacity? It is only fair to state his drawbacks and weaknesses before passing on to his many excellencies.

In contrast to Lincoln he was cold and austere personally and had little inspirational value to the Confederacy. Conscientious and sometimes grim in his attitudes, he lacked the spark of warmth except when with intimates. He tended to be pedagogical and legalistic. He lost himself in routine and details. He appeared upon occasion to be touchy and bureaucratic.

He and Vice President Alexander Stephens did not get along. Davis regarded Stephens as a defeatist and Stephens thought of Davis as a despot.

As the war progressed the good of the Confederacy demanded that the central government become more and more autocratic and the President more apparently dictatorial. This, of course, was paradoxical inasmuch as the Confederacy was formed by 12 States seeking more freedom from central government. As a consequence a strong anti-Davis faction developed among the civilian leaders of the young Nation. Davis had the impossible task of leading a struggling nation in bloody war for independence. To do this he had to exercise arbitrary power because of crisis. But the ardent States Righters could not see this as anything but an assumption of power.

Jefferson Davis had many wonderful attributes.

(1) He had a deep sense of loyalty. He did not turn his back on people because of political expediency. This is illustrated by his maintenance of Colonel Northrop in office as coordinator of supplies to the army. This worthy was actually inefficient and unbending and did not do his job well. A storm of criticism arose against him but Davis was loyal to him.

(2) He personified dignity and poise. This tended to give confidence and stability to the government.

(3) He utilized to the fullest the abilities of Judah P. Benjamin. He had him serve in three capacities in his cabinet. There were bigots who wanted to get rid of Benjamin, but Davis ably and vigorously defended him.

(4) Most important, it was Davis who made possible the rise of Robert E. Lee to command.

If he had nothing else this would have justified his presidency. When Joseph Johnston was wounded during McClellan's peninsular campaign it was Davis who gave Lee his chance to lead the Army of Northern Virginia. Subsequent events testify eloquently to the wisdom of this choice.

His arrest, incarceration in irons after the war can hardly be justified. He was the symbol of a defeated nation. There was nothing personal in what they did to him. But this must have been cold comfort to him as he lay in durance vile.

Because he was not a great military hero like Lee or martyred like Lincoln, history has not been kind to one who followed his heart's conviction to perform such services as were required of him. Today, we may, partially at least, rectify that disservice to a great statesman.

Part I—Latin Medical Aid: Our Help Is Going Astray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I was very impressed recently by an article in the Los Angeles Times, May 30, 1965, by Dr. Alex Gerber, a physician in the city of Alhambra, which I represent.

Dr. Gerber is one of those wonderful men of medicine who has contributed a part of his life working on the hospital ship *Hope* and, while it was anchored in Peruvian waters, he made some invaluable observations. Dr. Gerber has also been in southeast Asia as a visiting lecturer, is a clinical professor of surgery at the Loma Linda School of Medicine, and is a senior attending surgeon at Los Angeles County General Hospital.

I do not believe that a single Member of Congress should overlook the salient points he makes concerning our medical aid to Latin America and the fact that there is a serious flow of doctors from underdeveloped countries to the United States because of our failure to train an adequate number of physicians here. The article follows:

LATIN MEDICAL AID; OUR HELP IS GOING ASTRAY

(By Alex Gerber, M.D.)

The frustrations which plague our foreign aid efforts in Latin America can be summarized by such newspaper headlines as: "The Alliance for Progress Is Not Progressing" and "Underdeveloped Nations: How Can They Catch Up?"

Despite our housing projects and water purification plants, one is impressed by the sense of despair and utter futility in the underdeveloped areas of South America. As the economies of these countries stagnate, or improve minimally, the living standards of the developed nations climb steadily, and the gap between the "haves" and the "have nots" continues to widen.

Our failure to elevate the level of the economy in Latin America appreciably, despite a massive outlay of monetary aid, is disappointing. More perplexing is a paradoxical medical aid program which can be best described as foreign aid in reverse.

It is indeed unfortunate that our foreign aid policy in the health field has not been bold and imaginative; few categories of aid can equal the results of a well-planned medical program. The person-to-person contact inherent in a doctor-patient relationship is unsurpassed in its potential for engendering good will and enhancing our image in the eyes of the poverty stricken masses of Latin America.

The hospital ship *Hope*, while anchored in South American waters, uniquely demonstrated how skepticism, suspicion, and outright hostility could be converted to respect and warm friendship. Equally important is the role that medicine can play in stimulating to the long-term socioeconomic growth which President Kennedy stressed as vital to the progress of undeveloped countries when he launched the Alliance for Progress.

The staggering health problems of the undeveloped nations of Latin America border on the chaotic. The problem basically stems from an absolute shortage and maldistribution of medical personnel.

Peru (a country which I can discuss from personal observation) has a doctor: population ratio of 1 per 2,300 (1 per 740 in the United States). This ratio assumes its proper perspective upon an analysis of the distribution of Peruvian physicians. Lima, with less than 20 percent of the nation's population, is served by more than 70 percent of its doctors. Thus, Lima has 1 doctor for every 460 persons, while the rural districts contend with ratios of 1 doctor per 20,000 or 40,000, or even 100,000 population.

With such an appalling lack of medical attention, it is not surprising that the infant mortality rates in wide areas of undeveloped countries are 5 to 10 times higher than in the United States. Further, it is obvious that social injustice in the outlying areas leads to unrest among the impoverished and leaves a fertile field for the violent political upheavals.

The lack of hospitals and medical facilities, the absence of suitable educational opportunities for children, and the rugged living conditions make it extremely unlikely that trained doctors will voluntarily work in the underdeveloped parts of underdeveloped countries. To expect such a migration in the future is to assume a degree of devotion to country and dedication of purpose which have not manifested themselves to date.

As I shall point out, there is a more appealing alternative for those who are faced with an oversupply of doctors and an undersupply of paying patients in the urban centers of Latin America.

The United States has participated in an ambitious program of medical foreign aid since World War II. The bulk of our money in this field has been invested in such public health measures as malaria eradication and water purification. These projects, carried out with the cooperation of the World Health Organization, the Pan American Health Organization, and the United Nations Children's Fund, have significantly improved health standards. Latin American has certainly benefited by diminution of human suffering, while sharing in the reduction of cases of malaria from a worldwide total of 350 million to 100 million in the past 15 years.

However, meaningful benefits from these death control measures can only be realized if accompanied by birth control policies that will maintain the population at a reasonable level.

Preventing death from dysentery in a young woman is obviously commendable; the impact of this humanitarian act is less apparent as we watch her give birth to 14 children, 7 of whom will die before the age of 5.

Does this substitution of seven deaths for one death constitute an act of compassion? And the seven who live, only to wallow in the mire of poverty for the remainder of their lives, how does their existence fit into the World Health Organization's definition of "health" as "a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being, and not merely the absence of disease?"

The latest report of the U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization shows a drop in agricultural production in South American of 2 percent in 1962–63. In the face of the highest population growth rates in the world, this adds up to increasing food shortages and malnutrition among the poor.

The lack of success in solving the most basic of human problems, hunger, while the death rate has been reduced without a concomitant attack on the birth rate, stamps our public health measures in Latin America as shortsighted. Should this policy be continued, not only will all foreign aid be nullified, but widespread famine will surely be encountered in the relatively near future.

It is not generally known that family planning clincs have been enthusiastically received wherever introduced in Latin America.

Other Agency for International Development health funds are budgeted for technical assistance projects. These are designed to help underdeveloped nations obtain a self-sustaining status; there can be no argument with this fundamental concept. Too often, however, our technical assistance programs are poorly implemented so that the stress is on health service rather than on medical education.

Technical assistance programs providing medical services are wasteful of human resources. These efforts have immediate propaganda appeal, but do not contribute importantly to the ultimate function of foreign aid—the stimulation of social and economic growth. The expenditure, for example, of $1.6 million on mobile hospital units to roam the jungles of Costa Rica can only raise the level of health in this area to a minor degree.

Working in an area with the highest population growth rate in Latin America, these mobile hospitals will find larger waiting lists for medical care at the conclusion of the 7-year program than at its inception. Service projects are self-defeating because of the inexorable pressures of population growth. Short-term impact projects, although necessary, can only be meaningful if accompanied and coordinated with long-range programs designed to educate the underdeveloped countries to help themselves.

LACK OF PLANNING

A minor portion of AID funds is directed toward medical education, but this effort suffers from lack of long-range planning and too much diversity. A neurosurgeon in Iran, a cardiac surgery team in Pakistan, and an understaffed medical school project in Indonesia are representative of sporadic endeavors which promise meager health dividends for these countries. This has been a criticism leveled at educational technical assistance in fields other than medicine.

Educator Frank Bowles voiced this feeling to the American Council on Education when he stated, "They are not used as universities, but are necessarily employed piecemeal—a school librarianship here, a public administration there, agriculture somewhere else. In piecemeal operations they rarely command the best administrative talents, or the best teachers from the parent organization."

Harold Everson of AID, speaking to the Association of Governing Boards, disclosed that AID had 118 contracts with 69 universities to provide various types of technical assistance to 37 countries. He continued, "The American university contribution is impressive in its variety; it is less impressive in its impact."

MOUNTING PROBLEM

Curiously, an adequate medical foreign aid program is inextricably bound to a mounting health problem in the United States—a severe shortage of locally trained doctors. The growing shortage of physicians in this country has been insidious and responsible people in the health field have only recently become alarmed by the statistics. The current physician-population ratio is 146.7 physicians per 100,000 Americans—a proportion exceeded by some dozen nations, several of which are behind the Iron Curtain.

Any apparent gain in the physician-population ratio is illusory due to the changing pattern of medical practice. An enlarging number of doctors are engaged in activities outside their private practice—research, administration, and teaching. The size of the private practice group has diminished from 86 percent in 1931 to 63 percent in 1964, or a net shrinkage of 23 percent in the past 33 years.

The problem has been compounded, moreover, by the recently increased requirements for medical care occasioned by higher incomes, health insurance, and more public awareness of health needs—the explosion of demand.

The shortage of doctors in the United States is becoming more acute every year. The physician population is now increasing by 4,500 each year, based upon the number of licentiates minus the number of deaths.

Projecting physician and population increases into the future, and allowing for proposed expansion of medical school facilities, we shall be hard pressed to maintain the current physician to population ratio. Published plans fall far short of furnishing the 4,000 additional freshmen places in medical schools that will be required by 1971 to support our population growth; of necessity, we are resorting to a more expedient solution.

SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS

To alleviate the local shortage of doctors we simply import them from other countries, an appreciable number from underdeveloped areas of the world. Of the 8,283 physicians duly licensed to practice in the United States in 1963, graduates of foreign medical schools (exclusive of Canada) numbered 1,451. As noted previously, the current annual addition to the doctor population is 4,500, of whom 30 percent are foreign trained (again excluding Canada).

The trend of the influx of doctors into this country is even more dismaying. Foreign graduates accounted for 5 percent of the total who passed medical licensing examinations in 1950. In 1963 this rate had risen to 17 percent. At present, 24 percent of our hospital house staffs are comprised of foreign graduates. In New Jersey, 67 percent of the interns and residents are graduates of foreign medical schools. A large percentage of these trainees come from underdeveloped countries and are destined to practice in the United States.

The "brain drain" from England, although well publicized, has caused no great hardship, since England, in turn, has been importing scientists from other members of the Commonwealth, where working conditions are less satisfactory.

But how do we justify the drain of doctors from backward nations, struggling with as few as one doctor per 10,000 people, while we pump aid into these areas "to stimulate social and economic growth?" Certainly, the young Latin American medic, frustrated by lack of facilities to exercise his talents at home, has compelling reasons to migrate to the United States, where the law of supply and demand insures professional gratification and financial reward.

ECONOMIC LOSS

In 1963, approximately 25 percent of the foreign trained licentiates in medicine were graduates of Latin American schools (exclusive of Cuba). Despite the glaring lack of medical care in the Sierras of Peru, more than one-fourth of the entire Peruvian output of doctors in 1963 took the United States licensure examination, and 26 doctors passed.

The flow of doctors from underdeveloped countries to the United States represents a far greater immediate and future economic loss than we repay by medical foreign aid. This policy can be legitimately criticized as "foreign aid in reverse."

Economic Inequities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11, 1965

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I have recently had called to my attention an article on economic inequities which appeared in one of Nevada's leading daily newspapers, the Las Vegas Review-Journal. The article is written by an economist, Mr. William D. Pardridge, formerly with the University of Chicago and now a resident of Nevada.

While I do not necessarily endorse all of Mr. Pardridge's conclusions, I believe that they are worthy of the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Las Vegas (Nev.) Review-Journal, May 23, 1965]

ECONOMIC INEQUITIES: BASIS OF ECONOMY

(By William D. Pardridge)

No private enterprise economic system can operate without a free market where goods are bought and sold on a competitive basis. Similarly, the American free enterprise economy cannot operate without an open market where its productive forces are bought and sold on a competitive basis.

Communication and transportation over hundreds of years have created the stock market as the central marketplace of the buyers and sellers of those factories and plants that make the goods by which we live. In America, the largest by far of these central markets is the New York Stock Exchange.

It is in the NYSE, the economic core market, that the producers of our material civilization are bought and sold in parts and parcels by those citizens and groups of citizens whose savings and profits create our economic growth.

Real economic production and growth does not stem from side-issue, shortrun, profit ventures—like real estate booms, gold mines, or pizza parlors—rather, it stems from the real goods and essential services of our material civilization.

But last year the common stock yields, the dividends paid to investors on the NYSE, our core market, was at a 25-year low of 3.3 percent.

Whatever the Government sources of either party—or the professors—say about the increase of our gross national product, it is an economic impossibly for it to be in the long run greater than the interest rate on invested productive capital; because this interest rate is that increase.

Yet the latest Annual Report of the (President's) Council of Economic Advisers States that "gross national product (GNP) for the year as a whole (1964) exceeded that of 1963 by 6½ percent."

But the NYSE median yield for 1963 exceeded 1964, the very reverse. Yield for 1963 was 3.6 percent, and yield for 1964 was 3.3 percent. Now how about that.

War production, moon races, and man-permitted inflation may camouflage and falsify our gross national product—but they cannot increase it.

There can be no economic growth greater than some productive capital interest rates—if the domestic military production (which is not a part of gross national economic product) and foreign aid are included—but only when Government instead of true private enterprise directs the expenditures of business profits. This, then, ceases to be a free enterprise or private enterprise economy.

Over the centuries of economic man, the interest rate has remained about the same when its fluctuations are related to those of general prices. The reason for this is that prices are absolute and interest rates are proportional. High prices on the NYSE are not favorable economic indicators unless the interest rate, or yield, also is high.

Last year this aggregate interest rate hit a 25-year low of 3.3 percent.

No amount of bootstrap inflation, no amount of manufactured money, can do anything except lower the 3.3 percent rate. Then what?

The far out economists talk of interest rates other than those of producers of our real goods and useful services. They talk about bond rates, bank rates, consumer loan rates, and when in doubt, general rates. All these are second-cousin rates, every one of them depending in the last analysis on whether or not John has not enough money but enough purchasing power—and there's a whale of a difference—to buy what Fred provides in the way of goods and services.

John's purchasing power is reflected in the 25-year low of 3.3 percent in America's central industrial market—and it isn't much. So Fred doesn't do so well, either, but everybody's getting more and more money—even the people who don't work at all get the stuff.

Workers get paid when they don't work, and farmers get paid when they don't farm. And last year one radio announcer in a public service broadcast told you to save through Government bonds at the same time another official public service announcement told you to spend your tax cut! What tax cut?

Disregard of an economic inequity such as the 25-year low of a 3.3-percent return on central market common stocks alongside vast uneconomic expenditures invites disaster. And with that disaster goes your own free right and choice of work—with or without a union card—because you then enter not an old-fashioned depression but a functional economy.

That's a technical term meaning to do as you're told.

Academic Honor, Political Burden: A Deserving Tribute to Carl Elliott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my tribute today to a man whose political courage is a matter of public record. Carl Elliott never failed to stand firmly on his convictions. By his forthright challenge of extremist elements in this country he has placed us all in his debt. I am taking this opportunity to share with my colleagues the thoughts expressed in the following article which serves to illustrate Carl Elliott's contributions to educational opportunity for all American citizens:

ACADEMIC HONOR, POLITICAL BURDEN

(By Ann Cottrell Free)

The man who helped to open the "schoolhouse door" to 750,000 students has not been completely forgotten during these June days when universities are bestowing their accolades for excellence. But, ironically, when the president of Tufts University in Medford, Mass., handed an honorary degree of doctor of laws on Sunday to the tallest, gangliest political man since the days of Abraham Lincoln or "Kissin' Jim" Folsom, its recipient, Carl Elliott, accepted, in the opinion of some, another political albatross.

For the degree was for political courage as well as for his support of higher education while in Congress. The citation noted that the former Alabama Congressman "refused to campaign on a platform of racism when such a platform ran counter to his concept of responsible leadership."

Being loved and admired by the folks in the land of the Kennedys, Mrs. Peabody and Harriet Beecher Stowe will never win votes in the Alabama of Governor Wallace or Sheriff Jim Clark. And Mr. Elliott, his friends believe, will be seeking votes in Alabama again—perhaps for the governorship. They remind that other notable Elliott honors in the past—a seat on the powerful Rules Committee and the friendship and admiration of the late John Kennedy—proved to be members of the albatross family.

But Elliott is aware of all that. He is convinced that the albatross in this case is a better bird to swear by than the white rooster of white racial supremacy that adorns all ballots in Alabama.

Elliott never paused to worry about political liabilities when Tufts notified him months ago of its decision. He had taken his stand in the fall of 1963 and put his career on the line when he gave his view of John Birchers and rightwing extremists: "They are loudmouthed know-nothings whom Thomas Jefferson would have dismissed as intellectual nit-wits and whom Jackson probably would have horsewhipped."

Alabama's population is growing slowly, and the 1960 census cost the State one congressional seat. The State had spasms of indecision for several years over redistricting. But finally the problem was solved by the at-large Democratic primary. Voters in the black belt could pass judgment on men from the TVA and hill country. Anything could happen. A few days before the voters went to the polls, more than 100,000 sample ballots were distributed throughout the State to guide the people on how to vote. They bore the slogan, "Stand Up for Alabama," made popular by Governor Wallace. And Elliott's name was left off.

Elliott's "liberal" stamp had to be stamped out. Forgotten were the contributions to education made by this first son of 9 children of a Franklin County dirt farmer. Elliott, who had entered the University of Alabama at age 16 with $2.50 in his pocket, had authored with Senator LISTER HILL of Alabama the National Defense Education Act to help students go to college. From 1958 to 1964, 750,000 student loans were made—17,000 to Alabamians. It was as if Elliott, 10 feet tall, had also stood in a "schoolhouse door," but with arms outstretched and calling "Y'all come."

John F. Kennedy may have seen the political handwriting on the wall and may have wanted to spare him the pain of defeat at the polls. He offered him a Federal judgeship. But Elliott, who had made 220 speeches for Kennedy in Alabama in 1960, declined. He preferred to continue his struggle to bring his people back politically into the Union.

Education, he still believes, is the key. When he was born 50 years ago, one of every 12 white persons was illiterate and 1 of every 4 Negroes. Tremendous progress has been made. Without education people cannot communicate, he stresses. And the best communications contain words that convey truth—"not shopworn phraseology and safe catch phrases for a leader to hide behind."

He told the graduating class at Florence (Ala.) State College last week that most Alabama political speeches would be void of substance if a dozen words and phrases were removed. They are: "Segregation, integration, States rights, Federal power, conservative, liberal, moderate, violence, law and order, Central Government, and sovereign State."

The class listened attentively. One of its members, Wendell Wilkie Gunn, was the second Negro student to graduate from a "white" Alabama college.

One June day in the future Carl Elliott may be able to tell an Alabama graduating class that the bird everyone thought was an albatross, in reality, was a phoenix—arisen, live and kicking, from the ashes.

Padre Island National Seashore Offers Many Treasures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have often lauded the many surprises and treasures of the newest national seashore, Padre Island; but today this island can make a claim that probably no other national seashore can make.

Although almost every island has a legend of buried treasure, Padre Island is one of the few that has reinforced that claim time and time again by turning up coins and other treasures. Since these treasures were not an integral part of the reasons for my urging that this island be made a national seashore, I do think Congress should be informed that it got a fringe benefit of treasure, along with its wise decision to make Padre Island a national seashore.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Treasure Hunters Find Padre Island Fertile Grounds," from the May 30, 1965, Wichita Falls Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURE HUNTERS FIND PADRE ISLAND FERTILE GROUNDS

CORPUS CHRISTI.—The prospectors are pouring in again on Padre Island. This time the metal detector brigade is after silver.

The latest pilgrimage was prompted in March when a Corpus Christi housewife returned from a weekend of beachcombing with 19 old Spanish silver coins. Of even more interest was a round metal bar which has been determined to be silver, also. The bar weighs about 1½ pounds.

A persistent legend of buried treasure attaches itself to any island, but through the years Padre has reinforced this story. During the years of her New World conquest, the Spaniards annually sent a great flotilla, loaded with treasure, back to the mother country, and, as their sailings often coincided with the hurricane season, millions of dollars worth of gold and jewels disappeared into the gulf. During the 1800's, authentic records tell of dozens of ships which went down in the vicinity of the island, many loaded with coins, bullion, and jewels.

For many years, Padre Island was the headquarters of smugglers, freebooters, and sand pirates, who lured ships to their doom by showing false lights along the shore. Much of the loot from these ships was buried, and never recovered.

During the Civil War Capt. John Singer, who following a shipwreck had set up residence on the island, raised cattle, and buried a treasure on the island while escaping Federal troops. Returning after the war he found that the wind and tides had rearranged the dunes, and his treasure remains buried somewhere on the island.

Following nearly every turbulence in the gulf, the dunes are reshaped, and coins are

found. Also located recently on the island are the remains of a marine cannon carriage, the tongue of a carriage, the hull of an ancient sailing schooner, and a bucket full of large square nails.

The housewife's take wasn't limited to coins. Included in the loot was the remnants of a metal sword scabbard. While many take metal detectors, the majority of the discoveries of Padre step over these things without knowing what they are.

Since Padre is the Nation's new national seashore it appears that more and more treasure-seekers will be forthcoming, along with the swimmers, campers, and fishermen.

Its probable some of the choice treasures of Padre will not be taken by a treasure-hunter, but by a casual vacationer who may casually pick up an object which could lead to a king's ransom.

Complete information on Padre, and the national seashore, may be procured by writing the Tourist Bureau, Box 1147, Corpus Christi.

Latin Medical Aid: Doctor Drain Top Challenge for U.S. Program—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Alex Gerber, a physician now in private practice in Alhambra, Calif., which I represent, recently wrote two articles for the Los Angeles Times. I call the attention of my colleagues to the second of these articles at this time, which appeared on June 6, 1965, and Dr. Gerber's most important analysis of the effects of the shortage of doctors in this country as it relates to Latin America. I have previously inserted the first of these two articles in the RECORD.

Part II is as follows:

LATIN AID: DOCTOR DRAIN TOP CHALLENGE FOR U.S. PROGRAM

(By Alex Gerber, M.D.)

The "cold war" has conditioned us to compare our every effort with Russia's experiences in the same field. In the field of medicine the comparison is interesting.

With a physician: population ratio of 1 to 500 (surpassed only by Israel), Russia needs no outside help for adequate health coverage. More importantly, the Soviets graduate 20,000 per year, while we graduate 7,000. As we struggle to keep our "medical heads above water," the Russians can literally flood the underdeveloped nations with doctors.

The quality of Russian medicine, on the average, is not as high as ours, but this is of no consequence in the foreign aid field. Their doctors will look impressive, indeed, vis-a-vis the witch doctors of Africa and the herb dispensers of southeast Asia.

We may be awakened as rudely as we were by sputnik when the Soviets exploit their surplus of doctors by exporting them to the emergent nations. Russia has been paying increasing attention to medical care and hospital facilities in its foreign aid program.

PROJECT IN NEPAL

The Agency for International Development has not attempted hospital construction and staffing on the magnitude of the Russian enterprises in southeast Asia. Recently they completed a comprehensive medical project in Nepal. This concrete hospital has a water purification plant, outpatient department, X-ray equipment, clinical laboratory, operating suites, physiotherapy facilities, and ambulance. The Soviets have provided a full-time medical staff including two surgeons, two pediatricians, one radiologist, one medical specialist, and one pathologist. They have also supplied nurses and maintenance technicians.

This is a far cry from our amateurish effort to build a hospital in Costa Rica. Under the direction of a Peace Corps volunteer, who was an elementary school teacher, an old two-story building was converted into a hospital and furnished with hand-me-downs. Not a single American full-time doctor or nurse was available for staffing. The story of the financing of this project by nickel and dime contributions, grease pole contests, and pizza sales is too pitiful to be recounted.

Russia, with its huge output of physicians, can greatly increase this phase of its foreign aid program without impairing the level of health care at home. At the same time, the medical schools under construction or planned in the United States will scarcely turn out sufficient graduates to cope with our population growth.

THE RUSSIAN IMAGE

As the Peace Corps attempts, with little prospect of success, to recruit 500 doctors for its worldwide program, the Soviets apparently have no problem in placing 500 physicians in 1 underdeveloped country—Algeria.

We can only look on hopelessly at Russia's farsightedness in preparing to present an image of humanitarianism in its concern for the health needs of underdeveloped nations. Frustratingly, we cannot catch up as quickly as we did in rocketry following Sputnik. From the time a medical school is first planned, 10 years usually elapse before the first class grad ıates.

To develop a medical foreign aid program that will yield impressive short- and long-range results, a two-pronged effort on a considerable scale will be required. The stakes are high, and some risks must be taken. But as Hubert Humphrey has said, "The Alliance has made a few hits; it has managec to get some men on base. But it badly needs some runs, and it ought to be prepared to take a few chances to get them."

Diluted, picayunish attempts are doomed to fail. Thus, at the outset, our program should be aimed at Latin America almost exclusively, for by no stretch of the imagination does the United States have the financial or human resources to preform adequately in the area of medical foreign aid if we shoulder the health problems of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

With medical personnel in such short supply, we simply cannot afford the "global overextension" that Walter Lippmann has decried as detrimental to our foreign policies.

Obviously, no imaginative medical foreign aid program can be undertaken so long as there is a shortage of doctors in the United States, and we continue to import Latin American medics. Only the most ambitious medical school construction "crash program" can have any hope of graduating physicians in ample quantity to implement a teaching project in Latin America.

TREMENDOUS LIABILITY

A medical school is a tremendous financial liability, and it is unrealistic to assume that our universities, beset as they are with money problems, will embark on an ambitious schedule of medical school expansion; the magnitude and cost of this task brings it into the domain of the Federal Government. The most vociferous opponents of Federal aid to education would not argue this point when faced with the millions of dollars involved.

Paralleling the program to eliminate the domestic doctor shortage, we must institute a policy of realistic Latin American medical foreign aid, oriented toward alleviating the health problem created by the lack and maldistribution of physicians and auxiliary personnel. The emphasis must be on teaching rather than service.

A SLIGHT DENT

Simply put, if I operated from morning to night for the next 10 years in the highlands of Peru, I would make only a slight dent in the surgical waiting list. But if I spent only 3 years teaching 10 Peruvians to operate, and if these 10 would each train 10 more surgeons in the following 3 years, and if the resultant 100 surgeons would each train * * *

This "teach the teacher" approach is the only logical method to elevate an underdeveloped country to self-dependency. This philosophy has obvious application in fields other than medicine. It can all be summed up in that old Chinese proverb, "Give a man a fish, and he can eat for a day; teach a man how to fish, and he can eat for the rest of his life."

Gaston Palowski, French minister of state for scientific research, agreed with this concept when he criticized technical assistance programs as unproductive and advocated "training men locally who, in turn, would spread technical know-how around them. Training the trainers is undoubtedly one of the most urgent needs if we are to make the earliest possible use of latent intellectual resources of the underprivileged countries."

Harold Evarson of AID was similarly explicit concerning the necessity for deemphasizing the foreign student program in the United States in favor of developing strong educational systems in underdeveloped countries so that the students can have quality education at home.

WORK OPPORTUNITIES

In the field of medical education, this course of action assumes greater importance. The Latin American doctors who migrate to the United States for postgraduate study have little inclination to return home when they awaken to the vast opportunities created in this country by the deficiency of locally-trained physicians.

An increased output of skilled technicians in any category becomes meaningless if improper planning leads to lack of work opportunities. The level of health in underdeveloped countries can only be raised by trained doctors if proper facilities are available for patient care; hospitals are indispensable. Hospital construction in rural areas is a proper function of U.S. foreign aid, if correlated with a training program. It must be mandatory for trainees to staff those outlying hospitals for several years. This time could possibly substitute for military service.

DISBURSING FEATURE

The compulsory feature is disturbing, but such rural service would differ slightly from the obligatory Army requirements of West Point graduates and would repay in only small measure the time, effort, and money expended for training people to hold positions of high qualifications. Mexico has such a compulsory system, and is meeting the health demands of the rural population.

Of prime importance, these community hospitals could render total obstetrical care, which, in its fullest sense, includes family planning and birth control. No significant development of poor countries with limited technical skills can take place unless top priority is given to controlling the "population explosion."

Since human considerations preclude an increase of the death rate by discontinuance of public health measures, population control can only be attained by decreasing the birth rate. Initial steps have been taken in some areas of Latin America. In Chile, where one out of three pregnancies ends in a criminal abortion, birth control clinics have been established with government and church approval.

The important role of birth control in elevating socioeconomic standards cannot be too strongly stressed. Community hospital health centers could play a determining part in introducing this information to the rural areas where the need is most desperate.

There are those who insist that population growth will automatically be checked as the populace becomes educated so that no energetic attempts at birth control are necessary in areas with high literacy rates. The speciousness of this argument is demonstrated by the experience in Ceylon, which is catastrophically confronted with rampant inflation, rising unemployment, and rural unrest. The Ceylonese are 85-percent literate, but cannot cope with a 2.8-percent population gain while the economy grows at an annual rate of 0.8 percent.

In summary, the program that I have outlined would first eliminate the doctor shortage in the United States. In the foreign field, this plan would train Latin Americans in their own environment, would provide medical care in the rural areas where health services are now almost nonexistent, and would introduce birth control clinics in districts where they are distressingly needed.

BOLDNESS REQUIRED

Moreover, we would be sending men and materials to Latin America instead of money. This is an important consideration, for I have seen with what contempt intelligent Latin Americans view foreign aid that lines the pockets of the wealthy, without demonstrably helping the poor.

What I advocate will require boldness, but we have fed the patient aspirin long enough when an operation is indicated. As a matter of fact, we have dissipated enough money on aspirin to pay for several operations.

The item of money raises a question. The cost of sending a man to the moon is considerably more than the financial requirements of the entire program outlined above. Which project will contribute more to mankind at this time—the moon shot or medical aid to underdeveloped countries? One wonders.

In the meantime, as we drain skilled medical personnel from underdeveloped countries and thus obviate the necessity for building sufficient medical schools in the United States, I ask: "In the field of medical foreign aid, who is helping whom?"

California State Senate Backs President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the entire membership of the Senate of the State of California has authored and adopted a resolution urging "all Americans to unite in support of our President's bipartisan policies" in the Far East and Latin America.

Unanimous action by this bipartisan body of distinguished Americans further affirms the fact of widespread support to President Johnson and his conduct of the foreign affairs of this Nation.

I commend the members of the California State Senate for their objectivity in setting an excellent example in times as difficult as these.

The San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, in an editorial dated June 2, 1965, comments further on the action taken by the State senate.

The text of the resolution and the editorial follows:

CALIFORNIA SENATE RESOLUTION 198

Resolution relative to supporting President Lyndon B. Johnson

Whereas the people of California, both by tradition and proximity, are deeply concerned and affected by events in the Pacific basin and Latin America; and

Whereas aggression in the Far East and Latin America has brought the Nation to another decisive point in world affairs demanding firm, thoughtful leadership in the interest of world peace and security in the bipartisan pattern required in periods of peril: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the California State Senate commends and supports President Lyndon B. Johnson for his courageous, firm, patient efforts to guide American policies and actions in the Pacific and in Latin America in order to achieve peace and the successful defense of freedom; and be it further

Resolved, That the California State Senate urges all Americans to unite in support of our President's bipartisan policies to achieve peace with honor in all areas of the world.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the Senate of the State of California on May 24, 1965.

J. A. BEEK,
Secretary of the Senate.

[From the San Francisco News Call Bulletin, June 2, 1965]

THE STATE SENATE BACKS JOHNSON

Last May 24 the California State Senate unanimously approved a resolution which, for all its significance, created something less than a stir among the day's news offerings.

The resolution, shorn of "whereases," stated simply that the senate supports President Johnson's policies in Vietnam and Latin America and called upon all Americans to do likewise.

The reason the statement was approved unanimously was that it was coauthored by every 1 of the 39 State senators now serving.

The two lead-off authors are the senate's two party leaders—Republican McCarthy and Democrat Burns. The bipartisan aspect of the resolution is emphasized by the fact that the name of Minority Leader McCarthy leads all the rest.

The names of the other senators that follow range across the political spectrum from liberal Democrats to conservative Republicans.

"Aggression in the Far East and Latin America has brought the Nation to another decisive point in world affairs * * * demanding firm, thoughtful leadership in the interest of world peace * * *," the senators declared.

"The California State Senate * * * supports President Johnson in his courageous, firm and patient efforts to guide American policies * * * to achieve peace."

We believe this expression of counterviews is a helpful offset to those put forth in the recent 30-hour protest at UC. It comes from the people's elected representatives, who much answer for their position at election time.

Our own view of the UC teach-in—or whatever it may be called—was within the framework of the American right of dissent and to debate public issues freely. But we did not and do not think much of the hootenanny air around it.

The President himself, in his commencement address at the National Cathedral School for Girls, in Washington, Tuesday, put strong emphasis on the value of democratic discussion, but did make this eminently practical point:

"Let no citizen, secure in his own liberty, forget how precious it is, how brave we must be to keep it, how many generations of men have perished to guard its light, and how many are dying still."

If this reminder needed illumination, it is provided by the letter from five UC graduates, now naval officers on the carrier *Midway*, off Vietnam.

They understandably are unhappy over the events transpiring at their alma mater and refer to its "tarnished image."

The ever-present danger of loudly proclaimed criticism of Government policy is that our enemies may take it for weakening of the national will.

Such statements as those of the State senate and the combat officers serve as valuable rebuttals.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., *Calif*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, John, *Ala*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr* — 1200 S. Courthouse Rd., Arlington, Va.
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*
Clawson, Del, *Calif*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C* — 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1705 Longworth House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Edwards, Don, *Calif*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., *Pa*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa* — 301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn* — 119 7th St. SE.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 3424 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Howard, James J., *N.J*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hungate, William L., *Mo*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

The President's Rent Supplement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times carried an editorial in today's issue commenting on the housing bill, H.R. 7984. While it does not express complete satisfaction with the bill reported by the committee, largely on the grounds that the administration's "new towns" proposal was eliminated, it does constitute an endorsement of the bill.

The comments on the rent supplement proposal are particularly interesting. The Times notes that "For no valid reason the rental subsidy program has become the focus of controversy." The newspaper clearly endorses this section of the bill.

Today's issue also carries a letter to the editor which I wrote in rebuttal to an earlier article by Arthur Krock. His article had been based almost entirely on the now discredited minority report on the housing bill. Because of the partisan nature of that report, it is obviously an inadequate basis for understanding President Johnson's rent supplement program. In fact, the minority report was so distorted that the Committee on Banking and Currency felt it necessary to issue a special committee print entitled "Correction of Misleading and False Statements Concerning Rent Supplement Program Made in Minority Report on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965." I hope all of my colleagues will take the brief time to read that committee report so that they will have an accurate understanding of this proposal which President Johnson has called "the most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city."

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, June 14, 1965]

THE HOUSING BILL

The administration's housing bill, scheduled for action in the House this week and cleared by a subcommittee in the Senate, rates two cheers. Although it contains several solid and useful programs, its drafters were content with old answers to old problems. These answers are good but not sufficient.

In any housing bill several interests compete for supremacy. Since new housing starts are one of the chief props of the economy and since the Federal Government through its mortgage insurance and loan programs is deeply involved in the private housing industry, a strong interest—and as usual this year the dominant one—is to keep an important sector of the economy operating at a high rate.

A second interest is to clear slums and help low-income families find better housing. A third interest is the effort of cities to save their blighted downtown business districts and, through urban renewal, develop a new tax base. And, finally, in recent years there has grown up a strong if diffuse interest in making both cities and suburbs more livable by providing green spaces, better planning and coherent "new towns" rather than mere bedroom suburbs.

It is not astonishing that these interests are often in conflict. The present bill resolves this tangle in the usual way—everybody gets something, but the strongest interests get the biggest shares. The bill continues FHA operations without change. It steps up spending for urban renewal over the next 4 years. It provides for the construction of 35,000 units of public housing a year during the same period.

The original "new towns" proposal has been badly mangled, but survives in part. The cause of environmental conservation is modestly served (title 8) by permitting cities to participate in the existing open spaces program, restricted up to now to undeveloped areas. But not many parks and malls are going to be created if the present low limits of $500,000 per project and $20 million for this program are maintained.

For no valid reason the rental subsidy program has become the focus of controversy. Since housing of all kinds already receives innumerable subsidies, there is nothing novel or immoral about this proposal. It would merely enable the Federal Government to pay to nonprofit housing corporations—not private landlords—the difference between the true economic rent and the artificial rent, which would be set at one-quarter of the tenant's income.

The idea's chief merit is that it offers an alternative to public housing, which in many cities has become immobilized by local political quarrels. Since churches, unions, cooperatives and other private groups as well as private lenders would be involved in the formation of these limited-dividend corporations, this approach might win broader community support than public housing now enjoys. Such corporations would also be freer to experiment in new types of construction to get away from the ghettolike towers that prevail in public housing projects because of cost limitations.

But this bill makes little headway against the bull-dozing of salvageable neighborhoods and the failure to rehouse all those who are displaced, which are the two bad sides of urban renewal. This bill, notwithstanding its public housing and rent subsidy programs, will leave tens of thousands of families in every large city still living in slums. Through its truncated "new towns" program and its modest extension of the "open spaces" program, the bill makes only the most tentative foray against urban sprawl and planlessness.

[From the New York Times, June 14, 1965]

RENT SUPPLEMENT FOR LOW-INCOME GROUPS

To the EDITOR:

The May 27 article by Arthur Krock of the Times was highly critical of President Johnson's proposed rent-supplement plan for low-income families. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Housing, I feel an obligation respectfully to disagree with Mr. Krock so that your readers will have a balanced picture of this important new plan which the President has called "the most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city."

Mr. Krock quotes extensively from the minority report on the housing bill signed by eight Republican members of the committee (two other highly respected Republicans, WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey and SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York, voted for rent supplements).

The minority report is written quite frankly as an attack on this proposal and naturally gives a very one-sided point of view, one which I believe is unfair and misleading. As Mr. Krock himself noted, the irresponsible cry of "socialism" is "a doctrinal attack."

PRIVATE HOUSING

The rent-supplement plan is essentially quite simple. The housing would be privately built, privately financed, and privately owned. It would be rental and cooperative housing financed under Federal Housing Administration section 221(d)(3). The sponsors would be private nonprofit or limited dividend corporations or cooperatives.

The families to be aided would be those whose incomes are so low that they cannot afford decent housing by paying not more than one-fourth of their total income, and who are elderly or handicapped, displaced by Government action, or now living in slum housing. The aid would be the difference between one-fourth of their income which they would pay as rent and the fair market rental on the unit, and the supplement payments would end when the family's income rose to the point where it could pay the rent on its own.

There are too many distortions in the minority report to go into all of them here. As one example, it is charged that the proposal would "kill the incentive of the American family" to improve its circumstances. In support of this claim, the statement says that no family making $3,000 a year would aspire to purchase their own modest $7,500 home, but would instead seek to be a renter in a $100 a month apartment for which the Federal Government would pay $37.50 while the family paid only $62.50.

FALSE ASSUMPTION

The fallacy of this argument lies in the assumption that a $7,500 house is available for purchase by a family earning $3,000 in the same community where $100 a month is the rent required for a decent unit. In this hypothetical community where a good home could be bought for $7,500, no rent supplement would be available for families earning $3,000.

On the other hand, in communities where decent housing could only be obtained for $100 a month, the rent supplement program would enable the family to occupy a good unit with only 25 percent of its modest income instead of 40 percent.

I see nothing in this very promising proposal to justify the extravagant alarm of those who have singled it out for attack. It would add to the supply of decent housing available to low-income families. It would take advantage of the energy and imagination of public spirited citizens—churches, cooperatives, and the thousands of civic organizations—who are deeply concerned about slums.

And it would offer low-income families a healthy third choice to the alternative of slums or regular public housing.

WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Housing.

WASHINGTON, *June 1, 1965.*

Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last June 10—page A3005 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—I had printed in the RECORD an inspiring baccalaureate sermon by the dean of the chapel at Princeton University, Dr. Ernest Gordon, in which he stressed the national trend toward materialism and loss of faith.

That confirmed the observation, by the great British statesman, Edmund Burke, that nations do not learn by experience, because the same theme was discussed in a baccalaureate sermon to a Princeton class, in 1910, by a Princeton graduate who was second in fame only to Alexander Hamilton—Woodrow Wilson.

I am indebted to my good friend David Lawrence, who was a close friend and a great admirer of Woodrow Wilson, for a copy of Mr. Wilson's last address at Princeton University, in which he said:

I have heard this called an age of science, in which individual choice counts for less and less and law for more than ever before. I have heard it said, by men who claimed to base their statements upon observation, that this is an age in which individual men of necessity fall into the background, an age of machinery, of combination of individuals, of massed and aggregate power; and I marvel that the obvious facts should be so ignored. Perhaps not so many individuals are of significance as formerly, but the individuals who do tell more tremendously, wield a greater individual choice, command a power such as kings and conquerors never dreamed of in the simpler days gone by. Their sway is the sway of destiny over millions upon millions of their fellow countrymen, over the policy and fortunes of nations. There never was a time when the spirit and character of individual men was of more imperial import and consequence than now. The whole scale of action is altered; but with the scale are magnified also the essential elements themselves.

During the half century since that notable address was delivered, we have made progress in the field of science undreamed of even by such men of vision as Woodrow Wilson. By means of the radio, ideas have taken the wings of the morning, and airplanes that exceed the speed of sound have brought the nations of the world jostling together. Every trend of that character, mentioned 55 years ago by Woodrow Wilson, has been greatly intensified; and the answer is as true today as it was when Woodrow Wilson gave it in 1910:

There never was a time when the spirit and character of individual men was of more imperial import and consequence than now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from Woodrow Wilson's Princeton address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS—LAST ADDRESS AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, JUNE 12, 1910. FROM ORIGINAL TYPEWRITTEN MANUSCRIPT BEARING MR. WILSON'S OWN CORRECTIONS, AT THE LIBRARY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

"We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal."—II Corinthians iv: 18.

This is inevitably a day of reckoning. This is a turning point in your lives: a day of endings and of beginnings. We cannot choose but stop and ask what it signifies, what profit and loss there is as we look backward, and what confidence as we look forward. We must examine so much of life as we have had; and as we look we realize that "we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen," and perceive, as we never perceived before, that "the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal." It is an old and very familiar text: now at last we are in a way to see what it means.

* * * * *

I am not now thinking of knowledge so much as of what certainly underlies all knowledge. I do not mean merely that you have acquired certain definite information here which may serve you always as the material upon which your thought will feed. Information is no great matter. It changes from age to age, is often altered, and can be made to take a thousand shapes. I am thinking, rather, of what lies behind all knowledge, gives it color, significance, variety. Science, for example, alters its allegations of fact from decade to decade, alters even its theories and hypotheses, but it does not alter its method. You feel that solid under your feet, do you not, as you have traversed it in the classroom and in the laboratory? It has made the world for you not a place for children and for ignorant guesses, but a place of definite ascertainable phenomena to be candidly and discerningly sought out and rationally explained by careful and clarified processes of reason. You know that the mind can be used as an instrument of precision and also as an instrument of definition when once it has mastered that thing of enlightenment, the method of science. There is one certitude for you. The physical world need not remain the realm of conjecture.

You are certain also, are you not, that there are definite comprehensible practices, immutable principles of government and of right conduct in the dealing of men with one another? The narratives, whether of history or of biography, are faulty, no doubt full of errors and of circumstances misapprehended, but you cannot doubt that the main lines are drawn with substantial accuracy and truth; you cannot be uncertain how it is that men come by happiness or failure; you are sure that there is such a thing as justice and a noble force in men who are righteous and love the truth; you perceive that some governments are free, some tyrannous and cruel, that there is a way of freedom and of peace and a way of certitude and strife in the affairs of men, and that it is all a rewarding study of human life in its realities, in its actual habit as it lives—that you have looked in the face of life, very noble, very tragical, full at once of pathos and of hope.

And the literature you have studied and the philosophy you have read under wise masters—have they not yielded you something that you will not henceforth doubt? All the great books of any language are records of the human spirit, the voices of men like yourselves who speak to you the secrets of your own souls as well as theirs. You enter a wide comradeship when you read them. You are made free of the company of all men everywhere, as you are also in your study of philosophy, where is the same thing unfolded in orderely and formal fashion, with the insight of interpretation, as if life were read for you by men of science.

Surely you cannot be bewildered now. The world can no longer be to you a place of vague conjectures and childish ifs and buts, a play whose rules are guesses. And yet this is not information. This is not knowledge. You know very little. You are a good deal at sea in respect of your facts. You are glad your definite examinations are behind you. You have been made certain only of what sort of world it is you live in and how you should handle yourselves in it. The things you have been rendered certain of are intangible, but more actual, authentic, infallible than facts themselves. They represent the human spirit in command of the facts. They are the laws and masteries of the mind. They are the spiritual processes and realities by which we are made sure of life. Life is made definite and manageable by masteries and convictions, and these are what you have acquired, if you have acquired anything.

But what is the ultimate certainty? Is your certainty piecemeal and fragmentary? Have you learned only in disconnected segments? Education is a method of enlightenment concerning your relations to the material universe and to your fellow men: has this brought you no confidence with regard to your relations to the God and Father of us all? Are you not more certain than ever that God is in his Heaven? Is your spirit awakened to all these other perceptions of life and reality without being vouchsafed a glimpse of the Father of Spirits? To know these other things that only implied Him is life, to know Him is life eternal,—eternal because perfect, stripped of its last doubt and uncertainty, given the very spirit of vision.

I have read in your hearing this morning the 103d Psalm. Did it seem to you unreal and fanciful? Had it not, on the contrary, a reality which you would be at a loss to find anywhere else in the whole body of great songs men have conceived, unless perhaps in some other Psalm which speaks the same confident meaning with the same supreme conviction? When Paul stood upon Mars Hill facing that Athenian crowd gathered about him in skeptical curiosity, did he tell them anything that seems to you incredible, a tale of mere credulity and superstition? He did not hesitate to call the ignorance of the Athenians religion; was his religion not the religion of certitude, of knowledge? "I perceive," he said, "that in all things you are very religious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, 'To an unknown god.' Whom therefore you ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you, God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with man's hands, as though He needed anything, seeing He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and hath made of one blood all the nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us: for in Him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain of your own poets have said, 'For we are also his offspring.'"

We have an instinctive sympathy with and comprehension of Paul as he stands there. His voice of expostulation and interpretation seems our own. He is very natural, very inevitable. "We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not

seen." And we see deeper than did the Athenians who once stood about Mars Hill and listened to the great apostle. We do not spend our time "in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing." In all our studies we have seen this to be a world of law, not dead but quick with forces of which the phenomena about us are not the reality but the mere temporary embodiment. At every turn it has been life that we have studied, whether the life of nature or the life of men; only in life have we been interested. We perceive now that it is not knowledge that we have been getting, but understanding, comprehension, insight, and that what we chiefly desire to understand are ourselves and our fellow men. And so we have seen Scripture become mere plain philosophy, the words of Christ the words of a teacher who has seen the ultimate realities and speaks them very simply, with the simplicity of utter authority.

It is plain enough to us that "man's life does not consist in the abundance of the things which he possesseth," but in his mastery of himself, of circumstance, of physical forces and of human relationships, of the spirit that is within him: that man "doth not live by bread alone," but by every word of truth, every word that proceedth out of the mouth of God, the author of truth, however spoken. Our thought cannot stop short of these ultimate realities, is not content without them. Mysteries become plain facts, the things which are seen appear thin to our gaze like mere masks, and the things which are not seen become real.

Our experience here, as well as our formal study, becomes part of the explanation as our thought dwells upon it. The things we have been most conscious of are our comradeships, our companionships, the commerce we have had with one another, and we have become conscious, as we never were before, that life is a thing that links spirit with spirit, that it is itself personal, not abstract, and yet intangible, not material; a thing too of law, but not of law imposed, of law accepted, rather, not made up of what we must so much as of what we will. We are drawn into it by impulse and affection as well as by interest. It is a thing by which we live and move and have our conscious being. And so we are drawn on to Paul's conclusion. If life be thus personal, if it be of law, if the law of highest compulsion be the law of our own spirits, how shall we dispense with the knowledge of Him who is the Father of Spirits; and yet how can we know Him whom we have not seen—how can we know Him except in the person of Christ, the express image of the Father, the Word that became flesh and "dwelt among us, full of grace and truth?"

I have heard this called an age of science, in which individual choice counts for less and less and law for more than ever before. I have heard it said, by men who claimed to base their statements upon observation, that this is an age in which individual men of necessity fall into the background, an age of machinery, of combinations of individuals, of massed and aggregate power; and I marvel that the obvious facts should be so ignored. Perhaps not so many individuals are of significance as formerly, but the individuals who do tell more tremendously, wield a greater individual choice, command a power such as kings and conquerors never dreamed of in the simpler days gone by. Their sway is the sway of destiny over millions upon millions of their fellow countrymen, over the policy and fortunes of nations. There never was a time when the spirit and character of individual men was of more imperial import and consequence than now. The whole scale of action is altered; but with the scale are magnified also the essential elements themselves.

And so the type and symbol is magnified—Christ, the embodiment of great motive, of divine sympathy, of that perfect justice which sees into the hearts of men, and that sweet grace of love which takes the sting out of every judgment. "We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen": we do not, we cannot, see Christ, but there He stands, the most indubitable fact of history, with a sway over the hearts and lives of men which has not been broken or interrupted these nineteen hundred years. No man can ever think of Him as dead, unreal, a thing of books, a creature of theology. "The things which are seen are temporal," but He, He is the embodiment of those things which, not seen, are eternal—the eternal force and grace and majesty, not of character, but of that which lies back of character, obedience to the informing will of the Father of our spirits.

The force and beauty of Christ seem not to have been His own, as if original. He spoke always of His Father, and of himself only as doing His Father's will and speaking His Father's words. There dwelt in Him a spirit, great and universal, as that of the round world itself, compact of law and truth, a spirit greater than the world, conveying life and vision from the source from which all worlds and existence itself must have taken origin. He is our revelation. In Him is our life explained and our knowledge made comprehensible. He is the perfect elder brother of our spirits. In Him we are made known to ourselves—in Him because He is God, and God is the end of our philosophy; the revelation of the thought which, if we will but obey it, shall make us free, lifting us to the planes where duty shall seem happiness, obedience liberty, life the fulfillment of the law. Science is our intimation; literature is the imperfect voice of our fellow men, seeking, like ourselves, an exit for their hopes; philosophy is what we would fain convince ourselves of but cannot see: in all of these the things which are unseen and real lurk, but elude us. In Christ, in the God whom He reveals, the veil in torn away. Look. Look there and have your fill of what you have sought most. You must ever seek in vain until you raise your eyes to the Christ, where He is lifted up. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have eternal life—that life which subsisteth upon the things which are not seen.

China Eyes Soybean Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the 1920's and 1930's, when soybeans were just catching on in the United States, mainland China completely dominated world soybean trade, supplying four-fifths or more of total soybean exports. Today, however, it is the United States that dominates soybean trade with a similar share of the total.

Though a relatively new export crop, they have had a phenomenal rise, and nearly half the harvest now moves into world trade. Soybeans moved from near obscurity to third place currently among cash crops in this country, outranked in value only by corn and cotton. The crop value of soybeans in 1964 surpassed that of wheat for the first time and it is only a matter of time before our exports of soybeans and their products reach the billion-dollar mark.

Therefore, it is obvious that we should not do anything to spoil our overseas markets. In talking to Dr. Tokuji Watanabe, a leading Japanese soybean scientist, he had a word of advice for American exporters—"you cannot afford the luxury of bad shipments." Evidently, some of our shipments to Japan, our leading customer, have been contaminated by dirty soybeans and weedseed.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the soybean grower, processor, and exporter do not want or need soybeans on the list of commodities which may be planted on diverted acres. Supply and demand have been kept in reasonable relationship by price and it does not make sense to stimulate further acreage. We have already absorbed about 25 million acres out of other crops into soybeans and planting intentions indicated sufficient increases.

The following article from the June 10, 1965 issue of the Peoria Journal Star cities a word of warning. The article follows:

CHINA WANTS TO REGAIN HOLD ON SOYBEAN MARKET

(By Ovid A. Martin)

WASHINGTON.—The Foreign Agricultural Service reported yesterday that Communist China is anxious to regain a larger hold on the world soybean market, now dominated by the United States.

A report on the world soybean situation said the Chinese made a comeback in production last year after several years of low production.

"Efforts will be made by the Red Chinese to regain or exceed the previous high level of output in view of this product's significance as a source of edible oil and as a foreign exchange earner," the report said.

World production last year reached a record high of 1.1 billion bushels, the Service said. The United States accounted for 65 percent of the crop and mainland China 30 percent. This country supplied 93 percent of the soybeans moving in world trade.

Although the U.S. crop was the largest of record—totaling 700 million bushels—stocks are expected to be virtually exhausted by October 1, the beginning of the 1965 crop statistical sales year.

Year by year, soybean production has been increasing in the United States. Yet, markets at home and abroad turn up each year to take the full crop. This favorable situation is reflected by the fact that grower prices for the 1964 crop have averaged $2.66 a bushel, 41 cents above the Government support rate.

In other farm news, the Agriculture Department is sending a woman to Europe to expand markets for farm products.

Miss Donna Lee Hersey, Norton, Mass., economist, will serve as assistant agricultural attaché at The Hague to assist in promotion of farm products and in the collection of agricultural information vital to this country in developing exports.

Miss Hersey is the first woman to be named to such a post in Europe.

The Agriculture Department also says increasing efficiency in the growing of peanuts is hampering its efforts to stabilize production.

A crop control program allots planting shares to individual farmers, largely on the basis of past plantings. But the law does not permit the total to be less than 1.6 million acres a year, and increasing yields per acre are making this minimum allotment too large.

As a result, the Department has found it necessary to acquire from 15 to 25 percent of the crop under price support operations. Last year this program cost $28 million.

Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, today Americans throughout the world are observing Flag Day, in commemoration of the adoption by the Continental Congress of the original Stars and Stripes on June 14, 1777.

During the 188 years that have passed since that occasion, the flag has been a symbol of strength and freedom to untold millions. The observance of this day gives us cause to reflect on just what our flag means to each of us, personally.

Recently, I had a personal experience that very forcefully brought home to me just how meaningful a symbol of our Nation the flag is. On the occasion of his 83d birthday, last March, I arranged to have a flag which had flown over our Capitol sent to a close and personal friend, Robert H. Kutschenreuter, of Fargo, N. Dak. Since then, on May 26, he has passed away.

Always a humble man, Mr. Kutschenreuter came to this country in 1910, and became a citizen in 1916. For more than 50 years he served the people of his community as a blacksmith. Never blessed with personal wealth, and gaining his education by teaching himself to read and write, through studying the Bible, his life provided inspiration and an outstanding example for all who knew him.

Upon receiving this flag, Mr. Kutschenreuter was moved to write a verse which expresses so well the feelings of many of us toward the flag. I ask unanimous consent that this verse be printed as a part of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the verse was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SALUTE TO OLD GLORY

Old Glory, thou art so true, so dear—
Almost in part divine;
And under thy protecting care,
We'll sure contentment find.
May God so grant wherever thou goest—
In righteousness but stern—
That all the nations of the world,
Respect for thee will learn.

Concern Over the Situation on American Campuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish also to include an editorial by Mr. Ed Delaney appearing in the Valley Times, North Hollywood, as well as in the Citizen News in Los Angeles, Calif., as further evidence of the general concern over the situation on our American campuses:

CONCERN OVER THE SITUATION ON AMERICAN CAMPUSES

(By Ed Delaney)

How long will our educational institutions supinely submit to the usurping of authority by bearded beatniks and callow creeps? Are universities and colleges to be centers for teaching, or hothouses for spawning maggot-minded malcontents? The disturbances we observed on the Berkeley campus and elsewhere across the Nation are said by our self-opinionated sociology sages to be signs of the times. They are—very definitely. Some supposedly erudite pedagogues endeavor to explain that the youths of today are emerging from the thralldom of fulsome and antiquated inhibitions which in the past have restrained the younger generation from wholesome expressionalism. What we are observing, according to the double domes, is visible evidence that the youth of today have escaped from the transcendentalism of the archaic eras, as manifested in their shattering of precedents and primordial codes of the past. Speaking in the vernacular, that is nothing but double-distilled hogwash.

The disturbances of students against some ruling of the college or university authorities, is positive proof that those authorities have been remiss in their duties. They failed to impress on the students that they came to the university to get an education, not to incite agitation. In every such institution, some students, by their exceptional abilities plus application to their studies, outdistance others in their classes. The same applies to those who excel in sports, art, or cultural fields. The well-earned acclaim given those students is irksome for the dullards. In an effort to focus attention on themselves, they take the lead in demonstrations against the faculty, the regents or in protest of some campus regulation. A hackneyed pretext for the troublemakers is their interpretation of what constitutes free speech.

The regents or those in authority should make unmistakably clear to the young anarchists just what their ground rules are in this regard. Those who refuse to abide by the rules should be summarily dismissed. If some faculty members support the insurgents, they too should be given the alternative of abiding by the rules or leaving. And the sooner the better.

If some cadets at West Point or Annapolis staged demonstrations against discipline or the etablished code of conduct, we would expect that, for the good of the Nation and society in general, they should be dismissed. It is no different at other institutions. The sporadic displays of instigated anarchy at educational centers, follows an alarming pattern of disregard for law and authority. J. Edgar Hoover has cited this repeatedly in recent months.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that one rotten apple will destroy the whole barrel of apples, if not removed. There are some rotten apples in our universities today that could destroy not only our universities but our entire Republic. Why do we fail to learn a lesson from history? Student demonstrations and riots have destroyed many a country. In an Executive briefing this week, it was stated that every South American country was on the brink of disaster; and that the core and center of all of the trouble started and continues to be the student riots and demonstrations led by Communist-trained saboteurs.

The student demonstrations, which started on the university campus at Berkeley, are now spreading to most American universities. They are sponsored and financed by the International Communist Conspiracy. They are led by a hard core of professional revolutionaries trained in every form of subversion. Many of them have been trained in Cuba. The Communists have an unlimited, global solidarity fund to finance the Communist-led student agitation throughout the world.

The University of California was notified a year ago that the Berkeley campus was to be the first target in America. The Berkeley campus was chosen because the Communist apparatus considered the climate most favorable and thought it could be very easily exploited. Having been forewarned, it is amazing that no countermeasures were set up to meet this situation.

Many innocent but gullible students and professors are trapped by the misuse of the words "freedom," "self-determination," and "peace." The Communists are experts in taking our most cherished words and prostituting them for their own evil purposes. The so-called "free-speech movement" was not to promote free speech, but to promote license. The FBI has identified many Communists involved in this movement.

Dr. Roswell G. Ham, former president of Mount Holyoke College, speaking to the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco on May 14 of this year, stated, in part:

Contemplate rather the day of the general strike. In one class a wildeyed Oriental stood up and called for a walkout, answered by another student who said she was there for an education. The room was well filled—but the professor adjourned the class. That phenomenon happened over and over, many professors wearing FSM (free speech movement, now called free student movement) armbands.

No, I would not indict the students so much as the faculty. In the crucial December 8 meeting of the academic senate, 115 men of sense were lost in a vote 7 to 1 on measures submitted to the board of regents (and buried there). As in South America, the push here was the intermediate one, for faculty and student assumption of administrative power.

Student and faculty groups are so violently and vocally attacking the administration on its policy in South Vietnam and Santo Domingo that they make the world believe that a majority in this

country is not supporting the administration. The nationwide TV teach-in on this subject was a disgrace. This was followed by two foreign-born fuzzy professors on "Meet the Press," telling the world how terrible our current policy is in Vietnam. This is a crucial time in our history when the President should have broad national support, and our fighting marines should know that they have the full backing of those of us at home. Tokyo Rose was a piker in comparison with these Communist-oriented groups in America.

These bearded beatniks and these fuzzy-wuzzy professors are a threat not only to our internal security but to our external security. They would not shed a tear or a drop of blood to preserve this Republic. I think Bob Hope made the classic statement when he said that the only four-letter word these beatniks did not know was "soap."

Let us demand that our regents and our Governors clean up this situation, expel the hard core involved and fire the professors involved.

Survey Ship "Explorer" Charts San Juan Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I have previously inserted extraneous material pertaining to the Coast Survey ship *Explorer* as an extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The *Explorer* has been working in Puerto Rican waters since she left Norfolk on February 4, and in the interest of disseminating information in the interest of science and science students, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the May 28 edition of the Ledger Star, of Norfolk, Va.

AT SAN JUAN HARBOR—"EXPLORER" GLEANS DATA SHOWING AIRPORT INSTEAD OF CHANNEL

(By Donald Moore)

NORFOLK.—It was high time that the Norfolk-based Coast Survey ship *Explorer* should chart the waters of San Juan Harbor.

Charts last compiled in 1901 showed a deep channel where an airport now exists, *Explorer* Capt. Marvin T. Paulson, reported on his return to Norfolk.

Channels 20 feet deep a half century ago are now from 30 to 36 feet deep, Paulson said.

"San Juan Harbor is a very busy harbor, both military and commercial," he said.

The 220-foot-long *Explorer*, largest vessel based at the Norfolk regional headquarters at the Hague, berthed Thursday as families and friends waited ashore and a naval air station band played.

She had left Norfolk on February 4 for Puerto Rican and Virgin Island waters and chores which included charting such as the detailed survey of San Juan Harbor, special magnetometer studies, wire dragging for underwater obstacles, oceanographic, and current studies.

The wire-dragging work, in which a cable is strung between two boats to determine the depth beneath the water of submerged objects, was done in the Vieques Sound area for the Navy.

Magnetometer studies in conjunction with Dr. Thomas W. Donnelly, associate professor of geology at Rice University, were taken and will indicate compass deviation and give an idea of the geology of the seas' bottom.

Bottom samples were taken at a depth of about 18,000 feet in several locations. They will be studied for indications of geological history and plantlife at the bottom of the seas.

Current surveys were taken at the entrance to San Juan Harbor, which Paulson described as dangerous because the currents push an incoming ship and then slack off at the entrance.

Chart information such as depths and currents obtained by the *Explorer* and her 78-man crew will be smooth plotted in the processing office of the Norfolk regional office, headed by Capt. John Bull, and then sent on to Washington for the final work by cartographers.

Paulson estimates the charts will be published in the late fall.

Not listed among the official work of the *Explorer* was the rescue of four marooned fishermen on Lobos Island off the coast of Puerto Rico.

The men, taken aboard the *Explorer* about daybreak, had been aground since 11 p.m.

The *Explorer* soon will be at sea again plying her trade. One assignment that may lie in her future is the tracing of the Gulf Stream from Cape Hatteras to south of Nova Scotia.

New Chill in the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, recently the two major Dallas newspapers have carried some incisive and analytical editorials which merit the serious perusal of everyone. For this reason and as a tribute to both these fine newspapers, I am inserting into the RECORD copies of these editorials.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald, May 24, 1965]

NEW CHILL IN THE AIR

It's only been 6 months since President Johnson and new Soviet Premier Kosygin were talking about an exchange of state visits amid an air of growing amity.

In terms of the elusive nature of international relations, that seems ages ago. U.S. actions against the Vietcong Communists in Asia, and our intervention against the threat of Red subversion of a revolt in Latin America have taken place. Nothing has changed in U.S. policies toward the Soviet Union, but we are getting more signs almost daily that Russian attitudes are rehardening toward the United States.

The attack last week by the news agency Tass, rejecting President Johnson's recent offer to improve relations between Washington and Moscow, is the sharpest blast to date to be aimed at Johnson. The official statement, responding to L.B.J.'s recent World War II anniversary bid for cooperation, declared no agreement is possible while the United States pursues policies of aggression and intervention in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

President Johnson doubtless recognized that U.S. foreign engagements would endanger our improved relations with Russia. He has sought to minimize or avert that damage, hoping to convince Kremlin leadership that the Soviets themselves share a stake with the West in braking Peiping-inspired aggressiveness.

Judging from the Tass reaction and other recent barometric readings, the Soviets are heeding pressures from within and without for a sterner posture to the West. Reappearance of politically disgraced Marshal Zhukov and the public plaudits for the name of Stalin may be ominous signals.

Thus relations between Moscow and Washington—which realistically could not be expected to weather current events unscathed—have begun a new metamorphosis. But regardless of the new East-West chill, every diplomatic effort should be made to minimize the damages and maintain maximum contact. Despite the demagogic purposes the Soviet Union may feel must be served at the moment, both nations lie under the lengthening shadow of a malevolent Chinese dragon.

[From the Dallas Morning News, May 31, 1965]

PERSONAL REPORT: WASHINGTON

(By Robert E. Baskin)

President Johnson this last weekend has again demonstrated his great affection for his native State and the fact that he likes to come home whenever the opportunity affords.

It has not been an ideal weekend from the standpoint of the weather, but Texans are never satisfied with their meteorological conditions.

If Mr. Johnson got buffeted about a bit in his helicopter flights up to Waco and back to his ranch, he did not show any signs of displeasure. After all, Texas springs, which frequently bring tornadoes and cloudbursts, are something to be taken in stride, if one can do it—and hardly are as disagreeable as the cable reports Mr. Johnson is getting these days from Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

The President has let it be known that he would like to spend as much time as he can this summer in Texas. His staff and the press which follows him may be somewhat unhappy about this prospect, envisioning days of intense southwestern heat and winds which make the Italian Sirocco feel like a cool fall breeze.

But the President has always seemed to enjoy the climate along the Pedernales, whether a winter norther is blowing or the hot sun is baking the limestone hills.

From the standpoint of conducting the Nation's business, it actually makes little difference whether Mr. Johnson is here or in Washington. He has communications galore. He once told reporters that the only time he was really not in arm's length of a telephone was when he was riding a horse.

This communications lapse, of course, is not beyond correction, and it may be that Mr. Johnson's saddlemaker is already incorporating a radiotelephone of some sort in his next design. It is not difficult to imagine the President talking to members of his Cabinet, or even officials in Saigon or Santo Domingo, while riding among his herd of pedigreed Herefords.

And there are other advantages about being out on the ranch. Mr. Johnson has complained about the planes flying noisily over the White House on their way to National Airport, the chattering tourists below stairs and Mrs. Johnson's meetings in the Presidential Mansion on beautification which have disturbed his rest.

It is apparent, too, that Mr. Johnson feels somewhat hemmed in at the White House. It is a major enterprise, and a newsmaking one, when he decides to walk across Pennsylvania Avenue to visit Lafayette Park or Blair House.

And there is always the press loitering in the lobby of the executive wing to trail after him. Down on the Pedernales he can keep most of them 65 miles away in Austin.

It may be that the President will spend a good deal of time in Texas this summer, particularly if Congress can wind up its affairs at a reasonable date.

Mr. Johnson is said to feel, however, that if a major crisis confronts the Nation he should be at the White House. This is a symbolic matter. The people understandably are reassured when the President is at the official seat of the Government—no matter how attractive the hill country of Texas may be to their Chief Executive.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News, May 25, 1965]

THIRTY FLAGS FOR FREEDOM

Although the cries of the critics of the Vietnam struggle are most loudly heard, we should not ignore the quiet votes of confidence from the other side. Many free nations besides the United States also recognize that the fight against Communist aggression there is crucial.

South Korea has sent 2,000 troops to help defend the South Vietnamese. Australia has committed a battalion of infantry. The Philippine House has voted to send 2,000 more troops to join 68 specialist advisers already in Vietnam.

The SEATO meeting in London supported South Vietnam in much stronger language than had been expected, despite the abstention of France. At a recent NATO meeting, foreign ministers of our European allies lined up in support of the defense of that remote land, again despite the veto of France.

Today some 30 countries have sent or pledged assistance in South Vietnam. They include, in addition to the Philippines and South Korea, the Asian nations of Japan, Malaysia and Thailand.

Have these 30 nations placed their flags in the front rank of a jingoistic military adventure, as President Johnson's critics charge? Or have they in fact learned the hard lesson that the fight for freemen anywhere is the fight of freemen everywhere?

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald, May 20, 1965]

RAIDS RESUME

Lyndon Johnson has tried his legendary "carrot and stick" persuasive approach on the North Vietnamese. It is no discredit to him or his motivations that the attempt was a failure.

The cessation of bombings of North Vietnam, it turns out, was on orders from the President. The rais were stopped to see if, indeed, the Communists could yet be coaxed to the bargaining table. Hanoi responded with a mixture of anger and ambiguity, the essence of which was a "no" to the President's restated offer of unconditional talks.

The Reds' response was "disappointing but not surprising," said the administration. Evidently the Hanoi regime of 75-year-old Ho Chi Minh still feels it is on the verge of military success in the South. The air raids may not have begun to hurt sufficiently and the Reds may feel the fortunes of the fight will turn back more strongly in the guerrillas' favor once the Asian monsoons start snarling the U.S. aerial attack.

President Johnson has again shown this country's willingness to negotiate in southeast Asia. But his determination to improve the military situation is, or should be, equally evident. Now that the "carrot" has been spurned, a bigger and harder "stick" can surely be expected.

A Profile in Political Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to place before our colleagues a column published in the June 10 Washington Post about our former colleague, the Honorable Carl Elliot. Mrs. Free, author of the column, is a correspondent for several newspapers in Alabama and the North American Newspaper Alliance. I sincerely hope that her thoughtful appraisal of our beloved former colleague reaches the widest possible audience. I am proud to have served in this House with him. Mrs. Free's column is as follows:

ACADEMIC HONOR, POLITICAL BURDEN

(By Ann Cottrell Free)

The man who helped to open the "schoolhouse door" to 750,000 students has not been completely forgotten during these June days when universities are bestowing their accolades for excellence. But, ironically, when the president of Tufts University in Medford, Mass., handed an honorary degree of doctor of laws on Sunday to the tallest, gangliest political man since the days of Abraham Lincolon or "Kissin' Jim" Folsom, its recipient, Carl Elliott, accepted in the opinion of some another political albatross.

For the degree was for political courage as well as for his support of higher education while in Congress. The citation noted that the former Alabama Congressman "refused to campaign on a platform of racism when such a platform ran counter to his concept of responsible leadership."

Being loved and admired by the folks in the land of the Kennedys, Mrs. Peabody and Harriet Beecher Stowe will never win votes in the Alabama of Governor Wallace or Sheriff Jim Clark. And Mr. Elliott, his friends believe, will be seeking votes in Alabama again—perhaps for the governorship. They remind that other notable Elliott honors in the past—a seat on the powerful Rules Committee and the friendship and admiration of the late John Kennedy—proved to be members of the albatross family.

But Elliott is aware of all that. He is convinced that the albatross in this case is a better bird to swear by than the white rooster of white racial supremacy that adorns all ballots in Alabama.

Elliott never paused to worry about political liabilities when Tufts notified him months ago of its decision. He had taken his stand in the fall of 1963 and put his career on the line when he gave his view of John Birchers and rightwing extremists: "They are loud-mouthed know-nothings whom Thomas Jefferson would have dismissed as intellectual nitwits and whom Jackson probably would have horsewhipped."

Alabama's population is growing slowly, and the 1960 census cost the State one congressional seat. The State had spasms of indecision for several years over the redistricting. But finally the problem was solved by the at-large Democratic primary. Voters in the Black Belt could pass judgment on men from the TVA and hill country. Anything could happen. A few days before the voters went to the polls, more than 100,000 sample ballots were distributed throughout the State to guide the people on how to vote. They bore the slogan, "Stand Up for Alabama," made popular by Governor Wallace. And Elliott's name was left off.

Elliott's "liberal" stamp had to be stamped out. Forgotten were the contributions to education made by this first son of nine children of a Franklin County dirt farmer. Elliott, who had entered the University of Alabama at age 16 with $2.50 in his pocket, had authored with Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, the National Defense Education Act to help students go to college. From 1958 to 1964, 750,000 student loans were made—17,000 to Alabamians. It was as if Elliott, 10 feet tall, had also stood in a schoolhouse door, but with arms outstretched and calling, "Y'all come."

John F. Kennedy may have seen the political handwriting on the wall and may have wanted to spare him the pain of defeat at the polls. He offered him a Federal judgeship. But Elliott, who had made 220 speeches for Kennedy in Alabama in 1960, declined. He preferred to continue his struggle to bring his people back politically into the Union.

Education, he still believes, is the key. When he was born 50 years ago, 1 of every 12 white persons was illiterate and of every 4 Negroes. Tremendous progress has been made. Without education people cannot communicate, he stresses. And the best communications contain words that convey truth—not shopworn phraseology and safe catch phrases for a leader to hide behind.

He told the graduating class at Florence (Ala.) State College last week that most Alabama political speeches would be void of substance if a dozen words and phrases were removed. They are: "Segregation, integration, States rights, Federal power, conservative, liberal, moderate, violence, law and order, Central Government, and sovereign State."

The class listened attentively. One of its members, Wendell Wilkie Gunn, was the second Negro student to graduate from a white Alabama college.

One June day in the future Carl Elliott may be able to tell an Alamaba graduating class that the bird everyone thought was an albatross, in reality, was a phoenix—arisen, live and kicking, from the ashes.

Reorganization of Customs Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I am happy to submit for the RECORD a memorial passed by the Oregon Legislative Assembly expressing its concern over the recent announcement of plans to reorganize the Bureau of Customs. I am happy to introduce this memorial today because, since its passage, Members of the Congress working with officials of the Treasury Department have been able to effect a workable solution to the problem cited in this memorial. It is always a pleasure for me to be able to answer a request from the people of my State with "thank you for your active interest; we have reached a satisfactory solution."

This solution, which simply recognizes the fact that Portland is the No. 1 dry cargo port on the west coast, is in the form of an agreement with the Treasury Department to make Portland and Seattle district headquarters within

the proposed new region. As the Member of the Oregon delegation representing the city of Portland, I want to express my appreciation to the Treasury Department for their understanding of the economic interests of Oregon and their splendid cooperation.

The memorial follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 25

To His Excellency, the Honorable President of the United States, to the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 53d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas a report on the organization and management of the U.S. Customs has been submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury, which report contemplates the downgrading of the quality and quantity of services furnished by the U.S. Customs office in Portland, Oreg.; and

Whereas the downgrading of the U.S. Customs office in Portland, Oreg., would severely impair its ability to furnish adequate services to local brokers, exporters and importers, thus affecting the economy of the region; and

Whereas the U.S. Customs offices in the State of Oregon have a long tradition of service to the people of the west coast, the first U.S. Customs office on the west coast having been established in Oregon in 1848, and the headquarters office in Portland, Oreg., in 1870; and

Whereas Portland, Oreg., as the headquarters port for the U.S. Customs District 29, also serves the Oregon ports of Astoria, Newport and Coos Bay and the Washington ports of Longview and Vancouver and is of service to the inland empire consisting of the States of Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and part of Washington; and

Whereas Portland, Oreg., is a national distribution center for imported and exported goods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) The Secretary of the Treasury is memorialized to revise the proposed plan for reorganization of customs districts as contained in the report issued in December 1964 by the Bureau of Customs of the Treasury Department and entitled "An evaluation of: Mission, Organization, Management" and commonly referred to as the "Stover Report" so that the proposed customs district 19 be divided into two districts, one of which shall constitute the present customs district of Oregon (district 29) and Montana-Idaho (district 33), with district headquarters in Portland, Oreg.

(2) A copy of this memorial shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Dempsey Was Prepared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have today, as a followup to my previous resolution, introduced a bill to establish a Federal Boxing Commission. Much has been said recently about the need for congressional action into the various aspects of professional boxing which is threatened with extinction.

Mr. Joe McNaughton, in the June 10, 1965, issue of the Pekin Times, points up several areas the Harris committee would do well to explore during the course of their investigation. Mr. McNaughton discusses the preparation and conditioning of Jack Dempsey as compared to current boxers. The article and the text of my bill follow:

PROFESSIONAL BOXING

(By Joe McNaughton)

Professional boxing is threatened with extinction.

It is difficult for me to write objectively about boxing, for it is a sport in which I actively participated for years, and for decades took an avid interest.

Boxing, like Christianity and law, is part of our Greco-Roman heritage.

Pugilism is a vestige of the gladiatorial spectacles, shows in which the destruction of one's opponent was the object of the contest. Of course, in the Roman Colosseum, boxers wore spiked gloves. In A.D. 500, Emperor Theodoric banned this form of pugilism. In 1920, 1,420 years later, boxing was legalized in the State of New York.

In modern times, under the Marquis of Queensberry rules, an honest professional heavyweight bout, between skillful, well conditioned boxers, arouses contenders and spectators to the apogee of excitement.

Pugilism demands more conditioning than any of the other sports. This is a broad statement because each sport calls for a special kind of preparation. Still, because of the peculiar nature of boxing, which requires enormous stamina and toughness, plus lightning speed combined with Nijinsky's sense of balance, I will repeat that training for a professional bout is, or should be, most exacting.

I am a friend of professional boxing and wish to see the sport flourish, and yet, there are sound negative arguments.

The overwhelming majority of modern boxers do not have the necessary background of preparation. They are not really in condition. Ideally, every professional fighter should have first performed arduous physical labor as a boy, then trained and boxed for years before coming into the public eye. Jack Dempsey was a classic example of the "golden age fighter." When he was a youth, Dempsey worked at various common labor jobs. At age 17, he toured the West, making his living by entering saloons and offering to fight, for money, any man at the bar. Dempsey weighed 155 pounds and usually battled mature 200-pound opponents to a finish.

July 4, 1919, when Jack Dempsey finally met Jess Willard at Toledo in a struggle for the heavyweight championship of the world, he (Dempsey) was ready. A rock hard Dempsey was 6 feet 1 inch tall, and weighed 187 pounds. Willard was 6-feet 6½-inches tall, and weighed 243 pounds. In the first round, Dempsey broke Willard's jaw and four of his ribs. If Cassius Clay had been in Willard's shoes on that occasion, the question would not have been which was the better man, but whether Clay could have escaped with his life.

Boxing is also in disrepute because the hoodlum element has edged in and there is always the possibility, or even probability, of a "fixed fight."

Another question mark is brain damage. There is no question but that a high percent of professional fighters receive substantial brain damage. However, most professionals are not very smart to begin with, and this is their one chance of making a fortune.

I am in favor of cleaning up boxing and insisting that the fighters be in the best possible condition, or abolish professional bouts.

H.R. —

A bill to establish and prescribe the duties of a Federal boxing commission for the purpose of insuring that the channels of interstate commerce are free from false or fraudulent descriptions or depictions of professional boxing contests

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a Federal Commission on Boxing (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall consist of three persons appointed by the President. Members of the Commission shall receive compensation as provided in the Classification Act of 1949. The President shall designate a member of the Commission to be its Chairman.

(b) The Commission may, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949 and the civil service laws, appoint such staff as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions.

(c) The Commission shall have power to make such investigations as it deems necessary to carry out its duties under this Act. For the purpose of any investigation carried out by the Commission, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49, 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Commission.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall exercise continuing surveillance over the field of professional boxing. Whenever the Commission determines that it is likely that a professional boxing event which is to be televised in interstate commerce, or an account of which is to be transmitted in interstate commerce by wire or radio (while such event is occurring) will be in any way affected by bribery collusion to effect the result, intentional losing, racketeering, including terrorism, extortion, organized use of threats, coercion, intimidation, or use of violence, it may issue an order prohibiting such interstate transmission or televising.

SEC. 3. Whoever violates an order of the Commission issued under section 2 shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

U.S. Highway 95 Through Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to enclose a letter written by the great mayor of Philadelphia, the Honorable James H. J. Tate, to the Federal Highway Administrator, Mr. Rex M. Whitton, regarding Interstate Highway 95 in our city.

The letter follows:

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
June 8, 1965.

Mr. REX WHITTON,
Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WHITTON: Please accept my warmest thanks for everything you have done

to assure the depression of Interstate Highway 95 (the Delaware expressway), where it passes between our justly famed Society Hill redevelopment and the planned Penn's landing project.

Without your complete understanding of the situation it would have been impossible to achieve this tremendously important change in design. Now that it has, in fact, been achieved, I want you to know that the entire city of Philadephia is grateful for your enlightened handling of the problem.

You may be sure that the decision to depress Interstate Highway 95 is fully in keeping with President Johnson's determination to make America more beautiful, especially along its highways. It would have been disastrous if an elevated throughway had been allowed to desecrate what is destined to become one of the most beautiful historic areas in the United States.

With all good wishes and kindest personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. J. TATE, *Mayor*.

Beauty Abounds in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 27, 1965, an article appeared in the New York Daily News written by Mr. Ted Lewis critical of my home State of Texas. Mr. Lewis inaccurately claimed that Texas had only drab landscape and no spots of beauty. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take great issue with Mr. Lewis. In Texas, the home of our astute and capable President, Lyndon B. Johnson, and the homes of my 22 Texas colleagues in this Chamber, there are many, many spots of sheer beauty. Ranging from the rich, lush valleys in the south, the glistening coastal waters around Padre Island and the gulf coast, to the charming hill and lake country in central Texas and our State capital of Austin, to the inspiring mountain range in our western border. There are many places where we Texans sit, gaze in admiration at God's artistic flare and contemplate our good fortune to be so blessed with so much in our home State. I am sure everyone of my good colleagues from Texas can cite example after example of the places in his district which makes Texas a marvelous State to visit on vacation or in which to settle and to live.

In my own district of Dallas County, the farsighted people whom I represent have established, through vigor and a progressive spirit, a skyline of clean, modern structures which reflect the Texan's appreciation and concern for the esthetic and for beauty. Dallas' Theater Center, designed by Frank Lloyd Wright, her many city parks festooned with bright arrays of multicolored flowers, the lovely residential areas spread over my city through which gurgle brooks which twist and cavort as if frolicking in nature's own playground, certainly refute Mr. Lewis' erring remarks. In the countryside surrounding my district are fields and fields covered by our State flower, the bluebonnet, and by the colorful Indian paint brush with its many colored hues.

The wide open spaces of Texas abound with beauty, Mr. Speaker. The growing metropoli are well designed and well planned by men who appreciate and protect and even improve on nature's work. Texans are proud of Texas and rightly so. For this reason have I seen fit to disagree with the misguided opinions by Mr. Lewis.

Minnesota House of Representatives Commends Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota House of Representatives unanimously passed a resolution commending the Minnesota Association of Future Farmers of America for their outstanding program and significant contributions to the development of citizenship and rural leadership qualities in its members as well as the agricultural economy of the State of Minnesota. The resolution specifically mentions the Minnesota Future Farmers' wild mallard duck program, tree-planting projects, installation of slow-moving vehicle emblems, statewide antismoking education program, tools for the Congo, self-help machinery program, and corn for Camp Courage scholarships and speech therapy building funds.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE ROSOLUTION 21

A house resolution commending the Future Farmers of America

Whereas the Minnesota Association of the Future Farmers of America has just held its 36th annual State convention at the Institute of Agriculture, University of Minnesota; and

Whereas this organization has an alltime high membership of 14,236 students enrolled in high school vocational agriculture in 285 secondary schools in Minnesota; and

Whereas members of this organization are contributing to the agricultural economy of this great State of Minnesota through the application of recommended practices in their investment of nearly $4 million in farming programs; and

Whereas this organization conducts outstanding programs of conservation and wildlife and nearly 100 chapters will release 14,000 wild mallard ducks this spring. The members have engaged in a tree planting program involving over 5 million seedlings; and

Whereas this organization has participated with the State and National safety councils to promote the use of slow-moving vehicle emblems on farm machinery; and

Whereas this is the only known youth organization conducting a satewide antismoking education program; and

Whereas this organization has contributed $100,000 to charitable activities, including $37,000 for a speech therapy building at Camp Courage; and

Whereas this organization has contributed to the tools for Congo and self-help machinery programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the house of representatives commend the Minnesota Association of the Future Farmers of America for their outstanding program and significant contributions to the development of citizenship and rural leadership qualities in its members as well as the agricultural economy of the State of Minnesota; be it futher

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives forward a copy of this resolution to the Minnesota Future Farmers of America organization at the State department of education, vocational education section.

Mr. Speaker, the above resolution was introduced and a request made for unanimous consent by house members Hon. Harvey B. Sathre, Adams; Wendell Erickson, Hills; Douglas Sillers, Moorhead; Frank DeGroat, Lake Park; Paul P. Overgaard, Albert Lea.

The Real Alabama—Part X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, some of the Nation's most extensive river systems are in Alabama, and our State has worked in the past and is now working to develop them into major elements of the Nation's water transportation networks and also sources of hydroelectric power.

The story of this development was treated in an article appearing in the New York Journal of Commerce April 26. It follows here:

POWER DAMS ASSURE EVEN WATER FLOW

Alabama's wealth of natural resources, which include one of the most extensive river systems in the Nation, has been aided considerably by the Alabama Power Co. and its network of reservoirs and hydroelectric projects.

These waterways, which are fed by a rainfall averaging 50 inches per year, offer a vast potential for industry coming into the State. The nine hydroelectric projects presently create reservoirs on three of the State's major rivers—Coosa, Tallapoosa, and Warrior Rivers.

Besides the advantages for industry, the area has more than 128,000 acres of compoundments as a result of the company's existing dam projects, for fishing, sailing, swimming, motorboating, camping, and picnicking.

WATER IMPOUNDMENT

The company, in order to realize the full benefits from some of these projects, withdraws water from them during periods of seasonably low rainfall and droughts, which usually occur in the late fall.

At the same time, capacity is provided behind these dams to store flood waters during periods of seasonally heavy rainfall which come in the winter and early spring. This stored water, in turn, is released during the next seasonal drought period.

To complete the development of the Coosa River, Alabama Power Co. undertook the largest water resources conservation program ever undertaken in the State by private capital.

PROJECTS CITED

The projects included the Lock 3 Dam, near Ragland, and the Jordan No. 2 project

near Wetumpka, in the lower Coosa River Basin. Modification of the Lay Dam by raising its height and adding new generating capacity was also included in the major changes.

The $188 million program also included the Weiss Dam near Leesburg, in the upper Coosa River, and the Logan Martin Dam, near Vincent and Pell City.

When the current program is completed in 1968, another 20,000 acres of lake area will be available.

Rear Adm. R. E. M. Ward, U.S. Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the current copy of Navy magazine carries a story about Rear Adm. R. E. M. Ward, U.S. Navy. We all remember Admiral Ward as being chief of legislative affairs for many years here on the Hill where he endeared himself to all who came in contact with him.

As set forth in the story, Admiral Ward has an outstanding record as a submariner, though through innate modesty, he never mentioned it and I, for one, am extremely proud to call "sweet old Bob" friend:

REAR ADM. R. E. M. WARD, U.S. NAVY, COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE TRAINING COMMAND

(By Tom Langenfeld)

One day back when Robert E. M. Ward was commanding a submarine, one of his officers drew him aside and asked confidentially, "Have you heard what the crew is calling you now?"

"No," said Ward. "What?"

"Sweet Old Bob," replied the officer.

"Sweet Old Bob," gasped Ward, who until that moment had considered himself the toughest submarine commander in the business. "What are we going to do about that?" that?"

"Oh, I wouldn't worry about it too much," said the officer. "They're just using the initials for short."

HARD DRIVER

That was a good many years ago, but Admiral Ward, now commander of the Naval Reserve Training Command, still chuckles about it, and admits that some of his men probably are calling him by the same initials today. They see him as a hard-driving commander.

But they admire him.

A trim, compact officer whose face has been burnished by salt air and sun, the admiral looks much younger than his 51 years. If he expects a lot from his men, he says, it's because he thinks so highly of them.

"I have yet to have a duty assignment where I haven't had outstanding people working above me, with me, and for me," he says. And he adds: "The only talent you need is the ability to surround yourself with talented people."

He apparently has that ability, but he has displayed a variety of other talents, too. For his distinguished service during World War II he was awarded two Navy Crosses and two Silver Stars. He also wears the Presidential Unit Citation and the Navy Unit Commendation.

SURVIVED A SINKING

He survived the sinking of one submarine early in the war and later commanded the U.S.S. *Sailfish* (ex-*Squalis*) in a 10-hour typhoon-tossed battle in which she became the first submarine to sink a Japanese carrier unassisted.

Since the war he has handled a balanced blend of sea duty and administrative assignments, ranging from Chief of Legislative Affairs to Commander of Amphibious Group Two, Atlantic, the post he held before taking the Reserve command at Omaha, Nebr., last October 6.

When Ward decided at the age of 15 that he wanted to be a naval officer, he had no way of knowing, of course, that 36 years later he would be a rear admiral in landlocked Nebraska with a fort for a flagship (Fort Omaha, built by the Army in 1868). After spending most of his life on, under, or at least very near the sea, he could be excused if he felt as though he had run aground. And while he has to admit that the stout aroma of Omaha's sprawling stockyards and meat packing industry will never replace the smell of salt water, he finds his assignment in the Midlands challenging.

Ward has become interested in Fort Omaha's history, and he's looking around for more documents like the one that turned up not long after he arrived last fall. It was a warning sign that said: Soldiers will refrain from shooting buffalo from the barracks.

HAS GOOD-SIZED FLEET

From his headquarters, Ward directs the training of all Navy reservists except those in the Air Reserve. His fleet comprises 81 ships, 300 Reserve Trainings Centers and 152 other training facilities.

The ships—destroyers, destroyer escorts, submarines, minesweepers, and patrol boats—are located in ports along both coasts, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes. The training centers are scattered throughout the continental United States and Hawaii.

Fort Omaha is right in the center of it all, and that, says the admiral, makes it an ideal spot for the headquarters of a nationwide command—even though the closest water is the Missouri River. The fort's proximity to Offutt Air Force Base gives the admiral quick access to swift military flights for his frequent inspection trips to the various parts of his command.

In the first 10 weeks after he took command, for example, Ward traveled more than 20,000 miles from coast to coast, visiting each of the naval districts to conduct seminars and inspections at dozens of training centers.

One look at his travel schedule makes it easy to understand how he acquired one nickname many years ago that is still used by his men today: Ward's initials, R. E. M., stand for Robert Elwin McGraner, but his men insist they stand for Run Every Minute.

"I've worked hard all my life," he says, adding that he wouldn't have wanted it any other way.

WARDS' OPEN HOUSE

His father was graduated from Stanford Law School at 21 and became a country lawyer in Antioch, Calif. The family lived in a three-story concrete building that was once a small hospital. Visitors were always welcome. Mrs. Ward never knew how many to expect for breakfast. The Wards took in needy children and kept coffee and goulash on the stove at all times for the benefit of neighbors who dropped in day and night. Once a friend came from Boston to visit for a month and stayed for 17 years.

It was a wonderful environment to grow up in, the admiral observes, but it wasn't very economical. Starting when he was 11, he went to work for a dairy. He got up at 3:45 a.m., 6 days a week, to help milk the cows, bottle the milk, and deliver the bottles. He finished his route by 7:30 a.m. in time for breakfast at the dairy. When classes ended at 3:30 p.m., Ward stayed on to finish his homework, then it was off to the dairy again to "milk, bottle and deliver." He would get home at 8:30 p.m., just in time to go to bed.

The job earned him $17.50 a month until he got into high school and was tapped by several of his school's athletic teams. He lettered in track, baseball, football, basketball, swimming, and tennis.

When he was 15 and a junior in high school, he took $250 he had saved and went to San Francisco to buy a trumpet. He wandered all over the city, bought a box of candy and a potted plant for his mother and a smoking jacket for his dad, then laden with his packages he took a cable car to the top of Nob Hill. There he gazed out over the as-yet unbridged Golden Gate and caught a glimpse of his future.

THE DREAM

He saw the ships steaming into the mile-wide corridor of water that connects San Francisco Bay with the open sea, and he knew that he wanted to be a ship commander when he grew up.

And someday, he thought, I will bring my ship through the Golden Gate.

He graduated from high school at 16, finding time to become an Eagle Scout along the way. He completed one semester at the University of California before getting his appointment to Annapolis.

He went out for football at the Academy and made the squad, although he weighed only 154 pounds. He got his first underwater experience by going out for water polo, got his nose broken boxing and tried wrestling for a year. He stayed with track for a couple of years, clearing 12 feet 3 inches in the pole vault—not a bad mark in the bamboo-pole days.

Ward was graduated in 1935 and got his first sea duty aboard the battleship U.S.S. *Texas* and the cruiser U.S.S. *Augusta*. It was while he was on the *Texas* that he was introduced to the girl who would become Mrs. Ward, the former Frances L. Larco of Santa Barbara, Calif. They were married in Shanghai.

Their first home was a converted stable in the walled city of Manila in the Philippines.

The couple was in New London, Conn., when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. Ward had just completed submarine school, and he was already en route to the Pacific aboard the submarine *S-26* when their son Robert, the first of three children, was born December 12.

SINKS TOP CARRIER

S-26 never reached its objective. It was rammed by an escort 14 miles off Balboa on January 25, 1942, and sank with most of her 49 men trapped inside. Three men who had been on the bridge escaped. One was Ward.

After a tour as executive officer of the submarine U.S.S. *Gurnard* during the North African landings, Ward took command of the U.S.S. *Sailfish*. It was on his first patrol as skipper that the *Sailfish* met and sank the Japanese aircraft carrier *Chuyo* 250 miles southeast of Tokyo Bay on December 4, 1943. The *Chuyo* was the first large Japanese man-of-war sunk by a submarine in 16 months.

Shaken by the depth charges and later bombed, the *Sailfish* nevertheless completed her patrol and returned to the States for repairs. And fulfilling the dream of a boy on Nob Hill, Ward brought the battered boat into San Francisco Bay through the Golden Gate.

He took the *Sailfish* on two more patrols, sinking additional shipping and two destroyers on the first run and picking up 11 American aviators who had been shot down making air-strikes at Tarawa on the second.

In 1945, he took command of a new submarine, the U.S.S. *Sea Leopard*, and was headed for action in the Pacific when the war ended. In 1946, he switched to the submarine U.S.S. *Chopper*.

Two years later he took over anti-submarine warfare (ASW) training at the Pacific

Fleet Sonar School in San Diego. Then, after a tour as executive officer of the submarine U.S.S. *Nereus* in 1950, he took command of Submarine Division 52 which comprised five guppy-type subs.

GOT FLAG RANK EARLY

He was a student at the National War College in 1953–54, then became administrative assistant to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for 2 years. In 1956, he assumed command of Submarine Squadron 7 and helped work out some radical new submarine-versus-submarine combat techniques.

A year later he returned to a surface ship, the amphibious attack cargo ship U.S.S. *Washburn*. The next year he moved up to a heavy cruiser, the U.S.S. *Rochester*.

He was selected for rear admiral in 1959, one of the youngest men to achieve the rank, and was assigned to the office of the Chief of Naval Operations. Later he went to the office of the Secretary of the Navy and served from April 1960 to May 1962 as Chief of Legislative Affairs.

"It's a job very few military officers get to have," Ward says. "It gave me a deep, reinforced respect for the way our form of government operates."

During the following year he was director of the Material Management Study Group, turning out a vast volume of recommendations on the Navy's material management; then he took command of Amphibious Group 2 in May 1963.

Nebraskans are proud to have Ward aboard. Gov. Frank Morrison welcomed him by making him an admiral in the mythical Nebraska navy. And Ward has discovered that since taking over the Reserve command he is known from here to the Orient and the eastern Mediterranean as "Mr. Omaha."

That's quite an improvement on sweet old Bob.

The 50th Anniversary of the Ordination of Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD the following statement on the 50th anniversary of the ordination of Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty:

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORDINATION OF JOZSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

On June 12, 1965, lovers of freedom the world over join to do honor to the heroic Hungarian cardinal, Jozsef Mindszenty, whose stubborn resistance to tyranny has thrilled and inspired us through many years. This date marks the 50th anniversary of Jozsef Mindszenty's ordination to the priesthood. Physically, this priest's pastoral mission is prevented, this archbishop's jurisdiction impeded, this primate's authority nullified, and this cardinal's participation in the administration of the Catholic Church made impossible. Yet still this priest, archbishop, primate, and cardinal, deprived of his rightful place and official functions in the Catholic Church in Hungary, stands before the world in a glory beyond these dignities. Imprisoned by the Nazi tyrants in 1944 and 1945; imprisoned again by the Communist tyrants from 1949 to 1956; and living in refuge in the U.S. Embassy in Budapest since November 1956, Cardinal Mindszenty is a living witness and martyr to the cause of religious freedom. On this occasion we recall, at once with joy and with sadness, the ordination of the young Hungarian priest on June 12, 1915. Father Mindszenty, born March 29, 1892, in Csehimindszent, Hungary, was but 23 when he took up his priestly office. Under the Nazi occupation, Father Mindszenty's pastoral care for his oppressed people, and his activities in alleviating their hardships, led, in 1944, both to his elevation to the post of bishop of Veszprem, and to his imprisonment. On October 2, 1945, after the Allied victory and his release from prison, he was made archbishop of Esztergom and primate of Hungary. Soon after this, February 18, 1946, he was made cardinal.

But though his faithful Hungarian people love and honor Cardinal Mindszenty; though Popes have raised him to the highest ecclesiastical honor short of the papacy itself; and though freemen everywhere look with admiration and sympathy upon his courage and his sufferings—yet it is, in the last analysis, to his Communist oppressors that this man owes his most shining glories. It is the tragic irony of persecution that it magnifies and ennobles its victims, while it dwarfs the persecutors themselves. The world knows and loves Cardinal Mindszenty. Those who tried him and those who testified against him in the Stalinist regime of 1949 are long forgotten. When Hungary rises, free and glorious, from the present term of Communist domination, Joszef Mindszenty will come into his own as one of the greatest national and religious heroes in the long and honorable history of the Hungarian people.

Prevent Duplication of Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in recent years this Congress and the executive branch have combined to superimpose programs upon programs. The result has been duplication, confusion, and outright waste.

An excellent example of some of this confusion and duplication was recently conveyed to me in a letter I received from Mr. R. P. Weiss, administrative assistant, Jefferson Union School District in Santa Clara, Calif. I believe all Members of the House would be interested in reading Mr. Weiss' letter to me. It will clearly point out that there is a crying need for guidelines to prevent duplication of effort.

The letter follows:

JEFFERSON UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Santa Clara, Calif., June 3, 1965.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLIE: In the past several weeks I have seen further evidence of duplication of effort, and I have also seen further awareness on the part of school people that this duplication exists. In Santa Clara County we must recognize the efforts of our own county office of education in their attempts to avoid duplicity; however, by the very nature of laws passed at the Federal and State level which affect education, it would appear there have been few guidelines offered to eliminate this needless duplication of effort.

Perhaps, on one of your visits home, you would like to speak to our teachers association with regard to Federal aid to education. Our association is almost 500 strong and includes teachers, administrators, counselors, nurses, psychologists, and librarians. Our local association has formed a special committee to study the effect of Federal aid to education on our local program, and a presentation by you to the entire association would assist them greatly in their efforts. Please advise me how we might schedule a program in the fall that would be convenient to you.

Sincerely,

R. P. WEISS,
Administrative Assistant.

Congress—More Profligate Than the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the free-spending Democrats and the expensive economy-minded President Johnson are feeding the flames of inflation under the guise of progress. The President has asked for voluntary restraint on the part of management and labor.

In some cases he has succeeded by using Executive pressure. This cannot be called voluntary restraint. That is, unless you are a Democrat. Unfortunately, until election time, the people must rely on the Congress and the President to practice voluntary restraint. It has already become obvious that the faith of our people has been betrayed by a most blatant disregard of sound economic principles in the pursuit of absolute political control by the exploitation of every man's common concern for the poor. It is my belief that in the next election, many of those in the Congress who have failed to practice voluntary restraint will be involuntarily restrained from returning to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Chicago Tribune on June 8 expresses a reasonable concern for the actions of Congress in handling the President's expensive economy and it reads as follows:

MORE PROFLIGATE THAN THE PRESIDENT

As profligate a spender as President Johnson is, Congress is proving more profligate still. Congress is supposed to be the watchdog of the Treasury and prudent controller of the purse strings. If so, the watchdog has taken knockout drops and the purse strings have been cut to speed the flow of dollars.

In his Washington radio report last Saturday, Walter Trohan, chief of the Capital bureau of the Tribune, recited the dismal facts. He said that the President's budget called for 42 specific authorizations. Of these, 32 were for authorization to spend new or additional funds. The remaining 10 were to save or recover funds.

Congress has rushed to comply with the spending requests. Among major appropriations already approved are those for the Appalachia area, Federal handouts to education, contributions to the International Monetary Fund, increases in the manpower development and training program, and for Federal

support of sewer construction. Seven other spending bills have been passed by either Senate or House.

So far only one bill to save money has been passed, and that only by the House. The savings are the negligible sum of $7½ million—a drop in the bucket of an administrative budget that is expected to hit $105 billion in the fiscal year beginning July 1. This legislation is in the form of an amendment to the Federal Farm Loan Act and Farm Credit Act which would help to eliminate Government credit in Federal intermediate credit banks.

Congress has backed away from proposals to save by merging the Army Reserve and National Guard and to cut agricultural research and conservation, as well as Public Health Service hospitals. Mr. Johnson, responding to a clamor of protest from affected communities, has shelved his recommendation that 14 veterans hospitals be closed.

Of course, the window dressing of Presidential "economy" is meaningless. In 1964, an election year, Mr. Johnson loaded part of his 1965 fiscal year spending onto the late President Kennedy's budget for the previous fiscal year, in order to make himself look good, and this year he had to come back to Congress for supplementary appropriations to cover spending in excess of figures slimmed down for the sake of appearances in the budget.

Mr. Trohan reckons that the budget for the fiscal year 1966 will carry about $3 billion in spending for 12 large new programs, such as that for the war on poverty. Another billion and a half will be added in supplementary appropriations.

Although Mr. Trohan perceives the possibility of cuts in the budget amounting to $8 billion, he states that, with free-spending Democrats in the saddle, and Congress going along in a carefree fashion, economy will never materialize. He anticipates that Federal spending will rise $5 billion a year in the future, with a proportionate degree of inflation, so that the Nation has seen the last of budgets which, in theory, at least, are under $100 billion.

The cash budget for the year, including disbursements through trust funds such as those for social security and highway construction, is now $127.4 billion—up $33.1 billion from Mr. Eisenhower's last year in office. As inflation proceeds, the people will have larger numbers of dollars, but the dollars will constantly buy less. This is the product of uncorseted Presidential spending policies and the abandonment of any trace of restraint by a Congress which throws billions around like confetti.

Midshipmen Class of 1965 Commencement Address by Paul H. Nitze, Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to insert in the RECORD the commencement address of the Honorable Paul H. Nitze, Secretary of the Navy, at the graduation exercises for the midshipmen class of 1965, they are:

Dean Delwin Sedar, son of the late Mike Sedar and Evelyn Sedar.

Thomas James Coyler, son of Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Coyler.

Kenneth Michael Castelano, son of Mr. and Mrs. Michael J. Castelano.

This graduation was particularly meaningful for me, because Mr. Sedar is the son of the late Mike Sedar, who was a classmate and lifelong friend of mine and who was an inspiration to all of Wyoming for his example of courage, physical fitness, and his moral leadership.

It is my pleasure to join Secretary Nitze in his wish to the midshipmen of "Godspeed and good luck."

The address follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE PAUL H. NITZE, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, AT THE GRADUATION OF THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY MIDSHIPMEN, CLASS OF 1965, ANNAPOLIS, MD.

Thank you, Admiral Minter. Members of the class of 1965, distinguished guests, careers beginning here today will play fascinating parts in the unfolding of the final third of the 20th century. The class of 1965 will have members on active duty until the year 2007. It has an excellent chance to produce the first Chief of Naval Operations and perhaps the first Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the 21st century.

During the next several minutes, let us project ourselves into the 42 years during which this class will make its contribution to our national destiny, speculating: first, on the statistical projection of the class as it progresses from today's base of the career pyramid to the ultimate peak; second, on the kind of world in which you will play your part; third, on the probable impact of this developing world of military careers.

The class profile can be forecast with reasonable confidence. We already know the statistics of the career choices you have made upon graduation. The class graduates today 801 strong. Seventy of these are entering the Marine Corps; 3, the Army; 10, the Air Force. Of the remainder, we can predict the following:

By 1967, 713 of you will have been promoted to lieutenant (jg.); by 1969, 682 of you will have achieved the rank of lieutenant; by 1975, 409 of you will be lieutenant commanders. By that year your choices of basic career channels will have become final. Among you, at that time, there will be 103 naval aviators; 146 submariners; 80 surface officers; 20 engineering duty officers; 7 weapons engineering duty officers; 15 construction engineering corps officers; 23 supply officers. Two hundred and twenty-five of those who remain in the line will have completed postgraduate courses. By 1981, a large number of you will become commanders; by 1987 a sizable portion of that group will be captains. Between the years 1988 and 1995, some 20 to 30 of those captains will have achieved flag rank. By the end of that period, several of you will have achieved three-star rank. By the end of the century, this class will have four-star admirals in command of fleets or unified commands. And within a year or two after that, in the beginning of the 21st century, a midshipman sitting here today will probably run up the flag of CNO or of Chairman of the JCS.

To pave the way for our projection of the nature of those years in which your careers will be spent, let us recall the literally unbelievable forecast that we might have made 42 years ago to the graduating class of 1923. Midshipman Arleigh Burke and his graduating classmates might have considered a speaker reasonable to have predicted the future breakup of the patchwork world order created out of the chaos of World War I. He might have seemed foolish, however, to have predicted the worldwide depression of 1929–33. And what sage could have foretold the rise of Hitler and Mussolini, the abject terror of the thirties and forties in Stalin's Russia, the cataclysm of World War II, the alliance of the free world with Communist Russia, the postwar struggle of Europe against Communist Russia, the communization of China? Who in his wildest imagination, in 1923, could have predicted fission weapons, to be followed by fusion weapons and intercontinental ballistic missile systems? Who could have foreseen the concept of limited war fought in Korea with the United States acting as the executive agent of a then unconceived United Nations? Who could have visualized the then isolationist United States: assisting in 1947 the Greeks and Turks; taking over the role of the British in the Mediterranean; pouring billions of treasure into the reconstruction of Europe; or fighting to assist South Vietnam to preserve her independence? Could one possibly have foreseen the sovereign nations of the world increasing in number from about 60 to 123?

Could one have predicted two super powers, each risking the loss of hundreds of millions of their citizens, over the issue of the emplacement of missiles in Cuba?

If these forecasts might have seemed fantastic 42 years ago, let us strike out boldly in suggesting possible changes in the next 42. My own judgment would be that however imaginatively we do so, we shall fall on the conservative side of the mark.

On the political scene, in the next 40 years, under the influence of rapidly changing technological and population factors, the world will be dramatically different. The most dangerous pressure point of recent years, the continuing division of Germany and the isolation of Berlin, could well have been eliminated through the unification of the two Germanies within a larger European association.

The nations of much of Europe and the Western Hemisphere will probably have worked out arrangements to associate to solve their supranational problems of convertibility of money and distribution of their agriculture and industrial excesses. Other areas of the world may also have developed regional associations of some significance. The United States, as a power with heavy responsibilities for world order and stability, probably will have alliance arrangements with those regional associations who are committed to a free world. The structure and operating procedure of the United Nations might have evolved appreciably to fold in these regional associations.

The polarized power structure of recent years will have given way to a more diverse situation in which five or six, or a dozen, major power centers exist, some loosely tied together through their regional arrangements.

The U.S.S.R. will have continued the improvement of her industrial base and her citizens will be enjoying standards of living comparable to those of our country today. As a result, we can expect that she will be less inclined to disturb the world's status quo and more likely to work with the free world in maintaining stability and order.

The key political issue of your 40 years will be the evolution of Communist China. As the United States and her allies maneuver to constrain her excesses, as her industrial base improves and the need for the resources of others lessens, as her revolution passes its thermidor and the second generation of Communists grow up, as her several leadership struggles produce dynamic changes, will it be possible to nurse her grudgingly and gradually into some degree of support for world order and responsible behavior? The outcome of this issue is truly imponderable. Whether Communist China can be brought into the fold without war is unpredictable. It depends on the calculus of her own internal developments. It depends on the wisdom with which the Soviet Union comports herself and, indeed, upon the wisdom, through the years, of U.S. foreign and military policy. Certainly, President Johnson is laying the

basis for the enlightened pursuit of this objective over the decades to come, by coupling his firm commitment of U.S. forces to assist South Vietnam with his offer of aid to southeast Asia, including the recalcitrant North Vietnamese.

Second, let us consider the field of technology and industrialization. During your 40 years, Communist China should achieve a degree of industrialization equivalent to that of the Soviet Union at the beginning of World war II. There will have been great strides in the technological development of Europe, North America, the U.S.S.R. and Japan. As a result, the standard of living of their peoples should show great improvement. You will serve your careers on behalf of a country where the lowliest citizen will increasingly acquire the good things of life as well as the leisure to enjoy them. The aid programs of the industrialized Northern Hemisphere, cooperatively or competitively, plus the aid programs of the United Nations, will have improved the infrastructure of the "have not" nations. Roads and railroads and incipient industrial bases will have been brought to the now isolated areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. These changes will be the first order effects of technology. By themselves, they are insufficient to narrow the gap between the "haves" and "have nots" but are likely rather to widen it. Yet, we cannot flatly state that this will be the end result. It is always difficult when examining technological revolutions to predict the second order effects of these revolutions. We tend to discount the moral values, the sociological effects, and the political consequences which such changes introduce into our lives. We tend to think of a new discovery as a means of doing better what we used to do before. We do not foresee the new things that can become possible once this particular new discovery has become known to many people of different backgrounds. These are the second order effects. And after these, there is a third stage, caused by the fact that the life of the average citizen changes to adapt to these new conditions.

It has been suggested that whenever an important technical parameter of our civilization varies by a factor of 10 or more, a radical change is usually introduced into the lives of the people. As an example, travel time from the east to the west coast of the United States has decreased by a factor of about 100 in the last century, while price of air travel has become 500 times cheaper since the early 1900 period. You are aware of the result. Similar changes in many fields are in store.

One of the great pressures shaping the torrent of these second and third effects of technological changes will be the population problem.

In China, India, and the underprivileged areas, the problem will have become acute. Today, we have 3.2 billion people in the world. In 2000, there will be at least 5.1 billion. The pressures of these populations, together with their fully awakened expectations, will spur the underprivileged lands and indeed, all nations, to greater exploitation of the earth. In the race to feed himself, man will have had to turn to the sea. He will have learned to conserve and farm the plant and animal food of the seas. He will have learned to live more fully on, in, and under the sea. He will have developed a capacity to exploit the resources under the ocean deeps. The converted fresh water of the oceans will have become essential to the sustenance of life on earth.

What, then, will military affairs and military careers be like in this vastly different world? Here again, we have only the dimmest guideposts.

First, let us consider weapons systems. During your careers, the world will become more dangerously armed with nuclear weapons. Even as you graduate, a fifth and most irresponsible nation has acquired fission weapons. Before you are lieutenants, you will see this Communist state acquire fusion weapons. Before you are commanders, Communist China will have acquired the means to deliver these weapons on our homeland. In the absence of effective arms control agreements, during your careers, perhaps 10 or 20 other nations will have acquired these weapons and delivery systems. The challenge to the United States and to her military services will be greater by far than it is today. To continue to deter any enemy from strikes on our homeland with nuclear weapons, we will have to think beyond present capabilities and such advances as the newly conceived Poseidon weapons system which will come into place in your early years. We will have to be able to demonstrate that we cannot only retaliate against any enemy overwelmingly, but also that we have the means to distinguish between our adversaries—to know from which enemy country or from which sea or airbased platform, weapons are fired. You will have had to consider the development of surface ship and ocean-bottom missiles and of scores of sea, aerospace, and land-based observation systems to maintain our strategic nuclear superiority.

Other new and equally destructive weapons systems will have been acquired. Lasers, germ, and genetic warfare may have achieved major significance as will other weapons systems not yet foreseeable. Capability to control the weather and the oceanological environment may well come in your time.

You will have the problem of analyzing how to integrate into a single national defense system the component parts necessary to provide defense against the strategic weapon systems of several adversaries. For example, to guard against strategic nuclear assault, you must evaluate the contributions of civil defense, antiballistic missile defense, bomber defense, antisubmarine defense to ascertain the best damage limitation mix. Into this equation you will have to add defensive systems against other strategic threats.

It will be your lot to conceive, build, and deploy new strategic umbrellas for the United States, to prevent an enemy from being able to use such systems against us. Correspondingly, you will find yourselves continuously evaluating the time at which present conventional weapons systems require replacement, in order to maintain a capability for the United States to apply minimum force precisely where needed without the major destruction and escalatory risks of strategic weapons.

By the end of your careers, the U.S. Navy will be almost completely nuclear propelled, submarines will be submerging to unimaginable depths, and the use of submarines will have been enlarged to encompass practically the entire spectrum of naval craft. Before the end of the 20th century, it should be possible to land U.S. forces on short notice, in response to emergency requests, from submarine amphibious forces supported by suddenly surfacing aircraft and missile carrying ships, and perhaps even suddenly retrorocketed amphibious space stations.

In the field of sublimited war, you will have developed a whole new field of expertise. Much of your careers will be spent in helping to contain and counterthrust the sublimited aggression of the Communist bloc as the free world supports and strengthens its concept of world order based on law and respect for the sovereignty of others. Your work here will involve increasing cooperation and liaison with foreign navies and other foreign officials. The foreign language you have learned here will be put to good use.

In the field of command and control the vistas are remarkable. During your early commissioned years, man will land on the moon and return, and permanently occupy orbiting space stations. During your middle years, man will land on Mars and return, and other planets will have been explored by instrument or the human eye.

The technology developed as a result of these programs, and others, will provide the United States a capability to station aerospace platforms to observe everything that moves.

Unknown to most of us, the technological world is now entering a second electronics revolution. The cost of the electronics components and the volume they occupy are decreasing by orders of magnitude. This development will provide the sensors to place into space platforms and the communications to transmit the data the sensors acquire.

Computerization will come into its own. Data transmitted into them, integrated with spoken orders from your ships and other craft will produce reactions and analyses at other locations.

Perhaps the greatest impact of the technology of your world on military careers will be the second order effects related to communications and data collecting. In the past we have been limited by a point-to-point transmission or by the necessity to erect large towers and fixed antennas, to broadcast. Moreover, only the most expensive central locations have been able to collate and analyze all data received. Communications satellites and other transmission media in the future will have within themselves the promise of a system where anyone can talk to anyone else without going through switches. At the same time future computers will make it possible to use vast amounts of data so received. Consider the effect on future military organizations. The communications system will permit each commander up through the Commander in Chief to listen to and evaluate all the transmissions which take place between all elements. When this comes to pass our military line system may begin to change into a web-shaped structure in which many elements are able to evaluate and assume command, and from which command intelligence flows outward in ripplelike form.

We have already reached the stage in the integration of human affairs where the decision to build or not to build new weapons systems is often a national issue. This will become increasingly the case. During your careers an entire new military art is likely to develop; i.e., the analysis of the second and third effects on our Nation and possible adversaries of decisions to build or not to build new systems.

The effects of these changes on your careers can be stated in general terms. You will need far better technical foundations than your predecessors. You will acquire responsibility for complex systems, ships, aircraft, and platforms earlier and under more unnatural environments than those who have come before. There will be more remotely located places to be manned, with a constant information flow to be evaluated. Yet, the collection of data at the center and the necessity for detailed overall control from the center will increase the demand for numbers of responsible officers at headquarters locations. I would anticipate that large portions of the second halves of your careers will be spent in evaluating competitive programs to ascertain not only those which are more cost effective but those which also have the desirable second- and third-stage effects.

It is truer today than it has even been before that the undergraduate education you have received is merely the "qualifying" round. As my projections have suggested, your military, technical, and above all, your human education will have to continue throughout the entire span of your careers;

you will be acquiring new insights and new knowledge on matters not yet known to man.

It is for that reason that I, for one, have been pleased with the changes instituted in the Naval Academy over the last several years which have been designed to make you capable of acquiring the vast knowledge yet to come to you.

The academicians that the Navy has successfully assembled here have, I am confident, accomplished this objective well. This class has had another great advantage. It has served under the inspirational leadership of two remarkable Superintendents, Adm. Charlie Kirkpatrick and Adm. Charlie Minter. They and the executive team they have assembled here set a leadership example that will serve you well. Nothing I have discussed of the exciting events of the future gives any intimation to me that the role of leadership will lessen. As a matter of fact, the problems and skills of leadership during your careers will be more important than ever. You will have to make time during your busy and technically oriented lives to come to know and understand and lead those with whom you associate and whom you will command. The great work that has been done here, and the examples set, have prepared you well.

I wish you Godspeed and good luck.

Installation of Dr. Carl W. Folkemer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on Pentecost Sunday, Christ Lutheran Church in my district in Baltimore, had the pleasure of installing one of its sons as its pastor. Up until the time he began his theological training at Gettysburg College, he was a faithful member of Christ Church, and since his ordination, has served two congregations in the Baltimore-Washington area.

On that occasion Mayor Theodore R. McKeldin of Baltimore delivered an address of welcome to Dr. Folkemer, which I would like to insert in the Appendix of the Record, because of its inspirational nature:

AN ADDRESS OF WELCOME TO DR. CARL W. FOLKEMER, PASTOR

It is a pleasure of an unusual kind to welcome Dr. Folkemer to the pastorate of Christ Lutheran Church, for it is actually a return to his childhood home.

As a small boy, Carl W. Folkemer attended Sunday school in this church, and as a youth he worshipped here with his parents. But as he attained young manhood the path of duty led him away from Baltimore, first to Gettysburg College, and when he had completed his secular education there, to Lutheran Seminary, from which he was ordained in 1940.

But the lure of the Chesapeake country was strong, and I like to believe that it played some part in bringing him to Luther Place Memorial Church in Washington, where he served 2 years as assistant pastor.

Then he assumed his first full charge, and where was it? At St. John's in Linthicum Heights, where his pastorate extended to the extraordinary length of 23 years—ample evidence of the affection that grew up between pastor and flock.

Now he has come full circle, back to his first spiritual home, but no longer the small Sunday school pupil, no longer the youth looking hopefully, if uncertainly, at the great world outside. We welcome today the distinguished scholar and theologian, Carl W. Folkemer, bachelor of theology, master of theology, doctor of divinity, recognized authority on the "Niney-five Theses," and one of the intellectual ornaments of American Lutheranism.

Do you wonder that I called this an unusual pleasure?

As the representative, not of Lutherans alone but of the whole city, I would find it a pleasure to draw attention to distinction conferred upon any member of the Baltimore clergy, regardless of his origin, or of the rite by which he worships. But it so happens that I, too, am a Baltimore boy, so I find it a double pleasure and also a matter of pride to hail this man of the cloth who is not only a citizen, but also a product of Baltimore.

Perhaps some of the more austere brethren may accuse me of un-Christian pride, and they may be right, at that; but I am persuaded that it is not wrong, it is entirely right, to hope that the young in this congregation, aspiring youth as well as Sunday school children, will mark this occasion and take it to heart. For it was here that the man we honor today learned to fear God and do his duty; and because, when he went out into the great world beyond these walls, he never forgot that lesson, as the years gathered upon him, so did honors that now are reflected upon the place that bred him.

What he did, others can do. Of course, not everyone can become a great classical scholar, or follow the subtle thinking of the famous doctors of theology. But everyone of us can fear God and do his duty. That is not a matter of brilliant talent. It is a matter of faith and courage.

Yet, the man with the character and the will to apply in the outside world what he has been taught within these walls, cannot fail to gather honor with his years. It may not be intellectual, political, or military honor; that depends upon circumstances often beyond our control. But whatever the description of his honor, it will be real; for it is written: "The hoary head is a crown of glory, if it be found in the way of righteousness."

So as representative of the city beyond this church, and beyond the Lutheran communion, I take pleasure in welcoming Dr. Folkemer to this charge; but as a native son I take more than pleasure, I take delight and pride in welcoming him.

"Let us now praise famous men," said the prophet known as Ecclesiasticus, and I happily accept the invitation for one who belongs to that category; for

"The Lord hath wrought great glory by them * * *
Men renowned for their power,
Giving counsel by their understanding * * *
Leaders of the people by their counsels,
And by their knowledge of learning meet for the people,
Wise and eloquent in their instructions:
All these were honored in their generations,
And were the glory of their times.

Others who participated in the installation were the Reverend Augustus Hackman, D.D., synodical representative and dean of Baltimore West District, and pastor of Second Lutheran Church in Baltimore; the Reverend Roy L. Sloop, visitation pastor of Second Lutheran Church in Baltimore; and the Reverend Howard O. Walker, pastor of St. Peter's Lutheran Church in York, Pa. Arrangements were made by the members of the pulpit committee: Mr. Louis F. Huber, chairman, Mr. Henry G. Erck, Mr. William J. Frank, Mr. Milton C. Smith, and Mr. H. Herbert Wanner, Jr.; and the church council officers: Mr. H. Herbert Wanner, Jr., vice president; Mr. Henry G. Erck, treasurer; Mr. Milton C. Smith, secretary; and Mr. J. Charles Strott, financial secretary.

Dr. Folkemer was fortunate in having present on that occasion, his mother, Mrs. Paul I. Folkemer.

For Dr. Folkemer and the members of Christ Lutheran Church, I pray for a long and blessed ministry.

"The States of the Union—Shape Up or Ship Out"—Chapter IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this is the last of four installments of the brilliant series on the crisis of responsibility in Federal-State relations written for the Kansas City Star by the Star's Kansas correspondent, Ray Morgan. This final chapter points the way for responsible government at all levels, under the leadership of freemen who care, to preserve our constitutional concept. I am delighted to be able to bring this entire series to the attention of the Congress and of the leadership of the Nation:

"THE STATES OF THE UNION—SHAPE UP OR SHIP OUT"—CHAPTER IV

(By Ray Morgan)

WASHINGTON.—The quiet crisis has replaced the rattling rifle fire and booming mortars of Antietam and Shiloh of 100 years ago in the effort to preserve and strengthen the Federal Union, but the issues are still as clear and vibrant.

Out of the bright minds of such men as Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and Alexander Hamilton came the concept of a union of sovereign States willing to the National Government the rights to protect certain universal freedoms and provide certain national services of mutual need.

Ever since, freemen have debated in taverns, on the floors of Congress, and in political conventions the meanings of this concept, the roles of the State and local governments on one hand and the Federal Government on the other.

MOVE TO CENTRISM

After the bloody Civil War of 1861 to 1865 was fought on this issue, the pendulum of government began to swing toward a stronger and stronger National Government as the States and local governments, under the union concept, began to abdicate more and more responsibility.

Now, however, there is growing concern here and across the Nation by the Members of Congress, President Lyndon Johnson and organizations of other units of government, that there is a danger that the State and local governments may wither as partners and die from inactivity.

No one wants to talk about this crisis as one of State rights, because as one Member of Congress said recently in the National Capitol building, "It is unfortunate that the term has become virtually synonymous in

recent years with the building of political prisons for Negroes."

Instead it is a genuine awareness by Senators and Representatives who owe their existence to the voters in their respective States; President Johnson; Dwight D. Eisenhower and others that the concept of government must be changed from one of isolated layers into one of cooperative partners.

TASK FOR HUMPHREY

President Johnson has begun to talk about the partnership in terms of "creative federalism." Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, who knows the problems both from his role as a U.S. Senator and as a former mayor of Minneapolis, has been named to work with cities and counties.

One Federal official said in discussions this week: "We've got to stop thinking about our Federal system as a layer cake with each layer separated in its own compartment, but as a marble cake with the layers intertwined in one equal unit."

The concern of the Congress for the future of Federal, State, and local government relations is shown in the new series of hearings being conducted by the House and Senate intergovernmental relations subcommittees, headed by Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, and Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina.

Dr. Walter Heller, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors under Johnson and the late John F. Kennedy, has suggested that Federal taxing resources utilized to raise funds for State and local governments.

ANDERSON HAS PLAN

John Anderson, Jr., former Governor of Kansas, told the subcommittees last week that he thought Congress should explore such a concept. He said his experience had indicated States were reluctant to enter certain areas only because of a lack of funds.

William G. Coleman, executive director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations the last 5 years, has become one of the most articulate spokesmen on the roles of the three levels of Government.

The commission has served to bring the issue into focus, with its membership of three U.S. Senators, three U.S. House Members, three from the Federal executive branch, four Governors, three State legislators, three county officials, four mayors, and three public members.

An example of the renewed concern of the States for a partnership role is indicated by the current effort to establish a New England interstate planning commission to coordinate planning regarding the physical, economic, and social resources of the New England States.

BILLS MUST COINCIDE

This commission would undertake pertinent studies and make practical recommendations for achieving these goals. Consistent legislation in the six States involved is naturally necessary, and a bill has been drafted which the six Governors have approved. The bill was developed out of the deliberation and cooperation fo three New England organizations and the Council of States Governments.

County governments are receiving renewed interest because of their role and new demands are being made for their efficient operation. This stems from the fact that even in the largest cities the county has responsibility for many of the most important functions, such as welfare, care of the aged, mental health, juvenile matters, courts and penal administration.

The trend to the suburbs has brought the urban county face to face with becoming a regional city providing a host of municipal services once the sole responsibility of cities.

Out of all these discussions, both from the standpoint of the State and local government officials who come here and from Federal officials administering the programs, these seem to be basic facts:

Federal grants-in-aid must continue to be used to encourage the State and local governments to overhaul their machinery and undertake reforms that will make them more effective tools in the Federal partnership of government.

State governments must continue the processes now underway to revamp their constitutions to bring them into the modern era of transportation and communications, give more power to city and county governments, cooperate in regional projects, and provide regional planning among themselves.

State and local governments must be given a greater voice in determining domestic policies through congressional action to require that Federal programs be administered by intergovernmental boards which include them, in the fashion of the Advisory Commission on Intergovenmental Regulations.

County governments must reorient themselves as government units of the future by replacing sole authorities of boards of judges or commissioners with an administrative executive such as mayors in city governments and by becoming active, vibrant coordinated area units.

The time has come for an overall approach to the problem of government financing with a goal of finding the most efficient way of channeling the share of gross national product needed to finance Federal, State, and local administration.

SPUR FOR ACTION

There is a growing awareness at all levels of enlightened leadership that a government of freemen is only the vehicle for doing cooperatively what they cannot do for themselves individually. This leadership is attempting to galvanize the laggards into a new preservation of our constitutional concept.

Perhaps the best summation lies in the story of a visit, by the great Daniel Webster, home to one of his New England towns. As he walked along the street, a woman stopped him on the sidewalk and asked:

"How goes it with the Union, Mr. Webster?"

"It goes well with the Union, madam," Webster is reported to have replied. "It will as long as freemen care."

The Total Dedication of Pete Akers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Chicago Sun-Times, Milburn P. Akers, has just retired. His journalistic seriousness and concern for city and State government have left a definite imprint on the great newspaper he served. He is a familiar face in my hometown of Peoria, having worked on the newspaper that preceded the Peoria Journal Star.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star which appeared on June 11, 1965. It gives a very good synopsis of the hard work and the many contributions of Pete Akers:

THE TOTAL DEDICATION OF PETE AKERS

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

Those lines by Longfellow came to mind when we read this week of the retirement of Milburn P. Akers, editor of the Chicago Sun-Times.

Pete Akers, who is widely known in the Peoria area because of his many talks here and because he once worked for the Peoria Transcript, left behind some footprints worth noting.

"Total dedication" were to be read in the sands of time wherever Akers traveled.

He was totally dedicated to making the Chicago Sun-Times a great newspaper, and because of that single-minded determination, we believe, he succeeded in his task.

He rose to editor of that newspaper because of total dedication to whatever job lay before him. He wanted to do that job as well as he possibly could, no matter the obstacle, no matter lack of recognition. He was completely devoted to doing the best he could in the job he was in.

Thus he rose from reporter on a number of newspapers, including the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and the Peoria Transcript, to managing editor, executive editor, and finally editor of the Chicago Sun-Times.

Akers, whose 42-year career included serving as correspondent for the Associated Press in Springfield, Chicago, and Washington, had (and still has—his column still runs once a week) a number of talents. Most of all, he is keenly perceptive of what government is doing and what it should be doing.

But what carried this son of a Methodist minister to his high journalistic honors, we believe, was his total dedication to his work. His was no halfhearted interest in getting the job done. His attitude was never "any old way will do." He wanted nothing but the finest job that could be done.

This was the philosophy which enabled him to turn the Sun-Times from tabloid sensationalism into a serious, yet hard-hitting newspaper. Talent alone couldn't accomplish this minor journalistic miracle. It took complete devotion and single mindedness.

The total dedication of Pete Akers when turned on the affairs of city and State was a great force in effecting improvement in government.

Akers will continue to give total dedication, we are sure, in his new post on the Illinois Board of Higher Education.

Anyone looking for a clue to success can surely find it in the footprints on the sands of time left by Pete Akers. We wish him well and are grateful for his illustrating so well that the key to life is total dedication to your work.

Castro's Communist Hand in Dominican Revolt Documented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Sunday Washington Star of June 13, over the byline of Jeremiah O'Leary, details the Communist infiltration in the Dominican Republic and the part Castro-trained groups played in the revolt.

Mr. O'Leary's article is based on an official U.S. paper compiled by U.S. intelligence sources expert in Communist activities. The paper overwhelmingly supports our action in sending marines into

the Dominican Republic. It also substantiates my long-held contention that Castro poses a serious threat to the sovereignty of other Latin American nations.

In my May newsletter, I said the following:

Castro's efforts to subvert other governments in this hemisphere were dramatically illustrated in the Dominican Republic and I predict that the festering troubles now besetting that Caribbean nation will erupt in much the same form in other parts of Latin America unless this country becomes determined to treat the disease as well as the symptoms.

The disease is Communist Cuba where training in infiltration and subversion has become that island nation's major export. Thousands of Communists from throughout Latin America have been receiving schooling in subversive tactics in Cuba's training schools for many years now. After graduating, these trainees return to their own countries where they infiltrate labor unions, universities, and other groups in which they can stir up discontent and egg on revolutions.

It is essential that short-of-war action be taken against the cancer in our hemisphere—Communist Cuba. There are numerous weapons available including a meaningful trade ban, the recognition of a non-Communist Cuban government-in-exile so that the refugees, with the encouragement of the United States, can win back their own freedom, and stopping the flow of Communist trainees and arms between Cuba and other Latin American nations, as examples.

In light of the documentation by U.S. intelligence sources of Castro's part in the Dominican Republic revolt, I am hopeful the administration will adopt meaningful measures to weaken Castro's hold on Cuba and his export of Communist and thereby prevent further Communist revolts in this hemisphere.

Following is the above-referred-to article by Mr. O'Leary which appeared in the Star, June 13, 1965:

U.S. DOCUMENTS RED ATTEMPT TO SEIZE REVOLT—THREE SEPARATE GROUPS WORKED TOGETHER IN DOMINICAN CRISIS

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

The organized effort by three Communist Parties to capture the revolt in the Dominican Republic and seize power in that country has been documented in an official U.S. paper compiled by intelligence sources expert in Communist activities.

The report, chronologically and in narrative form, describes the day-by-day activities in Santo Domingo between April 24 and May 5 of 77 known Communists. Many of the 77 were previously identified as participants in the revolt by U.S. Government sources on May 6, but the new document gives intimate details of their participation before and after the American intervention.

The document, obtained last night, is the first disclosure of details of the Communist participation in the revolt from U.S. sources since a list of 58 leftists was disclosed.

At least 45 of the extremists had been deported from the Dominican Republic in May 1964, and most of them received guerrilla warfare training in Cuba before they started filtering back into the Dominican Republic last October, the document disclosed. Cuba's principal agency for promoting revolutionary activities in Latin America, the General Directorate of Intelligence (DGI), trained many of the Dominican rebel leaders, the document said.

THREE RED PARTIES LISTED

DGI has for some time provided financial support to two of the three Dominican Communist parties: the 14th of June Political Group (APCJ) and the Dominican Popular Movement (MPD). The APCJ party, according to U.S. sources, has between 3,000 and 5,000 members and has been Communist-run and pro-Castro since early 1963. MPD, which follows the Peiping line, has about 500 members. The other Dominican Communist group, which cooperated in the rebellion, is the Dominican Popular Socialist Party (PSPD) with between 800 to 1,000 members who follow the Moscow line.

The U.S. document said the parties acted in harmony in the current rebellion.

It said the largest department in the DGI is the one responsible for directing Latin American guerrilla warfare activities. Identified as the DGI officer who handles revolutionary operations for the Dominican Republic is Roberto Santiesteban Casanova, who was reported by the United States for engaging in espionage in 1962 while serving with the Cuban delegation to the United Nations.

The 26-page document is virtually a "white paper" on the Dominican revolt and reflects the official U.S. version of what transpired there. The following is a day-by-day account of Communist activities in the Dominican revolt as compiled by U.S. intelligence sources from April 24 to May 5:

APRIL 24

Elements of the Dominican Army, led by disaffected middle-grade and junior officers, revolted against the government of Donald Reid Cabral. They seized control of the 27th of February military camp, making prisoners of the army chief of staff and his deputy.

A group of civilians seized two radio stations in Santo Domingo and announced that Reid had been overthrown. The radio stations were retaken later in the day by Reid forces, but just before they were forced off the air the rebels called on the civilian population to join the anti-Reid movement and to go into the streets to support the rebellion.

Communist leaders of all three parties issued orders to their members to incite the civilian crowds gathering in the streets, and to stage rallies and demonstrations. The Communists began organizing their forces and assigning members to various functions throughout the city.

Among those Communists active in the first hours of revolt were: Narcisi Isa Conde, of the PSPD), already armed with a submachinegun; Diomedes Mercedes Batista (PSPD), who was relaying instructions to party members to stand up for further orders; and Amin Abel Hasbun, APCJ member, engaged in organizing for Communist participation in the revolt, operating from a house on Elvira de Mendza Street.

The situation in Santo Domingo became increasingly confused. Senior officers of the Dominican air force and army informed Reid that they would not support him, and he resigned and went into hiding.

PSPD members carrying weapons gathered at Parque Independencia early in the morning and harangued civilian crowds in support of the revolt. Among these again were Diomedes Mercedes Batista and Narciso Isa Conde. Also active was Asdrubal Dominguez Guerrero, a student leader who received training in Russia in 1962. Throughout the morning, mobile loudspeaker units, including a white Volkswagen station wagon operated by Diomedes Mercedes Batista, patrolled the city urging the population to join the revolt.

In what later proved to be a key element of the revolt, rifles and machineguns seized by rebellious army elements were handed out to the civilian crowds during the day. One of the rebel officers, Capt. Mario Pena Tavares, arranged for distribution of several thousand weapons, including machineguns and hand grenades. Arms from the camp were loaded on trucks and sent to the downtown area of Santo Domingo where they were passed out to civilians. The following Communist leaders participated with army rebels in handing out arms and in some cases assumed control of the distribution:

Hugo Tolentino Dipp, PSPD leader who received guerrilla training in Cuba; Fidelio Despradel Roque, APCJ leader, trained in Cuba and one of the chief figures in the guerrilla uprising in late 1963; Felix Servio Ducoudray Mansfield of the PSPD, former resident of the Soviet Union and Cuba and one-time employee of the Peiping Communist New China News Agency; Eduardo Houellemont Roques, APCJ, who was in Cuba in the 1963 guerrilla operation.

Other Communists who handed out arms were: Buenaventura Johnson Pimental, Juan Ducordray Mansfield, who once worked on Havana Radio broadcasts to the Dominican Republic, and Gerardo Rafael Estevez Weber, all of the PSPD; and Maximo Bernard Vasquez, of the APCJ, who worked with subversives in the Dominican military in the 1963 guerrilla movement.

Bottles and gasoline from tank trucks at several points in the city were distributed to civilians for making Molotov cocktails, MPD members being particularly active in this work.

A mob of several thousand civilians, armed with clubs and rifles, marched on the National Palace, responding to a call issued over a rebel-held radio station. Among them were armed Communists.

Rebels seized the National Palace and the rebel army officers gathered to assume control. Members of the Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD) arrived with the intention of installing an interim government headed by PRD leader Rafael Molina Urena, pending return of the ousted former President, Juan Bosch. The PRD leaders and rebel army officers who were pro-Bosch prevailed and Molina became provisional President. But military officers who had not joined the rebellion declared they would attack the rebels unless a military junta were installed to prepare for national elections in September.

Many important Communists attended political meetings in the National Palace that day. Among those conferring with Molina was Facundo Gomez, a PSPD member and part owner of the *Scarlet Woman*, a boat used in the attempted landing of Cuban arms in the Dominican Republic in November 1963. Another, Alejandro Lajara Gonzales, an APCJ member who had been active in distributing arms to civilians, was appointed by Molina to be Deputy Director of Investigation (the Security Service).

Communist agitators began inciting the armed mobs to burn, destroy property, and seize additional arms. MPD members were told their party planned to kill any policeman found on the streets. Armed civilians roamed the city, many of them looting stores and private homes.

The offices and plant of the anti-Communist newspaper Prensa Libre were seized by an armed group which included Communists. They prepared immediately to publish propaganda leaflets.

The offices of three anti-Communist political parties, the democratic conservative Union Civica Nacional, the moderate rightwing Partido Liberal Revolucionista, and the moderate center Vanguardi Revolucionaria Dominicana, were broken into and sacked.

During the afternoon, Communist organizers continued to distribute weapons to groups regarded as reliable by the Communist parties, as well as to round up additional manpower for civilian militia units. Weapons depots and distribution points were set up.

Mercedes Batista and other PSPD leaders were observed leading a paramilitary force

armed with submachineguns, rifles, and grenades.

Other armed Communist groups were observed on streets and in buildings, including one led by Manuel Gonzalez Gonzalez, Spanish civil war veteran and Cuban intelligence agent.

APRIL 26

Antirebel forces, which had been badly disorganized, now began to move against the rebel-held area of the city under command of Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, head of the Armed Forces Training Center. The Dominican Air Force bombed and strafed rebel-held installations. The ferocity of this and subsequent attacks consolidated public resentment and inadvertently presented the rebels with an effective propaganda weapon.

A large quantity of arms and ammunition had, by this time, fallen into the hands of the Communists. Teams of party members were fanning out through the central part of Santo Domingo organizing paramilitary groups.

Agitators from all three Red parties continued to exhort the mobs. They distributed mimeographed propaganda sheet calling on the people to fight and stating, in part, that "the hour has arrived to give arms to the working class * * * to form common units of soldiers and civilians and to organize people's combat units."

Additional Communist leaders were identified among the armed mobs and in the rebel military forces, including Juan Miguel Romman Diaz, of the ACPI, who participated in the 1963 guerrilla operation, and Jaime Duran Herando, Cuban-trained guerrilla expert.

Gustavo Ricart who returned from Cuba in 1963 bringing money to finance MPD activities, was identified as the commander of another rebel stronghold. Five other Communists were in charge of production of a considerable number of Molotov cocktails during the day.

The leaders of the various Communist parties were well equipped with weapons and became an increasingly important element in the rebel force. Rebel army officers and men, numbering about 1,000 at the outset, were soon greatly outnumbered by armed civilians who, in a state of disorganization, became easy prey for disciplined Communist leadership.

Efforts by the U.S. Embassy toward a cease-fire between the rebels and elements of the Dominican armed forces were unsuccessful. During the day, a large number of American citizens assembled in the Hotel Emmajador seeking safety. They requested assistance from the U.S. Embassy in evacuating them from Santo Domingo, which was under bombardment by the Dominican Air Force and was by this time the scene of widespread rifle and artillery fire between the opposing factions. The Embassy secured from the rebel leaders agreement to cooperate in evacuating Americans from the nearby port of Haina. Armed civilian groups, over which the Molina regime had lost control, paid no attention to this agreement.

APRIL 27

About 100 armed civilians, hearing over the rebel radio that a prominent Dominican newspaperman and broadcaster, well known as anti-Communist, was at the Hotel Embajador (actually he was not there) went to the hotel and fired several hundred shots. April 27 saw the complete breakdown of law and order. Molina, the so-called provisional president, went to the U.S. Embassy in apparent defeat, accompanied by rebel army leaders, Col. Miguel Angel Hernando Ramirez and Col. Francisco Caamano Deno. Shortly afterward, Molina abandoned office and took asylum in the Colombian Embassy.

During the day, Lajara Gonzalez of the APCJ arranged for additional arms to be passed to Communists. The offices and plant of the newspaper Listin Diario was taken over by armed PSPD Communists headed by Asdrubal Dominquez Guerrero and Jose Israel Cuello Hernandez, both carrying automatic weapons.

APRIL 28

The anti-rebel armed forces commanded by General Wessin established a three-man military junta headed by Col. Pedro Bartolome Benoit (air force), Col. Enrique Apolinario Casado Saladin (army) and Capt. Manuel Santana Carasco (navy). Early in the day, the junta seemed to make progress against the rebels but encountered heavier resistance in the afternoon and lost momentum.

The situation in the city was increasingly tense and confused. Junta forces, tired and disorganized, began to crumble. Armed mobs terrorized the city, firing on homes and other buildings, including the United States and other embassies. With collapse of the Molina government, PRD leaders abdicated their positions of leadership fearing their cause lost and their lives in danger. They left the rebel movement in the hands of politically immature army officers who had lost command over armed civilians who now far outnumbered the rebel army forces. Communist leaders, by then in control of the armed mobs, moved quickly into the political leadership vacuum in Santo Domingo.

Late in the afternoon, the junta and police authorities informed the U.S. Embassy they could no longer assure the safety of American lives. U.S. Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett recommended that U.S. Marines be landed to establish a safety perimeter from which Americans and other foreign citizens could be evacuated. By that night, approximately 600 marines were landed and had taken positions around the Hotel Embajador.

APRIL 29

The rebels held the central part of the city and retained the military initiative. An armed mob under Communist MPD leaders began a full-scale assault on the remaining police stronghold, Ozama Fortress. The fortress fell next day. Another armed mob sacked the cathedral.

Communists among the university students were active in organizing the crowds.

House-to-house fighting continued. The United States and several other embassies remained under sniper fire. The U.S. Government ordered the landing of an additional 1,100 marines and, during the night of April 29–30, approximately 2,000 troops of the 82d Airborne Division landed at San Isidro. Reinforcements arrived on succeeding days.

Leaders of all three Communist groups met to discuss tactics in the light of new developments. They also met with rebel military officers.

APRIL 30

The official rebel radio broadcast instructions to armed mobs not to fire on U.S. troops but firing continued and a number of casualties were inflicted on U.S. personnel.

Two Communist commando groups were particularly active roaming the city looking for targets. Other Communists working closely with rebel army officers included two who received political and guerrilla training in Cuba in 1963.

MAY 1

A shaky cease-fire was achieved but snipers were active throughout the day, firing on the U.S. Embassy and U.S. troops. This was in keeping with propaganda emanating from the rebel-held area that the real purpose of the cease-fire was to permit junta forces to reassemble and attack from a sanctuary provided by U.S. troops.

About 50 Communists, probably a high command group of all 3 parties, met in one of the Communist strongpoints fortified with machinegun emplacements on the roof.

MAY 2

A shortwave radio transmitter in the home of a Communist broadcast instructions to the civilian mobs to shoot Americans on sight. A large crowd gathered in the Praque Independencia heard a violently anti-American speech from a Communist.

MAY 3–4

Rebel leaders began to consider how to give their movement the form and structure of a legitimate government. Communist leaders discussed among themselves the desirability of their top leaders withdrawing from open participation in the rebel movement in order both to support rebel claims that the movement was free of Communist influence and to afford protection to the principal figures of the Communist parties.

Colonel Caamano Deno, generally regarded as anti-Communist, had said on several occasions during the revolt that he was aware the Communists had been playing an increasingly important role.

MAY 5

It was the consensus at meetings of Communist leaders that, while rank-and-file members of the three parties should fight on, prominent Communists should begin withdrawing from the scene. Some went into hiding, others attempted to leave Santo Domingo for towns to the north. One of these was later captured by antirebel forces.

Some of the APCJ and PSPD leaders who left Santo Domingo were under instructions to attempt to organize local party members and sympathizers for eventual guerrilla action in the north. False identity cards were prepared for Communist leaders.

MPD leaders also agreed that the more prominent party figures should go under cover for the time being. They further decided that arms and ammunition in the hands of party members should be hidden for possible use in guerrilla operations. Orders were given to secure as many arms as they could and deliver them to party headquarters.

Offensive in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Peoria Journal Star on June 10, 1965, pointed out that the only question involved in Vietnam dealt with our commitment—not our ability. The recent movement of the free world's military forces should remove any doubts or questions the Communists have had regarding our commitment to defend the Republic of South Vietnam. The editorial that I have referred to follows:

OFFENSIVE IN VIETNAM

The State Department's formal announcement Tuesday that we are going to provide combat support if requests are made by the South Vietnamese command (whoever that is) would hardly seem to be news because that is what we have been doing for the past couple of years.

What the announcement apparently means is that we are readying a large-scale offensive action which will involve regular American Army and Marine units rather than depend upon limited warfare tactics of our Special Forces and the Vietnamese Army which obviously are failing to stem a Communist takeover of South Vietnam.

If this is the case, we can expect that American combat casualties which now total about 400 dead and 2,000 wounded in 4½ years of limited fighting will grow considerably as the meat grinder of day-in, day-out combat begins to turn.

Such a prospect is black indeed, but it does not appear to us that there there is any way to avoid it, short of surrendering the nation we have been defending to communism. President Johnson's appeals for negotiations have fallen on deaf ears and apparently nothing but a real war effort on our part is going to bring the Communists to an agreement to halt their efforts to take over this country.

Strength—from the time of Lenin down to today—has been the only thing that Communist leaders have understood and feared, and in this time in point the strength quite obviously is in the hands of the United States. The question has been whether we intend to use it, and Johnson's answer is clearly that we do.

The above chart shows that we have more than doubled the number of fighting men we have in South Vietnam in the past 6 months. The Allen-Scott report across the page says the Joint Chiefs of Staff want to double the number again.

Reports of troop movements through Hawaii and from Okinawa appear from day to day, and it could be that a great deal more is taking place than we are aware of. Reference to Korean and Nationalist China offers of troops in large numbers add to the picture an aura of impending bloodshed.

Actions taken 2 weeks in Australia and New Zealand, both of whom announced they would send combat units to South Vietnam, indicate some success has been achieved by Henry Cabot Lodge in convincing our allies that we need help to carry on against the Communist effort to dominate southeast Asia.

The Australian and New Zealander contingents, totaling about 1,000 men, are small, but the important thing is that they are committed—and committed to combat rather than the halfway role of advisers.

Part of the reason that America's long involvement in South Vietnam has not met with success stems from the fact that both President Eisenhower and the late President Kennedy persisted in calling our forces "advisers" to the confusion of no one except the American public and our allies, neither of which has yet to face up to the significance of the fact that there is a war going on in Vietnam.

One of President Kennedy's first acts of office was to call in Gen. Maxwell Taylor who put together the concept of fighting a limited war in Vietnam, largely with Special Forces units, and a great deal of propaganda was put out which made the Vietnam problem look like a little one.

Vietnam has never been a small problem. There has been consistent warfare of one description or another going on there ever since 1941, and it is quite obviously in more of a mess than any other spot in the world.

The error in Vietnam, which now appears ready to take many American lives, has been that we have allowed this situation to continue to fester in hopes that some kind of miraculous event would take place and cure it. Miracles do take place, even in international politics, but unfortunately none has occurred in Vietnam.

In the cold war which America has fought with communism since the close of World War II, no more serious threat has existed to our position that the one we face in Vietnam. Korea was a bigger, bloodier battle, but there was no question about our ability and commitment to win it from the minute President Truman ordered troops to defend the South Korean Republic.

In Vietnam there have been questions about our commitment—not our abilities—to defend that republic, and it now appears that we are ready to remove those doubts even if it takes a great deal of American blood to do so.

L.B.J. Task: Trying Not To Use Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most delightful journalists in our city, amply endowed with beauty, brains, and personality, has written an article recently in the New York Journal-American about President Johnson.

Marianne Means is highly regarded as a journalist, author and friend to many officials in Washington, and her article in the Journal-American of May 30, 1965, is a penetrating and accurate narrative of our President.

The article follows:

[From the New York Journal-American, May 30, 1965]

L.B.J. TASK: TRYING NOT TO USE POWER

(By Marianne Means)

AUSTIN, TEXAS—President Johnson is a colossus. He stands in his size 12 Oxfords firmly astride the administration, the Congress, and the economy.

In the Capital there is no doubt that he is the boss. No problem is too big for him, or too small. He is as willing to devote an hour discussing a petty irritation with a Senator as he is to personally selecting the raid targets on North Vietnam from a checkerboard-sized colored map brought to him just before bedtime.

The impression in the country is understandably one of a man of immense power, ordering Cabinet members and labor leaders about at will, demanding—and getting—whatever he wants.

Yet an essential element is missing from this picture of Johnson, the President. For the secret of his ability to get effective results from the vague powers of the Presidency is his conscientious restraint about the use of those powers.

Ironically, ambitious lesser men spend most of their time officiously throwing their weight around. But the President, in the most potentially powerful job in all the free world, sighed the other day, "I spend all my time trying not to exercise my power."

The President believes that men who exert their authority brashly only anger their targets and in the end, as he put it, "may win the argument but lose the sale."

This correspondent has personal knowledge of several occasions when the President was called upon to solve a difference of opinion between two Cabinet members, or a Cabinet member and a Senator, or a prominent private industry figure and a White House adviser.

Each time the President could easily have dispensed with the matter in a few minutes. But instead he carefully spent hours seeking to persuade both sides that what he had already determined was the wise course, was after all in the best interest of each. And in every case, the President's decision did grant some surcease to each side.

The President has a story which he tells to illustrate the values of friendly persuasion and a respect for the opponent's case.

He recalls that one day when he was a young school teacher in Houston he and the football coach strolled across the schoolground at lunchtime, puffing on cigarettes and leaving a big cloud of smoke in their wake. The school superintendent stopped them and asked them not to smoke at the school because they were setting a bad example for the students.

The President promptly agreed to comply but the coach was indignant that the superintendent would try to interfere with his personal rights. The next day in the school cafeteria the coach lit up a big, black cigar.

Predictably, the superintendent in anger called the coach into his office. The coach insisted that he was sorry but he was merely asserting his right as an individual to do what he pleased.

The superintendent leaned back in his chair and rubbed his hands together. "Well, in that case," he told the coach, "I will merely assert my right as an individual and do what I please—and I please not to pick up your contract for next year."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund F. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Highway Beautification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, many years ago the late Senator Richard Neuberger, a friend of so many of us, began a campaign to beautify our Nation's highways by restricting the use of billboards. President Johnson has now taken Senator Neuberger's campaign to its apparently necessary conclusion; he has asked Congress to allow the States to obtain up to 1,000 feet of right-of-way, instead of the customary 100 to 300 feet.

In a recent editorial, the Idaho Falls Post-Register pointed out that only seven States have taken advantage of the Federal bonus payment to States which control signs. It said that the new law was a "tough proposition," but that the States themselves have not moved, or been able to move, in avoiding the billboard "fences." The editorial then asked the question now before Congress:

> The big reservation to its final execution, however, will be the cost to purchase the sign prohibition rights. This could be impressive when finally calculated. But what other approach is there to the problem?

The editorial provides a realistic summation of the need for the enactment of President Johnson's requested legislation, and of the thorny problems involved. As such, it should be part of the national record; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Blunt—But Still Useful," from the June 3 issue of the Idaho Falls Post-Register, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLUNT—BUT STILL USEFUL

President Johnson's highway beautification proposal is hardnosed, and punitive * * * but Idaho can use it, nevertheless.

President Johnson is proposing legislation which would allow States to obtain, even by condemnation, 1,000 feet of right-of-way rights. This would, in effect, prohibit billboard and private promotional direction signing on the insterstate highway, for example.

Anyone driving from Idaho Falls to Pocatello can see that something needs to be done. Some private turnoff signs are misleading. They send motorists out of their way to get to a destination they didn't want to go to in the first place. Some lighted signs have a shine back which are becoming a traffic hazard. And then there's the thicket of inviting signs which turn one's attention from the business of driving.

In the past, the Idaho Highway Department has purchased its 100-foot right-of-way for the interstate proper but could only try to persuade private owners to allow them to purchase additional use rights to avoid billboard signing. Anytime a land dispute resulted in a condemnation suit, the additional rights-of-way appeal was immediately extracted from the suit. It would not hold up.

The Idaho Highway Department can only move against highway signing beside the right-of-way when it becomes a traffic hazard—like the shineback from some signs.

The new law will presumably give the States powers to obtain the additional right-of-way—or lose the 92-percent Federal funding for the main highways. It's a tough proposition, but the States themselves have not moved, or been able to, in avoiding the billboard "fences" themselves. Only seven States in all, in fact, have taken advantage of the Federal bonus payment to States obtaining rights for controlling signs.

The State highway department is not without its beauty sensitivity, as witnessed by the impressive beautification projects on the interchanges at Idaho Falls now underway. The ground has been meticulously prepared for grass, and trees are being planted to give refreshing relief to the concrete and oil.

The proposed new Federal highway beautification legislation is not the kind of approach the Federal Government should ordinarily espouse, the do-it-or-we-will-punish-you kind. But there is unquestionably sound purpose in it.

The big reservation to its final execution, however, will be the cost to purchase the sign-prohibition rights. This could be impressive when finally calculated. But what other approach is there to the problem?

Address by the Honorable John N. Erlenborn Before Northern Illinois Air Force Academy Appointees on June 12, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 12, 1965, my colleague the gentleman from the State of Illinois, the Honorable JOHN N. ERLENBORN, addressed the northern Illinois Air Force Academy appointees at the Colonial House in Morton Grove, Ill. Following is Mr. Erlenborn's speech, which I feel merits the attention of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY MR. ERLENBORN

Air Force appointees, because this occasion is held for the new appointees to the Air Force Academy I will be directing my comments to them.

During the next 4 years—and we all trust and hope you will be graduated—you gentlemen will join 4,400 others who have been selected to attend the Nation's newest service Academy.

You are entering the Academy during the year of its 10th anniversary.

From this time forth you will carry with you a new responsibility as a citizen.

The responsibility that you are among that handful of young men who have been classified as the cream of this Nation's youth.

It is only our finest, most capable and honorable young men we send to our service academies.

You already stand tall among your peers.

You have already achieved and accomplished.

And you have been given the opportunity offered only to those believed to be the best.

Your Nation has placed a special faith in your ability, and your honor.

As I thought about what I would say tonight I could not help but recall the words of a great fellow countryman, a great leader, an outstanding soldier and an extraordinary American.

He was a graduate of a service academy. In his case West Point.

His life is an inspiration to all Americans, a special inspiration to those who select the military for their careers.

I am speaking of Douglas MacArthur—citizen, soldier, statesman.

I am recalling his final address to the cadets at the Point: "Duty, honor, country."

"These three hallowed words reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be."

Those are General MacArthur's comments, not mine.

"What you ought to be."

"What you can be."

"What you will be."

A portion of what you ought to be, you already are—uncommon young men with an uncommon capacity for leadership, duty, honor, and responsibility.

"What you can be."

Your opportunities are limitless. You will be attending a U.S. service academy offering the finest education this Nation can provide.

In the jet age, the age of the atom, and that time when we may decide between liberty and slavery throughout the world, you will attend the academy of this age, the aerospace age.

I envy you.

Yours is the challenge to cross frontiers of time and space. The challenge that has dazzled the mind of man since man began.

"What you will be."

You will be men who accept responsibility, opportunity, and challenge.

Men in the service of their country.

Men who with them rides our Nation's hope for a better tomorrow, our determination for liberty and freedom, our pledge for peace.

Your guidepost in all your future endeavors will be duty, honor, country.

What are your duties?

They are all the obligations and opportunities of full citizenship—plus. Plus the fact that for the remainder of your lives you will be a symbol of Uncle Sam to all those you meet. A symbol of this, our Nation.

You will carry with you the traditions of the American military, a military set quite apart from men in uniform from other lands.

You will not be of the military that conquers for the sake of conquest.

You will not be of the military that lays waste to show mere might.

But you will be of a military that knows not defeat.

A military that knows not surrender.

A military that always, in times of need, accepts the challenge and does not turn back until victory is achieved.

All our military victories are not battlefield victories.

As much as for their valor in battle, our Nation's military men are known for valor in peace.

Our military has not been, and never shall be, the strength of the bully. For the bully is without honor.

Duty, honor, country.

We first honor you by offering you this opportunity.

You honor your Nation by accepting.

And your responsibility is a life to be lived on a foundation of honor.

Duty, honor, country.

Service to country is a high calling.

Many say they would sacrifice life for country.

Your testimony is unquestioned.

In our quest for liberty and freedom for all men, we pray you will never be called upon to lay down your life for your country.

But your clear acceptance of the willingness to pay this ultimate price for liberty, for freedom, and for country demonstrates your deep-seated love of liberty, freedom, right, justice, and country.

I salute you.

The conflict of battle need not come to earn that salute.

Service to country alone—far short of sacrifice of life—earns you honor.

While other men may choose to live narrow lives bounded by service to self, you have chosen to serve beyond self.

Duty, honor, country.

Are "duty," "honor," "country" but three empty words?

Is it but a slogan?

Something for the old soldier, Douglas MacArthur, to murmur when he returned that final time to his academy?

A flamboyant phrase?

I think not.

You shall prove not.

By the end of your 4 years it will mean much more to you than it does tonight.

It will become your way of life.

It will be a part of you.

If your heart doesn't quicken when the flag goes by today, it shall.

This is the greatest nation known to man.

Not because of its affluency, but because of its people—and the blessings of God.

It is a mighty nation.

Its arsenal is but a fraction of its might.

It is the people.

Their sense of, and for, justice.

A generous nation.

A kind nation.

Nowhere is man's opportunity greater.

Nowhere is man's achievement greater.

We have in this country what all the rest of the world is searching for.

And you are being given an opportunity to join our front line.

The front line for the defense of freedom.

The front line for the offense for freedom.

Whether after graduation you follow a career with the military or return to private life, you are in the front line.

All your life, everywhere you will go, you will be marked—marked as a man his nation trusted to hold a position of leadership.

Marked as a man who accepted the responsibilities of that leadership.

Leadership is not an easy thing accepted or executed.

It requires special qualities.

You must be trustworthy.

And so all your life you will be marked as a man of honor, as a man to be trusted.

I have known but a limited number of graduates of our service academies, probably because the number is limited. Upon meeting each one I have thought to myself—here's a guy who is OK.

He's on the ball.

He'll go places.

You've got to be top grade to get through one of those.

As a member of the Air Force Academy—a service Academy—as a graduate—your reputation preceeds you.

You will be known as a man with a sense of duty, with honor, with a love of country.

And never grow too old, too sophisticated to stand tall and say you love your country.

To be proud of your country.

To have faith in your country.

Right or wrong let this always be your country.

Our history is a legend of a neverending determination to be right, to be just. We may falter, but we will never fail. Our courage is a special kind of courage. It is a courage of action.

Today we fight confined frustrating battles to extend the boundaries of freedom.

Vietnam is an example. It takes a special kind of national courage to help others help themselves along the road to freedom.

We are not seeking the usual kind of military victory there.

At our command are devastating weapons of destruction, the might for conquest. It is not an easy thing for the most powerful among nations not to turn loose its full military might.

But our dedication is for freedom, our goal liberty.

It is neither destruction nor peace.

We could have peace tomorrow. All we have to do is stop fighting, halt our aid, end our advice.

We could have peace in Vietnam and peace today worldwide if we would surrender.

Peace is easy to achieve.

It takes courage not to succumb to its lure.

It takes continued courage to recognize the price of this available peace. The price is freedom, is liberty.

And it takes a special kind of courage not to succumb to the lure of conquest.

History does not tell of this record for any other nation, or any other people.

We are neither greedy nor cowardly.

There are some among us who would thrust us along the path of conquest.

There are those among us who would have us forsake our honor, shirk our duty and in doing so betray ourselves.

In Vietnam we have drawn a line to the enemies of freedom—I only wish we had been more firm earlier. And as we draw that line and pledge to turn back the invaders we must not become guilty of their crime.

It is an unusual nation with uncommon courage that accepts this responsibility. I pray we do not hesitate to keep our faith.

We are the Nation that keeps the light of liberty aglow. It shines for all men to see: They need but ask to share its light and we respond.

Be proud of your Nation and its heritage. Dedicate yourselves to keep alive its legends.

This does not mean we should endure insults or aid those who would destroy us. If we have a fault of national policy—it is our seemingly unending patience. But better patient than impulsive. And better patient than complacent.

You can still love and honor your Nation and be critical. I am critical of that thin line we draw between patience and complacency when we turn the other cheek to those who trample our flag.

"These are the times that try men's souls" is fitting to our worldwide role.

One hundred and ninety years ago the men lined up at Concord to draw a line against oppression, to fight for the responsibility of self-determination and the promises of freedom and liberty.

One hundred and ninety years ago the young Virginian asked his fellow assemblymen, "Is life so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"

For 190 years these have been our inspirations. For nearly 10 generations Americans have fulfilled the destiny of the men at Concord, have answered the Virginian's question.

This is your heritage.

Remember it with pride.

It is worthy of your dedication.

We entrust you with the responsibility of leading us in the future. With the defense of freedom, that offense for freedom.

It will be no easy task. The crisis of past generations pale before your challenge.

I selected General MacArthur's words for more than one reason this evening. He was a vital part of an astounding experiment for our way of life, our national philosophy.

In 1941, the Imperial Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor in a daring sneak attack, even while their representatives were in Washington under the guise of peaceful talks concerning the war in China.

Our response is recorded in history.

Our entry into World War II led to the eventual victory of the forces for freedom.

We conquered Japan, after first defeating her allies.

Our cost can best be measured in the 400,000 Americans who died in service.

That was our price for freedom.

Has there ever been another victorious nation that once victory was achieved devoted its energies to establishing liberty, justice, freedom, and self-government for its former enemy?

And, in the case of Japan it was Douglas MacArthur who was first driven from Bataan and Corregidor, who returned to the Philippines a victor, who lead the Allies to victory in the Pacific, who accepted the Japanese surrender and then was sent to Japan to establish eventual self-government.

This record, too, is your national heritage.

We did not extend our own boundaries in the wake of victory.

We did not make the conquered subservient to our will.

We believe and practice what we preach.

There is little need to detail any comparison of records with the Soviet Union.

We have only one similarity. They, too, seek to practice what they preach. In their case it is world conquest.

You will be among the leaders of the Nation—these United States—that stands between communism and its goal.

Yes, the crisis of other generations pale before your challenge.

We pray that in the third century of our Nation's history your children and children's children are able to live without the cloud of oppression over any man.

This is your ultimate challenge.

You have been selected as leaders for the task.

An appointment to the Air Force Academy is not granted lightly.

You are among the finest of all our young men—the pride of any nation.

Your parents who have joined you tonight are proud of you too.

They will be prouder still when you are graduated.

I don't discount that between then and now you will have moments of concern, and they will have moments of concern.

It will not be an easy 4 years.

You aren't guaranteed that diploma and commission.

You will have to earn it.

I believe that your parents deserve praise too this evening.

Their sons do them proud.

You are their rededication of a love of country.

And so we send you on your journey. You will join the class of 1969 at the U.S. Air Force Academy.

Almost each day man records a new achievement of breathtaking proportions. As we thrust into outer space we are entering a new epoch in the history of mankind. We accept and conquer the challenge of boundless frontiers. You will become a part of those conquests.

Today we can hardly imagine some of the achievements of your generation.

But at the basis of every endeavor, every challenge, and every conquest, for you, from the moment you step onto the campus it will be duty, honor, country.

And that day of freedom for all, when the crusade for liberty ends in victory, and peace reigns, will be that day when duty, honor, country triumphs.

The 25th Anniversary of Lithuanian Enslavement

SPEECH

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian American citizens of Lake County, Ind., in a mass meeting held on Sunday, June 6, 1965, condemned the Soviet Communist tyranny for the aggression and enslavement of their people 25 years ago.

Lithuania was forcibly robbed of its freedom and self-government at that time. Through mass murders, wholesale transportation to slave labor camps and other barbarous methods, the Soviet Union took control of a freedom-loving nation.

The Lithuanian people of the Calumet region of Indiana will continue, along with free Lithuanians everywhere, the fight until self-government and liberty are restored to their homeland.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the meeting in East Chicago, Ind., on June 6, 1965:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN LITHUANIAN COMMUNITY BRANCH OF EAST CHICAGO, IND.

Gathered in a mass meeting sponsored by the American Lithuanian community, branch of East Chicago, Ind., on June 6, 1965, at the Lithuanian Parish Hall, in East Chicago, Ind., to recollect the mass deportation of the Lithuanian people and condemn aggression of the Soviet Union which Lithuania has placed at the mercy of ruthless imperialistic power which stops at no means to achieve its end of turning Lithuania into a phantom nation saturated with Russian settlers and spies. The American Lithuanian community unanimously adopted this following resolution:

"Whereas in spite of the compulsory isolation of Lithuania and the overwhelming might of the occupying power, Lithuanians continue to resist fiercely the alien rule. They have not accepted and never will accept Soviet slavery; and

"Whereas the free powers are aware that without a world order of law and justice they would be forced to live a precarious life of threats, brinks, and anxieties; and

"Whereas recent decades have demonstrated again and again that the estrangulation of small nations poses a knife of extinction at the throat of the entire free world.

"*Resolved*, That this meeting respectfully asks the Government of the United States in their future meetings with the Soviet Union, to avoid any agreements about peaceful coexistence and to reaffirm on every suitable occasion the inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people to national independence and individual freedom; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the United Nations Special Committee of 24, charged with the implementation on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples extend its concern and investigation to Lithuania, as well as the other Soviet Union subjugated countries on the agenda of the United Nations; be it also

"*Resolved*, to remove Soviet and military and police forces from occupied Lithuania."

This resolution will be forwarded to the President of the United States, and copies thereof sent to the Secretary of State, the Senators, and Representatives of the State of Indiana, and to the press.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY COMMITTEE,
KAZYS VALEIKA, *Chairman*.
GARY, IND.
TADAS MECKAUSKAS, *Secretary*.

The Baltic States: A Tribute

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, June 15, 1965, marks the 25th anniversary of the brutal Soviet seizure of the Baltic States—Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania—which led to the enslavement of those three gallant nations behind the Iron Curtain.

The Baltic nations, with noble histories going back at least 700 years, had emerged from enslavement by the old Russian empire at the end of World War I. They had begun a new era of freedom, and established their own Western-oriented governments. Despite a lack of natural resources, all three were working industriously to raise their standards of living.

But as the brief interwar period drew to a close, in the fall of 1939, the Soviet Government imposed on her Baltic neighbors the so-called pacts of mutual assistance. By the terms of these pacts, the Soviets assumed, under conditions of duress, certain political and territorial rights in the Baltic region. The significance of these pacts lies in the fact that they constituted the first breach in the wall of Baltic territorial integrity and national independence. For within less than a year, the Red army invaded the Baltic States. By June 16, 1940, the U.S.S.R. had occupied the region and forcibly annexed the three states to the U.S.S.R.

A year later, the Soviets initiated widespread deportation of the government, business, and religious leaders of these lands to slave labor camps in Siberia. Over 60,000 Estonians, 34,000 Lativans, and 45,000 Lithuanians were either executed or forcibly deported from their homes to distant corners of the U.S.S.R. on the charge that they were "politically unreliable."

Today we commemorate the anniversary of the Soviet conquest of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. On this occasion, we pay our respects, Mr. Speaker, to a truly gallant and heroic people who have in this quarter century suffered enormously from the tyranny of their oppressor.

Let us pray that justice will one day be done in the Baltic region.

Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the illegal occupation of Lithuania by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics 25 years ago and of the beginning of the mass deportations by the Soviets of the peoples of the Baltice States, the following year, is a sad occasion. It is a heartbreaking remembrance; but it is tinged with happier feelings. With all of the reawakened memories of terror, of hardship beyond description, of injustice, of outrage, of physical and mental suffering, there is an exultation in the extent of Lithuanian perseverance.

That the spirit of Lithuania is alive today in many countries of the world, that the Lithuanian people have endured with vigor and determination and ethnic unity is indeed a basis for rejoicing.

The marking of this anniversary is, too, a reminder of the history of that endurance. The wonder would be great enough were it for the last quarter of a century only that that spirit had survived the violence and vicissitudes of the uprooted life of a nation.

Yet this is only one of a series of such outrages that the Lithuanian people have suffered in the course of a long history. Buffeted by neighboring tribes and nations from every side, literally wiped off the map, not once but many times, the Lithuanian people can nevertheless boast and rightfully claim a history that goes back to an early century in the Christian era. Their antiquity in the annals of Europe is rivaled only by the Basques. The persistence of their national tradition and of a culture unrivaled in modern history has withstood all attempts of their enemies to enslave them. Their language, their customs, their religion, their characteristics as a nation have weathered every effort of their adversaries to annihilate them.

The Lithuanian nation once extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea. In the 14th century it reached its maximum in area. In succeeding centuries it was repeatedly attacked by invading Poles, Germans, and Russians. Gradually reduced in size until it was completely overrun by succeeding generations of its enemies, it nevertheless endured in spirit

and in personality as a nation. Repeatedly too it reemerged as a political entity. Its establishment after World War I as a "democratic republic" was a rebirth, a bursting from the bonds of tyranny of czarist Russia.

That it was to suffer again, at the hands of Soviet Russia, with the advent of World War II, was indeed a disaster. But the spirit of independence was all the stronger. During the intervening years the doughty little Republic had enhanced the reputation of its people for their strength of character, the quality of their culture, their recognition of freedom of the individual, and the maintenance of individuality as a distinct and surviving people.

It is for this endurance, this personality, this persistence in freedom, and the determination to remain independent in the face of all adversity that we honor the Lithuanian people today.

Congress Needs To Know!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, earlier today—as will appear in the body of the RECORD—I urged further consideration by the appropriate committees of this and the other body of full-scale hearings on Vietnam.

I am reinforced in my belief that such hearings, followed by whatever action Congress might deem appropriate to take concerning the new phase our support of the South Vietnamese has entered into, would be a salutary thing, by the following column written by Erwin D. Canham as appearing in today's Christian Science Monitor.

As Mr. Canham—for whom I have long had a high regard—points out, there is a proper demand in America, today, for a clarification of U.S. policies in Vietnam, as those policies have had to be changed by the President to meet the increasing threat to our ability to hold to our commitment to the people of South Vietnam. As Mr. Canham says: "If the Nation is drifting into a Korean-type war, the people and the Congress need to know about it."

Although there is, of course, an ever-present danger that any hardhitting debate over what is happening in Vietnam, today, might possibly give the aggressors there the mistaken belief that the American people are seriously divided concerning what needs to be done, there is also the danger to the Nation that it cannot ever really have an effective, viable foreign policy unless that is founded on the consent and approval of a fully informed people, after the widest possible public discussion of all the alternatives available to them and of the true dimensions of the challenge they face.

In addition to making this point, I believe that Mr. Canham has given us a perceptive analysis of the reasons why we must try to hold the political and military balance now existing in South Vietnam, if that can possibly be done, and, under leave to extend my remarks, his column is now set forth:

PATIENCE, FRIENDS, PATIENCE

(By Erwin D. Canham)

The intellectual critics of U.S. policy in Vietnam, as well as the critics in friendly ovreasea countries, seem to overlook one prime fact. It is that Communist China, which is undoubtedly decisive in the situation, has everything to gain and nothing to lose by keeping the United States involved.

Every effort to negotiate a settlement has met with rebuff. Naturally. Communist China has managed to get the United States caught up in war on the Asian mainland—the situation most to be avoided in the view of American military and political leaders alike.

The American commitment grows larger every day. It is costing Communist China very little. The damage inflicted on North Vietnam is manifestly not enough to force a settlement. Nor is it likely to do so unless the American bombings are increased to a highly hazardous level.

RISK OF DISASTERS

For the United States to accept Peping's terms, and withdraw totally from Vietnam, would risk a string of disasters:

Vietnam itself would be handed over to the ruthless mercies of the Vietcong. All the adjacent quadrant of southeast Asia would be in danger of ultimate Communist control. The United States would have suffered the greatest defeat in its long history, and with no prospects of ultimate redress.

There now are reports from Saigon—apparently speculation—that the group now in control is moving in the direction of neutralism. They might, it is guessed, make their own deal with North Vietnam. Any such development risks many of the hazards just listed. But conceivably they might not ensue soon.

Perhaps the United States could reinforce the position in Malaysia, Thailand, and the Philippines so as to hold the lines there. Such a result is unreasonably sanguine, but it is certainly one outcome which might be somewhat short of disaster. South Vietnam, not the United States, would have rung down the curtain.

CLARIFICATION DEMANDED

Unless events in Vietnam itself cut short this prolonged ordeal, it would seem that the United States can rationally do little more than continue its present policies. Success in ground warfare would require many hundreds of thousands of American soldiers. Success by bombing would require virtual destruction of Hanoi, Haiphong, and much else in North Vietnam.

Meanwhile, there is increasing demand in the United States for a clarification of American policies. If the Nation is drifting into a Korean-type war, the people and the Congress need to know about it. The President has behind him the clear authorization of Congress resolution on southeast Asia. But Congress needs to know where action under the resolution has led and where it is pointing.

Presumably, the holding action during the monsoon period will require more American forces, but perhaps not enough to justify the Korean description. If this period is withstood, the administration hopes, the time may come when the Communists will be ready to negotiate reasonably.

UNITED STATES TESTED, TOO

It is at the least a test of patience. The South Vietnamese people are suffering most. The United States is suffering in its manpower, in its world position, and in its pocketbook.

There is one possibility: Will the time ever come when the Soviet Union, feeling Communist China is benefiting too much, would throw its weight behind a negotiated settlement? This hope has buoyed American policy for some time, but there are no signs of its coming true.

Critics in the non-Communist nations ought to realize one of these days that the United States is not willfully bombing an Asian people, not deliberately taking part in a war. It finds the war profoundly disturbing. It has been progressively drawn into a dilemma from which it finds no usable exit. It will get out just as soon as it decently can.

"Unconditional surrender" is the only basis of settlement now offered the United States. This is not reasonable.

The Real Alabama—Part XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the city of Birmingham, Ala., have endeavored over the past many years to make their city a place of beauty, culture, and progress.

Some results of their work are described in an article appearing in the New York Journal of Commerce in a special supplement devoted to Alabama appearing April 26, 1965.

The article follows:

BIRMINGHAM A PLANNED CITY WITH MANY CULTURAL GROUPS

BIRMINGHAM.—From forest farmland and Indians to the 39th largest metropolitan area in the Nation and the 4th largest in the Southeast in little more than 90 years—that is the remarkable record of Birmingham, Ala.

Founded in 1871, the developers prior to any construction, plotted the area to be a model city physically. Thus Birmingham's broad, straight streets—a boon in today's automotive age—are a fortunate heritage of the past.

Not visualized then were the 254,000 automobiles transporting citizens to work and play daily, and 38,500 local and interurban freight trucks and other vehicles.

The three essential ingredients for steel production—iron ore, coal, and limestone—exist here in close proximity. In 1879–80, when Birmingham had a population of 3,086, construction of the first rolling mills and blast furnaces of the area was begun.

For many years the production of iron and steel and cast iron pressure pipe was predominant. They are still of first rank importance in the area's economy. However, Birmingham's diversified industrial complex today includes food processing, paper products, aeronautical and space components, machine tools, metal products of great diversity, textile and clothing manufacture. Over 2,500 different products could be laebled "Made in Birmingham."

Sufficient temperature contrast between winter and summer to avoid monotony, a beautiful spring with flowers often beginning to bloom in February, an invigorating, colorful fall summarize the weather in and

around Birmingham. Although a Southern city, summer temperatures often are less than in northern latitudes, and low extremes during winter are rare. Usually there is not a month in the year when outdoor recreation may not be enjoyed.

Birmingham residents are blessed with year-round recreational facilities in abundance. Many large lakes, within a short driving distance of the city, provide water sports, camping, fishing, boating, water skiing in beautiful mountain settings. Diversity in water sports is available at ocean beaches only a few hours to the south.

MODERN MUSEUM

The Birmingham Museum of Art is one of the newer and more modern in the country and is said to be the best lighted. It ocntains a $2 million collection from the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, the Rivers collection of Palestinian art, and over 3,000 objects ranging from the highest European cultures to prehistoric days.

Winter performances by the symphony orchestra, summer pop concerts, an occasional chamber music concert, the American Guild of Organists and the Classical Guitar Society offer opportunities to fulfill all musical interests. The Birmingham Civic Ballet Association maintains an 8-month performance schedule.

Tragic Fate of the Baltic States

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, today, we take occasion to remind the free world again of the tragic fate that befell the once proud and free people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia who, in June 1940, were attacked and invaded by the forces of Communist Russia in violation of nonaggression treaties it had signed with those nations. We have heard the story, which must be recounted again and again, of the despotic and ruthless means by which the Soviet Union entrenched its rule and consolidated its power over these Baltic States. The suppression of individual rights and fundamental freedoms, exploitation and mass deportations characterized the Soviet occupation of these nations. For 25 years the people of these countries have endured the tyranny of communism, but their hope for eventual deliverance still remains strong. We know that they continue to resist their oppressors and maintain their faith in man's birthright of freedom.

Let those who say there is no great issue between the free world and the Communist world take heed of the fate of the Baltic States and the means by which they were subordinated to the power-hungry Communist aggressors. The cause of liberty and peace in the world will not be furthered unless we clearly distinguish between the oppressed and the oppressors and stand fast on the principle that the rights of man are inalienable. The free world today must identify itself with those who have become the unwilling subjects of self-imposed rulers and must continue to work for the right of self-determination. Let there be no doubt that our fate as a free people is inextricably involved in this global struggle against Communist aggression and tyranny. Modern conditions have not changed the eternal truths of individual liberty and justice. Our age is marked by a new awareness of the rights of man and his desire for freedom. It is to our peril to deny these truths and to turn our eyes and minds away from the aspirations of man anywhere in the world for freedom and justice.

On this occasion of the 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression against the Baltic States, let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom and reaffirm our faith that in the end liberty and justice will prevail.

A World Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the June 21 edition of U.S. News & World Report is must reading for all the American people. I have yet to read a newspaper or weekly news magazine which reviews our current scene—our international and national economic, political, social, and military issues and problems—with such keen analysis of current facts available against the backdrop of recent history.

The issue is topped off by an editorial essay by Editor David Lawrence on our foreign policy dilemma which is brilliant in its simplicity and historical perspective:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, June 21, 1965]

A WORLD CONSCIENCE

(By David Lawrence)

We have been given not only in the Judeo-Christian doctrines but also in the older codes of ancient religions a simple commandment: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house."

But strong nations nevertheless have invaded weaker ones and have either established colonies or imposed military control as helpless peoples are deprived of decent standards of living and the opportunity to exercise their rights of self-government.

We are confronted by the same challenge today as in yesteryears—how can we maintain peace in the world?

The word "peace" means not merely an abstention from war on our part. It means the prevention of aggression on the part of others. It means that some restraining influence must be exerted against those governments which are not content to live within their own territories and to enjoy peaceful intercourse with other peoples.

The world has long dreamed of a Utopia—a universal peace. At the end of the 19th century, as population grew and economic relationships became more complex, an era of interdependence between nations ensued, and it was recognized that some international force must be organized to deal with aggressors if the world were to be kept at peace.

America fought, through two World Wars, for such an ideal. In the first instance, President Woodrow Wilson declared that "the world must be made safe for democracy." He said that free nations must be allowed to develop without interference from outside and that autocratic governments which ignore the will of their own people must be thwarted.

But not long after the First World War was ended, dictatorships arose once more. America in World War II took up arms against an autocracy and endeavored to secure adherence to a formula for maintaining international peace through understanding rather than through military measures.

The League of Nations struggled for two decades in vain, and so did its successor—the United Nations—for two decades more. Neither organization was able to assure the peace of the world.

There was no real flaw in the covenant of the League of Nations. Nor is there any substantial defect in the charter of the United Nations. What has been missing is the practice of morality and honesty on the part of major governments which covet the resources of the weaker countries and seek to control their destinies. The doctrine that might makes right is still behind many of the procedures, rulings, and votes in the United Nations, and we today face the menace of nationalistic power which can bring on a third world war.

International agreements can be written in explicit terms, but unless and until pledged words are made meaningful and unless and until there is mutual trust, there is little chance that we can abolish the state of continuing anarchy which plagues us today.

What, then, is the answer? We can learn from the religious teachings which have come down to us through the centuries. We know what is right. We know what is honest. But we have not developed a world conscience which would tell us that nations, like individuals, must exercise self-restraint if serious friction is to be avoided and reason is to prevail.

Our hope for the future lies in better communication between peoples. We have all the mechanical devices whereby voices, sent into the heavens and relayed back to earth, can speak from continent to continent.

But do we reach the hearts of people? Have we emphasized and convincingly conveyed to human beings everywhere that self-preservation in a nuclear era is to be achieved only when every nation is obedient to moral standards and applies in international relationships the same fundamental principles of honesty and equity and justice that the world's religions—even of ancient days—have pointed to as the guide to human happiness?

Until we are able to awaken the conscience of mankind around the globe, we shall not stop wars and we shall not halt the insidious infiltration of other countries by the aggressors, whose only objective is material gain and absolute power.

It may require the patience of Job to help mankind realize the meaning of the phrase "a world conscience." But it must be our objective. There must be a new awareness of the simple truth that mutual respect and mutual trust are the fundamental prerequisites for a peaceful existence.

We must not lose hope. It is a changing world, but the change can be for the better if we have faith in and practice the basic principles of human brotherhood and do our part to help build a world consicence. Only then will a federated society of independent nations give us an international organization that can deal promptly and effectively with the troublemakers of the world and assure peace on earth.

Put Away the Shovel—Boxing Will Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much tumult and shouting in the past 3 weeks since the Liston-Clay bout, mostly adding up to the bloomy prediction that the sport of boxing is dead.

I have seen many heavyweight championship fights in the past 33 years and I did not like to hear many Members say boxing was finished. I remember when World War II started, the Army wanted Joe Louis to go around to give the soldiers in training camps inspiration.

Not every sportswriter has taken such a pessimistic view as some of my colleagues. Lonnie Ayres, award-winning sports editor and columnist of the Perth Amboy, N.J., Evening News, had this timely observation to make on June 9:

PUT AWAY THE SHOVEL—BOXING WILL SURVIVE

(By Lonnie Ayres)

A piffling farce. Fake. Disgrace. Boxing's blackest day. The death knell of boxing.

Farce it was. Fake, who knows? Disgrace, indubitably.

But put the lid back on the coffin. Roll up the crepe. Dry your tears, if any.

Boxing is not dead. It doesn't even have the sniffles.

The only ailing patient is the public. It is suffering from compound gullibility. And, like any hypochondriac, it takes excessive pleasure in complaining about its malady.

Critics lately, and especially since the Lewiston fiasco, have traced the fatal infirmity of boxing to the emergence of Sonny Liston as champion.

Before that, through the intermittent regime of Floyd Patterson and back perhaps, as far as Joe Louis, pugilism was decried as merely hopelessly crippled.

In the latter stages of the lingering demise, with statesmen, commissioners, and disgrunted customers ready annually to administer the last rites, Liston has appeared in four championship matches totaling less than nine rounds.

A little more than 24 minutes of boxing grossed more than $14.8 million.

Death, where is thy sting?

The truth is, most of us succumb to a perverse satisfaction in being taken. Barnum was blunter about it.

Nothing in the personal attributes of past public performances of Liston and Cassius Clay made their rematch a good risk as a financial investment by a discerning boxing fan.

But, at prices of $3 and $10, about 515,000 customers in 258 theaters and arenas shelled out more than $4 million to subject themselves to less than 2 minutes of chaos bordering on high comedy.

The man stalking from the theater or arena after the knockout, or whatever it was, grumbled over kicking away $5. But, in his heart, he wouldn't have missed it.

And those in line, too late to get their money down, congratulated themselves on their narrow escape. But, deep down, they were cursing their luck at missing the silly spectacle.

Scientists will vouch that that's the nature of the beast, the indestructible boxing fan.

Ten years from now, he will cherish the chance to complain: "Yeah—those dogs took my five bucks, and it wasn't worth a nickel. But I was there, and I saw it hapepn.

"Liston was moving in like this—and see * * *."

Boxing is dead? Scarcely. It is trying hard. It is obsessed by suic'dal tendencies.

But every time its head is under water—as at this moment—the self-deluding public fishes it out and applies hand-to-pocket resuscitation.

The definitive description of the boxing fan is worth repeating here: "He does not get his money's worth, but he gets what he deserves."

Martin Buber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, we are much the poorer for the loss of Martin Buber, that distinguished Jewish philosopher, teacher, and scholar who died in Jerusalem Sunday.

As his leading disciple and closest friend and associate, Prof. Shemuel Hugo Bergman, said of his passing:

Humanity has lost one of its greatest sons, Jewry has lost its greatest son and Israel has lost her living conscience.

Knowing that my colleagues share my feelings on the death of Professor Buber, I therefore call to their attention the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

"I AND THOU"

Martin Buber, whose death has deprived the world of one of its most provocative humanists, will long be remembered for his stark and cogent formulation of the moral choices that confront modern man. There are, in Buberian terms, two sorts of human relationships, "I-it" and "I-Thou." "I-it" relationships are those in which people treat one another as machines or find in others only projections of their own personalities. An "I-Thou" relationship, on the other hand, is truly personal, one in which people regard each other as human beings, not animated objects.

The theological counterpart of the "I-it" relationship is a religion in which man regards God as an abstraction beyond emotional reach. But the "I-Thou" relationships foster a genuine contact between God and man. In fact, Martin Buber thought of God as the "Eternal Thou."

Martin Buber was deeply influenced by Chasidism, a revolt against religious austerity and detachment that swept through many Eastern European Jewish communities in the 18th century. It was a movement that attempted to make God more accessible to the humble by introducing strongly emotional and mystical elements into religious worship.

Martin Buber's life in Israel embodied what is best in the Chasidic tradition. He offended stern nationalists by insisting that the Arabs are human beings with whom the Jews can live in harmony. And through his religious writings, which have influenced some Christian theologians, he incurred the wrath of the zealots who would turn Israel into an intolerant theocracy.

Among his followers, the founder of Chasidism was known as the Baal Shem Tov, the Master of the Good Name. A similar title might also be conferred upon Martin Buber, a scholar, a philosopher, and a theologian who worked in the universalist tradition of the great Hebrew prophets.

Soviet Occupation of Lithuanian Soil

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, we in the Congress observed the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence—a brief independence. Today we recall the dates of June 15, 1940 and June 14, 1941, days of Soviet aggression on and occupation of Lithuanian soil.

Lithuania, one of the first countries to experience the aggression of both Hitler and the Soviet Union, attempted to maintain a state of absolute neutrality during World War II. However, a mutual assistance treaty between Lithuania and the Soviet Union was imminent when Klaipeda was yielded to Germany. This treaty, signed on October 10, 1939, required Lithuania to admit Soviet garrisons and provide airbases for the Soviets.

After months of discontentment and ill feelings toward the Soviets, Lithuanians were again coerced by the Soviet Union. On June 14, 1940, after deposing the legitimate Lithuanian Government, the Russian Government demanded the immediate formation of a friendly government. To successfully implement and insure this demand, 300,000 Soviet soldiers overran Lithuania. On August 3, 1940, Lithuania, a player on the Soviet stage, speaking from the Soviet script, requested to be a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. As a result of this action, many Lithuanians fled their homeland. Countless others were arrested or deported thus noticeably decreasing the population by 45,000.

To add to the already intolerable situation imposed by the Russians, 30,000 members of the Lithuanian intellegensia were forcefully deported to Siberia. When Soviet forces retreated from a German attack on June 14, 1941, 5,000 political prisoners were executed.

Russian aggression murdered the peace and the nonaggression treaty. The fact that Russia committed and continued to commit these dastardly acts created horrendous violations of the United Nations Declaration, the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, the Convention on the Suppression of Crimes of Genocide, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Ironically, all of these documents were signed by the Russian Government.

Today let us join with the free world Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians on the 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression and in concerted voices protest past and present Soviet national and personal atrocities.

The Half-Dollar Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert an article from the Baltimore Sun of June 13, 1965, written by Herbert Bratter, a well-known writer on banking and financial questions. This article is entitled "The Half-Dollar Question" and is an excellent summary of the questions before Congress in relation to the subsidiary coinage proposals which Congress will very shortly consider.

I recommend it to the consideration of every Member of this House:

THE HALF-DOLLAR QUESTION

(By Herbert Bratter)

WASHINGTON.—The new coinage program which, after prolonged gestation, the administration laid before the Congress early this month, is being rushed through both Houses. But there is a chance it may be amended in the process, to eliminate or modify one or more of the all too obvious political concessions to the mining bloc contained in the draft bill.

Silver mining, a minor element of the economy even in the West, has for generations wielded extraordinary influence in the Congress. Although subsidiary coinage is of vital interest to the Nation's business and should be designed without embodying concealed subsidy, the pending coinage bill does at least three things for silver politics:

1. The bill retains the standard silver dollar in the coinage system, despite the fact that practically all "cartwheels" now outstanding are being hoarded and the fact that a $1 Federal Reserve note is fully adequate to do the work of a dollar coin.

2. The bill envisages that, whether or not the market price of silver weakens, the Treasury would be empowered to buy newly mined domestic silver at not less than $1.25 an ounce. This is being proposed only 2 years after the Kennedy administration finally persuaded the Congress to repeal the indefensible silver purchase laws.

3. The bill calls for replacing present 90 percent fine silver half dollars with sandwichlike coins containing 40 percent silver and 60 percent copper, while advocating quarters and dimes made of cupronickel.

The House Banking and Currency Committee in considering the bill, has wisely agreed on two major amendments. The first would prohibit the minting of any more silver dollars for 5 years. President Johnson on May 15 ordered the prompt striking of 45 million cartwheels and, later, dangled before the westerners the possibility that some day the minting of still more silver dollars might take place. Just 9 days later the House Treasury Appropriations Subcommittee in a special hearing on silver dollars sternly chastised the Treasury on this matter, with the result that the same afternoon the Treasury issued an unusual press release which canceled the President's May 15 order.

In backing the 5-year cartwheel prohibition the Banking and Currency Committee reflects House exasperation with endless concessions to silver Senators. The White House surrender on the silver dollar one Congressman—JEFFERY COHELAN, Democrat, of California—termed "outrageous."

The second badly needed amendment adopted by the Banking and Currency Committee would eliminate from the new half dollar all silver. According to Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, this change, if finally enacted, would save the taxpayer $40 million a year from now on. This is due to the fact that a sandwichlike coin containing 40 percent silver is much more costly than one made of cupro-nickel.

The material in the administration-proposed new 50-cent piece would cost about 43.25 cents; but in the coin tentatively proposed by the Banking and Currency Committee, the material would cost only about 5.9 cents.

There is no good reason why the new 50-cent piece should not be made of the same material as the new quarters and dimes. Mining spokesmen advance the specious reasoning that the administration-proposed half dollar, having a silver coating, will lend prestige to our coinage and be in keeping with tradition and sentiment. A gold coin would add still more prestige, but no one any longer argues that we can afford gold coins. The American dollar must be in a bad way if its prestige depends on a clad or silver-coated piece made chiefly of copper.

The mining spokesmen say that "intrinsic value" will instill confidence in the subsidiary coinage. This absurd contention was disposed of by the President's message, which said: "For many decades now the value of a particular coin has depended not on the value of the metal in it, but on the face of the coin. Today's coinage must be primarily utilitarian." Then why in the world put 40 percent silver in the half dollar, when world demand for that metal is far outstripping production? A 40 percent silver 50-cent coin probably would have to be replaced later by a base-metal coin. Silver supply cannot keep up with demand.

Only the other day Gov. Grant Sawyer, of Nevada, testified: "I suggest to you that the Treasury silver supply will one of these days reach the point of exhaustion no matter what steps are taken now." If this is so, a silver-clad half dollar will not provide a lasting solution to our coin shortage.

The Treasury has had recent experience with unwise decisions on silver coins. Apart from the above-mentioned order to mint 45 million cartwheels, which had to be rescinded 9 days later, there was the speculators' spectacular run on the Treasury Building for silver dollars last year, while the rules for redeeming silver certificates were being changed every few days. A silver-clad 50-cent coin would be another mistake.

Doubtless, silver miners would like the continued market support which silver coinage implies. Most of them are sensible enough to realize that there just is not enough silver to keep up with this country's voracious appetite for coins to make change, operate vending and other machines, etc. Silver Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, realizing this, is sponsoring the administration's bill.

But the use of silver in the new 50-cent coins, which will consume 15 million ounces of the metal a year, according to the Treasury, and more than twice as much, according to private estimates, is not essential to the prosperity of silver mines—most of which, incidentally, are outside the United States. In this country mines whose chief product is silver may be counted on the fingers of one hand.

Apart from coinage, silver is widely used industrially. Of the latter demand, only a fifth is for silverware and jewelry. Photography consumes the biggest share. Silver is used in home appliances, radios, TV's, phones, motors, generators, aircraft, farm machinery, switches and controls, data processing equipment, dental fillings, medical compounds, surgical and medical appliances, missiles, submarine batteries, and many other items in which the use of this precious metal is better justified than in a pseudo-prestige coin. Future mint consumption of silver will deprive these essential users of the metal, the shortage of which is bound to increase year after year.

Not only should the House Banking Committee's lead be followed, eliminating silver from the 10-, 25-, and 50-cent pieces and prohibiting the wasteful minting of silver dollars for speculators, as the Treasury started to do in May; Congress should strike from the administration's bill the proposed and quite unjustified authority for Treasury purchases of domestic newly mined silver at not less than $1.25 an ounce.

During the changeover to the new coins the administration is warranted in continuing to hold the market price of silver, through sales or redemption of silver certificates, below the silver coins' melting points. But there is no corresponding justification for keeping a floor under silver, subsidizing mining.

Now, while the coinage bill is before the Congress, is the time of all times to make a clean break with silver. This is not the time to mix shabby politics in the alloy.

The 20th Anniversary of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to add my wholehearted support to House Concurrent Resolution 429 introduced by Congressmen FASCELL, FRASER, FRELINGHUYSEN, and BOLTON to further strengthen the United Nations on its 20th anniversary. I feel that this resolution is doubly appropriate at this time as the year 1965 has been designated by the United Nations General Assembly as International Cooperation Year.

I strongly support the President's charge to those participating in the International Cooperation Year program to "search and explore and canvass and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace." In my estimation, the United Nations has enjoyed 20 most successful years in its attempt to bring peace to our troubled world and to eradicate poverty, disease, and ignorance throughout this globe.

However, I feel that now is the time for us to evaluate and recommit ourselves to this vital world organization to make it more viable and responsive to our fast-moving and ever-changing world. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the worthwhile objectives of House Concurrent Resolution 429 would greatly strengthen the United Nations, and therefore I strongly support this resolution on the 20th anniversary of the United Nations.

Free Speech, University of Wisconsin Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, we observe, once again, that a certain type of negative thinking, generated and influenced by the effect of the cold war, is still with us. This time, it is the right to free speech on our university campuses that is under attack. The right of freedom of speech and inquiry is essential, not only to our universities but also to our American way of life. The free exchange of conflicting ideas has been a cornerstone of our American democratic system.

The University of Wisconsin is an outstanding example of where the right of freedom of speech and inquiry has been encouraged and fostered. Located near the entrance of the university's Bascom Hall is a plaque containing a statement made by the board of regents in 1894. It reads:

Whatever may be the limitations which trammel inquiry elsewhere, we believe that the great State University of Wisconsin should ever encourage that continual and fearless sifting and winnowing by which alone the truth can be found.

It is in this respect that I commend to my colleagues an editorial which appeared on June 4, 1965, in the politically conservative Madison, Wis., Wisconsin State Journal:

OHIO SYSTEM BACKFIRES: RED SPEAKERS IN PERSPECTIVE

It is perhaps appropriate, at this time, to repeat that the University of Wisconsin, contrary to statements of a few people around the State, is not being overrun by Communist speakers.

Nor are State taxpayers paying thousands or millions of dollars, as the same people imply, for the appearance of Communist speakers on campus.

It should also be pointed out that the university has strict rules about prior registration of all speakers and that student organizations face expulsion if they fail to follow the speaker registration policy. It is not, as they imply, that Communist speakers commute between party headquarters and the campus, coming and going as they please.

No, in terms of numbers alone, Communist speakers are not a significant part of even the off-campus speaker part of student life.

Since last September, only 2 persons of some 344 visiting speakers could be classified as Communists or Communist spokesmen. They were but 2 of more than 300 speakers on a rainbow of subjects. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has told a congressional committee that five known Communists appeared at the university during the year 1964, which includes the two who spoke here during the first semester of the 1964–65 school year.

The expenses of the speakers were not paid by the university but by the groups sponsoring them. The only university expense involved would be the cost of lighting a meeting room or hall.

The university's system of registering speakers effectively prevents a speaker from "sneaking on campus and stealing away with a student's mind." The student organizations which sponsor controversial speakers are registered with the university and have faculty advisers. They are required to register each speaker they present and face expulsion if they break the rules.

The policy requires registration at least 10 days in advance of the speaker's appearance with the Office of Student Organization Advisers.

In some cases, registration must be made even earlier if it is felt that the Student Life and Interests Committee (SLIC) might have to act on it. (SLIC action is needed in those cases in which the public record of a speaker is in question, cases in which the student organization has not previously sponsored guest speakers, and cases in which admission is charged. Registration clearly identifies the speakers and makes it impossible for them to appear on campus with no one knowing who they are.)

The registration form requires the name of the sponsoring organization, the name of the speaker, the subject of his address, and the speaker's present position or occupation.

It also requires a listing of the speaker's educational background, training, or experience which qualifies him to speak to students on the subject selected, and copies of previous speeches if available.

The student organization's plans to meet the fees and expenses of the speaker must also be included in the report.

Of the 344 visiting speakers during the current school year, 229 were sponsored by student organizations, another 70 came through the all-university lecture series, the Knapp committee, and the Meiklejohn lecture series, and an estimated 45 were scheduled by the campus' dozen or so religious groups.

The speakers ran the range of the philosophies of the student organizations.

Freedom of speech and inquiry is vital to academic life in Wisconsin and it must not be curtailed. More is to be lost by setting up arbitrary rules.

The policy at Ohio State University differs from that at Wisconsin and a recent incident demonstrates its failure.

Ohio authorities recently barred Herbert Aptheker, identified by Hoover as a member of the Communist Party, from speaking on campus. This set off demonstrations by a student group called "the Free Speech Front" and members of the faculty.

So, on May 22, Aptheker sat silently on an Ohio State stage before an audience of 2,500 while an assistant instructor read from one of Aptheker's books. It was a bigger gain for the Communists than if only a handful of students came to hear him speak.

The Wisconsin way works better. Comparatively few Wisconsin students have bothered to hear a Communist speaker, certainly not 2,500 as showed up when the Ohio University said they couldn't.

The 50th Anniversary of the Ordination of Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, June 12, 1915, was the date of the ordination to the Catholic priesthood of the man who, more than any other, has come to stand before the world as the symbol of religious liberty. Jozsef Mindszenty, that young Hungarian priest of 50 years ago, is now recognized by the free world as archbishop of Esztergom, primate of Hungary, and cardinal priest.

Living under Communist condemnation to life imprisonment, he has been in refuge in the American Embassy in Budapest since the brutal repression of the Hungarian revolt in 1956. It has been abundantly clear that the Communist tyrants who rule Hungary would permit him to exercise his religious functions in freedom—if he would leave Hungary and not come back; or would permit him some degree of personal freedom within Hungary—if he would consent to the abolition of his ecclesiastical authority. By his silent, stubborn refusal to submit, Cardinal Mindszenty bears witness, at once for the Catholic Church in Hungary, and for the essential freedom of each man to serve and worship God.

On the 50th anniversary of Cardinal Mindszenty's ordination, I join lovers of freedom everywhere in praying that God may continue to sustain him in his ordeal, and permit him to see the triumph of these principles for which he has long suffered.

The Soviet Depredations in Lithuania

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago Soviet troops, in violation of the Soviet Union's pledged word, poured into Lithuania, and snuffed out freedom in that progressive country. A puppet government was established, and an independent Lithuania disappeared from the map of Europe. The same fate befell her Baltic brothers, Latvia and Estonia.

But the Soviet Union could not rest content with this. She was determined to break down any will to resistance, and any perpetuation of Lithuanian national traditions. Thus deportations of Lithuanian intellectuals, professionals, and so forth, commenced at once, but they reached their peak a year after the Soviet occupation, when on June 15, 1941, over 30,000 individuals were deported to Siberia.

Shortly thereafter the Germans declared war on their Soviet allies, and they quickly occupied Lithuania. Three years later the Soviets were back, and this time their deportations were to be even more ferocious. Ever since, Lithuania has been part of the Red empire, and the Russians have been trying to convince the rest of the world that this is the way the Lithuanians want it. But their hypocrisy fools no one.

Lithuania and the Baltic States were the Soviet rehearsal for the occupation and seizure of so much of Eastern Europe

in the wake of World War II. Just as we have never acknowledged the justice of those seizures, so we do not recognize any shred of justice to the Soviet domination of Lithuania. We in the West know what true self-determination is. We know that the Soviet Union does not permit it. In calling attention to the anniversaries of Soviet depredations against Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, we can serve notice once again of America's commitment to freedom, and we can rekindle the flame of hope in the hearts of our many true friends who are caught behind the Iron Curtain.

One Battle in the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson recently proposed a massive program for beautifying our highways and countryside, a program, which, many will agree, is long overdue.

For years, all of us have been nauseated by the sight of junkyards hard beside four-lane arteries, miles and miles of rubbish within easy view of the passing motorist, and the blatancy of flashing arrows and blinking lights leaping off billboards at oncoming drivers.

Hopefully, the President's program will terminate these sources of optic misery once and for all.

Last week, there appeared in the Ithaca Journal an editorial endorsement of the President's plans. The editorial also raised a number of other interesting and significant points, each deserving of reflection. This excellent editorial follows:

ONE BATTLE IN THE WAR

Most people will support President Johnson's plan to beautify and protect the "scenic corridor"—the area within the line of sight of the Nation's highways.

More and more Americans will be using the new interstate freeways in coming years, driving quickly and conveniently to parts of the country they might not otherwise have visited, seeing new landscapes and works of nature they might not otherwise have had the opportunity to enjoy.

The dumps, the junkyards, the blatant billboards will be banned from the purview of the traveling motorist. None of the ugly artifacts and discards and byproducts of an industrialized and urbanized civilization will be allowed to mar the esthetic quality of the passing scene.

But out of sight should not be allowed to mean out of mind, for it will not necessarily mean out of existence. The ugliness will not be so visible, but it will, too often, remain.

It is easy today to drive into our large cities on the broad backs of throughways that slice with surgical directness through congested, run-down sections—and forget that the slums still fester beyond the antiseptic right-of-way.

It is easy to cruise a modern freeway that arcs with engineered effortlessness across the green countryside—and forget that the quiet stream in the distance may be fetid with the effluvia of town and factory or that the pleasant grove of trees may screen the raw wounds of land raped for its minerals and then abandoned.

Beautification of the highway vista is important because it is along the roads that so much of our 20th-century ugliness springs up, but it is only one skirmish in the war on ugliness.

Other fronts involve the preservation and protection of untouched green spaces and waterlands and the restoration of those that have become derelict, ending stream and river and air pollution, finding some new use or method of disposal for the mountains of scrapped automobiles whose metal new steelmaking processes have rendered surplus.

Americans must care not only for the quality of the land they can see from the highways but also that which they may never see or visit or reside upon.

"Beauty was here and man has destroyed it to a great extent," says Anthony Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"The question is how we can change man's behavior to restore beauty."

The 25th Anniversary of Baltic Enslavement

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the years following World War II were a time of world flux and transition. New alliances were formed and the precarious balance of power teetered as wartime conferences desperately attempted to find some solution to the problem of world realinement.

From these conferences arose an awesome phoenix, hovering ominously over genuine attempts at peace and threatening to again plunge the world into another war. Our triumph in 1945 was, in reality, a Pyrrhic victory, for with it came the emergence of the Soviet Union as a world power as deadly as the Fascist-Nazi specter had ever been.

But there was ample precedent for the atrocities the Soviet Union was to commit. The free world, indeed, had been warned that Russia's menacing power could be directed at an independent nation to crush and destroy it. In 1940 the Soviet Union marched ruthlessly on Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and illegally seized control of those nations. Since then she has retained hold of these nations and denied them their individual sovereignty.

In the 25 years since Russia has assumed control, there has been an inexorable erosion of human freedom and independence in the three Baltic States. The peoples of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia are denied a free press, a free assembly and access to free worship—under the fraudulent guise of Soviet "Republicanism." There is no excuse for such a subversion of the word "freedom" to exist any longer.

The people of these nations have always been freedom-loving, dedicated, and persevering. However, the question arises as to how much longer a people can exist in an enslaved land, submitting against their will to a torturing form of totalitarianism. We have nothing but admiration for the people of these nations and for the esprit de coeur and esprit de corps they have shown in the face of nearly insurmountable odds over the past quarter century.

The Baltic States situation must be put into its proper historical perspective. As the nations of Asia and Africa emerge and as they begin to play a larger role in the affairs of the world, we must remember what happened 25 years ago in northern Europe.

Although self-determination is seldom as efficient as colonialism, it is a requisite for independent national development. The emerging world must hold free elections, just as free elections should be held in the Baltic Nations. We cannot afford nor allow another set of captive nations to wither in the Eastern Hemisphere.

Then, two things must be done at once. First, Congress must approve the resolution calling for creation of a special Captive Nations Committee. This will serve as the necessary fact-finding group to keep the American people and the rest of the free world informed as to what is really happening behind the Iron Curtain. In truth, little is known of what happens from day to day in Estonia or Latvia or Lithuania. Formulation of such a committee would open the eyes of millions of Americans to what really transpires in Soviet-dominated countries.

Secondly, we must make optimum use of the United Nations. We must ask the U.N. to put pressure on Russia to live up to the purposes of the original charter and to let the Baltic States have their freedom. In this way and in this way only will the real purpose of the United Nations be served.

Today we salute the people of the Baltic States for their courage and their fortitude. If no other good has come of their enslavement let it be a warning so that a similar tragedy is not repeated in the future.

The West High School A Cappella Choir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my admiration for the musicianship of the A Cappella Choir of West High School from Davenport, Iowa. This fine group of young students sang at noon today in the rotunda of the Old Senate Office Building and their singing was indeed a delight to hear. I have heard many high school groups and it is rare to hear one of such quality. This choir, under the able direction of Mr. Calvin Hedegaard, has distinguished itself and brought honor to the people of

Davenport and the First District of Iowa in this concert and the many others it has given during the past year. Their excellence had been noted in the National Music Educator's Journal and I am happy to make note of it again and command them. The A Cappella Choir of West High School typifies the high standards of Iowa youth.

An OAS Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Richmond, Va.:

AN OAS MONROE DOCTRINE

President Johnson's speech at Baylor University was more than a commencement oration. It may go down in history as a companion piece to the doctrine of hemispheric independence pronounced by President James Monroe, when he announced the Monroe Doctrine in 1823.

But whereas Monroe, and Theodore Roosevelt after him, assumed it to be the "unilateral" responsibility of the United States to oppose further colonization anywhere in the hemisphere, Mr. Johnson has now proposed to have this country share that responsibility with all members of the Organization of American States.

"Out of the Dominican crucible, the 20 American nations must now forge a stronger shield against disaster * * * guided by new realities.

"In today's world, with the enemies of freedom talking about wars of national liberation, the old distinction between civil war and international war has already lost much of its meaning.

"We need new international machinery geared to meet the fast-moving events. When hours can decide the fate of generations, the moment of decision must become the moment of action."

And he paraphrased Woodrow Wilson's assurance that we will "never again seek an additional foot of territory by conquest."

The international situation in which President Johnson made his proposal of a multilateral Monroe Doctrine, is not much different from that which prompted Monroe to assure the Western Hemisphere against intrusion. At that time the monarchs of Russia, Austria, and Prussia had pledged themselves to "put an end to representative government anywhere in Europe."

Latin American colonies had taken advantage of Europe's preoccupation with the Napoleonic wars to liberate themselves from Spain and Portugal. But during Monroe's encumbency there was a growing fear that the Russian-Austrian-Prussian entente, miscalled the holy alliance, would attempt to restore European monarchies to power in this hemisphere.

Now another unholy alliance, of Moscow and Peiping, having established a foothold in Cuba, has similar designs to conquer Latin America by infiltration, indoctrination, and civil war.

Their propaganda mills now accuse the United States of imperialist motives. That slander should have been effectively refuted by Mr. Johnson's forthright declaration at Baylor University:

"We seek no territory. We do not seek to impose our will on anyone. We intend to work for the self-determination of the peoples of the Americas within the framework of freedom."

He countered the Red revolutionary conspiracy's professed motives with a democratic alternative.

He diagnosed "the roots of the trouble—wherever the landless and despised, the poor and the oppressed, stand before the gates of opportunity seeking entry into a brighter land."

He made it clear that those anachronistic conditions conducive to Communist agitation must be removed—by ending the "feudal systems that deny social justice and economic progress to the ordinary peoples of this hemisphere."

This, he reminded the OAS, is in accordance with the Charter of Punta del Este—of which the United States is a signatory.

The difficulties of replacing the long established feudal systems referred to are tremendous. In the final analysis, the change must come from within the individual republics. The President's restatement of the original purpose of the OAS, and his emphatic reiteration of our unselfish motives, are welcome. Let us hope that they will spark the Latin American political-economic, self-defensive coalescence needed to frustrate the Soviet-Chinese conspiracy.

Commemoration of the Baltic Peoples' Loss of Freedom

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL J. KREBS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, in the history of relations between neighboring nations there are many examples of friendship, cooperation, and peaceful relations. The United States has long unfortified land borders on the north and south, and friendly relations with our neighbors Canada and Mexico. The nations of Western Europe appear to be in a state of peaceful relations with diminishing barriers quite unprecedented in the turbulent history of that area.

But, unfortunately, opposite examples seem to be more numerous, both in the past and in the present. There are scores of examples of aggression, subversion, and treachery which serve as a constant reminder that national liberty and independence cannot be taken for granted.

This month we commemorate the 25th anniversary of one of the most treacherous acts of aggression ever committed. The Soviet Army simply moved in and took possession of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by force. This put an end to the steady progress that these peoples had been making toward freedom, prosperity, and social advancement.

And the Soviets were not satisfied merely with total control of these small Baltic States. With ruthless inhumanity they proceeded to liquidate and deport thousands of people from their historic homeland. Families were broken up and men and women were put into forced labor camps, often in the distant wastelands of Russia.

But the Soviet efforts to reconstitute the population of these countries inevitably failed to extinguish the powerful national sentiments of the people. Our observance of this tragic anniversary is ample testament to the failures of the Soviet Communists to persuade the world that these nations have ceased to exist.

The GI Buildup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following article from the June 14, 1965, edition of the New York Times, which describes an aspect of the fighting in Vietnam that is receiving too little public consideration.

The article follows:

THE GI BUILDUP—SOME MILITARY MEN FEAR WASHINGTON IS MOVING TOO CAUTIOUSLY ON VIETNAM

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The arrival of the monsoon season in Vietnam and the beginning of an expected Communist offensive have focused attention on the size of the U.S. forces involved and on the command system for those forces.

Most officers maintain that the war in Vietnam is not insoluble and that the Vietcong can be defeated. Most agree that it must be won on the ground in the South, with the aid of U.S. air and naval power, which they feel must be used to deny "sanctuaries" to the enemy in North Vietnam or in Laos.

They agree strongly with the administration policies of bombing North Vietnam and committing U.S. ground troops to the South, and they feel that the slowness of the U.S. buildup is due in considerable part to domestic and international political and psychological considerations.

GREATER SPEED FAVORED

Nevertheless military officers express considerable worry that the gradual, piecemeal commitment of U.S. ground forces to South Vietnam may be "too little and too late," that at best it has merely been matching Communist increases in strength. Some have long favored the commitment of far larger ground forces and a far more rapid buildup to take advantage of the shock effects this might have upon the enemy.

But there have been military and logistical obstacles, as well as political ones, to a rapid expansion of U.S. ground strength in South Vietnam. Other than the units already stationed there, very few U.S. troops are specially trained for the kind of war being fought in Vietnam.

The small Marine Corps units remaining on Okinawa and the 25th Army Division in Hawaii have been trained rigorously in jungle and counterinsurgency warfare, but even these units are not acclimated to the humid heat of Vietnam. Moreover many Army units, particularly support organizations, have old or incomplete equipment.

The Army, moreover, has taken the position that support facilities must be proved in Vietnam before sizable combat forces can be sent there. This policy resulted last week in the landing of 2,500 troops, including 1,200 Army engineers, at Camranh Bay. These and other supporting units are scheduled to build extensive supply and communication facilities before combat troops come ashore.

EIGHT WEEKS OF ORIENTATION

Critics of this policy suggest that the situation in Vietnam is moving too fast to make this slow and methodical approach effective. They feel that combat troops should be committed first, with minimum supply-and-transport support, and that the heavier support units should follow them.

The critics point out that it will take the newly arrived combat troops a long period—some authorities estimate 8 week as the minimum training period for jungle war—to become used to the specialized problems of climate, terrain, and enemy tactics in Vietnam.

Many of them foresee a need for more combat troops this summer. Accordingly they see the current buildup as too slow.

The issue of overcontrol is not new. The same charge has been leveled against military operations in many other parts of the world. In part, military officers say, the problem arises from what has been called a "nuclear neurosis"—a fear on the part of some Government officials that field commanders might take impulsive or unwise military actions that would lead to a nuclear war.

In greater part, however, it is a product of the speed of modern communications, the tightly centralized command and control system established in the Pentagon by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and the personality of President Johnson.

THE PENTAGON REIGNS

As a result, commanders in Vietnam have received detailed instructions from Washington not only on objectives and policies but also on execution. Command over operations, during the operations themselves, is actually exercised in part from Washington. Military men see in this arrangement a dangerous lack of flexibility and a possibility of mistaken judgment.

In the bombing attacks against North Vietnam, for example, detailed targets have been assigned from Washington, and the numbers and types of aircraft, the bomb loadings, flight plans, flak-suppression missions, and other details have either been determined in Washington or approved there.

Washington also monitors all movements of U.S. ground forces in Vietnam; and their commitment to combat, in answer to South V' tnamese requests, is subject to approval by Washington unless a clear emergency exists.

The restrictions and the control are so severe, some military men suggest, that they are defeating their purpose and are making the military operations of U.S. forces in Vietnam dangerous, less flexible and less effective than they could otherwise be.

The problem is complicated, it is pointed out, by the peculiar status of U.S. offiers in Vietnam. The United States does not command Vietnamese forces, and there is no joint command; hence if American ground troops are committed to battle in answer to South Vietnamese requests for assistance, those troops will be in the peculiar position of supporting troops over whom they have no control in situations of great uncertainty.

Soviet Seizure of Lithuania in 1940

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the seizure and outright annexation of Lithuania by Soviet Russia constitutes one of the most flagrant violations of long-established and well-recognized international law. And the subsequent enslavement of the Lithuanian peoples was an outrageously inhuman act.

Lithuanians had regained their freedom and independence at the end of the First World War. Thenceforth they were fully occupied with the task of rebuilding and recreating their homeland in their own image. And in this they had done remarkably well. In the course of two decades they had made their small country a haven for themselves, and their only desire and goal was to be allowed to work out their salvation in peace. But peace was denied to them by their inveterate enemy, the Soviet Government. In violation of its solemnly signed treaty, the Soviet Government broke the back of the Lithuanian Government by force, until that Government had to submit to the Soviet dictate. Early in 1940 the country was invaded by the Red army, occupied, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Thus the young and strong Lithuanian Republic was robbed of its existence, and its helpless people enslaved by the agents of the Soviet Government. Today, on the 25th anniversary of Lithuania's illegal seizure by the Soviet Union, we all hope and pray for its liberation.

Soviet Union's Enslavement of the Baltic Countries in 1940

SPEECH

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, all nations and peoples suffered during the last World War, and many small nations suffered more, even though they were not directly involved in it. The three small nations of the Baltic countries were victimized only because of the aggressive and treacherous policy of the Soviet Union.

Early in the war the Soviet Government accused the Governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania of anti-Soviet plots. Such charges were made without any perceptible evidence, and proceeding on these charges, the Red army invaded and occupied these three small countries, and then in mid-1940 made them part of the Soviet Union. Thus the sovereign and independent Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian Republics not only ceased to exist, but their helpless citizens were enslaved by Stalin's callous agents. Hundreds of thousands of innocent and helpless people were arrested and deported to distant parts of the Soviet Empire, while those left behind were regimented and forced to work for their Communist overlords. This is what these once proud and gallant souls have been doing in their homelands during the last 25 years.

On the observance of the 25th anniversary of the Soviet Government's illegal seizure of these countries, let us hope that soon these peoples will regain their freedom.

Right-to-Work Laws—The Protestant Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, this body soon will have the opportunity to cut out of our society an unhealthy source of retardation, much like the skilled surgeon removes a cancer from an otherwise healthy person.

Our opportunity is the removal of section 14(b) from the Taft-Hartley Act.

For those of my colleagues seriously meditating the morality of this proposed action, I commend the current issue of the Machinist, the weekly publication of the International Association of Machinists, of which I have been proud to be a member for more than 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, I place the front page of the current Machinist in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Machinist]

THREE MORAL ARGUMENTS FOR REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b)—TO END RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

Shortly before the U.S. House Labor Committee last week approved the bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, three well-known clergymen testified. Representing key organizations of the United States three major faiths, they spoke out against State right-to-work laws which repeal of section 14(b) would end. Each based his opposition to such laws in part on moral and ethical grounds. Here are excerpts from the testimony of the three clergymen:

THE PROTESTANT VIEWPOINT

The Reverend J. Edward Carothers, who spoke for the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., is associate general secretary of the National Division of the Methodist Church's Board of Missions:

"The National Council of Churches has from its earliest beginnings had a lively interest in the problems and issues confronting both labor and management and more particularly in those involving their interrelationships.

"The national council's general board has summarized this interest in the introduction to its statement on 'Ethical Issues in Industrial Relations of Concern to Christians,' adopted in December 1959. Because I believe this brief paragraph is germaine to the subject before us and to my presence and testimony at this hearing, I would like to read it to you:

" 'God in Christ comes to man in restoring love. This engenders and demands a response: that we love one another. This act of God is the ultimate ground of man's freedom and worth. On this ground he lives out his responsibility toward God, and toward the brother in whose company he is set. The effort to establish the largest possible measure of just, cooperative, and orderly relationships in his daily work is witness to and reflection of Christian concern for his neighbor.'

"I will quote further from the statement:

" 'It is the opinion of the General Board of

the National Council of Churches that union membership as a basis of continuing employment should be neither required nor forbidden by law: the decision should be left to agreement by management and labor through the processes of collective bargaining.'"

THE CATHOLIC POSITION

(The Right Reverend Monsignor George G. Higgins is director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference).

"The ethical issue involved in this controversy concerns the right to compel union membership as a condition of employment. Even if an overwhelming majority of workers wish a union shop. do they have the right to demand that the minority conform to this decision?

"Since the right to work is the right to life itself, may conditions be imposed on this right?

"The response to both these questions is a straight 'Yes'. Man is more than an individual, he is also a member of society. Such is his nature as God made him. For this reason, the rules necessary for harmonious social living can be binding laws, not merely optional regulations.

"Thus, as members of civil society, we must obey laws, pay taxes, and fulfill our duties as citizens. As members of the family society, we have rights and duties, whether we be parents or children. Likewise, the common good of industrial society may demand that individuals conform to rules laid down for the good of all.

"If an employer and a union agree, in collective bargaining, that union security would aid industrial relationships, they are in effect laying down a regulation for the common good of their industrial society.

"When a worker accepts employment in that plant, he is no longer a detached individual; he is a member of the community and is governed by its rules. The alternative to such procedure would be chaos and the breakdown of industrial society."

THE JEWISH OUTLOOK

Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch is director of the Religious Action Center maintained by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

"I appear here today in behalf of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. In consonance with our historic support of the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively, we urge repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

"There is no doubt that belonging to any group potentially inhibits freedom of individual action, but in our complex society, to encourage an individual to refrain from accepting responsibility in and for the group created to assure him a dignified livelihood, is to encourage anarchy and license.

"When a citizen votes for the losing side in a local election, he still has to pay taxes. To permit an individual not to support a union representing the majority of his fellow workers is not a protection of minority rights, but a destruction of majority rule.

"Our society is now engaged in a struggle to eliminate poverty. How inconsistent, on the one hand, to encourage the poor to organize to help themselves, and, on the other hand, to deprive the laborer of his most useful tool—the right to organize effectively.

"A strong democratic labor movement is essential to the well-being of American society and the American economy, because it is the primary means for giving workers the opportunity to deal with their employers on an equitable basis. Responsible employers and responsible unions engaged in free collective bargaining offer the greatest possibility for achieving the economic justice which is the foundation of social justice."

The Voice of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, students from many communities throughout the State of New Jersey gathered recently at Rutgers University for the Seventh Annual Institute for Youth, sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. These young people conducted many activities aimed at developing greater understanding of each other and their fellow citizens. They also heard a number of outstanding speakers, who urged them to help exercise and strengthen those democratic ideals upon which this Nation was founded.

One of the highlights of this institute was a speech delivered by Bernard Shore, director of special services at Teaneck High School. Mr. Shore aptly summarizes what took place at the conference. So that my colleagues can be made aware of some of the positive actions being taken by New Jersey teenagers to further brotherhood, I insert the text of Mr. Shore's speech in the RECORD:

I feel like an imposter—the theme of this conference is the voice of youth—and I feel guilty that a candidate for the geriatric society is summarizing.

But I can tell you, that as Howard Devaney and I wandered into various groups and listened to your fervor and your enthusiasm (and some groups were swinging) we discarded our walking canes and in the words of John Kennedy, "The trumpet summoned us again."

It was a privilege to live in your world today—and I was convinced that if more adults had had this experience, the built-in obsolescence of adulthood would not be inevitable, and perhaps our war of generations would be tempered by more understanding of your ideals and aspirations.

The theme of Mr. Gee, our keynoter, could best be summed up in the phrase "public service." The war on poverty was seen as an extension of the idealism and imagination that created the Peace Corps. Operation Headstart programs that Mr. Gee described were seen by many of you as a challenge to your own commitment to the Judeo-Christian ideal which is such a basic part of our democratic way of life; namely, "I am my brother's keeper."

One group recognized that the American system had disproved the Marxian doctrine of class struggle to resolve poverty. It was mentioned that in our way of life, education has mediated class differences—yesterday's immigrant can bridge social and economic class lines through education. It was seen that class struggle could be resolved through education; that social mobility paralleled the availability of learning opportunities; that the war on poverty was really a war for learning * * * and there was Socratic wisdom in the youth who asked, "If communism appeals to the poor, why don't we give the underdeveloped countries more schools and more teachers instead of guns and generals?"

There was no discomfort with integration, there was a mature wisdom in your recognition that prejudice is learned and the antidote is experience, knowledge, and familiarity.

Most of you were impatient with a world that condoned a society in which the minority child is treated as a second-rate citizen and then is compelled by subtle pyschological pressure to live up to this inferior role. In one group comment was made of the research project in which 3- and 4-year-old Negro children were given white and Negro dolls, and at that tender age, a majority had learned it was a liability to be Negro. Is it any wonder that the insidious phenomenon of "self-fulfilling prophecy" warps the development of minority children.

Continual comment was made of the role of preschool education in the poverty program. Research has shown that children do not enter school as equals. If slum children are to take advantage of public schools, they need preschool programs to compensate for the cultural disadvantages that poverty imposes on an individual. "Operation Headstart" was seen by some of you as not only a beginning for underprivileged children but your headstart in voluntary public service.

Some of you discussed the role of religion—many of you are looking to your church for leadership in today's struggle for brotherhood. Some of you are impatient with the second-class role that some of your ministers have taken—you deplored pursuit of income rather than the pursuit of brotherhood—you wanted not only sermons on Sunday but action and leadership.

You examined academic freedom—should Communists and John Birchers be allowed to teach? * * * and your answers were stimulating—let them teach—but not indoctrinate. Give us the kind of education that equips us with the strength and skill to differentiate truth from propaganda.

Some of you questioned whether the war on poverty was generated by politics or idealism. The answer is probably both. But I must remind you that although politics sometimes places men and nations in the posture of greatness—on the stage of history the players often get caught in the drama and live with conviction their role. Is the war on poverty politics or idealism, playacting or truth? The answer depends on you the audience—if you climb up on the stage you will find thousands of young people committed to the democratic ideal. The spectator is very often the cynic; the men of action are the true believers.

Contemporary geopolitics, the space age and the shrinking globe have challenged our pluralistic society. Equality is no longer a cliche on a musty document but a living process. History is compelling us to activate ideals that for a long time have only received lipservice.

To you participants in the Seventh Youth Institute I say your generation cannot equivocate. Today's conflict of generations is youth's rebellion against hypocrisy—youth's dedication to public service—youth's pursuit of the democratic commitment.

Remember, a free society can only sustain itself by constant self-examination and self-criticism, and it is the role of youth to shake the complacency of that society, to ask its elders the searching questions and demand the honest answers.

Texas Is a Land of Many Scenic Wonders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have here a column written by Mr. Ted Lewis

of the New York Daily News in which he makes the following statement:

The Lone Star State is big but its landscape is drab and without one scenic beauty worth touting.

Since the New York Daily News reportedly has the largest circulation of any newspaper in the United States, I am taking this opportunity to call this awful absurdity and fantastic falsehood to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. As you and I know, every State in these United States has its scenic wonders worth touting. And Texas is certainly no exception, as all of those who have visited our great State can testify.

We Texans have long been a proud people—and justifiably so. We are proud of our glorious past, during which the flags of six nations—including that of our very own independent Republic—have flown over our vast lands. We are proud of our present, and the great political, economic, and scientific contributions we are making in this age of astronauts. And we are proud of our future, and the ever-growing progress and prosperity we Texans share with the rest of America under the dynamic and effective leadership of our native son President Lyndon B. Johnson.

And we are especially proud of the unique and infinite variety of natural and scenic attractions that stretch across our State.

People all over the world are suddenly learning that the so-called "tall tales of Texas" are filled with fact—and not boastful bragging. The 14 million Americans outside our borders who come to Texas as tourists each year—and the number is growing—are evidence of the enjoyable vacations to be had in the Lone Star State. Some two-thirds of these tourists are paying us repeat visits.

There remain, however, those who either refuse to recognize the beauty within our borders, or else they are the ignorant few who have missed the marvels of our State's numerous scenic, historic and cultural attractions.

Mr. Lewis is in such a category.

Fortunately, the New York Daily News columnist doesn't speak the sentiments of his fine fellow citizens of that wonderful State. We Texans feel close to the people of New York because they make up a very large percentage of our visitors.

During 1963, for example, some 400,000 New Yorkers came to see our magnificent mountains, our seashores and cities, our forests and lakes. Yes, and even our drab landscapes. But they must have seen these drab sights at a different time than Mr. Lewis did. Because they and others like them return each year to see the splendor of the Big Bend National Park, with its miracle of springs in the desert, and the colorful and shadowy gorges of the silent, towering mountains. Perhaps, they too saw the desert at sunrise, or at sunset, and absorbed the seldom-seen beauty of cactus blooms and prickly pear that paints the prairie yellow, red, and orange.

The people of New York think enough of the attractions of Texas to spend some $20 million a year as tourists in the Lone Star State, and we appreciate this. We are grateful not for this big payroll alone, but for the proud privilege we have to show off our State and provide relaxing, carefree, uncrowded good times to our fellow Americans who aren't themselves blessed with the bountiful beauties of Texas.

Excluding the States that adjoin us, New Yorkers rank fourth in the number of out-of-State tourists to Texas. California, Florida, and Illinois rank first, second, and third—in that order.

This data is assembled by the Travel Division of the Texas Highway Department which maintains the best system of roads found anywhere in the world. We have some 63,000 miles of excellent Texas highways which are scenic wonders in themselves, because we take pride in maintaining more than 1,000 clean and attractive roadside parks and camping and picnicing areas. These are always found in the more scenic areas across the length and breadth of Texas—such as the hill and lake country of my congressional district in central Texas, and in the forest and park country of east Texas, the mountains and canyon country of west Texas, the 110-mile-long Padre Island and other Texas coastal areas, and the lush semitropical Rio Grande Valley of south Texas with its thriving and colorful citrus groves and Latin atmosphere.

Few non-Texans realize that our State has 54 mountain peaks over 6,000 feet in height. And next to Alaska, we have more surface water than any other State. Our lakes and streams are truly lovely—clear and sparkling, and a paradise for fishing and boating enthusiasts.

What better combination for scenic beauty is there?

Space does not permit me to adequately describe our numerous scenic wonders, Mr. Speaker. But in my central Texas district alone, one can find every ingredient that goes into the beauty of all Texas. We are famous for our many lakes and rushing streams and rivers—like the Pedernales that flows by the Texas White House on the L.B.J. ranch, and for the surrounding scenic hills, the dude ranches, the historical sights, including our magnificient, granite State capitol in Austin, with more than 400 room and 18 acres of floor space under its soaring dome, and we are equally famous for our abundant wildlife, our picturesque communities—like San Marcos, with its world-famous Acquarena.

And in historic old San Antonio, Mr. Speaker, we have the Alamo. Our heroes immortalized it—Travis, Crockett, Bowie, Bonham. In this cradle of Texas history, 200 courageous Texans fought to the death in a 13-day siege by Gen. Santa Anna and his 5,000-man Mexican Army. This and scores of other historic spots help explain our pride in Texas.

But the Alamo is not exactly a scenic wonder, Mr. Speaker. It may even appear drab to someone like Mr. Ted Lewis. It is simply a scarred and weathered old monument to courage and determination.

Yet, there is a strange bit of beauty the Alamo imparts—especially to Texans. Amidst the sadness, one can feel this beauty that seems to swell our hearts.

Texas, as I have explained, is truly a land of many outstanding scenic wonders. We invite all Americans to come see for themselves that our landscapes are far from drab. Rather, they are ensconced in nature's most magnificent setting.

And I especially invite Mr. Ted Lewis.

Our Baltic Friends Hope for Freedom and Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians throughout the world who have kept the spark of freedom alive for a quarter of a century.

Millions of helpless and innocent people died during World War II, and many millions more suffered indescribable misery and hardship. In Europe, the war's most innocent victims were the peoples of the three small, peaceful, independent republics in northeastern Europe—the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians. The tragedy of these peoples was brought on by the deliberate and evil designs of the men in the Kremlin.

These peoples had endured czarist Russia's autocratic yoke for more than a century, and had regained their independence at the end of the First World War. In their historic homelands they had instituted their own democratic governments, with all variety of institutions under freedom. But as the international situation in Europe became tense late in the 1930's, and clouds of war began to darken the skies in 1939, these peoples realized their precarious status and were apprehensive of their own fate. The government officials in all three of these countries were fully aware of the dangers threatening them, but they were helpless to avert the impending tragedy.

Soon after the outbreak of the war, the leaders of these governments were ruthlessly bullied by the Soviet Government. They were forced to sign mutual defense and assistance pacts with the Soviet Union. Then early in 1940, under some flagrant pretext, the governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were accused by the Kremlin of anti-Soviet activities. Soon the Red army moved into these countries, and many of the government officials of these countries fled for the safety of their lives. In June Soviet occupation of these countries was complete, and a few weeks later all three were incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Thus was brought about the seizure of the three Baltic countries by the Soviet Union and the enslavement of some 5 million peoples in these countries. Of these innocent peoples, several hundred thousands were summarily arrested and deported to distant parts of the Soviet Union, most of whom have probably died in prison-labor camps. I am happy to

say that the Government of the United States and the people of this country have never recognized the seizure of these countries by the Soviet Union as valid. We still recognize the old, legally elected governments of these countries and continue to extend them diplomatic recognition. And, of course, we all hope, as do freedom-loving Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians all over the world, that some day, and soon, these countries will be able to resume their rightful places in the family of independent nations.

Right or Wrong—Immigration Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, once again I call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the crying need for immigration reform. Rev. Daniel Lyons S.J., director of forensics, Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash., in an article that appeared in the June 20, 1965 issue of Our Sunday Visitor, the National Catholic ecumenical weekly, has again stated his case against the unjustice that exists in our present immigration law and his demand that change in this law is long overdue.

Father Lyons' article follows:

RIGHT OR WRONG—IMMIGRATION REFORM

(By Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

Change is not always progress, and action does not always mean achievement. A conservative is one who realizes the good in what we have, and who does not favor change unless it is for the better. This is no excuse, however, for people who oppose something new simply because they are unwilling to study it with an open mind, nor does it justify a position based on the prejudices of the past or emotional fears of the future. Being against something because one does not understand it does not justify condemning those who do. Shibboleths are not sacrosanct, and blind slogans are no guarantee of security. There is nothing sacred about hysteria, nor should we panic at the thought of progress.

No matter what I say on this subject of immigration reform, some people are bound to be opposed without bothering to open their minds. Some will blissfully condemn the article as soon as they read the title. Others see red when anyone favors changing the McCarran Act. Still others consider such a proposal to be part of a Communist plot. They will be wondering how the Communists got to me.

I can only plead that I have studied the subject for many years, that I have written articles on it in both European and American journals, that Congressmen have quoted my remarks on immigration at length in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without any prompting from me, and that in advocating a change I am in the company of many loyal and well-informed Americans including our President, his three immediate predecessors, and a majority of our Senators and Representatives.

LONG OVERDUE

The simple fact is that a change in our immigration laws is long overdue. Not only have there been 13 event-filled years since the Immigration and Nationality (McCarran-Walter) Act was passed, the act itself perpetuated the policies of the Immigration Act of 1924, the Quota Law of 1921, and the Asiatic Barred Zone provisions passed during World War I.

The difference between 1965 and 1921 is epochal. Three things characterized our thinking at that time: America had been practicing a vicious discrimination against the Chinese and Japanese; America had absorbed many of the foolish notions of Lothrop Stoddard, Madison Grant, and others about the same Nordic supremacy later to be peddled by an Austrian paperhanger; America believed that we were a Protestant country and that Catholics should not be admitted in large numbers. It was on these three points that our immigration laws were based.

The formula for favoring the Nordic and for discriminating against all the rest of the world so that only 15 percent of our immigrants would be non-Nordic was concocted by a Protestant minister, Dr. Sidney L. Gulick. Dr. Gulick, representing the Federal Council of Churches, devised the national origins quota system. At first it was based on the nationality of our population in 1910, but this was soon changed to a base of 1890. This latter switch reduced the number of immigrants from Italy, for example, from 42,057 to 3,845; from Poland from 30,977 to 5,982. The noted historian, Oscar Handlin, commented:

"This use of outdated population statistics was the most flagrantly discriminatory device of any employed in quota calculation, and it made particularly obvious the motives which were behind the quota legislation."

Our present immigration laws are so inadequate that every year Congress has had to pass special laws to circumvent the quota. Far more people come in under these special acts than under the immigration laws themselves. So much so that Congressman MICHAEL FEIGHAN, the chairman of the House Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee, declared that our present quota arrangement is a myth. The mass of evidence assembled by his committee eloquently attests the need for bringing our immigration legislation up to date. The Hart bill in the Senate (S. 1932) and the Celler bill in the House (H.R. 7700) were introduced at the request of the late President Kennedy, and have the urgent backing of President Johnson. Presidents Eisenhower and Truman advocated similar legislation.

ALL ELIGIBLE

In theory the McCarran-Walter Act made all nationalities eligible for immigration, but in practice it so discriminated against Spanish, Italian, Greeks, and others that 85 percent of all our immigrants must come from northern Europe. Moreover, the northern Europeans are no longer interested in coming to this country. In theory the McCarran Act made all races eligible for immigration, but in practice it permits only 100 persons per year from such enormous areas as Japan, India, and China. Even these 100 include Americans and Europeans who are citizens of those countries, and natives of Canada and elsewhere who are of oriental descent. Both Eisenhower and Truman criticized the McCarran bill, but it was finally passed over the President's veto because Congress felt that it was at least a start, that it was better than nothing. But an immigration policy that is insulting to most of the world makes a successful foreign policy impossible. Our Vice President is right when he declares:

"You cannot very well go around the world preaching the doctrine of human equality and democracy and freedom and justice and then have written in your own laws that you do not believe it."

Today we are not only preaching democracy, we are in a last-ditch stand to preserve what is left of freedom in a world that has seen communism increase its rule from 200 million at the end of World War II to 950 million today. If we expect countries like Italy and Greece, Japan and Formosa, Zambia and Argentina to oppose the rise of communism and if we expect South Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, Malaysia and the Dominican Republic to fight on the side of America and the free world, we had better wake up to the fact that immigration laws based on the concept of Nordic superiority and white supremacy must at least be modified. We can ill afford to continue insulting our allies with discriminatory legislation. We white people are a small minority in the world, and we need all the friends we can muster.

Public Opinion Wins Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recently a friend sent me a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Memphis Press-Scimitar on April 23 calling attention to an action by the Corps of Engineers which, in my opinion, may indicate there is hope for the corps yet. The action in question concerned a recommendation by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to the Chief of Engineers that the Eleven Point River project near Pocahontas, Ark., be deauthorized.

The Memphis Press-Scimitar calls this decision "a great victory for the common people over construction and speculative real estate interests." Because this is such a landmark action by the Corps of Engineers, I think it should be called to the attention of all our colleagues. For this reason, without objection, I will insert the full text of the editorial at this point in my remarks:

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar, Apr. 23, 1965]

PUBLIC OPINION WINS AGAIN

The 27-year battle of citizens against a dam proposed by the U.S. Engineers on the sparkling little Eleven Point River near Pocahontas, Ark., appears to be ending in final victory.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has recommended to the Chief of Engineers that the project be deauthorized.

This is a key recommendation. The mere fact of it is a great victory for the common people over construction and speculative real estate interests.

Not since 1948, when Gen. Lewis Pick, then Chief of Engineers, put a proposed $187 million worth of high dams across the Current River "on the dead hook for all time" has there been such a dramatic people's victory in the Midsouth.

The Eleven Point recommendation will follow a routine course—to the Chief of Engineers, who will submit it to Congress for consideration. Congress responding to the will of the people and the opinion of the experts, should then pass a bill of deauthorization.

The Eleven Point River Valley can then come into its own, free of the dam curse, as the Current River Valley did. These two alone, of the nine once-sparkling rivers of the Ozarks, remain undammed.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in its report recommending deauthorization, spoke in commonsense terms:

"As the result of natural factors, the dam would really have been of little value in the White River Basin water control plan of which it was a part [the very point made so many times by citizens].

"Since the favorable factors have been unable in 27 years to outweigh the unfavorable factors, future realization in the face of more objections appears remote."

The Press-Scimitar has supported the fight of the citizens against this dam from the start with scores of columns of news space, through scores of meetings, at times when success appeared so remote that the faint-hearted were giving up, moving out, quitting. But always a loyal nucleus—whose spokesman has been Mrs. Helen Bly, Box 343, Pocahontas, Ark.—has fought on, confident that the American way will not tolerate the kind of injustice that was being attempted.

The Press-Scimitar congratulates Mrs. Bly, the few who always stood by her side, and the many who have later joined the fight to keep this part of America naturally beautiful.

The Press-Scimitar also congratulates the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors for finally tuning its ears to the voice of the people, for viewing the proposal as a whole for what it really was, and for upsetting the lower echelons of the Corps of Engineers who kept this sore spot festering so long.

John M. Lehmann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a resolution was unanimously adopted recently by the House of Representatives of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois in which it commended Mr. John M. Lehmann, director of the Chicago district office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice.

I firmly believe that this resolution is worthy of the attention of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

JOHN M. LEHMANN

A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois

Whereas "we are—one and all—immigrants or the sons and daughters of immigrants," as President Eisenhower has well said; and

Whereas it behooves us to welcome the immigrant with decency and respect in the administration of law, and those who administer the Immigration and Nationality Act have done so; and

Whereas the Chicago district office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice, under its director, John M. Lehmann, has performed the delicate task of administering the law with intelligence, honesty, courtesy, and humanity, and has succeeded in conveying here and abroad a sense of the highest qualities of American justice and public service: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That this body highly commend the Chicago district office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice and its director, John M. Lehmann, for the superlative quality of their administration of the law and for the incalculable good that this has done for the immigrant and for his chosen home; and that a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be sent to the U.S. Department of Justice.

L.B.J. Pushes Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post, under date of Monday, June 7, published an excellent editorial praising President Johnson for his civil rights speech, and I ask unanimous consent to have the same inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial is as follows:

L.B.J. PUSHES CIVIL RIGHTS

All but the most ignorant and most bigoted recognize that there is no issue more central to our times than the struggle of the Negro to win the rights and reap the rewards of first-class American citizenship.

No nation is justified in having any pretentions toward greatness so long as a significant group of its citizens is regarded as inferior and is forced into a debased and degrading position by law or tradition.

In the past few years, the Negroes themselves have been successful in creating pressures which have resulted in the abolition of repressive laws and in the creation of new laws designed to assure Negroes their rights as American citizens.

As the civil rights movement has gained momentum, it has won the support of more and more white Americans. The movement's most important white supporter is now the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson. This is entirely as it should be.

The President's unequivocal and, indeed, impassioned championing of the Negroes' cause has been a matter of surprise to some Americans. The President is, after all, a native of Texas, whose citizens have generally not distinguished themselves by enthusiastically advocating fair and equal treatment for Negroes.

But in speech after speech since he became President, Lyndon B. Johnson has demonstrated not only a sympathetic understanding of the Negroes' cause but also a deep determination to use all the considerable power of his office to advance that cause.

The President's speech at Howard University last Friday was still another step forward, probably the strongest speech any American Chief Executive has ever made on the question of civil rights.

This speech signals the beginning of a new phase in the civil rights struggle. In the phase just completed (or in the process of being completed), the Negroes won equality "as a right and as a theory," and now they must achieve equality "as a fact and as a result." The Negro must now move beyond opportunity to achievement.

The President is calling a White House conference to determine how this move can most quickly and effectively be made. It is clear that the President, like all others who are convinced of the eminent worth of the civil rights cause, is determined that the movement shall now not pause in order to savor its victories but shall push forward even faster and farther to flesh out legal victories with solid achievement.

In this cause, the President deserves the thanks, and the support, of all Americans.

State Department Seeking Wider Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of my distinguished colleagues to a very pertinent and enlightening article by syndicated columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott. The article, entitled "State Department Seeking Wider Powers," appeared in the May 31, 1965, issue of the Knoxville Journal, Knoxville, Tenn.

I believe that every Member of Congress will profit from reading the article; therefore, under unanimous consent, I place it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

STATE DEPARTMENT SEEKING WIDER POWERS

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—An amazing piece of legislation is being seriously considered by a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, headed by Representative WAYNE HAYS, Democrat, of Ohio.

Unknown to the public at large—as well as most Members of Congress—this measure has all the earmarks of being the biggest "sleeper" of President Johnson's wide-ranging legislative program.

On the ground of establishing "one personnel system for the Department of State and to improve the morale of its employees," this extraordinary bill would:

Create a new super foreign service by blanketing in thousands of civil service employees of the State Department, and thousands of other civil service employees on foreign duty of 22 other Government agencies—among them the Peace Corps, U.S. Information Agency, Agency for International Development (in charge of foreign aid), Export-Import Bank, Federal Aviation Agency, Maritime Commission.

Strip these civil service employees of their veterans' preference, job security, and other safeguards under existing laws. Under this measure, they could be arbitrarily fired within days on the charge of being incompetent, inadequate or otherwise undesirable.

Make the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration—now William J. Crockett, principal author of the sweeping bill—virtual czar over the new super foreign service, with power to hire, fire, promote, transfer, and to bar these employees from aiding congressional investigations of their agencies.

Unpublished charts prepared by Crockett—which some members of the Foreign Affairs Committee haven't even seen—illustrating the scope and range of the far-reaching legislation label the proposed new super foreign service as "The [State] Department and Domestic Field Establishment" and the "Overseas Field Establishment."

In the past State Department authorities have emphatically denied the existence of an "establishment" in the Department.

No. 1 target of this little known bill is Otto Otepka, State Department security officer whom Crockett has long been trying to oust for allegedly giving information to a staff member of a congressional committee.

The measure would strip Otepka, and all other affected civil service employees, of their present right to discuss their cases with Members of Congress under the provision: "The right of persons employed in the civil service either individually or collectively, to petition Congress, or any Member thereof, or to furnish information to either House of Congress, or to any committee or member

thereof, shall not be denied or interferred with."

Foreign Affairs committeemen have been informed that at a high-level State Department conference, Crockett remarked, "Once this bill is passed, there will never again be an Otto Otepka in the Department."

Freedom for the Baltic States

SPEECH

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 25th anniversary of Soviet Russia's captivity of the Baltic States. It was on June 15, 1940, that the Red Army moved into Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and took over these free and independent nations by force of arms.

During these 25 years, the three countries have lost more than one-fourth of their populations. Hundreds of thousands were murdered by the Soviet despots or died in exile in Russian slave-labor camps.

But Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians are proud and courageous peoples. They will never give up in their prayers and hopes for the day of liberation from tyranny nor in their search for help from the governments of other freedom-loving peoples.

Mr. Speaker, with the help and leadership of the United States and the United Nations, many new free and independent nations have been established in Asia and Africa since World War II. But what of formerly free and independent nations that no longer enjoy that status but are now bearing the yoke of oppression imposed by the Kremlin?

In the name of consistency, the United Nations can and should do no less than champion the cause of freedom for these peoples as well. It was with that goal that I introduced earlier this year House Concurrent Resolution 295, which declares it to be the sense of Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring up the Baltic States question in that body.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include House Concurrent Resolution 295 at this point:

H. CON. RES. 295

Whereas the United States has consistently recognized and upheld the right of the Baltic States to national independence and to the enjoyment of all independent rights and freedoms; and

Whereas the Charter of the United Nations declares as one of its purposes the development of friendly relations among nations based "on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples": and

Whereas the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics has by force suppressed the freedom of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and continues to deny them the right of self-determination by free elections; and

Whereas involuntary enslavement cannot be encouraged or sanctioned by the United States and other nations subscribing to principles of freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the United States mission to the United Nations to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask the United Nations request the Soviets—

(1) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

(2) to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the United States mission to the United Nations to request the United Nations to conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision.

Radio—Sound Without Meaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a statement presented by M. S. Novik, radio consultant of New York City, to the Ohio State University 35th Institute for Education by Radio and Television, held in Columbus, Ohio, June 2–3, 1965. Mr. Novik's remarks follow along with his letter to me in reference thereto:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *June 15, 1965.*

Congressman EMANUEL CELLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MANNY: Enclosed is a copy of remarks which I delivered at the 35th Ohio State Institute for Education by Radio and Television. The institute is the oldest organization of its kind in the country and the only place left where commercial and noncommercial broadcasters meet to exchange ideas.

You know of my interest in public service programing, talks, debates which used to be called special events. It is sad to report, for all intents and purposes, even in New York City, so far as radio is concerned, program competition has forced all of the major stations, with the exception of WOR, to bar all talk programs, paid or sustaining, day or night, every day of the week, except Sunday on some stations.

Even the President's own statements on foreign and domestic problems—issues that are involved in creating the Great Society, are not getting out on radio. They are summed up in quick headlines.

In 1934, as you know so well, the Congress thought it had spelled out the rules of the airwaves—they have not been updated; they have just been ignored. This situation has been going from bad to worse.

Three years ago, I had hoped that all of this would come out at a National Radio Goals Conference. That did not happen and now I'm convinced that the only hope is for the Congress to evaluate how radio is doing its job in terms of the Communications Act of 1934, and decide what legislation or clarification will meet the needs of 1965.

If you consider the speech to be of value, and my recommendations worthy of consideration, I would appreciate it if you would insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If, for any reason, you cannot or should not, please let me know—I'll understand.

Sincerely,

M. S. NOVIK.

RADIO—SOUND WITHOUT MEANING

(By M. S. Novik, radio consultant)

Technically speaking, radio is a lot of hardware. And that hardware has been making remarkable technical progress from the first crystal set to modern transistorized equipment. The only thing that has not kept pace with the technical advances is its intelligent use by the men who control it.

Instead of using the hardware to retain radio's lead as a medium of information, as a fountain of knowledge, programing has been going downhill, away from its once bright promise. As a result, radio has given up its dynamic role and abdicated its leadership to television. It has become a symbol of intellectual silence.

Indeed what's right with radio or wrong with radio is not in the hardware but in ourselves.

Once upon a time, a million years ago it seems now, there was an Edward R. Murrow, a Raymond Gram Swing, an Elmer Davis—men who made the world come alive through radio, who made continents neighbors to each other. These were no headline screamers. They were men who made us a part of their experience, who shared wisdom with us, so that all of us might share democracy with one another.

Once upon a time there was a "Town Meeting of the Air," when the American people flattered themselves with ideas, to be examined for what they were. Ideas, rather than jingles and slogans. There was still room enough—too much room, perhaps—for the soap operas, but at least there was some room some of the time for something else. The listener did have some sort of choice—if not all the time, some of the time.

How did radio get into its present sad state of programing? Partly because of panic over the competition of television; partly because of competition from a flood of new-low-powered, low-cost local stations after World War II.

The battle of the ratings gave the format operator his first breakthrough. Program prestige went out of the window.

Instead of holding the line and improving the radio service, the big stations, the network stations capitulated; some more, some less, some all the way.

The disintegration of network radio in these critical times poses a serious problem not only for the radio industry, but for the Nation.

Look at the world we live in. Great questions of foreign policy are bedeviling the American people. What do we do about Vietnam? The recent teach-ins, the recent Washington debates on the subject have barely been touched on by radio, except for brief summaries.

Not only foreign affairs but also pressing domestic questions demand that we know what we are thinking, talking, and voting about. What about civil rights, unemployment, automation, the art of being a wise consumer, education to meet the rising demands of our society? All these great questions have, among our own people, great people who can discuss them intelligently. But they are not heard on radio.

Take the President's own statements on the crisis in Vietnam or at Santo Domingo, or on the domestic issues of our time that are involved in creating the Great Society. They, too, are summed up in quick headlines.

Radio has time for brief summaries, but no time for anything resembling real infor-

mation. And this brings us to the all-important question: What is information?

Information is knowledge. It is both fact and opinion. It is the raw material for wisdom. It is not just a shouted headline torn from the teletype machine. It is not just 5 minutes of news on the hour. It is not just whether it's going to rain today or not, or how the traffic is on the bridge. It is, in short, the material men need if they are to make a nation work, especially a democratic nation.

We are a self-governing people. This high order of self-challenge demands that we be an informed people.

Broadcasters speak of radio's forthcoming $1 billion a year income. Is this the ultimate proof of radio's viability? Crime pays three times as much, but you can't quite measure virtue this way. You can't say that you're rich, therefore you're right. It's not quite that simple.

How many radio stations, beginning, say, with the Kennedy-Nixon debates in 1960 and continuing to the current nationwide Vietnam discussions, have carried even portions of these great discussions, or any other discussions? Presidential press conferences, statements of world leaders, community problems presented in forum or debate, any of these?

Radio today has the opportunity, as well as the obligation, to become the medium it might be, it was planned to be long, long ago. For radio to say that television and the newspapers should be doing the informing is equivalent to saying that radio has no responsibilities in this direction. The law says otherwise, and it is high time that Congress and the FCC make sure that the law is clear.

Who was it who decided that none of the American people want anything but music and instant news on their radio sets? I don't know. How is it that a major law of the land, the Communications Act of 1934, can continue in existence if it is not enforced? Respect for law itself, and with it free institutions, depends upon equal treatment under law, enforcement of the law, and clarity of its meaning. Who has exempted radio men from these truths?

Many of these same radio stations that offer only rock-and-roll and headlines; classical music and headlines, talk jockeys and headlines, or conversation and headlines, excluding all else, are owned by responsible networks, responsible newspapers, magazines, nonprofit institutions, and respectable corporations. Do these people realize these policies are contributing to radio's delinquency?

These station owners are public-spirited citizens, they serve their communities faithfully, they give generously to charity. But they fail their communities where they can best serve—by using their radio facilities to serve the public welfare.

They, of all people, should know that the fastest, quickest buck is not synonymous with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

The United States is no longer in a position, and I don't think she ever was, to waste great natural resources. Radio is one of the greatest of these treasures.

Radio is not quite a private enterprise. It involves the use of limited frequencies that are available on the publicly owned airwaves. For this reason, the radio station owner is a licensee. He operates under privilege, not by right.

One reason why laws and governments are set up among men is to moderate self-interest in terms of a more generalized public interest, and, necessity and convenience. A driver's license is a case in point: Certain ground rules are posted under which we operate. But the ground rules for drivers are clearly stated; we even have signs and lights on highways to remind us of the laws.

Radio could use a touch or two of the same.

In 1934, Congress when it passed the Communications Act thought it had spelled out the rules of the airwaves. The rules of the highways made in 1934, are unworkable today, and they have been changed.

But not the rules of the airwaves—they haven't been updated. They've just been ignored. And, mind you, the usage of the airwaves has changed even more than the use of the highways. We now have FM, TV, pay TV, and now the flood of CATV. And it's the people—the public—that are the victims of today's airwave traffic jam.

It is no longer enough to say to the people that you can just turn off the set if you don't like it. The people who don't like radio today pay the same taxes and live in the same times as the people who walk the street with transistors to their heads. Thinking, talking, interested people have the same rights as others. You keep telling them to lump it and the lumps will end up in unexpected places. The public will not be damned indefinitely.

And what is it that the people want. They want, and this is so little, just a bit of time on radio—time to talk, to discuss, to argue, to debate, and to analyze. Is this so much to ask? Will this favor, if that is the word, impoverish the industry?

Too many stations simply have no room for what they call talk programs. They will not even sell 15 minutes or half an hour for a political campaign, whether local or national.

Where does this leave a political candidate? He can buy spot announcements. He may even have time for a recording of his own voice, delivering a 60-second commercial for himself.

Does this promote public information? Does this lead to a better understanding of the campaign issues? I doubt it.

Those of us who have been in broadcasting for a long time remember the course of the congressional debates on the Communications Act of 1934. No one in Congress—and very few outside of Congress anticipated a scarcity of air time. The concern of Congress was for equality, not availability.

Everyone knows the phrase "equal time" but the true concept of the words escape too many broadcasters. How else can one explain the number of major stations that eliminate all political programs, paid or sustaining, taking the position that nothing equals nothing.

That, of course, violates the intent of the Congress and it violates the U.S. Supreme Court decision of June 29, 1959, in *The Farm Union* v. *WDAY* case (360 U.C. 525). Here are two sentences from that decision:

"While denying all candidates use of the station would protect broadcasters from liability, it would also effectively withdraw political discussion from the air * * *. Certainly Congress knew the obvious—that if a licensee could protect himself from liability in no other way but by refusing to broadcast candidates' speeches, the necessary effect would be to hamper the congressional plan to develop broadcasting as a political outlet, rather than to foster it."

It has never been the subject of a specific FCC order. Even though the then Chairman recognized and discussed it, and the trade press gave publicity to it, many broadcasters seem to be unaware of it. Certainly a prompt implementation of the decision ought to have top priority.

Radio today has the opportunity to become the medium of media, reaching people where they are with the instantaneous transmission of the wisdom and the beauty and the challenge of life.

It seems to me the future of radio can be bright. It seems to me that radio is vital to the Great Society.

But we will not be worthy of the challenge—we will not be able to move forward—without some new rules of the road, new charts for the airwaves.

Where are we going? How do we get there? These are questions we must face.

But first of all there must be an evaluation of where we are now and it cannot be a self-serving evaluation.

I regret to say that the Commission has not done the bob. Five long years ago, it held hearings on this subject and nothing has happened.

Three years ago, in this same place, we called for a conference on goals for the industry and nothing has happened.

Now, it seems to me, we must look to the Congress that wrote the Communications Act of 1934.

It seems to me the Congress should:

1. Evaluate how radio is doing its job in terms of the Communications Act of 1934.

2. Decide what legislation will meet the new needs of 1965.

3. Define public interest, convenience, and necessity to take into account the need for time on the air for responsible groups; the need for time on the air for political talk or discussion, free or paid—not just during elections, but at all times, leaving no doubt that every broadcaster must allocate equal and adequate time for political discussions, free and paid, in National, State, and local elections.

4. Require all stations to offer programing that will serve the various needs and conveniences and interests of the entire public, not just one segment of the public.

5. Spell out the power of the FCC to enforce the laws of the airwaves.

The times demand answers. Congress, which has jurisdiction over broadcasting, and the FCC, which enforces the broadcasting laws, can make certain that radio resumes its great role in American life. It must. Then the people will be informed and broadcasting will fulfill its role in the Great Society.

Huge Throng Greets Astronauts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 14, 1965, Chicago celebrated Astronaut Day. Over 1½ million people turned out to honor the Gemini Astronauts, James A. McDivitt and Edward H. White, and to pay tribute to the heroism, courage and resourcefulness demonstrated by them on their recent unprecedented space flight.

Hon. Richard A. Daley, the distinguished mayor of the city of Chicago, personally welcome the Gemini astronauts when they arrived at O'Hare International Airport and led the gala parade honoring the space twins. The Vice President of the United States, Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and the Governor of Illinois, Hon. Otto Kerner, also participated in this great event.

Chicago is extremely proud of the fact that Astronaut McDivitt is a native son who attended parochial grade school and Lane Technical High School in Chicago. As Mayor Daley appropriately stated:

We are willing to share him with the entire Nation.

The astronauts were taken to the city hall where the Chicago City Council read a resolution eulogizing them for their great feat and an overflow crowd later greated them at a luncheon in their honor at the Sherman House's grand ballroom.

I am happy to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared yesterday in the Chicago Tribune, one of the outstanding newspapers of Chicago, with reference to Astronauts McDivitt and White. The editorial on Astronaut Day in Chicago and the schedule of events for this great day follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 14, 1965]

ASTRONAUTS' DAY

By action of the city council and by universal acclaim, today is Astronauts McDivitt and White Day in Chicago. McDivitt comes first alphabetically and as a native son—born at St. Mary of Nazareth Hospital on North Leavitt Street, educated at St. Mel Grade School and Lane Technical High School before he went [as did White] to the University of Michigan. But as Mayor Daley graciously said of James A. McDivitt, Jr., "We are willing to share him with the entire Nation." We are happy to have a share of Edward H. White II, too.

The ride from O'Hare Airport down the Kennedy Expressway and through the near North Side past Tribune tower, over the bridge, down State Street, and thence to city hall will be a grand and gala procession. Chicago receives celebrities with gusto, and especially celebrities who have acquired distinction by achievement rather than by such accidents as inheriting a royal title. The world, emphatically including us, thrilled to the high-altitude adventures of the space twins and shared in concern for a safe splashdown as days earlier for a successful launching. But we also are mindful of the commitment and preparation that preceded their few glorious days in the spotlight of history.

Our cheers today will be primarily for the courage and resourcefulness shown by McDivitt and White under spectacular and unprecedented circumstances. We may not understand how *Gemini 4* went up, or why, but we in the "I Will" city recognize the heroism and discipline of the two men whose will was equal to the demands of their awesome assignment.

Astronauts McDivitt and White Day will be a day to remember.

THE SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

10:30 a.m., arrival of the astronauts and their families on the military side of O'Hare International Airport.

10:45 a.m., motorcade leaves the airport for downtown Chicago.

11:45 a.m., a parade downtown.

12:30 p.m., arrival at city hall.

12:45 p.m., special meeting of the city council.

1:30 p.m., astronauts leave council chambers for the Sherman House.

1:45 p.m., luncheon for 1,400 persons in the Sherman House.

3:15 p.m., astronauts leave for McCormick Place.

3:30 p.m., question-and-answer period for 6,000 youngsters after they view a 20-minute film of the *Gemini* launch and space walk, never before shown.

4:15 p.m., astronauts return to the Drake Hotel for a private dinner with their families.

BANNERS ARE PLACED

9 p.m., fireworks salute for 35 minutes on the lakefront. Reilly said the fireworks display will be visible along the beaches of the lakefront from Ohio to Oak Streets.

Blake Construction Co.—A Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, success stories always make for fascinating reading and particularly so when they chronicle events of a private investor from a few buckets of paint to a present-day rank of 33d among the Nation's largest general contractors. Such is the success story of the Blake Construction Co. as related by the Washington Post in their edition of Saturday, June 12, 1965, which I submit for your enjoyment:

BLAKE FIRM BUILDS THE BIG ONES

(By John B. Willmann)

"B" initial looms large in the nomenclature of the Washington firm that ranks 33d among the Nation's largest general contractors.

Blake Construction, which handled $50 million worth of buildings last year, is headed by Jack I. Bender and his sons Morton, Howard and Stanley. Their headquarters is in the Bender Building, which fronts on both Connecticut Avenue and L Street NW. Jack Bender breeds and owns a big bundle of racing horses and most of their names begin with B's.

This aggressive firm has grown mightily since Jack Bender's painting business became overshadowed and finally phase out by his construction business. The name Blake took over from Bender—Blake being the family name of Jack Bender's wife.

Before 1948, Jack Bender was known as one of this town's paintingest contractors. Then, his sons joined him in forging a building organization that now includes a hundred persons on the payroll ("they get paid whether we have a job or not," commented Morton, the firm's officer of the deck). Blake also has 500 to 1,000 men picking up weekly checks, depending on how many jobs are going.

Right now business is good for Blake-Bender. The firm is ready to begin construction on a 100,000-square-foot office building at 1111 18th Street NW, where the Blake office will be located. "Like some of our tenants, we have outgrown our space in our own building," said a Bender. "We will move just around the corner."

Beside that $4 million building on 18th Street, Blake also will sponsor and build a 225,000-square-foot office building on a part of the wedge between Rhode Island Avenue and M Street NW., opposite St. Matthew's Cathedral. The site has been cleared for this $8½ million structure.

But the biggest Blake project for 1965 will be the multimillion, 450,000-square-foot office building on the Stoneleigh Court site at Connecticut and L Streets. Designed by architect Chloethiel Smith, this structure will have fenestration on three sides of its 12 stories and feature an upper story setback, glass and precast concrete facade, fully carpeted suites above the first floor (commercial), underground parking for 411 cars (the not-quite-so large Bender Building finished about 5 years ago, accommodates 200 cars). "You've got to have plenty of parking these days," the Benders agree.

Permanent financing in the amount of $12 million from Equitable Life Assurance Co. was obtained by the Washington office of Brooks, Harvey & Co., a New York firm. Clarence E. Johnson and Christopher B. Ross head the office here.

Blake recently finished Washington's largest privately developed office building—$25 million and 600,000 square feet of rentable—at 1800 G Street NW. Now the firm is ready to orbit with a $10 million, 432-unit high-rise apartment project in two 16-story buildings at the former Gustin Garden site at Old Georgetown Road and Montrose Road in upper Bethesda—just off the pike.

Other Blake building credits include $27 million in Bureau of Standards buildings at the new Gaithersburg site; $21 million for the now-building U.S. Court of Claims on Lafayette Square, $17 million for Maryland office buildings in Baltimore and the $9 million Norfolk Civic Center.

But there appears to be one flaw in the Blake organization. The person in charge of naming buildings—nobody admits to his identity—has been missing the ball. The vast building at 1800 G is still nameless, as are the new ones for Connecticut Avenue and M Street.

"You have to have a name that fits a building. The Bender name was an obvious choice for our first big major downtown building that was the largest when it was built," said Morton Bender. "But we keep so busy bidding new jobs—we got 4 out of 5 last year and 7 out of 13 in 1963—and asking questions of architects and worrying about brick, lighting fixtures and so forth that we come up short on names.

"If any of your readers has a sound idea for a name for the building at 1800 G, or any of the new ones, I'd like to have it in writing," added Morton, who works in his shirt sleeves and uses a pencil or telephone or both almost every minute of his long working day.

And if you're thinking of names such as Empire or Kennedy or Roosevelt or Truman for a Blake-built-and-owned building, you can keep on thinking some more. But the Blake organization will welcome your suggestion.

If this firm has been weak on names, it has been doubly strong on creating projects and bidding outside jobs. The firm paid a then-record-high of $150 a square foot for the Stoneleigh Court site several years ago and probably a good deal more for a new acquisition at the corner where Connecticut and 18th meet.

While founder Jack Bender, 57, still functions as the top boss with full veto authority, he has delegated much of the worrying and followthrough to 32-year-old Morton as his alter ego for bidding, site selection, negotiations and such; to 34-year-old Howard for construction supervision and to 36-year-old Stanley for financing, mortgaging, and keeping an eagle eye on the books and balances. A good friend, Samuel P. Cohen, has been an investor partner in some of the big Blake-owned buildings.

"This is a highly competitive business," summarized Morton, "and we've grown because we work hard and figure every detail and keep asking questions until we get all the answers. We're not building monuments; we live in an economic market and adjust to conditions. For instance, this new building at Connecticut and L could be more eye appealing if it were to rise to 20 stories and still provide the same amount of floor space. It could be set back and soar—so could a lot of other new downtown buildings."

Well, that's a look at and a talk with a firm whose founder (Jack I. Bender) painted almost everything in Washington, including the White House, before he took his first $16,000 remodeling job about 17 years ago. Since then his Blake firm has amassed a construction total approaching $400 million and now owns and manages its own buildings.

Opposition of Federal Highway Administrator to President's Program for Beauty, Recreation, and Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the amazing refusal of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads to cooperate with the Department of the Interior Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and conservation agencies on current highway programs. This certainly and effectively blocks the proposed programs and fine encouraging statements of the President and Mrs. Johnson on highway beauty and recreational and wildlife facilities.

The fine Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation are now being overriden when they reported against proposed Highway Route 87 in Westchester County, N.Y., being driven through Chestnut Ridge, destroying the value of 2,000 acres of wildlife area and recreational facilities. The Federal Highway Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce bluntly overrode also the New York State Highway Department, Westchester County development plans, and recreation and wildlife organizations as well.

On 15 currently proposed highway routes in various sections of the United States the idea is to drive through the "whiz ways" before conservation and recreation agencies can make an effective stand.

What a joke this makes of the President's statements on highway beauty and conservation of America's priceless assets.

What a farce the actions of the Bureau of Public Roads make of Mrs. Johnson's fine participation in the recent White House Conference on Beauty and Recreation.

Does the President or Mrs. Johnson not know two of the Cabinet members have disagreed?

I offer recent correspondence of the Sierra Club to show the seriousness of the lack of coordination of the Bureau of Public Roads and the Department of Commerce and their failure to implement the President's program:

SIERRA CLUB,
San Francisco, June 11, 1965.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: In view of the interest you have shown in assuring proper coordination of highway planning with recreational and wildlife values and your introduction of a bill to require this, we thought you might be interested in the exchange of correspondence we are enclosing.

The Sierra Club recently wrote to the Federal Highway Administrator seeking clarification of the administrative procedures governing coordination between State highway and recreational agencies and the Bureau of Public Roads. Instead of clarification of the specific steps of procedure, we received bland assurances from the Administrator that all factors and opinions would be considered in making decisions and that the Bureau of Public Roads would keep an open mind.

Sound elaboration of procedures for coordination would assure the public that the Bureau of Public Roads really is serious about coordination. Vague assurances that the "right thing will be done" do not add to public confidence about the Bureau's seriousness.

An exchange of correspondence such as this tends to corroborate the characterization of the Bureau's operations which Drew Pearson made in his column of May 15, 1965 "Fruitless Protest on Highway Beauty." It is increasingly clear that legislation is needed to assure that proper and well regulated coordination does occur.

Perhaps you or Congressman FULTON woudl like to introduce this exchange of correspondence into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as evidence of the need for enacting the legislation which you propose.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL MCCLOSKEY,
Assistant to the President.

SIERRA CLUB,
San Francisco, April 30, 1965.

Mr. REX WHITTON,
Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WHITTON: The Sierra Club regards the circular memorandum which your office issued on May 25, 1964, concerning the protection to be afforded to outdoor recreation resources under Federal-aid highway programs as an important step forward in fashioning the more beautiful America called for by the President in his message on natural beauty.

In the light of the policy established by that circular, we would like to ask for clarification of the procedures which your bureau and the Department of Commerce will follow in the event that the California Division of Highways and the California State Park Commission cannot agree on highway routing affecting redwood State parks. We understand that you have indicated that your bureau does not anticipate receiving any proposals for the use of Federal-aid funds from the California Division of Highways for highway construction that would be detrimental to the California Redwood State Parks. However, we on the scene here are less optimistic that the two State agencies involved will be able to reach agreement in the case of routing the reconstruction of highway 101 to freeway standards in the vicinity of Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park.

It is our understanding that if the highway department and the recreation agency concerned are not in concurrence, then sections 1.8 and 1.10 of title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations require you to decide the issue. We would appreciate it greatly if you could verify this understanding. In the event that you must resolve this issue, are we correct in understanding that section 1.6(c) of title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations allows you to consider the conservation of natural resources in deliberating on revisions in the routing of a previously approved Federal-aid highway system? Of course, our magnificent redwood State parks and associated beachlands are a natural resource which citizens of this State, and indeed the Nation, have spent many years and millions of dollars conserving. Inasmuch as their virgin stands are not replaceable, the conservation of their integrity is conservation of the highest order.

There is an additional factor to be considered in choosing the proper route for relocation of the Federal-aid highway at Prairie Creek. The section of Highway 101 lying in Humboldt and Del Norte Counties quite possibly could be included in the national program of scenic roads and parkways which the President's Recreation Advisory Council has recommended. We note that the Department of Commerce has been charged with the responsibility of conducting a study to implement this national program suggested by the Council. As stated in circular No. 4 of the Recreation Advisory Council, such a study should include establishing the relationship of a program of scenic roads to such other forms of outdoor recreation as hiking trails and wilderness area use. In the light of this responsibility vested in the Department of Commerce, it would appear that the criteria for scenic highways must be formulated and suitability of designating the redwood region segment of Highway 101 as a scenic highway must be determined before construction could go ahead in the disputed area around Prairie Creek. Will the Department of Commerce delay granting matching funds for this construction until the Department completes its studies on scenic roads and determines the applicability of the program to this area?

It has been stated (perhaps facetiously) by the chairman of the California Highway Commission that "scenic highways must go through the scenery." In connection with our suggestion that the redwood highway might qualify as a scenic highway, we would like to observe that such a highway must be constructed so that it will not destroy the very values it is designed to display. In the case of Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park, the existing two-lane redwood highway through the park can continue as the low-speed, low-volume "scenic" roadway, with a high-speed, high-volume freeway location existing on the ridge to the east of the park, where excellent views are possible without damage to the existing park. A proposed route along or near the beach would be especially harmful to the ecological integrity of the park.

Referring again to your circular memorandum dated May 25, 1964, the statement is made that if the officials of the appropriate State authority responsible for the recreational resources do not agree with the highway department, the highway department must provide documentation of this nonconcurrence and then must state reasons why the final highway department recommendation is thought to provide the best solution. From the point of view of procedural fairness, it would seem that the State park authorities should be provided an opportunity for a surrebuttal to indicate their reasons for disagreeing with the final decision of the highway department (in cases where they do). Such a procedure would give both agencies an equal number of chances to state their position and counter the claims of the other. Will such an opportunity be provided?

We will appreciate your efforts to answer these questions. They involve basic matters of broad concern to many citizens of California and the Nation. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

EDGAR WAYBURN, M.D.,
Vice President.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1965.

EDGAR WAYBURN, M.D.,
Vice President, Sierra Club,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR DR. WAYBURN: Thank you for your letter and suggestions regarding U.S. 101 in northern California. Secretary Connor has asked me also to thank you for sending him a copy of that letter.

The Federal-aid highway regulations from which you cited selected sections state that

the Federal-aid highway program is a cooperative arrangement between the State highway departments and the Federal Government. You will note that each State highway department must be authorized by law to make final decisions for the State in all matters necessary to comply with Federal laws and regulations. The highway departments are responsible for selecting, programing, planning, designing, and constructing routes of the Federal-aid highway system. We in turn are charged with the responsibility for review and approval or disapproval of each of these actions.

When and if a proposal is received from the State we will make a thorough review of all pertinent information. Each factor—those of special interest to you, those of special interest to others and those of interest to all the people—will be compared and weighed in reaching a decision to approve or disapprove the proposal.

You ask will the Department of Commerce delay granting matching funds for this construction until the Department completes its studies on scenic roads and determines the applicability of the program to this area. Our action on a proposal from the State will be on its merits and the policies and conditions prevailing at the time. If we are to properly discharge our responsibility we must maintain an open mind on this issue.

You also ask will the State Park Authority be provided an opportunity to make a surrebuttal should it disagree with the final decision of the State. We will consider any pertinent information submitted from any source. Information submitted by the Park Authority as a surrebuttal will be given the same thorough review as all other.

We appreciate your continued interest in this highway and urge you to make your views known to State authorities to assure their proper consideration.

Sincerely yours,

REX M. WHITTON,
Federal Highway Administrator.

Social Security Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate dependency as a condition of entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits and to provide that dependent parents of living insured individuals—as well as surviving parents of deceased insured individuals—shall be eligible for parent's insurance benefits.

In keeping with the concept of equality between the sexes in business, I am introducing this legislation at the request of the New York League of Business and Professional Women to equalize dependency requirement in social security so that a husband may share in his predeceasing wife's benefits without a showing of dependency just as the wife would share in his. I also feel that dependent parents of living insured individuals ought to be eligible for parent's insurance even while the insured is living, total benefits not to exceed the allowable ceiling.

Twenty-five Years in the Communist Russian Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article sent to me by Mr. Leonard Valiukas of the Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States:

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS IN THE COMMUNIST RUSSIAN SLAVERY—SOVIET GENOCIDAL PRACTICES IN THE BALTIC STATES

Since June 15, 1940, the Baltic States have been suffering in the Soviet captivity. The Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms.

The Baltic States have never experienced in their long history through centuries such an extermination and annihilation of their people as during this Soviet occupation since June 15, 1940. During the last 25 years the countries lost more than one-fourth of their entire population. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were murdered by the Kremlin despots or died in exile in Soviet slave-labor camps and prisons in Siberia and other places of Communist Russia. At least 20 percent of the present population of Soviet-occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are not the Balts, but the Soviet colonists. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight. Bearing in mind that all of the murdered and deported people have been the most educated, courageous, industrious, comprising the strongest elements of the countries, the losses in population become more terrible and almost fatal to the survival of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian nations.

But let us now return to the details of the Soviet occupation of Lithuania. At the same time that the forces of occupation were entrenching themselves and the mock elections were being carried out in 1940, leaders and active members of all non-Communist political parties and thousands of public officials were arrested. This was but a prelude to one of the most despicable acts of modern times; namely, the mass deportations that ensued. Interrupted only by a temporary Nazi occupation of Lithuania from 1941 to 1944 when the Soviets reoccupied Lithuania, these deportations went on for about a decade. People from every walk of life, even old and dying people, were put on cattle freight cars for the 3-week journey to Siberia or remote areas near the Arctic Ocean. The number of all the deportees amounted to about 20 percent of the population, or 600,000 Lithuanians. In 2 nights alone of June 1941, 34,260 Lithuanians were deported to the horribly miserable conditions of the slave labor camps. The consequent death toll of these deportees was very high.

With the increase of physical terrorization by the Soviets, a strong Lithuanian underground resistance organization was formed and fought the Soviets. It was a heroic and widespread resistance movement, but it was a costly one: after the war about 30,000 died in battles with Russian Communists.

If we demand for freedom from Portugal for Angola, full freedom for the black population of Africa, we should do exactly the same thing in Europe and elsewhere. The Baltic States are more than 700-year-old nations and they have the same (or even more) right to be free and independent as any new state in Asia or Africa. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in the whole or in part, any place in the world, including the Soviet Union is surely intolerable.

Breedlove To Ride Herd at Boys' State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, again this year Barnett W. "Barney" Breedlove, of Indianapolis, will serve as teacher, adviser, and counselor to the Indiana high school boys attending the American Legion's annual Hoosier Boys' State.

The following article from the June 10, 1965, Indianapolis Star is a fitting tribute to Barney and his 28 years' service to the youth of Indiana at Boys' State:

BREEDLOVE TO RIDE HERD AT BOYS' STATE

Riding herd on 1,000 Hoosier boys from 650 high schools throughout the State at the American Legion's annual Hoosier Boys' State at Indiana University will be Barney Breedlove again this year.

An old hand at the game of teaching Indiana youngsters the intricacies of Hoosier politics, Barnett W. Breedlove has been at it since the legion started Boys' State 28 years ago and it is he who will start the actual workings of the do-it-yourself political campaigning at 8 a.m. Saturday.

Breedlove is a 72-year-old retired attorney with a thousand stories and a grandfatherly mein known affectionately to 20,000 boys who have attended Boys' State as "Barney."

Since 1937 when the first Boys' State was held at the Indiana State Fairgrounds, Breedlove has been its guiding genius.

He oversees the entire operation which requires the recruiting of 100 counselors, arrangements with I.U. officials to feed and house the boys and staff, preparation of programs for each day of the weeklong session, checking with Indiana's 444 American Legion posts to see that all the boys have transportation, and processing application forms and doctor's certificates for each of the delegates.

Breedlove, a retired attorney for the Veterans' Administration, has a world of stories and never has been caught short of an appropriate yarn for a difficult situation.

His stories range from his experiences as an artillery sergeant with the Rainbow Division in France in World War I and as a driver of a horse-drawn hose cart for the Indianapolis Fire Department to his professional life as an attorney and public servant.

Breedlove gets not a cent for his work for Boys' State, but was made a Sagamore of the Wabash for his service to youth by former Gov. Harold W. Handley.

Gov. Henry F. Schricker made him a trustee of the State school for the deaf and for 2 years he was a member of the Indiana Alcoholic Beverage Commission and sternly lectured his fellow Legionnaires for harboring slot machines in their posts.

His 38 years as chief counsel for the local office of the Veterans' Administration was capped by a Civil Service award in 1960 as "Man of the Year."

He was born in Brown County on a farm homesteaded by his grandfather in 1832 and

which has since been incorporated into Brown County State Park.

Breedlove came to Indianapolis at the age of 7 years and was graduated from Shortridge High School and the Indian School of Law.

He is a life member of American Legion Post No. 3 and since 1937 has been treasurer of the Department of Indiana.

The mock political races eventually will send one boy to the Boys' State governor's chair and other to lesser offices.

During the 7-day event at Bloomington, the boys will learn first hand the strange and wonderful workings of a Republic and its demrocratic processes.

The delegates will select two slates of county political officers as their first order of business and then nominate and elect and finally govern.

The highest honor and the one requiring the most campaigning is that of Governor.

Hightlights of the week will include talent night when the boys prepare and present an outstanding show. Another highlight, and the only one to which the public is invited, is the parade and review which is held on Friday night on the Indiana University campus.

Amherst Young Republican Club Passes Resolution Stating Views on Repeal of Section 14(b)—Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the Amherst Young Republican Club recently passed a resolution stating their position on repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and has asked that I convey their views to the Members of Congress. I have spoken to this group, headed by my good friend, Jay Brett. While I found that our views on legislation do not always coincide, I did find our discussions enlightening and in the spirit of friendly, free, and open debate. Once again I find our views differing and I am attaching my statement on the legislation along with the resolution offered by the Amherst Young Republican Club.

The resolution follows:

AMHERST YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB RESOLUTION ON REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b), TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Whereas the present administration has recommended to the Congress of the United States, that it repeal section 14(b) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (Taft-Hartley Act); and

Whereas the said section 14(b) now permits each State to determine for itself whether union shop contracts shall be permitted within its borders; and

Whereas the retention of these right-to-work laws are in the best interests of all the people, both union and nonunion alike in that the freedom of the individual to join or not join a union or any other organization is part of our American heritage; and

Whereas even though the State of New York has not adopted and would not likely adopt such a right-to-work law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of the Amherst, N.Y., Young Republican Club in its regular June meeting assembled does hereby express its strongest opposition to the repeal of section 14(b) as yet another unnecessary and dangerous incursion of the Federal Government into the area of the rights and powers which are or ought to be reserved to the States; and be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Senators from New York and the Representative for the 39th Congressional District of New York be notified of this resolution and urged to oppose the repeal of section 14(b); and be it further

Resolved, That our said Senators and Representative be requested to spread these resolutions upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the end that the entire Congress may be made aware of the depth of feeling on this issue.

Certified a true copy of resolutions passed by the membership of the Amherst, N.Y., Young Republican Club at a meeting held at Amherst, N.Y., on Thursday, June 10, 1965.

JAY E. BRETT,
President.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have received many letters and it is apparent there are strong feelings for and against repeal of that section of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to enact these laws.

The Buffalo Evening News spelled out the controversy in this way:

> What the issue really comes down to is this: far from being a party issue, the outlawing of union-shop contracts is really a controversy that divides the strongly unionized industrialized States from those using the openshop as a lure to attract new industry. On those realistic terms, can see no reason why Republicans in Congress from this part of the country should be bashful about joining northern Democrats in amending the Taft-Hartley Act to ban State right-to-work laws in interstate commerce.

That was on November 8, 1958. In a May 20, 1965, editorial the News restated its earlier position and added that:

> New York and other industrial States which have achieved a measure of maturity in labor-management relations have little reason to take up the cudgels against some uniformity in national labor policy.

The distinguished, ranking Republican on the House Education and Labor Commitee; Representative WILLIAM H. AYRES of Ohio, has said he favors repeal of section 14(b) without any strings attached.

While I am impressed with many of the points advanced by opponents of repeal, I represent 85 percent of Erie County and I want to make sure that nothing I do here helps other States pirate our industry. I wonder if we are consistent if we strive to bring new industry to Erie County but at the same time support a law that helps other States lure our existing industry?

Since the bill has not yet been reported out of committee, I am withholding my final decision on how I will vote until I read the bill and find out what else it includes.

Soviet Seizure of the Baltic Countries in 1940

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the three Baltic countries, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, constitute a natural unit by themselves, and they have been united by their common interest in peace and by their desire to maintain their independence. But being relatively small and weak, they have not always been successful in warding off dangers which have threatened their independence.

Late in the 18th century they could not withstand the czarist Russia's aggressive expansion, and all three were conquered and made part of the Russian Empire. For more than a century these stout and sturdy fighters had to submit to the cruel and callous agents of the czars, for they were in no position to challenge Russia's colossal armed froces. Toward the end of the First World War, however, they had their golden opportunity. Russia's oppressive regime was shattered. The peoples in the Baltic countries felt free and proclaimed their independence.

Thenceforth, for two decades these energetic and industrious peoples remade their war-ravaged countries, strengthened their democratic institutions, became members of the sovereign community of nations and were quite content with their lot in their respective countries. All this was to their liking while there was peace in Europe. But the outbreak of the last war changed everything, bringing on disaster and tragedy to them.

Early in the war the Soviet Government wanted to put an end to the independent status of these countries and annex them to the Soviet Union. While the friends of the Baltic peoples in the West were in the throes of war, Soviet leaders forced the Governments of the Baltic countries to submit to humiliating terms. Mutual assistance pacts were signed, strategic parts of these countries were occupied by Soviet forces, then the Red army overran and occupied all three countries, and finally, in mid-1940 they were made part of the Soviet Union.

By treacherous acts and illegal means the Soviet Government thus robbed the Baltic peoples of their freedom and put an end to their independent existence. To this day this illegal seizure of the Baltic countries by the Soviet Government constitutes a cruel international crime committed against the innocent and inoffensive Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. On the 25th anniversary observance of this international robbery we once more condemn it, and pray for the deliverance or these peoples from Soviet totalitarian tyranny.

Federal Aid to Education: The Problem in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful discussions of Federal aid to education that I have seen was presented earlier this month in the

Berkeley Daily Gazette by the city of Berkeley's very able and distinguished superintendent of schools, Dr. Neil Sullivan.

Dr. Sullivan's analysis of the factors and developments leading to the landmark Elementary-Secondary Education Act of 1965 is sound and constructive and I commend it to all who are concerned with insuring that the United States continues to provide the best possible education for its young people:

SCHOOL REPORT—FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION DISCUSSED

(By Dr. Neil Sullivan)

The recent passage by the 89th Congress of the Perkins-Morse bill (the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) focuses attention on the role of the Federal Government in support of public education. The emphasis given to education in the United States stems from many sources. It reflects a basic belief in the worth of the individual and a belief that the state exists for the individual rather than the individual for the state. It implements the vision of the Founding Fathers who held that the enlightenment of the people was basic to a government of freemen. It gives reality to the ideal of equal opportunity for all. To put these concepts into effect, the American people developed a system of schools, colleges, and universities providing higher learning opportunities which in scope and numbers exceeded those offered elsewhere in the world.

Over the years, education in the United States has been regarded as primarily a State and local matter, with regal control vested in the States. The Federal Government has encouraged education through Federal grants for over a hundred years. The land-grant colleges established with the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 (signed by President Lincoln) provided for the support of at least one college in each State.

Among the many objectives of the land-grant colleges, the leading one was "to teach such branches as are related to agricultural and mechanical arts in such manner as the legislature of the States may respectively prescribe."

Federal cooperation with the States in promoting education below college grade began with the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917. This act provided aid to the States for support of agricultural trades and industries and home economics at the high school level.

During the Roosevelt administration Congress authorized the spending of millions of dollars for surplus foods to be used in school lunch programs in both public and private schools.

During the Eisenhower administration Congress passed the National Defense Education Act which provided millions of dollars for the support of foreign language programs, mathematics, science, and counseling services.

During the Kennedy administration the passage of the 1963 Vocational Education Act provided millions of dollars to train young adults for immediate employment.

Since World War II Congress has made funds available to the several States in areas affected by Government operations. Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 made dollars available to those communities with problems caused by the increased enrollment in their schools of children of Federal workers employed locally in large Federal installations.

Despite all of the aforementioned Federal support, this broad bill supporting public education did not become a law until April 11, 1965. Most observers would agree with me that passage of such a bill had been difficult in prior years for the following reasons:

1. Ability of local communities to support school programs from money raised locally or received from the State.
2. General fear of "Federal control."
3. Opposition from private and parochial school groups who would not support a bill providing money exclusively for the support of the public schools.

Conditions obviously changed. The climate in 1965 was favorable to the passage of the bill. Several factors have stimulated this change of climate:

1. Local property taxes have been overused and no longer can carry the full responsibility for support of local schools.
2. Most States have not continued to contribute a fair share for the support of local schools. California, for example, provided 44 percent of the support in 1945 and in 1964 provided 41 percent.
3. This year, the Federal bill included provisions for children attending both public and private schools to receive help through the "shared services" concept. With this inclusion the bill became more palatable in Congress.
4. There is a growing recognition that, with our mobile population, education is a national, not just a local concern. People whose education is slighted in one State can become a public charge in other States to which they move.

The new act more than doubles the amount of money the U.S. Office of Education will be spending in the several States. It is so structured that we have no reason to fear Federal control. As an example, title I, where most of the money will be, is controlled by the State Department of Education and our State's chief school officer.

In order for Berkeley to receive money under title I, we must develop worthwhile projects for the improvement of education in the areas where we have children from poor families. We must then submit these projects to the State department of education for approval. The amount of money available to Berkeley will be based on the number of children of Berkeley residents whose total family income is no more than $2,000 per year, times one-half the per pupil cost of education in the State of California. I estimate that under title I Berkeley might be eligible to receive up to $400,000.

The act contains five titles. In broad terms these titles provide:

Title I: Financial assistance to districts in meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children and children of low-income families.

Title II: Grants for the acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, audio-visual materials, and other printed and published instructional materials.

Title III: Grants to districts for supplementary educational centers and services, to provide vitally needed educational services or to serve as models for regular school programs.

Title IV: Grants for support of cooperative research and development programs and to provide for the dissemination of results of research.

Title V: Grants to strengthen State departments of education.

As I have indicated, Federal aid to education is not new. However, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 represents a major advance. It marks the recognition that education is a national concern and that the Federal Government must assist in providing the necessary financial support.

Business Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arnold Maremont, a well-known Chicago industrialist and civic leader, is especially known for his forthright comments on issues of the day. Therefore, I thought it would be of unusual interest to insert into the RECORD his article which appeared in the Saturday Panorama section of the Chicago Daily News outlining his philosophy on the subject of business profits:

[From the Chicago Daily News, June 12, 1965]

SHOULD BUSINESS LIVE FOR PROFITS ALONE?

(By Arnold Maremont)

When the first wheels of the industrial revolution started turning, it looked like the pie had come down out of the sky. The wonderful machines were making more goods, creating more jobs and generating more money than ever imagined before. The maxim, "Be fruitful and multiply," was reinterpreted to mean: build bigger inventories and find more markets.

The social benefits seemed self-evident. For a long time, the rich got richer and the poor got poorer and nobody noticed it. Certainly nobody hired a public relations firm to publicize it. Getting rich was being good and making the most of God's world. Social responsibility was left to women and to churches while businessmen got on with the job.

After awhile, the profits got too big and the social conditions too bad: the grumblings of reformers, labor unions, and churchmen reached the ears of the businessman. They muttered to him that he had a social responsibility as a corporate executive to do something about the situation. Giving some of the profits away to good causes became a business responsibility, though the cause and the amount was up to him.

Now we say that big business cannot live by profit alone. It has a social responsibility and, in discharging that responsibility, it can move over into areas that cannot possibly affect the profit and loss columns. To this, I say "Baloney." Who says that big business cannot live by profits alone?

The story of what Ivy Lee did for John D. Rockefeller is the Torah or the Koran of the public relations business, recounted as the magna cum laude of public relations achievement. Why is it that nobody ever talks about what a hoax it was? John D. Rockefeller was Adam Smith in full flower. Business was to make money, and he made it by the hundreds of millions. In the process, the balance of the country had a chance to see what free enterprise really was, and they didn't like it, and they didn't like old John D., who made a shambles of their game.

But he sensed what they intended to do before even they did, and suddenly Ivy Lee was having Mr. Rockefeller tell America that he wasn't accumulating all the millions for himself. He was only acting as God's servant in putting an impressive kitty together for a bigtime crusade of the Lord's work.

"And that," said Humpty Dumpty, "is social responsibility." It means making

necessity a virtue, convincing our fellowmen that business executives have been sent to earth from Heaven to help God work His will. Thus the profit system is the essential part of God's work and those who pursue it most successfully are blessed thrice and endowed with heavenly wisdom, and those who criticize them are heretics and troublemakers.

Of course, every last one of us has a real responsibility to society. Man learned, thousands of years ago, that his survival and well-being were enhanced by group activity, and the contemporary version of this is government. We delegate social responsibility to our Government in its various branches, executive, judicial, and administrative. Government is part of the system, and let's give it a chance to work out the imbalance without trying to use corporate profits to try to mesmerize the referee and change or even improve the results.

There are many other private claims to social responsibility—there are desperate, last-ditch fights, public relations fights essentially, going on in many industries against governmental regulation—the insurance companies against medicare, the real estate men against open occupancy, the automobile companies against stricter safety standards for cars, and the chemical companies against more severe laws to conserve our natural resources and prevent further pollution of our streams, rivers, and the food we eat. All these fights are based on the premise that businessmen have a finer sense of social responsibility than anyone who wishes to regulate them. This is also baloney.

Corporations as such have no social responsibility. But, ever since John D. Rockefeller heard those rumblings and began handing out profits in godly packages, corporations have hoaxed themselves and us to the contrary.

If the citizens of a community have a bad school system, it isn't the function of a corporation to spend its money to educate the school board by paying for experts to come in and tell them how to do it better. The minute, the very second, you aren't positive about where to draw the line, you give the corporation the right to attack a school system which not you, nor the community, nor even competent experts, consider bad, but which only the chief executive of the corporation believes bad.

It is considered part of a corporation's social responsibility to spend corporation funds in the form of tax-deductible contributions to educational institutions. Who decides what kind of educational institutions? How about a school that trains missionaries to convert nonconformists to the true religions, or something equally as remote.

It's too easy for a corporation executive to buy into the establishment using stockholder's funds for contributions. There are a group of "in" businessmen in this country who believe that the power they have through their control of capital goods and financial resources is threatened by the increasing power of Government. They lead the campaign to make business more responsible. They want more self-regulation. They want business to assume more social responsibility. This appears to be a formula that will make more governmental intervention unnecessary.

We don't need more consumer councils, so the song goes. Business is protecting the consumer. We don't need more stringent packaging rules to prevent small quantities from being represented as more by huge containers.

We must face the fact that we're in a profit system. Only utilities can operate benevolently. The balance of us must keep humping every day. There is a place for business statesmanship, but that place is standing up and fighting for the right to make a profit, today, tomorrow, and the next day. It is the responsibility of business to make a profit, and the responsibility of government to see that management conducts its business within the law and, if the law does not protect the public adequately, to create new laws.

Public relations, properly used, can help business make money. But it can't be honestly used to set business up as the high priest of our culture. To create a corporate "image" of social responsibility for communal welfare would be just that, creating an image, and nothing more.

The ultimate responsibility for policing industry lies not with industry itself, but rather with government, its social agencies, and concerned private citizens. Any business attempt at social responsibility is phony, as obvious as the business paternalism of a few generations that built milltowns, factory stores, and kept employees forever in hock.

Paradoxically, the business management that wants to improve its corporate image in the area of social responsibility is, at the level of the private citizen, hardly ever found in the ranks of those concerned with and active in these areas, such as civil rights, welfare, public housing, and similar activities. It is the sheerest hypocrisy for the man in business to try to create an image of corporate responsibility while at the same time, as a private citizen, to ignore completely these responsibilities.

Let business stick to making money, government to regulating business, and management, as private citizens, to contributing time, talent, and abilities in areas of social action. Each then will be operating properly within the limits of its honest concern.

Minnesota Supports Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8310 is viewed by the experts in vocational rehabilitation as a significant step forward in our policy in this area.

I have long felt that Congress, in cooperation with the States, could make important changes in our vocational rehabilitation policy.

Mr. A. L. Peterson, acting assistant commissioner for rehabilitation and special education for the State of Minnesota's Department of Education has written me indicating the support of the State of Minnesota for this bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Peterson's letter be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
St. Paul, Minn., June 7, 1965.

The Honorable DONALD M. FRASER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FRASER: Minnesota has been a leader in providing rehabilitation services to its handicapped citizens since the inception of the rehabilitation program in 1919. The strength of the program stems from the type of relationship that exists between the Federal establishment and the State operating program. Periodically, the State-Federal program has been modified and redefined to improve and perfect the basic structure of this partnership in service to our handicapped citizens. The last great milestone in the rehabilitation effort occurred with the passage of Public Law 565 cited as the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1954. Since this giant step was made a number of changes have developed in terms of the needs of the State's rehabilitation program as conditioned by the great demands placed upon the program to serve more adequately the handicapped of the State. The complexity of the cases being served—such as the mentally retarded, the mentally ill, and the older disabled worker—call for a strengthening of the State program as well as the community based rehabilitation resources that are a vital component in the rehabilitation effort.

H.R. 8310 embodies amendments to the Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 565) which will strengthen the rehabilitation effort in Minnesota. This bill is presently awaiting action by the House Rules Committee and in all probability will be scheduled for House action in the near future. On behalf of the rehabilitation effort in Minnesota, I am asking for your active support of H.R. 8310 in urging prompt and favorable consideration of this measure by the House Rules Committee and a prompt scheduling for House action.

Humanitarian and economic reasons are compelling justification for ameliorating dependency of the handicapped in our midst.

We will be most grateful for your consideration and support of this important measure to strengthen the rehabilitation effort in Minnesota.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. PETERSON,
Acting Assistant Commissioner for Rehabilitation and Special Education.

Hoch Career Recalled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Topeka, Kans., Daily Capital concerning the lasting contributions of a distinguished Kansas family to government, public service, and journalism in my State. The editorial follows:

HOCH CAREER RECALLED

Newspapers with "40 Years Ago" columns this week recorded the death of E. W. Hoch, who served Kansas as Governor from 1905 to 1909.

Mr. Hoch died at age 76 on June 1, 1925, at Marion, where he was a newspaper editor for many years. For a half century he was prominent in Kansas political affairs.

Mr. Hoch's rise to prominence was typical of the self-made men of his time. He came to Kansas from Kentucky, where he had worked in a newspaper office, and preempted a quarter of a section of land near Florence. Crop failures brought hard times, however, and he bought the Marion Record. One biographer says the newspaper plant was then worth $1,000.

The political career of Mr. Hoch started in the 1880's. He was speaker pro tempore of the Kansas House of Representatives when the house was besieged by the militia

of Populist Gov. L. D. Lewelling in the famed "legislative war" of 1893.

Governor Hoch was outstanding as a public speaker. For several years after leaving the Governor's office, he was one of the prominent lecturers of the chautauqua circuit.

The Daily Capital said, at the time Mr. Hoch died, that "Next to William Jennings Bryan, Governor Hoch is said to have drawn the highest pay of any American lecturer in chautauqua work."

Homer Hoch, son of the Governor, was to continue the family prominence in Kansas politics. Homer, a lawyer and Washburn graduate, was elected to Congress in 1919 and served seven consecutive terms. Later he was chairman of the State corporation commission and a justice of the State supreme court. He was the father of Mrs. Leslie L. Saylor, of Topeka, and Wharton Hoch, who has continued to publish the family newspaper at Marion.

The "40 Years Ago" item noting Governor Hoch's death recalls the career of an outstanding Kansan who served his State well.

WBBF Endorses Sol Linowitz' Views on Vietnam "Teach-Ins"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial comment broadcast to its listeners last week, radio station WBBF, which serves a large area of the 36th Congressional District in and around Rochester, N.Y., paid tribute to my constitutent, Sol M. Linowitz, for his statements about recent "teach-ins" that have questioned the conduct of American foreign policy.

I find Mr. Linowitz expertly entitled to examine and evaluate what is good and what is bad for the United States as it respects our international involvements. He has had a long association with public and private efforts to strengthen and support the United Nations. Mr. Linowitz chairs the U.S. State Department's Advisory Committee on International Organizations, and just recently was selected by President Johnson for service with other distinguished citizens on a special committee formed to advise the administration on foreign assistance programs and proposals.

That WBBF chose to repeat remarks from a recent speech by Mr. Linowitz in order to manifest its position on the "teach-ins," I believe offers further weight to the case for careful attention to his point of view.

In sharing this WBBF editorial with my colleagues, may I say with reference to its subject that foreign policy discussion by all citizens must always be welcome, but let us strive to keep its direction constructive and positive.

MR. LINOWITZ AND THE "TEACH-INS"

WBBF is far from enthusiastic about the Vietnam teach-ins that have been taking place at some of our universities. Speaking at Hamilton College, Xerox Board Chairman Sol M. Linowitz expressed views that coincide with ours. Said Mr. Linowitz:

"Joining a protest is not the same as offering a solution; and true involvement in an issue calls for far more than carrying a banner or joining a march. Protest for the sake of protest is not * * * the same as objective analysis. And eloquence for the sake of eloquence * * * can be not only irrelevant but harmful when the issue at stake involves a critical foreign policy of deep concern to the entire Nation.

"At least some of the teach-ins seem to have lost sight of the fact that a major charge placed upon a college and a university is not only to stimulate concern about issues, but also to convey a real understanding of the importance of forming judgments on the basis of relevant facts weighed with clarity and objectivity. And it is at a college or university—above all other places—that we have a right to expect that the measured and rational course rather than the emotional and impetuous will prevail."

That view, expressed by Rochesters Sol Linowitz, expresses, better than we could express it, the WBBF view on the subject of the Vietnam teach-in.

Lack of Farmworkers Leaves Skilled Workers Unemployed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, for those who suggest that only the farmer is being penalized by the refusal of the Department of Labor to permit importation of temporary, supplemental farm labor, I insert the following telegram. I hope Members with large, vocal union membership will read it.

Union members on the scene who know the situation intimately urge me to help obtain adequate, competent, reliable farm labor so that the union members employed in industries allied with agriculture can go back to work.

KING CITY, CALIF.

BURT L. TALCOTT,
Congressman,
Washington, D.C.:

We have accepted all recruits available under the Department of Labor's State and interstate program. They leave as fast as they come. Some are too young. Some are too old. Some are skid-row types. As we have stated before, we were the first to go with the program last year and used no braceros in our carrot fields. The results were disastrous—this year we were forced to destroy 400 acres in Imperial Valley. Now we are facing the same thing in the Salinas Valley. Some recruited workers remain on the job but the wage cost is more than the selling price of the carrots, and the market is good. Please, please we beg you to do something about it. I do not want to destroy foodstuff that hungry people need. We have 250 union workers on our 3 packing sheds and practically all are drawing partial unemployment benefits because we cannot get sufficient carrots harvested.

ANTHONY MAGGIO,
President, Carl Joseph Maggio, Inc.

Can you imagine skilled agriculture shed workers being unemployed and drawing unemployment benefits when their employer is plowing under mature vegetables and valuable food is wasting in the fields? Well, it is true.

There is nothing to process, grade, box, package, refrigerate, transport, or sell if the carrots cannot be harvested. Only the Department of Labor can alleviate this monstrous disaster.

The 25 Years in Communist Russian Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following by request of my constituent, Mr. Leonard Valiukas, chairman of the board of directors of Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States:

THE 25 YEARS IN COMMUNIST RUSSIAN SLAVERY—SOVIET GENOCIDAL PRACTICES IN THE BALTIC STATES

Since June 15, 1940, the Baltic States have been suffering in the Soviet captivity. The Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms.

The Baltic States have never experienced in their long history through centuries such an extermination and annihilation of their people as during this Soviet occupation since June 15, 1940. During the last 25 years the countries lost more than one-fourth of their entire population. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were murdered by the Kremlin despots or died in exile in Soviet slave-labor camps and prisons in Siberia and other places of Communist Russia. At least 20 percent of the present population of Soviet-occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are not the Balts, but the Soviet colonists. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight. Bearing in mind that all of the murdered and deported people have been the most educated, courageous, industrious, comprising the strongest elements of the countries, the losses in population become more terrible and almost fatal to the survival of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian nations.

But let us now return to the details of the Soviet occupation of Lithuania. At the same time that the forces of occupation were entrenching themselves and the mock elections were being carried out in 1940, leaders and active members of all non-Communist political parties and thousands of public officials were arrested. This was but a prelude to one of the most despicable acts of modern times; namely, the mass deportations that ensued. Interrupted only by a temporary Nazi occupation of Lithuania from 1941 to 1944, when the Soviets reoccupied Lithuania, these deportations went on for about a decade. People from every walk of life, even old and dying people, were put on cattle freight cars for the 3-week journey to Siberia or remote areas near the Arctic Ocean. The number of all the deportees amounted to about 20 percent of the population, or 600,000 Lithuanians. In two nights alone of June 1941, 34,260 Lithuanians were deported to the horribly miserable conditions of the slave-labor camps. The consequent death toll of these deportees was very high.

With the increase of physical terrorization by the Soviets, a strong Lithuanian underground resistance organization was formed and fought the Soviets. It was an heroic and widespread resistance movement, but it was a costly one: after the war about 30,000 died in battles with Russian Communists.

If we demand for freedom from Portugal for Angola, full freedom for the black population of Africa, we should do exactly the same thing in Europe and elsewhere. The Baltic States are more than 700-year-old nations and they have the same (or even more) right to be free and independent as any new state in Asia or Africa. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in the whole or in part, any place in the world, including the Soviet Union is surely intolerable.

"Birth Control" or "Control of Birth"—Moral, Religious, or Legal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 13, 1965, a resident of Valley Stream, Long Island, in the Fifth Congressional District of New York, which I am proud to represent in Congress, was arrested for disseminating birth control information in violation of the New York State penal law, section 1142 entitled "Indecent Articles."

My mail has been heavy since the arrest mentioned above and the widespread press coverage of the incident, in our daily and weekly press. This statement is not in any way an attempt to judge the wisdom of the statute, or prejudge the guilt or innocence of the defendant or pass on the constitutionality of the State law in question but rather to highlight the issues involved in birth control legislation in general. Should "birth control" or "control of birth" be a subject of moral, religious, or legal concern?

The New York State penal law, section 1142, provides that it shall be a misdemeanor "to give information or show a device or a drug or medicine purporting to be for the prevention of conception or to give orally such information as to how same can be purchased." The case now under consideration in the First District Court of Nassau County, N.Y., involves a 32-year-old former pharmaceutical company executive charged with commission of a crime for violation of section 1142. The defendant has asked the court to dismiss the charge on the ground that the law is unconstitutional.

In recent months the question of birth control and birth control laws has been the subject of dialog among clergymen, attorneys, and citizens concerned with the population explosion and the blight of poverty in our Nation. The U.S. Supreme Court has handed down a landmark decision striking down a Connecticut birth control law enacted in 1879 forbidding the use of contraceptives by anyone, including married couples. The New York law in question was enacted 84 years ago.

It is not the responsibility of a Congressman to comment on the merits of a controversy pending in the local courts. It is, however, the responsibility of a Representative to inform his constituents of developments on issues which may have an impact on their lives, whether moral, religious, or legal.

In a world where one-third of the population goes to sleep hungry every night; where children suffer from the diseases of malnutrition and together with their parents are dying of starvation; the United States is being urged to send birth control information, as well as drugs and devices to control the growth of the population, should the decision to do so be based upon—moral—religious or legal grounds or a combination of each of them?

I am inserting at this point excerpts from editorials and news reports relating to this question which outline the moral, religious, social, and legal principles and issues which have been raised by both the Valley Stream incident and the Supreme Court decision of May 7, 1965:

[From the Long Island Press, April 18, 1965]

HE'LL DEFY THE LAW TO TEACH BIRTH CONTROL IN THE SLUMS

A one-man effort to disseminate birth control devices and information in underprivileged neighborhoods of the metropolitan area will begin tomorrow.

The man is William R. Baird, of North Valley Stream, a 32-year-old medical director of a pharmaceutical company.

Baird plans to enter the neighborhoods in his mobile "Plan Van" and set up his birth control clinic. He is fully aware, he said, that he will be breaking the law by doing so.

"I may get arrested," he said, "but I feel this is something that must be done."

He emphasized it is not his intent to make himself a martyr in a test of the law's constitutionality. "My only goal is to help those poor people stand on their own feet," Baird said.

Baird is outspoken in his condemnation of the New York State law which makes it a crime "to give information or show a device or a drug or medicine purporting to be for the prevention of conception or to give orally such information as to how same can be purchased."

"It is my firm belief," Baird said, "that no law, no matter how right its intent, should invade the sanctity of a married couple's bedroom to dictate what is right and what is wrong."

Violation of the law could result in a $2,000 fine or 2 years imprisonment or both, he said.

Baird's van is equipped to handle 30 persons an hour. He said he will show them "what they can gain" by practicing various birth control methods.

He said he will distribute to them free of charge "nonprescriptive methods such as creams, suppositories, jellies and condoms." He said he will inform the people where they can go to obtain further information on the subject.

There will be no commercial aspects to this, Baird pointed out, since he will distribute the products of many companies. "As a matter of fact," he noted, "I haven't told my own employer about this * * * and I'm not sure what his reaction will be."

Baird believes the problems of drug addiction and juvenile delinquency are closely associated with the problem of large families in which parents have little control over their children.

"The strength of our Nation is based on the strength of the family unit. What I am attempting to do is show these people how to make the family unit stronger by controlling its size," he said.

Baird's Plan Van is finished off inside like a living room. "We want to make the people feel like they're walking into the home of a friend," Baird explained.

Accompanying him on his tour will be a nurse, a minister, a rabbi, a pharmacist, a physician and a Spanish interpreter—all volunteers.

Baird said he has been saving money for more than 2 years to launch the project. He paid for all the equipment, including the van, the literature and the birth control devices. They cost him more than $4,000, he said.

Baird said he is disturbed particularly over the failure of elected officials to set up birth control clinics in Nassau.

Baird is looking for volunteers to help with the campaign and has set up a nonprofit, State-chartered group called the Parent's Aid Society for this purpose.

He lives with his wife, Eve, and their four young children at 1269 G Street, North Valley Stream.

[From the Village Leader, May 5, 1965]

R.V.C. PRIEST ANSWERS STREAMER ON BIRTH CONTROL METHOD VIEWS

(By Norman Jay)

On Wednesday, April 7, this paper published an interview with Mr. William Baird titled "Validity of Birth Control Laws Questioned by Valley Stream Man."

Many of our readers felt that since Mr. Baird had said he would welcome the Catholic viewpoint on the subject that we should consult with the Catholic Church. The man best informed would be the coordinator of the family planning information centers with the Catholic diocese of Rockville Centre. He is Father Richard P. Hendel.

FATHER HENDEL

We talked with Father Hendel at the chancery office in Rockville Centre.

OPINION

My first question to Father Hendel was, "Father Hendel, what did you think about the article by Mr. Baird?"

"Norman, the article concerning Mr. Baird has been brought to my attention and I read it with a great deal of interest. He indicates in his statement that he does not have the cooperation or the assistance of a Catholic on his panel.

FAMILY PLANNING

"Since the program has to do with family planning, I was quite surprised that Mr. Baird made no reference to our program which Bishop Kellenberg announced publicly and undertook first on a pilot program basis. Having seen the proven success of it, he continued and expanded the program. It is aimed at providing Catholics first (although we have had non-Catholics avail themselves of this service) with family planning information.

"Perhaps I might at this time, Norman, either answer questions or give you some of the specifics of the family planning centers which are now in operation in our diocese."

HISTORY

"Father, would you be good enough to tell me what is family planning and, briefly, the historical background of family planning—and just how many centers there are available to people?"

"Norman, first of all, it became a quite obvious problem to many Catholic people in our community—it became apparent to priests and certainly the Bishop—that people were facing problems in our current society—the solution to which involved the size of their families. When we speak of family planning in a very loose definition we would mean this * * * How a Catholic couple can

so plan the size of their family that they might in good conscience fulfill all their obligations as married people and as parents.

"Now, if parents are to fulfill their responsibility toward their children, many are convinced that they must either space or perhaps curtail the possibility of future children. This is a legitimate and proper goal. The big and difficult question—how to do this in good conscience."

BISHOP KELLENBERG

"The program that Bishop Kellenberg eventually established then moved into its first stage, which was to bring together parish priests, doctors, moral theologians, psychiatrists, in committee to discuss the problem."

NUMBER

"Father, may I ask again how many centers are there where this information is disseminated?"

"Well, Norman, before I give the number, may I add:

"Bishop Kellenberg set up this committee and after many meetings they came up with the plan whereby a pilot program was set up at Mercy Hospital in April of 1964. The program began operating with a priest who spoke very briefly to a group of couples interested in this program (there by previous appointment), and gave a talk on the religious and moral aspects of the rhythm system."

SECOND STAGE

"Then the second stage of the program (that we run each week)—a doctor spoke to the entire group on the general methods involved in the rhythm method. Then each couple in a private interview with a doctor had the rhythm system personalized for their particular use."

ONLY METHOD

"Father, may I ask whether * * * you consider the rhythm system the only method of birth control or are there any other systems that the Catholic Church would espouse, and lastly, do you consider the rhythm method effective?"

"Norman, that is a very good and comprehensive question."

"Many people in speaking of birth control generally, seem to look to birth control as a panacea, a cure-all for all the problems of the world * * * marital probems, economic probems, food problems, etc. I think this is unrealistic. Even if we limit the answer to marital problems, birth control is no magic cure-all or solution to all the problems.

"The family planning information center of which I have spoken is an attempt to make available another possible source of assistance to people in solving their difficulties."

ONLY METHOD?

"Is the rhythm system the only solution to birth control? I would doubt that. As of the moment I would say this, that the only way that a couple can in good conscience accomplish the purpose of either curtailing, controlling, or spacing possible conceptions is by some type of periodic continence. In this, I refer to Catholic couples."

EFFECTIVENESS

"Now, what about its effectiveness? The program which we have run for a year now at Mercy Hospital—by all methods that we have of measuring—the rhythm system is as good and as effective as any of the contraceptive devices in use today. The only method that surpasses all of these is 'the pill' which perhaps is about 99 percent effective."

PILL

"Father, you said 'the pill,' but would 'the pill' be an acceptable method for use by Catholic couples?"

"Well, Norman, I'm happy you phrased the question the way you did * * * 'The pill' today not only may be used but is being used by many couples under direction and with the advice of a physician where the health of an individual is concerned and this medication like any other medication will help solve some medical problem. I am sure all of your readers have seen a good deal over the past year and very recently the press release from the Vatican where Pope Paul spoke to a commission, which he himself had established about a year ago, and kept under absolute secrecy. He met with them to receive their first report on a study of the entire situation of family planning—its morality—the use of 'the pill' etc. According to published reports the only agreement that the group reached was this * * * they could not agree."

INVITATION

"Father, I'd still like to ask one question. Would you under any circumstances consider the invitation of Mr. Baird to have a Catholic explain the rhythm system to those that want to know about it, on his plan van?"

"Norman, I did see an open invitation for Catholics to join Mr. Baird on his van. I would say this, we have experienced many difficulties in getting people who are first of all professionally competent to give sound advice free on their own time."

YES

"Now, perhaps on some one occasion, we would be very happy to have someone explain what our work is, what our goals are. We live, we understand (and I am sure Mr. Baird does also) in a very complex society—a society which represents many different types of thinking, codes of morals and each of us, ultimately, must answer to our own conscience."

CATHOLICS

"We realize that the Catholic segment of the community might not agree with everything that Mr. Baird says and perhaps vice versa, but we would acknowledge the sincerity of Mr. Baird's program. We might even on some prearranged occasion have someone representing our family planning information center explain the program just as it is in operation for us today. However, Mr. Baird's goals are perhaps different than our goals. We are pursuing ours and we have no objection to Mr. Baird pursuing his, and I see no area of direct or immediate conflict."

[From Newsday, June 9, 1965]

TWO SIGNIFICANT DECISIONS

The Supreme Court of the United States has handed down two significant decisions. The first outlaws the Connecticut birth control law, dating from 1879, forbidding the use of contraceptives by anyone, including married couples. The basis for the ruling was that the law abridged the concept of privacy set forth broadly in the Constitution. The result may be a major step toward striking down laws in 29 States, including New York, which limit birth control activities. A bill to liberalize the sale of contraceptives by pharmacists to adults only, but banning advertising of such articles, is pending in the New York State Senate and ought to be approved.

The Court's ruling on birth control, which in the past has generated so much emotion, comes at a time when some segments of the Catholic Church in the United States have relaxed their insistence upon government regulations in this field. Richard Cardinal Cushing, archibishop of Boston, supports the legalizing of birth control information and devices in Massachusetts, on the sound ground that Catholics do not seek to impose by law their moral views on other members of society. In his attitude, he has the backing of prominent laymen elsewhere in the country.

At a time when the population explosion is causing such grave worldwide concern, the Court's ruling serves as a guidepost for Americans. Those whose conscience forbids them to use contraceptives will continue to avoid them. Others who wish to limit their families will be free to practice birth control without stigma—assuming that the decision is accepted by the States that now impose restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we are dealing primarily with a moral principle—one which perhaps should not be dealt with by a statute.

In the Old Testament, Book of Genesis, 38: 8–10, that which Onan did, "was evil in the sight of the Lord." The Catholic Church, as Pope Paul VI recently stated, also recognizes the multiple aspects of this grave problem and is now carrying on a dialog on the entire subject.

Mr. Speaker, section 1142 of the New York State penal law, enacted more than 84 years ago, is more honored in the breach. It is well known that many pharmacists and druggists in the State of New York have been guilty of repeated violations of this law and accordingly I believe the statute should be reviewed and amended.

I am making this statement bacause so many of my colleagues represent States where laws of a similar nature are being, or are about to be tested in their courts, and I want them to have the benefit of the experience in my district.

Marine Has Good Suggestion for Restless Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have all been concerned about recent student activity protesting U.S. foreign policy. Some groups have encouraged defiance of the Universal Military Training Act by tearing up draft cards and other publicity-seeking methods.

Gen. A. A. Vandergrift, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, has sent me a clipping containing a suggested solution to some of these activities, and I believe it is worthy of serious consideration and therefore place it here in the RECORD:

MARINE HAS SUGGESTION FOR RESTLESS STUDENTS

EDITOR, THE NEWS LEADER:

I've noticed, the past couple of months, in the paper that the students in a lot of colleges are on the march for everything from freedom of speech to stop the fighting in Vietnam. Most of these groups use call letters for their names.

Since these protesting groups like to march so much, I know an organization that has its own island, right off the coast of South Carolina. They like to march and they use call letters a lot.

The teachers are called DI's, the island is called PI, and the organization is called USMC.

I guarantee the parents of these mop-haired, bearded students that if they send these people there, they'll look like and act like first class solid American citizens—and it only takes 12 weeks—not 4 years.

Besides teaching you how to march, they also teach you the value of freedom and how to defend it—not to abuse it.

DON WILSON,
Captain, U.S. Marine Corps.

TAPPAHANNOCK.

A Tribute to Helen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, there are comparatively few people whose passing have left an irreplaceable void. Mrs. Helen Waterhouse certainly ranks amongst these.

As a reporter for the Akron Beacon Journal and the other Knight newspapers, the world was her "beat." She has covered some of the historymaking events of our time.

A true investigative reporter, Mrs. Waterhouse delved deeply into the "story behind the story" so that her readers might share the true facts with her.

There were those who called her a "sob sister." I have no quarrel with this title except to say that every sob that she brought to her readers, originated in her own heart.

To the little people of this world, she was indeed a sister. Like an elder sister, she championed and defended them. Their battles became her battles and as a strong and valiant fighter, she brought many victories to those who had only known defeat.

A good reporter is one who delves deeply into the facts and the background of a story and has the ability, the honesty, and the courage to share their total findings with us. Helen Waterhouse's readers shared her adventurous life with her. She will be deeply mourned by them.

Helen Waterhouse was the possessor of many national awards. Her own beloved organization, the National Federation of Press Women, recognized her great reportorial ability on 15 separate occasions. Just a little over a year ago, they acclaimed her "Woman of the Year."

I append an editorial that was reprinted in the Akron Beacon Journal on Monday, June 14, 1965:

A TRIBUTE TO HELEN

(NOTE.—This tribute to Helen Waterhouse, a great newspaperwoman and a dedicated humanitarian, appeared in the Beacon Journal on Christmas Day, 1960. It was written by Helen's longtime friend, Ben Maidenburg, executive editor and publisher of this newspaper.)

The person who in my opinion comes closest to the true spirit of Santa Claus is not a man.

She's not fat. Sometimes she's not even jolly. Her name is Helen Waterhouse. She's been on the staff of the Beacon Journal for some 30 years. At her years, she has more vim and vitality than any other person who ever worked for the Beacon Journal, no matter what age.

There isn't a person in this town, or any town, who has so given of herself to the poor, the friendless, the hungry. I wonder how much money she's taken out of her own purse to feed some worthy but needy person, or some utterly worthless bum.

I wonder how many thousands of hours of her own time she has taken to be a friend to families and individuals who have fallen on hard times; and families whose mothers and fathers have turned out to be drunken louts.

To some in Akron, Helen Waterhouse is a pest.

To others, she is a sob sister type of writer.

Many think she is only interested in aviation.

And some may have concluded that Helen Waterhouse is a globetrotting war correspondent who stops off in Akron between conflicts in Korea, Indochina, Hungary, and other places.

But those who really know her identify Helen Waterhouse with goodness and with charity. We know her as true friend to the poor and the unfortunate.

I said that some think her to be a pest. I imagine a lot of people in the charity and social organizations have that opinion of Helen.

F Mrs. Waterhouse stands on no redtape, no authoritarian rules and regulations when it comes to lending a hand to someone immediately in need of food, shelter or clothing, or medicine.

For a rather small woman, Helen swings a mighty muscle.

The heads and staff people of our social and relief agencies crab about Helen. Down underneath I suspect (at least I hope) they have a tremendous respect for her.

I daresay there have been many times when a down-and-outer, applying to a recognized agency for aid, and being barred from help by rules and regulations, is sent to Helen Waterhouse by that agency. The agency people know Mrs. Waterhouse can and will do things that even the regulated agencies cannot accomplish.

There's hardly an hour in the day when a couple of old folks, or a young mother with crying children, or a couple with ill-clothed and ill-fed infants aren't standing at Helen's desk.

There's no secret about the reasons for these visits. They are so common any more that few of us in the office even look up.

These unfortunates have either been turned down by some professional agency, or just don't know where else to go.

So they trudge up to the third floor of the Beacon Journal to see Helen.

From Helen they get a sympathetic hearing, unmarred by rules and regulations and redtape. Many's the time I've seen Helen dig into her own purse for a dollar or two or more.

Many's the time I've dug into my own pocket when Helen has come over to relate a sad story. And others in the office, too.

They call her late at night, early in the morning. They are standing at her desk at 6:30 a.m., when Helen comes to work. They are after her on Sunday.

People who know Helen Waterhouse—even a few people right here in the Beacon Journal office—sometimes make snide remarks about her.

They can say what they wish about Helen Waterhouse. They can call her a pest, or a sob-sister, or a nut on aviation. They can say she considers the world her own private newspaper beat.

But on this Christmas Day, I want to nominate Helen Waterhouse as the closest thing to a real live Santa Claus that I have ever seen.

All of us can take a lesson from her. I don't know what sins she has committed in this world, but if there is a God in Heaven, and He doesn't welcome Helen Waterhouse with open arms to the Pearly Gates, there's something wrong somewhere.

She deserves more of Heaven than any person I know, or have known.

Community Newspapers: Grassroots Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the weekly newspapers across the Nation are the tendons and sinews of American strength. American democracy gains its vitality from the involvement of the grassroots. And it is papers like the Great Neck Record, Great Neck, N.Y., which reflect and form that opinion. Under the able leadership of Carol Hauptman and Ted Majeski, this paper stands as an example of true public service, dedication, and civic involvement, which I commend to my colleagues as one worthy of emulation. As just one instance of this spirit, I submit an essay which took first honors in a very commendable contest sponsored by the Daughters of the American Revolution. This essay was written by an eighth-grade Great Neck student, Alyson Adler, and vividly portrays the spiritual underpinnings of our great heritage—proving that these forces can be made contemporaneous to our youth. The article is reprinted from this week's Great Neck Record:

WHAT THE FLAG MEANS TO ME

(Following is the DAR prize winning essay written by eighth-grade Great Neck student, Alyson Adler.)

The flag of the United States is only a symbol, but it is a symbol of a country that is unequaled in the world today. The flag represents the wide scope of our ideas, our goal of peace, and our hopes for the future in a free world. It symbolizes our willingness to help our fellowman and our varied talents which contribute to our Nation as a whole and to the world.

Our flag is but a mirror in which are reflected all the wonderful things that compose our country. We should treat the flag as such, because a mirror is important to see and to appreciate things as they really are. When looking at the flag proudly waving in the breeze, my mind is filled with a thousand pictures of what the flag stands for.

If I stare at it long enough, it becomes fields of swaying wheat, a traffic jam in New York City, the view of the Golden Gate Bridge or canyons in the desert. These things show the diversity of our land. Our natural resources and the beauty of our ever-changing landscape are such important factors in the wealth of our country that the flag couldn't possibly be meaningful without them.

The flag is our heritage and our link with the past, present, and future of this country. Its 13 stripes are a remembrance of the way our country started. It grew slowly but surely with the unflinching help of men who gave all for our cause. Its stars are our link with the present and help us to remember that our unity comes above all. Its link with the future is to spur us to create a happy, peaceful existence with all nations and peoples.

May our flag forever wave. Although wars and world progress can take place under its shadow, let its spirit always live in the hearts of men.

Milwaukee Journal Commends President Johnson's Proposal To Restore Beauty to America's Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, for too long we have allowed ugliness to mar our cities and our countryside, particularly along the highways that are built largely or substantially with Federal funds.

President Johnson's four bills to restore beauty to America's highways are among the key measures we need to make beauty an integral part of the Great Society we are building in this country.

The Milwaukee Journal recently published an editorial commending the President's program and pointing out the need for the adoption of the legislation he has recommended.

The editorial follows:

WAY TO ROADSIDE BEAUTY

The automobile, as President Johnson puts it, "is a central feature of American life," essential to our growth and prosperity. It also has produced ribbons of concrete bare of roadside beauty, lined with ranks of garish billboards and flanked by rusting auto graveyards.

Now the President has proposed to Congress four bills to restore beauty where it has already been destroyed and create a highway environment which will enrich the journey.

Most urgently needed is the proposal that States, to get Federal highway aid, be required to ban billboards within 1,000 feet of Federal interstate and primary roads except in areas zoned for commercial or industrial use.

The voluntary approach to billboard control hasn't worked. Ever since 1958, States have been eligible for a bonus of five-tenths of 1 percent of the cost of their I-road construction if they agreed to regulate outdoor advertising. Only 20 States have entered into the needed agreements. Only eight, Wisconsin included, actually have qualified for the bonus.

This new approach to billboards, long a national eyesore, is so logical and so inevitable that it now has received the almost unanimous support of the outdoor advertising industry itself.

At last count there were 17,726 auto graveyards, junkyards and like eyesores along 265,000 miles of Federal-aid primary roads. The President asks that States, again as a condition to getting aid, be required either to eliminate these visual blots or effectively screen them. The Federal Government would pay a share of land purchase or condemnation cost.

The proposal raises some problems. Junkyards in hilly terrain often cannot be screened and would have to be bought or condemned at considerable cost. The screening requirement could put an additional and unexpected burden on a legitimate industry. Screening and removal would only sweep the problem out of sight, not solve the knotty problem of junk disposal.

The two other bills would require use of some Federal highway funds for landscaping and beautification of federally aided highways and to acquire scenic strips of land beside them.

These are bold and, in the main, workable proposals. They bid the Nation to concern itself with what Laurance Rockefeller calls the quality of its environment as well as the quantity of its resources.

The Correct Aim of the United States in Asia Is To Draw a Defendable Line Somewhere Between China and India and Hold It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it has been difficult in the welter of conflicting comment to keep an informed and balanced view of the American aim and purpose in Vietnam. Nowhere have I encountered a more succinct and pinpointed expression of that purpose than in an article appearing in a recent issue of the Economist:

The correct aim of the United States in Asia is to draw a defendable line somewhere between China and India and hold it.

In that sentence is an abundance of dynamic meaning. Without the establishment of such a defendable line the vast resources and millions of people of India are genuinely threatened. The position of Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines are placed under a perilous pall. The confidence of Japan and Korea would be destroyed and these countries would inevitably accomodate themselves to the realities of a Chinese-dominated East. This is the stake. To relate our policy singularly to South Vietnam and what happens to that little country, as important as that is, is to miss the big game altogether. When we count the cost of our commitment to the bloody and bothersome days between now and summer, can we do it in the light of the awesome weight of what we have to win and lose in this conflict?

I commend to the consideration of my colleagues the well done article from which I have drawn this important sentence and under unanimous consent include it in full below:

THE MONSOON CAMPAIGN—HOW DANGEROUSLY WILL THE WAR IN VIETNAM DEVELOP DURING THE WET WEATHER?

"When and if necessary," said a State Department spokesman on Tuesday, American troops in Vietnam will fight to help their South Vietnamese allies. The protests that followed make one wonder what on earth the protesters think the Americans are doing in Vietnam. They long ago stopped claiming that they were there simply as advisers, it being clear that advice alone would not stop the Vietcong and its allies stuffing South Vietnam into the bag. American airmen, marines and paratroopers have already been in action, in attack and defense; nobody ever thought they went there just to garrison a few islands among the Vietcong's paddy-fields.

The correct aim of the United States in Asia is to draw a defendable line somewhere between China and India, and hold it. This involves, among other things, preventing the Vietcong from achieving a quick and total victory over the South Vietnamese Army during the present monsoon. The Vietcong's successes in the last fortnight have produced more signs of wobbling among South Vietnamese politicians; they need the encouragement of knowing that South Vietnamese soldiers will not be asked to fight alone. For the New York Times to describe this as "an American war against Asians" is a depressing piece of intellectual sleight of hand. Was the Battle of the Bulge—and the American counterattack out of it—an American war against Europeans?

What this week's news has made clear is that the Vietnam war has now left the stage of guerrilla operations. Only the fact that American air power prevents the Vietcong from operating in large, vulnerable formations has so far stopped the process of escalation reaching the level of a conventional war of movement. The scale of operations is indicated by the numbers of troops involved. The United States now has over 50,000 men in Vietnam, supporting a South Vietnamese Army of about a quarter of a million. The Vietcong is reckoned to have about 64,000 main force troops and between 80,000 and 100,000 part-time guerrillas. This rebel army includes an apparently growing number of northerners; captured documents show that all but two soldiers of a Vietcong battalion engaged at Quang Ngai on May 31 came from the north, and on June 7 South Vietnamese troops captured 32 North Vietnamese members of an engineering battalion just south of the border between the two countries.

This buildup by both sides reflects their realization that the battle for the country can be won or lost in the coming weeks. Now that the monsoon has begun, the aim of the Vietcong and its North Vietnamese friends is to exploit a hard-won advantage. They have succeeded in their first major objective: the cities in South Vietnam are now, in Mao Tse-tung's phrase, "besieged by the villages." But, though the Vietcong has taken over the countryside, this victory will not be permanent if it cannot be completed by breaking the morale of the South Vietnamese Army and jostling the Saigon politicians into setting up a government that will negotiate peace on Hanoi's terms. The Vietcong has every interest in striking a mortal blow before the United States can deploy any major counterstroke.

Since the end of May the sharp increase in the scale of Vietcong attacks has shown the tactics by which the Communists hope to finish off the war. On May 31 an attack at Quang Ngai badly cut up some units of the South Vietnamese 1st Corps. On June 1 and 2 the Vietcong inflicted heavy casualties on government forces in Pleiku Province. On June 3 it wiped out a battalion in the same area. The Vietcong presumably calculates that the morale of the South Vietnamese Army will collapse if the monsoon campaign brings ambush after ambush laid by an unseen enemy whose intelligence is streets ahead of its own.

This is an extremely serious threat. The mountainous country that includes Pleiku province dominates the vital Highway No. 1, the coastal road that joins the American bases at Da Nang and Chulai. It is also relatively easy for the guerrillas to reach this stretch of country from their bases in North Vietnam and from their arms supply route through Laos. Its occupation in force by the Vietcong would threaten any American plan to secure the waist of Indochina, thereby cutting the Vietcong off from their northern support. It looks as if the Americans and the South Vietnamese have no choice in the next 10 weeks but to hang on to what they can of the area and accept the heavy losses this will involve. It remains to be seen if political nerves will stand the strain.

For the moment, then, the only possible tactics in Vietnam are to dig in for a bloody 2½ months while trying to avoid any major setback to American prestige—the capture of an American base (Pleiku is the most vulnerable) or the defeat of a substantial American force. The Vietcong will probably hesitate to attack an American perimeter. The experience of the Vietminh in the Red River Delta in 1951 showed that, where the defending side has enough firepower, such an attack can fail disastrously. But the guerrillas will certainly make it difficult for American forces to move outside their bases. The cutting late in May of Highway No. 1 between Da Nang and Hué, and the operations by American marines to clear the road since then, show the shape of the wet-weather fighting to come.

When the rains are over, however, it may be possible—if the Communist are still refusing to negotiate on reasonable terms—to counterattack. This counterattack will probably concentrate on establishing more American bases in the waist of Vietnam and on an attempt to clear the area around Saigon of guerrillas. If the American guide operations in the Saigon area more tightly, it may be that counterinsurgency tactics of the sort that Western advisers have long been urging on the South Vietnamese can be applied more effectively than they have been in the past. The autum (assuming one gets through the summer) will also be the time for taking another look at the bombing of North Vietnam. If the American decision to go into the ground war on a big scale proves enough to hold down the Vietcong, and to start pushing it back, the military advantages of going on bombing the north may be outweighed by the public relations disadvantages. But if North Vietnam decides in the autoum to carry on helping the Vietcong to an extent that still leaves the Vietcong with a potentially winning hand, the bombing will have to go on.

The big wet weather heave by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese will pretty certainly achieve some limited successes. But by now the United States probably has enough forces in the field to prevent a major defeat, and President Johnson's decision to commit those forces to open combat serves notice on the North Vietnamese that they may have to fight a long and more sophisticated war which, even with Chinese aid and comfort, they are not very well fitted to sustain. The question is whether South Vietnam's Army, and even more its politicians, can stand the strain any better. The battle in Vietnam is a battle of opposing wills. Pourvu que les civils tiennent.

Continued Illegal Soviet Control of the Three Baltic Nations—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my colleagues here this afternoon in recognition and remembrance of the heroic people of Lithuania and the other Baltic States on this occasion of the 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression against them.

Twenty-five years ago, on June 15, 1940, the Russian troops overran Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, took away their independence and transformd them into colonies of the Soviet Union.

It was, indeed, a black and treacherous day in the history of mankind. The peaceful people of the progressive Baltic States were practically forced into slavery by the Russian dictators and from that dark day until this very moment they have been truly isolated from the rest of the free world.

Although the people of the Baltic States have been subjected to these terrible persecutions through the years we have no cause to despair that they will never regain their liberty. In fact we have great cause to think just the opposite. For the history of these states reveals that even in their worst times of trials and tragedies they demonstrated again and again that they have retained their faith and trust that divine providence would always return their bright promise and destiny to them.

From our own knowledge of their history and personal observation of the Lithuanian-Americans and the other peoples of the Baltic States we know they have an unabiding faith that the Communists can never destroy.

We know they have a high courage that the Communists can never vanquish.

We know that they have a Christian character and culture that will survive when all the fraud and the hypocrisy of atheistic tyrants have vanished from the face of the earth.

It is to this objective that we and all the other friends of the Lithuanian and Baltic peoples must continue to dedicate our efforts.

To this end I, early last January, introduced House Concurrent Resolution 75 which calls upon the Congress to request the President to bring up the Baltic States question in the United Nation and to ask the United Nations to urge the Soviet Union to withdraw from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, return the Baltic exiles to their homes and provide for free elections under the supervision of the United Nations. This resolution is designed to reaffirm a basic principle of U.S. policy—self-determination of all peoples and the right of all peoples to choose their own form of government. I most earnestly hope the Congress will see fit to approve this or a similar resolution in the near future.

It is most fitting that we pause here this afternoon to recall to the world the tragic history of the Baltic people. It is further fitting that we also solemnly pledge that both as Members of Congress and private citizens we will never cease our united efforts until the gallant people of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia and all other subjugated peoples have been restored to freedom in a world at peace.

Want To Play President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in his column of Sunday, June 13, the distinguished observer and writer of the New York Times, James Reston, has again pointed his finger to the crux of the problem confronting us in Vietnam today.

President Johnson, Mr. Reston points out, has chosen to follow a path which shuns the extremes; a policy of "applying limited pressure from the air, a roving defense of key areas in South Vietnam on the ground, and constant probing for a negotiated settlement."

The President does not expect, Mr. Reston adds, that this will work right away:

His hope is that this holding action will withstand the Vietcong attacks during the monsoon season until October, and that the Communists will finally realize America is not going to withdraw, and then negotiate.

This is admittedly a difficult policy and a dangerous problem. But, Mr. Reston asks of the many self-appointed critics:

What are your specific proposals to deal with the facts as they are? And what would be the consequences of your proposals in the rest of Asia and the world?

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Reston's article to our colleagues' attention:

WASHINGTON: WANT TO PLAY PRESIDENT?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 12.—President Johnson seems a little solemn these days, but neither falling governments in Saigon, nor squabbling politicians in the Dominican Republic, nor complaining critics in Washington and the other allied capitals have persuaded him that his policy is wrong in the Caribbean or southeast Asia.

He does not say it is a good policy. He does not even claim it is succeeding. He merely thinks it is better than all those other policies and invites anybody who wants to play President to come up with a better one.

JOHNSON'S CRITICS

As he sees it, there are now four groups of critics on Vietnam. There are the "bombers," who want to hit all military targets anywhere in North Vietnam and some who even want to hit them in Communist China, too, if necessary. He's against them. At the other extreme are those who want to get out. He's against them, too.

Then in the middle there are those who really want to give up and get out but who don't quite admit it, and there are what he calls the "yes but, or New York Times school," which partly approves of what he's doing but criticizes him all the time anyway. Then, finally, there are those who merely want us to stop the bombing and, as he puts it, "squat down and hunker up" in Vietnam. He thinks this would consign our men to picking up the dead.

So he has chosen to follow what he calls the policy of "maximum effectiveness and minimum risk," of applying limited pressure from the air, a roving defense of key areas in South Vietnam on the ground and constant probing for a negotiated settlement.

He does not expect this to work for a while. His hope is that this holding action will withstand the Vietcong attacks during the monsoon season until October, and that the Communists will finally realize America is not going to withdraw, and then agree to negotiate.

His fear is that the summer battle will get so severe that the U.S. command will have to use much more power to survive, and thus risk a wider and perhaps even an uncontrollable conflict.

INCREASED FORCE

The outlook, therefore, is for a constantly increased U.S. ground force in Vietnam this summer. Of the 51,000 American military

and naval personnel there now, only 12,000 are regarded here as fighting units and the other 39,000 are put in the category of services and supply.

This is felt at the Pentagon to be just large enough to risk a spectacular attack by the Vietcong but not large enough to beat it back if it comes, so the force will undoubtedly be reinforced in the coming weeks and months.

The President is keeping a careful record of his efforts to explain his policy at home, and to seek a negotiated settlement in Vietnam. He knows precisely how many speeches he has made on the subject, how many press conferences he has held, how many private interviews he has granted, and how many efforts he has made through the U.N., the Russians, the British, the Canadians, and others to arrange a negotiated settlement.

NOT DEPRESSED

He had a special report written this week on what he calls "the different tracks I've gone down" (now numbering 13) seeking peace, but so far nothing from the other side but a demand for a humiliating withdrawal of American forces.

If all this is profoundly disappointing to the President, he gives no sign of being depressed or emotional about it. His critics irritate him mainly because he feels they prefer to deal with what might have been rather than with what is in Vietnam He thinks he's a pretty good cowboy, but he doesn't see how he can rope the Communists into peace talks or the South Vietnamese into organizing a stable government or talking to the Vietcong.

Meanwhile, he proposes to go on carrying out the terms of the southeast Asia resolution passed by the Congress last August. He carries this around in his pocket wherever he goes, and reads it to anybody who has forgotten its terms.

It says that "the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States, and to prevent further aggression."

It adds that "the United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia," and that it authorizes the use of force "as the President determines," for this purpose.

WHAT TO DO?

Moreover, it states that the Congress may terminate this authority to the President any time it likes merely by passing another concurrent resolution, so the President assumes that the Congress will act rather than merely talk if it really feels the facts in Vietnam justify a different policy.

Sure, it's an awkward and dangerous situation, he says, but what would you do? What are your specific proposals to deal with the facts as they are? And what would be the consequences of your proposals in the rest of Asia and the world?

They Asked for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the last week reactionary elements have been organizing demonstrations and harassing public officials in an attempt to force the removal of the Chicago School Superintendent Benjamin Willis.

By no stretch of the imagination can anyone accuse the mayor of Chicago and his administration of being indifferent to minority rights, nor can there be a legitimate accusation that there is any deliberate discrimination in the administration of the Chicago school system.

The recent demonstrations are an impediment to the progressive developments that should be forthcoming in a major city such as Chicago. The Chicago Daily News, in an editorial on Saturday, June 12, very properly and effectively expressed the attitude of what, I am sure, is a substantial number of Chicagoans over the public agitation now confronting that city.

The article follows:

THEY ASKED FOR IT

What would happen if a group of motorists parked their cars in the middle of Lake Shore Drive? The cars would be towed to the auto pound and the owners charged with obstructing traffic. Even if they escaped a fine, they would have to pay for towing and storage so the effect would be the same.

Should a small group of attention-seeking people on foot have greater immunity even when they march under the hallowed banner of civil rights? Obviously not. City authorities deserve praise for preventing on Friday the misuse of the streets they permitted on Thursday. Obstruction is not a weapon to be handed any splinter group that threatens to harass the city until it gets what it wants.

What this group says it wants is the scalp of school Supt. Benjamin C. Willis. Since the board of education has compromised the issue of Willis' tenure and retained him for a limited time, the extremists led by Albert Raby have turned their pressure tactics on other targets.

Raby, deserted by the more responsible civil rights leaders and frustrated in his ill-advised plan to boycott the schools, led the remnants of his following in a march on city hall. Apparently he would have Mayor Daley intervene, usurp the powers of the school board, and fire Superintendent Willis.

This approach is wrong from first to last. Street demonstrations that disrupt the work of the city fall into the category of malicious mischief. Some of this excessive zeal could be forgiven, perhaps, if it were directed toward a just and sensible goal, but it is not.

Right or wrong, the school board was wholly within its authority in retaining Willis for a limited period. It is proceeding with the task of finding a successor. About the worst thing that could happen now would be political intervention at the behest of a mob to reverse the board's decisions.

Mayor Daley clearly understands this, and we are certain he has no intention of yielding to harassment. He has been patient and understanding in listening to the complaints that have come from all directions. But there are limits to patience, and the limit was reached by the antics of marchers who are so far off target that they would disrupt education on the false pretext that they are improving it.

Given the depth of division in this city over the organization of the school system, it will be difficult at best to find a top-ranking administrator to replace Willis when the time comes. Continued agitation by self-seeking, irresponsible elements can only postpone the reforms the Chicago schools need.

The Role of the Negro Preacher in the Struggle for Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, recognition of the role Negro ministers have played in the struggle for human rights has been submerged in more dramatic and widely publicized events. With notable exceptions such as Dr. Martin Luther King and some of his associates, the public has been almost wholly ignorant of the valuable and courageous service being rendered daily by the Negro minister throughout the United States. The following article by the Reverend Dr. J. Raymond Henderson is therefore very timely and I am pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues as a tribute to the new dedication of this group of Americans to the cause of human dignity and freedom.

THE ROLE OF THE NEGRO PREACHER IN THE STRUGGLE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

(By the Reverend Dr. J. Raymond Henderson, minister emeritus of Second Baptist Church, Los Angeles)

When the historian assesses the combining factors accounting for the achievement of human rights and dignity, he must assign primary credit to the Negro preacher. This is particularly true in respect to the progress made in the more recent years. Those of us who have been in any way an integral part of the struggle point with justifiable pride to the above fact.

It has not always been so. We must acknowledge that during the early days of our emancipation the Negro preacher was the undisputed leader among Negroes. In course of time he somewhat forfeited this leadership. The Negro politician, labor leader, such as A. Phillip Randolph, civil rights organizations, such as the NAACP with Walter White and Roy Wilkins, prominent Negro doctors and lawyers; these all conspired to dull the image of the Negro preacher as leader of anything except his local church. The Negro preacher during this period was used by other leaders and organizations to help in the drive for human rights but was not himself foremost in that drive, except in rare instances.

Today the picture has changed. The change has been brought about largely through the organization of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, under the matchless leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. For reasons that I cannot assign, the NAACP never attracted to its support the leadership of the Negro pulpit which I think it rightly deserved. The SCLC from its incipiency was able to capture and to fire that leadership Negro preachers, whose churches had never given as much as $100 to the NAACP, gave $1,000 to the SCLC, and have done so repeatedly. In saying this I am not at all criticizing the NAACP. Its place is secure in history. It worked through long and tortuous court proceedings, while SCLC indulged in direct action and proceeded on Gandhi's philosophy of noncooperation with evil, nonviolence, and love. The Negro preacher is a believer of the power of soul force.

Pursuing his role as leader in the struggle for human rights, the Negro preacher has done the following:

He has raised tremendous sums of money, kept the doors of his church open for meetings which could be held nowhere else, preached love, marched in picket lines, engaged in sit-ins, marched on Washington, and on Montgomery. His courageous leadership aroused the conscience of America and brought to his side kindred, but hitherto timid spirits among white preachers. Let us therefore salute the Negro preacher for the new image he presents.

U.S. Highway No. 30

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have received a memorial from the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon asking that U.S. Highway No. 30 connecting Astoria and Portland be considered part of the federally assisted National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

The coastal city of Astoria has long served military, industrial, and recreational interests of the State and the Northwest. Because of the connection of this expanding recreational and industrial coastal area with Portland, the State's major population center, the designation of Highway 30 as part of the national system would facilitate communications between these metropolitan and industrial areas and further serve the national defense.

With unanimous consent I insert this memorial in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 18

(Introduced by Representatives Holmstrom, Howard, Turner, Senator Thiel)

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 53d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government has established and is assisting the several States in the construction of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

Whereas the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways is designed to connect principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense; and

Whereas Astoria, because of its strategic location, has served and is serving military establishments, business, industry, and recreation on the coast of Oregon, is a center for business and industry from a large area of the coast with substantial new industies now locating in the area and potential for accelerated expansion and development with the opening of the Oregon-Washington Bridge on the Columbia River, is a recreation center for Oregon and the Pacific Northwest, is the base of a new Job Corps center and has been recently selected as the location of a new U.S. Coast Guard installation; and

Whereas U.S. Highway No. 30 extends between Astoria and Portland and the designation of this part of U.S. Highway No. 30 as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways would complete the route to the Pacific coast: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State or Oregon:

(1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized to direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting in cooperation with the Oregon State Highway Department, to designate as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways that portion of U.S. Highway No. 30 which extends between Astoria and Portland, Oreg.

(2) A copy of this memorial shall be transmitted to the Secretary of Commerce and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation and to the Oregon State Highway Commission.

Adopted by house April 15, 1965.

Chief Clerk of House.

F. F. MONTGOMERY,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate April 29, 1965.

HARRY J. BROWN,
President of Senate.

Summer Jobs and the Chance for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has proposed an extraordinary program of summer help for our Nation's youth. Its success will depend in part on how much community backing it receives. On numbers of occasions in the past, I have brought to the attention of our colleagues the public service positions of the Kansas City Star. I would like, once again, to commend to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to that of our colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Star on June 1 in support of the President's proposals:

SUMMER JOBS AND THE CHANCE FOR YOUTH

The next 2 weeks will be crucial for more than 2 million young Americans between the ages of 16 and 21 who may be unable to find summer jobs. For many, a job means the difference between going on to school next fall or dropping out. For others it means the difference between a productive summer and a gradual shift to a life of idleness on the streets.

If by mid-June a young person hasn't found work, experience shows that he probably won't. The summer slips by quickly.

The President has asked Federal agencies to find work or training for at least 25,000 young people and the Neighborhood Youth Corps will be expanded for an additional 50,000. He is asking mayors, Governors, and other officials to find jobs.

But the big push will have to come from private enterprise if the jobs are to materialize. The President hopes that large employers will find 1 extra position for each 100 employees and that smaller firms (with forces of from 10 to 100 persons) will add at least 1 extra summer job.

The idea is not simply to put a youth on the payroll and let him sit in the shade for the summer. The Government believes that necessary, meaningful work can be found—work that will benefit the employer as much as the young employee.

If business were being asked to find busy work, in effect to raise their costs and consumer prices by adding employees for which there is no need, then we would give the project small chances and no support. But that isn't the case. With the vacation season beginning there will be openings and opportunities. The young people need summer jobs and we hope business and industry can use them to the profit of all.

The Abominable "Cookie Tax"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a little girl in my district in North Carolina has written to me complaining that we are about to raise the price of wheat and that will increase the cost of cookies, and crackers, and bread—cookies, especially.

A number of Members of the House, if not all, are receiving letters opposing the wheat legislation offered by the administration and now pending before the Committee on Agriculture.

Many of the letters call the legislation a "bread tax."

I shall not here discuss the nature of the assault upon the wheat section of the omnibus farm bill, but I have written to the little girl about her worries as to cookies; and it is my thought that by publishing her letter and my response, my colleagues here will have a better understanding of the problems that confront us now in the Committee on Agriculture. Therefore, with the permission of the House, I am submitting this correspondence for the Appendix of the RECORD.

JUNE 11, 1965.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: I'm only 13 years old and I don't know too much about politics, but I do know that I don't like this 50-cent tax being put on a bushel of wheat because it raises the prices of cookies, crackers, and bread.

Since I'm only 13 I love cookies. Also I'm skinny, so I can eat as many cookies as I want and not worry about a weight problem.

My family is not rich nor are we poor, but the price of potatoes is so high we are substituting rice for potatoes. That doesn't bother me too much because I like rice. So would you mind telling me how you can substitute cookies.

I demand you should do something about this. Please?

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY.

JUNE 15, 1965.

DEAR DOROTHY: Thank you for writing to me so delightfully about cookies.

No, Dorothy, we are not about to place a tax on cookies or crackers or bread.

We are simply trying to find a way for the farmer to get a fair price for the wheat he produces so that he can buy his own little girls like you the things they desperately need, and perhaps some pretty things—and some cookies, sometimes.

I believe that you will agree that the children of farmers who produce our food should have the essential things, and the nice things, like the children in our towns and cities.

But that is not the way it is now.

At 13 years of age, you are well advanced in school, and you are certainly intelligent as your letter shows me. You will understand some facts and figures that set out what has happened to our farm people, as compared with other people in our country, during your young lifetime.

In 1952, that must be the year you were born, the income of our farmers throughout the country amounted to $14.4 billion. Last year the income of our farmers was only $12.6 billion, a drop of 12 percent.

The earnings per hour of all farm labor and management last year amounted to only $1.06, while the pay of employees in the food marketing industry averaged $2.25 an hour. The average wage in all manufacturing industries in the United States last year amounted to $2.53.

So you can see, Dorothy, that the fathers and mothers who live on farms have only about half the money to spend on needed things and nice things for their children like you, as do the fathers and mothers in our towns and cities.

I do not think this is good for these children on our farms, and I do not think it is good for our country.

In the Congress we are constantly trying to do something about this. We want our children on farms to have the needed things, and some nice things.

Now about the price of wheat.

In your letter you said: "I don't like this 50-cent tax being put on a bushel of wheat because it raises the prices of cookies, crackers, and bread."

I have figures before me comparing prices now with what they were in the years 1947 through 1949, just a little while before you were born. During this time the price farmers received for wheat has dropped 9 percent, while the prices of cookies, crackers, bread, and other bakery products have gone up by 45 percent. In terms of money, the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread was $12\frac{1}{10}$ cents on the average in the 1947–49 period, and the price of this loaf of bread today has risen above 20 cents, although farmers are getting considerably less for the wheat that goes into that loaf of bread. So you can see the price of wheat has very little to do with the price of bread, or of cookies.

We now are considering a bill which proposes to give the farmer a little better price for his wheat. In a 20- to 30-cent loaf of bread the farmer has gotten only about $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents for the wheat it took to make that bread. We propose to give him just a fraction of a cent more for that wheat that makes a pound of bread.

Some people are saying that this fraction of a cent will be a "bread tax." These same people did not say things like that when the price of wheat was going down but the price of bread was being increased—almost doubled—so that the workers who make wheat into bread would get better pay.

So, Dorothy, we simply want to make it possible for fathers and mothers who are wheat farmers to get something near a fair price for their wheat, so they can have a decent American standard of living, and so that their children can be healthy and have the things that every American girl and boy should have.

I believe you will want to help us in this. You tell me "I'm skinny, so I can eat as many cookies as I want and not worry about a weight problem." I assure you that you can always have plenty of cookies, and crackers and bread, too, and that what the farmer gets for his wheat never will make prices so high that you cannot have all that you want.

You are a lovely little girl.

With cordial good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

——— ———,

Chairman.

American Scientist Reports on Growing Soviet Progress in Oceanography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have a strong and continuing interest in the subject of oceanographic research and the full development of the resources of the world's oceans. It is my belief that this is a subject to which we should make a full commitment. This effort by our country would be, I am convinced, a most valuable and desirable one even if there were no international competition in this vital field. However, we must realize that the Soviet Union presents a very real and growing threat to our present lead in oceanography, a development which this Representative views with alarm.

One of the best evaluations of the Soviet's oceanographic program which has come to my attention has been done by Dr. Robert S. Dietz, an oceanographer with the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey. Dr. Dietz participated last fall in the United States–U.S.S.R. scientific information exchange program.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include the Department of Commerce press release of June 14, which summarizes Dr. Dietz' report, in the RECORD:

SCIENTIST REPORTS ON SOVIET PROGRESS IN OCEANOGRAPHY; SECOND ONLY TO UNITED STATES

An American scientist said today that the Soviet Union has made such great strides in oceanography during the past decade that she has surpassed Great Britain and Japan and is now second only to the United States.

Dr. Robert S. Dietz, an oceanographer with the Coast and Geodetic Survey, U.S. Department of Commerce, declared in a report just released that the Soviet Union's "total effort in ocean sciences now appears to be one-half to two-thirds the size of our own." He added that the overall expansion of the Soviet oceanographic program seems to be about 10 percent annually.

"Their progress in the last decade is all the more striking," stated Dietz, "when one considers that Russia has been traditionally a heartland country with her major interests directed inward to the land. Today, Russia is looking outwards to the world ocean. The marine sciences, and especially fisheries, occupy a prominent role in her scientific effort. Their oceanographic ships now explore all the oceans of the world and a bright future seems assured for Soivet oceanic research."

Dietz' report summarizes impressions received during a visit last fall to the Soviet Union as a member of the first U.S. oceanographic team to participate in the U.S.-U.S.S.R. scientific information exchange program. The trip was sponsored by the Coast and Geodetic Survey. During a 4-week stay, the group visited research centers in Moscow, Leningrad, Murmansk, and in the Black Sea cities of Sevastopol, Yalta, and Gelendzhik. In addition to Dietz, the group consisted of Lawrence Coachman, University of Washington; Felix Favorite, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries; Kirk Bryan, Weather Bureau; Donald F. Squires, Smithsonian Institution; and T. K. Treadwell, U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office.

Dietz reported:

1. There are now about 1,200 oceanographers in the Soviet Union, using the term in a rather broad sense. This compares with an estimated 1,500 to 2,000 in the United States of a similar status. About 50 research centers are contributing to the Soviet effort in oceanography, although only about a dozen are strictly oceanographic institutes.

2. Four out of about forty universities offer training in oceanography, two in Leningrad and one each in Moscow and Vladivostok. The curriculum at Moscow University consists of 3,500 hours of lecture and laboratory work over a 5-year period. About 200 hours, or 6 percent of the curriculum, is devoted to political subjects. About 50 oceanographers are graduated each year.

3. The Soviet Union in 1961 operated oceanographic ships with a total gross tonnage of about 50,000 tons. This compares with a U.S. oceanographic tonnage the same year of about 60,000 tons. Our present tonnage is estimated at about 72,000 tons.

4. There is little evidence of any Communist party line in oceanographic work. "The scientist-technologist group seems to have usurped the leading role in Soviet society," said Dietz. "The Soviet scientist has high prestige and his morale is good, but he still lacks the high degree of personal freedom enjoyed by American scientists. Salaries of Soviet oceanographers are substantially below U.S. levels, but they are among the highest in the U.S.S.R.

5. The Soviet oceanographic program in the Arctic Ocean is unique in its scope. Dietz said, "Their understanding of this realm is unexcelled, but in other realms of marine science they are behind the United States."

6. A great strength of Soviet oceanography is the amount of support by technicians. Each senior scientist has five to 10 assistants which makes it possible to thoroughly work up results of research. By contrast, the U.S. oceanographer ordinarily works alone and often becomes overwhelmed in a morass of data.

7. Few Soviet scientists are engaged in a broad general synthesis of scientific results, with little evidence of "frontier" research such as generates new theories or other breakthroughs. "The flux of ideas is more intense in the West than in the U.S.S.R," asserted Dietz. "Although their politics may be radical, their scientific thoughts are conservative."

8. Soviet laboratories are bleak by Western standards. Crowding is excessive; laboratory instrumentation is poor; and office machines and calculators are rare, with most calculation done by hand, assisted by the abacus. Even their new buildings seem to have an inherent antiquity.

9. The Soviet research libraries are "quite good." There is an extensive program for the translation of American technical books and periodicals. Many Western periodicals are republished by photo-offset and distributed to Russian research institutions. Twenty of their reproduced English-language scientific publications were noted in the library of one laboratory.

10. Women play a "most impresive" role in Soviet science. They outnumber men at biological institutes and make up about 30 percent of the total work force at oceanographic institutes. However, men control top job assignments and policymaking positions.

11. Each year, the U.S.S.R. sends a fleet of nearly 300 ships and 15,000 fishermen to the Georges Bank fishing grounds off the New England coast. About 60 tons of fish are recovered daily by each ship. Three fisheries research ships generally support the fleet, measuring such things as temperature, salinity, and oxygen content of the waters.

12. The Russians operate the only nonmilitary research submarine, the *Severyanka* which is used for fisheries research out of

Murmansk, but they are far behind the West in the development of deep sea vehicles, such as bathyscaphes, for oceanic research. So far, the Russians use only diving bells, but a more sophisticated entry in this field, the *Sever II*, will be launched next year.

Dietz said the American scientists were well received by their Russian counterparts. They discussed their results freely and with few apparent restrictions. "The post-Stalin thaw seems in full sway," remarked Dietz, "and there are hopeful indications this liberalization will continue."

Six Soviet oceanographers had been scheduled to pay a return visit last month, but they postponed their tour of American oceanographic facilities, possibly until fall.

Dietz is an authority on the nature and history of the ocean basin. He also collaborated with Jacques Piccard on the early development of the bathyscaphe *Trieste*.

"Report on U.S. Federal Courts"—Address Delivered by Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, at the Annual Meeting of the American Law Institute May 18, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following:

REPORT ON U.S. FEDERAL COURTS

(By Chief Justice Earl Warren)

I am happy to welcome the members of the American Law Institute this morning. It is always a pleasure for me to attend this meeting and participate at least to some extent. I note that your agenda is once again a very full one. I am very pleased to see that it includes both a continuation of last year's discussions on the diversity-of-citizenship phase of the study on the division of the jurisdiction between State and Federal courts and the commencement of discussions on the Federal question jurisdiction. As I stated to you last year, the Judicial Conference and the entire judiciary should be very grateful to the institute for undertaking this monumental study. We look forward eagerly to its completion.

It has been my custom in the past in reporting to the American Law Institute to give you an overall picture of the workload in the Federal courts as we near the close of another Court term.

The number of cases brought to the Supreme Court continues at approximately the same level. In fact, it is remarkable how constant the dockets and the work of the Court are. This year, for example, there are 2,520 cases as against 2,557 at the same time last year.

The Court's regular appellate docket has risen only from 1,129 last year to 1,176 during the current term. The miscellaneous docket, on the other hand, which is largely made up of applications by indigent prisoners seeking correction of what they consider unfair convictions, dropped from 1,428 cases to 1,344 cases.

The Court has thus far disposed of 1,918 cases on both dockets this term as against 1,915 at a comparable point at this date last year. It has heard arguments in 122 cases in a period of 177½ hours as compared with 144 cases in 225 hours last term.

The Court is well along with its work in this term. It has heard arguments in all cases which were ready to be heard and these cases will all be disposed of before the end of the term.

The criminal caseload in the district courts has remained fairly stable. During fiscal year 1964, 29,944 criminal cases were brought in the district courts as against 29,858 in the prior year. There was a slight increase last year in the number of prolonged criminal trials but criminal dockets, generally, are current.

The district courts are facing increasing difficulty in disposing of their civil litigation. During the first 9 months of the current fiscal year, ending March 31, 1965, the number of civil cases filed was 50,142 and the number terminated 47,815, leaving the pending caseload at the end of March as 74,522, the highest figure on record. These filings and terminations compare with 48,789 civil cases filed in the first 9 months of the last fiscal year and 45,714 terminated. Not since 1960 has the number of cases terminated exceeded those filed. In fiscal year 1960, 59,284 cases were filed and 61,829 were terminated, leaving the ratio of terminations to filings at 1.04. By 1963, this ratio had declined to 0.98. In that year, 63,630 cases were filed and 62,379 were terminated. The ratio for the first 9 months of the current year has dropped to 0.95.

A number of the courts of appeals are also facing increased difficulty in disposing of their current workload. The caseload for all courts of appeals on March 31 of this year was 20 percent higher than on the same date in 1964, with 4,711 pending as against 3,902 pending a year ago. During the first 9 months of this fiscal year, 4,945 cases were filed in the courts of appeals as compared to 4,459 in the comparable period of 1964 and 4,014 cases were terminated in both 9-month periods.

The heaviest number of filings in any circuit during the first 9 months of this fiscal year was in the already overburdened Fifth Circuit. Although nine judges are authorized in this circuit, one vacancy has existed for more than 13 months and another for over 6 months. Thus, seven judges have had to meet the fastest expanding caseload in the country. I am happy to say that their fellow judges in other parts of the country, despite their own crowded calendars, have been willing to serve in the Fifth Circuit for short periods of time to assist in carrying a share of the intolerable burden in that circuit. Over a 6-month period in this fiscal year, 17 judges from other circuits sat in the Fifth Circuit. The Judicial Conference last September and again in March of this year took note of this situation and urged the Congress to create four temporary judgeships for the circuit.

Year after year, I have had to report to you the ever increasing workload of our Federal courts and the backlogs which have accrued in the judicial process. It had been my expectation that with the authorization of 73 new judgeships in 1961, we would by this time have seen a substantial decline in these serious backlogs. I must admit to disappointment and grave concern, however, that we have made so little progress in conquering this situation. This is not a problem solely for the judges. Every member of the bar, every practitioner in our courts share this responsibility.

This year, it has become necessary for the Judicial Conference of the United States to recommend to the Congress the creation of new judgeships. These 42 positions, which include the temporary judgeships recommended for the Fifth Circuit, were agreed upon only after most careful analysis of the statistics compiled for each district and for each circuit by the Administrative Office for the use of the Judicial Statistics Committee of the Conference. The Conference was satisfied with the demonstration of need, and for that reason has recommended this additional judgepower. I must, however, express to you my feeling of alarm that our solution to the mounting workload of the courts seems to depend so largely on the creation of additional judgeships.

The time has now come when we must probe more deeply than we have in the past and with a much higher degree of inventiveness into the diagnosis of the problems of judicial administration to assure that our system is responsive to the demands of the age in which we live. We must utilize the aids, devices and techniques which this generation has developed, as do the other professions, so that we can assure to our people the prompt and effective administration of justice to which they are entitled. This is the responsibility of the entire legal profession—professor, practitioner and judge. The need for action is immediate and urgent. I hope and urge that the bar associations of the country and the learned societies will devote their talents and efforts to seeking a solution to this critical problem. We cannot afford to go on pyramiding judgeships periodically without making our judicial system responsive to and part of the times in which we live.

Years ago—even a half century ago—before the advent of the Judicial Conference and before provision was made for circuit conferences of judges, it was not unheard of that a judge might serve his entire tenure without meeting a brother judge of a neighboring State or district in his circuit. The Judicial Conference and the circuit conferences broke down this isolation, and in recent years the seminars we have conducted for new judges have served a most useful purpose in this respect. The first of these seminars was held in 1962 in Monterey, Calif., and three have been held since that time. Another seminar for newly appointed judges will be held in June of this year in Denver, Colo.

The same problem which once existed among judges has until recently been true of our referees in bankruptcy. As a result, there has been a marked lack of uniformity of procedure among the referees. This lack of uniformity extended beyond the requirements of local conditions to all phases of administration. Last year we held our first seminar for referees in bankruptcy. These seminars are conducted by experienced referees who speak from practical experience and deal entirely with matters of procedure and administration within the framework of the Bankruptcy Act. This first seminar, followed by a second a month ago, has already begun to promote greater uniformity of administration. The published proceedings have been made available to all referees who have not yet attended these seminars, but it is our hope that in due time we will have an opportunity for the older and more seasoned referees to meet with the newer referees with the end result that better service can be afforded to the public in spite of variations in local laws and conditions.

Much work has been done by the Judicial Conference of the United States in the field of pretrial procedures, in the trial of complicated cases, the trial of multiple cases emanating from a common cause, statistics, court administration, the implementation of the Criminal Justice Act and Rules of Practice and Procedure by Chief Judges Biggs, Murrah, Johnsen, Hastings and Senior Judge Maris, and their committees. But for most of them it has been a slow and hard grind in order to make progress. Really I believe the time has come when the bench and bar should join with vigor in finding ways and means to keep us current with our work.

We do not want to change established principles of decisionmaking, but it stands to reason that if courts fail to keep pace with the workload, further inroads on the judicial process will be made through administrative procedures that will water down the rights of our citizens to their day in court.

I am pleased to be able to report significant progress on the part of several advisory committees which have been studying and working on revisions of the Federal Rules of Practice and Procedure. Five of the advisory committees have been working over a period of nearly 5 years on this important task and four of them are about to send the products of their labors to the Standing Committee of the Judicial Conference on the Rules of Practice and Procedure.

The Advisory Committee on Civil Rules and the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules have made a thorough-going study of the existing civil and criminal rules. Their recommendations were circulated, as were those of the other committees, at least twice to the bar generally and to scholars throughout the country, and the comments received have been given the fullest study and consideration by committee members.

The Advisory Committee on Admiralty Rules has prepared amendments to the civil rules designed to merge the admiralty procedure into the civil procedure.

A complete set of appellate rules has been prepared by the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules and these rules are also designed to reach the standing committee when it meets this summer.

It is probable, therefore, that the reports of these four advisory committees will reach the Judicial Conference and the Supreme Court for consideration later this year.

At the close of the last session of Congress, legislation was enacted authorizing the promulgation of Rules of Practice and Procedure under the Bankruptcy Act. The Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules, which has also held several meetings over the past years, now has a new charter for action which will require it to make a new start in some areas of its activities.

Earlier this year, at the request of the Judicial Conference, I appointed members to an advisory committee to study the possibility of adopting uniform rules of evidence in Federal courts. This committee, under the chairmanship of Albert E. Jenner, Jr., of Chicago, is, like the other advisory committees, broadly representative of the legal profession across the coutnry. Prof. Edward W. Cleary, of the University of Illinois, will act as reporter for this committee. Their labors are certain to be long and arduous, but they are fortunate in having available to them the results of the studies of the American Law Institute in formulating its model code of evidence and the subsequent work of the commissioners on uniform State laws. A few States have also made extensive studies in this area, which will be available to the committee.

The bench and bar are deeply indebted to our colleagues on these advisory committees. They have given fully and conscientiously of their time and efforts to the work of the committees. This has involved many hours of controversy and long hours of study of the many comments which have been received from all parts of the country on the proposed revisions of the rules.

On August 20, 1964, the President signed the Criminal Justice Act, a statute which will have profound implications for the administration of justice in this country. There are two major innovations in this statute. First, when defendants are financially unable to employ counsel of their own, the court must appoint counsel for them as early in the proceedings as possible, which means in most cases when the defendant is first brought before the U.S. commissioner. Heretofore, counsel was rarely appointed in Federal criminal procedings until arraignment in the district courts.

This will be a new burden on the U.S. Commissioner and raises serious questions as to the availability of many commissioners to cope with this added responsibility.

The commissioner system is as old as the Republic. It was established by the First Congress. It has grown and developed differently as the Nation has expanded, so that today the functions and activities of the commissioner lack consistency, as do the qualifications of the commissioner himself. A recent survey showed that of the approximately 1,100 commissioners, only about two-thirds were lawyers.

Proceedings before a commissioner have generally been informal, conducted without a strenographic record, and without counsel being present. The commissioner's only compensation has been through small fees which he has collected. Once the Criminal Justice Act becomes operational, the question arises whether the proceedings before the commissioner will not have to become formal and be adequately reported and, if so, whether our commissioners are qualified and competent, especially the one-third who are not lawyers, to conduct formal hearings.

Undoubtedly, the passage of the Criminal Justice Act will bring to light many inadequacies in our commissioner system. I believe our experience may well demonstrate the need for a thoroughgoing study of the system not only to assure the effective administration of the act at the commissioner level but also to assure that the position of U.S. commissioner is a meaningful one viewed in the light of current needs.

The second major innovation of the Criminal Justice Act is the provision for at least partial compensation for assigned counsel in criminal cases. It also provides for the appointment and compensation of expert witnesses. The judges of each district have been required by the act to make appropriate plans for the disbursement of public funds for this purpose and the circuit councils are given supervision over the program. This requirement places a difficult administrative burden upon the courts and the successful discharge of this new function will require the active cooperation of the bar. The act must be administered in a manner that will be both fair and adequate to the defendant as well as equitable to the members of the bar. This act poses a real challenge to our profession because we have had no similar experience. It cannot be the problem of the courts alone. The local bar associations must participate both in the making and administration of the plans. The members of those associations must each accept a measure of responsibility, and it should not be delegated to those in our profession who are willing to accept the partial compensation because they find difficulty in making a living otherwise. To permit this would convert the objective of affording legal assistance to indigents to that of affording assistance to indigent lawyers.

Recently, the President sent to the Congress a challenging message calling upon the Nation for a renewed and increased effort to combat the problem of crime and delinquency. As lawyers, we should accept this challenge as being particularly directed toward us. The judicial branch of the Government is necessarily involved in every aspect of this effort because criminal cases are processed through the courts and because the judiciary is deeply concerned with effectiveness of our correctional system.

In furtherance of the President's message, the Attorney General and I discussed the desirability of reorganizing Federal corrections into an administrative system which would have jurisdiction over the entire Federal correctional process from beginning to end, including the training of all correctional personnel, both those in correctional institutions and those engaged in supervision in the community.

To me, this is a challenging idea and one that seems to offer an opportunity for a vast improvement for dealing with people convicted of crime in Federal courts. A correctional agency thus broadly organized should participate with other agencies in Government, including particularly the National Institute of Mental Health, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and, of course, the U.S. judges through the Judicial Conference of the United States in continuous practical research and development in the correctional field.

More and more, modern legislation has been giving the sentencing judge opportunity to adopt flexible programs to meet the particular needs of the individual before him, programs which combine the facilities and techniques now under separate administrations.

More and more, institutional administrators and probation officers have felt that the ultimate success of their work depends upon their understanding of and coordination with what is done in other phases of the correctional process.

Perhaps most important, we are realizing that the hope for continued progress in corrections rests on the development of programs of research and evaluation which will create and test against alternatives a large number of techniques to be matched with the individual offender.

We are proud of the advances recently made in corrections. The Judicial Conference Committee on the Administration of the Probation System, the Bureau of Prisons, and the Parole Board have been imaginative in their response to the development of knowledge and technique. The steps which they have taken lead logically to the creation of a unified Federal correctional service.

Continuous research and development is the life blood of a successful correctional system. This requires continuous experimentation, constant research. It is important in any system which is created that the research and development be separately organized within the correctional system so that its personnel will not be diverted from their research functions and become involved in daily operations. Its work must, of course, be closely integrated with the system.

An important advantage which would result from a unified service would be the strengthening of the professional character of correction personnel. The new system would break down and eliminate the present administrative barriers and distinctions and it would require intensive basic training.

Proper training programs are a vital part of any correctional system. They would result in making the services of our probation officers of even greater usefulness to our district court judges.

By providing promotion from and to institutional and field positions and by transfers from one part of the country to another, new opportunities would develop for the infusion of knowledge, the gaining of experience, and the rewarding of excellence with responsibility equal to ability.

Another function which a unified service can uniquely perform is the administration of new correctional techniques which plainly cut across traditional lines. We have long known that the presentence investigation is invaluable to institutional classification and treatment, and to the parole board in making its decision. We have also known, and acted on the knowledge, that prerelease planning and counseling are essential to community-based treatment. These simply illustrate the inevitable interdependence of the parts of the process. It is new programs, such as work-release and halfway houses, which bring this interrelationship to the

forefront. You can easily see how difficult it would be to place and administer these hybrids in a system which drew lines between the institution and the community.

It goes without saying that the services of all personnel now engaged in one or another part of the Federal correctional field would be needed in the operations of a unified system. The functions they now perform would be continued, and often expanded, but for the first time all functions would be conducted on a coordinated basis and within the concept of a career service.

The renewed interest of the Department of Justice in improving our corrections system has been most gratifying. I hope the judiciary will play its proper role in achieving these necessary and important changes.

We note a tendency today to blame the courts and the rulings of the courts for the vast amount of crime. Thinking persons, and especially lawyers, know that this is not the fact. They know that crime is inseparably connected with factors, such as poverty, degradation, sordid social conditions, the weakening of home ties, low standards of law enforcement, and the lack of education. The courts, law professors, and lawyers everywhere have a deep responsibility, however, to see that the rules which guide our criminal trials are fair, adequate, and capable of efficient administration. We of the legal profession must consider this as one of our major responsibilities, as must every bar association, National, State, or local.

Every lawyer has taken an oath to dedicate himself to the preservation of the rule of law. He must, therefore, realize that it is his responsibility not only to perfect procedures in the law but as a citizen to see that the conditions that give rise to crime, vice, and violence are not permitted to exist in his community.

No nation, regardless of its general economic prosperity can continue to prosper unless its citizens in all walks of life are dedicated to law observance, not merely by the other fellow, but by all. In a free society such as ours, this is the only secure foundation upon which we can build our home and business lives. Otherwise, we build upon sand.

There are other things that I could properly discuss with you, but time is precious and you have your own agenda to which I must now leave you, with the knowledge that your discussions will, as usual, be purposeful. I hope they will also be satisfying to you and contribute to the better administration of justice throughout the land.

Soviet Seizure of the Baltic Countries

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the brave but unfortunate peoples of the Baltic countries—Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians—have had long and difficult histories. They have had their ups and downs, but fate was most cruel to them in 1940. In the middle of that year these northeastern democracies were overrun by the Red army, their inhabitants enslaved and then all three countries annexed to the Soviet Union. Thus these strong and brave people, who had withstood the oppressive and callous regimes of the czars for more than a century, and had regained their national freedom at the end of the First World War, had to submit to the treachery of Stalin's Communist agents.

Mid-1940 marked the end of freedom in these Baltic lands, and since then these unhappy souls have been suffering under Soviet totalitarian tyranny. Besides enslaving some 5 million Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in these countries, at the time hundreds of thousands innocent people were arrested, imprisoned and then deported to inhospitable regions of Asiatic Russia. During the war there was some hope for their return after the war, but not many of these people survived the hardship and misery that was their lot in their prison labor camps.

Today, in observing the 25th anniversary of their tragedy, we ardently pray for the deliverance of these Baltic peoples from Communist totalitarianism.

Buffalo Courier Express Praised for Its Editorial Efforts in Focusing Attention to Water Pollution Problems on Lake Erie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of hearings to be conducted in Buffalo, N.Y., by the Senate Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution I would like to commend the special efforts of the Buffalo Courier Express and its editorial writers Carroll McPherson, Fred McKenzie, Ed McCarthy, and its very able Washington correspondent and Bureau Chief, Lucian Warren for the outstanding reporting and writing efforts in focusing public attention the very serious problems of water pollution on Lake Erie. There have been many other mass media outlets who also have made significant contributions to public understanding, but I believe the sustained effort by the Courier Express during the past months has contributed greatly to growth of public indignation and pressure for more rapid action on these problems. The following editorials printed during the past months show how thoroughly they conveyed their knowledge and reporting skills in getting to the heart of this problem on the Niagara Frontier:

[From the Courier-Express, Feb. 4, 1965]

BOOST IN U.S. POLLUTION-CONTROL AID ASKED

The interest of the Niagara Frontier in the control of water pollution was expressed further in Congress with sponsorship of a measure of Representative RICHARD D. McCARTHY to boost the limit on the amount of Federal aid a community may receive for construction of sewage-treatment facilities.

The present limitation on Federal aid for any one project is $600,000. Under a bill passed by the Senate as part of President Johnson's Great Society program last week, the limit would be raised to $1 million and a project sponsored by a combination of municipalities could be eligible for a grant of as much as $8 million.

The House bill sponsored by Representative McCARTHY, freshman member of Congress from the 39th District, and Representative JOHN BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, subcommittee chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, would raise the present $600,000 maximum for a single project to $2 million. Representative McCARTHY is a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

The value of an increase in Federal aid to localities for sewage treatment is indicated by the situation of the village of Silver Creek whose difficulties in financing a proposed $2.5 million program were described in these columns recently. Silver Creek applied for $600,000 in Federal aid, but even with this assistance, it is seemingly impossible for the community to finance the balance of the cost because of its limited tax base and a constitutional limitation on its borrowing power.

It is possible that the McCarthy-Blatnik bill's introduction will result in increasing the aid authorized under the Senate measure when the Great Society legislation is adopted finally by Congress.

[From the Courier-Express, Feb. 26, 1965]

AREA NEEDS U.S. POLLUTION CONTROL

New York State's newly aroused interest in control of water pollution fortunately is echoing in Congress. Without Federal and interstate attention to the problem, western New York hardly can hope to see much improvement of the border waters of the Great Lakes system.

Governor Rockefeller's testimony before the House Public Works Committee Tuesday dealt with his plans for a $1 billion State bond issue for sewage-treatment facilities and pollution control. He wants the Federal Government to contribute another $513 million to be spent over 20 years. He proposed changes in the Water Pollution Control Act so that New York will be eligible for more Federal assistance than it can receive under present provisions.

The objectives of the Governor are all in the interest of the Empire State's pollution-control effort. Probably a large part of the money would be spent to clean up conditions in the eastern part of the State where they are especially bad. This still leaves western New York in the position of needing Federal and interstate action with respect to the Great Lakes more than it needs a State-centered program.

A Buffalonian, Stanley P. Spisiak, seems to have promoted this area's interests before the House Public Works Committee better than the Governor. Representing a private organization, the New York State Conservation Council, as chairman of its Water Resources Committee, Mr. Spisiak argued in behalf of Federal regulation of polution. The Governor said Federal standards should not be imposed on States having adequate laws. Mr. Spisiak insisted this State does not enforce its laws.

In any case, pollution control that is not broadly based on national and international programs will not be completely useful to communities hereabouts. Interest in the subject at Washington is more important here than attention given at Albany to a State program, helpful though the latter could be in relation to the whole struggle for pure water.

[From the Courier Express, Apr. 1, 1965]

ENDING LAKES POLLUTION VITAL TASK

What are the prospects for the Great Lakes, accustomed to be described as the world's largest and most valuable source of fresh water? Bad, according to Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio, un-

less something drastic is done to conquer the rising tide of pollution.

Senator YOUNG quoted expert predictions that Lake Erie and perhaps the other Great Lakes would be "dead within a decade or two" from pollution. Into Lake Erie alone, the Senator said, each day 3 million tons of debris and filth are dumped, making it probably the largest body of seriously contaminated fresh water in the world. And what is happening in Lake Erie, he told the Senate, is typical of what is happening in the other Great Lakes, where cities bordering them and their tributaries discharge sewage into the water. The lakes, he warned, are rapidly becoming one continuous "cesspool."

It is an extremely ugly picture and in all likelihood it will get worse before anything can be done to make it better. However, there is reason to welcome a word of optimism from James B. Coulter, chief of water projects of the Public Health Service Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control. His opinion is that pollution can be controlled, that Lake Erie could be restored to health in 10 years. He said the project would require the cooperation of Federal, State, and local governments.

And it's no insignificant project, either. It would include these steps: Cleaning up the tributaries which carry sewage and industrial wastes into lake waters, maintaining water quality at present levels by reducing the amount of nitrogen and phosphorus entering the water, stepping up sewage treatment up to one-half above present costs, dredging the bottom sediment and harvesting crops of algae and aquatic growths.

Coulter said the salvage of Lake Erie "depends on what people want and how much they are willing to pay for it." In this situation there isn't much choice. It's a cinch things can't be allowed to go on as they are. We can't afford to let such a vital national asset as the Great Lakes go down the drain. We can't afford not to take the steps necessary to restore them and maintain them as they ought to be. We think the imperative nature of the task is gaining impressive recognition. The cost will be heavy, but it is unthinkable that the money will not be forthcoming and put to effective and beneficial work.

[From the Courier-Express, Apr. 26, 1965]

RIVETING U.S. ATTENTION ON LAKES

Members of Congress, including Buffalo's Representative RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, are insisting more and more vociferously that the Great Lakes can be saved from "death" only by strict Federal control over pollution and national measures to conserve the water supply. The Buffalo Congressman went further in a speech before the junior chamber of commerce to say that an international agency should be empowered to regulate conditions around the lakes.

The subject of control elsewhere than by individual States is important in New York State currently because of Governor Rockefeller's pure-water campaign. No amount of interest in pollution control at a State capital will correct the conditions in the Great Lakes from which western New York suffers.

This point was made recently by a Michigan Congressman, Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, in responding to an invitation to attend a conference of Governors of eight States on the pollution of Lake Erie. Gov. James A. Rhodes, of Ohio, invited him to a conference to be held May 10. Representative DINGELL replied:

"I can conceive of no more fruitless enterprise than the formation of another debating society to wring hands over the desperate pollution situation in the Great Lakes."

Every time Congress has tried to do something about Great Lakes pollution, the Michigan legislator said, "we have received torrents of cant about the rights of States and localities with respect to their waters and the great jobs being done by State and local enforcement authorities."

In the meantime, DINGELL said, "State agencies charged with the responsibility for abatement of pollution of the Great Lakes and their tributary waters continue by inaction and otherwise to permit the pouring of tons of municipal and industrial wastes into the lakes, thus promoting their accelerated decline into open cesspools."

Representative MCCARTHY told the junior chamber of commerce that in considering the problem of Lake Erie it is necessary to consider the entire Great Lakes Basin. Of course it is. And only Federal, or perhaps international, authority is ever likely to establish a course which the Great Lakes Basin will follow to reverse the trend toward "death," already reported to have set in at the expense of communities along Lake Erie.

Western New York communities should not confuse Governor Rockefeller's meritorious effort to clean up State waters with the necessity for Federal attention to the Great Lakes. The State's most populous communities on the border of Lake Erie—Buffalo and Erie County—already are doing far more than most localities to collect and treat municipal wastes that otherwise would be dumped untreated into the precious waterways.

[From the Courier Express, May 8, 1965]

LAKE ERIE'S FATE HANGS IN BALANCE

Whether or not control of pollution in Lake Erie and in interstate streams is to move soon beyond the sorry enforcement so far left to individual States seems to depend on developments in the next few weeks.

Establishment of Federal water-quality standards to control and abate pollution in interstate waterways appears to be one answer to failure of States to act effectively. But whether the setting up of Federal standards will be authorized by Congress depends on results of a Senate-House conference on bills passed by the two bodies.

The Senate version of the Water Quality Act of 1965 provides for Federal standards, but the bill passed by the House goes no further than to require States applying for Federal grants for pollution control to submit letters of intent to set up water quality "criteria." It will be up to the Senate-House conferees to attempt to resolve this and other differences in the two measures.

On May 10 in Cleveland, the Governors of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan are expected to attend a pollution-control conference which could have a great bearing on a cleanup of Lake Erie.

Here again the issue is likely to be whether Federal enforcement shall be invoked. According to a Courier-Express Washington bureau dispatch, advance indications are the Governors will reject the proposed Federal approach.

Western New Yorkers should note that a Federal enforcement program is in progress in Lake Michigan. Cities and industries at the south end of Lake Michigan have been ordered to stop contaminating the lake within 1 year and to curb danger from pollutants within 6 months. Legal action to compel compliance and stiff fines for violations are possible under this procedure.

The Lake Michigan program was set in motion following a Federal enforcement conference in Chicago March 9.

The States to be represented at the meeting in Cleveland next week could call for an identical Federal enforcement conference to deal with pollution in Lake Erie. Certainly the public interest would be served by bringing the Federal Government into the picture to deal with this interstate problem.

Governor Rockefeller is represented, however, as opposed to invocation of Federal control and in favor of joint action by the States. The deterioration of Lake Erie obviously is less likely to be arrested if the problem continues to remain solely at the door of the hitherto neglectful States.

[From the Courier Express, May 10, 1965]

MAKING FEDERAL CASE OF POLLUTION

A visit to Buffalo by a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Commerce Committee for a public hearing on the pollution problem in Lake Erie and the Niagara River is in prospect for next month. Since this seems to offer the best opportunity the western New York region ever has had to make a Federal case of Great Lakes pollution, it is to be hoped that area witnesses will get into the record a convincing representation of how badly the waters hereabouts have deteriorated in quality in the absence of effective control measures.

The Senate group headed by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, is chiefly responsible for the proposed Water Quality Act of 1965, different versions of which were passed by the Senate and House. The bills are now before a Senate-House conference committee to resolve the differences. The Senate measure would set up Federal quality standards, which appear to be essential since the record of individual States in establishing or enforcing standards obviously is bad.

A good bit of controversy over the extent to which the Federal Government should step into the pollution-control undertaking is already in evidence and can be expected to intensify. This seems especially so in New York State, where Governor Rockefeller has proposed a billion-dollar State bond issue to finance the State's share of a Federal-State-local program.

Communities along the Great Lakes are directly concerned over control to be effected in other States more than they are in a cleanup of the Hudson River Valley, necessary as that is. They therefore have a bigger stake in interstate action under Federal supervision than in a State-directed program.

Because of the size and the importance of the Great Lakes to the national welfare, their preservation as a natural resource should become the concern of the United States—for that matter, the concern of both the United States and Canada.

The more testimony to this effect that goes into the record, the better it will be for western New York. If evidence for congressional consideration is gathered here, all local interests concerned with the condition of Lake Erie and the Niagara River should not fail to seize the opportunity to be heard.

[From the Courier-Express, May 17, 1965]

LAKE POLLUTION ISSUE AND GOVERNORS

The Governors of New York, Ohio, and Michigan and representatives of other States in the Great Lakes region who met recently in Cleveland to discuss pollution control in "dying" Lake Erie did nothing of consequence about it except to agree to confer again on June 15 in Detroit.

That meeting in Detroit could be of consequence because it will be held in conjunction with a conference of far more importance than a gathering of all the Governors of all the States who might meet to discuss the complexities of Great Lakes pollution.

The conference was scheduled in Detroit before Governors Rockefeller, Rhodes of Ohio and Romney of Michigan decided to meet there. It was called by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Its purpose is to further the control of pollution in the Detroit area of the Great Lakes.

What makes this significant for western New Yorkers is the fact that the U.S. agency has initiated compulsory pollution-abatement proceedings in the Detroit area. Presumably Governor Romney knows all about this, though the United States was called into the control picture by his predecessor, John B. Swainson; but Governors Rocke-

feller and Rhodes may have much to learn about Federal pollution control as it is being undertaken in Lake Michigan and may be persuaded of its effectiveness.

If they are so persuaded, western New York's hopes that something effective will be done about "dying" Lake Erie seem likely to mount.

None should miss the point that an old "States rights" argument is possible here—though without validity, in our opinion—since some may insist that pollution control should be left to interstate action rather than Federal enforcement.

It should not be missed either that the Governors of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan are Republicans while the administration at Washington is Democratic; specifically the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is a former Democratic mayor of Cleveland.

Because of this political fact, the issue of "States rights" may be raised from ulterior political motives rather than from any firm belief that the condition of the Great Lakes is none of the Nation's business. We submit it is the Nation's business, for certainly the United States has few greater natural resources than this greatest body of fresh water in the world.

What we hope will happen at Detroit of course, is persuasion of Governor Rockefeller and the heads of the other State governments that the pollution abatement undertaken under Federal auspices in the Detroit area should be extended eastward along Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York shores of Lake Erie.

[From the Courier Express, May 25, 1965]

ROCKY'S GREAT-LANES "BLINDNESS"

This newspaper welcomed Governor Rockefeller to the ranks of clean-water advocates when he came out in recent months for a major program to abate pollution; but we've come to doubt that the Governor is on the right track at least in his attitude toward one of the most grievous pollution problems in the Nation: The "dying" condition of Lake Erie.

"I don't think we need Federal enforcement procedures," the Governor said in Washington when asked his views on enlisting the United States in Lake Erie pollution control by means of a conference such as has been initiated for a clean-up of Lake Michigan.

"What we need is Federal money," the Governor added.

No amount of Federal money spent in New York State is going to do any substantial good for western New York communities concerned with Lake Erie's and Lake Ontario's condition so long as a clean-up westward from New York's borders is not undertaken and enforced.

It is clearly evident that the undertaking and the enforcement must be under Federal auspices; and if the Governor does not think so, he is too much of a Johnny-come-lately to the antipollution endeavor to inspire much confidence hereabouts in his plan for a $1 billion State bond issue as part of a $1.7 billion outlay in Federal, State, and local funds for New York pollution control.

Invocation of a Federal water-pollution-control conference by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entails an invitation from the Governors of States bordering Lake Erie.

If the Governor has closed his mind and stands unalterably against Federal enforcement procedures on the Great Lakes, his professed interest in the struggle for clean water is too limited to win applause in the Great Lakes region.

A clean-up elsewhere—in the Hudson Valley, for instance—is business for the State. The Great Lakes are a national resource and their pollution should be dealt with accordingly.

[From the Courier-Express, May 30, 1965]

FIFTY-DOLLAR FINES ACCENT CLEAN-WATER NEED

In the interest of protecting western New York's relatively copious but endangered supply of water, attention should be paid here to stringent measures adopted in New York City for conserving water for drinking purposes. Indicative of the great lengths to which the city must go to prevent waste, restaurants may serve water only if it is requested by the customers.

For every glass of water put on a restaurant table without its being asked for by a diner, an eating place is liable to a fine of $50. The prohibition is one of several regulations going into effect as a consequence of the shortage of water in upstate reservoirs supplying New York. The storage is only at 56 percent of capacity, one-third below last spring's level.

Meanwhile, a representative of the State division of water resources recently told the Courier-Express that areas of western New York will be afflicted by drought unless rainfall over the next few months is heavier than average. The regional division engineer, John C. McMahon, said that subsurface water levels have not been restored sufficiently to escape shortages if the rainfall is light.

Rainfall reported so far this year by the U.S. Weather Bureau is 3 inches below normal. Last year's total precipitation was nearly 6 inches under normal.

This newspaper has pointed out innumerable times that the supply of potable water in western New York is limited only by capacity to process and distribute water from the Great Lakes. The facilities for this processing and distribution have been greatly expanded with population growth and increased demand for water. But all the needs have not been supplied and the demand can be expected to continue increasing.

The prospects of a further drop in subsurface water tables and the growing need for reliance on the Great Lakes reservoir makes it imperative that the greatest public attention be turned on preservation and improvement of the Great Lakes supply.

This is why scientific opinion that Lake Erie is "dying" is a matter for the highest public concern and insistence on remedial measures. Abatement of pollution is one of these measures.

We do not know whether the condition of lakes and streams in eastern New York motivated Governor Rockefeller principally in launching his proposed $1.7-billion clean-water campaign. We suppose New York City's situation was—and it should be—a major consideration.

But western New York's interest in cleaning up water supplies will always revolve around the Great Lakes; and a clean-water effort in their behalf must go geographically far beyond New York State. Only Federal, and later international, regulation and enforcement are likely to achieve worthwhile results.

The time is now for western New Yorkers to guard against conditions wherein the serving of a glass of water other than by special request may one day cost the server a $50 fine. The immediate preventive step appears to be to convince the Governor that he and the Governors of the other States bordering on Lake Erie should ask the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to head up pollution control on the lake.

Controversy Over Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, among the many excellent discussions of the present controversy over the question of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act are a letter from the Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, Elliott Richardson, and a recent editorial in the Lowell, Mass., Sun.

Lieutenant Governor Richardson contends that repeal is essential to maintain balance in our collective bargaining relationships. In his words, "Only a strong union can become an equal bargaining partner."

The Lowell Sun, on the other hand emphasizes the importance of the right of free choice for the American worker. and warns that repeal "would constitute an assault on individual freedom."

I think there is much merit in the discussions and I would like to make them available to my colleagues by inserting the Lieutenant Governor's letter and the Lowell Sun editorial of June 4, 1965 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The articles follow:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE HOUSE,
Boston, May 26, 1965.

Hon. F. BRADFORD MORSE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BRAD: Having had the occasion in some of my early legal experiences to consider the implications of legislation affecting union-security arrangements, I am taking the occasion to express my views with regard to the proposal now pending before you to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

Just as our system of government rests upon the preservation of delicate balances between the State and the Federal powers, and among the executive, legislative and judicial branches of our National Government, so, with the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act, we committed ourselves to a reliance upon a process of negotiation between balanced elements as the best means of promoting progressive and harmonious labor-management relationships. All labor legislation since the act has had, as its objective, the preservation of this sensitive balance in the context of the collective bargaining situation. It is toward this same end that I urge you to supoprt the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

What is under question is the wisdom of permitting the States, in contracts which are otherwise governed by Federal legislation, to restrict union-security agreements beyond the prohibition against the closed shop included in the Taft-Hartley law. In my opinion, such permissive legislation works a disservice to the collective bargaining relationship.

If agreements for a union shop or a maintenance of membership shop are deemed to be against Federal labor-management policy then, like the closed shop, they should be

prohibited by the Federal legislation. If such agreements are, as I believe, not counter to our national policy to promote successful employer-employee relations in contracts covered by Federal law, then their existence should be a subject of negotiation between the duly elected bargaining representative of the employees and the employer, and not a matter of legislative or popular judgment on a State-by-State basis.

That these agreements have not been against Federal policy seems clearly implied from the fact that, while the closed shop is specifically prohibited by Federal law, these less restrictive union security arrangements have not received the same attention. This negative implication, while clarifying the prior legislative intent, does not completely answer the question of whether we should now positively encourage unions to seek union shop and maintenance of membership contracts by repealing section 14(b). This repeal should be supported only if such encouragement is in the interests of a successful collective bargaining process; only, that is, if such agreements will not detract from the balance referred to above.

In my opinion, it can be demonstrated that these less restrictive union-security agreements are in fact a logical and desirable item for bargaining. Most businessmen with successful employee relations appreciate the validity of Justice Brandeis' comment that employers "Ought to recognize that it is for their interests as well as that of the community that unions should be powerful and responsible; that it is to their interests to build up the union; to aid as far as they can in making them stronger; and to create conditions under which the unions shall be led by the ablest and most experienced men." Only a strong union can become an equal bargaining partner.

A closed shop distorts this balanced relationship by permitting the union to determine whom the employer is to hire. The union shop, on the other hand, maintains the integrity of the employer by allowing him to continue to select his employees.

Under the National Labor Relations Act, the duly elected union must represent all the employees in the bargaining unit. If this responsibility is invested in the elected bargaining representative by law, then that representative should, as a natural corollary of that responsibility, have the power to bargain for an agreement which gives it some degree of security against the undercutting of its position as the representative of all the employees.

Finally, these less restrictive union security agreements provide the union with a viable source of financial support to carry on the activities required of it by law. To ask a new employee, who must get the benefits of union activity, to pay dues and establish at least nominal membership is not to demand that he become an active unionist. He is only asked to pay his fair share for the benefits that he receives both indirectly from the protections of the Federal legislation, and directly from the contract reached through the collective bargaining process.

The case is a strong one for allowing employers and employees to bargain on the matter of the union shop or maintenance of membership shop. Parenthetically, it should be noted that those States which have taken advantage of section 14(b) and prohibited these agreements are the same nonunion low-wage States which have been developing economically by drawing industry away from Massachusetts with the lure of a labor market which does not have the power to obtain its due as an equal bargaining partner.

I respectfully urge you to vote for the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law in the interests of the collective bargaining system and successful labor-management relationship throughout the country.

Very sincerely yours,

ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,
Lieutenant Governor.

[From the Lowell Sun, June 4, 1965]

FREEDOM VERSUS COERCION

In recommending repeal of the section of the Taft-Hartley Act that permits State right-to-work laws, President Johnson has presumably paid his debt to organized labor for its help in his campaign for election last November. The low-keyed style of his recommendation, which took up only two paragraphs at the tail end of his labor message to Congress, is hardly indicative, however, of any great enthusiasm for it.

The President's only given reason for knocking out State laws that ban compulsory union membership is to reduce "conflicts in our national labor policy that for several years have divided Americans in various States." Yet his proposal is bound to set in motion one of the bitterest conflicts that has divided Congress during the present session, and to arouse passionate arguments concerning the rights of man, and the rights of the State, versus federally backed coercion by labor.

In 19 States, workers can join, or not join, unions, as they desire. Repeal of that proviso would deprive the workers of the right to make their own choice. It would constitute an invasion of States rights, but, much more, it would constitute an assault on individual freedom. It is one of the remarkable anomalies of our times that people who cherish their designation as "liberals" should be in the forefront of those pressing for compulsory unionism.

The President's message, including recommendations also for an increase in the unemployment insurance tax paid by employers to help finance supplementary jobless pay benefits, and for extension of the Federal minimum wage and overtime law, is patently intended to comfort organized labor. By the same token, it will be construed in many quarters as an administration bristling against business. Politics, obviously figures in this kind of power play, and somebody inevitably gets the worst of it.

William Butler Yeats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, June 13 marked the 100th anniversary of the birth of the greatest modern English poet, W. B. Yeats.

Although William Butler Yeats was an Irish citizen, the magnificence of his poetry has made his name a byword throughout the world wherever English poetry is read and he is indeed a citizen of the world. It is fitting, therefore, that we should take note of this anniversary and pay tribute to the memory of this great man.

There is another reason why it is appropriate to mark his birthdate in a legislative forum. For many years Yeats served as an Irish senator and his contributions to Irish legislation were many, varied, and progressive.

I had the privilege of meeting W. B. Yeats and the unforgettable experience of hearing him read his poetry in Hanover, N.H., in 1932, and I treasure a copy of "The Tower" autographed by him at that time.

I vividly recall his account of the "playboy" riots and his share therein, including a dumb-show speech which he purported to give to a howling mob and the content of which he composed at leisure for newspaper consumption.

I shall always remember his reading of the following poem:

SEPTEMBER 1913

What need you, being come to sense,
But fumble in a greasy till
And add the halfpence to the pence
And prayer to shivering prayer, until—
You have dried the marrow from the bone;
For men were born to pray and save:
Romantic Ireland's dead and gone,
It's with O'Leary in the grave.

Yet they were of a different kind,
The names that stilled your childish play,
They have gone about the world like wind,
But little time had they to pray
For whom the hangman's rope was spun,
And what, God help us, could they save?
Romantic Ireland's dead and gone,
It's with O'Leary in the grave.

Was it for this the wild geese spread
The gray wing upon every tide;
For this that all that blood was shed,
For this Edward Fitzgerald died,
And Robert Emmet and Wolfe Tone,
All that delirium of the brave?
Romantic Ireland's dead and gone,
It's with O'Leary in the grave.

Yet could we turn the years again,
And call those exiles as they were
In all their loneliness and pain,
You'd cry, "Some woman's yellow hair
Has maddened every mother's son":
They weighted so lightly what they gave.
But let them be, they're dead and gone,
They 're with O'Leary in the grave.

As a mark of our respect and to note his anniversary, I should like to insert at this point an article "W. B. Yeats: On His Centennial" by John Unterecker which appeared in the New York Times book review on June 13, 1965:

[From the New York Times, June 13, 1965]

W. B. YEATS: ON HIS CENTENNIAL

(By John Unterecker)

(NOTE.—Mr. Unterecker, poet and member of the English faculty at Columbia, is the author of "A Reader's Guide to William Butler Yeats.")

"Things fall apart; the center cannot hold," Yeats wrote in 1920; "Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world." Yet no poet of the 20th century worked more diligently to hold things together, struggled more resolutely against the growing anarchy of his times and ours. A man passionately devoted to the idea that only through order, deliberately imposed, could life or art yield meaning. W. B. Yeats spent nearly 60 creative years constructing and reconstructing a body of literacy work—poetry, plays, criticism—more tightly made even than the 16th-century tower he had declared his symbol. It is because of the fullness and coherence of his literary achievement that the 100th anniversary of Yeats' birth will today be celebrated, in one way or another, literally around the world.

It is difficult to think of any man who more single mindedly set out to make himself not just a poet but a great one. "If when I grow up I am as clever among grownup

men as I am among these boys," Yeats remembered thinking as a schoolboy. "I shall be a famous man." He had climbed to the top of a tree near his school's playing field and, there surveying ordinary humanity, had decided that he "must take some work as the whole end of life and not think as the others do of becoming well off and living pleasantly."

It may be that the singleminded dedication to what he himself would have called the simplifying of his life helps make both the man and his work memorable. Yeats recognized very soon that the world requires not just an artist but an image of an artist if it is to be able easily to fit him into textbooks and into its too-fallible memory. The real man, in all his intricacy, with the complex passions that, changing minute by minute, drive him first one way and then another, is too difficult to assimilate. Who can understand at all the man he knows best? To be memorable, Yeats decided, the man in love with lasting fame must construct for himself a mask—something opposite to his own nature—through which he can play a part before the world's audience. Food of historical parallels, Yeats took as one example Dante Alighieri, a man born exactly 600 years before him. One of the two debaters in the poem "Ego Dominus Tuus" says of Dante, "I think he fashioned from his opposite an image that might have been a stony face," and goes on to say it is that image which we have come to take for Dante, rather than the real man whose lecherous life lay behind the "hollow face" of the chief imagination of Christendom.

Though Yeats did not fashion for himself a face altogether hollow or stony, he did manage to present us one—especially toward the end—that seemed careworn, serious, slightly ironic.

A good deal of responsibility for this image he credited to the Irish patriot Maud Gonne, whom he loved; again like Dante, Yeats had found a way to wear at least one side of his heart on his sleeve. He felt that Dante had in part masked himself through his very public celebration of Beatrice, "the most exalted lady loved by a man." Though Yeats could not bring himself to call Maud Gonne "exalted," he could heap upon her almost all other superlatives. She was "a Helen," "a Pallas Athene"; a woman alternately "gentle" and full of "wildness"; a woman symbolized sometimes by a red rose and sometimes by a hawk.

Compounded of such opposites, she had the power to excite him into remarkable literary displays of almost always unrequited passion; and yet, as Yeats privately knew, she was not the only woman that he loved. But she managed superbly to fit into the drama he was making of his life; for very soon after he had decided to become a great poet, he had hit on what would be his lifelong attitude: "We should write out our own thoughts in as nearly as possible the language we thought them in," he decided, "as though in a letter to an intimate friend. We should not disguise them in any way; for our lives give them force as the lives of people in plays give force to their words * * *. I shall, if good luck or bad luck make my life interesting, be a great poet; for it will be no longer a matter of literature at all."

If Yeats' love for Maud Gonne gave him one kind of dramatic material, Ireland gave him another. Being born in Dublin, becoming a Fenian, living through Easter week of 1916 and the Irish troubles of the early twenties, becoming a member of the Irish Senate, turning himself into a propagandist not just for Irish nationalism but as well for almost all the Irish artistic endeavors of his time—these pieces of good luck and bad luck did indeed make Yeats' life interesting. They served to give both to him and to his work the sort of unity of being he always talked about as indispensable.

The same sorts of historical accident could, he felt, be a source of strength to his strife-torn country. His last demand of his countrymen was that they remember the agonies, the "seven heroic centuries," of their subjugation. For through such memories, he felt, they could finally be united into a great nation. "Cast your mind on other days," he wrote in "Under Ben Bulben":

> "That we in coming days may be
> Still the indomitable Irishry."

Yeats' patriotism was comprehensive and persistent. He loved Ireland, he made Ireland the center of his work. As Oliver St. John Gogarty remarked in an unpublished letter to Patrick McCartan late in life, Yeats, after all, "could have gone native in London as Bernard Shaw and James Stephens and O'Casey did. He just did not. He dies where he was born." Yeats did not die where he was born—he died in France shortly before the outbreak of the Second World War; but one of his last requests, one that was finally granted him, was that he be buried in Drumcliff Churchyard, under the great looming head of Ben Bulben Mountain, in the country that he had most loved and that he was never able to forget.

If Maud Gonne and his country made Yeat's life "interesting," and so gave him subjects, a force quite as powerful as those strong loves inspired a number of his most memorable poems. I mean, of course, grief for the death of one's friends, a grief that moves anyone who lives as long as Yeats did. From it he made such vivid elegaic verse as "In Memory of Major Robert Gregory" ("I'll name the friends that cannot sup with us. * * * All, all are in my thoughts tonight being dead."), and "Upon a Dying Lady," the elegy for Mable Beardsley which at the end demands of death:

> "Give her a little grace,
> What if a laughing eye
> Have you looked into your face?
> It is about to die."

It is "The Municipal Gallery Revisited" which defines most accurately the importance of these friends.

> "You that would judge me, do not judge alone
> This book or that, come to this hallowed place
> Where my friends' portraits hang and look thereon;
> Ireland s history in their lineaments trace;
> Think where man's glory most begans and ends,
> And say my glory was I had such friends."

Love of a woman, love of his country, love for his friends drove Yeats to write. For those loves—and the art which expressed them—helped him to hold at arm's length the chaos into which he saw the world descending.

It may be, as many of his admirers have claimed, that it is Yeat's vision of chaos that makes him a peculiarly modern poet. But if that is so, it is his determination to oppose that chaos that makes him a great poet. Like Albert Camus, he accepts the disorder of life as inevitable; yet also like Camus, he sees man's part as the necessary denial of that inevitability. It is the refusal to accept defeat, the refusal to weep, the refusal—when hope has gone—to give up the struggle, which both writers see as the essence of modern man's heroism and which makes both writers in many young men's eyes the most attractive figures from the recent literary past. They are both honest enough to face unflinchingly the horror of life and death, and yet uncompromisingly human enough to continue, in spite of that horror, to celebrate the world's beauty and to celebrate destructive man's capacity for affection and for joy.

Yeats over and over again draws on this theme of heroic freedom achieved through courageous cheer in the face of inevitable defeat. It comes to perhaps its most eloquent expression in "Lapis Lazuli," one of that magnificent group of poems that, in an astonishing burst of literary activity, had been produced in the last year and a half of Yeats' life.

In "Lapis Lazuli," Yeats set out explicitly to define for us not just the nature of the tragic hero's vision but, more important, the vision of that artist who invents the tragic hero: the dramatist or painter or musician who drives his hero toward death, and who fills that hero with dread, and who then allows him the superior knowledge that can lift him beyond dread into redeeming gaiety.

For as Yeats insists, "Hamlet and Lear are gay; Gaiety transfiguring all that dread." The vision of gaiety, Yeats explains, is "Tragedy wrought to its uttermost." And it is available to them only because the artist who created Hamlet and Lear accepted completely both his own mortality and that of his art. Every man who has ever had a dream of artistic immortality knows also the countertruth, out of which Yeats builds the center of his poem:

> "All things fall and are built again,
> And those that build them again are gay."

It was Yeats' belief that the builder—the artist—is able to function properly only after he has acknowledged that death and destruction harry the world. His project—like that of the Chinese musician who, carved in lapis lazuli, is the subject of Yeats' poem—is to distance himself from "all the tragic scene" so that his "mournful melodies" may bring enlightenment. The enlightenment he brings (in the poem, it is an enlightenment brought to two old men) is the gaiety which illuminates tragedy, a gaiety which, thanks to the power of a transforming art, shapes the disorder of the world into a heroic statement. "Accomplished fingers begin to play." And as they play, the eyes of the musician's audience kindle:

> "Their eyes mid many wrinkles, their eyes,
> Their ancient, glittering eyes, are gay."

I think that Yeats may have felt "accomplished" to be the crucial word in his poem. It is not enough, he felt, that the artist express either feeling or idea; it is of commanding importance that he give his feeling or his idea its proper form.

In taking such a stand, Yeats was, he knew, placing himself in opposition to the great tide of expressionism that has for more than 50 years been sweeping through contemporary painting and contemporary poetry, and that has even managed—in a corruption of Stanislavsky's technique—to influence much of the theater.

In its most extreme form, expressionism discards all artistic standards for the single standard of the artist's own taste. He need follow no rule other than the rule of his feelings. His primary purpose is private therapy: getting rid of his bottled-up passions. When the expressionist communicates—and, of course, he frequently does—it is chiefly through our identification with his feelings rather than through any deliberate organization that he has given them. His forms—when he achieves forms—are lucky accidents.

Needless to say, Yeats was quick to endorse personal feeling as the driving force behind the work of any artist; but he felt that the great excitement of the finest art comes not from its displays of feeling but from the tensions achieved when unruly and violent personal emotions are poured into formal molds. It is out of contained force that explosions are made.

For that reason tension becomes a key notion in his criticism, and he frequently works to construct poems that almost literally explode out of tight forms strained to their limits. The structure is always closely

calculated. For instance, the technical virtuosity by which he manipulates his rhythms is, I imagine, obvious to most readers; but the echoing pattern of rhyme and partial rhyme is less obvious, a pattern that moves not just through the ends of his lines but that carries into the body of the poem to signal those climaxes which hardly ever miscarry, which are of a unique force.

It is no accident, then, that the ends of Yeats' poems stick so well in our heads. All of "Among School Children," for example, drives toward its summary lines, those lines which define Yeats' notion both of the coherence of great art and the more intangible but just as real coherence of that art and the artist who creates it:

"O chestnut treee, great-rooted blossomer,
Are you the leaf, the blossom or the bole?
O body swayed to music, O brightening glance,
How can we know the dancer from the dance?"

A catalog of such extraordinary last lines might embrace all of Yeats' best-known poems. Not simply great lines, they are the focused strength of the poems that have preceded them, memorable because the body of the poems makes them memorable.

It is one thing to define Yeats' achievement. It is quite another to define his influence.

Part of it is, of course, a negative influence. Thanks to certain rather obvious syntactical tricks. Yeats really does have a voice altogether his own. And no poet worth his salt wishes to speak in another man's voice. Most Irish poets strain hard to avoid Yeatsian echoes. Austin Clarke, Thomas Kinsella, and John Montague, for instance, quite deliberately avoid the sort of grand rhetoric Yeats was fond of.

In other parts of the world, his shadow hangs almost as heavily. When he is imitated by other poets, it is more often than not in a display of mechanical proficiency—an I could achieve this sort of thing myself if I put my mind to it bravado. Wallace Stevens, for instance, once entertained himself by assimilating "The Lake Isle of Innisfree" into one of his own poems; W. H. Auden in his great memorial poem on the death of Yeats draws, I assume, on "Under Ben Bulben" as a model for part of the verse structure. But these are acknowledgments of the mastery of Yeats and not evidence of pervasive influence of any sort. Stevens sounds like Stevens, even when he draws on Yeats; and in the memorial poem Auden sounds uniquely like himself.

Of our major poets, only Theodore Roethke, I think, attempted quite deliberately to incorporate some of Yeats' techniques—perhaps even some of his themes. But Roethke, for all his excellence as a teacher, was almost as much of a solitary genius as Yeats, and undoubtedly for that reason the only important poet of our times daring enough to risk his own integrity by attempting such a project. That the risk was justified is, I should think, self-evident.

There is, however, a Yeatsian influence which is barely definable, which has no clear literary consequence, yet which is detectable, insistent, demanding. It hangs over Ireland—not so much in Yeats' poetry, which is even now not widely read there, as in the legends that Yeats turned to and the lives that he attempted to make legendary. Those friends' portraits in the Municipal Gallery that he refers to in his poem—the portrait of John Synge, "that rooted man"; Augusta Gregory, whose portrait could not show, Yeats felt, "all that pride and that humility"; Maud Gonne—these friends' portraits begin, I think, to take on something of the luminous quality Yeats assigned to them. The statue of Cuchulain in the Dublin post office lets us make links to the legendary Irish hero Yeats had selected as of all men in history or in myth the one most unlike himself and so most appropriate as his own mask.

Beyond these objects and the others that Yeats was responsible for—he advised on the design of the beautiful Irish coinage, for example—lie the institutions which Yeats founded, among them the Irish Academy of Letters and the Abbey Theater.

But those are local manifestations of Yeats' power. There is another influence that is only beginning to be felt but that may finally prove to be great indeed. It is the influence of that image Yeats had turned himself into: the image of a man careworn in the service of a human love worth a lifetime's devotion, the image of a man whose serious concern that his country be not just a free one but a great one had hardened his face, the image—slightly ironic—of the artist who knows, when all is said and done, that time, which tears down every tower, even a symbolic one, will sometime level one of the most eloquent literary structures built in modern times.

More than a model for poets, Yeats is becoming that which he most wished to be: a model for men. The face of lover, patriot, and artist stiffens finally into a mask, a cold mask which, for lack of a better word, helps define for us the lover's, the patriot's, the artist's integrity. It was with those fixed features in mind, I think, that Yeats, dying, wrote the words he wished to end his collected poems and to cap his grave:

"Under bare Ben Bulben's head
In Drumcliff churchyard Yeats is laid.
An ancestor was rector there
Long years ago, a church stands near,
By the road an ancient cross
No marble, no conventional phrase;
On limestone quarried near the spot
By his command these words are cut:
'Cast a cold eye
'On life, on death.
'Horseman, pass by'."

The United States and China's Totalitarian Dynamics—1965—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a portion of a significant address by Dr. Richard L. Walker, a distinguished educator and a scholar in the field of the cold war conflict, delivered during the National Conference on the United States and China, held at Washington, D.C., April 29, 1965.

This background material is pertinent, I believe, to an understanding of the ideological contest in the Far East.

The address follows:

THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA'S TOTALITARIAN DYNAMICS—1965

(By Richard L. Walker)

It is gratifying, and certainly for me a compliment, to be able to speak before such a distinguished gathering, and doubly so because of the importance of the topic to which we address ourselves. Before I move into the main substance of my topic, therefore, I hope you will permit me to list for you some of the underlying theses which I wish to stress.

1. We are locked in a full spectrum of conflict with a new totalitarian despotism in the Far East, and in large part because other smaller states in the region are also threatened by its ambitions.

2. Democracies tend not to believe the facts and policies of totalitarian regimes, no matter how blatantly their leaders state them.

3. The Communist regime in mainland China is deserving of close attention and realistic assessment, particularly because we do tend to underestimate what totalitarian powers can accomplish and because we give inadeqaute attention to Asia.

4. The national security and the whole position of the nontotalitarian states of the world may well depend upon the manner in which the United States deals with the challenge of Communist China, for Mao Tse-tung's China belongs at the center of all considerations of security and strategy in East Asia.

5. Unless the United States and its allies can arrive at a successful strategy for defeating Chinese Communist-style guerrilla warfare and subversion in the underdeveloped areas of the world, many of the leaders there will accept the thesis advanced by Peiping that the United States is a "paper tiger" and that the "East wind is prevailing over the West wind."

6. It is vitally important, therefore, that we make a rational calculation of what is the force of the new Chinese Communist power and what are its policies.

For these reasons, the major portion of my remarks is devoted to the discussion of the great power sensitivities and ambitions of Mao Tse-tung's China.

It can only be with a heavy heart that we survey the danger of threat of escalated violence in east Asia today. Only a quarter of a century ago, the U.S. Secretary of State was warning that America would resist attempts to bring about change in east Asia by "other than peaceful means." A failure to understand American resolve was in large part responsible for the escalated conflict which followed. How tragic, that exactly 20 years ago today delegates were gathered at San Francisco to write a Charter for a new and peaceful world, and today the results of that conference, the United Nations, is maligned as "a vile body" by a major world power and we should find ourselves gathered here to concern ourselves about the hostile relationship between the United States and mainland China. It was in large measure in defense of the independence and peaceful future of mainland China that American lives and fortunes were spent during World War II.

For more than a decade and a half, there has been fervent hope that the leaders of Communist China do not mean what they say. Neutrals, allies, and even concerned citizens in the United States have searched for means of conciliation only to be met with stinging rebuff from Peiping. Only 2 weeks ago the Secretary General of the United Nations was told to spare himself the trouble of a visit to Peiping to seek for conciliation in the crisis in Vietnam and was informed by the government of Mao Tse-tung that "the United Nations has degenerated into a U.S. tool for aggression and has committed many evils."

There are a number of basic factors in the confrontation between the United States and Communist China in 1965 which circumscribe the limits of American action, and much though we would like to wish some of them away, they are unlikely to change in the immediate future. Three of them deserve special attention.

First, and most important, Communist China is a totalitarian state in the fullest meaning of that term. This is not a Confucian state; it is not the China of the T'ang or the Ming dynasties; and we must not confuse modern totalitarianism with the classical Chinese autocracy. Despite the fact that

we live in an age which has had bitter experiences with totalitarianism—Hitler's Germany, Mussolini's Italy, Stalin's Russia, ultranationalist Japan—we still find it difficult to understand the direction which a totalitarian regime can give to a culture and a people. How frequently, in the face of evidence to the contrary, we have looked for saving graces, for positive achievements, for excuses, or simply turned our heads aside and pretended the totalitarian ability at excesses simply did not exist.

It is important that we realize how a totalitarian regime manipulates a culture and a people—in internal as well as foreign policies. Within the framework of excuses provided by an official ideology totalitarians have committed crimes against humanity which can have no justification. Such a regime can give to a culture a unique bent which upsets the balance, bringing out forces of oppression and terror at the expense of forces of humanity and compassion. It can play down or submerge in the efficient application of the ideology the patterns which have given proportion to a culture. The persistence of the cultural patterns themselves has freqeuntly led observers to underestimate the power of totalitarian thrust and to maintain hopes that amicable relations can be constructed on a people-to-people or culture-to-culture basis.

The Germans who are our NATO allies today are the same German people who served Hitler's organization and purposes, yet even at that time they had the qualities of family love, of musical genius, of village spontaneity, and of religious devotion which have made men admire them through time. The Japanese people, who today constitute a major force for the future of democracy in east Asia, are the same people who shouted banzai's for the inevitable victory of Japanese arms 30 years ago. The Russian people, who are today experiencing an atmosphere of relatively relaxed cultural controls, are the same people who, under Stalin, helped to wreak upon each other the policies of oppression and horror which Khrushchev confirmed so dramatically for the world in his 1956 secret speech. In all of these cases, outside observers were frequently misled by the seeming cultural continuity or by the expressions of reasonableness and claims of accomplishment on the part of the totalitarian leaders and their flatterers.

One has only to examine some of the statements about Stalin's Russia or Hitler's Germany in the 1930's to realize how frequently totalitarian policies were overlooked by those who did not really wish to face up to their meaning. Neville Chamberlain found at one time that Hitler was a "reasonable man" with somewhat justified and legitimate goals. After all, the war guilt clause of the Versailles Treaty had been proven wrong. Statesmen or correspondents who met with Stalin found "good old Joe" to be rational, popular, and concerned about the welfare of his people. Today, some who have interviewed Mao Tse-tung have found the "72-year-old warrior" reflective and statesmanlike. Again, the achievements of Mussolini's trains running on time or of Hitler's overcoming depression unemployment by constructing his militarily significant Autobahnen or Stalin's forced industrialization tended to overshadow totalitarian goals and methods. A visitor to a small German hamlet 30 years ago, making a sociological study, would have noted the revolutionary fervor of national socialism among the people, but would probably have concluded that life was going on much as usual. Today, although a major revolution has been carried on throughout China, life in a village is still much as it has always been. Finally, it is worth recalling that whenever the Kremlin under Stalin or Hitler's chancellory muttered soft words of reasonableness, the outside world was only too anxious to hope and believe that change had come.

It is the totalitarian bent of Mao Tse-tung's China, not the human qualities in a Chinese village or the continuing pride of Chinese scholars in their history and culture, which is the major problem for the United States and other nations in east Asia. A mere enumeration of the characteristics shared by Mao's China and other modern totalitarian regimes should be sufficient to indicate the seriousness of the problem posed for the outside world: Cult of the leader, parades of military power, glorification of war, fanaticism among the youth, irredentism, racialism, oppression of minorities, labor reform camps, party-controlled mass organizations, use of the "great lie," denounciation of world security organizations, large-scale executions, exploitation of former injustices to legitimize aggression.

The totalitarian bent, indicated by such items, all of which characterize the regime of Mao Tse-tung, has tended to submerge or render insignificant many of the balancing features in Chinese society which made former autocracy bearable. Traditional Chinese humanism and sense of humor, for example, have been among the first victims.

Totalitarianism unfortunately has its own dynamics, and this fact is all too frequently overlooked by those who see only the individual elements of the culture: the people, the enterprises, the arts, the industrial achievements, village life, or literature. A totalitarian regime needs tension, it requires enemies, it foments and thrives on ultranationalism, to pursue "great power" policies it needs victories, and it insists on the universal applicability of its doctrines. Mao's totalitarian rule is the first inescapable factor which must be borne in mind in assessing our relations with mainland China today. It is strange that in 1965 I should have to begin with emphasis on this point, but unfortunately it is all too frequently bypassed in serious discusssions. Perhaps our intense affection for the Chinese people and emotional attachment to China have led us to play down Chinese Communist totalitarianism. But as Prof. John K. Fairbank pointed out in his Brien MacMahon lecture in 1960:

"If we are to move forward in the 1960's we must have still another perspective, and that is, on ourselves and our emotional involvement with the fate of China. This also is at a dead end, for the Chinese people under Chinese communism are even further removed from our influence than the Russian people under Soviet communism. This has been so for 10 years, but it takes us a long time to lose the Sinophile feeling that the American people are the special patrons and protectors of the Chinese people."

The second overall factor which must be understood is that the United States is a Pacific power. Certainly World War II and the Korean war should have made that fact abundantly clear. This is an area where vital national security interests are involved. It is perhaps unfortunate, particularly in this day of rapid sea transport and jet aircraft, that we still use that expression of European origin, "the Far East." In view of United States deep involvement in the Pacific area, it might be better if we began to refer to the "Near West" when talking about the areas of eastern Asia.

Part of the problem of the Chinese Communist outlook and of our own thinking at times has been what Eugene Staley has referred to as "the myth of the continents"—that is, the idea that land connects and the seas divide. Our British ancestry should have taught us better. In many respects the United States, as a sea and air power, is far closer, from the point of view of influence, power, strategy, trade, or involvement, to the areas of eastern and southern Asia than is China, simply because the seas and air connect and the land barriers are formidable. As the major Pacific power, with the possible exception of the Soviet Union, the United States is the only country capable of resisting what the Soviet leaders now refer to as "the hegemonic designs" of Peiping.

A third factor which forms an important basis on which plans for U.S. policies for dealing with Communist China must be formed is the extent of American commitment in eastern Asia. The United States is directly involved in mutual security pacts with a number of the nations of east and southeast Asia. At present, the validity of our commitments is being challenged by insurgent forces whose leadership, organization and direction can readily be traced to the support of Peiping. A major policy goal of the Chinese Communist regime has therefore been to force the United States to abandon its commitments for defending those smaller nations connected with it by bonds of mutual security interests.

The major item of contention is, of course, over the continued United States support for the Chinese Government on Taiwan. The American commitment to Taiwan against Communist control is hardly likely to be abandoned. The Korean War was prolonged in order that Chinese prisoners should have the choice of voluntary repatriation either to Taiwan or to mainland China, and more than 14,000 chose Taiwan rather than to return to mainland totalitarian control. In the case of Taiwan, as in Korea, the Philippines, and elsewhere, the United States is confronted with the demand stated in February 1965 by Chou En-lai that every American base and troop be withdrawn as the condition for peace in East Asia. It is impossible for America to accede to such terms, and thus the impasse of 15 years continues, in large part because Peiping, with its landsman's view, refuses to recognize the important fact that the United States is a Pacific power and that this is overwhelmingly more important in many respects than the fact that we are not an Asia power.

In the course of our 15 years of confrontation with Mao Tse-tung's China, a number of myths have grown up about the relations between the two countries—scratches on our minds, Harold Isaacs would call them. And it is important that we mention a few of these before turning to the dynamics of totalitarian China's great power ambitions which have brought it into conflict with its Soviet ally, with neutral India, as well as with the United States. Let us examine some of the current mythology about China.

1. That the United States is somehow largely responsible for the present hostile pose of Peiping, and that we have exluded China from world councils. This carried some weight until India and the Soviet Union joined the ranks of Peiping's pariahs. American moves to establish relations with the Communist forces in 1949 were sternly rebuffed, as have been other gestures since. As Guy Wint of St. Anthony's College, Oxford, has put it in a book just published:

But why should the government in Peiping, from the start, have regarded the United States as its sworn enemy, apparently ruling out all possibility of reaching an understanding with America? China's Communist leaders were not inclined to respond to any generous and imaginative gesture unless assured of its validity by America's surrendering completely its position in the Far East. And this America was unlikely to do. For several decades, the United States had been an active power in the Pacific and had thought of itself, with some justice, as the champion of progressive causes—above all, of nationalism. Victor in the greatest war in history, it was not likely to bow before a parvenu govenment in China and to withdraw from what it conceived to be its liberalizing role in Asia. If in the first months after the Communist triumph in China its resolution seemed somewhat pliant, it was goaded into inflexibility by the insults from Peiping and the apparent madness of everything that came out of China. Peiping, far from offering a

dialogue with the outside world, conducted a hysterical monologue against it.

2. That the United States has not attempted to negotiate or come to terms with Communist China. This month the American and Chinese ambassadors held their 125th meeting in almost 10 years of attempts to resolve differences. At these meetings, first at Geneva and then in Warsaw, the American Ambassador has been subjected to regular diatribes against the United States and personal abuse, but we have persisted patiently in the discussions. The major point made at each meeting by the U.S. representative is to seek on the part of Communist China the renunciation of the use of force in the Taiwan Strait.

3. That by our failure to exchange diplomatic representatives and correspondents with Communist China we are denied accurate knowledge of what is happening in China. In the first place, we are not so chauvinistic as to believe that only American reporters and diplomats can ferret out the truth. Far from being separated by a "curtain of ignorance" as some might claim, American scholars have as much information, and probably more, about developments in mainland China as those of any western power.

4. That the Chinese have a natural sphere of influence and a legitimate hegemony and destiny in east and southeast Asia. With the exception of Vietnam—and mainly North Vietnam at that—the indigenous cultures of mainland and southeast Asia are Indian in origin, and the islands off the mainland of Asia, particularly Japan, have long resisted Chinese attempts to assert authority.

5. That it should be possible to work out some agreement for peaceful coexistence with Communist China if the United States were just a bit more flexible. Of course, the Indians have learned to their chagrin just what the Chinese policy of peaceful coexistence can mean. The U.S. policy has not been inflexible. Again and again it has opened the door for change and amelioration in Peiping's policies despite a constant stream of abuse.

6. The mainland China has a legitimate right over alien lands and peoples based on traditional Chinese claims and as a part of China's manifest destiny. Chinese claims based on former imperial pretensions and imperialism are no more valid today than other imperial claims, and this should include Tibet. In some cases, Mao's regime has been hinting at claims over lands which were only subject to mainland Chinese rule when the Mongols were themselves ruling China. Many of those who speak today of the "restoration" of China's rightful claims are accepting the Chinese landsman's view of the world.

Such are some of the myths which have clouded our discussions about China. Several others could be mentioned, but one in particular needs to be stated. There are all too many people who, sharing what D. W. Brogan has called the "myth of American omnipotence," feel that if only the Americans could get together and agree on China policy and make the proper noises of conciliation in the direction of Peiping, this would tame the Chinese dragon, which would then lie down and purr. Unfortunately, many of the policies of the Chinese Communist regime are expressions of Peiping's great power ambitions and the determination of the present leadership to set the pattern for the newly emergent nations. It is these expressions of great power ambition which the United States, as the major rival power in the Pacific, must contend with. These are expressions of totalitarian dynamism which call for the closest scrutiny if the present confrontation between Communist China and the United States is to be understood in its full dimensions.

On the Profession of Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, a free press is one essential element in a free society. Yet the freedom of the press must be exercised with restraint.

The fundamental principle—

As Mr. Walter Lippmann recently declared—

cannot be merely that men have a right to express themselves.

In an address before the International Press Institute in London on May 27, Mr. Lippmann discussed some of the more sophisticated problems of a free press, what he termed "the problems of maturity," as faced by members of the press in attempting to report legal and criminal issues, foreign policy, technical advances, and the great range of governmental activities.

I am pleased to insert Mr. Lippmann's perceptive and provocative address, "On the Profession of Journalism," in the RECORD:

ON THE PROFESSION OF JOURNALISM

(By Walter Lippmann)

We all know that the opportunity to speak and to print with even a modicum of freedom is, by itself, a satisfying and enjoyable thing to do. But the fundamental principle of a free press cannot be merely that men have a right to express themselves. No journalist can be satisfied to print a newspaper that has no readers. Journalism must be something more than singing in the shower bath or uttering soliloquies, however magnificent, to the desert air. For, while philosophers may argue whether a painting exists if no human eye beholds it, there can be no arguments that journalists write in order to be read, and that they are like Nietzsche who exclaimed that he had to have ears.

Thus, journalism is not a soliloquy without an audience. Moreover, and this has some practical bearing in the world as it is today, free journalism is not a monolog delivered to a captive audience which must at least pretend to be listening. As a matter of fact, since journalists and editors and publishers are men, and therefore human, and therefore liable to error and prejudice and to stupidity, a free press exists only where newspaper readers have access to other newspapers which are competitors and rivals, so that editorial comment and news reports can regularly and promptly be compared, verified, and validated. A press monopoly is incompatible with a free press, and one can proceed with this principle, if there is a monopoly of the means of communication—of radio, television, magazines, books, public meetings—it follows that this society is by definition and, in fact, deprived of freedom.

A NECESSITY IN A GREAT SOCIETY

A free press is not a privilege but an organic necessity in a great society. I use the term "great society" in its original sense, as it was used in passing by Adam Smith himself and made current in this century by Graham Wallas, who taught in this city at the London School of Economics. As Wallas used the term, a great society is not necessarily the good society which President Johnson, for example, hopes to make it. A great society is simply a big and complicated urban society.

In such a great society the environment in which individuals act and react is not the visible world of their homes and their neighborhoods and their communities. It is an invisible environment which has to be reported to them. For this reason, a great society cannot be governed, its inhabitants cannot conduct the business of their lives, unless they have access to the services of information and of argument and of criticism which are provided by a free press.

Without criticism and reliable and intelligible reporting, the government cannot govern. For there is no adequate way in which it can keep itself informed about what the people of the country are thinking and doing and wanting. The most elaborate government intelligence service is an insufficient provider of the knowledge which the government must have in order to legislate well and to administer public affairs.

Where there is a turbulent, pluralistic electorate, the rulers, the official bureaucracy, and the legislature will be in the dark, they will not know where they are and what they are doing, if they are deprived of the competitive reporting and the competing editorial commentaries and also the forum in which the spokesmen of the various shades of opinion can say their say. This is what a free press is supposed to provide.

In a great society, controversial laws cannot be enforced successfully, innovating policy cannot be administered, unless and until the government can find among the people of the country a reasonably high degree of consent. No government is able for long, except under the extreme, abnormal pressures of a war, to impose its rule and its opinions and its policies without public consent.

CONSENSUS IN GOVERNMENT

In my country we use a rough rule of thumb. It is that for controversial measures, the government should aim to rally a consensus, which in practical terms means a majority big enough to include from 60 to 75 percent of the voters. Only then will those who observe the law willingly and support the policy actively be numerous enough to persuade and induce the recalcitrant and dissident minority, leaving only a marginal minimum where legal coercion is needed.

To create such a consensus requires a considerable period of public education and debate. The consensus must not be confused with the plebiscites conducted by tyrannical governments where the government majority is 99.9 percent of the voters. In a society where there is such a superficial appearance of unanimity and conformity, there will always be at least a minority, it may even be a majority, who, though silenced, remain unconverted and unconvinced. The government of the tyrannical state will be forced to rely on secret agents who, because they operate in the dark, can never be wholly relied upon, being subject to intrigue and corruption and other hidden influences. Thus, there is raised up between the people and the government an impenetrable curtain through which there is no dependable communication.

It is evident that the interests of a great society extend far beyond the business of governing it. An essential characteristic of a great society is that it is not monolithic and cannot be planned or directed centrally. It is too complex for that. It has too many functions. Its needs are too varied, and there are no men who have the minds, even if they are assisted by computers, capable of grasping all the data and all the variables which are needed for the central planning and direction of a great society.

Inevitably, therefore, by the very nature of things, a great society is a pluralist so-

ciety, with local and regional interests, and activities and organizations. They are bound to have a certain autonomy, and some degree of self-determination, and, in some significant sense, they are bound to have freedom of initiative and of enterprise.

In order for such a pluralist society to work, there must be available a great mass of data: the current state of the markets for labor, for goods, for services, for money—what is and was for sale and at what price—what can be seen in the theater, what is coming on radio and television, what games are being played and how they were played and who won them, what is visible in the art shows, where one can go to church and what was preached there, and what is in the lecture halls, in the shops, and department stores, where one can travel and enjoy life, who has been born, who has been married, and who has died. The list is as endless as the activities of a great society. Experience shows, too, that the naked data are not enough. The naked data are unintelligible and so have to be interpreted and cross-interpreted by political analysts, financial analysts, drama critics, book reviewers, and the like. There has to be criticism of plays and books and concerts, and television and magazines and newspapers themselves. There has to be advocacy and there has to be rebuttal.

CONFLICTS OF A FREE PRESS

I must now talk about some of the key problems which present themselves when the freedom of the press has been established by law and when sufficient private financial resources have become available to support the publication of separate and competing newspapers. These are the preliminary problems. They consist of getting rid of the censor and the domination of the advertiser and of financial groups. Then come the problems of maturity. They become crucial when the preliminary problems have in some substantial measure been solved.

I have in mind, to begin with, the conflict between, on the one hand, the public's right to know, or it may be the public's curiosity to know, and, on the other hand, the right and the need of the Government to be able to deliberate confidentially before announcing a conclusion, and in certain circumstances, especially in its foreign relations, the Government's right to a measure of secrecy and dispatch.

This conflict is, I am inclined to believe, perennial in the sense that there is no abstract principle which resolves it. The right of the press to know and the right of the responsible authority to withhold must coexist. In my country, we have a continual tension between public officials and reporters about the disclosure of coming events, what is going to be announced, what policy is going to be adopted, who is going to be appointed, what will be said to a foreign government. There is also a conflict about what has happened and why it happened and who was responsible for its happening.

The tension is between vigilant, ingenious, and suspicious reporters who haunt and pursue officials, causing these officials never to be allowed to forget that they are withholding information at their peril, at the risk of being scalped in the newspapers. It is not a neat or an elegant relationship, but a modus vivendi which works tolerably well, at least in time of peace.

THE RANK OF A JOURNALIST

An important aspect of this problem is in the field of crime and punishment. Here the press is often in conflict with those whose business it is to catch the guilty man and to spare the innocent man, and then to give the man who has been arrested a fair trial. The trouble with crime and punishment as it concerns the press is that it is too interesting and too absorbing, and too convincing because it comes out of real life. Thus, the reporting of the news of crime and punishment often runs athwart the administration of justice.

This conflict is nowhere near to being resolved, and consequently, we should at least avoid the sin of complacency when we contemplate the real achievements of even the greatest of our newspapers.

As the function of a free press in a great society becomes more and more demanding, we are moving toward professionalization. A few generations ago journalism was a minor craft which could be learned by serving an apprenticeship to a practicing newspaper editor. Journalism is still far behind established professions like medicine and law in that there does not exist an organized body of knowledge and a discipline which must be learned and absorbed before the young journalist can practice. There are, moreover, only the first beginnings of the equivalent of bar associations and medical societies which set intellectual and ethical standards for the practice of the profession.

UNDERDEVELOPED DISCIPLINE

Journalism, we might say, is still an underdeveloped profession, and, accordingly, newspapermen are quite often regarded, as were surgeons and musicians a century ago, as having the rank, roughly speaking, of barbers and riding masters.

As you know, as indeed this institute is an impressive witness, the concept of a free press today has evolved far beyond the rather simple abstractions of the 18th century. We recognize today that the press as a whole must be capable of reporting and explaining, interpreting and criticizing, all the activities of mankind.

To be sure, not every reader of every newspaper cares to know about or could understand all the activities of mankind. But there are some readers, specialized in some subject, who have to be alerted to important new developments of even the most specialized activities, be it in the remote reaches of astrophysics or microbiology or paleontology, or in the game of chess.

For this, the profession of journalism is becoming specialized, and the editor who presides over large staffs of local and national and international specialists, of political, commercial, financial, legal, medical, theatrical, musical, and cooking specialists, art critics and fashion writers, has to meet the specifications, which were current when I was at college, that an educated man should know everything about something and something about everything.

Just as the profession of journalism is the consequence of the organic need for it in a great society, so a direct consequence follows from this professionalization. The journalist is becoming subject to the compulsion to respect and observe the intellectual disciplines and the organized body of knowledge which the specialist in any field possesses.

This growing professionalism is, I believe, the most radical innovation since the press became free of government control and censorship. For it introduces into the conscience of the working journalist a commitment to seek the truth which is independent of and superior to all his other commitments—his commitment to publish newspapers that will sell, his commitment to his political party, his commitment even to promote the policies of his government.

As the press becomes securely free because it is increasingly indispensible in a great society, the crude forms of corruption which belonged to the infancy of journalism tend to give way to the temptations of maturity and power. It is with these temptations that the modern journalism has to wrestle, and the unending conflicts between his duty to seek the truth and his human desire to get on in the world are the inner drama of the modern journalist's experience.

RESPONSIBLE JOURNALISM

The first and most evident of the conflicts is that between choosing, on the one hand, to publish whatever most easily interests the largest number of readers most quickly—that is to say, yellow journalism—and, on the other hand, to provide, even at a commercial loss, an adequate supply of what the public will in the longer run need to know. This is responsible journalism. It is journalism responsible in the last analysis to the editor's own conviction of what, whether interesting or only important, is in the public interest.

A second drama, in which contemporary journalists are involved, consists in the conflict between their pursuit of the truth and their need and their desire to be on good terms with the powerful. For the powerful are perhaps the chief source of the news. They are also the dispensers of many kinds of favor, privilege, honor, and self-esteem. The most important forms of corruption in the modern journalist's world are the many guises and disguises of social-climbing on the pyramids of power. The temptations are many, some are simple, some are refined, and often they are yielded to without the consciousness of yielding. Only a constant awareness of them offers protection.

Another drama arises in foreign affairs from the conflict between the journalist's duty to seek the truth and his loyalty to his country's government—between his duty to report and explain the truth as the sees it and his natural and human desire to say "my country right or wrong." These conflicts are trying, and for the journalist striving to do his work there are two rules which can help him. One is to remember President Truman's advice that if you do not like the heat, stay out of the kitchen. It is always possible to retreat into less hotly contested subject matter. The other rule is that if you believe you must go into the kitchen, keep an eye on yourself, keep asking yourself: are you sure you are still seeking the truth and not merely trying to win an argument?

This brings me to my final point which is that as the free press develops, as the great society evolves, the paramount point is whether, like a scientist or a scholar, the journalist puts truth in the first place or in the second. If he puts it in the second place, he is a worshipper of the bitch goddess Success. Or he is a conceited man trying to win an argument.

Insofar as he puts truth in the first place, he rises towards—I will not say into, but towards—the company of those who taste and enjoy the best things in life.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

The Netherlands: The Tale of Progress and Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 8, 1965, the Rotary Club of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., my hometown, had as its guest speaker Mr. Jeff van den Bogaert, director of the Netherlands Information Service and press counselor of the Netherlands permanent mission to the United Nations.

Mr. van den Bogaert's address was timely and highly informative and I understand the meeting was graced by the presence of a number of Dutch exchange students studying in the high schools of my congressional district, which was most appropriate for the occasion.

Mr. van den Bogaert's address was entitled "The Netherlands: The Tale of Progress and Change."

As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of that address.

The address follows:

What is your "image" of Holland?

A country of tulips, wooden shoes, windmills?

An agricultural country?

If so, we have been selling our country short; we Netherlanders have not done a good job of telling the story of our achievements in the last decades. We have not been telling the story of the Netherlands: The tale of progress and change.

One of the most notable things in the Netherlands is the population pressure. The population has been doubling every 50 years since 1850, and the estimate of 20 million people by the year 2000 is based on the assumption that this rate of increase will continue. With more than 900 inhabitants per square mile, the Netherlands is the most densely populated country in the world. Not even the Asian masses can match this figure. It is obvious that such a population could not be supported on a territory chiefly devoted to agriculture.

Next to our tulips, wooden shoes, windmills, most of you—I, at least, hope so—will have heard of the engineering achievement represented by the reclamation of the Zuyder Zee; this project started in 1920 and is now well along toward complete realization.

We have started an even more daring project, one that could not have been conceived before the development of modern engineering techniques. It is called the Delta plan.

This is to be followed by a third project, not yet begun, the linking of the Frisian Islands of the northern section of the Dutch coast to make a dike of them. The sea behind the dike will then become part of the land area of the Netherlands. When this program is completed in the year 2000, some 500,000 acres of water will have been converted into land and a population of 12 million will have increased to 20 million.

Land reclamation and industrialization are the major efforts of the Dutch at this moment.

If the Netherlands is changing from a predominantly agricultural to a primary industrial country, it is not because Dutch farmers are producing less but because Dutch industrialists are producing more.

The 9.2 percent of the working population (410,000 persons) now employed in agriculture produce more, export more than the 30 percent who worked the land at the opening of the century.

They are doing it despite a decreasing area of cultivated land, for the polders reclaimed from the sea do not compensate for the land lost to the expanding cities and industrial uses.

The whole land area of the Netherlands is only 13,000 square miles—less than a third of Pennsylvania. Of this, only 9,000 square miles—equivalent to the area of Vermont—is available for cultivation.

These 9,000 square miles include such unrewarding areas as the peat country in the north and east, and the sand dunes along the western coast. The best soil in the Netherlands is the soil that has been reclaimed from the sea.

On this meager, natural basis, Holland has achieved so much productivity that, despite her small size in relation to her competitors, she is the world's largest exporter of potatoes, potato flour, eggs, flower bulbs, strawboard, condensed milk, and cheese.

Nature, so unkind to Dutch agriculture in other ways, has nevertheless provided that one condition that the Dutch converted into an asset.

This is the constant assault on the land by water, which we have met by a system of drainage and pumping stations. As a result, our engineers are able to control the ground water level of our fields. In times of heavy rainfall—a good deal of rain normally falls in Holland—the excess water is pumped away. In dry weather, more water is allowed to run in. Thus, no matter what the weather, the control system permits the maintenance of a high water level on pasture land, to promote a lush growth of grass, but a low water level on land used for field crops.

Every Dutch crop is grown, so to speak, on individually tailored ground.

Dutch agriculture today is becoming increasingly "industrialized." Large tracts of lands are now under glass; this makes the operation more like factory work than open-air farming. In 1964, more than 3,000 acres of vegetable cultivation were under glass; about 1,000 acres of fruit.

These massive tasks the Netherlands has undertaken—reclamation on a large scale and industrialization—demand a readjustment in the stereotyped foreign image of our country.

Holland is no longer primarily a country of windmills and picturesque costumes, of tulips and wooden shoes.

The fact is that the Netherlands is now a highly modern industrialized country and is becoming even more so every day. Increased industrial vision is a major objective of the government. Hand in hand with this goes the intensification of trade; this, of course, is not new, since the Netherlands has been a great trading nation for centuries. But, even so, the government is making tremendous efforts in this field.

In the past, Dutch industry was a byproduct of Dutch trade—because Dutch ships plowed all the oceans of the world in the late 16th and early 17th centuries. One result was the importation of raw materials and the exportation of products made from them. But now, it is the tail that wags the dog. Dutch shipping is stimulated by industry's demand. Both are still growing, hand in hand.

Dutch industry is making enormous strides, particularly in the most modern techniques—electronics and the latest applications of chemistry.

As in most industrialized countries, there has been a steady internal flow of the population from sparsely inhabited areas to those already congested. From the northeast and the southwest, there has been a drain toward Amsterdam, The Hague, and Rotterdam. This has usually been caused by a lack of jobs in the outlying regions. For instance, in the country around Emmen, in the northeast, the chief occupation was traditionally peat cutting, but now nobody burns peat; so Emmen was left without means of support.

Its workers drifted off to the factories and construction projects in the more prosperous centers—and Emmen became a "dying city." It was down to 5,000 or 6,000 inhabitants when, with Government encouragement, AKU (ENKA) set up a synthetic fiber factory. This was followed by other plants, with the result that Emmen is now a flourishing city, boasting 70,000.

In creating new centers of employment, we are not trying to provide more jobs but simply to redistribute the labor force. The Netherlands is not beset by unemployment but by overemployment. This is a considerable asset in the task of modernizing our industries.

Automation does not meet with opposition, because it relieves the tight labor market. Many factories have, therefore, been able to go far in automation.

To this progress a magnificent stroke of good fortune has been added: the recent discovery of vast deposits of natural gas, conveniently located in the hitherto industrial, little-developed, north. Lack of energy sources has been one of this country's handicaps until this discovery. The boost given to Dutch economy by natural gas will aid greatly toward the present conversion of the Netherlands into one of the strongest industrial countries of Europe.

Our progress and the extent of our change is best shown by the story of Rotterdam.

Twenty years ago, Rotterdam was a flattened wasteland, razed to the ground by a German air attack. Today, it is the world's largest port.

For several years it has been playing a game of leapfrog with New York for first place. But today, on the basis of tonnage of oceangoing cargoes handled (as good a measuring rod as any), it is definitely ahead.

Furthermore, the perennial argument about which port is leading, seems about to be settled for good in Rotterdam's favor, by works now in progress which New York is geographically in no position to match.

In 1963, the last year for which complete figures are available, the world's four largest ports, on the basis of sea cargoes handled, ranked thus in millions of metric tons: Rot-

terdam, 103; New York, 92; London, 61; Antwerp, 46.

Figures for the first 7 months of 1964 permit an estimate; and when these are completed, it will be found that Rotterdam will have handled between 110 and 120 million tons of cargo in that year.

More than one-third of the international Rhine fleet belongs to Rotterdam. The Netherlands owns the largest Rhine fleet of any nation (and the largest inland waterways fleet of all Europe), though it is comparatively less strong than before the war, when our country had more Rhine tonnage than all the other nations put together.

But the relative position has moved the other way for ocean cargoes. Before the war, the Netherlands' share of cargoes handled was 32 percent of that of the rest of Europe. Today it is 50 percent.

The reason why Rotterdam may feel confident that she has definitely won the race with New York is that she has a tremendous development well on the way: the Europort. This is an extension of her present harbor all along the 20 miles that separate the city from the sea—and at its tip, even out into the sea. There, new land is being reclaimed, across the New Waterway from the Hook of Holland, where passenger boats from England land.

Europort can now service tankers up to 85,000 tons; it will be able to take 100,000-tonners shortly, and when the Japanese turn out their tankers of 150,000 tons (and perhaps 200,000), Europort expects to be ready for them.

Europort is conceived of as a combination: port and industrial areas, that is. It will be open to factories, refineries and similar installations for which close access to sea communications is important.

One area is planned for steel furnaces, and its basins will be specially equipped for unloading ore, and coal carriers and taking away finished products. The oil section is already studded with immense storage tanks.

Some companies will put refineries next to them; others will use Rotterdam as the starting point for pipelines running thousands of miles across Europe. Among American concerns, Caltex, Esso, Tidewater and Gulf are already installed in Europort.

It will probably be 20 years before the blueprints for Europort have all taken physical form, but with a steadily expanding and an ever more productive hinterland, Rotterdam has no fears about looking that far into the future. The hinterland, indeed, has become practically all of Europe.

Rotterdam is a port with a city attached to it. New York is a city with a port attached to it.

After you have heard all this—that is, if you had the patience to stay with me—one conclusion should be arrived at:

Holland today is more than a country of windmills, tulips, cheese and wooden shoes. It is a country that is up to date, just as advanced as the United States, but with its own charming pecularities—a country worth visiting—a country to do business with.

Commencement Address at West Virginia State College by the Honorable Dr. P. K. Banerjee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, the Honorable Dr. P. K. Banerjee, Minister, Embassy of India, delivered the commencement address at West Virginia State College at Institute, W. Va. At the same time, Dr. Banerjee was awarded the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws by West Virginia State College.

I include under unanimous consent the text of Dr. Banerjee's provocative commencement address:

EXISTENCE THROUGH COEXISTENCE

(Commencement address by the Honorable Dr. P. K. Banerjee, Minister, Embassy of India, at West Virginia State College, Institute, W. Va., May 29, 1965)

I am deeply grateful to you for having honored my country by inviting me to give the commencement address, this morning, to the 1965 graduates of West Virginia State College. I feel doubly honored to have received the honorary degree of doctor of laws and I am proud to call myself an alumnus. I shall treasure this honor, as it will always remain a source of inspiration to me and serve as a symbol of my visit and association with this great center of learning—a living laboratory of human relations. This is indeed a unique temple of knowledge and truth where the philosophy of integration in reverse has been proved to be a living reality, leading to increased opportunity and understanding for all citizens of this great country irrespective of race, color, class and religion.

You have given a new dimension to the dignity of man in this beautiful mountain State. There is a perfect blend between man's spirit and Nature's gifts. It is, therefore, quite natural that you should have the cardinal as the State bird, the black bear to represent your rugged individualism, and glowing blaze of rhododendron to symbolize your love for beauty. Your soaring idealism is typified by the tall and stately sugar maple trees. The world today needs your pioneering determination based on human values and aspirations.

I will also take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation for the warm welcome and generous facilities you gave to many Indian scholars and students who came to receive advanced education and training in this institution. This is further evidence to show that your institution reaches out, across the many seas, to share common experiences in order to help other countries to solve their problems. About 2 years ago, President Wallace visited my country along with a group of well-known American educationists. His visit not only made a valuable contribution in India, but also strengthened ties of friendship and understanding and brought closer thereby the two largest democracies in the world.

Last year, this distinguished gathering was addressed by a great jurist, statesman, and humanist, U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. It is a great privilege for me to follow his footsteps.

I wish to speak today on a subject of immediate importance to the survival of mankind. In conquering the atom, man has, perhaps, also conquered intolerance. In the nuclear age, in order to live, we have to let live, to survive, we have to suffer ephemeral ideas, to exist, we have to coexist. Let me say a few words on the importance of coexistence.

The world today is united in sentiment but divided in ideas. Save for the present Communist Chinese leaders, we share a common anxiety for survival. The signing of the test ban treaty, though inadequate and incomplete in terms of ultimate objective, is a great testimony to man's hopes and aspirations. Mankind has taken the first step on the long and treacherous road to survival.

Neither nations nor statesmen subscribe to a single ideal as they traverse this unmarked and uncharted road. This need not unnerve us. Man's dilemmas cannot be measured in terms of mathematical calculations. The division of ideas is perhaps a healthy sign displaying the vitality of the spirit.

An educational institution is essentially an agent of unification. You unify not by suppressing or regimenting other ideas but by expounding them. You thus encompass the intellectual tradition of all mankind. You do not deride what you do not understand, or reject what you do not recognize. You know that knowledge has no limits, no nationality, and no prejudice. You naturally seek to uphold the academic heritage of universality. Mahatma Gandhi spoke of this concept when he said: "I do not want my house to be walled in on all sides, my windows to be stuffed. I want the cultures of all lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible. But I refuse to be blown off my feet by any. Mine is not a religion of the prison house. It has room for the least of God's creations, but it is proof against insolent pride of race, religion, or color."

It is easier for us to comprehend that ignorance is a painless vice. Much of our misery emanates from the lack of knowledge of the essential conditioning factors of life. Man is a blend of good and evil. As Prime Minister Nehru put it: "Whatever gods there be, there is something godlike in man, as there is also something of the Devil in him." The sphinx that stands in Egypt symbolizes the humanity in man as well as the animal in him. Yet, man is malleable though not moulded, perfectible but not perfect. Man has to go a long way to convert facts into logic, free will into purpose, conscience into decision, individual morality into group ethic. There is still some essential lack, some vital element missing. Though he knows how to fly like a bird, swim like a fish, man has yet to learn how to live on earth. The triump of science in mastering outer space compares poorly with spiritual growth in man. Yet, man, pushed by some vital force, worships that invisible altar—some vague conception of a perfect man and a better world.

In building a better world there are two well-defined paths—democracy and communism. The former emphasizes the importance of the individual, the latter demands his sacrifice to the needs of the community. Democracy, as we know it assures the individual of his dignity and identity in the society he serves. Communism, on the other hand, sacrifices the individual's claim and hopes ultimately to curb the Devil in man to build a classless society. This simplistic division of ideologies into black and white, however, obscures the shades of grey in between. The complexities of life do not lend themselves to an easy classification. Only an immature mind, without the experiences and the responsibilities of the statesman, can envisage the issues strictly in ideological or moral terms. International relations are more than moral acrobatics—at least it should be so.

Being born and brought up in the Gandhian era, I cannot ignore the moral compulsions that motivate man's actions. But as a practicing diplomat, I agree with Lincoln that the Union must be saved. National interest as a guidepost to international relations is a practical necessity. Nevertheless, national interest alone, devoid of ethical values, would be like sailing a ship on a dark and rough sea without any lodestar as a guide. But our devotion to the lodestar of morality should not blind us to the necessity of steering the ship to avoid icebergs. National interest and morality should not act like the blades of a pair of scissors, each applying equal pressure in arriving at a decision affecting the security of a nation. It is fatal to seek shelter under the approbation of either.

All this has a greater meaning today. The development of nuclear energy has imposed upon us an obligation to rethink and recast our ways of settling international disputes through peaceful negotiation. The increas-

ing deadlines of nuclear weapons, which are becoming available to all nations, enhance the chances of a nuclear holocaust by accident or adventurism. India has, of her own volition, committed herself to a policy of employment of nuclear energy to peaceful purposes. As you are perhaps aware, India is one of the countries which is capable of exploding a nuclear device within a period of 12 to 18 months. After a vigorous debate in the largest democratic Parliament, India has decided against the manufacture of the bomb. We have done our duty in not adding to the threat of the destruction of mankind. We know that in a nuclear war there would be neither victors nor vanquished and the living could only envy the dead. Victory will be manifested only in death, darkness, and destruction. Peace, then, must be the summum bonum of international life. As President Johnson recently said, there are no losers in peace.

Aspiration is one thing, its achievement another. What appeals to one coterie appalls the other. In the ensuing cold war, hegemonial tension tends to be clothed in the ideological raiment. Upon this backdrop, each nation owes it to itself not to surrender its judgment to the high and the mighty but to work toward peace. Peace, unfortunately, is always accompanied by that unwanted guest—fear. Fear begets fear; trust begets trust. International interests can only be served in a climate of peace based on the bedrock of mutual respect and collaboration. We cannot build peace by preparing war. I want to emphasize, however, the relevance of deterrence as the fulcrum of foreign policy of a nation. We are too concious that weakness invite aggression. War—that organized engine of violence—cannot be discarded in the current context of human development. In this shrunken world, peace, like pregnancy, cannot be partial. Nonetheless, we have to labor to abolish war as an instrument of policy. This can be achieved by building peace in piecemeal, which would be a working peace and not a protected peace.

Peace today has a new dimension. It includes international cooperation: From the spraying of DDT to the building of nuclear reactors. Diplomacy, too, has acquired new tools. Every embassy all over the globe maintains an information department to influence, to educate, and to enlighten the people. The art of putting one's best foot forward or allowing oneself to be photographed from the right angle, involves a myriad of trivial actions, which in themselves are unimportant, but which go a long way to win the battle for the minds of men.

Diplomacy alone, however, cannot arrest a worsening situation. It is only a cutting edge of the public opinion. Modern communications have pierced the stone wall of sovereignty. Minor incidents of local import assume international importance. This affects the projection of the image of a nation. Each nation has to be watchful not to fan the flames of cold war. Public opinion within a country should be directed and channelized to foster the forces of peace. In protecting the national interest, a nation should also serve international interests. Each nation should strive to serve the cause of peace.

In this drama, the individual, too, can play a meaningful role. Modern civilization is accompanied by centralization of authority and concentration of power at the cost of freedom of the individual. In a sense this is inevitable as the modern world cannot function without considerable centralization. In this process, authority corrodes individual freedom to such an extreme that it almost destroys it. The groups that hold power on behalf of the state tend to encourage this. Different and sometimes hostile ideologies, from their point of view, also encourage the accumulation of power in the state or in a group. This would ultimately result in human unhappiness and decay of that creative genius which is so essential to the growth of humanity.

The individual must strive to understand other cultures. The follies, crimes, and massacres of history are the results of the surrender of individual freedom to the custody of the crowd. Some leaders anesthetized the public mind until their followers ceased to feel responsible for their actions. The people became bundles of prejudices and enmities resulting from narrow loyalties. Many times ignorance was mistaken for stupidity, paganism for barbarity, inertia for sloth, a difference in ethical standards for deceitfulness. This curtain of ignorance can be lifted if people try to learn more about each other through personal contacts and tolerance. Human relations could and should surmount the sanctuary of sovereignty.

In raising hosannas for peace, tolerance is really a gravid factor. Coming as I do from a social and cultural milieu that preaches and practices tolerance, I am capable of recognizing the existence of an unorthodox idea which may be unacceptable to me. I could even debate it without sacrificing my own convictions. That is because India, through centuries of continued history, never sought to impose her ideas on others. She accepted other cultures sometimes spontaneously, sometimes by compulsion but she assimilated and blended them into one, which is Indian culture. India had no crusades until Islam and Christianity arrived on her soil. Earlier reform movements like Buddhism and Jainism were assimilated into Hinduism. The god-intoxicated India, paradoxically, even accepts atheists into its fold. India has a secular tradition, which juxtaposes opposing ideologies.

To appreciate a viewpoint is not to applaud it. The complexities of life cannot be clearly comprehended unless we understand the diversities of life. Diversity is the natural law. No two trees, no two climes, no two dawns, no two fingerprints are identical. As President Kennedy eloquently put it. "Let us not be blind to our differences—but let us direct attention to our common interests and the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help to make the world safe for diversity." President Johnson, too, placed before his people the ideal of a world without war, a world made safe for diversity, in which all men, goods, and ideas can freely move across every border and boundary. Diversity, let us admit, need not be divisive or even destructive. On the other hand, different cultures, which have never been exposed, could be coalesced to form a unique unifying force binding all men together.

We should not, therefore, resign ourselves to the march of time or act as if mankind is a prisoner of drift, but we should behave like creative responsible nations. "The greatness of a nation is to be measured not by its material power or wealth, but by the quality of its people." The Great Society that President Johnson dreams of "asks not only how much but how good; not only how to create wealth, but how to use it, not only how fast we are going but where are we headed. It proposes the first test for a nation the quality of its people." You, as the educated elite, are required to draw up the plans for the future and sell it to the world. As pioneers in the promotion of peace, you will be accepting a challenge. The burden will be yours, so will be the glory. In this year of international cooperation you could gainfully emphasize what unites rather than what divides us.

Prime Minister Nehru, who originally propounded this idea of International Cooperation Year, in a speech at the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1961, thought we should direct our attention to cooperative ventures, especially for peace and in the interest of peace. The idea of cooperation, he admitted, would not solve the problems of the day, "but it will lessen this destruction and conflict which now afflict the world." He pleaded for a new way of thinking, a new attitude too and development of humanity.

We have to develop a positive attitude in thinking that the world today needs more emphasis on cooperation and not on conflict. If we cannot have peace at once, we can have peace by pieces by extending the existing ventures in functional cooperation. Even when we have enough explosions—bombs, babies, and bulldozers—to combat, let us turn the tide. It is always better to argue, to count votes rather than wars, for out of the clash of ideas truth emerges, embellished and anointed in the process. We shall plan a world ushering promise of future happiness, free from ugliness and misery that surrounds us, where diversity may flourish, freedom may prosper, men and nations may compete with each other peacefully. The essential conditions of existence demand coexistence and that liberty live with the forces opposed to it. But, let us not forget that freedom, like virtue, cannot live in isolation.

Poet Rabindranath Tagore sang of the glory of freedom in these words:

"Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
Where knowledge is free;
Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;
Where words come out from the depth of truth;
Where then mind is led forward by thee into ever-widening thought and action
Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country awake."

Support for Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, regretfully, the easiest way to obtain national publicity today is to stage a demonstration.

Take the following ingredients: A crowd of people, a 3-day growth of beard, a few two-by-fours, posters, and paint. Put them all together, march them by the Pentagon, and presto—instant TV coverage.

Recently, I received a letter from a young constituent in my district who, I believe, represents the majority view in the United States. He is not a demonstrator, but a young man who uses the force of reason to support his view.

Following is a letter from David M. Powell, of Springfield, Mo., a young high school student:

SPRINGFIELD, MO.,
June 7, 1965.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Recently, my sense of Americanism was aroused by the meeting, in Washington, D.C., of 3,000 college students and professors. They were representing the minority which protests U.S. involvement in Vietnam. They were demanding the withdrawal of U.S. troops thus advocating isolationism.

These people, though they be a minority, are being listened to by Congress and the

administration because the majority is saying nothing to back up its belief. I have taken on the responsibility of representing the majority.

I am firmly against any withdrawal of any troops from Vietnam. If any action is to be taken it should be a stepped up offensive on the ground to flush out all guerrillas south of the 17th parallel.

It must be proven to the administration that the American people do support this particular facet of Vietnam policy. Sir, you can provide this proof by speaking to your colleagues, in the House, about what I have mentioned in the above. This would demonstrate to the administration that the American people are behind them.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. POWELL,
A Concerned Portion of America's Future Leaders.

Megalopolis: The Challenge for Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Thomas F. Richardson, president of the Fairfield County Trust Co., Stamford, Conn.

As Mr. Richardson points out, Connecticut is on the threshold of a population explosion and needs to take coordinated action in both the public and private sectors to avoid being overwhelmed by growth. I know my colleagues will be interested, since it is a problem that will become increasingly important throughout the Nation.

The article follows:

[From the American Banker, Apr. 29, 1965]

MEGALOPOLIS: THE CHALLENGE FOR CONNECTICUT

(By Thomas F. Richardson, president, the Fairfield County Trust Co., Stamford, Conn.)

Early this month the little Greek seaport town of Megalopolis was torn by a violent, rolling earthquake. Megalopolis, halfway between ancient Sparta and ancient Olympia, gets its name from the Greek words "megalon" or great and "polis" or city. It was built originally to protect Arcadia from Spartan invasion, and was envisioned as a giant, spread city on the Ionian seacoast.

THE AMERICAN MEGALOPOLIS

The shocks and rents which recently devastated ancient Megalopolis could be a prophetic warning to 20th century America. Demographers and city planners have described a modern megalopolis on our Atlantic shore. Streching from Portland, Maine, to Norfolk, Va., is a spread city of 41 million people, 21 percent of the Nation's population. Composed of some 65,000 square miles, the complex is a system of urban development made up of roads, people, and buildings which has coalesced over the years into an almost continuous chain of urban spread nearly 600 miles in length.

The 11-State region boasts not only one-fifth of America's population, but also 23 percent of its retail sales and 25 percent of the country's disposable income. The American megalopolis is a growing area, dynamic with activity and extending its influence into every corner of the globe. Rapid and widespread change is the rule—orderly adjustment the exception.

The region is characterized also by close similarities and violent contrasts. The area's wealth is contrasted to some of the Nation's worst poverty pockets. Nestled snugly against its giant, central cities are suburban towns. Megalopolitan regions of high employment are often close by tracts of high unemployment. And while our Atlantic megalopolis is the acknowledged information and communications center for the world, it is also plagued by some of this Nation's most congested highways.

The average density of megalopolis numbers just under 800 inhabitants per square mile. But Manhattan Island strains under the pressure of 78,000 to the square mile, while neighboring Sherman, Conn.—a quick 50 miles away—can count only 39 people to the mile.

CONNECTICUT AND THE PEOPLE GLACIER

In the heart of American megalopolis lies the State of Connecticut, bridging the gap between the rest of New England and New York City. In this geographical setting, Connecticut faces the challenge of a projected population growth more rapid than a majority of the other States in the Union. And the Nutmeg State's population explosion will compound existing problems for both Connecticut and its neighbors.

Rumbling into Connecticut with immutable force is a thundering population avalanche * * * a people-glacier. Connecticut's 2½ million persons in 1960 represented the growth of 300 years. It took three centuries for Connecticut to build up to 2½ million people. By the year 2000, it will have all happened again. In a short 35 years the State's population will bulge to 5 million.

James S. Klar of the Connecticut Development Commission admonished last year: "Contemplate all of the schools, houses, highways, churches, and public buildings that we have today, then think about doubling the whole thing within the next 36 years. And just to make your contemplation a little more interesting, think of doubling within 36 years the results of three centuries—without a coordinated plan."

AN INTENSIFICATION OF PROBLEMS

In the final decade of this century, about 100,000 new Connecticut babies will be born annually, doubling the 50,850 births for each year during the 1950–60 decade. With a projected decline in the death rate from the current 1.06 percent to just 1 percent, the average number of births over deaths each year will increase from approximately 30,000 today to 57,000 during the 1990–2000 decade. In addition, each year in the final decade of the century, about 26,500 more persons will enter the State to live than will leave for residence elsewhere.

The doubling of Connecticut's population may occur intermittently in the next few decades or the increase may be evenly spread over the years. In either case there will be an intensification of problems.

TREASURED VALUES

Already the environment shows an evidence of losing some of its treasured values because of the haphazard building of housing developments, poorly located businesses, roads, industries, and other elements of intensive urban development. Coupled with environmental challenges are the complications of land use. In recent years the character of residential, commercial, and industrial building has been horizontal in construction, and open land is rapidly disappearing. But land is a fixed quantity, and there is no frontier on which to move. Judicious land use for residential building, commercial and industrial construction, and recreational needs is essential.

A fast growing population has accelerated the intensification and expansion of development within the central valley and along the western coastal portion of the State. And future population growth is expected to compound the existing problems of these regions with greater intensity than other portions of the State.

THE TIME IS NOW

The people of Connecticut have been just about able to cope with all the problems of past growth and development. But many difficulties are now in their infancy stages ready to ferment, then to burst into staggering problems as they become further aggravated by population expansion.

Today, there is much concern with pollution in Connecticut waters. The obtaining of space on a salt water beach or fresh water lake under the summer sun is increasingly difficult. Taxes continue to rise as rural town governments, wrestling with problems of double sessions in schools, poorly maintained streets and trash accumulation, struggle to keep pace with demands. Additional population can do nothing but intensify these and other problems unless steps are taken to prepare for tomorrow's population. Connecticut residents must begin to think now of ways to accommodate and cope with the inevitable onslaught of additional persons.

THE "CITY OF CONNECTICUT"

By the end of the century, 98 percent of Connecticut's people will live in urban centers of 10,000 or more. The population explosion—today's 2½ million is almost triple that of 1900—may qualify our State by century's end to be known as the city of Connecticut.

FACING UP TO THE FUTURE

In a bold and farsighted action program, Connecticut's State government is facing up to the future. A State interregional planning program was initiated by the State's development commission in 1960. It was developed to assist Connecticut's regional planning agencies and to insure the compatibility of regional plans with one another and with State goals and responsibilities.

During the 1960–63 period, the Connecticut Development Commission, through the Connecticut interregional planning program and with the assistance of other State agencies and regional planning agencies, completed basic inventory studies at the Statewide and regional levels. During the conduct of these studies it became clear that a close integration of long-range planning activity was needed in order to establish a more comprehensive approach regarding the future growth and development of the State.

INTEGRATED PLANNING

To achieve this, initially three agencies of Connecticut State government—the Connecticut State Highway Department, the Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources, and the Connecticut Development Commission—undertook to integrate their long-range efforts by joint participation in the planning phase of the Connecticut interregional planning program. While these and other governmental agencies have involved themselves for many years with long-range planning, their joint approach to Connecticut's future is a recent cooperative effort to insure the most productive achievements.

The integrated planning phase began in October 1963, and is scheduled to be completed by the middle of 1966. Through this program there will be introduced into State government an integrated, comprehensive and long-range planning process for anticipating and meeting the challenges of future development.

While the Nation's population expands from 192 million in the last census to over 300 million by the end of the century, Connecticut will be doubling its population in the next 35 years.

THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS

If the private and public sectors in Connecticut join in a coordinated effort and are enterprising in their actions, the year 2000 will find a robust State which enriches and rewards its people. Should we fail, the "city of Connecticut" may suffer the earthquake effects which recently rocked ancient Megalopolis.

Commencement Speech—Congressman Samuel L. Devine, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1965, our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, SAMUEL L. DEVINE, delivered a commencement address to the graduating class at Bexley High School, Columbus, Ohio.

When the high school graduate of today leaves school and considers the accomplishments of our age group, he could be somewhat confused about the meaning of "success." There are all sorts of temptations which glitter and give the appearance of success, but in the end, turn out to be misleading. Mr. DEVINE outlines the real meaning of the term and how one's own success is tied into the success of his country and his fellow man. I recommend it as solid reading and sound thinking for all of us:

SUCCESS—UNITED STATES—1965

Everyone in this stadium senses the relaxed and good feeling which you young people have as you are about to receive your diplomas. You have worked and studied for 4 long years and all of us in this fine gathering pay tribute to each of you, on the completion of a job well done.

Undoubtedly, each one of you has resolved to be successful. Indeed, such a resolution is natural and praiseworthy, provided that you have a proper understanding of success. Your education and training here at Bexley has thoroughly indoctrinated you that it is what you give, not what you get, that counts; you know that true success cannot be measured solely in the terms of financial reward or rank in life.

I am convinced that the basic, fundamental rules for true success, which can be measured only in terms of how effectively one serves his fellow man, remain unchanged from the beginning of time.

Repetition of basic rules—like the repetition of the Lord's Prayer, the Sermon on the Mount, the Bill of Rights, and the Pledge of Allegiance—adds to their meaning and significance—both to those who repeat them and to those who hear them again.

Every human being has a continuing need for love, affection, sympathy, and understanding; and true love spends itself in action. If you remember this in your daily dealing with the people with whom you associate in the years to come, you will attain and maintain a success more satisfying and more enduring than all the dollars in the world and passing prestige can ever bring to you.

Every worthwhile vocation and avocation in life serves some human need. The clergy serves the sinless and the sinful; the husband and wife comfort each other and their children; the doctor attends and cures the sick; the lawyer instructs and counsels to maintain justice; the businessman, the chemist, the clerk, the laborer and the skilled mechanic each in his own way contributes to the physical and spiritual needs of his neighbors.

My only reservation about the future is a prayer—that your generation, and future generations will accept and use the amazing scientific, medical, and other great benefits available, as gifts from God, and shall be ever mindful that it is only by and through Him that these benefits belong to us.

If you hope for success, you must perspire freely and often. There is no substitute for industry and hard work. You can see that I agree wholly with Thomas Edison that genius represents 1 percent inspiration and 99 percent perspiration.

In my opinion, an absolute essential for true success is integrity of desire, purpose, and action. Honesty is not only the best policy but the only safe policy; and that means not only honesty with others but also honesty with one's self.

Without exception, the people whom I have found the most widely respected and genuinely admired are those whose motives are beyond reproach as to truth and veracity; even when others violently disagree with their decisions and conclusions. Honesty not only creates and maintains and unimpeachable reputation, but its rewards are enduring beyond the measurement of time and material value. As success begets success, honesty begets honesty from others. Sam Rayburn, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, often said, "As long as you tell the truth, you don't have to remember what you said."

Successful people also have a passion for loyalty. They are loyal to God, to church, to country, to their families, to their associates, and the causes they espouse. Loyalty is a priceless ingredient of true success.

Successful people have an affinity for perseverence, stick-to-it-iveness; the so-called never-say-die spirit. Too many people quit too seen. Too many people tire before they reach the finish line. Too many people discourage too easily; and discouragement breeds pessimism—a mortal obstacle to success. Too many people lack that extra bit of faith in God, in themselves, in their fellow man and in their cause.

You have to be an optimist and to learn to laugh at yourself, and enjoy it. People avoid the pessimist and the sourpuss like the plague, and since you must live and work with people to achieve success, you just have to learn to be attractive to people and to get along with them.

As "Boss" Kettering, of Dayton, once said, "Concern yourself with the future, because that is where you are going to spend the rest of your life."

A great deterrent to success is fear of the future and for one's personal security.

There is rather general agreement today that probably the worst obstacle which your generation has placed in your own path is the increasing tendency of young people to concentrate on personal security. This concentration on security is particularly unfortunate in light of the infinite challenges, opportunities, and the new and great economic, industrial, social, and moral frontiers which are opening all over the world for the brave; for those who have the heart, mind, and will to conquer in order that all men everywhere will more effectively and justly know and serve each other. These opportunities and challenges are the legacies of my generation to you.

You might keep in your heart the words of the so-called lost prayer:

"O, God, give us serenity to accept what cannot be changed; courage to change what should be changed; and the wisdom to distinguish one from the other."

You must learn to recognize, accept, and discharge responsibility. This will require the making of decisions, sometimes very hard and difficult ones; but make them you must, if you are to succeed. Be sure of your facts; test them against truth and morals, then make your decision sharply and clearly. You won't be right all the time, but you will be most of the time; and the indecisive person, even when he is right, is most often too late.

Be curious, inquisitive, and a good listener. As the old adage goes, "You never learn anything with your mouth open."

Improve your ability to communicate your thoughts and actions to others. Most of the violent and costly controversies are basically nothing more than overheated misunderstandings, resulting almost entirely because the people involved just never understood—in most cases didn't even attempt to understand—each other's purposes and position. So make sure you understand the other fellow, and that he understands you—then, if he wants an argument, let him have one, but good.

Don't be depressed about your imperfections—we all have them—but be thankful for them. It isn't your accomplishments which are important but your mistakes. It is through your mistakes that you will learn to become more perfect, more resolute in virtue, and more tolerant of your fellow man. It is a fortunate person who knows his limitations; and how to use them in the achievement of real success in both his public and private life.

Be tolerant and kind to the less fortunate and find time to give help and comfort to these people. This is the silent phase of a successful life, but oftentimes the most effective way of serving one's fellow man.

Be a good citizen, and take an active interest in your local, State, and National governments. Become informed on the various phases of our laws and of our history. Vote, run for office, and take a position on local and national issues. Join a political party—be an active Democrat or Republican. Remember, politics is the science of government, and not something to be avoided. I firmly believe the strongest bulwark against any kind of "ism" in this country is the militant maintenance of a truly strong two-party system of government.

Have respect for duly constituted authority. Unquestionably, the evil root most responsible for the deterioration—yes, even the destruction—of every fallen government has been a breakdown in respect for authority.

In the last few weeks, you have heard a highly publicized and controversial civil rights leader recommend to his followers to break laws if they disagreed with them. Let me emphasize that this, in my opinion, is bad advice, which could well result in mobocracy and chaos. It is not the American way. Keep in mind, ours is a government of laws, not of men.

Follow the example of truly successful people. Example is one of life's most potent instructors. The best advice that I can give to you on this matter of example is to pattern your lives after your parents.

Almost without exception, your parents are true successes—the pure exemplification of love, sacrifice, tolerance, and charity. It is their example which most of you have imitated; which has culminated in this great occasion for you—and for them. You are dramatic proof of the vast importance of proper domestic training.

For whatever may be the efforts of this or any other school, the example set in the home is of vast influence in forming the characters of our future men and women. The characters of parents are constantly repeated in their children; and the acts of affection, discipline, industry, and self-control, which they daily exemplify, live and act when all else which may have been learned through the ear has long been forgotten.

So today, I know that each of you join me in a loving salute to your parents as successes in the truest and purest sense, and in a silent prayer that the example you shall set, and the image which you shall create, in your own homes, shall continue unbroken the rich heritage with which your fathers and mothers have endowed you.

I promise you young people that if you build your future upon the solid foundation of the education and self-discipline training which you have had here; and, if your conduct meets the rules and standards which I have suggested, you will achieve success in every sense, and also material rewards and happiness beyond your fondest dreams. But you must do it yourself. No one can or will do it for you.

Let me leave you with this thought:

"If you want your father to take care of you, that's paternalism.

"If you want your mother to take care of you, that's maternalism.

"If you want Uncle Sam to take care of you, that's socialism.

"If you want your comrades to take care of you, that's communism.

"But—if you want to take care of yourself, that's Americanism."

Thank you, and good luck.

The Real Alabama—Part XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the vigorous efforts of local government and the imagination and energy of Alabama's people have combined to produce many examples of economic development in our State.

An example has been the construction and operation of a papermill near the city of Jackson in Clarke County. To describe how this was done I call attention to the following article from the "Southern Pulp and Paper Manufacturer":

ALLIED PAPER'S NEW BLEACHED SULFATE PULPMILL PRODUCING HIGH QUALITY PULP IN ALABAMA

(By Jerry W. Waters and Vincent F. Waters)

The Allied Paper Corp. over the years has made coated and uncoated book and commercial printing papers through the extensive use of deinked pulp. The use of bleached deinked pulp in many grades of paper produces a number of desirable printing properties. In the past decade, however, printers requirements for both cleaner and brighter paper has limited the markets available to mills like Allied—the world's largest producer of bleached deinked pulp. Serious contamination of wastepaper by resin and rubber-based coatings, heat-set inks, plastics, etc., has become a fact of life in deinking and Allied Paper had to determine whether or not it was going to have its future exclusively tied to this type of raw material. After long and careful consideration, Allied decided to build a southern bleached kraft pulpmill which would process both hard and soft woods.

Site selection, design, and financing for the new mill were overwhelming problems for Allied's meager resources and even the uninitiated were quick to observe that if it could be done at all, it would have to be done differently. Allied has done just that.

FINANCING AND SITE SELECTION

The Industrial Development Board of the City of Jackson, Ala., financed the mill through the use of industrial revenue bonds and leased the mill (built to the specification and under the guidance of Allied) back to Allied. The lease runs for 20 years with an option to renew for 20 years. Allied needed both hard and softwood pulp and was naturally drawn to the South through its board chairman, Dr. Ward Harrison, and its pulp division president, J. D. Dailey, both of whom had had experience there.

Since southern hardwoods grow profusely in river bottoms, it is easy to see the logic in choosing a site at Jackson in Clarke County, Ala. Clarke County is bounded on the west by the Tombigbee River and on the east by the Alabama River. This makes available within a reasonable trucking distance a great quantity of hardwood from these river bottoms. Clarke County is 87½ percent timbered and even though there are some large sawmill and pulp company holdings there, a great deal of land is still held by private landowners. Pinelands are extensive and the rate of growth is better than average for the South.

The site of the mill at Jackson is situated on the Tombigbee River, a navigable stream (9-foot channel—to be increased to 12 feet), and has an average flow of about 26,260 cubic feet per second (1928–59) and a minimum flow of about 2,260 cubic feet per second (August 1959). That means that at the lowest possible river conditions, 1 million gallons of water passes the mill site every minute. Allied uses less than 12,500 gallons of water per minute so less than 1 percent of the river will flow through the mill when the river is at its lowest, and less than 0.1 percent when the river is at its average flow.

In choosing a millsite, Allied Paper was interested, in addition to the two main items of wood and water, in the people in the locality. An officer of the firm said "We took the people of the area on faith. We liked the people. They seemed to be anxious to have us build a mill in their area and already our faith in them has been confirmed. They are a friendly group, they actually wanted and needed the Allied Paper Corp. to come and build a mill to use their wood and give their citizens a good place to work."

CHOOSING A DESIGN

Since Allied's financial ability was limited, it was imperative that the mill be functional and low cost. A plan finally was evolved whereby no compromise would be made in the quality of the equipment but the mill would be compacted so as to make the smallest possible pipe runs, the smallest possible conduit runs, and at the same time make it easy to manage by having all operations close together. This in turn decreased the supervisory help required. In working on this, Allied Paper used the help of others. They carefully considered the problems with mill suppliers and consulting engineers. They had the basic ideas themselves but wanted to be sure that others were in agreement. Every place they turned, they found people in agreement with their ideas, and as a matter of fact, others urged them on. A great number of people think that the cost of building pulp and paper mills today is more than it should be. From the beginning, Allied worried about what they would do if they wanted to expand in several directions. Allied, however, decided that they would limit themselves to expansion in just one direction; thus the mill that they have built can be expanded best in only one way.

DESIGN FEATURES

The bleach plant-washer building is designed with the operating floor 38 feet above the ground. This gives approximately 30 feet of down leg for the vacuum washers. The ground floor of this building is utilized for shops and stores. The second floor of the building is used for offices for maintenance, engineering, production supervision, and for the technical laboratories. The second floor also contains a large conference room for meetings of production workers with their supervisors. The floor just below the operating floor is a pipe gallery and is open. The operating floor houses the deknotting, washing, screening, and bleaching systems.

A reactor-clarifier was selected for water purification. It was designed so the top part is used for water storage. This saves space and the cost of foundations for a storage tank. A traveling water screen was supplied by Rex Chainbelt.

Clarifiers in the causticizing plant also have the storage as the top part of the vessel containing the clarification equipment. This, too, has saved space, foundations, and the extra cost of equipment.

Tree length logs are debarked and chipped. Chips are stored outside with space available for 4 weeks supply.

The pulp drier uses conventional paper machine driers. Its enclosed hood is in effect the building housing the drier. This equipment was selected because of its simplicity of operation and because of the desire to be in a position to operate with 100 percent hardwood efficiently.

Tribute to Capt. Stanislaus Mlotkowski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, throughout our history, Americans of Polish descent have distinguished themselves in service to the Nation. On June 27, 1965, a celebration will be held at Fort Delaware, 42 miles below Philadelphia, in honor of another in a long tradition of Polish-American patriots, Capt. Stanislaus Mlotkowski, who commanded the artillery at the fortress during the Civil War.

Following is a resolution introduced in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives by Representatives John Pezak, Joshua Eilberg, Joseph A. Sullivan, of Philadelphia, and other distinguished members of the State legislature which pays fitting tribute to Captain Mlotkowski's achievement:

In the house of representatives, May 26, 1965, exactly 100 years ago the worst internal conflict in our country's history ended. The part Pennsylvania played in that conflict is commemorated in a number of ways. Still another event will be commemorated on June 27, 1965, when the memory of Capt. Stanislaus Mlotkowski, who commanded one of the finest artillery groups ever assembled in Pennsylvania, will be honored at Fort Delaware, located on Pea Patch Island in the Delaware River, 42 miles below Philadelphia.

After an unsuccessful revolution in his homeland, Stanislaus Mlotkowski left Poland, where he was born in 1827, and came to America. He settled in Philadelphia and earned his living as an artist with a brush and paints. He married a German girl named Dorothea Meinke on March 8, 1855, and by her had a boy and a girl.

At the beginning of the Civil War when military experience of any kind was at a premium, Mlotkowski was appointed an officer

of Independent Battery A, Light Artillery of Pennsylvania, organized in Philadelphia. When he reported for duty at Fort Delaware in the fall of 1861, Mlotkowski was raised to the rank of captain and his outfit became known as the Mlotkowski Battery.

Throughout the war, Captain Mlotkowski was stationed with his artillery company at Fort Delaware. Steamboats ran excursions from Philadelphia to this fortress so that the people of Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware could see how well protected they were. When Fort Delaware was made a prison camp in June 1863, Captain Mlotkowski and his company remained there not only to operate the guns in case of emergency but also to guard the prisoners of war.

Mlotkowski was quartered directly above the imprisoned Confederate officers and was noted for his kindness to them, often in the face of ridicule from fellow officers. His fairness, his respect for the rights of others, and determination to recognize the goodness of human beings were exemplary.

After the war, the Mlotkowskis was one of the Philadelphia families that became interested in the development of a seashore resort known as Egg Harbor City in New Jersey, and there the Polish captain who commanded the artillery of Fort Delaware died August 19, 1900.

He is indeed worthy of remembrance, and we owe it to the people of Polish descent in Pennsylvania to join with others from Delaware and New Jersey in recognizing Mlotkowski's past achievements: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the speaker of the house of representatives appoint members of this house who are of Polish extraction, and the chief clerk, Anthony J. Petrosky, to represent Pennsylvania in this year's celebration at Fort Delaware; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Tri-State Civil War Centennial Committee, the Council of Polish Societies in Delaware, the Fort Delaware Society, and John A. Kowalewski, the program chairman, 1205 Beech Street, Wilmington, Del.

John Pezak, Robert K. Hamilton, William J. Lederer, Stanley A. Meholchick, Joseph A. Sullivan, Henry John Jani, Frank Folaski, Joshua Eilberg, Alfonse Parlanti, James P. Ritten, Saul V. Fraub, Frank L. Malinjak, Max H. Homer, Peter Dumbauld, Walter H. Morley.

Governor Volpe Praises Civil Defense Advisory Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, we all know the vital need for our country to develop and maintain emergency plans to mobilize our Nation's resources in the event of a nuclear attack. I am proud that Massachusetts has taken the lead in providing a responsible and far-sighted approach to this problem. The distinguished Governor of my State, John A. Volpe, recently convened a resources management conference at which he addressed a meeting of 300 business executives who are working hard on 13 industrial task groups. Their commission is to develop emergency plans for industrial survival in the event of nuclear disaster or other natural catastrophes. I should like to pay tribute to Governor Volpe for his leadership in this matter so vital to our Nation's defense; to Director Allan R. Zenowitz of the Massachusetts Civil Defense Agency; and to the business executives of Massachusetts who have contributed their time and talents so willingly and effectively. Governor Volpe's address outlines so admirably the need for an effective civil defense effort that I take great pleasure in reprinting it in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. VOLPE, GOVERNOR, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE GOVERNOR'S SECOND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY, JUNE 8, 1965

(Full text of address by Gov. John A. Volpe, prepared for delivery on Tuesday, June 8, 1965, at luncheon meeting of the Governor's Second Resources Management Conference, George Sherman Union, Boston University.

(Following the speech the Governor is scheduled to award commissions to 300 business executives, members of 13 industrial task groups, now developing emergency plans for industrial survival in the event of nuclear disaster or other natural catastrophes.)

I take immense satisfaction in attending this very timely resources management conference by the State's resources management office in the Massachusetts Civil Defense Agency.

Together with Director Allan R. Zenowitz, I praise each of you task group members for the magnificent contribution of your time, executive ability, and advice.

Also, I am very pleased to welcome at this, their first meeting, members of our new civil defense advisory committee of outstanding civic and professional leaders, of which our distinguished General Needham is the chairman again. Another new chairman I am pleased to welcome today is a well-known business leader, Samuel M. Seegal, who now heads our economic stabilization board.

I hope your splendid example of public service will prompt many other businessmen to join the preparedness team.

It is a solemn honor for me to present you with your proud task group commissions.

For only a few days ago trigger-happy Red China, in total disregard of the test ban treaty, exploded a second nuclear device.

George Minot, alert Boston editor-columnist, called it the "most sobering, even scary event so far this year."

I warn that this explosion may have speeded up by years the dreadful count-down of acute atomic peril.

In such a growing crisis, including rapid Soviet long-range missile progress, your role becomes increasingly vital to the security of this densely populated, highly industrial State. You demonstrate that you believe General Bradley's grim forecast—and I quote—"The industrial capacity of the United States will be the first target of an A-bomb offensive."

Your decisions and your actions may mean the difference between survival and utter ruin, should global war engulf Massachusetts with all its horror and havoc. For your current mission is to advise me as Governor on the preparation of plans for the mobilization and management of Massachusetts resources in the event of enemy attack.

It is a military axiom that after the first mutual atomic blows are exchanged, the nation that first gets back on its industrial feet wins the war. In large measure that crucial comeback is the goal of business.

I join you today as a Government official and a fellow businessman, who talks your language and shares your views.

Because of my years in the construction industry, I bank on the talent, know-how, and drive of American business and labor, in cooperation with Government to cope with any severe emergency—including hurricane, flood, fire, or enemy action. As President Eisenhower's first Administrator of the 41,000-mile Interstate and Defense Highway System—and I emphasize the word defense—I know the necessity of keeping transportation operating in disaster, so as to bring first aid, food, and reconstruction materials.

From such a background I naturally appreciate the value of business action. It would be a betrayal of business tradition for any industrial executives to duck responsibility for learning about nuclear danger or to fail to set their own company house in readiness—before it is too late.

Our presence here today proves that you and I believe the late President Kennedy who said we live continually under a nuclear sword of Damocles.

We are acutely aware that in less than an hour an atomic avalanche could be poured on our exposed people and our industrial plants—with attending shock wave, thermal radiation, fallout, and chaos.

As clearheaded realists, you and I will not minimize the hazard. For example, the other day I looked up official estimates on battle deaths in all of America's wars—from Lexington Green to Korea. Approximately 500,000 were killed in action.

But think or it: Military experts estimate that, if Massachusetts is not properly organized for survival, a nuclear attack could surpass this total.

The copilot, whose plane dropped the world's first atomic bomb on Hiroshima, writing in his journal could only describe the frightful spectacle in two words of awesome wonder—"My God."

This single blow killed more than 90,000 victims. Modern thermonuclear weapons are many times more powerful. They are capable of a much more ghastly toll.

So you and I fervently pray that this curse of ultimate terror will never turn any part of Massachusetts into a charnel house of death—buried under radioactive cinders.

Terrible as are the possible effects of nuclear offensive, nevertheless, military experts strenuously maintain that if all of us concerned with national security do our work well, then—even in atomic attack—millions of Massachusetts people will be alive afterwards.

Huge geographical areas of our State could escape almost without a scratch. A badly shattered industrial system could be put back into business. Adequate preparedness can blunt the blow and hasten recovery.

That is our job. Yours and mine.

On the other hand, one of the most disturbing aspects of the situation is that the specter of atomic debacle appears so stupendous that the public too often shrinks from facing the awful truth. So do some of our fellow businessmen.

Others assume that the consequences are so terrible that no ruler will press the button. That is living in a fool's paradise. They forget recent unbelievable events. A few years back no one could imagine a beloved President shot down in cold blood. But he was. No one could dream that in modern civilization anyone would doom millions of helpless prisoners to murder ovens. Yet Hitler did.

Others assume that once calamity is on the wing nothing can be done for escape or recovery. Their senses are dulled into fatalistic attitude of absolutely unnecessary hopelessness—and they do nothing.

I warn you: the most deadly gesture of our atom-haunted times is not the shudder of fear but the shrug of indifference.

So today, I know that each of you join me in a loving salute to your parents as successes in the truest and purest sense, and in a silent prayer that the example you shall set, and the image which you shall create, in your own homes, shall continue unbroken the rich heritage with which your fathers and mothers have endowed you.

I promise you young people that if you build your future upon the solid foundation of the education and self-discipline training which you have had here; and, if your conduct meets the rules and standards which I have suggested, you will achieve success in every sense, and also material rewards and happiness beyond your fondest dreams. But you must do it yourself. No one can or will do it for you.

Let me leave you with this thought:

"If you want your father to take care of you, that's paternalism.

"If you want your mother to take care of you, that's maternalism.

"If you want Uncle Sam to take care of you, that's socialism.

"If you want your comrades to take care of you, that's communism.

"But—if you want to take care of yourself, that's Americanism."

Thank you, and good luck.

The Real Alabama—Part XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the vigorous efforts of local government and the imagination and energy of Alabama's people have combined to produce many examples of economic development in our State.

An example has been the construction and operation of a papermill near the city of Jackson in Clarke County. To describe how this was done I call attention to the following article from the "Southern Pulp and Paper Manufacturer":

ALLIED PAPER'S NEW BLEACHED SULFATE PULPMILL PRODUCING HIGH QUALITY PULP IN ALABAMA

(By Jerry W. Waters and Vincent F. Waters)

The Allied Paper Corp. over the years has made coated and uncoated book and commercial printing papers through the extensive use of deinked pulp. The use of bleached deinked pulp in many grades of paper produces a number of desirable printing properties. In the past decade, however, printers requirements for both cleaner and brighter paper has limited the markets available to mills like Allied—the world's largest producer of bleached deinked pulp. Serious contamination of wastepaper by resin and rubber-based coatings, heat-set inks, plastics, etc., has become a fact of life in deinking and Allied Paper had to determine whether or not it was going to have its future exclusively tied to this type of raw material. After long and careful consideration, Allied decided to build a southern bleached kraft pulpmill which would process both hard and soft woods.

Site selection, design, and financing for the new mill were overwhelming problems for Allied's meager resources and even the uninitiated were quick to observe that if it could be done at all, it would have to be done differently. Allied has done just that.

FINANCING AND SITE SELECTION

The Industrial Development Board of the City of Jackson, Ala., financed the mill through the use of industrial revenue bonds and leased the mill (built to the specification and under the guidance of Allied) back to Allied. The lease runs for 20 years with an option to renew for 20 years. Allied needed both hard and softwood pulp and was naturally drawn to the South through its board chairman, Dr. Ward Harrison, and its pulp division president, J. D. Dailey, both of whom had had experience there.

Since southern hardwoods grow profusely in river bottoms, it is easy to see the logic in choosing a site at Jackson in Clarke County, Ala. Clarke County is bounded on the west by the Tombigbee River and on the east by the Alabama River. This makes available within a reasonable trucking distance a great quantity of hardwood from these river bottoms. Clarke County is 87½ percent timbered and even though there are some large sawmill and pulp company holdings there, a great deal of land is still held by private landowners. Pinelands are extensive and the rate of growth is better than average for the South.

The site of the mill at Jackson is situated on the Tombigbee River, a navigable stream (9-foot channel—to be increased to 12 feet), and has an average flow of about 26,260 cubic feet per second (1928–59) and a minimum flow of about 2,260 cubic feet per second (August 1959). That means that at the lowest possible river conditions, 1 million gallons of water passes the mill site every minute. Allied uses less than 12,500 gallons of water per minute so less than 1 percent of the river will flow through the mill when the river is at its lowest, and less than 0.1 percent when the river is at its average flow.

In choosing a millsite, Allied Paper was interested, in addition to the two main items of wood and water, in the people in the locality. An officer of the firm said "We took the people of the area on faith. We liked the people. They seemed to be anxious to have us build a mill in their area and already our faith in them has been confirmed. They are a friendly group, they actually wanted and needed the Allied Paper Corp. to come and build a mill to use their wood and give their citizens a good place to work."

CHOOSING A DESIGN

Since Allied's financial ability was limited, it was imperative that the mill be functional and low cost. A plan finally was evolved whereby no compromise would be made in the quality of the equipment but the mill would be compacted so as to make the smallest possible pipe runs, the smallest possible conduit runs, and at the same time make it easy to manage by having all operations close together. This in turn decreased the supervisory help required. In working on this, Allied Paper used the help of others. They carefully considered the problems with mill suppliers and consulting engineers. They had the basic ideas themselves but wanted to be sure that others were in agreement. Every place they turned, they found people in agreement with their ideas, and as a matter of fact, others urged them on. A great number of people think that the cost of building pulp and paper mills today is more than it should be. From the beginning, Allied worried about what they would do if they wanted to expand in several directions. Allied, however, decided that they would limit themselves to expansion in just one direction; thus the mill that they have built can be expanded best in only one way.

DESIGN FEATURES

The bleach plant-washer building is designed with the operating floor 38 feet above the ground. This gives approximately 30 feet of down leg for the vacuum washers. The ground floor of this building is utilized for shops and stores. The second floor of the building is used for offices for maintenance, engineering, production supervision, and for the technical laboratories. The second floor also contains a large conference room for meetings of production workers with their supervisors. The floor just below the operating floor is a pipe gallery and is open. The operating floor houses the deknotting, washing, screening, and bleaching systems.

A reactor-clarifier was selected for water purification. It was designed so the top part is used for water storage. This saves space and the cost of foundations for a storage tank. A traveling water screen was supplied by Rex Chainbelt.

Clarifiers in the causticizing plant also have the storage as the top part of the vessel containing the clarification equipment. This, too, has saved space, foundations, and the extra cost of equipment.

Tree length logs are debarked and chipped. Chips are stored outside with space available for 4 weeks supply.

The pulp drier uses conventional paper machine driers. Its enclosed hood is in effect the building housing the drier. This equipment was selected because of its simplicity of operation and because of the desire to be in a position to operate with 100 percent hardwood efficiently.

Tribute to Capt. Stanislaus Mlotkowski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, throughout our history, Americans of Polish descent have distinguished themselves in service to the Nation. On June 27, 1965, a celebration will be held at Fort Delaware, 42 miles below Philadelphia, in honor of another in a long tradition of Polish-American patriots, Capt. Stanislaus Mlotkowski, who commanded the artillery at the fortress during the Civil War.

Following is a resolution introduced in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives by Representatives John Pezak, Joshua Eilberg, Joseph A. Sullivan, of Philadelphia, and other distinguished members of the State legislature which pays fitting tribute to Captain Mlotkowski's achievement:

In the house of representatives, May 26, 1965, exactly 100 years ago the worst internal conflict in our country's history ended. The part Pennsylvania played in that conflict is commemorated in a number of ways. Still another event will be commemorated on June 27, 1965, when the memory of Capt. Stanislaus Mlotkowski, who commanded one of the finest artillery groups ever assembled in Pennsylvania, will be honored at Fort Delaware, located on Pea Patch Island in the Delaware River, 42 miles below Philadelphia.

After an unsuccessful revolution in his homeland, Stanislaus Mlotkowski left Poland, where he was born in 1827, and came to America. He settled in Philadelphia and earned his living as an artist with a brush and paints. He married a German girl named Dorothea Meinke on March 8, 1855, and by her had a boy and a girl.

At the beginning of the Civil War when military experience of any kind was at a premium, Mlotkowski was appointed an officer

of Independent Battery A, Light Artillery of Pennsylvania, organized in Philadelphia. When he reported for duty at Fort Delaware in the fall of 1861, Mlotkowski was raised to the rank of captain and his outfit became known as the Mlotkowski Battery.

Throughout the war, Captain Mlotkowski was stationed with his artillery company at Fort Delaware. Steamboats ran excursions from Philadelphia to this fortress so that the people of Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware could see how well protected they were. When Fort Delaware was made a prison camp in June 1862, Captain Mlotkowski and his company remained there not only to operate the guns in case of emergency but also to guard the prisoners of war.

Mlotkowski was quartered directly above the imprisoned Confederate officers and was noted for his kindness to them, often in the face of ridicule from fellow officers. His fairness, his respect for the rights of others, and determination to recognize the goodness of human beings were exemplary.

After the war, the Mlotkowskis was one of the Philadelphia families that became interested in the development of a seashore resort known as Egg Harbor City in New Jersey, and there the Polish captain who commanded the artillery of Fort Delaware died August 19, 1900.

He is indeed worthy of remembrance, and we owe it to the people of Polish descent in Pennsylvania to join with others from Delaware and New Jersey in recognizing Mlotkowski's past achievements: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the speaker of the house of representatives appoint members of this house who are of Polish extraction, and the chief clerk, Anthony J. Petrosky, to represent Pennsylvania in this year's celebration at Fort Delaware; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Tri-State Civil War Centennial Committee, the Council of Polish Societies in Delaware, the Fort Delaware Society, and John A. Kowalewski, the program chairman, 1205 Beech Street, Wilmington, Del.

John Pezak, Robert K. Hamilton, William J. Lederer, Stanley A. Meholchick, Joseph A. Sullivan, Henry John Jani, Frank Folaski, Joshua Eilberg, Alfonse Parlanti, James P. Ritten, Saul V. Fraub, Frank L. Malinjak, Max H. Homer, Peter Dumbauld, Walter H. Morley.

Governor Volpe Praises Civil Defense Advisory Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, we all know the vital need for our country to develop and maintain emergency plans to mobilize our Nation's resources in the event of a nuclear attack. I am proud that Massachusetts has taken the lead in providing a responsible and far-sighted approach to this problem. The distinguished Governor of my State, John A. Volpe, recently convened a resources management conference at which he addressed a meeting of 300 business executives who are working hard on 13 industrial task groups. Their commission is to develop emergency plans for industrial survival in the event of nuclear disaster or other natural catastrophes. I should like to pay tribute to Governor Volpe for his leadership in this matter so vital to our Nation's defense; to Director Allan R. Zenowitz of the Massachusetts Civil Defense Agency; and to the business executives of Massachusetts who have contributed their time and talents so willingly and effectively. Governor Volpe's address outlines so admirably the need for an effective civil defense effort that I take great pleasure in reprinting it in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. VOLPE, GOVERNOR, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE GOVERNOR'S SECOND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY, JUNE 8, 1965

(Full text of address by Gov. John A. Volpe, prepared for delivery on Tuesday, June 8, 1965, at luncheon meeting of the Governor's Second Resources Management Conference, George Sherman Union, Boston University.

(Following the speech the Governor is scheduled to award commissions to 300 business executives, members of 13 industrial task groups, now developing emergency plans for industrial survival in the event of nuclear disaster or other natural catastrophes.)

I take immense satisfaction in attending this very timely resources management conference by the State's resources management office in the Massachusetts Civil Defense Agency.

Together with Director Allan R. Zenowitz, I praise each of you task group members for the magnificent contribution of your time, executive ability, and advice.

Also, I am very pleased to welcome at this, their first meeting, members of our new civil defense advisory committee of outstanding civic and professional leaders, of which our distinguished General Needham is the chairman again. Another new chairman I am pleased to welcome today is a well-known business leader, Samuel M. Seegal, who now heads our economic stabilization board.

I hope your splendid example of public service will prompt many other businessmen to join the preparedness team.

It is a solemn honor for me to present you with your proud task group commissions.

For only a few days ago trigger-happy Red China, in total disregard of the test ban treaty, exploded a second nuclear device.

George Minot, alert Boston editor-columnist, called it the "most sobering, even scary event so far this year."

I warn that this explosion may have speeded up by years the dreadful count-down of acute atomic peril.

In such a growing crisis, including rapid Soviet long-range missile progress, your role becomes increasingly vital to the security of this densely populated, highly industrial State. You demonstrate that you believe General Bradley's grim forecast—and I quote—"The industrial capacity of the United States will be the first target of an A-bomb offensive."

Your decisions and your actions may mean the difference between survival and utter ruin, should global war engulf Massachusetts with all its horror and havoc. For your current mission is to advise me as Governor on the preparation of plans for the mobilization and management of Massachusetts resources in the event of enemy attack.

It is a military axiom that after the first mutual atomic blows are exchanged, the nation that first gets back on its industrial feet wins the war. In large measure that crucial comeback is the goal of business.

I join you today as a Government official and a fellow businessman, who talks your language and shares your views.

Because of my years in the construction industry, I bank on the talent, know-how, and drive of American business and labor, in cooperation with Government to cope with any severe emergency—including hurricane, flood, fire, or enemy action. As President Eisenhower's first Administrator of the 41,000-mile Interstate and Defense Highway System—and I emphasize the word defense—I know the necessity of keeping transportation operating in disaster, so as to bring first aid, food, and reconstruction materials.

From such a background I naturally appreciate the value of business action. It would be a betrayal of business tradition for any industrial executives to duck responsibility for learning about nuclear danger or to fail to set their own company house in readiness—before it is too late.

Our presence here today proves that you and I believe the late President Kennedy who said we live continually under a nuclear sword of Damocles.

We are acutely aware that in less than an hour an atomic avalanche could be poured on our exposed people and our industrial plants—with attending shock wave, thermal radiation, fallout, and chaos.

As clearheaded realists, you and I will not minimize the hazard. For example, the other day I looked up official estimates on battle deaths in all of America's wars—from Lexington Green to Korea. Approximately 500,000 were killed in action.

But think or it: Military experts estimate that, if Massachusetts is not properly organized for survival, a nuclear attack could surpass this total.

The copilot, whose plane dropped the world's first atomic bomb on Hiroshima, writing in his journal could only describe the frightful spectacle in two words of awesome wonder—"My God."

This single blow killed more than 90,000 victims. Modern thermonuclear weapons are many times more powerful. They are capable of a much more ghastly toll.

So you and I fervently pray that this curse of ultimate terror will never turn any part of Massachusetts into a charnel house of death—buried under radioactive cinders.

Terrible as are the possible effects of nuclear offensive, nevertheless, military experts strenuously maintain that if all of us concerned with national security do our work well, then—even in atomic attack—millions of Massachusetts people will be alive afterwards.

Huge geographical areas of our State could escape almost without a scratch. A badly shattered industrial system could be put back into business. Adequate preparedness can blunt the blow and hasten recovery.

That is our job. Yours and mine.

On the other hand, one of the most disturbing aspects of the situation is that the specter of atomic debacle appears so stupendous that the public too often shrinks from facing the awful truth. So do some of our fellow businessmen.

Others assume that the consequences are so terrible that no ruler will press the button. That is living in a fool's paradise. They forget recent unbelievable events. A few years back no one could imagine a beloved President shot down in cold blood. But he was. No one could dream that in modern civilization anyone would doom millions of helpless prisoners to murder ovens. Yet Hitler did.

Others assume that once calamity is on the wing nothing can be done for escape or recovery. Their senses are dulled into fatalistic attitude of absolutely unnecessary hopelessness—and they do nothing.

I warn you: the most deadly gesture of our atom-haunted times is not the shudder of fear but the shrug of indifference.

History is filled with tragedies caused by indifference and ignorance and unbelief and neglect. These gaps resulted in dearth of safeguards and lack of preparedness. All of these disasters might have been prevented by adequate foresight and resolute forearming.

Because proper safety measures were not taken, 1,500 were drowned on the Titanic and close to 500 were burned to death in Boston's Cocoanut Grove fire.

Along the American frontier, Indians massacred settlers who neglected to build and man blockhouses. The Dutch, Danes, and Norwegians escaped World War I. Thereafter they lived in false hope that they would be forever free. They ignored building adequate defenses. Then Hitler struck "like a thief in the night"—slaughtering those unready neutrals.

Failure to recognize danger brought disaster. But almost every catastrophe can be diverted or lessened by adequate preparedness—and so can nuclear attack. I repeat, so can nuclear attack.

Your State government must try to organize for any emergency. With your help we shall. We must plan as best we can even though we cannot foresee the future with pinpoint accuracy. Every war is different from the last. Each had unique surprises that military intelligence failed to discover.

Unexpectedly the Kaiser's huge guns quickly pulverized the stout Belgian forts. Nazi V-2 rockets penetrated Britain's defense system. The "day of infamy" struck Pearl Harbor.

Yes, task groups and civil defense personnel plan for postnuclear attack. But all of us associated with Government must be ready for any other sneak punch. We must be on our toes for any gigantic force of nature on the rampage.

Who knows? Maybe accident or sabotage will trigger explosion. Maybe death-dealing missiles will reach their targets through outer space. Maybe eventually the bomb and its far-reaching fallout might be unleashed—not by Moscow but by Peiping. Maybe that bomb might be delivered by a Red Chinese ship off Boston Harbor.

Maybe terrible tornado, flood, earthquake, drought, fire, explosion, or other peacetime disaster might hit our State a staggering blow.

We must not be caught napping. We must prepare for all contingencies. We are trying to do that now at the State level—through all sorts of group studies, disaster drills, and realistic demonstrations at our civil defense agency headquarters in Framingham and our training academy in Topsfield. Other State agencies also are cooperating in emergency preparedness.

Your conference today on the management of resources is a very important part of that continuous alert. For it will further develop advice which you will give me on plans to regulate in war emergency the distribution and use of Massachusetts resources. Without such—confusion and chaos. With such—rescue and recovery.

In conclusion, let me hold up to you this ideal, expressed by the late Prof. Alfred North Whitehead of Harvard University.

"A great society," declared this famous teacher, "is a society in which its men of business think greatly of their functions."

Members of the task groups, that description fits you.

There is no greater business function today than to save Massachusetts from nuclear doom. There is no finer business service than to strengthen peace by increasing economic might.

For your leadership in these grand missions and in behalf of a grateful Commonwealth, I proudly award your commissions.

Federal Government and Delaware: Partners in Crime and Vice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the unhapy situation whereby the State of Delaware and the Federal Government are behind the scenes partners in the most infamous crime and vice. I refer to the refusal of the Federal Government and Delaware to recognize and regulate gambling, which refusal has kept gambling a fat, flush source of mob revenue.

If gambling were regulated by the Government, it would not be financing all shades of underworld activity as it now does. The actions of the Federal and State Governments in keeping gambling illegal are essential to crime's well-being.

Gambling is big business in racket-ridden Delaware. The Diamond State is a favorite jewel of the mob. In 1964, the Delaware parimutuel turnover exceeded $90 million, but this was only a small part of Delaware gambling. Total off-track betting amounts to $50 billion a year nationally, according to figures presented to the McClellan committee, and off-track betting represents only some 42 percent of total gambling, according to related testimony. This would put total illegal gambling in America at $120 billion a year, of which Delaware would have about $350 million, figuring the amount on a population basis. Bookies estimate that $4 or $5 are bet off-track for every dollar bet on track, so that a $350 million a year betting figure for Delaware is probably conservative. The mob keeps about 10 percent of this as profit. The $35 million per year mob rakeoff in the Blue Hen State is hardly chickenfeed.

At any rate, gambling is lucrative in Delaware—for the mob. It is the crooks and syndicated punks who are the big beneficiaries of gambling's illegal status. Illegal gambling profits are gangland's biggest revenue source. I am tired of seeing a pattern in State after State where the dual ignorance and dual negligence of the Federal and State Governments is keeping illegal gambling profits ripe for gang picking. This dual negligence makes these governments—in this instance Delaware and the Federal Government—partners in all the vice and crime these moneys are financing.

As far as I am concerned, the answer—or at least the best answer—is obvious. We need Government-run gambling to make the gambling urge work for the people, from Rehoboth to Wilmington, and similarly across the Nation. I urge this House to react to this crying need by giving favorable consideration to my plan for a national lottery.

Cracking the Federal Aid Whip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as a conservative I have always taken the position that Federal aid is analogous to Federal control. Such a statement can no longer be refuted by liberals who once sought to dress Government handouts in Santa Claus suits.

With each new Federal aid prgoram it is becoming increasingly evident that strings are attached. However, there is no longer an attempt to dispute conservative charges. Instead, the administration has adopted a bold "whip cracking" approach to make the States submit to stringent Federal controls.

I call the attention of my colleagues to a recent syndicated column by James J. Kilpatrick which documents my position:

CRACKING THE FEDERAL AID WHIP

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

For a good many years conservatives have been growling that "Federal aid means Federal control," and liberals have been snapping back that Federal aid means no such thing. You used to be able to work up a lively fight on the matter. No more. With every month that passes, it becomes increasingly evident that here, at least, the conservative warnings were sound.

President Johnson's May 26 message on highway beautification is the most recent example of the changing technique in action.

Johnson began with a lyric tribute to nature and beauty. The new concept of conservation, he said, must seek "to put beauty within reach of those who live in our cities, and make it a part of the daily life of every American."

In times past, he went on to say, Federal programs have sought to encourage the States to achieve beautification voluntarily. The voluntary approach hasn't worked. But if the States wouldn't do it for love, he would make them do it for money.

Therefore, I recommend that States—as a condition of receiving Federal-aid highway grants after January 1, 1968—institute control over outdoor advertising along those sections of the interstate and primary systems not zoned or used predominantly for commercial or industrial purposes * * *. Existing signs would have to be removed by July 1, 1970."

The same rule would apply to junkyards: "I recommend that as a condition of receiving Federal aid, States must exercise control along the entire interstate and primary systems. No new junkyards could be established within 1,000 feet of the pavement and visible to the motorist. Existing junkyards would have to be effectively screened or removed by July 1, 1970."

So, too, with Federal funds for landscaping. For some years the States have been permitted to use 3 percent of their Federal aid funds for beautification, but they have put the money to other highway purposes.

"Here is another case where a voluntary program was not sufficient to carry out the intent of Congress. Therefore, I propose that States be required to use the 3 percent for natural beauty."

This whip-cracking approach to highway beautification is being applied in countless other fields. Southern States especially are feeling the lash in the matter of Federal funds for aid to education. Under regulations promulgated by the U.S. Commissioner of Education—regulations that go far beyond the language of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—every county and city in the South is being compelled to file a desegregation plan or face the loss of Federal funds.

The same pattern emerges in various programs of Federal grants for urban renewal, public housing, and the like. In his housing message of March 2, the President outlined the picture:

"The Federal Government cannot, and should not, require the communities which make up a metropolitan area to cooperate against their will in the solution of their problems. But we can offer incentives."

It is true that some degree of Federal control historically has been exercised over Federal aid programs in the past. By and large, however, the controls have been gentle. State and local plans for "matching" programs generally have been approved in Washington without great quibbling. Often the potential Federal subsidies were not large, and State and local governments could pass them up, without particular pain.

All that is changing now. In one field after another, the lure of "Federal money" becomes overwhelming. It becomes politically impossible for local governing bodies to spurn a Federal grant. Too much money is involved.

Besides, State and local budgets are now heavily dependent upon subsidies from Washington. If these subsidies were abruptly canceled, as Johnson threatens in the case of highway funds, it would be nothing short of catastrophic. The States will do what "Big Daddy" demands.

For the past 30 years, since these programs of Federal aid really began to multiply, the States and cities have been nudged along by carrot and stick. Today the delectable carrot diminishes, and the Johnsonian stick gets longer all the time.

Volunteers for International Technical Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, when busy men and women give up their leisure time to assist others less fortunate than themselves, it is always worthy of notice. But when that helping hand is extended to all the peoples of the world, and when the contributors of time and service are scientists of the highest qualification, I believe that the Members of this House should learn more of a truly remarkable program.

I am proud to report that such an organization has been formed and has its headquarters in my district, in the city of Schenectady, N.Y. Started a little over 5 years ago, it is called Volunteers for International Technical Assistance. Perhaps more appropriately, it is commonly known by its initials—VITA, Latin for "life." VITA was conceived and organized by a group of scientists and engineers, most of them working at General Electric Co. in Schenectady or on the faculty of Union College there. Knowing that much of this Nation's strength rests on its technological know-how, and realizing that the underdeveloped nations of the world were greatly handicapped by their lack of technical knowledge, these men decided that the interests of humanity and of the United States required some step to make the great sources of knowledge in this country available to people in less fortunate lands. The result was VITA.

The plan of the organization is simplicity itself. Scientists and engineers agree to contribute their time and professional talents to solve technical problems originating in the less-developed countries, and they register their names, together with their areas of competence, with the Schenectady headquarters. Persons in other countries who have technical problems write to Schenectady, and there the problems are matched up with the names of the consulting scientists or engineers best qualified to provide a solution.

When VITA began 5 years ago it had a roster of about 50 scientists and engineers, most of them in Schenectady. Today it has more than 1,000 members, all of them highly qualified, living in 47 States and many foreign countries. VITA now has a number of specialized chapters—organized groups working together—in New York State, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, together—in Schenectady, Rochester, and Metropolitan New York; in New Holland, Pa., and Morgantown, W. Va.; in Detroit, Milwaukee, and Peoria; and in Los Angeles and Santa Barbara, Calif. In all, VITA has received more than 1,000 requests for assistance originating in more than 75 countries and territorial dependencies, including more than 500 from our Peace Corps volunteers abroad.

Let me tell you about some of those problems, to illustrate both the need that exists and the way in which VITA meets it. For a missionary in Peru, VITA designed a flashlight-powered filmstrip projector, and for a priest in Bolivia VITA provided advice on pumping water in the high Andes. For a Peace Corps volunteer in Bolivia an automotive engineer, working through VITA, designed a simple braking system which makes it safer to operate native carts on the mountain roads.

For an educational mission in Turkey, VITA provided advice on the local manufacture of chalk and blackboards. In a village in Guatemala a local poultry industry now flourishes, thanks to a gas-fired chick brooder designed by an American agronomist and a retired marine engineer working through VITA. In Sierra Leone in Africa stands a large school building, an American A-frame structure adapted to native construction methods by VITA engineers. In Jordan a cooperative farm now cans sediment-free grapejuice, thanks to the aid provided by a VITA food technologist. In the Congo Republic, the United Nations is testing an astonishing sun-powered stove designed by a VITA scientist and easily built largely from local materials at a cost of $3 per stove. And around the world many fieldworkers consult the two editions of the "Village Technology Handbook"—a collection of simple devices and advice, compiled by VITA out of its experience and distributed by the AID agency.

Most of VITA's financial support comes from private individuals and from corporations and foundations. I am pleased to note that the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and the Kettering Foundation have provided major support, as have such American corporations as the Mobil Oil Co., Johnson & Johnson, International Business Machines, and Detroit Edison Co. It is most proper that they should do so, for VITA springs from an ancient American tradition, which in an earlier, simpler day found its expression in such institutions as the barn raising, when individual citizens came together and worked long, hard hours for no reward more substantial than the knowledge that they had helped others. We have heard much in recent years of so-called people-to-people programs as something new in our relations with other nations. I submit that such programs are, in fact, only an extension into a new field of a characteristically American way of doing things—the combination of private individuals to accomplish broad purposes. And among such efforts, VITA must stand among the most inventive, the most exciting, and the finest.

Project Headstart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, most of us are familiar with Project Headstart. It is, in my opinion, one of the most worthwhile programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The concept of Project Headstart is indeed an excellent one. It strikes at the very heart of poverty and provides needed assistance at a most crucial time.

The program is designed to provide Federal assistance for local communities to organize and operate preschool programs for underprivileged children. These programs, which extend over a period of 8 weeks, involve intensified efforts to develop and improve the physical, mental, and social abilities of these children in order to prepare them for what might otherwise be a strange and frightening experience—their entrance into school.

Mr. Speaker, the May 20 edition of the Louisville Times carried an editorial headlined "For Deprived Children, a Chance." This editorial presents a cogent analysis and evaluation of Project Headstart and the problem it is designed to solve. It is an excellent editorial and I hope all of my colleagues will take the time to read it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FOR DEPRIVED CHILDREN, A CHANCE

Education, said Horace Mann, is "the great equalizer of the conditions of men * * * the balance wheel of the social machinery." So we have liked to think. But the wheel seems out of balance. Dismaying numbers of young people seem stubbornly to resist our best efforts at education. No informed person can believe this is due solely to inborn differences. It comports ill with our vision of the schoolhouse as the engine of democracy.

This disquieting failure probably accounts for the popularity of Project Headstart, the President's program to give preschool slum children a chance to put their best foot forward in the first grade. The Federal Government proposes to put selected preschool children in school for 8 weeks this summer, not to learn, but simply to get used to the place.

The scheme has obvious merits. Some of these youngsters, President Johnson said, "have never looked at a picture book or scribbled with a crayon." On a more practical plane, these young people will get useful medical screening. The Office of Economic Opportunity has developed stunning statistics on their physical needs. Three out of ten are partially deaf. One out of twenty has nutritional anemia. These basic indignities cry out for attention.

But it is easy to overestimate Project Headstart. Eight weeks cannot undo the damage done in 5 crucial years. The gap between these young people and the middle class is almost indescribable. We who can do so, start educating our children the day they are born. "Oh. See this." "What did you do today?" "This is a zebra." Some of these slum children have never seen a picture book, or their own face in a mirror. Many of them have never been downtown, much less to grandma's farm or the seashore.

No doubt it is true, as someone has said, that the best education starts 100 years before birth. But apparently it is possible for public effort to bridge the cultural chasm. Israel faces a problem quite like our poverty problem with her Oriental Jews. She has undertaken a novel and exciting effort to assimilate them. But her effort is much more ambitious than ours. The first rule is that solutions to really sticky problems do not come wrapped in 8-week packages for easy bureaucratic handling.

Project Headstart is a good start. But it can easily become a false start unless we view it with realism. If it fails—as it must fail—to bridge this cultural barrier, then there will be an impulse to conclude that the goal itself is unreachable. We owe these slum children more than that. We owe ourselves more.

Lithuania: A Tribute

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, at mid-June of this year the free world commemorates two anniversaries: One is the 25th anniversary of the Soviet seizure of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia; the other is the 24th anniversary of the mass deportation of peoples from the Baltic States.

The Soviet invasion of Lithuania and the other Baltic States was an act of brazen aggression undertaken without just cause and carried forth with utter disregard for international law. During the period of Lithuanian independence the Governments of Lithuania and the Soviet Union had established a network of treaties and agreements governing their relations. Explicitly stated in a large number of these treaties was the Soviet declaration recognizing the independence of Lithuania and promising to respect Lithuania's territorial integrity.

For the Soviet Union this relationship under law was created solely as an expedient. During this period, as indeed today, the Soviets have accommodated themselves to the customs and general norms of international law not out of desire but out of necessity. For them acceptance of bourgeois international law was an unpalatable reality, but being a reality, they were determined to live with it only so long as this necessity prevailed. In general, the Soviets looked forward to the day when Communist domination of the world would require a new international law, a Socialist international law.

But, the Soviets did not have to await the workings of history according to their claims or their own conspiratorial activities in order to realize their goals at least in the Baltic region. The opportunity came in August 1939 when Stalin concluded an agreement with Hitler according to the terms of which the Baltic region was to be considered within the Soviet sphere of interest.

The first breach of Soviet promises came in the fall of 1939 after World War II had broken out. In the first step to realize the ultimate Soviet goal of control over the Baltic region, the Moscow government imposed upon Lithuania and her neighbors the pacts of mutual assistance. These were no genuine mutual agreements; they were pacts that the Baltic States had to accept, and at the great sacrifice of their integrity.

The final and complete breach of Soviet promises came in June of 1940. In a Soviet contrived artificial climate of crisis, the Red Army moved across the frontiers of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, occupied those countries, destroyed the legitimate governments, replaced them with their own puppet regimes, and forcibly annexed the three states to the Soviet Union as constituent republics.

The destruction of law had now been complete. The Soviets had shown themselves for what they are, a state whose ideological and power goals were and continue to be the expansion of communism until at long last communism dominates the world.

One of the most cruel devices the Soviets had used in order to assert their will over the Lithuanian people and their neighbors in Latvia and Estonia was the mass deportation of peoples. This is a device that the Soviets were to apply not only in the Baltic States but throughout other parts of the Soviet Union. Whole nations, as in the case of the Volga Germans and Chechen and Ingush, were uprooted from their historic lands and dispersed through Soviet Central Asia and Siberia. During the period 1940–41 the Soviets had imprisoned and deported to Siberian concentration camps approximately 40,000 Lithuanians. This figure has been documented by the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives. This was the Soviet solution to the nationality problem, and what a diabolical solution it was. The suffering that had been wrought upon Lithuanians and others deported is incalculable. Even Khrushchev was appalled by the barbarity of deportation and in a display of extraordinary ridicule said that Stalin would have deported the entire Ukranian nation if there were not so many Ukranians.

On this anniversary commemorating the Soviet seizure of Lithuania and the deportation of Lithuanians we pay tribute to a great and courageous people. The hope of all free men is what they and their Baltic nighbors, the Latvians and Estonians, will one day know the joys of liberty that they all had shared during the golden years of their national independence in the interwar period.

Residual Oil Import Controls Are Greatly Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Emergency Planning is currently engaged in a study of the oil import control program. This will include both the security and domestic economic aspects of import controls.

The results of this study are vital to the immediate and long-range prospects for the Nation's coal industry. We who represent coal-producing districts are firm in our belief that a program of controls, especially on residual oil, is very much needed. Imports of residual oil have long plagued the coal industry and have had a very adverse effect on the economy of the coal regions.

In connection with its investigation, the Office of Economic Emergency Planning has received a letter from Mr. J. P. Routh, chairman of the board, the Pittson Co., New York, which operates coal mines in my district. This very fine statement on the need for controls on residual oil has been brought to my attention, and I believe it merits the consideration of the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Routh's letter to OEP:

THE PITTSTON CO.,
New York, N.Y., June 4, 1965.

The Honorable BUFORD ELLINGTON,
Director, Office of Emergency Planning,
Executive Office of the President,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ELLINGTON: In 1959 it was recognized that the national security of this country required a strong domestic energy industry encompassing both coal and oil to sustain the energy requirements of our country

in time of emergency. It was apparent that the unlimited flow of foreign residual oil into this country could jeopardize the attainment of this goal by adversely affecting our energy industry in the two areas of domestic coal and oil. The importation of inexpensive foreign residual oil would make the Appalachian coal industry uncompetitive and thus seriously affect not only the continued growth of the industry but contribute to the steady decline and possibly the elimination of the Appalachian coal industry.

The Appalachian coal industry, as its name implies, refers to coal produced in the Appalachian area in the States of Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky. This coal, particularly from northern West Virginia, takes the lowest freight rates to the eastern seaboard and supplies by far the greater part of the coal for that market.

The same adverse effect would be felt in the domestic oil industry with respect to continued exploration for the necessary buildup of oil reserves in this country, since the cost of domestic oil would also not be competitive with foreign residual oil. Therefore, an oil import control program was instituted which was designed to stimulate our Appalachian coal and oil industries so that in times of emergency we could have a self-sustaining energy industry. The necessity for national security is as strong today as it was in 1959 or perhaps stronger in view of the current Caribbean crisis. The economic impact of an oil import program on the Appalachian coal and oil industries should be and must be a secondary consideration behind the larger purpose of national security.

The Pittston Co. is the fourth largest commercial producer of bituminous coal in this country and is the largest independent wholesale distributor of heating oils, including residual oil, along the eastern seaboard. Both divisions market primarily in New England and the Middle Atlantic States, and both have been carried on by this company for many years prior to the inception of the oil import program.

As long as increases in residual imports are based on increased consumption and declines in domestic production, it is our position that the program is a workable one. It represents a balance between free flow of imports and a complete restriction of imports. A complete free flow of imports of excessive levels of import increases will have further harmful impact on coal's economic health as well as the people of Appalachia. Additionally, there is great risk in a full commitment of our energy fuel needs and markets to foreign resources. Every coal-producing country in the world has recognized this, and in each one of these countries some form of restriction, such as, quotas, tariffs, government purchasing or high import duties, is practiced. They are unwilling to jeopardize their national security by depending solely on imported fuel for their energy requirements. A study of such coal-producing countries as Germany, England, France, Belgium, Holland and Japan will quickly verify this statement. On the other hand, a complete restriction of imports would be harmful to friendly foreign sources and put an unworkable requirement on our Appalachian coal and oil industries and severely deplete natural resources.

That the present program is workable is evidenced by the fact that the price of residual fuels to consumers is equal or below prices at the beginning of the program. The price of coal to consumers has correspondingly declined despite rises in the cost of living index. The fact that growth and competition exist within the industry under the oil import program is evidenced by the fact that since mandatory controls have been instituted, the original 29 importers have expanded to 62 and there are over a dozen more deepwater facilities available.

What is needed now is a long-term regulation. Within such a framework, a large volume of postponed capital expenditures involving millions of dollars in the Appalachian area can be committed and long-term coal and oil sales contracts can be made. In only this manner can a healthy domestic energy industry plan for the future.

While national security is, of course, the most important and the very first consideration in discussing the oil import law, it is well, nevertheless, to point out some of the other factors involved.

(1) It is obvious that to obtain the cheapest source of any commodity or material there must be competition. Therefore, in spite of much propaganda, the only hope of New England and the eastern seaboard for obtaining a cheap source of fuel for their energy requirements, both today and tomorrow, is to preserve a healthy, competitive coal industry. The price of residual oil has gone down since the quota law has been established because coal prices have gone down at the pithead and coal rail freight rates have been reduced as much as $1.50 a ton. Residual oil cargo prices in New England have dropped since the quota became effective from $2.26 per barrel to $2.06 per barrel.

On the other hand, in Europe, where the coal industry is not competitive and prices are much higher (American coal delivered to European countries sells from $3 to $5 a ton less than coal produced in these countries) residual oil, with the same and in many cases lower freight rates, sells at a considerably higher price than it does along the Eastern seaboard.

(2) The loss of the Eastern coal market to the Appalachian coal-producing area is one of the main causes of poverty in that region of our country. The Appalachian area, as we all know, is mountainous and has only one great natural resource left; namely, bituminous coal. The coal miner, averaging $25 to $50 per day with fringe benefits, is the real difference between prosperity and poverty throughout this area. In Pittston on January 1, 1964, we were forced to close down two mines in the Appalachian area which in the previous year produced approximately 1,450,000 tons of coal. As a result this revenue was lost to the hard-pressed Eastern railroads, and some 425 coal miners lost their jobs and are now on unemployment relief. If it had not been for the constant erosion of the eastern market because of the importation of greater and greater quantities of residual oil, these miners would unquestionably be at work today.

(3) The balance of payments is, of course, affected materially by the importation of residual oil, which has averaged increases of 17 percent each year while demand has increased approximately 2 percent per year. The amount to be imported in the current quota period of 745,000 barrels per day, valued at almost a half million dollars annually, contributes materially to the unfavorable baance-of-payments position.

In summary, from our experience in both oi and coal, we believe it is imperative to have a reasonable oil import quota law primarily for national security and for the additional reasons enumerated above.

Tranking you, I am,

Sincerely,

J. P. ROUTH.

Memorial Day, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copy of a speech delivered by Robert E. Germond, commander of Mercer County Barracks, No. 1895, Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Trenton, N.J., commemorating Memorial Day, 1965. Commander Germond has expresed in words for all of us our thoughts on this special day of remembrance:

[From the Hamilton Life]

MEMORIAL DAY, SUNDAY MAY 30, 1965

The regular monthly meeting of the Mercer County Barracks 1895 Veterans of World War I inclusive will be held on Thursday evening, May 27, 1965, at 8 p.m., at 344 Hamilton Avenue, the home of the "Itams."

Commander Robert E. Germond will deliver the following pre-Memorial Day tribute.

Today, America bows her head in mourning tribute. Today, the proud Stars and Stripes dip in salute.

For this is the day when we honor those who have given their lives that the United States might be a strong, unified, and free nation.

This is the day when we who look forward hopefully to tomorrow, stop briefly to think of those for whom time stands eternally still.

But it must be something more than just a day when we reverently remember our war dead and once more honor their deeds of valor and their great sacrifice. It is a time when we dedicate ourselves to action—action that will keep these heroic dead forever a living force in our Nation.

They went to war from homes as warm and secure as yours and mine. They left behind parents, wife, and children as dearly loved as those who are at our sides today.

They went to war because the security of their Nation was at stake, and with it the security of those homes and those families. They went to fight for a cause in which many of us also fought.

And we who fought beside them know that they fought to preserve a way of life we have all found good. They did not go because they sought death on a battlefield. It was because they wanted life in a free country—life for their loved ones, for us and for themselves.

You and I are living the life that was denied them, and for that reason we have a responsibility which will be ours so long as we shall live.

First of all, we must do everything in our power to preserve this freedom which has been so dearly bought. That, I feel sure, is the one admonition which comes to us unanimously from our hero dead. "We died in the cause of human freedom," they remind us. "You must live for it."

Yes, we must so live that we keep liberty always the unquenchable flame in our torch. We must so live that we protect against all threats the inborn dignity of man as an individual.

In its broadest aspects this means of course combating the antagonistic idealogies which may threaten us. But they must be combated sanely and reasonably and not with the heated passion that breeds bigotry, factions, hatred, and even war.

If we work to make man's lot constantly better in our own Nation and to relieve suffering abroad, wherever that is possible; if we strive always to understand our neighbor, to respect his point of view instead of resenting it, we will have gone far toward realizing our goal.

This, as I said, is the broad aspect of our responsibility as a peace-loving Nation. We are a Nation which traditionally seeks peace. We must now be a Nation which fights valiantly for peace.

But what of the everyday responsibilities that have been placed upon our shoulders by men who gave their lives in the cause of peace.

There are those responsibilities, you know, and when we accepted the security bought

by our neighbor's blood, we inevitably accepted those responsibilities, too.

They are much more than the mere memorial service, moving as it may be, and more than tears shed in reverent memory, no matter how heartfelt. They are very special responsibilities which have resulted from the individual sacrifices of men and women who have fought in our wars.

First of all, of course, I believe we all recognize the duty we have to the dependents of those who died in service. It must be our continuing responsibility to accept guardianship of them as a sacred trust, to make certain that they are always secure.

Then comes our responsibility to those who, fighting beside those we honor today, were wounded or otherwise disabled in the same cause and who will live out their lives with infirmities and disabilities, injuries, and handicaps which are all too often a searing barrier between them and normal life. If we forget them, we are forgetting, too, in a measure, our hero dead. For the sacrifices were side by side, in the same spirit.

Therefore, it becomes our job to see that the greatest measure of comfort and assistance is given to these aging veterans. We should see to it that sufficient hospitals to accommodate these broken bodies and broken minds, are kept open, fully equipped, fully staffed, and occupied.

Today, hundreds of thousands of veterans of our wars are patients in hospitals of the Veterans' Administration. But another 20,000 are outside these hospitals, awaiting admission.

We must put forth every effort to see that these hospitals and beds and medical and scientific staffs are continually provided to ease their suffering and restore their health.

You will ask how you can do this as a single individual, with only one vote. Well, your vote and your vote, combined with my vote and the votes of your neighbors, all put together have considerable weight with a Congressman. And that weight we should combine to put behind the rehabilitation and legislative program of the aging veterans.

You can urge your President and your Congressman's support, to keep the hospitals open and the recommendation that legislation be adopted, providing adequate pensions for the aging veterans.

This must always be safeguarded against the forces which seek economy at the expense of those who have the least but who have sacrificed the most.

Actually, these are easy ways in which to discharge our debt to those who have made possible for us a way of life unique among all others on the face of the earth. All they want is the opportunity to share that way of life with us. Have any of us today a better right?

Let us here today, gathered in solemn tribute to our fallen heroes, resolve that our tribute will be a living one, a vital force throughout our future.

Let us constitute ourselves in effect our brothers keepers, accepting that trust from those who held it so sacred that they died for it.

Let us remember—always.

Southwestern Pennsylvania on the Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Regional Industrial Development Corp., of southwestern Pennsylvania, is concerned with the economic growth of nine counties in the Pittsburgh area. I should like to call the attention of the House, under leave to extend my remarks, to another chapter in its story of "Southwestern Pennsylvania on the Move":

SOUTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA ON THE MOVE

INDUSTRIAL PARK

In order to further the economic development of the Pittsburgh area, the Regional Industrial Development Corp. secured with the cooperation of the Board of Commissioners of Allegheny County a large tract of land in O'Hara Township located a short distance northeast of the city of Pittsburgh. This land is now under development as the RIDC Allegheny County Industrial Park.

The park is extremely well located in respect to rapidly developing expressway patterns. There will soon be an interchange of the Allegheny Valley Expressway on the property to provide quick access to downtown Pittsburgh 8 miles to the southwest, and the Allegheny Valley interchange of the Pennsylvania Turnpike approximately 4 miles away. The Allegheny Valley Expressway will follow the Allegheny River in a northeastern direction and link the Pittsburgh region with the Keystone Shortway—an entirely new part of the Interstate System crossing Pennsylvania in an east-west direction.

The RIDC-Allegheny County Industrial Park is a well-planned open space industrial park designed to provide valuable benefits for new and expanding manufacturing and service industries. With excellent residential areas close by it will also attract the interest of companies seeking research facility locations. It will offer an attractive and economic environment with compatible neighbors, long-term values, and an all-inclusive service which avoids site development, zoning, utility, access and other related problems.

As part of the development plan RIDC is prepared to provide a time and money saving site and building "package" consisting of a custom tailored design, quality construction and a wide choice of attractive and liberal financing plans.

From the standpoint of the metropolitan area this planned industrial park is an important part of the essential framework for harnessing of physical facilities so vital for economic growth and stability. It is the community's way of demonstrating, in a most tangible form, its strong interest and assistance in aiding the growth of both new and expanding companies.

RIDC welcomes the opportunity to provide specific information on this park or others located in southwestern Pennsylvania.

VITAL LOCATION FACTORS

Markets: From the standpoint of close relation to industrial markets and major population centers, the southwestern Pennsylvania region enjoys tremendous advantages. Within a 500-mile radius are 15 of the top 20 industrial markets of the country, representing almost 75 percent of the total industrial buying power. Within this same sphere on influence lives more than half the population of the United States, with high income levels and purchasing power. For the industrial manufacturer, or the producer of consumer goods, this is indeed a strategic location.

Labor: With its long history as one of the industrial centers of the country southwestern Pennsylvania has an abundant labor supply, readily adaptable and trainable to the requirements of new industries. Increasing emphasis on vocational and technical schools, plus the joint efforts of industry, State government and the Federal Government in the development of retraining programs, assures a steadily increasing number of skilled workers to meet the needs of new and expanding industry.

Transportation: Few areas in the entire country enjoy the combination of transportation facilities which serve the southwestern Pennsylvania region. It is a hub of major east-west rail lines. The "port" of Pittsburgh at the head of the Ohio River connects with the vast inland waterways system all the way to New Orleans. A complex of modern highways and turnpikes provides swift movement of goods and people. The Greater Pittsburgh Airport is one of the country's busiest air terminals. In variety, accessibility and capacity—this is transportation to meet every need.

Utilities: For every conceivable industrial or commercial need, there is an abundant supply of electric power, natural gas, oil and coal readily available throughout this area. Development of EHV (extra high voltage) transmission lines carrying power at 500,000 volts and new techniques of underground storage of gas means unlimited reserves in these major energy sources. The extensive flood control program has not only provided a safety factor, but has served to stabilize the tremendous volume of water essential to expanding industry and to increased private use.

Education: From the broad base of excellent public and private schools and junior colleges, the opportunities for the highest levels of learning have expanded steadily in southwestern Pennsylvania. The University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Duquesne University, and other fine institutions in the region offer a wide variety of undergraduate courses. Professional and graduate schools, with access to both public and private research facilities, place this area in the forefront of educational centers.

There follows excerpts from my remarks on foreign affairs delivered to the Wisconsin State Democratic convention on July 12:

Abroad, we face a troubled world. We have moved to meet the challenge. Through food for peace, we are marshaling our most efficient industry—farming—to move toward a world in which no child will go to sleep at night crying with hunger. With our Peace Corps, thousands of young Americans are fighting hopelessness and poverty in the greatest adventure of the age. Our defenses are stronger than ever, but with the test ban treaty we have shown our determination to reduce the chance of an atomic war which would make our earth as lifeless as the moon.

But violence and turmoil still erupt in far-off places, bringing strange names into the headlines of our hometown papers.

This is a world that we Americans of the 1960's did not create. We are the inheritors of the legacy of the past.

In the two current hotspots, we struggle not only against Communists but against deep-rooted causes of conflict and ingrained suspicions of our motives and purposes.

In Vietnam, the fighting has been going on intermittently for a quarter century. The French attempted to hold on to their colonial empire in French Indochina after World War II. After they lost and Vietnam became half Communist, a succession of Saigon governments has failed to achieve real social reform or to create anything like a government of, by, and for the people. Thus we, the United States, find ourselves a Western nation largely going it alone in Asia.

In the Dominican Republic, the memory is strong of our occupation of the country with Marines from 1916 to 1924. The bloody Trujillo dictatorship worked its will for years with little opposition from the United States. When the constitutional and democratic government of President Bosch was overthrown by a military coup in September 1963, we at first took no action and then recognized the dictators.

Now we have again sent our troops into the Caribbean.

Miss Velmarae Dunn, of Hammond, La., Supervisor of English and Speech at Southeastern High School, Exemplifies a Truly Great and Dedicated Person in Our Teaching Profession and Typifies Education in Its Highest Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to take this opportunity to pay tribute to one of the finest ladies I have ever known in my life, and one of our best English teachers, Miss Velmarae Dunn of my hometown of Hammond, La.

At the end of a remarkably devoted career of teaching English and speech in both Hammond High School and Southeastern High in Hammond, La., Miss Velmarae Dunn, supervisor of English and speech at Southeastern High, will retire this month after 44 years of unselfish dedication to the students of Hammond.

Many years ago, Mr. Speaker, I had the honor and the privilege, myself, to be a student of Miss Dunn's in her English and speech classes in Hammond High. As I look back on my experiences in her classes and the many things she taught me, I realize now more than ever before the gift which this great lady bestowed upon me. She gave me an excellent and thorough grounding in English grammar, and instilled in me and so many of my fellow students, a great appreciation of literature which I have held dear to this day. Not only did she teach me the fundamentals of good and imaginative usage of the English language, but also Miss Dunn, by her own example, strengthened my character and fired my ambition to study harder in college and to pursue knowledge for its own sake all my life.

Miss Dunn also taught my two sons, James Hobson, Jr. "Hobby," and Benjamin "Benjy" Morrison, at Southeastern High School many years later. My two boys also had, Mr. Speaker, the fine exposure to this wonderful lady's devotion to her students and her energetic, imaginative mind. I know that they, too, have benefited from this experience with Miss Dunn.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to cite some of the highlights of this remarkable lady's career. Miss Dunn received both her B.A. and her M.A. degrees in English at the University of Oklahoma.

She returned to her hometown of Hammond, and began her teaching career at Hammond High School in 1921.

In 1927, while teaching at Hammond High, she sponsored and initiated a chapter of the National Honor Society.

In 1941, she assumed her present position at Southeastern High, and in 1951, she sponsored the installation of another chapter of the National Honor Society there.

Miss Dunn also, has helped install chapters at Ponchatoula High and Wardline Junior High.

At Southeastern, Miss Dunn is sponsor of the Scribbler's Club and Great Books Club.

In appreciation, students in the past have dedicated an annual to Miss Dunn, and this year are naming the new organization, of the Future Teachers of America, the Velmarae Dunn Chapter.

After retiring, Miss Dunn is anticipating teaching English during the summer session at SLC, as she has done in the several seasons of the past.

Also, she will have time to devote her time to community projects and hobbies, which include writing, good music, drama, reading, and bridge.

An Episcopalian, Miss Dunn is also a member of Phi Kappa Phi, Delta Kappa Gamma, Kappa Delta, Pi; Blue Violet; NEA; LEA; PTA; Language-Arts Club, American Association of University Women, and the National Council of Teachers of English.

For these reasons, and many more, I am very grateful to Miss Dunn for her exemplary contribution to my education, and I know I speak for all the people of Hammond area who themselves were students of Miss Dunn's or whose children benefited from this gracious lady's wisdom and devotion to her important duties in education. She has so justly earned the respect, appreciation, and commendation from all of our citizens for her outstanding career.

Endorsement of President Johnson's Policy on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is with a considerable amount of pride and pleasure that I herewith submit a resolution recently adopted by the student council of the University of New Mexico, pledging the full support of the students at this fine university to the actions now being taken by President Lyndon B. Johnson during the struggle in Vietnam:

Whereas the foreign policy of the United States is of vital concern to the students of the University of New Mexico; and

Whereas the present situation in Vietnam is of great significance to the students of the University of New Mexico as members of the world community: Be it

Resolved by the Student Council of the University of New Mexico, That the Student Council of the University of New Mexico pledges its support to the actions being taken by President Johnson in Vietnam.

JIM BRANCH, Jr.
Student Body President.

This resolution seems to me to be of singular importance, representing as it does the opinion of the student body in one of this Nation's finest universities. Additional respect must be paid to this fine resolution with the realization that several thousand of our university students know full well that by assisting the South Vietnamese Government in their fierce struggle against a combination of forces, including the communistic North Vietnamese Government, Red China, and the Soviet Union, this Nation has committed its full power and resources to the defense of freedom and the rights and privileges of freemen everywhere. It is good to see that this representative group of young American men and women fully realize that our fight in Vietnam is not merely a token resistance in a remote spot somewhere in southeast Asia but that it is, in fact, a full scale operation which they consider a frontline battle for the preservation, not alone of our American way of life, but of the basic principles of human decency, self-government, and absolute freedom from tyranny, oppression and subjugation to a reign of terror.

Wisconsin Democrats' and Republicans' Views on Vietnam: Use the United Nations; or "More Significant Targets" in North Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin's Democrats and Republicans continue the debate on our policy in southeastern Asia.

This week the Wisconsin State Democratic convention, assembled at Green Bay, adopted the following resolution on foreign affairs, stressing the need for a United Nations presence in southeast Asia:

International trouble spots such as Vietnam represent complex problems that are not only military, but social, political, and economic as well. American policy must reflect an adequate balance between the basic tenents of international diplomacy: The constant readiness to negotiate; the wise and prudent use of power; and the willingness to employ economic strength to help construct stable societies.

It is our fervent hope that peace in southeast Asia can be secured by completely unconditional negotiations about Vietnam with all actual parties to the conflict and we endorse efforts of the Johnson administration directed to this end. We urge that the United Nations be enlisted in this cause, and we ask that the United Nations be called upon to provide a presence in southeast Asia, in order to pacify the area, conduct free elections, and sponsor its economic development.

To further consolidate the peoples of the free world, we urge the further lowering of tariff barriers, and the continuance of foreign aid where it contributes to economic and political advancement of developing peoples. We applaud the Peace Corps success as a people-to-people program of international understanding.

If we and the world are to find a peaceful and secure future, we must seek it in partnership with other nations. We must strengthen our regional alliances and adopt them to changing needs.

We continue our vigorous support of the United Nations as mankind's greatest hope for peace.

The results of our actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic illustrate the limitations on our power as a single nation to create a world in which all men may prosper in peace and freedom.

Recognition of these limitations—that even the world's most powerful nation cannot do everything everywhere—is not isolationism, as the Goldwaterites would have you believe.

We Democrats in the Midwest fought the old isolationism of the 1930's. We came out strong against the notion that America should do nothing, though the civilized world might be collapsing around us.

Now in the 1960's let us never adopt the idea that America should do everything, all by itself, in a new isolationism.

The internationalism of the 1960's must be based not on isolated, individual actions in international politics, but on concerted actions of coalitions of free nations.

We must rehabilitate the United Nations by settling the assessments question, and put it back on its feet. We must strengthen the Organization of American States. We must use them for peacekeeping, for conducting free elections, for sponsoring economic aid, wherever we can—and that includes Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. We must invoke them not as a last resort, but from the first and as a matter of usual policy.

It is the Goldwaterite viewpoint that contends that the American people and their representatives have no right to debate the great issues of foreign policy, that debate weakens our country's position.

Thomas Jefferson defined us Democrats as "those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish, and consider them as most honest and safe."

Well, we are the Democrats. And since we have confidence in the people, public debate can only strengthen our policy in its common sense and breadth of support.

I'm proud, therefore, that Democrats in both the House and Senate have been asking the important questions about our foreign policies and exploring, constructively, the alternatives that may be available.

Building world peace in freedom resembles building the Great Society at home. It takes the contributions and efforts of many men and nations working together, each with the same goal, each contributing his special talents and his wisdom on how the goal may be achieved. That is the America we love, the America that in Abraham Lincoln's thrilling phrase, can be "not the terror of the world, but the encourager of the world."

Yesterday, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], who is chairman of the Republican conference in the House of Representatives, issued a formal statement on Vietnam policy in which he said:

We may be dangerously close to ending any Republican support of our present Vietnam policy.

James Reston, in the New York Times of June 16, 1965, described the statement as follows:

In a formal statement, he has criticized the administration for seeking a negotiated settlement, for failing to aim at total victory in Vietnam, and for using large numbers of American troops for limited ends rather than using the bombers against military targets around Haiphong.

"If our objective is a negotiated settlement," Representative LAIRD says, "it is time to use other means than the needless sacrifice of American lives to attain that objective. Once American troops are committed in any situation, a top priority objective must be to take those steps necessary to protect American lives and minimize the number of casualties.

"One such step, already long overdue, is to retarget our bombing raids on more significant targets in North Vietnam."

Representative LAIRD does not explain how we are going to achieve his dual objectives of limiting American casualties and "driving the Communists out of South Vietnam," but since there is a lot of support for this policy at the Pentagon, and he is addressing a clever political argument to a very political President, his case is worth analysis.

It is based on the assumption that the only trouble with our bombing campaign is that there has not been enough of it, that it will "protect American lives" if only we bomb the populous supply areas in the north within the range of the North Vietnamese fighting aircraft.

President Johnson is staying away from these precisely because he believes raiding Haiphong and Hanoi will kill a lot of civilians, produce a major invasion of the south by North Vietnamese forces and thus tip the power balance against the Americans as well as the South Vietnamese.

The issue is worth debating.

Recreation for City People Included in Imaginative Program of the Rural Community Development Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Community Development Service is considering an imaginative program to help make possible the private development of a new type of recreation area which would be a cross between a public park and the increasingly popular "hobby farm."

This program, which was outlined today by Rural Community Development Service Administrator Robert G. Lewis, is attractive because it ties together existing Federal programs in a package designed to benefit city people while strengthening sagging rural economies.

The concept of recreational land-use projects aided by the regular services of the Department of Agriculture and cropland conversion payments is one element of the program of the Service to make sure that rural people have an equal opportunity to benefit from the Federal programs enacted for all Americans.

Lewis described the Service's program in an enlightening speech to the REA annual field conference in St. Louis, Mo. The text of his speech follows:

THE NEW HORIZONS FOR RURAL AMERICA

(By Robert G. Lewis, Administrator, Rural Community Development Service)

President Johnson, in his message to Congress on February 4, 1965, pledged energetic action to insure that full equality of opportunity is made available to all the people who live in rural America. In the same message, the President announced the formation of the Rural Community Development Service, with the President's charge to carry out that pledge.

Today's economy in the United States is in the course of the longest period of continuous prosperity in our history. Month after month, new records are being set in the volume of wealth being produced. Most Americans are enjoying the highest standard of living in their lives, and look forward with confidence to continuing progress.

But there are millions of Americans—one-fifth of our people—who have not shared in the abundance that has been granted to most of us.

Rural America contains nearly one-half of these people who do not share in our prosperity. They live among the 30 percent of our total population who live on farms, in the open countryside, and in small towns under 2,500 population. Forty-seven percent of the Nation's poverty exists in these rural communities.

Very few farm families earn returns on their investment and from their skills and labor comparable to the returns received in other sectors of the economy.

Gross farm income reached an alltime high in 1964. Net farm income was higher last year than in 1963, and it has been higher in each of the past 4 years than in 1960.

Yet the disposable income per person of the farm population in 1964 was only about 60 percent of the average received by the nonfarm population.

Fewer than 400,000 farmers earn a wage for their labor comparable to that of a skilled industrial wage earner, $2.46 per hour; and as much as 5-percent return on their investment.

There are between 2 and 3 million farmers who receive less than a 5-percent return on their investment and the national minimum hourly wage of $1.25 per hour. In 1960, there were 1,600,000 farm families living in outright poverty, with family incomes below $3,000 per year.

Not all of the rural poor people are farmers. Three-fourths of the people who live in rural America neither live nor work on farms. They include former coal miners in Appalachia, Illinois, and Iowa; timber workers and iron and copper miners in the Upper Great Lakes region; and many others in every rural county in every State in the Nation. In 1960, there were 2,800,000 rural nonfarm families living in poverty.

Let me illustrate the opportunity gap between urban and rural areas by reference to a single field of Federal activity—housing. The proportion of substandard and deteriorating housing is twice as high in rural America as in our metropolitan areas. Almost half the people who live in bad housing in this country are rural people, although they comprise only 30 percent of the population. Yet, despite this heavy concentration of need in the rural areas, the Federal Government since 1950 through the Federal Housing Administration insurance programs alone has helped to build more than 3 dozen new houses in the cities and their suburbs for each single one that has been built with the assistance of the Farmers Home Administration in rural communities.

Or consider the manpower development and training program, administered by the Department of Labor. Its purpose is to provide specific and intensive training in job skills. Certainly such a program is needed urgently in rural areas—where regular educational opportunities all too often have been far below par.

The RCDS staff has just completed a series of representative spot checks on the actual training programs conducted under the manpower development and training program

during the past year. We examined the number and proportion of the training projects conducted in rural areas, or towns and cities under 10,000 population—where 46 percent of the Nation's people live.

We found that only 3.4 percent of the training projects were conducted in these rural areas and small towns.

And we found that only 3.1 percent of the total number of trainees who participated were in the rural and smalltown projects.

Similar disparities in service, although not to the same degree, can be found in education, in employment counseling, in youth employment, in health services, in community facilities, in industrial development, in antipoverty programs, and many other Federal programs.

Why is this?

The Federal agencies want to extend their services into rural areas. What they have lacked is the administrative means of dealing with widely scattered rural residents and the tens of thousands of rural communities.

Remember, Federal agencies cannot impose their programs on the rural people or the local communities. The rural people must, (1) learn about the program, (2) decide locally how they can make use of it, and (3) submit an application in a form that can be considered by the agency.

This may sound simple. But in fact, the problem is enormously complex. To acquaint rural leaders all over America with the specific benefits available in the numerous and constantly changing Federal programs requires a gigantic job of technical assistance.

Obviously, each agency cannot have an office in every rural county. The answer, as the President's message makes clear, is that the Department of Agriculture, which does have one or more offices in every rural county, must somehow help the other agencies to reach these rural people.

The central responsibility for coordinating the entire "outreach" function has been assigned to the Rural Community Development Service.

Through the new and unprecedented "outreach function," the Department of Agriculture will cooperate with other Departments and agencies of the Federal Government in helping them to perform their official administrative duties and meeting their responsibilities to serve people even in the most remote of rural communities.

I will attempt to describe, in a brief and general way, the long-range plans which we propose to perform this new function.

First, through systematic and continuous consultation, RCDS and each Federal agency administering a service needed by rural people will define those services that are applicable to rural problems.

Next, the two agencies will determine the specific steps that need to be taken in the field to assure that rural people will have fully equal access to those services.

These steps, insofar as the USDA is concerned, might amount to no more than furnishing information about what service is available and how and where to apply, or they might extend to providing technical assistance in the preparation and submission of applications. USDA might even take the responsibility for completion of the preliminary stages of processing applications originating in rural areas.

Third, RCDS will analyze the nature of the service and the particular obstacles that stand in the way of its extension to rural areas, in order to determine the most suitable administrative means for the USDA to assist the agency concerned to extend its outreach.

And finally, a regular operating agency of USDA with offices in the field will be assigned by the Secretary to take responsibility for performing those steps that are needed in order for each Federal program to be effectively used by rural people. For example, in the case of lending programs, it might be the Farmers Home Administration, as the Department's general purpose lending agency, which would be assigned by the Secretary to take responsibility. In other cases, SCS or ASCS might participate.

I want to emphasize that the Department of Agriculture will in no way intrude upon the responsibility and authority of the other agencies of the Government to carry out their programs in accordance with law and their own administrative discretion. The aim of USDA's outreach service will be simply to give service—just what the President in his message to Congress called for from the Secretary of Agriculture: "to put the facilities of his field offices at the disposal of all Federal agencies to assist them in making their programs effective in rural areas."

When the outreach service is in full operation, every agency of the Federal Government responsible for a program or service for which rural people are eligible, will be able to utilize USDA field offices located in practically every county in the Nation in order to reach even the most remote rural resident.

The new emphasis and improved capability that is being brought to bear upon the problems of rural communities would remedy some of the serious weaknesses of the present effort.

The rural areas development committees, composed of volunteer citizen leaders, are seriously handicapped by their lack of full-time professional staffs. They have only limited time to absorb or to accumulate specific know-how about the availability, potential usefulness, and required procedures for obtaining Federal assistance. They have particular difficulty in contending with the technicalities of programs, in keeping abreast of changes in program provisions and benefits, and providing continuity to the local development effort.

We expect that the new approach in three principal ways will increase the effectiveness of our efforts to help rural people:

First, our aim is to provide "one-stop service" to rural people who are seeking help from their Federal Government.

One-stop service to the rural citizen and community leader will mean, first, that the Department of Agriculture will take the responsibility for finding out what Federal service is available to help him cope with his problem, and secondly, for giving him, right in his home county, advice as to the procedure that is necessary in order for his application to receive fair consideration. It will be USDA's goal, in short, to spare the rural citizen and community leader the kind of frustrating runaround he sometimes encounters because no agency that he calls on is fully responsible for all parts of his problem. It will give him professional assistance in coping with Government redtape such as urban citizens and urban community leaders usually can get from their paid staffs of specialists and experts.

In line with our one-stop service goal, we propose to establish six small staffs of specialists in Washington, each of which will be responsible for a specific problem area. Each staff will be responsible for the consultations and liaison with the authorities in charge of all the Government programs that have a bearing on its assigned problem area. In this way, information and know-how about all the Government programs and assistance that is available for dealing with water and sewer facilities needs, for example, will be assembled and coordinated in one place. If a rural leader wants to find out what he should do about his community's specific water and sewer problem, the USDA through RCDS, will be responsible for helping him find the program, or combination of programs, that best fits his needs—whether it comes from the USDA's own Farmers Home Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Area Redevelopment Administration (or its successor) or the Department of Defense (Corps of Engineers).

The six proposed staffs will be assigned to the following general problem areas: housing and community facilities; jobs development; schools, education, and training; economic opportunity, health, and welfare; natural resources conservation and development; and family farm development. I am attaching for the record, at the end of my statement, a compilation of all the programs, and the governmental agencies which administer them, that are directly related to problems that arise in each of the six areas. The lists are long, and serve to illustrate the complexity of finding exactly the right door to which the citizen or community leader should bring his problem.

Second, RCDS will follow up and expedite the processing and consideration of applications for assistance from rural communities.

This will be carried out through informal liaison between RCDS and the responsible agency. Its purpose will be to clear up questions or technicalities in the rural applications so as to achieve treatment of applications from rural sources equal to that accorded to those from urban communities having the assistance of their own paid professional staffs.

Third, the Department of Agriculture will be more able to plan for better coordinated and more comprehensive solutions to the problems of rural residents and rural communities.

This will result in an immediate convenience to the rural resident or community leader. He will be able to identify the Government services he needs simply by describing the problem he has recognized, instead of being confronted with an array of seemingly disconnected agencies, each dealing in a framentary way with the problem.

We propose to develop plans for packages of programs which will combine services originating from the various agencies of USDA as well as other branches of the Federal Government. These services would be coordinated in such a way as to deal in a comprehensive manner with problems of the rural citizen or the rural community.

In this way, a variety of programs can be linked together so as to reinforce each other, and enlarge the total impact upon the citizen's problems.

As an illustration of what we have in mind, I would like to describe in a very general way some of the ideas that are in the formative stage in RCDS:

1. A retiring farmers' program: We believe it might be possible to combine a number of existing Government services, and to initiate activities under existing authorities, to develop a program for retiring farmers that might as much as double the amount of retirement income available for some farm couples above what they might expect unless the proposed special services and guidance are provided.

The social security program, which is now available to self-employed farmers, and which now incorporates the new medicare provisions, would provide the basic foundation of this retirement system. It would be possible to reinforce and enlarge this basic source of old-age security in a number of ways, including:

Special counseling services, which are available from the Social Security Administration, but which now reach rural residents only very rarely, and give inadequate attention to the special problems and opportunities that often arise in the case of retiring farmers.

Guidance in making advantageous arrangements for disposition of the retiring operator's farm assets, in order to provide maximum retirement income, and if desired, a life estate for the retiring farm couple in the use of their home.

Development in the community of special recreational land-use ventures or farm enlargement that would create an opportunity for a more advantageous plan for disposing of the farmer's assets than the usual type of outright sale.

For those who are eligible, credit assistance under the senior citizens housing loan program, either for rehabilitation and modernization, or construction of a new retirement home.

Development of community medical and nursing care facilities, with special provision for retired persons.

2. Recreational land-use projects: Blocks of 2,000 to 5,000 acres or more would be developed for recreational use by urban people at a level of intensity about midway between the public park and the hobby farm. Projects might be owned jointly by a group of urban users; or the project might be owned and operated by a rural public body or by commercial interest, with urban users paying for their privileges on a lease and fee basis. Projects would be developed to include:

Summer homesites, planned in accordance with good land use principles, with an acre or so of space accompanying each. Each family could have a place of its own.

Sewer, water, and electrical facilities would be furnished centrally.

The major portion of the land and water resource would be developed for common use by all patrons for riding, forestry, wildlife, hunting, fishing, swimming and water sports, hiking, camping, etc., and would be managed by a full-time manager or caretaker.

The urban family would buy a user's right (or share) which would entitle the family to a summer homesite, and to full access to the common land and water and other facilities of the project.

Cropland conversion payments and the regular array of USDA technical services would help to finance and to design the development of the project for the new use of the land and water.

This kind of project would appeal to urban people like those who have been buying hobby farms of 20 to 100 or more acres. It would be much more economical, much less difficult to manage, and much lower in cost per family than the individual hobby farm, yet such a project would give each participating family access to a far greater extent of much better developed recreational land and water resources than is possible on an individual hobby farm within the financial reach of most families.

Important advantages of this approach are that it would draw upon private urban capital for the major portion of the capital cost of land acquisition, construction of buildings and facilities, and other developments, and that it would establish a positive and permanent channel for the flow of income from the urban community into the rural area.

3. Rural low-income mutual help housing improvement: Small groups of rural families in need of construction or rehabilitation of housing might be encouraged to form mutual help do-it-yourself housing associations.

The individual members might be eligible for varying Federal credit programs, and would be given guidance in selecting and applying for the assistance best suited to their needs.

The services of one or two VISTA volunteers could be secured to furnish supervision and technical guidance, and physically able members of the association would work together, in a manner somewhat similar to the "threshing ring" tradition, to perform the necessary construction and repair work on the houses of one after another of the participating families.

Possibly the Office of Economic Opportunity programs might be drawn upon to enable the participant and his family to subsist while the work is underway.

The association, functioning as a cooperative, might secure an economic opportunity loan from the Farmers Home Administration to enable members to secure materials and supplies at reduced cost.

An intensive program of household management counseling and training, conducted under the auspices of the war on poverty or by the home extension service, could be particularly effective if carried out concurrently.

In addition to the obvious advantage of improved housing that would result from such a project, participants would also obtain work experience, a gain in technical skill sufficient at least to improve their ability to care for their own property, instruction and experience in working together as a group, and probably a substantially elevated sense of their own worth and confidence in themselves.

This has been a general description of how we propose to help the Department of Agriculture to meet its increased responsibilities for rural problems.

However, I want to raise a note of caution. The limitations of the funds proposed in the budget for the forthcoming fiscal year will restrict our operations for the year ahead to only a few States, on a limited trial basis.

The budget for the fiscal year beginning next July 1 provides for establishment of offices in 20 States in addition to the 3 already serviced, each to be staffed by one man and a secretary. But it does not provide for the additional staff that would be required in Washington to perform the planning and continuous liaison required with all the Federal agencies concerned, both outside and within the USDA, in connection with the outreach function. This responsibility was assigned to the Department of Agriculture after the budget for the forthcoming year had been submitted, and the cost of carrying it out is not reflected in the budget. We would require about 25 to 30 professional specialists in addition to those provided for in our budget, plus necessary clerical and secretarial assistance, in order to accomplish the consultations, planning, and continuous liaison required. Even if all of the additional personnel proposed in the budget for staffing RCDS field offices were to be diverted to work on liaison and planning assignments in Washington, we would not be able to meet the full staffing requirements to perform the outreach function, and then, of course, we would not have sufficient field force to insure the effectiveness of the operation in many of the States.

In view of these limitations, therefore, we would be able to contemplate only a small beginning in the year ahead, with application in the field restricted to a small number of States, unless additional manpower is provided.

Pittsburgh Prospectus: America's Industrial Heartland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include a copy of the comprehensive new Pittsburgh Prospectus just published by the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh:

PITTSBURGH PROSPECTUS: AMERICA'S INDUSTRIAL HEARTLAND

A singular description of the Pittsburgh profile could be that of "a city at work."

Long described as the "steel capital of the world," Pittsburgh has implemented this reputation with a sophistication of its commerce that has led the city beyond the realm of being a one-industry city.

Today, while still being the leading steel center of the Nation, Pittsburgh has put to work all of its energies for sound economic growth. The area offers a wealth of human resources, an ample supply of investment capital and land, extensive natural resources—including an unlimited water supply; good river, land and air transportation; an upgraded, technically oriented educational system; a complex of corporate and university research facilities, and a strategic position in relation to the Nation's great eastern and midwestern markets.

New vistas of opportunity have opened as a result of the hardhitting work of many civic agencies. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that research and development has grown to a point in the Pittsburgh area where it is exceeded, in terms of employees, only by the primary metals and electrical machinery industries. This fact was substantiated by a recent study of research facilities by the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania which showed that a total of 150 laboratories in the 9-county region provide employment for more than 14,000 professional research workers and the investment in research facilities exceeds $365 million, with annual budgets approaching $349 million.

Still the mainstay of Pittsburgh's economic base, steelmaking here accounts for over 21 percent of the national output. In addition, the area has a total of 2,400 large and small manufacturing plants employing 246,500 workers—with primary metals employing 108,200 of them.

Placing steel at the hub of Pittsburgh's industrial wheel, complementing and supporting industries make up the spokes. Feeding the steel complex with needed materials and supplies are allied industries of coal, chemicals, rolling mill machinery, refractories, steel rolls and steel fabricators.

At the same time, industries which depend on steel as a raw material have substantially diversified the area's industry to the point where today, Pittsburgh produces nearly 6,000 different products.

Production of electrical machinery ranks second in a listing of Pittsburgh's major industry. Employing more than 22,000 workers in the area, the electrical machinery industry pumps more than $150 million into the Pittsburgh economy in the form of wages.

Providing food for the huge Pittsburgh market is also big business. The food industry employs over 20,000 persons who annually take home more than $100 million in wages.

Coal, credited with giving impetus to the growth of Pittsburgh into an industrial giant, continues to provide 34 million tons of bituminous coal to the national and world markets from the mines of western Pennsylvania; while oil produced in the area averages 500,000 barrels annually.

Within 100 miles of Pittsburgh are located many of the major glass producing plants in the Nation. In addition to a large share of the flat glass market, about 80 percent of the total output, Pittsburgh area glass container plants also produce a sizable part of the 20 billion glass containers manufactured in the United States.

Pittsburgh's varied manufacturing includes chemicals, an industry which employs over 5,000 and provides an annual payroll of over $34 million. This industry alone is a $1 billion market.

In all, 41 of the Nation's 500 largest industrial companies have 1 or more plants in the Pittsburgh district; 23 of these make Pittsburgh their headquarters—giving the city the distinction of being the third largest center of corporate headquarters in the Nation, exceeded only by New York and Chicago.

Geographically in the heart of the Middle Atlantic States—the center of the third largest populated area east of the Mississippi River—only 370 miles from New York City and 450 miles from Chicago, Pittsburgh is influenced by commerce on the Great Lakes and the Ohio-Mississippi systems, and flourishes as the major trading center for the 56-county consumer market in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia, with a population in excess of 7 million.

Within 600 miles of the city are 15 of the top 20 industrial markets, over 70 percent of all manufacturing industries and over 80 percent of all industrial workers; two-thirds of the Nation's income; three-fifths of its retail trade; and 6 of the Nation's 10 largest cities.

Metropolitan Pittsburgh is the sixth largest market in the Nation, and sixth in the number of production workers. It ranks ninth in effective consumer buying power and eighth in retail and wholesale sales.

Pittsburgh's retail market extends out in a 50-mile radius of the city. In 1964, retail and wholesale employment was at 146,600 and retail sales at $3.8 billion.

Pittsburgh, too, has shared in the national growth of the suburban shopping center. More than 60 such centers have been constructed during the past 18 years. They include more than 1,500 shops and accommodations to park more than 55,000 automobiles.

With its natural routes of surface and air transportation, its basic industrial activities and wealth in capital and natural resources, Pittsburgh serves the Nation and the world as a leading import and export center.

A total of 414 western Pennsylvania firms employing 300,000 persons were active in exporting during 1963. In that year Pittsburgh area manufactured goods shipped abroad amounted to more than $235 million.

The major products exported from the area are: primary metals, electrical and nonelectrical machinery, fabricated metal products, transportation equipment, chemicals, and allied products, and stone, glass, and clay products.

Vital to the industrial well-being of the area is an effective and all encompassing transportation system.

Pittsburgh, naturally situated in a superior position on three rivers and laced with a network of adequate highways, excellent rail facilities, and comprehensive airline facilities, serves as a corridor of commerce to all points in the Nation.

WATERWAYS UNLIMITED

Enormous tonnages of freight originate, terminate, and pass through Pittsburgh. All contribute to the development of this corridor. More tonnage is moved in the Pittsburgh district than in any other inland river area. More than 42½ million tons were moved along Pittsburgh waterways in 1963. Three major barge lines serve Greater Pittsburgh, and, in addition, many local industries maintain their own fleets for water transportation.

Substantiating Pittsburgh's position as one of the Nation's great rail centers, is the fact that about one-eighth of all the rail freight tonnage of the United States originates, terminates, or passes through the Pittsburgh area.

The railroad companies serving the Pittsburgh area earn about one-quarter of the Nation's railroad freight revenues. There are 22 railroads operating within Allegheny County which handle everything from frozen poultry to hot slag from steel plants. In addition, 94 other railroad companies, serving every State in the Nation, maintain local offices in Pittsburgh.

Greater Pittsburgh Airport, one of the country's largest, was used by more than 2,788,000 passengers during 1963, while over 30,322,000 pounds of freight were handled. Since its opening in 1952, therefore, the airport has nearly doubled its passenger traffic from 1,436,958 and has more than doubled its freight tonnage from 12,184,017.

Pittsburgh area industry and commerce is served by more than 350 common and contract motor carriers which haul, to and from Pittsburgh, freight over a network of some of the Nation's newest and finest highways.

Created to bolster and expand Allegheny County's mass transit facilities, the Port Authority of Allegheny County has, in 1964, acquired the assets and facilities of more than 30 independent transit companies. Already, some of the country's most sophisticated mass transit equipment is under construction at South Park. The pilot study being conducted there holds promise not only for Pittsburgh, but all metropolitan areas where road construction can no longer meet the rapidly growing needs of a rapidly growing number of commuters.

A GOOD PLACE TO LIVE

Few sections of the country are as richly endowed as the Pittsburgh area with so balanced an array of fundamental ingredients for satisfying the livability needs of an urban-oriented society. And no area is employing greater imagination in nourishing its natural assets and shaping them to the varied interests of all its inhabitants.

The Pittsburgh renaissance is itself on outgrowth, and a tribute, to the livability of the area. Renewal programs are scaled and executed to human values as well as commercial considerations.

With a canopy of clean skies overhead, the setting of Pittsburgh's business community is heavily accented with modern tones of livability. In reaffirming a bona fide claim to the title of "Golden Triangle" for Pittsburgh's business district, civil leaders emphasized beauty and functional utility in renovating the city's 300-acre core area.

Mellon Square Park in midtown Pittsburgh is the "central jewel" of a number of downtown parks and parklets established since 1947. The 36-acre Point Park and plazas to Equitable Life's gateway center accommodate large crowds attending the expanding schedule of cultural and entertainment events being held in the city. These include the summer program of free concerts by the unique American Wind Symphony and the annual Three Rivers Art Festival. Performance of the Civil Light Opera Company and a host of sports and entertainment attractions are held in the city's civil arena.

The city's business district—molded to an angular framework by the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers—is unusually compact in comparison with the rest of the world's metropolitan centers. Its capsule-sized character affords a "walkability range" of only 20 minutes or less from any single point to another—making the Golden Triangle ideally suited to administrative livability for corporate executives and businessmen who espouse a personal approach in effecting their commercial transactions.

The city harbors the largest number of hospitals in the area—in addition to the expanding research-oriented Health Center of the University of Pittsburgh. More than $150 million has been spent for hospitals to provide for the growing health needs of the area.

For year-round outdoor livability, Pittsburgh offers an unusually moderate climate and temperature range—despite its location in a geographic area that is subject to the distinctive variances of a conventional four-season weather pattern. The average temperature readings in winter are in the low thirties, and in the summer are recorded in the midseventies. Annual rainfall ranges from 36 inches at the Point to approximately 44 inches in the northwestern reaches of the area.

The topography of the land is generally rugged and appealing to the eye, with extensive areas comprised of rolling hills and wooded slopes, mountain streams and freshwater lakes. Parks and natural land preserves are situated throughout the area—with facilities that invite participation in a full complement of summer and winter sports activities.

Serving the city of Pittsburgh is a system of strategically located parks covering a total of several hundred acres. And within relatively short driving distance of the business district are seven regional parks—newly added to two fine parks that have long been established at the northern and southern edges of the city.

In the arena of spectator sports, the Pittsburgh area is represented professionally by the Pittsburgh Pirates baseball team, the Pittsburgh Steelers in football, and the Hornets in the American Hockey League. The University of Pittsburgh and Duquesne University are among the leading competitors participating in the NCAA program of athletics for the Nation's colleges and universities. Many other area colleges also participate in a broad program of athletics.

With an estimated total of 1,500 churches and synagogues catering to the religious needs of the people, the livability of the Pittsburgh area encompasses all aspects of urban life: business, culture, entertainment, health, recreation, and religion—with full consideration for the development of the individual and the well-being of the family.

Oakland district—3 miles east of the business center—is accessible from any point in the area, and is the research and cultural embryo of Pittsburgh. Here is located Mellon Institute, Carnegie Art Institute, music hall, museum, and library; educational television stations WQED and WQEX; Phipps Conservatory and garden center; and Syria Mosque—home of the Pittsburgh Opera Co. and the Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra. The symphony is the recipient of a $5 million endowment made by the Howard Heinz Endowment, the Richard King Mellon Charitable Trusts, the A. W. Mellon Education Charitable Trust, and a $500,000 gift of an individual nature by Mr. Paul Mellon.

In the Pittsburgh Playhouse, the area has one of the finest exponents of the legitimate theater in the country—and one whose success has influenced the development of a number of outstanding community theaters within the area itself.

Situated near Oakland, are the excellent Highland Park Zoo, the Children's Zoo, and one of the Nation's few underground zoos.

Only a few miles from the business district, across the Allegheny River to the north, are located Pittsburgh's distinctive conservatory-aviary—haven of tropical bird life and plants—maintained in their natural (recreated) environment; Buhl Planetarium, and the Allegheny Observatory.

Education at the highest levels of learning is served in the area by five excellent urban universities and colleges located near the business district and in Oakland; and by many fine institutions situated throughout the area. In Pittsburgh and Allegheny County alone, approximately $250 million has been invested in new school facilities to accommodate the 350,000 public, parochial, and private school students of the primary and secondary grades.

Commencement Address by Dr. William Manchester, University of Massachusetts, June 13, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an excellent address made by Dr. William Manchester at the commencement exercises of the University of Massachusetts on June 13, 1965:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY WILLIAM MANCHESTER AT UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS, JUNE 13, 1965

President Lederle, Cardinal Cushing, Governor Volpe, Governor Peabody, members of the faculty, Frank Boyden, board of trustees, reverend clergy, guests, members of the class of 1965, it is—literally—a conspicuous distinction to share this platform with so many eminent men, particularly with His Eminence, who has been so generous in his counsel to me, and with Dr. Woodside, who taught me freshman zoology in the autumn of 1940. After a quarter century I can still recall his lectures on procreation. They were lucid, instructive, and useful. Today he is being awarded his honor after a lifetime of academic service, while I, as President Kennedy observed at a commencement 2 years ago, am earning mine in the next 30 minutes. Life, the President observed, is unfair.

"Now I have the best of both worlds"—a Massachusetts education and a Massachusetts honorary degree.

Yet, I am skeptical of this annual ritual in which seniors become a captive audience for solicitous advice. Not that I doubt my wisdom. That is why I am illustrious. And gaudier than you are. And up here.

I question the value of the rite because I suspect that you doubt it—because 10 years at Wesleyan has taught me that this is a generation of generational chauvinism, when a man looks to his peers, not to seers—and my doubt is deepened by the fact that I labor under a double burden. I am a certified maverick. I have been one for quite some time. At my own commencement I delivered the senior class valedictory, and as I spoke I became aware of a muffled stirring on the scaffold behind me. Certain members of the faculty, realizing that they were under fire, were quietly departing to seek defilade. From my invitation to speak today I can only infer a kind of institutional death wish. I may have invented the teach-in. I may also be about to scuttle it.

Nevertheless, college degrees began, historically, as licenses to teach, and I do not shrink from this responsibility; I welcome it. So let us begin by restating certain propositions. The world has turned over many times in the two decades since my last outrage here, but truth does not change. Bedrock remains bedrock. The dread and hope of the 20th century continue to hang in suspended tension, and within green memory the lessons of honor have been etched upon the national conscience by the life and passion of the 35th President of the United States.

The lessons of honor. And of dishonor.

On November 24, 1963, a former member of the Harvard faculty who was a member of the President's staff received a call from Chicago. The caller was one of America's most gifted women novelists. Lee Oswald had just been shot, and she was distressed. This was the greatest of crimes, she said; the most outrageous of acts; the worst that could have happened.

When, she had finished he replied icily, "The worst happened on Friday, and I didn't hear from you then."

She was confused; she commenced to weep. Her tears and her bewilderment are symptoms of an illness which has afflicted contemporary letters for as long as I have been a reader. In that late autumn of 1963 the conditioned reflexes of the American intellectual were prepared for the murder of an assassin—not for the murder of the Nation's First Magistrate. And the situation is even worse among certain European intellectuals, who by a fantastic feat of mental gymnastics, have made Lee Oswald the martyr of Dallas.

This is madness. But there is a system to the fugue, which is worth exploration. It is a measure of midcentury Angst that while the ignoble are treated with instinctive compassion, nobility is discounted, and even discredited. John Kennedy was a scholar. Yet many of the very men who should have identified themselves with his Presidency were uncomfortable with it. Somehow they couldn't believe in him. Such leaders, they thought, belonged to the past—to the legends of Siegfried, Balder, Attis, and Osiris—if indeed they had ever existed outside of balladry, which was doubtful. In any event the leonine mold had been broken. It therefore followed that this young President who seemed to have been cast from it must be an imposter. Modern greatness was a mirage. The apotheosis who had entered the White House in January of 1961 was a new Quixote, splendidly armored in an era which had become convinced that all armor was tin.

The victim, or "antihero"—their own word—was very different. He was entirely credible. The puerile, Chaplinesque patsy was familiar to them; his sufferings had been celebrated in a thousand contemporary novels and volumes of tragic verse. Of course, there were some dissenters. Robert Frost protested what he called his "tenderer than thou" colleagues. Man, he said, was becoming "a diminished thing." And Lord Russell mocked what he described as "the superior virtue of the oppressed." They were treated as Luddites. Every intellectual had vicariously shared the sufferings of the misfit, the nonconformist, the antiauthoritarian, the picaresque rebel at war with society. Alienation, as it was known among the neosophists, had become a cultural vogue.

It is still fashionable. Remembering Whitman I asked a celebrated poet of my generation whether he contemplated a tribute to President Kennedy. He answered that he was thinking of a eulogy for Oswald. One marvels that no one has written an encomium to Jack Ruby and his trulls. But I suppose there really is a limit to the number of figures who can dance on the end of a pin, especially if they are strippers. And anyhow, I am being quizzical. One ought to take serious literature seriously. Whenever possible.

Kennedy was very much aware of this mode. He was a man with an almost unbelievable range of interests, and unlike most politicians he was acquainted with both the fashion setters and their work. He had realized from the outset that the knee-jerk absolutists among them would regard him as a counterrevolutionary. He had written vividly of the gallantry they deprecated, and he spoke eloquently of the need for a new idealism. In Houston, the night before his death, he quoted the Scriptures: "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

His words did not reach the pedants. Their hearts were too small to receive a President. But there was hardly an academic cloister—hardly a single coldbed of antihero nonworship—which wasn't primed to sympathize with the wretched waif who was to become his murderer.

For every serious fictive work of the past 30 years whose chief character resembled John Kennedy, there have been a hundred whose protagonist was Lee Oswald.

And for every creative writer who has treated politics with high seriousness there is a host which has been willing to make complex questions of American foreign policy the occasion for panty raids.

Thus stated, the issue is ugly. But the facts are ugly, and I am fully aware that citing them is annoying to those whose reasoning is visceral. They do not want reason at all. They want to feed their own ravaged emotions. They—we—have created a literature of protest, and often it is merely a literature of self-pity. The defeated, not the victor, excites the admiration of the artist. It says a great deal for established doctrine that a zealous civic leader is branded "ruthless." One can do much with words.

"Alas," wrote Thomas Carlisle, "the hero of old has had to cramp himself into strange places; the world knows not well at any time what to do with him, so foreign is his aspect in the world."

Carlisle further observed that every age reverences its "gilt-popinjays" and "soot-smeared mumbojumbos." In the new scholasticism there is much gilt and soot. There are on the other hand, few beams and fewer arches. And this lack of architecture is surprising, because the consequent sludge lies thickest on campuses.

In that long ago valediction I spoke about the idea of a university, and I remember being troubled by waspish doubts about what a university really was. The Oxford English Dictionary was no help. "University," it said. "See also varsity." Which seemed needlessly arch. The word itself is almost universal in the West. The original Latin has survived, virtually intact, in English, French, Italian, German, Dutch, Spanish, and Portuguese. Unfortunately there is a rub. In its original sense it denoted any community or corporation. Using that yardstick, Levittown would be a university, and so would Playtex Park. But I think we ought to be more precise.

Benjamin Disraeli once told the House of Commons that "a university should be a place of light, of liberty, and of learning." I wish he could be with us, because I like his definition and I think he would find modern university thought highly entertaining. Disraeli didn't find it necessary to follow through and define learning. In 1873 everyone knew. Today the world spins on a wobblier axis. In an electric age, in an age of flux and elusive shadow—in this age of the darkling plain we are less certain society looks at itself and beholds an image like a carnival mirror. And universities reflect all these distortions and add a few of their own.

Recently, a clinical psychologist who is an eminent authority on pregnant rats stopped in my yard. He had just returned from a convention of clinical psychologists. We sat at either end of a log, he at the Mark Hopkins end, and he looked at me shiftily. "Do you know what the new status symbol is?" he inquired. "Girl graduate students. One old man had three. He rented a house for the meeting." I asked if wives counted, and he shook his head. "Count against you," he said. My friend has only his wife (and his rats) and he looked unconsolable. Status-symbolwise he was obviously non-U.

Another academic, a young professor of English, has created an extraordinary role for himself, complete with costume. He has a beard, eccentric headgear, several carefully rumpled corduroy suits, and a gently rusting automobile. His personal life is disorderly; so is his speech; so are his manners. He is esteemed by his students, whom he openly despises, and although he is rude to his colleagues, he had achieved their respect on the ground that he is creative. The odd thing is that he's not at all creative. He has published a few dull pedagogic articles which slavishly follow the prevailing wind in his

discipline, and that's all. No new ideas, and certainly no stories or poems. But he has cultivated the right image. Never mind what he hasn't done—he looks as though he's done it. He looks creative, and is so accepted. Here, surely is the ultimate triumph of the package.

In each of these cases the catch—catch 22—is the confusing of sheen and substance. We are mistaking the clothes God sometimes wears for God himself. With the ardor of a medieval dance craze men from places "of light, of liberty, and of learning" stampede toward the new shibboleths. The highest of all, the glittering prize at the top of the pole, is unconventionality. Some time ago I encountered a singular advertisement in a magazine which enjoys a large circulation among undergraduates. In large letters the headline read, "Join the Beat Generation." Underneath were instructions on how to join. You merely had to buy one or more items from a list which included "beat generation" rings, "beat generation" lapel insignia, "beat generation" sweatshirts—each with an antic coat of arms on which, among other things, there was a rampant glass of spirits. The implication was clear: Be a nonconformist with the rest of us.

Clearly logic has nothing to do with such fetishes. What is going on here is a highly emotional revolt against all tradition. It has been in progress for quite some time—dadism is 45 years old—and now it has reached the reign of terror stage; now the revolution is devouring its own. The explanation lies in the shape of 20th-century history which has, on the whole, been rather depressing. Two great wars, an enervating depression, and the constant threat that civilization may at any moment be hammered into the earth like a white-hot saucer has weakened faith in traditional authority. Thus many intellectuals—who as a group are far more comfortable with inflexible doctrine than they will concede—have embraced neosophism as revealed religion.

Before the revolt (a good half century ago) we lived according to an intricate pyramid of values. On the whole it was an unsatisfactory structure: unsound, rigid, and, within, stifling. A novel, for example, had to tell a story; painting and statuary had to be representational, music had to be tuneful. The theater was sterile. In life, deviations from the ideal were ignored; in art they were likely to be suppressed.

Today that pyramid has been inverted. Everything which was, is not; everything which was not, is. A novel which displays any semblance of form is dubious. The photographs which are most admired, are taken from odd angles with the lens deliberatly out of focus. One of the best ways to study the inversion is to watch the films acclaimed in Cannes. In some of them protest is total. They appear to be about drab people to whom nothing seems to happen—but then, one cannot be certain, because the camera is usually turned in some other direction.

As incoherent as a superstition, the notion that inversion will solve the macerating problems of our time also has a superstition's power. It would be hard to find an American institution free of its spell. Certainly the American home isn't. The dictatorial father of Freud's time is extinct. Once he roamed the land in vast herds, snorting virile snorts and refreshing himself in austere men's clubs walled with fumed oak before thundering home to preside over his cave. In the 1960's he survives as a flaccid parody of his grandfather, a comic figure on televised situation comedies whose cretin blunders are deftly corrected by his amused family. He is cheap household help.

Above all—or perhaps I should say beneath all—lies an implacable enmity toward the concept of excellence which John Kennedy exalted. We are confronted by a gray tide of mediocrity. If you acquire a light you must cast about quickly for a bushel. If you receive a Phi Beta Kappa key, or a letter sweater, or a legion of honor riband, or any of the bijoux in which people once took pride, you are expected to stow it away in a murky backstair corner. Pride is regarded as primping; as preening.

It naturally follows that the distinctons which separated men from men have become suspect. Instead of leadership we have problem-solving teams. Instead of judges we have referees. Instead of a General in Chief (once a venerable title in the American Military Establishment) we have a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and in lieu of grace and style we have the cult of informality, which in some obscure way is regarded as democratic virtue—as though Mirabeau and Tom Paine would have endorsed come-as-you-are barbecues and the aggressive use of nicknames. Five years ago this summer the Chief Executive of the United States, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and the Chairman of the Soviet Union attended an international conference. They were referred to as "Ike," "Mac," and "K." Is this democracy? I think it is hypocrisy.

Today the brackish tide stands at flood, its eddies lapping at crannies which would once have been thought unapproachable, and conceivably there are endless snubs ahead from those who think that they are better than we are because their manners are worse, their pasts shadier, their brainpans smaller. Decorated soldiers may be insulted by men with unimpeachable records of cowardice. Chaste women may be cut dead by tramps. Dependents may deride us because they are dependent upon us, and unlettered alumni of teachers colleges—the jitney messiahs of bread-and-circuses curriculums—may correct us when we don't talk like they think we should.

Without vision the people perish.

But there is a pendulum, and it swings.

It is a torsion that lies deep in the silent engine of history. It is never at rest. And when it has reached the end of a cycle, when the systolic is ready to replace the diastolic—when the moment of climax has arrived—its own weight reverses it. Then it becomes irresistible, and all the incantations of all the druids in all the Hercynian groves of neosophistry cannot arrest it, or deter it for an instant. The change does not announce itself. But certain individuals can hold the mirror up to the future, and in 1961 such a prescient statesman assumed the Presidency of the United States.

To grasp what he meant, one must first comprehend what he seemed to mean. The two are not at all alike.

There is a montage, and we know it well, for in each picture he is the central figure. We see him first as the boy in the splayed-out football helmet, and the athlete in the black silk swim suit. Next there is a snapshot of a debonair officer posing in the Solomons with a cane and an easy smile, followed by another wartime photograph in which he is being decorated for valor. We watch the young Congressman, the young Senator, the gay groom; and after his inaugural the images flash by with bewildering speed. In the album of our memory there are thousands of frames of him, striding bareheaded and confident through our lives and into history, and together they create an overwhelming impression of a strapping physique, of boundless health and untapped reservoirs of energy. His key was always C major. He didn't even own an overcoat.

But though a man may seem to be larger than life, he is not really. Each of us has his dark star. Even the brightest of us—which he was—is shadowed by another self, the negative that complements the positive print. Throughout life we are in constant dialogue with this other self, sometimes battling it, sometimes losing. It is a measure of this man's stature that he fought these private struggles so successfully that most of his countrymen were unaware there had been any conflict. That victory was a triumph of one man's will. And, indeed, it was a remarkable triumph.

Look for a moment at that other album, of prints which were never published. Consider just one page of it, his struggles with his own health. We glimpse him first as a young boy, defying the sick bed. Doctors are forever sewing him up, or giving him pills, or hospitalizing him. At Choate he is thin as shad, going out for every sport and never making a team. At 18, when he should be in the full flush of health, he is disabled for an entire year. At Harvard he is still trying, and in a sophomore scrimmage he sprains his back. Very well; he will be a swimmer. Feverish, he is ordered to the college infirmary—and slips over to the pool each day to practice his backstroke.

Later he pays. Campaigning for the Senate he hobbles around on crutches. He won't let the voters of Massachusetts see him on them. At rallies he thrusts them aside and forces himself to walk down the aisle unassisted, in racking pain. To shed the crutches he undergoes a critical operation. He doesn't have to do it. He would simply rather die than live an invalid. Afterward doctors strap him to a board. But even there the spark within refuses to be shackled. Lying on that board he writes a book. He calls it "Profiles in Courage," and to the end of our lives we shall never hear the word courage without thinking of him.

His body never really recovers. As President he lies awake until 2 or 3 in the morning, an array of medication beside his bed. He has to wear a medical corset and a quarter-inch lift in his left heel. He can't pick up his own children—can't sit unless the chair had been designed by physicians. Yet he never quits. He becomes a poster of vitality. But his stamina was never physical. It was a vigor of the spirit.

In his lifetime this was poorly understood. Much else about him was misunderstood. For all the millions of words which were written about him, few saw what he was, and this became startlingly clear in the weekend after his death. Those whose job it is to study Presidents had written that he was intellectual, but cold. They said that he had failed to kindle affection in the country, that his countrymen liked him, but would never love him. Then he was gone, and a quarter million people stood in the iron cold to file past his bier; a million lined the streets of Washington to watch it pass and the world went through a convulsion of grief. It was the pundits who had liked him. The people—and not his people alone—had loved him.

And why? Because of his elegance, his self-deprecating wit, his sophistication? That was largely camouflage. He never really admired the irrationalism and mechanism of his time. He remained apart from the ideological stylesetters; he declined to join the bland who led the bland. The one illness which never afflicted him was the cloying narcissism which clots the modern idiom. He never felt victimized. He never felt alienated. That was left to his assassin.

And this, I think, is why John Kennedy meant and continues to mean so much to so many. He wrote of valor, believed in heroes star crowned and all golden, and made his life a monument to that faith. Duty, dedication, and devotion lay at the core of him, and if those words sound quaint the fault lies with us and not with them.

In 1940, as a senior in the Harvard class which is observing its 25th reunion this week, he wrote that "Unless democracy can produce able leaders, its chances of survival are slight." That thought became his keel,

and that was the kind of democracy Paine and Mirabeau would have understood. He fashioned a dream of leadership and fashioned himself to fit it, until ultimately he seemed as the winged lion in the Book of Revelations, with six pairs of wings about him and eyes before, behind, and within. It was illusion. He wasn't even especially tall. But he appeared taller because he was reaching, and because he would never stop reaching his grasp became quite extraordinary.

In the autumn of 1961 Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy told me, "I see him on TV, in rain and cold, bareheaded—and I don't worry. I tell you, something's watching out for him. I know nothing can happen to him. I've stood by his deathbed four times. Each time I said goodby to him, and he always came back."

The Ambassador was wrong. Two autumns later something did happen. And this time he didn't come back. For 18 months we have been living with that thought, and from the first shock of agony millions of us were overwhelmed by a sense of desolation. After he had been lowered into the numb Virginia soil and the wounded earth had been closed and the perpetual light had been left to shine upon the unmending scar—through and through my mind rang Simonides haunting lines, graven at Thermopylae:

"Go, stranger, and in Lakedaimon tell
That here, obdient to their laws, we fell."

That was all we could do then: mourn, and offer the coffin our sprig of lilac, hearing in the sleepless night the stutter of the drums on Pennsylvania Avenue, realizing that victory could never ride at his stirrups now, because those stirrups now held the reversed boots of the fallen chieftain.

But now, I think, we should recall the dazzling hour when he was our champion; pondering what he was, what he meant, what he said—and what he left unsaid, for much of his message was implicit in the staves of his life, and much more was written between the lines. When he told the Germans in Rudolf Wilde Plaze, "Ich bin ein Berliner," and "Lass' sie nach Berlin Kommen," for example, he was really saying, "Ich bin Burger der Stadt der Vernunft," and "Schliesst euch an," and "Zuhlt Euere Steurn."

"I am a citizen of the city of thought."

"Follow my lead."

"And pay your taxes."

The taxes in the city of thought are not coin. They are the act of judgment, the calculated risk, the free assumption of responsibility. They are heavy, they are strenuous—no one knew that better than he did—and they are paid in vain unless they lead to vision. But since the alternative to vision is to perish, since the choice is between payment and extinction, there is no option. "And so," in the words of the inaugural, "let us begin anew."

We must see that horse recaparisoned and remounted by another champion of thought. We must perceive that no weapon can destroy the gift he gave us, unless we let it. He was stronger than flesh in life, and that strength is still among us, waiting to be invoked. The gift is still here, waiting to be taken. In taking it we can do more than grieve, remembering how much more he would have done—and remembering that the first man to answer the tocsin would have been John Kennedy.

It is the least we can do for him. It is the least we can do for ourselves. And we shall do it, provided we do not for a moment forget the Biblical warning he never lived to deliver to the audience that awaited him in the city of Dallas:

"Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

President Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. James D. Atkinson, a distinguished professor at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., personally brought to my office the following article which appeared in the New York Times on June 14. This is a superb article and I recommend it to every Member of Congress, every student and teacher in the United States:

[From the New York Times, June 14, 1965]

IN DEFENSE OF OUR FREEDOMS

(By A. N. Spanel, founder-chairman, International Latex Corp.)

In South Vietnam, and then in the Dominican Republic, President Lyndon B. Johnson faced soul-searing and agonizing decisions. To a man of his strong political instincts, the temptations must have been to push for "peace," however illusory. Better than anyone else he understood that there was no political profit in assuming the risks of military action.

But courageously he brushed aside short-term expediency, and chose instead, commitments to the long-range interests of this Nation and of the free world. He recognized that failure to stop the current Communist aggressions—masquerading as "wars of liberation"—would guarantee more and more aggressions; that temporizing and surrender in southeast Asia and the Caribbean now, far from securing peace, would invite larger and bolder Communist confrontations, each "escalating" the danger to world peace.

Moreover—and this is another measure of the President's dedicated courage—he knew better than anyone else that resolute policies would make his administration the target for organized attack by all the forces directly or indirectly under Communist influence.

The pressures of pacifists and the emotional outbursts of professors and poets, must have come as no surprise to the White House. The American Communist party, its duBois Clubs on the campuses, the Peiping-oriented Communist splinter groups, the irrational better-Red-than-dead outfits—all of them have made clear, long in advance, their intention to block any American interference with Communist "wars of liberation."

THE PRESIDENT'S ASSURANCE

At a news conference on June 1, President Johnson declared: "I am hopeful that every person will always exercise the free speech that the Constitution guarantees him, and I would prefer, of course, that it be constructive and that it be responsible."

But unfortunately much if not most of the current assaults on our policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic do not meet these crucial tests. In the main they are neither constructive nor responsible. Other Americans, who understand and support the President's actions, are under no obligation to shut their eyes to the nature of the raucous protests.

On the contrary, it is their duty to identify the string-pullers behind the scenes, to make clear who initiated the chorus-like calls for withdrawal from southeast Asia and why. It is their duty to expose the forces now manipulating the willing or duped educators who mouth prefabricated slogans that aid Communist imperialist goals. We are grateful that our system permits free debate and open protest. But those cherished rights can be eroded through recklessness or calculated misuse—and this danger all reasonable Americans must overcome through forthright exposure.

TERMITES AT WORK

In a recent dispatch to the New York Times, C. L. Sulzberger posed the issue sharply: "The remarkable Communist propaganda apparatus seeks to undermine the resolve of governments in Saigon and Washington * * *. Many American intellectuals display a strange lemming instinct and refuse to see the struggle in its true meaning as advertised quite openly by the Communists themselves: a showdown with global implications * * *. Our adversary finds it possible to use democratic processes of free speech to harass distant vulnerable spots."

That "remarkable Communist propaganda apparatus" has not even bothered to conceal its operations. More than a year ago Jack Stachel, a top leader of the American Communist Party, called for united fronts of Communists, pacificist groups, and anyone else who could be roped in for a campaign against U.S. policies in southeast Asia.

A party directive to this effect went out to the faithful as far back as March 1964. A Communist-organized telegram campaign to pressure the White House has been underway ever since. The duBois Clubs quickly responded to the party call with all species of demonstrations in the colleges, and left-wing faculty members hastened to join in the mischief.

In every major demonstration against the official policies, duBois Clubbers and others with known Communist backgrounds have been setting the pace and providing the slogans. At the University of California in Berkeley, they were the masterminders and agitators in the demonstrations, the FBI charged after a thorough investigation.

These are but a few of scores of ascertainable facts that, taken together, leave no margin for doubt as to the inspirations and motivations of most of the protest campaign. Professors, who should lead our youth along the paths of truth rather than the back alleys of planned propaganda, have no excuse for allowing themselves to be duped and exploited in behalf of Red imperialist purposes.

THREAT FROM WITHIN

These bemused teachers, fortunately, represent only a small part of the country's college faculties. But the confusion they sow, their bland disregard of the hard facts of Communist aggression, the aid and comfort they give to our sworn enemies, should not be underrated.

There are those who, in the name of a counterfeit liberalism, raise eyebrows at the very mention of the Communist menace. They argue that the known Communists in the Dominican Republic, for instance, are just a handful. Let them recall how a great and vigorous democracy, its people overwhelmingly opposed to communism, was taken over by a handful of native Communists backed by Red Russia. Let them, in short, ponder the fate of Czechoslovakia.

Recently, in a column dealing with what he called "the new appeasers," Joseph Alsop pointed to the extraordinary behavior of "the new American left." They want our country, he wrote, "to go out of business as a great power." Then he added: "It is time to remember that the shadow of Nazi tyranny was not lifted from the world because the United States went out of business as a great power" in the 1930's.

Let us suppose that the danger in southeast Asia today were not a Communist takeover but a Nazi takeover. Would the same

professors and poets have become hysterically noninterventionist and isolationist? Or would they not, most likely, have been clamoring for the use of American power to halt the disaster? Somehow it is only when Communist aggressions are involved that these gentry suddenly break into loud protest.

Are these teach-in and sit-in stalwarts opposed to any interference with Communist plans to enslave more countries? If we do not draw the line in Vietnam or in the Caribbean, shall it be in Thailand, Japan, the Philippines, Hawaii, Alaska? Or do they want us to wait supinely until the Red tide reaches the shores of the American mainland.

Most of the demonstrators profess to be humanitarians, concerned with saving human life. Yet they manage to close their minds to the vast genocidal slaughters awaiting the South Vitenamese and the 240 million people in all of southeast Asia if we permit familiar Communist tyrannies to be imposed on them.

PRESIDENT SUPPORTED

From the country at large President Johnson has received a vote of confidence. Congress overwhelmingly supports him. It is also evidenced in opinion polls, and in editorials in the great majority of grassroots newspapers. But the dissenters are making most of the noise, grabbing most of the headlines and TV time, giving the rest of the world—including the whole Communist world—a false impression of American opinion.

It therefore behooves the rest of us to speak up. We must make manifest our support of the President and our pride in his courage. None of us believes in restricting freedom of speech and protest in meeting the challenge of subversion. But since sheer survival demands that the threat be countered, we must be forever vigilant. We must learn to recognize and to expose, in the marketplace of ideas, the presence of the enemy.

Education Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, an indication of the widespread awareness of the necessity for adequate education in this, and other countries in the world was succinctly pointed out in an editorial in the Fremont Tribune of Nebraska. I include it in the RECORD at this point.

EDUCATION CORPS FIELD IS GREAT

We have a Peace Corps abroad to bring modern skills to backward nations and a Job Corps at home to aid youth in finding useful work. What we need now is a "Minerva Corps" to bring knowledge to the underdeveloped world.

The advice comes from Dr. Henry Steele Commager, philosopher-historian of Amherst College. Speaking before the annual conference of the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools in Washington, Commager urged that the United States set up a Marshall plan for schools in the new nations and a "Minerva Corps" to help educate their peoples for orderly evolution.

Even though this Nation is confronted with educational problems of great magnitude and of the utmost urgency at home, it must help "in one of the great moral and intellectual crusades of modern history—building up schools and technical institutions and universities for the backward parts of the globe."

This must be done, Commager believes, if we are to avoid the disorderly emergence of new nations onto the modern scene and, perhaps most fearsome of all, wars of race against race and of continent against continent.

ROTC Enhances Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest success stories in our Nation is the Reserve Officers Training Corps.

On May 6 in New Orleans, at Tulane University's Air Force and Army ROTC Awards Day, the speaker was Army Maj. Gen. Ralph Palladino.

In his speech, General Palladino outlined the amazing benefits that a college youth gains from ROTC training and this, of course, means that the Nation benefits as well. Since the Congress has a strong and continuing interest in this dynamic program, as evidenced by the passage of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps Vitalization Act of 1964, I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in the statistics cited by General Palladino.

Accordingly, it is a real pleasure to include the text of General Palladino's address into the RECORD. The message aptly might be summarized by saying that "ROTC enhances success":

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. RALPH PALLADINO

Dr. Longenecker, members of the faculty of Tulane University, it is a distinct honor and privilege for me to participate in this most important ceremony. It is indeed a pleasant duty for me to be here.

It is always a pleasure for me to take part in a ceremony which has to do with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for I personally owe a great deal to the ROTC.

Furthermore, I welcome this opportunity to come to Tulane and be on the platform with your distinguished president, Dr. Longenecker. As a member of the ROTC Panel of the Department of Defense, Dr. Longenecker has contributed greatly to the discussions and deliberations of the Panel, and I know from personal observation that his wise counsel has found its way in much of the recommendations of that body.

Dr. Longenecker, I extend to Tulane University my sincere congratulations for the outstanding record of the three ROTC programs on this campus. While several hundred colleges and universities have at least one ROTC unit, Tulane University is in a select company of only 33 universities with all 3 officer training programs—Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Tulane also deserves highest commendation for the extent of voluntary participation of its undergraduate students in the ROTC. With 40 percent of all freshman and sophomore men students enrolled on a voluntary basis, Tulane University has one of the highest, if not the highest, records of voluntary participation in the Nation.

Almost 40 years ago I was in a formation similar to one such as this and I can recall with mixed emotions my thoughts of that day.

Happy that I had about completed the course of instruction that was to result in my being commissioned a second lieutenant of infantry of the Army of the United States, and yet apprehensive as to what the future had in store for me.

Little did I know at the time, that my ROTC training was going to stand me in such good stead throughout the years.

My ROTC, my Army Reserve career, my active military service, my business and Government experience, have been a series of happy and satisfying experiences, just as it has been to many other graduates. The ROTC is a program that we can be justly proud of, and one that is of great importance to the defense posture of our country.

Incidentally, one of Tulane's illustrious sons, the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT, the distinguished Congressman from New Orleans, is a tower of strength in the ROTC field, and he played the lead role in steering through the last Congress, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps Vitalization Act of 1964.

Many of the present leaders of our Services are graduates of the ROTC. In the Army there are upward to 100 general officers on active duty with a background of ROTC; and in the Air Force there are 40 such general officers.

Only 3 short years ago, three of the four Chiefs of the military services were ROTC graduates.

Gen. George H. Decker was the Army's Chief of Staff, an ROTC graduate from Lafayette College.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force; a field artillery graduate of the ROTC program at Ohio State University.

Gen. David M. Shoup, the then Commandant of the Marine Corps, and a Medal of Honor winner; an ROTC graduate from DePauw University.

You can readily see that there is no limit as to how far you can advance in the military should you choose to make it your career. Some of you could well be thinking, "Well, I do not intend to make the military my life's work. How about the many other fields?"

In recent months the ROTC staff of the Office of Reserve Components, Department of the Army, have done an analysis of successful Americans in four fields, to determine the statistical relationship between success and Army military training in college. Briefly they discovered that: (1) close to 15 percent of the ambassadors who last year represented the United States throughout the world, had ROTC training in college; (2) 10 percent of the Members of Congress have had ROTC training; (3) 24 percent of the Governors of our various States have had college military training; and finally (4) of the highest paid executives listed in "Who's Who," earning between $100,000 and $300,000 a year, 28 percent are ROTC-trained men.

In other words, according to the analysis that was made, the student who included military training in his civilian education was six times more likely to become a top executive than the young man who concentrated exclusively in other areas. It may be concluded, therefore, that the college educated, trained leader, and that is what the ROTC produces, has a real advantage in life.

You know really, there isn't a great deal of difference between a successful military leader and a successful leader in business. Drive, ambition, initiative, imagination, and a sound education are all necessary in any successful leader. I'm not trying to say that I have all these qualities, nor to what degree—but I do want to get across that I know from experience that ROTC does make a significant contribution to the chances of success in business, in Government, and in the military.

Again, I'm happy to be here and participate in this fine ceremony.

My congratulations to all of you for having successfully completed another year of your training. Special congratulations to you award winners and all those about to be commissioned as officers in the U.S. Army and U.S. Air Force.

To all of you—you look good out there—good luck and thank you.

Driblets of History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the public very properly questions the long-term effectiveness and intent of the administration foreign policy. It is especially important that we check the history of U.S. diplomacy in the Roosevelt era since President Johnson is so often described as a protege of F.D.R.

The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial this morning, commented on the conduct of foreign policy under President Roosevelt that has finally filtered through the web of wartime censorship:

DRIBLETS OF HISTORY

Twenty-one years after the event, the State Department lets us know that in 1944, a year before the end of the war in the Pacific, Japan was already trying to surrender. The overture, made through the minister of neutral Sweden in Tokyo, is disclosed in the State Department's publication of papers bearing on America's foreign relations for 1944.

The minister, Widar Bagge, cabled Stockholm that Japan was prepared to relinquish all the territory it had occupied during the war and also that part of China which it had previously seized and organized as the puppet state of Manchukuo. Bagge said that he was approached by a representative of "one of the best known statesmen in Japan and there is no doubt that this attempt must be considered a serious one."

The Swedish Government transmitted the peace feeler to Britain, which in turn informed Washington. The reply from the administration of President Franklin Roosevelt was that the sole American terms were "unconditional surrender."

This is a witless formula carelessly tossed off by Roosevelt at the Casablanca Conference in January 1943. Its inevitable effect was to close the door upon any reasonable negotiated peace, to solidify Axis resistance and needlessly prolong the war, and to insure that peace would never come until Germany and Japan, the two great barriers to Communist expansion in Europe and Asia, were prostrate.

The result in Europe was to insure that the war would drag on for more than 2 years after the German defeat at Stalingrad had convinced most responsible officers and the German people that the war had been lost. In the Pacific, judged from the peace tender transmitted through Sweden, the slaughter was prolonged for a year or more after the Japanese Government was willing to quit fighting. The wholly unnecessary atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was one consequence. Soviet entry into the war in the last 6 days of a contest that had already seen 1,341 days of fighting was insured and the installation of communism in Asia followed.

All of these grim results, disastrously shattering the world balance of power, flowed mechanically from Roosevelt's doctrine of "unconditional surrender," which for 2½ years hung like an albatross around the necks of America and Britain.

Even Roosevelt was not unaware of the consequences of his crack-brained demand. His son, Elliott, who was with him at Casablanca, quoted him as saying, "Of course, it's just the thing for the Russians. They couldn't want anything better. Unconditional surrender," he repeated, thoughtfully sucking a tooth. "Uncle Joe [Stalin] might have made it up himself."

Because of this folly, and because of Soviet duplicity, Japan was forced to wait until it had been smashed to the ground before it could get out of the war, and countless American lives were sacrificed to no purpose. After the attempt through Sweden to communicate its readiness to quit the war, Japan made many others. Most of them were routed through Russia, with which Japan had a nonaggression pact—broken as soon as it served the Soviet purpose. All of them were pigeonholed.

But the last thing Moscow wanted was to get the war over quickly, for it had to cut itself in on the conflict in order to pick up the pieces in the Far East. Roosevelt, in secret deals at Yalta, threw in needless bonuses to Stalin in return for a promise to jump Japan—an enterprise from which Stalin could not have been kept even if wild horses had tried to drag him from it.

So now 21 years afterward, we get another spoonful of secret history from the State Department, and all it confirms is what we already knew—that Roosevelt, in his travels to conferences and in his diplomatic decisions, could have used an escort of wardens to keep him from sacrificing his country and the world to an endless future of conflict.

Worse Than War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Bristol Enterprise, an outstanding weekly newspaper in my district, published a thoughtful editorial on the meaning of Memorial Day. As we face a most uncertain future, I think it sums up what most Americans are thinking now. I am glad to offer it for the RECORD:

WORSE THAN WAR

Another Memorial Day. Never a joyous holiday, but a time of sadness tinged with pride, for there are few among us without some member of the family to honor on this day. The sadness deepens as we realize that even as we commemorate them their numbers are growing every day. The fight is far from won.

The stories of atrocities, the sickening sight of pictures from our current battlefields, make this indeed a solemn Memorial Day and cast a pall of deeper hue than usual. The thought of our sons and husdands and fathers carrying the torch of freedom at such a price is enough to make the bravest falter.

Perhaps we can take some heart from the words of the great Winston Churchill, when before World War II every means, both good and bad, was being taken to avoid that conflict. The story is told that one day at table, somebody remarked that nothing was worse than war. Churchill, almost rising in his chair, thundered, "Dishonor is worse than war. Slavery is worse than war."

Highly Respected National Industrial Conference Board Joins Long List of Martin Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, following is an item from the Washington Post of June 12 that disputes Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin's observations of June 1 of "disquieting similarities between today and 1929," by Martin R. Gainsbrugh, vice president of the prestigious National Industrial Conference Board. The writer rightly refers to a series of protective measures that has been developed to deal more directly with the basic causes of recession and depression. These include, as the article recites, the Employment Act of 1946, which I actively supported, as well as deposit insurance, unemployment insurance and many others.

The NICB is another among a long list of critics of Chairman Martin's unfortunate and erroneous doomsday message and serves as further proof that Martin's speech was intended to pave the way for further credit tightening by the Federal Reserve. Such a move would benefit short-term profits for money market banks, but would certainly have grave consequences for the continuation of our unprecedented business prosperity. The article follows:

GAINSBRUGH COUNTERS MARTIN WARNINGS: U.S. ECONOMIC STRENGTHS CITED

SYRACUSE, N.Y., June 11.—National Industrial Conference Board Vice President Martin R. Gainsbrugh today listed some comforting dissimilarities between the Nation's economy today and in 1929.

Gainsbrugh's speech, before the Syracuse Rotary Club, was the latest of a series of economic statements by industry and Government leaders to counter the effect of Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McC. Martin's observations last week of "disquieting similarities" between today and the 1920's.

Martin said the overwhelming impression of recent comparison of the economic scene in the two periods "is that the current situation closely parallels that of 1929 with all the ominous overtones such a conclusion might imply."

He said, however, that as a result of the great depression, a series of protective measures has been developed designed to deal more directly with the basic causes of recession and depression. These include the Employment Act of 1946, which commits the Nation's full resources to whatever action might be required to create high-level employment, margin controls for securities trading, bank guarantees and deposit insurances, and amortized mortgages.

Gainsbrugh also noted that sweeping changes in the structure of industry also

provide bulwarks against depression and recession that were nonexistent in the twenties.

He said today's business executives are drawn more from professional talent "trained in the discipline of business decisionmaking at graduate schools of business and through executive seminars."

Gainsbrugh noted that investment decisions today "reflect far more organized deliberation and determination of future market potential than was possible in the 1920's, and that American enterprise today is more multiproduct and multinational in that, should demand fall off in one sector, such diversification would mitigate against as sharp a curtailment of employment and production as took place after 1929."

Bury the Ohio Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Press, June 14, 1965:

BURY THE OHIO CANAL

The latest studies of the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal indicate that the Army Board of Engineers was entirely correct in granting more time to analyze this billion-dollar boobytrap. Evidence of the plan's potential disaster is mounting daily.

Ohio ports, for example, are beginning to realize the full extent of the problems they would face if the project is approved.

"If the proposed canal is built, the importance of Toledo as a lake port and a world port will wane," said Charles Denby, counsel for the Upper Ohio Valley Association. "Traffic for the proposed billion-dollar ditch is not new traffic; it is simply traffic now being handled in Ohio's Lake Erie ports."

The economic stability of these ports would be reason enough to reject the plan to spend more than a billion dollars (possibly as much as $2 billion) on this project. But other areas would also face serious problems.

The New York State Water Authority has protested that the canal would divert critically needed water supplies from Lake Erie. The Canadian Government also has expressed concern because water levels of the Great Lakes have already declined to the point where commercial interests of the United States and Canada have been threatened.

In addition, the canal would put Pittsburgh district industries at a competitive disadvantage and could toss thousands of railroaders out of work.

Perhaps the only district which stands to benefit from the canal is the Youngstown area, whose spokesmen have been campaigning relentlessly for the project. In other words, U.S. taxpayers are being asked to shell out more than a billion dollars for a shameful boondoggle which might benefit Youngstown industries but would pose new problems for other areas of the United States, not to mention Canada.

In view of the huge volume of evidence against the canal, it should be quite apparent by now that the project would be a scandalous waste of the taxpayers' money. It is nothing more than an attempt by Youngstown interests to grab more than a billion dollars of U.S. tax money. This overripe proposal deserves a quick burial in Congress.

The Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Dan K. Moore, Governor of North Carolina, made the following statement before the subcommittee of the House Labor Committee conducting hearings on section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. Governor Moore's statement is a classic in defense of individual liberty.

The statement follows:

My name is Dan Moore. I am Governor of the State of North Carolina. My appearance here today is to present testimony for preserving the right of every American to be able to work in the job of his choice without being required to join an organization of any kind or having to pay tribute of any kind as a condition of his employment.

My reasons for opposing any change in section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, are, I believe, in harmony with the guarantees of the Constitution of the United States of America.

No man is free if he is compelled under the law to join an organization to retain his job. It is a subterfuge to claim that a man may obtain employment freely, when, under a union shop, he must join a union in order to keep his job. He might just as well be required to join an organization before he is given employment, because the end result is the same: He must pay tribute to the labor union in order to keep his job.

The Congress has passed legislation prohibiting any discrimination in employment because of sex, race, religion, or national origin. And, yet, those who wish to abolish our right-to-work laws would, it seems to me, discriminate against the employee who does not wish to join a union.

In North Carolina we have had a right-to-work law since 1947. It has served our people well. Under our law, any North Carolinian is free to join or not to join a union, just as he is free to join or not to join a church, a fraternal, or civic organization. This, we believe, is democracy.

In order to express the fundamental philosophy upon which right to work laws rest, I would like to read to you from section 1 of North Carolina's right to work law, which has been in effect for 18 years. It reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. The right to live includes the right to work. The exercise of the right to work must be protected and maintained free from undue restraints and coercion. It is hereby declared to be the public policy of North Carolina that the right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization or association."

Where right to work laws exist, no man is denied his democratic right to join a union. Where compulsory unionism exists, his choice to join or not to join is gone.

North Carolina has prospered and is making rapid strides in industrial development. Relations between labor and management are excellent and our industrial community has enjoyed an unprecedented period of industrial peace. We want to preserve this splendid relationship; we want to preserve this peace; above all, we want to preserve the right of every worker to join or not to join a union according to the dictates of his own will and conscience.

I count it a privilege to make this statement in behalf of the right of the individual to make a choice, for in this age of big business, big labor, and big government, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the voice of the individual to be heard.

The Tragedy of the Baltic States

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago while the world's attention was focused on the Battle of Britain, Soviet troops moved into the Baltic States of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. During 3 agonizing days, June 14, 15, and 16, 1940, over 100,000 people were deported to Soviet concentration camps in Siberia. The occupation of these three small, progressive, and independent nations took place under conditions of extreme cruelty and in complete defiance of international law and order.

In their long history through the centuries, the Baltic States have never experienced such extermination and annihilation of their people as during the Soviet's last 25 years of occupation. During this time, these countries have lost more than one-fourth of their entire population. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were murdered by the Soviets or died in exile in slave-labor camps and prisons in Siberia and other places of Communist Russia. At least 20 percent of the present population of Soviet-occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are not the Balts but the Soviet colonists who are diabolically trying to repopulate and "Russify" the Baltic lands.

At the present time, the Soviet Union in its ruthless fashion carries on the pretext that the people of the Baltic States are content as members of the U.S.S.R. and also maintains the pretext that the Soviet Socialist Republics bearing their names gives their people recognition and autonomy.

The people of the Baltic States have displayed throughout their history the stamina and ingenuity necessary to withstand years of occupation. They courageously maintain their language, cultures, and religious beliefs, and their brothers in the free world strive to keep alive the spirit of freedom for which they stand. They look forward to the day when independence and legitimate governments may be restored.

The Baltic States, like all countries under Communist rule, belong properly to the community of free nations. The ideals of freedom and independence remain alive in the men, women, and children of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

If the United States is to retain its leadership in the struggle against communism, it must demonstrate courage, firmness, and an unequivocal stand for basic human rights. The yearning for freedom of these enslaved people and their continued devotion to the ideal of human liberty constitute a threat to the rule of the Communist oppressors. We must help keep that faith alive. For 25

years our Government has refused to recognize the legality of the Soviet occupation of these countries, but today the gestures toward accommodation with the Soviet rules are discouraging and frightening to the many friends of these Baltic States.

In observance of that day 25 years ago, we today pay tribute to the bravery and dedication of these people through an expression of our warmest affection and with the assurance of our continued efforts to return freedom and democracy to their countries.

Lake Michigan Water Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for too long, the Chicago metropolitan area has suffered from an artificial limitation on the amount of water that the city is allowed to draw from Lake Michigan.

Numerous attempts in recent years to obtain legislative adjustment have failed due to the lack of understanding on the part of many Members representing other States bordering on the Great Lakes.

The Economist newspapers, an independent chain serving the Chicago metropolitan area, carried a most timely editorial on this issue on June 2, which I feel should be carefully studied by those Members who have in the past disagreed with Chicago's request for additional diversion of water from the Great Lakes.

NOW IT'S OUT

For almost half a century, the other States and cities bordering on the Great Lakes have blamed Chicago for the periodical lowering of lake levels. They succeeded in inducing the U.S. Supreme Court to reduce the city's original taking of 11,500 cubic feet of water per second from the lake to 7,500 feet, and they succeeded again in having that amount reduced to the present withdrawal of 1,500 cubic feet.

Still not satisfied, the other States and cities have been pressing for more than a year for a further reduction. Hearings have been underway that long by the International Joint Commission of Canada and the United States.

At the latest session of the Commission, held in the U.S. courthouse Wednesday, Albert J. Meserow, chairman of the Great Lakes Commission of Illinois, contended the lack of rainfall, evaporation, and the tilting of the earth are responsible for the lowered levels.

He reminded the Commission that lake levels in 1952 and 1953 were so excessively high that damage to shorelines, buildings, roads, and docks was about $150 million on the lower end of Lake Michigan.

And the high levels occurred at a time when Chicago was withdrawing its allotted amount.

Meserow also asserted the opposition of the Great Lakes States is politically motivated.

Abundant fresh water to maintain the levels of the lakes has and is being wasted, and engineers familiar with the situation know this to be true. Meserow pointed out, for instance, that huge streams now flow into Hudson's Bay in northeast, upper Canada. Other streams in Canada empty into landlocked lakes.

To divert them into the Great Lakes is not an insurmountable project. What has proven to be insurmountable is to convince Congress and Parliament that the United States and Canada should get going with it. The need of water for the Great Lakes will continue as long as man inhabits the earth.

Bridgeport Symbolizes Rise in "Public Goods"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article from the Christian Science Monitor of June 12, 1965, which tells what Bridgeport is doing to make it a better place to live and work in, while not overwhelming the taxpayer. As the article points out, it is the Bridgeport story, but it has a meaning reaching far beyond the city's borders.

The article follows:

BRIDGEPORT SYMBOLIZES RISE IN "PUBLIC GOODS"

(By Charles J. Stokes)

Park Avenue is a symbol of the rapid economic changes in the United States now.

The Park Avenue under discussion runs the entire north-south length of Bridgeport, Conn.

What is going on along this Park Avenue is a story about the American economy that figures don't quite show. And Bridgeport is a factory city very much like Rockford, Ill., Erie, Pa., Utica, N.Y., or Paterson, N.J.

New factories are scattered all over the metropolitan area of Bridgeport. Some are the older, more familiar type, while some are of the newer, "think shop" type.

What is new and significant, though, is the vast increase in the provision of what John Kenneth Galbraith calls "public goods." His "Affluent Society," now a classic, pointed up a severe lack of these goods and a reluctance to spend for them.

A new science and art museum, a community center, a cathedral, a university, and an expanded hospital—these are but a few of the new "public goods" provided citizens of Bridgeport since 1960.

GOVERNMENT ASSISTS

There is a new public-school complex at the poorer end of Park Avenue, a redevelopment project underway in connection with a north-south expressway, and some widening, straightening, and paving of Park Avenue itself. These give a measure of the government contribution.

You may recall that Mr. Galbraith was particularly at pains to show that local taxes could not support the potential growth in demand for public goods. But in Bridgeport, it is apparent that the property tax base has not had to bear all the burden.

Here are some of the latest additions:

A new museum, financed entirely by a public-funds drive.

The new University of the Sacred Heart, the only lay diocesan Roman Catholic university in the United States. It is financed by gifts from a constituency which has long felt a need for such a school.

The community center contributed by the Jewish people of Greater Bridgeport. It already has become an intellectual and cultural focus for the region.

A new Greek cathedral still under construction.

Park City Hospital, in the lower reaches of the avenue, is being doubled in size with little or no government contribution.

The new Roosevelt School complex, which will serve a neighborhood traditionally on the fringe of affluence.

INTEGRATED ROSTER

Though Negroes and Puerto Ricans will form a significant proportion of this schools' roster, it will be integrated in every sense of of that term.

Park Avenue now has a 15-story apartment house, 2 more apartment towers underway, and many smaller housing units finished. There are new office buildings for professional men—doctors, dentists, lawyers, accountants, and the like.

The pride of homeowners along the North Avenue to State Street stretch is shown in a paint-up, clean-up, perk-up campaign that has put an end to decay for a pleasant old neighborhood.

Most people recall the factories of mill towns across the Nation. The smoke, the noise, and the crowding are being replaced rapidly by more livable cities. All this while employment continues to climb.

Park Avenue, Bridgeport, then, is a symbol of the way in which Americans are increasing their supply of public goods—a story worth telling.

The 25th Anniversary of the Soviet Union's Enslavement of the Lithuanian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanians are one of the three constituent peoples in the Baltic region, in northeasternmost part of Europe. These 3 million Lithuanians have played an important part in European history, and have contributed more than their share to the civilization of the West. They have had their ups and downs, but in modern times their history is marked mostly by misfortune.

Their homeland had been overrun by the Russians in late 18th century and they had become the restless subjects of Russian czars. For more than a century they endured the unbearable yoke of Russia's oppressive autocratic regime, and when that regime was no more, they proclaimed their independence in 1918. Having thus regained their freedom and independence, they reconstituted their own democratic government, rebuilt their ravaged country, and lived happily there for about two decades, in peace and prosperity. Both their democratic institutions and their prosperity roused the jealousy and envy of their inveterate foes, the Communist Russians. This view was confirmed when early in the last World War the Soviet Government showed its clear determination of putting an end to Lithuanian independence.

The Soviet authorities committed this international crime by seizing Lithuania in mid-1940 and enslaving its peaceful and inoffensive inhabitants. Since that fateful year, Lithuanians have been robbed of their freedom and today they suffer under Communist totalitarianism. On this 25th anniversary observance of that illegal act by the Soviet Government, we all ardently hope for the deliverance of the Lithuanian people from their ruthless oppressors.

Fifteenth Annual Convention of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the 15th Annual Convention of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas has been held in Miami, Fla., on the 14th, 15th, and 16th of this month. In work sessions, panels, discussions, and from speeches, the delegates and observers at the convention are engaging in personal communication of the finest kind to improve relationships between the continents of South and North America.

Delegates and observers are in attendance from the Caribbean, the countries of South America, and North America. The entire hemisphere is represented, and some of the outstanding names in business and government have made significant contributions to mutual understanding. Among the speakers are the Honorable Jack Hood Vaughn, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Department of State, and Dr. Alberto Sola, Secretary General of the Latin America Free Trade Association. Also participating is Dr. Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, Chairman of the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress. One of the work sessions will be addressed by the Honorable Dr. Victor Manuel Cuellar-Ortiz, Under Secretary for Economic Integration and International Commerce, Ministry of Economy, El Salvador.

Mr. C. Lincoln Sandelin of the Inter-American Development Bank will address the convention, as well as the Honorable Earl Faircloth, attorney general of Florida. There are representatives of tourist boards and tourist commissions from various countries discussing modern tourism development and its place in the hemisphere's economy. Dr. Irving Muskat discussed Interama and its relation to Latin America. The potential is limitless for hemispheric understanding and cooperation which is inherent in this truly outstanding and unique concept of an inter-American cultural and trade center.

The convention was also addressed by Mr. Fred H. Billups, who is president of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce, which is one of the sponsoring organizations of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas. Mr. Billups brings a wealth of experience to this convention, having operated more than 20 years in almost every country in Latin America. He addressed the convention on the responsibilities of U.S. business organizations abroad. The Alliance for Progress came in for its share of the discussions. One of the speakers who talked on current AID developments was Mr. James Boren, director of the Partners of the Alliance.

One of the high points of the convention came on opening day, with the address by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. He has made a most significant contribution to the thinking and the actions of this body and our Government concerning inter-American relations. His work here, of course, is well known, recognized, and respected. He addressed the opening session of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas, discussing in candid, straight talk, the very timely and important question of Santo Domingo. Our colleague's speech was well received, and gained for him and for us new recognition and perspective. I am sure that all my colleagues will be interested in his remarks which were delivered on Monday, June 14, 1965, at the 15th Annual Convention of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas in Miami, Fla.:

ADDRESS OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE ARMISTEAD SELDEN AT THE 15TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE AMERICAS AT MIAMI, FLA., JUNE 14, 1965

Gentlemen, it is a great privilege to address this annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas. Your membership in the chamber signifies your devotion to democratic ideals, your appreciation of the intricate connection between private enterprise and political freedom, and your determination to work individually and collectively to further hemisphere friendship and understanding.

In view of the chamber's purposes and goals, the choice of Miami for this convention seems especially suitable. This area has produced a number of distinguished Members of the U.S. Congress who have demonstrated deep and abiding concern for strengthening inter-American cooperation: Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, Congressman PAUL ROGERS, and Congressman DANTE FASCELL. I can attest specially to Congressman FASCELL's wide knowledge and interest in hemisphere relations for we have worked together closely on the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs for over 6 years.

The Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, of which I am chairman, has long recognized that private organizations such as yours can make substantial contributions toward hemisphere peace and progress. In the first report issued by the subcommittee, shortly after I became chairman in 1959, we stated:

"That nongovernmental contacts between people of all the American Republics are an essential avenue toward better understanding."

But while thousands of private citizens strive to improve hemisphere cooperation, other forces are at work to divide the Americas. The current situation in the Dominican Republic clearly reveals the nature of our problem. I wager that as you gathered here with old and new friends, not long after abrazos were exchanged the question of the Dominican Republic crept into your conversation. And that is only natural, for free trade, investments, the protection of private property, inter-American development, democratic ideals—indeed, all the goals of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas—are intimately bound up with the outcome of the Dominican crisis. For that reason, I should like to talk with you about that crucial situation.

Unhappily, reporting by some segments of the press, major networks, and wire services has been inaccurate and sometimes distorted. For instance, at the height of the chaos in the Dominican Republic, the New York Herald Tribune, a newspaper of national circulation, published a four-column photograph on its front page. The picture showed a U.S. Marine firing at a target which could not be seen. But the caption read: "On the fence in Santo Domingo, an American Marine, under orders to stay neutral, fires at a sniper." Similarly, the influential New York Times published a picture on May 21 of two armed marines marching seven men, hands clasped behind their necks, through a crowded street. The caption on this picture read: "Police action: U.S. troops arrest Dominicans suspected of insurgent activity in Santo Domingo, Washington spokesmen have denied aiding forces of the junta." These are the grossest sort of distortions. The fact is that U.S. troops were under OAS instructions to maintain peace in the neutral zone and supply corridor established by OAS mandate on May 1. In both pictures, that is exactly what the marines were doing. Furthermore, the picture published by the Times had been taken 10 days earlier, yet the Times used it in conjunction with stories on May 21 to the effect that the United States was supporting Imbert's forces in their attack on rebel positions in the northern sector of Santo Domingo.

Not all the distortions have been by pictorial innuendo. The Herald Tribune's reporter on the scene stated categorically that he could find no foreign diplomat accredited to the Dominican Republic who agreed with Washington's assessment of the situation. Other reporters simply ignored completely the opinions of the diplomatic corps in Santo Domingo, making no mention at all of their conversations with Latin American and European Ambassadors on the scene. Yet Ambassador Vazquez Carrizosa of Colombia, one of the five-man special committee sent to the Dominican Republic by the Organization of American States, had a different story.

Upon the Special Committee's return to Washington on May 7, the Ambassadors of Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, and Guatemala (the fifth member of the Committee, the Ambassador of Panama, remained in Santo Domingo to keep the OAS presence there alive) answered their OAS colleagues' questions regarding the situation in the Dominican Republic for over 4 hours. In answer to a question of whether, "in the high command of the rebel group, there is now definite and significant Communist leadership," Ambassador Vazquez Carrizosa replied:

"With regard to the sector led by Col. Francisco Caamano, many diplomats accredited in the Dominican Republic, and I can include my country's diplomatic representative, feel that, if not Col. Francisco Caamano, who I do not know to be personally a Communist, there are indeed numerous persons on his side that, if they are not members of the Communist Party, are actively in favor of Fidel Castro's system of government or political purposes. There is such a tendency in the opinion of many diplomats I spoke to, and I do not mention other countries in order not to commit countries represented here. They are firmly convinced that on that

side there are many persons, I do not say members registered in an officially organized Communist Party, but persons who do have leanings toward a well-known trend prevalent in Cuba."

Ambassador Penna Marinho, of Brazil, answered in this way:

"I should like to add, gentlemen, that with the complete collapse of public authority—since neither the forces of the government junta of Benoit, Santana, and Saladin, nor those of Colonel Caamano were in control of the situation—the domonican state practically disappeared as a juridical-political entity, and the country became a sort of no man's land. The arsenal had been given to the people and an entire disoriented population of adolescents and fanatics was taking up modern automatic arms, in a state of excitation that was further exacerbated by constant radio broadcasts of a clearly subversive character.

"Neither do I believe that I am, nor does any of the members of this committee believe that he is, in a position to state with assurance that the movement of Colonel Caamano, inspired by the truly popular figure of former President Bosch, is a clearly Communist movement. But one fact is certain. In view of the real anarchy in which the country has been engulfed for several days, especially the capital city, where bands of snipers have been sacking and killing and obeying no one, any organized group that landed on the island could dominate the situation.

"For that reason, and our understanding coincides with that of a majority of the depositions of the chiefs of diplomatic missions accredited there, all of the members of the committee agree in admitting that the Caamano movement, fortunately truly democratic in its origins, since none of us sincerely believes that Caamano is a Communist, could be rapidly converted into a Communist insurrection; above all it is seen to be heading toward becoming a government of that kind, susceptible of obtaining the support and the assistance of the Marxist-Leninist powers.

"Therefore, Mr. President, we do not believe that Colonel Caamano and his closest advisers are Communists. Meanwhile, as the entire Caamano movement rests upon a truly popular basis, by certain areas escaping from the control of that democratic group of leaders it would be quite possible for that movement to be diverted from its real origins and to follow the oblique plan of popular-based movements, which can easily be controlled by clever agents and experts in the art of transforming democratic popular movements into Marxist-Leninist revolutions."

I hope you will pardon me for quoting at such length from the report of the OAS Special Committee. But it is extremely important that the views expressed by an official committee of the Organization of American States be widely disseminated so that public opinion throughout the Americas will understand the conditions prevailing in the Dominican Republic which led President Johnson to the painful decision to send U.S. troops into a neighboring country.

I would be willing to bet that the majority of you—all well informed men—were unaware of the Special Committee's illuminating report to the Council of the OAS, a report which thoroughly vindicates the precautionary measures which President Johnson was forced to take. But your ignorance of the report is understandable. Here again the major news media were gravely derelict in not reporting a crucial item.

Despite the fact that an official organ of the Organization of American States has confirmed the imminent possibility of a Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic, the press continues to question the validity of the Communist threat.

Furthermore, a large segment of the news media is perpetuating the myth that Colonel Caamano represents "constitutionalism." I do not take sides one way or another in the Dominicans' internal conflict, but I do believe that hemisphere interests are not served by grave distortions. If we are to understand what is transpiring in the Dominican Republic in order to make rational decisions, it is imperative to stick to the truth.

Hence, it is with wonder and despair that I observe certain omissions in stories regarding Colonel Caamano's role in the Dominican crisis. The fact is that Col. Francisco Caamano Deno's so-called constitutional credentials are nonexistent. Caamano helped overthrow the constitutional President, Juan Bosch, in 1963. Furthermore, the Bosch constitution that Caamano supposedly supports contains two interesting provisions. Caamano, you will recall, claims to be Bosch's legitimate heir, having been elected to the post of President by the remnants of the constitutional Congress. It is true that the constitution provides that in the absence the President, Vice President, President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House, Congress shall elect a chief of state to serve the remainder of the missing President's term. However, the same constitution states that the new chief of state shall be selected from the party of the missing President. The same constitution also forbids any military man to hold office. Colonel Caamano is, of course, a military man; and Colonel Caamano is also not a member of Bosch's PRD.

Unhappily, these distortions of the facts in the Dominican situation are making an intensely difficult situation even more trying. The American nations are going to need all the clarity they can bring to bear to prevent the Dominican case from shaking the very foundations of the Organization of American States and the Alliance for Progress.

The Communists and fellow-travelers are gleefully portraying U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic as a return to gunboat diplomacy. Should this view take root and blossom throughout the hemisphere, the foundations of inter-American cooperation could be fatally undermined.

It is therefore, imperative to understand the present challenge to inter-American relations. The framework of the inter-American system—the Charter of the Organization of American States and the treaty of reciprocal assistance—was forced in gentler times, before the nuclear age and before the Soviets stepped up a campaign of aggression in Latin America through covert subversion. "Aggression," in the context of hemisphere doctrine, meant old-fashioned direct armed attack. "Nonintervention," the sacred cornerstone of the inter-American system, came to apply largely to the United States. Thus, when the Communists embarked on their more subtle tactics of subversion, many sincere Americans, both north and south of the Rio Grande, were slow to recognize that the Communists' modern techniques constituted as certain an "intervention" and "aggression" as moving troops across borders.

My Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs has for some time been concerned about the apparent failure of the regional system to cope with the new Communist techniques. In a report of April 4, 1963, we found:

"Although the inter-American collective security system is prepared to meet the possibility of open military aggression by Communist forces against nations of the hemisphere, no plan for collective action against Communist subversive aggression has been put in effect."

We further stated:

"Communist potential for aggression cannot be measured solely in terms of regular military forces of 'offensive' capabilities. The fact that Castro Communist forces in Cuba are incapable without outside assistance of mounting successfully a traditional military 'offensive' blow in the hemisphere does not minimize the Communist threat to inter-American security."

In its recommendations, the subcommittee stated:

"The distinction between 'aggressive' and 'subversive' activities is without significance. Subversive activities, as conducted by Communist forces in the world today, represent as certain a form of aggression as direct military aggression.

"It is recommended that the threat posed by the aggressive capability of Castro Communist subversion be dealt with by whatever means may be necessary in the security interests of the United States and all the nations of the Western Hemisphere."

Two years have passed since that subcommittee recommendation. Now we are confronted with the very circumstances which the subcommittee feared. The United States, forced to move unilaterally because the OAS had still not devised a collective instrument against Communist subversion, must now bear the criticism for "intervention," when indeed the United States moved to counter Communist intervention.

But I am not completely pessimistic about the future. The inter-American system has a way of rising to meet emergency situations. In its 75-year existence, the regional organization has assumed new obligations, refined old doctrines, and adapted and strengthened its machinery, precisely to meet new conditions as they arose. In international affairs, unhappily, it often takes a severe crisis to galvanize nations to action.

Today the Organization of American States is at a crossroads. It can adhere to outmoded interpretations of doctrine, becoming an anachronistic and ineffectual instrument for the peace and security in the hemisphere. Or it can mold itself to the exigencies of the day, thus renovating and renewing its effectiveness.

I believe that we are going to witness the happy, second alternative. By electing to send an inter-American peace force into the Dominican Republic, the OAS has already taken a first leap forward. However reluctant the move, the OAS decision represents a major departure from former timidity to assume responsibility. The inter-American peace force, under command of the able Brazilian general, Hugo Panasco Alvim, can serve as a demonstration for the future. The existence of that peace force should help to allay the understandable fears many have of the unknown. In short, now that we have taken the plunge, the next steps should be easier.

Of course, the road ahead in devising new instrumentalities to cope with Communist subversion in the unstable areas of Latin America remains difficult indeed. Nevertheless, we must not be dissuaded from trying because the obstacles loom so large. That would be tantamount to abandoning the field to the Communists.

As private citizens engaged in promoting inter-American friendship and understanding, you can do much to help preserve our regional system. It is my hope that each of you, in your own countries, will bring whatever influence you can bear upon both the short- and long-range problems which we face together: the short-range problem of Communist subversion, and the long-range task of creating the kind of democratic economic, political, and social climate in which Communist tactics can no longer flourish.

Mr. Speaker, the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas is making a vital contribution to hemispheric solidarity. I have long maintained that the people-to-people approach is the most useful and the most lasting cement to bind to-

gether free people in the Western Hemisphere. Certainly, the discussion and exploration in depth of the matters under consideration at the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas convention will be immeasurably helpful, not only to the participants, but also to other people and the respective governments of the delegates and observers.

The convention committee, under the able and dedicated chairmanship of Frank P. Gatteri, has done an outstanding job, and I am sure that the men and women from throughout the hemisphere who attended this convention have found it instructive and informative as a result of such speeches as delivered by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable ARMISTEAD SELDEN. I am sure, also, the convention was an enjoyable occasion because of the wonderful hospitality of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce, the Convention Committee, the patrons, and the sponsors.

A View of Excise Tax Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an article by William D. Pardridge which appeared in the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch, on June 13, 1965, as follows:

EXCISE TAX CUT CALLED A TURKEY

(By William D. Pardridge)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Proposed excise tax cuts have become the subject of argument an counterargument among economists. This article presents a critical view of parts of the proposal. It was written by the former editor of the Washington publication, Air Affairs, who also has studied in the fields of international relations and economics.)

The proposed lifting of Federal excise taxes on certain consumer goods and services is a real turkey.

Taxation of nonessential goods or near-luxury items is economic and no cause of lower employment.

Taxation, however, of essential goods and services is uneconomic and a drag on employment.

There are two reasons why our economy could now have salt in its wounds.

First, look at some of the goods that get preferential treatment—handbags, luggage, toilet articles, jewelry, and furs.

That's not all. Here are some services that get a boost—bowling alleys, pool tables, movies, racing, cabarets, and club dues.

These goods and services should be taxed in deficit times, for they are expenses of those who already have provided themselves with food, clothing, and shelter, three prime necessities of human life.

Second, taxes on these nonessential goods and services tend to subdue production that does not make for real, basic economic growth.

Economists know that basic employment—growth employment—stems from real goods and mass production instead of from recreational services and near-luxury items that are not mass consumed.

Unfortunately, professional economists, including the ones in government, are an introverted lot. They mind their own little pet projects, and shy away from the outside world where spades are spades and hourly wages are bread and meat rather than jewelry and club dues.

This is what happened in the excise tax relief.

An honest effort has been made to increase consumer purchasing power by lowering prices.

But wage earners who produce our food, clothing, and shelter—canners, ladies' garment workers, plumbers—are just not going to buy more luggage, jewelry, and furs.

Shucks, they don't buy any right now.

On the other hand, we may be able to bowl more, play a lot of pool, and go nightclubbing after a day at the races.

Now, if some way were found to lower the prices of meat, shoes, and housing construction materials, we'd be helping our mass customers buy more that is produced by the mass of workers, the very backbone of our economy.

Anybody who is financially able to buy the tax-relieved extra goods and services is more able to pay for them than is the guy or gal who thinks first of eating, staying warm, and getting out of the rain.

This whole mess brings to mind the picture of the socialite drinking champagne at a charity ball for the needy.

Here again are the two reasons why we're more sick than we think:

(1) Tax relief is given to the higher-income-bracket folk who aren't going to use their savings to buy more goods that will increase employment. They've now got all that stuff they need.

(2) The noble effort to increase purchasing power is not directed at those goods that do increase the demand for workers in the expanding plants and for clerks in the retail stores.

Almost 200 years ago Adam Smith wrote of the distinction between productive workers and unproductive workers. His book still sells today—in large numbers, too—but nobody reads the thing. It's a conversation piece only—like Aunt Maud's truck garden.

Automobiles are no longer economic luxury items—except when they're used to impress the neighbors, just as are fancy foods, natty suits, and split-level mortgages. This we cannot avoid.

Modern civilization has added personal movement and transportation to its basic needs of food, clothing, and shelter. This was not brought about by greed or statute.

It came along with technology and communication. Movement of one's person from here to there and back again has become an economic and social fact of life. It's here to stay.

An excise tax on an automobile is like a sales tax on a loaf of bread, a blue denim outfit, or a tract bungalow.

We've got these, sure, but does that make it OK? Must we continue to make mistakes that can be averted by just a little common sense?

Technically and briefly, excise taxes should be eliminated on those goods that provide the most employment and that are purchased of necessity by the mass of people.

And such taxes should be maintained or raised on those goods and services that provide least employment and that are not purchased of necessity by the more affluent citizens.

This loss of huge "affordable" tax revenues at a time in history when we are forced to pour untold economic assets into war machines is an economic inequity born of superficial thinking.

John C. Hilly Delivers Commencement Address at St. Francis College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, Mr. John C. Hilly, one of New York's outstanding public figures, delivered an inspiring commencement address to the graduating class of St. Francis College in Brooklyn.

So that our colleagues may have the benefit of Mr. Hilly's remarks on that occasion, I include the text of his address:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF JOHN C. HILLY

This moment in the sun, this recognition, this conformation, this most serious responsibility began 4 years ago for most of you. Today represents the final step of this preparatory phase. You have manifested your intentions. You have had the desire and the great determination. You have qualified. St. Francis gives you its imprimatur, its blessing and its prayers.

Four years ago, as you looked ahead to the future, to this day, the road loomed deep and steep. You dared not raise your eyes in search of the distant horizon lest you become discouraged and fall by the wayside. Today as you look back and reflect on your journey so far, immediately you are struck with the thought that time seems inconsequential and is all too brief. The distance you traveled was not as long as you first thought. On the contrary, it was all too short. The road was not as rough or as rocky as it seemed. Too quickly have you arrived at this point, breathless, tired and somewhat confused in your thinking. You have conquered all. There are no other mountains to scale.

Four years ago, for the first time in our history, a Catholic was elected President of these United States. We truly had reached a new frontier. Our country was then, and still is, racked with deep rooted prejudices that dominate our thinking. This evil philosophy and way of life builds one false premise upon another. This rejection by the creatures of their Creator, this attempt to deny the existence of God and His teachings, brings mankind ever near to self-destruction. The erosion is slow but steady.

Atheistic communism continues its rampant attack and successfully divides and conquers more and more nations. Human life and man's eternal destiny to achieve the "Summum Bonum" have become mere pawns in the struggle for world domination. We point with pride to man's exploration of outer space. We sing a joyful song of progress, advancement, and achievement; yet, in the light of objective appraisal, at best, has been minimal. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say retrogressive. Our path, in our own country, is blocked by discrimination and segregation, by man's inhumanity to man.

Russia and China continue to worship false gods. The rest of mankind, including our beloved country, does little to resist, to rebuild, or to rearm for the final decisive showdown. The battle is being waged for the minds of men. In the farflung corners of the world today we see that time is beginning to run against us. These deadly forces continue their triumphant march. In many cases their cause receives assistance from

subversive groups protected, yes encouraged, by our society. Aid also flows from the confused liberals in the name of constitutional guarantees. Our failure to act originates from a complete lack of understanding and appreciation of the issue involved or objectives that are being pursued. In many cases resistance is negligible since it is not the popular thing to do. It is easier and safer to seek obscurity in the crowd rather than to subject oneself to the taunts and ridicule of the mob. Many of us have forgotten sacred principles which once we cherished or in the interest of necessity have chosen to abandon them.

Today the New Frontier has been replaced by the Great Society. Your Franciscan diploma and degree is your passport of admission to this society. It is not transferable. It is personal. You and you alone must exercise this right and participate. It is your mandate.

Truly it has been said there is no easy way to make the most of life. If we follow the hedonists, believing that pleasure alone is the only good, nevertheless to make the pleasure possible requires some work. Of course, we do not subscribe to this irreligious concept. However, it is important to note that whatever we do or fail to do requires some degree of effort.

Your graduation gives you a deep obligation and a grave responsibility—one that is as indelibly imprinted and binding as your membership in the rudimentary priesthood imposed at baptism and confirmation. It is even stronger for you might argue that then you had no right of choice. You were infants or immature youths. Today, however, your choice is voluntary and fortified with determination and devotion. It is the product of your labors. It originates in your mind. It was achieved through your understanding and will. Your presence here is evidence that you do not seek to minimize or explain it away but rather you glory that you have been singled out for this special honor and all that it means.

We welcome you today, Franciscans all, as you emerge from the shelter of the classroom, the library, the laboratory and begin to assume your mantle of responsibility as member of the community. Never before in the history of man has the need been as pressing. You must become involved. You must make your commitment before it is too late.

It is estimated that over the next 30 years you have 70,000 hours of time and energy at your disposal for productive purposes. Viewed by the unthinking this seems like a limitless reservoir, however, considered in the light of the issues that you face and the questions that must be answered, it is apparent that this resource is small and precious; moreover, in view of your fiduciary relationship, you must exercise extreme care to see that it is spent wisely and only in the best interest of man.

Your goals and objectives must never be personal, triggered by self-interest of what may be considered the popular or acceptable point of view. You must be ever mindful of your dual role. You must not only love one another, but equally important, you must also serve one another.

Your love must be formed within the silhouette of the Divine Lover. It must not be self-centered or shallow. It must be strong, deep rooted and abiding. It must be self-sacrificing. It must be total and complete. It must be personal, yet, at the same time impersonal. It must be dedicated. It must originate and spring from your desire to actively cooperate with the Divine Plan and reason for your being.

Your service must be coequal. It must have all of the qualities that your love possesses. You cannot render lipservice to principles. You cannot be hypocritical or evasive. If you believe in the principle you must be prepared to recognize and acknowledge it, regardless of the consequences. The cost of the price you may pay cannot be used by you as a barrier which prevents your acting nor can it be used as a cloak which conceals your identity. You cannot compromise as Henry David Thoreau proposed when he wrote "he hears a different drummer, let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away." We must hear only one song and follow but one drummer. The mere fact that in time we may be lawyers, doctors, teachers, artists, priests, brothers, nuns, public officials, or whatever course one may follow, does not provide us with any justification for our failure to act. On the contrary, we have an even greater reason for our commitment. We are Franciscans, sons and daughters of St. Francis. We are in truth, missionaries. We have a mission. We must roll back the blanket of injustice, prejudice, segregation, atheistic communism and all the other alien ways of life which today jeopardize world peace, deprives man of his human dignity, promotes the worship of false idols, and emphasized the transitory and the temporal.

We may seek to disclaim this awesome responsibility. We may try to avoid our involvement. We may pause for a second look. We may desire to reappraise our position. The created may raise their voices in protest, yet the day will come when an accounting must be made for our failures and our refusal to act.

In the limitless time allotted we have much to accomplish. We seek to obtain the beatific vision for ourselves and those we love and serve. Simultaneously we must exert our influences in government, business, our society, our community. We must plan for future generations. Those that follow are entitled to the same opportunities and advantages which have been ours. Our intellectual toil begins today. It must be direct and prompt. We must march forward with our banner held high, ever mindful of our motto "Deus Meus et Omnia." This is the way to success. This is the road to final and total victory.

Public Support of President Johnson's Position in Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I sent to my constituents a questionnaire and one of the questions invited comments on President Johnson's stand on Vietnam. With very few dissenting votes, the public has overwhelmingly supported the President in his position with added comments concerning the position this country took in the Dominican Republic. If we are to meet the challenge of communism, we must meet it on every front, and this President Johnson has stated we will do. I admire him for it and will support him in this stand.

Consequently, I was particularly pleased when I read the following editorial in the May 18 edition of the Corsicana Daily Sun, Corsicana, Tex., one of the leading newspapers in my congressional district which supported the President in his intervention in the Dominican Republic.

[From the Corsicana (Tex.) Sun, May 18, 1965]

STAMPING ON FLAMES

President Johnson's statement that U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic was essential because Communists had taken over the revolution is being supported by daily developments.

The time is past when an American President can run the risk of being fooled by a Communist takeover in Latin America. Castro's rise to power in Cuba provided an everlasting lesson. It drove home for Presidents and the State Department the absolute necessity for prompt action when the flames of revolt begin flickering on the American doorstep.

It may be a scare; it may be the real thing. It doesn't matter which. A risk can no longer be taken. The price of being fooled is much too high and dangerous.

It is one of communism's familiar techniques to have small, superbly trained leadership cadres ready to direct a revolution the way they want it to go. As for the masses, they will shout slogans, march and shoot under strong leaders who will insure that the prime targets are secured. So communism thinks and acts.

Speech of Hon. George H. Hearn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein a very significant speech delivered before the 36th Annual Convention of the Association of Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners by the able, distinguished Commissioner of the Federal Maritime Commission, the Honorable George H. Hearn:

ADDRESS OF COMMISSIONER GEORGE H. HEARN OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION AT THE 36TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION PRACTITIONERS, MAY 13, 1965

It is a great pleasure and a signal honor to have been invited to participate in this 36th annual meeting of the Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners' Association. I commend this conference for recognizing the inevitable trend toward the cooperation and coordination of those regulating the various modes of transportation for examining the peculiarities of the different transportation fields, and by including representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Maritime Comimssion. An understanding of the potential of coordination among the Federal agencies regulating transportation presupposes an understanding of the regulatory schemes, as presently constituted, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Maritime Commission.

Having spent a few years at the Civil Aeronautics Board before assuming my present position with the Federal Maritime Commission, I can appreciate not only the problems occasioned by the differences in transportation modes, but also the problems occasioned by the sometimes divergent, procedural machinery and tools employed by the several agencies to common problems. In the interest of economy and purposefulness, I believe, much remains to be done in exploring

our community of interests and arriving, as nearly as possible at uniform solutions in this regard. This challenge in my opinion falls, primarily, within the ken of practitioners before our agencies. By opening your own doors to sister agencies, and devoting this conference to "coordination" you have taken a meaningful, and commendable step in the right direction.

First I would like to describe, generally, the Federal Maritime Commission, its organizational components, and its jurisdiction. Secondly, I want to address myself to the inherent peculiarities of our agency vis-a-vis your own special calling and finally to the current interagency coordination from the Maritime standpoint.

The Federal Maritime Commission is a relatively new and certainly a small agency. We were created in 1961 by Reorganization Plan No. 7 of that year, and we inherited the regulatory responsibilities of the former Federal Maritime Board.

Historically, our jurisdiction—and that of our several predecessor agencies—is based on the Shipping Act of 1916 and the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933. It is convenient, although inaccurate, to state that our powers under the 1916 act relate to our regulatory authority in the foreign trades, and the 1933 act gives us jurisdiction over domestic waterborne commerce. Under the precise scrutiny of transportation experts, however, we must be exact. Both of the statutes, insofar as carriers are concerned, limit our jurisdiction to common carriers by water, and even in this context it is inaccurate to make the rough division between foreign and domestic. Under the 1933 act, our jurisdiction over common carriers by water extends only to the noncontiguous trades, principally between the continental United States and Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Under the 1916 act, too, our jurisdiction extends, in addition to common carriers by water, primarily in our foreign commerce, to a group called "other persons subject to this act," principally, freight forwarders and terminal operators.

In our noncontiguous trades, our jurisdiction is not unlike that of the Interstate Commerce Commission, with at least one significant exception: while carriers under the jurisdicition of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board must obtain certificates of convenience and necessity before engaging in their trades, our carriers can enter and leave their respective trades at will. Certificates of convenience and necessity are unknown to us; under the 1933 act the Commission has authority which approaches that with which you are familiar at the Interstate Commerce Commission. For example, whenever a carrier files a new or initial rate, our Commission may enter upon an investigation of that rate and suspend it for a period of up to 4 months. Once a rate has become effective, our Commission has no suspension authority. Nevertheless, we may investigate that rate and determine, after a full hearing, whether the rate is just and reasonable. In such cases, the Commission may find that the investigated rate is fair and reasonable, therefore lawful, and permit it to go into effect.

We also have authority, in those cases where we find that a particular rate is unlawful, to set and order enforced a just and reasonable maximum or minimum rate, or maximum and minimum rate. I believe that you will find our rate authority and the Commission techniques for investigating rates under the 1933 act, not at all unlike your own experiences before the ICC.

In the foreign commerce our rate authority is substantially different and quantitatively less than it is in our domestic trades. Until 1961, for example, carriers in our export foreign commerce were not required to file rates with our Commission until 30 days after the rate was offered to shippers. And no inbound rates were required to be filed at all.

In 1961 the Shipping Act was amended by the Bonner Act which adds, among other things, section 18(b) which now requires that all carriers in our foreign commerce file with the Commission a schedule of both inbound and outbound commodity rates. The amendment also requires that rate increases may not be instituted by carriers on less than 30 days' advance notice, except by special permission granted upon a showing of good cause. The obvious consequence of this is that, for the first time, carriers in our foreign trade have had to file their schedule of rates with the Commission, they are available to the general public, and a shipper is aware, before he ships, what his ocean freight rate will be, and more importantly, he is also aware of the rate that his competitors must pay for the movement of like cargo. Another important provision of the Bonner Act provides that carriers must charge their tariff rates and may not deviate therefrom. While this may sound strange to some of you, it is a fact that tariff deviation, by itself, was not a violation of the Shipping Act prior to 1961.

Obviously our rate regulation is quantitatively different in the domestic trades from that of the foreign trades. I do not want to create the impression however, that in the foreign trades rate filings with the Commission represent the full extent of our rate authority. Significantly, section 18(b)(5) authorizes the Commission to disapprove any rate which is unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States. Further, section 15, pursuant to which carriers may set their rates in concert, permits the Commission to disapprove an agreement which operates in a manner detrimental to our commerce or contrary to our public interest. I should add here, that cases involving these provisions are now pending before the Commission.

Now, I would like to discuss the operational components of our agency. The substantive bureaus of the Commission are the Bureaus of Foreign Regulation and Domestic Regulation. Each of these bureaus is concerned with the day to day operating problems of carriers and other persons subject to our jurisdiction. In addition to rate supervision our Bureau of Domestic Regulation administers the activities of freight forwarders and terminal operators. The freight forwarders which we regulate differ in character from those known to both the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board. Essentially, our freight forwarders are expeditors as opposed to freight consolidators. Their function is to handle all the arrangements to enable the cargo to clear the port. For example, they arrange for overland transportation, secure vessel space, make vessel bookings, obtain export permits and licenses, secure consular invoices, arrange for accessorial services, and prepare ocean bills of lading. They are engaged by the shipper and in his stead perform all those services which the shipper would otherwise have to perform for himself in order to get the cargo shipside. As odd as it may appear, ocean freight forwarders rarely see the cargo which they handle. Beginning in 1961, the Commission has had the responsibility for licensing freight forwarders. We have approximately 700 freight forwarders who perform an honest, efficient and necessary function in the exportation and importation of ocean shipped goods.

Another responsibility of our Bureau of Domestic Regulation involves the regulation of terminals which serve common carriers by water, and the cargo carried by them. Like the forwarders, terminal operators represent an indispensable link in the chain of our import and export commerce. Any discriminatory practices at terminals, including free time, storage, wharfage, or the rates connected therewith, present an almost insurmountable impediment to the efficient and economical flow of our commerce.

Now, by way of organization I should mention that in addition to these two substantive Bureaus, the Commission consists of several support or service bureaus: the Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Hearing Counsel, the Bureau of Financial Analysis, the Office of International Affairs, the Office of Hearing Examiners, the Office of the General Counsel, and the Office of Transport Economics. The work of these Offices and Bureaus, excepting that of the General Counsel and the Hearing Examiners, is coordinated and supervised by our Managing Director. The Office of General Counsel for example, provides legal advice to the Commission and its components and unlike many agencies, actively represents the Commission in the courts. The Bureau of Hearing Counsel represents the public interest in all agency instituted cases as well as privately litigated cases which involve questions affecting the public interest.

Generally, our Commission is concerned with rulemaking, adjudication, and licensing. With the exception of freight forwarders to which I have already referred, our licensing jurisdiction, if it may be termed that, refers to section 15 combinations in derogation of our antitrust laws and, to my mind, they constitute the heart of our jurisdiction.

Our rulemaking and adjudications undertakings are not unlike those with which you are familiar at the Interstate Commerce Commission. I think I should state here, however, that the Commission often sits as a tribunal, adjudicating disputes between two or more private parties with respect to causes of action arising under the Shipping Act. In such cases there may or may not be an important public interest question at stake. Nevertheless, in our ad hoc rulemaking cases, an important regulatory principle may be enunciated. For example, the Commission recently had occasion to adjudicate a dispute between a shipper and a terminal operator here in Massachusetts. Out of that dispute, *International Trading Corp.* v. *Fall River Pier Line*, in 1962, the Commission determined that the full reach of our jurisdiction extended to a terminal operator through the breadth of the terminal business even though the terminal operator was primarily devoted to nonregulated private or contract carriers.

Because section 15 of the Shipping Act, the anticompetitive section, is so important, I should like to say a few words about it. That section provides that anticompetitive concerted actions by persons subject to the act, upon approval by the Commission, are immune to the operation of the antitrust laws. The number and types of these agreements are staggering. Standing approved at the present time are more than 100 ratemaking conferences, 35 sailing agreements of various types, hundreds of transshipment agreements and more than a score of pooling agreements. In addition to these combinations, which all involve ocean carriers, there are countless agreements between terminal operators and between ocean freight forwarders. Serious questions pertaining to the "public interest" of the United States arise immediately, when it is recognized that foreign-flag vessels predominate all or most all of our conferences. The serious questions become even more grave when we consider, as we have learned through analysis of both inbound and outbound tariff rates which have been required to be filed only since 1961, that on the whole, outbound rates are higher than inbound rates. A measure of the efficacy to the public interest of the conference system will be ascertainable when our attempts to secure foreign-to-foreign rate data bear fruit.

I have referred to the section 15 problem here in an effort to show why the Commission is so concerned with this historically vexing problem.

Now I would like to revert to coordination among the agencies. Since January 1963, the Chairmen of the ICC, CAB, and FMC have met monthly. The purpose of these monthly meetings of the agency heads has been to determine areas of common interest, and its goal is uniformity of regulation where feasible. Three avenues immediately suggest themselves for the attainment of these goals: administrative action, rulemaking, and legislation.

This informal approach has, I believe, made solid progress. In the area of administrative action, staff liaison groups have been formed to explore remedies for problems that are troublesome not only to each of the agencies, but to those entities which are subject to the jurisdiction of more than one of our agencies. The delineation of terminal areas, a particular problem for terminal operators subject to several jurisdictions resulted in the promulgation of rules by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board with reference to pickup and delivery zones. Problems involving freight forwarders, a group familiar to all agencies which involves distinctly different entities, is at present receiving careful attention of our various staffs. An accomplishment which has already been achieved relates to accounting requirements where the carrier or entity is subject to the jurisdiction of two or more of our agencies, and to this end arrangements have been made whereby audit information is freely interchanged. In addition to the formal liaison groups I know that tariff examiners in our Bureau of Domestic Regulation, for example, are in constant informal contact with their counterparts at the Interstate Commerce Commission. Similarly, our Bureau of Financial Analysis works closely with its counterpart in both the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Rules of practice, which vary so drastically from agency to agency, present the agencies with a formidable task in striving for substantial uniformity. Our own rules of practice are currently being revised and when they are streamlined we will attempt to coordinate them with the rules of the other agencies before they are promulgated. Our present rules, for example, do not permit hearing examiners to rule on motions to dismiss or motions to discontinue. We are currently considering that hearing examiners be given such authority which is enjoyed by examiners in other agencies. Until the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals gave us an adverse ruling more than a year ago our rules of practice contained a discovery provision which is similar to that found in the Federal Rules of Practice and Procedure. At the moment we have no discovery tool and I understand that this is the situation at both the ICC and CAB. In my opinion it is almost unthinkable that an administrative agency cannot, without specific statutory authority, promulgate pretrial discovery rules. The lack of this authority in our case is all the more annoying when it is realized that the Commission entertains suits between private parties where redress is sought for injury resulting from violations of the Shipping Act. A report of the Conferences on Administrative Procedure, not long ago, specifically recommended that agencies promulgate discovery rules. Efforts must be made, I believe, by not only the agencies, but by the members of their respective bars as well, to take those steps necessary to afford proper discovery powers for use in our quasi-judicial endeavors.

Another area which has occupied the attention of our agencies jointly has been the task of tariff simplification. Our goal is a system of uniform commodity classification. This need is underscored by a case entertained by the former Maritime Board in 1961 in which was considered the movement of a single commodity via rail from a point in California to New Orleans under one description and via vessel from New Orleans to a foreign destination under another description, although both the rail and the vessel tariffs specifically referred to each description. Needless to say, the shipper availed himself of the lower rate in each instance.

Jurisdictional responsibilities over a new concept in transportation have also engaged our three agencies. I speak of the Hovercraft. In this regard the three agencies jointly released a statement in October of last year spelling out our respective jurisdictional guidelines. Our agency has taken the position that if such a craft is operated as a common carrier by water it would be regulated to the same extent as are conventional craft of FMC jurisdiction.

We are all familiar with the legislative efforts to create a joint board to administer through routes and joint rates among the three modes of transportation. The bill, proposed as a modification to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, is now pending before the Congress. In 1962, the enactment of Public Law 87-595, amended section 216 of the Interstate Commerce Act to permit the filing of joint rates over through routes with the Interstate Commerce Commission regarding transportation which involves our off-shore domestic trades. As a matter of fact, one of the prime water carriers between our west coast and Alaska has now altered its operation so that it is now a 100 percent hydrotrain service and no longer files its tariffs with the Maritime Commission.

The Joint Board bill would permit carriers subject to the jurisdiction of our agencies to enter into joint rates over through routes and provide for their regulation by a joint board. If we are to develop our national transportation system to its fullest it seems obvious that the public interest would be served by the establishment of reasonable through services and joint rates between common carriers of all transpotration modes throughout our domestic communications system.

The bill, of course, provides for an equitable division of rates between carriers, gives the Board suspension and investigative powers, provides for the award of reparations and judicial review. The Joint Board would have authority to entertain matters referred to it by one of the participating agencies either upon complaint or on its own motion, the power to issue lawful subpenas, and after hearing, to set reasonable maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum rates.

Have no doubts about it, a joint board will not be the panacea for the economic and legal maze which today confronts intermodal transportation. But it is a commencement: a broadly based stepping-off point. Before it can become effective we must have common ground rules, fairly uniform rules of practice, uniform financial reporting including common terminology which will obviate semantic harassments, and solutions to a myriad of other matters which must be worked out by the agencies themselves. The bill, however, augers increased efficiency and economy in our combined transportation fields, and in this day and age we cannot afford not to avail ourselves of all possible improvements. Finally, I believe that this bill gives some effect to President Johnson's admonition to the heads of regulatory agencies that we must "concern ourselves with new areas of cooperation before we concern ourselves with new areas of control."

The Vanishing Half Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, coin speculators and hoarders are beginning their runs on our half dollars. Evidence that these coins are disappearing from circulation has mounted since H.R. 8926 was reported to this body. If the bill is passed and nonsilver coins are minted, in time silver coins will be at a premium. They cannot circulate side by side with the nickel-clad copper substitutes created by H.R. 8926. A newspaper in the State of Washington, the Spokane Daily Chronicle, has made an on-the-spot check of banks and coin dealers in Spokane, and the findings are included in two articles by Mr. Wafford Conrad.

The articles follow:

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Daily Chronicle, June 10, 1965]

SILVER COIN SHORTAGE WORSENS HERE

(By Wafford Conrad)

Will silver half dollars and quarters become as scarce as silver dollars? Has the recent sharp price break in silver stocks been justified?

These were among questions being asked in Spokane mining circles this week. Here are some of the answers:

1. Spokane banks and merchants are experiencing an acute shortage of half dollars and they can't get all the quarters they need.

2. Mining brokers think prices slid farther than they should have and that the bottom has been about reached.

The shortage of half dollars has been growing for several months, a survey of downtown bank tellers showed. The Federal Reserve bank has been rationing the 50-cent pieces to local banks for some time and now the banks can't get all the quarters they request.

One downtown bank ordered 5,000 half dollars recently from the Federal Reserve and got only 100. It ordered the same number of quarters and got 200.

Another large bank was able to get only 40 half dollars from the Federal Reserve bank Monday.

This reporter tried to get half dollars at six banks and was turned down flatly at five of them. The sixth offered to exchange two half dollars.

Tellers at a branch bank said they had no half dollars on hand. Some tellers said they had orders to keep what few they had to operate their coin changing machines and those of other business firms. The coin changers won't work without 50-cent pieces.

GETTING PAINFUL

One teller complained she had to make change manually and added: "This is getting to be a pain in the neck."

Most were of the opinion that hoarding was responsible and that President Johnson's proposal to eliminate silver from quarters and dimes and lower the silver content of half dollars would make it worse.

Commented one teller: "Some people must have their basements full of half dollars."

A bank official said he didn't want to be quoted on any coin shortage but volunteered the information that people who had never

bought them before have been requesting from $10 to $100 worth of half dollars.

He said he thought people were hoarding halves like they did silver dollars in the belief the price of silver will go up. The Government can't permit this so long as there is a coin shortage because it would result in coins being melted down for their silver content, he said.

SHORTAGE PREDICTED

W. L. Graham, Jr., Chicago author of a book on silver, told the Chronicle there is strict rationing of silver coins in his city and he predicted an acute nationwide coin shortage within 60 days.

The Federal Government may have to issue fractional paper currency or revalue silver coins at double their present value to get hoarders to put them back into circulation, he said.

R. E. Nelson, president of the Spokane Stock Exchange, said the break in the New York Stock Market aggravated the weakness in the Spokane mining market caused by the administration proposal to reduce sharply the amount of silver used in coinage.

"I don't think the sharp price breaks (up to 35 percent) were justified," he said. "Some people just got panicky and wanted to sell at any price. I think the bottom has been reached."

No informed persons expected any substantial immediate price increase in silver even had the administration proposed to retain some silver in quarters and dimes, he said.

Nothing has happened that will reduce the profits of silver producers or affect exploration programs, he said, pointing out that the proposed floor under silver would keep the price at approximately where it is for an indefinite period.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Daily Chronicle, June 11, 1965]

COIN DEMAND HIGH, SALES LIGHT HERE

(By Wafferd Conrad)

Hoarders and speculators, not coin collectors, are to blame for the growing shortage of silver half dollars, Spokane coin dealers said today.

Coin collectors have not increased their purchases since President Johnson's recommendation a week ago to sharply curtail use of silver in coinage, a survey of coin dealers showed. But demand by speculators has increased, and prices have advanced.

Since the President's recommendation, the price of Kennedy half dollars has gone up about 10 percent, said Ron Douglas, Spokane investment dealer in coins, who said he has a hookup with a national teletype system for buying and selling of coins in quantity.

DEMAND HOLDS UP

"There is a big demand but little selling," he said. "One man offered to buy $2,000 worth of Kennedy halves at 10 percent above the price prevailing before the President's recommendation, but he got no offers."

The price of Kennedy proof sets has gone up 20 percent within the last week, Douglas said.

Common half dollars are beginning to demand a premium price just like silver dollars did before they disappeared from circulation, he said.

"I tried to buy half dollars by the thousand for 52 cents apiece, and nobody would sell," he said.

He said silver dollars of any common mintage are being traded at around $1.17 each in large quantities and at a slightly higher price in small amounts.

There is an active market for dollars and half dollars, he said, but not much activity yet in quarters. However, large-scale buying of quarters may develop within a few months, he said, adding that "dimes will be the last to go."

"Many Spokane people have been hoarding half dollars in recent months," he said. "I know of one Spokane resident who has purchased more than $3,000 worth."

Mrs. Frances E. Mills, owner of Carroll's Stamps & Coins, said legitimate coin collectors are interested mainly in keeping their coin sets up to date, while hoarders are persons who "squirrel it away in the attic."

"I get calls daily from persons who want to know how much silver dollars are worth and whether the price has gone up," she said. "I tell them the dollars of common dates haven't gone up any of late."

THOUSANDS "COLLECT"

She said there probably are several thousand legitimate coin collectors in the Spokane area. The number of collectors of all types has been growing, she said, and has quadrupled in the last year or so since investors entered the field.

She described investors as persons who buy bags of new coins, anticipating they will increase in value later.

Russell Hamilton, of Hamilton's Coin Shop, said legitimate coin collectors are interested only in the scarcer coins.

Some Spokane businessmen buy coins monthly with the idea they will be worth more at some future date, he said. Bankers also lend money on coins to speculators, holding dollars as collateral.

Only the scarcer silver coins are worth more than their face value at Spokane coin dealer shops at present, the survey showed. Uncirculated coins are worth considerably more than those that have been circulated.

PRICES VARIED

Uncirculated 1964 half dollars bearing a D (Denver) mint mark sell for 75 cents, the 1964 Philadelphia (no mark) for $1, the 1955 P for $10, and the 1949 P for $40.

Circulated silver half dollars struck by the Philadelphia Mint in 1948, 1949, 1950, 1953, 1955, and 1958 sell for 75 cents to $6.

Quarters minted in Denver in 1955 were said to be worth $3.50 circulated and $5.50 uncirculated; a 1949 S (San Francisco) uncirculated dime, $12.25; a 1916 D mercury dime in any condition, from $65 up.

The Administration's Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future the House will consider the administration's housing bill, one of the most important pieces of legislation before us. It deserves our most careful consideration. On June 14 the New York Times published a letter written by the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, our colleague, WILLIAM A. BARRETT. This letter should be read by all Members as part of their deliberations concerning this vital bill.

The letter follows:

[From the New York Times, June 14, 1965]

RENT SUPPLEMENT FOR LOW-INCOME GROUPS

WASHINGTON,
June 1, 1965.

TO THE EDITOR:

The May 27 article by Arthur Krock of the Times was highly critical of President Johnson's proposed rent-supplement plan for low-income families. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Housing, I feel an obligation respectfully to disagree with Mr. Krock so that your readers will have a balanced picture of this important new plan which the President has called "the most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city."

Mr. Krock quotes extensively from the minority report on the housing bill signed by eight Republican members of the committee (two other highly respected Republicans, WILLIAM B. WIDNALL of New Jersey and SEYMOUR HALPERN of New York, voted for rent supplements).

The minority report is written quite frankly as an attack on this proposal and naturally gives a very one-sided point of view, one which I believe is unfair and misleading. As Mr. Krock himself noted, the irresponsible cry of "socialism" is "a doctrinal attack."

PRIVATE HOUSING

The rent-supplement plan is essentially quite simple. The housing would be privately built, privately financed, and privately owned. It would be rental and cooperative housing financed under Federal Housing Administration section 221(d)(3). The sponsors would be private nonprofit or limited dividend corporations or cooperatives.

The families to be aided would be those whose incomes are so low that they cannot afford decent housing by paying not more than one-fourth of their total income, and who are elderly or handicapped, displaced by Government action, or now living in slum housing. The aid would be the difference between one-fourth of their income which they would pay as rent and the fair market rental on the unit, and the supplement payments would end when the family's income rose to the point where it could pay the rent on its own.

There are too many distortions in the minority report to go into all of them here. As one example, it is charged that the proposal would "kill the incentive of the American family" to improve its circumstances. In support of this claim, the statement says that no family making $3,000 a year would aspire to purchase their own modest $7,500 home, but would instead seek to be a renter in a $100-a-month apartment for which the Federal Government would pay $37.50 while the family paid only $62.50.

FALSE ASSUMPTION

The fallacy of this argument lies in the assumption that a $7,500 house is available for purchase by a family earning $3,000 in the same community where $100 a month is the rent required for a decent unit. In this hypothetical community where a good home could be bought for $7,500, no rent supplement would be available for families earning $3,000.

On the other hand, in communities where decent housing could only be obtained for $100 a month, the rent supplement program would enable the family to occupy a good unit with only 25 percent of its modest income instead of 40 percent.

I see nothing in this very promising proposal to justify the extravagant alarm of those who have singled it out for attack. It would add to the supply of decent housing available to low-income families. It would take advantage of the energy and imagination of public spirited citizens—churches, cooperatives, and the thousands of civic organizations—who are deeply concerned about slums.

And it would offer low-income families a healthy third choice to the alternative of slums or regular public housing.

WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Housing.

Statement of Richard G. Hirsch on Behalf of the Central Conference of American Rabbis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, director of the Religious Action Center, before the Special Subcommittee on Labor on May 28.

Rabbi Hirsch made this statement on behalf of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. He strongly urges the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I heartily agree with the eloquent statement of Rabbi Hirsch. As a member of the Special Subcommittee on Labor, I have heard the testimony of the various witnesses on both sides of this issue and I have found that the evidence in favor of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is overwhelming. I was especially gratified when the Education and Labor Committee ordered reported without any amendments, H.R. 77, the bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, on June 10.

Rabbi Hirsch's statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF RABBI RICHARD G. HIRSCH, REPRESENTING CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR ON H.R. 77 AND RELATED BILLS TO REPEAL SECTION 14(b) OF THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

I am Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, director of the religious action center, which is a joint instrumentality of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

I appear here today in behalf of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. This organization of the Nation's reform rabbis has long advocated policies which would assure the labor movement the vitality it needs in order to play its proper role in our society. Toward this end, the Central Conference of American Rabbis passed a resolution in 1953, which stated in part: "We call for the revision of the Taft-Hartley law to eliminate the gross injustices which have jeopardized the status and growth of the labor movement."

Now, in consonance with our historic support of the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively, we urge repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

We should like to address ourselves to the broader significance of the issue before us—and that issue, stated bluntly, is the strength of the labor movement. In the historic context in which 14(b) was written, there is little doubt that its supporters viewed it as a means of diminishing labor's strength. The real purpose was not to give freedom to the individual worker, but to give license to the employer; not to grant labor rights, but to deprive labor of rights. How else can we explain the fact that the legislation has been used by right-to-work States to attract industry with the inducement that the strong unions will be weakened, the weak unions will be destroyed, and no others will be allowed to organize.

Is it only coincidence that in most of the right-to-work States, there is such an obvious correlation between the incidence of poverty and the weakness of the trade union movement? Is it only coincidence that most of these States have the longest hours of work, the lowest pay scales, the least protection of women and child labor, and substandard unemployment insurance and accident compensation? Is it only coincidence that many of these same States are the last bulwarks of racial discrimination?

Some observers have noted that right-to-work legislation is not responsible for all these social evils and that repeal of 14(b) will not necessarily change social and economic conditions. They thereby imply that right-to-work laws are effect and not cause of antiunion attitudes—and that the struggle currently being waged over repeal is merely symbolic.

Even were we to grant this assumption, since when has America failed to be concerned with symbols? It is our Nation's devotion to symbols, to ideals, which is responsible for our greatness. In the minds of both labor and management, as well as the general public, section 14(b) has become a symbol of antiunionism. This explains why the labor movement is placing such emphasis on its repeal and why, conversely, organizations of the far right and opponents of civil rights, determined to "keep the Negro in his place," are joining the ranks of those who would "keep labor in its place."

This also explains why we of the Central Conference of American Rabbis urge repeal. Jewish tradition has always emphasized the dignity of labor and the necessity for men to associate together to achieve common objectives. "Two are better than one; because they have a good reward for their labor. For if they fall, the one will lift up his fellow; but woe to him that is alone when he falleth, and hath not another to lift him up" (Ecclesiastes 4:9, 10). If it was true in ancient times, then how much more is it true in our day that a single employee is subject to the arbitrary treatment of his employer unless he and his fellow can organize and bargain collectively.

There is no doubt that belonging to any group potentially inhibits freedom of individual action, but in our complex society, to encourage an individual to refrain from accepting responsibility in and for the group created to assure him a dignified livelihood, is to encourage anarchy and license. When a citizen votes for the losing side in a local election, he still has to pay taxes. To permit an individual not to support a union representing the majority of his fellow workers is not a protection of minority rights, but a destruction of majority rule. Our society is now engaged in a struggle to eliminate poverty. How inconsistent, on the one hand, to encourage the poor to organize to help themselves, and, on the other hand, to deprive the laborer of his most useful tool—the right to organize effectively.

We should like to take special note of the problem raised by those among the Amish, Mennonites, Plymouth Brethren, National Association of Evangelicals, and Seventh-day Adventists whose religious convictions do not permit them to join labor unions or any other nonreligious organizations. It is essential in our democratic society to protect the rights of these persons, as of all minority groups, no matter how small the number involved. We believe, however, that it is a mistake to assume that 14(b) is the appropriate instrument for offering such protection. In the first place, right-to-work legislation is extant in only 19 States, covering only a small proportion of the working force, and there is little likelihood that other States will pass such legislation. In the second place, such a small number of persons is involved that it is unnecessary to devise a Federal statute which would be extremely difficult to administer.

We recommend, therefore, that the most effective means is for the unions and these workers to establish an equitable arrangement privately. Some unions have already worked out such arrangements and we have good reason to believe that all others would be willing to do so. It would be a serious error to permit this issue of religious conscience, which is extraneous to the fundamental issue, to obfuscate the right-to-work debate.

We Jews have been well versed in industrial relations since the day when Moses led the children of Israel out of Egypt. Moses and Pharaoh engaged in history's first labor-management dispute. Jewish tradition records that not all the Jewish slaves working on the Egyptian pyramids were cognizant of the major issues. There were some who would have settled for shorter work hours, others who would have been satisfied with better working conditions, and others who would have been content with more fringe benefits or with a higher standard of living. Even after the Jews had left Egypt and were wandering in the wilderness, there were those who yearned so much for the security of the fleshpots of Egypt that they threatened to return. However, they were persuaded by the majority that loyalty to their fellow workers should prevail over their presumed individual short-range interests—with beneficent results for their group and for civilized mankind.

A strong democratic labor movement is essential to the well-being of American society and the American economy, because it is the primary means for giving workers the opportunity to deal with their employers on an equal and equitable basis. Responsible employers and responsible unions engaged in free collective bargaining offer the greatest possibility for achieving the economic justice which is the foundation of social justice.

Water Resources Development: A Basic Element of National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding address by the Honorable Paul R. Ignatius, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics. It was delivered at the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at the principal meeting of the annual convention of that organization in Washington on June 11. Secretary Ignatius has made a distinct contribution, and I feel that his address is worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress:

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT: A BASIC ELEMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

(Remarks by Hon. Paul R. Ignatius, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., June 11, 1965)

I am delighted to have the opportunity to address the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, which, since the turn of the century, has exerted so much vigorous and constructive influence at the highest levels of Government and civic life in support of a

realistic program of water resources development to meet the emerging needs of our Nation.

National defense is the area of my particular responsibilities, and the Federal Government's principal developer of our water resources for almost a century and a half—the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—one of the important elements of the Department of Defense, falls within my own area of interest.

National defense is a very broad field indeed. It involves the maintenance, equipment, and employment of armed forces adequate to our needs, but this audience certainly knows that it goes far beyond that. Our Nation could not produce the necessary modern weaponry, provide the manpower, nor bear the cost of sustained military power without a strong and expanding economic base, which is, therefore, a matter of serious concern in our defense effort.

It is one measure of the military load upon our economic base that we must spend some 8 percent of our gross national product for military purposes, and maintain about 2½ million military and 1 million civilian personnel in the Defense Establishment itself. And the current military load, of course, is only a small portion of what our economy would be called upon to bear should a major war be thrust upon us.

At the same time it is supporting our military requirements, our economic base must support the constantly accelerating growth of our civilian economy resulting from the population and technological explosions of our time, and the dynamic drive of the American people, to attain an ever-higher standard of living.

All the principal factors which have come to bear upon our economy in the last 40 years or so—two wars and the development of a world situation which makes it imperative for us to maintain a high level of defensive strength throughout the foreseeable future—an unprecedented rise in the rate of population growth—the evolution of a whole new industrial complex based to a major extent on products and technologies almost unknown in the twenties—have placed unprecedented demands upon our national resources of every kind, and upon none more heavily than our water resources.

Aside from the air we breathe, water is the basic resource supporting human existence—the one resource upon which the availability and utilization of every other resource depends. But it is also a strictly limited resource, and unevenly distributed by nature, which gives rise to many of the serious and growing problems facing our Nation today, and places major emphasis upon the importance of water resources development.

We have come to recognize that if our overall national interests are to be adequately served, if our economic base is to continue to expand in line with our needs, our water resources must be developed with foresight, and with forebearance on the part of all interests, to serve all beneficial purposes and return the greatest good to the greatest number of people over the longest period of time.

The management of our rivers to maintain adequate flows for municipal and industrial use and for pollution abatement is one of the objectives of water resources development which has special significance in our defense effort and the maintenance of a healthy and growing national economy.

The mounting number of people, especially those who live and work in our crowded cities and industrial areas, need more and more water for normal household use, which it is becoming increasingly difficult to supply. It has been estimated that the average per capita consumption in urban communities may increase from 147 gallons per day to 185 gallons per day during the next 15 years.

Proliferating industries require ever-larger and more dependable—and cleaner—supplies of water for processing basic materials for defense and to meet the general economic demand. For example, within 15 years three industries alone—chemicals, steel, and paper—many require four times the amount of water public and private utilities are now pumping to all homes, industrial plants, fireplugs, and other users combined, throughout the United States. And more and more cooling water will be needed for the generation of power to turn factory wheels, and to meet the rapidly increasing home demand of our electrified society.

The menace of pollution is on the increase. It is striking at the strength of America. It is rendering water unfit for human use—and, very often, for industrial use—befouling our cities and towns, killing our fish and wildlife, and destroying the recreational values of our rivers. Although the responsibility for controlling pollution at its source begins with State and local governments, residual pollution must be—and can only be—dealt with through our Federal water resources development programs.

The construction of navigation facilities is an element of water resources development which looms especially large in the defense picture. Waterways are indispensable links in a transportation system capable of meeting all the combined military and civilian requirements placed upon our expanding industrial base. It is the most logical course—and the most economical course in terms of money and land—to continue to develop to the utmost practicable extent the potential of the natural water highways which reach into many parts of our country, in order to assure the uninterrupted flow of heavy bulk materials, and unwieldy loads such as missiles and rockets, under all conditions.

The outstanding value of intracoastal waterways to the national defense was clearly demonstrated during World War II, when the protected channels of the gulf Intracoastal saved thousands of lives and many millions of dollars worth of high-priority cargoes at a time when open-sea shipping was being cut to pieces by enemy submarines.

Because they afford ready access to a dependable water supply and low-cost water transportation, our waterways have also paid handsome dividends by encouraging industrial expansion along their banks, such as the well over $21 billion investment in new plant along the Ohio and its tributaries since World War II.

Almost none of our country's great harbors could accommodate the big ships in the ocean trade were it not for their improvement by the Corps of Engineers over the span of many years. Some, such as Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, are completely man made. We need to carry forward a continuous program of further justified harbor improvement in order to keep pace with the mounting demands of deep-sea shipping, a mainstay of our commerce and a major lifeline of defense.

Flood control is one of the most important functions of water resources development essential to the maintenance and expansion of our economic base and the well-being of all our people. The devastation of floods which destroy or damage critical industrial production facilities is a serious blow to our national defense posture as well as to the general economic health and stability of our country. It must be prevented as far as it is practicable to do so.

Flood control has thoroughly proved its worth by chalking up savings of over $2 for every dollar invested since the general flood control program of the Corps of Engineers was inaugurated less than 30 years ago. Some projects have shown astonishing returns—up to 17 to 1. People living under the constant shadow of a flood threat should take every measure necessary to secure adequate protection, not only in their own interest, but in the overriding national interest.

The collateral benefits derived from water resources development are also of tremendous value to the Nation. One basic purpose of the development program is the multiplication of opportunities for recreation, which is becoming more and more important to the maintenance of a healthy and productive society in this increasingly complex and demanding age. The preservation of our fish and wildlife heritage for the enjoyment of present and future generations and the beautification of our country in order to make it a better place in which to live and strive toward the noble goals to which we aspire, are also taken into full consideration in water resources planning and development.

In this connection, I might point out that in addition to providing primary protection to life and property, flood control measures contribute extremely important benefits by stimulating and aiding the beautification of communities and countryside. When there is nothing better to look forward to than another flood, the incentive to invest in the improvement of property is diminished or lost entirely. Effective flood control, however, permits people to build and beautify for the future with confidence that their work will not be in vain.

Although we have potential sources of sufficient water and related resources to support the demands of national growth for generations to come, sound planning to assure their availability when and where needed, and an expanding program of orderly construction of facilities to conserve, control, and utilize streamflows for all beneficial purposes, are necessary to the security and progress of our Nation. This is conservation in the most precise sense of the word, as defined by the architects of the natural resources conservation movement inaugurated by farsighted Americans early in this century. We must develop our water resources in such a way that we are able not only to satisfy all the inexorable demands of our increasingly urbanized and industrialized society, but also, as far as it is reasonably possible, the desires of a great many of our people to protect esthetic and other values which often conflict with measures for meeting material requirements.

President Johnson has made abundantly clear his advocacy of a realistic and comprehensive program of water resources development to meet the pressing needs of our Nation—present and future. In transmitting his fiscal year 1966 budget to the Congress, he noted the "increased attention * * * focused in recent years on the importance of the wise use and conservation of our water resources," and declared that "Federal investment in water and related resources development has grown sharply—and is expected to grow further in the period ahead." The President has consistently and strongly stressed his belief that such investment will both strengthen and expand our resource base, and thus contribute directly to economic growth.

In closing, I would like again to compliment the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on its splendid service to the Nation in helping to create a broad awareness of water problems, and to generate throughout the land a genuine sense of urgency in seeking and finding adequate solutions. In the final analysis, the goals so important to the future of us all—to our security and well-being—cannot be reached without a widespread, cooperative effort based on a common ground of understanding.

We live in a time of stress, in a world of strife and contention which constantly tests our strength, our stamina, and our resolu-

tion. But with an informed public, a vital economy, and citizens of vision and public spirit, we have no problem in any field which cannot be resolved. The years ahead hold the potential of achievements that would tax the imagination. And even those achievements will be taxed by the requirements of the surging growth of our great and prosperous Nation.

The Schmaltz Around "Gemini 4"

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the latest in television spectaculars—our manned space shots—are fast becoming drenched in emotion. Unfortunately, it now appears that even the President of the United States will be continually making an appearance on these soap-opera-type programs. For a bipartisan program as large as these NASA programs one would think that the President would restrain his political nature and not participate publicly in each of these presentations on a partisan basis.

It is my opinion that we should publicly display our efforts in a more factual manner. We should attempt to emphasize the scientific value and its importance to world peace in a logical fashion. Certainly, our concern for the human lives participating in each venture into space should continue to be emphasized, but emotionalism is not the proper vehicle for conveying this message to the world. The scientific diligence, the care taken by technicians during construction, the accurate research techniques that are employed, the extensive testing by determined engineers, the hours of engineering design, the practiced management of our free-enterprise system and the NASA space management—presenting these should be the proper vehicles for conveying our concern for the men who dare to travel with the stars. The greatest benefit television might provide would be to help us better understand the coming age of science. Unless more men grow to understand the everyday uses and needs of the coming advances in science we will not be able to cope with population growth or the required complex systems of automation.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Peoria Journal Star on June 9 clearly illustrates the importance of *Gemini 4*'s mission and it reads as follows:

THE SCHMALTZ AROUND "GEMINI 4"

The *Gemini 4* space flight was a tremendous success.

That is the essential point to keep in mind in considering the 62-orbit flight of Astronauts White and McDivitt.

There is a danger of missing this essential point in all the hoopla, schmaltz, and downright corn which surround those space flights.

We think NASA officials are ill advised to submit to having these billion dollar projects turned into television spectaculars in which emotion is more important than fact.

While it may be cute to know what the wives say to the astronauts, the danger is that we will lose sight of the fact that this isn't a show, that it is an historic flight—indeed the one that may prove most critical to putting man on the moon.

When Ed White walked in space it was interesting, in a way, to know what he said, but it was a thousand times more important to realize the significance of the fact which was being proved—that man could operate in space independent of a space craft.

While to some apparently (or at least television thinks so), it is worth noting that the fifth backup man on the *Wasp* recovery ship has two kids who are pulling for dad to make the pickup, it is a million more times important to grasp the significance of White and McDivitt's not falling unconscious when they got out of the craft as many medical experts had direly predicted.

What the astronaut's mother says about hoping her son gets home cooking, how the astronaut's son makes out in a Little League game, and the admonitions of the astronauts' wives should be kept in perspective. This is the trivia.

The significant facts are as large as those of Columbus' first voyage, McDivitt and White took the biggest steps yet to—what? A new universe?

Schmaltz, as we understand it, comes from a Hebrew word meaning melted fat. The danger in schmaltz on a daring adventure like this, is that the melted fat will so cover it that its true and tremendous significance will be obscured.

These astronauts and the army of technicians and scientists behind them have successfully accomplished a tremendous feat, which dispelled many fears about outer space and made moon landings only a matter of time. That's the significant point which must emerge from a welter of excessively sentimental trivia presented in the 4-day coverage of this event.

Utilization of Domestic Labor for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to note recently that the Ohio Migrant Ministry of the Ohio Council of Churches and United Church Women of Ohio which has an active chapter in Lucas County, Ohio, unanimously adopted, on April 1, a statement in full support of the policies of Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz on the utilization of domestic labor for agricultural purposes in preference to foreign labor. I wish to include this statement as part of my remarks and call it to the attention of my colleagues for their consideration:

STATEMENT ADOPTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF MIGRANT MINISTRY, APRIL 1, 1965

We the Department of Migrant Ministry of the Ohio Council of Churches support the Secretary of Labor of the U.S. Department of Labor, Mr. Willard Wirtz, in firmly upholding the criteria issued on December 19, 1964, as a basis for importation of agricultural labor under Public Law 414. In the inteerst of both farm laborers and growers we are opposed to the importation of foreign labor because of its detrimental effect; namely, to depress wages and cause more domestic farmworkers to be either more underemployed or unemployed. Furthermore, we believe that sufficient farm labor to meet farm needs can be secured if properly recruited, trained, and adequately paid.

We believe that the regulations provide adequately for the possibility of importing labor when it has been demonstrated beyond all reasonable doubt that domestic labor is not available. We express confidence in the Secretary of Labor to administer the regulations.

We commend those growers who have by their own efforts and initiative raised farm labor standards and wages. The Secretary of Labor is also urged to intensify the efforts of the Government to provide an adequate number of trained domestic farmworkers and to raise labor standards and wages that will bring dignity and hope to those who harvest much of our national food supply.

Reserve Officers Association Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very fine, helpful statement of Col. John T. Carlton, executive director, Reserve Officers Association, opposing the merger of the Army Reserve and the National Guard.

I think this statement, which recently appeared in the Journal of the Armed Forces, should be read by every Member of Congress because it reflects a well informed point of view and is written in the interest of the efficiency, adequacy, and readiness of our Armed Forces, including the Reserves:

AS RESERVE FORCES REALINEMENT CLIMAX NEARS, ROA MAINTAINS DRUMFIRE OF OPPOSITION TO PENTAGON PLAN

(Congressional consideration of the controversial Pentagon proposal to merge the Army Reserve and National Guard is reaching its climax. Principal opponent of the plan is the Reserve Officers Association. In keeping with its policy of presenting arguments both for and against the proposal, the Journal asked ROA Executive Director Col. John T. Carlton to discuss the plan from the ROA viewpoint.)

(By Col. John T. Carlton, executive director, Reserve Officers Association)

House and Senate hearings on the Pentagon plan to abolish the historic Army Reserve and then merge the U.S. Army Reserve and the National Guard under control of 52 Guard jurisdictions have demonstrated fully that this proposal was not carefully thought out, that it is producing great turmoil at a time when national unity is required, and that it is fraught with dangers to the national security.

Both the National Guard and the Reserve are being dealt substant've blows; yet the most disquieting effect is that the inevitable fight which ensued has created disunity throughout the Army's components and has for all practical purposes destroyed the "one army" concept so painstakingly built up as an integral part of the Reserve Forces program.

Those who have been present at congressional hearings have heard members of both committees—most with long experience in

dealing with complex military matters—rather fully discredit this proposal. Official witnesses, who presented their side first, gave frequently evasive and sometimes contradictory answers to questions, and engaged in dispute with counsel over points of law and the responsibility of the Pentagon to abide by the law.

PLAN IS BASICALLY UNSOUND

Like many other aspects of the controversy, ROA's stand has been distorted. This association's sole purpose of existence (to quote from the public law upon which our congressional charter is based) is "to support a military policy which will provide adequate national defense." ROA's conviction is that this proposal—to reduce the Reserves by 150,000 and to place the remainder of the combined Reserve-Guard strength under the fragmented command of the 52 Governors—is basically unsound; that the military leaders know it is unsound; and that their carefully expressed views in support of the Secretary of Defense—views they were instructed to hold—are deceptive of the real purpose and effect.

Although the plan obviously is a military one—or at least should be—ROA has every reason to believe it was born in the DOD comptroller's office and more specifically in that office's cost effectiveness analysis section. All the plan does and all it was ever intended to do, is eliminatee 21 low-priority divisions and from them salvage 5 brigades to be put in high-priority status.

Every subsequent action was to rationalize the plan in order that it could be sold.

Whether the plan is a product of the Secretary of Defense, as he told his December 12 press conference, or the Secretary of the Army as he later testified before Congress, or indeed whether it emerged from the electronic womb of a computer is of little import.

But presumably it was fathered by the novel theory of logistical balance, i.e., that equipment on hand and trained personnel must be in balance. It follows then that if trained personnel on hand are in excess of equipment, you liquidate the personnel rather than go out and get the equipment. Ergo, you establish a condition which assures that trained men will never exceed equipment on hand.

Another way of putting this singular rationale is to guarantee that on M-day the Army must gear its combat capability to equipment only. You already have disposed of the personnel and, at that point, mobilization consequently is paralyzed.

REBELLION IN THE WEST

When Army Secretary Alles ordered his three-member merger team to go into action it was inevitable that they would almost at once come out face to face with the unpalatable fact that when the 21 low priority divisions had been axed 15 of them would be, of all things, National Guard divisions. This, in turn, meant that not a single Guard division would remain west of the Mississippi.

Consequently the planners saw they must reorganize the entire high priority force into the National Guard, otherwise there would be wholesome (and proper) rebellion from every western Governor.

One feature of the plan is the claim that it will increase combat readiness. However, there are really but four principal ways to achieve this goal: (1) increase manning levels, (2) increase intensity of training, (3) increase quality of training, (4) increase quality and experience of the personnel structure.

And if early deployment capability also is considered to be a desirable goal administrative procedures must be streamlined in order to convert inactive duty status units to active duty status. Improved and preplanned rail and air lift to get these units to their active duty stations is also necessary and, finally, equipment quantities must be increased.

And what does the merger plan call for with respect to the foregoing?

According to DOD's own figures, the manning levels of the units in each line item remain precisely the same with the exception of the two special purpose divisions, which receive only a 10-percent increase. Yet personnel in the State headquarters, strictly an administrative activity, are more than doubled.

TRAINING WILL DETERIORATE

The only real solution to increasing combat readiness is to increase manning levels of the high priority units to 100 percent. It is no accident that Reserve planners in the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Air Force have recognized this fundamental precept and aim at a 100-percent M-Day manning level. Yet the Pentagon merger plan provides for no significant increase in the manning levels of any of the high priority units.

Insofar as intensification of training is concerned, ROA has searched the appropriations request for fiscal year 1966 and is shocked to find there is no change whatsoever from the current year; 48 drills annually and 2 weeks of active duty for training annually, precisely what it has been every year since the postwar establishment of the USAR.

By this time it comes as no surprise to learn that the plan has no provision for increasing the quality of training. Instead, training responsibility would be diffused into 52 separate State and territorial jurisdictions, controlled and administered by politically appointed adjutants general. Presently, Army Reserve units are under the direct supervision and control of 14 general officers of the Regular Army who, in turn, work directly under the Continental Army Command. It seems obvious, therefore, that training can only deteriorate under the Pentagon proposal.

Turning to personnel structure, ROA submits that the quality and experience of the persons who man any combat organization is of overriding import and requires a proper blend of noncommissioned officers with extensive active duty experience with troops. Only 4 percent of the National Guard today is made up of such persons. The others are in the USAR because they are federally oriented and have little, if any, desire to turn out to sandbag levees, police demonstrators or shovel snow from State capitol parking lots. This is why the most intensive recruiting campaigns by the Guard have attracted only 4 percent of their numbers.

FILLERS CREATE PROBLEMS

It should be noted at this point that 36 percent of the enlisted men in the Army Reserve division have had 2 or more years of active duty.

The Army, through the Secretary of the Army, has reluctantly accepted the fact, as the transcript of the hearings bears out, that only 16 percent of Enlisted Reserve personnel will transfer to the Guard. Eighty-six percent have indicated preference for duty in the Reserve pool which, of course, is not real duty at all. Yet both the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff have testified that the key to the whole merger is the willingness of Reservists to transfer to the Guard.

For reasons best known to itself, the Army is unique among the services for having a built-in delay in mobilizing its Immediate Reserve by keeping their units at 80 percent manning level and depending upon fillers to flesh them out. It has been amply demonstrated in the recent past that fillers create problems and are not susceptible to immediate mobilization. For example, should a filler die the Army would know nothing about his demise unless some member of the family happened to advise the Army of that fact.

Consequently, talk of early deployment capability is nonsense. There is no substitute for full manning levels in the Immediate Reserve when we talk of early deployment capability.

Based on the pronouncements of the Secretaries of Defense and Army, there is nothing but the most hopeless sort of confusion in the equipment situation should the merger go through.

For example, Mr. McNamara told the Senate he would supply six complete packages of equipment to the six high priority divisions. Then along came Mr. Alles with the statement to the House that under no circumstances would the Army issue 100 percent of the TOE equipment to these units.

GUARD WILL PAY "TRAGIC PRICE"

Going back to Mr. McNamara, he testified that the PEMA buy was $1.8 billion and that it would all be spent on equipment for the six priority divisions. Later he said half that figure would be earmarked for the priority divisions. Finally he said the Army actually distributes the equipment and he did not know how it would be distributed.

This, no doubt, is what Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT had reference to when he twice described the merger plan in public hearings as "half baked" and (once only) as "what a mess this whole proposition is."

ROA pauses at this point to shed a tear for the National Guard, long a splendid organization as a State militia. Nor is it a crocodile tear, for the National Guard would pay a tragic price if the merger should be effected. Not only would the Guard lose 15 divisions, but it would come more and more under the control of the Secretary of Defense, who sat in the Senate and said:

"The Army is running the Guard, for the very good reason that it has legislative authority to do it, because I have directed it to do it, and because we pay 90 percent of the total cost of the Guard and we have a tremendous bludgeon over it as a result."

As Mr. HÉBERT put it in the hearings, "They have been promised more sugar, but you pay for the sugar in the end."

And he also said:

"This is the tragedy of our times, and that is the thing that concerns me more about the National Guard right now.

"Up until the time this sugar was held out to them and butter put on the bread, they were ordering like we are ordering, but immediately when you came and offered them what I call Eve's apple, they have changed.

"Now they will probably ask, 'What do I do after I get the apple?' This is what is going on, and this is what concerns me. They will find out down the road when their usefulness has ended."

NO SAVING TO TAXPAYER

Returning to the specifics of the merger plan, Mr. McNamara initially attempted to sell it as an annual $150 million saving to the taxpayer. But on February 25, 1965, Lt. Gen. W. H. S. Wright, chief of Reserve components, told a public meeting of our association in Washington, D.C.:

"Actually, calling this a saving is something of a misnomer, as I tried to point out in my presentation. * * * It is not a saving to the taxpayer. It is a redistribution of funds within our program."

Of course the Nation's press seized on the so-called savings factor and many newspapers editorialized for the merger on this basis alone. They mistakenly assumed that we were talking about savings and not about redistribution of funds. Mark one up for Pentagon Press Chief Arthur Sylvester.

As Congressman HÉBERT put it when he had Secretary Sylvester in the witness chair in mid-April, "I never saw a department that tried its case so effectively in the newspapers."

Another catchword used to sell the merger is the magic phrase "contingency war plans." The merger, it is claimed, fits in with the contingency war plans. But an artful job

of confusing contingency plans with mobilization plans has been attempted, and this neat device must be put in proper perspective.

Contingency plans, of necessity, are based on available equipment, whereas mobilization plans must be based on available equipment and on the use of new equipment when the production lines are accelerated. ROA applauds the procurement of additional equipment but brands as "unacceptably dangerous" any plan limiting mobilization to contingencies based on the enemy's supposed intentions rather than on his capabilities.

Indeed, it was General Wright who, in an address to the Adjutants General Association in New Orleans a year ago, said:

"It is not militarily sound to tailor our forces based on enemy intentions although smaller forces would possibly be needed if we did. We must base our forces on capabilities and thus be ready for any eventuality. This is the only prudent course, and the present enemy capabilities are such that we need all of our Guard units whether in the immediate Reserve or reinforcing Reserve."

And it was General Wright who also acknowledged before the Hébert subcommittee that in April of 1964 he called for a total of 45 Active and Reserve divisions.

General Wright's explanation as to why, in April 1964, he thought we needed 45 divisions and a year later saw fit to revise this figure to 24 was reserved for executive session.

RESERVE CHIEF OPPOSES PLAN

Not every uniformed witness has bought the Pentagon merger plan. No less an authority than Maj. Gen. W. J. Sutton, chief of the Army Reserve, forthrightly announced in the hearings that he was personally opposed to the plan.

General Sutton advanced three alternative plans, all of which would satisfy the combat readiness and early deployment goals, all of which would save money, and all of which would still retain the integrity of the U.S. Army Reserve. Unfortunately, under the one-man rule prevailing in the Pentagon, no one in authority troubled to appraise the Sutton alternatives, their feeling being that it would not be unlike setting off firecrackers in a thunderstorm.

There is little point at this date in belaboring the method—or rather the lack of method—that prevailed as the merger plan took shape. Suffice it to say that the initial planning was conducted by three officers, "locked in a room," to use Secretary Ailes' own words, and that neither General Sutton, who runs the Army Reserve, nor Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, knew anything about the study until it had been underway for a whole month. This was testified to by Brig. Gen. Thomas A. Kenan, Deputy Chief of the Office of Reserve Components, who chaired the three-member study group.

That General Sutton was kept in the dark came as no great surprise to those well versed in Pentagon machinations, but that General Wilson, the officer who would have to implement the merger plan, also was kept totally ignorant of the study is so astounding as to border on the unbelievable.

ROA'S COUNTER PROPOSAL

It is not, and never has been, ROA's position to simply call attention to the many gross inadequacies of the proposed merger and let the matter rest here. ROA has already presented a counterproposal calling for the revitalization of the Army Reserve instead of its abolishment. We have outlined new legislation that would increase the Army Reserve's combat readiness and deployment capability on a year-to-year basis to meet changing world conditions.

The plan calls for retaining the 21 divisions now in the Reinforcement Reserve and to reorganize them into the ROAD concept to retain the essential elements of the ROAD Division, and to maintain these elements at 100 percent manning levels.

The ROA proposal would create no disruptive effect on the Immediate Reserve and it retains the divisional organization so fundamental in any mobilization. It also provides for a geographical spread that would enable each State to maintain adequate forces.

Inherent in the ROA plan is a highly flexible response. Should the need for jungle or guerrilla-type organizations arise (hardly an unlikely prospect) these units would be ready immediately as light infantry divisions.

Whatever path is eventually followed, ROA fervently hopes that it is not the dangerous and reckless one that is represented by the merger plan. There is a wealth of alternatives, any one of which is preferable to the merger concept advanced by the Department of Defense. We have every confidence that in the final analysis the democratic process will prevail and that the U.S. Army Reserve will remain intact and brought up to genuine readiness.

Space and Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial of the Christian Science Monitor eloquently attests to the fundamental reasons for our national space program as embodied in our Gemini and Apollo programs and support by our successfully completed Mercury manned space flight effort. I commend this analysis to your reading:

SPACE AND EARTH

Now that the science writers have explained what *Gemini 4* really means, perhaps it is time for the rest of us to peer from our cloisters in amazement.

With a family man out walking in space, can anyone still favor giving up the exploration of space until the problems of earth are solved? If turning away from the moon suddenly gave mankind a soaring impetus to erasing poverty and establishing freedom, our response might be different. As it is, let us continue to realize the visions of space while we continue to battle the nightmares on the ground.

As usual Shakespeare said it first. But somehow we cannot think of those two majors in their capsule as Hamlets saying: "I could be bounded in a nutshell and count myself a king of infinite space, were it not that I have bad dreams."

Rather these Gemini twins were new stars in the human firmament. Major White, of course, would be the counterpart of the white star, Castor. And Major McDivitt, perhaps thinking of his family as well as his varied tasks in space, would be the multiple star, Pollux.

What would that grim 18th-century preacher, Jonathan Edwards have thought if he knew that a sense of humor would flower when American men actually arrived where his thoughts had preceded them? For once, in a respite from fire and brimstone, he looked to space as a temporal analogy to the ever presence of the Deity. Human beings cannot imagine the absence of space, he suggested. Neither should they be able to imagine the absence of God.

We do not mean to sermonize on those glowing color pictures of a fellow man floating free at the end of golden cord. The cord tied him to his nutshell and to the demands of the groundlings.

"Get back in." This is the end of every episode of progress tethered to the earth. But somehow today's Castor and Pollux give us a hint of undreamed possibilities.

The United States and China's Totalitarian Dynamics in 1965—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I called to the attention of the House, earlier today, a significant address by Dr. Richard L. Walker, entitled, "The United States and China's Totalitarian Dynamics in 1965."

At this time, I should like to offer, for inclusion in the Appendix, a further portion of this address dealing with elements of the strategy of the Chinese Communists, as directed from Peiping, as follows:

Let us turn to some of the major aspects of Peiping's world stance today:

1. THE CULT OF THE LEADER

With the death of Stalin, the Chinese Communists became more forthright in asserting that their own leader was the chief theoretician and ideological spokesman for the correct interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. By the time of the celebration of the 10th anniversary of the Chinese Communist regime, the People's Daily of September 30, 1959, was portraying Mao Tse-tung as "the most distinguished representative of our superior traditions in the entire history of our great nation and the most outstanding contemporary revolutionist, statesman, and theoretician of Marxism-Leninism."

The development of the cult of Mao Tse-tung and Peiping's great power claims have been mutually reinforcing. Every statement by Mao has been played up as a great new addition to the science of Marxism-Leninism. Soviet leaders have themselves linked the cult of Mao Tse-tung to Chinese chauvinism. In his secret speech to top leaders of the CPSU on February 14, 1964, made public less than 2 months later by the Soviets on April 3, Suslov commented in detail about the cult of personality in mainland China. At one point he asserted:

"The present positions of the CCP Central Committee both within the country and in the international arena cannot be understood without reviewing the situation within the CCP and the country which has arisen from the propagation of the personality cult. One cannot be silent about the fact that Mao Tse-tung's personality cult is having more and more negative influence on the activity of the CCP. * * * The ideology and practice of the personality cult explain to a great extent the appearance of hegemonic plans among the Chinese leaders."

Another of the many articles in the Soviet press expressing concern about the cult of Mao noted that "too many things in common with Stalin's worst ideas and practices have appeared in Peiping's ideology and practice," and decried the "halo of infallibility, wisdom, and almightiness has been created around one person."

The very nature of the statements and proclamations from the pen of Mao in recent years supports the thesis that his personality cult is linked with Chinese great power aspirations. Mao pronounces on many subjects—Panama, the Congo, the Negro movement in the United States, or Cuba—which would not ordinarily prompt comment from less ambitious leaders. The following play given to a Mao statement by the People's Daily of December 1, 1964, illustrates the tone and treatment given to pronunciamentos from on high by the new occupant of the Dragon Throne and the self-proclaimed top interpreter of scientific socialism:

"Chairman Mao Tse-tung, in his statement supporting the people of the Congo Leopoldville against U.S. aggression, said: 'People of the whole world, unite, defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their flunkies. People of the whole world, have courage, dare to fight, defy difficulties, advance one after the other, so that the world shall belong to the people. Each and every evildoer shall be liquidated'." This is a scientific statement on the revolutionary situation in Africa and the world.

2. THE UTILITY OF HOSTILITY

Peiping's aggressive and frequently hostile stance in international affairs can also be better understood as motivated in part by world power ambitions. Here a consistent feature has been the intense campaign of hostility waged against the United States by Mao Tse-tung and his comrades over the years. Hostility toward the United States has had some substantive base, stemming from the Korean war and the interposition of American naval forces in the Taiwan Strait, thus preventing the Chinese Communists from eliminating an alternate and challenging Chinese regime from Taiwan. But there have been other aspects of the campaign against "U.S. imperialism" which have made it a logical and necessary policy in Mao's strategy.

From the point of view of doctrine, an uncompromising hostility toward the most powerful democracy in the world can help to reinforce Peiping's claim to orthodoxy and leadership of the "forces of socialism" in a two-camp world. The U.S.S.R. is pictured as abandoning leadership of the revolutionary forces as a result of its willingness to reach certain agreements for detente with the United States, the camp of the enemy, according to Peiping. Peiping's absolute hostility toward the United States gives the impression of near-equality for the Chinese Communists in the world struggle. In terms of practical relations around the borders of China, Mao's regime attempts to intimidate the smaller countries from being too friendly with the United States. Their fear of incurring the displeasure of the great giant to the north can lead them toward a one-sided neutrality.

Peiping's uncompromising hostility toward the United States and its policies in East Asia has frequently led to pressures upon Washington from its allies for changes in American policies. They lack, of course, adequate means for pressure toward policy changes in Peiping, and thus the Chinese Communists are able to assert increasing influence by dividing the camp of imperialism and seeming to have sway over the allies of the United States. In all his statements foretelling the doom of the United States as a result of the inevitable course of the dialectic in history, Mao pictures great China as the leading element of the irresistible forces of the new phase in human history. His assessments that U.S. imperialists and the atom bomb are paper tigers and that the east wind is prevailing over the west wind also fall into the category of helping to enhance China's great power position. Peiping has consistently pictured itself as the leader with the correct policies for smashing the United States. A People's Daily editorial of January 4, 1965, for example, stated:

"The Johnson administration's 1-year reign has been replete with evil deeds. Countless facts show that U.S. imperialism will never lay down its butcher's knife, not of its own accord anyway. The peoples of the whole world have seen still more clearly that the way to defend peace does not consist in cherishing illusions about U.S. imperialism. The danger of nuclear war can never be removed by relying on the sensibleness and good intentions of U.S. imperialism but by effectively smashing its nuclear monopoly and foiling its policy of nuclear blackmail, nuclear threat, and nuclear war preparations. There is no other way out."

In its hostile posture the Chinese Communist regime has apparently deemed that personal abuse also has some utility. President Eisenhower was denounced as a "bloodthirsty warmonger" and President Kennedy was proclaimed to be "worse than Eisenhower." President Johnson is now worse than that. Soviet leaders, and especially Khrushchev, were upbraided for commenting favorably on the moderation of U.S. leadership. The wrath of Peiping toward Moscow for such un-Marxist sentiments was bound to discourage expression of even the most innocuously pleasant sentiments on the part of the leaders of smaller countries toward the United States. In bidding for leadership, especially of the newly emergent forces, Peiping has attempted to focus the frustrations, tensions, hatreds, and passions against the United States by pointing out that the anti-U.S. movement helped China build power.

Soviet "revisionists" thus have been put in the same category as the "imperialists" in Mao's book. According to the Red Flag (November 1964) editorial, "Why Khrushchev Fell:" "As Comrade Mao Tse-tung has repeatedly pointed out, imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers, and the revisionists are too." Thus the fall of Khrushchev was pictured as a victory for the inevitable forces of history and further vindication of the correct Chinese position and power.

Any nation or international body which dares to question the great power position of Communist China or the correct policies of its leaders risks a torrent of abuse. Peiping, of course, hailed Indonesia's withdrawal from the United Nations and described the world body as a "U.S. imperialist instrument of aggression, an infamous organ in the service of the old and new colonialism, and a vile place for a few powers to share the spoils." Leaders in Brazil who arrested Chinese Communist agents there were showered with invectives, and governmental leaders in India have been almost stunned at the intensity of Chinese Communist abuse.

3. THE POLITICS OF NUMBERS

One factor which has been given particularly great stress in the Chinese bid for great power status has been the mighty population of China. When Mao Tse-tung proclaimed during the period of the great leap forward that a mighty population is a good thing, he was echoing the sentiments of many past Chinese emperiors who asserted China's superiority over neighboring small states by constant reference to the myriad millions in the middle kingdom. Given China's population of over one-fifth of the people of the world, it was to be expected that the Mao regime would emphasize this factor.

Peiping links its claim to great power status on the basis of population to its doctrinaire Marxist position that the people of the world count. It asserts that the people, as opposed to the imperialists, reactionaries, and revisionists, will be the decisive factor in history and it defines as people those who support the policies which it proclaims. It is worth noting that the stress on the people strikes a particularly responsive chord among the leaders in many of the newly independent states of Africa who have based their own power on an appeal to this concept. Since it views the people as the truly revolutionary force in history and believes itself to be the revolutionary leader of the world, the Mao regime draws inspiration from what it perceives to be the revolutionary situation in the underdeveloped countries. The mighty people of China led by the ever-correct CCP and the thought of Mao Tse-tung thus become a crucial component of great power status in the eyes of the Chinese Communist leadership. Parades and demonstrations against established governments and those organized against policies of the imperialists and especially the U.S. imperialists are given great play by the Chinese Communists as proof of the validity and inevitability of the strategy of Mao. This absence of major demonstrations against such events as the explosion of a nuclear device by Communist China on October 16, 1964, in contrast to the mass demonstrations and mob actions against U.S. policies in Panama, the Congo, or Vietnam, for example, undoubtedly add conviction to Peiping's claims that the masses count.

Peiping's utilization of the politics of arithmetic in claiming great power status is evident in the constant flow of statements over the past 15 years proclaiming the number of Chinese participants in demonstrations, the number of signatures on letters of protest, or the number of "volunteers" for this or that project. On January 21, 1964, for example, the People's Daily proudly announced, "During the current worldwide movement against U.S. imperialist aggression against Panama, more than 16 million people in our country have taken part in demonstrations and meetings in support of the Panamanian people." Less than a year later, Peiping was claiming that more than 50 million had participated in demonstrations in support of the Vietcong forces in South Vietnam.

The politics of numbers and its utilization by Mao's regime has also been reflected in other ways. When Indonesia withdraw from the United Nations, Peiping immediately pointed out that the total of the Chinese and Indonesian populations constituted a great force of "the people opposed to the U.N." The Chinese point out that the CCP, with more than 18 million members, is the largest Communist Party in the world. It is supported by the 3-million-member Indonesian Communist Party, the largest outside the Communist camp. Thus Peiping claims to have a larger number of CP members supporting its view in its dispute with the Soviet leadership. In its letter to the CPSU of June 14, 1964, it pointed out, "In relation to the total number of Communists in the world, those who really believe in revisionism constitute only a small fraction, and they are bound to come to grief."

4. THE POWER OF THE GUN

In their exchange of polemics with the Soviet leadership, the Chinese Communist leaders have made quite clear their belief in the efficacy of military force for approaching world problems, and they picture themselves as the leaders of the forces of military violence in the world revolution. Peiping's position was forcefully stated in the joint People's Daily and Red Flag statement of March 31, 1964:

"Basing himself on the Marxist-Leninist theory of violent revolution and the new experience of the proletarian, * * * Comrade Mao Tse-tung advanced the celebrated dictum that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: "Revolutions and revolutionary wars are inevitable in class society and * * * in their absence no leap in social development can be accomplished, the reactionary ruling classes cannot be overthrown, and the people cannot win po-

litical power" ("On Contradiction," Selected Works, 2d Chinese ed., vol. I, Peiping, p. 322).

He stated: "The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries" ("Problems of War and Strategy," Selected Military Writings, Foreign Languages Press, Peiping, 1963, p. 267).

"To sum up, violent revolution is a universal law of proletarian revolution. This is a fundamental tenet of Marxism-Leninism. It is on this most important question that Khrushchev betrays Marxism-Leninism."

Communist China's commitment to a military solution to problems can also be viewed as a method of asserting its great power status. Statements from Peiping stress the inability of the imperialist powers to deal with the forces of the people or to sustain their position through periods of protracted conflict. In a manner reminiscent of pre-World War II Japan, Mao Tse-tung has subordinated other projects in mainland China to the buildup of military power. Of course, the most dramatic example of this has been the commitment by Communist China to the development of nuclear weapons. China's first atomic device reflected the tremendous investment in a gaseous diffusion plant at Lanchow, an achievement which even France had been unable to attain, despite a French investment of over $1 billion for the development of a gaseous diffusion process for making U^{235}. Communist China's great power sensitivities were clearly reflected in the statement released by Peiping on October 16, 1964, at the time of the announcement of the successful detonation:

They [the U.S. imperialists and their partners] have it and you don't and so they are very haughty. But once those who oppose them also have it, they would no longer be so haughty, their policy of nuclear blackmail and nuclear threat would no longer be so effective, and the possibility for a complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons would increase.

Peiping's bid for leadership in exporting revolution has been reflected in the training provided for guerrilla leaders from Africa and Asia in mainland China, and the export of military supplies from Communist China to areas where "revolutionary forces of the people" can be supported. Many of the present leaders of the new states of Africa have been disturbed by the extent of Peiping's support of violence in their countries. President Houphouet-Boigny of the Ivory Coast expressed concern over the systematic Chinese policy of training terrorists "to assassinate those whose eyes were open to the Chinese danger and put in their place servile men who would open the gates of Africa to China" (Le Monde, Jan. 26, 1965). Arms manufactured in China have been supplied in such faraway places as Tanganyika and the Congo. These shipments lend credibility to Peiping's contention that it is now such an important power in the world that no decision affecting peace and security anywhere can be made without Chinese participation.

The towering intimidation of smaller powers and the consequent buildup of Chinese great power status by military action was illustrated by the dramatic victory scored over Indian forces in the Sino-Indian border war of October–November 1962. The well-planned operation of the Chinese Communist forces offered convincing evidence that Mao Tse-tung is able to employ the People's Liberation Army with effectiveness in a conventional-type engagement as well as in support of guerrilla operations. The Chinese performance along the Tibetan border undoubtedly sent a shiver down the spines of the leaders of smaller countries around the Chinese borders. Shortly thereafter Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia was ousting U.S. representatives and programs from his country. On January 29, 1965, the Cambodian Prince gave a speech at the inauguration of a model village in his country, indicating the extent to which Peiping's arguments about the decline of American power had swayed him:

"Dear children, the Americans are at the point of total defeat, for all their war material [South Vietnam] has been destroyed by the patriots. Their days are numbered. They will soon go to hell."

5. THE PERSUASION OF THE PILGRIMAGE

Mao's regime has also borrowed chapters from the books of the ancient Chinese emperors and from the guided tour directories of the Soviet Union to back its world leadership theme. Hundreds of leading figures from the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America make the pilgrimage to Peiping and other cities in mainland China where they are feted and frequently convinced that the Chinese Communists regard them as more important than even their own countrymen. Chinese Communist leaders have shown a remarkable ability to play on the vanity as well as the prejudices of visitors, to impress them with Chinese numbers, Communist enthusiasm, and the cultural and historical greatness of the Middle Kingdom.

Mao's regime has been willing to spend lavish sums for propaganda gatherings in Peiping such as, for example, the scientific syposium held there, August 21–31, 1964. Some 299 papers were read to more than 1,000 delegates—many of the papers dealing with the common struggle against imperialism. Participants came from the newly emerged countries, but representatives from the United States, Canada, the Soviet Union, and Europe were excluded.

During the course of visits to mainland China, political leaders, even from countries which recognize the Chinese Nationalist Government on Taiwan, find themselves joining in statements in support of Peiping's foreign policy goals and thus giving credence to the contention of Mao's regime that "all the people of the world" support People's China and only a handful of reactionaries in such countries as Japan or Mexico (whose non-Communist leaders have signed frequent joint statements) are responsible for policies friendly to the United States. The pilgrims to Peiping are given ceremonious attention by the top leaders, sometimes including a brief audience with Mao Tse-tung himself. Pictures are disseminated widely both within China and in the home countries of the visitors. All this tends to reinforce the propaganda within China that the Communists have the sympathy and support of people all over the world, and in the countries abroad that the influence and weight of China is growing.

The 50th Anniversary of the Ordination of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 12, the Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, and his admiring friends will observe the 50th anniversary of his ordination into the priesthood. This devoted and dedicated prince of the church will not, however, be allowed to take part in person in this rare celebration because he is not free to do that in his native Hungary. Godless Communists who rule there have been harassing him even in his sanctuary in the U.S. legation in Budapest.

Since his elevation to the college of cardinals in 1946, this kind and peace-loving servant of the church has been at odds with the Communists who rule Hungary. He has been fighting for the restoration of freedom, human rights and the guarantee of the basic rights of his church. He is one of the greatest leaders of resistance to communism and, at the same time, one of the greatest of all freedom fighters. However, since 1949 he has not been free. For a while in the abortive October revolution of 1956, he was freed, but before he could celebrate his first mass as a freeman, he was forced to flee to the American legation for his safety. And there he has been since then, enjoying all the privileges the legation is in a position to grant him, though it unfortunately cannot grant him freedom from persecution by the Hungarian Government.

Mr. Speaker, on the 50th anniversary of his ordination let us all hope and pray for the release and safety of the 73-year-old freedom fighter, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, the Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, and for the fulfillment of his crusade for a Hungary in which the whole fabric of society woud be permeated with the spirit of Christianity.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Communications Explosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, recently Mr. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America, spoke to the Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association at their annual convention banquet at the Sheraton Park Hotel. The subject of his talk was the communications explosion in which he traced the history of the phenomenal growth of communications and the pressing problems that must be resolved if the United States is to maintain its leadership. He brought into sharp focus the manifold problems involved in this complex field of communications particularly since the advent of space communications and the need for a unified overall telecommunications policy in the international field.

The Senate Commerce Committee has been keenly aware of the need of such a policy and has urged the various Government agencies who have an interest in such a program to develop this policy. A high level intragovernmental study is underway under the leadership of James O'Connell, Director of Telecommunications Management and special assistant to the president for telecommunications. I am hopeful this study will be completed and recommendations submitted to Congress in the next session.

I, therefore, commend to my colleagues the comments of Mr. Sarnoff and ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sarnoff's speech of May 26, 1965, to the Armed Forces Communications & Electronics Association be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMUNICATIONS EXPLOSION

(Address by David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corp. of America, at the annual convention banquet of the Armed Forces Communications & Electronics Association, Washington, D.C., May 26, 1965)

Sixteen years ago, I had the honor of addressing the annual banquet of this association on the subject of communications progress. In those relatively primitive days, the only objects flying in space were meteorites. Automation and computers were the exclusive possession of a handful of specialists. Solid-state circuitry was just out of the laboratories, and the vacuum tube was still the building block of electronics.

Since then, electronic communication has advanced more rapidly than any other branch of 20th century technology. Our progress has been the product of many skills and talents and has been aided significantly by the working alliance of industrial and military leadership represented in this organization.

It took nearly two centuries and several prolonged conflicts to teach us that the absence of this vital alliance in time of peace could be costly in time of war. One of those who understood the relationship and sought to strengthen it was our former chief signal officer—my old friend and associate, Harry Ingles.

Nineteen years ago, he took the initiative in establishing this organization to perpetuate and strengthen the communications ties that were fashioned in battle during World War II. It was my honor to serve as its first president, and I feel a parental pride at the progress it has made. AFCEA has fashioned a community of interests so closely interwoven that whatever affects the progress of one partner is reflected in the progress of the other.

The bulk of our military and Government traffic between the United States and overseas points is normally routed over commercial facilities as a matter of national policy. In time of emergency or war, these facilities are at the instant and total disposal of the armed services. Thus, the manner in which our commercial services develop and the extent to which they are permitted to develop, is of direct concern to the Defense Establishment.

There has never been a time when understanding and collaborative effort between us were more critically needed than today. Despite the formidable advance of our technology in recent years, we are only in the first stages of a communications explosion that will invalidate many of the historic premises on which American leadership in communications was based. The best of our combined talents will be required to channel the force of this explosion for the benefit of our country and the free nations.

To be properly understood, the communications explosion must be related to other major explosions of our generation which are also having a profound impact on society. The first, and most widely discussed, is the population explosion. Only 35 years from now, within the lifetime of many in this room tonight, there will be 6 billion people on this earth. The population of Asia alone will exceed all of the people inhabiting the earth today.

The second explosion is in science and technology, and its occurrence at this moment in history is particularly fortunate. Otherwise, it might be impossible to sustain the impending increase in population and still preserve any semblance of a rational social order.

The primary significance of the scientific explosion is that it will give man the capability to bend nature to his will, to alter life processes and to loosen the fetters of gravity that bind him to the immediate vicinity of earth. For the first time, man will acquire dominance over his environment.

His ability to harness and exploit the opportunities offered by this new dominance will depend, in turn, upon communications, which has given us our third explosion. I believe this will be the most significant of the three explosions because the basic purpose of communications is the transmission of intelligence. Without this capability, modern society could not function.

Electronic communication has already given man the means to extend the capabilities of his mind a thousandfold, to bring within grasp the world's recorded knowledge and to reach for the knowledge hidden in other worlds. It has provided him with instruments and channels to transmit this knowledge in virtually any form to any place or person, and to direct other instruments hundreds of thousands of miles away. It has also changed the character of our communications services.

In my early days in communications, there were three distinctly separate services, transmitted in different ways and used for different purposes. There was telegraphy for point-to-point record messages. There was telephony for point-to-point voice messages. There was radio broadcasting for mass communications.

These services were logically segregated by law, by technical limitations, and by usage. But today the electronic pulses which we use to transmit information make no distinction between voice and data, words or images. They are all so many bits of energy. The broadband channels through which they flow can accommodate them all.

In the past few years coaxial underseas cable systems have been handling a mounting combination of voice and record communications. Now we have communications satellites that accommodate voice, record, and television indiscriminately. Soon transistorized underseas cables will do the same.

By the 1970's, new devices, circuits and transmission channels—among them radio circuits in the millimeter-wave range and laser beams—will be coupled with satellites and other advanced communications techniques to provide thousands of additional channels for the world's voice, telegraph, and television services.

At the terminal points, instruments which are in existence or in development can handle voice or record messages interchangeably. Communications between man and machine, and machine and machine, will become as extensive as man-to-man communications are today. It will be possible to transmit any and every type of information over the same channels, in virtually unlimited quantity and at incredible speeds, to and from all points on earth.

Inevitably, change of this magnitude creates problems which cannot be resolved simply by drawing upon the experience of yesterday. Developments are too radical in their nature, and the pace at which they come is too swift, for the past to serve as an effective prelude to the communicating future. We must look for entirely new procedures, attuned to the realities of the space age, if our communications services are to function in harmony with the new technology and if America is to maintain its leadership in this vital field.

Three years ago, in an address to the American Bar Association, I called attention to the anachronisms of a communications policy which continued to enforce separation of voice and record transmissions and the channels over which they traveled. Since then, many other voices in industry and Government have been raised against such clearly outmoded regulations which impede our progress and hamper our leadership in world communications.

One of the most distinguished voices has been that of the chairman of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Mr. Frederick R. Kappel. In a recent speech, he observed that electronic communication is beginning to approach the universality that has been built

into the senses of man; that all communications are united by the fact that they can be transmitted electrically. To insist upon a legal separation between voice and nonvoice communications, he pointed out, would make it virtually impossible to provide a complete service to the public except at a totally unacceptable cost, and would be akin to requiring certain tracks on a railroad to carry only passengers and others to carry only freight.

Mr. Kappel said further that he did not think the American people would ignore the efficiencies that could be obtained from using the full capability of the telephone system.

I endorse Mr. Kappel's viewpoint, and I would go a step further. If it is logical, efficient, and in the public interest for the telephone system to offer a complete communications service to the public, including both voice and nonvoice communications, it is just as logical for the authorized international record companies to provide the same universality of service.

If it is logical to demolish the arbitrary barrier between voice and nonvoice communications, then again it is equally logical to eliminate the arbitrary barrier between the full interconnection of international communications with domestic telephone facilities.

As we operate today, a person or organization in this country wishing to talk, telegraph, or transmit data at the same time between the United States and overseas cannot do so over the same public service. He must go to one place and one carrier for voice communications, and to another place and carrier for record communications. Furthermore, the record carrier is not permitted to interconnect with the public telephone system in this country.

The exception to this is the large organization with resources to lease its own private channels. These leased systems have recently been permitted to carry both voice and record traffic and to interconnect with domestic telephone circuits. For the general public, however, there is no such convenience.

But even if we demolish these barriers, there are broader issues to be resolved which affect America's position in international communications. In this satellite era, it takes only a split second to communicate any type of intelligence—voice, data, facsimile, or television—to and from any point on earth. One-half of this sliver of time involves communications from other countries, the vast majority of which speak as a single unit through State-controlled monopolies. Our half—the United States—speaks with a multiplicity of voices because of the historic competitive nature of our international communications structure.

The American common carriers, each competing with the other, must negotiate separately with communications monopolies in other countries in order to provide international service to their customers. The foreign organizations have the advantage of unity in bargaining. We are weakened by a factor of six—the number of our authorized international carriers.

Even the addition of the Communications Satellite Corp. to our international communications structure has failed to resolve the problems that grow out of procedures inherited from an earlier time. The different American common carriers will, of course, use the Comsat channels, but they will still carry on separate negotiations with the foreign monopolies in such matters as the division of revenues and the use of circuits. The fragmentation of service has simply been extended into space.

The existence of such a situation does not, of course, reflect unfavorably in any manner upon Comsat itself. In its brief period of existence, face to face with all the unknowns of operations in a new environment. Comsat has done a remarkable job in terms of both organization and technology. It has already given America a formidable early advantage in satellite communications. The efforts of all of us should be concentrated on developing a climate in which Comsat can function with maximum efficiency and in harmony with other elements in our communications structure.

Yet, in view of the confusing situation that exists today, it is hardly surprising that conflicts of interest have already emerged between Comsat and the various carriers which own half of its stock. There has been a difference of view over the proper roles of the authorized carriers and of Comsat in the ownership and operation of satellite ground stations in this country. Directors elected to the Comsat board by the carriers have apparently felt compelled to abstain from voting on the issue.

Then there is the unresolved conflict over whether Comsat can lease its international circuits directly to such organizations as the news services, the television networks, or other entities whose identity has never been spelled out. If this should happen, Comsat would occupy the traditional role of the authorized carriers and in effect compete directly with them for international traffic. It would thus preempt the satellite facilities intended for use by the authorized carriers.

Beyond these jurisdictional problems, there is now a different operational environment for satellite communications than had been anticipated when legislation on the subject was enacted.

When congressional hearings were conducted in 1961 and 1962, the estimated costs of a complete system—including the development program, the satellites and ground stations—were extremely high. The technology was complex. The reliability of booster rockets was uncertain, with a possible ratio of two or three failures for every successful orbital launching.

As far as anyone could foresee, it appeared certain that one global system would probably do the job for a long time into the future, and that satellite communications was neither technically nor economically feasible for any but the richest and most technically advanced Nation to undertake.

Today, as General Jackson said at New Orleans, we have elevated our sights lower. A satellite booster rocket now costs as little as $3 million, and the chance of a successful launching approaches 100 percent. The technical complexity of satellites has been simplified to such an extent that a single satellite may cost as little as $1 million. Depending upon its function, a ground station can be built at a cost ranging from $2 to $6 million.

The costs and the technical requirements for a satellite communications system have thus diminished until they are will within the capability of many nations that possess relatively moderate industrial and technical resources, not to mention nations whose capabilities approach our own.

A month ago, the Soviet Union launched its first communications satellite and began to broadcast television programs across the 4,000 miles between Moscow and Vladivostok. The satellite's capability also extends to two-way multichannel telephone, radiophoto, and telegraph communications.

Satellites serve a political and psychological as well as a communications function, and no nation is more keenly alert to the broader implications of space than the Russians. They will use their new capabilities, ultimately, to pose a new challenge to America, to demonstrate their technological power and to attempt to make valid in the eyes of other nations their claims of space superiority.

Many of the underdeveloped nations, in addition to the Soviet Union and its satellites, have chosen to remain outside Comsat. We can expect that ultimately Russia will set up a satellite communications system competitive to our own and offer it to other nations on favorable terms determined more by political than economic considerations. When this happens, we will be challenged for communications leadership on a global scale.

Nor is this the only quarter from which competition may come. The Western European countries are working together on space projects through their own joint enterprise, the European Launcher Development Organization. Some of its members have already voiced opposition to adopting a position in any way subservient to the United States in the field of satellite communications.

Western Europe unquestionably has the capability to establish a communications satellite system of its own, and it is entirely possible that such a system might be in operation within the next 5 years. Finally, of course, there is always the possibility that General de Gaulle might decide that the language of space should be French, and not English or Russian.

Only 5 years from now, interim agreements between Comsat and 45 participating nations for the direction and operation of the satellite system will be up for reexamination. We will have to negotiate a new ocmpact under different circumstances and possibly vastly altered bargaining conditions.

During the negotiations last year, the European nations refused to enter into bilateral agreements. They formed a union of all their telecommunication authorities and insisted on negotiating as a unit. By 1970, we can anticipate that they will hold vastly stronger bargaining cards, including the option of organizing or joining competing satellite systems.

Faced by this prospect of increased competition from abroad, America cannot, in my judgment, successfully operate a system of global communications with one company responsible for international voice transmission, five others for international record transmission, and with unresolved jurisdictional lines between the single American satellite entity and all the international communications carriers. We require a fundamental change in the policies and the regulations under which we now operate.

If, despite the recent developments in technology, and the new circumstances they have created, our Government still elects to maintain a cmopetitive pattern at the American end of international circuits, then let us at least make certain that it is truly competitive. To accomplish this, all international carriers should have total and unrestricted access to all channels of communications, without regard to whether they are voice or record. They should also have complete interconnection with, and uninhibited use of, domestic facilities. In this way, we can at least make far greater use of the modern tools available to us and better serve the growing and changing public needs.

At the same time, a clear regulatory distinction should be recognized between the functions of Comsat and the communications carriers. It should also be recognized that Comsat was established to function as a carrier's carrier, neither dealing directly with organizations not authorized for the service of communications, nor preempting facilities which are indispensable for providing that service to customers.

There is a second alternative, which is the practice followed by most foreign nations. A single government entity would take over and operate all our communications facilities. This would be counter to the deeply rooted traditions of American private enterprise. I would be very much against it. So would most Americans who believe, as I do, that Government ownership and operation are not necessary or justified where, as in this instance, private enterprise can do the job efficiently and serve the public interest adequately.

In my American Bar Association speech of 1962, I suggested a solution in keeping with our historic tradition of private enterprise in American communications. I proposed the creation of a single, privately owned American company, uniting the facilities and operations of the present competing U.S. carriers—both voice and record—in the international communications field. This company would be completely independent in its policies and operations, subject only to appropriate Government regulations.

This unified company would be able to render an efficient, complete, and economical international communications service to the public with all the advantages made possible by modern technology.

It would permit the United States to deal on equal terms with foreign government monopolies.

It would simplify relationships with Comsat to the benefit of the Unified Carrier, Comsat and the public.

It would advance and strengthen both the voice and record services now rendered to the public.

It would avoid the danger of the single voice carrier capturing the traffic of the competing record carriers—a danger that will develop if A.T. & T. is permitted to render both record and voice services.

It would give new cohesion to our entire communications structure and automatically solve the problem of providing interconnection for the flow of international traffic with the established domestic telephone facilities.

With our communications structure thus in order, we would be in a stronger position to take advantage of another great opportunity that technology will soon offer. It may be as significant as the orbiting of the first communications satellite itself.

Within a decade, and possibly less, I believe it will be technically feasible to broadcast directly into the home from synchronous satellites. All of the basic components and technology already exist for radio and television broadcast transmitters to operate in space.

These would be high-power satellites, weighing about 5,000 pounds, and powered by nuclear reactors of the same general type as the smaller experimental SNAP 10-A which is now in space operation. These reactors may well generate up to 30 kilowatts of power, sufficient to transmit three separate radio and television signals directly to home receivers on earth. They would also permit a tremendous expansion of every other type of communications service.

Placed in synchronous orbit over the equator, each satellite coud broadcast to an area of 1 millon square miles, covering such nations and regions as Brazil, India, Western Europe, or the United States. These satellites would operate in the UHF TV band. To receive them would require only minor modification in the home receiver, and redirection of its antenna. A 6-foot antenna would be sufficient to receive a clear television signal in the home. The total cost of adapting home receivers and antennas would be minimal.

Apart from developmental costs for the system, the actual cost of the launching, booster, and direct broadcast satellite would be in the area of $10 million. Cost of the ground station to transmit programs to the satellite would approximate $5 million.

With three such satellites—together costing about $30 million, exclusive of ground stations—three TV channels would be available through each satellite to beam programs to the entire United States and north into Canada. To purchase a single leading VHF television station now operating in a major American market would cost approximately as much as this entire three-satellite system.

Today, the three American networks spend approximately $50 million a year to lease 53,000 miles of circuits to transmit programs to their affiliated television stations. These costs are only for regular interconnecting facilities for networks. Additional millions of dollars are required for special feeds. It is therefore not difficult to visualize what effect direct broadcast satellites can have on the economics of broadcasting.

For countries such as India or Brazil, where there is urgent need of a national television network to educate a growing population, a satellite broadcast system offers a most promising solution. Its cost would be perhaps half of the minimum needed for the present type of ground-based broadcast service.

Whether used for education, entertainment, or political indoctrination, direct broadcast satellite systems will ultimately be within the technical and economic reach of many nations and they will penetrate many barriers, with unpredictable social, political, and economic results.

What will happen when countries can broadcast directly into the homes of other countries—when the U.S.S.R. can televise to New York and Seattle and the United States can broadcast directly to the citizens of Moscow and Kharkov? What forms of jurisdiction must be established to prevent the television spaceways from degenerating into a confusion of sounds and images? Again, how do we preserve American interests and assure continued American leadership in the new era of space communications?

In 1962, I suggested that the way to achieve these goals was through the establishment of a unified national communications policy suitable to our current and future needs. Such a policy should recognize the fact that competition in international communications is no longer within nations—it is among nations. I believe the need is even more imperative now than it was 3 years ago.

Fortunately, a high-level intragovernmental study is now underway to make recommendations to the Congress for an international communications policy for this country. I hope that out of it will come proposals that can be translated into legislation which will permit our country to utilize every communications resource at its command.

When America sets forth to achieve a national objective, there is no nation on earth that can equal its capabilities. We established this decisively almost a quarter of a century ago, when our combined industrial and military resources created the most effective instrument for military victory in history. Despite a late start, we are proving it again in the exploration and conquest of space.

Today, when the means for transmitting and receiving intelligence extend to every corner of the globe, the maintenance of our communications position in space and elsewhere must command the highest priority. It is a fact of 20th century life that the nation which leads in communications is also equipped for leadership in many other crucial areas of national and international endeavor.

America must continue to play the decisive role in shaping the force of the communications explosion. It can do so if our vision and our policies keep abreast of our science and technology.

The National Fraternal Congress of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is with personal pleasure and honor that I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of this distinguished body the designation of this week—June 13 to 19, 1965—as Fraternal Week by the National Fraternal Congress of America. The president of this huge fraternal organization, representing 100 fraternal benefit societies throughout our country, is a very distinguished citizen of Michigan's Eighth Congressional District and a good personal friend, Mr. Frank H. Lee, of Port Huron, Mich.

It is particularly interesting to note that the 79th annual meeting of the National Fraternal Congress of America will be here in Washington, D.C., September 26 to 29. I am certain that many of us will be attending this annual affair.

For additional background information on the National Fraternal Congress of America, organized in 1886, its societies currently account for over $13 billion worth of insurance in force for over 10 million members. The real concern of the National Fraternal Congress of America, however, has been its sincere and dedicated efforts in behalf of the social welfare of its membership.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, permit me to insert the following proclamation issued by Mr. Lee, as president of the National Fraternal Congress of America, and a news release from the organization entitled "You Are Your Flag";

PROCLAMATION BY NATIONAL FRATERNAL CONGRESS OF AMERICA

Whereas the National Fraternal Congress of America in its endeavor to develop public awareness and understanding of the fraternal benefit system and its function and ideals has established the custom of designating a specific week as Fraternal Week; and

Whereas fraternal benefit societies are steadfast in their support of the American form of government, its values and its precepts; and

Whereas fraternalists hold the flag of the United States of America in highest esteem: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the week of June 13 to 19, 1965, is hereby designated as Fraternal Week, and that member societies of the National Fraternal Congress of America use any and all appropriate means at their command to direct the attention of their members and of the general public to the observance of Fraternal Week; be it further

Resolved, That in accordance with the patriotic ideals and principles of the fraternal benefit system, it is fitting that National Flag Day, June 14, 1965, be observed through proper display of the national flag

and as occasion for public ceremony wherever possible; and be it further

Resolved, That this proclamation be communicated to all member societies of the National Fraternal Congress of America and submitted by them to their members for attention.

FRANK H. LEE,
President.

YOU ARE YOUR FLAG

You are your flag. Whether it flies in Vietnam or over a bombed embassy or in front of your county courthouse, it stands for you as an American. It is your valor in facing the cold war and the new income tax that keeps the red stripes red; it is the liberty of your ballot and your letter to the editor that keeps the blue field blue. White represents purity and sincere patriotism is a part of it. You are your flag; and what is more, your flag is you.

You may have become part of it at Ypres, Omaha Beach, Guadalcanal, or Pork Chop Hill, or perhaps it happened some otherwise ordinary day when you sat back for a moment and thought about being an American. It is important to feel as well as to be a part of the flag; America can be Americans only as long as Americans believe in America.

As a nation we always have. How the Revolutionary War came to be fought beneath banners bearing pine trees, anchors, and rattlesnakes explains how the lives of the colonists gave meaning to their flags just as their flags gave meaning to their lives.

It is to this meaning that National Flag Day, June 14, is dedicated. As a special activity of Fraternal Week, June 13–19, the fraternal benefit societies of the United States seek to refurbish this feeling for the flag in every American. This feeling comes with the understanding of our flag's history.

AN APPEAL TO HEAVEN

Sheltering Hanover Square, Boston, meeting place of the Sons of Liberty was a fine old elm known as the liberty tree. Citizens of Charleston, S.C., gathered beneath a massive live oak to hear the Declaration of Independence read for the first time. All the money minted by the colony of Massachusetts bore on one side a tree.

Because trees were so much a part of colonial life, the colonists made them a part of their flags. A white maritime flag bearing a green pine tree and the inscription "An Appeal to Heaven" became the ensign of cruisers commissioned by General Washington. That same pine emblazoned the flag that flew at Bunker Hill and the continental flag of the Sons of Liberty.

Early in 1776 Benjamin Franklin's Pennsylvania Gazette suggested turning loose a cargo of rattlesnakes in London parks to retaliate for British injustices. The idea appealed to the patriots and by the end of the year American flagpoles were flying the famous coiled rattlesnake which defended the words "Don't tread on me."

One writer of the time explained that "As the rattlesnake's eye exceeds in brightness that of any other animal, and as she has no eyelids, she symbolizes eternal vigilance. Inasmuch as she never begins an attack, nor, once engaged, ever surrenders, she is an emblem of magnanimity and true courage."

After Col. William Moultrie's Charleston, S.C., garrison defeated a British naval force, they created the Moultrie flag. Upon the blue of their uniforms they affixed a crescent in the upper left-hand corner and the word "Liberty" along the lower border. The insignia derived from the silver crescents inscribed "liberty or death" which they had worn on their caps.

Over the battlefields of Brandywine, Trenton, and Yorktown flew the flag of maritime Rhode Island. It bore a white anchor, 13 stars and the word "hope" against the now familiar blue field.

Though the patriots fought under different flags, their loyalty was to the same America. And so their flags gradually evolved into similarity and finally into the single design that became at once their goal and their inspiration.

STARS AND STRIPES

From the Moultrie, Rhode Island Continental, and Bunker Hill flags came the red, the white and blue. The design, it is claimed but not verified, originated with the banner so gallantly defended by the Green Mountain Boys at the Battle of Bennington. The Bennington flag featured 13 alternating red and white stripes surrounding a blue field in the upper left-hand corner. In this section was an arch of 11 white stars over the figure "76" with a white star in each upper corner.

If the Bennington flag is not wholeheartedly acknowledged as "Old Glory's" forerunner, which flag, then, was? The Stars and Stripes began when, "Out of compliment to the United Colonies," General Washington hoisted the Grand Union flag at Cambridge, Mass., as the standard of the Continental Army. It carried the now traditional 13 alternating red and white stripes, but, instead of stars, the blue field carried the Union Jack of England.

The stripes symbolized both the Americans' separation and emanation from their mother country. On June 14, 1777, the United States of America removed England from our national flag. On that date the Continental Congress resolved that the stripes be retained but that the "Union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation." America had become the land of Americans; and Americans had put themselves, by State, into their flag.

When two stripes and two stars were added for the new statehood of Vermont and Kentucky, the Star Spangled Banner was born. "Proudly it waved," inspiring Francis Scott Key to compose our national anthem.

It was carried "to the shores of Tripoli," where it became the first American flag to fly above a foreign fortress. Its "broad stripes and bright stars" flew above the Battle of Lake Erie and the Battle of New Orleans.

By 1818 Congress realized that adding a new stripe for each State would soon narrow those "broad stripes" and destroy the design of the flag, so it returned the stripes to their original 13 and decreed that "only a star be added for each new State."

Stars were indeed added, and Fourth of July speeches increased in number as well as in length. Finally, in 1885, a 19-year-old schoolteacher who was later to become dean of the Illinois School of Dentistry, held a brief patriotic flag raising in the Fredonia, Wis., schoolyard. As he conducted the solemn ceremony, hoping to teach his pupils the honor due the flag of their country, it occurred to him that all Americans should take part in similar ceremonies—that all Americans should take time out to consider the meaning of their flag. He undertook to bring this about. Thirty-one years later, in 1916, Dr. Bernard J. Cigrand's efforts were rewarded as President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed June 14, National Flag Day.

Fraternalists, through the National Fraternal Flag Day Foundation, have kept alive the memory of Dr. Cigrand and his devotion to the American flag. The foundation has purchased the little schoolhouse at Fredonia, Wis., now a national shrine. Each year on June 14, National Flag Day, a salute of honor is given the American flag and the memory of Bernard Cigrand, who is credited with being the "father" of Flag Day.

"Old Glory" held a special meaning for Dr. Cigrand, just as it holds a special meaning for all loyal and patriotic Americans. National Flag Day offers opportunity for you to display your patriotism by displaying your flag.

Dr. James W. Bass, of Dallas, Retiring After 40 Years in Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the director of public health in Dallas, Tex., Dr. James W. Bass, has been one of the leading crusaders for better medical and health services in this country. Dr. Bass is now ending 40 years of city service to the community of Dallas, during which time he has compiled an outstanding record.

Although Dr. Bass has often been regarded as a controversial figure, because he was fighting for and pushing for better public-health actions, he is recognized as one of the outstanding public-health men in the entire Nation, and is especially well known in the fields of epidemiology and vital statistics. He is known and honored as a public-health officer who has worked for progress and for better public health, even when the opposition of those not interested in improvement was stirred up.

As a tribute to Dr. Bass' many fine years of service, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Crusader for Public Health Retiring After 40 Years," from the June 6, 1965, Dallas Times-Herald, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. JAMES W. BASS: CRUSADER FOR PUBLIC HEALTH RETIRING AFTER 40 YEARS

(By Al Hester)

Stocky, gregarious Dr. James William Bass, the city's retiring director of public health, doesn't look the part of a knight in shining armor.

But without a doubt, just as did oldtime knights, Dr. Bass has spent a good deal of his time crusading—but crusading for public health. And if occasionally he has tilted at a few windmills in passing, this can be forgiven, for city hall observers say the good he has accomplished far outweighs the few unsuccessful jousts he has had.

Dr. Bass officially ends his more than 40 years of city service June 22 and is currently being honored with a round of dinners and parties for his outstanding record. But the testimonials to his effectiveness he probably treasures most are the living, breathing Dallasites who would probably not have survived without his efforts at making the community healthier through the years.

The list of accomplishments Dr. Bass can chalk up is a long one. He successfully introduced widespread immunization in Dallas against diphtheria and has seen the number of cases dwindle from 781 cases with 46 deaths in 1932 to only a handful of cases currently. He worked diligently to get city officials to pass a dog-leash law after Dallas had the unfortunate distinction of becoming the rabies capital of the entire Nation in 1957 with four deaths caused by hydrophobia.

INFANT DEATHS

During his tenure as health director the infant death rate in Dallas has plummeted from about 80 per 1,000 to about 25 per 1,000. His emphasis on maternity and well-baby

clinics is at least partially responsible for saving many lives.

The 65-year-old health director promoted a successful bill in Austin many years ago to get rabies vaccine distributed to local health departments. Until this occurred, unfortunate persons bitten by mad dogs had to journey to the State health department in Austin to take long and painful treatment.

Dr. Bass also counts as one of his biggest achievements his successful fight during Dallas' scorching drought of the 1950's to keep the city from tapping the sewage-saturated West Fork of the Trinity as a water supply.

"That stuff, even after treatment, would have been at least 50 percent sewage and totally unfit for consideration as a water supply," Dr. Bass said this week.

COLORFUL FIGURE

Dr. Bass is frequently a controversial and colorful figure and has sometimes been known to cause headaches rather than cure them among public officials. But few would deny that he has had a fierce desire always to work for the good of his city.

Dr. Bass is recognized as one of the outstanding public health men in the entire Nation and is especially well known in the fields of epidemiology and vital statistics.

Dr. Bass, a native of Van Zandt County, is one of the few remaining city officials whose service stretches back into an earlier era of Dallas when politics was more colorful, city government not so smooth, and the town wider open.

"Doc" said he can remember a time about 1925 when being a member of the Ku Klux Klan was pretty important to insure job security at city hall.

"Yep, I was a member then, although I never put on any bed sheet. It was purely politics then. Nearly everybody felt they had to belong at that time around here," he recalled.

LIBERAL PHILOSOPHY

Dr. Bass, who is recognized as having a pretty liberal philosophy, never believed Klan doctrine, and he prides himself that he has always believed in equal rights for Negroes and other minorities.

"I can say I never ran a racially segregated health department," Dr. Bass said.

Dr. Bass, at the blink of an eyelash, loves to recall yarns of the twenties and thirties. He is no stranger to times when the Catfish Club controlled city politics. He remembers when the area around Alamo School in South Dallas was called Ignorant Hill and had many health problems.

He recalls when several hundred poverty stricken families were camped out in tents at "Hoover Heights"—a small "city" of the unemployed during the depression, located where the Dallas News now stands.

Dallas had its share at one time, too, of prostitutes who did a thriving business, according to the health director, who was later responsible for setting up the city's venereal disease clinics.

With a laugh, the gravel-voiced doctor loves to recall the time a certain Dallasite decided to run for mayor and met with his cronies to plan campaign strategy in a hotel frequented by ladies of ill repute.

"This man's political opposition got wind of the caucus and had the place raided for prostitution, implicating all his friends," Dr. Bass said.

"Those friends suddenly decided they didn't want any part of that man's campaign," Dr. Bass said.

After public health, Dr. Bass' second love is politics. He participates to the extent the law allows a public official, and is a well-known Democrat around town. He is as efficient as a vacuum cleaner in picking up political tidbits and the latest gossip.

But the reader shouldn't get the idea that the robustly humored health director is only full of froth and jokes. A look at his medical background belies that. He took his medical degree at Baylor University and interned at Parkland. He became an epidemiologist in 1925 with the City of Dallas and its health director in 1931. He was a Rockefeller Foundation fellow and a graduate of the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health and Hygiene. He has been a lecturer in public health at Southwestern Medical School and associate professor at Baylor.

He has been a surgeon with the 2d Infantry Division, assistant medical inspector with the 3d Army, epidemiologist, General Headquarters, U.S. Army, chief of preventive medicine and vital statistics for the Armed Forces, southwest Pacific and has the Legion of Merit.

He is an American Public Health Association fellow and a certified specialist in preventive medicine, public health, by the American Medical Association.

Testimony of Rabbi Eugene J. Lipman on Abolishing the Death Penalty in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1965, the Subcommittee of the House District Committee, which I have the honor to chair, held hearings on my bill, H.R. 559, to abolish the death penalty in the District of Columbia.

At that time, we were privileged to hear in support of this legislation my good and longtime friend, with whom I have had the occasion to work closely over the years, Rabbi Eugene J. Lipman. He testified on behalf of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism, which is jointly sponsored by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Rabbi Lipman's testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF RABBI EUGENE J. LIPMAN, REPRESENTING THE COMMISSION ON SOCIAL ACTION OF REFORM JUDAISM, ON H.R. 559, JUNE 10, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I am Rabbi Eugene J. Lipman, of Washington. I am grateful for the opportunity to testify for the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism. The commission represents the more than 660 reform congregations in the Western Hemisphere through the Union of American Hebrew Congregations; and the almost 900 reform rabbis who are members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. To insure maximum democratic involvement, the commission includes representatives of the National Federations of Temple Sisterhoods, Brotherhoods, and Youth as well as our temple administrators and educators.

Both the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis have taken formal positions against capital punishment anywhere for any crime. Since both statements are brief, I should like to quote them:

"We believe that in the light of modern, scientific knowledge and concepts of humanity, the resort to or continuation of capital punishment, either by a State or by the National Government, is no longer morally justifiable. We believe there is no crime for which the taking of human life by society is justified, and that it is the obligation of society to evolve other methods of dealing with crime" (UAHC, 15th biennial, November 1959).

"Last year we declared ourselves in favor of the abolition of the death penalty for any and all crimes. We reaffirm that declaration now. The statistics clearly indicate that capital punishment is not an effective deterrent to crime. Moreover, we believe our religious tradition justifies us in taking a stand against this form of official retribution" (Report of Commission for Justice and Peace, CCAR, 1959).

The positions of our national agencies are firmly grounded in Jewish law, theology, and experience.

There is no doubt about the fact that the Bible permitted capital punishment for a variety of offenses. It even specified the four acceptable means of execution. But it must be kept in mind that the Bible is not the totality of Torah, of God's instruction to mankind; it is the first sacred document in a long and evolving process of revelation which continues over all the centuries, as we attempt to determine and to act in terms of God's will.

For reasons I shall enumerate in a moment, it became clear early in this evolutionary process that Biblical law regarding capital punishment was not consistent with the ideals of the Jewish community. Since Biblical law could not be openly abrogated, legal technicalities had to be introduced to abrogate it. This was done. In his testimony before the relevant committee of the Massachusetts Legislature, my colleague Rabbi Israel J. Kazis, of Boston, enumerated sequentially the 13 means adopted by rabbinic scholars to make capital punishment a legal impossibility within the Jewish community. For centuries, local Jewish communities, each of them an imperium in imperio, autonomous legal authorities, carried on full judicial, legislative, and executive functions, with no single case of capital punishment being recorded. There were crimes and there were criminals and there were courts and there were jails—but legal murder was never committed.

This accomplishment resulted, I believe, from three religious concepts of Judaism which are as valid today as they have been over the centuries, and which compel our commission to work ceaselessly for the abolition of capital punishment in our country.

The first concept revolves around the word sanctity, the sanctity of life and the sanctity of every human life. Every man is a child of God, not just law abiding, respectable people. Every man's life has sanctity. The logical conclusion would appear to be that society cannot arrogate to itself the right to overrule Divine sanctity, by taking human life.

The second concept follows from the first. In a real sense, my life is not my own to control absolutely. I do not determine its beginning and I do not determine its end. My life is God's to command; it is bestowed by Him and it can be ended only by Him. We in Judaism do not believe that God has delegated this responsibility to human governments.

The third concept adds a different dimension to our consideration. Judaism has taught for centuries that no man can be beyond redemption. No matter how sinful his life, no matter how heinous his crimes, we believe that a man can be deemed, can become a pentinent, can be restored to the way of life demanded by God. If God is always prepared to welcome the pentinent and to forgive sin—how much the more so must men be so prepared and willing. To inflict capital punishment is to state that an individual is beyond redemption. We cannot ac-

cept this doctrine as a basis for any human relationships.

In summary, then, Judaism affirms the sanctity of every life, the sole right of God to bestow life and to take it back again, and the availability of redemption to every man at all times. Consequently, we have no choice but to oppose capital punishment.

We should have to oppose capital punishment, Mr. Chairman, even if it were to be demonstrated that the maintenance of such ultimate power in human hands did in fact deter substantial numbers of people from committing serious crimes. However, in view of the fact that this deterrent power has never been proven at all, that there has been demonstrated no correlation whatsoever between the use of capital punishment and the control of major crime—how much the more so must we deny to human agency this ultimate power.

Our commission would mention two other aspects of this problem briefly, for they concern us deeply.

It has become increasingly apparent over recent decades that capital punishment has been very selectively inflicted in America—on the criminal without financial resources and most especially on the Negro criminal without financial resources. This very committee of the Congress reported, back in the 69th Congress:

"Almost any criminal with wealth or influence can escape it, but the poor and friendless convict, without means or power to fight his case from court to court or to exert pressure upon the pardoning executive, is the one singled out as a sacrifice to what is little more than tradition."

This is an additional reason for abolishing the death penalty in the District of Columbia.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we as religiously-committed people who see nobility of spirit as the potential of man created in the image of God, we are deeply unhappy when men regress to the level of lower animals and act out the primitive vengeance motive in our society. We believe this is the true reason for the existence of the death penalty—vengeance. We take our stand with the generations of our people who have declared vengeance to be unworthy of man, immoral, wrong.

I wish with all my heart, Mr. Chairman, that the District of Columbia could have been the pioneer in the abolition of this barbaric, obsolete technique of punishment. At the very least, however, we should catch up with the 13 States which have already acted to bring their jurisdictions to a higher level of human relationships by doing away with the death penalty. I trust that we of the District of Columbia may attain this higher level at this session of the Congress.

The Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in May, together with several other Members of the Senate and several Members of the other body, I attended a meeting of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. It was a most interesting meeting.

Paul Belfont has written an interesting account of that meeting. His article was published on June 14 in the Baltimore Sun; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, June 14, 1965]

FULBRIGHT & CO. AT STRASBOURG

(By Paul Belfont)

STRASBOURG.—The Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe has concluded its 17th regular spring session. The 1965 meeting was highlighted by the active participation of a strong and outspoken American delegation, led by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT.

This was not the first visit of American Congressmen to Strasbourg, but coming just a few days after the Europe-wide anti-American television speech of General de Gaulle in which he urged keeping "Europe for the Europeans and America out of it," it certainly was the most significant visit.

Eighteen European nations are members of the Council of Europe, including the Six of the European Economic Community or Common Market and the Seven of EFTA, the European Free Trade Association. Strasbourg is the only forum where the Six and the Seven can meet and discuss their problems within the framework of a greater Europe.

The mayor of Strasbourg, former French Prime Minister Pierre Pflimlin, was elected for the third consecutive time as chairman of the Consultative Assembly. He is one of the most determined opponents of General de Gaulle's European policy. Strasbourg is the only place in France where this policy can openly be criticized.

The chairman of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe is the Swiss Foreign Minister and former President of the Swiss Confederation, Friedrich T. Whalen. Strasbourg is the only forum where the views of neutral Switzerland can be propounded to a common meeting of representatives from all the countries of Europe and of the United States.

Strasbourg, finally, is the only place in France where American spokesmen will find a highly selected and representative audience sympathetic to their points of view and responsive to their ideas.

All this means that the importance of the Council of Europe is ever growing and that this European institution, although denied all executive power, is a uniquely useful forum.

Senator FULBRIGHT and his colleagues understood this and made full use of their opportunity to speak with utter frankness. Thus the debates of the Consultative Assembly, usually confined to the Europeans, turned into a full exchange of views between the United States and Europe on all subjects relevant to true western solidarity and cooperation.

This is all the more significant as each of the three partners in this broad discussion—the EEC of the Six, EFTA of the Seven, and the United States—was and still is under severe stress, though for different reasons.

The EEC is under stress because Chancellor Erhard shows an ever greater reluctance to follow his predecessor's role as stalking horse for General de Gaulle. This in turn encourages the other members of the community, the Netherlands, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, to greater independence.

The United States is under stress because of de Gaulle's increasing hostility toward President Johnson's action in Vietnam and in Santo Domingo.

The EFTA is under stress because of the 15-percent surcharge imposed on imports by the new labor government of the United Kingdom shortly after its accession to power, without consulting or even informing fellow members in the association. The recent reduction to 10 percent does not wholly ease the original sting.

But the history of this EFTA crisis does demonstrate one of the basic realities of contemporary Europe and at a time when seasoned American observers were on the scene for ringside seats, as it were.

Under pressure of its partners, Britain, leader and indeed inventor of EFTA, backed away at least in part from a decision taken only 3 months earlier. It is all but unthinkable that General de Gaulle's France, leader of the Common Market, would under similar pressure from her partners in EEC have taken the same humiliating step. De Gaulle would have remained calmly adamant, even at the risk of wrecking the European Economic Community.

The truth, of course, is that France's partners in the Common Market have accepted, if somewhat grumblingly here and there, the unquestioned leadership of De Gaulle. What Paris says may be formally discussed: it still remains basically a mandate and De Gaulle never hesitates to use the big stick. This is so because the other partners need France to counterbalance Germany's growing power. Someday they may turn toward Germany to counteract France's growing hegemony, but not now.

Ont he other hand, the EFTA Seven accept Britain's leadership only to a degree. If they are dissatisfied, their pressure is strong enough to swing the United Kingdom their way. The Six need France more than France needs them but Great Britain needs the Seven more than they need her. For Britain the EFTA partners certify her European power challenging France's leadership. Not that the British membership is unimportant to EFTA; it makes EFTA a major grouping in European integration problems and more so in worldwide trade aspects; the Kennedy round at the GATT for example.

This is the background Senator FULBRIGHT was briefed upon when he came to Strasbourg and it turned out that it was for the other Europeans and for America a blessing in disguise.

Being totally uncommitted in the recent EFTA crisis the Americans could count on good will and open minds from all these countries and many more. When Britain speaks, it speaks always with a view toward its partners in the Commonwealth and these are fully sympathetic with President Johnson's policy in southeast Asia. Furthermore, De Gaulle's recent anti-American television speech antagonized all European countries—most of all Germany—whose friendship with America is the paramount line of their policy.

Thus, the very open, candid, forceful explanations of U.S. policy given by the American Members of Congress before the representatives of 18 European governments and parliaments at Strasbourg fell on friendly ears and may well mean a historical turning point for the Council of Europe, and even for the future of European integration.

In recent years the tendency among most delegates to the Consultative Assembly was to see in the Council of Europe a mere lobby leading to the Common Market at Brussels. Those who favored rigid supranational institutions and a rigorous centralization—their leader was the Belgian Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Paul-Henri Spaak—thus played the game of the Executive Commission of the EEC which tried to rule not only the Six, but Europe as a whole.

But the response to Senator FULBRIGHT's statement that De Gaulle's proposal to negotiate the reunification of Germany with the Soviet Union, but without the United States and Britain, was most unrealistic, was at Strasbourg overwhelmingly favorable.

As for the U.S. action in Vietnam, Santo Domingo, and elsewhere, there will undoubtedly be criticism by many European poli-

ticians and many European papers. But American public opinion should know that the true fact, with few exceptions, is that Europe sighs with relief when a President of the United States takes action without looking over his shoulder. As a French Socialist Minister once told Winston Churchill, when he ordered British forces to disembark at Athens in order to crush a Communist coup: "Go ahead, I am with you; and don't pay an attention if I orate against you: I have to, to get reelected."

The American interventions during these recent discussions of the Council of Europe have erased the rather clumsy approach of George Ball in 1960 which pushed Prime Minister Macmillan into hasty negotiations with the Common Market and ended in disaster with De Gaulle's veto. Now comes the time of the true way to European integration: a Europe united in its diversities, a federation of sovereign states, in uninhibited partnership with the United States of America.

Southwestern Pennsylvania on the Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Regional Industrial Development Corp., of southwestern Pennsylvania, is concerned with the economic growth of nine counties in the Pittsburgh area. I should like to call the attention of the House, under leave to extend my remarks, to another chapter in its story of "Southwestern Pennsylvania on the Move":

SOUTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA ON THE MOVE

INDUSTRIAL PARK

In order to further the economic development of the Pittsburgh area, the Regional Industrial Development Corp. secured with the cooperation of the Board of Commissioners of Allegheny County a large tract of land in O'Hara Township located a short distance northeast of the city of Pittsburgh. This land is now under development as the RIDC Allegheny County Industrial Park.

The park is extremely well located in respect to rapidly developing expressway patterns. There will soon be an interchange of the Allegheny Valley Expressway on the property to provide quick access to downtown Pittsburgh 8 miles to the southwest, and the Allegheny Valley interchange of the Pennsylvania Turnpike approximately 4 miles away. The Allegheny Valley Expressway will follow the Allegheny River in a northeastern direction and link the Pittsburgh region with the Keystone Shortway—an entirely new part of the Interstate System crossing Pennsylvania in an east-west direction.

The RIDC-Allegheny County Industrial Park is a well-planned open space industrial park designed to provide valuable benefits for new and expanding manufacturing and service industries. With excellent residential areas close by it will also attract the interest of companies seeking research facility locations. It will offer an attractive and economic environment with compatible neighbors, long-term values, and an all-inclusive service which avoids site development, zoning, utility, access and other related problems.

As part of the development plan RIDC is prepared to provide a time and money saving site and building "package" consisting of a custom tailored design, quality construction and a wide choice of attractive and liberal financing plans.

From the standpoint of the metropolitan area this planned industrial park is an important part of the essential framework for harnessing of physical facilities so vital for economic growth and stability. It is the community's way of demonstrating, in a most tangible form, its strong interest and assistance in aiding the growth of both new and expanding companies.

RIDC welcomes the opportunity to provide specific information on this park or others located in southwestern Pennsylvania.

VITAL LOCATION FACTORS

Markets: From the standpoint of close relation to industrial markets and major population centers, the southwestern Pennsylvania region enjoys tremendous advantages. Within a 500-mile radius are 15 of the top 20 industrial markets of the country, representing almost 75 percent of the total industrial buying power. Within this same sphere on influence lives more than half the population of the United States, with high income levels and purchasing power. For the industrial manufacturer, or the producer of consumer goods, this is indeed a strategic location.

Labor: With its long history as one of the industrial centers of the country southwestern Pennsylvania has an abundant labor supply, readily adaptable and trainable to the requirements of new industries. Increasing emphasis on vocational and technical schools, plus the joint efforts of industry, State government and the Federal Government in the development of retraining programs, assures a steadily increasing number of skilled workers to meet the needs of new and expanding industry.

Transportation: Few areas in the entire country enjoy the combination of transportation facilities which serve the southwestern Pennsylvania region. It is a hub of major east-west rail lines. The "port" of Pittsburgh at the head of the Ohio River connects with the vast inland waterways system all the way to New Orleans. A complex of modern highways and turnpikes provides swift movement of goods and people. The Greater Pittsburgh Airport is one of the country's busiest air terminals. In variety, accessibility and capacity—this is transportation to meet every need.

Utilities: For every conceivable industrial or commercial need, there is an abundant supply of electric power, natural gas, oil and coal readily available throughout this area. Development of EHV (extra high voltage) transmission lines carrying power at 500,000 volts and new techniques of underground storage of gas means unlimited reserves in these major energy sources. The extensive flood control program has not only provided a safety factor, but has served to stabilize the tremendous volume of water essential to expanding industry and to increased private use.

Education: From the broad base of excellent public and private schools and junior colleges, the opportunities for the highest levels of learning have expanded steadily in southwestern Pennsylvania. The University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Duquesne University, and other fine institutions in the region offer a wide variety of undergraduate courses. Professional and graduate schools, with access to both public and private research facilities, place this area in the forefront of educational centers.

Death of Representative Ann T. O'Donnell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, some individuals accomplish a great deal in a very short time.

One such was Representative Ann T. O'Donnell who, until a few days ago represented our 37th legislative district in the Washington State Legislature. Until cancer cut short her productive career.

This was my old district, the one I represented in the legislature in the session of 1933, both regular and special.

Mourn and miss Ann O'Donnell we shall, because she did so much to help so many.

Learning of her loss, nearly all with whom she had worked in the Washington Legislature, including Governor Evans, remembered a personal kindness, a singular legislative accomplishment, or both, which Ann had done.

But none described her career and our loss better than did Ed Donohoe in his "Tilting the Windmill" column in the Washington Teamster of May 28.

I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Teamster, May 28, 1965]

TILTING THE WINDMILL—TO REPRESENTATIVE ANN T. O'DONNELL: GOOD NIGHT, SWEET PRINCESS

(By Ed Donohoe)

If ever there was one person the labor movement could ill afford to lose from the present political scene, that person must be Representative Ann Teresa O'Donnell, Democrat from the 37th legislative district who fell to the ravages of cancer last Tuesday.

Not only have the workingmen and women of the State lost a champion for even their minutest causes, but on the larger canvas of life we have lost a real, honest-to-goodness worker for justice through the legislative process. It will take many a season to fill the gap that Ann O'Donnell leaves; and it is our frank opinion that there will never again be as dedicated and conscientious a lawmaker like her from either sex.

Miss O'Donnell was of proud but humble birth. Early in life she learned that there is no easy way to get ahead. She received a fine education all of her own and her parents' doing. She took to politics like a duck to water simply because it was the only way open for her to impress her ideas on the society around her.

That she was labor's friend was a fargone conclusion. Not only did she hail from a district of working folks, but all her sympathies laid with the problems of the underprivileged and what could be done to improve their lot. She was a happy person, a good listener, and a good fighter for the rights of her sex. She could take a rib on this, but it never deterred her for an instant.

The grueling 39th session of the State legislature was too much for Representative Ann T. O'Donnell. She inherited the Labor and Industrial Insurance Committee because it was a sure-fire hot potato that more experienced legislators from the majority party ducked. Her work here was outstanding—a legacy to the legislative process. She helped to save trial by jury for the injured workman.

Yet she found time to raise funds in Seattle and Olympia for Representative Alan Thompson, the Castle Rock publisher, who was nearly paralyzed as a result of an automobile accident midway in the session, and whose family was saddled with astronomic hospital and doctor bills.

It may seem like a small incident, yet it really tells what kind of person Ann O'Donnell was * * * her cup overflowed with Christian charity for her fellow man; her loyalty to the party as an instrument for doing good was never to be questioned; and Miss O'Donnell showed that she could be a leader simply by asking the question of who wanted to be led and for what cause.

Her name is on many pieces of meaningful, social reform legislation as a four-session lawmaker. But the force of her character as an honest political leader was of far greater impact. She was no ordinary woman, no shrinking violet, no doll to be seen but never heard.

Her passing to her many friends in the Teamsters Union is remindful of the tragedy that befell a Shakesperean hero who was also young, a leader, and a victim of bad luck. We take license with the immortal bard to tell of our own sorrow for Representative Ann T. O'Donnell in these words:

"Now cracks a noble heart.
Good night, sweet (princess),
And flights of angels sing
thee to thy rest!"

Wisconsin Democrats' and Republicans' Views on Vietnam: Use the United Nations; or "More Significant Targets" in North Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin's Democrats and Republicans continue the debate on our policy in southeastern Asia.

This week the Wisconsin State Democratic convention, assembled at Green Bay, adopted the following resolution on foreign affairs, stressing the need for a United Nations presence in southeast Asia:

International trouble spots such as Vietnam represent complex problems that are not only military, but social, political, and economic as well. American policy must reflect an adequate balance between the basic tenents of international diplomacy: The constant readiness to negotiate; the wise and prudent use of power; and the willingness to employ economic strength to help construct stable societies.

It is our fervent hope that peace in southeast Asia can be secured by completely unconditional negotiations about Vietnam with all actual parties to the conflict and we endorse efforts of the Johnson administration directed to this end. We urge that the United Nations be enlisted in this cause, and we ask that the United Nations be called upon to provide a presence in southeast Asia, in order to pacify the area, conduct free elections, and sponsor its economic development.

To further consolidate the peoples of the free world, we urge the further lowering of tariff barriers, and the continuance of foreign aid where it contributes to economic and political advancement of developing peoples. We applaud the Peace Corps success as a people-to-people program of international understanding.

If we and the world are to find a peaceful and secure future, we must seek it in partnership with other nations. We must strengthen our regional alliances and adopt them to changing needs.

We continue our vigorous support of the United Nations as mankind's greatest hope for peace.

There follows excerpts from my remarks on foreign affairs delivered to the Wisconsin State Democratic convention on July 12:

Abroad, we face a troubled world. We have moved to meet the challenge. Through food for peace, we are marshaling our most efficient industry—farming—to move toward a world in which no child will go to sleep at night crying with hunger. With our Peace Corps, thousands of young Americans are fighting hopelessness and poverty in the greatest adventure of the age. Our defenses are stronger than ever, but with the test ban treaty we have shown our determination to reduce the chance of an atomic war which would make our earth as lifeless as the moon.

But violence and turmoil still erupt in far-off places, bringing strange names into the headlines of our hometown papers.

This is a world that we Americans of the 1960's did not create. We are the inheritors of the legacy of the past.

In the two current hotspots, we struggle not only against Communists but against deep-rooted causes of conflict and ingrained suspicions of our motives and purposes.

In Vietnam, the fighting has been going on intermittently for a quarter century. The French attempted to hold on to their colonial empire in French Indochina after World War II. After they lost and Vietnam became half Communist, a succession of Saigon governments has failed to achieve real social reform or to create anything like a government of, by, and for the people. Thus we, the United States, find ourselves a Western nation largely going it alone in Asia.

In the Dominican Republic, the memory is strong of our occupation of the country with Marines from 1916 to 1924. The bloody Trujillo dictatorship worked its will for years with little opposition from the United States. When the constitutional and democratic government of President Bosch was overthrown by a military coup in September 1963, we at first took no action and then recognized the dictators.

Now we have again sent our troops into the Caribbean.

The results of our actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic illustrate the limitations on our power as a single nation to create a world in which all men may prosper in peace and freedom.

Recognition of these limitations—that even the world's most powerful nation cannot do everything everywhere—is not isolationism, as the Goldwaterites would have you believe.

We Democrats in the Midwest fought the old isolationism of the 1930's. We came out strong against the notion that America should do nothing, though the civilized world might be collapsing around us.

Now in the 1960's let us never adopt the idea that America should do everything, all by itself, in a new isolationism.

The internationalism of the 1960's must be based not on isolated, individual actions in international politics, but on concerted actions of coalitions of free nations.

We must rehabilitate the United Nations by settling the assessments question, and put it back on its feet. We must strengthen the Organization of American States. We must use them for peacekeeping, for conducting free elections, for sponsoring economic aid, wherever we can—and that includes Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. We must invoke them not as a last resort, but from the first and as a matter of usual policy.

It is the Goldwaterite viewpoint that contends that the American people and their representatives have no right to debate the great issues of foreign policy, that debate weakens our country's position.

Thomas Jefferson defined us Democrats as "those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish, and consider them as most honest and safe."

Well, we are the Democrats. And since we have confidence in the people, public debate can only strengthen our policy in its common sense and breadth of support.

I'm proud, therefore, that Democrats in both the House and Senate have been asking the important questions about our foreign policies and exploring, constructively, the alternatives that may be available.

Building world peace in freedom resembles building the Great Society at home. It takes the contributions and efforts of many men and nations working together, each with the same goal, each contributing his special talents and his wisdom on how the goal may be achieved. That is the America we love, the America that in Abraham Lincoln's thrilling phrase, can be "not the terror of the world, but the encourager of the world."

Yesterday, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], who is chairman of the Republican conference in the House of Representatives, issued a formal statement on Vietnam policy in which he said:

We may be dangerously close to ending any Republican support of our present Vietnam policy.

James Reston, in the New York Times of June 16, 1965, described the statement as follows:

In a formal statement, he has criticized the administration for seeking a negotiated settlement, for failing to aim at total victory in Vietnam, and for using large numbers of American troops for limited ends rather than using the bombers against military targets around Haiphong.

"If our objective is a negotiated settlement," Representative LAIRD says, "it is time to use other means than the needless sacrifice of American lives to attain that objective. Once American troops are committed in any situation, a top priority objective must be to take those steps necessary to protect American lives and minimize the number of casualties.

"One such step, already long overdue, is to retarget our bombing raids on more significant targets in North Vietnam."

Representative LAIRD does not explain how we are going to achieve his dual objectives of limiting American casualties and "driving the Communists out of South Vietnam," but since there is a lot of support for this policy at the Pentagon, and he is addressing a clever political argument to a very political President, his case is worth analysis.

It is based on the assumption that the only trouble with our bombing campaign is that there has not been enough of it, that it will "protect American lives" if only we bomb the populous supply areas in the north within the range of the North Vietnamese fighting aircraft.

President Johnson is staying away from these precisely because he believes raiding Haiphong and Hanoi will kill a lot of civilians, produce a major invasion of the south by North Vietnamese forces and thus tip the power balance against the Americans as well as the South Vietnamese.

The issue is worth debating.

Dangerous Information Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in a very timely address before the National Federation of Young Republicans, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] charged that "deep and dangerous information gaps exist between the White House and the American people." He said that this crisis stems from "a stifling propaganda campaign now in progress, directed by a staff of hundreds of Madison Avenue types operating out of executive agencies in Washington."

The gentlemen from Maryland cited reports that Castro-inspired revolution could break out any day in Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala and asked:

How many of you have heard one word about Cuban agents said to be operating in Puerto Rico? Is is true that respected and well known reporters have written of the destruction of millions of dollars of American-owned property in Puerto Rico, only to have these reports suppressed before publication?

Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of this body will be interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland and under unanimous consent, I include excerpts of those remarks in the RECORD at this point.

Congressman MORTON's remarks follows:

EXCERPTS FROM CONGRESSMAN MORTON'S SPEECH

A TV news broadcast yesterday morning made up my mind to deal tonight with foreign policy, a subject that is much talked around and much misunderstood.

I watched a transatlantic interview conducted over Comsat's satellite in which Vice President HUMPHREY was answering questions posed by a group of European students. Responding to one question about U.S. difficulties in world affairs, the Vice President had this comment, "Well, we're still a very young nation with little experience in foreign relations."

Of course, the delegates and alternates to this convention understand the impulses of youth and recognize the dangers of inexperience. But it strikes us as ridiculous when the Vice President of the most powerful nation on earth takes the out of "America is so young" when faced with a probing question about our country's foreign policy.

Political and government leaders have used this tactic ever since our Nation was founded, particularly when the policy in question was under heavy fire. On other occasions the reason has been lack of information.

In the cast of the Vice President's recent interview, I am inclined to believe it was lack of information. Everybody knows that Lyndon keeps all his facts under his 10-gallon hat.

In these days of crucial decisionmaking in U.S. foreign policy, in these days of ever increasing commitments of men and women in the struggle for freedom in Vietnam, in the Dominican Republic, in these days of a critical breakdown in our free world alliances, the American people and the Congress have the right, and the need, to know all the facts.

Americans do not want to be coddled. Victory was never achieved by men on a diet of sugar-coated pills. There is nothing in our history to suggest that we are afraid to face the truth. The responsibility of leadership is to inform the people, not to shelter them.

But how many Americans know what is really at stake in South Vietnam? Are we being told what our short- and long-range objectives in that far-off battlefield really are? How can we be resolute, and firm, and united in the face of conflicting reports, predictions and explanations which have followed each on-site inspection tour?

What are Americans to think of our policymaking apparatus when a State Department public relations man announces we are now committing U.S. infantry to combat duty in Vietnam, and within hours, the White House, almost apolegetically, says this has been our policy for months?

We have had enough of propaganda, of conflicting statements, of leaked press reports, of last minute presidential television commercials. A blank check commitment is not a policy.

We want to know, Where are our allies? Where is the U.N.? Why don't we use South Vietnamese guerrillas and paratroops in North Vietnam? Are our bombing raids in the north intended to produce maximum results, or are they intended to silence criticism of what has been called a no-win policy?

The American people have every right to be asking these questions, and every right to expect that our strategy for success, if there is one, will be revealed to them.

In the continuing war against freedom carried out by Castro from his island fortress of communism, so near to us this evening, the interests of the United States and our Latin American friends are coming under more dangerous and insidious attack. No one doubts the degree of involvement of Castro agents in the present subversion of law and order in the Dominican Republic. As disastrous as that situation may yet become, are we being fully apprised of other targets for Communist takeover?

Reports persist that Castro-inspired revolutions could break out any day in Venezuela, in Colombia, in Guatemala. But how many of you have heard one word about Cuban agents operating in Puerto Rico, an area almost as much a part of the United States as Florida?

Is it true that several respected and well-known reporters have written of recent destruction of millions of dollars in American-owned property in Puerto Rico, only to have these reports suppressed before their publication?

To what extent might Puerto Rico, virtually a U.S. port of entry, serve as a funnel for traffic in Chinese Communist dope production sent by way of Cuba? These questions are valid and vital, and the American people have the right to know if such dangers actually exist.

Congress, too, has the right and the need to know the full implications of America's commitments abroad and the full extent of Communist subversion close to home. But Congress, under the Great Society has become more of a rubber stamp for White House edicts than the checks-and-balances force it once was.

The greatest difficulty that Congress faces today in providing any kind of meaningful discussion and leadership in foreign policy is, very frankly, the lack of facts, the dearth of full and complete information about the activities of our own Government.

Even though the Congress must vote the money to carry on our foreign policy, Congress does not have the full story and, I must admit, we have not shown much disposition to get the full story either.

Take, for example, the case of Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Indonesia, and, indeed, the whole southeast Asia problem. In Vietnam alone, we have lost more than 400 in American dead, and are spending taxpayers' money at the rate of several million dollars a day. Yet, incredible as it may seem, the Congress has not investigated this problem in depth.

How many of you well-informed young Americans are aware that less than 1 year ago our Government was actually training Indonesian paratroops and guerrilla officers, right here in the United States; yes, training the same troops who are today actively attempting to subvert the free Government of Malaysia? The full story of our long misused aid program to Indonesia is still stamped "secret."

Congress can play an important role, when it conscientiously undertakes to do so, in creating responsible and factual public discussion of foreign policy issues, and in developing the strong national consensus that can be so effective on major issues. But it cannot play this role if it abandons the quest for facts, and holds even its one-sided hearings in secret session.

This process cuts off a vital channel of national guidance and encourages the development of the kind of uninformed extremism and distrust that all thinking Americans must deplore.

Deep and dangerous information gaps exist today between the White House and the American people and their Congress. Reports abound from abroad that our Voice of America doesn't tell the whole story about U.S. involvement overseas or about some of our nagging problems here at home.

I maintain that a far more stifling propaganda campaign is now in progress, directed by a staff of hundreds of Madison Avenue types operating out of executive agencies in Washington. And, in the long run, the damage their unopposed and often unquestioned campaigns can do to our national objectives will be far greater than any problems we might have had in our informtaion services in past years.

Congress cannot function as the eyes and ears of the people if the facts are concealed, or admitted only under pressure and after the policies, for better or worse, are determined. Where the country is uninformed, uncertain, and undecided, weapons alone will not turn the tide.

Americans want to know the truth, bitter though it may sometimes be. I know of no example in our Nation's past which would indicate that Americans are unwilling to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to protect our welfare or security.

But this spirit can only be nourished by support of the public's right to know and by rejection of any theory that our fate must be surrendered to some all-wise bureaucrats in Washington who will decide everything for us.

You Young Republicans can be of tremendous help in seeing that the right and the need to know are given the American people. Help us to return a Republican Congress in 1966.

We are terribly undermanned and understaffed in Washington these days. And we need, and I believe the national interest of the United States needs, more Republicans in Washington.

I mean all Republicans, neanderthal, conservative, moderate, liberal, and fusion. To fail to support any Republican, in any city

The grueling 39th session of the State legislature was too much for Representative Ann T. O'Donnell. She inherited the Labor and Industrial Insurance Committee because it was a sure-fire hot potato that more experienced legislators from the majority party ducked. Her work here was outstanding—a legacy to the legislative process. She helped to save trial by jury for the injured workman.

Yet she found time to raise funds in Seattle and Olympia for Representative Alan Thompson, the Castle Rock publisher, who was nearly paralyzed as a result of an automobile accident midway in the session, and whose family was saddled with astronomic hospital and doctor bills.

It may seem like a small incident, yet it really tells what kind of person Ann O'Donnell was * * * her cup overflowed with Christian charity for her fellow man; her loyalty to the party as an instrument for doing good was never to be questioned; and Miss O'Donnell showed that she could be a leader simply by asking the question of who wanted to be led and for what cause.

Her name is on many pieces of meaningful, social reform legislation as a four-session lawmaker. But the force of her character as an honest political leader was of far greater impact. She was no ordinary woman, no shrinking violet, no doll to be seen but never heard.

Her passing to her many friends in the Teamsters Union is remindful of the tragedy that befell a Shakesperean hero who was also young, a leader, and a victim of bad luck. We take license with the immortal bard to tell of our own sorrow for Representative Ann T. O'Donnell in these words:

"Now cracks a noble heart.
Good night, sweet (princess),
And flights of angels sing
thee to thy rest!"

Wisconsin Democrats' and Republicans' Views on Vietnam: Use the United Nations; or "More Significant Targets" in North Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin's Democrats and Republicans continue the debate on our policy in southeastern Asia.

This week the Wisconsin State Democratic convention, assembled at Green Bay, adopted the following resolution on foreign affairs, stressing the need for a United Nations presence in southeast Asia:

International trouble spots such as Vietnam represent complex problems that are not only military, but social, political, and economic as well. American policy must reflect an adequate balance between the basic tenents of international diplomacy: The constant readiness to negotiate; the wise and prudent use of power; and the willingness to employ economic strength to help construct stable societies.

It is our fervent hope that peace in southeast Asia can be secured by completely unconditional negotiations about Vietnam with all actual parties to the conflict and we endorse efforts of the Johnson administration directed to this end. We urge that the United Nations be enlisted in this cause, and we ask that the United Nations be called upon to provide a presence in southeast Asia, in order to pacify the area, conduct free elections, and sponsor its economic development.

To further consolidate the peoples of the free world, we urge the further lowering of tariff barriers, and the continuance of foreign aid where it contributes to economic and political advancement of developing peoples. We applaud the Peace Corps success as a people-to-people program of international understanding.

If we and the world are to find a peaceful and secure future, we must seek it in partnership with other nations. We must strengthen our regional alliances and adopt them to changing needs.

We continue our vigorous support of the United Nations as mankind's greatest hope for peace.

There follows excerpts from my remarks on foreign affairs delivered to the Wisconsin State Democratic convention on July 12:

Abroad, we face a troubled world. We have moved to meet the challenge. Through food for peace, we are marshaling our most efficient industry—farming—to move toward a world in which no child will go to sleep at night crying with hunger. With our Peace Corps, thousands of young Americans are fighting hopelessness and poverty in the greatest adventure of the age. Our defenses are stronger than ever, but with the test ban treaty we have shown our determination to reduce the chance of an atomic war which would make our earth as lifeless as the moon.

But violence and turmoil still erupt in far-off places, bringing strange names into the headlines of our hometown papers.

This is a world that we Americans of the 1960's did not create. We are the inheritors of the legacy of the past.

In the two current hotspots, we struggle not only against Communists but against deep-rooted causes of conflict and ingrained suspicions of our motives and purposes.

In Vietnam, the fighting has been going on intermittently for a quarter century. The French attempted to hold on to their colonial empire in French Indochina after World War II. After they lost and Vietnam became half Communist, a succession of Saigon governments has failed to achieve real social reform or to create anything like a government of, by, and for the people. Thus we, the United States, find ourselves a Western nation largely going it alone in Asia.

In the Dominican Republic, the memory is strong of our occupation of the country with Marines from 1916 to 1924. The bloody Trujillo dictatorship worked its will for years with little opposition from the United States. When the constitutional and democratic government of President Bosch was overthrown by a military coup in September 1963, we at first took no action and then recognized the dictators.

Now we have again sent our troops into the Caribbean.

The results of our actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic illustrate the limitations on our power as a single nation to create a world in which all men may prosper in peace and freedom.

Recognition of these limitations—that even the world's most powerful nation cannot do everything everywhere—is not isolationism, as the Goldwaterites would have you believe.

We Democrats in the Midwest fought the old isolationism of the 1930's. We came out strong against the notion that America should do nothing, though the civilized world might be collapsing around us.

Now in the 1960's let us never adopt the idea that America should do everything, all by itself, in a new isolationism.

The internationalism of the 1960's must be based not on isolated, individual actions in international politics, but on concerted actions of coalitions of free nations.

We must rehabilitate the United Nations by settling the assessments question, and put it back on its feet. We must strengthen the Organization of American States. We must use them for peacekeeping, for conducting free elections, for sponsoring economic aid, wherever we can—and that includes Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. We must invoke them not as a last resort, but from the first and as a matter of usual policy.

It is the Goldwaterite viewpoint that contends that the American people and their representatives have no right to debate the great issues of foreign policy, that debate weakens our country's position.

Thomas Jefferson defined us Democrats as "those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish, and consider them as most honest and safe."

Well, we are the Democrats. And since we have confidence in the people, public debate can only strengthen our policy in its common sense and breadth of support.

I'm proud, therefore, that Democrats in both the House and Senate have been asking the important questions about our foreign policies and exploring, constructively, the alternatives that may be available.

Building world peace in freedom resembles building the Great Society at home. It takes the contributions and efforts of many men and nations working together, each with the same goal, each contributing his special talents and his wisdom on how the goal may be achieved. That is the America we love, the America that in Abraham Lincoln's thrilling phrase, can be "not the terror of the world, but the encourager of the world."

Yesterday, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], who is chairman of the Republican conference in the House of Representatives, issued a formal statement on Vietnam policy in which he said:

We may be dangerously close to ending any Republican support of our present Vietnam policy.

James Reston, in the New York Times of June 16, 1965, described the statement as follows:

In a formal statement, he has criticized the administration for seeking a negotiated settlement, for failing to aim at total victory in Vietnam, and for using large numbers of American troops for limited ends rather than using the bombers against military targets around Haiphong.

"If our objective is a negotiated settlement," Representative LAIRD says, "it is time to use other means than the needless sacrifice of American lives to attain that objective. Once American troops are committed in any situation, a top priority objective must be to take those steps necessary to protect American lives and minimize the number of casualties.

"One such step, already long overdue, is to retarget our bombing raids on more significant targets in North Vietnam."

Representative LAIRD does not explain how we are going to achieve his dual objectives of limiting American casualties and "driving the Communists out of South Vietnam," but since there is a lot of support for this policy at the Pentagon, and he is addressing a clever political argument to a very political President, his case is worth analysis.

It is based on the assumption that the only trouble with our bombing campaign is that there has not been enough of it, that it will "protect American lives" if only we bomb the populous supply areas in the north within the range of the North Vietnamese fighting aircraft.

President Johnson is staying away from these precisely because he believes raiding Haiphong and Hanoi will kill a lot of civilians, produce a major invasion of the south by North Vietnamese forces and thus tip the power balance against the Americans as well as the South Vietnamese.

The issue is worth debating.

Dangerous Information Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in a very timely address before the National Federation of Young Republicans, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] charged that "deep and dangerous information gaps exist between the White House and the American people." He said that this crisis stems from "a stifling propaganda campaign now in progress, directed by a staff of hundreds of Madison Avenue types operating out of executive agencies in Washington."

The gentlemen from Maryland cited reports that Castro-inspired revolution could break out any day in Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala and asked:

How many of you have heard one word about Cuban agents said to be operating in Puerto Rico? Is is true that respected and well known reporters have written of the destruction of millions of dollars of American-owned property in Puerto Rico, only to have these reports suppressed before publication?

Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of this body will be interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland and under unanimous consent, I include excerpts of those remarks in the RECORD at this point.

Congressman MORTON's remarks follows:

EXCERPTS FROM CONGRESSMAN MORTON'S SPEECH

A TV news broadcast yesterday morning made up my mind to deal tonight with foreign policy, a subject that is much talked around and much misunderstood.

I watched a transatlantic interview conducted over Comsat's satellite in which Vice President HUMPHREY was answering questions posed by a group of European students. Responding to one question about U.S. difficulties in world affairs, the Vice President had this comment, "Well, we're still a very young nation with little experience in foreign relations."

Of course, the delegates and alternates to this convention understand the impulses of youth and recognize the dangers of inexperience. But it strikes us as ridiculous when the Vice President of the most powerful nation on earth takes the out of "America is so young" when faced with a probing question about our country's foreign policy.

Political and government leaders have used this tactic ever since our Nation was founded, particularly when the policy in question was under heavy fire. On other occasions the reason has been lack of information.

In the cast of the Vice President's recent interview, I am inclined to believe it was lack of information. Everybody knows that Lyndon keeps all his facts under his 10-gallon hat.

In these days of crucial decisionmaking in U.S. foreign policy, in these days of ever increasing commitments of men and women in the struggle for freedom in Vietnam, in the Dominican Republic, in these days of a critical breakdown in our free world alliances, the American people and the Congress have the right, and the need, to know all the facts.

Americans do not want to be coddled. Victory was never achieved by men on a diet of sugar-coated pills. There is nothing in our history to suggest that we are afraid to face the truth. The responsibility of leadership is to inform the people, not to shelter them.

But how many Americans know what is really at stake in South Vietnam? Are we being told what our short- and long-range objectives in that far-off battlefield really are? How can we be resolute, and firm, and united in the face of conflicting reports, predictions and explanations which have followed each on-site inspection tour?

What are Americans to think of our policymaking apparatus when a State Department public relations man announces we are now committing U.S. infantry to combat duty in Vietnam, and within hours, the White House, almost apolegetically, says this has been our policy for months?

We have had enough of propaganda, of conflicting statements, of leaked press reports, of last minute presidential television commercials. A blank check commitment is not a policy.

We want to know, Where are our allies? Where is the U.N.? Why don't we use South Vietnamese guerrillas and paratroops in North Vietnam? Are our bombing raids in the north intended to produce maximum results, or are they intended to silence criticism of what has been called a no-win policy?

The American people have every right to be asking these questions, and every right to expect that our strategy for success, if there is one, will be revealed to them.

In the continuing war against freedom carried out by Castro from his island fortress of communism, so near to us this evening, the interests of the United States and our Latin American friends are coming under more dangerous and insidious attack. No one doubts the degree of involvement of Castro agents in the present subversion of law and order in the Dominican Republic. As disastrous as that situation may yet become, are we being fully apprised of other targets for Communist takeover?

Reports persist that Castro-inspired revolutions could break out any day in Venezuela, in Colombia, in Guatemala. But how many of you have heard one word about Cuban agents operating in Puerto Rico, an area almost as much a part of the United States as Florida?

Is it true that several respected and well-known reporters have written of recent destruction of millions of dollars in American-owned property in Puerto Rico, only to have these reports suppressed before their publication?

To what extent might Puerto Rico, virtually a U.S. port of entry, serve as a funnel for traffic in Chinese Communist dope production sent by way of Cuba? These questions are valid and vital, and the American people have the right to know if such dangers actually exist.

Congress, too, has the right and the need to know the full implications of America's commitments abroad and the full extent of Communist subversion close to home. But Congress, under the Great Society has become more of a rubber stamp for White House edicts than the checks-and-balances force it once was.

The greatest difficulty that Congress faces today in providing any kind of meaningful discussion and leadership in foreign policy is, very frankly, the lack of facts, the dearth of full and complete information about the activities of our own Government.

Even though the Congress must vote the money to carry on our foreign policy, Congress does not have the full story and, I must admit, we have not shown much disposition to get the full story either.

Take, for example, the case of Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Indonesia, and, indeed, the whole southeast Asia problem. In Vietnam alone, we have lost more than 400 in American dead, and are spending taxpayers' money at the rate of several million dollars a day. Yet, incredible as it may seem, the Congress has not investigated this problem in depth.

How many of you well-informed young Americans are aware that less than 1 year ago our Government was actually training Indonesian paratroops and guerrilla officers, right here in the United States; yes, training the same troops who are today actively attempting to subvert the free Government of Malaysia? The full story of our long misused aid program to Indonesia is still stamped "secret."

Congress can play an important role, when it conscientiously undertakes to do so, in creating responsible and factual public discussion of foreign policy issues, and in developing the strong national consensus that can be so effective on major issues. But it cannot play this role if it abandons the quest for facts, and holds even its one-sided hearings in secret session.

This process cuts off a vital channel of national guidance and encourages the development of the kind of uninformed extremism and distrust that all thinking Americans must deplore.

Deep and dangerous information gaps exist today between the White House and the American people and their Congress. Reports abound from abroad that our Voice of America doesn't tell the whole story about U.S. involvement overseas or about some of our nagging problems here at home.

I maintain that a far more stifling propaganda campaign is now in progress, directed by a staff of hundreds of Madison Avenue types operating out of executive agencies in Washington. And, in the long run, the damage their unopposed and often unquestioned campaigns can do to our national objectives will be far greater than any problems we might have had in our informtaion services in past years.

Congress cannot function as the eyes and ears of the people if the facts are concealed, or admitted only under pressure and after the policies, for better or worse, are determined. Where the country is uninformed, uncertain, and undecided, weapons alone will not turn the tide.

Americans want to know the truth, bitter though it may sometimes be. I know of no example in our Nation's past which would indicate that Americans are unwilling to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to protect our welfare or security.

But this spirit can only be nourished by support of the public's right to know and by rejection of any theory that our fate must be surrendered to some all-wise bureaucrats in Washington who will decide everything for us.

You Young Republicans can be of tremendous help in seeing that the right and the need to know are given the American people. Help us to return a Republican Congress in 1966.

We are terribly undermanned and understaffed in Washington these days. And we need, and I believe the national interest of the United States needs, more Republicans in Washington.

I mean all Republicans, neanderthal, conservative, moderate, liberal, and fusion. To fail to support any Republican, in any city

or State, for any office, is to give aid and comfort to a party that accepts such divergent leads as HUBERT HUMPHREY and Bull Connor, Walter Ruether and James Eastland, Averill Harriman and ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

George Bernard Shaw once said that the "trouble with youth is that it is wasted on the young." I know you Young Republicans will give the lie to that inaccurate quip. I also know that you will be giving your best, right down to the wire, in the campaigns that will shortly begin. Your ability is tested, your fervor is infectious, your objectives in the cause of freedom at home and abroad can be won. They can and they must.

It Couldn't Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker:

Somebody said that it couldn't be done,
But he with a chuckle replied
That "maybe it couldn't," but he would be one
Who wouldn't say so till he'd tried.

Edgar Guest could well have had David Bell in mind when he penned those lines.

Because, that is what they were saying about the foreign aid program when David Bell took it over on December 21, 1962. They were saying that foreign aid could not continue to work, that it would be a waste of taxpayers money, that although it had succeeded as the Marshall plan in Europe, it could not succeed in the newly emerging and developing countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

David Bell heard all these stories, but he refused to believe that it would not work before he tried.

Well, today, foreign aid is working—all over the world:

In Taiwan, where our economic assistance will come to an end this month because the Taiwanese are now able to go it alone.

In India, where industrial production has increased 110 percent since 1951.

In Chile, where aid-assisted savings and loan associations with 84,000 members and $48 million in savings, are providing the capital for a thriving housing industry and opening the door to decent housing for thousands of middle lower income families.

In Thailand, where nearly one-fifth of the entire budget has been earmarked for education, and the literacy rate has been raised to 70 percent.

In Jordan, where foreign exchange earnings increased from $8 million in 1959 to $22 million in 1964.

In Pakistan, where the gross national product has risen about 5 percent a year and the per capita increase has been over 2 percent a year since 1960.

In Korea, where between 1958 and 1963, power production increased 50 percent.

In Vietnam, where some 35,000 farm families have benefited from a self-supporting pig-raising problem which has given villages a new source of cash income.

In Upper Volta, where a U.S.-supported measles campaign saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of children in the space of a few months.

In Nigeria, where AID-financed teams from 11 American universities are working to reshape the entire educational system.

And foreign aid is working in other countries, too, because David Bell has insisted on self-help and local participation as a requisite for our aid.

I would like to join with my colleagues in saluting David Bell for his refusal to say that "it couldn't be done."

We are all better off because he tried—and is still trying.

California Aerospace Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House Members to excerpts of an article from the Wall Street Journal of June 9, 1965. The report highlights the initiative taken by the California aerospace industry in reorienting its resources toward domestic problems that continue to plague our State and local governments.

It is encouraging to me that an industry about which so much concern has been expressed regarding its economic future has the flexibility and ingenuity to meet the changing demands of our society. I am also very proud that the initiative has been taken by California:

DOWN TO EARTH: AEROSPACE FIRMS SEEK TO TURN THEIR TALENTS TO CURING URBAN ILLS—MOVE IS HEDGE AGAINST CUTS IN SPACE OUTLAYS, SYSTEMS ENGINEERS MULL DELINQUENCY—GOAL IS BIG FEDERAL CONTRACTS

(By Mitchell Gordon)

EL MONTE, CALIF.—"Creating a system to warn a field army the enemy has launched an attack of germ warfare is basically no different from creating a system to control juvenile delinquency."

So argues the head of a firm that has devised a biological warfare warning system for the U.S. Army and is now working on the problem of juvenile delinquency. The executive is Frank W. Lehan, an engineer (Cal Tech 1944) who is president of Space-General Corp., an Aerojet-General Corp. subsidiary based here in El Monte, 15 miles east of downtown Los Angeles.

Space-General made the jump from germs to juveniles under a $100,000 contract from the State of California. The aim of the study and of three others in different fields ordered up by California is to determine the feasibility of the long discussed schemes for using techniques developed in the aerospace and defense industries to attack complex problems resulting from the increasing urbanization of the United States.

The studies could have broad implications. For aerospace and defense firms and for the communities that draw their livelihoods from these industries, the projects may show whether the vast resources now used to build such things as rocket engines and guidance systems could indeed be employed elsewhere should Government spending on defense and space level off or decline.

WELFARE AND WASTE DISPOSAL

For the Nation as a whole, the studies may suggest whether dramatic new approaches might speed the solution of social and other problems in urban areas, where 70 percent of Americans now live. Besides juvenile delinquency, fields in which California has contracted for preliminary studies include transporation of people and freight (North American Aviation, Inc.), information flow in government (Lockheed Aircraft Corp.), and waste management (Aerojet-General's life sciences division). Gov. Edmund Brown now is seeking authority from the legislature to award a study contract in the field of welfare administration.

Aerospace and defense concerns, which obviously are not the most impartial judges of their qualifications for new ventures, are already convinced of their ability to contribute to the improvement of urban life. So is the State of California, where over 17 percent of the Nation's employment in space and defense is concentrated and where cities are expanding rapidly.

But the feasibility studies underway here are arousing considerable interest and support outside California. At least half a dozen States, including Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, have asked officials at Sacramento to keep them posted on results. The Federal Government is also demonstrating keen interest. "We believe there is a place for the aerospace industry in the solution of urban problems," declares Guy Black, a staff member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

FORGOING PROFITS

California aerospace companies make clear they are deadly serious in their determination to demonstrate a relationship between their prowess in space and their competence to cope with problems on earth. They are confident enough of their ability, they note, to forgo profits and even incur losses on the feasibility studies in return for the prospect of larger contracts in the future.

"We just happen to think there's an excellent potential here, and we're willing to take the chance to demonstrate it," says J. P. Nash, vice president of Lockheed's missile and space division in Sunnyvale, Calif.

What do the scientists and engineers of the aerospace and defense industries have to offer?

"Our talent lies in the systems approach—being able to organize a vast complex problem by its components," says Mr. Lehan of Space-General. "Whether we understand the relationships or not and without necessarily understanding any of the whys of those relationships, we can then expose that problem to all the technological devices and methods we use, for instance, in devising a grand plan to land a man on the moon."

Farfetched as this may sound, aerospace officials have some fairly concrete ideas about how they would tackle urban problems. Thomas P. Jackson, project manager of the waste management study at Aerojet-General's life sciences division, says the systems approach as applied to the smog problem, one aspect of the waste project, would first concentrate on pointing up the economic, health, and other effects of smog on such "systems" as people and agriculture. Persons suffering from respiratory ailments, for instance, might be equipped with transistor monitors that would telemeter information on their reactions to smog in terms of breathing rate or lung murmur.

Once the effects of smog were precisely known, Mr. Jackson reasons, the public might be better prepared to choose among alternative solutions. These solutions could

also be worked out with the systems approach; one possibility might be gradual replacement of cars powered by exhaust-producing internal combustion engines with battery-driven vehicles.

Space-General's investigation of the applicability of the systems approach to juvenile delinquency, the findings of which are to be delivered to California officials in July, represents one of the biggest leaps an aerospace firm has tried to make outside the realm of physical science and engineering. As Mr. Lehan explains it, the basic task of aerospace researchers working in this area would be "breaking the system designed to control juvenile delinquency into component subsystems—anything at all that the experts suspect may have something to do with juvenile delinquency."

TEMPTATION TO CRIME

"Let's say temptation is one of those subsystems," he continues. "Then we'd start directing our techniques at temptation. Let's say statistics indicate, as we believe they do, that auto theft is a major and rising factor in juvenile delinquency and we suspect that perhaps keys left in autos may have something to do with encouraging auto theft. We've set up our block diagram of possible cause and effect and now we're ready to run some controlled experiments."

One way to run such an experiment, Mr. Lehan suggests, would be to select "a reasonably isolated area" and "wire up all autos registered there so they will sound a loud buzzer when there's no longer any weight on the driver's seat but the key is still in the ignition." This should help break people of the habit of leaving their keys in the car, and then, says Mr. Lehan, "you might find that you've really reduced the incidence of juvenile delinquency by the very simple, uncomplicated device of developing a method for reducing the incidence of keys forgotten in the ignition."

Mr. Lehan insists that aerospace and defense firms can take a fresher approach to juvenile delinquency and other social problems than sociologists, psychologists and others already working in these areas. "We are the grand skeptics," he declares. "We have to be shown everything, we don't take anything for granted and we're free of many of the inhibitions of interdisciplinary rivalries. Moreover, we are oriented toward the cold mathematical, scientific-engineering approach."

War and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much criticism of recent date over our foreign policy. Our national leaders are in a frustrating, difficult position in both hemispheres. But the American people, although generally sympathetic, need a broader understanding of our foreign policy objecties.

A series of two recent editorials in Newsday are helpful toward that end:

WAR AND FOREIGN POLICY—I

Once again, freedom is in danger around the world, and once again, America's determination and willingness to defend freedom from dictatorship are on trial.

This is an old and familiar challenge—one which Americans have faced valiantly, from Bunker Hill to Pearl Harbor. In today's world, however, the enemies of freedom are often harder to identify.

The international nuclear stalemate has changed the face of aggression, and the forces of slavery today wear many disguises. They come cloaked in promises of liberation and the better life but their tools are subversion and terrorism. They work in the lands where poverty and disease and illiteracy offer the most fertile fields for the creeation of conomic and political chaos. Out of national disorder, they build dictatorships under the guise of socialism and communism.

To meet these threats, U.S. troops are battling in southeast Asia and in the Dominican Republic. They are there, not to conquer territory, nor to plunder the wealth of other countries but only to prevent the building of new links in the chain of Communist police states.

This is a hard and difficult road on which the United States has now embarked. It recognizes the harsh realities of today's world. But it is not universally popular. This is understandable. The use of American military force as a part of U.S. foreign policy has always been distasteful to all Americans. Wars—whether they be small ones or large ones—create untold suffering. Americans put too high a price on human life in this country to regard even a single U.S. casualty with anything less than a fierce bitterness for the life that was lost.

Throughout the years, enlightened man has dreamed of a foreign policy that would end the holocaust of life and goods from endless wars among nations. Conflict and wars have been caused by the social, economic, and political systems under which man lives, and by his religious heritage. But the basic cause of conflict lies in the inherited or acquired characteristics of man himself.

Until man reaches a higher state of development than his present one, realism demands a foreign policy that deals with man and nations as they are today. There are 3 billion people on the earth. Perhaps 2 billion live in abject poverty, are disease ridden and uneducated. The United States has a quarter of a billion people whose material and sanitary standard of living exceeds that of any people heretofore known.

The aim of the foreign policy of the United States should be to continue this progress made by its people and also contribute as far as possible to the progress of the other peoples of the world.

In his yearning for peace, modern man has attempted to devise international instruments for the elimination of war. In our times the first was the League of Nations, which could not be implemented. Now we have the United Nations and, in this hemisphere, the Organization of American States.

Unfortunately these organizations have not been able to take the place of foreign policy. They are of greatest use after the emergencies have arisen—where joint action can be taken quickly against threats to peace. They are forums where foreign policy can be examined and debated and where good will, if present, can promote international harmony.

But until all the strong nations become willing to temper strength with reason and justice, the U.N. and OAS will not substitute for a definite, well-defined foreign policy such as we are displaying in our defense of the principle of self-determination for the people of Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

True, war is frightful. But it is an essential instrument of our foreign policy. Unhappily, at times, we still must use it for the preservation of our freedom and for the progress of man.

WAR AND FOREIGN POLICY—II

At sit-ins and teach-ins and pray-ins—around the clock and around the Nation—an anguished wave of criticism and protest has been washing over the White House.

President Johnson has thrown American military might into the struggle against Communist-supported aggression in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic. By so doing, he has made it clear to the Communist dictators that while we are always ready to talk peace, we are also ready to use American military force to defend freedom in the strategic regions of Latin America and southeast Asia.

The use of force as an instrument of foreign policy is considered inexcusable by some school- and college-age students and by their highly articulate teachers. (The protest group includes many mothers with sons of military age but few combatants of former wars.)

They complain of our intervention, yet they ignore the Communist dictators' drive for world domination.

Since World War II the democracies, believing in the principle of "self-determination" of peoples, have freed, with rare exceptions, their former colonies. On the other hand, while preaching "peaceful coexistence," Communist Russia and China have occupied the lands of their neighbors and established puppet governments. The international use of force is freely proclaimed by Communist China, Russia has flaunted the Monroe Doctrine with a base in Cuba.

Dictators with a professed communistic ideology have replaced the governments of many of the freed colonies. Their people now live in police states, denied the blessings of the freedoms that men have longed for and fought for throughout the ages. Although socialism and communism are the myths proclaimed by the dictators, they survive by time-worn methods of force of arms, surveillance of the people, blood purges, demagogic appeal to nationalism and division of wealth among the masses.

Yet, against the threat of Chinese and Russian aggression, many of our students and teachers demand that we should not use our arms to defend freedom.

What is the alternative? Is it dictatorship under the guise of communism? Indeed, students are often told or believe that communism is not a bad ideology and, perhaps, even better than the free enterprise system. Unfortunately, there is no evidence to bear this out. As one commentator has said: "It is a demand by the sick that the healthy should be cured."

Our youth are tender of heart, impressionable and, to our good fortune, ready and eager to tilt at windmills. Striving for education, they are naturally impressed by the higher education of their teachers. They sometimes have difficulty distinguishing between education and wisdom. Yet, they should never take for granted that they have enjoyed all the advantages lavished on American youth. They should never take for granted that they live in a land blessed with a free press and a strictly enforced Bill of Rights.

Unhappily, many of our adult intelligentsia also are dismayed by the imperfection of our democratic government. They are shocked at humanity in the rough under our free enterprise system. They are distressed by poverty in a land of enormous wealth; outraged by certain signs of greed and conspicuous consumption; and deplore obvious injustices to minorities and the weak. Indeed, they sometimes appear humiliated by the material blessings and honors that come to their less-learned, but more acquisitive and competitive, fellow citizens. (Envy is a vice not restricted to the uneducated.) These adults, too, lack faith in the American way of life.

Yet, the long rows upon rows of American military graves around the world are silent proof that while the meek often preach peace at any price—it is the brave who have won

and secured our liberties. Once again today, brave men are being called to stand firm for freedom—wherever it may be threatened and regardless of the price.

Fire Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Chief Jay W. Stevens, a director of the Institute for Home Fire Safety, 2 West 45th Street, New York City, given at the Institute on May 24, 1965.

Chief Stevens is the director of education for the Institute, director of fire prevention for the International Association of Fire Chiefs and is an honorary fire chief of 256 cities in the United States. Chief Stevens was formerly fire prevention chief of the National Board of Underwriters for 38 years; executive secretary of the International Association of Fire Chiefs for 33 years; secretary-treasurer of the Pacific Coast Association of Fire Chiefs for 38 years; State fire marshal of the State of California for 17 years and fire marshal of Portland, Oreg., for 4 years.

Chief Stevens' address should be read carefully by every homeowner. The address follows:

I want to thank you for your courtesy in asking me to say a few words, and also for the opportunity to say them. For over 50 years I have never turned down a chance to talk about fire protection and prevention. If I had 50 years ahead of me I'd continue to do the same thing. But I don't ask for those years—at the age of four score and one someone might accuse me of being greedy.

Now somewhere along in this 50-page speech, I'm going to bring up the subject of "mental blocks." And because I want very much for you to listen to what I'm going to say, and to think about it later, I want to brush away a possible block to that desired reception. I am director of education for the Institute for Home Fire Safety, a nonprofit organization dedicated to educating people on the subject of home fire safety. The activities of the institute are financially supported by the Wafa Corp., which is in the business of selling home fire detection systems.

What the organizationally independent institute will ultimately do to spread the good word of fire safety can do nothing but benefit the commonweal. Like the National Safety Council, which was organized originally by the country's automobile manufacturers, the institute is out to lessen injuries and save lives.

Ever since 1914, in Portland, Oreg., when I first conceived the idea of having firemen inspect private homes for fire hazards, when they weren't out fighting fires, I have been gratified by the slow but steady growth of fire prevention in the home. I feel proud of the fact that many, many cities have adopted the concept of home inspections that originated in Portland. Being an honorary fire chief in over 250 local fire services throughout the country, I practically glow when I think of the advances in both equipment and technique made by these local companies over the years.

But when I read of the number of people—especially the children—whose lives have been lost by fire every year, I'm telling you—it takes a lot out of me.

Do you know that America has the worst fire record in the world? Tokyo has about 7,000 fires a year while New York City—New York City alone—is having 75,000. Italy, with a population one-third that of the United States, has as many fires in an entire year as this Nation has in 1 week.

Last year in the United States close to 12,000 adults and children lost their lives to fire. Practically everybody is fully aware and alarmed, and rightly so, about the death toll on the Nation's highways. But hardly anyone is aware that for every four deaths on the highways fire takes the life of one. Fires kill and injure more children than any leading disease, and more than a combination of several leading diseases. Last year 1,800,000 people were injured by fire; burned, scarred, disfigured. And just think, 85 percent of the fires and the casualties could have been avoided had there been a complete understanding of, and adherence to, the principles of fire prevention and familiarity with escape procedures.

There is no doubt that rigid adherence to acceptable fire prevention methods have saved an untold number of lives throughout the country but, what of those who lives have not been saved? Or those burned and scarred for life? Somebody's got to get involved with this problem. Intimately involved.

The Shriners are, I read with great interest last December in the Saturday Evening Post of the laudable effort the Shriners are making to alleviate the sufferings of the burned. They have donated $10 million toward the establishment of three medical centers to treat burned victims and to study and research less painful and more effective medical treatment. Again, a highly laudable and compassionate gesture. My hat is off to them.

But there's room for more involvement. Between the efforts taken to prevent fires and those made to lessen the sufferings of fire casualties, there is a big, wide, important—no, vital—gap. Education in home fire safety.

Just like the man who drops dead from a heart attack the day after his doctor pronounced him sound, so also can fire break out in a home that has no visual fire hazards. Local fire inspectors cannot vouch for the condition or adequacy of hidden wiring; the possible mechanical and electrical malfunctioning of our many home appliances; nor the idiosyncrasies, habits, and mistakes of those people living in the home.

People recognize this possibility because if they didn't they wouldn't be taking out the billions of dollars in fire insurance that they do each year. But although millions of people recognize and accept the possibility of fire in the home, only a handful know the devastating facts of fire or the simple rudiments of home fire safety!

It's downright ridiculous.

No one would think for a moment of buying a new car and handing the ignition key over to a loved one who doesn't know the first thing about driving—car insurance or no. Yet millions of people insert keys in front doors today with absolutely no knowledge of safe practices to follow in case of house fire.

And I'm probably talking to a group of responsible, conscientious key holders. But don't get mad at me for making you uneasy. I'm going to make you more uneasy.

Do you know how hot a free-burning fire can heat air? Do you know how fast superheated air can move throughout a house? Do you have any idea of the many deadly gasses given off by burning off materials especially the many synthetic materials built or brought into our homes today? Have you ever conferred with the members of your family to determine escape routes and establish individual responsibility for getting the children, the elderly or the infirm out of a burning house? Do you know how fast—and I mean fast—all must act after the discovery of fire?

I may be wrong, but I don't think many of you know the answers.

Now—how come? Why have you grown up unaware of the details of home fire safety, while at the same time you're able to thread your way on foot through streets glutted with speeding cars, erratic drivers, and sometimes diabolical pedestrians?

It does take a measure of skill, I'll admit. But mainly it's because you keep your eye peeled for hazards—you anticipate trouble and you plan your escape. It's knowledge—some of it instilled, some self-taught. But the message got through.

Well, over the years people and organizations have been trying to educate the public on home fire safety, but for some reason or another the message just hasn't been getting through. Some of the reasons are known. Local fire services have done and are doing an excellent job with their fire safety campaigns. But they have neither the manpower nor funds to undertake continuous programs. Other existing authorities recognize the fire-safety problem, but are geared to what may be considered more immediate objectives and problems. And Government authorities can't do much about the needed educational job because of the lack of budget.

But, we of the Institute for Home Fire Safety believe there is another reason for this lack of knowledge—ineffective communications. Someplace along the line we're using popguns instead of rifles, mortars instead of artillery, or—it could be—air bombs instead of hand grenades. The point is—the target is being missed.

Could it be that home fire safety is simply not being written about, or discussed often enough? Is frequency the problem? Or is the medium wrong, should we be telling our story with films instead of words? Or pictures? Should the target be the woman in the home or the man? Or the children? And lastly, are there actual psychological blocks that exist that prevent people from facing up to the dangers of fire? Believe me, there are many indications that these blocks do exist.

Let me try to shed some light on that last point. People read about prowlers and burglars entering homes on the inside pages of their daily newspaper. Even though the great majority of readers have never had a burglar in their own homes, they conscientiously go out and buy bolts and assiduously lock their doors at night or when they are away from home.

Now people also read in papers about others being killed by fire, not on the inside pages but right on the front page, with pictures and many of the tragic details. Now most people have had some experience with fire in the home—a burned rug or sofa, a smoldering wastebasket, or perhaps a small grease fire in the kitchen. Yet relatively few are motivated to buy fire extinguishers, rope ladders or fire sensing devices, and of these only a baby's handful take the precaution of having a fire detection alarm system installed in the home. This, in spite of the fact that they may be aware that 85 percent of the serious fires occur during the hours when people sleep.

Do you see my point? Two somewhat similar stimuli. One motivates the reader, the other does not—even though life is far more frequently at stake due to a fire than it is due to burglary.

Well, what is to be done about it?

In one sense the Institute is going to turn its back on the situation and look in other directions. We are currently contacting the research units of a few top universities, and hope to lay the problem on one or more

of their doorsteps. We are going to ask them to study the fire-safety problem from a psychological viewpoint, and pursue the solution in whatever direction or directions they deem necessary. Then when they can put their finger on the one or more reasons—and these may vary with the individual and his environment or experience—that are blocking successful communications, then they will turn their attention to communications media, and experiment and determine the best way to get the fire-safety message across.

Once the answers are found, every local fire service and community across the country will be given them. Community leaders, dawn from every civic, social, and business activity, will be in possession of the knowledge and techniques that will permit their direct involvement in the vital area of home fire safety on a 365-day basis. I might add here that Wafa's plan to seek community leader sponsorship of its products is not only a brand new idea in home sales, but it will also supply your region with the necessary community leader contacts for the rapid dissemination of Institute-sponsored research findings.

Hopefully, thousands of tomorrow's children will reach a maturity denied them by today's ignorance of the "Unknown Need"—the unknown need for lifesaving knowledge of sound fire safety information and techniques.

The Real Alabama—Part XIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, industry of many kinds has found a comfortable and successful home in Alabama. The port city of Mobile, especially, has worked to provide a climate which is ideal for business and industry.

Some measure of the city's success has been expressed in letters written by the heads of some of the industrial plants which have located in Mobile. I present here two of these letters:

AN INDUSTRIALIST SPEAKS: WHY I LIKE MOBILE

(By Lawrence Litchfield, Jr., chairman and chief executive officer, Aluminum Co. of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.)

An enduring relationship between a business and the community in which it is located can only develop in an atmosphere of mutual respect, understanding, and cooperation.

Alcoa's experience offers proof that these attitudes do exist in the Mobile area and have assited in promoting growth and prosperity for the community generally.

Many factors, tangible and intangible, are involved in a good plant-community relationship. The community provides industry with such necessities as employees, transportation facilities, long-term tax stability, and the basic understanding of the free-enterprise system.

On the other hand, industry provides important economic and civic benefits: Employment and wages, direct community support through taxes, additional financial support from local purchases, and community affairs participation by the company and the employees.

A business to be permanent and healthy must operate in an environment where there is long-term tax stability and where a balance exists among the various economic factors at work within the community. This economic balance goes a long way toward explaining the fine relationship which Alcoa and Mobile have enjoyed for more than 25 years.

But tax dollars and employment figures do not tell the whole story of a lasting plant-community relationship. Also significant is the amount of participation by the plant and its employees in community affairs. It is gratifying to me that Alcoans may be found busily engaged in civic affairs such as Mobile's wide-awake Chamber of Commerce, successful United Fund, and many other service organizations.

Natural advantages such as the port of Mobile and development of the Alabama State docks, as well as the rail transportation facilities, are important factors in the more than tenfold expansion of production capacity of the refining plant at Mobile in its 25-year history.

Since Mobile and Alcoa joined forces, results have shown that the relationship has been good both for the company and the community.

(Vaughn Smith, president, American Bitumuls & Asphalt Co., San Francisco, Calif.)

I appreciate the opportunity of expressing to you some of our views concerning your fine city.

We have enjoyed doing business with people in this part of the South and value the privilege of being a part of Mobile's industrial community. We feel that the Mobile area has a bright future because of its advantageous location, the enthusiasm of its people, and the forward planning that is evident among industrial concerns that have picked Mobile as a place to locate.

We look forward to the continued growth and prosperity of your fine State and its most beautiful city—Mobile.

Address of the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, in Honor of 1964 All America City Award to Bluefield, Mercer County, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday afternoon, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the Vice President of the United States, honored us by visiting my home city of Bluefield, W. Va., to deliver the principal address at the public celebration in honor of the selection of Bluefield as an "All America City for 1964" by Look magazine and the National Municipal League.

It was my privilege to join U.S. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, who introduced the Vice President; Senator ROBERT C. BYRD; Congressman HARLEY O. STAGGERS, dean of the West Virginia congressional delegation in the House, and Congressman ARCH A. MOORE, in attending this most outstanding affair.

Every man has a warm spot in his heart especially reserved for his home city.

The noteworthy address of the Vice President on this historic occasion in Bluefield was most enthusiastically and warmly received by my friends and neighbors at home.

The Vice President most effectively outlined the necessity of continued close cooperation between all levels of government so that America can continue to move forward.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with the Members of the House the following text of the Vice President's stirring remarks:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT THE PUBLIC CELEBRATION IN HONOR OF BLUEFIELD, W. VA., BEING CHOSEN AS AN ALL AMERICA CITY, JUNE 16, 1965

It certainly is a privilege to share this day with you—with the city that licked its problems and not its wounds. America needs more Bluefields.

Here in the heart of Appalachia, you decided to do something about your problems. And you did. As the result of your work, Bluefield is today one of 11 All America Cities.

You developed Skyland, Inc., your $2½ million resort complex.

Then you developed your scenic railroad, the Ridge Runner.

Then came your successful effort to develop new industry, to develop Bluefield College, to build a new chamber of commerce building, a golf course, and a new youth center.

All of these were by individual and private effort. And so were other projects aimed at making Bluefield a better place in which to live and work.

Your local government has done its job too. As a result of a bond referendum which received a handsome majority, park facilities have been expanded, storm sewers put in, and other needed improvements made. Community facilities have been expanded and improved with an outlay of approximately $10½ million.

The Federal Government has helped too.

Your city planning and urban renewal project are helped by Federal funds. So is your new low-rent housing project. And interstate highway 77 has been an important factor in what you have accomplished.

Business and industry responded to the challenge. This is demonstrated by the $7 million they have invested in a new bank and expansion and improvement of stores and factories.

Your progress has been achieved as the result of cooperation—a partnership of private citizens, the business community, and government.

I looked over again today the list of this year's All America Cities.

Their names are different, and their problems and successes have been different, too. And yet I was struck by similarities among them.

All have been forced to deal with problems stemming from the growth and change that is taking place in this Nation.

There was another similarity among all 11 cities. All of these cities have been assisted by one or more Federal programs, programs designed to help local leadership solve the kinds of problems you are solving.

There are other similarities. Three cities—Bluefield is one of these—have been cited for coming to grips with the great challenge of our times—human relations.

I see evidence of progress in this area here and now.

I know the soul-searching effort it took to achieve this.

It was only last February that your YMCA-YWCA trustees voted unanimously to open those organizations to all citizens of this community.

And your human relations commission has done work that any American city could be proud of. You are working in Bluefield to create equal opportunity in jobs as well as in education.

The spirit you have shown is the spirit behind President Johnson's new approach to economic development.

You in West Virginia know about the area redevelopment program. But, as you may know, ARA is due to go out of business at the end of this month.

President Johnson's new program under the Economic Development Act, is based on past program experience.

This new program is based on the idea of cooperation between the Federal Government, State and local governments, and private enterprise—the same cooperation which did the job here in Bluefield.

Our goal is to create permanent jobs through long-term economic expansion. How is this to be done?

States and counties will be encouraged to plan economic development together.

Loans and grants will be available to encourage new industry in redevelopment areas.

A long-range program of public works will be started to build new sewage disposal systems, water mains, and access roads, for without these things, industrial development can't even begin.

I predict today that this Congress will give its approval to this new program. The Senate has already done so; the bill is now under consideration in the House.

The workability of this program will depend in large measure on the ability of local leadership to plan and work—just as you have planned and worked here.

For example, 5 years ago the city of Bluefield received a $12,000 grant from the Urban Renewal Administration for the purposes of planning.

I'm sure you will agree that your decision to make an extensive planning study was one of the wisest decisions you ever made.

Out of this developed the master plan filed in January 1962, and I know that this has served as a valuable, indispensible guide for new ideas underway in this city.

I know that recently the Urban Renewal Administration has approved another and much larger planning grant for Bluefield so that you can continue your progress.

I had someone bring me a copy of your 1962 plan. Thumbing through this plan, I saw the recommendation on new manufacturing employment as "the most basic means of economic improvement."

This of course has been translated into jobs in Bluefield, through your new factory.

I also saw reference in your plan to highway 77, along with the recommendations carried out so well to increase tourism.

I could go on further but you know this plan better than I.

The point is this:

We would not be here today if there had not been such successful followthrough on that plan.

We would not be here if it had not been for the aid government at all levels brought to Bluefield.

But we would also not be here if you had not acted on that plan, and with that assistance, with energy and imagination.

This is the lesson that all of us have learned.

In this day and age, good fences do not make good neighbors. All of us in this Nation—in Government, in private industry, in cities and towns, on farms—all of us must share responsibility for seeing that all people and places in our society have both a chance to contribute to and share in the fruits of our abundance.

We cannot have a Great Society, no matter how rich this Nation becomes, if parts of that society are left behind.

President Johnson has made his pledge. And I join him in that pledge. We will not be satisfied until all Americans, and all parts of America, can participate in this better life.

I know that you here in Bluefield share that determination. With your continued work, and with ours, I know we will succeed.

Charles McDowell, Jr., Will Become Capital Correspondent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to report an addition to the corps of Washington correspondents and, in so doing, to extend a word of welcome to Charles McDowell, Jr. Effective July 1, Mr. McDowell will become the Washington correspondent for the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch, an illustrious newspaper whose readers have known him since 1949 as a reporter and columnist of great ability and rare humor.

Actually, Mr. McDowell is no stranger to Capitol Hill—or to the ways of Washington. His comments on the congressional scene have been distributed nationally by the Register and Tribune syndicate. Now this frequent visitor will become a full-time reporter of the national scene.

Newsmakers should be forewarned—Mr. McDowell's typewriter takes him to strange and wondrous places. He has been known to puncture the pompous and to lift the lowly to pleasurable heights. New readers will find him fair and, not infrequently, quite funny. In brief, he is a writer with something to say that deserves to be heard.

His background is set forth in the article from the Times-Dispatch of June 13, 1965, which follows:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, June 13, 1965]

McDowell Will Become Capital Correspondent

Charles McDowell, Jr., a member of the staff of the Times-Dispatch since 1949, will become the newspaper's Washington correspondent July 1.

In making the announcement, John E. Leard, managing editor, said the new assignment would improve the newspaper's coverage of Washington activities and would permit McDowell more flexibility and immediacy in his writing for the paper's readers.

McDowell will cover political and other news of special interest to Virginia and the Richmond area and will write columns and features on various aspects of the national scene.

This, as he views it, includes the lighter side of life in the Government and the city as well as the zoo and suburbia.

For his assignment, McDowell will move to Alexandria along with his wife, his three children, and his imaginary neighbor Mr. Bumbleton, all of whom have contributed to McDowell columns regularly. He also will continue there his prolonged correspondence with his Aunt Gertrude.

McDowell's Sunday column, started in 1954, will continue without basic change of format or subject matter. Other columns will appear during the week but not on a rigid schedule.

The Register and Tribune syndicate will continue to distribute some of McDowell's columns and features to other newspapers.

McDowell, a native of Kentucky who was reared in Lexington, Va., joined the Times-Dispatch after his graduation from Washington and Lee University and the Columbia University graduate school of journalism.

On the Times-Dispatch he has been assigned to various beats, including the State Capitol, and has covered the general assembly, national political conventions and local, State and national political campaigns.

He has frequently reported on events in Washington, and in 1959 covered Nikita Khrushchev's tour of the United States. His column won the National Headliner Award in 1960.

McDowell's third book, an account of the 1964 presidential campaign with the title "Campaign Fever: The National Folk Festival From New Hampshire to November 1964"—will be published in July.

The Wool Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of legislation proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture for amendment of the Wool Act and other bills for extension of that act, I believe the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of June 16 is most timely and appropriate.

The editorial follows:

A Woolly Proposal

If we recall aright, some of the political science textbooks used to say that one characteristic of a good law or regulation is that it applies equally to all. Whatever they say today, it is plain there have grown up some laws—on taxes and housing, for instance—which do not treat everybody alike.

The anomaly apparently doesn't bother very many people any more, so perhaps it is to be expected that a peculiar program providing for a sliding scale of Government support payments to woolgrowers, proposed by Agriculture Secretary Freeman, doesn't seem to disturb many people either, other than farmers and sheep ranchers.

Now the whole costly price-support system as presently administered is dubious, but the wool proposal pushes the support theory over the brink of absurdity. For the administration plans to make lower support payments to larger woolgrowers and higher payments to smaller growers. Thus a grower who markets more than 7,000 pounds would be paid between 53 and 66 cents per pound the smaller grower who markets up to 2,000 pounds would get between 62 and 74 cents.

Possibly smarting under all the criticism that farm schemes up to now have mainly aided big operators, the planners presumably want their new proposal to aid chiefly small producers. But as so often is the case, it would only produce a new inequity. The highest support payments would go to 200,000 growers who produce less than 2,000 pounds a season, raising sheep as a sideline and getting most of their income from other farm output. The lowest would go to about 5,000 growers, mostly in the West, who pro-

duce more than 7,000 pounds and depend almost wholly upon wool for their livelihood.

Just this sort of confusion is all too common when the Government seeks to impose its own economic theories on producers by one means or another. And it can be corrected only if all are treated alike, under the workings of a free market system. Otherwise, it's not only the sheep who will keep on getting fleeced.

Adoption of the Metric System of Weights and Measures for Use in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have from the Department of Commerce a favorable report on my bill, H.R. 1154, and others, which would provide for an investigation to determine the practicability of adopting the metric system of weights and measures for use in the United States. It is my hope that this Congress can act upon such a bill, and I place the referred report in the RECORD at this time so that my colleagues and other interested persons may have notice of the Department's favorable position:

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1965.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: Enclosed for your information is a copy of a report just received from the Department of Commerce on H.R. 1154, which you introduced, and related bills.

Sincerely,

CHARLES F. DUCANDER,
Executive Director and Chief Counsel.

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington D.C., June 4, 1965.

Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in further reply to your request for the views of the Department with respect to H.R. 38 and H.R. 2626, bills to provide that the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures, and H.R. 1154, a bill to provide that the Secretary of Commerce shall conduct a study to determine the practicability and desirability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures.

The bills would require the Secretary of Commerce or the National Bureau of Standards to conduct a study to determine the practicability and desirability of a general conversion to the use of the metric system of weights and measures in the United States.

Each of the bills would accomplish the same general purpose. H.R. 38 and H.R. 2626 are somewhat more specific than H.R. 1154 concerning the various matters to be studied and the cooperative arrangements to be employed. All of the bills require a full and complete report and recommendations within 3 years after enactment. In addition, H.R. 38 and H.R. 1154 require annual reports, while H.R. 2626 leaves interim reports to the discretion of the National Bureau of Standards. Each bill authorizes the appropriation of funds to conduct the study but H.R. 2626 limits such appropriations to $2,500,000.

We note that H.R. 38 and H.R. 2626 direct the National Bureau of Standards to conduct the necessary study, while H.R. 1154 assigns this responsibility to the Secretary of Commerce. To be consistent with administration policy as well as Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1950, any final legislation should direct the Secretary of Commerce rather than the Bureau to conduct the required investigations. While authority would be delegated to the National Bureau of Standards to undertake most of the work under the general direction of the Secretary, it is possible that the gathering of some economic data and other portions of the study might be undertaken more efficiently by some other office or bureau in the Department.

The bills are similar to measures that were introduced in the 87th and 88th Congresses and were endorsed by this Department. The Department still recommends that legislation along these lines be enacted, subject to the foregoing comments concerning H.R. 38 and H.R. 2626. However, our continuing consideration of this matter has led us, in recent months, to the conclusion that some changes in the direction and emphasis of the proposed study would be highly desirable.

We are of the opinion that the most critical question to be answered at present is the extent to which the disparities in systems of measurement between the United States and metric-using countries constitutes a barrier to our international trade and other international activities. The recent announcement of the Board of Trade of the British Government that it would encourage conversion to the metric system within a 10-year period highlights the importance of the international trade aspects of the question of conversion to the metric system over the domestic aspects of that question. The results of the international study will strongly influence the nature of the study of the domestic advantages, problems, and cost of conversion.

The relationship of measurement standards to international trade is complex, involving many considerations in addition to the usual difficulties of communication and negotiation that invariably arise when producer and purchaser are accustomed to dealing in different units of measurement. It includes the increasingly important matter of international standards which establish preferred sizes, shapes, and other physical characteristics of the articles of commerce, and which may be strongly influenced by measurement systems. It is particularly important that we acquire a better understanding of the extent to which the differences between our measurement system and the metric system may interfere with the acceptance of international standards favorable to the customary sizes and shapes of U.S. products.

The study should also encompass other international aspects of our nonuse of the metric system. This would include consideration of the possible impact on our participation in international development programs, for example, and on other international responsibilities and activities.

It appears possible to explore these pressing questions within the framework of the broad study that would be required by the bills now under consideration. Accordingly, we support enactment of any one of these bills subject to our earlier comments on H.R. 38 and H.R. 2626.

We cannot estimate the ultimate cost of the studies contemplated by the bills, although the maximum authorization of H.R. 2626 does not appear unreasonable to us. For the first year of the study, we estimate the cost to be approximately $750,000.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of our report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. GILES.

Address by Hon. Richard C. McCarthy Before the Graduating Class of the Park School in Amherst, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 11, 1965, my colleague, the Honorable RICHARD C. MCCARTHY, representing the 39th District of New York, addressed the 42d graduating class of the Park School in Amherst, N.Y.

Mr. MCCARTHY's speech, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues, follows:

REMARKS FOR THE PARK SCHOOL GRADUATION

I want to establish immediately that I approach this speaking engagement with some small amount of fear and trembling. Many of my colleagues who are far more experienced commencement speakers than I have warned me of the built-in hazards inherent in such an apparently happy and harmless occasion. One of these is especially discouraging to any politician—the fact that most of you will little note nor long remember what I may say here today. Most of the parents and faculty present here probably cannot even recall the names of their commencement speakers, much less what they said. And I am forced to admit that I can't remember either.

Yet, even the possibility of obscurity could not deter me from accepting your kind invitation to speak to you on such an important day. The graduation ceremony is replete with meaning to the students whose achievements it honors, to the faculty whose efforts have been rewarded, and to the parents whose pride and love are reflected in their concern for their children's education. And I am delighted to share in your joy and satisfaction.

I am delighted also for the opportunity to talk about a matter which intimately concerns both me and you—the role that students in particular and all citizens in general play in determining our Nation's future course. I am sure this problem is not foreign to any of you, especially in light of the political ferment that is stirring America's campuses.

The graduates of the Park School are going on to colleges and universities where extracurricular activities are now dominated more by peace demonstrations and protest marches than by the traditional panty raids. And parents are justifiably concerned about their children partaking in many of these activities—some of which they feel might seriously jeopardize their children's futures. In my remarks, I hope to do several things—none, I believe, incompatible with the others.

I hope to encourage the students among you to learn and act and speak out for what you believe; I hope to reassure the parents among you to respect the convictions and devotion of your children; I hope to hearten the faculty to continue in their arousal of curiosity and debate inside and outside the classroom. This seems a monumental task to accomplish in a few minutes of a late spring morning, but I shall try, nonetheless.

The phenomenon of activism is relatively new to this generation and, as with any innovation, it has both its strong points and its disadvantages. Let's examine first the positive aspects.

First, the prime obligation of every citizen in a democracy is to participate actively and intelligently in public affairs. That the students of America have chosen to do so in such large numbers is an encouraging and healthy omen for the preservation of a strong society.

That wise and respected jurist, Learned Hand, warned of the dangers to a community when people don't care enough to protest, to examine, to challenge. He said:

"That community is already in the process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy, where nonconformity with the accepted creed, political as well as religious, is a mark of disaffection; where denunciation, without specification or backing, takes the place of evidence; where orthodoxy chokes freedom of dissent; where faith in the eventual supremacy of reason has become so timid that we dare not enter our convictions in the open lists to win or lose."

It wasn't too long ago that commencement speakers, parents, Government officials, and social critics emphasized the dangers of the indifference of young people. In the fifties especially, lack of interest in a world they never made led many of us to fear for our future if youth cared so little. Journalists and commentators noted that students seemed only concerned with achieving the material comforts that life could offer, the physical advantages that they could command when in possession of a sheepskin. These observers claimed that they did as little as they could possibly get away with in the process and that their diplomas from high school and from college were little more than a ticket to economic security and physical ease.

Since 1960, however, with the ascendancy of the civil rights movement—which is also primarily a young movement—we have seen a radical change in attitude. The conscientious youth of today are enchanted by the world of ideas and aghast at the abuses of human dignity. Youthful idealism has emerged once more from behind the cloud of indifference and boredom. The power of their idealism has moved us to greater efforts and deeds than we would have reached otherwise.

Another positive aspect of deepened concern with current events and problems is that our people are informing themselves more intelligently, more thoroughly on the happenings that affect the conduct of their affairs. One of the great dangers to a nation as large as ours—where the seat of decisions seems so far removed from our everyday lives in our communities, homes, businesses, professions, and schools—is that people will too readily accept the decisions that are made and too easily invest with a sacred aura the dicta of those in positions of power.

An informed electorate is the most important check we have on the abuse of that power. And a government must constantly be under surveillance by its people to insure that they know all they should about mattres concerning the national welfare. By denying information to its electorate, a government essentially denies the electorate its right to criticize constructively—for how can one criticize constructively when one does not know what is going on?

Our Government has encountered great disapproval—and with some justification—for its recent reticence on the touchy situations in Vietnam and Santo Domingo. I personally am a strong supporter of this administration and its policies. Yet, I deeply regret the growth of distrust and hostility which is being aroused by a lack of forthrightness on such crucial issues.

The publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, Eugene Patterson, recently said:

"The public often stands barehanded and often blind before its government. I submit this is not a very good idea in our democratic society, which depends for its guidance on a free people well informed."

Such criticism, such distrust, are very dangerous to our democracy, as Mr. Patterson has indicated. And I feel very strongly that the people have a right—and a duty—to know what's going on.

The American people—largely at the instigation and the insistence of its young people—are now insisting on knowing, so that they may judge for themselves. This is a commendable—indeed a necessary—demand if this Nation is to remain strong.

Now that we have examined the assets, it is time for a glance at the debits. A story which has become firmly established in the legends of Washington will, perhaps, illustrate one of the serious drawbacks of this new wave of discussion and criticism. Some years ago a very colorful Senator from Texas—Tom Connally—was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Connally was the prototyped caricature of the old-fashioned legislator with his black frockcoat and his string ties and his flowing white hair.

But Senator Connally wasn't so old-fashioned in his ideas. He was a strong and early supporter of our foreign aid program when the existence of such a program was still a matter for heated controversy. Not all of the Members of the Senate agreed with him, however, and some fairly voluble discussions often echoed against the walls of the Senate Chamber.

One day, after listening at some length to a violent attack on foreign aid from a Senator who shall remain nameless, Senator Connally arose and gently interrupted his colleague with a request that he at least keep an open mind on the subject. But, being undeterred by this reasonable request, his colleague continued his harangue for some 15 minutes longer before an exasperated Senator Connally arose once more and said, not so gently this time: "I said open mind, not open mouth."

I am afraid that some segments of the protest movement have not thought out their ideas nor seriously contemplated alternatives before becoming loud and angry critics of Government policy. I am afraid that many young people have abused their right to be heard. There are a variety of examples of this.

Witness the free speech movement at the Berkeley campus of the University of California last fall. Students were protesting a university decision forbidding political activity on campus. And I for one feel that they were right to protest. The campus is a world of ideas and a place where free discussion and political activity should be encouraged, not limited.

But elements of the free speech movement's leadership got out of control. They had forced concessions from the administration and the intoxicating brew of power went to their heads. Things went from bad to worse, until Clark Kerr, one of the most competent and understanding college presidents of our age, felt forced to resign—a decision which he later reconsidered after much persuasion.

The situation got so far out of hand that students challenged university authority and public decency by parading around placards painted with obscenities—earning for themselves the nickname of the "Filthy Speech Movement."

So these hazards—of ill-founded criticism and of ill-controlled strength—are threats to the effectiveness of new-found political strength among young people.

As the success of the civil rights movement indicates—when you are right and vigilant at the same time, success can be achieved. But, as the Berkeley incident has shown, a worthy goal can sometimes be corrupted by immoderate and senseless demands. The hard-won political effectiveness can easily be dissipated and not so easily regained.

An early American critic once said: "Accurate knowledge is the basis of correct opinions; the want of it makes the opinions of most people of little value."

Let this not be said of you. You have been well educated and you have good minds. Most of you are going on to very exciting careers and interests. No matter what they are—no matter how diverse and varied—you will all share a responsibility for the society in which you live. This is an obligation that can only be met if you are well-informed and vitally interested and, yes, a little bit skeptical. Ask questions and listen carefully to the answers. Trust your judgment.

If you do only this you will have repaid the faith, love and trust of your school and your parents.

Close to Heart of Juvenile Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram on May 27 published a very thoughtful editorial relating to the juvenile problem and commending President Johnson for his insight into this basic problem.

In the thought that it contains comment which should be interesting and useful to the Members of Congress, I am including these remarks for reproduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, May 27, 1965]

CLOSE TO HEART OF JUVENILE PROBLEM

President Johnson may be getting close to the heart of the juvenile problem when he urges schools, churches, Government agencies, and private industry to make the utmost cooperative effort to find summer employment for youngsters. The greater the success of this effort, the less the country is likely to endure "a long, hot summer" of youthful demonstrations and violence.

It safely can be predicted that the more youths that are at work in the next few months at useful jobs, the fewer will be found in the streets throwing bricks and bottles. The old saying that "the devil finds work for idle hands" is demonstrably and, in the modern context, shudderingly true.

Psychologists and sociologists concerned with the youth problem say that one of the principal troubles among the young is that they have little sense of belonging—of being useful members of society. And the increasingly urban character of the Nation's de-

velopment not only engenders but intensifies the feeling. In older and more rural days the child was a working member of the family. He had duties to perform that were essential to its welfare and often to its livelihood. Even the boy who had the onerous job of woodbox filling or water carrying knew that he was performing a needed task.

Now many apartment-dwelling families do not even have lawns to mow, and many an out-of-school teenager is simply at loose ends. Supervised sports and planned activities help to fill their time, but these do not provide that sense of usefulness that a worthwhile job does. A job not only can help a boy to grow up, it can help to determine how he grows up.

World Poverty and the Christian Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the very fine work done by the Catholic Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference in New York. It is my great pleasure to have Mr. James J. Norris, assistant to the executive director of that organization as one of my constituents.

Mr. Norris, who lives at the Avenue of Two Rivers in Rumson, N.J., is well known for the fine work he has accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, on November 5, 1964, Mr. Norris gave a statement to the bishops assembled in the Vatican Council in Rome. This is historic in that for the first time in history an American layman so spoke to the bishops of the world in a council of the church.

At this time I would like to include that speech in the RECORD:

WORLD POVERTY AND THE CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE

(By James J. Norris at Vatican Council II, November 5, 1964)

In the last decade the problem of poverty—one of the oldest and deepest that confronts the Christian conscience—has taken on a new shape, new dimensions, and new urgency. "The poor you have always with you"—yes, but today the poor are with us in a new and revolutionary context, because modern science, medicine, and technology have helped to bring about a single economy, a neighborhood that is interdependent, but largely lacking the institutions and the policies that express solidarity, compassion, and human obligation.

In this lopsided community, one small group of nations have become immensely wealthy. These nations represent 16 percent of the world's peoples, and they own 70 percent of its wealth. They are the nations grouped around the North Atlantic, which are Christian by tradition, if not always in practice. For the first time in history they foresee rising prosperity—rich today they will be richer tomorrow.

Meanwhile, three-quarters of the human race live in a state of poverty bordering on or below the subsistence level.

The gap between the rich and the poor is rapidly widening—side by side the rich grow richer and the poor grow poorer, in a single world community. This is a wholly unprecedented historical fact, and it presents the Christian conscience of the Western nations with a challenge, because for the first time in history it is accepted as a fact that, given time, they have the means to wipe out poverty in the rest of the world.

There will be no meaning to their Christian profession or humane traditions if they forget that wealth is a trust and that property carries social obligations and that riches on the scale of the West's modern riches must be redeemed by generosity.

A number of church, private, governmental, and international agencies have been attempting to alleviate the problems of poverty and hunger in the world; nevertheless, the constantly widening gap between the rich and the poor demands now a sustained, realistic dedicated campaign to bring full Christian activity to bear upon these problems.

All Christian communions are involved and therefore the opportunity is offered to all to unite in these efforts and bring joint influence to bear to encourage governments to continue and expand their policies for providing capital and technical assistance. No other group is likely to have the staying power needed for this long, arduous and often disappointing work.

World poverty will not be wiped out speedily, nor will the problem of development be solved in anything short of several generations. Our Christian peoples must not become weary of well doing.

But the goal will be reached if in each wealthy country there is brought into being a strong, committed, well-informed, and courageous group of men of good will who are prepared to see world poverty as one of the great central concerns of our time and press steadily and vocally for the policies in aid, in trade and in the transfer of skills that will lessen the widening gap between the rich and the poor.

This problem is not only the concern of the wealthy nations. In our complex 20th cenutry world, the developing nations, to progress effectively, need the capital, the knowledge, and the technical assistance of the more economically developed countries, but as wise leaders in those countries insist, the development must come from the local resources, both material and human, which God has given these lands.

Recently, a bishop from one of these lands said to me, "My people live not only in poverty but in permanent misery." This type of utter poverty brings with it other human sufferings. The first is hunger—a constant, gnawing hunger that is never satisfied day or night. Poverty brings diseases that cannot be cured because there are no medical services. Poverty brings illiteracy in lands where the great majority of people cannot read or write. Poverty brings bad housing slums that breed crime and sin. Poverty means that a mother looks at her newborn infant knowing that it will probably die before the year is out. For millions of people, living in this kind of poverty, death is a sweet release.

A loving human family does not permit its members to suffer in this way. When all the members of our Christian family become aware of the extent of suffering and privation among the poor of the world, surely they will make certain that their wealthy lands will not fail to respond to their Christian obligation.

From this ecumenical council could come a clarion call for action which would involve the creation of a structure that would devise the kind of institutions, contacts, forms of cooperation and policy, which the church can adopt, to secure full Catholic participation in the worldwide attack on poverty.

This great gathering of bishops represents every continent and every country on earth. Since world poverty affects all humanity, the great contribution of our universal church can be a world-encircling manifestation of brotherly love, bringing effectively to bear the social teaching of the church on the problem which our beloved Holy Father discussed in his Christmas message last year when he said that hunger is the principal problem in the world today and concluded with these words: "Unless this heart-rending situation is relieved, we must foresee that it will grow worse, not better. * * * Even though we are not given Christ's miraculous power of materially multiplying bread for the world's hunger, still we can take to heart the plea that rises from the masses, still oppressed and languishing with misery, and to feel it vibrate in us with the very pity which was felt by the heart of Christ which is both divine and completely human: Misereor super turbam—'I have compassion on the multitude. * * * They have nothing to eat.' We make our own the sufferings of the poor. And we hope that this our sympathy may itself become capable of enkindling that new love which, by means of a specially planned economy, will multiply the bread needed to feed the world."

University of Chicago in a Modern World Holds to the Place Set by the Founders as One of the Leading Universities of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the full text of the address by Edward H. Levi, provost of the University of Chicago, at the university's 310th convocation in Rockefeller Memorial Chapel, Chicago, on June 11, 1965.

The address follows:

This is a time for congratulations. We are proud of you. There is even a certain amount of envy in this edifice as we think of your future. The degrees to be conferred today by President Beadle represent a hope for further work to be done, for a deepening of understanding, and for that service which comes from those specially endowed and trained. I trust you carry within yourself, in response to these expectations, the proper mixture of confidence and anxiety.

It is the university which brings us together. Each of us has been touched and changed by the experiences of this place. We do not all share the same values. The skills which have been perfected here vary enormously. Yet the power of this institution—because of its restless, critical spirit, its hospitality to many cultures, the supremacy which it gives to the intellectual disciplines, the recognition it asks for excellence—compels a unity among us.

TRIBUTE TO THE FOUNDERS

It is a tribute to the founders of this university that the institution they created is now so much taken for granted. When it was organized, almost 75 years ago, it was a new kind of institution, borrowing from the structure and aims of German and English universities, joining the gentlemanly tradition of zeal for good works of the New England colleges with the confidence and brashness of the Middle West.

"No episode," a recent study of American higher education declares, "was more important in shaping the outlook and expectations of American higher education during those years than the founding of the University of Chicago, one of those events in American history that brought into focus the spirit of an age."

The creation began and continued as one of the leading universities of the world. A national survey in 1925 placed this university as first in its graduate departments, followed by Harvard, Columbia, Wisconsin, and Yale. During that period, as another commentator has recently written, "The University of Chicago * * * was unquestionably the greatest single university, department for department, school for school, that this country has seen."

ROCKEFELLER AND HARPER

This university did not create itself. It did not come into being spontaneously. It was not the God-given right of the region to have it. Many forces and groups made it possible. But these were effective because of the leadership of John D. Rockefeller and William Rainey Harper. This was not a reluctant partnership. Without this partnership, this university, as we know it, would not exist. The course of American education would have been different. Harper and Rockefeller were joined by other leaders; by teachers and scholars whose later careers would justify the confidence placed in them. All realized they could not take the existence of the university for granted, for its was to be the work of their hands. Men do make a difference. And, if I may be excused for saying so—since it runs contrary to one of the many contradictory themes of American folklore—so does money, creatively given and creatively used.

The decisions made in those early years and so often magnificiently reaffirmed have fixed the character of this institution. Harper's innovations gave the university multiple functions, but he created one university, graduate and undergraduate, although Harper was told the mixture would not work; always interdisciplinary, never as much as we say, but more than we have a right to expect. There never was any doubt of the importance of teaching. Never any doubt of the duty to investigate and to speak out. At bottom there was a religious faith, which because of the spirit of the times converted itself into a belief in the mission of the human mind to understand the universe and the civilizations of mankind, and to transmit that understanding both to the elite and to the unenlightened. The mission was deemed sufficiently important to justify what appeared to be arrogance. At many times and in many ways this has been an embattled institution, regarded as too liberal by some, too conservative by others, and unsettling by many. For the most part this has not been a quiet place.

CHICAGO AN INNOVATOR

You may say this is a view of history through tinted glasses, and, of course, it is. There was a time, for example, approximately 40 years ago, when the university senate suggested a limitation on undergraduate instruction because of the greater importance of the university's graduate and professional work, and when, as a later dean of the college described it, "undergraduate work was grossly neglected. The college came to be regarded by some members of the family as an unwanted, illbegotten brat that should be disinherited." But this period was followed by one of the most courageous, influential and far-reaching efforts to rethink the fundamentals of a college education, and to change both the materials and methods of instruction.

The fact is that the basic liberal arts programs in most colleges have been influenced by the Chicago experiment of many years ago. Chicago has been an innovator at all levels of higher education. Its research has prodded the growth of almost every strategic field of knowledge. At the frequent cost of popularity, it has stood for intellectual freedom. And however irritating the newcomer may have been, the standards of education in innumerable institutions have been helped by its presence.

YEARS 1950–55 DIFFICULT YEARS

Between 1950 and 1955, the university went through a most difficult period. There was a grimness to the neighborhood and to the campus; both were considered doomed by many. The crime rate in the police district became the highest in the city. On top of this, gifts and income declined by more than a million dollars annually. This came at a time when the buildings, libraries, and laboratories of the university, as is still the case, were inadequate because of appropriate prior choices to maintain salaries, fellowships, and scholarships over the need for bricks and mortar. The regular academic budget was severely cut. In 1953, the budget cut was more than 9 percent. There was a flight of faculty from the university reminiscent in reverse of Harper's raids which originally had established Chicago. It was extremely difficult to make replacements.

At a time when the university should have been building on strength, it found itself in a fight to stay alive. Enrollment in the entire university declined from 8,500 in 1947 to 4,600 in 1953. College enrollment declined approximately 60 percent. The university considered moving. Then in an act of courage, the full extent of which probably never will be known, it decided to remain, not as a declining middle-aged mediocre institution, which those careless about excellence would have considered good enough, but to remain, rebuild, and to recapture its academic strength.

NEIGHBORHOOD REDEVELOPMENT

Rebuilding meant going far beyond what had been previously considered central academic concerns. The leadership in a unique neighborhood redevelopment program had to be assumed. New methods of approach of importance to all urban communities had to be devised. The cost to the university of this program became about $29 million given or pledged at a time when the academic work of the institution was starved for funds.

The income on this money would be sufficient to pay every member of the faculty $12,000 in each 10-year period, or to establish a fellowship program of the kind we still need for top students, awarding 230 top students each year a stipend of $5,000. The $29 million would have given us the projected new graduate library, and made possible in addition the restoration of Cobb Hall for the college, new facilities for chemistry, the new science library, new quarters for the music department, and possibly a much needed new theater.

If anyone thinks I speak with feeling concerning these matters, as one concerned with academic budgets and the academic strength of the institution, he is not far wrong. But these steps had to be taken, with the partnership of many, and a certain amount of free advice from many more.

UNIVERSITY IS AGAIN STRONG

One can speak of these matters now, for the university is again strong. Its neighborhood is an asset. The university in fact has gained in meaning, in understanding, in opportunity because of the responsibilities it assumed. The crime rate has been cut in half; on any comparable basis it is the lowest in the city. Almost every academic unit has responded to the challenge to rebuild or increase its strength. The faculty is outstanding, equaled in only a very few institutions, and unrivaled in some fields. Under the leadership of President Beadle, for the last 3 years the strengths and weaknesses and central conceptions of each area have been explored. Innovations of 30 or more years ago are now no longer new; sometimes they are no longer appropriate or at least not the best possible.

We have subjected our own ideas to criticism—which is more difficult and less enjoyable than criticizing the views of others. It is the kind of experience which might well be built into any curriculum. We must do more of this. There are still quite a few sacred cows about, not worth the grass they eat. The reference of course is not to faculty, or indeed to persons at all, but to ideas. The studies are continuing. We know, for example, that the divisions, created to further an interrelationship among subject matters now sometimes constitute artificial barriers splitting growing fields of knowledge, imposing unnecessary restrictions on training and research. In some areas a multiplicity of departments provides unnecessary artificial pockets, obscuring the university's resources in related areas, complicating the life of the student.

HIGH INTELLECTUAL DEMANDS

The college has been reorganized into five colleges to preserve and further its unique values, including the appropriate relationship of concern among faculty and students. The reorganization will bring the university's strength into more direct confrontation with the problems of undergraduate education, and should give impetus to the kinds of experiments which have characterized Chicago's leadership. Chicago with a total student body of 7,000, a faculty of more than 900, and a college of approximately 2,000, has a superb faculty-student ratio in aid of this venture, even though not all faculty will be involved, of course. This is the opportunity to demonstrate that preparatory instruction in a variety of disciplines may be recast within the structure of knowledge to become through its questioning discipline a genuine part of liberal education. In many areas this is already being done; so much the better. I trust that both tolerance of plans and an insistence upon high intellectual demands will characterize all our programs. It is better to develop diverse challenging programs suited to the growth capacity of students, as an adjunct to whatever programs we have, than to compromise on what is acceptable to all.

Through their partnership in these new programs, at a time when students feel the need to witness, I hope we can remind them, indeed as I believe our present college program does, that learning itself is a form of witnessing, and in some ways the highest form. At the same time, possibly we should respond also in a more structured way to the desire of students to break the 7 or more years of expected undergraduate and graduate training with some opportunity for meaningful service. I hope attention will be given also to the opportunities for cultural enrichment for students beyond the bounds of the formal curriculum. Surely Chicago is not at the point where credits, formal courses, or even examinations must be the measure of inclusion in the total academic program.

ACADEMY OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

During the period of the greatest difficulties, it was natural for the university to lose its voice on issues of public affairs. I do not mean the university should take an institutional position on matters of public importance, but rather through commissioned papers, seminars and conferences, it should stimulate disciplined discourse to elevate the understanding of both sides of public issues. We hope the organization of an Academy of Public Affairs will provide the mechanism for this and will add also a new dimension to student life. We must rethink the university's participation in the training of scholars for public service, not

losing the inhibitions which have guided us, but recognizing this is one of the missions of scholars, and that in some areas, of which the education of the underprivileged is one, and, in a quite different way, international studies programs is another, greater involvement is required both for training and for research.

American education is now going through a somewhat tumultuous period. New temptations and necessities have been placed upon the schools. New responsibilities have been added without in any way diminishing the old. The universities have been unable to avoid being caught in a conflict between old ways and new demands. No one thinks it is sufficient any more, if it ever was, for colleges to exist for the custodial care and feeding of young adults. But just at the time when increased seriousness about undergraduate education might have established some principles and priorities, colleges have become universities, universities have greatly expanded their graduate and postgraduate work, and research has become more expensive, more exciting and more threatening to the entire educational process. The resulting turmoil has been stirred by placing additional service functions upon the schools. Universities have outposts throughout the world, advise foreign governments, redevelop neighborhoods, run hospitals, and have become instruments for social change. The service functions of the American university have always been present but now they are more embracing. In this situation universities find themselves, as scholars frequently do, forced to take stock of cherished beliefs, forced to learn new techniques, forced to establish new frontiers.

RESPONSIVE TO ALL CHALLENGES

In meeting these challenges universities will be responsible, as they always have been, to the popular demands and views of the society they serve. But the response must not be automatic acceptance. Universities are expected to be masters in their own house, and if they are not, their value diminishes.

In the midst of these conflicting pressures and demands, Chicago finds itself in a most fortunate situation. Almost the entire educational process is here represented. Our facilities range far and wide. Our incredible lack of rules and regulations has made possible a variety of university experiments and ventures. We are, to a considerable extent, the complete university, as Harper intended. We have not been afraid to take on projects which remade the world. Yet we are of small size. The dialog among us is real. We can know what we are doing, and we can talk about it to each other. The greatest dangers to us are our prior successes, our desire for the comfortable life, our willingness to rest on the creations of 30 years ago, the insidious and reasonable thought that mediocrity also has its uses.

LINKING THE CULTURES OF THE AGES

I have taken this occasion to speak to you about your university because it is just that. There are many colleges and universities. All have important functions to serve. But if Chicago cannot be of the best, its particular mission will have been performed, its role ended. You have the right to the knowledge of the effort it has taken throughout all the departments and schools and in the college, and particularly by the eminent faculty who stayed and those who came, and who by their presence have attracted others, to restore this univerasity to the excellence which its view of itself and its mission demand. And you have the right to share in the pride of this achievement. I will not flatter you by telling you that students add to the intellectual environment, as much as faculty do and perhaps more. But of course it is true.

Institutions are wonderful inventions because they can transcend all of us. To this university is given the power to link the cultures of many ages. In a more immediate sense through this institution you are not only joined to each other and to us but to graduates of long ago and hopefully of many years to come. In other than the strictest legal sense, no one owns this institution—not even the students. In a more genuine way it possesses all of us. It calls upon us to enter into its fellowship of the intellect. In this fellowship no place is more honored than that of the graduate who carries this university in his mind and heart. I welcome you to that place.

Eulogy Delivered by Rabbi Irwin I. Hyman for Gordon Alderman, June 10, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, the city of Syracuse, which I have the privilege of representing, was deeply shocked to learn of the death of Mr. Gordon Alderman.

Gordon, whom I was proud to call a personal friend, was one of the finest gentlemen ever to grace this earth. His was a talent in the world of communications, but more so he used this talent for the betterment of his neighbors and community.

A prime mover in the field of interfaith dialog, Gordon won the respect, admiration, and I say unequivocally, the love of all who knew him. His contributions to a better understanding among men of all faiths stand unequaled in the annals of the television world.

When his untimely death occurred here in Washington at the age of 49, Syracuse and Onondaga County lost one of their noblest sons and I lost a good friend.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to fully express this loss. I wish to include in my remarks the eulogy of Rabbi Irwin I. Hyman, of Temple Adath Yesherun. These comments adequately underscore our deep sense of grief:

EULOGY DELIVERED BY RABBI IRWIN I. HYMAN FOR GORDON ALDERMAN, JUNE 10, 1965

Together with all of you gathered here this morning, I was shocked at the sudden passing of our dear friend, Gordon Alderman. My first thoughts were for his mother, with whom I worked side by side at Temple Adath Yeshurun, where I have the honor to be the rabbi, and for whom I have had a high measure of esteem for her personality and capacity for leadership. My thoughts were also with his brother Joseph, whom I have known from his childhood days. I conducted the funeral service for Gordon's late father.

Gordon and I used to meet often while serving overseas in the U.S. Army. There was many a happy function in the temple in which Gordon participated as director, writer, or narrator. My own career as rabbi generally coincides with his activities in the field of religious communication, and there was a meeting of minds between us on matters of content and dignity of religious presentations on the mass media of radio and television.

So my involvement with the Alderman family as rabbi and friend has been a long one over the years, and it is understandable that it is with deep personal sorrow that I learned that this vibrant person with so much talent and ability is no longer among us. Without exception, everyone who had any contact with him whatsoever, and who heard or saw him on the air, is touched by the loss of a friend.

There was not an iota of evil in Gordon's makeup; he was personally a man of charm in the best sense of the word, his bearing was gentlemanly, and his approach was cheerful and full of grace. He was so constituted that he could not refuse anyone who asked for some form of aid. I know of cases when he helped beginners to get started in their TV careers, and they came to me within the last few days with a blessing on their lips for Gordon, who helped them launch their own way in the fields of radio and television.

Gordon Alderman's talent lay in his ability to project on the screen a sense of reverence for religious idealism. He poured into his subject matter something of the dignity and beauty of his own spirit, because he himself was a man of grace and impeccable taste. He had abundant talent for presenting and dramatizing the beautiful, because he himself had a deep sentiment for the beautiful, for music, for literature, for the higher and more abiding values of life. Gifted with a lovely voice and diction, it was always a pleasure to listen to him, and to be carried away by the beauty of his expression and manner.

His mind was ever open to new fruitful ideas. He was imaginative in the creative meaning of the word, and thus was a pioneer in the area of religious and educational programs on the air. The numerous national awards that he received both in the United States and Canada are testimony to the high regard to which he was held by his colleagues in the profession.

His talents were available to all. He knew no barriers among people, and did so much in our community and on the national scene to promote interfaith understanding by providing programs to serve Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish groups, white and nonwhite, and conducted workshops all over the continent for clergymen of all faiths and races to learn to use the medium of television effectively. In that sense, Gordon was a deeply religious man, for his religion expressed itself in serving his fellow man. His art transcended religious and racial divisions; his talent spoke the language of beauty which is inherent in all great culture and great religion.

Station WHEN in Syracuse, and the community as a whole, have lost a great soul, but we have been the richer for his presence among us, and it is a profound source of sorrow to realize that he has been removed from us in the prime of his life and powers.

But a person's life is to be judged not in years, but in the measure of his love and contribution to society. By that measure, Gordon lived a full and meaningful life, for he gave of himself and of his spiritual substance to all of us. It is in the Book of Job where the question is asked—"Shall we receive only the good from the Almighty?" In the course of one's years, there is not only sunshine, but tempests as well, and while we may bend in the storm we must not break. The process of life must continue, and we proceed to build where our friend left us. Gordon's course, if short, was sweet; it had narrow bounds, but was a garden of beautiful flowers that have borne fruit in their loveliness. This large attendance of men and women composed of all walks of life, Negro and white, clergymen of all faiths, people

with a variety of backgrounds, is a eulogy in itself, and testifies to the affection in which Gordon will be remembered.

His passing left a void in our hearts. But we are grateful for the opportunity to have been associated with him, and for the joy he brought to thousands.

Atom Smasher Can Help Save Midwest From Economic Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, an intense amount of interest has been generated nationwide in the site selection for the Atomic Energy Commission's proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator. I understand that proposals in this respect have been received this week from every State in the Union.

One of them is for a 3,150-acre site located on the northwest edge of Indianapolis, Ind. Many other proposals have come from the technical research complexes which have developed during recent years on the east and west coasts.

In this connection, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by James Robinson of the Chicago Daily News Service. The article appeared in the Indianapolis Times. Mr. Robinson urges the location of the accelerator in Indianapolis because he points out that such location "would go a long way to prevent economic disaster in the heartland of the United States."

The article follows:

ATOM SMASHER CAN HELP SAVE MIDWEST FROM ECONOMIC DISASTER

(By James Robinson)

WASHINGTON, June 15.—Is the Nation's great industrial heartland in the upper Midwest in danger of becoming a poverty-stricken, mined-out Appalachia for our next generation to worry about?

Is the Federal Government already marking out its future "pockets of poverty" where wealth now exists?

Will our children be asked to wage another war on poverty to rescue Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin from technological blight?

The answer to these questions, in the opinion of a competent authority, must be "Yes"—unless some radical change is made soon in the Federal Government's research and development activities.

Should Indianapolis, or any of the other Midwestern sites, land the atomic smasher, it would go a long way to prevent economic disaster in the heartland of the United States.

Representative WESTON E. VIVIAN, Democrat, of Michigan, the only research scientist in Congress, is in a unique position to call attention to the danger that threatens the Midwest from the concentration of Federal spending on research activities.

Prior to his election last fall in Michigan's Second District, VIVIAN spent 20 years as an electronics engineer. He was an employee, officer, or consultant of various firms that received large Federal research contracts.

He developed an intimate knowledge of how contracts are awarded and how research spending controls industrial development and economic growth.

Now a member of the Science Research and Development Subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, VIVIAN has made a special study of where the Government is spending its research money and what is happening to the Nation's economy as a result.

"The $15 billion a year that the U.S. Government spends on research and development is more than 75 percent of all research and development expenditures of this country.

"By virtue of its present control of these research and development expenditures, the Federal Government thus now is controlling, even if unintentionally, our future economic growth and it is doing it without any evidence of an operative plan or visible public policy for geographical balance."

VIVIAN pointed out that in the last 20 years research and development spending has grown from 1 percent of the Federal budget to more than 16 percent.

In the same period a great imbalance has come to exist in geographical distribution.

Three States—California, Massachusetts, and New York—get more than half of the Federal research and development contract awards.

Federal officials have long recognized that these States are taking research brains away from other areas because of the concentration of Federal spending.

The Defense Department, Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have argued, however, that this cannot be avoided because these States are the best qualified to carry out the scientific work involved.

Congressmen have long disputed this argument, but until VIVIAN came along, they were at a considerable disadvantage as laymen arguing with scientists and technological experts.

VIVIAN, with his background as a founder and officer of the successful Conductron Corp., of Ann Arbor, Mich., challenges the agency claims from a position of equal scientific expertise. Conductron is a firm composed of scientists and most of its business is research work for the Defense Department.

"It is often said that the research and development contracts are let strictly to the lowest cost acceptable bidder," VIVIAN said.

"Well, my experience in this field has taught me that this remark is an overstatement of the true situation.

"Contract proposals for advanced work, especially research, are by nature so inexact in specification of tangible result, that often the written claims of a bid proposal cannot be allowed to be the only determining factor in who is awarded the contract.

"I assure you, the process of awarding research contracts is at best a very inexact art. It is so inexact, that I think some criteria for geographical balance can be inserted into the procurement formula without distinguishable detriment to the mission requirements of the procuring agencies."

How bad is the present geographical discrimination in Federal research and development spending?

VIVIAN quotes figures supplied by eight agencies that accounts for more than 95 percent of Federal spending in this area, using three standards for measurement of State and regional qualifications.

"For example, in 1963 the east-north-central region of the Nation—which includes Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin—received $18 per capita in Federal research and development money, while the Pacific, Mountain and New England regions received $181, $115 and $108, respectively.

"Again in 1963, the east-north-central region received $24 in Federal research and development money for each $1,000 of Federal taxes paid by its citizens. The Pacific, mountain, and New England regions received $342, $301, and $110, respectively.

"Comparing Federal research and development funds per scientist in industry and educational institutions, the east-north-central region received $37 per scientist, while the Pacific region received $148, the mountain region $101, and New England $44."

Nationally, of the 50 States, one-half received 96.8 percent of all Federal research and development funds while the other 25 States split only the remaining 3.2 percent.

To VIVIAN, these figures add up to only one possible conclusion:

"If this present pattern of geographic imbalance is allowed to continue, it is quite conceivable that economic disaster could eventually occur in these 25 or more States currently barely participating."

He points out that research money draws the "brains" and "idea men" to the companies and States where it is spent.

Development money builds the technological capability and trains the working force that can give these organizations a virtually insurmountable advantage over competitors.

VIVIAN challenges the idea that California, Massachusetts, and New York have the best ability to perform research and development work.

"I know from engineering and business experience that both talent and capital are mobile; both largely follow contract awards.

"True, the balmy clime of California has drawn greeat engineeering and scientific talent to that State; but so has the lure of well-paid and diverse Government contract work.

"Massachusetts, with less than a 'balmy clime,' also gets talent to serve its contracts. True, the great universities draw talent to Massachusetts; yet the eeast-north-central region, which lists last in almost all categories used to measure regional participation in Fedeeral research and development activity, has such universities as Ohio State, Indiana, Purdue, Notre Dame, Illinois, Northwestern, Chicago, Wisconsin, Michigan State, and the University of Michigan."

VIVIAN has discovered that these five Midwestern States produce 40 percent of all advanced degree scientists and engineers. But the region still ranks last in its share of Federal spending for research and development.

VIVIAN has been trying to work out a solution for the geographical discrimination.

He has introduced a bill to make it legally possible for Federal agencies to consider geographic balance in the award of research and development contracts.

In addition, he tried to set a policy in the recent authorization of NASA's Project Voyager that required 50 percent of research contracts to be awarded in States now receiving less than 50 percent of NASA contract funds.

His move failed after NASA officials said it could not be done because of competitive bidding requirements.

But VIVIAN has discovered that of $7.75 billion in NASA contracts only $87 million were "bid out," while $5 billion were "negotiated competitively," and $2.5 billion were "negotiated noncompetitively."

This convinced him that the lack of geographical balance is the result of the failure of Congress or the executive branch to develop a meaningful policy to guide agency decisions.

New York City's Debt

SPEECH

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to the remarks just made by

the gentleman from New York that the city of New York, which he claims is so strong for President Johnson, has another record—it has the highest per capita debt of any municipality in the United States—$413 for every man, woman, and child or a total of more than $3 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AID Administrator Bell Strengthens Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget was established to supervise and control the administration of the Federal budget, to develop improved plans of administrative management, and to bring about more efficient and economical conduct of Government service.

Mr. David Bell graduated from the position of Director of the Budget to Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and his training is showing.

Recently there has been comment on the fact that Mr. Bell has held office longer than any of his many predecessors. This record, by itself, is noteworthy, but of even greater significance is the progress in the administration of AID which has been achieved in the 2½ years of his service.

In one sense, when David Bell became head of the Agency for International Development he took on a lesser job. He had exercised broad supervisory authority over the whole budget, and now he controls only 3 percent of it, which represents the AID appropriation.

But the importance of this fraction is greater than its size.

For it is from this small portion of our resources that we are striving to build the strength of the underdeveloped nations of the free world so that they can live in health, in peace, and in freedom.

The Budget Bureau has been called a school for training in the "suppression of overgenerous instincts."

A man who as part of his job must view the appalling poverty, illiteracy, and disease, the rancid slums of the world where "hope" is a word in the dictionary—except that there are no dictionaries—could be forgiven overgenerosity in providing for their needs.

But David Bell, while deeply mindful of the desperate needs of the poorer nations, is conducting a program promoting the security and prosperity of the developing nations while not diminishing the security and prosperity of the United States.

David Bell is making AID efficient, and in doing so, he is making it more effective.

What has he done?

For one thing, he is using a rifle instead of a shotgun. Our assistance is becoming increasingly concentrated—and 95 percent of it is going to just 31 countries.

We are relying more on loans than on grants—now at a proportion of 70 percent loans and 30 percent grants.

Firm policies tying our assistance to the export of U.S. goods and services have been established, and in fiscal year 1966 more than 85 percent of AID funds will be spent in the United States.

Improvements have been made in management; work procedures and organizational structures have been simplified; and the size of the AID staff has been reduced.

The planning of each specific country program is more rigorous and comprehensive, and each program is tailored to the unique needs of that country.

We have taken the lead in promoting the establishment of international assistance agencies, financed cooperatively by the advanced countries, and in urging other advanced countries to enlarge their own assistance efforts.

Steps have been taken to minimize the adverse effect of AID spending on the U.S. balance of payments.

In addition to new economies, there are new directions.

Real progress is being made in using AID as an effective device to help prevent or resist Communist-inspired insurgency. There are plenty of AID people on the front lines of freedom. In Vietnam these are technicians and artisans and agriculture experts who work in areas subject to very real threats from Vietcong terrorists.

David Bell has sought to expand the role played by private American resources in helping to move developing countries forward, and has sought to strengthen the private sectors in those countries.

He has shown a keen awareness of the problems of food supply and population growth, and great new stress is being placed on increasing farm productivity overseas.

Partly as a result of cost saving and concentration, proposed programs of military and economic assistance for fiscal 1966 represent the smallest request for funds in the history of the AID program.

David Bell has seen this program succeed, in places where chances of success once seemed remote. He knows it will work, because he has seen it work.

Every aeronautical engineer knows that a bumblebee does not possess the aerodynamic characteristics to make flight possible. However, the bumblebee doesn't know this. He flies anyway. Dave Bell has seen countries which seemed as though they would never get off the ground, reach the takeoff point from which they can fly on toward self-sustaining economic growth.

This is a proven program, with a proven man in charge, and I would feel remiss today if I failed to join with others in noting Dave Bell's remarkable record of time on the job.

Independence Day of Kuwait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on the northern shores of the Persian Gulf, there lies a small and intensely interesting state which this Saturday, June 19, will celebrate the fourth anniversary of its independence—Kuwait.

I want to take this opportunity, therefore, to extend warm and personal felicitations to His Highness Abdulla al-Salim al-Sabah, the ruler of Kuwait; and His Excellency Talat al-Ghoussein, the Kuwaiti Ambassador to the United States.

In the short space of time since the end of World War II, Kuwait has grown from a small British principality, dependent upon pearl fishing, boatbuilding, and entrepot trade, to an independent state whose immense oil revenues and progressive policies have given it a much larger role in the economic affairs of the Middle East than its modest geographical dimensions and population might indicate.

Despite the meager historical records of the gulf, it has become increasingly apparent in recent years that the region is not without an impressive past. Excavations by Danish and other archeologists have disclosed that the island of Failaka, located in Kuwait Bay, contains two different settlements of considerable interest. The first dates from about the middle of the third millenium B.C. and indicates that the island and surrounding area was an important trading center of the ancient world; the second, dated about the second century B.C., has brought Greek statuettes and other remnants to light—including a tablet addressed to the people of the island by one of Alexander the Great's generals—indicating a significant Greek settlement.

Quite naturally, the advent of Islam was the next most important event in Kuwaiti history, and one of the most important battles in early Muslim history was fought near the modern city of Kuwait. Nevertheless, Kuwait's lack of water meant that for centuries it could only support a small population, and it was little heard from.

The discovery of oil in 1934, however, radically changed the economy as well as the way of life of the people of Kuwait. As a result of World War II, this tremendous natural resource was not exploited until the late 1940's, but the progress which this small nation has made since that time by wise use of the revenues obtained, on the other hand, staggers the imagination.

The wealth obtained from oil has immensely stimulated trade, led to the development of an incredible number of new industries, as well as one of the most comprehensive and extensive programs of economic and social develop-

ment ever undertaken by a single country.

It is undoubtedly the latter of which the Kuwaitis are most proud, and justifiably so. Rather than squandering its resources, the Government immediately undertook to provide Kuwaitis with many of the social services and modern facilities which they had not been able to afford earlier. It established some of the most modern hospitals in the world, whose facilities were available free to all comers; it built dozens of schools in order to provide all Kuwaitis, both male and female, with the benefits of education, again at no cost; it constructed the largest single water desalinization plant in the world, capable of producing over 6 million gallons daily, to insure that Kuwaitis would never again have to fear a lack of fresh water; it undertook a variety of programs which had as their sole purpose the channeling of public funds into the private sector; it almost completely demolished the old cities and tracks in order to construct one of the most modern cities and transportation networks in the world—in fact, such a list could be continued indefinitely.

It is, of course, most gratifying that Kuwait has seen fit to do so much for its citizens; as a result it has also attracted people from all over the area, and now plays host to a population from all over the world that is nearly as large as its own. But, perhaps even more gratifying is the fact that at the same time that Kuwait continues with its own vigorous program of internal development, it has felt the need to assist other countries which are less fortunate. Through the medium of the Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development, the Kuwaitis are exporting large amounts of capital, both in the form of grants and loans, to other Arab countries. It is, therefore, making a significant contribution toward the capital needs of these countries, and helping them to achieve a higher standard of living.

It is with particular pleasure that I congratulate Kuwait on the progress which it has made. All the evidence indicates that the future will see even greater achievements, and I am certain that I am not alone in wishing the Kuwaitis every success for this bright future.

NASA Authorization for Fiscal Year 1966

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I would agree with the gentleman from New York and perhaps with the gentleman from Indiana that the report is not as good as I would like to see it be but, after all, there are two Houses in the Congress of the United States. While the report, in my opinion, is not as good as the bill that passed the House, still it is a matter of a compromise which was made between the two Houses in an effort to reach an agreement so we could have a bill at all.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I asked for this time—and I think the distinguished chairman for yielding this time to me—is to call to the attention of the House a very important program which may be subject to cancellation by NASA. As you will recall, both Houses authorized some $25.6 million for the Advanced Orbiting Solar Observatory, which is a very important program, and a second generation spacecraft which will give us a great deal of information that is extremely important to man's future space flights particularly as it relates to the 11-year sunspot cycle and the radiation effects of sun eruptions on man's space flights. It is my understanding now, however, that to take care of certain contingencies which might arise during the fiscal year, NASA is seriously considering cancelling this program out and using these funds for other purposes. Because there were no differences between the Senate and House bills, obviously, of course, no language could be put into the statement of the managers for fear of raising a point of order. Nonetheless I have discussed this with the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of the committee, and he has proposed to write a letter to NASA suggesting if the AOSO project is eliminated after the authorization and appropriation bills have given the agency some $25 million for that purpose, the money should not be spent for other purposes. So, just to inform the House that we do have this intention and that we hope this action will save a very important program, I make this statement.

I thank the gentleman from California for yielding this time to me.

Can the War Be Won?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune in its June 17 edition carries a most sensible editorial on the prospects of victory for the forces of freedom in Vietnam.

The Tribune concludes that the war in Vietnam can be won, albeit with great difficulty.

This realistic conclusion is drawn by the Chicago Tribune on the basis of observations made in Vietnam by the Tribune's very distinguished chief of their London Bureau, Arthur Veysey.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mr. Veysey from the Chicago Tribune has performed an impressive public service in preparing this realistic resolution on the situation in Vietnam. Mr. Veysey is acknowledged today as one of this Nation's most responsible international observers.

It would be my hope that those who urge a quick withdrawal of our efforts to save South Vietnam from Communist occupation would take the trouble to read this penetrating editorial. The American people have a right to be concerned with the mounting cry of those who seek a quick and convenient solution to Vietnam at the cost of freedom. As the Tribune properly points out, the task before us for victory in Vietnam is a difficult one; but, even if it takes a long time, that victory can be ours if we Americans remain resolute.

The Chicago Tribune editorial follows:

CAN THE WAR BE WON?

Arthur Veysey, chief of our London bureau, after extended observations of the fighting in South Vietnam which brought graphic reports to our readers of the quiet heroism of American participants, has summarized his impressions of the eventual prospects in the struggle.

That it will be a hard war to win is acknowledged by Mr. Veysey, but he thinks it can be done, even if it takes a long time. But military victory is only part of the task. After that there would remain the job of creating a united people, an orderly government, and a viable economy which will improve the lot of the people. If these objectives are not accomplished, any settlement achieved by arms could fall apart quickly.

Mr. Veysey observes that South Vietnam is an accident of recent history—one of the "nations" that emerged after the expulsion of the French colonial administrators 11 years ago. Vietnam itself was partitioned between the Communist north and the non-Communist south, but the south itself was divided by religious and ethnic differences and by a general lack of experience in self-government.

Its most stable period was during the 8 years the late President Diem governed, but he was deposed with American connivance 19 months ago and then assassinated. Since then the military has been the only stable force.

The United States became involved 11 years ago through efforts to reinforce the new nation. Primarily the program was to improve education, build hospitals, train a civil service, introduce modern methods in agriculture and industry, and improve sanitation. A small military mission started training and equipping a Vietnamese army.

Four years ago our military involvement became of a major order, for by that time the Communist Vietcong had initiated a full-scale guerrilla war, terrorizing the peasants into covert support and killing off village leaders who would not cooperate. Some of the rebel forces were trained in North Vietnam, and trained Communists from that country have provided field leadership. Estimates of the rebel strength place the number of trained troops at 60,000 and that of partly trained guerrillas at an additional 80,000.

Against these are ranged a South Vietnam army of 200,000, backed up by 53,500 American soldiers and marines. The advantages lie with the rebels, for the jungle and mountain terrain is difficult, the enemy can melt by day into the peasant population, and he can plan attacks and lay ambushes at places of his choice. It is a frustrating job trying to hunt him down and force him into an open fight.

Nevertheless, American military leaders think that in perhaps 3 years they may have the rebellion under control, even though they foresee many more years of peacekeeping after that. Mr. Veysey feels that, having committed itself, the United States has no option but to remain and to fight to win. Otherwise southeast Asia would see a land-

slide to communism and American prestige would be impaired throughout the world. As for "negotiation," urged by Americans who want to pull out, there is no one to negotiate with, and no prospect any settlement would stick.

Our correspondent believes that the new policy of using American forces in ground combat to plug gaps in South Vietnamese defenses is imperative, that the 7th Fleet must cut off the flow of arms by an effective blockade of the coast, that the United States must seek stability in government and order throughout the country, and that it must seek the long-run betterment of the people so that they will not succumb to Communist promises of a brighter future.

So far the cost has been $3 billion and the loss of more than 400 lives. This is war, whatever Washington may choose to call it, and a difficult, protracted war at that which will try our patience and resolve to the utmost.

Federal Spending: A Panacea or the Road to Ruin?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent and thought-provoking editorial which provides a thorough examination and sound conclusions regarding Federal spending. I commend this editorial from the Wichita Sunday Eagle and the Wichita Beacon to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

FEDERAL SPENDING: A PANACEA OR THE ROAD TO RUIN?

The national debt now stands at about $316 billion, and last week the Johnson administration asked Congress to raise the Federal debt limit to $329 billion. The House cut the increase by $1 billion and promptly approved it, over the objections of a few Members, including Representative GARNER SHRIVER, Republican, of Wichita, Senate approval was expected shortly.

It was the eighth time in less than 5 years that the debt ceiling had been raised.

Meanwhile, the administration is cutting taxes and, consequently, its revenues. The Federal income tax reduction is now history. The Senate Finance Committee has approved a $4.7 billion excise tax cut and full Congressional approval seems imminent, over the objections of such watchdogs as Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, who says that until the President curbs his spending to match this reduction in revenue, he can't support the tax cuts.

And if the administration is spendthrift, the Congress is still more so. Not only does it buy the Johnson programs, but when the administration proposes to close obsolete military bases, and unneeded Veterans' Administration facilities it screams to heaven.

If the problem were merely that of repaying this burgeoning Federal debt it would be bad enough. But there are related problems that are equally vexatious.

Politically the combination of tax cuts and massive giveaways seems to be unbeatable. The cuts put a little more spending money in everyone's pockets and the giveaways either save them money on local taxes or actually increase their disposable incomes. Nobody seems worried about who ultimately will have to pay the public debt that mounts steadily, billion upon billion.

In a series of articles appearing on the Eagle's editorial page last week, pollster Samuel Lubell reported that his samplings of public opinion across the Nation show the President more popular than ever and his opposition weaker and more divided. It's because the U.S. budget is being used as a political weapon, said Lubell.

The Federal spending is done in such a way as to offer something desirable to nearly every class of citizen—medicare, higher social security benefits, aid to education, higher military pay, higher civil service pay, the war on poverty, which benefits many politicians and perhaps some genuinely poor people, the Youth Corps, and endless other programs, many of which doubtless respond to real needs, but all of which secure votes.

Lubell draws the gloomy conclusion that all this may spell an end to the two-party system in America unless higher prices or higher taxes or both occur to end this period of enchantment.

One of the most complex of the related problems is foreign aid, which has cost the United States $111 billion since World War II—a sum equal to more than a third of the national debt.

Most analysts agree that in its earlier phases—the Marshall plan and the Truman program for aid to Greece and Turkey—foreign aid accomplished its aims. It brought those countries to the point of economic self-sufficiency and greatly aided their political stability. It also strengthened export markets for U.S. producers.

But when foreign aid became less a matter of business and economics and became more an instrument of foreign policy it acquired numerous critics. Many of them contend that after 20 years there is little to be shown for the billions we have given away. The satellite countries are still Communist, the emerging nations, though not avowedly Communist are certainly not cuddling up to the United States politically, and even some of the most long term recipients of our beneficence, such as India, often show a hostility that argues against foreign aid.

Every administration since Truman's has countered such criticism with the retort that it it had not been for foreign aid many a nation that is now merely anti-American would have been instead actively Communist. And this, since it is largely a matter of conjecture, is hardly arguable.

There remains, however, room for doubt that the aid money is being spent to best advantage. Many commentators and travelers have seen the results of aid money either spent ignorantly or channeled into the hands of dubious governments when it might better have gone to strengthen industry.

An attendant problem is the diminishing of our gold reserves. To what extent our pouring of Federal money into foreign aid is accountable for the gold drain is difficult to determine. Advocates of aid contend that it is scarcely a factor, since most aid is granted on the basis of letters of credit, with the money to be spent largely in the United States. But certainly it seems likely that the foreign suspicion of the continuing U.S. deficit is an important factor in the demand of those countries for gold in place of dollars. The effect of foreign aid on the U.S. economy and on the balance of payments will be analyzed at length in a series of articles to appear on the Beacon editorial page shortly.

The conservatives in America have long argued that Federal aid brings Federal control, and our experience has borne them out, at least to an extent. In appropriating money Congress must specify for what purposes it may be spent, and even this is control of a kind.

But the trend increases. In his message to Congress on highway beautification, Mr. Johnson recommended that the States, as a condition of receiving Federal highway grants after January 1, 1968, institute control over outdoor advertising along certain highways. The same rule would apply to junkyards and landscaping.

Southern States are finding that to qualify for continued Federal aid to education they now must file desegregation plans. Similar patterns emerge in various programs of Federal grants for urban renewal, public housing, and the like. Unquestionably the aims of Washington in these matters are sound and valid, but the encroachment is there all the same.

And if the Federal debt grows apace, so does private debt, and in even more astonishing proportion. The people of the United States now owe $882-billion privately. They owe it for homes and cars and television sets and boats and furniture and vacations that are now only a memory. They borrow to send their children to college. They fly now and pay later. They live beyond their means and the foreclosures and personal bankruptcies are mounting to prove it. It is the American way of life. Counting their own debts and those of the various governments for which they are responsible, Americans now owe $1.3 trillion, a figure so vast most people have no idea what it means.

Where will it end? Probably nobody knows for sure. If our managed economy continues strong this generation and the next may thrive on borrowed prosperity. Only time will tell whether the Keynesians are right and the Federal Government can spend us all into Easy Street, with resultant tax revenues that will ultimately balance the budget. If they are, well and good.

If they aren't this Nation and its people at some point in the future are doomed to a crash that might well prove fatal to the American system.

Disrespect and Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned with the tendency of a minority of students on college campuses and juveniles in cities to become embroiled in either organized or spontaneous cases of anarchy often under the guise of civil disobedience.

The Polish American, an independent publication serving the greater Chicago area, in its edition of June 5, carried a most timely editorial on this subject:

DISRESPECT AND DELINQUENCY

The president of the American Bar Association recently called for a revival of public morality and decency—to combat rising juvenile delinquency and growing disrespect for the law.

Lewis F. Powell, speaking in Missouri, said juvenile crime in the United States is "a national disgrace, with more than 40 percent of all arrests for serious offenses involving teenagers."

He added that the nature of the crimes themselves were highly disturbing, with crimes of violence increasing year by year. "I have found lawyers everywhere to be more troubled by the rising tide of lawlessness than anything else," the ABA president said.

This is the reward Americans are reaping from U.S. television. Because so much money is at stake, the protests of clergymen, psychiatrists, social workers, criminal experts and others, before congressional committees, has not cleaned up television programs.

Despite angry blasts from the last two heads of the Federal Communications Commission (the first was sacked after forthright attacks) the deluge of crime, violence and degradation continues.

This is one of the worst advertisements of the U.S. free enterprise system in the eyes of the rest of the world. With money as a god, we allow shock-violence-crime fare to be beamed into American homes night and day, where millions of young people are ruthlessly exposed to it, as a means of selling products by attracting audiences with sensation.

The United States and China's Totalitarian Dynamics—1965—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that I submitted for the Appendix on Tuesday past portions of an address by Dr. Richard L. Walker delivered on April 29, 1965, to the National Conference on the United States and China held in Washington, D.C.

At this time, I should like to offer the summation of Dr. Walker's address, which I believe makes impressive reading for anyone having a serious concern for the problems of the free world—which means, in the last analysis, what the United States faces in the Far East.

This concluding portion of Dr. Walker's address—and I might mention that he has impeccable credentials as a scholar in the area of the cold war conflict—follows, and includes several additional background passages in his delineation of the Peiping concept:

6. THE SWAY OF THE MIDDLE KINGDOM

Restoration of China's former grandeur is linked with the world power ambitions of Peiping's present leadership, and they have made it plain that an essential policy in this connection is the firm establishment of Chinese hegemony in east Asia. Maps produced in China have shown areas of Soviet Siberia as part of China's traditional territory, and as a worried Pravda editorial of September 2, 1964, pointed out, have also included Mongolia, Burma, Vietnam, Korea, Thailand, Malaya, Nepal, Bhutan, and Sikkim. "We are faced with an openly expansionist program with far-reaching pretensions," said Pravda.

Peiping hopes at a minimum to gain docile neutralist regimes such as Cambodia or Burma around China's borders or, better, to establish Communist regimes amenable to Peiping's leadership, such as those in North Korea and North Vietnam. In order to push for regional hegemony it has attempted to export the type of protracted guerrilla warfare which helped bring success to Communist forces in China. Guerrilla insurgency, using Chinese trainees and methods, has been proving remarkably effective in Laos and South Vietnam. By December 1964, Mao's regime was evidently sufficiently convinced that victory in South Vietnam was within grasp that it announced open support for the Thailand independence movement whose political program, proclaimed to the world on December 8, included such items as:

1. Drive the U.S. imperialist aggressors out of Thailand.

2. Overthrow the traitorous and despotic thanom government and set up another to be composed of patriotic and democratic political parties and individuals committed to a policy of neutrality and peace.

3. Fight for a policy of neutrality, peace, and democracy, and prosperity, and the people's well-being.

In addition to giving support to guerrilla movements to southeast Asia in its bid for regional hegemony, Peiping has been devoting efforts to utilizing the overseas Chinese who constitute sizable minorities in many of those countries. Overseas Chinese students in southeast Asia have been organized into Hsüeh-hsi or study groups in many areas. These groups become the centers for training devoted followers of orders from Communist China. As a government spokesman put it in Sarawak shortly before it became part of Malaysia in 1963, "What is going on in the Hsüeh-hsi classes of Chinese secondary school students is not training in wrongheaded idealism, but apprenticeship for murder." Peiping has also undertaken the construction of a number of militarily important roads into or to the borders of Nepal, Bhutan, Burma, and Laos.

From the Chinese point of view even the successes gained in Africa may be only temporary if there is not a firm base for superiority in China's own area. Peiping's claims to a regional dominance are therefore closely linked to the assessment of China as a leading world power. The continued existence of the Nationalist regime on Taiwan is in consequence a major frustration for Mao's ambitions. As long at Taiwan remains free from Communist control, as a result of U.S. guarantee and the presence of American forces, Peiping's claim to equal status with the two great nuclear powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, can be questioned. Thus the mainland leaders frequently appeal to patriotic sentiments and asks the Chinese in Taiwan to join the motherland and help in the building of a great new China, an appeal which has to date had only marginal success. The emotional tirades and sensitivity of the Chinese Communist regime regarding any suggestion of a "two Chinas" solution to the problem of settling peacefully the Taiwan issues become more readily understandable when viewed within the framework of the great power ambitions of Mao's China. Taiwan remains the major symbol in the Far East of the exaggerated nature of Peiping's great power pretensions, and as such the elimination of the Nationalist regime there becomes a pressing urgency.

7. THE CONVICTION OF INEVITABILITY

An essential part of the Chinese Communist claim to status as a superpower is the impression assiduously cultivated by Mao and his comrades that they are on the side of history, on the side of the new forces which are bound to crush and destroy the old, on the side of "the people" whose will inevitably decides history, and on the side of science, whose truths are increasingly manifest in the world. Each small revolution around the world, each act of violence, each transfer of recognition from the Chinese Nationalists to the Communists, each stoning of a USIS library is portrayed with firm conviction by Peiping as a victory for its side in a divided world.

The Chinese Communist myth of inevitability is thus linked to the whole pose of Peiping in world affairs, and particularly to its presentation of its ideological views in the dispute with Moscow. The concept of inevitability reflects the deep Chinese pride in history, the conviction of infallibility which surrounds the leader Mao Tse-tung, and the determination of the present rulers to capture the leadership of a revolutionary world. Inevitability does not, however, preclude forceful action in promoting the revolutionary future as far as the Chinese Communist leaders are concerned. They view their task as one of helping the wheel of history to turn. As Chou En-lai said at the Albanian National Day reception in Peiping on December 2, 1964, "Marxism-Leninism is no dogma but a guide to action. We hold that unity of the Socialist camp and the international Communist movement should manifest itself in action against U.S. imperialism."

The combination of factors which reinforce each other and in turn propel totalitarian China on a collision course with the outside world offers scant hope that Peiping will cease and desist from its export of violence and revolution around the world until confronted with a sufficiently serious setback to shatter the mystique of inevitability and infallibility which has been built up around the Chinese Communist cause. Edmond Taylor reported from Paris in the March 25, 1965, issue of the Reporter that no less a figure than Andre Francois-Poncet, who had been French Ambassador in Berlin during most of the 1930's, was urging a change in President de Gaulle's policy of placating Mao's regime:

"Mao Tse-tung needs a lesson," Andre Francois-Poncet wrote in a recent article published on the front page of Le Figaro. "If he does not get it soon, tomorrow will be too late to administer it to him. If we had taken action against der Führer when ne first stepped out of line, perhaps he would not have dared go farther. Mao makes no secret of his plans. He wants to be master of Asia and of Africa, of the yellow and of the black races * * *. Indochina is one of the obstacles in his path. If he can break it down, there will be no holding him. By blocking him, America is defending the cause of the free world, our cause, and we should give her our support."

As I have pointed out, the United States is the only major power in the Far East capable of and committed to blocking Communist China's totalitarian ambitions. The fate of the whole free world is bound up in the manner in which the United States responds to the challenge. It has already become sufficiently plain that the struggle in East Asia is not a minor affair. Africa and Latin America can be rapidly pushed into Vietnamese-style agony unless the hand of Mao Tse-tung is stayed and his great power ambitions blunted. The combination of those ambitions with the dynamics and policies of a totalitarian structure with unilimited ambitions make the regime of Mao Tse-tung a clear danger to world peace.

The great power ambitions and the totalitarian dynamics of Communist China obviously pose for the United States and the other nations of the free world policy problems which are not readily amenable to solution. But there are a number of realities which the United States, more than other nations which do not have vital security interests in the Pacific, must face in its confrontation with Mao Tse-tung's China. These realities are the items which must inescapably guide our policies, and I have attempted to indicate what some of them are. What then of the policies?

First, it is manifestly clear that the United States must contain the military thrust of Communist China.

Second, we dare not allow Mao Tse-tung's strategy of violence in the underdeveloped areas of the world to succeed.

Third, we must not in response to Peiping's hostility back away from commitments we have made to allies in Asia or through wavering undermine their faith in our resolve.

Fourth, while we can hope that the forces of balance in Chinese society may in time re-

assert themselves and that the government of mainland China may play a constructive role in world affairs, we dare not ignore the dangers which the present totalitarianism poses. On this score past experience with totalitarian regimes indicates we have little basis for expecting that (a) expansion of trade leads to amicable relations—Britain and Nazi Germany; (b) concessions made in the name of "reasonableness" will evoke a reasonable response—Munich; (c) expanded cultural relations involving scholars and artists will have any measurable impact on the behavior of the ruling elite—extensive cultural exchange preceded the falling out between Moscow and Peiping; (d) expressions of conciliation by other countries will be treated other than as signs of weakness—Prime Minister Nehru's government learned this to its dismay; (e) membership in the United Nations will act as a restraining influence—it hardly influenced the policies of Stalin, nor did it prevent the implantation of missiles in Cuba.

Fifth, because popularity seldom accompanies power and because the United States bears the responsibility for keeping the free world's powder dry in east Asia, it is unlikely that our policies will be greetd with full support among nations less threatened and less involved.

Sixth, it must be made crystal clear that the U.S. policies toward the totalitarianism of Mao Tse-tung's China are not policies in a vacuum; they are intimately related to the whole stance of the United States and its policies everywhere in the world.

While it is necessary, as President Johnson has indicated, always to keep the door open for negotiations and possible changes in Communist China's world stance, it must nevertheless remain clear that U.S. policies and commitments cannot change until: (a) Communist China abandons its official projection of hatred and vituperation against the United States; (b) Peiping ceases its export of violence, assassination, and subversion and the training of the terrorists to carry it out; (c) Mao's regime accepts the renunciation of the use of force in the Taiwan Strait and elsewhere around the borders of China.

A great number of people with obvious concern about the threat to peace in Asia advocate changes in U.S. policy. Let us hope that even more peoples and countries can exert their suasion on mainland China to change its policies which have made ours so necessary.

Archbishop John Patrick Cody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to salute an outstanding leader of the Catholic Church who is being elevated to the head of the largest diocese in the United States. I speak of Archbishop John Patrick Cody, now leader of Catholics in the archdiocese of New Orleans, which includes my district, and soon to be head of Catholics in Chicago.

Archbishop Cody deserves the plaudits of all Americans, including Catholics, because his visionary and forceful leadership has given impetus to the cause of all mankind—that we learn to live together as men of good will and justice in a changing world.

Archbishop Cody has left an indelible mark on New Orleans as a champion of social justice, as a knowledgeable businessman and as a devoted spiritual leader.

He succeeded another outstanding Catholic leader, Archbishop Joseph Francis Rummel, and he did so without a pause in the church's continued powerful leadership in the New Orleans area community.

It was the beginning of a fruitful, although short, stay in New Orleans for Archbishop Cody. Few persons have had the impact on New Orleans that Archbishop Cody did in just 3 years.

Archbishop Rummel announced on May 24, 1962, that at his personal request Pope John XXIII had appointed Archbishop Cody as apostolic administrator of the archdiocese of New Orleans, with full jurisdiction in spiritual and temporal affairs. He was appointed officially on June 1, 1962.

At the annual meeting of the U.S. bishops in November 1963, Archbishop Cody was elected to the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference for a 5-year term, serving as chairman of the youth department.

In addition, he was named as a member of the pontifical committee for the North American College at Rome.

At the last meeting of the U.S. bishops in Rome in 1964, he was elected as a member of the executive committee of the board of trustees of the Catholic University and the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C.

Archbishop Cody has played an important role during the Ecumenical Council. He was appointed in August 1960, by Pope John, to serve on the Preparatory Commission on Seminaries, and Studies before the council began. At the ninth general session on October 29, 1962, his name was announced among 11 appointed by Pope John to the Working Commission for Seminaries, Studies, and Catholic Schools.

On November 8, 1964, following the death of Archbishop Rummel, Archbishop Cody became the 10th archbishop of the archdiocese of New Orleans.

If two fields of work could be signaled as the most important to Archbishop Cody, they would be the Catholic education and religious vocation. In April 1964, while serving as president general of the National Catholic Educational Association, Archbishop Cody declared "We must build and build"—education—and he has carried out this declaration in New Orleans.

He made a statement in the meetings of the National Education Association, declaring that Catholic education in this country was in a precarious position.

Proof that he stands upon this statement is the fact that most of the more than $34 million in individual investments made under his 3-year administration in New Orleans have been for school construction.

The emphasis has been on education by expanding existing school facilities and in building facilities for the new schools in those new parishes which Archbishop Cody has established since June 1962.

Many of these new parishes will have elementary schools in operation by September 1965.

Highlighting the secondary educational advancements in the archdiocese was the announcement by the archbishop last June of a $28.4 million program, which included plans for seven new high schools immediately.

The laity of the archdiocese, upon whom Archbishop Cody has called to implement his building program, responded to his fund drive to begin financing a high school program by pledging $3,423,108. This was $1 million over the $2.5 million goal of the first of a series of planned annual campaigns.

Included in the programing of the overall planned $28.4 million construction program is a new building for St. John Vianney Preparatory High School for boys interested in the priesthood. More than 125 youths are enrolled for school in September 1965.

The inauguration of St. John's school last year was the first step in reorganizing the seminary training program in the archdiocese, the plan being necessary to stimulate vocations and improve the training of future priests.

In the field of vocations, Archbishop Cody also established the archdiocesan vocation office, staffed by both religious and lay personnel. The vocation program has won recognition in Rome.

The archbishop has stimulated greatly lay participation in the work of the church through the confraternity of Christian doctrine, the Family Life Bureau, and other church agencies. The fact that Family Life Bureau participation has tripled in 3 years reflects the response of the laity.

Through the confraternity he has organized an extensive high school of religion in every parish in the archdiocese. Some 6,000 laymen are enabling this program to bring religious classes to teenagers not able to attend Catholic high schools.

The physical advancements of the archdiocese have been made possible, primarily through the central financing program, inaugurated by Archbishop Cody in June 1962.

The program has saved tens of thousands of dollars, provided low-cost loans to parishes, and enabled parishes with excess funds to draw interest on their idle money.

Since the central financing program was inaugurated in June 1962, more than $27.2 million has been expended for individual improvements in the archdiocese.

Another $9 million has been spent to retire debts. In addition, another $7 million is to be paid on churches, schools, and other structures now being built, and yet $18,643,000 in physical advancements is on the planning boards.

The central fund was made possible by the established parishes pooling their resources—depositing their surplus with the archdiocese. The archdiocese increased the amount in the working fund by negotiating financial loans through outside sources. This loans was obtained at an interest rate lower than the individual parish could obtain for a relatively small amount.

In the field of communications, Archbishop Cody established the Clarion-Herald, Catholic weekly in the archdiocese of New Orleans, and set a pace for the U.S. Catholic press, as the Clarion won top national awards in just 2 years of publication.

Archbishop Cody came to New Orleans from the diocese of Kansas City-St. Joseph, Mo., in November 1961, as coadjutor bishop, to the late Archbishop Joseph F. Rummel. At Archbishop Rummel's request, Archbishop Cody took over the reins of the archdiocese as apostolic administrator 3 years ago on June 1, 1962.

Archbishop Cody has placed strong emphasis on ecumenism. In December 1963, he inaugurated "operation understanding"—a program of exchange visits for the members of various faiths in the archdiocese.

At a pace which challenged even the youngest of his age, the 57-year-old prelate has also established in the archdiocese a new salary scale for law teachers in the Catholic school system as the need for teachers continued to mount; set up the school department for exceptional children; established a retirement program for lay employees of the archdiocese; dedicated new churches and schools and signed contracts for others; inaugurated a subadministrative agency to handle church affairs in the western section of the Archdiocese of New Orleans; established an advisory board in Catholic schools; reorganized the purchasing program of the archdiocesan school office; expanded the program in Catholic schools; set up Newman Club activities in universities, colleges and nursing schools; intensified the Catholic Youth Organization, and other youth programs in the archdiocese; asked for and received cooperation of religious orders in establishing schools for the retarded in the archdiocese.

In addition to the archdiocese programs, Archbishop Cody served from mid-1962 to the middle of this year as president of the National Catholic Education Association; served as chairman of the National Catholic Welfare Conference Youth Department; and he is a member of the Vatican Council's Commission for Seminaries and Statutes.

I congratulate Archbishop Cody on his new position. I congratulate the Catholics of Chicago on their new leader.

Statement Commemorating the Conquest of the Baltic States

SPEECH

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago the freedom loving peoples of the Baltic States were thrust under the yoke of Communist oppression. These sovereign nations were subjected by brute force, both physical and psychological. At the time of this flagrant aggression these states were sovereign and independent deserving of all the rights that any other state in the world community of nations possessed. This was in 1940. Now the year is 1965 and the Baltic States are no longer sovereign.

The memory of this oppression, which has perhaps never been equaled in history for brutality and utter disregard for human rights, has slipped into the dim past. We have for the most part forgotten. Since June 1940 the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—have suffered to lose almost one-fourth of their populations. The Soviets have employed subversion, slave labor camps and even liquidation in their ruthless capture of these peoples.

The events which took place in the Baltic States during these tragic months of 1940 were repeated throughout Eastern Europe and the Far East in the period after World War II. None of us needs to be reminded of the manner in which communism was imposed upon Poland and the other states of East Europe. All forces of dissent were silenced by terror and death. Communist authority was thrust upon a large sector of the European population that had hoped for a new era of democracy and freedom. Instead, their reward for surviving the Nazi conquest was another more enduring and oppressive type of tyranny, communism.

We must cast aside the illusion that East Europe and the Baltic States are solidly Communist. The increasing demonstrations in recent years attest to the fact that the people of these supposedly sovereign nations yearn for real freedom and true independence. We cannot with any rationality cross off the 30,000 persons who died after World War II attempting to stem the tide of communism in the Baltic States. We can gain perspective by remembering that only 4,000 died for American independence during the Revolutionary War.

Now a new revolution is upon the world, the revolution of rising expectations. Nations throughout the world are gaining independence and freedom. In Africa and Asia the United States is backing attempts of colonies to gain independence. The United States has fought long and hard to help the causes of these nations, and rightly so. But our task is far from completed. World opinion is now against the concept of colonialism. Now is the time for the United States to sponsor in the United Nations the cause of freedom and independence for the Baltic States and indeed all of the Eastern European nations that now suffocate under the yoke of Soviet oppression.

Without our help I can scarcely imagine these nations gaining their independence. In 1775 it took a shot that was heard around the world to free our Nation. The annals of the Revolution ring with the names of volunteers from East Europe. Now in 1965 we are strong. Let us now speak the words that will be heard around the world and demand the freedom that the peoples of the Baltic States so richly deserve.

Federal Aid With Strings Attached

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Columnist James Kilpatrick, in an article which appeared in the June 10 Chicago Daily News, very effectively pointed out the fact that Federal aid always carries with it conditions which must be imposed on State or local governments.

This commentary is especially applicable to programs now being rushed through the House by the misnomered "Great Society."

The article follows:

FEDERAL AID WITH STRINGS ATTACHED

WASHINGTON.—For a good many years, conservatives have been growling that "Federal aid means Federal control," and liberals have been snapping back that Federal aid means no such thing. You used to be able to work up a lively fight on the matter. No more. With every month that passes, it becomes increasingly evident that here, at least, the conservative warnings were sound.

The President's May 26 message on highway beautification is the most recent example of the changing technique in action.

Mr. Johnson began with a lyric tribute to nature and beauty. The new concept of conservation, he said, must seek "to put beauty within reach of those who live in our cities, and make it part of the daily life of every American."

In times past, he went on to say, Federal programs have sought to encourage the States to achieve beautification voluntarily. The voluntary approach hadn't worked. But if the States wouldn't do it for love, he would make them do it for money.

"Therefore I recommend that States—as a condition of receiving Federal-aid highway grants after January 1, 1968—institute control over outdoor advertising along those sections of the interstate and primary systems not zoned or used predominantly for commercial or industrial purposes * * *. Existing signs would have to be removed by July 1, 1970."

The same rule would apply to junkyards: "I recommend that as a condition of receiving Federal aid, States must exercise control along the entire interstate and primary systems. No new junkyards could be established within 1,000 feet of the pavement and visible to the motorist. Existing junkyards would have to be effectively screened or removed by July 1, 1970."

So, too, with Federal funds for landscaping. For some years the States have been permitted to use 3 percent of their Federal aid funds for beautification, but they have put the money to other highway purposes.

"Here is another case where a voluntary program was not sufficient to carry out the intent of Congress. Therefore, I propose that States be required to use this 3 percent for natural beauty."

This whip-cracking approach to highway beautification is being applied in countless other fields. Southern States especially are feeling the lash in the matter of Federal funds for aid to education. Under regulations promulgated by the U.S. Commissioner of Education—regulations that go far beyond the language of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—every county and city in the South is being compelled to file a desegregation plan or face the loss of Federal funds.

These localities have been put on warning that desegregation within the classrooms is only the beginning; the next step will require desegregation of facilities as a prerequisite for continued Federal aid.

The same pattern emerges in various programs of Federal grants for urban renewal, public housing, and the like. In his housing message of March 2, the President outlined the picture: "The Federal Government cannot, and should not, require the communities which make up a metropolitan area to cooperate against their will in the solution of their problems. But we can offer incentives."

And Mr. Johnson went on to spell them out: Localities would have to develop certain long-range programs "as a condition of Federal assistance." He proposed $100 million in grants for community facilities, but "these grants will be contingent upon comprehensive, areawide planning * * *."

It is true that some degree of Federal control historically has been exercised over Federal-aid programs in the past. By and large, however, the controls have been gentle. State and local plans for "matching" programs generally have been approved in Washington without great quibbling. Often the potential Federal subsidies were not large, and State and local governments could pass them up without particular pain.

All that is changing now. In one field after another, the lure of "Federal money" becomes overwhelming. It becomes politically impossible for local governing bodies to spurn a Federal grant; too much money is involved. Besides, State and local budgets are now heavily dependent upon subsidies from Washington; if these subsidies were abruptly canceled, as Mr. Johnson threatens in the case of highway funds, it would be nothing short of catastrophic. The States will do what "Big Daddy" demands. They are hooked; they cannot wiggle free.

For the last 30 years, since these programs of "Federal aid" really began to multiply, the States and cities have been nudged along by carrot and stick. Today the delectable carrot diminishes and the Johnsonian stick gets longer all the time.

Charles de Gaulle, of France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article dealing with the actions of President Charles de Gaulle, of France, in recent years has been written by the distinguished and very able chief of the Washington Bureau of the Gannett Press, Mr. Paul Martin.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that Mr. Martin's article be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The article referred to follows:

WASHINGTON, June 4.—President Charles de Gaulle, of France, seemingly has done everything possible to strain a Franco-American friendship dating back almost 200 years—through two World Wars and the gift of the Statue of Liberty—to the Marquis de Lafayette in the American Revolution.

The enigmatic French leader has recognized Red China, called for "neutralization" in Vietnam, criticized U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic, and refused to pay United Nations assessments for peacekeeping operations in the Congo and Middle East.

He has jeoparized the political, military, and economic effectiveness of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, whose 20-year charter expires in 1969.

De Gaulle withdrew French naval units from the NATO Sea Command, denied U.S. tactical atomic planes the right to land on NATO airbases built in France with American military aid and never raised the ground forces pledged by France for the common defense of Europe.

He refused to sign the nuclear test ban treaty negotiated with the Soviet Union, or to cooperate in a multinational nuclear force with the United States, Britain, Germany, Italy, and other NATO allies.

Instead, France has continued to do atomic testing in the Sahara and pursued development of its own national nuclear force based on a light jet bomber and an atomic bomb without a modern missile delivery system.

De Gaulle blocked British entry into the European Common Market. He expanded trade with the Communist bloc, including transportation and industrial equipment for Castro's Cuba.

He has pursued a vision of the "grandeur" of France in a "Europe of states" by promoting France as the leader of a so-called third force of neutral or uncommitted nations of the world—an ambition remarkably similar to that of Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia.

In recent years, De Gaulle apparently has sought to deliberately embarrass the United States in its chronic deficit position in the international balance of payments by converting surplus dollars to gold, while calling for a new world monetary system that would derogate the American dollar and British sterling as reserve currencies.

Between the Suez crisis of 1956–57 and the end of 1964, the French had converted $1.8 billion in dollar earnings to gold. In the first 5 months of this year, they siphoned off another half-billion from the dwindling U.S. gold stock.

This is particularly vexing to U.S. officials who recognize that the strong French position today, and the American weakness in foreign exchange, is due primarily to what Americans have spent overseas on foreign aid or mutual defense including the postwar reconstruction of France.

From a prostrate position immediately after World War II, when the French franc was being blackmarketed at half its face value, France has risen to a creditor position in the world holding $4 billion in gold and $5 billion in dollar reserves.

International bankers regard this as a very tidy financial position for a country of 47 million people compared to 190 million in the United States, judged against the $14 billion remaining in the U.S. gold supply.

In addition to liberation from the Nazis in World War II, the recent record of American aid to France includes $2.6 billion in lend-lease donations during the war, and $10 billion in foreign aid since 1945.

There is also the matter of the old, repudiated war debts hanging over from the First World War which are still carried in U.S. Treasury accounts as a legal liability of the French Government. These amounted to $6.5 billion in principal and interest on June 30, 1964.

For the common defense of Europe, the United States is continuing to provide 5 out of the 20 ground divisions on the line from Switzerland to the North Sea, although the combined population of the NATO allies is 50 percent greater than the American public.

The United States also foots the bill for 75 percent of all capital ships in NATO sea forces, 50 percent of all submarines and destroyers, 90 percent of tactical air nuclear striking power, and 100 percent of nuclear strategic deterrent planes and missiles.

American taxpayers have provided 35 percent of the total cost, or around $1 billion, of the NATO "infrastructure" complex of bases and logistics facilities in Europe, including the French airfields which De Gaulle has forbidden to U.S. tactical aircraft.

This network of permanent installations, suitable in large degree for civilian as well as military use, includes 220 air bases, 27,000 miles of communication lines, 5,300 miles of fuel pipelines, 440 million gallons of fuel storage tanks, supply depots, barracks, housing, administration buildings, naval facilities, radar warning and air traffic control systems, ammunition dumps, missile sites and other projects.

It wasn't so long ago that Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower was imploring the French to grant autonomy and independence to the Associated States of Indochina. The United States put up $3 billion in military aid for the losing French war against the Vietminh, and inherited the defense of southeast Asia against communism after the 1954 Geneva agreements partitioning Vietnam at the 17th parallel.

France is one of few European powers retaining colonies in the Western Hemisphere, including French Guiana in South America; Martinique, Guadeloupe and other islands in the Caribbean; St. Pierre and Miquelon in the North Atlantic near Newfoundland.

The fabled island of Hispaniola, which includes both Haiti and the Dominican Republic, was under French domination at various times in the 18th and 19th centuries. The 4.5 million Haitians speak Creole French while the 3.5 million Dominicans are Spanish speaking.

It was in fact a combination of monarchial and imperialistic powers in the "holy alliance" including France, Austria and Russia which led President Monroe to enunciate the Monroe Doctrine in these words in his December 2, 1823, message to Congress:

"We should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

To his eternal credit, De Gaulle brought a stable government to France starting in 1958 after a succession of ephemeral premierships in the early postwar period. He also settled the Algerian problem which might have turned into another Cuba on the strategic Mediterranean rim of north Africa.

At 75 years of age, the towering French leader is proposing to run for another 7-year term as President of the Fifth French Republic. This prospect arouses mixed feelings in Washington. President Johnson used to say of De Gaulle: "We can count on him in a crisis." Now, the administration is not so sure.

Stable Coal Industry Is Vital to Nation's Future Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I placed in yesterday's RECORD an excellent statement from the chairman of the board of the Pittston Co., to the Office of Emergency Planning concerning the need for a realistic and firm residual oil import control program. Today, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an equally fine statement from Mr. D. C. Cook, president, American Electric Power Co., New York, which forcefully and clearly sets forth the importance of having reliable residual oil import controls.

Mr. Cook has written this letter to the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, in connection with OEP's investigation of the need for oil import controls.

I would urge my colleagues to particularly note Mr. Cook's comments on the position of the coal industry in providing the Nation's electricity requirements, and the need to maintain this industry on a stable basis for the future economic growth of the Nation.

OEP is conducting a most important investigation, and I would certainly hope that Mr. Cook's comments would be carefully considered. They certainly support the contention of the coal and related industries that unrestrained residual oil imports are a real threat to the Nation's economy.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Cook's letter to OEP:

JUNE 7, 1965.

Hon. BUFORD ELLINGTON,
Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GOVERNOR ELLINGTON: This is in response to your inquiry in connection with the investigation by the Office of Emergency Planning of the national security basis for control of residual oil imports.

I believe that the continuation of a program of residual fuel import control is essential to the economic and military strength of the United States. The elimination of such controls would have an adverse impact on the health of the domestic coal industry and thereby adversely affect the defense posture of the country.

Despite the decline of the coal industry from its position of dominance in the U.S. energy markets, especially since the end of World War II, coal continues to play a major role in providing the Nation's economy, including the east coast, with abundant, relatively low cost energy supplies. Coal is the principal source of primary energy for conversion to electric energy and accounts for over half the total electric energy generated. Despite the incipient emergence of nuclear energy as an important contributor to the primary fuels supplying electric energy, coal is expected to increase still further its contribution to electric energy generation. Because of this, and because of the rapid growth of electric energy and its increasing importance in our economy, coal will become increasingly vital to the economic and military strength of the United States.

If the east coast of the United States is to be assured a continued supply of relatively low-cost fuel necessary for maintaining economic growth, and if it is to be assured an adequate supply of fuel in the event of a national defense emergency, it must retain the capability to be independent of residual oil imports. Many of the oil-producing countries, especially the members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, have been attempting to exert pressure on oil producers to obtain higher revenues from their oil exports. In the absence of coal as an effective competitor in the east coast fuel markets, that area would be vulnerable to these efforts of the oil exporting countries to raise oil prices through such devices as higher royalties and export taxes.

Once driven from these markets and eliminated as an effective competitor as a result of unrestricted oil imports, coal could not quickly reenter these markets should the need arise. The mines that will have been closed as a result of the loss of coal's markets to unrestricted oil imports would be capable of being reopened only after long delay, if they could be reopened at all. The highly skilled labor force required for modern, efficient coal mining would be lost and could not be reassembled quickly. The coal transportation capabilities of the railroads would be disrupted and, indeed, the capabilities of the railroads as a transportation system in the eastern half of the United States would be threatened. These railroads are highly dependent upon coal traffic for a significant share of their total freight revenues—about 25 percent. The loss of coal traffic would threaten their viability as transportation systems far beyond the damage to their ability to transport coal.

Furthermore, once coal has been driven from these markets, and as existing coal-burning equipment is gradually retired from service, the manufacturing capability to produce new coal-burning equipment would tend to decline so that, in the event of an emergency that would make conversion of fuel utilization equipment from oil to coal desirable, such conversion would be handicapped. In the case of those fuel consumers who at the present time install equipment capable of burning either oil or coal, the elimination of import controls would encourage the installation of oil-burning equipment exclusively, thus further intensifying this difficulty.

It is important not only that there be an import control system applied to residual oil, but that this system, once established, be dependable—that it remain firm, stable, and free from arbitrary, sudden, or capricious changes. This is particularly important from the standpoint of opening new mines as old mines become worked out or become otherwise inadequate. The opening of a new coal mine requires an investment of about $10 per ton of annual capacity. Such a major investment cannot be undertaken if the industry is confronted with uncertainty in appraising its competitive market position. In planning the transportation facilities needed to move coal to market, the railroads require an investment of about $10,000 per coal hopper car or about $1 million for each 100-car unit train. The investment required to maintain coal-carrying capacity and to introduce modern, efficient transportation technology, therefore, can be sustained only if the outlook for coal transportation markets can be projected with a reasonable degree of certainty.

Both in coal mining and transportation, investment in the facilities required to provide large quantities of coal efficiently will usually require long-term contractual commitments. The price of residual oil is frequently established at whatever level will be just below the equivalent price of coal and sufficient to clear the market of whatever quantity of oil is available. Thus, the possibility of an arbitrary increase in residual oil import quotas, making available larger quantities of oil, offers the possibility of a temporary decline in price and tends to discourage large fuel consumers from entering into firm, long-term contracts for coal in those areas on the Eastern Seaboard where residual oil is available. This, in turn, discourages the investment in coal mining and transportation facilities that is necessary to make coal increasingly competitive in these areas.

Should residual oil import quotas be removed and coal be driven out of the east coast markets, this area would become almost completely depedent on imported residual oil and vulnerable to the arbitrary and capricious policies of foreign oil-producing countries of varying degrees of reliability and friendliness to the United States. The east coast energy economy would be vulnerable to the consequences of blockade, boycott, and the arbitrary decisions of foreign governments. The maintenance of the ability of the coal industry to continue to compete for a significant share of these fuel markets serves to protect this area against such potential actions which could pose a threat to the security of the United States. Our allies in Western Europe, in their energy policies, have recognized the need to avoid excessive dependence on foreign supplies of energy, especially oil that comes from some of the less stable countries. They have determined to maintain minimum levels of indigenous energy supplies in the interests of national security. In the words of Mr. Del Bo, President of the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community speaking last March to the International Congress on Energy, "It is timely to underline at this point that from the Community's point of view, it will be indispensable to insure a considerable output of Community coal for the near future and even, we should be able to affirm, over a much longer period. This is necessary, first of all, to insure security of supply." The United States can do no less.

The loss of coal's markets on the east coast would jeopardize the capability of the coal industry to meet its responsibilities in the in the interior regions of the country. East of the Mississippi River, coal accounts for about 90 percent of steam-electric energy generation. These regions require a strong, stable coal industry if they are to continue to enjoy the benefits of low-cost electric energy. The stability of coal's markets on the east coast that can be insured by a firm residual oil quota policy would permit the continued development of a strengthened coal industry capable of undertaking still more intensive efforts to improve both the mining and transportation of coal. The large scale of operation required in the coal industry and the magnitude of investment called for make it necessary that the coal industry not be subjected to the chaotic conditions that would result from unlimited imports of residual oil, if the coal industry is to maintain a spirit and morale no vital for decisions to undertake the kind of investment program required for it to meet its responsibilities not only for considerations of national defense, but for the growth and development of the American economy in the years ahead.

Sincerely yours,

D. C. COOK.

House Concurrent Resolution 40

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, for the last 25 years the Baltic States—the brave states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—have suffered under the occupation of the Soviet Union. Their people have been murdered, deported, terrorized by the Russian Communists. Although they have fought and withstood these onslaughts against their peoples and nations with courage and strength, they are still under Soviet enslavement. They want and deserve their freedom and independence. In an attempt to assist them to receive these rights, I, along with many other Members of Congress, have introduced the following resolution which I sincerely hope will receive prompt and favorable action in the Congress:

H. CON. RES. 40

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having

been able, through democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, on the other hand, the Baltic nations having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the free Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas no real peace and security can be achieved in the world while Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia remain enslaved by the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take such steps as he may deem appropriate to bring before the United Nations the question of Soviet action in the Baltic States for the purpose of urging the United Nations to request that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—

(1) withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

(2) return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union.

SEC. 2. The United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States.

Information Explosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the question of what to do about the information explosion, which has now confronted the entire world, has recently caused more and more attention throughout the scientific circles.

I was very pleased to receive a release about the remarks of Don R. Swanson, a computer expert and dean of the Graduate Library School at the University of Chicago, who is exceptionally qualified to discuss this subject.

I insert his remarks in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

The "information explosion" in science may in part be solved by small information centers with "hot lines" leading to 50 or 100 laboratories around the world.

The scientific journals of today are rapidly becoming obsolete, according to Don R. Swanson, a computer expert and dean of the Graduate Library School at the University of Chicago.

Swanson said that a staff of experts in an information center could keep track of who is doing what in an area of research, organize and distribute relevant findings, and put out periodic digests of new information for the scientific community at large.

Swanson, a physicist, recently spoke on "Human Aspects of Future Information Services" at the afternoon session of the Columbia Engineering Centennial Symposium of the School of Engineering and Applied Science at Columbia University, N.Y.

He envisaged information centers in which automation would play an important part. Vast teletype networks or "hot lines" and general purpose computers—or whatever substitutes for them in the technology of the future—would link the invisible "college" of scientists working on similar problems.

Swanson referred to predictions that by A.D. 2000 libraries would be "suffocated in a hundred million volumes of unfindable books," but that computers and remote interrogation consoles would one day place the world's knowledge at our fingertips.

He said that such predictions are based on "a dubious extrapolation of past exponential growth rates of recorded knowledge, and it is well known that unbounded extrapolation leads to absurd conditions."

The fundamental constraint which will determine the shape of the information services of the future is that "even as long as a century from now, the rate of input and output of information to the human brain will not have changed radically," Swanson said.

Technology will develop in response to the needs of the human brain rather than the other way around, Swanson asserted, for "a solution in search of a problem is a doubtful recipe for progress."

Swanson said he believes that the parts of the present system which work best will grow at the expense of the rest.

The most remarkable single facet of the current situation is that the dominant form of scientific communication takes place within relatively small groups of select individuals who communicate frequently and informally, Swanson asserted. He presented evidence that most scientific journal articles today seem to have a readership of about 50 persons.

Certain journals have large circulation and some articles receive wide attention, Swanson added, but the average readership for scientific articles certainly is not measured in thousands or tens of thousands.

"The notion of small clusters of scientists who read and cite each others papers and, more importantly, communicate through informal channels has been often recognized and seldom disputed, yet largely ignored in most visions of future libraries, information centers, and information services," he continued.

"As evidence that scientists themselves do not ignore this situation, we may note with considerable interest the emerging of informal newsletters which circulate among small groups of scientists and which serve as a rapid, highly responsive form of disseminating scientific information. These have not come about as a result either of global planning or of 100-year prophecies made a century ago. They arose simply and directly by force of need."

A primary task of future information services, Swanson suggests, is "to identify the small groups of information-exchanging scientists * * * and more importantly follow their changing patterns in time, including their changing pattern of overlaps with other groups," he said.

Swanson offered the "somewhat novel" suggestion of a new type of information center or perhaps a group of centers:

"There might be a small headquarters within this center staffed by one or several people to keep track of who's who in the groups, publish and circulate its newsletters, and study citations in the literature. * * * They administer, they promote, they sell, and they organize. They may act as a switching center for information inquiries that cannot be directly handled at decentralized points.

"This new center may monitor the whole pattern of dissemination of scientific information, and take the necessary steps to insure maximum encouragement of the production of necessary reviews, summaries and digestions of scientific literature."

Swanson pointed out that his proposal was a logical outgrowth of present practices:

"In short, communication among scientists should be improved through a systematic and large scale amplification of information activities already found to be useful among members of small groups of individuals."

Swanson acknowledged that a highly selective communications system would contain "decidedly harmful aspects," and proposed countermeasures to promote unification within the sciences. "It is the digestion, the summary, and the packing down of scientific knowledge that permits us to make additional progress without bogging down in the backlog of published information," he said. "Scientists do write books, summaries, and review articles, many of which permit the creation of 1 page where ten grew before. This phenomenon, if it could somehow be amplified, could have a great impact on the character of future information services."

Swanson admits that the suggestion that "we somehow identify the important literature and treat it differently from the unimportant" may seem to some to represent scientific censorship. However, he says that the kind of censorship implied in his proposal already plays a vital role in the communication of knowledge, inasmuch as nonsense is suppressed and redundant and inaccurate material rejected.

One great advantage of an information center would be that it could operate in an active manner, Swanson said. Scientists seem to have "an incurable case of galloping apathy toward present services," Swanson said. They tend to ignore bibliographic tools because "time spent in the library is less rewarding than time spent elsewhere, such as in the laboratory, a professional meeting, or a centennial symposium."

Selective dissemination of information to interested scientists would result in small numbers of highly pertinent articles being sent directly to the desks of individual scientists, "and this alone may become almost a science," Swanson said.

"It is difficult to say with certainty that the rewards will justify the investment, but it is my strong suspicion that they will, and that it is plausible to count this notion as one of those 'driving forces' that will change the character of future systems.

"The question of initial disseminaton of recorded knowledge is too important to be left to a large extent to random or chance encounters with the literature which in large part characterizes the present state of affairs."

Swanson said that indexing and classification systems do not work very well and may never work well. This is partly because "users seldom know quite what they want when they ask for something, anyhow."

Good initial dissemination would make subsequent retrieval easier, for it would increase the quantity and pertinence of the literature with which the requester is already familiar. Swanson suggested further that interaction between an information retrieval system and its users should consist of dialog rather than a single stage interrogation, and a machine system must be "essen-

tially sensitive and tolerant of vagueness on the part of its users."

Swanson emphasized that he was not foreseeing the demise of great libraries. "The question of decentralized service must not be confused with decentralized repositories," he said.

Swanson was born October 10, 1924. He received his B.S. degree at California Institute of Technology in 1945, his M.A. in physics at Rice Institute in 1947, and his Ph. D. in physics at the University of California at Berkeley in 1952.

From 1952 until 1955 he was a physicist at the Hughes Aircraft Co. Research and Development Laboratories, Culver City, Calif., engaged in research on computer design, applications, and programing. From 1955 until he joined the University of Chicago in 1963, he was manager of the Synthetic Intelligence Department of Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc., Canoga Park, Calif. From 1958 until 1961, he was a member of the Science Information Council, an advisory body to the National Science Foundation on problems of communicating scientific information.

President Johnson's Beautification Program Lauded by South Bend (Ind.) Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial in the South Bend, Ind., Tribune commending the goals of President Johnson's legislative proposals for beautification of highways.

This fine editorial points up some of the problems facing this important program and the determination of the administration that the Federal Government be "a model and a pacesetter" in the antiugliness program.

The editorial follows:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, May 27, 1965]

ANTIUGLY

The Johnson administration's antiugly program began to take shape with the legislation proposals the President sent to Congress this week.

The proposals call for a bigger investment in beautification of highways, would ban billboards within 1,000 feet of most heavily traveled highways except in industrial or commercial areas, and seek to hide or eliminate junkyards along these routes.

The proposals also call for more recreational areas along the major highways and more consideration for the establishment of scenic routes.

The goals are commendable.

The President's proposals would force States to fall in line with the Federal concepts of beautification in order to qualify for Federal aid for interstate and primary roads, those which carry the bulk of the traffic.

It is a hard-nosed approach to the problem and one, no doubt, that will be tempered in the journey of the legislation through Congress. It brings up the States rights issue and the question of dictation from Washington.

There will be some sticky legal questions for Congress to ponder. As Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, said, "I don't know what you can do about a farmer or rancher who leases the sides of his barn for a patent medicine ad."

The billboard people will be up in arms as usual at the mention of putting restraints on their normal operations.

But where the imposing of stern conditions for qualifying for Federal aid goes, the administration will naturally cite the disappointing experience under the bonus plan bonus of one-half of 1 percent by regulating

Since the birth of the voluntary program in 1958, under which States could claim a bonus of one-half of 1 percent by regulating outdoor advertising on interstate highways, only eight States, Indiana not included, have begun using the program. And only 184 miles of roads are involved. Mr. Johnson could well call that approach a failure and ask for a far more stringent arrangement.

The arguments pro and con should make interesting reading as the battle is joined in Congress. But one thing already is clear: The administration is determined, as the President said, that the Federal Government be a model and pace setter in the antiugliness program. This is all to the good.

Man's Greatest Invention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, Lowell, Mass., is very proud of an item which appears in the June 1965 issue of Columbian Squires. It is the winning essay in the annual contest sponsored by the Squires and was written by Walter Jabzanka of the John F. Kennedy Circle 166 in Lowell.

Mr. Jabzanka chose for his topic "Antibiotic Drugs." He traces the history of their development and their tremendous importance today for a variety of diseases.

I would like to share Mr. Jabzanka's accomplishment with my colleagues by inserting his winning essay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MAN'S GREATEST INVENTION

(By Walter Jabzanka, Lowell, Mass.)

THE WINNING ENTRY IN THE ANNUAL ESSAY CONTEST—SQUIRE JABZANKA'S TOPIC: ANTIBIOTIC DRUGS

Since ancient times some of the worst catastrophes ever to befall man have been epidemics of contagious diseases. Plagues of measles, tuberculosis, scarlet fever, whooping cough, typhoid fever, cholera, smallpox, as well as dysentery, malaria, and a number of other less familiar sicknesses, have killed more human beings than have all of history's most bloody wars. Only during the past 20 years or so has man been able to combat these scourges effectively. The development of antibiotics, or "wonder" drugs, will be recorded in history as a great accomplishment. Where the natural body defense against ills fails, antibiotics are employed and the results obtained are truly gratifying.

The above diseases may be caused by a bacteria, protozoa (one-celled animal), or virus. In each case, the microscopic living particle enters the human body and may cause several of many complications. Bacteria are the principal culprits. When a harmful bacteria cell invades the human body, it may take compounds of carbon and nitrogen for its food. These compounds are present in the human cells in the form of carbohydrates and proteins. The bacteria attack the cells and actually split the molecules of those compounds to obtain the nitrogen and carbon. This splitting kills the human cells, leads to further harm in the immediate area, and later to the remainder of the body. Bacteria may also secrete toxins to overcome strong human cells, which may resist the invader. Such toxins are harmful to the body and thus a disease may have its beginning in that way. Even if the human cell overcomes the toxin and forces the bacteria to starve, the decay of that bacteria may produce a harmful poison, again presenting a serious condition.

The type, severity, and such a disease will depend on the species of bacteria, and the strength of the natural resistance of the affected person. Antibiotics are most effective on the bacteria diseases, although they are successful against virus, fungi and protozoan illnesses.

All bacteria are not harmful to man. They are very necessary to life welfare in many ways too numerous to mention. Only a minority of all bacteria existing do cause diseases.

The word "antibiotic" is derived from the Greek word "bios" meaning life and the familiar Latin "anti" meaning against. So we have a drug that is against life. The lives it is against are those of the virus, bacteria, and the protozoans, which are, as I mentioned, all living particles. Most of the antibiotic drugs are formulated from a growth of bacteria or fungus selected for its ability to destroy its fellow creatures in the struggle to obtain food. The drug itself does not harm the human body, since the beneficial bacteria or fungi receives its food from substances quite useless to human body cell. Thus the science of antibiotics may be said of as fighting fire with fire.

At the present time there are about 100 types of drugs. Of the 100, about 20 are generally used. Some are very similar to each other in their application. Others stand alone as the only weapon against a specific illness. No one drug can cure all the diseases. There are some diseases for which none of the drugs can do much good. The majority of the diseases, however, can be treated. With the advent of the antibiotics, or miracle drugs, as they are often called, new hope has been given to afflicted persons. The death rate due to the sicknesses has been very sharply reduced. Miraculous cures indeed, have been obtained many a time through treatment with one of the wonder drugs.

Perhaps the drug most familiar to the public is penicillin. It was discoverered in 1928 by Alexander Fleming. He was doing research on the bacteriacidal properties of certain bacteria and fungi by growing several of them together in a dish, and observing whether one of them inhibited the well being of the others. The dishes were supposed to be covered to produce a warmer temperature for the growths. One of them, however, was left uncovered accidentally, the previous day, and remained so throughout the night. The next morning a growth was noticed that had killed all others near it. Fleming found it to be a foreign growth and concluded that its spore had landed in the open dish and taken root so to speak. Spores serve as the seeds of fungi, some bacteria, and other microscopic life, as well as certain plants. When isolated from the culture, as the growths are called, the foreign growth was found to be a microscopic species of fungus, of the name "penicillium." Fleming, therefore, called it penicillin. However, before its valuable property could be fully utilized, countless experiments had to be performed. Problems such as its safe use in

the body, suitable means of producing it and purifying it, had to be overcome. In 1943, after 15 years of painstaking research and development, penicillin made its debut as an antibiotic drug, and has since saved many millions of lives.

A group of drugs, that are second to penicillin in popular use, is that of the sulfa drugs. They receive their name from the sulfonamide compound of sulfur which is their main composition. The manner in which they destroy bacteria cells is quite unique and interesting. All bacteria cells require a certain molecule which I will call X, to maintain their life processes. They obtain chemical X from the animal body. Sulfonamide molecules resemble the molecules of structure of chemical X almost identically. When this sulfonamide is introduced into the patients system, the bacteria mistakes it for chemical X and incorporates it into its cell structure. This error soon proves fatal to the bacteria. Although the two molecules resemble each other in structure, they do differ slightly. This small deviation makes a big difference in the bacterial cells, works, disrupting them and thus killing the cell. Sulfonamide drugs were developed around 1929, primarily by Dr. Gerhard Domagk.

The discovery of penicillin led to much experimentation and search for other antibiotic fungi. One of the drugs to be found, as a result, was Streptomycin. After many difficulties of its administration were overcome, Streptomycin proved to be a wonderful drug indeed. It is especially used to treat tuberculosis, and tuberculine meningitis, giving excellent results. As are others, Streptomycin is used also against, to mention a few diseases, diphtheria, plague, influenza, and warts Dr. Selman A. Walsmarr and his colleagues made the initial developments, which led to the classification of Streptomycin as an antibiotic drug by 1953.

Aureomycin was also discovered, much in the same way as its relative, Streptomycin. This drug was developed chiefly through the efforts of Dr. Benjamin Minge Duggar, in the late 1940's. Aureomycin destroys many types of bacteria and virus, which are immune to penicillin and Streptomycin. Since it forms a golden yellow colony, in a culture, it is called, very fittingly, Aureomycin; from the Latin "aureo" meaning gold. This drug may be used in its pure form or can be broken down to a simple form called Tetracycline, which also has amazing effectivity against diseases.

Another antibiotic drug, Terramycin, was derived from the soil. From thence it gets its name from the Latin "terra" meaning earth. This drug, along with those mentioned previously, provide the most effective treatments, are better known, and naturally more widely used, than the remainder of the miracle drugs.

Of all the inventions that man has had the grace to make, to better the world he lives in, antibiotics have to be included among the greatest. When the suffering are aided, the dying saved, this greatness is evident, for surely Providence smiled upon mankind when He allowed them to invent developable antibiotic drugs.

Auburn-Folsom South Unit, California

SPEECH

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 485) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and as one who believes in reclamation, I commend the author of this bill for a sound bill, which will help to build the West and to build the Nation. I enthusiastically support the bill and urge the members of the committee to do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, this is another example of the statesmanship that has prevailed through the years in drafting and enacting reclamation legislation. This is not just a California project; it is a project contributing to the reclamation of the arid Southwest. As an Arizonan, I might have been expected to oppose a project like this for California, since our States in years past have had differences on water matters. However, those days are past, and we find the States of California and Arizona working together now to solve their mutual water problems.

A further example of this cooperation is the Lower Colorado River Basin project bill, which has been introduced in the House by 33 members of the California delegation and the three members of the Arizona delegation. A comprehensive plan to finance long-range solutions to the water needs of the Southwest, this legislation will probably be the next major reclamation proposal to come before the Congress.

The reclamation idea has proved of inestimable value to this Nation, making the deserts bloom and providing a vital resource to the millions of Americans who have moved to the West in recent decades. I am pleased to see this idea being extended today in California and look forward to the day—hopefully soon—when we will extend it to the development of the Lower Colorado River Basin.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Authorizing Certain Construction at Military Installations

SPEECH

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8439) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to offer congratulations to my chairman [Mr. RIVERS] for his leadership with respect to H.R. 8439. It is, indeed, an honor to serve on his committee.

I am pleased to join with my fellow committee members in giving this bill unanimous approval. It is as economical and practical as can be made and will sensibly serve our military departments in fiscal year 1966.

There is one part of the bill—section 608—which has caused considerable discussion. This section calls for the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department to give prior notice to Congress of any planned closure or substantial reduction to any base. I admit that I had some initial misgivings as to the overall advisability of this provision. However, after due consideration I decided that section 608 would not prevent me from supporting the bill.

First of all, there is no question of the constitutionality of such a provision. Article I, section 8, of the U.S. Constitution reads in part:

> The Congress shall have power * * * to pay the debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;
>
> To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;
>
> To provide and maintain a Navy;
>
> To make rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;
>
> To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The Founding Fathers obviously meant for Congress to hold such power over the military.

May I also add that I believe section 608 would be in the best interests of my district, living as I do in the Dayton, Ohio, area where Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is located.

In the event that an attempt is made to close, move, or substantially reduce Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and it appears that the move is politically inspired to raid the base for parochial reasons, I would have an opportunity to be heard as a result of the process of requiring a notice to the Congress.

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I enthusiastically support the bill with the controversial section included.

New Orleans Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues in the Congress two impressive editorials appearing this month in the New Orleans,

La., States-Item, the afternoon daily newspaper in my hometown of New Orleans.

The first of these editorials points up to the tremendous economic boom now being enjoyed by the citizens of the Metropolitan New Orleans area—a prosperity which surpasses that of the Nation in many spheres of activity.

The second editorial notes that the Greater New Orleans area has now passed the 1 million mark in population, according to the latest Bureau of the Census figures.

The growth of business and industry highlighted by the full entrance of the New Orleans area into the space age with the expanding operations of the NASA-Michoud Plant, are directly tied in, Mr. Speaker, with this population increase which my area is experiencing.

One of the most salient examples that the New Orleans area is striding ahead of the Nation as a whole in economic development and prosperity is the fact that the metropolitan area has enjoyed for the months of April and May 1965, an unemployment rate of 3.6 percent—the lowest rate in almost 10 years. The drop in unemployment in my area since 1961, beginning with the advent of the Kennedy administration and continuing into the Johnson administration, has been nothing short of phenomenal. In 1961, the average rate of unemployment in the New Orleans area was 7.1 percent; the next year the rate had declined to 6.4 percent. In 1963, my area saw unemployment drop to 5.3 percent, and in 1964 the average rate went down to 4.4 percent.

And now, Mr. Speaker, the average unemployment rate for the first 5 months of 1965 has remained just under 4 percent. For the past 2 months—April and May—the rate has been down to 3.6 percent—a full percentage point below the national average for the month of May.

The first editorial, entitled "Unprecedented New Orleans Boom," was based on an excellent series of articles on the area's growth and prosperity in the States-Item newspaper by one of the paper's finest writers, Mr. Robert Kelso. In his series, Mr. Kelso relates the various sources and manifestations of this economic boom in a skillful, colorful manner, including the fantastic expansion of industrial plants in the New Orleans area and along the Mississippi River between New Orleans and Baton Rouge. He terms the expansion of industry, and the establishment of industrial plants, as the biggest single contributor to this unprecedented boom. He also cites the significant rise in retail sales, in building permits issued for new homes, apartment houses and office buildings, in construction contracts awarded, in the increase in salaries and wages, and so on.

Running with this high tide of prosperity, Mr. Kelso points out, is the vibrant National Aeronautics and Space Administration space plant at Michoud. Probably no other single industry has contributed more in the past 3 years to stimulating the economic development and prosperity of the New Orleans area.

But above all, Mr. Speaker, that which Mr. Kelso does not fail to note and to emphasize is the fact that the "Father of the Waters," flowing past the great port of New Orleans, has long been a prime factor in the progress and prosperity of New Orleans and all of south Louisiana. The mighty Mississippi River has helped to make all of this possible.

New week, it will be my pleasure to introduce into the RECORD this first-rate series of stories by Mr. Kelso, and to analyze them in order to show why this unprecedented boom for the New Orleans area and for our entire country has occurred. I will outline the principal reasons for this unparalleled prosperity in my part of the country and in the Nation as a whole. I also will compare those spheres of activity in which the New Orleans area is blessed to be ahead of the national average, at least at this time. And last of all, I will attempt to lay to rest any fears or doubts which the people of the New Orleans area and south Louisiana may have as to the future development of another severe recession, much less a depression like our Nation and much of the world experienced in the period 1929–33. I will show that the dissimilarities between today and the late 1920's are so significant, that a severe depression in our country is very unlikely to ever occur again.

The two editorials, Mr. Speaker, entitled "Unprecedented New Orleans Boom," appearing in the New Orleans States-Item of June 5, 1965, and entitled "New Orleans Area Passes 1 Million Mark," appearing in the issue of June 10, 1965, follow. Under unanimous consent I place them at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New Orleans (La.) States-Item, June 5, 1965]

UNPRECEDENTED NEW ORLEANS BOOM

Expectations of boom times in the New Orleans metropolitan area have been rife during recent years, but the meteoric physical and economic growth that has suddenly swept over this city is far beyond all previous anticipation.

Dimensions of the boom, as measured by States-Item staffer Robert N. Kelso in a series of articles ending today, offer the heady suggestion that New Orleans is not only swiftly cashing in on delayed opportunity, but also establishing new potential at a dizzying pace.

Physical evidence of breakneck expansion abounds everywhere—soaring downtown construction, huge apartment complexes and new houses abuilding by the thousands, multimillion-dollar industrial plants springing up along the river and inland, brisk port activity.

Notable pacemakers are the Michoud moon-rocket plant, currently operating with a billion dollars' head of contractual steam and hiring 12,000 employees who are pouring $90 million a year into the city's economy, and Avondale Shipyards, which now has in excess of a quarter of a billion dollars' construction underway.

But those are only the readily visible evidences of skyrocketing expansion. Other proof may be read in statistics which measure economic change, such as:

Housing permits are up 78 percent for the first 3 months of 1965, with 11,000 units expected to be completed before year's end.

During 1964 alone, more than $500 million was earmarked for new plants or industrial expansion.

Unemployment currently stands at an almost negligible 3.7 percent.

Retail sales in the area during the first quarter reached $494.2 million, a 16 percent increase over the same period last year.

Bank clearings during the first quarter soared to $5 billion, up 13.2 percent, while homestead savings reached $627.7 million, up 12.7 percent.

New Orleans' boom, of course, takes its principal impetus from two significant sources: clustering of plants along the river and recently begun rocket-building activity at Michoud, which elevated this metropolitan area to an enviable industrial position in the dawning space age.

And it's worth noting that the area's water resources are the chief attraction for new and expanding industry—fresh water for plants along the Mississippi River and the Intracoastal Canal for shipping Saturn moon rockets to Cape Kennedy.

Equally responsible for the city's current, apparently limitless expansion, however, are expressions of confidence in the form of outside development capital and the unprecedented release of local capital.

So brisk is such development that New Orleans suddenly finds itself entertaining strong hopes of overtaking those other southern cities which have passed it up during postwar years.

Although excitement over the future is justified, sight should not be lost of self-imposed handicaps which serve to ballast this city's economic revitalization.

The Kelso series pinpoints two of these drawbacks as a severely undereducated population and property assessment inequities as they exist under an antiquated system.

Were these barriers removed, floodgates of development and industrialization would surely swing further open.

[From the New Orleans (La.) States-Item, June 10, 1965]

NEW ORLEANS AREA PASSES 1 MILLION MARK

Substantiation of New Orleans' soaring growth comes with announcement by the U.S. Census Bureau that the local metropolitan area's population has zoomed past the 1 million mark.

In an estimate based upon vital statistics, migratory trends and similar data, the Bureau counts in excess of 1,001,000 noses in the four-parish area, compared with 907,000 in 1960.

Contributing to the local population explosion are Orleans Parish's 651,000 persons, up 3.7 percent over 1960; Jefferson Parish's 261,000, up 25.2 percent; St. Bernard's 42,000, a 29.6 percent increse, and St. Tammany's 48,000, an increase of 24 percent.

In a mathematical-minded society that attaches significance to impressive numbers, ascension of the metropolitan area to the 1 million plateau justifies chest swelling.

But such an achievement should come with no great surprise. At the time of the last decennial census, New Orleans had not yet entered its current era of vigorous development.

Since then, however, evidences of accelerating growth have been marked. There has been a virtual implosion of industry and enterprise into the area.

Telling stimulus has been exerted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's local investment in rocket-assembling and support activities. Meanwhile, record homebuilding and downtown construction are hard pressed to stay abreast of the galloping economy.

Although breast thumping is in order, New Orleans should be aware of a sobering note in the Census Bureau statistics.

This metropolitan area's growth rate was pegged at a considerable 10.4 percent, which would ordinarily raise hopes of recapturing New Orleans' former distinction as Queen City of the South.

But other southern urban areas are showing even greater expansion rates—Tampa-St. Petersburg, 12.6 percent; Miami, 13 percent; Atlanta, 14.9 percent; Dallas, 16.3 percent.

That New Orleans is ninth in growth rate of 23 urban concentrations selected for population estimates, however, shows that the local metropolis is on the march.

And that five of these nine are in the South suggests the regional nature of the economic and physical extension which New Orleans shares.

Naval Reserve Components and the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD two articles which appeared in the June 1965 issue of Navy magazine, telling the story of our Naval Air Reserve and the Naval Reserve and their unique importance to our national defense:

THE NAVAL AIR RESERVE

BORN BEFORE WORLD WAR I, IT HAS HAD A ROLE IN EVERY MAJOR U.S. FOREIGN CRISIS SINCE—40 SQUADRONS NOW AT THE READY

In every national emergency since the American Revolution, a military reserve force of civilians has played a major role in the destiny of our Nation. Paul Revere started it when he made his famous ride to summon the Minutemen to fight the British at Lexington.

The Minutemen of today's Naval Air Reserve bear little resemblance to their forefathers in uniform or weaponry, but they possess the same spirit and motivation.

The history of Reserve aviation in the Navy dates back almost to the beginning of naval aviation itself. In February 1914, an act was passed by Congress to promote the efficiency of the Naval Militia, as the Naval Reserve was called then. In April of the same year plans were initiated for an aeronautic force in the Naval Militia. General Order No. 153 of June 10, 1915, established the principle of lending planes to States having such forces in their Naval Militia. The aircraft became available with the Appropriation Act of August 29, 1916, which specifically provided for 12 planes for the militia.

Hangar in a barn

Several college groups organized and applied for enrollment. Participation and organization was on a voluntary basis. The fact that a squadron consisted of a single plane, hangared in an abandoned garage or barn, or that there were little or no funds for operating, did not dampen the spirits of these men.

The first group was organized by Trubee Davison and was known as the Yale unit. The members trained at their own expense, first at Palm Beach, Fla., and later at Huntington, N.Y. Other such groups trained at Newport News, Va., and Buffalo, N.Y. These units provided a nucleus for wartime expansion and in 1917 were integrated into the Regular Forces.

Soon after the signing of the armistice, the Reserves were demobilized. By 1922, the Naval Reserve Flying Corps was completely inactive. But on November 4 of that year, the Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics recommended to the Secretary of the Navy that a Naval Aviation Reserve be fostered and efficiently maintained. In 1923, hundreds of letters from former naval aviators poured into the Bureau, indicating a widespread interest. On April 13, 1923, the Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics recommended a definite Naval Reserve aviation policy and in May preparation commenced. On November 16, 1923, the plan was approved and Naval Reserve aviation began to take shape again, increasing to 8 activities and then to 12 by 1933.

How to get fuel

Pilots of the early planes were plagued with supply problems. Meager funds limited the amount of fuel that could be purchased and many ruses were used to augment the number of flight hours. With possibly larcenous means, but with an honest end, the unit at Long Beach devised a method to requisition additional fuel for their operations. Long Beach was one of the stopping points of navigation hops out of North Island and the planes usually refueled at the Navy Reserve hangar. A typical conversation at the time probably went something like this:

"Did you fill the tank?" "Yes sir, clear to the top." "There must be some mistake on this gas chit. It says you put in 100 gallons." "That's right, sir—it was almost empty." "It must have been because the tank only holds 80 gallons."

Gas consumption from San Diego to Long Beach was high, but the Navy actually gained by it.

Maintenance problems were equally vexing. Spare parts were practically unknown and many of the biwinged planes were kept "up" with parts fabricated through the ingenuity of the crews.

The Naval Air Reserve organization of the twenties also engaged in preliminary flight training. Seamen second class with an aptitude for flying were given primary flight training. Those who qualified were then sent to Pensacola for completion of training and assigned to the fleet as an ensign for a year. At the end of this time they returned to inactive duty with an aviation fleet division of the Naval Reserve where they maintained their proficiency with regular drills and an annual 15-day active duty training cruise.

The 1930's: Peaks and valleys

By 1933, additional Reserve bases had been established at Seattle (Sand Point), Oakland, Detroit, and Minneapolis. The years 1932 and 1933 found the greatest progress and improvement in the Naval Reserve Flying Corps. With the delivery of servicetype aircraft, systematic training and competition among the units, morale and enthusiasm were high. The pre-World War II Naval Air Reserve reached its peak in 1933, logging more than 30,000 hours during that year.

The years 1934 through 1938 were a period of decline. This was due to the drastic cuts in appropriations, the toll of age on the veteran pilots and the lack of influx of new pilots from the fleet. As a result, the mobilization potential was far below requirements when the clouds began to gather, foreshadowing the outbreak of World War II.

The months immediately following Pearl Harbor were dark indeed. Our fleet had been seriously crippled. Trained men were at a premium. Reserve Forces were inadequate. The staggering task of molding peaceful civilians into capable fighting men, pilots, mechanics, and technicians in sufficient numbers seemed almost impossible when the added task of thwarting enemy onslaughts required the nucleus of available trained fighting units. Few could be spared for instructors.

Our naval air forces had to be built almost from scratch. The process was exceedingly expensive, both in money and lives. And it was time consuming—too much so. Bitter lessons were learned during those dark months, but they were lessons which have not been forgotten.

Learning the hard way

True, there had been a Naval Air Reserve between wars, but when the chips were down, of the 37,000 men trained in aviation during and after World War I only a handful could be mustered to bolster our forces in the early days of the Second World War. The Navy resolved that this would not be repeated. While plans were being made in the Navy Department to mothball the ships of the fleet, thinking was directed to preserving the expensively taught and difficultly learned know-how of the most important part of the fleet—her officers and men.

On July 1, 1946, the Chief of Naval Air Reserve Training officially raised his two stars at the centrally located naval air station at Glenview, Ill. From here he began the task of molding a trained force of selected reservists capable of joining the fleet on short notice. The effort was to pay off in big dividends just a few years later.

The commander of the Air Force, Pacific Fleet, came back from Korea in April 1952 and wrote a letter to the Chief of Naval Air Reserve Training. He wanted to comment on the performance of naval air reservists in Korea.

"Their operations under difficult flying conditions were something that all naval officers were proud to associate with the Navy itself," wrote Vice Adm. H. M. Martin to Rear Adm. L. A. Moebus. "I sincerely believe that this country never before has had a Reserve so splendidly trained and ready to meet any sudden emergency. I am likewise firmly convinced that never before has our country realized such dividends from a peacetime training program. It is my sincere hope that we will profit from our experience in Korea and continue to maintain our Naval Air Reserve program at peak efficiency."

The Berlin callup

Nearly 10 years later, 3,600 Naval Air reservists were called to active duty as the country engaged in a buildup of military forces to meet the Berlin crisis. Some were veterans of World War II. A number had seen action in Korea. Still others were facing the grim prospect of war for the first time. That war did not develop was attributed in a great degree to their readiness—trained units, ready for action, that immediately upon recall assumed their roles as operational components of the fleet.

The Honorable Carl Vinson, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said:

"These Reserves were ordered to active duty to prevent a war—not to fight a war. They were called to meet the crisis and it is to their everlasting credit that they met that crisis head on. Let us recognize that they performed an invaluable service to the Nation."

The Cuban crisis of October 1962 was the third time since the end of World War II that naval air reservists were called upon to provide supplementary naval strength during a critical period in our Nation's history. Although not actually mobilized to full-time active duty, reservists serving on 2-week active duty training periods and weekend drills responded to the emergency and flew hundreds of flight hours in direct support of our Cuban operations. Included were logistic and surveillance flights which carried tons of supplies and resulted in the detection and reporting of 190 different foreign surface shipping and underwater contacts.

Today the Naval Air Reserve bears little resemblance to the same organization of a few years back. The mission is the same—to provide naval aviation with immediate combat-ready air forces in time of national emergency. The equipment, methods and tactics are different because modern warfare is constantly changing.

Forty ready squadrons

The command consists of 18 major and 4 satellite activities located near major

population areas throughout the United States. The primary responsibility is to provide the aircraft and personnel to field and support 40 fleet-sized air squadrons of all types—light attack and fighter, maritime air and carrier-based ASW squadrons, and a transport capability to lift Naval Air Reserve Forces and equipment and support the increased military air transport service wartime load.

Flying is obviously the most important aspect of training. Each jet pilot and each pilot and aircrewman of the antisubmarine squadrons is authorized to perform 84 drills per year and 2 weeks continuous active training duty. The transport and propeller attrack aircrews perform 60 drills and one 2-week training period. They average three to four flights every month of the year.

What prompts the naval air reservist to give up 1 weekend each month and 2 weeks each summer with his family and friends to participate in the Naval Air Reserve?

While there are certain financial and fringe benefits, money is the least consideration. The great majority of them could earn considerably more money for the weekend or cruise simply by plying their own trade. No—it is much deeper. These citizen volunteers from the 50 States do not rest complacently in a troubled world. Foremost in their hearts is the security of the United States. They give their loyalty, their devotion and, if necessary, their lives to preparedness.

Kennedy accolade

In a letter to recalled reservists after the Berlin crisis, President John F. Kennedy voiced the sentiments of the Nation:

"Since the recall I have been deeply impressed by the wonderful response of our naval reservists, their willing acceptance to sacrifice, and their outstanding performance of duty.

"Our 18 naval air squadrons and the crews of the 40 destroyers and destroyer escorts took their places in the active fleets and bolstered our forces in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Mediterranean, Caribbean, and in the South China Sea. They have demonstrated that the high regard we have always had for the readiness of the Naval Reserve is completely warranted. They merit a resounding 'well done' from a grateful nation."

To our President, and to each citizen of this Nation, the U.S. Naval Air Reserve pledges continued dedication to readiness.

The chiefs of Naval Air Reserve training

Rear Adm. F. D. Wagner, from November 1945 to December 1945.

Rear Adm. E. C. Ewen, from December 1945 to February 1948.

Rear Adm. R. F. Whitehead, from February 1948 to July 1949.

Rear Adm. A. K. Doyle, from July 1949 to August 1951.

Rear Adm. L. A. Moebus, from August 1951 to November 1952.

Rear Adm. D. V. Gallery, from November 1952 to November 1956.

Rear Adm. H. H. Caldwell, from November 1956 to October 1958.

Rear Adm. A. Smith, Jr., from October 1958 to May 1960.

Rear Adm. A. W. McKechnie, from May 1960 to October 1961.

Rear Adm. W. I. Martin, from October 1961 to May 1963.

Capt. E. M. Stever, from May 1963 to July 1963.

Rear Adm. Geo. P. Koch, from July 1963 to ——.

THE NAVAL RESERVE AND NATIONAL DEFENSE: OVER 500,000 MEN AND WAVES CONTRIBUTE TIME AND TALENT TO READINESS EFFORT

Section 262, 10 United States Code: "The purpose of the Reserve components is to provide trained units and qualified persons available for active duty in the Armed Forces, in time of war or national emergency and at such other times as the national security requires, to fill the needs of the Armed Forces whenever, during and after the period needed to procure and train additional units and qualified persons to achieve the planned mobilization, more units and persons are needed than are in the regular components."

Congress has provided each of the armed services legislative authority to procure and train Reserve Forces. The Navy through this authority maintains a large reservoir of trained inactive duty Naval Reserve personnel, both officers and enlisted, who are responsive to the Navy when and if needed.

The organization, training and administration of the Naval Reserve is based on policy set forth in SECNAV (Secretary of the Navy's) Instruction 1001.4:

"The operation, administration and training of the Naval Reserve shall be integrated within the Regular Establishment so completely that all bureaus and offices of the Navy Department, all commands and units of the operating forces and all shore activities of the Naval Establishment shall perform their assigned tasks and functions in connection with the Naval Reserve in the same manner as provided for the Regular Navy."

This policy has resulted in the complete integration of the Navy's reserve forces with the Regular Establishment. The Chief of Naval Personnel, for example, is responsible for the procurement, training, promotion, detailing and retirement of all Naval Reserve personnel in the same manner as for Regular Navy personnel. Once procured, the training of Naval Reserve personnel must be such that their readiness to augment the active duty forces when and as needed is assured. They must be * * * "available for active duty in the Armed Forces in time of war or national emergencies and at such other times as the national security requires. * * *"

METHODS OF TRAINING

Active duty: 2 to 4 years' service with the Operating Forces of the Navy.

Two weeks' active duty for training annually in Navy schools and with the Operating Forces of the Navy.

Inactive duty: 48 drill training periods annually of at least 3 hours' duration each to provide: practical training; team and group training; theoretical training and correspondence courses in professional subjects.

TRAINING ON ACTIVE DUTY

Officers: The professional development of Naval Reserve officers has its beginning with active duty. Before officers are released to inactive duty, they will have completed at least 3 years of duty with the operating forces of the Navy. This readiness is anchored in the professional skills acquired while on active duty.

Enlisted: Annually, some 30,000 Naval Reserve enlisted personnel, principally seamen apprentice and seamen, report to active duty for 2 years with the fleet. It is during these 2 years that the Navy expects them to develop the technical skills necessary to be proven man-of-warsmen.

The active duty period affords enlisted reservists a good opportunity to qualify for and be advanced to petty officer status in a rating consistent with their aptitude and ability. Here again active duty plays an important part in the professional skills development of enlisted reservists, too.

CHURCHILL'S VIEW

When released from active duty, both officers and enlisted can continue their training in one of the 452 Naval Reserve training activities in the continental United States and Hawaii. Their training consists principally of 48 3-hour training periods (drills) and 2 weeks' active duty aboard ship or at a Navy school. New skills are developed; old ones are updated.

In World War II, the late Sir Winston Churchill said of England's reservists: "To be a Reserve is indeed to be twice a citizen."

This can also be said of the some one-half million reservists who unselfishly give of their time and effort to add additional muscle to the Navy's defensive strength.

The Naval Reserve is organized into units to facilitate the augmentation of the fleet and Shore Establishment with both hardware and trained personnel. Some 20 percent of the Navy's initial wartime buildup is comprised of ready reservists. Units of the Ready Reserve given the highest priority training comprise the Selected Reserve. These 4-day forces carry orders to active duty in their pocket at all times. When our country comes under direct attack, or is in danger of attack, these orders will be executed without delay.

The Selected Reserve is further organized into five components to augment the surface, submarine, and naval air arm of the fleet, as well as the Shore Establishment. The missions of the components are:

ASW: To provide trained ASW forces capable of immediate employment at full war complement. Its forces: Destroyers, destroyer escorts, and Reserve crews and aircraft, and Reserve crews.

Mine warfare: To provide trained mine warfare forces capable of immediate employment at full war complement. Its forces: Minesweepers (MSC/MSCO) and Reserve crews.

Fleet support: To provide urgently needed personnel for immediate active duty for the limited augmentation or formation of first priority activities or units, serving with or directly supporting the fleet. Its forces: Harbor defense program, advanced base program, ship activation program, construction battalion programs, Military Sea Transportation Service program, and ship supply officer program.

Active fleet augmentation: To provide trained personnel for immediate active duty to raise the manning level of afloat units of the active fleet to full war complement and for requirements to meet specific needs of other programs in certain rates not being trained therein. Its forces: Surface program, aviation program, submarine program, electronics program, and Hospital Corps program.

Shore establishment: To provide urgently needed personnel for immediate active duty for limited augmentation of various first priority activities of the Shore Establishment. Its forces: Telecommunications censorship program, intelligence program, communications program, mobilization team program, and Naval security group program.

The organization alone lends no strength to the Navy. It is the Navy reservist himself that does. His contribution to the defense of our country is as real as that of his full-time active duty counterpart. Each reservist is keenly aware of the need for him to help himself in readiness for a more active role in the Navy when needed. To this end, he dedicates a considerable portion of his time to keeping ready.

Four Cited for Heroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the genuinely heroic acts of four employees of the Pacific Telephone & Tele-

graph Co.—two of whom—Jerry L. McCain, of Atascadero, Calif., and Ralph Villers, of San Luis Obispo, Calif.—reside in my district.

For their selfless devotion to the welfare of their fellow man, and for their willingness to become involved, the four are scheduled to receive fitting awards.

I join with their families, friends and the general public in saluting these fine Americans who cared enough to render lifesaving assistance to others—even at the risk of their own lives.

Mr. Speaker, an excellent account of their actions, prepared by Lee Cox, appeared in the April 19, 1965, issue of the Central Counties Courier—a publication for employees of the Central Counties area of the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.

I ask unanimous consent to include the article by Mr. Cox, entitled "Four Men Cited for Heroism," at this point in my remarks:

[From the Central Counties Courier, Apr. 19, 1965]

FOUR MEN CITED FOR HEROISM

(By Lee Cox)

Social critics nowadays are fond of pointing their fingers and exclaiming, "people would rather do anything than get involved."

They cite as examples of this trend the people who refuse to give aid to injured motorists and who rationalize their lack of concern by saying "It's none of my business."

These social critics would do well to take a close look at four central counties employees—Jerry McCain, Paul Leggett, Ralph Villers and Arthur Wright.

Each man was faced with an emergency last year, and each made it his business to become involved.

Last week the Bell System and Pacific Telephone honored them for the individual acts they performed.

McCain has been named the recipient of a Vail Silver Medal, the only one awarded in Pacific Telephone history. The medal is named after Theodore N. Vail, first president and chairman of the board of A.T. & T. It goes only to employees who demonstrate a combination of good judgment, courage, and initiative in an emergency.

Villers and Leggett will receive Vail Bronze Medals; and Wright will be awarded a P.T. & T. certificate of honorable mention.

The incident that won McCain the Vail award reads like the script from a Sunday movie serial.

With the agility and derring-do of Batman and Robin, McCain and a companion saved the lives of three seriously injured persons stranded on a rocky ledge 650 feet above the crashing Pacific surf.

The three victims, a woman and two men, were thrown from the car in which they were riding as it careened off a treacherous stretch of Highway No. 1, a mile south of Monterey-San Luis Obispo County line.

During a dramatic 4-hour rescue operation, McCain risked his life by lowering himself on a nylon rope 120 feet down a jagged cliff to reach the injured victims.

As an installer-repairman in Atascadero, McCain had taken an American Red Cross course conducted by the company. It was the principles he learned there that helped him save three lives.

Paul Leggett, a security agent in San Jose, will be presented a Bronze Vail Medal for his calm and careful action after a car that passed him on a narrow road turned broadside, crashed through a wooden fence and slammed into a brick wall.

Four persons were thrown from the car. One, a little girl, landed 65 feet from the site of the crash. A 2½-year-old boy was thrown onto a lawn 30 feet away.

Leggett stopped his car and rushed to the scene. There he found the young boy kneeling on the lawn with his head between his elbows, blood rushing from a severe wound on one arm.

Aware of the need for immediate assistance, Leggett ran to a nearby house to call emergency vehicles.

Returning, Leggett sat on the lawn, cradled the boy in his arms, and applied digital pressure to the boy's left armpit.

Minutes later, highway patrol officers arrived and saw that the boy was so severely injured that he should be taken to a hospital immediately rather than waiting for an ambulance to arrive.

A highway patrolman asked Paul to maintain the digital pressure during the ride to the hospital, and Paul readily agreed.

Today a young boy has a chance to reach manhood because Paul Leggett "would rather get involved than do nothing."

Another Vail Bronze Medal winner is Ralph Villers, a PBX installer who works in San Luis Obispo.

Villers was witness to an automobile accident last September. A 1929 model A Ford that had been following him jumped a divider strip and plowed into a light standard on Highway No. 1 near Carmel.

As Villers watched, a young man stumbled from the damaged car, blood gushing from his throat.

Grabbing a blanket and towel from the back seat of his car, Villers ran to where the injured boy was kneeling. Another motorist had tried to help the victim by placing him on his back, but the injured youth had forced him away.

Villers realized at once that the boy's jugular vein had been severed and that he was strangling from the flow of his own blood.

Immediately Villers put the boy in an upright position, wrapped him in the blanket and placed the towel snugly around his throat to control the bleeding.

Villers continued to care for the boy until the ambulance arrived. Then he insisted that the attendants transport the boy to the hospital in a sitting position.

Three weeks later the boy was released from the hospital, thankful that Ralph Villers had thought carefully, acted quickly, and remained calm.

Installer-repairman Arthur Wright, who will receive a Pacific Telephone Certificate of Honorable Mention, was dispatched on a case of trouble in Sunnyvale last September.

While working on a pole in a residential district, he heard a scream, and, as he descended the pole he saw a woman run from a nearby house, cross the street and return with another woman.

Wright walked to the house and saw the woman standing inside the front door, holding a very small baby and blowing into his mouth.

She immediately handed the baby to him. The baby's face was blue, almost black, and there was no evidence of breathing.

Wright quickly laid the baby on a chair and started mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. On the second breath, the baby's chest rose and he started breathing.

As there were no cars available, Wright put the baby, his mother, and grandmother in the truck and rushed them to the child's doctor. On the way, the baby began to recover its natural color and to breathe easily.

After the doctor examined the infant and found him to be all right, Wright returned the family to their home.

During the time Wright was with the family, he instructed them in mouth-to-mouth resuscitation.

Several days later, the baby again had a severe choking spell. This time the boy's grandmother administered the lifesaving resuscitation that Wright had taught her.

Wright, along with McCain, Leggett, and Villers, are noteworthy examples that it does pay to get involved.

Statement of Roger H. Davison, David M. Kovenock, and Michael K. O'Leary of Dartmouth College, Presented to the Joint Committee on Congresional Organization, June 8, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr Speaker, one of the most valuable statements presented to the Joint Committee on Congressional Organization during the current hearings of that committee was made by three distinguished members of the faculty of Dartmouth College who have specialized in studying the legislative process.

They are: Roger H. Davidson, David M. Kovenock, and Michael K. O'Leary.

Their statement, presented to the Joint Committee on Congressional Organization on June 8, 1965, follows:

STATEMENT OF: ROGER H. DAVIDSON, DAVID M. KOVENOCK, MICHAEL K. O'LEARY, DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, PRESENTED TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

Distinguished cochairmen and members of the joint committee, we deeply appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee to discuss a matter of vital concern for both practitioners and students of politics—the present status and future course of Congress. Your decision to invite scholars to participate in these investigations is particularly gratifying to those of us who have long considered Capitol Hill as a most instructive vantage point from which to learn about our political system.

At the outset we should concede that, in general, we are favorably disposed to existing congressional institutions and practices. In this respect we may depart from many (though certainly not all) of our professional colleagues. The political science fraternity has often revealed a distinct preference for executive institutions. The historical reasons for this are in themselves revealing. First, since the New Deal, the executive branch has been the repository of liberal policy values shared by many academic political scientists. Second, the Executive embodies to a greater degree the expertise, functional specialization, and tidy organization so highly prized by academicians—many of whom have been schooled in the traditional techniques of administrative management. And third, to the extent that political scientists have had governmental experience, they have been predominantly associated with executive agencies.

Seen from the Executive's perspective, congressional initiatives are often interpreted as meddlesome or reactionary interference. Much of the impetus for congressional reform, we suspect, has arisen from the attempt to reshape Congress in the image of the Executive. We take strong exception to the implications of many of these proposals; and we wish to express our preference for a vital, autonomous legislature. We believe that history has validated the judgment of the Framers of the Constitution, who concluded that no institution, no matter how efficient, could generate internal checks sufficient to control its operations.

PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD CONGRESS

Every citizen should share a lively concern for the objectives of Senate Concurrent

Resolution 2. Unfortunately, however, few citizens indeed will ever hear of this committee or its work. Public understanding of congressional organization is narrowly circumscribed, a fact which greatly complicates the problem of the congressional "image." We feel it would be useful to open our presentation by discussing environment of public attitudes toward Congress as an institution.

First, Congress lacks the unique visibility and respect accorded in our political system to the Presidency. A sizable segment of the public, especially at the upper educational levels, seems to share the cartoonists' image of the Congressman as a loquacious and not-too-trustworthy individual. According to one opinion survey, nearly two-thirds of the college-educated respondents considered Representatives as mediocre; almost half of the same group made a similar judgment of Senators. This finding is especially significant in light of the fact that better educated citizens tend to be the most informed and active participants in American politics.

Secondly, public assessments of Congress are highly volatile. Surveys of public opinion over the past 25 years reveal great variations in the way people have viewed congressional performance. Public approval is usually high in times of national emergency; in normal times approval is moderate, with a sizable minority critical of Congress. When partisan controversy is especially acrimonious, or when Congress is slow in resolving legislation before it, public disaffection increases. Such a crisis of public confidence occurred during 1963, when much of the Kennedy administration's legislative program was stalemated on Capitol Hill. Almost half of the people interviewed in the fall of 1963 by one survey organization felt that Congress was doing a poor job. This situation was somewhat alleviated by late 1964, when only 35 percent of the respondents gave Congress a negative assessment.

A third and related finding is that Congress is evaluated in large part on the basis of specific legislation which it does, or does not, pass. Surveys indicate that a major reason for dissatisfaction with Congress is that it is slow, or that it is unable to pass bills desired by certain segments of the population. Conversely, Congress is applauded when it approves specific legislation, or simply because it passed a lot of bills. Apparently the ongoing and unglamorous work of Congress in such areas as legislative oversight goes largely unnoticed by the general public.

Finally, the public tends to view Congress through the prism of the presidency. Our analysis of public opinion data indicates that members of the President's party tend to view Congress more favorably than do members of the out party, whether or not their party also controls one or both Houses of Congress. There is no precise explanation for this, but we assume that persons of the President's party merely suppose that their party is "the government in power," and that they evaluate other Federal institutions accordingly. It should be noted, however, that there is wide public acceptance for the notion of having the President and the majority in Congress represent opposing political parties.

These findings imply, regrettably, that specific congressional reforms will receive little, if any, public attention. Those rare occasions of public excitement over congressional organization and procedures arise when these issues are linked directly in the public mind with policy conflicts. The identification of Speaker Joseph Cannon with obstruction of progressive legislation in the first decade of this century; the House Rules Committee's blockage of a whole series of social welfare bills in the late 1950's; and the inevitable association of the Senate filibuster with Southern opposition to civil rights legislation—these examples come readily to mind. "Congressional reform" as an issue is most salient in times of political stalements; yet it is precisely at such times that broad reforms are most difficult to effect, because attitudes are intense, large legislative majorities are simply not available, and energies are consumed in more immediate policy conflicts.

When the flow of legislation becomes relatively smooth, impetus for reform quickly subsides. To debate congressional reorganization during such times is to work in a political vacuum so far as the general public is concerned. This is unquestionably the situation we find ourselves in at this moment. Nonetheless, the problem of adapting Congress to its complex tasks is still with us; and it is in this atmosphere of relative public apathy that this committee must pick its way, carefully considering the strategies and tactics of congressional change.

WHAT DO CONGRESSMEN THINK?

It is no surprise that Congressmen, like members of the public at large, are concerned with changes in congressional organization and procedure primarily when such changes are instrumental to some other goals. And the goals of Congressmen are diffuse and often conflicting.

Because changes in the structure or rules of Congress may redistribute resources available to the institution or its Members, such changes are likely to alter the outcomes of political conflicts. As one political scientist has so aptly put it, members of all parliamentary bodies are continually preoccupied with inventing plausible reasons for changing rules in a way that is likely to work to their advantage. Sometimes the advantage sought is not over other participants in the political process. Reforms are occasionally advocated so that legislators can better perform their complex and demanding jobs. But in most cases, suggestions for reform of Congress seek to alter, frequently marginally and occasionally fundamentally, the existing distribution of power—between some Members and others, between incumbents and challengers, between one policy viewpoint and its opposition, between one party and the other, between the House and the Senate, and between Congress and the Executive. Reform of Congress is an intensely political undertaking. But this fact does not preclude the possibility of change.

Whatever the nature and intensity of outside professional or popular comment, the fate of congressional reorganization is ultimately a matter for Congress itself. This has been the underlying premise of our own studies on the politics of congressional reform, studies undertaken under the auspices of the public affairs center at Dartmouth College.

DARTMOUTH SURVEY OF CONGRESS

During the 88th Congress we conducted interviews with a sample of 115 Members of the House of Representatives with two general purposes in mind. First, we sought to identify the attitudes of Congressmen toward their own problems and the problems of Congress as an institution. Second, in an attempt to understand the congressional market for reform, we also probed the attitudes of Members toward many of the typical proposals for change. Our purpose was neither to advance nor hinder reform, but rather to obtain an accurate picture of the congressional point of view. Our preliminary findings have been made available to the joint committee, and we would like merely to summarize them at this time.

On the general question of reform of the House of Representatives, the "noes" have it. By combining the responses of our entire sample of Members to each of 32 typical reform measures, we can say that only slightly over one-third of the House supports reform as a general proposition, while nearly two-thirds oppose it. Moreover, the intensity of opposition is clearly stronger than the intensity of support.

The characteristics of Representatives who support and those who oppose this generalized notion of change differ in a number of respects which are crucial to an understanding of the politics of congressional reorganization. Surprisingly, we found little difference between Democrats and Republicans in the level of their support for change. However, Democrats tend to vary more widely in their views than Republicans: a higher proportion of Democrats are found among both those who strongly oppose change and those who strongly support it.

Opponents and supporters of reform are divided about equally in all geographical regions except the South, where only 11 percent of those interviewed indicated a balance of support for the reorganization items. Members from urban and suburban districts are considerably more disposed to support change than are Representatives from rural constituencies.

While some have assumed that positive attitudes toward institutional change are part and parcel of a more generalized liberal outlook on public policy, our analysis did not produce such a clear-cut relationship. The division of proponents and opponents of congressional reform remained constant (about 30 percent in support and 70 percent in opposition) with varying levels of support for the legislative policies of the Democratic administration, except among the very stanchest advocates of the administration viewpoint, where a slight proreform majority was evident.

The most important correlates of antipathy toward the idea of reform are high seniority and formal leadership position within the House. Though support for change tends to decrease with increasing seniority, freshman Members are not the only group backing change. Approximately 60 percent of those who have spent less than 10 years in the House favor, on balance, the list of reform proposals. Among Representatives who have served 10 or more years, however, the average level of support drops sharply to 12 percent. Separating the views of formal leaders (elected party leaders and the chairmen and ranking members of the committes and subcommittees) from those of nonleaders uncovers a predictable pattern—since formal leadership position is a corollary of seniority in the Congress. Nonleaders are about equally split between those favoring and those opposing change, while only about one out of five formal leaders interviewed is, on the average, an advocate of structural and procedural reform in the House.

Opposition by these party and seniority leaders is a major factor to be considered in any assessment of the likelihood of reorganization. The typical Congressman's assumption that the senior Members of both parties are generally opposed to most suggestions for reform perhaps helps account for the fact that although 14 of the 32 proposals received the support of a majority of our respondents, only four of these 14 were judged by a majority as having at least an even chance of being adopted by the House in the next decade.

ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESULTS

The opposition of most Congressmen to the general notion of reform and the apparent absence of strong Member disaffection with the performance of Congress should not be permitted to obscure the fact that Congressmen do perceive themselves—and the House—as being confronted with a number of problems, many of them far from trivial. To critics attempting to rationalize the operation of the House by engineering consent for change, these problems might seem to provide the basis from which reorganization proposals might be drawn. But to ob-

serve that all Members perceive individual and institutional problems is not to prove that treating congressional reform as a classical exercise in rational problem solving is the most realistic and efficient route to change.

In the first place, the problems mentioned by the Congressmen we interviewed fall into a large number of diverse categories. This is in part the result of the divergent perspectives from which Members see their own jobs and that of the institution as a whole. It also reflects an absence of consensus on public policy objectives. Moreover, most of the problems identified by Congressmen relate to conditions which are only marginally, if at all, susceptible to reform. About one-third of the problems mentioned might be labeled "endemic." These are problems inherent in a legislative system where men and women of finite capacity grapple with issues and problems of near infinite dimensions. Nearly one-half of the problems enumerated by the Representatives relate to the capabilities of House leaders, the quality of individual Members, and the overall American electoral system. This second group of problems in theory may be open to solution, but they are of a scope which is far broader than that usually considered as congressional reform. This means that perhaps one-fifth of the problems mentioned can conceivably be dealt with through internal House reorganization. This figure, though small, is far from insignificant. There are few people who would be unhappy in a world where one-fifth of all their problems were removed. It is these problems—such as the operation of the committee system, scheduling, and staffing—that provide a realistic starting point for considering congressional reorganization.

But again we must question any orderly assumptions about how change may be expected to take place. Even universal recognition of a given problem does not insure acceptance of a specific remedy. Intervening factors greatly complicate any pattern of agreement both on problems and on possible solutions. Congressmen who agree on the existence of problems of procedure and scheduling may heatedly disagree on the question of whether changes should be made to expedite the legislative program of the President, or to promote alternatives to executive branch proposals. As Members move from abstract and general agreement on problems toward actual implementation of specific proposals, differences in goals could well become more obvious and serve to inhibit innovation. Furthermore, even when Members agree on desired goals, they may differ strongly as to whether a given change will in fact lead to the expected result.

There is considerable appeal for viewing the strategy of congressional reform as one of moving logically and rationally from problems to solutions. The difficulty of the engineering approach is that although its procedures can be described, they can seldom be utilized. For this approach assumes a high potential for consensus on what are now widely disputed goals. It calls for comprehensive means-ends analysis involving information and foresight beyond the grasp of even the highly talented. And it presumes that Members of the House and their staffs are now, or can be, motivated to readjust radically their busy schedules and devote considerable time to a self-conscious evaluation of congressional reform, a matter which at best is of marginal interest to them.

Nevertheless, support for specific reorganization proposals may occur even in the absence of agreement on goals, problems, and means-ends relationships. Three recent congressional innovations appeared on the list of 32 specific reform proposals which we submitted to our sample of Members of the 88th Congress.

All three of these changes—the establishment of this committee, the provision for a highly-paid staff assistant to each Representative, and the reinstatement of the "21-day rule"—were among the 14 reform proposals which received a favorable balance of support over opposition. And two of these three recent changes ranked first and second in terms of the Members' estimates of the likelihood of House acceptance of specific reorganization proposals. (Of the 11 remaining reform proposals which were backed by a majority of Members of the 88th Congress, only 2 were judged by the Members to have at least a 50–50 chance of adoption by the House in the next decade: a change in House rules to permit the broadcasting or telecasting of committee hearings, and the scheduling of yearlong congressional sessions with specified periodic recesses.)

Changes in the composition of the House brought about by the 1964 elections have most certainly increased the likelihood of adoption of at least a small number of modest changes in House organiaztion and procedure. Our analysis would suggest that such an increase in support for reform has been brought about not so much by the increase in the number of so-called liberal or proadministration Democrats, but rather by the increase in the proportion of Congressmen at the lowest seniority levels and by the growing number of Members who represent urban and suburban districts.

Congressional reform, we have noted, becomes more salient to the public in times of political stalemate. But in the 89th Congress the flow of legislation has so far been relatively smooth, a condition which reduces the outside impetus for reform. The temporary reduction in the level of policy conflict on Capitol Hill may free some of the time, energy, and political credit of a sufficient number of Congressmen to study—and perhaps support—changes in congressional organization and procedure.

GUIDELINES FOR CHANGE

While political scientists and legislators share an uneasiness concerning congressional operations, they are hardly agreed as to the objectives of congressional reorganization, much less the specific forms which these changes ought to assume. Often, proposals seem to be predicated upon no consistent conception of what Congress should be expected to do. We urge this committee to give priority to the task of articulating the objectives of Congress, and the criteria by which its performance is to be judged. Only in this context will specific proposals be meaningful. As a fragmentary example of the kind of intellectual operation which should be undertaken, we have set down a few of the criteria which we have used in sifting and evaluating the proposals we wish to recommend to the committee.

1. Congress should be organized so that no political group making demands upon it will be permanently or severely deprived of the opportunity to achieve its goals. (This is not to imply that all groups, no matter how small or extreme, have an equal right to success. But it does mean that barriers to such groups should not be embodied in congressional rules or procedures, but rather in the good sense of the American people and their representatives.) That is to say, congressional rules should not consistently predetermine the outcome of the numerous conflicts which infuse vitality into American politics. This is true for conflict arising from economic and geographic interests, and no less for competition between institutionally based groups—incumbent versus challenger, senior versus junior Members, majority party versus minority, Senate versus House, and Executive versus Congress. Reform proposals should be rejected if they give inordinant advantage to one or more of these sets of actors, or if they serve merely to facilitate some partisan or policy expedient.

2. Congressmen should be equipped to participate successfully in what has been termed the "game against nature"—the race to apply at least a modicum of organized information to decision-making in a world of increasing complexity. Perfect rationality in decision-making is perhaps unattainable; nor should legislators duplicate executive branch specialization in their effort to make informed judgments on technical matters. Indeed, the legislator's unique contribution to decision-making is not so much technical expertise as a sense of the strains and tolerances of the political system. Yet Congress has a serious problem in obtaining adequate technical information. Four out of every five Congressmen told us that "lack of information" and "complex decision-making" were major problems preventing them from doing their job as they would like. Satisfying this criterion, therefore, is a major task of congressional organization.

3. Any proposed change must be examined closely for its probable effects, and not simply for its conformity to abstract models of neat or orderly structure. If we adopt reform A, we ought to be reasonably certain it will lead to desired result X, rather than undesired results Y or Z. (An illustration of this problem is the suggestion for the use of electronic voting devices for floor rollcalls. Some efficiency-minded reformers see electronic voting as a method of saving at least an hour of the Congressmen's time each day of the session; but many Members, equally concerned with demands on their time, predicted a "horror show" of unanticipated consequences of this allegedly efficient innovation.)

4. Some assurance that the proposed change will meet with the acceptance of Members should direct attention toward some proposals and away from others. Our own findings provide some relatively precise measures of sentiment on a number of proposals. This requirement is of greater salience for congressional proponents of change than for outside observers such as ourselves. It is the congressional sponsors who must weigh the desirability of various changes against the task of obtaining a favorable vote.

Not all of these criteria can be satisfied in every case; and some of the criteria are perhaps more fundamental than others. (We have listed them in order of importance.) The following proposals are, we think, consistent with the "philosophy of change" outlined above.

SPECIFIC PROPOSALS

Staffing: It is our conclusion that staff assistance to Congressmen is deficient in three major areas: personal staffs, committee staffs, and staffing for the minority party. Day-to-day problems in the Congressman's office create a hectic and erratic schedule. The demands on a Member's time prevent him from becoming conversant with more than a tiny fraction of the substantive issues on which he must take a position and vote. We support increased staff allowances for Members and committees. Some assistance is needed to help the Congressman carry on the details of operating his office. Additional help is needed in research and factfinding on legislative issues. We strongly urge that additional staff be made responsible to individual Members or legislative committees. We oppose the relegation of constituent services to a nonelective office (an "Ombudsman"). Such a scheme would interrupt the vital communications between the Congressman and his constituency, and would probably impair his effectiveness in overseeing administrative agencies.

We also want to record our agreement with the minority party's protest over staffing. One may argue over how much power a minority should have to amend or delay legislation, but certainly it cannot be denied that the minority should have the resources to develop meaningful alternatives to majority proposals. The Congressional arm of

the minority party is increasingly its most active and visible segment and is closest to the actual process of national policymaking. Minority staff representation should be assured for all legislative committees. And party policy committees should be established, with staff provided from legislative appropriations.

The difficulty of persuading the majority to make concessions to the minority in such matters is well known. Although our survey showed that a majority of the entire House (57 percent) favored increased minority staffing on committees, more than 60 percent of the majority party, including most of its leaders, opposed it.

Scheduling: A second set of proposals relates to the problems of scheduling legislative sessions. Our survey included two questions relating to scheduling: holding year-long sessions with specified periodic recesses, and formally designating specific days for floor or committee business, increasing the days for floor business as the session proceeds. Better than 60 percent of our respondents endorsed these two proposals. More importantly, this desire for a more orderly allocation of times arises from countless personal and family hardships undergone by Congressmen under the present system. Both the Member and his constituents would be better served if the legislator could anticipate when he would have substantial blocks of time available for trips to his political home base. And in Washington, time could be better allocated under a system in which time formally allotted to floor and committee business coincided more closely with the normal cycle of legislative business.

District of Columbia: Congress should divest itself of its current governing power over the District of Columbia. Under present arrangements our national legislature is forced to be both a colonial power and a part-time city council—tasks for which it is ill fitted. We are aware that full account must be taken of the inevitable preeminence of the Federal Government as the District No. 1 industry. (Many of the bare majority—53 percent—who opposed this provision in our questionnaire did so because we left the details of self-government unspecified; but few were able to offer what we considered valid arguments in favor of the present practice.) Any discussion of admittedly difficult details must, we believe, be predicated on the recognition that congressional talents should not be dissipated in the minutiae of District affairs.

Seniority: It would be futile to repeat the countless arguments for and against the seniority system. We generally concur with the great majority of Congressmen who feel (to paraphrase Sir Winston Churchill) that seniority is the worst method of selecting chairmen—except for all the others. We nevertheless suggest two modifications of the present application of the seniority system, one to limit the system and one to extend it.

We advocate a modest change in rules which will increase the chances for the majority party to exert at least a small amount of influence over committee chairmen. (The following discussion applies also to the minority party and ranking minority members.) We propose the following: At the beginning of every Congress, there shall be an automatic secret ballot in the party caucus to determine the chairman of each committee. The rules would provide that the most senior member of each committee shall become its chairman unless another member of the committe receives two-thirds of all votes cast. The provision for an automatic secret ballot eases the way for those who are dissatisfied with the status quo. The requirement of a two-thirds vote means that the seniority leader would be bypassed only in the most extreme cases of dissatisfaction. The task of calling chairmen to account for their actions would remain difficult, but the mere requirement of this repeated vote of confidence would tend to make seniority leaders more responsive to their legislative colleagues.

We recommend additionally that the principle of seniority be extended to include rights on subcommittees as well as full committees. We suggest that the choice of subcommittee membership be decided according to seniority on the full committee; and that rank on the subcommittee be determined by seniority on that subcommittee. This may help counteract a source of dissatisfaction which is widely observed in Congress: the situation of the middle-seniority Congressman who has relatively long service but is still dependent on a committee chairman for such perquisites as subcommittee chairmanships. (This system need not preclude voluntary arrangements made on grounds other than seniority.)

Ethics: We have earlier stated that most steps Congress might take to improve itself, however desirable per se, are unlikely to have much impact upon public thinking. We will conclude with one probably exception to this statement—the subject of ethics. Perhaps we cannot establish comprehensive standards of proper behavior for public officials. But we can move toward prohibiting the more blatant forms of misconduct; and we can make available information from which citizens may form their own judgments about their representatives. Our recommendations closely follow two items in the Report of the 26th American Assembly (Nov. 1, 1964):

First, each Congressman should be required to report annually his financial interests, sources of income, and the way in which he has utilized office and staff allowances.

Second, the holding of reserve military commissions by Congressmen is a clear case of political conflict of interest, and is of doubtful constitutionality. We recommend that this practice be forbidden.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In presenting our findings to this committee, we acknowledge the inherently limited viewpoint of the scholar, who most typically views legislative institutions as an observer rather than a participant. And as observers we as a profession need to undertake much more study of Congress than we have so far done. Our own research has been limited to the House of Representatives; and we have omitted from our discussion such specialized subjects as political campaigning and the appropriations process. We hope, however, that what we have had to say about politics of congressional organization will be of some use to this committee. Finally, we would be remiss if we did not take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the approximately 120 Members of Congress, and their staffs, who participated in our study, contributing their valuable time and sharing with us insight into the legislative process. We hope that this presentation will in some small measure repay their generosity.

Excellent Program for Duquesne University of Pittsburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of one of Pittsburgh's outstanding citizens, Chancellor John Wright, bishop of the Catholic Diocese, the guidance of the Very Reverend Henry J. McAnulty, president, and excellent university administrative and faculty direction, Duquesne University is rising fast among our outstanding U.S. educational institutions of higher learning.

As a long-time friend of Duquesne University, I am calling to the attention of the U.S. Congress and the American people, the broad outline of the program of Duquesne University sent to me by my good friend Ed J. Hanley, chairman of the Duquesne University Foundation and chairman of the board and president of Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp.

Duquesne is a fine resource of the Pittsburgh community as Ed Hanley states. It is becoming more and more a resource for the whole country. We friends are proud of the giant stride and progress now being made by Duquesne University.

The outline of the program follows:

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY

Founded 1878 by the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, a society of priest-teachers.

Accredited by the State Council on Education of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction, Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Individual schools and departments of the university hold memberships in numerous professional societies.

Achieved university status, 1911–now contains eight schools.

College of arts and sciences, 1878; the graduate school, 1911; school of law, 1911; school of business administration, 1913; school of pharmacy, 1925; school of music, 1926; school of education, 1929; school of nursing, 1937; and two separate institutes, institute of African affairs, 1957; degree-granting, partially Government-supported, and institute of man, 1963.

Offers 38 undergraduate majors, 20 for the master's degree and Ph. D. programs in chemistry (1952), philosophy (1956), English (1958), and psychology (1960).

Through the division of educational services offers noncredit courses in continuing education, inplant training programs, management seminars, conferences, and long-term courses tailored for specific community groups; is currently administering a pioneering program in Pittsburgh's "Hill" District under a $150,000 grant from the Area Redevelopment Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce to see if the right environment might be created in a culturally and economically deprived neighborhood to bring into existence a group of small business enterprises where none has existed; to develop a workable program which might become a prototype for the Federal war on poverty program in Appalachia.

Teaching faculty—fall 1964, 378; men 308; women 70; full-time 304; part-time 74; laymen and women 341; priests 37, Catholic 72 percent; Protestant 20 percent; Jewish 8 percent.

Visiting European professor programs in philosophy, psychology, theology.

Administration, 68; men 57; women 11; full-time 65; part-time 3; laymen and women 52; priests 16.

Clerical workers, 171.

Maintenance force, 182.

Libraries:

Law—unique in that it is open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to students and professional bench and bar; 35,000 volumes.

University—special collections include the African room, the French in the Ohio Valley, and the History of Catholicism in western Pennsylvania; 167,000 volumes; 1,800 titles in periodicals.

Enrollment—fall 1964, 7,088; men 4,065; women 3,023; full-time 4,399; part-time 2,689; graduate 1,765; undergraduate 5,323; 88 percent from Allegheny County itself; 90 percent from Pennsylvania; 10 percent from 32 other States, District of Columbia; 14 foreign countries and American possessions abroad. Resident students 1,190 or 16.7 percent—fall 1964.

Scholarships, loans, grants-in-aid awarded 1963-64 fall, spring, summer by Duquesne $783,033 to 2,655 students.

Noted university activities: Tamburitzans; Ray DeFade Jazz Orchestra; Ranger Raiders; WDUQ-FM; Duquesne Dukes—basketball varsity that has participated 11 times in the National Invitational Basketball Tournament, New York City; concert choir, sings regularly with Pittsburgh Symphony, appeared with them in Carnegie Hall, New York City; debate society; university speakers' bureau; symphonic band; Red Masquers (theater group); management forum; Mid-East Instrumental Conference; Duke (all-America student newspaper); and Duquesne magazine.

Alumni—Fall 1964: 17,865 men and women, 60 percent in Allegheny County; 17 percent from other parts of Pennsylvania; 22 percent in 49 other States; 1 percent in 36 foreign countries.

Campus: Present size, 12.9 acres; projected, 36.9 acres.

Master plan: Phase I: Science center (construction), projected cost, $6,200,000, scheduled for construction, 1965; university center (construction), projected cost, $3,200,000, scheduled for construction, 1965; administration building (rehabilitation), projected cost, $500,000.

Phase II: School of music building, library's second addition, college hall, faculty housing.

Phase III: Fieldhouse, ROTC quarters, permanent athletic field, landscaping.

Duquesne University Press, founded 1927—Member, Association of American University Presses, publishes seven periodicals, seven continuing series of books, two reprint pamphlet series among its annual output.

Bureau of research: In business, community, and Government affairs, founded, 1957; member, Associated University Bureaus of Business and Economics Research; undertakes independent research projects, publishes monographs, and contracts services for indsutrial and governmental units.

Research projects of faculty currently underwritten by Government and foundation grants of $310,485.

Tuition: Average undergraduate, $1,300 per year; graduate, $38 per credit, room and board, $870 to $950.

Total annual operating budget: 1963-64, $6.5 million; 1964-65, $7.8 million.

Total assets: $26,975,184.97.

Total faculty endowment fund: $822,368.63.

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY: THE SCHOOL OF LAW

Founded in 1911, the year in which Duquesne was accorded university status by the State Council on Education of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction; accredited by the American Bar Association; member of the Association of American Law Schools; approved by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

Offers the degree of bachelor of laws in two distinct programs—daytime program of 3 years (instituted in 1958) and evening program of 4 years (instituted in 1911—now the only evening law division in western Pennsylvania), with identical standards for admission and continuance in the two divisions.

Coeducational; located first in the former George building on Fourth Avenue; moved to Canevin Hall on campus, 1923; moved to former Fitzsimons Building on Fourth Avenue, 1932; permanently located on campus in 1958 in Rockwell Hall of Law and Business Administration, seventh, eighth, and ninth floors.

Dean: Thomas F. Quinn, A.B., LL.B., M.B.A.; assistant dean: Sally Mrvos, B.S., LL.B.

The school of law cooperates closely with the professional bench and bar; with its faculty serving on committees of the Allegheny County Bar Association and taking active part in community affairs; with its curriculum mirroring the current concerns of the legal profession, subjected by a faculty curriculum committee to a constant process of revaluation, revision, and change, where advisable. Example: Duquesne's expanding interest in the trade regulation field and the field of patent law; with the school hosting for the past 6 years, helping to organize, and direct the 1- and 2-day institutes in continuing legal education cosponsored by the American Law Institute and the Pennsylvania and Allegheny County Bars; with the John E. Laughlin Memorial Law Library, 8th floor, Rockwell Hall, probably the only law library in the Nation open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week; its highly workable current collection of approximately 40,000 volumes available to the bench and bar as well as to the law school student body; its ultimate capacity—in excess of a quarter million volumes; with the Duquesne Law Review issued for the first time as an annual, winter 1963; with the Institute of Forensic Sciences established 1964 for research, development, and teaching of matters touching upon medical-legal relationships; with the more than 800 Duquesne law alumni, many of whom are practicing in Allegheny County, with a proportionate representation on the Federal, State, and county bench.

Faculty: Fall 1964, 20; full time, 13; part time, 7; professors, 5; research professor, 1; associate professors, 2; assistant professors, 5; lecturers, 7; representing a broad cross-section of legal educational backgrounds and experience.

Enrollment: Fall 1964, 244; men, 236; women, 8; day, 124; evening, 120; full time, 227; part time, 17.

Admissions requirements:

Student must:

Hold satisfactory bachelor's degree from college or university recommended by the Pennsylvania State Board of Law Examiners and approved by supreme court and give evidence of undergraduate work of satisfactory caliber.

Be eligible for registration as a law student with the Pennsylvania State Board of Law Examiners, if student's law practice is to be in Pennsylvania.

Take and achieve satisfactory score on law school admission test.

Win approval of faculty of school of law.

Tuition: Day division (per semester), $500; evening division (per semester), $375.

Prizes and awards: Shalom Moot Court Awards, National Moot Court Competition, the Lawyers Title Award, the American Jurisprudence Awards, Law Week Award, American Trial Lawyers Association Awards, Allegheny County Bar Association Award, the J. Alfred Wilner Prize.

Scholarships: The John and Elizabeth Laughlin Scholarship, the James P. McArdle Scholarship, the Duquesne University Scholarship, the T. Robert and James H. Brennan Scholarship, University Trustees Scholarship, Rev. Cornelius McArdle Scholarship.

A substantial amount of other financial aid is also available.

Moot court: Intramural participation in both appellate argument and jury trial divisions required of all law students—day and evening, Maurice and Laura Falk Moot Courtroom, seventh floor, Rockwell Hall.

Student organizations: Phi Alpha Delta Legal Fraternity, Law Wives Club, Student Bar Association.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

The Organization of American States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Arturo Morales-Carrion, special adviser to the Secretary General of the Organization of American States, has cogently analyzed the reasons for the amazing resilience of the Organization of American States, now 75 years old. During this time, the OAS has grown in strength and adaptability, despite the rapid changes that have swept the hemisphere and despite the highly individualistic nature of Latin America.

Dr. Morales-Carrion's credentials in this area are impeccable. Scholar, author, teacher, and noted historian, Dr. Morales-Carrion has on many occasions put his special competence at the service of his country.

Therefore, I know my colleagues will be interested in his speech, "Asserting Our Hemispheric Birthrights: The Inter-American System at 75," which he delivered April 7, 1965 at the Conference on World Affairs at Kearney State College, Kearney, Nebr.

The speech follows:

ASSERTING OUR HEMISPHERIC BIRTHRIGHTS: THE INTER-AMERICAN SYSTEM AT 75

(Speech delivered by Dr. Arturo Morales-Carrion, special adviser to the Secretary General of the Organization of American States, during the opening plenary session of the Conference on World Affairs, Kearney State College, Kearney, Nebr., Apr. 7, 1965)

I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to participate in an international adventure right here in the very center of the American heartland. The fact that you are opening a window on the world at this conference is to me a sign of the profound optical revolution that has shaken the United States.

The building of this great Nation was based on the proposition that there should be no entangling alliances with the social turmoil, the international tensions, the increasing quest for power which characterized the other hemisphere.

There was to be a disengagement from international affairs, while energies were concentrated in making this vast land rich and productive.

The issues that are confronting us everywhere are so grave and complex as to require a recasting and rethinking of our traditional concepts and the discarding of many cherished assumptions or illusions. Chief among these is the notion of what Prof. Hans Kohn has called the "overvaluation of the distinctiveness of national history and national character." The amazing technological revolution of the last century, the links of trade and economics, have made us interdependent. But there is another interdependence which grows out of the enmeshing of values and ideas, of our clashing or disparate viewpoints and, above all, out of that threatening possibility of ultimate nuclear annihilation which hovers like a psychological cloud over all of us. We are all entangled now, and if there is one distinct notion in our present ordeal it is that no nation can stand apart and no national iterest can pursue its objectives in splendid isolation, in proud disregard of the opinions of mankind.

With his keen perceptiveness, President Kennedy once wrote, "In the 18th and 19th centuries, we could concentrate now on foreign problems, now on domestic problems. If we erred in one place it seemed not to affect our power of action in a second place. But the line dividing domestic and foreign affairs has become as indistinct as a line drawn in water. All that happens to us here at home has a direct and intimate bearing on what we can or must do abroad. All that happens to us abroad has a direct and intimate bearing on what we can or must do at home. If we err in one place, we err in both. If we succeed in one place, we have a chance to succeed in both. For, in a real sense, all of us, as individuals and as public officials, now belong simultaneously to a national and international constituency."

This international constituency of which President Kennedy wrote is a most complex and pluralistic entity. It is no longer made up of a select club of a few powers which could comfortably and in truly 19th century fashion slice up the world into spheres of influence. As a matter of fact, we have now, rather than spheres of influence, spheres of affluence and nonaffluence. It is the gross national product that constitutes the dividing line.

But it would be a mistake to let statistics take over what once was the unchallenged domain of a Talleyrand or a Metternich. The lumping together of the have, as distinct from the have-not nations, could oversimplify our analysis of the international constituency. The same holds true if we try to make another neat division of the world into two hemispheres, the northern and the southern. Such a division might reflect the industrial indexes but it bears little relation to the cultural and historical indexes.

There are certain realities no less distinct when we engage ourselves in an exercise in globalism. I refer to the existence of regions which represent a set of special relationships, based on history, geography, psychology or the persistence of deeply rooted convictions. The Western Hemisphere is one of them. It has been claimed that the onrushing wave of world entanglements has reduced to shambles the concept of a Western Hemisphere. It has been pointed out that the existence of international organizations on a world scale has diminished the role and significance of regional groupings.

But the international constituency, and to a degree all these other entities, is also an aggregation of regions and subregions, of undeniable complexity.

The strengthening of the regional consciousness should not be viewed as a weakening of international worldwide organizations. On the contrary; an understanding of the function and value of the regional experience, of the ties it creates among nations and peoples, of the peculiaries of its problems and issues, are an essential requirement for that broader optical exercise to which we are here committed. The active agents of contemporary history are not just nations, but regions as well.

I should like to dwell now on the significance and role of our Western Hemisphere. It has created a regional organization, now called the Organization of American States, that has endured—and grown in strength and adaptability—for 75 years. That by itself shows an amazing historical resilience. The tremendous changes of the last half century have not liquidated the original assumption that the nations and peoples on this side of the ocean had certain common problems and interests which could best express themselves in a regional organization. Two world wars have gone by and the challenges of the nuclear age have arrived. The revolution of rising expectations is in full bloom. There has been a crowding of voices in the world arena. But amidst the turmoil and the clamor, the regional organization born of our hemisphere's realities still lives on.

These realities are as diverse as our mountains, our weather, and our resources. Differentiation is the rule. The differences are not limited to those commonly stressed between the United States and Latin America. There are sharp differences within Latin America itself.

For Latin America is a highly individualistic, paradoxical region. Its peoples have had to fight an incredible and magnificent geography. Man has been absorbed by his natural habitat, whether in the almost lunar landscape of the Andes, or the green vortex of the jungle, or the great plains of the pampas. It has been said that whoever travels the pampas will never be the same man again.

Singularity exists to the nth degree in Latin America. Cultural anthropologists now tend to divide the area into groups and subgroups, cultures and subcultures, a veritable mosaic of peoples, with the fastest rate of population growth in the world—so singularity and complexity remain very much on the agenda of the Latin American future.

To this ethnic momentum should be added the great social urge for reform, education, health, opportunity, and dignity. Here is a continent in ferment gripped by the challenge of underdevelopment. No longer are its peoples content to live within archaic systems of land tenure. No longer is poverty to be accepted as an unmitigated heritage.

The centrifugal factors are such that regional cooperation could easily become a myth, were it not for the factors of hemispheric cohesion. As the United States is absorbed in the intricate web of its worldwide responsibilities, so Latin America is absorbed in the fight to remedy its social and economic ills. Is there, then, a common ground for cooperation? Is there, then, a common hemispheric purpose?

There is, indeed, a hemispheric purpose. It has grown out of certain convictions expressed at the time of the emancipation struggles. Several of the leaders of thought and action in those critical times looked upon the New World as having a separate destiny and as linked by a common faith in the blessings of liberty.

This basic belief in a common destiny in spite of national diversity persisted through the rough and tumble of 19th century history and the ensuing social and economic crisis of the 20th century. It has endured in

spite of several dissenting voices and undeniable strains. We find echoes of that historical purpose in the Preamble to the Charter of Punta del Este, approved in 1961, which brought the Alliance for Progress into being. The Preamble is less concerned with a system of common laws and more concerned with the burning contemporary issues of social justice and accelerated economic progress. But its forward thrust is based on the heritage of the past. It states: "Almost 200 years ago we began in this hemisphere the long struggle for freedom which now inspires people in all parts of the world. Today, in ancient lands, men moved to hope by the revolutions of our young nations search for liberty. Now we must give a new meaning to that revolutionary heritage. For America stands at a turning point in history. The men and women of our hemisphere are reaching for the better life which today's skills have placed within their grasp. They are determined for themselves and their children to have decent and ever more abundant lives, to gain access to knowledge and equal opportunity for all, to end those conditions which benefit the few at the expense of the needs and dignity of the many. It is our inescapable task to fulfill these just desires—to demonstrate to the poor and forsaken of our countries, and of all lands, that the creative powers of freemen hold the key to their progress and to the progress of future generations. And our certainty of ultimate success rests not alone on our faith in ourselves and in our nations but on the indomitable spirit of freemen which has been the heritage of American civilization."

As the tensions and demands heighten, the regional system has moved forward to meet its new responsibilities.

Its organizational origins are found in the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics, set up in 1890 and committed to assure cooperation in trade and commerce. In its next phase, the system was highlighted by a series of international conferences where legal concepts on nonintervention and the equality of states were the paramount considerations. In 1948, it was restructured as an Organization of American States, and as such has been heavily committed since the Act of Bogota in 1960 and the Alliance for Progress, embodied in the Charter of Punta del Este in 1961, to foster social and economic development, within a regional framework.

It has created a number of institutions that have demonstrated a capacity for growth and action.

One of the oldest is the Pan American Health Organization, established as the Pan American Sanitary Bureau in 1902. From a tiny staff that could do little more than consult with governments about health problems it has become a powerful instrument for action and is now pressing campaigns of disease eradication—malaria, TB, yellow fever—on a wide front in the Latin American countries.

One of the newest institutions is the Inter-American Development Bank, established in 1960, which has become a principal financing institution of the Alliance. Its performance has been such that the U.S. Government has entrusted to it the administration of the Social Progress Trust Fund financed with appropriations by the U.S. Congress of $525 million.

Newest of all is the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—created to execute and coordinate the hemispheric program as a truly multilateral and self-help effort.

There are those who say the Alliance charter is meaningless because it is not an international treaty ratified by the parliaments of the participating nations. CIAP's chairman points out that the principal commitments of the charter are by the governments of the participating nations to their own peoples. Indeed, Sanz de Santamaria said recently, "the Alliance charter represents so towering a moral commitment that the governments are obliged to act as if it were a treaty and to go forward with the reforms that the charter calls for."

Further, the system has created significant instruments for insuring regional peace and security. Foremost is the Rio Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, signed in 1947, under which decisions can be taken by a two-thirds vote, legally binding all governments, to assist states which are the victims of armed attack, or other types of aggression, or to deal with situations which constitute a threat to the peace. In the last 15 years, the Rio Treaty has been applied 13 times.

The most dramatic instance on record was the impressive reaction of the system at the time of the confrontation between the United States and Soviet Russia, as a result of the Cuban missile crisis. It was under an OAS collective action that the United States established the "quarantine" of Cuba, with the collaboration of other OAS members.

The Inter-American Peace Committee, another instrumentality of the system, created by a resolution of a meeting of foreign ministers, has dealt with 17 intrahemisphere conflicts or situations of international tension.

More recently, on the occasion of the United States-Panamanian dispute, the Committee provided for a "cooling off" period where friendly mediation was able to reduce the tension.

In the crucial field of human rights, let us not forget that the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, adopted at the Bogotá Conference in 1948, was the first international declaration of its kind. An Inter-American Commission on Human Rights was set up, before which individuals may exercise the right of petition and in spite of many limitations in its statute, it has done pioneering work in this vital field of human betterment and personal dignity.

Through its fellowship program, and the impetus given to educational planning and human resources development, through a host of activities in the field of humanities, through its encouragement of exchanges in the area of science and technology, the Inter-American system is promoting cultural understanding on a peoples-to-peoples approach, way beyond the sphere of intergovernmental contacts.

A regional system however does not have the ready made answers to all issues affecting its sphere of activity, any more than a global system. It is naive to expect more of international organizations than what the governments and peoples are ready to concede.

Regional conferences can become forums for nationalistic propaganda or legal negativism, whose roots are in ingrained national traditions, not easily done away with. They can, on the other hand, boldly tackle basic economic and social ills, as the Inter-American Economic and Social Council did at Punta del Este in 1961, because the will of governments and peoples has been galvanized.

A Special Inter-American Conference has been convoked and will meet in Rio in May of this year. It is hoped that the system will be strengthened as a result of its deliberations. Bearing in mind the experience gained in the last decade and the growing hemispheric consensus regarding the role the Organization should play, the Secretary General, Dr. José A. Mora, has put forth a program of nine points, which chart a dynamic course for the future. Among its suggestions, the program includes closer political contacts at the Ministerial level through the holding of an annual meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs; the broadening of the sphere of action of the Council of the Organization; the strengthening of both the Inter-American Peace Commitee and the Inter-American Commission of Human Rights; the need for insuring the effective exercise of representative democracy; closer cooperation with parliaments and nongovernmental organizations; the agricultural and industrial use of international rivers and the promotion of Latin American integration.

The belief in international cooperation is an underlying commitment of the collective mind of our times. As Gunnar Myrdal, the brilliant Swedish sociologist has observed, "The main explanation of the fact that the intergovernmental organizations generally survive, even through the most disappointing periods, is undoubtedly that people, at bottom, behind the facade of nationalistic attitudes, do believe in, and do desire, international cooperation."

In the Americas there are obvious pitfalls and frustrations and there is always the centrifugal urge towards rejection if not dissolution of the system, stemming from the many complexities of the area and the uneven levels of economic, social and constitutional development.

Latin America, for instance, is now being tempted with the attraction of a third world with a special alinement that would short circuit its own regional system. It is argued that the pattern of world trade requires this alinement. It is stressed that this is the most convenient way to assure Latin America's economic independence.

Important as trade relationships may be to Latin American economic growth, important as cooperation and contact with other areas may be in other fields of human effort and activity, they cannot supplant the partnership created by the regional, Western Hemisphere experience.

Latin America is an integral part of the Western Hemisphere. It is also by history, by culture, by religion, by mores and traditions, by the roots of its social philosophies and the thrust of its institutional developments, very much a part of the Western World. It may be highly individualistic and complex, what with its point and counterpoint of Indian, African and Iberian ethnic and cultural components. But it is not a miscellaneous third world, nor a marginal and chaotic appendix to contemporary history.

For the regional experience has also to do with a set of purposes and conditions, deeply rooted in the historic past: the concept of the hemisphere as a land of unlimited opportunities; the belief that this was a region committed to the growth of human freedom and the assertion of human rights and representative democracy; the conviction that in spite of their differences and cultural diversities, somehow the United States and Latin America have a future together. These were ideals echoed by the North American Henry Clay, the Central American José Cecilio del Valle, the South American Domingo F. Sarmiento and many others. But they were also expressed in the eloquent contemporary prose of John F. Kennedy which galvanized Latin American opinion. They are not relics of the past; they are pointers to the future. They constitute our hemispheric birthrights, and the cornerstones of our regional efforts.

Address by the Chief Justice of the United States at the Brandeis University Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, on June 8, 1965, Jacob A. Goldfarb, a widely known businessman,

and a trustee of Brandeis University, was honored in New York City on the occasion of his 70th birthday. In his honor, friends of Mr. Goldfarb raised more than $1 million for Brandeis.

It was a memorable occasion. Mr. Goldfarb received the first Brandeis Medal for Distinguished Service to Higher Education. The guest speaker was Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States.

In his remarks of acceptance of the Brandeis Medal, Mr. Goldfarb movingly traced his own rise to prominence. He sketched the development, in a few years, of a new institution of higher education—Brandeis University—to the first rank among our colleges and universities, and in substantial measure he credited this to the leadership of Dr. Abram L. Sachar, the president of Brandeis.

At the birthday dinner Mr. Goldfarb told his friends that:

> The world is faced with conflicting ideologies and threats of nuclear destruction. Education is the bulwark of tolerance and understanding. It is the means by which world peace will ultimately be assured.

Mr. President, those are wise words. Wise, too, are the words of the Chief Justice, the text of whose speech I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY EARL WARREN, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY DINNER, NEW YORK CITY, JUNE 8, 1965

It is a pleasure for me to be here tonight with such an impressively large number of those who are close to Brandeis University. I have the privileged feeling of being allowed to participate in a family gathering. I am sure that this is just such an occasion. In one capacity or another each of you is here either as a member of the Brandeis University family or as a close family friend.

And what more intimate or pleasant family function can there be than the celebration of a birthday? I understand that this occasion marks the 70th birthday of Jacob Goldfarb, who has meant so much to the growth and development of Brandeis University. I tender him my warmest congratulations. So often observances of this sort seem to be reserved for those who are euphemistically called "elder statesmen." It is, therefore, especially gratifying that tonight we can give recognition to one who has hopefully so many more years of fruitful and dedicated service ahead of him that he can properly be termed a "younger statesman." It is in that capacity that I salute him and wish him well for years to come.

Most great educational institutions have had a long period of incubation and development before achieving any appreciable academic stature. Oxford and Cambridge were founded in the 12th century as was the University of Paris from which the Sorbonne emerged as a great locus of learning in France. Some of the famous Italian universities are of still older origin. Elsewhere, at Uppsala, Leiden, and in many other places, venerable universities have had centuries of experience and tradition behind them.

In America, we have not had the luxury of time in the development of our institutions. Yet our cultural, political, and spiritual heritage has been such as to enable us to achieve success in many areas, not the least of which is education. Progress in education has been facilitated by the recognition from the earliest period of our development of its importance to the fullness of the lives of our people and to the fulfillment of our national destiny. As the Court over which I have the honor to preside said in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483, 493, "Today, education is perhaps the most important function of State and local governments." We have also had from the very beginnings of our history a firm tradition of private education. Many of our oldest places of learning began as denominational institutions. Of these there were in turn many which over the years lost their sectarian character completely or in part. The recognition of the importance of education in American life has been manifested in many ways. One early and eloquent expression of this feeling occurred when the members of the Continental Congress in 1787 as part of the great charter for the expansion of the Northwest Territory stated: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

As I have indicated, we have had to make progress in education as well as in other fields within a much shorter time than has been the case in European countries. It is nevertheless true that it has taken a great many years in this country for colleges and universities in general to realize excellence. Harvard was established in 1636 and Yale was founded in 1701. Other respected American educational institutions trace their lineage back more than a century and a half. It must be observed, moreover, that age itself has aided many of our older colleges and universities to prosper. These respected institutions have often flourished and been sustained by the very traditions which brought them greatness. This is illustrated by a story—an apocryphal one, I understand—which is told about a visit which President Lowell of Harvard made to President Taft at the White House. Someone had made inquiry as to Lowell's whereabouts. He was told: "President Lowell is in Washington visiting Mr. Taft."

It is usually a substantial period before the scholarly world is willing to concede that an institution has achieved that degree of wisdom, maturity, and accomplishment that add up to greatness. For quality usually takes a long time to develop. The thought was nicely expressed by a well-known education editor when he related this incident: "A visitor to Oxford, admiring the lawns, asked the grounds keeper how he managed to attain such perfection. 'It's easy, sir,' said the man. 'You plant your best seed and wait 500 years.'" In the usual case we would all have to agree with the editor's conclusion that "high-quality universities, like the grass on their campuses, take time to grow" The story I have just related may be familiar to some of you because it appeared in an account of what has proved to be the happy and rather dramatic exception that proves the rule. This account concerned what the author referred to as "an educational phenomenon." The reference, of course, was to Brandeis University.

In the relatively few years that Brandeis has been in existence it has attained a position of eminence and respect in the academic world that it has taken other institutions many generations to achieve.

Brandeis, which has been functioning less than 17 years, now has an academic body close to 2,000 alert students. Most of its undergraduates come from the top of their high school groups.

I am mindful that most of you are already familiar with the details of that progress. But there are times—especially at family birthday parties—when we are warranted in both glowing and crowing. Tonight we can glow with pride at what has taken place in Waltham and we can crow (just a bit) in the process.

Having satisfied these normal impulses, however, we must acknowledge a more serious purpose in the process of stocktaking. All this did not just happen. How, then, did it come about? I should like to give you my impressions of some of the reasons for Brandeis' success. Two preliminary observations are in order. In the first place, it must be realized that none of the reasons for the success of the university can be compartmentalized or viewed in isolation from other considerations. It is only from the composite of many different factors that one can fully comprehend what has really occurred at Brandeis. Secondly, I am cognizant of the fact that although in years Brandeis is still a fledgling, careful and painstaking planning preceded its founding in 1948. In fact, what has been characterized as the Brandeis idea goes back more than 75 years. It was then, in the words of one observer, that the idea began "within the American Jewish community to create a school reflective of the American Judaic character with its reverence for learning—rooted in social justice, liberal in outlook, and receptive to the intellectual and cultural stirrings of the community." So we must acknowledge that long before Brandeis opened its doors there was painstaking thought and planning for its establishment and future development. We must be equally mindful that the same sort of careful attention to its needs by the trustees, an increasing family of alumni, by a dedicated faculty and by students wholeheartedly committed to its basic philosophy has maintained the Brandeis idea as a dynamic and viable academic concept.

I referred to the desire to create a "school reflective of the Judaic character and its reverence for learning." This, I believe, is one of the most significant explanations of the Brandeis greatness. Those who founded the university believed in the traditional values of Judaism. I am sure that they deeply felt the need for maintaining a place where those values could be nurtured and sustained and where they could be meaningfully transmitted to young and receptive minds. The founders of Brandeis envisioned a place of learning which would be deeply rooted in the moral, ethical, and religious traditions of the Jewish people, traditions which go back to the very beginnings of recorded history.

But however important has been the religious tradition at Brandeis, it is in no sense a parochial institution. One of the conditions imposed when the property of the old Middlesex College in Waltham was conveyed to Brandeis was that the new school follow the convictions of the founder of Middlesex that no form of religious or racial discrimination be practiced there. I am sure that no condition could have been more acceptable or could have been more readily reflective of the founders' own principles and outlook. Two dramatic illustrations come to mind as to how this objective of equality and understanding has been realized at Brandeis. To me there is no more thrilling sight on any university campus, and I have visited a great many in various parts of the globe, than that of the three houses of worship which stand side by side on the Brandeis campus, one each for the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. Each has its own chaplain; each is attended by its own worshipers. As Dr. Sachar so nicely expressed it, "On this plaza there is no majority host." These beautifully modern structures symbolize the respect at Brandeis for individual convictions. They are symbolic of our pluralistic society. They stand as enduring and sacred monuments against movements of hatred, nurturing division and misunderstanding, which all too recently have again shocked our national conscience.

Another symbol, one of far more modest proportions but of scarcely less significance, further illustrates the spirit of equality and understanding which permeates the atmos-

phere of the University. I refer to a rather unprepossessing paper, the application for admission to Brandeis. Nowhere does this form contain a space for a racial or religious designation with the result that roughly a quarter of those who attend Brandeis are not of the Jewish faith. Representatives of many different races, nations, and religions may be seen on its campus at all times. Indeed, about 7 years ago Brandeis began a unique and wonderful international scholastic program under a permanent grant—the Wien International Scholarship Program—which brought to the University 60 students from 35 different countries. It is not uncommon to observe on the Brandeis campus a colorful Indian sari or a majestically flowing African tobe, contrasting with the more pedestrian, garden-variety of dungarees or slacks not infrequently worn by American students; nor is it unusual to hear Arabic, Japanese, and countless other foreign languages around the campus and in the dormitories and halls.

Freedom of thought and freedom of speech are given the fullest expression at Brandeis. In fact, the school might well be termed a working laboratory of democracy. A daily implementation is given on its campus and in its publications to those immortal words of Justice Brandeis himself:

"Those who won our independence believed that the final end of the State was to make men free to develop their faculties; and that in its government the deliberative forces should prevail over the arbitrary. They valued liberty both as an end and as a means. They believed liberty to be the secret of happiness and courage to be the secret of liberty. They believed that freedom to think as you will and to speak as you think are means indispensable to the discovery and spread of political truth; that without free speech and assembly discussion would be futile; that with them, discussion affords ordinarily adequate protection against the dissemination of noxious doctrine; that the greatest menace to freedom is an inert people; that public discussion is a political duty; and that this should be a fundamental principle of the American Government."

"The only bias at Brandeis," it has been noted, "is a strong [bias] in favor of scholarship." And this brings me to still another facet of the university which accounts for its impressive position today. Pervading the campus is a sense of serious purpose which belies what used to be the conventional notions about the fecklessness of college life. In this connection, however, I believe that one must take note of the increasing sense of purposefulness that has manifested itself among our young people generally since the Second World War. There is now a greater awareness among students of the importance of a good education. Too many have realized often too late in their lives how difficult it is to progress in the modern world without the benefits of a sound education. But at Brandeis this feeling of purposefulness is perhaps keener and more deeply embedded than often is the case elsewhere.

Another important aspect of Brandeis' academic personality is its vitality, its willingness to experiment, its eagerness to make new departures. The university is anything but conformist. Rather than allowing its newness to impede development, Brandeis has put it to work; you might say that it has exploited its own youthfulness. As Dr. Sachar has put it: "Brandeis, the school of a prophetic people, had to be the institution of social justice, of an intellectual intensity integrated within a dynamic, changing world. Since we had no traditions [at Brandeis], change would be our tradition. The idea was not to nurse our newness but to capitalize on it."

To me one of the most impressive facets of the university's striking out in new directions is the Lasker Fellowship Program in Civil Liberties and Civil Rights. Another is the Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, which prepares doctoral candidates for leadership in such significant areas as social work, international social welfare, urban development, and mental health. How all this would have delighted Justice Brandeis himself. It was he who wrote:

"To secure social advance we must regard the field of sociology and social legislation as a field for discovery and invention. Research is necessary, as in the field of science and invention, as in the field of mechanical and other arts."

And it was he who wrote the following words, which I venture to say are even more valid today than they were in Brandeis' time:

"When men begin to think as hard, as intensely, about their social problems as they have thought about automobiles, airplanes, and wireless telegraphy, nothing will be socially impossible. Many things which have seemed inevitable will be seen to have been quite unnecessary."

Brandeis University has been doing intensive work in social problems. Its great talents and resources could be put to no worthier purpose.

The university has expanded appreciably since its first year when it had 107 students and 13 faculty. But it still can be termed a small institution, and I have no doubt that there is no disposition to let it grow out of bounds. The ratio of faculty to students is about 1 to 8, which can be matched by few other institutions. The intimate contact which is thus made possible between teacher and student is a truly enriching educational force. It is one which those in our larger institutions often never experience. The small size of the university also permits interaction between the undergraduate college and the graduate and professional schools. This side of the university would also have greatly pleased the Justice. His views on the evils of bigness are well known. He also felt keenly that personal contact is what makes life truly meaningful. Judge Learned Hand eloquently expressed the Brandeis point of view in words which seem equally descriptive of the philosophy of the institution which bears his name. As Judge Hand put it:

"Brandeis believed that there could be no true community save that built upon the personal acquaintance of each with each; by that alone could character and ability be rightly gaged; without that neighborly affection which would result, no faith could be nourished, charitable or other. Only so could the latent richness which lurks in all of us come to flower. As the social group grows too large for mutual contact and appraisal, life quickly begins to lose its flavor and its significance. Among multitudes relations must become standardized; to standardize is to generalize, and to generalize is to ignore all those authentic features which mark, and which indeed alone create, an individual."

The foregoing excerpt logically leads to still another reason why the university has achieved its present stature: it has been true to the standards of excellence and to the integrity of the man after whom it was named. For Louis Dembitz Brandeis was indeed an exemplary individual. It is nice to reflect that though he has gone to the great beyond the rich legacy of his thinking remains very much a part of our lives. It survives in the monumental opinions which he wrote both for the majority and in dissent while he was a member of the Supreme Court. And it survives in the university which bears his name and which has been true to the ideals for which he stood. For Brandeis' life was the distillation of the wisdom of the ages. His was the vision of a prophet. He searched the past for its wisdom and the future for its promise. He combined the two in a way which made for the ideal of American life. By being true to the great spirit, Brandeis University has been able to compress into a few short years what has often not been accomplished in centuries.

So tonight it can be said that Brandeis University is old in the sense that it incorporates the enduring ideas of the past. It is young in the sense that it is attuned to the problems and needs of today. There abounds at the university a great vision for our future. Brandeis, I am confident, is determined that this country will in all respects be worthy of the leadership which destiny has thrust upon us. And you, its friends, must be happy tonight in its accomplishments because you have made it what it is.

Address Delivered by Hon. Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, at the Commencement Exercises of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 1965, Hon. Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, delivered at the commencement exercises of the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn., a significant address on the importance of the U.S. Coast Guard, and its outstanding services and record in our country's history.

In my remarks, I am pleased to include the address delivered by Under Secretary Barr:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JOSEPH W. BARR, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY, NEW LONDON, CONN.

Admiral Roland, Admiral Smith, members of the class of 1965, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. Secretary Fowler has asked me to express to you his very deep regret that he cannot join you today on this important occasion in the lives of you young men who will shortly receive your commissions as officers of the U.S. Coast Guard. The Secretary had looked forward eagerly to being here today, but unfortunately had to forego that pleasure in order to testify before the Congress on recommendations for the first major revision of our coinage system since 1792—when the first Coast Guard fleet was still being built. The Secretary has asked me to appear in his absence and to convey to each and every member of the class of 1965 his very warmest congratulations and best wishes.

I am particularly delighted that the Secretary asked me to come here today, for I have had a particularly warm and close association with the Coast Guard—an association that dates back to the spring of 1943 when, as a young and rather green naval lieutenant, I was shipped to Bizerte Harbor in Africa to take command of a subchaser. My qualifications consisted of the usual wartime training of 3 months at Miami Beach and a background as a boating enthusiast. But while I could get by on most maneuvers, I had had no experience at all in the extremely tricky business of landing a craft alongside a dock.

Thus, it was that, when I took command of my subchaser, a compassionate lieutenant

commander in the Coast Guard took 6 hours of his valuable time to teach me how to bring a craft in alongside a dock—and in general to give me the benefit of his extraordinary seagoing skill and knowledge. That was the beginning of a wartime association with the Coast Guard that extended through the landings at Salerno, Anzio, Elba, and southern France. On the basis of that experience I have long been convinced that coastguardsmen are the greatest sailors in the world.

To that conviction, my years in the Treasury Department have added a profound respect and admiration, not only for the seagoing prowess of the men of the Coast Guard, but for their extraordinary dedication and performance in carrying out their high mission—the mission of service to their country and to humanity.

Let me illustrate: Every spring, as you may know, the national administration begins an intensive review of every Government program in every Government department and agency—a review to set the stage for shaping the budget to be presented the following January. This spring, President Johnson emphasized that this review must not simply be an exercise in numbers, but must reach into the realities behind those numbers—must deal not simply in allocating different amounts of money for different programs, but in a searching analysis of programs in order to distinguish between those of greater and those of lesser priority. In accordance with the President's directive, Budget Director Gordon requested that the Treasury—along with all other Government departments and agencies—review and report on all of its programs in terms of priorities.

I know of no better way to characterize the value and importance of the Coast Guard's mission than simply to cite the list of priorities which it set up in response to Budget Director Gordon's request.

Let me simply list those priorities: through its search and rescue operations the Coast Guard performs its first and highest mission—its mission of saving lives and protecting property. At the second level of priority, its programs for aids to navigation, for law enforcement, and for merchant marine safety serve—although not as directly or totally—the same high goal of saving lives and protecting property while at the same time they help promote the growth and security of our Nation's economy. The icebreaking operations of the Coast Guard benefit the national economy—and thus accomplish its mission on the third order of priority—by keeping open the vital flow of commerce in our ports and waterways throughout the winter months. At the fourth level of priority, the military readiness and reserve training programs help strengthen the security of our Nation. And at the fifth level of priority the Coast Guard, through its oceanography and other programs, helps to advance the cause of scientific knowledge and ultimately to strengthen our national economy and our national security.

These, then, are the programs and the purposes of the Coast Guard. There are no higher purposes, for these are the purposes of humanity and peace. And there are not many programs that serve such high purposes so effectively as these.

So I am not surprised at the intense pride that I see reflected in the faces of you young men of the class of 1965. For it is pride in the high and humane mission of your service—pride in the tradition of surpassing excellence and courage in the performance of that mission that has characterized the men of the Coast Guard since its very inception—and pride in yourselves and in the accomplishments that lie ahead for you and your service.

As you meet the challenges ahead of you, you will have the advantage not only of a splendid tradition, of superb training, of knowing that you serve such high goals—but the advantage also of being an officer in one of the most modern services in the world.

Already our shipyards are at work building new classes of Coast Guard ships to augment the Coast Guard fleet in the decades ahead. New aircraft, still in the experimental stages, will add new capability to search and rescue and other operations. Those marvelous electronic computers which can be one of mankind's greatest servants will play a revolutionary new role in Coast Guard planning, and your research in the marine sciences will contribute even more significantly than it already does to our understanding of the age-old secrets of the sea.

Coast Guard enforcement of conservation laws designed to protect our valuable marine resources will be crucial to a world which seeks new sources of high-quality protein. In the vital area of aids to navigation, Coast Guard engineers are working hard to adapt the power of the atom to the operation of lighthouses, buoys, and other humane navigational needs.

An outstanding example of the Coast Guard's capacity to adapt the wizardy of modern electronics to the humane uses of search and rescue is its Automated Merchant Vessel Reporting program, known as AMVER—the voluntary position-reporting program, open to vessels of any nation which furnishes search and rescue operations with accurate and instant information on the position and characteristics of any vessel which chooses to participate. Since its inception in 1958, more than 8,000 vessels of all nationalities have participated in this program. It has proven so successful that in the near future it will be extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. In this instance as in so many others, the Coast Guard's willingness to help all in peril at sea transcends politics and national boundaries.

Through its icebreaking, through its merchant marine safety, and other operations, the Coast Guard plays a key part in the maintenance of our merchant fleet—and thus helps the Nation meet one of its most serious national challenges, the deficits in its balance of payments.

We have underway, as you know, a comprehensive program to wipe out those deficits—and no part of that program is more vital to the current, as well as long run, strength of our balance of payments than our trade position. We are fortunate that our trade position is far and away the strongest in the world. But we must continue to maintain that strength, and to increase it in every way possible. In that task, the American merchant marine plays a prominent, even a crucial, role—and so does the Coast Guard in helping our merchane marine.

These, then, are but a few of the challenges and opportunities that will confront you young men in the years ahead—as you serve your country and your fellowman. Many of you will continue to further your education in your fields of specialization. For the Coast Guard needs—its mission demands—officers of the highest competence, and thus its assigns many of its young men to outstanding graduate schools around the country as well as gives them every incentive throughout their careers to keep abreast of new advances in their fields. As your service continuues to move into the more complex world of tomorrow, its need for new ideas and fresh approaches will become more and more urgent—and for these it must look to men such as yourselves.

In a few moments you young men of the class of 1965 will raise your right hands to take the oath of a Coast Guard officer. You will become part of a most distinguished service. Into your hands will be entrusted the high traditions established by generations of brave men before you. I know you will bring new honor to those traditions.

To all of you, I extend—on my own behalf, and on behalf of Secretary Fowler—our warmest congratulations and our earnest hope that you have long and successful careers in the service of your Nation and of humanity. Godspeed—and good sailing.

Proposed Repeal of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Gaffney Ledger, of Gaffney, S.C., carried an excellent editorial in its June 11, 1965, edition. This editorial, entitled "What Are the Bosses Afraid Of?" contains some very thought provoking and well reasoned comments concerning the proposed repeal of section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act. This editorial merits the attention of all the Members of Congress, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE THE BOSSES AFRAID OF?

What are the union bosses afraid of?

Why do they have to have compulsory union membership and with it, the dues of every worker in a plant or in a business?

President Lyndon B. Johnson, in calling for the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law said he did so "with the hope of reducing conflicts in our national labor policy that for several years have divided Americans in various States."

We believe it is a sad day for the people of Cherokee County and for South Carolinians and other Americans when the powerful force of the Federal Government is turned loose in behalf of the labor bosses. When the labor chiefs can speak through the President to tell the American people they must join a union to hold a job, it presents a kind of force that should be shouted down by freedom-loving Americans everywhere.

An American should have the right to join a union.

He should have the right not to join a union. The labor bosses groan because their unions are not so powerful in the right-to-work States. In these States the worker has a right to join—or not to join a union—as he sees fit.

If President Johnson is successful in his goal to repeal the law, the workers lose their right. Union bosses will win another round in their quest to dominate the political and economic life in the United States.

Nineteen States, including South Carolina will see further dimunation of their powers in favor of Federal regulatory agencies.

Another State where workers will lose their civil right is President Johnson's home State of Texas. As a Member of the House when the Taft-Hartley Act was passed April 17, 1947, Johnson voted for passage. There was no separate vote then on section 14(b); it was one of the key features of the act.

On June 20, 1947, Johnson voted to override President Harry S. Truman's veto. Johnson was in the Senate when that body voted down an attempt to strip section 14(b) from the law. That was June 30, 1949. Johnson

voted with the majority to retain section 14(b). Now he wants to repeal it.

We think President Johnson's call for repeal of the right-to-work section is strictly political, to make good on a 1964 campaign promise to big labor. Congress should turn it down—vote the way Johnson himself voted when he was a legislator.

Memorial Day Massacre and Tragic Story of Hilding Anderson, for Whom New Union Hall of Steelworkers Is Named

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of the publications always warmly welcomed and read in my office is 65 News, which is published monthly by Hilding Anderson Local 65 of the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, and dedicated to the advancement of southeastern Chicago steelworkers.

Local 65 is housed in the magnificent new union hall at 9350 South Chicago Avenue in the district that I have the honor to represent. The hall is named for Hilding Anderson, and here is the dramatic and tragic story of the reason for the naming of the hall as told in the May 1965 edition of 65 News:

LEST WE FORGET—A TRIBUTE TO 10 MEN

(By Ed Sadlowski)

Who was Hilding Anderson? Where did he work? Why is local 65's new union hall named after him? These are a few of the questions asked by members of our union and the visiting public when they see the name Hilding Anderson in front of our hall.

Hilding Anderson was a young man of 29 in the year 1937. He had come to this country from his native Sweden only a few short years before, with the hopes of improving his way of life.

Upon starting to work as a rigger in the 96-inch plate mill and the 44-inch slab mill, Hilding soon learned of the disadvantages of not having a strong labor union to represent himself and his fellow employees. He had seen the type of representation employees received under the employees representation plan more accurately called company-unionism. It wasn't long before Hilding became a member of the old Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel & Tin Workers.

The spring of 1936 brought with it the inception of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, CIO. Hilding like thousands of his fellow workers signed with SWOC in hopes of a new way of life for all steelworkers.

They knew what they were up against. An industry with power, wealth, and might, which had relentlessly fought unionism through the years. They remembered or were told of Homestead, 1892. The steel strikes of 1909 and 1919. Martial law. Tear gas. Company goons. Beatings. Shooting. Pinkertons and killings.

But still they joined, knowing that to remain in the serfdom state they were in would only bring more abuses from the industry. They were tired of being forced to work 10- or 12-hour day. A 7-day week with no overtime premiums. No vacations, no holidays, no insurance, no pensions, no grievance procedure, no safety, and substandard wages.

Benefits like these were just dreams to steelworkers like Hilding Anderson, before the union.

People would have said, you were crazy in 1936 if you spoke of 13 weeks vacation, paid up insurance, shift differentials, jury pay, seven paid holidays, SUB, and the right to be treated like human beings.

So when in March of 1936 the most powerful adversary of organized labor, United States Steel, recognized the SWOC-CIO as the sole bargaining agent for its employees, most people thought that the rest of the industry would follow suit.

Unfortunately this wasn't the case. Instead of obeying the law of the land and "bargaining collectively" with SWOC, Little Steel made up of Republic, Bethlehem, Inland, and Youngstown Sheet & Tube, formed an unholy alliance and declared war against the CIO.

That year, Tom Girdler, head of Republic Steel Co. declared "Regardless if every man at Republic joins the union, we are not going to recognize it. We are not going to sign any contract. We will shut and board the mills up before we will sign with the CIO. I'll pick apples before I recognize the union."

Little Steel employed spies who shadowed union organizers; it's police attacked and beat employees at will. It's superintendents and foremen threatened, laid off, and discharged employees for union activities.

This is what the pioneer unionmen in the steel mills were up against when they tried to build an organization for themselves in the spring of 1937.

This is what Little Steel employees had to face and overcome to establish their American rights to be treated like human beings.

From March until May of 1937 the Steel Workers Organizing Committee under the leadership of Philip Murray tried everything imaginable to secure a contract from Little Steel through peaceful collective bargaining but the corporations making up Little Steel remained firm in their stand of not recognizing the union.

This type of attitude on the part of the corporations set the stage for a strike being called against Republic, Inland, Bethlehem, and Youngstown Sheet & Tube.

On May 26 the strike involving 78,000 steelworkers began. It stretched over 7 States—at the mills of Republic, Inland, and Youngstown but later it spread to the Johnstown, Pa. plant of Bethlehem affecting 12,000 more workers.

The strike was but a few days old when a meeting was called for Memorial Day for all area steelworkers to assemble at Sam's Place at 113th and Greenbay Avenue which was then being used as strike headquarters by employees of Republic Steel's South Chicago plant.

The purpose of the meeting was to inform the strikers and other steelworkers of any progress that had been made with the companies and also to secure their rights of peaceful picketing.

Hilding Anderson, being the good unionman he was, and knowing that in order to raise his standard of living, he in turn would have to help others raise theirs, joined the strikers at the meeting at Sam's Place.

Over a thousand strikers, their families and friends, gathered at Sam's Place that bright Sunday afternoon. There was a holiday spirit over the crowd and it was decided that they would parade peacefully across the prairie to the gates of Republic Steel then located at 117th and Burley.

Led by two bearers of American flags, men, women, and children began their peaceful march to the gates of the plant.

As they approached the street bordering the plant, they encountered over 200 Chicago policemen with drawn clubs and hands on revolvers. Spokesmen for the strikers talked with the police for a few minutes. The peaceful paraders were then commanded in the name of the law to disperse. A moment later, at some signal from the police captains, the lines of police advanced upon the crowd. The marchers turned, and many began to walk, some to run, back across the prairie. The police fired in volley pointblank at the backs of the people. They then moved in to finish their fiendish task with their clubs. Seven were killed and over ninety wounded. With three of the injured dying later from wounds they had received, bringing a total of 10 peaceful marchers dead on a now not-so-bright Sunday afternoon.

Hilding Anderson was one of the three men who later died from wounds received at the hands of the Chicago police. He died for the rights he had thought every American possessed when he came to this country, the right to be free and to be treated as human beings.

Those who died for these same rights with Hilding Anderson were:

Kenneth Reed, age 23, of 3920 Deal Street, Indiana Harbor, Ind.

Leo Francisco, age 17, 10012 Commercial Avenue, Chicago.

Sam Popovich, age 50, 3604 Deador Street, Indiana Harbor, Ind.

Earl Handley, age 37, 3307 Michigan Avenue, Indiana Harbor, Ind.

Joe Rothmund, age 48, 2857 Belmont Avenue, Chicago.

Alfred Causey, age 43, 7050 Arizona Avenue, Indiana Harbor, Ind.

Lee Tisdale, age 50, 5624 South State Street, Chicago.

Otis Jones, age 33, 13211 Buffalo Avenue, Chicago.

Anthony Tagliori, age 26, 615 East 74th Street, Chicago.

To these men who shall walk the picket lines forever, and to the hundreds of other martyrs in labor history like them, we dedicate this paper.

AS TOLD BY EYEWITNESSES

Mr. Speaker, I am further extending my remarks to include excerpts from statements of steelworkers "who were there" on May 30, 1937, as printed in the May 1965 issue of 65 News:

Gust Yuratovac first president of Local 1033, Republic Steel: "Tom Girdler, chairman of Republic Steel Co. at that time, said he would rather go to his farm and pick apples than recognize the union. The steelworkers gave their lives and hundreds were wounded for life so that they could have a real union and make it easier for the younger steelworkers. Tom Girdler did not go to the farm to pick his apples. Instead he picked up his pen and wrote to the stockholders that now was the time to sign with the Steelworkers Union.

"Sunday, May 30, 1937, the date of the Memorial Day massacre, was a nice sunny day. What did happen is difficult to believe could happen in the United States. * * *

"There were two strikers carrying American flags who were clubbed and the flags were thrown to the ground after being clubbed by the police. Seconds after that all hell broke loose. There were 10 marchers killed. All were shot in the back. About 70 were wounded or injured."

Xavier "Sailor" Smykowski, president of 1033, Republic Steel Co.: "In a moment the peaceful prairie had become a battlefield. Great clouds of tear gas filled the air. Women screamed as they saw their husbands struck down by policemen's bullets and clubs. Bloody bodies were scattered all around.

"In man's fight for freedom and dignity, the names of the 10 men who died in the

Memorial Day massacre of 1937 will always be remembered with most solemn reverance."

John Sargent, president of local 1010, Inland Steel Co.: "I was there * * * when we arrive at South Chicago, there's a big field in front of the Republic gates, and it's rapidly filling with men, women, and kids. * * * We pick up our banners, signs, and flags and start walking up the field. About 100 feet in front of the gates there's a solid line of Chicago cops * * * suddenly, zing, zing! * * * on the roof of the mill are a bunch of company guards with rifles, taking potshots at the crowd below, like shooting fish in the barrel. People begin to fall. Panic seizes the crowd."

Joseph Germano, director, district 31: "* * * The Chicago police force—aided and condoned by the company—wracked a terrible and bloody massacre that will never be forgotten in the history of our union. The steelworkers were slaughtered by gunfire and among them was Hilding Anderson of local union 65. * * *

"It is fitting and proper that on Memorial Day, 1965, we pause, reflect, and pay tribute to men like Hilding Anderson who gave his life for the benefits and privileges we enjoy. Local 65 and its membership in the best tradition of the labor movement rightfully pay tribute in their recognition of their martyr member, Hilding Anderson."

Joe Cook, first president, local union 1029: "Steelworkers paid very dearly to establish our union. Steelworkers at Republic Steel in South Chicago died, as did steelworkers in Ohio. * * *

"Women screamed as they watched men being shot and beaten senseless by policemen. Wounded men were loaded into patrol wagons like cattle and hauled away to jail, instead of being taken to hospital for medical attention.

"In man's fight for freedom and dignity, let's not forget Hilding Anderson and the nine other steelworkers who gave their lives so the union movement could be more firmly established. It was their fond hope that a good strong union would emerge from this tragic incident.

"It has been through blood, sweat, tears, and deaths of the early organizers our present day steelworkers are reaping a harvest of benefits. An everlasting debt of gratitude is owed the early organizers. The responsibility for continued improvement now rests with the young steelworkers of today. Count your many blessings and pray their deaths have not been in vain."

George A. Patterson, first president of local 65: "Twenty-eight years have passed since that eventful day at Republic Steel in south Chicago near Hegewisch. What are my thoughts today?

"A prayer for the dead, a thought for those still living who miss their dear departed ones, our martyred steelworkers. What was gained from that awful day?

"The right to picket. The right to have a union. The right to have a signed contract. The right to have representation at meetings with the steel companies. The right to bargain collectively on wages, hours, and working conditions. The right to pay your union dues for services rendered. The right to look at the union contract. The right to say something about this contract. The right to consider it a sound piece of insurance, covering sick pay, vacations and above all the right to attend union meetings and be heard. If you have thoughts that you feel should be expressed concerning your work, politics or pleasure, if you are of a negative nature you have the right to express ideas about things you are displeased with.

"A few of the 10 men who died I knew or saw personally that day. Others I remember from the newsreel.

"From South Works our own Hilding Anderson worked near and around the rigger shop. His friends were the riggers and he was a leader among them. Unionism came second nature to him. Fresh from the old country, he was usually in the forefront. It was no accident that Hilding was in the front lines that day. His eyes laughing and Swedish accent sounding sweet in the sunlit air, he was leading his men on the picket line, little dreaming that loaded guns would be used to kill. This was the land of freedom he believed.

"Young Leo Francisco, a stripling of 16 years, raised in the community and just about to begin work in the mills. Dark eyed and virile, proud of life and what lay ahead of him. He grew up in the shadow of the mills, in the shade of Republic Steel, and was cut down in the flower of his youth.

"Lee Teasdale, an older man, who struggled for a short while with his wounds, then passed on. A true representative of his people.

"Adieu good friends. Farewell to the other seven. You are gone but not forgotten.

"Today stand mighty union halls and in those halls the work continues that you helped start. People of the mills, union men, of steel have made many accomplishments, racked up records that you would be proud of, and still roll out steel and break records every week. Tonnage soars and soars. Proudly we say this is paid at union wage scales. Sadly we have to admit, it is done by fewer men under a method called automation. The steel mills grow larger and the profits increase more than ever. More and more money is needed for expansion but if it were not for the union you helped to start and the fact that we have something to say, we would not get our share of return but would still be waiting for the handout we used to get 30 years ago.

"You have not died in vain. Today we see others marching, martyrs dying for the right to vote—the right to end discrimination—the right for freedom. It is a shame when we hear some disgruntled member say he won't attend a meeting or will drop out of the union because he does not get all he wants. Can't he remember your sacrifice? How much distances we have traveled since your day. I say very much, thanks to you."

Veterans' Legislation

SPEECH

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join today in support of the six veterans' bills on the Consent Calendar reported to the House by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs after weeks of careful and thoughtful consideration. At this time I should like to compliment Chairman TEAGUE for the leadership he has given during his years in Congress to legislative matters concerning all phases of veterans' legislation.

I had the great privilege of serving for a short time on Chairman TEAGUE's committee, and a member cannot help but be impressed there by his disposition to our veterans and his conscientious work on their behalf.

A grateful nation has built our unique system of veteran benefits, and these bills on our calendar today strengthen and improve this benefit system which recognizes the magnificent service our men and women have given this Nation. No one needs more the additional benefits today than the children of those men who lost their lives for our country.

In H.R. 206 and H.R. 208 there is a recognition of improved vocational rehabilitation training allowances, which are long overdue. Again, on all these bills it is a privilege to give support and to again thank the committee for their recognition of our veteran needs.

Where the Gag Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Peoria Journal Star dated June 14, 1965, states very clearly the problem the liberal teach-in groups are having. I certainly hope that these groups closely consider the possible adverse effects their activity has had on those who will determine in Red China whether or not we mean what we say as a Nation. The results that liberals seek might be further away due to the publicity they have received. The abovementioned editorial follows:

WHERE THE GAG IS

Of all the rabid criticism which is being expressed about our foreign policy in Vietnam nothing is quite as wild as the charge that democratic debate is being gagged.

It is difficult to recall a time in recent years when so much currency has been given to the opinions of a limited number of critics. Far from being gagged, these critics have found the facilities of national network television turned over to them and they have seen their views published far and wide.

Yet screams are made that discussion is being curtailed, that the press isn't fair, that Americans don't know what is going on.

The truth is that most Americans do know what is going on and they have quit listening to the critics because they have failed to hear anything from them which makes much sense beyond the simple premise that there is a problem in Vietnam. That premise is hardly worth debating.

It is utterly sophomoric to think that saying something long enough and loud enough makes it any more sensible than it was the first time it was said. Yet the effort is being made.

We have no desire to foreclose discussion of our foreign policy in Vietnam nor anywhere else in the world, but we can appreciate the desire of the Johnson administration, which is trying to pursue a hardened line toward Communist expansionism, to counteract the possibility that the repetition of the soft line put forth by a few critics may gain wider acceptance. It is normal for a leader with his mind made up to want to carry out his design with as little criticism as possible.

Foreign policy is the domain of the President of United States and while some citizens may disagree with his decisions, it does not change the fact that the decisions must be made by the President. All of the picketing and the petitioning is of little value unless it manages to change the President's mind.

It is our feeling that the heat which is being generated by a number of professors and students who cannot even agree with themselves is going for naught, because they

have failed to find any significant support from political leaders of either party or from the public in general.

There is in this protest movement a number of professors who consider themselves to be liberals with a primary interest in seeing ideas of international cooperation furthered to the point that the peoples of the earth can live in peace and prosper together, and this is an aim which most Americans, liberal or not, endorse.

The problem, of course, lies in mapping the correct route to this achievement. The Johnson administration and every administration since World War II has felt that it is essential to stop first Russian and now Chinese Communist designs to expand their totalitarian systems. In this, they have not been completely successful, but the effort continues because nothing significant has taken place to indicate that Communist principle of conquest—it parades under the title of "National Liberation"—has changed.

No one likes to see the rising toll of American lives in Vietnam, but it seems to us—even if it doesn't to a few noisy college professors and students—that the lessons of recent history indicate that firmer stand against Facist Italy, Hitler Germany, and imperial Japan might have avoided the grand-scale bloodletting which we call World War II.

We think the majority of our college professors—and hopefully their better educated proteges—know their history well enough to realize that their rabid colleagues are spewing out a more sizable dose of emotion than fact, and consequently they aren't bothering to jump into a debate on those terms.

We feel that we have to speak out so that the impression is not left that our lack of attention to their remarks is an indication of our approval or an effort to suppress discussion of their opinion.

In this country anyone can express an opinion, and at this point the professors who feel their viewpoints are being ignored are suffering simply from the pangs which come from pursuing a theme which has simply been rejected by their listeners.

There is no gag in anybody's mouth, but there are an awful lot of people who are looking around for cotton to stick in their ears.

The Merit System: Another Maginot Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a most stimulating and challenging speech delivered recently in Washington by the Executive Director of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Warren B. Irons.

It happens that Mr. Irons was honored with the 1965 Stockberger Award of the Society for Personnel Administration. He accepted the award and addressed the organization at a meeting held June 4 in the Statler-Hilton Hotel.

In reading the text of Mr. Irons' remarks I am impressed by the argument he makes for some new flexibility in the merit system. He likens this system, designed to insulate the Federal service from political pressures, to the famous maginot line of France. And he suggests it is time we recognized there are differences which ought to be reflected in the hiring of laborers as opposed to top-level Government executives.

I believe Mr. Irons has some excellent answers to those who might argue that more flexible procedures would load up the Federal service with personal cronies and political hacks.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I insert Mr. Irons' address at this point in the Appendix:

ACCEPTANCE REMARKS BY WARREN B. IRONS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, ON RECEIPT OF THE STOCKBERGER AWARD FOR 1965 FROM THE SOCIETY FOR PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION, AT THE STATLER-HILTON HOTEL IN WASHINGTON, D.C., AT NOON ON FRIDAY, JUNE 4, 1965

I am most grateful that you selected me as the 1965 recipient of the Stockberger Award.

A tradition has been established over the past few years that the recipient of this high honor is allowed to make an acceptance speech. I am grateful for that tradition also.

When I leave this room, however, some of you may say: "There goes an alarmist." For the message I want to leave with you is that it is high time we asked ourselves if perhaps we who are handling the Government's personnel business aren't operating behind a Maginot line that we ourselves have erected or at least reinforced.

Specifically, I want to question seriously the concepts we are following with regard to recruiting, appointing, and assigning people in the career service. A manager needs the right man at the right time to accomplish his mission. Are we delivering?

For a good many years I have lived with, read about, discussed, enforced, and administered the merit system as it was spelled out in the Civil Service Act of 1883, and supplemented very substantially by the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

As conditions have changed over the years, we have taken timely—and what we thought was remedial—action in the form of Executive orders, rules, regulations, and practices, that we felt were necessary to permit a manager to operate effectively. Always, we have provided the change within the letter and spirit of those two venerable laws.

Whatever remedy we have provided has been compatible with those two laws and with the way they define the concept of merit. In other words, we have defended a fortress that, through tradition and heritage, has assumed an aura of sanctity.

Today some of you may think that I am committing sacrilege when I question, as I am about to do, the application in the Federal service of such hallowed principles as open competitive examining, stability, and tenure, on a uniform basis.

My fear is that we in the personnel business, in worshiping these concepts have painted ourselves into a corner.

I fear that without realizing fully what we were getting into, we have—like the well-intentioned people of France between World Wars I and II—erected a bulwark that was fine for the last campaign, but is not quite adequate for the next campaign.

In worshiping open competitive examining, we have somehow slept through the realization that in the Federal service today we have hundreds and hundreds of occupations, ranging in pay from the $1.25-an-hour summer trainee at one end of the scale to the $25,000-a-year executive at the other end.

We have somehow permitted our vision to be obscured if we will think the ground rules for hiring a laborer are the right ground rules for hiring a $25,000-a-year Deputy Assistant Secretary for Mobilization Planning.

Can you imagine and private business in America inserting the following ad in the Wall Street Journal?

"Wanted: Experienced executive. Must have near-supernatural ability, unquestioned loyalty, highest moral character, complete grasp of management techniques, governmental operations, and world affairs, plus the strongest dedication to public service.

"Salary range, $15,000 to $25,000.

"Go to your nearest post office or Federal building. Read the poster for details. File your application with the U.S. Civil Service Commission, as thousands of others are being encouraged to do.

"After 90 days, or perhaps longer, you may learn (a) what agency might use you, (b) what the mission might be, and (c) the specific nature of the duties. At that time you will be queried as to your availability."

We need very badly—and I hope we can get very soon—a complete revision of the staffing concept that says we apply the same devices for staffing clerical, lower level technical, and low-skilled jobs that we use to staff middle and upper level positons.

Open competitive examining at the middle and upper levels can be cumbersome and frustrating to the manager who needs a quality employee today. And the concept that encourages all interested parties to apply for middle and upper level jobs can produce mediocrity.

All too often, the very person we need most is the one who is simply not willing to wait 3 months to a year. He is in demand, by us or somebody else, more immediately.

The system I would like to see placed into use is one that will give a manager the flexibility he needs. One that will let the job go looking for the man, rather than the man for the jobs. One that will let a manager compete today for the man he needs today.

Then, when the employee proves himself, he could earn the right to some of the merit system benefits we talk about so proudly.

"Ah ha," you say, "this smacks of patronage. Give a manager too much license and he will load up his organization with personal cronies and political hacks."

I have two very substantial reasons for saying "Hogwash" to this kind of Maginot Line thinking.

First, the head of a Federal agency is a man the President of the United States has selected personally as a man who can get a job done. The President has made it absolutely clear, on at least a half-dozen occasions, that he demands excellence in the people he appoints. He wants the best of the best; the doers, the innovators, the first-class managers.

The man whom the President chooses for the top job in a department or agency is questioned and confirmed by the Senate, a very discerning body. His integrity can be trusted.

He has been made responsible for managing a program that is based upon law. He will be accountable to his conscience, his President, the opposition party, and the public press for his success or his failure to produce what he has been appointed to produce.

Furthermore, it is my firm belief that if he is inclined to play political footsie or personal favoritism in filling the jobs that will have a make-or-break effect on mission accomplishment, he will do so under any staffing system, including the present one.

My second reason is in fact an introduction to the second point I want to bring up, namely: It shouldn't be too often that a manager has to go to the open marketplace to find the man he needs to fill an important middle or upper level position.

The Federal service today abounds with talented people who have proved their competence over a period of years. These people comprise an invaluable reservoir of competence for the manager who has to tool up in a hurry for a new or changed mission, or the manager who has to replace a valuable employee he has just lost.

This explains my opening punch at the demigod we call stability.

Under our present concepts, we have reached a pass where a good employee often finds himself married to one agency, one bureau, one division, one branch, and one specialization within that branch.

Even though he has the potential to go much further, he often finds himself at the end of the line because we (you in the agencies and we in the Civil Service Commission) have not greased the way for his talents to become known elsewhere.

If my initial plea is that we develop a more flexible means for middle and upper level staffing when we have to go into the public marketplace for talent, my second and equally important plea is that we establish—and soon—a mechanism that will, on the one hand, encourage a manager to look inside the service for talent, and on the other hand, encourage an employee to break out of a narrow box.

I know the typical supervisor's attitude when somebody suggests a "career roster," or a "talent bank" that would encourage employee flexibility. He says: "You think I'm nuts? I'm not about to recommend my best employee for somebody else's mission."

I say it's time we frustrate the supervisors whose minds are set along these selfish—albeit practical—lines. The service would be the better for our efforts.

My third target today is the demigod we have come to worship in the name of tenure. Alias security. Alias job protection.

In my judgment, we do need to maintain that aspect of the merit system that provides tenure—up to a certain level. Perhaps grade 15 is the proper level.

But I think we are doing ourselves and our taxpaying citizens a disservice when we attempt to provide tenure to executives beyond grade 15, or to imply that a person above grade 15 has any right to his job.

The kind of officials we need in grades 16 through 18 today are those so competent that they do not need to worry about security. We need risktakers who have the total traits required for successful performance in a dynamic atmosphere.

When you give a manager the freedom to select the right man for the right job, tenure is no longer a concern. You can bet your bankroll that the manager will want to keep the right man in the right job, so long as the right man is delivering.

Throughout this speech I might have given the impression that my philosophy is: "Let's burn the house down and start all over." That's not my intent at all.

I am saying in essence that we can and we should develop, within existing law, a system that will give a manager the freedom he needs to recruit, select, assign, and retain the employees he needs to get a mission accomplished.

Open competitive examining is fine at the clerical levels of the service. It is the best known way to hire recent college graduates and certain technicians who are needed in relatively large volume on a recurring basis. But I question its validity when we have to go to the open market to fill a middle or upper level managerial position.

A stable work force is a desirable commodity, and a measurable asset to any manager. But when a work force gets so stable that good employees are being boxed in, or that inbreeding is prevalent, the danger signal comes on. I think rotation—encouraged, thoughtful rotation—is a good remedy.

Tenure, or security, or job protection is perfectly fine—in its place. But when you are paying a man $15,000 to $25,000 a year for dynamic leadership, for razor-sharp judgment, for profound decisions, you just don't expect him to sit around computing his annuity or counting off the days until his retirement.

In times of war or emergency we have let down the bars of our maginot line; often on a temporary basis. Some of the folks who got in during those periods of expediency have acquitted themselves well. I would go so far as to say that if the service were to lose every present-day executive who got in during the depression or the war, the loss would be profound. In other words, the expediency that was tolerated by the purists under conditions of hardship or war, was not necessarily bad.

Let me give you an interesting statistic or two. In 1955, 10 Federal employees received the first National Civil Service League Award. Six of these entered the service through the standard open competitive method. Four were from the excepted service and later blanketed in. A decade later, the 10-member award class of 1965 consisted of 5 who entered by the open competitive route and 5 who were blanketed in. I don't know what all time proves, but these facts were revealing to me.

It is my conviction that we are too intelligent to wait for another war or another period of strife to shake the tree that needs some shaking. I think the time is ripe as of now.

We must move boldy—in the face of tradition or in defiance of tradition—to give our managers the staffing flexibility they need to cope with the problems they face.

As me move forward in meeting the challenges of this dynamic age, I hope we don't let traditional concepts and the bogeyman of political or personal patronage be a deadening influence in developing fresh approaches to merit staffing of the Federal service.

Michigan's New Faces on the Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recent edition of Washington Report, the newsletter printed every week by the UAW Citizenship-Legislative Department, carried a report on the seven new Members of the House of Representatives elected by Michigan voters in the last election.

We in Michigan are very proud of the seven new members of our congressional delegation. They have already distinguished themselves as Members of the House and have earned respect as hard workers in their committee assignments and as representatives of the people who elected them.

As the Washington Report article points out;

The seven are bright and young—their average age is only 40—and they're the kind of hard workers who can stick around with good support from the folks back home.

With the record they are compiling, I am confident "the folks back home" will give them the support they need to "stick around."

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to ask unanimous consent that the article about our seven Michigan colleagues be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MICHIGAN'S NEW FACES ON THE HILL

"Exciting, productive, and challenging." This is how one of Michigan's new crop of seven liberal Democrats in Congress describes his first months in Washington. RAY CLEVENGER, of the Upper Peninsula's 11th District, could well be speaking for the other six young Congressmen who are now serving their first terms in Congress from Michigan.

In this issue of the Washington Report, we're taking a look at the seven new men Michigan voters sent to Washington last year. They're all bright and young—their average age is only 40—and they're the kind of hard-workers who can stick around with good support from the folks back home.

JOHN CONYERS, the youngest of the crop at 35, is from the First District, which includes north-central Detroit and Highland Park. CONYERS, who served as a legislative assistant to Congressman JOHN DINGELL, served as a hearing referee in Michigan's workmen's compensation department before his election.

Pulling down one of the juciest plums in committee assignments, CONYERS was appointed to the Judiciary Committee and has been working long hours on the voting rights bill. He knows the need for a strong voting bill very well, having defended Mississippi Negroes arrested for voter registration activities. CONYERS also has a deep interest in civil liberties, and took a leading role in the fight against appropriations for the House Un-American Activities Committee.

WES VIVIAN, a native Canadian who represents the Second District, including Ann Arbor, knocked off arch-reactionary George Meader last fall. One of the few scientists in Congress, VIVIAN has been vice president of an electronics firm in Ann Arbor and was made a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee. With three college degrees, including one from MIT and a doctorate from the University of Michigan, he plays an important role in shaping our scientific policies.

VIVIAN had a real knock-down-drag-out campaign against Meader, who had voted against the civil rights act of 1964, ARA, the Peace Corps, and just about every piece of progressive legislation before Congress.

PAUL TODD, who has the cities of Kalamazoo and Battle Creek in his Third District, beat arch-conservative August Johansen the second time around. TODD, a native of Kalamazoo, lost to Johansen in 1962, but a vigorous campaign stressing Johansen's vote against the civil rights bill put TODD into Congress the second time around.

Formerly president of a spice company, TODD was appointed to the Banking and Currency Committee. He's on the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee, and he'll be working hard for truth-in-packaging legislation, as well as the housing bill and mass transit. In a letter to his constituents, TODD invited them to come to Washington to sample the "excellent instant coffee" brewed up by his hard-working staff of five.

JOHN MACKIE, from Flint in the Seventh District, is also a native Canadian and is a past president of the American Association of State Highway Officials. Before running for Congress, MACKIE had won election since 1957 as Michigan's State highway commissioner.

With a district that's both rural and industrial, MACKIE has a seat on the Agriculture Committee and also works hard for bills to help Flint's urban renewal program. He also helped lead the drive for the auto excise cut, and just received a distinguished alumnus award from Michigan State. With a good staff in Washington, MACKIE is getting a reputation as a hard-working freshman.

RAY CLEVENGER, who has the big Upper Peninsula in his 11th District, beat Congressman Victor Knox last year. CLEVENGER, who had held many Democratic Party posts in upper Michigan and on the State committee, serves on two House committees, Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Post Office and Civil Service.

CLEVENGER is working hard to implement the war on poverty in his district, which now

has a Jobs Corps conservation camp to train young men in forestry and recreation skills. He also plugged hard for the President's education bill, which would give the 11th District over $2 million to upgrade its schools and hang on to its young people.

BILL FORD, a former Michigan State senator, is from the 15th District, which includes southwestern Wayne County. When he was in the State senate. FORD was a member of a special study committee on welfare, and is now a member of the House Education and Labor Committee.

A lawyer by profession, FORD was a member of the Michigan Constitutional Convention. He now represents a newly drawn district, and scored an impressive victory last year, winning more than 70 percent of the vote as a strong supporter of President Johnson's programs. FORD is plugging away at his committee work, building a reputation as an expert on welfare problems. He's a good friend of working people and the poor, and should become a real power on his committee.

BILLIE FARNUM, came out of the CCC camps in the thirties and went to work for GM, becoming a UAW member and later a staffer. A living ad for the kind of job the CCC did for thousands of depression-hit young men, FARNUM served on the staff of former Senator Blair Moody and was appointed assistant secretary of state for Michigan in 1955 and was elected as Michigan's auditor general in 1962.

FARNUM beat out a conservative Republican in the new 19th District, in central and western Oakland County, and won a real prize for a freshman Congressman by being tapped for a seat on the powerful Appropriations Committee. A dogged worker who understands people's problems, FARNUM is working for good programs as a down-to-earth progressive.

A Great Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Most Reverend John Patrick Cody, Roman Catholic archbishop of New Orleans, was named archbishop of Chicago on Wednesday, June 16, by Pope Paul VI. Archbishop Cody has won praise for the role he played in the integration of the parochial schools of the archdiocese of New Orleans, which is the largest archdiocese in the South. He now becomes the head of the largest archdiocese in the Nation, the archdiccese of Chicago.

I am delighted at this appointment, and I want to congratulate Archbishop Cody and to wish him many years of good health as the spiritual leader of the archdiocese of Chicago.

As general chairman of the Villa Scalabrini—Italian Old Peoples' Home—development fund, a $4 million project, I look forward to the opportunity of cooperating with him so that the dream of the late Cardinal Stritch and the hopes of the late Cardinal Meyer can be fulfilled in the completion of the Italian Old Peoples' Home in North Lake, Ill.

I am pleased to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial about Archbishop Cody which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of June 17, 1965. The editorial follows:

A GREAT SUCCESSION

We gladly join in welcoming the appointment as Roman Catholic archbishop of Chicago of John Patrick Cody, archbishop of New Orleans. The succession of Chicago archbishops, from 1880 to the present, has been a distinguished one. Archbishops Patrick A. Feehan, James E. Quigley, George W. Mundelein, Samuel A. Stritch, Albert G. Meyer—each has made a notable contribution to the life of his church and of this city. The last three were all elevated to the College of Cardinals, and it is presumed that Archbishop Cody will soon be similarly honored.

The new archbishop of Chicago was not among those most frequently mentioned in advance speculation about the appointment. But his career in the church amply supports his selection to lead the populous archdiocese of Chicago. Since leaving his native city of St. Louis at the age of 19 to study at the North American College in Rome, John Patrick Cody has been entrusted with steadily increasing responsibilities. He has served as assistant (whether secretary or archbishop coadjutor) to an impressive series of leaders of his church; the director of his college; Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli (later Pope Pius XII) when secretary of state at the Vatican; Archbishops John Glennon and Joseph E. Ritter (both later made cardinals) of St. Louis, and Archbishop Joseph Francis Rummel, of New Orleans, whom Cody succeeded less than a year ago. He has also demonstrated leadership as president general of the National Catholic Education Association. Now, at the age of 57, he has been appointed to one of the most influential positions in the entire Roman Catholic Church. We can be sure that he comes to his new position well prepared to continue the record of his distinguished predecessors.

Chicagoans of many differing religious faiths unite in a hearty welcome to John Patrick Cody as Catholic archbishop of Chicago.

Politics: Illinois Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, William H. Rentschler, of Lake Forest, Ill., is a very dynamic young man whom it has been my pleasure to know for a number of years. As a matter of fact I openly supported his candidacy in the primary for the U.S. Senate in 1960. While Bill lost that skirmish, he nonetheless made a host of friends throughout the State of Illinois and in addition to making his mark in the business and professional world, has continued to give unselfishly of his time in the political arena. He has been writing a regular political column entitled, "Politics: Illinois Viewpoint." The column which bears a release date of June 19 is, in my opinion, a very good and appropriate one for the day.

As one whose voting record, philosophy, public statements, and all-out support of Senator Goldwater in the last presidential campaign would surely place me in the ranks of the more conservative Members of Congress, I want to go on record as wholeheartedly endorsing the views so ably expressed by my good friend, Bill Rentschler. To me this column makes good sense and I include it in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

POLITICS—ILLINOIS VIEWPOINT

(By William H. Rentschler)

Now comes the Free Society Association, a conservative educational group whose patron saint is Barry Goldwater.

It follows hard on the heels of the American Conservative Union launched earlier this year by two Republican Congressmen.

Then there was the National Republican Citizens League, started after the 1960 election by the Eisenhower wing of the GOP. Still another group is the so-called Committee of 68, headed by a onetime Scranton man, which is dedicated to seeing that someone like Barry Goldwater doesn't get the presidential nod in 1968.

No matter what lofty motives these political midwives profess, every last one of their organizations dilutes the Republican offensive and puts further from reach the hoped-for day of Republican resurgence.

These four organizations have much in common:

Each was started by someone with a philosophical axe to grind.

Each is rather presumptuously dedicated by its well-meaning founders to saving the Republican Party from itself, which means saving it from those whose views differ from their own.

Each inevitably costs big money, which just as inevitably is siphoned away from the main party coffers.

Each has hired hands who compete with other Republican organizations and regular GOP leaders and with each other rather than the real opposition.

Each tends to issue conflicting ideological manifestos which serve mainly to baffle still further the already confused public at large. Each has a perfect right to do whatever it is doing, even thought it may not be in the best interests of the broad cause which each seeks to represent and advance.

And each to some extent, indignant denials notwithstanding, exists as a vehicle for keeping alive favorite defeated candidates and/or promoting the fortunes of others.

There is no question that such organizations drive to the brink of drink a canny, knowing old pro like GOP National Chairman Ray C. Bliss, whose thankless chore it is to rebuild the wheezing, clanking GOP engine.

Bliss is no extrovert. He isn't given to public outbursts, and he doesn't wear his frustrations on his sleeve. But he knows that such extra organizations as these drain away vitally needed, hard-to-come-by dollars; heighten the divisive ideological conflict within the party; ignite prematurely the presidential maneuvering for 1968, and contribute nothing appreciable to the sheer drudgery of grassroots renaissance.

And Ray Bliss must surely feel deep in his heart that the GOP would be infinitely better off if its loyalists would focus their minds and muscles and contributions on strengthening the statutory apparatus of the party; on working through the national, State, and county committees; on ringing doorbells and stuffing envelopes and selling a forward-looking brand of republicanism—through the Republican Party.

While a hodgepodge of GOP fringe groups scramble for money, virtual starvation is the lot of most regular organizations. The Republican State Central Committee in Illinois labors on a sparse budget, pretty much without staff, without paid leadership, without field men, without public relations and research personnel. How can this scrag-

gly, underfed body compete effectively with the mercenaries of big labor and the payroller hordes of Chicago's Democrat machine?

When all is said and done, there is precious little evidence that these GOP splinter organizations pack much punch, convert many voters, or spur many victories.

George Romney, Michigan's controversial maverick Republican Governor, summarized rather effectively in a recent speech the GOP dilemma:

"By 1940, 42 percent of the American voters called themselves Democrats and 38 percent said they were Republicans. The other 20 percent were independents. By last summer, only 25 years later, there were 11 percent more Democrats, 2 percent more independents, and 13 percent fewer Republicans. * * * On the basis of those figures, our party is an underdog today by better than 2 to 1. We've had one Republican President out of five since 1932. We've had 2 Republican Congresses out of 17. We have 17 Republican governors out of 50. We're down to 25 percent of the voters."

Continues Romney: "Too many in the GOP embrace the optimistic fallacy that things are so bad that they can't get worse, and there's no way to go but up. Well, there is another way to go besides up. It's down. Things can get worse. It will be easier to go on losing elections than to start winning them."

Can the Free Society Association reverse the trend? Will the American Conservative Union get the GOP back on the track? Is the Republican Citizens League the obvious answer? Can the Committee of 68 do the trick?

Maybe all will contribute a bit to Republican resurgence.

But I prefer to send my dollar or so to Ray Bliss, no magician or miracle worker, but a sound political technician who will seek out the broad areas of agreement within the party and subordinate personalities to the larger cause. Bliss will make my dollar work harder and go further because he knows the requisites of victory and is a notoriously poor loser.

After all, your side must win a few elections before it can make a better world.

Politicians Pitifully Poor Parents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, politicians, at least the male variety, are, characteristically, pitifully poor parents. Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, writing in the June 20 edition of Parade gives us some broad hints as to why this is true in his article "The Importance of Being Dad."

Dr. Yolles does not pick on politicians; but, being one myself, I can. We Congressmen, for instance, know very well that most of the father failure patterns which Dr. Yolles mentions are our own daily dish. It is, in fact, surprising that more of our kids do not get into trouble and tragedy. But plenty do; and our ability to cover up for them in most cases obscures the true picture.

The first rule for a dad, according to Dr. Yolles is:

Spend more time at home, both in body and spirit. Include the children in the dinnertime conversation, in most weekend plans and in vacations. Don't encourage family vacations that leave you behind.

For years as a Congressman I have not been able to plan a vacation with my children when school is out. None of my colleagues have had that chance. It is not that Congress does not take liberal vacations, recesses and all other sorts of benefits for its Members, including what I consider a very high salary.

But when it comes to consideration of its numerous children, a planned vacation while school is out seems too complicated or too selfish a social reform for Congressmen to arrange, even though it could be in lieu of other periods of recess, not adding to the total days away from Washington.

Our constituents might point out how much we are paid. What constituent does not already know that? What Congressman-parent feels that a generous salary can furnish even a partial substitute for parental duty?

Well, we are at war. We have been for years and we have had many a recess, and will again even in 1965 in all probability. The question remains will any of these periods away from Washington allow congressional parents to plan even a short vacation while school is out? Right now, the answer seems to be probably not.

The article by Dr. Yolles is as follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING DAD

(By Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, Director, National Institute of Mental Health)

For most of this century, mother has been accepted as the greatest single influence on the development of the young. She has been given most of the credit—and the blame—for how the offspring turn out.

Considerable well-documented research now indicates, however, that father may have as great if not greater effect on his children than does mother. There is mounting evidence that dad's influence is considerably more important than the experts have thought.

Today, scientists are conducting investigations in the schools, the police files, the Armed Forces, the mental hospitals, the suburbs and the cities to pin down the influence of father on the behavior of the young. Studies at the National Institute of Mental Health of the U.S. Public Health Service and elsewhere reveal some provocative information about what an important figure he is.

This is not to discount mother's significance in child rising. As the father of two children myself, I do not intend to belittle the importance of mother. Still, here are some of the things behavioral science now says about the importance of father:

Father has it in his power to reduce delinquency and youthful crime. He has a decided influence on his child's mental health and on his IQ. He has a great impact on his son's manliness and bent toward success. He is the apple of his daughter's eye and helps her flower into femininity. He is, in short, close to indispensable.

While the child may be closer to the mother in the early years, he turns toward the father as the more interesting and exciting parent as he enters the teens, according to one researcher. This is because the father is not so available as the mother and because his job outside the home lends him an aura of glamour and prestige. He becomes the child's bridge from the home to the outside world.

Tired as father may be when he comes home from work, he provides some order and system to the family routine and gives mother the moral support she needs at the end of her day. As one scientist puts it, "Everything seems to snap into place when the father arrives."

One reason for the current interest in the influence of father is that many behaviorial problems in youngsters cannot be explained by pointing to mother.

In one of the Nation's best educated suburbs, Montgomery County, Md., for example, children commit more than half the serious crimes reported. Why do well-mannered children under the tutelage of mother in privileged, suburban homes become accomplished housebreakers, arsonists, or auto theft specialists? Child experts, attempting to explain what the FBI reports has become a national trend, look increasingly at the fact that the busy suburban father does not have much time to spend at home with his children.

In a random sample, Montgomery County police recently found that one-third of their young criminals came from homes in which father was entire absent—usually through divorce. Juvenile authorities report that in suburbia the men spend long hours working and commuting and complying with the pressure to keep up with the Joneses and often serve as fathers in name only.

Here are the results of several recent studies about the influence of father and some recommendations the man of the house may consider:

THE FATHER INFLUENCES DELINQUENCY

1. The Army and the National Institute of Mental Health conducted a study of 27 emotionally disturbed sons of Army officers who traveled. They tested the boys at Walter Reed Child Psychiatry Clinic, Washington, and interviewed their parents. The researchers found that when the officers traveled, their sons became disorganized and impulsive. They misbehaved in school, vandalized their neighborhoods, and picked fights with other children. And the longer the fathers stayed away, the more disturbed and delinquent the sons became. The researchers concluded that the men had provided a stability and restraint which their sons deeply missed.

2. Studies of impoverished rural homes and city slums also show that fatherless homes seem to breed delinquency. Dr. Loren Mosher, an Institute psychiatrist, believes that low socioeconomic status alone does not account for crime among deprived youngsters. In an analysis of the 1960 U.S. census figures, he found the lack of a father to be a stronger factor in delinquency than poverty. He reports that "the boy, in particular, needs a father to pattern himself after, to stimulate his interests, and to provide a job and recreation model. If the only consistently present adult in the child's early life is female, the male child will have no man to be like. For however loving and wise the woman may be, she cannot take the place of a man physically or psychologically."

3. Dr. Walter Mischel, a psychologist working under an Institute grant, also reports that the lack of a father may be more damaging to a child than being poor. He compared two Caribbean communities, one poorer than the other but with fathers in the home. The more impoverished youngsters turned out to be more stable and less impulsive than the richer children whose fathers were not in the home.

4. A group of Yale scientists studied delinquency in 48 cultures around the world under an NIMH grant. They concluded that the societies where the children were raised solely by women had higher crime rates than those where the fathers helped with child rearing. Dr. Irvin L. Child writes that crime may arise as a protest against femininity, and that the crime is the boy's aim-

less search for the masculinity he cannot find at home.

These clues to delinquency have spurred the scientists into digging up other facts about father:

THE FATHER AFFECTS HIS CHILD'S IQ

A study of some 500 middle-class grade-school children in New York City shows that those with a father in the home showed significantly higher IQ's than those without fathers. Dr. Martin Deutsch, director of the Institute for Developmental Studies, New York Medical College, and one of our NIMH grantees, explains that "the father furnishes some degree of order and organization in the home. His presence and his conversation, especially at dinnertime, stimulate the child. We think these factors help the student perform better in school."

THE FATHER INFLUENCES HIS CHILD'S MENTAL HEALTH

Scientists, comparing a group of mentally disturbed GI's with a group of normal soldiers, asked each to describe how he remembered his parents. Both groups of men remembered their mothers as kindly and helpful. But there were differences in how they remembered their fathers. The normal GI's recalled their fathers as warm and encouraging, yet firm when necessary. On a questionnaire prepared by NIMH psychologist Earle Schaefer, they described their fathers this way: "He always listened to my ideas and opinions." "He liked to go to interesting places with me." "He made me feel better after talking things over with him." The disturbed soldiers, on the other hand, described their fathers as hostile, cruel, indifferent: "He was always finding fault." "He spoke to me in a cold, matter-of-fact voice when I offended him." "He didn't seem to think about me very often." "He didn't care where I was or what I did." Dr. William Vogel, Worcester State Hospital, Worcester, Mass., concludes: "The harsh male parents might well account for the inability of the disturbed group to adapt successfully."

One expert declares that a son's homosexuality is largely the fault of the father. Dr. Irving Bieber, of New York Medical College, has found that such a boy often has a domineering mother who smothers his masculinity, and a disinterested father who permits the situation and withdraws from it. Men could prevent such a result, Dr. Beiber believes, by stepping in and serving as buffer between son and mother.

One group of scientists at the Institute believes the personality of the father can contribute to his child's mental illness. In analyzing schizophrenics, both boys and girls, researchers noticed that their fathers had followed a pattern. Harddriving and successful on the job yet cold, indifferent, and detached at home, these men preferred to let the mothers raise the children. One father, engulfed in two jobs, "seemed like a shadow in the house" to one of his daughters. Another, constantly traveling to build up his own business, played with his children only after he had put his hat on and was about to go out the door.

In contrast, in a study of normal children, researchers found that the fathers managed to find time to talk to and play with their children. They also arranged for the family to do things together on weekends and vacations. As one child puts it, "Dad always seemed willing to give something of himself to us."

THE FATHER IS IMPORTANT TO HIS DAUGHTER

Some experts think that fathers play as important a role in molding girls as they do with boys. Dr. Miriam M. Johnson, of the University of Oregon, reports that a girl becomes feminine not by copying her mother but enjoying a warm and happy relationship with her father. Through him she learns to understand and to feel at ease with boys and men. Dr. Johnson, analyzing a group of college girls, found that the more feminine ones were those who got along well with their fathers. The fathers took an interest in them and complimented them. The less feminine girls described their fathers as "distant," "critical," "indifferent." One said, "Father does not seem to care what I do. Often it is just as though I did not exist."

THE FATHER FOSTERS HIS SON'S MANLINESS

A study of several hundred Harvard boys shows that those whose fathers were home during their younger years have more masculine abilities than those boys whose fathers were away. On the college board examinations the boys whose fathers were present scored higher in math, typically a masculine ability, according to nationwide test results. The boys, whose fathers were away scored higher in verbal abilities, typically a female characteristic, according to Lyn Carlsmith, psychologist. One explanation is that the anxiety which afflicts the boys whose fathers are away does greater damage to mathematical skills than to verbal ones.

THE FATHER PROMOTES HIS SON'S SUCCESS

National Institute of Mental Health scientists, studying the top boys in the Westinghouse Science Talent Search, have concluded that these brilliant and well-adjusted boys have remarkable fathers. Successful and men of wide interests, they are fond of their sons, share their hobbies, listen carefully to them no matter what they want to talk about. They are kindly toward them, yet according to the boys don't hesitate to punish them when necessary. Drs. Lois-Ellin Datta and Morris Parloff note that fathers don't try to be "one of the boys," but treat their sons with a fine blend of permissiveness and authority.

Many of the findings about the great effect father has on his family have inspired new methods for salvaging problem children. In Newton, Mass., a Boston suburb, Drs. Milton Shore, and Joseph L. Massimo, a psychologist, conducted a "substitute father" experiment for 10 delinquent but bright high school dropouts. They included Jerry, 17, with a lurid record of street fighting; Jimmie, 15, a school vandal; Sam, 16, a drunk and a burglar. As a rule, these boys' fathers were too busy or too indifferent to help them.

In contrast, Dr. Massimo made himself available to the boys 24 hours a day. He rescued one boy from a street fight, took another to the hospital at 3 in the morning, went with others to the dentist, to buy clothes, to the movies, and to baseball games.

Instead of letting the boys complain endlessly about their hard luck, he nudged them into learning skills necessary to stay in school or hold a job. By observing that one boy always ordered the same thing he did at a restaurant, Dr. Massimo found out the boy could not read. Starting with menus, he succeeded in getting the boy to master reading.

He also helped the boys job-hunt, then went with them to the actual interviews.

In a followup 3 years later, four were learning a trade, three were in school, two had jobs. None had been in legal trouble.

In contrast, 10 other similar delinquents outside the "father" program were unemployed or were involved in crime 3 years later. Only 1 of the 10 returned to school.

In the light of this new research, several recommendations may be made to the male parent who intends to fulfill his important part in the family.

GUIDE TO FATHERS

1. Spend more time at home, both in body and in spirit. Include the children in the dinnertime conversation, in most weekend plans and in vacations. Don't encourage family vacations that leave you behind.

2. Don't allow your job to wrap you up to the extent of slighting your children. Success for which sons and daughters have to pay the price in their psychological well-being may not be worth it.

3. Remember that daughters need affection and attention for healthy development.

4. Remember that sons need fatherly affection, authority, and some prodding that shows your interest in them.

5. Be available in times of crisis, but to quiz your child on what went wrong but to assuage his distress and, like Mount Everest, just to be there.

6. Take part in community programs that are of interest to your children.

Dr. Lyman Wynne, an Institute psychiatrist and authority on family problems, believes that the key to a child's welfare is the quality of relationship between the parents. If they love and respect each other, all will be well. If one parent compensates for the mistakes of the other, all is not lost. But when both are out of step, trouble can be expected.

In all fairness to fathers, the pattern of our society does not make it easy for them to be all that they should be. Being a good father is probably more difficult than being a good mother. Motherhood has been a well-defined role since the beginning of time. Fatherhood has varied from culture to culture and from one era to another.

Mother is bombarded with expert advice on how to do her job, and the Government has even set up bureaus and departments to assist her. But the man will find our libraries and magazines singularly bare of information on how to be a good father. There are no departments of paternal welfare to send him pamphlets, nor columns on child care to solve his problems.

Yet evidence shows that the role of the father is more demanding than ever before. Because today's families are smaller, more competitive and more isolated, they carry an extra emotional burden. With fewer grandparents, relatives, and oldtime friends nearby, the family must furnish an extra measure of affection and security for its members.

Many a father, faced with such demands, retreats altogether into his business or his club. Yet in many families where the father succeeds in shouldering this load, the rewards are surprisingly rich. The children reciprocate by offering the kind of ego-building affection that the father sorely needs. Family ties grow stronger. Everything seems to go better in the home, and a new deal unfolds for the father. He has always shared much of the blame when things have gone wrong. Now, at last, the experts are willing to give him much of the credit when all goes well.

Golden Spike Reopens Northwestern California Disaster Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday a golden spike, symbolic of the spike which was put in place about a century ago to link East and West when the railroad first spanned this Nation of ours, was driven into the tracks of the Northwestern Pacific Railroad along the Eel River in California.

With this act, this railroad was restored to operation for the first time since the disastrous floods which hit the

Pacific Northwest last Christmas. In five and a half months since disaster struck, the Northwestern Pacific Railroad and its parent company, Southern Pacific, have worked around the clock to restore the railroad's operation. This has cost the company $10,700,000. Neither money nor manpower were spared to expedite the reconstruction of the railroad for the economic survival of a large area of our Golden State was at stake. The railroad is the only feasible means of moving great volumes of timber products from this area to the rest of the Nation and the world and communities in this region are totally dependent upon the timber industry for their very existence.

There was naturally great joy and celebration when the first train left Eureka to travel along the winding Eel River to Shellville Junction where it entered the Southern Pacific system. In my hometown of Roseville, Calif., this, the first train from the Northwest, reached the Southern Pacific's switching yards where the timber products carried from the northwestern California famed redwood regions were sent speeding on their way to points north, south, and east throughout our Nation.

And soon thereafter the first train to return to the Eureka region carried the products of the Nation and the world back to the communities which had been isolated for such a long time.

Even as these trains moved back and forth for the first time across this important railroad line, President Lyndon B. Johnson was signing into law the Pacific Northwest Disaster Act which made special provisions to protect and stabilize the banks of the Eel River so that the same type of disaster might not occur again. I am proud to have authored this legislation.

For the people of northwestern California this was a memorable week. To commemorate the occasion, our California colleague, Congressman DON CLAUSEN, also an author of the Pacific Northwest Disaster Act, and I were scheduled to drive that golden spike which marked the final step to restoration of the essential rail line. At the last minute, I was forced to cancel my participation in the ceremony because of legislative responsibilities here in the House of Representativs, but Representative CLAUSEN did participate and did drive that spike.

Without objection, I would insert at this point in the RECORD Congressman CLAUSEN's comments made on that memorable and important occasion for they point up Federal efforts to help our disaster stricken neighbors. May I also, at this time, express the deep appreciation of the people of all of California for the wonderful and heartwarming assistance which was extended to the people of our great State by both the legislative and the executive agencies of the U.S. Government.

Comments by the Honorable DON CLAUSEN:

Dr. Dolfini, President Biaggini, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to express my heartfelt congratulations to you, Mr. Biaggini, and your railroad associates who have labored so diligently to accomplish the engineering miracle of reestablishing rail service over this line in the short period of less than 6 months.

I am most happy to join in this celebration commemorating the restoration of this vital rail link to the redwood empire. As your representative in Congress, I would like to tell you what we in Congress and the Government service have done to rehabilitate this area after the devastating flood and hopefully to prevent a recurrence of such disasters in the future.

As you know, the catastrophic floods of last December and January were not limited to northern California, but also wreaked havoc in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Nevada. They were among the worst experienced in the history of this country. The President of the United States immediately declared the area a major disaster area. All available machinery of the Federal and State governments, as well as of the county and municipal jurisdictions, was directed to immediate relief and subsequent rehabilitation. The Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force all supplied equipment and services to transport food and forage, clothes, fuel and other necessities. The prompt action of the Federal agencies in emergency assistance, coordinated by the Office of Emergency Planning, as well as the help of State and local agencies, and private agencies, greatly alleviated the suffering and losses that occurred. The Corps of Engineers established 47 field offices and had 867 personnel engaged in disaster activities.

The catastrophe prompted the House Committee on Public Works, of which I have the privilege to be a member, to send a special subcommittee last January to inspect the damage in California and Oregon first hand. I also served with this subcommittee. We held numerous meetings in this area with Federal, State, and local officials, as well as with representatives of Southern Pacific and Northwestern Pacific, lumber companies and other private interests. From Eureka we flew on an inspection tour by helicopter along the Eel River Canyon for a distance of about 40 miles. This was the only way to see this area, since practically all roads and bridges were impassable. On April 1, 1965, this subcommittee issued a 67-page report on the disaster to the full Committee on Public Works. Its findings were appalling: preliminary estimate of total damage in the major river basin areas, $462 million; $60 million alone in the Eel River basin; 100 miles of the Northwestern Pacific rail lines virtually wiped out.

My California colleague in Congress and on this committee, BIZZ JOHNSON, from Roseville, who would have been here with me except for the fact that he had his bill—the Auburn Folsom Dam project up for floor consideration today, and I each promptly introduced several flood relief bills in Congress. We each appeared and made presentations on March 9 at hearings before the House Subcommittee on Flood Control in support of legislation to alleviate this disaster. I take pardonable pride in reporting that Congress has now enacted the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965, to provide assistance to California and the four other affected Northwestern States for the reconstruction of areas damaged by these floods. Although President Johnson took exception to one minor feature of this law, he indicated that he would promptly sign it if this feature were eliminated. The Congress has already repassed the law with the objectionable language deleted.

What are the salient features of this act?

1. The act would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to expend not to exceed $70 million in the 1965 and 1966 fiscal years for the repair and reconstruction of highways, roads, and trails damaged as the result of the disaster.

2. The act would facilitate resumption of logging on Government land by authorizing reimbursement in part of timber sale contractors for the cost of restoration of access roads damaged by the flood, and by authorizing appropriation of an additional $38 million for forest development roads.

3. The act would give public land entrymen relief by providing additional time to comply with requirements of law.

4. The act would allow loans under the Small Business Act maturing up to 30 years for replacing or repairing damaged dwellings.

5. Finally, and most important in connection with our gathering here is the provision in the act for a Federal Government survey to determine what protective work is necessary and in the public interest to prevent the recurrence of flood damage to the banks of the Eel River adjacent to this railroad and authorizing the performance of such future work by the Government and the reimbursement of such work as has already been done by the railroad. This is a recognition by Congress of the public interest in preventing a recurrence of blockage of service on this peculiary vital railroad. The public interest is indicated by the fact that some 80 percent of the forest products produced in the Eel River basin is shipped to market over this railroad, and the forest products industry makes up approximately 70 percent of the economy of the area. This provision affords important interim protection before a projected permanent multipurpose flood control project on the Eel River, now under survey by the Corps of Engineers, can become a reality. While this act is an important step towards providing protection from future floods and toward alleviating some of the suffering from the past one, it is not responsible for the major feat of restoring these rail lines in this brief interval. Under the act the Federal Government bears no part of the cost of restoring the railroad. Instead, this tremendous accomplishment is due solely to the Southern Pacific and Northwestern Pacific and their contractors plunging ahead at full speed with their own people and financial resources in the best free enterprise tradition, without waiting for Government help. As our committee put it in its report on this act:

"Railway management has acted with dispatch and with high regard for its responsibility to assist in restoring the economy of the region, by taking emergency action to reconstruct the rail line and resume train operation at the earliest possible date."

The railroad management is to be commended too on its use in this restoration job, wherever possible, of its own former operating employees and others from this area, who would otherwise have been unemployed, thus giving important interim help to the severely damaged economy of the area. In particular, I want to recognize the construction crews who gave that extra effort in order to expedite the completion date of the reconstruction project. Finally, they are to be commended for granting reduced rates on lumber, so that it might be trucked to the nearest railhead during the period when the line was shut down.

Let us firmly hope that the line of steel, which we today relink, may never again be cut and that the whole redwood empire may again blossom with its restoration. Again, my congratulations.

To Explore the Deep Ocean Floor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has shown

much insight into the importance of exploring the ocean as well as outer space. The project to build a special atomic submarine for this purpose is a very commendable one and I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on April 25, 1965.

The article follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Apr. 25, 1965]

TO EXPLORE THE DEEP OCEAN FLOOR

President Johnson's announcement of a joint project by the Navy and the Atomic Energy Commission to develop a nuclear-powered submarine designed especially for deep ocean exploration is welcome recognition of the importance of pushing efforts in this comparatively neglected field.

The fact is that the Nation's fleet of nuclear undersea vessels, the mightiest ships in the U.S. Navy from the standpoint of firepower and key importance to the Nation's defense, must cruise most of the time above more or less uncharted ocean bottoms and often dive into mysterious depths where the slightest miscalculation might send them crashing into an unknown void from which, at present, there is no return.

The resources of this Nation should be used to better purpose in providing protection and information for the men who are even now at sea in these vessels. In addition, there are other reasons for building maneuverable vessels capable of visiting the deep ocean bottoms. The immediate assignment of the new submarine—when it goes to sea—will be to explore an ocean floor area which, as the President pointed out, is several times that of the continental United States.

There is every reason to believe that vast new sources of raw materials, particularly oil and ores, may be exploited on the Continental Shelf and perhaps in other unexplored regions. In short, we believe the new project is thoroughly worthwhile and one that ought to pay for itself many times over from both the humane and practical standpoints. It is likely, in fact, that more than one such vessel will be—and ought to be—authorized and constructed, once the prototype has taken definite shape.

The Urgent Need for Passage of a Constitutional Amendment Offsetting the Supreme Court Decision on Reapportionment of State Legislatures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, the attached article entitled "Reapportionment Mess" by Raymond Moley was published in the June 21, 1965, issue of Newsweek. This article points out clearly the reasons why it is urgent that the Congress take prompt action to pass a constitutional amendment offsetting the Supreme Court Decision on reapportionment of State legislatures.

REAPPORTIONMENT MESS

(By Raymond Moley)

The Supreme Court had ample warning when, in 1962, it first plunged the courts into a crusade to remake the Nation's system of representative government. For Justice Frankfurter in his dissent in the initial case of *Baker* v. *Carr* made it eloquently clear that the Court, by a tortured interpretation of the Constitution, opened the way to a mathematical quagmire.

While Frankfurter, with plenty of historical evidence, covered the traditional recognition that there were interests as well as people that needed representation, his strongest point was that the reform in view was something which the courts were incapable of managing. He said that the decision of the majority of the Court was without guidelines for formulating specific, definite, wholly unprecedent remedies for the inevitable litigation which today's umbrageous disposition is bound to stimulate.

There was no change in Frankfurter in 1962 from his pre-judicial days when his outlook was in the classical sense broadly liberal. I knew him well in the early 1930's when he was busy advising the administration in Washington on innumerable issues and personalities. Even then he vigorously opposed any legislation which would impose burdens upon the courts which might overload them and tend to divert them from the deliberation and judgment appropriate to the disposition of great issues of law. This is why he favored the creation of administrative commissions to relieve the courts.

DUCKS AND DRAKES

The *Baker* v. *Carr* decision was, he believed, wrong on all grounds, especially those which would overburden the courts with details of reapportionment in a conflict which would permit the "legislatures to play ducks and drakes with the judiciary."

When, in 1964, the Court went even further with its idea of one man, one vote Frankfurter was not there to dissent. But Justice Harlan was equally vociferous.

These warnings have been amply justified by what is going on now. The utmost confusion prevails. Instead of reforming some of the lower houses of State legislatures, the Court has plunged itself into reforming both houses and, as was inevitable, the redistricting of the representation of the States in the National House of Representatives.

Lower Federal courts, confused and without guidelines or the facilities to redraw districts, are being overruled by the Supreme Court. And the High Tribunal is overruling not only legislatures and State courts, but the wishes of the voters of the States as they are registered in initiative and referendum elections. Apparently nobody is responsible but the Court, and the Court itself is utterly confused.

SUPREME COURT DEMOCRACY

A tide of litigation has swept the Nation. States where there had been no hint of civil rights problems have been man, or rather court handled. In one State, three congressional reapportionments have been compelled since 1961. In another case, a Federal court was reprimanded for overruling a State supreme court; and in another, a State court was overruled. The U.S. Supreme Court has overruled a California reapportionment plan for the State senate which had received the approval of the voters of the State four times. Apparently, the only kind of democracy that is to be tolerated in the present dispensation is Supreme Court democracy.

Meanwhile, 26 State legislatures have moved for a constitutional convention to deal with the issue, while several State senates have passed resolutions called for such a convention. This drive for a convention is regarded as a means of pressure on Congress to approve a constitutional amendment proposed by Senator DIRKSEN for submission to the States. But since only nine more States are needed to bring about a constitutional convention, it is becoming more and more apparent that Presidential intervention is highly desirable to pass the Dirksen proposal before further confusion develops. For it should be unnecessary to have a constitutional convention to rectify the palpably bad judgment of the Supreme Court in seeking to reform, along the lines of its own capricious judgment, not only State legislatures but the lower House of the Congress itself.

Far-Out Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the far-out liberals are not bound by reason or even standard parlimentary procedure. They continually demand more Federal control in their legislative proposals and they proceed to condemn those who do not vote with them for more Federal control as being negative—antiprogressives. They use the freedom of speech as a license while depriving the other side of a real hearing. William S. White in the following editorial in the Washington Post of June 21, 1965, can see the end of their exaggerated strength.

FAR-OUT LIBERALS

(By William S. White)

This country's far-out liberals, who are roughly 90 percent Democratic and 10 percent un-Republican Republicans, are beginning to push well past the limits of tolerance to the vital American center.

Already they have obtained from President Johnson and Congress the most massive and the most far-reaching range of reformist domestic legislation ever accomplished here.

But they are not content. They go on demanding and demanding yet more and more. And then, even so, they can know no content. They have no cutoff point. Having had their way everywhere so far in the area of the domestic issues—antipoverty, Federal aid to education and medicine, a revolutionary voting rights act, et cetera—they must have yet more.

They must have positive assurances that Supreme Court decisions tending in sheer defiance of the Constitution to destroy the last of the power of rural and small-town people in the legislatures and in Congress will never be critically touched by Congress itself.

They must have a new Federal cabinet department for further housing and further urban development still further to reward the already politically overprivileged city masses at the expense of that new largely forgotten minority which is not urban. Congress must strike down the authority of the States to maintain, if they wish, right-to-work laws which in plain truth only forbid compulsory unionism just as "yellow dog" compulsory nonunionism practices by management were outlawed long ago. And so on. And so on and on.

In short, they must have everything, and have it all at once. But even all of it will never be enough. For while they endlessly prod President and Congress to materialize every one of their economic and social ideas, with no nonsense about giving the other side a real hearing, what else do they do? They demand the right to control not simply the domestic but also to veto the foreign policy of this Nation.

The very men in Congress to whom the President has given an unbroken—and in

this columnist's opinion sometimes a most regrettable—series of yes responses on domestic issues shriek an unbroken series of noes at him when he takes a rationally hard line against Communist encroachment anywhere abroad.

Wherever it may be, in Vietnam or in the Dominican Republic they wish to paralyze him and the country in their curious conviction that they are appointed to run everything, everywhere.

So, the far-out liberals are now more than impossibly demanding. They are also now too demanding for their own good. Congress has not passed all these things because it agrees that the far-outs know all the answers and that to reject them, any time, is, say, simply Goldwater Republicanism.

In many instances the controlling moderates have gone along only in the notion that perhaps the parochial urges of the far liberals would then be satiated. At least, so it was assumed, they would allow the President's more conservative side some freedom and help on the grand issues of national honor and national survival.

What the far-outs never understand is that free government proceeds at last upon consent, in a politics of civility and of a decent willingness to allow something, sometimes, to the fellow. Their total disrespect for this great reality is going to put a rude brake upon them soon. For their actual power in Congress or country is not one-half what they suppose it to be. The true national majority is becoming fed to the teeth with the assumption of the far-outs that whatever these Lolas want, these Lolas must and infallibly will always get.

They Braved Death To Free Trapped Buddy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, acts of heroism in the coal mining industry have been well documented for generations. As the Representative from the largest anthracite-producing area of the world, I have personal knowledge of many of these heroic deeds where men will risk their lives in efforts to save the lives of their fellow workmen trapped beneath the surface of rock falls, gas explosions, passageways sealed off from the outside and for many other dangerous reasons.

Just last December another in the long series of heroic sagas took place at the Franklin Colliery in the city of Wilkes-Barre where three men—Bill Holena, Frank DiAndriole and Clair Sigworth—risked their lives to save the life of one of their colleagues, Peter Buczkowski.

In recognition of the bravery displayed on that occasion by these three intrepid miners, they will receive on Thursday, June 24, the Joseph A. Holmes Medal from the U.S. Bureau of Mines in Washington.

I understand, moreover, that plans are already underway for them to receive consideration for the highest civilian award for bravery, the Carnegie Foundation Medal.

The Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent in its edition of June 13, 1965, featured a narrative of that heroic rescue and, Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks today I would like to include that article.

The article follows:

FRANKLIN COLLIERY'S HEROIC TRIO TO RECEIVE MEDAL FOR THEIR DEED—FATHER OF SEVEN AMONG RESCUERS; ONE MINER KILLED

It was a bleak December day last year when Bill Holena, of Forty Fort; Frank DiAndriole, of Avoca; and Clair Sigworth, of Kingston; got up for work.

All three were—and still are—among the seemingly handful of men still employed by the anthracite industry.

Bill and Frank worked as a miner and assistant foreman for Franklin Colliery, located off the Route 309 bypass near Blackman Street, city. Clair is a Federal coal mine inspector.

About 1:10 that afternoon it happened. A fall of rib coal at the Franklin workings killed one worker instantly and injured three others. One of these, Pete Buczkowski, of Plymouth, was entrapped by the falling debris.

Larry Malachefski, 37, of Plymouth, was the killed miner. Al Kotch and Tony Saitta were the others injured. They were brought out by rescuers in a relatively short time.

TIME WAS SHORT

The dilemma then was to free Buczkowski. Time was growing short since the vein near which he was trapped was constantly working, with small falls frequently occurring.

Federal inspectors were wary about sending rescue teams in. Holena, DiAndriole, and Sigworth didnt wait for an invitation.

Despite orders by the Federal men on the scene not to reenter the mine, the trio did just that. Holena's venture was all the more reckless, it was thought at the time, since he is the father of seven children.

For 2½ hours Holena, DiAndriole, and Sigworth battled the maze of fallen timbers, coal, and rock in their frantic efforts to free Buczkowski.

TASK COMPLICATED

Their task was complicated by the fact that the vein was pitched 69 degrees and several times they had to withdraw while smaller falls took place.

Before they withdrew, however, they constructed a protective planking network around the trapped Buczkowski to ward off any further debris.

Buczkowski, in obvious pain, repeatedly called for help. The three men once again ventured into the dangerous area, climbing over, under and around fallen coal, shale, rock, and timber.

While coworkers installed timbers, braces, and cribbing against the active coal rib, Holena, DiAndriole, and Sigworth worked feverishly to free Buczkowski.

ANOTHER FALL IMMINENT

Another fall in the area was imminent as the timber creaked under the additional weight. Undaunted, Holena, DiAndriole and Sigworth kept digging, tugging, and shoveling.

Buczkowski was conscious all the time and finally, 10 hours after the original fall, he was freed from the materials which pinned him and which had him on the precipice of death during all that time.

Four hours after Buczkowski was rescued, another large fall occurred at the point of the original cave, the resultant rubble being so extensive that it took 6 days of timbering and reopening work on four shifts a day to recover the body of Malachefski.

The official report of the accident fixed the cause as failure to recognize the hazardous condition presented by the thin separation between the top and bottom red ash vein. Excessive width of the "place" was a contributing factor.

OPERATIONS CEASE

The mining operation at Franklin Colliery has since ceased, but the heroic deed of Holena, 37; DiAndriole, 55; and Sigworth, 54, hasn't been forgotten.

On June 24, at Hanover Township High School, they will receive the Joseph A. Holmes Medal from the U.S. Bureau of Mines in Washington.

Friends of the trio hope this is but the first step toward recognition of their unselfish efforts. Plans are already underway for application to the Carnegie Foundation for that group's heroism award.

LEAST IMPRESSED

But the three men are probably the least impressed of anyone with the news of their impending decoration.

They know all too well that there have been many instances of similar heroism in the anthracite industry in days gone by—incidents which the average miner considers no more than his duty.

They also know there are many instances when the heroes never returned to tell about their exploits deep in the bowels of the anthracite area's earth.

But, while medals tarnish and memories dim with time, there's one guy who'll never forget what those three men did during those 10 dark hours—Peter Buczkowski.

The Ferchills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article that appeared June 7, 1965, in the Longview Daily News about the very outstanding Ferchill family.

[From the Longview Daily News, June 7, 1965]

FAMILY OF FINE CITIZENS

The Ferchill family of Longview—Pat Ferchill, Joe Ferchill, Vic Ferchill, and their respective family groups—are among the finest citizens that Longview or any community could have. They are hard workers in business and community affairs and are unusually productive in good results for their city and area.

The "Turning Back the Calendar" column on our editorial page a few days ago carried under the "5 Years Ago" division this item: "Vic Ferchill was convention chairman of the State convention of the Texas Elks State Association which was being held in Longview."

At the time this column item appeared, the Texas Elks State Association again was holding its annual convention in Longview, and Viv Ferchill was playing a prominent role in arrangements for the many convention affairs and in entertaining the visiting Elks.

Just as Vic has been busy for the past several days at the job of being a friendly host and useful citizen so it was with him 5 years ago when he served as convention chairman—and so it has been with the entire Ferchill family since they moved to Longview many years ago.

Pat Ferchill has just announced that his firm, Reliable Motor Supply, has opened new units in Longview and Hallsville. Organized here in 1944, Reliable now has six sales units, is the largest automotive distributor in east Texas and carries one of the largest inven-

tories of parts and equipment to be found in Texas.

Pat, Joe and Vic are active in the day-to-day operation of the business and have a number of associates who are managers in the sales units in various locations in the Longview and east Texas area.

Longview will be host on June 10-13 to the 12th Annual Texas Antique Automobile Tour—thanks to the good work of the Ferchills.

This tour will attract some 600 persons to Longview to take part in the events, which will include an awards banquet where first, second and third place trophies will be presented in each of 12 categories of competition.

This event will bring to Longview a large number of antique automobiles that have been attractively restored to operating condition. They will be driven to points of interest in the east Texas area around Longview, and will be driven in parade competition around the courthouse square.

Pat Ferchill for some years has acquired and maintained a major collection of more than 150 of the ancient models and now has some of the finest antique automobiles in Texas and the Southwest. He often makes various models from his collection available for driving in parades and for display at other appropriate times.

The Ferchill brothers have been active in civic and community organizations, service clubs, fraternal groups, and on committees and projects too numerous to mention here. Wherever they have served, their work has been outstanding and a real contribution to community progress.

In Longview's business community the Ferchills are highly regarded for their good relationships and for their modern and progressive business methods. Their personal popularity and their unselfish and dedicated civic service combine to assure their continued business success and to rank them at the top as citizen leaders in community development and public progress.

This newspaper today salutes the Ferchill family of fine citizens. They are always found squarely in the middle of any progressive movement for the development and growth of Longview and east Texas and for the enjoyment and enrichment of life in their community.

The 350th Anniversary of Taos, N. Mex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride and pleasure that I inform my distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives of the 350th anniversary of Taos, N. Mex. This charming and picturesque village in the mountains of north-central New Mexico is widely known as the location of the famous Taos Indian Pueblo, and for being a center of art and cultural activity. The following remarks are offered as a tribute to my many friends in the Taos area.

THE 350TH ANNIVERSARY OF TAOS, N. MEX.

In his perceptive article on New Mexico in February's Harper's magazine, the late David Boroff said that for new Mexicans "the graceful coexistence of three cultures—Spanish, Indian, and Anglo—is an article of faith." Nowhere in New Mexico is this graceful coexistence to be found in a purer and more interesting form than in Taos.

Forty-eight years after Columbus discovered America, members on the expeditionary forces of Coronado reached this area. Twenty-two years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, Don Juan de Onate came to Taos. On September 9, 1598, Padre Francisco de Zamora arrived to introduce Christianity to the Taos and Picuris Pueblos. Thus began the Spanish stream of the history of Taos. By 1615, the walled town of Taos had been built; we observe this year 1965 as the 350th anniversary of the founding of Taos.

The Indian part of the Taos story extends far back into pre-Columbian history. In 1680 occurred an Indian revolution when all Spanish residents were driven out of New Mexico. Although Don Diego de Vargas reconquered the area around Santa Fe in 1692, peace with the Taos Indians was not achieved until the winter of 1696. De Vargas came to the Pueblo in September of that year, causing the Indians to flee to the mountains where they remained until heavy snows forced their return; they then restored their partially ruined church, and resumed friendly relations with the Spanish.

The first Anglo trappers came to the area in 1805, and were overjoyed to find in the sheltered valley a haven of civilization on the borders of the vast wilderness that stretched north, east, and west over the mountains and plains. The mountain men made Taos their headquarters; Kit Carson was one of the most famous of them.

The original Santa Fe Trail of the early 1820's led through Taos, but was abandoned when wagonmaster found a route to the southwest that was easier to follow than the steep trails of Taos Canyon and the Vermejo area. But this route was always used as a so-called loop of the Santa Fe Trail, and a small section of it can still be seen under the cliffs of the Picture Rocks southwest of Taos.

In 1846, Gen. Stephen Watts Kearny captured the area from Mexico for the United States. Among the famous citizens of the community who were prominent during Santa Fe Trail and Territorial days were Kit Carson, Charles Simpson, Padre Jose Antonio Martinez, Capt. Smith Simpson, Colonel St. Vrain, and Judge Beaubien. Padre Martinez established the first newspaper published west of the Mississippi.

In 1861, Capt. Smith Simpson achieved fame by nailing the Union flag to a tall cottonwood pole and planting it in the Taos Plaza. For years, Confederate sympathizers had been accustomed to taking down the flag that had first been placed there in Kearny's time. Simpson and his friends guarded the flag against further aggressions, and, to honor their solicitude for the national emblem, the Stars and Stripes have been permitted ever since to fly over Taos both during the day and at night.

The growth and fame of Taos as an art colony grew out of one man's enthusiasm for this town which he had never seen, and a broken wagon wheel. Joseph Henry Sharp, a young painter sketching in New Mexico in 1880, reported so enthusiastically what he had heard about the charm of the remote Taos village to his artist friends Bert Phillips and Ernest L. Blumenschein that they decided to visit it. They traveled by train to Denver, bought camping supplies, and headed south, painting as they traveled.

Thirty miles from Taos one of their wagon wheels broke. On the flip of a coin it became Blumenschein's job to ride his horse to Taos, carrying the broken wheel there for repair. It took him 3 days to make the trip and return to camp. He was so enchanted by what he had seen of Taos that he suggested they stay there for good. Later Sharp joined them, followed by another artist, Irving Couse. They eventually organized the Taos Society of Artists, and sent east their exhibitions of works that reflected the beauty and charm of the landscape and people of Taos. More and more artists have been attracted to Taos over the years. A very powerful esthetic source was discovered by these men in the Indian culture; in the Spanish culture they found an established tradition of religious art. These have been blended with the strength of American art, just as the three cultures of Indian, Spanish, and Anglo have been blended in Taos itself.

One of these Taos artists, Paul Keith, has designed a beautiful commemorative coin for the 350th anniversary of the founding of Taos. It may be obtained in either bronze or silver, and it is an appropriate symbol of one of America's most unique and lovely places, the home of three cultures, the home of artists, and the home of the most striking natural scenic beauty in the world.

Taos has had an historical and colorful past and it has played an important role in the early settlement of the Upper Rio Grande mountain area. May of the early settlements are today still in existence and retain some of the earmarks of earlier years. But Taos like many of our frontier towns is taking on a new role. The clear mountain streams and lakes, the beautiful stands of fir and ponderosa pine, and the scenic Rio Grande Gorge have a great attraction for visitors and outdoor recreationists from all over the country, and these visitors are increasing from year to year.

Today Taos boasts of having one of the finest ski resorts in the southwestern Rocky Mountain area. Nearby Eagle Nest Lake provides some of the finest and largest rainbow trout in the Southwest. The camping areas in high mountains provide excellent refuge from the telephone and the tumult of city life. Excellent facilities are available for the vacationer who wishes to take a horseback trip into the mountains and rough it for a few days. New road improvements and construction are making it possible for those who seek a milder form of recreation than horseback riding and fishing the mountain streams, to tour the Taos countryside and enjoy the scenic mountain beauty, see the Indian pueblos and nearby cliff dwellings, or enjoy a picnic at some nearby recreation area.

For many years, visitors to Taos have not had an opportunity to get a closeup view of one of our scenic attractions of that part of the State. This attraction is what we often call our miniature Grand Canyon or the Rio Grande Gorge. Flowing through this deep gorge west of Taos is the turbulent Rio Grande. The State of New Mexico has near completion a high span bridge across this gorge which will connect for the first time the east and west side of northern New Mexico and give our visitors a look at this rugged country. After a recent study by the Department of the Interior, it was proposed that the Rio Grande be declared a wild river and be included in a Wild River System to be created by legislation now pending in the Senate and in the House. Under this legislation, the Rio Grande, through this deep gorge which stretches from Pilar, N. Mex., to the Colorado State line, would be preserved in its primitive state, thus, permanently conserving and protecting the scenic, recreation, fish and wildlife values.

Taos will continue to play an important role in the future history of New Mexico. Because of the farming, mineral, timber, and recreation resources of this area, which are just now entering a new era of development, there is promise that Taos and northern New Mexico will make a large contribution to the future economy and well-being of our people.

Creston (Iowa) News-Adviser Points Out the Importance of Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, with the arrival of summer, which begins today, we are reminded once again that water is one of the basic necessities of mankind.

For many communities across the Nation, water will be in short supply during the warm months ahead. Already, New York City is having trouble supplying its residents with enough water. Other urban areas will be facing the same problem.

And so will many rural areas. Too many of our smaller communities are without an adequate water supply system. The Farmers Home Administration, for example, has estimated that about 30,000 rural communities lack modern water facilities.

Thus the development of our rural water resources is of great importance. In this connection, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members an editorial from the June 15, 1965, issue of the Creston News-Advertiser of Creston, Iowa.

As the editorial points out, our supply of water is limited. But the need for it increases annually, especially in those communities seeking to develop their commercial and industrial potential.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has done a good deal to aid in the development of rural water resources. The Soil Conservation Service, for example, helps plan and finance watershed projects. These projects, in addition to their other benefits, can serve as a source of water supply to nearby communities.

As the editorial notes, such a project is planned for the Three-Mile Creek in the Creston area. Once completed, this watershed will do much for the Union County area, in which Creston is located.

Since 1961, another branch of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Farmers Home Administration, has provided loans for financing water supply systems in rural areas. This program has been a success, but more needs to be done.

Legislation, including a bill I introduced last month, is now pending before the Congress to authorize the Farmers Home Administration to make Federal grants, as well as loans, to finance rural water facilities.

I am hopeful that this legislation will become law. A program of Federal grants for rural water systems would help greatly in solving some of the problems outlined in the Creston News-Advertiser editorial, which I hereby include in the RECORD:

[From the Creston News-Advertiser, June 15, 1965]

IMPORTANCE OF WATER

We want to talk a little about water.

From the way rain has been falling this June, not a few to let the matter drop for a bit—until they can get the weeds out of the corn and beans. Or can get the corn or beans planted.

But water is a tremendously important item. Even in this current stretch of dampness, many have observed they still prefer this to a drouth.

And there you have it.

Over in the State of New Jersey, they are imposing restrictions in four counties—restrictions that are to continue into next November, or until rain adequately replenishes reservoirs. These restrictions prohibit filling of swimming pools, washing of cars, watering lawns, washing of driveways. They even restrict serving of water in restaurants, unless requested.

Experts in the field of water use and handling remind us there is just so much water. The supply is limited. Our job is to handle it in a fashion that will serve our needs when we need it.

It is estimated that within 15 years, the water demand may well equal or outstrip the dependable supply of fresh water.

Now here in this country we get the rainfall—runs about 31 inches a year, and very steady. The objective then is to catch it and store it in seasons of heavier precipitation for times of less rainfall.

Building of Green Valley Lake was one of those reservoir saving measures. Developing of Three-Mile watershed—with its storage lakes is another. Development of 12-mile watershed with another large storage lake is still another step.

Work has been accomplished in these directions. It must be continued—for it takes some years to achieve these goals of water preservation.

Farsighted planning for good water supplies is important to our own well-being, important to the future of our community. Just think of the revived attitude about things that came to pass with establishment of Green Valley Lake. Further lake supplies in our watersheds in this area will continue that sense of progress and development.

Income Limits Under the Rent Supplement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the vitally important housing and urban development bill, H.R. 7984, will be on the floor in a very short time. One of the most important provisions of this bill is President Johnson's proposed program of rent supplements for low-income families. These supplements would enable families generally within the public housing income level to obtain decent housing paying no more than one-fourth of their small incomes. It would be rental and cooperative housing, privately built, privately financed and privately owned. This program holds great promise and would be a greatly needed supplement to the existing public housing program which would also be continued and expanded by H.R. 7984.

As the New York Times noted:

For no valid reason the rental subsidy program has become the focus of controversy.

This is, indeed, unfortunate because if the opponents were to succeed in killing the rent supplement program the real victims will be the 500,000 poor families who would thereby be denied the chance to live in decent housing.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a regrettable amount of misunderstanding in connection with the rent supplement program, particularly regarding the income range which it would serve. We have heard charges that families earning $8,900 a year would be eligible for this assistance. Actually, the ceilings would be much lower and are set by a fixed formula in the bill—four times the minimum necessary rent for decent housing in the community.

Because this is a new program the Housing Agency did not have actual figures when it testified. However, they now have very reliable estimates based on a very similar provision included in the 1964 Housing Act. And let me note that those who say that rent supplementation is a new concept must be unaware of the fact that we have very much the same thing in existing law. Last year's housing act offered temporary rent supplement payments to families displaced by urban renewal and that bill passed the House by a vote of 308 to 68.

Under the provision in last year's bill the Housing Agency is required to make the same kind of finding as they would under the proposed rent supplement program. The first figures have just become available under that program and have been transmitted to me by Administrator Weaver. In order that members will have an accurate idea of what the actual ceilings would be under the rent supplement program I would like to submit for the record a copy of Dr. Weaver's letter and table on income ceilings for 25 cities:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,

Washington, D.C., June 18, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM A. BARRETT,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing, Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARRETT: Over the past several weeks, you and various members of your committee have made inquiries about income limits for eligibility that would be established under the rent supplement program which would be authorized by the proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

As I stated in hearings on the bill, the income limits would vary from locality to locality, depending upon rents required to obtain standard private housing in the local market. Surveys will have to be made in each area to determine the rents at which such housing is available and the related income equal to four times the rent. Although we have not made surveys specifically designed to establish income limits for a rent supplement program, similar rental information has been obtained for a number of areas in conjunction with relocation adjustment payments that were authorized for people displaced from urban renewal and publis housing sites by the Housing Act of 1964.

Based on the information which was obtained in this manner, we have prepared preliminary estimates of income limits that would be established for families of various sizes in 25 localities under the rent supplement program. These estimated income limits are shown in the enclosed table.

When the rent supplement program becomes effective, we will review the available

data, make additional surveys, establish income limits for individuals as well as families, and make whatever modifications might be warranted by changed local housing market conditions. The enclosed table of income limits provides a good sampling, however, of the approximate income limits that would be established at this time for the rent supplement program in 25 cities of different size in different parts of the country. I hope that you and members of your committee will find it helpful.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator.

Preliminary estimates of income limits for families of different sizes under proposed rent supplement program in 25 cities

Cities	2 persons (1 bedroom)	3 or 4 persons (2 bedrooms)	5 or 6 persons (3 bedrooms)	7 or 8 persons (4 bedrooms)
Atlanta, Ga	$3,100	$3,800	$4,900	$5,500
Bangor, Maine	3,400	4,300	4,800	5,700
Batavia, N.Y	3,400	4,100	4,800	6,000
Boston, Mass	4,400	4,800	5,300	6,000
Bridgeport, Conn	4,100	4,600	4,800	5,300
Chicago, Ill	4,300	5,000	5,800	6,800
Columbia, S.C	3,400	3,700	4,600	5,000
Columbus, Ohio	3,700	3,900	4,500	4,900
Fresno, Calif	3,900	4,400	5,100	6,100
Huntington, W. Va	3,200	3,700	4,200	4,700
Jefferson City, Mo	3,600	4,100	4,600	5,500
Kansas City, Mo	3,600	4,100	4,800	5,500
Louisville, Ky	3,700	4,300	5,600	6,200
Milwaukee, Wis	3,600	4,100	4,600	6,000
Newark, N.J	4,600	5,000	5,500	6,000
Providence, R.I	3,200	3,700	4,300	4,800
Paterson, N.J	4,300	4,800	5,300	5,800
Pittsburgh, Pa	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,600
Port Arthur, Tex	2,400	3,700	4,300	5,800
San Antonio, Tex	3,300	3,700	4,400	4,800
St. Louis, Mo	4,000	4,500	5,500	6,300
Terre Haute, Ind	3,600	3,900	4,300	4,900
Toledo, Ohio	4,000	4,500	5,500	6,000
Waco, Tex	3,400	3,700	4,600	5,800
Utica, N.Y	2,900	3,700	4,500	5,300

Never Underrate a Soybean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 12, the Christian Science Monitor published a short five-paragraph article entitled, "Never Underrate a Soybean." But in those short five paragraphs is told the amazing story of the miracle in American farming. The article states:

In 1961 somebody timidly forecast that the lowly soybean might someday crowd wheat and cotton for first place among American farm exports. Today it tops them both.

Last year, in fact, feed grains and soybeans earned about as much abroad as the entire auto and truck industry combined. And they outpaced the exports of the huge chemical industry.

Soybeans speak everybody's language. A dash of it makes discriminating French animals like their feed better. So France is buying 218,000 tons of soybean meal a year.

Spaniards love it. They have hiked their imports of soybean meal from 5,000 to 200,000 tons a year. And in Pakistan, a marriage was arranged between mustard oil and soybean oil and a new product was born.

A world beater, that soybean.

The raising of soybeans in the United States was sparked by World War II, and by 1950 soybeans had moved ahead of potatoes as a cash crop, in 1956 soybeans surpassed oats, and in 1960 this fabulous oilseed moved ahead of tobacco. Today, soybeans rank third, outranked in value only by corn and cotton.

Truly, as the Christian Science Monitor comments—A world beater, that soybean.

Ottumwa, Iowa, Courier Warns Against Anonymous Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, political extremism, whether of the right or the left, is essentially alien to the American tradition. Those who openly advocate extremist doctrines stand little chances of success, since ours is a political system based on the preference for moderation.

Unfortunately, these doctrines are not always preached openly. The conviction of many extremists is greater than their courage and, convinced that some vague conspiracy is at work, they resort to anonymous threats and charges in an effort to destroy it. This is the worst form of extremism, but all too often these tactics meet with some measure of success.

The June 15, 1965, issue of the Ottumwa, Iowa, Courier carried an excellent editorial on this subject, and I commend it to my fellow Members. As the editorial correctly points out, it is the duty of enlightened and responsible citizens to speak out against this anonymous extremism, and to substitute fact for falsehood.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the editorial:

ANONYMOUS VILLAINY

In Meadville, Pa., members of the clergy and the newspaper have denounced the dissemination of anonymous mail. They have challenged members of the local John Birch Society to have the courage of their convictions and come out into the open.

"Who in our city sends us these 16-page attacks on the U.S. Supreme Court and on the President and Mr. Eisenhower?" asks an editorial. "Who tries to poison our minds against American Negroes by charging that the civil rights movement is a Communist conspiracy? Who in Meadville hides behind the name of Robert Welch (national head of the Birchers) and spreads vitriolic tracts over the city through the mails? Which of our neighbors attempt by this tactic to intimidate and control our thought?"

The Christian Century takes up the same subject by comparing such tactics with Hitler's demonism, says a Century editorial:

"Few are lower in the human scale than the sneak who commits his malicious act under the cloak of anonymity, the dastard who plunges a poisoned pen in the back of his unsuspecting victim and scurries to safety under the cover of darkness. And this kind of villainy flourishes in our time. It is not confined to hooded members of the Ku Klux Klan riding by night or to white Fascists stealthily bombing and burning Negro churches and homes, or to footpads who strike down their prey on dark city streets.

"Anonymous villainy also has more subtle forms: the unidentified callers who breathe heavy threats over the telephone, the unknown and irresponsible mailers of hateful propaganda tracts, the unnamed writers of poisonous letters * * *."

What is the answer? Not a police state control of the postal system and the telephone system and other means of communication, surely. The answer to darkness must not be more darkness, but more light. In a free country where we have a right and a responsibility to speak up—we in the various fields of education and communication and religion—we must work harder to make facts and truth more abundant than errors and falsehood.

The Anatomy of Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks an editorial.

This editorial appeared in the April 11 issue of the Los Angeles Times.

In my opinion the editorial is timely and treats with the alarming growth of extremists of various types. I commend this editorial to my colleagues:

THE ANATOMY OF EXTREMISM

Periodically, in the history of this Republic, there have emerged during times of stress extremist cults and movements of various stripe. They often rally under patriotic banners. But they are dedicated nonetheless to assaulting by word and deed certain basic institutions and tenets of American society.

In the 1840's and 1850's the Nation suffered, and survived, the Know Nothings. In the 1930's, amidst the fear of the great depression, both Fascist and Communist organizations flourished. At other times, in less organized ways, we have endured other divisive, truly un-American movements, which preached hatred of class, or race, or religion, or democracy.

These have not been nor are they today welcome experiences. Living through them has sometimes left scars. In every case, however, the fundamental strengths of our political and social structure have readily absorbed the attacks of internal foes.

This is not to minimize or discount the inherent threat posed by organized extremist movements. These are ugly intolerable manifestations whenever and wherever they occur.

Whether of right or left, extremists are a departure from both the ideal and practice of American national life. And when hate, which so easily is expressed through violence, is the chief mark of extremism, the aberration is even more alarming.

We live now, as we have for some decades past and as we no doubt will for some time to come, in an uneasy world. Fears, real and imagined, vague and precise, surround us. Within and without our borders, great and unusual transformations are taking place.

Old values are questioned and sometimes discarded without being replaced. What

once were sureties making for stability—of belonging, of participation, of individual worth—now seem frequently in doubt.

In this changing climate a sense of frustration, a feeling by the individual that life is wasted or spoiled, can be easily nourished. Widespread frustration, with all its ambiguities, is the commonest breeding ground of extremism. It is from among the frustrated that the zealots, the true believers, are recruited for extremist movements.

Regardless of the cause to which he dedicates himself, the extremist in every case seems motivated and compelled by an inner turmoil, for which he invents elaborate and high-sounding rationalizations. This is true whether he is a college youth eagerly enlisting in a far-left crusade, or a goon marching in a bedsheet, or a man in a business suit conspiring to take over a PTA—or a local police force.

The raw material for making extremists has always been with us and, given human nature, always will be. The existence of this fortunately limited element in our midst is not itself alarming. Extremism in any form, thanks to the basic commonsense of Americans, has never yet grown into a mass movement.

What is alarming is the chance that passivity, preoccupation and apathy on the part of the overwhelming majority of decent Americans will permit one of more extremist movements to assume a strength far out of proportion to its size. Then it may prove too late to do anything about it.

This has happened in other countries.

Despite the phrases they mouth or the flags in which they wrap themselves, extremists can be readily identified. For what distinguishes them all is a basic hatred and contempt for American society as it exists today. That hatred, however disguised, gives extremists cohesion and motivation. It is their strength, but it is also their undoing. For such sick hatred ultimately is self-destroying.

Given a vigilant, concerted public, the process can be accelerated.

Arthur Hoppe's Satire on Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the columnist, Arthur Hoppe, recently paid a visit to Washington, and three of his columns are fine examples of his satire. They were published in the San Francisco Chronicle on June 3, 6, and 9:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, June 3, 1965]

MR. JOHNSON HAS THE ANSWER

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—Every once in a while the President holds a press conference because he loves to be asked hard-hitting questions by us ace newsmen. Through his answers he states his case before the bar of public opinion. Thus this cherished American institution satisfies all parties involved.

And of all our recent Presidents, Mr. Johnson clearly holds the most mutually satisfying ones. Never before, I'm sure, have the purposes of the presidential press conference been better served. Take his latest one, which I was fortunate enough to attend.

There were a couple of hundred of us ace newsmen waiting grimly for him in the East Room of the White House, running through our hard-hitting questions in our minds, glints of steel in our eyes, scornful snarls on our lips. I only hoped we didn't cut him to shreds in full view of the nationwide television audience before he got to state his case.

But Mr. Johnson had obviously thought of that danger, too. Because he opened the proceedings by stating his case.

This he did by making three speeches. In the first speech he said he was doing a great job in the Dominican Republic. In the second speech he generously said the United Nations has been doing a great job elsewhere and he was proud of them. And in the third, he said Asians are very poor, but he was going to do a great job and make them rich.

That took up the first 10 minutes of network television time. Then, having stated his case, he hesitantly asked us impatient ace newsmen if there were any hardhitting questions. It was like tossing raw meat to a pack of starving wolves. Indeed, in the carnage that followed I lost my notes. So I can only try to reconstruct the hard-hitting questions and Mr. Johnson's answers from memory. I only hope I get them all straight.

Question. Where'd you get that silly idea, Mr. President, of a permanent OAS force?

Answer. Let me take this opportunity to explain to you what a great job I'm doing in the Dominican Republic. (Which he then did.)

Question. Do you realize your trigger-happy, half-baked adventurism in Vietnam is going to cause World War III, sir?

Answer. I'm glad you want to know about the great job I'm doing in Vietnam. I'll explain it to you. (Which he then did.)

Question. How do you get us into all these stupid messes, sir?

Answer. And I want to say my Cabinet's been doing a great job and my Army's been doing a great job and Luci's been doing a great job and——

And so it went. We got to ask 18 hard-hitting questions. And Mr. Johnson got to state his case 18 times. Thus you can see how mutually satisfying a Presidential press conference is these days. It gives us ace newsmen a chance to get our hard-hitting questions off our chest. And Mr. Johnson gets to state his case over and over.

The only thing I don't understand is why two such totally unrelated activities should be held in the same room at the same time.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, June 6, 1965]

WASHINGTON HANDICRAFTS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—In my book, "Strange Native Customs in Washington and Other Savage Lands," I plan to include a chapter on the native economy, which, you will be overjoyed to hear, is booming.

Truly, you can go nowhere in Washington without bumping into a brand new building going up. Busy construction crews are everywhere, hammering, sawing, pounding, as they struggle feverishly to keep abreast of the ever-increasing demand for more working space. Never, have you seen such a dynamic, viable, expanding native economy, which is very odd because the sole and only product the Washington natives produce is something called government.

All day long in thousands and thousands of little cubicles, thousands and thousands of native workers are busily making government. All day long, they fold, they staple, they spindle, they type, they scrawl—making government. I'm sure a brief description of the techniques involved in this native handicraft will be of interest to all cultural anthropologists.

First, the chief of one of the many indigenous tribes such as State, Pentagon, or Budget, will decide to make some government. He holds a series of rituals with his subchiefs who chant their praises of his decision. He then confers with the chiefs of other tribes, who all shake their heads. But eventually, in some mysterious manner, it is agreed that the government can be produced.

The order is transmitted to the workers, who begin to fold, spindle, staple, type, and scrawl. As in all native handicrafts, of course, the workers must be extremely careful to fold, spindle, staple, type, and scrawl in exactly the same fashion as their predecessors have done down through the mists of antiquity. If a staple has always been stapled to thus and so, the penalty for not stapling it to thus and so is immediate expulsion from the tribe.

At last, after innumerable manhours of painstaking work, the final product emerges, more government. This is shipped to the outside world where, due to the time-consuming efforts involved in its manufacture, it naturally brings very high prices. The money is then brought back to Washington where it is used, of course, to produce more government in a seemingly endless economic cycle.

And while I'm sure we are all extremely proud and happy to see these industrious natives pull themselves up by their bootstraps by exploiting their primitive skills, one cannot help having forebodings. For never have the dangers inherent in a one-product economy been celarer.

Should the demand in the outside world for more government decrease even slightly, the resulting privation and destitution amongst these poor, backward natives would be appalling to witness.

Thus I say we civilized peoples must do our level best to help diversify the native economy. Let us send in teams of experts, before it is too late, to help train these natives to make some other simple product. But one that would be useful, one for which a more pressing need exists. Like, say, egg cups or snakeskin hat bands.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, June 9, 1965]

WEIRD RITES AT THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—I fear my book, "Strange Native Customs in Washington and Other Savage Lands," may never be finished. For despite crouching in the bushes for hours on end, I still haven't been fortunate enough to catch a glimpse of that weirdest ritual of them all—the White House walk.

From hints reaching the outside world, this rite appears to consist of the most important of all the local chiefs walking 1 to 15 times around a large building call the White House, followed by 30 to 40 natives brandishing note pads and pencils. Plus a beagle on a chain.

The purpose of the Chief in conducting this strange ritual, all authorities agree, is to appease a malevolent demon called the press, whose hexes and spells are greatly feared by all natives. And while many sacrifices are made to appease the press, none is stranger than this one. I have, therefore, attempted to piece together an accurate description by conducting a number of lengthy interviews with the pencil-bearing natives who regularly take part.

The White House walk is invoked at the whim of the Chief. He calls for his beagle and he calls for his pencil-bearing natives and off they all go in a raggle-tail mob around and around the White House, briskly.

Now, as he walks, the Chief talks and it is the duty of the three or four natives closest to him to scribble feverishly on their note pads. At the same time, all the other natives, pushing up from behind, keep up a constant chant: "What's he saying? What's he saying?"

Due to the pressure from those behind, the three or four natives closest to the Chief are slowly pushed outward toward the edge of the mob, still scribbling furiously. Their places are taken by three or four new natives who promptly start scribbling furiously. This process is repeated every few minutes. Thus an interesting, if primitive, choreography emerges, with each native dancing to the rear of the chanting pack and then forward to become a scribbler once again. All, while briskly circling the White House.

To make the ritual more complex, some of what the chief says is on the record and some off the record. And as each native invariably arrives within scribbling range in mid-sentence, he never knows which. Although phrases such as "Retail sales are up 17 percent" are invariably the former.

Nor are these rites without danger to the participants. One highly respected native, Mr. Peter Lisagor, his head bowed devoutly over his notepad, ran smack onto a steel light pole, suffering a deep gash in his brow and 3 days of dizzy spells. And the purpose of the beagle on the chain, of course, is to trip up unwary question-askers, especially those who have tried to trip up the chief.

After a number of grueling laps, the chief dismisses the followers. They immediately hold a meeting to determine: (1) what he said (a) on the record, (b) off the record; (2) what it means and (3) who cares? They then collapse and the festival is over.

Now this account certainly makes sense to anyone familiar with typical Washington rituals. Except for one thing: Its purpose. When asked if he felt the rite appeased the press, every single pencil-bearing native recoiled in horror. And although their unprintable comments varied, I think we can deduce from their general tenor that it involves some strange sex rite instead.

The Real Alabama—Part XIV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the current issue, June 28, 1965, of U.S. News & World Report, carries a two-page article entitled: "The Latest Look at Alabama's 'Image'."

This objective report goes a long way in pointing out the other side of the story in Alabama. I commend it for careful review to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article follows:

THE LATEST LOOK AT ALABAMA'S "IMAGE"

MONTGOMERY, ALA.—An impression widely held over the Nation is that Alabama is a State sunk in one big race problem. The image is one of boycotts, the Ku Klux Klan, demonstrations and violence or the potential for violence.

Yet travel the State, talk with the people, look at what's going on and you discover a State of contrasts. The problem of racial differences is only one of many impressions gained. More striking, to many, are the signs that Alabama is another State of the South undergoing sweeping change and development.

George C. Wallace, Alabama's Governor, recently invited 1,700 editors to visit Alabama and look it over. Fewer than 50 accepted the invitation. Much of what was written concerned past racial incidents.

What was shown, however, was the varied nature of this Southern State, its problems and its prospects.

EVEN IN ALABAMA—A "NORTH" AND A "SOUTH"

Northern Alabama: Mostly a hilly land of low-cost power, booming space installations, steel and other manufacturing industries, abundant water, small farms, expanding tourism. In all 29 counties in this part of Alabama, whites far outnumber Negroes, who totaled only 412,000 in 1960—fewer than in some northern cities, and less than 23 percent of the total population in northern Alabama. About half of those Negroes lived in Jefferson County, site of Birmingham, the only large city which has had racial violence.

Southern Alabama: Mostly coastal plains of rich, black soil where cotton plantations once reigned supreme. Now farms are shifting to cattle, trees, and diversified crops. In 12 of the 38 counties, Negroes outnumber whites, and it is in a few of these counties that most racial unrest has erupted. Mobile, a major seaport, is the center of Alabama's gulf coast, a pocket of industry, commerce, and tourist attractions.

NOT UNIQUE

In the northern part of Alabama, the Negro population differs little, in proportions, from that in many States of the North. Race issues are not a constant concern. Large-scale industrial development is going on.

As you move southward, into west-central Alabama, you come to the so-called black belt. This is farm area once devoted almost entirely to cotton growing. The term black belt come from the rich black soil.

Today, while cotton is important, agriculture is more diversified. Production of beef cattle and poultry is expanding, field crops declining.

In this section, there still remains, though, the heaviest concentration of Negroes in the State. Whites are outnumbered by 2 to 1 or more. In one county, 82 percent of the people are Negroes. Fear by whites of Negro domination is strong and racial troubles are severe. This is the part of Alabama the rest of the country hears most about.

Still farther south, along the Gulf of Mexico, Alabama's picture again changes. This area has more in common with adjacent gulf areas of Florida and Mississippi and with New Orleans than with the rest of Alabama.

SPACE, POWER, TOURISTS

Northern Alabama offers the biggest surprises to visitors.

Here is where fundamental change has been worked by cheap electric power and lakes created when the power dams went up.

On the base of abundant power and water, Alabama's space industry was erected. Huntsville is the State's "space capital."

Huntsville's population has increased nearly eightfold in 15 years, from 16,400 in 1950 to about 125,000 today.

Mainspring for this amazing growth is the Redstone Arsenal, which has in its 60 square miles the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, plus major missile facilities of the U.S. Army.

About 30,000 persons are employed at Redstone, and an equal number work for private firms in the Huntsville area. Most of them depend on Federal contracts.

The Space Flight Center alone had a budget of $1.7 billion for the year ended June 30. It is here that rockets are being perfected for the moon-landing effort later in this decade.

A list of firms with plants in the Huntsville area reads like a "Who's Who of American Industry." Many are located in a new space-research park, a 2,000-acre site set aside by the city for research activities. The Huntsville campus of the University of Alabama is located adjacent to the research park.

With space spending now leveling off, Huntsville's growth is expected to slow to a more normal rate. Other cities in northern Alabama cannot match Huntsville's past growth rate, but they are still expanding.

Decatur is an example. One of the larger cities along the Tennessee River, Decatur has electric-power rates about one third the U.S. average rate. Decatur's population rose nearly 50 percent in the 1950's, now exceeds 35,000. Plants involved in 39 different industries are strung along the city's 7-mile industrial waterfront.

Racial problems seem far away throughout this region. Because of its many large lakes, tourists are flocking in. Boating, fishing, swimming, and hunting are big attractions.

STEEL CENTER

Birmingham, Alabama's largest city, is the major steel center for the rapidly growing regional economy of southeastern United States.

For a long time, steel completely dominated Birmingham. Now there is greater diversity. Nearly 1,000 factories turn out truck bodies, auto parts, fertilizer, cement, watches, textiles, roofing materials—some 3,500 products in all.

One of Birmingham's most important "industries," which is seldom if ever noted in national news comment, is a 14-square-block medical center near the downtown section. It is the largest medical complex in the Southeast.

Another growing enterprise is the Southern Research Institute, a nonprofit organization which employs over 400 scientists and technicians engaged in both industrial and medical research.

Racial tensions have plagued Birmingham. Two years ago the bombing of a church killed four Negro children. Lately, an argument has raged over the police force, which has had no Negro members. Civil rights groups charged discrimination while city officials said that Negro applicants were unable to pass qualification tests.

While central Alabama is not changing as fast as the northernmost area, a number of cities are proud of their growth.

Montgomery, the State's capital city, is one of these cities. State government activities, plus two Air Force bases, lend stability to Montgomery's economy. Several ultramodern shopping centers have been built, along with new schools and hospitals.

Even in Selma, where racial violence flared earlier this year, new industry is coming in. Ground was broken recently for a large textile plant at Selma.

WINDOW ON THE WORLD

At the southern edge of Alabama sits Mobile, one of the country's leading seaports. It gives Alabama an increasingly important window on the world.

At Mobile's modern docks, 30 oceangoing vessels can be handled at one time. Through the port flows a rising volume of raw materials from South America and elsewhere—coffee, sugar, iron ore, bauxite, rubber, jute, and other products. They are headed for Alabama's factories and industries all over Midwestern United States.

Going out, via Mobile, are increasing shipments of manufactured goods such as chemicals, textiles, food and machinery, headed for South America and other world markets.

Bauxite from Surinam is refined in Mobile, then shipped to aluminum-smelting plants inland. A paint manufacturer with a big business in Latin America is located at Mobile. The port city also has come to be a magnet for chemical, paper, and lumber plants, which can ship their products overseas, or to U.S. markets by way of the inland

waterways that connect Mobile with the hinterlands.

With beautiful old homes, plus Mobile Bay and the Gulf of Mexico for water sports and fishing, Mobile also is a growing tourist center.

Mobile never has had severe race problems. Its police force has been integrated for more than 20 years. School integration has not gone far, but plans have been drawn to speed up the pace.

Recently, Mobile suffered a blow when it was announced that Brookley Air Force Base would be phased out.

EMIGRATION, OTHER WORRIES

To many Alabamians, the State's most serious problem is that of outmigration.

From 1950 to 1964, Alabama's population-growth rate was only 35 percent of the national average.

People leaving the State include not only Negroes but many of Alabama's top high school students. They depart for colleges in the East and Midwest and many do not return.

If this trend is not stopped, Alabama could lost another congressional seat when the 1970 census is taken, as it did after the 1960 census.

The only answer, according to Alabama officials, lies in providing more education and jobs for both Negroes and whites.

Since 1962, State appropriations for education have risen about 50 percent, the largest jump in the State's history. A number of new junior colleges and trade schools have been set up, and free textbooks provided in public schools from 1st through 12th grades.

Industrial jobs are increasing gradually. Per capita personal income is rising at a faster rate than the U.S. average. But Alabama still stands 47th among the 50 States in this key economic indicator.

COME DOWN AND SEE

Some Alabamians told visiting editors they believe the restoring of racial harmony is the State's No. 1 problem. They showed no inclination to minimize this or other Alabama ills. But they also feel strongly that many of their fellow Americans have a false image of Alabama.

"We've got nothing to hide and a lot to be proud about," said one businessman. "Come down anytime and see for yourself."

Keep Section 14(b) Alive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Memphis, Tenn., Press-Scimitar, one of the Scripps-Howard group and a leading newspaper in the Midsouth editorialized on the pending proposals to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The statement was so fine that the editor of the Helena, Ark., World reprinted the editorial in their June 7 issue.

I concur in the judgment of Mr. Jack Young, editor of the Helena World, that this editorial should be given widespread attention, and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the editorial is made a part of my remarks:

[From the Helena (Ark.) World, June 7, 1965]

KEEP SECTION 14(b) ALIVE

The Press-Scimitar believes that labor unions, honestly run, perform valuable service for their members, the community, and the country. But we also favor keeping alive the principle of freedom of choice in an increasingly regimented world.

For both these reasons, we urge Congress not to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which permits States to pass so-called right-to-work laws barring compulsory union membership.

Section 14(b) has been denounced by labor leaders as a death blow to union organization drives. Since it was enacted 17 years ago, it has been the target of more argument from both sides than almost any other piece of legislation within memory.

Using official Government statistics, it can be "proved beyond a doubt" that workers in the 19 States with right-to-work laws are (a) moving faster economically than those in States without them, or (b) falling behind the employees in the 31 other States. What is "proved" depends on the preconceived point of view.

The fact is that section 14(b) is neither as bad as its opponents claim nor as effective as its supporters like to think. It does not prevent unions from enlisting every worker in the United States if they are able to do so. Conversely, it neither grants the "right to work" to anyone nor gives Federal sanction to union-busting anywhere. What it does is simple. It says that a State, if it wishes, may pass a law forbidding union membership as a condition of employment—in other words, barring anyone from being forced to join a union in order to hold a job.

Unions argue that under Federal law they are required to represent every worker in a plant, whether or not he supports he union of pays dues. For that reason, they say, it is unfair to prevent them from signing a union-shop contract with a willing employer which would compel "free riders" to contribute to the union from which they benefit.

But it can be argued equally that a union which has to earn the loyalty of workers is much more likely to be honest and aggressive than one which can merely sit back and collect their dues. In this connection, it is interesting to note the words of former Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg when the long-time union lawyer was explaining to Government workers why the union shop was not for them.

"In your own organization," Goldberg said at a 1962 meeting of the American Federation of Government Employees, "You have to win acceptance not by an automatic device which brings a new employee into your organization, but * * * by your own conduct, your own action, your own wisdom, your own responsibility and your own achievements."

President Johnson, calling for repeal of 14(b) in his labor message on May 18, gave no reason beyond the vague suggestion that it would help reduce "conflicts in our national labor policy that for several years have divided Americans in various States. Surely Congress will need more convincing arguments than that to destroy a legal provision which merely permits States to decide for themselves what course they want to pursue.

The right-to-work laws which 19 States, including Tennessee, passed under sanction of section 14(b) preserve freedom of choice for individual workers to join or not join a union. We consider this a moral principle basic in the American ideal of society and government.—Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar.

The 28th Annual Dinner, May 20, 1965, in Boston of Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a truly great organization, dedicated to extending areas of agreement, and reducing tensions, emotions, and bigotry, is the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.

The members of this organization are outstanding men in all walks of human activity who are daily waging the fight for good and against evil.

Each year this committee conducts a banquet with at least 1,200 persons in attendance at which citations of merit are awarded to three persons of differnt religious beliefs.

The banquet this year was held on May 20, 1965, at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Boston, Mass. The citation of merit from this committee is an outstanding recognition for anyone to receive.

The dinner this year was the 28th annual good will dinner conducted by this organization of men of good will.

The recipients of the citations this year were: Hon. LeRoy Collins, director, Federal Community Relations Service; Joseph E. Cronin, president, American Baseball League, chairman, Executive Committee Children's Cancer Research Foundation; Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS, U.S. Senator from New York.

Dr. Asa S. Knowles, president of Northeastern University was toastmaster.

Mr. H. D. Hodgkinson presented the citation to Joseph E. Cronin. Mr. Norman L. Cahners presented the citation to Gov. LeRoy Collins, and Hon. Edward W. Brooke presented the citation to Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

The program was televised by WNAC-TV and carried by more than 100 radio stations throughout New England.

Messages were received from the President of the United States; His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing; Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY from Massachusetts; and the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, a member of the executive committee, Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews and a former recipient of the committee's citation.

Herewith are included the remarks by Dr. Asa S. Knowles, the toastmaster; Mr. Oscar W. Haussermann, chairman of the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews; Mr. H. D. Hodgkinson, general chairman of the committee; Mr. Ben G. Shapiro, secretary, and one of the original founders of the committee; Gov. John A. Volpe; Mayor John F. Collins; Peter Fuller; Lester A. Williams; also the remarks of Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS, Joseph E. Cronin, and Gov. Le-

Roy Collins, and the citations presented to each recipient:

REMARKS BY DR. ASA S. KNOWLES, TOASTMASTER, PRESIDENT, NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

Thank you, Mr. Haussermann, for your especially gracious introduction.

The reverend clergy, Governor Volpe, Attorney General Brooke, Mayor Collins, Senator JAVITS, Governor Collins, Mr. Croning, other distinguished guests at the head tables and in our audience and friends all, I should like at the very outset to express my sincerest gratitude for the honor bestowed upon me to serve as toastmaster at this 28th annual dinner of the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. For many years I have attended these meetings and have admired greatly the objectives and accomplishments of the Massachusetts committee.

The committee has indeed been fortunate to have as its secretary, Ben Shapiro, whose reputation is widespread for the work he is doing in the development of better understanding and cooperative relationships among all peoples, regardless of race, creed, or color. No matter how great the problem or how great the amount of time involved, Ben has always given generously of his own efforts and time in serving the cause of humanity.

The strength of our society is in its citizenry composed of people having many diverse cultures and creeds. All contribute greatly in combination to fulfill the American dream of a great and free society. The human element, however, causes blight in the forms of hatred, bigotry, and intolerance. Lest these may weaken or destroy the whole social structure they should be removed and, hopefully, obliterated. Contributing to these objectives, and thereby to the welfare of all humanity, is the reason this organization exists. It is a pleasure to be associated with it and to be a participant in one of its great meetings being held here tonight.

On this, the eighth year that WNAC–TV, channel 7, has televised these annual proceedings, I should like—on behalf of the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—to express heartfelt thanks to Mr. William McCormack, vice president and general manager of WNAC–TV, for arranging this evening's upcoming telecast.

Let me now take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the newspapers of Metropolitan Boston, the radio stations, WNAC–TV and other cooperating television stations, as well as the airlines who have provided the gracious and attractive hostesses to serve as ushers and special thanks are due to the following individuals who assisted in the dinner arrangements—

Mr. Pat Ryan: Overall arrangements.

Mr. Louis Miller: Reservations.

Mr. Isadore Zach: General publicity.

Mr. Benjamin Bartzoff: Television arrangements.

Mr. Jerry Hayes: Arrangements for airline hostesses.

Mr. James McDonald and the Boston Edison Co.: Lighting and decorations.

John Donnelly Co.: preparation of the poster providing the background for our stage tonight.

Commissioner McNamara and the Boston Police Department for courtesies extended to Senator JAVITS and Governor Collins.

If only the 221 people who attended the first dinner meeting 28 years ago in the old Boston City Club could have known at the time just how successful their efforts would prove to be over the years—how proud they would have been.

Tonight, 1,200 people are assembled in the Statler-Hilton Hotel to continue the important work begun 28 years ago and to honor the men who best characterize the ideals of leadership, generosity, and outstanding public service.

At this time I should like to read a letter received from Richard Cardinal Cushing:

"DEAR BEN: I regret very much my inability to attend the 28th dinner sponsored by the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.

"It is very difficult for me to refuse this invitation. First of all, because of the cause that I have been interested in since its foundation; second, because of my interest in you who have kept alive this good cause for the past two decades. You are certainly dedicated to the highest ideals of brotherhood.

"Although I will be among the missing, I would like to convey through you my congratulations to Joe Cronin, Gov. LeRoy Collins, and Senator JACOB K. JAVITS—three very deserving recipients of brotherhood honors. They have demonstrated over the years their love for their fellow men irrespective of the accidental characteristics of different groups.

"If there was ever a time when we should all be united by the bonds of love and mutual respect and esteem, it is now when human rights are finally becoming available to all those dwelling within our shores

"May the Heavenly Father of us all and the Creator of the world be with us in all our efforts to sponsor good will among our fellowmen without exception.

"With fondest regards to you personally, I am your ever grateful and devoted friend,

"RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING,
"Archbishop of Boston."

Perhaps the telegram I am about to read best describes the successful accomplishments of the man I am about to introduce.

"Mr. BEN G. SHAPIRO,
"Secretary, Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews:

"I am delighted to join Speaker McCORMACK in extending my warm greetings and hearty good wishes to the members, friends, and award recipients of the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.

"I am delighted to have this opportunity to publicly praise the deep dedication of each of your honored guests to the cause of social justice and human brotherhood.

"May I also at this time express to the members of your organization my conviction that your work has been in the highest tradition of social justice and individual dignity. I have watched with deep gratitude the growth of many of your productive and inspiring endeavors.

"You have my sincere personal fgood wishes as you continue to perpetuate the ideals and aspirations cherished by all men of good will.

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON."

And now it is a particular pleasure to introduce the founder and secretary of the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews and commissioner, Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination, Mr. Ben G. Shapiro, who will report for the committee.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF OSCAR W. HAUSSERMANN

Reverend clergy, Your Excellency, Governor Volpe, Your Honor, Mayor Collins, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of our Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, I welcome you, one and all, to this our 28th annual senior good-will dinner.

This year, I shall respect our time schedule and say no say about my native State of Indiana or about my baseball past in Evansville; and I shall leave to others the detailing of the doings of our committee since its inception 30 years ago.

In other words, I shall stick to my prescribed assignment, which is to present to you your distinguished toastmaster.

While I cannot hail him as a fellow Hoosier, as I could his predecessor, Carl Ell, I can depose and say that I feel our community, as well as Northeastern University, is fortunate in having Asa Knowles carry on where Carl Ell left off.

As most of you know, he's a native of Maine and a graduate of Bowdoin who came to these parts for postgraduate studies at Harvard and Boston University. In 1931 he entered upon his first tour of duty at Northeastern University—a 10-year tour—beginning as an instructor in industrial management and ending up as professor of industrial administration and dean of its college of business administration.

From Northeastern University he was called to high service outside Massachusetts—first as professor of industrial administration and dean of the School of Business Administration at the University of Rhode Island; then as president of the Associated Colleges of Upper New York; then as vice president of Cornell; and finally as president of the University of Toledo.

In 1959, he became a repatriated Bostonian, returning here to succeed Carl Ell as president of Northeastern University—one of our new Boston's miracle institutions which now has a student enrollment of more than 27,000.

In the past quarter century, Dr. Knowles' work as a teacher, college administrator, and writer of books and articles on industrial management and his extracurricular services as the head or as a member of various ad hoc commissions addressed to special assignments pro bono publico have made him worthy of the impressive honorary degrees, citations, and awards which he has received to date.

Ladies and gentlemen, your toastmaster, Dr. Asa S. Knowles.

REMARKS BY H. D. HODGKINSON, GENERAL CHAIRMAN

For 28 years, leaders in the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths have worked together as the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews to improve group relations.

Among its many other activities, this committee has cooperated with the good citizenship program of the Boston Park Department, Tufts University civil education project, Brandeis University three chapels program, Human Relations Center at Boston University, Massachusetts Department of Education. And, in addition, the committee has distributed many thousands of copies of educational material to schoolteachers and heads of educational institutions throughout the United States.

Our 14th annual junior good-will dinner, bringing together boys of the Boston public and parochial schools, held at Fenway Park, Boston, on January 27, created favorable comment by leaders in human relations throughout the country.

Our general aims and purposes: to sponsor good-will work in the general community of Greater Boston; to serve as a medium through which representative citizens can endorse the basic democratic principle of good will among men of different faiths and different racial origins; to bring out and emphasize the many fine things which citizens of different faiths have in common; and to encourage and support those forces in the community which generate in the individual a respect for the validity and dignity of each other individual's particular religious faith, with no qualifications or reservations based upon racial origins.

This committee is a separate, independent association, not connected with any other local or national organization.

The committee appreciates the support of all who have made this work possible in the community. We operate without hired quarters or paid help and with funds derived solely from voluntary contributions by our many friends. To the newspapers, radio,

and television who have carried our message of good will to millions of people, we are deeply indebted.

Our annual dinners are dedicated to that ever-widening circle of representative citizens who believe in and respect the rights and the dignity of the individual. They are true exemplars of the concept of brotherhood—their lives are eloquent testimonials to the greatness of our democracy.

REPORT BY BEN G. SHAPIRO, SECRETARY

Gentlemen of the clergy, Governor Volpe, Mayor Collins, our guests of honor, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a warm and distinct pleasure to welcome you to the 28th annual dinner of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews. I should call this gathering of our distinguished audience the blue ribbon meeting of the year in the city of Boston. You are distinguished not for who you are but for what you are. You are the sponsors of good will work in the general community of Greater Boston. Kindly reflect that I mentioned work, because good will work is abundant in Boston. If it were not, this committee would have been a shambles as far back as 1937 when we held this first annual dinner. You serve as a medium through which you can endorse the basic democratic principle of good will among men of different faiths and different racial origins, and through the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews you are active in the encouragement and the support of the vital forces in the community that generate in individuals a respect for the validity and dignity of each person's religious faith. You tear down rather than set up barriers of distinction between races and creeds and national origins; you are builders and believers in good will.

Yes, I believe you are a blue ribbon audience. You carry the ideals and the imprints of good will from out of this hotel and into the community. You are many people, tied together by the ribbon of good will and brotherhood. You are jurists and journalists, who stanchly believe in equal rights of all men; you are insurance men and importers, labor leaders and lawyers who believe and practice the Bill of Rights. You are printers and publicists, athletes and advertising men who understand that the mainstream of a healthy community is mutual respect for one another. You are clergymen and legislators, educators and editors, people upon whom we all rely for your counsel and your judgments in the affairs of the soul and society. Our committee has grocers, bankers and brokers, social workers and surgeons—all united in the good-will work for a great society. You are merchants, salesmen and statesmen. You are, in my humble estimation, what is the highest accolade that I can summon—you are a good and generous people. Again, in the past year you have helped us to elevate healthy group relations in our community through such worthwhile projects as the good citizenship program of the Boston Park Department the Tufts University civic education project; the Brandeis University chapels program—which we salute tonight on the 10th anniversary of its inception; the human relations center of Boston University, the good will program of the Massachusetts Department of Education, and our annual junior good-will dinner.

Since our last annual dinner this community has suffered the loss of four stalwart members of our committee:

Walter Brown, the creator of the champion Boston Celtics, was a champion among champions.

Dr. Walter Downey, the "Mister Chips" of Montgomery Street and Boston English High School.

Judge William McCarthy, a distinguished jurist.

Prof. John J. Mahoney, the father of civic education in America, and the founder of the civic education center at Tufts University.

Yes, we have lost much in their passing, and they can never be forgotten.

No report on the work of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews is complete until there is reference to His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, who has not only inspired but activated the things that we strive to do in the field of human relations. Our dear friend the cardinal was the subject of a discussion at a religious instruction class recently. The lesson really was on the cardinal virtues. The teacher was reviewing the principles of the virtues of prudence, justice, temperance, fortitude, faith, hope, and charity. As the teacher was making his point, he asked his class: "Now do you understand what I'm trying to get through to you?" A youngster in the back of the class came through sharp and clear: "We're talking about Cardinal Cushing, aren't we?"

I conclude now on that note, and suggest each and all of us adopt more fully in our own lives, the cardinal—the Cardinal Cushing virtues of good will and brotherhood.

Thank you.

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN A. VOLPE, GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Congratulations to former Gov. LeRoy Collins, now Director of Federal Community Relations Service, U.S. Senator JACOB JAVITS of New York, and Joe Cronin, president of the American League as award winners. Their contributions in the areas of civic and legislative service, legislation concerning housing, education, public welfare, immigration, labor, health, and the arts have done much to eliminate discrimination in almost every facet of American life.

As a member of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, its aims and ideals have long been of great personal interest to me.

This Nation of ours is widely hailed throughout the world as the "melting pot." And, as you know, a melting pot sometimes contains ingredients which do not jell, despite heat from the flame of goodness.

It is no secret that our Nation has been confronted with the matter of brotherhood. This is to be expected from a melting-pot situation.

However, neither should it be a secret that the United States has done more than any other nation in the world to foster the spirit of brotherly love for all mankind regardless of race, religion, or creed.

We have long held the torch of equality high among our tenets. But this ever-lasting flame of hope for mankind has sometimes passed over dark corners of bigotry and dissension which need to be exposed.

The emphasis presently being placed on civil and human rights is far less than an admission that there is more to be done in this field, than the reflection of a desire for action, so that we and the rest of the world may come to live in a real and true peace.

America offers to so many, from so far, a promise. We must not allow that promise to go unfulfilled. Our republic was founded on the precept that "All men are created equal." This applies to the right to vote, the right to employment, the right to education, the right to public facilities and the right to adequate and proper housing.

One hundred and eighty-nine years after our pledge of equality for all men in all things, we are still trying to fulfill that promise. With the continuing endeavors of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, and those of so many other concerned organizations working in concert with governmental units, Massachusetts will keep her word. And America will keep her word.

And now I have a very pleasant announcement to make. I have just been informed by Mr. H. D. Hodgkinson, general chairman of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews that a room in the new Institute of Human Science Building will be dedicated in honor of our secretary, Ben G. Shapiro.

May I offer my personal congratulations to you, Ben.

HON. JOHN F. COLLINS, MAYOR OF BOSTON

The new Boston is proud to participate in this significant meeting honoring three great American citizens and sponsored by this distinguished committee of leading Bostonians.

The new Boston is more than beautiful buildings and plazas, more than facades of glass and concrete and steel, more than Prudential Center and Government Center. The new Boston is more than a renewed vision which looks to the future with the hope and expectation that the enlightened self-interest of the entire Commonwealth and a sense of history and justice will provide Boston with the wherewithal to meet its commitments with financial integrity.

Above all, the new Boston is people, young and old, rich and poor, black and white, Catholic, Protestant, and Jew, bound together by common traditions and common goals and aspirations, to make Boston a city of economic, social, and spiritual progress, where all of its people can live in safety, decency, and happiness.

The new Boston is symbolized by this backdrop of the three chapels at Brandeis University, a project, rich in religious meaning, which grew out of a meeting of this very committee exactly 10 years ago.

The new Boston is the ecumenical spirit of understanding and good will, expressed not just in words, but in private and public conduct throughout the year. The new Boston is the continuous dialog with all elements of our community, especially with minority groups, conversations with Rev. Martin Luther King and with Negro leaders of our own community, in our common effort to break down ghetto walls and eliminate discrimination, hate, misunderstanding, and racial imbalance. The new Boston is every force available to our city, hacking away at the jungle of unequal opportunity, of inadequate training, of the roots of poverty. And we use the most effective tools we have, such as ABCD with all of its human and material resources, experts from our Greater Boston universities, the imaginative programs of this committee and my own committee on civic unity and on minority housing.

That is why the new Boston is proud that those honored tonight are symbols of the moral imperative of equal rights and equal opportunities for all people and of the need to live and work together in the brotherhood of man.

Senator JACOB JAVITS wears the Republican label, but his program reads like a Democratic platform. His fight for social justice, his support for all liberal causes, his role in the battle for voting rights—side by side with our courageous Massachusetts Senator TED KENNEDY—his determination that little people shall not be bullied—whether they are Jews in the Soviet Union or Israelis surrounded by the threatening Arab League—all these make us proud that he is one of the great leaders of our Nation.

Boston has an especially warm spot for Joe Cronin. We now share him with the Nation, because his influence and good deeds span the entire continent. To him, fair play and sportsmanship on the playing fields are the motivating forces for civil rights and equal opportunities in the totality of our lives.

LeRoy Collins is the embodiment of the enlightened South, the new South, and of

the determination that this country has a responsibility, after a century of failures and delays, once and for all to eliminate discrimination in jobs, schools, voting and homes, a responsibility which must be fulfilled. The community relations impact of Governor Collins is being heard throughout the land, because of his statesmanship and his leadership qualities. His is a voice of silk and an arm of steel.

Each of these three men shares a common attribute: his concern for his fellow man, whatever his race, creed or national background. Each is dedicated to the concept of American pluralism: that our Nation is great because it is the sum total of all of its component parts; that our strength comes from the very differences in the ethnic and cultural origins of our people, as well as from the unity of our ideals and our unswerving determination that we will prevail over all enemies, abroad and at home; that we must act brotherhood as well as talk it, that understanding and good will must be implemented by action, every day of the week, every hour of the day, with persistence and with courage.

The new Boston is people, and we are delighted to honor these three noble examples of dedication to people, as we honor this Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, for its programs which implement the concept that all people are the children of God.

REMARKS OF MR. PETER FULLER

Fourteen years ago, the late Michael T. Kelleher and Ben G. Shapiro conceived the idea that bringing young men together from our public and parochial schools would help to indoctrinate these young men in a spirit of brotherhood.

Chosen by their headmasters, these public and parochial students in Boston meet in the press quarters at Fenway Park through the courtesy of Thomas A. Yawkey and the Boston Red Sox organization.

Outstanding leaders in our community act as sponsors of these boys and four lads are chosen to give a short talk on what brotherhood means to him. One is selected to give his speech at our annual good will dinner.

During these 14 years more than 2,000 young men have been our guests and we know of no lad who has attended these annual dinners who has been involved in any juvenile delinquency nor at any time been a discredit to themselves or to the schools they represent. Obviously, this message that we are participating in tonight is understood and appreciated by these young men and they are missionaries—I only wish we had 2 million of them rather than 2,000.

The committee recognizes and appreciates the cooperation it has received from both superintendents of the public schools and the parochial schools in Boston and the community leaders who each year act as hosts.

We are particularly grateful to Tom Yawkey, Dick O'Connell (who is with us tonight) and the entire Red Sox organization who make these facilities available.

Tonight you will hear from one of those young men who spoke at our dinner at Fenway on January 27.

His name is Lester A. Williams, 86 Harold St., Roxbury, Mass., senior at Boston Technical High School. I am proud to list his school activities:

Member of National Honor Society: president, Boston Tech Chapter.

Class rank: No. 21 in class of 463.

Special course at Trimount House, biochemistry.

Vice president.

Science Club.

Science Institute for Able Learners.

Won three science fair awards at Technical High.

Won one city science fair award (third place).

Coeditor of yearbook.

Member of school math team.

Class representative.

Chairman of two school assemblies (honor assembly and Christmas assembly) outside activities.

Member of Boston Children's Theater.

Member of People's Theater.

In plays at MIT and Harvard and on television.

Musician (classical) piano.

Acted in play "Caves and Clouds," short film.

Interested in Clark University—psychology.

Last summer attended Tufts—National Science Foundation.

Grant (psychology).

Now you have the same treat in store for you that we enjoyed on January 27—here's young Lester Williams with an inspiring message.

REMARKS OF LESTER A. WILLIAMS, OF BOSTON TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL

Senator JAVITS, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, first let me tell you what a great honor it is to be speaking to you tonight. I see here many outstanding men and women, people whom I have seen and admired. I have always respected the ideas of the leaders of this community; I've listened with unusual enthusiasm to their words of wisdom, because, someday, I, too, hope to be able to pass on some of my ideas.

As a senior in high school, who will be attending college next fall, I am an intricate part of that group commonly, and sometimes bitterly, referred to as "the younger generation." We have been the object of severe critimism, harsh warnings, unearned merits, and sincere praise. Parents continually fall back, amazed at the antics of their sons and daughters. They wonder where they went wrong, what could have caused such a pronounced conflict of principles and ideas. Using the broad, undefined term of "good will" as a shield, I will attempt to interpret the message of the "younger generation."

Our country is a unique, idealistic conglomeration known as a democracy. It was founded on the principles of freedom: freedom of speech, and freedom of the press. Only in America has the Constitution insured the right to be truly individual. Yet this right has been distorted, molded like a piece of clay, into a fixed set of rules known as "society." Society has told us what to eat, what to wear, what to do, and what to think. Society has no place for the individual, so consequently, the individual has no place for society. The individual withdraws, gathers with others like himself, and forms his new society. It is to this new group of nonconformists that the title "the younger generation" applies.

The younger generation forms a new school of philosophy, the school of realism. Seeing the problems and conflicts that the idealistic philosophy of our parents have caused, today's young people choose to look realistically upon these problems. It is this new outlook that causes the problems between parents and children.

This problem is nothing new. A well-known historian once wrote: "I do not know what has happened to the young people of today. They have become unruly and irresponsible—I fear they may cause our destruction." This is quoted from "Plutarch's Lives," a book written less than 100 years after the birth of Christ. The future of America lies in the hands of the young men and women of today.

Let us use today's methods in today's world to fashion tomorrow's future. Our country is what we make it. Give us the chance to prove what we want to, can, and will do.

REMARKS OF JOSEPH E. CRONIN, AWARD RECIPIENT

I hope that you will understand and that I will be forgiven when I say that, at this minute, I would much prefer to be standing up at homeplate at Fenway Park facing even the great pitching of Red Ruffing and Lefty Grove than here at this podium facing these microphones. It is a tremendous thrill for an ex-ballplayer merely to find his name listed in a triple-play combination with men of such notable distinction as Senator JAVITS and Governor Collins. I should like to extend my word of welcome to these distinguished visitors to the historic yet thoroughly modern area of the new Boston—and to add my congratulations to them for this honor they receive and so richly deserve.

I can assure them, from personal experience, and close friendships of many years, that these honors are bestowed by good men, of good will, whose efforts and accomplishments, over a span of nearly three decades, made the old Boston and continue to make the new Boston a better place for all of us to live.

I hesitate to call individually the honor roll of the committee, men I have so admired since coming to the Boston area 30 years ago, lest I be accused of trying to pinch-hit for Dr. Knowles. But it can be said, with equal parts of protocol and truth, that all who have joined with Ben Shapiro in carrying on so completely the work begun with our beloved Mike Kelleher, have built here a permanence for the present, and a firm foundation for the future, in activities in good will among all men.

If I may add a provincial note—I would make special mention of this committee's junior good will dinner, because it is held most appropriately in the setting of a baseball park. On a winter's night in January, each year, through the cooperation of Tom Yawkey, the pressroom in Fenway Park is warmed by the presence of hundreds of high school students breaking bread together and learning lessons in a few hours which can last throughout their lifetimes.

Shortly, we shall be seeing living testimony of the benefits of this junior good-will program, when young Lester Williams comes to bat before these microphones.

Multiply this one evidence of accomplishment several hundredfold over the years, by the number of youngsters partaking of good food flavored with good will, and you will know why baseball is proud to play a part in such a program. If further justification be required, there exists a firm and long-founded relationship between the fields of baseball and the battlegrounds of brotherhood—so much so, that perhaps it might not be entirely beyond reality to claim that baseball—and many of its fellow citizens of the sports world—have been pioneers in the area of religious and racial relations.

I say pioneers. My claim is not that any of us in the sports world, any more than in other fields of our personal, business, and professional activities, have been perfectionists. But even as the wheel ruts of the covered wagons blazed the trails for our modern-day superhighways to the West, the efforts of the pioneers are required to pave the way to the perfection we all hope some day to achieve.

No doubt, in the rusted history of sports in this country, back to the day of doubleday in baseball, prejudices existed, which, if they ever were chronicled, happily have long since been forgotten.

I know that by the time I was introduced to the thrills of professional baseball, no one asked how a man prayed, but only how well he played—we did not note where he worshipped, but, carefully, how he could field, hit, run, and throw.

Finally, in 1946, the final barrier in baseball came tumbling down. If, in the second guess of reflection, we now realize, with more than a semblance of shame, that this was more than 80 years after Appomattox, can we not take pride in the fact that, from this beginning, sports have progressed, in a comparatively short span of time, so that baseball, for example, has been hailed as the true national sport for all Americans, and here in Boston, for another showpiece, a championship basketball team is recognized as a champion in the ideals of brotherhood as well.

Most importantly, the modern-day pioneers have provided us with guideposts on the path to eventual perfection in our relationships with all our fellow men.

There have been raised, from time to time, perhaps each time progress is proposed or effected, voices of alarm and dire foreboding. In fairness, these cries often come from two areas and in two ways—caustically, from men of ill will—but sometimes, as a caution, even from men of good will and admirable foresight.

Now I can say tonight that baseball is much the better for each progressive move it has made in keeping with the ideals espoused by this committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.

With such proven facts provided by the pioneers of the sports world, can we not now proceed toward perfection throughout our personal and work-a-day lives, keeping in mind a few thoughts which the saintly Father James Keller, who follows so faithfully in the footsteps of the Sainted Christopher, proposes for our consideration in the face of challenges certain to arise in the coming years and decades. Father Keller reminds us well, that—

"This is still God's world;

"The vast majority of people, despite real weaknesses, are basically good;

"Those bent on evil are relatively few, even though aggressive;

"Problems, however discouraging, can usually be turned into opportunities;

"And that—every individual, with God's help, can take some steps, however few, to change the world for the better."

In conclusion, I wonder if the goal we all should seek was not once summarized for us on our own sports pages—in that one day we may regard all our fellow men as a sports columnist once wrote of the great Joe Louis—"He is a credit to his race—the human race."

Ladies and gentlemen, with this hope for the future, humbly in the present, with gratitude in behalf of our great national game of baseball, I thank you for this citation.

REMARKS OF HON. JACOB K. JAVITS, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW YORK

Thank you very much, Attorney General Brooke, and I consider the honor doubly great by being presented by such hands of achievement and character and standing with the people of this Commonwealth as your own.

Dr. Knowles, Mayor Collins, and my respects to Governor Volpe and Lieutenant Governor Richardson, who have had to leave us; reverend clergy, very distinguished guests, and my fellow honorees, Mr. Cronin and Governor Collins, I am deeply honored to be in their company and considered worthy of being honored with them; and ladies and gentlemen, I thank you deeply for your citation, and I thank Mr. Shapiro for inviting me as he has; and I am now not nearly as put out with Senators SALTONSTALL, RIBICOFF, and TED KENNEDY, who insisted that I had to be here this night, though I must leave for Europe this very night from here. I gather this may be inaugurating some kind of direct service from Boston abroad.

I am very happy to be found in the company I have tonight and to have noted those who have been honored before. My own predecessor, Herbert Lehman, is one of the honorees of the Massachusetts committee. I find Bernard Baruch and Gen. David Sarnoff, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and even a Republican or two—like Christian Herter, Max Rabb, and LEV SALTONSTALL. So, I am in very good company and I am deeply honored.

In a sense, though, there is a poetic justice in this. I think Massachusetts owes me an honor. After all, you sent us a Senator; you owe me a citation.

My friends, I have heard with the deepest interest the work which is done in the name of the committee. This is certainly, I am sure, as distinguished a gathering as one could find in the Commonwealth—honored by the mayor, the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the highest officials of State and city, and by such distinguished men and women as are represented here. And I feel this is all to the good; and I have heard with the deepest interest and the greatest appreciation the invocations of the ecumenical spirit, of the spirit of goodwill, of brotherhood, in every sense—religious, from the sports world, from the world of the pacification of racial relations which Governor Collins represents and in every way that it could be expressed. And perhaps it is somewhat fitting that when it comes my turn I might tell you what I believe awards to be.

I believe, if awards are going to be rewards for services rendered, then they should all be postulants. But on the other hand, if awards are going to be incitements to action, if they are going to inspire men and women to do the things for which awards are given, then I think they are suitable, and necessary, and delightful in terms of the living world.

And so, I beg of you to associate me with every sentiment of brotherhood and good will which has been uttered tonight. And I would like to go on from there and suggest to you some of the things which you can do as an individual in the name of this very noble concept.

We are engaged today in massive struggles in the world of the greatest depth and importance, and we live in a very revolutionary age when anything can happen and, as some have said, generally does, and there are many disquieting tendencies abroad which deserve to enlist the greatest efforts of the individual who is interested in this cause of human brotherhood, without regard to faith, race, color, or any other distinction of that superficial character.

My friends, for example, I have seen in the civil rights field and in these developments which we have lately witnessed on television, the teachings, a manifestation of thinking which I believe deserves correction by all men of good will. There is a disquieting tendency among those who are the most passionately moved by racial injustices, a feeling which is beginning to put some pressure on that movement, to identify the struggles against racial injustice with new isolationist opposition to U.S. foreign policy.

We have heard time and again, and I have heard—I am sure you have, too—the idea that, How is it we can send troops to Vietnam and the Dominican Republic; how is it that we can spend hundreds of millions, even billions, for foreign aid, and we cannot at the same time assure our Negroes in the United States of equal justice, or give them the money with which by training and education to catch up with the tremendous handicap under which they have been put in a century of neglect—indeed, of three centuries of neglect if you take their continuous history in this country?

There seems to be an idea that the United States, in order to do justice domestically, must let the enemies of freedom triumph abroad—if you would take that argument at its face.

Now we believe no such thing, and any confusion upon that score should be speedily dispelled, especially by people who have devotion to good will and to brotherhood.

I support the essentials of our Nation's foreign policy, and I won't bemuse you with the details—they are immaterial now. I support the essentials of that foreign policy. I believe very deeply that scores, even hundreds of casualties suffered now in the cause of freedom, which is indivisible, just as the cause of justice is indivisible, and the cause of equal opportunity is indivisible—when denied to one it is denied to all, so the cause of freedom is indivisible, and the cause of peace is indivisible from freedom. I believe that scores of casualties, even hundreds of casualties, suffered now are suffered by heroes and martyrs who are saving us millions in the days ahead if the world will but learn that we have a responsibility to our brothers, and that in this kind of dangerous world we are our brother's keeper.

And so I hope very much that in your own personal activities, in your devotion to the moral struggle for civil rights and for equal justice and equal opportunity, to the legal and the social effort to grant rights in full to every American, particularly every Negro, at the same time you will not allow your judgment to be clouded or the movement to be obscured by being confused with an opposition to the Nation's foreign policy as if there was something inconsistent between the two when the two are quite consistent—indeed, one is necessary to the other as they possibly could be.

And then in another area in which I think you can help and help greatly. We are in for summer now, and you have all heard the expression about its being a long, hot summer in this revolutionary time in which we live.

Well, there is a tremendous ferment in the land, and though we have passed many laws, and your own Senator, TED KENNEDY, has waged, as someone here has said quite properly, a very fine battle to ban the poll tax in company with a valiant band of other Senators, in which I am very proud to be included, and which includes BOB KENNEDY, too, to make some kind of decent voting rights bill that would at last safeguard this right, and though we have passed bills in 1957 and 1960 and 1964 and will again in 1965, laws set a norm of conduct, but there is yet conduct which must be carried out in human relations.

And so I ask you, in the spirit of the award which you have so graciously given to me, think through yourself as to whether you are doing everything in terms of your deep conviction upon this subject which this tremendous social revolution really calls for.

How many Negroes do you know who are your friends? How many jobs or training opportunities have you given to Negroes? How little irritated have you been if your children's school has been changed from a school which had no Negro representation for a more integrated status? How happy are you if a Negro lives on your block or suburb? And if you are a businessman, how conscious are you of the fact that unemployment among Negro girls up to 21 years of age is about one-third of the total number of employable, and that that compares with other teenagers who are about 15 percent, and that is awfully high, too?

What are you doing, specially in this hot summer, to give jobs to all teenagers and opportunities to them with a special eye to the particular problems of Negroes in this country?

Now, my friends, these are perhaps a little provocative, perhaps even a little irritating, but I am not given to broad forensics, and I have taken an award only for what it will inspire me to do and as an example to others to inspire you to do.

I compliment and congratulate you upon your work. I think it is magnificent. Your Mr. Williams was an inspiration, as I heard him; and I am delighted to be in the company of such distinguished awardees as Mr. Cronin and Governor Collins. And I evoke from you, in the spirit of your generosity and the warmth of your reception, a correlation with the activities for which you have honored us. Earn this award, too, each one of you, in some of the ways which I have described; and then the blessings of good will and of brotherhood which have dominated this organization for so long will be translated in a joy to you which you can only realize when you have achieved them.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS BY HON. LE ROY COLLINS, FORMER GOVERNOR OF FLORIDA, AND DIRECTOR, COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. Cahners, Dr. Knowles, Governor Volpe, Mayor Collins, Senator JAVITS, Mr. Cronin, and other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, for me it is always a happy occasion when I visit historic Boston, but to be receiving one of your Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews annual awards makes this evening a highly privileged time as well.

First of all, may I commend this organization for its splendid program of improving human relations in this community. I have been talking here with Chairman Hodgkinson, and he has told me of the many fine efforts you have made in the past and has given me a forecast of some of the exciting projects you will undertake in the future. I extend my congratulations and warmest good wishes for your continued success.

If we of the Community Relations Service can ever be of any assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

From the incubation of the Republic down to the present time, Boston is a community which has been characterized by the greatness of people who have lived here. This gives you an extraordinarily rich heritage, but I would caution you that change and progress must come everywhere in our land, and there is no community which can ever consider itself safe from destructive conditions and influences; and the danger is all the greater unless the people and their leaderships are made continually aware of all eroding conditions and demonstrate through positive efforts the will and means to go forward to remedy them.

I am especially delighted to see my longtime friend, Mayor Collins, here tonight. Not only have your mayor established a splendid record for his work here, but in various conferences in which I have participated, I have learned that his counsel and guidance are highly respected by people interested in municipal progress throughout the Nation.

The distinguished Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and I were visiting in his office the other day, and mention was made of this meeting. He explained that he would not be able to come here tonight personally because of the arduous duties of his present position. He spoke to me in the warmest of terms about this great audience. "Beyond any doubt," he said, "you will be with the finest of Boston and Massachusetts leadership there."

I would like to express my appreciation, and that of my assistant, Mr. Jay Janis, to Mr. Ben Shapiro. He is an extraordinary person and has looked after every detail of this splendid meeting with amazing competence.

May I say, too, that I am highly honored to be in the company of my fellow awardees here this evening.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, is one of the Nation's leading and most respected Republicans. But more than that, he is a great American and contributes enormous skill and dedication to duty in his public service. The whole Nation looks to him for leadership.

Mr. Joseph E. Cronin is one of the country's foremost heroes and citizens. He is in everybody's hall of fame. I would consider it a high privilege if I had had the opportunity to be his second-string bat boy.

Ladies and gentlemen, may I try to express in just a few additional words my great appreciation for the honor which has been given me this evening. I shall always be grateful to you and try to show this by ever-increasing efforts to deserve it.

I think our generation is faced with the crucial test of doing what other generations which have gone before us have failed to do. True, our forefathers had the vision of developing here a nation "of liberty and justice for all"; but with the degree of discrimination which we have experienced over the years, especially that practiced against our Negro citizens, no fairminded American can say that a full measure of success has been achieved.

But this is a new time—a new opportunity—a new challenge—we now live with.

Ours is the time of new achievement in civil rights, and, unless I judge my fellow Americans wrongly, ours will be the time of great success.

This will take much more than flag waving, oratory, and good intentions. It will take much more than laws and ordinances and Executive orders. It will take work—very hard work—by all of those who want this to come to pass.

We are all called to action. In whatever ways, little or big, that our opportunities and talents allow we must not fail to respond.

Thank you.

AWARDS

The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, at its 28th annual dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, first generation American, born in New York City and deriving his formal education from its public schools, night classes at Columbia and law studies at New York University Law School; admitted to the bar in 1927 and now the head of a large law firm in New York City; active supporter in 1937 and 1940 of Mayor LaGuardia's programs for civic reform; combat officer in World War II who attained the rank of lieutenant colonel; a member of the U.S. House of Representatives from 1946 to 1954; elected attorney general of New York State in 1954; elected to the U.S. Senate in 1956 and again in 1962; author of the revealing book entitled "Discrimination, U.S.A."; writer of numerous articles for magazines and periodicals; recipient of honorary degrees from 11 universities; nationally acclaimed for his legislative record in Washington, particularly for his work with respect to civil rights, civil liberties, and foreign economic policy—Senator JAVITS' life of public service has exemplified American citizenship at its best.

For his enlightened sense of the challenges of a free society and his unceasing efforts to bring the practices of our democracy closer to its preachings, the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews presents to Senator JAVITS this testimonial of its appreciation and esteem.

Dated at Boston, Mass., this 20th day of May 1965.

The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, at its 28th annual dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to the Honorable LeRoy Collins, thoughtful, constructive and courageous American who has served with distinction in the field of government and in the field of education.

His good work as a legislator in his native State of Florida and his wise administration of his office of Governor of Florida won for him national acclaim and led to his selection as chairman of the National Governors' Conference, as chairman of the National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment, as a member of the Peace Corps' National Advisory Council, and as permanent chairman of the 1960 Democratic National Convention.

In the scholastic field, he has served as a member of the Committee on Goals for Higher Education in the South, as chairman of the Southern Regional Educational Board, as a member of the board of governors of the National Cathedral School, and as a trustee of Randolph-Macon Women's College.

After 3 years as the president of the National Association of Broadcasters, Governor Collins was appointed by President Johnson in 1964 to his present difficult post of Director of the Federal Community Relations Service.

In recognition of his more than 30 years of high service to State and Nation and of his dedication to the peaceful achievement of the goals of our current civil rights movement, the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews presents to Governor Collins this citation and award.

Dated at Boston, Mass., this 20th day of May, 1965.

The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews, at its 28th annual dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to Joseph E. Cronin, adopted son of Boston; vice chairman of our committee; an original sponsor of our annual junior goodwill dinners; executive committee chairman of Children's Cancer Research Foundation; shining knight in baseball armor from 1924 to 1946; famed player-manager of the Washington Senators for 2 years, and of the Boston Red Sox for 11 years; voted the American League's most valuable player in 1930; seven times a member of the American League's all star team; twice designated the American League's all star manager; vice president and general manager of the Red Sox from 1948 through 1958; immortalized in 1956 at Cooperstown as a member of Baseball's Hall of Fame; and enthroned in 1959 as president of the American League.

Today, by virtue of his sui generis athletic past, his personal character and enlightened civic sense, he is nationally recognized as the ideal chieftain of a major baseball league and as the personification of baseball at its best.

Sharing the general public's admiration and respect for our helpful fellow members, the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews presents to Joseph E. Cronin this citation and award.

Dated at Boston, Mass., this 20th day of May 1965.

California Remains Leading Farm State Without Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a most encouraging and perceptive report on the near-record prosperity of California agriculture this year.

The report, written by Los Angeles Times' Labor Editor Harry Bernstein, and appearing in the June 15 edition of the Times, notes with pride that California will maintain its position as the

Nation's leading agricultural State in 1965 for the 18th consecutive year despite the end of the bracero foreign farm labor program.

Moreover, Mr. Bernstein's article predicts that California's estimated cash receipts from agricultural sales will top second-ranked Iowa by more than $1 billion.

In fact, total gross receipts to California farmers in 1965, though about 1 percent less than the $3.65 billion 1964 alltime high record, will still be some 3.5 percent above 1963—which had been the second best year in history.

The Los Angeles Times' article follows:

CALIFORNIA REMAINS LEADING FARM STATE—WITHOUT BRACEROS

(By Harry Bernstein)

California will maintain its position as the Nation's leading agricultural State this year for the 18th consecutive year despite the end of the foreign farm labor programs.

And it is evident also that the State's growers in general have weathered the bracero program's end without the predicted disastrous results.

This State's estimated cash receipts from agricultural sales will be about $1 billion above second-ranked Iowa.

It is generally agreed that there are some serious problems in individual cases, and that next fall, there will be more problems, especially in the tomato harvest.

But the impact on the overall economy of the State so far has been mild, despite widespread fears in recent months that it faced disaster because the foreign farmworkers were no longer available in massive numbers after Congress decided to let the Mexican bracero program die.

Farming is, in some respects, not unlike the stock market: prices fluctuate widely for many reasons, including psychological ones.

Many growers contend, with justification, that the widespread attention given to the end of the bracero program in the press was, in itself, another factor in the problems facing the farm economy.

If buyers and brokers were fearful of major crop disasters, this gloom and doom attitude, even though accurately reported in the newspapers, would help spiral prices upward.

No one wanted to be left without products to sell, and most were willing to pay higher prices even though supply in many cases was equal to the demand.

Similarly, reports of soaring wages to farmworkers led many to believe this factor was enough to double last year's prices, as did happen in some cases.

But while it would be erroneous to say there have been no losses because of farm labor shortages, it would also be incorrect to suggest that the State's farm economy has been struck a disastrous blow.

As in most situations, the truth is at neither extreme. Each crop must be examined separately, and the factors applying in one case may be meaningless in another.

Some economists will strongly argue that the State is economically healthier so far this year than last, and as a direct result of the elimination of the bracero program.

Millions of dollars which once went to Mexico are now remaining in this State's economy; thousands of Americans who were last year jobless or on relief are this year working in agriculture; farm wages generally are unquestionably well above last year, which these economists say means more purchasing power in the economy, aside from humanitarian considerations involved in raising wages of the lowest segment of the State's and Nation's work force.

Other economists argue that the impact on some crops, such as strawberries and asparagus, are not being offset, and that the losses are more than the gains.

The Bank of America predicts now that the 1965 total gross receipts for farmers in California will be down 1 or 1.5 percent from 1964, when the $3.65 billion total was the highest in the history of any State in the Nation.

But Marvin D. McGregor, research economist of the Bank of America, noted that this possible drop will still leave 1965 about 3.5 percent above 1963, which was the second best year in history.

There have been decreases in some crop acreages, and a downturn in first-quarter cash receipts for farm marketing generally is attributed to lower prices for hay and winter lettuce from Imperial Valley. But other crop acreages are higher than before.

In part this is because some growers anticipated shortages of labor and switched to other crops which use less labor.

A survey of overall planting intentions in field crops, for example, shows such facts as a jump of 10 percent in the State's corn acreage, 18 percent in potatoes, 5 percent in beans, and 5 percent in grain sorghums.

And while barley, for instance, rose only 1 percent over last year in acreage, this meant an additional 15,000 acres of barley.

But consumers are more concerned with the price of say, lettuce, than of grains because they see the lettuce daily on their market shelves while the grains are less directly noticeable.

By now, housewives have probably forgotten that the price of lettuce in February and March was low—even lower than last year when foreign workers were available.

LOSS ON WINTER LETTUCE

The loss suffered by Imperial Valley winter lettuce growers was substantial. The price to the grower dropped to about $1 to $1.50 a carton, which was less than the lettuce cost to produce.

There was no labor shortage in the valley even though there were no braceros. Thousands of domestic workers were available, including many "green carders" who live in Mexicali but have already won the right to work and, if they want, live in this country.

There was too much lettuce then, not to little. The glut on the market was in good part responsible for the collapse of the market price, causing a serious loss to the growers there.

STILL SECOND HIGHEST

But the several millions lost on that winter lettuce crop are part of the drop calculated by the Bank of America when it says this year's total gross farm receipts, while still the second highest in history, are likely to be below 1964.

The consumer is more concerned with spring lettuce, which is now on the shelves, and while the price is dropping slightly this week, it has been running up to 35 cents and more a head.

Last year at this time, the price was around half that.

Many lettuce men agree the cause of the increase is, in some part, "psychosomatic," reflecting "stock market-like jiters," rather than the higher costs of labor or a reduced volume.

This is the firm view of Bud Antle, who, while regarded as a maverick by many of his fellow growers, does produce more lettuce than any of his competitors. Last year he grossed $15 million.

THE STOCK MARKET

"You tell me why the stock market prices went down last week when President Johnson sneezed, and I'll tell you why my lettuce is bringing more. But it isn't what most people are trying to say it is," Antle said.

Workers harvesting the crop this year are making 25 to 50 percent more than last year in wages, and in some cases they get even more. The average increase is being estimated at about 33 percent.

Last year, the wage cost of a carton of lettuce was around 22 to 24 cents. This year it is estimated at about 32 cents a carton.

This means labor costs increases accounted for less than half a cent per head, since there are 24 heads in a carton.

So labor costs cannot be blamed for the 17-cents-a-head price hike.

ARIZONA CUTBACK

There was some cutback in the supply of lettuce from Arizona, and some of the experts say this reduced volume helped create the high-price psychology which at the end of May was bringing growers around $5 a carton for their spring lettuce, instead of the $1.50 to $2 they were getting last year. Prices are dropping sharply again this week.

But there were no labor shortages, and one reason for this seems to have been the ability of the lettuce growers to attract workers away from lower paying crops.

And despite the decrease in Arizona lettuce, California shipments from the coastal harvest had reached 9,061 carlot equivalents by May 29 compared to 8,933 carlots last year, the State department of agriculture's statistical bureau chief reports.

Export Shrinkage Threatens the Hefty U.S. Surplus in Merchandise Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a danger signal sounded in two separate and small, but nonetheless significant, articles which appeared in the Thursday, June 17, and Friday, June 18, editions, respectively, of the Wall Street Journal. On Thursday, the warning appeared in the second item of the Journal's regular feature, "Business Bulletin," and read as follows:

Export shrinkage threatens the hefty U.S. surplus in merchandise trade.

During the first 4 months of this year the surplus of exports over imports dropped to an annual rate of $4.3 billion from $6.5 billion for all 1964. The decline probably was due partly to export losses during the January–February dock strike. But with the strike now history, further narrowing signs persist. May general cargo imports through New Orleans piers climbed 76 percent from a year earlier; exports rose only 8 percent. Coal exports through big Norfolk-area docks dipped slightly in May from last year.

S. J. Rundt, an international trade consultant in New York says, he will be surprised if the U.S. trade surplus hits $5 billion or more this year. He suspects U.S. voluntary restrictions on bank loans are limiting foreign borrowing to finance U.S. purchases. Lester Goodman, a San Francisco trade expert, blames "outbreaks or anti-American feeling" abroad and declining U.S. price advantages, among other factors. This week's strike against U.S.-flag ships could further damage the trade balance, some observers believe.

On Friday, in an article on page 3 headlined, "Interest Rates Rising on Business Loans at New York Banks," the Journal reported that a panel of bankers at the 69th annual convention of the

New York State Bankers Association had expressed the opinion that, as the article put it:

The President's program for banks to curb voluntary foreign loans to help check the Nation's balance-of-payments deficit will noticeably reduce the Nation's export surplus this year.

And as we have seen from the article in Thursday's Journal, this apparently is happening already.

This is indeed disturbing news, Mr. Speaker. This development should certainly command our continued most serious attention. Having long believed that the key to our balance-of-payments problem lies in the continued growth of our balance of trade, I have consistently and wholeheartedly supported vigorous, positive programs to increase the volume of our foreign trade. Conversely, I have opposed outright all proposals aimed at restricting trade, and have viewed with increasing apprehension the use by our Government of such negative approaches to the balance-of-payments problem as the interest equalization tax, discouragement of loans abroad and the recent attempts to reduce the amount of duty-free goods which may be brought back by American travelers. Were these techniques separate from, and without effect upon, our overall balance of trade which is the key factor in this most serious problem then perhaps their use would be justified. Such, however, apparently has proved not to be the case. For our international trade and the financing thereof is based upon a highly complex web of interrelationships, and a negative approach in one area is likely to produce an adverse reaction in another. If this is the case, as recent events so indicate, then it would seem that the medicine of these negative measures is aggravating rather than healing the balance-of-payments disease.

We must take heed of these warnings, Mr. Speaker. They remind us of the extreme complexity of our international trade relationships. So sensitive, so delicate and so interwoven are these relationships that there is a real need for the most searching kind of analysis before coming to a decision to implement policy that aims to alter part or all of the balance of trade structure. Such policy must be analyzed not only in terms of the effects upon that area which it is desirable to change, but also in terms of its ultimate result for the entire balance of trade picture.

In other words let us plan far enough ahead that we do not lead the child out of a patch of poison ivy into a den of rattlesnakes. But analysis of a policy must not end with its implementation. Once the policy is in action, it must be subjected to close and continuing scrutiny with a view to determining all of its effects, good and bad, upon our international trade. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, we might borrow a leaf from the book of some of our defense contractors who setup what they call "systems divisions" to analyze and coordinate all activities relating to a particularly complex project. I would recommend that the President set up a "systems division" for international trade. This would be an office responsible for analyzing the entire complex of our international trade. It would recommend policy to the President, coordinate its execution, and then closely analyze it for its effects after implementation. It would, moreover, make periodic and accurate reports on policy results—and not just stratified results either, but total results. Not merely the results in one small area but all of the ramifications for the entire structure of international trade would be reported. For instance, suppose that it is desirable to reduce the flow of our capital abroad; and suppose that a reduction is achieved due to governmental encouragement in this direction. But, if in turn our balance-of-trade surplus is also reduced in the process, what have we gained?

With its responsibility for, and consequently view of, the total international trade picture, my proposed "systems division" should be able to foresee that policy which might produce results favorable in one area might also produce adverse results in another and thereby forestall its adoption. If it did not, it would certainly discover such ill effects soon after policy enactment. If it then found the total effect adverse, if the policy measures are in fact self-defeating, this would be discovered, and we could more quickly and more knowledgeably move away from their use toward a better solution. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the complex and serious nature of our balance-of-payments problem demands the kind of close analysis, careful coordination and constant review offered by the "systems division" approach.

I also believe that we can push forward in two other positive directions. First, we must continue to promote our foreign trade with vigor and imagination. Here the efforts and accomplishments of the administration and Congress have been most commendable. They include, of course, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the development and improvement of a system of export credit insurance, and the praiseworthy efforts of our Commerce Department to encourage American business to trade more and to export more. These and other positive programs like them have been the right steps in the right direction. But much still remains to be done in this area. More imaginative programs to bring foreign travelers to the United States, more aggressive and sophisticated salesmanship by American businessmen of their products in foreign markets, more flexibility by them with regard to credit terms and product specifications, and constant improvement of Government programs to encourage such activities are only a few examples.

Then, too, we must actively seek in concert with the free nations of the world to develop international trade mechanisms which will better reflect and better finance the ever-rising output of goods and services, the ever-increasing wealth of a developing world than those which now exist. We must continue to reach for a new era of international cooperation in the field of trade and finance.

Johnson and His Critics: Diplomacy in a Fishbowl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding colleague, the Honorable MORRIS K. UDALL, has recently published an excellent discussion of the administration's foreign policy. I would like to share with you the contents of this report and ask unanimous consent for it to be placed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON AND HIS CRITICS: DIPLOMACY IN A FISHBOWL

Vietnam lies 7,000 miles away; Santo Domingo is 400. But the troubled events in these two widely separated places are related and involve basic foreign policy issues. Our actions have shocked some Americans and pleased others. They have prompted one of the most heated foreign policy debates we have heard in this country since the early 1940's. And behind all of these events and these actions is the lonely man who can't correct his mistakes in the "final arguments"—the President of the United States.

I saw a cartoon the other day. It showed President Johnson walking alone through a dark and gloomy terrain. He was saying to himself, "There seem to be some lonely stretches." And indeed there are. No men alive today, except former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, know what it means to bear the awful responsibilities of that office. And it may be significant that both of these men are supporting the President.

Recently I had the rare privilege of sitting in the Cabinet Room of the White House for nearly 2 hours as the President defended and explained his policies in these two trouble spots. Wrestling with the hard alternatives presented him and with the conflicting advice being offered from all sides, he said, "Every President wants to do what is right. This is not the problem The problem is to know what is right."

What is right in these situations? What kind of action should the United States take to advance its interests in this volatile and changing world? A few years ago political scientists and others were critical of our foreign policy, saying it was little more than a set of meaningless phrases imploring the rest of the world to comply with our version of goodness and morality. The danger in this, we were told, was that other nations would tend to expect words, rather than action, if we were put to the test. And we might find our ability to influence events on the decline as a result.

I believe President Johnson has determined that this Nation will not decline in power and prestige, and that we will adopt a credible foreign policy which other nations will—not necessarily love—but respect. In the end it is generally power, and not good intentions or moral preachments, which prevails in the affairs of nations. A nation ignores this basic fact at its peril.

Has the President made decisions which will advance our national interest? Only history can decide. Some of the best minds in the country say, "No." But I can't help wondering how different those decisions would have been if those same critics had been saddled with the same responsibility in the same circumstances. One can't emphasize enough the important distinction between the spectator and the participant.

THE FOREST VERSUS THE TREES

The President's critics, in the Congress and in the press, have broadcast their views widely. The President has expounded his views in a number of speeches and television appearances. Yet I do not believe that the reasoning and philosophy behind the President's actions have been sufficiently understood. Lyndon Johnson is not a warmonger; he wants peace and stability; he wants freedom to develop his domestic programs; he wants to reduce our commitments overseas.

An effective foreign policy for these troubled and revolutionary times must not be just reactions to external events; it must be initiative as well. If we are not going to spend this era fighting the wrong wars in the wrong places, we need a positive foreign policy setting forth long-term goals and objectives toward which we can direct specific military, political, and economic decisions. In this newsletter I shall explore "the forest," as I think the President views it, and then relate it, as he does, to the "trees" in Saigon and Santo Domingo. In the process I want to reflect on some of the critical arguments being made against U.S. policy in these areas.

NEEDED—A NEW NAME FOR A NEW ERA

In the late 1940's someone came up with a catchy name for the power struggle that followed World War II. He called it the cold war.

But not even cold wars last indefinitely, and I think we need a new phrase for the era in which we now find ourselves. For one thing, the war is no longer cold. In places like Vietnam it's pretty hot. But, more than this, there are important differences to be noted between the world of 18 years ago and the world today. Communism is no longer monolithic. The Soviet Union, while still making noises and gestures toward Communist expansion, has turned inward to its own domestic problems. In fact, Russia is now a "have" nation with things to lose in any major encounter. In this new era the bully we have to worry most about is not Russia but China, still very much a "have not" nation.

Then, too, methods have changed. Before the last Soviet ultimatum in Berlin, to which President Kennedy responded with firmness, and the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, when our strong stand caused the Russians to withdraw, there had been repeated tests of our will to resist direct military action. Since then Russia has gone one way—avoiding military encounters—and China has gone another. And in China's case the emphasis has been on internal revolution, subversion, and—as in Vietnam—guerrilla "wars of national liberation." These changes call for new thinking and new tactics on our part.

There is still another characteristic of this new era, and I think it's the most important of all. At the start of the cold war we were concerned about what happened in Europe. We saved it. Now we're concerned about what happens to countless brandnew nations on the continent of Africa, in southeast Asia, and elsewhere. Here there is no direct confrontation or great powers, as there was in occupied Europe. Rather, there is concern on the part of at least three contending power blocs that these nations not become strong allies of some other bloc. The nature of the struggle thus is quite different from the struggle that has concerned us in past years. The overwhelming military confrontations, with their awesome implications of nuclear war and world destruction, have subsided. And more limited encounters have become the order of the day.

In these new nations we see tremendous forces at work. As I commented in my foreign policy newsletters of last year, there are four concurrent revolutions in progress around the world. There is the political revolution in which the old colonial order is being replaced by self-government. There is the economic revolution in which 2 billion underprivileged people are trying to break through the walls of poverty and ignorance. There is the population revolution, threatening the world with ever-new problems in production of food, fiber, housing, and other essentials of life. And finally there is the scientific revolution, posing unknown threats to the existing order. Nowhere are these four revolutions more forbiding than in the newly developing nations.

This is the world President Johnson looks out upon the world in which he has to make his decisions. It's probably no more awesome than the cold war world, but it poses new challenges and requires new responses. Whether he is right or wrong, President Johnson clearly intends to have his country make the right responses to these challenges. For he is aware that the history of mankind is strewn with doctrines and ideas which were perfect for one age and disastrous for another.

PHILOSOPHY BASED ON EXPERENCE

Before you can understand a man's philosophy you must understand the man. President Johnson has said, "Our political philosophies are the sum of our life's experiences." He is a man born in 1908. Two shattering and disruptive events left their marks on people of his generation—the great depression and World War II. As he views his country's future, we must never again have the breadlines and economic waste of the 1930's, and we must never again become involved in a major, world war.

In his lifetime we have fought two world wars and a serious but limited war in Korea. To Mr. Johnson the key to avoiding other large conflicts is this: Never let a potential enemy miscalculate our intentions. It is his belief, supported by most historians, that we became involved in each of those wars because our intentions were misunderstood. Consider the following:

In the first three years of World War I we were an isolationist people. There was no evidence apparent to the Germans that we would join in on the side of the Allies. On the contrary, President Wilson was reelected in 1916 on the slogan that he "kept us out of war." Congressmen ran for office on their opposition to foreign entanglements. Germany thus was tempted to take far bolder steps than prudence would have dictated if she had assessed our will differently.

In the 1930's Hitler, noting our rejection of the League of Nations, our "America First" rallies and the many speeches of our isolationist Senators, was persuaded that we would stand by while he conquered Europe. Even as great a leader as Senator Robert Taft had declared, "It would be better that Hitler conquered all of Europe than that a single American boy die in this foreign conflict." And, indeed, it is quite possible that we would have let Hitler carry out his conquests had not the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and resolved our domestic debate. Thus, again, Germany miscalculated the intentions and will of the United States by heeding our own words and actions.

In the late 1940's and early 1950's we led North Korea, China, and the Soviet Union to believe that South Korea was outside our defense perimeter. The result was a long and costly war.

After the 1962 Cuban missile crisis President Kennedy remarked to me and other Members of Congress that its most frightening aspect was that each side had misjudged the other. Khrushchev assumed we would permit installation of missiles 90 miles off our shores; we assumed he wouldn't dare. The result could have been World War III, but luckily wasn't.

The lesson President Johnson draws from all this is that the Russians and Chinese simply will not believe that we are serious about defending really vital places like Berlin, the Philippines, Japan, Turkey, or India if we stand back and allow them to take less important places like South Vietnam. In short, he believes we are being tested there, and possibly in the Dominican Republic, too, and in his view if we fail we shall surely be confronted with more difficult tests elsewhere.

THE ROLE OF PUBLIC DISCUSSION

This brings us to a related point. It has been suggested that the President wants no public criticism of his policies. No doubt he is as sensitive to criticism as all of our recent Presidents have been. However, I think he has been receptive of the advice he has been given, and nowhere was this more apparent than in his Baltimore speech calling for unconditional negotiation in Vietnam.

What the President wants, I believe, is more responsible criticism and less of the other kind. How to draw the line is difficult, of course. But the fact is that intemperate and uninformed attacks on this country's foreign policy can have a material effect on the course of the very events in question. A few weeks ago there were some indications, gained through intelligence channels, that the Hanoi government was about ready for a negotiated settlement. Unfortunately, these came to nothing, and our intelligence sources indicate the probable reason: recurring attacks by prominent Americans on our Vietnam policy led strategists in Hanoi and Peiping to believe that an outraged American public opinion very soon would force us to abandon the struggle and pull out.

Public discussion is important, and I am sure the President would defend the right of a critic to speak out, even irresponsibly, for this is the essence of our democratic system. For this reason I abhor the kind of thought control imposed on the American people through the sedition laws of World War I. But what we say in a free society does influence the leaders of other countries, and I believe it is the responsibility of all of us to weigh this influence when we speak out. If a Senator believes the President is pursuing policies that are dangerous and wrong, he ought to talk with the President and try to persuade him privately. If this fails and he remains convinced of his own judgment in the matter, he has a right and duty to go to the press and the public seeking to rally public opinion to his side. A private citizen, of course, has less opportunity to communicate his views, but at the same time his remarks carry less weight overseas. But even a private citizens, who loves his country, should weigh his words before he accuses his President of favoring dictators or advocating a new world war.

The fact is that the President of the United States, unlike the rulers of China and the Soviet Union, has to operate in a fishbowl. When we demand that he explain his every move, and preferably in advance, we make his position increasingly difficult in relation to these other participants in the world struggle. The President may not always be right; he may be wrong in Vietnam or the Dominican Republic or both places. But he is our President, and he deserves our loyalty and support.

J. B. Priestly put it this way: "We should behave toward our country as women behave toward the men they love. A loving wife will do anything for her husband except to stop criticizing and trying to improve him. That is also the right attitude for a citizen."

VIETNAM—THE PROS AND CONS

With this background and in the spirit of open debate and discussion, let's look at some of the arguments made against our Vietnam policy and compare them with the President's answers:

Argument: We should stop the fighting and negotiate a settlement. The President answers: "This is what I want, too. But,

pray tell me, with whom and where shall I negotiate? I have offered to negotiate with any government at any time, but there has been no response. I replied to the 19 unalined nations who asked for an end to the war; Hanoi did not. Our diplomats all over the world have tried to make contact with Hanoi and Peiping; the answer is scorn and ridicule. But I want to negotiate a settlement, and I will continue to press for negotiations."

Argument: Vietnam is not of critical importance to this country; it really makes no difference if we lose it. The President answers: "We are being tested to see if we will stand behind our commitments. Either we will remain a leader in world affairs or we won't. No matter how much we talk about freedom, democracy and international morality, it is mainly power that influences nations. If we shrink from honoring a commitment, we can expect our influence over world events to decline and that of our enemies to grow. We stood firm in Greece and Berlin, and the world is better for it; the same will be true in Vietnam."

Argument: The risks are so great that we ought to pull out before it's too late. Arthur Schlesinger, the former adviser to President Kennedy, answered this very well at the excellent teach-in we had in Washington recently. He said, "a pullout would prove to the Communist world that the militant Chinese position is right and the Russian position wrong in the current ideological struggle." This would mean evermore aggressive action by the Chinese and their allies around the world—and possibly force the Soviet Union to adopt similar tactics. It could only spell increasing trouble for the United States and the free world.

A GUNBOAT DIPLOMAT?

Similarly, the President is under attack for his actions in the Dominican Republic. This is what we're hearing:

Argument: We violated our treaties in landing troops in Santo Domingo. This action will undo all the confidence and good will we have earned in Latin America in the last 30 years. The President replies: "Historians will have plenty of time to weigh the facts; I didn't. In my judgment there was a very great risk that another Castro would emerge in the Caribbean. I acted to prevent that and insure that the Dominican people could have an opportunity to choose their own government. A decision not to act in what is clearly our sphere of influence might have been irreversible. I'm called a gunboat diplomat by some of my critics, but what would they have called me if the revolution had produced another Castro?"

ISN'T THIS THE GOLDWATER POLICY?

One student with whom I talked recently in Arizona remarked with some bitterness, "I supported Johnson and HUMPHREY because I was frightened of the Goldwater foreign policy. If we are to have Goldwaterism abroad, I'd prefer to have the real, genuine article and not a watered-down substitute." In my judgment this criticism reveals, first, a misunderstanding of Senator Goldwater's views (he said recently he would "pray" as President for a provocation to bomb Red China) and, second, a tendency to accept the "wishy-washy" description accorded President Johnson by his opponents last fall. The President advocated a strong and credible foreign policy then, and he is attempting to carry out such a policy now.

A few years ago we had a totally unbelievable policy based on so-called massive retaliation to any enemy move. President Johnson has substituted for this a policy of limited response—just that measure of force needed to demonstrate our will. He doesn't pray for a chance to expand the war in Vietnam. He wants no "holy" war with Red China or the Soviet Union. Rather, through firmness to our commitments he hopes to strengthen our role in world affairs, thereby increasing prospects for peace. This policy of cautious and carefully measured response is not the Goldwater policy I read about in either of his books or heard about in the campaign last fall, and it is not the policy he is advocating today.

HISTORY AND THE LONG VIEW

Most Americans today acknowledge that President Truman was one of our best Presidents, yet he contributed to the miscalculation in Korea. President Eisenhower, seeking a settlement with the Soviet Union, bungled the U-2 affair and perpetuated the cold war. President Johnson, seeking only peace, has become involved in two awkward military situations. How will history assess these Presidents and their actions? We can only guess, but what is clear is that the decisions of our Presidents never come easy. Even in a free society such as ours all facts can't be disclosed all the time. And no one not in that position of awesome responsibility can know fully what factors are involved in the decisions that are made.

I believe President Johnson made the case for a credible foreign policy when he said in his state of the Union message this year: "We will not, and we should not, assume that it is the task of Americans alone to settle all the conflicts of a torn and troubled world * * *. We are prepared to live as good neighbors with all, but we cannot be indifferent to acts designed to injure our interests or our citizens or our establishments abroad. The community of nations requires mutual respect. We shall extend it—and we shall expect it."

As I write this, there is no way to know how events turn out for us. But before this year is out I think we will have turned some corners, for better or worse, both in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. I am inclined to believe this dark hour will pass. As Saville R. Davis wrote in the Christian Science Monitor a few days ago:

"For all the rough methods that tough-minded Americans may use against communism, and for all the highhanded politics they may use, their motive is to clean up the situation and get out. And they may end these vexing episodes in Vietnam and the Caribbean by doing just that.

"The crisis of confidence in the world today is based on the fear that they won't. But they probably will, all the same."

Concord Wecomes Antioquia, Colombia, Delegation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, following the first Inter-American Conference of Partners of the Alliance on June 10 and 11 here in Washington, the delegation of 14 members of the Partners Committee of Antioquia, Colombia, spent several days visiting with their counterpart committee in Massachusetts.

The group visited educational, industrial, financial, and cultural institutions and explored the implementation of the several projects recommended by the Massachusetts survey team after their trip to Antioquia last December.

Among the highlights of the visit to Massachusetts was the welcome by the people of Concord, with whom the people of Rionegro, Antioquia, have developed a special people-to-people relationship.

The visit was described in the June 17 issue of the Concord Free Press, which follows:

CONCORD WELCOMES OFFICIAL VISIT OF ANTIOQUIA, COLOMBIA, DELEGATION

A delegation of 14 representatives from Massachusetts' sister state, Antioquia in Colombia, arrived on Sunday to spend the afternoon and evening in Concord.

Among the places they visited in town were the public library and the antiquarian museum, and the delegation also attended the Elks Flag Day celebration at the Old North Bridge.

Sunday evening a reception was held for the visitors at the First Parish Meetinghouse, sponsored by the town-to-town committee and the Concord Inter-Church Peace Group. A welcome was given by chairman of selectmen, Seymour W. Archibald, Jr., followed by a brief address by Jorge A. Uribe, the official representative of Concord's sister town, Rionegro.

Mr. Uribe began his remarks by saying that when his fellow Rionegritos chose him to come on this tour, they chose a man who is very enthusiastic about the project and has some command of English but is "no public speaker." Which statement he immediately set about to disprove by giving a most interesting sketch of the background of Rionegro.

The town was founded, no one knows exactly when, by miners who stayed until the supply of minerals in the area was exhausted. It was the location of Colombia's first textile mill and is famous for the manufacture of shoes.

One of the high points in the history of Rionegro occurred in the year 1863 when, at the end of a bloody civil war, a convention assembled in the town and fabricated what is, according to Mr. Uribe, the most idealistic and utopian constitution known to history. Among its provisions it made legal the keeping and use of firearms and all forms of insurection. Very idealistic, as Mr. Uribe said, but not very human. The new constitution lasted for 20 chaotic years.

Today, Rionegro is a town of about 18,000 people, located on a plateau at 6,000 feet which is not high for Colombia. The climate varies from 55° to 65° F.

Recently, two companies have opened new textile plants in Rionegro, and with the assistance of a Peace Corps man from United States the shoe industry, long a primitive hand operation has been consolidated into cooperative centers of manufacture.

Mr. Uribe stressed the fact that it is not money primarily which is needed in Antioquia as much as advice.

In the general conversation which followed his formal remarks, Mr. Uribe said that his own dream was to establish an "industrial park" in Rionegro, and that he had been talking with experts in the field in this country. Rionegro, he said, has about 20 to 30 percent illiteracy which is very low by comparison with other areas of Latin America.

Twenty-four-year-old Uribe is no stranger to the United States, having spent 2 years at Culver Military Academy in Indiana and another 2 years at George Washington University. He is now an insurance broker in Rionegro.

Other members of the delegation included: Dr. and Mrs. Alberto Vasquez L., schools' administration and finance; Helena De Ospine, wife of the director of Incoplan, daughter-in-law of a former President of Colombia; Gabriel Angel, chairman of National Finance Corp. and son of a former Colombian Ambassador to the United States and the United Nations.

Also, Dr. Alberto Jaramillo S., president of Corporation Patriotica de Antioquia, and former Governor of Antioquia; Vicent Uribe R., president of Banco Commercial Antioqueno; Ignacio Velez, former president Universidad de Antioquia and former Governor of Antioquia; Jorge Restrapo, president of Antioquia Development Institute; Ernesto Satizabal, member of the board of Small Industrials Association.

Still others were: Ivan Correa A., manager of Banco Industrial Colombiano; Juan Rafael Cardenas, vice president of the Colombian Tobacco Co.; Alberto Delgado, vice president of Banco Industrial; and Javier R. Mesa, vice president of Medellin Public Utilities Co.

Two items of general information are of interest: The name of the town, Medellin, is pronounced May-day-yeen with the accent on the last syllable, and several of the members of the delegation use a form of indentification consisting of the Christian name and the family name followed by the initial of the mother's maiden name.

The hosts for dinner were Mr. and Mrs. John D. Briggs, Mr. and Mrs. Daniel A. Cronin, of the town-to-town committee with Selectman and Mrs. Louis K. McNally; Selectman and Mrs. William O. Faxon; Mr. and Mrs. Roger C. Fenn; Dr. and Mrs. John Raker, and Mr. and Mrs. Robert Shaw.

INVITATION TO RIONEGRO TO BECOME SISTER TOWN ACCEPTED BY MAYOR LEMA

The town of Rionegro, Colombia, has officially accepted the invitation of Concord to become a sister town. The letter of acceptance was read by chairman of selectmen, Seymour W. Archibald, Jr., at a reception for the visiting delegation from Colombia on Sunday evening:

DEPARTMENTO DE ANTIOQUIA, REPUBLICA DE COLOMBIA, ALCALDIA MUNICIPAL, RIONEGRO,

Rionegro, May 31, 1965.

Hon. W. SEYMOUR ARCHIBALD, Jr.,
Chairman, Board of Selectmen,
Concord, Mass., United States of America.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ARCHIBALD: In the name of the people and council of Rionegro, I take pleasure of informing you that, having accepted your kind proposal of entering into a town-to-town affiliation with Concord, a committee has been formed to implement the association of our towns. The following persons have been appointed as members of the Rionegro committee:

Mr. Jorge Uribe, Mr. Carlos Ossa (Lema), Miss Pepa Tobon, Mrs. Anna Gomez deSierra, Mr. Jaime Tobon (V.), Mr. Guillermo Arbelaez A., Mr. Luis Sann, Mr. Adam Bettancur G.

As members of a community where rapid development is bringing along new, diverse, and difficult problems and conscious as we are of the increasing importance of cooperation between areas, different in many aspects but equal in their belief in freedom of thought, religion, and enterprise, we consider this association a very important event in the history of our city.

We have hopes in the future of this program and therefore we pledge to dedicate to its development the best of our ability.

Having received the kind visit of Mr. Daniel Cronin and after the return of Mr. Jorge Albert Uribe from Washington and Concord next month, we will be ready to begin carrying out some specific projects of mutual interest to our cities.

Once again expressing our recognition for your interest and hoping that Mr. Uribe's visit will be the beginning of a long, fruitful association between our cities, we remain,

Yours sincerely,

CARLOS OSA LEMA,
Mayor of Rionegro.

Tuning Out Voice of America Static

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for years the Voice of America, despite its claims to the contrary, has been less than an effective instrument. Its questionable policies and the controversy over its operations has been described by Columnist Marguerite Higgins in the Chicago Daily News of June 17, 1965:

TUNING OUT VOICE OF AMERICA STATIC

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—There has been a lot of static lately about the Voice of America and it hasn't just been on the airwaves.

The Johnson administration, and most notably Carl Rowan, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, have been accused of inaugurating new procedures that bring Voice broadcasts under tight policy control and allegedly destroy its credibility.

The controversy flared into the open when Henry Loomis, former head of the Government's overseas broadcasting branch, resigned last March and delivered himself of the remarkable pronouncement that "The Voice of America is not the voice of the administration."

Whose voice is it then?

Is there any excuse for the Voice of America if it does not serve the national interests of the United States?

This question can be intelligently answered only against a backdrop that brings out what is often overlooked—the split-level nature of Voice operations.

The Voice operates very much like a newspaper. There are two separate divisions. One involves straight newscasts and aims at a factual accounting of events—and from what I have recently seen succeeds quite well. The other section involves editorial opinions or commentaries prepared by Voice of America staff experts.

With regard to straight newscasts, there was a slight uproar a few weeks ago when word reached the press of a Moscow Embassy complaint to the effect that one evening's broadcast by the Voice seemed to have given short shrift to events in the Dominican Republic.

There was some confusion in Washington since the Voice of America transcript showed that the first 5 minutes of that particular broadcast to Moscow had indeed talked of nothing but the Dominican Republic.

When Foy Kohler, our Ambassador to Moscow, tracked the matter down, he discovered that the Embassy employee assigned to monitor and comment on the program had tuned in on it a few minutes later than he had realized. This is not, of course, the first time in Government that a minor matter has ballooned into a momentarily embarrassing incident.

This is not to say that there is no difference of opinion between Rowan and some of the Voice staff. But the heart of this dispute revolves—not around newscasts—but around control of what goes into expressions of editorial opinion written by the Voice staff writers.

Anyone who has served overseas as a foreign correspondent knows that Voice broadcasts are regarded as expressions of U.S. policies. After all, what else does its very title "Voice of America" imply? And therefore Rowan certainly seems to have a legitimate point in insisting that this country cannot take the risk of having some Voice of America staff writer distort—even unwittingly—what administration policy is, especially in moment of great international tension.

But in an interview the other day, Rowan stressed that the policy of controls over editorial-type broadcasts is not even new but was inherited from Edward R. Murrow, the late former director.

As one example, during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, Murrow assigned one of his deputies, Burnett Anderson, to go over to the Voice offices and stay there physically day and night to check every piece of editorialized copy that went out to make sure that nothing broadcast by the Voice could be misinterpreted by the Russians in the extremely delicate contest of wills that was going on between them and ourselves.

It seems that high level, informed control of editorialized broadcasts—far from being an infringement of the Voice of America's independence—gives such commentaries the ring of authenticity.

How can it damage American credibility for Voice broadcasters to give authoritative accounts in their editorials of the air of what this country is trying to accomplish, especially when those editorials are labeled as such?

Red Arrow Division Has Proud Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Defense Department recently announced that under a proposed reorganization of the National Guard, the famous Red Arrow or 32d Division will be reduced to a brigade of the 47th Infantry Division of Minnesota. The Wisconsin men who fought with and shared the proud history of the 32d Division were dismayed at this announcement. It was the 32d that fought in more battles than any other American division in World War I. And again in the Second World War the division distinguished itself by chalking up more days of combat than any other division of the United States. During the Berlin crisis the high priority of the 32d was acknowledged when it was the only National Guard division called to active duty. It is understandable that the men of Wisconsin take great pride in the division whose symbol is the Red Arrow. Quite rightly they desire to keep and wear the Red Arrow symbol so that they may preserve one of the traditions of their division. On May 31, 1965, the Madison Capital Times reported that Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, said that men of the new brigade would be permitted to wear the Red Arrow patch even when they become a part of the 47th Division. However, the Pentagon has not taken action on this proposal. It is my hope that the reported statement of General Wilson will soon be affirmed

and that the men of the 32d will be allowed to continue one of their finest traditions.

I would recommend to my colleagues the following article from the Madison Capital Times by George Hamel on the history of the 32d Division.

HISTORY OF THE 32D—RED ARROW—DIVISION

(By George F. Hamel)

"I chose the barred arrow as the division symbol because we pierced every line the Boche put before us."

Those words by Maj. Gen. William G. Hahn, commander of the 32d Infantry Division during World War I, explain the origin of the red arrow patch which has since become so familiar. The selection was an appropriate one as the Red Arrow Division has proved by its outstanding performance over the years.

The 32d Infantry Division, Wisconsin National Guard, is once again prominent in the news. This time it is not because of an unusual achievement, but because of plans to inactivate the division which were recently announced by the Defense Department. This move is part of a plan to combine Reserve and National Guard forces.

A brief look at the glorious history of the Red Arrow Division will reveal why the Defense Department announcement came as such a shock and disappointment to the people of Wisconsin.

Organized at Camp MacArthur, Tex., in August 1917, the division was formed from Michigan and Wisconsin National Guard units. Wisconsin men outnumbered those from Michigan by about 2 to 1.

Training for the 32d continued in Texas until the division sailed for Europe early in 1918. The division was large in those days, having more than 26,000 men at one time. This is about twice the strength of an Army division today.

Although men of the Red Arrow were impatient to get into the fight, the division was first assigned the role of providing replacements for other units. But Gen. John J. Pershing, American commander in chief, visited the division shortly after its arrival in France. He was so impressed with the spirit and state of training of the 32d that he canceled the replacement task and assigned the Red Arrow a combat mission.

From the time the Red Arrow first saw combat in May 1918, it suffered from too much success. Because of its aggressive spirit, the division spent only 10 days in a rest area from May until the armistice was signed in November 1918.

The 32d fought in more battles than any other American division in World War I. It fought on five fronts in three major offenses. Red Arrow veterans of World War I will never forget the names of these offensives: Aisne-Marne, Oise-Aisne, and Meuse-Argonne.

It was at Aisne-Marne that the French gave the 32d their own nickname, "Les Terribles." This was quite a tribute to the fighting qualities of the division, coming from an army which had fought the Germans for nearly 4 years.

The 32d gained the distinction of being the first American division on German soil when it crossed the border in May 1918.

The armistice found the division in action east of the Meuse River. As the 32d paused briefly, it counted more than 13,000 casualties suffered during its time in combat. In recognition of its exploits, its officers and men had received more than 800 decorations from the American, French, and Belgian Governments.

Shortly after the armistice the Red Arrow was moved to the vicinity of Coblenz on the Rhine River where the division became a part of the army of occupation.

During this period a group of Red Arrow men formed the 32d Division Veteran Association, a strong organization in Wisconsin today.

In April and May 1919, the 32d returned to the United States and was inactivated.

The 32d disappeared from the Army roll-call until July 24, 1924, when it was reactivated as a National Guard division. The division was again made up of units from Michigan and Wisconsin, with Wisconsin predominating.

Until the clouds of war again appeared, the Red Arrow continued its training as part of the National Guard. This period ended in October 1940, when the division was ordered to active duty at Camp Beauregard, La. Five months later the division moved to Camp Livingston, La., where it continued vigorous training.

As in World War I the Red Arrow quickly reached a high state of training, and early in 1942 the division was one of the first three American divisions alerted for movement overseas. The division moved to Fort Devens, Mass., preparatory to sailing for Northern Ireland.

However, events in the Pacific intervened to change these plans. General MacArthur, recently moved from the Philippines to Australia, made a strong plea for American ground troops. Since it was one of the best trained divisions in the Army, the Red Arrow was selected to be diverted to the Pacific.

This change in orders must have been one of the best kept secrets of the war. Men of the 32d loaded on trains at Devens thinking they were headed for New York to board ship.

While some thought it strange when pullman porters began making up berths, others explained that the men would probably remain on the train in New York overnight. Imagine the surprise when they awoke the next morning to find the trains still moving, and through the Midwest.

Sailing for Australia in April 1942, the division landed in May, and immediately began specialized training for jungle warfare.

Beginning with the commitment of part of the Red Arrow to combat in New Guinea shortly after its arrival in Australia, the division stayed in combat most of the time until the end of the war. In addition to the campaigns in New Guinea, the Red Arrow fought in Leyte and Luzon in the Philippines.

As in World War I the division distinguished itself in combat. It again proved its endurance by chalking up 654 days of combat, more than any U.S. division in any war.

Official Army figures credit the division with 7,268 casualties. Its officers and men received more than 14,500 decorations, of which 11 were the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The fighting qualities of the Red Arrow received high praise from commanders from General MacArthur down. Perhaps most significant was the comment by Gen. Tomoyuki Yamashita, who commanded the Japanese forces defending the Philippines. General Yamashita stated that Red Arrow men were the best American troops he had encountered.

The 32d Division was moved to Japan in October 1945, where it served as part of the army of occupation until it was inactivated February 28, 1946.

This time the division was inactive for only a few months. It was federally recognized in the National Guard in November 1946. For the first time all of the division units were located in Wisconsin.

Again the 32d maintained a high state of readiness to serve in time of need. The high regard for the proficiency of the Red Arrow was evidenced when it was the only National Guard infantry division called to active duty during the Berlin crisis.

The division was ordered to Fort Lewis, Wash., in October 1961. It was built up to active duty strength and remained at Lewis until relieved from active duty in August 1962. After only 4 months of training the Red Arrow was designated as a trained and ready unit of the Army's Strategic Army Corps (Strac).

When the Red Arrow was relieved from active duty, Maj. Gen. Herbert A. Smith, the division commander, received a letter of appreciation from the late President John F. Kennedy, addressed to all members of the division.

President Kennedy concluded his letter as follows: "To you, and to your families, and to the communities from which you came, may I say, as Commander-in-Chief, 'Well done.' "

Ironically, this period of active duty contributed to the present plight of the division. When the Red Arrow returned to inactive status many of its men were eligible for discharge. The consequent drop in strength resulted in removal of the division from a high priority status.

At present the 32d Division headquarters is in Milwaukee, with its units spread among 72 Wisconsin communities. Maj. Gen. John A. Dunlap, Milwaukee, commands the division, which now has a strength of about 3,000 officers and men. The assistant division commanders are Brig. Gen. Francis F. Schweinler, of Madison, and Brig. Gen. Donald P. Radde, Sparta.

The Defense Department has announced that, under the proposed reorganization, the 32d will be reduced to a brigade of the 47th Infantry Division of Minnesota, Red Arrow members and veterans naturally oppose this on the ground that the record of the 32d is by far greater than that of the 47th.

Gov. Warren P. Knowles, protested inactivation of the 32d and asked that the division be reorganized as a separate brigade. In this manner the name and traditions of the Red Arrow would remain active in the National Guard. However, Knowles has since accepted the Defense Department plan in order to avoid losing other National Guard units in the State.

Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, told the Wisconsin National Guard Association at its convention in Eau Claire on April 26, that men of the brigade would still be permitted to wear the Red Arrow patch even though they would be a part of the 47th Division. Even if this should occur it would be small consolation to members and veterans of the 32d Division.

The Red Arrow received a reprieve when Secretary McNamara agreed to postpone implementation of the reorganization plan until Congress has had time to study and act upon it. Under the original plan the Red Arrow would have been reduced to brigade status by September 30. General Dunlap has stated that congressional action may postpone reorganization for as long as a year.

As for the men in the Red Arrow, they are hard at work preparing for the annual training period of the division at Camp McCoy, Wis., June 12–26.

The members of the division are reluctant to look beyond June and what may be the last muster of the Red Arrow. They hope that somehow the Defense Department plan may be changed to permit the Red Arrow to continue as a separate unit. The people of Wisconsin join in this hope.

Regardless of what the future holds for the Red Arrow, the division will live on in the history of Wisconsin. Men of the Red Arrow have contributed many of the finest pages to that history.

Money Supply Drop Obscured by Furor Over Martin's 1929 Repeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, must has been said lately about the remarks made by Federal Reserve Chairman Martin at Columbia University on June 1. The substance of these comments has been primarily concerned with criticism for his sounding a false alarm as to the similarities or dissimilarities between our economy today and our economy in 1929.

I think we are missing the point where we merely argue about similarities to the 1929 situation or about what really caused the stock market crash if we ignore drastic recent changes in the money supply.

I call attention to the fact that in the month of May alone, the Federal Reserve decreased the Nation's money supply by $1.2 billion. Furthermore, member banks reserves have been at the minus $150 million level for a month or more. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the real issue here is that not only has there been no growth in the money supply to finance orderly expansion in the economy but there was an absolute decline of over $1 billion in the month of May. This is a real threat to continuation of our prosperity. My distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN], has made this point many times.

Following are two recent editorials from the Washington Post which I think get to the heart of this very serious problem:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 4, 1965]

MR. MARTIN AS HISTORIAN

Many professional historians would like to change the course of contemporary events, but in the end it is only the amateurs who have any chance of success. The other day at Columbia University Chairman William McChesney Martin of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System courted Clio with an address entitled, "Does Monetary History Repeat Itself?" But before the words could be uttered on Morningside Heights, Wall Street was reeled by what it regarded as the bearishness of the advanced text, and the Dow-Jones average fell by 9.51 points.

There are those who will argue that the market was already jittery, that the effects of Mr. Martin's muscle-flexing excursion through history are trivial. But they are wrong. Mr. Martin, by virtue of his prestige, both within the Federal Reserve System and outside, can indeed alter the course of contemporary events. And that is why his reading of past events, in this instance the great depression, is important.

It is tempting to subject Mr. Martin's remarks to a deep analysis, to find in them a veiled desire to boost interest rates in this country to the higher levels prevailing in Europe. But before moving into the subterranean realm of conjecture and imputation, one ought first to explore what is palpable and above the ground. There is an instructive parallel between Mr. Martin's very selective view of monetary history and the monetary policy now pursued by the Fed.

Mr. Martin dilated on many of the "factors that converted a stock exchange crash into the worst depression in our history." There are many references to collapse of the gold exchange standards, to speculation, to the lopsided distribution of income, and to loose banking practices. But nowhere in his chronicle does the Chairman mention the money supply, the central element in any monetary history. It is as if he had rewritten "Hamlet" without the prince.

What Mr. Martin failed to tell his Columbia audience is that the stock of money declined by a third between 1929 and 1933, and that the Federal Reserve policy was directly responsible for that devastating shrinkage. This point is relevant because the Fed has of late been pursuing a policy of increasing monetary restraint. There stock of money is now no larger than it was 6 months ago, and unless it is permitted to grow, the economic expansion will grind to a halt.

If Mr. Martin's selective history has any moral, it was stated by Santayana who wrote: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." Congress, which under the Constitution is charged with the regulation of the Nation's money supply, can avert a repetition of the baleful past by instructing the Federal Reserve authorities to follow a consistent policy, one that will provide the stock of money required to sustain economic growth.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 15, 1965]

A FITTING RETORT

Although the Council of Economic Advisers is maintaining a discret silence in the wake of the furor over William McChesney Martin's historical exegesis, one of its alumni has provided a fitting retort.

Writing in the New Republic, James Tobin, the distinguished Yale economist who was a member of the Council in 1961–1962, makes this sage observation:

"Chairman Martin views economic expansion as a potentially explosive chain reaction which only the tightest control prevents from running away. Some booms may merit this metaphor. But the current one seems more in danger of ending with a whimper than with a bang. To keep it going has required a succession of carefully timed and gaged stimuli increases in Federal spending, income tax cuts and now excise tax reductions. 'Leaning against the wind,' the favorite expression of the Federal Reserve, is not an appropriate stance when the problem is to keep the wind blowing."

The Federal Reserve Board, which almost invariably reflects the views of its Chairman, has in the last 6 months brought about a cessation of growth in the Nation's money supply. The influx of funds from abroad, which is a byproduct of the effort to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit, has prevented a sharp increase in domestic interest rates. But unless the Fed can soon be deflected from its restrictive course, the longest expansion in peacetime history will grind to a halt.

Brighter Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, nowhere has the courage and wisdom of our great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, been more evident than in his leadership last year that brought a reduction in our income taxes. The prophets of doom who criticized his leadership and our action can now look at the record of what has happened to our economy. His action on the taxes went hand in hand with a tight-dollar discipline in our National Government expenditures, so that each projection of the budget deficit for the fiscal year shows an increasingly bright picture. One of the well-merited allusions to the result of the President's action is written as an editorial in today's edition of the Newark Evening News, one of the major dailies in my district. As the News says, "a magnificent thing is happening under our President":

BRIGHTER BUDGET

It is becoming increasingly evident that last year's $11.5 billion income tax cut was not as great a risk as defenders of orthodox fiscal policy feared. With the reduction, which the administration designed to stimulate the economy, it was felt the revenue loss would result in a still larger deficit unless Federal spending were substantially reduced.

In April, President Johnson disclosed the budget deficit for the current fiscal year would be $5.3 billion in the red, not $6.3 billion as he forecast in January. When he sent the excise tax reduction proposal to Congress the deficit was dropped to $4.4 billion.

And now, only a month later, Mr. Johnson has come out with the comforting news the deficit may drop to $3.8 billion. If this becomes a fact, the deficit will be at a 5-year low. In the last fiscal year the deficit was $8.3 billion.

Mr. Johnson's figures, of course, are projections. The actual financial statement will be issued after the books are closed the end of this month. Nevertheless, his Budget Bureau officials have a remarkable record for making predictions on the side of understatement.

The changed budget picture is the consequence, of course, of an unexpected flood of tax collections and the fact that Mr. Johnson has restored some respectability to Government economy. In the case of tax collections, the President estimated they will total $92.8 billion, or $1.6 billion more than he estimated in January and $3.3 billion more than the Government collected last year. As for spending, it will be about $900 million under the $97.5 billion in the current budget and $1.1 billion less than last year's expenditures.

From Mr. Johnson's figures, the Government would still be $3.8 billion from a balanced budget. But now at least we have a basis for looking forward to balance.

Speaking of the budget's prospects, the President happily remarked, "We expect a very unique thing to happen to us."

Unique? The word is magnificent.

Revision of U.S. Copyright Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks the Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, Copyrights, and Revision of the Laws has

been holding extensive hearings on revision of the U.S. copyright laws. The subject matter is quite involved and many difficult questions have come up. Our subcommittee is trying to be as objective and fair as possible, taking into consideration the various viewpoints expressed. It was, therefore, most encouraging to read a recent article about our subcommittee and its task in revising the copyright laws.

The article, entitled "The Anatomy of Copyright Revision," appeared in the June 14, 1965, issue of Publishers' Weekly. It pays particular tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Honorable ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, who is chairing the hearings of the subcommittee.

I am pleased to bring this article to the attention of all our colleagues:

THE ANATOMY OF COPYRIGHT REVISION

In a time which now seems long ago—though in truth it was only 1961 or so—when a general revision of the American copyright code really appeared imminent, a number of experts, members of the copyright bar, argued that among all the interests concerned with copyright reform, unanimity had to be achieved before a revision bill went to Congress. Otherwise, it was said, Congressmen, confronted with dissention in the ranks of experts in the field, would chuck the whole revision program. In very few congressional districts is copyright an issue to send pulses coursing. Very few votes have been swayed by a Congressman's stand on copyright.

Well, the copyright revision bill is now before Congress, there is dissension in the ranks, and the viewpoint expressed in that long ago time has turned out to be overly cynical. This month, in full knowledge that it wouldn't win them a vote, Congressmen from semirural districts in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Virginia, where most of the constituents wouldn't know a copyright if they fell over it, were asking accurate, probing questions of witnesses who had come to testify for their own special interests in the copyright revision.

To an observer, the members of Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on the Judiciary seem to be earnest, conservative, conscientious. They have done their homework before they arrive to sit behind the committee table in room 2226 of the Sam Rayburn House Office Building, a gaudy structure designed to serve as a forum for controversies of greater moment than the issues of photocopying, fair use, reversion and term of copyright. The man who is serving as standin for the subcommittee's chairman is ROBERT KASTENMEIER, a Wisconsin Democrat, who is youthfully handsome and engagingly diffident. He warmly welcomes each witness, thanks him when his testimony is completed, often congratulates the excellence of the testimony as well. At one point, Mr. KASTENMEIER noted that he and a witness had something in common: Both were graduates of the University of Wisconsin. It could have been a class reunion, there in the Sam Rayburn Building.

And yet, beneath all the politeness and grace, a probing is taking place. An educator who complained that research would be crippled unless there were an educators' exemption from normal copyright procedures, under questioning admitted that every time he personally had requested permission to use copyrighted works he had received it, without charge, through courtesy of the publisher. Another witness, in response to a series of questions, admitted that what the education establishment wants is permission to use anything, at any time and in any quantity, without paying for it. The committee was quietly shocked. In Wisconsin, Michigan, and Virginia, they may not know much about copyright specifically, but they understand property rights. It is not a committee that is about to slight the rewards of creativity.

The experts have failed to achieve unanimity among themselves, and it is just as well. No important issue should be steamrollered through without dissenting voices, and we continue to insist on the importance of the conditions under which the literature and music of the Nation is created and disseminated.

There is an aura of true disinterested public service about the men on Subcommittee No. 3. If they wish they could be reassigned to a committee that grabs the headlines, they don't show it. They have been listening to self-interested testimony which is presented in the guise of public interest, and they have been trying to ascertain the real public interest. The matter of copyright revision is now beyond the realm of smoke-filled rooms and uneasy alliances and has come before a public bar. What Subcommittee No. 3 is doing is the practice of representative democratic government. Watching the committee members in their deliberations, one may reflect that there are worse systems than this one.—R.H.S.

Astronaut Symbolic of American Ability to Meet Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the sight of a lean, alert young man with an American flag sewn to his left sleeve floating majestically in outer space over a backdrop of a globe of brilliant blues, greens, and brown is a sight I shall never forget. Ed White's walk in space recently is more than a momentary exhilaration though. Ed White is a symbol of a dynamic American space program equal to that of any nation. Under President Lyndon B. Johnson's challenging leadership as majority leader, Vice President, and now as President we have eliminated forever any talk of a so-called space gap.

This significance of our latest feat in space is graphically demonstrated by the following excerpts from a worldwide survey of press reaction to the *Gemini 4* conducted by the U.S. Information Agency:

EXCERPTS OF SURVEY CONDUCTED BY U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY CONCERNING "GEMINI 4"

All the major Japanese newspapers not only gave full and prominent and sophisticated news coverage to *Gemini 4*, but also praised various aspects of the flight, especially Major White's 20-minute walk outside the capsule and the flight's contributions to medicine and science.

Scattered but nonetheless enthusiastic African comment praised the successful *Gemini 4* space flight. Several editorials indicated that the United States had now achieved equality with the Soviets in space exploration.

Banner headlines and detailed coverage were given to the *Gemini 4* exploit by the West European press. Editorial comment was plentiful, and praised this space achievement; many papers almost shouted their pleasure and joy. Others took a more pessimistic view, foreseeing only a great space race.

The 4-day space flight of *Gemini 4*, particularly Astronaut White's 20 minutes outside the capsule, received very heavy news play in all areas of the world. This feat was front-page page news, frequently with banner headlines and huge pictures of Major White floating in space.

Editorial acclaim for the American walk in space was immediate. Even newspapers critical of the United States paid tribute to this achievement, indicating the strength of its worldwide impact.

Most of the Latin American press gave heavy and detailed news and pictorial coverage to the *Gemini 4* space flight and welcomed its success in a veritable stream of elated editorial comment. Superlatives were freely used, praise extended to the U.S. social and political system as well, and the space achievement itself was viewed as reason for justifiable pride throughout the Americas.

Leading papers in Greece, the United Arab Republic, and India—some usually critical of the United States—were unanimous in their praise of America's new achievement in space.

Christian A. Herter Endowment Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Brandeis University announced in Waltham, Mass., the establishment of a Christian A. Herter Endowment Fund to create a chair of international relations at the university in former Secretary of State Herter's honor.

I can think of no more fitting way to pay tribute to this distinguished statesman who has served his country in his home State of Massachusetts, in Washington, and all around the world as Secretary of State.

Secretary Herter, who now serves as Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, will celebrate his 70th birthday this year. The committee selected to pursue the Christian A. Herter Endowment Fund, of which I am proud to be a member, is some indication of the esteem and affection with which he is held by his colleagues and friends. The honorary chairman of the committee is former President Eisenhower, and the Massachusetts cochairman are Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Gov. John A. Volpe, and Sidney R. Rabb, chairman of the board of Stop & Shop, Inc.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to include the press release from Brandeis University together with the list of the committee members at this point in the RECORD:

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER ENDOWMENT FUND

A Christian A. Herter Endowment Fund, in honor of the former Massachusetts Governor, U.S. Secretary of State, and present Special Representative for Trade Negotia-

tions of the United States, has been created at Brandeis University, according to an announcement today by President Abram L. Sachar.

The public has been invited to contribute to it.

In addition, an official committee, headed nationally by the honorary chairman, former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and in Massachusetts by three cochairmen, U.S. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Gov. John A. Volpe, and Mr. Sidney R. Rabb, chairman of the board of Stop & Shop, Inc., has been formed with the objective of raising $400,000 for the fund so that an endowed chair in international relations, named after Christian A. Herter, can be created at the university in the near future.

President Sachar revealed that Brandeis University would allocate $150,000 from its recent second Ford Foundation challenge grant for academic excellence toward the Herter chair objective if the balance of $250,000 can be raised by the committee. However, President Sachar stated that a scholarship or fellowship in Mr. Herter's honor was a certainty at Brandeis, regardless of the outcome of the drive for the permanently endowed professorship.

He added: "Christian A. Herter is an extraordinary, wholesome person who has served the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Nation in the finest tradition of dedicated American citizenship. His leadership and inspiration to young people impelled our board of trustees, a few years ago, to vote him an honorary degree and I felt it to be a great personal privilege when I placed the doctorate's hood over his shoulders. I know that Brandeis University honors itself when it brings into its permanent assets the endowment which will be named, in perpetuity, for Christian A. Herter. The committee, which has spearheaded the drive and is headed by former President Eisenhower, is also to be congratulated and I am certainly confident that the people involved will succeed in this worthy project."

Because of "Mr. Herter's wide and singular popularity among people in all walks of life and of various political shadings;" President Sachar stated that Brandeis University would welcome participation by the public at large. All donations are tax deductible.

A basic objective of the endowment fund is to honor Mr. Herter on his 70th birthday, which fell on March 28, 1965. It is hoped that the campaign can be successfully completed before the end of the 1965 birthday year.

An executive committee, consisting of State Representative Francis W. Hatch, Jr., of Beverly Farms, Mass., Mrs. Thomas B. Gannett, of Wayland, Mass., Hon. George W. Cashman, of Wellesley Hills, Mass., and Emanuel Goldberg, of Newton, Mass., is assisting in the drive. Nearly 50 Massachusetts areas have been organized with chairmen and more are currently being formed. Former U.S. Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, U.S. Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, Lt. Gov. Elliot Richardson, Will Clayton, of Houston, Tex., former State Senator John Powers, Massachusetts Attorney General Edward W. Brooke, Sinclair Weeks, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, former Massachusetts Gov. Robert F. Bradford, Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, Douglas Dillon, and Senator JACOB JAVITS, of New York, are among the committee members.

Others include: Mr. and Mrs. Francis C. Gray; Carl J. Gilbert; Hon. Paul C. Reardon; Hon. Edmund V. Keville; Thomas M. Joyce; Maxwell M. Rabb; John Fisher; Henry W. Minot; Harry F. Stimpson, Jr.; Wilfred Chagnon; Bruce Crane; Gen. R. G. Ervin; Mrs. Alvah Crocker; Francis W. Tully, Jr.; Robert S. Kretschmar; John S. Nolan; Harold D. Hodgkinson; Mrs. Charles Howard; Mrs. Carl Remington; Carl Sheridan; James F. Mahan; Elmer Nelson; Clarence Elam; Stacy Holmes; William Carmen; Col. Bernard Gorfinkle; Hon. Peter Jordan; Mark Bortman; John W. Agnew; Donald J. Hurley; James F. Cullen; Richard Preston; Hon. Matthew Brown; Ralph Lowell; Edward C. Weeks; Frederick Dumaine; Joseph G. Weisberg; Phillip K. Allen; Ephron Catlin, Jr.; Forrester (Tim) Clark; Frederic C. Church; Hon. Beatrice Hancock Mullaney; Stanley S. Lewenberg; Sidney A. Aisner; O. Kelly Anderson; Joseph Stern; Miss Edna Bogosian; David Brickman; John E. Lawrence; Mrs. T. J. Coolidge; C. Henry Glovsky; David L. Winer; David B. Nissenbaum; Henry E. Russell; Mrs. R. E. Danielson; John P. White; Joseph E. Mullaney; Daniel J. Finn; James B. McIntosh; Ralph Bonnell; Mrs. William Nickerson; Paul A. Newsome; David Brackman; Mr. and Mrs. John B. Hollister; Joseph W. Reardon; Barnet N. Samuels; James H. Angevine; Mrs. Edward D. Male; Vincent J. Celeste; Roland A. Merullo; Jason A. Aisner; Mrs. Eleanor K. Estey; Mrs. Peter E. Palmieri; James Bulkley; Mrs. Hillard W. Welch; Mr. and Mrs. William F. Nourse; George R. Wallace; Max Kabatznick; Dr. and Mrs. Albert V. Danielsen; Dr. James M. Faulkner; Charles Francis Adams; Mrs. Elinor C. Hedden; Denholm M. Jacobs; Mr. and Mrs. J. Verity Smith; Joseph W. Fitzgerald; J. Robert Ayers; Francis W. Sargent; Robert Scott; D. Joseph St. Germain; Rene J. Hebert; Louis A. Sisca; Robert Goldman; Mrs. Henry L. Mason; Edward J. Goodfellow; Harold Katz; Nathaniel H. Hurwitz; Mrs. William G. Brown; George P. Davis; George Karelitz; Philip S. Weld; Harold R. Allen; Arthur D. Saul, Jr.; Frederic B. Williams, Jr.; William J. Speers, Jr.; Frederick B. Taylor; Richard C. Paine; Joseph B. Grossman; V. Carlisle Smith; William H. Gulliver, Jr.; Lawrence W. Lloyd; Nathan I. Greene; George E. Lodgen; Egbert S. Newbury, Jr.; Thomas S. Burgin; Hon. Alvin Jack Sims; Hon. John M. Quinlan; and others.

Christian A. Herter was born in Paris and graduated from Harvard in 1915 with an A.B. degree, cum laude. He is married to the former Mary Caroline Pratt and has four children. His long public career, beginning with 1916–17 service when he was attached to the American Embassy in Berlin, included: Secretary to the American Commission To Negotiate Peace, Paris, 1918–19; Assistant to U.S. Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover, 1919–24; Executive Secretary to the European Relief Council, 1920–21; editor, the Independent, 1924–28; associate editor, the Sportsman, 1927–36; lecturer in international relations, Harvard University, 1929–30; member, Massachusetts House of Representatives, 1929–30, 1931–43 (speaker of the house, 1939–43); Member, U.S. House of Representatives from the 10th Massachusetts District, 1943–53; Governor of Massachusetts, 1953–57; Under Secretary, U.S. Department of State, 1957–59; Secretary of State, 1959–61; cochairman, U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, 1961–62; chairman, Atlantic Council of the U.S., Inc., 1961–62; Special Representative for Trade Negotiations of the United States, 1962 to the present.

An honorary trustee of Johns Hopkins University, overseer of Harvard from 1940 to 1944, and holder of many honorary degrees including the 1955 LL.D. from Brandeis, Mr. Herter has also received the following decoration: Grand Commander Phoenix (Greece); Order of the Crown, Order of Leopold (Belgium); Order of Merit of the Italian Republic; Grand Cross, First Class Order of Merit (West Germany); Order of Polonia Restituta (Poland); Gorgas Medal, 1959, and U.S. Medal of Honor, 1961. His clubs include the Century and Harvard Clubs of New York, the Somerset and Tavern in Boston, the Essex County in Manchester, Mass., and the University and Metropolitan Clubs in Washington, D.C.

Persons wishing to contribute directly toward the Christian A. Herter Endowment Fund may send gifts to the office of the associate director of university planning and development, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass., 02154. Checks should be made out to Brandeis University.

The Sad Strawberry Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, growers in my district raise about 25 percent of all the strawberries produced in the United States. As a result, the serious crop losses which we are sustaining due to lack of adequate competent farmworkers are perhaps more severe and concentrated than in any other area of comparable size.

Other strawberry growing areas, however, also are suffering. A reporter on the scene can tell the story more accurately than I, and the accompanying article by Alton Pryor from the June 5, 1965, issue of the California Farmer is a graphic account of the situation in Orange County—particularly with regard to the problems faced by the growers.

Obviously, crops are spoiling, food is being wasted, growers are losing money, quality of produce is declining, and prices to the consumer are increasing. Not only the growers and consumers, but many workers who pack, process, transport, and sell strawberries throughout the United States are being adversely affected and prospects for the future are discouraging.

The article by Mr. Pryor follows:

THE SAD STRAWBERRY SITUATION

(By Alton Pryor)

There may be plenty of domestic workers to pick the strawberry crop, but keeping them on the job is about as difficult as making a rollcall in a flea circus.

The payroll records of an Orange County grower, where most workers were earning $2 an hour, prove the futility of the present labor situation.

Emile Boisseranc, Jr., and Steve Manassero raise about 30 acres of strawberries in Orange County and need about 65 men to harvest the crop.

Mrs. Boisseranc, who does the housekeeping chores for her husband and brother, issued 151 checks in order to maintain a crew of this size during a recent payroll period.

Thirty-six of the so-called workers who reported to the farm stayed 1 day; 12 more stayed 2 days; 26 lasted for 3 days; 12 others for 4 days; 15 stayed for 5 days; 7 worked 6 days; 11 for 7 days, and only 33 stayed on the job for 10 to 13 days.

This latter group, she said, had been on the job from the beginning of the harvest in March, with six or seven of them working on the ranch the year around.

"By the end of the harvest," she estimated, "we will have gone through about 500 men in order to have a 65-man crew."

Of the 33 men who had been on the job for the entire harvest period, Mrs. Boisseranc said, the highest paid worker took home a check of $297.75 during the 2-week pay period mentioned above. The smallest check

of the group was for $98.95 for an 8-day period.

The firm pays the regular rate in Orange County for picking berries: $1.10 an hour plus 25 cents per tray. The ones that are coming out to work, she said, shuffling the ream of pay sheets she had processed during the last 2 weeks, "are making good money."

When California Farmer talked to Steve Manassero, he said the "biggest trouble is going through a turnover every day, making it necessary to train new pickers."

Manassero said it was necessary to put on an extra field foreman just to do this task.

Both Boisseranc and Manassero claimed that for some reason, there were always more pickers on hand on Wednesday than any other day of the week. They said workers apparently come to the fields on Wednesday to make enough money to carry them through a long weekend. By Wednesday, they are out of money and have to work again.

Mrs. Boisseranc said she had written checks for one man and wife team which certainly put them far above the depressed class. He had earned $261 and she received $256.75 for the 2-week pay period.

Even the retraining of new workers could be tolerated, the growers claimed, if they would do a good job of picking.

"There hasn't been a good car of berries shipped out of Orange County this year," Boisseranc said. "And most of it is due to mishandling. The workers are just too rough in their picking and they throw them in the box too hard."

This was backed up by Jerry Kirk, general manager of Mendelson & Zeller shipping firm in Orange County.

Kirk said, "We've had as high as $4,300 loss on a load of strawberries and we've lost $2,500 average on each of six cars."

He said that most of the damage to the berries when they reach the East could be attributed to mishandling by the pickers.

"I've shipped 15 percent more berries this year than I did last year, but the profits are nil. We had a good year last year, and so did the growers."

Kirk explained that it's not the amount of labor that is causing headaches for growers and shippers, but the "kind of labor." He said pickers are picking berries by the handful instead of one at a time, making it impossible to put out an eye-appealing pack.

"The only way I can put up an eye-appealing pack," Kirk explained, "is using fruit from family operations of about 5 acres, where family members do most of the harvest."

This caused Steve Manassero to comment that the rejection of many berries because of bruising and other mishandling by pickers is leaving the door open for shippers to close their Orange County offices, leaving the growers high and dry.

"They can survive only 1 or 2 years with a situation like this, and then they would have to pull out. There would be no point in raising berries or shipping them if there is no profit in it."

The Mexican Contribution to America

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I noticed that recently efforts are being made in the Congress to provide for the commemoration of Ellis Island as a national monument honoring the great numbers of immigrants who entered the United States in bygone days and who first saw a glimpse of America at this noted isle and then went on to contribute their talents, intelligence and muscle to making our Nation the greatest on this earth.

I herewith serve notice that I shall initiate action to provide ancillary or similar legislation to note and call the attention of the Nation to the equally great contribution made by those steady and noble incursions of immigrants from across our "southern bounds": that great race, bronze-tinged and long known to us as the "race of the future" for its monumental contribution to the wealth and progress of the United States, particularly that great area popularly known as the Southwest. These were the men and women of Mexican origin who have built the roads, constructed the skycrapers, and have hewn the cedar and drawn the bolls of the white-spotted fields of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. Yes, I shall speak more of these indomitable people. I hereby serve notice.

Western Dams Generate Recreation as Well as Electricity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, an astute observer of the development of the West, John Corlett, of the Idaho Statesman newspapers, Boise, has pointed out in a recent column the often-overlooked recreation benefits made possible by the great dams and reclamation projects in the Western United States. I wish to insert the column in the RECORD and bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

POLITICALLY SPEAKING

(By John Corlett)

There has come to my desk a publication of the Department of Interior entitled "Lake Powell, Jewel of the Colorado." Lake Powell is the manmade reservoir behind giant Glen Canyon Dam, the key structure of the Colorado River storage project benefiting the upper basin States of that river—Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

Lake Powell, when full, will be 186 miles long. Its backwaters extend into the San Juan River and reaching almost to the mouth of Green. The lake has a shoreline of 1,860 miles.

On this 180-mile stretch of the river where once it ran muddy and red, the water of the manmade lake is startlingly blue and matches the color of the desert sky. The sediment of the once running river has sunk to the bottom of the lake.

But the real significance of Lake Powell, other than the storage, power, and irrigation benefits, is that it provides a playground for tens of thousands of people—a playground that could not exist on the free-flowing muddy Colorado River, known locally as "Big Red."

As everyone knows, the great canyon of the Colorado River is virtually inaccessible in its free-flowing state. The wonders of its canyon have been seen at water level by comparatively few persons.

Now, the magnificent beauty of the 180 miles of river canyon can and will be seen by boat by uncounted thousands of persons who visit the lake in years to come. Fishing in the Colorado will be made available to more people than ever before. The lake has been stocked with trout and bass.

Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of Reclamation, is ecstatic about Lake Powell, calling it an "aquatic wonder." In a personal report about the lake he tells about the "side canyons" to be explored, the water skiing, swimming, and scuba diving, "all in clear, blue water that looks like deep blue sky."

"You have a front-row seat in an amphitheater of infinity," wrote Dominy. "The bright blue sky deepens slowly to a velvet purple and the stars are brilliant—glittering in that vast immensity above. Orange sandstone cliffs fade to dusky red—then to deepest black. The fire burns low, reflected in the placid lake. There is peace. And a oneness with the world and God * * *."

There has now been proposed in Congress the Lower Colorado River Basin project—once known as the central Arizona project. It includes a dam at Marble Canyon, downstream from Glen Canyon and well above the boundary of Grand Canyon National Park, and another at Bridge Canyon about 80.8 miles below the park boundary.

The project includes pumping plants and other facilities to convey 1,200,000 acre-feet of water annually to the central part of Arizona.

The Colorado is already overcommitted, and the legislation authorizing the lower basin project would grant California a priority for 4.4 million acre-feet of Colorado River water, as decreed by the U.S. Supreme Court, until works have been completed delivering no less than 2.5 million acre-feet of water annually into the Colorado from outside its basin.

The great Colorado River dams are sought primarily for cyclic storage. They will be filled, hopefully, in highwater years and the water used consumptively in years of drouth. They will, of course, generate a lot of power to be used to pay most of the cost of the billion-dollar project.

Wildlifers, however, are screaming against construction of the new proposed dams. In the face of the vital need to store and more efficiently use every drop of the Colorado, some persons are upset that the river below Glen Canyon to the backwaters of Lake Mead is not included in the wild rivers bill.

There ought to be a lesson in Lake Powell. The Department of the Interior reports that "only about 900 persons have been able to view the depths of the inner canyon up to this time because of the inaccessibility, physical risk, time involved, and cost of this venturesome trip (on rafts and rubber boats shooting rapids)."

Both the Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Reservoirs would open up additional beautiful vistas of the Grand Canyon to the eyes of thousands of persons who otherwise would be denied the view.

And this is what is going to happen in the Hells Canyon of the Snake. The canyon is being opened to automobile traffic by the simple need of access to construct Brownlee, Oxbow, and Hells Canyon Dams of the Idaho Power Co. The reservoirs behind each of theses dams are likewise "jewels" of a sort. And when High Mountain Sheep is built, the full stretch of the deepest gorge of the North American Continent will be opened to view from water level to millions of tourists.

Hells Canyon is as spectacular in its own right as the canyon of the Colorado.

But just imagine, if the wildlifers had their way, both the Colorado, the Green, and the Snake would run free but also unused for the benefit of the most people—and unseen.

Manmade reservoirs in southern Idaho provide more recreation than all of the natural lakes of the area.

The people of the Lewiston area will discover this recreational advantage for the first time when the reservoir fills behind Dworshak Dam on the North Fork of the Clearwater River.

It is time the people of this Nation were properly educated and told that reclamation and dambuilding has done more for recreation, benefiting all people in the West than any other role performed by Government. And the same recreation benefits exist on the large reservoirs behind private power dams.

Alexander Trowbridge Speaks at Oklahoma Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last weekend Congressman TOM STEED and I attended ceremonies opening a beautiful new recreational complex on the shores of a magnificent new lake in Oklahoma. The lake is Lake Eufaula, part of the Arkansas Basin navigation project. The recreational complex consists of a State park and two majestic lodges, Fountainhead and Arrowhead, on the lake's shores.

This recreational complex is an outstanding example of cooperation between the Federal and State Governments. The lake was built by the Corps of Engineers, the park was put in by the State, and the lodges were built by a State authority with the help of a Federal Area Redevelopment Administration loan.

The featured speaker at the ceremonies officially opening these facilities to the public was the Honorable Alexander Trowbridge, assistant Secretary of Commerce, who very ably represented Secretary Connor. Mr. Trowbridge's remarks defined clearly the constructive spirit of cooperation which is growing between the Federal and State Governments, and he also made some excellent points on the value of tourism as a source of economic growth. I insert Mr. Trowbridge's remarks in the RECORD and commend them to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE ALEXANDER TROWBRIDGE AT THE OPENING CEREMONIES OF LAKE EUFAULA STATE PARK IN OKLAHOMA, JUNE 19, 1965

Today we add a splendid new resort area to the great array of attractions in the United States.

Lake Eufaula State Park is a model of what a modern travel and recreation center should be—both in its excellent facilities and scenic wonders. In my opinion—and I am sure that the distinguished members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation will agree—it is one of the most attractive recreational areas to be found anywhere in our country, or any other country.

This combination of natural and manmade beauty fills the future of this region with promise. Fountainhead Lodge and Arrowhead Lodge will generate a thriving tourist trade. These new facilities already mean jobs for some 350 employees. And in the chain reaction of the tourist dollar they can lead to new stores, service stations, banks, airports, and similar ventures that bring steady employment on a year-round basis.

The tourist industry offers one of the best opportunities for increasing basic employment and income in this part of Oklahoma. This fact prompted the Area Redevelopment Administration to take part in making this resort a reality.

ARA acted on the conviction that tourism today is one of our Nation's most promising growth industries. The decision to loan $10 million for this project was inspired by a program submitted for Lake Eufaula by a representative group from this four-county area. Probably no individual contributed more to the realization of this project than your chairman of this celebration, Leland Gourley.

In essence, today's ceremonies are a tribute to the creative efforts of Federal, State, and local officials working cooperatively with private enterprise to bring new opportunities and progress. I know that we in the Department of Commerce have been delighted to work with your distinguished Members of Congress—Congressman ALBERT, Congressman EDMONDSON, Senator MONRONEY, and Senator HARRIS on projects like this.

Since 1961, the Area Redevelopment Administration has provided financial support for some 70 recreation and tourist projects throughout the Nation, representing a total investment of $69 million. More than one-third of these funds were extended to private enterprise in the form of commercial loans to be used for developing, modernizing or expanding hotels, motels, and ski resorts.

Last year, Americans spent $24 billion on recreation, up more than 500 percent since 1940. Behind this booming exepnditure for recreation are our rising incomes, our increasing leisure time, the building of new highway networks, and our growing numbers of automobiles. American motorists will be driving more than a trillion miles a year by 1970.

The National Association of Travel Organizations estimates that travel is a $27 billion a year industry, the Nation's third largest, after manufacturing and agriculture. Last year, 68 percent of us took some kind of weekend or vacation trip. And 94.5 million persons took at least a 1-day trip by car in 1964.

President Johnson recently initiated a "See the U.S.A." program in which the States and private industry are cooperating to stimulate recreation and travel as productive forces for economic growth.

The President's task force on travel is focusing on tourism as an increased generator of jobs and profits in our national economy.

We are ecouraging Americans to see their own country before going abroad. And we are encouraging oversea travelers to tour America as Americans in the past have toured their countries.

The Commerce Department, through the U.S. Travel Service, has mounted a worldwide promotional effort to induce more foreigners to visit the United States. Nearly one million travelers came here last year, excluding those from Canada and Mexico, pumping more than $375 million into the economy. We hope to better the million mark in oversea tourists this year, and the President has asked Congres to add $500,000 to the U.S. Travel Service budget to expand the program.

In short, your Government is committed to the proposition that travel and recreation hold vital economic benefits for American business and industry.

I suppose the classic proof of this proposition is found in Puerto Rico, whose rapid economic ascent is due largely to its expanding tourist trade. The estimated gross national product for Puerto Rico this year is $2.4 billion, nearly half of which will come from tourism.

In recent years tourists have spent at an annual rate of some $2 billion in Florida, $1 billion in New England, over $150 million in Upper Michigan, $300 million in Minnesota, and $400 million in the District of Columbia.

While these figures are impressive— representing 18 percent of Florida's personal income and 15 percent of the District of Columbia's—they do not include the chain of tourist expenditures for related goods and services.

An analysis of the tourist business in New Hampshire, for example, showed that tourists spent $135 million visiting the State and that these expenditures were ultimately responsible for generating a total income of about $220 million, or 20 percent of that State's income. Travel is among the top three or four revenue producers in all our 50 States.

Today, we look to Lake Eufaula to usher in a new era of promise and prosperity.

In the overall efforts to achieve greater economic development in this State, tourism can be a decisive force. It is estimated that more than 16 million persons travel through Oklahoma by automobile yearly, half of whom are likely to patronize various elements of the State's economy affected by the tourist trade.

Lake Eufaula, with its good location, easy accessibility, ideal recreation facilities and beautiful surroundings, should prove a powerful new magnet to travelers. Of course, success won't fall into your lap. You now face the challenge of getting out and working hard to win increased patronage.

I know you will work hard and I believe your future is bright. I am proud of the Commerce Department's part in bringing this magnificent resort to fruition. And we are grateful for the cooperation and support of the numerous State and local officials who have worked so hard to bring about this memorable occasion.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity to extend to each of you the very best wishes of the Secretary of Commerce, John T. Connor. The Secretary asked me to express his regrets at being unable to attend these ceremonies today. But he also wants you to know of his conviction that Lake Eufaula will live up to its promise of many benefits for Oklahoma.

And I also want to express the best wishes of Bill Batt and his ARA staff, who have worked so closely with you to bring this vision to reality.

I join him in wishing you good luck and godspeed.

The Honorable Mayor Richard G. Crenshaw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. HANNA. It is my pleasure and honor today, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States and the people

of our Nation the testimonial dinner which will be held July 6 in honor of Richard G. Crenshaw, the former mayor of Buena Park, Calif.

Dick Crenshaw is and has been a leader during his entire life. He served two hitches in the U.S. Navy, including 4 years in a naval intelligence unit which operated behind enemy lines in China and Burma during World War II. He was honorably discharged at the conclusion of World War II with the rank of lieutenant commander.

At home, which has been southern California for the Crenshaw family for more than half a century, Dick Crenshaw has served many civic causes in innumerable capacities. Among these, he has been particularly active in YMCA and Boy's Club work, as a 32d degree Mason, and in the Shriners. Dick Crenshaw is a past master of the DeMolay's and holds honorary life membership in the California Congress of Parents and Teachers, an honor which was bestowed upon him for his valuable work with the youth of our great State.

In his adopted community of Buena Park, Calif., Dick Crenshaw has been most active in civic affairs. Since 1956, when he and Mrs. Crenshaw moved their family to Orange County, Dick has given unselfishly of his time and many talents to the city, and has contributed greatly to its rapid and orderly development. Dick served as president of the community coordinating council, as a member of the Buena Park Planning Commission, and was elected to the Buena Park City Council. Dick Crenshaw's hard work and leadership on the city council culminated in his election as mayor of Buena Park by his colleagues on the city council.

Surely no man, Mr. Speaker, is more deserving of the outpouring of gratitude by the people of his community, and State, and Nation than Dick Crenshaw. It will be my distinct honor to be the main speaker at the testimonial dinner planned for Mayor Crenshaw. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to express what the service of Dick Crenshaw has meant to the people of Buena Park, Orange County, the State of California, and his beloved country. It will not be an easy task, Mr. Speaker, for the Honorable Mayor Richard G. Crenshaw has done a great deal for each of us.

Virgin Islands Push Plans for Wayne Aspinall High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is pleasing to his colleagues to note the esteem and affection with which the able and popular chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Mr. ASPINALL, is held in the lands and regions now or recently under the jurisdiction of the important committee of which he is the head. In Alaska an honorary degree of doctor of laws has been conferred on him in recognition of his outstanding contribution to Alaska's fight for statehood and his service in aiding in the difficult period of adjustment from territorial to statehood status. Guam, too, has signaled out Chairman ASPINALL for many distinctions that mark the appreciation of that American island in the farflung Pacific.

In the Virgin Islands this general acclaim of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is in the form of giving his name to a new high school. Under a large headline on page 1, reading "Plans for ASPINALL School Here OK'd," the Home Journal of St. Thomas, V.I., carries the following news item:

PLANS FOR ASPINALL SCHOOL OK'D

Plans for the construction of the WAYNE ASPINALL High School on reclaimed land on the St. Thomas waterfront have been approved and bids will shortly be invited, it was disclosed today.

Originally, officials expected that construction would be completed to permit occupation of the new school by September this year, but by the time bids are received June will be here, and it seems impossible to get the school ready before 1966. Bids will be advertised on the proposed new high school for St. Croix at a later date.

The Burnup & Sims Construction Co. is expected to be awarded the bid to construct an addition to the Julius Sprauve School on St. John. That firm submitted a bid of $103,536. Camso, formerly Samford Construction Co., bid $103,900.

The ambitious school construction program, designed to end overcrowding and modernize school plants throughout the islands, is being financed by a bond issue. The government has borrowed money from local banks in advance of the bond issue.

A Variety of Factors Cause High Lettuce Prices, but a Shortage of Farm Labor Is Not Among Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that several prominent agricultural spokesmen have been attributing the recent high retail market price of lettuce to the American housewife to an alleged shortage of agricultural workers, which they claim is due to this year's termination of the Government-subsidized bracero foreign farm labor importation system.

I believe it is vital that these allegations be examined thoroughly, that the actual facts be determined, and that the real cause or variety of causes for such consumer price rises be established.

Only in this way can we be sure of obtaining an accurate and unbiased picture of the true situation.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point two very interesting articles. The first is an Associated Press release datelined from Salinas, Calif., one of the richest lettuce-producing areas in the Nation.

The article, appearing in the June 3 edition of the Los Angeles Times, quoted Bud Antle, president of the world's biggest lettuce-shipping firm, as categorically denying that an alleged scarcity of farm labor had contributed to the recent rise in the retail price of lettuce.

The second item is a U.S. Department of Labor mid-June background information summary analyzing the fluctuations in lettuce prices this year. The Department's summary also disputes the charge that a shortage of agricultural workers has caused the price rises.

However, the Department does note the steady upward pressure on prices due to an apparently effective growers' harvest slowdown and shipping holiday in the early months of the year when the bumper crop of winter lettuce threatened to glut the market and further depress wholesale prices which were then averaging some 35 percent below the previous year.

Then the early spring lettuce crop was reduced materially, with a resultant price rise, according to the Department's analysis, by a combination of substantial acreage underplanting together with adverse weather conditions delaying and shortening the Arizona harvest.

But, with the late spring and early summer crops coming in now, prices have begun to edge downward again.

The two articles follow:

HIGH LETTUCE PRICES REMAIN UNEXPLAINED

SALINAS.—The head of the world's biggest lettuce shipping firm said Wednesday high lettuce prices are not a result of scarcity of farm labor.

But he didn't attempt to explain why prices are more than double a year ago.

More lettuce is being shipped this year from the Salinas-Watsonville Salad Bowl than in 1964, Bud Antle, president of Bud Antle, Inc., said in a telegram to Charles Schuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation in Washington, D.C.

Schuman recently contended lettuce prices were high because of scarce farm labor.

NOT BASED ON FACTS

"Unfair, irresponsible, and not based on facts," retorted Antle.

"Through May 31, total shipments of lettuce from all areas are 9,036 carlot equivalents, compared to 7,409 in the same period of 1964."

Antle said his figures are from the Federal State Market News Service.

Iceberg lettuce has been selling wholesale at $4.45 a carton of 24 heads consigned to the eastern market. This compares with an average of $1.78 in 1964 and $1.50 in 1963, growers said.

EMPLOY INGENUITY

Antle also told Schuman:

"It is the job of agriculture to employ all of its great energy and ingenuity to the job of improving the opportunity of migratory workers and filling its jobs with Americans.

"Agricultural leaders should quit complaining and start working to push and lead this great effort."

Antle has been a leader in the effort to find Americans for farm jobs and to improve their working conditions.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR MID-JUNE BACKGROUND INFORMATION SUMMARY RE RECENT HIGH RETAIL MARKET PRICE OF LETTUCE

The cost of lettuce rose substantially in recent weeks but this increase cannot be attributed to a shortage of farm labor.

On June 2, Lester V. "Bud" Antle, the world's largest lettuce grower charged that attempts to lay the blame for higher prices on a shortage of labor are "unfair, irresponsible, and not based on fact."

On June 14, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, George L. Mehren, declared that "early this year when lettuce supplies were overly abundant for a period of time, there was no problem in getting the crop harvested."

Equally inaccurate are the allegations that lettuce price increases are the result of higher wages paid farmworkers. While wages did increase when growers switched from foreign workers to American workers, the higher wages costs represent no more than one-half of 1 cent for each head of lettuce.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that an average of about 18 minutes of direct labor time goes into the planting, raising, and harvesting of a 24-head carton of lettuce. Last year the average pay rate for this was $1.05 in California and $1 an hour in Arizona, making the total direct labor costs about 32 cents a carton or 1⅓ cents a head. This year the hourly rate is up to $1.40 in California and $1.25 in Arizona, for a labor cost of about 42 cents a carton or 1¾ cents per head.

In the early months of this year the winter lettuce crop was up substantially over last year—13,092,000 hundredweight, compared with 12,356,000 hundredweight last year. The result was depressing on lettuce prices which averaged about 35 percent below a year ago at wholesale, according to the Department of Agriculture. Because of this Mehren reported that growers "joined in a 'shipping holiday' of the harvested lettuce to prevent a glut on the market and to bolster prices."

The California Agricultural Reporting Service reported that in February and mid-March growers were harvesting only 4 days a week because of the overproduction.

The early spring crop, however, was some 5,350 acres below last year in plantings. This coupled with adverse weather conditions which delayed harvesting and permitted the Arizona crop to end before the California crop was in volume production, resulted in a reduction of the total available supply and caused prices to rise.

Agricultural Department spokesman Mehren noted that the "poor quality of the heads reaching the consumer was not caused by inexperienced help but by weather conditions which lowered the quality of the crop, and this was compounded by the efforts of growers to speed harvest to take advantage of the temporary bulge in price."

The late spring crop, about half of which comes from New Jersey, has now started to come in and prices are again edging downward.

On May 31 wholesale prices for lettuce were reported averaging $8.25 for a 24-head carton and by June 14 the New York wholesale rate for western lettuce was down to $3.50 for a 24-head carton.

At mid-May the growers' free on board price was averaging around $5.25 for a 24-head carton compared with the June 14 quotation in Salinas, Calif., of $1.25 to $1.50.

Martin Distrusts Ackley's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, I requested and was granted permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article on the William McChesney Martin debate written by J. A. Livingston which appeared May 21, 1965, in the Washington Post. My remarks and transcripts of other articles which I received permission to insert in the RECORD appear on pages 13475–134481. However, Mr. Livingston's article was inadvertenly omitted. I now include this article in the RECORD:

MARTIN DISTRUSTS ACKLEY'S VIEWS

(By J. A. Livingston)

Too bad Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, wasn't at the convention of the Society of American Business Writers. He'd have heard William McChesney Martin, Jr., express misgivings about the new White House economics.

It might have shaken Mr. PATMAN in his resolution to legislate the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board into subservience to the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. Or, on the contrary, it might have reconfirmed Congressman PATMAN's determination to deprive the Board of independence.

"I am not sure that the policy of perpetual growth will be vindicated by easy money and perpetual deficits," Martin told the writers at a session in the Federal Reserve Bank in New York. "Don't let's think we can always have rolling prosperity."

Martin has not joined in the Washington worship of the new economics. Instead of expressing confidence in proposals to reduce taxes to pump up consumer spending, he wondered: Are consumers getting overburdened with debt, is the quality of credit deteriorating? He didnt mention the Webb & Knapp bankruptcy, but he might have.

Martin has been a professional in the money-and-credit business long enough to be from Missouri. And he is. (He was born in St. Louis in December 1906.) He is conscious that economic and political events control men even when men try to control events.

Consequently he has doubts about the spreading faith in our wisdom to apply the ideal mixture of monetary, fiscal, budgetary, and wage-price policies to tilt prosperity ever upward without inflation.

Gardner Ackley, Chairman of President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers, is the high priest of the new economics. He puts the case persuasively and intelligently. Just the other day he told a group of savings bankers that he believes we can continue to stimulate the economy without courting the dangers of inflation.

Martin doesn't deny that changing the policy mix might perpetuate prosperity. But he isn't sure. He wants to guard against too easy assumptions of success: To be wary is to be forewarned.

Martin puzzles whether events—the war in Vietnam, the revolution in Santo Domingo and troubles in the Congo—may not upset optimistic hopes about the balance of payments. The deficit isn't licked until it's a surplus is Martin's point.

If Representative PATMAN had his way, Chairman Martin's doubts would be unuttered. His skepticism would be submerged in the Executive Office. Martin would be part of the administration. He'd be silenced and not the spokesman of an independent agency.

"It is no secret," PATMAN has said, "that I have long been concerned about the aloofness of the Federal Reserve from both the executive branch and the Congress. Although the Federal Reserve System is a creature of Congress, it is not subject to any of the usual Government budgetary, auditing, and appropriations procedures.

"Also, the Federal Reserve is not required to obtain congressional approval for its policies, even though its actions have important repercussions for every sector of our economy. This sort of unbridled freedom, whether it is used for good or evil, just isn't compatible with representative democratic government.

"The will of the people ought to be reflected in monetary policy as well as fiscal policy, foreign affairs, and all other matters affecting the public welfare."

To carry out this purpose, PATMAN would have the Federal Reserve Board chairmaned by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Martin is not aloof, indifferent. All members of the Reserve Board want prosperity to continue. No conflict on this—none whatsoever. But a policy of ever-rising prosperity and growth can conflict at critical moments with another important economic objective—protection of the dollar, stanching the outflow of gold.

How to deal with these objectives—sometimes mutually supporting, sometimes competing—brings on differences in method and emphasis, not only between Martin and the President's advisers but within the Federal Reserve Board itself.

Were the Board subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury, were it to lose its independence, it would lose also its power to dissent, its right to step out of the chorus.

For that we'd all be losers—not only Chairman Martin, not only President Johnson and Gardner Ackley, but also you and I.

The Capitol and the Clergy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend to the House an outstanding television and radio series in California entitled "The Capitol and the Clergy." This 14-week series of half-hour television programs, featuring candid discussions of major issues by leading California clergymen and leaders from the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the California State government, has been carried out by the Northern California Council of Churches, the Southern California Council of Churches, and the Sacramento-Stockton Area Councils of Churches.

Television station KCRA–TV in Sacramento has provided the studio and production facilities without cost to the church groups. Six television stations have broadcast the entire series without cost as part of their public service programing: KNBC–TV Los Angeles, KRON–TV San Francisco, KCRA–TV Sacramento, KOGO–TV San Diego, KFRE–TV Fresno, and KERO–TV Bakersfield. In addition, six radio stations carried the audio portion of the programs: KPPC Pasadena, KRON-FM San Francisco, KXKX–FM San Francisco, KCRA Sacramento, KUOP–FM Stockton, and KBLA Los Angeles.

The councils of churches and the broadcasters deserve the commendation of all the citizens of California for bringing to their listening audiences these discussions on some of the significant issues of our day—capital punishment, campaign ethics, divorce law reforms, religion, and the public schools, among others.

We look forward to the continued concern of the churches and the broadcasting industry with other questions relevant to our times, presented through the mass media of television and radio in the months ahead.

Bernard M. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the people of South Carolina were saddened and grieved this morning to learn of the passing of their elder statesman, Bernard M. Baruch. Mr. Baruch was a much beloved, revered, and honored native of our State. He was born at Camden, S.C., in 1871 during the Reconstruction era, the son of a Confederate doctor who followed the fortunes of his neighbors and friends in the "lost cause." Mr. Baruch, to the end of his life, maintained a residence in South Carolina and commuted back and forth from his adopted city of New York.

Mr. Baruch's life was a classic example of success in the American tradition. Born in abject poverty, in the wake of Sherman's march, Baruch became a millionaire in the great city of New York before the age of 30. He became the companion and adviser to Presidents, barons of industry, and notables throughout the world.

His was a great philosophy; he believed in the individual. He never lost his love and respect for his fellow men regardless of their station in life. He spent many hours of his life on park benches in New York and in Washington talking to the local citizens and the wayfarer. His Negro neighbors in South Carolina were among his best friends and greatest admirers. He was a man of great integrity and character, who devoted much of his time and energy to philanthropy and helping others.

Throughout his long life, he was keenly interested in government—local, State, and National. Not only was Mr. Baruch adviser to eight Presidents, but he was the adviser and confidant of virtually all political leaders in the State of South Carolina, for more than a generation.

Mr. Baruch was a warm personal friend, admirer, and adviser to our own great beloved elder statesman, the Honorable James F. Byrnes. Not long after the turn of the century, they formed a long and lasting friendship which continued to the end, late yesterday in New York City.

Mr. Baruch typified and epitomized the southern gentleman in his grandest tradition. In physical appearance and in conduct, he was a gentleman always. In elementary school in New York, he received a book from his teacher for "gentlemanly conduct." He received medals, decorations, and awards from kings, queens, and presidents, but to his death he prized more than any this award from his schoolteacher at the age of 9.

Mr. Baruch, had a fierce pride in his native State, and his interest in South Carolina never waned. He knew firsthand of South Carolina's courtesy, hospitality, and good manners. He was proud of the gallantry and tolerance of the genuine South Carolinian. Mr. Baruch was proud of the fact that in South Carolina, a man of his faith is speaker of the house and has served longer as speaker than any man in history. He was proud that culture and tolerance in South Carolina permitted him to belong to any civic club or organization he so desired while being denied this privilege in some areas of our country.

Mr. Baruch's success, his sterling character, and his devotion and dedication to his country will always be an inspiration to me and to generations to come. It can be truly said that Mr. Baruch, having departed, leaves behind "footprints on the sands of time."

Mayor Locher's Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day of this year the Honorable Ralph S. Locher, mayor of Cleveland, delivered a meaningful address over the Slovak radio hour in Cleveland.

Mayor Locher examined the meaning of our freedom in a world where it is challenged, and the citizen obligation to our country. He reminded his listeners of the historic struggles of the Slovak people to win their national freedom and how this traditional love of freedom among Americans of Slovak origin had produced so many fine citizens of Cleveland.

By leave previously granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address delivered by Mayor Locher:

AN ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE RALPH S. LOCHER, MAYOR OF CLEVELAND

On this Memorial Day 1965, we again call to mind and heart that our freedom and liberty required struggles and hardships that ended in victory only after much sacrifice. The preservation of our country's freedom over the past 188 years has been marked by much blood, sweat, and tears. We are all dedicated to the sacred principle of our country's national honor and security because we know the precious heritage which has been won, and is today being preserved, by those who fight our country's battles all over the world—including, Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

We, all of us, who benefit so much from the blessings of hard-won liberty and freedom must not and cannot let it be lost. Let us not take our precious freedoms for granted. Let us be ever aware that there are those whose ambition is to take away our freedoms and liberty. So there is a solemn purpose for this day. It is to remind ourselves of the supreme sacrifice of those who died for our country, and to recognize that we the living must not forsake or forget that we owe a duty to our country, a personal obligation of self-dedication to the preservation of our Nation, and the responsibility to rise to the defense of our beloved country just as our heroic dead did. This is the noble burden of patriotism; this is our highest duty as free men.

I know that the Americans of Slovak ancestry have a real appreciation of the blessings of liberty. They are aware of their ancestral struggle for freedom, and the fierce devotion to liberty and independence in Slovakia. They have yearned for the blessings of liberty which we too often take for granted. Slovakia has been struggling for the right to exist as a free nation since the fifth century of the Christian era, but except for brief periods of freedom during the rule of the Moravian kingdom in the ninth century, and the more recent short period of the Slovak Republic, the Slovaks have been beset by foreign invaders and rulers down through the centuries. This yearning for freedom is one of the reasons why Americans of Slovak ancestry have made such fine citizens of the United States. The Slovak people live by their timeless motto: "Za Boha a Na'rod" (for God and country).

On the occasion of this day of homage and respect to those who died to keep America free, let us firmly resolve to keep America free, as a lasting memorial to the supreme sacrifice made by our heroic dead.

May God bless America.

America Loved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Miss Barbara Moran, of Chicago, Ill., secretary to the Honorable Edward A. Kelly, former Congressman of the Third Congressional District of Illinois, composed a very deserving and appropriate poem entitled "America Loved" which pays tribute to our great Nation.

I commend this poem to the attention of my colleagues, and under unanimous consent, I include this poem in the Appendix of the RECORD so America can read it:

AMERICA LOVED

America! From coast to coast
What is there here I love the most?
The frenzied cities' bustling crowd?
The noisy tempo beating loud?
The quiet little town and glen
That takes you back to childhood when
You strolled along the country road
And watched the farmer's haying load.
A running brook to cool your toes
And now in tangled mass a rose!
Then climbing to the crest of hill
The view so vast you stand quite still!
The stretch of blue far out to sea!
A tiny island that could be
Another land! Another dream!
America! You always seem
To have more beauty 'round each turn.
We really love you and we yearn
For mountain tops with crest of snow
And wooded stream in moonlit glow!
But sight serene, all beauty holds
The stars and stripes in waving folds!

HemisFair 1968

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to provide for U.S. participation in the HemisFair 1968 exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968. An identical measure has also been introduced today in the Senate by both Senators from Texas.

The main purposes of the bill introduced today is to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study to determine the manner and extent of Federal participation as an exhibtor in HemisFair 1968. The President is also directed to report to Congress during the first regular session of Congress which begins after the date of enactment of the bill with respect to the findings derived from the study, together with such recommendations as the Secretary of Commerce and the President deem appropriate, and the amount of appropriations necessary to accomplish U.S. representation at the exposition.

I conceived the idea for HemisFair 1968 to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the founding of South America and "a fair for the Americas," to honor and display the diversified cultures of Pan America, including the history, art, industry, commerce, and economic development of each of the nations of the Western Hemisphere, their interrelationships and common ties, and the contributions to their development from Europe, Asia, and Africa. The confluence of civilizations that occurred in the Americas is one of the most exciting stories in the history of mankind and the development of civilization. In the course of that development there were vast migrations of peoples from several continents to both North and South America; civilizations such as the Mayan, Incas, and Aztecs rose and fell; and great nations were born. This is part of the story that HemisFair 1968 has to tell.

President Lyndon Johnson has already said of HemisFair 1968:

> The New World nations are brothers in history, friends in commerce, and partners in aspiration. San Antonio's Fair of the Americas, HemisFair 1968, will celebrate this partnership. Dedicated to the advancement of special, economic, and cultural well being of all peoples of the Americas, it will be a living example of our Nation's policy of Inter-American cooperation. I wish you every success in your plans for this truly American fair, which will not only be a symbol but a product of unity.

From the beginning, HemisFair 1968 has been a communitywide effort in San Antonio, strongly and enthusiastically supported by the businessmen and the general public. Recently, the Texas Legislature appropriated the sum of $4.5 million to HemisFair for the construction of a permanent building. In 1963 San Antonians pledged more than $7.5 million to provide a firm financial base for preopening expenses, and in 1964 the people of San Antonio overwhelmingly approved a $30 million bond issue to prepare the city for HemisFair 1968. So the fair is widely supported by the host community, San Antonio, as well as the State of Texas.

San Antonio, the "Alamo City," which will celebrate the 250th anniversary of its founding in 1968, the historical and traditional "Gateway to Latin America," is the logical location for an exposition of the scope and content of HemisFair 1968.

No nation has a greater interest in the furtherance of the goals of Pan American unity and progress than the United States. Federal participation in HemisFair 1968 in addition to being another contribution toward those goals will help create a permanent meeting place for the nations and people of this hemisphere and will provide a showcase of hemispheric solidarity.

A Warning To Cool the Boom, Not Kill It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, since his speech on June 1 on the economic dangers that may lie ahead, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McC. Martin, Jr., has been attacked almost daily for daring to raise warnings about the current condition of the economy. The attitude of some of Mr. Martin's critics calls to mind similar outbursts against those who questioned the stability of the boom in the late 1920's. In times of prosperity, those who object to a mood of complacency are likely to be characterized as dangerously rocking the boat. But is it not better to test the boat for leaks before it begins sinking rather than after?

It is clear from a careful reading of Chairman Martin's speech that his purpose was not to predict a depression comparable to that of the 1930's but to remind us that the present prosperity need not last forever, and to alert us to certain areas of weakness that could turn a slight setback into a deep recession. The editorial in the June 18, 1965, issue of Life magazine emphasizes that the major contribution of Mr. Martin's speech was to remind us all, and particularly those administration economists apparently living in a state of economic euphoria, that the business cycle has not been permanently repealed and that caution should still be the byword in economic policy affairs.

The editorial points out that certain structural flaws in the economy make the current prosperity vulnerable. Among these is the quantative rise and qualitative deterioration of private credit, which could aggravate a setback by curtailing consumption when it is most needed to prevent a recession. Further, the Federal Government may prove less effective in stemming a mounting recession because its most effective weapons have been blunted by recurrent deficits and taxcuts during the boom period. And, finally, the administration's continued failure to solve our balance-of-payments problem saps the effectiveness of monetary policy if a recession comes at a time when higher interest rates are required.

Instead of castigating Chairman Martin for pointing out areas of possible difficulty in the Nation's economy, he should be commended for trying to cool the prevalent boom psychology that engenders laxity and complacency. At least in part, Chairman Martin's "cooling" approach is a requirement of his position as a guardian of our economic well-being. The Life editorial emphasizes the crucial value of Mr. Martin's speech and I, under unanimous consent, include the article in the RECORD at this point:

A WARNING TO COOL THE BOOM, NOT KILL IT

By his now famous speech on dangers in the present boom, Federal Reserve Chairman William McC. Martin, Jr., sparked a real argument over our economic outlook that has at least broken through the official optimism decreed by the White House. His speech also set off a drop in prices on the New York Stock Exchange that erased nearly $20 billion of paper values in the ensuing week. The stock shakeout was an overdue corrective and the market will emerge the healthier for it. The more important question is which way the economy is heading.

Martin made the effect of his speech more lurid than necessary by raising the specter of another 1929 crash. He listed 12 disquieting similarities between our present recordbreaking proseperity and that of the 1920's which led to the great depression. He also mentioned 12 important differences between the situation then and now, but he gave these less stress than they deserved. He did not, in fact, predict a depression nor does he expect an early end to this boom. He was not even signaling (as some Wall Street traders feared) a rise in interest rates, which would moderate the boom and dampen profit prospects. He was instead attacking the euphoria of many business leaders and the new era, permanent prosperity talk of administration economists.

The President's own Council of Economic Advisers, on the 50th mensiversary of our present boom last month, announced "the beginning of a new era in the economic annals of the United States." To anyone with as long a memory as Bill Martin, who cast his first vote against Hoover, this inevitably recalled the similar new era talk that turned and bit the Hoover administration in 1929-32. But it was the talk, rather than the state of the economy, that alarmed him. And since the Federal Reserve is fortunately independent of the administration, Martin was in an ideal position to offset the talk with his own meditations on the long-term problems of the dollar, past, present, and to come.

His analogy with the 1920's was not very meaningful, since so much has changed in the U.S. economy since then. For one example (as Martin mentioned), there is much less disparity in income distribution and therefore less danger of underconsumption. For another, the banking system is far better regulated and insured. For another (which Martin did not mention), the economy has many built-in stabilizers, such as social security and unemployment insurance, which it lacked in the 1920's. Martin's meditations merely proved what was known before, that he is a conscientious guardian of the dollar who worries more about its purchasing power at home and abroad than the White House economists do.

One of the latter recalled an old saying that "Central bankers can't stand prosperity." It would be truer to say that they hate inflation and runaway booms. They read the same indices as the business or political forecasters but from a different perspective. They give less weight to the big-picture or "macroeconomic" statistics like the gross national product and its growth rate than they do to certain qualitative factors like confidence, incentives, and the soundness of loans.

Even the macroeconomists, including Chairman Ackley of the Council of Economic Advisers, predict that the current rate of expansion will slow down over the coming months, though Ackley sticks by his estimate of a $660 billion gross national product for the year. He expects a weaker market for automobiles, less inventory accumulation and a lower rate of Federal spending. There is also some trouble in the housing market, especially in the West; and it may be harder for manufacturers to increase productivity further at this stage of the boom, especially with the wage settlements in autos, aluminum and (perhaps) steel raising costs in defiance of the President's guideposts. Some prices have already risen; but Ackley feels that the coming slowdown in the rate of growth "removes any serious prospect of overheating our economy in the next year." As for the longer view, he still sees no reason why prosperity can't last indefinitely.

It is precisely this longer view that concerns Martin and like-minded worriers. If the boom should run out of steam next year, or is already doing so, our economy may prove vulnerable to trouble from certain structural flaws that the boom itself has accentuated. Private debt, for example, has risen since 1949 from $212 billion to $811 billion and from 82 to 130 percent of the gross national product; and bank and consumer credit has recently been expanding much more rapidly than production. This inevitably means some deterioration in the quality of the loans being made. Mortgage foreclosures are rising. And a Hartford insurance officer was heard to say (by the Wall Street Journal): "We're making loans to companies we would have turned down flat a couple of years ago." All this borrowing helps prolong the boom, but the size and somewhat dubious quality of the debt load will also make the economy less resilient if it gets in trouble.

The Federal Government may also prove less resilient if it has to intervene in a recession. It has run deficits throughout the boom (for 11 of the last 15 years in fact) and also, with Martin's collaboration, has in recent years kept the money supply generally easy. Its tax cuts and concessions to business (e.g., the corporate depreciation allowance) have been wonderfully stimulative to prosperity, but when stronger doses of the same remedy are needed, they may turn out to be less potent.

As for the money supply, it will be hard to make that any easier for antirecession purposes if the need should come at a time when our balance-of-payments problem calls for higher interest rates. Some of the measures taken under the President's balance-of-payments program, such as the voluntary restraints on private lending abroad, "are of a temporary character," said Martin, and "the initial success of these efforts [must not] blind us against the need of permanent cure." Martin believes that the requirements of a sound international dollar are compatible with those of the domestic economy. The two requirements could, however, put him and all of us in a real dilemma in case of a recession. It is a dilemma which our boom-time easy-money policies may well have been making worse.

The U.S. economy remains the strongest in the world, and its recent performance has been spectacular. There is no reason to believe it cannot meet all the demands on it, both for profits and welfare, for change and stability, for American consumers and for world trade and development. There is also little doubt that the business cycle, though not obsolete, has been brought under much better control and no longer threatens us with the wild swings of its past. Yet any boom produces laxities in management, both public and private; and these reduce the efficiency of the economy as a whole and must therefore be paid for one way or another. The boom psychology that encourages such laxity was Martin's target, and we can thank him for taking a shot at it.

The Rise of Lud Andolsek From Humble Surroundings to the Vice Chairmanship of the U.S. Civil Service Commission Is a Typical Example of How Courage, Hard Work and Ability in This Land of Opportunity Can Give Anyone a Chance for Greatness and Phenomenal Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lud J. Andolsek has demonstrated how a person from one of the most humble beginnings can achieve the top pinnacle of success in this great Nation of ours, and I was most pleased to call to your attention the following article which appeared in the Postal Record:

L. J. ANDOLSEK, VICE CHAIRMAN, U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

When you first meet L. J. Andolsek, the Vice Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, you are aware that behind his flashing blue eyes lie a vibrant idealism and a genuine love for the entire human race. After a few minutes' conversation, you realize that these attributes are backed up by a deep and incisive mind and an impenetrable integrity. When you realize how rare this combination is on the Washington scene you thank Almighty God that Lud Andolsek is one of those three powerful gentlemen who hold a great part of the destiny of the postal and Federal workers of the United States in their hands.

Andolsek, a longtime friend of NALC President Jerome J. Keating, proudly calls himself a "bohunk" because he, and others of the same national background who were out of the same mold, have been able to erase from that once-derisive word all the social stigma it once implied.

In a speech delivered to postal employees in Detroit, Mich., Andolsek brought lumps of emotion into the throats of his audience when, quite simply, in his slightly accented voice he told his own life's story.

"Just after the turn of the century, my parents decided to come to America, the land of opportunity, from their native Austria-Hungary. They were fed up with the caste system that kept the 'little man in his proper place.' They were tired of poverty-level earnings with no hope for improvement, and they had had enough of the persecution that prevailed. They had heard about the 'pot of gold' that was just waiting to be picked up by anybody who migrated to America, so they decided to come.

"My father was so poor that he had to come alone and earn the money to send back for my mother's passage. Two of my older brothers remained behind after my mother came. One came to America at age 15 and the other never got here.

"But my parents came to this land of opportunity, and they settled not very far from here in the mining country of Minnesota. Suddenly they discovered that, in this land of opportunity, opportunity had to be earned.

"My father worked 14 hours a day for $1.25. He traded at the company store. He practically bowed in obeisance to minor officials of the town, and he got the message early that 'immigrants should remain in their places.' There were days and months and years when my father felt that he was still wearing the immigrant's tag he had worn on his jacket during the trip to America. Times were so tough, my mother took in boarders to make ends meet. At one time she had 22.

"Both of my parents continued to work. And hope. They exercised some privileges of a democracy that they hadn't been able to exercise in the old country. My father joined the union at a time when it was not exactly the most popular move to make, and he helped to raise living standards for himself and those like him.

My parents exercised their right to vote. One matter they supported regularly was bond issues for new and improved schools. They felt that through education their children would be able to enter doors that had been closed to them.

They took an increasingly active part in the community, and somewhere along the way they came to realize that the "bohunk immigrant" stigma had disappeared; they were being accepted as breadwinning, taxpaying, responsible citizens of the community.

My parents never did discover that pot of gold, and they never did achieve that dream of affluence they thought would come true when they left the old country. They just continued to work, and to try to make things better.

But their children did.

I was able to attend good elementary and high schools. I was able to work my way through college. I am now enjoying the fruits of a society that my parents helped to build.

Many of my friends, who also wore the badge of "bohunk immigrant" in their youth, are now legislators, physicists, astronomers, lawyers, and doctors. They are contributing something worthwhile to the society their parents helped to build.

We of my generation are the beneficiaries of the equal rights and the equal opportunities that our parents carved out for us.

What a pity it would be if we failed to continue in the tradition of our ancestors. The tradition of giving more than we get; the tradition of making more out of less; the tradition of uplifting the minds and the aspirations of young people around us.

The rise of Lud Andolsek has been steadily upward. He started out his Government career as Chief of the National Youth Administration in Minnesota, in the same year (1935) that a young man named Lyndon Baines Johnson was appointed to the same position in Texas. He served with great distinction as a captain in the Army in World War I, and returned to become Assistant Chief of Personnel in the Veterans' Administration in St. Paul, Minn. From 1951 to 1962 he was administrative assistant to the beloved Minnesota Congressman, JOHN BLATNIK. In 1963 he became the chief clerk of the House Committee on Public Works, in Washington, and shortly afterwards was named to the Civil Service Commission.

Andolsek is married, and has a delightful daughter, Kathy. He is a man to watch for

the future. There is no ceiling on the career potentials of such a man. Here is no ceiling, either, on his potential value to the people of the country that his parents adopted.

Uncle Sam and World Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the editorials which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press and the Philadelphia Inquirer on June 1.

While I do not profess to be an expert on foreign affairs nor an adviser on foreign policy for our Nation, I must admit that I cannot understand the criticism being directed to this Nation's position and action in Asia and Latin America.

How many remember, I wonder, during those years preceding our entrance into World War I the terrific stand made by France—and in World War II the beating England took in holding back the supermen until we were ready to enter the conflict? Today, the only other great power that is in a position to act is Russia.

Our President feels as many of us do—"We do not want to force our way of government upon any other nation—but—we do not feel the smaller nations should be forced to accept foreign ideologies sponsored by still other governments." As the leader of the free world—we must accept our responsibility and help those who have asked for our assistance.

The editorials follow:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, June 1, 1965]

UNCLE SAM AND WORLD ORDER

The unique personality of Lyndon B. Johnson influences the timing and the style but the new, tough trend in America's world attitude may be viewed as historically inevitable. It had to come sometime

For the last half-century the world has been trying to get along without any nation exerting a firm hand to keep order, meanwhile tolerating a situation of constant turmoil. At an earlier period Rome handled this police assignment, enforcing a relative state of peace for 500 years. Britain kept at least a semblance of order in the hundred years from the Congress of Vienna to the First World War. But since 1914 there has been no such strong influence for world order. No nation has been strong enough or willing enough, to assert itself.

In the century when Brittania ruled the waves, disorders even remotely affecting British interests, such as abuse of foreign nationals, encroachment over fixed borders or stones through embassy windows were discouraged by visits of gunboats to the harbor. The hint usually was sufficient, without any shots being fired.

Our own Monroe Doctrine served bold notice regarding Latin America but the United States, in 1823, had little military force, either by land or by sea. It was tacitly understood that the British fleet stood back of the Monroe Doctrine. It was in the British interest as much as in ours, to avoid a new struggle among European regimes over Latin American real estate.

The measure of world stability enforced by the British collapsed when, in 1914, Germany challenged for world leadership. Even though Britain won, she lost control of the seas. British wisely foresaw they no longer could maintain an empire and hasten organization of the commonwealth, giving independence to former colonies. The Second World War speeded this process.

The French were similarly weakened but not so foresighted. Frightfully expensive disasters in Indochina and Algeria were among the results. The weakening of these two great colonial powers, along with the Dutch and the Belgians, precipitated the "end of colonialism"—rather than any necessarily new and humanitarian enlightenment. Britain no longer could maintain the old status. Europe could not hold its colonies, and the U.S. served plain notice it wouldn't help.

Responsibility for forceful opposition to events threatening world chaos and war is a thankless and expensive job which no peacefully inclined nation wants. Even while America prospered, with minimum military expense under protection of the British fleet, "perfidious Albion" was unpopular in the United States. A Chicago mayor even threatened to punch King George on the nose.

But events sometimes force this distinction on an unwilling nation, as alternative to something worse. That is the position in which the United States finds itself today.

The Soviet Union is ready and willing to take on the job if we turn it down. Such a development would mean the triumph of world communism and obviously is something we can't accept.

In the interregnum since 1914 statesmen have worked to devise a form of collective security designed to make unnecessary the enforcement of order by one strong nation. Undoubtedly the organizations set up for this purpose—the League of Nations and the United Nations—have served useful purposes in the settlement of relatively minor disputes. But essentially these have been alliances among the victors in war. They have found trouble when allies have fallen out.

The U.N. is powerless to intervene between big nations, or even to act effectively when the big fellows disagree over disturbances in the small ones.

Given another century of life the U.N. may develop into a substantial influence for order; but meanwhile too much has been expected of the U.N. and unless this soon is realized it will go the way of the League.

To simplify greatly the British fleet no longer enforces the Monroe Doctrine and, until President Johnson sent the Marines into the Dominican Republic, neither did the United States. It is the Soviet Union, along with Communist China, which now are moving into Latin America—rather than France and Spain, as in the last century. The techniques are different but the threatened results are similar. It is in behind recognition of this that American troops are in Santo Domingo. Another Castro-Communist takeover south of the border is not to be permitted.

The situation in Vietnam is somewhat similar in that it involves—as it has been permitted to shape up—a Communist bid for dominance in a strategic section of the world, threatening the whole structure of free institutions in the Pacific and, eventually, our own security.

President Johnson has chosen to take a strong stand there. Despite all the talk about getting out, this hardly could have been avoided.

Those who like to note history repeating itself may see a close parallel between ancient Rome and modern America in events leading to reluctant acceptance of world leadership. Rome also was hostile even to its citizens who engaged in foreign commerce. But there was Carthage, challenging across the Mediterranean, and it was either one or the other. With Britain, it was France. We got our national independence as a side result of that struggle.

President Johnson naturally is being assailed by those who cling to a world congress to keep the peace and protect American interests. It cannot be expected that long-held faiths will be abandoned overnight.

The President may bungle, though there is no sign that he has; but this is an assignment that, in the light of history, had to be accepted eventually. It may be observed that the United States held back a long while.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 1, 1965]

U.S. POLICY ON INTERVENTION

Critics of U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic who have been charging that the Johnson Administration's policy means a U.S.-imposed regime in Santo Domingo and an entanglement from now on in Latin American revolutions received some clear answers on Sunday from Secretary of State Rusk.

Speaking on NBC's "Meet the Press" television program, the Secretary gave U.S. support to a plebiscite in the Dominican Republic on a new constitution and said the Dominicans should elect their own government. It is not up to the United States, he pointed out, to impose a solution.

He also ruled out the idea of U.S. intervention in all revolutionary situations in Latin America. He said that there were unique aspects in the Dominican crisis and cautioned against generalizing on the basis of it.

To assume from our actions in Santo Domingo that we will step in, and impose our will, wherever there is a governmental overturn in Latin America, is, of course, far-fetched. So is the conclusion drawn by some from President Johnson's proposal for a stand-by inter-American emergency force that interference with domestic affairs inside a country would inevitably result.

The Dominican upheaval posed, as Secretary Rusk has emphasized, a unique problem for us. There was no OAS machinery adequate to handle the crisis quickly. We did what had to be done, on the theory that if we did nothing, another Castro-like Communist dictatorship might be set up in the Caribbean.

In urging establishment of such a peacemaking force, the President is not promoting outside interference with the domestic affairs of any country. He wants an inter-American agency prepared to handle emergency situations, so the United States will not be forced to step in unilaterally.

Rights of Privacy—And the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey Hon. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey's 13th District, has done yeoman work in fighting against invasion of privacy by overzealous Government investigators. His work has borne considerable fruit and has earned him deserved editorial praise throughout the United States.

I would like to insert in the RECORD a column written by Ralph de Toledano and distributed by King Features Syndicate pointing out another great abuse whereby the constitutionally guaranteed right of privacy is being violated. I am sure that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] will consider carefully the abuses which Mr. de Toledano outlines. The column follows:

RIGHTS OF PRIVACY—AND THE CONGRESS

(By Ralph de Toledano)

Representative CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, the New Jersey Democrat heading a special investigation on the growing practice of snooping, has sounded off with justifiable indignation at the loss of privacy now being suffered by Americans. Electronic devices and Government nosiness are the two widest causes—and the question is, Which one is the more pernicious?

With the Federal Government taking on more and more functions of private business, it has used its muscle to include in official forms a variety of questions that deal with matters which are no concern of anyone but the persons involved. Some of these questions are included because a bureaucrat with sociological pretensions believes it will be of value to his researchers to have the information. The Census Bureau, which is supposed to count noses, now wants to know some pretty private things about you, and those who have protested are slapped down by the courts.

Electronic snooping is something else again. I know an officer of a large corporation who always takes a portable radio with him on his trips to Washington. When he is discussing confidential business in his hotel room, he turns on the set to talk or music—a good though not foolproof way of thwarting the recording devices used by snoopers.

On at least two occasions, when I was in frequent touch with controversial figures prominent in the news, taps were put on my phones by organizations that loudly proclaim their devotion to civil rights. In one case, the tap was placed there by a wiretapping company in the pay of the lawyers of a man on trial, at a time when I was in journalistic touch with some of the principals in the litigation.

What Representative GALLAGHER can do about electronic snooping is problematical. Direction mikes, induction coils, and miniaturized equipment are simple to make and cheap to buy. Many of these devices are already illegal to use, but local police forces and Federal agencies use them frequently. The late Harold Ickes, when he was Interior Secretary, was notorious for bugging the phones of other Cabinet members—or so it was said in Washington.

There is, however, one form of privacy invasion which the Congress should look into. Various corporations have set up central "clearinghouses" which gather information of the most intimate nature for their mutual use.

If you apply for an insurance policy, you will be checked out—and the chances are that secrets you had thought long buried will turn up on the report made of your past. The "facts" in these files are based on allegation, not systematic investigation, so that you may be falsely charged with vices or habits with no chance to defend yourself.

Credit bureaus operate in somewhat the same manner. They receive allegations from businesses, then report on the credit rating of an individual without checking the accuracy of the information.

I know of one instance in Washington in which a man with a high credit rating at his bank and no record of defaulted payment of bills was turned down when he tried to buy a piece of equipment on the installment plan. Both puzzled and angered, he demanded to know the reason. He was told that the credit bureau report claimed that he was being sued by three companies for nonpayment of bills.

In the first case, the company was in error and had so admitted, and in any case the man had never even been served. In the second instance, he had paid the bill in question even though it was one he had not incurred himself and might have beaten in court. In the third instance, again a bill he had not incurred, the matter was in litigation, with no determination of his indebtedness.

A phone call by the credit bureau would have straightened out the matter. Instead, it had given the impression that a man of some standing in the community was a deadbeat. There is no defense against this except a slander suit, which few people have the time or the inclination to institute.

This is something that should occupy the attention of Representative GALLAGHER. It involves an invasion of privacy and a secret assault on reputation. The Constitution holds that in criminal cases a man must be confronted by his accusers. But in cases such as these—and in those involving secret files and electronic eavesdropping—the Constitution does not seem to apply any more. The Gallagher investigation is an important one, but its scope should be expanded.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

The New Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Pennsylvania is experiencing a remarkable acceleration in its rate of growth. The "new" Pennsylvania is demonstrating that it knows how to utilize its human and natural resources to build for the present and the future.

One of the persons in Governor Scranton's administration who deserves a large share of credit for this economic revival is Secretary of Commerce John K. Tabor.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interview with Secretary of Commerce Tabor which I believe will be of interest to all members of Congress.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sunday Patriot-News, May 23, 1965]

STATE'S CRUSADE FOR INDUSTRY—SECRETARY TABOR DISCUSSES ECONOMIC GAINS, LOWER UNEMPLOYMENT, THE "NEW" PENNSYLVANIA, THE NEW PIDA LAW, THE OLMSTED PROBLEM, THE STATE'S FUTURE, URBAN AREA PROBLEMS, THE 1966 CAMPAIGN

(NOTE.—As Secretary of Commerce, John K. Tabor has been in the forefront of the Scranton administration's campaign to attract new industry and new jobs to Pennsylvania.

(Tabor, a 43-year-old Pittsburgh attorney, is counted among the four top Republican possibilities as Scranton's successor in the Governor campaign next year.

(A graduate of Yale University in 1942, he studied at England's Cambridge University, then returned to get his law degree at Harvard University. During World War II, he served with the Navy, achieving the rank of lieutenant and commanding a mine sweeper.

(Before returning to his hometown of Pittsburgh to establish his own law practice, he was with the New York law firm of former Secretary of War Henry Stimson.

(Secretary Tabor, his wife, the former Kate Hill Williams of Camden, S.C., and their two sons now live in Bowmansdale.)

(By George Draut, Sunday Patriot-News)

Has Pennsylvania finally turned the corner in the decade-long effort to rebuild the State's economy?

"Yes," says Secretary of Commerce John K. Tabor. He believes the new plants, new jobs crusade waged by State government and the local communities finally is bringing about the diversification and economic strength to overcome Pennsylvania's postwar problem of depressed areas and chronic unemployment.

But, Tabor adds, the Commonwealth still has a long way to go.

If we can maintain our present climate to attract new industry and maintain the wonderful momentum of industrial development and economic gains, Secretary Tabor says, Pennsylvania will achieve an absolutely topflight economy in the next 5 to 6 years.

This prediction highlights a tape-recorded interview with the Sunday Patriot-News in which the secretary of commerce ranges over Pennsylvania's progress and problems. The questions and answers follow:

Question. In many of his speeches, Governor Scranton keeps saying that "bad times are over for Pennsylvania." Why don't we start out by having you elaborate on this claim?

Answer. I think the Governor is very heartened by the fact that when he came in, unemployment was 9.4 percent, or almost 1 person in 10 in Pennsylvania out of work. Today, the most recent figure is 4.2 percent. In other words, unemployment has been more than cut in half. Our industrial production is up more than any other State in the Union. Another thing: For the first time since statistics have been maintained by the Federal Government, Pennsylvania's unemployment rate has gone below the national average. This occurred first last June; again in October of last year; and then, this April, it actually fell six-tenths of a point below the national rate. So I think this is what he means when he says that we're on the move.

Question. Nationally, the boom is now in its 51st consecutive month. In claiming, with the Governor, that "bad times are over for Pennsylvania," are you saying that good times are here to stay?

Answer. Well, we have been struggling not only to put people back to work in our traditional industries of coal and steel and iron. We also have been attempting, as rapidly as possible, to diversify. If we are able to sustain our momentum and actually to increase our diversification and if we are able to get, in steel, new equipment and new plants, then even with a slight downturn in steel we will maintain a high level of employment and even with a national downturn in many realms our diversification will strengthen us. I think if we have a downturn nationally our unemployment will increase, but I don't think—unless we have a very severe downturn—it will get back up to that 9.4 percent.

Question. Are you saying that the era when we were plagued with chronic unemployment and depressed areas is pretty well behind us?

Answer. I would say so. I believe this because I think the communities themselves have done a tremendous job. Today, for example, Hazleton, Scranton, and Wilkes-Barre are much stronger than they were 10 years ago—through community effort, through State effort, through the new climate in Pennsylvania. Pittsburgh probably would feel most severely any significant downturn in steel production. I think that area, which is now at 4.2 percent compared to 11.4 percent unemployment about 2 years ago when the Governor took office could jump up to 6.

Question. There has been an unprecedented boom in the steel industry. Steel has been not only the bedrock industry of the national economy but has overwhelmed the Pennsylvania economy. On top of the inroads of automation on total steel jobs in recent years, you've had this migration of steel into the Midwest. What does this do to Pennsylvania?

Answer. Well, interestingly, this is an encouraging fact: Just the other day I saw figures indicating that even though steel is migrating west, Pennsylvania's percentage of total steel production, in the past 2 years, has increased. We've jumped up from 21 percent of national steel production to nearly 25 percent. I think this is a great expression of steel's confidence in the new "climate" in the new Pennsylvania.

Question. What do you think this means in terms of employment? Will this change in the years immediately ahead?

Answer. A part of this is putting back on the line some of the more obsolete steel plants, so that if there is a downturn in total steel production we will feel some unemployment in the steel industry as a result. On the other hand, I do believe—United States Steel has brought its headquarters to Pittsburgh, Bethlehem has invested considerable amounts here in Harrisburg and in Johnstown—we will continue to sustain a very steady steel employment as one phase of our total economy over the next 4 or 5 years.

Question. For the 12 months ended last July 1, the U.S. Census Bureau reports that Pennsylvania continues to lag behind the national average on both population growth and personal income. How do you square this report with your statement that our economy is outstripping the national average?

Answer. The economy is—in terms of the rate at which we are reducing unemployment, the rate at which we are increasing our industrial production. We are, of course, a State that has many automated industries so that our production, our wages, and our total employment can increase even though the total population is not leaping ahead at the same rate as California. But, very frankly, I think that total health and assurance for the next two decades of Pennsylvania's absolutely topnotch economy will only come when we begin to hold all of our young people here, who are still leaving us, and when we actually begin to be a magnet and draw people in from all over the Nation because this is the best place to live and to work. That's what we're shooting for.

Now what we've done is to improve at a much greater rate than any other State in the Union and, certainly, any other industrial State; but we haven't achieved our ideal yet, and that is an even more rapidly growing labor market, an even more rapidly growing population and even greater increases in wages for all of our people.

Question. Would you like to crystal-ball this at all—on how much time will be involved before the State can reach these goals?

Answer. It's a very complicated picture, but I think if we can maintain our present "climate" and if we can maintain the wonderful momentum—that I frankly believe can be attributed in a large degree to Governor Scranton and his administration—I would think in 5 or 6 years, if we can possibly maintain our present pace, we would be in that position of achieving an absolutely topflight economy.

Question. The times have been so good that many Pennsylvania counties have become ineligible for loans from PIDA (Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority) * * *.

Answer. Yes.

Question. And a new law, recently signed by Governor Scranton, has eased the eligibility requirements for loans—and additional money has been appropriated. Won't this tend to work against the original concept of PIDA as a government agency to help only the depressed areas of the State?

Answer. No; I don't believe so. In the first place, the new or broadened eligibility does not bring the same benefits to the new counties that go to the old counties. The new bill says that areas that have less than 6 percent unemployment and more than 4 percent will get some assistance from PIDA, but not the same amount as the traditional PIDA areas. Actually these new areas will have to contribute, or participate with, twice as much money as the areas which have more than 6 percent unemployment.

Question. How much is that?

Answer. Twenty percent of the cost of a project, the cost of a plant, as compared to 10 percent for the others. That's a big difference when the citizens have to reach into their jeans and dredge up twice as much as the depressed areas. There is a very considerable advantage for the depressed areas.

Question. At this point, how many counties are in the old depressed area category and what does the new law take in?

Answer. Let me put it this way: First of all, this bill only made eligible for the first time five counties that never before have been eligible—Dauphin and Cumberland were among them and, I believe, Chester and Philadelphia, and there may have been one up in the northern tier, Warren.

Then, the second thing it did was to make eligible again 13 counties which once had been eligible but which had improved to the point where they slid out. This includes, for example, Northampton and Lehigh Counties, Lycoming County where Williamsport is, Beaver County, Bucks County—a number of them. It was our thinking that as the whole State continued to improve, and as we are shooting toward the 4-percent unemployment rate as the objective for the whole State, we ought to give some help—but not the full help—to those counties which are on the move, have their momentum going, help them to continue to attract new plants.

(Other counties which became eligible are Lebanon, Centre, Berks, York, Delaware, Monroe, Franklin, and Mercer.)

A box score on industrial development

	Latest month (April)	Preceding month (March)	Year ago	Year to date	
				1965	1964
New plants announced	30	17	41	76	130
Expansions announced	46	23	36	98	90
PIDA projects	9	11	9	27	30
PIDA employment created	1,599	1,574	601	3,948	4,171
PIDA dollars invested	$3,026,000	$2,570,224	$1,623,800	$6,306,586	$7,530,624
PIDA payroll created	$6,502,644	$6,844,000	$3,312,000	$16,617,944	$16,786,304

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Commerce records.

Question. Won't this tend to work more to the advantage of the counties which are already prosperous, compared with the older depressed areas? There is an intense competition for new plants and their new jobs.

Answer. Yes, there is. I think the areas having greater than 6 percent unemployment, however, will have a very definite advantage in the amount of money they have to contribute to a project, and this will give them a definite competitive edge over the others. The board also may make a different rate of interest on the loans between the communities which have from 4 to 6 percent unemployment and those which have over 6. So I think there will be enough advantages fully to give an edge to the more depressed areas.

Question. PIDA now can cover most of the State's counties, can't it?

Answer. All but two now—Lancaster and Montgomery.

Question. How do we compare with other States which have similar programs?

Answer. I would prefer to quote other people than myself. The Governor has been told by some specialists in the field in Chicago that we have the best industrial development program and the best variety of financing tools of any of the States in the country. I might also say that we've just had a survey made by a private firm. They surveyed about 700 executives around the country. The report here is that our State effort and the tools and facilities offered by Pennsylvania are highly regarded by these men. They know about them and they know a lot more about them than they used to, 2 years ago.

Question. During the Fine administration, the Chesterman committee—the so-called "Little Hoover Commission"—came up with its report that the commerce department ought to be either drastically revised or abolished. When the Leader administration established PIDA in commerce, it got a major new responsibility. What other major changes has commerce undergone in recent years?

Answer. Since we came in we've had the chance, I think, to get into a variety of very significant and—to me personally—very exciting programs. For example, in addition to industrial development and tourist promotion, we have had the business services part of commerce. Here is where we have the so-called action board that cuts the redtape for businessmen when they have to deal with more than two departments of the State. We are responsible for bringing all the departments together and getting an answer—maybe it's "Yes" and maybe it's "No," but to do it quickly. The bureau of business services has taken on a foreign trade program, to stimulate foreign trade by our companies. It has taken on Federal procurement.

The commerce department is in direct liaison with the Governor's representative, Jimmy Van Zandt, in Washington to help all our businesses and industries to get better priorities on defense contracts.

Then you get over into another of our bureaus, the area of developing and improving our communities. Here we've got the urban renewal program. We've got the long-range planning program. We have project 70—the acquisition by communities throughout the State of parks, parklets, and green space. We're administering $20 million of that $70 million program.

The Governor also has asked us to handle the Appalachia program. We have been assigned to administer the antipoverty program in Pennsylvania. We are now working on the mass transit program, and we have also been, of course, very actively at work in the development, in the improvement of the port in Philadelphia, in Bucks County, in Chester County; also taking a look at the port up in Erie. Earlier we were responsible with the Attorney General to appraise the railroad merger between the Pennsylvania and the New York Central.

So I think that the Commerce Department, working with really superb cooperation from the other departments on the Hill, has been right at the heart of many of the things that this administration and even the National Government have been trying to do. I should add that, in addition to all those items, we also have initially launched the "100,000 Pennsylvanians" program, and we now maintain very close relations with it, although as you know, it is a completely privately financed operation. But it coordinates very closely with us in industrial development, tourist promotion, and general State promotion.

Question. Many people regard the "100,000 Pennsylvanians" as pretty much a public relations effort. Does this kind of public relations really pay off?

Answer. First of all, maybe to the surprise of many, the "100,000" has been a very practical, rather effective entity, even outside the field of public relations. Let me illustrate that. Particularly in industrial development it has helped through something called the "Action Sales Force," made up of the chief executives of 70 Pennsylvania companies. These men are on call to us, and we have used them to put in a strategic good word to supplement our industrial development salesmen. They are able to talk to the chairman of the board or the president of a company when the decision is in the balance.

This action sales force also has actually taken the Governor to New York, to Chicago, to Detroit, to Los Angeles. And we now have a program where he is going to go into Lyndon Johnson's State of Texas. They have made arrangements for these trips; they have financed it; and they have invited their colleagues to come and hear the Pennsylvania story. This has been very effective.

Now in the general public relations field we have tried to educate 101,000 Pennsylvanians who signed up. We have given them brochures. We have given them a newspaper. We try to tell them what is happening in Pennsylvania. This is very intangible, but I think that it has brought new pride and a new appreciation of what we have. And we also have given them the specific assignments of taking trips in Pennsylvania, of spending their money here instead of at Atlantic City, or in New York City. Go to the Poconos. Go to Pittsburgh. Go to Wellsboro. Go to the Pennsylvania Grand Canyon. Go to Lake Erie. If they're doing these things, they're actually putting dollars back into the economy.

Then, of course, the "100,000" paid a quarter of a million dollars for the book, "Discover the New Pennsylvania." We matched that with a quarter of a million dollars of Department of Commerce money, and I think that was a very tangible piece of State promotion. The results accomplished are that tourism was up in the State 20 percent last year. Inquiries at the ends of the turnpike were up 800 percent over the preceding year.

Question. When is this Texas trip to be made by the Governor?

Answer. It's not firm yet, but we are looking toward the latter part of June, tenatively June 24, in Houston.

Question. You talked a little earlier about your department's involvement with Federal procurement. Pennsylvania still ranks far down the list on defense contract work. Why is this?

Answer. We're into the aerospace age, and Pennsylvania did not get into the electronics industry. It did not get into the space age with both feet the way it should have. California is there. California is getting about 53 percent of the Federal dollars in this field. It's fantastic. The Southwestern States are

doing quite well also. I think we were not alert 10 and 15 years ago. Our efforts today, through the Governor's Council of Science and Technology and the Governor's science advisers who, incidentally, are being paid by the "100,000 Pensylvanians," is to identify the future industries so this doesn't happen again. As the Federal Government shifts over from great investments in defense into very major investments in the field of public health and public benefits, like air pollution, stream pollution, and rapid transit, mass transit—these areas, we're hoping that, maybe, we'll be far enough in the van in these fields this time to be there "firstest with the mostest."

Question. Let's talk about Olmsted Airbase a little. Over the phaseout period of the next several years, nearly 11,000 high-pay civilian jobs will disappear in this mid-State community. What will this do to our economy and what do you think we can best do about it?

Answer. It's going to be a severe blow to the economy of central Pennsylvania—Harrisburg, York, Lancaster, Pottsville, Cumberland County, Lebanon, Columbia County, Schuylkill County—no question about it. It involves an enormous amount of personal residences, an enormous amount of personal spending. As you know, the first effort was to prevent it from closing. I don't think that's going to be successful, though certainly the community, its citizens and everyone else, made a tremendous effort. The congressional delegation united and forgot partisan politics and did a job.

The next effort, then, is to find some substitute industry for this area. The Governor has given directions to our department. Clifford Jones, my deputy, is working very closely with all the people involved in our area as well as with the Governor's representative in Washington, to look for substitutes. We have had a number of prospects, some of whom are still interested and some of whom are not still interested. This is going to take time. We have the problem right now of working out a schedule so that our needs to refill Olmsted with private industries will mesh into the needs of the Air Force in their plans. Actually, they want to hold onto some of the buildings that we think are the most useful. The Governor and all the other people involved are trying to work at this, but it's a major and very difficult problem.

As far as retaining these skills here, a great many of these people are going to go, and I think that is a loss to us. I think that the Harrisburg group, in purchasing the industrial park land, is taking the proper steps to diversify the economic base so it no longer will be so dependent upon Government and military employment. The drive for funds here—a half-million dollars raised—is a step in the right direction. But it's going to take all the effort of State government, the county groups and the Federal officials to work this out in a way that is going to ease the blow for us.

Question. Is there anything specific?

Answer. Well, we have the present schedule, and we would like to see that schedule modified somewhat to meet our needs more particularly. We are working all the time on prospects. Every prospect that we have—if Olmsted is one of the sites in Pennsylvania that fits the needs of that prospect—we sell it hard. But there are a limited number of industries which can use the facilities of Olmsted. And there is another matter that we have under consideration that we can't make public that I think will offer some hope at Olmsted, too.

Question. Where will our area fit into the new PIDA program?

Answer. Olmsted is in Dauphin County, and Dauphin County is eligible for PIDA assistance at the rate of 30 percent of the cost of a project. Therefore, if an industrial development group in this county were to take title to some of the buildings or some of the facilities there, we could certainly improve or renovate buildings for industry at the expense of PIDA.

Question. You talked of the new scientific advisory program. How is this being set up?

Answer. They are actually the Governor's scientific advisers, and they work with us. They have been appointed, they are at work, they're on their first project, which is exploring the possibilities of rapid transportation improvement as a major Pennsylvania industry. We have a request for $100,000 in the legislature to help finance them. We would hope—we are working, as a matter of fact, already—to get some matching Federal funds to enable this group to keep working. We have, as you know, a General Electric plant in Erie, a great producer of diesel engines and mass transit facilities. Westinghouse Air Brake in Pittsburgh, Mine Safety Appliance Co. and the Westinghouse Electric Co., the Budd Co. in Philadelphia—all are in this mass transportation. We have the skills and knowledge of Pennsylvania Railroad. We'd like to pull all these things together and make a breakthrough in this field of providing new transportation to serve the cities, who really are strangling in highway traffic.

Question. Just how do you go about carrying through on all this advice the scientific advisers will give you?

Answer. Well, each project will obviously have to be considered on its own. Take what this group is doing. Dr. Thomas G. Fox, of the Mellon Institute, Pittsburgh, and Dr. Patrick Conley, of Carnegie Institute of Technology, the scientific advisers, have a committee of about a half-dozen men from all over the State, who are experts in this field. They may ask for proposals from universities and transportation specialists. They might design a whole new program for the State. Or they might design new techniques. One of the things they're thinking about doing is to get a keystone corridor which would run from Pittsburgh to Philadelphia and tie in with the Federal program to develop a high-speed mass transportation system from Washington to Boston. If we could get ourselves into that Federal program with an east-west branch, then we could get experimental funds, possibly money to develop new roadbeds, new stations, new equipment, that kind of thing.

Question. You've talked about the growing emphasis on urban problems and urban affairs. Do you favor the proposal to take away this bureau which you now have and to establish a new Cabinet-level department for the cities?

Answer. I think this is vital. I think it is essential that there be a single focal point at the Cabinet level where the cities and their problems can be dealt with directly with the Governor. This has the strong support, I am sure, of the cities. This is a great area of problem and opportunity, and I think it deserves the highest priority.

Question. Is there anything you'd like to add on how Pennsylvania has improved its economy?

Answer. I would say that there have been three principal things that we've done. The legislature has provided some excellent tools for us. Second, I think the Governor has transformed the "climate." He has made business and industry know that we need them if we're to have jobs. And, finally, I think there has been a very dynamic partnership between private individuals and State government. It has been these three things, all working together, plus the very strong effort at the community level—through the industrial development groups, of which there are 141 all around the State, all pushing hard, all selling hard—that have produced the result we have.

Question. Let's talk a little about politics. In speculation on the 1966 Governor race, your name is always among the top four Republicans mentioned as possible candidates. Let's clear the air on this. Are you interested?

Answer. Well, let me say that I am complimented. I'm delighted. I think that I've had the good fortune to be involved in many of the major programs of this administration. And I've had the very good fortune of really being quite familiar with much of what we have been doing. I think the immediate job is to sustain our momentum and do a whale of a job, producing results for Pennsylvania. I think any red-blooded man in government would obviously be interested in serving this Commonwealth in the role of Governor.

Question. Will you make a decision, one way or another, whether to go after your party's nomination actively later on?

Answer. Yes. I think this is a period when we should concentrate on the November elections at the local level. We also have the job of getting through this legislative session and producing and developing constructive programs. I think when those two things are done, it'll be time. I think the party is very fortunate in having a number of extremely able people, and I think that all of us at that time will make our final decisions.

Question. You've cited the local elections this November. Earlier in the year you were thought to be a prime possibility as a candidate for mayor of Pittsburgh. Why didn't you make the race?

Answer. Again, I was flattered and honored to be thought of, and I love that city. On the other hand, very frankly, I felt that my best contribution—both to the party and to my community and the State—was to stay here. We have a certain amount of momentum going. I think the responsibility is to follow through on this job and complete it, as I undertook to do when I started. And I think, above all, to press home the many advantages that the State now has in the field of attracting industry and developing a sound economy that will sustain us over the next 10 to 15 years.

Question. When overtures were made earlier to you to make this race, you were reported to have given a flat negative answer. Is this true?

Answer. I did say that I thought my duty was to stay here.

Question. One of the major problems your party has, not just in Pennsylvania but across the Nation, is in cities like Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and the rest. What do you think will happen to your party in these big cities?

Answer. I think that programs such as the Governor has announced, where the Republican Party shows a dynamic and positive approach to the problems of the cities—this is a major way of meeting the needs of these cities and thus strengthening our appeal to the people in the cities. I think in the past there has been a belief that the Republican Party was not as interested in the cities. I think we now have proved we are. I think every city has its own local political problems, and we always have to build the organization, block by block, to the point where—strengthened by State government programs—it can do an effective job for the city. City people will want Republicans as their leaders.

Question. Hasn't one of the problems of your party here in Harrisburg been the rural orientation of the Republicans, especially in the legislature?

Answer. I think if you look at the record over the past 2 years, this party has done things that have been good for all of Pennsylvania. This administration and its leadership have stepped up to many an urban problem. We're doing it particularly now with our concentration on mass transit and our look at problems of poverty where I think

we're trying to be as affirmative and constructive as we can. Problems of welfare, under Secretary (Arlin) Adams. The problems of the magistrates, which the attorney general (Walter Alessandroni) is looking at. I think this party, in this State, has in no way slighted the cities. I think there has been a great appreciation of the problems. But we have to tell this story, and it isn't out yet.

Question. You're talking largely of the Governor and his administration's approach. Do you think the same thing holds true in the legislature, though? This will be a changing thing with the new legislative reapportionment. What do you think this will mean?

Answer. Yes, the reapportionment obviously will have an effect upon the balance of power between city and upstate. But I think the upstate legislators have an increasing recognition of the interplay of their problems and the problems of the more concentrated areas.

Question. Certainly this administration has made industrial development and Pennsylvania's prosperity its No. 1 hallmark. Doesn't this entail considerable political risks? Suppose times aren't so good in November of next year—wouldn't this tend to hurt the Republicans pretty badly?

Answer. I think any bold program involves risks. I think the greater the risk, the greater the reward if you're successful. I think we've done our best, and we'll continue to do our best. We just have to hope that the best is going to be good enough to provide jobs for the people of Pennsylvania in the coming years, and that they will recognize what was done.

Question. When you come to political campaigning on prosperity and the economy, how do you sort out what the National Government has done and what you have done?

Answer. It isn't hard—especially when we can see that we have cut our unemployment at three times the rate they've cut it nationally. When we have cut our unemployment at a much greater rate than any of our surrounding, competing industrial States. When, for the first time in the history of Pennsylvania, we drop below the national unemployment rate, and when we actually become a contributor to the national economy instead of a drag on it. Then I think there is something special that is happening in Pennsylvania above and beyond the high level of national prosperity.

I think we can make out this case very well. I think we can go to community after community where people are working, and they can see that the plants are there because of the direct efforts of the local industrial group sustained by the State program, as a direct result of PIDA, which has been not only extended in scope but also enlarged in dollars by this administration.

Where you see highway improvements. Where you see many of the other things that this administration has brought to the people.

Question. One of the problems you face then, from the standpoint of politics, is a continuance of the upturn in the economy?

Answer. Yes. If we have continued improvement in the State situation, this is certainly going to be something that we are going to bring to the attention of the people as something this administration should be credited with to a very large degree.

I do think there is a new climate. There is a new attitude. I've just been going through a series of letters. We've mailed out 22,000 booklets to industrialists all over the country, and the attitude of these people and the manner in which they talk about Pennsylvania today is so different from what I met when I first started calling on companies 2 years ago. They are interested in us and sympathetic with our efforts.

Our Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask that a recent speech of Mr. Earl W. Kintner, an outstanding member of the Antitrust Bar and former Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This address concerns the role that Congress plays as the architect of our competitive free enterprise system, and I believe it will be of considerable interest to many of the Members and others.

Excerpts from this address follow:

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY SELF-REGULATION IN OUR COMPETITIVE FREE ENTERPRISE ECONOMY

(Portions of the statement of Earl W. Kintner, Washington, D.C., before the Smaller Business Association of New England, National Press Club, Washington, D.C., May 27, 1965)

I am honored and delighted to be here today. I hope that you have had a fruitful tour this year in Washington's marble halls and vaulted executive offices. In reviewing recent statistical studies dealing with the health of smaller business in the United States, it is most encouraging to see that the prognosis is excellent. New business incorporations have increased for the third consecutive year to the astounding record of 198,000, and business failures have dropped to the smallest number since 1956.

Our country has shown to the world the tremendous opportunities for economic growth which are uniquely provided in a private capitalistic system. This is a consideration which is valuable to bear in mind as we begin this examination of our competitive free enterprise system, and the grand plan of Congress to regulate and preserve this precious asset.

It was 75 years ago—in 1890—when the mood on Capitol Hill was one of grave concern over the economic future of our country. These were the days of the robber barons, the Whisky Trust, the Lead Trust, the Sugar Trust and others. Such concentrations of economic power, coupled with abuses and potential for abuse, furnished the impetus for enactment of the cornerstone of our Federal antitrust laws—the Sherman Act of 1890.

The Sherman Act was designed by Congress to police the outer boundaries of competitive activity, beyond which there ceases to exist the economic forces of supply and demand, and the free-market considerations of price, quality, and service. In short, the Sherman Act was, and is, aimed at preserving competition by declaring unlawful those acts and practices which impinge on the free play of economic forces. Thus, combinations and conspiracies in restraint of trade were declared unlawful, as well as monopolization and attempts to monopolize. In addition to such per se offenses as agreements to fix prices, to allocate and divide markets, and to engage in group boycotts, the Sherman Act has been used over the years to attack unlawful concentrations of monopoly power in such diverse industries as petroleum, pullman railroad cars, tobacco, aluminum, newspapers, shoe machinery, and others.

Shortly after the turn of the 20th century, there emerged a growing concern over the ineffectiveness of the Sherman Act to curb certain forms of "incipient" conduct which were not technically trespasses of these outer boundaries embraced by the Sherman Act. So it was that Congress acted again in the Wilson administration to provide laws which were aimed at prohibiting certain specific acts and practices which may substantially lessen competition. Again the theme was one of freeing private enterprise from the shackles of conduct which would affect adversely the free play of economic forces. The Clayton Act of 1914 generally prohibited certain tie-in and exclusive dealing agreements, price discrimination practices and mergers which may give rise to adverse competitive effects. Also in 1914, the Federal Trade Commission was established by Congress with broad powers to curb unfair methods of competition, thus forming today's partner in antitrust enforcement with the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Then came the great depression. Our country became paralyzed in an economic crisis, and cries for relief were heard from all quarters. This was the time when the Securities and Exchange Act was passed along with laws regulating banking, and other activities of commerce, and diverse crash programs were instituted to bring our country out of economic chaos. This was the time, too, of the NRA—The National Recovery Administration—with its codes of unfair competition. After the NRA was buried by the Supreme Court on constitutional grounds, there emerged a plea for laws which would prevent economically powerful buyers from extracting price concessions from suppliers, which smaller and weaker buyers were unable to secure. The economic buying power of the grocery chain stores, vis-a-vis the ma and pa grocery stores was cited as the prime example of the need for strengthening our price discrimination laws.

In 1936 Congress responded. It enacted a law designed to strengthen and expand the prohibitions against price discrimination provided by the original Clayton Act of 1914. The Robinson-Patman Act thus came into being. This act, curiously enough, ended up primarily as a series of prohibitions aimed at the seller, although we have seen that the primary concern of Congress was the economic power of large buyers.

Section 2(a) of the Robinson-Patman Act prevents a seller satisfying the requisite jurisdictional standards, from charging different prices in connection with the contemporaneous sale of the same commodities, to two different purchasers, where adverse competitive effects may arise. But such price differences condemned under section 2(a) are defensible, if the seller is able to cost justify the price difference, or if the price concession to one purchaser is made in good faith to meet the lower price of a competitor, or if a distress merchandise sale is involved.

Sections 2(d) and 2(e) require any seller granting promotional allowances, services, or facilities in connection with the sale of commodities, to make such promotional aids available to all competing purchasers on a proportionally equal basis, again, without regard to "competitive effects."

Only when we reach section 2(f) of the Robinson-Patman Act do we find a prohibition on buyers dealing with price discrimination. Under section 2(f) of the act a buyer is prohibited from "knowingly inducing" a price discrimination which is unlawful under section 2(a).

After World War II ended and Congress turned again to an examination of our free enterprise economy, the attention was focused on mergers, and the weakness of the Clayton Act of 1914 in combating mergers with potentially adverse anticompetitive effects. The most notable weakness of the

original act of 1914 was that it referred only to corporate acquisitions of stock and share capital; it was silent as to asset acquisitions and as to mergers and consolidations. As a consequence, Congress amended and strengthened the antimerger prohibitions of the Clayton Act, by referring to any acquisition of assets as within the ambit of the jurisdiction of section 7. Today, the major developments in antitrust enforcement are in the field of mergers under section 7 of the amended Clayton Act; some indication of the current activity in the field of merger law lies in the fact that in the last 3 years the Supreme Court has rendered decisions in no less than eight merger cases.

Congress, in enacting these fundamental antitrust laws in 1890, in 1914, in 1936, and in 1950 reflected the grave public concern over the economic vitality of our economy, and the desire to foster and preserve the opportunity of all businessmen to share in the fruits of our free enterprise system.

I will, however, pause briefly here to pay my respects to those businessmen and their counsel who maintain that the Robinson-Patman Act is contrary to the spirit of the other antitrust laws, that it is anticompetitive in effect, and that it is impossible of compliance by businessmen.

Turning first to the question of compliance, it is my professional judgment that any businessman and his counsel who wish to do so may devise lawful profitable practices for living well within the letter and spirit of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Perhaps I could most succinctly answer the other two common criticisms of the act by quoting here from an extensive interview which I had recently with Mr. Charles Horton, editor of Supply House Times (Mar.-Apr. 1965 issues):

"Question. Some wholesalers I have talked to are against trade practice rules because to them it represents 'Government interference with business.' Many people today are concerned about what they call big government and creeping socialism, with the clumsy hand of bureaucracy injecting itself insidiously into the workings of the economy; curtailing liberty, paralyzing initiative and undermining our cherished institutions of free enterprise and competition. Any comment?

"Mr. KINTNER. The first of the laws, the Sherman Act, was passed 75 years ago with only one dissenting vote in both Houses of Congress. The Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act have been on the books 50 years, while the Robinson-Patman Act is 29 years old.

"Thus they all predate the so-called big government era. They have endured and have been continually strengthened in their interpretation and enforcement because they express a virtually unanimous consensus of the American people. They have never been a partisan matter, nor has their validity been affected by the passage of time or the many changes and fluctuations in our economic condition.

"The whole purpose of these laws is to foster competition and preserve a free economy. The restrictions imposed on business by the Sherman Act and the other laws that followed were minimum restraints; the least that could have been done to keep business free. There are two alternatives to our antitrust laws; one is cartels, or private monoply; the other is public monopolization through Government control or outright Government ownership. In either case, it is a closed economy with no place for the small independent and no opportunity for the new entrant.

"There is no question that our economy was rapidly becoming cartelized when the Sherman Act was passed. Fortunately, we put the brakes on in time. We developed laws which limit the absolute freedom of business to do anything they wished in the interest of preserving a free economy of opportunity; of protecting the independent and the small businessman, and preserving a high degree of competition in the marketplace.

"You might say that to preserve competition we have wisely chosen to put certain restraints on competition; but a type of competition that needs to be restrained. This country doesn't believe in dog-eat-dog competition where the powerful can use their size and naked economic power to destroy or gobble up the less powerful. It really isn't competition without equality; and that's what these laws seek to preserve—equality in the marketplace.

"All games have to be placed by rules. Football has its book of rules and its referees, but that doesn't keep if from being a tough, fast, and competitive game. The business game, too, must have its rules. The only kind of contest that doesn't have rules to govern it is the barroom brawl. The American people do not want their economic life conducted on that basis.

ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

"Question. In the opinion of some, these laws, particularly the Robinson-Patman Act, tend to deprive the country of the benefits of competition by putting an umbrella over inefficiency and preventing the more efficient—which is to say, the larger units—from achieving the full possibilities of their superior competence. Thus, the public is victimized through higher prices in order to keep inept and inefficient little producers, wholesalers, and retailers in business.

Mr. KINTNER. "I think of the Robinson-Patman Act as an equality of opportunity statute. It seeks to insure that competing business units will start the competitive race at the same starting line, no matter what happens beyond that point.

"Question. Some lawyers and some businessmen say that the Robinson-Patman Act works at cross purposes to the other antitrust laws. Both the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act forbid price fixing. Yet, the Robinson-Patman Act, they say, introduces an unnatural rigidity into the free play of price competition. By requiring the vendor to sell all or most of his customers at the same price, it becomes a form of price fixing. How about that?

Mr. KINTNER. "I concede that it does tend to stabilize prices somewhat. But it is a desirable stabilization in the interest of free pricing is not the same as price fixing. The and fair competition. Nondiscriminatory pricing is not the same as price fixing. The Robinson-Patman Act does not require all businessmen to sell at the same price. It does not seek to control margins or markups or resale prices. Nor does it require the individual supplier to sell all of his customers at the same price. But he must, as a general rule, sell all competing customers at the same price for like merchandise in like quantity. On the other hand, if one customer buys in much larger quantities than the other, and if the supplier has economies in serving the larger customer, he can pass the savings on in the form of a lower price.

"I can't see how this requirement for fairness interferes with the freedom of the marketplace or the freedom of the individual supplier. It actually protects him from the unfair and unlawful exercise of economic power by large customers. And in a certain sense, it protects him from himself.

"In actual practice, when a supplier grants a discriminatory price to a favored customer, the other suppliers tend to meet it or go below it. And the competitors of the favored customer then demand competitive prices from their supply sources, also. It becomes a vicious circle which can throw an entire industry into chaos, drive the profit margin down to zero, and cause the weaker members to sell out or go into bankruptcy.

"Discriminating prices always weaken an industry. It saps its economic health and vitality by driving its profit levels down, down, down. The time soon comes when the industry can no longer afford to keep abreast of the new technology, or improve its products and services, or reinvest in new facilities and methods, or upgrade its personnel, or enlarge its markets through sales promotion and advertising.

"But when competition and pricing is fair, businessmen make reasonable profits. This is good for them, good for their industry, and good for the country. Taxes come out of profits, so does progress; so does economic growth."

It is worthwhile to examine briefly other methods developed by Congress which enhance the opportunity of smaller businessmen to compete. Perhaps the most frank and significant effort by Congress in this direction is the formation of the Small Business Administration. Congress has, under the Small Business Act, provided machinery for giving positive aid to small businessmen—to insure that competition can thrive from this economic base because of governmental financial assistance and counseling. To quote from the Small Business Act:

"It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as possible the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise."

A clearer endorsement of small business by Congress would be hard to envision. Through the SBA, impressive activity has taken place. In 1964, the SBA loaned $425.8 million, 10,700 separate transactions, at very favorable interest rates. A special concern for granting business loans to businessmen of minority groups, notably Negroes, developed into a program of making available 6-year loans of amounts up to $6,000. Management counseling and assistance to small businessmen is provided under the SCORE program—the Service Corps of Retired Executives, which now numbers 2,000 retired executives who have volunteered their services. The SCORE program is aimed primarily at assisting businessmen with fewer than 25 employees in learning the sophisticated intracies of management and competition. Small business may be able to secure favored consideration in Government procurement contracts, and special disaster loans, as well as favored treatment in areas of economic duress, like Appalachia.

The various House and Senate committees, and subcommittees concerned with small business, commerce, and antitrust all have an open door to matters of public interest which affect the competitive well-being of small businessmen.

Two conclusions are hopefully clear. First, competitive free enterprise has flourished because of, and not in spite of, our Federal Government. Congress, the architect of our competitive free enterprise system by constitutional mandate, has developed a product of which we can be proud, and which business executives large and small have a deep concern in preserving. This flows into my second conclusion; namely, the responsibility which is imposed on business executives to preserve and enhance our free enterprise system.

In the final analysis, given the benefit of an immensely successful system of congressional regulation of private enterprise, the burden rests squarely on the shoulders of exercutives everywhere to educate themselves as to what the law requires, and to stay within the boundaries of the law. Self-education, and self-regulation are essential to a healthy system of competition in any particular industry. In learning what the law requires, not only do you avoid the serious consequences of an antitrust violation, but you perform two valuable services to your-

self and to the free enterprise system: (1) you learn how to use the law as a positive aid to developing business policies which take full advantage of what the law allows you (and your competitors) to do, and (2) you preserve the public confidence in our competitive free enterprise system, thereby avoiding congressional action which might otherwise be in the public interest, because of failure or breakdown of self-regulation in a particular industry. Please, always keep firmly in your mind that if illegal practices, whether they tend to create monopoly, restrain competition, or deceive the public, clog the marketplace, the public must act. If laws do not exist to cover the practice which injures competition, the Federal or State Governments will fill the vacuum with more law and more regulation.

This process eventually can leave the businessman, whether he be large, medium size, or small, stripped of all but the rags and tatters of his freedoms. The alternative is good faith, meaningful compliance with the existing laws that regulate business conduct. This involves self-education, self-discipline, and self-responsibility on the part of all American business.

This is Small Business Week. Your concern over the economic vitality of smaller business in New England constitutes a tremendous public service, and I wish you every success in the difficult challenges which lie ahead.

Long Island Presbytery Resolution on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, recently I received from the Presbytery of Long Island, N.Y., a resolution on Vietnam. The Presbytery represents 60 churches, 3 preaching stations, and 32,091 communicant members in the counties of Nassau and Suffolk. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution, adopted by the Presbytery at its stated meeting at Northport, N.Y., on April 27, 1965, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we are concerned about Vietnam because of the deplorable destruction of lives and property and because the peace of the world is being threatened by events taking place there, and

Whereas we are concerned that the aspirations of the people of emerging nations for a better life be fulfilled,

The Presbytery of Long Island, motivated by Christian concern, commends the President on his forthright Vietnam speech of April 7, 1965, and urges:

1. That he continue to make every effort, formal or informal, to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam situation, in the spirit of the words of President Kennedy, "Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate."

2. That he implement plans designed to contribute to the satisfaction of the rising expectations of the Vietnamese people through increased nonmilitary foreign aid, realizing that we can only win the respect and friendship of the people by the quality of our concern for them, and our understanding of their desires and points of view.

3. That he continue to encourage other concerned nations to join with us in the nonpartisan regional development of southeast Asia, realizing that by working together nations can improve relationships with one another and with underdeveloped populations.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, a year ago the Nation was shocked by the brutal slaying of three young civil rights workers. The lives of Andrew Goodman, Michael H. Schwerner, and James E. Chaney were brutally snuffed out. Their crime: They sought to bring a ray of hope into the life of the downtrodden Mississippi Negro, shackled by years of bigotry.

Although I am confident that this body will enact an effective voting rights bill that will strike one more blow against bigotry and segregation, we still have a long road to travel.

A year after the slaying of these young idealists, their murderers have not been brought to trial.

A year after the slaying of these young idealists, the sister of one of the three victims, Barbara Chaney Moss, reminds us that the situation in Philadelphia, Miss., near where the three young men were slain, has changed little.

She told a reporter:

It's important that people keep remembering what went on here last year. Things won't get any better for Negroes here unless they remember.

And on this unhappy anniversary it is important that we reaffirm our commitment to the ideal of equal rights for all citizens.

Perhaps no one can articulate this ideal better than Nathan H. Schwerner, father of one of the slain workers, who instead of merely succumbing to grief tried to do something to advance the goals that his son Mickey believed in.

Mr. Schwerner, in an article in the June 20, 1965, New York Herald Tribune, looks back on the crime and the contribution his son and the other two victims made to the fellowship of man. The article follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 20, 1965]

AN ARTICLE BY NATHAN H. SCHWERNER

It is strange, almost unbelievable to me, that because of the brutal death of my son, there has crystallized a clarity of both conviction and commitments so deep that they have come to pervade my whole life. I have tried to determine how and why this has come about.

My wife and I had lived with great fear, although with true pride, during the first 5 months of 1964, when our 24-year-old Mickey and his young wife first went to Mississippi. The pride was borne of a deep conviction in our family that fulfillment in life is attained by using one's ability to be of service to people and that our son had found this direction in which to channel his own talents. The fear stemmed from our knowledge of the dangers to anyone who attempted to cooperate with southern Negroes in throwing off the yoke of segregation and second-class citizenship.

Yet the shock of loss in late June was so sharp as to result in an inability to think clearly—to do anything. When, in the early hours of June 22, I learned of the disappearance of our son and his coworkers, James Chaney, of Meridian, Miss., a Negro, and Andrew Goodman, a white student from New York, I strongly feared the worst. And when, at the White House, President Johnson told Mr. and Mrs. Robert Goodman and me that the burned-out station wagon had been found, I knew that we would never again see our children.

TWO COURSES

Then as the days wore on, through the grief and the sense of utter futility, came inner probings: How was I, as a father, as a husband, and as a man, to face the horrible situation? Two courses seemed to be open. On the one hand, I could attempt to pick up the strands of a normal life, quietly helping the cause of people, a cause I shared with my son. On the other hand, because of the public spotlight under which our family had been placed, I could participate actively in the struggle for human dignity that is known as the movement. I decided upon the latter course and I let this be known.

What impelled this decision? I cannot fully answer that question. I was keenly aware that this was a road that would help open the wounds that my dear ones and I had suffered. Nevertheless, I felt that I owed it to my son, and to all those who have similarly dedicated themselves, to do everything in my power to help bring sanity to our great country.

Continually before me was the question: Why were Mickey, James, and Andy murdered? Was it an insane act? The result of a resentful whim of a group of rednecks? Or was it more purposive and, if so, what were the motivating factors?

The indictments against 18 men lodged in Mississippi by the U.S. Justice Department make it clear that, in the opinion of the Attorney General and his staff of experts, there was a careful, long-planned conspiracy to kill Mickey. What could he have done in 5 short months to have caused people to plot his death? I have believed the answer to this lies deep in our entire society, not merely in the Black Belt of the South. The events of the last several years, and those in Selma, Ala., last March have confirmed this belief.

The vast majority of us whites has not, to this day, accepted the fact that every human being is as much an American—is as much entitled to respect as a person—as we who are white.

I fear that until the great bulk of our people not only realize this simple fact, but live by such realization, there will be more—far more—turmoil in our country.

ONE BASIC REASON

I strongly believe that resistance to this realization was one basic reason for the murders. Mickey and his coworkers had been helping to bring to southern Negroes a measure of identity as citizens—as Americans. And I feel sure that a major factor in the killings was the conspiracy to deter other rights workers from coming down to help accelerate that process.

But this was not all. There was an equally important factor: although most civil rights workers were Negroes, Mickey was white. His camaraderie with Negro people, his growing acceptance by the Negro community as just another person, posed a threat. Suppose whites, in increasing numbers, especially young people from the South, were to establish rapport with the Negroes? For such rapport, founded on mutual respect, was

being built through Mickey's establishment of the Meridian Community Center jointly with James Chaney and its growing role in the lives of more and more of the Negro people of Meridian. That center became a place where people could congregate, could learn the basics of citizenship and a good deal more. With sewing machines and materials sent down to the center, they were able to make for themselves a few articles of new clothing—made by and for people who had never worn anything but hand-me-downs from the homes in which many of the women work as domestics. In addition to the organizational support of the Council of Federated Organization (COFO), my wife and I, together with a host of friends, were of some small help in supplying materials, machines, stationery, books, and many other items so sorely needed for education and self-help. Mickey's example could not be tolerated; he had to be stopped.

What the conspirators and their mentors overlooked, however, was the fact that the American people had at least part of a conscience. That part was aroused by the fact that two whites albeit young Jews from New York, were brutally murdered. As a result, the movement got a national impetus which no previous event had engendered. But what about James Chaney, who, for 5 months, helped build the center, went into outlying areas with Mickey to establish freedom schools, who became more a brother to Mickey than a coworker?

Let me answer that question with another: What about Herbert Lee? I am ashamed, as an American, that I had not known the name until August 1964. Lee was a Negro farmer in Amite County, Miss., who was murdered September 25, 1961, because he had attempted to assert his right to vote as an American citizen. There was hardly a ripple of American conscience stirred by Mr. Lee's death, or by the hundreds of clandestine murders, disappearances and beatings of Negroes in the Deep South. And I am convinced that if James Chaney had been murdered alone, there would have been no comparable awakening of white Americans.

I think of a few more names. We all know of the Reverend James Reeb and Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, both murdered in Alabama in March 1965. I think it was right for public figures and people from all over the Nation to express their grief and their indignation. But where were those expressions of grief and indignation a short time before when a young American was shot to death by an Alabama State trooper for putting his body between his mother and the club of that officer? Where were the dignitaries representing Federal, State, municipal, trade union, churlch, fraternal and other organizations at his funeral? Jimmy Lee Jackson was black.

The vast majority of us whites has not, to this day, accepted the fact that every human being is as much an American—is as much entitled to respect as a person—as we who are white.

During these months we have received much solace from intimates, from acquaintances and from strangers. People from all walks of life and from all over the world have expressed their sympathy. Many have also made kind comments about the courage of the three families involved—most justified, in my opinion, in the case of Mrs. Fanny Chaney and her children. But for me, one of the most moving experiences occurred last August while my wife and I were at the Atlantic City National Convention of the Democratic Party. It was during the historic attempt by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MFDP) to have its delegates seated in place of those "elected" at primaries in Mississippi from which Negroes were systematically excluded.

BEYOND SYMPATHY

A white-haired Negro, pulling himself tall and erect, approached us, clapsed our hands, and said simply, "I am a delegate of MFDP from Lauderdale County. I would not be here if Mickey had not come to see me." We were very much touched by this living indication of the effectiveness of our son's work. But beyond that, I was impressed by this gentleman's words for another reason. I was aware of the courage it must have taken for this citizen, oppressed for his more than 60 years of life, even to have permitted Mickey to talk to him. Thereafter, I knew, he must have attended local MFDP meetings, must have gone to a county convention, the State convention and now to the national convention. All this he must have done with the knowledge that on his return home, he and his family might well meet with both physical violence and economic reprisal—loss of job, curtailment of credit, a thousand things. To me, such courage has transcended all others because it is typical of many thousands of Negroes who walk in constant fear.

More and more, I have pondered the question of how to move large numbers of our people beyond expressions of sympathy and admiration. It is heartwarming to realize that so much of America has identified itself with those of us who have become closely involved in the struggle for freedom of all of our citizens. But how far does this identification go?

I have often wondered what would happen if, by State laws and by oppression, violence and intimidation, all citizens of Irish or Italian extraction in New York State were denied the right to vote, or if, by similar means, all persons of Scandinavian or Teutonic ancestry in Minnesota were denied the right to vote. What an uproar there would be from every corner of the land. And yet, that is exactly what is happening in Mississippi, in Alabama and elsewhere. Isn't it time we adopted one standard for all Americans?

I certainly hope, as I write, that all the measures President Johnson has advanced for securing Negroes' right to vote will be implemented rapidly. But I have become convinced that legislation, carefully as it may be drawn, is subject to the tortuous delays of long, drawn-out litigation. Those people who are in absolute control of the political machinery in a given area have always been capable of frustrating the will of the majority of our citizenry for indefinite periods. This has been so, historically, in the South, until now, and there is little reason to doubt that it will continue to be so unless a means of shaking that control is found.

There is a means, however, whereby that control can be partly shaken in the next brief period. That is the situation, soon to come before the U.S. House of Representatives, in which the voices of all of us can be heard with immediate effect. It is a situation which can go far to undermine the political power illegally assumed by the dominant people in the Deep South. It is one upon which can be based major changes in the social and economic suppression of hundreds of thousands of American citizens. I refer to the challenge to unseat the five men purported to have been elected to the House from Mississippi.

THE CHALLENGE

I have been told that the challenge is supported by about 600 depositions which clearly indicate denial of the right to vote to great numbers of people. Every bit of testimony was subject to the right of cross-examination by attorneys for the challenged five men, and many of the witnesses were cross-examined. Yet the five so challenged have failed to adduce a single item of testimony on their own behalfs to rebut the evidence of the illegality of their election.

I cannot understand how we can face the world or face ourselves if we permit people elected without even the semblance of democratic process to sit in our Congress. Their voices affect not only the affairs of Mississippi, but every facet of national and international life in which our Federal Government plays a role. They are our Representatives, not merely those of Mississippi. I urge every American to press upon his own Representative the duty to unseat the five challenged Mississippians.

During the year, many people, many organizations, have created awards in the names of the three young men murdered in Mississippi. Little would be more fitting to memorialize their sacrifice, in my opinion, than for Congress to insist that all of its Members be elected by an electorate fully and freely composed of all citizens from any congressional district.

Many of us have long felt that our individual voices are too puny to have an effect upon our communities, our Congressmen, upon any situation. But the enemies of an integrated America, although in a small minority, are outspoken both as individuals and in groups. We, who truly believe that all men are created equal, must make our support most clear in our daily lives, by our financial assistance, and, yes, by our political support. Each of us must help do the job of all of us.

Aiding Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, if President Johnson intends to authorize any more food for Egypt, the American people deserve a clear explanation of how it could possibly serve the national interest. Reports out of Egypt indicate that the President is planning to release $37 million of surplus commodities. The administration will not deny it. It is my opinion that any decision to release this food should take note of the wishes of Congress. An editorial, that follows, from the Chicago Tribune of June 18, 1965, indicates that any further aid to Egypt will help our enemies:

AIDING OUR ENEMIES

Reports persist in Cairo that President Johnson is about to authorize release of $37.5 million worth of surplus food to the United Arab Republic. This is the shipment, designated under the current 3-year aid program, which Congress blocked last February after an Egyptian mob burned the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library and a truculent President Nasser told this country to go drink seawater—slang for "go to hell." Our State Department, however, continues to deny that any decision to release the food has been made.

Nasser not only wants the food he thinks is coming to him under the current aid program which expires at the end of this month, but he also would like a new 3-year program to provide $500 million worth of food. That would raise the cost of American food aid to the United Arab Republic to well over $1.5 billion since 1954.

Now comes a new report from informed Cairo sources that the United Arab Republic has violated its aid agreement by diverting 40 percent of its rice crop from its own food-short population and selling it abroad. More than half of the rice exports are reported to have gone to Communist nations, including Red China and Cuba. Thus, while the United Arab Republic was accepting American food aid, which amounted to $175

million last year, it was selling a large share of its own food to two Communist countries against which the United States has trade embargoes.

Incredible as it may seem, our aid agreement with Nasser permits him to sell to these two countries, among others, but he pledged himself to restrict exports in any 1 year to no more than about 32.5 percent of the total rice crop.

After Congress balked last February, it relented to the extent of authorizing Mr. Johnson to resume food shipments to the United Arab Republic if he found they were "in the national interest." It is hardly necessary to point out that the United States is trapped in an increasingly hot war in Vietnam, in which Red China has an influential hand. We are up to our necks trying to prevent a Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic where the Red followers of Fidel Castro play a prominent role.

By shipping food to Nasser the United States has been giving aid and comfort to two of our most implacable enemies, Red China and Cuba. If President Johnson intends to authorize any more food for the United Arab Republic, the American people deserve a clear explanation of how it could possibly serve the national interest.

Our Guy in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco News Call-Bulletin of June 10, 1965, carried an interesting story by Guy Wright of Capt. James D. Strachan, who, I am proud to say, is a valued constituent serving his country with honor in Vietnam. This is a moving account of Captain Strachan's experiences and talents, and in these days of teach-ins I particularly commend it to my colleagues:

OUR GUY IN VIETNAM—THE UGLY-WAR AMERICAN OF GOOD WILL

(By Guy Wright)

QUANG NGAI.—At dusk Capt. James D. Strachan and I left by helicopter to bring back the bodies.

Jim took along his rope.

"I'll loop it around a leg and drag them first," he said, "in case they've been booby-trapped."

An infinite sadness came over his young face. "I had to do the same thing when I brought back O'Sullivan," he added.

Bringing back bodies isn't his real job. He's an infantry adviser and one of the best. He brings back bodies because they ask him and someone has to do it, but I wished they'd ask someone else to bring back these particular bodies.

They were Vietnamese and he would take it harder than most Americans because to him the Vietnamese are very real people.

Captain Strachan speaks Vietnamese. How he happened to learn it is interesting and offers an insight into the man.

Only 26, Jim Strachan has been a captain for 2 years. He gives Chicago as his hometown but he's a professional soldier, a West Pointer, and his real home is the Army.

He has lived in many places.

In Thailand, one day, he stopped to help a child who had been hit by a bus. The next morning a Buddhist monk in saffron robes appeared at the American compound and sought him out.

"He said he'd seen what I did and wanted to repay me by teaching me Thai," Jim explained. "He drilled me like a Prussian drillmaster. Before long I was speaking pretty good Thai."

With that basis of a kindred language, Jim took a spare-time course in Vietnamese and later underwent intensive training at the Monterey Language School.

"So I had a little headstart when I came here," he said.

The truth is that he speaks fluent Vietnamese. More than that, he has an instinctive compassion and understanding for these people.

Other Americans lump them all together as good or bad. Jim Strachan never does that. He sees them as individuals and even the individuals as men with both strengths and weaknesses.

When everyone was down on a dai uy (captain) who had blundered, Jim said quietly, "He's done a good job but this time he made a mistake."

His face was sad when he said it. In fact he looks sad most of the time. I think he sees things other men miss.

I wanted to ask him about that but I didn't because he isn't a person who tells you his life story the first time he meets you.

I wish more American advisers could speak Vietnamese. From watching Jim work I'm convinced it would help immeasurably.

Another adviser was having differences with his Vietnamese counterpart in planning a patrol. It turned into a pidgin English row.

Jim went over and talked with the Vietnamese officer in his own language and soon things were straightened out.

Another time two Vietnamese soldiers started taking down our shade tent in the middle of an operation, leaving us in the broiling sun. They were about to get lynched until Jim intervened.

He learned that the tent had been borrowed from the Vietnamese after a helicopter blew down our own. Now they needed it back. But as a favor to Jim, they agreed to put ours up for us again.

In the course of the day he comforted a widow who came to watch a plane take her husband away in his coffin.

He handled the intelligence debriefing of a Vietnamese pilot, helped a stranded Vietnamese photographer, and did many other things, all the while performing his regular work.

Now, at dusk, a Vietnamese major had learned that two of his soldiers lay dead on a river bank. Naturally, he brought his problem to Captain Strachan.

Going for bodies at dusk is risky business. The Vietcong use the dead as decoys for ambushes. But Jim couldn't refuse this man because they spoke the same language, in more ways than one.

So he coiled his rope and the 'copter took off. We swooped over the sandy river bank where the bodies were supposed to be, then upstream and down.

We made several passes but they clearly weren't there.

"Fishing boats were working along here today," Jim said. "A fisherman must have found them."

I'm ashamed of myself, but I was glad that we didn't find the bodies. I'd seen and smelled enough death for one day.

Jim gave the pilot the go home sign with his thumb and the 'copter wheeled toward its pad.

Once again Jim's knowledge of the language proved valuable. If some other American had returned without the bodies, the Vietnamese major would have suspected he didn't really look.

But when Jim said they weren't there the man accepted his word.

His mission finished, the young captain dropped the coiled rope with utter distaste.

"Let's go to dinner," he said and smiled. But even his smile was sad.

National Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I include an editorial appearing in the June 10, 1965, issue of the Catholic Standard of Washington, D.C., entitled "National Course," highly commending the leadership and courage of President Johnson in the field of foreign affairs.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Catholic Standard, June 10, 1965]

NATIONAL COURSE

The recent speeches of the President on our foreign policy should have a beneficial and cumulative effect on all, especially our critics at home. He has been spelling out, repeatedly, the precise purpose of our actions in a manner that cannot fail eventually to convince the world.

The President's speech at Catholic University appropriately emphasized our moral commitment to mankind, "For America's only interests in the world today are those we regard as inseparable from our moral duties to mankind. This is the truth, the abiding truth about America. Yet all through this century, men in other lands have—for reasons of their own—elected to discount moral duty as the motivation that moves America."

The actions of the United States in Vietnam and in Santo Domingo give substance to the words of the President. Despite the caterwauling against our action in those countries by some critics, the events have dramatically demonstrated that such action was indispensable.

The critics of our continuing action in South Vietnam, especially the intellectuals, become tonguetied about the constant atrocities of the Vietcong; the murder of 700 civilians in 4 months of this year, the kidnaping of more than 3,000 civilians, of whom about 300 were Government officials, as well as the massive invasion of the whole country by the Vietcong forces. In the other disturbed area, Santo Domingo, and our Armed Forces are being withdrawn as Latin American forces are sent in—which proves the continuing need for peacekeeping forces.

Fortunately, the President has indicated that he will not be deterred from following the course he has charted. In stating his goal, he used the words of Pope John XXIII, "There is an immense task incumbent on all men of good will, namely, the task of restoring the relations of the human family in truth, in justice, in love, and in freedom."

JUSTICE IN LOUISIANA

The cause of justice in the South, particularly in Louisiana, is once again on trial. The occasion for the trial is the murder of a Negro deputy sheriff of Bogalusa. Evidence indicates that the murder may have been a carefully planned ambush. It is time that the South show by a fair trial that a spirit of justice exists.

This latest murder and other murders connected with integration highlight the obliga-

tion upon all men of good will in the South to join in hastening an orderly transition to full equality for all. The advice of Archbishop Cody, of New Orleans, is particularly timely and appropriate.

"This tragic lesson of hate should serve as a warning to all of Louisiana that men must come together on official ground to determine the future course of the State. Both the State and local communities should begin immediately establishing committees composed of representatives of both races to provide for the orderly transition to full equality for all.

"Men with venom coursing through their veins where warm human blood should flow have turned away from their Governor and mayor and as a result a Bogalusa law enforcement officer lies dead."

As God can inspire men to bring good out of evil, we hope that this murder in Louisiana and others in the South will arouse the moral indignation necessary to spur men of good will to take the lead in racial matters in the South. Archbishop Cody's words have given them a rallying point which should not be neglected.

MISSION GENEROSITY

The generosity of Catholics the world over to the missions reached an alltime high last year. Yet, despite this record generosity, the needs of the missions were not satisfied indicating the tremendous growth of the missions and the need for continued generosity from all Catholics.

Catholics contributed $31 million to the missions last year, most of this going to the Pontifical Society for the Propagation of the Faith. The propagation's contributions increased by $2 million over 1963.

Archbishop Raymond Etteldorf, the secretary general of the propagation, pointed out that the increase in contributions should give no cause for relaxation on the part of Catholics toward the missions. As an example. Archbishop Etteldorf states that in 1964, the Society for the Propagation of the Faith was able to meet a little less than one-third of the many petitions it received.

The work of the missions must continue and must increase. It is the work of every Catholic since we all have the obligation to bring Christ and His gospel to the entire world. This work requires money, and this is our task too. The support of the missions should not be something piecemeal but should be something we do as often and as generously as possible.

The Late Bernard M. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, there is little that I can tell my colleagues about Bernard M. Baruch. Adviser to Presidents, distinguished wartime servant, financial genius, and park bench philosopher, Mr. Baruch, who died Sunday at the age of 94, will be sorely missed by all of us. Knowing that my colleagues share my feelings, I therefore call to their attention the following editorials from today's editions:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

OUR AUTHENTIC ELDER STATESMAN

In the Japanese Empire the "genro," the elder statesmen, were a regular, if unofficial, part of the governing apparatus. In the United States, it is usually only ex-Presidents who are listened to ex officio, so to speak. But by wisdom and character Bernard M. Baruch carved out a position of influence upon the course of public events that is perhaps unique in our history.

Some men have achieved moral authority by long service in the legislature; others (Col. Edward M. House is an example) by being the confidants of a President. Mr. Baruch never stood for elective office and was close to no particular President. He was, however, adviser to many, and when he spoke, the American people listened.

His name was especially associated with two major themes: economic mobilization in wartime, and international control of nuclear energy. In neither were his ideas wholly successful, but he made immense contributions to American efficiency in two World Wars, and his untiring efforts to harness nuclear power for humanity's good were evidence of his farsightedness and his broad patriotism. If there is ever a global nuclear authority, it will owe much to Mr. Baruch's eloquence in the United Nations nearly two decades ago, as well as to his unflagging personal zeal in the years that followed.

In addition, there are very many, in and out of public service, who have profited by Mr. Baruch's selfless counsel. He provided a wellspring of wisdom which did not know partisan lines and which was offered to all who could effect events in the national interest. His symbol was the park bench; his true instrument was the telephone. His mind was keen, but his manner mellow, and he will be remembered with gratitude, pride, and affection as America's authentic elder statesman.

[From the New York Times]

BERNARD BARUCH

Bernard Mannes Baruch was a speculator, as he described himself, and an immensely successful one. But he preferred to be known as an adviser to Presidents. He became a power and an authority, but he never quite attained all of the authority or the power that were within his grasp.

Mr. Baruch first demonstrated his remarkable talents during World War I, when President Wilson brought him from Wall Street to Washington. A patriot of vision, he performed valiantly as Chairman of the War Industries Board, mobilizing the economy in a fashion that provided a pattern for World War II. He also displayed an instinctive grasp for the financial facts of political life at the peace conference in Versailles, where he protested in vain against the unrealistic scale of reparations sought from Germany.

His brilliant wartime record could have been the springboard for a political career. Tall and courtly and handsome, he had the essential physical attributes as well as a flair for attracting public attention. But though he had merged from the rough and tumble world of Wall Street, he refused to take part in the hurly-burly of political campaigning. He chose to become a power behind the throne if not quite behind the scenes, for he made himself readily available to the press, proffering his views from a highly publicized bench in Washington's Lafayette Park.

There were times when his advice was heeded. There were other times when it was ignored. His real contribution is hard to measure, however, because despite his devotion to his country, he rarely accepted responsibility for carrying things out. Apart from his World War I experience, his only other important official post was as the first American delegate to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, when he fought hard and long for controlled disarmament. Before and after, he avoided the risks and rewards of public service, appearing instead as a financial sage above the battle.

His imposing record—as a speculator, sportsman, philanthropist—and the almost universal respect in which he was held suggest that he might have achieved even more than he did had he been willing to undertake the public responsibilities of a more active and exposed role.

The Real Alabama—Part XV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the fast and steady growth of of paper production in the United States, together with expanding air transportation facilities, have provided Alabama and the South with increasing potential for economic progress.

The port city of Mobile plays a key role in both of these industries. Two major American industrial organizations with facilities in Mobile relating to paper production and air transportation have joined with others in presenting reasons why they have found this city a pleasant and successful city with which to work.

Following are statements by the American Cyanamid Co. and Eastern Air Lines:

AN INDUSTRIALIST SPEAKS: WHY I LIKE MOBILE

(By K. H. Klipstein, president, American Cyanamid Co., Wayne, N.J.)

Paper production in the United States today is one of the fastest growing factors in America's economy. In recent years, much of that expansion has taken place in the South. And the dynamic community of Mobile has become the chosen location for some of the largest U.S. papermakers.

Back in 1939, American Cyanamid analyzed the growth potentials of the southern paper industry, and selected Mobile as the logical site for its most important paper chemicals plant.

Over the years, as the South's papermaking capacity soared from 21 to 41 percent of total U.S. production, Cyanamid expanded its family of paper chemicals to keep pace with the vital needs of its customers. Today, Cyanamid's Mobile operation is considered the largest and most diversified manufacturing complex in America devoted exclusively to paper chemicals.

It has been a gratifying growth, shaped by a dynamic industry stimulated by creative research, and strengthened by the good will of Mobile's forward looking business leaders, and its other citizens.

Cyanamid takes pride in sharing with Mobile, this partnership in progress.

(By F. D. Hall, president, Eastern Air Lines, New York City)

We at Eastern are keenly interested in efforts to spur industrial development in the Mobile area. They have already produced notable results.

The enthusiastic spirit of your citizens is evident both in Mobile and in distant cities where the efforts being put forth through the Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce are being registered effectively.

Particularly impressive to us, understandably, is the importance given to adequate airport facilities in your program for progress. Such steps as the lengthening of your instrument runway, clearing of approaches

and the improvement of terminal facilities evidence your awareness that air transportation today and in the future is a vital factor in community growth.

Through the years, Eastern has worked with Mobile's civic leadership and has keyed its services to the increasing growth potential of the area. Between March 1955 and March 1964, capacity between Mobile and northern cities has increased nearly 50 percent. Today our fast, popular prop-jet Super Electras serve the area and, in addition to Golden Falcon accommodations, provide both day and night air coach services. Congratulations are due everyone taking part in Mobile's determined drive to attract more industry as a realistic means of strengthening the economy of the area and thus contributing more fully to the further development of Mobile's already notable cultural, educational, and other living advantages.

And to the aviation committee of the Mobile area chamber of commerce, please add my gratitude to the past expression of appreciation from my associates for the outstanding cooperation of its members through the years.

Grassroots Reaction to Internal Revenue Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to draw the attention of the Members to a column which appeared in the Daily Enterprise of Riverside, Los Angeles, Calif., May 13, 1965, by Iris Hayward entitled "Some Taxmen Have a Heart." This comment was drawn to my attention by the Honorable Sheldon Cohen, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. It refers to the courteous treatment which is being given to taxpayers by local Internal Revenue Service offices. The column is as follows:

IT'S BEYOND ME: SOME TAXMEN HAVE A HEART

(By Iris Hayward)

Now that the April 15 tax deadline is fading into the realm of bad memories, I'd like to put in a plug for the people who staff the Riverside office of the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Paying taxes is like having teeth pulled, and the very mention of the words "Internal Revenue Bureau" is enough to send you into a cold sweat.

And the thought of being called into the tax office is like contemplating a visit to the interrogation room at the FBI.

This is to say, here and now, that every encounter I've had with local guardians of the Government's share of my income has been a pleasant one.

In the past, I've had some unhappy encounters with Government employees in other fields. Some of them are more than aware of their lofty status, and don't mind rubbing it in.

The mental image we have of the tax man is that of a Simon Legree with a whip in his teeth, one hand in your pocket and the other on the door to tax evader's prison.

As a taxpayer who struggles through her own returns each year, however, and occasionally needs help, I can't ever recall phoning or showing up in person at the Riverside Internal Revenue Bureau office and not getting courteous treatment.

If you have to ask dumb questions, you get the answers in a way that makes you feel only an Einstein could have unraveled it in the first place, and it was a pleasure to deal with such complex problems.

On my yearly trip to the office this year for advice, I was not only told how to save (tax) money, but was told that in a couple of prior years I'd probably paid too much tax.

Why not put in a claim via amended returns and try to get some of it back, a helpful tax expert suggested.

Why not, I wondered, when I saw that such a refund would amount to a sizable piece of change.

Not with trepidation (who was I to beard the tax collector in his Washington den and say I paid him too much money in 1962 and 1963, and could I please have some of it back), I filed the amended returns.

After some time I got a letter saying the case was being considered, and after a few more weeks I received another letter asking me to show up at the Riverside office with records to support my claim.

The appointment was made over the phone by a polite, helpful, young lady who suggested that I'd probably want to come in this week rather than next to get it over with.

I agreed it would be a good idea to get it over with, and in 3 days I found myself keeping an appointment with a man who, in some miraculous fashion, had received my returns from headquarters and seemed to know all about everything.

He, too, was polite and helpful, and proceeded to help me prove I was right, the Government really did owe me the money. Don't worry, he assured me as I was ready to go, my claim was just and I'd receive the refund as soon as it went through channels.

My case, I'm sure, isn't an isolated one. I know of two other people with tax problems that had caused worries for weeks, and also necessitated personal interviews.

So whether or not you believe in the internal revenue system, it helps to know there are people at hand willing to make the tax pill as easy to swallow as possible.

Operation Head Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, community aid is the key and community cooperation is the means whereby the head start program, launched recently by the President as a part of the war on poverty, can be a success. This program is designed to root out poverty at its source by helping preschool children in deprived communities prepare for their first year in school.

The head start program should pay dividends in human fulfillment and help to build a stronger nation internally.

The Christian Science Monitor, in a recent editorial, pointed out how important it is that community leadership join in this effort to make it successful.

Under unanimous consent I place this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial follows:

A "HEAD START"

Few scenes are filled with greater promise or disappointment than that of the young child hunched over his school desk. If all goes right, the child is on his way to the mastery of knowledge which will help make his life happy and meaningful. But if things go wrong, sorrow, tragedy, and waste are too often the result.

The United States is about to invest $112 million to see if some 530,000 young children from poverty-stricken or cultureless homes can be helped make the important right first step in education. This is Project Head Start, whereby these children will gather in thousands of preschool centers for a 6 to 8 weeks' practical training program. In general, only those children who will enter kindergarten this fall will attend.

The purpose of the program is short, sharp, and crucial. It is to provide these children with the outlook, training, and encouragement which will give them a better chance to benefit from the precious years of education which lie ahead. For experience has shown that all too often the children from these homes are unequipped to cope with the stern demands of education, fall behind, and eventually fall out.

The ability to speak coherently, the use of sanitary facilities, the knowledge of how to get on with their fellows, these and many more such fundamentals are often lacking among such pitifully deprived children. When these are learned, the child's ability to profit from education is immeasurably heightened.

As of the moment, this is a "one shot" affair. Washington apparently wishes to weigh the results of this summer's effort to see whether the project should be continued, altered, or dropped. Many questions remain unanswered. Will 6 to 8 weeks' training be enough? Where will the special-knowledge teachers come from? How much larger should the effort be to have a sure hope of ending the tragic circle of poverty ignorance in which so many American are caught?

But we rejoice to see this start. We wish it well wholeheartedly. We agree with President Johnson that we must keep in mind that the "5- and 6-year-old children are the inheritors of poverty's curse and not its creators." He is right in declaring that unless we act these children will pass these burdens on to future generations.

Although Washington has taken the first step in this program, if there is anything that the Federal Government cannot do alone, it is to lift this burden of cultural deprivation from millions of children. Only united community efforts in cities, towns, and villages all over the land can get to the real roots of the problem. This requires determination, organization, and inspiration. Yet we can think of few efforts which can do more to guarantee a happier tomorrow than this.

Castro and the Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing more and more that the Russian Communists are changing their colors. The following Evans and Novak column presented in the Washington Post of June 21, 1965, refutes this belief. Vio-

lence that pays off has always been and is now being employed by Russia.

CASTRO AND THE SOVIETS

In Fidel Castro's police state today, any Cuban who spouts Chinese Communist propaganda attacking Soviet "revisionism" is liable to end up in a Havana dungeon.

The implications of this latest twist in the Castroite line go far beyond Havana. The new line means that China is losing—and losing badly—its contest with the Soviet Union for control of the Latin American Communist movement. It means the Soviets have pulled well ahead of the Chinese Communists by switching to a more revolutionary stance in promoting violence and terror in the Western Hemisphere.

This leftward change in Moscow's Latin policy has worldwide significance, strongly indicating a post-Khrushchev drift by Russia away from peaceful coexistence. The new Soviet leaders are in a tooth-and-nail competition with the Chinese for leadership of the revolutionary Communist pirates in the underdeveloped world, and it's showing up everywhere south of the border.

The key to Communist leadership in Latin America is held by Castro, who not long ago seemed more attracted to Peiping's more militant brand of communism. But evidence is piling up that Castro is back in Moscow's corner.

After Castro's major speech of March 17, warning against internal feuding, pro-Chinese propaganda abruptly disappeared from Havana papers. The Soviet Ambassador conspicuously appeared with Castro at the Camaguey canecutting ceremonies during Easter Week, a symbol of Moscow's new importance. Joaquin Ordoqui, a Moscow-oriented Communist purged by Castro last year, has disappeared from sight without a public trial—a trial that might embarrass the Soviets.

This reconciliation between Havana and Moscow has been unwittingly fed by the intransigence of Peiping.

In his trip to Peiping last March, Ernesto (Che) Guevara—the member of the Castro inner circle closest to the Chinese—failed miserably in trying to explain away Castro's flirtation with the Russians. And now, Chinese sympathizer Guevara is mysteriously absent from the Havana scene.

Why did Castro choose the Russians over the Chinese? There is, of course, the absolute necessity of Moscow's cash subsidies. But Castro does not live by bread alone. He lives by guns.

The new leaders of Russia did what Khrushchev never would do. At last November's Havana summit conference of Latin American Reds, the Soviets promised to underwrite Castro's plots to export revolution throughout the hemisphere.

Actually, Moscow's peaceful intent in this hemisphere has been exaggerated in the past. Even Khrushchev believed in backing violence where he gave it a chance to pay off. For example, the 4-year-old Red insurrection in Venezuela always has had ample support and subsidies from Moscow.

But since November, the Soviets have turned from political to terror tactics not only in Venezuela but throughout South America's northern cone and in Central America. The increased revolutionary activity in Guatemala and Colombia is the most obvious.

Bolivia's political chaos is so extreme as to make that country almost a case apart, but the new role of the Communists there is instructive. Although always considered less revolutionary than other far-left parties in that country, the Bolivian Communists actually allied themselves with leftist revolutionaries (including the Trotskyites) in the recent unsuccessful insurrection.

Armed with Moscow's gold and Castro's renewed blessing, the newly militant Soviet Communist parties are outdistancing the Chinese parties throughout the hemisphere. But this is scant cause for cheering in Washington. The Soviet sponsorship of violence in Latin America flatly contradicts the oversimplified concept of white-hat Russian Communists and black-hat Chinese Communists.

Rather, Latin American developments offer a concrete example of how Russian versus Chinese enmity has propelled Moscow into a more aggressive stance. What makes matters worse is that Castro, who needs to export trouble to survive, will insist that the Russians maintain their tough stance to keep his friendship.

Helping Others: "The Most Wonderful Experience of His Life"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent a copy of my remarks and testimony in support of the proposed Freedom Academy—legislation now before the House Un-American Activities Committee—to one of my former constituents. The letter I received from him in response is such an inspiring testimony to the concept of the people-to-people approach in foreign affairs, upon which the Freedom Academy proposal is based, that I feel compelled to share it with my good colleagues.

The story told here could be multiplied manifold by tapping the as yet virtually unused vast resources of the private sector of our Nation, as we seek out answers to the continuing conflicts throughout the world.

The letter follows:

AM-MEX EXCHANGE,
Cupertino, Calif., May 21, 1965.

Hon. DON H. CLAUSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DON: While I was at Del Norte, I was asked to help raise funds for the American Field Service exchange program, which I did with the combined efforts of my Spanish classes. We raised more money than was necessary, so decided to have our own little exchange. Pooling our resources, we rented the Seventh-day Adventist schoolbus, drove to Hermosillo, Sonora, and spent 16 days in Mexican homes while the Mexicans returned in our bus, spending 12 days in Del Norte County, the difference caused by using the same bus.

Something happened on the exchange which we hadn't anticipated: we fell in love with the Mexican people, and they with us. Because of this wonderful feeling, we decided to continue the exchange every year, increasing it as much as could be done successfully until every sincere student of Spanish here and every sincere student of English there may know that he can actually live reciprocally in a Mexican (American) home for a month after he completes his year of study. This year there will be over 500 of these people.

Another good thing about the exchange is the way a student benefits in Spanish, also. He may grow about a year and a half in achievement in 1 month's time. Isn't that great? And he comes back with a whole new outlook on life—broader, more appreciative of his own home and country, more interested in others (even worldwide), and he is filled with memories of "the most wonderful experience" of his life.

This all started in Del Norte at Malone Road. I thought you might be interested in knowing about it because of your paper "A Peace Offensive" which I just received.

Sincerely yours,

KEITH F. THOMPSON,
Director.

Adlai Points the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, gave a brilliant analysis of this country's foreign policy in his speech to the annual commencement meeting of the Harvard Alumni Association in Cambridge, Mass., last Thursday. I include Ambassador Stevenson's address and the "Uncle Dudley" editorial from the Boston Globe of Friday, June 18, 1965, entitled "Adlai Points the Way," with my remarks. I also include the citations accompanying the honorary degrees presented by Harvard University to 12 outstanding recipients be printed with my remarks in the Appendix:

STEVENSON TEXT: FROM LOFTY NONINVOLVEMENT TO TEMPTING POWER

Goethe said there are many echoes in the world, but only a few voices.

These days everyone is voicing or echoing their views about Vietnam, the Dominican Republic and student demonstrations and picketing.

I claim without shame that I am really a battle-scarred if not scared veteran of the demonstrators and picketeers.

I've been picketed, applauded and abused from right and left and center everywhere from Texas to Toronto for more years than I like to remember.

Indeed, my honorary degree should have a P.D.—a doctor of pickets.

I don't share the concern of some of my contemporaries about student demonstrations. I like their involvement in great issues.

But if I could offer them one word of advice, I would say that to state goals is easy; to tell them how to get there is not so easy. A moral commitment is hardly meaningful without a practical hope of improving the human condition.

But now I must speak a bit, and you must listen. I hope we both finish our work at about the same time.

I will suggest how we might—I say "might" advisedly—get to some of our goals in the world.

Twenty years have passed since we made the last peace, exactly the same span of time from Versailles to Hitler's war. This is the sobering fact which today overshadows our troubled world.

Last time not all our good intentions, not all our last-minute efforts of improvisation, could stave off catastrophe.

Can we be sure that on this grim anniversary we may not be failing once again?

The question dwarfs all others, for in the nuclear age we have peace or we have nothing.

We know all about our errors in 1919. They were, simply, to repeat the policies of the last century; high moral tone and noninvolvement.

ISOLATION A CLOAK

President Woodrow Wilson attempted through the League of Nations to bring our idealism down to earth in the first sketch of a functioning world society based on law, on self-determination, on the organized institutions of peace.

But this dive into reality was too much for us. We retreated to an old isolation and continued to mistake exhortation for power.

Could we have repeated this error in 1945? Perhaps, but in fact we were presented with the opposite temptation.

What a heyday of conquest we could have had—alone with the atom bomb, alone with a healthy economy in a shattered world, alone with our energy unleashed, unbroken by the ordeal of war.

But we are not conquerors. We are perhaps the most unwilling great power in history, and certainly no great power has been plunged so suddenly from the temptations of lofty non-involvement to the opposite temptations of almost vital total power.

Yet we did not lose our idealism. We set up the United Nations on the basis of equality and self-determination, and have helped mightily to make it work ever since.

We have pressed for decolonization. We have offered to internationalize atomic energy. We gave Europe the Marshall plan, first proposed from this platform. We preached the ideal of unity and federation of Europe.

A HEADY DRAUGHT

All of this was very far from selfish exercise of our power.

But of course it was power. The United States was dominant. The Western Alliance was guided by us. The United Nations majorities voted with us. The economic assistance was all from us. The Communists were largely contained by us.

It is a great record of magnanimous and responsible leadership.

But I suspect we became used to the idea that although nations were equal we were somehow a little more equal than anyone else. And of course for any nation this sense of leadership is very heady stuff.

I have myself said of flattery that "it is very fine provided that you don't inhale." The same is true of leadership. It's fine and we did inhale.

Today, however, we face entirely new conditions. Prepunderant power is a thing of the past. Western Europe has recovered its economic strength and military potential.

Russia commands a vast war machine with a full nuclear arsenal. China adds incipient nuclear power to massive armies.

And both exploit the new techniques of covert aggression—the so-called "wars of national liberation"—which have nothing to do with nation or liberation—and can be stretched to cover any use of outside interference to remove any government, whatever its policies, that is anti-Communist or even non-Communist.

IDEALISM BALKED

Our idealism is frustrated too. The "third world" of postcolonial states seems to have much less stability and staying power than we expected. Just as Western colonialism ends, some of them seem ready to fight it all over again under the guise of neocolonialism.

Meanwhile, the new tactics of subversion, infiltration, deception, and confusion seem to be little understood, to say the least.

Even in Europe the partnership we looked for with a unified continent has been challenged and circumscribed by a reassertion of national power.

So we face a new situation—less manageable and less appealing. What do we do about it?

There are those who would bid us accept the inevitable. If Europe is strong enough to defend itself, let it do so. If China has recovered its ancient influence in Asia—so what—we can't stop it.

If weak developing nations want to try communism, let them learn the hard way, we've done the best we could with aid and advice.

In these arguments we can detect some of the old isolationist overtones and assumptions.

But in a world much less closely knit than this, isolation has not saved us from two global wars. It launched us into a worldwide depression. It saw the Far East all but devoured by a single military clique.

WHERE CRY "HALT"?

Would we now keep the peace by leaving the levers of power largely in the hands of vast imperial systems whose ideological aim is still to dominate the world? At what point should we cry halt, and probably confront a nuclear holocaust?

The isolationism was always too naive about power and about the pretensions of power. We must not make that mistake again.

But equally we must not make the opposite mistake and put too much faith in power.

We have among us advocates of much stronger action. For them, it is the idealism of America that is at fault. Get the allies back into line. Confront Russia over Berlin and Germany. Bomb China's nuclear capacity before it increases.

And back any anti-Communist government anywhere. Teach everyone they can't push us around.

But this won't work either. What power have we to coerce our friends in Europe?

What assurance have we that direct action against either Communist giant will not unleash a nuclear war from which we would suffer as much as they? How can we be sure that unlimited support of any authoritarian anti-Communist government may not merely hasten the day when their citizens become Communist as the only means to change?

If total isolationism is no answer, total interventionism is no answer either.

In fact, the clear, quick, definable, measurable answers are all ruled out. In this new twilight of power, there is no path to a convenient light switch.

PARTNERSHIP VITAL

What then can we do? What are the options?

I want to suggest that the extremes are not exhaustive. In between—less exciting perhaps, less nationally satisfying but safer and more humane—are other routes and methods which recognize the image of our power, allow for our traditional idealism, take account of the world ideological struggle and include no fantasies of either total withdrawal or total control.

But they are all paths which demand a high degree of genuine partnership, of genuine cooperation.

As such, they will often seem more arduous and more tedious than the old pursuits, for it is easier to command than to persuade.

How do we apply a new sense of partnership and cooperation to the dilemmas of our time? In Europe, we have to help defend against renewed Soviet pressure westward.

Equally, we have to remove the grievance of a divided Germany which obstructs genuine peace in central Europe. And to compound the problem to defend the West we must take a hard line with Russia.

But our only hope of reunifying Germany peacefully is with Russian goodwill. I do not believe a divided, splintered, nationalist Europe cut off from America can accomplish this complicated balance.

Either its divisions will enfeeble it militarily or a resurgence of German nationalism will postpone possible reconciliation with the West.

TIES WITH SOVIET

Our best policy is, I think, on the one hand, to keep our defense commitment to Europe unequivocal and to explore all reasonable ways of transferring greater responsibility to them—by joint planning, by joint purchasing, by joint burden sharing, by our readiness to consider any pattern of cooperation that Europeans care to suggest.

And if at some future time they move to political union, then clearly the question of nuclear responsibility will have to be reconsidered.

But at the same time, let us seek all possible ways, together with our European allies, to increase peaceful and profitable contacts with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

There were small signs not long ago of a modest thaw in the dead winter of the old cold war.

We should be ready for all such signs—in trade, in scientific research, in cultural exchanges, in tourism, in anything in short that opens the two systems to each other, that substitutes knowledge and reality for myths and fear.

Just the other day, President Johnson said directly to the Soviet people, "There is no American interest in conflict with the Soviet people anywhere."

Had I been talking with you even a year ago, I would not have been more optimistic about these possibilities.

Today the drama in southeast Asia and the dilemmas faced by Russia in its relations with its stubborn, dogmatic Chinese associate have shrouded all hopes of yesterday.

But the aim is not at fault—to prove that we at least want to end this tragic breach in human society, want to overcome the barriers that unnaturally divide an ancient continent and culture, want to explore with our fellow citizens of a threatened world the dilemmas and possibilities of a stable peace.

THAILAND IN SHADOW

In Asia, too, I do not believe our aims are false. The right we seek to defend is the right of people, be it in Korea or South Vietnam, not to have their future decided by violence.

I do not believe this right can be secured by retreat. Retreat leads to retreat, just as aggression leads to aggression in this still primitive international community.

Already an active apparatus of subversion has begun its work in Thailand, and it is only a few years since Malayans beat down a long and murderous attempt to impose communism by force.

The Tibetans were not so fortunate, and the Indians have found in the neighborhood of 800 million Chinese hardly a guarantee of peace and security.

So the aim of reinforcing the right of peoples large and small to determine their own destiny does not seem one that we dare allow to go by default.

The old, old principle that powerful neighbors for reasons of power alone must prevail never gained the world peace in the past. I question whether it will do so even in a nuclear age.

But if you ask me whether the test of defending and upholding this right should be responsibility of any one power, particularly of a large, white Western power whose past behavior in its own hemisphere has not, shall we say, been wholly without imperial overtones, then I say emphatically, "No."

Let us be quite clear about this. The United States has no desire to dominate. We have no delusion of omnipotence or omniscience.

We do not cheat ourselves with the purple rhetoric of manifest destiny. We do not

see ourselves as self-appointed gendarmes of this very troubled world. And we do not rely on muscle instead of diplomacy.

UNITED EFFORT GOAL

But although we are not even a direct party to most of the world's disputes, we have had to take a disproportionate share of the burden because the international community is not prepared already to do so, or to do so fast and far enough in a given crisis.

In South Vietnam, the task of upholding the principle of self-determination and popular sovereignty is ours in part by the chances of history, but in part by default.

We should use every persuasion, every instrument available to put responsibility where it belongs—in the international community, with international guarantees and policing, and in a long-term settlement resting not only on our own arms but in the will and authority of the United Nations.

This is what we seek.

That the Communists have rejected every overture from every quarter—more than 13 for negotiations without preconditions, does not alter our aim to stop the fighting, to create the international machinery to safeguard the people's right to peaceful choice, and to underpin the whole postcolonial settlement.

Only the right of self-determination brought it into being. Only that right can properly be enforced to defend it now.

So I am suggesting that our role is not absolute responsibility. Rather, it is to seek patiently, yes, and modestly, to persuade our fellow nations to take on the indispensable tasks of peace and law.

CONSISTENCY A MUST

And if we want the new nations to recognize the reality of the threat to self-determination in southeast Asia, for example, we must be ready to recognize the reality of them, for example, of the threat of a continued colonialism in southern Africa.

We can hardly proclaim the duty to safeguard the right of free choice in the Caribbean and deny its validity on the other side of the Atlantic.

The credibility of our posture rests on its consistency.

Safeguards for the right of choice, like safeguards for peace itself, must depend ultimately on multilateral foundations and the concepts of collective security enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

At a time when peace is so precarious, it is shameful that the great peacekeeping institution must beg for the means of keeping the peace.

But I believe its financial troubles may soon be over. It has been on a sickbed long enough.

But it is not a deathbed. It is suffering not from death pangs but from growing pains.

The simple truth is that as long as the world is in crisis, the United Nations will be in crisis. That is what it's there for. As long as there is global tension, there'll be tension at a global headquarters.

When it ceases to reflect the troubles of the world, then you can start worrying about its demise.

But external pressure is not the only threat to self-determination. Of the United Nations' 114 members, perhaps two-thirds are vulnerable and unstable, not because of great power ambitions and rivalries.

TASK IS FOR MANY

The instability springs from the growing gap between their aspirations and the hard economic reality of making their way in the post-colonial world.

The fact that sugar prices fell by half last winter is not unconnected with the crisis in the Dominican Republic.

Nor has the stability in Latin America been reinforced by a 10-year decline in primary prices that wiped out the effect of all incoming capital, public or private.

These are roots of disorder exploited by external subversion. To suppose that our world can continue half-affluent and half-desperate is to assume a patience on the part of the needy for which, to put it mildly, history gives us no warrant at all.

But like peacekeeping, this vast global task is not a task for one nation acting singly. The developed nations together must redress the imbalance.

While America can give—and has given—a modest lead, we have to accept once again the patient, modest unsensational path of consulting and persuading.

The developing nations have started to act together in the framework of the United Nations Trade and Development Conference. The developed nations probably also should be internationalized more and more by working in and through the United Nations group.

JOINT ACTION BEST

If only one government is giving a country aid, it easily comes to play too persuasive a part in the local scene. Suspicious of neocolonialism arise. Issues of prestige and paternalism and dependence begin to obtrude.

The answer to these dilemmas is once again the way of consultation and joint action to bring a sizable part of the needed flow of capital under international bodies in which donors and recipients can work out their problems together.

No doubt much of this seems more difficult than the role of direct benefaction.

But our readiness to act not as a benefactor but as partner could lead to increasing respect, closer understanding, a sense of community and perhaps, at last, enough confidence to dissipate the myth of neocolonialism and to erase the memories of earlier servitude and humiliation.

In short, of what I believe we should speak, in this new age of more limited power but still unlimited challenge, is not so much new policies as a new emphasis, a new tone.

We should be readier to listen than to instruct—that curiosity which is the beginning of wisdom. It will take a greater effort of imagination for us to see the world through others' eyes, to judge our policies as they impinge on others' interests.

A SECURE LOYALTY

For what we intend today is to extend to the whole society of man the techniques, the methods, the habits—if you will, the courtesies—upon which our own sense of citizenship is based.

In our free society we ask that citizens participate as equals. We accept their views and interests as significant. We struggle for unenforced concensus. We tolerate conflict and accept dissent.

But we believe that because each citizen knows he is valued and has his chance to comment and influence, his final loyalty to the social order will be more deeply rooted and secure.

But as heirs to the tradition of free government, what else can we do? Our founders had the audacity to proclaim their ideals self-evident for all mankind. We can hardly be less bold when all mankind is no longer an abstraction but a political fact in the United Nations, a physical fact for the circling astronaut.

Nor should we despair. The art of open government has grown from its seeds in the tiny city-states of Greece to become the political mode of half the world.

So let us dream of a wrold in which all states great and small work together for the peaceful flowering of the republic of man.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, June 18, 1965]

ADLAI POINTS THE WAY

"In the nuclear age we have peace or we have nothing." Thus bluntly, Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson summed up the dilemma confronting today's uneasy world in his admirable redefinition of U.S. policy Thursday at Harvard's commencement.

Like his predecessor, Gen. George Marshall, who bade war-wrecked Europe take heart 18 years ago from the same platform when he pledged this Nation's assistance in the Marshall plan, Mr. Stevenson is dismayed neither by present difficulties nor the swarming negatives that envelop our problems in foreign policy.

His appeal is for patience, and a reinvigorated effort to widen partnership among all lands willing to join in strengthening peace and sharing more equitably the burdens of mutual aid.

Mr. Stevenson's survey of the world today as contrasted with the one we faced nearly a generation ago emphasizes changes and points up warnings. The divestiture of empires, the remarkable recovery of Europe, the coincident emergence of the two gigantic Communist power blocs with their doctrines of subversion and wars of liberation, the appearance of postcolonial states still deeply immersed in struggles for political and economic viability—all these spell out but part of that transformation.

None of these evolving changes can be dealt with in this Nation's policy by retreat toward an isolation which failed to save us from two global wars, unleashed a world depression, and "saw the Far East all but devoured by a single military clique."

Heady invocation of the manifest strength of the United States he rejects also. Apart from the perils such action would entail for this country's democratic traditions what power do we have, he asks "to coerce our friends in Europe. What assurance have we that direct action against either Communist giant will not unleash a nuclear war from which we would suffer as much as they?

"In this twilight of power there is no quick path to a convenient light switch."

The policy advocated by Mr. Stevenson sustains broadly the course the United States is pursuing. While maintaining our defense commitment to Europe without equivocation, he suggests we should press for greater sharing of responsibilities, welcoming every effort there to achieve closer political union. Wherever possible we should encourage contacts with the Soviet Union that "open the two systems to each other and substitute knowledge and reality for myths and fear."

In Asia he insists we should stand fast in "defending the right of people, whether in Korea or South Vietnam, not to have their future decided by violence." Regardless of repeated refusals from Moscow, Peiping, and Hanoi to accept unconditional negotiations for a peaceful settlement, we should continue to offer them.

The "safeguards for the right of choice, like safeguards for peace itself," declares Mr. Stevenson, "must depend ultimately on the multilateral foundations of collective security enshrined in the United Nations Charter." All Americans will share his hope that the present difficulties facing that world organization are at last on the way toward solution.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

TWELVE HONORARY DEGREE RECIPIENTS AT HARVARD

Romulo Betancourt, former President of Venezuela, doctor of laws: "An intrepid statesman who has demonstrated to the Americas the vitality of democracy."

David E. Bell, AID Administrator, doctor of laws: "An able, selfless public servant upon whose kind depends the health of our democracy."

John C. Bennett, president, Union Theological Seminary, New York, doctor of divinity: "A leader in theological education; a man of conscience who persistently seeks Christian solutions to the dilemmas of society."

Howard H. Aiken, professor of information technology, University of Miami, doctor of

science: "It shall be the enduring fame of this distinguished teacher and scientist to have made the first mark in a revolutionary new field of technology."

Gaylord P. Harnwell, president, University of Pennsylvania, doctor of laws: "An honored citizen of academe whose constructive questioning and forceful guidance have given new potential to a distinguished university."

Marston Morse, professor at Institute for Advanced Study, at Princeton, doctor of science: "An original thinker of influence and power whose contributions to pure theory have notably extended the reaches of mathematics."

George D. Woods, President of the World Bank, doctor of laws: "An astute financier who seeks to underwrite peace by nurturing social health in developing nations."

Galo Plaza, U.N. mediator in Cyprus, doctor of laws: "Able field general for freedom; in a quarrelsome and needy world, he works hopefully for peace and justice."

Elbert P. Tuttle, chief justice, Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, Atlanta, doctor of laws: "The mind and heart of this dauntless judge enhance the great tradition of the Federal judiciary."

Ridley Watts, chairman, Program for Harvard Medicine, doctor of laws: "The longtime concern for medicine and health of this public-spirited alumnus has brought new strength to a grateful university."

Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., doctor of laws: "Generous spirit, instant spokesman for freedom in the councils of the world; his intelligence and ready wit have informed and enlivened the political experience of a generation."

Thomas J. Wilson, director, Harvard University Press, doctor of humane letters: "Sympathetic and imaginative disseminator of the achievements of scholarship; sapient leader of a fine university press."

Freedom for the Baltic States

SPEECH

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we observed recently the sad 25th anniversary of the seizure of the Baltic States by force of arms by Stalin.

We memorialize annually about the continued incorporation of the small Baltic States in the Soviet Union. It is quite proper that we do so. However, it might be argued that the Soviet Union, a year ahead of Hitler's attack in 1941, felt compelled to make her northwestern flank secure, it can scarcely be argued today that her northern flank is menaced—by anybody.

The vast Soviet land mass is hedged by satellites, and there is no power in Western Europe that has either the desire or the power to reach her frontiers with an invading army a la Hitler.

The sovereign powers of Western Europe have been restored. There is a Norway today, a Denmark, a Belgium, a Netherlands, a Luxembourg, a France, an Italy. Austria has been neutralized by agreement of the great powers.

But the tiny nations of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania are still occupied nations, still held by force, still denied independence as peoples and freedom as individuals.

Like other Members of the House, I am sponsor of a resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 69—calling for the restoration of freedom to the Baltic States. I am pleased the House in its wisdom has now adopted a similar measure requesting the President to take appropriate action in the matter.

SBA Community Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the community development program of the Small Business Administration is one program that is concerned with smalltown America. Most of its loans have been made in small towns.

SBA has contributed materially to the building of sound and diversified economies throughout the United States.

The Director of Public Information of SBA, Miss Rose McKee, has had prepared a news release on Lincolnton, N.C., which illustrates just what this program can do when applied in depth to a single community.

Under unanimous consent I place this material in the Appendix of the RECORD, believing it will be of widespread interest to many communities.

The statement follows:

A North Carolina town is dramatically demonstrating how a community plagued by industry shutdowns and lost jobs can get itself on its feet and off the Federal "substantial unemployment" list.

The formula for Lincolnton's successful bootstrap operation is community determination plus assistance from the Small Business Administration's community development loan program.

And it's a formula that is being enthusiastically followed in many communities across the country. It has proved so successful that Lincolnton, the county seat, held an "SBA Appreciation Day" June 17 to express the community's appreciation for the Federal agency's help in revitalizing Lincoln County which has a population of 29,000.

SBA Administrator Eugene P. Foley was in Lincolnton to participate in the daylong celebration which included plant tours and presentation of the North Carolina Small Businessman of the Year Award.

What the people were celebrating is the return of economic "happy days."

At the end of 1964, Lincoln County's unemployment rate was down to 4.3 percent, well below the national level. But just 4 years ago the rate was 8.7 percent.

The downward slide started in 1957 when a large textile plant in Lincolnton closed its doors and the people started to go to the neighboring communities for work.

Determined local business and civic leaders set out to prove that a town doesn't have to die when its chief industry moves out.

The first step was the formation of a local development company to work out plans for financing new industries.

Under the Small Business Investment Act, SBA may lend to local development companies up to $350,000 for each small business to be assisted. The funds may be used for plant construction, expansion, modernization or conversion, including the purchase of lands, buildings, equipment, and machinery.

Seventeen loans totaling $3 million in Lincolnton have set up such diverse industries as furniture manufacturing, finishing of raw glass fibers, manufacturing of knitted fabrics and several others including a bonded warehouse.

Result: 833 persons are working at new jobs or will be when the facilities are completed.

And with the new jobs have come larger payrolls, more retail sales, and more supporting economic services.

Lincolnton is an example of what is happening in other areas of the country under SBA's community development program.

Since it started, more than 635 loans totaling more than $95 million have been made by SBA, creating more than 31,000 new job opportunities in 47 States.

Foley has put special emphasis on this job-oriented program since he became SBA Administrator in August 1963.

In the 22 intervening months, more community development loans have been approved than in the previous 5 years of the program.

If the present trend continues, Foley said, within 5 years SBA will be helping communities create 75,000 jobs a year by financing about 800 development projects annually.

Local Government Fiscal Reform: The National Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, for the past year or so, the financial problems being faced by State and local governments are commanding increased public attention. Discussion and debate continue about possible ways out of these dilemmas, including various proposals for action by the Congress such as tax sharing, block grants, and so forth.

A recent paper delivered to the Municipal Finance Officers Association's annual conference in Philadelphia on June 8, 1965, sheds much light on these questions. The address was delivered by Mr. L. L. Ecker-Racz, Assistant Director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The Advisory Commission, on which I have been pleased to serve along with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], has been devoting much attention to problems of intergovernmental fiscal relations. These issues must be faced up to and resolved if our Federal system is to remain strong.

The address follows:

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL REFORM: THE NATIONAL VIEWPOINT

(By L. L. Ecker-Racz, assistant director, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations)

We have much ground to cover this morning. The time allotted us will perhaps suffice for stating our conclusions, not for the evidence that suppports them. As the first

man "on," I should use some of my time to define the problem, place it in perspective.

Local fiscal reform is not a new need. It probably is as old as the institution of local government itself. What is new is its gravity and urgency. And ironically, it is national growth and prosperity that makes the need for local fiscal reform critically urgent.

National economic growth feeds on local government activity and in turn generates demand for more of that activity.

Currently local governments are spending at an annual rate of about $50 billion; they account for more than 8 percent of the gross national product. They employ more than 5½ million people—over twice the number of Federal civilian employees; almost three times the number employed by State government. Local employment accounts for about 7½ percent of the total civilian labor force and each month pumps over $2½ billion of wages and salaries into the income stream. Local government's investment in new school buildings, city halls, county courthouses, hospitals, water and sewage systems, and streets and roads now aggregates over $10 billion a year. Most of this involves contracting and contributes significantly to private employment and payrolls. And to finance this capital outlay and associated land acquisitions, local governments borrow annually some $8 billion from private investors. These are some of the ways local governments contribute to the GNP.

Increased economic activity in turn creates demand for more local government spending. It stimulates the business community's need for more municipal facilities and services; it prompts business management to insist on better environmental conditions for its employees, on better schools for its employees' children, on better health facilities for its employees' families.

National economic prosperity impinges on local revenue needs from other directions as well. An economically affluent population demands and expects better education, cultural and recreation facilities, and better protection services. Economic prosperity, moreover, enables the National Government to focus on social objectives that operate in the same direction. You need no reminder that the national administration's present emphasis on the Great Society with its antipoverty, urban renewal, beautification, and open space programs, made possible because national defense needs no longer preempt a rising proportion of the country's growing output—has important implications for your respective communities' budgets.

Again, there is nothing new or different in the phenomenon that national prosperity generates new national obligations. Economic affluence, public and private, bestows both bounties and burdens. What is unique with respect to the public sector in the American situation is that the fiscal bounties of prosperity tend to be national, while its fiscal burdens tend to be local. This is so because under this Federal system, the lion's share of the responsibility for civilian governmental services falls first on local government then on State government, and only when both default, on the National Government. The tax revenue byproduct of economic growth, on the other hand, accrues disproportionately to the National Government.

While responsibility for most civilian functions of government are local, the interest in the quality and adequacy of these services is very much national. There is no need to belabor the fact that communities in the North, South, East, and West are tightly interrelated, and grow progressively more so with the accelerating interdependence of the economy and the growing mobility of the American people. Inevitably, the quality of education and other public services provided by one community is reflected in the quality of the work force and in the welfare load of other communities hundreds and thousands of miles away.

Even the American image is affected by what occurs in local communities. When American citizens' civil rights are abridged, when crime and juvenile delinquency make headlines, when blight festers in the cities, the international view of the American dream is sullied. In this age of communication satellites, America's linen, the soiled with the clean, is on the line for all the world to see.

Each of you can testify to the relationship between national prosperity and local government's revenue needs out of your own budgetary experience. In the last 10 years alone, the direct general expenditures of local governments increased by 130 percent, expenditures for personal services by 140 percent, and the indebtedness by 150 percent. During this same 10-year period, the national output of goods and services increased by about 160 percent.

Since local government's expenditures tend to grow nearly twice as fast as the national economy while property tax collections do well to keep pace with economic growth, local budgets suffer from chronic imbalance. Since revenue requirements rise faster than the yield of existing taxes, the deficiency grows progressively wider and can be bridged only by additional taxation and increased intergovernmental aid. The 115-percent increase in local tax collections during the past 10 years was achieved only with benefit of new tax enactments and higher tax rates.

The irony that increased national prosperity necessarily spells aggravated fiscal problems for local governments is an inevitable consequence of this Federal form of government. Of all types of taxes in general use, only the income tax can be designed so as to produce at a rate that approximates the spending growth that accompanies economic growth, and most local governments are neither free nor able to utilize income taxes so as to exploit their revenue potential. Effective income taxation, effective in terms both of productivity and equity, is uniquely the National Government's monopoly—by virtue of its exercise of taxing jurisdiction over the entire country and over income from whatever source derived.

The disparity between the local and national shares of the fiscal bounties and fiscal burdens produced does not arise in unitary systems because those national governments are free to finance essential civilian services, whether provided locally or nationally, out of national revenues. Under our system, however, the diversion of national revenues to financing civilian functions labors against important restraints. We want to vest responsibility for spending close to the people at the local level and we want the taxing responsibility to accompany the responsibility to spend, so that those who have the pleasure of spending assume the onus of taxing. The American system does provide, to be sure, for interlevel financial aid, but we want the role of grants kept to a minimum in deference to our dislike for centralization and our affinity for home rule.

Under the pressure of postwar developments, State aid to local governments and Federal aid to State and local governments have both increased. But their relative role in local government financing has not appreciably changed. Somewhat more than one-fourth of the $50 billion local governments spend annually is financed by State and Federal grants. Some of the newest Federal grant-in-aid programs—antipoverty, mass transportation, urban renewal—are directed especially at community action. These programs, however, contribute less to easing the strains on local governments than is generally assumed because they require local matching and the commitment of local revenues to programs which might have rated relatively low priority in the absence of Federal grants.

It requires no clairvoyance to predict that as national economic growth continues, America will need to reconcile itself to more and more Federal financial aid, and that States will need to assume financial responsibility for increasing shares of local needs. It is equally clear that the pace of this reconciliation will be materially affected by local fiscal reform. At both the national and State level, the case for financial aid will be strengthened as local governments demonstrate that they have utilized and exhausted their own resources. By the same token, those who would minimize State and Federal grants will realize their hopes only as local governments make more effective use of their own taxes and of the dollars their taxes produce.

One can identify at least three distinct facets of this problem: One is the need to maximize the effective use of moneys already available to local governments. Tools and techniques for assessing the comparative effectiveness of alternative public expenditure programs still remain to be perfected. Another is the need for local governments to make effecitve use of taxing powers already available to them. Finally, local government needs to be restructured into general purpose governmental units large enough for reasonable efficiency in present circumstances; alternatively, there is need to develop techniques of interjurisdictional cooperation, to secure reasonable efficiency despite fractionated political jurisdictions. The most pressing need in this regard is in urban centers where progressively more and more Americans are clustering across far too many, too small and overlapping governmental jurisdictions.

Since there is a national interest in adequate governmental performance at the local level there is also a national concern with maximizing the revenue potential of local governments. Much of the work of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has been directed to this end.

The 26-member Advisory Commission was created by Congress in 1959 for several purposes, including these:

To bring together representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments for consideration of common problems;

To encourage discussion and study at an early stage of emerging public problems that are likely to require intergovernmental cooperation;

To recommend, within the framework of the Constitution the most desirable allocation of governmental functions, responsibilities, and revenues among the several levels of Government; and

To recommend methods of coordinating and simplifying tax laws and administrative practices to achieve a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the levels of government and to reduce the burden of compliance for taxpayers.

Since the Commission consists primarily of Federal, State, and local executive and legislative leaders, it looks at intergovernmental problems from diverse points of view. With all levels of government in mind, it has been developing piece by piece by a program of fiscal reform.

Local government is the creation of the State and its very existence depends upon State legislative action. Its structural form, its powers and responsibilities, the way it can raise revenue and borrow, even the titles and salaries of its officials—all are set forth in more or less detail in State constitutions and statutes. Some local governments have been granted "home rule" but even home rule charters are circumscribed by State law. Therefore, it is at the State level that local

fiscal reform will have to be initiated, and it is to the States that much of the Advisory Commission's counsel in this area has been directed.

The Commission's recommendations for strengthening local government call for three general courses of action by the States: (1) unshackling their local governments; (2) assisting their local governments; and (3) overseeing their local governments.

UNSHACKLING THE FISCAL RESTRICTIONS ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Commission has looked in some detail at two of the traditional ways in which State constitutions and statutes tie the hands of local finance officers in their efforts to provide the money their governments need to operate effectively—the restrictions on local taxing and borrowing powers.[1]

Both tax and debt limits are relics of the 19th century, long before modern devices for fiscal control were conceived. In the tax field they typically take the form of a percentage of the locally assessed valuation as the limit above which property tax mill rates may not be raised. These property tax limitations have had little or no effect upon the ability of local governments to increase property tax revenue. They have challenged local officials to use their ingenuity in finding means of getting around them and officials have not been found wanting for devices to do so. The methods are familiar to you: special district financing, short-term borrowing to finance deficits that are ultimately funded, special limitations applicable to particular functions, etc. The Commission concluded that modern bugeting and other fiscal controls eliminate the need for property tax limitations and that our State-local governmental system would be far better off without them.

On the other hand, the Commission does not recommend unlimited proliferation of locally administered income, sales, excise, and similar nonproperty taxes. Such taxes should encompass broader geographic areas than are usually covered by local communities. Where local property taxes have become so burdensome as to necessitate the extension of local taxing powers to nonproperty taxes, the States should allow local supplements to their own broad-based taxes. At the very least they should provide for joint administration of local nonproperty taxes by contiguous local governments that comprise an integrated economic unit.

Debt limits, which like property tax limitations are often tied to assessed valuations, have also come under the Commission's scrutiny and have been found wanting. They have been subject to the same abuses as property tax limitations. Much of the nondebt debt has been issued at additional cost to the taxpayer, to evade the constitutional and statutory limitations. There are better, more sophisticated ways of overseeing and helping local government borrowing operations, and the Advisory Commission recommends repeal of the traditional debt limits. The Commission also feels that the authority of local governing bodies to issue debt should be subject only to permissive referendums, on petition, and that the results of such a referendum should be determined by a simple majority vote.

ASSISTING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

As the States build up their own technical expertise they should be in a position to provide valuable assistance to their local governments, particularly the smaller ones, in the various aspects of financial administration. Two fields, in particular, lend themselves to State participation through technical assistance—the investment of idle funds and debt management. The Advisory Commission has studied these aspects of local fiscal administration and made a number of suggestions.[2]

In a number of States, local governments do not even have adequate authority to invest their temporarily idle funds in interest-bearing securities. This is an oversight the States can and should correct. Having provided local governments with this important fiscal tool, States should also help them by identifying available investment opportunities, including short-term Federal securities, savings and loan shares, and the like. The Advisory Commission has cooperated with the Treasury Department in preparing a brochure describing the various kinds of short-term Federal issues available for the investment of public funds. Millions of dollars are lost to local governments annually because they do not have the legal power to invest their funds or because they are not aware of the investment opportunities.

Municipal finance officers need hardly be reminded of the highly technical problems connected with debt management and of the pitfalls that beset the uninitiated. Local governments, particularly the small ones that come to the money market infrequently, need help when they issue bonds, and the States shouuld be in a position to provide such help. The Advisory Commission has outlined a program for State technical assistance to local debt management which could well enhance the quality of local debt offerings and reduce their interest costs. Under the Commission's program, States would provide the following kinds of debt management assistance to their local governments:

Development and maintenance of a State file on local debt and related data;

Dissemination of data on local government finances;

Preparation of standards for official statements on local debt offerings;

Development of an educational program for local finance officials;

Advisory review of both the legal and fiscal aspects of proposed local bond issues; and

Optional State sale of local bonds.

OVERSEEING LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCES

There are some facets of local finance in which the States' stake is so overriding as to demand State participation far beyond technical assistance. Property tax administration is a case in point. The property tax is and in the foreseeable future will continue to be by far the most important source of local revenue. It produces $7 out of every $8 collected by local governments and has performed well since World War II. Its yield has almost matched, dollar for dollar, the aggregate yield of all variety of State taxes. In many areas, to be sure, it is exhibiting strains. Where rates are relatively high, homeowners are pressing for tax relief and industry is beginning to weigh tax rate differentials in making location decisions. In these situations, poor and inequitable administration is particularly perilous.

You are probably familiar with the Commission's property tax study conducted by Dr. and Mrs. Frederick Bird.[3] The Commission uncovered no new new startling facts about property tax administration. Its study crystallized what has been common knowledge for a long time: that many assessment jurisdictions are too small for efficient administration; that much of the property tax assessment is conducted in a nonprofessional manner by elected, untrained officials; that the property tax base is being eroded by a conglomeration of exemptions; that assessments are inequitable because of poor or nonexistent equalization procedures, and that taxpayers have inadequate protection against assessment discrimination. When the States vacated the property tax for exclusively local use during the 1920's and 1930's, it was hailed as a step toward "separation of tax sources." This proved to be a mixed blessing, for the States also lost interest in maintaining the quality of property tax administration.

It is the Commission's view that the States will have to take vigorous action to revamp their property tax laws and its report sets forth 29 recommendations for State action. These run the gamut from a re-examination of the role of the property tax in the State-local tax structure, to reorganization of State and local property tax assessment administration, to setting up reasonable assessment review and taxpayer appeal procedures.

Property tax administration is one governmental area in which our time-honored attachment to home rule is misplaced. When each local jurisdiction is left free to apply its own political judgment to the way property should be assessed and taxed in a society in which property is becoming more specialized and intercommunity relationships increasingly more sensitive, the quality of property tax administration suffers. What is needed is a State-local partnership, with the State as senior partner.

Another case in point is the use of local government borrowing powers to finance the acquisition of plants for lease to private industry. You are all familiar with the highly publicized industrial development bond device. Its potential for abuse is well known: large, financially strong national companies taking advantage of municipal governments' tax exemption for their private gain; small communities over-extending their credit to entice industry from others, and in the process overstraining their revenue resources to meet unanticipated demands for public services.

The use of local industrial development bond financing started over a quarter of a century ago in Mississippi and after World War II the idea was emulated by other Southern States. Some of the Northern industrial States began to be concerned about the loss of industry to the South and a few of them entered the industrial development bond field. Now about three-fifths of the States engage in the practice.

The advisory commission concluded that unless the States control their local governments' activities in this area, the system will topple of its own weight and in the process will do irreparable damage to local finances.[4]

The States can avoid this eventuality by providing a number of safeguards. They should:

Subject all industrial development bond issues to approval by a State supervising agency;

Restrict authority to issue such bonds to local units of general government (counties, municipalities, and organized townships);

Limit the total amount of such bonds that may be outstanding at any one time in the State;

Prohibit such financing for pirating of industrial plants by one community from another; and

Provide machinery for informing the public as to proposed industrial development bond projects, and to enable citizens to initiate referendums on such projects.

---

[1] "State Constitutional and Statutory Restrictions on Local Government Debt" (A-10), September 1961; and "State Constitutional and Statutory Restrictions on Local Taxing Powers" (A-14), October 1962.

[2] "Investment of Idle Cash Balances by State and Local Governments" (A-3), January 1961; and "State Technical Assistance to Local Debt Management" (M-26), January 1965.

[3] "The Role of the States in Strengthening the Property Tax" (A-17), June 1963.

[4] "Industrial Development Bond Financing" (A-18), June 1963.

FISCAL DISPARITIES BETWEEN CENTRAL CITIES AND SUBURBS

The revenue problems of local governments stem in part from fiscal disparities between central cities and their suburbs. The persistence of these disparities means that individuals living in different communities in the same metropolitan area can provide themselves with roughly comparable levels of public services only at the expense of highly disparate tax burdens. In view of the limitations on how far individual communities can push their tax rates above prevailing levels, the actual result of disparities is such as to force the poorer communities to forgo high levels of education and other essential government services.

Fiscal disparities among communities may arise because the costs of similar service levels differ or because fiscal capacities are unequal. Obviously, the two factors may cancel out or they may reinforce each other, depending on the particular situation. On the expenditure side, identical facilities and programs tend to be more expensive in central cities than in suburban communities. Moreover, programs are not always identical in suburbs and cities. Education and welfare programs are generally costlier in the core city.

In recognition of this, the Advisory Commission is urging the States to insure that school grant formulas provide for an educational level below which no community system may fall, and they take account of the factors that cause per pupil costs to vary from community to community.

Certain State policies may aggravate differences in the costs of public services by encouraging the proliferation of small governmental units. If the most efficient administrative unit for a particular program is fairly large—say the county—a State policy that makes grant-in-aid available on the same basis to all incorporated units of government, however small, will result in higher program costs because of inefficiency.

In addition, the Commission is urging the States to eliminate all features of grants-in-aid, shared taxes, and authorization for local nonproperty taxes that tend to aggravate disparities in local fiscal capacity and that encourage the proliferation of local governments in metropolitan areas.

The unequal distribution of the property tax base among local governments within a metropolitan area is partially responsible for both the disparities of public service levels and variations in tax burdens and these variations, in turn, create a fiscal climate hostile to the solution of the basic political problem—the fractured unity of the metropolitan area. For example, the citizenry of the local government with the relatively low tax burden is apt to look with special disfavor on any proposal to merge with a government that has a high tax burden, particularly if the proposed annexation or consolidation would not materially raise public service levels.

In order to create a fiscal environment more hospitable to the solution of the basic metropolitan political problem, States could shape their grant program to promote greate uniformity in tax burdens and service levels within metropolitan areas. A general purpose grant program weighted in favor of communities carrying the heaviest tax burdens would tend to smooth out the fiscal contours of the metropolitan landscape and thereby facilitate solution of the metropolitan problem from within.

Time does not permit the detailing of other Commission proposals that reflect the vital national interest in strong local governments. Without adequate financing, local governments cannot begin to provide the essential services in the quantity and quality demanded by a steadily growing and urbanizing population and an increasingly complex society. The Federal Government can help through its grant-in-aid programs. However, it is the States that will have to take vigorous action in providing the fiscal powers local governments need to discharge their responsibility, in offering them technical assistance, and in supervising them in those areas where they cannot be allowed to go astray. If time permitted, I would take another half hour of your time to underscore the truism that States are able to discharge their obligations in behalf of local government fiscal strength only as they strengthen their own revenue systems.

Safety Standards for Automobiles Would Save 25,000 Lives Per Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, last year 47,800 persons died in our Nation's highways, marking traffic accidents as the fourth largest killer of Americans.

By the end of this week, 1,000 Americans will have died on the highways.

By the end of 1965 almost 52,000 Americans will have been killed in traffic accidents.

Almost 2 million others are expected to be injured in traffic accidents this year, and $3 billion in property damage will result from this highway mayhem.

Accidents have already brought about a loss of property and life that is greater than that of any war in which America has participated.

These figures are appalling.

But what is more appalling is the fact that 43 percent of the people who died in traffic accidents will die because they travel in unsafe vehicles. Elmer Paul, of the U.S. Public Health Accident Prevention Bureau, cites the fact that almost one-half of those who are killed in accidents could have survived in a safe automobile.

This means that we would save 25,000 Americans this year if their automobiles were equipped with certain safety features.

President Johnson has said:

> We cannot accept the intolerable drain on our human and economic resources that these accidents are causing.

There is a definite tendency on the part of the American public to accept the rising death rate as inevitable, and yet statistics prove that, far from being inevitable, almost half of these deaths are unnecessary.

The prime source for corrective measures for unsafe vehicles lies with the automobile manufacturer, but for the most part, the manufacturer has cavalierly said, "safety doesn't sell." Recently, a fresh approach to this great problem came from the president of American Motors Corp., who said the industry "has done an excellent safety engineering job," but "the industry has been expert in selling almost everything, but it has acquired no experience in selling safety features."

Legislation is essential, especially when we have been told by experts that safety standards on automobiles would save half of those lives we now lose annually.

During the last decade I have introduced and strongly supported legislation to require certain safety devices on motor vehicles sold in interstate commerce. In the last session of Congress legislation was enacted which establishes certain required standard safety devices for automotive vehicles purchased by the Federal Government. The General Services Administration prepared safety features, including standards for seat belts, dash, safety glass, exhaust, lights and other devices, will be available in 60,000 Government-purchased cars by 1967.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation which would extend the new Federal safety standards for Government vehicles to all vehicles manufactured for, sold, or shipped in interstate commerce.

I have pushed this needed legislation since the 85th Congress, and now with more Americans being killed and injured on the highways than ever before, I sincerely hope speedy action will be taken by the Congress. I commend the following bill to the House of Representatives and the Nation:

H.R. 9303

A bill to prescribe certain safety features for all motor vehicles manufactured for, sold, or shipped in interstate commerce

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the manufacture for sale, the sale, or the offering for sale in interstate commerce, or the importation into the United States, or the introduction, delivery for introduction, transportation or causing to be transported in, interstate commerce or for the purpose of sale, or delivery after sale in interstate commerce, or the use in interstate commerce, of any motor vehicle manufactured after the date of this Act, shall be unlawful unless such motor vehicle is equipped with passenger safety devices prescribed in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register standards for passenger safety devices required under authority of the first section of this Act, which standards shall to the extent deemed desirable be consistent with standards prescribed by the Administrator of General Services pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-515. The standards first established under this section shall be prescribed and published not later than one year from the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Commerce shall cooperate with other Federal departments and agencies and with other public and private agencies, institutions, organizations and companies, and with any industries involved, in the establishment of safety standards under this Act. Where other Federal instrumentalities have prescribed standards in the field of automotive safety, standards issued hereunder shall be fully coordinated with those of such instrumentalities.

SEC. 4. Any person violating the provisions of section 1 of this Act shall be fined not more than $1,000. Such violation with respect to each motor vehicle shall constitute a separate offense.

SEC. 5. As used in this Act the term "motor vehicle" means any vehicle, self-propelled or drawn by mechanical power, designed for use on the highways principally for the transportation of passengers, and

light trucks up to a gross vehicle weight of ten thousand pounds, but will not include any vehicle designed or used for military field training, combat, or tactical purposes, and motor vehicles subject to standards prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

SEC. 6. This Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment except that section 1 of this Act shall take effect one year and ninety days after the publication of standards for passenger safety first established under section 2 of this Act. If additional standards are established, or if the standards first established hereunder are later changed, such standards, as so later established or changed, shall take effect one year and ninety days after the date of their publication.

A Tribute to Stewart Riley, Late Publisher of the Bedford (Ind.) Daily Times-Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial which appeared in the late publisher's own publication, the Bedford Daily Times-Mail. It is an excellent tribute to a man who gave life to his community through his newspaper:

A VERY STRONG, BUT GENTLE MAN

(By Ray Snapp)

Change is inevitable, and this is good. Can you imagine a life in which nothing changed?—a life in which everything remained exactly the same eternally?

Can you imagine remaining at your present age, doing exactly the same thing, seeing the same sights, living and working in the same building? Life would become so monotonous that it eventually would become unbearable.

That was the philosophy of Stewart Riley, publisher of the Times-Mail, who died Sunday morning.

But change is not always desirable, however inevitable. And change is often expensive. Mr. Riley's death represents an expensive change, because his valuable guidance, counsel, and leadership are forever lost.

Stewart Riley, the stranger who suddenly came to town a little more than 23 years ago and proceeded to revolutionize the newspaper business, is a legend.

He did not become a legend after his untimely death. He had been somewhat of a legend ever since he came to Bedford early in 1942, just after the war clouds had broken with all their fury over Pearl Harbor.

It was not long after he arrived that he developed as one of the strongest personalities in the community, and a strong personality as the head of the city's newspaper is bound to become a controversial figure.

People came to know him as a strong, energetic, often aggressive person with a tremendous amount of drive. Many people expressed dislike for him even though they had never met him. Others recognized the importance of his influence and leadership in the community and held him in highest esteem.

To me, Stewart Riley was many things. He was the most brilliant man that I have ever known. His brain was a vast storehouse of knowledge and he was literally a walking encyclopedia. Without doubt he was one of the best read people in this area, and one of the greatest pleasures of his life were books on every conceivable topic. Bedford has seen few men of his caliber in its history, and for certain they will continue to be extremely scarce in the future.

Not many people knew how much effort he put into the community in his healthier years. Not many knew how generous he was to the united fund. Few were aware of the community projects which he supported with the newspaper and also financially.

Stewart Riley was a strong-willed man who never dodged an issue or avoided an argument. He was quick tempered, strong, and aggressive when encountering someone who he felt was wrong, but he also was a sensitive and emotional man who would shed a tear when told of a family tragedy, misfortune, or problem.

He was quick to lend a helping hand when one was requested or obviously needed, and as an employer he was gentle, kind, and generous. But he had no use for bigots and hypocrites and took pleasure in bursting balloons of pompous individuals who had an inflated opinion of their own importance.

Mr. Riley was always ready to listen to a reasonable proposition, but lost patience quickly with the unreasonable and with those narrowminded persons who refused to see more than one side of an issue.

As a wonderful employer, he had no match. "Life has been good to me," he has often said, "and I want to share the good things of life with my associates." By associates he meant everyone from a mailroom employee to the top executives.

When he came to Bedford in 1942, the first thing he did after taking over ownership of the old Daily Times and the Daily Mail was to raise everyone's pay. With the first year he distributed a Christmas bonus to all employees and this bonus has grown each year. The bonus itself has become somewhat of a legend, but it is no mysterious thing. He and his wife, Dagmar, who he affectionately referred to as "Mrs. Publisher," simply chose to distribute to the employees a substantial portion of each year's earnings of the newspaper.

Stewart Riley was a born optimist and Bedford is a better community in which to live because of this optimism and foresight. He always had faith in the future of the Bedford area. He had purchased two rather poor newspapers at a time when Bedford was still in the economic doldrums remaining from the great depression. Immediately after the war, when the economic future of the area was in considerable doubt and it was not known whether the General Motors Foundry and the Crane Naval Ammunition Depot would continue in existence, he made plans for a new Times-Mail building. A few pessimists remarked at the time that he was foolish for spending such a large sum of money on a newspaper plant.

A progressive community must have a good newspaper, he used to say, and a good newspaper must have good facilities. He demonstrated his faith in the community by his large investments in newspaper plant and equipment. His optimism, supported by his enthusiasm, his energy, and his tireless efforts to promote growth proved wise.

Mr. Riley felt that the newspaper publisher should be available to the public at all times and he practiced this theory. When designing the new Times-Mail building, he insisted that his desk be directly inside the main front doors of the building. "There will be no private office for me," he said, "I want to be available to anyone who comes in to see me." In more recent years he had his desk moved from its original location in the building because of a draft from the intake ventilator of the heating and cooling system.

The Times-Mail has a conference room which has the appearance of a private office, but it is never used as an office. The conference room has been used for private consultations and a library—nothing else.

Concerned with the comfort of his employees, Mr. Riley had air conditioning installed in the front portion of the building when the structure was erected. Soon after, he added air conditioning to the entire building. The Times-Mail was one of the first, and still among the few newspaper plants to have the entire composing room and stereotype departments air conditioned. Some said that air conditioning would cause too much trouble with the equipment, but Riley took the attitude that "we'll find out." It worked, and Times-Mail employees are comfortable during the hot summer months.

Stewart Riley had a tremendous interest in young people and education. Even though he was brought up in a newspaper background and it was his life, he held an Indiana teacher's license. He always backed proposals for new schoolbuildings and better equipment. His interest in education extended from kindergarten through college graduate work and this interest was recognized when twice he was appointed to the board of trustees of institutions of higher learning—Rockford College and Indiana University.

He delighted in associating with young people and stood ready at all times to offer counsel, advice, assistance, and encouragement to youngsters who sought it.

I have known Stewart Riley ever since he came to Bedford—nearly a quarter century ago, and one comes to know another person quite well in that length of close association. Twice he has surprised me with complimentary editorials about particular articles that I had written. I doubt that any publisher has ever done that before for one of his employees. I only regret that I feel at liberty only now to say as much for him.

He was a lovable, tolerant, generous, kind employer, a man of deep love for his family and bountiful respect for the people with whom he worked. In my long association with him, I have never heard one employee lift a little finger against him. That, to me, is one of the greatest tributes that can be paid an employer.

Bedford has lost a tremendous man and a great force for constant betterment of the community. The Times-Mail will continue, and little change will be readily observed, except for the absence of his brilliant editorials. But the newspaper will never be quite the same without him. Nor will Bedford.

RAY SNAPP.

Excise Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, President Johnson signed into law a bill which eliminates and reduces excise taxes on a variety of items amounting to a savings of $4.7 billion to the American people.

A schedule of reductions and repeals of Federal excise taxes as a result of this bill, as provided by the New York Times, is as follows:

Excise tax

EFFECTIVE THE DAY AFTER ENACTMENT OF THE BILL

Item taxed	Amount of tax	Action
Jewelry, furs, cosmetics, toiletries, luggage, handbags	10 percent of retail price	Repealed.
Passenger automobiles	10 percent of manufacturer's price	Reduced to 7 percent retroactive to May 15, 1965.
Air conditioners	do	Repealed retroactive to May 15, 1965.
Business machines, sporting goods (except fishing equipment), phonograph records, musical instruments, television sets, radios, phonographs, photographic equipment and film, pens and mechanical pencils, 3-wheel trucks, schoolbuses.	do	Repealed.
Refrigerators, freezers; electric, gas, and oil appliances	5 percent of manufacturer's price	Do.
Lighters	10 cents a lighter or 10 percent, whichever is lower.	Do.
Playing cards	13 cents a pack	Do.
Matches	2 to 5½ cents per thousand	Do.
EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1965		
Safe deposit boxes	10 percent of rental charge	Repealed.
Coin-operated amusement devices	$10 a year a device	Do.
Bowling alleys, pool tables	$20 an alley or table	Do.
EFFECTIVE NOON, DEC. 31, 1965		
General admissions	10 percent on amounts over $1	Repealed.
Race, dog-track admissions	20 percent	Do.
Cabarets	10 percent of bill	Do.
EFFECTIVE JAN. 1, 1966		
Passenger automobiles	7 percent	Reduced to 6 percent.
Local and long-distance telephone and teletype service	10 percent	Reduced to 3 percent.
Telegraph service	do	Repealed.
Communications wire and equipment service	8 percent	Do.
Private communications service	10 percent	Do.
Club dues and initiation fees	20 percent	Do.
Pipe and chewing tobacco and snuff	10 cents a pound	Do.
Electric light bulbs	10 percent of manufacturer's price	Do.
Automobile parts	8 percent of manufacturer's price	Do.
Truck parts	do	Unchanged; revenues will be transferred to highway trust fund.
Lubricating oil used in highway vehicles	6 cents a gallon	Do.
Lubricating oil not used in highway vehicles	6 cents a gallon	Repealed, tax will still be imposed but purchasers can claim refund on income tax.
Cutting oil	3 cents a gallon	Repealed.
Documentary stamps	4 to 11 cents per $100 of value of securities depending on type.	Repealed.
EFFECTIVE JAN. 1, 1967		
Passenger automobiles	6 percent	Reduced to 4 percent.
Local and long-distance telephone and teletype service	3 percent	Reduced to 2 percent.
EFFECTIVE JAN. 1, 1968		
Passenger automobiles	4 percent	Reduced to 2 percent.
Local and long-distance telephone and teletype service	2 percent	Reduced to 1 percent.
Deeds	55 cents per $500 of valuation	Repealed.
EFFECTIVE JAN. 1, 1969		
Passenger automobiles	2 percent	Reduced to 1 percent.
Local and long-distance telephone and teletype service	1 percent	Repealed.

Dracut, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday, June 20, issue of the Boston Globe, an article by Joe Harrington in the magazine section describes the efforts of Dracut, Mass., to adapt the community to the pressing demands of the modern age without losing its New England charm.

New schools and restoration of historical buildings go hand in hand in Dracut. I would like to insert this interesting article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ONE OF DRACUT'S FOUR SECTIONS IS NAVY YARD

(By Joe Harrington)

Anyone even faintly interested in the way rural New Englanders have evolved into townspeople and wage earners would do well to take a long look at Dracut.

This process, which began 100 years ago, is still going on in the town which nudges Lowell so closely it is practically one of that city's suburbs.

Like many another old town which now finds itself within easy reach of Boston, Dracut was once entirely agricultural.

It still is, in a limited sense. There are 30 good-sized farms and orchards in the town, which average out to about 75 acres each. But a dozen years ago there was twice that number.

The twin forces have operated there just as in other semirural communities. The sons of the farmers compared the long hours and uncertain returns of a farm against working a regular schedule in a shop, store or office for an established wage. So they bowed out of the cowbarn and the fields where they cut the hay.

Then there is the demand for new homes which require land. As the farms disappeared in Dracut the dwellings have gone up at a rate of about 150 a year.

This new building is reflected in the population which has increased from 13,674 in 1960 to 16,418 today.

The other complementing statistic is the tax valuation. Last year it was $17,714,435, up $1 million from the previous year.

Dracut is a big place, 21 square miles, and its northern boundary is the New Hampshire State line. You can reach Lowell in minutes from the center of the town, and a good deal of that city once belonged to Dracut.

It was established in 1701, and Lowell siphoned off sizable tracts of the town's land in 1851, 1874, and 1879.

For a long time after it was settled by Samuel Varnum in 1664 it was strictly a farming town. Manufacturing began to move in during the 19th century, and there is still a large textile mill in the community.

Strangers learn that Dracut has four sections or precincts, Dracut Center, Kenwood, Collinsville, and Navy yard.

Navy yard in a town where you can stand on the steps of the Town Hall and see a pastoral panorama of fields and trees? That's right.

"The reason for calling the district on Beaver Brook 'the Navy yard,' is pretty elusive," said Edward F. Dockett, president of the local historical society. "One version is that there is an inlet of the river at this point where they launched many boats. Another is that the textile mill there made canvas sails for the Navy.

"But our late town counsel, Warren Fox, had his own explanation. He pointed out that there was a barroom in the district where they shoved so many schooners (glasses) of beer over the bar that the area became known as the Navy yard."

Incidentally, the hitsorical society shows the civic spirit is pretty active in Dracut.

The organization needed a place to preserve and display the artifacts of the town's early families, and it acquired a 99-year lease of the Oliver Colburn House from the town on a nominal rental basis. The house is about 175 years old and the last homestead of one of the families that helped establish the settlement.

So the historical society began a drive for members, and it was cheered by the response that numbered over 150. Then they formed work parties to restore the 21-room house.

Every Wednesday night groups of 15 to 25 men and women gathered at the building near the junior high school to scrape wallpaper, paint, and to do other jobs to bring back the old dwelling to its appearance in the latter part of the 18th century.

So many residents contributed shrubs and trees for landscaping the house that the officers of the society had to call a halt and establish a waiting list of prospective donors.

This volunteer restoration work is still in progress, and there are hundreds of persons in the town who are looking forward to the public opening of the Colburn House.

About two-thirds of the town is well off, because a water supply and the independent water district in the community gets its supply from five artesian wells. The residents brag that their water has such good flavor that people from Lowell and Lawrence come to their town to get drinking water.

From time to time there is talk of establishing a municipal sewerage system, but the town's land area is so large that its cost would be extremely high.

The younger set is educated in six elementary schools and a junior and senior high school, the last two being relatively new buildings of the modernistic design which is steadily becoming conventional for suburban schools. This year there were 3,396 children enrolled in the public schools, while the total in private and parochial schools is 1,026.

Dracut has a committee which studied and recommended joining in a regional technical school. The site of this new institution has not yet been settled. The communities banded together in this project with Dracut are Lowell, Tyngsboro, Dunstable, and Pepperell.

Quiet Spot in Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, over the past months the Boundary Waters Canoe area within the Superior National Forest of Minnesota has been a storm center of wilderness controversy. A recent policy directive by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, which followed the strong recommendations of conservationists and the conclusions of a special six-member study committee named by the Secretary, has cleared the way for greatly improved protection of wilderness lands within this incomparable lake country unit of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

The Secretary's decision is being challenged by some local lumber and commercial interests in northeast Minnesota. As a result, Secretary Freeman has been under heavy fire because of his intervention to protect the BWCA. The New York Times, in an editorial in its June 14 edition, has clearly emphasized the need for wilderness and conservation-minded citizens to support the Secretary in the policy that he has laid down through his recent directive.

There are thousands of conservationists in Minnesota and throughout the Nation who strongly support the Secretary in this move. I believe it is very important that they know at this time of the need for informing the Secretary and the Forest Service of their support for the strengthened wilderness protective regulations that are being adopted as a result of the Secretary's directive. For this reason I place in the RECORD at this point the New York Times editorial "Quiet Spot in Minnesota" with the hope that it will be of interest to my colleagues here in the House as well as to conservationists throughout our Nation who have been so deeply concerned and who have sought and will continue to seek stronger protection for the wilderness lands of the canoe country.

[From the New York Times, June 14, 1965]

QUIET SPOT IN MINNESOTA

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, a former Governor of Minnesota, is under heavy fire in his home State because he has intervened to protect from exploitation the irreplaceable Boundary Waters Canoe area.

The canoe area comprises a million acres of the Superior National Forest which lie along the border between Minnesota and Canada. Since it is the only large wilderness area within reasonable distance of the metropolitan cities of the Middle West, one might suppose that everyone would agree upon the necessity of keeping it unspoiled. This is particularly true inasmuch as the lakes of Wisconsin and Minnesota provide innumerable other places for hunting and fishing lodges and for motorboating and other organized recreation. But such an assumption is wrong.

The pressures for intensive development never cease. For more than 50 years, conservationists have been fighting off mining, lumbering, and private power interests which have sought unrestricted exploitation in this area. Now the threat is renewed from those who want to make money out of intensive recreation, a threat enhanced by the advent of snowmobiles, gasoline-driven machines with skis in front and crawler tracks in the rear, which can damage the natural ground cover but make winter access much easier than ever before.

Acting on a directive from Secretary Freeman, the Forest Service has recently banned snowmobiles, extended the rule forbidding timbering to include two-thirds of the area, forbidden further mining and strictly zoned the use of motorboats and outboard motors. Airplanes were banned earlier from the area.

The issue is one arising increasingly across the country: recreation versus wilderness. But it is a fales issue. No one denies that motorboating is more popular than canoeing, or that motels with a full range of vacation comforts are more popular than pup tents and sleeping bags. But why pose the issue as an either-or choice? Americans should have a wide range of choices when seeking rest and recreation. There are times, as the popular song goes, when "people need people"; and there are other times when we need the perfect quiet and the untouched beauty of a remote primitive area— or at least some of us do.

Secretary Freeman has shown statesmanship and imagination in acting to preserve this broad spectrum of choices. His decision to protect the Boundary Waters Canoe Area deserves the strongest public support.

Congress Should Watch a Development in Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned about a proposed decree which may be issued by the Argentine Government, which will seriously affect many business firms, both foreign and domestic. It is a price-fixing decree which establishes a formula for establishing the prices of pharmaceutical products. If such a decree can fix prices in one industry today, another decree may set the prices in other industries tomorrow.

This proposed decree has been sharply criticized in a number of the newspapers in Argentina. I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the respected La Nacion of Buenos Aires on Friday, May 21, 1965, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. I think it might be well for my colleagues in the Congress and for the people of the United States to read what the press of Argentina is writing about this proposed decree.

The article follows:

[From La Nacion, Buenos Aires, May 21, 1965]

REGULATION OF THE PRICE OF DRUGS

Decree No. 3042, recently proclaimed, establishes standards to fix the prices of drugs. It is a type of state intervention in private enterprise without precedent in previous legislation, even in those decrees of the dictatorship deposed in 1955. One aspect in the production, marketing, financing, and trade of medicinal products has been overlooked.

Everything has been submitted to arbitrarily established standards, which will simply not adjust to the state of the national economy—and this will disturb the processes of production and marketing of goods and cause, in fact, the high prices the decree intends to avoid.

We must remember that the prices of drugs have remained frozen since November 1963, and that by taking the prices of March 31, 1965, as a basis for determining costs (with the condition that they will not exceed those on November 11, 1964—by 12 percent for raw materials and by 10 percent for production chemicals), the diminishing buying power of our monetary unit would be ignored. Also, the decree does not take into account the devaluation made in April 1965, as well as the readjustment in the economy due to the high prices of consumer goods and services. These include those prices which belong at the doorstep of a government which has pronounced itself against political price setting, but which, nevertheless, is imposing hardships on the pharmaceutical industry, without providing special means (issue of bonds) to cover the losses which must result by selling at less than cost.

The decree carefully fixes the following percentages to be included in manufacturing costs, which must agree with the standards set by the decree: expenses for administration, 12 percent; sales, 18 percent; research, 1 percent; advertising, 19 percent; patent fees, 3 percent; financing, 5 percent; replacement of equipment, 0.5 percent; and profits, 11 percent. On the basis of manufacturing costs found for November 30, 1964, the new structure represents a decrease in profits by 31 percent. Of course, one can imagine the administrative agitation that control by fixed percentages will cause. Among other observations, it must be said that a decrease in promotion and advertising expenses will have an impact in many sectors of the national economy, and even on the efforts of scientific groups that count on work from the large laboratories. Moreover, the decrease in free samples will harm poorer patients to whom doctors gave away samples, at the same time affecting hospital care which is supported by the aid of free readjustment in drug-oriented (supplier) industries, with consequent unemployment.

On the matter of patent fees, which the decree seeks to fix at 3 percent of production costs, the functionaries forget that the fees depend on existing and new contracts made with the owners of patents, who will not accept limitations contrary to their interests. Moreover, it is improper in that it affects the renewal of existing contracts by confining them to the new regulations. This could break down legal control—and, possibly, by not recognizing those entitled to patent fees—the new standards will paralyze activities in the laboratories, at which time Argentina will have to import the drugs indispensable for proper public health.

It is also extraordinary that the decree fixes the amortization of equipment at 2 percent of the original value, which gives it a useful life of 50 years, a span unacceptable in any type of productive activity let alone medical specialties, in which changes occur with such extreme rapidity that it is often necessary to change over an entire factory. This happened when the Salk polio vaccine was replaced by the newer Sabin vaccine.

Contrary to what one might believe, while the drug industry suffers so will the consumer under the new decree, for in establishing fixed prices, the discounts which pharmacists actually grant in order to meet competition will be illegal. In sum, the decree under discussion, whose implementation will mean paralyzation of work at many laboratories and pharmacies, constitutes a clear demonstration of the errors that can occur when one establishes regulations in some office, with absolute disregard of facts and the judgment of experts. The results will be a scarcity of drugs which will gravely damage the public. We hope that good sense will prevail and that the Government will suspend the application of a decree capable of complicating even more our already complex economic situation.

We hope that our attitude, without reservation, will help bring about a multitude of reaction provoked by a law that threatens to bring about major unemployment by the dreaded shutting down of the sources of employment. It will force Argentina, as we said, to use more devices to acquire elsewhere those drugs we will no longer be able to produce here. The miniscule code of laws called decree 3042 can only bring harm.

India Loses Luster as Counterweight to Chinese Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Thomas Ross, of the Chicago Sun-Times, has earned a proper reputation in journalistic circles for objectivity in reporting. In the Sunday, June 20 edition of the Chicago Sun-Times he writes from New Delhi, analyzing the status of India in the Asian complexities.

This article, I believe, deserves the close scrutiny of the Members:

INDIA LOSES LUSTER AS COUNTERWEIGHT TO CHINESE AIMS

(By Thomas B. Ross)

NEW DELHI.—The vision of India as the great counterweight to Communist China is fading rapidly throughout Asia.

A survey of official sentiment here and in neighboring capitals has revealed extreme pessimism about India's ability to challenge China as the wave of the future in the East.

The pessimism, stimulated by India's inability to cope with massive domestic problems, has been compounded by an apparent weakness in its border disputes with China and Pakistan.

Ironically, India's prestige has plummeted at a time when its economy has shown its greatest improvement—a 6.5-percent growth rate in the current year, up 2 percent over last year, and 4 percent over 2 years ago.

Nevertheless, India appears to its neighbors much like a prehistoric animal—mighty in size but slow and cumbersome in response to the swift complexities of modern times.

And despite the robust, unwavering optimism of Ambassador Chester Bowles, this view is shared by most American observers in India and the rest of Asia.

India's fundamental problem is its population, close to 500 million, second only to China's and growing at the rate of 2.5 percent a year.

There has been no mass starvation since the immediate postwar period, but it takes $250 million in U.S. surplus food each year to keep "the feeding just barely ahead of the breeding," as the weary American agricultural specialists put it.

Yet, in a Hindu nation which has no religious scruples against contraception, the government failed last year to expend in full the relatively meager funds appropriated for birth control.

Many experienced observers here lay the blame for this and other critical problems to India's bloated bureaucracy which, in the view of one colonial Briton, "adopted most of our vices and few of our virtues."

Despite the stern moral teaching of Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Nehru, the civil service often proves corrupt as well as arrogant and inefficient.

The government is hampered further by an addiction to old ideas and slogans which continue to influence policy long after they have outlived their usefulness.

"Nonalinement" remains the subject of endless government pronouncements and newspaper editorials, even though India was forced in 1962 to throw itself into the protective arms of Britain and the United States to ward off the Chinese invasion.

As a nation which sought to become the world's "peacemaker," India was stunned to find that China gained, not moral outrage, but fear and respect, particularly from its Asian neighbors.

India was shocked again by the reaction of the underdeveloped countries to China's atomic bomb. It had expected China to be condemned but found it lavishly praised as the foremost scientific nation of the nonwhite world.

These experiences have propelled India full circle in its relations with Peiping. Elaborately friendly in the 1950's, it has become massively fearful.

Observers here see the dread of China behind virtually all of India's dealings with the world. Fundamental is a conviction that India can be secure only as long as the Sino-Soviet split continues.

From this perspective, the $1 billion in aid which the Soviets have given India means as much if not more than the $6 billion which has been provided by the United States.

Similarly, Indian leaders compelled to support the Russians on world issues at every turn but see little need to conciliate U.S. opinion.

On Vietnam, Prime Minister Lal Bahadar Shastri has repeatedly criticized U.S. policy because, his advisers explain, of a fear that all-out war there will push Moscow and Peiping together again.

Indian officials expect Americans to tolerate all this without question, and they are gneuinely astonished when the United States reacts adversely.

President Johnson's decision to cancel Shastri's visit to Washington is still viewed here as an inexcusable insult, despite private suggestions that it might have been expected in view of the prime minister's pronouncements on Vietnam.

Ambassador Bowles shared the Indians' dismay at the cancellation. But many of his subordinates were quietly delighted. Although they are no less friendly to India or less sympathetic to its plight, they believe nothing could better serve this nation at this time than a rude awakening to the fact that the United States may grow tired of being taken for granted.

The Baltic States

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 21, 1965, this body passed House Concurrent Resolution 416, a resolution urging the President to take appropriate action to bring

the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of freedom to the Baltic nations.

Unfortunately, I was not able to be present for that vote, as official business had called me away from Washington that day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the RECORD show that I join in supporting the resolution and did, in fact, introduce a similar resolution in both the 88th and 89th Congresses.

This is a belated action, commemorating the loss of independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and the illegal actions by the Soviet Union in persisting in denying these three countries the universal right to self-determination. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea" on the resolution.

We're Teaching Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1965, KGBX radio station in Springfield, Mo., carried an editorial broadcast entitled: "We're Teaching Socialism." The editorial commented on some of the results of the recent legislative questionnaire given to members of the Southwest Missouri Youth Advisory Council.

KGBX concluded that a much more effective job needs to be done in teaching economics at the high school level, if we are to maintain a proper understanding of the free enterprise system.

The editorial follows:

WE'RE TEACHING SOCIALISM

The Seventh Missouri District Youth Advistory Council which met recently at Drury College certainly called attention to some of our most pressing needs in the field of education.

Congressman DURWARD HALL organized the conference to discuss with our high school young men and women the national issues of the day. Students from 83 high schools in this area attended. They answered a questionnaire before they left that showed dramatically that a great need exists for greater emphasis on how our own economic system works. The questionnaire also showed the great drift in thinking and philosophy of our high school students toward socialism. Those that applaud such thinking undoubtedly were gleeful at the outcome. But for the majority who still believe in the free enterprise system, this was a most disturbing sign.

Evidently our high school students in southwest Missouri aren't being taught the economic facts of life. Only 5 percent of those answering the questionnaire checked the figure "3 percent" when asked to indicate the average percent of profit in relation to sales in business. Almost 80 percent thought the average U.S. business profit was 10 percent or over. Almost half of them thought it was greater than 20 percent—a long way from the true figure of 3 percent.

In the field of education over 48 percent of the students thought the Federal Government should guarantee a college education for all qualified high school students. Over 45 percent thought Federal aid was preferable to private loan programs for those that need assistance in going to college.

Over 46 percent of the students believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to furnish all persons with the necessities of life if those persons find their own efforts inadequate. This leads us to wonder what would happen to all of us that work and pay taxes under our free enterprise system if we should all stop working, then announce that our own efforts were not adequate and demand that the Government provide all of us with the necessities of life. And in the area of States and their sovereignty, the question was asked: "Do you believe the 50 individual States are archaic and that the various States should serve primarily as an administrative arm of the Federal Government?" Almost unbelieveable the answer "yes" was given by a whopping 43 percent of the students.

These same young people will be voting, raising families, working in business and government in just a few short years. If they are typical, and we have no reason to believe they are not, then our public schools are teaching enough paternalism, great centralized governmentism and yes, even socialism that you and I as parents should be disturbed. But perhaps we cannot entirely lay this deed at our school's doorsteps. Perhaps these weakening philosophies are being taught right in the home too. If so, then we will get what we deserve in the years immediately ahead.

In our school days we were taught that those that profess to be Socialists are nothing more than unsuccessful people who figure their last chance to get something is to get a part of yours. Winston Churchill said it another way, "socialism is the philosophy of failure and the gospel of envy."

We believe America's future may well depend on whether or not our college and high school economics teachers—along with the parents—start teaching the real economic facts of life again—while there is still time.

Gun Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial broadcast during the week of May 30, 1965, by radio station WMAL here in Washington says in a few short sentences exactly what the truth is about pending legislation in the House and the Senate which would control the sale of firearms.

I am a sponsor of this legislation and I hope we will see some action on it during this session.

The editorial follows:

GUN CONTROLS

National legislation to regulate the sale of firearms has become necessary. The Washington metropolitan area points up this need. A person can easily go into another jurisdiction and buy a gun. When he returns home, the local police may not know that a gun has been purchased.

Legislation proposed by Senator DODD would limit mail order sales of firearms to importers, manufacturers, and dealers. It would permit over the counter sale of sporting rifles and shotguns to local residents over 21 years of age. The bill would help States control firearms traffic and curb importation of nonsporting guns.

The Dodd bill does not restrict a law abiding person's ability to buy a firearm. It does help control the sale of guns. The Dodd gun control bill should be approved.

YMCA TRY Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Young Men's Christian Association of Greater New York has embarked on an exceptionally worthwhile and ambitious program in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of New York City, where a serious and foreboding riot occurred last summer.

The program is called Training Resources for Youth, or TRY. Its objective is to train 1,000 young men in their late teens for future employment. The trainees will be those who are out of school and out of work.

The project area has a population of more than 360,000 and 9 out of 10 persons living there are either Negro or Puerto Rican.

TRY is to become operational this summer with a budget of about $7 million. Its primary sources of funds are the Economic Opportunity Act, the Vocational Education Act, and the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Mr. Speaker, I think TRY represents the best of the YMCA, which for a long, long time has been one of the most respected and admired organizations in this country. The project is needed and pointed; it is directed to what is perhaps the most difficult of all urban problems, the deprivation and hopelessness of the unschooled and unemployed. I believe other Members of the House may find a description of this activity applicable to the areas they represent, and for that reason I offer a summarization of the TRY project for inclusion in the RECORD:

YMCA TRY PROJECT

TRY is being developed by the YMCA of Greater New York, a nonprofit, tax-exempt membership corporation with 28 branches and 75 activity centers in the 5 boroughs. The year of preparation of TRY was underwritten by the YMCA at a cost of more than $40,000. It is being continued with the aid of a grant of $42,000 from the Antipoverty Operations Board of New York City.

TRY will offer a new life skills and basic education program which starts with the needs of the individual and helps him develop the personal resources to resolve those needs. The program will develop new counseling techniques, new tests, new curriculum, and new professional roles. Relationships with universities and public school systems will be established for full exchange of information, resources, and techniques. Occupational training will include six areas offering the greatest promise of employment: auto service, food services, vending machine service, heating and air-conditioning service,

small appliance repair and service, business machine repair and service. Trainees will receive counseling, work experience, leisure time education, placement, and follow-through services.

The TRY project provides for housing of trainees at YMCA and other available facilities, making possible a 24-hour-a-day learning environment. Each student will be paid $20 to $30 a week, and each will progress at his own speed. Estimated time per trainee: 9 to 18 months.

TRY will have a racially integrated staff of more than 200 psychologists, counselors, classroom teachers, shop instructors and youth advisers. It is intended that a substantial number of these will be recruited from the project area.

TRY HAS EVOLVED FROM YOUTH AND WORK

In September 1962 the Vocational Service Center Branch, YMCA of Greater New York, initiated at the Bedford YMCA a demonstration youth and work training program for 17- and 18-year-old male high school dropouts, from the Bedford-Stuyvesant area, where the school dropout rate exceeds 50 percent. Youth and work provides 16 weeks of job training in either auto mechanics or machine shop practices, work experience, remedial reading and mathematics, group counseling and placement.

Youth and work is now in its eighth 16-week cycle. The most recent analysis (seventh cycle) reveals that of the 42 teenage boys who started training 81 percent completed the course; of these 65 percent have been placed in jobs and 6 percent have returned to school. The national average for high school dropouts obtaining and holding jobs is estimated at less than 25 percent.

Each student is paid $20 a week to train, contingent on attendance. The cost per youth per cycle is $1,400. Funds for the youth and work program have been provided by foundations, the New York State Division for Youth through the New York City Youth Board, the YMCA, the Office of Manpower Automation and Training (U.S. Department of Labor) and the New York State Department of Vocational Education.

YOUTH AND WORK GREW OUT OF THE YMCA'S EXPERIENCE

The YMCA's Vocational Service Center was organized in 1944 as a continuation and expansion of previous services dating back to 1871. It is the branch of the YMCA responsible for providing professional counseling and testing, educational and career guidance and job placement services to young people in the New York area. VSC is approved by the American Board on Counseling Services and represents the YMCA in the war on poverty program.

The Arabs Begin To Live With Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, tells the true story of the situation in the Middle East.

Mr. Drummond's column appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on June 18, 1965, and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

The article follows:

STRONG ISRAEL—ARAB WORLD BEGINNING TO LIVE WITH REALITY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL.—Israel today outmatches its Arab adversaries at every crucial point: (1) unity of national will, (2) military strength, (3) economic growth.

Neither the strongest Arab nation—Egypt—nor any conceivable grouping of Arab countries shows any sign of overawing the Israelis militarily or coming within viewing distance of their dynamic economic growth, which has been ahead of the industrialized pacesetter, Japan, and twice as great as the European Common Market.

This, in large part, explains the Israel-is-here-to-stay heresy of Tunisian President Habib Bourguiba.

It isn't that Mr. Bourguiba loves Arabism less, but he is too intelligent, too realistic, and too creative to base his policy on an increasingly threadbare fiction.

The fiction is that Israel is here to go, that it will either fall apart or be crushed by Arab power.

That isn't going to happen, and Mr. Bourguiba is the first Arab leader to say so openly and constructively.

The opposite is happening, and Mr. Bourguiba knows it—and is acting accordingly.

Seventeen years have passed and it is not Israel that is in serious difficulty. It is stronger economically, militarily, and politically. It has more allies than ever before, many in Africa and Asia.

Seventeen years have passed and Israel is not being crushed and is not going to be crushed.

While Israeli progress has been accelerated Arab difficulties and divisions have been mounting.

President Nasser's military intervention in Yemen is a growing burden.

Egypt divided the Arab world in its vain effort to prevent West Germany from recognizing Israel.

The Arabs know that Israel will not tolerate their diverting its legitimate share of the Jordan waters.

Even the more violent Syrians, let alone Jordan and Lebanon, show no sign of wanting to be "protected" by Egyptian troops on their soil.

President Bourguiba has been willing to fracture the Arab front on the only issue which in the past has united the Arabs—total hostility to Israel. He did so because he knew that all this Arab talk of crushing Israel was unattainable and, therefore, untenable.

Too many Arab leaders still see enough political mileage in their "crush Israel" propaganda to suggest that any real Arab-Israel peace can be achieved soon.

But it is coming—slowly and painfully.

When this time comes, Israel will not alone be the gainer. The Arab nations will also be enormously benefited. With far more natural resources than Israel, Arab economic development has been perilously slow and unbalanced. Everything Israel has achieved in the past decade the Israelis could and would help the Arabs to achieve in an atmosphere of normal relations, normal trade, and normal goodwill.

With the single exception of tiny, oil-rich Kuwait (population 300,000) the per capita gross national product of Israel is higher than that of any Arab nation. In fact, it is more than twice as high as the highest Arab gross national product (Lebanon's) and nearly eight times greater than Egypt's. Israel experts are helping many African and Asian nations to move into the world of modern technology.

An Arab-Israel reconciliation is at last faintly visible on the distant horizon. It would be a boon to the Arab world—and to everybody else.

The Teach-in Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the people in the country recognize that we are at war in South Vietnam, war instigated by the Communists, directed by the international Communist apparatus and intricately intertwined with our problems in the Dominican Republic, Cuba, Berlin, and other world trouble spots.

The extremely vocal but small group of our university professors who have abused the communications media drawing attention to their opposition to our actions in Vietnam are very effectively and properly analyzed in a column by Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J., in the June 27 Sunday Visitor, a national Catholic weekly.

Father Lyons is himself a member of the academic world and certainly understands the issue. He effectively discusses the disruptive conduct of the small minority involved in the teach-in performances:

RIGHT OR WRONG—THE TEACH-IN TRAGEDY

(By Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

More than 50 of the Nation's colleges have been playing a rather deadly role in regard to Vietnam. We can expect more activity from them now that we seem to be winning. As long as we were losing they did not seem to mind. There were no demonstrations during all the years that North Vietnam was succeeding in its savage efforts to conquer the south. There were no campus protests or student marches when our embassy was bombed and 121 civilians were injured, or when American families were grenaded in their apartments. The colleges protested only when we arrested the impending defeat by carrying the war to the north.

My first experience with the leftwing reaction to our escalation of the war was not long in coming. Some non-Catholic students phoned from Berkeley that the left were staging mass protest demonstrations against the action we were finally taking against North Vietnam. They wanted to know if I would debate "anyone the leftwing could put up." I agreed, and soon found myself on the Berkeley campus, 900 miles away. My opponent turned out to be Professor Scott, a doctor of political science. Hundreds of students stood for an hour and a half on the campus plaza to hear the debate.

The professor argued that the war in Vietnam was entirely indigenous to the south. He said that Diem had been "dug up out of a monastery," that the United States was the aggressor, and that we should get out. A question period followed, and the students brought 800 copies of the booklet I had written on Vietnam. A resolution calling for withdrawal from Vietnam was introduced into the student council a few weeks later. A Jewish student named Danny Rosenthal wrote to let me know that they had been able to use the arguments in the pamphlet effectively, and that the resolution was defeated. He reported that the council vote was "9 to 9. Whew."

Later in the spring I debated professors at San Francisco State College and else-

where. The arguments I encountered invariably undermined the U.S. position, but never criticized the Communists. The reasons given were similar to those I heard when I debated at Eastern Washington State College in May, the difference being that I was debating there against James Jackson, the Communist editor of the Worker.

What depresses our servicemen most in Vietnam is the scuttle-and-run movements led by our intellectual communities here at home. The real danger America faces is not in southeast Asia but in our own centers of learning. They have blissfully abandoned the basic principles of Christianity on which our country was founded, and without which our democracy cannot survive. FBI Director Hoover has warned that the Communists are striving to initiate other marches and demonstrations "to keep their campaign of fear and terror rolling." But Hoover is old hat to the pseudointellectuals. They consider him passé.

Colleges used to be our main source of patriotic leadership, but if the teach-ins are any indication, they are mainly a source for saboteurs. The newspapers in Hanoi and Peiping are full of reports about the "dissension" in this country over Vietnam, and nothing is giving so much solace to our enemy as the remarks of our professors.

When I spoke at the University of Oregon, for example, I heard the following arguments. Said Professor Ball: "Our position in Vietnam is hypocritical. We are moving in the same direction Hitler did." Declared Professor Aberle: "I am against domination of any country and I am opposed to capitalist imperialism, which is the worst." Stated Professor Edwards: "Our foreign policy is absolute self-delusion." Said Professor Boulding, who had come from the University of Michigan to lend his scholarly support: "The United States is a bandit. We have no legitimacy. Red China is much less committed to conquering the world than we are. The monolithic concept of communism as a world force is a paranoic concept of the John Birch Society."

At the teach-in in Washington, D.C., the University of Chicago's Hans Morgenthau made a slashing attack on U.S. policy. His solution was brilliant: "Let Ho Chi Minh win." Briarcliff's Professor Millet said that "terror on our side accounts for all that has happened in Vietnam." Even Harvard's Arthur Schlesinger, who was supposed to be defending the administration's position, said that we should never have gone to the aid of Vietnam, indicating that we do not even know what freedom is. With Schlesinger on our side, we really did not need anyone against us.

EASY TO REFUTE

My experience in debating against left-wing professors has taught me that they are impossible to convince, but are easy to refute. Don Clark, a junior at the University of Oregon, recently refuted them very well in a letter that appeared in the student newspaper on May 11.

"PROFESSORS: Why is it, gentlemen, that in class many of you repeatedly emphasize that truth is wholly relative, that ethical values have no inherent worth, that the concept of right and wrong is a prescientific myth, yet now you vigorously denounce the immorality of America's commitment in Vietnam?

"Especially you gentlemen of the political science department who continually stress that there is no scientific basis for an ought to argument, how can you affirm that we ought to withdraw from southeast Asia? Why this sudden preoccupation with ethical abstractions? If moral precepts are ultimately meaningless for individual conduct, why should they restrict our national affairs? Or is there, after all, a higher truth to which both men and nations should submit? If so, why aren't we informed about it in class (or has the Supreme Court ruled against that too)?

"Suddenly our professors have become moral prophets, calling the Johnson administration to repentance and damning all who oppose them with hell, fire, and nuclear holocaust. Really now, which one is the phoney; the concept of morality or the professor who does not believe in morality and yet appeals to it in order to win public sympathy and support?

"Or maybe this is just one more example of the utter bankruptcy of modern liberalism. Perhaps, as Whittaker Chambers believed, the liberal professor has no answers for the diseases of our age, but is himself a symptom of its sickness."

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, Gov. John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts, addressed the Second Resources Management Conference at Boston University.

He spoke of the need for civil defense and the proper planning for the management of our resources in case of nuclear attack. He also emphasized the importance of this planning in the event of other disasters—from natural or unnatural causes.

I shall make his fine speech available to the House by including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. VOLPE, GOVERNOR, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE GOVERNOR'S SECOND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE, AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY, JUNE 8, 1965

(NOTE.—Full text of address by Gov. John A. Volpe, prepared for delivery on Tuesday, June 8, 1965, at luncheon meeting of the Governor's Second Resources Management Conference, George Sherman Union, Boston University.

(Following the speech the Governor was scheduled to award commissions to 300 business executives, members of 13 industrial task groups, now developing emergency plans for industrial survival in the event of nuclear disaster or other natural catastrophes.)

I take immense satisfaction in attending this very timely Resources Management Conference by the State's resources management office in the Massachusetts Civil Defense Agency.

Together with Director Allan R. Zenowitz, I praise each of you task group members for the magnificent contribution of your time, executive ability, and advice.

Also, I am very pleased to welcome at this, their first meeting, members of our new Civil Defense Advisory Committee of outstanding civic and professional leaders, of which our distinguished General Needham is the chairman again. Another new chairman I am pleased to welcome today is a well-known business leader, Samuel M. Seegal, who now heads our economic stabilization board.

I hope your splendid example of public service will prompt many other businessmen to join the preparedness team.

It is a solemn honor for me to present you with your proud task group commissions.

For only a few days ago trigger-happy Red China, in total disregard of the test-ban treaty, exploded a second nuclear device.

George Minot, alert Boston editor-columnist, called it the "most sobering, even scary event so far this year."

I warn that this explosion may have speeded up by years the dreadful countdown of acute atomic peril.

In such a growing crisis, including rapid Soviet long-range missile progress, your role becomes increasingly vital to the security of this densely populated, highly industrial State. You demonstrate that you believe General Bradley's grim forecast—and I quote—"The industrial capacity of the United States will be the first target of an A-bomb offensive."

Your decisions and your actions may mean the difference between survival and utter ruin, should global war engulf Massachusetts with all its horror and havoc. For your current mission is to advise me as Governor on the preparation of plans for the mobilization and management of Massachusetts resources in the event of enemy attack.

It is a military axiom that after the first mutual atomic blows are exchanged, the nation that first gets back on its industrial feet wins the war. In large measure that crucial comeback is the goal of business.

I join you today as a government official and a fellow businessman, who talks your language and shares your views.

Because of my years in the construction industry, I bank on the talent, know-how, and drive of American business and labor, in cooperation with government, to cope with any severe emergency—including hurricane, flood, fire, or enemy action. As President Eisenhower's first Administrator of the 41,000-mile Interstate and Defense Highway System—and I emphasize the word "defense"—I know the necessity of keeping transportation operating in disaster, so as to bring first aid, food, and reconstruction materials.

From such a background I naturally appreciate the value of business action. It would be a betrayal of business tradition for any industrial executives to duck responsibility for learning about nuclear danger or to fail to set their own company house in readiness—before it is too late.

Our presence here today proves that you and I believe the late President Kennedy who said we live continually under a nuclear sword of Damocles.

We are acutely aware that in less than an hour an atomic avalanche could be poured on our exposed people and our industrial plants—with attending shockwave, thermal radiation, fallout, and chaos.

As clearheaded realists, you and I will not minimize the hazard. For example, the other day I looked up official estimates on battle deaths in all of America's wars—from Lexington Green to Korea. Approximately 500,000 were killed in action.

But think of it: Military experts estimate that, if Massachusetts is not properly organized for survival, a nuclear attack could surpass this total.

The copilot, whose plane dropped the world's first atomic bomb on Hiroshima, writing in his journal could only describe the frightful spectacle in two words of awesome wonder—"My God."

This single blow killed more than 90,000 victims. Modern thermonuclear weapons are many times more powerful. They are capable of a much more ghastly toll.

So you and I fervently pray that this curse of ultimate terror will never turn any part of Massachusetts into a charnel house of death—buried under radioactive cinders.

Terrible as are the possible effects of nuclear offensive, nevertheless, military experts strenuously maintain that if all of us concerned with national security do our work

well, then—even in atomic attack—millions of Massachusetts people will be alive afterwards.

Huge geographical areas of our State could escape almost without a scratch. A badly shattered industrial system could be put back into business. Adequate preparedness can blunt the blow and hasten recovery.

That's our job. Yours and mine.

On the other hand, one of the most disturbing aspects of the situation is that the spectre of atomic debacle appears so stupendous that the public too often shrinks from facing the awful truth. So do some of our fellow businessmen.

Others assume that the consequences are so terrible that no ruler will press the button. That's living in a fool's paradise. They forget recent unbelievable events. A few years back no one could imagine a beloved President shot down in cold blood. But he was. No one could dream that in modern civilization anyone would doom millions of helpless prisoners to murder ovens. Yet Hitler did.

Others assume that once calamity is on the wing nothing can be done for escape or recovery. Their senses are dulled into fatalistic attitude of absolutely unenecessary hopelessness—and they do nothing.

I warn you: The most deadly gesture of our atom-haunted times is not the shudder of fear but the shrug of indifference.

History is filled with tragedies caused by indifference and ignorance and unbelief and neglect. These gaps resulted in dearth of safeguards and lack of preparedness. All of these disasters might have been prevented by adequate foresight and resolute forearming.

Because proper safety measures were not taken, 1,500 were drowned on the Titanic and close to 500 were burned to death in Boston's Cocoanut Grove fire.

Along the American frontier, Indians massacred settlers who neglected to build and man blockhouses. The Dutch, Danes, and Norwegians escaped World War I. Thereafter they lived in false hope that they would be forever free. They ignored building adequate defenses. Then Hitler struck "like a thief in the night"—slaughtering those unready neutrals.

Failure to recognize danger brought disaster. But almost every catastrophe can be diverted or lessened by adequate preparedness—and so can nuclear attack. I repeat, so can nuclear attack.

Your State government must try to organize for any emergency. With your help we shall. We must plan as best we can even though we cannot foresee the future with pinpoint accuracy. Every war is different from the last. Each had unique surprises that military intelligence failed to discover.

Unexpectedly the Kaiser's huge guns quickly pulverized the stout Belgian forts. Nazi V-2 rockets penetrated Britain's defense system. The "day of infamy" struck Pearl Harbor.

Yes, task groups and civil defense personnel plan for postnuclear attack. But all of us associated with government must be ready for any other sneak punch. We must be on our toes for any gigantic force of nature on the rampage.

Who knows? Maybe accident or sabotage will trigger explosion. Maybe death-dealing missiles will reach their targets through outer space. Maybe eventually the bomb and its far-reaching fallout might be unleashed—not by Moscow but by Peiping. Maybe that bomb might be delivered by a Red Chinese ship off Boston Harbor.

Maybe terrible tornado, flood, earthquake, drought, fire, explosion, or other peacetime disaster might hit our State a staggering blow.

We must not be caught napping. We must prepare for all contingencies. We are trying to do that now at the State level—through all sorts of group studies, disaster drills, and realistic demonstrations at our Civil Defense Agency headquarters in Framingham and our training academy in Topsfield. Other State agencies also are cooperating in emergency preparedness.

Your conference today on the management of resources is a very important part of that continuous alert. For it will further develop advice which you will give me on plans to regulate in war emergency the distribution and use of Massachusetts resources. Without such—confusion and chaos. With such—rescue and recovery.

In conclusion, let me hold up to you this ideal, expressed by the late Prof. Alfred North Whitehead of Harvard University.

"A great society," declared this famous teacher, "is a society in which its men of business think greatly of their functions."

Members of the task groups, that description fits you.

There is no greater business function today than to save Massachusetts from nuclear doom. There is no finer business service than to strengthen peace by increasing economic might.

For your leadership in these grand missions and in behalf of a grateful Commonwealth, I proudly award your commissions.

Fine Address by Monsignor John J. Gannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Clinton Daily Item setting forth a brilliant address at the recent high school baccalaureate exercises of the distinguished spiritual leader and Pastor of St. John's Church, Clinton, Mass., the Right Reverend Monsignor John J. Gannon, P.A., V.G.

I think this address by Monsignor Gannon is one of the very best of its kind I have ever read.

It is on a lofty, spiritual plane, and yet it is down to earth, eloquent, brilliantly conceived, and inspirational to a very rare degree.

The great talents of Monsignor Gannon, and his deep understanding of people and his sensitive response to human problems and needs, as well as his friendliness, neighborliness, and good works have won for him the high esteem and deep affection, respect, and admiration of the Clinton community and of everyone who knows of him in every part of our State and Nation.

This is a fine address that I can commend to all:

[From the Clinton Item, June 7, 1965]

MONSIGNOR GANNON IS SPEAKER AT CHS BACCALAUREATE

The Right Reverend Monsignor John F. Gannon, P.A.V.G., pastor of St. John's Church, spoke of Clinton, its history, the dedication of its founders and their contribution to the United States as he addressed the 185 graduates of Clinton High School yesterday afternoon.

The occasion marked the annual baccalaureat exercises opening the commencement week activities.

The program was held at 3 at the school auditorium.

The students attired in their caps and gowns and led by the class officers marched into the hall for the traditional program.

The musical program in conjunction with the event was directed by Charles H. Young, music supervisor. Miss Merina Healey and James P. Pender, members of the class, were soloists.

The text of Monsignor Gannon's address follows:

"I like our town. I think it is a beautiful town. It nestles in a valley outlined by a big dam, built by men, to supply a precious commodity, water, to a great city, Boston, the largest city in our State, where the capitol of Massachusetts is located.

"There is a lot of history in our town. It is a small America because the founders of our town and all who took up residence here contributed in many ways to make the United States the great country that is today, a model for the whole world. In industry first the carpet mills and today our electronics, bookbinding, furniture, wire, plastics, and other industries make industrial America aware of Clinton. In statesmanship our town has in the past and continues today to contribute respected citizens to leadership in State government, congressional government, and, indeed, one of our native sons became a Governor of this State and later served with distinction for many years in the Senate of the United States. The fields of education, of medicine, and of religion and science and law have been and are graced today by citizens of our town who contributed much to the common good of these professions. I could continue to mention those who left our town to make America great in the various professions and callings, and vocations, our country offers, but time will not permit me.

"But I like my town most of all because of the people who live here. A town is not rivers, roads, bridges, dams, and buildings, a town is people and I suppose I am prejudiced but I think people are just wonderful. They are good people and they have worked hard to make our community a wonderful place to live. They work together on all sorts of projects of common concern. We have our differences, of course, but we manage to settle them in a friendly fashion because we are always able to sit down and talk out our problems. We have the old-fashioned town government here. We do not always agree but we manage to arrive at some answer that is generally accepted in the common interest.

"Our town is very cosmopolitan. People who come from different parts of the world live here. These good people came to our town and established their homes. Many of them settled in a particular section of the town in the early days. One could make a map identifying, section by section, the people by their custom and their language. But great as were these differences, and they still exist, these people learned to live together, to respect one another and to help one another. They formed a good town and I am proud that it is my town.

"I like my town because I think it has done and is doing a fine job for children. There are parks, playgrounds and various youth programs sponsored by the community and by the churches. There are problems of course but all in all the children are rather good. There is a fine school program here. Public and parochial schools educate our children.

"At the elementary level about half the children attend parochial schools. If the parents wish they may send their children to one of the religious or nonreligious private schools or they may send their child to a public or parochial school. One finds here all good schools and I think they have

been doing a wonderful job educating the youth of our town for a long time.

"An opportunity for religious education is given to the youth of our town. Each church sponsors a religious training plan. Our citizens recognize dependence on God and we like to worship God. Witness the variety of churches and a synogogue here. They testify to a fundamental American right of each of us to worship in freedom. The released time hour for religious training enjoyed by the public school children each week educates each generation of youth to a better knowledge and dependence on our Creator and I know our community is better because of this part of our education to complete our formation for citizenship. The approach to education in our town is good and healthy and it has proven to be a source of tremendous and unusual strength and vigor. Of course, I don't think Clinton is a Shangri-la as the expression goes but it is a wonderful town where people can come and build a life that balances the common good in a happy harmony.

"I like our town and the longer I live here the more I realize why thousands of other people, natives, and others not born here, like the community and ever speak well of it. Somehow, I feel it is rather typical of American towns, large or small. Indeed it is a typical American town.

"Because I think it is good I am happy to take this opportunity granted to me by the kindness of the Clinton High School officials, to tell you—the 1965 graduates of this high school—what I have found here.

"This is America. Every culture, every race, every interest, every background, thriving in a free world, contributing to the common good, producing a way of life and a strength which is completely different than the world has ever known. We do not survive by denying what we believe or what we hope for or what we aspire to; we do not survive by asking others to surrender their differences. Americans are dedicated to the principle of diversity and unity. We cannot demand, we must not demand, that everyone be the same, think the same way, believe the same things, accept the same ideas.

"Rather, within the bountiful freedom of these shores, with clear recognition of our obligations, we must continue to develop a unity which allows and encourages differences and draws from all the best for the common good. America then is a mosaic with meaning. It is people joined together in a common cause without surrendering personal desires, ambitions and goals, national or religious differences.

"Our present educational system has emerged from the unique form of government which our forefathers fashioned. On the basis of this was built a Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the idea that all men were created equal. They pledged liberty and justice for all. Our education is an expression of this and we should treasure this gift.

"And this I believe is America. I venture to say that we see America at its very best where we find a society progressive, competitive, free and dynamic. Our founding fathers, our teachers, our clergymen, our civic leaders, with our parents have tried to form such a community.

If you by now have received the impression that I think our town is a perfect community, then you have received the wrong impression. However, it is a good American community. Here people are living together and working together and achieving a sort of unity which yields strength and vigor. We are trying to recognize the differences that are so essential in American life. We are all trying to do our best to make our little piece of America everything it should be without tramping on anyone, without denying anyone his basic rights, without any intention of weakening what we understand to be democracy—a free people living together, respecting one another, accepting one another as they exercise their rights and freedoms, respecting our sacred national heritage and trying to achieve a unity that stands in sharp contrast to a uniformity.

"Clinton High has given to you a planned schedule to succeed in life. The courses taught, some difficult, some easy according to your individual preferences and talents have developed in you the spirit of self reliance and accomplishment. You have mastered the lessons given or you would not be here today.

"Your family life also aided in your education. The living examples of your parents, hard working, industrious, have affected your actions, your speech and your dress. In fact, your whole character, inwardly and outwardly, is but a mirror of your family life. Never forget it and be ever grateful to those loved ones, be they parents or guardians, or grown up sisters and brothers, who were kind and good to you.

"You live in a free society where obedience to law is liberty, but that obedience has not been difficult or constricting. Freedom to play, to work, to pray, to dream, to plan for a future is part of our educational background. Today, as never before, must we remember that freedom and we should ever thank God that our childhood is not a bitter memory of oppression, slaver labor, spying on one another and the regimentation of mind as well as of body.

"I mention these things to you because I wish you to recall where you go out into tomorrow that you have been given every help, religious, educational and material to follow whatever path in life God will open to your choice. Strength of soul, strength of mind, and strength of body, are yours. Use them wisely and well.

"I read an interesting story recently. It read somewhat as follows:

" 'When I was young I wanted everything and all at once, until a clergyman explained things this way. One night he had a dream. There was a new store in the community he lived in. He went in and saw an angel behind the counter. "What does your store sell?" "Everything your heart desires," the angel answered. Then I want "peace on earth, an end to sorrow, famine, and disease," cried out the clergyman. "Just a moment," smiled the angel. "You have not quite understood * * * we don't sell fruits here only seeds." '

"With loving care the church, the school, and the home, has planted the seeds for your heart's desires. Nourish them with constant faith in God, trust in them to produce the career in life you will follow and rely on them to make you worthy of the proud heritage of family love given to each of you.

"All these things have been given to you in our town in 1965, graduates of Clinton High. I think it is therefore a thoroughly American town, I think it is truly an American way of life. I hope that in 2065 our town will still exist and it will be a free, strong, vigorous, dynamic community. I think it will be free if there are still the same opportunities for youth, for this will ever be a dramatic symbol of a free people, exercising free choice, educating children in a spirit of freedom and forming a free society.

"And all this will be possible if you remember with gratitude the lessons taught here and if in your life to come you put into practice the gifts of knowledge, of example, and of faith your parents, your teachers, and your friends gave to you.

"May God who holds us in the palm of His hand guide and keep you is my prayer for you always."

The College Teach-in on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, recently, an article by Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J., director of forensics, Gongaza University, was mailed to me by one of my friends. It deals with the war in Vietnam and with statements of members of our so-called intellectual communities which no doubt are very useful to propagandists in Hanoi and Peiping.

I am sure my colleagues will find this short article interesting and, therefore, I have obtained leave to have it printed herewith in the Appendix of the RECORD:

More than 50 of the Nation's colleges have been playing a rather deadly role in regard to Vietnam. We can expect more activity from them now that we are winning. As long as we were losing they did not seem to mind. There were no demonstrations during all the years that North Vietnam was succeeding in its savage efforts to conquer the South. There were no campus protests or student marches when our Embassy was bombed and 121 civilians were injured, or when American families were grenaded in their apartments. The colleges protested only when we arrested the impending defeat by carrying the war to the North.

My first experience with the leftwing reaction to our escalation of the war was not long in coming. Some non-Catholic students phoned from Berkeley that the left were staging mass protest demonstrations against the action we were finally taking against North Vietnam. They wanted to know if I would debate "anyone the leftwing could put up." I agreed, and soon found myself on the Berkeley campus, 900 miles away. My opponent turned out to be Professor Scott, a doctor of political science. Hundreds of students stood for 1½ hours on the campus plaza to hear the debate. The professor argued that the war in Vietnam was entirely indigenous to the South. He said that Diem had been "dug up out of a monastery," that the United States was the aggressor, and that we should get out. A question period followed, and the students bought 800 copies of the booklet I had written on Vietnam. A resolution calling for our withdrawal from Vietnam was introduced into the student council a few weeks later. A Jewish student named Danny Rosenthal wrote to let me know that they had been able to use the arguments in the pamphlet effectively, and that the resolution was defeated. He reported that the council vote was "9 to 9. Whew."

Later in the spring I debated professors at San Francisco State College and elsewhere. The arguments I encountered invariably undermined the U.S. position, but never criticized the Communists. The reasons given were similar to those I heard when I debated at Eastern Washington State College in May, the difference being that I was debating there against James Jackson, the Communist editor of the Worker.

What depresses our servicemen most in Vietnam is the scuttle-and-run movements led by our intellectual communities here at home. The real danger America faces is not in southeast Asia, but in our own centers of learning. They have blissfully abandoned the basic principles of Christianity on which

our country was founded, and without which our democracy cannot survive. FBI Director Hoover has warned that the Communists are striving to initiate other marches and demonstrations "to keep their campaign of fear and terror rolling." But Hoover is old hat to the pseudointellectuals. They consider him passe. Colleges used to be our main source of patriotic leadership, but if the teach-ins are any indication, they are mainly a source for saboteurs. The newspapers in Hanoi and Peiping are full of reports about the dissention in this country over Vietnam, and nothing is giving so much solace to our enemy as the remarks of our professors.

When I spoke at the University of Oregon, for example, I heard the following arguments. Said Professor Ball: "Our position in Vietnam is hypocritical. We are moving in the same direction Hitler did." Declared Professor Aberle: "I am against domination of any country and I am opposed to capitalist imperialism, which is the worst." Stated Professor Edwards: "Our foreign policy is absolute self-delusion." Said Professor Boulding, who had come from the University of Michigan to lend his scholarly support: "The United States is a bandit. We have no legitimacy. Red China is much less committed to conquering the world than we are. The monolithic concept of communism as a world force is a paranoiac concept of the John Birch Society."

At the teach-in in Washington, D.C., the University of Chicago's Hans Morgenthau made a slashing attack on U.S. policy. His solution was brilliant: "Let Ho Chi Minh win." Briarcliff's Professor Millet said that "terror on our side accounts for all that has happened in Vietnam." Even Harvard's Arthur Schlesinger, who was supposed to be defending the administration's position, said that we should never have gone to the aid of Vietnam, indicating that we do not even know what freedom is. With Schlesinger on our side, we really did not need anyone against us.

My experience in debating against left-wing professors has taught me that they are impossible to convince, but are easy to refute. Don Clark, a junior at the University of Oregon, recently refuted them very well in a letter that appeared in the student newspaper on May 11.

"PROFESSORS: Why is it, gentlemen, that in class many of you repeatedly emphasize that truth is wholly relative, that ethical values have no inherent worth, that the concept of right and wrong is a prescientific myth, yet now you vigorously denounce the 'immorality' of America's commitment in Vietnam?

"Especially you gentlemen of the political science department who continually stress that there is no scientific basis for an 'ought to' argument, how can you now affirm that we 'ought to' withdraw from southeast Asia? Why this sudden preoccupation with ethical abstractions? If moral precepts are ultimately meaningless for individual conduct, why should they restrict our national affairs? Or is there, after all, a higher Truth to which both men and nations should submit? If so, why aren't we informed about it in class (or has the Supreme Court ruled against that too)?

"Suddenly our professors have become moral prophets, calling the Johnson administration to repentence and damning all who oppose them with hell, fire, and nuclear holocaust. Really now, which one is the phony: the concept of morality or the professor who does not believe in morality and yet appeals to it in order to win public sympathy and support?

"Or maybe this is just one more example of the utter bankruptcy of modern liberalism. Perhaps, as Whittaker Chambers believed, the liberal professor has no answers for the diseases of our age, but is himself a symptom of its sickness."

Commissioner George H. Hearn Addresses the Group Travel Executives Association Regarding the Expansion of Ocean Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month Federal Maritime Commissioner George H. Hearn delivered a very timely address before the Group Travel Executives Association in New York.

Although the Commission's interests are involved primarily in cargo operations, the views of Commissioner Hearn will be of such interest to everyone concerned with ocean travel and passenger service that I insert the full text of his remarks below:

REMARKS OF GEORGE H. HEARN OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION BEFORE THE GROUP TRAVEL EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION, AT NEW YORK CITY ON JUNE 3, 1965

Gentlemen, I was pleased to receive your kind invitation to join you here today. At the outset I should explain that I appear here as a member of the Federal Maritime Commission, that our mandate from the Congress is encompassed in the Shipping Acts, and that our business is peculiarly cargo oriented rather than passenger weighted. Although the thrust of our energy and expertise involves cargo operations primarily, I must say that we are not without concern or responsibility in the passenger field.

First, I think I should explain the nature of the Commission, its composition, and its work. I will then attempt to explain our passenger undertakings and to comment, as an American citizen, upon the present posture of cruise operations in this country.

The Federal Maritime Commission was established in 1961 pursuant to reorganization plan No. 7 of that year. We inherited from the old Federal Maritime Board the regulatory functions set out in the Shipping Act of 1916 and in the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933. The promotional responsibilities of the old Federal Maritime Board which concerns the development and maintenance of a strong American merchant marine, now reside in the Maritime Administration which is an entity within the Department of Commerce. The Federal Maritime Commission, as an independent regulatory agency, is not at all connected with either the Maritime Administration or the Department of Commerce. Under the 1933 act, our Commission exercises rather extensive regulatory authority over common carriers by water plying our offshore domestic trades, primarily between the continental United States on the one hand and Puerto Rico, Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam on the other hand. Our authority is not unlike that exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission over common carriers here in the United States, with one notable exception: the Federal Maritime Commission does not issue certificates of convenience and necessity. Any American citizen is at liberty to enter or leave our domestic trades at will. As to the level of rates and fares charged in our domestic trades, however, the Commission has authority to investigate the reasonableness of the rates and fares and upon a finding that such rates and fares are unjust or unreasonable, it has the authority to prescribe and order enforced reasonable maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum rates and fares. In our foreign commerce our rate authority stems from the Shipping Act of 1916, and is substantially less than that granted to us by the Intercoastal Shipping Act.

By reason of an amendment to the Shipping Act, passed in 1961, the Commission has authority to disapprove, after hearing, any rate or charge observed by a common carrier in our foreign trades which is so unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States. The thrust of the 1916 act, as I see it, is contained in section 15, whereby persons subject to our jurisdiction can band together and set rates and conditions of carriage in concert, provided such schemes have the prior approval of the Commission. Approval under that section renders such agreements immune from the provisions of the antitrust laws. A weighty responsibility is thus cast upon the Commission by this section. In my view, this exception to our national antitrust policy is warranted only where the grant contributes to the public interest of the United States. Consequently, we at the Commission must maintain continuing surveillance over approved agreements to insure that their continued operation is not inimical to our public interest or detrimental to our commerce.

In addition to the common carriers by water, under the Shipping Act we have regulatory responsibility over freight forwarders and terminal operators who offer their services in connection with common carriers by water.

I hope that my previous remarks have given you some broad insight into the Commission and its responsibilities. I know, of course, that you are more concerned with passenger travel and particularly with the authority of the Commission as regards passenger travel. So, to that end, I would now like to address myself. Until 1959, when the old Federal Maritime Board instituted docket No. 873, an "Investigation of Passenger Steamship Conferences Regarding Travel Agents," strange as it may seem, only one case concerning passengers was reported by our predecessor agencies: Passenger Classifications and Fares, American Line Steamship Corp., and was in 1934. Oddly that case involved domestic or intercoastal fares. I say oddly because only an infinitesimal share of ocean passenger travel involves our domestic trades. Apart from its historical interest, however, that particular case offers no meaningful precedent in today's world. But in 1959 the old Board took a broad look at international passenger travel in the aforementioned proceeding.

I need not remind you gentlemen that the lion's share of intercontinental passenger and cruise business emanates from New York. Nor need I comment, as a private citizen, that an overwhelming amount of this business leaves our shores on vessels which do not fly the American flag, and consequently, which do not employ American citizen seamen. But I will revert to this later.

In any event, our 1959 investigation, which was extremely thorough, inspected our passenger business through an examination of the Trans-Atlantic Passenger Steamship Conference and the Atlantic Passenger Steamship Conference, both approved agreements under section 15 of the Shipping Act, to determine whether they deserved the privilege of continuing their concerted operations, immune from the antitrust laws, particularly in light of their dealings with American travel agents. Our decision in that case was rendered only in February 1964, and I should note that part of our decision has been challenged by the carriers, and the matter is still pending before the courts.

The chief accomplishments of that decision, I believe, (1) prevents the passenger conferences from prohibiting freight for-

warders acting as travel agents, (2) discontinues an impediment placed on travel agents, by the conferences, against the selling of transportation by nonconference lines, the so-called "tieing rule," and (3) in the "unanimity rule" by which, among other things, an increase in agents commissions could be prevented by any one member of the conference, whether or not our trade is ever served by that member line. I fervently believe that our decision in this case should unshackle travel agents to the extent that they can substantially encourage sea travel.

Ocean cruise business, as you most certainly know, is ever on the increase. As our citizens become more and more affluent, cruises of varying durations and costs become more and more attractive. On the whole, these cruises represent a wholesome, refreshing and rather economical vacation. Last summer, however, over 300 American cruise passengers were bitterly disappointed when the *Riviera Prima* departed our shores prematurely, frustrating the entire cruise, preempting these people of their vacations, and, as a coup de grace, leaving them without meaningful resource to recover their fares. Gentlemen, cruise travel, then crossing the threshold into a most substantial market, was there given a serious back eye. A consequence, as you know, has been the introduction in this Congress of several bills to regulate cruises. Now, while it is true that the unfortunate instances represented by the *Riviera Prima* fiasco are few and far between, the disappointment and loss to the particular cruise passengers on that occasion was nevertheless very real, and I fear, in light of the burgeoning cruise business and especially its potential, symptomatic of further ills which could befall the American traveling public.

Further, and again as a private citizen rather than as an official of the Federal Maritime Commission, I take unhappy note of the fact that our cruise business is drifting more and more to foreign flag vessels. You know, our cabotage laws, as they do in other countries, notably Great Britain, restrict to American registered vessels that trade, including the transportation of passengers, which is wholly within the United States. I seriously wonder whether our cabotage laws should be extended, rather than restricted, so as to reserve for our merchant marine, and our own seamen, the operation of cruise vessels which, in fact, do not engage in the foreign commerce, but on the contrary have the same beginning and terminal point in the United States. This matter, however, is beyond my particular expertise. Nevertheless, as a citizen, mindful of our national commitment to establish and maintain a strong merchant marine, I believe that the question should be raised and the issue carefully examined.

In any event, gentlemen, while ocean travel is not growing at the rate air transport is, at least as a means of movement from place to place, there is, however, an increase in ocean travel and there will always be a demand for it. And in addition to ocean passenger travel from place to place, cruises properly operated and realistically priced, offer a market of untold size and unexploited value. The large concentration of our population in the Northeast United States represents a lucrative tomorrow for those who are willing to provide honest cruise services from our ports. Therefore, I urge you to nurture this enterprise, to develop it realistically, without gimmicks, but with straightforward presentations, designated to meet the needs and understanding of your potential market—honest working people who desire simple diversions and who could appreciate the grandeur and adventure of our ocean vacations.

NCWC Aid Backs Repeal of Right-To-Work Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing in the Michigan Catholic on June 10, 1965, wherein Msgr. George G. Higgins, testifying before the House Education and Labor Committee, opposed the so-called right-to-work laws:

NCWC AID BACKS REPEAL OF RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW

WASHINGTON.—The director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference's Social Action Department has endorsed the administration's proposal to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act's right-to-work section.

Msgr. George G. Higgins, testifying June 3 before the House Education and Labor Committee, said so-called right-to-work laws are politically, socially, economically and ethically unsound.

He said in his testimony, "I am speaking in the name of the social action department and not in the name of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference or in the name of the body of American bishops."

Monsignor Higgins said right-to-work laws "do not provide jobs for workers, they merely prevent workers from building strong and stable unions."

Right-to-work laws, barring labor-management agreements making union membership a condition of employment, are authorized by section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947. Nineteen States have such laws.

Monsignor Higgins said the pressure of them "does not arise from workers seeking their 'rights'."

"Proponents of these measures are uniformly employers' organization and related groups," he said. "Often such laws are part of a program by underdeveloped States seeking to attract industry by the lure of a docile and low-paid labor force."

He rejected the argument of States' rights raised in support of these laws, saying there are "strong reasons why States should not regulate labor matters where interstate commerce is involved."

"The greatness of our economy is attributable in no small measure to the absence of trade barriers and the presence of uniform conditions of commerce among the several States of the Union," he said. "Measures which would destroy this uniformity and erect barriers would be contrary to the general welfare."

Monsignor Higgins also denied that compulsory membership is "contrary to the American tradition of freedom," calling this assertion a political slogan and dangerously false.

"People who make this argument," he said, "are claiming for workers a freedom which the latter do not desire." He noted that in nearly 50,000 secret elections, workers had voted in favor of the union shop 97 percent of the time.

As for the argument that compulsory union membership conrtibutes to "abuses of unionism, such as autocracy, dissipation of funds, and racketeering," he acknowledged that this claim has "a basis in fact."

"But the remedy for abuses within a union is not a measure which weakens a union in its legitimate functions. * * * When a useful and proper form of activity is occasionally abused, the remedy is to attack the abuse directly, and not abolish the activity itself," he said.

The Fallacies of the Opponents of Our Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column from the New York Herald Tribune of June 21, 1965, by the distinguished journalist, Roscoe Drummond, on the fallacious reasoning of the opponents of this administration's policies in southeast Asia:

THE CRITICS—JOHNSON'S VIET POLICY AND OPPONENTS' FALLACIES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—You come back to Washington after a reporting trip abroad, and what do you find?

You find President Johnson being criticized on the political right for not carrying the war far enough and fast enough into North Vietnam.

You find the President being criticized on the political left for not getting out of the war entirely and leaving South Vietnam to its own devices.

You find, not surprisingly, that more Americans—according to the latest Gallup poll—are supporting the administration in exactly what it is doing, holding the course without any intention of giving up.

And this leaves LBJ right in the middle of the national consensus, where he is perfectly willing to be.

The nub of the Ballup poll is that, in the wake of this attack from two extremes, support for quitting has gone up 1 percent and support for holding the course has gone up 7 percent.

What is particularly striking to a returned reporter is the extent to which the American critics of our defense of South Vietnam rest their arguments on the same fallacies as do the foreign critics whom I encountered in Africa—and ignore the same facts.

If their premises are correct, then Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson either egregiously misread the facts or they really are imperialists who should be rejected by the American people. The premises:

That the attempt to impose a Communist government in South Vietnam is a civil war.

That the Vietcong is a great idealistic movement, a sort of Indochinese version of the American Populist Party.

That, even if neither of these premises is true, the South Vietnamese people do not have the will to defend themselves and, therefore, either cannot be or do not deserve to be helped.

These are the arguments which the neutralists leaders abroad love to throw at you. Evidently they are about the same arguments which dominate the critics' dialog at home.

What are the facts?

Is this truly a civil war in South Vietnam? The answer is that a majority (excepting its one Communist member) of the International Control Commission, set up by the Geneva Conference of 1954, has rendered the independent judgment that the Vietcong are armed and led by Hanoi.

Are the Vietcong "social reformers" who just want to create a better life for the South Vietnamese? Or are they hard-core aggressors intent upon imposing a totalitarian rule from North Vietnam? The answer, in the words of Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, certainly no reactionary imperialist, is that "they are very tough terrorists whose gains have come, in the main, not from the hopes they have inspired but from the fear they have created."

Are the South Vietnamese lacking in the wish and will to resist? The answer is that the Vietcong have been constantly raiding medical clinics, destroying agricultural stations, and murdering schoolteachers, village chiefs, and others who risk their lives to give South Vietnam order and social service.

Since 1954 the Vietcong have killed or kidnaped 10,000 civilian officials in South Vietnam. On the basis of comparative populations, this would be like having 130,000 American officials killed or kidnaped at home during a war.

In the face of all this, the South Vietnamese are resisting harder than ever.

The only way the critics can make their case is to ignore the facts. Most Americans are not ignoring them.

Vietnam Propaganda Lies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Palm Beach Post recently editorialized on the propaganda we have been hearing from Communist sources regarding our role in southeast Asia, and because the editorial clearly outlines the fact that many nations are cooperating to defend freedom in this area, I ask that it be printed here in the RECORD:

[From the Palm Beach (Fla.) Post, May 29, 1965]

PROPAGANDA LIES

A comparative handful of Americans (small in number but large of mouth) has been very active denouncing American assistance to the South Vietnamese in their attempt to keep communism out of their country.

This noisy minority would have us believe the United States is defying the world to aid the South Vietnam people.

Actually, 30 different nations are aiding the South Vietnamese in their struggle against Communist domination. To mention only a few:

South Korea has 2,000 troops in South Vietnam.

Australia is sending an infantry battalion.

The Philippines House of Representatives has voted to send 2,000 troops.

Japan has a small unit on the scene.

And many other nations, unable to send combat troops, are offering aid and support of various kinds.

So, when demonstrators, conscientious objectors, leftist faculty members or students, or other critics of America's role in the cold war complain that the United States is "going it alone" against world opinion; remember, it's just not so.

Keep in mind, too, that many of the 30-odd nations giving aid and support to South Vietnam are Asian countries.

There are millions of people in Asia who, having seen our fair treatment of Japan following World War II and our granting of independence to the Philippines, are well aware that we do not seek to dominate Asian affairs.

Those throughout the Americas who criticize our presence in the Dominican Republic might recall that we helped Cuba gain her independence, then turned it over to the Cuban people that they might run their own affairs; that for a century and a half we kept the colonial powers of Europe out of the Americas.

Some of our own people would do well to consider the facts of history.

Men Argue, Government Does Nothing, Crops Rot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, "a tragedy—made in Washington" is aptly described in an article by Harlan Trott, which appeared in the June 17, 1965, issue of Christian Science Monitor.

There are several sides to every story. Some may be more accurate and honest than others.

The Monitor has done another excellent reportorial job. I commend this article to my colleagues and others who are seeking facts.

The full text of the Monitor article follows:

MEN ARGUE, CROPS ROT

(By Harlan Trott, staff correspondent of Christian Science Monitor)

SALINAS, CALIF.—"A tragedy—made in Washington" is the way a farm spokesman describes the plight of California's strawberry growers.

Hundred of acres of strawberries are wasting in the Salinas Valley as growers, unions, and Government men argue over the shortage of farmworkers.

"Tragedy, nothing" scoffs Tom Pitts, State AFL–CIO chief. "It's a hoax."

Governor Edmund G. Brown has told union leaders to "put up or shut up."

The Governor is convinced the growers are in real trouble. He is begging Washington to open farther the door Congress slammed on the braceros December 31, and to let in enough Mexican crews to save this year's crop.

Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz toured the Salinas Valley in March. He announced that growers were making out well enough with domestic farmworkers. Since then the picture has grown critical.

Mr. Wirtz named a fact-finding panel to assess the farm crisis. Then, on April 26, he approved the use of 2,500 Japanese and Mexican nationals to help save the strawberry and asparagus crops.

"Mr. Wirtz should see this field now," said Ben Lopez, director of the Growers Farm Labor Association here. "Would you call this a hoax? You're standing right where Mr. Wirtz stood in March when he said there were plently of domestic workers."

The reporter's gaze swept the deserted expanse of Stolich Ranch—one of four 500-acre fields run by Salinas Strawberries, Inc.

The firm is using all its available help, domestic and foreign, on the other three adjoining strawberry ranches, the Hagaman, the Old Stage, and the Esperanza. For lack of workers, it is letting 500 acres of ready-to-pick strawberries spoil at Stolich Ranch.

"Not a berry has been touched on this spread," Mr. Lopez told the reporter after first making a 3-mile circle around the field.

"You work strawberries in a cycle," the grower's agent explained. "You spray, weed, water, and pick, over and over in that cycle, all season long, from April almost to November. We just didn't have enough workers when we needed them. That was why we wrote this field off and concentrated on the other three ranches."

UNION CHARGES DECEIT

Meanwhile, in Washington, George L. Mehren, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, said: "Weather conditions caused the crop to mature late and all at once, a condition which would strain even a perfect labor situation."

The California Labor Federation insists strawberry growers in the Salinas Valley are "deliberately deceiving" the public. Leaflets sent out from the AFL–CIO office in San Francisco imply the growers may be "in collusion" with banks and big allied farm industries.

"Why don't the union people come out here and make those ridiculous charges?" asked J. (Bud) Vukasovich, headman at Salinas Strawberries' field freezing plant. "The trouble is unions never have to prove their statements."

CONTRACT GROUP DECLINES

The union contends growers are trying to panic Washington into meeting their demands for more foreign workers instead of trying to recruit domestic workers. Mr. Pitts argues that there would be no shortage of domestic workers if the growers were willing to provide wages, housing, and working conditions comparable to benefits in other industries.

California farms hired 271,000 domestic workers at the peak of last year's harvest, and 64,400 foreign contract workers. Use of braceros had been dropping every year since 1957. That year the farmers hired 94,100 foreign nationals, mostly Mexicans.

Braceros worked chiefly on lettuce, strawberries, asparagus, tomatoes, lemons, and sugar beets. All the sugar used in Mr. Vukasovich's freezing plant comes from sugar beets grown and processed in the valley. The fields back up close to the tawny foothills where the ranchers run beef and dairy cattle.

During the peak of the 1962 season, tomato growers hired 43,700 braceros. Strawberry growers came next with 17,000. Asparagus was third with 9,250.

Washington blames the growers for this year's strawberry losses. "The growers haven't tried all-out programs to recruit American farm workers," says Glenn E. Brockway, the Labor Department's regional administrator in San Francisco. "Strawberry growers in Monterey County merely persisted in their contention that their operations are uniquely based on bracero labor."

AMERICAN WORKERS RISE

Mr. Brockway says the big labor turnover in Salinas strawberry work has been ascribed to everything except growers' failure to provide decent housing, wages, supervision, and working conditions.

Has the virtual ban on braceros this season helped domestic workers?

"Right now there are 5,100 more American farm workers in the valley than a year ago," said DeWitt Tannehill, business agent for

the AFL–CIO's Agricultural workers Organizing Committee.

"The trouble is," interposed Floyd Quick, "growers make it so rough on domestic workers they are discouraged from coming here." He and Mr. Tannehill are busy trying to recruit new members for the AWOC in the Salinas Valley.

FIELD FLOODING REPORTED

Growers are accused of driving away domestic job seekers. How?

"For one thing," says Mr. Quick, "the growers are too slow in processing job seekers. They wear them out keeping them standing around waiting to be registered and put to work in the fields. One trick the growers have is flooding a field so that workers have to wait two or three days for the mud to dry before they can work it.

The union agent charged that the growers flooded their fields at the start of a weekend when 1,500 volunteer berry pickers showed up from as far away as Los Angeles and Phoenix. This was after the State labor office sent out an urgent request for volunteers to help pick strawberries for Salinas Strawberries, Inc.

Leaning across the desk in his air-cooled office at the firm's freezer plant, Mr. Vukasovich swept aside these charges. He says the company has not turned away anybody looking for work. He denies it is slow in processing workers, denies that growers turn their farms into quagmires to keep workers away.

TOTALS POINTED OUT

Actually, the firm processed nearly all the 1,500 who came to pick strawberries on the peak weekend, Mr. Vukasovich says. He tossed a sheaf of records that he submits to the U.S. Government showing haw many workers are hired each day, how many hours they work, and haw much they receive in wages and piece rates.

He pointed to the Saturday and Sunday job totals, running into the hundreds. "You're welcome to add them up," he said, "Does that look as if we chased anybody away?" He said the company has every incentive to process job seekers quickly. Ripening fruit does not wait.

On the critical weekend, he said, the firm signed up nearly 1,500 volunteers. "The most the State employment office here ever processed in a day is about 300."

While touring the four big strawberry farms, Mr. Lopez pointed to a worker letting irrigation water into the furrows. He suggested this might be what the union had in mind in its complain about flooding out workers.

"You will notice that while this strip is being watered, that group of workers over there is weeding, and the group way out beyond them is picking strawberries. These operations are all part of the work cycle I mentioned."

STRIP PICKED EARLIER

"It's true you can't work this irrigated strip for a day or two. That strip was picked yesterday by one of our work teams. Later we will spray and then weed and by that time it will be about ready to pick again. We'd be crazy to flood so much land all at once. We couldn't keep our cycle going."

Union criticism of California's farm-labor camps makes Mr. Vukasovich wince, he says. When Secretary Wirtz was here in March, he cited the workers' houses and food furnished by Salinas Strawberries as "models" of cleaniness and wholesome food, Mr. Vukasovich declared.

The company says it is paying the minimum $1.40 hourly wage set by Secretary Wirtz. The union says the growers are using that figure as a ceiling rather than a floor.

Mr. Vukasovich's eyes blazed. Out came another sheaf of reports, this time showing picking costs day by day. A breakdown of these tabulations for May 30 showed that one team of 50 braceros picked 769 crates in 9 hours at Old Stage Ranch. This was an average of 15.3 crates per man per day. The crew was working on freezer berries. Strawberries which are not picked soon enough for the fresh-fruit market are sent to the freezer plant. The firm pays pickers $1 a crate for freezer fruit. This team's pay for the day came to $15.30 a man. This was 30 cents an hour above the $1.40 hourly work rate set by Secretary Wirtz.

Earlier, out at the Esperanza, a Chinese girl working as a strawberry checker showed this reporter what some Japanese boys were making. It was then 2:30 in the afternoon, and one worker had 27 slant marks on the day's tally sheet.

"Here he comes now," she beamed. A wiry youngster trotted up to the checker with his heaping tray, checked in with a grin, and trotted back to his furrow.

FIFTY-DOLLAR-A-DAY TOP QUOTED

Some of these pickers make up to $50 in a day, according to Mr. Vukasovich.

But Mr. Tannehill and Mr. Quick feel as sure as their AFL–CIO leaders that what is happening out on Stolich Ranch is a hoax, a "phony" disaster. Rather, perhaps, because nothing is happening out at Stolich.

Except for a lonely irrigator or two on its 3-mile circumference, the ranch sits forlornly in a tangle of weeds redolent with strawberries. Now and then a red-winged blackbird dips in the rolling-green distance, accentuating the farm's forgotten, empty look.

Chatting in their cramped union quarters nine blocks out on East Alisal Street, the AWOC strategists have it figured like this:

"A big strawberry spread always has some marginal plantings—fields where the plants are about played out and ready to be plowed under and replanted."

PANIC ACTION CHARGED

"We think the company spokesmen are trying to inflame the public against us and panic the Government into bringing back braceros. You couldn't quite say they're making a virtue out of necessity because there's no virtue in deceiving the public. Let's just say they are making a big Federal case out of nothing. At least they're trying to."

All this, says Salinas Strawberries management, is a little too pat.

"It is true the Stolich vines are in their fourth year," says Mr. Vukasovich, "Normally we plow under the plants after they stop bearing on the fourth year. By that time, the plants are beginning to fall off in yield. This is the first time we ever lost a crop for lack of workers.

"What makes it even worse is that this year the spring rains were just right. This fourth-year growth on the Stolich was better than it was a year ago. Already we have lost a million crates out there."

LOSS SET AT $2,350,000

Mr. Vukasovich paused as though lost for words. Then he added, "A million crates of fresh strawberries at $2.35 a crate. And the union charges we are deliberately throwing that away?" The manager tossed another report across the desk.

This time it was the company's 1964 cost sheet:

"Take that along with you. Study it. Why, the rent on the Stolich Ranch for the first 6 months of this year comes to $35,000—that's $70,000 we'd be throwing away on this year's lease, and for what—just to let the crop spoil."

The boss' voice rose above the rattle of conveyor belts in the processing room next door:

"For a while I was getting calls every morning from buyers in London, Frankfurt, Oslo, Copenhagen.

PHONE ORDERS REJECTED

"These union people say the most irresponsible things. Do you think we like to tell those people on the telephone it's no use calling us any more. Or that somehow it suits us to see those 500 acres of strawberries rotting out there on the Stolich."

Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address I delivered at the commencement exercises of the Regional Vocational Technical School at Norwich, Conn., in my district, on Monday, June 21, 1965. The theme of my address was the role of vocational education today and ways to improve such education.

The address was as follows:

NO ROOM AT THE BOTTOM

Mr. Rooke, Reverend clergy, members of the graduating class, parents and friends, thank you for the gracious reception you have given me. I am delighted to be here with you in Norwich again, and I am especially pleased to have been invited to attend this graduation ceremony. As a one-time member of the school board in Putnam, as a parent, and as the Representative in Congress from this area, I am deeply interested in education and in the educational process generally. I believe with President Johnson that education belongs at the head of our national work agenda, that schooling must be the No. 1 business of our country. You young people have made it your business over the past years. Your very presence at today's commencement testifies to the success you have attained in that business.

If I could impress but one fact upon you today, I would like for it to be this: The business of education must go on for each of you, even after graduation. Today should represent the completion of only one stage in your educational progress, not the end of the process itself. We live in a world of change, and education is our best tool for coping with change. You are ready to begin your working lives in this changing world. In order for your work to be successful and rewarding, there must also be room in your future for continuing education. Dr. Grant Venn, a leading educator and keen observer of the American school scene, has stated in his book, "Man, Education, and Work" as follows:

"Today's accelerating and changing technology has placed man, his education, and his work in a new relationship in which education becomes the bridge between man and his work."

Now, your first thoughts may be that this has always been the case in America, and you will be right to a degree. For certain jobs—teaching, medicine, law, engineering, the professions in general—education has indeed been the bridge between man and his work since long before the beginning of our Nation. But there have been other large

areas of work in which the lack of formal schooling has not been much of a hurdle between most men and their work. I think this can be borne out if we think back over the last century in our Nation's past.

In 1865, our country was just emerging from 4 years of blood and iron which has finally established that we were to be one nation. Our country was in a jubilant mood and confident of its future. It had the freedom from foreign entanglements that makes for swift settlement of domestic problems, and it had a vast, undeveloped continent in which to work out its destiny. The northern States, including our own Connecticut, were, largely as a result of war needs, becoming the seats of industrial production and commerce, and the procedures and methods of the industrial revolution were making themselves felt to no small degree. Immigrants were pouring into our shores from old Europe in such numbers that there were plenty of hands to turn the wheels in our new factories, and plenty left over to tame the vast stretches of wild land extending from the eastern mountains to the Pacific. They tamed that land; they joined its old east with its new west by steel rails; and, everywhere, they drew from its fastness the grain, the cattle, the metals, oil, and timber from which a giant new nation was forged.

In those wide-open days a century ago, most Americans had a rudimentary education. They could read a bit, write, and cipher. And that was enough for most of them. The possession of strong arms and a willing mind was more important than a university education in those days. For the eastern boy, there was ready work in the mills and on the farms. If this didn't suit him, there were the rails to be pushed westward. The great west was full of free land where the easterner could settle to farm, mine, and trade. There were always more jobs than men to do them.

Moving from 1865 to the 1940's, we can see many differences on the American scene, but many similarities as well. From a small and isolated Nation in the west, America had developed into the bulwark of the entire free world. It had nurtured the seeds of the industrial revolution to their highest fruition. In the vast industrial complexes created by necessities of war, there was a place for the highly educated, but there was also a place for the less highly educated majority. There were still more jobs than people to do them, and unemployment all but vanished from our land, with the exception of the period of the great depression in the 1930's. Education, at least highly sophisticated education, was not yet the single bridge between man and his work.

But in the short 20-year period between the end of the second World War and the present, the period in which most of you graduates have lived your entire lives, great changes have come about, changes which have, as Grant Venn pointed out, undoubtedly established education as a bridge between man and his work. These changes have been in the field of technology and science. They are often referred to as automation or cybernation.

A century ago, many Americans made a living by combining their intelligence with their own muscle and the muscle of animals; some others, especially in the manufacturing east, by combining their intelligence with the muscle of machines. Twenty years ago, almost all Americans gained a livelihood by using their minds and the power of machines. Today, as a result of technological advances, work can be done by machines with muscles and intelligence. This is automation.

This technological revolution as embodied in automation is still so new that it does not admit of definite predictions as to the results it will bring in the coming years. Various qualified observers view it either as a curse or as a blessing. According to one scholar who was among the first to comment on the subject, and I quote, "Automation will produce an unemployment situation in comparison with which the depression of the 1930's will seem a joke." But the chairman of one of our largest industrial corporations has this to say: "New technology is creating three new jobs for every two we eliminate."

So we are not quite sure of all the ramifications of the new technology—automation, cybernation, increased mechanization, call it what we may. We do know, however, that its results, whatever they are, are not occurring in a vacuum, but are being accompanied by other changes. Perhaps foremost among these other changes is the great population boom, with the great increase in the labor force it is causing. There are currently over 73 million workers in our country, and this figure is expected to rise to nearly 90 million by 1970. In the single year 1963–1964, and one-fourth million new workers were added to the American labor force.

This is also a great process of urbanization going on in our Nation. Each year, more and more of the working force is employed in or near the great cities and large towns. During the war years of the 1940's 1 out of every 6 American workers was on the farm. Today, 1 out of 18 remains on the farm and that figure is still declining.

Then there is the rising degree of educational attainment among the labor force. Not too many years ago, if you had a high school education, you had a distinct advantage over most of the people with whom you would be in competition for a job. Today, with that same high school education, you will have no advantage at all over your competitors, for the median education attainment of the American worker has increased to 12.2 years.

In effect, then, the employment outlook for today, while not fully clear, would seem to shape up like this: There are more workers, each worker can produce more work, and work is available in more limited geographical areas. Most important, the day of the uneducated, unskilled worker is fast drawing to a close. If education is a bridge, it is also a ladder, and there is no room at the bottom. From now on, in the business of making a living, the brain will be more important than the back, the skill more vital than the will. Education will be almost the sole bridge between man and his work, the single ladder between you and your job.

In this context, the role of vocational education is just as vital as the role of other types of education, the university-trained architect will continue to design buildings, but the mason, the carpenter, the electrician and the plumber must execute his designs. The engineer will develop more and more intricate machines, but the skilled technician must build them, run them, and service them. The production-line worker and the day laborer will be in less demand, but the skilled craftsman, the service producer, and the technician will be in greater demand than ever.

The Labor Department has estimated that we will need 50,000 new carpenters for every year of this decade. We will need 5,000 new tool and diemakers annually; 5,000 appliance servicemen; 10,000 plumbers; 40,000 auto mechanics; and 200,000 science and engineering technicians. For the first 5 months of this year, an average of 4.8 percent of our labor force has been unemployed. These are for the most part people who possess no skills. Experts say that for every 10 people without jobs, there are seven open jobs without skilled people to do them. This is where vocational education can render a great service, for it helps close this distressing gap by preparing skilled people to fill those empty jobs.

I do not consider myself an authority on vocational and technical education, but I am interested in this important field. I read about it, and I discuss it with others, for I feel it is vital to our Nation's economic and social welfare. In such readings and discussions, this question, of course, is bound to arise: Is vocational education doing a good job? Is it achieving its goals?

From my nonprofessional viewpoint, I would have to answer with a qualified yes. I think that the people trained in vocational-technical schools are trained well, and I think that our State, with its system of regional schools and State technical institutes, makes quality training available to almost all who need it or want it. In this opinion, other more professional observers concur.

I recently saw some very interesting figures cited by the Connecticut State Board of Education showing that graduates from our vocational schools earn more money and have a lower unemployment rate than graduates of other secondary schools. In 1964, we had 2,425 graduates of vocational schools in the State, but only 1.6 percent are currently unemployed, compared with 5.7 percent for public high school graduates. Thus, the opportunities for employment are exceptionally high for vocational school graduates.

In a survey last year, the Engineering Manpower Commission, a private professional group in New York, said that within the coming decade business and industry will increase their hiring of technicians by 3 percent annually. During that same period, however, the hiring of technicians who are graduates of our technical schools will increase at five times that rate. It is clear, then, that business and industry are convinced of the value of vocational-technical education, and are in constant search of people possessing such education.

You will remember that I qualified my "yes" in reply to the question of whether vocational schools are doing a good job. I did so because I believe there are several ways in which they could do a better job. Let me mention them briefly:

First, vocational education must be made available to all the segments of our population who want it and can profit from it. This would entail increasing opportunities at several levels of the formal schools—in the high schools, where it is estimated that only 5 percent of the students receive any vocational instruction; in the postsecondary technical and vocational schools; and in the 2-year junior and community colleges. It is also vital that we provide greater opportunities for people who are out of the formal schools, including the unemployed school dropouts and adults who have lost their old jobs because of the changing technology, and the development of new industries requiring new skills.

Second, I think vocational education could be improved if there were more interplay and feedback among the schools, business and industry, and labor organizations. With such interplay, the schools could be constantly aware of the needs of the employment fields, of the opportunities which arise, of the vacancies which exist, and they could then concentrate on training people to fill those vacancies and meet the needs. Vocational education is aimed at preparing a person for a job; if that job doesn't exist, the training is wasted. It has been estimated, for example, that about one-third of the money spent on vocational education today is used for agricultural education. Back when most of our population were farmers, that would be fine. But today, when only 1 out of 18 of our present work force is on the farms, I think a shift of emphasis is definitely required.

Third. I wish to emphasize that vocational education must be geared to the needs of the times, as well as to the needs of particular areas. This should be done by introducing specific courses to train people

for new industries, and especially for local industries. At this point, I want to commend the Norwich Regional Vocational Technical School and its very capable director, John T. Rooke, Jr., for its forward-looking program. Mr. Rooke has recently announced the launching of a new program to train health physics technicians, which was suggested by Electric Boat Co., at Groton, with the approval of the U.S. Office of Education. These men will be trained in the methods of health control, radiation monitoring, use of radiological measuring equipment, and the like. You can readily understand why this will be important in the future. There is a growing demand for health physics technicians in the country by various industries. This is what I mean when I suggest specific courses for new industries, with emphasis on local industries—and I am proud that the Norwich school has the necessary vision and foresight.

Fourth. I believe vocational education, like all other sorts of education, needs more teachers and better-paid teachers. From my experience, vocational school teachers are competent and dedicated men. They have to support their families like the rest of us, however, and they can do this more easily by practicing their skills than by teaching them. We must make it sufficiently remunerative for them to remain in the teaching field for the benefit of our young people. Education must meet industry's offer, and the colleges and universities must put more stress on producing competent teachers in larger numbers also for the vocational schools.

Fifth, I would like to see the early enactment of legislation to establish a system of loan insurance, including direct loans to assist students to attend postsecondary business, trade, technical, or other vocational schools. As you know, Congress has in recent years enacted legislation which provides such assistance to needy students enabling them to attend colleges or universities for academic and professional studies. I believe there are also many students in the fields of vocational and technical education who need such assistance, and they are entitled to this aid as much as others. There is such a bill now pending before the Congress, introduced by Representative JOHN H. DENT, of Pennsylvania, which should be enacted as soon as possible and I plan to support it. It would not only fill a gap, but also help place vocational education on an equal status with the rest of our educational process.

Sixth and finally, there is the matter of prestige. For some reason, many Americans look on vocational education as a stepchild of the real schools. They are wrong, of course. Those who are closest to vocational education—the businesses and the industries who need these graduates and hire them as fast as they can get them—have long realized its worth. But it will be up to you and others like you to change this mistaken public image. The task of the vocational school is as noble as the task of any other American school. Indeed, it is the same. It is to prepare young people with the general education and to provide them with special skills that will help them become competent members of our country's productive force and intelligent participants in its governmental and social processes. Your performance in the years ahead will tell whether or not this school has succeeded. If it has—and I am confident that it has—the prestige of vocational education as a whole will be greatly enhanced.

A while back I spoke of education as a bridge and as a ladder—the bridge between you and your job, the ladder between you and success. Each step up the ladder of learning is more difficult and more challenging. You have worked hard to attain that diploma and you have earned it well. But keep climbing up that ladder, leave room in your future for continuing education and growth—otherwise you may find yourself struggling at the bottom.

So, on this day of completion and beginning, I congratulate you and extend to all of you my best wishes for the future.

Air Force in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, from time to time questions are asked with reference to our space program as to the part the military plays in its overall objectives. Last month, Gen. Ben A. Schriever, Commander of the Air Force Systems Command spoke to the Aviation-Space Writer Association Conference in Albuquerque, N. Mex., where he discussed the Air Force role in space.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include General Schriever's remarks:

THE AIR FORCE IN SPACE

(By Gen. B. A. Schriever)

I welcome the opportunity to discuss the Air Force in space. This is a subject that has occupied much of my life for the past 10 years. Of course, the Air Force interest in space is much older than that. It goes back to the 1940's—with the Rand study of satellites in 1946 and the establishment of the Department of Space Medicine at the School of Aviation Medicine in 1949. But it was not until 1954 that we began the ballistic missile development which led to a practical means of access to space. Since that time our efforts have grown rapidly. Today, nearly 5,000 military and civilian personnel are employed in our Space Systems Division alone. Hundreds of thousands in the aerospace industries work with the Air Force and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the national space effort.

The Air Force responsibility for our Nation's military developments in space is clearly established. This morning I would like to review our current progress in the areas of unmanned space programs, boosters, and propulsion, and finally, manned space programs.

Let me begin with four representative unmanned programs—ballistic missile warning, antisatellite defense, detection of nuclear detonations, and communications.

In this age of ballistic missiles we must try to achieve the maximum warning time of missile attack. A space-based system has a decided advantage in furnishing early warning on a worldwide basis.

In the late 1950's, a small group of Air Force officers began a program to develop a space-based missile detection and warning system. To obtain information on the background as observed from space and on the signature of ballistic missile rocket motors, the Air Force initiated a series of measurement programs. Instrumented aircraft were used to obtain data on our missile target, from many aspects and in various weather conditions. Concurrently, a spacecraft "piggyback" program for background measurements was instituted. This program has resulted in information of great value and is still collecting valuable data.

Studies are being carried out in several distinct technologies—spacecraft stability, orbital power generation and satellite thermal control. Rapid transmission and processing of the acquired data and optimum display are also required. Giant strides are being made in this field. We are continuing to develop the technological base from which an effective space-based ballistic missile detection system can be produced and operated.

The second area of interest is antisatellite defense. Last September, President Johnson announced the existence of operational U.S. antisatellite defense systems. Although our national policy is clear that space should be preserved for peaceful purposes, we cannot assume that offensive space systems will never be developed; nor can we wait until such a threat becomes a reality to develop an effective counter. Accordingly the Secretary of Defense directed the Army and the Air Force to achieve a satellite defense capability in just over 15 months. This attainment by the Army and the Air Force in even less time was a noteworthy achievement. All steps necessary to provide an operational capability, such as training of launch and maintenance crews, ordering of spares, and compilation of operating and maintenance manuals, were undertaken concurrently with the research and development effort.

Despite our success in fielding this system, there is still much to do in extending this capability to meet future challenges. We are striving to increase the overall effectiveness of existing systems and are working on those that will follow.

The third area of interest is the detection of nuclear detonations in space. The original effort was formerly known as "Vela Hotel," and has now emerged as the present Vela satellite program. Overall responsibility for high altitude detection was assigned to the Department of Defense with the assistance of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) has primary responsibility for the Vela satellite with detailed management and actual implementation delegated to the Space Systems Division of Air Force Systems Command.

The prime objective of the Vela satellite program is to conduct space-based experiments to gather knowledge of radiation backgrounds in far space and to define an operational nuclear detection system. The research and development (R. & D.) program will evaluate X-ray, gamma ray, and neutron sensors to detect and diagnose nuclear detonation signals against the natural radiation background of far space.

In 1963, the first pair of Vela satellites was launched from Cape Kennedy; the second launch occurred in 1964. Both launches were completely successful, and the four satellites are still functioning. The four spacecraft are not only providing the necessary background radiation data and scientific information on solar phenomena, but actually constitute an excellent test ban monitoring capability with the research and development satellite configuration.

Success of these first two launches has enabled us to move the research and development program ahead by more than a year and thereby achieve cost savings. In the next Vela launch the two basic satellites will have significantly greater detection capability than the first two. The following two launches will employ completely redesigned spacecraft to investigate new and improved concepts of nuclear detection. The last two will use the Titan III-C booster with its greater payload capability.

The last area that I would like to consider in unmanned military space systems is communication satellites, commonly called Comsat. Our current philosophy of controlled response has placed an additional emphasis upon communications between field commanders and the highest levels of our Nation. One need only to examine the

current Vietnam situation to realize this point.

A satellite communication system to satisfy military requirements has long been technically possible, and now has been authorized by the Department of Defense. An initial research and development system is planned for lanuch early in 1966. It will consist of up to 24 communication satellites circling the globe in random spacing at an altitude of about 21,000 statute miles. Only three launches will be required to place the system in orbit, with clusters of eight satellites launched from a single Titan III-C. Individual satellites will be positioned along an orbital path in a predetermined pattern.

An advanced system is also planned, in which the expected life of each satellite is to be increased from 1½ years to 3 to 5 years.

Now let me turn to the subject of boosters and propulsion.

The Air Force has a stable of reliable space boosters derived from the balistic missile program. The earlier Atlas and Thor vehicles have been joined by the Titan II-type Gemini launch vehicle. Soon the versatile Titan III system will be added to the inventory.

Titan III is the first booster that the Department of Defense had developed specifically for space applications and operations. It was first proposed in 1961, and its development and test schedules were established in 1962. The first launch of the Titan III-A was accompanied only 1 day late of the original target month, August 1964. We are progressing on schedule toward the first launch this summer of the Titan III-C which is the Titan III-A augmented with two 120-inch-diameter solid strap-on motors.

The Titan III vehicle demonstrated the capabilities of its inertial guidance system in February by executing perfectly a complicated series of maneuvers. First it was placed in a 100-mile circular orbit with better than 99-percent positional accuracy. At a prearranged time, the guidance system then caused the vehicle to be transferred from its 100-mile orbit into a 1,500-mile circular orbit within an accuracy of several feet of altitude. The accuracy of this guidance system indicates that Titan III-C, with no midcourse correction, could impact a 5,000-pound payload on the moon with a high degree of accuracy.

The Titan III provides a vehicle family which can satisfy a broad spectrum of performance requirements with maximum cost effectiveness. The Titan III-A core provides the nucleus upon which combinations of essentially off-the-shelf propulsion elements may be added. This modular, or building block, design concept makes possible a series of vehicles that can boost payloads in the 5,000- to 40,000-pound class to a variety of orbits.

To carry heavier payloads we can increase performance by adding a third-stage Agena vehicle, by strapping on two or four standard solid propellent Minuteman motors, or by increasing the standard 120-inch motors from five segments to seven. Finally, 156-inch solid motors can be attached to the basic core to provide even greater capability. Studies have shown that the Titan III is readily adaptable to other upper stages now in being or under development, including the high-energy lox-hydrogen Centaur stage.

By thus combining flexibility with proven reliability, the Titan III concept can yield potential savings of millions of dollars.

By virtue of storable propellants and solid motor strap-ons, the Titan III is capable of remaining on pad in a launch ready status for 30 days. It is the first space booster vehicle that will satisfy military operational requirements of extended readiness and ability to respond almost instantaneously. We are gratified with our progress in demonstrating the value of this launch vehicle.

Beyond Titan III we must seek space vehicle combinations which offer more economical access to space. The direct operating costs with current boosters range from $1,200 per pound in low earth orbit with the Titan II Gemini launch vehicle to about $2,500 per pound for the Thor-Delta. We expect that Titan III will reduce this launch cost to approximately $500 to $700 per pound in low earth orbit. Greater savings are possible through the use of cheap expendable boosters and reusable vehicles. Some of our studies have revealed advanced launch vehicle concepts that appear capable of orbiting payloads of $100 to $200 per pound.

We visualize three general classes of advanced launch vehicle systems. These are an advanced expendable booster; a reusable or partially reusable rocket vehicle that takes off vertically and lands horizontally; and, finally a fully or partially reusable vehicle powered by combinations of air breather and rocket engines which takes off and lands horizontally. An advanced expendable booster and a verticle takeoff recoverable rocket could be developed and produced in the near future. Air breathing, horizontal takeoff recoverable vehicles appear to require longer development times. Other classes of vehicles such as reusable nuclear vehicles, reusable single stage to orbit vehicles, and hypersonic aerospace planes are further off.

A recoverable first stage is well within the state of the art. The problems of upper stage and spacecraft reusability are being attacked. Problem areas include vehicle separation aerodynamics, materials, refurbishment, and cryogenic tankage difficulties.

Several promising technology programs are underway in the area of propulsion, which is a big pacing factor in space technology. The Air Force is embarking on a program with NASA to demonstrate very high chamber pressure cryogenic rocket engines. The performance from these engines is expected to increase payloads for recoverable vehicles by 50 percent. These engines also will be capable of being throttled, which will provide future recoverable space vehicles with a better maneuvering capability.

A second propulsion technology program shows the exciting possibility of bridging the gap between the upper atmosphere and space. This is the supersonic combustion ramjet, or scramjet. It is a technology program today—it may be an engine if we push it hard enough. The scramjet engine would operate within the sensible atmosphere to the edge of space and could provide either the base to thrust tremendous payloads into space—or else an engine that could propel supersonic aircraft. Aircraft powered by scramjet engines could travel from coast to coast in less than an hour.

Scramjet is a ramjet whose flow is supersonic throughout the inlet, combustor, and nozzle. The advantages of supersonic flow in a ramjet engine at high mach numbers are the low internal temperatures and pressures that otherwise would be so great as to require very heavy and massive structures. As a result, the large energy losses typical of a subsonic burning ramjet—caused by slowing the incoming air, burning, then accelerating again—do not occur in the supersonic burning ramjet, where the flow is slowed but very little in its supersonic passage. Consequently, scramjet offers outstanding fuel economy.

A number of leading U.S. scientists have found supersonic combustion technically feasible and have urged its development. Our Nation just cannot afford to ignore such a promising propulsion system. For this reason the Air Force intends to pursue the technology necessary to realize scramjet.

Now let me turn to the application of technology to manned military space flight.

The Air Force first studied and proposed exploratory manned space flight as early as the winter of 1957-58. When the basic Manned Orbiting Laboratory concept was announced by the Secretary of Defense a year and a half ago, we welcomed the opportunity to evaluate potential military capability and operations in space.

During the past year the Manned Orbiting Laboratory concept has been studied in considerable detail. The Laboratory, originally likened to a small house trailer, can now be described in specific terms. The initial questions and alternative technical considerations have been largely resolved. Maximum use will be made of hardware and subsystems from other DOD and NASA programs, such as Gemini and Apollo hardware, thereby minimizing development risks and costs.

An important aspect of the Manned Orbiting Laboratory system is the significantly increased free volume for flight crew operation. It will permit much greater physical activity than is available in the Gemini and Apollo spacecraft—an important factor in maintaining the well-being of the crew during extended spaceflight, as well as providing the capability for varied exepriment combinations.

The Manned Orbiting Laboratory subsystem would enable us to test and evaluate prototypes of military space subsystems and components in actual orbital conditions. Failures can be observed as they occur, and on-the-spot analysis and corrective solutions can be applied. This would enable us to develop more reliable equipment in reduced time and at lesser cost.

Two approaches to the design of the vehicle are being considered. One would use the Apollo spacecraft and the other would use a modified Gemini. If the Gemini approach is selected, the spacecraft subsystem for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory would make maximum use of the investment in that program. The military version of the NASA Gemini spacecraft, the Gemini B, would use 75 percent of the design and engineering developed by the NASA, and 85 percent of the flight and operations experience. Approximately 40 percent of the Gemini B aerospace ground equipment hardware requirements can be met from equipment becoming excess to the NASA Gemini program—a large dollar savings.

The early availability of the Titan III-C would permit the Manned Orbiting Laboratory program to proceed without costly delays. The Titan III transtage can supply most of the required on-orbit maneuver capability.

The primary experiments in the Manned Orbiting Laboratory program are directly associated with potential military applications and are designed to determine man's role in the space environment. The other services will participate in the sponsorship of experiments and in technical assistance. NASA will be invited to provide experience and technical assistance to make the Manned Orbiting Laboratory a truly national space program.

A further aspect of the manner spaceflight program would be the development of spacecraft capable of maneuvering during reentry. The use of ballistic reentry vehicles with over water recovery is not satisfactory for military purposes. Flexibility of space operations can be improved by use of reentry vehicles which can maneuver and land at any point within a certain area known as the vehicle's "footprint." This "footprint" may encompass thousands of square miles.

As the size of the "footprint" increases, a greater choice of alternate landing sites is possible. Lifting reentry vehicles can also make horizontal airplane-like landings on existing runways.

The Air Force spacecraft technology and advanced reentry tests program (START) is an investigation of lifting bodies to provide such a capability. A forerunner to the START program was a radiation-cooled winged glider called Asset, which successfully

completed its sixth and last hypersonic flight in February.

The next phase will use the SV-5 lifting body reentry vehicle, which is wingless and derives its lift from the fuselage. It has sufficient maneuverability to provide a reasonably large "footprint" and is provided with an ablative heat shield. Four hypersonic flight tests with launch from Vandenberg Air Force Base, are planned in 1966-67. The vehicles will follow a ballistic trajectory with reentry at orbital velocities and maneuvering flight down to aircraft speeds.

A later phase of the program might provide the data from mach 2 to landing speed. A piloted SV-5 lifting body could be dropped from a B-52 mothership, in the same way that the X-15 is launched. Data could be obtained on the flight characteristics, aerodynamic stability, and control. The flights would be coordinated with flight tests of other lifting body configurations being investigated by NASA. As a side benefit Air Force pilots would gain experience in the flight characteristics of a potential future spacecraft.

My remarks reflect the Air Force contribution to the space age. We are continuing to improve our technical competence. With NASA we expect to contribute materially to the national space program. A solid base is being built with the successful Gemini flights and the steady progress toward the Apollo lunar landing. But we cannot afford to be complacent. As a Nation we must redouble our efforts in space.

Both NASA and the Air Force have responsibilities in this regard. I get impatient with allegations that the two agencies are in some kind of wasteful competition. Where there is competition, it is productive, not wasteful. The NASA and Air Force programs are complementary, not duplicating. By the joint direction of Mr. McNamara and Mr. Webb, the Air Force and NASA have completed coordinated studies of the quite different missions to be performed by the Manned Orbiting Laboratory and extended Apollo. These studies currently are being evaluated. The Air Force stands ready to assist NASA in its space effort. At the same time I know that we can call on NASA for assistance when needed.

In summary, space is a new environment of activity. We need to exploit it effectively for our own purposes to prevent it from being used against us. We are aware of the many problems confronting us and do not pretend to have all the solutions. But much has been done, and we are building a broad technological base to meet the even greater challenges of the future.

Thank you.

The New Departure Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the best examples I have ever seen of a unified city effort for a common goal and a newspaper's contribution to civic duty and responsibility was demonstrated recently in Bristol, Conn.

If my colleagues will note an editorial which appeared June 7 in the Bristol Press, they will read of the results stemming from many months of hard, unceasing work by business leaders, labor leaders and Bristol city officials, results of which any city in the United States could be proud.

But there is one part of the story which is not told in this editorial—the role of the Bristol Press in accurate and perceptive news reporting and editorial page support and the role of that paper's copublisher and general manager, Mr. E. Bartlett Barnes. Mr. Barnes not only spearheaded the Press' full support for the city's solution to its problem but also personally spent many hours conferring with all of the people involved in this situation and exerting his influence as one of Bristol's outstanding civic leaders. The people of Bristol owe him a great debt of gratitude.

I commend Mr. Barnes, the Press, and all the other business, labor and government leaders who brought this project to fruition and include the June 7 editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE NEW DEPARTURE STORY

Since the first water wheel started turning on the Pequabuck River some 2½ centuries ago, the destiny of Bristol has been interwoven with its industry.

What has been good for the one has not always been good for the other but the two have learned to live together for their mutual benefit.

It comes as no surprise, therefore, that Bristol is making a determined effort to persuade General Motors Corp. to build here a new plant for its New Departure-Hyatt Bearings Division.

The New Departure story in Bristol dates back to its founding in 1888, as the New Departure Bell Co.

But the current and most important chapter of recent years began on January 8 of this year.

John F. Gordon, president of General Motors at that time, announced a consolidation of New Departure with Hyatt Bearings, a New Jersey firm.

He further revealed that the Meriden and Britsol units of New Departure would be merged and that "a new manufacturing plant will be built in the Bristol area."

The term "Bristol area" did not go unnoticed.

To even the most casual observer it implied that New Departure-Hyatt might build its new plant outside Bristol proper.

Responsible citizens immediately rose to the challenge. City officials and the chamber of commerce pledged their assistance to General Motors and set out to find a satisfactory building site.

During the next 2 months six locations were offered to General Motors. None were acceptable for one reason or another. Finally, as the result of some yeoman spadework on the part of a few individuals, options on 300 acres of prime land on Chippens Hill were secured for General Motors.

This move was followed closely by a proposal to esablish an industrial park on Chippens Hill. City fathers indicated a willingness to provide the necessary utilities, including an expensive rail spur.

The Chippens Hill plan was not put forth without some soul searching and trepidation on the part of its proponents.

No finer land exists in Bristol than the rolling green acres of Chippens Hill. Logically, the area is in a top residential zone.

Common good, however, seemed to justify the decision.

Those involved were well aware that a modern industrial complex can become an attractive addition to almost any neighborhood. They felt that General Motors—if and when—would do its best to be such a neighbor.

And there existed across the Nation ample precedent for using tax money to attract or retain industry.

So, the industrial park proposal went to Hartford for approval by the general assembly.

Up to this point the connection between the Chippens Hill plan and General Motors had not been made public.

But as any cub reporter can tell you, no story involving the world's largest corporation and a city of 50,000 persons can remain under wraps for long.

The word was already out by May 11 when a public hearing on the Bristol bill was held at the State capitol by the assembly's finance committee.

Here Bristol presented an almost united front in support of the measure—house bill 4856.

One after another, city officials, political chiefs, labor spokesmen, and civic leaders paraded before the committee to offer their endorsement.

It was a nonpartisan effort in the best tradition of a municipality rallying in times of stress.

There was recorded at the hearing some opposition to the Chippens Hill plan, as might have been expected. Those against the bill, however, were more out for information than they were for blood.

Three weeks slid by during which the bill was reported favorably out of committee. Then came the battle of Bristol.

For reasons political, economic, and bureaucratic, various legislators were reluctant to hasten house bill 4856 on its way.

Mayor James P. Casey was not to be put off.

Day after day he roamed the capitol, wheedling, cajoling, applying pressure where it would do the most good. Ably backing up Bristol's cause were this city's representatives—Charles J. Leclere and William C. Hogan—along with house finance chairman, Representative Robert T. Cairns and senate finance chairman, William Verriker.

Finally, a much modified bill was approved last week by the assembly and signed into law by Governor Dempsey.

Now the burden rests entirely with this city.

It must approve an ordinance defining the industrial park's bounds and authorizing a bond issue to pay for the utilities. It must provide both zoning and planning commission sanctions.

The first test will come at 8 p.m. Thursday night at a public hearing on the industrial park ordinance.

We feel certain that Bristol will continue to support this bid for New Departure's plant. Like the partners in a successful marriage, each needs the other.

The nearly $1 million in taxes, the 5,100 jobs which a new General Motors plant would provide here are of inestimable importance to the welfare of the city. Moreover, the personal ties between Bristol and New Departure are strong. Few are the residents who do not either work at New Departure themselves or who do not have a friend or neighbor there.

Not to be minimized, on the other hand, is the skilled labor force, in the best father and son General Motors tradition, provided by Bristol, nor the choice plant site now being offered.

Taxpayers here should not be misled into thinking that the $800,000 or $1 million to be spent on the Chippen Hill industrial park is giveaway.

It is a calculated investment in the future of the city, an investment which stands to yield a huge return.

Statement of Allan L. Levine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, now pending before the Committee on Ways and means is H.R. 6960, to implement an agreement concerning automotive products between the Government of the United States and Canada.

During hearings, recently conducted on this proposed legislation, Mr. Allan L. Levine, of Lowell, Mass., presented a most cogent and penetrating analysis. Mr. Levine is executive vice president of Towers Motor Parts Corp. of Lowell. In addition, he is president of the Automotive Service Industry Association, a national trade association of over 5,000 members representing independent automotive parts manufacturers and wholesalers.

Because this House will be called upon to consider this legislation, I bring to the attention of my colleagues Mr. Levine's studied and considered commentary on H.R. 6960:

STATEMENT OF ALLAN L. LEVINE, PRESIDENT, AUTOMOTIVE SERVICE INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, APRIL 28, 1965

My name is Allan L. Levine, of Lowell, Mass. I am executive vice president of Towers Motor Parts Corp., a wholesaler of automotive replacement parts. I am appearing here today in my capacity as the elected president of the Automotive Service Industry Association. Our members are primarily interested in the replacement parts segment of the automotive industry, with respect to this proposed adoption of free trade in new vehicles and parts for installation as original equipment in new vehicles, between the United States and Canada.

First, I should like to state that the Automotive Service Industry Association is a national trade asosciation speaking on behalf of the entire independent automotive service industry—from manufacturer, through distributor, jobber, and garage repairman. It has a membership of over 5,000 manufacturers, rebuilders, warehouse distributors, and wholesalers of automotive replacement parts, tools, equipment, chemicals, paint, refinishing materials, supplies, and accessories. Affiliated with it are Automotive Booster Clubs International, whose members are manufacturers' sales representatives, and Independent Garage Owners of America, whose members are engaged in the servicing and repair of automobiles. ASIA thus represents a combined direct and affiliated membership of approximately 20,000 automotive firms, located in all 50 States, and employing over 400,000 people in the automotive service industry.

We are here today to consider legislation designed to implement an executive agreement which has been presented as establishing free trade between the United States and Canada in new motor vehicles and in parts to be used as original equipment in new motor vehicles. The present proposed agreement does not extend to parts manufactured for replacement use, although the proposed legislation does allow the President to negotiate an extension in the future that will cover replacement parts as well as new parts.

But it is extremely doubtful if this authorized free trade extension to cover replacement parts will ever be brought about; the fact of the matter is that the Canadians do not want free trade in replacement parts, because the greater efficiency of American parts manufacturers, made possible by longer production runs and a much larger market, would make their entry into the Canadian market a disaster to Canadian independent manufacturers.

Actually, this proposed legislation is not a free trade agreement except in a very limited sense. What we are really considering is a special agreement between the Canadian Government and the large vehicle manufacturers, whereby there will be free trade between the American and Canadian divisions of these same large companies in return for certain commitments, the details of which we do not at this moment know. However, we sincerely hope the full facts will be brought to light in the course of these hearings.

It is interesting to note that it was not until last Saturday as a result of agitation in the Canadian Parliament, that these agreements came into the public record by virtue of the fact as I understood from yesterday's testimony here, that they were tabled in Parliament and thus became public information.

I do not think that the details are varied to any great extent from what had been revealed through press reports, and I think that it confirms our feeling that there were definite commitments on the part of the manufacturers to maintain the amount of production in Canada that they have and to increase over the next 3 years by some $260 million the production of vehicles in Canada and that this confirms our understanding that this is a special deal, this is not free trade, this is an agreement for free trade between the Canadian and the American divisions of the same company in return for definite commitments on the part of the companies to maintain and increase their production in Canada.

The Automotive Service Industry Association is extremely hesitant to endorse any legislation that would have the effect of increasing the percentage of the market in new cars or in replacement parts penetrated by the so-called big three: General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler.

The big three are now competing regularly and directly with many small independent parts manufacturers and wholesalers, offering replacement parts for cars other than those of their own manufacture, through both wholesale and car dealer channels. They are also the direct beneficiaries of the Canadian plan here considered (reference being to the Canadian Order-in-Council P.C. 1963—1/1544 of Oct. 22, 1963), a fact which puts their U.S. independent competitors at a considerable disadvantage.

What is happening is that Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler have all expanded the divisions of those companies which are in the replacement part end of the market. Officials of General Motors have publicly stated that where they control 50 percent of the market in new vehicles, their aim was to eventually control 50 percent of the replacement market.

It is the position of ASIA that the proposed legislation would aid and assist the large American vehicle manufacturers to implement their publicly stated purpose of vastly increasing their percentage of penetration of the market, that this would occur to the detriment of the independent American replacement parts manufacturer and to the detriment of the efficiency and competitiveness of the automotive service replacement parts industry as a whole. This is the first major reason for our opposition to H.R. 6960.

PROTECTION OF THE AFTERMARKET

There is a second reason for our opposition which I should like to present at this time. We who are in the replacement parts end of the business are extremely concerned about the inherent and incipient threat of parts manufacturered in Canada entering this country free of duty because of their being declared destined for installation in new vehicles as original equipment, but actually being diverted into the replacement parts market. If the present legislation is enacted, we cannot doubt that the motor vehicle manufacturers will have to increase production of their Canadian facilities, since this is their part of the bargain. It is more than likely that this material can find its way into the replacement market. Let us not forget that each of the Big Three has a distribution setup for replacement parts; I find no safeguards in the proposed legislation that would effectively prevent duty-free parts imported from Canada from being diverted into replacement channels. It is true that the proposed legislation provides for penalties should such irregularities come to light. My point is that it will be difficult if not impossible to prove the existence of such irregularities no matter how widespread or flagrant such activity might become. For the fact is that it is impossible to designate whether a part used both as original equipment and as a replacement part as examples of which dual function I might mention spark plugs, oil filters, universal joints, sealed beam headlamps, etc., is actually slated for original equipment or replacement until it is used in one function or the other.

We recognize that the legislation contains penalties for diversion of imported tariff-free parts on the aftermarket. However, both the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Treasury Department have repeatedly confirmed the impossibility of policing "end use." That is the reason that strenuous efforts were made to eliminate, to the fullest extent possible, "end use" classifications when the tariff schedule was last revised.

On this point, we specifically ask this committee to determine what steps the Bureau of Customs has now devised which will effectively prevent original-use items from ending in the replacement market. In the past, they have declared that statements of end-use intentions on customs invoices were not adequate safeguards. We concur in that appraisal.

LEGISLATION CONTRARY TO U.S. POLICY ON GOLD FLOW

There is a third matter which I would like briefly to indicate as a major reason for the objection to this act, and that is the probably adverse effect on our gold reserve situation. The officials of the Commerce Department have indicated that Canadian production of the motor vehicle manufacturers' subsidiaries will probably be increased by more intensive use of existing Canadian facilities, rather than by expansion of Canadian plant facilities, but it is obvious that this is the interpretation of the U.S. Commerce Department and not necessarily that of the Canadian Government.

At any rate, the present agreement for so-called free trade in new motor vehicles and parts, involving, as it must, increased production by and eventual expansion of the Canadian subsidiaries of the major motor vehicle manufacturers, with consequent outflow of gold, is inconsistent with President Johnson's appeal to U.S. businessmen to "trim their export dollars"; perhaps this inconsistency is explainable only by the rather facetious assertion that in many matters there is one rule for the major vehicle manufacturers and another rule for everyone else.

Let me repeat again the three points which are the basis for the objection to the proposed legislation by ASIA: first, the proposed

legislation will lead to a government sponsored competitive advantage for the Big Three over the independent automotive replacement parts manufacturer; second, the proposed legislation contains inadequate safeguards with respect to the possible diversion of duty-free imports of parts from the OEM to the replacement market; and third, the proposed legislation will contribute to the increased investment of American dollars abroad at a time when President Johnson is sensibly calling upon American businessmen to exercise restraint and care in making such foreign loans or investments.

RELATIONSHIP OF INDEPENDENTS TO VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS

There are a few more points I should like to make. Our independent manufacturers of parts, and by the term "independent" I refer to those manufacturers who are not subsidiaries of the vehicle manufacturers, can be divided into four categories; those who manufacture in this country solely for replacement; second, those who make replacement parts in this country for distribution through wholesale channels, but who also supply the same parts to the vehicle manufacturers for original equipment; third, those who manufacture in this country solely for original equipment and sell only to the vehicle manufacturers; and finally those who manufacture both for replacement and for original equipment and who have plants both in Canada and in the United States.

Most independent manufacturers make both for replacent and for original equipment. They are understandably reluctant to take any public posture that will put them in the bad graces of their vehicle manufacturer customers with consequent threat to the possibility of getting future contracts for original equipment.

But they are worried; they have made representations to Members of Congress as individuals, and they have stated their concern that this act is detrimental to the welfare of independent manufacturers. And what hurts the independent manufacturers will hurt the independent wholesaler whom my association represents.

THE NEED FOR ALTERNATE SOURCES OF SUPPLY

We thrive in this industry because we have many competitive sources of supply. We do not want the big three to become so strong that we will have to depend on them alone or go out of business.

We independent wholesalers do not want to see our position in the industry destroyed. For that reason we support the independent manufacturer, and urge that the big three vehicle manufacturers not be allowed unlimited scope of operation.

I might say I was slightly amused by some of the questioning of Mr. Kendall, distinguished counsel of Chrysler Corp., as to what effect this pact would have on his suppliers. This is like asking a wolf what affect it is going to have on the sheep.

LEGISLATION DOES NOT PROMOTE "FREE TRADE"

If this were a genuine bill for free trade in automobiles and parts, our association might be less concerned than it is. But this is not such a bill. Let me quote from a press release by Chrysler Canada, Ltd., dated January 26, 1965, of a speech by R. W. Trodgham, its president, before the St. Thomas (Ontario) Board of Trade. The press release states:

"The Canadian motor vehicle manufacturers—collectively—have 3 years to boost their Canadian production by this amount ($260 million) but once at this level must maintain it on a yearly basis, he added.

"Debunking the misconceptions about the pact, Mr. Trodgham reiterated that obviously its terms do not provide free trade; its fixed ratio of Canadian production to Canadian sales prevented unlimited importation of American-made automobiles duty free; there was nothing in it that would make possible any immediate price cuts."

In closing, I would like to return to the original purpose of the trade agreement. Notwithstanding terms such as "rationalization," "common North American market," "longer and hence more efficient production runs in Canada," the prime purpose of the agreement from the Canadian viewpoint is to balance trade in automobiles and parts for automobiles. The concept that trade between countries should be balanced commodity by commodity is quite novel, and one which Canada surely would not wish to extend to lumber.

If Canadian automobile production matched the efficiency of the U.S. manufacturers, Canada would have removed tariffs unconditionally, as the United States proposes to do. The U.S. independent parts manufacturers do not fear competition from Canadian producers, but they are apprehensive about a Government-sponsored combination of the Canadian Government and the Canadian subsidiaries of the major vehicle manufacturers. It is in the light of these facts that we ask that careful consideration be given to the proposed legislation.

Poverty War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the problems of the poor continue to plague our Nation and so do the problems created by the professional poverty fighters. I have said many times and I repeat now, that the Congress will do the poor people of this Nation and the American people as a whole a grave disservice if it does not act in this session to correct the machinery of the war on poverty. As this program is now conceived, it is wasteful, haphazard and even, in some cases, appears to be doing more harm than good.

Take, for instance, the feelings of the poor in Philadelphia, who see themselves now cast in a "rubber-stamp" role, after having been promised the right to help devise their own programs. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following report from the June 16 issue of the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post, June 16, 1965]

POOR SEEN DENIED POVERTY WAR ROLE

(By Eve Edstrom)

Philadelphia's election of the poor by the poor to help run that city's antipoverty program has increased the poor's cynicism and distrust of the powers that be, a Republican congressional task force was told yesterday.

The cochairman of the Philadelphia Citizens Emergency Committee on Antipoverty declared that her "phone rings all day and night" with calls from the elected poor who are so frustrated with their rubberstamp roles that they want to quit.

Mattie Humphrey testified that the "poor are not communicated with and do not feel involved" even though they were elected to councils in 12 impoverished areas last month, and delegates from the councils serve on the city's official antipoverty board. The poor have 12 seats on the 31-member board.

When the delegates attended their first board session last week, Mrs. Humphrey said, they raised numerous questions about Philadelphia's antipoverty proposals, but were constantly outvoted. It is only "very grudgingly and in a minimal way" that the poor are participating in the war on poverty, she said.

Philadelphia's election has been hailed by Federal and local antipoverty officials as a great experiment in democracy. But Mrs. Humphrey said the entrenched leadership developed slates of candidates so that independent candidates had little chance to win.

Mrs. Humphrey asserted that no sample ballots were distributed and ballots at voting polls were so confusing that "you would not even know how to vote for yourself."

Similar testimony was submitted for the record by Clarence J. Harris, a member of the emergency committee that serves as a watchdog body over the antipoverty effort.

He declared that city officials conceived a "perverted" election to obtain Federal financing after their original proposals were rejected in Washington because the poor had not been involved in the planning. The frustration in the poverty ghetto has now increased, he said, and the poor are more alienated than unified.

Mr. Speaker, in addition there are the problems of the so-called VISTA program—Volunteers in Service to America. I admire the goals of this program, but I believe that the Director of Economic Opportunity ought to stop making exaggerated claims about its achievements which are modest, a fact which Mr. Glenn Ferguson, who heads the VISTA portion of the so-called poverty war, makes no effort to conceal. After conferring with Mr. Ferguson, I am aware of some of the problems he confronts within the Office of Economic Opportunity itself. The problem is well outlined in the following article from the May 31 edition of the National Observer:

[From the National Observer, May 31, 1965]

VISTA FIGHTS LOW PRIORITIES TO GET AT POVERTY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—There is a recurrent theme in speeches by Sargent Shriver, director of the Federal antipoverty program. The passage refers to the Volunteers in Service to America, the domestic Peace Corps.

"The experts said that without the exotic appeal of service abroad, nobody, young or old, would volunteer for VISTA," Mr. Shriver's theme runs. "They were wrong. Almost 15,000 men and women have already asked to serve in VISTA. * * * By July 1 applications should exceed 25,000. * * * By June 30, when this year's college graduates are available, a target of 2,000 will be in the field or in training for VISTA."

Every time Glenn Fefguson hears this he shudders. Mr. Ferguson, a veteran administrator whom Mr. Shriver brought over from the Peace Corps staff to head VISTA, has never entertained illusions of putting 2,000 volunteers in training or in America's slums, migrant camps, Indian reservations, or mental hospitals by June 30. His goal is 1,200. And he is sensitive to the fact that the impressive number of Americans who have asked to serve includes, in his words, "anyone who filled out a preliminary application, including people who sign their name Muhammad Ali, ineligible youths under 18, people in mental institutions, or people who misunderstand the nature of the program."

EMBARRASSING FIGURES

Mr. Shriver's continued use of the high figures embarrasses VISTA staffers in Washington because it makes their actual accomplishments appear trifling.

There are currently 136 VISTA volunteers battling poverty in 22 States. Fifty-two other recruits are in training. That makes a total of 188. Mr. Ferguson will have to put more than 1,000 volunteers in training in the next 30 days to meet his own goal of 1,200 volunteers by the end of June. He hopes to reach Mr. Shriver's goal of 2,000 by

September 1. The number of Americans who have followed up their preliminary inquiries with final applications and references was not divulged until last week. That number is 5,343, of whom 1,600 are fully qualified.

Mr. Ferguson's lieutenants say the goal of 2,000 volunteers that Mr. Shriver set for VISTA would have been impossible to reach under the best of circumstances. And VISTA has not been operating under the best of circumstances. In their view, VISTA's needs for personnel and publicity have been set aside repeatedly in favor of other programs in the catch-all antipoverty program. Says an ex-staffer bluntly: "We are the forgotten stepchild of the war on poverty." Director Ferguson puts it more mildly: "VISTA has not been considered to be of critical impact in view of the other weapons available."

VIEW OF THE CRITICS

Critics see it differently. Representative ALBERT QUIE, of Minnesota, ranking Republican on the House Labor Subcommittee on Poverty, charged 2 weeks ago that recruitment had fallen into an "unbelievable administrative shambles." He accused VISTA of using deceptive figures to justify a proposed fivefold increase in its budget next year. Mr. Ferguson spent 3 hours last week trying to quiet the fears of Mr. QUIE and fellow subcommittee Republicans. Mr. QUIE now says he would "not have hit the program so hard" if he had conferred with the VISTA director before delivering his blast.

In comparison with other aspects of the antipoverty programs run by Mr. Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity, VISTA's accomplishments do indeed appear to be modest. New Federal Job Corps camps are currently training 2,400 boys and girls, ages 16 to 21. More than 300 communities have received community-action grants to fight poverty. Under Project Head Start, a crash program announced in February, 600,000 preschool slum children will learn basic skills this summer.

VISTA men argue that it is precisely because of these efforts that their program has suffered. Says one: "The table of priorities reads 'community action first. Job Corps second, and VISTA third.' Then along came Head Start and it was a crash program so it took higher priority. We were left out in the cold for months."

Actually, Mr. Ferguson's problems are compounded of many elements. One of them is a shortage of funds. Of the nine antipoverty programs outlined in last year's Economic Opportunity Act, VISTA, with a budget of $4,500,000, is the least heavily endowed. In contrast, the Job Corps received $190,200,000 and community action was allowed $235 million.

LATE IN RECRUITING

Then, too, as a result of what Mr. Ferguson calls the "omnipotent Gross amendment," VISTA was late in recruiting a staff. The amendment, inserted in the act by Representative H. R. GROSS, Iowa Republican, prohibiting any money being spent on VISTA in advance of appropriations. The Job Corps had a staff of 100, most of them on loan from the Labor and Interior Departments, at work at the time of last November's general election. Mr. Ferguson was formulating plans for VISTA with the help of 20 unpaid volunteers at the same time.

But even with its funds, VISTA has had trouble organizing its Washington headquarters. Mr. Ferguson estimates he spent 30 to 40 percent of his time on a "talent search" until April 1. Until mid-February he had no deputy director, and his three associate director slots were unfilled. One reason is that available top administrators were siphoned off into larger antipoverty programs. Another is that some of the people he did pick didn't last long. The first head of recruiting left in January. VISTA's second recruiting chief was a talent scout for a Connecticut sales firm. He was fired 3 months ago after it became known that he made it a practice of starting staff conferences with a sectarian prayer and referred to VISTA volunteers as "apostles." His replacement has not been named.

RECRUITING PROBLEMS

VISTA also ran into bad luck in some of its early recruitment efforts. A mailing to 2,000 Peace Corps veterans yielded 3 volunteers. Letters to 2,000 groups of older persons drew a similarly poor response. Because of a stipulation that volunteers must have no dependents under 18 years of age, little success came of efforts to recruit middle-aged workers.

Difficulties in organizing its Washington staff forced VISTA to abandon several ambitious plans for recruiting. One discarded idea was to entrust some of the recruitment to community-action groups around the country to relieve the burden shared by Washington's 14 VISTA recruiters. Proposals to recruit residents from impoverished areas in California and East Harlem in New York City and send them back to their home towns after training ran aground; a policy decision was made that recruits must be sent to new areas. That decision has now been reversed, and the residents will be allowed to train for service in their own communities—if they are still available.

In one respect, it may have been fortunate that VISTA's early recruiting efforts did not bear more fruit. Until recently, VISTA has not been prepared to act on great numbers of final applications. "We've been so shorthanded," explains a spokesman, "that it sometimes takes a couple of months to process applications. Job Corps has followup people. Somebody goes out and contacts their applicants, they go through screening boards and are interviewed. We've got nothing like that, we've had cases where because of the timelag less than half of those accepted are still available by the time we're ready to take them."

SUPPORT LONG DELAYED

Another problem, and in the view of VISTA officials a major handicap to their recruitment efforts, has been a lack of support from the Office of Economic Opportunity's Public Affairs Division. Job Corps pamphlets and posters were mailed to post offices, schools, and public, and private agencies as long ago as last November, VISTA received its first recruitment aid—a 16-page brochure—in February. "There was a regular celebration when it arrived," recalls one staffer.

VISTA managed early in the year to circulate television promotions from Danny Kaye, Dick Van Dyke, and other entertainers. The stars had been hired to do Job Corps spots. "We got permission to have them do our announcements since they were here anyway," explains a VISTA spokesman. VISTA did receive a little publicity help from the White House. President Johnson greeted the first group of volunteers in December. Mrs. Johnson spoke in St. Petersburg, Fla., at their graduation from a training course in February. But, VISTA officials say, this help was no substitute for the blanket promotion campaign that was needed to spread public awareness of their program.

Critics contend that VISTA should have begun an intensive recruiting campaign on college campuses in March, the last month, they argue, to entice seniors uncertain about their future. Mr. Ferguson counseled against such a course, first because he did not have the staff to carry it out, and second because he saw no hope of competing successfully with more experienced recruiters from Peace Corps and civil-rights groups, who were visiting campuses at the time.

Instead, he mounted an intensive month-long campus drive in late April. In the past 4 weeks VISTA recruiting teams have visited 20 colleges for campaigns lasting from 2 days to a week. They have operated largely without competition from other recruiters. More important, with Job Corps, community action, and Head Start plans well underway, Mr. Shriver's public-affairs division has been providing the kind of support VISTA has been urging all along.

Staffers from other antipoverty programs have been loaned to VISTA to supplement the work of its own recruiters on the campus drive. And Mr. Shriver recently pressed public figures into the campaign. Mrs. Arthur Goldberg, wife of the Supreme Court Justice, was the star performer at Syracuse University earlier this month. Mrs. Robert S. McNamara, wife of the Defense Secretary, aided recruitment at Wayne State University. Last week, in a windup to the campus drive, Vice President HUMPHREY exhorted students at the University of Minnesota to "spark a revolution" among the poor by giving a year of their lives to VISTA.

Recruiters say they picked up 328 final applications at the first nine schools visited. They expect the total may go over 450 when all the applications are in. Students showing up at campus VISTA information booths are being handed final applications to fill out on the spot. As a result the timelag has been cut to a little more than a week, and the acceptance rate, says Mr. Ferguson, is running close to 50 percent.

POST OFFICE ASSISTANCE

Mr. Shriver is now helping VISTA in other ways. At his request, the Post Office Department agreed last week to place VISTA applications in all first-class offices, just as it agreed last fall, also at Mr. Shriver's request, to make Job Corps blanks available.

With the college drive ended, Mr. Ferguson hopes to get back to recruiting among workers in private industry, early retirees, and senior citizens. "I want our volunteers to reflect the diversity of American life," he says. "The one thing I don't want is for 95 percent of our volunteers to be 21-year-old graduating college seniors."

He is annoyed that reporters try to judge VISTA's performance by Mr. Shriver's claims, though he wishes the claims were more realistic. "The important thing," he contends, "is not the number of volunteers we have but the quality of them. We've put volunteers through seven training classes already. They're dedicated people, and they're working as a catalyst to give hope to victims of poverty who have never had hope before. I want to be judged by what they do."

Mr. Speaker, dedicated people, as Mr. Ferguson points out, should always be admired and encouraged. I am reminded of the great work done to aid the poor for so many years by the Salvation Army and so many other church groups of virtually every denomination. I am reminded of the efforts of the States and of localities and of private foundations. Thus, when the Federal Government enters the field, some questions are to be asked and chief among them is this: Is the Federal Government automatically assumed to be more efficient and does it thus stand a far better chance of success than the churches, the States, the localities and the private foundations? If the answer is yes, then we ought to utilize the Federal Government. But what if the answer is no?

The idea that the country may not need a proliferation of such programs is raised in still another National Observer article of May 31, which says:

[From the National Observer, May 31, 1965]

A VISTA VIEW

Three years ago President Kennedy suggested that a Federal program might be set up through which Americans would volunteer to assist in various kinds of social welfare work in this country, much as Peace Corpsmen were doing abroad. Last year, Congress approved the idea as part of the administration's antipoverty program and allotted $4,500,000 to get the project going.

This new effort—Volunteers in Service to America, or VISTA as it is more commonly known—naturally fell into the province of Sargent Shriver, Director of the poverty program. Since then, Mr. Shriver has been irrepressibly voluble about VISTA. He has said, on a number of occasions, that there would be more than 25,000 applicants for VISTA by July 1, and that some 2,000 men and women would be in the field or in training by then.

It will not happen. The truth, as Staff Writer Mark Arnold reports in an article on page 5, is that the VISTA program is in dire straits. Some administrative jobs still have not been filled; volunteers have not flocked to sign up; recruiting campaigns have failed to stir much enthusiasm; and budgeting and bureaucratic ineptness have created innumerable snafus. As a result, there are today just 136 VISTA volunteers at work and another 52 in training.

As a prophet, Mr. Shriver comes a cropper. But that is not the real point. Mr. Shriver is a very able fellow, and he is not the first administrator in Washington to be caught up in the current tide of hucksterism.

The real point about VISTA, however, is that the experience thus far plainly demonstrates the limitations of such Federal programs. Granted that its aims are lofty and worthwhile. What has happened?

For one thing, there aren't enough good administrators around to staff the program; VISTA officials complain they are being "siphoned" off to run more expansive projects, the Job Corps, the Peace Corps, the "headstart" program for preschool children, among others. Moreover, the competition among governmental agencies for participants in their multitudinous programs is becoming increasingly acute. VISTA officials fret because they lacked the money and the manpower (it has only 14 recruiters) to compete against the Peace Corps, which mounted an elaborate recruiting campaign on college campuses this spring.

It is only a simple leap in logic from this kind of frustration to the common conclusion that the problems of VISTA, or any other Federal program, could easily be solved by heavier injections of funds—money to publicize the program more, money to offer higher salaries, money for better recruiting drives, money for bigger and better facilities. Thus, VISTA is asking for a fivefold increase in its annual budget—to $24,500,000 in the next fiscal year.

Unthinkable as the thought might be to some, it is possible that this country does not need such a proliferation of Federal programs. To be sure, all the problems of the poor, the ill, the uneducated, the distressed have not been solved. But how necessary in the task is a Federal agency incapable of being either effective or efficient?

VISTA's plight is sad, but it would be sadder still to ignore the lesson of VISTA and blithely assume that the Federal Government can solve old problems by fathering new ones.

Mr. Speaker, in these articles we see how in some cases the so-called war on poverty seems to be doing more harm than good and how it is haphazard in its operation, as illustrated by VISTA. It is also wasteful, as illustrated by the following article circulated by the Chicago Tribune Service:

[From the Chicago Tribune Service]

COST NO OBJECT AT JOB CENTER

(By Mary Pakhenham)

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.—"Sure it's expensive, but over there they don't seem to care about that."

That was the response of Dr. Charles J. Crist, medical director for the Johnson administration's first Job Corps Center for Women, to a reporter's questions about the center medical expenses.

Dr. Crist said thousands of dollars are being wasted by inadequate screening of potential recruits before they are sent to the center.

Federal officials say it costs about $75 for each acceptable recruit obtained through local screening agencies. Officials estimate that travel costs to and from the center average $70 one way for each recruit.

Some officials of the center have attempted to conceal the number of screening failures discovered since it opened April 6. A worried staff member sought out a Chicago Tribune Press Service reporter to report that at least 13 girls already have left and that a dozen more have asked to be released.

Included among those who have left, most of them by plane, are two described as emotionally disturbed. They stayed less than 2 days. The cost of returning one of them to her home in Massachusetts will include round-trip plane fare for an employee of the center because the girl could not be trusted to travel alone.

Dr. Crist gets $1,000 a month from the center to examine incoming girls for major diseases and to be on call for emergencies.

Joseph Ems, director of the center, said Dr. Crist has spent 30 minutes to 1 hour a day at this job since the girls began arriving April 6.

Dr. Crist said his examinations, conducted in the center's infirmary with the help of four nurses who staff it in shifts, have turned up "mostly mental problems and bad tonsils."

A major purpose of these examinations, Crist said, is to rehearse the girls for the visits they then make to other doctors who charge the center regular fees for more thorough examinations.

He said many of the girls have then been referred to specialists, including psychiatrists. Many of the girls, more than half of whom are Negroes, are presumed never to have seen a doctor before.

Dr. Crist said his services to the center "may cut a little bit into" his regular practice, "but not much." The center's total budget for health services is $221,800 for the first 18 months.

The center is the first and the prototype in an experimental program which its sponsors hope eventually will include hundreds of thousands of girls from poor families and billions of taxpayer dollars.

Representatives of four other women's centers, just opening or about to open, have visited St. Petersburg to obtain ideas they have taken back to Cleveland, Los Angeles, Charleston, W. Va., and Omaha. The YWCA, of Chicago, is among the many prospective operators of such centers which also have sent representatives here or watched the first centers progress from afar.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the operation of the so-called war on poverty is wasteful, haphazard, and, in some cases, appears to be doing more harm than good.

I believe that we all have the well-being of the poor at heart. Now, as the so-called war on poverty again comes before the House for a new dosage of Federal funds, I believe that it is time to assess this program and to make any needed changes.

This is a wonderful opportunity for the administration and the majority in Congress to show their good faith by working in a bipartisan manner to correct present failures. It is an opportunity for all to illustrate that the job of helping the poor has nothing to do with political opportunity, but has as its goal the helping of those who need help, while giving the taxpayer a dollar value for a dollar spent.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk's Address to the First Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, who spoke at a banquet of the First Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance, at the Mayflower Hotel, Thursday, June 10. I feel this is one of the finest and most significant speeches ever given, concerning the Alliance for Progress, and I should like very much to include it in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE, AT BANQUET OF FIRST INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF THE PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE, MAYFLOWER HOTEL BALLROOM, WASHINGTON, D.C., THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1965

I

Good evening. I count it a special privilege to be here, as you wind up your first day's work as delegates to the First Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance. This first conference is a milestone in a truly great enterprise: the Alliance for Progress.

Nearly 4 years have passed since representatives of the 20 independent republics of this hemisphere met in Punta del Este to fashion the Alliance for Progress. The Charter of Punta del Este gave hope to the aspirations of responsible and progressive Latin Americans. The United States helped in the formulation of the charter, but the ideas and the inspiration were profoundly Latin American.

The signatory governments pledged to their own peoples—and to one another—that they would meet the challenges of the 20th century. The commitment was clear: to change old ways so that each nation would become politically more democratic, economically more developed, and socially more just.

The ties that bind the American Republics in the Inter-American system command us to respect one another, and to help one another. The Alliance for Progress was fashioned in that spirit of mutual help and respect.

The Charter of Punta del Este made it plain that no one nation would, or could, assume the major responsibility of carrying out the purposes of the Alliance. Indeed, that historic document declared that this was to be a common and united effort of the peoples of the Americas.

The Charter of the Alliance recognized that the strengthening of liberty in Latin America required rapid and profound change. It de-

ciared: "The men and women of our hemisphere are reaching for a better life which today's skills have placed within their grasp. They are determined for themselves and their children to have decent and even more abundant lives, to gain access to knowledge and equal opportunity for all, to end those conditions which benefit the few at the expense of the needs and dignity of the many. It is our inescapable task to fulfill these just desires—to demonstrate to the poor and forsaken of our countries, and of all lands, that the creative powers of freemen hold the key to their progress and to the progress of future generations."

Those words were a call for peaceful revolution. And as President Johnson has said, "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible, make violent revolution inevitable."

Obviously, then, the United States welcomes change in Latin America. From its inception, the Alliance for Progress has been the cornerstone of our policy in Latin America. The Alliance objectives—of reform and development in democracy—are our objectives. They are our objectives because we have always believed in them, and because their attainment in each and every country of Latin America is in our national interest.

II

The Alliance for Progress is approaching its fifth year. It stands at a hopeful but critically important stage.

The situation is hopeful for several reasons:

Last year Latin America achieved an overall increase in its gross national product of 2½ percent per capita—the rough target set in 1961. The increase varied from country to country but was rather well spread. The Inter-American Commitee for the Alliance for Progress (CIAP) feels there is a fair chance that overall 2½ percent per capita rate of growth will be achieved again in 1965.

Let me cite a few figures on the achievements of the Alliance: 12 countries have land reform laws; 10 have produced national development plans or sector investment programs, and other country programs are being completed; 15 have self-help housing programs, and more than 300,000 dwelling units have been completed or are nearing completion; every Alliance country has improved its tax system or tax administration; 9 have undertaken major tax reform; 42 intermediate credit institutions have been created; 6,150 miles of roads have been built; more than 75,000 teachers have been trained; nearly 10 million school books have been circulated; more than 13 million schoolchildren are participating in special school lunch programs, three times the number of 2½ years ago; more than 200,000 agricultural credit loans have been made.

In most of the countries of Latin America there are governments, backed by a vital new generation in public and private life, which are facing courageously the tremendous problems which must be solved to achieve well-balanced economic and social development. It is not easy to bring inflation to a halt. It is not easy to increase tax collections and to design and execute programs of land reform.

It is not easy to move away from the protection of high tariff barriers and to expand manufactured exports in a competitive world. But these things are happening. The language of the Charter of Punta del Este is being translated into reality.

The Western Hemisphere has fashioned effective machinery for promoting sound development and reform—institutions such as the Inter-American Development Bank and the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress.

Many of our friends in Latin America wish to go beyond modernization of the individual nations of the hemisphere. They seek to accelerate the process of economic integration. We see the beginning of this process in the Central American Common Market and the Latin American Free Trade Association. Economic integration offers many potential advantages. Investments for integrated markets can be more efficient and productive. Wider markets stimulate competitive attitudes and practices. Integration accelerates diversification of agriculture and industry. And diversification is fundamental to efficiency and regular self-sustained growth. The United States has supported, and continues to support, economic integration in Europe. We think integration would be correspondingly beneficial to Latin America. We look forward to having a strong economic and political partner in Latin America. That partnership would be strengthened by the success of the integration movement.

III

Although we have solid grounds for satisfaction in the progress that has been made and for hope as we look to the future, we must not underestimate the difficulties confronting us.

One of the most serious difficulties is the decline in the prices of certain traditional Latin American exports—exports on which many Latin American countries depend to earn foreign exchange. The drop in the price of sugar from 11 to 2½ cents was one of the causes of the crisis in the Dominican Republic. The long-range solution to overdependence on the export of a few agricultural commodities lies in the diversification of agriculture and the development of export industries.

Another serious problem in several countries is inflation. Controlling it is a searching test politically and socially as well as economically. We are full of respect for those governments which are dealing with the inflation courageously and tenaciously.

A third problem—and a far-reaching one—is the modernization of rural life. Latin America is at a stage of development where industry and urban life are moving ahead with high momentum. But most people in Latin America still live in the countryside, substantially untouched by modern life. These people need schools and roads and electricity. They need to organize cooperatives to sell their products in the cities at a fair price. They need to learn how to improve and diversify their production. Above all, they need to hope that they will not be left behind as the modernization of Latin America moves forward. They need to feel that not only their governments but that their fellow citizens in the cities have an interest in improving rural life. Building a modern nation is more than a technical task. City folk and country folk, the rich and the poor, the educated and the illiterate, must develop a sense of common purpose and brotherhood.

IV

The Alliance for Progress was only beginning to take hold in the Dominican Republic—a little country with a great potential to provide a good life for its people—when the government was overthrown in April. Tragically, a hard-handed dictator had for three decades thwarted the development of the institutions required for effective democracy and social progress. Such economic advance as took place was poorly balanced. Potential leaders in the country did not have an opportunity to develop mutual understanding and trust. Such a legacy is indeed hard to overcome.

The countries of this hemisphere must devise new mechanisms for cooperative action in the Dominican situation and for any crises which might arise in the future. And all of us in the Alliance for Progress must demonstrate our deep and lively interest in the welfare of the people of the Dominican Republic. For, they want what the rest of us want for ourselves: Representative constitutional government, economic and social progress, hope that their children's lives will be happier and more fruitful than their own. One of our jobs in this hemisphere is to help the Dominican people to attain these objectives. The machinery of the Alliance for Progress should set to work to build as rapidly as possible on that island the foundations for a modern, democratic life.

V

Above all, however, the Alliance for Progress needs the enthusiastic and sustained support of the people of all the member countries. The people must know that this is their program. And this is where you—the Partners of the Alliance—are helping to make an invaluable contribution. You have established the means whereby the people of all our countries can join together in a partnership of mutual help—a partnership based on respect for each other's culture, and for each other's dignity.

One of the greatest strengths of our form of society is the readiness of private citizens, as individuals and through voluntary organizations, to further public objectives.

Through your efforts more and more people will come to see and understand that the Alliance is a living thing and that it goes beyond power projects and trade conferences and governmental decrees. Through your efforts more and more people will come to realize that there are many things they can do for themselves, things that governments cannot do for them, things they can do right now to change their lives and to improve the chances of their children having better lives.

Your work has already produced suggestions for hundreds of ways in which the people themselves can participate in the Alliance for Progress.

So, I think we are all entitled to regard this First Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance as a significant milestone. I congratulate you. Let us move forward, never forgetting, as President Johnson said recently, that we in North America and Latin America have always had very special ties of interest and affection and that "together we share and shape the destiny of the New World."

African Game in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced House Concurrent Resolution 440 expressing the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of State shall take steps to convene an international conference under United Nations sponsorship to promote international conservation of wildlife.

Such a conference is urgently needed. Some 250 species are threatened with extinction. The marvelous variety and abundance of wildlife in Africa particularly will be irretrievably lost if the nations of the world do not aid the struggling conservation groups in carrying out an effective program to save and use Africa's wildlife as a great natural resource.

In an excellent article published in National Wildlife magazine, Thomas L. Kimball, executive director, of the National Wildlife Federation, tells the story of "African Game in Trouble."

The article, written after Kimball attended the Eighth General Assembly of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources at Nairobi, Kenya, and toured east Africa, concludes that we must focus worldwide attention on the problem of African wildlife now.

The text of Kimball's article follows:

AFRICAN GAME IN TROUBLE

(By Thomas L. Kimball)

On my recent trip through Africa, I saw a sign along a Uganda road that warned: "Elephants have right-of-way."

Now I am sure our little Land-Rover would have been glad to give ground to any hulking 5-ton pachyderm that challenged us. But I seriously doubt that elephants—or any other of the magnificent wild animals in this "huge and wonderful zoo without bars"—really have the right-of-way.

Not today. Not in this continent, so deep in revolutionary ferment. Not, I'm afraid, in the thinking of the continent's new generation of native rulers.

Uppermost in their minds is throwing off the colonial yoke, perpetuating their own political power, plus the understandable drive for food and land for their expanding human populations—a quest that inevitably is taking a disastrous toll of the world's most unusual wildlife.

Man's impact on the landscape is devastating when he recklessly sets out to harness a new country to suit himself. And African actions are no different from what has taken place in many lands over the centuries.

To meet their skyrocketing needs, they bludgeon into new territories, hacking away dense forests and plowing up lush grasslands. Wild animals driven from natural habitats have no place to hide and no food to eat. Zebras and other game come back to graze the green shoots of grain, while elephants tear down fences and make shambles of the village.

Gameproof fences are almost impossible to build and costs are prohibitive, so some local leaders declare it is in the country's best interests to destroy all wildlife in the areas where agriculture is given a priority. Natives are paid to hunt from dawn to dark, and when night falls killing goes on by moonlight. Carcasses—often too numerous to haul away—are left to rot where they fall. Sometimes the supply is too great even to be cleaned up by hyenas and scavenging birds.

Multiply this tragic story hundreds of times over and you have the danger facing African wildlife today. While suitable land must be devoted to intensive agriculture, areas must also be preserved for wildlife. Wise management of all natural resources will benefit the Africans themselves.

In Tanganyika and Kenya, nomadic tribesmen like the Masai herd scrubby cattle that supply them with food. For centuries, disease kept cattle numbers in check—there was enough forage for both domestic and wild animals. But modern veterinary medicine has decreased disease losses and herd numbers have skyrocketed. Fifty years ago Kenya tribes had scarcely 750,000 cattle; now there are over 6½ million. Sheep and goat numbers are jumping even faster, and they denude the land, forcing both domestic and wild animals to battle for food. Many tribes have arrived at this solution: Kill all wildlife.

Another, but lesser, danger is wasteful game poaching by money-hungry hunters. With high-powered guns, poisoned arrows, traps and snares, they kill for skins and ivory, collect elephant feet for umbrella stands and waste baskets, and make fly whisks from giraffe tails. Rhinos are hunted for their horns because powdered rhino horn is believed to be a potent sex stimulant for the jaded. Meat of the eland and zebra brings high prices in mining camps.

But although illegal hunting has threatened several species, such as the white rhino, crocodile, and leopard, man's mangling of the landscape poses the greatest wildlife threat. Twenty-five years ago, 70 percent of the land area of Uganda was suitable for elephants; today, only 17 percent. Many of the tropical hardwood forests have given way to banana groves, coffee, tea, and cotton plantations, and family truck gardens.

More than two dozen African mammals are faced with possible extinction. Magnificent creatures such as the ant-eating aardvark, several kinds of zebras, the mountain gorilla, the fleet cheetah, and its cousin, the leopard are threatened. Among African antelope and deer in danger are the hunter's, sable, and Angola antelopes, the bontebok and the blessbok, the greater kudu and the giant eland, the red hartebeest and the rufus gazelle, the white-tailed gnu, the Barbary stag, and the Wali ibex, the addax, the bongo and the oryx. The tiny chevrotain, a deer the size of a rabbit, is in the same leaky boat with the African buffalo and the white rhino.

Something must be done—and quickly—if the world is to preserve this greatest of wildlife treasures. But making proposals and getting results are two different things. I found I could talk cultural and economic benefits of wildlife to African leaders and feel I was getting through. But you're wasting your breath trying to explain this to bush tribesmen.

For example, a Masai warrior's main concern is keeping his belly full, and getting more cows—a real wealth and status symbol. The tribesman does not care if his cows are scrawny scarecrows, as long as he has a lot of them (just as you are not concerned when a $10 bill gets dirty and crumpled). But the Africans are getting little food from their cattle.

And the desperate food problem grows worse. For example, Kenya's population more than doubled since 1890 and is expected to double again in 20 years. That's why conservation measures must serve tribal interests—if they are to be adopted.

One ray of hope is the fact African leaders are now trying to devise ways to use wildlife as a steady source of food and income, without destroying it as a valuable resource.

Game ranching is one method. There is good evidence that wildlife can provide substantially more protein than domestic livestock ranging on the same area. Native wildlife have had centuries to adapt to the environment. They carry a built-in disease immunity, and also do less damage to the range. Wildlife utilize the forage produced more efficiently and completely. Nature has developed a wildlife species to feed on most growing plants in the environment, including thorny trees and shrubs. Domesticated livestock utilize only a few of the more palatable species.

A southern Rhodesian rancher trapped and tamed 20 eland (a bull eland weighs over 1,000 pounds), let them run with his cows, and drove them into a corral at night. He found their flesh was tastier than beef, and they gave far more milk than cows.

Promoting safaris to harvest surplus game is another plan. Uganda has initiated supervised safaris, after scientifically determining the areas, the species, and the numbers of game to be taken. This has established a source of food and income for local tribes as well as the Government.

Most widely accepted way to cash in on wildlife resources is to set up national parks and game sanctuaries. For example, the opportunity to shoot wildlife with a camera accounts for much of the $15 million spent annually by tourists in Kenya.

During its tenure the British colonial government developed a model national park system. Two percent of East Africa is now in parks, which compares favorably with our U.S. park area.

What can foreigners do to help? Well, we should not be guilty of promoting such projects as the Anchole cattle project in Uganda, financed by U.S. foreign aid. It must be one of the most unfortunate and unrealistic programs yet devised. Thousands of wild animals have been killed in a mass slaughter. The tall grass range has been burned, and natural trees and brush eradicated. There was mass aerial pesticide spraying to control the tsetse fly.

The aim was worthy—to develop small cattle ranches to increase the per capita income and grow more protein. But the result is a terrible fiasco. The landscape has been devastated, the plants and animals completely changed, and food production has actually been decreased.

Africa's greatest need today is a long-range natural resource development plan. Competent scientists should inventory all resources. Land and water resources should be evaluated and classified for the type of development which will contribute most to the economy of the struggling, newly independent African nations and the needs of their people.

These newly born nations do not now have these technical people. That's where the United States could help—if asked.

We could furnish soil and water conservationists, range management specialists, wildlife biologists and other natural resources management technicians to assist in the development of resource management plans. We could make available sociologists and conservation education specialists to encourage public understanding and support of conservation measures. A tremendous educational effort is needed in the bush where tribesmen are still living as they did 1,000 years ago.

Meanwhile, let us hope for the best. The picture is not all dark. Even today, wildlife specialists at Serengeti National Park talk in terms of herds of Thompson's gazelle numbering 900,000, wildebeest totaling 450,000, and zebra in excess of 250,000 within the park boundaries. Some of the best wildlife habitat remains relatively undisturbed by man, and where proper management exists wildlife abounds in tremendous quantity and variety.

I do not go along with the dire predictions that, unless the current trend is reversed, African wildlife will disappear within 20 years. Not if we focus worldwide attention on the problem—now.

Let's hope Professor Baer's words are not prophetic. He said, "Future generations may castigate 20th century man who, in the 1960's was too preoccupied in reaching for the moon to bother about saving one of the richest and most precious inheritances of his earth."

Texan Guides Space Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Titan III–C rocket, as we all know, is perhaps the Nation's most important development in the current space race. This is the vehicle which will propel our spacemen to the moon.

Development of this super-rocket undoubtedly is moving us speedily ahead of

the Soviet Union in the efforts of man to conquer outer space.

This particular project was developed under the capable guidance and leadership of Brig. Gen. Joseph S. Bleymaier, Jr., a Texan whom I had the privilege of knowing when we attended the University of Texas.

Joe Bleymaier grew up in Austin, the son of German immigrants, and distinguished himself as an outstanding athlete and academic scholar. He has frequently returned to Austin over the years to visit with his many friends, who know him as an effective, hard-working, hard-nosed "Dutchman" who likes people and is dedicated to the responsible duties of his space job.

We can all take pride in the devoted, determined spirit of this great military leader from Texas who has done so much to bridge the space gap and to hasten our Nation's first voyage to the moon.

On Sunday, June 20, 1965, the Sunday Star featured General Bleymaier as "Headline Personality," and I am delighted to bring this fine article to the attention of my colleagues. It follows:

HEADLINE PERSONALITY—TITAN III–C CHIEF CALLED ON WAY UP, TOO,

(By William Hines)

If the Air Force gets a manned space role of its own—as many people think is inevitable and imminent—a good deal of the credit will belong to a sunny-faced Texan named Joseph Sylvester Bleymaier, Jr.

Bleymaier (pronounced Blaymeyer) is 6 months away from his 50th birthday, and his many admirers predict that in the dozen years of active duty left to him he will add three more stars to the one that now adorns the collar of his summer uniform.

He has been a brigadier general for only about 2½ years, ever since Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara gave him $800 million to build a rocket and warned him that there would be no more when that was gone.

"The countdown began that day, December 1, 1962," Bleymaier said on the eve of the first firing of a Titan III–C superrocket.

It may have been Bleymaier's early Texas training at the poker table, but in the final hours of the 2½-year countdown of Titan III–C he never revealed the slightest worry about his rocket's prospects.

M'NAMARA PLEASED

Even before Titan III–C left Cape Kennedy's pad 40 Friday, McNamara was on record as delighted with Bleymaier's performance in program manegement. The Defense Secretary has publicly referred to "624–A," code number for Titan III–C, as "the best managed program we have."

In addition to 624–A, Bleymaier has responsibility for the "MOL"—manned orbiting laboratory—which is the Air Force's repository of hope for a part in the zippy business of human astronautics.

Already well enough along so that Bleymaier is talking about it in the simple future tense, MOL will cost a good deal more than the $800 million Bleymaier spent to get Titan III–C off the ground.

Bleymaier learned management theory at the University of Texas (B.A., business administration, 1937), but has gone far beyond the textbooks in developing a workable formula for running big programs. The formula contains a heavy folks factor.

"It's people who get things done," Bleymaier philosophizes. "Machines and bricks and mortar are important, but behind all these things are people. And the way to motivate people is to let them know that they are an essential part of what is going on."

For himself, Bleymaier has adopted a personal job philosophy that "whatever job I am doing at the moment is the most important job in the world."

This attitude, in the opinion of associates, has enabled Bleymaier at times to press his viewpoint and prevail against people with more rank but less conviction.

INSPIRES LOYALTY

Correspondingly, Bleymaier welcomes evidence of conviction on the part of subordinates. While there is never any doubt about who is boss, there is always room for full—and ofttimes spirited discussion in staff meetings.

This give-and-take atmosphere makes for an uncommon amount of loyalty on the part of subordinates—loyalty that the underlings are sure is reciprocated all the way.

Bleymaier's crew is known in the Air Force as a group that get things done.

Ever since the end of 1962, when Bleymaier got the Titan III–C assignment, he has been practically living out of a suitcase. In 1963, he made 42 trips to Washington from Los Angeles headquarters. In addition, Bleymaier repeatedly shuttled to northern California and to Colorado for meetings with key contractors in the program.

This gave him little time for his large and close-knit family. "We have five children—four of them still at home," Bleymaier says, "and my wife and I decided that at least once a week we would have a family meal together.

"Sometimes we really had to plan together to make it happen."

Friends of the Bleymaiers say his wife of almost 24 years—they were married June 25, 1941—is "a regular doll." Bleymaier says she is real understanding, and elaborates:

"If a wife doesn't understand what motivates a person to dedicate himself to something, then it becomes an almost unbearable problem. I see this happening to so many young officers."

Mrs. Bleymaier, the former Rosemary Mathias, had plenty of training; in their first year of marriage their residence changed 11 times.

The oldest Bleymaier child, Joseph III, was graduated from the Air Force Academy this year and accompanied his father to Cape Kennedy for the first Titan 3C launching, resplendent in the gold bars of a second lieutenant.

Young Joe was away at the academy during the most hectic of his father's traveling period, but knows the setup at home in those days. The other children—three boys and a girl—all had chores and all pitched in to help their mother run the house, a hillside place in Palos Verdes, about 20 miles south of where Bleymaier works in El Segundo, Calif.

DEEPLY RELIGIOUS

The Bleymaiers are a deeply religious family of Roman Catholic persuasion. When he is home, Bleymaier kneels with the others and leads the rosary service, and he joins the young children in their morning and evening prayers.

Joe, who is 22, is shortly to be married to a San Diego girl, Marcia Hillenbrand, whom he met on a blind date in Denver when he was at the academy and she was in college there. Marianne, 19, goes to the college of the Holy Name in Oakland, Calif. Ted, 15, John, 13, and Gene, 11, attend parochial schools in the Los Angeles area.

The free time Bleymaier has at home is spent with the boys at outdoor sports—baseball and swimming, principally. They liked water sports while living on the Chesapeake Bay near Annapolis, Md., during a tour of duty in the Washington area in the late 1950's, but have not done much boating on the west coast.

Bleymaier almost had his fill of boating in the late 1940's while assigned to experimental work at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. He and an associate, Frank Spinney, took a 30-foot aluminium boat with a 50-horsepower outboard out into the Gulf of Mexico one day to test survival equipment.

They ran into a hurricane and were lost for 6 days while search aircraft bored into the storm's eye seeking them with radar.

Spinney and Bleymaier rode the hurricane out.

GREW UP IN AUSTIN

Bleymaier grew up in Austin, Tex., in the 1930's, when his father was in charge of the athletic grounds of the University of Texas. The elder Bleymaier had come over from the southern part of Germany in 1904 and had subsequently brought over his hometown sweetheart and made her his wife.

Bleymaier bears all the signs of his Germanic heritage—blue eyes, blond hair, fair complexion that reddens easily under stress of embarrassment, anger or mirth. He is, as more than one associate remarks, "a hard-headed Dutchman from Texas."

But there is as much Texas as German about him. When he was a colonel "on travel," as they say in the military, he could be seen in airports all over the country carrying in one hand a suitcase and in the other hand a dispatch-case and a white Texas-type Stetson.

As a brigadier general, Bleymaier has an aide now who takes care of the suitcase and dispatch case for him. The Stetson no longer goes on trips, although 2d Lt. James F. Wheeler, the aide, points out that on weekends the general wears his Texas hat to the office as an adjunct to civilian sports clothes.

The Stetson is something of a trademark for Bleymaier, and its identification with him may be revealing of the man. William Purdy, an old friend who manages Titan 3C for the Martin Co. of Denver, prime contractor, puts it this way:

"It's a wonderful thing, sometimes, to see Joe do battle with the Washington process. It's like the Texas sheriff, walking down the dusty street to do battle with the bad guys.

"You know, there's a good bit of the romantic in Joe Bleymaier."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate heard addresses in memory of the late Senator Olin D. Johnston, took up coinage bill, and passed D.C. appropriations.

House passed bills on cigarette labeling and public works appropriations.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 13793–13819

Bills Introduced: Seven bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2171–2177; and S. Con. Res. 39. Page 13795

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S.J. Res. 56, relating to the bicentennial celebration of the birth of James Smithson (S. Rept. 339);

S. 827, 858, 859, 864, 867, 868, 925, 1001, and 1076, private bills (S. Repts. 340–348);

H.R. 3994, removing $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling claims arising from crash of USAF aircraft at Wichita (S. Rept. 349);

H.R. 3996, authorizing delegation of authority to settle admiralty claims not exceeding $10,000 with respect to military vessels (S. Rept. 350);

H.R. 6507, to make it a Federal crime to travel in interstate commerce in aid of arson (S. Rept. 351);

H.R. 6848, to amend the U.S. Code with regard to the imparting or conveying of false information (S. Rept 352); and

S. 828, 834, 862, 943, 1012, 518, and 954, private bills (S. Repts. 353–359). Pages 13794–13795

Bills Referred: Seven House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Page 13793

President's Communication—Agriculture Appropriations: Communication from President transmitting amendments to the budget for fiscal year 1966 involving a net decrease of $32.5 million for the Department of Agriculture was received, referred to Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 38. Page 13794

President's Communication—Interoceanic Canal: Communication from President transmitting amendment to the budget for fiscal year 1966 in the amount of $7.5 million for the Interoceanic Canal Commission was received, referred to Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 37. Page 13794

D.C. Appropriations: Senate passed with amendments H.R. 6453, fiscal 1966 appropriations for the District of Columbia, after taking the following actions on additional amendments thereto:

Adopted: Ribicoff amendment as amended by adoption by 76 yeas to 14 nays of Byrd (West Virginia) substitute amendment which would provide $300,000 for immediate use under the D.C. work and training programs. The Ribicoff amendment would have provided $341,753 to initiate a 6-month program for aid to dependent children of unemployed parents.

Prior to adoption of Byrd (West Virginia) substitute for the Ribicoff amendment, Senate rejected by 40 yeas to 47 nays, Ribicoff motion to table the Byrd substitute amendment.

Senate insisted on its amendments, asked for conference with the House, and appointed as conferees Senators Byrd (West Virginia), Hayden, Bartlett, McIntyre, Case, Cotton, and Saltonstall.

Pages 13819–13820, 13824–13838

Coinage: Senate made its unfinished business S. 2080, to provide for the coinage of the U.S. Pages 13838–13839

Memorial Addresses: Numerous Senators spoke in tribute to the life, character, and public services of the late Senator Olin D. Johnston. Pages 13840–13865

Nominations: The following nominations were received: LeRoy Collins, of Florida, to be Under Secretary of Commerce; Robert H. B. Baldwin, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of the Navy; George C. Trevorrow, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review; two judicial; numerous Public Health Service; and two Navy. Pages 13865–13866

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. Pages 13834, 13835

Quorum Call: One quorum call was taken today. Page 13820

Program for Wednesday: Senate met at noon and, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator Olin D. Johnston, adjourned at 4:27 p.m. until

Appendix

The Ozarks: Peaceful Land All Love

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Edson, writer for the Associated Press, has confirmed what I have always known—that there is no finer place to visit or live than in the Ozarks.

Mr. Edson has been touring the United States for the Associated Press, doing a series on "America the Beautiful." As a native Ozarkian himself, he was on guard against his own prejudice. Nevertheless, he says:

It is a pleasure to report that the wild flowers bloom as abundantly, the birds sing as joyously, the brooks flow as exuberantly as they did 40 years ago.

The article follows:

THE OZARKS: PEACEFUL LAND ALL LOVE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Ozarks are a land of wilderness and springs, lakes and caves, birds and flowers, and floating down the rivers. They are also, alas, a land of beer cans and poverty, but the people are serene and genuine in "the most peaceful place in the world." The second in a series on "America the Beautiful.")

(By Arthur Edson)

PRUITT, ARK.—As you meander down Highway 7 from the north, a drive many think is the most beautiful in the Ozarks, you see a sign that is a delightful understatement.

"This road crooked and steep for 11 miles," it says.

So you twist and turn, rise and fall for 10 or so lovely miles—and you reach a second sign—exactly like the first one.

The Ozarks are like that.

They stretch across southern Missouri, northern Arkansas, and eastern Oklahoma, and although they are called mountains, they really are a plateau that is marvelously tousled on top.

It's a land of sudden ridges and deep valleys, of springs that bubble tirelessly from deep caverns, of streams that are clear and merry, of vast wooded spaces that remain much as they were when first the white man came.

Only a stay-at-home could readily answer the question: What spot is the prettiest in the Nation?

The experienced, practicing traveler would be awash with engaging and contending memories, from the sensuous, beguiling Everglades to the magnificent, formidable Rockies. Not many votes would be cast for the Ozarks. Alas, this hilly region isn't well known, and not even the most loyal native, greedy for tourist cash, would claim that it inspires awe.

Yet, as Daniel Webster once said of Dartmouth, there are those who love her.

Here fishermen can seek out bass, channel cat, and rainbow trout. Hunters can pursue deer, wild turkey, and quail. Boatmen can roar around or laze upon a half-dozen large manmade lakes.

And it is ideal for those who simply love the wilderness, who treasure the violet or the sweet-william, who listen for the dulcet wood thrush, or who find music in the shoals of a scurrying stream.

As a witness, I could be prejudiced, I grew up on the edge of these hills, with plenty of carefree time to explore and to observe and to wonder.

Since nothing can be more disillusioning than boyhood revisited, I was mildly apprehensive when the Ozarks were included in a project describing America's beauty spots.

It is a pleasure to report that the wild flowers bloom as abundantly, the birds sing as joyously, the brooks flow as exuberantly as they did 40 years ago.

In addition to their charm, the Ozarks point up a strange national problem. For if you take the hill roads from the east, through Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and on into the Ozarks, you will find people in dismal poverty while surrounded by glorious beauty.

No place illustrates this better than Pruitt, which is little more than a ramshackle post office in northwestern Arkansas.

Here Arkansas Highway 7— if you are ever in this area don't miss driving it—dives down and crosses the Buffalo River. This is Newton County, possibly the prettiest and statistically the poorest in the State. Highway 7 is the county's only paved road.

Pearl Holland operates a sort of fishing camp here. A sign warns: "No hard drinks, shouting or unlawful acts allowed."

Mrs. Holland's grandfather settled here; her grandchildren are with her now, making five generations in this same pleasant spot. The living isn't easy. At 59, Mrs. Holland's face is well lined, and her cotton dress is held together by safety pins, but her eyes are steady and serene.

"I love it here, sir," she says. "You are so close to God you can just see it all around you. The birds sing all the time, sir, and you should hear the whippoorwill at night. It's the most peaceful place in the world."

All over the Ozarks you see signs advertising "floats." This is an invitation to float down the river, fishing or just gazing, while an enterprising native drives your car to meet you at a predetermined spot.

Mrs. Holland watches a canoe drift toward shore, the rendezvous point for a canoe party. There are 50 canoes altogether, and each is well stocked with nature lovers who have been floating down the Buffalo with time out for an overnight camp.

Husky Patrick Montgomery is a canoeist from Kansas City, 280 miles north, and if you think this is a far piece for an overnight float, then you understimate nature lovers.

Passionately devoted to keeping the Ozarks tidy, Montgomery belongs to a club that each Labor Day laboriously collects trash from streams.

"We get everything from beer cans to tractor tires," Montgomery says. "You can use a magnet to pick up the ordinary can on the bottom, but they make aluminum ones now. You got to dive for 'em.

Now let's float the White River from Cotter, Ark.

It is a magnificent day, the hills are softly graced with dogwoods, the birds, especially those debonair mockers, sing so overlappingly there is never a second's silence.

This is great fishing country. The water is released from the chilly bottom of Bull Shoals Lake so it is cold enough for rainbows. Every bend brings new boats in view, and every boat has two or three fishermen or fisherwomen, each frowning and concentrating as if they were Einstein solving relativity. Only the guides seem to have fun.

River protocol demands that inquiries be made as to how the fish are responding. Our guide, a high school senior named Tooter Flippin, politely asks: "You slaying 'em?"

The other guide, shepherding a couple of novices who are unlikely to come up with anything but sunburn, shakes his head, winks and grins.

The idyllic scene has one flaw. Recently discarded beer and soft drink cans, some of aluminum, bob past, melancholy evidence of how the search for nature untouched is then stupidly despoiled.

Many large caves, and innumerable small ones, are under these hills.

A few are well known and nationally advertised, but the biggest and best may still be filled with the water that pours from countless springs.

The Nation's largest spring is in southeastern Missouri; appropriately but unimaginatively, it is simply called Big Spring.

What a gigantic cavern must be under these old bluffs. Each day as many as 846 million gallons of water may surge out, forming an instant river. This spring is so tremendous that the daily erosion of limestone mounts up to 175 tons.

A few hundred yards away Big Spring joins the swiftly running Current River, a fortunate stream that is constantly refreshed.

If you turn off famed U.S. 66 at Cuba, Mo., and head south, you'll find a succession of State parks, each with a large, attractive spring that hurries to the Current.

When man tampers with nature, the results often are catastrophic, but the lakes here may be an exception. They range from the Lake of the Ozarks in central Missouri to Lake o' the Cherokees in northeastern Oklahoma to Table Rock Taneycomo, Bull Shoals and Norfolk lakes on the Arkansas-Missouri border.

Damming a crooked river produces a most unlakelike looking lake. But interlacing valleys mean a tremendous shoreline—the Lake of the Ozarks wanders so its shoreline is 1,350 miles—that offers fine sites for homes and recreational facilities.

Although the words "recreational facilities" are often a coverup for honkytonks and beer joints, unspoiled places remain. Land is still comparatively cheap in the Ozarks, and many a visitor returns to retire here.

When Cecil Rice quit as a hog buyer in Illinois, he and his wife built a home overlooking Bull Shoals. "This is the most beautiful place in the world," Mrs. Rice says, "and that's pretty good for a woman born in Texas."

Natives love their hills and valleys, but curiously their esthetic sense does not extend to things they build for themselves. Their towns, often constructed around a square, may be dreary blotches. But there are exceptions, of which Eureka Springs, Ark., is a picturesque example.

It calls itself Little Switzerland—it even has a Lake Lucerne—and it is built on 20 hills divided by 19 canyons. A statistical naturalist has counted 115 species of trees

and 254 species of wild flowers to go with its 63 springs.

Yet even Eureka Springs, unusual and quaint as it is, is having its troubles. Modern tourists may marvel at it, but they're likely to travel its streets that writhe like a wounded snake, and go on without pausing to part with their money.

"The old town is looking shabby," an elderly retired man told me. "I don't rightly know why. There's a lot a-fussin' and a-fumin'. I reckon a business can't operate any more only 3 months out of the year."

Oddly, these 3 months are those likely to be least attractive. Summers can be hot and dry, but spring and fall are delightful.

Much of rural America suffers these days, nowhere worse than in the hill country. The early settler found water, fish, wood, game and a patch of bottomland big enough for the meager crops he needed. He never dreamed that the agricultural future belonged to the prairies where giant contraptions would cultivate and harvest vast acreages enriched, not by spring-flooding rivers, but by commercial fertilizers.

Arnold Jones, caretaker of the water mill at Alley Spring Park, Mo., remembers when the mill ground night and day. But it has been stilled since 1917 and farming has become increasingly precarious in these hills.

"I can't recall nobody who is making their all off a farm," Jones says. "They either have a wife workin' or they're drawin' social security."

What has happened is painfully revealed in the population figures. Here in Benton County the population has dropped from 10,881 in 1940 to 8,685 in 1950 to 5,963 in 1960.

The country may be beautiful, but, as the saying goes, "You can't eat the scenery," and the young flee.

But the memories cling indelibly, of redbud on the hills, of chatty streams like the Illinois, Jack's Fork, Eleven Point and Roaring River.

Pearl Holland, looking at the flower-flecked bluff across the murmuring Buffalo, sized it up for the exiled sons and daughters.

"You never see people who lived in the Ozarks, sir," she said, "who don't want to come back."

Rev. David Choate's Memorial Day Sermon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, an excellent Memorial Day sermon by the Reverend David A. Choate, of the First Congregational Church of Boise, Idaho, has come to my attention. I ask unanimous consent to have this thoughtful sermon printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THINKING DANGEROUSLY

(Memorial Day sermon by Rev. David A. Choate, First Congregational Church, Boise, Idaho, May 30, 1965—Scripture Micah 4:1–5)

On this Memorial Day Sunday, I should like to examine the purposes for which we memorialize those who have given their lives in the service of their country and at the same time to raise the question "How may we take advantage of the periods of peace to resolve the problems which periodically lead to armed conflict?"

Albert Schweitzer in his book "The Teaching of Reverence for Life" pointed toward the ultimate dilemma facing us when he said "The essence of goodness is: preserve life, promote life, help life to achieve its highest destiny. The essence of evil is: destroy life, harm life, hamper the development of life." If Albert Schweitzer is right, and I rather imagine that we would all agree that he is, then the goals for which these memorialized people gave their lives, are being undermined by the means we use in our effort to establish them. War and the use of military force is evil for it destroys, harms, and hampers; it does not preserve, promote, or help life to achieve its highest destiny. There are many among you this morning who will agree with this position. But our problem as a people is to discover how to achieve our highest dreams of human life without using the means of military force which in effect destroys the goals for which we yearn.

I am no authority on foreign relations speaking from the secret files of our State Department. I, like you, read of concerned human beings speaking out for a more constructive approach in human relationships around the world. Harry Bullis, chairman of the board for General Mills, Inc., is one such voice, "Much of the anticapitalist fanaticism in Communist lands, like the anti-Communist crusades in the open societies, is meaningless. The great concerns of our time lie far deeper than the cold war."[1] I do not know whether we should be giving more or less military assistance to South Vietnam but I strongly suspect that if we aren't able to solve the pressing human problems between the wars then the use of military force becomes our inevitable alternative and the saving of national face and preservation of an untrammeled Stars and Stripes our call to battle. On May 27, 1965, in the Idaho Daily Statesman there was an article by Jack Foisie who describes the growing pessimism with which American and foreign military men view the use of arms as a means of stabilizing southeast Asia. Date line Saigon: "The belief grows here that even all-out bombing of North Vietnam will not force the Communists to cease their war in the south. * * * But the pessimism is evident not only to the Americans. Thoughtful Vietnamese and many foreign military men here are coming to the same conclusion. They are convinced the war can end only when the Vietcong guerrillas are whipped in the south. So strong is the enemy hold on many regions that it will take a protracted effort involving tens of thousands of American troops to root them out of the jungles. * * * But this would put the United States in a position somewhat akin to the Russian planting of missiles in Cuba. President John F. Kennedy was willing to go to war if a hostile force remained at his doorstep. Red China's reaction certainly would be the same if Americans occupied North Vietnamese territory adjacent to China's southern border." War cold or hot thwarts the major goals of life. You know it, I know it, it is expressed in plaintive tones by Micah in his dream for all mankind that swords will be recast into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks. Poets write verse about it, our leading and respected statesmen deliver speeches about it, it is engraved above the portals of our public buildings and it now comes to us from the steaming, bloody jungles of Vietnam. What we need is some new and dangerous thinking.

Above the posing members of a high school class there was printed on a banner their motto which read "Forward ever; backward never." Because of some heads obstructing the view the motto on the picture when printed read "Ever, backward." We will want to see the whole picture without some heads obstructing the view.

The other half of the picture is that major use of military force in the resolution of major international disputes is basically irreconcilable with the means which must be employed if such disputes are to be resolved. Alfred Kazin writing some time ago said, "People seem to be able to tolerate war, national crusades, racial segregation, mass hysteria. What they can't seem to tolerate is unemployment, the feeling of being useless, the sight of their children going without. If this is true, if we are fairly indifferent to the fate of humanity until our own fate is called into question, then the great lesson of the 1930's, that anybody will revolt if he gets angry or humiliated enough, is the great lesson of our own day, and we had better hoist some storm warnings now."[2] Openness of communication and responsive understanding of extra national problems are the constructive attitudes which make the healing of social problems possible. The same point was elaborated upon by Ruth Knowles, "If we simply denounce Castro and make no attempt to understand what he offers the Cuban people—a few specific achievements, a sense of national dignity and a large store of hope—then we fail to understand what he offers to the rest of Latin America. If we are to combat Castro's revolution, we must combine the spirit of our Revolution of 1776 with our 20th-century technology revolution, and export this spirit and accomplishments to Latin America."[3]

It isn't popular to think of the causes which lie behind the first which gives you the bloody nose and then treat the causes without retaliating in kind. But the open social wounds, so inviting to the Communist virus, is best treated by healing the wound rather than waiting so long that it becomes necessary to combat a well entrenched virus. If this is the case we had better look to the deeper problems of human relationships and provide an adequate solution to these before war becomes our last remaining alternative. This day calls for thinking big and thinking dangerously. Are we as Americans big enough, sensitive enough, or imaginative enough to penetrate the cultural and political barriers and to contribute significantly to a people's sense of usefulness, meaning and dignity? Are we big enough to surmount the barriers of national sovereignty and genuinely credit other nations with their achievements as their contribution to human knowledge.

This, however, will take some changing of time worn attitudes before this Nation or any nation will give priority to the human concerns which cut across sovereign boundaries. These are some of the time worn attitudes which need modification: (1) Blood is thicker than water. This belief is untrue for human concerns are not based upon the accidents of biology. (2) We are the good people and any one different from us is bad and should be beaten into giving up their differences. (3) Other cultures are quaint and have nothing to teach us. Such attitudes may have held a primitive people together and supported the survival of families, cities, and nations but no longer are they valid since the needs of humanity in general now take precedence over all other sovereign entities. We cannot rely upon ancestral attitudes we have inherited from our fathers to guide us on the new frontiers of human relationships brought about by the phenomenal advances in scientific knowledge and communications.

If we are to survive as the human race we will begin our process by showing in action that we are our brother's keeper, for his sake and ours. We show it by spending less on

Footnotes at end of speech.

nuclear arms and more on nuclear powerplants. We show it by cranking out less propaganda and by developing more opportunities for cooperation between ourselves and the Communist nations. We put less stock in national sovereignty and more muscle into a truly international judiciary and supporting international police force. Red China will be invited to her rightful place in the United Nations not because she is good but because she is a sovereign power with whom it is necessary to have open debate and continuing communications if there is to be any hope of resolving international human problems. Many avenues which now seem closed to us will open to view when we accept the fact that we are born first into the human race and to this race we owe our first allegiance and not to our families, cities, nations. Only accidentally are we white, Smiths, and American. Our first responsibility is to people to lift them to a sense of usefulness and dignity, even if it means, as in most good families, some sacrifice to ourselves.

I suggest that we more responsibly hold in memory those who served their country well when we convert into reality their dream for world understanding and peace. No better summation could be made than the following words of Harry Bullis, chairman of the board for General Mills, "That this is a time of dangerous, turbulent change we all know. That this is a fantastic, wonderfully promising era we all may believe. The world tensions will continue to challenge us, long after the present encounters are solved, we all may assume. Taking the dangers, the promises, and the tensions all together, should everybody get ready for nuclear war? On the contrary. The business outlook for moral growth, national development, human productivity, economic profits, freedom for leisure, and intellectual maturity were never as general as they are at this moment in history. We have the conditions for peace. Our dream now is for a new age of mankind, a new breed of interdependent nations. Let us work to make this dream a reality." [4]

[1] Saturday Review, Oct. 13, 1962.
[2] Saturday Review, Oct. 13, 1962.
[3] Saturday Evening Post, Oct. 9, 1962.
[4] Saturday Review, Oct. 13, 1962.

The Vanishing Commuter Trains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, Harry Golden, as my colleagues from North Carolina will tell you, can hardly be classified as a railroad commuter. Yet Mr. Golden has had a love affair with trains dating back to his childhood days on the lower East Side of New York City when the elevated trains were all around him.

Now the railroad tracks are gone and the commuter railroads could also disappear, Mr. Golden notes in a column in the June 21, 1965, Stamford Advocate. Commuters are sure the Federal Government will take over in a pinch, but, as Mr. Golden points out, they forget that the Government did not rush in to take over the coal mines in West Virginia.

Wrapped in Mr. Golden's light touch is a serious message: that we cannot sit back and expect the Federal Government to do it all for us. It is a message that is particularly appropriate at this time for those of us in Fairfield County, Conn., and other commuter areas.

The Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency has approved a $3 million demonstration grant that will keep the New Haven commuter trains running for up to 18 months. But we must not sit back and think that everything has been taken care of. The grant just buys time to work out a permanent arrangement for commuter service, and unless we accomplish this within the next year and a half, we will be right back in a crisis situation.

The article follows:

THE RAILROAD

It may well be that in the near future there will be no more passenger trains. The New Haven Railroad is petitioning for the right to stop hauling passengers from Westchester County to New York City. Two other major eastern railroads have threatened they cannot continue their runs unless they can merge. All over the country the same complaint is heard: the railroad men say they cannot compete with superhighways built with public funds.

Freight still turns a profit for some lines. A lot of that, however, comes from piggyback hauling—hauling loaded trucks over long distances. Even the companies which manufactured toy electric trains have fallen on hard times, the victims of an age in which children prefer rocketry and spacecraft to pedestrian and wheeled travel.

Imagine an America without trains. Imagine the most mechanical country in the world without locomotives. My father could not conjure so bleak a vision. He was an immigrant from Galicia of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. He saw very little of America, only the Lower East Side of New York City and in the last decades of his life, the reaches of the Bronx. My mother never saw Grand Central Station. But they knew all about railroads. The elevated trains were all around us in those years. And like most Americans, my father and mother always had a love affair with the romantic trains.

Now the elevated trains are gone. The Third Avenue El came down 10 years ago to make way for the Second Avenue Subway which is still 50 years away.

My father spent 5 years agitating for rabbis to receive the same consideration on the railroads as the rest of the clergy received—half fare—and one day the press reported that this privilege had been granted. My father loved President William Howard Taft for the rest of his life.

The railroad will die for lack of profits. Lack of profits is the hallowed American excuse for abolishing anything. Passenger rates, no question about it, do not produce profits. Railroad management argues that if a company doesn't make 4½ percent on its investment it also loses interest it would receive on that percentage. It is only when we hear such reasoning that we passengers begin to understand why railroads are hesitant to open their books for public inspection. Conveniently, the trainmen also forget that once upon a time the U.S. Government gave them mile upon mile of free land in exchange for operating a public utility. The utility no longer turns the dollar it once did but the land does. But no one balances the losses of one operation with the profits of another for the simple reason that visionary accountants long ago advised railroad management to divide all its varied holdings into separate corporations. Now everybody's got to make a profit.

Perhaps the real reason the railroads will go under is because passengers cannot conceive of so profound a catastrophe. "Why," say the commuters, "realty values would drop immediately," as though stable realty values were ever a guarantee.

Commuters are sure the Government would take over, forgetting the Government didn't hasten to take over the coal mines in West Virginia. And even if the Government did dispose itself to take over the railroads it would take the bureaucracy several years to set up a Public Transit Commission to run them.

Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the pendulum of power is seriously threatened with imbalance in the Middle East. The buildup of Communist military aid to the United Arab Republic, the increase in the number of Arab commando terror raids on Israeli territory, and the current work in Syria and Jordan for diversion of Israel's water sources by her Arab neighbors are three real and present dangers to peace and stability in the Middle East.

The United States must take concrete steps to insure peace in this crucial, strategic area of the world. We must provide the State of Israel with the necessary defensive arms, so that she can protect herself against aggressors. Moreover, we should encourage renewed efforts for direct Arab-Israel peace talks.

We in the United States must rally the people of the Free World to be courageous, to do what is morally called for which clearly is to move now with action to preserve the peace and balance of power in the Middle East.

Mr. President, an excellent "Statement on the Middle East" was recently adopted by the American Jewish Committee, at its recently concluded 58th annual meeting. It contains specific recommendations for United States action to help achieve peace and stability in the Middle East. I ask unanimous consent that this "Statement on the Middle East" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE,
June 7, 1965.

Hon. HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: The establishment of peace in the Middle East has long been a matter of deep concern to the American Jewish Committee. The committee believes that this strategic region is approaching a critical turning point and that the policies pursued by our Government in the coming months may have a decisive influence in determining whether there will be a pattern for peace or a design for war in the area.

I would respectfully invite your consideration of the enclosed "Statement on the Middle East," which was adopted by the American Jewish Committee at its recently concluded 58th annual meeting and which contains specific recommendations for U.S. action to help achieve peace and stability in the Middle East. I am also enclosing the committee's statement pledging support to the efforts of International Cooperation Year.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS B. ABRAM,
President.

STATEMENT ON THE MIDDLE EAST

Recent activities in the Middle East strongly suggest that this strategic area is approaching a critical turning point. What is done or not done in the months immediately ahead may well determine the course of events for the long term—whether there will be a pattern for peace or a design for war in the area.

We applaud the renewed initiative of the Government of Israel in again offering to negotiate outstanding issues directly with the Arab States. Equally welcome are those Arab voices which evince a willingness to accept the undeniable fact that Israel is here to stay.

By way of contrast, the Arab purpose to destroy Israel continues to be advanced by many Arab leaders in most strident and incendiary terms. These leaders seek insistently to implement their belligerent aims through a unified military command and the creation of a Palestine liberation organization. They would waste the waters of the Jordan rather than see Israel get its just portion. To them, water is an instrument of war.

The United States, whose own security is inextricably involved in the Middle East, has a vital interest in counteracting such critical threats to peace and stability in the area. Other free world powers have an equal concern.

Israel requires and deserves their active, sustained, and meaningful support in order that it remain strong both militarily and economically. Too often, experience has shown that aggressor nations, led by personally ambitious leaders, interpret failure to act boldly as weakness of purpose—to be exploited in furtherance of their aims.

Against this background, and as Americans to whom U.S. interest is paramount, we urge our Government:

1. To use its presence in the Arab countries to persuade them to recognize Israel as a full-fledged member of the family of nations. Such recognition would facilitate the resolution of the outstanding issues between the Arab States and Israel—for example, the achievement of a viable and equitable settlement of the humanitarian problem of the Arab refugees, whose plight continues to be exploited by Arab politicians.

We believe that the United States has concrete tools with which to implement its foreign policies. We recognize that often these tools must be employed through quiet diplomacy and without fanfare. But the inadvisability of public pronouncements should not be an excuse for inaction.

2. To continue its firm commitment to the right of Israel to its fair share of the waters of the Jordan and to leave no doubts in the minds of the Arab nations as to the depth of that commitment. The need of Israel for an adequate supply of water is crucial. No nation—be it Israel or any other—should be exposed to the spiteful deprivation of its natural resources by its neighbors. Israel is committed to limit its share of the waters of the Jordan to the allocation set forth in the unified water plan. That plan was evolved under U.S. auspices and its technical provisions were embraced by both the riparian Arab States and Israel—it failed of formal adoption by the Arab governments for purely political reasons.

We must recognize that Jordan water is a vital security interest of Israel. That nation must, of necessity, have a flexibility of response to any threat to that interest. We are confident that Israel will not react in a way which will escalate armed conflict except as a last resort.

3. To provide Israel with the necessary physical means to insure a meaningful balance of arms vis-a-vis the Arab nations. Since its birth, Israel has been and still is a beleaguered nation. The Israelis may be blessed with an unusual degree of military competence and efficiency, but they are not supermen. In determining Israel's needs we must not be lulled by the alleged military ineptitude or inefficiency of its adversaries. Moreover, we should recognize that because of its size and geographic location, Israel cannot be expected to accept a level of risk of attack which a strong nation, such as ours, located thousands of miles away, might be prepared to accept.

4. To continue a reasonable level of economic aid to Israel and to afford Israel adequate protection in its trade relations. Israel has made enormous strides in the development of its economy. But it is still far from achieving the required level of trade and financial stability. It has been especially handicapped by the lack of commercial intercourse with its Arab neighbors and the concerted efforts of those neighbors to stifle its economic growth. It still needs development assistance and help to broaden its relations with the European Common Market and to compete in other international markets. Only in this way can it solidify its past gains, provide the necessary means of livelihood for its people, and continue to absorb the large numbers of immigrants who have been forced to leave their native countries and are finding renewed hope in the land of the Bible.

We should make clear, as a matter of official U.S. Government policy, our opposition to the boycott and restrictive trade practices presently being pursued by the Arab League and our determination to protect U.S. business concerns in their efforts to combat Arab pressures.

We are not unaware of the danger of a confrontation between East and West or of the possible proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Middle East. Either of these possibilities would be most dangerous to our own national interest. At the same time, neither should these possibilities obscure the immediate need for the United States to deal firmly with the aggressive designs of the Arab States, which constitute a clear and present danger to peace in the region.

We are convinced that insufficient action will increase rather than decrease the likelihood of occurrence of these dangers, and that strength of purpose and the implementation of our recommended actions by the United States will go a long way toward achieving peace and stability in an area vital to our own national security.

We believe that U.S. influence, effectively brought to bear, can do a great deal to bring the Arab States and Israel to the point where a pattern for peace can begin to emerge. We should leave no stone unturned in our resolute pursuit of this cardinal objective.

Beauty, Not Billboards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, 1965, there appeared in the Christian Science Monitor an outstanding editorial in support of the President's campaign to restore and enhance beauty along our Nation's highways.

The editorial states:

BEAUTY, NOT BILLBOARDS

Even our years of delight with the Burma Shave advertisements have never made us like roadside billboards. Thus we happily endorse President Johnson's efforts to restore and enhance beauty along the highways of the United States.

His proposals to discourage billboards and junkyards along federally financed highways, to encourage landscaping and to build scenic roads are steps to which Congress and the States should give springtime thought.

Since voluntary efforts to remove roadside ugliness and blight have not succeeded, there is much merit in using the potent prod of Federal funds to move us faster toward so worthwhile a goal.

America's beauty belongs to all its citizens not to its commercial interests. Those citizens have the right to enjoy that beauty free from the constant intrusion of tawdry or ugly elements. Legitimate advertising at the very outskirts of a city, junkyards carefully placed in out-and-out industrial areas are doubtless necessary. They should be speedily and firmly removed from all other spots.

Today's tension, crowding, and speed make it more than ever needful that we have the opportunity for the undisturbed enjoyment of natural beauty. Since, as the President stressed, "the automobile is the central feature of American life," there is no better place to start in the search for natural beauty than along the highways.

The New Breed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a very personal friend of mine, Very Rev. Msgr. James A. Healy, addressed the students at D'Youville College, Buffalo, N.Y., at a baccalaureate Mass.

Monsignor Healy has made his mark doing God's work, and I commend his address, "The New Breed," to the attention of my colleagues:

THE NEW BREED

(By Very Rev. Msgr. James A. Healy at baccalaureate Mass, 1965)

A baccalaureate service is an occasion of mingled emotion. Certainly it is joyous, marking as it does, the completion of the course: the achievement of that bachelor's degree which the term baccalaureate signifies. This gathering of the college is not without sadness: partings are sweet but sorrowful.

There is no new life without pain, no beginning without an ending, no commencement without leavetaking.

Mother D'Youville has nurtured you for 4 or more years. During these years, you have established by now a familiar pattern of school, work, and play, you have made new friends. The halls of alma mater have become as familiar as your own homes; now this ends, a new pattern of activity emerges, friendships change when there is no longer propinquity and a common purpose. You will no longer be an important member of the college community, we shall see you henceforth as a visitor. In brief, you will no longer need be concerned about keeping the coffeeshop clean.

It is time then for reflection. In this period of hiatus between school and your next occupation, your thoughts turn naturally to what the future holds. We are children of a society that bids us press on. But we are children too of our past, and it is the past that I would direct your attention this afternoon.

You may well say I have lived my past, I know it better than you, it is over and done, what of worth is there in such a review?

Your past has been a full and hurried one, your eye fixed on the goal you are now achieving. In your headlong pursuit of the goal, perhaps, you have never really seen or appreciated the route you traversed.

You came to D'Youville, a select group, having met certain standards of scholastic achievement and character. You were welcomed to this institution as a creature of God, able to reason and to choose between the alternatives life presents.

In this you differed from the new breed. The noun of this rude term implies something less than a human being. Breed is defined as a type or variety of animal or plant. You were considered to be somewhat different and higher than a plant or an animal. The breeding of animals and plants is done with cold calculation, impersonally, with regard to the parent stock as being of importance only as transmitters of the genes and chromosomes to the new breed. Those who proclaim themselves the new breed are very conscious of the nonhuman treatment which has produced them. On campus after campus, the charge is raised that our education is impersonal; there are too many of us; we are only numbers; the school is too big, alma mater is an education factory, the teachers don't care, the administration is a computer.

Having enrolled at this college, you began a course of studies, designed for the stimulation and enlargement of your intellectual capacities.

Is this a trite and obvious statement? Not to those who hold that education is only a cumulative string of experiences, situations or responses. It is a trite and obvious statement to you because your course of studies has a philosophical bedrock, it has striven to give you a unifying comprehension of man in relation to himself, his neighbor, creation and the Creator.

The philosophy of education which animated your course of studies is not some novelty of yesterday, hailed as a great step forward in the morning, discarded and forgotten by night fall. You are the inheritor of the universities of the middle ages: the gowns you wear as seniors are not some archaic memento of a dead past but a vital reminder that the philosophy of education which your college presented to you is in continuing line with the educational system and philosophy which had its first flowering five centuries before Columbus set sail for this new world.

The statistics and the record show that D'Youville is a small college some half a century old. As far as the spirit which molded your faculty is concerned, D'Youville is truly a part of the largest educational system in the world and the oldest.

The new breed is not impressed with venerable antiquity and broad concepts. If you have no tradition nor history, it is impossible to learn from the lessons of the past. If you view the world as a terrifying jungle having no beginning before your birth, no continuity after your death and no broader scope than your own experience—like some of the new breed—you do well to withdraw from life, to seek whatever sensory pleasure may be wrested from the moment, to barricade the rest of mankind from your pad.

Your faculty is a teaching faculty, a faculty trained and imbued in scholasticism, still the most widely accepted philosophy in existence. In this you have been more fortunate than the new breed who cry out bitterly that their teachers do not teach and that instruction is left to a mechanical device or to an instructor little more mature than their own immature selves. If you are a spokesman for the new breed and a graduate student—as so many of them seem to be—it buttresses confusion to have a fellow graduate student drawing on the same lack of experience as oneself as he seeks to illumine inner relationships.

D'Youville is a woman's college, and as the years go on—as the facts are forgotten or changed, as the methods are updated, the formulas forgotten, the answers no longer recalled—even when you have forgotten our greatest president, you will find increasingly useful the social graces your college sought to impart. D'Youville is not ashamed to state as one of her objectives that she seeks to train young ladies.

You brought to this college the natural qualities of girls. Among them, need for loveliness and a desire to create it, a longing for poise and assurance, untapped reservoirs of charm, of understanding, of sympathy and tenderness. Your college has not hesitated to teach you posture as well as physics, a gentlewoman's acquaintance with the creative and performing arts. You have been exposed to teas, socials, mixers, dances, and summonses when you failed in the social amenities. You came here girls, you leave here young women, articulate and poised, your natural feminine qualities refined and polished.

In this you are most obviously not the new breed. That some of your contemporaries are called the new breed and not the new breeds is indeed the correct tag. They are one breed, even physically indistinguishable: all have long hair and wear trousers and since they do not practice godliness they seem to feel no need for the virtue so closely allied to it. The new breed is distinguished by sloppy dress, manners and thought. The inarticulate mumble and utter lack of the common courtesies are their hallmark. You were trained to the graces which make life gracious. All training is irksome. The result in you will be lifelong gratitude that you not only know when to wear gloves but will be invited back to places where they are required.

Most important of all you have been given a God-centered way of life. No matter what storms may buffet you, what disappointments may befall you, what tragedies strike at you, the faith you brought with you has been strengthened, deepened, raised to an adult level. Life, for you, is no trackless waste. The eternal guideposts have been pointed out to you, their directions clarified, your own rsponsibilities fixed. You know you follow your individual journeys with a mature and comprehending faith. Your religious education and training have been an integral part of your college years. Woven into your very being is not alone the formal instruction you have received, but your personal encounters in the confessional, and the chapel, and the dedicated example of your faculty and fellow students. Your college proposed to mould your character, and it is in this that perhaps you differ most from the new breed.

Religious illiteracy does mark the new breed. A transient concern for this or that social problem may move the new breed to picket or sit-in. Except for the few politicals among them, the enthusiasm of the new breed for social betterment have no more foundation and will have no more results than a breeze which ripples the water briefly then passes on leaving no trace. I have been a practioner of social justice all my adult life—from my own experience I know that changes—the many changes we desperately need to build here the new Jerusalem. These changes are accomplished only by dogged, persevering hard work, pursued year in and year out, without the glare of publicity, with no reward but the spiritual one.

Emotional speeches, publicity grabbing devices, revolutions in coffee houses, the excitement of the police court, may make the new breed feel they are changing the face of society, but history teaches the hard lesson that without the moral training the divine objective, which assures perseverance, self-professed social reformers are an unmitigated nuisance. Pink colleges turn out yellow kids. They break and run, desert in the face of the enemy because once the emotion of the moment passes there is no substance to strengthen them against active hatred, cold indifference, venality, discouragement and delay.

We have spoken of your nature, as creatures of God and as women, we have spoken of your college which has trained you intellectually and morally in the oldest tradition, we have not spoken of your futures. Dr. Horgan will undoubtedly do that on Sunday. We have reminded you of your pasts. Mother D'Youville has built upon nature to make you not a new breeed but another of the traditional classes of Catholic young women which is the reason for being of your school.

When the term "new breed" has fallen into the limbo, you will bear reverently, proudly and gracefully the honored designation "D'Youville graduate." It is our hope that as the years go on, your appreciation of what you have received will match the love with which it was given unto you.

Selling the Nation on Beauty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the First Lady of this country, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, has undertaken an important campaign of beautification of Washington, which we hope will set an example for the Nation. I take pride in bringing to your attention an article which appeared in the New York Journal-American on Sunday, May 30, 1965, by Ruth Montgomery.

It underlines the excellent job that Mrs. Johnson is doing, and also indicates the support which she is getting from my fellow New Yorker, Mrs. Mary Lasker, who has done so much to help beautify New York City:

[From the New York Journal-American, May 30, 1965]

SELLING THE NATION ON BEAUTY

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—If a woman is ever elected President of the United States, the Nation's chief loss may be a First Lady. Few projects in modern times have more captivated Americans than those launched by the two most recent presidential wives: Jacqueline Kennedy's White House restoration, and Lady Bird Johnson's beautification drive.

White House mailbags are currently inundated with letters praising Lady Bird for her program to beautify the Nation's Capital, and telling how her example is inspiring similar projects in their hometowns.

Because the First Lady is generally credited with putting beautification into President Johnson's state of the Union message, I inquired how she came to interest herself in

a project which has touched off such instantaneous reaction throughout the land. This is her reply:

"My interest in beauty dates way, way back to my girlhood. Some of the most memorable hours I've ever spent have been in the out-of-doors, communing with nature and reveling in the scenic beauty which abounds. These have been my happiest and most pleasant times."

With typical modesty, she added: "I don't know how much influence I had on putting 'beautification' into the state of the Union message, because I made no direct suggestions, but I do know that the President has heard me talk-talk-talking about beauty and nature for a very long time."

Mrs. Johnson conceded that the electrifying campaign to beautify the Capital was her own brainchild:

"After the state of the Union message, I decided to select certain projects in which I felt that I could be of the most use in furthering Lyndon's programs. I picked beautification and the war on poverty as two fields where I might have something to contribute."

Lady Bird asked Mary Lasker and Laurance Rockefeller to recommend names of those whose abilities would be most helpful. Twenty-five were then invited to the White House, and formed themselves into a permanent committee to beautify Washington.

At the second meeting, on March 9, Lady Bird really had things rolling. She loaded the committee into minibuses for four stops at busy intersections and housing projects, where she helped plant pansies and azaleas.

As soon as fellow countrymen realized that the First Lady meant business, donations poured in so rapidly that the committee had to incorporate in order to handle the funds. Mary Lasker, Mrs. Milo Perkins, and the city of Norfolk donated thousands of dollars worth of azaleas. Mrs. Lasker also gave dogwoods for the banks of the Potomac River near Key Bridge. Mrs. Vincent Astor sent $10,000, and Laurance Rockefeller gave $100,000.

Seed companies and nurseries from as far away as California and Pennsylvania sent plants and blooming trees; local stores magnificently landscaped two dreary schoolyards.

Senate wives, cheered on by Mrs. Johnson and Second Lady Muriel Humphrey, began pressuring their husbands to permit an open-air restaurant on the west sundeck of the Capitol.

Jackie Kennedy will long be remembered for beautifying the White House interior and Lady Bird Johnson's out-of-doors beautification project is snowballing so rapidly that her imprint may be left on every hamlet and highway in America.

The Crisis in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker:

In the eyes of all Asia and most of the world, the U.S. commitment to aid the Vietnamese is complete. Any indecision, any withdrawal now, would be a major military and political defeat for the United States.

This is but one penetrating conclusion by Gordon H. Cole, eminent editor of the Machinist, the highly acclaimed official newspaper of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, AFL–CIO.

Mr. Cole has just returned from a personal factfinding visit to South Vietnam. Highlights of his observations and conclusions are contained in his report, "Some Answers From Vietnam," published in the Machinist issued today.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Cole for his astute contribution to our national need for understanding our involvement in Vietnam. And, I commend his report, "Some Answers From Vietnam," to the careful attention of my colleagues:

SOME ANSWERS FROM VIETNAM

(By Gordon H. Cole)

What's going on in Vietnam? Why is the United States involved so far from home? Can the Communists be defeated in guerilla warfare? Have the Vietnamese the will to fight? Have they the courage? What will it take to win this one? And how long? Why don't we turn the whole mess over to the United Nations?

These are some of the questions I asked in Vietnam earlier this month when I flew there at the invitation of the Department of Defense for a firsthand look at the action. There, on the other side of the world, the realities make the answers clearer.

Here is what I found:

The conflict in Vietnam, in reality, is part of the battle for southeast Asia. That landmass includes the Philippines, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, Thailand, Malaya, and Indonesia. Altogether more than 200 million people live in this disputed area—more than the total population of the United States. Beyond this, India and all Asia is watching this test of the U.S. commitment. How much help can they expect if they stand up against the Chinese Communists?

Why do we care about these people who live half way round the world? The flight from Washington to Saigon is a reminder that the world has grown smaller in the past 25 years. In travel time, San Francisco is as close to Saigon today as Washington was to London in World War II.

SMALLER WORLD

In 1943, this reporter flew from Washington to Prestwick, Scotland in an old C–54. We took the southern route with refueling and repair stops at Bermuda and the Azores. Elapsed time was 23 hours. Last month, a Pan American 707 jet took 23 hours from takeoff at San Francisco to touchdown at Saigon. We arrived 14 minutes ahead of schedule.

From Saigon today, a GI can phone home for less than $8 for 3 minutes. Paris and Rome were never so close, yet in 1940 we felt that a totalitarian power in Europe threatened our freedom at home.

When did the United States become committed to such a war? It began in 1947 and 1948 with President Truman's policy of containment of communism, a policy continued by President Eisenhower who in 1954 promised to assist South Vietnam to remain free and independent. That commitment has grown as our Government encouraged the South Vietnamese to resist Communist aggression.

In the eyes of all Asia and most of the world, the U.S. commitment to aid the Vietnamese is complete. Any indecision, and withdrawal now would be a major military and political defeat for the United States.

U.S. COMMITMENT

More than 50,000 U.S. troops are in Vietnam in addition to hundreds of civilian employees of the U.S. operations mission (AID) and the U.S. Information Service. There is no easy way out. Either we stay until the non-Communist Vietnamese can win or we pick up and run.

The hope for negotiations have no basis in the apparent realities in Vietnam. At the moment, the Vietcong—the Vietnamese Communist Party—is winning more battles than it is losing. There is no incentive yet for the North Vietnamese to negotiate a cessation of hostilities unless we are prepared to sign a surrender. They think they have it won.

Passing the buck to the United Nations seems impracticable. Neither North Vietnam nor the Chinese Communist Governments are members of the U.N. Neither have any confidence in the U.N. as an impartial agency.

An International Control Commission already is operating in Vietnam under the 1954 Geneva agreement. The ICC, as it is called, is powerless. The Chinese Communists promised to pay a share of its expenses, a promise that has been ignored since 1961.

The South Vietnamese will tell you they have enough problems without adding the U.N. with its conflicting obligations.

The Vietnamese are willing to fight. I talked with American officers and men who have served many months in combat as advisers to the Army of the Republic of Vietnam. Without exception, they praised the valor of the Vietnamese troops. Vietnamese leadership is another matter. For 80 years, the French ruled Vietnam, repressing and explointing its people and controlling Vietnamese political and economic activity. They were not permitted to hold positions of authority. Most military leaders developed in the revolt against the French prior to 1954 stayed with the Communists.

Since the insurgency was renewed in 1959, the Communists have conducted a systematic campaign of assassination of local Vietnamese political leaders. That campaign is still in progress. As a result, the Vietnamese are desperately hunting new leaders at every level. There aren't many volunteers.

How strong are the Communists? Authorities say that the Communists control at least 22 percent of the people of South Vietnam. About 28 percent are neutral, concerned principally with personal survival, paying lipservice to the government by day, to the Communists by night.

They also pay taxes to both governments. The Communists come out at night and almost everywhere except in the big cities they collect taxes, recruit young men for their army, and enforce their own law. Murder, arson, or bombing is the penalty for those who refuse to cooperate. The Government's stronghold is Saigon; the Communists rule most of the rural areas.

The Communists are bold and skillful fighters. They train carefully for every mission, whether it is to overrun a government outpost or storm a provincial capital. They strike, kill, and disperse. They pick out a single target; they pick their own time. The defense must be everywhere all the time.

Counter insurgency, as the defense is called, requires much larger forces. The British succeeded is overciming a similar problem in Malaya with a superiority of about 13 to 1. The present ratio in Vietnam is 3 to 1.

That's why the buildup of both United States and Vietnamese forces continues.

Communist popularity, especially in the rural areas, is partly a holdover from the long struggle against the French which the Communists led. Today the Communists hold the peasants in many areas by dividing up the big plantations. The peasants are told that if the government ever regains control of the area, they will be arrested for stealing land. So far, the Vietnamese Government has developed no effective answer.

ROLE OF UNITED STATES

U.S. military commanders in Vietnam are quick to explain that the fighting

there is not for territory, not for real estate, but for the loyalty and confidence of the people.

They talk about the social revolution in Vietnam which they say is based on the real needs of the people. They tell you this revolution cannot be stopped, that it can be directed. That is why the U.S. forces are advising not only on military matters but also providing help for farmers, medicine for the sick, housing for the dispossessed. It is the reason our Government is encouraging the organization of labor unions in Vietnam.

I came away from Vietnam proud of the U.S. activity there. The war will be long and often perplexing, but I am convinced that it will eventually be won by and for the Vietnamese.

The Right To Be Different

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Forest City Daily Times Herald of June 16, 1965, carried a most enlightening editorial entitled "The Right To Be Different." This article deals with what is known as the truth in packaging bill, which has been sponsored by certain Members of the other body. I agree wholeheartedly with the Times Herald in that the consuming public need not be "taken by the hand" in connection with purchasing goods from the storekeeper's shelves. They are well able to make those decisions without additional Government directive.

The Times Herald article deals with a new facet in connection with this program, having to do with the woman's right of freedom to be different—freedom of choice.

I recommend this fine editorial to the Members of the House.

THE RIGHT TO BE DIFFERENT

Senate committee hearings on the so-called truth in packaging bill were enlivened by the appearance of a group of women representing the perfume, lipstick, and cosmetic industries—which, as just about any woman will tell you, are very important industries indeed. Their testimony was in opposition to the proposed measure. Standardization of cosmetics, one said, would "destroy a woman's right to be different, her freedom to be an individual." Another observed that "to standardize packaging would be as catastrophic as to standardize women."

Such valid objections, of course, are not confined to these particular products. All manner of products would be subjected to broader and more arbitrary Government controls. The cost of changing packages and containers to fit new rules would be very heavy, as representatives of the businesses concerned have testified, and this, like all other costs, would have to be paid by the ultimate consumer. More important, in the long run, is the adverse effect the bill could not help but have on the consumer's freedom of choice.

Existing laws, Federal, State, and local, give Government abundant powers to prevent and punish the comparative few who misrepresent their products. Beyond that, the consumer is her own best policeman—it's a case of once bitten twice shy. And if strengthening of the law is needed, this certainly can be done without destroying or undermining so basic a freedom as that of choice.

Casser Fund Aids Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in this age of specialization, there is much emphasis on education and a great deal of discussion and effort on the part of governmental agencies on methods to improve our schools. I would like to bring to the attention of this body the efforts of a private individual from the Ninth District who has done something personally to improve education in his own community.

I refer to the Honorable Benjamin Casser, a mayor of Cresskill, N.J., who, despite a lack of education, rose to become a leading real estate owner and philanthropist in the northern New Jersey area.

His latest gesture on behalf of his neighbors has been the establishment of a fund to enable public school teachers to study and travel abroad during the summer months.

Under unanimous consent I place the following article from the Hackensack, N.J., Record, describing this generous gesture in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CASSER SETS UP FUND FOR TEACHER STUDY

CRESSKILL.—Former Mayor Benjamin Casser, a former stationery-store owner who rose without a high-school education to become a leading real estate owner and philanthropist in northern New Jersey, has established a fund that will permit local public school teachers to travel and study abroad during the summer months.

The first beneficiary of the fund will be Mrs. Harry Zimmerman, a world-history teacher at the high school, who will study this summer at Oxford University. Mrs. Zimmerman, a New Milford resident, is scheduled to take a 6-week course that will delve into the history of England.

The fund, known as the Rose Lerner Casser Grant, which is named after the philanthropist's late first wife, will provide the history teacher with $500. An additional $100 is being provided by the board of education.

"I anticipate that this will be an exciting experience," said Mrs. Zimmerman, the mother of two grown sons. "It won't be a goof-off summer, it will be a working one."

The history teacher, who has taught at the high school ever since it was built 4 years ago, said that study abroad would provide her with an opportunity to hear history taught from a different point of view.

"I've learned British history from an American perspective. But it would be fascinating," she said, "to learn about the American revolution from a British point of view."

Mrs. Zimmerman said that she will be studying and living at Exeter College, one of the dozen or more colleges at Oxford, about 1 hour by car from London. As one of 120 foreign students, she will have 10 hours of lecture classes weekly with extensive seminars and individual discussions with instructors. (Students are not permitted to leave the campus, she said, except for two scheduled weekends.)

Mrs. Zimmerman plans to travel through England with her husband and one of her sons before classes begin.

The teacher was selected for the grant by a panel of teachers and residents, headed by School Superintendent Dr. Robert Scott. The panel was composed of two elementary teachers, two high school teachers, a principal, a school trustee, and a parent.

Included as part of the grant are funds for taking tape recordings of discussions with fellow students.

Dr. Scott said that the recordings will be placed at the disposal of teachers and community groups when Mrs. Zimmerman returns in August. "She will also be available to speak before parent groups and the school teachers," he said.

The grant from Casser is one of several that he has given to Cresskill schools. He gave sizable contributions toward the establishment of the high school library.

A borough resident since 1916, Casser first opened a stationery store on Union Avenue. He latter went into the transportation field and amassed large real estate holdings in the Northern Valley area.

He is now president of Manhattan Transit Co., in East Paterson and Westwood Transit Co., in Little Ferry. He has contributed to the Jewish Community Center in Englewood, the United Jewish Appeal, and Englewood Hospital.

Middle Course in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, having been a member of the special study mission to southeast Asia, I know we are all concerned about Vietnam because the peace of the world is being threatened by events taking place there, and it is fitting at this time to refer to an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on June 18, 1965, that merits the attention of all the Members of Congress, and for that reason I place it in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, June 18, 1965]

MIDDLE COURSE IN VIETNAM

Since 1961 the number of U.S. troops in South Vietnam has been increased from 2,000 to the 75,000 announced on Wednesday by Defense Secretary McNamara.

McNamara's review of South Vietnam made it plain that the U.S. policy is a grim go-ahead with whatever measures are needed to contain and throw back the Communist aggression.

President Johnson has made it clear, as did Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower before him, why the United States is in South Vietnam.

The United States responded to a call for help from a free country under Communist aggression. The whole purpose of the United States is to halt that aggression.

The Communist aims are equally clear. More than 2 years ago North Vietnam Communist leaders said that a "new type of war" was being tested in South Vietnam; that the Communists would prove that a powerful nuclear nation could be defeated on the ground. They also said that the South

Vietnam war would be a model for Communist movements in Latin America and Africa to follow.

To abandon the effort in South Vietnam, as some petition and demonstrate to do, would be disastrous. It would open the door to a succession of South Vietnams in Latin America and other areas.

Nor is it necessary, as some extremists advocate, to press for an unconditional surrender by North Vietnam. That invites involvement in a major conflict on the land mass of Asia, a prospect most military strategists hold to be potentially disastrous. As Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, pointed out this week, our policy should be one of determination to end the war as soon as possible by means of negotiation.

That means convincing the Communists they cannot win and must negotiate a peaceful settlement. Such conviction will not be easy to attain. It may take several years. It will, by any measure, be costly.

The President should make this clear to the Nation. The Communists should be warned that the planned U.S. escalation in South Vietnam is the expression of the single policy of the United States: to oppose and contain Communist aggression against free nations no matter how costly.

U.S. Intervention in the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I include an article which has quoted an excerpt from an address by the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, before the graduating class of Baylor University:

[From the New York (N.Y.) News, May 29, 1965]

SPOKEN MOSTLY LIKE A TEXAN

Addressing Baylor University's graduating class at Waco, Tex., yesterday, President Johnson talked mainly like the hardheaded, realistic Texan we hope he will continue to be as long as he is Chief Executive.

His principal subject was the Dominican Republic and the U.S. armed intervention a month ago in that revolt-torn island nation threatened with a Red takeover.

We did what had to be done, said the President, and there was no time to consult the other members of the Organization of American States before sending in the Marines and paratroops.

We're now willing to consult our OAS colleagues; already have set up an OAS peace force commanded by a Brazilian general; want to see a moderate government installed by the Dominican Republic people; but still are determined that communism shall not set up another Western Hemisphere bridgehead or two on the island of Hispaniola.

Fine, we think, and we only hope the President sticks to this position regardless of the yowls and caterwauls of "liberals" and godsakers. If these people have their way, the Dominican Republic will yet be grabbed by Reds—as will South Vietnam, where we think Mr. Johnson also is pursuing the only right and constructive policy now feasible.

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my honor to deliver an address, prepared by Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, JR., concerning a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, to a luncheon of the Joint National Conference of the America Symphony Orchestra League and Arts Councils of America.

So that my colleagues may have the benefit of Mr. THOMPSON's remarks, the text of the address follows:

REMARKS OF HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR., BEFORE THE AMERICAN SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA LEAGUE LUNCHEON AS READ BY HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

Your meeting here in Washington at this particular time is very significant.

This week started with the White House festival of arts, a first for this Nation. It reflected a growing national concern for the state of the arts and the humanities.

A little more than a week ago the Senate approved the bill, S. 1483, to create a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. It had been my hope and my plan to report to you today that the House Committee on Education and Labor had cleared the companion bill, H.R. 6050, for action by the House of Representatives.

As you may have learned from the news media, such action has been delayed as a result of matters which have no bearing on this particular piece of legislation.

Despite this momentary delay, you are meeting almost simultaneously with House committee action, for I intend to bring it up for consideration at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee on Thursday.

We have the votes to report a bill, which will parallel the bill already approved by the Senate.

The significance of these legislative actions, both recent and soon to be, and your meeting here is that American Symphony Orchestra League footprints are all over this bill.

It began in 1961, when a subcommittee of which I was the chairman conducted an investigation into the economic conditions of the performing arts. Your Mrs. Helen Thompson was a witness. We were not considering specific legislative proposals, nor did she, at the time, make any specific recommendations.

Some of the possibilites for assistance to the arts, and symphony orchestras in particular, which she suggested as areas of study included:

1. Federal aid to education, which could greatly expand the playing of concerts for children and he use of that personnel for teaching. This has been accomplished partly through the elementary and secondary education bill, enacted earlier, and through the inclusion in H.R. 6050 of provisions to improve the teaching of the arts and humanities.

2. The possibility of some Federal, State, and local matching program on buildings. Again, in the elementary and secondary education program we provide for construction of educational centers, designed to bring to bear all of the cultural resources of a given community, and, thanks to an amendment sponsored by a member of my subcommittee, so physically constructed as to provide separate entrance to an aduitorium so that it might be utilized for cultural activities, including symphony concerts. As to the bill primarily under discussion, H.R. 6050, the arts endowment would be authorized to make grants for construction, as well as for alterations and repairs. All grants under the arts endowment would be matching.

Finally, in the section of our present bill relating to labor standards, we are adding a proviso that whenever there is compliance with State safety and sanitary laws, this shall be prima facie evidence of compliance with the Federal statute. This proviso has been included directly at the suggestion of the American Symphony Orchestra League.

Of course, over the years since, we have had testimony from official spokesmen for your organization, as well as from individual members thereof, and it has always been constructive. I should like to apologize once more to Mrs. Thompson for our inability to hear her in person this year. She was a scheduled witness before a joint hearing being conducted by the House and Senate subcommittees. Before we reached her, we were called to the floor for a roll call. Her testimony was made a part of the record and we all read it. As usual, it was very constructive. Last year, because Mr. SICKLES, of Maryland, is a member of our subcommittee, and personally very interested in this legislation, we had testimony from Mr. William Boucher III, vice president of the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra Association.

The record of the various symphony orchestra associations is a proud one. Of all the arts, the symphony in America has gained the greatest audience. Our orchestras are among the finest in the world. There are well over a thousand in existence. These are exclusive of secondary school symphony orchestras. The total number of performances given per year must approach the 10,000 figure.

On the face of it, these are extremely impressive statistics. Throughout our hearings this year, as well as last year, we have been reminded of these splendid accomplishments.

And the suggestion is then made that the arts must be doing very well, indeed.

We know differently, however. We know that the large number of symphony orchestras vary from completely volunteer operations to the completely professional.

They vary in expenditures from a few hundred dollars a year to several million—or more.

They have a gross audience of between 10 and 15 million people, who pay varying prices of admission.

About one in six of the musicians playing in these orchestras is a professional. This is significant, for the only way to achieve quality of performance is to be able to devote full time to perfecting the skill or art.

No one would deny the strength of professional sports in the United States, but neither would they count all of the sandlot and Little League teams, nor include the Golden Glovers in support of their arguments.

You and I know the facts of life regarding the health and well-being of symphony orchestras. You know it because you run these thousand and more orchestras. I know because you have told the Congress many times in testimony.

We know that ticket sales account for but 55 percent of the revenue to support your orchestras. We know that the deficit is made up through campaigns for contributions as well as a variety of fundraising ac-

tivities, such as balls, bazaars, raffles, and the like.

You know that it is becoming increasingly more difficult to raise that other 45 percent to keep your symphony orchestras going because you wrestle with the problem every year. I know because you have told us about your problem. I know also because I became personally involved a few years ago in raising money to help our national symphony out of a hole.

These problems are not confined to the orchestras in the smaller cities. The greatest of our orchestras have faced it.

If the most successful of the performing arts—excluding the commercial theater—has these financial woes, it stands to reason that the others have even a greater struggle.

You who operate and manage our symphony orchestras have these problems; your musicians have great problems also. Most musicians have to moonlight. This is true even of those who perform before the widest audiences, such as those in our largest cities.

Some are fortunate in having the opportunity to perform during the summer at their trade, if you will. Those who can teach are also able to maintain their proficiency, perhaps to a lesser degree.

But what of the musician who must clerk in a haberdashery; or drive a taxicab; or even draw unemployment compensation? The only thing that can be said for the latter situation is that it enables the musician to have time to practice—providing he hasn't had to hock his instrument.

The current bill, when enacted—I repeat, when enacted—and implemented, will not, of course, underwrite every artistic endeavor. It will not even come close to underwriting the deficit of symphony orchestras.

It will, however, provide some seed money to stimulate additional support. That is its primary thrust, to stimulate private support for and interest in all of the arts and humanities, and to stimulate the States to show greater concern.

In 1964 at hearings I suggested to Mr. Boushay of Baltimore that studies had indicated that a dollar of Federal money would generate 8 more dollars of spending on the arts. He responded, and I quote:

"This is our purpose, not to get a deficit underwritten or not to take care of those people who can come to a symphony concert in the Lyric Theater in Baltimore and pay their price, because plenty can do that, but to provide opportunity as a part of national policy to develop a cultural base for the total community and reach out in new areas where it is so important."

I can find no better way of expressing the intent of the current legislation than those words which explained Mr. Boushay's petition to enact an arts foundation bill last year.

Unfortunately we did not have the support to do this last year, so we took the first step by forming a National Council on the Arts.

This year many bills were introduced, over a hundred, to establish a foundation on the humanities, and there were many bills to establish a foundation on the arts. The two are in a way inseparable. The arts and the humanities are like love and marriage. From a legislative standpoint, however, we have had some difficulty in joining them, since in the area of creation and performance we deal with different circumstances than we do in the area of study. After hearings on all of these bills had started, we worked with the administration in drafting a bill, which was introduced with the President's blessings, and became H.R. 6050. Fifty of my colleagues, from both parties, have joined as cosponsors. I am pleased that four members of my subcommittee, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan; Mr. CAREY, of New York; Mr. SICKLES, of Maryland; and Mr. SCHEUER, of New York, are among the cosponsors.

The legislation still required careful refinement, much of which is reflected in the Senate approved bill. Briefly, it will provide a foundation, which will have three segments. There will be an endowment for the arts, an endowment for the humanities, and a Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities. The Council will serve to coordinate the work of the two endowments, recommend areas of joint support, and prevent overlapping with other Federal operating programs.

Some concern has been expressed over the mechanics of screening and approving applications. We now place authority for making grants in the hands of each endowment chairman. He must, however, have the recommendations of the Arts Council, already in existence, and the Humanities Council which will be created.

It is implicit in the legislation—and this will be carefully spelled out in the legislative history—that each Council will form subcommittees and appoint panels of experts who will screen and evaluate applications. But—and this is consistent with sound public administration of public funds—final responsibility to the Congress will rest with the respective chairmen.

Each endowment may be funded with a maximum of $5 million per year. Each endowment may ask for up to an additional $5 million providing that each endowment has received at least $5 million in gifts. Limited sums are authorized from this additional money as grants to the States to support arts councils. For those States without arts councils there is a one-time grant of $25,000 for surveys and to encourage the formation of arts councils.

We have tried to weigh all suggestions, and meet all anticipated administrative problems. We think we will have created a sound program. This is, admittedly, a new field and experimental. We therefore authorize funding for but 3 years. We do this so that the legislative committee must review the operation 3 years from now, and make adjustments, if necessary, before additional appropriations are authorized.

We think we have a good bill and a viable bill.

I have indicated that this bill will be enacted. I do so on the basis of administration support—affirmative support—plus the fact that close to 150 Members from both parties have sponsored legislation of a similar nature.

We shall need your active support.

I hope we have it.

I think we do.

The President Thinks Aloud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States made an outstanding address at Howard University about the gravest social problem in the United States.

I bring to the attention of my colleagues, an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Monday, June 7, 1965, commenting on the President's speech:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON THINKS ALOUD

In his commencement address at Howard University, President Johnson was neither urging nor explaining any particular course of action. He was, rather, thinking aloud about the gravest social problem in the United States—a problem which this country has only belatedly begun to attack with legislation, but which cannot be solved by legislation alone.

That, of course, is the relationship of the Negro to his national community. Indeed, the heart of the question is really the Negro himself—the way in which his culture, his family life, his drives, and his attitudes, have been affected by living in a nation which once condoned his slavery and later only grudgingly began to admit him to equality under the law.

Evidently, the President has some measures in mind that might begin an attack on the worsening economic plight of most Negroes. But he also admits that many aspects of this deep-rooted, stubborn, and emotionally charged question are obscure. In effect, he was calling for help from his fellow Americans, Negro and white, not only in the form of a conference specifically charged to discuss the complex issues, but on a day-to-day basis from all who have any contact with the problem—which, whether we realize it or not, means all of us.

The overwhelming majority of white Americans knows that this country cannot, for its own spiritual and material health, permit overt segregation of Negroes. It is becoming uneasily aware, too, that more is necessary than the repeal of segregatory laws or the enactment of laws against segregation. It has to supply the incentives that for centuries were denied to the Negro, and the long lack of which has warped Negro society; it has to foster self-reliance among people who were taught, even compelled, to rely upon others. And it cannot do that by moral preachments alone, any more than the Negro can find his place in America by demonstrations alone.

The task will be a long one, and a difficult one—but the difficulty cannot be allowed to make it too long. Too much time has already been wasted; too many expectations have gone unfulfilled; too much steam has been generated to permit delay. The President has spoken frankly to the Nation, and the Nation must reply in kind.

Hull House: National Historic Landmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn today from the Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, that Hull House has been selected to receive a certificate and bronze plaque from the Department of the Interior designating it as a registered national historic landmark because it possesses exceptional value in illustrating the history of the United States. Hull House is located in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois which I have the privilege to represent.

Secretary Udall approved the recommendation made in April by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments. The selection this year of Hull House, together with 32 other sites throughout the United States, brings the total num-

ber of sites approved for inclusion in the registry to 608.

Hull House is indeed worthy of this appropriate and timely recognition as a national historic site. Built in 1856, this suburban residence was acquired by Jane Addams in 1889 as a settlement house for her pioneering social experiment in aiding poverty-stricken slum dwellers. Now included within a new campus of the University of Illinois in Chicago, it has been restored by the university. Hull House is located at 800 South Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.

It is my pleasure to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article about Hull House released by the Department of the Interior. The article follows:

HULL HOUSE, ILLINOIS

Jane Addams, in establishing Hull House, did not found the first settlement house in the United States, but she did create an institution that invariably responded to the needs of its visitors, a unique service in its period. The close identification of Hull House with the people it served gave the settlement house an internationally deserved reputation.

Nothing in Miss Addams' early career indicated what her true vocation would be. Born in Cedarville, Ill., on September 6, 1860, she was a small, bright child who responded best to her father. His influence caused her, when college age, to abandon her desire to attend Smith College and induced her to enter Rockford College, in Rockford, Ill., in 1877. Two years after completing college in 1881, she began studying medicine at the Woman's Medical College in Philadelphia, but soon abandoned her work there because of a physical collapse.

For about 5 years after leaving medical school, between 1883–88, Miss Addams searched for a purpose to her life. Two trips to Europe helped her discover it. She sailed from the United States for the first time in the summer of 1883, and while on her European tour gained a realization of the human tragedy inherent in poverty.

Despite her inability to decide definitely upon her life's work by the time of her second trip to Europe, December 14, 1887, she still sought, more zealously than ever, some means of applying her training and experience to a useful purpose. Her aim achieved realization through her learning of Toynbee Hall in London. Toynbee Hall enabled university students to live among the poor while working to improve the lot of the unfortunate. Upon visiting the hall and studying it, Miss Addams understood how she could apply the advantages that had befallen her in behalf of the poor: she could obtain a house in the slums of Chicago, live there, and place her experience at the call of the local residents.

Her decision made, she chose what would now be termed a blighted area in Chicago to begin her work. The house that she and two friends moved into on September 4, 1889, had formerly stood outside of Chicago, but now was in ward 19. Ward 19 had 9 churches and missions, but probably more, for it also harbored 255 saloons. Undaunted by the saloons, the amazing variety of nationalities, and the dirt, Jane Addams concentrated on her settlement work for the next 25 years.

Charles Hull built Hull House in 1856 as a suburban residence. The house was a two-story brick structure, with a piazza and a cupola on top of the roof. Now that the University of Illinois is creating a new campus in Chicago in the Hull House area, all but the original building of the expanded settlement house has been demolished. The original house is being restored.

Located at 800 South Halstead Street, Chicago, Ill., the structure is owned by the University of Chicago.

Honor for Senator Dodd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer for the RECORD, the fine remarks of our colleague, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, on the occasion of his receiving the Rickenbacker Award in Columbus, Ohio, on June 18, 1965.

Senator DODD's remarks follow:

REMARKS BY SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD ON RECEIVING RICKENBACKER AWARD, COLUMBUS, OHIO, JUNE 18, 1965

I am more honored than I can tell you by this award, which you have seen fit to confer on me.

I am honored in the first place because the many distinguished citizens of your State who serve on your selection committee apparently felt that my record in Congress merits this signal recognition.

But I am honored above all because Eddie Rickenbacker has been a personal hero of mine for many, many years, and because I believe that he has, in his personal life, exemplified the best in the American tradition.

Eddie Rickenbacker has been a patriot in the purest and most positive sense of the word—not a jingo, not an imperialist, not a flag-waver as some of our professed patriots are, but a man whose whole life has been lived in the spirit of liberty which inspired our Founding Fathers, a man who is the personification of the genius and enterprise which have from the first wedded progress to freedom in our country, a man who has served his country in a thousand acts of dedication, a man who may justly be held up as a figure for the youth of America to emulate.

The qualities which Eddie Rickenbacker possesses in such rich measure are qualities which our country must display if we are to survive as a free nation.

For we live in a time that will try the soul of the bravest and strongest men.

In years gone by, world crises occurred at infrequent intervals and wars at still more infrequent intervals. But, since the close of World War II, the Communist conspiracy has confronted us with crisis after crisis and aggression after aggression.

We have had crises in China, in Korea, in Vietnam, in Laos, on the Indian frontier; in Greece, in Lebanon, in the Congo, at Suez; in Berlin and in Hungary; in Guatemala, in Cuba, in Brazil, and most recently in the Dominican Republic. And all of this over the brief span of 20 years.

The contrast between the world of today and the world of yesterday reminds me of a cartoon that appeared many years ago in the New Yorker. Two businessmen were slouched in overstuffed chairs in their clubroom, reminiscing about the past. And one of them was saying to the other, "Remember the good old days when we had nothing to fear but fear itself."

This joke would perhaps be funnier if there were not so much truth to it.

The war we are fighting today is infinitely more complex, infinitely more trying, than the wars we have had to fight in the past.

It is a war in which there is no declaration of war, no clearly defined line of battle, and, I am afraid, no durable diplomatic solution on the horizon.

It is a world war in which our survival and the survival of all free nations is at stake.

It is a war made up of many minor wars. At this very moment, for example:

American boys are fighting and dying in Vietnam.

The Communist and anti-Communist forces are locked in battle in Laos.

The Government of Burma is having great difficulty of coping with Communist insurgents who control important parts of the country.

Indonesia, which must now be considered a quasi-Communist state, has mounted its so-called confrontation, which is just plain aggression, against Malaysia and is sending guerrillas in a steady stream into Malaya and Sarawak and Brunei.

The Congo Government is still busy attempting to mop up the remnants of the Communist insurrection which a year ago threatened a complete takeover.

In the Dominican Republic only President Johnson's resolute intervention prevented the emergence of a second Castro regime in the Americas—and even as I speak here American boys are fighting and dying in the effort to restore peace in this unhappy island.

Armed Communist bands are active in Venezuela, in Guatemala, in Chile, and in other Latin American countries.

It would be a fatal mistake to look upon these many crises as localized problems to be dealt with by localized means, because what is involved here is a coordinated, worldwide assault on the free nations of every continent by the forces of international communism.

The Communists have developed the concept of "the long war." Because they are fanatics, because they are convinced that history is on their side, 10 years or 20 years, or more, mean nothing to them. After all, it took the Chinese Communists more than 20 years to conquer China. And, because of this peculiar brand of fanaticism, human life means absolutely nothing to them either.

They are confident that free peoples do not have the staying power to compete with them in this kind of war, and that, if they keep up their attacks without cessation, they will ultimately succeed in so confusing and dividing the free world and in so eroding the will to resist, that the still-free countries will, one by one, tumble into their laps, like so many overripe plums.

This concept is now being applied on a worldwide scale.

I wish that I could be more optimistic about the future. But, as I see the situation, we can expect no change in the pattern of Communist aggression over the coming decades. On the contrary, the chances are that we will be confronted with crisis after crisis, and with one so-called "war of national liberation" after another in such rapid sequence that there will be no respite from crises and wars on the Vietnam model.

There is only one way in which we can meet this Communist assault. We must stand up to it, as we did in Korea and as we are today attempting to do in Vietnam and in Laos and in the Dominican Republic.

But above all, the situation calls for understanding and confidence in the justness of our cause. I raise this point because I have been deeply troubled by the manifestation of a kind of "moral neutralism" between freedom and communism at every level of our society. I find this "moral neutralism" for lack of a better expression, reflected in our press coverage in Vietnam, in the situation on some of our campuses, and even in the ranks of Congress.

The philosophy of the "moral neutralists" has, perhaps, been articulated most clearly by the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in a speech which he made on Tuesday of this week in the Senate. Appealing for "major concessions" on both sides in Vietnam, the Senator from Arkansas told us that—and I quote: "It is a mark of both greatness and maturity when a nation like the United States, without abandoning its convictions and commitments, is capable at the same time of acknowledging that there

may be some merit and even good intent in the views and aims of its adversaries."

In replying to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday morning on the floor of the Senate, I said that I had never been prepared to concede any merit to the Nazi regime because, whatever its minor social accomplishments, it was evil by every moral criterion that mattered.

And I am not prepared to concede any merit, or even the possibility of merit, to the Communist system, which, whatever its mechanical or statistical accomplishments, have wiped out every vestige of human freedom, persecuted all religions alike, and sought to convert its subjects into brainwashed robots.

I can see no merit in a regime which has inflicted more suffering and cost more human life than all the wars of this century combined.

How can we possibly resist the worldwide offensive of communism unless we are prepared to face up to the facts—unless we are prepared to recognize that we are dealing with an utterly ruthless, utterly amoral, totally ambitious enemy—and unless we are convinced of the justness of our cause?

How can we possibly fight a war if the people on our side torment themselves with agnostic doubts about the rectitude of our cause, expressing a bland preference for our way of life but nevertheless conceding that there may also be merit and good intent on the Communist side?

I may be wrong, but I have the distinct impression that one of the reasons why there is so much confusion on Vietnam in this country is that much of the reporting and writing has been done by people who share some of this attitude of moral neutralism. Neutralism would be bad enough on the part of spectators at a football game. But in my opinion it becomes a danger to our own security when members of the American press corps in Vietnam look upon it as their duty to adopt the posture of neutral observers in the deadly war that is now going on in that country.

We must attempt to prove to the peoples of the Communist world—yes, and to the Communist leaders, too—that aggression and subversion do not pay off, that we are not moral neutralists paralyzed by agnostic uncertainty about the justness of our own beliefs, that we have the will to resist the Communists and the means to resist them, and that we have the patience and perseverance and dedication to match their own.

If we can force the Communists back in southeast Asia as we forced them back in Korea, if we can hold the line at other points against the many-pronged thrusts of Communist subversion, there is reason to hope that, with the passage of time, the advocates of aggression and subversion will be compromised by their many failures and that the more moderate elements who unquestionably exist in both Moscow and Peiping will come to the fore.

That is why I say that if America is to survive, we must all seek to imbue ourselves with the spirit and patriotism and courage of an Eddie Rickenbacker.

A hero with a great gift of rhetoric, Eddie Rickenbacker, has given us a philosophy for our time in these words:

"Our generation exists in a period of terrible peril. We must not be afraid. Life is sweet, yes, but as a great people let us not value it above principal, for Christianity and morality are entwined.

"If we Americans falter now; if we cringe in fear before the threat of a nuclear war; if we soften and appease, and try to mollify the most evil force ever to come upon this earth, then the people of all the world shall sink into a slavery, far worse than death. Again, I repeat, we must not be afraid, for a nation afraid is already dead.

"Therefore, let us have a rebirth of patriotism for our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution; a rekindling of the spirit of those two great freedom-giving manifestos in the hearts and minds of the American people—both young and old."

To receive an award that bears the name of a man such as this is indeed an houor to cherish.

Free Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the ever increasing threat to world peace posed by Red China has prompted an untold number of articles on ways and means to meet this challenge. I recently read such an article penned by the noted columnist, Ruth Montgomery, which appeared in the New York Journal-American on Saturday, May 8, 1965. It follows:

WOULD NEW "HERO" FREE RED CHINA?

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—A distinguished, American-born Chinese advances an interesting proposal for winning back the Chinese mainland through the combined help of the U.S. Government and oversea Chinese.

William Dock Lee, proprietor of fashionable Genghis Khan restaurant here, whose stockholders include Adm. Basil Rittenhouse, former Senator Homer Capehart, society hostess Polly Guggenheim Logan, Adm. Leland P. Lovette and former Secretary of the Senate, Leslie Biffle, says of the problem:

"The United States should select a Chinese of proven dignity, humility and character, and build up his image as a second Dr. Sun Yat-Sen. The oversea Chinese would then rally behind him, and send word to their mainland relatives and friends that a new anti-Communist leader had emerged who would bring freedom to China."

Lee wryly observed that "America has the world's finest public relations experts who can sell the domestic consumer anything, but the poorest public relations abroad of almost any nation."

"America created Syngman Rhee as an image, and groomed him to lead Korea after the war," Lee said. "In similar vein, Dr. Sun Yat-sen used Hawaii as the base from which he began the revolution which overthrew China's Manchu dynasty."

He said that without the aid of many thousands of overseas Chinese that revolution could never have succeeded, "just as we cannot now rid China of the Communists without boring from within through messages to the people from relatives living abroad."

Lee, stressing that China has "the fastest grapevine in the world," said every Chinese overseas corresponds with relatives and friends on the mainland.

"The greatest strength we have in trying to win back the Chinese mainland as a friendly power is the overseas Chinese who never sever their relations at home," he declared.

Lee was born in New York City, where his father owned and operated the Quong Yuen Shing export-import house on Chinatown's Mott Street, a business still run by his brothers. As a youngster he went to Canton to attend grammar school and St. John's University in Shanghai, before returning here to graduate from Columbia University in 1935.

He then returned to Shanghai to publish an anti-Japanese newspaper, married Ellen Sun, spent 4 years as a Japanese prisoner of war, came back to America in 1945, and headed the Far Eastern division of the Pacific Far East Shipping Lines until he launched his popular restaurant here 7 years ago.

Recently a prominent American of oriental descent dropped in to tell Lee that he had just returned from a clandestine visit to Shanghai. He expressed "amazement" that life there now goes on much as before, with well-dressed Chinese attending operas and movies and frequenting gay nightclubs.

Reminding that China is expected to develop a hydrogen bomb within 4 years, he said: "Time is against us. The educated Chinese would be on our side if we could rally behind a high caliber leader whose image can be projected back to China as a 'savior," in the manner of Dr. Sun Yat-sen."

Lee believes it would be a simple matter for the CIA to find such a Chinese, after which the public relations guns could go to work on his image.

Lee's proposal seems worthy of thought.

Senator Olin D. Johnston

SPEECH

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues and associates of the late Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON in paying tribute to the memory of one of the most popular leaders to serve the State of South Carolina.

As a Member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I had occasion to meet with Senator JOHNSTON several times to discuss various postal matters, et cetera. Without qualification, he was one of the most dedicated public servants it has been my privilege to meet.

He was interested not only in the welfare of the Federal worker but he also had great concern for the welfare of all his countrymen. Those who were his constituents had reason to have confidence not only in his integrity but in his ability as well.

Senator JOHNSTON's service will not be forgotten by the people of his State, nor by the many Federal and postal employees who were the recipients of his tireless efforts to improve their working conditions. He was one of the strongest champions Government and postal workers ever had in Congress.

Although the Senator is no longer with us to advise and counsel, he remains with us in our hearts and minds. He will be remembered not only for his legislative achievements, but also for his kindliness, friendliness, and deep affection for mankind.

The great outpouring of sorrow and regret at the passing of this distinguished Senator is a monument to the high esteem and regard in which he was held by his colleagues and the people in the State of South Carolina.

UCLA Operating Plant To Purify Salt Water—Project at Coalinga Will Determine Cost of System Designed by School Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the remarkable scientific achievements of our time has been the controlled purification of sea water. Various methods of desalination have been developed but none has approached a reasonable cost necessary to supply huge quantities to our growing population.

An article from the Los Angeles Times of June 10, 1965, describes an experiment being carried out by UCLA aimed directly at solving the economic problem inherent in this effort. I commend this article to the attention of the House Members:

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 10, 1965]

UCLA OPERATING PLANT TO PURIFY SALT WATER—PROJECT AT COALINGA WILL DETERMINE COST OF SYSTEM DESIGNED BY SCHOOL ENGINEERS

(By George Getze)

An experimental plant developed at UCLA to convert brackish water into fresh drinking water went into operation Wednesday at Coalinga.

The plant, designed and put together in an engineering lab at UCLA, uses the process of osmosis to remove salt from water. If salty water and fresh water are placed in tanks separated by a thin film or membrane, the fresh water filters through into the salt water.

With enough pressure, however, this natural process can be reversed. This is what is done in the Coalinga plant, and is called "reverse osmosis."

Six hundred pounds of pressure a square inch is used to force the salty water through the membrane filter, leaving the dissolved salts and other impurities behind.

COST DETERMINATION

Chief purpose of the Coalinga plant is to determine the cost of purifying water by such methods. However, the plant also will supplement the Coalinga water supply. It already is adding about 3,500 gallons a day to the town's water supply and within a few weeks will be adding twice that.

Water from the plant, when turned into the town's mains, reduces the brackish water from 2,500 parts of salt a million to fewer than 500 parts.

UCLA engineers hope eventually to build a plant that will be able to produce 500,000 gallons of fresh water a day, and to do it cheaply enough to make reverse osmosis practical for large water systems.

ADVANTAGES TOLD

The same process can be used to purify sea water, according to Sidney Loeb, UCLA engineer who developed the reverse osmosis system. The membranes, made of cellulose acetate, foramide and acetone, were developed by Serop Manjikian, a UCLA graduate engineer.

The only energy used to operate the plant is that needed to maintain the pressure of 600 pounds a square inch on the brackish water.

Other advantages over distillation, according to Dr. Loeb, are the standardization of mechanical parts, simplicity of design that makes it possible for parts to be assembled, serviced and replaced with ease, and the fact that the plants are run at ordinary room temperatures. This avoids many problems of corrosion and scaling.

Working with Dr. Loeb on the project have been J. W. McCutchan, E. K. Selover and William Griffith, all of UCLA. The city of Coalinga provided the buildings, utilities and other services for the pilot plant.

The membranes are carried in copper tubes 10 feet long and an inch in diameter, a method developed by G. G. Havens of San Diego, Dr. Loeb said.

The Real Alabama—Part XVI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, among other attributes of Alabama which business and industrial people have found to be helpful to them, is the nature of Alabama people.

Alabama people recognize the part that a free and energetic business community plays in the constructive development of any community. Alabamians are friendly, helpful, and are prepared to work for steady advancement of the State's economic growth.

Following are two statements by industrial leaders on this subject:

GULF, MOBILE & OHIO RAILROAD,
Mobile, Ala.

Mobile has many outstanding advantages to offer industry, such as attractive sites, a copious water supply, and all of the other physical factors necessary to a successful plant location. But she also has another very important asset to offer: the very friendly attitude which her people have toward business and progress and toward one another.

We know this from experience. Mobilians conceived the idea for this railroad in 1848 and have wholeheartedly cooperated through the years to help further its growth and to increase the extent of its usefulness.

Also are we aware of the city's fine reputation for fairness and friendliness in the daily contact of our representatives as a nationwide transportation agency. Industrialists generally are already aware of the high rate of investment and expansion by existing industry in the Mobile area—$503,242,500 since 1925. Such an outstanding record is the best indication of a happy plant location.

In every respect Mobilians have demonstrated time after time their willingness to work together for the overall development and welfare of the community and we are exceptionally proud of our local heritage and longtime citizenship.

GLEN BROCK,
President.

IDEAL CEMENT CO.,
Denver, Colo.

The Mobile area has been good for Ideal Cement Co. We have operated our plant on the Alabama State Docks for 18 years and have always found the leaders in the business community friendly, cooperative, and helpful.

There is an excellent progressive business climate in the Mobile area. Mobile's deep-water port facilities give us access to markets throughout the gulf coast area by water, as well as rail and truck.

The climate is mild and extremely pleasant. The cultural and recreational facilities available to our employees are unexcelled.

We believe Mobile has all the attributes necessary for the establishment of a profitable business operation.

CHRIS DOBBINS,
President.

Federal Government and California Partners in Crime and Vice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the unfortunate partnership of the Federal Government and the State of California in keeping gambling illegal and thus lucrative for the mob. The combined ignorance of California and the Federal Government is deadly—deadly for the Californians shot by gunmen hired with mob gambling profits, deadly for the Californians tortured and killed by dope from dope syndicates financed with mob gambling profits. The lethal negligent partnership in crime of the two governments is only something less fatal for housewives driven into prostitution by gambling debts owed the syndicates. The backlash of illegal gambling profits is a fantastic menace to society, yet the California and Federal governments continue to keep gambling illegal and ineffectively regulated.

Gambling is big business in California. The Golden State is a gangster's paradise and presumably a grafter's paradise. The parimutual turnover in California in 1964 was a shade less than $600 million. Far more important is California's vast share of the national illegal gambling total. The off-track betting national total was pegged at $50 billion a year by testimony before the McClellan Commission and additional testimony which set off-track betting at 42 percent of the illegal gambling total leads to a national illegal gambling figure of about $120 billion. California's share of this figure on a population basis would come to more than $11 billion. The mob keeps about 10 percent of this turnover. This 10 percent pays for a lot of high living and fast killing—and slow killing. A portion of it goes for graft and protection—and I feel sure that is safe to say that graft is a multimillion-dollar industry in California.

The sum total of the gambling situation in California is this—the Federal Government and the California State government, by refusing to recognize and regulate gambling, have left it wide open for mob operation. The syndicates have been happy to fill the vacuum left by the blue-nosed governments, and by these gambling operations, they have derived profits that now support everything from housewife prostitution to narcotics rings.

To me, the answer is simple, both in gang-paradise California and in the Nation as a whole. We need Government controlled and regulated gambling. We need a national lottery and a series of State lotteries.

Japanese Air Rights Would Tend To Widen the Flow of Tourists to This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in Sunday's Washington Post concerning the efforts by Japan to obtain landing rights which would enable Japan Air Lines to fly across the United States and beyond to Europe. As the editorial points out, the domestic airlines in this country have consistently opposed the Japanese request. Although the editorial does not make this point, I believe that the airlines have been most shortsighted in this regard. Unfortunately, the airlines have displayed similar symptoms of myopia before. They have consistently refused for example, to consider instituting charter flights from Europe at a lower rate per passenger on the grounds that this would reduce the volume of their receipts from individual ticketing at the regular rate. But these charter flights actually would ultimately increase that volume rather than reduce it. For one thing, they would increase the number of European travelers to this country and thereby increase the number of potential air travelers within the United States. For another thing, they would introduce a greater number of people to transatlantic air travel, many of whom would later be drawn to individual ticketing.

Now, in the case at hand, the airlines are again hurting themselves and the country by their shortsightedness with respect to the Japanese request. There is no question but that, with a hundred million people and a rising level of personal incomes, Japan represents one of this country's greatest opportunities to increase the inflow of tourists. The Japanese are eager travelers, and for most of them the most desired travel objective is the United States. Anything that we can do to encourage fulfillment of that objective and to widen the flow of traffic from Japan will be to the benefit of all of us—including the airlines. And I believe that granting this concession to the Japanese on a quid pro quo basis, as the Post editorial suggests, will be a great boost in widening the flow of tourist traffic from Japan to the United States. More foreign tourists—Japanese and/or European—coming to this country means a greater use of all our domestic transportation facilities—bus, train, and airlines.

The Post editorial makes some other good points, Mr. Speaker, and I would at this time like to introduce it into the RECORD.

JAPANESE AIR RIGHTS

The Japanese Diet last month unanimously passed a resolution instructing Premier Sato's government to obtain landing rights to enable the Japan Air Lines to fly across the United States and beyond to Europe. This would give Japan both the prestige and the revenue of a round-the-world flight.

The Diet resolution threatened to terminate Japan's present air agreement with the United States if these landing rights are not obtained, a threat which would severely jeopardize the present lucrative transpacific traffic now enjoyed by both Pan American and Northwest Airlines. Four members of the Diet currently are in Washington on an unusual lobby expedition to press home their point.

They note that whereas the United States has granted cross-continental flying privileges to Britain's BOAC, Australia's Qantas and India's Air India, Japan's request, begun in 1961, has gotten nowhere. The Japanese complain that they have the short end of the bargaining stick because the United States was able to obtain its landing rights to Tokyo and beyond while it was still Japan's occupation overlord.

It is unfortunate that such relatively minor issues as air rights, fishing privileges, and textile agreements must detract from the many common interests which make Japan this country's most important friend and ally in Asia. It also is unfortunate that Japan has felt it necessary to do its business bargaining through government-to-government diplomacy because the United States, as the world's biggest commercial air power, legitimately could claim a disproportionate share of traffic points for the payload its commercial planes carry.

On the merits of the case, however, Japan does seem to have a point in its request. JAL currently can pick up passengers in Honolulu, San Francisco, and Los Angeles; it also has "beyond" flying rights from these west coast traffic points to Latin America and, via the North Pole, to Europe. These "beyond" rights, however, have not been found profitable enough to bother with. What Japan wants is the right to land in New York, which would permit JAL planes to pick up passengers bound for either Europe or Asia.

U.S. domestic airlines are opposed to this, not because they fear JAL competition across the continent, which would be negligible, but because they fear it would open the door to their really big American competitor, Pan American, to link up its Atlantic and Pacific overseas routes. There also is some fear that if JAL were given the right to cross the U.S. continent, a whole host of other foreign airlines soon would be demanding the same privilege.

Perhaps the best way to assuage Japan's feeling of being discriminated against, and still provide the United States with the necessary quid pro quo, would be for Japan to grant this country an additional Japanese traffic point, say in Osaka, with rights to fly "beyond" in new directions, say to the Asian mainland.

Conceivably the Soviet Union may one day open one of its Siberian cities on the Pacific to U.S. air traffic. It is even conceivable that Communist China may one day entertain U.S. commercial air traffic. In any event, Japan, as a trusted ally and partner, would appear to deserve better treatment than she has received to date.

Human Environment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last weekend to hear an outstanding address by the Honorable LeRoy Collins, currently the Director of the Community Relations Service and now the President's nominee for Under Secretary of Commerce, before the Florida bar convention in Miami Beach.

I commend this address to my colleagues and commend Governor Collins on his new assignment which I am confident he will fill with great ability and dedication. The text of Governor Collins' remarks at the junior bar luncheon in the Fountainbleau Hotel, Miami Beach, June 1965, is as follows:

On a clear, calm Sunday morning in Washington recently I was sitting relaxed in the garden of our home in Georgetown. All around was bright green foliage and the stir of new life which comes with spring and early summer.

Squirrels chased each other through branches of the giant weeping bay, as they have for years. A cardinal, swinging on a crabapple limb near her nest of three blue-and-brown speckled eggs, chirped the same song cardinals have sung for centuries.

A fat worm pulled its length out of the damp sod and inched up on one of the bricks edging the terrace where it could better soak in the warm sunlight.

What a peaceful world, I was thinking until a robin glided low over the lawn and swallowed the worm with one gulp. In a twinkling then, life for that insignificant creature was transformed from sluggish contentment to black oblivion.

And no sooner had that taken place than the cardinal changed her song to shrieks of alarm and was joined by a scolding, frantic chorus of neighbors—two bluejays, a mockingbird, and a red-wing blackbird.

The cause of the commotion was a black-and-white cat, stalking through the ivy along the top of the brick wall heading for the overhanging crabapple tree. His destination was the cardinal's nest of three eggs—one of which at that instant happened to be hatching an ugly, helpless, hungry baby cardinal.

Well, I diverted the cat, and the young brood was saved—but only for a while, as I knew. The next day the nest was empty and the cat looked full.

The world, I was reminded, is anything but peaceful and the beauty of nature serves as a camouflage for brutality.

The robin had done what it had to do, and what it must continue to do.

And the cat was being just as true to his instincts for consuming birds' eggs, passed along to him through heredity.

As I turned to the Sunday papers in the garden that day, there were reminders that man, too, is not spared some of the suffering of song birds, squirrels and simple worms.

There were several allusions to the hunger and disease endured by the impoverished two-thirds of all mankind.

There was a story of an American family agonizing in the loss of a son shot down in his helicopter in Vietnam.

Another item told of a family gathered, at that moment, in Walter Reed Hospital,

where their son—a casualty from Santo Domingo—was only half filling a bed, both legs gone.

And I could not keep back thoughts about my own son still beneath a far-away ocean on a 3-months continuous undersea patrol in his Polaris nuclear submarine, itself a reminder that man at last has fashioned instruments capable of the ultimate annihilation of his species.

No, I thought, it is anything but a peaceful world; and how little it has changed during the lifetime of the ancient brick carriage house at the back of our garden or, for that matter, since life first emerged on this planet.

But there was other news that morning—exciting reminders that, although the animal kingdom is in a relatively changeless state, mankind is caught up in a state of change which can be described only as incredible.

An incredible metal container, at that moment, was hurtling at incredible speed at an incredible altitude around and around our planet.

And the most incredible part of it all was that inside that container were two young men who, during their brief lifetimes, had seen the concept of earthmen leaving the natural confines of their environment for a round-trip space voyage to the moon evolve from a preposterous joke to a commonly accepted fact of life.

Not only is the rate of change in mankind's life more rapid than anyone ever believed possible, but the character of that change is even more beyond the credulity of yesterday.

Historians now calculate there has been more substantial change in man's life during our lifetimes than in all the previous history of the race. And the rate of acceleration of change promises only to increase.

The late Harvard educator, Alfred North Whitehead, underscored the disparity between man's cultural heritage today and the static instincts of the lesser creatures this way:

"Tradition is warped by the vicious assumption that each generation will substantially live amid the conditions governing the lives of its fathers and will transmit those conditions to mold with equal force the lives of its children. We are living in the first period of human history for which this assumption is false.

"In the past the timespan of important change was considerably longer than that of a single human life.

"Today, this timespan is considerably shorter than human life, and accordingly our training must prepare individuals to face a novelty of conditions."

So, unlike the worms, birds and cats, man no longer has to accept the age-old ways of doing things.

Nature, for him, need not be a jungle of cruelty. Nature—indeed, all of life's experiences—now can become truly beautiful for man.

Raw instincts for survival at the expense of the weak always may serve the animals but now they actually place in grave jeopardy the very survival of man.

For, unless man can put aside the vestiges of animal instincts—the unreasoning reliance upon force to settle differences, the fear of unfamiliar ideas and people, the proclivity to take for one's self rather than give for one's fellow man—he not only can lay little claim to an existence more meaningful than the animal's, but he is very likely to lose his battle for survival.

You and I are living in a nation which for the first time in its history—indeed, the first time in the history of any nation—has both the wealth and the know-how to banish forever from its borders the age-old cripplers of nature: hunger, disease, poverty, ignorance.

There literally is no reason—scientifically, technologically, economically—why any American generation ever again need know what it is to be poor, to be sick, to be hungry.

And I suggest that this fact is more incredible, more monumental in its significance, than any yet postulated with regard to space and the other planets.

History is sure to single out this generation as a turning point.

But its judgment is now inconclusive.

For, to possess the means to achieve such a society is not the same thing as to make this a reality.

We should remember that 2 billion of the world's 3 billion inhabitants live in squalor, sickness, ignorance and despair.

And right here in our own rich and abundant land, one family in five lives in poverty. In addition, in the view of some authorities one of five American families is getting along on substandard health, substandard food or substandard housing.

So the ultimate assessment of America will depend upon whether—and how—and how soon—we as a nation put to work the means we have to achieve the goals within our reach.

This is how we are being judged today by the rest of the world, and by the millions in our own midst, who see on every hand the means for a peaceful, prosperous, healthy life but not yet—for them—its reality.

And there are pieces of the picture which are not so encouraging.

While the percentage of our national income which we devote to research and development for the space and military programs has tripled in the past decade, the percentage which goes into civilian research and development has remained unchanged.

We spend twice the amount on a single aircraft carrier as we spend through the National Government on all medical research each year.

One Polaris nuclear submarine costs about as much as 25 150-bed hospitals.

Right now, we are spending less than 10 percent of the Federal budget on health, education, employment and welfare all combined, and some 55 percent on defense.

Today, the military strength of America is unsurpassed. It is an awesome thing to contemplate, but we now have a greater military capacity than the accumulated military might of all the nations of the world during the entire history of nations.

And we are today stronger militarily than any other nation or combination of nations.

As President Johnson put it:

"Against such force the combined destructive power of every battle ever fought by man is like a firecracker thrown against the sun."

But, as overwhelming as our military superiority is, it takes on a certain ironic emptiness. For, despite our massive superiority, we and the Soviet Union both possess enough nuclear capability to wipe out not only each other but all of mankind—and not once, but many times over.

Obviously, within such a massive margin of what the military scientists call "overkill" there is room for reductions in military expenditures, as our National Government has recognized.

In his first state of the Union message, President Johnson pointed up the necessity for tying in expanded service in health, education and employment training with military cuts.

He has continued to stress that the surest path to peace lies not in military strength alone but increasingly in the improvement of the economic, social, and political conditions of men everywhere.

There is no escaping the reality that peace at home and peace abroad are dependent one upon the other.

It must be obvious to all by now that we are not going to have real peace, or prosperity, within the United States until we resolve our racial problem. For the racial problem is an inseparable amalgam of economic disadvantage and racial discrimination. Over the country generally where poverty is at its worst there you also find that both the greatest percentage of the poor and the poorest of the poor are Negroes.

This simply cannot be ignored. It must be met constructively and resolved effectively.

And, as the President stated so forcefully in his recent commencement address at Howard University:

"It is not enough just to open the gates of opportunity. All our citizens must have the ability to walk through those gates."

Now, this is a gigantic undertaking.

It means that we must recreate the economic and social conditions, change the fundamental environment of the underprivileged millions among us. We must make it possible for all of them—white and black, immigrants and native-born, farmers and city dwellers—to move across the threshold of opportunity into the mainstream of American life.

This does not mean depriving some to relieve the deprivation of others. It does mean a vast increase in the productive strength of our Nation, with resulting enhancement of opportunity for all our citizens.

I am proud of my country for what it is trying to do in that direction now. Never before has so much attention been given by government—local, State, and national—and by private groups and individuals to combat the ravages of economic privation and racial discrimination.

But, as these efforts are demonstrating increasingly, we still are pecking away at the fringes of the problem, dealing more in treatment of symptoms of the sickness than in cures for the causes.

A massive reorientation of our attitudes and efforts will be necessary before we can bring about the fundamental changes necessary in our society.

And it will mean a massive attack on rural poverty, on urban slums, on inadequate schools, on overcrowded hospitals, on substandard health, on unsatisfactory places of recreation, on insufficient jobs and on lack of training for jobs.

Americans, as a Nation, now have the resources—material and human—to do this job. It is a question of how we deploy those resources.

The first and greatest need is for leadership.

Ours is a society of great pluralism. This is our national glory as well as our heritage. No President, no Congress, no Supreme Court, not all the politicians in this land working with the utmost skill and dedication, can supply all the leadership needed by our country. This must come from everywhere—the homes, churches, labor unions, schools, businesses, professions, voluntary agencies. It must manifest itself at all levels—the home, neighborhood, city, county, State, as well as the Nation.

And this leadership must reflect vision and intelligence and courage.

There is every reason why we should find these qualities in greatest abundance in our young people, especially among young people who are trained in law. And it is because I feel this deeply that I came here today.

This week there is being celebrated the 750th anniversary of the meeting at Runnymede when the barons exacted from King John approval of the Magna Carta, which a respected historian, Lord Bryce, has described as the:

"First link in a long chain of constitutional developments that have molded men's minds and have held together free government wherever the English tongue is spoken."

Indeed, new links have been added continually since that day in 1215.

The makers of our Constitution drew heavily upon the English experience in government but had the vision and boldness to add many new links of their own. This work, as the revolution, itself, came largely from the minds and wills of the young men of that day. They gave us not only a charter for the generation in which they lived, but one of enduring flexibility which could meet well the needs of generations to follow.

I realize it has been fashionable in many quarters over the past several years to abuse the U.S. Supreme Court and lament its rulings which have represented some departures from established precedents.

While neither I nor any other lawyer would ever find himself expressing carte blanche approval of all the decisions of any court and would insist upon a case-by-case judgment, I would emphasize here that many of these decisions which have provoked such controversy have served as important new links in the progress of free government.

And I firmly believe that history will give a special place of honor to this Court and the men who serve on it—a place of honor which will long outlast the views of their critics of lesser vision.

The Court has not been overawed by the past and its precedents. Its members have been less concerned with what the tide has left on the beach than with their own responsibilities to shape the force and direction of the next tide.

They have given greater vitality to our Constitution through the application of its most basic precepts that all men stand equal before the law, that they are entitled to equal opportunity to be judged upon their merits and that those merits must always be subject to enhancement without hindrance of race or color or creed or national origin.

It is a little strange, I think, that so many of the critics of progress in our time are also the loudest proclaimers of undying ardor for men like Jefferson. I wonder if they realize that, in his day, Jefferson was an innovator, a pioneer, an iconoclast and, in the eyes of many of his conservative contemporaries, even a dangerous man.

But to feel the lash of the critic, just or unjust, is the price a free society demands of leadership, of patriotism, of integrity of mind and spirit. Only the weak cringe in fear of it.

If the patriots of our revolution had allowed the tories of their time to frighten them away from fresh approaches to old problems, we would not have this Nation today. And it is no less true that if we fail in the same spirit to find fresh approaches to problems and needs of our time we will fail those who will follow us.

I feel strongly that lawyers and judges have no right of monastic isolation from society, that they have a heavy special responsibility to be trustees of the future—to be creative and courageous in their labors for the fulfillment of the American dream.

Mr. Justice Holmes said:

"Life is action and passion. I think it is required of a man that he should share the action and passion of his time at peril of being judged not to have lived."

The great struggle for social progress, including the elimination of racial discrimination, happens to be the action and passion of our time. All of us should become involved in it with such talents and opportunities as we possess.

There is the story told about Pericles of ancient Greece who, in his later years, came across a young lawyer of Athens who was, as Holmes centuries afterward prescribed, involved in the actions and passions of his time.

Pericles upbraided the young man for being too bold and brash, for concerning himself with things better left to older men.

Patronizingly, the older man said: "Of course, I understand for I, too, was overeager in my youth. But now that I am older I have learned better. Take my advice and do not become so involved."

To which the young man replied:

"I regret I did not have the privilege of knowing you when you were at your best."

What a sad thing it is when young men, especially young lawyers grow old before their time, reach senility prematurely, turn into "young fogies" and become slaves of a status quo they did not build.

At times I have thought that many young lawyers with brilliant records in law school, so eagerly taken in by the great firms, have become handicapped at the outset of their careers through the dehumanized legal nurturing of large, impersonal corporate clients.

I have thought that these men have missed the humanizing experience of defending the poor, the weak, the friendless—the underdogs—whose children are like those Tennyson referred to: "Crying in the night, crying for a light, with no weapon but a cry."

Perhaps there is still something to this, but it is not necessarily so.

In the first place, beyond the lawyer's clients' interests there are endless opportunities for every lawyer's involvement in the reform efforts which need his time and talents.

And, aside from this, the corporate client, itself, now is confronted with needs of social involvement never dreamed of only a few years ago. Today, businessmen, large and small, are being called upon to unlock doors of human progress far beyond the walls of their stores and far outside the fences of their plants.

If there is one lesson above all others the Community Relations Service has learned in its yearlong experience it is that good human relations produce good business and that bad human relations and prosperous business development cannot coexist in any town or neighborhood.

Ours is an age which cries so eagerly for the talents of the dedicated, selfless and compassionate lawyer.

And to you, my hosts, here today, I want further to say: consider the opportunities, the need for your bright talents in public service.

Your State needs you.

I question whether there is another State in the Nation where the need for young people in public service and the opportunities for such service are so pronounced as in Florida.

We are a State brimming with resources and potential for progress, a State approaching 6 million in population—now No. 8 in size, ahead of Massachusetts and behind only Michigan, Ohio, Texas, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New York, and California.

This State is begging for new faces, fresh ideas, original leadership in countless areas of service, local and State.

Do not settle for the provincial—or the self-serving—or the mere special-interest-serving—or the get-by disposition—or the mediocre standard. Go for talent. Go for unselfish dedication to the public interest. Go for greatness.

Believe me, you can find high excitement and warm satisfactions in serving your State—in helping Florida to become as big in outlook, in spirit, in worthwhile achievement as its vast opportunities now allow.

Your Nation also needs you to add new lights to its purpose, to find new dimensions in its challenges, to give new strength to its efforts.

Be a constitutionalist. But start your allegiance with the first three words of that document, "We the people * * *."

The Constitution was meant to serve all the people alike, not just some of them. The Constitution gives rights of national citizenship to all the people, and nowhere does it give any right or power to any State or abridge them.

It is with the people and their rights that you should take your stand and do your fighting, wherever you may be.

These rights must include the chance to obtain a first-class education—not for some, but for all; the opportunity to get a decent job—not for some, but for all; the ability to afford and live in a respectable home—not for some, but for all; the assurance of a healthful environment and adequate medical care—not for some, but for all; the access to enjoyment of our culture and society—not for some, but for all; the guarantee of protection from discrimination because of racial, ethnic, or religious reasons—not for some, but for all.

Let us allow the cats and the birds and the worms to continue the cynical side of nature's cycle.

But so far as people are concerned, let us not fail to seize the moment which has been given us to help recreate a human environment truly representative of the beauty in life—worthy of the best efforts of free men and women.

Activities of an Urban Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the duties of a Congressman include a good deal more than legislating. We spend a good deal of our time concerning ourselves with community problems in our district. This is right and proper.

I have just prepared a report on my community activities for my constituents. I think that my colleagues and students of Congress will be interested in the activities of an urban Congressman. I have permission to insert the report in the Appendix.

The report follows:

Dear friend, since becoming your Congressman 6 months ago, I have devoted a great deal of time to the problems of our community. This report will tell you about many of my local projects and activities.

In the past months I have written to you about national and international issues. These of course must be my first concern as your Representative in Washington. But as the highest elected local official of our district, I have a special duty to concern myself with our many serious community problems, particularly because the Bronx has for so many years been New York City's neglected stepchild.

Here are some of the things I and my staff have undertaken to make our community a better place to live.

ST. FRANCIS SAVED AT LAST MOMENT

As this report was going to press, Cardinal Spellman announced the welcome news that St. Francis Hospital on East 142d Street had been granted a reprieve.

The loss of the hospital's 380 beds and the jobs it has provided for nearly a thousand workers would have created a major medical and economic crisis in this desperately needy south Bronx area.

I am happy to have been able to work closely with the tireless administrator of St. Francis, Sister Anthony Joseph, to achieve this goal. I organized a citizens' committee to help save the hospital, met with the de-

partment of hospitals and community leaders, urged the Mayor and the Governor to take action, and made a last-minute appeal for help on a TV program. I feel sure that our final success, however, came about through our total community effort to save St. Francis.

Cardinal Spellman has given us the best possible news. A brand new 350-bed hospital will be built on an adjacent site, creating hundreds of new jobs, and, when completed, greatly expanded medical services.

AREA BOYS SOUGHT FOR MILITARY ACADEMIES

If you have a friend or relative who would like to attend a U.S. military academy, please send his name and address to me in Washington as soon as possible. We are about to begin a district-wide search for qualified candidates.

As Congressman, I am entitled for this year to appoint seven boys to U.S. military academies—three to the Air Force Academy, two to West Point, and two to the Naval Academy at Annapolis. In addition, 5 alternates for each post must be selected, and another 10 will be chosen to take a qualifying exam for the Merchant Marine Academy. This makes a grand total of 52.

I have decided to depart from the tradition which allows me personal choice of any candidates I wish to recommend. Instead, I have formed a committee of public-spirited citizens in the Bronx to give equal consideration to every interested boy in our community. The committee will recommend candidates solely on the basis of merit.

Wouldn't it be a wonderful thing for our 21st District, and a good thing for our military academies too, to send a group of outstanding young men who might otherwise have missed this opportunity?

The chairman of the Committee on Academy Appointments is Donald Darcy, senior vice president of Northside Savings Bank, vice chairman is Harrison J. Goldin, attorney and leader of the Metropolitan New York Council of the American Jewish Congress.

Other members include: Frances Castaldo; Father Mario Ciampi, O.F.M., Our Lady of Pity; Dennis Coleman, president, Bronx NAACP; the Honorable Maximo Gonzalez, Bronx district rent director, rent and rehabilitation administration; Abraham Gurevich, president of the Security Mutual Insurance Co.; the Reverend Edler Hawkins, former moderator of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States, and now minister of St. Augustine United Presbyterian Church; Rabbi David Hollander, Mount Eden Center; the Reverend James Keller, minister of Morisania Presbyterian Church; Leonard Lichtblau, principal of Public School No. 35; Ernest Minott, vice president of the United Parents' Association; Ira Petowski, commander, Pvt. Harvey Ehrilich Post, Jewish War Veterans; Mrs. Hyman Schneider; Rabbi Reuven Siegal, Adath Israel congregation.

CRIME AND PUBLIC SAFETY

Over 400 people attended our May 16 conference on crime and public safety. Mayor Wagner, our new Police Commissioner Vincent Broderick, Representative JONATHAN BINGHAM, Assemblyman Seymour Posner, and many other national and local experts participated.

Recommendations based on the panel discussions at the conference—on the role of the Federal Government, the role of the courts, narcotics control, and neighborhood safety—are being drawn up. We are creating an advisory council to help put these recommendations into effect.

The long, hot summer is with us again—longer and hotter because of the water shortage. We have been conferring with the captains of the local precincts on measures to help keep the streets safe in this period. These meetings have produced a number of helpful suggestions, which my advisory council will help the police implement.

In early June I convened a meeting of community leaders, police captains, and youth patrolmen from local precincts to discuss this whole problem as it affects our neighborhoods. We took up specific plans for this summer, and long-range programs to ease community tensions.

Finally, I have tried to do something in Congress about the crime problem. On May 12, I introduced an anticrime bill in the House of Representatives embodying President Johnson's proposals for fighting crime, but adding two amendments not included in the President's recommendations.

My bill calls for the creation of a new office in the Justice Department devoted exclusively to criminological research. It also calls for the formation of a Scientific Advisory Council which would find ways to apply the scientific advances of modern life to crime prevention and detection. To give you an idea of what I mean: the local policeman on the beat might carry a weapon which fires not bullets, which kill, but pellets which temporarily stun a suspect. Such a device might produce more arrests yet cause less danger to all concerned.

PLANS FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

So many older people in our community have spoken to me about the need for small, easy-to-get-to places where they can spend friendly social hours together, and I am hopeful that we can make this wish a reality.

I have organized a committee in the community to concentrate on the needs and problems of our aging. Its special job is to work for worthwhile projects which we hope will qualify for Federal funds under the antipoverty program.

One such project is these store front clubs for older persons. They would be similar to Golden Age Clubs, but smaller, easier to find, and closer to home—like a corner drugstore.

Another project we hope will qualify for a demonstration grant is a geriatric center for the Concourse Division of the Bronx Lebanon Hospital. The purpose of this center would be to offer not only improved medical attention for the aged, but a great many helpful social services as well—all coordinated under one roof.

The committee, called the South West Bronx Anti-Poverty Advisory and Coordinating Committee, is headed by the active community leader, Carl Sontz.

Members include Ida Arbitman, supervisor of Golden Age Clubs for the Bronx YM-YMHA; Marvin Belle, director of health education for old-age groups of the Bronx Board of Health; Abraham Fleischman, executive director of the Bronx YM-YWHA; Donald Granick; Fannie Hurlinger, director of social services at Bronx-Lebanon Hospital; Susan Kinoy, director of the Kingsbridge neighborhood project on aging; Manfred Klein; Ralph Rivera; Dr. Herbert Seltzer, executive director of the Daughters of Jacob; and Ida Townsend.

PROGRESS ON SCHOOLS

I am very happy to tell you that funds for a new public school No. 35, a crucially important elementary school at 165th Street and Morris Avenue, have been included in the new city budget. I spoke on behalf of the new school at city planning commission hearings, and presented testimony at the budget hearings of the board of education.

I am working hard to get one of the first supplementary education centers in the Nation approved for our district. These centers will be provided under the new Elementary and Secondary School Education Act just passed by Congress. They are to be used for remedial reading, audiovisual programs, counseling, and are to be adaptable for cultural activities under the Scheuer amendment to the new act. My staff has located several possible sites for such a center, which are now before the board of education for approval. We are pursuing this actively with the superintendent of schools, Dr. Bernard Donovan, who is cooperating with our efforts to the full.

To be sure that the new planning by the board of education for Taft High School does not lower its educational standards, I have arranged meetings with the leaders of the PTA, school officials, and Dr. Donovan, superintendent of schools.

NEW HELP FOR AGING

The Kingsbridge neighborhood project on aging has been set up to assist all elderly men and women in the Concourse area. Its aim is to identify the problems of aging persons—family, financial, or medical problems, or perhaps simply the great problem of loneliness—and to put them in touch with the right health and welfare agencies.

I am working with this neighborhood project. Above all, we want to keep elderly people living in the southwest Bronx, and to include them in the life of the community.

I spent an afternoon with one of the project's volunteer interviewers, Mrs. Magda Quittner. We had a heartwarming visit with Mrs. Rose Siegal of Walton Avenue, who emphasized the need I mentioned earlier—the need for places close to home, without difficult stairs and hills to climb, where older people can gather for recreation and companionship.

At the end of our visit, our gracious hostess was so interested in the project she volunteered to interview others. If you would like to volunteer, your help is needed and welcome. Call 537-3885.

As your Congressman in Washington, I have worked to ease the problems of our aged by cosponsoring the medicare program in the House, voting for the Older Americans Act, and supporting increased pensions for retired Government employees.

ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM UNDERWAY IN DISTRICT

We have had a major breakthrough for the antipoverty program in the Bronx. SEBU—South East Bronx United—has received a planning grant of over $25,000. I am happy to have had the opportunity, in cooperation with Councilman David Ross and Borough President Joseph Periconi, of working to obtain it.

SEBU is a coalition of community organizations and social agencies in the south and east Bronx formed under the leadership of the Reverend George Hardy of the Congregational Church of north New York.

As you know, I am a member of the Antipoverty Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee. I was thus able to arrange the first congressional hearing held in the Bronx for years—an Antipoverty Subcommittee hearing on April 10.

Over 20 community leaders as well as residents of poverty areas in the Bronx participated. The views which they expressed on Federal antipoverty efforts were subsequently published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am working with city and Federal antipoverty officials to get a Community Progress Center and a JOIN (Job Orientation in Neighborhoods) Center for the south Bronx. Some of the most impoverished areas in the city are in the south Bronx, and it is important that they get both local and Federal assistance.

We have been working closely with the Einstein Medical Center Mental Health Division at Lincoln Hospital in its program to develop local community centers. The first was opened in our district on February 28, at 349 East 138th Street. It has already attracted widespread interest and community support.

TREES AND PARKS

My staff and I have met on numerous occasions with Commissioner of Parks Newbold Morris and his aids. Plans are now well developed for special tree plantings on Jerome, Willis, University, and Melrose Avenues, and 149th Street. I am also presenting plans for the planting of additional trees to fill the bare spots on the Grand Concourse.

It has taken many decades for New York to come back to an appreciation of not only the beauty, but the importance of trees. Trees purify the air, cushion the harsh noises of city streets, hold moisture in the ground, and help to moderate uncomfortable extremes of temperature. Above all, they delight and soothe the spirit.

My staff is working to locate possible sites in our area for badly needed vest-pocket parks. A survey of defects in our existing parks has been made by the local reform Democratic clubs, and submitted to Commissioner Morris. We have already had some results, and more improvements are expected in the near future.

HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION

Commissioner Herbert Evans of the city housing board and I are working to explore an area conservation program for the South Highbridge area, which would prevent the continued deterioration of sound housing there because of landlord neglect.

In cooperation with Housing Commissioner Hortense Gabel and Federal antipoverty officials, I have developed a plan to rehabilitate two blocks of subetandard housing in the district. We have recommended a possible site to Commissioner Gabel.

I am actively working with the Mid-Bronx Community Council which is developing two proposals for middle-income Mitchell Lama projects off Jerome Avenue.

I have also worked closely for several years now with the Bronxchester Mutual Housing Association, a group of community organizations, businessmen and leaders, which is sponsoring a huge 4,000-unit middle-income development in the general area of 3d to Eagle Avenues, and 149th to 161st Streets.

I have conferred with Milton Mollen, city coordinator of housing and development, to urge additional middle-income housing in our district.

BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT

I have had several meetings with Bronx business leaders and am planning a Business Advisory Council to work on ways of bringing new businesses and more jobs into the area. We are exploring a proposal for an industrial park in the South Bronx which would be designed to attract firms with permanent, well-paying jobs.

We have also explored the possibility of demolishing the antiquated Third Avenue el, and a campaign to improve the 149th Street shopping area. The creation of a shopping mall is an attractive idea, but some viable substitute for the blight-producing el must first be found.

I am planning a small business workshop this coming fall or winter. The Small Business Administration will send representatives to explain opportunities for small businessmen under existing Federal programs.

COMMUNITY CONSUMER PROGRAM PLANNED

Esther Petersen, the President's charming and indomitable adviser on consumer problems, is working with me on a demonstration program on consumer problems which will take place this fall in our community. You will be hearing more about this in a few months.

BRONX CULTURAL LIFE

My wife, Emily, has become active with the Bronx Council on the Arts and is trying to develop projects which will give us more cultural facilities in the Bronx. We certainly need them.

With Congressman BINGHAM and Assemblyman Posner, I have sponsored a series of concerts in the Bronx by the young people's symphony.

I have conferred with the borough president's office to be certain that the new Bronx Civic Center will really serve community needs fully. I have expressed my concern that the civic center be a true public facility of great beauty and not another architectural monstrosity.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

We are now preparing a simple guide to community services offered in the Bronx. No such booklet is now available.

I have conferred with Welfare Commissioner Dumpson about setting up a new system to solve individual constituents' problems more quickly.

ESCALATORS AT SUBWAY STATIONS

I am forming a committee to explore the use of escalators in our elevated subway stations and to study the problems of Bronx public transportation in general.

PICTURE CAPTIONS

Photos taken at conference on crime and public safety, held May 16 at Taft High School. On left, Mayor Wagner speaks with Representative SCHEUER and interested citizens after his keynote speech. On right, the panel on the role of the Federal Government meets in the school gym; from left to right, Julius Edelstein, special assistant to Mayor Wagner; Richard Brown, administrative assistant to Representative SCHEUER; Seymour Feller, former president of the John F. Kennedy Independent Democratic Club; George O'Connor of the International Association of Chiefs of Police; and the Honorable Vincent Broderick, police commissioner of New York City.

Representative SCHEUER and Mrs. Magda Quittner of the Kingsbridge neighborhood project on aging, discuss problems of elderly persons with Mrs. Rose Siegal of Walton Avenue.

The Concourse Little League began another season this year with a parade in which I marched to express my support of this fine organization, directed by the dedicated Harry M. Klinetsky. Representative SCHEUER's youthful companions here are: Row 1, left to right, Jackie Almalech, Steve Weissman, Al Tragerman, Randy Garfield, Barry Norch. Row 2, Mike Greenberg, Jeff Newman, Louis Nazel. Row 3, Jeff Kruger, Bill Jackson, Ira Brander, Jeff Hirsch, Preston Faro.

Dennis Coleman, president of Bronx NAACP, with Representative SCHEUER at Antipoverty Subcommittee hearing held April 10 in the Bronx.

Since I have not yet been your Congressman for 6 months, many of these projects are only in the beginning stage. While I cannot guarantee their successful conclusion, I can promise you that my staff and I are working as hard as we can to bring them to fruition. I hope and trust that, with your support, we will be successful in our efforts to provide a better neighborhood for you and your children.

Authoritarianism and the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, numerous critics of the Great Society have pointed out the cost in dollars and cents of this type program, but few have touched on the cost to that all-important bedrock of American liberty—individual freedom. The Great Society may be possible to achieve, if we are willing to pay the cost in money for the material benefits that have been promised, but I doubt that it can be achieved without a serious diminution in individual liberty, and much more authoritarian rule than the American people are accustomed to. Precisely this view was recently stated by Felix Morley in the March issue of Nation's Business, and I commend his article to my colleagues:

THE GREAT RISK OF THE GREAT SOCIETY

(By Felix Morley)

(NOTE.—Dr. Morley is a Pulitzer Prize winning former newspaper editor and college president.)

Just as pertinent as the cost of the Great Society, though much less discussed, is the question of whether it can, in practice, be attained by governmental action. One fears that the answer must be: Only under a much more authoritarian rule than the American people have ever, as yet, been willing to accept.

The basic problem of unemployment helps to illustrate. Communism has undoubtedly solved that problem, after a fashion. An unskilled Russian, whether displaced by automation or otherwise out of a job, is simply drafted into the army or ordered to some menial civilian occupation. Whether he or she enjoys the work assigned is wholly immaterial. Because of this dictatorial procedure the Soviet Government can, and does, compare its full employment with scornful reference to the persistent 5 percent out of work reported by the United States.

But if we look closely into the actual character of our unemployment quite a different picture emerges. The statistics include housewives who have held remunerative jobs in the past and are willing to work again, at hours and in places of their own choosing. They include youngsters who have given up schooling in search of income which will get them a hotrod, a weekly hairdo or other enticing pleasures. The unemployment statistics include older people unwilling to leave the depressed areas where work is scarce. And they include not a few would would rather live on relief than accept a disagreeable job. In Russia all such people would be hard at work, at wages they would not be entitled to question.

This is not to assert that all the unemployed in this country are voluntarily in that condition; nor to suggest that there is no misery and suffering from involuntary unemployment. Nevertheless it is true that the American way is not to make work legally obligatory, except for the relatively few who are called into military service. And as long as that free system prevails, human nature being what it is, we shall have the unemployment which slavery so easily eradicates.

Between the relief of unemployment and its elimination there is, unfortunately, an inherent contradiction. The more adequate the support provided for the workless, the less will be their incentive to support themselves. Often this sociological law works out fortunately for mankind. The great artist, Vincent van Gogh, in his lifetime never sold even one of his now almost priceless paintings. He was enabled to stick to his unprofitable easel by the faith and charity of his brother. Today the museum that possesses even a single van Gogh is by that fact alone distinguished.

There is, of course, inefficiency in a system which maintains that individuals should

have the right to choose just how and when and where they exercise a lawful talent. For every unemployed van Gogh, or Poe, or Mozart, there are doubtless thousands of drones who will never produce anything of beauty or value. But the emphasis on freedom pays off with sufficient frequency to justify some subsidization on other than humanitarian grounds, even at public expense.

A new concept in subsidization is, however, apparent in President Johnson's visualization of the Great Society. Evidently it is his belief that by pouring out billions, improvement of many kinds will come as an almost automatic result. The greater the expenditure, he suggests, the greater will be the accomplishment. That belief ignores the contradictions inherent in the planning of any representative government.

These contradictions are already disconcerting enough, even while the concept of a Great Society is no more than a political talking point. Beautification of our cities is one of its worthy objectives, involving expansion of the Federal urban renewal program. Unfortunately this has demonstrated that wholesale elimination of slums tends not only to create new blighted areas, but also to increase unemployment.

In his well documented book, "The Federal Bulldozer," Prof. Martin Anderson, of Columbia University, has collected evidence of both these defects which is as yet uncontroverted. Researchers at Brown University, he tells us, "found that 40 percent of the businesses in the urban renewal areas of Providence, R.I., had to go out of business." In many cities adjacent districts have deteriorated as old ones were improved.

In other fields of potential improvement the right hand of the planners also works to obstruct what the left hand is doing. A major objective of the Great Society, as stated, is to insure that no worthy American youth shall be denied college training through lack of financial means. Scholarships are to be made freely available at Government expense. Yet simultaneously other governmental agencies are draining away from the colleges a large proportion of the better teachers who alone can make higher education worth while.

The president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington tells us, in his current annual report, that of all the qualified scientists in the country "nearly three in every five were [in 1963] engaged in projects supported or sponsored by the Federal Government, or located within the Government itself." A sister foundation, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, is deeply worried by this professorial flight from the campus to Government jobs.

Better transportation is another objective of the Great Society and experimental high-speed trains, shuttling swiftly from Boston to Washington and back, are promised as an initial rail improvement. The development is heralded, ironically enough, just as the bankrupt New Haven, dragged down by stifling regulations, humbly petitions for the right to abandon all passenger service over a part of this very route.

Indeed one cannot examine any aspect of the Great Society without turning up existing inconsistencies which cast grave doubt on the possibility of attaining utopia by governmental action. In the field of public health the Surgeon General warns us against smoking. But even as he does so the Department of Agriculture goes on paying what are in effect substantial subsidies to tobacco growers. If the one position is well taken, obviously the other is not.

Some of the contradictions are, even for a patient people, scarcely tolerable. Illegitimacy and juvenile delinquency are frequently related problems. Yet relief programs pay a bonus for illegitimate children as delinquency mounts. A variant of this problem is the case of those elderly couples now living together out of wedlock, so that a widow need not lose the social security benefit which she would forfeit with remarriage. The practice is scarcely compatible with the ideals of the Great Society, as promoted.

If these conflicts in policy were merely a result of bureaucratic bungling, they would be less serious. Inconsistencies could be removed as they became apparent, as is done arbitrarily in Russia.

But in a democratic society, pledged to the principle of one man, one vote, contradictions are a built-in hazard. Voters form into conflicting groups and the lawmakers must lend an attentive ear to their lobbyists, or else risk repudiation at the polls. Consequently, with a few courageous exceptions, Congress tends to favor all strongly urged expenditures, regardless of whether or not the objectives harmonize. Then multitudinous Federal agencies are set up to administer conflicting policies and happily go their various ways, regardless of cross-purposes.

What causes concern is the certainty of increase in these stultifying inconsistencies, assuming that the contemplated Great Society is to remain a free society, as President Johnson surely hopes. Under our system it can be very difficult to put an end to unworkable governmental policies, even if no well-entrenched interest seeks their continuance. The prohibition era should have taught us that.

Disillusion is therefore the foreshadowed end of effort to produce this Great Society by legislative action. The more grandiose the effort, the greater the eventual confusion and frustration is sure to be. Conceivably Utopia could be attained by the well planned methods of a ruthless dictatorship. Fantasies have been written on that assumption and hard-core Communists, in spite of dreadful failures, still believe it possible. But Utopia for a Marxist would be far from that to a thoroughly regimented American. He would more likely call it Hell.

A Great Society, directed by governmental agencies, implies centralized controls over every part and aspect of the society. Such a concept is directly at variance with the theory of a federal republic, under which the function and power of centralized government are sharply limited. From the constitutional viewpoint even the phrase is objectionable. A great society would necessarily be standardized and regimented, with spontaneous local effort subordinated to the assumed good of the whole. It would mean, in economic terms, the enlargement of centralized planning at the expense of the free market.

Yet is is the vitality of the free market, more than any other factor, which has brought the United States to the stage where a Great Society can be discussed as something other than an idle dream.

What Americans have accomplished is in a large measure due to faith in spiritual rather than in political leadership. To turn from the former to the latter could mean that we have already reached our summit and are starting downhill. It could mean that instead of perfecting our society we are proposing to forget the elemental virtues which have already made it great.

A Year Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the National Observer of Monday, June 7, pertaining to the Governor of our great State of Pennsylvania, the Honorable William Scranton:

A YEAR LATER, ANOTHER LOOK AT GOVERNOR SCRANTON—PENNSYLVANIA REPUBLICAN BAFFLES THE OPPOSITION, WORKS ON BIG CITY VOTE

HARRISBURG, PA.—A year ago this week, William Warren Scranton, the Governor of Pennsylvania, rushed to the Republican State Convention in Baltimore to say: "I come here to announce that I am a candidate for the Presidency." Barry Goldwater, on hearing the news, said: "It is too late now. It is a desperation move." And, of course, he was right. It was much too late; the delegates to the national convention had been chosen, and they wanted Barry.

But Barry Goldwater, riding so high then, is just another private citizen today. And Bill Scranton, 47 years old and as bright-eyed as ever, is still Governor of Pennsylvania and he still, at least in the opinion of the men around him, has a limitless political future.

The heart-pounding excitement of a year ago is, naturally enough, missing today. The talk here is like the talk in most State capitals—reapportionment, mass transit, aid to education, jobs for the faithful, and politics and politicians. Towns like Harrisburg, Lansing, Albany, and Sacramento thrive on rumor (most of it wildly erroneous) and speculation (most of it ill-informed).

SOME KERNELS OF TRUTH

But there are some kernels of truth here. Among them:

Governor Scranton is outpointing the Democrats on almost every issue, even though the opposition controls the legislature's lower house.

The Republicans are better organized in Pennsylvania than at almost any other time in the last decade. Conversely, the Democrats are even more disorganized than usual, and that's saying quite a bit.

Pennsylvania's economy, ordinarily a problem in good times and bad, is extraordinarily healthy, and the Governor is taking a lot of the credit for it. In Pennsylvania, this is the best political issue of all.

For these, and for other reasons, Governor Scranton—at this early stage—must be regarded as a contender for his party's 1968 presidential nomination. He is almost certain to leave office in 1966 with a decent record and in good repute with Republicans and with thousands of Democrats. And he may be able to hand pick his successor and see him elected. In Pennsylvania, where Governors historically leave office embittered and discredited, all of this would be remarkable indeed.

THE CONFLICTING VIEWS

There are two views of Bill Scranton. His admirers say he is a brilliant administrator and a brilliant politician. His critics say he is the luckiest man they've ever seen, and concede him only a flair for public relations.

There is something to be said on both sides. This boyish, pixie-faced man is smart; his timing is first rate, and his ideas are remarkably appealing to the mass of Pennsylvania's voters. But, surely, he has been luckier than any Governor of Pennsylvania in recent history and, surely, his public-relations flair is something to behold in a State that has produced so many ham-fisted Governors.

Talk to the Governor aboard the *Yellow Peril* the State's two-engine, blue-and-yellow Beech as it flies to Pittsburgh, where the Governor was scheduled to make a pitch for some campaign funds.

He insists, first off, that he hadn't even realized that this week would be the anniversary of that high point of his political career, And he adds that he had no

regrets about his disorganized and hopeless campaign. "I never wanted to run in the first place," he says. "I never would have run at all if someone else had been running in June (of a year ago)."

REVIVAL OF THE MODERATES

Mr. Scranton is pleased by the way the party has come along since the beating it took in November. "The moderates have come back so well," he says, "that there no longer is a question about the direction the party is heading." The Republican coordinating committee, of which he is a member, and the national committee under Ray Bliss both have been effective, Mr. Scranton believes.

And what, he was asked, is his role in the activities of the party at the national level? "To give all the constructive help I can to the coordinating committee and in the meantime to do my job in Pennsylvania, keeping the party unified and progressive here."

What Mr. Scranton really likes to talk about, however, is the condition of Pennsylvania's economy. He rattles off the statistics with unconcealed relish. "For 33 straight years," he says, "Pennsylvania had the second-highest unemployment rate in the country, trailing only West Virginia. In February of 1963, Pennsylvania's rate was 9.3 percent. That meant that more than 400,000 people were out of work."

But in 1964, he notes triumphantly, Pennsylvania dropped to 18th in unemployment. And in 2 months of that year—June and October—Pennsylvania's unemployment rate was slightly below the national average.

And 1965 has been even better. "Normally," says the Governor, "Pennsylvania's unemployment rate is twice the national average in the winter months. But in the first 4 months of this year we were even with the national rate and, as a matter of fact, a little below the national rate in April. In May, our figure shows an unemployment rate of 3.8 percent. That means about 173,000 are now unemployed."

A WORLD'S RECORD FOR CHANGE

At the same time, the Governor continues, industrial production has increased at a pace three times the national average. And he says there has been more new industry and expansion of old industry in Pennsylvania than in any other State. "This," he concludes, "is a world's record for change."

And what are the reasons for the improvement?

"First," says Mr. Scranton, "the wonderful work of the people of Pennsylvania. Second, an improved business climate, due to the State administration. Third, the generally good performance of the national economy."

* * * * *

But, quibble or not, the statistics are there for all to see. And almost everyone in Pennsylvania has felt, in one way or another, the improvement in conditions. The Governor is the boss and so he gets the credit. When the economy declined under the Democrats, helping to pave the way for Mr. Scranton's election, they got the blame. That's how politics works.

A RECORD SURPLUS

The conditions in Pennsylvania have been so good that Mr. Scranton was able to reveal a few days ago that the fiscal year would end with a record surplus of $102,713,510 in the State treasury.

The best the Democrats could do with it was to complain that the Governor shouldn't have raised the State sales tax almost 2 years ago and to suggest that there was something underhanded about the whole thing. They also said that the surplus is really larger than indicated and that millions are being held back to advance the Governor's presidential ambitions in some unspecified way. And, although the Democrats had long known that there would be a substantial surplus, they had not agreed on a program of their own on what to do with it.

The Governor had a precise program. He recommended last week just where every penny of the surplus should be spent; where he hopes to spend it is an interesting commentary on Bill Scranton's political shrewdness.

He wants to distribute the largest chunk of the surplus to the State's hardpressed school districts. The money can be used for "whatever is needed" to improve education, the Governor said in a message to the legislature. Millions were also requested to lower tuitions at Penn State and Temple Universities. He also asked that $2 million be set aside for a new scholarship fund. All together, he wants to spend more than $43 million for education.

He wants to spend millions more in aid to big-city mass-transit systems, to fight juvenile delinquency, to help the blind, and to improve neighborhoods "in some of our most critical urban areas."

"Urban," in fact, is the key word to this and most of the other programs being pushed by Mr. Scranton. "The Republican leadership in this State is realistic," the Governor says. "We can't win without winning the urban votes."

"We've zeroed in on the cities," says William Keisling, one of the Governor's aides. "The Governor delivered the first urban message to the legislature in the history of the State."

Most Rev. John Patrick Cody, Archbishop of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to acknowledge the appointment of the Most Reverend John Patrick Cody, the new archbishop of Chicago.

Chicago is one of the great urban centers of the world. Its dynamism and growth are without precedent anywhere else on earth. Archbishop Cody, one of the most experienced and able men in the Roman Catholic Church, inherits one of the most challenging posts in America.

He brings with him a dedication and responsiveness to human problems which will be of great help in continuing and perpetuating the goals of the late Cardinal Meyer.

On behalf of the 11th District, I welcome Archbishop Cody to Chicago. Following, for the benefit of my colleagues, are the newspaper accounts of his career and his service to the cause of humanity.

Mr. Speaker, the articles follow:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, June 17, 1965]

JOHN CODY NAMED ARCHBISHOP OF CHICAGO—SURPRISE CHOICE BRINGS PRAISE OF LEADERS

(By Richard Philbrick)

The Most Reverend John Patrick Cody, 57, Roman Catholic archbishop of New Orleans, was named archbishop of Chicago yesterday by Pope Paul VI. Announcement of the appointment was made at the Vatican and at the apostolic legation in Washington, D.C.

Archbishop Cody has won praise for his role in integration of the parochial schools in the largest Roman Catholic archdiocese in the South. In his new post he will head the largest archdiocese in the Nation.

A SURPRISE APPOINTMENT

The simultaneous announcement of his appointment said:

"The supreme pontiff has transferred to the metropolitan church of Chicago, United States of America, John Patrick Cody, archbishop of New Orleans."

Archbishop Cody, who has headed the New Orleans archdiocese since November 8, 1964, will succeed the late Albert Cardinal Meyer, who died April 9, after surgery for a brain tumor.

KEY ROLE IN LOUISIANA

Speculation that began soon after the death of Cardinal Meyer had centered on a half dozen other church leaders, but the surprise appointment drew immediate praise from churchmen and laymen alike.

The late Archbishop Joseph F. Rummel of New Orleans started the school desegregation process, but Archbishop Cody, as his assistant and certain successor, was in the forefront of the controversy that developed.

He was appointed as bishop coadjutor of the New Orleans archdiocese in 1961 and became its apostolic administrator June 1, 1962, when illness had limited even further Archbishop Rummel's participation in church affairs. Archbishop Cody suceeded to the post after Archbishop Rummel's death.

A native of St. Louis, the future archbishop entered St. Louis Preparatory Seminary at the age of 12.

When 19, he enrolled in the North American College in Rome to complete his training for the priesthood. He was ordained December 8, 1931, in Rome, a few days before his birthday, which falls on Christmas Eve.

MADE BISHOP IN 1947

In July 1947, he was made a bishop and became an aid to Archbishop Joseph Ritter (now Cardinal Ritter) of St. Louis. He went to New Orleans after heading the Kansas City-St. Joseph Diocese.

As head of the Chicago archdiocese, the will be spiritual leader of about 2,300,000 persons in Cook and Lake Counties. Within the boundaries of the archdiocese are 14 seminaries, 6 colleges and universities, 22 general hospitals, 33 orphanages and infant asylums, and 49 cemeteries.

There are 460 parishes, 434 elementary schools, and 90 high schools. The school system is exceeded in size only by the public school systems of Chicago and New York.

The magnitude and diversity of the archdiocese's interests are regarded as a challenge to an archbishop's administrative ability.

Because of population shifts, especially within Cook County, Archbishop Cody will face the problems of maintaining church buildings in some neighborhoods that are too old, too large, and too elaborate for their parishes.

SOME BUILDINGS LACKING

In other places he will find buildings that are too small and too limited in their facilities for their parishioners.

Bishop Cletus F. O'Donnell, administrator of the archdiocese since Cardinal Meyer's death, recently told of heavy demands made on it to provide schools, churches, convents, rectories, and other parish facilities and welfare institutions and cemeteries. Because of the needs, he said the archdiocese fulfill its obligations.

The racial desegregation issue, so familiar to Archbishop Cody, is felt in the Chicago archdiocese primarily in terms of housing, Chicago area priests say.

The new head of the archdiocese will have to seek new ways of persuading the faithful not only to worship together regardless of race, but also to live together and send their children to the same schools without making racial distinctions, the clergymen believe.

PRAISE FROM RITTER

One of those who said Archbishop Cody will be equal to this and other tasks of his new office is his former superior, Cardinal Ritter.

He said yesterday that Archbishop Cody is qualified in every way for the post and brings to it wide experience gained in a number of dioceses.

"He is a completely dedicated and wonderful churchman who looks upon himself as a servant of the church," Cardinal Ritter continued.

Archbishop Cody was chancellor of the St. Louis archdiocese from 1943 to 1947.

At the press conference in Washington at which his appointment was announced Archbishop Egidio Vagnozzi, apostolic delegate to the United States, described Archbishop Cody as "a man who carries into action whatever purpose or plan he sets out to handle."

CALLED A PROGRESSIVE

He termed Archbishop Cody a progressive in civil rights and liturgical matters and a moderate in questions of dogma.

Archbishop Cody's interest in obtaining racial equality led him to appeal along with other American prelates at the third session of the Vatican council for stronger statements denouncing racial bias.

He was a member of the council commission which drew up the declaration which pleaded that "justice and equality demand that a due measure of public aid be available to parents in support of the school they select for their children."

The statement is regarded as a significant addition to the discussion developing concerning tax support of church-related schools.

HEADED EDUCATION UNIT

Archbishop Cody recently completed a 2-year term as president of the National Catholic Education Association.

When Archbishop Cody assumes leadership of the Chicago archdiocese it will be the third time he has become head of a see and the first time he has not inherited his new post.

He was bishop coadjutor of Kansas City-St. Joseph, with automatic right of succession, before he headed that diocese, and in similar fashion he became archbishop of New Orleans.

SERVED VATICAN OFFICE

In 1932, soon after he was ordained, he was made assistant to the rector of the North American College in Rome. A year later he joined the staff of the Vatican secretary of state, where he met the present pope.

He returned to the United States in 1938 as secretary of Archbishop John Glennon of St. Louis.

His father, a St. Louis fire department captain died in the 1930's, and his mother died in 1946. A brother, Thomas, lives in St. Louis. He is recovering from a heart attack and could not be interviewed yesterday.

CODY CHOICE IS WELCOMED BY LEADERS—ALL PLEDGE THEIR COOPERATION

Mayor Daley and Bishop Cletus F. O'Donnell, administrator of the Chicago Roman Catholic archdiocese, led civic and religious leaders yesterday in welcoming the appointment of Archbishop John P. Cody of New Orleans to the post of Archbishop of Chicago as successor to the late Albert Cardinal Meyer.

The selection of Archbishop Cody was announced simultaneously at the Vatican and in Washington, D.C.

Mayor Daley wired the archbishop that all Chicago joins him in extending congratulations.

The telegram continued: "We look with great expectation to your coming to our city. May the Lord bless you with good health and a long life of service."

Daley characterized the new archbishop as "one of the outstanding churchmen of America." He added, "He is a warmhearted man. We are fortunate."

Bishop O'Donnell coupled a promise of loyalty with the welcome he extended to Archbishop Cody at a press conference in the archdiocesan chancery office, 719 North Wabash Avenue.

"I know that I am speaking in the name of all the bishops, priests, religious, and all citizens when I extend to His Excellency, the Most Reverend John P. Cody, a true Chicago welcome," Bishop O'Donnell said.

"We leave the time of mourning for his eminence, Albert Cardinal Meyer, and step out toward a new era and continuing renewal of the life of our archdiocese.

"We pledge our prayerful support, our loyalty, our fidelity, in the task that is his. We extend to him our welcome."

The Reverend Donald E. Zimmerman, executive head of the Chicago presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church, United States of America, said: "We congratulate Chicago Roman Catholics on the appointment of Archbishop Cody. He will find here an uncommon foundation for the further pursuit of genuine ecumenical dialog and action."

Rabbi Seymour J. Cohen, new president of the Synagogue Council of America, and spiritual leader of Anshe Emet synagog, 3760 Pine Grove Avenue, hailed Archbishop Cody's opposition to racial segregation: "We rejoice at the designation of Archbishop Cody," Rabbi Cohen said, "Coming from a southern community, his presence and participation will serve as a powerful impetus to all who labor for the improvement of the position of the Negro in our country."

Other comments were:

School Superintendent Benjamin C. Willis: "I am pleased to join Chicagoans of all faiths in extending a welcome to Bishop John P. Cody."

Seymour Simon, county board president: "The perpetuation of great Catholic leadership in defense of human rights in our community is assured by the choice of Chicago's new archbishop."

Dr. Robert Bruce Pierce, pastor of the Chicago temple, First Methodist church, 33 North Clark Street: "We all look forward to the leadership Archbishop Cody will provide not only for his own people but for all of Chicago's religious community."

A. Abbot Rosen, director of the Anti-defamation league: "As archbishop of New Orleans, he was a strong exponent of Catholic-Jewish friendship. At the last session of the Ecumenical Council he, together with the late Albert Cardinal Meyer, was one of the most dedicated and active friends of the draft document on the Jews."

The American Jewish Committee wired the archbishop: "We look forward to opportunities of mutual assistance in the fine spirit that characterized our long relationship with the late Albert Cardinal Meyer." The message was signed by Morris B. Abram, national president, and Arthur W. Oppenheimer, head of the Chicago chapter.

Similar messages were extended by Rabbi Ben-Zion C. Kagan, president of the Chicago board of rabbis, and the board's executive director, Rabbi Mordical Simon.

The Reverend Edgar H. S. Chandler, executive director of the Church Federation of Chicago: "We are delighted to know of his role in the cause of civil rights."

The Very Reverend James F. Maguire, president of Loyola University: "As president general of the National Catholic Education Association for the past 2 years, he has been concerned with the advancement of Catholic education. His long years of experience in St. Louis, Kansas City, and New Orleans has singularly equipped him for the challenging problems which are necessarily a part of life in the Nation's second largest city."

The Very Reverend John R. Cortelyou, president, De Paul University: "Archbishop Cody has been a leader among those who struggle to assure equal rights for all the citizens of our Nation. We at De Paul University welcome the opportunity to assist in whatever tasks he undertakes."

Kimberly-Clark Dedicates First Coated-Paper Mill in State of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, 1965, at Anderson, Shasta County, Calif., a new first was added to the already impressive list of superlatives rightfully claimed by the State of California. On that day the Kimberly-Clark Corp., formally dedicated its multimillion-dollar pulp and paper complex, the first coated-paper mill in California history and the first in the world to operate exclusively on sawmill wastes.

I was privileged to have been present at the ground breaking ceremony which marked the start of the construction of this brandnew $50 million papermaking complex. Unfortunately the legislative schedule was heavy and I felt that it was necessary for me to remain here in Washington at the time of the dedication.

I am anxious, however, to return to Shasta County and see the finished product for I have followed this development very closely. As representative of the city of Anderson and the county of Shasta I am extremely proud of this major undertaking which is the largest single project completed in the 93-year-old history of the Kimberly-Clark Corp.

We have there the most modern and efficient papermaking operation in the world. This facility represents great strides in the timber industry because of the tremendous increases in utilization of the full log and elimination of any waste products which now can be put to beneficial use in the manufacture of paper and other related products. This is the type of natural resource utilization I am most happy to see.

California Governor, Edmund G. Brown, who delivered the principal address to the more than 1,000 guests attending the ceremonies, hailed the new mill as "a solid example of the kind of industrial expansion which I hope will characterize the next stage of California's growth." He listed as his chief reasons for this statement:

First, you are a nondefense industry whose product—printing paper for magazines, catalogues, books and brochures—will play a major role in the continuing growth of education.

Second, we have every hope that this new mill, part of a basic industry, will stimulate new growth in the graphic arts industry in California.

Third, as the first printing papermill in California history this plant not only in-

creases the healthy diversification of California industry, but reduces our dependence on eastern sources of supply. And further, the plant is providing hundreds of new jobs. It is broadening the economic base by providing year-round employment in a new industry.

The Governor paid tribute to Kimberly-Clark in still another vein when he said:

This mill represents emphasis on the conservation of natural resources—a fact of major importance in Shasta County, one of the most beautiful parts of our State.

Until recently, the mill scraps from which pulp is made were considered useless, and therefore burned. Now, by making chips for all your pulp needs, you are stretching the output of the forest without, in essence, having to cut a single tree for pulpwood. The mill's scraps now constitute a new raw material source and an increase of 60 percent in total use of the harvested log.

Similarly, your treatment of effluent water—which is metered into the Sacramento River only after extensive purification—is already a model for the entire paper industry.

This, too, is a major reason why we welcome you to northern California. You are proving that a water-using industry can operate responsibly next to a great river without adversely affecting the purity of the stream—the immediate wildlife—or recreational values—

Governor Brown said.

Among the numerous stories and comments on the new mill by the news media was a penetrating report on this water purification system which appeared in the New York Times edition of June 9, 1965. The dispatch is one of a series by Gladwin Hill, veteran Times Los Angeles bureau chief, on American water resources which has done much to alert the Nation to the urgent problems facing us in the areas of water supply and waste disposal.

With the House's permission I would like to insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COAST MILL AVERTS RIVER'S POLLUTION

(By Gladwin Hill)

ANDERSON, CALIF., June 8.—Here in the forested vacationland of northern California's Shasta County, spawning-bound salmon weighing up to 50 pounds disport themselves in the waters of the Sacramento River, 250 miles upstream from the Pacific.

Remarkably, as the salmon cavort, a new pulp and paper mill nearby is discharging 10 million gallons a day of waste-processed liquid into the river that does not harm the fish.

The immense amounts of water involved in papermaking, laden with spent chemicals and waste pulp, are an important source of pollution of streams on the Atlantic seaboard and in some inland sections of the country.

Such pollution has lately become a major source of concern to Federal officials, conservationists, and sanitation experts. President Johnson has said that many of the Nation's principal rivers have become little better than open sewers.

Pollution poses a health hazard of still unknown dimensions. Chemical contaminants usually consume large quantities of oxygen in water. This can paralyze streams in their traditional function of neutralizing the ever-growing volume of sewage from cities.

STRICT MEASURES TAKEN

This condition, along with recreational and esthetic impairment of the river, has been notably avoided here through two unusual developments:

The insistence by California on exceptionally high standards of effluent quality as a condition of the establishment of a $50 million combination of lumber, pulp, and paper mills here by a leading manufacturer. The pattern has been to woo industry with tacit assurances that stream pollution would be dealt with leniently.

The expenditure by the Kimberly-Clark Corp., of Neenah, Wis., of more than 4 percent of its total investment on development of the most advanced waste-treatment system known to the paper industry.

PLANT IS DEDICATED

The new plant, in preliminary operation for several months, was formally dedicated today. Its system, an independent engineer said recently, is likely to be "the pattern of the future" in many places in the Nation, as worsening conditions on many rivers compel a new outlook on both municipal and industrial waste disposal.

The torrent of fluid waste that pours from the pulp and paper mill daily goes through processes similar in technology to those used by progressive communities to render sewage innocuous, but both the volume and chemical complexity here presented an engineering challenge.

It takes as much as 50,000 gallons of water to produce a ton of finished paper—about the amount consumed, on the average, by every six persons in the Nation every year.

Water is the solvent for the many chemicals used, and the vital conveyor of paper constituents. As the souplike "pulp" starts its journey through a roaring maze of traveling screens, whirling felt blankets and gleaming rollers, it is 99 percent water. At Anderson, this water comes from wells.

LUMBER CHIPS COOKED

First, fine chips from lumbermill trimmings are "cooked" with sodium sulfide and caustic soda to separate their fibers. These are then bleached with sulfur dioxide, sodium chlorate, hydrogen peroxide, sulfuric acid, and sodium hydroxide. Then, as the soupy pulp whizzes through the rollers, such ingredients as corn starch and clay are added to give the final paper body and smoothness.

The residual fluids from this process range from a noxious brew known as black liquor to blander white liquor. Unlike ordinary sewage, the waste contains few bacteria.

However, untreated, its effect on a waterway could be equally undesirable. By absorbing oxygen from water, and disrupting normal plant-fish life cycles, alien chemicals rob streams of their purifying capacity, and encourage slime and unhealthy worm growth. Sulfur-impregnated waste pulp discharged by some eastern mills has emitted fumes that peeled paint from houses.

At the outset of the Anderson project, the State's water pollution control board laid down a 14-point set of requirements for effluent quality.

These specified that the discharge should not result in concentrations in the river of chemicals—acids, sulfate compounds, and mercaptans—of more than half the established level at which toxicity to living organisms begins (the maximum permissible with any of the chemical being 1 part per million in the water). The effluent, it was specified, should not reduce the river's dissolved oxygen content by more than a half part per million.

Another requirement was that "settleable solids shall cause no discernible bottom deposits." This was in striking contrast with at least one eastern river in which the accumulation of waste pulp is too great to be readily removed even by dredging.

Quintin Narum, a staff engineer who had helped develop the company's waste-treatment system at New Milford, Conn., on the Housatonic River, was brought here to direct the design of treatment equipment to meet the rigorous standards.

The result of several years' work was a waste-treatment system approximately big enough for a city of 100,000 persons. Various components of the system have been used piecemeal in previous industrial and municipal plants, but their integration here is believed to be unusual in the paper industry.

The Anderson Mill combination was designed to produce 200 tons of pulp and 180 tons of finished book-quality paper daily.

Waste fluids go first to a series of outdoor basins, like huge swimming pools, holding around a million gallons each. Here waste woodpulp and other gross solids settle out, and later are buried. In mills without such treatment, the proportion of pulp going out as waste runs as high as 50 percent.

The resultant, partly clarified liquid is then churned and aerated in a second series of basins containing plant organisms that digest pollutants. Finally, the effluent, now largely water, goes to a third tank where it flows slowly over sawtooth metal weirs that strain out finer sediment.

At this stage, small amounts are diverted to a laboratory tank containing newborn salmon, less than two inches long, from a nearby hatchery, which are more sensitive than humans to pollution. If they thrive in it—as they do—the effluent obviously will be harmless in dilution in the river.

The most undesirable factor in industrial discharge, "biological oxygen demand" constituents, have been reduced about 90 percent.

"Our BOD," Mr. Narum says proudly, "runs about 8 to 12 parts per million. That is in the range that would be in the river if we weren't here at all."

Most of the effluent is piped 4 miles to the river and diffused underwater from 16 vents.

Part of the flow is diverted to a 1,000-acre experimental farming tract along the river, established to explore agricultural use of the waste water. This week a farmer was busy baling a crop of hay from the farm.

The following editorial in the New York Times of June 21, 1965, commends the State of California and Kimberly-Clark Corp. for the water pollution abatement measures installed at the company's Shasta Division mill.

PATH TO POLLUTION CONTROL

California and the Kimberly-Clark Corp. have demonstrated that economic progress need not entail sacrifice of clean streams and recreational opportunities. The State—facing up to the fact that maintaining a decent environment is as important as new jobs and taxable property—insisted upon complete waste control before permitting establishment of a new pulp and paper plant. The corporation complied, although it was necessary to spend 10 percent of a $20 million plant investment on the necessary pollution-control facilities. As a result, salmon are spawning successfully in the Sacramento River while the plant pours 10 million gallons a day of cleaned-up effluent into the stream.

It is easier and cheaper to do what is being done in Shasta County, Calif., if the new technologies in waste control are built into an industrial plant from the beginning. Much of the pollution still caused by the pulp and paper industry in New England and other places comes from old plants now barely competitive because of obsolete equipment and methods. The same situation prevails in other industries. Companies saddled with this problem need help.

A new law in New York State meets this problem by allowing a company to deduct the expenditures it makes to install or improve waste-treatment facilities. The law also exempts such facilities from real prop-

erty taxes. States that have not granted this kind of tax relief ought to follow New York's lead. More important, because it would help eliminate competitive disadvantages between regions and States, Congress should write similar incentives into the Federal tax laws. The Nation's economy would benefit; so would its health.

Kimberly-Clark Builds Pollution-Free Papermill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the New York Times describing the new papermill which Kimberly-Clark Corp. has constructed on the west coast.

By utilizing the latest methods of waste treatment, the new mill almost completely eliminates the pollution potential of the vast quantities of waste water which it discharges into the Sacramento River each day. This is a noteworthy achievement, typical of the efforts that the paper industry is making toward the abatement of pollution in the streams and rivers of the Nation.

It must be recognized, however, that these results are achieved only through the substantial outlay of largely nonproductive investment. In the case of this mill 10 percent of the total investment was devoted to the intricate waste-treatment system. If we are ever to successfully overcome industrial pollution, economic ways must be found to meet the vast outlays that will be required to build complex facilities for the treatment of industrial wastes.

The article follows:

COAST MILL AVERTS RIVER'S POLLUTION

(By Gladwin Hill)

ANDERSON, CALIF., June 8.—Here in the forested vacationland of northern California's Shasta County, spawning-bound salmon weighing up to 50 pounds disport themselves in the waters of the Sacramento River, 250 miles upstream from the Pacific.

Remarkably, as the salmon cavort, a new pulp and paper mill nearby is discharging 10 million gallons a day of waste-processed liquid into the river that does not harm the fish.

The immense amounts of water involved in papermaking, laden with spent chemicals and waste pulp, are an important source of pollution of streams on the Atlantic seaboard and in some inland sections of the country.

Such pollution has lately become a major source of concern to Federal officials, conservationists and sanitation experts. President Johnson has said that many of the Nation's principal rivers have become little better than open sewers.

Pollution poses a health hazard of still unknown dimensions. Chemical contaminants usually consume large quantities of oxygen in water. This can paralyze streams in their traditional function of neutralizing the ever-growing volume of sewage from cities.

STRICT MEASURES TAKEN

This condition, along with recreational and esthetic impairment of the river, has been notably avoided here through two unusual developments:

The insistence by California on exceptionally high standards of effluent quality as a condition of the establishment of a $20 million combination of lumber, pulp and paper mills here by a leading manufacturer. The pattern has been to woo industry with tacit assurances that stream pollution would be dealt with leniently.

The expenditure by the Kimberly-Clark Corp. of Neenah, Wis., of more than 10 percent of its total investment on development of the most advanced waste-treatment system known to the paper industry.

PLANT IS DEDICATED

The new plant, in preliminary operation for several months, was formally dedicated today. Its system, an independent engineer said recently, is likely to be "the pattern of the future" in many places in the Nation, as worsening conditions on many rivers compel a new outlook on both municipal and industrial waste disposal.

The torrent of fluid waste that pours from the pulp and paper mill daily goes through processes similar in technology to those used by progressive communities to render sewage innocuous, but both the volume and chemical complexity here presented an engineering challenge.

It takes as much as 50,000 gallons of water to produce a ton of finished paper—about the amount consumed, on the average, by every six persons in the Nation every year.

Water is the solvent for the many chemicals used, and the vital conveyor of paper constituents. As the souplike pulp starts its journey through a roaring maze of traveling screens, whirling felt blankets, and gleaming rollers, it is 99 percent water. At Anderson, this water comes from wells.

LUMBER CHIPS COOKED

First, fine chips from lumber mill trimmings are cooked with sodium sulfide and caustic soda to separate their fibers. These are then bleached with sulfur dioxide, sodium chlorate, hydrogen peroxide, sulfuric acid, sodium hydroxide. Then, as the soupy pulp whizzes through the rollers, such ingredients as cornstarch and clay are added to give the final paper body and smoothness.

The residual fluids from this process range from a noxious brew known as black liquor to blander white liquor. Unlike ordinary sewage, the waste contains few bacteria.

However, untreated, its effect on a waterway could be equally undesirable. By absorbing oxygen from water, and disrupting normal plant-fish life cycles, alien chemicals rob streams of their purifying capacity, and encourage slime and unhealthy worm growth. Sulfur-impregnated waste pulp discharged by some eastern mills has emitted fumes that peeled paint from houses.

At the outset of the Anderson project, the State's water pollution control board laid down a 14-point set of requirements for effluent quality.

These specified that the discharge should not result in concentrations in the river of chemicals—acids, sulfate compounds, and mercaptans—of more than half the established level at which toxicity to living organisms begins (the maximum permissible with any of the chemicals being one part per million in the water). The effluent, it was specified, should not reduce the river's dissolved oxygen content by more than a half part per million.

Another requirement was that "settleable solids shall cause no discernible bottom deposits." This was in striking contrast with at least one eastern river in which the accumulation of waste pulp is too great to be readily removed even by dredging.

Quintin Narum, a staff engineer who had helped develop the company's waste-treatment system at New Milford, Conn., on the Housatonic River, was brought here to direct the design of treatment equipment to meet the rigorous standards.

The result of several years' work was a waste-treatment system approximately big enough for a city of 100,000 persons. Various components of the system have been used piecemeal in previous industrial and municipal plants, but their integration here is believed to be unusual in the paper industry.

The Anderson Mill combination was designed to produce 200 tons of pulp and 180 tons of finished book-quality paper daily.

Waste fluids go first to a series of outdoor basins, like huge swimming pools, holding around a million gallons each. Here waste wood pulp and other gross solids settle out, and later are buried. In mills without such treatment, the proportion of pulp going out as waste runs as high as 50 percent.

The resultant, partly clarified liquid is then churned and aerated in a second series of basins containing plant organisms that digest pollutants. Finally, the effluent, now largely water, goes to a third tank where it flows slowly over sawtooth metal weirs that strain out finer sediment.

At this stage, small amounts are diverted to a laboratory tank containing newborn salmon, less than 2 inches long, from a nearby hatchery, which are more sensitive than humans to pollution. If they thrive in it—as they do—the effluent obviously will be harmless in dilution in the river.

The most undesirable factor in industrial discharge, "biological oxygen demand" constituents, have been reduced about 90 percent.

"Our BOD," Mr. Narum says proudly, "runs about 8 to 12 parts per million. That is in the range that would be in the river if we weren't here at all."

Most of the effluent is piped 4 miles to the river and diffused underwater from 16 vents.

Part of the flow is diverted to a 1,000-acre experimental farming tract along the river, established to explore agricultural use of the waste water. This week a farmer was busy bailing a crop of hay from the farm.

Greater Miami Celebrates Alan Stewart's 20 Years of Service to Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as we all realize, the development of air transportation has revolutionized almost every feature of American life. No area has benefited more from the manifold services of our Nation's aviation industry than Greater Dade County, and I want to bring to the Congress attention the recognition which the people of Dade County gave to this industry at a recent occasion in Miami.

Alan Stewart, the present director of the Greater Miami Port Authority, has been associated with the port authority for 20 years. He has become well known among the citizens of Miami for his con-

tributions to and genuine interest in local affairs. During these 20 years, he has been significantly instrumental in the port authority's expansion of facilities and services. Today, at Miami, Fla., he directs one of the most modern, diversified, and complex port authorities in any of our Nation's great metropolitan areas. His efficient and capable direction—as well as his dedication to Dade County and the entire aviation industry—mark him as one of the select men who are responsible for the progress in air transportation which we have witnessed in the last few decades.

The Greater Miami Aviation Association recently held a giant testimonial lunchean honoring Mr. Stewart and the Dade County Port Authority. Capt. John Halliburton, vice president for flight operations at Eastern Airlines, delivered the main address, "Air Transportation—Past, Present, and Future."

I am pleased to join the large number of citizens who came to honor and give appropriate recognition to the great air industry of Greater Miami, the Dade County Port Authority, and its dedicated director, Mr. Alan Stewart.

How One State Mustered Forces in Scramble for Atom Smasher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, more than 80 communities in 42 States submitted bids to the Atomic Energy Commission for location of the $280 million atom smasher in their area. Indiana's efforts are described in the following article from the June 21, 1965 National Observer:

HOW ONE STATE MUSTERED FORCES IN SCRAMBLE FOR ATOM SMASHER

INDIANAPOLIS.—"The prize of the century." That's how Gov. Roger D. Branigin, of Indiania, describes a $280 million atom smasher the Government plans to build somewhere in the United States. When bidding for the location ended last week, more than 80 communities in 42 States had submitted proposals for location of the great research device.

Like leaders in many Central States, Governor Branigin believes that if this new facility is located in his State it will help slow the "brain drain." This is the term used to describe the exodus of disquieting numbers of bright young men and women from the Central States for work in or near the research facilities of the big universities and industrial complexes of the east and west coasts.

Of course, not only do major research facilities attract smart people; they also attract industry, particularly sophisticated industry like electronics or aerospace. And the Central States are still smarting from Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's blunt reply when he was asked a couple of years ago why interior States didn't get more defense contracts. The Defense Department seeks the best brains, said Mr. McNamara, and "generally speaking" they aren't to be found in the interior States.

RESEARCH FROM "WRECKAGE"

The atom smasher, or particle accelerator, unquestionably will attract brains. It will be the most powerful accelerator in the world, capable of giving test particles energy of 200 billion electron volts (Bev.). The present champion at Brookhaven (N.Y.) National Laboratory has a 33 Bev. capacity. Russia is reportedly building a 70 Bev. accelerator.

A series of huge magnets is at the heart of particle accelerators. For the new accelerator they will form a circle a mile in diameter. They will be, in a sense, a sort of underground research racetrack. The magnets will send protons of elements like hydrogen racing around the accelerator until they reach almost the speed of light. They will then be sent crashing into another element, say copper. In the atomic "wreckage" that is produced, scientists hope to discover new information about the composition of matter and the nature of the forces that bind it together. Smaller accelerators contributed significantly to learning how to release some of those forces to cause nuclear explosions.

Besides attracting industry, the new accelerator would be a major plum for any community on the basis of its payroll alone. An estimated 2,000 scientists and technicians would be needed to run it. Annual operating costs would be about $50 million.

The Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), with help from a panel from the National Academy of Sciences, hopes to pick a winner by the end of the year from among such diverse spots as Madison, Wis.; Flat River, Mo.; Missoula, Mont.; or the Bad Lands of South Dakota.

Some contending areas have offered expensive inducements to the AEC. The Indiana Legislature, for example, has agreed to foot the $10 million bill for a 3,000-acre site just outside Indianapolis if the Hoosier State is chosen.

Governor Branigin and other Indiana leaders went to work to try to get the accelerator within days after the AEC, in April, announced site specifications. The proposed site, owned by Purdue University, was picked. The legislature, in a special 1-day session, appropriated the $10 million to buy it. A committee of 64 educators, government officials, businessmen, and technical specialists compiled arguments and data to support Indiana's bid.

As did most other contenders, the Hoosiers bragged that their site was accessible to ample electricity to power the huge magnets and had plenty of good-quality water to keep the magnets cool. A nearby metropolitan center, several universities, and a jet airport were also noted.

JOLTED BY COMMENT

Elvis Stahr, president of Indiana University, and Frederick Hovde, president of Purdue, presented Indiana's case to the AEC last week. And they left the meeting a little jolted by an AEC staff member's comment that the electric rates listed in their proposal were higher than those in most other competing communities. The staff members suggested that power company officials back home in Indiana "sharpen their pencils" and try to figure some lower rates. Within 24 hours O. T. Fitzwater, president of the Indianapolis Power & Light Co., had done just that. Power costs, he said, would be shaved to meet any competition.

There are, of course, many other States and communities that are working just as hard as Indiana to win the accelerator. Governor Branigin is aware of this and of the possibility that Indiana won't win. But he thinks his State will win something even if it loses.

Outsiders, he believes, have tended to think Indiana "doesn't present a very positive appearance." The drive for the accelerator, he said, marks "the first time that the entire State has been mustered in such a massive effort. We have done more than was ever done before." That interest and effort, he feels, will not go unnoted the next time the State goes after a big Federal project.

—LAWRENCE S. CONNOR.

Commencement Address of Hon. Edith Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under the wise leadership of its president, Dr. Randle Elliott, Hood College in Frederick, Md., has increased its reputation as a dynamic institution offering an education of high quality. On June 6, Dr. Elliott and the graduating class of Hood were privileged to have as their guest and main commencement speaker our colleague, Representative EDITH GREEN of Oregon. Mrs. GREEN's thoughtful address was focused on the vital role of youth in this troubled and complex age. Praising the enthusiasm and social concern of the present college generation, she encouraged the graduates to press forward their drives for truth, justice, and human decency.

I am pleased to insert Mrs. GREEN's provocative address in the RECORD:

HON. EDITH GREEN, AT COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF HOOD COLLEGE, JUNE 6, 1965

President Elliott, Dean Keeler, Dean Sherrill, Mr. Thomas, and other members of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class of 1965, and parents and friends of those whom we are honoring today, I was very pleased when your distinguished president invited me to participate in the commencement activities at Hood College. Graduation day is a festive occasion. The speaker is permitted an unlimited number of clichés; there is the sense of brightness—and future—and unlimited possibilities in the air; and for those of us who have long since forgotten our own graduation, there is also a feeling of renewal of tradition—the thought that here—for better or for worse—here stands the next generation.

I'm not going to apologize for the kind of a world our generation gives to your generation. And neither am I going to complain about your generation. Someone has said: "The old begin to complain about the conduct of the young when they themselves can no longer set a bad example."

But seriously—let me say—that in spite of the fact that this is a world where warhead faces warhead—where atomic annihilation is an ever present possibility—I still firmly believe that this is the most exciting time, the most challenging time in which to live.

And today you are receiving a diploma which may not be the open sesame to all the opportunities of this world, but at least it provides an entering wedge because it certifies that you have earned a college degree—and college trained people are in great demand. You don't have to worry about finding a job because you enter a world which wants you and needs you.

And I hope that many of you are thinking of today not only as the day you graduate, but as the time when you commence your graduate work. Many of us are concerned

that the ratio of women who go on to get their master's and doctorate degrees has not risen since the war; in fact the percentage has declined. I hope many of you will help to change this picture, because doors are being opened to women in almost every field. Opportunities are now available that never were before.

By a more active involvement in the world around, women are growing not less concerned about when little Johnnie or Susan takes that first step, but they are growing far more concerned about the kind of a community and the kind of a world in which John and Susan will stride, as grown men and women.

Over the great temple of Delphi at the time of the ancient Greeks, was carved the maxim, "Know thyself." In the over 2,000 years since that command was given, science is just now beginning to open the ever-widening paths to knowledge of ourselves—to knowledge of the mechanisms of our minds and bodies. We are working, not just to understand the universe around us, but the world within us—not just the matter which surrounds us, but the nature of our own being.

In our society, which has learned to open cans electrically; to broadcast voices and pictures across oceans and continents, even to bounce them from a tiny satellite hurtling through space; to journey below the polar ice; to hurl man, borne by the most powerful engines known, literally toward the stars; that while doing all these things we have failed to solve the great unanswered questions that have faced the world since time began—the problems of hunger, want, disease, shelter from the cold and the heat—the problems of the basic needs of one-fifth of our Nation and three-quarters of our world; are making it possible for man to literally walk in outer space, while many, many cannot walk as men with dignity on this planet.

We have not solved the great human problems of despair and hardship and meaninglessness in a world so full of riches for so many.

We have not solved the great Christian problems of peace and brotherhood. We have not achieved triumph over warfare with victories of reason.

I am sure every graduating class is told that a commencement is only partly a beginning, even for you who are about to leave the academic life and emerge into a world of crisis. And this is true—but as Louisa May Alcott said, "Life is my college." And her hope is the hope of all of us as she expressed it, "May I graduate well, and earn some honors."

So graduation from college is a time for rededication, and reaffirmation of purposes and goals.

The anthropologists tell us that at a given time in the inexorable passage of the seasons, the young people of primitive tribes are gathered together, usually in the presence of the elders of the tribe, and are subjected to various rituals and ordeals which comprise what is called, by the anthropologists, a rite of passage.

The rite of passage, the anthropologists tell us, varies in its details from tribe to tribe, but there are certain underlying similarities everywhere.

In most groups, the rite of passage is a fairly uncomfortable, sometimes quite painful ritual. In most cases, the rites are administered by the old to the young, and in every case, it is a means of passing on to a new generation, the conventional wisdom which has enabled the tribe to cope, for years beyond measure with its environment—with natural forces, with neighbors, with enemies, with the everpresent supernatural currents.

This week, last week and next, throughout the length and breadth of this continent, the young men and women like you are undergoing our version of this rite of passage. I am sure that the graduating seniors can testify as to the discomforts they underwent during final examinations; and all of us can testify that the ritual wardrobe of a commencement must have been designed with redemptive suffering in mind.

These rites will differ in superficial details. But in one essential, the rites of passage everywhere in this great land will be identical with the rites of passage of tribal groups. In every case, the elders of the tribe are called upon, in various ritual ways, to impart to the youth conventional wisdom. All these will tell you and your counterparts how the tribe has achieved its greatness, or, alternatively, how it has begun to lose its past greatness. They will tell you what it is that you must struggle to preserve or perhaps what you must struggle to regain.

This advice will not be given in a condescending or smug fashion, I can assure you. This generation of ours has seen too much evil and too much of the ultimate depravity of which man can be guilty, to look back with excessive pride on its own accomplishment and hold them up as a necessary object of your emulation. There have been things done in this generation of which we are justly proud. There have been things done, too, by my contemporaries which only demonstrate how far men can depart from common decency and simple humanity.

No, we will not advise you because we believe we have found the ultimate in human insight, and we will not, I hope, look upon you as a Lost Generation, incapable of following the high example set by your elders. When we give advice to your generation we do so feeling both proud of you and concerned about you and your future—our future.

But—as this has usually been the case in rites of passage—we will probably not communicate well—because we feel, perhaps even more keenly than you feel, that the generations do not understand one another.

Never, I think, as I talk with countless young people, has this gap of communication been more evident than it is today. And never, probably, will it be more evident than during our annual rites of passage.

Let me cite a few seemingly unrelated facts. Let me draw a tentative conclusion from them, and let me, in all humility offer it as my advice, my word—if not of wisdom, at least of good will, and friendship to you.

Item 1: Young Americans, most of them under the age of 30, have in recent years, gone by the thousands into every corner of the world as Peace Corps volunteers. In this capacity, even in situations where the American image in general was in rags and tatters, they have been able to carry out their work and to earn and retain an affectionate rapport with the people of these countries.

Item 2: Many of the first group of Peace Corps volunteers to return to this country met in Washington, earlier this year, to explore, with the leadership of the Peace Corps, ways of further service to the United States.

Item 3: A large number of young people have left their homes and gone to such places as Mississippi, there to work, to help encourage voter registration, to live and to know fear and privation, and, in a couple of cases, to die.

Even larger numbers of young people have participated in demonstrations in their own communities and in other States, in opposition to the racial injustices which are still too much a part of our society.

Item 4: Young people, in some cases the same young people who demonstrated for civil rights, have engaged in demonstrations against our foreign policies.

Item 5: In another great university, 3,000 miles from here, students demonstrated so vehemently in defense of what they thought to be a threat to their freedom of speech and political action, that a university administration was shaken and a major statewide political issue was born.

Item 6: In the Midwest, earlier this spring, record-breaking floods threatened to sweep into several major cities and to cause untold millions of dollars of damage. Among the hardest working volunteers on the dikes and levees were young college students. A number of newspaper accounts, and at least one editorial commented on this fact, to the effect that "Not all students are bearded troublemakers, demonstrating against the Government. Some of them, in Minnesota, at least, are valiantly out there helping their neighbors and their community."

Item 7: Much of the newspaper and other public criticism of the young people who have protested our foreign policy, and of the young people who have worked for civil rights, seems to stem from the fact that they were unshaven, and often poorly dressed.

Now, what do all these things mean? What conclusions can we draw from these facets of the always abrasive relationship between generations, and what comfort can we draw from our store of tribal wisdom?

First, let me say to any of you who may have picketed, who may have protested what seem to be injustices or stupidity, to those who have, in short, set their instinctive feelings against the accumulated knowledge of the people who bear responsibility for the resolution of issues—I would be the last to pass final judgment on the wisdom of such moves. If you have any contribution to make to a world which stands on the brink of self-destruction, to a nation which is in the throes of the most soul-searching revolution of the century, it is precisely your enthusiasm, your clear eyed, perhaps mistaken, perhaps not, but your concern about the irreconcilability of right and wrong.

You will be told that the things to which you object are impossible to correct overnight. Maybe they are, but they will never be corrected unless you and others like you continue to demand that they be corrected.

You will be told that this is not the way to seek reform, that you should present your requests through channels. But, also you know and I know that too often a channel is simply a ditch artificially dug to allow still waters to continue to run untroubled.

Respect for authority is indeed a laudable attribute. And I do not minimize it one single bit. Authority must be respected, but authority also must earn respect. I say the Republic is better off today for those young people whose respect for authority did not extend to the sheriff of Selma or others in authority who used electric cattle prods and bull whips on fellow human beings. When authority is abused to perpetuate wrong, it forfeits its right to respect. And age is no guarantee of wisdom. Respect authority, yes by all means—but first, respect yourselves, and love justice.

I'm told one of the slogans of some of our young people is "never trust anyone over 30." If this be true what a sad commentary on the lack of communication, of understanding between our generation and yours. I will admit to being over 30, and I would hope my contemporaries would not lose your trust. But, if you must discriminate, if you must be prejudiced, perhaps the generation which perfected the hydrogen bomb is as worthy of your lack of trust as any.

Let me say, too, that your addiction to folk songs and blue jeans and tennis shoes is a poor case for those who find you make them uncomfortable.

And to those who found a dilemma in the spectacle of young people from the same generation joining the Peace Corps, helping stem the raging Mississippi and picketing against the established policy of a community or a nation, I suggest there is no anomaly here.

These young people were each reacting, in ways which were really remarkably similar, to challenges which they could see, not challenges to policy, not challenges to authority, not challenges to order, but challenges to something more basic—challenges to life itself.

I don't automatically agree with every young person I see carrying a picket sign. I don't assume that a beard and a guitar are the infallible hallmarks of righteousness, and I agree that a vast amount of nonsense makes itself heard as the voice of youth.

But there is something infinitely precious which your generation has brought to a nation which could otherwise be infinitely smug and self-satisfied. It is not difficult, in countries of widespread poverty and obvious oppression, to awaken the spirit of protest and of revolution in which this Nation was founded. What is difficult is to keep the spirit alive when a nation is fat and prosperous, and when injustice masquerades under the guise of that great untouchable and impersonal deity policy.

"Why can't we do this?" asks the impatience of youth. "Because it's never been done that way. It's policy," replies the organization man. Well, we need organization men, and we need policy. But we need, as the world has never before needed, impatient, nonconforming, uncomfortable and uncomforting young men and young women who demand that policy justify itself and that the organization adapt to change.

So, perhaps, in this rite of passage, the tribal elder can only tell the young men and the young women, with a rueful shrug, "We have tried the conventional truths, and they don't always answer the new questions. We have made the customary sacrifices, and chanted the hallowed incantations, and still the rain doesn't come, the crops fail, and the flocks do not multiply as they should. Perhaps the impatient young men and women should give expression to their impatience."

I am not counseling you to throw off all the ancient ideals of the civilization of which you are the heirs. You could not if you would, and you should not, if you could.

And I do not really find much evidence in the rebellious spirit of your generation that you are even seeking to do so. I don't believe for one minute you are losing faith in democracy, in the Constitution, in American liberties and the concept of law and order. On the contrary, I find you making your elders uncomfortable precisely because you have the bad taste to take those concepts literally. You hear talk about free speech. You seek to speak out freely.

You read the 13th and the 14th and the 15th amendments to the Constitution, and you seek the equal justice, the equal opportunity and the equal rights which those honored but unobserved amendments promise.

And above all, I find that perhaps the most disquieting thing your generation is doing is to act as though the most fundamental religious beliefs were literally true. You act as though the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God were facts to be rejoiced in, not platitudes to contemplate in a segregated church on Sunday morning. You act as though the man who drove the money changers from the temple wanted his followers to concern themselves with economic inequities and social justice on weekdays, instead of just putting a dollar in the collection plate on Sundays to feed the distant poor.

You act as though you really thought the peacemakers are blessed. You act, in short, as though Jesus Christ were a man who spoke with authority, instead of just a troublesome Jew, who didn't care much about going through channels.

So I wish you well as you pass from the campus to the world of business or government, or finance, or to your professions, or to further study, or whatever. I assume much of your youthful enthusiasm will be tempered by your further experience. Other generations have been suspected by their elders of being uncontrolled. And the world has gone on. It will change most of you and some of you may change the world. The change in you will be the price you—and we—must pay for the change you will work in us.

Let me close by quoting a great philosopher who said to an audience in Boston over 100 years ago: "Ideals are like stars. You will not succeed in touching them with your hands. But like the seafaring man on the desert of waters, you choose them as your guides and following them you will reach your destiny."

Political Hocus-Pocus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from the May issue of the Hoosier Farmer is illustrative of the thinking of many midwestern farm families and deserves a wide reading and understanding:

POLITICAL HOCUS-POCUS

Why does Farm Bureau oppose many of the "fine" farm programs proposed by the Federal Government? The proposal made to Congress recently by President Johnson provides an excellent example to analyze.

The answer is simple, yet it becomes blurred in the hocus-pocus of political considerations. The truth is that most farmers in Farm Bureau want to be relatively free to make their own management decisions, rather than shift this decisionmaking responsibility to Government. Experience proves that free farmers produce more food efficiently than socialized farmers, and farmers make more net income when they produce for the public market than when they produce for Government.

President Johnson possibly overstated the case when he said earlier this winter that about 1.5 million (about one-half) of our U.S. farmers will be forced to find work elsewhere, yet farmers themselves recognize that there will be fewer farmers in the future.

Why then, in the administration's recent farm program suggestions, do most of the provisions lead to stabilized poverty for most farmers? The answer can only be political.

Instead of helping the net income of farmers in general, the present feed-grain and wheat programs place the control of the market prices for these grains in the hands of the Government. This disrupts not only the grain market to the point that the farmer seldom knows where he stands, but it also upsets the closely-allied livestock industry.

In short, the administration's farm program proposals were designed for farmers by nonfarmers, with no apparent concern for the farmer's welfare. Certainly, they were developed with no counsel from the one really big, general farm organization which represents the vast majority of commercial farmers in the United States—Farm Bureau.

Since the proposal does nothing for the net income of agriculture, and further strangles the system of farming under which efficient farmers have thus far progressed, why wouldn't farmers oppose it through their organization?

Several Congressmen introduced a program in both Houses 2 months ago which has the support of farmers and Farm Bureau. It would let farmers compete in the marketplace, instead of the polling place, for their income. It would keep our country's food production high and efficient. It would cut the cost of farm programs to the Government, thereby cutting taxes. It meets all of the alleged standards of the administration, except it does not deliver the decisionmaking to Government officials.

Why has the Farm Bureau proposal not received any consideration to date by congressional committees? There's been plenty of time. The only reason that is apparent is that it didn't come from the right place. It makes it clear that where agricultural legislation is concerned, Members of Congress are no longer as responsive to the will of farmers as they are to the will of others not farm connected.

Let's hope this leveling technique doesn't blow up in our faces when we find one of these days that we need a "strategic reserve" of food and discover the hard way that Government can't produce it.

Resolution Condemning Traffic in Obscene Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, if there is one issue that the people in my congressional district are united on it is the problem of the easy availability of pornography. There is no greater threat to the moral well-being of this Nation than the flood of filth which is being directed toward our impressionable young people.

In many parts of the Nation, people who should know better merely shrug their shoulders at the filthy books and obscene films and say, "What's the use?"

It is gratifying to know that in the district which I have the honor of representing, action is being taken to eliminate smut. Influential lay and religious leaders are taking the offensive against the filth peddlers. I am very proud of Hudson County and I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a resolution which was adopted by the Hudson County Federation of Holy Name Societies, an organization representing many thousands of Catholic men.

The resolution follows:

Whereas widespread public concern has been evidenced relative to the continued traffic in obscene matters and materials, causing grave national concern; and

Whereas the Federal Government has a responsibility to find more effective ways and means of preventing the transmission of such matters and materials through the instrumentalities which, under the Constitution, are subject to Federal regulation; and

Whereas the State and local governments have perhaps an even greater responsibility in the exercise of their police powers to protect the public, and particularly minors, from the morally corrosive effects of such matters and materials; and

Whereas effective governmental action needs the support and cooperation of an informed public; and

Whereas there is an immediate need for a coordinated effort at the various govern-

mental levels, and by public and private groups, to combat, by all constitutional means, this pernicious traffic; and

Whereas the purpose of bill H.R. 7465, in the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, is to create a Commission, known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials, and which Commission shall consist of 15 members, appointed by the President of the United States, as follows:

1. One from the Senate;
2. One from the House of Representatives;
3. One from the Post Office Department;
4. Two from the Department of Justice; one of whom shall be from the Federal Bureau of Investigation;
5. One from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;
6. Three from the clergy; but no two members shall represent the same faith;
7. One who shall be a prominent librarian;
8. One who shall be a prominent representative of the book publishing industry;
9. One who shall be a prominent representative of the newspaper, magazine, and periodical publishing industry;
10. One who shall be a prominent representative of the motion picture industry;
11. One who shall be a prominent representative of the radio and television industries;
12. One who shall be a chief prosecutor of a city or county government;
13. One who shall be a prominent educator; and

Whereas this Commission shall be invested with the powers of investigation, analysis, and recommendations, and shall report their findings to the President of the United States and to the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Hudson County Federation of Holy Name Societies, representing more than 100,000 Holy Name men of the county of Hudson in the State of New Jersey, does respectfully petition the Congress of the United States for the enactment into law of bill H.R. 7465.

THOMAS CONROY,
Secretary, Hudson County Federation of Holy Name Societies.

Welcome Home, Space Trav'ler—With a Bourbon Street Beat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, while the contributions of the city of New Orleans to America's heritage are legion, its most famous contribution is in the field of music.

Virtually anywhere a person may go on the face of the earth, he will find some rendition of New Orleans' most famous export, Dixieland jazz.

And, Mr. Speaker, now that Americans are literally walking in space, I predict that it will not be too many years before celestial versions of the Bourbon Street beat will be just as commonplace as the earthly arrangements.

Therefore I find it most fitting to point out to my colleagues that a New Orleans song writer has already taken steps to make this leap forward.

The song writer, Gaston Olivier, has composed a tuneful and topical musical item entitled "Welcome Home, Space Trav'ler." I have heard a recording of this, and I sincerely hope that my colleagues also soon will be hearing this Bourbon Street tribute to our astronauts.

Since New Orleans is the home of the huge Michoud operations of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Mr. Olivier's song is all the more appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to salute Mr. Olivier's inspiration and to commend his continuance of a long history of made-in-New Orleans music.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, nothing would make me happier than to have the first men on the moon to be Americans who arrived via rockets made in New Orleans, and who stepped off humming "Welcome Home, Space Trav'ler"—with a Bourbon Street beat.

American History—A Forward Step by Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, this, indeed, is a critical era in world affairs; and also a time of grave peril for free institutions wherever they exist. Patriotism and a just and indispensable nationalism have been deplored and downgraded in our own land—especially in the ranks of our youth. There has been grave failure in the teaching—in any adequate manner—in our educational institutions of American history—especially that dealing with the colonization, revolutionary, and founding years.

It is therefore refreshing, and most encouraging, to know that in a few of our States, praiseworthy and effective steps have been taken, and are being taken, to counteract the situation thus presented. My own great State, Wisconsin, is one of these. Recently there was enacted, by the legislature and approved by Governor Warren Knowles, an act designating the month of February in each year as "American History Month." This, I would submit, is a fine and truly forward step in the cause of freedom and patriotic endeavor; and those responsible therefor are entitled to the commendation of all our citizens.

It is to be hoped that Wisconsin's action in this connection will not only be of great inspirational and practical benefit in the State, but, as well, of great value to the Nation at large.

For the purpose of aiding in the dissemination of this important enactment, under unanimous consent I include a copy of the act at this point in the RECORD.

STATE OF WISCONSIN, SENATE BILL 128

An act to create 14.238 of the statutes, relating to American History Month

The people of the State of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

14.238 of the statutes is created to read:

14.238 American History Month: To emphasize the spirit of America and Americanism and to remind the citizens of this State of the history of our Nation and its free institutions, the month of February in each year is designated "American History Month" and the Governor is directed to annually issue a suitable proclamation for the observance thereof.

An Open Letter From a Columnist to His Son—A Tribute to All America's 1965 Graduating Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of America's most distinguished columnists, Mr. Herbert Lyon, has captured in his column, which he dedicated to his son, a 1965 graduate, the mood of all parents and, indeed, all the people of the Nation regarding the thousands of young people graduating this year.

Mr. Ed McElroy, past commander of the Catholic War Veterans, has called this column to my attention and I am including it in the RECORD today because it so dramatically describes the world which our young graduates are facing this summer. He has put into beautiful words the thoughts that all of us have been experiencing as parents during the past 2 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

OPEN LETTER FROM A COLUMNIST TO HIS SON

(By Herb Lyon)

DEAR JEFF: This is it. I can hardly believe the big day is at hand. It's been a while, 4 years to be exact, since my last wide-open communication to you; that was the day you grabbed your high school diploma. I hope you don't mind, old boy, if I once again use you as a symbol—the symbol of all the university grads of the class of 1965. At approximately 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, you'll knock down that treasured hunk of parchment at Northwestern University's McGaw Hall, along with 1,508 of your fellow seniors. And like every concerned parent, similarly awed, I'm a proud, if sentimental guy today. * * * The years have flashed by all too fast. As you well know, I'm not the kind of a fellow who bawls easy, nor is your mother, but I don't doubt we'll be shedding a happy, nostalgic tear or three as the ritualistic commencement ceremonies spin along. I'll be remembering many things: the long, cigarette-studded wait in a cold hospital corridor as you entered this mixed-up world. The scores of anxieties when we excitedly brought you, our first born, home; and the long, sometimes bittersweet, years in between. It isn't a breeze being a parent these days and only a devoted one can ever know the depth of feeling, the torment, the gladness that goes into bringing a kid through it all to his 21st year—and to his graduation from college. One day you'll understand.

Tomorrow is somehow the wrap-up, yet only the beginning. Exit the boy, enter the man, so to speak. I've tried to be a worthy example, but like most preoccupied, busy pops, I've goofed on occasion. Yet mostly we've had a clear, honorable relationship and the kind of realistic understanding that

makes everything all right with the world. As I watch you tomorrow, I'm sure I'll be more humble than boastful at the find kind of a guy you turned out to be. Yours is a generation born into a war. So was mine. And still we live in a time of clash, chaos, and hate. But even as we adults commiserate over our errors, I'm oddly excited. I have looked into the eager eyes of you and your contemporaries. You are by some divine instinct able to pillory the phonies, the fakes, and double dealers faster than we ever were. You are involved and aware and ready to tackle the urgent problems of our time, without hypocrisy and with a reassuring directness.

As in the wide sweep of this great Nation of ours, the men and women of the class of 1965 are, in the main, solid Americans who fully understand the meaning of those greatest of words—duty, honor, country. The fringe people are really getting nowhere—and we can all thank God that the commonsense majority still prevails. Especially among the kids of your generation. The outlook for the crackpots and demagogs is bleak. You young adults make me optimistic. But what of Vietnam, Red China, Russia, Cuba, the constant threat of annihilation? What about the burning questions of racial injustice and the exaggerated breakdown in ethics, morals, and decency we keep hearing about? I'm back to our favorite quote: "Plus çá change, plus c'est la même chose"—The more things change the more they remain the same. 'Twas ever thus, but who knows what tomorrow may bring? Doggone it, son, all I know is we're still here and battling for the same principles as always. And just might win.

Lest I begin to sound like one of those platitudinous commencement orators, you gotta know your old man is a realist before anything else. The days, the weeks, the years ahead are fraught with peril; much isn't as it should be in this land of the free. But we're also still the home of the brave * * *. To you and your fellow graduates in the class of 1965 I say, you've got the brains, the humanity, the moral fiber, and the youthful drive to maintain and propel us into a more perfect future. The exciting challenge is yours. Make the most of it.

Son, I feel a trifle old today, but I'm somehow thrilled to know you, too, have chosen journalism and will raise your typewriter in the cause of the betterment of mankind. And an extra bit rewarded at the Sigma Delta Chi award you modestly won as the outstanding male student in this year's graduating journalism class. Make your words and deeds count, old buddy.

Congratulations and love.

DAD.

Vietnam—The President Has Answered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in a recent column David Lawrence outlined steps the President has taken to inform the world of our reasons for defending southeast Asia. Mr. Lawrence has also suggested a new way to publicize our position, and because it is worthy of serious consideration I include his thoughts on this important matter here in the RECORD.

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR? THE PRESIDENT HAS ANSWERED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—There was an art festival at the White House on Monday. It took the time and attention of the President of the United States. The occasion had a praiseworthy purpose. But there is something far more important which needs the time and attention of the Nation's Chief Executive right now. It's the wavering morale of the parents and relatives of the more than 50,000 American boys who are fighting the war in Vietnam.

These families cannot know what is going on in the jungles of Vietnam just by reading the newspapers, and naturally little mention of individuals is made unless there are casualties. Meanwhile, what the critics are saying, both here and abroad, is widely publicized. The impression is given that it is a useless war and that the lives of the American boys are being sacrificed in vain.

The real truth, however, is that the Americans in Vietnam are performing a service not only for the 190 million people in the United States, but also for the hundreds of millions of human beings in other countries who are being protected against a nuclear war because of the steadfastness and resoluteness of America's Armed Forces.

President Johnson is conscious of the worries and anxieties of the families of the Americans who are in Vietnam. But he admitted on Tuesday that he had a difficult time replying to a letter from a mother whose son was en route to Vietnam. He said he told her the Nation's liberty and freedom are so precious that her son's service is needed in Vietnam. But there has not yet been a definitive declaration telling the parents and relatives of the members of the Armed Forces of the United States why the mission in southeast Asia is so vitally important.

President Johnson could readily dramatize at a ceremony in the White House the reasons why American troops are in Vietnam. A delegation of parents of soldiers, airmen, and sailors in southeast Asia could be brought to the White House at Government expense so that the President personally could explain the war and what it means not only to the American people but to the world as a whole. Such an occasion would serve also to remind the parents of many boys who have not yet gone to vietnam that if a crisis comes, they, too, must be prepared for the great sacrifices that are necessary to prevent a nuclear war.

President Johnson did make a generalized speech on April 7 at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, but what he said then about Vietnam needs reiteration. Mr. Johnson declared:

"Tonight Americans and Asians are dying for a world where each people may choose its own path to change.

"This is the principle for which our ancestors fought in the valleys of Pennsylvania. It is a principle for which our sons fight tonight in the jungles of Vietnam.

"Vietnam is far away from this quiet campus. We have no territory there, nor do we seek any. The war is dirty and brutal and difficult. And some 400 young men, born into an America that is bursting with opportunity and promise, have ended their lives on Vietnam's steaming soil.

"Why must we take this painful road? Why must this Nation hazard its ease, its interest, and its power for the sake of a people so far away?

"We fight because we must fight if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny, and only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure.

"Over this war—and all Asia—is another reality: The deepening shadow of Communist China. The rulers in Hanoi are urged on by Peiping. This is a regime which has destroyed freedom in Tibet, which has attacked India, and has been condemned by the United Nations for aggression in Korea. It is a nation which is helping the forces of violence in almost every continent. The contest in Vietnam is part of a wider pattern of aggressive purposes.

"We are also there to strengthen world order. Around the globe, from Berlin to Thailand, are people whose well-being rests in part on the belief that they can count on us if they are attacked. To leave Vietnam to its fate would shake the confidence of all these people in the value of an American commitment and in the value of America's word. The result would be increased unrest and instability, and even wider war.

"We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

The President could say a lot more at a White House ceremony and awaken an appreciation of the service being rendered by brave American boys as they risk their lives so that their families and their fellow Americans at home may be spared the horrors of a nuclear war.

The Capitol—Chronicle of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker—

It is dawn * * * overture to another day in the history of the United States. Here atop its hill in Washington, D.C., the building waits for those who will come to it and give it life. Waits for the Congress whose home it is. There is no structure in the country more important than this building; no monument to democracy more surpassing than this building. For within its walls, America—through its elected Representatives—rules as master of its fate; indeed, sometimes * * * in deciding for war or peace * * * the fate of humanity, whose every nation (no matter its distance from it) knows the fate of this building.

With these lines, narrated by Raymond Massey, an exciting and educational experience begins. This is part of the description of the Capitol, written by television producer Lou Hazam that opens his 1-hour documentary, "The Capitol—Chronicle of Freedom."

Many of us first became acquainted with the television creativity of Mr. Hazam so successfully applied to America's lawmaking home, shortly before the inauguration. NBC–TV presented the program as a news special so that the art, architecture and history of this building, on whose steps stood the inaugural stand, might be better known.

Subsequently, the acclaim of the press and the public led to special showings of the program here on Capitol Hill, and an even greater appreciation of this color masterpiece developed. In fact, the U.S. Capitol Historical Society held a luncheon honoring Mr. Hazam at which Vice President HUMPHREY presented him a citation of merit.

Because of my belief in the exceptional educational value of "The Capitol—

Chronicle of Freedom," I am pleased to call my colleagues' and constituents' attention to a scheduled rebroadcast. William K. Divers, president of the Savings and Loan Foundation, sponsor of the program, informs me "The Capitol—Chronicle of Freedom" will be telecast Sunday, October 17, at 6:30-7:30 p.m., e.d.t.

I think this early hour is especially appropriate for I know it means that millions of school students will have a rich opportunity to learn more about their country's Capitol. Further, I am confident that all who see the program will be left with a feeling of patriotic pride, for it is in this building, the Capitol, that the voice of a democracy—the people—is heard.

AEC Site at Fort Custer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, last week, a presentation was made to the Atomic Energy Commission by the Michigan Department of Economic Expansion, proposing that the new AEC high energy accelerator be located in Michigan. One of the two sites proposed was Fort Custer, which is located near the city of Battle Creek, in the Third Congressional District. Needless to say, I intend to support this proposal to the best of my ability.

The attractions of the Fort Custer site were, I think, put exceptionally well in an editorial in the Battle Creek Enquirer-News, in its issue of Friday, June 18.

Under unanimous consent I place this editorial in the RECORD:

SO, WE HOPE HE READS THIS

Our lead editorial today is based upon a letter from the White House expressing President Johnson's appreciation for our support of his foreign policy.

Naturally, we are quite pleased to know that the President reads some of our editorial comment and we hope that what follows, herein, also will reach his desk.

Fort Custer, on the western periphery of the Battle Creek area, is under consideration by the Atomic Energy Commission as the possible site for a huge, $280 million nuclear energy research center.

The Department of Defense soon is expected to declare the fort's land surplus, thereby releasing it for use by other agencies of Government. The National Guard wants a large portion of the property. Even if the Guard gets what it wishes, there still will be enough land for the nuclear installation.

We appreciate the fact that at least 39 States are bidding for this project. We also realize, with regret, that it will be hard to escape the influence of politics in the final decision as to which locality does get AEC approval.

However, we submit that the Fort Custer site should be chosen for the following reasons:

The State of Michigan in general—and Battle Creek in particular—need this plant. In the increasing trend toward electronics and aerospace research and development, Battle Creek, like most midwestern communities, has disappointedly watched the South, the Southwest, and California acquire plant after plant and the economic prosperity that goes with new industry.

We can understand why electronics and space work has been concentrated in those regions. Climatic conditions, such as low humidity, and great reaches of clear atmosphere are a deciding factor. Delicate electronics instruments and devices give less trouble in dry, fairly stable weather conditions. Extreme visibility is a prime requirement in missile and rocket tests.

But a nuclear energy plant does not necessarily require such perfect climate. All that's basically needed is suitable terrain, sufficient water, good communications facilities and, of course, a friendly community.

The Fort Custer site offers every one of these elements.

Argentina's Decree Against the Drug Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, some of my colleagues have expressed alarm over the Argentine Government's decree which it is claimed could drive its pharmaceutical industry out of business by imposing totally unrealistic price restrictions. Such an event—a real tragedy for both Argentina's economy and the well-being of her people—would appear to be the inevitable result of decree No. 3042.

Warnings of the grave consequences to follow if this decree is enforced in its present form have been voiced by various segments of Argentine life, including major business and industrial associations as well as medical authorities. They contend that the decree could force into bankruptcy a highly developed pharmaceutical industry whose 20,000 employees supply the nation with its lifesaving drugs.

The Argentine people have been enjoying the health benefits of modern drug discovery and manufacture. The government action which could destroy this vital industry warrants great concern.

I note that investment circles in both Argentina and the United States are closely watching these actions and suggest that Members of the Congress do likewise.

A description of this situation in Argentina was recently published in the monthly bulletin of the Buenos Aires branch of the First National Bank of Boston. I include this article in the RECORD following my remarks:

THE SITUATION IN ARGENTINA

GENERAL CONDITIONS

The President of the Republic delivered his traditional message to the joint meeting of Congress on May 1 to inaugurate the regular legislative session which will last until September 30. The House of Deputies, having incorporated the new members elected March 14, then set about organizing its 22 administrative committees. This process, frequently not easy from the political standpoint, was further complicated by events in the Dominican Republic which produced a House resolution criticizing American moves there. The administration dispatched a medical team which performed valued services in the hospitals of troubled Santo Domingo, but severe differences of opinion, both in the Congress and within the Cabinet, have delayed any decision on the question of whether Argentine military forces will join the inter-American forces there. Important legislative matters could not be acted upon during May for lack of a quorum but, at month end, major House committee assignments were completed and it appears that the ruling UCRP will have the chairmanship of nine, including Foreign Affairs, Defense, Finance, and Budget, while Peronista-oriented Deputies will preside over eight, including Industry, Commerce, Justice, and Public Works. The completion of these organizational arrangements will clear the way for the normal legislative processing of many pending matters.

Our final page includes a résumé of Argentina's overseas debt, both Government and private. It is generally recognized that the servicing burden in 1965 and 1966 under present circumstances reaches beyond the economy's capacity to throw off exchange surpluses. The Government has sent a high level mission abroad to negotiate stretch-outs with creditor nations. The basic plan apparently is to ask the so-called Paris Club countries for 5 years of grace and 5 years of subsequent installment refinancing on some US$190 million maturing in each of 1965 and 1966, thus putting well forward the payment of amounts totaling some US$380 million. Simultaneously, the mission will request other creditors to shift from 1965 to 1966 further maturities of Government debts reaching US$110 million. The result would be a reduction of about US$300 million in 1965's requirements, some 35 percent of the total, and about US$80 million in 1966 maturities, about 15 percent of that year's total. Results of the mission's efforts are not yet known but, while the task is not an easy one, it is likely that a cooperative attitude will be encountered in most places.

Figures published by the Secretariat of Fuel and Power this month indicate that volume of crude oil production in Argentina for January through April ran about 3.7 percent lower than the corresponding period last year and that, for the month of April, the comparison was even wider. Meanwhile, consumption continues to rise with increased industrial activity and normal growth. This situation has necessitated additional imports of crude and other petroleum products, exchange expenditures for which have reached about U.S.$30 million for the first 4 months of 1965, more than double 1964's equivalent figure. The administration has reached out-of-court settlements with one Argentine company and two overseas groups whose contracts were annulled in 1963. However, in these particular cases, the amount of petroleum actually produced was either nonexistent or relatively small in the overall picture and the arrangements did not involve the payment of substantial amounts in foreign currency. Efforts to reach out-of-court settlements on the annulment of contracts pertaining to the large producers are being stepped up but, beyond a certain amount of press optimism, no specific details have been published and, of course, it is not known how any settlements that may arise will affect the overseas debt picture.

On April 28, decree No. 3042 came into force, providing for sweeping Ministry of Social Welfare and Public Health control over costing, marketing and pricing in the

pharmaceutical industry. Drug prices in many countries are subject to criticism by consumer and government alike, and Argentina is no exception. There are some 7,500 retail drugstores in the country, including about 200 cooperatives—largely operating in the Greater Buenos Aires area and mostly controlled by union organizations. Presently, there are about 150 major producers, many of international fame, manufacturing a broad line of products and accounting for about 90 percent of the industry's output. Some retail drugs tend to be expensive, although not more so than in other countries, and there are high advertising expenses involved in establishing new product markets. Basically, decree No. 3042 requires that producers establish on sworn declarations submitted to the Ministry their direct cost of production for each product, including raw material, direct labor and packaging expenses, using costs which cannot exceed certain guidelines. The measure then establishes percentages of the resulting cost of production as the upper limits for administrative, advertising, royalty, marketing, financial and other indirect costs, as well as amortization, research expense applicable and profit margin. The markup by jobbers and retailers, both private and cooperative, is also fixed—the co-ops having considerable advantage—and the price to the consumer must be uniform throughout the country and clearly marked on each package. Trade sources mention the decree will involve substantial paperwork and doubt its efficiency in achieving a reduction in drug prices. Beyond these problems, the measure establishes limits on amounts of royalty payments and restricts such agreements to a maximum validity of 5 years. From an economic standpoint, the producers claim that the limitations in the decree will lead many manufacturers into financial difficulty and have requested urgent modification.

H.R. 3014

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

The House, sitting as Committee of the Whole, had under consideration H.R. 3014, the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act, to which the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] had offered by amending to strike out section 7.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the last speaker has caused me to come to the well of the House to speak to you. I can assure my able and beloved friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON], that I am not going to go out to the cloakroom and smoke a cigarette.

I have not smoked a cigarette since the Surgeon General spoke. I am not going to commit suicide. Instead, I wish the satisfaction of leading my younger colleagues in the way of good health and conduct they should travel.

If some of my colleagues have not yet stopped smoking, let me tell them that stopping if properly directed can give the greatest kick in the world. There is no pain to it. You want a cigarette and old habit gnaws on you, and you have the urge to surrender—then you say to yourself, "At last I am free, at last I do not have to reach into my pocket and get a cigarette and search for a match, and wear my strength out, puffing in smoke and puffing it out—a wierd and funny sort of way to live a life, from all of which I now am free." If my colleagues will approach in this manner the big question of whether it is better to keep on smoking or undergo the pains of quitting they will be in for a real adventure.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Certainly, I yield to my good friend who inspired this talk of mine.

Mr. JOELSON. I would say to the gentleman, in my opinion since you have smoked before, you are the only advertisement for the benefits that come from smoking that I have ever seen.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. May I explain to my friend that I thought I might be getting a little old and perhaps before many more election days rolled around I should do something to get younger. So I stopped smoking.

Since I have stopped smoking, I calculate I have cut off about 20 years from my age but I have taken on about 20 pounds—and that I do not like.

Seriously, my colleagues, I would not want this opportunity to go by without preaching a sermon. Sometimes I have thought that the good Lord intended me to be a preacher—and I gummed it up.

But now let me tell you something that I observed many, many years ago. I was 30 years old and I was called upon to preside over the State senate in Illinois. You know when you are 30 years old, you think you know it all—at least you observe things—and I did observe things. I observed that there were three members of the State senate who did not smoke. I noticed that always when they got up to speak, they would be quicker on the trigger. That observation has remained with me through life.

I know that when somebody asks you a perplexing question, you do not quickly answer yes or no—you want to compose yourself, so you pull a cigarette out and take a few puffs—as though you were a philosopher. The puff on the cigarette can become the alibi for a lazy mind.

But I must go back a little bit further and tell you that when I was a boy, any man who smoked a cigarette was regarded as a queer fellow. You could not convince people otherwise.

There was a great prosecutor in New York. He prosecuted the Harry Thaw case. He was regarded all over the country as the top advocate of the law of that period—certainly the best known.

People could not understand how this fellow could smoke a cigarette. They would get together and say "How could he do it? How come he won that case? How could he move any jury? He seems to be an intelligent man, yet he must be a moron. He smokes cigarettes." That was the final verdict.

In the old days at Springfield when I presided over the State Senate of Illinois, we had a fine lady, Lucy Page Gaston. Every session she came in with her anti-cigarette bill. She never got any place with it. I do not think she ever got as many as 3 votes for it, yet everybody liked her, and in a way pitied her for giving her life to an unpaid service for a thankless cause.

Mr. Chairman, now I realize that Lucy Page Gaston wore the apparel of an angel and today my vote will be in testimony to the influence of this humble woman who many years ago had the faith in her mission and the courage to carry on. Perhaps she had her hand on JIM ROOSEVELT's head when he presented this amendment, for which I shall vote.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Parkersburg, W. Va., Site of New Production Facility of Marbon Chemical Division of Borg-Warner Corp.—Industrial Expansion Continues To Aid Resurgence of Appalachian Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a new production facility at Marbon Chemical Division of Borg-Warner Corp., near Parkersburg, W. Va., was dedicated on June 2, 1965. Participating in this notable event were: Hon. Hulett C. Smith, Governor of the State of West Virginia; Hon. Koder Collison, commissioner of the State's department of commerce; Lester G. Porter, president of Borg-Warner Corp.; Robert Shattuck, group vice president of Borg-Warner; and, William A. Suiter, president of Marbon.

It was my privilege to take part in the dedication and to join in a tour of the chemical complex. We were impressed by the recent expansion and welcomed this opportunity to meet and talk with a number of Marbon employees.

Mr. President, here is a concrete example of the dynamic business and industrial forces that are regenerating the West Virginia economy.

The size of Marbon Chemical is impressive. It covers 65 acres along the Ohio River south of Parkersburg. The spirit of Marbon people and their pride in the company and its products is a definite factor in the organization's success. Marbon is a valued industrial citizen of the Mountain State—one which has achieved a position of importance. Its role in the continuing economic renaissance of West Virginia will be increasingly significant.

Borg-Warner entered the chemical field in 1934 in Gary, Ind., by purchasing the Marsene Transparent Paper Co., changing its name to Marbon Corp., forerunner of Marbon Chemical. The company originally manufactured a transparent film made from casein—a derivative of milk. Following an extensive research program over many years, the original business was dropped in favor of crude rubber derivatives.

During the early years of World War II, this company developed and was the only source of cyclo rubber used exclusively as radar cable insulation. Operations were veiled in secrecy as this material was critical—particularly in the Battle of Britain where the newly developed radar system allowed the RAF to be most effective against unfavorable odds.

The chain of events that led Marbon to West Virginia began in the late 1940's in Gary, Ind., according to Robert Shattuck, then president of Marbon and now group vice president of Borg-Warner.

At the recent dedicatory ceremony, Mr. Shattuck noted that Marbon research personnel conducted extensive work with combinations of acrylonitrile, butadiene and styrene chemicals. As a result, the company placed an ABS—acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene—plastic on the market in 1952. Its tradename was Cycolac. Three years later, this tough, rigid material caused Marbon officials to face a major decision. Where could the company grow to meet the demand for Cycolac? Facilities at the Indiana plant were overcrowded. Less than 5 acres of property were owned. In addition, it seemed desirable at this time for Marbon to acquire a site of substantial acreage for current as well as future expansion.

In August 1953, a comprehensive survey was commenced with the objective of finding a suitable industrial site.

According to Mr. Shattuck, specifications for the site were approximately these: about 300 acres of land; flood free on a navigable waterway; served by rail and highway; and in a pleasant community.

A professional search group was engaged and over 7,000 miles of waterfront industrial sites were surveyed commencing on the Mississippi River at Paducah, Ky., and extending north throughout Kentucky and West Virginia along the Ohio River to Pittsburgh and on a 150-mile stretch along the south shore of Lake Erie.

As a result of this survey, five sites were selected for consideration. One of these sites was in Pennsylvania, two were in Kentucky, one on the Kanawha River near Charleston, W. Va., and finally the present site near Parkersburg.

Ground was broken in 1956 on February 22—George Washington's birthday. Quite appropriate since the land was once surveyed and owned by General Washington.

The new plant went into production approximately one year later. In August 1958, the company completed an administration building and research center, and moved its headquarters to Washington, W. Va.—a suburb of Parkersburg.

The recently dedicated production unit adds 40 million pounds annually to the plant's total ABS plastic capacity. It makes Marbon's Parkersburg plant the largest ABS plastic manufacturing facility in the world—with present annual capacity of 140 million pounds. This is more than 11 times its original size in 1957—which was 12 million pounds. It is interesting to note that since coming to West Virginia, this company's sales have increased 710 percent.

To West Virginia and to Parkersburg, here is probably the most important fact: When Marbon came to the State over 8 years ago, it transferred about 40 employees to the area. Today, the company employs over 750 people—most of them natives of West Virginia. The importance of this company to the area and State's economic health is self-evident.

From its small beginning just 30 years ago, Marbon today is an international business with eight plants located in the United States and overseas.

In addition to its continuing growth at Parkersburg, other expansions of its chemical facilities are taking place this year at the division's original plant at Gary where the company makes resins for the rubber and paint industries, and at a plant in Baytown, Tex., where it produces styrene monomer, a petrochemical raw material for many of its products.

Ground was broken this spring for a new plastics plant in Amsterdam, Holland, to supply Common Market countries.

Other company operations are located in Scottsburg, Ind.; Fremont, Ohio; and Oxnard, Calif. Foreign markets are served by plants in Grangemouth, Scotland, and Ube City, Japan.

The products which Marbon's professional people have developed and are marketing have helped lift the dimension of living in the 20th century. Not only are these products being refined and their markets broadened, but newer, more exciting products are continually being developed.

In a day, you may come in contact with Marbon products not once, but many times—at home, at work, at play and on the road.

Through its five main product lines—rubber resins, paint resins, ABS plastics, latices and adhesives—Marbon products have practically unlimited applications. However, research is the key to progress, and Marbon scientists are continually seeking new products and applications at the company's Parkersburg research center.

What does all of this mean to the State of West Virginia?

At the recent dedication, I talked with Lester G. Porter, president of Borg-Warner Corp.—the parent company of Marbon. He plans for the future.

In Mr. Porter's address, he noted that the Parkersburg area could well be "the core of Marbon's future growth." He also said that the corporation "is deeply interested in the economic factors which will affect the future of West Virginia and permit Borg-Warner to make a major investment in its chemical business in or near Parkersburg."

Mr. Porter added:

From all that is taking place, it seems to me that Marbon and Borg-Warner have the ingredients for growth and development in West Virginia.

My visit with these leaders causes me to believe that a productive change can come to West Virginia through chemical and related business. The development is all part of the petrochemical industry that must be encouraged to grow in our area. This industry, through the magic of chemistry, generates a host of materials that in turn make possible not only new plastics, but also fibers for clothing, rubber products, agricultural chemicals, paints and several building materials products. Petrochemicals can be the key that will unlock the doors of opportunity for many West Virginia businesses and create much employment.

West Virginia has great natural resources and unexcelled beauty. It is a wonderful land in which to live. Most important—it is in the heart of the great industrial east. By encouraging companies like Marbon to establish basic industries in the State, added employment will stimulate the economy through the chemical and satellite businesses. And we will provide a practical approach to the problems we identify with Appalachia.

Marine Wages Successful 10-Year Battle Against Polio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, grit and determination to overcome adversity are traits of character we all admire.

A young man from Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in my congressional district, Gunnery Sgt. John T. Margie, U.S. Marine Corps, was stricken with polio in 1955 after serving with distinction in the Korean conflict as a member of the 7th Marine Regiment of the 1st Marine Division.

Now, after 10 years of treatment and therapy, he has regained the full use of his limbs and as a recent ceremony was presented with a certificate of retirement from the Marine Corps and now holds an administrative position with the Naval Reserve and Training Department, Headquarters, 4th Naval District, Philadelphia.

Sergeant Margie's story is a classic example of the value of courage in overcoming serious obstacles to a happy and productive life. I am sure this same demonstration of courage will hold him in good stead in the years that follow.

In the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Thursday, June 17, 1965, a feature article, written by Mr. John C. Bush, himself a naval officer, appeared, and as part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Bush's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, June 17, 1965]

MARGIE WAGES LONG BATTLE TO RECOVER

The grit and determination which have characterized the U.S. Marine Corps have gained added lustre with the completion of a Wilkes-Barre sergeant's successful fight to overcome a crippling polio infection.

Gunnery Sgt. John T. Margie, wounded in the bitter Korean battles with the Chinese Reds, was stricken after returning from the Far East. His back, legs, and left arm paralyzed, he was first hospitalized in Lima, Ohio, where he had been on recruiting duty, and later spent 2 years in the Philadelphia Naval Hospital.

Now after 10 years of treatment and therapy, undertaken with the unyielding resolve that he would regain the full use of his limbs, Sergeant Margie has attained his goal. At a recent ceremony, he was presented a certificate of retirement from the Marines. Presently, he is attached to the administrative office of the Naval Reserve and Training Department Headquarters, Fourth Naval District.

Margie, a son of Edward F. Margie, 211 Madison Street, city, and the late Mrs. Margie, was graduated in 1947 from Coughlin High School, where he was a member of the varsity basketball team. The following year, he joined the Marine Corps.

He served in the Mediterranean area, and aboard U.S.S. *Worchester*, U.S.S. *Midway*, and U.S.S. *Leyte*. When the Korean conflict erupted, he was sent there with the 7th Marine Regiment of the 1st Marine Division.

In the bitter winter of 1951, the local Marine's group was nearly trapped when the Chinese Reds entered the conflict and met the combined South Korean and American forces at the Chosin Reservoir. Sergeant Margie was wounded in that battle, and in addition to the Purple Heart has been awarded a number of other decorations.

After returning to this country, he was assigned to recruiting duty. In 1955, he was escorting a group of newly enlisted marines to a train in Defiance, Ohio, when stricken. After hospitalization in Lima, he was flown to the Philadelphia Naval Hospital, where he remained for the next 2 years.

After that, a schedule of continued treatment and physical therapy was initiated, and as a result, the local marine was able to vanquish the disease and its crippling effects.

Sergeant Margie and his wife, the former Rosalie McHale of Kingston, reside at 612 Vassar Road, "Oak Valley," Wenonah, N.J., with their three children, Linda Ann, 11; Tommy, 10, and Donna, 8.

The Saline Water Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, next to the air we breathe, clear, fresh water is perhaps this country's most vital resource. Every facet of life depends on sufficient quantities of it.

Yet, today, many Americans live in regions which are suffering from acute shortages of potable water. In the Florida Keys, in southern California, and Arizona, and in parts of the industrial Northeast, these shortages already approach crippling proportions. Scientists tell us it is only a matter of time before other areas of the Nation will find that their thirst, too, is unquenchable.

The Department of the Interior estimates that 1980 will be the critical year. By then, the demand everywhere in the United States will have outstripped the supply obtainable from natural sources.

Clearly, if we are to continue to prosper—and perhaps even to survive—we shall be forced to turn to the last great untapped reservoir available—the sea.

Fortunately, the Federal Government recognized our needs in this respect long before the problem was so acute. Beginning with the Saline Water Act of 1952, Congress has passed a series of laws providing funds for a sensible, orderly program of research into the problems of converting salt water to sweet water. Five experimental desalination plants have been constructed, each one utilizing a different process; and, today, desalting technology stands on a high plane of refinement.

But, as we in the Senate acknowledged yesterday, in passing the saline water bill of 1965, there is still much to be done in this field. We have approved an additional $200 million, and have extended the life of the program until 1972, so that the final barrier to a limitless flow of clean, pure water can be assaulted, so that water obtained from the sea and brackish inland sources can be made economically competitive with conventionally supplied water.

The day of the leveling of the "cost barrier" need not be far off. Thirteen years ago, desalinated water cost in the neighborhood of $4.50 per 1,000 gallons. Presently, its cost ranges between $1 and $1.25 per 1,000 gallons. By 1975, according to the Office of Science and Technology, it will be possible to build combined nuclear electricity-saline water conversion plants that will produce clean water for about 20 to 25 cents per 1,000 gallons.

When that day arrives, the deserts will blossom in abundance; new cities will spring up on land where previously the cactus was the only visible sign of life; old, established urban areas will be given new impetus for growth; and industry and agriculture everywhere will expand and develop with renewed force and vigor. The sweeping changes which desalinated water promises to bring will reach into every American home. Quite possibly, their effects will be as significant and as far reaching as those of any earlier scientific or technological breakthrough. Certainly, the drama of the transformation of barren wastes into fertile fields rivals even that of astronauts spinning high above the earth's surface.

But, Mr. President, if promise is to become reality, both Congress and the executive must continue their enlightened approach to the entire problem of water supply. We must stand ready to initiate and pass whatever proposed legislation may be required in the future. For the present, I congratulate both the House and the Senate on the passage of the saline water bill, and urge an early signing of this vital measure into law by the President.

No National Outcry Against Chicago Demonstrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an article by Paul Harvey which appeared in the Gadsden, Ala., Times on June 20. Mr. Harvey's discussion of the lawlessness in Chicago as contrasted to that in Selma, Ala., shows clearly the double standard exercised by much of the news media and others in their continuing attacks upon the South.

[From the Gadsden Times, June 20, 1965]

FERMENT, BITTERNESS, AND THE THREAT OF BLOODSHED TAUNTS LIFE OF CHICAGO

(By Paul Harvey)

This is Chicago. The long, hot summer has begun. In the concrete canyons of the Loop and in the steamy asphalt jungles which surround it, there is ferment, bitterness, and the threat of bloodshed.

Three weeks ago in Chicago, Harlem Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL urged Negroes to seek for themselves "audacious power."

Coincidence or not, since that speech the tempo of marching, picketing, demonstrating has increased in Chicago.

During the 2-day visit of the astronauts, the entire city held its breath over the brazen boast by a rabble-rousing "rights" leader who threatened to "do something that will upset the whole country." He didn't.

Overwhelmed by official pleading, public indignation, and newspaper warnings "not to go too far," the demonstrators kept their peace for 24 hours.

The next day the midcity marching began again, protesting "de facto school segregation," demanding the outster of School Superintendent Willis.

Every day now it's something else. A local demonstration leader says the "real target is Mayor Daley."

"If we can topple the Daley machine in Chicago, we can topple the machine of any northern city. If we can't do it with marches we will take economic means."

Comic-crusader Dick Gregory urged followers to turn on all water faucets and thus cripple the city's water supply.

He and 440 others including James Farmer, were arrested earlier this month, detained, then released.

As these were handcuffed and tossed into police vans, the Chicago press gave this local story less picture coverage than it customarily gives to similar incidents in the South.

Selma, Ala.'s mayor wondered why. He sent a telegram to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS asking why Mrs. Douglas did not participate in the demonstrations in Chicago. She had gone all the way to Selma, Ala., to march, said Mayor Joe Smitherman.

"If coming to Selma, Ala., was in our national interest, certainly you could do as much good in taking the same action in your own State."

LeRoy Collins, President Johnson's troubleshooter in race relations, in Chicago last week, urged northerners to "view their own ghettos instead of concentrating on southern racial problems." He termed Chicago's South Side Negro neighborhoods "sickening," "a disgrace."

He said, "the urban ghetto of Chicago, and everywhere it exists, feeds on its own filth—then spreads its poison, physical and moral, through the whole body of our population."

It was such a little while ago that Chicago's press and public officials—and some clergy—were so generous with their carte blanche castigation and condemnation of the South.

I knew and said then that there would be a day of reckoning for such hypocrisy. No, I find no satisfaction in the realization of that prediction. Only sadness—to see the storm clouds gather.

Alibates Flint Quarries Reveal Early American History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, now pending before the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is a bill, which I have introduced, to establish the Alibates Flint Quarry, on the Canadian River, as a national monument.

Discovered in 1925, this 300-foot-wide, mile-long shard of a ridge, about 35 miles northeast of the present city of Amarillo, is one of the most significant archeological finds of our time. Alibates flint was the best material for making weapons and tools that the early American man could find; and this particular quarry is the only place where it could be obtained.

Two ancient Pueblo-type villages and numerous campsites have already been discovered, and indicate that a community developed around the quarry. Further archeological explorations will surely uncover many more significant relics of these early years of our continent's history.

In order that further explorations may be promoted and, in order that this important monument of early America may be secured for the intellectual enrichment and pleasure of all the people of Texas and of our Nation, both present and future, I feel that it is the responsibility of this Congress to preserve the Alibates flint quarry as a national monument.

Recently, an article entitled "Alibates Flint Quarry Pinpoint 'Longest Story'" was published in the Amarillo Sunday News-Globe of May 16, 1965. The article was written by Thomas Hough. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Amarillo (Tex.) News-Globe, May 16, 1965]

ALIBATES FLINT QUARRIES PINPOINT LONGEST STORY

(By Thomas Hough)

AMARILLO.—Walking over the Alibates flint quarries in the Texas Panhandle makes a person realize that the Pyramids and China's famous stone wall are recent innovations in man's life upon earth.

The quarry contains the longest story ever told.

When naked early man killed the giant mammoth for food, he used the best weapons he could get: That is why Alibates flint holds such a prominent place in archeology.

Because of a 35-year secret by a dedicated amateur archeologist, and the administrative skills of an Amarillo businessman, the priceless story in the quarries now will be preserved for all mankind.

The businessman is Henry Hertner, a former city commissioner, who took the lead in bringing the project to the attention of Government officials so that the site could be protected as a monument to prehistoric free enterprise.

Back in 1925, Floyd Studer, of Amarillo, discovered the quarries on one of his many field trips. Studer probably has done more poking around in the Panhandle than any other single person.

Many of his artifacts from a lifetime of collecting are displayed in the Panhandle Plains Historical Museum at Canyon.

Studer knew he had a great discovery, but he had no way of exploring it. So he kept it a secret.

He did share his discoveries with a few prominent archelogists. They determined that flint from the Alibates quarries had been taken into Canada, to California—in fact, all over the West.

Alibates flint made the best weapons and tools that early American man could find. And there was only one place in the world where it could be obtained—out of the 300-foot-wide, mile-long shard of a ridge about 35 miles northeast of the present city of Amarillo.

Archeologists say the flint must have had extreme value in order for early man to have carried it so far away from the quarries.

Today a person can see the hundreds, at last count, 550 pits that pock the area. Ancient man used poles, stones, and his hands to root through the weathered surface rock to get solid flint.

Two ancient Pueblo-type villages and numerous campsites in the area indicate that at one time flourishing communities existed.

Competent exploration of ancient civilization takes time and money. Progress is slow. Studer continued to keep secret the location of the quarries.

But then the Canadian River Water Authority began planning Sanford Dam to contain Lake Meredith. The water will be used by 11 west Texas cities, and the lake is planned as a recreation area for water sports enthusiasts.

VFW Citation to the Defenders of Quemoy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as Members of this House are well aware, is one of our most helpful and influential national organizations.

One of the reasons the VFW's views are respected and listened to is that the VFW officials know what they are talking about. For example, in matters pertaining to national security and international policies, the VFW speaks with per-

sonal knowledge. The VFW national commander and the organization's national security director have seen personally the troubled spots that are of such deep concern to our Nation.

Within the past few weeks National VFW Commander John A. Jenkins, of Birmingham, Ala., who is well known to Members of this House, and the VFW National Security and Foreign Affairs Director, Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps (retired), personally visited southeast Asia, including battle fronts in South Vietnam. In so doing, the VFW commander performed a truly valuable service to our country and its fighting men. As representative of the 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans, Buck Jenkins could personally assure our fighting men—and he did—that our country is behind them and they are not forgotten in the far away battlefields.

There was another great service performed by the VFW through Commander Jenkins. During his visit to the Republic of China, he flew in a Republic of China Air Force plane to the off-shore, and regularly shelled, island of Quemoy. This island of Quemoy is an outpost of freedom in Asia and is a bastion of the free world's defense against aggressive communism in the western Pacific.

On behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and as a result of a resolution unanimously adopted by the VFW at its 1964 national convention, in Cleveland, Ohio, Commander Jenkins presented a VFW certificate of admiration and appreciation to the military and civilian defenders of Quemoy for their contribution to the defense of the free world. It is such things as this which the VFW does to strengthen our defense against communism, that has earned the VFW such high esteem in the United States and overseas.

Commander Jenkins' remarks were brief but eloquent, and because of the importance of the occasion, as well as what the VFW commander said, I include his presentation address at the conclusion of these remarks:

REMARKS OF JOHN A. JENKINS, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, PRESENTATION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS CITATION TO THE MILITARY AND CIVILIAN DEFENDERS OF QUEMOY, QUEMOY, REPUBLIC OF CHINA, MAY 12, 1965

One of the high privileges that comes to me as the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, is to present on behalf of the VFW, citations honoring those who have contributed to the defense of the free world. Today, it is my privilege and pleasure to participate in such a presentation.

I bring you the greetings and respects of the 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans who comprise the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Every member of the VFW is a combat veteran. Because of this experience, our members respect and admire those whe have demonstrated heroic bravery in the face of enemy attack.

We of the VFW share with freedom-loving peoples everywhere a devotion to liberty and a determination to defend freedom against the evil attacks of communism. We know that the free world can be protected only by people who believe so deeply in freedom that they will die to preserve it.

Because we recognize these things, we recognize the importance of Quemoy and the heroism of those who have defended it so bravely and effectively.

Consequently, the thousands of delegates attending the 1964 convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in Cleveland, Ohio, last August, unanimously voted to award an official citation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to the military and civilian defenders of Quemoy.

This decision by the convention was made for many reasons:

Because of the bravery and the determination you have demonstrated in beating back repeatedly the onslaughts of Communist aggression.

Because of the brave manner in which you defy communism while living on an island of freedom literally under the guns of communism.

Because in defending Quemoy against Communist aggression you are preventing communism from seizing Quemoy, which is one of the most strategically important positions in the defense of the free world.

And finally, we of the VFW take this means of expressing to the military and civilian defenders of Quemoy our admiration and our gratitude for all these things which you have done in the defense of your freedom, and most assuredly in the defense of free peoples everywhere.

At this time it is my privilege, as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, to present this official citation. It is our hope that it will be for you a lasting reminder of the friendship, admiration, and esteem in which you are held by the members of our organization.

It is our hope, too, that although we may be separated from you by the thousands of miles of the Pacific Ocean, you are not forgotten, and that what you have done, and what you are doing in the defense of freedom, is prominently in our thoughts and our hearts.

Debate on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, as President Johnson recently said on nationwide television, the genius and strength of America rest largely with our freedom to debate and criticize our national policies.

Certainly, no thinking American wants to curb that freedom of discussion. By the same token, however, no American wants this precious liberty to damage the many other freedoms for which the United States stands.

Unfortunately, I feel that the loud and, in far too many cases, uninformed criticisms of America's commitment in Vietnam have, indeed, damaged the cause of world freedom.

Max Freedman, in an article entitled "The Progression in Vietnam Debate," which was published in the June 23 issue of the Washington Star, made this point quite clear.

Mr. Freedman noted that President Johnson has made every effort within reason to find a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

The President has tried to meet every legitimate request. First, there was the demand for negotiations. The President eloquently appealed for negotiations, with his offer of unconditional discussions. The Communists turned a deaf ear.

Next came the demand to halt the bombing. The President ordered this pause. Again, the Communists refused to help find a way to peace.

Now there is the demand for negotiations with the Vietcong.

Criticism is essential to our democracy. But, in this case, such criticism seems to be strengthening the Communists' determination to control all of southeast Asia.

Mr. Freedman pointed out this danger:

Over the weekend President Ho Chi Minh, of North Vietnam, was quoted as saying that the Communist military effort is receiving encouragement from the criticisms heard inside the United States.

I strongly support President Johnson's leadership of the free world.

Communism knows one language; that is the language of strength and determination. The United States has the strength. President Johnson has displayed the determination.

I recommend that the entire Freedman article be read. At this time I request consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROGRESSION IN VIETNAM DEBATE

(By Max Freedman)

In the White House they are drawing up an interesting list of the various stages that have marked the public debate on Vietnam.

First there was the demand for negotiations. This demand died away when the President went to Baltimore and made his offer of unconditional discussions.

Then there was the campaign for a pause in the bombing. When President Johnson ordered this pause and nothing happened to bring the Communists to the conference table, the agitation became far less vehement.

Now there is a demand for direct negotiations with the Vietcong. The White House is struck by the progression of these demands. The argument moves from a simple request for negotiations, to a campaign against bombing raids on North Vietnam, to a demand for a negotiated settlement based on direct talks with the Communist guerrilla forces in South Vietnam. Always the pressure is on the United States to make the first concessions to the Communists.

In pointing to these facts, White House officials make no criticism of the group of Democratic Senators who have become the public opponents of U.S. policies in Vietnam. The President himself has acknowledged that these Senators have both "the right and the duty" to express their convictions on such a major aspect of U.S. policy. Officials in the White House are not opposed to criticism. They are wondering instead whether the critics are sufficiently aware of the uses to which their protests have been put by the Communist side.

Instead of persuading the Communists that the time had come to seek a negotiated settlement, these American criticisms have had the opposite effect. They have hardened the Communist military campaign, led them to hope that the United States may yet become grievously divided, and pushed the

Communists further away from the conference room.

Over the weekend President Ho Chi Minh, of North Vietnam, was quoted in Pravda as saying that the Communist military effort is receiving encouragement from the criticisms heard inside the United States.

Now the last thought in the mind of any Senator is to say or do anything that will bring aid and comfort to the Communists. Not a single critical Senator is trying to help the Communist side. Without exception all of them are trying to save the United States from following a path that they conceive to be full of mischief and danger. Their convictions command respect even when they do not carry agreement; for it is never easy to stand out against a mounting war fever.

But it cannot be challenged by anyone who has studied the uses made in Hanoi and Peiping of these senatorial criticisms that they have an impact which quite often mocks the purposes of the speakers. These Senators are men of experience and patriotism. It surely should be possible for them, within the traditions of responsible debate, to criticize their own Government without giving comfort and encouragement to the Communists. After all, they could have been no happier than the White House with Ho Chi Minh's interview with Pravda.

Incidentally, far too much has been made of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's meeting with the President before his recent speech in the Senate. As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Arkansas Democrat has his own constitutional duties to discharge. His ability to command a national or indeed a world audience does not depend on his being a spokesman for the White House. It depends on his own intrinsic wisdom. Nobody understands this better than the President.

That being clearly understood, it should be added that it is utter nonsense for the Republican Party to pretend that FULBRIGHT is challenging the President's program. Johnson is pledged to a policy of unconditional discussions. That means he is ready to go to the conference table without preconditions of any kind. He is ready to listen to everything without agreeing to anything in advance.

Quite plainly there can be no settlement, as FULBRIGHT has said, without concessions from both sides. The President has no quarrel at all with that position. He merely reserves the right to decide for himself at the proper time what precise concessions are in fact essential to a settlement. He would like that fact to be thoroughly understood here no less than by the Communists.

Kentucky Boosters Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, the Loyal Boosters Club of Bellevue, Ky., located in the Fourth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent here has passed a resolution calling for every one of its approximately 70 members to fly our American flag every day during the month of July.

This club which is one of the oldest in northern Kentucky, felt that instead of celebrating one day of Independence of our country, it would like to observe this significant national holiday by displaying this beautiful banner for 31 days.

The club has the enthusiastic endorsement and cooperation of the city officials who have issued a proclamation designating July as "Rally Around the Flag" month. Other organizations are cooperating with the members of the club in devising ways and means of rendering special courtesies and respect to our national flag which stands for the United States of America, "one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Such special recognition by the Loyal Boosters Club is a splendid way of paying homage to this shining symbol of our national sovereignty, our glorious past, and the promise of our future greatness.

I would like to commend the Loyal Boosters Club for this admirable tribute. Each member of its organization and all of the others cooperating in this splendid action have given us a patriotic example worthy of praise and emulation.

The Real Alabama—Part XVII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, industrial expansion in Mobile and other parts of southern Alabama is continuing at a rapid pace. Leaders of industry have on many occasions indicated their successful experience with growth operations in our area.

As examples I call attention to the two following statements:

LOUISVILLE & NASHVILLE RAILROAD,
Louisville, Ky.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad is proud of its past association with the development of the city of Mobile and is confident of future progress in which we expect to participate.

The location of Mobile provides a fortunate environment and a sunny industrial climate for the import and export of many commodities. As Alabama's only port, Mobile offers a growing operation that already ranks among the top 10 ports of the Nation. This status has been achieved largely through efforts of the Alabama State docks organization, which has provided facilities for convenient and economical transfer of goods from ship lines through an extensive rail distribution system to all parts of the United States.

The L. & N. contributed to the establishment of the State docks by deeding a substantial block of its property to the State early in 1926.

This railroad has also cooperated with the Alabama Development Association, the Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce and civic leaders in promoting development for industrial use of 7,400 acres near Mobile.

Establishment of competitive freight rates has further encouraged industrial expansion at Mobile. Tangible results of these efforts include a recent expansion of International Paper Co.'s Mobile operation and the establishment by the Scott Paper Co., in cooperation with the L. & N., of a warehouse to accommodate a large expansion of Scott's paper-producing mill.

WILLIAM H. KENDALL,
President.

INTERNATIONAL PAPER CO.,
New York.

International Paper Co. has been an industrial citizen of the Mobile area since 1928 and the headquarters of our Southern Kraft Division has been located there since 1930.

We have very deep roots in this enterprising, fast-moving community. Mobile has been home to several thousand of our employees and to many of us from other parts of the company. Mobile also has been a gracious host on the frequent occasions when we have visited there.

But much more important to our company has been the economic and business climate that has been fostered in Mobile by the public spirited businessmen and community leaders who set the tone for the city. Mobile welcomes growth; it welcomes innovation and expansion; it looks to the future.

To a large extent, this sound, business-oriented background has encouraged us to invest more than $67 million in expansion and development of our Mobile operations since 1954. One of the most important single aspects of our operations in Mobile has been the establishment and growth of our Erling Riis Research Laboratory. Named for the former head of our southern operations and a longtime Mobile resident, this laboratory is one of the outstanding pulp and paper research organizations in the country.

We look forward to our future associations with your progressive, alert community. The combination of a growing complex of modern industry and a stable, hard-working, cordial populace, makes Mobile almost unique of all the cities in the Gulf South region.

RICHARD C. DOAN,
Chairman of the Board.

Employment of Older Workers in the U.S. Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have been interested in the extent to which the older people of our Nation have opportunities to be employed by the Federal Government. I have feared that it is entirely too difficult for an older person to get work with the Federal Government. I desire to include in the RECORD a letter which was written to me June 8, 1965, by Chairman John W. Macy. Chairman Macy has sent to me some very informative figures. I ask to include these figures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1965.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil Service, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This letter is in reply to your inquiry of April 16, 1965, asking for information that might serve to update your subcommittee on developments in

the program to insure there is no discrimination against older persons in connection with Federal employment.

There has been no indication of need for a special drive in this area of placement of people and none has been undertaken. The reports received in our Bureau of Inspections have not shown any cause for concern. So far as we have any reason to believe the selection of older people from our registers is in reasonable relationship to the number who apply and are qualified. The Commission, however, is staying alert to any changes. We have in process a study of the Federal employee population by age which should shed further light on the overall situation. We expect to have the report by early summer and will send you a copy as soon as it is available.

One enclosure is the statistical material we prepared last year and submitted to the editors of the 1964 annual report of the President's Council on Aging which was issued under the title "Action for Older Americans." The material which we submitted was more comprehensive than the editors found occasion to use. It may be of interest to you.

Last year the Commission sponsored a bill to require mandatory retirement at age 70 after 5 years of service rather than after 15. Employment beyond 70 could still continue but on a year-to-year basis. We felt that such a measure would encourage agencies to appoint more people of really advanced years so far as normal employment prospects are concerned. The bill was reintroduced this year as H.R. 442. A copy of our report on it is enclosed.

Another enclosure of possible interest to you in connection with age and employment is a reprint of an early retirement survey from our Civil Service Journal, "Thirty-eight Years Is a Plenty."

Finally, it is my understanding that some of the agencies in the excepted service have elected to follow the same "no age limit" employment policy now required of all in the competitive service. The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration is one of these.

I hope that this survey of developments will prove helpful to your subcommittee.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

Federal employees covered by retirement system, by sex, age, and length of service, June 30, 1963

[Estimates based on a 10-percent sample of employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act]

Age and length of service	Total	Number of employees			Percent distribution [1]		
		Male	Female	Percent male	Total	Male	Female
Total	2,300,000	1,739,480	560,520	75.6	100.00	100.0	100.0
By age group: [2]							
Under 20 years	14,080	3,410	10,670	24.2	.6	.2	1.9
20 to 24 years	107,630	51,700	55,930	48.0	4.7	3.0	10.0
25 to 29 years	171,280	123,790	47,490	72.3	7.4	7.1	8.5
30 to 34 years	234,900	188,750	46,150	80.4	10.2	10.9	8.2
35 to 39 years	318,500	250,960	67,540	78.8	13.8	14.4	12.1
40 to 44 years	418,070	332,950	85,120	79.6	18.2	19.1	15.2
45 to 49 years	371,930	293,950	77,980	79.0	16.2	16.9	13.9
50 to 54 years	285,050	217,170	67,880	76.2	12.4	12.5	12.1
55 to 59 years	201,300	147,630	53,670	73.3	8.8	8.5	9.6
60 to 64 years	114,830	81,710	33,120	71.2	5.0	4.7	5.9
65 to 69 years	56,070	42,460	13,610	75.7	2.4	2.4	2.4
70 to 74 years	5,980	4,690	1,290	78.4	.3	.3	.2
75 years and over	380	310	70	81.6	(3)	(3)	(3)
By length of service group: [4]							
Under 5 years	313,040	166,960	146,080	53.3	13.6	9.6	26.1
5 to 9 years	440,500	324,490	116,010	73.7	19.2	18.7	20.7
10 to 14 years	435,320	326,000	109,320	74.9	18.9	18.7	19.5
15 to 19 years	453,390	367,200	86,190	81.0	19.7	21.1	15.4
20 to 24 years	457,560	379,690	77,870	83.0	19.9	21.8	13.9
25 to 29 years	122,840	105,490	17,350	85.9	5.3	6.1	3.1
30 to 34 years	41,250	36,490	4,760	88.5	1.8	2.1	.8
35 to 39 years	24,240	22,340	1,900	92.2	1.1	1.3	.3
40 to 44 years	9,650	8,910	740	92.3	.4	.5	.1
45 to 49 years	2,100	1,800	300	85.7	.1	.1	.1
50 years and over	110	110		100.0	(3)	(3)	

[1] Percents are rounded independently and not forced to add to totals.
[2] Average age for all employees, 43.1 years; for males, 43.5 years; for females, 42 years.
[3] Less than 0.05 percent.
[4] Average length of service for all employees, 14.2 years; for males, 15.1 years; and for females, 11.2 years.

TABLE 1.—*Distribution of paid Federal civilian employment, by selected agency and by age group, June 30, 1962*

Selected agency	Age group							
	Total	Less than 20	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 to 69	70 and over
General Accounting Office	4,758	75	818	980	1,227	1,249	409	
Department of State	5,002	148	887	1,091	1,569	989	318	
Department of the Treasury	82,997	1,784	11,078	18,194	25,244	18,396	8,205	96
Department of Defense	996,030	15,726	121,455	259,348	340,315	191,561	65,912	1,713
Office of the Secretary of Defense and other Defense activities	21,457	835	3,580	5,099	6,756	3,897	1,252	38
Department of the Army	356,338	6,914	44,391	92,589	118,794	69,567	23,468	615
Department of the Navy	331,480	4,591	35,108	77,435	118,710	69,625	25,421	590
Department of the Air Force	286,755	3,386	38,376	84,225	96,055	48,472	15,771	470
Department of Justice	17,971	454	2,130	4,155	5,901	3,957	1,327	47
Post Office Department	588,469	5,567	78,018	159,996	195,298	106,810	41,546	1,234
Department of the Interior	53,900	1,067	9,449	13,850	15,106	10,726	3,512	190
Department of Agriculture	110,045	2,575	19,300	27,580	29,850	23,435	7,041	174
Department of Commerce	31,124	732	6,391	7,561	8,257	6,122	2,025	36
Department of Labor	8,929	535	1,560	1,777	2,665	1,743	638	11
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	73,161	3,298	16,699	17,640	20,160	12,298	2,961	105
Civil Service Commission	4,123	168	514	972	1,463	704	291	11
General Services Administration	31,518	305	2,351	5,887	9,828	8,260	4,789	98
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,469	519	1,546	2,235	3,652	3,362	2,055	100
Information Agency	4,271	234	683	975	1,073	877	429	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,442	74	222	518	827	530	271	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	23,686	671	5,670	7,972	6,711	2,060	556	46
Veterans' Administration	176,234	1,445	22,301	44,575	59,235	34,828	13,540	310

NOTE.—These data have been drawn from a random sample of approximately 10 percent of the Federal work force and are therefore subject to sampling error. Excludes foreign nationals overseas, the Agency for International Development and the Peace Corps in the Department of State, the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice, the Alaska Railroad and the Geological Survey in the Department of the Interior, commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce, and the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 2.—*Percentage distribution of paid Federal civilian employment, by selected agency and by age group, June 30, 1962*

Selected agency	Age group							
	Total	Less than 20	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 to 69	70 and over
General Accounting Office	100	1.58	17.19	20.60	25.79	26.25	8.60	----------
Department of State	100	2.96	17.73	21.81	31.37	19.77	6.36	----------
Department of the Treasury	100	2.15	13.35	21.92	30.42	22.16	9.86	0.12
Department of Defense	100	1.58	12.19	26.04	34.17	19.23	6.62	.17
Office of the Secretary of Defense and other Defense activities	100	3.89	16.68	23.76	31.49	18.16	5.83	.18
Department of the Army	100	1.94	12.46	25.98	33.34	19.52	6.59	.17
Department of the Navy	100	1.39	10.59	23.36	35.81	21.00	7.67	.18
Department of the Air Force	100	1.18	13.38	29.37	33.50	16.90	5.50	.16
Department of Justice	100	2.53	11.85	23.12	32.84	22.02	7.38	.26
Post Office Department	100	.95	13.26	27.19	33.19	18.15	7.06	.21
Department of the Interior	100	1.98	17.53	25.70	28.03	19.90	6.52	.35
Department of Agriculture	100	2.34	17.62	25.06	27.13	21.30	6.40	.16
Department of Commerce	100	2.35	20.53	24.29	26.53	19.67	6.51	.12
Department of Labor	100	5.99	17.47	19.90	29.85	19.52	7.15	.12
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	100	4.51	22.83	24.11	27.56	16.81	4.05	.14
Civil Service Commission	100	4.07	12.47	23.58	35.48	17.07	7.06	.27
General Services Administration	100	.97	7.46	18.68	31.18	26.21	15.19	.31
Housing and Home Finance Agency	100	3.85	11.48	16.59	27.11	24.96	15.26	.74
Information Agency	100	5.48	15.99	22.83	25.12	20.53	10.04	----------
Interstate Commerce Commission	100	3.03	9.09	21.21	33.87	21.70	11.10	----------
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	100	2.83	23.94	33.66	28.33	8.70	2.35	.19
Veterans' Administration	100	.82	12.65	25.29	33.61	19.76	7.68	.18

NOTE.—These data have been drawn from a random sample of approximately 10 percent of the Federal work force and are therefore subject to sampling error. Excludes foreign nationals overseas, the Agency for International Development and the Peace Corps in the Department of State, the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice, the Alaska Railroad and the Geological Survey in the Department of the Interior, commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce, and the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Percentages are rounded independently and not forced to add to totals.

TABLE 3.—*Distribution of paid Federal civilian employees appointed since Jan. 1, 1959, by selected agency and by age group, June 30, 1962*

Selected agency	Age group							
	Total	Less than 20	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 to 69	70 and over
General Accounting Office	840	75	506	151	22	75	11	----------
Department of State	1,262	136	580	284	193	46	23	----------
Department of the Treasury	22,125	1,731	8,365	6,089	3,963	1,742	203	32
Department of Defense	275,878	15,698	85,430	74,509	69,551	25,757	4,699	234
Office of the Secretary of Defense and other Defense activities	8,274	797	2,353	1,898	2,062	999	152	13
Department of the Army	97,680	6,586	29,470	25,610	24,540	9,544	1,835	95
Department of the Navy	76,898	4,355	23,534	20,091	20,176	7,283	1,384	75
Department of the Air Force	93,026	3,960	30,073	26,910	22,773	7,931	1,328	51
Department of Justice	4,027	442	1,339	954	989	233	58	12
Post Office Department	160,542	5,342	55,867	50,771	35,228	10,963	2,253	118
Department of the Interior	18,619	1,034	7,181	4,969	3,513	1,477	378	67
Department of Agriculture	33,239	2,400	13,005	8,887	5,819	2,575	509	44
Department of Commerce	10,049	732	4,695	2,427	1,512	622	61	----------
Department of Labor	3,360	501	1,241	706	718	149	34	11
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	30,194	3,182	12,368	7,014	5,423	1,998	197	12
Civil Service Commission	1,117	168	413	301	134	67	34	----------
General Services Administration	8,358	294	1,719	2,405	2,491	1,210	239	----------
Housing and Home Finance Agency	4,849	519	1,207	1,038	1,197	718	140	30
Information Agency	1,170	234	429	312	156	20	19	----------
Interstate Commerce Commission	654	74	173	160	210	37	----------	----------
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	9,234	625	3,749	2,812	1,655	324	46	23
Veterans' Administration	48,489	1,431	16,631	14,363	11,069	4,267	634	94

NOTE.—These data have been drawn from a random sample of approximately 10 percent of the Federal work force and are therefore subject to sampling error. Excludes foreign nationals overseas, the Agency for International Development and the Peace Corps in the Department of State, the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice, The Alaska Railroad and the Geological Survey in the Department of the Interior, commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce, and the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—*Percentage distribution of paid Federal civilian employees appointed since Jan. 1, 1959, by selected agency and by age group, June 30, 1962*

Selected agency	Age group							
	Total	Less than 20	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 to 69	70 and over
General Accounting Office	100	8.93	60.24	17.98	2.62	8.93	1.31	----------
Department of State	100	10.78	45.96	22.50	15.29	3.65	1.82	----------
Department of the Treasury	100	7.82	37.81	27.52	17.91	7.87	.92	0.14
Department of Defense	100	5.69	30.97	27.01	25.21	9.34	1.70	.08
Office of the Secretary of Defense and other Defense activities	100	9.63	28.44	22.94	24.92	12.07	1.84	.16
Department of the Army	100	6.74	30.17	26.22	25.12	9.77	1.88	.10
Department of the Navy	100	5.66	30.60	26.13	26.24	9.47	1.80	.10
Department of the Air Force	100	4.26	32.33	28.93	24.48	8.53	1.43	.05

TABLE 4.—*Percentage distribution of paid Federal civilian employees appointed since Jan. 1, 1959, by selected agency and by age group, June 30, 1962*—Continued

Selected agency	Age group							
	Total	Less than 20	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 to 69	70 and over
Department of Justice	100	10.98	33.25	23.69	24.56	5.79	1.44	0.30
Post Office Department	100	3.33	34.80	31.62	21.94	6.83	1.40	.07
Department of the Interior	100	5.55	38.57	26.69	18.87	7.93	2.03	.36
Department of Agriculture	100	7.22	39.13	26.74	17.51	7.75	1.53	.13
Department of Commerce	100	7.28	46.72	24.15	15.05	6.19	.61	----------
Department of Labor	100	14.91	36.93	21.01	21.37	4.43	1.01	.33
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	100	10.54	40.96	23.23	17.96	6.62	.65	.04
Civil Service Commission	100	15.04	36.97	26.95	12.00	6.00	3.04	----------
General Services Administration	100	3.52	20.57	28.77	29.80	14.48	2.86	----------
Housing and Home Finance Agency	100	10.70	24.89	21.41	24.69	14.81	2.89	.62
Information Agency	100	20.00	36.67	26.67	13.33	1.71	1.62	----------
Interstate Commerce Commission	100	11.31	26.45	24.46	32.11	5.66	----------	----------
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	100	6.77	40.60	30.45	17.92	3.51	.50	.25
Veterans' Administration	100	2.95	34.30	29.62	22.83	8.80	1.31	.19

NOTE.—These data have been drawn from a random sample of approximately 10 percent of the Federal work force and are therefore subject to sampling error. Excludes foreign nationals overseas, the Agency for International Development and the Peace Corps in the Department of State, the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice, the Alaska Railroad and the Geological Survey in the Department of the Interior, commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce, and the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Percentages are rounded independently and not forced to add to totals.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1965.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This refers further to your request of January 11, 1965, for Commission report on H.R. 442, a bill "To amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for mandatory retirement of employees upon attainment of 70 years of age and completion of 5 years of service, and for other purposes."

The Retirement Act now requires the automatic separation (mandatory age retirement) of an employee at the end of the month in which he attains age 70 with at least 15 years' service, or at the end of the first month after that age when service totals 15 years. H.R. 442 would prospectively amend the act to provide for automatic separation at or after age 70 with at least 5 years of service.

This new requirement would apply only to persons appointed, or reappointed following a break in service of more than 3 days, after the date of its enactment. Persons now serving would continue to be subject to the present age-70, 15-year mandatory retirement provisions. Also, all existing exceptions to the general mandatory separation requirements would be maintained. Age 62 would still be the superannuation point for employees of the Alaska Railroad in Alaska and for citizen employees of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government serving on the isthmus (with 15 years' service on the isthmus or in Alaska). Members of Congress, congressional employees, the Architect of the Capitol and his employees, and judicial branch employees appointed for definite terms, would remain exempt from age retirement. Continuances beyond retirement age could still be authorized in unusual cases and age retirees would continue to be eligible for reemployment in the Government.

H.R. 442 embodies legislation officially recommended by the Commission in the 88th Congress. Our April 8, 1963, submission resulted in the introduction of three bills (H.R. 5774, H.R. 5776, and S. 1371) but action was not completed on any of the bills prior to adjournment of the 88th Congress.

The Commission strongly supports H.R. 442 as a constructive and needed change in the retirement law. The principal purpose of the change is to solve a problem created by the 15-year service requirement in the present age retirement provision. This requirement is inhibiting Federal employment opportunities of persons aged 55 and over. Agencies are reluctant to appoint apparently best qualified older candidates who have little or no prior Federal service when there is the prospect of having to retain them until their seventies or even their eighties automatic retirement will operate after 15 years' service.

The economic need to gear mandatory retirement to annuity based on 15 years of service has largely been eliminated by the availability of social security and other sources of retirement income based on employment prior to entering the Federal service. Enactment of this proposal would have the immediate effect of lessening resistance to the appointment of persons over age 55, and would facilitate the setting of higher age limits for appointment to certain positions. A long-range effect would be improvement of the service through a reduction in the number of overage employees. Also, it would desirably standardize at 5 years the service period required for disability, deferred, and superannuation retirements. As indicated, existing law already permits unrestricted reemployment of age retirees and agencies could still utilize the needed services of such persons regardless of age.

The Commission accordingly recommends that prompt and favorable consideration be given H.R. 442. Any additional retirement cost to the Government resulting from enactment of the bill would be negligible, and probably would be offset by the improvement in the efficiency of the service it would bring about.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the administration's program here is no objection to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.

[From the Civil Service Journal, October–December 1964]

EARLY RETIREMENT SURVEY—"THIRTY-EIGHT YEARS IS A PLENTY"

(By Elizabeth F. Messer, assistant to the Deputy Director, Bureau of Retirement and Insurance, U.S. Civil Service Commission)

EARLY RETIREMENT SURVEY

The early retirement survey reported in this article was made at the request of the Subcommittee on Retirement of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Subcommittee members asked repeatedly, during 1963 hearings on bills to liberalize the 30-year optional retirement provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act, why employees elect to retire early; how many work elsewhere after retiring, in what kinds of jobs. They wanted this information to assess better the magnitude and the probable impact on the legislative changes being considered. Since the answers were nowhere available, Civil Service Commission Chairman Macy agreed to obtain them from a sample group of early Federal retirees.

Questionnaires were sent to half of all the still-living annuitants who retired in 1956, 1959, and 1962 under the 55–30 optional retirement provisions. (About 665 of the 7,859 who originally retired in those years and under those provisions are no longer living. A total of 3,002 usable responses, more than a 91-percent return, had been received by the time tabulations began. They provide a wealth of information that will undoubtedly have interest far beyond that of the Senate subcommittee which requested the survey. A statistical summary of responses to the key questions is given at the end of the article.

"Thirty-eight years is a plenty."

"If you work to the day you die, you're missing something good—like never being a boy."

That is the way two annuitants answered the Civil Service Commission's question about why they retired early from their Government jobs. "Early" means between the ages of 55 and 60, after at least 30 years of work in the Federal service.

And would they do it again, if they had it to do over? They would indeed. Said one homespun philosopher: "I live alone and am as happy as two bugs in a rug. I have my flowers and cameras and hi-fi, and I do not have to answer to anyone. I am in hog heaven. I am healthy and ornery as they come, do my own cooking * * * sleep as late as I want * * * give the housework a lick and a promise when it gets too bad * * * watch any TV program I desire, cuss the TV commercials—who would want more?"

These annuitants, and the 2,999 others who responded to a rcent Civil Service Commission questionnaire about early retirement, recount an absorbing and richly human story of their motivations, their post-retirement life, and their attitudes about early retirement. This is the story, told partly in their own down-to-earth words.

All of them retired between the ages of 55 and 60, and all had at least 30 years of Federal service. Because they had not yet reached the normal retirement age of 60, the annuities of all were permanently reduced a specified percent for each year or part of a year they were under age 60. Those who retired in 1956 did so under considerably less liberal provisions of law than the others: they took a greater reduction for each year they were under 60, their annuities were computed under a less generous formula, and exercise of the right to provide an annuity for their survivors cost them more.

THE EMPLOYEES WHO RETIRED EARLY

Many of the early retirees had more than 30 years of Federal service to their credit

when they left, and some had as much as 40, 41, and even 42 years.

Most left jobs that paid in the $4,000 and $5,000 brackets and that offered limited promotion opportunities. A surprising 4 out of 10 had been post office clerks or carriers, and an additional 1 had done other postal field work; 2 had been in trades or technical fields or were unskilled workers; 2 had been in nonprofessional white-collar jobs; and 1 had been an engineering, scientific, or other professional worker. Most said that they were foremen, supervisors, managers, or executives at the time they retired, and most were men.

Their civil service annuities ranged from less than $100 a month in 19 instances to as much as $1,000 a month in 2 instances, but 6 out of 10 received annuities between $200 and $299 a month.

A third of them retired during their 55th year, the earliest in which they were eligible. A fifth (631) of them, however, were already in their 59th year before they exercised the option and so had worked practically to normal retirement age.

WHY THEY RETIRED EARLY

Most said they left early because they wanted to enjoy retirement before it was too late, but economic reasons, dissatisfaction in Government, and health and family reasons were cited frequently. Their views of the reasons others retire early followed the same pattern.

The one most frequently given reason was "wanted to quit while still able to enjoy retirement." Over half of all who responded gave this as one of the reasons, and over a fourth gave it as the main one. They often elaborated:

I was spending all my time making a living, so that I had no time to live. When I found myself going to sleep over the newspaper, I decided it was time to quit.

I wanted to travel more. I had never been abroad and I knew that if I waited too long I would never make it.

I was tied down to work and studying from the age of 14 years until I had 33 years of service. * * * It was a long drag, and I felt that I would like more time to myself.

My father's family has a long history of sudden death from heart attacks * * *. I was not going to take a chance with suddenly dying without a few years of not working.

Lots of my coworkers have kept on working since I retired, and today they are dead. I had my home paid for, a small farm, three rental units, and have a garden, chickens, birds, pigeons, and geese. Do lots of fishing, hunting, trapping, and enjoy myself generally. I have not worked one day since retiring except a few days jury duty. I enjoy raising flowers and have a mint julep at the end of my day.

Many, especially ex-postal workers and professionals, left for economic reasons (the second most frequently cited reason):

I put in over 39 years and had to quit and get another job to have a living salary for my old age. I have enough quarters now for social security, but I had to quit my lifetime job to get it.

My wife is a registered nurse. For us to get some place where she could work as much as required is the only way we could give our three children a college education. Merely a business matter.

I worked 36 years; 16 of that I was compelled to work a dual job. Having a family, I decided at 55 to retire. My pension plus a job would enable me to live better, and my health would not be impaired by two jobs.

As a trial lawyer for the Government, I deal continuously with outside lawyers who were getting from two to five times my salary for comparable work. On my frequent assignments away from home, I had to stay in third-rate hotels and eat cheap meals, and still pay an average of $5 to $10 for the privilege, while opposing counsel on the same cases lived well at the expense of their clients * * *.

Why shouldn't employees retire early when they can earn more than half as much social security in 6½ years as they acquire in 37 years of Federal service And I have earned these benefits so, so much easier.

Some—the professionals more than others—had become dissatisfied:

Believed I had reached the end of the road at GS-16, wanted a new challenge.

I served 38 years, 3 months, 10 days in the service, and felt tired of the same job. I was very tired of the same work, and no promotions. Too much time spent justifying your existence. Not enough time spent on work which has taken years to learn and for which you are qualified. Too many persons not engineers, telling engineers how, and where, also how much. Too many auditors with too much power.

"I hated junk mail.

"If post office would stop counting the mail and start delivering it, the unemployment figure would probably rise to an alltime high. * * * Anyone who doesn't retire from a large post office at the earliest possible date either can't afford it or is already crazy."

And some retired for health and family reasons:

"The winters seemed to get longer, the weather colder, the load heavier, and the strain greater. And just the opposite in summer—hotter and more miserable." [A former letter carrier.]

"I did piecework for 39 years and piecework is a very nerve-racking job. It is especially hard to keep up the pace after you are 50.

"I have an invalid father to take care of, my wife was sick in the hospital, I was run down because of the strain.

"Tension kept mounting so as to be almost unbearable. If you made a mistake, it could cost 150 to 200 lives and several millions of dollars worth of equipment." [A former air traffic controller.]

There were a variety of other reasons: desire to devote more time to farming or other family business; dislike of "bumping" other employees during reductions in force; a feeling that good performance on the job demanded a younger, more vigorous person. On this latter point, one annuitant said: "I saw older people in the same work trying to hold on and having to be carried by the balance of the crew, and I knew how much extra work I had to do to carry them. That helped me decide to retire before I got in that class." And several men suggested to the Commission that perhaps its questionnaire designers weren't really on the ball: "This questionnaire seems to assume that all of the decisions are made independently by the subject. Can it be that the U.S. Civil Service Commission underestimates the power of a woman?"

No change in work, or in working conditions in Government, would have held them longer, said 4 out of 10. But some others said that they might have stayed if they'd had a raise in pay, different supervisors or coworkers, more interesting work, or better working conditions (traffic and transportation problems were often mentioned here).

Three out of 10 reported that they made the retirement decision rather suddenly, but 2 had made definite plans, far in advance, to retire as soon as they could. The required reduction in annuity delayed the retirement of over a fourth of them (28.8 percent) until some time after they first became eligible.

THEIR EMPLOYMENT STATUS

The majority of those who retired early have worked some since leaving Government—usually for short periods of time and in less demanding and less than full-time jobs. A higher proportion of postal employees, especially clerk-carriers, worked than did employees in any other pay system or occupation. Those who held scientific, engineering, or other professional positions in Government ranked next highest, followed by blue-collar and technical workers, and other white-collar workers.

Over half of all who have worked at any time since leaving Government, however, did so only temporarily, part time, or occasionally. An unknown, but substantial, number of those who worked at some time after retiring no longer do so. Well over half put in fewer hours on the job than they did in Government; only 187 worked more hours outside than in the Federal service.

Most who have worked seem to have taken easier jobs than they had in Government. Many have been self-employed, and many others went into service occupations. Most of the postretirement jobs have been in clerical or administrative fields, with unskilled, semiskilled, and technical employment next most frequently reported. Very few early retirees (218) said that they have done professional work since they left. The kinds of postretirement jobs listed and the write-in comments indicate clearly that postretirement earnings are usually modest. One person explained that there is quite a demand in private industry for retired civil servants because "salaries are not high (mostly nearer the minimum wage law), and young people cannot raise families on the small income."

THE JOBS THEY'VE HELD

The specific kinds of jobs early retirees have held since leaving Government have been even more varied than their reasons for retiring:

"Bought a farm and raised Christmas trees. * * * I sold my Christmas tree business last year and have retired for good, I think."

"I have a small route of coin-operated vending and service machines."

"I am a part-time waiter and a full-time cab driver."

"I have regarded remodeling this old house as self-employment and have enjoyed myself tremendously. I will probably sell it and either remodel another or build new, if health permits."

"I deal in used furniture and antiques. * * * It's work, but mostly fun."

"I do maintenance work on my own rental property."

"Have a real estate license and work when I take a notion."

Some other examples of their jobs: Babysitter, bank messenger, band player, barber, bartender, beekeeper, book salesman, cabin steward, cattle breeder, chauffeur, farmer, freelance advertiser, fruit grower, gas station operator, guard, handyman, innkeeper, janitor, landscape foreman, livestock judge, locksmith, movie usher, music teacher, newspaper dealer, parking lot attendant, peddler, repairman, school crossing guard, shipping clerk, short order cook, upholsterer, yard worker.

A few hold more spectacular positions. One of these devotes full time to a merchandising corporation which he helped organize while still in Government and which he says now grosses some $40 million a year. Another studied accounting while still employed and, beginning then, acquired accounts which now bring him a greater income than his salary did; "If I reach the age of 65," he says, "I plan to sell my practice, apply for full social security benefits, and then travel with the Mrs." The retirement of another "has worked out fine. We organized a new life insurance company. My position is its president."

Even less typical is the story of a former meteorologist who felt that inadequate education was now keeping him from the professional status he used to enjoy; he re-

turned (after 40 years) to his university for a full academic course plus part-time meteorological research work, obtained a B.S. degree in 1962, and expected to receive the M.S. degree in earth science during August of 1964, after which he would be given professional status in teaching and research at the university. And the story of the former Navy engineer who, with his family, founded and now operates a private school for gifted children (IQ's ranging from 130 to 170) on a Long Island estate which they bought and converted; the school already has students ranging from nursery school through high school, plans to expand to include a 2-year liberal arts junior college. And that of the erstwhile research scientist who found that too many applicants for professional jobs in Government lacked—and disliked—math and science; deciding that his experience could help make these subjects more interesting to students, he enrolled in evening school, qualified for a high school teacher's certificate, and took a teaching position as soon as he became eligible for retirement.

THEIR REASONS FOR WORKING

Those who have worked at any time since retirement were asked why they did so. Their replies—consistent with their reasons for retiring—show that they worked primarily for economic reasons or because, having to continue earning, they needed easier work. They believe that others work for the same reasons.

By far the most frequently given reasons for working after retirement were economic—"had to have more money," for example, was marked by 786 people, and "wanted to qualify for social security benefits" was marked by 1,126. Almost half (45.5 percent) of all responses to the question had to do with need (or desire) for more money, and this was given as the main reason by twice as many people as gave any other:

"I needed more money and I could get a job at Boeing, so I took it."

"When I had to start paying taxes on my total annuity, I had to return to work. * * *"

"The retirement income is sufficient if I stay home and putter around and die in a chair of old age. But for travel, hobbies, etc., which unfortunately cost money, I find it desirable to work for a while and then spend the money."

"I could not live on my retirement pay, that is why I am working."

The second most frequently given reason was need for less demanding work. "Had a chance to work just part of the time" was marked by 504 retirees, and "was able to get work that was less tiring, and caused me less strain, than my Government job" was marked by 708.

Almost as many started working again—or kept on working—just because they wanted to: 480 did it because they had a chance to do work they really wanted to do, 279 because they were bored, and 222 because they'd had a break and were ready to start again:

"Our daughter graduated from college, my husband was retired, and we both wanted very much to go to the Mission field where we were very much needed. * * * Have been training natives in the Mission Hospital (Nigeria) and find much satisfaction in this work."

"The days are long and there comes a time when one isn't too welcome around the house constantly. * * * People who are engaged in public business are too busy to visit with those who have retired. * * * One must keep himself busy."

"I found myself depressed. * * * I sought temporary or part-time work and am still employed doing what I like, with the happy thought of being in circulation."

Some were approached by private employers and asked to work; 304 of these went back because they felt they were really needed.

AND THEIR REASONS FOR NOT WORKING

Paid employment holds no attraction for many, however. They are not interested in working, they have income sufficient for their needs, and they are too busy with their hobbies, community activities, recreational or educational pursuits. These satisfied, and unemployed, annuitants tell why they don't work:

"I like to hunt, fish, golf, play bridge, garden, care for my yard. I love music, good literature, sports, and just plain loafing, which is an art in itself * * *. Work just took up too much of my time."

"I always wanted a better education * * *. I am going to school, studying electronics. I decided this was a good course for either young or old. Sometimes I think I am too old, and again I feel that age is no barrier * * *. It could mean additional income for me in the future; if not, it still should be a nice hobby."

"One of the things I have enjoyed is freedom of movement * * *. My brother and I took a trip to the west coast. No one should miss seeing the beauty and vastness of this great county * * *. My only complaint is that time, each day and year, passes too quickly."

"I wanted to travel some before I died, and I also wanted the time to do just as I pleased. Now I spend my summers on a nice northern Michigan lake and my winters in Florida, and between times I just travel around and visit my children and friends. I play golf about twice a week and fish all summer."

"Many activities such as visiting sick at hospitals, volunteer community work, taking old ladies to grocery, etc. Would not desire any employment except in national emergency."

"I read from 5 to 8 hours a day. I studied German for 2 years at the university. Tomorrow I begin a course in 'Introduction to the New Testament.' I do not have to do anything under tension."

There were, however, 231 checks for items dealing with inability to obtain work and 558 of those dealing with health and family responsibilities. Some say: "There doesn't seem to be anything much for ex-tax collectors who can't do manual labor"; "businesses do not hire women 58 years old so readily"; "I am totally disabled and not allowed to do any work"; "my aged parents require more help"; and "no success as yet in finding work. I've written to my Congressman for suggestions * * *. It's rough * * *. Discrimination against age is terrible here."

HOW THEY ARE FARING FINANCIALLY

One question asked in the survey sought to determine how well early retirees are living now. This question read: "All of us can, of course, use more money at any time. We would like to know, however, whether the total income of employees who retired before reaching age 60 allows them to maintain a reasonably good standard of living now. Will you please check the answer that is most nearly right for you: (1) Live better than before I retired; (2) live about as well as before I retired; (3) don't live quite as well but am doing all right; (4) have had to reduce my standard of living drastically in order to get by."

Over 83 percent answered that they are doing all right or better. Some were doing it on annuities plus savings and return on investments, but more than half have worked at least some of the time since retiring from Government. In addition, many volunteered that they have a spouse working or receiving an annuity, or are also drawing social security benefits or a veteran's pension, or—surprisingly often—have come into a small inheritance. They say:

"My income (outside) for only 8 months of work per year far exceeds the maximum of grade 15, the salary I was paid at the time of my voluntary retirement."

"If you are a married woman, as I am, with a working husband, the amount of retirement is not bad, but if you are a married man with a wife who does not work, it is close picking."

Some of the 12.6 percent who have had to reduce their standard of living drastically say: "If you have recently tried living on $173 a month, the answer is obvious"; "The doctors', hospital, and high-priced medicine bills make it very difficult to make ends meet"; and "I still have the same expenses I had when I worked and more, too, because the gas and water and sewage have gone up, the house is older and needs more repairs * * * everything goes up * * *."

Ex-postal employees had the highest percentage of persons living better than before and wage-board employees had the lowest, with GS's in between. Among occupational groups living better than before, those who had engineering, scientific, or professional positions in Government ranked highest, followed by clerk-carriers in close second place; others were all low. Men were doing better than women. All groups that were doing better had relatively higher rates of postretirement employment than those who were hard up.

The more recent the retirement, the more likely the person is to be living better and the less likely he is to have had to reduce his standard of living:

	Percent living better	Percent living worse
1956 retirees	10.6	17.6
1959 retirees	17.3	12.2
1962 retirees	21.1	9.9

Write-in comments strongly suggest that a major explanation—apart from the less liberal benefits paid the earlier retirees—is that the 1956 and 1959 retirees had already exhausted the income tax exemption on their annuities, while the 1962 retirees had not yet done so.

HOW THEY FEEL ABOUT EARLY RETIREMENT

The survey asked annuitants whether they would still retire early if they had it to do over again and would recommend that others do so, and also inquired about the extent to which the early retirement option influences employee decisions to remain with Government for full careers.

Practically all said that they "certainly" or "probably" would retire early again under the same circumstances, and most of them had no doubt whatever about it:

"This is living."

"I knew what I wanted, so I did it, and my wife and I are very happy here. You can have all that ice and snow back there. I would rather mow my lawn than shovel snow off the sidewalk."

"I enjoy retirement and am glad I retired early. I believe people make better adjustments at an early age."

"Have had a balanced spiritual, mental, and physical retirement; opportunity to enrich my spirit, enlighten my mind, maintain my health, enjoy the companionship of my wife; time to become and be an informed citizen."

"Retirement life is wonderful—no bosses, no telephones, no budgets."

A surprising number, including many who have done some work since leaving Government, added comments like, "My retirement gave a chain of promotions to younger people with families" and "I firmly believe if a guy has put in 35 to 40 years, he should retire to make way for the younger fellows coming up."

A few say that if they had known then what they know now, they would not have retired. Most of these are people who have been ill and feel that they might perhaps

have been able to retire on disability; who were forced into retirement by family problems which no longer exist; or who find themselves hard up financially. Several, however, seem simply to have decided that they made a mistake in judgment: "One seems to lose importance when retired * * *. Had my foresight been as good as my hindsight, I would have worked on to at least 50 years"; and "[It is] not what a fellow figures it to be before he retires. * * * I was a lonesome man for quite a spell. * * * Even now, after 5 years, my mind runs back to the old gang."

Many hedged their answers about recommending whether others should retire early. Most often they said it is an individual problem on which each person must make his own decision, or "yes, if—." The "ifs" nearly always turned out to be if you are sure you can make it financially, or if you have got something definite you want to do—"nothing is sadder than a man who does not know what to do with his spare time."

Others did not hesitate to make a definite recommendation—but their views conflicted:

"Early retirement is a waste of manpower."

"Retirement a must at 55 or 60. After this age almost all employees just mark time and pick up their pay checks. Make them get out and give the man in the next lower bracket a chance for advancement."

'I am in favor of continuing work. * * * The greater percentage of retired people do not live much beyond 2 years after retirement. I believe this to be because inactivity leads to death."

[NOTE.—Over half of all retiring Federal employees live at least 12 years after retirement.]

"Older people slow down and cannot produce the same amount of work as when younger. Why keep a doddering old man on the job when he would be much better off on the retired list?"

"Retire before 60—the younger you retire, the easier it is to adjust yourself to the change."

"Advocate retirement as soon as possible. That is the reason for the retirement law. It was passed so that older people may enjoy their declining years and to make an open job for a young person. They need a regular job to raise a family and maintain a home."

In response to the questions about the effect of the early retirement option on employees' decisions to remain in Government, they acknowledged—but rated relatively low—the "holding power" of this option so far as they themselves were concerned. Interestingly, however, they considered it a much more powerful influence on the decisions of other employees—the only instance in which there was any noticeable inconsistency in the answers they gave for themselves and the answers they thought applicable to others. Annuitants who were clerk-carriers while in Government rated the early retirement option a more important consideration than did others.

OTHER VOLUNTEERED COMMENTS

A great many people took advantage of the opportunity offered them to make additional comments "about retirement before age 60." A few stated flatly that they consider the present (not the pre-1956) optional retirement provisions entirely adequate, but most who commented favored liberalization: "All employees should be given the option to retire after 30 years of service, regardless of age and without a reduction in annuity. I believe it is unfair to penalize a person who comes into the service at an early age." "I know of Federal employees with 35–38 years of service who are fed up but cannot retire because they are not 55 years old."

Some believe that liberalization would benefit the Government as much as it would employees, and several argued that early retirement would stimulate employment and promotion opportunities, thus influencing qualified people to seek and hold Government jobs. But one observed, almost as if in answer to that argument, that "while employees fight for more liberal optional retirement provisions, very few seem to take advantage of such retirements when they do meet the service and age requirements—so why liberalize?

Many feel that civil service annuities should be tax exempt, especially since railroad retirement and social security benefits are exempt. Social security benefits for Government workers are desired by many—one thinks that "if the Government would put postal employees under social security, very few men would retire before age 62 or 65."

A number want the same treatment for former annuitants as is accorded those who retire now and in the future; liberalizations, they say, should apply to persons already on the rolls. Some advocate various kinds of gradual retirement plans.

Quite a few have regrets about the unused sick leave they "gave back to the Government" and still want some kind of retirement credit, or other compensation or recognition, for it.

And, in contrast to those who had critcisms such as the ones already quoted, a great many volunteered favorable comments about Federal service and expressions of gratitude for the benefits the Government provides its employees:

My career was wonderful.

I am very grateful that I have this annuity and can work a little or not, as I am able or desire; I think Government service is tops.

I thoroughly enjoyed my career as a postal employee and shall be forever grateful for its retirement benefits.

To my Government I say thanks for the privilege and opportunity to serve. I am proud of the opportunity to have done so.

ANNUITANTS ANSWER KEY QUESTIONS

These are the results of key questions asked in the Civil Service Commission's survey of persons who retired early from the Federal service. Figures in columns marked (*) are percentages of the total number of responses to questions allowing several answers. All other figures are percentages of the sample group of 3,302 respondents.

REASONS FOR RETIRING EARLY

Why did you retire before reaching 60 years of age? (Up to four answers allowed.)

	Percent*
Wanted to quit while still able to enjoy retirement	22.6
Economic reasons (better paid job, better off with annuity plus outside earnings, wanted to qualify for social security benefits)	21.8
Dissatisfied with job, working conditions, supervision, management	17.9
Health or family reasons	13.6
Organization reasons (would have had to take unwanted job, was RIF'd, urged by agency to retire)	4.3
All other (work part time or for self; move elsewhere; take break, then start again; just had enough, etc.)	19.8

INTENTION TO WORK

When you retired, did you intend to work at something else, either immediately or after you'd had a good rest?

	Percent
Yes	57.3
No	41.1
No answer, or qualified answer	1.6

ACTUAL EMPLOYMENT

Have you actually worked at something else since you retired?

	Percent
Yes	57.7
No	41.6
No answer, or qualified answer	.7

TIME WORKED

How much have you worked?

	Percent
Full time since starting	26.1
Full time for temporary periods	7.7
Part time but fairly regularly	13.5
Only occasionally	9.0
No answer, or haven't worked	43.7

REASONS FOR WORKING AGAIN

Why have you worked? (Up to four answers allowed.)

	Percent*
Economic reasons (had to have more money; to buy "extras"; to qualify for social security benefits)	45.5
Chance to do less demanding work (part time, less tiring, less strain than in Government job)	25.2
Just wanted to (bored; had break, ready to go again; chance to do something really wanted to do)	20.4
All other	8.9

KIND OF WORK DONE

What kind of work have you done?

	Percent
Unskilled (laborer, building maintenance, etc.)	8.1
Guard, law enforcement	2.9
Skilled, mechanical, technical	6.2
Engineering, scientific, professional	3.9
Clerical, stenographic, typing, filing, office machine operation	12.7
Sales	6.0
Finance, insurance, real estate	3.6
Other nonprofessional white collar	5.2
All other	6.4
Haven't worked, or no answer	45.0

ADEQUACY OF INCOME

We would like to know whether the total income of employees who retired before reaching age 60 allows them to maintain a reasonably good standard of living now.

	Percent
Live better than before retiring	17.2
Live about as well	34.4
Not quite as well but all right	32.2
Have had to reduce standard of living drastically to get by	12.6
No answer, or qualified answer	3.6

DO IT AGAIN

If you had it to do over again under the same conditions, would you still retire when you did?

	Percent
Certainly would	68.0
Probably would	24.1
Certainly would not	5.7
No answer, or qualified answer	2.2

Civil Rights Act Used for Invasion of Privacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, last year when the Congress debated the Civil Rights Act, a number of Members were concerned with language that could be used to control the membership in private clubs and organizations. They were assured by the leadership, the administration and the proponents of the bill that this could not happen and would not happen. So what happened?

Once more our old friend, Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, has issued an order. Remember, a few weeks

ago he issued an order to all Southern States and school boards in Southern States, "desegregate on my conditions or no money for your schools." Now he has told all the colleges and universities that if any chapter of any fraternity, club, or organization refuses membership to certain individuals, Federal funds would be withheld. Remember, too, how the proponents of Federal aid to education always solemnly assure us that "Federal aid does not mean Federal control?"

Well, Commissioner Keppel has other ideas. Evidently he is determined to fulfill the role as Federal Commissar of Education and, using the provisions of the Civil Rights Act as his weapon, to determine which schools will stay open and which ones will be closed, who will attend various schools, and now who will become members of private organizations.

Is it reasonable to believe that the Federal planners who are using the Civil Rights Act to seize control of the educational system of the United States and to control the private clubs, fraternities, and organizations in the educational field are going to be satisfied to be dictators in education alone? No, Commissioner Keppel's actions toward the schools are but a forerunner of what we can expect in every phase of our national life if Congress continues to give up its constitutional responsibility to legislate, continues to give more and more power to Lyndon Johnson and the advocates of a planned society. We are dangerously close to dictatorship and I hope Congress and the people will call a halt to the seizure of any additional power by the Johnson administration and reinstate the traditional separation of powers so that we may once again operate as a Government of, for and by the people.

As a part of these remarks I include an editorial from the National Observer, "Colleges, Discrimination, U.S. Money," and a column by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star of June 21, "Clubs' Right to Privacy Periled."

The articles follow:

[From the National Observer]

COLLEGES, DISCRIMINATION, U.S. MONEY

Colleges may lose their Federal aid money if one Federal official decides a fraternity on the campus is practicing racial discrimination.

The official is Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, a fellow who has distinguished himself by also saying "schools can teach no lesson more important for all our children than integration * * *." Under his new dictum, not only could one college lose its grants if one fraternity discriminates. Also, all colleges having chapters of a national fraternity, one of whose chapters discriminates, could lose their Federal money.

Mr. Keppel believes this is required by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The law requires schools to assure the Federal Government that there is no discrimination in making available for the use of students any building, room, space, materials, equipment, or property."

Says Mr. Keppel: "This language makes it apparent that an institution which maintains a fraternity system as part of its activities and overall program is responsible under the Civil Rights Act requirements for assuring that discrimination is not practiced by the fraternities in the system."

Well, fraternities have long been unpopular in many circles for various practices ranging from hazing to snobbery, with an occasional dash of envy thrown in. They make a convenient handle, certainly. But that is not an argument we care to go into.

What interests us is the apparent leap in logic by the Commissioner, an apparent disinclination to distinguish between university facilities and properties and facilities and properties owned by others.

We are fascinated, also, to see that yes, indeed, Federal grants to colleges are not only a carrot but a stick. A stick that doesn't have much to do with education unless, of course, you believe that "schools can teach no lesson more important for all our children than integration."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 21, 1965]

CLUBS' RIGHT OF PRIVACY PERILED

(By David Lawrence)

The way has been opened to compel every fraternity in the colleges, universities, and high schools, every private club and every fraternal organization to include in its membership persons of every race and religion or suffer as a penalty the loss of Federal tax exemption. In the case of educational institutions, there would be a loss of Federal financial aid to the university or college which permits any campus organization to practice racial or religious discrimination.

These steps are foreshadowed by the interpretation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 just issued by the administration through the office of the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel.

The Federal Government intervened recently when it was discovered that the local chapter of the Sigma Chi Fraternity at Stanford University in California had been suspended by the national chapter for having decided to admit a Negro student. The national chapter is a private organization. It is not under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, : or does it receive any financial assistance from Washington. But the U.S. Commissioner of Education warned in a letter that, unless the Stanford chapter were allowed to include the Negro student in its membership, Stanford University itself would be penalized.

This extraordinary threat is contained in the Commissioner's pronouncement. It states first that there must be no discriminatory practices in "making available for the use of students any building, room, space, materials, equipment or other facility or property." Then the Commissioner points to the regulations which were issued supposedly under the authority of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and which require schools to give assurances that there is no racial discrimination "in admission practices or any other practices of the institution relating to the treatment of students." Furthermore, the Commissioner declares:

"This language makes it apparent that an institution which maintains a fraternity system as a part of its activities and over-all program is responsible under the Civil Rights Act requirements for assuring that discrimination is not practiced by the fraternities in the system. * * *

"To my knowledge the suspension of Sigma Chi at Stanford by the fraternity's national executive committee is the first major test involving defacto discrimination within a national fraternity to develop since passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As such, it seems certain to attract wide public interest."

Unfortunately, though the letter was made public last Thursday, it hasn't attracted "wide public interest." But possibly this is because the American people—particularly those who are identified with clubs, fraternities or other social organizations—haven't discovered as yet that the new ruling makes a mockery of what the Supreme Court of the United States said just a few days before on the importance of preserving the "right of privacy" as an inherent part of the Constitution itself.

While almost everyone with human sympathy and understanding recognizes that discrimination by reason of race or religion gives the individual affected a feeling of unforgettable stigma, there is a bigger injustice in brushing aside constitutional methods and endeavoring to achieve reform by applying the doctrine that "the end justifies the means."

There is nothing in the Constitution which permits the Federal Government to control the educational process in America. The mere grant or loan of taxpayers' money to the States or directly to colleges or universities does not carry with it the right to exercise any jurisdiction over such matters as regulating the conduct or relationships of students to each other.

But if a regulation can be derived from the civil rights law of 1964 empowering the Federal Government to use its financial transactions with the citizens to impose punishment for actions which are not in themselves forbidden by State or Federal law, then the way is opened to apply the same procedure to fraternal organizations of all kinds, as well as private clubs generally. It can be done by denying them exemptions from the payment of income taxes in those years in which their receipts exceed expenditures.

It apparently would be sufficient for the Treasury to declare that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 authorizes the withholding of financial assistance to any organization or institution which permits discrimination on racial or religious grounds. Certainly in these days of official word-twisting, "financial assistance" is a broad enough term to cover tax exemptions.

Thus, Federal power could be used as a form of coercion in private clubs in the same way it is about to be exercised in passing upon the qualifications for membership in student fraternities in colleges and universities throughout the United States.

The Diminishing Respect for Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Roy McClain is the pastor of the First Baptist Church of Atlanta, Ga. I recently had the pleasure of hearing him in person while I was there.

Dr. McClain is performing a wonderful ministry and is a great American by any measure. Recently he was selected by a national weekly news magazine as one of the 10 most outstanding ministers of the Nation.

As one of his regular contributions to the Atlanta Constitution, Dr. McClain has written the following timely article:

THE DIMINISHING RESPECT FOR WORK

Man must work. That is certain. But he may work grudgingly or he may work gratefully; he may work as a man or work as a machine. There is no work so dull but that it can be brightened by the right attitude. No job is little when a big person does it. Our generation is witnessing a spreading sickness. A diseased attitude toward honest work.

Who believes that sweating is a wholesome therapy any more? Where is that old-fashioned honesty which taught that it is as wrong to steal time from an employer as it is to steal money? The same folks who would not think of walking off the job with stolen tools will never give a second thought to the fact that 30 minutes before quitting time the lathe was still, or the typewriter covered, or the ledger closed.

One of the glaring evidences of this slothful attitude is the extended, empty hand—the hand which reaches out for a dole from friend, relative, or government. A decade ago the word "welfare" had an insulting ring to it. Now it has been elevated by a wasteful government to the level of acceptability. "Let's live on Uncle Sam," is the functional decision of millions in our day.

How many able-bodied men and women are drawing pensions or disability checks when their only disability is their good-for-nothing laziness? How many women are on the welfare roles strictly as a means of financing themselves and the illegitimate children they bring into the world? Thousands of these mothers are not married, nor do they intend to be married. It is a matter of record that as many as three generations in the same family have lived on government doles through welfare departments without a one of them working at a regular job. It isn't that these "poor, unfortunate" people cannot find work; it is the fact that they don't want to work.

In that rich valley of California last week, 150,000 crates of strawberries rotted in the field because there was no one to pick the berries. Farmers claimed that there were hundreds of people living within smelling distance of those delicious strawberries who were drawing either unemployment checks or full welfare payments. But is requires bending the back to pick strawberries.

The Bible says, "* * * this we commanded you, that if any would not work neither should he eat. For we hear that there are those who walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies." Could it be that the Apostle Paul had 1965 in mind when he wrote these words to the Thessalonians?

Hon. Homer Thornberry Appointed as Judge of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and predecessor as a Representative from the 10th District of Texas, the Honorable Homer Thornberry, was recently promoted from Federal district judge to judge of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. As U.S. Congressman, he made an enviable record and was highly respected in this body.

I know that each of you joins me in extending heartiest congratulations and best wishes to this distinguished jurist and former colleague in the House. Also, I know this House was pleased to see the appointment of former Mississippi Governor, James P. Coleman, an outstanding jurist, to the fifth circuit.

Judge Thornberry's promotion was the subject of a laudatory editorial in the June 19, 1965, issue of the Washington Post. Under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include this editorial, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 19, 1965]

JUDGES FOR THE FIFTH

President Johnson moved cautiously in filling the vacancies on the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. One reason may have been the controversy that has swirled about this court in recent years. Another reason was certainly the complexity of recruiting men of the highest qualifications for the bench. On the whole we think the President has done well in promoting District Judge Homer Thornberry, of Texas, and in giving what is regarded as the Mississippi appointment to a former Governor of that State, James P. Coleman.

Judge Thornberry is a close friend of President Johnson; he is also a first-rate judge. Before his appointment to the U.S. district court by President Kennedy, he was a moderate-progressive member of the House Rules Committee. The law and the courts have been his primary interest, however, and he has already proved his capacity on the bench. His judicial temperament, his habit of hard work, and his deep respect for the law should prove to be great assets to the fifth circuit.

Former Governor Coleman's speeches and official actions mark him as a segregationist, but he has never been an extremist. His moderation appears to have been the chief cause for his defeat in his second race for the governorship of Mississippi 2 years ago. Mr. Coleman has a good reputation as a lawyer, and he may be expected to follow the Supreme Court's rulings as to segregation as well as other matters.

We hope that the Senate will hasten to confirm these nominations and then pass a bill to create the additional judgeships that the fifth circuit so urgently needs. The move for more judges in this overworked court has been stalled for some years because of an unfortunate recommendation that the circuit be divided. Some months ago, however, the Judicial Conference of the United States put aside that idea and asked for four additional judgeships in the fifth circuit on a temporary basis. A bill to carry out this purpose and to create more than 30 additional judgeships in other parts of the country is now awaiting action in both Houses of Congress. It should be passed before Congress adjourns.

Weston Instruments Wins Defense Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, on June 9 the following editorial appeared in the Scranton Tribune:

KEEPING LOCAL PLANT BUSY

Congressman JOSEPH M. MCDADE is to be commended for his part in paving the way for Weston Instruments, Inc., Archbald, to bid on a sizable defense order.

Through the intervention and convincing arguments advanced by the congressman Weston not only was permitted to offer a bid but was succesful in obtaining the $1.2 million contract for the production of some 1,498 practice bombs for the use of the U.S. Air Force trainees.

When the Air Force originally asked for bids in a U.S. Department of Commerce publication, MCDADE found that it was limiting them to small businesses.

The Congressman was quick to explain that such a limitation would be contrary to the objectives of the Defense Manpower Policy which was designed to channel as much defense work as possible into areas having labor surpluses. And while Weston is not a small business, it operates in an area in which there is a high rate of surplus labor.

It took several weeks but the Defense Department gave favorable consideration to the Congressman's plea and on April 28 reversed the limited bidding rule in this case. The new bids, including Weston's, were opened last week at Washington, followed by the contract award Monday to Weston.

By virtue of the new contract, the local plant will be able to continue for some time its present fine employment total of some 1,400 workers from the region.

That these workers are highly skilled for this type of work is seen in the fact that the practice bombs are intricate pieces of equipment. They are designed to simulate the action of real bombs when dropped from airplanes.

Two days later, on June 11, the following editorial appeared in the Scranton Times:

NEW CONTRACT FOR WESTON

The announcement that Weston Instruments, Inc.—popularly known here as Daystrom—has received a $1.2 million contract from the Air Force was accompanied by the disclosure that the company has added nearly 400 employees to its payroll since the first of the year, to bring the total to about 1,400. General Manager Warnken says that the contract, for 1,500 practice bombs for the Air Force, will provide enough work to maintain this force.

Congressman MCDADE, who announced the contract award, deserves credit for having fought the original Defense Department ruling that the Archbald plant was not eligible because it was not a small business. The Congressman argued that Pentagon policy calls for funneling defense contracts into areas with a labor surplus and that under this policy Weston should be allowed to bid. Congressman MCDADE's argument produced a decision by the Department to advertise for new bids without any restrictions on the size of the companies bidding. The receipt of the contract by Weston is due largely to the Congressman's insistence.

Both of these newspapers, Mr. Speaker, reflect the continuing concern of our colleague, Congressman JOSEPH M. MCDADE, with the problem of unemployment in northeastern Pennsylvania.

Two and a half years ago, when he came to Congress, my colleague from the 10th District of Pennsylvania was faced with an unemployment rate of approximately 14 percent in his district. Today, that rate of unemployment has been cut nearly in half; and no one has worked harder to fight unemployment and save jobs than JOE MCDADE.

In April of this year, my colleague came to grips with a situation which would have prohibited a company in his district from bidding on an Air Force contract—even though that company was currently producing the very item the Air Force needed. As a result of Congressman MCDADE's intervention, the company was permitted to bid, ended up as low bidder, and so guaranteed continued employment at Weston Instruments.

This is only one instance of the work of my colleague in this field, and I could name many more. I call this particular one to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to show them how the dedication of one man can affect the lives of so many people.

C. F. Buckler Celebrates His 80th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a man who has contributed so much to the building and development of the great Panhandle-Plains area of the State of Texas.

I speak of Mr. C. P. Buckler, who celebrated his 80th birthday on Sunday, June 20. Mr. Buckler, affectionately called "the Colonel" by his many friends, came to the town of Pampa, Tex., my own hometown, when there were less than 50 people who could call themselves citizens of Pampa. Due to his fine leadership, outstanding efforts, and sustaining courage, many joined with him in building one of the outstanding cities of the Great Plains area. A fine tribute was paid Mr. Buckler in the Pampa Daily News on Friday, June 18. Under unanimous consent, I include this splendid account of his achievements in the RECORD, at this point:

HON. C. P. BUCKLER

One of Pampa's beloved pioneers, C. P. Buckler, will celebrate his 80th birthday Sunday.

A special celebration for the Englishman, who came to Pampa when the population was less than 50, has been planned by friends, relatives and the church he helped organize.

A family reunion will be held all day Sunday at the Buckler home, 410 Buckler. A stained-glass window will be dedicated to him at 9:30 a.m. Sunday at St. Matthew's Episcopal Church.

Mr. Buckler's three daughters, Mr. and Mrs. Russell Allen and family of Austin; Mr. and Mrs. Aubrey Green and family of Borger, and Mr. and Mrs. Ben Gull and family of Washington, D.C., will be in Pampa for the reunion. Many other friends and relatives of Mr. Buckler from Pampa and out of town will also attend the birthday party and reunion.

Mr. Buckler came to Pampa from England in 1905 when he was 20 years of age. He and the late M. K. Brown became assistants to the late T. D. Hobart in the management of the White Deer Land Co. At the time, Gray County was only 3 years old and the county seat was located at Lefors.

Following the death several years later of Hobart, Mr. Buckler and Brown succeeded in management of the White Deer Land Co.

Mr. Buckler related that at that time there wasn't even a barber shop in Pampa and an old boxcar was used for the depot.

"From that date until today, the growth of Pampa has been miraculous," stated Mr. Buckler.

Mr. Buckler attributed the growth and progress of Pampa to "a bunch of good solid citizens."

During his 60 years in Pampa, Mr. Buckler has served as president and trustee of the Pampa Independent School Board for 16 years. He was president of the board when Pampa High School was built.

He has served as chairman of the selective service board for 6 years and president of the Panhandle Plains Historical Society in Canyon.

In 1959, he was named the "Outstanding Man in Pampa" by the chamber of commerce. A 33 degree Mason, Mr. Buckler is president of Security Federal Savings & Loan Co., director in the First National Bank, and director in Southwestern Investment Co.

He helped organize the St. Matthew Episcopal Church and is a charter member and past president of the Pampa Rotary Club and the Pampa Country Club.

Although Mr. C. P. Buckler is entitled to much credit for the achievements mentioned, I am sure he would be the first to admit that his greatest achievement was his marriage to the late Mrs. Buckler, the former Miss Annie Thut, and the three wonderful daughters who blessed this union.

I join all in saluting C. P. Buckler, "always the gentleman."

Another Failure for the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson and his advisers, who believe that all things may be accomplished through a benevolent government, have chalked up another failure. They just will not recognize the fact that you cannot legislate human behavior, initiative, ability or willingness to earn those things an individual may want out of life. The Secretary of Labor believed that all he needed to do was to wave the magic wand of federalism and all the fruits and vegetables in the Southwest and West would somehow be harvested, that the reservoir of labor from Mexico was not needed and that welfare recipients in Los Angeles and other areas were eagerly waiting an opportunity to earn their daily bread.

The sad truth is the welfare recipients in Los Angeles and other areas were not interested in the hard work of picking lettuce and tomatoes, not when they could continue to bask in the balmy sunshine of California spring at taxpayers' expense without lifting a finger. The result of the wishful thinking of the planners of the Great Society is that while those of us who are still willing to work to provide for ourselves and our families are paying higher prices for fruit and vegetables while those same fruits and vegetables rot in the fields and the uninhibited welfare recipients continue to enjoy a life of ease on their welfare checks. Silly, is it not? But that is the dream world in which the President moves as he uses the taxes paid by the ambitious and the industries to garner votes from the indolent and the lazy. Perhaps the people will wake up to the unreality of this dream before it is too late.

The following editorial from the Gadsden Times, Gadsden, Ala., points out the irony of it all:

JOBS WERE THERE—BUT NOT WORKERS

Opponents of the President's antipoverty program are making quite a case for themselves in California where fruit and vegetables are dying in the fields because of a serious labor shortage.

The Government stopped the importation of thousands of Mexican braceros so that unemployed Americans could find work.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz estimated that 150,000 to 200,000 jobs would fall to Americans if the Mexicans were kept out.

It just didn't work that way.

In spite of excellent food, good housing and working conditions, provided by the growers, the Americans have rejected the "stoop labor." Many who accepted the jobs, and this is according to State Employment Director Albert Tieburg, wouldn't stay.

Some of the adverse results of this involve higher prices, cutback of crop plantings, heavy losses to growers and loss of jobs among truckdrivers because of no fruit or vegetables to haul.

Producers are threatening to take the crops to where the hands are.

While no thinking person would be against any program to reduce poverty—to give a better way of living to underprivileged people—he would still have to deplore those unemployed individuals who shun honest work.

It is in this area the antipoverty program comes up missing. The situation in California proves that in many instances poverty exists simply because men and women are too lazy to work. They can get by with a visit to the welfare wagon.

The irony of it all is that jobs are available to thousands of Americans at a higher rate and just across the border are an equal number of Mexicans who would work if given the opportunity.

The Federal Maritime Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, last evening the Honorable Nicholas Johnson, Federal Maritime Administrator, addresed the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of Newport News, Va., on various aspects of our maritime subsidy program.

His informative speech is most timely now that we stand on the verge of a new overall Federal maritime policy.

Administrator Johnson, in his address, suggests that the allocation of subsidy moneys should be made in accordance with the relative productivity which it creates.

Anyone interested in the American flag marine will find his address most interesting and enlightening.

I commend the reading of his address to my colleagues:

THE NEED FOR CHOICE

(By Nicholas Johnson, Maritime Administrator, U.S. Department of Commerce)

"We must be ever mindful of the state of our merchant fleet. A balanced, economical, and efficient merchant fleet, manned by well-trained and skilled seamen, is a vital national resource."—President Lyndon B. Johnson, National Maritime Day Proclamation, May 22, 1965.

It is good to be here with all of you tonight. Until this past year making speeches was a rather new experience for me. Not very long ago I was a teacher, and had begun to suffer from the delusion, which is virtually impossible to resist, that all of my students were industriously taking notes because what I had to say was so interesting.

The very first speech I made to a group that had just finished a large dinner quickly dispelled that illusion. When I related this change to a more experienced friend, he told me of the time he rose to speak and asked the toastmaster how long he should talk. "Take as long as you like," was the answer, "we leave in a half hour."

I will try to see that we both leave together tonight.

It is often difficult to have the problems of the maritime industry for dessert, as it were. Yet it is terribly important, I think, that you and I both take the time to consider these problems together. We must do so if we are to came to some common ground on the policies that must be adopted and executed to improve the situation.

As is almost invariably true with subsidy programs, there is a relative scarcity of funds. The limitation on available funds means that we must perhaps build fewer ships than we would otherwise desire, and that we can subsidize the operation of fewer ships than we might otherwise wish to have sailing under the American flag. This scarcity raises the need for choice, and the perplexing problem of the criteria according to which the choice is to be made.

Nor is this in any sense an academic exercise. Lack of ship construction funds has made it necessary for the Maritime Administration to defer beyond the contract date the replacement of 66 ships. In addition, the stautory lives of ships built after January 1, 1946, were extended to 25 years in order to prevent the piling up of replacement obligations. Forty-one cargo ships now owned by subsidized operators were constructed after that date but prior to the delivery of the first mariner in 1952.

In addition, applications for operating subsidy covering 100 additional ships, all built before 1947, are now pending before the Maritime Subsidy Board. These ships must be replaced or lost to American-flag operations.

Similar problems are presented by the operating subsidy. Presently subsidized operators want more sailings. In 1964 the total requests for additional sailings came to 77, and in the past 5 months of 1965 there have been requests for 30 new sailings.

In addition the presently unsubsidized operators have requested operating subsidy for a total of 648 sailings.

How is the available money to be allocated, both between new applicants and, consistent with the requirements of law, between old and new applicants?

One possible standard, and one which has received increasing discussion in recent months, is relative productivity.

I would like to discuss with you for a while some of the possible meanings of this word "productivity" in the context of the American merchant marine, and some of the ways in which I think it may be a useful tool in making these difficult judgments.

There has been a great deal of misunderstanding on this issue. The word "productivity" in maritime affairs has been taken by some to be synonymous with "crew reductions." In part this confusion arises from the fact that the appearance of mechanized ships, with the resulting possibility for substantial crew reductions, has tended to focus national interest in this relatively narrow area. But while crew size is an area where progress must—and is—being made, it is hardly the area where the most dramatic changes are possible.

In the strange economic world of maritime subsidies, productivity is the result of many forces. This is best illustrated by a report I recently had prepared which compared the productivity of the war-built 15.5-knot C–2's with that of a group of 23-knot C–4's recently ordered by one American operator.

The profitability of any investment, private or public, is a function of the extent to which the expected return has been realized. The Government does not expect to earn a dollar profit on its venture into maritime subsidies. But it does expect a national shipping capability in return; and the more capability purchased for each subsidy dollar, the better has been our investment.

The investment in the C–2's and C–4's may be measured initially in terms of productive capacity—their theoretically maximum utilization. In terms of cubic capacity and speed, the C–4 has more than twice the productive capacity of the older ship. Thus without taking into account any reduction in crew at all, we have doubled the Nation's return for its subsidy investment.

It is true, of course, that a ship spends a high percentage of her time in port, unproductively. This means that the potential gains of size and speed cannot be fully realized. For example, the company which ordered these C–4's plans to substitute four of them for six C–2's, a reduction of one-third instead of one-half, and even that involves substantial reductions in the turnaround time for the newer vessels as compared with that of the C–2's.

But even if we take more conservative figures and assume that in actual service five new ships will be required to substitute for six old ones, the increase in shipping capacity purchased for the subsidy dollar is impressive. Taking into account a decrease in operating subsidy because of reasonable crew reductions on the newer ships, it is actually cheaper per unit of shipping capacity for the Government to subsidize the construction and operation of a new ship than it is to continue paying operating subsidy on the older ships.

We may also look at the performance of the ship from the point of view of the operator. Is the ship profitable before subsidy? After subsidy? What is the return on the operator's investment?

These questions are relevant from the Government's point of view for a number of reasons. Profitability, especially after subsidy, is something of an index of the viability of the industry. If it cannot make money even after an equalization of major cost differentials, then the industry's continued existence would need strong justification indeed. Moreover, we are dedicated to private ownership and operation of our Nation's shipping resource. Profitability is some measure of the degree to which the industry can attract capital and new management.

The profitability of a company also has a direct impact upon the level of subsidy expenditures.

The fear often has been expressed that when we speak of "a more adequate and economic merchant marine" we surely must be talking about cutting profits. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In a recent publication of the Department of Commerce, "Profits and the American Economy," Secretary of Commerce John T. Conner said, "There is a growing realization that the profit incentive, which encourages both vigorous initiative and healthy competition, is fundamental to our economic growth. It is an impelling factor in our search for new and better materials, methods, and products."

But the Government's interest is not limited to the fact that profits are essential to the economic growth of our Nation and the shipping industry. The Government's interest in a profitable shipping industry is also somewhat parochial.

Under our present subsidy system 50 percent of all profits in excess of 10 percent of capital necessarily employed is "recaptured" by the Government. In recent years the Government has been able to recapture only a small portion of the subsidy expended. Nevertheless, it does create for the Government a direct financial interest in an increasingly profitable American merchant marine. For example, a recent proposal for a container service indicates that this service will result in the Government recapturing substantial amounts of subsidy—perhaps well over half—and that there will be an increase in productivity over the conventional C–4's of 1.27 times.

It is obvious that two somewhat different factors have been so far discussed together under the general rubric of productivity: potential and actual use. In order to come to some conclusion about the relative importance of these two factors, we must have recourse to the aims of our national maritime policy.

A major justification for the subsidy program is the necessity of having a fleet in time of military emergency. This factor places relative emphasis upon future use, and suggests that we ought to be concerned with large, fast ships capable of quickly unloading bulky military cargo and leaving the danger zone. The military, of course, has a need for many kinds of specialized ships, but this need is met by the Military Sea Transportation Service. In the inevitable compromise between military need and commercial necessity, large, fast ships best fill our need for the movement of enromous quantities of military supplies within a very short time after the commencement of hostilities.

A similar conclusion is suggested by an examination of the commercial needs of the United States for an American-flag shipping capability. To the extent that we feel it desirable to have the self-sufficiency to carry a large portion of our trade in American-flag ships, that goal is more closely approached by investing our limited funds in the most productive ships.

Most important, however, is the fact that our interest in possessing a merchant fleet grows out of our needs as a trading nation. Unlike some nations in which the merchant marine makes a very substantial contribution to the gross national product, the value of our merchant marine lies primarily in the actual and potential control it gives us over the rates and terms at which our trade moves.

The weight of our voice in private shipping conferences and in the international shipping councils of governments is directly related to the size and strength of our fleet. Moreover, we want our ships to provide American shippers with transportation at the lowest possible rates.

Both of these factors argue for the most productive present use of the vessels, for the more economic are our ships, the greater will be the resulting pressure for lower rates. The more cargo we carry the more will our voice carry the day.

On the other hand, the use of American ships for economic emergencies, as with military emergencies, tends to give relatively more weight to potential use. For example, during the Suez crisis of 1956 the closing of the canal resulted in a sharp drop in the available shipping services; we were forced to take more than 200 ships from our reserve fleet because of the doubling and tripling of freight rates. Of course, existing ships

fully employed in commercial service cannot provide the net addition to available service obtained by activating reserve fleet ships. But it is nevertheless clear that the larger, faster ships provide the Government with more flexibility in allocating available shipping services in time of emergency.

This discussion suggests, I think, that between competing applications for existing construction and operating subsidy dollars the choice ought first to be made according to the potential shipping capacity which the proposed vessels will make available. This factor being relatively equal for all applicants, the next to be considered is the relative productivity of the use to which the ships will be put—the return on the operator's investment. This question is a function of both equipment—such as containerization or a barge-ship concept—and the trade in which the ship is employed.

The importance of advances in cargo handling and ship utilization is emphasized by the fact that many of our subsidized operators are already building more productive ships. Yet the full potential of these ships, and of even more productive ships to come, cannot be realized without a prior solution to the problem of increasing the utilization of ships in their primary task—carrying cargo across the sea. For the ship, time spent in port is time wasted. Advances like the new coal pier at Norfolk, one of the most modern in the world, are a cornerstone of future progress.

It is quite true that there are some trades in which only a relatively small ship, moving fairly slowly and making many stops at ports at either end of its run is economical, and it is fair to ask where such ships fit in the pattern of principles I have sketched out. In answer I can only ask whether such a route is a wise place to invest scarce Government funds when the ship will be of relatively lesser value in time of war, and relatively more costly in time of peace. So long as our needs are vast and we must be selective in satisfying them, should we not at least begin with the relatively more productive ships for subsidized construction and operation, and spend our necessarily limited funds to satisfy the greatest possible number of needs? It would seem to me in our national interests to do so.

This analysis also has consequences for old ships which operators—subsidized or unsubsidized—propose to bring under subsidy. It is plain that older ships are the least productive units possible for an American merchant marine. They consume relatively scarce operating subsidy funds and must be replaced as soon as possible, for it is clearly to our benefit to do so. On the other hand, the additional management capability and capital represented by new applicants may be a decided contribution to an industry in need of both. Perhaps, if it is financially possible, we may want to explore ways of bringing new operators into the subsidized fleet without bringing all their old ships with them, except on a nominal basis. It would be to the benefit of the United States, for example, if the private capital could be found, to build all new ships for the presently unsubsidized operators without paying operating subsidy on the old ships for any substantial length of time.

Let me illustrate. The 100 ships now covered by applications for operating subsidy will probably cost the taxpayers about $51 million per year to subsidize. However, the operating subsidy on new ships supplying an equivalent shipping capacity would be only $36 million. In choosing between new applicants the number of relatively unproductive old ships, the speed of proposed replacement, and the productivity of the proposed replacement are all essential factors.

Of course, there will be no reprograming of funds presently appropriated to named operators contrary to their desire. It will apply prosectively only, in the request for and allocation of future appropriations and of funds subsequently made available by voluntary reprograming of replacement schedules.

Recently Mr. Ed Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, responded to the challenge posed by these simple economic facts. In a speech at the New York Merchant Marine Academy he said: "With the same amount of money, the Government could buy more maritime capability and maintain a more modern fleet by building new ships." In addition, the Shipbuilders Council has undertaken a study of Government construction subsidy procedures to find ways in which they can be simplified.

I believe that the application of the criteria I have discussed broadly today will result in a stronger fleet for the American people, and better service for American shippers. I welcome your judgment on the question.

But the general idea I would like to leave with you is more fundamental. In the maritime industry we have tended to make our judgments on a somewhat general and sometimes unarticulated basis. If we are to have a truly adequate and economic merchant marine, we must think carefully about where we want to be 15 and 20 years from now, and adapt today's policies to tomorrow's goals.

Drift Toward War Benumbs Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Columnist James McCartney of the Chicago Daily News Washington bureau has taken a good, hard look at the handling of the Vietnam crisis here in Washington. His article on Wednesday, June 16 in the Chicago Daily News is a very penetrating and timely analysis of this major problem which is felt so keenly here in the Capital:

DRIFT TOWARD WAR BENUMBS CAPITAL

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—Most of this town is watching what is happening in Vietnam with a sense of numbness. It's like a far-off, unreal thing that can't be controlled. We drift, but we are not sure where.

We are faced with a growing threat of war, and everyone knows it, from the newsstand operator to the White House guard. But few are talking about it. It's not on everyone's lips.

No bands are playing, few patriotic speeches are being given. The town can get excited about lots of other things, like the spacemen or a party at the White House.

Somehow war, or the threat of war, has become so much a part of life that a new threat, involving thousands more troops, can be tolerated without excitement. People go right on planning their summer vacations.

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam, can predict that months of "hard fighting" are ahead, and no one blinks.

It may be simply that the White House and the State Department and the Pentagon and the CIA have succeeded too well in finding ways to fight these newfangled wars of liberation. They have sought to confuse the Communists in Peiping and in Hanoi and in Moscow. But an unexpected byproduct has been in confusing the American public, too.

The war in Vietnam is confusing all by itself. It's a different kind of war from any the Nation has ever fought before. By comparison, the war in Korea and World War II were simple to follow. They at least had lines and the soldiers knew which way to look to find the enemy.

But here's war where the Government doesn't want to say what it's doing for fear of tipping the enemy and causing a reaction. And you can add to that the fact that the war just hasn't gone according to plan. It hasn't worked out the way it was supposed to.

So statements of the Government have often been confusing by themselves, have often been in conflict with what was going on.

A look back over what has been said about the war, and the U.S. position, is enough to confuse anyone, perhaps even in retrospect. General Taylor in 1961, as President Kennedy's adviser, once said: "Nobody wants to send American troops anywhere."

As recently as early 1963 Adm. Harry D. Felt, then commander of U.S. military forces in the Pacific, predicted victory over the Communist guerrillas in 3 years.

Only 20 months ago a top-level team of Presidential advisers told President Kennedy, after visiting Saigon: "The end of the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965."

And Secretary of Defense McNamara told a congressional committee 16 months ago, after President Johnson took office, that the United States would pull out most of its troops by the end of 1965.

General Taylor said as recently as last October that the Communists were "militarily farther from success than ever."

You look at all of that, and realize that the talk now is of a growing number of troops, perhaps as many as 100,000, and nobody is talking about pulling out at all anymore.

So, of course, the United States changed its policy, and anyone who cares knows it, from the newsstand operator to the White House guard.

But you can't pick a specific day and say: "That was the day we switched." And you can't pick a specific speech by President Johnson and say: "That was the speech in which he announced our new policy."

This is a war without a dramatic rallying point—no Pearl Harbor, no "Remember the *Maine*." Band playing and patriotism, bond selling and bunting are not a part of the new kind of war.

And maybe that's why the town seems numb—because people aren't quite sure about this kind of war.

Snack Foods Producer Aids AAU Olympic Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the program being sponsored by the Old London Foods division of the Borden Co. for both physical fitness and the development of athletes to represent the United States in international competitions through the Olympic development program of the Amateur Athletic Union. Last year Old London inaugurated its program with the AAU and this year's

efforts show a broad expansion. Perhaps the strong showing by U.S. athletes at the recent Olympic competition in Japan was due, in part, to Old London's efforts.

The Nation's efforts at physical fitness have had support at the highest level, following the move by the late and beloved President John F. Kennedy in setting up the President's Council on Physical Fitness. Old London, however, was the first representative of U.S. industry to actively associate itself with the efforts of the AAU in training amateur athletes for Olympic competition.

I wish to commend Old London for its efforts in this field. This company, which started in the Bronx with a $4,000 investment during the dark days of the depression and now has plants in four States and distributes its products domestically and abroad, is contributing to something which is of utmost importance to all Americans. For there can be no success is anything for a nation or an individual, if one is not physically well. Therefore, I would now like to insert into the RECORD a statement which details Old London's newest move in this program:

SNACK FOODS PRODUCER AIDS AAU OLYMPIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

NEW YORK, June 23.—The Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, the Nation's largest amateur sports organization and a primary source for Olympic Games athletes, announced today that the Old London Foods Division of the Borden Co., producers of snack foods, had agreed to national spnsorship of medals to be awarded this year in the AAU's broad-scale Olympic development program.

The AAU Olympic development program involves over 1 million youngsters, seasoned athletes, and volunteer workers participating in 10 Olympic sports in communities throughout the Nation. The program was inaugurated by the AAU 6 years ago to find, develop, and polish athletic talent to represent the United States in the Olympic Games and other international competitions.

The entire program embraces track and field, swimming and diving, basketball, gymnastics, boxing, wrestling, judo, weightlifting, water polo.

Stan Musial, consultant to the President of the United States on Physical Fitness, who was unable to attend the news conference at the last moment, expressed his congratulations and good wishes for the success of the program.

On behalf of the AAU, executive director, Col. Don Hull, U.S. Army, retired, welcomed the support of Old London Foods in helping to prepare athletes for the 1968 Olympic Games, Pan American Games of 1967, and other international competitions.

Morrie R. Yohai, president of Old London, said in reply, "We are pleased that we can assist not only the AAU Olympic development program, but also the Nation's youth fitness effort as well."

Last year Old London cosponsored the AAU Junior Olympics which engages youngsters in track and field and the aquatic sports as well as gymnastics, judo, wrestling, and weightlifting.

"Expansion of its aid to the full range of age and Olympic events," said George E. Seedhouse of Cleveland, AAU National Olympic development chairman, "will have far-reaching benefits in the AAU's 1965 program. Each of our 54 district AAU organizations will be able to expand its local activities and conduct additional meets and events. From the increased competition, the United States should be adding to its reservoir of athletes qualified for international competition in both the short- and long-range in order to maintain our Nation's preeminent position in athletics."

Old London Foods, headquartered in New York, with plants in four States, has offered the services of its local representatives throughout the country to cooperate with district AAU officials in implementing the Olympic effort.

Outstanding Diplomatic Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Governments of Korea and Japan on a truly outstanding diplomatic achievement. On June 22, in Tokyo, the foreign ministers of these two nations signed a series of treaties to normalize their lond disrupted relations. As a result the two nations, in the words of Japanese Prime Minister Sato, will render a greater contribution to the prosperity and stabilization of peace in Asia.

Korea is important to both the security and to the economic development of the Pacific community; a community of which this Nation is very much a part and a community in which Japan, as one of its most highly industrialized and rapidly growing nations, has a high stake. The Normalization Agreements will encourage both trade and credit exchanges between these two key members of the Pacific community. The body of the agreement already insures Korea $300 million in economic grants, $200 million in long-term development loans and $300 million in commercial loans. This extension of grants and loans from Japan will be of immeasurable benefit to Korea's achievement of her 5-year plan goals which terminate in 1966 and which demand $700 million in foreign investment for accomplishment.

The Normalization Agreements will also benefit Japan. In addition to opening Korea's rapidly expanding domestic market it will also permit Japanese businessmen to take advantage of Korea's low-cost labor market through investment—an opportunity for the Japanese which also promises to accelerate Korea's economic growth.

Through the Normalization Agreements Korea and Japan have done more than recognize their historic and strategic importance to one another. They have formalized the economic development potential of their geographical proximity. Although there are still many obstacles to be overcome, the Normalization Agreements, Mr. Speaker, are indeed a giant step forward in the full utilization of both Korea's and Japan's potential, in addition to acting as an example and stimulus to the entire Pacific community. We hope for speedy final ratification and look forward to successful implementation.

The Study of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, back in 1961 when I was a freshman Member of this House, I had a rather portly "shadow" who went in and out with me for a full week.

That shadow was Dr. Nelson Polsby, one of the most energetic students of the congressional process. It happens that I was the first Congressman he shadowed, but he also followed that same procedure with several other Members, including some of the much more senior Members. He was attempting to observe in minute detail the life Congressmen live and how they make their decisions.

Since that time, I have had many further opportunities to watch with interest Professor Polsby's continuing studies of the Congress. He is now associate professor of government at Wesleyan University in Connecticut, and that university has been very generous in allowing him extended leaves of absence during which he has devoted his time to studying this legislative body.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is good to know that an exceptional group of scholars—including Professor Polsby—is now engaged in a very broad and thorough study of the congressional process. That enterprise, entitled "The Study of Congress," is being sponsored by the American Political Science Association, using a grant of some $230,000 for the very respected Carneigie Corp., of New York.

Directing the study is Prof. Ralph K. Huitt, of the University of Wisconsin, one of the best known of American political scientists. Dr. Huitt has managed to recruit a group of some 15 of the more outstanding of America's younger scholars to assist him in the study.

I cite Dr. Polsby to indicate that the caliber of that study will hopefully be excellent and valid. His publications concerning the Congress indicate that he already ranks high among Government scholars. A Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Johns Hopkins University in 1956, he obtained his Ph. D. from Yale University Graduate School in 1961, and since then has taught at the University of Wisconsin, Columbia University, and Yale University before becoming associated with Wesleyan.

Dr. Polsby is the author of numerous articles in scholarly journals and has written or edited six books. Their subjects range from community power structure to the Congress and the Presidency, presidential elections, and urban renewal.

Mr. Speaker, I am impressed by the fact that, like Dr. Polsby, the other scholars working with Dr. Huitt on "The Study of Congress" all have done considerable work in this field and have established reputations for responsibility on the basis of their firsthand, personal

experience and observations right here on Capitol Hill. It is good to have such studies done by men who have spent considerable time in close personal touch with the way Congress operates, its actual day-to-day processes, rather than only secondhand from sterile records.

As I understand it, the purpose of the study which Professor Huitt heads is to provide a set of comprehensive research papers which will be available, in effect, as staff material for congressional committees or citizens groups which may be interested in the problems of congressional reorganization. But they will be written with the idea of first finding out how Congress works, not for the purpose of trying to tell us how we should work.

Only Congress itself can make any final decisions concerning its own reorganization, that is obvious. But I feel confident that the Congress should welcome objective studies conducted by men as responsible as Professors Huitt and Polsby, financed by such an eminent foundation as the Carnegie Corporation, and sponsored by the leading professional organization of students of government, the American Political Science Association.

United States Refuses To Return Friendship of South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Walter Trohan, chief of the Chicago Tribune Washington bureau, in his "Report from Washington" of Monday, June 21, discusses the administration's diplomatic policy vis-a-vis the Republic of South Africa.

I believe that this is a subject that deserves scrutiny, since, as Mr. Trohan points out, domestic political considerations should not be permitted to adversely affect the problems in foreign affairs. It is unfortunate to have an administration whose obvious interest is in politics first and sound foreign policy second:

UNITED STATES REFUSES TO RETURN FRIENDSHIP OF SOUTH AFRICA

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, June 20.—The Republic of South Africa is the one stable nation on the African Continent that wants to be friendly with the United States and gets the cold shoulder from our State Department.

South Africa does not take one penny of our foreign aid. Hundreds of millions of aid dollars are going to other African nations, including dictatorships and Communist-oriented nations. South Africa contributed to the strength of the American dollar by buying more than it sells to this country.

South Africa is importing American goods at the rate of $400 million a year, or about one-third of all American exports to the African Continent. American investors are getting a return of 13 to 17 percent on some $450 million of investments in South Africa, which is stable and enjoying fabulous economic growth.

Yet, the State Department is trying to steer American investors away from South Africa to other African nations, totalitarian and Communist. South Africa cannot buy warships and other arms it wants from the United States—for cash. The State Department policy against South Africa is dictated by the politics of integration at home.

IMPORTANT TO AFRICAN CONTINENT

If South Africa falls, the entire African Continent could drop into the Communist lap. There are those who are concentrating on South Africa because they want all Africa to be black ruled, even though South Africa was settled by whites—Portugese and Dutch and later British—who found fewer Negroes in the area when they landed in the 17th century than the Pilgrims found Indians at Plymouth in 1620.

Whites moved northward in South Africa at about the time the Bantu, blacks, began moving south. The two groups met for the first time in 1779 in the vicinity of the Fish River. The two did not mix, any more than in the United States.

But South Africa embarked on a system that has become known as apartheid, which is a Dutch word for separateness or apartness. The United States abandoned this system for integration by law. It thus became politically desirable to oppose South Africa.

There are no South Africans in a political block in the United States, where there are almost 20 million Negroes. What makes South Africa more reprehensible in the eyes of some Americans is the fact that the South African policy of the black and white races separately is working.

The South African Negroes have a national council, and so has the Indian population. The government maintains the closest of contacts with these appointed and elected groups.

There are some 2,600 Bantu African university graduates. There are 1,000 undergraduates in 3 Bantu university colleges. In the past 16 years South Africa, with a population of 11 million blacks, has produced more Bantu college graduates than 9 other African nations with a total population of more than 70 million have done in 50 years.

EDUCATION, PROSPERITY ABOVE AVERAGE

There are 29,500 Bantu African teachers, and each year 2,000 more graduate from teacher training colleges. Eighty-three percent of the Bantu children in South Africa between the ages of 7 and 12 go to school. For the rest of Africa the number varies from 5 to 40 percent.

More than 12,000 Bantu own their own businesses, and 3 are reputed to be millionaires. More than a million foreign Bantu are working in South Africa. Blacks are better fed, better paid, and better housed than elsewhere in Africa. And they enjoy better health.

South Africa is the world's largest producer of gold, annual production being just over a billion dollars. It also produces the most diamonds—industrial and jewels. This gold flows to the free world and is part of its life blood.

Other African nations have been marked with violence against the United States and against themselves in government changes. Communism likes to fish in troubled waters. Red China has one-third of its diplomatic establishments in Africa preaching hate against whites.

One African nation has seen its white population drop from 1,200,000 to about 200,000 under independence. It is not essential that we approve South Africa's internal policy, but it would seem wise that we know a friend when we find one, a friend that is properous, stable, and advancing the lot of all peoples of all races in a strategic area.

No Repeat of 1929

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy recently about Mr. William McChesney Martin's warning of a possible repeat of the 1929 financial crash.

A recent editorial printed in the Bristol Press quite capably points out that there are numerous safeguards built into our society today which were not present in 1929—unemployment insurance, social security, minimum wages, union strength, SEC regulation of margin buying of stocks, insured mortgages for private homeowners, and many more things which Mr. Martin apparently failed to consider.

With permission of the House, I place this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

NO REPEAT OF 1929

William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Board, threw a scare into Wall Street with his statement that there are many similarities between conditions now and those which existed when the market crashed in 1929. Some of his advice was sound but there are many reasons why a repetition of the 1929 crash is hardly possible.

Too many safeguards have been built into the national economy since that time. In spite of the Martin warning, it appears that the general air is one of confidence among businessmen, industrial leaders, bankers, and economists.

There seems to be ample reason for this confidence.

After the 1929 crash, bank failures were prevalent. People were afraid to trust their savings to banking institutions. There was no guarantee that they would not be wiped out if their bank failed. Now the Government has insured deposits up to $10,000 for banks and savings and loan associations. There is little likelihood of any wholesale withdrawal of deposits so long as this guarantee exists.

When jobs became scarce during the depression years and layoffs were the order of the day, there was no protection to those made idle. Now nearly 50 million workers are assured of unemployment compensation during layoffs, in some cases up to 52 weeks of idleness. Many firms also provide for supplemental benefits when workers are laid off.

The elderly are much better off, too. Nine out of ten retired workers are protected by social security. In most cases these payments are supplemented pension plans set up by the employers. It also appears now that some sort of medicare plan will be put into effect to take care of illness for the elderly persons.

A protective wage system now exists. In the depression days, employers cut wages to make ends meet. Now minimum wages are in effect. Powerful unions have negotiated long-term contracts providing stable wages, in some cases containing cost-of-living adjustments.

It is extremely unlikely that the stock market will ever experience such a drastic tailspin. In the 1920's it was possible to purchase shares with margins as low as 10 percent. Regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission the market now operates on a rigid checkup procedure. Margin

requirements are 70 percent and the typical investor actually owns his stock outright.

In the field of homeownership, the situation is far different today than it was 35 years ago. Many thousands lost their homes which were held under short-term mortgages and no Government guarantees. Today many mortgages extend for as much as 30 years. Mortgage payments are much the same as paying rent. Better than a third of home mortgages are underwritten by the Federal Government.

These are some of the reasons why any repetition of the 1929 crash is extremely unlikely.

Urban Transport Research Bill Receives Favorable Response

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 9200 requiring the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to undertake a $20 million research program designed to achieve a technological breakthrough in the development of new urban transportation systems. Eight other Members joined as cosponsors: the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], the gentleman from New York, [Mr. ROSENTHAL], the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The new systems would be designed to carry people quickly, safely, and economically from place to place within urban areas, without polluting the air and in such a way as to meet the needs of the people for individual transport.

New systems obviously are needed when we look at the state of transportation in our Nation's cities today. We cannot continue to handle urban transportation needs in our present style—primarily lots of roads and refurbishing of wornout buses and subway cars. We need entirely new modes of urban transport.

The June 19 edition of the Dallas Morning News carries an editorial endorsing the proposal:

TRANSIT RESEARCH

Congressman EARLE CABELL is one of eight Members of the House who are cosponsoring Representative HENRY REUSS' bill to set up a research program on urban transport. The measure calls for $20 million to find ways to meet growing needs of big cities such as Dallas.

The Federal Government is the logical agency to finance research affecting large parts of the population and has long been so considered. This has been true since the days when agriculture was the main business of the American people. Now that most of them are crowding into cities, their traffic, transport, and other problems require the best engineering and technical solutions possible. No single community can do this alone.

Congress last year edged the Federal Government into subsidies for urban mass transit. These handouts call already for millions of dollars, and the prospect is that they will in time total in the billions.

This extension of Federal aid has not met with approval on all sides, but Federal research can reduce the overall cost of transport systems by finding more economical and efficient ways of building and operating them. In that event, the $20 million in the Reuss bill could prove a real bargain for taxpayers.

Cleveland Orchestra From 11-Week, 11-Country Tour of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I call to the attention of this body that the Cleveland Orchestra will be returning home on June 26, concluding an 11-week eastern and western European tour of 11 countries, giving 45 concerts in 20 cities, including 25 in 6 Russian cities. The tour was a part of the overseas Cultural Presentations Program of the Department of State.

Audience, critic, and official reactions were consistently expressed in superlatives. As an example, a press story in Warsaw referred to the "Magicians from Cleveland" saying:

This phenomenal orchestra is one of the best, if not the best, in the world.

In Berlin, long accustomed to the finest in the performing arts, the Manager of the Philharmonic Orchestra, referring to a special concert for the university students, said:

The enthusiasm and rapport was unmatched in his Berlin experience.

The impact of the Cleveland Orchestra extended far beyond their formal concerts. In practically every country all or parts of the concerts were broadcast over radio or television. Dr. Szell was untiring not only in giving the normal press conference but in appearing in special television interviews.

Discussions were arranged enabling members of the orchestra to meet informally in small group to exchange ideas with their colleagues of the host countries; seminars and discussions were led by Dr. Szell, Mr. Lane, and others at music conservatories of the host countries; dinners and luncheons arranged by the embassies enabled Dr. Szell, Mr. Lane, Mr. Barksdale, Mr. Druian, Mr. Browning, and others to have contact with the cultural and political leaders of the countries visited. These opportunities for individual American musicians to have personal contact with the citizens of cities visited were pleasant and rewarding.

It is impressive to note that during the time when the Soviet press was dominated by official party propaganda in connection with existing tensions with the United States, the Cleveland Orchestra's tour was given extremely favorable and accurate coverage. This feeling of friendship and understanding spilled over from the official aspects of the tour. Many individual members of the Cleveland Orchestra were invited to private apartments for informal friendly conversations.

In Vienna, Dr. Szell was awarded the Cross of Honor for Science and Art, first class, by the Austrian Minister of Education.

The first 5 weeks of the tour were all spent in the Soviet Union where concerts were given in Moscow, Kiev, Tbilisi, Yerevan, Sochi, and Leningrad. After leaving the Soviet Union, concerts followed in Helsinki, Stockholm, Warsaw, Berlin, Hamburg, Paris, Bergen, Norway; Prague, Czechoslovakia; Bratislava, Czechoslovakia; Vienna, London, Amsterdam, and Scheveningen, Holland.

The success of the tour of this great orchestra under the baton of one of the world's greatest conductors evidences again the great value of such a Government-sponsored cultural tour in conveying the depth and substance of our cultural endeavors in the United States to countries around the world. It is my sincere hope that many more tours of this nature will be conducted to as many countries around the world as will receive them. Music, and the arts generally, have proved to be one of the finest means to convey our desire to strive for peace and understanding throughout the world.

Walk in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent, very successful space flight has prompted much commentary on our space program. One of the finest newspapers in the great State of Nebraska, the Pierce County Leader, contained one of the best I have seen. It deserves a wide audience, and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Pierce County Leader, June 17, 1965]

WALK IN SPACE

Nearly every citizen in the United States spent what time they could to hear and see the exploits of James McDivitt and Edward White as they circled the world in *Gemini 4* and were able to walk in space for some 15 or 20 minutes before completing their 4-day mission in space.

This successful manned space shot put the United State back in the running against Russia * * * but the question very few in the United States can answer is where is the finish line of this particular race?

Some say it's a race to see who can land on the moon first * * * but at the same time the people are warned that even if a spacecraft does reach the moon and make a soft landing, it is possible man cannot operate from the moon as a base.

The race is between Russia and the United States and while there are many more factors involved * * * it does seem possible the race is being spurred here in the United States to beat Russia to the moon because Russia seems to be in a big hurry to get there.

The public has never been given any detailed information as to the military advantage of world domination from a moon headquarters * * * but indications are that this could possibly be Russia's goal and this spur the efforts of the United State.

This Nation has been very fortunate in not having lost a single astronaut in the space shots * * * so to date the results have all brought glory to the space efforts. If misfortune should strike, a public reaction may result that could seriously hamper space efforts.

The race to the moon is a serious business. The United States, through utmost efforts of all persons involved has been able to keep up with the Russians. The entire program for both Russia and the United States could possibly end in a sour note after someone lands on the moon and decides it is made of "green cheese" and not wanted by anyone.

Until this question is settled the United States must keep in this unusual race * * * Russia cannot be allowed to win but the problem is no one knows where the finish line is.

Illinois State Legislature Pays Tribute to John M. Lehmann, Chicago District Director of Immigration and Naturalization Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the Illinois State House of Representatives adopted a resolution in which it singled out for special commendation Mr. John M. Lehmann, Chicago district director of immigration and naturalization.

We here in Congress can look with pride to the fact that a Federal employee would receive such singular recognition from a State legislative body. It should be a source of great pride to us that a Federal employee, through his conduct, has won such recognition.

I should like to add my own congratulations to Mr. Lehmann and to his very dedicated secretary, Miss Mabel Platt, who, with Mr. Lehmann, has made the Chicago district office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service a model agency.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution adopted by the Illinois House of Representatives follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 200 BY STATE OF ILLINOIS 74TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Whereas "We are—one and all—immigrants or the sons and daughters of immigrants," as President Eisenhower has well said; and

Whereas it behooves us to welcome the immigrant with decency and respect in the administration of law, and those who administer the Immigration and Nationality Act have done so; and

Whereas the Chicago district office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice, under its director, John M. Lehmann, has performed the delicate task of administering the law with intelligence, honesty, courtesy, and humanity, and has succeeded in conveying here and abroad a sense of the highest qualities of American justice and public service; Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That this body highly commend the Chicago district office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice and its director, John M. Lehmann, for the superlative quality of their administration of the law and for the incalculable good that this has done for the immigrant and for his chosen home; and that a suitably engrossed copy of this preamble and resolution be sent to the U.S. Department of Justice.

Adopted by the house, June 4, 1965.

JOHN P. TOUHY,
Speaker of the House.
CHAS. F. KERVIN,
Clerk of the House.

Rural Mail Plan Needs Recheck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department has indicated that it is considering a plan to lease the automobiles used by rural mail carriers.

This possibility desrves the most careful consideration before it can be instituted. A recent editorial in the Fremont Tribune discussed this proposal and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

RURAL MAIL PLAN NEEDS RECHECK

Nebraska's rural letter carriers meeting in Fremont will be taking a closer look at the Postmaster General's proposal that cars they use be leased rather than owned by the carriers.

The letter carriers now are reimbursed at the rate of 12 cents per mile for mileage driven on their rural routes. Postmaster General John Gronouski proposes that the 31,000 rural carriers be provided leased cars. A study, he says, shows that the leased cars can be provided for 6 to 8 cents a mile.

The first question of a watchful taxpayer is: If cars can be obtained for 6 to 8 cents per mile, why did the Post Office Department ever saddle us with payment of 12 cents?

Gronouski apparently still feels the figure is about correct, at least for some carriers for he has said the new plan can give "relief" to some rural carriers who now have out-of-pocket expenses for operating their own car.

There is good possibility that the figures on which Gronouski bases his proposal for saving $25 to $30 million are a little misleading. His announcement referred to the Civil Service Commission and the Internal Revenue Service as agencies which already lease vehicles. One can be reasonably sure that roads traveled by the rural letter carriers are not on the average the same as those traveled by the agencies mentioned. Nor are the rural miles comparable to those traveled by salesmen and other representatives of companies which lease cars.

Undoubtedly savings are available to car-leasing firms both at time of purchase and in repairs. Most savings would be based on reduced prices quoted for mass purchases.

But there also are difficulties which could prove expensive in time, money and service. Rural carriers being reimbursed for using their own cars find it advantageous to keep their vehicles in good working order. If they should encounter difficulty, it is up to them to get it fixed immediately—there's no saving in money or energy if they delay. Lessors might not be able to provide such maintenance and speedy repair service.

Obviously service facilities can't be provided in every city and hamlet at which rural letter carriers are based. How far away would a repairman be when a carrier calls in that his vehicle has lost an oil pan 3 miles west of Wolf Creek Bridge on Lone Hawk Road? How soon could the carrier be provided a substitute vehicle?

There's another item of expense that often escapes those who figure "great savings" to the Government. How expensive will be the bureau that handles lease arrangements and other administrative details and the bureau which polices use of the Government-leased fleet?

One carrier reports on fleet operation out of a post office in a larger city: "The vehicles are left out overnight. If they do not start in the morning which is many times, a filling station comes with a booster battery, charges $2 to start them and then they let them run all the time they sort the mail. If they have a flat tire while delivering mail, they just sit in the car until the repair shop comes."

Before Congress proceeds too far in approving another expensive economy move, more positive proof should be presented as to actual saving which can be realized without reduction of service to rural patrons. If there's a genuine saving, let's proceed. But let's remember that gross expenditures of the Federal Government in fiscal 1966, as estimated in the new budget, will total almost $155 billion, an increase of $10.3 billion over fiscal 1964. And this takes into consideration President Johnson's turning off lights in the White House.

Uncle Sam's Dangerous Gift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Polish American, a new publication serving the Greater Chicago area, features a number of talented writers who, in very interesting fashion, discuss major problems on our international and domestic scenes.

Mr. Harry Dembkowski, writing in the June 19 edition, analyzes the effect of our foreign aid program as it has earned dubious value for us among various recipient nations:

UNCLE SAM'S DANGEROUS GIFT

(By Harry E. Dembkowski)

Pakistan and India recently engaged in a military skirmish in the unhospitable desert called the Rann of Kutch. Following his nation's defeat, Prime Minister Shastri immediately set to work excusing India's lack of military success. Pictures were promptly published revealing that Pakistan had em-

ployed American-manufactured arms and equipment, presumably acquired through our foreign aid program. Thus, runs Shastri's soliloquy, the United States must be held responsible for India's military defeat and political embarrassment.

The Rann of Kutch incident is of no great military importance. It is but an offspring or aspect of the long-standing and long-festering Indian-Pakistan dispute over Kashmir, and it decided nothing other than that the Indians are not good warriors—a fact which Communist China proved to almost everyone's satisfaction several years ago.

It matters little that Pakistan won a few miles of desolate desert. But the Indian charge of America's compliance and connivance with Pakistan's aggression does matter because it brings to world attention an important question: If the United States does not support or condone Pakistan's military venture—and we may safely assume it does not—then why has American-furnished equipment been available for carrying out the venture? And the answer is simple: because it was a gift—a present from Uncle Sam.

Military assistance is the most hotly defended part of our foreign aid program. The slick and sly propagandists operating out of the State Department never tire in telling us how it is an essential weapon against "Communist aggression" (the platitude of platitudes which can justify anything and everything). And to that end many billions have been invested.

But to what end?

More often than not the practical result of the program is that the arms and equipment supplied to allies and neutralists, supposedly to be pointed against the Communists, soon are pointed against the recipients' non-Communist neighbors.

Witness the interminable Arab-Israel Cyprus. Both nations have been lavishly equipped with U.S. arms and, from their mutual threats, seem determined to someday use these arms against each other.

Witness Sukarno's aggression against Malaysia now that his army—one of the largest in the world—has been outfitted by good old Uncle Sam.

Witness the interminable Arab-Israeli conflict. All the nations involved have received American military supplies.

The proliferation of the instruments of war—referring to nonnuclear, conventional arms—enlarges the opportunity, and therefore encourages the chances, of war. This is particularly true when the recipients are not in need of these weapons in the first place.

For years, long before the entrenchment of Castro and his cohorts, the United States helped to equip the armies of Central and South American countries on the pretext of fighting communism. One difficulty with this policy, however, was that almost all of these countries did not need large or well-equipped military machines since the chances of any Communist invasion were quite small. Moreover and more importantly, in many cases, as in Batista's Cuba and Trujillo's Dominican Republic, the military was mainly used as an instrument for perpetuating authoritarian rule.

But in those areas where U.S. donations of arms are actually needed—as in southeast Asia—the problem is more complicated.

Once military aid has been received by a sovereign and independent nation, there is little the United States can do to prevent its use for unwise or illegitimate purposes appearing to be imperialistic.

Since almost all military assistance is a calculated risk which may backfire—as it may be doing in Pakistan—it should be limited to those pro-Western nations with a real and genuine need for it. This should serve to reduce the accompanying risks considerably.

Misguided generocity—a prime fault of American policy during this century—can be, and has been, the cause of much trouble and grief. (Who has forgotten Roosevelt's lend-lease received by Stalin?)

Giving a child a loaded revolver to use as he pleases may be "generosity," but it is also criminal irresponsibility. And giving a nation the tools for waging war when the need does not exist or when those tools may well be used for immoral or unjustifiable purposes is political irresponsibility. This implies that in the future the United States should be much more careful and scrupulous in its dispensing of military aid than it has been in the past.

Trenton Goes to Washington—New Jersey Lawmaker Offers Antismut Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 1965, I introduced a bill to set up a Presidential Commission to find ways to combat smut. The reaction to my bill has been much greater than I had expected. From all parts of the Nation, I have received encouraging letters.

In New Jersey, groups representing various denominations as well as nonsectarian organizations have volunteered their services.

A very excellent summary of the sentiment within the New Jersey delegation appeared in the June 4, 1965, edition of the Trentonian, a very influential newspaper in southern New Jersey. The article in question was written by Cyril J. O'Brien, a journalist with a deep understanding of both New Jersey and the Washington scene. I urge all Members to read Mr. O'Brien's article which I am inserting at this point in the RECORD:

TRENTON GOES TO WASHINGTON—NEW JERSEY LAWMAKER OFFERS ANTISMUT BILL

(By Cyril J. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—Pornography: the Supreme Court won't define it and the lower courts which try to obliterate it find their decisions knocked into a cocked hat the first time a test is made.

It is a problem because what might be prurient for Aunt Sadie would not cause Uncle Harry to bat an eye. And censorship, too, is a bugaboo with people so afraid of freedom's protection they permit almost anything to go by.

There is a limit somewhere, and members of the New Jersey congressional delegation queried this week all would draw a line, for instance, to shield teenagers and children. As for the public, the New Jersey legislators agreed with the Supreme Court that they would have trouble saying where the line should be drawn.

Recently, a New Jersey legislator, Representative DOMINICK V. DANIELS, introduced a bill to set up a commission on pornography. On it would be representatives of book publishers, the motion picture industry, newspapers, churches, librarians, lawmakers and other interests.

From the Garden State mail has been engenered, with several church groups behind the proposed law: the Knights of Columbus, with 50,000 membership in the State, and the Archdiocesan Federation of Holy Name Societies.

Daniels, a Hudson County Democrat, told The Trentonian that the danger is "clear and present. It's obvious to anyone looking at a newstand. On all sides we are assailed by hardcore pornography."

The commission he proposes would develop a plan for cooperation of local, State, and Federal officials, and would find ways to keep the public informed on the origin and scope of the traffic. Members would try most of all to get the ball rolling with the voluntary cooperation of all.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., wanted any such proposal to protect the constitutional rights of individuals.

"I am unalterably opposed to the spread of pornography," THOMPSON said, "but insist that the guarantees of the Constitution be met in the making and enforcement of laws to deal with it."

Representative WILLIAM P. CAHILL, Republican, of Camden, thinks the problem is now right down to the line. Up to now, he feels, every law to block obscenity has been blocked by the courts, notably the Supreme Court. CAHILL thinks it is time a law was passed specifically putting the finger on pronography and its dangers.

Representative JAMES J. HOWARD, Republican, of Monmouth-Ocean, thinks pornography should be attacked.

There's a danger, however, that laws on what people can get to read may infringe upon peoples' rights. Under DANIELS, he feels, the law has wide and sound counsel.

Representative WILLARD CURTIN says "the guards are down all around for this type of thing. In general I am in favor of anything honoring individual rights that will halt the sale of this disgusting commodity." CURTIN is also the author of similar bils.

The 20th Anniversary of the United Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 1965, the United Nations will celebrate the 20th anniversary of the signing of its charter in San Francisco. To help commemorate this important milestone, and to demonstrate the steadfast support of the United States for the United Nations, I would like to urge the passage of House Joint Resolution 499 which states: "that the United States reaffirms its faith in, and support of, the United Nations and the principles of the United Nations Charter and urges such reaffirmation of faith and support by all the members of the United Nations and peace-loving people everywhere."

The past year has been a difficult one for the United Nations. A member has withdrawn. The financial crisis caused by the refusal of certain members to pay their assessments has brought the work of the General Assembly to a standstill. But it is important that these troubles, which frequently make headlines, do not obscure the tremendous record of achievement which has been made in the past 20 years by the United Nations. It is important that as our representa-

tives work to solve problems such as these they know that Congress and the American people remain committed to the principles of the United Nations and that they want the organization to continue as a cornerstone of American foreign policy.

What are the principles upon which the United Nations is founded? As set forth in article 2 of the Charter they are that the United Nations is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members; that all members, in order to insure the rights and benefits of membership, shall fulfill their obligations in good faith; that all members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means; that all members shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.

If all nations observed these principles, there would be far less conflict in the world in which we live. Tensions would be greatly reduced, and world peace would be much more secure. The fact that all nations do not observe these principles is at the root of the most serious threats to peace as well as the financial problems of the organization.

The world has changed greatly in the past 20 years since the United Nations Charter was signed. The emergence of dozens of newly independent nations is symbolized by the growth of the organization from 51 original members to its present membership of 114. The Disarmament Commission of the organization is struggling to bring about control of weapons which did not even exist when the United Nations was founded. The vast frontier of space has been opened up. Nevertheless, the United Nations has proved flexible enough to adjust to these great changes and many others, including a basic cleavage between the great powers.

Throughout the history of the United Nations, the United States has been one of its principal supporters. The United States, like the rest of the world, has benefited from the international cooperation encouraged by the organization, by the opportunity to discuss serious problems and present its views to a world forum, and by the activities which have been undertaken by the organization in behalf of peace. It is my hope that not only Congress and the American people, but all peace-loving people throughout the world, will seize the opportunity presented by the 20th anniversary celebration to reflect on the achievements of the United Nations and to reaffirm their support for the organization and the principles upon which the United Nations is based.

Rent Supplements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, clearly the most controversial item in the general housing bill which the House will soon consider is the President's rent supplement proposal—section 101 of the bill—which he has called "the most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city."

I agree with the President that the rent supplement program offers the greatest potential promise of any proposal in recent years to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for the low-income families of our Nation.

Despite the clearly desirable objectives of the proposal and its many merits, there has been some misunderstanding as to why the program is needed, what it seeks to achieve, and how it will operate. To help clear up these misunderstandings, I am inserting in the RECORD for our colleagues' attention a series of questions and answers which I hope will clarify everyone's understanding of the proposed program and also convince them of the desirability of voting for the new proposal when the House considers the bill.

Question. How would the program work?

Answer. The sponsor of a private nonprofit, limited dividend, or cooperative project would negotiate with a private lender and the FHA for a market interest rate mortgage to be insured under FHA section 221(d)(3). The sponsor would also enter into contract with HHFA for rent supplement payments on those units in the project which are to be occupied by eligible low-income families. The sponsor would select the occupants, subject to qualifications relating to eligibility, such as tenant's age, physical handicap, displacement or occupancy in substandard housing, and income. These qualifications would be checked by the offices or agencies designated for this purpose by the Housing Administrator.

The amount of the rent supplement payments with respect to a family would be for the difference between the full rent for the dwelling unit it would occupy and 25 percent of the income of that family. Incomes of tenants, except the elderly, would be checked every 2 years, or more frequently if necessary, by the offices or agencies designated for this purpose. As incomes of tenants increased, the rents charged to tenants would be increased, and the rent supplement payments would be reduced until the tenant could pay the full rent. At that time, rent supplement payments with respect to that tenant would cease, but he could continue to occupy the unit by paying the full rent.

Question. Who would be eligible?

Answer. Families eligible for housing units assisted with rent supplements would be those who, first, are either elderly, physically handicapped, displaced by public improvement programs, such as the urban renewal and Federal highway programs, or are living in substandard housing, and second, have incomes that do not exceed the income ceilings established for their locality. Income ceilings, in turn, would be established for various sizes of families as follows: the lowest rental at which private standard units are available in a locality would be determined, and that rental would be multiplied by four to establish the maximum income for that locality. Thus, only families otherwise eligible, who have to pay more than 25 percent of their income to rent the lowest rent standard rental units that are available in the private market in that locality would be eligible.

Question. Who supports the rent supplement program?

Answer. This program is recommended by the administration, the committee which held full and extensive hearings on the program, mayors and Governors, and representatives of labor, agriculture, banking industry, the construction industry, and almost every interested organization. Favorable testimony on the rent supplement program was received from representatives of:

National Association of Home Builders.

Mortgage Bankers Association of America.

American Bankers Association.

National Association of Mutual Savings Banks.

AFL–CIO.

American Association of Homes for the Aging.

Archdiocese of New York—Committee on Housing and Urban Renewal.

Cooperative League of the USA.

Joint Center for Urban Studies of MIT and Harvard University.

General Improvement Contractors Association.

National Conference of Catholic Charities.

National Council for Senior Citizens.

National Council on the Aging.

National Farmers Union.

National Housing Conference.

Question. How would income ceilings for eligibility be established?

Answer. A survey would be made in each locality to determine the lowest rents at which private standard units are available and the maximum income of families that would be eligible for rent supplements in that area. Thus, the Housing Administrator would establish income ceilings for various size families in each locality.

Recently, the Housing Agency indicated that on the basis of some preliminary data for two dozen cities of various population sizes, the estimated income ceiling for a three- or four-person family—assuming a 25-percent rent-to-income ratio—in more than four-fifths of the cities covered were in the $3,000 to $5,000 range. Most of the remaining cities were slightly above $5,000, with a few near or at $6,000 and one slightly below $3,000.

Question. What kind of housing would be eligible under the rent supplement program?

Answer. The housing would be new or rehabilitated housing financed under FHA section 221(d)(3). The units would be of modest and unextravagant design, as i n the case of the below market interest rate program—FHA section 221(d)(3). Under that program, FHA by regulation limits the maximum mortgage amounts permissible in an area and thus assures that rents appropriate for moderate-income families in that area will result.

Question. What is the estimated cost of the program?

Answer. Authority would be provided to enter into rent supplement contracts

not to exceed amounts approved by appropriation acts and not to exceed $200 million a year. While this would be the maximum contractual authority, the aggregate of the actual rent supplement payments would be substantially less because as incomes of tenants increased, rent supplement payments would be decreased, and when the tenant could afford to pay full rents, rent supplement payments would cease. The Housing Agency has estimated that the rent supplement payments actually made under a program authorizing an annual maximum of $200 million would probably not greatly exceed $100 million per year over 40 years. This is only one-tenth of 1 percent of our annual Federal budget.

Question. Why is the rent supplement program needed in addition to the substantial number of low-rent public housing units authorized in other sections of the bill?

Answer. The housing would be available only to families and individuals in the lowest income group, basically the same income group now eligible for public housing.

The number of low-income families on the waiting list for public housing units has reached 500,000. It is obvious that we must use every possible tool to deal with the housing needs of our low- and moderate-income families. The public housing program is, and will remain, one of our basic tools for providing standard housing for low-income families. To the extent that the rent supplement program can serve these families it will constitute a needed supplement—not a substitute—to public housing. The need is sufficiently great to warrant maximum effort under both programs.

Question. Why has the rent supplement program been characterized as a program of private enterprise and private participation?

Answer. The rent supplement payments would be made with respect to housing built by private nonprofit or limited dividend corporations, or by cooperatives, and financed with section 221(d)(3) market-interest-rate mortgages insured by FHA.

Housing built under this new program would be privately built, privately financed, and privately owned. It is basically a private enterprise program with supplemental Federal assistance through partial rent payments to help meet the housing problems of our low-income families.

Question. Will the rent supplement program reduce the incentive for home ownership?

Answer. The rent supplement program would provide an opportunity for low-income families who are desirous of becoming homeowners and have the potential for increased incomes that would permit homeownership at a later time. This would be accomplished under the lease-with-option-to-purchase part of the program. Under this plan, an eligible family would rent a detached, semi-detached, or row house in a project of such homes, and rent supplements would be paid in the same manner as for rent supplement units in other projects. When the income of the family had increased sufficiently so that it could afford to pay the full rent, the rent supplements would be terminated and the family would proceed to purchase the unit it occupied with the aid of an FHA-insured section 221 home mortgage.

Question. Will the rent supplement program reduce incentives to increase income?

Answer. No, because only 25 percent of any increase in income would go for increased rent. The other 75 percent of the increase in income would be available for the family to use in meeting family needs other than rent. The head of a family making $250 a month will not lose incentive to raise his income by $50—$300 a month—just because that would require him to increase his rent payments by $12.50 a month. This would be the same as saying that a person would not accept a higher income because his Federal income tax rate would be increased.

Question. Would the rent supplement program tend to establish national rent standards?

Answer. No, the rent supplement program will not cause or enable landlords to increase the rents they charge. Rents in privately owned units are determined by demand and supply in local housing markets.

Actually, the addition to the housing supply which this program would make will help to reduce rents through the normal competitive process. According to the Bureau of the Census, over three-fourths of our lowest income families now pay 35 percent or more of their small incomes for rent because of the inadequate supply of housing for the disadvantaged.

Question. How would a family's income be checked for eligibility?

Answer. First, maximum income limits would be established by the Housing Administrator based on a market analysis showing the lowest rent at which standard housing is available to accommodate a given family size. Payments could not be made on behalf of any family whose income was more than four times the minimum rent required to obtain standard housing in the community. Second, applicants found acceptable by the private owner of the project would then be referred to an agency, which might be the community's relocation service or a similar qualified organization, which would determine if the applicant met the maximum income limits established for the project. While the private owner chooses the prospective applicant, he would have no voice in determining the applicant's eligibility.

The check on income which would be performed by this agency would be a mere routine function, much less detailed than is currently being carried on by local housing authorities throughout the country under the public housing program. Primarily, it would involve the applicant—on whose behalf the payment is to be made—presenting either a tax return, or W-2 form, or statement of his earnings from his employer.

Question. Would most families have incomes below the maximum for eligibility purposes?

Answer. The great bulk of rent supplement tenants would have incomes below the maximum. And where an occupant's income is up close to the ceiling, the supplement would be correspondingly small and the family would be paying a substantial rent out of its own income.

Question. How would a family's assets be determined and how would they affect eligibility?

Answer. A family's assets would have to be considered, just as they have to be considered now in determining eligibility for public housing. The Housing Administrator testified that this will be controlled by regulation.

Along with his statement of income, an applicant would have to present a statement of his assets. Just as maximum income limits would be set for each community, reasonable limits will be placed on the amount of assets permitted in addition to income. Even though an applicant's income qualified for a rent supplement payment on his behalf, he would be ineligible if his assets exceeded these limits.

Question. If a tenant's income decreases during occupancy in a rent supplement unit, will his rent supplement payment be increased?

Answer. Yes, the rent supplement would be increased if a tenant's income decreased. In general the incomes of tenants would be expected to rise, thus reducing their need for rent supplements. There would, therefore, be sufficient funds available under the maximum for the project permitted by the original rent supplement contract to take care of those cases in which income decreased.

Question. How often will incomes be recertified?

Answer. Except for the elderly, incomes of occupants will have to be recertified at least every 2 years, or lesser periods in those instances where the Administrator decides that it is desirable. Since elderly are not likely to have any significant increases in income, there will be no need to recertify the incomes of these households.

Question. What will be considered as income in determining the eligibility of an applicant?

Answer. As indicated in the House Banking and Currency Committee report on the bill, H.R. 7984, gross income of the family or the individual will be used in determining eligibility to receive rent supplements. Gross income would include all income, before taxes, from all sources.

Of Food and Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the strong voices which has been raised in the interests of agriculture in this country is the Lincoln Evening Journal, Lincoln, Nebr. This voice was raised re-

cently following hearings of the National Commission on Food Marketing in Omaha. The editorial deserves a wider audience and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

OF FOOD AND FARMERS

No sudden change in agriculture or food marketing will result from the 3 days of testimony before the National Commission on Food Marketing in Omaha last week.

But the prolonged conversation there did much to shed public light on the complex business of getting food from producer to consumer. There is a good chance, too, that this discussion, and others like it over the Nation, ultimately could lead to a somewhat larger share of the food dollar getting into the pockets of the American farmer.

If this is the result, the Omaha hearings and the work of the National Commission will be valuable beyond estimate.

For one thing brought out at Omaha, and in every other economic analysis of food costs, is that the producer—the farmer and rancher—is not getting nearly as much of consumer's food dollar as he got just a few years ago; and, because of this fact, the agricultural economy and the total economy of agricultural sections of the Nation have declined.

While food prices have risen 31 percent in the past 17 years, according to a recent report by the House Agriculture Committee, prices received by farmers have declined 15 percent.

But the job of the National Commission on Food Marketing is not to show that agriculture is getting a dwindling share of the food dollar but to find out why this is so, and what might be done about it.

A big part of the Omaha hearings dealt with the impact that packers and chain stores have on the prices received by farmers. Specifically, the question was raised of whether packers and chain stores manipulate the livestock market by feeding their own animals and putting them on the market when prices paid to farmers otherwise might increase.

The extent to which such practice is used or the extent to which it actually influences farm prices was not clearly established at the Omaha meetings. But it was evident that it is possible for prices to be driven down by packers and chain stores at key periods if they are in the feeding business.

On this basis, here would seem to be ample cause to examine the feasibility of some form of legislation to restrict packers and retailers from the production and feeding of livestock.

This would be basically the same kind of antitrust legislation which now applies in many industries. It would not amount to an unusual interference by Government with business, but would simply be an extension of an accepted governmental authority to another phase of the economy.

E. A. Schumaker of North Platte, vice president of the stanchly conservative Nebraska Stockgrowers Association had this to say of the potential influence of livestock feeding by packers and chain stores:

"Such power, if present, should not be tolerated in a free enterprise system. By eliminating such integrating processes we can continue the competitive market for cattle."

Continuation of a competitve livestock market is as advantageous to the consumer as to the farmer.

A slight increase in consumer food prices would be a small price to pay for the safeguarding of the agricultural economy and the prevention of monopoly powers in the life and death matter of food.

The American consumer today is paying a smaller percentage of his income for food—less than 19 percent than anyone else in the world at any time in history. It is not asking too much that the farmer share more abundantly in the bounty he has created.

Mail Explosion U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, for several years the C. & P. Telephone Co. has been conducting an ambitious and admirable public affairs program. Its activities have included "register and vote" campaigns, courses in basic economics and in political action, and the publication of legislative bulletins on issues of interest to the company and its employees. The public affairs articles in the C. & P. magazine, the Transmitter, have won awards and citations from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge for the past 4 years, including the top national award in this field in 1964.

A current theme of this fine program is "Know Your Government." At the core of this program is a new series in the Transmitter entitled "Your Federal Government in Action." Each issue will feature an article by the Secretary of a Cabinet department, explaining the history and functions of his department. These articles will be circulated widely, to schools, libraries, and civic groups, and will be made available to other Bell System companies and other industries. They should ultimately be read by hundreds of thousands of interested citizens in all parts of the Nation.

This series is but one of the projects currently underway. A series on the Congress is contemplated, as is coverage of the Supreme Court and the Presidency. In addition, the public affairs program will be in operation at other levels through publications, lectures, and seminars.

I commend this effort to answer the need for more information about our Government and its officials, and to provide material which is both enlightening and entertaining. I would like to place in the RECORD the first article in this series, "Mail Explosion U.S.A." by Postmaster General John A. Gronouski:

MAIL EXPLOSION U.S.A.

Sam Osgood was dubious about the whole thing. He didn't want to be the first Postmaster General under the new Constitution. That was General (by this time President) Washington's idea. Others clamored for the job, but Washington put them off. Osgood succumbed to the President's persuasion finally and became Postmaster General in 1789.

Thus, Osgood became director of the fledgling system that Benjamin Franklin had established under the Continental Congress—the embryo of today's postal system. There were about 75 offices and 2,400 miles of post roads to serve a population of three million persons. Rates of postage were high and often at variance according to the distances covered. Discipline among postal riders was lax. Enforcement of financial accountability and adherence to rules was all but impossible. Osgood reported to Congress in January 1790, only 4 months after taking office, "I beg leave to observe, that there may be so few letters written that it will not amount to anything considerable."

Had Osgood only known the growth in store for the Nation and the needs this growth would create. Operating under the main policies and basic rules of 1790, today's postal system handles 72 billion pieces of mail each year. The mail volume of this country alone nearly matches that of the rest of the world combined. The total volume amounts to one letter per day for every man, woman and child in the country.

Expressed in comparative terms, Greater New York City produces and processes about the same volume of mail as Great Britain. The annual increase in U.S. mail is equivalent to the total yearly volume of some European countries.

Such statistics and comparisons become blurred in their immensity. Suffice it that a slide rule expert recently concluded that our country's mail this year, if placed end to end, would reach 44 times between the earth and moon. But, enough of that.

COPING WITH THE MAIL EXPLOSION

The growth in mail volume during the latter half of the 20th century amounts almost literally to a "mail explosion." Handling the 72 billion pieces of mail with efficient dispatch requires a huge delivery system consisting of nearly 34,000 offices and 10,000 additional stations, garages and terminals. Some 590,000 employees are needed to man the system, and almost 120,000 vehicles—ranging from light and mobile Mailsters to huge over-the-road tractor trailers—are used in the complicated process of collection and delivery.

In great similarity with telephone companies, the mail service must adjust itself to the peaks and valleys of public demand, with little or no opportunity to stabilize work flow. Communications must be handled as perishable products and time is of utmost importance. The mail can't be stockpiled in order to obtain the most economic use of manpower and machinery. Unlike many businesses, there is no opportunity to control the number of pieces placed in the postal system or to dictate to customers the hours and dates when mail can be accepted for processing. Like the telephone company, the Post Office has to be ready to give service when, where and how public needs demand it.

The Post Office serves 45.1 million families and 4.3 million business addresses located along more than 103,000 city delivery routes. Nearly 10 million farms and nonurban addresses are served by some 31,000 rural delivery routes. Clockwork collection schedules are maintained for half a million street letter boxes.

CONGRESS AND EBENEZER'S HORSE

Members of the Congress may find solace in the monetary tribulations of their forebears of the Continental Congress.

Ebenezer Hazard, Continental postmaster at New York City during the Revolution, sought a special appropriation to purchase a horse.

It all began when Gen. George Washington, to consolidate his defensive position, fell back from Long Island and abandoned the New York Harbor area to the superior strength of the British. Ebenezer Hazard had been delivering mail dispatches on foot. But now the American Army was off somewhere in New Jersey.

"The post office," he claimed, "hath need of a horse."

We may have lost something in translation from the official documentese of the day but in substance the word to Postmaster Hazard was:

"Sorry, don't you know there's a war on?"

PRESORTING, 1773

The recent Post Office Department order that second and third-class permit holders presort their mail by ZIP codes before it enters the postal system has precedent in early colonial annals.

The following passage is found in the 1773 diary of Hugh Finlau who succeeded Benjamin Franklin as England's Deputy Postmaster General for the American Colonies: "Acting Postmaster Antill (N. York) wishes that the letters sent from England by the Packet cou'd be sorted in London, each city its different bundle viz., N. York, Phila, Boston, Quebec, Montreal, &c; his reason for mentioning this wish is, that it often does happen that there is not time to assort them before the departures of the different riders or at least of some of them, by which means they lie in the office until next post day which makes eight days different to Canada for instance."

OPERATES ON A BUDGET, LIKE BIG BUSINESS

Yes, the Post Office is big business. It operates within a rigid budget of $5.3 billion and handles in the course of a year's business about $20 billion. Like private business, it has labor contract agreements with organizations representing its 590,000 employees—the largest civilian labor force in the Government and comparable in size to General Motors and A.T. & T. The Post Office "board of directors" is the U.S. Congress which sets the Post Office budget (the moneys used for wages, facilities, transportation and the like) and the postal rates that may be collected for its various services.

The Post Office leads all departments of Government in the recovery of its costs to the taxpayers served. Much of its cost-revenue gap results from activities designated by Congress as free public services. Among these traditional functions performed without charge are: delivery of franked mail for Members of Congress and other Departments and agencies of the Federal Government; delivery of books for the blind; the annual registration of aliens; sale of U.S. savings bonds and stamps, documentary Internal Revenue stamps for payment of taxes on Federal documents, and migratory bird handling stamps; assistance in obtaining statistical data for other Federal Departments, distribution of Internal Revenue forms and civil service information; conducts civil service examinations, locates relatives of deceased persons for the Armed Forces, certifies widows and children for Government benefits; through its rural carriers, surveys wild fowl population, reports forest fires and distributes livestock and crop acreage survey materials, and sometimes used for voter registrations, and most recently, for registration of Job Corps members in the war on poverty.

THE SPIRIT OF SERVICE

There is no section of the country, no matter how remote, where the mails do not penetrate with scheduled regularity. Symbolic of the spirit of service this represents is the oft-quoted line paraphrased from Herodotus (424 B.C.) which appears on the facade of the New York Post Office: "Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

The creed was a challenge to physical stamina and personal determination for colonial post riders and the famous pony express. Post riders in 1789 were adjured to cover 100 miles in 24 hours traveling through day and night, a feat seldom accomplished when inclement weather turn rustic roads into quagmires.

But, how are these appointed rounds to be completed in this modern age of technology and ever-growing mail volumes? Surely, nature still impedes these modern couriers and personal determination and dedication of individuals still insure that "the mail must go through." However, today's postmen have an increasing arsenal of modern management methods and electronic machines at their disposal.

These new developments have fathered the ZIP code (zoning improvement plan) and completely new patterns of distribution. Probably the most far-reaching improvement in postal service since city deliveries began in 1863, the ZIP code works with 553 sectional centers, or mail massing points, located strategically across the Nation.

The 5-digit ZIP code identifies every community in the 50 States, from the smallest crossroads hamlet to the largest metropolis. A natural extension of the old zone system which was limited to about 125 larger cities, the ZIP code enables originating post offices to sort mail for direct shipment to sectional centers nearest destination (see diagram), and to bypass terminals and intermediate offices where mail formerly was rehandled as many as a dozen times in cross-country transit.

In less populated areas, the first 3 digits identify sectional centers, which are main focal points for air, rail and highway transportation, and the last 2 digits identify the local post office or delivery station. In cities that formerly had local postal zones, the first 3 ZIP code digits establish the city, and the last 2 designate the former local zone.

PARCEL POST ZIPS, TOO

A prime example of how ZIP code and sectional center distribution is transforming the mails is a brandnew service called scheduled parcel post, a project of top priority on Postmaster General Gronouski's timetable of postal service improvements. Already, in a dozen geographical parts of the country, nearly 5,000 post offices are offering next-day parcel post delivery over wide areas, some of them as large as entire States.

Scheduled parcel post is one of the great accomplishment of our time in the postal service. And it works by ZIP code—with the same sectional center distribution being installed for letter mail.

Some of the geographical areas already included in the nearly 300,000 square miles of scheduled parcel post are southern Michigan, now interchanging with central Ohio; Baltimore, the Chespeake area, Washington, D.C., and northern Virginia; northern, central and southern California—with second-day interchanges; southern Illinois and eastern Missouri, with St. Louis as the hub; the wide expanses of eastern and southern Texas, including Houston, Dallas, Fort Worth, Beaumont; all of South Carolina; most of Louisiana.

Who is using scheduled parcel post? Farmers and nursery growers; manufacturers and warehousers of machinery replacement parts; the suppliers of automotive items. All have found that fewer handlings spell faster delivery and less damage in transit.

Even more than a business-type organization in Government, the post office is a service organization to business. Time was when the bulk of mail consisted of individual correspondence. Today much individual mail, especially within cities, has been superseded by the telephone.

Today, 80 percent of the volume is business mail: magazines, insurance premiums, credit-card transactions, department store bills and payments, mortgage payments, automobile payments, dividend checks, and social security checks. The centralization of accounting by use of computers has accelerated the trend.

Because the United States has more telephones than any country in the world, the postal service gets 600 million phone bills to deliver and 600 million checks going back. The same is true in almost any other area. We produce 8 million cars a year, we set up millions of accounts, and some of them carry over as much as 36 months. Thus, around 200 million payments a year go through the mail to automobile sales organizations or finance organizations, and around 200 million statements go back to customers with return envelopes for the next month's check.

The interdependence of business and the postal service is the very core of the NIMS program—nationwide improved mail service. In 275 of our larger cities, 16,000 large business mailers have joined Mail Users Councils. Through the NIMS program they are reducing the after-5 p.m. mail glut by depositing mail throughout the working day—allowing more economical scheduling of manpower and machines by the post office.

Before, over 80 percent of the mail in big cities was coming into the postal system after 5 p.m.—and the jam-up was getting so bad that much of the mail couldn't be handled in time to make the final deadline for important dispatches. Now, as the result of business cooperation, the volume of mail coming in after 5 p.m. is less than 43 percent.

ABCD—SAME-DAY DELIVERY

Installed in 271 cities is an entirely new service concept, the accelerated business collection and delivery program (ABCD). By careful scheduling of collections and deliveries, ABCD gives same-day deliveries in these cities. All mail deposited in the ABCD collection boxes by 11 a.m. is delivered within the business district by 3 p.m.

Considering that business generates more than three-fourths of all first-class mail, 4-hour delivery is of tremendous value in processing vital correspondence during midday hours. Nearly 1 billion pieces of U.S. mail per year are now given same-day delivery by this means.

This program did have some disadvantages, however. For example, an Atlanta bank had to alert customers to be sure to have money in the bank before writing a check, because checks were getting to the bank before deposits.

A system for speedier delivery of mail to tenants of high-rise office buildings is called vertical improved mail—or VIM. Under this program, builders are asked to install a sophisticated conveyor system so that postal employees, working out of a downstairs mailroom, can dispatch mail to the various floors as soon as the mail comes in.

With the advent of ZIP code, which provides an improved transportation routing system, with the installation of optical scanning machines to read and sort letters at the rate of 36,000 an hour, and with the formulation of a transportation policy that is abreast of the time, new service breakthroughs are in store for the American public. One wonders what Samuel Osgood, first Postmaster General under the Constitution, would have thought about the changes wrought by the post office in less than two centuries. Had it been possible for him to look into the future and see the interdependence of business growth and the postal system of this great Nation, perhaps he would join with Postmaster General Gronouski in this expression of post office philosophy:

"We look upon ourselves as partners in an expanding economy. As long as our economy depends heavily upon the mails, we have a public trust that we will not fail."

Hopes To Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are few programs in the history of

foreign policy conducted by the United States which have been such instantaneous successes as the Peace Corps program.

One of the noteworthy things about this program is the cooperation of private individuals and industry with the volunteers who are giving so willingly of their time and talents to help underprivileged peoples throughout the world.

One example of this is the recent gift by the Ingraham Co., of a supply of clocks and watches to Miss Barbara Barnes, of Bristol, Conn., who is a member of the first Peace Corps group in the African nation of Kenya.

A story about this gift appeared recently in the Bristol Press and, with consent of the House, I would like for this article to appear in the RECORD:

HOPES TO HELP—INGRAHAM'S BACKS UP BRISTOL GIRL IN KENYA

B. S. Staton, vice president of marketing, announced today the Ingraham Co.'s participation with the U.S. Peace Corps.

Ingraham has donated a supply of watches and alarm clocks to the Peace Corps through one of its volunteer members, Miss Barbara Barnes, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. E. Bartlett Barnes of Belridge Road.

Miss Barnes is a graduate of Vassar College and a member of the first Peace Corps group to serve in Kenya.

Miss Barnes will use the Ingraham products as good will gifts on her assignment in the town of Butere, Kenya in East Africa where she is teaching girls history, geography, astronomy, physical education, and music at Butere Girls' High School, an Anglican Church-sponsored girls' boarding school.

Staton said that on behalf of the Ingraham Co. he wished Miss Barnes the very best of luck and hoped in some small way the products donated will aid her in her assignment.

Prominent Texas Agricultural Grower Hails End of Foreign Labor Importation as Overall Benefit to the Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, much of the continuing debate on the use of foreign farm labor has been between U.S. Labor Department and labor union spokesmen on one side, and the large growers and their allies on the other.

In the process, we tend to lose sight of one vital factor; the overwhelming majority of American farmers never employed foreign farmworkers. More than 99 percent of America's farmers either hired no labor, or hired domestic labor last year.

In fact, though you would not realize it from listening to some of the comments on farm labor, many responsible growers actively support the adminstration's position on braceros.

Bud Antle, the Nation's largest lettuce grower, is one good example. Another good example is O. E. Brand, president of Griffin & Brand of McAllen, Inc., a Texas outfit which describes itself as "the world's largest growers and shippers of onions."

Mr. Brand recently wrote two very interesting letters to the editor of the Kansas City Packer, a national trade paper for the fruit and produce industry, which follow:

[From the Kansas City Packer, June 19, 1965]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: BRAND SEES END OF FOREIGN LABOR AS OVERALL BENEFIT TO INDUSTRY

MCALLEN, TEX.,
June 11, 1965.

To the EDITOR:

I would like to express my appreciation to the Packer on behalf of our company, and I am sure I speak for the industry as well, for the excellent coverage given to the bracero situation.

Much has been said and written about the termination of the bracero program. I would like to present my views in support of Secretary Wirtz, all or part of which you may use in your publication should you see fit to do so.

Our industry has faced many challenges in the past and found solutions. I have every confidence that through new machinery development and labor recruitment and distribution, the industry will meet its challenge today.

GRIFFIN & BRAND OF MCALLEN, INC.,
O. E. BRAND, *President.*

To the PACKER:

Secretary WIRTZ is to be commended for his firm stand on and realistic appraisal of the bracero program and its effect on the national economy. His action may well have turned the tide of overproduction which, for many years, has plagued the produce industry.

Contributing causes to overproduction are the availability of land and water, favorable weather and, finally but certainly not the least in importance, a ready supply of cheap labor. We, in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas have had all of these, and the same is generally true of Florida and the extreme Southwest vegetable producing areas of the United States. In this area we have a surplus of land and at no time since the completion of Falcon Dam have we been in short supply of water; and, as a rule, we have enjoyed beneficial weather.

The most important single factor in encouraging overproduction has been the availability of an almost unlimited supply of braceros which stimulated ever-increasing planting among the big operators who were in position to produce thousands of acres of vegetables through the importation of hordes of foreign labor. This has been true, while at the same time the United States has hundreds of thousands of unemployed. No section of the country, including those areas now clamoring for foreign labor, is an exception.

As the world's largest growers and shippers of onions, we have been able to operate without bracero labor for the past 4 years. Since 1962 we have made exclusive use of citizen labor, found it more than adequate, and during that period, have never experienced a labor shortage. In fact, during the 1964–65 season we had an average of two applicants for every job available.

There are many reasons why the unemployed in some parts of the country do not choose to work in the fields. First of all, the wage scale has been too low. There is something disgraceful in a system which makes it more profitable to an individual to go on, and stay on relief rather than resort to labor for his livelihood. Second, industry has not been forced, by simple economics, to use the unemployed, and has failed to develop machines which would reduce the number of men required for fieldwork; and, at the same time, pay these workers a just and reasonable wage. And, personally, I don't believe the industry will make the effort and the investment to develop such machinery until compelled to do so.

Since the amount of labor available exerts such a profound influence on production, a vastly reduced number on hand ready and willing to work in the fields will compel growers to take another look at their operations and plant only such acreages as they can harvest and sell at a profit.

Without a doubt the termination of the bracero program has brought on some severe dislocations in certain areas, and will require readjustments, particularly on the part of large operators who depended mainly on foreign labor. But, in the long run, the end of imported labor on a large scale will work to the benefit of the industry.

GRIFFIN & BRAND OF MCALLEN, INC.,
O. E. BRAND.

Lance Cpl. Russell Rowe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week this country lost a precious commodity—a patriot. Lance Cpl. Russell Rowe, U.S. Marine Corps, died of wounds incurred in Santo Domingo. He made the supreme sacrifice for his country which he referred to as "The greatest place in the world." Every American should be aware of the convictions of Corporal Rowe, a patriot.

I include in my remarks an article from the Washington Post of June 20:

MARINE, 20, WHO LOST LEGS IN BATTLE DIES HERE

Marine Lance Cpl. Russell Rowe, a 20-year-old patriot from Zion, Ill., yesterday lost his fight for life at Walter Reed Hospital.

Cut down by bullets from a rebel machine-gun in Santo Domingo April 30, Rowe had lost both legs and was using an artificial kidney. Doctors hoped he would recover enough to undergo abdominal surgery.

Just before his landing with the First Marines in the Dominican Republic, Rowe wrote his 18-year-old fiance, Dora Compostello, back home:

"Now is my chance to do something for my country. America is the greatest place in the world. There'll be a lot of fighting, I imagine, and I might get hurt."

In a letter to his mother, Dorothy Harkness, he said, "I am proud to be a marine protecting my country."

One leg was amputated at an Air Force hospital in Puerto Rico. When he was flown to Walter Reed on May 3, he told his mother, "I'll get along on a wooden leg."

But in an effort to have his life doctors were forced to amputate his left leg. When his mother told him, the spirit suddenly went out of him she said.

Both his mother and fiance, whom he was to marry this August when he was due to be discharged, left jobs at home to come to Washington to be at his side.

He remained on the critical list and when he contracted pneumonia early Friday, his brother Richard, also a marine, was given emergency leave to be with his brother during his fight for life.

But at 2:05 a.m. yesterday, Russell Rowe's fight ended.

Burial will be in Zion.

Student Pickers Fired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, many charges and countercharges have been levied concerning the use of the so-called A teams in agricultural labor.

Many kids have told preposterous stories about work, food and living conditions. Many kids were recruited throughout the country by misrepresentations about an easy, expense-free travel adventure to California.

Many kids who had never worked in agriculture refused to work on a piece-rate basis—although all other workers prefer piece-rate to an hourly wage of $1.40 per hour. Some even brought basketballs into the fields where they were supposed to work.

Many, of course, are really trying to work and are conscientiously trying to earn a profit for their employers and for themselves. We would like to find more of these kids. Unfortunately, inexperienced, young, untrained high school kids are not an adequate labor force for any industry.

I include a newspaper article by Eric Brazil in the Salinas Californian of June 16, 1965, which shows some of the many problems with which businessmen in agriculture must cope. No businessman can make a profit under these circumstances. Without profits, business cannot survive. Next year there will be fewer jobs for the industrious and conscientious kids who have tried to make the A team experiment work.

The article by Mr. Brazil follows:

YOUTHS REFUSE ASSIGNMENT, ASK GUARANTEE

(By Eric C. Brazil)

More than 100 student strawberry pickers from the Salinas area were fired this morning by the Salinas Valley's major strawberry grower after they refused to pick berries in the field to which they had been assigned.

The youngsters demanded of Salinas Strawberries that they be paid either a flat $1.40 per hour guarantee or be assigned to picking in a field of the company's best berries, where they could make more money on a piece rate basis.

This morning's walkout—which also has been variously described as a sitdown, mass firing, staged demonstration and lockout—follows on the departure of 2 of the 15 labor department A teams now in the valley.

A TEAMS QUIT

The two A-teams—61 high school boys from Los Alamos, N. Mex., and their coaches Jay Berry and Audie Woodard—decided to give up strawberry picking after a week on the job. One team left Tuesday night, the other this morning.

Dave Weaver, student leader and foreman for Salinas Strawberries, told the Californian that the berry field to which the students were assigned had recently been picked over by braceros and that the berries were terrible. He said that the students "want to go back to work, but they want to work in a good field."

Another student, Ken McDonald, said that most of the students involved in today's incident have signed authorization cards with the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee.

Weaver said that company officials refused to discuss the students' complaints and fired them summarily. He said that most of the students were not paid after their firing. (The company provided bus transportation back to town for the students, although some apparently declined it.)

At a student meeting held by AWOC Tuesday night at the labor temple, it became evident that a waiver of the $1.40-per-hour guarantee for picking strawberries is at the heart of their grievance. The waiver, which some students signed, but most didn't, provides that workers picking at below average speed—12 crates of freezer strawberries in 8 hours—will be paid for what they pick, at $1 a crate, with no hourly guarantee. The students contended that the berries in which they have been working are so bad that it is difficult to come close to the average.

AWOC Business Representative Dewitt Tannehill said that the union intends to take the students' case to the labor department to "demand reinstatement because of this lockout" and also to demand immediate removal of the company's braceros.

BRACEROS LEAVING

The braceros now employed by Salinas Strawberries are scheduled to depart in any case by July 6. The first contingent may be leaving today. Salinas Strawberries has some 1,900 foreign contract workers—braceros and Japanese and Filipino nationals—about half the total in California today.

As for the A-team program—it is rapidly becoming one of the more confusing developments on the farm labor front, which in Salinas Valley, has been pretty frantic all year.

Ben Lopez, manager of Growers Farm Labor Association, told the Californian Tuesday evening that there were 15 A-teams in the valley. But this morning he said he didn't know how many teams there were. (The A teams have come from Idaho, Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, the San Francisco Bay area, Kansas, Nebraska, and points in between.)

Woodard told the Californian that neither he nor his A-team boys were adequately informed about wages and working conditions in the Salinas Valley strawberry fields. "If we had known," he said, "many of these kids wouldn't have come."

But Woodard said that "I think that the growers have been very kind to the boys. They're really trying hard."

Woodard said that the lack of recreational facilities at the Castroville labor camp at which the boys have been staying, delays in the chow line—particularly before breakfast—the nature of the work itself, and other factors all contributed to the group's decision to leave. "I'd say it was mainly a matter of misinformation and lack of recreation," he said.

Kip Roush, 16, one of the Los Alamos students who left, said he figured that "no one was going to get on the piece rate * * *. Nobody could pick that much." He said that on his best day he picked five crates of berries. "At that rate, I'd be making $11 a week for 40 hours," he said.

Another coach at the same camp, David McCracken, whose A-team hails from Bellvue, Nebr., said that his boys now are picking strawberries for the fresh market and like the work a good deal better than picking freezer berries, which must be stemmed. But he complained that thefts of the boys' personal effects at the camp have become a real problem.

A third coach at the same camp, Glenn Condit, who brought in 56 boys from Espanola, N. Mex., on Tuesday, said that they've been told all about the wages and working conditions in the Salinas Valley. He said he was worried, though, that "there are just too many people in this camp" and that discipline might suffer because of it.

Curiously enough, the Los Alamos A teams were among the best pickers recently brought in, a Salinas strawberries spokesman said. Some of the boys had picked up to 22 crates a day.

One A team that appears to be getting along fine is that employed by Admiral Packing Co.

The 38 boys—from Pittsburgh, Baxter Springs, Columbus, Fort Scott, and Girard, Kans.—are weeding and cutting lettuce. Gilbert Martinez, field foreman for the A-team's weeding crew, said that "they're doing a good job so far," although they've only been at work a short time. "We're not pushing them, but so far I have no complaint."

One of the youngsters, Robert Estes, 17, of Baxter Springs, told the Californian that "the work isn't exactly hard, but it's boring * * *. I don't think I'll ever eat salad again." Estes and his friends, Sid Conner and Terry Mayhood, both had complimentary things to say about the food the company has provided so far.

Mike Romero of Tierra Amarilla, N. Mex., supervisor of the first A-team to hit the valley, said that several of his boys want to go home. The waiver of the hourly guarantee that they have been asked to sign has upset them, he said.

But "we're still on the guarantee now," he said. "We haven't signed any waivers." Romero said that the boys "had no idea of how hard picking berries is." He said that "the new teams have a better chance of making it" than his has, because they will have been better informed before leaving.

Several of the Tierra Amarilla boys interviewed by the Californian said that they were about ready to pick up and leave now.

Crew discipline with the Tierra Amarilla A-team reportedly broke down into some horseplay Tuesday.

Todd Potter, a special representative of the labor department, is scheduled to arrive Thursday in Salinas to review the progress of the A-team program so far.

At this point, the prognosis is guarded. But if Salinas Valley strawberry growers replace all the foreign workers they have with A-teams, the valley is soon going to be chuck full of them. Louis Braun, manager of Salinas Farm Labor Office, said he feared that the A-team program might hamper the employment of local youth in the fields.

The Root of Evil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, a May 14 editorial in the New York Journal-American spotlighted a basic factor underlining the U.S. foreign policy today—and that factor is worldwide Communist aggression.

This factor should not be overlooked. Certainly, it is uppermost in the mind of President Johnson.

His decisive resistance to Communist subversion wherever it seeks to enslave freemen merits the plaudits of every American.

President Johnson has emphasized, as the Journal-American editorial noted,

that the Communists shall never succeed.

I join the Journal-American opinion that, "The President is thus expressing overall American public opinion. The people are fed up to the teeth with Communist aggression." The editorial follows:

[From the New York Journal-American, May 14, 1965]

ROOT OF EVIL

President Johnson has appropriately pinpointed the source of violence and war in southeast Asia—the aggressive, expansionist policy of the Red Chinese Government.

In his address to an audience of editorial cartoonists, the President was uncompromising in his depiction of Peiping as the ruthless string-puller behind the Asian scene.

These are welcome remarks, coming at a time when the United States is under customarily ill-informed criticism for its role in combating Communist imperialism, both in the Far East, and the Caribbean.

The high office of the President has thus been used to place this criticism and current world turbulence—particularly that in Vietnam—into correct perspective.

Red China's target is Asia, L.B.J. said, and it is using the Vietnamese people as pawns in a gigantic power play intended to "erode and discredit America's ability to help prevent Chinese domination over all of Asia."

Then came the phrase in the President's address which was most welcome of all: "In this they shall never succeed."

The President is thus expressing overall American public opinion. The people are fed up to the teeth with Communist aggression.

Reapportionment of State Legislatures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, there is great concern throughout the country and in the Congress about the Supreme Court decision affecting reapportionment of State legislatures.

The Supreme Court has taken upon itself to enter the legislative field of government by denying our individual States the right to govern themselves according to the wishes of their own people.

It has been my privilege during this session of the 89th Congress to introduce a constitutional amendment designed to overcome the great damage caused by the Supreme Court.

My legislation would provide that the individual States retain the right and power to determine the apportionment of their own governing assemblies, and does not restrict them to apportioning these bodies on a solitary population basis.

I sincerely believe that the Supreme Court has seriously overstepped its authority by requiring both houses of our State legislatures to be reapportioned on strictly a population basis. This theory conflicts with all principles of our Republican form of government.

The beauty of our unique, American system has been a carefully constructed method of checks and balances.

Fortunately, for generations of Americans, our Founding Fathers in a flash of genius unequaled since the dawn of civilization, wrought a constitutional system that has enabled the people of the United States to enjoy the blessings of liberty.

The prescribed function of the three branches of Government—legislative, executive, and judicial—is to act as a restraint on the others.

It is my firm conviction that the Supreme Court has usurped the legislative function in its reapportionment ruling that in effect prohibits the right of the States to use a basis other than population in apportioning membership of one house of their State legislatures.

As Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart states in his dissenting opinion:

The Court's draconian pronouncement, which makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States, finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our Federal Union.

The rule announced today is at odds with the long-established principles of constitutional adjudication under the equal protection clause, and it stifles values of local individuality and initiative vital to the character of the Federal Union which it was the genius of our Constitution to create.

The effect of this ruling on the rural and small town areas of America will be most harmful. To still the voice and conscience of rural America will be a blow to our representative form of Government, and strikes at the heart of the Federal system.

The Supreme Court has gone to the dictatorial position of telling the individual States they no longer can govern themselves as they please, but must abide by the Supreme Court in Washington, D.C.

The role of the Supreme Court was envisioned by our Founding Fathers as that of interpreters of the Constitution, but the present Court is dominated by a viewpoint that its duty is to make law, rather than interpret law.

To alleviate and correct the damage of this Supreme Court ruling, I have joined with other Members of Congress in introducing legislation designed to get the Supreme Court back into its proper role, and prohibit its trampling traditional States rights provided by our Constitution.

My legislation, entitled House Joint Resolution 176, provides that the right and power to determine the composition of the legislature of a State and the apportionment of the membership thereof shall remain in the people of the States.

My bill, and others like it, merely provide what our Constitution stated so emphatically, that the people shall retain the right to govern themselves.

It is unfortunate that corrective legislation is needed to reaffirm what our Constitution sought to provide, but this is the result of Supreme Court interference in the rights of our people.

To authorize both houses of a legislature to be apportioned on the basis of local need or selected interest or geography would, of course, be unfair and inimical to the general public interest.

But, by the same token, the requirement that both houses be apportioned strictly on population alone would amount to a desertion of the rights of the minority and to an abandonment of the unique needs of the individual citizen.

Some people may live in areas of high employment, others in depressed areas with high unemployment. Some may be farmers, miners, fishermen, or lumbermen. Some may be one religion or national origin peculiar in need or consideration from those of another religion or national origin.

Some may live in rural areas or small towns while others live in metropolitan areas or suburban expanses. Some may direct their needs toward secondary roads or superhighways while others are more concerned about rapid transit systems. Some may require priority consideration of irrigation projects while others demand consideration of water systems.

Between each group, conflicting interests of varying degree develop, with each conflict producing a majority and minority. Certainly, the majority must have effective rule, but the minority, too, is entitled to effective representation lest important segments of our people be completely subject to the tyranny of a temporary majority. Abandonment of this concept will most certainly convert our system of government, the oldest continuous constitutional government in the world, to something alien thereto and potentially dangerous to individual liberty.

It is correct to say, as the Supreme Court did, that legislators represent people, not trees or acres. But, the people who reside in States are more than mere numbers. They are people with dissimilar and sometimes conflicting needs, with conflicting hopes and aspirations, with ever-changing problems that sometimes fail to yield to computer logic. Through the wisdom of the people themselves, as represented by the elected leaders of sovereign States, they may well decide there is a need for representation of particular interests in one body of a legislature in contrast to the representation of general interests in the other body.

Mr. Justice Stewart put it perfectly when he said in his dissent:

Throughout our history the apportionments of State legislatures have reflected the strongly felt American tradition that the public interest is composed of many diverse interests, and that in the long run it can better be expressed by a medley of component voices than by the majority's monolithic command. What constitutes reasonable plan reasonably designed to achieve this object will vary from State to State, since each State is unique, in terms of topography, geography, demography, history, heterogeneity and concentration of population, variety of social and economic interests, and in the operation and interrelation of its political institutions.

Making his point further, Mr. Justice Stewart continued:

A system of legislative apportionment which might be best for South Dakota, might be unwise for Hawaii with its many is-

lands, or Michigan with its northern peninsula—Montana with its vast distances is not Rhode Island with its heavy concentrations of people. I do know enough to be aware of the great variations among the several States in their historic manner of distributing legislative power of the Governor's council in New England, of the broad powers of initiative referendum retained in some States by the people, of the legislative power which some States give to their Governors, by the right of veto or otherwise, of the widely autonomous home rule which many States give to their cities.

The American farmer represents only 7 percent of the total population of this Nation. Yet the general interests and well-being of the American farmer is important to every American. The Supreme Court would reduce the voice of the American farmer and the small townsman to a whisper, a legislative slave to the big cities and urban centers.

Let us make no mistake about the political implications of the Supreme Court ruling. Advocates of one-party, big city rule together with collectivists and Socialists in this country have claimed the Court decision as a victory and a blow to representative government.

Elimination of farm and small town representation in State legislatures will shift absolute and irrevocable power to the large urban centers which are controlled in most areas by advocates of centralized government, deficit spending, and one-party rule.

I respectfully request favorable consideration of a constitutional amendment to enable our States to retain control of their legislatures.

The time has arrived in America to determine if the Constitution as devised by the Founding Fathers is still valid and in force to protect the rights of our citizens, or if this precious document is to be perverted and rewritten at the whim of the Supreme Court.

Thank you.

United States Forges Ahead in Space Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week a joint effort of the Air Force and National Aeronautics and Space Administration resulted in the orbiting of a 700-ton rocket, the Titan 3-C, the heaviest yet in space.

The feat has assisted us greatly in our conquest of space, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Sunday Star for June 20.

TITAN IN THE OCEAN OF SPACE

Apart from boosting the hopes of the U.S. Air Force for an important future role in manned orbital operations, the magnificiently successful launching of Titan 3-C serves as yet another measure of ever-accelerating American progress in space. It serves, too, as striking evidence that our country—for the time being at least—has moved ahead of Russia in the art of heavenly weightlifting.

At any rate, even the Russians seem to accept the claim of our experts that this 700-ton U.S. Air Force rocket is the most powerful in the world as of this moment. More than that, with its 2.5 million pounds of thrust, it has hurled into orbit, about 115 miles up, the heaviest payload thus far in the history of spatial experimentation and exploration. The payload is a vehicle freighted with 21,000 pounds of lead pellets simulating the weight of some near-future satellite loaded with scientific instruments and men. It is about three times as heavy as the *Gemini 4* spacecraft of Astronauts McDivitt and White.

Even so, spectacular though its performance has been, Titan III-C is not the last member of the family of Titans. It will be followed by even more powerful relatives in the years immediately ahead. And in due course, wholly aside from what the Russians are likely to produce, it will lose its present weight-lifting championship to the coming Saturn rockets, Saturn I—with a thrust of 1.5 million pounds, or 32 million horsepower—has been launched almost flawlessly in no fewer than 8 tests. Between now and 1970, if all goes as planned, it will be developed into the awesome Saturn V, which is scheduled to send our manned Apollo spacecraft to the moon.

Saturn V will have a first-stage thrust power of 7.5 million pounds. It will be powerful enough to put a 120-ton craft in low earth orbit or send a 45-ton manned ship to a lunar landing. These tonnages are roughly comparable to those of the ships that carried Columbus to the New World. Clearly, man is really only at the beginning of things in exploring the ocean of space. Almost surely, there will come a time when rockets like the best of the Titans and the best of the Saturns will be looked upon—by our grandchildren perhaps—as relatively primitive instruments.

Well, why not? After all, there have been those in our own time who have scoffed at the flying machines and experiments—notably those of the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk—that have since led to the age of jet travel and supersonic flight. In fact, as recently as 1958, a lot of snickering greeted our first American earth satellites, the heaviest of which weighed under 40 pounds.

One lives and learns—and keeps on being astonished as he explores.

Duquesne University's School of Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have often spoken of the phenomenal progress of Pittsburgh's Duquesne University, its growth from a valuable community resource to a fine regional institution, and its advance toward serving the interests of the whole country with its growing educational facilities. Under the able guidance of Chancellor John Wright, bishop of the Pittsburgh Diocese, the university is certainly rising fast among our outstanding U.S. educational institutions.

Of increasing importance to western Pennsylvania and the Pittsburgh community is the contribution made by the Duquesne University School of Business Administration. Over 1,125 students are currently enrolled in this fine school, and I take pride in calling the attention of Congress and the American people to the program of Duquesne University's School of Business Administration that follows:

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AT DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY

The school of business administration founded in 1913 as school of accounts, finance and commerce; name changed to present, 1932; accredited by American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business.

Member of Pennsylvania's Zeta Chapter of Beta Gamma Sigma, coeducational.

On undergraduate level offers degree of bachelor of science in business administration with concentration in accounting, commerce, economics, finance, management.

On graduate level offers degrees of masters of business administration, masters of arts in economics.

Dean: James L. Hayes, M.A.

Assistant dean: William J. O'Brien, M.S.

Director, graduate program: James L. Fitzgerald, Ph. D.

Assistant director: Bernadine Meyer, M.S.

Department chairman: Blair J. Kolasa, Ph. D., coordinator, administrative science; Frank T. Ebberts, L.L.B., chairman, department of business law; J. James Miller, Ph. D., chairman, department of management; William K. Schusler, Ph. D., chairman, department of commerce; Daniel M. Poore, M.S., coordinator, quantitative sciences and chairman, department of analytic methods; Frank J. Wright, Ph. D., chairman, department of accounting; Thomas J. McDermot, Ph. D., coordinator, economics; Som Prakash, Ph. D., chairman, department of economics; Albert G. Sweetser, Ph. D., chairman, department of finance.

The school of business administration—

Places its research facilities and skills at the disposal of business, industry, and government through its bureau of research, undertaking independent research projects, and publishing monographs on results.

Gears its educational resources to meet specific community needs through its division of educational services, offering noncredit courses in adult continuing education, in-plant training programs, including courses for middle and advanced management, and seminars or short courses custom designed for certain groups.

Is currently pioneering, through a program in the Hill, Homewood-Brushton, and Hazelwood-Glenwood districts, which is underwritten by a grant from the Area Redevelopment Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce, to see if the right environment might be created in culturally and economically deprived neighborhoods to expand job opportunities in existing businesses and to create more small business enterprises, in what might become a prototype for the Federal war on poverty program in Appalachia.

Programs courses leading to both the master of business administration and the bachelor of science in business administration in evening as well as daytime hours for the convenience of area residents.

Weaves itself into the fiber of area business and industry through its faculty who serve as consultants, arbitrators, advisers, and lecturers; through its hosting of meetings and luncheons of professional and business societies; and through its 4,170 living alumni, 2,814 of whom work in Allegheny County, staffing insurance and accounting firms, operating both small and growing businesses, active in business and government tax fields, serving industry in the middle management level in marketing, sales, production, personnel, and finance, teaming

their business studies with law for careers as attorneys and judges.

Faculty, fall, 1964: 52; full time, 47; part time, 5; professors, 7; research professor, 1; associate professors, 14; assistant professors, 20; instructors, 5; lecturers, 5; Ph. D.'s, 22.

Enrollment, fall, 1964: undergraduate, 1,127; men, 1,058; women, 69; full time, 697; part time, 430; graduate, 220; men, 207; women, 13; full time, 24; part time, 196.

Tuition and fees: undergraduate tuition, full time (12 to 17 credits), $650 per semester (includes combined university fee); part time (less than 12 credits)—$36 per credit (plus the university fee determined as follows: 1 to 4 credits $20 per semester; 5 to 11 credits $35 per semester). Graduate tuition, $38 per credit.

STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

Beta Gamma Sigma (Zeta chapter), national honor fraternity.

Beta Alpha Phi honor fraternity.

Epsilon Eta Phi, national professional commerce sorority.

The Student Accounting Association.

American Marketing Association (student chapter), selected group of seniors permitted, under faculty supervision, to participate in the meetings of the Sales Executives Club of Pittsburgh.

American Management Association.

Omicron Delta Epsilon, national economics honor society.

FINANCIAL AIDS

Upperclassmen competitive scholarships, awarded annually by the university; the National Defense Education Act loans.

PRIZES AND AWARDS

Wall Street Journal Award.

Charles E. McDonald Medal.

Pennsylvania Institute of Certified Public Accountants Handbook Award.

Epsilon Eta Phi Scholarship Award.

Epsilon Eta Phi Alumnae Scholarship Awards.

Anna Eulenstein Memorial Medal.

Bachrach, Sanderbeck and Company Award.

American Marketing Association Award.

A. B. Wright Award.

A. L. Schneider Award.

Beta Alpha Phi Non-Accounting Award.

Society for Advancement of Management Award.

Hall of Fame Award.

Frank T. Ebberts Award.

School facilities occupy the first 6 and 10th floors of the Rockwell Hall of Law and Business Administration and include the Ryan Conference Room, which is utilized only by faculty and professional visitors; four conference rooms for student use in seminars and case-study work; complete 10th floor library of financial reports of all companies listed in the New York Stock Exchange and a reading room for periodicals in the field; and the computer center, devoted primarily to research and to integration of computer potential in all courses of the curriculum. (Students are not taught computer operations, since this is vocational rather than strictly educational, but they are given instructions that will enable them to carry out their own research projects or develop programs for their next classes.)

Baltic States Want Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, June 15, 1965, marked the 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression against the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. On June 15, 1940, in violation of solemn treaties with these sovereign nations the Soviet Union began her imperialistic movement into Eastern Europe, removed the legitimate Governments of these nations, and incorporated them into the Soviet Union satellite empire by force.

Following an ultimatum issued to the Lithuanian Government on June 14, 1940, the Soviet armies moved against this nation and moved subsequently against Estonia and Latvia overwhelming all three of these sovereign nations and suppressing such fundamental freedoms as speech, assembly, and religion.

Breaking their will by mass executions and deportations, the Soviet armies forcibly subjugated, persecuted, and physically annihilated their victims. Many sources estimated that the Baltic population was reduced by as much as 25 percent.

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia continued to wear the collar of Communist imperialism. Compounding this prolonged injustice, the Soviets have staged large-scale celebrations within the Baltic nations to commemorate their "liberation" from the "yoke of capitalism." Moscow has deceived no one with its propaganda designed to smother the freedom of the Baltic States under Communist ideology and power.

In the wake of this aggression, on July 23, 1940, the United States denounced this Soviet action against the Baltic States and has refused to recognize the Soviet domination of these nations. Every succeeding administration has refused to recognize or legitimatize the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

I take this opportunity to join with many of my colleagues in the Congress to reaffirm the position that the United States has taken for the past 25 years, and once again to condemn Communist seizure of power in the Baltic States. We all hope, as do freedom-loving Baltic Americans throughout the United States, that the near future will hold the promise of renewed independence and self-determination for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

I am encouraged by the action of the House of Representatives on June 21 in the unanimous adoption of H.R. 416 a measure directed toward restoring freedom to the people of the Baltic States.

Manifesto: The 25th Anniversary of Soviet Aggression Against the Baltic States—by Free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, we salute this year the brave peoples of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania who for 25 years have kept burning the love of freedom and the hope for self-determination even while being subjugated by their Soviet masters. I should like at this time to salute, also, people in the United States of Latvian, Estonian, and Lithuanian descent who have never flagged in their efforts in behalf of their oppressed countrymen.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a manifesto recently issued by the Baltic States Freedom Council which sums up the Baltic freedom cause and charts the road for the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia:

MANIFESTO: THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET AGGRESSION AGAINST THE BALTIC STATES—BY FREE ESTONIANS, LATVIANS, AND LITHUANIANS

Twenty-five years ago, in connivance with Hitler's Germany, the Soviet Union attacked the Baltic States. Some 300,000 Red army troops poured into Lithuania on June 15, 1940, and into Latvia and Estonia, on June 17, 1940. With the assistance of the occupation army, the emissaries of the Kremlin—Dekanozov, Vishinsky, and Zhdanov—unseated the legitimate governments of the Baltic States. The Baltic countries were robbed of their independence and transformed into colonies of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union's assault against its Baltic neighbors initiated the Soviet westward march against Europe. The beginnings of today's international tension and threat to peace may thus be found in the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States in 1940.

By its aggressive acts against Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the U.S.S.R. broke the peace and nonaggression treaties it had signed with those states as well as other international agreements.

Expropriation, exploitation, pauperization, slave labor, suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Russification, terror, murder, mass deportations—these are the marks of the Soviet occupation in the Baltic States. In committing and continuing these acts, the Soviets violated the United Nations Declaration, the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, the Convention on the Suppression of Crimes of Genocide, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—all these documents bearing the signature of the U.S.S.R.

The Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian peoples, historically and traditionally Western in orientation and outlook, have consistenly placed their hopes in the Western World. Their trust in the West was strengthened by the declaration of the U.S. Department of State of July 23, 1940; the statement of the President of the United States on October 15, 1941; the Atlantic Charter; the Yalta Declaration on Liberated Europe; the repeated statements by the U.S. Government about nonrecognition of the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States, the continued recognition of free Baltic diplomatic representatives by the United States as well as many European and South American Governments, and the proclaimed aims and principles of the United Nations.

At the same time the hopes of the Baltic peoples have been strengthened by the global process of decolonization and the universal acceptance of the right of self-determination of nations. The liberation movement of the colonial peoples in Africa and Asia has helped to expose Soviet colonialism as well and has raised the hopes of captive Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. They are convinced that the tide of emancipation from colonial rule will not stop at the borders of the Baltic countries.

The Baltic peoples have given active expression to their determination to regain freedom, and have resisted their oppressors,

thus contributing greatly to the continuing struggle for freedom and justice being waged by all captive peoples enslaved by the Soviet Union. Despite heavy setbacks and trials, our peoples maintain their faith in the restoration of their freedom and independence.

This summer the Soviet enslavers will unveil a macabre spectacle—a festive celebration of the 25th anniversary of the enslavement of the Baltic States during which the captive Baltic peoples will be coerced to appear grateful to their conquerors.

We, free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, are conscious of our responsibility toward our nations and to history. At this 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression, we feel dutybound to give voice to the will and the aspirations of our captive peoples:

We accuse the Soviet Union of committing and continuing an international crime against the Baltic States;

We demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military, police and administrative personnel from the Baltic countries;

We request that the governments of the free world, especially those of the great powers, use all peaceful ways and means to restore the exercise of the right to self-determination in the Baltic countries and in the rest of east-central Europe;

We further request that the United Nations' De-Colonization Committee immediately fulfill its overdue duty and take up the case of Soviet colonialism in the Baltic States;

We appeal to the conscience of all mankind to perceive the magnitude of the injustice perpetrated upon the Baltic peoples and to support the efforts toward the restoration of liberty to these countries;

We convey to our people at home our pride in their resolute resistance against the endeavors of the oppressor to destroy their national and personal identity;

We share with our captive compatriots their view that the recent Soviet economic, political and ideological setbacks—inherent in the structure of their totalitarian system—have considerably weakened the Soviet Union and thus raised the hopes of the captives for deliverance;

We pledge to intensify our joined organized activity in the free world to promote the cause of liberty for the Baltic countries;

We, finally, declare to the free world and the Communist-dominated world, including the U.S.S.R., that, once free again, the Baltic nations will do all in their power to insure the best possible relations with their neighbors on the basis of mutual respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Baltic States Feedom Council:

Chairman: Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, President, Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania; Chairman, Committee for a Free Lithuania. Deputy Chairman: Aleksander Kütt, Chairman, Committee for a Free Estonia. Deputy Chairman: Vilis Hazners, Chairman, Committee for a Free Latvia.

Members: Mrs. Gundega Michel, Chairman, Latvian Student World Association; Dr. Peter Lejins, Jr., Chairman, Latvian Free World Federation; Olev M. Piirsalu, President, Estonia World Council; Peep Rebassoo, President, Estonian Student Association in the U.S.A.; Juozas Bachunas, President, Lithuanian World Congress; Algis Zaparackas, Chairman, Lithuanian Students Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *June 1965*.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

should get the benefit of it, the many or the few? There is no other issue involved.

Some of the major officers and stockholders of various pharmaceutical firms like to talk about big government, that America is turning into a giveaway government. They talk about high taxes. When we study the taxes they pay, we find that they have found so many loopholes in the tax laws that 26 percent of those who had a gross adjusted income exceeding $5 million a year owed no Federal income tax to their Government.

Those people talk about big government. They say that government is capturing control of business. What major business corporation can continue to be free and independent if the Government is parceling out $15 billion of research money to its favorites, without any competition in bidding for the product? Corporations such as General Electric, which has over 15,000 patents to protect against competition, could be broken in its monopolistic power by simply parceling that research money out to someone else.

Then we find that other corporations come to Washington, become Government favorites; and, like the Aerojet-General Corp. grow from $7,500 to over $300 million in value in 10 years, doing business exclusively with the Government, almost entirely under research and development contracts.

There are many other companies in that general category which have grown primarily on Government money.

Does this not put the Government in a position to dictate what those companies will do?

Does this not tend to destroy the concept that the Government should be for the benefit of all, and that industry should conduct its affairs for the benefit of its stockholders and its owners?

If I had my way, I would keep Government out of business. I would also keep business out of Government. I would also keep labor out of both. Then I would keep all three out of the ordinary day-to-day life of the American citizen insofar as his private affairs are concerned.

This big bonanza for business, the vast expenditure of public funds which results in huge giveaways tends in many respects to undermine the integrity and independence of business. It tends to make business a captive of the Government.

In other respects, we find that the Government becomes so big, interferes in so many things, that the same problem develops with regard to the relationship of labor and Government.

This sort of thing can be avoided; and my amendment is an attempt to avoid it.

Mr. President, there was a time when no agency in Government gave away private patent rights on Government research, but that was over a period of time. Since then, for selfish reasons, many people have been able to persuade the Government to give them research contracts and patent rights on Government research.

From that small acorn a giant oak has grown. If we are to prevent that oak from extending and expanding ever larger, we must ask the Government: Who is to benefit from this research? Will it be for the benefit of 192 million Americans? If so, let us draw our lines of determination together and make sure that it will be.

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. ON MONDAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 28, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, June 25, 1965:

U.S. NAVY

Adm. David L. McDonald, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations for a term of 2 years, effective August 1, 1965.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade indicated and in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be rear admirals, Medical Corps

Edward P. Irons
John W. Albrittain
George M. Davis, Jr.

To be rear admirals, Supply Corps

Henry L. Beardsley
Kenneth R. Wheeler

To be rear admiral, Chaplain Corps

Henry J. Rotrige

To be rear admiral, Civil Engineer Corps

Walter M. Enger

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list, in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown O16761, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Sam Maddux, Jr., 1561A Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph H. Moore 1836A, Regular Air Force.

The following officers to be placed on the retired list, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

To be general

Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., 555A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Gen. Mark E. Bradley 552A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Ralph P. Swofford, Jr., 547A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be general

Lt. Gen. John D. Ryan 1418A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, currently serving as general under recess appointment.

Lt. Gen. Kenneth B. Hobson 616A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Bruce K. Holloway 1336A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Horace M. Wade 1872A, Regular Air Force, currently serving as lieutenant general under recess appointment.

Maj. Gen. Albert P. Clark 1218A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Lewis L. Mundell 1286A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John W. Carpenter III 1647A, Regular Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Lael J. Abbott to be major, and ending Ida M. Beam to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 7, 1965.

Appendix

Salute to Sons of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, Order of Sons of Italy, is currently holding its 28th biennial convention, in Philadelphia. It has a record of outstanding service to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to the Nation; and I ask unanimous consent that an editorial praising its accomplishments and good works, which was published in yesterday's issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD WORKS BY THE SONS OF ITALY

Public service for the betterment of community, State, and Nation is an accomplishment deserving laudable attention under any circumstances. When a record of such service extends without interruption over many decades, and is manifested in many different ways, it is worthy of special recognition.

We refer to the numerous and varied good works of the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, Order of Sons of Italy, currently holding its 28th biennial convention in Philadelphia. Although largely a fraternal organization, it devotes much time, effort, and resources to humanitarian deeds—often done quietly and with little fanfare. In providing care for orphans, for example, and in donating books to schools, in giving college scholarships to worthy students, in sponsoring projects to encourage good citizenship and patriotism, in carrying out a program of awards to honor exemplary public servants—in these and in other ways the Sons of Italy have performed with distinction.

Embodying all of these good services and fine traits is Philadelphia Judge Eugene V. Alessandroni, who has been Grand Venerable of the Pennsylvania Lodge, Sons of Italy, for 42 years. His own life of public service, and his fostering of the same spirit in others, are symbolic of the highest ideals of the organization.

We are sure that millions of Pennsylvanians will join us in saluting Judge Alessandroni and the State lodge, Sons of Italy, for their records of service and achievement.

"Government Is Not a Substitute for People"—Bernard M. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, this past week, the Nation lost the valued services and advice of Bernard M. Baruch, for whom so many Americans had great respect and admiration. But his words of wisdom will live on, and many of them will serve as continuing guidelines for those of us who will need them. Of especial pertinency to some of the danger signals flying today, are the following excerpts from Mr. Baruch's book, "The Public Years," as reprinted in a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal which, under leave to extend my remarks, are now set forth:

NOTABLE & QUOTABLE

(From "Baruch: The Public Years," by Bernard M. Baruch, Holt, Rinehart and Winston: New York, 1960).

CHAPTER XIII, "THE GREAT CRASH"

When one recalls the boom of the twenties and the ensuing crash, one is haunted by the question: Can it happen again?

From time to time, most recently in 1958, our economy has faltered badly, and a shudder of fear that we were about to plunge into another depression has spread through the land. But each time, with the help of safeguards built into our economy since 1929, we have regained our equilibrium. Such programs as unemployment insurance, bank deposit insurance, social security, and a host of regulatory measures to prevent economic abuses, have helped maintain stability in time of stress. The investor in the stock market is protected today, as he was not in 1929, by a watchful SEC. He has the benefit of a vast amount of information that companies are required to divulge. He can also seek the advice of professional, disinterested investment analysts.

Nevertheless, the measures have not been devised which can permanently protect men from their folly.

There are many danger signals flying today, and many disturbing points of comparison with the boom of the 1920's. Our Government owes an astronomical debt; private indebtedness is also at a record high. We are enjoying the good life on the instalment plan. Public participation in the stock market exceeds anything we have ever known.

True, speculation is not as unbridled as it was in the 1920's, but it is still dangerously prevalent. Taxes are huge, yet it is a rare occurrence when government, at any level, can balance its budget.

But added to all this, our economy of today operates in a world atmosphere of instability and uncertain peace. It will continue to be subjected to tremendous strains and pressures as long as the cold war continues.

Above all, the American economy is also laboring under the imbalances caused by a generation of inflation. And it is this inflation, more than anything else, which undermines our economic strength. If we are to maintain a healthy economy, we must learn to control this cancer.

Depths and heights are inevitable in any economy, and they are of course in direct ratio to each other. If we wish to escape the pit of depression, we must stay off the inflationary heights. We must learn to scale down the mountain of boom and fill in the valley of bust, so that all economic progress can be achieved as a sure and steady pace. But if, for whatever reason, we succumb to some economic madness, we will surely let ourselves in for trouble. And, as in 1929, we shall have only ourselves to blame.

CHAPTER XXI, "THE WORLD WE FACE"

Even when we know what is right, too often we fail to act. Moreover, we grab greedily for the day, letting tomorrow bring what it will, putting off the unpleasant and unpopular. We blame the Nation's troubles on others: Russia, the Government, labor, business, whatever our favorite whipping boy may be. But it is far more likely that we will find the source of our national trials in our own failures as individuals to discipline ourselves to do what the Nation's well-being demands.

I suppose most people would excuse this failure on the grounds that what they do has no bearing on America's fortunes—that it is only what "important" people do that matters. How wrong they are. For one thing, each of us—farmer, clerk, teacher, banker, nurse, mechanic, engineer—is important. Each of us, to the extent that we do our chosen work well, has a valuable contribution to make to the community. For another, each of us, no matter what our calling or status, shares equally in the responsiblity of citizenship. And a democratic system cannot endure unless its citizens fulfill these responsibilities, chief among which is the responsibility to exercise restraint.

It is all very well to blame inflation on the Government, but isn't it caused fundamentally by our selfishness, and self-indulgence? Isn't it true that our defenses are insecure because we as individuals are unwilling to bear the burdens involved? We understand the danger of Russian aggression. We know her capabilities and the tremendous advances she has made in the technology of war, and we know that the prospects of peace will grow less if she outdistances us in military and economic strength. Yet we have failed to enact those measures which would make our defenses secure.

There are many people who claim the American economy simply cannot afford to do all that is required to meet the Soviet challenge. But the American economy met the demands of two world wars, without seriously impairing the highest standard of living the world has ever known. I believe we are capable of maintaining a deterrent nuclear power second to none. I believe our conventional forces can be built up to handle any foreseeable contingency. I believe it is not too late to close whatever missile gap the Russians may have opened.

But there is no point in deceiving ourselves. An effective defense * * * may mean that we will have to defer many of the goals we would like to reach. It man mean inconvenience and even sacrifice—but this is a small price to pay.

We are faced here with a question of determining priorities. I have no doubt that we can meet our defense requirements and still provide our people with what they need, if not all they want. Peace is not going to come overnight; at best it will be a long haul, and we must begin to learn how to pace ourselves now.

It may sound old fashioned to talk of values, reasoning, and self-discipline, but these fundamental attributes lie at the heart of the democratic dilemma. No democracy can long endure unless its people pass these tests. Nor can we exempt ourselves from them on the ground that the government will do what has to be done. The government cannot do what we are individuals leave undone, any more than it can undo our mistakes.

Government is not a substitute for people, but simply the instrument through which they act. And if the individual fails to do his duty as a citizen, government becomes a very deadly instrument indeed.

The greatest blessing of our democracy is freedom. But in the last analysis, our only freedom is the freedom to discipline ourselves.

"Facts, Not Myths, on Reds"—"The Radical Left"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of Senators an important editorial from the State, of Columbia, S.C., dated June 12, 1965. The editorial is entitled "Facts, Not Myths, on Reds." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a newsletter entitled "The Radical Left," which I published on May 31, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial and the newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State (Columbia, S.C.), June 12, 1965]

FACTS, NOT MYTHS, ON REDS

Knowledgeable J. Edgar Hoover has issued a warning that this country faces a growing menace from the resurgent Communist Party, U.S.A., but many ears will be deaf to his words.

For one thing, it has become politically fashionable to denounce rightwing extremists. Those who have spent all their time decrying activities of the right cannot admit so quickly they were swatting at flies while the termites were eating away the foundations of our political system.

In addition, it has also become fashionable in many circles to say American Communists are so few they represent no danger. There has been no end of talk about good Communists such as the Russians, and bad Communists such as the more militant Chinese. In fact, not a few prominent figures in our country have disposed of the American Communist Party as being merely a myth.

But Mr. Hoover finds the domestic Communist Party no myth. He found them distributing copies of the Worker, the official Communist Party organ on the east coast, during the demonstration in the Nation's Capital this past April 17.

It might be well to remember that this April 17 march on Washington was in protest of our policies in Vietnam where we are fighting Communist forces. Hoover found known Reds playing a leading role in this particular demonstration. Similar demonstrations against our foreign policy in Vietnam—and our caution in the Dominican Republic to prevent a Communist takeover there—have occurred in many other major cities and on college campuses. On the campuses, W. E. B. DuBois clubs are furthering Communist aims, according to Mr. Hoover.

As some courageous people have been noting recently, there is a growing trend for civil rights organizations to combine forces with the antiforeign policy demonstrators. Some of the civil rights organizations, according to massive evidence, already have been heavily infiltrated by radical leftwingers.

It is completely logical that the Communists should have taken advantage of the anti-right-wing phobia which has swept the country. It gave them, indirectly, respectability. They, too, were against the radical right.

But it is ironic, and a sad commentary on the gullibility of the American public, that we should have heeded the legitimate warning against radicals of the right and ignored all warnings of danger from the radical left at a time when we were at war with the Communists.

And we are at war with Communists in more places around the globe than anyone cares to admit. When we are at war with Communists, both Russian and Chinese style, we should heed the warnings of Hoover that people loyal to communism rather than their own government are planning turmoil and trouble. Mr. Hoover, after all, has always been more interested in gathering facts than in creating or dispelling myths.

TH5 RADICAL LEFT

(By STROM THURMOND, U.S. Senator from South Carolina)

The man primarily charged with keeping tabs on enemy plans to subvert our Nation has been in large part ignored in his admonitions on internal security. For the past several years, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has warned in books, articles, speeches, and testimony about three primary project of the Communists in the United States: (1) twisting of minds of campus youngsters with Communist dogma; (2) exploitation and infiltration of civil rights movements; and (3) the silencing of anti-Communist voices. In recent months, the fruits of Communist seed planted across America have been blossoming forth on campuses, in the streets, and in leftwing periodicals.

In recently released testimony given before the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. Hoover officially revealed the Communist orientation of the student demonstrations at the University of California. He stated that 43 individuals with Communist backgrounds, 5 of them being professors and all being connected with the university, played active roles in the explosive developments.

Mr. Hoover laid bare Communist actions for pumping propaganda at college campuses, recruiting new members, and establishing front group operations. He particularly deplored the increasing number of lectures being presented on campuses by leading Communist Party officials. Given special attention by Mr. Hoover was the new Communist-organized W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America. He said this organization "is designed to attract youth interested in peace, disarmament, civil rights, and the like."

The progress of the Communist efforts to exploit and infiltrate civil rights groups has been astounding. This has even been publicly acknowledged by concerned "liberal" columnists. I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 20 a newsletter of the American Flag Committee setting forth in 1956 the Communist Party's detailed plan for causing a voting rights crisis in early 1965, a civil rights fight over public accommodations in 1964, and the employment of demonstrations and civil disobedience to stampede Congress into enacting Red proposals for subverting the powers of State and local governments. The newsletter forecast the tactics and timing almost perfectly.

In testifying on present operations of the Communists in the area of civil rights, Mr. Hoover told the committee of a recruitment drive now underway among Negro youth. He added: "The party plans to hold a training school for youth in New York City in the summer of 1965 * * *. In addition, certain Communist Party, U.S.A., youths will be asked to go to the South during the summer of 1965 to work with civil rights organizations."

One of the reasons why the public ardor for civil disobedience has cooled in recent weeks—and at the White House, too—is because many of the same beatnick demonstrators involved in the Selma provocations have been found working together in pacifist demonstrations against U.S. policies resisting Communist aggression.

Anti-Communist individuals and groups are on the defensive in the United States today as never before. They are being harassed, smeared, and investigated by Government agencies and left-wing news media. Indeed, the false idea has been planted across the country that the real enemy of America is the anti-Communist rather than the Communist.

Here is Mr. Hoover's frank evaluation of Communist plans for further progress in America: "Encouraged by recent Court decisions which the party considers major victories in its efforts to nullify the Internal Security Act of 1950, and convinced that a large segment of the population is ready to accept some form of socialism as a cure for domestic problems, such as civil rights and poverty, the party has streamlined its structure in preparation for operating more openly."

The No. 1 enemy of the American way of life is the radical left with its revolutionary aim of leveling all Americans to a common plane under an all-powerful centralized bureaucracy. The Congress is past due in thoroughly investigating the radical left for purposes of considering new internal security legislation. Communist and front groups have been able to get too far in recent years because internal security laws have been rendered impotent by Supreme Court decisions.

Higher Food Prices Hurt the Poor Most of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the June 21, 1965, issue of the U.S. News & World Report carries a succinct report on food prices—which are headed up, and fast.

Food—especially fruit and vegetable—prices are increasing dramatically. The primary cause is the lack of adequate, competent, experienced farmworkers. Other explanations and excuses—such as bad weather—are not valid. Weather is a common, chronic hazard for all growers—and is not appreciably worse this year than in other years.

The manmade disaster caused by the withdrawal of competent labor is the true basic cause.

By pursuing a variety of unrealistic policies, under the guise of aiding a few who work in the fields, the Department of Labor is forcing prices up. Higher prices hurt the poor most of all.

The full text of the article follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, June 21, 1965]

FOOD PRICES—WHERE THEY'RE HEADED

(Grocery shoppers must be wondering what's going on. Potatoes cost more at a time when they should be cheaper. Beef prices shot up overnight. Price of lettuce

seems sky high. The experts tell you why—and what to expect.)

For housewives complaining of sharp increases in food prices, there is good news and bad in Government forecasts.

The good news is that prices for many fresh vegetables should ease somewhat now that the summer harvest is beginning to bring bigger supplies to market.

A vegetable marketing specialist in the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported on June 9: "Shipment of vegetables into major markets reached the level of a year ago during the first week in June after being below 1964 levels by about 10 percent in April and May."

The bad news—from the viewpoint of the American housewife—is seen in predictions that prices for beef and pork will hold around present levels throughout the summer months and possibly to the end of 1965.

"If housewives don't like the prices they have been paying for red meat, they will not like the prices they probably will have to pay this summer," said an Agriculture Department economist.

HOUSEWIVES' PLAINT

Sharply higher prices for red meat and fresh vegetables have brought widespread complaint from housewives in recent weeks.

Potatoes, for example, have been going up in price at the time of year when they should start getting cheaper.

Reasons given for the unusual trend in potato prices: A short crop last autumn reduced supplies for storage. Then drought hit areas that normally produce large crops in the spring.

Though potato prices are expected to drop from high levels of recent weeks, marketing specialists say the June 10 Federal crop report indicates prices will remain relatively high, at least until mid-July.

Lettuce of the iceberg variety, which had shot from prices of 25 to 30 cents a head up to 40 to 50 cents in some cities, now is coming to market in greater volume, and wholesale prices were reported down sharply on June 8.

"A rapid pickup" in harvest of green beans, with a crop that should bring "reasonable prices," was predicted by an Agriculture Department economist.

Strawberries are expected to continue at higher prices than a year ago, according to market experts. The growing season has been poor in many areas. To add to the problem, there has been a shortage of labor in strawberry fields.

WANTED: FIELDWORKERS

The labor shortage, which also has affected supplies and prices of fresh vegetables, stemmed from a Federal order barring Mexican braceros from working in U.S. fields this year. Aim of the order was to give jobs to unemployed U.S. workers, but, according to growers and packers, there haven't been enough American workers to replace these Mexicans.

"The shortage of foreign labor is affecting all crops" said a California packer. "Domestic workers don't want to be pickers by choice. They'll pick a short time and then get out. Onions, cherries, asparagus are all affected by the problem. These workers don't know how to pack properly. For example, they put big and small lettuces in the same package."

Unless the labor situation is straightened out, say many growers and packers, vegetable and fresh-fruit prices may be higher than a year ago, even with the harvest outlook improving.

The economists say housewives have found beef-price increases so startling because they had become accustomed to relatively low prices during a 2-year slump in the livecattle market. This slump has ended in recent months, with the result that the cost of beefsteaks and roasts has shot up.

There may be some further increase in beef prices, the economists say, as prices still haven't reached the level from which they started falling more than 2 years ago.

Pork, too, has risen in price as farmers have been sending fewer hogs to market. Prices paid for live hogs in Chicago on June 8 were the highest in nearly 7 years.

OUTLOOK: LITTLE CHANGE

Summing up the overall outlook for food costs, Government economists say that housewives probably will have to continue to spend at about present levels to feed their families in the months ahead.

Why housewives are complaining about food prices

[A spot check of prices at major chainstores in Washington, D.C., showed sharp increases for several foods between early May and early June]

	Early May	Early June	Increase
Sirloin steak (pound)	$0.85	$1.05	$0.20
Sirloin tip (pound)	.95	1.05	.10
Porterhouse steak (pound)	.89	1.09	.20
Chuck roast (pound)	.53	.59	.06
Ground round (pound)	.85	.89	.04
Pork chops (pound)	.79	.89	.10
Bacon (pound)	.99	1.15	.16
Green beans (2 pounds)	.29	.35	.06
Pork sausage (pound)	.35	.39	.04
Potatoes (10 pounds)	1.09	1.19	.10
Lettuce (head)	.29	.39	.10

American Roadbuilders Association Dedicates Its New Headquarters Building in Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the American Road Builders Association today dedicated its national headquarters building at 525 School Street in the Southwest section of Washington. This handsome structure, for which the ground was broken on January 24, 1964, makes a significant contribution to the renewal and rehabilitation of that area, which is rapidly becoming a showroom of modern urban planning technology.

In commemoration of this occasion, in which I was privileged to participate, there was published a dedication brochure, which, in addition to other interesting features, contains a summary of the history of the organization and of its early and continued effective efforts in support of a program of Federal aid for the construction of highways. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads and one who has for many years appreciated the contributions of the American Road Builders Association to our highway program as well as airport development, I believe the story of ARBA will be of interest to other Senators who are concerned with the advancement of transportation facilities in America. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS ASSOCIATION DEDICATES ITS NEW HEADQUARTERS IN NATION'S CAPITAL

The story of the new ARBA building is a chronicle of men—those who set the scene, the men who raised the money, those who put up the money, the administrators, and the others. These men are unnamed for the most part, but the work they have done, and are continuing to do, has made this building possible.

The history of the association can be compared to the phases of construction of the new ARBA building. For example, the foundation was placed in 1880, some 85 years ago, when bicyclists got together and began demanding roads which were unscarred by deep wagon ruts and hoof holes. They called themselves the League of American Wheelmen, and they emitted a loud and lusty cooperative bellow on behalf of better roads. Roads then were hardly navigable after a rainfall, and any improvements were strictly for the ducks.

An offspring of the league's good roads movement was the Office of Road Inquiry, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Establishment of this office in 1893, later to become the Bureau of Public Roads, indicated that the Federal Government had recognized the national importance of road improvement. The agency's responsibility was to study methods of roadmaking, construct object-lesson roads, and publish information.

There were other important developments in 1893: Frank Duryea pushed the first American-made automobile onto the streets of Springfield, Mass. At the same time, the first brick surface on a rural road in this country was laid on the Wooster Pike near Cleveland, Ohio. Following on the heels of these events came rural free delivery of mail; this gave the good roads movement a strong push, since a gravel or macadam road was a requirement for the service.

In 1901, New Jersey enacted the first State road aid law. According to historical notes, passage of this law was due largely to "the valuable assistance of the League of American Wheelmen. * * * Their persistent demand and numerous publications * * * have done much to bring about the movement for good roads, a movement that they are sustaining by all means at their command."

THE CORNERSTONE

The cornerstone of the ARBA building was laid, theoretically, when Horatio S. Earle, president of the League of American Wheelmen, in 1901 sent a letter to a selected list of 200 persons throughout the country. He advised them of a proposed organization whose aim would be to secure a system of highways to connect the capitals of the various States with the Nation's Capital.

According to Mr. Earle's 1900 diary, he felt that an organization separate from the league would be required, and that he should make every effort to muster men who were road minded. "But to create interest is a severe task at this stage of road development," he complained. He prepared a constitution and bylaws, which accompanied the letters.

"It is time," he wrote, "for the American people to unite in a battle against a powerful monarch—m-u-d." He suggested that the new organization be called the American Road Makers. The three initials, ARM, indicated strength, determination and the will to win, Mr. Earle explained.

Of the 200 persons who received the letters, 25 answered, 16 sent in their proxies and 4 were present at the meeting. Those present were William P. Judson, deputy State highway engineer, New York; Col. W. L. Dickinson, president, Connecticut Valley Highway Association; William S. Crandall, editor, Municipal Journal & Engineer; and Mr. Earle. They adopted the constitution and bylaws, established a dues structure, elected officers, hoped for better attendance next time and vowed to continue preaching the good roads gospel.

ARM President Earle in 1903 became the first highway commissioner for Michigan. While making one of his numerous good roads talks he was ridiculed by a farmer who pointed out that in a recent election

only 1 out of 342 people voted for the county road system. Forthwith, Mr. Earle related the story of one progressive township in the State which decided to let horses vote, since they actually had to pull the wagons. Every horse in the township voted for the good roads bill, Mr. Earle declared, and every jackass voted against it. According to existing notes, only the skillful intervention of the chairman prevented Mr. Earle's eviction from the hall.

Other good roads meetings didn't fare this well. A report in the old Good Roads magazine, which was replaced eventually by the American Road Builder, states that "A good roads meeting, called in a somewhat rural locality, was almost a complete failure, as the roads were so bad that the greater number of delegates were unable to attend." The report concluded with a ray of optimism: "It is hoped that they will try again."

There were good signs, too. The old roads, which had turned into quagmires or grown up into brambles during the half century between 1850 and 1900, were now getting attention. With each improved mile the traffic poured in, and the sheep, which had taken refuge in the abandoned taverns, were alarmed by the strange sounds of popping automobiles.

A few blacksmiths and druggists began to sell gasoline and oil, and motorists lighted their lamps with matches, patched their own tires, and enthusiastically navigated streams and mudholes with a little luck and a few mules.

THE SUPERSTRUCTURE

Meanwhile, the American Road Makers continued its battle for favorable highway action at the national level, and they attempted another meeting in February 1904. Attendance this time reached 1,120, and 29 States were represented. Now, it may be said, the superstructure of the new ARBA was begun.

In 1904, only 7 percent of America's public roads were surfaced, and often the surface was buried in the mud. Automobile makers turned out some 50,000 motor cars, but buggy builders topped the 1 million mark that year.

The association magazine reported 2 years later that one of the most notable events in recent roadbuilding history was that New York City had decided to pave lower Broadway from the Battery to City Hall Park with wood blocks. "New York has been confronted for many years with the fact that it must allow heavy trucking to be done in the heart of its office building district," the magazine allowed.

Back during the early 1850's, the railroads had helped put highways out of business. Therefore, it was a big occasion in 1910 when surfaced roads mileage surpassed railroad mileage. Now, instead of Conestoga wagons creaking along bottomless trails to be set upon by Indians, shiny new automobiles were dusting along all-weather streets to be set upon by policemen.

MORE MODERN DESIGN

The American Road Makers changed its name in 1910 to the American Road Builders Association, and thus it could be said that this was when a more modern architectural design was adopted. Having been instrumental in obtaining the first State aid for highways, the association was exerting its efforts toward Federal aid for roadbuilding. In spite of the fact that Federal aid to highways was considered a "radical innovation," ARBA persisted in supporting, defending, and advancing the concept. It stood practically alone in this fight.

Perhaps you actually remember the condition of roads in 1916; if not, it is hard to imagine the shape they were in. Some 3½ million motor vehicles were all dressed up and had plenty of places to go, but the roads wouldn't get them there. It was not unusual to drive from a hard-surfaced road in one State into an impassable bog at the State line—or perhaps into a dead end. This hit-and-miss road system stunted national growth, and motorists began to understand, loud and clear, the message that ARBA had been trying to get across.

The association had been suspect for using its resources to change the traditional thinking that had existed since the mid-1800's when the old National Road, built with Federal funds in the States of Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana, had gone out of existence as a Federal interstate highway and become solely the States' responsibility. But something new was added when President Woodrow Wilson signed the Federal Aid Road Act of 1916; this was the first comprehensive step taken by the Federal Government, with the help of each of the States, aimed at establishing an integrated nationwide system of interstate highways.

ARBA still had its sights set on securing a Federal aid system of highways to connect every State capital with the U.S. Capital. From long before that day in 1916, and for long after this day in 1965, ARBA's efforts have been and will continue to be militant. Its effects have been incalculable. The association has earned a position of high prestige in Washington, in State and local governments, and generally throughout the country.

THE COMPLETED STRUCTURE

Growth of the association and its responsibilities has paralleled the development of primitive trails into the highly modernized superhighways of today. The first efforts were toward building a road, or opening a way. Now, however, the objective is not just to build a road but to build the best and the safest road that can be built for the expenditure. This complicated operation requires the most advanced technology as it relates to men, machinery and materials. An organization which can weld these requirements into a single successful purpose has to be unique.

ARBA today is just such an organization. It is the only group in America that represents every segment of the highway industry and profession, and it brings together all facets of the highway program. Obviously, a federation of such widespread interests as Federal, State, county, and municipal engineers, of consulting engineers, manufacturers, contractors, materials producers, distributors and educators, cannot proceed on a basis of self-centered interest. An objective organization is required that is nearly as complex in its makeup as the broad purpose it serves.

In order to cope with the myriad problems that face the highway industry and profession, ARBA maintains activities in such areas as laws and regulations, administration, finance, design, specifications, construction, research and development and education.

To most effectively serve its membership, the association is organized into nine major divisions aimed at accomplishing the overall objectives of the group (an adequate continuing highway program for the Nation, soundly financed) and specializing in the singular problems of each organized division. Except for the general membership division, each has its own president, board of directors and managing director. The managing director reports to the executive vice president of ARBA. He, in turn, is responsible to ARBA's elected president and national board of directors.

The American Road Builders Association today is stronger, better organized and more efficiently staffed than at any other time in its great and useful life. Its new headquarters building, is situated in the shadow of the Nation's Capitol and in the heart of one of the city's most modern, fastest growing and dramatic complexes.

THE DEDICATION

The new building symbolizes the spirit of cooperation that has marked the work of the association—all segments of the highway industry and profession working together—through the years past and those to come.

The future? Whatever it brings, ARBA is ready, willing, and able to cope with it, thanks to the members who have contributed their energy, talent and money to provide efficient and modern working space. And when the history of ARBA is reviewed a hundred years from now, the construction and dedication of the new ARBA building will be recorded as one of the great milestones in the association's colorful and distinguished history.

"The Church"—Sermon by Rev. Marlin C. Hardman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in his Sunday morning sermon from I Timothy 3: 14–16, on June 6, 1965, Rev. Marlin C. Hardman, pastor of the Barcroft Community Bible Church, of Arlington, Va., raised the following questions: "What is the church?" "Who is the head of the church?" and "Why is the church in existence?" Reverend Hardman's answers to these important questions are contained in a few excerpts from his outstanding message.

I ask unanimous consent that these excerpts be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD; and I commend them to the attention of all the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the sermon were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Why have a church?" Opinions are numerous, but the Scriptures are quite specific. Many today believe that the church is for religious instruction which will bring greater enjoyment out of life—simply a cultural influence. Others believe it is primarily for social reformation.

In fact, one major religious body recently went on record as seeking to remedy three areas of society in particular: (1) Race, (2) war, and (3) poverty.

I do not believe for a moment that the church can turn its back on these social issues, but the Scriptural pattern has been all but lost in the current ministerial role. Many members of the clergy have taken part in this active program of reformation to the exclusion of their true calling.

Increasingly, pulpits abound with sermons regarding "civil rights," "low cost housing," "peace," "urban renewal," and other such items. Often extremely strong suggestions are made as to how one should vote.

While no one will deny that these subjects are all important and answers must be found, the minister's essential mission goes begging. The Scriptures declare that ministers are to proclaim what God has said, to the exclusion of their opinions. I do not want any of you signing something simply because your pastor's name is on it, for then you are not thinking issues through yourself. My responsibility is to instruct you in the Gospel of Jesus Christ and its

accompanying principles, and trust Him to guide you in making right decisions.

The Apostle Paul's answers to the purpose of the church is contained in I Timothy 3: 15—it is, to be "the support and foundation of the truth." And "the truth" involves not my telling you for whom you should vote, what to sign, etc., but the declaration of the good news that Christ died for our sins and will change us (I Timothy 3: 16) that we might make decisions in our everyday life that please Him. When one's heart is right, his decisions likewise will be correct.

Oh, that men, who profess to be called of God, would quit dabbling in politics and crusading for pet projects; get back to the pulpit with the word of God and teach people what He has said.

Error by the Supreme Court in the Brown Desegregation Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Manchester Union Leader, of Manchester, N.H., very prominently displayed in its June 1, 1965, issue an article written by John J. Synon, of Richmond, Va., and entitled "Brown Revisited: No Creature Stirring." This article by Mr. Synon presents strong evidence to the effect that the U.S. Supreme Court was hoodwinked by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in connection with so-called evidence presented before the Court in the 1954 desegregation cases. To anyone who is interested in having all the facts in such an important matter, I suggest that this interesting article by Mr. Synon be put at the top of the reading list.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROWN REVISITED: NO CREATURE STIRRING

(By John J. Synon)

It is one thing for the Supreme Court to say it is unconstitutional to segregate schoolchildren by race because to do so is harmful to one or another of the races. That is one thing.

It is still another for the Court to refuse to look at overwhelming evidence to the contrary, evidence that proves not only the falsity of the Court's opinion, but that it was tricked into expressing it, misled by the NAACP.

Yet, such is the situation. Two Federal district courts—the only courts that have proved willing to hear the facts—have so found. The evidence is uncontradicted: (1) It is commingling and not segregation that is harmful to both races; (2) evidence to this effect was known and available to the NAACP when, in 1954, it sought and obtained its (Brown) desegregation decision; (3) the NAACP held back from the Court the evidence it had; (4) by this evasion, the NAACP misled the Court.

On its face, it would seem those people who profess an interest in the well-being of Negro schoolchildren would, themselves, demand a rehearing of the case. If colored children as well as white children are being harmed by schoolroom commingling, it would seem a point of wisdom to establish the fact and to do something about it before it is too late.

Yet, all is quiet, not a creature is stirring.

What it amounts to, of course, is a challenge to the Supreme Court's intellectual honesty. If, in the face of uncontradicted new evidence, the Court will not reconsider, its honesty stands challenged. And it will not. It has said it will not.

The situation is not complicated. Consider, for instance, the Brown case testimony of Dr. Kenneth Clark. See how it was done.

When, in 1954, the Court handed down its decision, the primary justification for its opinion was the testimony of this psychologist. Dr. Clark, himself a Negro, previously had testified in three of the four cases that undergirded Brown and it was his testimony about his own research, primarily, on which the other experts relied and on which the Court based its findings. Among its citations the Court gave Dr. Clark's testimony the No. 1, or preferred, position.

Dr. Clark, it seemed, had been retained by the NAACP to test segregated Negro schoolchildren for the purpose of determining that separation by race was injurious to their personalities. To this end, Dr. Clark ran tests in one southern school on 16 such children and then concluded that segregation throughout the United States, does injure them. That was it.

What the NAACP did not tell the Court was that Dr. Clark, long before he had been hired by the NAACP, had run similar tests on other schoolchildren. He had run them in the North as well as in the South, in desegregated as well as segregated schools. And he had run them not on 16 children, but on 300 children. As a result of this extensive testing, Dr. Clark had concluded ("Readings in Social Psychology," Henry Holt & Co., pp. 551–560) that comparison between the responses of Negro children in segregated and in nonsegregated schools shows that "they do not differ." Except, Dr. Clark said, that Negro children in segregated schools—segregated schools, mind you—"are less pronounced in their preferences * * *" for those elements used to determine personality injury. In short, Dr. Clark had found, earlier that Negro children were less likely to be psychologically injured in segregated schools than in desegregated schools.

This, of course, was the exact opposite of his later testimony in Brown when he was on retainer by the NAACP.

Years later, Dr. Alfred H. Kelley, another of the NAACP key strategists in Brown, referred to the case in a speech he delivered before the American Historical Association, December 28, 1961. In this speech Dr. Kelley boastfully told his audience: "It is not that we were engaged in formulating lies; there was nothing as crude and naive as that. But we were using facts, emphasizing facts, bearing down on facts, sliding off facts, quietly ignoring facts and above all interpreting facts in a way to do what (Thurgood) Marshall said we had to do—'get by those boys down there.'"

It was this sort of thing that brought Federal Judge Sydney C. Mize, in the 1964 Evers case, to find that the NAACP's evidence in Brown was "unworthy of belief." Judge Mize said that the conduct of the NAACP in that case * * * "shows what appears to have been a pattern of evasion of fact, if not an actual misleading concealment of fact in that case." The judge said the facts in Brown "cry out" to be reheard. Federal Judge Frank M. Scarlett had said as much in Stell the year before, in 1963. And these two Federal courts, it bears repeating, are the only Federal courts that have been willing to hear the "other side" in the matter.

Why? The Supreme Court has been asked to hear it and it has said, no, it will not.

It would seem the Supreme Court's refusal to hear this evidence would give something more than passing concern not only to those who are primarily concerned with the well being of children, but to attorneys as well. Attorneys can best understand the significance of arbitrariness on the part of the court and its ultimate effect on our total judiciary.

If, as the uncontradicted evidence has it, the Supreme Court's previous decision on segregation was based on misleading evidence, the concealment of evidence, and if desegregation, contrary to the Court's findings, is in fact harmful to both Negro and white children, it would seem somebody in a position to speak out would speak out.

Yet, not a creature is stirring.

Mr. Lois Laycock, Washington Correspondent for the Nashville Tennessean

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON], in expressing regret over the departure of Mr. Lois Laycock, Washington correspondent from the Nashville Tennessean from the Press Gallery. Mr. Laycock is returning to Jackson, Tenn., and will operate his family's firm, Laycock Printing Co.

It seems to me almost impertinent for a new Member of this body to add his word of praise in regard to Lois Laycock. He was an established institution upon my arrival here. I knew of his reputation, his good works, and his dedication to his profession. During the 6 months of my service here, I have found that his reputation is well deserved. His courtesy, his warm friendship to this freshman Congressman, his clarity, and the incisive character of his mind have made a lasting impression upon me.

As the able representative of a great Tennessee newspaper, he has served his country well. We shall certainly miss him.

Hon. Olin D. Johnston

SPEECH

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I join with the other Members of this House today to pay tribute to an outstanding man who served our Nation so capably in the U.S. Senate for more than 20 years. OLIN D. JOHNSTON was a lifelong Democrat and leader of the Democratic Party in his home State of South Carolina for many decades. Nothing I can say could do justice to the public service which this fine gentleman performed. His dedication, integrity, and the dignity he brought to the Senate was recognized by all who came in contact with him.

The State of South Carolina which he served as Governor and the rest of our Nation lost a great leader in the passing of OLIN JOHNSTON. Our Nation has benefited from the good fortune of having had the service of this devoted servant of his State and his Nation.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate considered bill to authorize funds to combat major diseases, adopted conference report on bill on water projects, and passed four bills on calendar call.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 14233–14271

Bills Introduced: Six bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2201–2206; S. Con. Res. 40; and S. Res. 120. **Page 14234**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 2154, extending time for submission of report by the U.S.-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico (S. Rept. 370); and

Report of Committee on the Judiciary entitled "Refugees and Escapees" (S. Rept. 371). **Page 14234**

Bill Placed on Calendar: H.R. 8131, to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, was ordered to be placed on calendar. **Page 14233**

Call of Calendar: On call of calendar, four bills were passed as follows:

Without amendment and cleared for House:

U.N. Participation Act: S. 1903, relating to U.S. participation in the United Nations;

Greece debt settlement: S. 1760, authorizing acceptance of a settlement of certain indebtedness of Greece to the U.S.; and

Gorgas Memorial Laboratory: S. 511, increasing authorization of funds for the support of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in the Canal Zone.

With amendment and cleared for House:

South Pacific Commission: S.J. Res. 71, providing for membership and participation by the U.S. in the South Pacific Commission. **Pages 14237–14240**

Small Reclamation Projects: S. 602, to broaden the scope of the Small Reclamation Projects Act, was passed after adoption of committee amendments. Subsequent to passage of the bill, Senator Ellender filed a motion to reconsider its passage. **Pages 14271–14272**

Private Bill: Senate considered S. 321, private bill, but before action was completed thereon the bill was displaced when other business was taken up. **Pages 14272, 14280**

Recreation: Senate adopted conference report on S. 1229, proposed Water Projects Recreation Act. Motion to reconsider this action was tabled. S. Con. Res. 40, to provide for correction in the enrollment of S. 1229 was adopted. **Pages 14276–14280**

Major Diseases: Senate considered S. 596, authorizing funds for combating heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases, adopting committee amendments en bloc, which were then considered as original text for purpose of further amendment.

Pending at recess was Long (Louisiana) amendment (No. 298) conditioning expenditure of funds on insurance that all developments resulting from research under Government auspices shall be made freely available to the public. The yeas and nays were ordered on this amendment and, by unanimous consent, it was agreed that further debate thereon will be limited to 2 hours, equally divided, on Monday, June 28, such time limitation to be effective after the prayer, when Senate meets at 11 a.m. **Pages 14282–14309**

Authority To Meet: All committees were authorized to meet while Senate is in session on Monday, June 28. **Pages 14305–14306**

Messages and Enrolled Bills: Secretary of Senate was authorized to receive messages from House during Senate recess until Monday, June 28, and Vice President, President pro tempore, or Acting President pro tempore were authorized to sign enrolled bills during such recess. **Page 14306**

Confirmations: The following nominations were confirmed: Adm. David L. McDonald, to be Chief of Naval Operations; and 7 other Navy in the rank of admiral; numerous Army, 1 in the rank of general; and 12 Air Force in the rank of general. **Page 14309**

Program for Monday: Senate met at noon and recessed at 5:49 p.m. until 11 a.m. Monday, June 28, when it will continue consideration of S. 596, to combat heart disease, cancer, and stroke, the vote on Long (Louisiana) amendment to be taken not later than 1 p.m. **Pages 14305, 14309**

Appendix

Focus on Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe two stories under the joint title, "Focus on Project HOPE," which appeared in a recent issue of the Rockford, Ill., Register-Republic, provide some of the best insight in print to date on this humanitarian program.

In one story the dramatic history of Project HOPE—from its early days when it struggled under the guidance of HOPE President Dr. William B. Walsh to its present, worldwide activities, is well summarized.

In the other account, the observations of a dedicated opthalmologist, Dr. Vernon C. Voltz, are recorded. I believe his comments on HOPE's work in the new Republic of Guinea illuminate the health problems of emerging nations in West Africa, and the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Register-Republic article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FOCUS ON PROJECT HOPE—ROCKFORD EYE DOCTOR HEALED AFRICAN NATIVES

Among the more than 700 American physicians, dentists, nurses, and auxiliary personnel who have served aboard the hospital ship, SS *Hope*, is Dr. Vermon C. Voltz, Rockford ophthalmologist.

Dr. Voltz was one of three eye doctors to serve with Project HOPE during its first tour at Conakry, Guinea, in west Africa during October 1964.

The system used in Africa differed somewhat from that of previous missions.

Each doctor, nurse, and technician from America had an African counterpart with whom he or she worked closely, teaching skills and the effective teamwork necessary to modern medicine.

The intensive training was done through on-the-job treating of thousands of sick and afflicted.

Necessary diagnosis and training were done mostly in the clinic; some was done in the classrooms, but at all times the emphasis was on teaching.

STAFF HOSPITALS

Dr. Voltz said most of the staff worked at the 2 hospitals in Conarky in the morning, attending about 25 patients per day. In the afternoon, the staff worked on the ship helping as many as 40 patients per day.

All the time, the counterparts were there learning and doing.

In the eye department of the hospital, where Dr. Voltz spent most of his time, there was one doctor in charge of teaching four assistants.

The assistants actually did much of the work, including eye surgery, normally done only by a qualified doctor of medicine, even though they had had no formal training.

Dr. Voltz classified them as amateurs doing ocular surgery, but he said they were eager to learn.

They knew how to straighten eyes, and they worked daily in their local clinics and on the ship.

The goal was to turn over to them various duties after these duties had been demonstrated to them. The goal has not been reached yet, Dr. Voltz said, but there is hope for success, and progress is being made. Their big need is to improve technique, he said.

Dr. Voltz left New York October 13, 1964, with the other doctors for the trip to Dakaar, Africa. From there, the group went to Conakry, a city of 80,000 on the west coast of Africa.

GETS TO WORK

The new *Hope* staff was given 1 day to adjust to its new environment, and then went into its medical program.

Hope personnel were confined to the coastal area away from the Congo or other threatened areas.

Dr. Voltz described the people of Conakry as timid but friendly, and they liked to have their pictures taken, except for certain adults who had some sort of superstition about cameras.

The city itself has many modern buildings and facilities, but much of it is Russian.

This is evidenced by a modern hotel, a modern school, an athletic field and many Soviet freighters tied up at the wharf.

But the Soviet influence is waning. The modern Russian facilities are unused because there are no Russians to use them or Guineans who are able to use them.

The city's presidential palace is considered beautiful by Dr. Voltz, and the architecture of the hospital in which he worked is modern by any standard even though it looks like a slum because of poor maintenance.

The water holes in Conakry are slushy and are used for taking baths as well as for washing dishes and for drinking.

SQUALOR ABOUNDS

There is squalor and poverty. The place is very primitive; just as in the storybooks, Dr. Voltz said.

He described health conditionss in Conakry as poor and unsanitary.

Postoperative conditions were horrible and showed a great lack of administration. Dressings would be rotten and saturated with discharge. And a patient would pile his dirty clothes in the anteroom to the operating room before surgery, and then put on the same dirty garments when leaving.

There would be more than one patient in a single bed; a mother would be in bed with her inflicted children; meningitis was deplorable; childbirth complications lasted as long as 4 or 5 years; and malnutrition was a major problem, even in some of the eye cases.

Dr. Voltz said Guinea has only 80 M.D.'s to serve its 3 million people.

He said language was no real problem. Translators from many sources were used much of the time. They usually came as Peace Corps volunteers, aid program workers, and families of Embassy personnel. French and English were used most of the time.

There wasn't much professional contact with fields other than ophthalmology except in a consulting capacity, Dr. Voltz said.

But, he said he did get involved with a full range of ophthalmologic diseases. Problems were similar to those at home except they usually were more advanced.

He said the most impressive part of his tour was the reaction he got from his first cataract patient.

The man was so elated at being able to see again that after he found he could see again, he grasped the doctor's hand and shook it vigorously, stood back and threw him a salute, and then grabbed his hand and kissed it.

But more descriptive of an acute case cured by *Hope* physicians was the large face tumor of a native man. His face was swollen to twice its normal size with one eye pushed near the other. He had gone this way for some time, but only 2 weeks after surgeons had removed the tumor, the man's face was back to normal and he hardly could tell he had been inflicted.

Dr. Voltz said he also was very impressed just with having had the opportunity to be associated with such a remarkably professional group. They were alert, cooperative, congenial, frindly, and professionally dedicated.

"They were a fine group; a close group, I would very much like to return," he said.

But like any trip, he said he was glad to be home.

OLD SHIP BRINGS "HOPE" TO NEEDY

A dream became a reality in 1958 when a U.S. Navy ship was taken from the mothball fleet and rechristened the SS *Hope*.

Project HOPE—Health Opportunity for People Everywhere—is the principal activity of the People-to-People Health Foundation.

This independent, nonprofit corporation formed by the American people bring the skills and techniques developed by the American medical, dental, and paramedical professions to needy people in newly developing areas of the world.

HOPE began in 1958 when President Eisenhower asked Dr. William B. Walsh, a prominent Washington heart specialist, to initiate a project aimed at international good will and understanding through person-to-person contact.

The plan Dr. Walsh submitted was for the world's first peacetime hospital ship, a reconverted, 15,000-ton veteran of World War II and the Korean war.

The SS *Hope* first sailed from San Francisco in September 1960, with a crack medical staff chosen from thousands of applicants.

Its destination—Indonesia.

Its mission—to spread good will to the people of this nation and to show them the skills of American medicine.

Its methods—to cure some of the acute cases, to instruct indigenous medical personnel in modern medical methods, and to show all the people of this country the general good will of the American people.

FIGURES SHOW

Figures alone could show the success of the SS *Hope* in Indonesia—200 doctors and 300 nurses trained, 1,000 lectures and seminars held, 18,000 patients treated, 700 operations performed, and thousands examined or X-rayed.

But the real story is revealed by the mayor of the Indonesian island of Sumbawa in remarks made to Dr. Walsh as the ship departed:

"This is the first time foreigners came to Sumbawa who did not come to steal our rice. I do not know where the United States is nor had I seen the flag of your country until this great white ship came to us, though I am an old man. But hear me: We will never forget what you have done."

The next port was Saigon, South Vietnam, in June 1961.

Even in the midst of increasing Communist guerrilla attacks, Project HOPE was able to teach native doctors new ways of administering medical treatment, to treat 10,000 patients, to perform 500 major operations, and to conduct oral surgery—to say nothing of creating goodwill.

After 4 months in Vietnam, the great white ship left for San Francisco.

It was no longer an experiment without precedent. It was now tried and proven under the most difficult of circumstances.

In the spring of 1962, the SS *Hope* sailed for Trujillo and Salaverry, Peru, in South America where in 10 months its services reached 80,000 persons directly and several hundred thousand indirectly.

TEAM FORMED

The new 210-bed Trujillo Hospital now has a team of "Hopies" assisting the native staff and a team of 25 nurses, technicians, and physicians is at the University of Trujillo School of Medicine.

Another ship and shore-based medical teaching services were in Ecuador where the medical and nursing professions of Ecuador and the faculty of the University of Guayaquil worked with Project HOPE staff members to learn new and better methods of caring for the sick.

Also, outpatient clinics were established at Quito, Cuenca, and Duran.

These two areas in South America have been hotbeds of anti-Americanism and fertile ground for Communist propaganda, but the people soon were affected by the compassion and friendship that emanated from the great white ship.

Slum clinics were set up to treat many and to screen those for admission to the ship. The *Hope* operating rooms were connected to classrooms by closed circuit TV, and averaged 12 operations per day.

Immunization programs for children were established and public health measure initiated by HOPE teams.

Everywhere the ship goes the emphasis is on teaching and training conducted through actual hospital procedure, classroom lectures and discussions, motion pictures, and film strips, and special Saturday night medical symposiums aboard ship.

Teaching is stressed because it enables Project HOPE to have a more enduring effect on local health conditions than would result by merely giving widespread treatment to the inflicted.

This plan enables HOPE to upgrade the local capabilities to diagnose and treat sickness. Local people, in turn, become able, to teach others, and thus the impact of HOPE grows and spreads.

HOPE hopes to raise the standards of these new medics to at least the equivalent of a trained military medical corpsman.

ALL HELP

Helping to make this program work are physicians, dentists, nurses, anesthetists, paramedical, and technical personnel including physical therapists, dieticians, dental hygienists, medical technicians, X-ray technicians, medical secretaries, records librarian, pharmacists, and ancillary personnel.

SS *Hope* is a complete and very modern hospital with all the latest equipment available.

The Need for Victory in the War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of Senators two outstanding editorials on the subject of the need for victory in the war in Vietnam. One was published on June 19 in the News & Courier, of Charleston, S.C., and is entitled "Needed: A Victory Goal." The other editorial was published on June 24 in the Nashville Banner, of Nashville, Tenn., and is entitled "Air Power for Victory: Red Showdown in Asia, a War We Must Win." The editorial in the Nashville Banner refers to, and quotes from, some very pertinent comments recently made by Gen. Mark Clark, an outstanding and distinguished South Carolinian, who has achieved much fame as an educator, a diplomat, and a military commander and strategist.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, June 19, 1965]

NEEDED: A VICTORY GOAL

Use of B-52 intercontinental bombers against Vietcong targets in South Vietnam introduces a new element in the Far East conflict. But we doubt that it will determine the outcome of the war. Moreover, the U.S. military goal is still unclear.

Bombing with conventional weapons has yet to win a war. Neither the Luftwaffe attack on Britain or the U.S. fire raids against Japan were decisive. Only the use of an atomic bomb brought an end to World War II.

A strong case can be made that strategic bombing with iron bombs is not effective. What the soldiers need is close aerial support a hundred yards ahead of them during an attack. Bombs dropped 500 miles away from the front have only long-range economic importance. A war has to be won on the front where men are fighting, not in the rear areas.

President Johnson is to be commended for not agreeing to the left-wing demand that he practice appeasement of the Communists. But Mr. Johnson apparently is without a well-defined military objective in southeast Asia. Sending in large numbers of U.S. troops is no substitute for a clear-cut goal.

The way to halt an aggressor is to destroy his military power. This truth is as old as warfare. When armies are used merely in an effort to frighten a foe, then armed power is misused in a dangerous way. Energy is frittered away, and the enemy is left free to gain strength. This was Germany's mistake on the Russian front. The German armies were used simply to cover territory and convince the world that they were victorious. But they failed to move in decisive fashion to destroy the Soviet forces in the field and to seize the most strategic bits of territory. The United States may be making the same mistake in southeast Asia.

For a number of months, the United States has used its forces in less than efficient fashion. Marines have been deployed as airbase guards. Land and sea-based fighters have been ordered by Washington to attack targets far from the battle front. It would be tragic if American lives were wasted away in a piecemeal, fragmentary effort in South Vietnam. If American forces are to be used in southeast Asia in large numbers, they should only be used in a campaign that has a major military goal that will advance the security of the United States.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, June 24, 1965]

AIRPOWER FOR VICTORY: RED SHOWDOWN IN ASIA, A WAR WE MUST WIN

It still is true, as when the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur stated it in April 1951, that, once war is joined, "there is no substitute for victory." Events have underscored it, notably in Asia—where the war occasioning that warning was not won. The substitute contrived in the retreat from realties there was the futile sacrifice of thousands of American lives, and an uneasy truce which directly paved the way for future Communist aggression as in South Vietnam.

The truism applies today. It is significantly related to what another American commanding officer in that war of the 1950's, Gen. Mark Clark, said Wednesday concerning the necessary steps for victory in Vietnam. Point 1 of that is to hit the enemy with the full weight of our Air Force and naval aviation powers.

It would be preposterous, and militarily suicidal, to propose a manpower swapout in fighting on the ground. As General Clark warns, the United States must continue to bomb North Vietnam or face "another Korea." And emphasis belongs on the collateral point as well: that in this strategic course we would be employing forces of unquestioned superiority, hitting the enemy where he is weakest, and depriving him of the advantage of choosing weapons and battlefield.

America's military authorities know the necessity for that. There must be no hesitancy in the policymaking circles about acting in the light of that knowledge; for the chips, discernibly, are down. The enemy sneers at proposals for negotiation. Confident of security in a privileged sanctuary, both Hanoi and Peiping rattle the sword, and launch new forays from bases they deem (by precedent) immune to attack.

The knockout blows to win this war must come from the air—and they must not be delayed indefinitely if the free world is not to suffer a humiliating and avertable setback there, where scores of thousands of American fighting men already have been committed.

Yes, Red China could be directly in the line of fire—by her own choice, as the instigator and particeps criminis of Communist conspiracy reaching for all Asia. Military authorities need no reminder, surely, nor realists in the policymaking circles, that a major opportunity was overlooked to demolish the Peiping threat when squeamish timidity made its decision just under 15 years ago to back down in the face of it.

Red China has manpower in the millions it regards as expendable. But it also has extreme vulnerability to American strength in the air. Those shuddering at that tactic on the ground of possibility that it would

bring Soviet Russia into the conflict are resting timidity's case on the same hypothesis that crowned the Korean affair with defeat and disaster. The Banner is among those doubting that the Soviet would join its needling partner in a gamble of that magnitude; or risk a world war to rescue it from a folly of its own making.

One thing is sure—a showdown with communism must come sometime if it is not, by piecemeal aggression, to gobble up the earth.

It must be defeated somewhere—and defeat is not achieved by tactics of defeat and policies of surrender.

It takes a will to win, backed by the strength that is there, ready and waiting. And that is the opposite of the purblind no-win policy mysteriously contrived and too long countenanced.

President Johnson knows those realities, as preliminary steps have indicated. He deserves the backing of the Nation, in a showdown that can determine—with full courageous followthrough—what sort of world we are to live in. America itself deserves that, whose sons are fighting and dying where they were sent. The Chief Executive, with the awesome burdens of responsibility, certainly deserves better than the sniping of policy critics, and professorial "teach-iners," propagandizing a theme of ideological blind man's buff, and shouting "negotiate" as the ipse dixit of peace with freedom's enemies.

Douglas MacArthur was right. There is no substitute for victory.

Gen. Mark Clark is right. As did MacArthur, he hates war. He has seen it, off and on, through most of a lifetime in his country's uniform. He knows that when one comes it must be won.

It is time the American people understood this, which is the only course for Lyndon Johnson.

Medical Libraries and Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech which I delivered at the John Shaw Billings Centennial, National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Md., on June 17, 1965:

MEDICAL LIBRARIES AND MEDICAL RESEARCH

(By the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. Representative from Rhode Island)

Ladies and gentlemen, we are here today to honor an individual whose great life and work helped materially in diverse ways to organize and advance the cause of medicine. The debt to Dr. John Shaw Billings is not a debt only of physicians and others in the health sciences. It is a debt of the entire Nation. Dr. Billings' achievements in helping to consolidate and focus the progress of medicine through its literature have benefited the lives of all of us, even today, 100 years later.

It is most proper for us to recognize also that it was Dr. Billings, who, through the National Board of Health, actually made the first Federal grants for medical research. In the 1880 Annual Report[1] of the Board, Dr. Billings, in his capacity as vice president, writes to the Honorable John Sherman, Secretary of the Treasury, to which the Board was answerable. Dr. Billings' letter speaks to the importance of medical research and cites the commendable work of the British Government in supporting such research. His report points out that the costs of research exceed the funds available to private investigators and emphasizes that the assistance of the Federal Government is therefore necessary. Sounds like 1965.

His report then lists out the types of projects the National Board of Health was supporting. These include:

Studies of the air, a forerunner to our present air pollution research; studies of the adulterations of food and drugs, matters about which we are still concerned; sanitation; yellow fever; disinfectants; diphtheria; and still other fields.

I have been extremely pleased to learn that my own State of Rhode Island was included in the research work financed by the old National Board of Health under Dr. Billings' direction. The annual report of the Board of 1882—83 years ago—contains a report of inspections of health resorts and under that a "Report on Sanitary Conditions in Newport, R.I." It is a very fascinating document including many maps, drawings, and illustrations including these three [unfolds three large illustrations]. One of these is a map of the city of Newport and the other two are graphs showing occupation figures and nationality figures in ward 3 of the city.

Beyond the question of sanitation the report is concerned with the city's water supply; and I believe the remarkable farsightedness of Dr. Billings is illustrated by the fact that the report contains extensive information on different types of analyses carried out on the water.

I am happy to say that the report about Newport was a very good one and I will illustrate this if I may by reading the first sentence of the report: "Newport has always been considered, and unquestionably is, naturally, an exceptionally healthy place."[2] Naturally I believe it still is.

From this particular locale here today it is easy to see and feel the importance of Dr. Billings' work—in the dignity, power, and significance we in America have given to medicine, and which in turn is serving to give us healthier, longer, more productive and happier lives. We stand on the steps of the world's greatest medical library. Next door to our north is the world's finest medical research organization. Across the street is the great National Naval Medical Center, and only a short distance from here is the Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology.

If there were a pinnacle of the world of medicine at which we could stand, this would be it.

It is a world as yet unfinished, however. We have not defeated disease, disability, birth defects, and premature death. These problems continue to challenge us to the limit of our abilities. At the same time, we seem to have achieved, at long last, the opportunity at least for almost total victory. It would seem to be within our grasp to attain an entirely new level of mental and physical health for mankind and perhaps witness the eradication of disease entirely.

We are living in the midst of dramatic and far-reaching changes in the concepts of biomedical research, with the employment of new knowledge, new techniques, new ideas, new instrumentation, and, indeed, new types of personnel, such as mathematicians and physicists. The influence and effects of the biomedical research effort are becoming wider and its character is changing. There is ample evidence that the biomedical achievements of the near future may be dramatically more significant than any in the past. I have in mind particularly a new spectrum of work in human reproduction and human development; molecular biology and genetics, and the new light they promise to throw on work in many other biomedical disciplines; and the extensive work in virsuses, in relation to cancer and other diseases. In recent testimony before Congress, Dr. James A. Shannon, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, pointed to new progress in understanding the relationship between psychology and physiology. He said: "The line between the medical sciences and the behavioral sciences is disappearing." This is as it should be.

In this place, on this day, at this particular point in history, it is difficult to avoid a sense of happy anticipation about the new hope being offered us by the health sciences; and it is proper that we again recognize Dr. Billings' work in having begun this great Institution, this library where this new knowledge resides for man's present and future use.

However, let me read something to you:

"Unless major attention is directed to the improvement of our national medical library base, the continued and accelerated generation of scientific knowledge will become increasingly an exercise in futility."[3]

The statement is from a section headed Communications for Research, from volume I of the report by the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke.

Let us consider carefully what this statement means. It is saying that the great potential benefits of medical research which I have just been talking about may not be improving the health of our Nation as they might. It indicates that the financial, human, and institutional investments we are pouring into research, to bring about better health for the American people, may be wasted or lost for the want of better facilities and methods to house, manage, and disseminate the medical literature.

This is indeed a curious commentary on the Nation which leads the world in its concern for health and medicine; and it could be a tragic commentary if the vast sums the Federal Government spends for medical research, education, and practice, were being rendered less effective because we are not willing to spend a few more dollars, relatively, for the medical libraries which serve as the communication centers for health science information.

Just how much money are we talking about?

If we talk only of research, the Federal Government is spending well over $1 billion, and private sources are spending another $600 or $700 million. Last year, out of the $1 billion provided in Federal funds, less than $1 million, under present legislative authorities, could accrue to the benefit of the nongovernment medical libraries. That's about one-tenth of 1 percent. If we try to make a comparison to the total budget of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, of $5½ billion, the comparison becomes even more ridiculous. The Federal Government is simply not paying its share of the Nation's costs for medical communications, even though it has helped to intensify the problem by its emphasis on, and support of, medical research.

We must remember that the medical libraries, as the prime storehouses and distributors of health science information, are feeling the pressures of all of our national

[1] House of Representatives, 46th Cong., 3d sess. Ex. Doc. No. 8. Annual Report of the National Board of Health, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1880.

[2] Bowditch, E. W., report of an inspection of certain health resorts. In: U.S. National Board of Health. Annual Report of 1882. Washington, 1883. App. C, p. 153.

[3] U.S. President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke. Report to the President; a national program to conquer heart disease, cancer, and stroke. Washington, 1964, vol. I.

activities in relation to health and medicine, both private and public. All of the tremendous increases in health and medical activities have an impact on the medical libraries. All research papers, journals, pamphlets, reports, conference proceedings, handbooks—nearly every printed document, in fact, which grows out of our concern for man's health, becomes something the medical libraries must acquire, store, and disseminate to those who need the information. Then these massive health activities generate greater demands on the medical libraries for services.

As a measure of these demands, let us take due notice of the fact that all public and private health and medical expenditures in the Nation today total more than $35 billion.

If this is a measure of our health concerns, we have failed very seriously—I hope not irreparably—to recognize and tend to the fundamental requirements for medical information and particularly medical libraries.

My special concern here today is for the medical libraries in relation to the promise held for us in medical research. Medical research is impossible without an adequate information base, without the resources and services of medical libraries. It has been said—and I believe this must be true—that all medical research begins and ends with the medical literature. If this is so true, then why are we jeopardizing our own purpose by scrimping when it comes to giving the medical scientist the library tools he needs?

Sir William Osler, who was a close friend of Dr. Billings, once said: "To study the phenomena of disease without books is to sail an uncharted sea, while to study books without patients is not to go to sea at all."[4] My friends in medicine tell me that this applies today as it did at the turn of the century.

The literature constitutes an integral part of the process of studying human biology and human diseases. To limit its usefulness is to limit the scientist and to limit man's chance for the new level of health I talked about earlier.

Today it clearly is not enough to say that medical scientists need information. The real question, instead, is just how do we meet their information requirements? We long ago recognized—or we should have recognized—that the production of books and journals was not enough, and that putting these books and journals in libraries was not enough. Dr. Billings saw this 86 years ago. He instituted control and access to the literature by producing the first comprehensive index to medical articles in 1879. This has been acknowledged by many to be America's greatest contribution to medicine in the 19th century.

But the quantity of the literature for some years has so overwhelmed all of our information-handling concepts as to render them obsolete. The worldwide production of biomedical literature is now estimated at more than 250,000 articles or 5 million pages per year. That many pages would constitute a stack higher than the Empire State Building. It obviously is of no help to the medical scientist to expose him to 5 million pages of literature in a year's time or a half-million pages or even 100,000 pages, unless you want him to do nothing but read the literature; and that is not what we want him to do. In fact, it would be impossible for him to read it in the time available. We want him to fulfill, to the most effective level possible, his capacities and opportunities for research, and if he is to do this his own effort to acquire information must be among the less time consuming of his concerns. He must have ready access to those parts of the literature relevant and pertinent to his scientific pursuits.

It is interesting to note that the problem is not new. Dr. Vannevar Bush in 1944 said: "The summation of human experience is being expanded at a prodigious rate, but the means we use for threading through the consequent maze to the momentarily important item is the same as was used in the days of square-rigged ships—the modern great library is not generally consulted; it is just nibbled at by a few." Libraries must be made more attractive and more functional so that bigger bites of information are taken by those who need it.

The quantity of the literature, however, is not the only problem. Our achievements have been such that the whole character of biomedical research has changed and out of this change has come a transformation in the structure of the health sciences. The particular classification of the sciences—necessary for their organization in teaching and research—has been outmoded. The divisions between disciplines have faded and new disciplines have been formed. Some, as we have noted earlier, have been found to have significance in nearly all other biomedical disciplines.

In 1962, Dr. Robert R. Wagner had this to say: "In the future, organization of basic science departments as separate disciplines will lose all validity. This eventuality is a natural concomitant of the centralization of biological thought. Even today, a visitor to a medical school can distinguish one department from another only by the lettering on the office doors of the department chairmen."[5]

So the problem of the scientist is not only one of tremendous magnitude in the literature but one also in which the disciplinary guidelines have ceased to have their former meaning. The complex interrelationships of the vast amount of data with which he is confronted may be such as to keep him from knowing just where to look; and certainly these two situations of quantity and complexity conspire not only to consume the time which he should be spending at his bench, but possibly also to bring confusion and frustration into his efforts. Physicians and scientists need information specialists to help them in the same way they need and use laboratory assistants and coworkers. We must begin to train these new types of librarians in abundance, and as soon as possible.

Also we need research in the field of information science. In 1960, Dr. Don R. Swanson said, "The sheer abundance of recorded knowledge and the growth rate thereof seems to foreshadow a crisis in inundation. The implied dearth of scientific information might be forestalled by engineering breakthroughs, but such breakthroughs may depend on first acquiring a deeper understanding of the conceptual nature of the problem itself."[6]

Before we can develop the systems and mechanisms to provide information to the scientists—even before we can conduct truly effective research in this area—we must know what information the scientist must have.

And he very well may not know what it is he wants. Since 70 percent of the medical literature is published in foreign languages, he may not be aware of what is going on elsewhere.

He is not expected to be an information expert; and as a man whose life is devoted to uncovering new knowledge, he cannot be expected to anticipate fully and accurately, if at all, what information he is going to need to relate to his work on a day-to-day or week-to-week basis. However, he should have quick access to all information when he is able to identify his needs.

During World War II there used to be jokes about high-ranking military officers in the Pentagon pounding their desks and saying, and I quote: "I don't know what it is I want, but I know I am not getting it." The biomedical scientists of the Nation today strike me as individuals who can honestly and justifiably cry out in this manner.

NLM has begun to meet this urgent need through the use of computers. Medlars (medical literature analysis and retrieval system) provides a fast method of recovering bibliographic citations in any medical discipline or any combination of disciplines. However, Medlars' tremendous searching power has not yet been decentralized across the Nation as it must be soon. It is the only system of its type in the world and its establishment in a research library is a spectacular achievement.

Still we must learn more about the scientist's habits of using information and his requirements for urgency, variety, and volume. We must know his needs for secondary publication forms, such as indexes, abstracts, data compendia, critical reviews. There are library functions and they need to be supported considerably beyond the current level.

These studies necessarily must be related to concurrent studies in medical terminology and classification, machine indexing and new techniques, systems and equipment for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing health science information.

In addition, the whole scheme of biomedical librarianship as it is now practiced must be studied and reevaluated—the object being to meet fully the users' needs.

We must immediately begin to develop medical libraries with a new concept of service responsibilities to the medical scientist. These libraries must have the flexibility and versatility to be active—not passive—partners in the research process. They must be staffed with people of imagination, advanced training and special skills necessary to assist the research scientist in every possible way. Certainly these libraries must have the resources in books, journals, equipment, and people necessary for them to fulfill their missions.

Just 2 months ago volume II of the report by the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke was released. It contains a section entitled "A Program for Developing Medical Libraries." It was prepared by the Subcommittee on Facilities of the Commission, and it tells a truly alarming story of the state of disrepair of the Nation's medical libraries. I think I should state frankly that we, the American people, have permitted this unfortunate condition to develop.

Let me read from one part of the report:

"The cutting edge of the country's medical research program may be blunted by the growing inability of scientists to gain quick and easy access to biomedical data they need. Teachers and students are hampered in their educational pursuits. Of direct and immediate importance to the health of the Nation are urgent needs of medical practitioners of all types for more ready access to the growing body of new medical information. Inefficiency in the medical library network creates an insidious ignorance which neither science nor the practice of medicine can condone. It results in the unplanned and unnecessary duplication of research efforts. It postpones the application of new knowledge

[4] Osler, Sir William: Sir William Osler aphorisms from his bedside teachings and writings. Collected by R. B. Bean; ed. by W. B. Bean. New York, Henry Schuman, 1950. 159 p.

[5] Wagner, R. R.: The basic medical sciences, the revolution in biology and the future of medical education. Yale J. Biol. Med. 35: 1–1, 1962.

[6] Swanson, D. R.: Searching natural language text by computer. Science 132: 1099–1104, 1960.

potentially important to the alleviation of human suffering."[7]

It is very difficult for me, indeed, to think of a more serious charge against this Nation.

The report goes on to present hard facts and statistics on the medical library needs. Let me cite some of these. For example, there are 6,000 medical libraries in the United States, but only 3,000 medical librarians—one-half of a librarian for every library. The needs for additional space, so that the libraries can be of a size sufficient to meet minimal standards, total into the millions of square feet. The requirement for books and journals totals into the millions. And in the area of training, despite the tremendous deficit in the number of librarians, only 40 additional professional librarians are being added to the field of medicine every year—while the attrition is 150.

The situation is truly desperate.

So this is our challenge. What is to be done about it?

There is before Congress at this time a bill which would establish the legislative and program foundations for this work. I refer, of course, to the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965. This bill constitutes formal recognition for the first time in this Nation's history of what have been our failings in the medical information field and of what we must now do to correct our past errors.

I have been tremendously impressed by the reactions of just about all elements of the library and biomedical community to this bill. I will not go into a great amount of detail but I would like to name for you some of the organizations which have formally expressed their wholehearted support of the proposed measure. These include: The American Heart Association, American Dental Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the American College of Physicians, the American Federation for Clinical Research, the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Society for Biological Chemists, the American Thoracic Society, the New York Academy of Medicine, and others.

Notice that none of these organizations is a library organization.

But in addition, of course, there have been formal indications of very strong support by the Medical Library Association, by the Special Libraries Association and by the Association of Research Libraries.

I can think of few legislative measures which have resulted in such a strong, concerted reaction of support from such a broad segment of the American health science community.

As I have become more and more familiar, as a layman, with the medical information problem, I have become more convinced that the establishment of an extramural program for the National Library of Medicine is essential and urgent. Also I wonder if the Nation should not take further advantage of the great skill and power of this institution and establish within the National Library of Medicine a National Center of Biomedical Communications. This Center, as a carefully coordinated division of the Library, would serve to carry out a number of service activities beyond those presently possible for the National Library of Medicine. I have in mind, for example, the need for improved approaches to the production of abstracts and the coordination of abstracting activities. I have also in mind the fact that the needs for medlars services, and the development of new and advanced medlars systems, will exceed the present capacities of the Library. Beyond these additional service activities, a National Center of Biomedical Communications would be closely and continuously concerned with research and development in the biomedical communications field. As I have tried to indicate in this talk, new additional informational activities are critical to the continued advancement of medical research, but, at the same time, we need a great amount of research in the communications and information processes themselves. This Center would become a national focal point for such work. A complex of regional medical libraries, under NLM's guidance, would be an essential part of this picture. My concern here of course is not to heap further honor on this fine institution, so much as it is to see to it that the Nation makes maximum use of every possible resource to help meet the needs for medical information.

Let us make no mistake about what our real mission is. It is the realization of the unprecedented research achievements held in the balance for us at this moment in history. It is the fulfillment of the great promises for better health and longer lives for the American people.

Great societies of the past invented libraries to preserve and transmit knowledge. If we are to achieve in this Nation a society of the greatness I consider possible, we must begin immediately not to reinvent the library but to capitalize on this achievement and to fashion it to these medical research and other needs which have overtaken us in recent years. The challenge before us cannot be met by legislation alone or by the National Library of Medicine alone, or by the private sector of the economy alone. The challenge calls for a wholehearted cooperative effort by everyone concerned. What Dr. Billings started in 1865 must be further supported in 1965. The future well-being of this Nation depends on it, literally.

Thank you.

[7] U.S. President's Commission on Heart Disease Cancer, and Stroke. Report to the President; a national program to conquer heart disease, cancer, and stroke. Washington, 1965, vol. II.

Tributes to Mrs. Etca W. Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Monday, June 21, South Carolina lost one of its finest ladies in the passing of Mrs. Etca W. Peace, of Greenville, S.C. On Tuesday, I flew to South Carolina to attend funeral services for Mrs. Peace.

Mrs. Peace will be remembered in our State as one who loved beauty in nature, and who lived a beautiful life as a devoted mother and wife, as a member of one of South Carolina's most respected families. Mrs. Peace was for many years noted as an outstanding gardner and writer for the two daily newspapers in Greenville. She was also a great inspiration to her husband, the Honorable Roger C. Peace, a former Member of the U.S. Senate, and a longtime newspaper, radio, and television executive in our State.

As a tribute to the memory of Mrs. Peace, I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the Greenville Piedmont of June 22, and the Greenville News of June 22, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, June 22, 1965]

MRS. ETCA WALKER PEACE

Mrs. Roger C. Peace, the former Miss Etca Walker, left behind her many-faceted memories of beauty, of beauty inherent and of beauty attained.

Hers was a beauty of love for those around her and of a broader loving concern for others whose lives she touched in great measure with endearing effect.

Hers was a beauty of mind reflected in her own writing and in a discerning appreciation of the works of others. She wrote of gardens and the plants and flowers they bore. Many a scrapbook contains clippings on her observations and suggestions on horticulture, carried in the monthly garden pages of the Greenville News which she originated. She wrote of the growing things she loved with authority and with an understanding that surpassed just technical knowledge.

Hers was a creative beauty that made her own garden a gladsome delight of color and contrast and perfumed perfection. Her flowers created an indoor garden in her own home and in the homes of those with whom she shared them.

Hers was a beauty of soul that shone in word and deed whose impact left an ineradicable imprint on the consciousness of those who knew her.

The wife of the publisher of the Greenville News and Piedmont died Monday after a long illness and after a fruitful life that enriched all with whom she walked. That enrichment remains with them in the memory of the beauty she wore and the beauty she created.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, June 22, 1965]

MRS. ETCA W. PEACE

"She walks in beauty, like the night
Of cloudless climes and starry skies;
And all that's best of dark and bright
Meet in her aspect and her eyes."
—*Lord Byron.*

Of the many memories of Mrs. Etca Walker Peace that we who knew and loved her best shall cherish, most are associated with beauty. Possessed of beauty of person and spirit, she radiated it and was naturally surrounded with the beautiful, and found rare joy in it.

Therefore, she truly walked in beauty and had an extraordinary ability to cultivate it and to share it with others.

Of the many achievements and contributions of her life, the most appreciated was the horticultural magic she wrought with her own hands and through the supervision of workmen for the heavy jobs on the spacious grounds of her home at 201 Crescent avenue.

While she would admit to being no more than an amateur, Mrs. Peace was a thorough student of gardening. For many years she personally edited and wrote much of the material for the monthly Garden Page which she originated in the Greenville News. These pages were both a primer for the beginner and a source of added knowledge for the experienced.

Flowers and shrubs she had cultivated filled her own home in season and found their way into the homes of friends and strangers alike.

In her personal life, Mrs. Peace was the completely devoted and dedicated wife of a lifelong newspaper editor and publisher, Roger C. Peace. Like him, she was known and admired throughout the Nation's publishing and broadcasting professions.

Through the 35 or so years that her husband has headed up the Peace family enterprises, she was his confidante, adviser, and constructive critic. If any woman ever understood editors and reporters, Mrs. Peace did, and all of us valued her counsel.

Her home was a place of grace and hospitality in the almost vanishing tradition of the gracious South that was part of her heritage. It was a favorite gathering place of the great and the humble alike.

All of these things, especially the beauty that is "a joy forever," are part of the legacy of love she leaves behind.

Senator Olin D. Johnston

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from South Carolina as well as many other Members of both the Senate and House in paying tribute to our departed friend, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON was recognized by the people of South Carolina soon after World War I as a man to be reckoned with in the future political arena of the State. When he returned home from the battlefields of Europe in 1918, it was said that this young former Army sergeant had a great determination to become Governor of his native State. In order to attain this ambition, OLIN realized he must equip himself with more education and knowledge. Since he was a poor country boy without finances, it was necessary for him to work his way through college. So he secured a job in a cotton mill where he work at night while attending college by day, and ultimately graduated at Spartanburg Junior College, Wofford College, and the University of South Carolina where he was awarded a degree in law.

He first held public office as a member of the General Assembly of South Varolina from Anderson County. He later moved to Spartanburg County, S.C., and was then elected to the general assembly from that county. The distinction of serving in the general assembly of his State as a representative of two separate counties was unique to say the least.

From the beginning of his career of public service he consistently emphasized the fact that he was a representative of the working class of people, who earned their livelihood primarily by the sweat of the brow in the cottonfields and in the hot, lint-filled atmosphere of the cotton mills. The laboring people on the farms and in the industrial plants of South Carolina immediately accepted him as the champion of the workingman. And until his final days on this earth his loyalty to them and their loyalty to him never diminished. Not only in his home State but throughout the land he was known as the friend of the toiling masses. Moreover, all Federal employees of this country looked upon him as their friend because his efforts and accomplishments in their behalf were unsurpassed by any man who ever served in either House of the Congress of the United States. During his more than 40 years of public service he established an outstanding and distinguished record of dedication and devotion to the welfare of the Federal workman and wage earner of America.

Senator JOHNSTON attained his announced ambition of serving his State as Governor on two separate occasions, but he was not satisfied with this great honor and privilege because he also had a burning desire to become a Member of the U.S. Senate. He achieved this goal in 1944 and continued to serve there with great distinction and ability until his untimely death April 18, 1965.

OLIN JOHNSTON had more than desire, ambition, and ability. He also had the human touch, a humble spirit, a calm and lovable personality, and an unflagging devotion to his family, church, and God. These attributes, plus his unfailing loyalty to the workingman, made him beloved by rich and poor, white and black, and those of both high and low estate. By virtue of these wonderful characteristics he was always able to obtain a tremendously large vote, not only among the farmers, industrial workers, and Federal employees, but on Main Street as well. Thus, it is evident that his friends and supporters were countless in every walk of life.

This man was also blessed with a lovely, consecrated and highly accomplished wife. She was from the beginning to the end, in the highest sense of the word, a "helpmeet for him." It is common knowledge among their close friends that Mrs. Johnston was always an inspiration to him and without her great ability, kindly spirit, and faith, OLIN would never have so successfully fulfilled the dreams and hopes of his young manhood. He knew the capacity of his wife, and I am sure often accepted her wise counsel and leadership. He recognized her strength and faith, and was smart enough to utilize her wisdom and sound judgment at every opportunity. She was truly the power behind the throne.

My wife, my daughter, and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Johnston and the entire family on this sorrowful occasion.

One Man, One Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, [Mr. HART], has been one of the most forceful advocates in the U.S. Senate of the principle of one man, one vote in apportionment of State legislatures. Senator HART took a leading part in the Senate debate on this vital subject last year and is prepared to do so again.

In a recent newsletter, Senator HART very clearly and very emphatically outlined his position on this issue for the benefit of the people of Michigan. I for one could not agree with the Senator more, and since he has stated the case so well, I will insert his newsletter in the Appendix of the RECORD. I hope all of my colleagues will take a few minutes to read the text of Senator HART's important and very timely newsletter:

SENATOR HART REPORTS: HOW SHALL THE VOTES BE COUNTED

Every citizen, when he leaves the polling booth, is entitled to a little glow of satisfaction at having made his influence felt—at having voted for candidates whom he believes will best represent his views.

It is easy for anyone to assume his vote has been counted as equal to all others. After all, if you have voted once and everyone else has voted once, doesn't that make everyone equal?

The answer: Not necessarily.

But votes can be diluted and the malapportioned vote, like watered whisky, may appear unchanged while actually having its effect significantly reduced.

The U.S. Senate, in which I serve, is a clear example of intentional malapportionment. Michigan, with a population of 8 million, sends 2 Senators. Alaska with a population of 250,000, sends 2 Senators. Not a very good break for the Michigan voter.

But the U.S. Senate was necessary to the formation of the Nation. The Thirteen Colonies were independent units and the smaller ones refused to join any union unless the Constitution assured them of an equal voice in at least one body of Congress.

So it was finally decided that the U.S. Senate system, however undesirable from the viewpoint of pure democracy, had to be accepted if there was to be any Federal system at all.

The question now is whether State legislatures should be allowed to copy this system. Should 200,000 urban and suburban residents, for example, be represented by 1 vote in a State senate while, say 50,000 rural residents get an equal voice?

Last year, the Supreme Court answered "No." It ruled that both houses of a State legislature must be chosen on a one-man, one-vote basis.

Now there is a strong movement in Congress to overturn this ruling. Those who disagree with the Court are proposing a constitutional amendment that would allow one State house to apportion on the basis of land area if the plan were approved in a referendum.

Basically, the issue stems from the rapid growth of the Nation's cities and suburbs and the understandable desire of rural areas to conserve their diminishing political power.

In the North, the Republicans would be the beneficiaries of such an amendment because Republican strength is largely in the countryside. In the South, where Republican strength is centered in the cities, the Democrats would stand to gain most.

Debate on the matter is likely to begin in the Senate shortly and I hope you will follow it closely even though the arguments sometimes seem tedious and easily dismissed as political squabbling. Because the principles are important.

Advocates of a constitutional amendment will argue that the people of each State should be allowed to decide how their legislatures are to be apportioned.

Opponents counter that there are certain constitutional guarantees that should not be tampered with by any majority, should not ever be made the subject of political campaigns.

These include the right to life, liberty and property, to free speech, freedom of worship and the right, under every possible circumstance, to an equal voice at the polls.

They add that the Federal Government's role in urban and suburban affairs can only be diminished if the State governments show a greater concern for this fast growing section of their constituency.

No officeholder who numbers both rural and urban constitutents can take a position on this one without suffering some political damage. Yet, citizens deserve a fair explanation of the issue and an idea of how their representatives stand on it.

In my opinion, the one-man, one-vote principle is a sound one. I think each citizen should have the same voice regardless of what part of the State he moves to. And I believe no majority, even all voters but one, should be permitted to deprive that one remaining citizen of his equal voice.

And while the following statement is bound to bring a small avalanche of disapproving letters, it nevertheless should not be a secret.

When the constitutional amendment proposal comes up for Senate action, I intend to be among those who fight it.

A Brighter Future for Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on June 11, 1965, the Nation's first association of foresters and conservationists—the Pennsylvania Forestry Association—held its annual meeting in Bethlehem, Pa., in my district.

I am pleased to report that Mr. John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture was the guest speaker. Mr. Baker delivered what seems to me an extremely fine address on the general subject of conservation, a subject which should be close to all our hearts when we look upon the magnificent natural beauty we have inherited.

I am proud to remind this distinguished body that Ameria's first native professional forester, the great conservationist, Gifford Pinchot, was a resident of the 15th Congressional District. And I point with justifiable pride to the tradition my State has established over many years as a keeper of the flame for the preservation of America's natural beauty in most of its regions.

Mr. Baker had some encouraging words to say about the propects before us for conservation. I believe they will be informative and interesting to every Member of this House and, for that reason, I am pleased to insert the text of his remarks as part of the RECORD:

THE NEW CONSERVATION IN A CHANGING AMERICA

(By John A. Baker)

These are stimulating days for conservation. The prevailing spirit has given us a new challenge for our cause—a challenge that is catching the attention of the Nation.

The President of the United States, in his February message to Congress, gave us the newest conservation challenge—to regain and to retain the "natural beauty of our country." In calling the Nation to action he declared, "The beauty of our land is a natural resource. Its preservation is linked to the inner prosperity of the human spirit."

This is especially so in the rural areas whose people hold in their hands the destiny of eight-tenths of the Nation's supply of natural beauty. But let there be no mistake about it, natural beauty also involves the suburbs and the cities—it involves every American old enough to be aware of the quality of his environment.

Natural beauty means many things to many people. It may be an attractive wayside park on Highway 11 on the banks of the Susquehanna. It could be the near wilderness condition that we find on so many of the State forests in Pennsylvania. The quiet beauty of the orderly Lancaster County countryside has an appeal all its own. The inviting coolness of Ricketts Glen State Park can be an experience never to be forgotten. The relaxing atmosphere that prevails along the old canal on the Delaware River can be contagious. A box full of colorful flowers on the window sill of an apartment house in Philadelphia has its charm.

National attention to natural beauty is part of the broadening concept of conservation. Conservation of natural resources has been expanded to serve the broad concerns of millions of additional Americans. New concerns for a quality environment, new forces to join in the effort. Let's ask ourselves, are we, who have been in conservation for years and dacades, prepared to embrace and encourage the multitude of willing hands that are now being stretched out to help us?

The task at hand is to enlist their talents and their drive in a broader approach to conservation. The task ahead will require a composite team of bird watchers, multiple-use adherents, preservationists, land developeras, sportsmen, lumbermen, farmers, water users, garden clubs, foresters, soil conservationists and many others—all with a serious concern for his particular sphere of interest and deep knowledge about it and with an equal concern for all the other aspects of conservation—to make the new conservation a reality.

We need all conservationists up front, right now, working together with all interests in natural resources to bring about the rural renaissance that is taking hold in the countryside—out there in fields, farmsteads, ranches, towns, and forests. State forestry associations like yours can perform a great service by bringing before the people, in a dynamic way, the broad, new concept of conservation that is rapidly sweeping the Nation.

Your Pennsylvania Forestry Association would not, today, carry the distinction of being America's first State forestry association if its initial thinking back in 1886 had been anchored to narrow gage thinking. Instead, your association saw a job to be done and it stepped out in front, into what, at that time, was almost as new and unknown as space is today. Such pioneers are needed to face the new conservation challenges of our time.

I congratulate you on this, your 79th year. Today, all of America would do well to capture some of your bold adventurous spirit of 1886 and bring it to bear on the creatively new dimensions of conservation—a conservation with sights high and an opportunity for everyone to serve and contribute.

All of the American people are eligible to become conservationists if for no other reason than that the President has invited all of us to beautify and conserve our cities and our countryside.

That conservation is a job for all of us was brought home to me, most strongly, at the recent White House Conference on Natural Beauty in Washington, D.C.

One thousand leaders, representing every segment of our national life, spent 2 intensely busy days participating in this Conference. It was called by the President of the United States to produce new ideas and approaches for enhancing the beauty of America.

The people participating in this Conference were creative conservationists—capable of developing a new line of action and of carrying it out. Your own Secretary of the Department of Forests and Waters, Maurice K. Goddard, led the Panel on the Federal-State-local partnership.

After the meeting conferees adjourned to the White House where they presented their reports.

After hearing the President's inspiring address to the conferees, I am confident that natural beauty, in all its aspects, will receive the full attention and leadership it deserves.

I believe that we who live in the United States today, and future generations that follow us, will be forever grateful that the people of the Nation saw fit to invest part of their material abundance in enriching all our lives with the pleasure and spiritual elevation that can come only from a quality environment.

Another dimension in the new creative conservation is outdoor recreation.

For decades, recreation has been a vital ingredient in multiple-use management of State and National forest lands. In recent years, we have found that it can be just as important to the private forest owners who must show a profit. Recreation is opening new income opportunities for the rural landowners. Millions of Americans, blessed with growing prosperity, better travel facilities, and more leisure time, are rediscovering the out of doors.

The report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and the subsequent public and private activity it generated has helped focus national attention on outdoor recreation. Lloyd E. Partain, past president of your association, and now with the Department of Agriculture, served as a member of the Advisory Council to the Commission. There has been a broad advance on the outdoor recreation front.

The Food and Agriculture Act, enacted by Congress in 1962, was a major turning point in the development of outdoor recreation on private land, especially on family farms. The act's provisions for technical assistance, credit, information, and cost sharing generated great interest in recreation development among landowners. For example:

About 60,000 landowners and operators have requested and received recreation information from USDA; and about 38,000 landowners and operators have received recreation planning assistance.

More than 26,000 landowners have established 1 or more income-producing recreation enterprises.

We have made loans to 390 family farmers to start or enlarge income-producing recreation areas. Loans also have gone to 147 nonprofit associations for community-sized recreation projects.

Through the cropland conversion program, we are helping 117 farmers shift more than 8,000 acres of cropland to recreation use, cropland that was producing commodities that are in excess supply.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has been established in the Department of the Interior. It is promoting coordination of outdoor recreation activities and is functioning with increasing effect throughout the Nation.

More recently, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act provided for congressional appropriations to States and certain Federal agencies to help them provide urgently needed public outdoor recreation areas and facilities. This act has brought new hope to State and local governments in their efforts to meet public recreation demands.

A few weeks ago, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman directed all USDA agencies to give greater emphasis in its programs to beautification.

We expect to have 60 Job Corps conservation centers in operation on the national forests by the end of 1965. More will follow. Underprivileged youths, who will earn while they learn, will perform conservation and development work on the national forests which will benefit all of us. The Blue Jay Job Corps Conservation Center was activated last April on the Allegheny National Forest. It is located in Forest County and now has 90 busy young men building their own future and building a better outdoors America.

Our newest USDA agency—the Rural Community Development Service—is working with all Federal agencies involved in conservation on private land. And through 2,100 rural areas development citizen committees, it is gearing up to give the grassroots research and development program another strong helping hand.

These and other conservation activities—the Appalachia program, scenic roads and recreation ways on the national forests, wilderness areas, the wild rivers project, and others—are beginning to blossom out in the countryside.

America's per capita supply of land and water is decreasing as a rising population shares a fixed acreage of these resources. Multiple use is a concept of management which, when properly applied, can make one acre do the work of several devoted to single-purpose use. Under multiple-use management, natural beauty can be developed and maintained; food, fiber, wildlife, recreation, forage, and timber can be provided; soil and water—the basic resources—can be conserved.

On national forest lands we went through periods of custodianship and protection. Now, through multiple-use management, we strive for a harmonious blending of the resources into a combination that benefits the greatest number of people. On community projects, such as small watershed development on private lands, flood control may be combined with recreation on municipal water storage.

On individual private landholdings, the usual aim is optimum net income consistent with the best conservation practices. We are convinced that as multiple use of land, water and related resources gains wider acceptance on private and public lands, natural beauty will become more abundant throughout the Nation. They are compatible.

Last September, at the annual meeting of the National Association of State Foresters, at Hershey, Pa., I reported that the Forest Service and related agencies were working on a proposed 10-year national program for State and private forestry. This program has been reviewed with the State foresters association and other groups and is being further improved and refined.

It will be a multiple use woodland program which will utilize every available forestry tool to get the job done in a coordinated and efficient fashion in partnership with State foresters and private landowners.

In view of USDA's latest report on the Nation's timber situation, it will be particularly timely.

The report, "Timber Trends in the United States," shows that American forests have made a comeback during the past quarter century. Timber growth now exceeds cut, but the supply of larger trees and quality timber is declining. The forthcoming cooperative State and private forestry program will help correct our deficit of larger trees and quality timber, primarily through more intensive management of the small private forests of which there are 4½ million. In addition, this program will help meet the increasing demand for outdoor recreation and improve the economic position of the landowner.

The new creative conservation is making it economically feasible for America's people to both live and play where they seem to prefer—in the rural countryside—and to work where they want to live.

Secretary Freeman has called this possibility an exciting new dimension of advancing civilization. He sees the probability that in our time our society will step up to a new and higher plane of creative living—a plane where all of us, who choose to, can live, work and play in the countryside.

Pennsylvania has always been a pace-setting State, and Pennsylvanians, in conservation especially, have been pace setters—the first State forestry association; the first American born professional forester and the first Chief of the U.S. Forest Service—Gifford Pinchot; the first Institute for Conservation Studies at Milford, Pa., also named after Pinchot. The first national meeting of America's State Foresters was held in Harrisburg.

It was a privilege to speak to you on the occasion of your 79th annual meeting.

Everywhere we look, conservation is on the move. I know you will continue to move with it—that you will continue to be up there where you belong, right up front.

Supersonic Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin on Wednesday, June 16, 1965:

SUPERSONIC COMPETITION

The supersonic transport race has a new entry—a Russian darkhorse unveiled at the Paris air and space show that may have an excellent chance of being first in the air. The design for the Soviet craft closely resembles that of the French-British Concorde; both are to fly at about 1,500 miles an hour (twice the speed of sound) and carry 120 to 130 passengers. Financial and political strains at times have clouded the prospect for a Concorde test flight by 1968, as projected, but that is the firm Russian target date. The betting is that the Russian plane could well beat the Concorde into actual service—including 90-minute runs from Moscow to London—in the early 1970's.

The American supersonic transport program is more ambitious but running 2 to 4 years behind the European endeavors. Early designs of 2 competing airframe manufacturers are for a jet that would fly 1,800 to 2,000 miles an hour with some 250 passengers. The higher speed greatly complicates the design problems and doubles the estimated cost of eventual production-line models.

But the big questions plaguing the American effort—some of which President Johnson is due to settle shortly—are more general. The sonic boom tests conducted last year in Oklahoma were hardly reassuring. The jarring noise and occasional damage that accompany faster-than-sound flight were more than what 3 out of 10 guinea pig Oklahomans who were interviewed thought they'd like to live with, and there was a big "don't complain" campaign by local industry boosters. The Russians pooh-pooh this problem, and there is a tendency for U.S. officials to do the same or to "buy off" critics with easy damage settlements.

The taxpayers have paid for most of the design work to date, and the President hopes to shift future expense largely onto the manufacturers. Yet to get the best plane, the public may have to subsidize awhile longer.

No military need for such an aircraft has been spelled out, and whether civilians want badly enough to fly at three times the speed of sound to justify the enormous cost and potential annoyances can only be guesswork. But European superjets will no doubt create some demand for such travel, and U.S. airlines can hardly afford to risk dependence on overseas manufacturers nor U.S. industry the loss of a possibly large market. As Senator MONRONEY has noted, this country already has a second-class merchant marine and second-class passenger railroads. Can it afford to lag in air travel too?

A Legislator Looks at the Pharmaceutical Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech which I delivered at a luncheon of the Pharmaceutical Advertising Club at the Hilton Hotel, New York City, on June 22, 1965:

A LEGISLATOR LOOKS AT THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

(By JOHN E. FOGARTY)

I appreciate that kind introduction. I would have thought myself better know to you as one in Congress who provides more money for Government health programs than they need or should have, to do a lot of things you think the Government shouldn't do anyway—judging from some of the comments I have heard.

In any case, it is true that for more than 20 years it has been my privilege, as a Member of the Congress, to serve the people of Rhode Island, the people of the United States, and the people of the free world. And it is true that during this time, in addition to my regular duties, my special field of interest and activity has been in connection with the programs of the Department of Labor and of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It has been an altogether satisfying experience. I know of nothing that is more important than the health and well-being of people, which is basic to happiness, to productivity, yes even to the capacity to protect and advance the cause of freedom. And I am sure this is a view you share.

It is my understanding that most of you who are here today at this luncheon meeting of the Pharmaceutical Advertising Club are here because you communicate for the pharmaceutical industry. I submit that given the issues confronting that industry today, it is also important that you communicate to its members and particularly to its leaders.

What is there to say to them? In my view, it is simply this: Unless the pharmaceutical industry finds better ways to demonstrate its concern for the public interest to provide more tangible evidence of its ability to be in at least some respects self-regulating, it is

destined gradually to be changed in character, by public mandate.

I want to elaborate on that. But first I want to make one point absolutely clear. As a bricklayer (and I am proud that I am still a card-carrying member of the union representing that skilled trade), as a citizen, and as a Member of Congress, I am committed to a belief in private industry and in the values of the free enterprise system. Under that system, this Nation has grown and prospered. The private component is vital to our kind of society and essential to our way of life. Do not count me among those prophets of doom who make a career out of predicting the socialization of all things. Do not count me, either, among those committed as a matter of political and economic philosophy to public ownership and public controls over the operation of all essential industries and functions. My natural inclination is to want to help repair and correct and strengthen, rather than to weaken and destroy private initiative. That is why I was happy to accept the invitation to join you today. I feel I have some things to say, or at least a point of view, that may help you, and hopefully, those you communicate to within the industry.

As far as the general public is concerned, "the industry" begins with the prescription drug manufacturer and ends with the retailer. This is another way of saying that to the consumer, the thing that matters is the immediate availability at a reasonable price of what the doctor has prescribed. Notice that I leave quality out of this. Quality may be readily apparent when the consumer buys a car, a shirt, a radio. He knows what quality consists of, and he makes his own judgment about whether he wants or can afford to pay for a premium product.

But with prescription drugs, as all of you must know, the situation is different. The consumer is a captive—he has—for the most part, no choice either about what will buy, or what he will pay for what he buys. And yet the product involved—the prescription drug—is, or may be, the difference between life and death, health and sickness, freedom from pain and suffering.

As compared with other industries, there is something different about the prescription drug industry. And there should be something different about the prescription drug industry's performance of its business in terms of the public interest. I am not at all sure that there is.

I understand that there are something like 1,200 companies known to be manufacturing prescription drugs in the United States alone. Literature from the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association indicates its membership to be about 140 companies. And I have heard that the top 20 companies do more than 80 percent of the prescription drug business in this country. In addition, the financial world records that profits as a percentage of sales in the prescription drug business are high. It is near the top of all industries in this respect, and apparently continues to improve its position despite the warnings it has been receiving and the controls that have been imposed since Senator Kefauver first threw the spotlight on the industry in 1959.

Now I know that the retail price of prescription drugs has been going down the last 5 or 6 years. According to the Consumer Price Index, there has been a significant decline at the same time that prices for food and other goods have been rising. This is certainly to the drug industry's credit. But the fact remains that the public still has the impression that drug prices—and profits—are too high. And this is a problem which the industry must somehow deal with.

What has its reaction been?

As a Member of Congress, I have been the recipient of some of it. You talk about your investments in research. You emphasize high risks and rapid product obsolescence. You proclaim how essential and expensive it is to inform physicians about new products. You speak of quality control and of the vital importance of product reliability. You point to the retailer and the ways in which his operation of his business affects the price of your products to the consumer.

I am sure each of these factors has a valid bearing on the question of prices and profits. One would think that they would answer the question—particularly when combined with the acknowledged and unparalleled record of the U.S. prescription drug industry in discovering and developing new drugs that have significantly assisted the physician in advancing the public health. But I think the continuing harrassment of the industry from many quarters suggests that the question has not been satisfactorily answered for many people.

Certainly research is a most desirable function for the reinvestment of profits made by the pharmaceutical industry. A number of companies have truly outstanding research laboratories, and the industry invests several hundred million dollars in this field. But is this a characteristic across the board? Do all the companies—all 1,200 of them, or even all 140 of them in the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association—carry out a share of the research endeavor? I think not.

Moreover, I am sure it is fair to say that the bulk of the industry's research must be invested in what is called developmental research, and quite properly so. Much of the basic research in medicine is done by scientists in university and Government laboratories, and they are supported either by tax funds or voluntary contributions. In this sense, others outside the industry help finance the acquisition of fundamental knowledge which, in turn, helps the industry in the development of new products. And it seems to me that this imposes yet another special responsibility on the industry to keep the public interest in mind in the conduct of its business.

Like research, the high risk and rapid product obsolescence factor is, I am sure, a valid one. It undoubtedly adds to the cost of drugs and it probably means that profit margins must be higher than in some other industries. And yet with the rapid—some would say excessively rapid—introduction of new prescription drugs during the past 20 years, there seems to have been little damage to the financial strength and stability of the industry and its members. And I can't think of how long it has been since I heard of a pharmaceutical company that failed because it was losing money.

The industry has a special challenge and responsibility in connection with the quality of its products. There can be no compromise. They must be as safe, as effective, as uniform in quality as it is possible for man and science to make them. Unfortunately, but understandably, people expect absolutes as far as their health is concerned. They expect the doctor to help them, and the drugs and vaccines the doctor uses to help them, 100 percent of the time. Yet there are no absolutes in the health field; no surgery is sure to cure, no drug is sure to ameliorate. So the dilemma is one you must live with. To compound the dilemma, the measures of quality are not readily apparent. One pill looks very much like another pill to the patient.

I support and applaud the industry's effort to sustain the uniformly high quality of its prescription drugs and vaccines. When a drug fails, in terms of either safety or effectiveness, it is a terrible thing. The initial failure of the Salk polio vaccine and the tragedy of thalidomide are cases in point. There is value in the quality of products related to human health, and people are willing to pay for it. Yet the industry may overstate the case when it talks quality as a factor in price.

To go back to the point about the 1,200 manufacturers for a moment—surely all of them do not build into their products all the quality factors that characterize the products of Eli Lilly, for example, or Upjohn. But their prices seem to be about the same. And if there are variations in the quality of drugs, the people don't seem to hear about it. They have the impression that drugs are all about the same, all checked and approved by the Government.

Right now, for example, you are trying to sell the idea that it is better to prescribe drugs under their brand names rather than their generic description. The implication is that there are real differences in the quality of drugs, and that a brand name helps guide the buyer to the most reliable manufacturer and the highest quality product. But the public has not really been told this. If one drug is less safe, less effective, or less uniform in quality than another, then the people assume it shouldn't be on the market. So it seems to me that you have a problem in product differentiation when those differences are certainly not apparent.

Now as to the distribution system for prescription drugs. I have seen several members of your industry, in effect, shrug their shoulders and throw up their hands, as much as to say that nothing can be done about it. When the question of cost to consumer is raised, the manufacturer looks at the retailer and says, "On the average, he adds 100 percent to our price to him and charges it to the patient, and nobody ever accuses him of profiteering on prescription drugs." And the retailer looks at the manufacturer and says, "Look at his sales and earnings statements. He's making all the money." Did you ever see a retail pharmacist who got rich in the business? I don't know the rights and wrongs of it, but I do know the forgotten man in such a situation is likely to be the patient.

As far as he is concerned, he sees only one thing, the bill, and applies only one measure—whether the drug helps. He is unlikely to love you for what you do. The most you can expect is that he will understand and respect you, and accept your prices and profits as necessary and reasonable in the light of the services you perform.

How can this be achieved? You who are in this audience should know the answers better that I. You are the pharmaceutical advertisers—the communicators for the pharmaceutical industry. Now, with whom do you communicate? The doctors? Yes, abundantly. The pharmacists? Yes, to a limited extent. Anybody else? I'm afraid the answer to that is, not really.

In other words, the industry has grown up believing that it is the doctors, not the people, who are your customers. Perhaps some of you would not even acknowledge that you deal in consumer goods.

Under the circumstances, it is understandable that you would give primary attention to communications with physicians and pharmacists, since they are the ones who prescribe and provide your drugs. But they are special circumstances, and their very special nature requires action and communication that goes beyond narrow commercial expediency. For—and make no mistake about it—the people are looking at you, and it is past time for you to be looking to the people. The physician-pharmacist-pharmaceutical manufacturer team, which may have been thought sufficient unto itself at one time, is no longer protection against public and governmental scrutiny.

How about it, you communicators? Are you prepared to recommend to the managements you represent that they must take their case to the people, as well as to the

professions, if they wish to survive and to retain their basic characteristics under our free enterprise system? Are you prepared to recommend that they find new ways to meet the challenges that confront them?

Part of the answer lies in telling people what you do. The other part is in doing better.

In the first instance, one does not have to look very hard to find good things to say. You know what they are better than I do—the products of your research, the care you devote to manufacturing and testing, the value of your services to physicians and others in the health professions, and so on. I have but one suggestion to make in this respect. Don't fail to remember that people care less about what you do than about what you do for them. As a legislator, I can tell you that the case has not been made to me and many of my colleagues, just as it has not to the American people. What are you doing—for them? Tell them, so they will have some basis for judging the merits of your present performance.

I have said that the industry should accommodate itself to the inevitability of essential change.

What do I mean by this? Let me give you just a few illustrations.

1. Are you prepared to adjust profit margins if this is indicated, as drugs are made available under the medicare and other programs that will make health care more widely available to those who need it most?

2. Are you prepared to assume responsibility for an increasing share of the financial needs of medical schools and other health centers—institutions from which you derive many benefits? They are a source of basic knowledge, the primary place for testing your drugs, the primary source of trained manpower for your research, and medical programs, the only source of physicians who later will prescribe your products. And yet, if I am correctly informed, industry has dedicated only relatively small amounts of its profits to these institutions.

3. Isn't there some way you can reduce the price of drugs required for chronic illness? It seems to me that the patient who has to take maintenance doses of the same drug over a period of years could be considered at least as a quantity purchaser, and entitled to a quantity discount?

4. New drugs are becoming more and more complex, and it is therefore more and more difficult to know how they will affect the patient on a long-term basis. Isn't there some way you could devote more of your research to developing new tests and procedures to permit more accurate estimates of the safety?

5. Does the industry, which so strongly protests overregulation, have the capacity to be more self-regulating? Is there in fact any way for the association that represents the industry to insist on the maintenance of certain principles and standards, and to discipline or reject those companies whose performance falls short?

6. Is there a way—assuming the maintenance of the patent system and of some means for company identification with the products it manufactures (and I hope both of these can be protected, since they are fundamental to the free enterprise system)—is there a way to achieve more price competition?

These are some of the challenges, as they appear to a Congressman in Washington and as they appear, I believe, to many of the American people. I have spoken frankly about them because I have come here as a friend. I want to be helpful, and constructive, because I know that you are as dedicated as I am to improving the health of people everywhere.

Indeed, no industry in the world has done more to relieve the sufferings of mankind, to push the frontiers of medicine forward toward healthier and happier living. You lead every other country in the development of new drugs. Nearly two-thirds of all the major new compounds made available since 1941 have been developed in the United States. And 90 percent of these have come from company laboratories.

You have worked conscientiously to improve the quality of your products, to make them as safe and as effective as humanly possible. Although you have received very little credit for it, you have supported measures to strengthen the Food and Drug Administration and, even, to add some new controls over drugs. You have responded willingly and often to the call of public service. And in recent years you have even cut some prescription prices.

For the most part, you have done all these things in the shadow of anonymity. You have worked through physicians and pharmacists, so that the public hasn't recognized the good you have done. And this is too bad, for you have a lot to be proud about. The country has many reasons to be proud of you and grateful.

Now, however, the American people and the Congress are taking notice. They are watching what you are doing, listening to what you say. And you, in turn, are having to listen to them. This requires some adjustments and poses some difficult challenges, I know. But it also presents an extraordinary opportunity.

For a pharmaceutical industry, working in harmony, understanding, and partnership with the American people, would be less vulnerable to outside criticism and interference. It would be an even greater force for the improvement of the Nation's health. And this would be in your interest as well as the public's.

Pella, Iowa, Chronicle Points Out Value of Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, soil and water conservation goes hand in hand with productive agriculture. My home State of Iowa has taken note of this by designating June 20 through June 27 as Soil and Water Conservation Week.

The June 24, 1965, issue of the Pella Chronicle of Pella, Iowa, carried an excellent editorial pointing out the value of these conservation practices, and I would like to call this editorial to the attention of my fellow Members.

As the editorial notes, on the farm conservation projects, such as watersheds, serve to preserve the fertility of the soil and, at the same time, aid in flood control. Iowa farmers are well aware of the value of soil and water conservation, and I am confident that the future will bring continued progress in this vital area.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the editorial from the Pella Chronicle:

SOIL—A VERY IMPORTANT ASSET

Soil is a farmer's most important asset, second only to his own strong hands and able mind. Without these, he can grow no crops. And if he is unable to grow crops, he is unable to make a living, and we must all go hungry.

For this reason, it is imperative that farmers and consumers of farm goods alike, be aware of the great need for soil conservation practices—ways to keep soil down on the farm instead of letting it go down the river.

The Federal Government has set up the Soil Conservation Service and related functions of the ASCS office to help farmers put into motion the latest and best soil conservation practices. Soil conservation districts have been set up, with men who realize the grave need for the expanded use of soil conservation serving on its board of directors without pay.

As you drive through the countryside, you will notice signs along the roads: "Kirkholm Watershed," "Tri-Valley Watershed," etc. These are watershed areas where all of the farmers involved have agreed to put into practice certain soil conservation farming practices. They all have had a conservation plan for their farm drawn up by the SCS office of their respective counties.

They all have put these practices into effect. Terraces, contour farming, grassed waterways, strip cropping, etc., may all be found on their farms. When the farms have met prescribed standards, the Federal Government then invests tax money into building the conservation structures that are necessary to control those land features such as deep gullies, that are beyond the ability or means of the individual farmer.

The concrete spillways, farm ponds, dams, drop-inlet structures, etc., that dot the organized watershed landscapes are all intended to do one thing; allow that water that does get off the farm in spite of the terraces, etc., to "walk off" rather than "run off."

They cut the speed of the water's flow so it will be less able to erode precious soil.

All of this has an effect on vital interest other than the maintenance of the fertility of the farmland. It is also flood control. But this is flood control where it counts—where the water hits the ground. The more water that can be slowed, or stopped and held, by conservation practices on the farm, the more water that will soak into the ground to be used for growing crops.

And at the same time, if there is less water leaving the farm, there is less water reaching the creeks and rivers. If this is happening all along the line, it will take a river or creek longer to reach flood stage.

If this is carried to its logical conclusion, with all farmers using conservation practices, it would take a very large rain to create a flood of major concern.

So soil conservation is of great importance to all of us, both from the standpoint of continued fertility of the soil and of flood control.

And since this is Soil and Water Conservation Week, we would like to take this opportunity to salute those farmers who have already made soil conservation a part of their farming operations. And we urge those who haven't, to seriously consider doing so soon.

—F. J. H.

Behind 14(b) Repeal: Labor's Drive To Reform Taft-Hartley Has Political Motive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently an individual, rather high up in the

AFL–CIO circles, told me that he considers the Taft-Hartley Act a symbol and a whipping boy for union officials in order to arouse their membership. He also said he could see very little advantage in repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act since the unions were gaining in membership in those States which have right-to-work laws.

This theory seems to be substantiated in an article by John A. Grimes, published in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, June 22, which follows:

BEHIND 14(b) REPEAL—LABOR'S DRIVE TO REFORM TAFT-HARTLEY HAS POLITICAL MOTIVE

(By John A. Grimes)

WASHINGTON.—For all its formal arguments about economic injustice, the overriding motive behind labor's determined drive to reform the Taft-Hartley law is its still-unsatisfied yearning for political muscle.

Publicly, of course, the congressional campaign by the AFL–CIO and its allies to repeal section 14(b) concentrates on the complaint that allowing States to outlaw the union shop with right-to-work laws unfairly restricts unions in organizing new members and bargaining for them—functions given public sanction by other sections of the law. Indeed, this argument appears to gain weight when some defenders of 14(b) warn that repealing it will open the floodgate to all-powerful union monopoly, almost overnight forcing thousands of unorganized workers to join up or lose their jobs, and leaving management almost helpless at the negotiating table.

Privately, however, union chiefs concede that their organizing and bargaining problems arise from far deeper forces, and they harbor no illusions that repealing 14(b) will magically cure those ills. But if repeal would be mostly a symbolic victory, the chiefs figure that's just what they need to boost their political fortunes.

CONCERN OVER AN IMAGE

What makes this particular symbol so important to organized labor is its need to establish itself as a political force which can not only help at the polls but deliver legislative goods. Ever since the Taft-Hartley Act was passed in 1947, top labor leaders have considered 14(b) a particular affront. They have so often labeled repeal their No. 1 objective they can no longer afford to sacrifice it for more substantive goals. Backing away or failing now, they believe, would be an especially severe setback for their reputation as political movers.

AFL–CIO chieftains are well aware that the legislative halls and the policymaking levels of Government—not the bargaining tables—have become their most fruitful fields for self-help. Particularly in the face of increasingly effective management opposition, individual contract negotiations can't cope with the complex problems of automation and technological change and persistent spotty unemployment, or provide higher minimum wages and improved unemployment benefits. But these can be dealt with, federation officials are convinced, through legislation that creates jobs and elevates work standards.

To accomplish these aims, union leaders have found, requires an intensely active and broadly based political organization—one that not only can be geared up to help win elections but will remain in gear to influence the officeholders it has helped elect.

Such a political force depends, even more than on money, on a continuing supply of enthusiastic manpower.

During an election campaign, one of labor's most potent weapons has been the availability of helpers from union ranks to perform the thousands of tasks that make a campaign successful. But these volunteers, largely unrewarded, tend to drift away after election day. The union chiefs have found that, to keep an interested and effective political force available to mount grassroots campaigns and other pressures on Government officials, they must convince their constituents that political action results in direct benefits.

Labor has been somewhat effective in helping elect candidates, but much less effective in winning all of the clearly labor-oriented legislation it wants from Congress or the White House. Indeed, some elections the AFL–CIO has hailed as smashing victories have been quickly followed by legislative disaster. Sample: Union chiefs fully hoped, after claiming sizable credit for the substantial liberal Democratic gains in the House in the 1958 election, to win rapid repeal of 14(b). Instead, they were saddled with the 1959 Landrum-Griffin labor reform law, a measure designed to produce more rank-and-file democracy but which union leaders still curse as burdensome and harassing.

Even with a Democrat in the White House, mere Democrat majorities in Congress haven't provided the unions any spectacular legislative victories. So after each new election the AFL–CIO chieftains start out patting themselves on the back for helping increasing the ranks of the liberals on Capitol Hill, then wind up almost emptyhanded exhorting their troops to still more intensive and effective political actions, in hopes that electing even more liberals will help labor win its way in the next Congress.

Over the years, the hallmark of such a Congress has been repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. So it isn't surprising that, with the smashing election of President Johnson and some 40 new Democratic House Members, mostly of the liberal stripe that's to labor's liking. AFL–CIO chiefs now are under obligation to deliver.

"If we don't get it now, we can't go back to our own people," declares one Federation aid. He means the union leaders will find it difficult to rouse their disillusioned members to the enthusiastic action needed to accomplish the Federation's legislative aims.

AN EYE ON 1966 ELECTIONS

Already, AFL–CIO politicos are talking of the need for more intense action, starting at once, to help protect the present liberal House majority in the 1966 congressional elections. Such off-year elections usually have resulted in a loss of seats for the party in power. So slight were the margins by which some of the 1964 liberals were elected, it wouldn't take much of a switch to cause sizable Democratic losses.

So, to fire up its troops, the AFL–CIO needs a tangible victory, and needs it now.

There are, of course, a number of other legislative items proposed by Mr. Johnson that the unions want besides repeal of 14(b). Some of these Johnson proposals, such as broader minimum wage coverage, increased and broadened unemployment compensation, may in the long run prove more important for labor.

But repeal of 14(b) would clearly be the union's own victory, and clearly identifiable as such. The impact of the Taft-Hartley law's provision falls entirely on unions: its removal would benefit unions alone. It is precisely this clear union label the AFL–CIO leadership needs to prove to its own people that the Federation has become a political power that can deliver the goods.

Project Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there is no more important goal for leaders in government in behalf of the peoples of the earth than the quest for peace. But the leaders in government cannot achieve this goal unless they have the support of many citizens in all walks of life. In my contacts with the constituents of the 19th Congressional District of California, which I have been honored to represent for almost 23 years, I find the desire to eliminate the scourge of war and the hope to establish universal peace to be the dominant interest.

As the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I believe I know more than most people the power for destruction which atomic weapon owning nations could unleash in the event of nuclear war. This knowledge has caused me to support the establishment of the U.S. Disarmament and Arms Control Agency. At the invitation of the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. THOMAS MORGAN, I made the closing speech of the debate in the House of Representatives when this Agency was established in 1961. I have consistently supported its appropriations and its enlargement since that time. Although its task is difficult and subject to derision by many, I believe that it has brought a tangible and practical function of planning for peace into being. The staff of the Agency has been carefully built until now it has a complement of 214 people. Their objective is to explore ways and means of settling international controversies by peaceful negotiations instead of by war. Their work should be supported by every Member of Congress, even though the history of man's inhumanity to man stands as a constant reminder that wars and rumors of war may continue until the end of time.

A great force for mobilizing the forces for peace exists in the spiritual leaders of our religious organizations throughout our country. In many places the clergy have, in sermon and in personal contacts, encouraged the cause of peace. In my congressional district I know of many members of the clergy who are deeply dedicated to the cause of obtaining peace in our troubled world. One of my personal friends in the ministry, Dr. E. Ezra Ellis, now serving as minister of the First Friends Church in Whittier, Calif., recently preached a sermon on Memorial Sunday, entitled "Project Peace." Under unanimous consent, I wish to have the words of this sermon printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my remarks and also

the card of principles, which he distributed widely:

PROTECT PEACE

(By Evert Ezra Ellis)

Let us project peace. Why not?

Peace is the secret ingredient of all healthy relationships. Viewed in such a perspective, the absence of peace is violence. This state of antisociological behavior is personal as well as social. It is economic as well as political. It is intellectual as well as spiritual. It is scientific as well as historical.

We all want peace. Books about peace roll off the presses unendingly. The big bugaboo is war. The skeleton in the closet is fear. The threat over humanity is extinction. We can read this from Homer to Hegel, Old Testament to New, Plato to the present struggle through the dilemmas of the minds of men regarding war and peace. So what?

When the foregoing is examined closely we see that problem is personal as well as perennial. It is filled with seemingly infinite sociological and political complexities but the implications are intensely individual.

What we are saying is that although we might be told that we do not understand the magnitude of the complications, the facts of war and peace face each individual in the conditions of his everyday existence.

Certainly if the civilization (or if you prefer "the coming world civilization" that W. E. Hocking talks about) of which we are a part is to have the summon bonum, or the supreme good for all people it is up to people to decide.

Again and again all over the world one hears it said "People want peace. It is the governments that make war." This seems naive to some. To others it is superficial. The important point perplexes as we ask, "Is it true?"

If it is, then what can individuals do about it? Nothing? Protest? Pray? Dream? Anything else?

Let us reason together. Why not make an attempt to think of ways, or a way, by which everyone can consciously and self-confidently make himself a part of the dynamic answer. So, from our all-too-prevalent attitude described as "Come weal, or come woe, our status is quo," let us push from status quo to pertinent queries which ponder peace.

Would not Jesus still speak through the "be attitude" of the Living Presence of Christ saying "Blessed are the makers of peace." Peace hopers and peace eulogizers need to do more than dream and talk.

The question of everyone when the matter of war and peace is discussed seems to be, "What can I do?" The following is proposed for a worldwide and earth-encircling proposition in the spirit if the words "Let there be peace on earth and let it begin with me."

I

Affirm peace by saying to yourself honestly every morning, noon, and night "I do believe in peace."

Although almost everyone you meet will say that he believes in peace the crux of the matter is what he will do about his affirmation.

A college girl said recently "There's not much time for peace. There is too much to do." Perhaps this sums up the matter for most of us. We have too much to do. We are so involved.

Does this mean that we do not honestly believe peace is important enough to devote some of our time and energy to the cause or causes of peace? Perhaps this might be classed as one of mankind's most subtle sins of omission.

We really know that peace is important. However, as has been suggested "man has always acted at variance with his wisdom, nullifying the hope of peace, by preparing always for the next war."

The great ambivalence of war and peace seems "inescapable and irradicable." Therefore, if we really believe in peace even though we but "see in a glass darkly," to remind ourselves is one way to involve our continual participation in the ideas of peace.

How shall we hold these ideas in our minds?

II

By thinking peace is our answer. Think peace by reading and exploring creatively the ideas of the greatest minds of the past and the present in what has been said and is being said today to promote good will among all people of the earth.

Countless volumes have been written in the theme explored by Tolstoy in his famous volume called "War and Peace." One of my friends introduced me to a book called "Towards a Science of Peace," by Theo. F. Lentz. Julian Huxley commends the book "to the increasing number of people who are no longer satisfied with the world's traditional ideologies, and to all who are profoundly perturbed by the threat of suicidal war."

Christians will turn always to the Bible to rekindle their minds. Peace is mentioned twice as often as war in the Bible. The word "peace" is used 404 times while "war" is only used in 211 instances. War is spoken of only 14 times in the New Testament while we find it 197 times in the Old Testament. In only one of the Gospels do we come across the mention of war, twice in Luke, but not once in Matthew, Mark, or John. Seven of the fourteen times war in the New Testament is spoken about are found in Revelations.

It is interesting to note that of the 404 times the word "peace" is used in the Bible it is found 296 times in the Old Testament and 108 in the New Testament.

III

This gives us reasons to talk peace by conversing with others about mankind's universal hope and desire for peace, as well as about the problems, the complexities, and the complications of man's inhumanity to man.

There are plenty of familiar words in the Bible to stir our thoughts in conversation. From Genesis to Revelation we have statements like "Peace be to you, fear not" (Genesis 43: 23), "He will keep him in perfect peace" (Isaiah 26: 3), "Great peace have they who love the Lord (Psalms 119: 165), "Peace be unto you" (John 20: 26), "Now the God of peace" (Romans 15: 33), "Grace be unto you and peace" (Revelation 1: 4).

War which Freud describes as the "legacy of embitterment" has no longer any charm or beauty. It has too long been as Dexter Perkins suggests that the "history of man is (the) history of violence."

We know that the cost of war is infinite. Kenneth Boulding tells us that our "World war economy is estimated between $110 and $120 billion." Our country spends slightly over one third of this, and the Soviet Union something less than one third of the total.

If, as Jefferson said, "peace is our passion" then it behooves those who believe in peace to speak out.

IV

You and I can make peace by helping in every way we can to create, maintain, and extend the spirit of peace to everyone we meet wherever we go.

We can do this even in the midst of the kind of a world in which we live. It still seems strange that in the Cabinet of the President of the United States we have a Secretary of War but no Secretary of Peace.

In this the 20th century, the first to have world wars, will we learn enough to find the "cosmopolitical ideal" of Kant? We face the choice—brotherhood or oblivion.

What is most important to humanity? Is it not the chance to be human in the highest sense for which man was created? Obviously all that negates and destroys must go. So, war is obsolete.

To project peace will continue to mean scientific study with utilization of all the sciences. An evolving political strategy with short-range and long-range objectives is essential. Communication of means and ends requires the mechanics of involvement. It calls for the utilization of the laws of the universe with the built-in and inherent abilities of man as well as his desires and aspirations.

Do we today believe enough to be willing to join others around the world in a far-reaching crusade for peace? Are we ready? Are we willing? Will we help?

We have the promise that "Blessed are the peacemakers."

PEACE?

From man's beginning—struggle—
What price glory?
Is this man's hope—peace?
Or do we delude ourselves?

Hope for peace—
Have we given up?
Do men only say and sing
They want to "study war no more"?

Is this our lostness?
We know not what we want—
Within or without?

What is the "realism"
We desire for our time and need?
Vulgar ruthlessness, crude ugliness?

Is it lust to kill? murder?
Destroy by war machines
To prove and gain "our rights"?

O sad shibboleths of man's
Inhumanity to man—war,
Dread disease of earth!

There must be ways of valor
To bring the victories
Projecting peace

Amidst the millions of our earth
Planning, working good
For each and all.

—E.E.E.

LET THERE BE PEACE ON EARTH

Let there be peace on earth,
Let it begin with me.
Let there be peace on earth,
The peace that was meant to be.

With God as our Father,
Brothers all are we.
Let me walk with my brother,
In perfect harmony.

Let peace begin with me,
Let this be the moment now.
With every step I take,
Let this be my solemn vow.

To take each moment and live each moment
In peace eternally.
Let there be peace on earth,
And let it begin with me..

—*Jill Jackson and Sy Miller.*

PROJECT PEACE

1. Affirm peace by saying to yourself honestly every morning, noon, and night "I do believe in peace."

2. Think peace by reading and exploring creatively the ideas of the greatest minds of the past and the present in what has been said and is being said today to promote goodwill among all people of the earth.

3. Talk peace by conversing with others about mankind's universal hope and desire for peace as well as about the problems, the complexities and the complications of man's inhumanity to man.

4. Make peace by helping in every way you can to create, maintain and extend the spirit of peace to everyone you meet wherever you go.

The Majority Opinion: We Are Here To Learn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, for a long while now, the political activity of students has been a question of great concern. The actions of Berkeley's young people shocked and amazed great segments of our population. Many of the issues on which demonstrations occur are highly complex and offer no simple solution. Lack of factual material and faulty logic have caused many of our youth to parade and march protesting or advocating things they know little about. It seems reasonable to assume that these students are attending institutions to attain facts necessary to form a valid opinion. If they spend all their time marching, how will they ever learn the facts? Some spend so much time picketing and "ining," they find little time to bathe or shave, much less time to attend class and learn.

Free speech guaranteed each person by our Constitution is one thing. Irresponsible, misinformed, illogical "hell raising" is quite another. The distinction bebetween the two must be recognized and dealt with accordingly.

In many areas the actions of the slim minority amplify themselves so as to seem to become the majority view. In the case of student demonstrations the vocal minority has managed to present their case in such a manner as to appear larger in number than they really are. In the Sunday, June 6, edition of the Washington Star, an article was printed on this very point. Here then, for your information, is the majority opinion, we are here to learn, articulated by Yoram B. Szekely, valedictorian of Columbia's graduating class. His commencement address was entitled "The Case Against Political Activity by Students." His case is well made:

THE CASE AGAINST POLITICAL ACTIVITY BY STUDENTS

(By Yoram B. Szekely)

NEW YORK.—The occasion for which we are gathered here today marks for some of us the end of one stretch in the road of life. As such, it possesses a reflective quality. It provides us with an opportunity to stop for a while, turn back and reconsider some episodes and experiences of our 4 years on this campus. In doing so, we, of course, should cherish the good and the pleasant, but at the same time we must not ignore issues and events which could bear some critical examination. I propose to devote the following remarks to one such issue; namely, the problem of student involvement in political activities—not campus politics, but active involvement with national and international political issues.

A critical approach would not seem totally inappropriate, in view of the general apathy which has hitherto prevailed in this matter. Individual acts have been occasionally criticized by members of the faculty, administration, and student body, but those were merely the more conspicuous manifestations of a wider problem.

The problem itself remained untouched. Not even after the unsavory outbreaks during the recent Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps ceremonies (in which a hundred jeering college students succeeded in blocking the commissioning ceremonies) was there any widespread tendency to question as such the right of students to engage in political activities while on campus. This right has been regarded as one aspect of academic freedom, and its denial was therefore held unthinkable.

STUDENT OUTBREAKS

Under these circumstances a small but vociferous student minority has been able to create an impression of numerical strength and influence which was quite out of proportion with reality.

Now is not the proper occasion to analyze the merits and demerits of the views propounded by this minority. We should rather consider the general problem in its relation to Columbia's academic practice and purposes.

A good portion of student political activity has involved confrontation with the university administration. Such affairs as the unionization dispute (when Congress of Racial Equality pickets staged a 4-day sit-in and hunger strike to protest allegedly low wages paid to Negro and Puerto Rican cafeteria workers), the NROTC disturbance and demonstrations against certain foreign guests of the university (such as Queen Frederika of Greece and Madame Nhu of Vietnam) constituted a direct challenge to established university policies.

They were bound to cause considerable official embarrassment, and it is difficult to imagine that this possibility had eluded their student organizers beforehand. The fact that they did not reconsider their plans indicates, therefore, not only lack of maturity and good taste, but outright and spiteful disregard for university authority. It constituted interference with matters bearing no relation to student interests, matters which are quite irrelevant to those concerns which are a student's purpose and justification for being at Columbia.

SHOULD BACK ADMINISTRATION

Those political acts were ill-concealed attempts on the part of individual pressure groups among the student body to force the university to undertake a certain course of action commensurate with their private views and inclinations. The administration wisely did, and should continue to, resist such attempts. The student body should give it unqualified support by voicing disapproval of the conduct of their colleagues.

To those in my audience who might be surprised to find a student championing the cause of the administration, I would point out a simple fact: We students have come to Columbia for a single purpose—to obtain an education. We ought, therefore, to devote all our efforts to this purpose alone, and leave teaching to the teachers and administration to the administrators. A university like Columbia consists of a complex of institutions, groups, and individuals, with different, sometimes conflicting views and purposes.

If each of these elements were to pressure the university into acceptance of policies agreeable with its own views, the academic community would have disintegrated into chaos long ago.

VOLUNTARY RESTRAINT

Individual self-restraint and respect for the academic authorities are therefore in order. It would be erroneous to take them for evidence of weakness or supression of academic freedom. They are as voluntary as the process of higher education itself, by dint of the very fact that it cannot proceed smoothly without them. In adopting these attitudes, the individual would undertake a voluntary curtailment of his personal freedom of action, to facilitate the good of the academic community of which he is part. The decision to do so is indicative not of weakness, but of good judgment and strength of character.

We would arrive at similar conclusions if we examine the problem from still another point of view. Looking at the state of higher education in the United States during the past two decades, two trends become immediately clear. On the one hand, the cost of running a college or university has risen steadily, and so has tuition. At Columbia College, for instance, tuition rose from $380 a year in 1944 to $1,700 a year in 1964, an increase of 350 percent. Under the circumstances it is not surprising that a large number of students receive financial aid. At Columbia, 65 percent of all college undergraduates held scholarships, from one source or another, during the academic year 1963–64.

On the other hand, the number of places in the institution of higher learning has not kept pace with the rise in applications. This resulted in ever larger numbers of qualified applicants being rejected for lack of space. At Columbia College, the number of applicants for the class of 1969 increased by approximately 10 percent over that of 1968, with 3,360 applicants competing for about 700 available places.

ACCEPTS OBLIGATIONS

The conclusion to be drawn from these facts is clear: a student ought to know that admission to an institution of higher learning, and especially a school of Columbia's quality and stature, is not an inherent right of his. It is rather a privilege to be grateful for and an honor to take pride in. Having been selected realize that he was deemed capable of meeting the requirements and fulfilling the goals inherent in the college's academic standards. A trust has thereby been placed in him, and with this trust the obligation of doing it justice. It is incumbent upon him to feel himself bound by this obligation take the best advantage he can of the academic opportunity accorded him.

Involvement in political activities does anything but further this aim. It consumes time and energies which should have been used to increase academic excellence. It constitutes a waste of intellectual resources, which is quite unforgiveable under existing circumstances. Those who spend their time at rallies and picket lines instead of in the library would do well to remember that they are not only squandering their own opportunity, but also denying it to others, who might have used it better. Moreover, by neglecting their own efforts they are jeopardizing the educational quality of the college as a whole, a quality which depends perhaps as much on the student body as it does on the faculty.

Academic considerations have always occupied a paramount position in the life of Columbia College. Although not necessarily incompatible with political activity, they should take clear precedence whenever a conflict of interests arises. The obligation that devolved upon the student at his admission to the college should weigh more heavily in his mind than dedication to any political beliefs.

CALLS FOR RESTRAINT

For as long as his academic education lasts, he should impose voluntary restraints on his political sensibilities, and thereby eliminate a source of distraction and impediment. It is, after all, not a question of an official ban on political activities, but rather one of voluntary renounciation or at least curtailment.

It is not a question of academic despotism, but rather one of putting an end to a practice which is neither intellectually rewarding itself nor a means of relaxation from the academic strain.

Such voluntary restraint would appear to be only a modest return, a mere token of appreciation for what is perhaps the best opportunity of a lifetime. Those who feel themselves incapable of making this small and temporary adjustment had best reexamine the sincerity of their commitment to academic excellence.

I am confident that Columbia College and Columbia University, for their part, could fare quite splendidly even without the services of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Thank you.

Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3014) to regulate the labeling and advertising of cigarettes, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I supported H.R. 3014, a bill to require the words "Caution, cigarette smoking may be hazardous to your health" to appear in print on all packages of cigarettes. I wish the bill had been stronger.

This is the sixth or seventh time that I have raised my voice on the floor of the House for the purpose of discouraging the use of tobacco. I shall continue to do so as long as tobacco continues to menace our health.

I deplore the bill's inadequacies. They are self-evident. The bill first confesses the health hazard of tobacco, and piously calls for remedial action. It then provides, by way of remedial action, a directive to cigarette producers which will curb that hazard about as effectively as a directive to hold back the waters of the Mississippi with bare hands.

If we really mean what we say, then why are we so afraid to act? If we are really convinced that hundreds of thousands of Americans will be struck down through the effects of tobacco, then why are we not proclaiming this fact from the housetops? We do not hesitate to do so in the case of other articles for human consumption, of far less harmfulness. Surely no one really believes that the pathetically inadequate and seldom-to-be-read warning to be placed on the small panel of a cigarette package can seriously compete with the hundreds of millions of dollars annually to be spent to glamorize cigarettes, and to seduce our youth into the tobacco trap.

I note that the tobacco interests have redoubled their promotional efforts on behalf of their product since the publication of the Surgeon General's report on the relationship between tobacco and cancer. Yet I also note that the tobacco interests generally favor this bill. There is little organized opposition to it except from those who deplore its inadequacies.

What do I conclude? Inescapably I conclude that the tobacco interests are determined to push "full steam ahead" in the peddling of cigarettes, in spite of the Surgeon General's report. I further conclude that they regard this bill as only an innocuous gesture, and not incompatible in any way with their grandiose plans to indefinitely expand the tobacco market. This bill constitutes the minimum necessary to satisfy the anti-tobacco activists, but the maximum permissible, without cutting into precious cigarette sales.

During the debate an amendment was offered to remove the restriction placed on the States to go beyond the provisions of the bill. In other words, the amendment would have enabled the States to take such stronger regulatory measures as they might desire. Thus, in addition to strengthening the bill, the amendment tended to strengthen the position of the States. It was considered to be a States rights amendment. Yet it was defeated. Many of those voting against it were Members who loudly professed their support, both of the bill itself and of the principle of State's rights. The amendment was apparently defeated for only one reason: to have strengthened the bill would have bitten into cigarette sales, and this, the tobacco interests could not countenance. Go through this gesture if you must, we were in effect told, but make very certain that you cut it off at that point where the "gesture" gives signs of carrying a weapon.

I regard the debate on this bill to have been virtually without meaning. Its enactment was pure futility. It is apparent that America has not yet made the hard choice which sooner or later it will have to make: namely that the smoking of tobacco is not in the best national interest.

It is argued that to cut down on cigarette sales would cause serious unemployment and economic disruption.

With this argument I have some sympathy, but it is the only aspect of the posture of the tobacco industry with which I have sympathy. Futhermore, I must call attention to the fact that the strength even of this argument has now run out.

It has been many years since scientific statistics were first available showing the unmistakable relationship between tobacco smoking and various human ailments. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that when this information became first available, it came as a complete surprise to the tobacco interests. At that point, the economic argument could have been advanced with full force and vigor, and we would have been required to be impressed by it. In equal fairness, however, the tobacco interests should then have considered themselves obligated to announce plans for the phasing out of their operation, in an orderly manner, and with a minimum adverse impact upon the economy. Under those circumstances the Nation would have cooperated, to the ultimate degree of reasonableness. But such a course, alas, was not that which the tobacco interests elected to purse. On the contrary, they elected to redouble their propaganda efforts to neutralize, or even counteract the voice of reason, as heard through the great men of science. At that point, in my estimation, the tobacco interests forfeited their claim on the sympathy of the Nation, as far as the economic argument is concerned.

How long, may I ask, is the economic argument supposed to pass for valid? Are we to understand that the tobacco industry claims an everlasting investment in the corruption of America's health, and that in their judgment jobs will continue to weigh heavier than lives, from this day forth, and forevermore? At what point in time, if not now, do they estimate that the economic argument will begin to lose its efficacy? If they contemplate a terminal date, then let them now declare it. If not, then their entire premise may as well be challenged today as tomommow, or next year, or next century. If tobacco production is to be phased out entirely, then the sooner it is accomplished, the less will be the adverse economic impact.

At this point I might add that the version of this bill enacted by the other body, although disappointing, was somewhat stronger than the House version. I am this day urging the House conferees to move in the direction of the other version, because of its superiority. Specifically, I urge them to accept the provision that the Federal Trade Commission shall have the authority, after a 3 year moratorium, to appropriately regulate the advertising of tobacco.

This whole issue is important beyond my power to express. Over the years to come, hundreds of thousands of lives hang in the balance. Millions of young people now stand at the crossroads. A little courage on our part will help them in their agonizing predicament and will reap for them and for the Nation a richer harvest in health and human dignity.

The Polish Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the Polish people have endured much suffering under the Communist rule for years. But this has not taken the form of a passive acceptance of their overlords. The heavy hand of the Soviet Union has not diminished the desire of the Poles to live in freedom and dignity.

That the flame of freedom still flickers, and at times burns brightly, was demonstrated on this day 9 years ago when the factory workers in the industrial city of Poznan rebelled against the Communist-controlled regime. Driven to desperation by wages so low they could not even buy sufficient bread with

their pay, by complaints that had gone unheeded, the workers in the large steel plant, about 30,000 in all, staged an uprising which the government quickly branded as a revolt. Tanks were rolled in, artillery pounded the workers, and regular army troops mopped up the hapless workers. In a couple of days, when it was all over, more than 100 were dead and several hundred were wounded.

Though the gallant protest was snuffed out before it could spread to other towns, it did have some beneficial effects. The Polish Communist Government took heed and improved working conditions, trimmed the work week and raised pay scales.

But the meaning of this brief uprising was clear far beyond the reaches of this town in western Poland. It showed that despite Soviet oppression, the will, the desire for freedom is still very much alive in Poland. And it is this unquenchable spirit that we honor today on the ninth anniversary of the Poznan uprising.

The United Nations at 20

SPEECH

OF

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, at this time of year we celebrate not only the birth of our country, but we commemorate the founding of the United Nations. By long and painful struggle, we severed our nationhood from that of Great Britain; by longer and more tortured experience we discovered that we could not separate our welfare from that of the world. Indeed, just as the American Revolution of 1776 protested violations of the basic rights and dignities of man, so did the San Francisco Convention of 1945 protest too many years of bloodshed, privation, and subjugation of peoples against their will.

As the United Nations reaches its 20th anniversary, critics argue that the U.N. has passed from infancy to senility without a ripe middle age of maturity. While nations and nationalism have existed longer than an organization of nations, it is certain that the parents of the United Nations regarded her birth as a blessing to mankind. Much expectation has become fact. But like any organization, the United Nations, regardless of age, has no will of its own; rather, it behaves as its members behave. When states act wisely and in harmony, the United Nations is applauded for its maturity; when countries dishonor the spirit of the charter, the United Nations is rendered feeble, never its most powerful constituents.

My praise of and good wishes for the United Nations cannot adequately attest to the monuments constructed by the U.N. to the peace and security of man. Human beings are alive today as a result of the work done and being carried on by the United Nations Children's Fund, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, and the World Health Organization. For example, by 1962 the World Health Organization had freed 329 million people from the curse of malaria.

In the past few months Americans have become highly conscious of the word "escalation." I suggest that this term would be much more common to our vocabulary had not the United Nations intervened in Palestine, in Korea, and in the turbulent religious and ethnic conflict that is Cyprus. In 1956 the world created the first international peacekeeping force, the United Nations Emergency Force. Having this power to bolster the collective wishes of its members, the United Nations has restored peace to Suez, and more recently, has prevented the spread of greater and more ghastly horrors in the Congo. To utilize the Emergency Force in Vietnam merits serious attention, and although we cannot ignore the Soviet veto in the Security Council, neither can we pass over the United Nations as a vehicle of negotiations.

Today the United Nations labors under difficulties, but these troubles are overshadowed by the evils which the U.N. prevents and are dwarfed by the good which it has accomplished. Not long ago the Congress appropriated $200 million to help finance the operations of the United Nations. Can anyone in good conscience say that this was not a wise investment? Perhaps the future will necessitate another such investment. This I would heartily support, for as President Kennedy said of the United Nations in an address before the General Assembly in 1961:

> Were we but to let it die, to enfeeble its vigor, cripple its powers, we would condemn our future.

Let me say that unlike totalitarian nations, the United States is not and never will be afraid to put its principles and practices before the world in an open and honest fashion. But I shudder at the dire consequences that would ensue should the world not have a meeting place where the actions of its members could be cross-examined, where the wants of its peoples could be fulfilled, and where men could come and reason together.

The Honorable Olin D. Johnston

SPEECH

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina and the Nation suffered a gigantic loss when Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON crossed over the river to take his place in history.

Many great and distinguished men have served in the Congress of the United States from South Carolina, but I know of no man more dedicated to his own State and to his Nation.

OLIN JOHNSTON has left an indelible mark in the annals of our legislative history. He will be remembered by countless thousands for his leadership in improving the working conditions of those who serve in civilian capacities in the Federal Government. But, his tremendous accomplishments in this area cannot overshadow the greatness he achieved as the only individual in the history of South Carolina to twice serve as Governor.

Lawyer, soldier, Governor, Senator. There are few Americans who can claim the distinctions which he earned.

OLIN JOHNSTON knew the rigors of war, having served in combat in France in World War I. But, above all, OLIN JOHNSTON understood, loved, and respected the most valuable asset to which any nation can lay claim—its people.

OLIN JOHNSTON never forgot, not for one moment throughout his long and distinguished career, that people are the only truly indispensable national possession.

His efforts in behalf of the farmers of South Carolina, as well as the farmers throughout the United States, will long be remembered.

But, OLIN JOHNSTON did not limit his interest in human affairs to any one particular group, for he was also in the forefront in the fight for better working conditions for men and women everywhere.

He knew the vicissitudes of history. He served as Governor of the State of South Carolina when poverty and unemployment were common catastrophies for countless thousands. He served in the State legislature during periods of prosperity, and he served in the U.S. Senate at the height of World War II.

He was continuously reelected by the people he so ably represented.

I have lost a personal friend. The South has lost a distinguished and truly great son. But the Nation has lost an outstanding patriot who was dedicated to every cause which led to the betterment of our way of life.

No words of mine can console those of his family and friends who remain behind, but we can take solace in the knowledge that we were privileged to know, love, and respect a great man who left this world far better because he lived, and during his lifetime, devoted his towering intellect, his humanness, and his energy to people and their problems.

The Dominican Failure—And U.S. Role in It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James McCartney, of the Chicago Daily News Washington bureau, writes the following telling report on the critical moments of decision for the United States

with regard to the Dominican Republic since the assassination of Rafael Trujillo in 1961. As he points out, our Government had hoped to make the Dominican Republic a showcase of democracy in Latin America, but something, somewhere went wrong. Surely there are lessons to be learned from the sequence of events that led up to the present crisis in that land. I commend this report to the readers of the RECORD:

THE DOMINICAN FAILURE—AND THE U.S. ROLE IN IT

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—Ten huge trucks were lined up in the hot sun just outside the port of Haina, near Santo Domingo. They were loaded with rich, but rotting melons.

The melons were raised, with U.S. assistance, to build a commercial fruit industry in the Dominican Republic as a means of strengthening the island's economy. This was the first commercial shipment, destined for the fruit-starved east coast of the United States.

But gunfire rattled in the distance and the 10 trucks did not move. The port was blocked—tied up by U.S. Navy ships, bringing in supplies for marines.

There was to be no new market, no new industry.

"It was ironic," says Carter Ide, the soft-voiced, mustached head of the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) program in the Dominican Republic. "We succeeded in growing melons. But those trucks just sat there and the melons rotted. It was too late."

In this particular instance, it was too late because the U.S. Government had deliberately withdrawn its AID mission in the Dominican Republic to protest a change in government.

This is the story of much of what happened in the AID program in the Dominican Republic, the major effect of the United States to build a Caribbean democracy.

From the time of the assassination of Dominican dictator Rafael Trujillo in 1961, the United States poured upwards of $100 million into the Dominican Republic.

There were many points of crisis, but in retrospect it is clear the most critical moments of decision for the United States came on September 26, 1963—the day that Juan Bosch, the U.S.-supported President of the Dominican Republic was overthrown in a military-supported coup.

Bosch was the first freely elected President in Dominican history. Now he had been booted out by a military-supported junta—that hated symbol of Latin American dictatorship.

The United States has been criticized by liberals for tolerating—and sometimes supporting—Latin American dictatorships. President John F. Kennedy now had to make a choice.

His first choice was to withhold recognition from the new regime as a gesture of protest. His second was to withdraw the U.S. AID mission.

He announced that the United States would withhold some $55 million in loan and grant aid, much of it administered by AID.

Toward the end of October President Kennedy stated U.S. objectives: The United States sought a "restoration of constitutional government" in the Dominican Republic.

That would seem to have been an argument for the restoration of Bosch. An argument raged in Latin circles at the time over whether the United States should recognize the new regime. Some European countries did.

In the State Department the new regime did not look too bad.

Pressures were exerted upon the junta to promise new elections—a tactic that has become a ritual in Latin American coups.

Donald Reid Cabral, then emerging as the country's new leader, promised the elections. Later, however, they were postponed. The most recent promised date was this coming September.

State Department officials say they were seriously worried at the time by the possibility of a military coup—a move by the far right wing that would have meant certain dictatorship.

As time passed, the longer they looked at Reid the more they felt he was truly a moderate with whom they could deal.

While arguments raged in the island republic, however, President Kennedy was assassinated. Suddenly there were new questions.

Only a few weeks after President Johnson took office, the junta was formally recognized, leading to wide speculation that Mr. Johnson had abandoned what was believed to be Kennedy's antijunta attitude.

State Department officials insist this sequence of events was misleading—that Kennedy actually made the decision to recognize the junta before he was slain.

When Reid actually assumed the Presidency in January 1964, the United States was deliberately cool. There was no rush to get a new Ambassador to the scene to replace John Bartlow Martin, who had worked closely with Bosch.

It wasn't until April—7 months after the AID mission was removed—that a new mission was established and the program resumed.

By State Department standards, Reid proved to be a top-notch President. No one believes he had wide popular support, but he was a tough administrator.

The economy was running wild and United States and International Monetary Fund experts advised Reid that he needed to institute an "austerity" program.

The military, among others, who fought him tooth and nail, were using military planes to fly in huge quantities of contraband goods—in violation of import regulations. Military brass were getting rich on the proceeds.

When Reid sought to crack down on the military, he lost vital military support.

Then he had more bad luck. The bottom dropped out of sugar prices—and sugar is the basic commodity of the Dominican economy. Sugar prices had risen to an astronomical 12 or 13 cents a pound the previous year because of worldwide shortages. The result was a vast overproduction of sugar around the world—and in the Dominican Republic.

By last September, the penalty for overproduction became apparent—prices dropped to 2½ or 3 cents a pound.

At one time, U.S. experts figured that Reid's government would survive if it could just get through April. The rebellion erupted April 24.

"Reid did everything the experts wanted," says one State Department official. "But every time he did something right, he lost political support. He lost the generals for cracking down on graft, labor for trying to stop featherbedding. He had no political sense."

But most of his advice, it should be recalled, was coming from the United States.

A key point, however, is that Reid actually had little meaningful U.S. help through his most critical days. This was not because of a lack of desire to help. It was an outgrowth of the cancellation of the AID program when Bosch was overthrown.

An AID program cannot be built overnight, and the U.S. program that had been built up in previous years went to pot in the months after it was withdrawn.

Ide, the head of the new mission that was established last April, says he found the program a shambles when he arrived in Santo Domingo.

According to official figures, the United States promised a total of about $65 million in AID funds to support the Reid regime. That was more than the United States had committed to Bosch.

Ide says he believes that if the reinstituted program had had more time to develop it could have been "politically decisive" in the Dominican Republic. In other words, it could have saved Reid.

But he says it was no strong enough at the time the rebellion began.

How much more time would he have needed?

"In 4 months we could have had visible evidence of the program—in the form of new housing in the slums, rural development programs, that sort of thing," says Ide.

Many State Department officials now believe it was a mistake to withdraw the AID program from the Dominican Republic. Some believe that the lesson to be learned is that aid funds should not be used to try to apply political leverage.

"We should try to help the people," says one. "In the long run that would do us the most good. We may lose sometimes, but in the long run it would be the best policy."

There are other dilemmas as well. Few in the State Department believe that Bosch was stable enough to have become a successful leader.

"As a Government administrator," says one, "he was a great short story writer." Officials doubt, even in retrospect, if restoring Bosch to power would have proven successful.

Almost all officials take the view that Dominicans are so politically immature that expecting them to operate a democracy in the U.S. pattern is asking too much.

"Maybe we tried elections too soon," says one. "Perhaps we should think in terms of permitting long periods of political education before pushing so hard for elections."

Should the United States have recognized the new regime in the Dominican Republic when Bosch was overthrown? Should it have withdrawn its AID mission?

Few here pretend to have absolute answers to these key questions of the Dominican crisis.

But evidence does suggest, however, that U.S. indecision on the questions may have contributed heavily to the Dominican tragedy.

Recall of Lyndon Johnson's 1959 Statements to Doctors in 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD today, for the benefit of my colleagues, the remarks of Dr. Ralph C. Teall, president of the California Medical Association, before the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association in New York on June 24, 1965. They are as follows:

I would like to remind this House that in its clinical session in Dallas, Tex., in December 1959, we had the honor of hearing from the late great Speaker of the U.S.

House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, and the Senator from Texas, Lyndon B. Johnson. It will be remembered that Senator Johnson was just recovering from the effects of a very serious attack of coronary heart disease. Mr. Johnson's comments included these statements:

"No respectable American could stand before an audience of your profession without feeling—as I do—both high respect and deep gratitude. My respect is objective. My gratitude—as you well understand—is very personal.

"I appreciate this opportunity to express my feelings to you on the occasion of your visit to our State. I don't know how it is with doctors in some other States, but I know that doctors in Texas want a good deal more from their public officials than respect and gratitude.

"The members of the medical profession in our State have themselves—and want from those who serve them—a strong interest in freedom.

"This is one thing that the profession has in common with all 9 million Texans and all 179 million Americans.

"It is not good for the Nation when its doctors have cause to fear those in public office—nor is it good when those in public office have cause to fear its doctors."

Gentlemen, the time of questioning and distrust has arisen. It is here today. The time is now. However, I am hopeful that our present questions can be resolved.

But now is the time to take the matter to the President of the United States, Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson, the man I have just quoted. I therefore urge that this reference committee report be amended to include:

"*Resolved*, That this house of delegates restate its offer to meet with the President of the United States through our legislative task force to discuss proposed medical care legislation with a view to safeguarding the continued provision of the highest quality and availability of medical care to the people of the United States."

Your New Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, newspapers in small cities quite accurately reflect the thinking of the majority of people in their communities. The Advertiser Tribune, Tiffin, Ohio, is such a paper and one of its editorials shows the views of the people in that area on the administration's housing bill. As the House begins debate on this incredible proposal, I think it is important to note that the average taxpayer who wants to take care of himself deeply resents being forced to pay rent for others who are equally able to take care of themselves. The editorial follows:

YOUR NEW DEPENDENTS

The administration has the votes to pass its new housing bill, which means that we taxpayers may soon have up to 4 million more families as dependents. These are the ones who will be eligible for a fantastic new housing subsidy for middle-income families.

Those who will be eligible for the proposed Federal payments of part of their rent are not poor. They are earning up to $8,000 a year—or more than $150 a week. They will be eligible for the subsidy if they pay a larger percentage of their income for rent or home payments than someone in the Government thinks is ideal.

We all know that the high wages paid to construction workers under their union contracts have made fine housing at low prices hard to find. But how can we justify using tax money to pay rent for all but the upper-income families? It is the vast number of middle-income families who pay most of the taxes from which such subsidies will have to be paid.

What is to be gained by taxing such families, and then through an elaborate accounting process giving part of the tax money back to them for rent?

Perhaps the secret lies in a conviction in Government housing circles that people ought to spend more for homes than they do. If they are denied the right to use this part of their incomes unless it goes for housing, the proportion spent on housing can be raised forcibly.

One thing is sure. Never has a subsidy been devised which so clearly demonstrates the principle that Government can only give you what it takes away from you.

Emery Air Freight Corp. Awarded President's E Certificate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, Emery Air Freight Corp. of Wilton, Conn., a pioneer in its field, was recently awarded the President's E Certificate for Excellence in Export Service.

As the award citation said:

Emery Air Freight Corp. has dramatically expanded its foreign freight business and services to exporters.

By providing worldwide shipment monitoring service, packaging advice, expeditions delivery and informational material on potential trade areas, Emery has greatly aided its customers in solving export problems. The activities of Emery Air Freight Corp. reflect credit on management, employees and the American system of free enterprise.

Therefore, I am pleased to offer for the RECORD, the fine remarks of James J. McNulty, Emery's president, who accepted the award in a ceremony in Wilton earlier this month.

Mr. McNulty's remarks follow:

ADDRESS OF JAMES J. MCNULTY

American industry, as it reaches for expansion of its market areas, expansion vitally necessary to absorb our ever-increasing production capacity, must look to the world market. America exports a lower portion of its total gross national product than any other highly industrialized nation. National interest and balance-of-payment problems are strong motivating factors in the export drive but nothing is quite as strong as economic motivation.

Increased productivity as we move further and further into the age of automation must find more outlets for that productivity than the domestic economy can absorb.

As our industry looks to the world marketplace, it will find a willing and indeed an enthusiastic partner in the air transportation industry. Airfreight, on a time basis, has brought every corner of the globe to your doorstep. Today, thanks to airfreight, Timbuktu is no farther away than was Chicago only 10 or 15 years ago.

Airfreight eliminates the need for large investments in overseas warehousing and extensive inventories tied up in slow surface transportation. Companies, large and small, can enter the international marketplace today with the ease and facility of opening a Midwest sales territory a decade ago.

The President's E Certificate for Export Service is gratefully accepted in behalf of the Emery Air Freight Corp. and, in a larger sense, it is accepted as a recognition of the role of airfreight as an essential ingredient in our country's export drive.

United Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has just celebrated its 20th anniversary in San Francisco. I can see very little about which to celebrate. President Johnson spoke at the meeting and extolled the virtues of the accomplishments of the U.N. in keeping the peace and stopping aggression of one nation against another. On this score, the U.N. is a woeful failure.

Wars of aggression are fought to acquire dominion and control over people and nations. They are motivated by covetousness, a desire to take that which is not rightfully theirs without paying for it. It is the same motivation that promotes robbery, murder, and rape.

The President appeared to be completely naive. He lives in the center of the Nation's Capital, an area comprising only 10 square miles and, yet, he cannot stop the selfish criminal element in this small speck of real estate. You dare not walk the streets alone or travel on a bus without the constant fear of criminal attack. Crime in the Nation's Capital is at its highest point in history and still rising. Policemen on patrol have to be accompanied by police dogs for their own protection. How, then, can you expect the people and the nations of the world to succumb to his plea for righteousness?

The respect for the United States has gone steadily downward since the creation of the United Nations. The Korean conflict was a United Nations operation, paid for mostly by the United States, with 156,000 casualties. It was the United Nations which prevented General MacArthur from crossing the Yalu River to destroy the Red Chinese sanctuary and forced the retreat to the 38th parallel where the U.N. negotiated the peace. That negotiated peace was a colossal failure and, for the 12 years following that so-called peace, the United States has had to maintain between 10,000 and 20,000 men along the 38th parallel, and the end is not in sight.

The U.N. is responsible for the failure at the Bay of Pigs. That operation was well planned and would have been suc-

cessfully executed except for the intervention of the U.N. Because of that fiasco, the Berlin wall was built, and Castro exported his communism to Latin and Central America and forced us to send our troops to the Dominican Republic.

Since the formation of the United Nations, communism has had its appalling expansion. Where was the United Nations when Russia invaded Budapest? The U.N. did nothing when India invaded Goa, a Portuguese enclave in India. The Communist pirate, Sukarno, was permitted to take over the Dutch possessions a thousand miles away from Indonesia and was not even condemned by the U.N. for this action.

The U.N. involvement in the Belgian Congo was reprehensible. It allied itself with the Communist leaders of the Congo to destroy the great non-Communist Province of the Katanga and then, after destroying it, they asked the leader of Katanga, Moise Tshombe, to try to put the pieces together. Hundreds of Americans were murdered by the Communist rebels, and the United States finally came to their rescue. All of this could, and should, have been avoided. The coalition government of Laos was the handiwork of the United Nations.

For several years the Congo-based Communist rebels of Angola, a Portuguese colony, have been raiding and murdering the inhabitants thereof with the full consent of the United Nations. Angola is one of the most progressive colonies in Africa.

If the United Nations can extricate itself from its financial difficulties, it is planning an all-out U.N. attack on one of our best allies, Portugal, to wrest from it its two African colonies. Portugal has strong military establishments, especially on the sea, and the estimated cost of this military operation by the U.N. is expected to exceed $400 million. Thus, the U.N. becomes an organization, not for peace, but for war. The U.N. is further planning to overthrow the Government of the Union of South Africa, the most powerful and wealthy member of the British Empire on the African Continent.

Many members of the U.N. have not paid their dues and assessments, and it is apparent that the United States is planning to recommend that article 19 of the U.N. Charter be completely disregarded, thereby permitting the delinquent nations to vote. The increase in membership of the U.N., made up of countries with a few hundred thousand population, has so diluted the voting power that 10 percent of the population of the U.N. membership now controls 66 percent of the voting strength of that organization. This is a far cry from one man, one vote that the Supreme Court has inflicted on the United States. Some 56 countries, with a combined population of less than that of the United States, have about 50 percent of the voting strength. The odds are just too great against the survival of this country.

Sixty-five merchant ships from Britain, Japan, Greece, Norway, Holland, and Lebanon carried supplies to North Vietnam, which is the aggressor against South Vietnam, but you have not heard the U.N. object. All of these foregoing six countries participate lavishly in our foreign aid funds, paid for by the sweat of the American taxpayer.

The President urged the U.N. to help negotiate a settlement in South Vietnam. This would constitute a surrender to the Communists, and we might just as well bring all of our military forces home immediately because we cannot win with the United Nations in the picture. The last 15 years of this operation is living proof of this.

Double Time for Overtime: Views of Edward H. Lane, the Lane Co., Inc., of Altavista, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished constituent, Mr. Edward H. Lane, chairman of the board of the Lane Co., Inc., of Altavista, Va., exercising his constitutional right to petition the Congress, has asked me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements he made concerning legislation pending before the Committee on Education and Labor. With the unanimous consent of the House, I quote the same herewith:

VIEWS OF EDWARD H. LANE

I am very much afraid that this bill providing doube time for overtime after 48 hours, if passed, is going to reduce production in this country in probably 90 to 95 percent of the areas, because certainly in this southeastern area, except probably in the coalfields section, there is no available labor with any sort of manufacturing training; and if this double time for overtime goes in, it will of course mean complete elimination of overtime beyond the 48 hours, as competitive situations will not permit the payment of double time. That, of course, will mean reduced production, which will add fuel to inflation.

In this particular area, there is no worthwhile labor available except inexperienced women who have never worked in a plant, and it takes a very expensive training period to make them profitable employees. So, rather than go through this expensive training period, we will just have to reduce our production as much as the reduction in overtime hours makes it necessary.

We in manufacturing can do most anything if you will give us time enough to get organized for it and get our people trained; so I would recommend, by all means, if this double time for overtime is seriously considered, that we extend the time of enforcement certainly at least 12 months, to give employers an opportunity to get organized to cope with the situation; and it will probably be necessary to build some additional facilities, and you can't get those available in much less than 12 months. So, while I think double time for overtime is uneconomical and will tend to reduce production in most of the plants in this country, I think if you are going to put it in anyway, regardless of whether it is the right thing to do or not, then you ought to extend the time it will go into effect at least 12 months from the time it is passed.

This matter of increasing the minimum wage, in my judgment, will reduce employment, because there are so many untrained people now on the minimum wage who are not worth the present minimum wage that we employers, if we have to pay them any more, certainly during a 6 to 12 months training period, will just have to get rid of them.

Of course, the enactment of an increase in the minimum wage will affect the Southeast, and probably the Southwest, more than it will the rest of the country which is heavily unionized and where the minimums are now above the $1.25 an hour, but the increasing of the minimum wage will definitely increase the cost of everything produced in the Southeast and Southwest; and that means raw materials, agricultural and manufactured products, because when you increase the minimum you pretty well have to increase those above the minimum about the same percentage; otherwise, you have a very unhappy working force.

The increase to $1.50 that the unions are serious about would mean a 20-percent increase. I hope those of you who are considering voting for such an increase will thoroughly consider what that is going to do to the cost of living, and how you are going to put money in one pocket and take it out of another.

This increase in the minimum wage will also affect the farmers very greatly. It will just add to their problems, because when business in an area increases its minimum the farmers almost have to do the same thing. If your committee decides that you are going to put in a minimum wage to please the labor union leaders, and you are not going to give too much consideration to the economics of the matter, then by all means, I would suggest that you put this in over a period of time, say, an increase of 5 cents an hour each year until the minimum reaches $1.50. In that way, we would have a chance to increase our efficiency and our training program enough to offset it. But if you should go from $1.25 to $1.50, and then pass a bill for double time for overtime, you are surely going to add a tremendous amount of fuel to the inflationary fire, and I would certainly advise against that. With a 20-percent increase in the minimum wage, which is going to be reflected all the way through the workforce eventually, and all the way through our economy, you are certainly going to increase the cost of living in this country. You are going to put more money in the workmen's pockets in pay and take more out in the cost of living. So, I would suggest that this matter be approached with the utmost caution and consideration.

First Reunion of the "Callaway"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE SCHISLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, the first reunion of the U.S.S. *Callaway* (*APA-35*) is scheduled for August 1–4, 1965, at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C. Reservations are to be made by July 22 with Mr. Wallace Shipp, 5319 Manning Place NW., Washington, D.C., or Mr. Duane E. Bluhm, 633 Stearns Avenue, Washington, D.C.

The *Callaway* was launched October 10, 1942, by Western Pipe & Steel Co. in San Francisco, Calif., under a Maritime

Commission contract. The *Callaway* sailed from Norfolk October 23, 1943, for San Diego and began the training of marines in preparation for the first of her five assaults. She landed troops for her initial firing at Kwajalein. She next sailed to Guadalcanal and from there proceeded, with combat troops, for the occupation of Emirau. The *Callaway's* third assault was the Battle of Saipan, June 15. She then launched her troops September 17 in the Palaus and returned to Manus and New Guinea to prepare for her assignment to the first reinforcement echelon for the northern Leyte landings.

The *Callaway* distinguished herself as a member of the Blue Beach Attack Group in the Lingayen assault. In January of 1945 a suicide plane broke through heavy antiaircraft fire to crash on the *Callaway's* bridge. Damage was able to be kept to a minimum, but 29 of the *Callaway's* crew were killed and 22 were wounded. Temporary repairs put her back in action and she carried Marine reinforcements from Guam to Iwo Jima.

She continued to transport men and equipment between the bases and operating areas of the Western Pacific, and then embarked Japanese prisoners of war at Pearl Harbor. Two transpacific voyages carrying homeward bound veterans ended with the *Callaway's* own return to San Francisco March 12 1946.

Reapportionment Bill: Manny Celler Plays the Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I have heard many demands in the House that it be permitted to "work its will" on legislation. I support this principle, but apparently some of our Members who have demanded that such a practice be followed have their own exceptions to it. Particularly, when they are opposed to the legislation and the will of the House would be to pass the same. Could this be why the reapportionment matter has not been brought to the floor of this House?

William S. White's column appearing in the June 28, 1965, issue of the Washington Post indicates that it is. His article follows:

REAPPORTIONMENT BILL: MANNY CELLER PLAYS THE GAME

(By William S. White)

A great crime against what the very-liberals so tirelessly call "the majority will" is being committed at stately leisure in the House of Representatives.

This time, however, the country hears no righteous outcries against the infamous process that the very-liberals so tirelessly denounce as the bottling up of legislation desired by a majority.

For this time the majority will that is being thwarted is not the will of the very-liberals, but only that of everybody else. This time the bottling up is being done to a bill desired by everybody else, but a bill implacably opposed by the very-liberals. So this time the bad guys are good guys.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of Brooklyn, chairman by grace of seniority of the House Judiciary Committee, is making it perfectly plain that, majority will or no majority will, he has no intention whatever of allowing the House itself even to vote on a proposed constitutional amendment.

It is an amendment demonstrably and in the highest degree "democratic"—but it has the fatal defect of not being agreeable to the city constituences of CELLER and many another. For, should it be submitted by Congress to the States and ratified by three-fourths of them, it would permit the people themselves to decide how the upper houses of their State legislatures should be apportioned as between the urban and rural districts.

In a word, people would be allowed to decide whether an unelected Supreme Court has the right to proclaim, as it has done, that the seats in their upper legislative houses must hereafter be allocated on mere headcounts of population. It would permit the people, if they chose, to go on taking minority geographic needs and interests into account. It would allow them to continue the principle of weighted democracy which is the bottom meaning of the whole American idea of government by check and balance.

Failing some corrective on the court, the simple fact is that within 10 years the city masses, often boss-led to begin with, will totally overrun both houses of nearly every legislature in the Nation.

No one denies, because no one can deny, that in both branches of Congress those who wish to offer this amendment to the States have clear majorities, if not necessarily the two-thirds that would be required. But the very liberals, who are also in nearly every case very urban politicians, are determined not to give these manifest majorities even an outside chance to put their case to Congress. They simply want the whole business bottled up. And bottling it up for them is MANNY CELLER. MANNY is using the entrenched seniority of a committee chairman, a seniority that the very liberals scream at day in and day out as an evil beyond compare—when nonliberals use it, that is.

And if as a top member of the establishment in Congress even MANNY's capacity for candid obstruction turns out not to be enough, then a band of very liberal and shriekingly antiestablishment men over in the Senate is waiting to come in with another weapon that they have never ceased to condemn. This is the filibuster, to prevent a majority from having opportunity to vote on an issue—a weapon which the head of the antiestablishment forces, Senator JOSEPH CLARK of Pennsylvania, has made a career of attacking.

Still, there is a very great human difference between what MANNY CELLER is doing and what the professional critics of the establishment are doing. MANNY has never claimed that there ought to be two standards and two rules for fair play, one set for his side and a different set for the wrong side. MANNY accepts the right of the other side to use the traditional congressional processes to beat him if they can. MANNY thus feels free, and is free, to use these processes himself in his own causes. The difference might be said to be simply this: MANNY talks from the same side of his mouth all the time. This is why MANNY, though a liberal, is not a very liberal.

The Real Alabama—Part XVIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the story of the real Alabama includes industrial growth, educational advancement, tourism activity, and other aspects of a vigorous, growing economy. But perhaps more importantly it includes people.

In Alabama we have people who are genuinely gracious in nature. Our people are also able, courageous, and forward-looking. One of our State citizens of whom we are very proud is Charlie Boswell, a great American.

The story of Charlie Boswell has been told effectively by a Pennsylvania newspaperman who visited in Alabama recently. He is Mr. Joe Tronzo of the News Tribune at Beaver Falls, Pa.

His article appeared in the June 23 issue of that newspaper, and I want to call attention to it here because it is an article I wish all American citizens would read. Charlie Boswell is truly a significant part of the real Alabama story:

THE CHARLIE BOSWELL STORY

(By Joe Tronzo)

It is very rarely that I feel humble, but during my trip to Alabama, I felt that way in the presence of Charlie Boswell, a former University of Alabama gridder.

Today Boswell runs a successful insurance agency and plays golf in the low 90's.

Now there are a lot of successful insurance agents and certainly plenty of people who fire in the low 90's.

But Charlie Boswell is blind.

Recently the versatile athlete from Alabama was voted blind father of the year.

His story is one of ups and downs and has proved interesting and one of the real bright spots of the trip.

To talk to a man like Boswell was refreshing and one in which you could have written a volume.

But my own tight itinary and his extremely busy schedule did not allow a lot of time.

But the time spent was certainly rewarding and gave me an insight on a man who suddenly woke up to find that he would live in a world of darkness forever.

Then the second awakening came when he decided not to feel sorry for himself and that there was a place for blind people in the world.

Boswell was an infantry captain with the 84th Division in the early drive through Germany.

Late summer and early fall saw the allies tear through the Nazi forces and send them reeling back to the German border and the vaunted Siegfried line.

It was to be a home-for-Christmas deal, and it looked as if the terrible carnage started in September of 1939 was finally coming to an end.

Then the supply problems started and the Americans had run out their string.

Meanwhile the Germans realizing they were fighting on their own home soil and with the promise of terrible new weapons by Hitler, stiffened.

It was a yard-by-yard battle and little towns like Puffendorf, Ubach, Linder, Apweiler, Baseweiler, Gerensowiler, Geilenkirchen and Linnich became as important as Berlin.

I was a member of the 102d Division and we were operating on the flank with the 84th. We were also doing some hedgehopping and little villages, many consisting of just a few farmhouses, became scenes of bloody action.

The reason I bring this up is that while I had never met Boswell, I operated within yards of his own unit.

The Germans were putting up a terific struggle and the turnip fields and the apple orchards were scenes of quick death.

The Germans were fanatics and suicide units were everywhere allowing an outfit to bypass them and then hitting the Americans from the rear.

The losses were the heaviest in months and the new units like the 84th Railsplitters and the 102d Ozarks were getting bloodied.

At first the new units were put in quiet areas with such veteran outfits as the 2d Armored, "Hell on Wheels" Division, and the 30th Division.

Dut the quiet front exploded in November of 1944 and the Americans started a move forward and crossed the insignificant Roer River.

It was at a little town, Lindern, that Captain Boswell was hit.

Boswell was trying to help a wounded GI from a tank when a shell hit. Boswell was hit and thrown to the ground.

He suffered wounds above the upper body and head.

He was later taken to base hospital and wound up in England. At first it was thought that his sight could be saved but each day, the hope disappeared.

Boswell was finally removed to Valley Forge General Hospital and more treatment was underway under some of the best eye doctors in the country.

There were nine operations in all but came the day in March of 1945 when it seemed the whole world had crashed for Charley Boswell.

After the usual series of tests, the doctor informed Captain Boswell that there was no hope and he would be blind.

The timing was extremely bad because Mrs. Boswell was on her way to see her husband.

She did not know the nature of Charlie's wound.

Mrs. Boswell arrived at the hospital and managed to get into the building. She wandered around the hospital looking for her husband.

It was a depressing scene that greeted Mrs. Boswell as she went through the many wards and saw the wounded. Valley Forge had some of the most serious and most horrible of wounds suffered by the Americans.

Many were skin grafts and had just been applied and many of the men were in terrible shape.

She finally found her husband but he did not tell her he would be blind until the next day.

It was a time to cry and probably the most disappointing day in the life of the young couple.

Prior to entering the service, Charles had been a halfback at Alabama under Frank Thomas, whose winning record ranks with the best of all time. He was a starter in 1938 and 1939.

But it was in baseball that Charlie was rated highly.

After graduation in 1940, he played baseball for a Birmingham steel mill. Charlie had worked in the mills and was a rugged individual.

He was offered a baseball contract with Atlanta and was to have reported in 1941. But he was drafted and went to the service.

After a regular tour of duty with the Army, he finally joined the 84th Division at Camp Howze in Texas. He became a company commander in an infantry regiment.

Then came the Louisiana maneuvers, a trip to various camps and the shipment overseas.

Immediately after it was learned that he would be permanently blind, Charlie went through a period of orientation.

Kenny Gleason of Pennsylvania, was one who worked with him in the orientation program. He suggested golf and Charlie was not enthused.

But he took up the game and became a bug.

Meanwhile he returned to Birmingham and in the annual spring intrasquad game of the University of Alabama, the contest was dedicated to Boswell.

Over 31,000 persons were on hand with the receipts listed at $35,000. The money was to be used to buy Charlie a home and also set up a trust fund.

For awhile he worked in the sporting goods department of Loveman's, one of the leading stores in Birmingham.

Later he went into a shoe business venture but this failed and he lost a considerable amount of money.

Then he started his own insurance business and has been doing very well.

It was in golf that he was most prominent as he took up the game seriously.

He has won the national blind title 13 out of 16 times and the international championship, 7 times.

His best score has been an 81 and he has played with the best in exhibition rounds.

Name important people and he has golfed with them. Two of his favorites are Arnie Palmer and Bob Hope.

In 1957, he was voted the most courageous athlete of the year. He has won the Golf Writers Association award and the Ben Hogan award.

In 1960, he appeared on Ralph Edwards' "This Is Your Life" TV program.

Charlie has three children, a daughter Kay, 21, Chuck, a sophomore at the University of Alabama, taking medicine, and Stevie, 14, who is rated a good football prospect.

Chuck was rated a fine center in high school.

Extremely busy, Charlie conducts a daily sport show over WATV, in Birmingham.

Asked if he had met Joe Namath, Charlie said, "Of course, and I thought he was a courteous, well-mannered, and mature youngster. Certainly he deserves the best in everything he does."

I was with Charlie only a short time and it was enlightening.

You can feel mighty inferior in front of a person who had been active and suddenly loses his eyesight.

But he was one of the friendliest persons I ever met. It took about 2 minutes to realize, you might have known him all your life.

He puts everyone at ease and has an outlook on life that is superior to most people you meet—even without handicaps.

The meeting with Boswell was arranged by Bill Woodey of WATV.

As we were leaving, Charlie got into a freight elevator run by a colored girl.

She was extremely kind and Charlie talked to her and asked about her family.

Extremely interested in people, he asked the girl why she had missed choir practice at her church. She made some excuse and Charlie kindly told her to keep up her interest in music and church.

It was just one of the human traits of Charlie to be interested in people, regardless of color.

Determination and courage are probably two abused words in the English language.

But when it comes to Charlie Boswell, they will have to do until someone else comes up with something better, and until someone comes up with something better than Charlie Boswell. As I look around, that may be a long time.

Clean Up the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, the desecration of the Great Lakes and the other natural resources of our country are, as we know, endangered by pollution and long neglect.

Fortunately, Americans are now becoming increasingly aware of the need to halt this poisoning of our waterways before it becomes too late and they are in support of legislation to enforce such action.

This problem was accurately stated in editorials appearing recently in the Janesville Daily Gazette, and the Kenosha News, two of the leading daily newspapers in Wisconsin's First District, and the State of Wisconsin.

The editorials make the point that the danger in some areas is almost beyond elimination and that the conscience of Americans must be stirred now to take immediate steps to preserve the Nation's natural resources. I am pleased to include these fine editorials, "Clean Up the Great Lakes" and "Pollution Perils Grow" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorials follow:

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette, June 2, 1965]

CLEAN UP THE GREAT LAKES

At long last the Nation is becoming aware of the true value of its natural resources, particularly its water and waterways. Wisconsin is more and more concerned with the tremendous advantages of its lakes and rivers. Now Congress is being asked for legislation to reduce pollution of the Great Lakes.

A recent bill, introduced by Senator GAYLORD NELSON, is aimed at the pollution of the lakes and other navigable waters by ships and marine terminals which service them. It would require that all vessels on these waters have approved sewage and refuse disposal facilities by January 1, 1970.

It would also ban discharge of oil into the Great Lakes and give the Coast Guard full authority to enforce laws against pollution by ships and simplify the prosecution by violators. A similar bill is sponsored in the House by Representative LYNN STALBAUM.

The true value of the Great Lakes to the Nation's midsection cannot be estimated. They are the life blood of industries, the source of fresh water to dozens of cities and towns, including Metropolitan Chicago and Detroit. They afford transportation of iron ore, automobiles, wheat and hundreds of commodities. The St. Lawrence Seaway has brought the sea to the Midwest, opening new markets abroad and revolutionizing our foreign trade.

Month by month the lakes become more vital to the livelihood, the recreational and

economic future of the Midwest. Yet every year these wonderful waters become more polluted by cities, industries, and by ships.

The public, swarming to the cool waters, is warned to stay clear of beaches in Chicago, Milwaukee, and other communities. Pollution in waters on southern Lake Michigan is "almost irreversible," Senator NELSEN declared. Lake Erie is polluted almost beyond recovery, some scientists believe.

The bill concerning cleanup of ship dumping strikes at only one source, but it is a start and deserves support. Industrial refuse, chemicals, and urban discharge are the great pollutants.

Public conscience must be aroused if bills such as this one are to be passed. The time is late. Pollution of these waters is spreading in such volume that the lakes may be ruined for many basic purposes before the public awakes to its irreparable loss.

[From the Kenosha (Wis.) News, June 19, 1965]

POLLUTION PERILS GROW

Events have created a sense of urgency in the matter of solving the pollution of the Great Lakes.

Milwaukee has found pollution of the two Grant Park beaches is up to seven times the tolerable limit set by the U.S. Health Service.

Concern has been voiced in Racine about pollution of the North Beach and the 14th Street beach.

This strikes at Kenosha, for past performance indicates that refuse from Racine winds up on Kenosha beaches, carried here by Lake Michigan currents.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON recently told Congress that the pollution of the southern tip of Lake Michigan may already have progressed so far that it is irreversible, in the opinion of experts.

Senator NELSON reported that for 64 days last year, beaches on Chicago's south side were unsafe for bathing. One beach at Hammond, Ind., has been closed for 15 years. At Milwaukee, some public beaches have been closed off and on since 1959. At Green Bay, public beaches have been closed for 25 years.

The Senator has introduced legislation designed to end the pollution of the Great Lakes by ships and the shore installations which service them.

This is a worthy cause, but it must be remembered that pollution comes in many forms. Many communities do not have adequate sewage treatment plants. Others have excellent sewage treatment plants but discharge raw sewage into public waters during storms because storm and sanitary sewers are interconnected.

The pollution problem has become one of the major issues of the day, one which should hold the attention of every individual. Lawmakers who move rapidly to meet the challenge deserve public support and encouragement.

A Tribute to Lance Cpl. Russell Rowe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 19, 1965, death came to a young Marine lance corporal, Russell Rowe, of Zion, Ill., one of the first casualties in our military operations in Santo Domingo in behalf of freedom and stability in that country.

Lance Corporal Rowe exemplified the courage and loyalty of the Marine Corps and of our Nation's military men in all the services. On April 30, Corporal Rowe led a fire team of four men in the occupation of an area protecting a group of snipers. Although the operation was successful and Corporal Rowe acquitted himself with exceptional bravery, he suffered grievous wounds from which he failed to recover. Corporal Rowe's experience was the subject of national recognition, and upon his arrival at Walter Reed Army Hospital in Washington he was provided with the most expert medical assistance and support in valiant efforts to save his life.

Corporal Rowe's courage on the battlefield and in his final struggle for life was supported by the devotion and steadfast attention of his loving mother, Mrs. Dorothy Harkness, and his fiance, Miss Dora Compostella, whom he intended to marry in August. Mrs. Harkness and Miss Compostella came to washington as soon as they received word that Russell was at Walter Reed, and remained with him constantly. They were both at his side when death came. Corporal Rowe was also visited by his brother Richard who is a member of the Marine Corps stationed in California and who was flown to Walter Reed Army Hospital to visit with his brother immediately following his arrival there and again during his final hours.

Corporal Rowe is also survived by a brother, Robert, 14, and two sisters, Anita, 11, and Kathleen, 9, and by his maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Barcarella of Chicago, and his stepfather, Meryl Harkness of Zion.

Cpl. Russell Rowe graduated from Steinmetz High School, Chicago, in 1961, and had completed his entrance examinations for later admission to Wright Junior College. He enlisted in the Marine Corps in November 1961, and received his recruit training at San Diego. He also served aboard the U.S.S. *Coral Sea* before being sent to the Dominican Republic.

The Marine Corps under its commandant, Gen. Wallace Greene, rendered every possible service in attending to the fatal wounds of Corporal Rowe and the corps extended appropriate honor to this young Marine hero. The award of the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star with the official citations are also to be presented posthumously by the Marine Corps.

Shortly after receiving word of his wounds, an American flag was flown over the Capitol in Washington and also above the Marine Memorial Iwo Jima statue at Arlington. While it was not possible to deliver this flag to Corporal Rowe during his lifetime, it is to be presented to his loving mother and other members of the family in ceremonies which are now being arranged.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad duty which has befallen me but one about which I want all Members of this House and the people of the Nation to know. While Corporal Rowe is but one young man in the community of Zion in the 12th District of Illinois, a son, grandson, brother, and fiance of one small group, he is in a larger sense representative of all the gallant young men who are serving with our military forces in various parts of the world. His bravery, his sacrifice, his devotion to his country, are significant in that the cause to which our Nation is dedicated is that of freedom and peace for all mankind. The affection and devotion which many persons held for this young man, and particularly the love demonstrated by his devoted mother, cannot help but touch the hearts of all and elicit expressions of profound sympathy on the part of all Americans toward the family which survives him.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute and honor to a fallen hero of the U.S. Marine Corps, Lance Cpl. Russell Rowe, and I bow my head in prayer and in the knowledge that Russell Rowe, the spiritual child of God, lives eternally in heaven.

Why L.B.J. Wants McKee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the bill making it possible for General McKee to be appointed Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, it was difficult to find out the paramount reasons for setting aside the law.

Apparently Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott found out at least one of the reasons, as set forth in the following article which was published in the Northern Virginia Sun on the 24th of June:

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Arlington, Va., June 24, 1965]

WHY L.B.J. WANTS MCKEE

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

President Johnson invoked his prestige and resorted to a unique backstage appeal in clearing the way for Senate confirmation of Gen. William McKee, his choice to head the Federal Aviation Agency.

He made the confirmation fight, including the successful battle to obtain a legislative waiver for a military man to head the FAA, a loyalty showdown between President Charles de Gaulle and himself.

Although there has been no public mention of this international interjection, the President personally called individual Senators opposed to McKee's nomination and bluntly told them a vote against the highly respected retired Air Force general would help De Gaulle and hurt his own prestige.

He made no bones about his concern that France, locked in a tight race with the United States in civilian passenger transport, could win this multi-billion-dollar business by producing the first supersonic jet if aided by the British.

The President stressed that the main reason he selected General McKee was because he was recommended as "the man to get the U.S. program off the ground, and the one who can win this race for this country."

Typical of the President's private phone calls is the one he made to Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, leading the fight against McKee. HARTKE opposed the legislation granting McKee a waiver to serve

as head of FAA. The original law creating the Agency states the Administrator shall be a civilian.

"You don't want to help De Gaulle," the President said to HARTKE, one of his earliest supporters for the presidential nomination in 1960. "You may not realize it, but by opposing McKee you are aiding President de Gaulle and hurting me."

"This is a matter of principle with me," explained the surprised HARTKE. "I have been concerned for some time that there are too many military men in high Government positions. This isn't a personal attack on General McKee."

"I picked General McKee to head the Agency because my advisers agreed he is the one man who can get this aircraft built ahead of France or any other nation," said the President. "I'm determined not to let De Gaulle beat us on this project. If he does, France will capture the jet plane market for years to come. Do you realize what that would do to our balance of payments?"

"Yes, I understand that problem," replied HARTKE. "You have nothing to worry about; with that kind of argument, I don't have a chance. You know you are going to win, but I'm committed to oppose McKee."

Earlier, the President made it clear to Senate Democratic Whip RUSSELL LONG, of Louisiana, that he expected him to support McKee.

Singling out Senator LONG at the weekly White House congressional meeting, the President lectured:

"I expect all the leaders to support the McKee nomination because of the international complications. He is needed to win this supersonic aircraft battle with De Gaulle, and I expect you to support the nomination."

The President made his terse comment after aids pointed out that Senator LONG had indicated in an exchange with Senator HARTKE on the Senate floor that he would join in opposing McKee.

In calls to other wavering Senators, the President used the same arguments but added more details. He said that once the appointment was confirmed, McKee would be given the task of implementing "decisions we will need to make on the supersonic transport."

He revealed that a study by an administration committee headed by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara recommends immediate development of the SST (supersonic transport) as a joint military-civilian project in order to assure U.S. superiority in this field.

Under the McNamara committee plan, the SST program would be financed mainly by Federal funds. The prototype plane, intended to carry 500 passengers is being discussed in Paris. The British Aircraft Corp. and French Sud-Aviation firm are working together on blueprints furnished by the French Government.

The British Government has secretly agreed to finance the initial design study stage of the project as part of a bid by France and Britain to beat the U.S. effort.

Centerville, Iowa, Newspaper Comments on Religious Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, freedom of religion in the United States is not only a constitutional right but a living tradition. One of the greatest accomplishments of this Nation is that it has made the ideal of religious liberty a working reality.

Our country is a vast continental republic, in which democratic government functions in an orderly manner amidst a great diversity of religious beliefs. America has demonstrated that freedom of worship is the friend, not the foe, of religion.

Unfortunately, this lesson has yet to be learned in some parts of the world. Perhaps, however, we may take hope from some recent developments in Franco's Spain. This government has never been a friend of freedom, either political or religious, but of late it has given at least some recognition to the principle of religious liberty.

The Centerville Iowegian of Centerville, Iowa, carried in its June 23, 1965, issue an editorial with some wise comments on the new situation in Spain, and I commend these remarks to my fellow Members. The editorial follows:

NEW SPANISH FREEDOM

Each new area of freedom around the world, however small, is a hopeful sign for the future. With this in mind, the reopening of Protestant chapels in Catholic Spain is noteworthy. It remains illegal for these chapels to bear identifying signs, but perhaps that also will be changed in time.

Most Protestant churches were closed by police action in the early years of the regime of Generalissimo Franco. Recently 30 of them have been allowed to open without fanfare. New sources give the credit to changes in papal policies on religious freedom, and to a growing national self-confidence as Spain emerges from semi-isolation into world affairs.

Whatever the reasons for the new policy, the resultant religious freedom for non-Catholics is highly desirable. Protestants are a small percentage of Spain's population, and can hardly constitute a threat to Franco's rule. Even so, he deserves some credit for this easing of repression.

Americans are inclined to take religious freedom for granted. Let this be a reminder that it is never automatic.

After 50 Years—A Symbol of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragic examples of modern-day persecution is seen in the struggle of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, against the Communist oppressors of his people and their country. In the June 11 edition of the Chicago Catholic archdiocese, its editor, Msgr. John Kelly, writes a very dramatic and timely article on the meaning of Cardinal Mindszenty's heroic struggle against the atheistic Communist captors of his homeland:

AFTER 50 YEARS—A SYMBOL OF HOPE

Springtime is annually an open season for clerical anniversaries, and there is a very special one this year on June 12. It is the 50th priestly jubilee of the great Hungarian primate, Jozef Cardinal Mindszenty. He will not enjoy his golden anniversary as do most priests who live long enough. There will be no sharing the joys of a great day with his flock. His day will be just one more day within the confinement of the U.S. embassy in Budapest, where he was granted asylum in 1956, after the short-lived revolt against Communism had been so thoroughly and brutally crushed by the Russians and the puppet Red regime. If he were to step out of his asylum, he would face death or worse. A virtual prisoner of the Communists for the past 15 years, he has stuck to his position with a tenacity that is positively heroic. A number of writers, including some Catholics, have tried to write him off as a "forgotten monument to the cold war, a curious commodity no longer in demand." Thank God such calloused thinking extends to only a few, and by no means to his own people and to the million of loyal admirers the world over. It would be well to review a few of the facts of his life.

The Hungarian primate, moreover, has known the price of speaking out against tyranny throughout his adult life. In 1919, soon after he assumed his first pastorate, he was jailed by the short-lived Hungarian Communist Bela Kun regime. In 1944, shortly after he was named a bishop, the Nazis jailed him. In 1949 he went into prison after a Communist show-trial. In 1956, freed in the brief success of the Hungarian uprising, he had to flee behind U.S. legation walls to avoid new imprisonment when massed Soviet tanks destroyed the new free revolutionary regime.

While enjoying full personal freedom in the American Embassy, the normal conditions for asylum have prevented him from exercising his episcopal responsibilities. The traditional restrictions of asylum prevented him from seeing visitors. He has been cut off from almost all direct contacts with the outside world.

He has retained his titles as Archbishop of Esztergom, the ancient See that includes Budapest, and as Hungarian primate. However, since the day after Christmas, 1948, with the exception of the 5 days of freedom he enjoyed during the 1956 revolt, he has been completely barred from exercising these offices.

Cardinal Mindszenty has always had a high regard for the United States. He paid a visit in 1947 to thank the Americans for the postwar aid sent to his country, which he said saved thousands of Hungarians from starvation. The year before he had stated: "I have made a special study of American Catholicism and will make its principles the guiding spirit of Hungarian parish life."

During his few days of liberty in 1956 he again appealed to Americans to send food and medicine to his suffering nation.

Cardinal Mindszenty was born on March 29, 1892, in the village of Csehimindszenty, the son of its mayor, Janos Pehm. The Pehms were of German origin, but for 300 years they had lived in Hungary farming their small plot of land. During the Nazi occupation of his country—a time when many Hungarians of German ancestry were dropping their Hungarian names for their old German ones—the Cardinal changed his name from Pehm to Mindszenty after his native village.

He was ordained in 1915 and spent 2 years as assistant pastor to a village church. In 1917 he was transferred to the town of Zalaegerszeg to teach religion in its high school and in 1919 was named pastor of the Zalaegerszeg church, a post he held until 1944.

At the beginning of his career in Zalaegerszeg the future Cardinal was first jailed by the Reds. When the Communists set up their shortlived regime under Bela Kun in 1919, Father Pehm was among those imprisoned for their opposition.

Father Pehm was named Bishop of Veszprem on March 3, 1944, shortly before the Nazis took over complete power in Hungary. During his year and a half as head of the Veszprem See he organized new parishes and schools, including three new high schools. But his main activity was his constant and open opposition to nazism, the "new paganism."

His sharply worded pastorals and sermons denouncing Nazi excesses, especially their persecution of the Jews, made him the focal point for Hungarian resistance efforts. As a result, along with 10 priests and 16 seminarians, he was arrested and jailed by the Nazis on November 27, 1944. He accompanied his jailers to prison in his full episcopal robes.

When the Nazis were driven out of Hungary, Bishop Mindszenty was released from prison and made his way back to his See on foot and by donkey cart, only to find his residence in ruins. He took up leadership in the work of reconstruction.

Bishop Mindszenty was promoted to Archbishop of Esztergom and primate of Hungary on October 2, 1945, shortly after the end of the war. His first act was to broadcast an appeal to the world to help feed the starving Hungarian people. As primate he found himself facing the new threats to the church in Hungary which were brought with the nation's occupation by the Soviet Army and the beginning of the Red drive which eventually made his country a Communist satellite of the U.S.S.R.

He was raised to a cardinal by Pope Pius XII on February 18, 1946. He was flown to the consistory at the Vatican by an American airplane placed at his disposal by Gen. William S. Keys, chief of the U.S. military mission in Budapest, who accompanied him to Rome.

The church's troubles began soon after the coming of peace in 1945. First the Apostolic Nuncio to Hungary was ousted. Next land reforms took away from the church most of the properties from which it derived its income to operate Catholic schools and other institutions.

Then restrictions were placed on the Catholic press and even the two small weeklies permitted to function were unable to obtain sufficient newsprint. In this way the church was deprived of the possibility of answering the anti-Catholic campaign waged in the Red press.

Throughout this period Cardinal Mindszenty addressed protest after protest to Government authorities. By 1948 the Communists were firmly in power and began a drive to isolate the Cardinal from the hierarchy, clergy, and laity.

Anti-Mindszenty demonstrations were staged and the Cardinal was deprived of answering Red charges by restriction of the right to issue pastoral letters. But when Catholic schools were placed under Government control in July 1948, the Cardinal announced the excommunication of every Catholic member of parliament who had voted for the bill.

On December 26, 1948, he was arrested. He was brought to trial in February of the following year. His conviction on charges of espionage, treason and illicit dealing in currency brought forth protests from all parts of the world, not only from Catholic sources but from Protestant, Jewish and secular groups as well.

The "trial" was a farce. The lawyer assigned to defend the cardinal spent much of his time praising those who were trying him, according to the eye-witness report of an American newsman. Following the "trial" the Cardinal was sentenced to life imprisonment and actually spent more than 6 years in jail.

In July 1955 he was moved from prison and placed under house arrest until he was freed by Hungarian freedom fighters during the uprising, on October 30, 1956.

He returned for a few days to Budapest, where he was welcomed by the pealing of church bells and people who knelt in the streets to greet him. He reported that he had been confined by the Reds in seven different places and that he had been treated "as is customary with the Bolshevists."

He said the same thing about his treatment at Communist hands during the period between his arrest and trial at which, after more than a month's "conditioning," he "confessed" to the Red charges.

The Cardinal's freedom came to an end on November 4 as the Soviet army moved on Budapest to put down the uprising with extreme brutality. That day he sought and was granted asylum by the U.S. legation.

On his 50th jubilee, the light will be burning in his third floor apartment. It remains a beacon of hope to his freedom-loving people. No doubt he will spend a good part of his day praying for them. We can be sure they will be praying for him. All of us wish him the happiest jubilee he can have, and we hasten to thank him for his example of devout heroism, and to assure him that this is by no means a forgotten monument, but rather a living and genuine symbol of hope to all who have freedom. May God bless him and give him strength.

Preparedness Review Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times recently in a very timely and perceptive editorial underscored the need for a thorough review of administration defense policies and the effect those policies will have on our defense preparedness in the crucial years ahead.

The editorial discussed many of the most critical issues we must face relating to our defense posture which require review. They are issues which were discussed during the course of hearings by the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on the proposed fiscal year 1966 defense budget and during the course of the floor debate on the defense appropriation bill on June 23.

The conclusion of the editorial cites an old but very appropriate saying when judging the defense of our Nation, "Better safe than sorry." Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial from the June 1, 1965, Los Angeles Times for inclusion in the RECORD. I believe it will be of much interest to the Congress:

PREPAREDNESS REVIEW WELCOME

Congressional experts on military affairs are said to be quietly preparing for a major review next year of U.S. defense policies—and the assumptions on which they are made.

Recent developments indicate that a properly conducted inquiry may be timely.

In the wake of the second Red Chinese nuclear test, Pentagon sources estimated that Peiping may have the ability to launch atomic missiles against American cities as early as 1975.

As a result, there is talk of spending $6 to $8 billion to implement the Nike-X antiballistic missile system to meet the looming threat.

The Nike-X, while capable of dealing with relatively primitive Chinese missiles, may be an insufficient answer to Russia's more sophisticated rocketry. A decision on defense against the latter has been put off because of the staggering costs involved.

Meanwhile, however, there is worrisome new evidence that, through all the talk of peaceful coexistence and detente in recent years, Soviet military development has proceeded apace.

The Russians lately have shown off four new long-range missiles—all using solid fuels, and two of them apparently capable of launch from submerged submarines.

Once the Russians have Polaris-type subs operating off our coasts, the existing radar warning system will be inadequate and our vulnerability to surprise attack greater.

It is not known whether the new Soviet missiles are operational or merely prototypes. Still, their appearance suggests two areas of national concern:

There has been an influential body of thought in this country that the Soviets develop offensive weapons only because they are spurred by our own program.

Washington, in fact, has been reluctant to start new weapons systems in recent years because of heavy costs. But it seems that Moscow is plodding relentlessly ahead in efforts to overtake America in missile strength.

Our decision to forgo new weapons systems often has been based on confidence that we can detect Soviet weapons progress in time to develop a U.S. countermeasure. This is now highly questionable, since the new Soviet missiles apparently caught Western intelligence by surprise.

The old motto, "Better safe than sorry," is still a good one.

GOP Unit Maps Policy on U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, for several months a small group of Republican Members of the House have been conducting intensive studies of our foreign policy. From time to time they have issued thoughtful analyses of various problems, and have proposed constructive ideas which could contribute to strengthening SEATO, the United Nations, and the OAS. Their statements have received attention within the administration, and have begun to earn favorable comments from the press.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an article by John W. Finney of the New York Times, which carried on the New York Times News Service for June 20:

GOP UNIT MAPS POLICY ON U.N.—HOUSE GROUP ANNOUNCES PANEL TO STUDY CREATION OF U.S. FORCE FOR WORLD TODAY

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON.—A panel of prominent foreign policy and military leaders has been formed by a House Republican group to study the proposed creation of a standby American military force for the United Nations.

The panel will consist of former U.N. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge; former Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates; former NATO Commander Lauris Norstad; Andrew W. Cordier, former Under Secretary of the U.N.; and Francis O. Wilson, former Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs.

Formation of the panel represents the most ambitious step yet taken by a newly formed Republican group in the House which is attempting to build a new, constructive "image" for the Republican Party in the field of foreign policy.

The panel has been asked to make recommendations on a proposal offered by the six-man Republican group to create a voluntary brigade of military specialists that could be used in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

Creation of the brigade was suggested by the group this week as renewed evidence of the American commitment to the United Nations on its 20th anniversary.

As proposed, the brigade would consist of 1,000 volunteers with specialized technical skills, such as medical, communications, transportation, and engineering experts.

The group also proposed that the Military Air Transport Service be placed on permanent call to the U.N. for use in any peacekeeping operations.

In making the proposal and forming the advisory panel, the group was trying to present a Republican counterpart to any proposal the administration may offer for strengthening the United Nations.

President Johnson is expected to make some specific proposals when he goes to San Francisco late next week to participate in ceremonies celebrating the signing of the U.N. Charter. The administration has encouraged the idea of earmarking national standby forces for the U.N. but thus far has not made any specific commitment of American forces.

Formation of the advisory panel was announced Saturday by the group, which consists of Representatives CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, Jr., of Maryland; FRANK HORTON, of New York; ROBERT ELLSWORTH, of Kansas; F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts; OGDEN R. REID of New York; and STANLEY R. TUPPER, of Maine.

Formed earlier this year, the still nameless group of relatively junior, middle-of-the-road Republicans is emerging as a vocal spokesman of at least one faction of the Republican Party on foreign policy. In a series of statements issued thus far, the group has already succeeded in drawing the attention of the administration and at times in provoking an annoyed reaction.

After the group complained in April, for example, that many ambassadorial posts had been vacant for months, the White House a few weeks later started announcing appointments to fill the posts.

Last month the group accused the administration of bypassing and weakening the Organization of American States in the Dominican crisis and drew an immediate point-by-point rebuttal by Secretary of State Dean Rusk at a news conference.

Reserves and Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, recently the Lincoln Evening Journal and Nebraska State Journal carried an editorial that underlined a proposal made by my distinguished colleague from Nebraska, Congressman CLAIR CALLAN.

This editorial recognized the leadership given by Congressman CALLAN in an area vital to both the farm economy and to the ready defense of our Nation. I am pleased to see that citizens of our farm areas recognize responsible leadership and take the time to express support and appreciation.

Because of the importance and timeliness of this editorial, I offer it for the benefit of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

RESERVES AND SURPLUSES

What is the difference between a "reserve supply" and a "surplus?"

Not much perhaps—until it comes to the agricultural policy of the Nation. Then the difference becomes more than a matter of semantics; it becomes a foremost factor in preserving the economic health and the good name of one of our most basic industries.

Over the years since World War II, the American public has taken the paradoxical attitude that "reserves" of metals and other manufacturing materials are an asset to the country and vital to national defense while "surpluses" of farm commodities are somehow a national disgrace and a drag on the economy.

The public can be excused in part for this irrational distinction. They have merely responded to the manner in which mineral reserves have been accepted and agricultural surpluses have been deplored by leaders of the Federal administration, particularly during the technological explosion in agriculture in the 1950's.

The brightest hope for reorienting the national attitude on this important matter resides in a bill introduced by Nebraska Representative CLAIR CALLAN which would make it national policy to maintain a strategic reserve of food products as well as of manufacturing materials.

Says CALLAN, a member of the House Agriculture Committee, "The time is past when we can store up strategic goods and leave out food which is probably the most important item we produce.

Under CALLAN'S proposal, the President would set aside whatever amounts of storable farm commodities are considered essential for national needs in time of emergency. These supplies of wheat, feed grain, cotton, soybeans, dry milk and other commodities would be isolated from the market.

The depressive effect of these supplies on market prices would be eliminated. The costs of maintaining such a strategic reserve would no longer be charged entirely against farmers, just as the cost of carrying zinc reserves is not charged against the zinc producers and just as the benefits of truck sales under foreign aid is not labeled a subsidy to the automakers.

The Nation's agricultural abundance is probably its best single contribution to world peace and to U.S. foreign policy. The ability of American farmers to overcome worldwide famine is only now starting to be appreciated.

Under these circumstances, to discredit agriculture for its life-giving productivity is not only illogical but destructive. While CALLAN'S bill might do little more than to change public terminology, it would amount to changing "liability" to "asset."

In his farm message in February, President Johnson called attention to the need for a national farm commodity reserve policy. But the administration seemingly has done little to press the issue.

CALLAN'S bill, logical as it seems, will not glide through Congress automatically. He will need all the help he can get in steering it to passage.

Actions and Intentions of the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, in these days of deep concern over the course of our foreign policy, many comments and analyses have been made. Mr. Stanley Krajewski, noted editor of the Polish Daily News in Detroit, Mich., has set forth an interesting theory regarding the actions and intentions of the Soviet Union. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a translation of Mr. Krajewski's editorial:

The revolution in Santo Domingo committed the United States, as Washington says, to not permit another Castro to arise. The lack of understanding between the junta and rebels and the charge that Washington desires to rule Santo Domingo does not help to solve existing problems. As a result, American as well as Pan-American forces will probably remain in this island country for a long time.

In South America, in Bolivia, where for several weeks there have been difficulties and where a revolution was attempted, the situation remains explosive. When the junta decided to reorganize the mines, tin miners refused to work. The workers, fearing that their numbers would be reduced through the introduction of new equipment and concerned about the lowering of wages, seized upon the strike as a method to protest, which resulted in serious political implications. The junta, however, quickly agreed to establish a dual presidency. The miners agreed to return to work but continued to threaten a new strike in the event that there were any undesirable changes in government policy.

Bolivia is on a powderkeg, and any misunderstanding between the government and miners could cause a new revolution. The situation is very serious for, as in Santo Domingo, the presence of Castro agents has been verified. They also operate in Venezuela and in other Latin-American countries.

There is no doubt that Moscow is putting to good advantage all of her influence, pulling all levers in order to disturb the peace of the Western Hemisphere. Despite sharp attacks on Washington for the intervention in Santo Domingo, Russia is actually pleased because this is grist for her mill.

Will the United States permit itself to be caught in a mousetrap in Vietnam as happened to the French some 10 years ago? Will the United States permit itself to be caught in a new web which is being woven by Moscow in Latin America? The Soviet plan to undermine the Western Hemisphere is very simple, but very deadly for the United States. How far this plan will go is unknown. The quick reaction of Washington in deploying armed forces into Santo Domingo temporarily saved this country. Russia would like to arrange a series of Cubas or Santo Domingos in South and Central American countries, counting on the likelihood that this will give rise to situations such as in Santo Domingo, which will tie up thousands of American soldiers, ships, and planes. The Kremlin reasons that by dissipation of military forces, by economic bleeding, and by simultaneous provocation of political unrest here on our own continent and in other parts of the world, even the

largest colossus could collapse. The plan is truly diabolical.

Washington, as is indicated by the pronouncements of President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk, is reexamining its policy toward Latin America. The behavior of the Russians, as we see here, enables them to conduct warfare without resorting to an all-out conflict. The speech of President Johnson in Waco, Tex., regarding the Communist danger was a voice of reason and realism.

Foreign Aid and Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Ralph McGill, the distinguished publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, has written an excellent article on the relationship between foreign aid and the responsibilities of power.

The article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 27, 1965, and follows:

FOREIGN AID AND POWER

(By Ralph McGill)

Both McGeorge Bundy and Adlai Stevenson has assisted greatly in clarifying the muddle of misinformation about American foreign policy in Vietnam and in Latin America.

Mr. Bundy said of that policy: "Whether in the accents of Hyannis Port, of Abilene, of Independence, Mo., or of Hyde Park, or of those more fascinating accents which I have the honor to serve, the foreign policies of the United States all flow in a single stream. * * *"

That single stream is to aline action with principles.

This we have done—and are doing.

Mr. Stevenson helped make this plain in a commencement week address at Harvard. He stands with the President's policy.

There is, as President Johnson has said, a middle ground between power and weakness. If unused, or unwisely use, power gets out of control. We were trying not to use our power when the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor. No American sought to be involved in stopping Communist aggression in Korea. We had no wish to become involved in southeast Asia when the Vietcong violated the Geneva truce and infiltrated the South during the Eisenhower administration. We assuredly had no wish to be anywhere in Latin America, but the responsibility of power required it—and may do so again.

Foreign aid is one arm of our policy and our power.

Many Americans persist in thinking of it in terms of giveaways, or of waste. True enough, in any vast program of aid there is waste and misuse. It is not always possible to supervise the recipient government and direct aid as we would wish. Corruption often frustrates aid. There was a lag in revision of aid programs after the Marshall plan had so well served its purpose and new complexities of needs had arisen. But aid is an arm of power.

Ceylon's predicament illustrates. In elections held early this year in Ceylon, a pro-Communist government headed by the only female Prime Minister in the world, Mrs. Bandaranaike, was defeated. Her policies had brought Ceylon, one of the world's most beautiful islands, to the edge of economic collapse. The new government inherited debt, unemployment, and subversion.

Ceylon subsidizes the price of rice so that the mass of people who subsist chiefly on that cereal may not go hungry and transmute hunger into political discontent and violence.

There is a need to increase exports and reduce imports.

The new government has asked us for aid, both in money and advice. A World Bank team was invited in. It will make recommendations and, one hopes, a loan.

U.S. aid was cut off when the former government nationalized, without compensation, American property. This included that of oil companies. The present government wishes to work out plans for operation of these properties and to allow their owners to take a fair profit.

It is important that the new government, which faces reality and is not bemused by a dream of Marxist socialism as a formula for economic success in an underdeveloped country, have assistance from the United States and other Western nations.

Ceylon illustrates the possibilities of foreign aid. Such aid is, to be sure, a gamble. But as a world power, we cannot avoid the responsibility which power and wealth impose upon us—in Ceylon, Santo Domingo, or Vietnam.

Democracy and What It Means To Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, recently I was proud to sponsor an essay contest for junior high and senior high school students in California's 27th Congressional District to stimulate their interest in their government.

Chairman of the judging committee was Larry Paulson, columnist for the Valley Times. Other judges were Mrs. Merrilyn Sommers, editor of the Record-Ledger of Sunland-Tujunga, Mrs. Dorothy Boyd, of the San Fernando Valley Girl Scout Council, and Carl S. Milliken, of the Van Nuys News. The students were asked to write on the subject "What Democracy Means to Me." In both the high school division and the junior high school division first prize was a set of the Encyclopedia Britannica. The first place winner from each of the participating schools was awarded a plaque to commemorate his fine work.

Each of the essays we received, Mr. Speaker, was outstanding. All of them indicated on the part of the students an acute awareness of our form of government. The high schools participating, and the first-place winners and runners-up were: Polytechnic High School: Bruce Ehrlich, Maggi Phillips, Meik Skoss, Carol Milner, and Dodie Kinsey.

Quartz Hill High School: Andy Weil, Charles Lord, Pam Taylor, Carolyn Ethridge, and Jann Dailey.

Verdugo Hills High School: Julie Warner, David Johnson, Pat Miles, Patricia Fechner, and Jane Manabe.

The judges have informed me how difficult it was for them to make their decisions, for all of the essays were outstanding. As an indication of the fine work of which our high school students are capable, it is a pleasure for me to enter into the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the excellent essay by the winner in the high school division, Bruce Ehrlich, of Van Nuys, Calif. Bruce's essay shows a thorough intellectual penetration of the principles of our system, and a devout dedication to the patriotism which the system requires:

DEMOCRACY AND WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Bruce Ehrlich)

Of all the systems of government, past, present, and probably future that have been thought of or attempted, democracy is the only form of government that is of the people, by the people, and for the people, and holds the belief of equality of all men. The people are the backbone of a democracy; the people are its flesh and lifeblood.

Democracy is a government of the people. Its officials come from all walks of life and millionaires have no more chance to be President than paupers. Our American democracy takes pride in the claim that "every boy can become President." While this statement is not entirely true, as the United States has become more democratic, this abstraction approaches closer and closer to the truth.

Democracy is also a government by the people. Unlike the phony elections of the Communists and the total absence of elections in dictatorships, a democracy elects its leaders through secret ballots with complete freedom of choice. Every qualified citizen has the right and the duty to vote for those leaders who will represent him.

Third, but by no means least, democracy is a government for the people. A democracy provides many services for its constituents. Such diverse benefits as public health, powerplants, and education are provided by local and Federal governmental agencies for its citizens. Even in the Soviet Union where it is claimed that the Government provides all the needs of the people, there is less service to the public than in democratic countries such as the United States and Great Britain. But unlike Communist countries where people live as servants of the state, citizens of a democracy are given certain inalienable rights.

The Declaration of Independence states that all men are created equal. This notion of equality is an integral crux in the concept of democracy. The Declaration of Independence also proclaims that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And as the concept of equality is elaborated by the statement of inalienable rights, it is further defined by the Bill of Rights of the Constitution. From these veins of freedom branch capillaries of law on all planes of government of our Federal system.

It is evident that democracy, that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, is the most just form of government and the government with the greatest affinity for the people. Mark Twain once wrote, "God loves the little man, he made so many of them." And as God loves the little man, so does democracy; it is made of them.

The Dirksen Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like

to insert at this point an editorial which appeared in yesterday's New York Times, on the apportionment problem.

Entitled "The Dirksen Amendment," this editorial suggests that no change or revision be made at this time in the decision handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court.

I agree wholeheartedly with the advice and counsel of the New York Times, and would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the contents of the editorial in question.

The article follows:

THE DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

The constitutional amendment which Senator DIRKSEN has sponsored and a Senate Judiciary subcommittee has now approved to permit one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on a basis other than population raises a troublesome question of public policy.

This newspaper has long recognized that there is merit in the argument of the amendment's backers that a legislature ought in some way to take into account the balance of diverse interests that make up the community it represents. Minority interests and minority values deserve protection; the fear of an ignorant or tyrannical majority is not a baseless concern.

It is also true, however, that the apportionment that existed in most State legislatures before the Supreme Court laid down its strict one-man, one-vote rule last year was scandalously unfair. It went beyond protecting the interests of rural residents to an extent that gave them an absolute veto over all legislation affecting the urban majority. It was the persistent refusal of the legislatures to correct this inequity that compelled the Supreme Court to intervene.

Now that the old system of apportionment has been overthrown, the difficult task is to reconcile, if possible, the values of minority protection in the old with those of majority representation and responsibility in the new. Thus far, no one has suggested a dependable road to such reconciliation. At the very least, the Dirksen amendment provides no persuasive formula for guarding against the old abuses.

If it were adopted, many States would presumably revert to the old method of electing members of one house on the basis of counties or other territorial districts rather than population. As it has in the past, this method would give rural interests control of one chamber and thus a veto over city and suburban needs. A stalemate between the two Houses would be the probable result, with an attendant choice between horsetrading and legislative paralysis.

To reduce the danger of a perpetual minority veto, the Senate Judiciary subcommittee revised the Dirksen proposal to provide that any apportionment plan not based on population would have to be reviewed every 10 years in a popular referendum. Rejection would permit submission of a revised plan for a vote 2 years later. If that, too, were rejected, both Houses would then have to be districted according to population. This cumbersome procedure seems likely to produce constant political turmoil and disorder at the very basis of government, where stability and predictability should prevail.

Considering all the circumstances, Congress would be wise to leave the apportionment problem alone for the present. When all the States have finished reapportioning their legislatures and some years of experience have been accumulated, it will be possible to judge better whether the fears for minority values are justified. The delay would also allow useful experimentation with the relative virtues of having one House or two in a legislature were population is the sole test of representation.

Another Senate Aid Pockets $90,000 in Stock Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is now revealed that another former Senate aid, Mr. H. W. "Bill" Brawley, executive director of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee from 1949 to 1961, then Deputy Postmaster General, and more recently assistant to the chairman of the Democrat National Committee, cleaned up $90,000 in one stock deal while an employee of the U.S. Senate.

Moreover, according to the Des Moines Register in an article written by its Washington correspondent, Clark Mollenhoff, the cash cleanup was made in the stock of Spiegel & Co., a Chicago mail-order house, which was vitally interested in postal rates.

According to Mollenhoff, Brawley explained that he bought 1,000 shares of Spiegel stock at about $10 per share, which with stock splits and increases in price, rose to more than $100 per share.

During 1961–62, as Deputy Postmaster General, Brawley became involved in a bitter feud with then Postmaster General J. Edward Day who eventually told President Kennedy he would not serve as head of the Department if Brawley continued as his assistant. Brawley was ousted and went to the Democrat National Committee.

In 1963, when Day resigned as Postmaster General, he requested the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make an investigation of Brawley's stock dealings. Brawley said the Justice Department found that no illegality existed. He said President Kennedy also found his stock dealings to be legal and President Johnson "examined the whole file" and found nothing improper.

Even though there may have been no outright violation of the law there is a grave question of propriety when the director of a congressional committee, dealing with postal rates, traffics in the stock of a company whose profits depend in vital part upon mail rates. And it is a sad commentary upon the processes of government when two Presidents apparently find no conflict of interest on the part of a Government official engaged in such transactions.

Brawley, according to the newspaper article, said he recommended a "former friend," Cyril T. Anderson, for a job as a lobbyist for Spiegel. Here again comes the question of the propriety of a staff member of a congressional committee recommending a lobbyist to a business firm which has a vital stake in legislation that issues from the committee.

In reviewing this latest get-rich-quick stock deal on the part of this former Government official it should be noted that Brawley and Bobby Baker, key figure in the sordid scandals that have rocked Washington, were both from the State of South Carolina. It should be noted further that Lobbyist Anderson was associated with Bobby Baker in the promotion of the Go Travel Agency.

There is more than meets the eye in the information thus far produced in connection with the Spiegel stock manipulations. This latest mess deserves to be investigated in all its ramifications.

Following is the article as published by the Des Moines Register of June 25, 1965:

SENATE AID HAD $90,000 STOCK PROFIT

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—H. W. (Bill) Brawley, executive assistant to the National Democratic chairman, made "about $90,000" on the stock of a mail-order house while serving as executive director of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee staff.

The 48-year-old South Carolina Democrat served as Deputy Postmaster General from January 20, 1961, until he was forced out by Postmaster General J. Edward Day on June 18, 1962.

INITIATED BY DAY

An FBI investigation of Brawley's holdings of stock in Spiegel, Inc., a Chicago mail-order house, was initiated by Day when he resigned in August 1963.

Brawley said in an interview Thursday that the whole transaction was given "the deepest investigation by the FBI" and that the Justice Department found that no illegality existed.

Brawley explained that he bought 1,000 shares of Spiegel stock in 1954 at about $10 a share, and that with stock splits and increases in the price it rose to over $100 a share.

"It was about $99 a share when I sold it," Brawley said. "I believe it was in about the last week of December 1960. I know it was 2 or 3 weeks before I was questioned by the Senate committee in connection with my appointment. I sold all of my stock before I went to the Post Office Department to make certain there would be no problem of conflicts."

JOHNSON'S OK

In addition to the FBI investigation and the Justice Department determination that no laws were violated, Brawley said President Johnson "has examined the whole file" and decided there was nothing improper in his investments.

"I wouldn't be over here (at the Democratic National Committee) if the White House thought there was anything wrong with it," Brawley said.

He said his transactions in Spiegel stock had been called to President John F. Kennedy's attention, and that President Kennedy also had indicated he found them to be proper.

Brawley emphasized that he sold all of the stock several weeks before taking office as the No. 2 man in the Post Office Department.

He claimed Postmaster General Day had told the FBI that he had information that Brawley had retained the Spiegel stock after taking office and had not disclosed it to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee when his nomination was up for consideration.

CAUSE HIM TROUBLE

Brawley contended that Day and a lobbyist for the Spiegel Co. have been trying to cause him trouble for several years.

The feud between Day and Brawley at the Post Office Department was the most bitter in the Kennedy administration, and Day had informed President Kennedy that he would not remain if Brawley was continued as his assistant.

Day was new to Washington, and Brawley had close connections with Kenneth O'Donnell, who as appointment secretary to President Kennedy was the most influential figure on domestic political matters.

Brawley was Executive Director of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee staff from 1949 until 1961 when he became Deputy Postmaster General. He had many political contacts in Washington, and was regarded as one of the best informed on post office and civil service matters.

While Day's request to J. Edgar Hoover for an FBI investigation primarily was aimed at the question of whether Brawley retained his stock while a Post Office official, Day also questioned the propriety of Brawley's acquisition of stock in any mail-order house that had such a great stake in legislation dealing with parcel post and other mail rates.

COMMON PRACTICE

On the question of the propriety of buying the Spiegel stock while on the Senate committee staff, Brawley stated "It has been common practice at the Capitol for employees to make such investments and "there is no law to prohibit it."

"There are always a lot of tips floating around the Capitol," Brawley said. He estimated that "there must be 50 Senators" who are constantly investing in tips that are available. He added that in his opinion the problem of a possible conflict is much more acute for Senators than for staff members who do not vote.

Brawley said he obtained his stock tip from some of the Spiegel officials and that he borrowed two-thirds of the $10,000 purchase price from a South Carolina bank in which one of his relatives is an officer.

A Spiegel official had told him the firm was installing electronic computers and other laborsaving devices and was due for a move forward, Brawley said. He said the stock was priced at only about $10 a share but was paying $1 a share in dividends.

"The increase was sensational," Brawley said. "I hoped it would go up, but I had no idea it would pay like it did."

Brawley contends that much of his trouble came from a "former friend," Cyril T. Anderson, whom he introduced to Spiegel officials and recommended for a job as lobbyist for Spiegel.

Anderson said he was not sure that it was Brawley who introduced him to Spiegel officials, and did not know if Brawley had recommended him as a Spiegel lobbyist.

Anderson said he had some differences of viewpoint on legislation with Brawley in 1961 and 1962, but that he considered this "normal" since he represented a firm that opposed the Kennedy administration's large mail rate increase.

Day told the Register that he "heard some disturbing reports concerning Brawley."

"I passed the information on to the proper law enforcement authorities for investigation," Day said.

ONE OF THE REPORTS

Brawley said the reports had included a story that he had received a $10,000 political contribution and had split it with two members of the White House staff.

Brawley said he made a telephone call to a Washington representative of a business publications organization and arranged for the $10,000 contribution.

He said that he was able to demonstrate that the money was delivered in cash to Matthew McCloskey, then the treasurer of the National Democratic Party, for a box seat at the 1961 gala to pay off the 1960 campaign debt.

Brawley said McCloskey had written a note for the file which showed that he had received the money for the box seat. Brawley said the man who delivered the cash to McCloskey had a witness with him. Brawley said he had no contact with this money.

Since leaving the Post Office Department, Brawley said he has invested in the stock of the National Bank of Commerce of Fairfax County, Va.

Brawley said he is a director of the recently organized bank that received its charter from Comptroller of the Currency James Saxon on August 13, 1963. He said it is his only present investment.

The records of the Comptroller of the Currency Office also list Brawley as the senior vice president of the National Bank of Commerce.

Support for the United Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 1965, the United Nations celebrated the 20th anniversary of the signing of its charter in San Francisco. Our President was present for that occasion and delivered an eloquent and timely restatement of this country's faith in the United Nations. The action of Congress in passing Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 was important in adding to the support given by our Nation to the N.U. Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER's leadership in the House of Representatives in this important area was extremely important.

All of us know the tribulations under which the United Nations has operated in this past year. We have seen first withdrawal by a country of its membership in the political aspects of the United Nations. Many have wondered if this was a repeat performance of problems of the League of Nations and pondered as to whether or not this would signal a breakup of the still quite young United Nations.

It was important for the President to express the support and faith we Americans have in the United Nations at this crucial time. We are fully aware that without this common ground for discussion and action many world crises would not have been eased or averted. The possibility of an all-out nuclear war would be multiplied a hundredfold.

All of us are concerned about a peaceful world. We see the United Nations as an alternative to the power struggle between nations and a resulting nuclear war. But we should not expect more than is reasonable from this young organization. The United Nations is still in its formative years and has much growing to do before it has reached full maturity and strength. We need to give it our full support so that we do not drag it to the ground and ourselves with it.

As the United Nations grows in responsibility and strength, we hope to see it equipped with the tools to enable it to avoid the conflicts and pitfalls of the Congo, Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic. More than that, it may show us through cooperation the way to eradicate hunger, disease, and ignorance. Let us join those who call for a strengthened United Nations through vigorous U.S. support.

To Get the Best Takes Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very timely and thoughtful commentary on a major domestic problem was written by Mr. A. T. Burch in the June 18 edition of the Chicago Daily News. Since Mr. Burch is a respected journalist whose objectivity is above question, I feel his words deserve careful consideration:

TO GET THE BEST TAKES MUCH MONEY

(By A. T. Burch)

In 1954 the U.S. Supreme Court decided that legally enforced segregation of public schools violates the equal protection provisions of the U.S. Constitution.

It struck down the Court's previous approval of "separate but equal" provisions for Negro education. It asserted that separate school systems are inherently unequal.

On several occasions, the Reverend Martin Luther King has asserted that the Court had declared de facto segregation, arising from neighborhood residential patterns, to be unconstitutional. This might seem to be implied in the proposition that separate education cannot be equal. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court has not actually said that de facto segregation in the schools is illegal.

In at least three instances, it has refused to reverse decisions by U.S. Courts of Appeals which had held that the neighborhood school system, which oftens results in some actual segregation, is not unconstitutional in itself. These courts approved the neighborhood system provided it arises naturally from the facts of population distribution, and is not the result of a prior purpose to create segregation.

The Supreme Court has not made any extended declaration of its own on this subject. It merely refused to review the decision of the lower courts.

It has not, however, said exactly what the Reverend Mr. King says it has—not yet, at least.

One inference some people appear to have drawn from the Supreme Court's 1954 opinion is erroneous in fact and mischievous in its practical results.

The dangerous inference comes in two parts. The first is that, since the Supreme Court has held separate education to be unequal, integration by itself will raise the achievement of underprivileged children to equality with the achievement of children of well-educated parents and stable homes. White or black, the children of well-educated parents will generally have an advantage over those of illiterate parents, in any school.

The second part of the fallacy is the assumption that integration, by producing "equal" education, will by itself produce good education. This, by itself, it will not do. The content of the curriculum, the size of the classrooms, the training, skill and dedication of teachers and their personal rapport with the children—all these things are important. To get the best takes money, much money.

To be sure, very exceptional children inspired by any influence with a determination to improve themselves can sometimes achieve distinction despite poor schools, poor teachers, or none. Abraham Lincoln went to school 1 year in his whole life; Thomas A. Edison 3 months. But such self-starting geniuses are rare.

For the vast majority of us, good schooling is necessary if we are even to hold a passably good job. And the outer bounds of the physical sciences, important today not only to ordinary industry but also to national security, can be reached only through intensive, specialized, formal education.

Fortunately, the notion that integration by itself will make good schools seems to be fading. Increasing emphasis is being placed on special teaching, as individualized as possible, to compensate for deficiencies in the home environment. Educators, among them Chicago's Superintendent Benjamin Willis, are emphasing the need for preschool, compensatory, and remedial education.

Still, the myth that integration by itself will do everything apparently lingers on. Otherwise how explain the total lack of involvement of recent demonstration leaders in Chicago in the effort to get a substantial appropriation from the Illinois Legislature for compensatory education? Future education in Chicago faces a real educational crisis, not in heaps of people blocking traffic at State and Madison Streets, but at Springfield.

I do not recommend that hundreds of people sprawl over the statehouse steps or block traffic at any intersection of downtown Springfield. The effect would be negative. But there are dignified and appropriate methods by which responsive friends of better education can communicate with State senators.

Even if one assumed that integration, by itself, would produce better education, a realistic observer would have to note the difficulty of achieving it, totally, in other big cities.

Washington, D.C., is a city where the school administration interpreted the 1954 Supreme Court decision as a call to abolish de facto segregation as well as legal segregation.

After 11 years, its schools are the most segregated in the Nation, outside the South.

In 1954, about half of Washington's schoolchildren were white. Now the proportion of Negroes in Washington schools is about the same as the proportion of Negroes in Chicago's public housing—not many points away from 100 percent and getting closer all the time. Still, a clergyman from Washington has participated in the recent Chicago demonstrations—to teach us what?

New York tried hard, on the same principle, with results which the Allen Commission reported last summer amounted to less than nothing. Each year the number of segregated schools in New York grows. New York's superintendent has been fired, and the president of the school board has resigned. What next?

I consider it educationally desirable that white and Negro children should get to know each other. But the organization of any big city school system so that the numbers in every class reflect the exact racial proportions of the school age population is not merely difficult. It is plainly impossible.

Twentieth Anniversary of the United Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, on this 20th anniversary of the United Nations, I should like to add my voice to those of other Congressmen in the praise of this international organization.

Although many imperfections still exist and its effectiveness is particularly in question now owing to disagreements among the major powers, the United Nations still remains the greatest hope mankind has against the scourge of war.

My hope would be that the Congress and the Nation, in our desire for peace and justice to men everywhere, will find expression through cooperation with one another. The United Nations gives us this chance.

The Nature of the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of June 27, 1965.

The Vietnamese Communists cannot be whitewashed. Their brutality and immorality should be obvious to all.

The editorial follows:

THE NATURE OF THE ENEMY

Those who regard war as immoral, or American involvement in Vietnam as immoral, will consider the slaying of an American prisoner by the Vietcong and the bombing of a Saigon restaurant as a natural consequence of the military actions of the United States. But most Americans, we believe, will draw different conclusions.

War is, from its very nature, a brutal business and revolution is more brutal still. In South Vietnam, North Vietnam is waging war through revolution. It should not be forgotten that the division of Vietnam was intended to make a rough (very rough) geographical separation of Communists and non-Communist areas, and that many non-Communists left their homes in the North for sanctuary in the South. The free national elections specified in the Geneva Treaty were rejected by the South because Communist rule in the North would have made any countrywide "free" election a mockery. So the North, and the Communists still in the South, undertook to subvert the South by propaganda and terror.

This process was well advanced before the United States fired a shot. When it did so, the Americans observed the rules of war; they tried, and are trying, to attack only military targets and to spare the civilian population as much as is humanly possible under the conditions. The Vietcong observe no such inhibitions. They bomb, for shock effect, in civilian centers, just as they terrorize the farmers of the countryside. And when their agents are executed for specific acts of treason and terrorism, they retaliate against an American soldier who has fallen into their hands as a prisoner of war.

It is a curious moral obliquity which can justify the acts of the Vietcong and find nothing but condemnation for those of the United States; which would have this country abandon South Vietnam to a system that began the war with terror and proposes to unify Vietnam with terror. That is the nature of the enemy we are fighting—and whatever hard choices the United States may face in southeast Asia cannot be obscured by whitewash.

On Presidential Disability and Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, last week House and Senate conferees agreed upon a much-needed Presidential disability and succession amendment to the Constitution. The author of this proposed amendment is my distinguished colleague from Indiana, Senator BIRCH BAYH, who has provided outstanding leadership in meeting this important problem.

This week the conferees' report will come to the floor of both houses for consideration. I know that this is a matter of serious concern to all Members of Congress and, therefore, I, under unanimous consent, include in the RECORD two editorials which appeared in the South Bend Tribune this month: "No Time To Stall," June 7, 1965, and "At Last" June 25, 1965:

NO TIME TO STALL

Both the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives have approved a constitutional amendment dealing with presidential disability, but the amendment is in danger of never reaching the States for ratification because the two Houses of Congress can't agree on one small point.

At issue is the question of how long Congress would be allowed to take in deciding who is President when a Vice President challenges the right of a once-disabled President to resume office.

The Senate version of the amendment imposes no time limit. Senate tradition holds unlimited debate to be an all-but-sacred privilege and the thought of even a constitutional deadline on any Senate decision apparently appals the members of the world's most exclusive club. The House, which has a more practical attitude toward debate, put a 10-day limit in its version of the amendment.

There are reports that House conferees are willing to stretch the limit to 21 days, but they won't remove all limitation. And we don't blame them. It is hard to imagine Congress requiring even 10 days to make such an urgent decision as deciding whether a President may reoccupy his office.

Such a period would be difficult enough for the Nation to weather without congressional stalling and indecision. A time limit is in order, and the shorter the better.

Let the Senate swallow its "unlimited debate" mystique on this important issue so that the States may get on with the business of ratifying a vital constitutional amendment.

AT LAST

The agreement of House and Senate conferees on a constitutional amendment for the determination of presidential disability and succession is most welcome.

The agreement gives Congress 21 days to decide the issue when the Vice President contests the right of a once disabled President to resume office. The earlier House version of the amendment imposed a 10-day limit. The Senate, with its strong feelings for unlimited debate, set no limit.

It is to the credit of the Senate that it swallowed its pride on this vital question and accepted a time limit. Obviously, a matter of such importance to the Federal Gov-

ernment and the Nation should be disposed of with all reasonable speed.

The amendment also provides for insuring that the Vice-Presidency always will be filled, which is an intelligent advance in treating the matter of presidential succession.

While immense satisfaction can be taken from the action in Congress in the last few days, it is a little sad to reflect on how long it has taken to come to grips with the problem.

The country repeatedly has found itself without a Vice President. And after President Dwight D. Eisenhower had been disabled by a heart attack in 1955 the voices for treating the disability issue became loud and insistent. It took 10 years to reach an agreement. That's too long for so important a matter.

B. Frank Heintzleman of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, Alaska has lost a dedicated and devoted Alaskan in the death of former Gov. B. Frank Heintzleman. Mr. Heintzleman, who died last Thursday night in Juneau, spent nearly 50 years of his life in Alaska working for the good of Alaska, first as regional forester of the U.S. Forest Service, then as Governor, and then, in official retirement. Unmarried—he made the people of Alaska his family and Alaska's development his life's work. I am but one of his host of friends and admirers who mourn his passing.

State flags were ordered to fly at half mast by Gov. William A. Egan, in recognition of the enormous contributions made to Alaska by this tireless worker, this highly respected, widely loved Alaskan, Frank Heintzleman. As a token of my deep personal regard and admiration for this great American and dedicated Alaskan, I insert here an Associated Press article from Juneau telling of his great career and Alaska's loss:

STATE FLAGS AT HALF STAFF FOR GOVERNOR HEINTZLEMAN

JUNEAU.—State flags were flying at half staff today for former Gov. B. Frank Heintzleman who died here Thursday at the age of 77.

A Pennsylvania native who devoted nearly a half century to the economic development of Alaska, Heintzleman succumbed a week after suffering a severe heart attack.

Among Heintzleman's effects was found a note directing that burial take place at Fayetteville, Pa., where he was born.

He also asked any services in Juneau, his home since 1937, be limited to memorial services.

Memorial services are scheduled for 3 p.m. Sunday in the Northern Lights Presbyterian Church, Juneau, with the Reverend Dr. Edward Holborrow officiating.

Heintzleman graduated from the Pennsylvania State School of Forestry with a bachelor's degree in forestry in 1907. He earned a master's degree in forestry at Yale University 3 years later and entered the U.S. Forest Service the same year.

After working in Oregon and Washington, Heintzleman was transferred to Ketchikan in 1918, and spent the rest of his life in Alaska.

From 1918 through 1937 he was regional forester for the territory. He was instrumental in the establishment of the Ketchikan Pulp Co., of Ketchikan, and the Alaska Lumber & Pulp Co. facility at Sitka.

Heintzleman was appointed as Governor of Alaska by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower March 16, 1953.

He served as Governor until January of 1957 and then retired from political life.

When Alaska Gov. William A. Egan heard of Heintzleman's death he ordered all State flags flown at half staff until the burial.

Egan remarked, "Alaska has lost one of its most distinguished citizens. Governor Heintzleman dedicated his life to the progress of Alaska."

A native of Fayetteville, Pa., Heintzleman was born December 3, 1888.

He came north to Ketchikan in 1918 and spent the remaining years of his life in his newly adopted State.

From 1918 through 1937, when he was appointed regional forester for the territory, Heintzleman served in various Forest Service positions in Alaska.

When President Eisenhower moved into the White House in 1953, Heintzleman quietly sought the appointment as Governor of Alaska.

Eisenhower announced the appointment of Heintzleman on March 16, 1963, and Heintzleman took office the following month, but he found soon that being in the political spotlight was substantially different from the life of a Government administrator.

When he left office, Heintzelman gave firm indication of his future plans in the following statement to newsmen:

"I won't be idle.

"I shall continue to live in Alaska and work on pending and prospective projects for the welfare of the territory."

Candidate Lindsay—Democrats Worried in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, national columnist, Roscoe Drummond, writing this morning in the Washington Post has caught the spirit of excitement that the candidacy of our colleague Congressman JOHN V. LINDSAY for mayor of New York City has created all over the country.

Pointing out that Congressman LINDSAY has the intelligence, energy, and popularity which New York City so desperately needs, Drummond is coming to grips with the fundamental responsibility of any political party: to provide competent government.

The disarray among the opposition, Drummond notes, could benefit Congressman LINDSAY, but he is quick to state that Congressman LINDSAY "is the only opposition mayoral candidate who has made a serious impact on the press and on the New York electorate in a long time and the only one who is giving the voters in the biggest metropolis in the country a meaningful choice."

Mr. Drummond's column follows:

CANDIDATE LINDSAY—DEMOCRATS WORRIED IN NEW YORK

(By Roscoe Drummond)

NEW YORK.—Ever since Representative JOHN LINDSAY took the cold plunge into the New York mayoralty race, he has been showing the Republican Party all across the Nation what it most needs if it is going to make a significant comeback next year.

What it most needs are younger, vigorous, intelligent, and attractive candidates.

Many Republicans give the impression that they feel politics is a "dirty business" in which they would prefer not to be involved. This makes it hard for them to draw the most qualified Republicans into public life. President Eisenhower tried to repair this weakness and made little headway. So did Richard Nixon with the same result.

The Republicans have had another self-imposed handicap. Since they genuinely believe that less government is desirable, they find it difficult to get good candidates to make less government better.

And now comes LINDSAY, who is making running for the most headaching office in the Nation—mayor of the most problem-laden city in the Nation—seem worthy and worthwhile—and downright exciting.

Most Republican leaders, including all the five living GOP presidential nominees except Barry Goldwater, are not in the least distressed by the fact that LINDSAY is not flaunting his party label in a city which is 3 to 1 Democratic.

That's not important. From the standpoint of basic philosophy, there is no such thing as a "Democratic" mayor or a "Republican" mayor of New York. The only thing that counts is whether there is going to be a competent mayor.

What is important from the Republican standpoint, is for the voters to see that the GOP is giving them from its ranks a candidate worthy of the race. That's all the credit a party needs. That will be plenty—if LINDSAY pulls it off.

You don't have to be in New York long to see that he has the Democrats here very worried.

For one thing, for the first time since LaGuardia, a Republican is virtually monopolizing the headlines. At this stage LINDSAY is the almost daily focus of the campaign. On the day this column is written, the New York Herald Tribune had a banner head on LINDSAY on page 3, the New York Times ran three Lindsay stories, and in the World Telegram and the Journal American he got a big play.

Not that the New York papers are all committed to LINDSAY. They aren't. But he is the only opposition mayoral candidate who has made a serious impact on the press and on the New York electorate in a long time and the only one who is giving the voters in the biggest metropolis in the country a meaningful choice.

They seem to like it.

LINDSAY not only has the advantage of political popularity in depth but the Democrats have the disadvantage of bitter intraparty competition in depth. Right now they have:

One candidate who has withdrawn—Mayor Wagner.

Four candidates who have announced that they will run against each other in the primary—City Council President Paul Screvane, Representative WILLIAM RYAN, Councilman Paul O'Dwyer, and the latest, Queens County District Attorney Frank O'Connor, who is basing his bid for the Democratic nomination on a denunciation of Mayor Wagner for "vacillation, indecision, and ineptness."

Two other candidates appear to be standing in the wing willing to join the parade if encouraged, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.,

and Assistant Secretary of Labor Daniel P. Moynihan.

Obviously it is too early to foresee how LINDSAY will fare in the election. The professionals figure he will likely win if there is a divisive Democratic primary. The ploy which one hears in some city Democratic quarters is that President Johnson may name Mayor Wagner as Cabinet Secretary for Urban Affairs and thus squash a primary fight by enabling Screvane to inherit the mayoralty before the primary.

Our Healthy Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our country is enjoying an unprecedented period of prosperity. The following analysis of the economic situation by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, tells the facts.

Mr. Drummond's column appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 27, 1965, and follows:

THE HEALTHY ECONOMY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Nothing is more vital to everything the United States is trying to do in the world—at home and abroad—than the state of the economy.

This is why it is important not to get the stock market mixed up with the valid thermometers of economic health.

The market has had its scare. It still may be a little jittery. But the truth is that the state of the economy is good, the outlook is for more of the same as far ahead as one can reasonably see, and no one, including Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin, sees a recession around the corner.

This isn't just a Lyndon Johnson peptalk, although the President has been saying as much at recent press conferences. This appraisal comes from looking at the objective facts. It is an appraisal shared by most private economists. It reflects a pervasive confidence on the part of the whole business community.

It isn't wishful thinking. It isn't political organ music to quiet the stock market.

There are reasons why the business community is not nervous about the future even if the market has been having some nervous vibrations. Among them are these:

Federal revenue is going up, Federal spending is going down and the budget is getting nearer to balance.

The Treasury finds business activity and personal income will yield $1.6 billion more in taxes than it estimated last January—this despite the substantial cut in rates last year.

Government spending will be $900 million below the estimate made 6 months ago.

This combination of an increase in revenue or of lower tax rates and a decline in spending means that the Federal deficit at the end of this month will reach a 5-year low.

All of this reflects a remarkable continuity in the healthy state of the U.S. economy.

There has been sustained prosperity and sustained economic growth for the longest period in American history—and nothing to the contrary is on the horizon.

Treasury Secretary Henry Fowler sees a steady upward trend in business activity for the rest of 1965—and beyond. This disagreeing on some things, the liberal Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Gardner Ackley, and the conservative Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Martin, share the view that no recession is in the making.

Mr. Martin's Columbia University speech did not start the downturn in the market. It had already begun. His speech, with its warnings against inflation and the still unresolved balance-of-payments gap, undoubtedly gave it a further push—more of a push than he intended because his warnings were played so much more prominently than his assurances.

Basically the warnings were well taken and timely. But the dissimilarities between now and 1929 are far greater than the similarities—and Mr. Martin said so. Few read his speech in full.

The most reassuring fact is that none of the ingredients of a recession show up in any of the economic indicators.

Just the opposite. Inventories are not bulging. They are actually lower today than when the boom got underway. Business is not overexpanding and that was what, in large part, brought on the recession of 1957. The expansion of productive capacity has been running just about even with the expansion of consumer demand.

The economy is in good health and Mr. Martin is rightly saying: Let's be alert to keep it that way.

U.N. 20th Anniversary Observance

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago a world was weary with war. Hardly a nation on the face of the earth had been spared the demolition of its cities, the death and maiming of its troops or the despair and devastation of its citizenry.

Millions had perished. Hundreds of millions lived in rubble and with hunger.

A war had just been won in Europe. But both victor and vanquished lived in the midst of misery.

Another war was soon to be won in Asia. But with the sudden end of that war would come a new age—the nuclear age, the age of the atomic bomb and the ultimate weapon.

In most parts of the world, there was one hope and one goal, and that was that another world war would never again be visited upon the human race.

In an effort to bring that goal to realization, a new organization was formed, the United Nations. In the midst of war and turmoil, this organization came into formal being with the formal signing of the United Nations Charter on June 26, 1945.

Two decades have gone by. Some call the United Nations an unqualified success. Others claim it is succeeding too well and is subverting national governments. Still others see the U.N. as a failure, a flop, a burst balloon of vain hopes and unattainable goals.

The United Nations is none of these and yet a little of each of these.

To say that the United Nations has been an unqualified success would mean that it has helped substantially to keep us out of war. We know that it has not. We know that Americans are dying now in Vietnam, that many died in Korea and that troops of many lands have engaged in battle under the flag of the United Nations.

But there has been no worldwide conflict since the creation of the U.N. There has been no brutal confrontation of big powers in open conflict which has dragged the rest of the world into the battle.

There have been brush fires but no all-out conflagrations.

To say that the United Nations has had no influence on the foreign and domestic policies of the United States would be unrealistic. The U.N. most certainly has done so.

More than any other organization, the United Nations has created—or rather discovered—something called world opinion.

It has helped to formulate a sort of consensus of conscience in the world community which has had its affect upon our own Nation in our dealings with other nations and even upon such internal affairs as race relations and civil rights.

We have not been alone in, at times, receiving criticism from the world community. The Soviet Union has found itself in the same position on many occasions and its policies have been modified and tempered at least partly because of world opinion.

Yet, despite this influence, the criticism that the U.N. is too weak and too slow to be an effective force in world affairs most certainly has its advocates.

The U.N. has not been successful in finding a solution to the conflict in Vietnam. It has not been successful in ending the race to join the nuclear club.

But it has not been a flop in heading off conflict, as witness the U.N. force in the Middle East, the open and worldwide debate in the U.N. when the Cuban missile crisis was upon us, the end to the bloodshed in Cyprus and the Congo.

The United Nations has not attained all the goals, fulfilled all the hopes, or brought to reality all the dreams of its founders.

But it has consistently and constantly moved in the direction of these goals. It has helped man to know himself in myriad ways. It has helped nations to know themselves and to associate themselves with the larger community of the world.

By expecting nothing less than perfection from man and country in the attainment of its basic goals, the United Nations has gone a lot further down the road toward peace and freedom than we had any right to expect in such a small slice of history.

As the prime creators, the instigators, and the implementers of the United Nations, our United States has more at stake than most other countries in its success.

As the world's prime believers in the worth of work and freedom, we have more at stake than most in seeing to it that the United Nations continues to succeed.

The doctrines and beliefs put forth in

the United Nations Charter are those to which each of us, as individuals, can subscribe completely.

The goal of freedom with justice is one which we can and must support domestically.

The aim of freedom and self-determination for all in the world is our goal in foreign affairs.

I think it is significant and important to note that there are only two nations in the world which show open hostility to the United Nations and look upon it with disdain.

One of these countries is Red China, an outlaw in the world community preaching a doctrine of racial hate, subversion of neighboring governments, assassination of public officials, and the inevitability of atomic war.

The other is Indonesia, another dictatorship which has the distinction of being the first nation to quit the U.N., which follows a policy of picking on its smaller neighbors and of ignoring the human needs of its own citizens.

If these are the kind of countries opposing the United Nations, then it should be clear to all of us that we want no part of such company in the world.

All of us realize that the United Nations organization is not perfect. But it is the best there is and the best we have.

If we support the U.N. in its efforts to achieve world peace as we have in the past, then our chances for peace will continue to improve.

If, instead, we support the splintering of the world community into noncommunicative cliques and groups, then our chances for peace are diminishing to that extent.

We do want peace; we do want freedom; we do want justice to reign in the world. Then let us continue our journey toward these goals in the vehicle we helped to create for just this purpose—the United Nations.

The Importance of the National Vocational Student Loan Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, action by the House of Representatives in approving H.R. 7743, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, was another of the wise actions taken by the 89th Congress to insure our Nation of trained and qualified technicians in our quest for a Great Society.

The young people this act is designed to help are those who for financial reasons have had to discontinue their education after high school.

The enactment of this measure will make it possible for these persons to secure insured financial loans to better prepare themselves for a productive role in our society.

Not all of our young people are inclined or equipped to attend college, but many of them have an avid interest in the trade and service fields. For too long our Federal Government has followed the pattern set by State governments in allowing this vast pool of talent to go untapped.

The tremendous need for this legislation has been fully outlined in the report of the Education and Labor Committee of the House and I am more than pleased to add my voice to those who see this as a creative and productive way to utilize our greatest natural resource—the youth of our land.

The 20th Anniversary of the United Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, after the most destructive and devastating war man has ever experienced, the leading nations of the world gathered together to create an organization dedicated to the principle of keeping a just and lasting peace. This was the second time in a half a century that such an attempt had been made and the delegates who gathered at San Francisco in April of 1945 well remembered the terrible price that had been paid for the failure of the first attempt, the League of Nations.

Profiting by the mistakes of the previous generation, these leaders constructed a charter which not only provided the machinery for keeping peace throughout the world, but also created the means for extensive international cooperation in all areas. Through the efforts of the United Nations, new and underdeveloped countries could seek and receive economic, educational, and technical aid from large and more prosperous nations.

A spirit of friendship, good will, and mutual help was intended to replace the old animosities, hatreds, and nationalistic fears which had for so long permeated the international situation. Deliberation and debate around the conference table would now arbitrate differences between soverign nations instead of bayonets and bombs.

With these as its principles, and with the new and terrifying realization of nuclear power which introduced an entire new dimension into world affairs, the United Nations embarked upon the task of measuring up to the most imminent need of man, the preservation from self-destruction.

Over the past two decades, the United Nations has indeed attained respect and stature in many of its endeavors. In Korea, Suez, and the Congo it has had the courage and determination to act in defense of the principle of nonaggression and its policy of mutual assistance has been invaluable to many of the new emerging nations. But there have also been failures and frustrations primarily due to the obstructionism of the Soviet bloc, in certain instances rendering the organization ineffective. However, on the sum total of evidence available, we must judge that the achievements of this organization have far outweighed its failures. Credit for this must be attributed to many truly great statesmen, from various nations, who have given of themselves and their ideas to the original proposition and to its continuity over the years. The United Nations was the ultimate dream of President Roosevelt, and his Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. Its successful initiation was dependent upon the forceful leadership of President Harry S. Truman and its continued dedication to principle has been furthered by the influence of such eminent statesmen and Henry Cabot Lodge and Adlai Stevenson. It is also indeed encouraging to observe the caliber of men such as Dag Hammarskjold and U Thant that have been selected to lead this body. Men of character and extreme competence who spare neither themselves nor their efforts in their dedication to mankind.

Much has been done, but much more is left to do. In an age of nuclear power and space exploration, the world looks to the United Nations and the United Nations must look to itself. Whether or not the principles of nonaggression, peaceful cooperation, self-determination and national integrity will become a reality is the burden which now rests on this organization. The world now awaits with apprehension and yet hope that the United Nations along with divine guidance can bring all men and all nations to the realization of the necessity of an honorable and lasting peace. In this light history will judge the United Nations and let us pray, for that we must, that it will be successful in the awesome endeavor.

Public Safety: Our No. 1 Domestic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech delivered on June 17 by the Honorable Henry Ellenbogen, president judge of the Allegheny County Pennsylvania Court of Common Pleas, and a former Member of the House of Representatives.

Addressing the annual Bench-Bar Conference of Allegheny County, Judge Ellenbogen argued that crime must be regarded as "the No. 1 domestic problem of our generation." In addition to presenting a learned analysis of the subject, Judge Ellenbogen suggested that President Johnson schedule a White House Conference on Crime and Crime Prevention.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the text of Judge Ellenbogen's remarks and a Pittsburgh Press editorial of June 20 entitled "The Problem of Crime":

PUBLIC SAFETY: OUR NO. 1 DOMESTIC PROBLEM

(An address by the Honorable Henry Ellenbogen, president judge, Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, delivered at the Third Annual Bench-Bar Conference of Allegheny County at Seven Springs Farms, Seven Springs, Pa., on Thursday, June 17, 1965)

When the legal history of Allegheny County is written, the year 1965 will loom large. It will loom large because it ushered in a new era in the relationship between the judges of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County and the Allegheny County Bar Association.

I say to you with a great deal of pride and with a great deal of pleasure that there has never been so close, so cordial, so harmonious a relationship between the bench and bar of Allegheny County as exists today.

This is a happy situation which will result in great good for the people of Allegheny County and of the whole State as well as for the legal profession.

The credit for this new era in the relationship between the Allegheny County Bar Association and the court of common pleas is due to a young and brilliant trial lawyer who came to the presidency of the bar association a scant few months ago. That man is David B. Fawcett, Jr. I salute him. I salute the other officers and the members of the board of governors who have worked with him in bringing about a new era of cooperation between the bench and bar.

A NEW ERA OF UNDERSTANDING

I know that I speak for every one of my colleagues on the bench when I tell you that we all value this relationship. We intend to maintain it and build on it for the good of all of us. This mutual understanding will be the basis upon which we will build our program for the improvement of the legal profession, and for making our court a better and a greater court.

United in purpose, as we now are, let us join here tonight in examining what I think is building up into a real crisis. The subject which I would like to talk to you about—indeed, that I must talk to you about—is the fact that there is today no safety, no security for our citizens in their homes, on the streets, in their places of business, at work or at play.

To put it briefly and succinctly, I say to you that Government is falling down on its No. 1 job—its duty to make every person secure in his life, his liberty, and in his person. Ask your wives if they dare go out at night on the streets. For that matter, is it safe for you to take a walk at night in the residential neighborhood in which you live?

There is no use in closing our eyes to the true facts. As lawyers and as judges we have been trained to face up to the facts and to see a situation as it really it. The bench and the bar should not permit our citizens to be tranquilized into a false hope that this grave danger will somehow be dissipated. You know, and I know, that it will not. It will not improve unless we face up to this evil in its stark reality; deal with it, and remove its causes.

SAFETY: OUR NO. 1 PROBLEM

Our first duty is to inform the people of America of the true situation. Our citizens must be warned that crime is growing like an evil cancer and, unless arrested, will consume the body of society. The ever-accelerating growth of crime, and with it the ever-growing insecurity of our people, will soon be recognized as the No. 1 domestic problem of our generation. I call it the No. 1 problem, with the exception only of the threat of extinction through thermonuclear warfare. If that great tragedy should occur, we will not be around to worry about crime, or anything else.

Tonight let us talk about the threat to our domestic tranquillity and the insecurity of our citizens. This problem is going to grow. It will be with us for the rest of our lives unless the bench and the bar unite to awaken the people to demand action.

We might well take judicial notice of a situation that all of us know to be true. But if proof be needed, let proof be offered. The Law Enforcement Bulletin, volume 34, No. 4, dated May 1965, issued by the Federal Bureau of Investigation has the proof. It shows on page 22 that "your chances of becoming a victim of a serious crime are increasing six times faster than the population is growing." Unless something is done to reverse this trend, FBI crime reporting experts agree, "the Nation faces another 78-percent increase in crime over the next decade."

A still later bulletin from J. Edgar Hoover confirms our fear that this hideous monster is not confined to our cities. Crime in the suburbs, the citadel of our middle class, shows the sharpest upward trend. It is up 6 percent for the first 3 months of 1965. Armed robbers, burglars, and other assorted felons now prowl the greener pastures of the once tranquil countryside.

Basic to any approach to this problem must be the realization that what amounts to a revolution has taken place in our criminal procedure.

I refer, of course, to the historic decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Gideon's trumpet reverberated through the hallowed halls of the U.S. Supreme Court. It blasted away the old interpretation of the Bill of Rights.

Gideon's Trumpet sounded the death knell of two different measures of justice—one for the poor and another for those who could afford the services of a good lawyer. From that day on, the humblest and the poorest of our citizens have been enjoying the same expert legal advice and the same protection of the Bill of Rights as our wealthy and influential citizens.

From that day on, we have truly become a democratic nation where the law is blind to wealth and position. Now all of our people, rich or poor, stand on an equal footing in a Court of law. The equality of man in the halls of justice is now a fact, not merely a cherished hope.

This has never been true before in the history of any nation. It is truly a peak in our developing civilization. It is a gain that we must retain. It must not be dissipated.

Your part in this notable development in our constitutional history is one in which you can take great pride. I take great pleasure in acknowledging your magnificant contribution.

The Allegheny County Bar Association and its most distinguished members made this constitutional development a reality. You responded most promptly and generously to my plea that you contribute your services to indigent prisoners who are seeking their freedom through applications for writs of habeas corpus. You have made 1965 one of the finest and noblest years in the noteworthy history of public service of the Bar Association of Allegheny County.

Let it be noted that 200 of the bar's most distinguished members are contributing their valuable time and extraordinary talents in serving this ideal of justice.

Grateful as I am for your splendid and overwhelming response in volunteering your services, it is my duty now to warn you that the end is nowhere in sight. The flow of letters and petitions—mostly handwritten—from hundreds of prisoners hopeful of gaining their freedom has turned into a flood. Sooner or later every long-term prisoner in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will resort to a petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The same situation prevails in the other 49 States. Many of these petitioners were convicted as murderers and rapists. Many of them have been imprisoned for staging spectacular armed holdups and burglaries. Nearly all of them, too, have long records of prior convictions.

The fact that so many of you have volunteered your services to friendless and hardened criminals demonstrates that we share a passionate belief in the enforcement of the Bill of Rights. We are dedicated to apply the great safeguards which it provides to every person, rich man or poor man, law-abiding citizen or hardened criminal.

Yet we must never forget that the first duty of government is to assure the safety of the person and the security of the property of every citizen. The preservation of the peace in the community is society's primary concern.

Can we overlook the danger inherent in the hundreds, indeed thousands, of hardened criminals now demanding to be freed from long-term sentences imposed upon them under interpretations of the law and the Bill of Rights then valid? The imminent danger now is that the scales of justice are so weighed as to give criminals greater and greater rights, and the law-abiding people less and less protection.

Each of these cases imposes on us the difficult and delicate duty of weighing the rights guaranteed to convicted criminals by the Bill of Rights with the right of every citizen to security and peace, an inalienable right conferred by the laws of God and man.

We must not stop here. As we have already said, society's first duty is to protect its people. We must now demand that government meet this obligation.

I do not have any ready solution as to how this can best be done. It is certain that laws against criminals must be strengthened. The prison system must be completely overhauled and revamped. We must have more policemen, they must be better trained, and better paid.

Other courses of action will recommend themselves after study and investigation. Since the threat of crime and criminals is statewide, indeed nationwide, the remedy must be statewide and nationwide.

The safety and security of our people deserve the attention of the best intellects of our country.

I urge this distinguished assemblage of the leaders of the bench and bar to consider all the aspects of this grave problem. We cannot evade the responsibility of seeking a solution. Perhaps a statewide conference called by the Governor in Harrisburg would be a step in the right direction. Perhaps a White House Conference on Crime and Crime Prevention is necessary to provide the answer. In any event, I urge you to give careful thought to this most important matter.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, June 20, 1965]

THE PROBLEM OF CRIME

The warnings continue about the growth of crime in the United States, and the statistics bear out the doleful prophecies. The most expert law enforcement officers and other public officials who have studied the problem agree that, unless something is done, we face large increases in both the incidence and nature of crimes.

President Judge Henry Ellenbogen, of the Allegheny County Common Pleas Court, rates crime as "the No. 1 domestic problem of our generation," and he sees government as fall-

ing down in its duty to make every person secure in his life, liberty and person.

"There is today no safety, no security for our citizens in their homes, on the streets, in their places of business, at work or at play," he told a bench-bar conference the other day. "Our citizens must be warned that crime is growing like an evil cancer and, unless arrested, will consume the body of society."

Strong words? A recent FBI report estimated that "your chances of becoming a victim of a serious crime are increasing 6 times faster than the population is growing." And the growth is not confined to cities. The sharpest increases have been found in suburban areas.

In Washington, U.S. Attorney David C. Acheson protested that police, prosecutors, and courts are being swamped by the rising crime rate. And another occurrence in the same city gave one specific answer for the increase.

Judge George L. Hart, Jr., reluctantly freed a defendant in a rape case because the police didn't have a search warrant and thus had made what, by recent court rulings, was an "illegal" arrest.

The 17-year-old victim had gone to police with her story of rape at knifepoint. She joined police in a search of the man's home. There the police arrested a man identified by the girl and recovered her skirt and sweater from a car in the backyard. But they had no search warrant. The court said the police could have surrounded the house and then tried to contact a judge (in the wee hours of early morning) to get a warrant.

Judge Ellenbogen, in his address to the bar, noted that "what amounts to a revolution has taken place in our criminal procedure," through rulings of the appellate courts.

"The imminent danger now is that the scales of justice are so weighed as to give criminals greater and greater rights, and the law-abiding people less and less protection," he said.

What to do? Judge Ellenbogen conceded that he had no ready solution, though he believes law against crime should be strengthened, our prison system completely overhauled and that we must have more policemen, better trained and better paid.

He suggested two steps that might be taken in the search for a solution or solutions. One would be a White House Conference on Crime and Crime Prevention, using a successful method on a new subject. The other would be a statewide conference called by Governor Scranton. Considering the gravity of the problem, some such concentrated study would seem to be in order.

Tolland, Conn., Celebrates 250th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, one of the oldest towns in New England, Tolland, Conn., located in my congressional district, is currently celebrating its 250th anniversary. Tolland was founded in the year 1715, after a group of settlers from England had 2 years earlier purchased the land from the Mohegan Indians for $2,500.

Throughout its history Tolland was a rural town, but it had several small local industries. When these industries closed down, its population decreased to only a little over 1,000 in 1920. In the past decade newer industries were established in the area and Tolland's population is now around 5,000.

The opening ceremony of the celebration took place on Sunday, June 27, which I attended. The celebration will last through this entire week ending on Saturday, July 3. In connection with this observance, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD two articles which deal with this event and include many interesting historical facts about Tolland. The articles were published in recent issues of the Hartford Courant and the Hartford Times:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Sunday Courant, June 30, 1965]

TOLLAND IS HAVING BIRTHDAY PARTY—250 YEARS OLD

(By Kirk G. Hatsian)

TOLLAND.—This typical New England town, filled with rustic charm and steeped in early American tradition, observes its 250th anniversary starting 1 week from today.

Town fathers are rolling out the red carpet and even bringing in a brass band for the festivities.

One of the highlights of the anniversary week will be the opening ceremony Sunday, June 27, on the grounds of the Hicks Memorial School on the Green. Among the dignitaries scheduled to speak are Governor Dempsey, U.S. Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, and U.S. Representative WILLIAM ST. ONGE. The Sphinx Temple Shrine Band will play.

Other events during the week include a beard judging contest, teenage block dance, tour of pre-Revolutionary War homes, talent show, anniversary ball, and a 90-minute parade.

Many moons ago, this northeastern Connecticut community was the home of the Mohegan Tribe. They were here when the settlers arrived from Windsor because it was getting too crowded there.

The settlers were descendants of Thomas Hooker's party which came to America's shores from England and settled in Windsor and then Hartford in 1635.

Relationship between the settlers and the Indians here was peaceful.

As the late Loren P. Waldo, president of the Tolland County Historical Society, said in a speech in 1861:

"We can point to no spot where the white and red men have met in mortal combat. We do not know that the savage war whoop was ever heard in these valleys. The history of Tolland, in short, is not calculated to interest the marvelous, nor produce wonder and astonishment in the reflecting; but like a gentle current, bears upon its quiet bosom facts worthy of our notice and which afford us both instruction and amusement."

In 1713, the settlers purchased the land from the Mohegans for about $2,500. The Mohegans drove a harder bargain than the Indians who sold Manhattan Island to the Dutch settlers in 1626 for $24 worth of trinkets.

In 1715, the town was chartered and they named it for Tolland in the English county seat of Somerset. Most of the families came from the counties of Somerset, Dorset and Devon in England.

According to tradition, the men who laid the first roads in town provided themselves with a temporary home under a large shelving rock—known as settler's rock * * * now situated on the west side of the highway leading to Bolton on Gehring Road.

The walls of the dwelling as well as the roof, being of stone, led to its being named Stoney House. And this led to the naming of the brook that runs by it, which is in the early records of the town, called Stoney House Brook.

Tolland did its share in contributing men to fight battles from the time of the Revolutionary War. When news of the Battle of Lexington reached Tolland, a company of 98 men from here and surrounding towns was immediately formed. Nearly half the contingent was filled by Tolland fathers and sons.

The legislature, in 1785, established an act creating the county of Tolland. For more than 100 years, this town was the seat of the county government until it was moved to Rockville.

The first courthouse was a wooden, two-story building on the center of the green, a short distance from where the present courthouse now stands. The old courthouse was razed in 1822.

Persons found guilty were escorted out of the courthouse to the lawn outside and tied to the whipping posts or locked in the stocks. The stocks accommodated two persons at a time.

When the old courthouse came down, the whipping posts and stocks disappeared, too.

Tolland ceased to be the county seat in 1960 when the general assembly abolished the county system and replaced the county courts with circuit courts.

Tolland has been the home of four jails, the first built by town subscription in 1785. One by one, the jails were replaced until 1856 when the present jail was built. It is now called the Tolland State Jail.

When the first settlers came here, they also brought with them Thomas Hooker's religious beliefs. They established the Congregational Church and for many years it was regarded as the State church.

The first services were held in a log building and the meeting house served the families from 1723 to 1755. It was situated on a hill at the south end of the Green. The worshippers outgrew the meeting house and in 1751 the town meeting voted to erect a larger building. This, too, began to split at the seams and in 1838 the present United Congregational Church of Tolland was constructed. It's on the Green facing the State Jail.

The steeple of the present church was copied from the original Congregational Church in Tolland, England, and attracts considerable attention because of its peculiar notched construction.

Like all other new towns, Tolland was basically an agricultural community. In 1854, the Tolland County Agricultural Society was organized, and its first fair was held that year on the Green.

During the next 100 years, there came a flourishing belt factory and other industries tied in with agricultural life such as cidermills, sawmills, grist mills, blacksmith shops and general stores.

Tolland remains a rural town despite the change in the economic life of the community. Such specialty crops as flowers, celery and tobacco are still grown here on farms that have kept up with modern trends in machinery and other farms still operating with the horse and plow.

The anniversary issue magazine, in its historical notes, is optimistic about Tolland's future. It says:

"From 1965 Tolland looks forward to an increasing size and importance in the State's economy. Growth of the town no longer depends upon what can be extracted from the soil, nor upon the political life of the county, nor upon waterpower.

"Power can now be brought a long distance; rapid transportation integrates Tolland with the long city area from Boston to New York to Washington and the life space of Tolland residents is enlarged beyond the few miles a man or horse could comfortably walk in a day.

"But still large in the life of our town is education and religion. The next few years will surely see the new St. Matthew Church and the Tolland High School.

"Tolland has changed with the rest of the United States. No doubt it will continue its development as an integral part of the State and Nation."

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, June 23, 1965]

TOLLAND SLATES GALA WEEK FOR 250TH ANNIVERSARY—TOWN FOUNDED IN 1715 PACED NEW ENGLAND'S GROWTH

(By Joyce Robinson)

TOLLAND.—This small eastern Connecticut town, founded in 1715 by settlers from Windsor, will celebrate its 250th anniversary June 27 to July 3.

The weeklong observance will include a wide variety of activities, from ox cart rides to a formal ball. Of special interest will be a rare tour of the town's homes, from the oldest to the newest.

Tolland is now one of the fastest growing towns in the State. Between 1950 and 1960, the population jumped from 1,659 to 2,950 or 77.8 percent.

The U.S. Census Bureau confirmed that Tolland had the fastest growth in New England during those 10 years. The growth hasn't stopped. This year, the population is expected to reach the 5,000 mark.

The population, though, wasn't always on the upswing. From 1830 to 1920 the number of townspeople dropped from 1,698 to 1,040. The blame has been put on the development of assembly line production, which finally forced the local handcraft industries to close.

In its early history Tolland had no industry and men relied for work on agriculture, dairy farms, and out-of-town firms. Today, much of the town's labor force is employed elsewhere, mainly with the Pratt & Whitney Division in East Hartford and insurance companies in Hartford.

Tolland's industry, though small in its heyday, was varied. In 1810, the town claimed two blacksmiths, a hat and hoop skirt factory, a linen mill and a tannery. From 1880 to 1915 there were five small basketweaving industries.

The most prominent industry of the last century was the Underwood Belt Co., which was active from 1836 to 1893. The company grew to the point where it not only manufactures belts but also belt hooks, small hardware items, belting supplies for other manufacturers and "stockinette," a knitted fabric used for stockings and underwear.

In the 1930's, Bruce Cramer, a geologist and mining engineer, discovered and developed a garnet mine on Mountain Spring Road. It is still in operation.

Stone from the quarry, sparkling with mica and freckled with garnet, has been used in the Veteran's Memorial Tower on Rockville's Fox Hill, has been sent to the Gettysburg home of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower and is on display at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington.

The Todd Division of the Burroughs Corp., Tolland's only present-day industry, is the largest the town has ever had. The Todd plant was built in 1963 and is a distribution point for the various business forms and equipment produced by the corporation.

Tolland's role in county government was important during the 1800's. The Tolland County Courthouse, built in 1822, was the meeting place of the superior and common pleas courts in the county for 66 years. In 1888, most of the sessions were transferred to Rockville because the trolley line ended there and lawyers and judges got tired of buggying out to Tolland.

The old courthouse on the Tolland Green is now the home of the town library, which occupies the first floor. The second floor remains as it was when legal oratory echoed through the building.

Whipping posts and stocks were conveniently located near the courthouse in the old days. Records show that one execution was carried out on the green.

There has been a jail on the green since the first one was built in 1785. The present State-operated jail, formerly the county jail, was built of stone and brick in 1856 and later expanded.

Until recently, inmates worked a farm which produced much of the food they ate. The farming ended when the State took over the jail and the land will soon be the site of the town's first high school.

The land was sold to Tolland for this purpose by the State this year for $15,000. Construction of the school, which will be the State's first all-electric high school, is underway.

Tolland high school students now attend Rockville High School, where they will continue until the new high school is ready for full-time operation in 1967.

There are two elementary schools, Hicks Memorial and Meadowbrook, both in the center of town. Hicks was built in 1908 and Meadowbrook in 1963.

Construction has begun on the town's first Catholic Church, St. Matthew. It is the first new church to be built in town since United Congregational Church was erected in 1838.

Because of its location on Boston Post Road, Tolland enjoyed early expansion and importance. The road served as a stage route from Boston to Hartford and by 1820 was in full swing.

A history of the town reports that "Tolland was a turbulent village with taverns, stores, factories, and law on every hand. Stage coaches stopped three times a week, freight wagons hauled to and from Hartford docks, and fast-trotting horses shuttled back and forth."

The town is now divided by the Wilbur Cross Highway (Route 15), still the major road between Boston, Hartford, and New York. The expressway has received much of the credit for Tolland's modern expansion. Residents are able to enjoy the rural atmosphere of the town while having quick access to work in Hartford in about 30 minutes. Townspeople hope the highway will carry visitors to the anniversary celebration, the first big birthday event since 1923.

In July 1923 several anniversaries were noted—the town's 208th, the Congregational Church's 200th, and the Methodist Church's 130th. The 2-day celebration included a pageant emphasizing education, industry, and religion. The Rockville City Band presented concerts. On Sunday, activity moved into the churches.

The 1965 celebration will have a much broader scope. Religious services at United and St. Matthew Churches will launch the anniversary June 27. Then, the mood will become more festive.

Exhibits of arts and crafts will be held daily along with a museum historical display. Many groups will sponsor dinners throughout the week and there will be a variety show and two outdoor dances.

Opening day ceremonies will be held at 2, June 27 on the Tolland Green. Guests will include Governor Dempsey, Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Congressman WILLIAM ST. ONGE, former Gov. John Lodge, Chief Justice John Hamilton King, and former Chief Justice Raymond E. Baldwin.

The Shrine Band of Hartford and the Chanters will present a concert in the afternoon, a reminiscent parallel of the town's 1923 celebration.

No Show Shriver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, in Washington we are all familiar with individuals who say "Yes" when they mean "No," and those who say "No" when the mean "Yes." A classic example of this technique is illustrated in the correspondence I have had recently with Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Because of its interest I am appending the exchange of letters to these remarks:

JUNE 3, 1965.

Hon. ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER, Jr.,
Director, Peace Corps,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SARGE: When I expressed the hope during your testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday that you testify before the Republican task force on economic opportunity, I had not really expected that you would be willing to do so. I was pleased, however, that you expressed willingness to appear before us and I should like to extend a formal invitation for you to appear either on Wednesday, June 16, or Thursday, June 17.

As you may know, we have scheduled hearings for 3 days this coming week, but we already have made firm commitments to others for those days.

The members of our task force appreciate very much your willingness to discuss your responsibilities as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Our primary purpose in holding these hearings is to see in what way the programs under your jurisdiction may be improved.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1965.

Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRELINGHUYSEN: During the course of the testimony concerning the Peace Corps you brought up the subject of my testifying before the Republican task force on economic opportunity. I assumed that any hearings to which you were referring would be conducted by a duly constituted committee of the Congress.

My acceptance was in keeping with a long-established policy of a willingness and even eagerness to appear and meet with committees of the Congress. And even further, I have always been willing to meet privately with individual Members or groups of Members of the Congress. In fact, only recently I had private meetings with the Democratic membership and the Republican membership of the House Education and Labor Committee concerning the poverty program. And I have always maintained that I should not have a public meeting with the members of one political party without the other party represented.

Consistent with this policy, I must decline your invitation to meet with your task force in any public meeting. Should any individual Members desire to meet with me privately to discuss common problems, I hold myself

readily available for such a meeting, as this would be consistent with the policy I have followed for a number of years.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

JUNE 10, 1965.

Hon. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SARGE: This will acknowledge your recent letter informing me that you are unwilling to appear before the Republican task force on economic opportunity.

Naturally, we were disappointed to learn that you would not be available for a public meeting. I can asure you that we would have no intention of embarrassing you in any way, as our purpose is simply to develop some factual information with respect to the operations of the Office of Economic Opportunity, as a basis for recommendations for strengthening its various programs.

We are very hopeful that you would be willing to meet with us in executive session at your convenience. Perhaps something could be arranged for the latter part of next week.

Sincerely yours,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., June 21, 1965.

Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRELINGHUYSEN: I have read with interest the newspaper reports of the sessions of the Republican task force on economic opportunity.

My position on the matters you covered has already been placed in the hearing record of the House Education and Labor Committee and, thus, it would seem unnecessary to schedule an executive session for the rediscussion of these matters.

As I have stated to you before, I do hold myself ready to meet with individual Members of Congress to discuss any aspect concerning the war on poverty. As you know, this is consistent with the policy I have followed during my years in Government service. And I am always available to the regular committees as frequently as they may wish me to appear.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

JUNE 28, 1965.

Hon. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SARGE: It was a real disappointment to learn that you are unwilling to meet with Republicans, in public or private, to discuss the administration of the Office of Economic Oppportunity. Although you profess to welcome discussions with Members of Congress, your continuing refusal to do so is hard to explain.

When first invited to testify before the Republican task force on economic opportunity, you clearly indicated your willingness to talk with us. On second thought you declined, on the odd ground that Democrats would not be present, even though I had clearly indicated that this was a Republican invitation. When invited to appear in executive session, in accordance with your declaration that you were readily available to meet privately with individual Members of Congress, you have now again refused.

How can we interpret your reluctance? Certainly your responsibilities as Director of the Peace Corps have not prevented you from making frequent public statements, and appearances, defending the antipoverty program. It is easy, therefore, to assume that you have the time but not the will.

You comment on the interest with which you have read newspaper accounts of the recent hearings held by the Republican task force on economic opportunity. We are gratified to know this. Just as those hearings interested you, and apparently the public also, so would your testimony—even if not available to the public—interest us Republicans.

Nor does it seem in character for you to resist the opportunity of discussing the programs for which you are responsible simply because you don't cherish an all-Republican audience. What have you to fear? You strongly emphasize your eagerness to appear before congressional committees, which are of course conducted in public, with both Democrats and Republicans, yet you shy away from serious Republican efforts to discuss privately the programs of the OEO. Could it be that we are interested in sensitive subjects which you would rather not discuss, in public or private?

In your opinion, it would "seem unnecessary" to hold an executive session for a "rediscussion" of matters you have already considered with the House Education and Labor Committee. We have not yet spelled out the areas which we should like to discuss, and I can only assure you that every effort would be made to avoid any rediscussion, or repetition, of your earlier testimony. I trust also that you will withhold your judgment as to the necessity of such a meeting until after it has actually taken place.

Since you reiterate your readiness to meet with individual Members of Congress, I can only hope you can still be persuaded to do so. To avoid a confrontation while professing to welcome it somehow smacks of arrogance—or an awareness of the present weakness of some of the antipoverty programs.

Sincerely,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Ben Barkin: Milwaukee's Idea Merchant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as Independence Day approaches, it is with great pride and pleasure that I call attention to the fact that my home city, Milwaukee, is the best place in the United States to be on the Fourth of July.

Each year thousands of persons visit Milwaukee to participate in our "Day in Old Milwaukee" festivities on the Fourth of July. This event is highlighted by the unique and spectacular circus parade, sponsored by the Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co.

It is my understanding that this year's parade will surpass anything in the past, presenting a full-scale circus parade including 40 historic circus wagons, 200 fine draft horses, clowns, cowboys, Indians, elephants, tigers, and more than 30 bands. There also will be a special performance of Ringling Bros. and Barnum and Bailey Circus and a stupendous fireworks display on the lakefront.

Today it is my wish to pay tribute to one of the men whose creative genius has been responsible for this revival of the past, Mr. Ben Barkin, Milwaukee's idea merchant.

Mr. Barkin, a public relations consultant, both conceived the idea for "A Day in Old Milwaukee" and convinced the Schlitz Brewing Co., that it should underwrite the event. Since the inception of the July 4 celebration in 1963, he has been intimately connected with its planning and operation.

"A Day in Old Milwaukee" is, however, only one of Mr. Barkin's many contributions to the life of our community. Recently the Milwaukee Journal featured an article outlining his achievements on the occasion of his 50th birthday. I am pleased to insert that article, by Mr. Doyle Getter, at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, June 13, 1965]

BEN BARKIN LOVES MILWAUKEE AND HIS GIFTS PROVE IT

(By Doyle K. Getter)

Milwaukee would be a much less interesting place to live without Ben Barkin.

Barkin is an idea merchant—a public relations consultant—who has a knack of making exciting things happen.

He has given as freely of his inspirations and energy to civic and religious drives of every sort, to scores of committees and groups working to improve Milwaukee, as he has to his professional clients.

His firm has been retained frequently for advice on major fund raising campaigns, including those for the memorial center and the center for the performing arts.

AIDED IN GETTING CONCERTS

Acting on Barkin's suggestions, one of his major clients, the Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co., is spending more than $300,000 annually to revive the days of old Milwaukee each 4th of July with a spectacular old time circus parade and fireworks display.

He interested Schlitz in bringing the New York and Philadelphia symphony orchestras to Milwaukee for free public concerts and in bringing four of the world's top golf professionals to Milwaukee for a free public exhibition.

Barkin, quite frankly, is in love with Milwaukee and its people. He treasures his hundreds of friends. Barkin celebrated his 50th birthday recently and he said, in responding to a toast:

"I know many people who have much more money, but I am the richest man in the world."

Large corporations several times have tried to lure him away. He once rejected the executive vice-presidency of a large eastern firm.

"I love this town," he said later. "It may not have many tall buildings, but it has tall people."

One clue to his character is that in describing someone whom he likes, the phrase he uses most frequently is: "He's a decent human being." Another clue is that everyone who knows him well—generals and ambassadors, corporation presidents and truck drivers, stage and screen stars, rabbis and priests—all call him "Ben"—affectionately.

Barkin was born in Milwaukee June 4, 1915, the youngest of six children of Adolph and Rose Barkin, who had immigrated here from Russia. The elder Barkin sold fruit and vegetables door to door.

Ben's flair for leadership and for making friends was already evident at Roosevelt Junior High School, where he was president of his graduating class.

BECAME FIELD DIRECTOR

After graduation from North Division High School, Barkin was persuaded to join the staff of Aleph Zadek Aleph, the junior order of B'nai B'rith, as national field director. Philip Klutznick, the founder and then national president of the order—he was later American ambassador to the United Nations social and economic council—had heard glowing reports of Barkin's leadership in the Milwaukee chapter.

That work kept him traveling 9 to 10 months of the year. The strain was too much for his ulcers, which had developed in high school. Early in 1941 he resigned and returned to Milwaukee for rest and treatment.

FOLLOWED BANK'S ADVICE

Prevented by the ulcers from enlisting in World War II, Barkin volunteered his services as a $1-a-year man to the Treasury Department and was one of three men who organized the national promotion for the war bond drive.

The bond solicitation and promotion schemes that he organized in Milwaukee later became models for nationwide drives. National officials called him America's No. 1 war bond salesman.

As the war neared its end, Barkin was considering several business offers that would have taken him elsewhere, but senior officers of the First Wisconsin National Bank convinced him that he should open his own public relations company here and they promised that they would be his first client.

The office was opened in December 1945, with a staff of three: Barkin, Billie Black, his secretary during the war bond days, and Bernard "Barney" Solocheck, a boyhood friend and Milwaukee advertising man. Since then the list of clients has grown to 20 and the staff to 23.

Barkin's philosophy of public relations is that a business firm or organization should "behave well, tell the truth, and get credit for the good things it does."

Barkin is a sentimental man and not ashamed to show it. He is warm and emotional and works as much from instinct as from cold logic, acting impulsively on his feelings. Sometimes a staff member will ask him why he recommends a certain course.

HERMAN PRAISED

"I don't know," he has said. "I just have a feeling about it."

Fortunately, he has admitted, he has a governor on his flywheel—David A. Herman, former publicity director of Gimbel Bros. here, who joined the agency as a partner in 1952.

Barkin gives Herman credit for many of the agency's brighter ideas and he spends considerable time with clients, making certain that other members of the staff get full recognition for their ideas, too. But Barkin remains the catalyst.

He is a deeply religious man, with respect for all faiths. Although the Jewish Community Center is virtually a monument to his fundraising and promotional energies, he was a cochairman of the drive, Barkin gives just as freely of his time and ideas to other religions.

GIVEN TWO AWARDS

In 1959, he was awarded the Interfaith award of the Milwaukee B'nai B'rith. In 1963, he received the Brotherhood award of the Wisconsin Conference of Christians and Jews.

When he returned from one trip abroad, Barkin passed out medals which had St. Christopher, patron saint of travelers, on one side and the Star of David on the other.

"I'm playing both sides of the street," Barkin explained, seriously. "I should be well protected now."

His office is always open to those seeking advice. A group of Catholic nuns once approached him for suggestions on how they might get $1,000 from a well-to-do Protestant businessman for their charities.

"Ask him for $2,500," Barkin said.

The nuns were appalled but Barkin convinced them that that was the only approach to take. A few hours later he got a call from them.

"He gave us $1,750," they told him, jubilantly.

INVITED TO SYNAGOGUE

It was natural that Barkin, a man of seemingly limitless friendships, should invite a lot of friends to his son's bar mitzvah at Beth El Ner Tamid synagogue.

They came—500 of them—bank presidents, the mayor and city officials, most of the Braves baseball players, brewery officials, old friends from all areas of life.

One of the Jewish guests, refusing a second glass of refreshments, had a surprised look on his face when he explained:

"I've only had one glass of champagne but I would swear I saw Bob Uihlein over there, wearing a yarmulke (skullcap) and eating gefuelte fish."

He was not mistaken. In conservative synagogues, such as Beth El Ner Tamid, all males, Jews and non-Jews alike, must wear skullcaps.

INTERESTED IN PEOPLE

Barkin is intensely interested in people. In his bond selling days, and since in his public relations work, he has met hundreds of the famous personalities of the day. Many of these associations have developed into close personal friendships.

He has never been heard to refer to any member of his staff as an employee. They are his friends. His clients are his friends. He's a hard man to resist.

When the late Quentin Reynolds was assigned by Reader's Digest to do a story on the baseball fever here after the Braves moved to Milwaukee, he telephoned Barkin from New York.

"Barkin," said Reynolds, "Bennet Cerf told me you were the man to call if I wanted the lowdown on Milwaukee. What are you, anyhow? Some kind of boss politician?"

REMAINED FRIENDS

"Nope," said Barkin, "I'm just a workingman."

Reynolds came and remained for several days and Barkin, as usual, saw to it that he found out everything that he wanted to know. Reynolds was so impressed with Barkin's personality and generosity that the adopted him as a friend on the spot. The two kept in touch until Reynolds' death.

Barkin's friendships are not limited to the famous, they extend to every walk of life—and he never forgets his old friends along the way.

Few know of his private kindnesses.

Touring Israel some years ago, Barkin struck up an acquaintance with a cab driver who was so impressed with Barkin that he took him home one night to meet his wife. When Barkin returned to Milwaukee, the two families corresponded regularly and eventually the cab driver brought his wife to New York to live.

PAID FOR TRIP

Barkin learned that the wife was unhappy in this new land, homesick for her family. He sent her a round trip ticket to Israel so that she could go home for a visit.

Barkin once learned that a Milwaukee friend of limited means was facing a serious operation.

"He's going to need you now more than ever," he told the man's wife, "and I don't want you worrying about what it is going to cost."

He offered her a signed blank check.

Barkin's correspondence, most of it personal, would swamp an average man, but he has become a master of the short, pithy, meaningful letter—many of them one sentence or one paragraph long—and they say everything that needs to be said.

He makes probably 100 telephone calls a day, most of them short ones like his written notes, but always long enough to keep in touch.

DOES THINGS WELL

An associate has described Barkin as a man "with a tremendous capacity to do several things at one time and do them all thoroughly and well."

Another said: "His mind seems to be divided into compartments and all compartments seem to be working at once. He can shift gears, from one subject to another, without losing a thought."

Barkin could not keep up his 19- to 20-hour a day pace if he had not parted finally with his ulcers at the Mayo clinic 8 years ago. Just as important, thanks to the surgeon, he can now eat anything that he likes.

Barkin married Shirley Axel of Manitowoc October 19, 1941. They have one son, Coleman, who has never been called anything except Spike in his life. Spike was graduated from the University of Wisconsin last week and will spend the next 2 years in England, studying movie making.

LIVE ON PROSPECT AVENUE

The Barkins live at 1610 North Prospect Avenue, in an elegantly decorated 8-room apartment whose furnishings and decor are a tribute to Shirley's judgment and taste. Their collection of art includes a complete set of Chagall prints of the stained glass windows in the Hadassah hospital in Jerusalem.

Characteristically, Barkin has five telephones in his home, including one on each side of his bed. He can relax with a telephone in his hand like others might relax with a book.

If business prevents someone from seeing him at his office, he invites him to visit at his home at night. Visitors there can usually count on finding other visitors.

The Barkins dine out frequently and one of Shirley's major complaints is that with Ben hopping around, greeting friends that he knows, the dinner usually is cold by the time he gets back to the table to eat.

ALWAYS FINDS A FRIEND

No matter what city Barkin is in, no matter what country, he never fails to run into someone he knows. He was exploring the catacombs of Rome once—surely an unlikely place to meet a friend—but, sure enough, there he found John Toigo, a former Schlitz vice president, browsing among the skulls.

From his fondness for show people and for the theater, Barkin has developed in recent years into something of an "angel" for new shows, investing modestly—he says—in several new productions.

He and five Milwaukee friends have a total of about $15,000 invested in Anthony Newley's "The Roar of the Greasepaint—The Smell of the Crowd" on Broadway and it looks like his fourth winner in a row.

For this sucess, he gives full credit to Shirley.

"I wanted to invest in an Alfred Drake musical a few years ago but Shirley said no, so we dropped it," Barkin explained. The show closed after five performances.

Barkin probably is more interested in making friends and being a friend than in anything else in life. But people and his hi-fi music and the theater aside, surely no one can think of Barkin without thinking of the Milwaukee Braves, too.

When the Braves came to Milwaukee, he was called upon to help channel the enthusiasm of the welcome. When they won the world's series, he was drafted—he practically enlisted—to plan the civic welcome. Actually, it never occurred to anybody that anybody but Barkin should do the job.

Classroom TV Comes to Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article appeared in the June 19, 1965, issue of Saturday Review, on a very successful Idahoan, Mr. Rex Lee, who has a most impressive record in Government service, culminating in his present position as Governor of American Samoa.

Many will not agree with every statement made by Mr. Tom Kaser, education editor of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, in his article. However, the overriding importance of the article is its tribute to Governor Lee and the initiative and ingenuity which he applies his work.

The article follows:

CLASSROOM TV COMES TO SAMOA

(By Tom Kaser, education editor of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin)

Last November, a large, elegantly dressed Polynesian stepped before 7,000 people in Pago Pago, American Samoa, and uttered what was probably, for that part of the world, the understatement of the year.

"In ancient times," said Crown Prince Tupou To'a Tungi, premier of the nearby Tonga Islands, "the environment of Samoa and Tonga ended at the seashore of Samoa and Tonga. Today, the world is smaller. Now the whole world is our environment."

The occasion was the dedication of an anachronism: educational television in the South Seas. Less than 2 months before that day, engineers sent the first signal of a $1,700,000 ETV system into the steaming jungles of a Pacific paradise which for years had been forgotten by time and, most regrettably, the United States. Now, American Samoa has become the education showplace of the South Pacific, not only because of television but also because of the man who brought it there, Gov. Rex Lee.

Lee was sent to the island territory in May 1961 after serving 11 years in Washington as a high-ranking administrator in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. He didnt particularly want the job, but he did want to oblige any request of the new President and the new Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall. The result was an agreement that he would serve as Governor of American Samoa 1 year for the primary purpose of preparing the island territory for the 1962 conference of the six-nation South Pacific Commission.

When Lee arrived in Samoa he was appalled. What he saw was 60 years of neglect from the naval officers who administered the islands from 1900 to 1951, the territorial Governors who came there during the Eisenhower years, and the white merchants and traders who had been there as long as anyone could remember.

The most serious neglect was that of the welfare of the Samoan people. Lee found that although half of the 22,000 natives in the territory were under 18, only 5,000 Samoan children were attending what was loosely called school—remote village huts of the native fale (pronounced "folly") design resembling open, grass-roofed houses. The only high school in the seven islands of the territory admitted only a third of the children of high school age in American Samoa—those who could pass the entrance examination.

But Lee was most shocked by the illiteracy of the Samoan schoolteachers. Although all instruction was supposed to be in English, he couldn't find one native teacher who could speak it fluently. He further discovered that most of the Samoan teachers had attended school only through the ninth grade, equal to about a fifth-grade education in stateside schools.

Lee realized that American Samoa was no place for a gradual improvement in the educational system. "There was no time for waiting, no time for armchair patience—there had been too much of that for 60 years," he says today. "It was obvious that what was needed was a sudden and explosive upgrading."

The answer in Lee's mind was ETV. He submitted the suggestion to the territory's department of education, a lifeless agency which rendered an equally lifeless reaction. Stateside educators assigned to the department belittled the idea as too expensive and not feasible for such a remote outpost.

Lee flew back to Washington and conferred with Udall, who surprisingly turned out to be "one of the few who didn't laugh," as Lee recalls today. With Udall's support, Lee went to Congress and obtained $40,000 for a study to determine whether the idea was feasible.

A four-man study team from the National Association of Educational Broadcasters went to Samoa in late 1961 and returned to Washington a month later to report that ETV was indeed the best potential tool for the task. The NAEB investigators, headed by Vernon Bronson, one of the most vigorous promoters of ETV in the country, cited television as the most likely means of: (1) training Samoan teachers, (2) providing quality instruction by top flight stateside teachers for every child in every village, (3) establishing, after a high initial investment, a low-cost permanent educational facility complete with a large library of tapes and other visual material. In short, ETV was seen as the fastest, most effective, and, in the long run, most economical way of bringing the education system up to reasonable standards.

The alternative was to replace nearly 300 Samoan teachers—some with 30 to 40 years of teaching experience—with 300 stateside teachers. This would have created not only serious sociological problems but several logistical problems, including a massive building program to provide accommodations for the stateside. It would also have involved millions of dollars in transportation costs alone.

When Lee returned to Washington in January 1962 to request general operating funds for the island territory, he was armed with statistics (provided by the NAEB) outlining how and ETV system might be installed. He found a friend in Ohio Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, chairman of the powerful House Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, who also realized American Samoa had been neglected too long.

While KIRWAN, Udall, and Bronson exerted influence on Congress to approve the ETV section of Samoa's budget request, Lee returned to the Pacific. But for the first time, he began to see more challenge to his job than hosting the South Pacific Commission conference. With an entire school system to renovate, and the possibility of ETV being approved, he told Udall he would remain in American Samoa because there was a job to be done. And indeed there was.

While the appropriation proceedings in Washington continued, Lee gathered his education officers together and outlined a plan to consolidate all of the territory's more than 50 independent village schools into a cohesive system of 26 new government-built schools—20 on the main island of Tutuila, 5 in the 3 Manua group islands, and 1 on privately owned Swains Island, 250 miles to the north.

Lee and his education officers agreed on a native design for the new consolidated schools: clusters of buildings resembling the open, grass-roofed Samoan fale or home. Each fale, to be built of concrete, steel and glass, was to contain two classrooms placed back to back, with television consoles at each end of the building and a blackboard wall forming the partition.

Lee's dream took a giant step toward reality in late 1962 when Congress approved a generous $10 million operating budget for general improvements in the island territory. Included in the appropriation was $1,583,000 for a 3-channel ETV system to be used in American Samoa's elementary grades (one to eight), and a pledge to appropriate funds for three more channels for high school instruction if the initial system showed promise.

News of the appropriation activated plans which Lee had been holding in abeyance for months. A chief engineer arrived in the islands in January 1963 to study technical problems involved in building the system. In February, 7 bids totaling $1,190,000 were let on electronic equipment, including a $60,000 contract to Motorola for 300 23-inch TV sets.

The onerous job of consolidating the village schools was started, and by August—1 month after the arrival of Blair MacKenzie, the new director of ETV—Samoan construction crews began work on a two-story, air-conditioned studio building which was later gratefully named the Michael J. Kirwan Broadcasting Center.

The most formidable construction problem was erecting a 226-foot transmitter atop Mount Alava, which climbs 1,603 feet almost vertically from the apex of Pago Pago (pronounced "Pongo Pongo") Harbor. The original plan was that Samoan workers, using modern equipment, could make their way to the top of the mountain. But after three-quarters of a mile of construction, the road idea was abandoned: workers found that Samoa's water-soaked volcanic rock could not support a road on sloping land. Engineers estimated that even if the rock provided a suitable base, it would take 2 years to penetrate the thick jungle to the summit of Mount Alava.

Hope was renewed a few months later when a Navy ship carrying two helicopters stopped in Pago Pago en route to the United States from an antarctic mission. Lee's engineers suggested that the steel transmitter and supplies to build the transmitter station might be lifted to the top with helicopters, but a survey flight in the Navy helicopters dampened the idea. Navy pilots noted that not only where the crosswinds at the summit too severe, but a job of that sort would require about 800 flights from harbor to mountaintop.

The solution was an aerial tramway, which was installed in the summer of 1964 after a 5,102-foot cable had been strung across Pago Pago Harbor to Mount Alava from a point near the Governor's mansion. The tramway and a few other last-minute expenses increased the first-year cost of the television system by about $140,000, but Lee plans to more than justify that amount with revenues reaped from eventual tourist use.

To the surprise of everyone in American Samoa, KZVK–TV worked when engineers beamed the first signal to Mount Alava on Sunday afternoon, October 4, just 4 days after the Samoan school year had begun. By that time, Bronson—now one of the prime movers of the Samoa ETV idea—had hired 6 ETV teachers and 32 technical personnel. He made it clear that their goal was to eliminate their own jobs by training Samoan understudies who will someday take over the operations.

Samoa's ETV system differs from the more than 100 ETV stations in the United States today in that it provides the core rather

than a supplement to the local educational effort. Its purpose is to educate not only children but also teachers and, eventually, adults.

Although television teaching in Samoa totally amounts to only 2 hours a day, all instruction revolves around that teaching. Lessons, developed at the broadcast center by stateside teachers working with Samoan understudies, are sent to each classroom teacher several days before the telecast. Stateside principals who live at each consolidated school advise their classroom teachers how to prepare for the telecast, what to watch for, and how to follow up after the televised portion of the class is over. Samoan vice principals at each school are responsible for paperwork and related administrative details.

Oral English has been the cornerstone of instruction in all of American Samoa's schools since 1962 and especially since the establishment of ETV. Reading and writing in Samoan is taught only in the first and second grades on the principle that Samoan youngsters should become literate in their own language before learning another.

The backbone of the oral English instruction is a series of drills designed to aid the Samoan child in pronouncing sound combinations and speech rhythms unfamiliar to his native language. This is accomplished through a philosophy of linguistics called the Australian Method, fostered by George Pittman, a lecturer at New Zealand's Victoria University and now a part-time consultant to the Government of American Samoa.

Pittman's philosophy is based on what he calls a reversal of the standard process of teaching language. "Normally, when you start a child in school you are concerned with literacy," he says. "What we're trying to do here is put language into the child's mouth first; literacy comes later."

The Australian method was founded in 1950 when Pittman and his staff of 150 were trying to give European immigrants in Australia a quick, fundamental knowledge of English. Their starting point was extensive oral drill based on easily understood situations which could be created in a classroom. In Samoa, these exercises have been adapted for television use.

For example, the ETV teachers spend several minutes of each class leading youngsters in responsive drills such as the following:

Teacher: "This is a bottle."
Pupils: "This is a bottle."
Teacher: "This is a bottle."
Pupils: "This is a bottle."
Teacher: "These are bottles."
Pupils: "These are bottles."
Teacher: "This is a bottle."
Pupils: "This is a bottle."
Teacher: "These are bottles."
Pupils: "These are bottles."

Even more basic are twice-daily sound drills in which Samoan children repeat certain English-language sounds which are foreign to them. Examples: "th" as in "the"; "zz" as in "is" or "nose"; and most difficult of all, "i" as in "it" or "is." ETV teacher David Lommen, one of the drill leaders, found that he became an overnight celebrity among the Samoan school children; whenever he visits a school he is mobbed by giggling youngsters who hop and dance behind him, chanting: "thhhh—zzzzz—thhhh—zzzzz."

As of April, eight of Lee's fale-style school complexes were open and receiving ETV; the rest of the 26 consolidated schools will be open to all of American Samoa's 5,500 elementary school children by this fall. Meanwhile, Lee is already working on an ETV plan for high school use: Congress, impressed with the progress and promise of the initial ETV system, appropriated an additional $985,000 in February of this year for three channels of phase II, which will be started this fall in Pago Pago High School and two new high schools now being built.

The new high schools, designed by San Francisco architect John Lyon Reid, are as new in design as ETV is to Samoa. One will be located in the Manua group of islands, 60 miles east of Tutuila, and the other is being constructed on Tutuila in the village of Leone, 15 winding miles by road west of Pago Pago.

Movable redwood partitions, suspended from the ceiling, will provide up to six changeable classrooms in the new high schools. A center room, under the loft, will be used for conferences and storage. Television sets with low-level speakers will be placed in each room, enabling the classes to use open space with minimum distraction. Redwood ceiling baffles will help control sound.

So far, no one in the high ranks of the Department of Interior is less than pleased with the progress of Lee's ETV dream. And for the Samoans, the novelty has not worn off even after 8 months of operation: school children are still just as entranced with the magic box as they were last fall. Meanwhile, Lee is giving careful doses of ETV to adult Samoans as the incipient stage of a planned adult education program. Since last November, travelogues, syndicated educational films, and even occasional feature movies have brought standing-room-only crowds to the school fales at night.

The significance of American Samoa's ETV system is evidenced by the fact that it is being watched closely throughout the world—especially in the South Pacific—as the most practical and effective way of educating people where there is a tragically short supply of good schools and good teachers. The system has been studied by UNESCO, the World Bank, New Guinea, New Zealand, India, Guam, Western Samoa, Tonga, and the Trust Territories. Tests will soon be made in the Tonga chain, which begins 180 miles to the south, to determine whether the signal can be received there. Reception in Western Samoa, 80 miles to the west, is excellent and Lee has made it clear that the broadcasts are free to anyone who can receive them.

So far, ETV in American Samoa seems to be producing the sudden and explosive upgrading in education that it was intended to do. But no experiment is complete without an evaluation, and the NAEB is currently negotiating with educators at the University of Pittsburgh and the University of California at Berkeley to conduct a long-term study—lasting perhaps over a decade—of the island territory's educational system.

Lee claims he will never really know the effectiveness of the television idea until the study is completed—probably not before the present first-graders are in high school. But he is clearly happy about the short-term results: absenteeism has dropped sharply, children are more attentive than ever, and, for the first time, Samoan parents are taking an interest in having their children learn English.

By anyone's standards, that's the most encouraging thing to happen in American Samoa in the last 65 years.

Defense of United States Is at Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the hearings on the defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1966 and the recent floor debate on the bill, a number of far-reaching questions were raised relative to the adequacy and direction of our defense program.

An editorial which appeared on April 15, 1965, in the Alhambra, Calif., Post Advocate concisely discusses this problem and the challenge presented. It is an interpretation that warrants serious consideration.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

CONGRESS MUST MAKE DECISIONS—DEFENSE OF UNITED STATES IS AT STAKE

The first article of the Constitution states that "Congress shall have the power to raise and support armies."

In recent years there has been an increasing trend on the part of the Defense Department to arrogate this power and relegate lawmakers to the simple role of appropriating money it requests.

Nowhere is this trend more evident than in the Defense Department's flat refusal to spend funds the Congress has appropriated for development of a manned bomber to replace the ancient B–52.

The Secretary of Defense simply insists that manned bombers as such are an obsolete concept in the missile age and too expensive to maintain. For several years he has flatly refused to spend money for development of new ones, including $52 million last year.

His stubbornness and refusal are in direct opposition to the best judgment of military men and the leaders and Members of Congress. They do not think military defense is a subject with which anyone should gamble. They ask for a versatile, flexible force to include manned bombers.

Congress has a reason to be alarmed. The proposed defense budget would add to some missile strength, but eliminate 45 of the subsonic B–52's. B–47's are being scrapped. As a result, by the middle of next year, the United States would have 630 manned bombers. Only 80 of them the supersonic B–58's. For all practical purposes the United States would not have a firstline bomber in the 1970's.

The aircraft programs underway do not include the heavy bomber prototypes that could replace the B–52. Appropriations for the trisonic RS–70 have been cut to relegate it to the research-in-technology category. The F–111, formerly the TFX, is a lighter and different type of aircraft. The super secret A–11 reconnaissance airplane does not fit the criteria of heavy bomber performances set by the Air Force.

For the first time in the history of the Air Corps or the Air Force there is no major new offensive weapons or delivery system in active development.

This year a Senate committee has voted $83 million for pursuing a manned-bomber development program, following a suggestion from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The House has indicated it is favorable. The Secretary of Defense says he is not.

Again the essential issue has arisen. Who shall make the decision, the legislative body or an administrator?

Unless the Congress lives up to its constitutional obligation on defense now, its voice will be further eroded and the day will come when it will have no say at all.

The War Stories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest editorials I have seen on the situa-

tion in Vietnam appeared recently in the Lincoln Star. I include it in the RECORD at this point in an effort to aid in the understanding of this problem on the part of all our citizens:

THE WAR STORIES

(By William O. Dobler)

It is not a pleasant world in which we live, in many respects, and Vietnam is a daily reminder of this. Stay abreast of the news out of Washington and watch the political rumblings on the international scene and the war in Asia has an unreal appearance to it. It takes on the nature of some kind of political struggle in which men simply vie for the most favored position.

But no war is really this way. Rather, it is a very human thing and something that tears your heart apart when you see it. It is this human side of the war that makes you sick and makes you wonder why the dream of peace is always so far from the grasp of the world. The homeless and orphaned child, the scorched earth and the stories of men who have died in battle are the accounts that make you wonder. They are the things that one hates to dwell upon and the things that cause you to wonder about the makeup of that leadership which promotes a war.

The stories of human tragedy and suffering can make all the politics of war take on an unreality that knows no equal. They make you sit back and wonder what possible issue there could be that would justify the hardships that war imposes on mankind. When you get all done with it, you conclude that there are no issues with such justification and you go on to contemplate how all the conflict in the world then comes to pass.

War is the product actually of a few who suffer little as a result of their personal ambitions but who inflict great punishment upon the many. The people of Vietnam, for instance, in large part wonder why it is that their country is engaged in such an awful conflict.

The country and its people are being desecrated today because of the ambitions, failures and frustrations of a small number of people. Communist party leaders of North Vietnam are steeped in international trickery and intentionally entered into a settlement of the French problem in Asia which they never intended to keep. The international agreements they signed for free elections, a unified government and a free people have meant nothing to them. Further, their own system of government and economics was proving a failure as compared to the advances of a relatively free society in the south and this comparison they could not live with. While people in the north were starving, South Vietnam was exporting rice. While roads, schools, homes, etc., contributed to an ever improving standard of living in the south, the people of North Vietnam saw their standard of living declining.

The Communist leadership of the north took the only course that communism can—conquest. With conquest it can sustain an active economy because it supplies the nation with a demand for work. With conquest, it can disrupt and slow down the national gains being made by an adversary and can sow seeds of discontent among the neighboring population. And all of these things it can do without repulsion because it attaches no value to human life. The individual is but a pawn to be manipulated by the party for the advancement of the state and the objectives set by party leadership.

The pattern is one that holds true for every major conflict that erupts on the scene today and for those that have so marred past civilizations. When you wonder how one people can inflict the suffering of war upon another, the answer is simple—they have no regard for human life and no compassion for their fellow man.

Thus, the sight of homeless children, of dead and suffering adults and of a land torn apart by fire and high explosives is a sight that not only moves us to compassion but one that contributes to our understanding and determination. In its wretchedness, war produces the scenes of tragedy that serve to indict communism and to dictate to us our course of action.

Because of the terrible consequences of war, we cannot remain apart from it. For to remain apart would be to encourage the path of progress for Communist regimes that are ruthless in their exploitation of humanity. War is an awful product of their inhumanity but they have many ways of practicing it. The orphaned Vietnamese child who cries today is shedding tears for many children who would otherwise be doing so if the aggressors from the north were not stopped. The sights of war are most disturbing but they are sobering, as well.

They do make you wonder why it has to be the way it is but they also show you what a real menace the free world faces in the rise of communism. If the human side of war is one that adversely affects you, it should tell you, too, why we cannot quit, why the grisly business must be carried to an end.

The Selznick Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, David Selznick was one of the great producers of motion pictures of our time. He brought creativity, imagination, and taste to his films, and the application of these talents gave his productions a special and unmistakable integrity.

"Gone With the Wind" was the kind of motion picture only David Selznick could produce.

I was especially saddened by the death of Mr. Selznick, for he was a friend to be remembered with admiration and affection. Many New Yorkers, in and out of show business, mourn his passing.

The distinguished motion picture critic of the New York Times, Bosley Crowther, commented on the death of David Selznick last week in these words:

It is not likely that his name and his achievements will soon be forgotten in notoriously short-memoried Hollywood.

The article is an excellent description of the legacy of Mr. Selznick, and I offer it for inclusion in the RECORD:

THE SELZNICK LEGACY—AS A CREATIVE PRODUCER, HE ENDOWED THAT FUNCTION WITH TASTE AND FIDELITY

(By Bosley Crowther)

David O. Selznick's contribution to American films—outside of his singular achievement with "Gone With the Wind"—was his taking on and giving meaning and importance to the role of creative producer, which is peculiar to Hollywood. Where the production of motion pictures in other countries—and in this country, too, before the consolidation of the big studios—has been mainly under the control of the directors, who make the big decisions, in Hollywood, it has been in the hands of the producers, the liaisons with financing. It is these men who pick the stories, oversee the preparation of the scripts, hire the casts, select the directors and designers, bird dog the filming and mastermind the selling campaigns, which are a large factor in American motion pictures.

It is this function, which, when fully accomplished, requires a maximum of intelligence and taste, not to mention an abundance of know-how and familiarity with all phases of the art and industry, that David Selznick, along with Samuel Goldwyn, Irving Thalberg and a handful of less qualified men, helped to establish and endow with standards, traditions and ideals.

Even though he lacked formal education (not because his father could not afford to give him as much as he wanted, but because he was too eager and impatient to get to work), the young Selznick, was an avid reader and wide-eyed devotee of American and English literature. This taste and familiarity were reflected in the films he produced.

FILMED LITERARY CLASSICS

As a young producer, right after the adoption of sound and the imposition of the requirement of a certain literate quality in films, he regularly picked his story properties from the library shelves—"Anna Karenina," "David Copperfield," "Tale of Two Cities," "Little Lord Fauntleroy." And his assiduously overseen productions were conspicuous for fidelity and taste.

It was his taste and much more than that—his fervor and his impassioned exercise of the creative urges of a writer and director—that dominated him during the 3 years of preparation and production of "Gone With the Wind." These were commanding factors in making for the richness of this film. Dave Selznick, along with the author, Margaret Mitchell, was the parent of this screen classic. He had more to do with the making of it than anyone who worked on it.

A tendency of critics and others has been to underrate and make fun of the Hollywood producer. Very few ever tried to make sport of Dave Selznick, except to tease or joke with him about his bursting enthusiasms and his rampant energies.

DEVOTED TO QUALITY

On these topics, he was sometimes touchy. He had a lively sense of humor, except about himself. He didn't like to have writers trifle with his hard-earned and well-deserved reputation.

His ingrained and persistent devotion to quality in films was manifested by his establishment and maintenance of the annual giving of Golden Laurel awards to the outstanding productions of foreign countries. While he himself was not creatively disposed to the kind of moderate-cost, esoteric pictures that are generally made abroad, he admired and encouraged their production and he was as sensitive in his appreciation of the best as any writer, director, or producer in Hollywood.

In recent years, the creative producer as such has been slowly deposed and his functions absorbed into the compound of the producer-director or the producer-actor who now have their own independent companies. Only a few of the old breed—the breed that David O. Selznick personified—remain or are active. But the new class of multihatted film men have abiding regard for the model and the standard that he set. It is not likely that his name and his achievements will soon be forgotten in notoriously short-memoried Hollywood.

The Rubin Era: 25 Years on the Progressive Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the forthcoming July issue of the Progressive magazine will also be a 25th anniversary issue. It marks the 25th anniversary of the day Morris and Mary Rubin became its editors and associate editor. The Progressive, edited and published in Madson, Wis., was founded originally as LaFollette's Weekly by Bob LaFollette, Sr., in 1909 as the voice of the Progressive movement in Wisconsin and the Nation.

As editors of this uniquely historical and distinguished monthly journel, the Rubins have carried on the great tradition of independent, liberal, progressive journalism which has characterized the Progressive during its long history.

Not only is the editing of the Progressive a family affair, most of the present staff has been associated with the Progressive throughout the same period. A recent article in the Madison Capital Times provides an insight into the operation of this magazine and I commend it to you for your consideration.

RUBIN ERA: 25 YEARS ON THE PROGRESSIVE

(By Elliott Maraniss)

Fresh out of Mukwonago, Wis., blue-eyed, pink-cheeked Mary Sheridan came to the university here more than 30 years ago with a clear goal in mind. She wanted to be a journalist.

Mary never left Madison. She married a man who had a job here, and she took a job at the same place. She keeps house at 1208 Bowdoin Road in Shorewood Hills and raises flowers in her back yard.

The small four-room office in which she works at 408 West Gorham Street is a long way from the 40-story slabs of glass and concrete that house the giant publishing firms in Manhattan.

Nevertheless, without ever leaving Madison, Mary Sheridan Rubin has achieved a distinction that is rare in the annals of American journalism.

She has just been named managing editor of the Progressive on of the Nation's most distinguished monthly magazines.

The July issue, which will go in the mail this Thursday, will carry the announcement to the Progressive's 40,000 subscribers in all 50 States and more than 110 foreign countries.

The timing of the announcement is both deliberate and appropriate. It coincides with the 25th anniversary of the sweltering summer night 25 years ago when Morris L. Rubin became editor of the Progressive and his wife, Mary Sheridan, became associate editor.

The Progressive that the Rubins took over was a direct descendant of the old LaFollette's Weekly magazine that was founded in 1909 by Robert M. LaFollette, Sr., and which became the voice of the Progressive movement in the Nation.

For several years the Progressive was published by William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the Capital Times.

If it was a magazine with a proud heritage whose stewardship Rubin assumed, it was also one which was in deep financial trouble.

The time was also one of confusion and disarray in the Progressive movement, which was pulling itself apart on the question of whether to support Roosevelt's policy of aiding Great Britain as the best way to fight fascism.

Much of the story of the Progressive's subsequent ascent to a position unrivaled in political influence among American magazines is now well known to Madisonians—how it rose from the ashes of death in 1947 when contributors sent in $40,000 to resurrect it; how it continues to attract a notable list of contributors, ranging from Presidents to Congressmen of both parties, to journalists who could command $1,000 an article but happily accept the nominal fee of $50 that the Progressive pays.

What may not be so well known, perhaps, is the personal side of the magazine, the quality and loyalty of the people who put it out, the high level of professional skill that goes into it, unmatched in excellence by those who labor with a view from the 40th floor.

A visitor to the Progressive's office last week, fresh from the clanging confusion of a newspaper city room, was struck by the absence of noise. The staff was working, of course, and it was the most difficult work there is—reading, thinking, editing, planning, and writing.

In his backroom office, Editor Morris Rubin had just completed a long distance phone call to a Government official in Washington who will contribute an article to the October issue.

Rubin does much of his work by phone. With two of his regular contributors—Milton Mayer and James Wechsler, editorial director of the New York Post—he is in almost constant phone communication.

The magazine receives from 25 to 50 unsolicited manuscripts each month, of which only a few ever reach print. Still, like most editors, Rubin reads them all and hopes they keep coming, because every once in a while a real gem is delivered by the postman.

Actually, all manuscripts whether unsolicited or assigned, are read not only by Rubin, but by all three of his associate editors—Mary Sheridan Rubin, John McGrath, and Arnold Serwer.

In her own office, Mrs. Rubin—she uses the name Mary Sheridan in her professional life—was leafing through a new book and trying to decide to whom she should send it for review. She has been editor of the book section since 1942.

The book was "The Making of the President: 1964," by Theodore White, who had written a similar book about the 1960 campaign.

"I wonder if he can match the level of the 1960 book," Mary said. "It will be fascinating to find out."

Serwer was deep in thought, books and pencils on his desk, an editorial in the making. McGrath, in his office, was composing a letter to a subscriber who wanted to know when his magazine would start coming.

On the Progressive, incidentally, there is no hard and fast division between editorial and other duties. From Editor Rubin down, everybody does everything, including reading proof, writing to subscribers, handling the ads—and writing promotion.

One of the most remarkable things about the magazine—both as a business and as a place of creative activity—is the long record of continuous service of those who work there.

When Morris and Mary Rubin took over the magazine 25 years ago, two other Madisonians joined them. Gordon Sinykin, a busy and successful lawyer, became the unpaid business manager and chairman of the non-profit publishing company. He's still there today, still unpaid. Mrs. Sinykin has slaved for many years as treasurer.

Rose L. Rediske 25 years ago became chief cashier and boss of the subscription department, and Rose is still on the job, cheerful and efficient as ever.

Mrs. Helen Kleppe, the receptionist and assistant cashier, and Dorothy Beyler, who handles mail and circulation, have been with the magazine for 24 years. McGrath, with 18 years of service, is a young veteran of the Progressive wars. Serwer joined the staff 3 years ago, when expansion made another editor necessary.

Mary Sheridan's promotion to managing editor makes her the first person in the magazine's history to hold that title. The new title formally recognizes duties that she has been performing for many years.

When Morris met Mary in the early 1930's he was on the staff of the Daily Cardinal and she was on the staff of the Badger yearbook.

Morris took a job with the Wisconsin State Journal as a legislative reporter, after he graduated from the U.W.

Rubin left the State Journal to join the staff of Phil LaFollette in his campaign in 1938 for a fourth term as Governor, and 2 years later took over as editor of the Progressive.

Morris and Mary Rubin live a quiet life among a close circle of friends. Morris says his favorite hobby is "standing around with a tall cool, glass in my hand and kicking around the state of the world with a few friends."

A Nostalgic Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on May 28 I had a nostalgic experience—the privilege of delivering the commencement address at the high school of Camp Hill, Ala., from which I graduated in 1917. Members who have experienced such an inspiration will know what it meant to me to be back amid the scenes and with the cherished friends of my boyhood. I was very much impressed by the superior character of this graduating class and especially by the salutatory address so impressively delivered by Miss Martha Evelyn Pinnell entitled "The First Part of Honor," and the valedictorian's address so ably delivered by Miss Patricia Harris.

Mr. Speaker, these two lovely and brilliant young ladies have given counsel which will profit the Congress and the country. Hence, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the salutatory address, by Miss Martha Evelyn Pinnell, and the valedictory address of Miss Patricia Harris delivered at Camp Hill High School at commencement exercises May 28, 1965:

THE FIRST PART OF HONOR

(By Miss Martha Pinnell)

Friends, parents, and classmates, we welcome you to our graduating exercises. We

are here tonight to receive our diplomas in recognition of our success in completing the courses prescribed by the State of Alabama. This landmark of our progress by graduation from high school is a great achievement to us; and we are proud that you have come to pay us respect and honor by your presence.

Since we are leaving high school and going into fields of service, depending on our own resources and abilities as graduates, we should broadly define and limit the meaning of honor. First, what is honor? Authorities tell us that honor is esteem or respect paid to worth. But it should be immediately obvious that such a definition is only approximate. The words "esteem or respect paid to worth" taken apart from their application in life mean nothing. Honor is not something which can be seen and held in the hollow of our hands. We cannot treat it as something tangible. Its very nature is incorporeal as is love, truth, or honesty. The word "honor" is merely a symbol that stands for some act or performance for which the citizenry pays respect. The first part of honor then is that something which demands respect and esteem of others for its worth.

But what is that something? Perhaps, if we examine the lives of the great, of those who have been honored, we may further clarify the "first part of honor." We know that the great are honored for their accomplishments. It matters not what the field. Soldiers and statesmen are honored for their victories on the battlefields and in the halls of legislative assemblies. Musicians and artists are honored for there great concertos and paintings. Scientists and builders, too, are famous for their creations. Thus, the "first part of honor" is accomplishment.

But accomplishment alone is not sufficient motive for honoring the creator. There is more to accomplishment which brings honor than the mere doing or performing. In recent years we have seen vast accomplishments of dictators and gamblers and grafters. As a result of them, nations and kingdoms have fallen. Wars have ravaged the world. Crime syndicates have built up fabulous fortunes. But we cannot associate honor with any of these accomplishments.

So accomplishment in itself may be good or bad. It may be good for humanity or against it. But great men of accomplishment to whom we pay tribute and homage must give unselfish meaning to honor. They must accomplish for the benefit of others. Their works must not be personal or selfish for their own grandeur. Honor is due only from that quality of the individual which is unselfish. It must be deserved. As the book comes from the mind of the author so is the book less than the author. As the painting comes from the mind and soul of the artist, so the painting is less than the artist. Nothing is higher than its creator. Honor cannot be higher than the force that deserves it. So to have honor, we as seniors, must deserve it.

Again, honor for honor's sake is as sounding brass. Let us not seek it for its sake alone. Rather let us deserve honor for our worthy accomplishments because we love others and desire to serve humanity. Elbert Hubbard once said that those who really advance the Kingdom of God on earth are those who build bridges, clear streets, and tear down slums. Let our efforts take this form and other outlets of service that we may make uplifting contributions to our community and Nation.

Then in leaving the schoolroom, may we as seniors strive with all our engeries to fulfill our obligations to society by serving our fellowmen. If we succeed in these accomplishments as citizens in our new life, automatically, we will fulfill and deserve this "first part of honor."

THE KNIGHTHOOD OF YOUTH

(By Patricia Harris)

Fellow classmates and friends, at this graduation time, we seniors are naturally keyed up to the top with inspiration; but we hope that we are not too far off when we exalt youth to the rights of knighthood. If a real knight is one devoted especially to the service of another, as a defender or avenger, displaying great chivalry and courage, maybe those who hear us in our message today could rightly declare that we appear to be a little presumptuous as we, first of all, are claiming the right to defend our own cause, as we assert our likeness to those great souls of the past who possessed the qualities of true knighthood.

At least, we may be accorded the honor of thinking along that splendid channel, for our choice of the subject furnishes proof that our aims and ideals are high. And all of us know that so long as our ideals are in tune with the stars, our lives are truly pointing in an upward and praiseworthy direction. The best of young people, at any rate, are searching for those eternal qualities which would give them deep and abiding satisfaction, just as those knights of the Middle Ages who were searching for the Holy Grail.

We highly respect Ralph Waldo Emerson, but he said something in his essay on "Self-Reliance" about youth which we challenge. He asked the question, "Where are the young who so recently showed great promise? Where have they gone—have their spirits been dissipated with the wind?" We youth of today hasten to say that we have not gone with the wind. Chivalry on the part of youth is not dead. It will never die. In modern times our chivalry has been converted into new channels. Youth today, at their best, are creating beauty—both as touching character and in practical service to humanity. We are eagerly looking forward to a more thorough development of character and service along life's greatest channels as we go out from this school. In fact, we shall take a new start from here, and we shall ever be in a developing process of growth and service; for this is commencement time—as concerns the greater part of our life.

We young people know that if we are going to do any good in our generation and for the world of tomorrow we must try to get a sane and wholesome view of the problems which lie before us. Our chief problem is twofold. First, if we are wise we shall not seek to destroy those good things which have been handed down to us from the past, but we shall seek to defend all the best traditions and teachings which we have inherited. We realize that many young people of the present time are accused of being flippant and careless at this point. Some may be guilty of that, but we like to think that multitudes of us are seeking to find that which is best in life, and then to display the greatest of knightly chivalry in defending and promoting it.

In the second place, as we face the new day, we want to place proper evaluation upon that which is new. We would not be silly enough to make fun of that which has been regarded as good in the past, neither would we foolishly swallow all that is offered us because it is new. Whatever the offerings of the new day, we would be true, for there are those who trust us. There are those whose lives would be ruined if we should resort to making foolish choices.

As we leave this good place, as graduates, we would go out to meet the future as knights of the highroad of righteousness, seeking to find the best way for ourselves and to make a road plain enough for others to see and to love. We'll keep the honor of a certain aim amid the perils of uncertain ways, and sail ahead, and leave the rest to God.

The Full Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 20, 1965, an editorial entitled "Subsidizing Waste."

Because of the statements made in the editorial and because of the splendid reputation of the Star as a newspaper of integrity and responsibility, I did something which I very seldom do—write a letter to a newspaper editor.

In replying to the editorial, I kept in character by failing to adhere to the rules and regulations of brevity. I must admit that not among my virtues is my failure to embrace terminal facilities in speaking or writing.

After reading my letter, the Star characteristically rendered the courtesy of contacting me personally, explaining that my letter was too lengthy for full publication under their rules of "Letters to the Editor" and asked my permission to cut down the letter. I readily agreed, fully cognizant that a fair and equitable editing of the lengthy letter would result. My confidence was not misplaced, and on Thursday, June 24, the Star did publish the abbreviated copy of my reply. In doing so, none of the essentials of my letter were deleted and a most fair presentation was made. I do appreciate the position and courtesy of the Star.

In order, however, for the full and complete record to be presented to the Members of this body, I am offering for your information the complete text of the editorial and the complete text of my reply, both of which speak for themselves:

[From the Sunday Star, June 20, 1965]

SUBSIDIZING WASTE

Any nation with an annual $49 billion outlay for defense is going to have trouble with politicians seeking a helping of this gravy for the home district.

Recent approval by the House of a scheme to keep open obsolete military bases offers an example of how Congressmen have become accustomed to this Federal largesse.

By means of a quickie amendment to a $1.9 billion military construction bill, Chairman RIVERS, of the House Armed Services Committee, would hand Congress a veto power over any future base shutdowns.

The Rivers clause would require the Defense Department to give House and Senate advance notice before phasing out any installation. And either body would have up to 70 days to block the closing.

The amendment is nothing short of an outrageous poaching by Congress on the executive branch. Is President Johnson to come to the House Armed Services panel, hat

in hand, every time he wants an outmoded depot dropped? And is there a Representative alive who will agree to such a shutdown in his home district when he can quietly prevent it?

In the past 4 years the Defense Department has announced 669 base closings and reductions at an estimated saving which ultimately will total $1 billion annually. Nearly 1.5 million acres of land are being returned to civilian use. It is not within the realm of the possible that this could have been accomplished under the Rivers amendment.

As Representative LUCIEN NEDZI, of Michigan, observed, we should expect the Defense Department as the greatest single employer and spender in the Nation to set an example in economy. It should not subsidize waste. It must not keep open useless bases merely to provide employment.

The House amendment is a parochial, short-sighted, selfish piece of logrolling. The Senate should strike it from the bill.

JUNE 21, 1965.

EDITOR, THE EVENING STAR,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is only because I have the highest respect for the integrity and objectivity of the editorial policy of the Evening Star that I pause to write this letter. After reading the editorial in your Sunday, June 20, edition, entitled "Subsidizing Waste," I cannot remain silent because I believe that had the author of the editorial looked at the other side of the coin, he would have written differently.

Permit me to refer to a pertinent sentence of your June 20 editorial:

"And is there a Representative alive who will agree to such a shutdown in his own district when he can quietly prevent it?"

I can answer that question with a strong affirmative reply because I am just such a Representative, and I think I am very much alive.

For substantiation, I refer to another editorial from the Evening Star published December 13, 1963, and which states:

"Let's strike off a medal of some kind for Louisiana's Congressman HÉBERT. For he is truly a man of distinction.

"The wails of anguish were rising from Capitol Hill after Defense Secretary McNamara had announced that 33 military establishments will be closed or cut back.

"Mr. HÉBERT, whose district will lose two installations, was heard to say: 'I've been preaching economy for all these years, and I'm not going to start screaming now just because they shut down something in my backyard.' "

When Camp Leroy Johnson was ordered closed in my home district (New Orleans, La.), I publicly praised the action of the Department of Defense and proudly declared that I could not and would not fight waste in other sections of the country and defend it in my own backyard. My fight against waste in the military for some 14 years as chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee for Special Investigations is a matter of record, and that record shows that I was instrumental in saving billions of dollars in the Defense Department and proposing policies and methods which have been put into effect by Secretary of Defense McNamara, accounting for much of the current savings claimed by the Department of Defense.

When the first list of closures of bases was announced 4 years ago, I not only agreed with the closing of the Algiers Naval Station in my district, but went even further and invited the Department of Defense to go an additional step and make a study with the view of consolidating all military activities in my area in the interest of economy. I finally accomplished that consolidation a week ago, and only on last Sunday, the day that your editorial appeared, I made a television broadcast to my constituency, telling them that they could not expect operation of the military on a wartime basis during peacetime—shaky as that peace is at the moment.

I have vigorously supported any move in the interest of economy, and by the same token I have just as vigorously opposed any action which I did not consider economical or more efficient. However, I do not write this letter to defend my actions, but to express my concern about the broader aspects of the problem of base closures.

The American public is prone to take as fact and dogma any statement appearing in a newspaper, especially when the public is constantly told that authenticity and accuracy are undeniable. The average reader, in no small tribute to your paper, backs up his assertion by saying: "And besides, I read it in the Evening Star!"

Your June 20 editorial makes this statement:

"In the past 4 years, the Defense Department has announced 669 base closings and reductions at an estimated savings of which will ultimately total $1 billion annually."

Where is the proof and documentation to validate such a statement? The Defense Department, through its effective propaganda machine, makes the statement, and the news media pick it up as a fact, without challenge. Now, as a matter of fact, these figures spoonfed to the public through the media are misleading, if not totally false. As an example, much of the savings in the closures are credited to reduction of civilian personnel. This is a bookkeeping devise which switches the charge of the civilian employment maintenance to another agency of the Government, with absolutely no savings in fact.

And how much does the Government recover by returning vacated property to civilian use? In the New Orleans area alone, not a red penny has been recovered by the Government from sale of the abandoned land. All vacated land has been given free to State and educational institutions. I approve of the procedure in this, but I do not approve of the legerdemain of the Defense Department in making it appear that the Treasury is being reimbursed.

Your editorial further states: "The amendment is nothing short of an outrageous poaching by Congress on the executive branch."

Have you ever stopped to think of the many outrageous poachings by the executive branch on the constitutional powers of the Congress? It is happening every day, but nowhere have I read a word of objection or heard a voice of the news media protesting against Government by executive directive instead of legislative action and procedure.

Your editorial says: "Nearly 1.8 million acres of land are being returned to civilian use. It is not within the realm of the possible that this could have been accomplished under the Rivers amendment."

Are you not aware of the fact that there is not an inch of real estate under present law and practices that can be disposed of without action by the House and Senate Armed Services Committee? The Rivers amendment which your editorial questioned would merely extend to proposed closures of activities at certain bases and would have nothing to do with the disposal of the real estate which is covered by present practice.

Under present conditions, the only time the public or a Member of Congress knows anything about the contemplated closure of a base is when it is publicly announced by the Defense Department. The decision, in effect, has already been reached, and the Member of Congress, in the legitimate performance of his duties, cannot challenge the logic behind the closing. It is only in rare instances that the Member of Congress can examine the alleged figures either to challenge or justify the alleged savings. Is the Department of Defense so infallible that it has not erred in 669 closings?

All that the House Armed Services Committee is attempting to do is to implement Congress' constitutional duty of "raising and maintaining" an army and a navy. All that the Armed Services Committee is fighting for is to be recognized as a full working partner in the business of national defense and security.

My colleague and chairman, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, does not need me to rise in his defense, but I resent the continued efforts of some people to make him a scapegoat. In this particular instance, the record shows that he has the almost unanimous consent of his committee and the House of Representatives itself, which adopted the bill and the amendment on an overwhelming voice vote.

The House Armed Services Committee and the Nation is fortunate to have such an energetic and dedicated leader as chairman of the committee. His interest is the same interest as the President, the Secretary of Defense, and all other Americans—the defense of this country.

Chairman RIVERS faces a challenge from which many others would fade. He follows in the footsteps of the great Carl Vinson, of Georgia, whose name became synonymous with the military, and who was one of the most beloved men ever to serve in the Congress of the United States. Filling his shoes is a tremendous order, but MENDEL RIVERS in a few short months has left little or no space in those shoes, big as they are.

It is most difficult for those of us who are fighting for something which a great many Americans believe in to get our story across to the public, mainly because we take a different road than the one walked by those equally dedicated patriots who disagree with us. Newspapers have more paper and ink than any of us has, and the air for us is only to breathe, and not to utilize to broadcast our views. Nor do we have millions of dollars and hundreds of experts for propaganda, as does the Department of Defense. We do not have 1 penny appropriated to us to get our story told.

It is only when individuals like myself become so concerned that they write letters like this to the editor of a great and respected newspaper like the Evening Star, in the hope that the words and our views will be printed and that the public will pause to realize that a pancake, no matter how thin, has two sides to it.

Thank you for your indulgence.

Sincerely yours,

F. EDWARD HÉBERT.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Senator Robert C. Byrd Brings Inspiring Message to Delegates at Opening Ceremonies of West Virginia's National Youth Science Camp—50 States Represented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the National Youth Science Camp was instituted as a part of the State of West Virginia's centennial 1963 celebration, and has been so well received that it continues as an annual event. Again in 1965 the Mountain State, in cooperation with West Virginia University, is sponsoring this worthwhile endeavor.

The National Youth Science Camp is attended by two young men from each State selected for their qualities of leadership and citizenship and their excellence in areas of scientific study. For 3 weeks, June 27 through July 17, they participate in a unique recreational and academic experience in the heart of our Monongahela National Forest, at Camp Pocahontas. They will be informed by lectures, engage in field trips, and discuss with noted figures in various disciplines of scientific inquiry.

Governmental and private agencies have cooperated in making the camp more meaningful. The boys will be privileged to visit the National Radio Astronomy Observatory, at Green Bank; they will be using an IBM electronic digital computer during the camp; Col. Chuck Yeager, the West Virginian who was the first man to fly faster than sound, will be a visitor. Colonel Yeager now heads the U.S. Aerospace Research Pilot School at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.

On July 7 and 8 the delegates will travel to Washington, D.C. In the Nation's Capital they will tour the White House, visit the House and Senate Chambers, receive a briefing at the Goddard Space Flight Center, and enjoy the historic and cultural attractions of Washington, D.C.

On Thursday, July 8, it will be my privilege to host a luncheon honoring the delegates to the National Youth Science Camp, in room 1202 of the New Senate Office Building. Is is my hope that every Member of the Senate will attend. Principal speaker will be Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, chief of the Air Force Systems Command, and respected members of our national scientific community are invited guests.

Mr. President, my esteemed and able West Virginia colleague, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, gave the address at the opening ceremonies of the National Youth Science Camp, Sunday, June 27, 1965, at Camp Pocahontas. It was a stimulating speech.

Representatives HARLEY O. STAGGERS and KEN HECHLER—both Democrats of West Virginia; Charles N. Cochran, camp director and a professor of mathematics at West Virginia University; Dr. Roman Verhaalen, of the WVU School of Appalachian Studies; Joseph M. Hutchison, Jr., and R. D. Slonneger, assistant directors of the camp, were also heard.

A striking part of the program was the unfurling of the flags of the 50 States by the young delegates.

In welcoming the 100 campers and more than 350 guests, Senator BYRD emphasized the vital role of scientific research in achieving a more prosperous and productive life for all Americans. He said that:

I am confident that if you are diligent and alert. you young students will emerge as leaders in your scientific fields and will have myriad opportunities to answer fully and constructively the challenges which our American society will pose to our scientific community."

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the text of Senator BYRD's address at the opening ceremonies of the 1965 National Youth Science Camp be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF SCIENCE

(Address by Senator BYRD of West Virginia)

I am very happy to be here today to welcome you to West Virginia and to congratulate each of you on being selected to attend the National Youth Science Camp as a representative of your State. This is a significant recognition of our Nation's emerging science talent, and we, in West Virginia, are proud to be the sponsors of this annual project and to serve as your hosts and interim mentors.

In my position as a U.S. Senator my observations increasingly convince me that the challenges of careers in research and development are so varied and important that you are to be greatly envied as you prepare yourselves for this work.

Evidence of our present era makes it quite clear that science has fully come of age and has taken its place as a body of knowledge, a determining force, and a community of scholars in affecting much of our national policy. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I see in much detail a Federal research and development budget aggregating approximately $15.5 billion per year, and I consider it as striking evidence of the penetration of science and engineering into all parts of our lives. In our complex world, the skilled mind is playing a role more vital than ever before. And the world of tomorrow—the immediate tomorrow—will be one of great, astounding, and rapid change, which is certain to render this world—our world of today—prosaic by comparison.

Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board for the Radio Corp. of America, recently observed that "there is no element of material progress we know today—in the biological and chemical fields, in atomics and electronics, in engineering and physics—that will not seem, from the vantage point of 1980, a fumbling prelude."

This, I believe, is an excellent prediction. Ironically, however, in the year 1844, the U.S. Commissioner of Patents reported to Congress that so much already had been invented that the day surely was dawning "when further improvements must end." The Members of Congress have good reasons to know that the 1844 prediction failed of accuracy, for the business of the Congress itself has an increasing technical content. Many of our public policy issues hinge on the technical capability to accomplish a particular project. With increasing frequency, our laws have to be changed and new legislation passed, because of advancements of science and engineering. More Senators and Congressmen with background training and experience in technical fields are being elected. To give us better access to scientific advice, we recently added a Science Policy Research Division in the Library of Congress. Our Federal involvement in education, particularly in institutions of higher learning, is closely associated with the importance of science to our national goals. Some years ago, Alfred North Whitehead said, "In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute: The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed." Education, science, and government are cooperating in meeting this challenge today in a combined effort of which we may all be proud.

Many of the tools with which the Federal Government serves the people are technical in nature. We are well aware of the role of science in warfare, atomic energy, and public health. The relatively new arena for the struggle for international power and prestige is the exploration of space, an effort which in the United States calls on all of our technical skills. Besides these Federal programs, satisfaction of other public interests and needs will require the products of basic research (and its application by technology) to serve in transportation, pollution abatement, desalination, and environmental management.

Thus, science and engineering will continue to shape the world in which you are beginning your college careers. And when you have completed your training, if you follow your present scientific interest, you will participate as vital contributors to new advances, for the challenge of science is increasing rather than reaching a plateau. There are many important discoveries to be made. For example, a breakthrough in the control of nuclear fusion could bring the cost of electric power down to little more than the expense of transmission. Oceanography may open the way to new food supplies and lift the threat of near starvation from countries which are struggling to take their place in a technological society of nations. Our space program could lead to major changes in transportation, communications, weather modification, and forecasting. The conquest of heart disease and cancer could increase that part of our population which is over 65 years of age and thus lead to a whole new concept of adult life.

The challenge of science in the future will be to find ways to apply the enormous reservoir of technical facts to the solution of the new problems of society, brought about by urbanization, automation, and population growth. We have seen science contribute to our industrialization to raise our standard of living, but there have also been undesirable consequences such as pollution. Science must now accept responsibility for these problems and come up with solutions which are economically attractive and which can be implemented in a practical and timely manner. Research and development must be channeled into socially constructive courses. The amelioration of the problems of society, such as pollution abatement, fresh water from the sea, ecological management, transportation, and improved housing, can only be expected through massive research efforts.

As the President's Science Advisory Committee has said:

"What this country spends on excellence in the sciences is not money gone with the wind. It is money that brings us handsome returns, and of many kinds.

"But we should not emphasize only the material returns of scientific investment. Science yields a return also in the quality and humanity of our civilization. Science is not merely an inducement to progress; it is an affirmation of man's respect for nature and a way to the fulfillment of some of his highest capacities."

You, as budding scientists, must take special care that your education is well rounded, so that you will understand the relationship of your special field to the whole progress of society. The problems of the future will be complicated indeed, and the challenge to science in the 1970's, the 1980's, and the 1990's—into the next century—will be how best to serve society.

I am confident that, if you are diligent and alert, you young students will emerge as leaders in your scientific fields and will have myriad opportunities to answer fully, and constructively, the challenges which our American society will pose to our scientific community.

South Korean Reconstruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, South Korea has quietly been making progress in healing its wounds, reconstructing its cities, and developing its potential as a nation. Few people in modern history have labored under the triple handicaps faced by South Korea: First, the long, hard Japanese occupation; second, the unnatural division of its people and resources; and third, the bitter war which seesawed across its soil and all but destroyed its national infrastructure.

I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Columnist Bob Considine on Korean reconstruction and the achievements of the American-Korean Foundation. Under leave to extend my remarks, the article follows:

NO "YANK GO HOME" SIGNS IN SOUTH KOREA

(By Bob Considine)

NEW YORK, June 22.—There are so many discouraging examples of ingratitude in our relations with the world that it's a pleasure to sit down with a man who can swear, on firsthand evidence, that U.S. foreign aid, per se, is not all in vain.

The man is Dr. Howard A. Rusk, who, in addition to all his other contributions to mankind, is Chairman of the American-Korean Foundation, Inc. He has just returned from Seoul.

"South Korea is about the only country in the world today where you'll never see a 'Go Home Yankee' sign," Dr. Rusk told us the other day at the great New York University-Bellvue Rehabilitation Center which is his masterpiece.

"They actually like us. They're so grateful for what we've done for them, but not in any obsequious way. They work so hard to warrant our faith in them, and so uncomplainingly.

"I've never heard a South Korean ask for anything that was unrelated to his yearning to do something for his country, his people, his wish to remain a free man. I never heard a child cry, never heard a sick man groan in pain.

"They maintain the world's fifth biggest army and it's a first-class armed force, a bulwark again communism. Its infantrymen are paid 50 cents a month. We can keep four ROK divisions for a year for the same money it costs to keep one U.S. division for 6 months.

"A lot of our military people out there ask for extended service when their tour is up, just to continue their association with the Korean military and the Korean people.

"The Koreans lost a million people during the war. That's more than our dead in World Wars I and II and the Korean war. It came 5 years after they had been liberated from nearly half a century of Japanese rule that that was so repressive the Koreans were not even permitted to speak their own language. When the Korean war ended, the place was a wasteland, particularly around the 38th parallel.

"It was as if you were confronted with an American city of 25,000, one-third of whose houses were knocked down, one-third more unroofed, with polluted water in the taps, fuel enough for only one hot meal a day, tuberculosis and pneumonia rates 10 times higher than normal, and but 1 doctor for the 25,000 people, and half a nurse."

Dr. Rusk and some other good people, including Mrs. Bernard Gimbel, went to work on those calamitous imponderables in 1953, before the war ended. He headed up a committee, at the request of Dr. Milton Eisenhower, which was the brain child of John Foster Dulles.

The Secretary of State had decided that South Korea would soon need, or already needed, a people-to-people aid program as much as it needed a government-to-government plan.

They found a desperate land, that winter of factfinding: Frozen dead in the streets of Pusan, mothers holding children all through the bleak nights awaiting the opening the next day of the Maryknoll Sisters mission, "and the first outpatient cases of tuberculosis and meningitis I'd ever see," as Dr. Rusk puts it.

Providentially, President Eisenhower was holding a White House conference of railroad presidents the day Dr. Rusk was scheduled to present his report. He asked Ike to give him 5 minutes with the railroad men. When the request was granted he appealed to them for a train, a train that could be sent across America to beg some of the things South Korea needed.

He got five trains, stuffed. The livestock he collected was the first step in the growth of what has become the world's second largest 4-H club.

Korea is coming alive with American know-how. The Korean doctors trained in this country by the foundation, a kind of private peace corps that needs your help, have revolutionized the medicine of that land, where a million persons still have tuberculosis and there are 100,000 lepers.

The American-Korean Foundation can build a house for a homeless Korean family for $149.95, a house occupied by good hard-working people who think more of us than we often think of ourselves.

Accomplishments of the Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, shortly less than 4 years ago, representatives of 20 independent republics of this hemisphere met in Punta del Este, to fashion the Alliance for Progress.

Since that time, the Alliance for Progress has been extremely successful in improving the welfare of many countries and in furthering the democratic development of this hemisphere. This has been accomplished through the cooperative efforts of all the peoples of the Americas; and the Alliance for Progress has played an important part in that success.

At the 15th annual convention of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas, held last June 16 in Miami, Fla., the efficient and effective director of the partners of the Alliance programs, James H. Boren, ably outlined the program. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF JAMES H. BOREN, DIRECTOR OF THE PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAMS AT THE 15TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE AMERICAS, DUPONT PLAZA HOTEL, MIAMI, FLA., JUNE 16, 1965

I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the program of your annual convention, and I am honored by the privilege of appearing on a program with the distinguished Secretary General of LAFTA, Dr. Alberto Sola. I regret that I have not been able to attend your earlier sessions, but I was not able to do so because of the duties imposed on me by the conclusion Friday of the first Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance.

It is the Partners of the Alliance which I wish to speak to you today.

The Partners of the Alliance is a private sector program which is an infant in terms of age but which is already beginning to show promise of being an active and contributing member of the family of groups and institutions seeking to implement the spirit of the charter of Punta del Este.

The partners' activity seeks initially to establish long-range working relationships between community and private sector groups in areas of Latin America and areas of the United States. At the present time there are partnerships established involving the private sector in 12 Latin American republics and 26 States of the United States.

The specific partnerships are developed in response to interest as evidenced by groups

in Latin America and by groups in the United States.

The role of my office is that of the catalyst—to transform interest into an operating program through the mechanism of Partners of the Alliance committees. After a broadly through arrangements made in my office, a "program development team" to visit its partner area and work with its counterpart Partners of the Alliance committee. The committees then develop their own program—the program which they shall jointly implement. After the committees have been formed and the program development team has made its report, the two committees continue to work together directly. I, and the staff members of the partners' office in AID, then withdraw to the wings. We stand ready to be of assistance when we can and when called upon. We can provide some services, for example, such as being a channel of communication through which the various committees can share their program experiences.

The program development teams generally are composed of at least one leading representative of business, an educator, an agricultural leader, and representatives from the fields of health and labor. Civic clubs, trade and professional associations, financial institutions, and all other interested groups can—and do—become active in the partnership.

The two partners of the Alliance committees normally develop programs involving three areas of operation: (1) Small socially oriented impact projects with emphasis on self-help; (2) educational, cultural, and technical exchange, and (3) investment and commercial relationships. Let me give you some specific illustrations.

In the first category are the many small projects in which local groups in a Latin American country may have undertaken self-help projects but need some assistance in completing them. For example, in some countries rural communities may have built schools but lack the materials for the roof, doors, and windows to complete them. Students in high schools, civic clubs, and other groups working through their State's partners of the Alliance committee, may provide the needed construction materials. Other similar projects already completed have involved equipment for medical posts or small hospitals, books for village libraries, hand tools for training programs, or cable for suspension bridges across Andean rivers. Many projects such as these have been completed, and scores more are in process of being implemented.

In the category of technical assistance, the U.S. partners committees may develop an inventory of specialists who would be available to go, upon request, to their partner area for 1, 2, or 3 months—not on the basis of a contract but solely on the basis of transportation and per diem costs. For example, the Texas League of Municipalities has offered to make available to their partners in Peru, men with broad experience in handling the practical problems of city government. Similarly, a Houston television station and another professional broadcasting group have offered to help the Peruvian broadcasting association in its educational programing. The offers are expressions of keen interest at the community level in the Alliance for Progress. In keeping with the two-way flow of the partnership, one State in the United States plans to organize a State development program and they may soon ask for help from their Latin American partner who has had experience in this field.

Last Friday, Mr. Frank Pace, Jr., president of the International Executive Service Corps, addressed the first Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance. He described the excellent program which he directs and he discussed the way in which the various partners committees and the IESC can work in close collaboration. The International Executive Service Corps was established to provide, on a strictly business basis, experienced managerial talent to assist growing businesses. For those of you interested in this aspect, I would be pleased to give you the address of Mr. Pace in order that you might make direct contact with him. (Mr. Pace, as you may know, is the former head of General Dynamics and a former Cabinet official.)

At the partners conference last Thursday and Friday, the Committee on Industrial Development and Investment Opportunities recommended that the various partners committees in Latin America develop a list of specific investment opportunities and assign to them priority ratings based on their general contribution to the country's economic development. These lists would then be made available to their counterpart group. Joint venture investment conferences are also a possibility as a partnership activity.

In the field of educational programs, Florida, under the leadership of Secretary of State Tom Adams and with the support of Congressman DANTE FASCELL at the Washington end, is developing a scholarship program with Colombia. Collaborating with ICETEX in Colombia, the Florida Alliance Committee has already worked with educational institutions in establishing a number of scholarships at the junior college as well as the graduate level. Plans also call for future collaboration with the Barranquilla midmanagement training center of INCOLDA and the technical and vocational training center of SENA.

The partners of the Alliance is not a program of mutual adoption but, rather, it is a practical approach through which the people in the United States and areas of Latin America can work together in a direct alliance. This is a two-way program the scope of which is limited only by the imagination and energies of the private sector. We in the United States long have talked about what we can learn from the great cultural and educational wealth of the other Americas, but we have not done enough to put that stated principle in practice. This we can help do through the partnerships.

Costa Rica sent 12 educators to Oregon and assisted that State in upgrading the teaching of Spanish.

The partners of the State of Paraná in Brazil are now sending a professor of Portuguese to introduce that language to high school teachers in their partner State of Ohio. Plans are being made for exchange tours of works of art as well as exchange of performing artists.

In the business world, partnership signifies a sharing in the proceeds of business operations. Similarly, the partners of the Alliance seek to establish a channel through which organizations and individuals in every area of the hemisphere can share in the work of the development process and together reap the benefits of educational, cultural, social, and economic progress.

You may not have heard of this program, not only because it is relatively new but also because we did not want to talk about plans but accomplishments. At our conference last week, ideas and techniques were exchanged and some initial accomplishments reported. Assistant Secretary of State Jack Vaughn, and the Deputy U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Bill Rogers, were among the conference speakers. Our two principal banquet speakers were the distinguished Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Juracy Magalhaes, and Secretary of State, Dean Rusk. The program thus has broad support from high levels, but the true key to its long-range success lies in the hands of the private citizens of the Americas. I have enough confidence in the imagination and drive of the private sector to believe it will succeed.

If you should be interested in knowing more about the Partners of the Alliance and, specifically, if you wish to know the names of the community and private sector leaders who may be active in the program in your home area, I would welcome the opportunity of talking with you following these proceedings.

I deeply appreciate the honor of addressing you today. From Congressman FASCELL I have heard much about this great gateway area of Miami and also of the excellent work of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas. I congratulate you for what you are doing and I thank you for the privilege of being with you.

We Are Tragically Forgetting Our Educational Processes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, there was recently an unusually good column written by Mr. Clifford B. Ward in the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel. In these days when so often the individual seems to be forgotten or regarded as one unit to be administered by big government, such a column can put things in the proper perspective. I include it herewith:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

Freedom belongs to man, not by a gift from his fellow men, but as a gift from God.

Government exists for man, not man for government.

Man's spiritual and moral goals have a primacy over any economic or political goals.

These are fundamental American concepts and they are being successfully challenged today in a million different ways, all erosive of man's value as a creature of God.

With all the billions of dollars being expended in this country on education, we are tragically forgetting in our educational processes the very keystone of thought which made the Republic of the United States unique in the history of the human race. Instead of telling American youngsters of the great principles upon which our Government is founded, we are ignoring the priceless of our great spiritual and intellectual heritage by, in effect, concentrating on teaching them things no more important than how to tie rope knots.

COURT HANDICAPS TEACHING

Can you imagine the usefulness of a compass without a due north on it, or a clock without a midnight or a midday on it? There has to be a zero on every compass or degree readings mean nothing, yet officially this country is now committed by reason of U.S. Supreme Court reasoning that no child in a public school may be taught anything about God or a Supreme Being, lest an injustice be done to those who do not believe in God or a Supreme Being. How can you teach a child that he is a creature of God, if you cannot teach him that there is a God? How can you teach him that freedom comes from God, if you can't teach him that there is a God? How can you teach him that government exists to serve him, not that he exists to serve government, if you cannot teach him that there is a God?

Few American children anymore are taught that our Government, founded on the resi-

dual wisdom of many generations of human being who went before them, was not a copy of any prior government, but was absolutely unique in enunciating formally the idea that man gets all of his inalienable rights by reason of his very nature as a creature of God.

FUGITIVES FROM OBLIGATIONS

No one can eat from a pot into which no one has put anything, and today many of our youngsters have been taught that such can be done. For many of them, higher education is sought, not for itself but as a means to escape either the military service or work. They are fugitives from obligations, a word which they have never been taught. They look upon those with a sense of duty to themselves and their Nation as saps. They want from the Government things to which they themselves have made no contributions, and look upon those who have made such contributions as likewise saps.

The greatest tragedy to a human being might well be when he does not sense his own worth as a human being, as a citizen, as a son or daughter, a husband or wife, a father or a mother. All great religions attempt to teach individual men their own worth, but Christianity, one of the world's great religious, teaches that one solitary human being would have made the unspeakably awesome sacrifice of Christ on the cross worth while. A king's ransom can be great, but a God's ransom is infinitely greater.

The conservation of this country's natural resources is a needed thing, but a much more needed thing is a conservation of the American's faith in himself as an individual, made priceless by reason of his God-given nature.

Raising of Earning Limitation on Social Security Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in today's issue of the Washington Post there is an editorial which points out the fairness of the action of the Senate Finance Committee in voting to raise from $1,200 to $1,800 the earning limitation applicable to retired persons who draw social security pensions. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHTING A WRONG

The Senate Finance Committee has moved to right a grievous wrong that the social security system inflicts upon retired persons. Under the present law a retired person may earn $1,200 a year without surrendering any of his social security benefits. But on earnings between $1,200 and $1,700, he must surrender $1 in benefits for every $2 earned, and for earnings in excess of $1,700, benefits are reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

Due to these limitations, the benefits paid under the social security program are reduced, but the glaring defects of this economy outshadow by far any savings in out-of-pocket costs. By penalizing those who wish to work, the economy is deprived of the services of experienced and talented workers, many of whom encounter frustrations in imposed idleness. And in practice the law discriminates against those who spent their lives in low-income occupations. A retired manager can arrange with his company to work for a number of days during a single quarter of a year without exceeding the earnings limitation. But a retired blue-collar worker in a lower income bracket is likely to run afoul of the earnings limitation.

The Senate Finance Committee proposes to raise the exemption to $1,800 and apply the $1-for-$2 penalty on earnings between $1,800 and $3,000. This reform will cost the social security system about $700 million in additional benefits, but it will pay the country a much larger dividend by releasing many retired workers from the indignity of enforced idleness.

Federal Government and Louisiana—Partners in Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to tell the Members of this House about the unfortunate partnership of the Federal Government and the State of Louisiana in financing Louisiana crime. What I mean to say is this—by their refusal to legalize gambling, the two governments have made gambling a mob monopoly so that gambling revenues bankroll every known shade of vice in the Bayou State.

Gambling has long been a profitable pastime in the New Orleans section, so much so that some of the counties—parishes—around New Orleans are known as real gambler's dens. Last year's pari-mutuel turnover in Louisiana came to $49 million, and this is just scratching the surface of Louisiana gambling. Testimony before the McClellan committee put off-track betting at $50 billion a year nationwide, and other testimony pegged off-track betting at only 42 percent of the illegal gambling total, which would have the national illegal gambling total climbing near to $120 billion a year. Louisiana's share of this total, computed on a population basis, would come to about $2.2 billion a year. The crime rings who run America's gambling operations get to keep about 10 percent of the take as profit—this would put their Louisiana haul in the vicinity of $220 million a year. This money goes to subsidize a lot of murder, dope, and prostitution in Louisiana each year, and it also goes to corrupt the political process so that gambling can stay both illegal—thus far for the mob—and operational.

If the two governments in Baton Rouge and Washington were mature enough to realize the need to regulate and control the gambling urge with Government-operated gambling, we would not see the cruel paradox of the two governments being silent partners in every depth and shade of crime financed by illegal gambling profits. What this country needs—and what Louisiana needs—is Government-controlled gambling so that the gambling urge works for the public good rather than against the public good. I recommend National and State lotteries to get gambling moneys flowing into the public treasury. I believe that Government-controlled gambling would stop Louisiana's being a steaming swamp of syndicate gambling.

People Who Really Know Selma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the July 3, 1965, issue of Human Events includes a very interesting article entitled "People Who Really Know Selma," written by Russell Kirk. The article presents testimony from a most reliable source—Sister Michael Ann, administrator of the Good Samaritan Hospital, in Selma, Ala.—about the various types of persons who participated in the recent unfortunate racial disturbances in Selma.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEOPLE WHO REALLY KNOW SELMA

(By Russell Kirk)

As disorderly demonstrations recur at Selma, Ala., it is well to pay attention to the remonstrances of some pro-Negro residents of Selma who are trying courageously to restore order and tolerable relationships between white and colored people.

One such is Sister Michael Ann, administrator of the Good Samaritan Hospital in Selma, established for Negroes of limited means. Speaking in Detroit recently to a labor union convention, this nun says that Selma is like a volcano ready to erupt again. Only Martin Luther King, she thinks, "can resolve the trouble there—and I don't think he realizes what's going on."

What is going on? Chiefly, Sister Michael Ann points out, reckless and demagogic agitation by some 100 radicals, white and colored, who have continued to hang about Selma since the troubles in March. These are irresponsible outsiders, a curse to everyone trying to achieve peace and the improvement of the Negroes' condition.

Four categories of civil rights demonstrators came to Selma in March, Sister Michael Ann points out: First, dedicated, religious people, "who really knew why they were there"; second, well-intentioned folk who didn't quite know what the fuss was all about; third, rude, uncouth, neurotic rebels, indulging in sexual promiscuity, dreaded by Selma's citizens; last, "the followers," who simply came along for the fun and games—as, under other circumstances, they might join a lynch mob. The latter two groups have almost ruined what the first two groups tried to accomplish. "Oh, if we could just have a breather," declares Sister Michael Ann.

Incidentally, the Good Samaritan Hospital treated the 100 civil rights workers injured in the fight with police in March, and most of those hurt since then. None of the civil rights demonstrators paid the hospital anything.

What are the fresh demonstrations at Selma accomplishing—the new ones organized by the 100 bearded freaks, white and

black, who linger mischievously in Selma? Why, provoking racial hostility, mostly. The demands made by these radicals are impossible to fulfill—and even when concessions are offered these extremists, the civil rights fanatics fail to turn up for negotiations, or to cooperate in any way. They thrive upon disorder.

Certainly the continuing demonstrations have little to do with voter registration. A leading Negro minister of Selma, the Reverend C. C. Hunter, says that registration is simple nowadays.

"It used to be hard," Mr. Hunter explains. "I took the literacy test four times before I passed it, but it has been very easy to pass for a long time now. All during January the State kept registration open longer than they were required to. They are only supposed to allow people to register to vote twice a month, but they were open every day in January and anybody could register. All they had to do was walk down and register and sign their names. Hundreds of Negroes could have registered every week, but only 26 went down and registered." This was before Martin Luther King's march to Montgomery ever began.

In the name of civil rights, fanatics and fantastics are not entitled to destroy a community. "License they mean, when they cry liberty," to use Milton's phrase. Or, in the words of a celebrated Justice of the Supreme Court, "the Bill of Rights is not a suicide pact."

Welcome to Colonel White and Colonel McDivitt on Their Safe Return

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Louis Goodwin, a young and talented cartoonist with the Columbus Dispatch, emotionally expressed the feelings of millions of Americans, and of many other persons throughout the world, upon the safe return of Colonel White and Colonel McDivitt after their multiple-orbit space flight.

Mr. Goodwin's cartoon appeared in the Columbus Dispatch of June 8. I regret that a Senate rule prevents the reproduction of such material in the RECORD. Mr. Goodwin's cartoon, entitled "Welcome Home," pictures the head and shoulders of our Statue of Liberty, in New York Harbor, which, since 1886, has been a symbol of freedom and welcome to millions of immigrants. In Mr. Goodwin's characterization, Miss Liberty fondly cradles a Gemini Twin in either arm; and, while her facial expression radiates happiness, a single tear on her cheek reflects release from moments of anxiety.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mrs. George Healy, of Columbus, Ohio, addressed to the editor of the Columbus Dispatch. In the letter, Mrs. Healy comments on Mr. Goodwin's cartoon.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the EDITOR:

"One picture is worth a thousand words" is an expression that can't begin to express my feelings concerning your "Welcome Home" cartoon in the June 8 Dispatch. The single tear was a master touch.

Your Mr. Goodwin so brilliantly portrayed the emotion of all Americans toward the astronaut twins, McDivitt and White.

We felt pride, joy, gratitude, and thankfulness that their mission was accomplished and they were home safe.

I feel that everyone in the United States should have the privilege of seeing this cartoon, so I'm sending copies to President Johnson and Senator Lausche, hoping that in some way Mr. Goodwin will be given national recognition for his million-word cartoon that spoke for all of us.

Mrs. GEORGE HEALY.

Columbus.

States and Localities Real Testing Ground for New Ideas, Democratic Officials Admit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who legislate on the Federal level have an increasingly difficult time to make clear the fundamental Republican point of view that State and local governments and officials, because they are so much closer to the people involved, can do a much more thorough and constructive job of servicing individuals than those in the Federal Government. Occasionally, with all this emphasis on Washington, there appear some frank, honest comments in which individuals admit that this is the case regardless of party or of personal philosophy.

Some years ago Mrs. Frances Perkins, the former Secretary of Labor, who served on a number of Episcopal Church groups as a member of the Church of the Resurrection, New York City, told one of my associates that much of her Labor Department record was based on ideas and mail which came from city, county, and State officials and organizations rather than from her own Department.

In connection with her recent death there came to light part of an interview she gave to Raymond F. Male, the commissioner of labor and industry of the State of New Jersey. In this report which was published in the New Jersey Star-Ledger, of June 13, 1965, Franklin Gregory, section 4, page 4, both Mr. Male and Mrs. Perkins went on record about the contribution made by local individuals and local government. Commissioner Male said, among other things:

It is my feeling that in national programs that deal directly with people (education, unemployment, health) the closer you can get the administration to the State and local level, the more effective they will be.

I don't believe that even the brightest administrator can sit in Washington and write a manual that will work well or uniformly in every State or community in the country.

There are great differences between the communities and the States and I see this as a strength rather than a form of weakness.

In fact, thinks Male, these social welfare projects should be started at municipal or State level before blossoming into national programs.

Male recalled the tremendous programs of the New Deal in the depression-ridden 1930's which were actually, he pointed out, an earlier war on poverty.

Shortly before her recent death, F.D.R.'s Secretary of Labor, Frances Perkins, granted an interview to Male.

She confirmed to me that not a single national program of the New Deal had not been lifted out of the successful experimentation in one or more State governments.

Building on that concept, my notion is that if we are to have the Great Society and fight poverty, if we are to make the necessary adjustments to automation, the successful approach will be maximum invention at State and local levels.

Differences and competition between the States are healthy. If New Jersey can find a better way to help solve the school dropout problem, let's make it available to other States. Let's not wait for somebody sitting on the Potomac to write the prescription.

If I were sitting in Washington, I wouldn't want to push a button for the 50 States.

The complete article in context follows below:

[From the Sunday Star-Ledger, June 13, 1965]

LOOK, FELLAS, A REAL LIVE BUREAUCRAT

(By Franklin Gregory)

We ran into New Jersey's commissioner of labor and industry, Raymond F. Male, the other day at the Newark station of the Pennsylvania Railroad and rode as far as Trenton with him. "Honest Ray"—as we dubbed him a good many years ago—has been since the first of the year on what Governor Hughes describes as a "qualified leave of absence."

The qualification is that, while he's getting no State pay, he must still keep an eye on some loose ends of problems with which his department was involved when he went on leave.

For example, his visit to Newark was to followup on the efforts by the Hughes administration to build a friendlier climate between ITT and its workers following last winter's bitter strike.

But most of Ray's time is spent occupying the erudite "chair of public administrator in residence" at Fels Institute, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia.

As Ray explained it:

"Just as Yale has a real live author (John Hersey) in residence and other colleges show off poets and painters, the University of Pennsylvania has in residence a real live bureaucrat for the students to look at."

The idea is that graduate students of public administration will get more out of rubbing elbows with a "live bureaucrat" than from textbooks. These students, incidentally, will later become city managers and other appointed public officials.

Professor Male has found his chores various and enjoyable. He has taught classes, including a night course for in-service students. The men are already working in government jobs: A Trenton State Prison captain and lieutenant; the personnel director from Trenton State Hospital; the Bethlehem (Pa.) commissioner of public safety, etc.

Male taught them the theory and practice of State and local government, illustrating how government is used as an instrument to deal with unemployment, crime, delinquency, and the like.

"This may sound funny," said Male. "But when I first arrived at the university, the dean of the school said he simply wanted me to sit down and think. I've spent a lot of time thinking—and reading and writing."

Writing what?

"Well, I'm taking a kind of look at Federal-State relationships in the light of problems and issues now facing the country. I'm writing from the obvious bias of one who

has been in State and local government for 20 years.

"It is my feeling that in national programs that deal directly with people (education, unemployment, health) the closer you can get the administration to the State and local level, the more effective they will be.

"I don't believe that even the brightest administrator can sit in Washington and write a manual that will work well or uniformly in every State or community in the country.

"There are great differences between the communities and the States and I see this as a form of strength rather than a form of weakness."

In fact, thinks Male, these social welfare projects should be started at municipal or State level before blossoming into national programs.

Male recalled the tremendous programs of the New Deal in the depression-ridden 1930's which were actually, he pointed out, an earlier "war on poverty."

Shortly before her recent death, F.D.R.'s Secretary of Labor, Frances Perkins, granted an interview to Male.

"She confirmed to me that not a single national program of the New Deal had not been lifted out of the successful experimentation in one or more State governments.

"Building on that concept, my notion is that if we are to have the Great Society and fight poverty, if we are to make the necessary adjustments to automation, the successful approach will be maximum invention at State and local levels.

"Differences and competition between the States are healthy. If New Jersey can find a better way to help solve the school dropout problem, let's make it available to other States. Let's not wait for somebody sitting on the Potomac to write the prescription.

"If I were sitting in Washington, I wouldn't want to push a button for the 50 States."

Ray told us that the Fels Institute of Local and State Government, where he occupies the chair of "live bureaucrat," was named after the late Samuel Fels, the soapmaker. It seems that the Fels fortune, which financed the institute, was begun in a modest way in the Philadelphia Fels home where Samuel's mother made soap in the basement.

Fels, it appears, was a crusader for the type of home rule which Male espouses.

When the train reached Trenton, we got off and Male continued on to Philadelphia. As we trudged up the stairs in the sweltering heat, we couldn't help wishing that the Pennsy would get its broken escalator fixed in time to celebrate Male's return July 1.

If the Pennsy does, Male will still have a fairly happy homecoming. He will find that his salary has been increased from its former $20,000 per annum to $25,000.

We anticipate also that when Male gets back into harness, his department of labor and industry will really start humming. After all, the commissioner has had 6 months of "thinking—and reading and writing."

Notable Step by Kentucky Press Association Toward Assuring a Free Press and Fair Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial and an article from the June 8 issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

As the editorial states:

A great deal has been written and spoken about the conflicts that have arisen between the constitutional guarantees of free press and fair trial.

I agree with the editorial that the Kentucky Press Association deserves applause for its courage in approving the statement of principles drafted by a committee of its members, headed by Norman E. Isaacs, executive editor of the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Courier-Journal, June 8, 1965]

EDITORIAL—NOTABLE STEP TOWARD ASSURING A FREE PRESS AND FAIR TRIALS

A great deal has been written and spoken about the conflicts that have arisen between the constitutional guarantees of free press and fair trial. At its meeting this past weekend, the Kentucky Press Association took an important and admirable step in adopting a statement of principles that may lead the way to higher standards for both press and bar not only in Kentucky, but, hopefully, in other States as well.

Kentucky's editors have attacked the problem forthrightly, with suggestions covering specific areas of news concerning crime. They urge law enforcement officers and newspapers alike to refrain from using the term "confession" to describe statements attributed to persons under arrest. They recommend that there be great care used concerning prior records of those arrested because "under the law an individual must be tried for the accusation at hand, not for prior delinquencies."

There is so much in the statement deserving of close attention that the Courier-Journal is today reprinting the text of it on the adjoining page. Every citizen ought to read it thoughtfully.

There seems to us great merit in the suggestion that major police departments consider adding staff legal counsel. We think the press association also is to be commended for its emphasis on the "principle of equity"—that "all acquittals, clearances of suspicion and corrections of serious misstatement of fact be given news treatment as close in importance and position to the original publication as possible."

In so many other areas of the country there has been only acrimonious debate between press and bar over this broad issue. We can justly take pride in the fact that the first gesture for meetings with representatives of the bar and the broadcast media came from the State's press association. The statement speaks well for the diligence all the groups put into the effort. It is, therefore, fitting that the press has taken the role of leadership in being the first to adopt the principles and to have invited the bar associations and the Kentucky broadcasters to join in endorsing the guidelines and to establish a joint standing committee to make more effective the total thrust.

Certainly, the statement of principles is not a cure-all. It imposes no restrictions and lacks enforcement powers. It is, however, an honest approach to a delicate and difficult problem. The Kentucky Press Association deserves applause for its courage in taking a position so advanced and responsible.

The Courier-Journal salutes its colleagues in the State press and pledges to do its best to live up to the spirit enunciated in these guidelines.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, June 8, 1965]

THE PRESS AND FAIR TRIAL REPORTING—A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES THAT WAS ADOPTED BY THE KPA

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This statement of principles, approved without dissent by the Kentucky Press Association at its weekend meeting at Kentucky Dam Village State Park, was drafted by a committee headed by Norman E. Isaacs, executive editor of the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times.)

One year ago—concerned over the apparent conflicts which arise from time to time between the 1st amendment to the Federal Constitution guaranteeing free press and the 6th amendment guaranteeing fair trial—the Kentucky Press Association authorized discussions with other State organizations toward the establishment of a statement of principles.

Such discussions have been held. They have been fruitful. The Kentucky Press Association believes that whatever conflicts exist can be kept to a minimum provided that all of those involved in the legal processes and in news coverage take every reasonable step to maintain an unprejudiced atmosphere.

Both press and bar stand in strong support of all the Federal and State constitutional provisions—the rights of the free press, the right of individuals against unlawful search and seizure, the right of an individual to counsel, the right to protection against self-incrimination, the protections against excessive bail or excessive punishment, and the right of all persons accused of criminal acts to swift and public trial by impartial jurors.

It is toward the furtherance of these goals that the Kentucky Press Association has drawn up the following guidelines.

The collaboration of all is solicited—of reporters and editors; of those who serve as law-enforcement posts; of officers of the courts; of those who serve as counsel.

And to attain these goals, the Kentucky Press Association warmly invites the endorsement of bar associations and of the Kentucky Broadcasters Association.

1. DANGER OF "CONFESSIONS"

It is the function of police officers and Commonwealth attorneys to question those suspected of crime. Law enforcement officers have every right to seek as much information as possible from those under arrest, provided these persons are notified of their constitutional rights, and are not coerced.

The publication, however, of the results of such questioning is not only extralegal, but is often dangerous.

Reporters and editors should bear in mind that in the great majority of cases brought to trial, many purported "confessions" which are published are often not introduced into evidence. The publication of such material, even though issued by law enforcement officers, does not relieve the newspapers of basic legal responsibility. In a great number of cases in recent years, the publication of such matter has resulted in the reversal of convictions by courts of appeal.

It is recommended, therefore, that all law enforcement officers and all journalists refrain from using the term "confession" to describe a statement attributed to a person under arrest.

Policy is outlined

As a general principle, newspapers should follow the policy of stating simply that law enforcement officers have reported that the individual under arrest has made a statement containing damaging admissions.

This procedure may not be adequate in cases involving major offenses and where the degree of public concern is sufficient to

justify news coverage in greater detail in order to pacify community unrest. In cases of this type, reporters should make every effort to interview the accused individuals to seek corroboration of the statements attributed to them; or to seek out the accused's counsel for comment.

Whatever is published in these instances, however, should be presented in such manner as not to place the newspapers in the role of judge or jury; and should be couched in such dispassionate terms as not to impair the accused person's right to a trial free of prejudice.

Police counsel advised

In this connection, it is the belief of the Kentucky Press Association that major police departments would be well advised to maintain staff legal counsel. It is not possible for police officers to keep abreast of legal developments, and staff counsel could provide a most valuable service.

The weight of legal decisions in recent years makes it clear that reversal is only to be expected in cases where an accused individual has not been notified of his right to counsel, or where notification has not been given that statements made to arresting officers may be used in evidence.

The addition of staff legal counsel would provide police departments with up-to-date data on proper procedures and save the law enforcement branch from the disappointments that come from technical failures in complying with both the statutes and the decisions of courts of appeal.

2. USE OF PRIOR RECORDS

Under the law an individual must be tried for the accusation at hand—not for prior delinquencies. Unless a defendant openly during a trial admits previous arrests and conviction, the record of the past cannot be disclosed to either jury or judge. Only when a verdict has been reached does a report of the individual's past record reach the judge so that he can appraise it in terms of sentencing.

Therefore, when a newspaper transmits information about the prior record of a person under arrest, it is unwittingly bringing into direct conflict the constitutional rights afforded by the 1st and 6th amendments.

There are cases, however, where a crime is of such a nature and of such importance that restraint in this regard is difficult, if not impossible.

The Oswald case

The Lee Harvey Oswald case is not a precise example. There were excesses of another type (these are discussed in section 3). There was no mention in the published reports of any prior criminal record on Oswald. Had such a record existed it most certainly would have been published.

While the principle remains that every accused person is entitled to his constitutional rights, the assassination of a President is of such unusual nature and the depth of public interest so far-reaching—and the need that maximum information be given the citizenry so compelling—that a violation by the news media under such circumstances would have to be regarded as an understandable departure from the norm.

The problem confronting the news media can best be illustrated by mentioning the name of John Dillinger. Were another Dillinger to develop and the full weight of the Federal Government be brought into play in seeking his capture, the press could not avoid giving all the details of past crimes.

Restraint is urged

It is not in such cases, however, that the normal difficulty arises. The Kentucky Press Association emphasizes that unless there be clear and overpowering reasons dictated by the public interest, the news media should refrain from publishing prior records of criminal activity.

The news media are urged, however, to seek out such information for its own guidance and for the subsequent protection of society should there be miscarriages of justice.

There have been, and there will be in the future, instances where individuals with long records of violent crime have either been freed or given minor sentences. In such cases, the possession of prior records by the news media will present opportunities after trials for public disclosure and the opportunity thus given the citizenry to seek reforms in the legal procedures.

3. PRETRIAL AND TRIAL REPORTING

In cases where there has been unusual news interest, the news media have followed the practice of summarizing such cases immediately preceding the opening of a criminal trial. Careless pretrial reviewing contains the danger of prejudicing the guarantees of fair trial.

The public is entitled to know when such casese are due for trial and to be given as much information as is proper and reasonable. Every care should be taken in such advance reporting to observe the principles outlined above concerning statements attributed to the accused individual and about prior records of violations.

The Kentucky Press Association believes that law-enforcement officers, attorneys, officers of the court, and newspapermen must keep in mind at all times that every citizen is a potential juror. It follows as a fundamental principle for all concerned that pretrial comment and publication should be as fair, factual, and impartial as conscientious men and women can present such information.

The Dallas blame

The Oswald case in Dallas brought sharp criticism from many sources, including the Warren Commission and the American Bar Association. The prime fault in that case rested with the ranking officers of the Dallas Police Department and with State's attorneys.

Both the Warren Commission and the American Bar Association held it one thing for police officers to collect evidence; and quite another to release this type of information because it has the effect of conducting a trial in the press, rather than in the courtroom.

There have been other cases (usually sensational in nature) where the conduct of both prosecuting and defense attorneys violated all precepts of fair trial and fair comment. It is the responsibility of the bar associations to control such conduct and to enforce proper standards.

It follows that if newspapers are to exercise restraint in the publication of information about arrests, about prior criminal activity on the part of those accused of crime, and in pretrial reporting, the public is entitled to fuller coverage of the actual trials.

Newspapers are therefore encouraged to expand trial coverage so that the public can be accorded full information about the nature of criminal activity and the results of the community's law enforcement procedures.

In covering trials, reporters should use care in one aspect. This concerns statements made in court during times when the jury has been excused. It is proper for a reporter to convey the essence of the courtroom argument, but any prejudicial comment uttered out of the hearing of the jury should be excluded from any published report.

4. HANDLING JUVENILE CASES

Perhaps more debate goes on concerning the proper method of reporting cases involving juveniles than any other phase of crime reporting. There remains widespread disagreement as to the most effective and ethical means of treating such cases.

The general practice in the Commonwealth is that wherever and whenever possible, the anonymity of juveniles placed under arrest be protected. Under Kentucky law, complete discretion in this field is given to the juvenile courts, or to the presiding court in those counties where no juvenile court exists.

There is as yet no standard method used by the various juvenile courts in releasing information for publication. What one county's court considers a serious violation, another county's court may treat as a juvenile prank. The Kentucky Press Association urges some system of uniformity by the juvenile courts in releasing information.

Difficult cases

The news media are placed in a difficult position in cases where gangs of young toughs attack other juveniles or adults and where a 16-year-old may use a gun to commit a crime. Under law, the press is free to report the names of those over 18, but the names of the worst of the violators can be withheld if the juvenile court of jurisdiction so decrees.

To cover instances such as this, the Kentucky Press Association stands ready to work with the bar associations in order that the public interest may be protected adequately.

As a basic principle, all responsible newspapers already cooperate fully with the juvenile courts to uphold the State law which protects juveniles for whom rehabilitation is possible.

5. THE USE OF WANTED DESCRIPTIONS

From time to time, crimes are committed in which law-enforcement officials must issue descriptions of individuals sought in such cases.

The press is urged to collaborate with the law-enforcement agencies in this regard, but is cautioned that there is danger in the use of photographs, sketches, and names.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation periodically releases the names and photographs of most wanted individuals. In these cases, the FBI is acting under Federal law and is seeking persons under indictment for major crimes.

In State cases, a newspaper assumes full risk in publishing names, protographs, or sketches of individuals sought, but not yet under indictment. A case of mistaken identity can result in libel.

There also is inherent danger in the publication of photographs taken by cameras placed in banks and other business establishments. Misidentification of a legitimate customer as a law violator can have serious repercussions for a newspaper.

Consistent with these precautions, newspapers are urged to give every possible assistance to law-enforcement agencies in their search for individuals under indictment.

6. THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUITY

One of the major, continuing criticisms against all branches of the news media is that reports of criminal involvement are often given considerable prominence, but that subsequent clearance or acquittal of he individual is accorded only casual mention.

The Kentucky Press Association recommends the principle of equity treatment—that all acquittals, clearances of suspicion, and corrections of serious misstatement of fact be given news treatment as close in importance and position to the original publication as is possible.

7. STANDING COMMITTEE

In the furtherance of thee principles, the Kentucky Press Association stands ready to join the bar associations and the Kentucky broadcasters in establishing a standing committee to periodically review these guidelines.

The Kentucky Press Association would envision the function of such a committee as that of appraising the scope and effectiveness of the principles and to recommend changes, alterations, or additions when desirable or necessary.

8. RIGHT TO INVESTIGATE

Nothing in this statement of principles in any way limits or proscribes the rights of the press to investigate and expose corruption and wrongdoing in society. The press remains free to search out waywardness no matter where it exists and to focus the searchlight upon the conduct of any who may violate the public trust.

The intent of these principles is to maintain the fullest flow of information consistent with the obligation of a free society toward those accused of violating the laws.

Every individual, no matter what his rank in life, is entitled to the protections of a fair and impartial trial. To this end, the Kentucky Press Association urges its membership to pledge themselves to pursue the precept of the preamble to the Federal Constitution which calls for the establishment of justice and the insuring of domestic tranquility.

Intelligent communications insures domestic tranquillity—in maintaining a community's faith that its law-enforcement machinery is operating faithfully and efficiently—in maintaining public faith that innocent individuals are not being unjustly sought or punished—in upholding faith that justice prevails.

Spirit of responsibility

By the same token, intelligent communications calls for a sense of responsibility. Responsibility indicates restraint in the dissemination of pretrial information concerning those accused of crime—the restraint of intelligent self-interest that dictates that fair and impartial trial is a cornerstone of American freedom—that we follow the advice of Abraham Lincoln, as written to the editor of the Illinois Gazette on August 11, 1846:

"He who makes an assertion without knowing whether it is true or false is guilty of falsehood, and the accidental truth of the assertion does not justify or excuse him."

It is in this spirit that these principles have been drawn up and adopted—toward the end that free press and fair trial may complement each other.

Birthday of the B-52

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Beacon which takes note of the 10th anniversary of service for the B-52 jet bomber with the Strategic Air Command. The editorial also emphasizes again the importance of moving ahead with planning and development of a follow-on aircraft.

The editorial follows:

BIRTHDAY OF THE B-52

This week brings us to the eve of a significant anniversary. Tuesday will mark 10 years since the Boeing B-52 bomber went into service with the Strategic Air Command.

No other aircraft in military aviation history can match the B-52's record of longevity as the mainstay of a bomber fleet. Wichita and the Boeing Co. and its employees can take pride in the role they have played in the defense of our Nation. Out of 744 B-52 Stratofortresses built in the past decade, 467 were produced at Wichita.

Nor is the B-52's end in sight. More than 600 of the bombers are still operational. And judging from present defense planning, 10 years from now the B-52 may still be an important part of the Nation's deterrent military force.

This would indeed make the B-52 unique, giving it a lifespan about twice that of the normal military aircraft. Most military aircraft, at the end of 10 years, have been succeeded by something better.

What will succeed the B-52? It cannot go on forever. The question, unfortunately, is a disturbing one. The Defense Department is not looking ahead to a successor for the B-52. No funds are allotted for developing a new manned bomber.

The Government's present attitude, of course, is that missiles are the weapons of the future. But the question is, should they be the only weapons? Should we be putting all our defense eggs in one basket?

GARNER SHRIVER, representative from this congressional district, urged in Congress this week that the entire $46 million set aside for military research be spent on new manned aircraft. He pointed out that the Soviets, because they are conducting their space and commercial aircraft development programs in secret, may also secretly be working on new and startling military aircraft.

SHRIVER's concern may go deeper than most, but there are plenty of knowledgeable men in both the military and civilian branches of Government, who feel we ought to be looking toward a manned bomber to replace the B-52 when its end finally comes.

Spending money now to develop a new manned bomber would not necessarily commit the Nation to its production. But at least we would be prepared to renew our bomber force if need be. Missiles alone may well be able to protect our Nation in years to come. But this is not yet certain.

As the B-52 marks its 10th birthday, the White House, Pentagon and Congress should ponder this thought: It would be far better to develop a bomber we'll never need than to discover we need a bomber we are unable to produce.

Treasury Department and Esther Peterson's Office Join To Issue Excellent Little Pamphlet on Excise Tax Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I try hard to study all of the provisions of the legislation we pass, as I know my colleagues also do, but it is almost impossible to remember every detail of any bill. Thus, last weekend, when I took a plane to visit some members of my family in southern Virginia, I was sure I was overcharged for my ticket, because the receipt showed payment of a Federal excise tax.

"Didn't we just repeal that tax?" I asked. If I had thought about it a bit more, I would have remembered that the 5-percent tax on airline fares was actually reenacted by the bill we passed cutting or repealing other excises. But at the moment of buying my ticket, I was sure the salesman was making a mistake by charging me this tax. Similarly, I am sure countless consumers will be complaining to sales clerks about the charges on merchandise or services on which excise taxes have been reduced or eliminated.

A HANDY GUIDE TO THE TAX REDUCTIONS

Hence, Mr. Speaker, I am indeed gratified that the Treasury Department, at the request of Mrs. Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, has prepared and made available to the public an excellent little handy guide to the various changes in the excise tax laws, explaining clearly—in question-and-answer form—what items are affected and in what way.

Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson, who also serves as Chairman of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests as well as the President's White House Special Assistant on Consumer Affairs, has demonstrated once again in this situation her alert awareness of the problems of the average family and consumer, and her initiative in doing something effective and affirmative in helping to solve them. Under unanimous consent, I am placing this excellent little excise tax guide in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

TREASURY POSITION ON "USER CHARGES" NOT SHARED BY CONGRESS

In placing this pamphlet in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I think I should make clear that the Congress does not fully concur with the discussion on the need for or the merits of "user charges" in all situations. For instance, the Bureau of the Budget, ever since the second Hoover Commission report, has been urging that the costs of Federal meat and poultry inspection, and the costs of maintenance and operation of waterways commerce, among other things, be passed on to the public through "user charges." I have made clear my position on this issue many times. It is not a partisan issue, since the Budget Bureau has won endorsement of its position on this matter from both Republican and Democratic Presidents, who have made these proposals in their budget messages. I intend to continue to fight the imposition of user charges for meat inspection because meat inspection is not a service to the meat processor—it is a public health necessity, and thus a legitimate expenditure by the Federal Government. My reasons for opposing such user charges are rather complex, and have been stated on other occasions here in the House, so do not have to be repeated here. But in view of the comments on user charges in the little pamphlet on excise tax changes which I am placing in the RECORD, I felt I should make it clear that I am not completely endorsing this particular section of the pamphlet or changing previous positions I have taken.

Incidentally, while Congress has not agreed with all of the suggestions of the Budget Bureau for user charges, we have enacted several such taxes or charges, including highway taxes, and fees for using the national parks, to name a few. The main point to keep in mind is that each such tax or charge must stand on its own merits, rather than on strict budgetary considerations.

Other than this reservation about one little section of the excellent excise tax pamphlet, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take this opportunity to make available the full text of the consumer publication on excise taxes, as follows:

THE EXCISE TAX REDUCTION: SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FOR CONSUMERS

"This is not our first tax cut. It will not be our last. But in consolidating our prosperity and advancing the cause of fairness and balance in our tax system, it will surely rank as one of the most important."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

MAY 17, 1965.

What does the excise tax cut mean to consumers?

It means lower prices on hundreds of items. It eliminates immediately the 10 percent retailer's excise tax on such items as toilet articles, wallets and pocketbooks, jewelry, and furs. In addition, manufacturers excise taxes on many other items are also eliminated or reduced immediately, with later reductions scheduled on January 1, 1966, January 1, 1967, January 1, 1968, and January 1, 1969.

What are some typical savings on purchases consumers can expect from the immediate elimination of the retail excise taxes?

Typical savings are shown below in the following table:

	Retail price	Tax saving
Cosmetics	$10	$1
Women's handbag	10	1
Suitcase	40	4
Watch	50	5
Engagement ring	250	25
Fur coat	750	75

What are the price savings consumers can expect, typically, from the manufacturers' excise tax cuts going into effect in 1965–66?

This is difficult to estimate because retail prices vary considerably in comparison to manufacturers' prices. If retailers and wholesale distributors continue to apply the same percentage markup as they did before the tax reduction, the price savings to consumers will be larger than the tax reduction itself. This happened in many cases when some manufacturers' taxes were reduced in 1954. The following table shows a range of possible price changes following the 1965–66 excise tax cuts. The lower figure in each case is a typical manufacturer's tax consistent with the indicated retail price. The higher figure is the reduction that would occur if the existing percentage markups are unchanged.

	Retail price	Saving
Camera	$75	$3– $7
Power mower	75	2– 4
TV set	175	9– 17
Refrigerator	200	6– 10
Room air conditioner	200	10– 20
Automobile	[1] 3,000	[2] 80– 110

[1] List price.
[2] Immediate and Jan. 1, 1966, cuts.

What are some typical tax savings consumers could expect from the elimination of miscellaneous excise taxes?

Consumers can expect tax savings such as those shown in the table below:

	Charge	Tax saving
Monthly telephone bill	$15	[1] $1
2 tickets for sporting event	12	[2] 1
Nightclub check	20	[2] 2

[1] Jan. 1, 1966, cut.
[2] Dec. 31, 1965, cut.

What is the total amount of tax reduction and when does it become effective?

The total amount of tax reduction is roughly $4.7 billion. About $1.75 billion becomes effective immediately. Almost that much additional tax reduction goes into effect January 1, 1966. This means that the tax reduction for 1966 will total about $3.4 billion. The additional tax reduction will go into effect in three stages: January 1 of 1967, 1968, and 1969.

How much will the tax cut reduce the average cost of the annual family budget?

Assuming that the precise amount of tax reduction is passed along to the approximately 60 million U.S. families, families would save on the cost of their annual budget an average of about $57 from the $3.4 billion tax cut in 1966. This figure would be lower if some reductions are not passed through. It is more likely, however, based on the 1954 experience, that the budget savings would be higher than this because retailers would often apply the same percentage markup to the lower manufacturers' price.

How will the excise tax cut help the economy?

Lower prices will mean increased purchasing power, greater consumer demand, higher production and employment, and a total increase in national output (gross national product) which will eventually amount to several times the total amount of the tax cut.

How will the excise tax cut help create jobs?

As prices are reduced, consumer purchasing power will increase, raising demand for consumer goods. This will stimulate production and create more jobs.

Will the tax cut help lower income families?

The excise tax reduction as a percent of income will be highest for families earning under $5,000 because the cut includes reduction of many highly regressive taxes—those which fall heaviest on the poor. These include taxes on telephones, automobile parts, household appliances, and toilet preparations.

Why weren't the taxes cut all at once instead of in stages?

The reduction were made in stages to minimize the impact they would have on the Federal budget. If they had all been enacted at once, the budget deficit would have been substantially increased. The sudden impact of such a large tax cut might have created inflationary pressure on the economy.

On what items will the tax be eliminated?

The law immediately eliminates the tax on handbags, wallets, cosmetics, luggage, jewelry, sterling silverware, furs, sporting goods (except fishing equipment), phonograph records, radios, and phonographs, television sets, musical instruments, cameras, film and other photographic equipment, refrigerators, freezers, room air conditioners, household appliances, pens, lighters, matches, playing cards, camper coaches, business and store machines, safe deposit boxes, and coin-operated amusement devices.

Starting in 1966, the law eliminates the tax on general admissions and night clubs (effective December 31, 1965); club dues, automobile parts and accessories (except truck parts), lubricating oil (other than for highway vehicles), telegrams, pipe tobacco, chewing tobacco, and snuff.

On what items is the tax reduced or eliminated in stages?

The 10-percent tax on passenger cars will be reduced in stages until it reaches 1 percent in 1969. It drops to 7 percent immediately; 6 percent on January 1, 1966; 4 percent on January 1, 1967; 2 percent on January 1, 1968; and 1 percent on January 1, 1969—where it will remain.

The telephone tax will be reduced in stages starting January 1, 1966, when it will drop from 10 to 3 percent. It is eliminated in three more stages of 1 percent each on January 1, 1967, 1968, and 1969.

What should consumers do about seeking refunds if they bought automobiles or room air conditioners between May 15, 1965, and the date the bill became law?

If they had not already made arrangements with the dealers from whom they purchased the article, they should contact the dealer to find out how he and his manufacturer intend to handle the refunds.

Why were the tax cuts made retroactive only for autos and air conditioners?

Generally, retroactive tax cuts were not made because of the complex procedures they would involve. Automobiles and air conditioners, however, present unique problems. May and June are the peak months for the sale of air conditoners—almost 40 percent of their yearly sales are during this period. In addition, many of the sales, if not made at this time, will be deferred until the next season. Therefore, unless the tax cut were made retroactive, many people would have delayed buying air conditioners and in many cases put off their purchases until next year. In the case of automobiles, the 3-percent tax reduction scheduled for this summer represents a sizable price factor—approximately $70 in the case of the average automobile. Unless the tax cut were made retroactive, many people would have delayed their purchases of new automobiles, disrupting an industry whose sales are important to our national economy.

Will the tax reductions automatically be passed on to consumers?

There is nothing in the Excise Tax Reduction Act which requires manufacturers and retailers to pass the tax cut on to consumers. However, for several reasons it can be expected that most of the tax cuts will be passed on. Many manufacturers and retailers will be able to substantially increase their sales volume because of the lower prices resulting from the tax cut. Moreover, because of competition, many or most manufacturers and retailers will pass the tax cut on to meet similar action by their competitors.

What are user taxes?

These are taxes imposed on those who benefit from special services provided by the Government. In this regard they are in the nature of a charge for the use of special services. The most widely known examples of user taxes are those imposed on gasoline, tires, sale and use of trucks, and on other items relating to the use of the Nation's highways. These taxes are placed in a special trust fund and are used to pay the Federal Government's share of the Interstate Highway System. Another important user tax is the 5-percent tax on airline tickets.

Are user taxes affected by the new law?

The new law does not impose any new or additional user taxes. It does, however, continue the existing 5-percent tax on fares for air travel. This tax was scheduled to expire on July 1, 1965. The President in his excise tax message recommended new and increased taxes on users of the highways, airways, and inland waterways. The Congress decided to separate action on these recommendations from the excise tax reduction.

Is there any tax reduction for central air-conditioning units?

No, there is no excise tax on central air-conditioning units. The only air conditioners that were taxed are room air conditioners, and the 10-percent excise tax on these is eliminated effective May 15, 1965.

Why wasn't the tax taken off fishing equipment?

The tax on fishing equipment is really in the nature of a user charge in that it is earmarked for use in a program to stock lakes and ponds and for similar purposes.

Does the cabaret or nightclub tax apply on New Year's Eve, 1965?

No, it is eliminated effective December 31, 1965.

Why does the Government want to increase user taxes?

In those cases where user taxes are already imposed—for example, on users of the highways and of airways—the users do not reimburse the Federal Government for its full investment. Users of highways come closer to reimbursing the Government for its investment, but inequities remain among the various classes of highway users. The airlines and their passengers make substantial, but still insuficient, contributions toward the development and operation of the Federal airways. In other cases there is presently no tax. For example, users of the inland waterways pay nothing toward the cost either of the initial improvements or of the operation and maintenance of the waterways.

The absence of a fair system of user charges strongly affects the ability of various segments of the transportation industry to compete and obscures the inherent advantages of some kinds of transportation.

For what items will the tax remain unchanged?

The tax will remain unchanged for three general categories of items: (1) Alcohol and tobacco taxes; (2) user taxes and other taxes relating to expenditure programs such as those for highways, and (3) regulatory and similar taxes.

On what items does the law itself provide for retroactive refunds to the consumer?

The tax cut will be retroactive for automobiles and room air conditioners purchased by consumers beginning on Saturday, May 15.

The United Nations—20 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on this 20th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, it is fitting that we assess the progress of this organization of nations which have banded together in the cause of peace. The United Nations has been beset during recent years by crises and misfortunes, the results of which have been a loss of confidence among many people in its ability to fulfill the functions envisioned by the framers of the U.N. Charter.

In spite of the many obstructions which confront the U.N.—and which seem to be inherent in its structure—there have been significant accomplishments for which credit must be given, particularly the worldwide activities in the cause of humanity. There is no question but that too much has been expected of the U.N. but those who have always faced the realities of its weaknesses have consistently demanded that steps be taken to improve and strengthen the organization. Unless all our resources are applied to the task of creating a sounder basis for the U.N., the future of the organization, regrettably, may not be bright.

I include at this point two editorials which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago Daily News last week in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations:

[From the Chicago Daily News]

THE U.N. AT 20

There have been better times than now for celebrating the United Nations. But since a 20th anniversary can't be postponed, the festivities in San Francisco will proceed with everybody putting the best face possible on the affair.

It takes no great powers of analysis to deduce that the U.N. at age 20 has not fulfilled the promise of the infant. It has grown physically—from 51 members to 114—but at an age when it should be at least approaching maturity it appears to be stalled in an unhappy and unending adolescence. It is deformed, weak, surly, flat broke and afflicted with schizophrenia.

Yet the astonishing thing is that not only do its parents still love it, but so do the nations which have added to its growth over the years. And for a very good reason: It's all we've got.

Looking back at the environment in which it has grown, perhaps the biggest wonder of all is that the United Nations has survived in any form. In spite of the cold war, nuclear threats, walkouts and such virulent illnesses as Korea and the Congo, only one nation—Indonesia—has left the organization in those 20 years.

The present crisis may not be the worst it has faced, but it is bad enough. With the Communist nations, France and a few others refusing to pay their assessments for peacekeeping operations, the U.N. is living on borrowed funds. The last meeting of the General Assembly was a no-vote fiasco and the next could be the same unless some way out of the stalemate is found.

Britain and the Scandinavian countries have started a voluntary subscription list with pledges of more than $17 million, and it is generally expected that President Johnson will put the United States down for a sizable sum when he addresses the ceremonies this weekend. The hope is that Russia will do the same, sooner or later. Somewhere along the line, everyone will quietly forget that Russia and the others are welshing on a debt declared legal by the World Court, and the United States will no longer insist that Russia be denied a U.N. vote if it doesn't pay up.

The whole procedure of passing the hat and bending the rules is degrading the world organization and trimming still further the limited power it was beginning to develop as a peacekeeping force in the world. Yet if the only alternative is the breakup of the U.N., the choice will doubtless be made to save it. We have nursed the U.N. too long to abandon it now. The hope born in San Francisco 20 years ago may be dimmed, and the organization today nearly unrecognizable as the same one, but hope and an organization do still exist.

There is a forum to which the quarrelsome nations of the world can bring their grievances. There is a place for the exchange of ideas and for the venting of pressures which otherwise could build to the blowoff point. A great many things which never make the headlines are done in and by the United Nations that could never be done without it.

Far too much was expected of the U.N. when it was born. And in the frustration over its failures, too little attention is paid now to the broad network of services it provides in the nonpolitical fields. If the anniversary celebration serves to bring better perspective, and teaches us to appreciate what the U.N. is, as well as disabuse us of what it is not, some portion of the expectations of 20 years ago may yet be realized.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times]

THE U.N. IS 20

Twenty years ago today President Harry S. Truman addressed the representatives of 50 nations in San Francisco. The Assembly had been at work for 9 weeks to draw up a charter, a constitution to unite nations in the common cause of world peace. President Truman said: "It was the hope of such a charter that helped sustain the courage of stricken peoples through the darkest days of the war. For it is a declaration of great faith by the nations of the earth—faith that war is not inevitable, faith that peace can be maintained." That faith is still strong, although the potential of the United Nations has never been fully realized.

As an instrument for lasting world peace, the United Nations is still not wholly effective. It has kept small wars from becoming big ones. It has stabilized some other conflicts but it has not always been successful in adjudicating the cause of the conflict. It has failed, as it did in the Congo, to provide the guidance and means to preserve the peace it secured with military force of arms. It lacks the power and the means to stop subversion and aggression at the outset.

On the other hand, the United Nations has proved that in the areas of social, economic, and humanitarian effort it could work successfully for the benefit of all nations. Its record in feeding the hungry, improving public health and living standards, in extending agricultural help, bettering sanitation, and a wide range of other efforts to improve the lot of the underprivileged, has been excellent.

When President Truman spoke to the founding U.N. nations 20 years ago, he compared the new U.N. Charter to the U.S. Constitution. He expressed the hope that the United Nations would grow in strength under the San Francisco Chapter as the Thirteen American colonies have grown under their Constitution. The hope has not been realized. The eroding pressures of the cold war, the unilateral actions of some major nations, and the admission of a host of underdeveloped nations, each with the same voting power in the General Assembly as the major nations, have kept the United Nations in a state of crisis for most of its life and robbed it of the strength it should have gained.

Nevertheless, the United Nations has survived. It has lost only one member, Indonesia, while growing from 50 nations to the present membership of 114. The United States has done more than any other nation to preserve the U.N., not so much for what the U.N. is or has been as for what it could and should be.

As the U.N. nations meet in San Francisco they should remember that 20 years ago President Truman warned, "The forces of reaction and tyranny all over the world will try to keep the United Nations from remaining united."

The United Nations, despite its failures, has done much more than its predecessor, the League of Nations. The promise of the U.N. Charter to "work for the equal rights of all men," and "to practice tolerance and live in peace with one another as good neighbors," is still valid. It must be preserved.

Memorable Visitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have been honored by a visit from Mr. and Mrs. A. Mather Hilburn, two distinguished citizens of Amarillo, Tex.

Through 55 years of marriage, the Hilburns have shared a strong interest in the affairs of their Nation, but with the exception of a brief stopover by Mr. Hilburn in 1917—as he traveled the country as an entertainer—neither had had a chance to visit the Capital.

They have now done so—and in grand style—thanks to their son, Henley M. Hilburn, whose home is now in Fairfax, Va. With the help of others in the Hilburn family, Henley Hilburn arranged for his father and mother to be flown to Washington as a Father's Day gift.

Few visitors of any age have seen more of Washington and environs during a 10-day visit. Henley Hilburn determined the itinerary for his parents and kept a record of points visited. They first paid their respects at the grave of the late President John F. Kennedy; visited other points at Arlington Cemetery; were honored guests at the Father's Day party of the Texas State Society; visited the several museums of the Smithsonian Institution; called at the offices of the Democratic National Committee; visited Mount Vernon, the White House, the Lincoln Memorial, the battlefield at Manassas. On two visits to Capitol Hill, they saw the Houses of Congress in session. Other members of the Hilburn family joined them for a family reunion at the Henley Hilburn home in Fairfax.

Mr. Hilburn is 80 years old. Mrs. Hilburn is 74. Their charm is boundless and it was a treat for me to help make their visit here as complete as possible.

The Washington Post, in its editions of Sunday, June 20, carried the following account of their visit—a chronicle of one of the most thoughtful Father's Day gifts of this or any other year:

(By John J. Carmody)

Henley M. Hilburn is a loving and dutiful son. Like millions of loving and dutiful sons in this country, he spent the last week shopping for a tie and maybe a couple of pairs of $3.98 stretch socks for the old man for a Father's Day present.

Wednesday, the conscience struck—and hard.

"There I was," recalled Hilburn yesterday, like millions of loving and dutiful sons, "trained to have a big box of chocolates at the house for Mother's Day and Dad braced for a couple of ties or something. Well, it suddenly dawned on me, it just wasn't enough."

Hilburn shamed us all. The Fairfax resident contacted a couple of daughters and a sister or two and a man at Braniff Air Lines in Dallas. Before Mr. and Mrs. A. Mather Hilburn, of Amarillo, could say "no," they found themselves yesterday flying in from Texas for a Father's Day Father's Day.

"They are lifetime Democrats," Hilburn, a Chrysler Corp. executive explained. "But they've never had a real chance to see Washington and all the wonderful monuments connected with their heroes and the family decided to give them the chance."

High on the senior Hilburn's list is a look today at the grave of President Kennedy in Arlington. After that there will be a reception among other Texans—those people never leave home—at Bolling AFB Officers' Club sponsored by the Texas State Society for Father's Day.

Then a visit next week with Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, and a VIP tour of the White House, arranged by Representative JOHN YOUNG, Democrat, of Texas.

Meanwhile, there will be a gathering of Hilburns, young and old, out at the 4232 Sideburn Road residence of the Henley Hilburns.

Mr. Hilburn is 80 and his wife of 55 years is 74. The youngest relative at next Wednesday's reunion will be Ethan Hill, 3 months, who will fly in with the Hilburn's daughter, Mrs. Sue Hill, of Milwaukee.

The Real Alabama—Part XIX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the enterprise of sturdy people has marked the progress of economic growth in all parts of our country. Alabama is no different.

Our State has an excellent history of vigorous, imaginative, and hard-working people striving to meet the needs of an expanding population and to build better lives for themselves and for their neighbors.

The story of the Gulf, Mobile, & Ohio Railroad is typical of Alabama's history. That story was told in the Mobile Press Register newspaper of June 20, 1965, and I call attention to it here to help show that when industries come to Alabama they love to stay:

One fall evening 118 years ago a group of Mobilians met at the Alhambra, a restaurant and popular gathering place that stood at the corner of Dauphin and Royal Streets. Like Mobilians today, they were interested in the future of their city as an important gulf port.

Led by M. J. B. Baldwyn, a prominent citizen, they were disturbed because most of the business of the rapidly expanding Mississippi Valley was moving through New Orleans and the Atlantic seaports to the detriment of Mobile.

What Baldwyn visioned was a railroad connecting Mobile with this vast trade area of the Mississippi, Ohio, and Missouri River basins. With such an artery he could foresee a steady flow of commerce in both directions with Mobile blossoming into its full growth as an important world port.

SURVEY FUNDS RAISED

Before the meeting was over funds were raised by public subscription for a reconnaissance trip from Mobile to the Ohio River. When this preliminary survey proved the idea sound the railroad then became a major civic project.

Less than 2 years after the original meeting—on an October day in 1849—the enterprising Baldwyn cut down a large pine tree on the north side of Beauregard Street between Royal and Water Streets and, as an enthusiastic crowd cheered, construction of the Mobile & Ohio began.

This railroad, together with the Gulf, Mobile & Northern Railroad, which was to originate on the south side of town 39 years later with much the same objective as that of the Mobile & Ohio, is the Gulf, Mobile & Ohio Railroad of today. Conceived by Mobilians 118 years ago, the affairs of this modern $238,-500,000 corporation and Alabama's only home-based major trunkline railroad, are still directed from general headquarters here.

VISION FULFILLED

The visions of Baldwyn and of Chancellor Huriosco Austill, one of the dominant personalities behind the early development of the G.M. & N., are a reality now. G.M. & O.'s rails stretch from Mobile to Chicago and Kansas City and the commerce of middle America funnels back and forth on the direct line that the early trailblazers had foreseen many years before. Last year more than 60,000 carloads of grain, steel, paper, ore, building materials, foodstuffs, heavy machinery, etc., poured into and out of Mobile through this flanged steel funnel. About one-third of these came ashore onto the rails from ships or left the rails to finish the rest of the journey by water.

But the early dreams of Mobilians when the city was trying to snap back from the panic of 1837 and move Mobile out of the meager transportation role of a cotton storage depot, were not realized overnight or without many discouraging incidents. In fact, it wasn't until 1947 when G.M. & O. bought the Alton Railroad that the route was extended beyond St. Louis to Chicago on the Great Lakes and into the Midwest at Kansas City.

In those first trying years pushing northward out of Mobile it took the Mobile & Ohio 2 years to get its steel rails through what is now Prichard and the first 33 miles to Citronelle.

TOTAL OF 184 MILES WRECKED

Completed to the Ohio River in 1861, the road was barely beginning to fulfill its role for the port of Mobile when the Civil War broke out. An annual report of the road in 1866 tells of the almost complete destruction of the 184 miles between Okolona, Miss., and Union City, Tenn.

About Mobile the M. & O. president of that day said, "On the evacuation of Mobile the stationary engine and tools in the shop at Whistler were destroyed. At the close of the war we had neither tools nor materials to repair our little remaining rolling stock and keep it on the track."

But through good years and bad years the railroad seemed to keep foremost the reason for its being—the development of the port of Mobile. President J. C. Clarke in his annual report of 1892–93 told of the road's "inauguration of a line of steamers to the bay islands and Central America, which are now supplying considerable tonnage in tropical fruits, reaching the Mobile & Ohio Railroad via the port of Mobile."

BOUGHT GRAIN ELEVATOR

Again 3 years later the report to stockholders said, "The company * * * entered into a contract to purchase a first-class lately constructed grain elevator of 250,000 bushels capacity, situated upon the property and adjacent to and connected with the Beauregard Street wharves and slips of the company; and also contracted to purchase the property upon Commerce Street adjacent to and connected with the Conti Street wharf property of the company. Both of these properties are regarded as essential and requisite to meet the increased activity and development of Mobile as a port, and, by affording the facilities, to further attract sea tonnage to it."

Much of this waterfront property developed by M. & O. was later to be surrendered to the Alabama State docks as it and its terminal railroad developed and assumed the job of shipside service for all the railroads.

ONCE RAN TO SOUND

One M. & O. venture along Mobile's waterfront, however, was a little too auspicious for the times. Seeking a way in 1899 to get ship berthing closer to the mouth of the bay and also to serve a new, growing agricultural sector, the railroad built a 38-mile branch to Alabama Port and to Portersville Bay, near Bayou La Batre. The new extension con-

nected to a belt line the M. & O. had already constructed a year earlier around the outskirts of the city from Prichard. This belt line is still in use today, enabling the Gulf, Mobile & Ohio to connect and interchange its operations between the north and south sides of the city, where it has extensive operating facilities and a number of large industrial plants which it serves.

The Alabama port venture was never to prove out and all that remains of the Bay Shore branch now is a track beyond the loop area which serves several industries in what is known as the Mertz Station area.

Possibly in building into the south part of the city M. & O. was also trying to shut off from the waterfront a new railroad that was coming into being at Frascati, now the vicinity east of Brookley Field and at the mouth of Mobile River.

With the same clear vision that M. J. B. Baldwyn evidenced in projecting the M. & O. Chancellor Huriosco Austill, an antecedent of Bank President Austill Pharr, also saw the great possibilities of direct rail communication between the great agricultural West and the Port of Mobile.

His company finally emerged as the Mobile, Jackson and Kansas City Railroad and by February 1898, 50 miles of track were in service from the Frascati terminals to Merrill, Miss., just north of Lucedale.

The Mobile, Jackson and Kansas City Railroad fell by the wayside as did several successors until the Gulf, Mobile and Northern Railroad finally was firmly established under the management that later was to buy Mobile and Ohio in 1940 and merge the two properties as Gulf, Mobile and Ohio Railroad.

From the window of his office at 104 St. Francis Street, Glen Brock, president of G. M. & O., can see the realization of the dreams of M. J. B. Baldwyn and Huriosco Austill. He sees switch engines of his road marshaling a banana train at the fruit wharf established by M. & O. so many years ago.

The old tradition is being carried on. An active foreign department quotes rail and steamship rates and provides a complete service in connection with all foreign commerce. Thirty-nine sales offices in all of the major industrial areas of the country sell the advantages of a direct one-haul route to Mobile's excellent seaport facilities.

ORE AND GRAIN VITAL

Fostering the importation of ore through Mobile to the Birmingham steel district, G. M. & O. bought a fleet of specially designed cars to handle the movement and in the opposite direction grain from elevators built by the road in Kansas City pour southward.

Early in the morning when Mobile industry draws a fresh breath, President Brock likes to look over his operations here first hand. The newly contructed spur line to serve the growing importance of McDuffie Island on the south side of the city gets his attention and on the north side the large paper industries which G. M. & O. serves through the switching facilities of the Terminal Railroad of the Alabama State Docks. In between there is the vast complex of industry that composes the Mobile and M. J. B. Baldwyn visioned 118 years ago when he met with Mobilians at the Alhambra.

Development of Indian Reservations as Tourist Centers Is Commendable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the June 27, 1965, edition of the Huron, S. Dak., Plainsman, regarding the development of Indian reservations as tourist centers.

For many years I have worked for the enactment of legislation known as Operation Bootstrap—Indian style, which is aimed at attracting industry to the reservations through a tax incentive. One industry that can be established without a tax subsidy is the tourist industry, and it deserves every encouragement.

The editorial is as follows:

DEVELOPMENT OF INDIAN RESERVATIONS AS TOURIST CENTERS IS COMMENDABLE

South Dakota's Indian reservations—considered by some to be an economic liability—may become one of the State's new economic assets.

This is possible through development of the reservations into tourist centers to add to the natural and manmade lure the State has for the traveling public. To many visitors, especially those from the East, seeing life on the reservation can be an unforgettable experience.

With an eye to this tourist dollar, several tribes are including recreational facilities in their economic development plans. These councils proposing camping, hunting, fishing and "western life" for the visitors, adding the color and excitement of ancient Indian ceremonials and rites to the package.

These Indian dances and customs, part of the ancient pattern of Indian life preserved on the reservation, are an important element in the cultural heritage of our Nation. And because of their schoolbook significance, are an added attraction to the traveling public.

The origins of the ceremonials perhaps are lost in antiquity and their performance no longer holds any real significance for the Indian, who becomes an actor. But the repetition of the ancient rites does help to preserve this part of history as the Indian becomes assimilated into modern society.

Thus the development of reservation tourist attractions would serve a twofold purpose—bring an income-producing enterprise to the reservations and preserve something of the Indian's heritage.

South Dakotans would do well to give continued support and encouragement to this program which could be of direct economic benefit to the Dakota people and to the State as a whole.

Houston TV Station Comments on Arm Twisting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to receive from station KHOU-TV in Houston, Tex., a copy of a recent editorial broadcast on the subject of the political arm-twisting cases on which I have repeatedly sought corrective action.

While these shakedowns go back all the way to 1961 rather than to last year's Democrat dinner, as the editorial indicates, certainly we are grateful to KHOU-TV for focusing public attention on these serious violations of Federal law. Many of us feel what is needed are not so much more laws to correct the alleged loopholes, but firm and forthright enforcement of present laws already on the books. Nevertheless, if present laws continue to be ignored, stronger laws will have to be written to protect the civil service system from the politicians. This is the course suggested by KHOU-TV.

I request unanimous consent to insert the KHOU-TV broadcast in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

[A KHOU-TV 11 editorial, Houston (Tex.), June 22, 1965]

DINNER-DUNNING

Thirteen months ago, channel 11 suggested it was time to get rid of certain loopholes in Federal law.

They're the ones which each major party, from time to time, accuses the other of using, or abusing, in order to solicit campaign funds from Federal employees.

The occasion last year was a special fundraising banquet to salute President Johnson, at $100 a plate, a rather hefty gift to seek from a Federal employee, whether he was hit at his desk or, by means of mail lists obtained from the Government, at his home.

Well, the dinner was a success, which is more than can be said for the investigation, for there was an investigation. It was launched by U.S. Representative ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota, brought a Civil Service Commission finding that, indeed, four Federal employees were involved in questionable procedures, went to the Department of Justice, included an FBI investigation, with a report filed several months ago with the Department, and * * *. And that's it, with the report now listed, as it has been for months, as being "carefully reviewed."

Another $100-a-plate Democratic Party dinner now is in the Washington mill, and we suggest that "care" is necessary in reviewing that old report, but, as we said 13 months ago, we also feel that the time is overdue for Democrats and Republicans to get together and produce laws without loopholes. Laws which make it clear beyond any doubt that Federal payrolls are for public, not political business.

Gary Player Improves Sports' Image

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress an action rare in there days of materialism, a performance of high character which represents a proud moment in the history of sports.

I refer to the turning over to charity of his $26,000 winner's check in the National Open golf tournament by Gary Player. He designated $5,000 to go to the fight against cancer, and $20,000 to advance junior golf in the United States.

As noteworthy as the deed were Player's remarks. He expressed gratitude for the opportunity that U.S. professional golf had offered him. He expressed gratitude for the friendly reception U.S. fans had accorded him.

What a contrast Player's conduct provides to many recipients of our foreign

aid who carp and complain, who take our goods, services, and money, then oppose our purposes in shaping a peaceful world. Gary Player comes from South Africa. He has been a model of sportsmanship and good conduct while being a fierce, aggressive competitor on the links.

I am hopeful that the U.S. Information Service will spread to the world the story of Mr. Player's generosity, his appreciation for the opportunity that is America and his action which cannot help but further international understanding and good will. Under unanimouse consent, I include the following editorial from the June 23, 1965, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, June 23, 1965]

GARY PLAYER IMPROVES SPORTS' IMAGE

We would like to pay tribute to a very fine and most unusual act by a professional athlete.

Gary Player of South Africa, who just won the U.S. Open golf tournament, gave away his entire $26,000 winnings, plus an additional $1,000.

Player gave $25,000 to the U.S. Golf Association with a suggestion that $5,000 go to the cancer fund and $20,000 be used to develop junior golf in the United States. He gave his caddie $2,000, the highest amount ever paid a bag carrier.

The South African golfer said that he wanted the U.S. Open title so badly that he promised God if he won it, he would donate the purse to a good cause.

"I have made most of my money and won most of my golf honors in this country. People have been wonderful to me. I think it is only right that I show my gratitude in this way," Player explained.

This contribution reflects well on professional golf, on foreign athletes, and on the sporting world in general. Athletes can't be so bad (as we've come to believe on reviewing unsavory exhibitions, like the Clay-Liston fight) when they do philanthropic acts like Player's contribution.

The 89th—The Medical Care Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I was privileged to deliver at the fifth annual president's dinner at Stonehill College, North Easton, Mass., on April 29, 1965:

THE 89TH—THE MEDICAL CARE CONGRESS

(Address of the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, Member of Congress, at Stonehill College's fifth annual president's dinner on Apr. 29, 1965)

It is very pleasant to come back to Stonehill College for this fifth annual president's dinner. I am grateful to Father Corr and to the Century Club for inviting me to be with you tonight.

As some of you know, I haven't had an opportunity to visit Stonehill since I made the retreats here with John McLaughlin and his friends, and I am naturally interested in seeing and hearing about all the changes that have taken place since then. But to me one of the most agreeable things about Stonehill is its liberal arts atmosphere. Here on this 500 acres so close to Boston and the busy world outside, Stonehill continues year after year to provide a liberal education to a new generation, by giving instruction in English, the languages, philosophy, science, the social sciences and theology. In an age of ever-increasing specialization, I am glad to see this broad instruction.

During my 24 years in Congress I have had the opportunity to talk with many of the leading specialists in many fields. Tonight I would like to do a little more of this—because—at one point in my remarks—I am going to seek some advice from you about how we in the Congress can strengthen one part of the Nation's health care for the benefit of all who are going to be living in the Great Society the President has outlined.

I cannot emphasize too strongly tonight that this—the 89th Congress—has an opportunity—and a responsibility—for this Nation's health care which is entirely without precedent. This 89th Congress can—and must—become "the medical care Congress." Please note that I did not say "medicare" Congress—proper medical care for the aged is but one aspect of the comprehensive medical care we must provide to our citizens if the results achieved by our magnificent research effort—largely supported by our tax dollars—over the past 15 years and more, is to pay off in lives saved and tragedies averted.

Since I became chairman of the House subcommittee concerned with medical research and health-related matters in 1949, I have taken every opportunity to urge my colleagues in Congress to mount and carry out a national medical research effort. I am well aware that we do not yet have all the answers we are seeking as to the causes of the chronic diseases—heart disease, cancer, mental health, and the neurological and metabolic diseases. I am well aware that we must continue—and even put greater efforts into—the conquest of these diseases. But at this time we have to give full attention to another, equally urgent problem—the application of the research results we have achieved.

I wonder if all of you here tonight realize that this is why the President chose to emphasize heart disease, cancer, and stroke in his health message to the 89th Congress. I wonder how many of you have read the President's Commission report, with its strong, hopeful words, "Every available fact points to the same conclusion—that the toll of heart disease, cancer, and stroke can be sharply reduced, now in this Nation, at this time."

At a time when 48 million American citizens will fall victim to cancer.

At a time when nearly 15 million people suffer from heart disease and this, together with strokes, accounts for more than half of the deaths in the United States each year.

At this same time, most forms of congenital heart disease are within our powers of correction.

At this same time, many strokes can be foreseen and prevented.

At this same time, cancer of the cervix and uterus can be brought to the vanishing point, and chances are greatly improved for the cure of cancer in other accessible sites, comprising more than 70 percent of all cancer patients.

These things can be done—now—without further scientific advances.

These great goals can be reached but not without a great national effort.

This means congressional action on a number of bills now pending. It means long-range planning and public support. It means cooperation and supplementary action by the nongovernmental sectors of our society—industry, education, the voluntary health agencies, and many, many others.

The American people must be made to realize that the lives of men, women, and children can be saved—that many, many deaths can be prevented. Even this is not enough—positive, practical steps must be taken if our goal is to be achieved.

Early in March I introduced several bills which, if approved by this 89th Congress, will do much to implement the suggestions of the President's health message.

The first of these bills would aid the establishment of regional medical complexes for research and treatment in heart disease, cancer, and stroke. This step is essential if the medical profession and our medical institutions are to provide their patients with the latest advances in diagnosis and treatment of these diseases. These complexes—consisting of one or more medical centers, one or more categorical research centers, and one or more diagnostic and treatment stations—could offer open-heart surgery, advanced and very high voltage radiation thereapy for cancer, and advanced disease detection methods. By serving a whole region of the United States, they would enable many more patients requiring such treatment procedures to have access to them. The centers would help the practicing physician keep in touch with the latest medical knowledge and techniques and the most efficient, up-to-date methods of treatment.

Another bill which I introduced into the House early last month comes to grips with another vital problem we face in meeting the health needs of our people—where are the physicians coming from to apply the research results? At the present time the United States has 290,000 physicians, and by 1975 it will need 346,000—this means that the number of new physicians graduated each year must increase at least 50 percent during this decade. The situation is even more serious with our dentists—so badly has population growth outpaced the increase in the number of dentists that our current shortage is acute and we must double our number of dentists graduated each year for the next decade if we are to meet the demands in this area of health care.

In the past three Congresses I introduced bills to provide Federal assistance to the States in awarding scholarships to students of medicine and dentistry. The scholarship provision was stricken from these bills. This Congress must not take similar action because the need for qualified, well-trained physicians and dentists is steadily worsening. Previous measures—such as the Health Professions Eduaction Assistance Act—were helpful, but were not enough.

Now, at least since 1959, we have had pretty clear guidance on the number of physicians and dentists we need in this country. Ever since the pioneering study by Frank Bane, Physicians for a Growing America, we have had realistic goals. This knowledge has been indispensible to the Congress in drafting legislation, to medical schools in their planning, and to the young people of America in choosing a career.

But as the President's Commission report pointed out, the limitations on the national supply of physicians is not the only limiting factor in the mounting of a nationwide attack on heart disease, cancer, and stroke. You can't have widespread use of the "Pap" smear for detecting cancer of the uterus unless you have someone capable of performing cytological procedures. You can't identify the organism that leads to rheumatic fever unless you have laboratory personnel trained in its identification. The key persons in hundreds of technical and time-consuming tasks that are absolutely essential to the diagnosis and treatment to be given by our overworked physicians are the medical technologists—and they are the almost but not quite forgotten men and women of the health professions.

The President's Commission report, recognizing the need, recommended that the Federal Government should do more within

the various authorities it has to add to the pool of technologists; that a new program of stimulation grants should be started; and that the cancer control program increase its support from a level of $1.5 million per year to $2.5 million, with additional increments thereafter. The President's health message, however, specifically endorsed only the first of these recommendations.

Probably one of the reasons for this conservative approach was that it is difficult to get the facts on how many technologists are going to be needed—in part because the need is going to depend upon the scope of the programs that finally result from the President's recommendations concerning heart disease, cancer, and stroke. I noticed last month an article in a national magazine which dealt with the problem of clinical laboratory testing and the lack of well-trained medical technologists. It stated that, in addition to the 35,000 employed today, some observers say 50,000 more are needed. If these are reliable figures, we have an idea of the dimensions of the problem.

Perhaps, after I have finished speaking, you can give me some advice on this point. I know that Stonehill has a recognized program for the training of medical technologists which has worked in association with St. Joseph's Hospital in Providence, R.I.; and when I began to think about what I might say to you tonight, it seemed to me that it might be mutually worthwhile if you would tell me whether Federal assistance is needed to assure an adequate supply of these vital workers. Reliable statistics on the dimensions of the need—for example—is one of the first considerations in the drafting of legislation.

I am in sympathy with the problems of the medical technologists. Three or four years ago I addressed the American Society of Medical Technologists, and at that time considered with them the problems facing their very young profession. It is ironic that it is so hard to get the facts concerning this element of the health team that is dedicated to getting the information on which doctors and pathologists rely. But, with the advice of such schools as this, I am prepared to urge the Congress to take whatever action seems appropriate.

Finally, among the necessary legislative measures now before the Congress designed to help build a bridge between the worlds of medical research and medical practice is one left over from the 88th Congress, which must not be postponed again. This measure would authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of staffing community mental health centers.

When John F. Kennedy suggested to the last Congress the measures that needed to be taken to meet the problems of mental illness and mental retardation—a subject very near to his heart, as you know—he proposed a three-part program. Two parts of this program were enacted by the Congress—grants to the States for the construction of community mental health centers, and grants for preliminary planning of these centers.

The third part of this program—support for the staffing of these centers—was not provided by the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. This provision was intended as part of the act and I supported the provision, but, unfortunately, it was deleted in the final version. It is imperative that an amendment to the act pass this Congress, and it must do so quickly, or the entire community mental health centers movement will be placed in jeopardy.

My remarks have not touched upon other matters of interest to this group and to me—for example, my bill to create a new Cabinet-level department of education. But tonight I have chosen to emphasize the 89th Congress and health care because of the extraordinary way in which events have conspired to place us in a position to capitalize on the gains we have made in research in medicine over the past 15 years or more. In the field of medical and health-related care there is no need to wait for opportunity to knock—it is knocking now, on the doors of Congress—and I hope that you will join me in urging passage of the health-related measures I have mentioned tonight. Opportunity is also knocking on the doors of our collective conscience—lives are being lost, while we wait to answer the doors.

Let me urge all of you—as I am urging all Americans—to do everything in your power to assure that this Congress does not miss this opportunity—an opportunity to be known in history as the "medical care" Congress.

Negotiate With Terror?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Communist Vietcong are engaged in a campaign of terror in South Vietnam that defies description. This can mean even the coldblooded murder and disembowelment of a mother and her baby, to strike paralyzing fear into the victims' family and neighbors, to the point where the survivors will cease resistance and will surrender.

The Vietcong objective is the old Communist trick of destruction of all who could provide opposition to them. That practice is well etched in history and it should have been clear to us much earlier. The following editorial from the June 27, 1965, Indianapolis Star discusses this familiar pattern and points out the futility of negotiations with those who adhere to such a philosophy:

NEGOTIATE WITH TERROR?

The bombing of a Saigon restaurant, bringing wholesale death to men, women, and children, and the murder of an American hostage by the Vietcong were not isolated acts of savagery but routine matters of Communist policy.

Terror as an instrument of policy is not new with the Communists. They adopted it long before they seized Russia. It has roots partly in a nihilistic destructiveness, a psychopathologic drive which communism shared with nazism, and partly in the Asian pagan heritage of Russia, which holds life cheap and inflicts pain and death without qualm.

This psychology was dominant in the preachings of an early Communist, Mikhail Alexandrovich Bakunin, who said, "The desire to destroy is also a creative desire," and insisted on the urgency, in time of revolution, "of unleashing the evil passions."

It was Bakunin who penned the "Catechism of a Revolutionist," in which he described the revolutionist as a totally committed man without personal feelings and interests or even a real name, who has broken with all the beliefs, laws, and codes of civilization and is absolutely dedicated to the destruction of existing society.

Bakunin classifies members of society in terms of their value to the revolution. The liberals must be exploited and their programs infiltrated and turned to Communist purposes. The wild and antisocial types, the natural psychopaths, can be permitted to commit acts of violence and terror that will demoralize the middle classes and kindle the fury and impatience of the proletariat to speed the revolution.

Bakunin longed to see "the whole of Europe, with St. Petersburg, Paris, and London, transformed into an enormous rubbish-heap."

His Communist heirs have extended their apocalyptic vision over Asia, Africa, and North and South America. And where their agents went, terror as routine policy went too.

In Africa, Red agents were instrumental in organizing a terrorist jungle underground with weird, repugnant blood, death, and obedience rituals that involved beheading and dismemberment of sons in the sight of their fathers and the dissection of men in the presence of their wives as means of initiating them into the Communist-oriented brotherhoods.

The same gruesome Red stamp was visible in the gory massacres, cannibalism, and mass rape in the Congo.

Beheadings and dismemberment of victims of the Vietcong in the villages of South Vietnam and the bombings of hotels, clubs, restaurants, airline terminals, and other nonmilitary facilities in Saigon are not simply isolated acts of savagery committed by savage men. They are deeds that are planned and calculated, with the same cool attention that would be given to production schedules or crop programs, in quiet offices by university-trained specialists dedicated, like Mikhail Bakunin, to further world revolution by any means.

Knowing the historical truth about terror as a Communist policy does not lessen the revulsion with civilized people feel when they are confronted by its spawn of death and ruin. But it helps put the evil realities into perspective. It sheds further light on the nature of the enemy.

And it exposes the shallowness and foolishness of the so-called liberals who object to the way the United States stands in the way of Communist liberation of South Vietnam and demand that we negotiate with the Communists, take them at their word and trust them with our lives and freedom.

A Truly Patriotic Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anthony J. DelPopolo, the assistant superintendent of the Youth Center at Lorton Reformatory, is a living example for the young men with whom he works of a truly patriotic and fine citizen. Mr. DelPopolo recently wrote two articles for the Lorton Personnel News which I believe merit the careful attention of all who read this RECORD.

It is my pleasure to repeat below "In the Memory of" which appeared in the May 26, 1965, issue, and "My Birthday Is June 14—Who Am I?"

IN THE MEMORY OF

(By Anthony J. DelPopolo, assistant superintendent, programs, the Youth Center)

Last week my younger son and I decided to visit Arlington Cemetery, and the grave of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our beloved

President, who was assassinated on November 22, 1963.

As we stood in line we looked around and could see the thousands of stone markers on the graves of the American soldiers and sailors who, also, had served their country well.

It was not long before we had the privilege of paying personal homage to President Kennedy, as millions of others had done before us. At that moment I thought it would be a good idea to visit the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier as we were nearby.

As we walked up the path leading to the site we observed a soldier with a rifle on his shoulder marching in front of the large marble tomb.

My son had been silent all this time. But then came his query, "Dad, why does that soldier march back and forth like that?"

"He is one of many honor guards who perform this duty, day and night," I answered.

Again my son asked, "Dad, what do they mean by unknown soldier?"

"During all our wars there are many soldiers who die in battle. Some of them cannot be identified. Therefore, they become unknown soldiers."

"The body of an American unknown soldier who died in World War I was placed in the tomb you are noticing. Let's look closer and see what the words on the tomb say: 'Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God.'

"Those figures carved on the tomb stand for 'valor, victory, and peace.'

"You might also be interested to know that, in May 1958, two other bodies were placed next to the unknown soldier. They represent the men who lost their lives during World War II and the Korean conflict.

"It is on Veterans' Day and Memorial Day that special services are held on this very spot. On that day the President of the United States or his special representative places a beautiful wreath at the tomb."

"Dad, you mentioned Memorial Day, how does that fit into all of this?"

"Well, on Memorial Day, or Decoration Day, as some people call it, relatives place flowers and flags on the graves of servicemen who died in our wars. In some cities, many organizations, including Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and fraternal groups march in military parades and take part in special patriotic programs.

"Another custom, started in recent years, is the decorating of graves on Memorial Day by the families of loved ones, even though they didn't die while in military service."

"There's one more question I'd like to ask you, Dad. How did this Memorial Day originate, anyway?"

"The historians tell us Memorial Day originated during the War Between the States when some Southern women chose May 30 to decorate soldiers' graves.

"The women honored the graves of both the Union and Confederate Armies. A Maj. Gen. John A. Logan in 1868 named May 30 as a special day for honoring the graves of unknown soldiers. Logan served as commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, an organization of veterans of the Civil War. They had charge of Memorial Day celebrations in the Northern States for many years. The American Legion took over this duty after World War I."

"Is Memorial Day on May 30 a holiday in all parts of the United States?" queried my son.

"Not exactly, Memorial Day is a legal holiday in most States, Northern States, on a whole, celebrate May 30 as Memorial Day.

"Most of the Southern States have their own days for honoring the Confederate dead. Some of these days are April 26, May 10, and June 3."

As we walked in silence toward our car from the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, I could see that many thoughts were running through my young son's mind. Suddenly, he said, "Dad, I've been thinking, why do we have to wait until Memorial Day to remember our war dead? Why can't we remember these heroes every day of the year?"

I continued my silence but one thought was repeating itself: "From the mouth of our children comes the wisdom of the ages."

MY BIRTHDAY IS JUNE 14—WHO AM I?

(By Anthony J. DelPopolo, Sr., assistant superintendent, programs, the Youth Center)

How often have you asked yourself the question: "Who am I?" But do you know who I am?

I was born on the bloodly battlefields of the War for Independence in 1776; I was the creation of Francis Hopkinson, a judge of Philadelphia, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence. My early days were spent in the sewing rom of Besty Ross, a seamstress, who put me together.

On June 14, 1777, I was officially adopted by the Continental Congress who resolved, "That the flag of the Thirteen United States be thirteen stripes alternate red and white, and the Union of thirteen white stars in the blue field." The 13 stars were arranged in a circle signifying the union of the States.

I flew for the first time over the victorious American troops at the battle of Saratoga in New York State.

My colors were selected with a purpose. Throughout the ages red has stood for courage and sacrifice. The red in me embodies the men who gave their lives for our country—the people who worked and sacrificed to make our country the greatest in the world. The white in me, symbolizing purity and justice and peace, stands for a country in which each true citizen endeavors to be clean in his dealings, working fairly with others, striving for a just peace throughout the world. The blue in me stands for loyalty, high quality, and preparedness.

My design as well as my colors have a deep meaning. When my red and white stripes ripple in the breeze you cannot help being struck by the impression they give in vigor and movement, by their suggestion of a dynamic country moving resolutely forward. The white stars on my blue field stand for trust in God and for the high hopes of every loyal American * * * young and old. The number of stars tell more clearly than any other part of me the story of the growth of America from the original 13 States, with a beckoning wilderness beyond, to the greatness it possesses today—with 50 stars and 50 States.

For 12 years I only had 13 stripes and 13 stars, but, in 1795, 2 extra stripes and 2 extra stars were added to me when Vermont and Kentucky, the first new States, were added to the Union. It was 17 years later when Francis Scott Key was inspired to write a song about me. He called it "The Star-Spangled Banner." He was aboard a British prisoner boat at the time, arranging for the release of a friend. Key saw me waving in the breeze on a flagpole at Fort McHenry in the Baltimore Harbor. How many of us remember his words: "Long may it wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave"?

In 1818, Congress adopted a plan to keep me always with 13 stripes, and only adding white stars to my blue field as new States joined the Union. The 49th and 50th stars were added July 4, 1959, and July 4, 1960, for the new States of Alaska and Hawaii.

I have been officially changed 27 times since I was born in 1777. My exact proportions were finally established by President Woodrow Wilson when he issued an Executive order in 1916.

When you see me fly in the breeze * * * don't forget I am a reminder to our own citizens and to the people of the world of the ideals of American democracy, of all the things for which I stand.

Let us not wait until June 14 each year to honor me or put me on display.

The idea of setting aside 1 day each year as a holiday to celebrate my adoption by the Continental Congress in 1777 was suggested by B. J. Cignand, of Batavia, Ill. Mr. Cignand, as secretary of an association which commemorated my adoption, was largely responsible for the establishment of this holiday in 1895.

This day is not a legal holiday, like the Fourth of July so the schools and banks do not close. It is observed by displaying me on all public buildings and private homes. Some schools hold special patriotic exercises in which both Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts take part.

As our Nation grew I absorbed the identity of every region of the United States. The traditions of the great Northwest, the expansiveness of the Southwest, the enterprise of the Northeast, the productivity of the Midwest, the agriculture and industry of the South and the Southeast, all are recognized in the number of stars that help to compose me—50 sovereign States bound together into a firm union by the blue of loyalty.

I have been on the frontlines of every one of our wars. Today, I proudly wave in all corners of the globe. I was up in space with Majs. James McDivitt and Edward White, who had me sewn on the left arm, of their space suits. Did you notice the blazing sun over 100 miles above the earth shine upon Major White's shoulder patch of me? How proud I was.

Francis Bellamy in August of 1892 wrote a pledge of allegiance to me which is recited by every boy and girl in school as part of the morning opening exercises. As I stand in the corner I could hear the children say: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

I am often called "Old Glory," sometimes "Stars and Stripes," and the "Star-Spangled Banner." By this time you have guessed who I am—The Flag of our United States of America.

Italian American War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1965, I introduced H.R. 8273 on behalf of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States.

Today, I am happy to inform my colleagues that the 74th General Assembly of the Illinois Legislature recently pased House Joint Resolution 51 urging the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian American War Veterans of the United States.

The States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York have already memorialized the Congress of the United States to grant a congressional charter and national recognition to the Italian American War Veterans of the United States.

It would be fitting indeed for the Congress to extend this long overdue recog-

nition to the members of this worthy organization who have done their share to uphold and preserve the freedom and security of the United States.

It is my pleasure to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD House Joint Resolution 51 passed by the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois. The resolution follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 51 BY STATE OF ILLINOIS, 74TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Whereas the Italian American War Veterans of the United States is a nonprofit and nonpolitical organization made up wholly and without exception of honorably discharged American war veterans; and

Whereas the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York have memorialized the Congress of the United States to grant a congressional charter and national recognition to this most devoted group of American citizens who through their splendid patriotism have contributed so much to the security of our Nation and to the cause of freedom; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Illinois, a State which is so fortunate as to have many citizens of Italian origin who have nobly served our country, would like to join with the legislatures of our sister States in memorializing Congress on behalf of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States; therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, with the Senate concurring herein, respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian American War Veterans of the United States; and, be it further

Resolved, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the presiding officer and clerk of each House of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member thereof from the State of Illinois; and to John F. Nave, past national commander of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and to Filippo Mazzei Post No. 1, Chicago, Ill.

Adopted by the House, May 3, 1965.

JOHN P. TOUHY,
Speaker of the House.
CHAS. F. KERWIN,
Clerk of the House.

Concurred in by the Senate, June 9, 1965.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Reason Is Obvious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hays, Kans., News which was reprinted by the Abilene, Kans., Reflector-Chronicle and deals with a subject dear to the hearts of American housewives—rising food costs.

The editorial follows:

REASON IS OBVIOUS

A major topic of discussion for housewives today is the soaring total of the family food bill. As any housewife can tell you, vegetables are at record highs and there is some complaint about the quality. A sampling of retail prices across the Nation shows that virtually all produce is considerably higher than a year ago.

Potatoes, lettuce, asparagus, tomatoes—you name it—and the price is up. Most food chains report prices about 15 percent above those of last spring. Tomatoes are high now and until the northern crop is harvested may be even higher. It will depend on whether or not the California crop can be harvested.

Don't blame your grocer. He's as unhappy as you are.

It all goes back to last December 31 when the administration let the so-called bracero act expire. Under this law Mexicans could enter the country to harvest vegetable and fruit crops. By barring this low-cost Mexican labor the administration hoped to create employment for American hands at higher wages.

In theory it looked good, but in practice it has been, and still is, a dud. Harvesting many of these crops is a backbreaking task. Growers have found that enough Americans, regardless of the wages offered, simply won't do this kind of work. The result is that commodities coming to market are priced high, and worse, thousands of acres of crops are rotting in the fields.

Though the Mexicans were admittedly paid low wages, they nevertheless liked the feel of American money and flocked in by the thousands when needed. Now we have few braceros, rotting crops, no Americans willing to do the work, and stiffer prices.

And with all this President Johnson has set up a vast unorganized organization to protect the American consumer and Congress is talking of launching a hearing in depth to determine why food prices have gone up.—Hays News.

Vietnam and the National Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, during these days of mounting crisis in Vietnam, the administration on the one hand is urged, by some, to escalate the war by bombing Hanoi and on the other hand, by others, to forsake our obligation by pulling out altogether from that wartorn land.

Under the onslaught of advice urging all degrees of involvement and noninvolvement, one is fortunate to hear occasionally a voice of reason which offers a perspective on the nature of our commitment in southeast Asia. Such a perspective, I am pleased to say, was furnished recently when Rev. John G. MacKinnon addressed his congregation in All Souls Unitarian Church in Indianapolis on the subject of "Vietnam and the National Conscience."

Because of the timely and highly instructive remarks made by Reverend MacKinnon on June 13, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of his statement:

VIETNAM AND THE NATIONAL CONSCIENCE

(A sermon by Rev. John G. MacKinnon, All Souls Unitarian Church, June 13, 1965)

Three weeks ago, Dr. John G. Stoessinger presented to this congregation what was probably the clearest and most perfectly balanced analysis of our present problem in Vietnam that has been uttered or written. I hope you all heard it. I feel some hesitance in addressing myself to this same area of concern after you have heard this masterly discussion. However, not as an international expert, but as your minister, I feel some obligation to share with you my feelings about Vietnam and our national conscience.

I would like to begin with a couple of Dr. Stoessinger's concluding remarks. One of these I have mentioned myself from time to time, the burden of responsibility which rests upon the President of the United States in contrast to the rather easy role (because it does not involve ultimate responsibility) of us who choose to be his critics. The fact that we do not have responsibility for international decisions should not absolutely prohibit us from expressing our views, for this would shut off public debate out of which public opinion ultimately emerges. But our lack of responsibility should color our expression with humility, and it should direct us to speak with the utmost of care and mature consideration.

Dr. Stoessinger's other concluding point concerned morality. Individual morality is measured in terms of intention, but national morality only in terms of outcome. Individuals often can choose in clear terms of right versus wrong. Nations never can (or almost never). National choices in the international arena must be made in terms of different shades of gray, never in terms of black and white. A nation can never choose the wholly good, but must opt for the lesser of evils.

An article by Senator FULBRIGHT in the May 8 issue of the Saturday Review of Literature has an interesting bearing on this point. He traces two strains in the American heritage, one open and flexible, the other closed up tight about morality with a capital M. The latter, the Puritan strain, as he calls it, seeks to force a preconceived right derived from our ideology, upon others, and is, interestingly enough, exactly paralleled by Communist behavior, although their right is a different right derived from a different ideology. FULBRIGHT favors the more open and flexible approach. A thought occurred to me as I was reading his article, perhaps an extension of his thesis. The advocates of the preconceived right in our culture are divided into two separate and opposite positions. There are the advocates of the use of international force to impose our ideological right on the world, and there are those who, in the name of a personal right, morality, and goodness, decry and denounce the use of international force in any (or almost any) situation.

My position on Vietnam is—and was before I heard the tape of Dr. Stoessinger's address or read the report in the New York Times of the principle speeches at the teach-in—substantially the position advocated by Dr. Stoessinger. Vietnam is a bad, unpleasant and dubious situation. I wish we were not in it. I wish it could be terminated. I do not like to have our marines and air power engaged in killing and destruction. I am quite sure that President Johnson feels the same way. But to stay and to continue the escalation of the conflict with great care is, as I see it, the course we must follow.

I do not propose to "make a case" for our present policy which I support. Dr. Stoessinger did that quite well, while presenting the opposite case fairly also. We have had a consistent foreign policy since World War II—to contain communism and keep it from expanding to take over more countries and more people. This policy has been successfully implemented in Europe; less successfully in Asia. Unless we are to renounce it and reverse it, we must stay on in Vietnam until some political arrangement can be made which will give some hope of keeping southeast Asia free from Communist domination. The alternative is to decide that it

doesn't matter whether communism prevails or not; or to decide that we cannot prevent its spread. I, for one, am not ready to advocate this.

I am concerned that our national policy which I support, is being portrayed by its opponents as a morally evil position; that, for example, a snide remark is made about Johnson that he looks pretty hypocritical to express his concern for people in his poverty program while killing people in Vietnam. I am concerned that this attack upon our Nation's moral posture has not been analyzed nor refuted. That is what I want to do today.

The attack upon the Nation's morality is made by honest, genuine and sincere pacifists. Pacifists are nice people who seem to stand morally above reproach in our culture. Their thesis is that to kill people is always wrong; that it is the greatest wrong and no other consideration whatsoever, of national policy or political life, can ever justify it.

Pacifists enjoy a measure of immunity in our American system, as shown by exemption of conscientious objectors from military service. Our respect for conscientiousness is such that we grant immunity from injury to one man's conscience, while demanding that a less conscientious man risk injury to his body (or loss of his life) for what we have collectively determined to be the common good. Usually this respect for conscientiousness extends to a reluctance to question motives alleged to be conscientious.

Pacifists, however, cannot operate as pacifists on the world scene. They can operate only within the structure of their own nation. Hence they oppose any use of force by their nation. This turns out to be what opponents of their nation want. In any specific situation, therefore, pacifists appear to be aligned, for whatever motives, with their nation's enemies. This is one of the crosses an honest pacifist must bear. More troublesome is the fact that he finds himself joined and supported, in his opposition to his nation, by those who are not in fact pacifists, but his nation's enemies. Pacifist conscience, is, therefore, frequently used as a respectable cloak by those who would subvert the nation's operations for political purposes. Not seldom, honest pacifists are so naive that they fail to realize that they are being used this way.

There were doubting and opposing voices raised to our Vietnam operations prior to the bombings north of the 17th parallel, but they were not very many and not very loud. Killing was going on then; killing of Vietnamese people and killing of our own troops and civilian advisors, but little protest was made by the pacifists. With the escalation of the conflict, these few, weak voices have suddenly swelled to a roaring chorus. Now killing in Vietnam by American bombs is ringingly denounced as a heinous crime. I cannot help but suspect that political voices have swelled the pacifist chorus. Content to remain quiet so long as what the United States was doing was totally ineffective politically, they swung into action (perhaps even directing the chorus) when the United States began to do something which might be politically effective.

It is no new thing for people of good will to be suckered, by clever political operators, into subversion of our Nation's program, as anyone who lived through the 30's, 40's and 50's ought to remember. I was appalled by a full page ad in the New York Times a few weeks ago, engineered by the fellowship of reconciliation and sponsored by five undistinguished clergy and our own top man, Dr. Dana Greely. It contained the names of a thousand clergy as signers. This statement undertook to instruct President Johnson as to what was God's will. The essence of the message. "In God's name, Mr. President, stop it."

I am sure that genuine pacifists did not approve of the ruthless use of power and violence by the Vietcong (the Communist revolutionary movement in South Vietnam) suported by the Vietminh (the Communist party in control of North Vietnam). Throughout the countryside people were forced into the ranks of this movement by the rawest sort of compulsion. Thousands of village "headmen" have been killed when they would not convert. But the genuine pacifists didn't say much about this killing; or say it very loudly. The chorus is much louder now, and it is directed exclusively against the killing by American bombs. One who has been listening might well conclude that killing by Americans is a crime; but killing by Vietcong is not. Such a thesis is explicable in politically motivated terms; but hardly on humanitarian grounds.

I note with some cynicism that the same chorus which demands that we get out of Vietnam and stop the killing there, demands that we get out of the Dominican Republic. Now, our marines didn't go into Santo Domingo shooting. There has been much less bloodshed than there would have been had our troops not been present. But this saving of life has not been praised by critics of our Nation's morality. To be sure, a certain political outcome was prevented, for the time being: the takeover of revolutionists pretty well dominated by Castro-type Communists. But curiously, the same voices by and large, that demand we get out of Vietnam and stop the killing, demand we get out of the Dominican Republic and let the killing be resumed to a political end.

Whatever the admixture of honest pacifists and subversives making up the chorus charging our Government with moral turpitude, I feel that the subversives are calling the plays. Even the honest pacifists, however, are not exclusively committed to the wrongness of killing and that alone, or they would be making more noise than they are about another kind of killing, the slaughter by automobile accidents. The number of Americans killed in Vietnam over 4 years doesn't begin to compare to the automobile death toll; not even to the Indiana death toll. It begins to compare with the increase in the Indiana death toll taking 4 years ago as a base. Yet I fail to hear an organized, cohesive demand from pacifists that we abolish automobiles to stop this killing. Of course, pacifists don't like death on the highway. Nobody does. I would guess they feel about it much as I feel about the deaths in Vietnam—I don't like it but it is a price we must pay for something we want; in the one place the convenience of automobile transportation, in the other the furtherance of our foreign policy in southeast Asia.

Another attack upon our foreign policy declares that we have no business using our military and political power to keep the people of Vietnam from having what they want. We are pictured as seeking to subdue and prevent a populace from achieving its rightful aspirations to self-government. Objection to our presence in the Dominican Republic is made on the same basis.

This begins with a great big assumption I am simply not willing to make. This is that "the people" don't want us there, don't want us to be doing what we are doing, and would prefer to have a Communist-dominated government instead. It is pretty obvious that these critics cannot be talking about all the people; for nowhere on earth are all the people of a single mind about what they want. They must be talking, therefore, about part of the people. Our Government is astute enough to recognize, if these critics are not, that the people are divided; that not all, but some of the people want us where we are, doing what we are doing. The important question, really, is how many of the people are we talking about and who are they.

The Vietnamese who are members of and active participants in the Vietcong do not want us there. Nor do those running the Vietminh, or Communist China. The paraders in the streets of Santo Domingo (or any other Latin American or southeast Asian city) who shout, "Yankee, go home," do not want us there. Are these "the people"? Shall we forgo our concern for, and even our committee to, that portion of the people who want us there, because some of the people tell us to go home?

Critics of our Vietnam policy—both moralistic and practical—charge that from 60 to 80 percent of the people are with the Vietcong and want us to go home. Territory containing such a proportion of the inhabitants is, indeed, controlled by the Vietcong. However, in view of the manner in which the Vietcong established this control, I doubt very much that all of the people in this rebel-controlled territory want the Vietcong. Just because they have been persuaded, coerced, and compelled (by the rawest and most ruthless sort of violence) to submit to Vietcong rule, it is not fair to conclude that they want us out. I suspect that some portion of the North Vietnamese really do not want the Communist government of the Vietminh, but dictatorships always appear to enjoy political unanimity. It is quite impossible to know what proportion of the Vietnamese want us to go home, but we were invited in by their recognized and established government. We are using force to prevent the seizure of complete power by the Communist rebels, but this is not the same thing as using it to prevent the legitimate aspirations of the Vietnamese people.

Were our Government to capitulate to this sort of criticism, we would withdraw—our military forces, our economic aid, our embassies, and information libraries—the moment some Communist controlled rebel leader was able to gather enough people to pull off an impressive street demonstration, on the basis that this was the will of "the people." If he were able to get together some arms and start shooting, we would recognize him as "the people" and get out, letting him have his way and subject the people to a Communist dictatorship.

Probably almost everywhere, Vietnam included, there is a vast body of people (probably an overwhelming majority) who don't care much about political alinements. They want to be left alone to live out their lives as best they can, or to be helped to do so at a better level. On either side are small groups of power seekers who attempt to control and use this vast and largely indifferent body. If one group can muster force, draw assistance from an outside Communist sanctuary, and force its control down the throats of a large part of the mass in the middle—should we get out and let "the people" have what they want? This is not fair to the other side. It is, indeed, not fair to the large body of the indifferent middle.

I am uncomfortable, and I am sure our Government is uncomfortable, that in this sort of power struggle we often find ourselves giving support to petty reactionary forces as the only alternative to permitting a Communist takeover. I think Dr. Stoessinger pretty well analysed that problem as due to the weakness and lack of organization of the genuinely liberal and democratic forces So, again, we cannot commit ourselves to the wholly good, but must choose the less bad of evils But this is not a case of us against the people In a conflict between Communist-oriented revolutionaries, and the usually reactionary establishment, we must choose to support the establishment We happen to think—and I agree—that the people have a better chance of getting what they want if we support (often ugly) governments upon whom we can bring pressure for reform, than if we bow out to let the Communists takeover I reject the charge that we are suppressing the people and keep-

ing them from fulfilling their rightful national aspirations

The practical case against our Vietnam policy is, to me, much more impressive than the alleged moral case Dr Stoessinger gave this the full treatment It holds we should give up and get out because we are licked. We cannot contain communism in Asia from our peripheral position Ultimately communism will take over by historical necessity. We are spreading ourselves too thin and will exhaust our resources. If I were ready to be convinced that our policy is wrong, it would be on these grounds. However I am not yet ready to agree that we cannot bring at least a stalemate out of this present mess. I was much interested and encouraged to hear what Dr. Stoessinger had to say about the viability of a Korea-type or a Laos-type settlement; and the possibility, after a long hot summer of no decision, of working toward such a solution. Perhaps we can't contain communism in Asia forever—but if we can do so for 20 years, there may develop in China, as there has in Russia, a kind of communism with which the non-Communist world can live. This practical consideration is open to rational discussion, as the incensed charges of immorality are not.

Conscience is a vulnerable point for Americans; because Americans are a conscientious people. I suspect we are conscientious, not only because of our Puritan strain, but also because we have a respect for moral goodness; i.e., we are a people committed to the creation and increase of human values. To charge our Government with moral turpitude is a blow that hurts. It not only hurts but it is apt to shake our commitment to a well-thought-out policy. If it is not justified in fact, I'm ready to call "foul."

I am distressed to find so many fellow liberals charging our Government with moral turpitude. I was distressed to see the name of my colleague, Dana Greely, and the names of some 14 other colleagues (down through F in the alphabet) declaring God's judgment upon our President for his moral turpitude. I wonder if it was because Goldwater advocated certain measures in Vietnam, that it has now become a liberal syndrome to declare that our Vietnam policy is morally wrong. If I must say that in order to be a genuine liberal, I guess I'll have to resign from the club after nearly a lifetime of membership in good standing.

I reject this charge of moral turpitude leveled against our Government's policy in Vietnam. I reject it because I believe it to be tainted with immoral considerations, itself. It is being used, by those who oppose our policy on political grounds, as a safe vantage point from which to make their attack. Many with clean hearts are being dragged into this position, either through their single-minded vision of the right (the Puritan complex) or through simple naivete.

I reject this charge, in the second place, because it is an erroneous charge. It is erroneous because it fails to take into account the distinction between individual and national morality. This charge is based upon the criterion of national morality—outcome. Were this attack to succeed in changing our policy, the inevitable outcome would be a prompt and immediate Communist takeover. I believe, the Government believes, and honestly I think a good many of the moral attackers believe, too, that this would be the worse of the evils between which we much choose.

As for the honestly pure in heart—I respect their purity. I shall support their relative immunity as conscientious pacifists. I envy them their moral certitude that they are right. But I must disregard them as irrelevant to make judgments in terms of personal morality on issues of national morality. Meanwhile our Government—with ultimate responsibility resting upon our President—cannot afford the luxury of this pristine personal morality. And our Nation, and the people within it, must resist this attack upon its moral integrity. It must do, and the people must ultimately concur or it cannot go on doing it, what it has to do: make its choice for the 75 percent good, or even only the 55 percent good in terms of expected outcome; then sweat it out, hoping that the turn of events will ultimately show that choice to have been, in fact, for 55 percent good instead of 75 percent bad.

I refuse to have the moral integrity of my Government, and its leadership impugned without an argument. I reject these charges of immorality, colored as they are by political considerations, and based as they are upon a personal concept of morality. In terms of national morality, I say that my Government is as morally right as, in this moment of history, it is possible to be.

Score Another for Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply distressed to learn that President Johnson had determined to proceed with the shipment of $37 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic on the basis that relations between the United Arab Republic and the United States had improved in recent months. The views expressed in the following editorial of the Chicago American reflect the feeling of many thoughtful Americans that Nasser has not proved reliable in the past and cannot be counted upon today to promote peace and amity among nations:

SCORE ANOTHER FOR NASSER

Dictator Gamal Abdel Nasser has won another argument with the United States. He has told us to "go drink seawater"—which is Egyptian for "go to hell"—because we thought he ought to stop giving arms and other assistance to the Congo rebels. The rebels were slaughtering captured Americans and Europeans.

The House of Representatives, for once responding to injury and insult as Americans used to, voted last February to forbid all American aid to Egypt, but after President Johnson applied pressure, the Senate weakened and left it to Mr. Johnson to decide in favor of aid to Egypt if he thought the aid was in the American national interest.

Now President Johnson has decided it is in the interests of America to help Dictator Nasser aggrandize himself. The Agriculture Department is issuing authorization for the purchase of $37 million worth of wheat, vegetable oils, dried milk, and tobacco. This will be given to the Egyptians.

Egypt will put up the equivalent of $37 million in Egyptian money to pay for the food, knowing that the United States will hand back 90 percent of it for the Egyptian Government to spend on new roads or public works. The remaining 10 percent will be used to pay U.S. expenses in Egypt.

The State Department says Nasser has stopped furnishing aid to the Communist rebels in the Congo; this may be true or it may not. In North Vietnam it probably will be believed that he is still helping the Communist forces in the Congo, as he said he would when he was telling us to go to hell. And the North Vietnamese will construe our weakness toward Nasser as evidence that the United States always weakens before it really gets tough with anybody.

And this will encourage the North Vietnam Communists to continue their warfare against South Vietnam on the theory that they will eventually win it, notwithstanding our bombing raids and our buildup of troops.

Why give Dictator Nasser in Egypt tender treatment that will encourage another dictator, Ho Chi Minh, across the continent of Asia in Hanoi?

Mr. "Mickey"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the death last week of C. Walter "Mickey" McCarty, executive editor of the Indianapolis News, is deeply mourned by all who knew this truly great giant of Hoosier journalism.

"Mickey" performed more than half a century of service to Hoosiers. He went through the ranks from reporter to editor and still found time to write a much-read column "Fellow Taxpayers." Few men on the Hoosier scene have been the equal of "Mickey" McCarty, with his great wit, deep understanding and love of humanity.

Few great civic undertakings in Indianapolis lacked the leadership of "Mickey."

The following editorials reflect to a small degree the many contributions he made to his profession and to his State, and the loss that all who knew him feel at his passing:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, June 24, 1965]

MR. "MICKEY"

Reporter, city editor, and civic leader, managing editor, toastmaster, publisher, executive editor, and university trustee, C. Walter McCarty was all these and much more.

To those who knew him as an acquaintance or friend or fellow taxpayer, he was a delightful Irishman whose wit was legendary and unique.

To those who believed in and worked for the future of Indianapolis and Indiana, as he did, he was a faithful ally in all endeavors and a sage and sane adviser in civic planning and execution.

To those who had chosen his profession of newspapering, he was a rare combination of reporter and writer, editor and counselor, columnist and quiet but competent critic.

And he gave unstintingly of his energies, time and abilities to his beloved Indiana University.

But above all else, excepting only his family, his life was wrapped up in the Indianapolis News. For it, he originated the phrase "the A paper" and for all his adult life—a full and productive half-century—he worked to establish and maintain the News as "the paper."

To Mr. "Mickey," the News was always "the Great Hoosier Daily, the A paper, circulation and advertising rates on request." And it was and is just that, "the A paper," to his countless thousands of friends, and, particularly, to those of us who were fortunate enough to have been in the newsroom with him.

The principles he followed, the example he set, the sense of humor he displayed, the kindness he always exhibited, the courtesy which was second nature, the calm wisdom which was effortless, the loyalty which never faltered—all these and more are the legacy of all who knew and loved him and of the community and State he served so faithfully and well.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, June 25, 1965]

MICKEY MCCARTY

The death of C. Walter "Mickey" McCarty at the age of 74 is an irreparable loss to the Indianapolis community—and to the News.

For more than 50 years, Mickey served this newspaper, and through it the city and the State he loved so well. For more than 50 years, he enlivened the political and civic life of Indianapolis with his charm, his quick smile, and his unfailing humor.

Most of all, for 50 years, he brought to the craft of journalism a rare combination of high talent and exacting standards, of dedication to truth and fairness, which are the highest attainments of the newspaperman's profession.

Mickey ran the gamut of positions on the News, beginning as a police beat reporter, and serving as city editor, assistant managing editor, managing editor, and editor. In each of these posts he brought distinction to himself and to the great Hoosier daily—the "A" paper, as he called it.

In addition to his labor of love here at the News, Mickey was constantly involved in the civil affairs of Indianapolis and of the Hoosier State at large. A much sought-after speaker, he could enliven any gathering with his rich collection of anecdotes, quips, observations on the news, and reminiscences of the great and not-so-great of years gone by.

Mickey contributed his time and effort to numberless public-spirited activities in Indiana. Among his many services, that as a trustee of Indiana University, a post he held from 1945 to 1962, was undoubtedly closest to his heart. It was therefore fitting that this year he should have received the university's Distinguished Alumnus Award, an honor we know he cherished.

There are many things about Mickey McCarty which cannot be set down easily on paper, but which will be remembered fondly by everyone who knew him or worked with him. He was unfailingly kind to even the most junior member of the News staff, as he was kind to everyone. He never thought it too much trouble to go out of his way to talk to a newcomer, to make him feel at home, to exchange ideas or pleasantries. He was, in every sense of the word, an Indiana gentleman.

Mickey McCarty, so full of energy and life, is dead. But he has left his imprint indelibly upon his State and upon this newspaper and insofar as we are capable of it, we here at the "A" paper will try to keep his memory alive.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Times, June 24, 1965]

"MICKEY" MCCARTY

We join the many who pay tribute today to a highly respected and capable craftsman who toiled to the end in the field of journalism he loved so much—C. Walter "Mickey" McCarty, executive editor of the News. Mr. McCarty died last night at the age of 74.

During an illustrious newspaper career, he reached numerous high points. Among them was his contribution as assistant managing editor to his paper's winning of a coveted Pulitzer Prize in 1932.

Mr. McCarty gave more than a half century to Hoosier journalism. Few newspapermen can boast that mark. Not many these days enter the field as high school correspondents and stick with the demanding but satisfying newspaper game long past normal retirement time, as he did.

As a very good poet expressed his feelings about such a loss a long time ago, his death diminishes all of us, particularly fellow newspapermen who knew him well.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, June 25, 1965]

MR. MICKEY

His kindness, his dry wit, his complete integrity, his engaging smile, his insistence on accuracy and fairness, his warm friendliness, his wonderful humor and engaging manner—these things and many more describe "Mr. Mickey"—C. Walter McCarty, executive editor of the Indianapolis News.

No Indiana newspaperman ever loved his State and its people more or worked harder to improve and advance their interest. He was a fine reporter with a nose for news and an insistence on accuracy that brought him to the top of his profession. He was unfailingly courteous and kind and never lost his sense of humor even in the tensest of times or when facing the most difficult problems.

Mickey was just one of the best, as a newspaperman and as a person. Everyone who knew him well loved him, respected him, and honored him. We laughed with him when, as toastmaster at banquets or meetings, he kidded our pomposities or poked fun at our foibles. We always liked to meet him on the street or in the office because with a few words and a broad smile he made the day seem brighter and the world a better place to live in.

As a reporter, city editor, publisher, editor, and columnist he gave his very best right up until the end of his life and his best was far better than most.

We in the newspaper profession have lost one of our shining stars. But more than that we have lost one of our best friends and counselors, "Mickey" McCarty. We are all a little better as men and women for having known and loved him.

The Next Stage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, in his recent address at Howard University, cited the Voting Rights Act which we expect to come to the floor for debate in the first week of next month, as perhaps the "end of the beginning" of the American Negro's struggle for freedom, justice, and opportunity. I would agree that this is step No. 1, the major and most crucial in America's obligation to right the wrong it has so long inflicted upon one segment of its citizenry because of skin color. It needs to be hammered at the conscience of this Nation that that bill, the Voting Rights Act, must be enacted into effective law, and unrelentingly enforced, so that the cornerstone of guarantees for the American citizen's participation in the opportunities and responsibilities of a democratic society is available to Negro countrymen. The voting rights bill is a basic cornerstone not to be detracted from, but the cost to this Nation of hatred, inhumanity, and waste based solely upon the color of a man's skin is beyond the possibility of full calculation in terms of defeated potential to contribute to the social progress, culture, and material abundance of this Nation. It is a cost which will not be cut back until, as President Johnson and virtually every leader in this human rights struggle has foretold, equal opportunity for the Negro citizen is made a fact in every dimension of life where opportunity is available to every other American. The Negro citizen is fighting for the basic rights and guarantees accorded to other American citizens. He cannot begin the being of a full citizen without this. But it is to be a full citizen in this age, to be permitted into 20th-century opportunity, for which he is also fighting, which is also the obligation of the America which knowingly and willfully barred this opportunity for economic and social progress open to all other citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I have the following recent editorial by the Christian Science Monitor commenting upon this obligation. I call it to the attention of this body.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 9, 1965]

THE NEXT STAGE

For several years experts on the American racial situation have stated that passage of civil rights legislation would not in itself end racial tension. They declare that the ability to vote, to use public accommodations, and to go to unsegregated schools would not on its own bring about a sufficiently great improvement in the Negro's condition to terminate the long, hot summer of his discontent.

These same experts warned that only a signal betterment of the Negro's economic position—above all in work and housing—would lower the dangerous head of steam which the racial movement has generated during the past few years. Indeed, there are those who assert that due to a combination of reasons—chief among them the decline in the number of both manual and farm labor jobs owing to automation—the Negro has actually been sliding backward economically at the very time when his civil position was improving so drastically.

President Johnson has made it clear that he accepts these findings and that steps must be taken to improve the Negro's economic position now that the civil rights fight is largely won. In his strongly worded address at Howard University, he referred to this further effort as the "next and more profound stage" of the battle on the Negro's behalf.

So far as can be gathered, the President, while wisely stressing that the Negro will be called upon to rely first of all on his own efforts, also believes that special help must be given the Negro to make up for the legacy of the past.

It is precisely at this point of the racial question that the country faces its most difficult decisions and must call upon the greatest wisdom. There can and will be no serious argument from any quarter against taking just and thoughtful steps to accelerate Negro progress. The more swiftly he is enabled to achieve fulfillment of his potential as a man and an American citizen, the more America as a whole will be blessed both economically and spiritually.

In the end, however, this advance, unlike the passage of civil rights laws, cannot come from the Government. It must come from national realization that the highest ideals of Christianity and of the foundation of the United States are premised upon the inalienable rights and limitless ability of individual men and women. This realization—and

there is ample evidence that it is broadening daily—will open a full path of progress to the Negro.

Failures of the Appalachian Redevelopment Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it may be true that the Johnson administration intends to improve the conditions of those Americans now classed as poor and depressed. However, evidence is mounting at an alarming rate indicating that good intentions are not enough. In the June 1965 edition of the Atlantic Monthly, Harry M. Caudill notes that the administration's efforts to alleviate poverty in the Appalachia region clearly show that Federal planners do not understand the nature and extent of the poverty in that region or how to cure it.

Mr. Caudill takes the President's Appalachian Regional Commission—PARC—to task for concentrating more on gaining acceptance of a development program by the Governors of the States affected than on drawing up effective solutions to the region's critical problems. In making the program as palatable as possible, PARC ignored the chaotic conditions in the coal industry, the region's major employer. PARC also failed to recommend measures to clean up the region, making it more attractive and a more healthy place in which to live and raise children. PARC made no recommendations for improving education except for modest financial aid to vocational education. Finally, PARC failed to tackle the need for far-reaching tax reform and the modernization of antiquated political structures.

It is bad enough that PARC's recommendations were so woefully inadequate. Even worse is that Congress and, more important, the Johnson administration, have accepted what the commission proposed as a comprehensive and effective redevelopment program. Any solution to the difficult problem of poverty in the region which is based on imperfect, incomplete information cannot hope to solve the problem and may even aggravate the misery of the poor in Appalachia. Mr. Caudill calls the Appalachian Redevelopment Act "a grim hoax" that is likely to speed the people "into the depths of despond."

What is needed is the type of development plan which was to have been drawn up by PARC during its 2-year study. This plan would treat the total environment of Appalachia, would index and utilize all its resources of people, soil, water, timber, and minerals, to build a viable economy and a healthy social order for the entire region. The hopes of the people in Appalachia have been raised. If the administration's program is not modified and improved, its continued application will bring only disillusionment and bitterness.

This article brings many of the basic shortcomings of the present Appalachian redevelopment program to light and points the way to several specific improvements which must be made if it is to be effective. I ask that this article be included in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Atlantic Monthly, June 1965]

MISDEAL IN APPALACHIA

(By Harry M. Caudill)

(Appalachia is home to Harry M. Caudill, a Kentucky lawyer and former State legislator whose sorrow for the fate of the area and passion for its renewal were movingly told in "Night Comes to the Cumberlands," his biography of a depressed area, published in 1962 by Atlantic-Little, Brown. In this article, he tells why the administration's Appalachian relief program promises to inject little light into that long night, and he explains what Appalachia really needs—all-out education, effective mining controls, and restoration of its natural beauty).

Appalachia is a region as large as all Great Britain and the home of 15 million Americans. Once, long ago, it was green and rich. For years it has been sick and now it is dying, a charity patient of affluent America.

Conscience-ridden by Appalachia's old and numerous social and economic ills, the Federal Government has enacted into law the Appalachian Regional Development Act, a program 2 years in the drafting and hailed by its sponsors as the cure for Appalachia. The act is a grim hoax. It won't restore Appalachia and its millions of poor to health and hope; more likely it will speed their descent into the depths of despond.

President Kennedy was deeply distressed by the destitution and demoralization he encountered in West Virginia during the preferential primary in 1960. He created the President's Appalachian Regional Commission (PARC), to consult with the Governors of the 11 States having counties in the Appalachian Mountains and to formulate a regional program calculated to bring prosperity to the jaded highland communities.

There is every reason to believe that President Kennedy sincerely desired to aid the area and that President Johnson has come to share his concern. But both President Johnson and the Congress appear to have assumed that the Commission's recommendations as embodied in the act constitute a comprehensive redevelopment program. The assumption is unfounded, and both the President and the Congress have been sold a bill of shoddy goods.

The President's Appalachian Regional Commission was headed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce. It held extensive hearings and made every effort to devise a program acceptable to the States involved. Unfortunately, the Commission seems to have decided at an early date that gaining acceptance of the program by the Governors was more important than finding effective solutions. To placate the Governors, some of whom showed little initial enthusiasm for the project, the Commission revived the hoary theory of nullification. Each State was authorized to veto any proposal which it deemed unsatisfactory, whether advanced by Washington or by another State. This new partnership arrangement, by which the Federal Government provides the lion's share (80 percent) of the money and the State governments (whose historic dereliction brought about most of the trouble) get the lion's share of the resulting political credit, was hailed by PARC and Appalachian Congressmen as a significant advance in State-Federal relationships.

The State-veto provision is of doubtful constitutionality. It is unlikely, however that the veto will have to be invoked, because there is little in the planned program that could arouse the ire of a Governor, let alone kindle hope in the thousands of impoverished mountaineers.

The redevelopment scheme produced by PARC is not only bland; it borders on the insignificant. Appalachia is a mammoth island of backwardness, and millions of its people are paupers. Impressive as it may appear to those who have to pay it in taxes, the $1 billion to be spent for the region's supposed rehabilitation is little more than a drop of aid in a bucket of need.

Roving reporters and probing television cameras have brought the face of Appalachian misery into every American living room. The bleak hillsides, the gray mining camps, the littered roadsides, the rickety houses, and the tattered, dispirited people have haunted millions. Shocked Americans everywhere have demanded that Appalachia be rescued by the Government that found it possible to rescue Europe with the Marshall plan and to nourish the once desolate Tennessee Valley through the TVA.

What most people may not suspect is that Appalachia has two faces. They have seen the face of Appalachian poverty. The face of Appalachian affluence has remained discreetly out of view. Absenteeism and anonymity curtain the vast domain of giant corporations which own the region's wealth.

The Nation's great steel and manufacturing corporations—including United States Steel, Inland Steel, Bethlehem Steel, Republic Steel, Jones & Laughlin, and International Harvester—own immense boundaries of coal, oil, gas, limestone, and other minerals, which were bought cheaply from their original owners nearly three-quarters of a century ago and have been held ever since at little more than nominal taxation.

State and local taxing officials have bowed to the ancient argument that to impose fair levies on the extractive industries "will kill the goose that lays the golden egg." For example, 8 years ago Pittsburgh-Consolidation Coal Corp. sold a part of its eastern Kentucky holdings to a subsidiary of Bethlehem Steel. The purchase price was nearly $16 million, but the assessed valuation of the same property was less than $4 million. These corporations and their allies, the electric utilities, the railroads, the huge real estate corporations, and the coal-mining companies, have a gigantic stake in the status quo.

Not all State and local officials are uncaring about Appalachia's ills, but in sum the State and local governments are little more than fronts for the absentee corporations which control the economic destinies of the region. The wealth—and it is almost immeasurable—is in "foreign" ownership as surely as are most of the riches of central America.

The power of the region's economic overlords was demonstrated in the West Virginia Legislature in 1953. Gov. William Casey Marland struggled unsuccessfully to persuade the assembly to levy a general fund tax on the privilege of severing coal and other nonrenewable resources from the State. Today an indigent coal miner must pay a tax for the privilege of removing a loaf of bread from a grocer's shelf, but the world's largest steel corporation can remove trainloads of coal daily from the Appalachian hills without paying a tax for the right to do so.

Economically, Appalachia is little more than an internal colonial appendage of the industrial North and Midwest. Its plight is worse than that of a banana republic receiving U.S. foreign aid. Its exploitative economy generates much wealth and much poverty. The wealth flows to distant cities; the poverty accumulates at home. Like Latin America, Appalachia can find no relief for its dilemma until there is far-reaching

tax reform and an overhaul of the antiquated political structure. But here the parallel ends. In the Alliance for Progress program, Washington insists on Latin-American reform as the price of aid. For Appalachia, Washington has devised a plan of relief that will leave the old pattern unchanged. While the politicians can speak piously of Appalachian rejuvenation, they lack the guts to break the iron vise that grips the territory and its inhabitants. Any basic change in the situation would send wrathful reverberations through the boardrooms of dozens of huge firms.

PARC in its joint labors with the State governments discovered that whatever aimed at effective reorganization of the decrepit economy ran afoul of the entrenched absentee-owned interests and the political power structure which they dominate. So the search turned toward palliatives rather than remedies. The commission decided to spend $840 million in 5 years on new highways and access roads. The construction of roads will make it even easier for the nonresident owners to market their minerals and timber. Roads are popular with the mountaineers, too, so more than 80 percent of the money could go for this one item with seemingly happy results.

The remaining funds are allocated at the rate of $41 million for hospital construction, $28 million for hospital maintenance, $16 million for the building of vocational schools, $5 million for development of timber stands, $6 million for sewage treatment systems, $36,500,000 for reclamation of strip-mined lands, and $2,400,000 for administration. None of these measures strikes at the real roots of Appalachia's troubles. They will not restore health, because the malaise is too critical.

The redevelopment program is noteworthy because of its glaring omissions. Appalachia is a beautiful country whose major resource is bituminous coal. Its wooded hills are stuffed with the fuel, and mining has shaped its tragic history. Any effort to revitalize this region without giving serious attention to the chaotic coal industry is nonsensical.

Until about 1948 coal was an immense industry, the counterpart of steel. As a mass employer, it was beset by oil and gas and advancing mining technology, and collapsed abruptly. Scores of coal companies were forced out of business in the fifties, and those remaining in operation were compelled to mechanize to an astonishing degree. Thus hordes of industrial workmen were left stranded in the mining communities. They were men who had been educated for the mines; their communities were poorly built and were without decent schools, hospitals, or roads. In the last decade the jerry-built communities have turned into people-sties. The land is scarred with crumbling shacks, tipples, commissaries, and culm heaps. The demoralized people, long dependent on public assistance for their bread, have littered the roadsides and streams with countless automobile hulks and trash dumps. The creeks and rivers are reeking sewers.

Many miners earn a subsistence living digging coal with hand tools from thin seams. These "doghole" operations lack the protection of the Federal Mine Safety Code and are in a hopeless competition with strip mines and the large mechanized pits. The land is being ripped apart by surface miners. Simply put, the region's main source of income, its coal industry, borders on anarchy. PARC, however, blandly ignored this salient fact.

The commission might have recommended a giant cleanup campaign for Appalachia; without this, it is impossible to see how the morale of the people can be restored. Children growing up in the incredible squalor of the typical mining community fall naturally into the ruinous, sometimes rapacious habits of their elders. Yet the possibility of clearing away the befouled landscape was not even considered.

The rest of the Nation has cause for alarm in the pollution constantly emanating from this tortured region. Some 500 gigantic culm heaps—man-made mountains of mining wastes and low-grade coal—containing millions of tons of fuel, are forever burning. Their acrid fumes cloak countless valleys. Simultaneously, billions of gallons of sulfuric acid water drain daily from unsealed mines and open coal auger holes. These nauseous contaminants must be restrained if Appalachia is to shed its grim reputation. A feeble start toward this goal is authorized by the legislation, but the task will be hard, and its ultimate cost will be high indeed.

The zooming American population gives Appalachia a genuine potential as a recreation area, but this potential is being aborted by the ravages of strip mining. New machines, including the giant rubber-tire high lifts now coming on the market, make it certain that surface mines will multiply and that their onslaught upon the land will quicken. A feeble gesture at alleviating this murder of the land is proposed in the legislation, but an amendment to the bill limits reclamation to publicly owned land. Since nearly all the torn earth is privately owned, the section dealing with strip mining is without practical meaning. According to the testimony of Pennsylvania Governor William Scranton, a quarter of a million acres of land in his State have already been ruined. Unless strip mining is prohibited in the near future, the coalfields will be churned into total wreckage.

The coal industry urgently needs a stable year-round market. Such a market is available, but PARC and Congress are ignoring it. The Edison Electric Institute has estimated that $175 billion will have to be invested in new electricity-generating facilities within 20 years if a power shortage is to be averted. The trend in the electric power industry is toward large mine-mouth generators, the power going to market by extra-high-voltage transmission lines. Such plants could be constructed in Appalachia with their power output carried cheaply and efficiently into all the great cities east of the Mississippi. The American Public Power Association, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and a research group sponsored by Lockheed Space & Missile Co. have concluded that these plants are feasible and that their product could be profitably marketed. And a small developmental royalty of perhaps one half mill per kilowatt hour produced would plow hundreds of millions of dollars back into regional facilities and services within a decade or two. Thus Appalachia could in large measure finance its own rehabilitation.

Such plants would make cheap power available everywhere in the Appalachian range. The lakes created to provide cooling water for the huge coal-burning generators would curtail the ravages of floods, simultaneously supplying water for new industries which the low-cost electricity would attract to the area. As in the Tennessee Valley, the lakes would bring fishermen, sportsmen, and vacationers. The modern trinity—electricity, water, and fertilizer—which has wrought such miracles for the TVA, is sorely needed in the valleys of Appalachia, but PARC and the Congress refused to learn from the Nation's first great and successful attempt to rejuvenate a dying segment of the country.

To its credit, PARC considered electric power development as a means of aiding the region's economy and requested congressional authorization for a full-scale power study. The Congress, goaded by lobbyists for the private power interests, moved with alacrity in the opposite direction and expressly prohibited the use of Appalachian Redevelopment Funds for the generation, transmission, or sale of electricity. Thus Appalachia, a land of heavy rainfall and vast coal reserves, is denied the blessings of cheap power—blessings bestowed by Federal action on the Tennessee Valley and most of the West.

The great need of the Appalachian people is education. The schools everywhere are poor, often abominable. Most of America's one-room schools are in highland counties, 40 percent of them in eastern Kentucky alone. The adult illiteracy rate is appallingly high. Teachers' salaries average about $1,000 per year under national averages. The best teachers moved away years ago. The States refuse to levy severance taxes on minerals for the support of the schools. New generations are born into the old relentless cycle of poor people, poor schools, poor job preparation, poor pay, more poor people. Yet except for a modest appropriation for vocational education, PARC made no recommendations for improvement of the public schools. As matters now stand, the administration's pending aid-to-education bill offers more long-range hope to the mountaineers than do PARC's remedial measures.

Another notion that a serious program would have embraced is the concept of new towns. At least two-thirds of the existing housing is dilapidated. Much of the populace is spread out in string towns that stretch up the winding creek valleys. Other tens of thousands are clustered in crumbling coal camps. All these communities lack adequate water supplies, and the available water is generally polluted. In fact, public health officials in one typical eastern Kentucky county recently estimated that 76 percent of the drinking water is "grossly contaminated." It is practically impossible to service the communities with adequate public facilities. Student transportation alone is a backbreaking burden on the meager school systems. The roads are for the most part ribbons of mud, and if new ones are built, maintenance costs will be extremely high. The people spread out in this fashion years ago when "new ground" farming was their principal livelihood. Now farming is passé. Even the family vegetable garden is disappearing. No valid justification for living on rough and isolated creeks exists at the present time.

By every reasonable standard the people would be far better off living in towns, where the amenities of life could be supplied at bearable costs. A few well-planned, solidly built, and strongly organized new municipalities would absorb much of the present dwindling population and would bring new talent into the region. Both the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority have had experience in building new cities. Their experience could have been invaluable in any undertaking to organize, house, and service the Appalachian population properly. The "new town" concept was urged upon PARC as an obvious and much-needed remedial measure, but those bold planners wasted no thought upon it.

The provision for building and financing hospitals is a patent absurdity. New hospitals can be built, and under some circumstances funds can be made available for their operation, but existing hospitals cannot be aided. Ten hospitals owned by Appalachian Regional Hospitals, Inc., were bought from the United Mine Workers of America's Health and Welfare Fund with Federal money advanced by the Area Redevelopment Administration. This nonprofit corporation has done an excellent job of administering the hospital chain, maintaining superb standards and paying union wages to its employees. It has begun to operate in the black despite a fantastically high charity load. Yet these institutions—the best public facilities in Appalachia—are threatened with extinction for lack of operating capital. The administrators of the Appalachian Regional Development Act will be powerless to aid them. They may be compelled to watch these immensely beneficial hospitals close

for lack of funds while simultaneously financing the construction of others.

An effort to obtain an amendment beneficial to satisfactory existing hospitals brought stern admonitions from PARC and congressional sponsors of the act that no changes could be tolerated, not even so much as "a single comma." However, when it came to another matter, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY of New York was not deterred by such notions. His amendment to add 13 relatively prosperous New York counties to Appalachia was promptly approved, and by legislative fiat the prosperous inhabitants of comparatively scrubbed upstate New York cities and towns became fellow sufferers with the miserable people of the Cumberland Plateau.

Paradoxically, not all of Appalachia is poor. There are growth centers within the region which are prosperous by national norms. In these areas—for example, Kingsport, Tenn.—industry has begun to diversify. Bank deposits are high. Schools, hospitals, libraries, and other public facilities and services are good by Appalachian standards. These islands of affluence in a sea of poverty grow as much by attracting people from other parts of America as by drawing highlanders out of the surrounding countryside. A cruel provision in the legislation requires all the development funds to be spent in such a manner as to expedite the expansion of these fortunate centers of prosperity and growth. The fact that only a relative handful of mountaineers live there did not deter PARC's planners. The growth of a few small cities will not affect the tens of thousands of people stranded in such abysmal backwaters as Hellier, Ky., and Stonega, Va.

Sorely needed is a plan of development based on the total environment of Appalachia, a plan that indexes and utilizes all its resources of people, soil, water, timber, and minerals to build a viable economy and a healthy social order for the entire territory. The accentuation of a spotty prosperity will make the rich wealthier still without alleviating the misery of the poor. This is a reversal of American policy in the development of the Tennessee Valley and of our great western territories. Here is a new national policy which declares that when an American region falls into misfortune, only a few of the people and only a part of the land will be rescued, with the aid going to those who need it least.

What, then, will be the consequence of this loudly trumpeted legislation for putting more than $1 billion of taxpayers' money into Appalachia? If we ask, in a paraphrase of John Kennedy, not what it will do for us but for our country, the answer has to be a dismal one. The future of Appalachia is bleak indeed. The absentee landlords are pillaging the countryside of its coal, oil, gas, and timber. With the exception of a few counties in Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and North Carolina, little of value is being manufactured anywhere in the huge territory. PARC's scheme will accelerate the bleeding of resources without relieving the region's most pressing ills. The hopes of the people have been stirred. Disillusionment is sure to follow. The old people are dying. The young are leaving. The middle-aged subsist on the dole. In the estimation of the corporations that control the resources, most of the inhabitants are simply superfluous. Their lands or worn out. They possess no skills that the Nation needs. Perhaps if they are retrained, they, too, will go away and stop bothering the public conscience. Appalachia is becoming a dark island near the heart of America, peopled in large measure by benumbed human relics and totally despoiled of its natural resources.

Perhaps the superhighways the Governors, PARC, and Congress have prescribed will bring some tourists to shake their heads sadly over this end result of man's greed and folly. It has been said that Appalachia, like Rip Van Winkle, slept through an entire age. Its backwoods people went to sleep in the agricultural age and were little disturbed until the dawn of the age of cybernetics.

Perhaps so. In any event, those who had hoped for a meaningful Appalachian development program as far reaching and revolutionary as was TVA 30 years ago have been bitterly disappointed. Unless Congress takes a new look at its number one trouble spot and unless the American public is aroused as the people of England were aroused over the fate of Wales 40 years ago, Appalachia can go back to sleep—the sodden sleep of the impoverished, the embittered, and the hopeless.

Tribute to Mrs. Alice Wainwright, Vice Mayor, Miami, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it was once a tradition that a woman's name should appear in print only twice—when she married and when she died. Today, this custom is merely a remembrance of the past. In this Chamber and in legislative halls across the country, we have come to recognize the dedication, accomplishment, and the political acumen of talented American women.

One of the most energetic and effective public servants whom I have known serves as vice mayor of Miami. Mrs. Alice Wainwright is the first woman commissioner in the city's history and has played a leading role in that post.

Mrs. Wainwright, a respected attorney, has become a leading figure in the campaign for a more beautiful Miami. She has been persistent in her efforts to secure the attractive and novel landscaping that characterizes our city and which is essential to a tourist- and resident-oriented community.

Among her many significant legislative accomplishments, her successful efforts for the commission to hire a professional city planner and create a separate planning department stand out. She also was instrumental in changing the charter to make surface drainage improvements a citywide obligation and remove this financial burden from individual property owners. Her efforts to change the State inventory tax will be put to test this November, as voters express their opinion on a constitutional amendment to this effect.

Mrs. Wainwright's name has become familiar to all the citizens of Miami, for the area's news media have oftentimes elaborated on her important activities. While her concrete accomplishments have been many, Mrs. Wainwright has been most appreciated for her personal contributions to the commission's work. Her efficient and dedicated service has never lacked the personal charm that has marked her public career.

All of us in Miami were greatly concerned when, in December 1963, Mrs. Wainwright was hospitalized. Although her condition has greatly improved, she has decided not to seek reelection. While we understand her decision, it comes as a great loss to the government of our community.

The commission has agreed to build a park in the city and name it in Mrs. Wainwright's honor. This is a suitable tribute to a most worthy citizen and public servant.

I join the many citizens of Miami, Fla., who say, "Thank you, Alice Wainwright, for a job well done, and for your continuing interest in civic affairs."

Government by Guideline: A New Threat to Economic Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Champion, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank, delivered an address before the Illinois Bankers Association on May 25, 1965.

The following is a condensation of that talk, as published by the Tax Review of the Tax Foundation:

GOVERNMENT BY GUIDELINE: A NEW THREAT TO ECONOMIC FREEDOM

(By George Champion)

A trend that has alarmed me increasingly and should concern all citizens is the trend in Washington toward government by guideline. There are guidelines for wages and prices, guidelines for labor-management behavior, guidelines for antitrust enforcement, guidelines for television advertising—even guidelines for how much you put in the collection plate on Sunday. Bankers have been given a special set of guidelines for the balance of payments and for lending rates. In fact, there seem to be guidelines for almost everything except the size of the Federal Government.

At the rate we're going, that's likely to keep getting bigger and bigger as the 2,400 departments, bureaus, agencies, and commissions issue more and more guidelines.

In my judgment, the new trend toward government by guideline is one of the most insidious and dangerous on the national scene today, and one which businessmen should work to reverse with all the energy and dedication they can muster. The guideline approach represents a giant step away from self-reliance and personal responsibility, and toward Federal domination of our national economy.

Of course, all of us acknowledge that private enterprise under mid-20th century conditions could not function, much less flourish without some degree of Federal supervision. In times of emergency, American business and finance have had an exemplary record of cooperation with Government authorities, and I am sure that will always be the case. But government by guideline is being looked upon in Washington not as a temporary emergency measure but as a permanent way of economic life. It differs in two cardinal respects from anything we have known in the line of supervision in the past.

One is its manner: the facade of friendliness and partnership between Government and business. Nobody talks any more about such mundane matters as controls or regulation. Now that the New Frontier has come under the civilizing influence of the Great

Society, terms like these are considered uncouth. Instead, the talk is about reasoning together and voluntary restraint. The bureacrat has been replaced by the consensuscrat.

But always in the background is the subtle threat that failure to comply with the guidelines voluntarily will bring sternly coercive measures—measures applied, for the most part, without public debate in the Halls of Congress or legal appeal in the courts.

Guidelines have become an increasingly important aspect of the Government's economic policy since 1962 when they were first suggested by the Council of Economic Advisers in connection with wages and prices. Originally, they were described in Government circles as a contribution to public discussion of how the national interest might be judged in the case of private wage-price decisions. Gradually, however, suggestions and exhortations were reinforced by specific formulas and took on new authority.

A timely example of the Government's manner of handling the so-called voluntary approach may be found in the balance-of-payments guidelines. American corporations with large overseas operations were advised to improve their balance-of-payments position this year 15 to 20 percent—by expanding exports, bringing home dollars held abroad, and deferring wherever possible new plant commitments in Europe. In February, the Federal Reserve Board set out more than a dozen retroactive guidelines for holding the growth of bank lending abroad to 105 percent of what it was at the end of 1964.

As invariably happens, though, there are exceptions to the guidelines, and exceptions breed inconsistencies and inequities. For one thing, if part of a foreign loan is guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank, the entire loan is exempt from the 105-percent ceiling; in other words, there are guidelines for everybody but the Government.

The balance-of-payments rules point up one of the most serious drawbacks of the whole guideline approach—the tendency to avoid basic causes and deal only with symptoms. The Government's program consists of short-run measures aimed at achieving quick results, while the balance of payments is and has been essentially a long-run problem. To bring about a lasting solution, in my judgment, we must take such fundamental steps as curtailing military spending overseas, particularly in Europe; working resolutely toward a balanced budget; and permitting a firming up of interest rates so that ours in the United States are more competitive with world rates. I have seen no evidence to substantiate the claim that you can achieve permanent solutions simply by issuing a few voluntary guidelines.

GOVERNMENT MOVE INTO DECISIONMAKING PROCESS RAISES FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS

Moreover, to call such a program voluntary is like calling our beloved New York Mets a baseball team—the words don't quite fit the facts. Businessmen are only too well aware that if they refuse to go along with the program, they must suffer the consequences—and the consequences can be painful in an economy where Federal expenditures account for 20 percent of the gross national product.

The second way in which government-by-guideline differs from the supervision we have known in the past is its vast scope, in terms of dollars spent and power applied.

There has been great fanfare about the administration's holding the Federal budget under the magic $100 billion mark. Much has been said about the fact that the budget for the new fiscal year represents an increase of only $2 billion over the old one. However, this applies to the so-called administrative budget. A more revealing total, by far, is the cash budget which includes the Federal trust funds for social security, highways and the like. This budget is put at $127.4 billion, an increase of $6 billion. And if Congress enacts the administration's new programs to bring about the Great Society, Federal cash outlays by 1970 will top $150 billion.

At the rate the Government is spending now, our budget is likely to reach the moon before we do.

Yet if you raise a question in Washington about balancing the budget, you run the risk of being hauled off to the Smithsonian for preservation as a quaint curiosity alongside the whooping crane and the dodo bird.

Sometimes figures tell a story more graphically than words. Consider these figures, for example:

One dollar out of every five spent in the United States and one job of every eight now flow from the Federal Government.

Federal loan and credit activities such as those of the Rural Electrification Administration now embrace 48 agencies using some $75 billion in direct or contingent liabilities in taxpayer funds.

In 30 of the 50 States, the Federal Government has more civilian employees on its payroll than the State governments.

Federal grants to States and localities have more than tripled in the past decade.

With this largess has come a new round of guidelines from Washington because Federal officials seldom advance funds without insisting that recipients meet certain specifications.

So we have a situation in which farmers in the most remote county are supervised by Washington-appointed officials. Hot lunches in our schools are subsidized and regulated by central authority. Medicare, aid to education, urban renewal, the antipoverty program—all these are controlled primarily from Washington. Thus the Federal Government is moving into the decisionmaking process to a degree and in a manner which seem to me to raise fundamental questions.

Do the Government's new activities interfere with the operation of the free market system?

Do they invalidate price as an index of the demand for products and services, and of the costs incurred in their production?

Do they weaken the regulatory force of competition?

These are the questions we as a nation have always asked in trying to determine whether Government activities went too far, whether they tended to create a planned economy, to regiment industry, and to imperil economic freedom. When we raise such questions today with respect to some of our guidelines—and more particularly with the guideline approach—the answers come back resoundingly in the affirmative. Interference with the free market system? Government-by-guideline is based on the assumption that bureaucrats know more than the market, that they can readily comprehend all the complexities of economic life. While in the market economy individuals and businesses plan for themselves, it is the essence of Government planning that the authorities plan for everybody. While in the market economy planning is largely voluntary, the characteristic of Government planning is that it is backed by the full power of the State implying the use of coercive authority.

The consequences of trying to substitute central planning for the market system are most clearly illustrated today in the case of Soviet Russia. There we are seeing a deliberate campaign by the Communist planners to unplan part of their economy.

Yet isn't it ironic that while the Communists are flirting with the old bugaboo of Marxism—the market economy—we in the United States appear to be leaning more and more in the direction of central planning?

INTEREST RATE AREA TARGET FOR GOVERNMENT BY GUIDELINE

The wage-price guidelines are a case in point. The Federal Government has undertaken to tell labor and management in the steel industry how it thinks prices and wages should be fixed in the next 3 years.

Dr. Arthur F. Burns, formerly Chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, argues persuasively that wage-price guidelines could have dangerous consequences for the economy. If they exerted the influence intended, he believes, they could throttle the forces of competition, become a drag on economic growth and efficiency, and lead to an economy which would be almost indistinguishable from one in which wages and prices were set by Government fiat.

Even closer to home is the example of interest rates. It is a peculiarity of our times that, while no one questions the desirability of a drop in these rates, many people in Washington view their rise as an infallible sign that the whole economy is going to pieces. Consequently, this area has been a prime target for government by guideline.

You'll recall that last November the Federal Reserve raised its rediscount rate and lifted the ceiling on interest rates that banks could pay for time and savings deposits. Simultaneously, however, the Government took vigorous action to dampen any tendency for lending rates to rise. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve, the Secretary of the Treasury, and finally the President himself spoke out to the effect that there was no justification for a rise in commercial-bank lending rates.

This was clearly an interference with the operation of our free-market system, and it raises some intriguing questions. Does anyone in the United States, including the President himself, have any special knowledge of just what specific interest rates—or specific steel prices, for that matter—ought to be? Economists agree that our knowledge in this area is sharply limited. It is the great advantage of the market system that puts this limited knowledge to work effectively. The consumer knows what he wants in a way that cannot be guessed by someone sitting in high authority; the manager knows how to produce it in the most economical way. So as our society grows increasingly complex, the market system actually becomes more, not less, essential.

Another question raised by the Presidential intervention on interest rates is this: When government concentrates on holding bank lending rates and long-term interest rates down to preconceived levels, doesn't this invalidate the whole economic function of such rates?

Interest, after all, is the vital balance wheel between savings and investment. When investment demand is strong, individuals and corporations will increase their borrowings. Banks and other lending institutions must get more money to lend, and to do so they must pay more to attract the saver. Money costs more, so banks have to charge more. When demand for borrowing is weak, it would be natural for interest rates to fall. Such fluctuation in the price of money, as in the price of any other item, far from being an unsettling influence on the national economy, is really a built-in stabilizing factor. In boom times, higher rates encourage savings as against spending, thus reducing inflationary pressures; in slack times, lower rates stimulate spending, thus helping to move the economy ahead.

The achievement of sound money, a dependable currency system and satisfactory economic growth requires open and competitive markets. Such markets cannot thrive when the Government is manipulating specific wages, prices, and interest rates. It is significant, I think, that Japan and the countries of Western Europe, which have

had the highest interest rates in recent years, have also enjoyed the fastest growth rates.

Another area where the Federal Government is making alarming inroads is education, which has been looked upon historically as a local responsibility. A sign of the times emerged just recently from Senate debate on the Federal aid-to-education bill. Senator PETER DOMINICK, of Colorado, proposed an amendment that would have empowered the States themselves, rather that the Federal Government, to approve applications for the supplemental education centers to be set up under the legislation. In other words, no Federal project could be started without the specific approval of the State. Now, you would think that a proposal so much in keeping with our whole posture on education would have been endorsed almost without dissent. Instead, the administration passed the word on Capitol Hill that it was opposed to this plan and it was overwhelmingly defeated.

It is not unusual to encounter in Washington and on our college campuses people who would like to sweep away the whole concept of State and local powers. A centralized domination, with States and localities reduced to mere administrative units, they argue, would be far more efficient. They seem to forget the lesson of history that such centralization flouts basic rights, weakens the moral fiber of the people, restricts individual decisionmaking, and in the long run would destroy the incentives that have made our country and our economy the envy and aspiration of the world.

The case of the government that thinks it knows more than the marketplace about how to run the economy is nothing new in history. This was one of the root causes of the American Revolution. The English system of mercantilism was based on government regulation of every aspect of the economy, including the colonies. The American colonists objected and eventually fought to enforce their will.

Today, those of us who believe that the trend toward centralization poses a grave threat to economic freedom must also be willing to fight.

I am convinced that this trend can be reversed. But it can be done only by a determined people willing to speak up and work hard for the things they believe in—for government policies that provide a favorable environment for the private economy, that promote competition and avoid government intervention, that leave private individuals with more of their own money for their own purposes, that avoid both inflation and deflation.

I hear few voices raised today in support of these policies. Indeed, there has been an almost total absence of constructive critical comment from the business community with regard to the administration's programs.

It's up to every citizen—to you and to me—to speak out for individual freedom of choice, personal responsibility, and sound fiscal policies. There are no government guidelines for these concepts, yet the total experience of the American people has demonstrated their validity beyond challenge.

They have always been our greatest source of strength. And they are our best hope for the future.

Washington Policy: Mix, Mix, Mix

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have previously called the attention of the President and this House to the unreasonable and even sadistic policy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in going far outside of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in its bureaucratic orders of compliance.

The result is destroying our essential and precious institutions, such as hospitals and schools.

I know that the South is greatly misunderstood, but I would like for my colleagues who have a limited knowledge and understanding of the southern position to give attention to the excellent editorial of Publisher B. T. Burson in the Camilla, Ga., Enterpise. This followed closely behind the announcement by hospital authorities that 19 employees were necessarily laid off of their jobs because HEW orders resulted in a bed occupancy of approximately half of normal.

Mr. Speaker, the White House and the Democratic leadership should ponder well the last paragraph if they have any political regard for us whatsoever.

The editorial follows:

[From the Camilla Enterprise, June 23, 1965]

HOW FAR MUST WE GO?

It appears to this newspaper that the Federal Government in all their zeal to enforce the various parts of the Civil Rights Act have exceeded the intent of Congress and have begun to meddle in private affairs and business.

There are many parts of the act and much controversy about various parts of the act but the basic intent was to assure all citizens equal treatment under the law. They wanted to guarantee by law that no citizen would be denied use of any public facility on the basis of race, creed or national origin.

This was stated many, many times.

The application of some of the aspects of the law however differ from the way the law reads and the way the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is seeking to apply it.

Take the schools for example—the law specifically states that it is not the intent of the law to correct racial imbalance—that is count out everybody like black and white peas in equal stacks or blocks—however in the application by the Department they are clearly seeking ways to force an equal distribution. They cannot tolerate an area which divides itself up in an unbalanced manner and prefers to remain that way. Their method is simply to reject the plans of the various school district without any specific details as to why—and ask for resubmission of plan after plan until at last the school administration catches on that to succeed they must go out and recruit some students of different races and mix them up to satisfy Washington. The fact that hardships are created, education is diminished, people are upset, has no bearing—all they want to see is salt and pepper everywhere they look in the South. This is the sole purpose of everything they are now doing.

Take the Mitchell County Hospital—all barriers and signs were taken down months ago. Both races have been making equal use and have free access of both lobbies for sometime. In the plans for the addition to the hospital—a third lobby was being planned as there already was insufficient space. HEW comes along and observes that there will be a natural separation—by free choice mind you—as long as there are two units for the same purpose—so the order is given to close the one lobby and have only one. This forces everybody to use the same one and at an inconvenience and crowding to the public. But Washington must be satisfied. Little does it matter that service is impaired or the situation worsened—just mix, mix, mix.

The same unthinking rule is being applied to admission policy—always patients have asked to be put in rooms with their friends. Always the local hospital in slack seasons has sought to provide one person to a room until it started filling up—although many were only paying semi-private rates. Washington says this is all wrong—stack them in like cord wood—fill this room, then this room, then this room. People are not people with illnesses, feelings, wishes, hopes and ambitions—they are a number which must fit into the probability tables of the social planners. Here again the welfare of people, the quality of the service rendered, is secondary to the issue of mix, mix, mix at all cost.

How thinking people of this country could allow themselves to be boxed in by a minority group into such a ridiculous position is beyond our reasoning. The country as a whole agrees to equal facilities and services to everyone. This is an established fact. The present administration policy seems to be to make these five southern States eat crow—before you do anything else.

If the policies which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are carrying out in the South currently were on a nationwide basis—the incumbent administration would not long remain in Washington.

Office of Economic Opportunity Program Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD the attached memorandum prepared for the task force on economic opportunity regarding the OEO program budget:

The Office of Economic Opportunity received an appropriation of $785.4 million for fiscal year 1965, although $947.5 million had been authorized in Public Law 88-452. As of the end of May 1965, about $650 million had been obligated and the OEO expressed confidence that they would end the fiscal year with a small deficit. For fiscal year 1966, the OEO had asked for $1.5 billion, but H.R. 8283, as reported by Congressman POWELL's Education and Labor Committee, increased this amount to $1.9 billion.

More than half of the total appropriation is funded for title I (Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and work-study programs) and title U (community action and adult basic education programs). In general, it is difficult to break down all of the total appropriations by States, but it can be done for individual programs requiring allocation by State. There are three such programs—the adult basic education program ($19 million appropriation) has been distributed fairly evenly. The work-study program shows considerable variation on a State-by-State basis, but the amount involved is $56 million. With respect to the third program, which is the largest of all the single pieces with $235 million appropriated, we have provided the enclosed statistical analysis. The first column shows authorized estimates for fiscal year 1965 and the next two columns the percentage alloted in March and April of 1965. You will probably notice that the correspondence between allotment and need (i.e., the number of poor people in the State) is not very good. In considering H.R. 8283, the Congress should remember that the Director of OEO has the power to allot these funds as he sees fit—there is no assurance that a State will

actually receive even a dollar of its authorization. Since the District of Columbia has already received almost twice its authorized estimate, Congress should consider establishing a safeguard for the proper distribution of these funds: no State shall receive more than its appropriated share until all States have received, for example, at least 50 percent of their estimate.

Community action program

State	Authorized estimates for June 1965	Percentage alloted in March	Percentage alloted in April	Percentage of families of income under $3,000 (in 1959)
Alabama	$6,132,163	3.2	6.2	39.1
Alaska	251,404	24.4	6.2	14.6
Arizona	1,621,015	156.1	169.3	21.3
Arkansas	3,133,323	5.0	10.0	47.7
California	18,005,345	47.2	53.5	14.1
Colorado	1,886,089	8.2	9.8	18.3
Connecticut	2,080,020	75.6	80.8	9.8
Delaware	381,220	10.6	80.8	16.0
Florida	5,435,424	4.2	59.8	28.4
Georgia	5,572,475	26.0	27.4	35.6
Hawaii	527,294	4.7	27.4	12.9
Idaho	604,957	18.5	32.4	20.8
Illinois	9,416,462	49.0	49.9	15.0
Indiana	3,068,750	10.7	12.4	18.0
Iowa	2,397,615	0	1.8	25.3
Kansas	1,704,703	2.0	1.8	22.3
Kentucky	4,837,770	46.3	49.0	38.1
Louisiana	5,748,485	5.0	49.0	35.6
Maine	1,005,725	2.5	49.0	22.8
Maryland	2,601,297	80.0	84.3	15.3
Massachusetts	4,780,084	24.7	26.4	12.5
Michigan	7,124,420	68.4	71.7	15.8
Minnesota	3,551,692	21.1	35.0	21.4
Mississippi	5,691,618	.9	2.9	51.6
Missouri	5,256,311	22.1	30.1	27.0
Montana	624,604	0	0	20.2
Nebraska	$1,055,919	8.0	0	26.1
Nevada	255,439	59.6	0	12.3
New Hampshire	420,138	6.0	0	15.2
New Jersey	5,394,533	26.1	43.9	11.4
New Mexico	1,210,859	89.3	90.8	24.3
New York	16,686,653	23.1	20.3	13.8
North Carolina	7,329,255	13.5	17.7	37.1
North Dakota	660,693	63.2	77.9	28.8
Ohio	8,769,185	20.8	28.4	15.7
Oklahoma	3,257,861	2.4	2.6	30.9
Oregon	1,410,296	52.8	2.6	17.1
Pennsylvania	12,446,547	17.4	2.6	16.9
Rhode Island	1,016,042	8.0	10.5	16.7
South Carolina	4,192,322	2.1	10.5	39.5
South Dakota	805,601	10.4	10.5	33.5
Tennessee	5,465,890	5.4	5.6	38.3
Texas	10,986,082	3.7	8.6	28.7
Utah	824,901	111.6	8.6	14.8
Vermont	372,611	6.7	10.4	23.1
Virginia	3,940,207	3.6	6.5	27.9
Washington	2,989,631	6.8	22.6	15.2
West Virginia	3,743,459	7.5	9.3	32.6
Wisconsin	2,843,731	13.4	15.8	17.4
Wyoming	293,527	0	.9	16.5
District of Columbia	842,453	192.7	.9	17.3
Territories	4,095,000	0	0	21.4

Source: "War on Poverty Projects," Office of Economic Opportunity, Apr. 30, 1965, Mar. 31, 1965; "Statistical Abstract of the United States," 1964, p. 341.

Bill Veeck Tells Why the Braves Are Leaving Milwaukee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on June 7 Sports Illustrated magazine featured an article by "Mr. Baseball" Bill Veeck, describing how a group of shrewd operators took over ownership of the Milwaukee Braves with an eye to making a quick buck.

In this article, which I am including hereafter, Mr. Veeck points out how the tax laws can be manipulated to make an easy fortune, as was done by the new owners of the Milwaukee Braves, should they move the Milwaukee franchise to Atlanta in 1966.

This article is further evidence that at present organized professional baseball is big business first and only secondarily a sport. It demonstrates the urgent need for legislation stripping baseball of its present exemption from the antitrust laws.

Mr. Speaker, many members of this body represent areas of the country which are fortunate to have major league baseball. I urge my colleagues to give this article their close attention. It provides a stern warning of what can happen in their own communities when "get rich" interests obtain control of a baseball club.

The time has come when Congress must act to protect the interests of baseball fans. Passage of my bill, H.R. 6, putting baseball on par with other forms of big business, would be an excellent start.

[From Sports Illustrated, June 7, 1965]

(By Bill Veeck and Ed Linn)

ANOTHER GONE WITH THE WIND

Occasionally I have disagreed with baseball operators—publicly, privately, and semiprivately, in print and out, in summer and in winter, in sickness and in health. I have called them backward, unimaginative, and feckless. I have even been known to assail a few of the more worthy as greedy and rapacious. So how come they don't like me?

Despite these quarrels and an occasional mild rejoinder on their part—like kicking me out of baseball—I have never, until these past couple of years, felt called upon to apologize for having been associated with them or the game.

I have always believed that in their hearts the operators did have some basic affection for and responsibility to the sport and, when pushed to the wall, even some small affection for the customers who support it. It took the newest members of the exalted order of National League franchise owners, the carpetbaggers of Milwaukee, to disabuse me.

The reason that the prospective departure of the Braves from Milwaukee disturbs me so much is that (1) for the first time in the history of franchise switches the deserted town will be left without major-league baseball, and (2) Milwaukee is a town that was moved into. Of course this doesn't concern the carpetbaggers. Here you find a group of would-be hotshots, having no connection with the city and little if any background in baseball, coming in to make a quick buck. If their personal fortune depends on taking a team away from fans who once were the most delirious and openhanded of all time—well, that's free enterprise, folks.

It was Lou Perini, the former owner of the Braves, who seems to have made the first move toward Atlanta. Or rather it was John McHale, then Perini's top lieutenant and now the Braves' president and general manager. McHale is an ex-first baseman who became Detroit's general manager at the age of 35. He is a nice enough guy but he is dull. His career at Milwaukee, and at Detroit before that, has been distinguished by a series of bad trades, trades that did a lot for other ball clubs.

It is on record that McHale visited Atlanta in 1962, a few months before he signed the Braves' final 3-year lease to play at County Stadium in Milwaukee. A new 10-year contract was suggested, but McHale would sign for only 3. By this time it was already known that the Braves were on the market.

There is no doubt at all that Perini had offers from perhaps half a dozen Milwaukee syndicates, because three groups that I remember contacted me about running the team for them. They weren't insubstantial people, either. Joe Uihlein, of the Schlitz beer family, was one of the interested parties. By coincidence, I bumped into him one night in Rochester, Minn., and we had dinner together. Joe was willing to work out all the arrangements so that I would have something like 30-percent ownership, but I had to tell him that I didn't feel like going back to Milwaukee at that time. For those who haven't studied their history, I once owned the Milwaukee Brewers of the American Association.

Perini had been having his troubles with the Milwaukee County park commission over the stadium rental figure, and perhaps he was incensed that the citizens had stopped supporting the team in the record-breaking manner to which he had become accustomed. On the other hand, this was a city that welcomed him when he came limping in from Boston, and it has hardly left him or his construction company any poorer. In fact, he has made a fortune there, although, in fairness, he has given much of that fortune back to the city in the form of charity. Even so, one might have thought, by standards of ordinary street-corner loyalty, that if he wanted to get rid of the team he would sell to local people. He didn't. Instead, he almost pointedly sold the club to a syndicate composed of half a dozen whippersnappers from Chicago, led by Bill Bartholomay.

I know most of these guys. They are all cut from the same bolt of tweed. They are the sons of wealthy families: the ivy-type education, the finance-oriented backgrounds, the family firm. They are so similar, so indistinguishable, that there is no particular value to listing them by name.

They have one final characteristic in common, too: the sum of their total knowledge of baseball is zero.

No, wait a minute. There is one exception, Del Coleman, who runs the Seeburg jukebox company. Coleman made his own money and he has a sizable personal income. Coleman is like the social-climbing wife who is accepted into a charity organization run by socialites because there has to be someone to do the hard, dirty work. Although Coleman is more able than all the rest put together, he seems flattered to be allowed to associate with them.

It was Coleman who came to Hank Greenberg and myself back around 1960 with an offer to buy our 54 percent interest in the White Sox. We had been unable to buy Chuck Comiskey's minority interest but these guys did not seem to have any doubt that Chuck would be more receptive to them. These guys, you have to understand, feel they are entitled to have everything fall into place for them, because it has been their experience—as it had been Gussie Busch's—that the lower classes, for reasons undoubtedly having to do with the wisdom of the Divinity, bow down gracefully and low.

When Hank and I sold our stock to Art Allyn, the carpetbaggers made the same offer to him and got turned down again. That didn't discourage them. They went to Chuck Comiskey and bought the minority 46 percent from him. By refusing to sell to us—or at least to sell enough to give us the 80 percent we needed to reorganize—Chuck had cost the club a tidy little $1,300,000 in taxes. The Bartholomay group quite obviously felt they would wage a battle of nerves against Arthur and force him to sell.

Boy, did they underestimate Arthur. Arthur told them that he not only had no intention of selling his stock but that he had no intention of voting any stock dividends. This left the carpetbaggers with a couple of million dollars tied up in the White Sox, earning nothing. The only comfort they did have was the prestige and publicity that came from being stockholders in a big-league club. But when they showed up at Sarasota in the spring ready to cavort with the ballplayers, Arthur barred them from the field. Your little boy could go out on the field but they couldn't.

Here you have as good a definition of power as any. The man with the controlling stock can go out onto the field and sweat like one of the hired hands. The manager will even tell him he has all the natural ability to have made a great third baseman. If you haven't got the power you can only sulk in the stands and adjust your cap (since Arthur couldn't prevent them from buying caps at the concession stand) in a way that will lead people to think—you hope—that you're an athlete. Arthur had them boxed in nicely.

The carpetbaggers came back from spring training somewhat subdued, and within a month or so they sold their stock to Arthur for the same price they had paid Comiskey. With this triumph, they brushed themselves off and, ever undaunted, looked around for new fields to conquer. Just to the north there were those rumors that Lou Perini, the Lochinvar from the east, wanted out.

The financing of the purchase is of interest to us here because it is directly related to the move to Atlanta.

The carpetbaggers bought controlling interest in the ball club from the Perini Corp. for $5,737,847. With the brokerage fee, the assumption of existing liabilities and the agreement to turn back to the Perini Corp. some money that was due, the total cost of the purchase came to $6,218,480. That's the figure we will be working with from here on in.

And now for the financing: to pay for the club, they were able to borrow $3 million from the First Wisconsin National Bank. I would assume that Lou Perini helped them get that loan. They also borrowed $900,000 from the Marshall & Ilsley Bank on a 120-day note.

In general terms, they had mortgaged the team to the extent of $3 million. The other $900,000 was an unsecured note, but it, too, had been borrowed on behalf of the Milwaukee Braves, not on behalf of the carpetbaggers themselves. As soon as they reorganized and formed their own company, the carpetbaggers sold back 15.4 percent of the stock to the Perini Corp. for $310,000.

When everything shakes out, we find that the carpetbaggers had a personal investment of some $2 million, borrowed from assorted banks, and probably guaranteed by Del Coleman. Not a thing wrong about this, students. On the contrary, I want you to absorb these figures because it is the proper way to buy a ball club or anything else. The more you can borrow in the name of the company, the greater percentage of the total stock you are able to buy for a limited amount of money. This is known, in dugouts and locker rooms throughout the land, as leverage.

But the carpetbaggers' financing had another twist. The 120-day note was due on May 1, 1963, which seemed to mean that our boys would still have to go out and borrow another $900,000 on their own names. That kind of thing does not help the leverage at all.

But they had that figured out, too. Their plan was to pay it back and give themselves a little working capital as well by selling 115,000 shares of stock to the residents of Wisconsin at about $10 a share, the same price they and the Perini Corp. had paid. If all the stock was sold to outsiders, the Perini Corp.'s share of ownership would be diluted to 9.8 percent. The public would own 36.4 percent and the carpetbaggers would still have a controlling interest of 53.8 percent.

It was confidently anticipated, it seems, that the fans would be so overjoyed at this opportunity to become part owners of their ball club that they would snap up the offering. From everything I heard, the carpetbaggers fully expected the issue to be oversubscribed.

It didn't happen that way at all. Their basic premise about the stock issue was just as bad as their basic premise that Arthur Allyn was a lamb.

Chicago is the last place on earth anybody should come from if he wants to sell stock in Milwaukee. Milwaukee has such an inferiority complex where Chicago is concerned that anybody from the latter is suspect. If you do have the misfortune to be from Chicago, it would be just as well if you are not part of a phalanx of polished young financiers. To the folks of Milwaukee, the whole deal had the uncomfortable smell of city slickers coming in to take over.

There was another handicap that was almost as bad. Perini had already given Milwaukeeans an opportunity to buy a financial interest in the Braves. When the Perini Corp. went public in June 1961, Lou had put the ball club into the corporation as a way of giving the offering a touch of glamour. However, the stock came out at the end of the bull market and was caught in the subsequent slide. The issue sold at something like 13, opened at around 11, and very quickly plummented to 3½.

So anybody who had wanted to own a piece of the Braves had already bought it. And all he had to show for it was a loss. Any impulse to buy it a second time was not difficult to restrain.

Only 11 percent of the new offering sold, a blow to the carpetbaggers. Under the terms of the stock issue they were obliged to buy any of the stock that had not been snapped up, which meant they had to run back to the money marts to borrow another million dollars or so, at what I would assume were considerably worse than prime rates.

The stock issue laid such a bomb that it should have been obvious that it was not a very bright idea. Instead, it seemed only to convince the city slickers that Milwaukee was no longer interested in supporting a big-league team. That's not an unnatural conclusion to reach, I suppose, once you have assumed that you and the team are synonymous. If people are not interested in supporting you and your stock issue they are not interested in supporting you and your team. It is quite possible that the carpetbaggers, in a pet, turned their shiny eyes toward Atlanta the next morning. Why not? Perini and McHale would already have the preliminary information to pass on to them.

The original plans were for the city of Atlanta to fix up old Ponce de Leon Park so that the Braves could move in the following year 1964, while the new Atlanta stadium was under construction. I can't swear that the contracts with Atlanta were promptly signed, but I do know that they were drawn up. The way I know indicates why it is so difficult to keep anything secret in baseball.

The stock issue bombed in April 1963. Then, a few months later, a New York lawyer with whom I am friendly phoned to pass on a piece of information he thought might interest me. He had been in Atlanta on routine business, he said, and on his last day there he had had a farewell lunch with four or five attorneys from the firm with which he had been dealing. When lunch was over, they hastily got up to leave, explaining—by way of apology—that they had to hurry back to the office to get the papers ready for the Milwaukee move to Atlanta.

I immediately called Russ Lynch, who had been the sports editor of the Milwaukee Journal when I was there. Russ, a close friend, had become the conservation writer. Russ found my report exceedingly difficult to believe. Rumors had been floating around for some time, he told me, and he assumed they had simply floated, in somewhat exaggerated form, over to me in Easton, Md. "Russell," I said, "you can take my word for it. They're going to move that ball club. Unless somebody does something, the papers are going to be signed within a day or two. I'm calling to warn you that you had better mobilize your forces at the Journal."

It pains me to say that because they know me in Milwaukee, I am suspect. "Do you have an angle?" Russ asked.

I tried to tell him that I didn't want to see the team leave Milwaukee because I have some thought of getting back into baseball. I could see where this constant moving, this lack of stability—to say nothing about the impression being created of a lack of honor—would have to hurt everybody.

I called Bobby Uihlein of Schlitz, the TV sponsors. Bobby Uihlein is a director of the First Wisconsin National Bank, where the Carpetbaggers have one of their loans (it is known around the Midwest as the Uihlein Bank), and even he couldn't believe they were dealing that seriously with Atlanta.

By coincidence, the majors were holding a meeting in Chicago that same day. Jim Enright, who was covering the meeting anyway for Chicago's American, became suspicious and concentrated on Milwaukee's projected move. Nosing around among his sources, he learned that the Braves had talked to the other clubs, off the record, and that they already had unanimous, if unofficial, permission to go to Atlanta.

The story came back to the Journal from Chicago. Now that they had the same story from a totally different source, they decided it had to be legitimate. Immediately, the Journal began its campaign to stop the carpetbaggers from packing.

If you know you want to leave a city and yet you also know you're stuck there for the rest of the year, you have to tread carefully. When O'Malley was in that spot, he kept saying how heartbroken he would be in an unfeeling city administration forced him to leave his beloved homeland. When Los Angeles officials, unable to contain themselves, kept breaking the news that the Dodgers were theirs, O'Malley would make clever comments about the reliability of politicians in an election year, sprinkling his words with grins and winks. It was a strategy that served O'Malley well. He never went on the record with a flat denial, and he conned everybody into thinking he was merely using Los Angeles to force the New York officials to give him what he wanted.

The carpetbaggers didn't have an O'Malley among them, of course, because the O'Malleys don't travel in packs. "We didn't buy the Milwaukee franchise to move it to Atlanta," was what Bartholomay said. "How do those things get started?"

Barked McHale: "Absolutely nothing to it. We recognized when we bought the club that we had a rebuilding job to do. Any city that can average attendance around a million and a half for 10 years as Milwaukee has and average over 2 million for 5 years must certainly have basic baseball interest. It's up to us to stir it up again."

The Journal's campaign apparently caused everybody to pull back. At the very least, it ended any thought of trying to move while there was only a minor league stadium, and a bad one at that, to play in. When plans for a new stadium began to take shape in Atlanta, the carpetbaggers continued to act as if the whole thing were a complete surprise to them. "I can't imagine the Braves anywhere but in Milwaukee," Bartholomay said. "We bought this club to play in Milwaukee, not in Atlanta, or Seattle, or San Diego."

On September 23, 1963, with the season coming to an end, McHale made a formal statement on behalf of the carpetbaggers: "The Braves will be in Milwaukee today, tomorrow, next year, and as long as we are welcome." To connoisseurs of this kind of thin-ice skating, it was apparent that the carpetbaggers were going to set their own standards as to how many paying customers constituted a wholehearted welcome.

The following February, with another season about to begin, Bartholomay said, "The Braves are going to play in and for Milwaukee; we are not moving elsewhere no matter what you hear * * *. I think that the day of transferring franchises is pretty well over * * *." Then, on April 10, Bartholomay said, "We are positively not moving. We're playing in Milwaukee—whether you're talking of 1964, 1965, or 1975."

As the season progressed, it became apparent that, while the Braves might not be going anywhere, some of their property was. For some reason, too baffling for the human mind, the Braves shipped some of their equipment and records down to Atlanta. The scoreboard for the Atlanta Stadium, it was learned, was being decorated with the Braves' emblem, and the contractor had been offered a $700,000 bonus to have the park ready by opening day of 1965. If we didn't have Bartholomay's word for it, it would almost have seemed as if the Braves intended to transfer their franchise.

For their part, the carpetbaggers continued to be bewildered by all the malicious talk. On July 2 McHale said, "We have definitely made no commitment of any kind to any other city. We have a commitment with the county extending through 1965 and we intend to keep it * * *. How many times do we have to keep answering?"

Two days later, after the Fourth of July fireworks show, the Braves cut off all promotions of their front office and maintenance personnel. That same day Bartholomay, still puzzled by the ugly rumors, said, "Only our board of directors could make a meaningful commitment of this magnitude. This matter has never come up for vote, nor is it scheduled for any future board meeting."

In August, Louisville Sports Editor Earl Ruby quoted an Atlanta advertising man as saying he had an appointment with representatives of the Braves to discuss sponsorship of a radio and television setup in Georgia and surrounding States. "It's the wildest of the wild," said Bartholomay, dismissing it with the good-natured contempt it so obviously deserved.

"It's the same old story we've been hearing for months and years," said McHale, beginning to weary of this hopeless battle against calumny.

But somehow, when the Jos. Schlitz Brewing Company offered the Braves a three-year radio and television deal, McHale sang a different song. "There are many other factors and considerations which we must study in the overall picture of major league baseball here," he said. The words may have been "Hello, Dolly!" but the actions were Good Night, Irene."

As late as October 11, 1964, Bill Bartholomay could say, "We didn't buy the club to sell it and we didn't buy it to move it. If it works out that way, it will be a personal disappointment."

Three days later Bartholomay, not struggling noticeably to hide his personal disappointment, announced that the Braves were "considering" the move to Atlanta. And not long after that the "considering" became definite.

Who'd have thought it?

When they do move next year, the carpetbaggers can't help but make money in Atlanta, because they have a TV contract that guarantees success. In Atlanta the sponsors are hitting the entire Southeast. In Milwaukee, where they are jammed between Chicago and Minneapolis, the market area is severely limited.

In their contract with the city, as I understand it, the carpetbaggers are being given the concessions, the right to set their ticket prices (not to exceed the highest price anywhere else) and some 6,000 parking spaces. The city put up $280,000 to buy the territorial rights from Bill McKechnie, owner of the Atlanta Crackers, and an additional sum to be applied toward the indemnity to the International League. It is also supplying money for moving costs.

There has been a lot of conversation around that Coca-Cola (one of the TV sponsors in Atlanta) has agreed to underwrite whatever losses the Braves may suffer in their final year in Milwaukee. My information is somewhat different. What Coca-Cola has agreed to do, so I've heard, is to advance them money against their TV contract in Atlanta so that they will be able to operate in Milwaukee this year without having to borrow. But I have also heard that the carpetbaggers are negotiating new loans in Atlanta to cover their existing loans in Milwaukee and elsewhere.

The big loan, you will remember, is the $3 million at the First Wisconsin National Bank. The first payment ($500,000) would have fallen due on June 1, 1966, the second a year later, and the final $2 million on June 1, 1968. There had to be profits or the poor chaps would have had to pay for the club themselves, a terrible fate.

It is almost impossible not to make money on a baseball club when you are buying it new, because, unless you become inordinately successful, you pay no income tax at all. It is, in fact, quite possible for a big-league club to go on forever without paying any income tax. All that is necessary is that it be sold often enough.

Look, we play "The Star-Spangled Banner" before every game. You want us to pay income taxes too? There are those chronic critics who are forever complaining that baseball is a favored business because of our special exemptions from the antitrust laws. Given certain very pleasant conditions, we also have a tax writeoff that might have been figured out by a Texas oilman.

It wasn't figured out by a Texas oilman. It was in part figured out by a Chicago hustler. Me. But it was perfected by Nate Dolin, to whom I sold the Cleveland Indians. He worked out the details and brought the plan to fruition.

I probably should keep my mouth shut about it, because I may be buying another club myself someday. If I'm going to explain this, though, I will have to do it right. Besides, it's the kind of a financial gimmick that is worth the best efforts of all would-be hustlers.

I will keep the historical background brief and, let us all hope, decently lucid. Historically, when you bought a ball club you bought the ballplayers as part of the inventory, just as you'd be buying the machines in a manufacturing plant. In liquidating the old company and forming your new company, you simply transferred the players, like any other assets, from their books to yours. When you bought a player yourself, you charged him off as an operating expense, like any other operating expense.

It seemed to me far more logical in forming the new company to buy the players from the old company when you liquidate, in distinct and separate transactions. Once you did this, you had assets, which you could depreciate over a period of time. If you expect to make a lot of money fast, you're better off being able to write them off as quickly as possible. If you don't except to strike a bonanza, the longer you can spread it out the better. OK?

The first thing you have to decide, then, is how much of the purchase price you can attribute to the players. Since they are the same players, no matter what valuation you place upon them, the more you can charge off against them the better.

OK, what are you buying when you buy a big-league ball club? You are buying three things: the franchise, the players' contracts, and a place to play; i.e., either a park or a lease that allows you to play in somebody else's park. (The park can be depreciated too, but this is covered by a guideline and it takes some 33⅓ years to write off the basic concrete and steel structure.)

In our case in point, Milwaukee played in County Stadium, so no park was involved in the purchase. That leaves only the franchise and the players' contracts. The less you can charge off to the franchise, the more you are paying for the players. It has become customary in recent years to place the worth of the franchise at $50,000—almost a token figure. The Government has not wholly accepted this evaluation, and has, in fact, challenged it in New York, Cleveland, and Detroit. (You will notice that in expansion there was no charge for the francise at all. The initiation fee took the form of exorbitant prices for lousy ballplayers.) Still, $50,000 was the price which the carpetbaggers, following the general practice, used. Everything else was attributed to the players.

Everything means everything. It means not only the price that was paid to the Perini Corp. but the entire cost of the acquisition (including the $180,000 broker fee, the bills they were taking over from the Perini Corp. and the accounts receivable that still belonged to the Perini Corp.). After the $50,000 had been deducted, the figure came to $6,168,480.

Being aware that the days of the 2 million annual attendances were ended, the carpetbaggers depreciated the players over the full 10-year period. What all this means, students, is that for the first 10 years of their operation they have an annual tax writeoff of $616,848. Put in a slightly different way, they will pay no Federal taxes

on their first $616,848 profit. Since the corporate tax is set at 48 percent, they would thus save $296,087 per year. If you want to be cynical you might even say that the Government was paying half of their purchase price for them.

After that original $616,848 profit, they do pay taxes, right? Well, if they're silly they do. In baseball, the cost of player replacement is a very considerable item. I would suspect that anybody who was unable to find a way to spend his surplus profits on new players is in the wrong business.

After 10 years, though, you are on your own. Right? You have written off almost the entire purchase price and you have been charging off your new player purchases as a normal operating expense. The time has come to face the world without the aid and comfort of the Internal Revenue Service.

You haven't learned a thing, have you? After 10 years, you sell. And the guy you sell to can start depreciating his entire purchase price (less $50,000) all over again.

Because here's the thing; as a seller, you are selling more than just the franchise and the players. You are selling the right to depreciate. This is the real reason why the price of ball clubs has been going up, up, up into the stratosphere.

The more the price goes up, the more the ballplayers are worth and the higher the tax writeoff becomes. But as the price goes up, it also becomes more and more difficult for an individual to buy a ball club. Even with a syndicate like the carpetbaggers the cost of borrowing money gets to be something of a drag. As a result, the corporations have been moving in. CBS is the horrible example, but Autrey, Fetzer, Busch et al. have all bought their clubs on behalf of a corporate empire. A corporation not only has the money, but any losses incurred by the ball club can be offset against corporate profits if the club is operated as a division of the corporation. Old-line owners don't enjoy this kind of writeoff, of course. On the other hand, they bought their clubs at a fraction of what they go for today.

As new owners put their clubs up for sale once their writeoff period comes to an end or as old sportsmen die, the corporations will take over. Private syndicates like the carpetbaggers will move the club before they will sacrifice these carryover losses. Because there is that one catch to the writeoffs. You have to make profits to utilize the losses. If you make no profits you save nothing.

The carpetbaggers, with their huge bank loans, were not making any money in Milwaukee. They were not losing what they claimed to be losing either. Their book loss in 1964 was about $45,000, but since the interest on their loan came to $150,000 it is obvious that they really had a net income from operations of more than $104,000.

What they were losing were all those beautiful carryover losses. No one can sympathize with them more than me because I know that 100-cent dollars are the hardest ones to lose. By the end of 1965 a lot of crisp green dollars will have slipped away from the carpetbaggers.

Ah, but not completely. The money has not yet gone with the wind. The tax laws allow you to carry forward this kind of operating loss over a 5-year period. When the carpetbaggers go marching into Atlanta, with their ragged band of Braves, they should really be singing "We Shall Overtake." They still have 3 years to overtake the first year's writeoff, 4 years to overtake the second year, and 5 years to overtake the third.

In those first few years at Atlanta, when enthusiasm will be at a peak—and profits quite probably guaranteed—they will not only be getting their fixed annual depreciation, they will be picking up the 3 years they have lost.

So why should they stay in Milwaukee? They're in the game to make money, aren't they? Would I, you are entitled to ask, turn my back on big money?

I don't know what I'd do. My resistance to money has not always been inspiring. There's one thing I do know, though, I do know that this floating crap game is bad for baseball. I do know that the Milwaukee situation has disgusted the entire Nation. Nobody connected with baseball seems to want to stop this trend except Art Allyn.

That leaves it up to Commissioner Ford Frick, who is presumably meant to represent the interests of baseball when those interests conflict with the understandably selfish interests of individual owners. Frick? No need to tell you how he stands on the carpetbagger affair. Why, he considers it a league matter.

No Giant Surprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, no achievement that Benjamin Bradbury Cheney might make in the field of sports could really surprise his wide circle of friends and fans. He is Mr. Sportsman—and especially Mr. Baseball—of the Pacific Northwest.

But it is gratifying to those friends and admirers, myself among them, to note that he is accorded increasing recognition for his accomplishments and devotion. Indeed, he has become a national figure, an example of what one man can achieve, given sufficient determination and belief in his work.

Ben Cheney has contributed perhaps more than any other individual to sports in the Pacific Northwest. He has launched many young men on important sports careers. He has introduced countless boys to the advantages of competitive sports, making participants out of potential spectators. Thus he has helped immeasurably to keep juvenile delinquency in his hometown far below what it is in many other areas. My own years as a judge on the superior court bench in Pierce County, Wash., brought me a deep appreciation of Ben Cheney's contribution toward keeping delinquency at a minimum.

It was with great pleasure that I noted a nationally respected newspaper's publication of a necessarily brief version of the Ben Cheney story. It is with great pleasure that I invite the attention of my colleagues to the Ben Cheney story as it apeared in the June 28, 1965, edition of the Christian Science Monitor:

NO GIANT SURPRISE

(By Lee Irwin)

PORTLAND, OREG.—It was just a little two-line item * * * "Tacoma lumberman Ben Cheney today was named to the board of directors of the San Francisco Giants."

This came, however, as no great surprise to the home folks in Tacoma. Benjamin Bradbury Cheney, frustrated shortstop, probably is the Pacific Northwest's No. 1 Giant fan.

But that's not all you can say about Cheney. By most any yardstick, he's also the Pacific Northwest's No. 1 sponsor of amateur and semipro athletes. Tocomans say you could expand that claim to take in the whole country.

For over three decades, Cheney has sponsored teams—football teams, hockey teams, baseball teams, basketball teams, bowling teams, etc. He has footed the bill for untold hundreds of youngsters, for the fields, equipment, and supplies they needed.

FITNESS AWARD

This past year, for instance, Cheney sponsored four boys' football leagues, embracing about 120 boys. Then came bowling, and he sponsored about 100 persons in seven bowling leagues.

Next, it was basketball and about 400 boys and young men. Finally, this spring came baseball and about 200 players. Teams sponsored by Cheney have gone to the National AAU basketball tourney in Denver and, in baseball, have won the ABC title (1960).

He recently was nominated for the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce national physical fitness award and in support of the nomination, local Jaycees presented these credentials:

His sponsorship of countless amateur and semipro teams of every description for over three decades.

His part in the drive to bring Pacific Coast League baseball to Tacoma several years ago.

His interests in the San Francisco Giant organization.

PLAYER OF PROMISE

Actually, Cheney is a substantial stockholder in the Giants so his ascension to the directorship is no surprise. He acquired a small block of Giant stock about the time the team moved west, and in 1962, when more became available, picked up another chunk. Reportedly, he now holds more Giant stock than anyone except Horace Stoneham.

Cheney's interest in baseball comes honestly; he was an amateur player of some promise back in the 1920's and 1930's.

"I could catch the ball and had a pretty good arm. But I never could learn to hit the curve," he says. This, about 1935, led Cheney into the sponsorship of kid baseball teams and eventually into his present involvement.

TEAM WORKOUTS

Cheney goes south when the Giants train each spring and actually dons his own uniform for workouts with the team. Occasionally, he even takes a turn at the first-base coaching job.

Cheney, obviously, has made a success of his lumber business, but he did it the hard way. Born in Montana, he was reared by relatives in South Bend, Wash., before he eventually came to Tacoma (in 1921) and went to work in a lumber mill. Then came work, study (at the University of Washington and College of Puget Sound), and ultimately a lumber enterprise which today reaches from Canada into California.

Betts Warns Against Government by Guideline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the growth and complexity of the Federal Government has brought with it a new trend toward Government by guideline. Those of us in the Congress who have urged

cautious action in authorizing Federal officials to establish policies, regulations, and standards which can be imposed on private segments of the economy are now seeing the worst of these practices become realities. A perceptive presentation of this growing danger on the national scene today is contained in the Tax Foundation's Tax Review for June 1965. George Champion, chairman of the board, the Chase Manhattan Bank, provides an excellent description of our Nation's movement toward Federal domination of the economy in his article "Government-by-Guideline: A New Threat to Economic Freedom."

Mr. Speaker, this is a vital subject for consideration by the Congress in its day-to-day deliberations. For that reason I am pleased to present Mr. Champion's article in its entirety:

GOVERNMENT-BY-GUIDELINE: A NEW THREAT TO ECONOMIC FREEDOM

(By George Champion)

A trend that has alarmed me increasingly and should concern all citizens is the trend in Washington toward Government-by-guideline. There are guidelines for wages and prices, guidelines for labor-management behavior, guidelines for antitrust enforcement, guidelines for television advertising, even guidelines for how much you put in the collection plate on Sunday. Bankers have been given a special set of guidelines for the balance of payments and for lending rates. In fact, there seem to be guidelines for almost everything except the size of the Federal Government.

At the rate we're going, that's likely to keep getting bigger and bigger as the 2,400 departments, bureaus, agencies and commissions issue more and more guidelines.

In my judgment, the new trend toward Government-by-guideline is one of the most insidious and dangerous on the national scene today, and one which businessmen should work to reverse with all the energy and dedication they can muster. The guideline approach represents a giant step away from self-reliance and personal responsibility, and toward Federal domination of our national economy.

Of course, all of us acknowledge that private enterprise under mid-20th century conditions could not function, much less flourish without some degree of Federal supervision. In times of emergency, American business and finance have had an exemplary record of cooperation with Government authorities, and I am sure that will always be the case. But Government-by-guideline is being looked upon in Washington not as a temporary emergency measure but as a permanent way of economic life. It differs in two cardinal respects from anything we have known in the line of supervision in the past.

One is its manner: the facade of friendliness and partnership between Government and business. Nobody talks any more about such mundane matters as "controls" or "regulation." Now that the New Frontier has come under the civilizing influence of the Great Society, terms like these are considered uncouth. Instead, the talk is about "reasoning together" and "voluntary restraint." The bureaucrat has been replaced by the "consensuscrat."

But always in the background is the subtle threat that failure to comply with the guidelines voluntarily will bring sternly coercive measures—measures applied, for the most part, without public debate in the Halls of Congress or legal appeal in the courts.

Guidelines have become an increasingly important aspect of the Government's economic policy since 1962 when they were first suggested by the Council of Economic Advisers in connection with wages and prices. Originally, they were described in Government circles as a contribution to public discussion of how the national interest might be judged in the case of private wage-price decisions. Gradually, however, suggestions and exhortations were reinforced by specific formulas and took on new authority.

A timely example of the Government's manner of handling the so-called "voluntary" approach may be found in the balance-of-payments guidelines. American corporations with large overseas operations were advised to improve their balance-of-payments position this year 15 to 20 percent—by expanding exports, bringing home dollars held abroad, and deferring wherever possible new plant commitments in Europe. In February, the Federal Reserve Board set out more than a dozen retroactive guidelines for holding the growth of bank lending abroad to 105 percent of what it was at the end of 1964.

As invariably happens, though, there are exceptions to the guidelines, and exceptions breed inconsistencies and inequities. For one thing, if part of a foreign loan is guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank, the entire loan is exempt from the 105-percent ceiling; in other words, there are guidelines for everybody but the Government.

The balance-of-payments rules point up one of the most serious drawbacks of the whole guideline approach—the tendency to avoid basic causes and deal only with symptons. The Government's program consists of short-run measures aimed at achieving quick results, while the balance of payments is and has been essentially a long-run problem. To bring about a lasting solution, in my judgment, we must take such fundamental steps as curtailing military spending overseas, particularly in Europe; working resolutely toward a balanced budget; and permitting a firming up of interest rates so that ours in the United States are more competitive with world rates. I have seen no evidence to substantiate the claim that you can achieve permanent solutions simply by issuing a few "voluntary" guidelines.

GOVERNMENT MOVE INTO DECISIONMAKING PROCESS RAISES FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS

Moreover, to call such a program "voluntary" is like calling our beloved New York Mets a baseball team * * * the words don't quite fit the facts. Businessmen are only too well aware that if they refuse to go along with the program, they must suffer the consequences—and the consequences can be painful in an economy where Federal expenditures account for 20 percent of the gross national product.

The second way in which government-by-guideline differs from the supervision we have known in the past is its vast scope, in terms of dollars spent and power applied.

There has been great fanfare about the administration's holding the Federal budget under the magic $100 billion mark. Much has been said about the fact that the budget for the new fiscal year represents an increase of only $2 billion over the old one. However, this applies to the so-called administrative budget. A more revealing total, by far, is the cash budget which includes the Federal trust funds for social security, highways and the like. This budget is put at $127.4 billion, an increase of $6 billion. And if Congress enacts the administration's new programs to bring about the Great Society, Federal cash outlays by 1970 will top $150 billion.

At the rate the Government is spending now, our budget is likely to reach the moon before we do.

Yet if you raise a question in Washington about balancing the budget, you run the risk of being hauled off to the Smithsonian for preservation as a quaint curiosity alongside the whooping crane and the dodo bird.

Sometimes figures tell a story more graphically than words. Consider these figures, for example:

One dollar out of every five spent in the United States and one job of every eight now flow from the Federal Government.

Federal loan and credit activities such as those of the Rural Electrification Administration now embrace 48 agencies using some $75 billion in direct or contingent liabilities in taxpayer funds.

In 30 of the 50 States, the Federal Government has more civilian employees on its payroll than the State governments.

Federal grants to States and localities have more than tripled in the past decade.

With this largess has come a new round of guidelines from Washington because Federal officials seldom advance funds without insisting that recipients meet certain specifications.

So we have a situation in which farmers in the most remote county are supervised by Washington-appointed officials. Hot lunches in our schools are subsidized and regulated by central authority. Medicare, aid-to-education, urban renewal, the anti-poverty program—all these are controlled primarily from Washington. Thus the Federal Government is moving into the decisionmaking process to a degree and in a manner which seem to me to raise fundamental questions.

Do the Government's new activities interfere with the operation of the free market system?

Do they invalidate price as an index of the demand for products and services, and of the costs incurred in their production?

Do they weaken the regulatory force of competition?

These are the questions we as a nation have always asked in trying to determine whether Government activities went too far, whether they tended to create a planned economy, to regiment industry, and to imperil economic freedom. When we raise such questions today with respect to some of our guidelines—and more particularly with the guideline approach—the answers come back resoundingly in the affirmative.

Interference with the free-market system? Government by guideline is based on the assumption that bureaucrats know more than the market, that they can readily comprehend all the complexities of economic life. While in the market economy individuals and businesses plan for themselves, it is the essence of government planning that the authorities plan for everybody. While in the market economy planning is largely voluntary, the characteristic of government planning is that it is backed by the full power of the State implying the use of coercive authority.

The consequences of trying to substitute central planning for the market system are most clearly illustrated today in the case of Soviet Russia. There we are seeing a deliberate campaign by the Communist planners to unplan part of their economy.

Yet isn't it ironic that while the Communists are flirting with the old bugaboo of Marxism—the market economy—we in the United States appear to be leaning more and more in the direction of central planning?

INTEREST RATE AREA TARGET FOR GOVERNMENT BY GUIDELINE

The wage-price guidelines are a case in point. The Federal Government has undertaken to tell labor and management in the steel industry how it thinks prices and wages should be fixed in the next 3 years.

Dr. Arthur F. Burns, formerly Chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, argues persuasively that wage-price guidelines could have dangerous consequences for the economy. If they exerted the influence intended, he believes, they could throttle the forces of competition, become a drag on economic growth and efficiency, and lead to an economy which would be almost

indistinguishable from one in which wages and prices were set by Government fiat.

Even closer to home is the example of interest rates. It is a peculiarity of our times that while no one questions the desirability of a drop in these rates, many people in Washington view their rise as an infallible sign that the whole economy is going to pieces. Consequently, this area has been a prime target for government by guideline.

You'll recall that last November, the Federal Reserve raised its rediscount rate and lifted the ceiling on interest rates that banks could pay for time and savings deposits. Simultaneously, however, the Government took vigorous action to dampen any tendency for lending rates to rise. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve, the Secretary of the Treasury, and finally the President himself spoke out to the effect that there was no justification for a rise in commercial-bank lending rates.

This was clearly an interference with the operation of our free market system, and it raises some intriguing questions. Does anyone in the United States, including the President himself, have any special knowledge of just what specific interest rates—or specific steel prices, for that matter—ought to be? Economists agree that our knowledge in this area is sharply limited. It is the great advantage of the market system that it puts this limited knowledge to work effectively. The consumer knows what he wants in a way that cannot be guessed by someone sitting in high authority; the manager knows how to produce it in the most economical way. So as our society grows increasingly complex, the market system actually becomes more, not less, essential.

Another question raised by the Presidential intervention on interest rates is this: When Government concentrates on holding bank lending rates and long-term interest rates down to proconceived levels, doesn't this invalidate the whole economic function of such rates?

Interest, after all, is the vital balance-wheel between savings and investment. When investment demand is strong, individuals and corporations will increase their borrowings. Banks and other lending institutions must get more money to lend, and to do so they must pay more to attract the saver. Money costs more so banks have to charge more. When demand for borrowing is weak, it would be natural for interest rates to fall. Such fluctuation in the price of money, as in the price of any other item, far from being an unsettling influence on the national economy, is really a built-in stabilizing factor. In boom times, higher rates encourage savings as against spending, thus reducing inflationary pressures; in slack times, lower rates stimulate spending, thus helping to move the economy ahead.

The achievement of sound money, a dependable currency system and satisfactory economic growth requires open and competitive markets. Such markets cannot thrive when the Government is manipulating specific wages, prices, and interest rates. It is significant, I think, that Japan and the countries of Western Europe, which have had the highest interest rates in recent years, have also enjoyed the fastest growth rates.

Another area where the Federal Government is making alarming inroads is education which has been looked upon historically as a local responsibility. A sign of the times emerged just recently from Senate debate on the Federal aid-to-education bill. Senator PETER DOMINICK, of Colorado, proposed an amendment that would have empowered the States themselves, rather than the Federal Government, to approve applications for the supplemental education centers to be set up under the legislation. In other words, no Federal project could be started without the specific approval of the State. Now you would think that a proposal so much in keeping with our whole posture on education would have been endorsed almost without dissent. Instead, the administration passed the word on Capitol Hill that it was opposed to this plan and it was overwhelmingly defeated.

It is not unusual to encounter in Washington and on our college campuses people who would like to sweep away the whole concept of State and local powers. A centralized domination, with States and localities reduced to mere administrative units, they argue, would be far more efficient. They seem to forget the lesson of history that such centralization flouts basic rights, weakens the moral fiber of the people, restricts individual decisionmaking, and in the long run, would destroy the incentives that have made our country and our economy the envy and aspiration of the world.

The case of the government that thinks it knows more than the marketplace about how to run the economy is nothing new in history. This was one of the root causes of the American Revolution. The English system of mercantilism was based on government regulation of every aspect of the economy, including the Colonies. The American colonists objected and eventually fought to enforce their will.

Today, those of us who believe that the trend toward centralization poses a grave threat to economic freedom must also be willing to fight.

I am convinced that this trend can be reversed. But it can be done only by a determined people willing to speak up and work hard for the things they believe in—for government policies that provide a favorable environment for the private economy, that promote competition and avoid government intervention, that leave private individuals with more of their own money for their own purposes, that avoid both inflation and deflation.

I hear few voices raised today in support of these policies. Indeed, there has been an almost total absence of constructive critical comment from the business community with regard to the administration's programs.

It's up to every citizen—to you and to me—to speak out for individual freedom of choice, personal responsibility and sound fiscal policies. There are no government guidelines for these concepts, yet the total experience of the American people has demonstrated their validity beyond challenge.

They have always been our greatest source of strength. And they are our best hope for the future.

Operation Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a unique experiment is presently being carried out in New York City in Manhattan's 24th precinct.

The following editorial was broadcast by WCBS in New York on June 16, 1965 and tells the story:

OPERATION FRIEND

Relations between some of New York's citizens and its police force have been a little stormy lately. On the one hand, there have been charges of police brutality, and on the other police officers have been attacked by mobs while trying to perform their duty. No decision has yet been made on the very volatile question of a civilian review board. It's a troubled situation. But there is at least one bright spot in the picture—an oasis of calm in the midst of the turmoil: The name of it is "Operation Friend."

The 24th precinct in Manhattan runs from 86th to 110th Street, from the Hudson River to Central Park. More than 135,000 people live there, and more than one-third of them speak Spanish. Until a year ago, things were pretty tense in the 24th.

But conditions are better now, better because just over a year ago Operation Friend began. Operation Friend is a community project—a grassroots project. Its purpose is to improve relations between civilians and police. Several things are being done to accomplish this end.

The members of the 24th precinct are going to school—studying Spanish and Puerto Rican culture. And you should know that most of them are doing it after working hours. At the same time, the precinct has begun a training program primarily designed to encourage Puerto Rican boys to join the force.

A precinct-community relations board has been established. It meets regularly and provides a forum for discussion of community problems. And last March, 11 members of the force were sent to Puerto Rico. As a result of their trip, the latest phase of Operation Friend will go into effect. In the first week of July, 15 underprivileged kids from Puerto Rico will be the guests of the 24th precinct. The will live with the policemen and be taken on trips around the city.

Operation Friend is an experiment—a pilot project. Many different programs have been tried, and more are planned. It seems to be working, and it is encouraging to watch. Other communities in New York City would do well to look to the 24th precinct. For here may well be the answer to one of the biggest problems plaguing our city. Operation Friend is proving that the police and civilians of New York can indeed be friends—if they try hard enough.

Tribute to Brig. Gen. John R. Jannarone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on June 19 I had the honor of joining 500 fellow New Jerseyites at a testimonial dinner for a distinguished constituent, Brig. Gen. John R. Jannarone, newly appointed dean of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

As Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves has so aptly remarked, General Jannarone exemplifies the "rarest of individuals who combines high intelligence, wisdom, and judgment with force and determination."

He was chosen over nearly a thousand other colonels for Presidential appointment to the deanship and for promotion to the rank of brigadier general—certainly military escalation of a noncontroversial variety. These twin honors have been well earned.

His outstanding Army career dates back to 1938, when he stood first in his

West Point graduating class, having compiled a distinguished record identical to that of the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He achieved the rare honor of graduating from the Academy as a cadet captain. A leader in campus politics and a three-letter man in athletics, he is remembered as a "regular guy," proficient in poker and—notes the Nutley Sun—"as willing to tutor less successful students as he was competitive on the playing fields."

Decorated more than a dozen times during his Army service, General Jannarone held command assignments during World War II in New Guinea, the Philippines, and Japan. After the war the scientist-administrator contributed his talents to the Manhattan project, which pioneered American research in atomic energy. In 1947 he returned to the Point to teach physics and chemistry, and served as professor and chairman of both departments since 1957. From 1950 to 1957, during a leave of absence from the faculty, his administrative work as scientist and engineer covered the areas of aerospace research, flood control and river basin development projects, and modernization of the Nation's military capacities.

West Point has become a way of life for the Jannarone family. The general assumed his duties as dean on the 1st of June, just in time to officiate at the graduation of his eldest son, Jack, himself a winner of the Point's coveted Academic Star. And recently I received the good news that a second Jannarone son, Robert, whom I was pleased to nominate for an Academy appointment, has been officially accepted and will enter the ranks of the cadets this year. Indeed, excellence has long been a family trait; the general's mother, Mrs. Concetta Jannarone, of Belleville, N.J., was honored at the dinner by the Daughters of the American Revolution as one of the area's most outstanding naturalized citizens. Mrs. Jannarone received the DAR's Americanism Medal and certificate for trustworthiness, service, leadership, and patriotism, an award "well deserved because of her influence in seeing that her son received the education necessary to reach the post he has achieved."

Citing the Academy's "major contributions to the leadership of the military forces which are defending the liberties of democratic governments and free people throughout the world," and noting our State's pride in the honors bestowed upon a native son, Gov. Richard J. Hughes proclaimed June 1, 1965, as John Jannarone Day in New Jersey.

It is fitting that we pause here to reflect on the crucial role played today by men of the caliber of John Jannarone. The escalation of the bitter strife in Vietnam, and the intervention of American troops in the Dominican Republic to prevent another Cuba, are fresh reminders of the Nation's reliance upon military preparedness.

To General Jannarone, I offer my sincere congratulations. And I share the well-merited confidence of Academy Superintendent, Maj. Gen. James B. Lambert, that "the future of our country, largely dependent upon the training of our young military leaders, is in good hands in the safe hands of John Jannarone." Certainly, under his eminently qualified supervision, tomorrow's officers will receive the best education and the best training possible to prepare them to carry out our Nation's program of peace through preparedness and strength.

Voluntary Unionism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Samuel Gompers is known as the "Grand Old Man" of labor. He viewed compulsory unionism as a great enemy of the labor movement. The following is from his final presidential address to the American Federation of Labor convention in El Paso, Tex., in 1924.

This message ranks with the greatest of all time, and I earnestly recommend it to the attention of each Member of the Congress.

THE VOLUNTARY BASIS OF TRADE UNIONISM

(By Samuel Gompers)

Forty-four years ago in the city of Pittsburgh a group of labor men met to bring to fruition an effort extending over a period of years—to organize a national labor movement. We were a group of labor men with little experience in a national labor movement. We had to find our problems and devise ways of meeting them. There was little to guide us.

Again in 1886 a national labor conference was called. This time it was designated a trade union conference to be composed of representatives of trade unions and to consider trade union problems. The deliberations of that conference resulted in the formation of our present American Federation of Labor with which the old Federation of Trades and Labor Unions was merged. This new federation recognized only the trade union card as a credential and proposed to deal primarily with economic problems. It was an organization that had no power or authority except of a voluntary character. It was a voluntary coming together of unions with common needs and common aims. That feeling of mutuality has been a stronger bond of union than could be welded by an autocratic authority. Guided by voluntary principles our federation has grown from a weakling into the strongest, best organized labor movement of all the world.

So long as we have held fast to voluntary principles and have been actuated and inspired by the spirit of service, we have sustained our forward progress and we have made our labor movement something to be respected and accorded a place in the councils of our Republic. Where we have blundered into trying to force a policy or a decision, even though wise and right, we have impeded, if not interrupted, the realization of our aims.

Men and women of our American trade union movement, I feel that I have earned the right to talk plainly with you. As the only delegate to that first Pittsburgh convention who has stayed with the problems of our movement through to the present hour, as one who with clean hands and with singleness of purpose has tried to serve the labor movement honorably and in a spirit of consecration to the cause of humanity, I want to urge devotion to the fundamentals of human liberty—the principles of voluntarism. No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion. If we seek to force, we but tear apart that which, united, is invincible. There is no way whereby our labor movement may be assured sustained progress in determining its policies and its plans other than sincere democratic deliberation until a unanimous decision is reached. This may seem a cumbrous, slow method to the impatient, but the impatient are more concerned for immediate triumph than for the education of constructive development.

Understanding, patience, high-minded service, the compelling power of voluntarism have in America made what was but a rope of sand, a united, purposeful, integrated organization, potent for human welfare, material and spiritual. I have been with this movement since the beginning, for I have been given the privilege of service that has been accorded but few. Nor would that privilege have continued open to me had not service to the cause been my guiding purpose.

Events of recent months made me keenly aware that the time is not far distant when I must lay down my trust for others to carry forward. When one comes to close grips with the eternal things, there comes a new sense of relative values and the less worthy things lose significance. As I review the events of my 60 years of contact with the labor movement and as I survey the problems of today and study the opportunities of the future, I want to say to you, men and women of the American labor movement, do not reject the cornerstone upon which labor's structure has been builded—but base your all upon voluntary principles and illumine your every problem by consecrated devotion to that highest of all purposes—human well-being in the fullest, widest, deepest sense.

L.B.J. Shapes Policy of Toughness and Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Sacramento, Calif., Bee, on June 24, 1965, carried an editorial which described President Johnson's foreign policy as being one of toughness and reason. The article makes some interesting comments regarding former Presidents and their particular foreign policy attitudes, implementations, and resolutions.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my distinguished colleagues:

L.B.J. SHAPES POLICY OF TOUGHNESS AND REASON

Each President in his time puts his own brand upon the Nation's foreign policy—attitude, implementation, resolution.

With Franklin D. Roosevelt there was the effort to lead the United States to a more active role in world affairs, this on the conviction that what happened in Paris or Berlin or London, as well as in Rio de Janeiro or Montevideo, in one way or another would affect the United States. Roosevelt was the expansionist.

With Harry S. Truman a directness seldom associated with the conduct of American foreign policy began to emerge. The United States had come into its time as a world

power. Truman sensed this and moved quickly against every threat to the common security of the free nations wherever the security was challenged. Out of this directness was born the Marshall plan, NATO, the European Council, and the collective stand in Berlin and Korea.

With Dwight D. Eisenhower policy was made to the moment and to the situation. It was a curious blend of brinkmanship and idealism but it lacked both the imagination of the Roosevelt effort and the hard realism of the Truman policy.

John F. Kennedy had only begun to shape his policy; at his death he had become his own department of state.

It is too early to fathom the Johnson foreign policy but in his short time in office he has shown clearly he is ready to commit this Nation, and there is no appeasment in him; but where there is no appeasement, he has manifestly made it clear he will talk anywhere, any time, in negotiation. Just as in the Congress, he is inclined toward the reasoned approach. Persuasion, negotiation, reason failing—then, his record indicates, he can meet toughness with toughness.

Johnson lacks the subtleness of Kennedy, perhaps, but he has Truman's hardness and Roosevelt's flexibility, and the rest of the world had no difficulty in understanding them.

As for the rest of the story, only Johnson, the author, can write the ending.

William E. Borah Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, today Idahoans are celebrating the centennial of William E. Borah, a ruggedly individualistic man from a ruggedly individualistic State. It is proper that we do so.

William Edgar Borah was a man of intensive convictions. He was a man of indomitable will in pursuing those convictions to their fruition. He was an independent force.

William E. Borah played a large part in many movements, but he stood apart from the event. He initiated some movements, he popularized more, he gave color to many; but he was seldom a member of the inner circle of organizers and promoters. He thrived on controversy. His part was that of molding and expressing public opinion; and his part was, through sheer forensic power, changing votes in the Senate Chamber.

William E. Borah displayed attributes which belong to the ages. He was frank, just, and well meaning, and he possessed a high degree of common decency.

As to his place in history, I believe he, himself, summed it up best. In one of his most memorable addresses, given on November 19, 1919, Borah said:

> Time, and time alone, unerring and remorseless, will give us each our proper place in the affections of our countrymen and in the esteem and commendation of those who come after us.

It is a pleasure and a privilege, Mr. Speaker, in joining this centennial honoring William E. Borah.

Sought After Military Career Is Best Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, June 16, 1965]

SOUGHT AFTER MILITARY CAREER IS BEST DEFENSE

(By Ira C. Eaker)

Dramatic events in Vietnam, Santo Domingo and in space have stolen the headlines from a current issue which may have more ultimate significance—military manpower.

Our first concern, in these dangerous times, must be our national security. The No. 1 security problem is people—volunteers in adequate numbers and with necessary skills to man our complicated modern weapons.

It has been obvious for some time that military careers are not competitive with careers in civil life, since 3 million men cannot now be found who will volunteer for military service.

Hearings are now in progress before the Armed Services Committe of the House on two bills designed to improve the status of the military career. The chairman of the committee, L. MENDEL RIVERS, supported by a large majority of his committee, proposed a military pay increase of about 10 percent, estimated to cost nearly $800 million. The Pentagon countered with a bill providing about 5-percent increase in pay at a cost of some $400 million.

Either bill is an economy measure since we are now wasting more than $3 billion annually, training draftees and first-enlistment men who return to civil life at the earliest opportunity. This constant turnover is not only economically wasteful, it fails to provide efficient defense forces, a fully credible deterrent to war.

In Elizabethan times impressed British sailors turned back the Spanish armada. Three centuries later impressed or drafted servicemen were adequate to our requirements in two world wars. Why then are drafted men inadequate for these times?

In the first place, the soldiers and sailors of earlier times were fighting against other nationals who also were drafted. In Communist countries today the military career is eagerly sought. It offers rewards surpassed only by politics—the Party—and equaled only by the scientific and teaching careers.

There is also the matter of duration. Earlier wars were fought for limited periods. An end was always anticipated in four or five years. The contest we are now engaged in could last for decades or into the next century. It is one thing to ask a man to give up a few years to fight for his country, but quite another to expect him to volunteer for life.

In earlier wars men could be trained for the relatively simple military tasks after hostilities began. Small standing armies in peacetime were then adequate. The power of nuclear weapons is such that wars must be fought in the future largely with the manpower available when hostilities begin. There will scarcely be opportunity to train men after the ICBM's and the bombers are launched. We must therefore continually maintain large, ready forces—currently 2,700,000 men.

There was great hope last year that the military career was to be upgraded when President Johnson said, "I am directing the secretary of defense to speed up his present review of such matters for the military as housing and medical care, pay and allowances, so that we can at the earliest possible moment take whatever steps both human equity and national defense may require to enhance the standing and morale of those who defend us."

I am not certain the latest Pentagon proposal fully meets this admirable preamble.

There is one sure test our President, our Congress and our people can make of the Rivers', the Pentagon and all other military manpower bills. What are the measures necessary to assure required numbers of capable volunteers for the armed services? The best bill will be the one which will make the military a sought, rather than a shunned career and in the shortest time.

Our country will be secure only when men are eagerly standing in line to get into uniform, instead of wearily standing in line to get out.

The 20th Anniversary of the United Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my warm-hearted congratulations to the United Nations on its 20th anniversary.

This international organization, through its various agencies, has done much in its 20-year history toward furthering the cause of peace and improving the material and social well-being of the world's peoples.

To further world peace, the U.N. undertook in 1950 the job of repelling Communist aggressors from the Republic of Korea. The success of this operation is attested to by the fact that South Korea exists today as a free and independent nation.

Other U.N. peacekeeping efforts have included the halting of hostilities during the Suez crisis, the ending of anarchy and mass blood-letting in the Congo, and the stoppage of shooting between rival factions on Cyprus. While such operations, it is true, have not settled the underlying problems in each of these areas, they have prevented these local conflicts from escalating into worldwide holocausts. And for this, we must all be grateful.

Such peacekeeping operations are but one part of the U.N.'s job; equally important part is the betterment of the world. To achieve this aim, the U.N. provides invaluable assistance to the world's underdeveloped countries. Such aid programs teach these nations to improve their educational systems, to introduce modern scientific methods of farming, to conserve and manage their natural resources, and to solve their food, health, and population problems. In addition, the U.N. runs various refugee programs and also provides aid to homeless and impoverished children all over the world.

The U.N. is an extremely worthwhile organization. Its peacekeeping and humanitarian efforts are a blessing to all mankind. This organization deserves and, I hope, will continue to receive our solid and everlasting support.

Tribute to Hon. Douglas Dillon, Former Secretary of the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on June 21 I was privileged to attend a luncheon honoring former U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon. It was a small luncheon attended by the officers and friends of the Inter-American Development Bank at its offices here in Washington.

I have long admired the work and objectives of the IDB and have been privileged to serve as a congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation at various meetings of the Board of Governors of the Bank.

The role Douglas Dillon has played as the U.S. representative on this Board of Governors will long be remembered. He has been a pillar of strength in this remarkable undertaking and is largely responsible for the great success the IDB has enjoyed. He has not only helped to set the Bank on a sound foundation, but has helped to chart its steady course in the years to come.

A most significant tribute was paid to Secretary Dillon at this luncheon by Felipe Herrera, President of the Inter-American Development Bank—one which, I feel, has such importance that it should be brought to the attention of the Members of this House since we, the Members of Congress, must make the ultimate determinations in regard to the U.S. participation in this endeavor. I know of no finer justification for our role than that reflected in the following remarks of President Herrera concerning our great former Secretary of the Treasury:

REMARKS OF FELIPE HERRERA, PRESIDENT OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK, AT A CEREMONY HONORING FORMER U.S. TREASURY SECRETARY DOUGLAS DILLON, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 21, 1965

In honoring Douglas Dillon today for his extraordinary service and devotion to the cause of inter-American economic cooperation, we must perforce remember the last 8 years—a period marked by the germination, the establishment and the growth of the Inter-American Development Bank.

The economic conference of the OAS held in August 1957, in Buenos Aires, was a significant landmark in the interesting and constructive process of providing the inter-American system with a structure to foster Latin America's development, welfare and stability. At that Conference, Douglas Dillon, then just recently named to a high State Department position after having served as U.S. Ambassador to France, began his long association with Latin American affairs.

I might venture to recall, that in those days when I headed by country's delegation to that meeting, Mr. Dillon whom I first met on that occasion told me that he was deeply impressed by the interest shown by Latin America in the creation of a regional financial organization and also by the vigor with which that idea was being put forth. He added that although the U.S. Government was not in a position to adopt a final decision at that time, it was fully prepared to explore, along with the other countries, the feasibility and the perspectives of such an institution.

Just 1 year later, in August 1958, our honored guest, then Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, voiced the historic announcement, at a meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, that the Eisenhower administration was prepared to enter into negotiations with the countries of Latin America for the creation of a regional development bank.

The year 1959 was thus an interesting period in which high officials of the United States and of the Latin American countries, many of them present at this ceremony, dedicated their maximum efforts to the preparation of a basic charter for an Inter-American Bank and to the ratification of that charter by the end of the year.

In February 1960, in San Salvador, the Bank initiated its organizational process. Little more than 5 years have passed since that time. But, for those of us connected with the Bank, those years have been marked by an intensity that cannot be measured by the mere passage of time.

In the initial period of our institution, Mr. Dillon, now not only a high State Department official, but also an Alternate Governor of the Bank, played an active role and demonstrated particular devotion to the task of putting into effect the project to which he had given so much support.

Just as the Bank prepared to open its doors in mid-1960, the "Declaration of Newport" was issued, followed by the call for the Conference of Bogota, the meeting at which new and dynamic steps were taken to promote hemispheric cooperation. In the Act of Bogota, the American republics recognized for the first time that the peoples' welfare and not just economic development should be an object of common concern. For this, reforms in traditional systems of production and distribution of wealth were needed; local resources had to be oriented on more efficient and social terms, and such efforts had to be complemented with external cooperation. Once more it fell to the lot of Douglas Dillon to express the support of his Government to this new dimension in regional relations and also to champion the plan to entrust a substantial part of the Inter-American Social Development Fund, approved at that meeting, to our new Bank.

This far-reaching decision enabled the Bank, practically from the start of its activities, to finance not only traditional requirements but also those connected with the fields of urban development and sanitation, of rural reform and of higher education. At this juncture, the Bank extended its first loan in February 1961, and symbolically it was one for potable water for the inhabitants and industries of the city of Arequipa, in southern Peru.

At that time, Douglas Dillon had just been named Secretary of the Treasury in the new Kennedy administration and in that capacity he became the U.S. Governor of our Bank. It is unnecessary to describe the full extent of the close association of our honored guest with the Bank in that position. I should like to recall, however, the inspiration of his presence and his speeches at the meetings of our Board of Governors; his lucid statements before the U.S. Congress every time the Bank's resources were being replenished; his daily intimate contact with the small and large problems of our organization. At times of tension, or of exaggerated concern, in the difficult stage when this multinational Bank was building its financial resources and placing its funds and when it was putting into effect new financial techniques and procedures, Douglas Dillon represented for us, the presence of an objective and true friend, of a banker of great experience, and of a statesman with a clear vision of international economic and political relations.

It fell also to Mr. Dillon's lot during this period to negotiate and sign in the name of his country the Charter of Punta del Este, the institutional framework of the policy of the Alliance for Progress: a document which despite ups and downs in hemispheric relations must be considered the cornerstone in the long process in which a modern society is being created for more than 200 million Latin Americans.

Not only through his imaginative and realistic ideas, but also through that approach which is so typically his, in which firmness is blended with persuasion, intelligence with humanity, and tact with conviction, Douglas Dillon projected and reaffirmed certain basic concepts for international economic and financial cooperation. These concepts, I am happy and proud to recognize, are part of the Inter-American Development Banks' very own philosophy.

He has been a promoter of the multilateral approach in the field of external financial assistance at both the international and regional scale.

He envisaged, as banker and as man of Government, the possibilities of using sound and well-conceived financial mechanisms, for the needs of economic and social progress in developing countries.

He has been a convinced advocate of the need for the countries south of the Rio Grande not only to develop at a vigorous pace at the national level but also to seek to complement and coordinate their development so that the western world might be able to rely on a strong, prosperous, and united Latin America.

Our bank fully participates in this approach. We are a multilateral organization, and above all we seek to permanently create a philosophy of respect and solidarity among nations of differing rates of development and with differing sociological and political structures. We are struggling, jointly with the governments of Latin America, in an effort to have our funds act as leaven in the necessary task of increasing investment levels in order to create higher standards of living. We have been demonstrating to the developed countries which contribute to our financial resources and to the nations which use our funds that an approach which is technically rigorous and financially sound is not incompatible with the growing and flexible needs of new countries.

This philosophy, of which we think the Bank has been a vivid demonstration, and of which Mr. Dillon has been one of the most important champions, has been reflected in recent times in other areas of the underdeveloped world. Thus, it has not been mere chance that in the creation of the African Development Bank and in the proposal to create a regional bank for Asia, the countries of those continents should have had such a profound interest in the achievements of this regional financial agency for Latin America, which has led us to give technical cooperation for both initiatives.

Esteemed friend Douglas Dillon, in the name of the Board of Executive Directors of the Inter-American Development Bank, its management and staff and as your friend and collaborator, it is a particular pleasure for me to present you with this medal and diploma.

I sincerely hope that this award will always serve to remind you that all of us at the Bank recognize in your selfless and dedicated services to the Americas, the brilliant reflections of a true statesman.

A Balanced Budget in a Balanced Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President signed into law the bill setting a new temporary national debt limit of $328 billion. This new limit is $4 billion above the ceiling that expires tomorrow, June 30, reflecting continuing deficit operations by the Government.

I regret that I could not support this measure with a clear conscience. I felt the necessity of making a strong protest and the only way to do so was to vote against the bill when it was before the House.

I am dedicated to fiscal responsibility and to the prospect of a balanced budget in a balanced economy, as is the administration. The fact is that the Democratic platform, adopted by the Democratic National Committee for 1964, reads as follows:

It is the national purpose, and our commitment, to continue this expansion of the American economy toward its potential, without a recession, with continued stability, and with an extension of the benefits of this growth and prosperity to those who have not fully shared in them.

This will require continuation of flexible and innovative fiscal, monetary and debt management policies, recognizing the importance of low interest rates.

Every penny of Federal spending must be accounted for in terms of the strictest economy, efficiency and integrity. We pledge to continue a frugal government, getting a dollar's value for a dollar spent and a government worthy of the citizen's confidence.

Our goal is a balanced budget in a balanced economy.

The administration has been showing great responsibility in this area. A former Secretary of the Treasury stated that the Department's goal of a balanced budget may be reached by fiscal year 1968. However, enough has not been done and the constant raising of the debt ceiling is not in line with the philosophy expressed in the Democratic Party platform.

While I was very much aware of the problems facing the Treasury Department by reason of Government spending in fiscal year 1965, I used this occasion to hoist the red flag for the benefit of any of my colleagues or constituents who were interested in showing that this constant spending beyond our estimated receipts must be halted sometime within the near future if our party is to fulfill its promises of sound fiscal policies in the operation of the Government.

For some time I have felt very much like many of my constituents—that repeated raises in the debt ceiling avoid the question. We are postponing the inevitable. A balanced budget is a must, sometimes. I am for making a beginning.

In conclusion, it might be considered apropos today to repeat the thoughts of Thomas Jefferson on this subject:

I place economy among the most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us up with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.

Although we are living in an urbanized economy, in a period of our country's growth much more complicated than the early one of Jefferson, I believe his words are worthy of some reflection, even today.

Our Good Neighbors Should Come First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful and perceptive articles on the nature of United States-Latin American relations appeared in the New York Times magazine on June 6, 1965. Written by Dr. John Plank, a noted Latin American specialist who has served in the State Department and on the faculty of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, the article comes to grips with the conflicting strands of U.S. policy in the Western Hemisphere.

Dr. Plank, who is now on the senior staff at Brookings Institution, points out that there is an inherent dichotomy in viewing Latin America as a "good neighbor" and as a battleground in the cold war. Because we have not resolved this conflict, he argues that we have misjudged the nature of the social and economic revolution and possibly forfeited the repect of an entire generation of Latin Americans.

Dr. Plank suggests that the United States must temper a legitimate concern with the development of Communist strength in the Western Hemisphere with confidence in the independence and devotion to freedom of our Latin American friends.

Although I do not agree with Dr. Plank in every particular, I would like to make his fine article available to all of my colleagues in the House by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OUR GOOD NEIGHBORS SHOULD COME FIRST

(By John Plank)

(NOTE.—John Plank is a former Foreign Service officer and professor of Latin American affairs at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. He is now on the senior staff at the Brookings Institution.)

We cannot yet reckon fully the costs to us of sudden, unilateral military intervention in the affairs of the Dominican Republic. We are obliged, however, on the basis of what we do know to look again at the Latin American policy of the United States. What are its principles, its premises and assumptions, its goals and priorities?

Such questions need urgently to be considered. Our Government's Dominican actions have caused concern among responsible citizens throughout the hemisphere, many of whom think they see in those actions signs of a partial return to a policy believed to have been superseded years ago. That policy was characterized by a thinly veiled contempt for the Latin Americans, self-arrogation to the United States of responsibility for determining the hemisphere's destinies, and a too-ready disposition to rely on our Armed Forces in defense of our hemispheric interests. A cloud of suspicion and doubt, confusion and bewilderment, now hangs over the region. Honest dialog between the two Americas and true inter-American cooperation, never frequent or easy, have been made much more difficult by our Dominican intervention.

The possibility of a tragic miscalculation of the Dominican kind—a miscalculation, evidently traceable to faulty reporting from our embassy personnel and others in Santo Domingo—has been a real and present danger for more than a decade, ever since the onset of the cold war in Latin America.

Since the 1950's our Latin American policy has been marked by an awkward if unavoidable dualism. One strand of policy has run from the era of the good neighbor and the traditions, myths, customs, and institutions of the inter-American system. To the extent that this strand has informed policy decisions, the states of Latin America have been regarded as standing in a special familial relation to us. They, while weaker than we and much less successful, are entitled to our full respect. Their integrity, independence, and sovereign equality with us are, at almost all costs, to be safeguarded, not only against threats and incursions from outside the hemisphere but also against untoward manifestations of our own vast power. Every appropriate effort is to be made to help our Latin American neighbors translate their juridical equality with us into effective equality in respects—political, economic, and social.

The other strand of policy, which is not really compatible with the former one, derives from our conception of Latin America as an active theater in the cold war, one of the battlegrounds on which we engage those whom we have identified as our mortal enemies, the Communists. In Latin America, as in Asia, Africa, and Europe, our national survival is seen ultimately to be at stake.

Those in our Government who are charged with responsibility for our Latin American policy find themselves in an extraordinarily difficult situation. In effect, they are required to approach Latin America with split vision, and the Latin America that appears under the good neighbor perspective is not the Latin America that appears under the cold war perspective.

The consequences of this duality of approach are manifested in all aspects of our official dealings with Latin America: political, military, economic, social, even cultural. No decision respecting Latin America is taken without some weighing of good neighbor considerations against cold war ones. Because of the different natures of the policy criteria, ambiguity in our Latin American policy decisions is inevitable.

Is a leading Latin American intellectual to be invited to the United States and encouraged to meet with North Americans, or is he to be denied a visa because of his failure to pass a stringent political test administered by a cautious consular officer? Is military assistance to a despotic regime to be curtailed because it is known that the regime maintains itself in power only through the use or threat of force; or is such assistance to be continued because the despot and his armed henchmen have been ferocious, if fre-

quently overzealous and unsophisticated, battlers against the Communists? Is economic aid to be given to a country because of the country's desire to develop and our recognition of the crying needs of its people; or is it to be withheld because of doubts about the depths of commitment of the country's political leaders to our side in the cold war?

Although both kinds of criteria continue to be employed, it seems evident that during recent times cold war considerations have weighed ever more heavily in the scales of judgment. That this should be the case is understandable. The cold war completely overshadows all other concerns in our global foreign policy. Moreover, the cold war in this hemisphere is becoming more intense and has, since 1959 and Castro's appearance, taken on increasingly a paramilitary cast.

Also, it is not surprising that our overworked officials, burdened with heavy responsibilities and harried by the press and Congress, should want to simplify their decision-making process by greater and greater subordination of good neighbor factors to cold war ones. They can accomplish this subordination by assuming that good neighbor policy and cold war policy are strictly congruent. As time passes they will come to believe that. Some of them undoubtedly already do so.

We shall pay much for such subordination, however, and we should consider carefully whether it is worth its cost. Our Dominican disaster, for example, and its unfortunate hemispheric repercussions, are largely accountable to an overemphasis on cold war criteria, almost to the exclusion of criteria of other sorts. If our interest in a given country is focused heavily on the question of Communist capabilities and prospects, if a disproportionate number of questions put by Washington to our missions in the field, whether bearing on matters political, economic, social, or military, are to be answered with the Communist/non-Communist dichotomy at the forefront of attention, then our understanding of that country is going to be seriously biased. The ferment of change in Latin America today should not be evaluated in cold war terms.

There is another, more serious consequence of weighting cold war factors too heavily in devising Latin American policy. It is that we shall alienate increasing numbers of Latin Americans and shall forfeit much of our small capital of trust and confidence so painfully and haltingly acquired during the past 30 years.

If, for instance, the Alliance for Progress comes widely to be believed in Latin America to be nothing more than a weapon in our cold war arsenal, the Alliance for Progress will die. The formal machinery of the Alliance will persist, of course, but the business transacted under its aegis will be disguised blackmail operations on the Latin American side and disguised bribery or payoff on our own. The spirit, the mystique, the challenge of the Alliance will disappear—and with them our best hope for building an effective inter-American community.

What must be stressed is that the Latin Americans think of themselves as people, not as objects at stake in a global conflict. They think of their states as societies in search of individual national identities and destinies, not as pieces of inhabited territory to be allocated to one side or the other in the cold war. Under the good neighbor perspective, these aspects of the Latin American reality are recognized; under the cold war perspective they are not, except derivatively and expedientially.

We must not allow the cold war to elide or absorb the good neighbor. The latter antedates the former and is a more comprehensive and profound expression of our best long-range interests. In striking the balance between the demands imposed by the one and those imposed by the other, knowledge, counts for more than doctrine, understanding for more than fervor, judgment for more than determination, and prudence for more than might.

It is tempting to speculate on how different might have been the course of our relations with Latin America had we chosen in 1945 to announce our willingness to give positive content to the good-neighbor policy through a program analogous to the Alliance for Progress. Had we done so, and had we moved with energy and good will to implement the program, the impact of the cold war upon the hemisphere and upon our Latin American policy would have been very different. For we should have initiated our program at a time of exceptional inter-American harmony and we might well have captured the momentum of inter-American cooperation acquired during the Second World War.

Moreover, we would have had a crucial margin of time, several years, in which to help Latin America prepare itself for the revolution of expectations and to establish firmly our identification with the forces of constructive, responsible, democratic reform.

This speculation is useful only because it serves to point up how very different was the policy we actually followed, which was until recently one of comparative neglect of the region. Although alert to the more obvious cold war threats in the hemisphere (we moved expeditiously to prevent a Communist takeover of Guatemala in 1954), and although not unsympathetic to the restless strivings of most people in the area for fundamental changes in their own status and in the traditionally sanctioned order of their societies, we devoted little time and few resources to Latin America.

On the basis of periodic reassurances to ourselves that there existed in the region an immense reservoir of goodwill toward the United States we relegated Latin America to the lowest priority among the major areas of the world. Busy confronting the Communists elsewhere, busy building new alliances and bolstering old ones, we regarded Latin America as something of a nuisance. What we wanted in the hemisphere above all else was quiet. We did not want our attention diverted from our other more important tasks.

The decade 1948–58 was a crucial one for Latin America. The region's great masses, urban and rural, bestirred themselves and began to make demands—political, economic, and social—that they had not made earlier and that the established order simply could not meet. The intellectuals, the professionals, the students, toyed with alternative modes of political and social organization. Nationalism, often strident and xenophobic, came increasingly to serve the purposes of Latin American demagogs.

Democratic regimes were sorely tried; the more fragile of them collapsed into dictatorships. The possibility of mass violence became ever more real: It is symbolic that the decade began in the year of the devastating Bogotá riots and ended in the year that Vice President Nixon was attacked in Lima and Caracas. Fidel Castro is reported to have been in Bogotá in 1948; we know where he was in 1958.

Where was the United States? Was it energetically, wholeheartedly, and constructively helping the Latin Americans to solve their economic and social problems? Was it identified in the minds of Latin America's young people with the forces of responsible but major change? Did the United States, through its actions in that decade, give those young people reason automatically to cast their lot with it in the global struggle against communism? The questions are rhetorical.

Young people do not stay young: a person 20 years old in 1948 was 30 in 1958; he is 37 today. The United States, through negligence rather than design, nearly forfeited a generation of Latin Americans.

That it did not altogether forfeit them is due to the tardy recognition by the Eisenhower administration that the "immense reservoir of goodwill" was rapidly drying up. More important, it is due to the sensitivity and vision of President Kennedy, who captured the imagination of Latin Americans as no other U.S. President, except Lincoln, has done and who, through his announcement of the Alliance for Progress, put the United States squarely on the side of profound reform in Latin America.

President Kennedy's Latin American policy combined, as deftly as two such incongruent elements can be combined, the good neighbor and the cold war. Both weighed heavily in all his Latin American decisions. Some among us criticized him for the inconclusiveness of his actions against Castro, but the President was not to be pushed into behavior that would jeopardize, perhaps destroy, the developing climate of inter-American trust and cooperation. When the introduction of missiles directly threatened our vital national interests, he moved forcefully, but that threat absent, he acted with masterful restraint.

Some Latin Americans criticized him for making assistance under the Alliance for Progress contingent upon the carrying out of difficult reforms, but the President, relating the Alliance for Progress to the cold war, judged that only by undergoing profound and painful change could the societies of Latin America acquire the inner coherence, the national consensus, that would make possible their withstanding, over the long term, Communist subversion and aggression.

There was, of course, a personal dimension of President Kennedy's Latin American behavior that transcended policy matters as such, one that must be taken into account in assessing his performance. He conveyed to the Latin Americans, as his predecessors had not done, that he understood and sympathized with them, that their problems were his problems. Responsible democratic and reformist Latin Americans felt that in President Kennedy they had a champion.

President Johnson inherited President Kennedy's Latin American problems and program. What he did not and could not inherit was the special trust and confidence invested in President Kennedy by the Latin Americans. That trust and confidence President Johnson will have to earn himself.

It must be said that he has not yet earned it, and that this Government's reaction to the outbreak of major disorders in the Dominican Republic has done little to reassure those to the south.

Today Latin America is in crisis. Only in Mexico and Chile, and to a lesser extent in Costa Rica, is there real institutional stability, and the future of at least two of those countries is perhaps less certain than present appearances would indicate.

The causes of the crisis are well-known: the revolution of expectations; expanding populations pressing on limited resources; immense population shifts from rural squalor to urban poverty and congestion; invidious class distinctions; serious unemployment and worrisome inflation; inequitable patterns of tax and income distribution; unresponsive and ineffective governments; lack of skilled and responsible political leadership and of adequate institutions for effective popular political participation.

This list is far from exhaustive. But are there not enough items on it to account for massive unrest in Latin America? The turbulence we have seen in the region in the past is likely to pale before the turbulence we shall see during the months and years ahead.

In the absence of out-and-out occupation by our Armed Forces, we cannot exert other than marginal and indirect control over developments in the states of Latin America. With that in mind, what should our policy be as we confront the troubled situation below our borders? In the eyes of the world we are at a clear policy crossroads today, and the world is awaiting our next major decision to see which route we have chosen. The options available to us can be reduced to two.

First, we can conclude, as evidently we did in taking our Dominican actions, that the cold-war risks in this hemisphere have become so great, the capability of Communist elements to take advantage of situations so advanced, and the inability of other Latin American elements to deal with the internal problems of their societies so manifest, that the United States must reexamine its whole relationship to the inter-American system and to the good-neighbor policy that system reflects.

More specifically, we can conclude that the United States must take to itself the right not only unilaterally to determine the existence and nature of Communist threats of takeover of Latin American societies, but also to act unilaterally or preemptively if in our judgment such action is called for to repel those threats. The principles of self-determination, nonintervention and multilateral decisionmaking regrettably may have to take second place from time to time to the exigencies of the cold war. Those principles, of course, will remain operative, but only within limits established by ourselves.

The second option depends upon a sharply different assessment. By this assessment, the conflict between progressive and traditional interests is the dominant problem in Latin America today, and our cold-war engagement with the Communists in the hemisphere is refracted through this prism in the eyes of most politically engaged Latin Americans. They do not, and they will not, see the cold war as we do. Most Latin American societies are in the incipient stages of profound national transformation with attendant disorder and the likelihood of violence (after all, the mold of custom is being broken). But very few Latin Americans participating in the social and political processes now underway foresee—or want to foresee—at the end of their national revolutions a substitution of their former relationship with the United States by a suffocating identification with the Communist world.

What they want is independence, identity, integrity, national dignity, things of which they feel their histories have until now deprived them. What they want is to move into the modern world, but to do so on their own, not on the leading strings of either the United States or the Communist powers. They want to be free to make their own mistakes, to decide their own destinies. They do not want to be Communists nor to see their societies taken over by the Communists; but they take it ill that the United States should presume to tell them what they can and cannot want.

The policy course that one derives from this assessment calls for sensitive understanding of the aspirations that motivate most demands for change in today's Latin America. It calls for a recognition that to equate anti-Americanism with procommunism is much too simple, and that much activity that we regard as being undertaken against our interest is not sparked by the Communists nor being carried out for the purpose of moving the region into the Communist camp.

It also calls for the utmost restraint and the most scrupulous caution on our part in the use of our coercive power. It calls for a show of confidence in the Latin Americans, a willingness to stand in the background and to let them largely on their own complete their perilous passage to modernity. It calls for a substantial elevation in the status assigned to good-neighbor considerations in the formulation of our decisions, a further development of the Latin American policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy, and the evaluation of cold-war threats under the assumptions of good-neighbor premises rather than the reverse.

The risks involved in this second policy are real. We cannot forget our bitter Cuban experience. But we do the Latin Americans small credit by assuming that the lessons of Cuba have been altogether lost upon them. Moreover, we must weigh these risks against the certain consequences of following the first policy. Those consequences include the evisceration of the inter-American system, a sharp reversal in our progress toward inter-American community, the welling up of great resentment toward the United States on the part of most Latin Americans, and a corresponding increase in the appeal of Communist propaganda and agitation.

Further, if we follow this policy, we shall probably have to set up proxy or client regimes in troubled parts of the hemisphere more and more frequently, in violation of legitimate nationalist aspirations, and to commit our own Armed Forces, with the deplorable effects such commitment entails. Neither our own long-term interests nor those of the Latin Americans will be well served if we follow this course.

On the other hand, if we reassign primacy to the philosophy of the good neighbor in our hemispheric dealings, we shall probably see intensified and ever more fruitful efforts by responsible Latin American leaders to work together and with us, across national frontiers, to resolve pressing Latin American problems. Knowing that we will protect them against external threats and will help them upon request to cope with domestic violence and subversion, they will move with greater assurance and optimism to meet the demands of their societies. Knowing that our attitude toward them is benign and constructive, they will assert their independence from us in various ways, experimenting with their freedom. They will increasingly act without us; they will not be acting against us. Over the longer term they will surmount their ingrained fear of us, their nagging sense of inferiority in dealing with us, and will assume their proper roles as self-confident, responsible members of a hemispheric community of which we, too, will be a part.

Surely that is outcome we want to see. Surely the running of some short-term risks is not too high a price to pay for its attainment.

The Late Senator Olin D. Johnston

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, for many years I enjoyed the friendship of our late and beloved colleague, OLIN JOHNSTON, who by the simplicity of his life and by his devotion to duty and by his sterling character and great ability endeared himself to his colleagues and to his countrymen. In the golden hours of his great life, he left the shores of sound and moved into the great realm of silence to receive the full reward which his strong faith had purchased. OLIN JOHNSTON was a brave and courageous man, yet he was an humble and devoted public servant. He was unswerving in his fidelity to truth. He discharged all of the vital functions of high office in a manner which proved him to be worthy of the confidence of the people he so well and ably represented. From an humble beginning through all of the hardships and vicissitudes of life he moved to places of prominence and great responsibility in the public life of his State and Nation. When he left the shores of sound for the great realm of silence, I lost a true and beloved friend, and his State and Nation lost a great statesman. May the Lord of Mercy bless and sustain the members of his family, and may the love and sympathy of his friends soften the sorrow they are now suffering.

The 20th Anniversary of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 1965, the United Nations observed the 20th anniversary of the signing of its charter in San Francisco. On this occasion, I should like to add my voice to those of my colleagues in calling for support of this international Organization. A recent survey revealed that less than 10 percent of American citizens have any extensive knowledge of the United Nations and its work. This is, to say the least, disturbing. The United Nations needs wide public understanding of its activities if it is to have the backing it requires. As a contribution to a better public understanding of the United Nations I discussed the work of this world body in my weekly report to constituents which is being broadcast this week over radio stations throughout Maryland's Fifth District. The following are excerpts of this report:

EXCERPTS OF REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS BY REPRESENTATIVE HERVEY G. MACHEN FOR BROADCAST DURING WEEK OF JUNE 21 TO JULY 2, 1965

It seems to me that before we can intelligently assess the work of the United Nations during the past 20 years, we must recall the purposes for which it was formed. Broadly, these purposes fall into two categories. First, political and diplomatic work aimed directly at the maintenance of peace; and, second, social and economic activities that indirectly promote stable, lasting peace by helping to eliminate the underlying causes of conflict.

The U.N. record of action in both those categories is impressive. In carrying out its peacekeeping function, the United Nations has scored many notabe successes.

The U.N. has helped to deter or to terminate warfare in Iran and Greece, in Kashmir and Korea, in the Congo and the Caribbean, and twice in the Middle East and twice in the Western Pacific.

It has settled disputes between countries which could have escalated into world war III.

In the tense moments of the great powers' confrontation over Cuba in 1962, the U.N. provided a worldwide forum for presenting the U.S. case and for mustering world opinion—an important factor in initiating Russia's withdrawal of troops and missiles from Cuba. Although the issue was resolved by the powers concerned, the U.N. discussions provided the necessary "cooling off" period.

But many of the U.N.'s greatest successes in peacekeeping have come about as a result of quiet diplomacy by its Secretariat. No publicity has been given to these activities because of a fear that it might embarrass the countries concerned and cause other nations to hesitate before seeking the good offices of the U.N.

Just as has been the case with many of the U.N.'s peacekeeping achievements, little publicity has been given to the constructive social and economic work of the U.N. Many otherwise well-informed Americans are surprised to learn that over 20,000 of the 25,000 staff members employed by the U.N. and its related agencies are exclusively engaged in promoting social and economic welfare. The point can be driven home with other significant—yet little known—statistics. Since 1949, for example, no less than $6 billion flowed from the three capital supplying institutions associated with the U.N. to help meet urgent capital requirements of developing countries. In addition, 18,000 international experts have been sent to those countries under U.N. auspices to impart their skills.

The economic help and technical assistance which the U.N. provides low-income and developing countries is an important weapon to combat the basic causes of war: hunger, poverty, illiteracy, and ill health. These activities have an essential role to play in the epic struggle currently being waged by almost two-thirds of humanity to raise living standards. Future historians may see the outcome of this struggle as the pivotal event of this century.

We all know that the U.N. has its limitations. After all, it is a human institution, one which reflects the idealism and the weaknesses of the people it represents. But with all its weaknesses, the U.N. has served well the cause of world peace and progress and therefore has served well the interest of the United States and each of its citizens.

In this world which now can be spanned in hours, where science can bring about either undreamed-of progress or complete devastation, the U.N. must continue its work. We can improve and strengthen it, and this we must do. But until a better way to keep the peace comes along, we must have the U.N. It is, as President Johnson once said, the best instrument yet devised to promote the peace of the world and to promote the well-being of mankind.

The Heart of the Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this distinguished body to the outstanding article written by my close friend, Thomas M. Hennessey, vice president of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. and a past president of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce. This article, entitled "The Heart of the Problem," appeared in a recent issue of the New England Telephone Co.'s monthly magazine. In the article Mr. Hennessey eloquently states how the Boston businessman is helping to make equal employment opportunity a reality in our cradle of liberty. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take this opportunity to salute Mr. Hennessey and the other enlightened Boston businessmen who recognize that their responsibility to the community no longer stops at the doorstep of the plant, and to place in the RECORD this fine article:

THE HEART OF THE PROBLEM: "TODAY'S ENLIGHTENED BUSINESSMAN RECOGNIZES THAT HIS RESPONSIBILITY TO THE COMMUNITY NO LONGER STOPS AT THE DOORSTEP OF HIS PLANT"

(By Thomas M. Hennessey)

Boston is on the move. Its skyline reflects a most refreshing change as new construction, both public and private, is gradually but unmistakably recording the constructive forward look that has now gripped the entire community.

But the strength of any community is derived from its people—their interests, their vigor, and their dedication to the long-term objectives of the area.

To the Boston businessman. I am sure that next to the economic health of the Boston community, one of the most pressing problems of the midsixties is the far-reaching impact of the nonwhites in the Roxbury and North Dorchester area.

During recent years, I have detected a growing sense of responsibility on the part of Boston's businessmen toward the future of the city. It is economic—but it is also civic, social, and basically human. For today's enlightened businessman recognizes that his responsibility to the community no longer stops at the doorstep of his plant. It spreads out into all areas of the city, embracing the broad consideration that must be given to the smoldering social, economic, and educational problems facing the community.

It was on the evening of March 11 that one of Boston's clergymen, the Reverend James J. Reeb, gave his life at Selma, Ala., for certain American principles so universally accepted by people in this Nation.

Such a tragic event is already prompting many people in the Boston area to take another long hard look at where we really stand on this highly emotional but nevertheless practical problem facing the city of Boston.

It is a problem of which there are many facets. They include employment, housing, and education. These are the things in which the Negroes of Boston want equality—and to which they are entitled not only by the laws of the land, but also by the moral principles by which we all live.

The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce is dedicated to a better future for the Boston area. It is motivated not only by enlightened self-interest, but also by a broad sense of civic responsibility—to make Boston a better place for all of its people and to search out and work toward a complete realization of complete equality for all of its people.

In this connection the chamber, some 1½ years ago, placed its principal emphasis on the field of equal employment opportunity. It worked with the Governor of the Commonwealth and organized itself to be the implementing agency for the Governor's plan for equal employment opportunity in Greater Boston.

Under this program, the chamber worked with various business firms in Boston, encouraging a constructive approach to the basic problem. As a result, some 20 Boston firms have led the way by coming forward with well-conceived programs to provide greater employment opportunities for the Negroes of Boston. They were formally accepted as participants in the Governor's plan for equal employment opportunity. They were joined by some 30 other firms that were brought into the plan by the Associated Industries of Massachusetts.

For the Boston firms, progress has begun. But it is only a beginning of a beginning.

In August 1964, a sampling was taken of firms enrolled in the Massachusettts plan on their hiring experience for the preceding 8 months. These firms reported that a total of 312 Negroes were placed on their payrolls during this 8-month period. This means that among this group of firms approximately 40 new jobs each month were opened up to Negroes. These new employees are now appearing as accountants, craftsmen, tellers, personnel representatives, in clerical groups, and as management trainees.

They not only represent Negro additions to business payrolls, but more significantly, they represent new and more visible assignments for Negroes in Boston's business complex.

For those who travel the downtown area, statistics are not required to demonstrate what is happening in Boston's central business district. As I have repeatedly pointed out to my community colleagues as we walk along Devonshire Street at 8:15 a.m., the trend of greater Negro employment in this area is most conspicuous. Negro men and women—smart, alert, and business-bent—are on the street with their fellow white employees on their way to work in the city's financial and professional institutions. This is in dramatic contrast with the situation a few years ago.

I would also like to point out that even more significant than employment figures, are the basic attitudes and convictions that have been shown by these enlightened employers in Boston. Not reflected in statistics, these basic attitudes are nevertheless a real source of encouragement.

Fundamental to employment is the qualified applicant. No one advocates the lowering of employment standards as a solution to the economic problem of minority groups. I am thoroughly convinced that when any employer lets down on his standards of employment, that is the day when his business starts to go downhill. He cannot do it, he should not do it, and he should not be asked to do it.

On the other hand, qualified Negroes can be found. And it is significant that many employers are no longer waiting for qualified Negro applicants to come into their employment offices. Such a procedure would be wholly inadequate.

Imagination, initiative, and a sense of community obligation have combined to encourage employers to find new ways of locating those qualified for employment.

Here let me cite a few examples. They are specific, they are real, and they reflect the employer's growing desire to break new ground in an effort to find qualified applicants—even though this involves more than routine recruiting procedures.

The first is the novel establishment of temporary satellite employment offices such as the one recently set up at Freedom House in Roxbury.

A second involves the special tuition-free clerical courses given at Chandler School last summer, the costs of which were borne by the school and interested Boston employers.

A third instance involves participation by employers in Northeastern University's new plan for recruiting young Negroes, and commitment by employers to hire these students in their firms as part of Northeastern's cooperative employment program.

These and many other steps being taken by Boston employers illustrate an attitude on which depends the permanent long-term

solution to the employment problem of minority groups.

On March 8, 1965, the chamber's board of directors took an unprecedented step in its determination to find solutions to Boston's problems. It recognized that the heart of Negro problems and frustrations in Boston centered on educational opportunity. It was also clear that the business community was dependent on a continuous stream of qualified applicants from the public school system.

Finally, the chamber found that there was a disproportionate concentration of Negroes in certain schools, and that this concentration was impairing the quality of education not only in these schools but in schools throughout the city.

The chamber concluded that it was now its responsibility to acknowledge the problem and to mobilize the resources of the community to correct this fundamental condition.

From the very start, my own interest in this area has been entirely objective. From my contacts with leaders of the Negro community, and from my experiences on the Mayor's Committee for Civic Unity, the Governor's Advisory Committee on Equal Employment, the Massachusetts Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and the Kiernan Committee on Racial Imbalance and Education, I have been exposed to the actual conditions as they now exist and to the personal expressions of attitudes and points of view of those subjected to these conditions.

With this kind of exposure and background, I can heartily subscribe to the decision of the chamber's directors on the matter of racial concentration in the Boston public schools.

Population reports clearly show that in the 1950–60 decade Boston's nonwhite population increased 60.2 percent (42,744–68,493) while the city's white population decreased 17 percent (758,700–628,704). Present trends indicate that there will be about 100,000 nonwhites in Boston by 1970, or approximately 15 to 20 percent of the projected city total.

These population statistics mean quite simply that any shortcomings or inequalities that exist today in the education of minorities will be seriously compounded within the next few years unless corrective action is taken.

Looking at the racial composition of our schools, we note that approximately 21,000 nonwhites are enrolled in the public school system which has a total pupil enrollment of 91,800. Of the 21,000 nonwhite students, some 15,000 are enrolled in elementary schools with the remainder evenly divided into the junior high and high schools. Boston's problems with racial imbalance obviously rest primarily with the elementary schools. Imbalance at these grade levels exists to the point that approximately 50 percent of all Negro children in the school system are enrolled in districts where 19 out of 20 pupils are Negro.

As a members of the Massachusetts State Board of Education's Advisory Committee on Racial Imbalance and Education, I have had the opportunity to study the adverse effects of racial imbalance in our public school system.

Lack of self-confidence, motivation, basic educational skills, and sometimes the presence of psychological disorders characterize culturally and economically deprived children. The thought that all or some of this is the byproduct of racial concentrations in the public school system should be of the utmost concern to us.

Disparities in reading achievement, intelligence ratios, special class children in regular classes, pupil-teacher ratios, and physical facilities between predominantly white and nonwhite schools demand our study and our immediate attention.

Here in Boston the need for new and expanded educational opportunity becomes enormously complicated with the obsolescent and already deteriorated physical plant of the Boston public schools. Nonetheless, the community has an enormous stake in seeing that the harmful effects of racial concentration are overcome and the total educational environment for all children improved.

Today's business is changing. Each day there is a decrease in the requirement for unskilled labor. On the other hand, the development of a highly technological society is requiring greater vocational preparation.

I think we all want the new Boston to provide a maximum of opportunity for all its citizens. This can only come when they have the maximum economic and social skills, education and employment opportunities leading to a better community.

Something for the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of favorable comment has greeted the proposal to create a special volunteer 1st Brigade of the American Armed Forces for noncombatant service in United Nations peacekeeping operations. The creation of this brigade, as one means of renewing the American commitment to the U.N., was suggested last week by the gentleman from Kansas, Congressman ROBERT ELLSWORTH; the gentleman from New York, Congressman FRANK HORTON; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE; the gentleman from New York, Congressman OGDEN REID; the gentleman from Maine, Congressman STANLEY R. TUPPER; and myself.

At a time when the strengthening of the United Nations is of paramount concern, I am pleased that two important newspapers have endorsed the proposed 1st Brigade. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorials, from the Boston Herald and the Wichita Eagle:

[From Boston (Mass.) Herald, June 24, 1965]

SOMETHING FOR THE U.N.

President Johnson could do worse, in paying tribute to the United Nations on its 20th birthday, than to endorse a new plan put forward by six House Republicans.

The Congressmen, who include Representative F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts, propose that the United States create a standby U.S. military unit of approximately 1,000 volunteers to be available on call to the U.N. for peacekeeping purposes.

Two years ago Secretary General Thant urged members nations to establish "suitable units which could be made available at short notice for U.N. service" as a substitute for a permanent U.N. force. Since that time a number of nations have answered the call.

Canada, Iran, Italy, and the Netherlands have all earmarked units of their regular forces. The four Scandinavian countries are creating a permanent standby force. And Britain has indicated its willingness to provide logistical support on a regular basis.

But the United States, while publicly applauding the idea, has done nothing of a practical nature to carry it out.

The plan of the Republican six is quite specific. The unit they propose would be the 1st Brigade of the U.S. armed services (Forces for International Relief on Standby) And it would consist of units with specialized technical skills—mobile medical teams, communications experts, supply and transport specialists, engineering personnel, and multilingual interpreters—on the theory that "great power" combat troops are not wanted by the U.N. The Congressmen also suggest that the services of the Military Air Transport System (MATS) of the U.S. Department of Defense should be placed on permanent call to the U.N.

Such a commitment by the United States would do much to step up the world body's capacity for ready response to threats to the peace. It would also be, in the Congressmen's words, "a symbol of this Nation's faith in the U.N."

Why not? What better contribution could we make on the U.N.'s birthday—and what more practical contribution in view of our continuing commitment to provide emergency help?

The 1st Brigade plan should be given careful and serious consideration.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle June 21, 1965]

A SOUND IDEA

Representative BOB ELLSWORTH, of Kansas, and five other young Republicans in Congress have come up with what sounds like a good idea for strengthening the effectiveness of the peacekeeping operation of the U.N.

They would create a U.S. 1st Brigade, which would consist of technical volunteers from the U.S. armed services on standby duty to assist U.N. forces whenever and wherever needed. They would be knowledgeable in logistics, communications, engineering, medicine, quartermaster problems and languages.

This brigade would be supplemented by the Military Air Transport Service, which would be on permanent call to the U.N. to airlift men and materiel in any U.N. peacekeeping operation.

Often it is technicians who are in shortest supply when the U.N. forces must go into action, and the provision of such a force as the Congressmen suggest would meet a real need. It would, in addition, bolster this country's often-expressed confidence in the U.N. as a viaable agency to serve the cause of world peace.

Congress in Boob-Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, last week, I voted against the temporary extension of the Area Redevelopment Administration because of what I consider to be a miserable performance record in my home State of West Virginia. Soon we will have coming up on the floor of this great House, a bill which would incorporate the ARA into a new Federal agency to be known as the Economic Development Administration. The Wall Street Journal touched on this subject with an editorial in the June 29 edition. I commend it to the attention of my col-

leagues, Mr. Speaker, and I include the editorial in the RECORD:

CONGRESS IN BOOB-LAND

If a doctor prescribes something to improve the health of a patient and it doesn't work, he isn't likely to keep on prescribing the same remedy, any more than a businessman will continue a sales-boosting plan that has flopped.

Now in Congress there are doctors and businessmen—and, indeed, representatives of all manner of occupations requiring practical and realistic thinking. Yet, when faced with a program that plainly does not work, time and again the Members of Congress will renew it, in one form or another. Or relabel it and keep it going. Somehow practicality and realism go by the board.

Take the case of the Area Redevelopment Administration, the temporary Federal agency which in 4 years has distributed about $400 million in an attempt to boost employment in depressed areas, and which is scheduled to expire at this month's end. The ARA's record is a sorry one and it has little to show for its money; in some places it subsidized new enterprises competing directly with already established businesses, in others it reported creating new jobs which on inspection failed to materialize, and in others it kept on spending money long after distressed area signs had been taken down.

In short, the ARA as a remedy failed. Is it to be abandnoned, or replaced by something better? Not at all. The Senate already has voted a 5-year program which differs from ARA chiefly in its name and in the amount of grants and loans it would provide. The ARA would become the Economic Development Administration, with $665 million to dispose of over 5 years. The EDA, if the House goes along with the Senate, will be a bigger and more expensive dose of the old ARA medicine.

Certainly something about the Washington air seems to encourage realistic and practical men to conduct their affairs like long-time residents of boob-land. Maybe it's just the heat of the next election, but in any case it makes for some unbusinesslike decisions and dubious doctoring.

Challenge to Leadership in the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make available to my colleagues a splendid speech by Mr. F. D. Hall, president and chief executive officer of Eastern Air Lines, which I was privileged to hear recently at the annual banquet of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce in my district. Mr. Hall speaks authoritatively of the challenge to leadership in the air and of the great progress and growth that his airline has shared with the Miami metropolitan area. The text of his address is as follows:

CHALLENGE TO LEADERSHIP

(Address by F. D. Hall to the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce, Miami, Fla., April 22, 1965)

The 20 years that have passed since the end of World War II have brought the most wonderful developments of the entire 2½ million years that scientists ascribe to the span of time since man reared up on his hind legs and began his search for a better life. It is startling to recall that it took man almost all of that 2½ million years to discover the wheel so that he could increase his speed and range of locomotion from a snail's pace in walking to only 50 miles an hour. By the end of World War II men had upped the speed to 2,500 miles in a single day—if all went well and if their backsides did not wear out in the process. Man's scientific knowledge has increased with almost the same velocity and has extended its range in almost the same proportion as has his ability to travel. It is surprising to learn that over 80 percent of all the scientists since the beginning of time are still alive and 90 percent of all the scientific literature ever produced has been printed in the last 15 years. So today you people here in Florida can witness at close hand the great achievements of Cape Kennedy. Just recently, NASA sent into orbit a new type of machine called SNAP which, if it proves to be successful, will make it possible for men to travel in space at fantastic speeds of over 100,000 miles an hour and for the first time travel to planets outside our own universe may become a possibility.

Far less spectacular, but perhaps more significant for us average citizens, has been the evolution of air travel. In this same 20-year period it has brought about great changes in our way of living, and has had a heavy impact on commerce and industry in the United States and all over the world. Since World War II, the development of domestic and international air travel has made it possible for businessmen to establish offices and factories at locations far away from their central offices and still maintain close managerial supervision over them. Today, a businessman can proceed from Miami to Boston, New York, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Chicago, Atlanta—and countless other centers of commerce and industry, do a respectable day's work, and be home at night to have dinner with his family. Compare that travel ability, if you will, with the not-so-long-ago luxury of an eastern silverliner trip from New York, where one boarded the airplane at about 9 a.m., traveled all day to Atlanta, spent the night in an Atlanta hotel, and resumed the journey the next morning, arriving in Miami about 4 in the afternoon after having made 13 stops in his journey. Two full days for travel had been consumed. Not only the United States, but the whole world has felt the effects of the speed and range of modern jet airliners. If I may use a personal experience, not long ago I was more than halfway around the world in Singapore, Malaysia, when it became necessary to return to New York as rapidly as possible. I left Singapore at 7:15 p.m. local time and was in New York having a meeting with my associates at 1:30 p.m. the next day. (Parenthetically remark about 13 hours difference in time.)

The speed of modern jet airliners—fast as it is—will likely not increase very much until the supersonic airplane comes into service. But some new factors are beginning to come into the picture. For one thing, the range of modern aircraft is expanding greatly. The first series of commercial jet airplanes that made their debut in 1959 could barely make it coast to coast or across the North Atlantic nonstop. Certainly, none of them could have gone nonstop from New York to Rio de Janeiro. But today, airplanes are already on the market that can go not only nonstop from New York to Rio, but could actually go as far south as Buenos Aires or Lima or even Santiago, Chile. Still longer range airplanes are on the drawing boards and will soon make their appearance. Right now, a flight is being planned to circumnavigate the world, flying, for the first time, over both the North and South Poles. Only four stops will be required for this truly round-the-world flight. Also, the new long-range airplanes will have enormous capacities for passengers. Eastern has already ordered a model that will carry 250 people and manufacturers are now talking about capacities of 500 to 600.

At the other end of the travel spectrum is the short-haul airplane, where for the first time we are able to purchase a truly economical machine that will make segment lengths of 200–500 miles a profitable operation. We now have an airplane that makes it possible to go "island hopping" out of Miami. It is technically feasible, for example, for us to operate from Miami to the Bahamas, to Puerto Rico, St. Thomas, St. Croix, and other major islands—and make the round trip in 1 day.

As the range and speed of airplanes have developed, in the United States—and all over the world—traffic centers of great air activity have grown up. The establishment of these hubs has not been dramatic and unless you are involved in planning an airline, you might not even be aware of them—except that holding patterns in the air seem to get longer during bad weather, and walking distances on the ground get longer as terminals are expanded to accommodate more airplanes. New York is the major hub in this country and some others that are continuously growing and expanding are Pittsburgh, Atlanta, St. Louis, Chicago, Denver, Houston, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and, of course, Miami.

These hub-centers of air travel have grown up for some very good reasons. First of all, they represent centers of commerce and industry in the United States. Also, they are strategically located to provide natural staging points for air travelers brought in from a surrounding commercial territory. But, perhaps most of all, they have become transportation centers because the civic and business leaders of the community deliberately set about planning for their city to be such a hub. In at least one case that I can think of, a city which had historically held a place of prominence in air travel, became complacent and allowed a neighboring city just a few miles away to capture the leadership through good planning and vigorous promotion and become what is now one of the major centers of the United States.

The traffic hubs that are located along our coasts are almost always heavily engaged in international travel. New York again is the largest. Los Angeles and San Francisco remain major West Coast cities but Seattle is gaining in importance. Houston is making some rapid strides and, if you have not already done so, you might look at the relationship of Houston, Tex., to South America, and Seattle, Wash. A major gateway to Japan and the Orient. A glance at a global map will show that it is almost a straight line from major South American cities to Houston and the Northwest. While looking at your globe, you might also note that another almost straight line leads from Santiago, Lima and Bogotá to Miami. If you live in or if your business is located in the industrial Eastern half of the United States, the shortest routes to most of Latin America, as well as the Bahamas and the Caribbean, go through Miami. Of particular interest to the people of Miami is the quickening tempo of commerce and industry in Latin America. In spite of the restrictions that have been required in Europe to stem our outflow of gold, our Government recognizes and encourages the development of activities in South America. Many Latin American countries—some just beginning to have a stabilized government—still have economic problems that create heavy inflation and require restrictions on the removal of earnings generated by companies from the United States. But long-range planners in many of the major U.S. companies continue to make investments against the day when the

enormous markets for all kinds of goods and services will be available to us. Germany, Italy, and Japan have already recognized its potential and you can be sure General de Gaulle did not take his recent trip through Latin America just for pleasure. The United States must not stand aside and see other countries capture this important world market, and Miami must continue to be the gateway to it.

For many years, Florida has been the largest single tourist center in the New World. The greater Miami area alone is said to attract over 5 million persons who spend almost a billion dollars annually with you. Air travels statistics, however, have indicated that the market has shown little growth from 1959 to 1964. For Eastern, 1957 was the peak year, however, when we brought almost 2 million people to Miami. Even 1964 fell far short of the 2 million figure, but our rate of growth in the last weeks of 1964 and in the first quarter of 1965 gives us reason to believe that for the first time since 1957 we will establish a new record—perhaps exceeding the 2 million figure.

At Eastern, we believe that the increases that we have seen in the winter of 1964–65 have been brought about largely by renewed promotional efforts. Certainly, this is true for that portion of the Florida market that used Eastern Airlines. Over the next 5 years—in the period ending in 1970—we expect our passenger boardings on a system basis to grow at an average rate of about 10 percent per year. In 1965, we expect to carry some 15 million passengers and—unless there is a significant reduction in the national economy—it is not unreasonable to expect that Eastern will carry more than 20 million people annually by 1970.

As air travel opportunities expand, your center of tourism will expand, spreading to the Bahamas and the islands of the Caribbean. Few people, even those who are sophisticated travelers, know that within a few hours of Miami are islands that equal and surpass the attractions elsewhere in this hemisphere. We at Eastern see the time not too far distant when travel between Miami and the Bahamas will support frequent schedules—perhaps even a shuttle service—as the vacationer living in Miami takes a side trip to try his luck at the roulette wheel, or takes a side trip to go "island hopping" through the colorful Caribbean.

Yet, we all know that at certain times of the year—the "off season," so to speak—the vast vacation resources of the Greater Miami area are in urgent need of customers to fill their rooms and use the beaches. Intense promotion of the vacation possibilities during the summer months would seem to hold attractive possibilities and our campaign at Eastern will be stepped up accordingly.

For the first time this year, Eastern has taken the leadership in providing a special promotional fare of $95, round trip, from all of the major cities of the Midwest—Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Louisville, St. Louis, Indianapolis, and others—to Miami, and we are backing up this special fare with the largest advertising and sales campaign in our history. The obvious purpose is to divert tourist travel, now being channeled in the summer months to the west coast by other major airlines, to fill the vacancies in Florida.

The real problem for Miami is retaining its already established position as the major hub through which the majority of commercial, industrial, and tourist travel flows. With the threat of ever-increasing length of flight in modern jets hanging over us, we must apply all our ingenuity to make it desirable to vacation in Miami, and to stop here on the way further south. Tourism is already well established. The banks in this community have gone a long way toward making Miami the financial center of the Southeast and one of the largest banks—one with which I am proud to be associated—is steadily increasing its interests in Latin America. But the concerted action of the whole community is necessary to maintain and expand the activities already underway.

I hope you have noticed that I have continually said "we." About a year ago, I was privileged to speak before one of the outstanding civic groups in Miami. Many of you are members and so heard me outline what the new management at Eastern stands for. One of the principal points of our business creed is to be a good citizen in every community where we are privileged to serve, to help the community grow and progress. We at Eastern have an unusual capability to help Miami grow. We serve 8 out of 10 of the largest cities in the United States and they are all directly connected to Miami. We serve an area of the United States that houses 75 percent of the population and over 80 percent of the industry. We are, indeed, the servant of commerce and industry in the industrial east—besides being number one to the sun!

I must frankly admit, however, that our motives are not altogether altruistic. We have a big stake in your future. Most of you may not remember when our maintenance facilities were moved here in 1935. At that time, we had two small hangars here and these have grown to our present facility which is 23 times bigger than it was in 1935. Our present facilities provide 1,600,000 square feet of floor space and the value of our total installation is $105 million. But besides that we have nearly 8,000 people based here; their payroll exceeds $60 million and we purchase another $36 million in goods and services in the Greater Miami area. During the winter season, we provide 6,700 available seats each day on 66 daily departures to 29 northern cities with single-plane service. The value of tickets purchased in the Greater Miami area alone—not counting the value of round trip tickets purchased elsewhere when people visit Miami—exceeds $22 million. So we have a great stake in Miami, and we have faith in Miami. In the past year, we have relocated many of our executive offices to Miami so that three of the four operating divisions now have their headquarters here. We are developing plans to locate additional functions here, expand our passenger facilities and build a new, nine-story office building at the airport to house the administrative and operating personnel who are based in Miami. The total cost of these projects will be near $7 million. With such an enormous investment in your community, it can be truly said that Miami's future is Eastern's future. If we are to succeed, long-range planning must be done, specific objectives established and action programs undertaken. Herein lies our great challenge to leadership. I know of no better organization through which to accomplish our aims than the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce. The machinery is already established—the tourist and convention council, international affairs council, the business industrial development department, to name a few—but the loyal support of every business in the Greater Miami area is mandatory if we are to make efficient use of the tools already at hand.

And so it was most gratifying when I came to Eastern last year to find that one of our major executives occupied a place of high standing in the affairs of this community—was, in fact, about to become president of this very organization.

All of us at Eastern are proud of John Halliburton and his fine record of service to Miami. I pledge to you our continuing support and I hope you will permit us to help in the planning to maintain Miami as the vacation, commercial, and financial center of the Southeast.

Physical Education in Nelson County, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege, some weeks ago, to attend an annual civic observance—Nelson County Day—at Lovingston, Va., at which Mr. Robert Stewart, Administrator for the President's Council on Physical Fitness, spoke. Mr. Stewart presented an inspiring message on the importance as a national resource of a physically fit young generation.

It was particularly fitting that this subject was emphasized in the program of Nelson County Day this year, because of the outstanding work in physical education which has been going forward in the public school system of this rural county under the direction of Mr. James Moyer.

Obviously, we want to encourage individual efforts among our young people to improve their physical fitness, but a well thought out program of physical education in the public schools is even more important in the potential for accomplishment in this field. In this connection, I believe it will be of interest to the House to read the summary of the program in the elementary schools of Nelson County, Va., which I include under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, as follows:

PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF NELSON COUNTY, VA.

Background material: The elementary physical education program in Nelson County was begun in September 1962, by Mr. James Moyer, appointed supervisor of elementary physical education. There was no program prior to that time. Mr. Moyer has charge over eight elementary schools spread over a large county. These 8 schools have a total enrollment of over 1,900 students in grades one through seven. Because of the distance between schools, a schedule was set up whereby Mr. Moyer is at one school every 6 days, going to three schools in the same day.

Facilities and equipment: There are no gyms in the Nelson schools and very few athletic facilities existed in 1962. Since that time, horizontal ladders, chinning bars, basketball goals, and volleyball standards have been added as outdoor equipment, at each school. Various types of balls and other equipment were bought.

Financing: The school board appropriates 25 cents per pupil for physical education use. Because of this very limited budget, it was necessary to approach PTA's and community organizations for donations to our program. Gymnastic exhibitions were another source of helping to pay for new athletic equipment.

Program: Since 1962 the following activities have been added to our program: touch football, soccer, volleyball, cross-country running, backetball, tumbling and gymnastics, square, folk, and social dancing, weight-training, softball, track and field, golf, and archery.

The program became so popular during the regular school session that a summer 6-week session of recreation was begun. Since there were no gyms at the elementary schools, a basketball program for students was started

on Saturday morning, at Nelson County High School, with buses bringing the participants in to a central location.

In the fall, a tournament is held at the high school, at which time boys and girls in grades four through seven come together to compete against one another in soccer and touch football.

Gymnastics has been a main feature of the Nelson elementary program. The equipment used, parallel bars, side horse, vaulting box, balance beam, etc., is all homemade and has received much attention. A boys' and girls' gymnastic team represents the entire county in nearby gymnastic meets.

The track and field program has been the most outstanding feature of the Nelson program. In the fall, cross-county running is introduced to the students, with regular track and field activities coming in the spring. These activities are set up to provide a complete and progressively difficult program for all boys and girls in grades one to seven. Field days are held at each elementary school, with the individual champions from each school then competing against one another on our big Nelson County Day. Seventh grade boys and girls from each school also compete against each other in regular track meets.

Physical fitness results: AAHPER fitness tests administered to approximately 900 students in September of 1962 showed only 9 boys and 10 girls scoring above the 50th percentile on all 7 test items. In May of 1965, approximately two out of every four students scored above the 50th percentile, with approximately one out of four students scoring above the 80th percentile. A large number of students missed achieving these groups by failing only one test item.

The Nelson County elementary physical education program has attracted statewide attention. Student demonstration teams from Nelson have performed at district education meetings and last fall gave a wide variety of demonstrations at the State Virginia Education Association Convention in Richmond, Va.

The Future of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the current of the Lamp, published by Standard Oil of New Jersey, contains a valuable discussion of the role of U.S. foreign aid abroad and its relation to free world economic progress, U.S. objectives and the individual private investor.

International economic affairs expert, Boyd France, points out that foreign aid "has become increasingly the victim of both excessive expectations and excessive pessimism." If foreign aid is to be continued on the present scale necessary to achieve its basic goal of self-sustaining growth of the developing nations, there must be greater public understanding and revised public attitudes to support it.

Our foreign aid program is a dynamic national investment in world betterment, in line with U.S. goals and U.S. ability. It is a long-term investment which must be made on an adequate level, with enlightened support from the homefront, before it is too late.

The article follows:

THE FUTURE OF FOREIGN AID

(By Boyd France)

Foreign aid, as the main positive tool of U.S. foreign policy since World War II, is peculiarly appropriate to American traditions, to the nature of the country's power, and to the world situation. It expresses both American humanitarianism and the pragmatic "can do" spirit of the frontier. It seems fitting too that the richest nation in history should look to its wealth rather than its arms to make its influence felt in the world.

Ironically, however, disenchantment in the Congress with the foreign air program has mounted as balance-of-payments problems have mounted and as the program has come to be directed more toward the long-term goal of economic development and less toward short-term political and military holding actions.

If there is one underlying reason for congressional disenchantment with foreign aid, it is a lack of clarity as to the limitations and capabilities of the aid instrument itself. As the thrust of the aid program has shifted from clearly seen short-term to dimly defined long-term objectives, it has become increasingly the victim of both excessive expectations and excessive pessimism. At times Congress has seemed to think of the foreign aid program as a magic wand that can achieve all of the international aspirations of the United States, large and small, long range and short range, with a casual wave. Then, when governments fall to military coups, when U.S. interests are expropriated, when nations follow external and internal policies that the United States deems to be reckless, there is impatience and disillusionment in Congress.

The aim of the current foreign economic assistance program is to promote the basis for self-sustaining economic growth at a politically acceptable rate throughout as much of the underdeveloped part of the globe as possible.

Few persons question that the achievement of this objective would be in the long-term interest of the United States. The underdeveloped countries of the free world contain two-thirds of its people and a great percentage of its virgin resources. Their potential in terms of markets, raw materials, and opportunities for investment is obvious; just as obviously, the potential cannot be realized unless these countries can achieve orderly economic progress. The political interest of the United States is, if anything, greater. Economic frustration tends not only to breed communism but also to spark violence and conflict within and between impoverished nations. And the great powers tend inevitably to be drawn in. Crises aside, the prospect of a world permanently and evermore bitterly divided between rich and poor nations promises ill for America's prosperity and the survival of its institutions and political and moral values.

Many persons argue that self-sustaining economic growth is impossible in many of the less developed countries. It is argued that the population explosion, cultural and political obstacles to growth, and structural barriers to expanding exports to the advanced countries combine to doom the underdeveloped countries to perpetual poverty. That economic growth and progress lead to open and peaceful societies also is questioned.

Less academic doubts about foreign aid are raised by many businessmen. They contend that industrialization can best be accomplished by private capital, initiative, and know-how. Indeed, given the inevitable limitations on the amount of public capital likely to be available, it probably can be done only by private investment. Businessmen also question whether the aid program is being used effectively to protect and promote private investment, local and foreign.

Emilio G. Collado, a Jersey vice president and director, in a thoughtful article in Foreign Affairs expressed the fear that the U.S. aid program might be encouraging two disturbing trends in the countries it seeks to help. He wrote:

"The first of the disturbing trends of recent years has been the growth of an excessive preoccupation with the direct introduction of measures for social improvement and a consequent neglect of the bases for economic development on which such social improvements must fundamentally depend. The second trend has been the increasing introduction of Government activity and control into fields of economic activity which could be more productively pursued by private initiative and which, when undertaken by governments, divert their limited administrative and financial resources from social development programs."

Is the achievement of self-sustaining economic growth among a significant number of the less developed nations possible? Does economic growth lead to open and peaceful societies? Can U.S. Government economic aid make a significant contribution? And what should be the relationship between the aid program and private enterprise?

Until such fundamental questions as these are answered more clearly, public and congressional support for continuing an effective foreign aid program is almost certain to be faltering.

So far, economic growth continues to outpace population increases in most areas of the underdeveloped part of the world. Once the dynamic process of self-sustaining growth starts, it tends to become self-accelerating. If, therefore, it can be kicked off on a broad enough scale, before the developing countries are swamped by their own fertility, economic growth should be able to draw ahead of population more rapidly—up to the limits of availability of resources, which still are quite large.

Developing and developed nations alike are becoming increasingly alarmed by the population explosion. The beginnings of a concerted attack on birth rates that race ahead of economic development are being made. As the National Academy of Sciences has reported, in recent history it can be shown that nations which move from a predominantly agrarian economy and farm environment to one that is predominantly industrial and urban generally experience a considerable decline in birth rates. So the menace of the population explosion itself is the best argument for an all-out effort to spur economic growth before it is too late.

The difficulty in developing market outlets for their raw and manufactured goods encountered by most of the less developed nations is certainly an obstacle to their overall economic success. But their losses in trade are more than covered by the development assistance they are receiving. The advanced countries undoubtedly will have to show greater willingness to import manufactured goods from the developing countries if the development of these countries is to continue. But again, development—and the diversification of exports that it makes possible—provides the only basis for a lasting solution.

David E. Bell, Director of the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID), predicts that 14 developing countries will be weaned from foreign aid within the next few years. They will be able to finance continued growth thereafter from private sources and from the hard loans of the World Bank and the Export-Import Bank.

Giant India, whose economic success or failure will be so crucial to the world, plans to be able to dispense with foreign aid by 1975. Industrial output already is increasing at 10 percent per year—thanks largely to

the performance of private enterprise. A major obstacle to India's eventual economic success is the persistent imbalance between industrial and agricultural development. This unfortunate plight, which is said to be due partly to excessive Government preoccupation with industrial progress, continues to create cruel hunger problems. The Government is trying now to right the imbalance, but it will be some time before the effect of these efforts can be measured.

There is no automatic link between economic growth and the emergence of the open societies the United States seeks in the world. Cuba was relatively prosperous when she went Communist. India has remained the largest democracy in the world despite her economic problems.

Still, there is evidence that economic growth is conducive to decentralization of political power, if not always or quickly to constitutional democracy. Perhaps the deductive argument is more persuasive. It seems certain that the inexperienced leaders of many of the underdeveloped countries, particularly those which are newly independent, will be forced to apply violent measures in order to retain power if they are unable to offer their peoples any hope of economic progress. They may choose the easier routes of force and demagoguery anyway. But if the route of economic advancement is closed to them, they will have little choice.

How significant a role can the U.S. foreign economic aid program be expected to play in the process of economic development and the emergence of free societies among developing nations?

On the face of it, a mere $2.5 billion or so of economic development assistance provided in the U.S. foreign aid legislation looks like a pitifully small contribution to the free world effort to lift the less developed nations out of poverty. (Actually, according to data collected by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, U.S. aid disbursements in 1962 and 1963 exceeded 50 percent of the total bilateral and multilateral aid disbursements from advanced countries, even including the Soviet bloc.)

In general, it is not the gross amount but the specific function of U.S. Government aid that is important. It is not intended to supply the bulk of the capital needed for development but rather that crucial margin without which development might not take place at all or, if at all, too slowly. Aid is intended to be the spark plug, not the fuel, for development.

The foreign aid program potentially brings to bear a wide panoply of spurs and disciplines upon the growth problems of a receiving country. Aid provides money for essential imports to keep the economy running. Program loans for the import of commodities sold for local currency help receiving governments to maintain financial discipline.

Big project loans provide long-term, low-interest financing for essential economic infrastructure. By coordinating U.S. assistance with that of other nations and international lending organizations, and providing injections of surplus American farm products, the power of aid as a guide and spur to development can be amplified. Technical assistance dovetailed with development loans can help provide the human resources needed for development. It can help governments to plan projects soundly so that they can qualify for external financing. And, in theory at least, aid can also be used to persuade recipient governments to provide an economic atmosphere favorable to private capital.

The use of aid as a prod to politically painful reforms is a delicate and risky business, of course. AID Director Bell and his staff always must bear in mind the limitations on the power of aid to influence the actions of foreign governments. No government worth helping is going to sell its sovereignty or compromise what it believes to be its national interest for any amount of American aid. AID cannot hope to buy blind compliance with U.S. wishes or advice. But, skillfully used, aid could be the gentle prod to nudge recipient governments along a constructive course of political and economic action.

Some or many of the functions of the U.S. aid program theoretically can be duplicated by assistance from multilateral lending organizations such as the World Bank, the International Development Association, and the Inter-American Bank. But the frequent suggestion that all or most U.S. aid and that of other countries should be channeled through multilateral organizations appears at this stage to be unrealistic. Governments bent on advancing their own national interests and protecting their balance of payments will not abandon bilateral aid programs. And the United States in particular, as the leader of the free world, has special interests in many parts of the world which it is not likely to entrust to the dispassionate care of international civil servants.

But what of the role of private capital investment, foreign and local?

It seems clear that private investment cannot be expected to do alone what the U.S. aid program is seeking to accomplish. Private investors generally cannot provide capital for non-revenue-producing public projects. They cannot supply the many kinds of technical assistance that governments of underdeveloped countries need to govern effectively.

The fact remains, however, that the struggling poorer nations of the world must, as their development proceeds, look increasingly to private enterprise for the initiative, the know-how, and, ultimately, the very large amounts of capital that will be needed for growth of economically efficient, open society.

The real question, then, is not whether or to what extent private investment can be substituted for Government aid but whether Government aid programs act in concert with private investment efforts in order to protect and promote private enterprise in the developing countries.

Agency officials insist that increasing emphasis has been placed by AID in recent years on measures to improve the climate for foreign and local private investment. Partly under congressional and business prodding, an array of devices has been designed to protect existing U.S. private investment in countries receiving American aid, to encourage new U.S. private investment, and to stimulate recipient governments into improving the conditions for private enterprise generally.

The Hickenlooper amendment to the foreign aid legislation is an example. It requires the President to cut off aid to any government that expropriates U.S. interests or fails to honor valid agreements with American firms without prompt and adequate compensation. No one questions that expropriation without compensation is reprehensible and that by scaring off private investment it is generally self-defeating. But even expropriation with compensation usually involves a wasteful use of scarce foreign exchange and discourages the making of new investments.

AID officials opposed the Hickenlooper amendment and still tend to view it with misgivings. They concede, however, that it may have deterred some aid-receiving governments from reckless action against American interests. So far, the Hickenlooper amendment has had to be invoked only once, against Ceylon for the nationalization of U.S. oil companies. What AID officials fear is that they may find themselves compelled to cut off aid to an important country because of one rash act—which may have been perpetrated by a Commuinst-influenced state or local government—thereby disrupting a long-term development effort whose success hopefully would make such acts less likely in the future.

AID has made some moves toward protection and encouragement of private sector activity. It guarantees approved new U.S. investments in less developed countries against losses from inconvertibility, war, or revolution and offers partial guarantees against losses from certain business risks. It also partially finances surveys of investments.

AID has financed local development banks and helped to create savings and loan associations. Occasionally, it lends directly to local private firms and often provides them with technical assistance of various kinds. Program loans provide foreign exchange for essential imports of parts and materials by private firms. AID increasingly shuns financing revenue-producing Government enterprises that can be more efficiently operated privately—although in 1963 it was restrained from financing the Bokaro steel mill in India only by congressional flat.

These inducements to private investment have been welcomed by some members of the business community. Other businessmen express concern that the stress on guarantees and subsidies may reduce the pressure on aid-receiving governments to take the positive steps needed to encourage private enterprise.

Many businessmen, and many aid officials as well, feel that AID could and should put more pressure on recipient governments to encourage local private initiative and to stay out of fields of economic activity best plowed by private investment, local and foreign.

How much additional private U.S. investment in the developing countries may be stimulated by these measures, and others under consideration in AID, remains to be seen. Most major companies believe that the investment potential is great where political conditions are favorable; indeed, they insist that the importance of the role of U.S. private capital often is understated by the tendency to rely on balance-of-payments figures which measure net capital flows and exclude reinvestments and retained earnings.

It is the fashion too to underrate the contribution to the development process of American investment in extractive industries. Not only can our oil and mining companies develop and market resources efficiently, thus generating vitally needed foreign exchange, but their tax contributions and their increasingly large investments in manufacturing often are overlooked. It is worth noting too the efforts Jersey Standard affiliates have made since 1961 to stimulate local private investment in Venezuela and Colombia by setting up investment companies to offer financing and managerial advice to promising local enterprises.

More recently, a group of 121 private companies from 15 countries joined in an economic development cooperative known as Adela. Its sole purpose is to provide financial backing to local firms planning investment expansion in Latin America. (A more detailed report an Adela will appear in the next issue of the Lamp.)

No precise estimates of the need for U.S. aid in the decade or so ahead can be made. If the underdeveloped countries are to achieve and maintain even a modest 5 percent annual growth rate, on any realistic assumption of self-help and export performance, their requirements for capital from the industrially advanced countries will continue to increase by about 10 percent per year. That would mean a need for about $11 billion of external capital annually by 1970. If private capital is discouraged, the need for U.S. Government aid probably will increase proportionately.

Finally, if it is granted that the United States has a vital interest in helping developing countries to achieve self-sufficient economic growth, that this is not necessarily a hopeless or an endless task, and that foreign aid must play a complementary role to that of private investment in the growth process, the question remains whether the Congress and the public will continue to support an effective foreign aid program. Will the aid program be granted adequate funds, on easy enough terms, free enough of unreasonable restrictions, for a long enough period to permit it to do its part of the job?

Analysis suggests that if this is to be the case, a change in the public attitude toward the aid program and the role played by private investment in the development process is essential. Foreign aid will have to come to be viewed not as a gift or a purchase but as a long-term national investment in a great international undertaking. As an investment it necessarily involves risk. Success is not certain, and returns may be slow in coming. But the cost to the Nation of failing to make the investment could be as great—long run—as failure to invest adequately in education or scientific research.

New York State Legislature Urges Enactment of Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following resolution adopted by the New York State Legislature on June 14, 1965, urging the Congress to enact legislation so as to afford nondiscriminatory tax treatment as between corporate employees and self-employed professionals:

STATE OF NEW YORK RESOLUTION No. 142

(By Mr. Gioffre)

Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending section 7701 (A) of the Internal Revenue Code, so as to afford nondiscriminatory tax treatment as between corporation employees and self-employed professionals

Whereas the Joint Legislative Committee on Professional Men—Tax Status and Tax Benefits of the New York State Legislature was created in April 1963 by concurrent resolution of the New York State Senate and Assembly (in assembly Apr. 4, 1963; in senate Apr. 5, 1963) and has been duly redesignated to serve until March 31, 1965, for the purpose of investigating and studying all phases of affording equitable tax status and tax benefits to professional men licensed to practice their professions pursuant to the laws of the State of New York; and

Whereas the said joint legislative committee has conducted its investigation and study of the question and has heretofore rendered its interim report, dated December 14, 1963, to the 1964 session of the New York State Legislature and its final report dated March 31, 1965, to the 1965 session of the New York State Legislature, in which, among other things, it recommended that the tax benefits and savings afforded corporation employees should not be denied to self-employed professionals; and

Whereas the said joint legislative committee in its interim report dated December 14, 1963, recommended that the New York State Senate and Assembly by appropriate joint resolution memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to afford nondiscriminatory tax treatment as between corporation employees and self-employed professionals which was done pursuant to concurrent resolution adopted on March 18, 1964; and

Whereas the said joint legislative committee reported that under the then existing Kintner regulations (Internal Revenue Code Reg. sec. 301, 7701-1 and 2, adopted Nov. 15, 1960; CCH 1964, Fed. Tax Rep., vol. 6, par. 5942), equality of tax status could be afforded professionals by enactment of legislation at the State level which would authorize professional practice in association or corporation form, but that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue had announced that impending amendments to the Kintner regulations as they then existed would soon be made; and

Whereas on December 19, 1963, a bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States (S. 2403), by Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law and providing that professional associations and corporations shall by definition be granted the status of corporations within the meaning of Internal Revenue Code of 1954, section 7701(a); and

Whereas amendments to the existing Kintner regulations were approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on January 28, 1965, in final form and thereafter published in the Federal Register, which make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for professionals conducting their professions in association or corporation form to qualify for the tax savings presently afforded employees of corporations; and

Whereas the said joint legislative committee in its final report to the New York State Legislature, dated March 31, 1965, recommended that the New York State Senate and Assembly by appropriate joint resolution again memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to afford nondiscriminatory tax treatment as between corporation employees and self-employed professionals; and

Whereas it is deemed desirable to create a tax status for self-employed professionals relatively equal to the favorable treatment afforded corporation employees, in order to eliminate the existing tax discrimination against professionals in New York State, which has resulted in a trend on the part of many professionals to enter corporate employment rather than private practice; now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact into law S. 2403, known as the Talmadge bill, amending section 7701(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law, or in lieu thereof, to enact other similar legislation amending the Internal Revenue Code to grant to self-employed professionals the tax benefits and savings afforded corporation employees; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Congress of the United States by forwarding one copy thereof to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate and one copy to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and one copy to each Member of the Congress from the State of New York.

By order of the assembly:

JOHN T. MCKENNAN,
Clerk.

In senate, June 14, 1965, concurred in, without amendment.

By order of the senate:

GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,
Secretary.

Rent Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times editorial this morning on the "Rent Subsidy" was most timely, in view of the fact that we are currently discussing the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

The editorial speaks eloquently and logically in favor of the proposed rent supplement program, and I feel that the endorsement of the New York Times should be brought to the attention of the Members of this body who are somewhat concerned about this promising new proposal.

The plan has attracted widespread support from private industry and labor, and will benefit some 500,000 families who have been unable to attain decent housing at a fair rental.

I include the editorial herewith, and hope that it will have the consideration of all the Members when this matter is before us for a vote.

RENT SUBSIDY

The rent subsidy, a key provision of the administration's housing bill, is expected to come under sharp attack in a House vote today. If it is rejected, the action will be a triumph for semantics and a defeat for logic.

Almost every kind of housing now receives a Federal subsidy, direct or indirect. Housing for veterans, for old people, and for farmers is subsidized. There are public housing programs for the very poor; the Federal Housing Administration provides mortgage insurance for one-family dwellings for the middle class; even luxury apartments for upper income citizens often get an indirect subsidy under the urban renewal program.

Under these circumstances, the opposition that has flared up against the rent subsidy idea seems almost bizarre. The administration's proposal would simply enable the Government to pay the difference in rent between one-quarter of an impoverished family's income and the fair rental value of its apartment. This subsidy would be paid on housing constructed or rehabilitated by limited-dividend corporations. Since there are 500,000 families already on the waiting list for admission to public housing, a supplementary approach is badly needed. The rent subsidy provides that approach.

The plan has the great advantage that it would enable low-income families to continue living in buildings that have been made fit for living. Up to now, the renovation of a slum has usually meant that a sizable number of tenants who could not pay the new rents had to move elsewhere, often to even worse quarters.

The rent subsidy can become a critical component in the war against poverty. According to the 1960 census, three-fourths of families with an income of less than $2,000 paid 35 percent or more of their income for rent. Of families earning $2,000 to $3,000 a year, one-third paid 35 percent or more for rent.

The old guard administrators of public housing who oppose this rent subidy program because it intrdudes upon their long-standing monopoly have scarcely displayed the compassion and disinterestedness appropriate to those dedicated to aiding low-income families. The Republicans in the House have likewise proved more partisan than constructive in making an issue out of this program. They have gone counter to the leadership of Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, the ranking minority member on the Housing Subcommittee and the GOP's foremost housing expert.

A vote against the rent subsidy program would be a vote against some of the most defenseless members of society. The House ought not place this black mark against the good record of the 89th Congress.

L.B.J.'s Afterdinner Conversation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, early this month the Miami Herald commented on President Johnson's address in Chicago, and I insert the editorial here in the RECORD:

L.B.J.'s AFTERDINNER CONVERSATION

President Johnson's address at the Democratic fund-raising dinner in Chicago could scarcely be called partisan.

The precarious state of peace and the dragging involvements in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are not the kinds of topics usually raised when the party faithful gather, at $100 a head, to toast the sainted names of the founders.

But it is a sign of the times that Mr. Johnson chose this forum for his moving plea for world peace and to announce that the slowly returning quiet in the Dominican Republic permitted withdrawal of our last remaining marines.

It is a sign of the national involvement that sees the Senate minority leader among the stanchest supporters of the Democratic President in this area of policy.

Mr. Johnson's recall of the marines from Santo Domingo, leaving our dwindling presence there in the hands of Army and Navy units under the OAS banner, has a double significance.

It underlines the rising hope for an acceptable caretaker government until elections can be held. It has a soothing sound to sensitive Latins who associate the Leathernecks with an era of less understanding.

Once more the President restated our basic commitment to serve the cause of peace. He assured the pepole of the Soviet Union that this is our only aim. He invited them, over the heads of their leaders, to "share together a new and beautiful harvest of happiness and hope on this earth."

These things need to be repeated as often as possible. A party dinner is as good a place as any to do so.

It is just as well, too, that these things were said as gunfire sounds and armed men stand guard because it shows the dual nature of the U.S. position in the world today.

We resist aggression but we also reject appeasement. This is the only way to make sure that the peace we desire so fervently will last.

Social Security "Graduates"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Senate will soon be completing its work on the Johnson medicare bill or, as it should be more accurately described, "governmental medicine" program. It had been hoped that the other body would make improvements over the ill-conceived House-passed version. Unfortunately, as the Chicago Daily News emphasizes in an editorial on Monday, June 21, the Senate is about to compound the deficiencies of the program.

The editorial follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY "GRADUATES"

Not content with all the revisions in the social security law passed by the House, the Senate Finance Committee has done some tinkering of its own. Among other things, it would increase the wage base on which social security taxes are paid, while reducing slightly the rate of the tax.

This is a subtle change, and would have only a small effect on the total revenue collected. But it would have a large effect as to who pays how much tax, and on the whole principle of equality that has theoretically been the basis for social security from the beginning.

The committee also amended the House-approved medicare bill to liberalize the benefits for low-income people over 65 and decrease benefits for those in higher income brackets.

The net of these changes, if they win House concurrence, is to strip away the last pretense that social security is directly comparable to insurance in that a fixed premium entitles the policyholder to fixed benefits. Both premium and benefits will vary according to income and the political whims of Congress.

To a small degree, social security has operated on a graduated scale of tax and benefits before this. Minimal wage earners pay less while they work and are entitled to smaller benefits when they retire. But since the social security tax applies only on wages and salaries up to a cutoff point of $4,800, the difference is small.

However, the Senate committee now proposes to boost the cutoff point to $6,600 beginning next year, and at the same time lower the rate, in a deliberate move to shift a larger share of the burden to the higher income groups. When the same principle is applied to medicare, social security becomes an instrument of social leveling paralleling the income tax.

This year, when an employee has paid $174 into social security, he is through for the year. The Senate proposal would raise this to $250.80 next year. The employer, of course, adds an equal amount. Further increases are inevitable as time goes on, and some are already provided for in existing plans.

But if the graduated principle gets a solid foothold, there is no limit. Withholding for social security could run a close second to withholding for the income tax.

The initial move in this direction is a small one, but we have ample evidence of how large burdens can grow from small beginnings. The social security system, especially with the addition of "medicare," would weigh heavily enough in the future even if equal payments for equal benefits were the rule. It could become a monstrosity if the graduated-tax principle is allowed to creep in and take over.

Triple Observance of Italian Executives of America, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, June 19, 1965, the Italian Executives of America, Inc., had a triple observance at the United States Pavilion of the New York World's Fair. The 95th anniversary of the establishment of the Department of Justice with the Attorney General as head, and the 57th birthday of the creation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation by Attorney General Chales J. Bonaparte, of Maryland, were celebrated. In addition, the Bonaparte citation for exceptional investigative efforts in cooperation with the Department of Justice leading to more effective law enforcement was presented to the Honorable Frank B. Mercurio, regional director, Wage Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Italian Executives of America is an organization dedicated to present to the American public through all available media of communication, the true image of 22 million Americans of Italian origin. The Honorable Sylvester J. Garamella is the national president.

The following is the program of this triple observance:

TRIPLE OBSERVANCE OF ITALIAN EXECUTIVES OF AMERICA, INC.

The 95th anniversary: Establishment of the Department of Justice with the Attorney General as head, June 22, 1870.

The 57th birthday: Creation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation by Attorney General Charles J. Bonaparte, of Maryland, June 22, 1908.

Bonaparte Citation: Presentation of the Bonaparte Citation "for exceptional investigative efforts in cooperation with the Department of Justice leading to more effective law enforcement" to Hon. Frank B. Mercurio, regional director, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, U.S. Department of Labor, at the U.S. Pavilion of the World's Fair.

Dinner-dance and entertainment at the Rathskeller's Belgian Village, Saturday evening, June 19, 1965, at 6 p.m.

Special presentation of decoration to Hon. Frank B. Mercurio of the Knight in the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic by Dr. Joseph Nitti, vice consul of Italy representing Minister Plenipotentiary Vittori Cordero di Montezemolo, consul general of Italy.

The Bonaparte Citation to Frank B. Mercurio is presented "for exceptional investigative efforts in cooperation with the Department of Justice to more effective law enforcement."

Special presentation of decoration to Hon. Frank B. Mercurio of the Knight in the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic by Dr. Joseph Nitti, vice counsul of Italy representing Minister Plenipotentiary Vittorio Cordero di Montezemolo, counsul general of Italy, "In recognition of his 25 years of Government service—both State and Federal—and for his efforts and contributions on behalf of immigrant workers and minority groups in the preservation of their rights under American standards and laws."

Frank B. Mercurio is regional director of region II of the U.S. Department of Labor's Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, with offices in New York City. He is responsible for administering and enforcing the Fair Labor Standard Act and the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act in the States of New York and New Jersey. As director in charge of investigations his office has the responsibility for the proper payment of wages to more than 5 million employees in more than 200,000 firms throughout the States of New York and New Jersey.

Prior to joining the U.S. Department of Labor staff in 1955, Mr. Mercurio served 10 years as assistant industrial commissioner of the New York State Department of Labor where he administered the enforcement of State labor laws dealing with minimum wages, unemployment insurance, employment security, child labor, and safety and health standards; this also involved mediation and conciliation services and workmen's compensation. Mr. Mercurio opened the Utica district office of the State department of labor when it was created in 1945.

Over the years he has worked actively in cooperation with enforcement and investigatory agencies in both State and Federal Government. During the war he graduated from the War and Plant Protection School at Amherst College; also conducted special national security investigations.

Mr. Mercurio has drawn on his background of 25 years of progressively responsible Federal and State Government experience in the field of industrial and labor-management relations and law enforcement in addressing professional educational, and business groups on labor-management topics, as well as TV appearances and radio talks.

After completing the regular course of study at Northwestern University and special studies in industrial and labor relations at Cornell University and Utica College, he was associated with the Chicago Daily News as a reporter.

Mr. Mercurio is a member of the New York Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration; he is treasurer of the Federal Business Association of New York. He is also a member of the board of directors of LaGuardia Memorial House, which is a community house in East Harlem.

He was born in Utica, N.Y.; attended Utica grammar schools. Graduated from Utica Free Academy and Northwestern. He is married to the former Mabel Graham Gillespie, they live in Manhattan.

NATIONAL OFFICERS

Hon. Sylvester J. Garamella, national president.

Joseph L. Marino, chairman, board of governors.

J. P. Sommer, director, public relations.

Dr. Elio E. Grandi, chairman, District of Columbia Chapter.

NATIONAL GOVERNING BOARD

Alan R. Ackerman, Hon. James Amadei, John Joseph Amodeo, John J. Amriati, Frank Arena, Louis Arena, Saverio Sal Arena, Vito W. Bassi, Salvatore Borriello, Hon. John P. Botti, Thomas Buttafuoco, Frank P. Castelnovo, Olin Cerrochi, Joseph R. Ciraldo, Thomas D'Alto, Vincent D'Elia.

Howard A. Denis, Fileno De Novellis, Anthony De Toffol, Sylvester Di Stasio, Louis Anthony Durante, Hon. A. Frederick Costanzo, Dr. Alfred De Maria, Rosalia Adelaide Cusa Ehalt, Michael Fazio, Neil Federico, Joseph Francis Ferruggia, Salvatore Giordano, Martin Goldman, John Iacobacci, Joseph M. Iuliano, Gerard La Penna, Hon. Charles A. La Torella, Jr.

Frank Lo Cascio, Albert J. Luglio, Victor Montanaro, Martin M. Moscato, Domenick L. Natale, Michael E. Orofino, George Oslar, Ferrer Rama, Joseph F. Ruggiero, Anthony M. Salvati, Dr. Sholom Shakin, Anthony G. Sparacino, John J. Tartamella, Joseph A. Tucci, Nicholas Tucci, Joseph Vinti.

Two Big Firsts for Spring Arbor College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, during the transaction of our day-to-day affairs, it is inevitable that certain men among us, because of their outstanding traits of character, achieve national recognition. We of the State of Michigan are proud to have as one of our representatives a man who demonstrates qualities of leadership which can be held as an example to our younger generation. The Jackson Citizen Patriot included an editorial on May 30, 1965, with reference to our minority leader, my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., commending him for his "personal integrity in political affairs, his strong stand for Christian ideals in moral matters, and his dynamic actions in national issues" on the occasion of his being awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by Spring Arbor College.

The editorial follows:

TWO BIG FIRSTS FOR SPRING ARBOR COLLEGE

Two important first will take place at Spring Arbor College Monday.

The school will graduate its first senior class as a four-year college.

It will confer on the commencement speaker, Representative GERALD R. FORD, of Grand Rapids, House minority leader, its first honorary doctorate.

In choosing Representative FORD to receive the doctor of laws degree, the president and faculty of Spring Arbor cited him as a man of "outstanding qualities" whose rise to the top in national politics seemed inevitable.

"Mr. FORD's personal integrity in political affairs, his strong stand for Christian ideals in moral matters and his dynamic actions in national issues are the reasons he has been chosen * * * " So spoke Dr. David L. McKenna, president of Spring Arbor.

To put it another way, JERRY FORD is exactly the kind of finished product Spring Arbor is trying to turn out. Thus is it proud to claim him as an honorary alumni.

In this era of much unrest on the campuses, strange antics by relatively small groups of students and a minority of the faculty members, and the apparent indecision on the part of the administrations of colleges as to what to do about all this, it is pleasant and comforting to find a fine and sensible liberal arts college singling out a man like Mr. FORD for honors.

The people at Spring Arbor, and in hundreds of other church-related private schools throughout the country, experience no confusion as to their roles and their goals.

It is to educate young men and women in the humanities and to instill in them the kind of religious training and moral values which will enable them to rise to positions of leadership consistent with their abilities.

They want to turn out graduates who, like GERALD FORD, can boil to the top of the heap in a field such as public service without suffering the indignities often attached to persons who make a career of politics.

No reflection on the public system of higher education is intended. Mr. FORD, himself, is a graduate of the State-supported University of Michigan.

A strong individual can go to school almost anywhere and emerge with qualities that will earn him respect.

But there is more than coincidence in Spring Arbor's choice of a commencement speaker and recipient of its first honorary doctorate.

The man on the podium Monday will be an example to the student body of the goals the college is trying to set for them.

The Menace of Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress we passed a very important act to strengthen the air pollution control program by encouraging State and local prevention and enforcement activities. It is increasingly clear, however, that this problem is not susceptible of easy or early solution. It is more than a local problem, for air pollution is no respecter of geographical boundaries.

As a member of the NATO Parliamentarians' Scientific and Technical Committee, I have presented the case for studies on this problem by this international body. And I am glad to say that at the last meeting in November 1964, our committee recommended that NATO should contribute to an international education and information program on this problem and should direct every effort to arousing public awareness of the urgent need for protection against this health danger.

Findings of a recent report on the problem in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area emphasize the need for cooperative efforts of all communities and between all levels of government. Two excellent editorials in the Newark Evening News and the Newark Star-Ledger of June 28, 1965, commenting on this situation follow:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, June 28, 1965]

CLEARING THE AIR

Strong reinforcements are being recruited for the campaign against air pollution. The American Medical Association is urging its 200,000 members to take a more active part in efforts to clear the atmosphere of pollutants dangerous to human health and damaging to plant life and property.

The AMA report, which outlines a comprehensive program of remedial action, was adopted while the New York City Council was holding hearings on the problem. The

report confirms most of the testimony presented to the council committee.

Some physicians are not sure that pollution causes cancer in nonsmokers, although many suspect it does. Otherwise there is complete agreement on the harmful physical effects of foul air. Both the AMA and council speakers affirmed it is a factor in tumors, asthma, bronchitis, emphysema, and eye ailments. It was identified by medical researchers as a factor in deaths during influenza epidemics. It intensifies the effects of allergies and no one needs to be reminded it causes bad smells and tastes.

Air pollution causes a national economic loss, the council committee was told, of $11 billion a year, with $520 million of damage in New York City alone. Its baneful effect is manifest in deterioration of stone building fronts and the art treasures in museums, in rusting of metal, increased cost for cleaning clothing, erosion of painted surfaces. Nor is the countryside exempt. Air pollution destroys or inhibits the growth of crops and damages orchards.

Some new sources of pollution were mentioned at the council hearings. Dr. Frank L. Rosen, chairman of the Air Pollution Committee of the Essex County Medical Society, pointed out that the takeoff of a commercial jet airliner causes as much pollution as the exhaust from 6,850 passenger cars. He added overburdened hospital incinerators, burning more and more disposable items, to the long list of offenders.

While conceding the complexity of the problems, the AMA concludes there is a technical capability to prevent many forms of air pollution. By this it means improved equipment design, more careful maintenance and operation of existing equipment, improved fuels and control devices.

But while the capability exists, it is being applied negligently. It will require a determined effort in every community, and with State and Federal support, to make capability produce clean air.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, June 28, 1965]

THE AIR WE BREATHE

Afflicted with a deadly case of air pollution, New York points an accusing finger across the Hudson. It sees in the belching smokestacks of Jersey factories part of the cause for its problem, while fully acknowledging that its own sources are major contributors of contaminants.

It serves no purpose to parcel out the blame, for this does nothing to abate this critical health problem. All it does, really, is to firmly establish where the pollutants are coming from and to identify contaminants.

The next step, and the most important, is what both New Jersey and New York are going to do about it. And how fast it will be done.

The need for expeditious official action is clearly delineated in the ominous findings turned up in the New York report, which cited foul air as a major contributing factor to a rising death rate from respiratory diseases and lung cancer.

A research team has found that air pollution was deeply involved in deaths that occurred in New York's influenza epidemic in 1963. The average level of smoke, fumes and dust is higher in New York than in any other major city.

Using this as a basis of comparison, metropolitan areas in Jersey are not far behind in this critical pollution stage. An air sampling study placed Newark as the third worst area in the Nation for sulfur dioxide levels. Sulfur dioxide comes from burning coal and residual oils, and was the major culprit in "killer smogs" that afflicted cities as widely separated as Donora, Pa., and London.

The ominous extent of atmospheric contamination was shown in this finding of the report: Over a year's time, urban residents can inhale from the air more benzyprene, a cancer-inducing substance, than one can get from smoking two packs of cigarettes a day for the same period.

Jersey has had four air sanitation codes in the last 11 years, and is now in the process of establishing regulatory controls on sulfur dioxide and other gases that are spewed into atmosphere from stacks and chimneys. It is expected to be ready for adoption by the end of this year.

Any health code, however, is only as effective as its enforcement. Unless there is stringent enforcement, even a fifth, or a sixth, code will not do the job. Industry must be prepared to cooperate, along with government, in an all-out effort to stamp out this menace from the atmosphere.

Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3014) to regulate the labeling and advertising of cigarettes, and for other purposes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H.R. 3014, the so-called Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act.

The avowed purpose of the bill is to provide adequate warning to the public of the potential hazards of cigarette smoking. It would require the labels on cigarette packages to bear the statement: "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health."

The bill represents the response of the Congress to a report released on January 11, 1964, by the Surgeon General of the United States. Among its principal findings was the following:

> Cigarette smoking is a health hazard of sufficient importance in the United States to warrant appropriate remedial action.

Acting upon the call for appropriate remedial action, the Federal Trade Commission, after hearings, issued a trade regulation rule under date of June 22, 1964, requiring that, in connection with the sale, offering for sale, and distribution of cigarettes in commerce—as defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act—all advertising and every pack or other container in which cigarettes are sold to the consuming public, disclose "clearly and prominently that cigarette smoking is dangerous to health and may cause death from cancer and other diseases."

Originally the effective dates of this regulation were January 1, 1965, with respect to labeling and July 1, 1965, with respect to advertising, but the FTC, at the request of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, deferred the effective date of the labeling requirement to July 1, 1965, in order to give the committee an opportunity to consider legislation on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that H.R. 3014 is seriously deficient in two respects. In a medical sense, it minimizes the health hazards in cigarette smoking by requiring that cigarette packages carry only a tentative note of caution. Such a warning is far weaker than the conclusions of the Surgeon General and other medical authorities on this subject. The word "may" might properly have been used, as the FTC proposed, in the phrase "may cause cancer." But to use in in the phrase "may be hazardous" is almost ridiculously cautious.

A second shortcoming of this bill is that it would shield the cigarette industry from any further requirements with regard to health warnings on labels or in advertising. The bill in effect would remove from the Federal Trade Commission the authority to regulate the labeling or advertising of cigarettes in this respect. Under section 6 of the bill, the FTC would be prevented from imposing any additional requirements with respect to labeling and advertising of cigarettes if the limited warning prescribed by Congress is printed on the packages. To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, such an industrywide prohibition against the FTC has no precedent. As the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], stated in his minority views, the bill would make a "sacred cow" out of the cigarette industry in U.S. commerce.

H.R. 3014 would grant the cigarette industry a privilege afforded to no other interest in the Nation. On the strength of this precedent, we may well expect other interests to ask for the same nullification of FTC authority.

Another part of the bill, section 7, would prohibit State and local governments from imposing requirements with regard to cigarette labeling and advertising going beyond the mild requirements of H.R. 3014.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], proposed an amendment to delete this section 7 of the bill, and I supported his proposal. However, this amendment did not prevail.

It is bad enough for the Congress to deny the FTC power to safeguard public health. It is perhaps even more indefensible, I believe, for the Federal Government to preempt State and local officials from acting with regard to the cigarette industry, especially when the Federal regulation is so weak.

I note that the Senate version of this bill limits the interdiction on FTC regulation to a term of 3 years. This would certainly be preferable to the preemption of indefinite duration provided in H.R. 3014. I would hope, therefore, that the conference report will follow the Senate approach in this regard.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Heroism of U.S. AID Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, recently this House passed a foreign aid bill and soon we will be asked to vote on the required appropriation. It occurs to me that it might be well for our colleagues to keep in mind how very important the foreign aid program is to the continuing policies of this Government. There are people involved in this program, Mr. Speaker, whose work is of really heroic proportions. Some of these people are quietly doing their jobs in Vietnam. I would like to submit for your interest and that of our colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Star of April 15.

The editorial follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, April 15, 1965]

THE "OTHER" WAR: HEROISM OF U.S. AID OFFICIALS

It is too often forgotten—and perhaps we allow it to be too often forgotten—that Americans also serve in South Vietnam who do not wear the uniform of a fighting man. More than 500 U.S. civilians, all volunteers, work in nonmilitary programs that are designed to give the Vietnamese people incentives to defend their homes and villages. A tragic reminder of this undertaking comes in the disclosure that a U.S. AID official, Joseph W. Grainger, was shot and killed by his Vietcong captors January 12.

Another official of the U.S. AID mission in Vietnam, Gustave C. Hertz, was kidnaped by Communist terrorists in suburban Saigon February 2. The Vietcong have threatened to kill Hertz in reprisal if a terrorist convicted of taking part in the recent U.S. Embassy bombing is executed. A young American woman employee of the Embassy died in the bombing. Thus U.S. civilians share the dangers imposed by Vietcong violence.

Most of these civilians are assigned to the mission administered by the Agency for International Development (AID). The mission supplements U.S. military assistance. The role of AID is to help the Vietnamese Government develop effective political, social, and economic programs. Some examples:

Assistance in the local election of hamlet officials, an unprecedented and unique experience for the former French colony.

Three national highways have been built. An AID loan has kept the Vietnam national railway system in operation despite sabotage. Over this artery flow military supplies and food shipments.

Water has been provided for almost 1 million rural inhabitants through the drilling of wells.

Almost 5,000 classrooms have been constructed for villages and hamlets.

Up to last year, 162 diesel generating plants had been provided to the chief province and district towns. Saigon is getting a large thermal electric powerplant through an AID loan. The new power supply will be a boon to industrial users and create many job opportunities.

A national network of seven major radio stations has been equipped. Some 100,000 transistor radios have been procured for sale at a nominal price. Poor communications have been a big problem. Now the Saigon government is better able to tell its story to the people.

Other projects are in the fields of agriculture and public safety. Farmers are being taught how to use fertilizer. A national police force has been trained.

The broad purpose is to build a nation. A comparable approach was seen in the Congo, where a large United Nations aid program was undertaken concurrently with the U.N. military effort to establish public order. In Vietnam the United States seeks to offer hope for the future.

That is being done even as the Vietnamese people with U.S. military aid, are fighting for survival against Communist insurgents.

The economic assistance program has cost more than $2 billion, including $240 million in food-for-peace commodities. It is cheap at the cost. And the American civilians who risk their lives carrying out the program are heroes in their own right.

Advice From General Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am indebted to the California publication entitled Think for acknowledgment of a reference to the immortal Robert E. Lee, in a recent speech by my good friend and esteemed House colleague, Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON, of Texas.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVICE FROM GENERAL LEE

All of us want to share in the material comforts of life; to a point, sharing in the economic abundance appeals to our sense of moral and Christian virtue. But America has no need for a race of young people fitted to the pattern of what someone called prosperous conformity.

National dependence on and worship of wealth comes at the expense of other values and goals. I want to see a nation that continues to produce large numbers of morally alert, upstanding people—citizens not lightly to be stepped on or muzzled, not to be herded about or managed, people who love freedom of choice and opportunity above security and material comforts. At the christening of her baby boy a mother asked the great general, Robert E. Lee, for some wisdom that would help guide her son along the road to manhood. The general's immediate answer was: "Teach him to deny himself."

Where are the fathers and mothers and professors and public officials who are teaching adequately the lessons and virtues of self-denial? We are an undisciplined people. It is too bad that more of us do not follow General Lee's lesson. It is indispensable that the younger generations coming along not cheat the tomorrows by ignoring this maxim.

The Chinese had a proverb for it: "Cut your own wood and it will warm you twice."

Is Shadow of Doom on Welfare Programs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there are many factors that can turn the most attractive welfare program into a cruel hoax on those for whom it is intended, and lead to costs and complications that were not foreseen when the program was inaugurated. The following editorial from the June 28, 1965, Bloomington, Ind., Herald-Telephone describes the trouble California is having with its employee welfare program, which should serve as a warning to those who advocate ever-expanding social welfare in all levels of government:

IS SHADOW OF DOOM ON WELFARE PROGRAMS?

If it be true that coming events cast their shadow in advance, then the current bankruptcy of the California employee welfare program indicates what could well be the future trend in Federal welfare programs.

As of April 1, and until such time as the California Legislature may act to raise additional revenue, the State has been forced to welsh on its promise to pay hospital benefits to employees for which deductions have been made from their paychecks for years.

When the principle of unemployment insurance was first put into effect in the golden State, employees were assessed 1 percent of the first $3,000 in wages toward unemployment insurance, with the employers paying the balance.

However, some 15 years ago when the then Gov. Earl Warren was unsuccessfully seeking to get passed a State medical care bill, a bit of what might be termed a political numbers racket was instituted.

It was decided the entire burden of the unemployment insurance premiums should be paid by the employers with the employee contributions going into a fund to pay a certain amount toward hospital bills, and also to provide pensions to disabled workers.

While the maximum employee contribution to this fund has been increased over the years from $30 to $56, the fund has continued to pay only $12 per day for hospital expenses despite the constantly increasing costs of hospital costs, with a limit of 20 days of hospitalization.

However, in addition, the fund also pays a maximum of $80 per week tax free to disabled workers, provided the worker qualifies for this maximum by earning at least $625 per month. The minimum payment made for disability is $25 per week.

But on April 1, the fund derived from these enforced employee contributions had sunk to such a low balance that it was necessary to discontinue the payments for hospital care. Presumably if a private insurance company failed to pay, there would be State prosecutions, but the only solution advanced so far by the State administration has been a request for more taxes. The legislature has been turning a jaundiced eye to these requests on the suspicion that there has been substantial abuses in making payments out of the fund.

When this welfare program was inaugurated, and then when it was enlarged, California was undergoing a fantastically high era of economic development.

Since that time, however, the economy has been slowed down by the declining demand for new aircraft, plus other cutbacks in the defense program with the result that California now has more than 400,000 unemployed.

In addition, the situation was probably made more critical by the fact that California was subjected to a "Wirtzkrieg." The basic economy of the State depends on the growing, harvesting, and processing of food. The refusal of Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz to permit continuation of the use of sufficient Mexican labor to carry on the industry has resulted in curtailments which have apparently had a severe depressant action on the State's economy.

Current surveys being conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business shows that California, which had for some time been the Nation's leading State in the production of new jobs and employment opportunities, has slipped badly in this respect and is no longer a national leader.

Commenting on the situation, Federation President C. Wilson Harder comments:

"Obviously, any politically inspired welfare plan can look good in a boom period, but what happens when an economic reversal sets in? This is a question not only of concern to the thousands of Californians now unable to get the hospital benefits they have already paid for, but should also be of concern to national planners in the area of social welfare."

Appreciation of U.S. Aid to South Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is refreshing and most reassuring to learn that Korea is coming alive with American aid and know-how.

The work of humanitarians such as Dr. Howard A. Rusk and Mrs. Bernard Gimbel—who have unselfishly given of their time and energy to improve the welfare of Koreans struggling in a bleak desperate land—should serve as an example to all peoples who would better mankind and foster peace and freedom in the world.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent, pertinent article by Bob Considine, which was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPRECIATION OF U.S. AID TO SOUTH KOREA

(By Bob Considine)

NEW YORK.—There are so many discouraging examples of ingratitude in our relations with the world that it's a pleasure to sit down with a man who can swear, on firsthand evidence, that U.S. foreign aid, per se, is not all in vain.

The man is Dr. Howard A. Rusk, who, in addition to all his other contributions to mankind, is chairman of the American-Korean Foundation, Inc., here in New York. He is fresh back from Seoul.

"South Korea is about the only country in the world today where you'll never see a 'Go home, Yankee' sign," Dr. Rusk told us the other day at the great New York University-Bellevue Rehabilitation Center which is his masterpiece. "They actually like us."

He continued: "I've never heard a South Korean ask us for anything that was unrelated to his yearning to do something for his country, his people, his wish to remain a free man. I never heard a child cry, never heard a sick man groan in pain. They maintain the world's fifth biggest army and it's a first-class armed force, a bulwark against communism. Its infantrymen are paid 50 cents a month. We can keep four ROK divisions for a year for the same money it costs to keep one U.S. division for 6 months.

"A lot of our military people out there ask for extended service when their tour is up," Dr. Rusk went on, "just to continue their association with the Korean military and the Korean people. The Koreans lost a million people during the war * * *. When the Korean war ended, the place was a wasteland, particularly around the 38th parallel.

"It was as if you were confronted with an American city of 25,000, one-third of whose houses were knocked down, one-third more unroofed, with polluted water in the taps, fuel enough for only 1 hot meal a day, tuberculosis and pneumonia rates 10 times higher than normal, and but 1 doctor for the 25,000 people, and a nurse."

Dr. Rusk and some other good people, including Mrs. Bernard Gimbel, went to work on those calamitous imponderables in 1953, before the war ended. He headed up a committee, at the request of Dr. Milton Eisenhower, which was the brainchild of John Foster Dulles.

They found a desperate land, that winter of factfinding: Frozen dead in the streets of Pusan, mothers holding children all through the bleak nights awaiting the opening the next day of the Maryknoll Sisters' Mission, "and the first outpatient cases of tuberculosis and meningitis I'd ever seen," as Dr. Rusk puts it.

Providentially, President Dwight D. Eisenhower was holding a White House conference of railroad presidents the day Dr. Rusk was scheduled to present his report. He asked Ike to give him 5 minutes with the railroad men. When the request was granted, he appealed to them for a train that could be sent across America to beg some of the things South Korea needed.

He got five trains, stuffed. The livestock he collected was the first step in the growth of what has become the world's second largest 4-H Club. Korea is coming alive with American know-how. The Korean doctors trained in this country by the foundation, a kind of private Peace Corps that needs your help, have revolutionized the medicine of that land, where a million persons still have tuberculosis and there are 100,000 lepers.

Agreement Necessary for Humane Immigration Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, because of my deep interest and concern over the presently existing problems connected with our immigration law and the glaring need for reform, I have introduced H.R. 9474 urging the revision of the present immigration law and repeal of the national origins quota system.

Prior to serving as a Member of Congress, I was an executive board member of the Chicago chapter of the American Committee on Italian Migration. In December 1963 I served as chairman of the largest rally held in the United States, with over 5,000 people in attendance at the Arie Crown Theater, McCormick Place, Chicago, Ill., where the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, addressed this rally. The Chicagoans assembled at this rally passed a resolution which was mailed to every Congressman and every U.S. Senator, urging the revision of the present immigration law and the repeal of the national origins quota section.

Today, I want to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post of Wednesday, June 30, 1965.

I know that Congressman CELLER and Congressman FEIGHAN are men of the highest principles. Because of the vast amount of their time and talents which they have already so generously given, I know it is their desire to bring to the floor of the House a realistic bill which meets the needs and wants of the people.

The magnificent effort both of my colleagues have already made convinces me that they will continue to give still a little more of their time and themselves to get the result that they, and all of us, so earnestly want—the very best possible immigration law for the United States.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1965]

CHOOSING IMMIGRANTS

An unfortunate conflict seems to have developed in the House Judiciary Committee over pending immigration legislation. Congressman CELLER, the chairman of the committee, has introduced the administration bill. Congressman FEIGHAN, the chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, has introduced a bill which, generally, aims in the same direction but which, in many of its features, is much more restrictive. It is a pity to have these two legislative leaders, and their respective bills, in opposition. We think the committee, which has been working on the legislation this week, can resolve the dilemma by merging the best features of the two proposals.

Both bills aim at abandonment of the national origins quota system. That system has bedeviled American immigration policy for the better part of half a century; conceived in prejudice, it has conditioned ad-

mittance to this country on ethnic grounds, discriminating flagrantly against eastern and southern Europeans and against orientals.

The administration bill would by no means open the doors to immigrants without limitation. It would, indeed, only very slightly increase the number of newcomers who could come here to live. But it would substitute for the national origins quota system a more rational basis of selection. It would pick immigrants not by race but by skill—and in accordance with the need of the United States for the capabilities the immigrants had to offer.

The administration bill provides for a gradual change from the old to the new system of selection—a 5-year phaseout. The purpose was to cushion the impact of the change. Mr. FEIGHAN's bill would make the change at once. If this can be done without injuring or insulting friendly nations, it seems to us highly desirable. We hope that Mr. CELLER—and the administration for which he speaks—will accept this feature of the Feighan bill and that Mr. FEIGHAN will accept the other features of the Celler bill and that cooperatively they will get the immigration measure speedily enacted. Its enactment is greatly needed and long overdue.

Troy E. Kern, From Delta County, Tex., Named President of the American Dairy Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at its recent meeting in Chicago, Ill., the American Dairy Association unanimously elected as its president, Troy E. Kern, of Lake Creek, Delta County, Tex.

In order for a man from such a small town to be elected to this prominent position in the American Dairy Association, he must be a very outstanding person; and that is just what Troy Kern is. Last year, Mr. Kern was named "Man of the Year in Texas Agriculture" and, in addition to serving 8 years as president of the North Texas Producers Association, he has served as director on the NTPA board since its organization in 1949.

The May 1965 issue of the North Texas Dairyman includes an article in which the accomplishments of Mr. Kern are described. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KERN ELECTED ADA PRESIDENT

(NOTE.—The unanimous election of Troy Kern, the Delta County dairyman-churchman-educator-legislator, as president of the farflung American Dairy Association is a signal honor to the most enthusiastic exponent of dairying the Southwest has known. For a Delta County neighbor to be elected president of the huge dairy association is a once-in-a-lifetime occurrence.—From the Paris News.)

A lone car sped along the highway late at night. At 1:30 in the morning it pulled off the highway, crossed a cattle guard, and climbed the gravel drive to a white frame house on a hill. Out of the car crawled a lean, energetic Texan. This scene occurred several nights each week.

That was 16 years ago. The man was Troy E. Kern. He was returning home after meeting with dairymen to urge them to band together for their own benefit. In the early days of organizing NTPA, Mr. Kern traveled more miles and spoke to more dairy farmers than perhaps any other dairyman. As a result, he was NTPA's first president and filled that post for 8 years.

This year, on March 23 in Chicago, Mr. Kern was elected national president of the American Dairy Association. The same energy and hard work that helped build NTPA had lifted him to a position of great influence in helping to sell more of the milk produced by dairy farmers in all 50 States. ADA is a dairymen's self-help program of advertising and promotion that is watched and admired by all other segments of agriculture.

Mr. Kern, who succeeds William J. Hitz, Polk City, Iowa, as president, operates a 1,250-acre dairyfarm at Cooper, Tex. He milks a herd of 125 cows. Mr. Kern and his wife, Bethol, have three children. Their son, Carrol, is 18 years old, and their twin daughters, Karen and Connie, are 16 years old.

Through the years, Mr. Kern has been active in civic, business, and church affairs in his community. In 1954 the Kern family was selected as the most outstanding family in their county of Delta, and in 1964, Mr. Kern was named man of the year in Texas agriculture by the Texas Extension Service. In addition to serving 8 years as president of NTPA, Kern has served as a director on the NTPA board since its organization in 1949.

Mr. Kern holds a bachelor of arts degree with a triple major in English, government, and speech, and a master's degree in administration from East Texas State Teachers College. He served as a schoolteacher for 10 years and as a member of the Texas Legislature's House of Representatives from 1935 to 1940.

Emmet Carter, Purcell, Okla., succeeds Mr. Kern as vice president. Mr. Carter has also served as vice president of the Central Oklahoma Milk Producers Association; president of the American Dairy Association of Oklahoma; a member of the Governor's agricultural advisory committee; and a member of the Oklahoma State University agricultural research advisory committee.

A record number of dairy farmers, delegates, and other representatives of the dairy industry were present for the silver anniversary (25th) meeting. Dairymen from Canada and Great Britain also were present.

Approval was given to a plan to purchase 20 commercial minutes on three TV shows in the fall season of 1965. ADA will have 5 commercial minutes in the "Virginian," 7 in the Daniel Boone Show, and 8 in the Flipper show in the last 3 months of this year.

East Texas' Richard A. Goodson, New President of Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include an article that appeared in the Longview Daily News about Mr. Richard A. Goodson on June 20, 1965. We of East Texas are mighty proud of the attainments of Mr. Richard A. Goodson.

The article follows:

IN GOOD HANDS

A former East Texas farm boy, Richard A. Goodson, has become the first native Texan to be elected president of the Southwestern Bell Telephon Co. He will assume his new duties in the company's headquarters offices in St. Louis, Mo., on July 1.

Richard Goodson, who put in his first 5 years on a Cherokee County farm and got his first business experience in box factories and his father's hardware store in Jacksonville, has earned his high position and will occupy the office with ability, dignity, and honor.

He is one of the finest men the writer has ever known. We have watched him in his steady climb of the ladder of success with the great Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. Across the years we have been the best of friends, and we have been pleased to see him rise in position and influence and responsibility.

Though Mr. Goodson in recent years has served with the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. as vice president for operations in New York, and with Southwestern Bell as vice president for operations in St. Louis, he has by no means deserted Texas nor has he lost the Texas flavor and spirit of life and work.

Well known in Longview where he has a brother, W. J. Goodson, of 607 Buchanan, the new Southwestern Bell president is a graduate of Texas A. & M. University and was on a scenic cruise on Texas waters when elected to the post. The company's board of directors held a meeting aboard the M-V *Sam Houston* on the Houston Ship Channel, naming the Texan as the eighth president of the organization.

Richard Goodson joined Southwestern Bell as a traffic assistant in Dallas in 1928. He had assignments in San Antonio and Abilene until 1952 when he was named general traffic manager in the Missouri-Illinois area with offices in St. Louis. He was named assistant vice president for operations in 1954.

He returned to Dallas in 1956 in charge of operations there, and was elected vice president and general manager in 1957 and promoted to vice president for Texas in 1961. He advanced to vice president for operations of A.T. & T. in New York in 1963, and moved to the same position in St. Louis in 1964.

As president in control of Southwestern Bell operations in Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Missouri, Kansas and part of Illinois, he will direct a stepped-up enlargement of facilities and service in this large Southwestern region. The current budget of $345 million is expected to rise to $355 million in 1966 as much new and expensive equipment is added and the present staff of 55,000 employees is expanded because of added use of mechanical equipment.

Texas and Longview, where industrial expansion is undergirding a growing economy that thrives best with excellent communications, expect to get some new facilities with a continuing expansion of service. Never a "9 to 5" man, Mr. Goodson puts in an average 60 to 70 hours a week at his job, and he will be in a most advantageous position to aid the march of progress in Texas as well as the other States he serves.

Richard Goodson has risen to the chief post of leadership and responsibility with his company because he has a proven record of native ability, training and experience, discipline and judgment, and the admiration and respect of those with whom he works. As its new president, he will be good for Southwestern Bell—just as Southwestern Bell has been good to him.

New York Bar Report on Migratory Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following report unanimously adopted by the Committee on Labor and Social Security Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

The report recommends that the Congress extend the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the National Labor Relations Act to migratory workers and follows:

REPORT ON MIGRATORY LABOR

Migratory agricultural workers are one of America's most depressed groups. They have not shared in the progress of recent decades achieved by others in our society. They are excluded from the elementary protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and other protective Federal and State legislation. It is little wonder that the status of this group has in recent years become a subject of increasing concern.

We recommend amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act to eliminate the existing exclusion of agricultural labor (29 U.S.C. sec. 213(a)(6)) and to provide for phased increases in an agricultural minimum wage, applicable at least to larger farm employers, reaching the level of the industrial minimum wage over a 4-year period.

We further recommend amendment of the National Labor Relations Act to eliminate the existing exclusion of agricultural labor (29 U.S.C. sec. 152(3)) and further study to determine whether other amendments to the act and special procedures are necessary for meaningful protection under the law.

Finally, we recommend further intensive study of the problems of migratory labor, including coverage under unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation and social security, provisions for better housing, health, safety, and education, and extension of the franchise by limitation of residence requirements for voting.

We support the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in these respects (S. Rept. No. 115, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Apr. 8, 1965).

In making these recommendations, we act both on the basis of the demands flowing from our traditions of equal justice under law, and on the basis of the demands of our conscience as citizens in the face of the conditions of migratory labor.

I. GENERAL FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The 400,000 to 500,000 of our fellow citizens who work as migratory farm laborers comprise one of America's disadvantaged groups.[1]

In the United States today there are approximately 1,400,000 unemployed farmworkers.[2] The migrants are drawn in significant part from the ranks of these unemployed farmworkers. Unemployment among farmworkers is caused in great measure by the failure of smaller farms to survive the competition of the larger more modern mechanized farms.[3] But even the most mechanized farm requires the work of farm laborers for short periods of time each year.

Starting in the spring of each year, three groups of migratory workers seek to fill this need.[4] The first group starts in Florida and wends its way through the old South, the Middle Atlantic States and ends up bringing in the late harvest in the northeastern section of our country. The second group starts from Texas and works its way through the heartland of the United States. The third group starts in California and moves through that State, Oregon and Washington. When winter comes and there is no work for the migrant, he generally returns to the starting point for his group.

The risks of the migrant farmworker

As discussed in greater detail below, the average income of the migrant farmworker is far below minimum standards.[5] Many workers migrate to obtain farm employment without having a definite job commitment. If, for any reason the work does not materialize, the migrant may be stranded without funds or any means of returning home. So also there is a loss of earning opportunities when there is delay in the need for the migratory farmworker. The causes of delay or total failure in obtaining work are numerous. They include weather conditions which can destroy a crop or unexpectedly accelerate or retard its ripening; a transportation breakdown on route; inaccurate information or no information as to where and when employment opportunities exist.[6]

The farmer who engages a migratory laborer is also susceptible to risk. There is the uncertainty whether enough workers will be available to harvest his crops and, even if sufficient workers are available, the labor turnover is often high and the farmer cannot be sure of retaining an adequate work force until the harvest is completed. His efforts to assure efficient labor by advancing transportation expenses are sometimes insufficient but they also involve the risk of financial loss if the workers do not arrive or do not stay on the job long enough to earn or repay the amounts advanced.[7] To lessen some of these risks to the farmer and the migratory laborer, there has evolved a system of farm labor contractors or crew leaders.

The role of the crew leader

The individual migrant cannot individually contract for work throughout the area in which he travels. The contracts of labor are made generally by a crew leader who recruits, transports, supervises and handles pay arrangements for the migratory worker and otherwise acts as an intermediary between the worker and the farmer.

Many of the crew leaders are fair and responsible; however, because of their dependency on the crew leader, the migratory workers are particularly vulnerable to exploitation and abuse at the hands of an unscrupulous crew leader. The abuses most frequently attributed to crew leaders as reported by the Department of Labor are as follows:

"1. Overcharging workers for transportation advances, collecting for travel expenses from both employers and workers, collecting advances from employer and failing to report to work or reporting with a crew smaller than for whom travel advances had been made;

"2. Underpaying workers by giving them a short count or short weight on units produced and overcharging employers by giving them inflated production figures on piece rate activities;

"3. Abandoning workers without paying them; failing to pay agreed upon wage rate, wages earned, or bonus collected from employers, and making improper deductions from workers' earnings;

"4. Overcharging for meals, groceries, and crew leaders' services; and

"5. Illegal sale of liquor and dope, gambling and similar illegal activities."[8]

In an attempt to curb these abuses, eight States and Puerto Rico have enacted laws requiring the registration of farm labor contractors or crew leaders.[9] Basically, the State laws applying to crew leaders include requirements for payment of wages when due and prohibitions against certain undesirable employment practices such as giving false information relating to the terms, conditions, or expenses of employment. An additional State, Texas, has a law which is primarily designed to control the recruitment activities of agents and also includes requirements for agents who recruit agricultural workers for out-of-State use.[10]

The Congress, effective January 1, 1965, enacted and on September 7, 1964, the President approved the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963.[11] The act prohibits acting as a crew leader without first obtaining a certificate of registration from the Secretary of Labor and maintaining it in full force and effect. In order to qualify for a certificate, a crew leader must satisfy the Secretary of Labor that he is financially responsible or insured against damages arising out of ownership or operation of vehicles for the transportation of migrant workers; must file a set of his fingerprints with the Secretary; must not have given false or misleading information to migrant workers concerning the terms, conditions, or existence of agricultural employment; must not have unjustifiably failed to perform agreements with farm operators or migrant workers; must not have recruited or used the services of anyone he knows to be violating the provisions of the immigration and naturalization laws; must not have been convicted of certain named crimes under State or Federal law; must have complied with the rules and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission applicable to his activities in interstate commerce; and must have complied with all the provisions of the act or any regulations issued by the Secretary under it.

A crew leader is required by the act to carry his certificate of registration with him at all times while engaging in crew leader activities and exhibit it to those he intends dealing with; must disclose to each worker at the time he is recruited the area of employment, the crops, and operations on which he may be employed, the transportation, housing, and insurance to be provided him, the wage rates to be paid him and the charges to be made by the crew leader for his services; must post at each place of employment a written statement of the terms and conditions of employment; must post the terms and conditions of occupancy of any housing facilities he controls; and, if he pays migrant workers on his own behalf or as an agent, must keep payroll records and give the migrant worker a statement of sums paid him and withheld from him.

Employees of crew leaders are required to have in their possession identification furnished by the Secretary showing them to be employees of a registered crew leader, and crew leaders may not knowingly employ persons who do not meet the conditions (other than those of financial responsibility and filing fingerprints) of certification as a crew leader.

Crew leaders and their employees who willingly and knowingly violate any provision of the act or regulation under it are subject to a fine of not more than $500.

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to issue regulations under the act and did so on December 22, 1964.

The act recites that it is not intended to excuse compliance with appropriate State law and regulation.

Those opposed to the legislation argued principally that Federal regulation was unnecessary as a supplement to State controls; that growers' associations hiring workers for employment by their own members, on whose part there was little or no evidence of abuse, might to some extent be covered by the act; and that a broad interpretation of the act by the Department of Labor might result in a

Footnotes at end of speech.

reduction in work opportunities for migratory workers.

With the act having been in effect only since January 1, 1965, it is too early to determine the degree to which it is effective in curbing the abuses which prompted its passage or the degree to which it will have the consequences feared by its opponents.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has also established certain requirements with respect to the transportation of migratory farmworkers. These requirements apply to the carriers in the case of transportation of migratory workers for a total distance of more than 75 miles or across the boundary line of any State. The regulations list qualifications of the drivers of the vehicles and place a limitation on the drivers' hours of work. They also require protection of passengers from cold, meal stops at least every 6 hours and rest stops.[12]

Housing

After the migratory workers arrive at a farm they often find substandard housing for themselves and their families. Often this housing is merely tar paper shacks. Housing, whether used for 1 week, 1 month, 6 months, or year-round is costly and agricultural income is low, thus forcing some farmers to meet only the minimum standards for housing migrants.[13]

Because of this 30 States have enacted mandatory laws and regulations that apply to labor camps used by migratory agricultural workers.[14] This, however, has only acerbated the financial dilemma of some farmers. To help the farmer finance adequate housing Federal legislation has been proposed to amend the Federal Housing Act so as to guarantee commercial loans for these purposes and to directly grant low-interest loans.[15]

Health and sanitation

Directly connected with the ned for adequate housing is the need for proper sanitary facilities. If a third of our rural homes do not have complete sanitary facilities[16] it follows that an even greater percentage of housing for migratory farmworkers lack proper sanitary facilities. The migrant worker is faced with inadequate water supplies, poor toilet and privy facilities, and inadequate sewage disposal.[17]

Many States have sanitation codes which should cover this problem but often they are inadequately enforced. An example given by the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor will suffice to prove this:

"Minnesota, for example, has an excellent code, but only one sanitarian to inspect 1,000 camps. In 1959, this inspector was able to check only 118 camps; yet in those he found 729 violations."[18]

This is in marked contrast to the enforcement of its law by New York State where in 1962 the State health department and the State police conducted over 7,000 inspections of health and housing facilities at the 1,000 labor camps which house migratory farm workers in that State.[19]

But the fact remains that sanitary facilities at most migratory farm labor camps are far below any minimum safe standards. This lack of proper sanitary facilities is one of the major reasons for the disease and disability of the migrant farm workers. The repeated serious outbreaks of diarrhea among the children of migratory farm workers is caused in part by this lack of sanitary conditions.

Farmwork is inherently dangerous. Of the 13,800 workers killed on the job in all industries in 1960, 3,300 or approximately one-quarter of the total were engaged in farm labor.[20] The constant interstate movement of migratory farm laborers and their families prevents them from utilizing public health services generally available to other citizens. The community services migrants receive are not planned with their needs in mind and are not coordinated with the services they may receive elsewhere.[21]

The migrants generally also have little knowledge of good dietary and food handling practices. They also lack understanding of health needs, or proper health maintenance practices.[22]

These conditions brought about the enactment of the Federal Migrant Health Act of 1962.[23] The act authorizes the Public Health Service to make grants to public or nonprofit agencies to pay part of the cost of establishing and operating family health service clinics, and other special projects to improve health services and conditions of domestic agricultural migratory workers and their families. The Public Health Service is also authorized to encourage and cooperate in programs aimed at improving migrant health services and conditions.

Many of the migrants health and sanitary problems could be alleviated by proper education but the migrant generally lacks any educational opportunities.

Education

The educational opportunities for migratory farmworkers are low. They have been called the most educationally deprived group in our Nation.[24] A 1961 study of migratory children in Colorado found that out of 345 children ages 6 through 11, 67 percent were retarded. Thirty-six percent of these children were retarded by 2 years or more. These figures typify the results of many surveys.[25]

The low educational attainment of migrant children is directly related to the large number of these children who do not attend school on a full-time basis during the regular school year. Many of the migratory children enter school in November and leave in the spring, 4 to 6 weeks before school closes. There are few, because of constantly shifting from area to area, who stay in any one school for more than brief periods of 6 to 8 weeks. While all States have mandatory school attendance laws, these laws appear to be laxly enforced, if at all, with relation to the children of the migratory farmer. It is highly impracticable to expect rural communities to provide adequate education for children of transient, low-income families who do not contribute to the local tax system or otherwise help to defray the cost of educating their children.

This lack of educational opportunities is tending to repeat the cycle whereby the children of migratory farmers are trapped to a life of poverty the same as their parents.

In short, the depressed status of the migrants is beyond question.[26] Public awareness of it, while not widespread, has been increasing, thanks to such efforts as that of CBS Reports' "Harvest of Shame," narrated by Edward R. Murrow and broadcast on November 25, 1960.[27] Lack of additional action to remedy the plight of the migrants to date may stem both from insufficient public awareness of the conditions they face and from their lack of effective political representation, resulting from inability to vote under existing residence requirements for exercise of the franchise.

II. THE IMPLICATIONS OF DISENFRANCHISEMENT

The obligation to assure fairness to our migratory workers is particularly compelling because they are generally barred from voting by residence requirement,[28] and hence can exercise little political influence on their own behalf. The disenfranchisement of the migrants was specifically alluded to by the Supreme Court in *Edwards* v. *California*, 314 U.S. 160, 174 (1941), striking down a State law prohibiting the entrance of migrants with insufficient funds into the State as violative of the commerce clause. The Court said: "The * * * nonresidents who are the real victims of the statute are deprived of the opportunity to exert political pressures upon the * * * legislature in order to obtain a change in policy."

The importance of such an opportunity to exert political pressure in our structure of government was recognized by Chief Justice Marshall in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, 22 U.S. (9 Wheat.) 1, 195–96 (1824) when he said of the Federal commerce power: "The wisdom and discretion of Congress, their identity with the people, and the influence which their constituents possess at elections, are, in this, as in many other instances * * * the sole restraints on which they have relief to secure them from its abuse."

See also *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 316, 433–34 (1819). For this reason, "other rights, even the most basic, are illusory if the right to vote is undermined." *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 17 (1964). And see *Williamson* v. *Lee Optical, Inc.*, 348 U.S. 483, 488 (1955) quoting *Munn* v. *Illinois*, 94 U.S. 113, 134 (1876); Stone J. dissenting in *United States* v. *Butler*, 297 U.S. 1, 78 (1936); Dowling, "The Methods of Mr. Justice Stone in Constitutional Cases," 41 Colum. L. Rev. 1160 (1941).

Where such restraints have been absent, as in the case of State regulation affecting interests beyond the State, the courts have recognized the profound difference in circumstances: "to the extent that the burden of State regulation falls on interests outside the State, it is unlikely to be alleviated by the operation of those political restraints normally exerted when interests within the State are affected." *Southern Pacific Co.* v. *Arizona*, 325 U.S. 761, 767–68 n. 2 (1945); see also *Nippert* v. *City of Richmond*, 327 U.S. 416, 434 (1946); *McGoldrick* v. *Berwind-White Coal Mining Co.*, 309 U.S. 33, 46 n. 2 (1940); *South Carolina State Highway Dept.* v. *Barnwell Bros.*, 303 U.S. 177, 184–85 n. 2 (1936); Givens, "Chief Justice Stone and the Developing Functions of Judicial Review," 7 V. L. Rev. 1321, 1961).

These reasons for exacting scrutiny of the fairness of legal distinctions against the disenfranchised, pointed out by the courts in cases where relevant to judicial decision, are applicable to us as citizens as well. It is the duty of each of us to do what we can to assure that those who are unable to vote for any reason are not subjected to what has been called in another context "irrelevant and invidious" distinctions. *Steele* v. *Louisville & Nashville R. Co.*, 323 U.S. 192, 203 (1944).

In this spirit, we must approach the task of remedying the legal disadvantages suffered by our migratory workers.

III. COVERAGE UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

The Fair Labor Standards Act was originally passed in 1938 and provided for minimum hourly wage rates for employees of employers engaged in interstate commerce. Title 29, United States Code, section 213, provided certain exemptions to the overall minimum wage legislation. Included in the 15 exemptions, number 6 is directed toward the committee's problem and reads in part as follows: "(a)(6). Any employee employed in agriculture."

Even from the very beginning of legislation looking toward a minimum wage, President Roosevelt called for such legislation to cover both "those who toil in factory and on farm." Since 1938, the Fair Labor Standards Act has been extended to numerous other workers not originally covered. Nonetheless, farm employees have never been included in this legislation. S. 528 of the 88th Congress would have amended the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for minimum wages for agricultural employees. This bill, over a 4-year period, would bring the wages of agricultural workers in line with those of other employees covered by the act. The wage paid to an agricultural employee would include the reasonable costs as determined

Footnotes at end of speech.

by the Secretary of Labor of board, lodging, or other facilities customarily furnished the employees. In addition, the piece-rate system would be protected by a provision approving any piece rate that yields, for at least 90 percent of the employees working at such piece rate, actual wages equal to the minimum hourly wage.

Coverage under the bill would extend to all employees performing hired farm labor for an employer who used more than 560 man-days of hired farm labor in any one of the four preceding calendar quarters.

Exempted from the minimum wage requirement would be members of employers' immediate families, sharecroppers, or members of sharecroppers' immediate families working on or in connection with the sharecroppers' tracts of land. An identical bill was introduced in the House (H.R. 4521).

The Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has recommended a similar proposal in the present Congress (S. Rept. No. 155, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965), p. 25). Although this legislation may not solve all the migratory worker's problems, which include poor housing ofttimes proffered by the employer, and the fact that some small farms might use less than the 560 man-day minimum—especially where migratory workers are employed for a day or two to harvest a fruit crop—nonetheless, it is a step forward which should be taken by Congress.

The low compensation of the migratory worker has become increasingly evident to the American people since the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Some of the pertinent statistics bear repetition. Of the approximately 2 million individuals who worked in agriculture 25 days or more during 1962, the average income amounted only to $1,164 during the entire year. Migrants who were employed over 25 days during 1962 earned $874, for an average of 116 days of work. They averaged $249 from their off-farm work for total earnings of $1,123, for the entire year. Moreover, migrants generally must pay their own transportation expenses, and their living costs are higher while working away from home.

In 1963, the average cash hourly wage of all domestic farmworkers, including the 25 percent who operate machines often requiring substantial skill, was less than 90 cents per hour.

The lowest average pay—68 cents per hour—prevailed in the South where more than half the farmworkers are employed and the greatest surplus exists. The highest rate—an average of $1.30 per hour—was paid in the Pacific coast States. It is noteworthy that, even if these most fortunate farmworkers were lucky enough to be hired year-round, their average annual earnings would have been less than $3,000.

In hearings before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 86th Congress, 1st session on S. 1085 (1959) the committee heard from representatives of organizations opposed to this kind of legislation. Basically, their objections were as follows:

1. No consideration was made in the legislation for the high costs borne by the employer of furnishing housing, recruiting, transportation expenses, and various insurance policies peculiar to migrant workers. (It should be noted that some of these objections are voided by the currently proposed bill which provides that the cost to the employer of lodging and other facilities can be deducted.)

2. Minimum wage rates eliminate incentive payments for production which would, therefore, result in lower efficiency. (The current legislation also obviates this objection by preserving the piece rate system.)

3. Such legislation was also objected to on the grounds that it would put the Federal Government in a position of preempting what ought to be a power reserved to the States, force farmers to mechanize and do away with this source of income for the many migrant workers who depend upon it for their livelihood, and would create undue hardships for employers when the weather was bad, because in inclement weather the farmer would have to pay a minimum wage regardless of whether or not the migrant workers could perform their services.

Despite these objections, it would seem that the legislation is much needed and worthy of enactment.

We do not consider at this time whether the hours provisions of the act should be extended to cover agricultural labor, or whether additional child labor restrictions are needed, confining ourselves to the recommendation as to the minimum wage for the present.[29]

IV. COVERAGE UNDER THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

The migratory agricultural worker is subjected to impersonal, brief and transitory periods of employment at below subsistence level wages. His condition has, as might have been expected, produced serious labor disputes in our agricultural economy in recent year. Yet neither Federal or State laws provide meaningful collective-bargaining rights for the Nation's agricultural labor force.[30]

Section 2(3) of the National Labor Relations Act specifically exempts agricultural labor from coverage. Conditions, however, have changed since the exclusion was originally included in the National Labor Relations Act of 1935. Collective bargaining is no longer new and experimental as part of our national labor policy. And conditions in farming have changed, with greater mechanization and the use of large farms employing many persons. Thus, while the characteristics of our Nation's modern industrialized agricultural economy and the plight of the agricultural worker require the development of mutually beneficial collective bargaining our national labor policy lags behind. The need for corrective legislation is manifest.

Bills to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make its provisions applicable to agriculture were introduced into the 87th and 88th Congresses. S. 529 was introduced in the 1st session of the 88th Congress by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey for himself and other sponsors.[31] It is similar to S. 1128 introduced into the 87th Congress. A companion bill to S. 529 (H.R. 4516) was introduced in the House by Representative J. COHELAN, of California.

Here also the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has recommended such legislation in the present Congress (S. Rept. No. 155, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965), p. 34).

The Senate bills would amend the National Labor Relations Act to make its provisions applicable to agricultural workers. They also take account of the seasonal nature of agricultural labor by according to this class of workers the same privileges regarding, among other things, precontract representational status and union security arrangements now applicable to workers in the building and construction industry under section 8(f) of the act.

We strongly recommend amendment of the National Labor Relations Act to extend the coverage to agricultural labor, including migrants. It may also be necessary to develop special jurisdictional standards and other procedures under the act to meet the special problems of agriculture.

CONCLUSION

In order to assist in dealing with the urgent problems faced by migratory workers, a depressed and dispossessed group in our society, we recommend:

1. Extension of the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to agricultural, including migratory, labor.

2. Extension of the National Labor Relations Act to cover agricultural, including migratory, labor.

3. Continuing study of the problems of migrant labor, including additional protections under the National Labor Relations Act, coverage under unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation and Social Security; better provisions for housing, health, safety, and education, and extension of the franchise by limitation of residence requirements for voting.

Respectfully submitted.

William J. Isaacson, chairman, Jerome H. Adler, Albert X. Bader, Harold Baer, Jr., Aaron Benenson, Laurence G. Bodkin, Jr., William Joseph Brennan III, Samuel J. Cohen, Kevin T. Duffy, Richard A. Givens, Alex J. Glauberman, Bernard D. Gold, Robert C. Isaacs, Isadore Katz, Samuel M. Kaynard, Arthur Merman, Francis A. O'Connell, Jr., Herbert Semmel, Michael I. Sovern, Burton B. Turkus, Stephen C. Vladeck, John W. Whittlesey, Benjamin Wyle, William A. Ziegler, Jr., and Max Zimny.

---

[1] The Bureau of Census, 1959 report, enumerates approximately 500,000 migrant farmworkers. The number of farmworkers has consistently dropped since that period. ("Farm Labor Market Developments," U.S. Department of Labor, January 1964.) The Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor now estimates that there are about 400,000 migrant farm laborers (Senate Rept. No. 167, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963).

[2] Senate Rept. No. 167, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, p. 17.

[3] "Farm Labor Market Developments," U.S. Department of Labor, January 1964.

[4] Levine, "The Migratory Worker in the Farm Economy," 12 Labor Law Journal, 622, 626 (1961).

[5] In 1959 migratory workers averaged only $710 income per year. (The Migratory Worker in the Farm Economy", supra, at p. 627). In 1961 the average annual wage was estimated at $902. U.S. Department of Agriculture, "Advance Report: The Hired Farm Working Force of 1961" (1962). See also S. Rept. No. 155, 89th Cong., 1st sess. 1965), p. 25.

[6] S. Rept. 167, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, at p. 17.

[7] S. Rept. 167, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, at p. 16.

[8] S. Rept. 167, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, at p. 11. See also U.S. Department of Labor "Survey of Farm Labor Crew Leaders Practices" (1960).

[9] U.S. Department of Labor "Coverage of Agricultural Workers Under State and Federal Laws," Bulletin 264 (1964).

[10] Ibid.

[11] 7 U.S.C.A. 2041 et seq.

[12] U.S. Department of Labor "Status of Agricultural Workers Under State and Federal Labor Laws" (1964).

[13] Williams, Proposed Legislation for Migratory Workers, 12 Labor Law Journal 630 (1961). Typically, the migrant worker lives by the side of the road in "Grapes of Wrath" style or in wretched farm labor camps such as the one found at Indio in the Coachella Valley in southern California. Operated by a county housing authority, it consists of several acres of thin-walled, one-room shacks dating to World War II. The New York Times, Sunday, Jan. 17, 1965, p. 77.

[14] U.S. Department of Labor, "Status of Agricultural Workers Under State and Federal Labor Laws" (1964).

[15] S. Rept. 934, 88th Cong., 2d sess. (1964), p. 48 et seq.

[16] Ibid. p. 49; see also message of President Johnson accompanying the administration's housing program, Jan. 27, 1964.

[17] U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor "Interim Report on the Status of Program Activities Under the Migrant Health Act." See also S. Rept. 155, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965), pp. 6–11.

[18] S. Rept. 167, 88th Cong., 1st sess., (1963), p. 15.

[19] New York State Interdepartmental Committee on Farm and Food Processing Labor "A Helping Hand" (1963), p. 5.

[20] S. Rept. 167, supra, at p. 26.

[21] U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, "Interim Report on the Status of Program Activities Under the Migrant Health Act" (1964), pp. 1–2.

[22] Ibid.

[23] 42 U.S.C.A. 242h.

[24] U.S. Senate Report No. 167, supra, at p. 7; S. Rept. No. 155, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965), p. 11.

[25] Ibid at pp. 7 and 8.

[26] See generally, S. Sept. No. 155, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965); Migratory Labor in American Agriculture: Report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor (1951); Report of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor 3–4 (1960; First Progress Repot, 1956); Hearings before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 1085 (1959); Report on Farm Labor: Public Hearings of the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor (1959); Levine, "The Migratory Worker in the Farm Economy," 12 Labor L. J. 622 (1961); Greene, "The Education of Migrant Children" (1954); Sutton, "Knowing and Teaching the Migrant Child" (1962); Lowry, "They Starve That We May Eat: Migrants of the Crops" (Council of Women for Home Missions, 1940). For historical background, see, e.g., Interstate Migration, H. Rept. No. 369, 77th Cong., 1st sess. (1941); Neuberger, Refugees From the Dust Bowl, 50 Current History 32 (1939).

[27] Transcripts, not for reproduction, may be obtained from CBS.

[28] See generally hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961); Schmidhauser, Residency Requirements for Voting and the Tensions of a Mobile Society, 61 Mich. L. Rev. 823 (1963); Note, 77 Harv. L. Rev. 574 (1964).

[29] See generally Kantor, Problems Involved in Applying a Federal Minimum Wage to Agricultural Workers (U.S. Department of Labor 1960).

[30] A description of labor disputes affecting the agricultural labor force and coverage of these workers under State collective bargaining statutes is set forth in the Third Report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the U.S. Senate made by its Subcommittee on Migratory Labor pursuant to S. Res. 273, as amended, p. 20 (1963). S. Rept. No. 167, supra.

[31] The bill was also sponsored by Senators CLARK, HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, METCALF, INOUYE, MCCARTHY, and YOUNG.

California Acts on Birth Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, California is the most populous State in the United States. I might add that we are still welcoming new residents and that our great population growth has continued to be primarily a boon, with economic growth maintaining a similarly high rate.

I am proud to note, however, that California has joined the ranks of those forward-looking States that are taking some action to help bring the benefits of family planning assistance to those who need and desire such assistance. Unwanted children perpetuate poverty and can add to the delinquency control problems even in the most affluent of States.

The following article, taken from the Alhambra, Calif., Post-Advocate, June 22, 1965, describes the action taken by the California State Legislature:

BIRTH CONTROL GUIDE OK'D BY LEGISLATURE

(By Ronald L. Soble)

SACRAMENTO.—Hundreds of California communities have been given permission by the legislature to instruct parents in the proper use of birth control devices.

Lawmakers last week adopted a heatedly debated resolution directing the State's autonomous local health agencies "to include family planning services in public health service programs."

The resolution aimed at a mushrooming problem of unwanted and unloved children, was vigorously opposed by the Catholic Church. It had died in committee with little support in 1963.

TEACH PARENTS

A State public health department spokesman says the measure, supported by the California Medical Association, gives reticent communities backing to teach parents the proper use of contraceptives.

And, the spokesman adds, it encourages local agencies to take advantage of available Federal funds that could help pay for birth control devices.

About half of California's 58 counties either operate birth control clinics under the State department of public health or cooperate with the Planned Parenthood League, private clinics or hospitals.

But the resolution's author, Senator Alvin C. Weingand, Democrat, of Santa Barbara, says it has been an "unwritten taboo" for clinics to make such information available even though there's no State law against it.

The 60-year-old luxury ranch and hotel owner declares he's mainly concerned with the child nobody wants—the youngster from a slum environment.

Specifically underscored is the requirement that such services be available only to "individuals who expressly request them and should not be regarded as a means of influencing the birth rate among any particular group or class."

"In California, as elsewhere upper and middle class families have access to birth control help and contraceptives," Weingand says. "However, persons of lower economic and social groups, whose only medical and health care is with governmental agencies, are denied the same help.

"This I submit, is discrimination, pure and simple."

The Real Alabama—Part XX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the port city of Mobile enjoys a combination of sea and air transportation facilities which enables it to be a hub of activity on the gulf coast.

The heads of two major transportation organizations, the Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. and National Airlines, have indicated reasons why they are able to operate successfully in Mobile. Their letters follow:

NATIONAL AIRLINES, INC.,
Miami, Fla.

Mobile and National Airlines have grown up together, and the good will and cooperation of this community have been potent assets to the airline I represent. You have moved into the jet age at an invigorating pace. To your rich cultural and historic heritage this generation has added industrial gains that are indeed enviable. The vision and the challenging spirit of the Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce officials have resulted in the best kind of encouragement to commerce and industry.

An airline grows as the cities it serves grow. Traffic and profits of an airline increase as the population and prosperity of the regions it serves increase. Therefore, we at National Airlines have had good reason to be keenly aware of the economic upsurge of the Mobile area.

The industrial vitality that is pulsing all across the southern tier of States is magnificently exemplified in Mobile's marked progress in recent years. You are riding a wave that has not crested, I believe. We are enjoying our partnership in your prosperity, and I wish you the best of luck, because what is good for Mobile is good for National Airlines.

L. B. MAYTAG, Jr.,
President.

LYKES BROS. STEAMSHIP CO., INC.,
New Orleans, La.

The foundation from which has grown the Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., of today, was laid 64 years ago, and over this entire period our decision to anchor fortunes to the golden coast along the U.S. gulf has been fully justified.

Members of our organization, who charted our course at the turn of the century, had visions of great industrial growth along the U.S. gulf and in its hinterland, served by a string of deepwater ports stretching from Florida to the Rio Grande.

Transportation was a vital necessity if this growth was to develop and our organization decided to establish ocean services that would meet the growing requirements of the commerce of the Mississippi Valley area and its deep sea gateways on the Gulf of Mexico.

We have seen much of this growth develop thus far. We have seen our coastal area provide the kind of modern, deepwater ports and a continuous growth of up-to-date port facilities needed to meet the ever-growing demands of international commerce.

Mobile is this kind of port. It is Alabama's deepwater outlet to ports throughout the world. It is keeping pace with the growing need for expanded and improved facilities. Its civic, business, and commercial leaders have been alert to meet the challenge of full participation in the increased foreign commerce of our country. Working as a team, the steamship industry and these port interests are seeking to attract an ever-growing amount of cargo to and from countries around the world, and growth figures indicate that such teamwork is paying off. Lykes Lines is proud to have played an important role in this growth of commerce through Mobile and stands ready to help implement its future growth.

There is good and sufficient reason to believe that this forward progress will continue for years to come There is also reason to believe that Mobile will meet its responsibilities as a port, and certainly Lykes will

continue as it has in the past, to provide the kind of ocean transportation service shippers require in meeting their sales commitments.

J. T. LYKES, Jr.,
President.

Lawlessness in United States: Warning From a Top Jurist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the U.S. News & World Report dated July 5, 1965 is an address by Charles E. Whittaker, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, retired, before a meeting of the Tennessee Bar Association, Nashville, Tenn., on June 17, 1965 on the subject of "Lawlessness in United States: Warning From a Top Jurist." Mr. Justice Whittaker pointed out one of the most significant happenings of our present day—the trend toward law violation, and the accent on crime. The address follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, July 5, 1965]

LAWLESSNESS IN UNITED STATES: WARNING FROM A TOP JURIST

Behind the spread of crime and violence—a retired Supreme Court Justice sees danger of a complete breakdown of law and order—a tendency, often officially encouraged, for people to take the law into their own hands.

What is this—a nationwide revolt against authority? Is the idea taking hold that it is all right for "demonstrators" and others to violate any law they don't happen to like?

Where is it leading? What is at stake?

The survival of the Nation, says Justice Charles E. Whittaker. He calls for swift and vigorous enforcement of all criminal laws, with real punishment of all offenders.

Following is full text of an address by Charles E. Whittaker, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, retired, before a meeting of the Tennessee Bar Association, Nashville, Tenn., on June 17, 1965.

No doubt you, just as I, have noticed in the news media an ever-increasing number of items and articles that show with unmistakable clarity a rapid spread of lawlessness in our land that seems to be thoroughly planned, and also to be designed to destroy, and that seriously threatens to destroy, law, order and all vestiges of decency in our land.

Recently, while sitting in my library meditating upon that subject and upon appropriate remarks here today, and also listening to the beautiful music of "My Fair Lady"—and being, perhaps, thereby lulled into a satirical mood—it occurred to me: Why not speak on "Old-fashioned law and order—wouldn't that be loverley?"

One of the recent articles that had deeply impressed me was by a husband-and-wife team of eminent criminologists of the Harvard Law School. It dealt with the rapid increase and spread of crime, and concluded with the statement that "unless much is done to check (current) vicious cycles, we are in for a period of violence beyond anything we have yet seen."

Another recent and impressive article contained the theme—which I think is fundamental—of the recent presidentially proclaimed Law Day, 1965, which was: "Uphold the law—a citizen's first duty."

Believing that this theme states an indisputable truth, yet, having read and heard many recent open and direct preachments of disrespect for and disobedience of our laws, and, also having seen the destructive effects of those preachments upon the good order and morality of our society, I am moved to speak out in demand for an immediate end to such conduct by the vigorous and even-handed enforcement of our laws.

While I do not claim that all of our crime is due to any one cause, it seems rather clear that a large part of the current rash and rapid spread of lawlessness in our land has been, at least, fostered and inflamed by the preachments of self-appointed leaders of minority groups to "obey the good laws, but to violate the bad ones"—which, of course, simply advocates violation of the laws they do not like, or, in other words, the taking of the law into their own hands.

And this is precisely what their followers have done and are doing—all under the banner of "peaceable civil disobedience," which they have claimed to be protected by the peaceable-assembly-and-petition provision of the 1st amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Although such preachments and practices have become far more vocal and widespread in our recent racial strife, they did not have their origin in that strife, but, rather, in the labor strife, sit-ins, and lie-downs of an earlier era.

More recently, certain self-appointed racial leaders, doubtless recalling the appeasements and, hence, successes of that earlier conduct, have simply adopted and used those techniques in fomenting and waging their lawless campaigns which they have called "demonstrations."

They have recently used these techniques to incite their followers to assemble, from far and wide—often, unfortunately, with the encouragement and at the expense of well-meaning but misguided church organizations—into large and loosely assembled groups which many have regarded as mobs, to wage what they have called "demonstrations" to force the grant of "rights" in defiance of the law, the courts and all constituted authority.

At the beginning, those "demonstrations" consisted of episodic group invasions and appropriation of private stores, first by sitting down and later by lying down therein, and, eventually, by blocking the entrances thereto with their bodies.

Seeing that those trespasses were often applauded in high places, were generally not punished, but, rather, were compelled to be appeased and rewarded, those racial leaders and their groups quickly enlarged the scope of their activities by massing and marching their followers on the sidewalks, streets, and highways—frequently blocking and appropriating them to a degree that precluded their intended public uses.

And that conduct, too, being nearly always appeased, the process spread areawise, as might have been expected, from one southern city to another, and then into many northern cities, including St. Louis, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Washington, New York, Brooklyn, Syracuse, and Rochester, and, eventually, pretty generally throughout the land.

"Crime," says Webster, means "an act or omission forbidden by law and punishable upon conviction." It cannot be denied that each of those trespasses violated, at least, the criminal-trespass laws of the local jurisdiction involved, nor that those laws impose penalties for their violation, nor, hence, that those trespasses constituted crimes.

In the first place, that conduct cannot properly be termed "peaceable," for we all know from experience that the assembly of large groups for the avowed purpose of forcing direct action outside the law amounts to the creation of a mob bent on lawlessness, and inherently disturbs the peace of all others.

One could hardly deny the truth of the statement written by Mr. Justice Black, joined by two other Justices, in June 1964, that "force leads to violence, violence to mob conflicts, and these to rule by the strongest groups with control of the most deadly weapons."

Nor can this conduct even be termed "civil disobedience," for conduct violating criminal laws is not "civil" but "criminal" disobedience. And, lastly, that conduct is not protected by the peaceable-assembly-and-petition provision of the first amendment.

That provision says: "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging * * * the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Nothing in that language grants a license to any man, acting either singly or in a group, to violate State criminal laws—including those laws which prohibit trespass upon, and appropriation of, private property, and those laws prohibiting the willful obstruction of the public walks, streets, and highways.

Rather, as Mr. Justice Roberts wrote upon the subject in 1939, "The privilege of a citizen of the United States to use the streets and parks for communication of views on national questions must be regulated in the interest of all; it is not absolute, but is relative, and must be exercised in subordination to the general comfort and convenience, and in consonance with peace and good order."

Surely, no thoughtful person will disagree with that statement, nor with the statement made very recently by the president of Yale University in a speech at Detroit, that the current rash of "demonstrations" make "a ludicrous mockery of the democratic debating process."

The philosophy of "obeying only the laws you like," and of openly defying and breaking the ones you do not like, has given rise to mobs and mob actions that have proven—as certainly we should have expected—to be tailormade for infiltration, takeover and use by rabble-rousers and Communists who are avowedly bent on the breakdown of law, order and morality in our society and, hence, in its destruction.

And even though those results may not have been contemplated, and surely weren't wished by those Americans who so advocated disobedience of our laws, nevertheless, they did advocate that philosophy and they did put its process into action, and cannot now escape responsibility for its results.

The process has now spread even into the campuses of many, indeed most, of our great universities. A fair example of what is there happening was recently related by the California State superintendent of public instruction, who, in commenting about conditions on the campus at Berkeley, said:

"Demonstrations there provided a vehicle for infiltration by rabble-rousers, red hots and Communists and resulted in assaults, kidnapings, and imprisonment of police officers, the commandeering of public address systems, and their use in spewing over the campus the most filthy four-letter words, and the general breakdown of law and order."

A recent national magazine contained an interview with Dr. James M. Nabrit, president of Howard University—the largest Negro university in our country—who finds on his campus "open defiance of law and order," which he characterized as part of a campaign "to bring the university into general disrepute."

"FRAUDS" IN RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Dr. Nabrit cautioned: "We must beware of some people who come to us like the Greeks bearing gifts. They do not believe in civil rights for anyone. They are chil-

dren of lawlessness and disciples of destruction. They are people who cloak themselves in the roles of civil righters but plot and plan in secret to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship. They must be unmasked for the frauds that they are, they must be fought in every arena."

He stated that he had seen known Communists passing out throwaways and helping to deliver placards to pickets on and about his campus.

The Kansas City Times of Wednesday, May 19, published an Associated Press dispatch about the lawless demonstrations in progress on the campus of the University of Wisconsin. It said that one of the leaders openly espoused, from a public rostrum on the campus, that "the students should band together to bring down the Government by any means."

It also said that the "demonstrations" there had now been infiltrated and were being led by "eight to a dozen" ringleaders who are operating under "pretty good cover"; that at least some of them are known members of the DuBois Clubs of America, which Senator DODD and J. Edgar Hoover have recently described as a "new Communist-oriented youth organization dominated and controlled by the Communists."

These lawless activities, nauseating as they are, can hardly be surprising, for they are, purely and simply, some of the results that we should have known would inevitably come from tolerating open and direct preachments to defy and violate the law.

A very recent issue of U.S. News & World Report [May 17, 1965] contains two pertinent articles. One saying that "increased Communist penetration and influence inside some sections of the Negro movement in the United States is a subject of growing concern to the FBI and White House." The other saying, "J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, and President Johnson both are increasingly concerned by the growing activity of known Communists on the campuses of colleges around the country. They would like to alert the country to the situation, but are concerned about being considered 'Red-baiters' if they do."

I, for one, would like to lend a voice of encouragement to them to forget those fears and to alert the country fully about the facts, for surely that is their duty and no odium can result from exposing those who are preaching and practicing defiance of our law and, hence, the destruction of our society.

There are, of course, first duties of citizenship, but there are also first duties of Government. It is undoubtedly true, as recited in the theme of the presidentially proclaimed Law Day, 1965, that "a citizen's first duty is to uphold the law," but it is also a first duty of Government to enforce the law—to do so by prosecuting and punishing those who violate our criminal laws.

In no other way can our people be secure from assaults and trespasses upon their persons and property, or maintain an ordered and moral society.

Because some of our citizens will not voluntarily perform their "first duty" to uphold the law, our Governments, State and Federal, have the paramount duty of, at least, making them obey it.

We have all along been told, and many of us have preached, that crime does not pay, but the recent rash and spread of law defiance, and the successes—however, tenuous and temporary—of that philosophy in attaining goals, seems to compel a reappraisal of that concept, for, from what we see currently happening, one could reasonably believe that certain types of crimes are being permitted to pay.

PUBLIC APATHY AND LAWLESSNESS

Probably because of a rather widespread recognition that, at times and in certain sectors, some of our colored brethren have suffered unconstitutional discriminations, and because many of us have been sympathetic to the ends they seek—and have not, therefore, thought very much about the destructive means they have embarked upon to attain those ends—there has been a rather general public apathy toward their preachments to violate, and their practices in violating, our laws.

Indeed, one of those who first advised, and was most successful in inducing, his followers to take the law into their own hands—and who, now that their conduct has led to widespread disorder, attempts to excuse his responsibility for it with the doubtless true statement: "I cannot control them"—parenthetically, an excuse quite reminiscent of the one given by the man who lighted the squib and threw it into the crowd—was rather recently twice honored. Once by an old and respected American university by conferring upon him an honorary degree—not in some new political science—but in law, and, second, by an honored foreign cultural group by awarding him a prize for, of all things, his contributions to peace.

What, I would like to ask, has happened to our sense of values?

But a recent article in the May 3, 1965, issue of U.S. News & World Report hints at a new and different appraisal of this conduct, and indicates some official impatience with this gentleman's apparent insatiable appetite for power, and some displeasure at his recently voiced criticism of the administration's foreign policies in Vietnam and elsewhere—concluding with the statement that "some Washington observers profess to see an attempt [by this gentleman] to 'escalate' his status as a national figure—perhaps with political goals in view."

This is heartening, as it indicates a new awareness of the inevitable destruction of ordered liberty that must be expected if we continue to allow any of our citizens to incite others to disobey the law—to take it into their own hands, and to get away with it.

Whatever may have been the provocations—and, doubtless, there have been some—no man, or any group or race of men, can be permitted, in a government of laws, to take the law, or what they think ought to be the law, into their own hands, for that is anarchy, and sure to result in chaos.

The fact that the provocations may have been themselves constitutionally unlawful cannot justify unlawful means for their resolution.

Both types of conduct are wrong—constitutionally wrong, the one as much as the other. And, obviously, two wrongs cannot make a right.

All discriminations that violate the Constitution and laws of the United States are readily redressable in our courts, which have always been open to all citizens. And no one has any room to doubt that, if he will resort to those courts, and have the patience to await their processes—as we all must do in an ordered society—all his constitutional and legal rights will be vouchsafed to him, whatever his creed or color.

But there has been impatience with the judicial processes, manifested by the recent hue and cry for "action now—not the delays of the law."

Certainly this cliche, too, advocates such direct action as amounts to a clear call for disobedience of the laws, the judgments of the courts and of all constituted authority and lawful processes.

It is true that legal processes, being refined and deliberative processes, are slow.

But like the mills of the gods, though they grind slowly, they grind exceedingly fine, and their judgments are most likely to be just.

In all events, there is no other fair and orderly way to decide the issues that arise among us, and to have an ordered liberty.

Every ordered society in history has found it necessary to establish laws, and courts fairly to interpret and enforce them; and the same history makes clear, too, that the first evidences of a society's decay may be seen in its toleration of disrespect for, and disobedience of, its laws and the judgments of its courts.

HOW MINORITY GROUPS CAN LOSE OUT

The great pity here is that these minority groups, in preaching and practicing defiance of the law, are, in fact, advocating erosion and destruction of the only structure that can ever assure to them, or permanently maintain for them, due process of law and the equal protection of the laws, and that can, thus, protect them from discriminations and abuses by majorities.

In May 1965, Mr. Lewis F. Powell, president of the American Bar Association, in a speech dedicating the new Missouri Bar Center at Jefferson City, said, "Many centuries of human misery show that once a society departs from the rule of law, and every man becomes the judge of which laws he will obey, only the strongest remain free," and also that "those who break the great tradition of respect and tolerance for the differing views of others by resorting to coercion, whether 'violent' or 'nonviolent,' menace the spirit of responsible inquiry essential to [our] institutions." "No 'end,'" he said, "however worthy [can ever] jutsify resort to unlawful means."

He concluded with the statement that "America needs a genuine revival of respect for law and orderly processes, a reawakening of individual responsibility, a new impatience with those who violate and circumvent laws, and a determined insistence that laws be enforced, courts respected and due process followed." To this, I say amen.

Surely we must always strive to eliminate injustice and discrimination, but we must do so by orderly processes in the legislatures and the courts, and not by defying their processes and actions, nor by taking the laws into our own hands.

We must take the laws into our hearts rather than into our hands, and seek redress in the courts rather than in the streets.

A very recent issue of the Kansas City Star contained several articles about the general breakdown of law and order on our college campuses.

One of them fairly puts the finger on the cause. It did so through quoting one of the "demonstrating" students. He was asked why some students had abandoned historical "panty raids" and similar college pranks for open and riotous rebellion. "Why," he said, "you could get kicked out of school for conducting a panty raid and things of that kind, but no one is ever kicked out or punished for demonstarting for something like civil rights."

It is thus plain that the students, knowing just as everyone else knows, that open and riotous rebellion in the name of "civil rights" is not being punished, but is being tolerated, have been thus encouraged to wage and spread rebellion.

Another of these articles quoted some comments of J. Edgar Hoover about the effects of spreading crime upon the peace and safety of our citizens. He said: "There is too much concern in this country * * * for the 'rights' of an individual who commits a crime.

"I think he is entitled to his [legal rights], but I think the citizens of this country ought to be able to walk all the streets of our cities without being mugged, raped, or robbed." But, he said, we can't do so today, and he added: "All through the country, almost without exception, this condition prevails."

The April 10, 1965, issue of the magazine America contained an article on the imperative need for certain and severe punishment of crime, which made many pertinent observations, including this one:

"[Government] has no right to turn the cheek of its citizens. Instead, it is gravely obligated—by the very purpose of its existence—to see to their protection.

"Sure and swift punishment [is our only way] to guarantee that protection * * *. We stand in need of sure, swift, tough punishment if we expect to decrease the crime rate, and to protect the great mass of our upright citizens."

To this, too, I can only say amen.

The causes are plain. We have, in high places, tolerated and even encouraged preachments to break the law—such as: "Obey the good laws but break the bad ones," which, of course, means to obey only the laws you like; and such as: "Action now, not the delays of the law," which is, of course, a call for direct action outside the law and the courts.

And we have also tolerated and in some high places have even encouraged, the actual defiances of the law which those preachments have advocated and brought into existence, and which have now spread to all areas of the Nation, and seriously threaten the breakdown of law, order, and morality.

REMEDY: DEMAND RESPECT FOR LAW

The remedy is equally plain. It is simply to insist that our Governments, State and Federal, reassume and discharge their first duty of protecting the people against lawless invasions of their persons and property and from assaults upon their liberties by demanding and commanding respect for law and legal processes through the impartial, evenhanded, vigorous, swift, and certain enforcement of our criminal laws and the real and substantial punishment thereunder of all conduct that violates those laws.

These are not platitudes, but are fundamentals and vital, as every thinking man should see, to the survival of our Nation.

In no other way can we orderly resolve the issues that confront and divide us, or live together in peace and harmony as a civilized nation of brother under the fatherhood of God.

Battleship Need Cited in Fight for Vietnam Plain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the following newspaper article clearly outlines the need for beefing up our naval forces off Vietnam. It was written by one of today's best informed men, Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, and appeared in the June 21 edition of the San Diego Union. General Hittle has just returned from nearly a month in South Vietnam and the Far East and his views merit considerable attention of all our colleagues:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, June 21, 1965]

FOUR STILL IN MOTHBALLS: BATTLESHIP NEED CITED IN FIGHT FOR VIETNAM PLAIN

(By Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director of National Security and Foreign Affairs, Veterans of Foreign Wars)

WASHINGTON.—The sooner the mothballing comes off our World War II battleships, and the quicker they sail for South Vietnam, the better.

The U.S. Navy still has four of those fast, huge, heavily armored, and big-gunned ships. Combat proven, they have been sleeping in the quiet waters of back channels. They could well prove to be a most important and timely weapon in Vietnam.

No, we don't need them in southeast Asia to repel a Communist fleet of coastal junks, nor to fight off Red torpedo attacks in the Tonkin Gulf. We need these battlewagons to make sure that we win the battle for the coastal plain of South Vietnam—and win it with the least possible casualties for ourselves and the South Vietnamese.

The heavy fighting around Quang-Nai, Da Nang, and Chu Lai marks the beginning of a new phase of the war—the struggle for the coastal plain. It could well be the decisive phase.

It doesn't take intricate staff analysis to realize why this narrow strip along the South China Sea is so important. It is the food-producing and population center for the vast area north of Saigon. Also, through this seacoast flatland runs the main north-south highway and rail line. Both are presently unserviceable for long stretches due to Communist bridge blowing and roadblocks.

PLAIN BECOMING CRITICAL AREA IN WAR

The portion of the plain from the Phu Bai region southward through Da Nang to the Marine beachhead at Chu Lai is becoming the critical area of conflict. It about 100 miles long, and in its broader portions is 5 to 10 miles wide.

The Vietcong commanders know that if they can't control the coastal plain with its food supply, they'll be in logistic trouble. If they have to fall back into the fast-rising foothills and the inhospitable forested mountains, they will have to devote more time to finding food and less to fighting.

It is difficult to imagine a more suitable area for battleship gunfire. These ships are the most powerful and mobile concentrations of precise, weather-immune, long-range shore bombardment weapons ever made. Each has nine 16-inch guns. They fire a projectile of 1½ tons almost 20 miles. Also, each ship has 20 5-inch guns for air defense and surface targets.

Vietcong attacks are being stepped up. The Reds are hoping to do their damage during the monsoon which hampers our supporting aircraft. Also, Vietcong doctrine emphasizes night operations. Again the purpose is to cancel out our air advantage. But they won't have such advantages if we have a couple of battleships off the coast, blasting their concentrations regardless of weather or visibility.

NAVY SUPPORTING GUNFIRE DEVELOPED

During the Pacific campaigns of World War II, Navy-Marine amphibious doctrine developed naval supporting gunfire to a fine art. Since then it has been further perfected.

In the Korean war the *Missouri* steamed up and down the coast, pummeling the Reds along the shoreline and inland.

Naval gunfire already has been used in Vietnam. But so far only the 5-inch guns of destroyers and a few remaining 8-inch guns of a cruiser have been available. They are a big help, but not as devastating or decisive as the battlewagon's big guns.

With battleship firepower available but not used, it means that our forces in the coastal strip are having to fight a tough enemy under an unnecessary handicap of not having the best available weapons. Such handicaps mean unnecessary casualties.

Our advantage in South Vietnam is that the war is essentially maritime in character. We can bring to bear the weapons, logistics, and mobility of our overwhelming seapower. Having our backs to the sea, which we control, gives us the opportunity for victory.

Failure to exploit this advantage by using battleship guns to back up our forces means rejection of seapower's most powerful and accurate all-weather bombardment weapon. It could also mean, figuratively, turning our back on the sea—and ultimate victory.

Tom Vail, a Man on the Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the Members of the House to an article that appears in the July 5 issue of Newsweek magazine concerning Thomas Vail, a son of Princeton and the editor of the influential Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Tom Vail, for a good number of years, has been a member of the fourth estate in Ohio and has served from a cub reporter, all the way up the ladder, to become editor of one of America's largest newspapers.

Not only is Tom Vail a man of influence, but he is a gentleman of judgment who is keen and alert as to the public interest. In my opinion, he has been constructive in his analyses of city, State, and Federal issues. And while I might not always agree with the editorial comment of his newspaper on those issues, I do find myself in agreement in the majority of instances, and quite agree with Newsweek's analysis of his spectacular achievements in reforming the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The Newsweek article follows:

TIGERISH

For a quarter of a century, Editor Louis B. Seltzer's afternoon Cleveland Press has been Ohio's most influential newspaper while the morning Cleveland Plain Dealer plodded behind, dispensing a bland diet of conscientious stodginess. "The Plain Dealer was run like a trusteeship," says Thomas Van Husen Vail, whose great-grandfather, mining millionaire Liberty Emery Holden, founded the paper in 1842. "Frankly, it didn't have any guts."

A cum laude graduate of Princeton, Tom Vail knows a successful idea when he sees it. In 1963, when he became editor and publisher of the Plain Dealer, Vail set out to whip the Scripps-Howard-owned Press on its own terms. The Plain Dealer's editorials, once ponderous and a week behind the news, became short, progressive, and current—like those in the Press. Makeup, once a grim gray, became bright and airy—like the Press. In the familiar Seltzer tradition, the Plain Dealer began crusading for such civic causes as a city payroll tax and a State university campus in Cleveland and started exposing crooks in the Longshoremen's Union and the foul conditions in a State mental hospital. The paper also cultivated Cleveland's numerous ethnic groups—as the Press had done for years—by running a weekly, page 1 series on each. Vail has accompanied his metamorphosis with a flourish of promotion. Just last week, for example, a 4-column, page-1 story boosted the paper's baseball clinic for ladies, where questions on the nuances of the game can be put to experts ranging from American League President Joe Cronin to Honey Alvis, wife of the Indians' third baseman.

PROFITS UP

Vail's decision to add a healthy charge of Seltzer to the fizzless Plain Dealer has paid

off handsomely. In 1960, the Press purchased the afternoon Cleveland News from the Holden heirs' Forest City Publishing Co. for some $2 million. The Press immediately folded the News, boosting its scant circulation lead over the Plain Dealer to 80,000. But 5 years of steady gains by the Plain Dealer and steady losses by the Press have left the two papers almost tied in the circulation battle—364,290 for Vail, 368,412 for Seltzer. Despite increases in operating expenses—the Plain Dealer composing room has not yet automated beyond the use of outside tape for the stock quotations and baseball scores—the paper almost doubled its net profit between 1960 and 1964. And the future looks even brighter for the Plain Dealer. While the Press faces evening competition from suburban and small-town dailies, the Plain Dealer's nearest morning competitor is the Toledo Times. Also, Scripps-Howard has interests in papers in Akron, Youngstown, and Cincinnati and doesn't want any intramural circulation warfare. With his chief rival hemmed in, Vail has almost a clear field in his fight to oust the Press as Ohio's leading paper.

But the 30-year-old Vail has done more than just copy Seltzer and take advantage of the Press' circulation dilemma. To blanket both city and State the Plain Dealer increased its cityside staff from 38 to 50, spotted 7 reporters in the suburbs, established new bureaus in Lorain, Elyria, Sandusky and Painesville-Ashtabula and added to its bureaus in Akron, Canton, and Columbus. For foreign news, the paper depends on the Associated Press and the New York Times News Service, but occasionally sends its own men abroad. Last week, on a tour of East European countries, staff correspondent John Leacacos was filing from Budapest. By guild contract, journeymen reporters are guaranteed $166 a week with top men well above scale. The Plain Dealer's neon-bright, second-floor city room exudes youth (27 reporters were hired within the last year) and enthusiasm. "Things have been hopping around here for 2 years," says the paper's alert city editor, Ted Princiotto. "It's the finest morale situation I've ever seen," adds executive editor Philip Porter. "We've got a bunch of young tigers."

The tiger-in-chief of course, is Princeton man Vail. He began his newspaper career as a police reporter on the News, was its political writer from 1953 to 1957, then moved to the business side of the Plain Dealer. Given to $250 English cut suits and black and maroon Mercedes 220 SE convertibles. Vail looks more like an F. Scott Fitzgerald hero than a publisher. But when he speaks, there is no mistaking him. "Too many papers in this country are operated by families as adjuncts to a financial empire," he said. "A newspaper should lead a community. Clevelanders have always been conservative. We are going to try and force things to happen. We want our candidates elected and our programs enacted." The Plain Dealer backed President Johnson last year after two decades of Republican presidential endorsements.

POLITICS

Some day, the Plain Dealer may be giving its support to Vail himself. Friend and foe alike are certain he is intrigued with the idea of succeeding either of Ohio's aging Democratic Senators, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, 76, or FRANK J. LAUSCHE, 69. "I've kind of given up on the Republican Party because it's been so unrealistic," says Vail, who doesn't deny his political interest. Nor does he dampen speculation with his heavy speaking schedule or the frequency with which his picture appears in the Plain Dealer.

In renovating the Plain Dealer, Vail has given Cleveland another forward-looking, if somewhat predictable, paper, and he has given himself a base for political power. Recently, GOP National Chairman Ray Bliss called Vail to discuss a possible candidate for Cleveland's mayoralty this November. "It seems to me, Ray," admonished Vail, tilting back confidently in his swivel chair, "that when you talk about running a Republican for mayor in this Democratic city, you should not come in a few weeks before the election but spend 5 years building an organization."

Ignorance Poor Cloak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the chief difficulties we are having in the widespread controversy over U.S. policy in southeast Asia is that no one—on any side of the issue—actually has access to the kind of information we must have if we are to formulate a wise policy for dealing with Red China. These next few years are going to be very critical, for now that the Red Chinese possess a nuclear capacity, the threat to world peace is dangerously increased. As was pointed out in a June 15 editorial in the San Jose Mercury, it is highly dangerous to have the United States and Red China remain so ignorant of each other. It is important that we seek the opening of Red China to U.S. reporters and allow their journalists to come here and learn the truth about us. I commend to my colleagues the text of this thought-provoking editorial:

[From the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury, June 15, 1965]

IGNORANCE POOR CLOAK

We in the United States are woefully ignorant about what is going on in Red China. What is just as distressing—and probably more dangerous—is that the Chinese mainlanders are even more ignorant about what goes on in this country.

Being a Canadian rather than a U.S. citizen, Mark Gayn of the Toronto Daily Star can travel in Red China. His series of articles, which ran in the San Jose Mercury, gave some startling insights into the thinking of the men who run Asia's vast Communist state.

A minor item was revealing. Gayn was told that some years ago the Book-of-the-Month Club was forced to publish a work that was not overly hostile to the Communist regime in China "because of pressure of aroused American public opinion."

He "learned" that the "toiling masses" are ready to rise against the American Government as soon as a depression hits.

He heard wild interpretations of the significance of the demonstrations here against U.S. policies in Vietnam.

These opinions came not from the peasant or the man in the street who had been saturated with Peiping propaganda. They came from the men who rule Red China.

Washington and Peiping are going to continue to eye each other like a pair of rival tomcats for a good many years to come. And until Red China tones down its aggressive attitude toward its Asian neighbors, there can be no serious talk of formal, diplomatic recognition of the Peiping government.

This does not mean, however, that there cannot be an increased flow of information between the two countries.

The first step could be the opening of China to U.S. reporters, accompanied by a reciprocal move by this country.

Such a step would not get the truth of the Chinese citizenry. The government controls the press and releases only that information it believes will suit its purposes. But a freer exchange of information might at least give the Chinese leadership some idea of what Americans really think about issues that affect both countries. And, of course, the more we know about Red China the better.

Ignorance is poor protection in an expensive world.

Anniversary of United Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have just marked the 20th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter. I think it is appropriate that we take notice of this significant event in the history of mankind. Although the United Nations has not, perhaps, fulfilled all the hopes that were expressed in San Francisco 20 years ago, it has certainly been a valuable instrument for world peace and cooperation.

THE UNITED NATIONS

This month has brought about a welcome increase in attention to the achievements, as well as the problems, of the United Nations. On June 3, 1965, the Senate consented to the ratification of the first two proposed amendments of the United Nations Charter, increasing the membership of the Security Council from 11 to 15 and that of the Economic and Social Council from 18 to 27. On June 15 the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations, which had been meeting since March 26, reported that more time was needed to find a solution to the financial problems resulting from the refusal of some nations to pay their assessments for peacekeeping. On June 26 the 20th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter in San Francisco was commemorated.

Through each of these events there has been the constant recognition that the United Nations is a vital part of today's world. It has helped to preserve or restore peace in many crises, such as Kashmir, Palestine, Korea, Suez, the Congo. Even in crises in which the United Nations did not undertake peacekeeping operations its existence has enabled the nations concerned to meet quickly for discussions in the tempering presence of nations which were not directly involved. Its important role in the time of crisis is not the only way that the United Nations makes an essential contribution to peace, however. Equally important is the cooperation which it promotes among nations in hundreds of different fields covering almost every aspect of international life.

In the effort to bring about economic development of the less developed areas, for example, the United Nations has launched the development decade to encourage members to intensify their efforts to speed up progress toward self-sustaining economic

growth, and to provide a new impetus and coordination for national, international, and private assistance. During 1964 it sponsored the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, with representatives of 119 states participating, to deal with the problems of international economic cooperation.

As another example, in the vast and important area of outer space the United Nations has already helped lay the foundation for promoting peaceful cooperation in its exploration and for developing international law to deal wtih its problems. In 1961 the General Assembly approved a resolution recommending the principles that international law, including the United Nations Charter, applies to outer space and celestial bodies, and that outer space and celestial bodies are not subject to national appropriation. In 1963, the General Assembly adopted another resolution against the orbiting of nuclear weapons in space. In addition, the United Nations has undertaken valuable activities such as the maintenance of a registry of space vehicles launched by all nations, and the encouragement of a worldwide program of weather research and forecasting based on data obtained from satellites as well as conventional sources.

These are only samples of the cooperation which has been encouraged by the United Nations in its 20 years. It is fitting that 1965 has been designated International Cooperation Year, in honor of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations, to encourage a full assessment of the scope and value of international cooperation. We look forward to the White House Conference on International Cooperation which the President will convene in November to take stock of past international cooperation and chart the course of continuing efforts.

Meanwhile, as the United Nations enters its 21st year, I would like to express my appreciation for the substantive contributions it has made to keeping the peace, for the practical assistance it has given to nations in their daily efforts to promote the welfare of their citizens, and for the moral leadership it has steadily exerted. It is my hope that before the 20th session of the General Assembly convenes, a solution to the financial problem will have been found and the organization will be able to move ahead to new achievements.

Anti Whose Poverty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the New York World Telegram of June 28, 1965. It illustrates some of the difficulties which the so-called war on poverty faces because of the unfortunate way in which these programs are currently being administered.

The editorial follows:

ANTI WHOSE POVERTY?

To criticize the war on poverty, or any of its components, is to risk being called a heartless curmudgeon. It's a risk few have cared to take, especially politicians.

In point of fact, there are vast numbers of politicians who have no reason to be critical. Far from it. They see in the program opportunities for patronage and boondoggling on a scale not approximated since Washington fought poverty in the 1930's with an awesome array of make-work programs.

While those programs inevitably did some good, they did not in any real sense cure poverty and in the end they deteriorated into a cruel joke.

That could happen again unless extravagance and selfish political exploitation of the antipoverty effort are checked at the outset.

Accordingly, Governor Rockefeller did right to blow the whistle on the "political clubhouse" complexion of the city's plans for community progress centers in six poor neighborhoods. The Governor's action jeopardizes a prospective $9 million Federal grant to the city.

But he insists that the centers make maximum use of existing community groups instead of subordinating them to a "superimposed" political apparatus that would be regarded with appropriate contempt in the neighborhoods.

To be sure, the Governor's opposition, or at least its timing, is probably political. He could have expressed it earlier to the city instead of waiting to do it in a letter to Sargent Shriver during the 30-day period in which a Governor may "disapprove" such grants.

But, at all events, Rockefeller's criticism is valid. And city hall, for all its anguished moaning, has ample time to make the proper alterations—however much it may pain the engineers, conductors, and passengers of the political gravy train.

Another example of how to sour public opinion toward the antipoverty campaign is the extremely generous pay scale for personnel in the head start summer program for prekindergarteners.

Teaching jobs pay $8 to $9.20 an hour for a 25-hour week. Social workers acting as "family coordinators" will be paid roughly the same rate.

This may not be lavish by some standards, but it is, for instance, nearly double the national average for head start teachers and fairly high even for New York.

A further ironic touch is the disclosure by board of education officials that they're having the devil's own time trying to round up enough youngsters to get in on head start.

City hall's lip-smacking yen for patronage delicacies and the casual disbursement of Federal funds for the ill-planned head start project may be isolated episodes. But they're symptomatic of the sort of abuse and waste that can discredit and ruin even the worthiest of programs.

The expression "ugly American" was invented to describe the U.S. image in countries where our foreign aid fell into inept or corrupt hands and failed to help the people it was designed to help.

Unless the strictest care is exercised, the grasping politician can become the "ugly American" of the domestic aid program—for the very same reasons.

Philosophy of Education—Revaluation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, with Memorial Day 4 weeks behind us and the Fourth of July only a few days ahead the timeliness of this excellent essay on patriotism is apparent. Its author, Maurice Jacobs, a school teacher in my district, is a 365-day-a-year American. We need more.

The essay follows:

PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION—REVALUATION

Does America have a problem today which concerns those living today? Actually what has been done to indicate the problem that is America's?

Should we not first take an approach as to what is the objective of being an American? Should we not review what the Founding Fathers had in mind, what the citizens of each succeeding generation of Americans had in mind, and then what we would like to perpetuate for the future generations to want for themselves?

Is the prime objective of the American citizen, which would be the objective of their Government, to determine ways and means of perpetuating and propagating government of the people, by the people and for the people? If the answer is yes, then we had best be sure we are doing just that ourselves every day of our lives so that this objective will be the same objective the children of the future will want and demand for themselves; not only in America but will want to see the same for others all over the world. What then can each school district do toward perpetuating and propagating this objective?

Before deciding let us look at the present citizenry and their state of mind.

From countless articles by leading citizens, newspapers, magazines, members of religious, private and Government organizations, as well as by word of mouth, the present generation is overly opinionated and overly concerned with what society owes to him; is self-seeking, thoughtless, careless of decency and eager to impress; give one excuse as being as good as another. They are pretty well set in their ways. If it were possible to do anything, time doesn't permit of a program directed toward improving the position with the generation going out of the picture now. The objective, therefore, is to prepare a program for the younger generation and future generations, not to prepare for the present generation. However, the older generation must work out the procedures, test them, check them, so the younger and future generations won't have the research to do; of trial and error.

What kind of children must we turn out that will become the future citizens?

Should they be imbued as patriotic citizens, as patriotic leaders? If so, the present generation (from experience) must put a value on patriotism and leadership in all fields of endeavor. It must be done with a firm belief and conviction in our form of government so that our children and their children will put a value on what they have and will resist anyone taking it away from them.

But at the moment there is a bigger problem.

There is no enthusiasm or firmness in the majority. It is not stylish to be patriotic anymore. The adults, and these are fathers, all use satirical and sardonic remarks * * * such as: "Get off the soap box * * * that went out with the horse and buggy age; and so on." Which means, "I'm lazy and in a nice comfortable rut * * * don't disturb me. I don't want to pay a price for anything. I get it for nothing. Let the next fellow do it." They have all the answers * * * just trust them. When it becomes so prevalent no one does anything. So this attitude will continue far into the future if there is to be one for America based on such an outlook of life and disregard for their own children.

It then falls back on a handful of people to reverse the trend * * * reverse the tide of indifference. This is the situation regarding patriotism—loyalty to a form of government.

The next thought is that intangible "how to live," which is the other prime factor today. People talked about utopia for centuries. How they would not have to worry

about where their next meal was coming from. The majority in America, unlike the poverty stricken nations of the world we call the "have-nots" who don't know where the next meal is coming from, don't have this problem of poverty. Now with all this, America is not the gay, happy place one would imagine. Happiness does not come automatically—it is a state of mind and satisfaction. So in how we live the satisfaction is not there. We must find a way to develop a sense of satisfaction. Is not this a problem of educational industry? We are told out of this educational industry called the public schools of America, is to come everybody's dream—to free people from oppression, want, terror, tyranny. Indeed, it would be a utopia. Now, as in the past, it is still a beautiful dream and a dream still worth striving for. 'Tis said, if you don't dream you are dead * * * so we might as well dream in that direction.

But we hear there are other countries whose objective is that they are going to free the world from oppression by the Yankees who are the oppressors and tyrants. They are going to free the world from want which they say was created by a system called capitalism and which we say is government of the people, by the people, and for the people. They say they have all the answers, they are offering utopias. And we claim we have a utopia. Then we look around and find the happiness isn't here. Still what America has the others don't have, where in so many other countries the terror, the fears, and the tyranny have not been eradicated. Still we will find in America people in whom there is no fear in that sense. They have a full stomach, no terror, and they have a fairly good sense of satisfaction and loyalty to the future generations; of courage and conviction in the America of the Founding Fathers and in the America of today; of their responsibility to provide for their family, to be an informed citizen and to obey their spiritual nature. So what have these Americans got that makes them outstanding products while so many are not? In other words, America needs more of a greater production line of that type of end product as a citizen.

Now the role and mission of the educational system should be to manufacture and turn out such products. The educational system, of which each school district is the local manufacturer, would set up a technique and a production line that would turn out the type of product called the typical American of the spirit of 1776. A spirit that didn't fear hardships, that didn't fear tyranny and would not bow to it, cower to it, or salaam to it.

Now if there is a minority population in America that can go along with this era and not be contaminated by it, then it must have some sort of foolproofing insulation that is built in, and certainly it isn't built in with steel or wood or aluminum. It is invulnerable to this atmosphere of hopelessness that pervades and permeates the attitudes—and actions—of cheating, jealousy, guile, and trickery, that are so rampant. It is very obvious what the upbringing and family life must contribute. The educational system also contributes to the family unit but only on the basis of how a family lives insofar as the children are concerned. If this is being done the end result is that the graduates of our educational systems will in turn consider the family unit so valuable they make sure the children have it. And the value of that training will become so engrained and so priceless that each and every family will pay the price willingly for it, and the father and mother will feel a nice sense of satisfaction—absolutely no regrets for having given to the next generation what was given to them. Is the family unit the basis of the American society? Is it the basis of any society governed by a constitution under God?

You can't walk into a man's home and tell him how to raise his own children or run his home but while his children are in school you certainly can discuss patriotism and citizenship and the parents are certainly willing. It would appear through commonsense and theory that through a process of elimination as one family is removed from the general category of being soft, lackadaisical, and lacking patriotism, that the problem is reduced by one family and then another and another will follow. Now if it is not done in the school system by the schoolteachers who themselves are inspirational and have this built-in, foolproof insulation, and are thus invulnerable to this present and any future atmosphere, we might just as well not waste time after that for it has been discovered that a permanent disability develops.

So if every school system has to determine and develop its own educational philosophy we must make sure that it is "consistent with the principles of American democracy and consistent within itself." Education accounts for the past and the present. The product accounts for the future.

Sensing the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the West Memphis Evening Times on Monday, June 21, carried a most revealing article written by Thurman Sensing regarding the testimony by a spokesman for the National Council of Churches before the House Committee on Education and Labor in behalf of repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This article is worthy of the attention of the membership of the House. The full text follows:

SENSING THE NEWS

(By Thurman Sensing)

LOBBYING WITHOUT CONSENT

The extraordinary action of the National Council of Churches in going to bat before Congress for repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which permits State right-to-work laws, has resulted in shocked reaction around the country.

Even as a NCC spokesman was testifying in Washington in support of what would produce compulsory unionism in all 50 States, concerned Protestant churchmen were sending protests to Congress. U.S. Representative RALPH SCOTT (Democrat, of North Carolina), announced during the testimony on June 4 that more than 100 clergymen and church officials of all denominations had sent him a telegram in opposition to the NCC action in backing up the union bosses. The statement by the protesting churchmen read as follows:

"Any statement or intimation that the national council's 39 million clergy and lay members favor repeal of section 14(b) is unsupportable. No person may presume to speak on this issue on behalf of the council's membership, inasmuch as member congregations have not been polled on the repeal or retention of section 14(b)."

TIMELY DECLARATION

This was a timely declaration, for the NCC spokesman, Rev. J. Edward Carothers, in appearing before a special subcommittee on labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor, endeavored to lay stress on the size of the Protestant interdenominational group. The spokesman said: "These bodies [the churches] include a total membership in the neighborhood of 40 million people."

Dr. Carothers, saying "I have been asked to make this statement on behalf of the NCC," is associate general secretary, national division of the board of missions of the Methodist Church, member of the program board of the division of christian life and mission of the NCC and secretary of the NCC's commission on the church and economic life.

Fortunately, the NCC testimony, which was aimed at getting rid of right-to-work laws, came in for penetrating analysis by members of the subcommittee. U.S. Representative ROBERT GRIFFIN, Republican, of Michigan, in questioning the NCC witness, brought out the fact that the National Council of Churches had made no attempt to poll the members of the churches before lending aid and comfort to the chief political plan of big unionism. Indeed Congressman GRIFFIN was successful in getting the NCC witness to admit that an official stand of the NCC general board would "not necessarily" represent the views of the membership of the council. The witness also admitted that there would be some times when general board members "actually knew that their constituency would differ with them."

Having established the fact that the NCC position for repeal of 14(b) might in no way represent what Protestant churchmen believe and want, Congressman GRIFFIN went on to explore the matter of compulsory union membership as a moral issue. He told the NCC witness: "You are advocating compulsory unionism. You are advocating the repeal of 14(b), which will permit compulsory unionism, compulsory payment of dues as a condition of employment." Then he pointed out compulsory membership in an organization is an idea repugnant to the American way of life. The Congressman noted the NCC witness had an association with his church that was strictly voluntary. No American, the Congressman indicated, would approve of compulsory membership in any particular church. Then why, he asked, should compulsory membership in a union be required?

WHY A STAND?

Inevitably, many citizens must wonder why it is that the NCC has taken a stand that backs up compulsory unionism. Why, many churchmen ask, is it that the NCC general board feels compelled to intervene in a legislative dispute on which the churches are by no means of one mind?

Congressman GRIFFIN, in exploring the NCC's reason for supporting the AFL–CIO's demands, asked the NCC witness what, if any, financial contributions the NCC had received from the unions. The witness declared that the NCC once received $100,000. The CIO News, however, stated that a grant of $200,000 had been given to the NCC. Walter Reuther, head of the United Auto Workers, said that the trustees of the Philip Murray Memorial Foundation, created to honor the former head of the CIO, "are most favorably acquainted with the work of the National Council * * *." It was stated that the money would be used by the NCC "on behalf of the practical application of religious principles to the everyday world of economic life."

Certainly, the union bosses got their money's worth when the NCC sent a spokesman up to Capitol Hill to help knock out the legislative provision for right-to-work laws.

The Aid Program: Reassurance, Not Reassessment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, some of the most challenging goals set for any U.S. Government agency have been undertaken by the foreign aid program overseas. The difficulties of helping to build nations, governments, economies—of increasing gross national products to raise living standards, of battling diseases, of dealing with problems particular to varied cultures, economies, and governments on three continents are momentus undertakings.

This is not a task in which any man or organization can claim complete success. It is not like building a road where all the variables have been charted by past experience—for every project and program that AID undertakes brings new challenges and calls for untried solutions.

Credit is due the foreign aid program for its accompilshments and its victories over the obstacles that it must meet in the difficult task which has been set for it.

But perhaps the most difficult problems that AID faces today are the problems that it meets at home from critics who refuse to understand the need for foreign aid and the nature of the program.

There appeared in the Durham, N.C., Herald on April 19, 1965, an editorial which I feel is a timely, succinct statement on the position of our foreign aid program today. I respectfully recommend that each of my colleagues carefully consider this well-written editorial:

[From the Durham (N.C.) Herald, Apr. 19, 1965]

AID'S NEED IS FOR LEADERSHIP

Critics of foreign aid have won a victory of sorts in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The committee has accepted the level of aid spending proposed by President Johnson for the next 2 years. But it added the proviso that the program as it now exists would end in 1967. It would be replaced by a program that would be recommended by yet another special study committee.

Senator MORSE, one of the authors of the Foreign Relations Committee's plan, insists that killing the program as it now exists will be a great reassurance to the American people. He foresees a new program that will put control over foreign aid back in the legislative branch where it belongs.

Perhaps another study committee is what foreign aid needs. Perhaps it will work better under closer legislative scrutiny. Yet it seems doubtful that many Americans will be reassured by the approach endorsed by the Foreign Relations Committee.

There is a widespread notion (promoted over the years by the scattershot attacks of Senator MORSE and others) that foreign aid in any form is a matter of picking Americans' pockets to help ingrates abroad. There have already been enough special studies to discourage any extensive conclusion that another study will set matters straight.

Any foreign aid program worthy of the name will have flaws and imperfections. It seeks, by definition, to cope with economic and social situations that no other agency could or would touch. Its concern is the abiding trouble of the most troubled parts of the world.

The problem in reestablishing aid as an acceptable feature in American public policy can't be solved by turning it into an institution like the first national bank. The solution demands leadership that admits the irksome risks of foreign aid but insists that rich nations like our own have a proper and necessary responsibility to extend aid nonetheless.

There has been no such leadership from the Johnson administration so far. The President has kept the program going by damning it with faint requests for record low appropriations. The tactic may work for a time. But neither it nor a new committee will remove the self-defeating controversy that has dogged foreign aid in recent years.

Commendatory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the resolution recently passed at the annual convention of Texas Chapter No. 18, National Association of Postmasters, held in Corpus Christi, Tex., June 5–8, 1965, showing their appreciation of our colleague and my great good friend, the gentleman from Texas, JOE POOL, for his unceasing efforts on behalf of Federal employees.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION: "COMMENDATORY"

Whereas Hon. JOE RICHARD POOL, Congressman from Texas, has been elected to serve in the Congress; and

Whereas he goes beyond the call of duty many times to use his talents, energy, and demonstrate his interest to encourage and help advance a better understanding between the people in our Government and country and in all countries of the world looking toward peace and harmony; and

Whereas he has served well in the capacity of U.S. Congressman and has proven his intense interest in postmasters and their problems; and

Whereas he has always cooperated with the Post Office Department and postmasters in improving conditions of the service: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Texas Chapter No. 18, National Association of Postmasters of the United States, assembled in convention in Corpus Christi, Tex., June 5–8, 1965, send an expression of gratitude to Congressman POOL for his untiring efforts in behalf of the postmasters and the postal service as well as in our country; and be it further

Resolved, That we pledge continued appreciation and support of him with our best wishes for his good health and success; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished Congressman POOL so that he will know of our appreciation of him and his efforts in the manner in which he performs the heavy responsibilities to which he is obligated.

Submitted by resolutions committee.

O. N. BRUCK,
Chairman, Austin.

Peter Wirth Honored for Academic Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently was honored by a visit from a very remarkable young man, Peter Wirth, of Stamford, Conn. Young Peter, a graduate of Stamford's Rippowam High School and the son of Mr. and Mrs. David J. Wirth, was one of the 121 presidential scholars picked from 800,000 students throughout the Nation for outstanding academic achievement.

Peter will be attending Harvard in the fall on scholarships and hopes to pursue a writing career.

Despite his youth, scholastic honors have not turned his head. He is as modest and as unassuming as he is bright. As proof of this you have only to look at the following examples of his writings, a note to me and an article he wrote for the Bridgeport Sunday Herald:

Hon. DONALD IRWIN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. IRWIN: Thank you for the kindness you showed me when I was in Washington for the graduation certificate.

Enclosed is a copy of the Bridgeport Herald containing a report of my trip to Washington. Would you please use this as you offered to. Please ignore the headlines and change the exclamation point at the end of the first sentence to a period.

I am looking forward to receiving the picture you had taken with me in Washington.

Sincerely,

PETER WIRTH.

(By Peter Wirth)

I heard "Connecticut" called, and to the sound of my own name I walked across the platform to meet the President of the United States.

It was June 8, and I was one of 121 presidential scholars participating in a special program in Washington, D.C. The scholars had been chosen from approximately 800,000 students who took the tests given by the National Merit Scholarship Corp.

There were two from each State; two each from the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and American families living abroad; and 15 chosen at large. Established last year as an annual event, the presidential scholars program was the first important official action initiated by President Johnson, himself a former schoolteacher.

I arrived in Washington with my family on Saturday, June 5. On the afternoon of June 7 I reported to the Georgetown University dormitory where the presidential scholars were to stay, girls on one floor, boys on another. That evening an informal reception was given so the scholars could meet each other. It was surprisingly like any other party.

The main difference was a slight awkwardness at the beginning—which soon disappeared—and the excitement of meeting the scholars from all over the country and talking about the next day's activities.

Eric Goldman, Special Consultant to the President, announced the names of some of the famous people we would see: President Johnson, Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black, Secretary of State Rusk, the senior Senators from our respective States, and many celeb-

rities from different fields who were invited to the next evening's reception.

On the morning of June 8 we went to the Supreme Court building to meet with Justice Black. As soon as he entered the conference room, Justice Black won our admiration by his mere presence. He began by saying that he disliked sermonizing, which he knew very well from commencement speeches, and that he preferred to have us ask him questions. Someone asked him to define the function of the Supreme Court. Justice Black said that its function was to interpret, but not to make, the laws, that plans to giving the Court executive and legislative powers had been considered and rejected when the Constitution was drawn up.

There were several questions about the recent decision on the Connecticut birth control law, reapportionment, and other specific issues. Justice Black often referred to his own published opinions in his answers.

Finally, when our time was almost up, someone asked, "What is the life of a Supreme Court Justice really like?" Smiling a little, Justice Black answered that his life had not changed much from the time when he was a Senator.

He said he still likes the same foods and has the same habits. He has more freedom now, he said, since he had no appointments to give out; he had not had many as a Senator either, but no one else had seemed to know that. Finally, he said that a Supreme Court Justice, in fact anyone in a high position, was just a person like anyone else and should be treated that way. We could all see that he meant it. Justice Black's honesty, unpretentiousness, and wit, and the greatness behind them, made him one of the most impressive people we saw in Washington.

After this we went to the Capitol, where Deborah Bliss, the other scholar from Connecticut, and I were shown around by Senator THOMAS DODD's office manager.

The scholars went next to National Aeronautics and Space Administration headquarters, where we saw a film on the X-15 narrated by X-15 Pilot Joseph Walker in person, and heard a lecture on the possible methods of determining the age of the universe by Dr. John O'Keefe, head of the Goddard Space Center.

Finally, we attended a question-and-answer session on foreign policy given by Secretary of State Dean Rusk at the State Department building.

Of course, the main event of the day was the ceremony and reception at the White House. This began at 5:30 in the East Room. President Johnson made a speech in which he compared our achievements to those of the astronauts and spoke of the future of light and decency for which he was constantly working, when he hoped we would be our country's leaders.

Then he presented us our medals, one by one, as we came forward and shook hands with him.

Even though other parts of the program had been almost casual, I think we were all excited, thrilled, and nervous now.

Soon after the ceremony and indoor reception (the only part of the program to which our parents were invited), we moved out to the White House lawn. There we were given a buffet dinner, which included the best hamburgers I've ever eaten.

Strolling around between the south side of the White House and the Washington Monument, looming large and magnificent across the lawn, we talked to the various celebrities who had been invited. I stood at the edge of a circle in which I recognized the novelist, John Updike. Mrs. Updike introduced herself to me, and I suddenly found myself in the middle of a conversation with her, Mr. Updike, the poet Karl Shapiro, the playwright Paddy Chayefsky, and Dr. T. D. Lee, the Nobel prize-winning physicist.

I was struck especially by the friendliness of Mr. and Mrs. Updike. Later, I listened to Mr. Shapiro discuss poetry with wit and insight for almost an hour.

The evening concluded with a wonderful entertainment: songs by Steve Addiss and Bill Crofut and by the Brothers Four, a piano recital by Andre Watts, and readings by Mr. Updike from his novels.

Among the famous guests whom I met only briefly or not at all were the authors John O'Hara, John Cheever, Marianne Moore, and Barbara Tuchman; the athletes Bill Bradley, Don Schollander, and Stan Musial; astronaut John Glenn, Dr. Jonas Salk, and Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT.

The next morning the Presidential scholars were given a breakfast by the National Education Association. The president and the secretary of the NEA spoke briefly, and then we were shown a film of the presentation of our medals.

A few hours later I saw Congressman DONALD IRWIN in the Rayburn Building. He showed unusual kindness and interest in me and even had me pose for a picture with him in the meeting room of the House Armed Services Committee.

On the way home that afternoon I thought gratefully of the many memories I would always have of the past few days.

Ozarks Paradise Village

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, it was my good fortune to attend a press conference at Devil's Pool Guest Ranch, located on the eastern banks of Table Rock Lake, a few miles south of Branson, Mo.

It now serves as the heart of a new private club and retirement village complex, to be known as the Ozarks Paradise Club and the Ozarks Paradise Village.

I saw the artist's conception of an ambitious project, which has been the 4-year dream of Mr. Charles S. Glover.

I am well acquainted with the beautiful surroundings of the Shepherd of the Hills Country, made famous by author Harold Bell Wright. The plans for this latest development, as explained to me, include a 600-unit accommodations motel, a dining room seating more than 300 guests, a lounge and entertainment area, capable of handling 200 persons, a summer camp for youth with riding stables, a PGA-approved golf course, and several thousand homesites for permanent homes, apartments, condominium accommodations, or summer cottages.

The President has urged Americans to see the beauty and learn the historical places of America, a suggestion made earlier in this century by Teddy Roosevelt. I know that many will want to include in their itinerary the Missouri Ozarks. Many of the 10 million who are expected to do so this year will want to return again and again to take advantage of the great variety of recreational benefits that are offered. I appreciated the opportunity to become acquainted with this latest development project, and I hope the completion of the Ozarks Paradise Village, though still 2 years away, will be still another addition to the complex of facilities that offer so much to both the vacationer and the retiree in the Table Rock Lake area.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am completely opposed to H.R. 7984. The entire measure is filled with gimmicks for the expansion of Federal participation in the housing field. It will increase Federal spending for bigger welfare programs. It will place dictatorial power in the hands of an administrator and further take away freedom from the people.

Although most of the bill is unacceptable, I am most concerned with section 101(d), the rent subsidy program. I commend the members of the committee who prepared the minority views and who so ably pointed out that this proposal will kill the incentive of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts; it kills the incentive for homeownership and makes renters wards of the Government; it is a system of economic integration of housing through Government subsidy, and it is a sure way to a socialistic state.

The minority views show the absurdity of the formula which could permit a welfare family, not earning a dime, to move into an $800-a-month penthouse, or help pay the rent for an individual making over $10,000 a year.

To finance such a wild experiment, we are going to charge the American taxpayer $8 billion over the next 40 years. It is bad enough to authorize such stupid waste of our own money, but we have no moral right to thrust such a burden on the backs of our children.

The real purpose behind this scheme has never been fully exposed and that is a plan to force integration into every neighborhood in America which a Federal Administrator decides he wants integrated. When you couple this bill with the proposal to set up a Department of Urban Affairs and the probable head of that Department will be the present Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency who has made no secret of his belief in complete Federal planning in the field of housing, I dread to contemplate the consequences to the private construction industry in this Nation. I am fearful of what this provision will do to hundreds of thousands of hard-working, industrious, Americans who have struggled to invest in a home for their families in neighborhoods of

their own choosing. This measure will open up fine residential areas to what amounts to public housing when the Government uses its economic power, through rent subsidies, to force integration and attempt to raise the level of many who have no other ambition than to be taken care of by the rest of us. This is wrong. It is immoral. It is a betrayal of the whole concept of private enterprise and individual initiative.

The President and his social planners should not use this subterfuge to pay off political debts to minority groups or to supplant our private enterprise system with a planned economy designed to take care of the social welfare of all the people.

I hope section 101(d) and the entire bill is defeated so that we can at least slow down the headlong rush toward socialism where America is being led by the enactment of such proposals.

Rehabilitation of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the program underway in West Virginia to rehabilitate the physically and mentally handicapped and return them to useful places in society has justificably received nationwide praise. During recent years West Virginia has ranked first among the States in rehabilitating handicapped persons and during the past year has maintained that position by rehabilitating 218 persons per 100,000 population.

Much of the credit for the success of the program must be attributed to the outstanding leadership provided by F. Ray Power, West Virginia's Director of Vocational Rehabilitation. Recently Mr. Power addressed the Southern Conference of the Council of State Governments on this subject, concerning which he has a vast fund of special knowledge and I am gratified to be able to call your attention to the text of that important address:

MAJOR REQUIREMENTS FOR A STATE PROGRAM TO REHABILITATE THE PHYSICALLY AND MENTALLY HANDICAPPED

(Speech delivered by F. Ray Power at the Southern Conference of the Council of State Governments, Hot Springs, Ark., June 17, 1965)

Disability might well be likened to a thermonuclear device. Either one can set off a violent chain reaction which leaves great destruction, misery, and suffering in its wake.

Although most of us seldom stop to realize it, disability is an extremely explosive thing that has the awesome power to wreck lives, destroy homes, cast children adrift, enslave human souls, and create an enormous drain on public and private resources.

When an individual is cut down by a crippling accident or disease, the chain reaction brought on by his resulting disability gives rise to a whole succession of social and economic ills. The loss of income opens wide the door to abject poverty with all its ugly implications—hunger, substandard housing, inadequate medical attention, despair and a strong susceptibility to serious disease and illness. Following close on the heels of poverty is a breakdown in family unity, which in turn, may result in school dropouts, idleness, public relief, juvenile delinquency, crime, and moral degradation.

But rampaging disability is not only a serious blight on the individual and his family. The handicapped person's community, his State, and his Nation are also forced to grapple with this grave problem. No citizen in America is left untouched or unaffected by the wrecked life of another fellow American.

Practically every social problem faced by our Nation today can be traced either directly or indirectly to a mental or physical disability. It is for this reason that our State and Federal Governments about half a century ago established cooperatively a dynamic program of rehabilitation services as a direct means of counteracting the destructive force of physical and mental handicaps.

It should be made clear, however, that vocational rehabilitation is not the traditional type of program that sits idly by until the violent chain reaction of disability has run its course before attempting to provide help. An effective vocational rehabilitation program moves in quickly at the onset of disability, and takes whatever steps are necessary to either remove or mitigate the individual's handicap before the impairment explodes into a multiplicity of problems. Vocational rehabilitation is not only a corrective program but a preventive program as well.

Fortunately, the chain reaction that follows disability can be effectively countered by the chain reaction which rehabilitation, itself, sets into motion. The provision of appropriate rehabilitation services can stop disability in its tracks and roll it back in the opposite direction. Elimination or alleviation of an individual's handicap leads to renewed hope, to employment and self-support, good citizenship and a useful role in the community, as well as many other positive activities which are the undoing of those problems which eat at the very fabric of family and community living.

Although the Federal Government offers financial assistance and professional leadership, the responsibility for the provision of an effective program of rehabilitation services to the handicapped rests squarely upon our States and local communities. A State-Federal partnership of this type cannot be effective without clear vision, able leadership, and strong financial participation by the States. If the respective States had not accepted their responsibilities, this program would never have reached the point where it is now rehabilitating 120,000 Americans in a single year. State and community support of this program must be intelligent and purposeful, if it is to continue to move forward on a broad front, attacking disability whenever and wherever it attempts to spread the seeds of misery and suffering among our citizens.

I am pleased to note that many of the 15 Southern States represented here today have been at the forefront in the national movement to provide rehabilitation services to the Nation's handicapped.

Several States represented here have actually pioneered new areas of service to neglected disability groups, such as the mentally ill and the mentally retarded, the welfare client, the disabled older worker, and the disabled adult offender. Six Southern States rank among the top 10 States in the Nation in per capita rehabilitations, and more than one-third of our Souhern States operate multiple-disability rehabilitation centers, such as this facility here at Hot Springs.

But no matter how much we are doing now, there is a great deal more that each of our 15 State rehabilitation programs can do for the handicapped. As legislators, for example, you'll be interested to know that only four Southern States put up enough matching funds to earn their full Federal allotments in 1964. This resulted in millions of Federal funds going unused. Inasmuch as most States in the South qualify under the 70-30 matching formula, this is a loss that none of our States can afford, particularly when these funds enable us to make one State dollar do the work of three.

Today, millions of disabled Americans are being supported in dependency because our State rehabilitation programs are either not providing enough services or are not offering enough depth and quality to the services they do provide. Our State programs must have more money, better qualified personnel, improved facilities, better legal status, and stronger support, if they are to blaze new trails in meeting the fast-growing need for rehabilitation. As lawmakers, you have it within your power to see that the State rehabilitation agencies get the tools and manpower with which to do the job. The handicapped are thinking, feeling people who have hopes and dreams just the same as you and I. They have similar desires to be first class citizens.

For more than 30 years, as a State director of rehabilitation, I have had the opportunity to use my ability and talents to gain support for the rehabilitation of the handicapped. Within this period I have had the privilege of presenting this cause to many Governors, many budget commissions, and hundreds of legislators. I do not recall any one of these high State officials who did not agree with me that it is far better and more economical to rehabilitate our disabled citizens into remunerative jobs, rather than to support them in dependency in their homes, on welfare, in mental institutions, in chronic disease hospitals, in penal and correctional institutions, or in other situations of dependency. My big problem has always been to get them to help provide the money needed to support the program in which they believed. Too often, the policy is followed of maintaining a "bare bones" program of services for the handicapped. State officials apparently hope that by some means of magic the problem of disability will disappear. Experience has demonstrated that the problem will not disappear, and the only way out is to rehabilitate the handicapped, and like everything else this costs money; but it costs only a fraction of what it costs not to rehabilitate them.

For the remainder of this discussion, I would like to share with you in a concrete way what I consider to be some of the major requirements of a State rehabilitation program equipped and staffed to restore the mentally and physically handicapped to the mainstream of community living.

STAFFING THE PROGRAM WITH QUALIFIED PERSONNEL

First of all, there is the matter of staffing. Twenty-five years ago, a typical rehabilitation client might have been an amputee who needed an artificial limb and a job; or he may have been in need of a hernia repair, some counseling and training. These were uncomplicated cases which were handled in a simple way.

Today, the basic client working stock is vastly different. This is because medical service is saving the lives of many of those who a generation ago would have died, because new methods and procedures are available for rehabilitating the handicapped, and because our society recognizes its responsibility of extending service to long neglected disability groups. Today a typical client is apt to be completely or partially paralyzed as the result of a spinal cord injury or a stroke, or he may be a mentally retarded or

a mentally ill person who can be rehabilitated into remunerative employment, if adequate rehabilitation measures are undertaken.

The net result is that the field of rehabilitation is now highly professionalized. The vocational rehabilitation counselor must be skillful in his use of psychological techniques in assisting the mentally and physically handicapped to reach their goals; he must evaluate the vocational potential of disabled individuals; he must arrange for medical treatment; he must carry on with employer education and community publicity programs. Other specialists in the field of vocational rehabilitation—physicians, social workers, nurses, speech therapists, occupational and physical therapists, clinical psychologists, teachers, and placement specialists—must be professionally trained to work as a team.

Present estimates are that approximately 600 graduates of rehabilitation counselor training programs will be required each year to meet the needs of public and voluntary rehabilitation agencies. Colleges and universities are currently producing about one-third this number. There are 6,500 occupational therapists in practice against an estimated need for 21,000. There is a comparable scarcity in other disciplines. What can we do about this?

There are two things we must do: (1) See that our colleges and universities step up their training of rehabilitation personnel; (2) see that salaries of personnel are raised to a level where rehabilitation agencies can be competitive with other employers.

As another means of stepping up the flow of qualified personnel to our State rehabilitation programs, I would further suggest:

1. The establishment of rehabilitation centers at colleges and universities to provide practical student training in rehabilitation. Most of the required disciplines are already on duty, but need to be organized so as to provide a team approach to rehabilitation.

2. The establishment of a rehabilitation research and training center in each State by a university and the State agency. Such a center would operate as a continuing project with the research and training efforts being aimed primarily at the solution of major problems involved in rehabilitation of the handicapped.

A research and training center is presently being established in this facility, and we hope to establish a similar center in West Virginia.

USE OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FACILITIES

Second, there is the very important matter of public and private facilities. This State rehabilitation facility in which we are meeting has a comprehensive program of services for evaluation, treatment, training, and placement of the severely disabled through a combination of medical, psychological, social, and vocational services. This kind of center greatly increases resources for serving the severely handicapped. One or more such facilities are an essential part of an effective State vocational rehabilitation program.

But this is only one type of rehabilitation facility; there are many others, ranging from large, comprehensive centers to small clinics and workshops serving single disability groups. Facilities include speech and hearing centers, rehabilitation centers in State institutions, halfway houses for patients discharged from mental hospitals, sheltered workshops, and others. Some have a medical emphasis, while others are vocationally oriented. The character of a rehabilitation program in any State is profoundly influenced by the availability of social rehabilitation facilities for the severely disabled.

Major emphasis has been placed in recent years on the development of sheltered workshops as a means of rehabilitating the severely disabled. There are basically two kinds of workshops; the one providing transient services designed to prepare the client for competitive employment industry, and the other giving long-term employment to those too severely handicapped to work in competitive industry. Both kinds of workshops are desperately needed to provide jobs for the unemployed disabled in every community of our Nation.

The use of facilities by State agencies has increased 10 times in the past decade. In 1955 the agencies paid for services at rehabilitation centers for about 2,400 persons. In 1964 the total had risen sharply to more than 30,000.

Within the past few years, several of the Southern States have established rehabilitation centers in State mental institutions through joint financing and program operation with mental health agencies. Similar programs are needed in publicly supported institutions for the chronically ill, penal and correctional institutions, and other programs serving the physically and mentally handicapped.

It is both impractical and impossible to rehabilitate all of the handicapped through State facilities. Counties and municipalities, as well as voluntary organizations, need assistance in the establishment of local facilities which will serve people in their home communities. State appropriations should include funds to be used in the planning, establishment, and initial operation of local rehabilitation facilities.

THE ROLE OF RESEARCH AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

All of you, I am sure, have observed the emphasis placed by industry on obtaining answers to questions through a vigorously applied program of research. Industry has been concerned with developing new products and new methods to manufacture old products. In vocational rehabilitation we have similar concerns. We are concerned with rehabilitating more people and being much more effective in the process. This concept certainly implies a need for a strong program of both basic and applied research. The effectiveness of such research in vocational rehabilitation can best be measured by its impact on program development. There is a need within State rehabilitation agencies for a technical developmental unit devoted to the more demanding and technical forms of research.

Through the use of research and demonstration grants, State agencies can try out new methods and new techniques on a pilot basis to determine their effectiveness. I would like to mention some specific examples of what we have accomplished through an active program of research and demonstration in West Virginia.

Project 537, West Virginia's initial research effort under this program, was begun in the spring of 1960. It was directed toward the establishment of a statewide program of services for the mentally retarded. We found through this study that the mentally retarded were being discriminated against by practically all public and voluntary agencies, including rehabilitation. Knowledge gained from this study helped lay a firm foundation on which services and facilities could be designed to do an effective job of rehabilitating the State's retarded citizens.

Project 569 was later undertaken as a means of establishing a much-needed program of services for disabled persons who applied for, but failed to receive, cash benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program. A significant result of this project was that many disabled individuals who had not been previously known to vocational rehabilitation were identified and began receiving services for the first time.

An optical-aids clinic to aid persons with low visual acuity was established under project 570; two rehabilitation houses, which helped expedite the return of discharged mental patients to a useful place in the community were established under project 571; and the role that a state rehabilitation agency can play in solving problems in a depressed area was explored under project 790. One of the significant findings of this latter study was that widespread unemployment and poverty actually breed disability. One-half of the unemployed in the economically depressed county of Logan were found to be disabled either mentally or physically.

Project 957, now nearing completion, has achieved some very impressive results in a 3-year period in working with small groups of retarded girls at our State rehabilitation center. This 8-week adjustment and evaluation course for girls confined in their homes or institutions has revealed that a large percent can be trained to achieve self-sufficiency and do remunerative work.

Two relatively new projects are currently underway in two of the State's largest counties. These projects are designed to restore to gainful employment disabled persons who apply for or receive financial assistance or services through the department of welfare.

They are intended to demonstrate the results which can be obtained by providing a high level of rehabilitation services through the cooperative efforts of rehabilitation, the department of welfare, and other related programs and facilities.

Also underway at our State rehabilitation center is a pilot program to demonstrate the value of vocational rehabilitation services to disabled West Virginians 55 years of age and over. This project is expected to find ways of counteracting the trend of denying employment to disabled older workers.

At the present time, the West Virginia rehabilitation program has either completed, or has underway, a total of 23 research and demonstration projects. We have found that research provides an excellent means of developing new ideas, new skills, new treatment methods, and new patterns of service.

FINANCING THE PROGRAM

In this discussion of some of the major requirements for a State rehabilitation program, I would be remiss, indeed, if I failed to mention the touchy subject of financing. Each year, in West Virginia, we are confronted with the problem of selling our program all over again to the Governor, the budget commission, and the legislature. Although the Federal Government puts up $2 for evary State dollar, that lone State dollar is often hard to come by.

For a number of years now, the West Virginia Legislature has failed to appropriate the total amount of funds needed to match all of the Federal money available under sections II and III of the Rehabilitation Act. However, our agency usually manages to earn the maximum amount of Federal funds allocated to the State by resorting to several courses of action. This has been accomplished by utilizing the unique features of the Federal Vocational Rehabilitation Act which permits the use of State rehabilitation funds for matching from sources other than direct appropriations. Examples of these other sources are as follows:

1. Funds expended from an appropriation to match employees' social security deductions.

2. Funds appropriated for matching employees' State retirement contributions.

3. Gifts and donations from voluntary, nonprofit organizations.

4. Proration of time of the State supervisor of the vending stand program for the blind for the time he spends promoting rehabilitation and supervising clients of the rehabilitation division.

5. Cooperative agreements to conduct rehabilitation programs with State agencies

such as the mental health department by certifying salaries of assigned staff for matching purposes.

By utilizing these funds two things have been achieved: (1) the expansion of the rehabilitation program beyond the scope which would have been possible through direct appropriations alone, and, (2) development of new rehabilitation programs in cooperation with other State agencies.

An example of the latter is the West Virginia program of rehabilitation which is being conducted in our five State institutions for the mentally handicapped.

In the spring of 1958, the West Virginia rehabilitation program took a close look at the services it was providing to the State's 6,000 or more mental patients and decided that a much greater effort was needed to help these unfortunate citizens find a useful place in their home communities. The big stumbling block was insufficient funds, both on the part of our agency and the department of mental health.

It was at this point that an ingenious plan was fashioned out of sheer necessity. Our agency proposed to the Federal Government that the salaries of certain institutional personnel be certified for matching of Federal funds. We were informed that if we would establish a joint rehabilitation facility in cooperation with the department of mental health, then the salaries of special mental health personnel assigned to this facility—either on a full- or part-time basis—could be certified for Federal matching purposes under Public Law 565.

The arrangement provided that our agency, in turn, would use these Federal funds to hire additional staff, to pay for necessary alterations and repairs of existing buildings, and to provide for the day-to-day operation of the joint facility.

This cooperative program proved to be an effective means of rehabilitating the mentally handicapped. Today, we have five such centers—all financed on such a cooperative basis—which earn more than one-half million dollars in Federal funds each year, solely through the assignment and certification of staff time by the department of mental health. This is Federal matching money that neither agency would earn without this unique arrangement.

The joint mental institution rehabilitation center program is only one example of the potential sources of funds which can be made available to earn additional Federal funds. Similar programs may be worked out with chronic disease hospitals, penal and correctional institutions, and other such agencies. Under the Laird amendment to the Federal rehabilitation law, this may now be extended into cooperative relationships with voluntary agencies.

What does this unique type of financing mean to the total rehabilitation movement? First, it makes possible an expanded program of rehabilitation through the use of additional funds not available through matching direct State appropriations. Second, it encourages the development of specialized rehabilitation programs and facilities in cooperation with other agencies. It has helped West Virginia maintain the No. 1 place in per capita rehabilitations in the Nation for a period of 5 years.

THE NEED FOR UPDATING STANDARDS AND REGULATIONS

As an arm of State government, the vocational rehabilitation agency has two important functions. The first is to rehabilitate handicapped individuals; the second is to propagate the principles of rehabilitation throughout our State. There are several conditions which are necessary to enable the State agency to perform these two functions effectively. First, vocational rehabilitation must be a distinct, visible, and autonomous professional service. Vocational rehabilitation is a process which involves such services as counseling, medical treatment, psychological evaluation, social adjustment, vocational training, job placement, and other types of services. However, the total process is quite distinct from either of its components. Therefore, vocational rehabilitation emerges as a discipline which is distinct and far more comprehensive than vocational education, health, welfare, employment service, or any of its component services. Not only is vocational rehabilitation a distinct arm of State government, but it is also of sufficient scope and importance to warrant the status of a major State agency. For example, in West Virginia the agency operates a field service program which blankets the entire State, a multidisciplinary State rehabilitation center, 5 rehabilitation centers in State mental institutions, a State sheltered workshop, a vending stand program for the blind, a rehabilitation house program, 12 service-oriented research and demonstration projects and a disability determination service for social security applicants.

In its role in propagating the principles of rehabilitation throughout the State, the rehabilitation agency must have proper status. The agency can produce maximum benefits only if the importance of vocational rehabilitation is felt throughout State government. Another important consideration is that the laws, regulations, policies, and standards under which the vocational rehabilitation agency operates must be constantly updated. It must not be frustrated by obsolete restrictions that belong to a different program at a diferent period. Few services are affected more by the rapidly changing conditions of our times than vocational rehabilitation. Automation is having and will continue to have tremendous impact on job placement; progress in medicine is bringing to the forefront new opportunities and new needs for physical restoration; new techniques are emerging for serving severely handicapped groups such as the mentally retarded. All these changes and many more make it highly desirable that the vocational rehabilitation agency be flexible enough to act advantageously on behalf of the handicapped persons whom it serves.

The legal and administrative structures which serve rehabilitation adequately in the past are now in need of overhauling to meet the new needs and conditions of the present. In summary, the vocational rehabilitation agency is charged with a heavy responsibility for serving handicapped individuals and for promoting the employment of the handicapped throughout our society. If it is to discharge its responsibility effectively, it must be outfitted with the necessary accouterments for the job—namely, visible identity, status, and an up-to-date legal and administrative base. As legislators, this responsibility falls directly in your laps. You can't afford to sit idly by and permit your State rehabilitation agency to mark time because of legal restrictions.

I have stated that a major responsibility of the vocational rehabilitation agency is to propagate the principles of rehabilitation throughout the State. The fundamental principles on which rehabilitation is based is that there must be no discrimination in employment against any individual because of race, sex, age, physical handicap, mental handicap, or any other condition except the person's ability to perform a given job. Rehabilitation insists that individuals be employed and retained in jobs on the basis of job performance only, and for no other reason.

The right of an individual to work is more sacred than any property right. Rehabilitation holds that it is not in the public interest to categorize any group of people and deny them the right to work. Our Nation must have as its goal suitable employment for each individual who is able to work and wants to work. Unless we follow this policy, the handicapped as well as millions of other Americans will be rapidly transferred to a dole represented by payments from social security or welfare.

As a State director of rehabilitation I urge each of you to support laws, regulations, and policies that will encourage the greatest possible number of our citizens to engage in productive work and to oppose discrimination in employment because of a physical or mental handicap or advanced age. Neither handicaps nor age should stand in the way of an individual getting or holding a job. The determination should be made solely on his ability to do the job and that only. This does not mean that all handicapped individuals should be employed or that all older workers should be employed. It does mean that all individuals who are able to work and want to work will have jobs. It will also counter the current dangerous policy of transferring millions of our productive workers to a deadening dole.

I mentioned earlier the great difference between accepting an idea and putting it into practice. It is a fraud against the handicapped and the older worker to force them to retire and accept a dole in lieu of a job. If we believe in free enterprise, let's keep the way open for all Americans to work and better their economic situation. The easy answer of some labor leaders and industrial managers is to place the greatest possible number of individuals on doles through discrimination in employment and forced early retirement. This short-sighted practice must be resisted by Government in every possible manner. Let us hope that when the chips are down, State government will hold firm to the principle that all individuals be given the opportunity to secure and hold jobs, based on their ability to do the job and for no other reason. This condition is necessary if we are to succeed in restoring millions of handicapped Americans to a useful, productive place in the Nation's economy.

Job Training for the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress will be keenly interested in a new program to prepare physically handicapped persons for jobs that has been initiated in Johnstown, Pa. In a joint undertaking by the Pennsylvania Rehabilitation Center, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the University of Pittsburgh. The research and training institute will develop techniques for rehabilitating disabled persons in Pennsylvania and surrounding States.

The Research and Training Institute was dedicated June 11, a day which we shall remember with deep gratification because we are confident that it marks a great step forward in providing new hopes for those unfortunate citizens whose potential has heretofore been restricted simply because it has been overlooked. Under the direction of Frederick A. Whitehouse, formerly director of rehabilitation for the American Heart Association, and with Dean William Mc-

Cullough, of the University of Pittsburgh's School of Social Work, and other dedicated members of the staff devoting their knowledge and experience to the unique program, the institute cannot help but produce rehabilitation methods and practices that will open opportunities never before anticipated.

I promise my colleagues that I shall follow closely the work of the institute, for you will want to be advised of whatever information can be of general benefit. I wish to insert in the RECORD the very descriptive remarks of Miss Mary E. Switzer, Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as the address by the Honorable William P. Young, secretary of Pennsylvania's Department of Labor and Industry:

WHY WE NEED RESEARCH AND TRAINING CENTERS

(By Miss Switzer at dedication of new rehabilitation research and training center, Pennsylvania Rehabilitation Center, Johnstown, Pa., June 11, 1965)

These centers, in cooperation with universities throughout the country, are needed to help overcome the acute shortage of rehabilitation personnel knowledgeable in clinical research and training.

Congress recognized this need in 1962 by making the first appropriation for establishment of research and training centers. Since the VRA has allocated a total of about $9.5 million to 14 centers, including $4 million in 1965.

The first 10 centers established were medically oriented: New York University, Minnesota, Washington, Baylor, Western Reserve, Emory, Tufts, Temple, George Washington, Colorado. The training program includes training of all types of graduate or undergraduate students working in any of the medical or medically allied and other professions in rehabilitation.

There are two mental retardation centers—one at the University of Wisconsin, the other at the University of Texas. The research and training conducted by these centers are essentially the same as those in the medically oriented centers, except that they are directed to specific problems of the mentally retarded.

That leaves two vocational rehabilitation centers—one at Hot Springs—University of Arkansas, and this one in Johnstown, affiliated with University of Pittsburgh.

The training is for graduate or undergraduate students and professionals working in any of the rehabilitation professions.

CHALLENGES AHEAD FOR THE JOHNSTOWN CENTER

Despite the advantages of medically oriented centers for rehabilitation of the severely disabled, there still existed a need for a research and training program that would help handicapped people not currently requiring intensive medical care to be prepared for a job. To meet this need, VRA is making $100,000 available to the University of Pittsburgh and Johnstown Centers to get this project under way. (Funds cover professional library, research equipment, closed circuit TV, and staff salaries. Over a 5-year period, Federal participation is expected to total over $1 million.)

This project is opening at a fortunate time: Legislation to expand VR services—particularly for the severely disabled—is rapidly moving toward enactment. That will mean more work for rehabilitation centers than would have been possible before. It also should ease the situation for future improvements and expansions of the workshops and rehabilitation centers.

Existing law hampers rehabilitation centers in serving the severely disabled. State agencies have been purchasing comparatively few services for these individuals. The reason: the physician must predict in advance that a person could work as a condition of acceptance.

All this will be changed under the new legislation. Services will be provided for 6 months for all disabled persons (18 months for retarded) before the decision on acceptance is made. Financing is also favorable: 75 percent Federal funds for these services—a break for Pennsylvania which is obliged to pay about 60 percent for regular services.

The legislation will help Pennsylvania DVR to rehabilitate even more people. The Bureau has led the country for the last 3 years and is expected to repeat this achievement in 1965.

Through March for fiscal 1965 Pennsylvania had 8,922 rehabilitants, a 13 percent increase over the comparable period last year when the figure was 7,920. Closest to Pennsylvania this year: New York, with 5,869 through March, just about 3,000 less than Pennsylvania.

PENNSYLVANIA AND THE PROBLEMS OF HEART, CANCER, STROKE

Aside from our own new law, President Johnson has directed an all-out effort to rehabilitate more persons suffering from heart disease, cancer or stroke. A bill to establish centers for these persons is under consideration.

Pennsylvania's DVR was No. 1 in cardiac, and No. 3 in cancer rehabilitation (no complete statistics available on stroke in 1964.) In 1964, 14 percent of all rehabilitants with heart conditions were in Pennsylvania—731 of the 5,212 cardiac rehabilitants. Eleven percent of all cancer rehabilitants were Pennsylvanians (61 out of 565). New York was first (82) and Florida was second (62).

Pennsylvania's success in heart patients can be attributed partly to the work of the Johnstown center. Also, VRA has supported research in this area that has stimulated this effort: at the University of Pittsburgh, where two such studies were conducted by W. Leigh Cook, M.D.; at the Heart Association of Southeastern Pennsylvania, David Gelfand, M.D., conducted another VRA-supported study of cardiacs.

Here then is proof of what further can be done in this new research and training project, particularly with such a director as Fred Whitehouse, himself an ex-official of the American Heart Association and longtime participant professional in voctional rehabilitation. It is to be hoped that this center will consider research or training in heart disease, cancer, stroke.

As evidence of congressional and administration interest in subject, appropriations bill is about to be enacted with $6.1 million for research and training in heart, cancer, stroke. This breaks down as follows: $2 million for 35 research and demonstration projects on these disabilities; $1,600,000 for training ($500,000 long-term graduate, $500,000 research training, $600,000 for short-term training); $2½ million for medically oriented research and training centers.

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM P. YOUNG, SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, HARRISBURG, PA.

Mrs. Sweigert, Mr. Vice Chancellor, Congressman SAYLOR, Mr. Eby, a year ago this facility marked its fifth anniversary. We held a meeting here of our State board and reviewed the progress which had been made. In 5 years over 2,000 clients have been served and 28 new training courses have been added to the original 20.

This morning I learned that an additional 900 clients have been admitted in the past year—an alltime high.

During these first 6 years of operation our center has concentrated its efforts primarily in the area of service to handicapped persons. Some beginnings were made in professional training and in research. Teaching affiliations with several universities were developed in the professional training of physical therapists, speech therapists, and rehabilitation counselors. Our center was the focus of a recent research and demonstration project on cooperative vocational training.

Such a partnership as we are dedicating today, however, is necessary if we are to fulfill our responsibility and reach our true potential in these two critical areas of research and training. The Commonwealth could not duplicate the vast resources of professional personnel, knowledge, experience, and technical equipment which modern research and training requires. How fortunate we are to have a major university so close at hand and—with a branch campus in Johnstown itself; and how fortunate we are that this major university is so vitally interested in vocational rehabilitation.

From our side of the partnership we offer a facility and a client population unique in the field. Disabilities of all types have been served and this will continue to be done. As one of the largest facilities in the world we have significant numbers of clients in every disability classification; and these clients are taking part in a wide variety of special rehabilitation services. Such a population, and in such a setting, offers unlimited research potential. We would be remiss if we did not engage in a quest for greater knowledge, for new and better techniques.

What we learned here should have wide duplications for other agencies and programs in vocational rehabilitation.

One of our greatest hopes is to bridge the gap between research findings and their being put into operation by practitioners in the field. These gaps exist in time and they exist in language. Sometimes years pass befor significant research finds its way into professional journals. Frequently, the research is written up in language too detailed or complex for the practitioners to fully utilize.

The proposed training phase of the institute will bridge this gap by bringing in professionals for short-term training as soon as research findings prove valid and useful.

The staff of the center is an intellectually curious and high motivated team. Over 700 hours of college credits have been earned by the staff during the last 6 years—during their spare time. I know they look forward to being a part of this new program.

We are proud to have been selected by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration as one of the research and training institutes.

We are proud to join with the University of Pittsburgh in this exciting and much-needed effort to enrich man's knowledge and his skills. We are proud to have been given this opportunity to find new ways of helping the handicapped to help themselves—in Pennsylvania, and in all parts of the country.

A Stacked Deck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of its general interest, I am in-

serting the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of June 28, 1965:

A STACKED DECK

When it becomes evident some much-touted Government social reform is heading for trouble, its advocates nearly always complain that the evil influence of politics kept them from doing enough of what they wanted. What they fail to see is that by pressing a Government program, they invoked politics themselves; it is the essential nature of the tool they favor.

An article in a recent issue of Atlantic magazine, for example, carries the illustrative title "Misdeal in Appalachia." Its author is Harry M. Caudill, a lawyer who has previously written of squalor in that region. He contends it needs a massive Federal development program, but argues that political machinations made the Appalachian aid program a "misdeal."

Governors of some of the states involved were initially unenthusiastic, he says, and Federal planners decided at an early date that gaining acceptance of the program by the Governors was more important than finding effective solutions. The Governors, he continues, sided with electric power, steel and coal companies to block certain solutions.

The upshot is that 80 percent of the Appalachian money will go into road construction, not because that's the best way to solve the region's economic woes, but merely because it's the only proposal that drew no effective opposition. The rest is spread ineffectually among various other items, often, in Mr. Caudill's view, hamstrung by further political restriction. As a result, he says the program "is a grim hoax. It won't restore Appalachia and its millions of poor to health and hope; more likely it will speed their descent into the depths of despond."

Those remarks bear striking similarity to the analysis of the Federal proverty war by Michael Harrington, the reformer and author whose books on poverty are credited with helping to inspire the Federal program. Mr. Harrington's particular devils are congressional Republicans. He says they forced (through hypnotism perhaps?) the huge Democratic majority to grant local control over antipoverty. * * * He says, the task of helping the poor was subordinated to local politics and the impoverished were the losers, as usual.

For our part, we'd certainly agree that these programs, not to mention many others, are highly unlikely to redeem their sales promises. Even more damage, however, might result if the reformers had their way whole hog. We, at least, would hardly be complacent about such ideas as the Government herding mountain residents into new towns merely because Mr. Caudill and like-minded thinkers have the notion that by every reasonable standard the people would be far better off.

That phrase, heavy in the implication there is no need to ask those people what they think of it, is typical of the theorizing of many reformers, and indeed, of many who direct Government programs. They seem to believe that humanity's problems will vanish if they are given enough money and coercive power to rearrange society according to their particular magic formula. Yet history has often shown, not only recently but over the centuries, that this assumption of easy answers is probably the cardinal flaw in what is called liberal philosophy.

When sensible reform is actually needed, it is unlikely to result from so doctrinaire an approach. It is further hampered by the reformers tendency toward unquestioning faith in the Federal Government. Political interference in Government programs is not, as they naively seem to feel, some kind of accident. It is inherent.

In any Federal program there will be money spent and favors distributed. There is no way to repeal the resulting political implications. Naturally, politicians will be interested in promoting proposals that suit their political needs—patronage, roads or whatever. Moreover, if such programs falter, the solution the politicians usually see is more of the same.

The reformers are right when they say that such programs as Appalachian aid and poverty wars all too often result in misdeals. The trouble is that by linking simple-minded doctrine with inherently political Government, they themselves help stack the deck.

A Lesson From Peoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Peoria story is becoming well known throughout the Nation. It is not surprising that other cities are becoming interested in the details of local initiative displayed in the second largest metropolitan area in Illinois. It is also heartening to note that cities around this country are still interested in do-it-yourself plans rather then spending time on how to get into the Federal grab bag. Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the June 28, 1965, issue of the Daily Advance of Lynchburg, Va.

A LESSON FROM PEORIA

Following World War II, downtown Peoria, Ill., began to suffer as businesses sprang up in the suburbs—a plight common to many American cities, large and small, Lynchburg included.

The Peoria downtowners didn't take this natural economic transformation lying down. What they did about it—at least a handful of their farsighted leaders—is recounted in a U.S. Chamber of Commerce news feature which contains in it the seeds of inspiration for communities like ours. Peoria, although somewhat more populous than Lynchburg—103,162 in the 1960 census—had and has many problems in common with Lynchburg.

The alert was first sounded when Sears, Roebuck & Co., announced that it was going to move from the center of the city to the suburbs. Business leaders, realizing this might set off a mass exodus and that the downtown could become a blighted area, got together—some 20 of them. They set out to determine what was needed to spark a revival of the city's urban heart. Retention of Sears was obvious. And the replacement of their decrepit county courthouse loomed as a priority.

Ignoring other matters for the time being, they focused efforts on these two projects. To keep Sears, a corporation was formed to raise equity capital, buy land and put up a new building for Sears to rent. To get a new courthouse, the businessmen concentrated their efforts on establishing a public buildings commission.

Both efforts succeeded. A $6 million project that will keep Sears downtown will be completed this year. In addition, a new downtown cafeteria has beeen built on the same site as Sears. A $4.5 million courthouse was completed in July, 1964.

What has happened since then in downtown Peoria has been dramatic. Caterpillar Tractor Co., is completing a new multimillion dollar headquarters building and a 1,500-car parking facility for workers. Peoria Savings & Loan erected a new 4-story building. A new 20-story, $5 million building is being put up by First Federal Savings & Loan Association. The Voyager Inn erected a 100-unit project at a cost of $2 million; Security Savings & Loan is erecting an 8-story building. Many owners and tenants who vacated the Sears and Caterpillar sites have built new facilities in the central business district.

All of this construction is within a block of the new courthouse.

Now comes the most significant part of the Peoria story:

None of the new construction totaling more than $50 million, used Federal funds. Costs to the local taxpayers was only $4.5 million for the new courthouse, which higher taxes from the other new structure may well offset in the long run. To the rest of us Federal taxpayers, not one red cent did it cost.

No area was bulldozed and left standing in rubble and ragweed for years, as is likely to happen under many Federal urban renewal programs.

Instead, in just a couple of years' time and the farsightedness of a score of business leaders, Peoria got a gleaming downtown that gives promise of expanding even more.

They Search for a Martyr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I would include at this point an editorial, "They Search for a Martyr," from the June 24 issue of the Jackson, Miss., Daily News. The editor has taken a calm, reasonable approach to the problems which will beset the South and other parts of the Nation during the summer ahead, and I agree with his sentiments. Because of the importance of this entire issue, I commend his thoughts to all Members of this body, and urge all Americans to take a similarly intelligent view.

THEY SEARCH FOR A MARTYR

Here's a prediction: Racial agitators will continue to foment hate and strife in Mississippi, probably in Jackson, this summer, especially within the next few weeks.

Purpose of this movement is to inflame passions and to provoke one or more deaths so that the professional hate gangs will get themselves a martyr so they can drape his casket with an American flag to arouse sympathy before national television cameras.

The end result sought is to generate sufficient passions in Congress so that an excuse can be found by the liberal element of Congress to unseat the Mississippi congressional delegation.

Mississippians are asked to exert fullest restraint in the face of the expected provocations and at all times to let law-enforcement officers handle the agitators.

The motives of the paid street performers are known.

Their tactics of public disorder are clear to all intelligent persons. The advocates of mobocracy have failed thus far, but they will continue.

We repeat: Do not yield to provocation to lawlessness in any manner. Let duly elected authorities deal with the agitators, both foreign and domestic.

What's Happened to the Will To Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the following significant article which appeared in the May 1965 issue of Nation's Business raises serious questions concerning the philosophy underlying the Great Society. The situation described is a dangerous and unhealthy one which bodes no good for the future of our country. How much longer must we wait for the administration to take the necessary steps to correct these abuses which can be laid squarely on the shoulders of those who administer the unemployment insurance, welfare, and USES program?

WHAT'S HAPPENED TO THE WILL TO WORK?—UNCLE SAM SPENDS BILLIONS ON UNEMPLOYED WHILE JOBS OF ALL TYPES ARE GOING BEGGING

The corner of Fifth and K Streets NW., is quiet and deserted at 6 a.m., like most other corners of Washington, D.C., at that time. A few years ago scores of men in overalls would have been there, waiting. Whenever a dump truck would stop at the corner, the men would jostle to clamber aboard. The driver usually had to yell for two or three to get off and wait for the next truck.

Today drivers still seek laborers to take to construction jobs, but they no longer bother stopping by Fifth and K. The men are not there any more. Now, the drivers go to the public employment service office, fill out forms and wait their turn and hope for a complement of workers. Sometimes they get the men they need, sometimes not.

It's the same story in many spots throughout the country. Jobs for low-skilled workers are available, but where are the workers?

Grocery stores seek stock boys, barbershops want men to shine shoes, cab fleets need drivers, lettuce growers advertise for help in the fields, service stations lack enough attendants, and families are looking for maids and yardmen.

Meanwhile, paradoxically, the Federal Government's Bureau of Labor Statistics is reporting 3.5 million people—about 62 percent of them low-skilled—looking for work.

Largely because of these reports, the President and liberal Congressmen are pressing for a 300 percent rise in antipoverty expenditures for the coming fiscal year.

They want the Federal Government to finance expansions of the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the work-experience program, the domestic version of the Peace Corps known as VISTA, the Area Redevelopment Administration, community-action grants, the job training program, youth opportunity centers for placing disadvantaged young folk, aid for depressed regions, public works in areas of high unemployment and enough welfare programs to make the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the third highest spending department in the U.S. Government.

Certainly there are many disabled or otherwise unfortunate persons who can't work today. However, public expenditures for aid to the unemployed, not counting welfare, have risen to a total of $4 billion in the past fiscal year alone.

To find reasons behind the paradox, Nation's Business interviewed the people closest to the problem, the private employment agents. They try to find jobs for persons who want them and persons to fill jobs they know are open.

"Our welfare system has produced a whole group of people who not only don't work, but won't work," comments Theodore C. H. Wilson, a director of the National Employment Association and the owner of a string of agencies in the Washington area.

"A lot of those fellows who used to show up on the corner for construction jobs have learned about the miracle called unemployment compensation. Why work when the District of Columbia, for example, will give you $49 a week tax free for not working? I know of people who work just 12 weeks of the year. They've found ways of skirting the law so they can live the rest of the time on unemployment compensation."

YOU GET BILLED

The compensation miracle varies from State to State. Utah pays $17 a week to people on its rolls. California goes as high as $55. You, the employer, pay for the whole program—so much for each worker on your payroll. Part of the rates you must pay—if you hire more than three persons (or, in some States, if you hire anybody at all) for more than 20 weeks in a year—is set by the Federal Government, the rest by your State.

In effect you are required to pay for a program that feeds on itself. The more money in the unemployment fund, the more likely payments to an individual unemployed worker will increase. The closer these payments come to what's paid under the Federal minimum-wage law, the more likely it is that a worker will refuse to take a minimum-wage job and the greater will be the pressure for higher minimum wages.

Mr. Wilson says his agencies no longer deal much with low-skilled workers, because he found too few of them willing to accept the present minimum wage, especially on permanent jobs.

"Kids drop out of high school and expect to get jobs paying at least $100 a week to start," Mr. Wilson said. "A lot of them are used to $15 or $20 weekly allowances and expect to keep on getting something for nothing.

"A kid with no experience will come in wanting to go into TV as a personality. He doesn't believe you when you tell him he'll probably have to start by running errands and sweeping out the studio at $35 a week.

"They say, 'I'll do anything.' But you offer them a job and they'll reply, 'Well, now gee, that's an awful lot of work.' Unless, of course, you offer to make them vice presidents of General Motors."

Grayce R. Taylor, president of Alert Personnel, Inc., in Tampa, Fla., reports that in a period of a month and a half recently her office had 97 job orders for unskilled jobs which the Florida State employment service could not fill.

Wanted were plant workers, trainee electricians, plumbers' helpers, filling station attendants, dishwashers, porters, warehousemen, electronic trainees, stock clerks, drug clerks, shipping clerks, cleanup men, yard workers, construction laborers, nailers, delivery men, janitors, counter trainees, orderlies, and kitchen helpers.

Wages on these job orders ran from 85 cents an hour plus meals to $1.70 an hour.

Meanwhile, the Florida State employment service, which doles out $33 a week to a person for not working, listed some 1,400 unemployed unskilled workers in Hillsborough County, which includes Tampa.

Just across Tampa Bay in St. Petersburg, Jules Dobey, manager of Admiral Personnel, says his recent job openings have included a steam cleaner trainee at $1.25 an hour, 4 printer's apprentices at $1.25 an hour, 2 factor trainees at $1.50 an hour, 5 jaintors at $1.25 an hour, 7 service station attendants at $60 a week, 10 truck drivers at $1 an hour and a lubrication man at $1.15 an hour.

The National Industrial Conference Board's help-wanted index, which measures the volume of classified job advertisements in 52 major newspapers across the country, climbed to 137 at the end of last year. That's 19 points higher than the year before and 37 points above the base years of 1957 through 1959. Biggest jumps between December 1963 and December 1964 were noted in Richmond, Va., 64 points, Nashville, Tenn., 39 points, and Charlotte, N.C., 35 points.

NEW LAWS ARE BEING CONSIDERED WHICH ACTUALLY COULD ENCOURAGE MORE LOAFING

"Any boy who really wants to work can get a job" claims John T. Scannell, president of an employment agency in Worcester, Mass., and a member of the legislative committee of the Massachusetts Technical Employment Association. He says there are many jobs for auto mechanics, greasers, parts clerks, and trainee draftsmen, if teenagers could shake off the idea that they should start by getting at least $85 a week.

William H. Hagedorn, manager of Personnel, Inc. of Wheeling, W. Va., contends that many low-skilled workers have "an inflated idea of what they're worth." They turn up their noses at openings in his area for such jobs as milk and bread route men, shipping clerks, store floormen, plumbing salesmen, maintenance men, body men, mechanics, and filling station attendants.

"A nearby company conducts a free 5-hour school each Saturday in die-setting work and machine shop practice," Mr. Hagedorn says. "Some of the unemployed show up one or two times until they discover that they have to work their heads some. Then they don't come back again."

Gordon Blair, manager of an employment agency in Seattle, Wash., believes any person who presents "a sharp image" can get a job in his part of the country.

The elderly owner of a small grocery store in Silver Spring, Md., plans to close his shop and retire because he can't get a reliable person to help him stack boxes and clean up the store.

"Sometimes I'll get guys who'll work a few hours, and then they find out it really is work and they quit," he laments.

Roy Fleischman, executive vice president of B-Line Cab Co., Louisville, Ky., pointed out to Nation's Business:

"Today there is hardly a town in this country where an adult male who can drive a car and is reasonably literate could not get a job driving a cab—and make a good living at it. Nevertheless, in this period of so-called unemployment, most cab companies have a great part of their investment in equipment inactive due to lack of drivers."

JOBS HAVE RIVALS

Why are people not snatching up these jobs? Competition from unemployment compensation and welfare programs and a lure for early retirement in the form of social security and private pensions are part of the answer.

Added to this are more personal reasons among would-be workers: inability to read or write well enough, lack of motivation, or simple aversion to work.

"I was too busy taking them by the hand across the street," recalls Sherry D'George, president of a personnel agency in Altoona, Pa., in explaining why she quit trying to get low-skilled workers to take jobs.

"They think they should start with $5,000 to $10,000 a year jobs even though they seem to have no qualifications.

"Their main problem is that they feel they are too good for the positions we have open.

"If we tell them about jobs outside of this area, 9 times out of 10 they want the interviewers to pay their expenses. They are not willing to invest in themselves.

"Often they come in and say, 'Next week my unemployment compensation runs out, so now I want a job.' They don't want to sacrifice to get ahead, especially while they have a party going."

A survey reported this year by the Gallup poll indicates that the public by substantial majorities supports each of the following plans to tigthen up relief regulations:

1. No unemployed person should get more money from relief than he could by taking a job.

2. Food and clothing should be provided to persons on relief, reducing the amount of money given to them.

3. Those who come recently from some other place and try to get on relief should be required to prove that they came because they had a definite job offer.

4. Persons should be required to live in a community for 60 days before they can get on relief there.

5. All men on relief who are physically able to work must take any job offered which pays the going wage.

6. If men on relief who are physically able to work, cannot find jobs, they must work for the city on streets, parks and the like.

Such regulations would prevent cases such as that witnessed at a Detroit unemployment center. A man standing in line there with his two small children said he had been laid off work and was tending the children and drawing unemployment compensation while his wife worked. After his eligible period for drawing unemployment checks runs out, he explained, he will get a job and his wife will quit to tend the children and start drawing unemployment checks on her own.

"It's a right nice arrangement," the man beamed.

Actually, the average jobless American is not a married man or chief breadwinner of a family. Less than half of them fit that category. Only about 1 in 20 unemployed bothers to go to a private employment agency to find a job, employment agency officials figure. And a majority of those who have been jobless for more than half a year still say they won't even consider moving to take another job.

In Los Angeles last August an unemployed electrician registered with the local Federal-State employment office, a facility you as an employer pay for to disburse unemployment compensation checks and to seek jobs for the unemployed. The electrician at the same time, on his own, advertised for a job in a local newspaper. That same day the newspaper ad brought him three job offers, one of which he accepted. Eight months later he had still not heard from the public unemployment office.

Unemployment compensation is supposed to help pay a person's living expenses from the time he may suddenly find himself out of work through no fault of his own to the time he finds another job. The U.S. Employment Service by law must see to it that unemployment compensation goes to persons regardless of need just so long as they show they don't have jobs at the moment and have made some move to find another job. So a stage star drawing $3,000 a week during the run of a play can start receiving unemployment checks at its end.

Theoretically, the Federal Government lets the States decide who should get unemployment compensation. But both the State and Federal unemployment taxes that you pay go first to a fund in Washington where the money is redistributed to the State employment offices. This redistribution is according to how Labor Department officials feel about the needs in various States and the way the State offices are running their programs.

The result is that a State trying to keep poachers off its unemployment compensation rolls by tightening its regulations could find itself threatened with a cutoff of unemployment money.

South Dakota last year amended its unemployment compensation law to require longer waiting periods for unemployed applicants whose earnings exceed $6,000 in the preceding 12 months. The Labor Department held that this was a "needs test." It said it would not certify the State's unemployment program as long as the provision remained.

Loss of certification would have meant, in effect, that the unemployment tax on South Dakota employers would rise. In November South Dakota gave in to the Labor Department by retracting the amendment.

THE COMPENSATION BOOM

"There is a nice correlation between the number of pregnancies and the number of people on unemployment compensation," notes Martin R. Gainsburg, vice president of the National Industrial Conference Board, the New York research organization. "Unemployment rolls also seem to go up during hunting seasons."

Julie Anderson, owner of Nationwide Personnel and the Helen Hart Agency in San Diego, Calif., reports that not once during her 13 years in the employment business has anyone from a State unemployment office contacted her to see if a person actually had applied for a job, as required to receive compensation.

"And this is true with everyone else in this business that I've talked with," she says. "I have even tried to call the unemployment office and give them information, but they aren't interested."

Persons with highly needed skills are among these shunning jobs in order to collect unemployment compensation. For example, in California, where you can get $55 a week for 39 weeks of not working, an employment agent in the past 6 months had three men with college degrees turn down suitable job offers because they wanted to take a vacation at public expense.

"Girls are worse," the agent said. "Many of them have no intention of a work career, but file for unemployment compensation to help pay their wedding costs.

"People in general have the feeling that unemployment compensation is a program they have invested in, so why not take advantage of it. Of course the truth is that all the money for the program comes from employers."

A small part of the mony would come from employees, under a program backed by President Johnson. But the proposal is seen mostly as sop to employers. For the administration also hopes to raise the weekly checks going to the unemployed, lengthen the time over which these checks are given and, of course, boost the taxes you would have to pay to finance the increases.

Along with that, President Johnson hopes to give the Federal Government a still stronger say in how States administer their unemployment programs. Congressional action on unemployment pay bills is not expected until late this session or perhaps during the next session.

Unemployment compensation pays out more money to more persons than any other type of aid to the unemployed. Compensation payments totaled $2.8 billion in the past fiscal year. Other types of aid include public spending by local, State, and Federal welfare agencies, special training programs, public works, area redevelopment, and State employment services and spending by private welfare agencies, by friends and families of the unemployed and by industry, mostly in the form of supplemental unemployment benefits, severance pay, early pensions, and training.

The W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research estimates that society's total expenditure for aid to the unemployed during the past fiscal year totaled $4.9 billion. That's 1 percent of national income.

The Nation's true unemployment rate—that is persons actively seeking work—is probably no greater than 2.2 percent of the labor force, not the 5 or so percent given by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, contends Robert O. Snelling Sr., president of 160 employment agencies all over the country.

The trouble with the Government's figures, Mr. Snelling says, is that they include many who say they would like to work but who don't urgently need a job and are not seriously looking for work.

RINGERS AMONG JOBLESS

He gives the following as examples of people who are wrongly included in unemployment figures:

1. High school and college students between semesters who will be returning to school.

2. Production workers on temporary layoff because of production changeovers.

3. Housewives who say they would like to earn extra money even though their husbands have jobs and are acting as heads of their households.

4. People who have voluntarily left their jobs to strike against the company.

5. Seasonal workers who regularly work only part of each year.

6. Children between the ages of 14 and 17 who have quit school and are in most cases being supported by their parents.

7. Actors between shows who have already earned as much as $50,000 during the year.

8. Retired people on social security and retired servicemen receiving pensions who say they'd like to work to get additional income.

9. Persons scheduled to start new wage or salary jobs within 30 days.

10. People who are temporarily ill and are not looking for work because they believe there is no work available for them in their community.

11. People whose skills are in demand elsewhere but who refuse to move.

12. People who are looking for part-time work.

13. People who have been offered work but have refused to accept it because they consider the pay too small, the distance too far, the work too different from their previous occupation or the position beneath their dignity.

"Including these kinds of people in statistics that are supposed to reflect the percentage of people genuinely out of work and actively looking for employment is ridiculous," Mr. Snelling claims. "Many of them would not take a position even if offered, especially if they are still collecting unemployment compensation.

"The unemployment figures advanced by the Department of Labor are bloated out of all proportion for political expediency, for bureaucratic reasons and to make sure the U.S. Employment Service keeps getting an increasingly larger share of the taxpayers' money."

This Motive Is Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following editorial from the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, June 24, 1965, as food for thought.

The editorial follows:

THIS MOTIVE IS GOOD

However history may deal with the judgment of the United States in its involvement in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, it must accord it an unique purity of purpose. No one who has not been brainwashed can believe this Nation has any aggressive purpose.

It wants peace; it does not seek material wealth, the ancient motivations of imperialism. Whenever American policies abroad are condemned these two basic truths must be kept in mind.

This Nation twice has been drawn into world wars. In the first one, it never ventured beyond its borders in any preventive action. In the second one, it did virtually nothing to head off the escalation of the Axis' aggression until it had to go allout as a belligerent.

Virtually all of America's military actions in foreign nations bespeak an effort not to make the same mistake three times. It believes communism to be inherently aggressive. It believes aggression often takes the form of a takeover from within nations. Hence this Nation's widespread participation in efforts to stop the seedling fires. This much the whole world may say, and history cannot denounce as evil the motivation of the United States.

Who Are the Leaders of the Demonstrations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include a news story from the Gadsden (Ala.) Times of June 25, 1965. I think the good people of the North, many of whom joined in the demonstrations in Selma and the march on Montgomery, should know the caliber of some of the leaders of the so-called civil rights movement.

The article follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS LEADER JAILED, ACCUSED OF FONDLING GIRLS

SELMA, ALA.—A leader of civil rights demonstrators was in jail today, accused of fondling teenaged girls, possessing pornography and using profanity before young girls.

William Ezra Greer, 41, also was being investigated by police in connection with complaints from local civil rights leaders that Greer channeled rights movement funds into his own pocketbook.

Police Commissioner Wilson Baker said Greer, a Negro, listed addresses in Selma, Chicago, and Birmingham and had papers showing affiliation with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the State youth crusade of King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Greer came to Selma last March and led a 5-day prayer vigil for the Reverend James Reeb, the Boston minister killed by white men in an attack on a Selma street.

Two weeks ago, Baker said, he received statements from members of the local SCLC staff accusing Greer of taking organization funds for his own use.

"I guess we weren't investigating fast enough, because they came back and signed this series of warrants," Baker said.

At midday, Greer was freed on $900 bond, but was arrested again after a Negro man claimed that Greer fondled his 16-year-old daughter.

An investigation of Greer's room turned up a quantity of obscene material, Baker said.

We Can't Withdraw From Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Fort Myers News-Press commented on the need for a continuing policy of strength in southeast Asia. It is pointed out that the war in Vietnam is not of our making, and is not of President Johnson's making—but it is our war all the same and it must be fought:

Perhaps if there were less talk of withdrawal the North Vietnamese might abandon the hopes they hold now that we will do so and be willing to talk terms.

I ask that this excellent editorial be printed here in the RECORD:

[From Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, June 18, 1965]

WE CAN'T WITHDRAW FROM VIETNAM

Now some 20,000 additional U.S. troops are being sent to South Vietnam, bringing the total of our fighting men there to 70,000. This troop buildup follows a buildup of planes and other armament there and more will probably follow for no end of the war is in sight. Instead of pouring more men, munitions and money into what seems now to be a hopeless struggle in some far-away jungle, should we give up and withdraw and let the Communist Vietcong have the country? That's what is advocated in certain quarters.

Those who advocate it are not necessarily Communists or Communist sympathizers. Many of them are perfectly loyal Americans who sincerely feel our policy there is wrong and that it will lead to war on a larger scale, which perhaps it will. But they can have little conception of why we're in Vietnam and what the stakes are that we're fighting for there.

The war in Vietnam is but part of a general Communist assault on the whole of free Asia which is now taking shape. Vietnam is the most important front and it may be the decisive one but it is far from the only one. In Laos the government is under attack by insurgent Pathet Lao forces led and supplied by North Vietnamese. In Malaysia there are constant efforts at terrorism and infiltration by Sukarno's Communist agents from Indonesia. In Burma, the government is fighting Communist guerrillas who control key areas. In Thailand a foothold has been established by Communist agents and a definite pattern of subversion is now emerging. In the Philippines the Huk guerrillas are becoming active again and control a number of villages by terror.

A lie circulated by the Communist propaganda apparatus is that these insurgencies throughout Asia and others elsewhere are all inspired by the quest for social justice and economic progress on the part of the masses. Actually in all the free countries of Asia that the Communists seek to liberate there have been great social, economic, and political gains. In the Communist-dominated areas there has been systematic impoverishment of the people both materially and spiritually.

The free people of Asia generally realize this, they seek to resist communism and they want and need our help. A recent editorial in the Indian Economic Review, semiofficial publication of the All India Congress Committee, says: "Nothing should deter lovers of freedom and democracy to make every effort to thwart Communist China's overrunning the vulnerable southeast Asia, for if our neighbors of southeast Asia succumb, we have no chance of survival. If the United States, which obviously realizes the tremendous danger of expansionist Communist China, keeps aloof from this area, man's freedom is at stake." Note the last sentence—not just India's survival but "man's freedom."

So if the United States should withdraw from Vietnam, then where in Asia would we hold the line against the advance of communism? If we draw that line somewhere else it might well take a far greater effort to hold it there and risk an even greater escalation toward all-out war. And if we pull out entirely, we will assuredly be confronted with more "Vietnams" all over the world, including Latin America.

The war in Vietnam is not of our making but it is our war all the same. And although it is not clear at present how it is to be won, it must be fought. Perhaps if there were less talk of withdrawal the North Vietnamese might abandon the hopes they hold now that we will do so and be willing to talk terms.

The United Nations—Two Decades Old

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago the United Nations came into being, invested with the hopes of men weary and torn by the most devastating general war in history. Since then, the roster of member nations has doubled and much has changed. Great strains threaten to rend the U.N., reflecting the strains within the international community. If there is trouble in the United Nations, and there is, it is not basically because of inherent defects within the structure. It is because of the failure of the membership to make it work. Fundamentally, the structure of the U.N. is sound and it would work if the members chose to make it work.

We in New Hampshire have a special interest in the United Nations because, in 1945, the question of whether the United States should endorse the proposal for the U.N. was put to the voters in the spring town meetings. It won overwhelming approval and this was, I believe, the only time when the question was put directly to the people anywhere in the country. In addition, the United Nations Building itself contains a quantity of New Hampshire granite.

As we reflect on the past 20 years and endeavor to fathom the future, let us

salute the United Nations for its past accomplishments and strive to correct its faults. Its success is dependent upon the goodwill of men and nations. Let it not fail because of any lack of goodwill on our part.

Barbara Ann Lynch: Heroine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, by an act of Congress the President is authorized each year to award Young American Medals for outstanding bravery and service demonstrated by our young American boys and girls. This year four recipients were named by Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach and today I had the pleasure of attending the White House ceremony and personally meeting three of these recipients. The award in the other case regrettably was granted posthumously to the parents of the young heroine who died in an effort to save her young brother from a fire.

I was particularly delighted that Barbara Ann Lynch, age 16, of Atco, N.J., a community in the First Congressional District which I have the honor to represent in the House of Representatives, was one of the four recipients. I know that the Members of the Congress will be pleased to learn that Barbara Ann, who was born on August 24, 1948, to Mr. and Mrs. Farrell Joseph Lynch, of Atco, and who is a junior at Camden Catholic High School in Cherry Hill, N.J., truly earned her award by a demonstration of outstanding courage and bravery.

On the morning of November 10, 1963, Barbara, who was then 15, discovered that there was a blaze in the living room of the family's frame home. She awakened her father who then roused his wife and son and all of them safely left the home. Once out on the street, however, Barbara noticed the absence of her 90-year-old grandmother and dashed back into the flaming bedroom for the purpose of rescuing her.

It became immediately apparent to her that it was impossible for her to lead or to carry her grandmother, who was an invalid, out of the home, so she helped the sick woman out of the bed and onto the floor, covered her with a blanket, shut the door and then lay across her grandmother to protect her from the flames.

Barbara's father was prevented from returning because of the intense heat and smoke and as a result, Barbara and her grandmother were overcome by smoke and suffered third degree burns before firemen were able to enter and carry them to safety.

Members of the Atco volunteer fire company were amazed to observe the unselfish devotion and the courageous heroics of such a young girl.

Knowing the Lynch family personally, I was particularly delighted to see the Attorney General and the President single her out of many nominees for this high award.

I know that I speak for all of the citizens of the First Congressional District and, indeed, for all the citizens of the United States when I say to Barbara Ann Lynch, "Well done."

It is demonstration of this type of courage that renews the confidence of all of us in the youth of America. I believe that this entire program is a worthwhile one and I sincerely hope that Congress will in the future increase the number of possible recipients as an encouragement and inspiration to the boys and girls of America.

Once again, I congratulate Barbara Ann and her entire family and wish them many years of good health and God's blessings.

Joe Maldonado, Los Angeles' Antipoverty Chief, a Highly Respected Professional Administrator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article from the June 21, 1965, edition of the Los Angeles Times on Mr. Joe P. Maldonado, the highly respected executive director of the Los Angeles Youth Opportunities Board.

The article, written by Times' staff writer Paul Weeks, is a fine study of one of the top professional administrators now working in the national effort to wage a successful war on poverty in America.

Mr. Maldonado's personal background and experience, in addition to his education and motivation, have prepared him well for the challenging and often times difficult task of organizing and coordinating the antipoverty program in the Los Angeles area.

Los Angeles has already received approximately $12 million in Federal assistance under this program, and should continue to be among the chief beneficiaries of the Johnson administration's promising new approach to solving the tragic paradox of extreme poverty for some 30 million disadvantaged citizens, in the midst of an all-time record prosperity for most Americans.

The ultimate success of this worthwhile effort in Los Angeles will depend in large measure on the determination and proven executive ability of such outstanding community leaders as Mr. Joe Maldonado.

The Los Angeles Times article follows:

MALDONADO WALKS TIGHTROPE IN WAR ON POVERTY

(By Paul Weeks)

A political tightrope between three sectors of the war on poverty here vibrates nervously these days to the toe-dancing of a 230-pounder who has no yen at all for the high wire.

Round-jowled Joe P. Maldonado, 43, climbed out on it at the insistence of the youth opportunities board—which he serves as executive director—because he's the only man anyone could think of who wouldn't immediately draw sniper fire from one sector or another.

Maldonado's job is to try to induce the contestants to establish a screening agency for community antipoverty projects so they will go back to fighting poverty instead of each other.

His assignment by the all-government board to mediate drew the endorsement of the economic opportunity federation, in which the private welfare agencies' strength lies, and from Mayor Samuel W. Yorty, flagbearer for city hall's interests.

At the same time, a silent prayer was offered up for Maldonado by kingpins in the community war on poverty committee, dominated by Negro and Mexican-American organizations which claim to hold vigil for the interests of the poor themselves.

Proof that he was the acceptable choice lay in the privately expressed fears from all sides that someone else might shoot him down, endangering the professional job he had done initially in launching the poverty war here.

That program, hailed all the way to Washington as perhaps the best in the Nation, is stalled. The youth opportunity board was a temporary expedient to get it started.

But failure to reorganize to meet Federal requirements for policy level participation by the private agencies and the poor has left the youth opportunity board stranded. Washington is bypassing it to fund local projects directly.

Within 3 days after Maldonado began to mediate, reports emanated that the deadlock was loosening, but there were still major areas of disagreement.

Maldonado's qualifications to soothe the disputants are unique. Besides being an on-the-job, $25,000-a-year pro, he has lived and worked in all three camps—Government, private agency and minority-group poverty area.

You might say he started his own personal war on poverty the day he was born, June 29, 1921, in the northern New Mexico coal-mining town of Dawson, population of 1,000 then, now obliterated from the map.

"Dad was a coal miner, when there was work, brought up by the railroads from Aguascalientes, Mex., before the first war," Maldonado said.

Joe's mother, with no schooling has never learned to speak English or to read or write. His father, self-taught, had only 8 months of school. Joe learned Spanish first.

But Operation Headstart, the 1965 program to prepare culturally deprived children for an equal footing when they start school, had its parallel in Dawson:

"There was a little girl named Maguire," Joe recalls with a grin. "She taught me English, and I taught her Spanish."

In 1931 with the depression, the father, Jose, faced 6 desperate years without work. Joe, youngest of four children, started work at 10 for his board and room.

"I pumped gas, worked in the general store and delivered groceries for a family in nearby Colfax. Sometimes they'd load a pickup full of food for me to take home. For a while there, I was the only one bringing home groceries."

His motivation to go on to high school, he admits, was to get off a $1-a-day job on a farm, "milking cows and slopping hogs at 4 a.m.," and driving a hay rake or a mower behind a team of horses.

He earned his room and board in another little town of Maxwell, working for his high school teacher and coach, now Dr. Curtis Martin, head of the department of political science at the University of Colorado.

Probably Joe was never paid better in his life—in inspiration.

"I like to say I finished second in my high school class," he laughs. "There were four of us in it."

Never more than 50 miles from home until he was 18, Maldonado was staggered by the wonders of Albuquerque when he enrolled in the University of New Mexico. He was graduated with a political science major, psychology minor.

He also advanced on campus from dishwasher at the men's dorm to a situation alarming to the university's job placement man:

"Joe," Maldonado recalls his saying, "you're our postmaster, proctor at the dorm and you have the laundry concession over there. You've got to give up one of them."

CHAOS IN 3 DAYS

Joe cunningly bowed out of the post office, his best job.

Within 3 days there was chaos, for he had never organized a system, depending on his memory to throw 600 boxes. The then-secret wartime atomic project at Las Alamos was getting its mail there.

"I probably set back development of the bomb 3 days," he chuckles. They had to put him back on the job.

Enrolled in Navy officer-training on campus during the war, he got as far as Pearl Harbor on the U.S.S. *Indiana*—before it was sent to drydock for 8 months and the surrender was signed.

Maldonado loaded sugar onto boxcars in 1946 while awaiting an opening in the University of Southern California School of Law. He got a year in there "before my money ran out."

Then he alternated between case-working for the Bureau of Public Assistance here and getting in more studies on scholarships at University of Southern California—this time in social work.

ON PLANNING COUNCIL

His nose was rubbed into the grinding poverty of the city at its worst: from the drifters on skid row to delinquent youth, the latter during 2 years with the California Youth Authority.

He switched to the private sector of welfare in 1950, serving with the Welfare Planning Council here 6 years. At one time he was planning director for the Los Angeles youth project, an outgrowth of the wartime "zoot suit riots."

Maldonado was executive director of harbor area welfare planning when he was summoned to a post with the Council of Community Services in Oakland in 1956.

"This was the beginning of government teaming with private welfare, anticipating the war on poverty," he said. "The city covered half our budget. We developed study centers with tutors."

COORDINATED EFFORT

Later, as executive director of Alameda County's Council of Social Planning, he brought the Ford Foundation together with elected officials and private agencies to develop a coordinated effort to attack urban poverty.

It resulted in a $100,000 grant from the foundation.

And that led to his being called to the rescue of the youth training and employment project of the YOB here in 1963, then faltering 3 months behind schedule. He pulled it together.

He won the 1963 Koshland Award for outstanding social work administration in California.

In February 1964, he was asked to take the executive director's post of the YOB, succeeding Karl Holton.

"It had funds for only 3 months and Washington wasn't planning to resume its support," Maldonado said. "I took the job and said, 'Give me a few weeks.' My wife thought I was crazy." The program came through.

MERGER PROBLEM

Last February, the YOB had received acclaim nationwide for its swift transition into the antipoverty program, but it already was embroiled in the merger problem. Maldonado was asked to step outside of a board meeting while it went into executive session.

"I didn't know what was going to happen," he said.

Then he was invited back in to find he'd been voted a $2,000 raise to put him on a par with other executives responsible for an annual $20 million cash flow.

In 1950, he married Jean Cox, a widow with three children. They have six of their own, the youngest only two. Formerly a teacher of adult education, Mrs. Maldonado is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Occidental. They live at 4528 Wawona Street in the Eagle Rock area.

"Problems?" Joe grinned. "Did you ever try living with a Phi Beta Kappa who's never had a traffic ticket?"

What she thinks of his current tightrope act, he isn't saying.

DEFINES HIS JOB

From Washington to Watts, Maldonado's effort is being watched with fascination—and trepidation.

"I don't see myself making any decisions for anybody," he said. "My job is to meet with the principals, determine what they would like to see happen, and then see if I can develop an organizational structure that will meet Washington requirements and the majority of interests here."

Participation of public and private agencies and the minorities and the poor is a must, he said—the problem is to work out the specifics.

For Maldonado will not suffer alone if he fails from the wire. The poor themselves, unaware of the drama, will only suffer some more.

Helping Young People Get Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Friday, June 18, 1965]

HELPING YOUNG PEOPLE GET JOBS

The lack of employment opportunities for young people is perhaps the darkest area in the generally brighter national unemployment picture.

The May figures show a national rate of 4.6 percent, the lowest in 7 years. But young people, while they make up only 12.5 percent of the work force, accounted for 33 percent of the unemployed.

With the influx of 2 million youngsters between 16 and 21 into the labor market—half of them permanently—during this June graduation month, youth unemployment is expected to account for 50 percent of the national rate.

A major cause of unemployment among the young is their lack of training in the technical skills needed today. For many young people, moreover, it is too late to return to full-time, school training programs.

The Federal Government's youth opportunity campaign represents an important attack on the problem. Its emphasis is not on make-work jobs for young people, but on-the-job training. This includes programs through the Neighborhood Youth Corps and job opportunities from Government agencies. But its success depends in the largest measure on private employers.

Youth opportunity registers are being opened in State employment offices. Private employers with a faith in America's young people and a willingness to help embark them on the road to economic self-sufficiency should reexamine their training programs in order to find places for the young. They can truly help to keep America a land of opportunity.

Full Cycle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as history slowly unfolds, the massive hypocrisy of the late President Roosevelt steadily comes to light. When the final historic evaluation is made of the Roosevelt administration, I am convinced it will reveal that he, more than any other President, failed the United States in the cause of freedom in the field of foreign affairs. Since so many of President Roosevelt's tragic errors still haunt us today, an editorial in this morning's Chicago Tribune carries special significance and I, therefore, place it in the RECORD:

FULL CYCLE

We have commented from time to time on the late Franklin Roosevelt's unerring talent for always jumping to the wrong conclusion every time he was called upon to make a diplomatic or strategic decision. The latest batch of U.S. foreign relations documents published by the State Department for the year 1944 offers further evidence.

The wartime President had an obsession about colonies and thought World War II must end with the colonial powers, specifically the British and French being forced to yield their territories. He also had an acute dislike of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, the leader of Free French Forces. These facts have long been known and were recorded at considerable length as early as 1946 by Roosevelt's son Elliott, in a memoir called "As He Saw It." The current State Department volume adds embellishments.

Some of its documents show that De Gaulle was embittered by the cavalier treatment he received from Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill of Britain. Roosevelt referred to him as a prima donna. He insisted that De Gaulle not be permitted to return to France until the Normandy landing had been accomplished, and he visited another slight on De Gaulle by refusing him a place at the Yalta Conference.

To a man of De Gaulle's vanity and sensitivities, these were unforgivable affronts, but the French general, the only survivor of all the allied wartime leaders, has had the last laugh. Today he is President of France and the unchallenged voice of that country in world affairs. He has repaid the slights of two decades ago with interest.

It is De Gaulle who has all but scuttled the NATO alliance with noncooperation, who incessantly preaches that Europeans can get along without American interference, who has planned a competitive nuclear arm, who has extended recognition to Red China and is on chummy terms with Moscow, who cashes in American dollar holdings for gold,

and who keeps informing the world that the United States can never win in Vietnam and should clear out of southeast Asia.

Vietnam is one of the succession states of former French Indochina, and American intervention in what used to be a French colony is a particularly sore point with De Gaulle. The State Department papers show that in 1944 Roosevelt was informing everybody that he had been insisting for more than a year that Indochina should not be returned to France, but should be administered by an international trusteeship.

"France", said Roosevelt, "has had the country—30 million inhabitants—for nearly 100 years, and the people are worse off than they were in the beginning. France has milked it for 100 years."

Whatever the failings of French colonial administration, it would take a romantic to entertain a current view that things in that former French domain are better now than under the French. North Vietnam is Communist. South Vietnam is the object of Communist conquest, and tens of thousands of American fighting men are involved in a desperate struggle. A good half of Laos is in Communist hands, and Cambodia is anti-American and engaged in a flirtation with Communist China.

General de Gaulle was out of politics when France lost a terrible 7-year war in attempting to hold Indochina. As President of France, he presided over the liquidation of most of the surviving French colonial empire. Algeria and the African colonies went the way of a British Empire which Churchill once proclaimed he had not become the king's first minister to lose.

General de Gaulle can hardly view Roosevelt's works with favor. His rancor dates from the war, when he was so often compelled to be an outsider looking in. If he devotes so much emphasis to undercutting the United States, his motives, at least, are understandable.

Eulogy to the Late Senator Olin D. Johnston

SPEECH

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to eulogize the late Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, a great statesman and a great American.

Like many other great Americans, Senator JOHNSTON rose from humble beginnings to devote a lifetime of outstanding service to his State and to his country. Academically, Senator JOHNSTON prepared himself well in spite of his modest circumstances and the fact that his educational training was interrupted by a period of combat service in Gen. Douglas MacArthur's famed Rainbow Division during World War I. Upon returning to civilian life, he received his B.A. degree from Wofford College and earned both an M.A. degree and the LL.B. degree from the University of South Carolina.

As he progressed in his public service career, first as a member of the South Carolina State Legislature, then as Governor of that State, and finally as U.S. Senator, OLIN D. JOHNSTON always remained close to the people whose interests he served so well. Truly, under his long and able chairmanship of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Federal Government employees throughout the Nation have benefitted from Senator JOHNSTON's fairness, vision, and legislative ability.

His qualities of leadership, benevolence, and integrity were also felt by other people whose lives were touched by laws that he had helped to enact.

I extend to Mrs. Johnston and to the other members of Senator JOHNSTON's family my deepest sympathy in this period of sadness.

Strikes Cripple Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, buried in the "Around the Nation" column on page A-4 of this morning's Washington Post, was a short story informing the world that a 6-day wildcat strike at Cape Kennedy had ended.

The strike, Mr. Speaker, involved a mere handful of willful men—120 mimeograph machine operators—but their picket lines kept some 2,200 construction workers off the job.

The United States, and rightly so, is very proud of its space program. We are proud of the noble and courageous men who man our space capsules. We are proud of the dedicated scientists whose know-how make possible our space probes. And we are proud of the amazing capability of American industry which builds and assembles the complex machines and equipment needed in the program.

However, we are just a little less than proud of some members of some unions who, apparently, put self and union above the space program—and even above the United States.

On June 14, 1965, radio station KSL, Salt Lake City, Utah, aired an editorial on this matter which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues, and I, as do they, pose the question: "Is it too much to ask for our space workers, probably the highest paid laborers in the world, to put aside strikes as usual and concentrate on getting the job done?"

The editorial follows:

MISSILES

America's newest space heroes, the twin astronauts of the walk-in-space flight, are still hearing the world's acclaim, and properly so. Their feat was a thrilling triumph, made even more impressive by the pictures that brought it into the Nation's living rooms.

But Astronauts McDivitt and White are not the only heroes of this flight. American industry should certainly share the honors.

Putting a space vehicle into orbit is an astonishingly complex matter requiring the efforts of thousands of companies and hundreds of thousands of workers. Do you realize, for example, that it took more than 3,000 subcontractors scattered throughout 43 States just to produce the capsule? Readying the launch vehicle took 1,500 companies. Even the relatively simple task of supplying food for the astronauts involved more than twoscore firms.

That, of course, is the way the American economic system works—each company and each man contributing special skills in a well-oiled and usually well-adjusted economic machine.

But the machine can break down completely when some part fails to function. And that has been happening far too often at Cape Kennedy.

In the past crucial 15 months, the heart of the Gemini program, and the core of the final Apollo moon-landing effort, were hit by three times as many major strikes as all other missile and space bases combined. Only some 6 percent of the stoppages grew out of disputes over wages, hours, or working conditions. Almost all of them were squabbles over jurisdiction. In many cases, thousands of skilled craftsmen stayed home because two unions were fighting for jurisdiction over a mere handful of jobs.

Can our space efforts afford such idleness? In other times of major national effort, Americans have been willing to put aside "business as usual" and concentrate on getting the job done.

Is it too much to ask for our spaceworkers, probably the highest paid laborers in the world, to put aside strikes as usual and concentrate on getting the job done?

NFFE President Wolkomir Speaks of Today's "Age of Anxiety" for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I had the privilege of attending the annual banquet conducted as the climax of the 3-day 24th annual convention of the New York State Federation of Federal Employees. The convention was held in my home community of Rochester, N.Y. and hosted by local No. 68 of the NFFE.

Those attending the convention banquet had the pleasure of hearing from Nathan T. Wolkomir, president of the NFFE. He had come to Rochester in order to take part in convention proceedings and to deliver the principal address.

I found his comments on the many difficulties faced by today's Federal employees so trenchant that I asked President Wolkomir for his permission to share these sentiments with my colleagues in Congress through the medium of the RECORD. I am pleased to be able to offer at this point the text of this distinguished gentleman's remarks as they were delivered in Rochester, New York on Saturday, June 19. Certainly, the interest and obligation we in Congress have for our Nation's faithful civil servants make these observations especially pertinent to our legislative responsibilities.

His comments follow:

A CHAOTIC MELODY

An author whose name escapes me, I believe it was Owen Phelps in "Grain of Dust,"

once wrote: "What are we all but a million million ants under the gleam of a million million suns."

Thus the civilian Federal employee, in a government that necessarily gets larger and larger, figuratively becomes an individual not only antilike but microscopic in size. In order to maintain some identity, some freedom, he strives through organization to improve working relations and find a place under his personal sun.

With labor, management, and the State all struggling over the convictions of man, I wonder when, in an interdependent society, genuine harmony and cooperation will prevail? The power of a few in labor has created a division and classes amongst Government employees. The words of a few in Government, have in turn created conditions and circumstances that have generated mounting disharmony and a managerial circle. And the State, in its role as the largest employer in the world, has undertaken to legislate human behavior.

Through this triumvirate series of counterpoints emerges a recurring theme, and whimsically apparent, a semblance of a melody. This melody, however, is chaotic harmony and turbulent like the symphony, "Storm Over Mountain." We in Government are now in what might be termed "the crescendo mood," and I sincerely hope that the symphonic "calm after the storm" will prevail and with little damage left in its wake. My chaotic melody, dear friends, is a composition based on today's "Age of Anxiety" for the Federal Government employee. It has lyrics written around several puzzling discordant notes. I thus come to the subject of my address: "A Chaotic Melody."

Discordant note No. 1: You, as Government employees, as labor leaders, have just completed a training course at this convention to enhance your leadership and further your technical know-how in "Employee-Management Cooperation" in Government under Executive Order 10988. Similarly, almost daily, the so-called management circle in Government has had and is still undergoing somewhat similar training. But they are trained by their agencies on Government time and taxpayers' funds. Your training, on the other hand, is self-paid and voluntary. You represent the vast mass of Government employees, they represent but a few rule-makers in comparison. Who is to be most commended under this discordant note?

Discordant note No. 2: This quarter's edition of the Civil Service Journal carried the Commissioners' statement on the merit system marking the 82d anniversary of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883. Since the statement is short permit me to quote it in full:

"The 82d anniversary of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, signals the start of a new administration, bringing the Federal work force new challenges and new opportunities in the Nation's service.

"On this anniversary, members of the career service may well be proud of their past performances and of the traditions of dedication and dependability they have strengthened and sustained. Through the years since 1883—in times of war and peace, of stress and strain, of challenge and change—the stability, skill, and sense of the civil service have justified the wisdom of those who fought to replace the spoils system with the merit system.

"Though fully merited, a prideful pause for reflection by civil servants must be but momentary—for they 'have promises to keep.'

"President Johnson has made clear that the tasks before the men and women of the Federal service will be more demanding than those they have faced in the past. He has called for a major effort of every agency to help achieve the Great Society. He has said he expects the formulation of 'imaginative new ideas and programs.' He has declared all-out war on waste, urged greater efforts to increase efficiency and economy, demanded full value for each tax dollar spent, and asked for the help of every employee, supervisor, and manager in the Federal service.

"The President's charge constitutes an unprecedented challenge to the career civil service, but past performance of public servants presages nothing less than success in fulfilling the promises they are pledged to keep.

"JOHN W. MACY, JR.,
Chairman.
"L. J. ANDOLSEK,
Commissioner.
"ROBERT E. HAMPTON,
Commissioner."

Now, in addition to this, the President has made it clear that Federal employees have more demanding tasks now than ever faced in the past. He has called upon the civil servant to achieve the Great Society. He has spoken about hard-hitting, tough-minded reforms in existing programs. He has declared all-out war on waste; he has asked for increased efficiency, economy, and full value for each tax dollar spent; and has called for the help of every employee, supervisor, and manager in the Federal service. As stated by the Commissioners, his charge indeed constitutes an unprecedented challenge to the career civil servants and calls upon them to fulfill the promises that they are pledged to keep.

Now, it is easy to have a unified attitude in a unified magnanimous world, but when the moral world is broken into fragments, one's emotional integrity is disturbed and shattered and as a result, the will of man inevitably is lessened. In today's Great Society a man spends more than half his waking hours on the job. He is called upon to produce physical and mental energies which in turn establish his particular status in society and also to a degree identifies him in the Great Society.

It is his work that measures the individual's claim and contribution to society and determines his material security. Is this security calculated strictly in dollars and cents, on the wages or salary he receives? The innate drives that force a man to go on in a self-sacrificing endeavor reflect in part at least his proper desire for recognition. As a result, the whole man ultimately can only receive adequate satisfaction in terms of his work and his social responsibility in terms of his collaboration and voice with others in shaping his own environment. We lately have heard much about human relations in Government employment. We hear much, too, about management-employee cooperation in Government employment and we hear much also about the terrific investment on the part of our Government in training its management people in developing improved techniques to effect a better relationship between management and the employee in Government.

So, bearing all of these considerations in mind, may I call to your attention more discordant notes or contradictions in fact: In order to indicate the success of the Federal program for employee-management cooperation as introduced by Executive Order No. 10988, signed by President Kennedy on January 17, 1962, the Civil Service Commission proudly proclaims the following data:

Three-quarters of a million Federal employees are in units where employee organizations have obtained exclusive recognition. At the same time there were 215 agreements negotiated in non-postal installations affecting 110,000 employees and another 8,000 local agreements that have been concluded in the Post Office Department alone. These figures are supposed to signify the success of the program.

May I show the reverse side of the mirror? The National Federation of Federal Employees, since October of 1964, has had its due share of agreements and intends to get more. Moreover, may I state that, following implementation of the Executive order, we, too, can use some very significant figures. Thus, grievances received by the National Federation of Federal Employees have jumped tenfold. The number of inquiries on procedures and interpretations on rules and regulations has increased a hundredfold. If, because of so-called recognitions employee-management relationships have been improved, then why is morale in the Federal service today at the lowest ebb in the history of our organization? If these relations were as good as indicated by the statistics and assertions of the Civil Service Commission, then certainly a very puzzling conundrum exists somewhere. For the Government employee, is this the age of the Great Society, or have we in actual practice hit a high C discordant note? This was counterpoint No. 2.

Discordant note No. 3: Under a March 3 date, special to the New York Times, the following article is quoted:

"UNITED STATES TO TRIM ROLE AS BUSINESS RIVAL

"The Budget Bureau will soon distribute a draft circular to all departments and agencies of the Federal Government emphasizing President Johnson's desire to end, to the extent practical, Government enterprises that compete with private enterprise. The circular orders departments and agencies to make an inventory of all their commercial and industrial enterprises and to undertake a review to see which can be closed."

It goes on to state:

"The President's determination to end unnecessary and uneconomical competition with private enterprise will please business groups, which have long complained of such competition."

At the same time this news report goes on to say that "such groups are unlikely to be completely satisfied with the policy as developed in the Budget Bureau document. * * * Business groups are often concerned with much larger and more debatable competion. A spokesman for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce pointed to such enterprises as MATS as a competitor with airlines, and to REA as a competitor of private power companies * * *. A similar drive to cut down such enterprises was made during the Eisenhower administration and it was then estimated that there were about 24,000 such enterprises and 2,000 were eliminated and about 500 were reduced in size."

At the same time, in a recent news release, we read the following as indicated by Congressman HENDERSON's Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization in the House.

"UP TO $1.9 BILLION WASTAGE IN DEFENSE SEEN

"The House Manpower Subcommittee headed by Representative DAVID HENDERSON today charged that the Defense is wasting up to $1.9 billion annually by using contractor supply personnel to perform work which could be handled more cheaply by civil service employees. It repeated its earlier charge that no one in the Defense knows either the full extent or the full cost of the widespread use of contract employees. * * * The subcommittee estimated that more than one-third of the Defense Department's $12.5 million annual expenditure in labor cost now goes to the so-called flesh merchants who supply it with contract employees."

Counterpoint No. 3.

The age of anxiety indeed. Our discordant notes continue.

Discordant note No. 4: May I now point to another contradiction in fact.

At 3 p.m. on November 19, 1964, the Department of Defense, through Secretary of

Defense Robert McNamara, announced 98 actions to consolidate, reduce, or discontinue Department of Defense activities in the United States and overseas. A most careful report itemizing the conditions of closures and a most comprehensive study around the actions taken was passed out as a news release. It was estimated by the Department of Defense that when the entire program was completed, $477 million would be saved annually. There would be a reduction of 63,401 civilian personnel without reducing military effectiveness and that 376,720 acres of land would be released to the private economy. Now, we are not in the position to nor do we desire to question the technical Defense posture on this austerity move. Nor, also are we in a position to question the announcement of VA closures first announced on January 13, 1965. But we are, however, deeply concerned with the human beings involved, both veterans and the faithful civil service employees who have served the veterans through the years at the VA hospitals, domiciliaries, and at various VA regional headquarters nationwide.

We are concerned with the hundreds of cries for help from our members throughout the country. We bleed with each one of these entreaties of distress and we ask so-called management in Government and the administration to bleed instead of taking tranquility pills and rendering computerized mumbo-jumbo as a sedative from glass-encased offices. We have heard much about the planning to provide a position for every individual displaced, and we have heard much about computer-operated centralized referral systems for displaced DOD personnel. We have heard much from the VA about placement but then we hear daily about what is really happening in the field. We hear about a take-it-or-leave-it attitude on the part of personnel, placement officers, and we hear about the placing of fair-haired favorite sons and hear about coldblooded CPA, not humane tactics, and we wonder who is really taking care of whom in this Great Society. Where does the civil service employee—who has been asked to carry out the general theme of the program that our President has proposed—fit into the scheme of things? A melody with discordant notes indeed. Point counterpoint No. 4.

It is easy to allege that we do not understand the big picture—but who better than the employees' own organization understands the deeply felt needs of the employee himself? Acting as the middleman, the national employee organization acts as a buffer between so-called management and the field-worker and as a result winds up as the human computer bleeding and constantly having salt added to the wounds.

Yes, much goes by the wayside between the policymaker and the interpreter of the policy. It is there, perhaps, that we are bogging down. But again, may I repeat, this does nothing more than increase and highlight the facets that control our age of anxiety.

Discordant note No. 5: And now, may I add another discordant note? We have heard much about the planning for the great cultural life in our Great Society. And we are certainly all for an improvement in our cultural existence. John Adams, back in 1780, wrote, "I must study politics and war, that my sons may have liberty to study mathematics and philosophy, geography, natural history and naval architecture, commerce and agriculture, in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music and architecture, statuary, tapestry and porcelain." We ask for rising standards of education and of income and we hope that our technological advances will bring the pleasures and satisfactions of the cultural life. The President has since stated this in his state of the Union message.

At the same time, while preparing for this Great Society and the wonderful cultural centers, in the attempt to stop our pockets of poverty, and in the increase for the overall standards of education—all which are most essential to a Great Society in a great democracy—we ask: "Where does the civil servant stand?" Certainly culture and democracy are reconcilable, but at the same time, where is the human aspect of our relationship? Do we not have an obligation to them in spite of our drives for economy? We have obligations the world over in order to better the existence of mankind—and in turn paradorically and ironically we reward our civil servants by an age of anxiety. I speak from the record because we in the NFFE have on hand not tens, not twenties, but literally hundreds of cases affecting the daily lives of our Federal employee in ways that I doubt all our agencies are really aware of, or fully understand.

Discordant note No. 6: I quote from news headlines:

"BUDGET MESSAGE STIRRING FEAR OF MOVE FOR WIDER FIRING POWERS

"It may be unjustified, but Federal employee leaders see some ominous implications in President Johnson's budget message. They feel that an indicated administration drive for legislation would make it easier to fire career employees and also force other careerists into early retirement."

Another headline: "All promotions frozen."

I questioned in an early release to the Nation's news media the soundness of the administration's reported arbitrary freeze on upper level Federal employees because at that time we stated that although aimed primarily at upper level jobs, it could readily be extended to all grades from the lowest to the highest. This is indeed fact and we have already presented evidence of actions at the lowest echelons affecting all of those positions in Government, and in all grades. We were told by the Bureau of the Budget that this was not a freeze, but the agency regulations frankly called them promotion freezes. Reclassifications and downgrading is in being and "we have promises to keep." Point-counterpoint.

We also forecast that the use of uniformed military personnel in career Federal civil service positions would show a sharp increase despite the deep concern of many Members of Congress that the practice is not being curtailed. We have passed this by hard fact evidence in many cases, but still get very little satisfaction from the departments and agencies. We have indicated before a forboding of evil with reference to Operation Prime Beef in the Air Force, for example, and its effect on civilian personnel in the Air Force, and may I state that to date have had little constructive response.

Need I go on and on and on emphasizing the fact that the civil servants today indeed live in the age of anxiety and that we have a disturbingly chaotic melody. Is there security in the position today, is there satisfaction in the job today, and what has happened to our employee management relations? Thomas Paine, in his "Age of Reason," stated that "man cannot make principles, he can only discover them. * * * The most formidable weapon against errors of every kind is reason * * * it is necessary to the happiness of man that he be mentally faithful to himself." And under these mental anxieties, the Civil Service Commission blandly says to the civil servant, "Please provide more." The caption on this quarter's issue of the Civil Service Journal reads, "A dollar of value for each dollar we spend." This caption seems to apply only to the civil servant.

The National Federation of Federal Employees is in no position to question the broad horizons, the "big picture" point of view of the Great Society. We are, however, in a position to speak for the hundreds upon hundreds of people who are reacting to what is going on in civil service. We read with special interest Chairman John W. Macy's recent statement on the manager's role in quality staffing; namely, "Today's missions and vast responsibilities of Federal agencies demand a higher degree of staff effectiveness. Building the Great Society will require an able, dedicated career force, in addition to presidentially appointed leaders of vision and talent." And we wonder what he means by "presidentially appointed leaders of vision and talent."

For, himself is an example of a leader of vision and talent who came from within and worked his way up in the civil service ranks. May I say the same of Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, William J. Driver. And again we wonder what is meant by the "presidentially appointed leaders of vision and talent." Mr. Macy goes on to speak about recruiting, examining and selecting employees and programs for reassigning and promoting employees already in effect. And we wonder, with morale what is is, with the lack of security and the complete loss of selfness in the broad scheme of things, where is he going to recruit? He speaks about the Federal merit promotion program and at the same time we live with the harsh fact of promotion freezes. And we face arbitrary actions designed to maintain a budgetary ceiling placed upon our agencies and which develops our agencies in accomplishing the very things we talk about is national goals. Our Federal employee sees automation, promotion freezes, base closures, the austerity program, RIF's—and he surely wonders. And I repeat, is this the age of the Great Society or the age of the great anxiety for the Federal employee?

The 20th Anniversary of the United Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to compliment the United Nations, which is celebrating its 20th anniversary this year. From its earliest inception, the U.N. has worked hard to achieve the primary objective of the charter—"to maintain international peace and security." The path has not been easy; an organization made up of sovereign states can move only in the direction and at the pace that its members want to move. Ideological differences between East and West, marked contrast in social and economic conditions between North and South, have been persistent obstacles hindering the effective workings of the organization.

And yet, the United Nations has served well the cause of world peace and progress. Through the United Nations, the members have acted together to avert war on at least a dozen occasions.

In Kashmir, the United Nations obtained and still polices a cease-fire line running through a bitterly contested area. In Suez, the United Nations de-

ployed an emergency force which enabled the respective national military forces to withdraw. In Korea, the U.N. stopped aggression through collective military action and forced the aggressor north of the 38th parallel. Further, the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency help Korea to rebuild its economy.

In the tense moments of the great power's confrontation over Cuba, the U.N. provided a worldwide forum for presenting the U.S. case and for mustering world opinion; the Security Council discussions provided a "cooling off" period. Later, the United Nations assisted in the removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba.

Without the United Nations, there would have been no international platform from which nations could communicate with each other and negotiate their grievances.

Today, the smallest nation can be heard as loudly as the most powerful. The United Nations serves simultaneously the large and the small, the rich and the poor—for the peace of one nation is but a part of world peace.

At the same time, the day-to-day objective of the United Nations is directed overwhelmingly toward creating conditions which make the peace worth keeping. United Nations experts are now at work in 13 countries or territories bringing modern knowledge and technology to bear on the universal struggle to liberate man from the slavery of poverty. The U.N. is in partnership with 89 nations and territories in cooperative preinvestment projects—surveying resources or training men and women in modern skills. The development lending institutions affiliated with the U.N. have been investing some $1 billion annually in world development. Many international institutions have been created in the last two decades within the framework of the United Nations to meet the varied needs of states and their people. There is not only the United Nations, but UNESCO, UNICEF, the World Health Organization, the World Bank, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the Trade and Development Conference and others.

Thus, through peacekeeping, through nation-building and through international technical services, the U.N. serves its members. In so doing, the organization serves the national interest of the United States; it helps us to do things we could not so well accomplish alone and encourages other nations to share the burdens. That is why consistent and effective support of the United Nations has been near the heart of U.S. foreign policy for two decades; that is why the Congress and the public, regardless of politics or party, have been ready to cooperate with the United Nations.

I have supported this organization since its inception, and as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, have personally witnessed its valuable role in preserving the independence and stability of numerous nation states. In February of this year, I submitted a concurrent resolution reaffirming the continued faith of the United States in the growth and strengthening of the United Nations. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the United Nations offers our most hopeful channel for finding reasonable and just solutions to pressing world problems.

The limitations of the United Nations are apparent. It has not been able to prevent aggression in southeast Asia, it has not been able to rid the world of poverty, nor has the United Nations been able to solve all of its internal problems. However, it is not the charter that obstructs the way to peace. The charter sets forth a few basic principles, but leaves to successive generations who will live under it the responsibility of finding suitable means of carrying out those principles. The charter is not a self-operating mechanism. Its operation depends not so much on the words of the charter as in the way member states exercise their rights and meet their responsibilities.

It is not the lack of power which stands in the way of the realization of the promise of the United Nations. It is the lack of genuine effort on the part of the member states to develop processes and procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes among states.

Our late President John F. Kennedy has said:

> Peace does not rest in the charters and covenants alone. It lies in the hearts and minds of all people.

Without the wholehearted commitment of all people, no pact, no treaty, no international organization can hope to succeed.

In this nuclear age, it is imperative that we move closer and closer to mutual understanding and cooperation among all nations. Although in its 20 years of existence, the United Nations has not at all times lived up to the expectations of its creators, its future is bright. "We support the United Nations as the best instrument yet devised to promote the peace of the world and to promote the well-being of mankind" said President Johnson when he addressed the United Nations General Assembly in December 1963.

I join him and urge all mankind to join with us in our effort to sustain this magnificent organization for its self-preservation.

Village of Streamwood, Ill., Community Improvement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great personal pleasure today to praise and congratulate the citizenry of the village of Streamwood, Ill., for its initiative in launching a community improvement program which could well be copied by communities all across our great Nation.

The village of Streamwood is located in the western end of the 13th Congressional District in Illinois. It is a comparatively new community, being incorporated in 1957, and it has some 11,000 residents. It is one of the many new suburbs which have been developed in the Chicago metropolitan area since the end of World War II, being about 35 miles distant from Chicago's downtown.

Like other young communities, Streamwood has experienced growing pains. Problems of zoning, land use, parks and recreation, industrial growth, schools, streets, and sidewalks, and many others are not unique to Streamwood. But the citizens of Streamwood have determined to beat these problems; they have determined to harness their collective energies in order to become a world-beating community. They have taken it upon themselves to improve their community—and without any matching Federal funds and without moneys from any governmental agency.

Streamwood will celebrate, as a part of its long-range improvement program, with a mighty, old-fashioned Fourth of July celebration this year. The celebration will stress the suburb's roots, its heritage, its pride in self-accomplishment, and its patriotism. The July 4 celebration will feature an afternoon picnic in the park, races and contests, a band, and an orator who will speak on patriotism in the grand old tradition. Children and adults alike will be provided with copies of the Declaration of Independence. An American flag will be presented to the community and many flags will be waved.

At this point, I want to offer my most sincere congratulations to Streamwood's village president and board of trustees. They are: Village President Nick Kosan and Village Trustees Robert A. Crawford, Robert J. Moisan, Howard D. Nichols, William H. Potter, William M. Rafter, and Lawrence J. Rossdeutcher. These are but seven of Streamwood's residents who are propelling the community to the forefront of suburbia. They are representative of the community's spirit.

In keeping with its program of excellence, Streamwood has adopted as its motto, "The City With a Smile." In this regard, the village is cooperating with the National Confectioners Association in singling out "champion smilers" and making them honorary citizens of the village.

A recent article in the Streamwood edition of the northwest suburban area's Paddock Publications very excellently analyzed the village's improvement program. I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point:

BOOST STREAMWOOD PROGRAM UNVEILED—ADOPT SMILE SLOGAN

Streamwood unveiled its multifaceted community improvement program Friday (April 2) before a crowd of more than 90 community leaders and residents at its civic center on Bartlett Road.

Nick Kosan, village president, said the promotional program is aimed at encouraging residents to take greater pride and a more active part in their community and to emphasize to our neighboring communities some of the favorable aspects of Streamwood.

The program was revealed by Kosan's special assistant for civic affairs, Sid Cato, to a crowd that grew steadily more enthusiastic as the plans were outlined.

Cato said all points in the program were not new and that many had been tried before in the village on a smaller basis.

However, he said he thought it was unique in that it combined many old proposals with some new ones on a community level.

Cato admitted Streamwood had got off to somewhat of a bad start as a village and often has been surrounded by conflict.

"A friend told me that if we could harness that energy we would have a world-beating community," he said. "I agree. I think right now is the time to harness this energy."

He said the program wouldn't cure "all our ills, solve all our problems," but added he felt "with strong community support, it can benefit Streamwood greatly."

Activities in the program will include:

1. The recently concluded fund drive for Little City, a Palatine home for mentally handicapped children.

2. Paint up, clean up week at the end of April.

3. An old-fashioned Fourth of July "complete with a mammoth parade, picnic in the park with sack races and watermelon-eating contests and "maybe even a band to play and fireworks to wrap up the day."

Cato said he hoped the Fourth of July celebration would become a permanent part of Streamwood activities, and he indicated announcement of a general chairman for the event would be made at the end of April.

4. Kosan, in a discussion Monday, added this point: arrangements are now being made to hold a fish derby this summer with trophies for the biggest and smallest fish. The Village is presently trying to get the fish from the State.

5. Observance of National Smile Week, Aug. 2–7. (This will be great fun, Cato predicted.)

6. Arbor Week: a widespread tree-planting program that will help overcome what we feel is one of Streamwood's biggest problems—beauty of the village.

7. Back to school: A program aimed at both the safety aspect and school dropouts. Cato indicated motorists would be reminded of their obligation to watch for children, while perhaps inspirational messages or statements from our President would help to keep dropouts in school.

8. Fall fix-up, clean-up.

9. Chicago Christmas parade float.

10. Christmas tree lighting and house decorations on a community basis.

Cato said Kosan and the village board had given him full cooperation in forming the program and that many of the ideas originated with the village president.

Points in the program would be spelled out in a later series of announcements, he continued. Cato dwelt on the new look of Streamwood, discussing at length creation of a new slogan, "City with a Smile."

Other activities planned during the 1965 program include a concerted effort to upgrade public service, a contest to design a flag for Streamwood and creation of a speakers' bureau to carry the word about Streamwood far and wide.

He indicated Thomas Duddy would be chairman of the speakers' bureau. He also said a public service citation would be created to upgrade the area of the program and that the village hoped to single out such individuals as chairmen of commissions for their efforts through news releases or special ceremonies.

To aid the program, he asked community leaders to do six things:

1. Support Streamwood. Take pride in it and show that you do.

2. Buy the boosters' kit and use it. "And above all get your teenagers who go to school in Elgin to boost Streamwood by wearing the campaign buttons."

3. Tell your friends and relatives elsewhere about Streamwood.

4. Let builders know of potential homebuyers here (and) tell the commerce and industry commission of businesses or factories interested in establishing here.

5. Support those who do serve you either in an elective or appointive capacity.

6. Help in civic projects and volunteer for public service.

Cato indicated Kosan has authorized him to tell them that the president and village board, in turn, promised civic improvement in 1965, including beautification of the village, especially approaches to the community; additional parks to be created and existing ones to be improved; and village roadways, including those under county or State jurisdiction, kept neater and cleaner with weeds cut often.

In addition, the elected officials, Cato said, would increase the friendliness on the part of village employees, including police; to residents and out-of-towners, obtain storm sewers with greater capacity and bring more businesses to the community in part through the efforts of the commerce and industry commission.

Cato also revealed that the village has a letter from State Senator John Graham of Barrington, informing them that he was trying to get Streamwood identified on the Northwest Tollway.

Kosan, in an official proclamation, declared Streamwood "to be the city with a smile."

And, in what may be the battle cry of the new Streamwood, Cato concluded his presentation with the following:

"We're going to try harder in 1965 because we want to be the best."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to hail and applaud "The City With a Smile," Streamwood, Ill. It is my hope that communities far and near may learn of Streamwood's program for improvement. Theirs is an example which warrants emulation.

It Can Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day of this year a nine-hole golf course was opened to use by its members near the community of Dows, Iowa, in the district I have the honor of representing. It marked the climax of a year's effort, with the course constructed almost entirely by volunteer help.

What is significant, and in this day and age rather unusual, about this project is the fact that the sponsors did not look to Washington for help. It is quite possible that they could have received a substantial Federal loan, but to their credit they decided to go it alone.

I congratulate the sponsors and all of those who contributed to the success of the project. They have demonstrated that a job can be done through individual initiative and hard work without the help of "Big Brother" in Washington.

Following is an article concerning the Dows enterprise which appeared in the Des Moines Tribune:

DOWS OPENING ITS GOLF COURSE

(By Herb Owens)

DOWS, IOWA.—Memorial Day will mark the climax of a year's effort as the nine-hole Dows Golf Course is opened to use by its members.

The course, constructed almost entirely by volunteer labor, is on what was the 52-acre Albert Thomas farm a mile east of this 882-population town on the Wright-Franklin County line.

A little more than a year ago about 15 Dows businessmen organized to promote this project. There was a possibility of getting a $100,000 Government loan, but the sponsors decided to go it alone.

By sale of shares in Dows Golf Course, Inc., by a benefit dance, by lesser money-raising ventures, they gathered enough funds to purchase the Thomas farm and build the course.

One hundred and thirty trees had to be bulldozed from a rolling timber area to make fairways. Gravel, black dirt and peat—500 tons of each—were hauled in and mixed to build the grass greens.

Wives and children of the golf club's members combed the entire course, picking up tons, literally, of stones.

All farm buildings except the farmhouse and the old beehouse—where bees were stored winters and where their honey was processed—were razed or moved off the grounds. The beehouse will be a golf shop and storage building. The farmhouse has been remodeled into a clubhouse—three small rooms being converted into one large main clubroom. Mahogany paneling was used. Restrooms were installed, and the kitchen was modernized.

"We are planning ladies' day on Tuesdays and men's stag night every Thursday," said A. A. (Bud) Williams, real estate agent who is president of Dows Golf Course, Inc.

Verandas will be built on the clubhouse, and there'll be a shuffleboard court beside it. Work on a large playground for children is underway. A timber area at one corner of the course will become a picnic area.

The club, which has more than 100 shareholders (including several former residents now in California who subscribed because they felt Dows needed the golf course, was designed under the counsel of Prof. Arthur E. Cott, of Iowa State University.

Most of the fairways run north and south, to reduce the need for golfers to look into the sun. And they'll come close to the clubhouse three times in a round of play.

Besides President Williams, club officers are V. O. (Andy) Anderson, appliance dealer, as vice president; Elmer Hanson, insurance agent, as secretary, and Robert O. Willitts of Farmers State Bank as treasurer.

Proper and Persuasive Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Gary Player of South Africa, has demonstrated, dramatically, that he is a great golfer—and a great sportsman—and a great man. Even though small in physical stature, he has fought and worked his way to the top in one of the most fiercely competitive and demanding of all individual sports.

Gary Player has always been a gentleman—perhaps the finest attribute a man can possess. He is considerate and understanding of all with whom he comes in contact—his family, friends, competitors, and the citizens of foreign lands.

Few greats of the sports world have provided such a wholesome example for young people—and for other champions, as well.

After winning the recent U.S. Open, and achieving the fabled "grand slam" of golf, Gary Player gave his winnings to an American charity and to promote American junior golfing activities. The amount was substantial in terms of dollars, but these gifts pale in comparison with what Gary Player has given in terms of human understanding.

His approach to the challenges of championship golf should be an inspiration to all young people, everywhere.

Gary Player has said:

It's no use just asking God to please let you win. You must do something about it yourself * * *. I try to love each course I play. I can't fight each course * * * Golf asks something of a man. It makes one loathe mediocrity. It seems to say, "If you are going to keep company with me, don't embarrass me."

The times cry out for more such men—men of character, men who aspire to greatness, men of the stuff of which heroes are made. Such men succeed by initiative, by developing their God-given abilities through persistence and effort. The life and achievements of Gary Player are worthy of study and emulation by all—and especially the young—who desire to make a positive, genuine contribution to our society.

Patriotism Vital?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed and appalled recently upon seeing the results of a poll taken among high school and college juniors by Northwestern, Purdue, and Wisconsin Universities and the magazine U.S. News & World Report. Among other things, the poll showed that 82 percent—82 percent of the students deny that patriotism is vital and plays an important part in our lives.

Whither are we drifting? There was a time when young Americans, almost to a man, were proud to fight—and even die—for our country. But now? We witness increasing numbers who defiantly burn their draft cards, saying they will not fight. They conduct sit-ins and lie-ins protesting our country's policy in Vietnam—not an exercise of the liberty of free speech guaranteed to us under the Constitution, but rather an exercise of license which would result in imprisonment or a firing squad if conducted under the Red flag of communism which many of them are actively seeking to justify.

I am concerned about this 20 percent noted in the poll—not because I feel they are not loyal, but because they could provide a fertile breeding ground for those who are disloyal and who use every means—every subterfuge—to destroy our system of government. Not since the depression days has the extreme of the political left been so active on our college campuses. Organizations such as the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, the Trotskyite Young Socialist Alliance, Students for a Democratic Society, and many others are setting the pace of reaction and law-defying demonstrations to a great degree on our college campuses.

In addition to the sit-ins and lie-ins in protest of our policy in Vietnam, witness the disgraceful actions of some students in the smut campaign at the University of California. Witness the actions of students a short while ago at a meeting of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and more recently by other youths at a similar meeting in Chicago. Witness the actions of a handful of students who, in defiance of a direct order of their Government, visited Cuba as guests of the infamous Fidel Castro—and applauded when shown movies of American planes being shot down in Korea.

Admittedly, these students are a distinct minority. But it seems that their actions are being encouraged in some cases by permissive, spineless, and beatnik-type college professors and administrators who have allowed a complete breakdown in classroom discipline.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dave Ainsworth, owner and general manager of radio station KSRA in Salmon, Idaho, on June 20 aired an excellent editorial dealing with this subject.

Under permission to include extraneous material, the editorial follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

Good afternoon, friends, two of three members of a California legislative committee on un-American activities have reported that Communist sympathizers controlled the recent student uprising on the University of California Berkeley campus.

The two members of the committee who signed the report—a third withheld his signature—charged that the Communist sympathizers were encouraged by policies of recognized liberal university president, Clark Kerr. Mr. Kerr came back later with the statement that the report was laden with misinformation. The accuracy of the report, however, if not of particular import—if you happened to see the CBS news documentary on "The Berkeley Rebels," which was shown last Monday evening. It was telecast on KID-TV.

When it got down to the sex problems of the "Berkeley Rebels"—they seem, by the way, to believe that they discovered sex—I gave up and shut the thing off. Up to that time, however, it was to a certain extent interesting—as a document illustrating what happens when discipline is relaxed to the extent that young people who think they are old enough to know what they want, but are unwilling to recognize the fact that they are adults with adult responsibilities, get the idea they can run things—and are allowed to do so.

Parts of the documentary were so amazing as to be almost dismaying.

The very overproduced sequence, for instance—of the woe-begone gal wandering around through shelves of books—whether it was supposed to be a bookstore or a library—wasn't made clear—bemoaning the fact that she had got an education in spite of rather than because of the university. She, it was indicated, had had to do her own studying in order to get what she considered to be an education.

If my memory serves me correctly, when I went to college, somewhere in the course of freshman orientation or through the mouth of some professor or college dean, we were told that the college could not spoonfeed us into an education.

About all the college could do, we were told, was to so stimulate our interests in an education—give us some leads—that we would go ahead and engender our own education. It sticks in my mind that we were told we weren't expected to believe implicity what we were told in lectures by our professors, but rather by our own study and research prove to ourselves whether we wanted to agree with them or not.

It seems to me we were told that the basis of an education might not necessarily be the stuffing of our minds with a wealth of miscellaneous facts and figures, but rather that we should know where to go and where to look for the information we wanted at the time we wanted it.

It seemed to me that this poor woebegone "Berkeley rebel," as she wandered through the piles of books at the behest of the television documentary director, was proving (if she does have an education that qualifies her for a diploma) that she has acquired an education in spite of herself, rather than in spite of the university.

Elsewhere in the documentary were pictures of classes with students sitting lolling in the classrooms and smoking as they listened to lectures. This seemed just a little beyond the realm of what I consider to be good and disciplined education. It's a well-known fact that I have no objection to smoking. That's not the point. Lolling in a classroom and puffing a cigarette as one listens to a lecture is another matter. It's not of the right and wrong of smoking, but the right and wrong of classroom discipline.

It was difficult for me to stomach the pictures of a shaggy-haired, disreputably dressed instructor standing in front of a class and lecturing on mathematics. And if my memory serves me correctly, he had a cigarette dangling from his unused hand as he illustrated a point at the blackboard.

Perhaps it's all right, but I wonder if it does anything to lend to the necessary respect for education, the institution, and the whole system of higher learning.

Amusing was the conformity in nonconformity of the leaders who were interviewed in the documentary. The men—many of them bearded, most of them shaggy haired, slovenly in dress; the girls apparently without makeup, with long lank hair hanging to their shoulders. Yes, the complete nonconformists, complaining of the machine but forgetting the fact that in their nonconformity, they become conformists to their own pattern.

Tragic was the complaint the "rebels"—most were in their early twenties—of what the "adults" were doing or trying to do to them.

Could it possibly be that the Berkeley rebels—the rebels who are cropping up on the campuses all over the country—actually are already adults who refuse to accept the responsibilities of adulthood. It makes one wonder.

It also causes one to wonder if we in this country, unfortunately, are beginning to accumulate a corps of professional students as has been the case in so many of the Latin American and European countries. Is the search for education leading to a class of professional students who would rather continue their student status than get out in the world and make use of the education that is being provided for them?

It is particularly tragic that so much of the rebellion is taking place in institutions where the taxpayers' money provides these so-called fountainheads of education.

Of course, one has to wonder if these young adults of today have any idea that they are the original rebels. This has been going on for a long time. But, up to now, some variety of discipline has been enforced, and the rebellion didn't get out of hand.

I remember very well a similar situation, in which a group of students thought they could make policy in the institution in which they were enrolled. One of the ringleaders was asked a very pointed question by the dean of students.

The question was simply this, "What are you doing here? Why are you enrolled in this school?"

The answer from the student was that he had come there to school because he felt that it was there he could get what he was looking for in the subject he wanted to pursue.

The dean's reply summed up the whole subject so far as the college was concerned, and it took care of the rebellion. He said something like this:

"We're happy to have you here. We're happy you chose this school because you felt it would give you what you are looking for. But, when you chose this school and enrolled here, implicit in your enrollment was an agreement that you would abide by the rules and regulations of the school. We hope you'll stay here. But if you don't like it, perhaps the best thing for you to do is get out and go to a school in which the rules and regulations fit with what you think. We don't need you here. You're the one who feels you need the school. Either agree to abide by the rules or get out."

Perhaps a little of that philosophy at the University of California and other schools where the rebels are arising might be the answer.

If the students go on strike let them go. If they don't like the situation at the university, let them find a better place to go.

Sooner or later, these rebels, who apparently have many complaints but no answers, will have to learn that there are some disciplines in life. The beard, the shaggy hair, the slovenly dress of their version of nonconformity are not the answers to the problems of this tension-torn world.

A couple of years ago we had the beatniks. Today we have the "Berkeley rebels." What next?

Every Man Should Have His Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by the gentlewoman from Washington, the Honorable CATHERINE MAY, before the 1965 Annual Convention of the Maryland-District of Columbia-Delaware Broadcasters Association held on June 17–19, 1965.

I know the membership is aware of the range of Representative MAY's many interests and the meticulous manner in which she documents her case. Her presentation is an excellent one and deserves the attention of the entire membership:

ADDRESS OF HON. CATHERINE MAY, CONGRESSWOMAN FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

A year ago this month I had the pleasure of attending your convention in this city, and to find myself once again a guest and participant at your convention is indeed a great pleasure. For one thing, the goal of every politician is a return engagement; (2) you pick such nice places for your conventions (usually I get asked to speak in one of the Canadian border communities in midwinter); (3) as you know, I have a kinship in my career background with the broadcasting industry which means that I once again have this opportunity to see if we can't cement our working relationships, i.e., with myself representing Congress and you, as members of a vitally important industry in the private sector.

Last year you may remember that my talk then dealt with the theme of the constant struggle between business and Government over who is going to control our national economy—and thence the welfare and freedom of all of us. At that time I said and I quote myself, "some of you are worried about where the yellow went—more of you had better be concerned about where the freedom went." Well, 1 year later, the teeth may be getting whiter, but the light of freedom is not burning any brighter.

Since I last spoke in your interest area, a rather violent political upheaval has shaken our country from coast to coast. As a result of that political upheaval I stand before you today as a member of the "Whooping Crane Society," i.e., a survivor Republican. And, as such, I feel compelled to admit honestly that there are growing indications that the Republican Party may not be as dominant today in the Nation's affairs as it was in the heyday of Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

This last year we made a major blunder. We transgressed a political axiom, never ask a question in public unless you know in advance what the answer will be.

We Republicans asked our countrymen, "Why not victory?"

The answer came roaring back, "You're short 16 million votes, that's why not victory."

So, let there be no mistake about it—I stand before you today minus a union card in the Great Society. In addition, I humbly confess I may never qualify for membership because I am having so much difficulty understanding some of the messages that are being sent up to us on Capitol Hill by major spokesmen for the Great Society. As I am sure you know, they are telling us that America is a paradise lost, to be federally regained. Within the context of one public statement we are told that American people are poverty ridden, ignorant, pressed into slums, our water poisoned, our food contaminated, our cosmetics defiled, and our air and air waves polluted. But, at the same time, thank goodness, in only 4 enlightened years we have become the richest, strongest, best educated, and healthiest people in all the world. Obviously, this means we must embark upon a realistic and businesslike program—in short, frugally extravagant and cautiously bold—for only through liberal conservatism can we ever achieve chronic deficits that are fiscally sound.

In addition to being very busy trying to understand the "blueprint for the grand design," I have (since the calamitous day of November 3) also been much involved with the "saga of good fellowship" that has been going on in the Republican Party as we immediately began, in traditional Republican style, to close our ranks and build party unity. You know, those fellows who say the Republican Party is dead and gone just haven't been listening to your news broadcasts. We Republicans haven't had such fun since the cadets at The Citadel in Charleston lofted the first shells into Fort Sumter 103 years ago.

Never has so small a party so greatly bled.

Clearly we Republicans are vital and strong—so much so, to paraphrase Thomas Jefferson, we are drenching the tree of liberty with the blood of our own patriots.

And now, quickly before you think I am trying to make a partisan speech here today, I am going to bring in mention of the Democrats. Maybe we Republicans do have a little family spat now and then. But, really, this is nothing as compared to our political competitors who wear the brand "L.B.J." I think the Democrats are detecting symptoms of fraticide in their own party. With Lyndon to the right of them, HUBERT to the left of them into the valley of 1968 will charge BOBBY and TEDDY.

But, seriously, why am I rehashing the story of last November's election? Mainly because it had so many tragic implications for the political future of this Nation. Please believe me, I do not say this as a partisan Republican. Rather, I say it as a citizen very partisan to the cause of freedom.

We all recognize that there is nothing in our Constitution that ordains or mandates that we have to run our Government through two great political parties. But, almost from the start our Nation made such a choice because by so doing we avoided the chaos of multigovernment, we avoided the loss of freedom of the single party, and we built into our Government an additional set of checks and balances. As both Democrats and Republicans alike realize not only does a strong second party provide the electorate with legislative alternatives but with a remarkable high level of frankness and honesty also. But, today, to all intents and purposes, we have no viable minority party in America. You all know the statistics of the 2-to-1 and sometimes 3-to-1 odds of the Republicans versus the Democrats in the U.S. Congress, among the Governors and in our State legislatures. This statistical minority translates itself into serious implications for the supposed constitutional separation of the two branches of government. Today the executive branch is a literal powerhouse of strength—the President has virtually unlimited resources for working his will. A veritable army of experts, authorities, researchers, propagandists and the like.

The President "is also kingpin of a branch of government that employs 2½ million civilians and controls the destinies of 2,600,000 military personnel. These two groups have a payroll cost totalling $26 billion and together they will spend over 127 billion tax dollars for fiscal 1966."

I am sure that the most uninformed American citizen once given these facts will see how easily this awesome power and vast apparatus, if ever used improperly, could mean the withering away and eventually the death of the two-party system, and I can't believe that there is any responsible American citizen today who would like to defend a one-party system in this Nation. And I am darned sure there is no member of your industry who doesn't understand the important co-relationship between the survival of the two-party system and the survival of free press and freedom of speech.

Now, the first priority of responsibility to rebuild a viable Republican minority rests upon us who are the survivors from last November's shambles. Our leadership has pledged to all the people of this country that because we are not chained to the proposals of the Executive, we are free to fight for the right of all Members of Congress, both Democrat and Republican, to speak out for his convictions and the good of his constituents, against the awesome power of the Executive machine. And, when we do speak out as a minority, I want to make it very clear that we do so to shock the conscience, not just the partisan calculations, of the majority.

We have been, and will continue to come up with a constructive alternative where there is a need for one and it will be devised as our way of saying that there are better ways for Americans to do things. We know our party has goals and programs and promises for the America we want to build and for the Americans who must do that building. We believe that the numerical minority of this Congress can still speak with the voice of a moral majority.

We may not win (and we haven't been winning) rollcall votes—but we can win for America that all-important second look that may save us from blindly accepting a Great Society that might be just another great mistake, just another scheme, just another great debt—accepted without due consideration. But, obviously we cannot do this unless we have the help of open communication lines to the American people through the medium of the press.

Not many weeks ago I was a very interested bystander at a very unusual meeting. Members of the working press gave a special dinner for some Republican Congressmen of their State and it was a first in history for that area. Those who were in attendance from the communications media of the states they represented all stated quite openly that they were active, voting, registered Democrats. But, as one of the newsmen explained to me, "We have been having some rather gloomy second thoughts about the state of the Nation since the last election, particularly in regard to your party. We really only intended to wound the beast, not kill him." Frankly, I gathered from the tone of the meeting and the press conference that these gentlemen had seen the handwriting on the wall concerning freedom of communications when the Government is in the hands of such a huge majority. (In all honesty, I think they were saying that they wanted to help us build the strength of the minority party as long as we stayed just short of becoming a majority party.) I wish I could say that these overtures of friendship from the communication media were becoming generally noticeable. However, our latest studies on this matter have not been very reassuring. I have in my office a report that shows some interesting facts that I would like to share with you today. The report, in essence, shows that if the trends continue, Republicans on television will be as scarce as hens teeth as the voice of the Great Society is heard in the land. (By the way, my teenage daughter who is with me at this convention, told me this morning that she thinks you fellows ought to be allowed to broadcast a few regular programs between Johnson speeches.)

But, back to this report—did you realize that as of the first of May, CBS has not presented one single Republican on a public affairs program in 1965? It is true, of course that since that time, as the summer reruns create a dwindling audience, there have been a couple of Republican appearances. Still it is difficult for me to believe that no Republican had anything worthwhile to contribute to "Face the Nation" until Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS was a guest May 30.

And, just so CBS won't accuse me of picking on them, the record of the National Broadcasting Co.—as of May 1, the "Today Show" had introduced many potitical guests to its viewing audience, but less than 20 percent of them were speaking for the Republican Party. Why, Barry Goldwater had a higher percentage than that in Johnson City, Tex. And, for those who delight in picturing the Republican Party as a group of tired old men, may I say that any Republican who starts each morning with the "Today Show" and the Washington Post gets grey in a hurry. On "Meet the Press," in the first 5 months of this year, only three Republicans crossed Lawrence Spivak's path. And the last time a member of my party was seen on the American Broadcasting Co.'s "Issues and Answers" the calendar read February 21.

Now, since the election a number of proposals have been made to assure that presidential candidates in future years will have a chance to meet face to face in debate. Most noticeable of the proposals came from former chairman of the FCC, Mr. Minow, who requested that networks be released from equal time provisions and that instead they be required to make available 4 hours of prime free time to each of the major political parties the month preceding election day. I think that if something like this is done, the month before election will be in excellent hands. But, as you can see, it is the 47 months that follow an election about which I am concerned. This is not a sour grapes comment. It is a very sincere plea that your industry which prides itself on high standards, which has often been the model of self-regulation, to hear the implication in these words. It would centainly be ironic if it were the Republicans, traditionally opposed to Federal intrusion into any part of the private sector, who should take steps which would make the "Fairness Doctrine" a stiff legislative reality. At the present time, the only enforcement of the doctrine occurs when a station's license is up for renewal. But, you know and I know who appoints the members of the FCC—and, when was the last time you heard of anyone losing their license for mistreating a Republican.

Finding a solution that will satisfy all parties concerned is not going to come easily, of course, but if the broadcasting industry is willing to admit that a problem does exist, then perhaps we are already fitting the last pieces into the puzzle.

I can think of a dozen reasons why the British rules of governing political broadcasting won't work here in the United States, but I think it is rather significant that during the first quarter of 1965, BBC presented 70 speakers from the Labor Party, 70 from the Conservative Party and 14 liberals. Latest polls taken to see if the people feel that British broadcasting is really impartial came up with affirmative responses that ranged from 66 to 85 percent. By contrast, the results of a nationwide poll conducted by Harold Stern and Jack Boyle were carried in the Washington Star on May 24. It found that only 38 percent approval of the content of news broadcasting, while 54 percent found them unsatisfactory. News was attacked as slanted, nonfactual, and lacking adequate expression of conflicting viewpoints.

And, by the way, in view of all these above statistics, it may come as a surprise to you that I am still an ardent voice in the vast congressional wilderness in favor of allowing radio and television editorializing. And, this is because I still have great faith that your industry is going to have the maturity and the responsibility to work out its problems in this field, not only because you are inspired by the ever-present threat of Federal regulation, but because you know that unless we protect the independence of our communications media we open up additional opportunities for the management of news by the State.

You have many good friends in Congress on both side of the aisle. One very good friend, Congressman WALTER ROGERS, had hoped to be with you at this meeting, but as you know, had a conflicting engagement. However, I did talk to Congressman ROGERS before I left about the several bills pending in Congress that you have discussed in your panel this morning. For one thing, he asked me to tell you that extensive hearings on the "Fairness Doctrine" will quite probably start sometime in early August. In our conversation, we reaffirmed our mutual belief that the airwaves should be policed only to avoid chaos. We want to avoid attempts at round-about censorship by the Federal Government and will do all we can to keep communications-controlled decisions in Congress because this is the best way to serve public interest in that we are the elected representatives of the public.

We are anxious to work out the problems of CATV, of the "fairness doctrine" and other matters without setting foot-in-the-door precedents for Government control of program content, but unless you in your industry meet your responsibilities you dull the weapons of your congressional friends who must fight on the front lines against pressures from people who don't understand the basic law.

In conclusion, may I ask your indulgence in allowing me to rewrite my prescription of advice that I gave last year:

1. Wherever you can in your industry, root out the problems, correct them, and prevent their recurrence. This is the best possible way to keep your enterprises free of public criticisms, unwarranted restraints and justification for the use of the Federal shillelagh.

2. Remember how disheartening and confusing it is to your friends in public life when the broadcasting industry comes to us with a babble of conflicting voices. I understand how difficult it is to achieve harmony on some issues that cut across a great complex of differing interests—but, again, where and when you can, strive for unity on the overriding issues. For only then can your views become clearly comprehended by people in Government; only then can your combined power and influence be brought fully to bear. And, finally, do your best, your very best, all the time to pinpoint the areas that invite criticism, and then move with a kind of boldness and decisiveness you have so commendably demonstrated in creating the ever-improving world of the broadcasting industry.

Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1801, "In every country where man is free to think and to speak, differences of opinion will arise from differences of perception, and the imperfection of reason; but these differences when permitted, as in this happy country, to purify themselves by free discussion, are but as passing clouds overspreading our land transiently and leaving our horizon more bright and serene." Some things never really change—ideas mainly. Even in Jefferson's time, success (and freedom) demanded responsibility, and responsibility required maturity. Through your wonderful industry every idea can be judged upon its own merit and every man should have his say. I thank you for having let me have mine.

Reds Linked to Willis Protesters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a Chicago American story of June 24, 1965, on the civil rights demonstrations aimed at ousting Chicago School Superintendent Benjamin C. Willis, states that members of the Communist Party were active in these marches. This report by an outstanding newspaper brings to mind the warning of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, that the Communist Party in the United States is making an effort to take over control of the civil rights movement. The news story follows:

REDS LINKED TO WILLIS PROTESTERS

(By Sam Blair)

More than a dozen individuals identified as members of the Communist Party in Chicago have infiltrated civil rights meetings and marches directed against School Superintendent Benjamin C. Willis.

Several have flung themselves into the streets, blocking pedestrians and traffic, and precipitating mass arrests.

In addition they were in the forefront of demonstrations that erupted around the old U.S. Court of Appeals at 1212 Lake Shore Drive, during hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

ANOTHER GROUP JOINS

Another group of identified Communist and sympathizers whose identities are known to security agencies, have also joined the marchers.

Several of the militants were identified as Communists during the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings. Others were named by congressional committees and investigators for local and national security agencies.

Many also marched and picketed for the Chicago Area Women for Peace rally in Grant Park April 17. This group has also been identified as a Communist-front organization.

THEY'RE ON PHOTOS

They have been photographed as they attended all these rallies and marched with various groups.

Some of those seen attending all the rallies and marching in all the "causes" and their affiliations are:

Danny Queen, 31, of 5017 Quincy Street, an executive committee member of the Communist Party of America, once head of Illinois' Communist Party Youth Commission, and described by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as one of the Nation's most promising and active young Communists.

WIFE IS NAMED

Helen P. Queen, wife of the above, and a witness subpenaed by the House Un-American Activities Committee. She was named as a Communist at the hearing by Lola Belle Holmes, an agent for the FBI working within the Communist Party.

Richard L. Criley of 1845 South Keeler Avenue, identified several times by both Senate and House subcommittees as being a Communist both before and after World War II. Criley is a founder of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, a Communist front organization, and secretary of the Chicago Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights, another organization cited by its own members as a foe of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

A WARD ORGANIZER

Ishmael Florey, director of the Afro-American Heritage Association, 306 East 43d Street, a former organizer for the Communist Party in the 24th ward and a legislative director of the party for the South Side of Chicago. He was also identified as a Communist by Mrs. Holmes at the hearings.

Milton M. Cohen of 5428 Kimbark Avenue, a member of the Communist Abraham Lincoln Brigade in 1937 and a former teaching colleague of Claude Lightfoot, executive secretary of the Communist Party in Illinois. They taught "Fundamental Principles of Marxism."

EX-UNION STEWARD

In addition, the list of those who have also been active in stirring up trouble during the anti-Willis demonstrations includes:

Wilberforce Cox Jones of 3827 Michigan Avenue, named as a Communist at the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings. Jones refused to answer when committee attorneys asked him if he was a Communist and if he gave his American passport to anyone during a trip to Europe. Jones is a former union steward for the United Auto Workers.

CORE AID NAMED

Ann Prosten of 5109 Cornell Avenue, a former writer and a coeditor of the Daily Worker, wife of Jesse Prosten, another member of the board of the Chicago Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights.

Eugene Tournour, 204 West North Avenue, midwest field director for the Congress on Racial Equality, who said "the tenets professed by an individual who wants to join CORE are not to be considered." Tournour was seen last month at a meeting of the W. E. B. DuBois club at 333 West North Avenue, an organization described as communistic by Hoover.

HONORED STATE RED

Rev. William T. Baird of 7348 Dorchester Avenue, executive director of the Communist-oriented Chicago Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights. Baird has been at virtually all meetings of the militants in Grant Park and has led some of the marches on city hall. Baird has spoken on many platforms with well-known Communists, including Lightfoot, and was a principal sponsor of a dinner October 27, 1963, in the Hamilton Hotel, honoring Illinois Communist Leader Gil Green.

MANY OTHERS KNOWN

Security and intelligence agencies have lists of from 12 to 15 other known Communists or Communist sympathizers who have infiltrated the ranks of the anti-Willis group. The numbers of some of their Communist Party cards are known, if they possess a card.

One young man from York Center village was spotted carrying a sign reading "DuBois Clubs of Chicago." Robert Lucas, newly elected head of the local CORE chapter, ordered him to dispose of the sign. CORE officers—with the exception of Tournour—insist they will not accept those identified as Communists or Fascists.

DISCIPLINE IS SLACK

However, Albert Raby, recently resigned as a Chicago schoolteacher and the acknowledged leader of the marchers, said he had no objection to any person, Communist or not, participating in the demonstrations "as long as they follow the discipline we lay down."

The discipline, however, has been slack. More than 500 persons have been arrested for disturbing the peace, blocking traffic, resisting arrest, assault, and refusing to dispense from busy traffic intersections where they sat down.

The catcalls and signs have been directed not only at Willis but also at Mayor Daley—whom many of the marchers call "Massa Daley," "a Ku Klux Klanner," and "Stooge for Ben Willis."

BOASTS 100,000 MEMBERS

The infiltration of the anti-Willis, anti-Daley marchers follows the prediction of Hoover earlier this year. Hoover said the Communist Party and allied, sympathetic groups are engaged in a mass attempt to take over civil rights organizations.

In February, Gus Hall, national leader of the Communist Party, said there are now 10,000 hard-core members with another 90,000 persons identified as close sympathizers.

Broadcasting: Vital for the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by my good friend, Morris Novik, before the 35th Ohio State University Institute for Education by Radio and TV.

Mr. Novik points out the downward trend in radio in meeting its responsibilities in the field of public service. We should take a close look at his suggestions for amending the Communications Act of 1934 to make the broadcasting industry more responsive to the public interest.

The address follows:

BROADCASTING: VITAL FOR THE GREAT SOCIETY

(Remarks by M. S. Novik, radio consultant)

RADIO—SOUND WITHOUT MEANING

Technically speaking, radio is a lot of hardware. And that hardware has been making remarkable technical progress from the first crystal set to modern transistorized equipment. The only thing that has not kept pace with the technical advances is its intelligent use by the men who control it.

Instead of using the hardware to retain radio's lead as a medium of information, as a fountain of knowledge, programing has been going downhill, away from its once bright promise. As a result, radio has given up its dynamic role and abdicated its leadership to television. It has become a symbol of intellectual silence.

Indeed what's right with radio or wrong with radio is not in the hardware but in ourselves.

Once upon a time, a million years ago it seems now, there was an Edward R. Murrow, a Raymond Gram Swing, an Elmer Davis—men who made the world come alive through radio, who made continents neighbors to each other. These were no headline screamers. They were men who made us a part of their experience * * * who shared wisdom with us, so that all of us might share democracy with one another.

Once upon a time there was a "Town Meeting of the Air," when the American people flattered themselves with ideas, to be examined for what they were. Ideas, rather than jingles and slogans. There was still room enough—too much room, perhaps—for the soap operas, but at least there was some room some of the time for something else. The listener did have some sort of choice—if not all the time, some of the time.

How did radio get into its present sad state of programing? Partly because of panic over the competition of television; partly because of competition from a flood of new low-powered, low-cost local stations after World War II.

The battle of the ratings gave the format operator his first breakthrough. Program prestige went out of the window.

Instead of holding the line and improving the radio service, the big stations, the network stations capitulated; some more, some less, some all the way.

The disintegration of network radio in these critical times poses a serious problem not only for the radio industry, but for the Nation.

Look at the world we live in. Great questions of foreign policy are bedeviling the American people. What do we do about Vietnam? The recent teach-ins, the recent Washington debates on the subject have barely been touched on by radio, except for brief summaries.

Not only foreign affairs but also pressing domestic questions demand that we know what we are thinking, talking, and voting about. What about civil rights, unemployment, automation, the art of being a wise consumer, education to meet the rising demands of our society? All these great questions have, among our own people, great people who can discuss them intelligently. But they are not heard on radio.

Take the President's own statements on the crisis in Vietnam or at Santo Domingo, or on the domestic issues of our time that are involved in creating the Great Society. They, too, are summed up in quick headlines.

Radio has time for brief summaries, but no time for anything resembling real information. And this brings us to the all-important question: what is information?

Information is knowledge. It is both fact and opinion. It is the raw material for wisdom. It is not just a shouted headline torn from the teletype machine. It is not just 5 minutes of news on the hour. It is not just whether it's going to rain today or not, or how the traffic is on the bridge. It is, in short, the material men need if they are to make a nation work, especially a democratic nation.

We are a self-governing people. This high order of self-challenge demands that we be an informed people.

Broadcasters speak of radio's forthcoming $1 billion a year income. Is this the ultimate proof of radio's viability? Crime pays three times as much, but you can't quite measure virtue this way. You can't say that you're rich, therefore you're right. It's not quite that simple.

How many radio stations, beginning, say, with the Kennedy-Nixon debates in 1960 and continuing to the current nationwide Vietnam discussions, have carried even portions of these great discussions, or any other discussions? Presidential press conferences, statements of world leaders, community problems presented in forum or debate, any of these?

Radio today has the opportunity, as well as the obligation, to become the medium it might be, it was planned to be long, long ago. For radio to say that television and the newspapers should be doing the informing is equivalent to saying that radio has no responsibilities in this direction. The law says otherwise, and it is high time that Congress and the FCC make sure that the law is clear.

Who was it who decided that none of the American people want anything but music and instant news on their radio sets? I don't know. How is it that a major law of the land, the Communications Act of 1934, can continue in existence if it is not enforced? Respect for law itself, and with it free institutions, depends upon equal treatment under law, enforcement of the law, and clarity of its meaning. Who has exempted radio men from these truths?

Many of these same radio stations that offer only rock-and-roll and headlines; classical music and headlines, talk jockeys and headlines, or conversation and headlines, excluding all else, are owned by responsible networks, responsible newspapers, magazines, nonprofit institutions, and respectable corporations. Do these people realize these policies are contributing to radio's delinquency?

These station owners are public-spirited citizens, they serve their communities faithfully, they give generously to charity. But they fail their communities where they can best serve—by using their radio facilities to serve the public welfare.

They, of all people, should know that the fastest, quickest buck is not synonymous with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

The United States is no longer in a position, and I don't think she ever was, to waste great natural resources. Radio is one of the greatest of these treasures.

Radio is not quite a private enterprise. It involves the use of limited frequencies that are available on the publicly owned airwaves. For this reason, the radio station owner is a licensee. He operates under privilege, not by right.

One reason why laws and governments are set up among men is to moderate self-interest in terms of a more generalized public interest, and, necessity and convenience. A driver's license is a case in point: certain ground rules are posted under which we operate. But the ground rules for drivers are clearly stated; we even have signs and lights on highways to remind us of the laws.

Radio could use a touch or two of the same.

In 1934, Congress when it passed the Communications Act thought it had spelled out the rules of the airwaves. The rules of the highways made in 1934, are unworkable today, and they have been changed.

But not the rules of the airwaves—they haven't been updated. They've just been ignored. And, mind you, the usage of the airwaves has changed even more than the use of the highways. We now have FM, TV, pay-TV, and now the flood of CATV. And it's the people—the public—that are the victims of today's airwave traffic jam.

It is no longer enough to say to the people that you can just turn off the set if you don't like it. The people who don't like radio today pay the same taxes and live in the same times as the people who walk the street with transistors to their heads. Thinking, talking, interested people have the same rights as others. You keep telling them to lump it and the lumps will end up in unexpected places. The public will not be damned indefinitely.

And what is it that the people want? They want, and this is so little, just a bit of time on radio—time to talk, to discuss, to argue, to debate, and to analyze. Is this so much to ask? Will this favor, if that is the word, impoverish the industry?

Too many stations simply have no room for what they call "talk" programs. They will not even sell 15 minutes or half an hour for a political campaign, whether local or national.

Where does this leave a political candidate? He can buy spot announcements. He may even have time for a recording of his own voice, delivering a 60-second commercial for himself.

Does this promote public information? Does this lead to a better understanding of the campaign issues? I doubt it.

Those of us who have been in broadcasting for a long time remember the course of the congressional debates on the Communications Act of 1934. No one in Congress—and very few outside of Congress anticipated a scarcity of air time. The concern of Congress was for equality, not availability.

Everyone knows the phrase "equal time" but the true concept of the words escape too many broadcasters. How else can one explain the number of major stations that eliminate all political programs, paid or sustaining, taking the position that nothing "equals" nothing?

That, of course, violates the intent of the Congress and it violates the U.S. Supreme Court decision of June 29, 1959 in *The Farm Union* v. *WDAY* case. (360 U.S. vs. 525) Here are two sentences from that decision:

"While denying all candidates use of the station would protect broadcasters from liability, it would also effectively withdraw political discussion from the air * * *. Certainly Congress knew the obvious—that if a licensee could protect himself from liability in no other way but by refusing to broadcast candidates' speeches, the necessary effect would be to hamper the congressional plan to develop broadcasting as a political outlet, rather than to foster it."

It has never been the subject of a specific FCC order. Even though the then chairman recognized and discussed it, and the trade press gave publicity to it, many broadcasters seem to be unaware of it. Certainly a prompt implementation of the decision ought to have top priority.

Radio today has the opportunity to become the medium of media, reaching people where they are with the instantaneous transmission of the wisdom and the beauty and the challenge of life.

It seems to me the future of radio can be bright. It seems to me that radio is vital to the Great Society.

But we will not be worthy of the challenge—we will not be able to move forward—without some new rules of the road, new charts for the airwaves.

Where are we going? How do we get there? These are questions we must face.

But first of all there must be an evaluation of where we are now and it cannot be a self-serving evaluation.

I regret to say that the Commission has not done the job. Five long years ago, it held hearings on this subject and nothing has happened.

Three years ago, in this same place, we called for a conference on goals for the industry and nothing has happened.

Now, it seems to me, we must look to the Congress that wrote the Communications Act of 1934.

It seems to me the Congress should:

1. Evaluate how radio is doing its job in terms of the Communications Act of 1934.

2. Decide what legislation will meet the new needs of 1965.

3. Define public interest, convenience, and necessity to take into account the need for time on the air for responsible groups; the need for time on the air for political talk or discussion, free or paid—not just during elections, but at all times, leaving no doubt that every broadcaster must allocate equal and adequate time for political discussions, free and paid, in National, State and local elections.

4. Require all stations to offer programing that will serve the various needs and conveniences and interests of the entire public, not just one segment of the public.

5. Spell out the power of the FCC to enforce the laws of the airwaves.

The times demand answers. Congress, which has jurisdiction over broadcasting, and the FCC, which enforces the broadcasting laws, can make certain that radio resumes its great role in American life. It must. Then the people will be informed and broadcasting will fulfill its role in the Great Society.

Resolutions of Connecticut Postal Supervisors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD the text of several resolutions adopted by the Connecticut State Branch of the National Association of Postal Supervisors at the organization's annual convention held this year at West Haven, Conn., on May 16. These resolutions deal with such problems as life insurance, overtime pay, retirement, sick leave, night differential payments, and others, all of which are intended to improve the postal service and the working conditions of those employed in this service.

The resolutions are as follows:

RESOLUTION ON LIFE INSURANCE

Whereas when an employee reaches the age of 65 or retires, whichever is later, his Government life insurance is reduced by 2 percent per month until it reaches a minimum of 25 percent of the original amount. This reduction comes at a time when employee's income is reduced and the purchase of more life insurance would prove too costly: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Connecticut State Branch of the NAPS in convention assembled at West Haven, Conn., May 16, 1965, go on record as favoring a reduction of 1 percent per month after reaching the age of 65 or retirement, whichever is later, and a minimum of 50 percent of original face value.

RESOLUTION ON NIGHT DIFFERENTIAL

Whereas conditions of work and pay have greatly improved since the establishing of the 10-percent nightwork differential for work performed between 6 p.m. and 6 a.m., and it is now felt that an increase is due and there is now in effect a 15-percent differential for nightwork in a Government office: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Connecticut State Branch of the NAPS urge the national officers to strongly favor any bill increasing our nightwork differential from 10 to 15 percent.

RESOLUTION ON OVERTIME PAY

Whereas postal supervisors in level 8 and above are not eligible for overtime pay when working in excess of 8 hours in 1 day or on Saturdays and/or Sundays during December under present regulations; and

Whereas we can see no difference between overtime work of any postal employee and the pay of overtime to one group of employees and denying it to another is unfair: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Connecticut State Branch of Postal Supervisors in convention assembled at West Haven, Conn., on May 16, 1965, strongly urge the national officers to have this law included in the coming salary adjustments.

RESOLUTION ON OPTIONAL RETIREMENT

Whereas a postal employee with 30 years of service who retires under the age of 60 is now penalized with reductions to his annuity; and

Whereas 30 years of conscientious and faithful service to the Department and the postal patrons should receive some recognition; and

Whereas because of the growth of automation, private industry is looking with favor on early retirements: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Connecticut State Branch, NAPS, in convention assembled at West Haven, Conn., on May 16, 1965, go on record as strongly in favor of such legislation and to urge the national officers to seek the enactment of such a law.

RESOLUTION ON UNUSED SICK LEAVE

Whereas many postal employees who retire have to their credit substantial sick leave balances; and

Whereas it is a savings to the Post Office Department which amounts to a great sum of time and money and the employee has no means for recovering any of this: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Connecticut State Branch, NAPS, in convention assembled at West Haven, Conn., on May 16, 1965, strongly urge the national officers to do everything in their power to get legislation enacted whereby employees would be given credit on retirement or a lump sum partial payment for any unused sick leave upon retirement.

RESOLUTION ON OUTER WEAR FOR ROUTE EXAMINERS

Whereas postal route examiners find it necessary to purchase certain articles of outer wear that they would not normally need: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the NAPS attempt to have enacted certain legislation providing postal route examiners with a cash allowance of x dollars per year to cover the cost of purchasing such items as warm outer coats, insulated shoes, gloves and rainwear such as rubbers and/or galoshes, raincoat, rain hat, umbrellas, etc.

RESOLUTION ON EMPLOYMENT OF RELATIVES

Whereas the Postal Bulletin No. 20471, of April 29, 1965, again brings to the attention of all postal personnel the following regulations of the Civil Service Commission regarding temporary summer employment:

"1. Appointments will be made without regard to race, religion, sex, or political or personal consideration.

"2. Employment in the same department of sons or daughters of employees is prohibited.

"3. Employees and applicants must be informed of the limitation on appointment of relatives.

Whereas these regulations are interpreted by the Post Office Department to absolutely bar the temporary summer employment of sons and daughters of postal personnel, regardless of qualifications, in all except extreme emergency situations, this regulation extends even to veterans;

Whereas the average postal employee who is striving to give his son or daughter the benefits of a higher education, would welcome the opportunity for his son or daughter to obtain summer employment in the postal department, performing a vital service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Connecticut State Branch of the National Association of Postal Supervisors expresses most vigorously its opposition to this entirely arbitrary policy of discrimination against both loyal and dedicated postal employees, and the young sons and daughters of postal employees, who are otherwise qualified for temporary summer employment in the postal department, and who are struggling to build themselves a foundation for the future; and be it further

Resolved, That the Connecticut State Branch of National Association of Postal Supervisors, again most vigorously, expresses this opposition to all members of the Connecticut delegation to the Congress of the United States.

RESOLUTION ON OPPOSITION TO RECENT PAY RAISES

Whereas the Congress of 1962 has passed and made into law the so-called comparability clause; and

Whereas the Congress has failed to obey their own law; and

Whereas the present pay scale and proposed pay raise do not allow for the responsibility and prestige of supervisors: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Connecticut State Branch of the NAPS at this convention, go on record as being opposed to the recent pay raises as not being according to law; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of Congress from Connecticut.

Self-Help and Self-Interest Through Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, in any appraisal of our foreign aid program we should keep in mind that our basic objective is to help the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America establish themselves as independent, self-supporting nations, with the ability to make economic and social progress through free institutions.

History has taught us—sometimes painfully—that our own security and freedom depend to a large degree on the strength and security of other free nations, that one of the best guarantees of our own continued prosperity and security is helping other people obtain a more meaningful and abundant life for themselves.

Our foreign aid program has been, and remains, a major weapon in the free world's war against the most immediate enemies of its underdeveloped partners: poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease—conditions described by President Johnson as the "grim recruiting sergeants of communism."

In the ever-shrinking world of today, we are convinced that the attainment of peace, progress, and prosperity depends ultimately on the degree to which the hopes and dreams people have of a better life for themselves and their families are capable of fulfillment.

The thread of humanitarianism running through the fabric of our foreign aid is no misstitch. It is there not by accident, but by purpose and design.

It has always been the American way to help others in need. As the richest and most powerful Nation in the world, we should do no less. Our aid program is a tangible expression of our concern for the welfare of others and of our belief that all mankind is entitled to a better world.

We are not trying to buy friends through our aid program, but I feel certain that we are winning them every day in the huts and villages of the developing nations through our programs which show that we do care about people.

Helping people to help themselves is the basic purpose of foreign aid. And the concept of self-help is part and parcel of our aid program today. Indeed, it is one of the few conditions of our foreign aid. We are letting the recipient nations know that our help is not "free", that we expect the recipients of our aid to not only share in the costs of development projects, but that they take positive steps to use their own resources better through improved administration, sound fiscal policies, fairer tax laws and

the like. And, we expect the people of the recipient countries to be willing to work shoulder to shoulder with American technicians in getting a job done.

In measuring self-help the U.S. Agency for International Development is concerned with performance that directly affects economic growth and social development. Assistance is not tied to political conformity or the way a country chooses to vote in the United Nations. But when countries divert their scarce resources into arms in order to mount political adventures against their neighbors, they waste substance badly needed for the welfare of their own people.

The minimum appropriations request for fiscal year 1966 reflects AID's determination to limit our assistance to those countries making the best use of it just as we are presently doing.

It is the self-help concept that is largely responsible for the present concentration of our foreign aid program. To make sure that we get the most for every dollar, AID is concentrating on those areas where our programs can do the most good, where there is effective leadership and action toward economic growth.

In fiscal year 1966, the aid program will be even more concentrated than in the past. Two-thirds of all development lending funds are planned for just seven countries, all of which are engaged in strong, self-help, development programs. They are: Brazil, Chile, Nigeria, Tunisia, India, Pakistan and Turkey. Three-fourths of all military assistance will go to 11 countries now maintaining 3.5 million of their own men under arms in defensive forces rimming the Communist world. Four-fifths of all supporting assistance funds will go to just four countries: Korea, Vietnam, Laos and Jordan.

In recognition of the priority the United States places on the progress of our Latin American neighbors and in response to the momentum already achieved under the Alliance for Progress, Latin America will again be the scene of our most intensive assistance effort. The $596 million planned for Alliance countries during fiscal year 1966 represents nearly a third of total AID country assistance and a per capita aid level of $2.73, by far the highest for any region.

The self-help concept is also reflected in the shift from grants to loans. Five years ago, we provided most of our economic aid on a grant basis. Today, that is reversed and two-thirds of AID assistance to countries is financed by loans, payable in dollars, and these loans are increasingly changing from "soft" loans to "hard" loans. Most AID loans are made at 1 percent of the first 10 years and 2½ percent for the remaining 30 years, as set by Congress in 1964. But, as a country's economic growth and repayment capacity improve, AID raises the interest charges and shortens maturities. For example, recent loans to Iran and Israel have interest rates of 3½ percent and maturities of 15 to 20 years.

The repayment record on U.S. foreign loans has been excellent since World War II. We have lent approximately $30 billion since the end of the war, and have already received over $11 billion in principal and interest. Payments have been prompt, and in some cases, ahead of schedule.

What we are trying to do in Asia, Africa and Latin America, is to help the less-developed countries there get started on an upward spiral of rising production, incomes, and living standards which will enable them, once started, to go ahead on their own, without outside help from anyone else. And we want to see them achieve this condition—what economists call "self-sustaining economic growth"—as we did in the United States, in a free and open society.

The success of our foreign aid can be demonstrated by those countries which have "graduated" from aid recipients to aid donors, and by the number of countries where the need for aid is now coming to an end. The countries of Western Europe, Lebanon, Japan, and Free China—Taiwan—have completed the transition from reliance on U.S. economic aid to self-support, and now have aid programs of their own. A group of other countries, including Korea, India, Pakistan, Brazil and Chile, is making solid progress toward self-support.

There are now 26 countries where our economic assistance has been brought to an end. This list includes not only the countries of Western Europe, but several less-developed countries as well.

The increased emphasis on long-term development has also been accompanied by a sharp reduction in supporting assistance grants, used primarily to keep other countries afloat in an emergency, generally by paying for necessary imports. Supporting assistance has been reduced from a level of more than a billion dollars in 1960 to less than $400 million proposed for fiscal 1966. Since 1960, supporting assistance has ended in 18 countries, and will be discontinued in Morocco and Burma at the end of the current year.

The record speaks for itself. There is great evidence that our investment in the security of the free world is paying off. There are many signs of progress that the developing nations are achieving self-sustaining economic growth.

In the years since 1950, the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America which have been recipients of our aid, have: Increased total production at an average of over 4 percent a year; increased industrial output at an average of 8 percent annually—except for Latin America, which averaged 6 percent—and increased the value of their exports from $19 to $29 billion between 1950 and 1962, despite falling world prices for primary products.

Since 1958, the less developed countries have increased their investment in education an average of 15 percent annually.

Great strides have also been made in public health. By 1963, for example, 700 million of the 1.4 billion people who live in the less developed world's malarious areas were protected by malaria eradication programs; for more than 300 million of these the threat of malaria has been completely eliminated.

The most significant sign for the future, however, may well lie in the fact that for every dollar of U.S. assistance received today, the 20 major U.S. aid recipients in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are committing an average of $6 for development from their own limited resources.

Put another way, our foreign aid represents one half of 1 percent of our gross national product, which now exceeds $3,000 a year per capita. The contribution of the developing countries to their own progress averages 12 percent of the gross national product of nations whose per capita GNP averages only $145 per year.

It is important that we view our foreign aid program in perspective, that we assess its many accomplishments and successes against its few failures. There have been mistakes, but we have learned a great deal about foreign assistance since the days of the Marshall plan, and we have profited by most of our mistakes.

Our foreign aid program is a commitment to the free world. It is a long-term commitment, not one that is made in anticipation of quick or easy results. We are dealing with nations striving to solve the kinds of problems which took many decades to overcome in what we now regard as fully developed nations.

The evidence is conclusive that if we continue to put forth our best efforts, we have a reasonable chance to overcome the Communist assault on the underdeveloped countries, and to help them to take their places in a world of free and independent nations.

Through our foreign aid program, we are striving for all that is best in our own heritage—giving help to those who help themselves—spreading education and health to more and more people—and at the same time preserving our own freedom and expanding free institutions around the world.

As leader of the free world, this Nation cannot afford to relax its efforts toward these objectives. I believe we should continue to accept the challenge. I believe that we should pledge our full support to the President's foreign aid proposals for fiscal year 1966.

The New Picture of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, for many months at every opportunity, I have been sounding a call for all Americans involved in agriculture or dependent upon it to get together and work for their own good.

The July 1965 issue of Farm Journal, on its "opinion" page, carries an editorial entitled "The New Picture of Agriculture." I believe this frank and forthright statement deserves the attention of every American who is in any way involved in the agriculture industry. I commend it to my colleagues for their attention:

THE NEW PICTURE OF AGRICULTURE

When the results of the new farm census begin to appear sometime in July there will be a lot of talk about which kind of farm operator is disappearing, which kind gaining—in other words what the evolving pattern of farming seems to be.

Whatever the figures show, one thing is certain:

We need a new picture—which the census won't provide—of who constitutes agriculture anyhow.

Surely the operator is at the center of farming, and always will be. But clustered about him are a good many other people who participate financially or are involved in some other way.

Consider, for instance, all those who have an ownership interest. There are at least 1½ times as many people who have money invested as there are farms and farm operators. (This doesn't count bankers who have other people's money invested.)

Or take all the people who provide farmers with their tools and supplies, or who buy, process, and sell what they raise, or who in some other way do business with them. They have a stake in farming too, whether they're on Main Street or in Chicago.

Since all these people have a direct stake in agriculture why shouldn't they all help it?

How? Well on some issues, at least, they can lend a hand in the legislative Halls, where farmers need it.

Furthermore, it's time farmers and country townspeople stopped eyeing each other from two camps and all got into one camp. They depend on each other in a business way, also for community services.

The rural communities that amount to much from here on will be those in which farmers and townspeople together analyze what they need and together go after it.

A community council, representing all interests, operating the year around, is the mechanism. Why not promote one in your community?

Buyers and sellers in country, town, and city, will always contend with each other, and that's as it should be. But there are some things on which they can work together, and it's about time they did.

If all those who have a money interest in this business will join the club, and if farmers will welcome them in, two things will happen: we'll find that agriculture is not losing people but may be gaining them, and all concerned will forge ahead.

A Maryland Pioneer Still Growing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from Baltimore—the Nation's sixth largest metropolis—I share with my fellow Baltimoreans justifiable pride in the fact that our city has long been one of the leading centers of the important suretyship and insurance industries.

In 1880, Col. Edwin Warfield, who later became Governor of Maryland, had an idea to start a surety and bonding business. This was the origin of the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland. At that time only two other companies in the entire country were engaged in such enterprise.

The Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland, one of the great business concerns in our country, is now in its 75th year and still growing with our great State of Maryland. The president of that company is Mr. Julian S. Neal.

Mr. John T. Ward wrote a very interesting story about this company, which was printed in the Baltimore Evening Sun on June 28, 1965. Believing it will be of interest to my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I place it at this point in the RECORD. It is as follows:

FIDELITY & DEPOSIT MARKS 75TH YEAR OF AN IDEA—THE BONDING BUSINESS

(By John T. Ward)

Back in the 1890's, which some historians have termed "gay," business was brisk, too, and a Marylander conceived the idea of what became a new type of enterprise—the writing of fidelity and surety bonds. His name was Edwin Warfield.

Born in 1848, he did some teaching and then was soon active in farming, law, business, and politics. In the latter, he became Register of Wills in Howard County, State senator, and president of the Maryland Senate, surveyor of the port of Baltimore, and eventually, Governor of Maryland from 1904 to 1908.

IN THE GOOD OLD DAYS

The 1890's were still horse-car days, but imaginations went beyond horse-and-buggy thinking. Industry and business were on a vigorous drive, checked and sorely beset by the panic of 1893, but undaunted.

While surveyor of the port, Mr. Warfield began casting about for a new business venture. Very late in the 1890 session of the legislature, after considerable urging, a bill was passed giving a perpetual charter to Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

This was radically different from one for the Fidelity Loan & Trust Co. of Baltimore City, good for only 40 years, which providentially had been turned down early in the session. The new charter had the powers not only of a bank, but also for the writing of surety bonds which had not been a provision of the other charter.

A DEMONSTRATED NEED

The legislative action was hurried along by a just-discovered major defalcation of a well-known State officeholder.

When the company formally opened that year, it embodied a brilliant business idea, and there was a demonstrated need for just such public official protection.

Bonds for the officeholders then were furnished by relatives or business friends, many of whom, as in the Maryland case, could not fully reimburse the State for the loss when a demand was made.

Long after, Mr. Warfield thought so much of his business handiwork of the 1890's that he composed his own epitaph as "founder of the Fidelity & Deposit Co. and Governor of Maryland"—in that order.

In the 1898 company report, Mr. Warfield proudly stated that "the history of the Fidelity & Deposit Co. is the history of corporate suretyship."

A MODEST BEGINNING

From a very modest office on June 2, 1890, at 7 North Calvert Street, with capital of but $200,000, and six paid staff members, success came so quickly that in September of that year the promoters were looking about for larger quarters. In November, they got an option on very desirable location at the northwest corner of Charles and Lexington Streets. By 1894, an eight-story office building had been erected. This meant weathering the severe panic of 1893, but the young company made the grade. In 1913, the building was enlarged to 15 stories.

THE ENTERPRISERS

Officers in the fledgling company were Clinton P. Paine, president; Lloyd L. Jackson, first vice president; Mr. Warfield, second vice president and general manager; Dr. George W. Bishop, treasurer; and Herman E. Bosler, secretary.

Mr. Paine was a large financial backer; even more so was H. Crawford Black whose name was connected with many business ventures than and later; Lloyd Lowndes, later a Governor of the State; Seymour Mandelbaum, the last of the original board of directors who died in 1931; and John Herman Bosler, whose investment was a vital key to the starting of the firm, a Pennsylvania capitalist with the greatly varied interests of farming, distilling, grain, iron furnaces, coal, railroads, banks, and western ranches.

Mr. Black's sons, Van Lear and Harry C., later had important association with development of the surety and bonding company.

Mr. Lowndes, despite other large business interests, took a very active part as an F. & D. director. So accustomed were stockholders to naming him to the board that they inadvertently reelected him after his death in 1905.

SURETY AND BANK SEPARATED

The company had power to accept money and pay interest, hence the word "deposit" in the corporate name. However, by 1905 a conflict between the insurance business and banking was realized, and the latter activity was divorced from the main enterprise as the Fidelity Trust Co. This in the 1950's was combined with Baltimore National Bank to form Fidelity-Baltimore National Bank, and now after other mergers and name changes is Maryland National Bank.

Only two other U.S. companies were in the surety and bonding business when F. & D. was founded. Its establishment was the inspiration for starting four more Baltimore firms, making the city the bonding capital of the country for a time.

The other companies were American Bonding, U.S. Fidelity & Guaranty, Maryland Casualty, and New Amsterdam Casualty. American Bonding was merged into F. & D. in 1913. F. & D. became a management seed bed which over the years provided executives to insurance companies in this city and elsewhere.

SPREADING THE WORD

F. & D. concentrated early efforts on educating its public—law and business—in advantages of corporate surety, and profited considerably through passage of an 1894 law which approved fidelity and surety bonds issued on Government officials. F. & D. was the first to qualify under the act, which not only permitted great expansion of its business, but also attracted intensive competition.

Expansion into the casualty field came around 1910, including auto and workmen's compensation, but later abandoned as unprofitable. Only burglary and robbery insurance are retained in that category now, the main effort being put on personal and corporate fidelity and surety bonds. F. & D. is still the national leader in the fidelity field.

A surety bond guarantees performance of a contract.

A fidelity bond guarantees reimbursement in event of default or dishonesty of an individual.

INTO THE LIFE FIELD

Two years ago, the company branched into another field with the purchase of Maryland Life Insurance Co., now operated as a wholly owned subsidiary.

Lloyd L. Jackson was the second F. & D. president, succeeding Mr. Paine. Mr. War-

field became president in 1893, holding office to the end of 1919. He died early in 1920.

In turn, the chiefs of the company since have been Thomas A. Whelan, Charles R. Miller, Frank A. Bach, Beverly H. Mercer, and beginning in February 1964, Julian S. Neal. Though retired, Mr. Bach and Mr. Mercer still are active in company matters.

Mr. Neal, born in North Carolina and a former vice president of the Chicago branch, is the first non-Marylander to become president of the company which now has 53 field officers and more than 1,000 employees.

THE OFFICIAL FAMILY

Other officers are: Harry Y. Wright, vice president and treasurer; Samuel Hopkins, secretary and assistant treasurer; Herbert N. Schisler, comptroller; J. Stuart Galloway, vice president and general counsel; Donald L. Buckler (also president of Maryland Life), Norman A. Burgoon, Jr., George A. Conner, and Elmer B. McCahan, Jr., vice presidents.

Over the years, the F. & D. has written surety bonds for some of the famous names of the country, for example, Calvin Coolidge as a trustee in bankruptcy, long before he became President, and Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War in the Wilson administration, on an estate bond.

The company has been a joint insurer on such large contract performance bonds as those for the Chesapeake Bay Bridge, the Baltimore Harbor tunnel, and at present on the biggest building ever constructed anywhere, the Vehicle Assembly Building for rocket launching in Florida.

NOT ALL DRY BONES

While the surety field can be prosaic, some of the business has concerned wrongdoers—cashiers skipping with company funds, for instance—to become captivating detective stories in fact, rather than fiction.

Aside from its main items of work, the company at times has organized some business spectaculars. Two of these of highly different nature took place in the 1920's.

Little known to many living then and to few now, post World War I 1920 and 1921 were rough in some fields of commerce.

AN IMPORTANT SURVEY

In September 1920, through its widely scattered agents, the company aided by some Government officials, undertook a telegraphic survey of U.S. business conditions. Such surveys, now a continuing part of several Government departments, were not then common. The analysis developed the fact that while conditions were severe in some spots, they were not as bad as many feared. News stories and editorials dramatized the findings.

The following spring, a similar painstaking survey was conducted as a follow-up procedure, checking to see if the original analysis had been correct. It was found to be much in line with the earlier opinion, and was credited with reassuring business widely in the early part of the decade.

SAILINGS ON THE CHESAPEAKE

In October of 1920, the company also undertook to dramatize itself and the port of Baltimore in a much different way. The American Bankers Association then was holding its annual convention in Washington. Through invitation from the F. & D., nine special Pullman trains brought 3,000 bankers, diplomats and other guests over the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad for a 1-day view of the city, the harbor and a boat trip to Annapolis. There were so many acceptances that both the Louise and the Dreamland, popular excursion boats on the Chesapeake Bay, had to be chartered for the voyage to the State capital.

The effort to impress the visitors was planned to the nth degree. As an example, while the bankers were briefly touring Annapolis, the excursion steamers were completely refurbished at the dock from a luncheon table setting to lounging parlor accommodations for the return trip.

It was a spectacular event which brought Baltimore to the attention of hundreds who had never known of it a great industrial and commercial city and a leading port of the world.

The U.N. at 20

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, unlike some groups, I do not advocate that the United States get out of the U.N.

I do advocate, however, our foreign policy administrators providing leadership for that body.

In this era, we are reviewing 20 years of the U.N. One of the most practical and objective commentaries is contained in the Thursday, June 24 edition of the Chicago Daily News, which I submit for the RECORD:

THE UNITED NATIONS AT 20

There have been better times than now for celebrating the United Nations. But since a 20th anniversary can't be postponed, the festivities in San Francisco will proceed with everybody putting the best face possible on the affair.

It takes no great powers of analysis to deduce that the United Nations at age 20 has not fulfilled the promise of the infant. It has grown physically—from 51 members to 114—but at an age when it should be at least approaching maturity it appears to be stalled in an unhappy and unending adolescence. It is deformed, weak, surly flat broke and afflicted with schizophrenia.

Yet the astonishing thing is that not only do its parents still love it, but so do the nations which have added to its growth over the years. And for a very good reason: It's all we've got.

Looking back at the environment in which it has grown, perhaps the biggest wonder of all is that the United Nations has survived in any form. In spite of the cold war, nuclear threats, walkouts and such virulent illnesses as Korea and the Congo, only one nation—Indonesia—has left the Organization in those 20 years.

The present crisis may not be the worst it has faced, but it is bad enough. With the Communist nations, France and a few others refusing to pay their assessments for peacekeeping operations, the United Nations is living on borrowed funds. The last meeting of the General Assembly was a no-vote fiasco and the next could be the same unless some way out of the stalemate is found.

Britain and the Scandinavian countries have started a voluntary subscription list with pledges of more than $17 million, and it is generally expected that President Johnson will put the United States down for a sizable sum when he addresses the ceremonies this weekend. The hope is that Russia will do the same, sooner or later. Somewhere along the line, everyone will quietly forget that Russia and the others are welshing on a debt declared legal by the World Court, and the United States will no longer insist that Russia be denied a U.N. vote if it doesn't pay up.

The whole procedure of passing the hat and bending the rules is degrading the world organization and trimming still further the limited power it was beginning to develop as a peacekeeping force in the world. Yet if the only alternative is the breakup of the U.N., the choice will doubtless be made to save it. We have nursed the U.N. too long to abandon it now. The hope born in San Francisco 20 years ago may be dimmed, and the organization today nearly unrecognizable as the same one, but hope and an organization do still exist.

There is a forum to which the quarrelsome nations of the world can bring their grievances. There is a place for the exchange of ideas and for the venting of pressures which otherwise could build to the blowoff point. A great many things which never make the headlines are done in and by the United Nations that could never be done without it.

Far too much was expected of the U.N. when it was born. And in the frustration over its failures, too little attention is paid now to the broad network of services it provides in the nonpolitical fields. If the anniversary celebration serves to bring better perspective, and teaches us to appreciate what the U.N. is, as well as disabuse us of what it is not, some portion of the expectations of 20 years ago may yet be realized.

The Rewards of a Great Teacher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, like the rose born to blush unseen, the story of those who bear a great responsibility in our society today often goes untold. Mr. Speaker, I refer to our educators. In a country which is dedicated to the goal of making the Great Society a reality, the role of the educator has become paramount, a fact shown so graphically by data indicating that in fiscal year 1966, roughly 58 percent of all expenditures in the poverty program will be devoted to educational programs of one kind or another. We have recognized that education is the cornerstone of the Great Society, yet we do little to reward our educators. While the importance of the role they must play increases every day, the stature of their profession in the public mind changes little.

Recently, in this Chamber, we honored two fine young men who had just returned from an epic journey in space. Certainly, they deserved all the honors and plaudits they received. Yet, James McDivitt and Edward White would not have been able to make the journey had it not been for the fine educations they had received in their formative years. There was little recognition for the scores of teachers who had guided and encouraged them.

Admittedly, it is not possible for this body to honor all fine teachers in the style in which it is accustomed to honoring our spacemen—there are simply too many of them. However, it is in our interest to cite their achievements whenever possible—not solely for the purpose of giving deserving educators a pat on the back, but also for the purpose of encouraging gifted young people to enter the teaching profession.

Mr. Speaker, we in Chicago are particularly proud of Mrs. Henrietta Miller, a Chicago high school history teacher. Since 1931, Mrs. Miller has been stimulating young minds at Senn High School in Chicago to strike out on their own—to think for themselves. Her teaching methods might be considered unorthodox by some. Nevertheless, no one would dispute the fact that they have been highly successful. Mrs. Miller was not drawn to teaching by the promise of financial gain, nor has she remained in that profession because of a lucrative salary. It is a much too tragic and true fact that teachers are nationally underpaid. Mrs. Miller has remained a dedicated teacher because she is richly rewarded by her work itself and by the joy of knowing that she is remembered affectionately by the hundreds of children with whom she has worked. This has indeed been true in Mrs. Miller's case.

Mrs. Miller received national recognition for her work in an article by Richard Meryman in the March 13, 1964, issue of Life magazine. This article was subsequently translated into Russian by the U.S. Information Agency and republished in the magazine America. Mr. Meryman has told her story eloquently and poignantly, and I know Members will be pleased to read it. It follows:

THE REWARDS OF A GREAT TEACHER

(By Richard Meryman)

Mrs. Henrietta Miller stands in front of a paper-heaped desk in the north wing of Chicago's vast Senn High School. She is a large woman, a trifle ungainly on thin legs. Her friendly eyes fairly snap with animation as she presides over the apparent anarchy of a truly extraordinary history classroom.

The topic under discussion—history source books and the importance of keeping file cards on them—would seem conducive to daydreaming, perhaps even dozing. For a time Mrs. Miller seems not to be teaching at all, merely asking questions as the half-formed thoughts of the students rattle around disjointedly like dice in a shaker. But there is little boredom among the 30 juniors and seniors in room 249. No one seems aware of the yelps from the gym class in the dusty quadrangle below the classroom windows or the periodic bellow of jet airliners entering and leaving the air traffic pattern of O'Hare International Airport.

As the class discussion continues, Mrs. Miller moves about the room. Sometimes she sits by her desk (never behind it), stands in the back of the room, even sits in a vacant desk amid the students. Her punctuating questions, begin to nudge here, clarify a bit there.

She is challenging the students. "Now why are we concerned about our sources of information?" she asks. "Mark, are you concerned?" "Oh?" "Any other reasons? We can get more specific." "Why worry about the author, the point of view, your reaction to the source?" "Do you think you could be brainwashed? What's brainwashed?" "Ah." "That's right, make you believe almost anything, everything, that you had believed was untrue." "What do you think, Mickey?"

After 20 minutes of group groping and flailing, Mickey comes up with an answer: "If you believe everything everybody tells you, you're actually a puppet. If you think things out for yourself and make your own conclusions, then you're an individualist." Mrs. Miller smiles with delight. A student presenting a sound idea in teenage terms is, she believes, more eloquent for the class than she can ever be. This is the way she teaches.

Whatever bones other educators may have to pick with the teaching techniques of this deceptively ordinary-looking schoolmarm, they do it with utmost respect. For, by any measure yet applied, Henrietta Miller is a great teacher.

She has reeceived three awards in Chicago, including, this past fall, the Kate Maremont Dedicated Teacher award, $500 toward a summer trip wherever she wants to go. She pioneered the advanced placement program in Chicago schools, which allows able and ambitious students to take college-level work for credit, and she started an elective course in international relations. It was later expanded and adapted for use elsewhere in the school system. Her salary is $9,995 a year—top pay in Chicago schools. Dr. Charles R. Keller, a former Williams College history professor who is in charge of the search for the Nation's top educators for the prestigious John Hay fellowships, tells all who will listen that Mrs. Miller is just about the best teacher he has ever seen.

Of far more direct import to laymen—and to Mrs. Miller—are the accolades, some of them wholly inadvertent, from the teenagers who pass through her five classes at the rate of 150 per day.

"I hate this class, I positively hate it," mourned a pretty youngster to her friend as they took their seats in room 249. "It's too interesting—it makes me work."

I WANT THEM TO BE JUST A LITTLE BEWILDERED

Another girl says, "She is always asking 'Why?' 'Why?' That makes you do the same thing to your fellow students. And Mrs. Miller just stands there beaming while the arguments fly back and forth. She gets so much enjoyment, and you feel kind of maternal toward her. All you can do is try to join in."

Henrietta Miller has set herself the goal of teaching young, often indifferent minds the painful process of analytical thinking. She considers her biggest weapon to be freedom—"freedom of inquiry into anything, freedom to discuss their findings, the freedom to make up your mind as well as the freedom to change your mind."

Mrs. Miller refuses to go over the factual "story," as she calls it. "Why should I spend my time giving students what they can get in books?" she asks. "I always take the position that we are learning together and I must never slip into the role they expect me to play—the superhuman being who can meet all their questions with the truth." Instead, Mrs. Miller fires back her own questions.

An average class may open thus: "Tom, what happened at Waterloo?"—and take off from there. "Would you say it was just the end of Napoleon or the end of an era?" "Do the codes of the French Revolution influence us today?" "How?" "Why?" And so on, to the bell.

Such questions spring from the students' current reading, but they will lead anywhere the class wants to go. A discussion of Napoleon's belief in his special destiny soon moves into the question of whether a life is predestined or whether a person has free will. "I ask myself," explains Mrs. Miller, "what in the universal problems that develop in history are the universal truths we can try to grapple with?"

"I'm attacking dogmatism," she continues, "the belief that any subject contains final answers. It is painful to see blind, unquestioning faith. If somebody got up in my class and said, 'Personally, I admire Hitler,' it would be very painful for me. But it would be most important to keep from blurting out, 'Oh, but this is not right.'—and instead to ask why the student came to this conclusion, and then listen to the development of his thoughts. A teacher is first of all a very, very careful listener."

"Homework," is virtually a misnomer in Mrs. Miller's classes. There are no specific, daily assignments. In an offhand way she indicates what historical ground will be covered in the next few weeks, or she mentions general areas, such as absolutism or liberty to read up on. The lists of questions she dictates are study guides and she often suggests sources. But the youngsters can choose any books they wish, including historical novels. They have three basic textbooks all covering the same ground—one very simple, one average, and one college level, thus matching the range of the students' abilities. In addition, there is the school library and Mrs. Miller's huge personal book collection, which she lends out to her students. This iconoclastic approach to homework, that bane of the teenage years, sounds like an invitation to do nothing—but it is the core of Mrs. Miller's technique. And the response she gets from the students indicates anything but indolence.

"You've just got to join in the class discussions," said one of her students. "But you can't join in unless you've done your homework—that's the awful part."

Like all fine teachers, Henrietta Miller has strong opinions on poor teaching, and little patience for it. "Spoon feeding," is the term she uses. High grades, she knows, too often are won by parroting back "right" answers and safely approved "truths." Daily assignments are too often mechanical—so many pages in the textbook and answer the questions at the end of the chapter. As a result a reasonably bright child may ease through school by doing little more than cramming for tests; grades, not learning, become the goal of schoolwork. "Mother and father," says Mrs. Miller, "come home and ask only, 'What grade did you get on your test?' I fight this constantly."

Mrs. Miller thinks that when students get lots of independence, dramatic things can happen. She feels that, released from stifling, lock-step prescriptions of what to read and when, students can follow their natural curiosities—even if it is only the encyclopedic knowledge one girl displayed of Napoleon's romance with Josephine.

Plunged into Mrs. Miller's brand of educational freedom, with its few signposts, many students begin by floundering. This doesn't bother her at all. "I want them a little bewildered—so they can't stand it until they get things clarified. I'm asking them to be a lot more mature than they want to be."

Probably the most mature class Mrs. Miller teaches is the advanced placement (AP) European history class—designed for very bright students doing college-level work. In the spring, members of this class will take the "AP" examination to get college credit for this high school course. Her other classes range from below average to bright students, mostly juniors and seniors. She admits her system does not always work on all of them.

A boy in one class shrugged, "I've had teachers I like better. For instance, our class was talking on philosophies of revolution, something like that I'd rather, you know, go into the facts. I have another history teacher, he assigns oral book reports for extra credit and then kids give them in front of the room and I can listen to those. He gives assignment sheets with essay questions and words to look up. We do about two a week, look up the answer and write the essay. Then he goes over them in class. I like that better."

True to her loathing of dogmatism, Henrietta Miller would be the last to claim that this student does not conceivably learn more under a different mode of teaching from hers. She merely feels that she cannot pursue any other method satisfactorily. When class discussion is clicking, she is buoyant: "It must be the way someone feels who water-skis, or the way an artist feels when he's created a work and can stand back and admire it."

She is the first to point out that Senn High School is the professional home of a number

of outstanding teachers who employ techniques very different from hers.

There is Margaret Helen Cain, who for 25 years has been turning out splendid English students by, as Miss Cain says, "just pounding and pounding and pounding." There is Terrence Kennedy, whose work with slow learners and foreign-speaking students in basic mathematics could be cited as a model for any school. There is Jules Williams, who excitingly combines the philosophical with the chemical-physical approach to biology.

There are, for that matter, some excellent teachers at Senn and elsewhere to whom Henrietta Miller's classroom techniques are anathema. "I might as well admit it," says one of these, Dan Powell, a fine, intense history teacher who holds forth in the room adjoining Mrs Miller's. He is her close friend and admirer, but he sums up the argument against her methods: "I'd just go crazy with this business where the kids are sitting around talking in six or seven directions."

"At first nobody got the point," Bruce recalled. "Mrs. Miller was just a little advanced for some kids, including myself. But it was different because she was saying, 'I don't care how you study, just study'; and I approved of that." But one day, he continued, "she asked me a question and I popped off, and before you knew it one question led to another. That's her way—before you know it, you have a whole slew of questions on your hands—and you have a whole new interest opened to you and everything's interrelated. I started reading and reading and getting everybody's opinion on things. I never did that before—just memorized the textbook."

Bruce's new interest took him regularly the the Chicago Public Library, and even to a UNESCO meeting held for teenagers on the Common Market. "I had no idea all that stuff was going on over there in Europe," he remarked afterward. "It makes you want to think. You have to learn more. You're forced to. And man, all of a sudden it's like looking out in the universe and saying, 'Where does it all end?' The more powerfull telescope you get, the more is there."

Once in awhile Mrs. Miller doesn't recognize a triumph until long after it has occurred. For example, she once had a student named Jim Sullivan, whom she remembers as almost a nemesis. She still bristles as she describes their first meeting: "He came in, very gruff, and looked at me antagonistically. Out of his wallet he pulled a soiled newspaper clipping about the advanced placement program. He literally threw it at me. 'Can I get into this?' he asked. My first reaction was, 'Why have anything to do with anybody so discourteous, so crude?'

"But there had to be something that I didn't see about a young man who would carry a clipping around until he got up the courage to ask me about it." She arranged to take him in.

In class, Mrs. Miller remembers, Sullivan often acted disdainful, and whenever a student does this, she says, "I find myself thinking, 'I don't like you. You don't appreciate what's going on.' "

But she swallowed her resentment, and they got on. At the end of the year Sullivan got the highest possible mark on his advanced placement examination. He went on to the University of Chicago, where he now is studying physics.

Recently, recollecting his hours with Mrs. Miller, Sullivan had no inkling of how hard his attacks had been on her. "I like to trap people, so I was trying to get other students to make mistakes—Mrs. Miller, too. It was just a game."

Good teaching is not a ritual but an art. Ultimately men and women teach the way they are most comfortable, and Mrs. Miller's methods were literally instilled in her from birth.

Her mother's parents, homesteaders in Wisconsin, had come from authoritarian Prussia in hope of finding a place sympathetic to their independent bent. Mrs. Miller's father, Ferdinand Hafemann, arrived from Prussia to visit one of his mother's friends—and stayed on to marry her daughter, Bertha. They settled in Menominee, Mich. Mr. Hafemann, a friendly man, worked in the local papermill and meatpacking company. Bertha Hafemann was a nonconformist who used to embarrass her young daughter until Henrietta learned to appreciate her as a fellow iconoclast. Mrs. Hafemann argued over the Bible so persistently with her minister, Henrietta Miller remembers, that he was driven to desperate shelter: "The Bible is a very complex book. One should not look too deeply into it."

Once Henrietta, age 3, suddenly stood up in church during a long, severe sermon and loudly shrilled, "Mummy, why is that old man standing up there in that barrel and scolding the people? Why are they all so quiet?" Mummy was delighted. She wanted her daughter to notice everything around her and ask, "Why?"

An only child, born when her mother was 40, Henrietta grew up mainly among adults. They gave her an important voice in her own affairs. It was she who chose to attend a public school instead of a private school. And at age 12, when her father died in an automobile accident, her mother insisted she be a partner in family affairs.

In high school an English teacher tried to force Henrietta to accept her answers as final. So she ignored the teacher and became an unashamed problem student. "This makes me sympathetic now with open rebellion," she says. "I always wonder what part I've played in it." Her school principal, however, was sympathetic and became a strong influence in Henrietta's early decision to be a teacher.

Her freshman year at Lawrence College in Appleton was a bitter one. The 14 girls in her dormitory section were a happy band until the sororities pledged all but one—Henrietta—leaving her a lonely castoff. And, unprepared for the completely free study of college, she started getting C's after her high 90's in high school. Because her mother was paying her college expenses by taking in sewing, Henrietta tried babysitting and was a flop. She quit when the children made a game of ripping off her glasses.

WHAT HAVE I TO OFFER? WHAT DO THEY NEED?

By this time she had become disenchanted with education and fearful that she was unfit for teaching. She looked for a secretarial job in Milwaukee. But fortunately the head of Gimbels' department store, who interviewed her there, saw her as a born teacher and talked her into going back to college. By her senior year she was a superb student.

Offered a scholarship for graduate work at the University of Wisconsin—which probably would have led her eventually into college teaching—she turned it down. "My mother had sacrificed quite enough," she explains. After teaching 6 years in high schools in Manistique, Mich., and in Milwaukee, she came in 1931 to Senn High School on Chicago's North Side, attending the University of Chicago during the summers for her Ph. D. For a number of reasons, she never finished her thesis. Her mother was dying of cancer over a 10-year period; the professor who was to read the thesis died; her faculty adviser, PAUL DOUGLAS, became a U.S. Senator, and she married a man named Frank Miller in Chicago (he is now retired).

"Maybe I was really just too lazy to get my doctorate," she says, "but I was getting awfully interested in teaching at Senn." She was also beginning to get recognition for her work there.

Henrietta Miller is an imposing model to any other history teacher. She believes strongly that teachers should not be narrow; she goes to concerts and lectures, reads widely in the humanities, travels and always knows where the first crocus will appear in nearby Evanston. Last year she was a John Hay fellow at the University of California and while there prepared a course in advance placement in European history. But though her curiosity is wide and her enjoyment great, it is only teaching that makes her eloquent, and she has devoted most of her life to history scholarship so that she can teach more ably. Her methods demand not only up-to-date mastery of her subject but also intense concentration. Not many teachers are willing to attempt anything that requires such single-mindedness. It is always easier to confine a class to carefully prepared material, and that is what most teachers do.

She has the benefit of a good place to teach, too. Senn High is a top big-city school. It has strong momentum from a long tradition of high academic standards and respect for learning. The school, which is located in a distinctly middle-income area, sends 65 percent of its graduates to 4-year colleges, including all Ivy League schools. Another 10 percent go to junior colleges. City teachers who are looking for a challenge often put their names on waiting lists for assignment to Senn. A trailbreaker such as Mrs. Miller could hardly flourish in any other setting.

Any good teacher, regardless of methods, knows that his profession takes the best he has. After 39 years of teaching. Henrietta Miller, who has no children of her own, still can fret about other people's offspring: "I always meet a first class in September with fear in my heart, wondering what I have to offer, and what they may need."

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following article from the Polish-American World of Friday, June 25, 1965. It relates a little-known story from the pages of American history—and one that tells us something of the tensions and pressures of the times. Diplomacy takes some unexpected turns, but the respect and admiration of the American people for the brave people of Poland in their long struggle against oppression and foreign domination will not dim.

The article follows:

THE YEAR 1863: POLAND, RUSSIA, AND THE UNITED STATES

(By Martin Kaufman)

While the United States was engrossed in its great Civil War, news reached America of a battle of freedom across the Atlantic. Poland was revolting against Russian tyranny. The Poles had long suffered under Russian domination, and in January 1863, Poland arose in opposition to the arrest of 2,000 youths to replace those who had deserted the Russian Army. The Central National Committee of Poland announced the emancipation of every person in the land on January 22, and Poles serving in the Russian Army revolted.

On April 10, England, France, and Austria sent notes to protest Russia's Polish policy,

demanding that Poland be given her liberty. Victor Hugo, the great French writer, added to the official protest the sentiments of the French people: Poland, overwhelmed, bleeding, and erect, dazzles the world * * * Poland will triumph. Its final death would be more or less death of us all."

The French Foreign Minister asked the American Government to join the protest, but President Lincoln and Secretary of State Seward were undecided. The Union was involved in a life-and-death struggle for survival, and could not become involved in European politics. Russia was the only ally of the Union, the only European nation to refuse to intervene in the American Civil War, and Lincoln could not turn his back on his only friend. Seward politely refused the French offer, stating that he hoped that the czar, Alexander II, would free the "gallant nation whose wrongs, whose misfortunes, and whose valor have so deeply excited universal sympathy."

The people of the United States read of the Russian atrocities; articles appeared in newspapers telling the tales of grisly horror, of murder, of hatred and desolaton. The Russians were accused of setting Poland afire, of killing every person in the street, and of committing sadistic crimes. For example, the London Daily News reported that a Russian soldier dipped a spoon in the blood of his Polish victim, and placed it to the lips of the dead man, saying "Drink some of this punch." Catholic priests were reportedly beaten with sticks, and in one instance 50 college men were stripped, tied to trees, and murdered, then their eyes were torn out and their arms broken. People were murdered while praying in church, and many innocent Poles were bayonetted kneeling before the altar. Young girls were reported to have been arrested, tortured, flogged, and whipped. In one item, Russian soldiers were said to be using a new knife with a jagged blade.

America's editors sympathized with Poland's valiant effort to rid herself of a cruel and immoral regime. Horace Greeley of the New York Tribune stated that "no people ever had a clearer title to national independence," while other writers stated that America wanted Poland to loosen the giant grasp of Russia and gain her freedom.

One group in America decided to do something to help the Poles achieve their liberty. Thirty thousand Poles lived in the United States at the time of the revolt, mainly in New York, California, and Texas. Most of them fled the ruthless suppression of the 1831 revolt and in 1834 Congress passed a bill donating land to the heroic refugees.

The Poles of New York met March 14 at the Stuben House in the Bowery. John Cedrowski was chairman, and in a stirring address Mr. Idorowski spoke of Poland, who, "rising from her grave, stretches out to her sons her hands, covered with wounds, produced by Russian chains." He called for American Poles to become representatives in exile, awakening sympathy for Poland throughout the United States. A message was sent to the Central National Committee, in Poland, stating that "burning with the sentiment of love of our country, believing in the immortality of our nationality, we, Poles in America * * * that handful of Pilgrims, although far away from our native homes, with our soul will always be with you and with our brothers, who, on the field of glory, shed their blood for our fatherland."

Committees were formed in Washington, St. Louis, Chicago, Cincinnati, Leavenworth City, San Francisco, and New York. Meetings were held throughout the country and a fund was started to help Poland free herself from the yoke of Russian imperialism.

A meeting was held at the Music Hall in San Francisco on May 22, presided over by the newly elected mayor, and the Polish Jews met in New York and pledged that Polish Jews in America should aid in the "deliverance of their brethren in Poland."

A total of $16,000 was raised to send the Polish revolutionaries—a tiny amount. It was expected that the Poles would be able to help themselves, as America was involved in a terrible war of its own, and donations were constantly being taken to aid Americans made homeless during the Civil War. For example, after Quantrill destroyed Lawrence, Kans., in the summer of 1863, over $2,000 was raised in Pittsburgh alone, and when the Irish were reportedly suffering in their homeland, over $6,000 was collected by the Irish of western Pennsylvania. It was expected that the Poles would support their own cause.

During this time of Polish suffering, the Union was going through very dark days. The Confederate Army was as far north as Pennsylvania, and the State was in a panic. France had placed Maximilian on the throne of Mexico, and America feared European intervention in the Civil War. The summer of 1863 brought nothing but despair to the hearts of the Union—Robert E. Lee was moving toward Gettysburg with the Confederate Army, and France and England were about to meditate in war. Suddenly in September two Russian ships sailed into New York Harbor, and in several days entered San Francisco Harbor. America rejoiced: The Russians had come to protect her from European intervention.

We know now they did not come to protect the United States, but rather to protect the fleet. The czar was afraid of having the ships bottled up in Russian waters, so the fleet was ordered to America, Russia's only ally. But America was ecstatic. Although some people realized the reason for the arrival of the ships, most Americans believed that Russia had come to protect the Union from European intervention. New York was "gaily bedecked with American and Russian flags," and on September 16, Mrs. Abraham Lincoln boarded the Russian flagship, the *Alexander Nevski*, and offered a toast to "the health of the Emperor of Russia." A ball was held for the Russian seamen, and several American observers noted that while people were dancing in honor of the Russians, "women and children were perishing in the dungeons or under the sharp hand of despotism in Poland. * * *" The World, a New York newspaper, stated that the dances and festivities were simply a custom, and that the Americans knew that "the partition and appropriation of Poland was the greatest crime in modern history."

The Polish-Americans were stunned at the sudden turn of events. New York loved Russia and New Yorkers entertained the Russians. Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy, wrote in his diary, "In sending them to this country at this time is something significant * * * God bless the Russians."

A meeting was held at Cooper Institute in New York on October 31, and the Polish-Americans and a few sympathizer expressed their feelings by a round of groans and hoots for the Muscovites. Henry Ward Beecher agreed in a London speech in which he said it was "indecent for the United States to flirt with Russia." Another meeting was held November 30, where speakers told of Pulaski and Kosciuszko, the great Poles who helped bring independence to the United States, and accused Russia for her inhuman treatment of the Polish homeland. One observer could not understand the sudden enthusiasm for the Russians: "Strange to say, amid the roar of cannon thundering freedom to slaves, amid streams of blood shed in the name of nationality on this side of the Atlantic, amid daily echos reverberating the groans of butchered martyrs, of mothers and sisters scourged, hanged, or dragged into captivity on the other side—New York had gone mad with enthusiasm for the Muscovites."

During the visit of the Russian fleet to New York, the Union was faced with having to prove her friendship to Russia. Alexander Milewski, a Polish sailor serving with the Russian fleet, jumped ship and enlisted in the Union Army. The Russians demanded his return, and on February 19, 1864, Secretary Stanton ordered Gen. Ben Butler to find Milewski and send him to Washington. By March 13, 1864, the Polish sailor was discovered serving with the 16th New York Artillery, and he was sent to Washington, where he was handed over to the Russian Minister. He was reported to have been lynched on return to his ship.

Milewski was no ordinary "ship jumper"—he sought political asylum in the United States. He certainly should not have been returned to the Russian fleet, but the State Department was in a dilemma. If it refused to return the sailor, perhaps the Union would have lost Russian friendship, but this is doubtful. He was returned due to the extracordiality existing between Russia and the United States, and the Union proved her friendship with Russia, even to the point of immorality.

Very few Americans knew of the incident, and only the New York Polish-Americans protested the State Department action. A bitter editorial appeared in "Echo Polskie," calling for mass protest. A letter questioning the action was sent to Congress, and in November 1864, the newspaper published the letter from William Seward to Roman J. Jaworoowski, the editor, pointing out that extradition treaties had existed between the United States and Russia since 1832.

Generally, the American people favored the independence of Poland in her struggle against Russia, but the American Civil War and America's love affair with Russia prevented the United States from acting to aid the Poles. John Harper, of Pittsburgh perfectly expressed the American attitude toward the Polish revolt in a letter to his son: "The Poles have our sympathies, though they rebel against, Russia." America was friendly toward Russia, and sympathized with Poland, and as a result, could not aid the suffering Poles.

The Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, Marquis Childs has written convincingly of the need for the Republican Party to make real progress in heading the party in a progressive direction in this morning's Washington Post.

Pointing out the warning of our colleague the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] that the true principles of conservatism are still in danger of perversion by extremist groups, Mr. Childs finds no evidence that the national party, as a whole, has yet learned the lessons of 1964.

I include Mr. Childs' article, "No Reconciliation Within the GOP," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NO RECONCILIATION WITHIN THE GOP

(By Marquis Childs)

If ever a man was caught in the middle, it is the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Ray Bliss. He is like a general who finds his troops melting away at the moment he prepares to commit them to battle. Bliss has not succeeded in satisfying either side of his divided force. The

rumpus over the rifled desks was a minor symptom of the divisions not only in the party but in the national organization.

Goldwaterites were furious when the chairman used the word "destructive" to characterize the new Free Society Association of which Goldwater is honorary chairman. For moderate-liberal Republicans in Congress Bliss has been too timid in criticizing the latest splinter movement. The splinters are bound to draw off money and men desperately needed if the party is to make a comeback. And the moderates are especially worried over the Goldwater faction, since they know the passionate loyalty that several million Republicans give to their one and only hero.

Their worry is not just for the next election or the election after that. Republicans among the little band of survivors in the House talk earnestly about how their party can go the way of the Whigs and vanish into the attic of political history. It would survive as a bitter and conservative remnant. And with a Democrat of the political skill and drive Lyndon Johnson in the White House the United States would become a one-party Nation.

Bliss had fair warning more than a month ago of the threat of a unity that merely papered over the cracks with well-meaning words. A letter sent by Representative Stanley R. TUPPER, of Maine, one of the band of Republican activists calling themselves the Wednesday Club, put the dilemma in unmistakable terms. It is being widely circulated by his colleagues.

"Because of apathy on the part of Republican moderates," TUPPER wrote, "rightwing elements captured the Republican Party in 1964. Now, 6 months after the overwhelming Republican defeat, there is still no evidence that ultra-conservatives learned anything from it. On the contrary, they continue their silly prattling that their doctrine of reaction is the true Republican philosophy and that the voter rejection was due to liberal Republicans and the press. These people talk constantly of the heritage of Lincoln; what they really want is not Lincoln—the man—who was our most progressive President but rather his time in history.

"If it is true that the rightwing learned nothing from the 1964 fiasco, it is also abundantly clear that moderates have not learned of the necessity of protecting their party from control by a noisy and well-financed minority.

"Republicans simply must not allow the voting public to identify the Republican Party as the creature of extremists, fanatics, or reactionaries. The GOP must prevent well-organized rightwing groups, now seeking legitimacy under the label of conservatism, from perverting the views of enlightened conservatives and moderates with the GOP. The Party must take every precaution to prevent rightwingers from taking control of key Republican organizational positions by default in the 50 States and later to control State and national Republican conventions."

This cry from the heart expresses the deeply felt sentiment of many of the survivors of the Goldwater deluge. They saw, too late for the most part, how in State after State the Goldwaterites took over the organization and thereby at the San Francisco convention a year ago controlled two-thirds of the delegates.

No fundamental change has taken place since then. In most States the rightwingers are sitting tight. In others—nearby Maryland is an example—money is so scarce that it is hard to see how a Statewide campaign can be mounted in 1966.

Many Republicans, as TUPPER noted in a subsequent statement, believe their only chance of coming to power is through a massive foreign policy failure or a great economic disaster. Since this is certain to happen sooner or later there is no need to take initiatives or to bother about organization.

For the moderates this is not just theory but survival. Last fall they resisted the onslaught of the rightwingers in their own party as well as the Democrats. They foresee that the well-heeled conservative splinters will carry on the vendetta against any and all dissenters in the next election.

It was said of Bliss when he was made chairman that he was the ablest technician in the party, as he had proved in Ohio. But what he confronts in his fragmented party calls for more than technical skill, however great.

Military Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Mr. R. A. "Bob" Means, national secretary of the Fleet Reserve Association, has recently expressed to me the Fleet Reserve Association's views on military pay legislation.

I would like to share the contents of Mr. Means' letter along with his statement before the Committee on Armed Services on June 11, 1965. I believe this to be a fair and excellent presentation of the U.S. serviceman's viewpoint on the legislation for the pay raise for the U.S. armed services.

The material follows:

FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1965.

DEAR MR. FULTON: President Johnson's message to the Congress proposing a 4.8 percent pay increase for the Armed Forces has left the membership of the Fleet Reserve Association and all career enlisted personnel in complete bewilderment. In the light of the present war on poverty and plans for the Great Society the American serviceman remains incredulous at the lack of understanding of his economical plight. The military personnel of today's Armed Forces do not have such short memories that they have forgotten the President's pledge to make them "first-class citizens in every respect" during his address to the joint session of the National War College and Industrial College of the Armed Forces at Washington, D.C., on August 21, 1964 during the peak of 1964 presidential election campaign. To the best of our belief and knowledge the only change since all of the great promises for a better life that has taken place in the past 6 months is that over 85,000 military personnel have been committed to the hazards of direct combat and war.

On March 3 the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and an overwhelming majority of the members of that committee, raised the hopes of the Armed Forces with their introduction of a reasonable pay increase bill. This reasonable legislation is a stride in the right direction to bring the military up to an equal standard of living with the vast majority of Americans. I will not in this letter set forth the tremendous volume of statistics which prove beyond any doubt the need for a minimum pay increase as proposed by Mr. RIVERS. We hope to be allowed to testify before the committees of Congress who must act immediately to correct the most disgraceful discrepancy in pay now existing. January 1966 is much, much, much too late.

Our more than 63,000 members are demanding of me to determine if their Representatives in Congress are going to allow them to be left out of the war on poverty. We feel that the personnel of the armed services deserve "first-class status" in return for their defending America.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. "BOB" MEANS,
National Secretary.

STATEMENT BY ROBERT A. MEANS, NATIONAL SECRETARY, FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 11, 1965

BACKGROUND

Since 1952, a period of 13 years, the Congress has acted on four military pay bills. It is our belief and opinion that none of these acts have been completely fair and equitable to those serving their country. We agree that the 1963 act, Public Law 88-132, was a great stride forward. We do not accept that the 1963 pay act brought the American service man to the standard of living enjoyed by the majority of the citizens of this great country. We certainly do not consider that the 1964 pay increase, which was so appropriately called by many Members of Congress as well as the press, "a crumb," improved the Armed Forces personnel's financial position. I certainly do not want to leave the impression that the career enlisted personnel are not thankful for what you have tried to do, Mr. Chairman. I do want to call to your attention that, in spite of the fact that the 1963 act provided a substantial increase for active duty personnel, subsequent action occasioned a large number of men to remain in a status quo or to lose money. Administrative action taken within the Department of Defense curtailed foreign duty pay and proficiency pay by changing the eligibility requirements for these allowances. This nullified the 1963 increase in basic pay for 37,300 of the 67,145 sailors who were then drawing proficiency pay. (Source—Memo to Secretary of Defense from Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) dated Aug. 14, 1963). Personnel of the other services were also affected. One must not lose sight of the fact that these 37,300 men who suffered a pay loss earned this propay by servicewide competitive examinations. Other thousands lost foreign duty pay and many lost both. Accordingly, their first pay under Public Law 88-132 did reflect the increase intended by the Congress. The 2½ percent pay increase authorized in 1964, I can assure you, did not alleviate the military man's financial hardship.

PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL PAY PANEL

In speaking of the President's special panel on Federal salaries I would like to review with you a few of their statements and conclusions. In studying their report we are at a loss to reconcile the pay panel's recommendations with the widely known facts of present military compensation. Our information is that the panel called no members of the military for their views concerning military compensation and retention problem. Apparently their decisions were based solely on information garnered by their staff. We expect that their information received was from the Defense Department. We would guess that their recommendations were arrived at from predetermined goals. We strongly suggest that the recommendations of a 4.8-percent increase for the military was influenced tremendously by the reserve sum for military compensation in the President's budget which was previously known.

We were amazed by some of the conclusions of the pay panel. For example, on page 13 of the House Document No. 170 which

contains their report to the President they state:

"1. Congressional action in 1962, 1963, and 1964 place military compensation at a level, in relation to civilian pay level, sufficient to attract and retain adequate numbers and quantities of personnel in the Armed Forces."

We cannot conceive how the pay panel arrived at this conclusion. The Department of Defense's study of military compensation dated October 1964, lists the following criteria to test the effectiveness of the present military pay system and states the accompanying conclusions:

"Objective No. 1—To attract a sufficient number of professionally skilled officer and enlisted personnel.

"Conclusion: It would appear that the current system is not completely responsive in that it does not attract a sufficient number of professionally skilled officer and enlisted personnel."

"Objective No. 2—To retain combat leadership, scientific, professional, technical and management skills required in the Armed Forces.

"Conclusions: (a) The current pay system is not entirely responsive to our needs in retaining the officers skills required by the Armed Forces and has lowered the selectivity ratio. (b) To the extent that the present reenlistment bonus payments influence a greater number than actually needed to select in some occupations, primarily the nontechnical area, the present system is not responsive."

"Objective No. 3—A system which will encourage a high level of performance and advancement to higher responsibility.

"Conclusion: In summation, criterion No. 3 is not completely responsive in some areas."

Evidently, the pay panel did not have this information despite the fact that the Secretary of Defense was a member of the panel.

On page 21 of House Document 170 the panel states its opposition to the military pay measure H.R. 5725, and the companion bills, proposed by the majority of this committee. The panel is in strong opposition to the fact that these measures provide for realistic increases in basic pay for the grades E-1 through E-5. The reasons for these realistic increases for the personnel in this group are obvious, they are the personnel with less than 2 years of service (who have not had a raise since 1952) or the personnel who are still on their first enlistment. Personnel in whom the Government has a large investment in training costs. These personnel we should be anxious to retain. To again quote the Department of Defense on its success in retaining this group we need merely to turn to the study referred to above, it states:

"Of those first term enlisted personnel eligible to reenlist by the various service standards, we lose about 74 out of 100."

The men with less than 2 years of service have not received a pay raise in 13 years. Now, if there are any other positions of employment in these United States which have not enjoyed a pay increase in 13 years I would certainly like to know of them. Judging from the pay panel's denunciation of this phase of H.R. 5725, the men with less than 2 years were either grossly overpaid in 1952 or they are grossly underpaid today. It is as simple as that.

Why should a young American boy enter the service, accept the hardship and risks of military service for the penurious sum of $78 a month when he can join the Job Corps, receive the same lodging, clothing, food, and medical care plus $30 a month spending money, an additional $50 a month savings account and if he is willing to send $25 of the $50 home to his parents the Government will add another $25 to match it, making a total monthly salary of $105?

We are quite sure that the Secretary of the Navy was pleased to learn the Navy does not have a personnel retention problem. He can now cancel his request of May 10, 1965, wherein he asked all Navy personnel on active duty to extend their present service for a period of 3 to 6 months to enable our fleets to meet their readiness requirements.

The Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, I am sure, was happy to learn that the figures he recently quoted to us concerning the Navy's overall reenlistment rate, which has dropped from 25.3 percent in 1962 to 20.3 percent for the first 6 months of fiscal year 1965, are erroneous according to the special pay panel.

In addition to the above I call to the attention of this committee that the cost of living is up. The Consumer Price Index between July 1957, the time that the 1958 pay rates were computed, and December 1963, the Consumer Price Index moved up 9.1 percent. Between May 1952 the effective date of the present officers subsistence rate and the current enlisted "under 2" rates, and December 1963, the Consumer Price Index moved 15.5 percent and by April of this year the increase had been 16 percent. Now let us look at the standard of living. It is moving more rapidly than the cost of living. An interpolation of Bureau of Census and Bureau of Labor statistics surveys of professional and technical salaries in industry show a 25-percent increase of median salaries from 1957 through 1963. In respect to fringe benefits the Chamber of Commerce of the United States reports on this subject compared to studies by the Defense Department now indicate that private industry has surpassed the military.

The pay panel's comments in the first paragraph on page 22 of House Document No. 170 are entirely misleading. The comments would have us believe that in the services critical electronic occupations career manning has increased by 23 percent for the Army and 30 percent for the Air Force in the 1956-64 period. These gains are meaningless unless measured against the needs of the services in these fields, during that time. For example the aforementioned Department of Defense study shows that the Navy's desired goal for career electronic technicians is 56 percent of the first term electronic ratings. The Navy realized only a 29.4-percent retention percentage in 1962 and they estimate only a 31.8-percent reduction percentage for 1966. This leaves the Navy 24.2 percent short of its needs and there is an ever-increasing need in the technical skills in today's and tomorrow's advanced Navy.

On page 14 of House Document 170 under item 3 the pay panel recommends:

"Full responsibility for deciding what adjustments are warranted should be placed in the President, subject to congressional disapproval."

We contend this recommendation to be unconstitutional and would usurp the duties of Congress. It would, in effect, place the cart before the horse. The career enlisted man desires the control of his future compensation to remain with the Congress. He has serious doubts of the wisdom of having civilian executives of private industry and the executive branch of the Government study and set the policies of future military compensation. The facts of military pay history will prove that the American serviceman was never overpaid nor the taxpayer unduly burdened under that system. We are adamant that military personnel participate directly without inhibition in future studies of military pay. The American people do not want our military strategy formed without adequate military counseling. Why shouldn't the vital issue of military pay be also influenced by the personnel who devote their lives to the safety of our Nation? Additional comments on this will be made further on in this statement.

The pay panel's second point at the bottom of page 13 stating it would be unwise, and probably inequitable, to change the established relationship between military and civilian pay and between military pay and pay in the private sector of our economy prior to the proposed major structural review in 1966 of the military compensation system—is wholly unrealistic. The "Settle Report" of 1963, concluding a Department of Defense study of military compensation, showed that military pay lagged 26 percent behind comparable Federal civilian pay at that time. It is obvious that the average 14.4 percent increase of 1963 and the 2.5 percent cost of living increase of 1964 did not overcome that disparity nor the increase in cost of living since that time. Military pay still lags 11 percent short of the comparability goal set by the Congress and yet the pay panel asks that military personnel patiently await another study. We do not concede or agree that military pay has yet reached the comparability with other Federal employees nor workers of private industry. We refer to your excellent analysis on this fact. We are in particular agreement with General of the Army Omar N. Bradley in his statement as pertains to the point of comparability.

In the past several months we have read and heard much about the "unfunded liability" of retired pay of the Armed Forces. We take exception to the statements that in previous pay legislations no consideration has been given to the fact that the military does not contribute directly to their retirement. It is our contention that the active military has always contributed indirectly to their retirement by working for a substandard wage.

VARIABLE REENLISTMENT BONUS

We sincerely regret that we must take strong opposition to this proposal. This proposal originated with Admiral Smedberg, a very dear friend of the white hat. The facts are that this variable reenlistment bonus is not desired by the career personnel. I have discussed this subject with many of them. All feel that this is but one more policy equivalent to pro-pay which is opposed by a large majority of those serving in the Armed Forces. If any one item of compensation has occasioned more dissention among the troops than pro-pay I do not know what it is. Possibly the reason for this is that pro-pay has never been utilized as the Congress intended. Let me assure you that the career enlisted man would much rather have a decent level of compensation coming in monthly than a carrot hung in front of their nose at only certain times in their career. Pro-pay as an example has come and gone to many causing temendous hardship. The variable reenlistment bonus will come and go too. It has been stated that the purpose for this allowance is for retention. As we see it, a specific rate where there was a shortage and the man's enlistment has expired could reenlist and receive several thousand dollars. A year or two later one of his shipmates in the same rate could be due to reenlist but in the meantime the particular rate would be up to guota and this man would not be eligible for the variable reenlistment bonus as his rate by then had been deleted from those eligible. We ask you gentlemen to not forget a most overriding factor in the retention problem—that of morale—and we challenge any one to talk to the man in the field on this subject to determine the morale effect of pro-pay.

MOONLIGHTING

There has been much said in previous testimony on this subject. What I want to call to your attention and I cannot produce computer facts here, I have discussed moonlighting the width and breadth of this land with our active-duty personnel. I can assure you that this working on off hours is being done by no less than 50 percent of

all enlisted personnel where they have the opportunity. And I can further assure you that the reasons for these moonlighters working in the majority of instances is solely to keep their head above water.

We contend that low military pay is the primary reason for the practice of moonlighting among service personnel. This practice is causing growing concern among our military leaders. The Secretary of Defense's press release on this subject explains the problem away by saying that the serviceman moonlights to provide luxuries and frills for himself and his family. His study of the problem states that one major cause of moonlighting is the luxurious desire of military personnel to provide higher education for himself or his children. One of the studies of moonlighting conducted by one of the four services stated that 42 percent of those surveyed stated their reason for moonlighting was the improvement of standard of living. The second most important reason was household expense which was given by 24 percent of those queried.

FRAUD AND WHITTLING AWAY AT FRINGE BENEFITS

At this point I would like to point out some observations of our membership. We strongly feel that these observations have had a tremendous bearing on the procurement and retention problem of the military in the past few years. My members cannot reconcile or understand the breach of contract which has taken place in the recent past and apparently more can be expected to come. The 1963 act established a new method of computing retirees pay negating that system which had been in effect for a hundred years. During these hearings I have heard the word "vest" in speaking of retirement. In 1947 the then Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Admiral T. L. Sprague, published a booklet entitled, "Facts and Figures of Naval Service." This booklet was "A Guide for Officers to the Benefits Afforded Enlisted Men of the Navy." I would like to quote just two paragraphs of that booklet.

"Does it cost anything to quit now?

"The average man of 38 who has done 20 years and then transferred to the fleet reserve can expect to draw $38,120.94. In order for the Navy to make that amount available for every one of its faithful people it must make an investment. The safe investment of money now returns a dividend of 3 percent per year. This means that for every year of your service the Navy has invested for you $2,145. After a 4-year enlistment you have on your account $8,580. After 10 years you have $21,450. Even after 2 years it amounts to $4,290."

"A Navy man is saving money

"He has to. The Navy is doing it for him. He cannot spend it. It cannot be lost, nor stolen."

And now 18 years later all we hear is those that have already retired and will retire in the future have no right to base their pay on the active duty rates as they are an "unfunded liability."

We cannot understand why, after 100 years or more, beds in military hospitals are no longer programed for retirees. We cannot understand the continual attempts to eliminate the commissaries or the continual price increases and purchasing restrictions therein. We cannot understand the procedures being placed into effect which has made space-available transportation for active duty and retired personnel practically nonexistent. We cannot understand the cutting off of an age-old privilege of retirees utilizing base laundries. We cannot understand the barring from service clubs of retires and in many instances of active duty personnel from the club of a sister service. All of these and many more fringe benefits are fading away while the civilian populace is enjoying greater and more fringe benefits. We urge this committee to study this severe problem and take corrective action.

OUR CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion I want to state our opinions briefly. H.R. 8——is most unfair, unrealistic and will not accomplish its aims. If the taxpayer is the one we are to be concerned with—let us not forget that both the active duty man and the retiree also pays taxes. It is our sincere belief that considerable thought, effort and hard work has gone into H.R. 5725 and that the enactment of this bill into law will assist in the procurement and retention of those men who are so desperately needed in our Armed Forces today.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Fleet Reserve Association strongly recommends the early enactment of H.R. 5725. We would recommend amendment to H.R. 5725 and that is granting of recomputation to retirees of at least a 15-percent increase in retired pay. Another committee of this House has reported favorably H.R. 8469 which would increase the retired annuity of civil servants by 10.5 percent. Has any consideration been given to allowing those now retiring to compute their retired pay on this legislation?

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement. I would be remiss if I failed to thank you, the career enlisted men's champion, and to all of those colleagues of yours in the Congress who I know want to see the career military man receive his just due. Thank you.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

180